

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年 報

平成17年度
(第9号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University
for the Academic Year 2005

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2006・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo・2006

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所・年報

平成17年度（第9号）

目 次

● 研究報告

Everyday Life in an Ancient Indian Buddhist Monastery.....	Oskar von HINÜBER	3
The First Three Folios of Manuscript B of the <i>Karmavibhaṅga</i>	Diwakar ACIARYA and Noriyuki KUDO.....	33
One More Manuscript of the <i>Karmavibhaṅga</i> in the National Archives of Nepal, Kathmandu: Transliteration of Manuscript E (1).....	Noriyuki KUDO	43
The Central Asian Manuscript Collection of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences.....	Margarita I. VOROBYOVA= DESYATOVSKAYA.....	61
	(tr. by Jan NATTIER)	
A Trilingual Edition of the Lotus Sutra — New editions of the Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese versions (4).....	Seishi KARASHIMA.....	79
An Old Tibetan Translation of the Lotus Sutra from Khotan: The Romanised Text Collated with the Kanjur Version (2).....	Seishi KARASHIMA.....	89
The Names of Amitābha/Amitāyus in Early Chinese Buddhist Translations (1)	Jan NATTIER	183
The Transmission of Indian Ayurvedic Doctrines in Medieval China: A Case Study of <i>Aṣṭāṅga</i> and <i>Triḍoṣa</i> Fragments from the Silk Road.....	CHEN Ming	201
不空音譯敦煌出土佛頂尊勝陀羅尼.....	湯山 明.....	231
Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica (IV).....	湯山 明.....	277
Brief Communication: A notebook transcribing manuscript B of the <i>Karmavibhaṅga</i> formerly belonging to the private collection of Hemraj Sharman.....	Noriyuki KUDO	297

● 国際仏教学高等研究所年報

活動報告	301
所長・所員の著作.....	304
受贈受入図書・雑誌.....	309

● 執筆者紹介／編集後記.....	314
新刊案内	

● Plates	1~22
(Karashima, “An Old Tibetan Translation of the Lotus Sutra from Khotan: ... (2)”)	

In this PDF version, plates are not included.

Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism
(ARIRIAB)
at Soka University for the Academic Year 2005
Vol. IX

CONTENTS

*: paper written partly in Japanese; **: paper written in Japanese

● RESEARCH ARTICLES:

Oskar von HINÜBER:

Everyday Life in an Ancient Indian Buddhist Monastery 3

Diwakar ACHARYA and Noriyuki KUDO:

The First Three Folios of Manuscript B of the *Karmavibhaṅga* 33

Noriyuki KUDO:

One More Manuscript of the *Karmavibhaṅga* in the National Archives of Nepal, Kathmandu:

Transliteration of Manuscript E (1) 43

Margarita I. VOROBYOVA=DESYATOVSKAYA (translated by Jan NATTIER):

The Central Asian Manuscript Collection of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of
Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences 61

Seishi KARASHIMA:

A Trilingual Edition of the Lotus Sutra — New editions of the Sanskrit, Tibetan and
Chinese versions (4) 79

Seishi KARASHIMA:

An Old Tibetan Translation of the Lotus Sutra from Khotan:

The Romanised Text Collated with the Kanjur Version (2) 89

Jan NATTIER:

The Names of Amitābha/Amitāyus in Early Chinese Buddhist Translations (1) 183

Chien Ming:

The Transmission of Indian Ayurvedic Doctrines in Medieval China: A Case Study of
Aṣṭāṅga and *Tridoṣa* Fragments from the Silk Road 201

*Akira YUYAMA:

Amoghavajra's *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dhāraṇī* from Tunhuang 231

**Akira YUYAMA:

Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica (IV) 277

Brief Communication:

Noriyuki KUDO: A notebook transcribing manuscript B of the *Karmavibhaṅga* formerly
belonging to the private collection of Hemraj Sharman 297

● IRIAB BULLETIN:

IRIAB Activities 301

List of Publications of the IRIAB Director and Fellows 304

Books/Journals Received 309

● EDITORIALS:

Contributors to this Issue / Editorial Postscript 314

New Publication

● PLATES 1~22

(Karashima, "An Old Tibetan Translation of the Lotus Sutra from Khotan: ... (2)")

In this PDF version, plates are not included.

Everyday Life in an Ancient Indian Buddhist Monastery*

Oskar von HINÜBER

Everyday life in medieval European Christian monasteries is well known, partly by a well documented literary tradition partly by extant buildings and their inventory, sometimes even in use today. Moreover, numerous monasteries converted into museums allow immediate access to this particular aspect of culture for any one interested.

In stark contrast, no Buddhist monastery from ancient India survives intact. Once large and famous buildings such as Nālandā lie in ruins. Only the results of excavations executed during the early 20th century in campaigns between 1915 and 1925 and later¹ are on view. For, as it is well known, when Buddhism vanished from North India during the 13th century and only centuries later, also from the South², monasteries were deserted and eventually fell into decay. Buddhist monks and laity disappeared from Indian culture.

Once the physical presence of Buddhism is lost in India, turning to other countries in the immediate vicinity, where Buddhism is a living religion today, such as South-East Asia or Ceylon, may be more promising and ample evidence of Buddhist monasteries still in use is certainly found. However, this evidence is fairly “modern” compared to a really old Buddhist tradition in India proper near in time to the early days of Buddhism and of the Buddha himself. Consequently, it is difficult, if not impossible to tell, how far the daily life observed here represents more than at best a very distant echo from ancient Indian times.

Therefore, if we wish to find out, how Buddhist monks might have lived in pre-muslim India, if not even earlier during the time of the first Buddhist millennium, immediate observation does not help, and we have to turn indirect evidence found in a variety of sources such as literature, not at all composed to satisfy our particular curiosity. For, as it often happens, we are asking questions, which the rich Buddhist literature, extant in spite of heavy losses of texts, never was meant to answer. Therefore, it is much

* This text is based on a lecture given at Soka University on 9th September 2004 and elsewhere, and, consequently, greatly profited from the subsequent discussions. — All abbreviations used follow the system of the Critical Pāli Dictionary (Epilegomena to Vol. I, 1948 supplemented in Vol. III/1. 1992 and III/8. 2001).

¹ H. D. Sankalia: *The Nālandā University*. Delhi ²1972, p. 249.

² See note 61 below.

easier to find information on philosophical problems, meditation or various aspects of spirituality, than on daily life. Even the rich narrative literature is not much concerned with the life of Buddhist monks inside or outside the monastery. The only exception, of course, is the equally rich Vinaya literature, which, however, describes the norm rather than real life, but allows precious insights into certain aspects of the life of a Buddhist monks, once it is read against its original intention³.

When turning from literary evidence to other monuments, it is of course possible to find paintings and sculptures depicting monks, buildings and scenes from monastic life. Old paintings, however, with the notable exception of Ajaṇṭā⁴, are found in Central Asia, and are, consequently, often influenced by non-Indian cultures. Moreover, they were created not only far away from the original home, but also during a time remote from the earlier periods of Buddhism. The latter is true of course already for Ajaṇṭā⁵. Only stone sculptures would allow an immediate look at really old monastic life, but this subject does not figure prominently in Buddhist art.

It is, therefore, evident already from this very superficial survey of early or comparatively early sources that it does require a certain amount of effort to collect material the available literature in form of books and inscriptions, from the monuments and from archaeological finds. Still, when different sources are carefully sifted and combined, it is not impossible to extract some details on daily life and to gather information which they were never meant to convey.

Luckily, there are some, if rare contemporary witnesses, who saw and even lived in ancient Indian Buddhist monasteries, although it was not their primary interest to describe monastic life. Chinese pilgrims in India, first of all Yi-jing (I-tsing) and Xuan zang (Hsüan-tsang), stayed in monasteries and mention precious details of monastic life and organisation. Again, these invaluable reports reflect a time long after the Buddha.

Given all these limitation of our sources it is hardly surprising that it turns out to be fairly difficult to find answers to some very simple questions: What did a Buddhist monk look like during the time of the Buddha or during the following centuries? How did he wear his robes, and what was the actual shape of his equipment as mentioned in the texts? Under which circumstances did Buddhist monks live, and how did they behave

³ In the recent past the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādins has used very successfully for studies of this kind by G. Schopen, many of whose articles are collected now in the three volumes "Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks. Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India"; "Buddhist Monks and Business Matters. Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India". Honolulu 1997 and "Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India. More collected Papers". Honolulu 2005.

⁴ According to the survey in D. Schlingloff: *Ajanta. Handbuch der Malereien. 1: Erzählende Wandmalereien* Vol. II. Supplement. Wiesbaden 2000, p. 106ff. "Inventory of Pictorial Elements", no scenes from a monastery can be seen on the paintings; only monks and nuns are rarely shown: no. 18, P. 124.

⁵ The date is discussed by Walter Spink: *The Innocent Evolution of Ajanta's technology*. In: H. Bakker [Ed.]: *The Vākāṭaka Heritage. Indian Culture at the Crossroads*. Groningen 2004, p. 87-105 and in many earlier articles.

towards each other in private, that is, when they were not participating in an official legal act or fighting a Vinaya case? — Lawsuits are at least briefly outlined in the relevant texts. — How were the monasteries furnished? How were they kept in good repair? How did the administration of large monastic complexes such as Nālandā work⁶, and where exactly did the financial means come from to keep the monastery up? For, as Yi-jing says, as many as 3000 or 3500, if not 5000 monks were accommodated in Nālandā – the text and consequently the figures are unfortunately unclear⁷. In addition, many laymen lived or were present in this and other monasteries as servants to the monks or as students of Nālandā university.

How, then, might Buddhist monks have looked during the beginning of first Buddhist millennium except from the fact that they had, of course, shaven heads⁸? Obviously, there is neither direct evidence nor any tradition of the appearance of any individual monk during the life time of the Buddha. This statement concerning Buddhist monks fits uncomfortably well into the larger frame of ancient Indian culture. For, extremely little historical information on individual persons survives from early India. The dates, as it is well known, even of highly prominent and important persons such as the Buddha himself are rather doubtful⁹, but at least his life span is mentioned, if only in one reference in the Mahāparinibbānasuttanta¹⁰. The second person, whose age at the time of his death survives, is the archrival of the Buddha, Mahāvira, the founder of Jainism, who died at the age of 72¹¹. It seems that these two are in fact the only life times known from ancient India well into the first millennium A.D., which could be considered as historical¹².

There are, of course, unhistorical life spans, obviously without any relation to reality, such as those concerning kings mentioned in the Purāṇas or disciples and other persons living at the time of the Buddha, and in fact living much longer than he did:

⁶ The administration of Buddhist monasteries is addressed in the forthcoming book by Jonathan Silk: *Managing Monks. Administration and Administrative Roles in Ancient Indian Buddhist Monasticism*.

⁷ *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago (A.D. 671-695)* by I-Tsing trsl. by J. Takakusu. London 1896 (Repr. Delhi 1966), p. 154.

⁸ This, however, would not necessarily distinguish a Buddhist monk from other ascetics such as Jainas. The terminology used for removing hair and beard is discussed by N. Balbir: *Lā- et Lau- en moyen-indien: emplois technique et morphologie*, in: *Langue, style et structure dans le monde indien. Centenaire de Louis Renou*. Paris 1996, p. 327-352.

⁹ For the pertinent discussion see H. Bechert: *Die Datierung des historischen Buddha*. *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse. Dritte Folge* I (Nr. 189, 1991), II (Nr. 194, 1992), III (Nr. 222, 1997).

¹⁰ *asītiko me vayo vattati*, DN II 100, 12; cf. on the different periods in the historical Buddha's life: *ekūnatiṃso vayasā Subbadda / yaṃ pabbajjāṃ kimkusalānuesī / vassāni paññāsasamādhikāni / yato abhaṃ pabajjito Subbadda*, DN II 151, 12*-29*.

¹¹ W. Schubring: *Die Lehre der Jainas nach den alten Quellen dargestellt*. Berlin und Leipzig 1935 § 19.

¹² Khāravala mentions his age in his inscription: He was 24, when he became king (line 2) and, consequently, 37 when he wrote the inscription during or after the completion of his 13th year as king (line 14). The length of his life, however, remains unknown.

Visākhā lives 120 years, four brahmins, Ānanda, Mahākassapa and Anuruddha lived each up to 150, and finally Bakkula as the most healthy of all monks even reached 160 years¹³. It is only the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī¹⁴, which adds these life times of the disciples in the explanation of the Mahāpadānasuttanta, where the enormous life times of the six predecessors of the Buddha in our Bhadrakalpa are discussed, and, where in contrast, the Buddha states modestly: *mayhaṇi ... appakaṇi āyuppaṃāṇaṇi parittaṇi labusaṇi, yo ciraṇi jīvati so vassasatam appaṇi vā bhiyyo*, DN II 4, 4 “Small is my lifespan, modest, insignificant. Who lives a long life, lives hundred years or a little more”.

Equally unknown are the features of any Indian individual living ancient India. One of the first attempts to ascribe a picture to a specific person is the well-known relief from Bharhut, where the presence of Anāthapiṇḍika is indicated by an inscription¹⁵. Similarly, a person is defined Aśoka by an inscription on a relief recently found in Kanaganahalli¹⁶. In later times, the statues of Śātavāhana or Kuṣāṇa rulers follow the same pattern of defining whose portrait is depicted¹⁷. The first real portraits intending to show the real features of individuals are found on the Indo-Greek coins in India. For, in contrast to India, there was already a long tradition of preparing portraits in classical antiquity.

Although no individual is depicted as such during the early centuries of Buddhism, we do see many anonymous persons on numerous reliefs with the notable exception of Buddhist monks. Only after Buddhism existed for about half a millennium, a monk is shown for the first time on a coin, the Buddha himself¹⁸. Again, it is only the accompanying inscription “BOΔΔO” which identifies the monk. And it is remarkable that it was obviously felt necessary to point out to Greeks or Kuṣāṇas that is to those who used and read

¹³ Cf. O. v. Hinüber: Old age and old monks in Pāli Buddhism, in: Aging. Asian Concepts and Experiences Past and Present, edited by Susanne Formanek and Sepp Linhart. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte 643. Band, Wien 1997, p. 65-78 and R. A. Ray: Nāgārjuna's Longevity, in: J. Schober [Ed.]: Sacred Biography in the Buddhist Traditions of South and Southeast Asia. Honolulu 1997, p. 129-159.

¹⁴ Sv 413, 14-20.

¹⁵ A. K. Coomaraswamy: La sculpture de Bharhut. Annales du Musée Guimet. Bibliothèque d'art. Nouvelle série: VI. Paris 1956, planche XXVI, fig. 67.

¹⁶ Indian Archaeology 1998/9 [2004], p. 66 and plate on the cover of the issue, where the Brāhmī inscription *asoka rājā* is clearly readable. The supposed “portrait” of Aśoka published in the Newsletter 13, Circle of Inner Asian Art, School of Oriental and African Studies in 2001, p. 15 as based on a grossly wrong reading; moreover, *rājā asoka* would be Sanskrit in a supposedly pre-Christian inscription!

¹⁷ On “portraits” in ancient India: O. v. Hinüber. Die Palola Śāhis. Ihre Steininschriften, Inschriften auf Bronzen, Handschriftenkolophone und Schutzzauber. Materialien zur Geschichte von Gilgit und Chilas. Antiquities of Northern Pakistan. Reports and Studies Vol. 5. Mainz 2004, p. 170 sq., where references to Padma Kaimal: The problem of portrait in South India ca. 970-1000 A.D. *Artibus Asiae* 59. 1999, p. 59-133; 60. 2000, p. 139-179 and Ph. Granoff: Portraits, Likenesses and Looking Glasses: Some Literary and Philosophical Reflections on Representation and Art in Medieval India, in: Representation in Religion ed. by J. Assmann and A. I. Baumgarten. Numen Book Series. Studies in the History of Religions Vol. LXXXIX. Leiden 2001, p. 63-105 should be added.

¹⁸ Therefore, the head is not shaven.

Greek script that the monk was meant to represent the Buddha. In later times, no such hint was necessary and consequently there is no parallel to this inscription. During early Kuṣāṇa times, however, nobody could be expected to know who was shown on the coin at a time, when iconography still awaited definition and development, and when neither the Buddha nor Buddhist monks were ever portrayed previously on coins or in reliefs.

If there is no immediate evidence for the appearance of monks during the times near to the beginnings of Buddhism or even during the first centuries of its development, that can be gathered from extant Buddhist art — of course we do not have and consequently do not know, if there were perhaps some early paintings of monks, which, given the evidence available, does not seem likely — we have to turn to texts, if we wish to imagine the appearance of any very early Buddhist monk. Here at least the robes of Buddhist monks are defined in the Vinaya texts, if in a paragraph, which is by no means easily understood: “Then, after having stayed at Rajagaha for as long as he felt agreeable, the Lord proceeded to Dakkhināgiri. The Lord saw a field typical for Magadha, laid out in squares (*accibaddha*)¹⁹, laid out by dams (*pālibaddha*), laid out by embankments (*ṇariyādabaddha*), laid out by crossroads (*siṅghātakabaddha*). Having seen it, he addressed Ānanda: ‘Do you see, Ānanda, this field typical for Magadha ... limited by cross-roads?’ ‘Yes, Lord’ ‘Are you able, Ānanda, to prepare robes like that for the monks?’” Of course Ānanda answers in the positive, and produces robes which are described in the text as follows: “And Ānanda is going to make a seam (*kusi*), he is going to make half a seam (*aḍḍhakusi*), he is going to make a (large square) piece (*maṇḍala*), he is going to make half a (square) piece (*aḍḍhamāṇḍala*), he is going to make a piece in the middle (*vivaṭṭa*), he is going to make a piece at the sides (*anuvivaṭṭa*), he is going to make a neck-piece (*gīṭveyyaka*), he is going to make a calves-piece (*jaṅgheyyaka*)²⁰, he is going to make an outer end (*bāhanta*). And the robe will consist of cut (pieces: *chinnaka*), and will be shoddy, appropriate for an ascetic and unattractive for anyone desiring to have a robe”, Vin I 287, 6-27²¹.

After reading this text in Pāli or in translation, it is by no means easy to imagine

¹⁹ So read, Ec *bandha*. The Samantapāsādikā 1127, 4-9 explains this paragraph as follows: “Laid out in squares (read *accibaddha*): a rice field laid out in squares; laid out by dams: laid out in width and in length by long embankments; laid out by embankments: laid out inside (a field) by short embankments (read with Bp *rassamariyādabaddha* and cf. note 64 below); laid out by crossroads: laid out by crossroads in crossing embankment by embankment at the place from where (the crossroads) start (? read *gataṭṭhāne* with Bp?), a meeting point of four (embankments)”. The translation, and particularly *acci*°, remains doubtful in many details.

²⁰ According to the commentary, an extra strip of cloth is attached to the robe to strengthen the parts touching the neck and the calves.

²¹ The robes of the Buddha or of Kassapa are described in general terms only, when they exchange their clothes: SN II 221, 10-21 *mudukā ... paṭapilotikānaṃ saṅghāṭī* (of Kassapa) “soft cloak of pieces of cloth” — *sāṇāni paṃsukūlāni nibbasanāni* (of the Buddha) “coarse, worn out rags from the dust heap”. On the meaning of this paragraph: M. Deeg: Das Ende des Dharma und die Ankunft des Maitreya. End- und Neue-Zeit-Vorstellungen im Buddhismus mit einem Exkurs zur Kāśyapa-Legende. ZfR 7. 1999, p. 145-169, part. p. 164, note 64 and J. Silk: Dressed for Success. The Monk Kāśyapa and Strategies of Legitimation in Earlier Mahāyāna Buddhist Scriptures. JAs 291. 2003, pp. 173-219, particularly p. 182ff., and now also A. Seidel: Den'e, in: Hōbōgirin VIII. 2003.

either field or robe, because the meaning of the most likely technical vocabulary used here has been lost. No difficulty, however, was felt by the author of this text who had a visual perception of the objects, which he described. Moreover, this text was composed for early monks, who most likely were well acquainted even with the agricultural terminology used in Magadha and much more so with the robes they themselves were wearing. This, however, is true only for fairly early times, when Buddhism was still based in or near to Magadha. For, although the author(s) of the *Mūlasarvāstivādin* continued to know and to follow the tradition that the model for the robes was a field in Magadha, they phrased the text in their Vinaya quite differently: “(The Buddha with Ānanda) disappeared in Rājagṛha and stood on the mountain Vaidehika²². At that time, when he saw the fields of the people living in Magadha, which were regular (*sama*), with regular precincts (*saṃopavicāra*), laid out in rows (*āvalīvinibaddha*²³), manifold by preparing plots (*bbhaktīracanāviśeṣavicitra*), he again addressed Ānanda ...”, *Cīvaravastu*, GM III 2, p. 50, 7, 12. Obviously, the older middle Indic version was no longer understood, and the author(s) of the *Mūlasarvāstivādin* Vinaya, who may have experienced almost the same difficulties as the author of the *Samantapāsādikā*, who in fifth century Ceylon did the obvious in shaping his explanation after the robes he knew.

The difficulties of both these authors are shared by modern readers who also lack a clear understanding of the fields in Magadha, or in general terms, are unable to connect the statements made in the texts to the reality of the times they reflect. What is evidently needed is the visual evidence, which tells us how monks’ robes looked in ancient India. Of course there is ample evidence again from paintings in Central Asia, but, in this particular case by lucky coincidence evidence from India is even much older. For a robe of perhaps even a Buddhist monk can be seen in one of the reliefs on the railings of the stūpa at Bharhut. The picture shows a robe hanging from a tree and being “milked” by a crouching man²⁴. The accompanying inscription says: *V[e]ḍuko katha dohati naḍode pavate* “Veḍuka milks the ascetic’s robe on the mounain Naḍoda”. As H. Lüders has already recognized, the word *katha* in the inscription corresponds to *kanthā* “garment of religious mendicants”, which is, as Lüders demonstrates from Sanskrit literature, patched together. He also draws attention to the passage from the Theravāda Vinaya quoted above.

Although the Buddhists of course do not use the term *kanthā*, but *cīvara* for their robes, and although the *kanthā* as seen in Bharhut has four widths compared with the always uneven numbers of monks’ robes with five, seven, nine or eleven widths²⁵, it is

²² Looking down from a mountain is a *topos* used already in a comparison in the *Majjhimanikāya*: MN III 130, 23–33.

²³ Thus GM III 2, 10, 12; the text is corrupt in GM III 2, 10 = FE 6, 151/814, line 2 reading *ālinīvinivaddhāni*.

²⁴ Coomaraswamy: La sculpture de Bharhut, as note 15 above, plate XLV, fig. 178. The inscription is discussed by H. Lüders: *Bharhut Inscriptions*, revised by E. Waldschmidt and M. A. Mehendale. *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* Vol. II, 2 Ootacamund 1963, no. B 73, p. 169.

²⁵ O. v. Hinüber: Eine Karmavācānā-Sammlung aus Gilgit. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen*

still fairly easy to recognize on the relief all the more important parts of the robe as described in the Theravāda Vinayapiṭaka with the *maṇḍalas* and *aḍḍhamaṇḍalas* separated by seems as the fields are either by dams or by embankments. The fairly characteristic arrangement of the individual parts of both robes, the one described in the Theravādavīnaya and the one seen in Bharhut, seems to allow the conclusion that Veḍuka has before him a garment which looks like a Buddhist monk's robe. This assumption can be supported by the sculpture of a Bodhisatva from Mathurā donated most likely by Nāgadina²⁶. This Bodhisatva wears a robe with divisions similar to those visible at Bharhut. Moreover, modern evidence can be compared. For even today Theravāda monks are using robes patched together according to the same method of distributing the same number of large and small squares separated by clearly visible seems. The evidence from ancient Central Asia, however, unsurprisingly differs, because the monks were of course not Theravādins following the tradition of the Mahāvihāra at Anurādhapura. Therefore, the number of widths is neither the same as prescribed in the Theravādavīnaya nor as seen in Bharhut.

In spite of the fact that the shape of a robe can be established by combining textual and visual evidence, one important detail is still missing, that is the colour. Here, the grey stone does not help, and again paintings from Central Asia show a large variety of colours, occasionally even shades of green. The colour of the robes of monks painted in Ajaṇṭā, on the other hand, seems to have faded. Therefore it is uncertain how far this light colour reflects the original intention of the painter. Moreover, the variety of colours used for monks robes used in present day Theravāda is considerable. Besides the standard yellow, darkish brown, rarely also red robes can be seen in present day Thailand.

Again the texts prescribe of course the standard colour and the Chinese pilgrim Yi-jing tells his fellow monks in China to use a shade of yellow "not too deep nor too light"²⁷. In a Sanskrit drama composed in South India roughly at the time when Yi-jing visited India, the Mattavilāsa by Mahendravikramavarman, a Kapālika states:

*yad etad āsīt prathamaṃ svabhāvato
mṛṇālabhaṇḍagacchavīcoraṃ ambaram
nanu tvayā nītaṃ acintyakarmaṇā
tad eva bālāruṇarāgatāmratām* (verse 15)

"The garment that was by nature first surpassing the colour of a lotus fibre (i. e. white), was certainly transformed by your inconceivable action into the copper colour of the early morning sun".

In the next verse, the Kapālika mentions also *kaṣāya anapāyīn* "unperishable yellow", the

Gesellschaft 119. 1969, p. 102-132, particularly p. 109.

²⁶ The number of widths of the garment seen in this sculpture cannot be ascertained, because the Bodhisatva is sitting. However, the number seems to be different from the one usual in the Theravāda tradition. The sculpture was published by T. N Ramachandran: An inscribed Bodhisattva image from Mathura. Ancient India 6. 1950. p. 100-102, plates XXXVIII, XXXIX.

same word used in Pāli for the colour of robes²⁸. Similarly, at the beginning of act VIII of the *Mṛcchakaṭika*, a monk says in Māgadhī²⁹: *gibidakaśāodae aśe cīvale* “This robe has taken the yellow colour”. Whatever shade of colour *kāsāya* / *kasāva* may have noted exactly, the colour was certainly not white, the colour of householders, and it was an ugly colour, because the Buddha emphasized that Ānanda should create ugly and unattractive robes.

Thus composition and colour of the Buddhist monk’s robe emerge from texts and pictures, ancient and modern. As these garments were quite different from those worn by laymen, who wrapped themselves in unsewn white clothes as long as they did not belong to those miserable poor³⁰, who had to wear anything, the Buddhists had to prepare their robes themselves, that is dye them and, first of all, sew them. All this is prescribed in the highly technical and not yet fully understood chapters of the Vinayas on the prescriptions concerning the Kaṭhina ceremony³¹. These rules will not be discussed here when looking for texts mentioning monks actually being involved in the act of tailoring their clothes. This is described in some detail in the Samantapāsādikā quoting from the Kurundī, when explaining the Pācittiya rule on *gaṇabbhojana*, in which *cīvare kayiramāne*, Vin IV 74, 37 “when a robe is being made” occurs:

Kurundiyaṃ pana vitthāren’ eva vuttam: yo cīvaraṃ vicāreti, chindati, moghasuttaṃ saṇṭhapeti, āgantukapaṭṭaṃ ṭhapeti, paccāgataṃ sibbeti, āgantukapaṭṭaṃ bandhati; anuvātaṃ chindati, ghaṭṭeti, āropeti; tathā paccāgataṃ sibbati; suttaṃ karoti, valeti; pipphalikaṃ niseti; parivattanaṃ karoti; sabbo pi cīvaraṃ karoti yevā ti vuccati. yo pana samīpe nisinno jātaṃ vā dhammapadaṃ kattheti, ayaṃ na cīvarakārako, Sp 813, 7-14

“In the Kurundī, however, it stated in great detail: ‘Who measures³² (and) cuts the cloth, makes marks (for sewing)³³, fixes (*ṭhapeti*) a patch³⁴, sews a hem³⁵,

²⁷ A Record of the Buddhist Religion, as note 7 above, p. 77.

²⁸ Cf. CPD s. vv. *kasāya* and *kasāva* and NPED s.v. *kāsāya*.

²⁹ On this verse see O. v. Hinüber: Origin and Varieties of Buddhist Sanskrit, in: Dialectes dans les Littératures Indo-Aryennes, ed. par C. Caillat. Paris 1989, p. 341-367, particularly p. 449, note 23 and note that on this pages two lines are missing: after “... verses extant in Māgadhī.” insert: “The dramas thus mirror the well known linguistic situation that the Buddhists adhering to different schools speak different languages such /p. 350/ as Māgadhī and Sanskrit ...”.

³⁰ Cf. W. Rau: The vagrant and the poor in Sanskrit poetry. ABORI 72/73. 1991 & 1992, p. 23-34 and the review of Klaus Wille: Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden. Teil 9 [Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Band X, 9]. Stuttgart 2004, IJ (forthcoming) on “Wiedergeburt Ib”.

³¹ Cf. CPD s. v. *kaṭhina*.

³² *vicāretīti pañcakhaṇḍādivasena samvidabati*, Sp-ṭ III 55, 16 “measures means: he arranges by the five pieces (of an *antaravāsa*) etc.”

³³ According to the Samantapāsādikā, the marks to guide subsequent sewing are made almost as in present times by tailor’s chalk: *moghasuttakan ti* (Vin II 116, 22) *vaḍḍhakīnaṃ dārūsu kālasuttana viya baliddisuttana saññākaraṇaṃ*, Sp 1206, 24 “making a mark by a turmeric thread as by the black thread of carpenters”. Turmeric is used because of the yellow colour and because it fades away quickly. Vajirabuddhi, however, is of a different opinion: *āgantukapaṭṭaṃ moghasuttana sibbetvā ṭhapenti*, Vjb 312, 22 “they fix a patch after

fastens (*bandhati*) the patch³⁶; (who) cuts (a piece of cloth to be used as) border, smoothes³⁷ (it and) attaches (*āropeti*) (it), sews a hem there (where it is attached); (who) makes a thread³⁸, twists (different strands to unite them³⁹); whets scissors; makes a winder for the thread⁴⁰, every single (monk) makes a robe' thus it is said. However, the one who sits in the vicinity and tells a Jātaka or (a story from) the Dhammapada(-aṭṭhakathā), is not a cloth maker".

Apart from the information on tailoring, which can be gathered from this short paragraph, this is one of the rather rare instances, where we learn something about the use of texts. For, while tailoring the monks were entertained or entertained themselves

having (it) sewn by a tacking thread". Either could be correct. This diversity of opinion aptly shows that there was no uniform tradition of the terminology of tailoring.

³⁴ *accchindirvā anvādbhiṃ āropetvā karaṇacīvaraṃ sandhāya vuttaṃ*, Vmv II 27, 17 "this is said concerning a cloth for making (a robe) (?) after attaching an extra supply without cutting". This is more or less quoted from *anvādbikaṃ pi āropetun ti* (Vin I 297, 30) *āgantukapaṭṭaṇi dātum. idaṃ pana appabonake āropetabbaṃ. sace paboti, āgantukapaṭṭaṇi na vaṭṭati, chinditabbam eva*, Sp 1129, 17-19 "to attach an extra supply means: to give a patch. This, however, must be attached if it does not fit. If it fits, a patch is not allowed, on the contrary, it has to be cut". The Vimativinodanī continues: *thapetīti ekaṃ antaṃ cīvare bandhanavasena thapeti* "fixes means: he fixes one end (of the patch) by fastening it to the cloth."

³⁵ *paccāgataṃ sibbetīti tass' eva dutiyantaṃ parivattirvā ābataṃ sibbeti*, Vmv II 27, 18f. "He sews a hem means: having folded the second end (of that very patch, see preceding note) he sews [that is he fixes the border of the patch by folding the outer end backwards (*parivattirvā*) in the direction of the cloth (*ābataṃ*)]". — It is tempting to understand *gatapaccāgata* in the definition of different kinds of discarded cloth (*paṇṣukūla*) in spite of *gatapaccāgatan yaṃ manussā susānaṃ gantvā paccāgatā nabatvā chaddenti*, Vism 63, 8 as "(a robe) without hem" that is worn out. The next items in this enumeration are *aggidaddha* "burnt by fire" and *gokhāyita* "gnawed by cattle", Vism 63, 9f.

³⁶ *āgantukapaṭṭaṃ bandhatīti cīvarena laggaṃ karonto punappunam tattha tattha suttana bandhati*, Vmv II 27, 20 "he fastens the patch means: he fastens it again and again here and there by a thread, while making it adhere to the cloth".

³⁷ *ghaṭṭetīti pamāṇena gabetvā daṇḍādīhi* (v. l. *dabbādīhi*) *ghaṭṭeti*, Vmv II 27, 21 "he smoothes means: he takes (a piece of cloth) according to the (correct) measure and smoothes it with a stick (piece of wood) etc."; vgl. *tattha anuvāte yathā ekatalaṃ hoti tatthā hatthehi ghaṭṭeti*, Vjb 312, 23 "there (on the patch) he rubs the border in that way with his hands that it becomes flat" and *ghaṭṭetīti anuvātaṃ chindirvā hatthena daṇḍena vā ghaṭṭeti*, Sp-ṭ III 55, 16f.

³⁸ *suttaṃ karotīti guṇādibhāvena vaṭṭeti*, Vmv II 27, 21f. ≠ Sp-ṭ III 55, 16 "he makes a thread means: he twists it as a strand etc."

³⁹ *valetīti anekaguṇasuttaṃ hatthena vā cakkadaṇḍena vā vaṭṭeti ekantaṃ karoti*, Vmv II 27, 22 "he twists means: he takes a thread with different strands and twists it with his hand or with a (perforated) board and a handle": This way of twisting ropes is described by G. A. Grierson: Bihar Peasant Life. Patna² 1926 § 598 (the modern terms are still the same: *carakh* and *daṇḍī*); vgl. *valetīti āvaṭṭeti*, Vjb 312, 24 and *daṇḍena vā hatthena vā āvaṭṭeti*, Sp-ṭ III 55, 18.

⁴⁰ *parivattanaṃ karotīti parivattanaḍaṇḍayantakaṃ karoti, yasmiṃ suttaguḷaṃ pavesetvā veūnālīkādisu thapetvā paribbhamāpetvā suttakotito paṭṭhāya ākaddhanti*, Vmv II 27, 23-25 "he makes a winder for the strands means: they make a device with turning sticks, into which he puts a ball of threads fastens it on bamboo sticks or reeds, makes it turn and pulls the thread from its beginning"; cf. *suttaṃ gaṇhantānaṃ sukbaggaḥaṇṭhaṃ suttaparivattanaṃ karoti. paṭṭaṃ sibbantānaṃ sukhasibbanatthapaṭṭaparivattanaṃ ca*, Vjb 312, 25. The word *parivatta(na)* survives as Hindi etc., cf. R. L. Turner: A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages. London 1968, no. 7871 *parivarta*. The technical meaning is not listed by Turner for *parivarta* nor *parivattana*. The device is described by Grierson: Bihar Peasant Life, as preceding note, §

by listening to edifying stories.

Some monks seem to have acquired quite a reputation as skilful tailors while working for their brethren. This is told in the introductory story (*paccuppannavatthu*) of Jātaka no. 38 Baka-jātaka: “A certain monk living in the Jetavana was highly skilful in all matters concerning the manufacturing of robes such as cutting (*chedana*), smoothing (*ghaṭṭana*), measuring (*vicāraṇa*), sewing (*sibbana*) etc. Because he used to embellish (*vaḍḍhati*) robes, he was known as the ‘robe-embellisher’ (*cīvaravaḍḍhaka*). But what did he do? He applied his craft to old rags and made a cloth pleasant to touch and agreeable, and, after dying it, he dyed (it again) by water mixed with powder (*piṭṭhodakena*?⁴¹), removed (the powder?) with a shell, made it shining and charming and put it aside.

Monks who did not know how to make robes saw him with new cloth (*abata sāṭaka*) in saying: ‘We do not know how to make robes, make a robe for us’. He replied: ‘To make a robe, reverend sir, takes a long time. I do have a ready made robe, leave the cloth here, take it and go’ took (the robe) out and showed it. They saw the splendid colour, but did not recognize the inner structure, agreed by saying ‘Certainly’, gave the cloth to the robe-embellisher, took (the embellished robe) and went away. When they washed it in hot water after it was soiled after a short while, it showed its true nature. It was recognized that it was worn out here and there. They regretted (their exchange). Having cheated monks seeing him time and again, he became well known everywhere.

Just like this one in the Jetavana, a robe-embellisher in a certain village also cheated people. His fellow monks told him: ‘Sir, a robe-embellisher in the Jetavana cheats people.’ Then he thought: ‘I should cheat this city dweller’. He made an excessively charming robe from rags, dyed it carefully, put in on and went to the Jetavana. When the other one saw him, he became greedy: ‘Sir, give me that robe, you will receive another one’. ‘Venerable sir, we are living in a village, where requisites are difficult to find. When I present this one to you, what should I wear myself?’ ‘Sir, I have new cloth (*abata sāṭaka*). Take it and make a cloth for you’. ‘Venerable sir, I have applied my craft on this (robe). However, if you say so, what can be done? Take it.’ He gave him the robe made from rags and went away thus cheating him. The monk living in the Jetavana wore that robe, washed it a few days later in hot water, saw the worn rags and felt ashamed. ‘The robe-embellisher living in a village cheated the one living in the Jetavana’: His being cheated became known to the community of monks” (Ja I 220, 16-221, 15).

Leaving morals aside, which are, of course, the fruit of actions in previous births, the paragraphs from the Samantapāsādikā and from the Jātaka demonstrate that monks obviously needed some equipment and tools for tailoring. Consequently, needles for sewing robes are mentioned among the rather few requisites which a monk is permitted to own. Originally, the possessions of each individual Buddhist monk were rather limited⁴². First, there is of course the set of three robes (1. *ticīvara*), the inner robe with five widths

353, 501.

⁴¹ This is some sort of colour, it seems: *lākhāya vā mañjittṭhiyā vā piṭṭhodake vā ... temervā*, Sp 612, 9f.

covering the body from the waist to below the knees (*antaravāsaka*) with a waist band (2. *kāyabandhana*), the upper robe (*uttarāsaṅga*) with seven widths wrapped around the shoulders, and finally some sort of cloak (*saṅghātī*) with nine widths. A Furthermore, a Buddhist monk owns his alms bowl (3. *patto*) and he is allowed a mat to sit on (4. *nisīdana*). To make sure that no living being is killed accidentally when drinking water, a cloth is used as a filter (5. *parissāvana*) and a small jug to collect the water (6. *dhammakaraka*). The needles for sewing are kept in a little box (7. *sūciḥara*).

In course of time this modest set of possessions started to grow and in the end the number of requisites almost doubled from seven to twelve. Different vessels were added, as was a staff, further an umbrella or sandals alternatively, and even a small hatchet. This was needed to cut “tooth brushes”. For, the custom to use twigs of the neem tree for cleaning the teeth, which is still living in India, can be traced back to the early times of Indian culture⁴³.

Of course every single item in this set of requisites served a specific purpose. However, as noted in the commentaries, the requisites might be used for other purposes as well. The *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* draws up a list how the requisites are serving alternatively the body or the belly:

*ticīvaraṇ ca patto ca vāsī sūci ca bandhanaṃ
parissāvanena aṭṭh'ete yuttayogassa bbikkhuno
te sabbe kāyaparibhāriyā pi bonti kucchiparibhāriyā pi. kathaṃ?*

*Ticīvaran tāva nivāsetvā pārupitvā ca vicaraṇakāle kāyaṃ pariharati posetīti
kāyaparibhāriyaṃ hoti. cīvarakaṇṇena udakaṃ parissāvetvā pīvanakāle
khāditaḥḥapalāphalaṃ gabaṇakāle ca kucchiṃ pariharati posetīti kucchiparibhāriyaṃ
hoti.*

*Patto pi tena udakaṃ uddharitvā nahānakāle kuṭiparibhaṇḍakaraṇakāle ca
kāyaparibhāriko hoti. āhāraṃ gahetvā bhuñjanakāle kucchiparibhāriyo.*

*Vāsī pi tāya dantakaṭṭhacchedanakāle mañcapīṭhānaṃ
aṅgapādacīvarakuṭidaṇḍakasajjanakāle ca kāyaparibhārikā hoti.
ucchucchedananāḷikerāditacchanakāle kucchiparibhārikā.*

*Sūci pi cīvarasibbanakāle kāyaparibhārikā hoti. pūvaṃ vā phalaṃ vā vijjhitvā
khādanakāle kucchiparibhārikā.*

*Kāyabandhanaṃ bandhitvā vicaraṇakāle kāyaparibhārikaṃ. ucchuādīni bandhitvā
gabaṇakāle kucchiparibhāriyaṃ.*

*Parissāvanaṃ tena udakaṃ parissāvetvā nahānakāle
senāsanaparibhaṇḍakaraṇakāle ca kāyaparibhārikaṃ. pāṇīyapāṇakaparissāvanakāle ten'
eva tilataṇḍulaputthukādīni gahetvā khādanakāle ca kucchiparibhāriyaṃ, Sv 206, 11*-32*

“A set of three robes, and an alms bowl, a hatchet and a needle, a band,
together with the (water) filter these eight belong to a Monk earnest in his

⁴² The respective objects are enumerated, e.g., at Vin II 301, 34f.

⁴³ Cf. G. Watt: The Commercial Products of India Being an Abridgment of “The Dictionary of the

endeavours.

All these serve the body and the belly. How?

The set of three robes protects and takes care of the body when put on (*antaravāsaka*) and wrapped (around the body: *uttarāsāṅga*) during the time of wandering about. Thus it is serving the body. Having filtered water with the end of a robe when drinking and when collecting all sorts of eatable fruits, it protects and takes care of the belly. Thus it serves the belly.

The alms bowl is serving the body as well, when water is fetched in it at the time of taking a bath or at the time of renovating (or cleaning) the cell. When collecting food at the time of a meal it serves the belly.

The hatchet is serving the body as well when wood to clean the teeth is cut and when, for beds and stools, supports, feet, ‘tents (*cīvarakuṭi*)’, handles are prepared. When sugar cane is cut or coconuts are opened, it serves the belly.

The needle serves the body as well at the time of sewing robes. When cakes or fruits are pierced at the time of eating, it serves the belly.

The waist band serves the body when put on during the time of wandering. When sugar cane etc. is bound together at the time of collecting it, it serves the belly.

The (water) filter serves the body, when it is used to filter water at the time of taking a bath or cleaning the furniture. At the time of filtering drinking water and when collecting sesame seeds, husked or wild rice in it at the time of eating, it serves the belly”.

When carrying all these requisites, it was obviously feared that Buddhist monks started to look very similar to mendicants of different sects such as the one depicted at Bharhut⁴⁴. Looking at the ever growing number of requisites, the monks were occasionally tormented by their conscience, it seems. Therefore, the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* hastens to add something to reassure the readers of this commentary, who, of course, were Buddhist monks: *etesu ca aṭṭhaparikkhāriko va santuṭṭho, itare asantuṭṭhā mahicchā ca mahābhārā ti na vattabbā*, Sv 207, 6f. “Among these only the one with eight requisites is modest, the others should not be called immoderate, greedy, overburdened”.

The opinion hinted at by the commentator that monks using too many requisites were criticised was not altogether unfounded, because it is supported by the story of the greedy monk Upananda. In the introduction (*paccuppannavatthu*) of no. 296 *Samudda-jātaka*, Upananda is described as follows:

so (sc. *Upanando Sakyaputto*) *hi mahagghaso mahātaṇho abosi. sakatapūrehi paccayehi santappetun na sakkā. vassūpanāyikakāle dvīsu tīsu vibāresu vassam upagantvā ekasmin*

Economic Products of India”. London 1908, p. 780 s. v. MELIA, *Linn.*

⁴⁴ Coomaraswamy: Sculpture de Bharhut, as note 15 above, plate XLI, fig. 137 illustrating no. 528. *Mahābodhi-jātaka*, Ja V 232, 9*f., cf. O. v. Ilinüber: 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. 53f.

upāhanā t̥hapeti ekasmiṇ kattarayaṭṭhiṇ ekasmiṇ udakatumbaṇ ekasmiṇ sayañ vasati.

janapadavibhāraṇ gantvā paṇṭaparikkhāre bhikkhū disvā ariyavaṇsakathaṇ kathetvā te paṇsukūlāni gāhāpetvā tesañ cīvarāni gaṇhāti. mattikapatte gāhāpetvā manāpamanāpe patte ca thālakāni ca gaṇhāti, Ja II 441, 6-13

“For he had an enormous appetite and an enormous thirst. It was impossible to satisfy him even by card loads of requisites. At the time when the monks entered the rainy season he would do so in two or three monasteries by placing his sandals in one, his staff in another, his water pot again in another one, and lived himself in still another one.

When he wandered around and saw monks carrying exquisite requisites, he would explain the ‘text on the noble lineage’⁴⁵, made them accept (his own robes) made from rags and took their robes. He would make them accept alms bowls made of clay and take their wonderful bowls and beakers”.

Other details of this story can be gathered from the Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā:

so (sc. Upanando Sakyaputto) ekasmiṇ antovasse upakaṭṭhe janapadam agamāsi. atha naṇ ekasmiṇ vibhāre daharasāmaṇerā dhammakathikāpemeṇa ‘bhante idha vassaṇ upethā’ ti vatvā ‘idha kittakaṇ vassavāsikaṇ labbhati’ ti pucchite tehi ‘ekeko sātaka’ ti vutte tattva upāhanā t̥hapetvā aññaṇ vibhāraṇ agamāsi, dutiyaṇ pi vibhāraṇ gantvā ‘idha kiṇ labbhati’ ti pucchitvā ‘dve sātakā’ ti vutte kattarayaṭṭhiṇ t̥hapesi. tatiyaṇ vibhāraṇ gantvā ‘idha kiṇ labbhati’ ti pucchitvā ‘tayo sātakā’ ti vutte udakatumbaṇ t̥hapesi. catutthaṇ vibhāraṇ gantvā ‘idha kiṇ labbhati’ ti pucchitvā ‘cattāro sātakā’ ti vutte ‘sādhū idha vasissāmi’ ti tattva vassaṇ upagantvā gahaṭṭhānaṇ ceva bhikkhūnaṇ ca dhammakathaṇ kathesi. te naṇ bahūhi vattthehi ceva cīvarehi ca pūjesuṇ. so vuttavavasso itaresu pi vibhāresu sāsaṇaṇ pesetvā ‘mayā parikkhārassa t̥hapitattā vassavāsikaṇ laddhabbaṇ. taṇ me pabhiṇantū’ ti sabbaṇ āharāpetvā yānakaṇ pūretvā pāyāsi, Dhp-a III 139, 17-140, 12

“He wandered around in the countryside, when the rainy season drew near. When the young novices in one monastery asked him out of their sympathy for a teacher of the Dhamma ‘Sir, enter the rainy season here’ he asked them ‘How much does one get here for spending the rainy season?’ and they said ‘One robe each’. Then he deposited his sandals there and went to another monastery. Arriving at the second monastery he asked ‘What does one get here?’ When they said ‘two robes’, he deposited his staff. Arriving at the third monastery he asked ‘What does one get here?’ When they said ‘Three robes’, he deposited his water pot. Arriving at the fourth monastery he asked ‘What does one get here?’ When they said ‘Four robes’, he said ‘Excellent. Here I will live’, and he entered the rainy season there. He taught the Dhamma to householders and monks alike. They honoured him with lots of cloth and robes. At the end of the rainy season he sent a request also to the other monasteries ‘I am entitled to the gains made during the rainy season, because I deposited my requisites’. He collected everything, filled a cart and left”.

⁴⁵ This is AN II 27, 16-29, 3 on being content with little.

Quite obviously, this story is grossly exaggerated. Still, it draws the attention to the simple fact that Buddhist monks not only were human beings and as such always tempted by greediness, but at the same time also to a real conflict. Laymen wanted to gain a better rebirth by accumulating good karma, which, as it is well known, was done by donation to the Buddhist community or to individual monks. The monks, however, were expected to live modestly, if not in poverty. And it is exactly this rule, which is skilfully used by Upananda, when he preached the Ariyavaṃsasutta, which praises the simple way of life.

Certainly there was a real conflict: The monks were and are unable to simply refuse gifts by laymen thus destroying their wish to make merit in order to advance their chances for a better reincarnation⁴⁶. On the other hand, the monks were and are expected not to live in luxury, which would easily happen after accepting too many precious gifts. Thus, Buddhist monks lived in permanent temptation, and consequently the pursuit of worldly goods is as old as the fight for keeping up modesty and poverty. And this conflict between poverty aspired to and forced possession has deeply influenced the way of life of Buddhist monks, occasionally leading to tragic-comical situations. A Thai monk reported once that well meaning laymen presented him with lots of different medicine. In spite of being in excellent health the monk felt obliged to take at least some of the medicine to ensure the merit of his well wishers. Of course his health did not profit from this pious attitude and he fell seriously ill.

The roots of this conflict is that the Buddhist order was founded as a community of mendicants, as the self-denomination *bhikkhu* “beggar” aptly demonstrates. It is worth while to recall that in spite of this intention no vow of poverty exists in Buddhism. Instead, there is an apparently very old set of rules, which entails a life at least originally in extreme destitution. These “four basic rules” (*cattāro nissaya*) were introduced according to the Vinaya to avoid that men joined the *saṅgha* only *udarassa kāraṇā*, Vin I 58, 3 “because of the belly⁴⁷”. They are communicated to all Buddhist monks during the ordination ceremony: “going forth is on account of meals of scraps (1. *piṇḍiyāloṇapabbhājā*), in this respect effort is to be made by you for life, ... on account of rag-robies (2. *paṃsukūlacīvara*), ... on account of a lodging at the foot of a tree (3. *rukkhamaḷasenāsana*), ... on account of purifying⁴⁸ urine as medicine (4. *pūtimuttabbhesajja*)”.

This strict rigor, however, was mitigated soon. For there are exceptions to each of the four *nissaya*: “(These are) extra acquisitions (*atirekalābha*): a meal for an order (*saṅghabhatta*), a meal assigned to an individual (*uddesabhatta*), an invitation (*nimantana*),

⁴⁶ Refusing to accept gifts was indeed seen as a weapon against laymen who did not live up to their status as *upāsakas*, and it was first used against the Licchavi Vaddha: Vin II 124, 14-127, 12.

⁴⁷ The success was limited. For, as the disciple of the mendicant confesses right at the beginning of the Bhagavadajjuka, he joined the Buddhist order *pādarasaṇaṇoheṇa sakkiasamaṇaṇaṃ pavvaido mhi* (*prātaraṇalobbhena śākyaśramaṇaṇaṃ pravrajito 'smi*) “longing for a breakfast I joined the Śākya mendicants”; on this text see below.

⁴⁸ This translation follows a suggestion made by A. Wezler, Journal of the European Āyurvedic Society 4, 1955, p. 226.

a ticket-food (*salākabbatta*), (food given) on the day of the waxing or waning moon (*pakkhika*), on an observance day (*uposathika*), on the day after the observance day (*pāṭipadika*) ... (robes made of) linen (*khoma*), cotton (*kappāsika*), silk (*koseyya*), wool (*kambala*), coarse hemp (*sāṇa*), canvas (*bhaṅga*) ... a dwelling place (*vihāra*), a long house (? *aḍḍhayoga*), a large house (*pasāda*), a mansion (*hammiya*), a cave (*leṇa*), ... ghee (*sappi*), fresh butter (*navanīta*), oil (*tela*), honey (*madhu*), brown sugar (*phāṇita*)⁴⁹.

In spite of these mitigations, the Buddhist remained committed to modesty and were, first of all, very strict in one particular respect: The use of money was and is absolutely ruled out. Now, if the enormous buildings at Nālandā for instance are kept in mind, where thousands of people were accommodated, monks and their personal in kitchen and garden, and finally numerous students, who, if we follow Yi-jing, were not at all bothered by **spiritual progress**, but had a worldly career in mind⁵⁰, if the huge administrative machinery is considered necessary to run this famous university, it is really difficult to imagine that this was all done without the use of money. The world of outdated normative texts with all their unchangeable legal rules and regulations had to clash earlier or later with a changing reality, because also Buddhist monks were living in a developing world.

Therefore the question arises how Buddhists managed to harmonize their texts with reality. Now, the Buddhist certainly were the best lawyers in ancient India and as smart legal experts they did find ways out of this and many other predicaments. If a layman wanted to present money to a monk, which neither was nor is uncommon practice, the monk is unable to accept it directly. However, the money could be handed over to an administrator, a trustee of the monk. This administrator being a layman could easily handle the money presented either to individual monks or to the order without any rule being broken.

Money, however, was not the only object unacceptable to a monk. This raises the more general question, what was a monk expected to do, if he was offered objects he could not accept. As stated above, simple refusal was often ruled out. Therefore it did happen that a monk suddenly acquired possessions he was not supposed to have, even if he was by no means as greedy as Upananda. If a monk had acquired what was called a surplus possession, the respective object had to be discarded. However, if a surplus alms bowl for instance was given up, there has to be also a recipient, to whom it was given. The recipient was the community of Buddhist monks, the *saṅgha*, whose property would increase by objects discarded by individual monks.

⁴⁹ The abridged translation follows I. B. Horner. In detail on these rules: O. v. Hinüber: *Das Pātimokkhasutta — Seine Gestalt und seine Entstehungsgeschichte*. (Studien zur Literatur des Theravāda-Buddhismus II). Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jg 1999, Nr. 6, chapter IV.2.1.1, p. 41ff.

⁵⁰ Students graduating from Nālandā seem to have been quite successful also in worldly careers: A Record of the Buddhist Religion, as note 7 above, p. 177, cf. also Samuel Beal: *Hsuan-tsang: Si-yu-ki: Buddhist records of the western world*. Translated from the Chinese of Hsuen Tsiang (AD 629), 2 Bände. London 1884, Nachdruck Delhi 1969, Vol. II, p. 170.

Consequently, there were objects, which belonged to the community as a whole (*saṃghika*), while other objects or goods were owned by individual monks (*puggalika*). The number of objects allowed to individuals was clearly defined and limited those of the whole community were not. Rules concerning the common property prescribe first of all that they must neither be disposed of nor distributed to nor appropriated by any individual monks.

Even money, which a monk had to give up as a matter of course, could become such common property, if it was given to a trustee. This layman could use and spend the money on behalf of the community of Buddhist monks. However, even he would not be free to buy whatever the *saṃgha* wanted from this particular money. On the contrary, the objects that could be bought were strictly limited to goods such as ghee, oil, honey or brown sugar (Vin III 238, 18). Then, it was permitted to the *saṃgha* to consume this oil or honey, but, much more important, oil and honey could also be exchanged for other goods, which were now neither defined nor limited. The Samantapāsādikā describes this in detail:

rūpiyapaṭiggāhakaṃ ṭhapetvā sabbeḥ' eva paribbuñjitabbau (Vin III 238, 20) ti sabbehi bhājetvā paribbuñjitabbaṃ. rūpiyapaṭiggāhakena bhāgo na gahetabbo, aññesaṃ pi bhikkhūnaṃ ārāmikānaṃ vā pattaḥāgam pi labhitvā paribbuñjituṃ na vaṭṭati ... tena vatthunā mañcapīṭhādīni vā gaṇhanti uposathāgāraṃ vā bhojanasālaṃ vā karonti paribbuñjituṃ na vaṭṭati. chāyā pi gehaparicchedena ṭhitā na vaṭṭati, paricchedātikkantā āgantukā vaṭṭati, Sp 692, 1-12

“Except the monk who accepted the money, all can use (it) means: It should be used by all (monks) after being distributed. The monk who accepted the money must not receive a share. It is also not allowed (for him) to use the share received by other monks or monastic servants⁵¹ ... if (the monks) acquire furniture or build a house for the *uposatha* or a refectory, he is not allowed to use it. Even the shade which falls over the precincts of a building (built by using the money discarded) is not permitted, if (the shade) surpasses (the precincts), it is allowed, as something additional (i.e., that has no connection to objects acquired and, consequently, to the money)⁵².”

It is most surprising to go through the list of items that could be acquired by the community of Buddhist monks in this manner. In addition to the buildings just mentioned goods and objects of extraordinary value are mentioned such as ships, dams, irrigation tanks, parks and fields (Sp 692, 11-27). Of course the offender is excluded from the use of all these objects: If this enumeration is taken literally, the offending monk must have

⁵¹ It is noteworthy that also the *ārāmikas* received a share, cf. Nobuyuki Yamagiwa: *Ārāmika — Gardener or Park Keeper? One of the Marginals around the Buddhist Saṃgha*, in: *Buddhist and Indian Studies in Honour of Professor Sodō Mori*, Hamamatsu 2002, p. 363-385, particularly p. 380.

⁵² Because it was not included in things acquired by using the discarded money like water in a pond bought empty: *anto udake pana asati aññaṃ āgantukkaudakaṃ vā vassodakaṃ vā vaṭṭati*, Sp 692, 17 “if there is not water (in the pond bought), other water let in (after the transaction) or rain water is permitted”.

accepted an exorbitant sum of money ...

Still it remains strange and astonishing that on the one side monks were strictly forbidden to own any money, and were, consequently, unable to enter any shop as simple customers, but they were, on the other side, doing exchange deals in grand style. This obviously is a glaring contradiction hard to overlook, and this was seen of course by the Buddhists themselves. Therefore, all sorts of deals are indeed forbidden. This is stated with all desirable clarity in the normative texts, when Nissaggiya Pācittiya no. 20 forbids “buying and selling (*kayavikkaya*).” This is how monks should live. How they actually did live, can be learned from the interpretation of the rules. In the case of exchanging goods, the Buddhist lawyers are in exceptionally good luck, because the formulation of the Vinaya allowed them to find a shrewd interpretation permitting almost any exchange deal.

The relevant rule itself does not leave the slightest doubt that all and every exchange deal is forbidden for Buddhist monks: *yo pana bhikkhu nānappakāraṇaṃ kayavikkayaṃ samāpajjeyyā, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ*, Vin III 241,26**f. “which monk, however, should engage in any buying or selling, (commits) an offence which entails giving up (the object acquired)”. The oldest commentary, the canonical Suttavibhaṅga, defines *nānappakāraṇaṃ* as “requisites such as robes, food, furniture, medicine for the sick” that is all the few things a monk was permitted to own and, consequently, could “buy or sell” by exchange. This, however, would be an offence. Although this seems to be a very clear statement, later commentators succeeded in almost reversing its meaning.

The unknown author(s) of the Sainantapāsādikā and possibly already his or their predecessors correctly say when explaining *nānappakāraṇaṃ: cīvarādīnaṃ kappiyabhaṇḍānaṃ vasena anekavidhaṃ, ten’ eva assa padabbājane cīvaraṃ ādiṃ katvā dasikasuttapariyosānaṃ kappiyabhaṇḍaṃ eva dassitaṃ. akappiyabhaṇḍaparivattanaṃ hi kayavikkayaṇigāhaṃ na gacchati*, Sp 799, 23-31 “different things means: because permitted objects such as robes etc. are manifold, therefore permitted objects are shown in its commentary beginning from the robe ending in the threads of the border (of any garment). For, exchange of objects, which are **not** permitted, is **not** covered by ‘buying and selling’”.

This unexpected turn of thought opens floodgates: The community of Buddhist monks can engage in large scale exchange as long as monks do not exchange any of their requisites such as tooth brushes. Complete buildings, on the other hand, do no longer pose any problem and can be exchanged without the slightest reservation or remorse. If, for instance, a house owned by a layman and located on the compound of a Buddhist monastery is exchanged against another house owned by the *saṃgha*, but located far away from that monastery, or if an orchard far away from the monastery, it is easily possible to offer this house or this garden to a layman, who in turn owns another garden in the vicinity.

When engaging in deals like this the problem of unequal value could arise, because a garden belonging to the Buddhist monks might be smaller than the one which they would wish to receive in exchange. All the monks have to do is to draw the attention of

the layman to this fact: *sace pana manussānaṃ bahutarā rukkhā bonti: 'nanu tumbākam bahutarā rukkhā' ti vattabbaṃ. 'sace atirekaṃ, ambākam puññaṃ hotu, saṅghassa demā' ti vadanti. jānāpetvā sampatichhituṃ vaṭṭati*, Sp 1238, 20-24 “If, however, the laymen own more trees, it is necessary to say: ‘Aren’t you owning more trees?’ They (the laymen) say: ‘If there is a surplus, this will be our merit. We give it (the garden: *ārāma*) to the *saṅgha*.’ Having notified, it is allowed to accept”.

In this way the community of Buddhist monks succeeded in legally owning land and buildings, which were donated in course of time, and which could be managed skilfully in order to preserve or even to increase their value, if the rules of the Vinaya were applied following the current interpretation. Real estate on the other hand unavoidably also needs preservation and renovation from time to time, in case of a mansion (*pāsāda*) every eleven years (Sp 1246, 10). This kind of work used to be costly also in ancient India. Therefore the monks are advised in detail how to collect the money necessary for renovation work:

sace so āvāso jīrati, āvāsasāmikassa vā tassa vaṃse uppannassa vā kassaci kutthetabbaṃ: 'āvāso vo nassati. jagghatha etaṃ āvāsaṃ' ti. sace so na sakkoti, bhikkhūhi ūtāke vā upaṭṭhāke vā samādepatvā jaggatabbo. sace te pi na sakkonti, saṅghikena paccayena jaggatabbo. tasmim pi asati, ekaṃ āvāsaṃ vissajjetvā avasesā jaggetabbā. babū vissajjetvā ekaṃ saṅghapetuṃ pi vaṭṭati yeva. dubbhikkhe bhikkhūsu pakkantesu sabbe āvāsā nassanti. tasmā eko dve vā tayo vā āvāse vissajjetvā tato yāgubhattacīvarādīni paribhuñjantehi sesā āvāsā jaggatabbā yeva.

Kurundiyaṃ pana vuttaṃ: saṅghike paccaye asati eko bhikkhu: 'tuyhaṃ ekaṃ mañcatthānaṃ gabetvā jaggāhi' ti vattabbo. sace bahutarāni icchati, tibhāgaṃ vā upadḍhabhāgaṃ vā datvā pi jaggāpetabbo. atha: 'thambhamattam evettha avasiṭṭhaṃ. habu kammaṃ kattabban' ti na icchati. 'tuyhaṃ puggalikam eva katvā jagga, evaṃ pi hi saṅghassa bhaṇḍakatthapanatthānaṃ ca navakānaṃ ca vasanatthānaṃ bhavissati' ti jaggāpetabbo. evaṃ jaggito pana tasmim jīvante puggaliko hoti, mate saṅghiko yeva. sace saddhivihārikānaṃ dātukāmo hoti, kammaṃ oloketvā tatiyabhāgaṃ vā upadḍhabhāgaṃ vā puggalikaṃ katvā jaggāpetabbo. etaṃ hi saddhivihārikānaṃ dātuṃ labhati. evaṃ jagganake pana asati ekaṃ āvāsaṃ vissajjetvā ti ādinā nayaena jaggāpetabbo, Sp 1246, 19-1247, 5

“If the residence falls into decay, one should tell the owner of the residence (*āvāsasāmi*)⁵³ or somebody born into his family: ‘Your residence is decaying. Take care of this residence’. If he is unable to do so, the monks must alert (their own) relatives or supporters and take care (of the residence themselves). If they are also unable to do so, it must be taken care of by means of resources of the *saṅgha*. If they are unavailable, one residence should be given away and the rest

⁵³ This term, which is very rare in Pāli, obviously corresponds to the *vihārasvāmin* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins: G. Schopen: Lay Ownership of Monasteries and the Role of the Monk in Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticism. JIASB 19.1.1996, p. 81-126 = Buddhist Monks and Business Matters, as note 3 above, p. 219-259. Similar problems concerning the repairs of monasteries are discussed in a Mūlasarvāstivāda context by G. Schopen: Art, Beauty, and the Business of Running a Buddhist Monastery in Early Northwest India, ibidem p. 19-44, particularly p. 27f.

taken care of (with the money received). It is allowed to give up many to preserve one. When during a famine the monks walk away, all residences are decaying. Therefore one or two or three residences should be given away, and then the remaining residences should be taken care of by those using gruel, food, robes etc. (acquired by the money received from selling the residences)⁵⁴.

In the Kurundī it is however said: 'When there are no resources belonging to the *saṃgha*, one should tell a monk: 'Take care of a room for one bed'. If he wishes more, one should give him one third or one half (of the residence) and make him taking care of it. Then, (if) he does not want it: 'Here only one post is left. There is a lot of work to be done', he should be made taking care of it: 'Take it into your personal possession and take care of it. For, in this way there will be storage room for the *saṃgha* and a dwelling place for young (monks)'. If (the residence) is thus taken care of, it is lifelong in (his) personal possession, when he dies, (it returns into the) possession of the *saṃgha*. If he wishes to donate it to his fellow monks, he should supervise the work and convert one third or one half into personal possession. This may be given to fellow monks. If no one can be found, who takes care (of the residence), one should see to it that care is taken (of the residence) according to the procedure 'having given away one residence etc.'⁵⁵."

Donating a building to the community of Buddhist monks seems to have resulted in a rather long-term financial obligation, if not a burden which could easily stretch over more than one generation. At the same time, texts like this one help to imagine how large monasteries such as Nālandā could subsist as long as there was a substantial and rich laity, on which the Buddhist monks could rely.

It is beyond doubt that the community of Buddhist monks was in the position to acquire substantial property such as large and lavishly furnished buildings, as they are described again in the Samantapāsādikā:

suvaṇṇarajatādīvicitrāṇi pi kavāṭāṇi mañcapīṭhāṇi tālavaṇṭāṇi suvaṇṇarajatamayāṇi pāṇiyaghaṭāṇi pāṇiyasarāvākāṇi vā yaṃ kiñci cittakammakatam sabbam vaṭṭati. 'pāsādassa dāsīdāsakhattavattbugomahisaṃ demā' ti vadanti, pāṭekkaṃ gabaṇakiccaṃ natthi. pāsāde paṭiggabite paṭiggabitaṃ eva hoti, Sp 1236, 27-1237, 1

"Doors, beds and stools, fans adorned by good and silver, golden and silver jugs for drinking water or cups for drinking water, all that is adorned is permitted. If (laymen) say: 'We give slave girls, slaves, fields, compounds, cows, buffalos for the mansion', it is unnecessary to formally accept every single item separately.

⁵⁴ In this way the monks could be fed and stay to take care of the necessary renovation.

⁵⁵ 'The reason for the difference of opinion put forward in the Kurundī is the obvious attempt to avoid an offence against the rule of the five things that may neither be given away (*avissajaniya*), i.e. sold, nor distributed to individuals monks (*avebhaṅgiya*), Vin II 170, 23; 171, 32 with: *vibhāro nāma yaṃ kiñci pāsādādisenāsaṇaṃ*, Sp 1237, 9f., although, in the end, both commentaries recommend an emergency procedure, which because of selling or transferring a residence to an individual monk, cannot be reconciled with Vin II 170.

Once the mansion is accepted, it is already accepted”.

This means that slaves etc. are accepted as included in the gift of a building, which opens a vast opportunity to accept legally items otherwise prohibited such as slaves⁵⁶.

All this was certainly not the fancy of Buddhist lawyers eager to demonstrate their resourcefulness by imagining all conceivable cases. On the contrary, it corresponded well to the real world, though not always to the spirit of the Vinaya as non-Buddhist texts tell us. And these texts certainly help to imagine the past splendour of all the many halls and rooms in the monastery at Nālandā before the buildings decayed.

Living in such a monastery well furnished with all thinkable comforts of the then contemporary civilisation must have been most agreeable for a monk. Everywhere, also in ancient India, such comfort enjoyed by supposed ascetics does not escape the sharp eye of neither laity, who frequently visited or even lived for a while in Buddhist monasteries to accomplish their worldly education, nor, and first of all, members of other religious movements. These persons observed the easy and cosy life of many monks with open envy and commented on it, often by mockery. This is particularly true and evident in two Sanskrit dramas composed by Hindus. If Buddhist monks appear on the stage, there seemingly very comfortable life is ridiculed.

In the South Indian satire “The Venerable One and the Courtesan”, Bhagavadajjuka, which was written during the 7th century that is during the time, when Yi-jing and Xuan zang visited India and stayed at Nālandā, one of the principal characters is the pupil of a Hindu ascetic, the “Venerable one” mentioned in the title. This pupil introduces himself by describing his career in the following words:⁵⁷ “I was born in a Brahmin family, which lived on the remains of offerings left by crows. Our tongues were untouched by learning, though we wore our sacred thread around our necks, and were very proud of our status as Brahmins. As there was no food in our house, I was always hungry. To get something to eat in the morning, I converted to Buddhism, only to find that these bastards eat only once a day, which again left me hungry in the afternoon. So I tore up my robe, broke my alms bowl and kept only this useful umbrella. Presently, I have to carry the belongings of my wretched teacher”. Quite evidently, the prospect of a good life, at the very least regular food did attract men to Buddhist monkhood in ancient India, as it occasionally still does in Buddhist countries.

The confession of the mendicant’s pupil corresponds closely to a second play. Here, in the allegorical Prabodhacandrodaya composed by Kṛṣṇamiśra in the 10th century, the impersonated Buddhist religion appears on the stage book in hand. This characteristic

⁵⁶ It is stated explicitly that the Buddha abstained from accepting slaves etc., cf. O. v. Hinüber: *Das Pātimokkhasutta* p. 28f.

⁵⁷ Michael Lockwood, A. Vishnu Bhatt: *Metatheater and Sanskrit Drama*. Delhi 1994: Text and Translation of Bhagavad-ajjuka Prahāsanam (The Farce of the Saint-Courtesan), p. 2, lines 15ff.

feature, a book, is well chosen. For, in contrast to Hindus, the Buddhist created at an early date already an impressive culture around books and even “invented” pocket books⁵⁸ to be used by monks during their wanderings.

The Buddhist monk impersonating the Buddhist religion introduces himself with a verse:

aho sādhubr ayaṇi saugatadharma yatra saukhyaṃ mokṣaś ca. tathā hi:

āvāso layanaṃ manoharam abhiprāyānurūpā vaṇiṇ

nāryo vāñchitakālam iṣṭam āsanaṃ śayyā nṛduprastarāḥ

śraddhāpūrvam upāsītā yuvatibhiḥ kūptāṅgadānotsava-

krīḍānandabharaṇī vṛjanti vilasajjyotsnojjvalā rātryaḥ, Prabodh. III 9

“Oh, excellent is this teaching of the Sugata, which combines comfort and salvation! For:

We live in splendid buildings, we are surrounded by the wives of merchants eager to serve, we have delicious food at any time and our beds have soft spreads. Our beautiful full moon nights are passed in the company of most devout young women, playfully prepared to do anything”.

This elegant verse with slightly bawdy undertones alludes to the correct observation that merchants were indeed the most important supporters of Buddhism⁵⁹, although the role of their wives might have had — hopefully — slightly different goals of their eagerness. The full moon nights mentioned are of course the *uposatha* nights, when monks and laymen meet regularly. Again the observation is correct that the majority of the audience during the *uposatha* nights were indeed women, if the evidence preserved in inscriptions is compared, which shows how actively women were supporting Buddhism. The queens of the Palola Śāhis of Gilgit are one example among many⁶⁰. This support by women has not changed over the centuries and can be easily observed in present days in the monasteries of Buddhist countries.

Obviously, Kṛṣṇamiśra as a Hindu author knew Buddhism well as did his later South Indian commentators as late as during the 16th century, who somewhat maliciously comment on this verse. Although both commentators of the Prabodhacandrodaya, Nāṇḍilla Gopa, the nephew of the general Sālva Timma, who served Kṛṣṇarāya of Vijayanagara (1609-1629), and Rāmadāsa Dīkṣita, still knew Buddhism astonishingly well. This

⁵⁸ O. v. Hinüber: Der Beginn der Schrift und frühe Schriftlichkeit in Indien. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jg 1989, Nr. 11, chapter XV, p. 71, and review of R. Salomon: Rhinoceros Sūtra. 2000. JAOS 123. 2003, p. 222.

⁵⁹ It may be recalled that the first laymen were the merchants Tapussa nad Bhallika (Vin I 3, 32ff.).

⁶⁰ O. v. Hinüber: Die Palola Śāhis. Ihre Steininschriften, Inschriften auf Bronzen, Handschriftenkolophone und Schutzzauber. (Antiquities of Northern Pakistan 5). Mainz 2004, p. 124ff., cf. A. Wezler: Zur Proklamation religiös-weltanschaulicher Toleranz bei dem indischen Philosophen Jayantabhaṭṭa. Saeculum 27. 1976, p. 329-347: Jayantabhaṭṭa criticises the good life of Buddhists in his drama Abhinavagamaḍambara in a similar way as Kṛṣṇamiśra does: p. 340.

corresponds to the fact that Buddhist bronzes were cast in South India as late as during the 17th century⁶¹.

However, how far are these descriptions of an easy and comfortable live correct, which are purposefully distorted by authors hostile against Buddhism? It is indeed possible to control these descriptions with the help of Buddhist texts. For, occasionally, even Buddhist authors criticized the behaviour of Buddhist monks as did the author of the *Rāṣṭrapālāpariprcchā* in a verse⁶²:

*grddho grbhīṇa tathā kāmair yādṛśe pravrajitva te grddhbāḥ
bhāryāḥ sutā duhitaraś ca teṣu bhaviṣya grabhasamānam*, RP 29, 11f.

“No householder would pursue the pleasures of the senses to such a degree as those, who enter the order with their wives, sons and daughter, to live as Buddhist monks like householders”.

These are strong words by a Buddhist about Buddhists, who supposedly live within the order as householders that is as laymen. Other Buddhist texts confirm this way of life, which was perhaps much less unusual than our sources normally would make us believe. In this connection, a text expressing disapproval of certain ways of live as led by some monks is remarkable:

acchinnaḡibhandbano samaṇakuṭimikapuggalo ‘ko jānissati kiṃ bhavissati’ ti mahallakakāle pabbajanto pi ḡibibandhanam na vissajjeti. mahallakapabbajitānaṃ ca sampatti nāma natthi. tassa sace cīvaraṃ pāpuṇāti antacchinnaḡam vā jīṇṇadubbaṇṇam vā pāpuṇāti. senāsanam pi vihārapaccante paṇṇasālāya maṇḡape vā pāpuṇāti. piṇḡdāya carantenāpi pūṭigandhakānaṃ pacchato caritabbo hoti. pariyaṇte nisīditabbaṃ hoti. tena so dukkhī dummāno assuṇi muṇcanto ‘atthi me kulasantakaṃ dhanam. kappati nu kho taṃ khādītva jīvītun’ ti cintevā ekaṃ vinayadharmaṃ pucchati: ‘kiṃ bhante ācariya attano santakaṃ bhāretvā khādītun kappati na kappati’. ‘natth ettha doṣo. kappat etan’ ti. so attano bhajamānake katipaye dubbacce durācāre bhikkhū gahetvā sāyaṇhasamayaṃ antogāmaṃ gantvā gāmamaḡjhe ṭhito gāṃmike pakkosāpetvā ‘ambakaṃ payogato utṭhitam ayaṃ. kassa detthā’ ti. ‘bhante, tumhe pabbajitā. kassa dassāmā’ ti. ‘kiṃ pabbajitānaṃ attano santakaṃ na vaṭṭatī’ ti kuddālapitakaṃ gahetvā kedāramariyādabbandhanādīni karonto nānappakāraṃ pubbaṇṇāparaṇṇaṃ ceva phalāphale ca saṇḡaṇḡhitvā hemantaḡimhavassānesu yaṃ yaṃ icchati taṃ taṃ pacāpetvā khādanto samaṇakuṭimiko viya jīvati. kevalam assa paṇcucūḡḡalakena dāraḡena saddhiṃ pādapāricārikā va ekā natthi, Spk III. 32, 25-33, 17

⁶¹ This was demonstrated by John Guy in his lecture “Buddhism in South India: Traces and Transmission” at Basel on 30th January 2003. Late interest in Buddhist art, if perhaps only as decoration, is shown by the find of a displaced Buddhist relief (in Amarāvati style?) in front of the “king’s audience hall” in the citadel (“Royal Enclosure”) in Vijayanagara: Indian Archaeology 1985/6 [1990], p. 40 and plate VIIA.

⁶² On the radical tendencies of this text cf. G. Schopen: The Mahāyāna and the Middle Period in Indian Buddhism Through a Chinese Looking-glass. The Eastern Buddhist 32. 2000, p. 1-25 = Pigments and Fragments, as note 3 above, p. 3-24, particularly p. 15f.

“An individual, who has not cut the bonds to **worldly life, is an ascetic-family man**⁶³: Although certain man became a monk during **old age only, he** did not cut the bonds to worldly life thinking: ‘Who knows, what is going to happen?’ Monks (ordaining during) old age do not gain prosperity (read *sampatti* with Be). If he receives a robe, he receives one with worn out edges, old and ugly. Also lodgings he receives at the far end of the monastery in a hut made of leaves or in an (open) pavilion. When begging for food he has to walk behind smelling (monks). He has to sit at the far end. Therefore, he became unhappy and dejected and shed tears thinking: ‘My family owns riches. Is it permitted to live by using them?’ He asked a monks well versed in Vinaya: ‘Is it permitted or not, sir, to collect one’s own possessions and use them?’ ‘There is no fault in it. It is permitted.’ He gathered some of his miserable fellow monks of bad reputation, went to a village in the evening and standing in the middle of the village announced to the people living there: ‘By our effort this income has been created. To whom do you give it?’ ‘Sir, you have become a monk. To whom, should we give it?’ ‘Have the monks no rights in their possessions?’ (Having said this), he took up hoe and basket, made small dams around fields etc.⁶⁴, collected different kinds of harvests and all sorts of fruit, cooked for himself in winter, summer or rainy season whatever pleased him. Only there was not a single wife with a small child⁶⁵”.

As the commentary on the *Samyuttanikāya* concludes this monk who acts following a most astonishing advice of a *vinayadhara* differs from a true householder only by the fact that he remained unmarried. Moreover, he is unable to reach *nirvāṇa*.

Nearer to real life than literary texts are documents, which are largely missing as sources for Buddhism in ancient India. Documents from Central Asia can fill this gap only to a modest degree. In the about 800 documents written around A.D. 300 and rediscovered by Aurel Stein in Niya, monks with wives and children are mentioned⁶⁶, first of all a monk named Ānanda, who got involved in a law-suit because of gross misbehaviour. Document no. 345⁶⁷ describes who this law-suit was settled. It all had started when this Ānanda borrowed thirty pounds of grain from a layman and — *horribile dictu* — fifteen litres of wine without returning either. So, most likely, Ānanda enjoyed the wine. Worse, a slave of this Ānanda stole fifteen metres of silk, two ropes, two robes made of felt and finally two sheep. After the layman resorted to law, Ānanda had to pay

⁶³ Three *kuṭumbi-srāmaṇeras* Gopaka, Cheṇḍavaka and Dāsaka are mentioned in a Maitraka inscription: O. v. Ilinüber: Rev. of M. Njammasch: Bauern, Buddhisten und Brahmanen. 2001. IJ 47. 2004 [2006], p. 308-320, particularly p. 311f.

⁶⁴ Cf. *madhurambabījāṇi ropetvā samantā mariyādaṇi bandhivā kālānukālaṇi udakaṇi āsiṇcivā*, Mp III 229, 21f., cf. note 19 above.

⁶⁵ The reading in Ec is faulty. For the meaning *padapariṇāṭikā* “wife”: After Kaṇhā’s (Draupadī’s) *svayamvara*, her father gives her to the five Pāṇḍavas: *pādacārikāṇi adāsi*, Ja V 426, 19.

⁶⁶ On married monks cf. O. v. Ilinüber: Rev. of Der Buddhismus I. 2000, IJ 45. 2002, p. 82.

⁶⁷ Quoted after T. Burrow: A Translation of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan. London 1940.

for all the damage done. Moreover, the court ruled that he had to hand over to the court a cow as punishment. However, this did not really happen because of a settlement out of court according to which Ānanda's slave was given to the layman to make good for his loss. The conclusion from this evidence is clear: Ānanda owned a personal slave and a cow — at least the court assumed that — and finally also money that would have enabled him to pay the damages.

In spite of these negative descriptions of the behaviour of single Buddhist monks, the impression is certainly not correct that all monks followed all sorts of occupations to assure their good life and to increase their riches. There is no reason to doubt that the vast majority of monks seriously pursued their spiritual goals, particularly those who criticised their fellow monks for lax behaviour.

Again, very little is known about this side of the daily life of monks, even for places such as Nālandā. Only the daily routine of the Buddha himself is described at great length in the commentary to the Dīghanikāya (Sumaṅgalavilāsini 45, 17-48, 2) and elsewhere⁶⁸: The Buddha raises very early in the morning, and, after attending to his personal hygiene, begins his tour to beg for alms, which, as a matter of course, is accompanied by all sorts of miracles: All roads are suddenly smooth and free from any holes, the wind blows gently and scatters flowers on his way. Of course the laymen shower gifts upon the Buddha and his disciples. After returning to his monastery and eating his meal in the company of monks, the Buddha instructs monks in matters of the *dhamma* and assigns objects of meditation to individual monks according to their abilities before he retires for a while. If the Buddha wishes to do so, he lies down on one side like a lion to have a short rest: Even Buddhas need sleep occasionally. After having rested the Buddha is ready to receive the numerous visitors, monks and laymen alike. Finally, the time for a bath arrives. Before the Buddha retires very late in the evening, he walks up and down for a short time to relax after the long hours of sitting and teaching. This is really a long and demanding daily routine!

This was the model every individual monk had before his eyes. How far he could or did try to follow this model, is difficult to estimate given the scanty evidence offered, e.g., by Yi-jing for Nālandā. First, Yi-jing points out the impressive number of monks living at Nālandā. They can use three hundred rooms and eight assembly halls, which are at the disposal of about three thousand monks. Because this enormous number does not permit all monks to assemble in one place, one particular monk circulates from assembly hall to assembly hall to conduct recitations in honour of the Buddha. He is accompanied by laymen acting as his servants and by children carrying flowers⁶⁹. This is an interesting remark, because it **proves the** presence of numerous laymen in a Buddhist monastery. This presence seems to be often overlooked or forgotten. For, when excavating dices occasionally in Buddhist monasteries, the archaeologists immediately see Buddhist

⁶⁸ For parallels see IIPL § 239.

⁶⁹ Cf. A Record of the Buddhist religion, as note 7 above, p. 154f.

monks indulging in gambling instead of spiritual progress. When dices came to light in different rooms at Nālandā, this was commented upon by J. A. Page, who conducted the excavations, by the following remark⁷⁰: “[This] seems to suggest that Buddhist brethren in residence here, were not altogether above the amusements of less austere humanity.” Obviously, the very likely presence of laymen here did not even occur to Page for a moment. Remembering them, we could at least give the monks the benefit of doubt.

Further, Yi-jing reports that besides those monks joining the reciter in their praise and veneration of the Buddha, others worshipped the Buddha in private by meditating quietly in one of the many niches with Buddha images.

Nothing is said explicitly on the time during the day, when all this happened. Here, modern practices could be compared: Buddhist monks would rise early between about 04:00 and 05:00 in the morning and meet about 05:30 for first worship and meditation. The first meal is taken between 06:30 and 07:30. The time between 10:00 and 11:00 is reserved for taking a bath, and before noon the main meal of the day is eaten.

In this description, which follows the brief, but useful remarks by Dilip Kumar Barua⁷¹ for modern practices, one thing is missing at this point. Begging for food is not mentioned. Of course this is still practiced every morning, however by no means by all monks. For, since many centuries, Buddhist monasteries are equipped with a kitchen. Again, Yi-jing pays due attention to the large refectories regularly furnished with a statue of Hārītī in Gandhāra. And he does not fail to mention the equally large kitchens.

The monks meet again in the evening for meditation and recitation before they retire by 10:00 at night. Meditation is and was of the utmost importance as a matter of course besides the worship of the Buddha as we read in old texts and observe it today. The numerous descriptions of meditation do not ignore the many obstacles met by monks trying to concentrate. The danger of falling asleep was always present, all the more so, as the time reserved for sleep was brief. It is therefore not at all surprising that Buddhist monks invented all sorts of devices to stay awake and to keep their brethren awake, from gently or not so gently kicking them with the knee, snapping the fingers, throwing small balls or even beating sleeping monks with a stick. This is done, however, as the text emphasises in a spirit of benevolent thought. For benevolence should be the guideline for the atmosphere in a Buddhist monastery⁷².

⁷⁰ Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of 1923/4. Calcutta 1926, p. 74.

⁷¹ Monastic Life in Bangladesh. A case study. JIBS 48.2 [96]. 2000, p. 1127-1124; on the daily routine of Mūlasarvāstivāda monks cf. G. Schopen: Marking Time in Buddhist Monasteries. On Calendars, Clocks, and Some Liturgical Practices, in: Śūryacandrāya. Essays in Honour of Akira Yuyama on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday. Indica et Tibetica 35. Swistal-Odendorf 1998, p. 157-179 = Buddhist Monks and Business Matters, as note 3 above, p. 260-284.

⁷² Abhisamācārika-Dharmā. ed. by B. Jinananda. Patna 1969, p. 208 = Transcription of the Abhisamācārika-Dharma Chapter V-VII by the Abhisamācārika-Dharma Study Group, in: Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūsho Nenpō 21. 1999, p. (1)-(79): 234-156, particularly p. (58) 175f. (*attha mairīcittena yaṣṭhīlī cārayitavyā*, 208, 9 = (59) 176, 4f.). On the corresponding evidence in the Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya: 11.

It is possible only rarely to get a vague idea of how monks **really** behaved towards each other, when they were not occupied by religious duties of one sort or another. An extremely negative example during the time of the Buddha are the infamous Assajipunabbasuka monks living at Kiṭṭagiri, who eat late in the evening, drink alcohol, dance and engage in all sorts of inappropriate behaviour (Vin II 9, 31-10, 16). Above all, they are notorious brutes (*caṇḍā te bhikkhū pharusā*), so much so that even Sāriputta and Moggallāna are afraid to intervene and are ready to reprimand them only after the Buddha dispatches a larger force of monks for their protection (Vin II 12, 30-37).

We are not told how the Assajipunabbasuka monks actually reacted when Sāriputta and Moggallāna arrived with all their army of monks. Of course an appropriate punishment according to the Vinaya was handed down to them. Besides formal exchanges of words as prescribed by the Vinaya in certain situations, we can listen only very rarely to monks not talking about legal or religious, but worldly matters. This is the case sometimes in the middle of highly technical discussions, when a humorous story is used to define truth and untruth. In the explanation of the first Pācittiya rule *sampajāñāmusāvāde pācittiyaṃ* "Consciously telling the untruth is an offence that entails expiation" (Vin IV 2, 14**) some ironical jokes are used as examples to demonstrate the border line between truth and untruth in the Samantapāsādikā:

yo pana sāmaṇerena api 'bhante mayhaṃ upajjhāyaṃ passitthā' ti vutto keūiṃ kurumāno 'tava upajjhāyo dārusakaṭaṃ yojervā gato bhavissati' ti vā sigālasaddaṃ sutvā 'kassāyaṃ bhante saddo' ti vutto 'mātuyā te yānena gacchantiyā kaddame laggacakkaṃ uddharantānaṃ ayaṃ saddo' ti vā evaṃ neva davā na ravā aññaṃ bhaṇati, so āpattiṃ āpajjati yeva.

aññā pūraṇakathā nāma hoti: eko gāme thokaṃ telaṃ labbitvā vibhāraṃ āgato sāmaṇeraṃ bhaṇati 'tvaṃ ajja kuhiṃ gato? gāmo ekatelo abosī' ti vā pacchikāya ṭhapitaṃ pūvakhaṇḍaṃ labbitvā 'ajja gāme pacchikāhi pūve cāresu' ti vā, ayaṃ musāvādo va hoti, Sp 737, 20-31, cf. Sv 72, 26-30

"Who says playfully **without speaking** rashly after being asked by a novice 'Did you see my teacher?' 'Your teacher has **probably** yoked the cart for collecting wood' or, if after hearing the **howling** of hyenas 'What noise is this' 'This is the noise of those who are **pulling out** the wheel of the carriage in which your mother is travelling and which got stuck in the mud', commits an offence.

Something else is irony (*pūraṇakathā*)⁷³: **One** (monk), who got very little oil

Hu-von Hinüber: Das Poṣadhavastu. Vorschriften für die buddhistische Beichtfeier im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādin. Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik. Monographie 13. Reinbek 1994, p. 276f.

⁷³ This technical term corresponds to irony. It is explained in the subcommentary to the Majjhimanikāya on *vutto va naṃ vadeyya*, M I 502, 24: *mayā vutto va hutvā apucchito va kathaṃ samuṭṭhāpetvā ambajambuādini gahetvā apūraṇamāno mayā katthitaniyāmena bhavaṃ Bhāradvājo vadeyya*, Ps III 212, 9-12 "the venerable Bhāradvāja should speak exactly as being told by me in the same way as I did, even unasked after having begun a conversation and without filling it with mangos, jambu fruits etc.": *ambajambuādini aññaṃaññavisadisāni viya pūraṇakathānayaṃ yaṃ kiñci akathetvā*, Ps-pt III 104, 29f. "not **telling anything** in the way of irony as like mangos, jambu fruits etc., which are different from each other". *A pūraṇakathā* is "a speech, which has to be filled" by a thought or statement opposite to or different from what has **been**

in the village returns to the monastery and says to a novice ‘Where did you go (to beg for food)? The village is flooded with oil’ or, after getting a piece of a cake that was stored in a basket ‘Today they carry cakes around in baskets in the village’ — this is the untruth”.

Obviously, all these statements are not entirely true and consequently humour of this kind was thought to be inappropriate for Buddhist monks. These harmless jokes are of particular value also, because it is mostly extremely difficult to guess, what was felt to be humorous or hilarious in ancient texts such as the Buddhist canon or its commentaries, which were both composed in a cultural environment largely lost to us. Consequently, many paragraphs which we are inclined to read with a smile today, may have been a deadly serious matter to those, who originally wrote them down. Concerning the paragraphs quoted, the humorous meaning is guaranteed by the remark in the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* that the monk who has received very little oil speaks *bassādbippāyena*, Sv 72, 27 “with the intention to joke” and by *keḷiṃ kurumāno*, Sp 737, 21 “playfully”.

Usually, this precious information is contained in very short paragraphs, if not single sentences embedded in virtually hundreds pages of sometimes complicated, if not deadly (at least to us) boring matter. However, all of a sudden a light flashes to illuminate for a brief moment the daily life in ancient India in the middle of elaborate theories on religion, philosophy or law. Therefore, these tiny bits of information are always in danger of being simply overlooked. Although they do certainly not promote the understanding of Buddhism as a religion or philosophy, they do help, however, understand those men and women as human beings, who kept Buddhism alive for so many centuries and much longer than even the Buddha himself anticipated, when he predicted the end of his teaching already after five hundred years (Vin II 256, 15). If Buddhism is still alive today in spite of this prediction, this is certainly the merit of those men who were attracted again and again to the life as a monk, if only because good live and salvation are so near to each other in Buddhism.

said. This term has not been observed so far outside the Theravāda Aṭṭhakathā, it seems. In Sanskrit poetics, *vyājastuti* or *leśa* seem to be the terms nearest to irony: Gero Jenner: Die poetischen Figuren der Inder von Bhāmaha bis Mammaṭa. Ihre Eigenart im Verhältnis zu den Figuren repräsentativer antiker Rhetoriker. Diss. Hamburg 1968, p. 82f. Mangos and jambu fruits not only look very different. Moreover, mangos are sweet and jambu fruits are sour.

Bibliography

- Abhisamacārika-Dharmāḥ ed. by B. Jinananda. Patna 1969 / Transcription of the Abhisamacārika-Dharma Chapter V-VII by the Abhisamacārika-Dharma Study Group, in: Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūsho Nenpō 21. 1999, p. (1) – (79): 234-156
- Balbir, N.: *Lā-* et *Luñ-* en moyen-indien: emplois technique e morphologie, in: *Langue, style et structure dans le monde indien. Centenaire de Louis Renou.* Paris 1996, p. 327-352
- Barua, D. K.: Monastic Life in Bangladesh. A case study. *JIBS* 48.2 [96]. 2000, p. 1127-1124
- Bechert, H.: Die Datierung des historischen Buddha. *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse. Dritte Folge* I (Nr. 189, 1991), II (Nr. 194, 1992), III (Nr. 222, 1997)
- Beal, S.: *Hsuan-tsang: Si-yu-ki: Buddhist records of the western world.* Translated from the Chinese of Hsuen Tsiang (AD 629), 2 Bände. London 1884
- Burrow, T.: *A Translation of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan.* London 1940
- Coomaraswamy, A. K.: *La sculpture de Bharhut.* Annales du Musée Guimet. Bibliothèque d'art. Nouvelle série: VI. Paris 1956, planche XXVI, fig. 67
- Deeg, M.: Das Ende des Dharma und die Ankunft des Maitreya. End- und Neue-Zeit-Vorstellungen im Buddhismus mit einem Exkurs zur Kāśyapa-Legende. *ZfR* 7. 1999, p. 145-169
- Granoff, Ph.: Portraits, Likenesses and Looking Glasses: Some Literary and Philosophical Reflections on Representation and Art in Medieval India, in: *Representation in Religion* ed. by J. Assmann and A. I. Baumgarten. *Numen Book Series. Studies in the History of Religions* Vol. LXXXIX. Leiden 2001, p. 63-105
- Grierson, G. A.: *Bihar Peasant Life.* Patna 1926
- Hinüber, O. v.: Eine Karmavācānā-Sammlung aus Gilgit. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 119. 1969, p. 102-132
- : Origin and Varieties of Buddhist Sanskrit, in: *Dialectes dans les Littératures Indo-Aryennes*, ed. par C. Caillat. Paris 1989, p. 341-367
- : Der Beginn der Schrift und frühe Schriftlichkeit in Indien. *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse*, Jg 1989, Nr. 11
- : 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
- : Old age and old monks in Pāli Buddhism, in: *Aging. Asian Concepts and Experiences Past and Present*, edited by Susanne Formanek and Sepp Linhart. *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte* 643. Band, Wien 1997, p. 65-78
- : Das Pātimokkhasutta — Seine Gestalt und seine Entstehungsgeschichte. (Studien zur Literatur des Theravāda-Buddhismus II). *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse*, Jg 1999, Nr. 6
- : Die Palola Śāhis. Ihre Steininschriften, Inschriften auf Bronzen, Handschriftenkolophone und Schutzauber. *Materialien zur Geschichte von Gilgit und Chilas. Antiquities of Northern Pakistan. Reports and Studies* Vol. 5. Mainz 2004
- : Rev. of M. Njammasch: Bauern, Buddhisten und Brahmanen. 2001. *IJ* 47. 2004 [2006], p. 308-320
- Hu-von Hinüber, H.: *Das Posadhavastu. Vorschriften für die buddhistische Beichtfeier im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins.* Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik. Monographie 13. Reinbek 1994
- I-tsing: *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago (A.D. 671-695)* trsl. by J. Takakusu. London 1896
- Jenner, G.: *Die poetischen Figuren der Inder von Bhāmaha bis Mammaṭa. Ihre Eigenart im Verhältnis zu den Figuren repräsentativer antiker Rhetoriker.* Diss. Hamburg 1968

- Kaimal, Padma: The problem of portrait in South India ca. 970-1000 A.D. *Artibus Asiae* 59. 1999, p. 59-133; 60. 2000, p. 139-179
- Lockwood, M., A. Vishnu Bhatt: *Metatheater and Sanskrit Drama*. Delhi 1994
- Lüders, H.: *Bharhut Inscriptions*, revised by E. Waldschmidt and M. A. Mehendale. *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* Vol. II, 2. Ootacamund 1963
- Ramachandran, T. N.: An inscribed Bodhisattva image from Mathura. *Ancient India* 6. 1950. p. 100-102, plates XXXVIII, XXXIX
- Rau, W.: The vagrant and the poor in Sanskrit poetry. *ABORI* 72/73. 1991 & 1992, p. 23-34
- Ray, R. A.: Nāgārjuna's Longevity, in: J. Schober [Ed.]: *Sacred Biography in the Buddhist Traditions of South and Southeast Asia*. Honolulu 1997, p. 129-159
- Sankalia, H. D.: *The Nālandā University*. Delhi² 1972
- Schlingloff, D.: *Ajanta. Handbuch der Malereien. I: Erzählende Wandmalereien* Vol. II. Supplement. Wiesbaden 2000
- Schopen, G.: *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks. Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu 1997
- : *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters. Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu 2004
- : *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India. More collected Papers*. Honolulu 2005
- Schubring, W.: *Die Lehre der Jainas nach den alten Quellen dargestellt*. Berlin und Leipzig 1935
- Seidel A.: Den'e, in: *Hōbōgirin* VIII. 2003
- Silk, J.: Dressed for Success. The Monk Kāśyapa and Strategies of Legitimation in **Earlier Mahāyāna** Buddhist Scriptures. *JAs* 291. 2003, p. 173-219
- : *Managing Monks. Administration and Administrative Roles in Ancient Indian Buddhist Monasticism*.
- Spink, W.: The Innocent Evolution of Ajanta's technology. In: H. Bakker [Ed.]: *The Vākāṭaka Heritage. Indian Culture at the Crossroads*. Groningen 2004, p. 87-105
- Turner, R. L.: *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. London 1968
- Watt, G.: *The Commercial Products of India Being an Abridgment of "The Dictionary of the Economic Products of India"*. London 1908
- Wezler, A.: Zur Proklamation religiös-weltanschaulicher Toleranz bei dem indischen Philosophen Jayantabhaṭṭa. *Saeculum* 27. 1976, p. 329-347

The First Three Folios of Manuscript B of the *Karmavibhaṅga*

Diwakar ACHARYA and Noriyuki KUDO

Sylvain Lévi published the *Karmavibhaṅga*¹ first in 1932 from transcriptions of two Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts. He was not able to use the original manuscripts during his actual editorial procedure and the basis of his edition was the transcriptions prepared under the supervision of Hemraj Sharman.²

Now the originals have become accessible, and recently one of the authors has published the transliterations of all the Sanskrit manuscripts found in Nepal which were so far available to him.³ Kudo, however, did not know at that time that the first three folios of the second manuscript (= MS[B]) he transliterated are not lost but are preserved in the same National Archives of Nepal. Diwakar Acharya, working as a member of the Nepal German Manuscripts Preservation Project (later as a Research Assistant of the Nepal German Manuscripts Cataloguing Project), was able to identify and catalogue these folios. These folios were previously deposited in the collection of Hemraj Sharman who had supervised the transcriptions of some Nepalese manuscripts for Sylvain Lévi, but Hemraj Sharman was not aware that these belong to the second manuscript of the *Karmavibhaṅga* of which a transcription was prepared for Lévi even in spite of the fact that he found the second manuscript and informed Lévi of this finding.⁴

Apart from the two manuscripts Lévi and Kudo used for their editions, i.e., manuscripts A and B, there is yet a third manuscript of the text. This new manuscript was also found by Diwakar Acharya; it is written in Newārī script on Nepalese paper, and is incomplete in the available 10 folios.⁵ Furthermore he noticed two western notebooks containing the Nāgarī transcription of two original manuscripts respectively in the private library of Hemraj Sharman, probably the same ones he had prepared for

¹ Lévi calls the text *Mahākarmavibhaṅga*, but Kudo has argued in favour of calling the text simply *Karmavibhaṅga*, see Kudo 2004: viii–xi.

² Lévi 1932: I: “Un peu plus tard, tandis que j’étais au Japon, une lettre de lui — écrite dans ce sanscrit élégant qu’il manie avec une aisance magistrale, m’annonçait la découverte d’un nouveau manuscrit du même texte, et bientôt après j’en recevais la copie”, cf. also Kudo 2004: vii. As to Hemraj Sharman’s personality and activities, see Garzilli 2001.

³ Kudo 2004: vii.

⁴ Lévi op cit.: “... m’annonçait la découverte d’un nouveau manuscrit du même texte, ...”

⁵ The third manuscript bearing accession no. 4-951 can be found on NGMPP reel no. A 914/4. A part of this manuscript is transliterated in another paper of this issue, see pp. 43–60.

Lévi.⁶ All of them are preserved in the National Archives and have been filmed by the NGMPP, and are now accessible.

In the following, we will present a transliteration of the three relocated folios of the second manuscript of Lévi's edition. These folios are kept separately and treated as a new manuscript with a new accession no. 5-141, and are filmed by the NGMPP on Reel no. B 22/26. They are slightly damaged at right, left and bottom margins. The appearance of the damage does not correspond to that of other folios of MS[B]: the first three folios are damaged at the right lower corner while the rest of MS[B] is not. It seems to suggest that they might have been kept separately for a long time.

The conventions used in this paper follows Kudo 2004: xv. In the left margins of both pages the pagenummer and line of the above book are given for convenient reference to the reading of MS[A]. In footnotes, we report the variants from the first manuscript (MS [A]) of Lévi's edition. In addition, after inspecting the third manuscript (hereinafter abbrev. MS[E]),⁷ we notice that this manuscript in general follows the reading of MS[B]; rather it seems to be, most probably, a direct copy of MS[B]. It is, therefore, significant to include the reading of MS[E] for a reconstruction of the portions where MS[B] is damaged.⁸ For the sake of convenience, we use the same brackets Kudo used in his transliteration; we also supply or cancel a punctuation mark, introduce line breaks and arrange the text in paragraphs.⁹

As these folios belong to MS[B], orthography and scribal tendency are already pointed out; we do not repeat here the peculiarity of these folios. However, since these folios preserve the introductory story of the KV and they show consistent readings in several words which do not correspond to those of MS[A], we would like to indicate some points: this MS generally gives *śaikhakukkura* together as a compound, and the same is true with *śukamāṇava*, which is not the case in MS[A]¹⁰; some phrases are omitted but they seem to be redundant in context (see nn. 20 and 27).

⁶ The transcript of Lévi's MS [A] bears accession no. 5-265 and is filmed on B 94/3, and that of MS[B] bears accession no. 5-263 and can be found on reel no. A 109/9. For the latter, see "Brief Communication" in this issue.

⁷ Kudo used abbrev. MS[C] and [D] for the extra folios contained in the same bundle of MS[B] and [A] respectively, see Kudo 2004: 218-224 and 225-227.

⁸ For details see the other paper on MS[E] in this issue (pp. 43-60).

⁹ See Kudo 2004: xi-xii.

¹⁰ The circumstances of this paper are as follows: Diwakar Acharya found these folios and other materials of the KV; later, in October 2005, he sent his first draft of this paper containing the transliteration of them to Kudo through E-mail. Kudo sent him back the first draft with corrections and suggestions. Later both agreed to publish it under joint authorship. Kudo revised the transliteration and reformulated the layout, and he added the reading of MS[E] by means of the images supplied by Diwakar Acharya.

Transliteration:

(1 recto) २¹¹ karmavibhaṅgasūtra ||¹²

(1v.1) ++ .. vajrāya¹³ ||

211 evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmiṃ samaye Bhagavān* Śrāvastyām viharati sma |
Jetavane Anāthapiṇḍadasyārāme ||

213 atha sa¹⁴ Bhagavā[n pū] .[vā] + + + + + + + + + + + + + + (1v.2) + + [ya]¹⁵
prāvikṣat* sāvādānaṃ Śrāvastīm piṇḍāya caran*¹⁶ yena
Śukamānava¹⁷ ○ Taudeyaputrasya niveśanan tenopasaṅkrāntas <|>

216 tena khalu punaḥ sama .[c] + + + + + + + + + + + + + + (1v.3) + + +¹⁸
śaṅkhakukuro¹⁹ gonikāstṛte paryaṅke niṣaṇṇaḥ | asyāntaropadhānaOyām²⁰
kāṃsapātryāṃ śālimāṃsodanaṃ paribhūṃkte²¹ <|> adrākṣīt* śaṅkhakukuro
Bha[ga] .. + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

4.5 + (1v.4) + + + + [n](*)²² śaṅkhakukuram²³ etad avocat* |

¹¹ An auspicious symbol, cf. Roth 1986.

¹² This title is written in the middle of the folio. It seems to be quite similar to the title appearing in the colophon.

¹³ Read *namo bevajrāya*. The two opening verses in the form of invocation to Buddha and a statement *bhagavatā sūtraṃ bhāṣitaṃ*, which are found in A, are not found in this manuscript. Needless to say, these are original in MS[A] so they are absent also in the Chinese and Tibetan translations.

¹⁴ = MS[E]; [A] omits *sa*.

¹⁵ Read *pā(r)vā(b)ne nivāsyā pātracīvaram ādāya śrāvastīm piṇḍāya*, cf. MS[E] 1v.1-2: *pūrvābne nivāsyā pā + + + [ram ā]dāya Śrāvastīm piṇḍāya*.

¹⁶ MS[E] reads *piṇḍāya carā**; [A] reads *piṇḍāya caran* (Lévi reads *piṇḍopacaranaṃ* and Kudo notes this and remarks that the manuscript reading is a mistake for *caranaṃ*).

¹⁷ For °*mānava*° = MS[E]. It is just possible to retain this compound, but a reading natural to the style of the text would be *Śukasya mānavasya Taudeyaputrasya* as found in [A].

¹⁸ Read *sama(y)e(na Śukasya mānavasya Taudeyaputrasya niveśane)*, cf. MS[E] 1v.2.

¹⁹ Read *śaṅkhakukuro*.

²⁰ Read °*dhānāyām*. Lévi reads *asmattaropadhānāyām* from MS[A] and corrects it to *aśmantakopadhānāyām*. Kudo suggests to read *aśmāntaropadhānāyām* on the basis of the reading of the third Tibetan translation: *kbar gzhong rdo ba'i kbar blangs pa la* | (Phug drag 157b2; London MS Kanjur 200b3-4; sTog Palace 716.2) [Kudo 2004a: 850-849]. However both MS[B] and [E] read *asyāntaropadhānāyām* throughoutly.

²¹ MS[A] reads *bhūṃkte*. Then follows in [A]: *Bhagavān adrā(ks)īt śaṅkhakukura(b) gonikastrate (sic.) paryaṅke niṣaṇṇaḥ* || *aśmāntaropadhānāyā(m) kāṃsapātryā(m) paribhūṃjānaṃ* |, which is not found in our manuscript and [E]. This line probably is secondary.

²² Read *Bha[ga](vantaṃ dvāramūle, dṛṣṭvā ca punar bukkati* | *atha Bhagavān*), cf. MS[E] 1v.3.

"etad api te śaṅkha na damayasi²⁴ ○ yad api²⁵ bhokkārād²⁶ bukkāram āgataḥ
<|>"

4.7 evam ukte śaṅkhakukura²⁷ abhiṣiktaḥ²⁸ ku[pit]. + + + + + (1v.5) + + + +
[ñkā]d²⁹ avatīrya adhaṣṭāt paryaṅkasya dārusyandanikāyān niṣaṇṇa ○ h |

4.10 tena khalu punaḥ samayena Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputra³⁰ bahinirgato³¹
[']bhūn* <|> kenac[i]d [e]v. k. r. ṇ. yen.³² <|>

4.12 [athā](1v.6) + + + + + .. s³³ Taudeyaputraḥ | adraṅsīt* Śuko māṇavas
Taudeyaputraḥ śaṅkhakukuram³⁴ adhaṣṭāt paryaṅkastha³⁵ dārusyāndanikāyām³⁶
niṣaṇṇam³⁷ dṛṣṭvā ca punar antarjanaṁ āmantrayate |

6.2 "kene;(2r.1) + + + + + k[i]ñcid uktaḥ <|>"³⁸

"ko (')smākaṁ āryaputra⁴⁰ śaṅkhakukuraṁ⁴¹ kiñcid vakṣati |

6.5 api tv āgato (')bhūt* śramaṇo Gautama⁴² dvāramūle dṛṣṭvā ca punar⁴³ bukkati |
tam ena⁴⁴ śramaṇo G[au]t. m. ev. m [ā]h.⁴⁵ <|>

'(2r.2) + + + + + .kha n.⁴⁶ damayasi⁴⁷ yad asi bhokkārād⁴⁸ bukkāram āgataḥ |'

²³ For śaṅkhakukuraṁ.

²⁴ = MS[E]; [A] reads *damayati*.

²⁵ = MS[E]; [A] reads *asi*.

²⁶ = MS[E]; [A] reads: *bhokārād*.

²⁷ For °kukkuro.

²⁸ For śaṅkhakukuro 'bbhiṣiktaḥ; [A] has 'tiṣayitaroṣa° for *bbhiṣiktaḥ kupita*°. This reading most probably is secondary. A standard expression 'bbhiṣiktaḥ kupitas caṇḍibbūto 'nāttamanāḥ appears several times in the subsequent passages in this manuscript and MS[E].

²⁹ Read *kupit(a)s caṇḍibbūto 'nāttamanā goṇikastrīt paryaṅkā*d, cf. MS[E] 1v.4.

³⁰ For °putro.

³¹ For *bahinirgato* = MS[E] 1v.5; [A] reads: *bahirgato*.

³² Read *ev(a) k(a)r(ā)ṇ(i)yen(a)*, cf. MS[E] 1v.5: *eva karaṇīyena*.

³³ Read *athā(gataḥ Śuko māṇava)s*. This reading is based on MS[E]: *athāta āgataḥ Śuko māṇavas* (1v.5).

³⁴ For śaṅkhakukkuram.

³⁵ For *paryaṅkasya*. It is interesting to note that MS[E] has also *paryaṅkastha*, probably a scribal error.

³⁶ A scribal error for *dārusyandanikāyām*.

³⁷ For *niṣaṇṇam* = MS[E]; [A] reads instead *prapatitam*.

³⁸ Read *kenai(vāyaṁ śaṅkhakukkuram)*, cf. MS[E] 1v.6.

³⁹ MS[E] has *antarjana āba* after this (1v.6).

⁴⁰ = MS[E]; [A] reads 'smākaṁ madb(y)e madīyaputraṁ.

⁴¹ For śaṅkhakukkuram.

⁴² For *Gautamo*.

⁴³ MS[A] reads °mūle 'vasthitaṁ tam ekha (< eṣo); [E] reads °mūle dṛṣṭvā cāyaṁ punar.

⁴⁴ For *enaṁ*.

⁴⁵ Read *Gaut(a)m(a) ev(a)m āb(a)*.

evam uOkte śāṅkhakukkuro 'bhiṣiktaḥ⁴⁹ kupita⁵⁰ caṇḍibhūta⁵¹ (')nāttamanā⁵²
 goṇikāstrtāt paryāṅkāḍ avatīryādhastāt paryāṅka(2r.3) + +
 [ru]syandanikāyān⁵³ niṣaṇṇaḥ⁵⁴ | "

6.11 atha Śukamāṇavas Taudeyaputrau⁵⁵ 'bhiOṣiktaḥ kupitaś caṇḍibhūto
 (')nāttamanā Śrāvastyā niṣkramya⁵⁶ yena Jetavanam Anāthapiṇḍadasyārāmes⁵⁷
 tenopasa (2r.4) + + s⁵⁸

6.14 tena khalu⁵⁹ samayena Bhagavān anekasatāyām bhikṣuparsadi pura;Ostān
 niṣaṇṇo dharman deśayati | adrākṣīd Bhagavān* Śukaṁ māṇava⁶⁰ Taudeyaputrat*⁶¹
 dūrād evāgacchantam dṛṣṭvā ca puna(2r.5) + + ṇām⁶² āmantrayate sma | |

8.4 "paśyatha yūyam bhikṣavaḥ ŚukamāṇavaTaudeyaOputrem⁶³ dūrād
 evāgacchantam <|>"

"evam Bhagavaṁ | "

8.7 "sacet* Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputro (')smiṁ sama[y]e [k]ā[l]am k. r[y]ād⁶⁴
 yathā (2r.6) + +. [i]kṣiptaḥ⁶⁵ | evam kāyasya bhedāt paraṁ maraṇād
 apāyadurgatiṁ vinipātan⁶⁶ narakeṣūpapadyate | tathā hy anena mamāntike
 citta⁶⁷ pradūṣitam <|> cittapradūṣaṇa⁶⁸ he[to] + + + + + (2v.1) + + [t⁶⁹

⁴⁶ Read (*etarhy api tvaṁ śaṅkha na*), cf. MS[E] 1v.7; [A] reads *etad api te saṅkha na*.

⁴⁷ = MS[E]; [A] reads *damayati*.

⁴⁸ = MS[E]; [A] reads *bhokārād*.

⁴⁹ = MS[E]; [A] reads *'riṣayitaḥ*.

⁵⁰ For *kupita(s)*.

⁵¹ For *caṇḍibhūto*.

⁵² For *kupitaś caṇḍibhūto 'nāttamanā*.

⁵³ Read *paryāṅka(sya dā)ra*^o, cf. MS[E] (although it reads *paryāṅkastha*).

⁵⁴ For *niṣaṇṇaḥ*.

⁵⁵ For *putro*; *Taudeyaputro* has been dropped in [A].

⁵⁶ MS[A] reads {*goṇikā*}<<*n na*>>*skramya*. Kudo assumes that several words have been omitted here and suggests a long sentence making pair with a later passage ([A] 6r.5-v.1) to insert, and says that "at the very least *Śrāvastyān* is necessary" [Kudo 2004: 6, fn. 16]. MS[E] reads *Śrāvastyāṁ niṣkramya* (1v.9).

⁵⁷ For *ārāmas*.

⁵⁸ Read *tenopasa(kranta)s*.

⁵⁹ MS[A] and [E] read *tena khalu punaḥ*.

⁶⁰ For *māṇavam*; [A] reads *māṇavakaṁ*.

⁶¹ A scribal error for *putram*.

⁶² Read *puna(r bhikṣū)ṇ(āṁ)*, cf. MS[E] 1v.10: *punar bhikṣūnām*; [A]: <<*pu(na)r bhikṣū*>>*n*. See also [B]4r.4; [A]6v.2; [E]3r.2.

⁶³ A scribal error for *putram*; MS[E] reads *Śukaṁ māṇavam Taudeyaputram* (1v.10).

⁶⁴ Read *k(n)ryād*.

⁶⁵ Read (*bhallo n*)*ikṣiptaḥ*.

⁶⁶ MS[E] reads *°durgativinipātam* (1v.11); [A] reads *°durgativinipāte 'vīcau*.

⁶⁷ For *cittam*.

pa]ram maraṇād apāyadurgatiṃ vinipātan⁷⁰ narakeśūpapadyante ||"

8.13 athānyatamo bhikṣus tasyāṃ velāyāṃ gāthā⁷¹ bhāṣate ||

8.14 praduṣṭacittaṃ dṛṣṭvaiva ekadyam⁷² iha pudgalaṃ <|>

et. + + + + + (2v.2) + +⁷³ ke ||

idānīm bata doṣo (')yaṃ⁷⁴ kālaṃ kurvīta māṇava⁷⁵ <|>

narakeśūpapadya; Ote⁷⁶ cittaṃ hy etena dūṣitaṃ ||

10.1 yathā hy ucitaṃ nikṣiptaṃ evaṃ eva tathāgate ||

cittapradūṣaṇa[he]. [o] .. + .. [ti]⁷⁷ [d]u g. [ti]⁷⁸ <|>

10.3 (2v.3) + + [Śu]ko⁷⁹ māṇavas 'Taudēyaputro yena Bhagavān*s⁸⁰ tenopasaṃkrānta
upaOsaṃkramaṇya Bhagavatā sārddhaṃ saṃmukhaṇi saṃmodanī saṃprañjani⁸¹
vividhān kathāṃ vyatisāryaikānte niṣarṇṇaḥ⁸² | Śuko mā(2v.4) + + [s]⁸³
Taudēyaputrau⁸⁴ Bhagavantam idam avocat* |

10.8 "āgamaḍ⁸⁵ bhavān Gautama⁸⁶ aOsmākan niveśanam <|>"

"āgama⁸⁷ māṇavaḥ⁸⁸ <|>"

"mā bhavata⁸⁹ Gautamena{ṃ}⁹⁰ śaṅkhakukkura⁹¹ kiñcid uktaḥ <|>"

⁶⁸ MS[A]: °d(ū)ṣaṇād dbeto; [E]: °dūṣaṇā(d) betor.

⁶⁹ Read betor evaṃ ibaike satvāḥ kāyabbedā[r], cf. [E] 1v.11-2r.1.

⁷⁰ MS[A]: °durgatāvīcau (Kudo thinks that it is a scribal error for °durgatyavīcau); [E]: °durgatī°.

⁷¹ For gāthā(ṃ).

⁷² For ekatyam, cf. MS[A] and [E].

⁷³ Read et(ān) arthaṃ vyākṛṣṭe chāstā bbikṣugaṇānti)ke, cf. MS[A] and [E].

⁷⁴ = MS[E] 2r.1; [A] reads batādbikṣepaṇi; Lévi reads batāvīkṣepaṇi.

⁷⁵ For māṇavaḥ.

⁷⁶ = MS[E]; [A] reads °padyete (< °padyeta. 'The reason is that it is originally written as °padyate but insufficiently corrected as °padyete).

⁷⁷ Read °dūṣaṇabeto(h satvā gacchant)ti, cf. MS[E]: °dūṣaṇabetos sa<tvā> gacchanti (2r.2); [A] reads °dūṣaṇād dberoh satvā gacchanti.

⁷⁸ Read du(r)g(a)ti(ṃ).

⁷⁹ Read (atha) Śuko, cf. MS[E]; [A] has atbādbikṣepya.

⁸⁰ For Bhagavāṇs. [A] has Bhagavāṇi.

⁸¹ For saṃmodanīṃ saṃprañjanīṃ, cf. MS[E]; [A] has saṃmodanīyāṇi sarajanīyāṇi.

⁸² For niṣarṇṇaḥ.

⁸³ Read mā(ṇava)s.

⁸⁴ For °putro.

⁸⁵ = MS[E]; [A] reads āgato.

⁸⁶ = MS[E]; [A] reads Gautamaṃ (< Gautamo).

⁸⁷ A usage of the third person singular for the first person singular (according to Diwakar Acharya). MS[A] has āgamaṇa (< āgamanam).

⁸⁸ Read māṇava as in MS[A] and [E].

- "ihāhaṃ māṇava pū;(2v.5) + + + .. [sya]⁹² pātracivaram ādāya Śrāvastīm piṇḍāya prāvīkṣat* <l> sāOvadānaṃ Śrāvastīm piṇḍāya caran yena tava⁹³ niveśanaṃ tenopasaṃkrāntaḥ <l> upāsaṃkramya⁹⁴ dvāramūle sthita⁹⁵ (2v.6) + + + + + + +⁹⁶ śaṅkhakukkuro goṇikāstrte mañcake (')dhiruḥe (')syāntaropadhānāyāṃ⁹⁷ kāmśa{ṃ}pātryāṃ śālimāṃśodana⁹⁸ paribhuṅkte | adrākṣic chaṃkhakukkurau⁹⁹ māṃ dvāramūle sthita¹⁰⁰ dṛṣṭvā ;(3r.1) + + + + + + + [v].¹⁰¹ vadāmi |
- 12.2 'etad api śaṅkha na damayaśi¹⁰² yad api¹⁰³ bhokkārad bukkāram āgataḥ | ' evam ukte śaṅkhakukkuro 'bhiṣiktaḥ kupitaś caṇḍibhūto (')nāttamanā goṇikāstrtāt paryāṅkāḍ avatīryā(3r.2) + + + + +¹⁰⁴ .[ā]rusyandanikāyāṃ¹⁰⁵ niṣaṇṇaḥ | "
- 12.7 "kiṃ punar bhavān*¹⁰⁶ Gautama{ḥ} śaṅkhaOkukkurom¹⁰⁷ asmākaṃ pūrvasyāṃ¹⁰⁸ jānīte | "
- 12.9 "alaṃ māṇava tiṣṭha mā me etam¹⁰⁹ arthaṃ pariprākṣīt¹¹⁰ mā te bhaviṣyati āghatās cākṣānti;(3r.3) + + + s[o]¹¹¹ daurmaṇasyaṃ <l> "
- 12.11 dvir api trir api Śuko māṇavas 'Tāudevaputro BhagavaOntam etad avocat* <l>
- 12.12 "kiṃ¹¹² punar bha{{ga}}vān*¹¹³ Gautamau¹¹⁴ 'smākaṃ śaṅkhakukkuram

⁸⁹ MS[A] reads {{māṇava}} bhagavatā.

⁹⁰ = MS[E] 2r.4.

⁹¹ For °kukkuraṃ.

⁹² Read pū(trvābhe nivā)sya, cf. MS[E] 2r.4.

⁹³ = MS[E]; [A] reads bhagavat atra (< bhavato 'tra).

⁹⁴ For upasaṃkramya.

⁹⁵ = MS[E]; [A] reads °mūle 'vasthitāḥ.

⁹⁶ Read (āsāṃ | tadāsan māṇava te) on the basis of MS[E] 2r.5; [A] reads tena khalu pima(r) samaye.

⁹⁷ = MS[E]; [A] has 'dhirūḍbo 'smāntaro°.

⁹⁸ For °danam.

⁹⁹ For °kukkuro.

¹⁰⁰ = MS[E]; [A] reads 'vasthitāṃ.

¹⁰¹ Read (bukkāram akarot tadāham e)va on the basis of the reading in MS[E]2r.6: bukkarim | < bukkāram| akarot tadāham eva; [A] reads ca punar bukkatī | tam eṇam evam.

¹⁰² = MS[E]; [A] reads damayati.

¹⁰³ = MS[E]; [A] reads asi.

¹⁰⁴ Read avatīryā(dbastāt paryāṅkasya), cf. MS[E]2r.7.

¹⁰⁵ Read (dārusyandanikāyāṃ).

¹⁰⁶ = MS[E]; [A] reads Bhagavān.

¹⁰⁷ A scribal error for °kukkuraṃ. MS[A] reads here: śaṅkhasya kuk(k)urasyāsmākaṃ.

¹⁰⁸ Both MS[A] and [E] have jātau after pūrvasya.

¹⁰⁹ = MS[E]; [A] reads tam.

¹¹⁰ MS[E]2r.8: pariprākṣīt; [A]4v.3: pariprākṣīt*.

¹¹¹ Read °(ca ceta)so, cf. MS[A] and [E].

¹¹² MS[A] omits kiṃ.

- pūrvikāyāṃ jātau saṃjānīte <|>"
- 12.14 "alam māṇava ti;(3r.4) + +[m].¹¹⁵ tam artham pariprākṣīt¹¹⁶ mā te¹¹⁷ bhaviṣyati āghātaś cākṣāntīś ca cetaḥ¹¹⁸ daurmanasyaṃ | "
- 14.2 arddhā va¹¹⁸ māṇava yāvat trir apy etam arthenālabdhāś¹¹⁹
- "tena hi māṇava śṛṇu sādhu ca suṣṭhu ca manasikuru bhā(3r.5) + +¹²⁰ | yas te māṇava pitā Taudeyaḥ sa eva¹²¹ kāyasya bhedād dhināyāṃ¹²² śvāyoḥ¹²³ nāv¹²⁴ upapannaḥ <|>"
- 14.6 "kim etat tu¹²⁴ bho Gautama eva¹²⁵ bhaviṣyati asmākaṃ pitā Taudeya¹²⁶ iṣṭayajña [āhi] .[ā] .[ir] .[c] .[itay] .[pa]h¹²⁷ (3r.6) + + + ..¹²⁸ kāyasya bhedāc chubhe¹²⁹ brahmaloke upapannau¹³⁰ bhaviṣyati <|>"
- 14.9 "anenaiva te māṇava mānābhīmānena pitā Taudeyo hīnāyāṃ¹³¹ śvānāyonāv¹³² upapanno pi tu¹³³ māṇava ya[di] + + + + + + + na¹³⁴ (3v.1) + + .. nava¹³⁵ yena svakan niveśanaṃ tenopasaṃkrāma upasaṃkrāmya śaṅkhakukkuraṃ evaṃ vada <|>
- 14.13 'saced bhavāc¹³⁶ chaṅkhakukkuro (')smākaṃ pūrvikāyāṃ jātau pitābhūt

¹¹³ MS[E] reads *bhavān**; [A] reads *bbagavān*.

¹¹⁴ For *Gautamo*, cf. MS[E].

¹¹⁵ Read *tāṣṭhā mā* [m](e), cf. MS[A] and [E].

¹¹⁶ MS[E] 2r.9: *pariprākṣīt*; [A] 4v.4-5: *pariprākṣīn*.

¹¹⁷ = MS[E]; [A] reads *mā ih(')* *eva ca te*.

¹¹⁸ = MS[E]. For *arddhā ca* ("in this way"). [A] has *anyatbā tvam*.

¹¹⁹ MS[A] reads *artha(n) nā* ... (Dīwakar Acharya suggests to read: *artham ālabdhas*).

¹²⁰ Read *bbā(śiṣye)*, cf. MS[A] and [E].

¹²¹ = MS[E]; [A] reads *eva*.

¹²² For *dbīnāyāṃ*, cf. MS[A] and [E].

¹²³ Is this a mere scribal error for *śvānāyonāv* as found in MS[E]? MS[A] reads *śvāyonāv*. See [E] 3r.6 below, and fn. 132.

¹²⁴ Both MS [A] and [E] omit *tu*.

¹²⁵ For *evaṃ*, cf. MS[E].

¹²⁶ = MS[E]; [A] has *ca youau* instead of *Taudeya*.

¹²⁷ Read *ābi(t)ā(gu)ir (u)c(chr)itay(ū)paḥ*, cf. MS[A] and [E].

¹²⁸ Read *(sa) niyatam* on the basis of MS[E] 2v.1; [A] reads *saṃniyatam*. Lévi edits this word as *sanniyate* and Edgerton includes it as a sole example of MIndic passive form of *saṃ-√jñā-*. However, on the basis of the reading of MS[A] Kudo doubts this reading and explanation although he could not offer any conclusive comment on this word, cf. Kudo 2004a: 847-846. Here "*sa niyatam*" means "Ic, inevitably"

¹²⁹ = MS[E]. For *chubhe* as found in [A].

¹³⁰ For *upapanno*; A *upapano*.

¹³¹ = MS[E]; [A] reads *mahādānapati(r)*.

¹³² = MS[E]; [A] reads *śvāyonāv*, cf. fn. 123.

¹³³ Read (')*pi tu*, cf. MS[E]; [A] reads *'pitur* (Kudo suggested to read "*upapannaḥ | pitur*" [Kudo 2004: 14, fn. 13] but this reading should be changed as in [E]).

¹³⁴ Read *(ne) bbāṣitam na śraddadbāsi teṇa*.

¹³⁵ Read *(hi) tvam māṇava*.

- Taudeya adhirohatu¹³⁷ [go] + + + + + +¹³⁸
 14.15 + + + .. [te]¹³⁹ || (3v.2) + + + haṃ¹⁴⁰ cainam evam vada
 14.16 'saced bhavāc¹⁴¹ chaṅkhakukkuro 'smākaṃ pūrvikāyāṃ jā;Otau pitābhūt
 Taudeyaḥ paribhuṃjita bhavān asyāntaropadhānāyāṃ¹⁴² kāmśapātryāṃ
 śālimāṃso[d]. [n].¹⁴³ + + + [kṣ]. te¹⁴⁴ | '
 16.3 bhuktava(3v.3) + +[na]m¹⁴⁵ evam vada <|>
 16.4 'saced bhavāc¹⁴⁶ chaṅkhakukkuro 'smākaṃ pūrvikāyāṃ jātau piOtau pitābhūt
 'Taudeya puttāu¹⁴⁷ 'smākaṃ maraṇasamaye satta¹⁴⁸ svāpateyaṃ nopadarśitan
 tad upadarśaya'
 upadarśayiṣyati | "
 16.8 atha Śu(3v.4) + + ṇavas¹⁴⁹ 'Taudeyaputro Bhagavato¹⁵⁰ bhāṣitam udgrhya
 paryavāpya yena svaOkaṃ niveśanan tenopasaṅkrānta upasaṅkramya
 saṅkhakukkuram idam¹⁵¹ avocat* |
 16.11 "saced bhavān śaṅkhakukkuro ('smākaṃ pū(3v.5) + + + + .[au]¹⁵² pitābhūt
 'Taudeya¹⁵³ adhiroha¹⁵⁴ goṇikāstṛtaṃ paryaṅkam <|>"
 18.1 adhiru;Ohaṃ¹⁵⁵ cainam evam āha |
 18.2 "saced bhavān* śaṅkhakukkuro 'smākaṃ pūrvikāyāṃ jātau pitābhūt 'Taudeyaḥ
 paribhuṅjatu¹⁵⁶ bhavān* (3v.6) + + + + + + + ..ṇ¹⁵⁷ [kām]sapātryāṃ
 śālimāṃsodanam paribhuktavān"

¹³⁶ For *bhavāñc*.

¹³⁷ = MS[E]; [A] reads *adbiroha*.

¹³⁸ Read *go(ṇikāstṛtaṃ paryaṅkaṃ)*.

¹³⁹ Read *(adbiro)[kṣate]*; both MS[A] and [E] read *adbiroṣati*.

¹⁴⁰ Read *(adhiru)baṃ*, cf. MS[E]; [A] has *adbiṛūḍbaṃ*.

¹⁴¹ For *bhavāñc*.

¹⁴² = MS[E]; [A] has *asmāntaro°*.

¹⁴³ Read *śālimāṃso(d)an(aṃ)*.

¹⁴⁴ Read *(paribho)kṣate*, cf. MS[E]; [A] reads *paribbokṣyate*.

¹⁴⁵ Read *bhuktava(ṇtaṃ cai)ṇam*.

¹⁴⁶ For *bhavāñc*.

¹⁴⁷ *Taudeyaputro*? Probably a wrong reading for *Taudeyaḥ yat te*, cf. MS[A] and [E].

¹⁴⁸ = MS[E]; for *santaṃ*. [A] has *mama satuṃ* (< *santaṃ*).

¹⁴⁹ Read *Śu(ko mā)ṇavas*.

¹⁵⁰ = MS[E]; [A] reads *bhagavātā* (< *bhagavatā*).

¹⁵¹ = MS[E]; [A] reads *etad*.

¹⁵² Read *pū(rvikāyāṃ jāt)an*.

¹⁵³ For *Taudeyaḥ*.

¹⁵⁴ = MS[A]; [E] reads *'dbirobatu* (2v.7).

¹⁵⁵ MS[A]: *adbiṛūḍbaṃ*; [E]: *adbiṛūḍbo 'dbirubaṃ*.

¹⁵⁶ An unfinished *akṣara* between *bhu* and *ñja* is cancelled.

¹⁵⁷ Read *(asyāntaropādhānāyā)ṃ*, cf. MS[E]; [A] reads *asmāntaro<pa>dbānāyāṃ*.

- 18.5 bhuktavantam¹⁵⁸ caina{{m}}m evam āha |
- 18.6 "saced bhavāc¹⁵⁹ chaṅkhakukkuro 'smākaṃ pūrvikāyāṃ jātau pitābhūt
Taudēya yatto¹⁶⁰ 'smāka¹⁶¹ maraṇasamaye¹⁶² sa(4r.1) + + + + + +[rśitam]¹⁶³
tad upadarśaya | "

References :

Edgerton, Franklin

- 1953 *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, vol. 1: Grammar, vol.2: Dictionary, New Haven.

Garzilli, Enrica

- 2001 "A Sanskrit Letter Written by Sylvain Lévi in 1923 to Hemaraja Śarmā along with Hitherto Unknown Bibliographical Notes (Cultural Nationalism and Internationalism in the First Half of the 20th Century: Famous Indologists Write to the Raj Guru of Nepal—No. 1)," in: *Journal of the Nepal Research Centre* XII, pp. 115-150.

Kudo, Noriyuki

- 2004 *The Karmavibhaṅga: Transliterations and Annotations of the Original Sanskrit Manuscripts from Nepal*. (BPPB VII) Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.

- 2004a 「*Mahākarmavibhaṅga* 写本再読による「仏教梵語」語彙の再考察」『印度學佛學研究』52-2, pp. 850-845. ("Some Remarks on the Buddhist Sanskrit Vocabularies found in Two Nepalese Manuscripts of the *Mahākarmavibhaṅga*," in: *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* [= *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*] 52-2, pp. 850-845(L)).

Lévi, Sylvain

- 1932 *Mahākarmavibhaṅga (a Grande Classification des Actes) et Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa (Discussion sur le Mahā Karmavibhaṅga), texts sanscrits rapportés du Nepal, édités et traduits avec les textes parallèles en sanscrit, en pali en tibétan, en chinois et en kutchéen*, Paris: librairie Ernst Leroux.

- NAK Catalogue The Unpublished Handwritten Master-catalogue of the National Archives Kathmandu in Six Volumes, vol. 3.

Roth, Gustav

- 1968 "Maṅgala-Symbols in Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts and Inscriptions," in: *Deyadharma. Studies in Memory of Dr. D. C. Sircar*, ed. by G. Bhattacharya, Delhi, pp. 239-250.

(This research is supported in part by a Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C)(2) from JSPS)

[Keywords] *Karmavibhaṅga*, Nepalese manuscript, Sylvain Lévi, NGMPP

¹⁵⁸ = MS[E]; [A] reads *bbuktanta(m)*.

¹⁵⁹ For *bhavāñc*.

¹⁶⁰ *Taudēyaputro*? Probably a wrong reading for *Taudēyah yat te*, cf. MS[A] and [E].

¹⁶¹ For *asmāka(m)*.

¹⁶² MS[A] adds *mama*.

¹⁶³ Read *sa(utam svāpateyam nopada)rśitam*.

One More Manuscript of the *Karmavibhaṅga* in the National Archives of Nepal, Kathmandu: Transliteration of Manuscript E (1)*

Noriyuki KUDO

Introductory Remarks on the manuscript

As far as Nepalese sources are concerned, only two manuscripts (called [A] and [B]) are available for editing a text of the *Karmavibhaṅga*, although our research reveals that both of them have been deposited with an additional different piece of manuscript respectively.¹ These two were used by Sylvain Lévi for his edition² and later by myself.³ Besides these, there are some fragmentary manuscripts in the Hoernle collection in London and in the Turfan collection in Berlin.⁴ The text in those manuscripts belongs to the first class of the *KV* which commonly has fourteen sections and is regarded as a canonical treatise. Furthermore, after the publication of *KV[K]*, I luckily came to know that several fragments in the Schøyen Collection, Norway, contain the text parallel to the *KV*. They are two different fragments: one fragment preserves the text corresponding to the opening story of the *KV* and parallel to the reading of MS[A] and the other fragments correspond to the text of latter part of the *KV*, i.e., §§ 65, 76, and 74 in that order.⁵ We have, therefore, materials that have emerged from several different areas such as Nepal, somewhere in Central Asia, and Afghanistan or Pakistan.

Needless to say, materials from Nepal are most important because only Nepalese manuscripts cover the text as a whole. A closer look, however, shows that some folios are missing in each manuscript: MS[A] lacks one folio (no. 49) and MS[B] lacks folios of nos. 1-3, 8-10, and 16-17. This fact compels us to edit the *KV* in some portions on the basis of the reading of a single manuscript. Certainly we have other sources of this text,

* Diwakar Acharya not only gave me valuable information about this manuscript and supplied the images of it but also gave me a number of suggestions in reading the manuscript. I am very grateful to him. Without his help and kindness this paper could not have been carried out in this form. Any errors that remain here, of course, are my own.

¹ Kudo 2004: 217-224 (MS[C] included in [B]), 225-227 (MS[D] included in [A]).

² Lévi 1932.

³ Kudo 2004.

⁴ Hoernle collection: No. 149 x/1-2, folio-nos. 56-57 (in: Hoernle 1916: 46-52), found at Jigdalik, near Kuča, in 1906 (acquired by G. McCartney and later sent to Hoernle); Turfan collection: Kat.-Nr. 1210 (X 1718), Bl. 51 (in: *SIIT* VI, pp. 5-6), found at Qizil by Le Coq in 1904-5. They are all Sanskrit fragments of the text called “Śukasūtra.”

⁵ I reported on these fragments in Kudo 2005. Later, I gave a presentation on them along with the collated text at the XIVth Conference of the IABS, London, 30th August 2005.

namely six translations in the canonical Chinese tripiṭaka and three in the canonical Tibetan Kanjur. They are, however, secondary. The number of the sections and their sequence are different from each other and their contents are not always the same.

Recently, Diwakar Acharya, at present a Research Assistant of the Nepal German Manuscript Cataloguing Project, University of Hamburg, found valuable materials for the study of the *KV* in the Nepalese manuscript collection. He kindly informed me of the existence of the first three folios of manuscript B which were supposedly lost and a newly identified manuscript of the *KV* as well. Inspection is still going on through the images reproduced from the microfilms of the Nepal German Manuscript Preservation Project which are kindly supplied by Diwakar Acharya but hereunder I will present the first part of the transliteration of this new manuscript (abbrev. MS[E]).

According to the NGMPP index card, the detail of this manuscript is as follows:

“MS. No. ca 951 [= 4-951], Subject: Bauddha No. 20 kha

No. of leaves: 10, Incomplete, Size in cm: 35 x 9, Reel No. A 914/4

Script: Newari, Nepale (*sic.*) loose paper, Colour: Light yellow.”

The number of lines per side is 10 or 11⁶ and there is no binding hole. The title is written on the recto of the first folio in the middle: Karmavibhaṅgasūtra ; evaṃ Kukkurasūtra. The latter title (“A dog sūtra”) is so far unknown; it seems to reflect the content of the opening story of the *KV*. And we can also find the same title on the left margin of the verso of the second and third folios in three lines: Karma/vibhaṅga/sūtra. This manuscript preserves the text from the very beginning, namely from the opening story up to the middle portion of § 32-a, in the middle of the story of Maitrāyājña. It ends in the middle of Maitrāyājña’s vow (*praṇidhāna*) after he talks to a person in hell and then recognizes his fate (Lévi 55.6 = *KV/K* 106.6). Therefore, although it is incomplete, it covers almost half of the text of *KV*.

Comparing this with the other two manuscripts, [A] and [B], this manuscript has all the folios up to § 32-a; MS[A] covers the same extent (up to 32v.4) while MS[B] lacks folios 8-10 and 16-17. The end of MS[E] corresponds to somewhere in folio no. 17 of MS[B] which is unfortunately unavailable at present.

The reading of MS[E] is almost identical with that of MS[B], which indicates that we can reconstruct the damaged portions in MS[B] by means of this new manuscript.⁷ It seems to me that this manuscript is likely to be a direct or at least a closely related copy of MS[B]. There is no doubt that they belong to same manuscript transmission. As seen in the transliteration of MS[B], there are many portions which are lost due to the damage of the folio: the damage is found on the top and bottom corners of both sides. Therefore, the reading is normally missing from the end of one line to the beginning of next line. In some cases MS[E] does not retain the text and in other cases it gives a reading different from MS[A]. In the following, I will first present the reading of MS[B] wherein the text is not preserved and next the re-reading of [E] (the corresponding portion is underlined). For convenient reference the reading of [A] is also given with a dotted

⁶ Eleven lines are found on 1 verso and both sides of 4th folio; ten lines on the rest of folios.

⁷ In *KV/K*, I reconstructed those damaged portions on the basis of the reading of MS[A]; but some of the suggested readings are now to be changed. I will note some of them in the following footnote.

underline. These are not, however, all the examples which show a similarity or co-identity between [B] and [E].

1) [B]2r.2: *[beginning of line]* + + + + + .kha

[E]1v.7: etarhy api tvaṃ śaṅkha

Cf. [A]2v.5: etad api te saṅkha

2) [B]2v.6: sthita (2v.r) + + + + + +

[E]2r.5: sthita āsaṃ | tadāsau māṇava te

Cf. [A]4r.4: 'vaṣṭhitah | tena khalu puna(r) samayena

3) [B]3r.1: *[beginning of line]* + + + + + + + + [v]. vadāmi |

[E]2r.6: bukkarim (< bukkāram) akarot tadāham eva vadāmi |

Cf. [A]4r.5: bukkati | tam eṇam evaṃ vadāmi |

4) [B]3r.3: kiṃ punar bha{{ga}}vān*

[E]2r.9: kiṃ punar bhavān*

[A] 4v.4: punar bhagavān*

Comment: In this case, the aksara *ga* is cancelled by the scribe in [B]; accordingly, [E] reads *bhavān* while [A] reads *bhagavān*. It is interesting to note that in the opening story when [A] reads *bhagavan* [B] and [E] read *bhavan* (see [A]4r.2 = [B]2v.4 = [E]2r.4; [A]4v.2 = [B]3r.2 = [E]2r.7-8), see also the next example.

5) [B]4v.4: yathā bhavatā gautamena *[omit]* anyad api tāvad vayaṃ bha«ga»vantam

[E]3r.8: yathā bhavatā gautamena *[omit]* anyad api tāvad vayaṃ bhaga(3r.9)vantam

Cf. [A] 7r.4: jathā bhagavatā gautamena *[omit]* anyad api tāvad vayaṃ bhagavantam

6) [B]6v.4-5: varṇavādī(6v.5) + + + + + bh[i]nandanam

[E]4v.2: °varṇavādītā yuddhadarśa«naṃ śāstrā» bhinandanam

Cf. [A]10v.4: varṇavādītā | amītramarābhinandanam

7) [B]6v.5-6: °kukkuṭādayo ghātyante tasya ;(6v.6) + + + + + trās cānye ca janāḥ

[E]4v.3: °kukkuṭādayo ghātyante tasya =(space for 8 akṣaras)= trās cānye janāḥ

Cf. [A]11r.1: °kukkuṭādayas tasya yajñapravarttakasya putrā(h) pautrās cānye ca janāḥ

Comment: This example apparently reflects the reading in [B]. A space is left open between *tasya* and *trās* in [E], which indicates that some letters are lost in this place. Same treatment in case of missing portion is found in [B]7v.5-6 = [E]5r.3 and [B] (missing) = [E]5r.6 below.

8) [B]6v.6-7r.1: taṣ[yai](7r.1) + + + + + + + + vamāno nīyate |

[E]4v.4: tasyaiva cāgrato 'nyair ekah paśū ravamānaḥ nīyate |

Cf. [A]11r.2-3: tasya grhasya pārśv(e)na rājapathas tena paś(ū) ravamāno

9) [B]7r.1-2: kāryā(7r.2) + + + + + .. [e]ṣa paś[ū] ravamāno

[E]4v.5: kāryyānanabhijñānām | ya eṣa paśū ravamāno

Cf. [A]11r.4: kāryārthan tu bravīmi | ya eṣa paś(ū) ra)vamāno

10) [B]7v.3-4: kāruṇyacittatā | (7v.4) + +tvānām

[E]5r.1: kāruṇyacittatā duḥkhitām satvānām

Cf. [A]12v.1: kārunyacit(t)atā | glānā(nām) satvānā(ṇ)

11) [B]7v.4-5: tathā stūpacaitya(7v.5) + + + + [śi]rṇṇānām

[E]5r.2: tathā stūpacaitya**abimbānām bhagnaśirṇṇānām**

Cf. 12v.2-3: tathā st(ū)pac[ai](12v.3)t[y]avīhārānām {vi}śirṇṇānā(ṇ)

12) [B]7v.5-6: ṛṣibhūtena {1} (7v.6) + + + + + .. [sy]. sārthasya

[E]5r.3: ṛṣibhūtena =(space for approximately 11 akṣaras)= sya sārtha [end of line]

Cf. [A]12v.5: tena kila ṛṣibhūtena pañcābhi(jñ)ena tṛṣ(ṇ)ārttaḥ sārtha°

Comment: A space is left open between -tena and sya, which indicates some letters to be supplied but unknown; see also the above example [B]6v.5-6 = [E]4v.3.

13) [B]7v.6: tatra ca sārthe bo; [end of folio; next one, no. 8, is missing]

[E]5r.4: tatra ca sārthe bo =(space for approximately 11 akṣaras)= (5r.5) ya enikūle janatām grhītvā |

Cf. [A]12v.5-13r.1: tatra sā(13r.1)rthe bodhisatvaḥ sārthavaho (°)bhūt* | ya Enikūle janatām grhītām |

Comment: Folio no. 8 of MS[B] is missing; thus [E] does not give the following portion after *sārthe bo*. In the next line, however, [E] starts again continuously in context.

14) [B]: [Folio no. 8 missing]

[E]5r.6: sa ca rājā =(space for approximately 5 akṣaras)= (5r.7) babhūva |

Cf. [A]13r.4: sa ca rājā bodhisatvo babhūva | |

Comment: Although MS[B] is not available, [E] has the missing portion in the text. This is the sole example in which [E] indicates the missing portion in itself in a case when the folio which has the corresponding passage is lost.

15) [B]11r.1: (11r.1) + + + + + .. pitroḥ vṛtṭyupacchedaḥ

[E]6v.10: adattādānānumodanam | mātāpitror vṛtṭyupacchedaḥ |

Cf. [A]18v.3: tadabhyānumodanam | mātāpitro(r) vṛtṭyupacchedaḥ |

16) [B]13r.4: tatra katamaṃ karma pretalokopapattisamvarttanīyaṃ | ucyate | | tatra katamaṃ karma yamalokopapattisamvarttanīyaṃ | ucyate | |

[E]8r.8: tatra katamat karma pretalokopapattisamvarttanīyaṃ || ucyate || tatra
katamat karma yamalokopapattisamvarttanīyaṃ || ucyate ||

Cf. [A]22v.3: katamat{a} karma yamalokopapattisamvarttanīyaṃ | (22v.4)
 ucyate |

17) [B]15v.2: + + [p]ūrvaṃ bhikṣavaḥ Jāmbūdṛpe manuṣyāṇāṃ aparimāṇaṃ āyur
 bhavati || yathānyatarasmiṃ, asti Jambūdṛpe Mahākośalī nāma nagaraṃ
Maitrāyājño nāma sārthavāhaputro babhūva ||

[E]9v.6: bhūtapūrvaṃ bhikṣavo Jāmbūdṛpe manuṣyāṇāṃ aparimāṇaṃ āyur bhavati
 yathānyatarasmiṃ | asti Jambūdṛpe Mahākośalī nāma nagaraṃ tatra (9v.7)
maitrāyājño nāma sārthavāhaputro babhūva ||

Cf. [A]26v.4: bhūtapūrvvaṃ bhikṣavo Ja(m)būdṛpe manukṣā(26v.5)ṇāṃ (<
 manuṣyā°) aparimāṇaṃ āyur bhavati, yathā rājo Māmdhātuh |
athānyatarasmin nagare Maitrāyājño nāma sārthavāhaputro babhūva |

Comment:

The above two examples show the difference between [B]/[E] and [A].

18) [B]: 15v.6: sa bhūyaḥ udyānaṃ gataḥ sahāyair uktaḥ [*end of line; next two folios*
16-17 missing].

[E]9v.10: [*beginning of line*] bhūya udyānaṃ gataḥ sahāyair uktaḥ tat kathaṃ <tvayā>
na gantavyaṃ iti | tena gatvā mātā prcchate | deśāntaraṃ gamiṣyāmīti

Cf. [A]27v.1-2: sa bhūya udyānaṃ gataḥ | sahāy(a)ir uktaḥ | atha gantavyaṃ
iti | tena mātā āprstāḥ | de(27v.2)śāntaraṃ gamiṣyāmīti |

Comment: Folio no. 16 of [B] is lost. The reading of [E] is slightly different from that of [A].

We can classify the above examples in this way:

[reading available: ○; not available: ×; identical: =; different: ≠]

1) [B] ×; [E] ×; [A] ○

7, 12, 13, 14?

2) [B] ×; [E] ○ ≠ [A] ○

1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 18

3) [B] ○ = [E] ○ ≠ [A] ○

4, 5, 16, 17

In the first case, it is probable that the blank space in [E] was a reflection of the damaged portion in [B] and that the scribe of [E] could not reconstruct any text according to the context. If so, the scribe might have seen the MS[B] which is already damaged. This assumption implies that [E] is a direct copy of [B] (chart: [B] with damages → [E] with blank space for the damaged portion). If not, the scribe of [E] might have used another unknown copy of [B] which also contains the missing portions as seen in [B] (chart: [B] with damages → [?] with blank space for the damaged portion → [E] with blank space for the damaged portion). This latter scenario is, however, too cumbersome.

In the second case, even though some portions are illegible or lost in [B], the scribe was able to reconstruct the word(s)/phrase(s). The readings are thus created by the

scribe of [E], so they are different from those of MS[A]. In this case, there is a possibility that he used another manuscript to reconstruct the text but if so, we have to face to another problem: why did he do so in the first case above?

The third case deserves attention as another piece of evidence which represents the relationship of [B] and [E]. The readings of [E] reflect those of [B], which are corrected or cancelled by [B] itself. They are not identical with [A]. This fact implies that [B] and [E] belong to one manuscript transmission while [A] belongs to another transmission, probably a later one.

The above observations lead us to the following assumption:

MS[E] is most probably a direct copy of [B]; if it is not the case, it still deserves to be considered a very close copy of it. Here what I mean by “very close” is that the original manuscript on which the scribe of [E] had based his transcription might have been at least one which belonged to the same manuscript transmission of MS[B]. Judging from the first case above, MS[B] that was damaged on the corners of folios was used by the scribe for transmitting the text.

In addition, it is worth noting that MS[E], we now have it, preserves the text up to § 32-a in the middle without any textual gap. If this manuscript is a direct copy of [B], its scribe might have used the missing folios of MS[B], namely folio nos. 8-10 and 15-16. In its present state of preservation in the National Archives of Nepal, MS[B] lacks those five folios. As we report in another paper in this issue, the first three folios of MS[B] were retrieved from the collection of Hemraj Sharman. Comparing the readings of both manuscripts, exclusively the reading in the first three folios of MS[B] with [E], the corresponding reading of MS[E] is almost identical with that of [B]. The places where MS[E] and [A] show differences are restricted to cases in which a part of the folios of MS[B] is damaged and thus the reading is not recovered. When [B] reads differently from [A], [E] follows the reading of [B]. Therefore, MS[E] is a manuscript which transcribed the entire MS[B] or another copy of it including the now missing folios of MS[B]. Since the first three folios were preserved separately, it is hoped that the missing folios of MS[B] and the rest of MS[E] will be found again.

On the Orthography of MS[E]

The orthography of this manuscript is quite correct. Although some damaged akṣaras are found on the corners of the folios, there are few, if any, scribal errors. It is quite interesting that the readings which seem to be an error are identical with that of MS[B] (for instance, see [E]2r.4 = [B]2v.4 = [E]2r.4, n. 55 below). Besides them, phenomena frequently found in the Nepalese Sanskrit manuscripts such as loss of anusvāra / visarga, duplication of consonant after *r*-, and the replacement of class nasals by anuvāra are scarcely recorded. Due to the lack of the final folio which might have a colophon, the date is unknown. On the basis of the script used here, this manuscript belongs to 17th century or later but this dating is uncertain.⁸

⁸ Diwakar Acharya suggests to me that the date of this manuscript is mid of 17th c. MS[B] belongs to 13th century or later; [A] has a colophon which tells us its date 531 (= 1410/11 CE).

Transliteration of Manuscript E:

(1 recto, in the middle) om namaḥ śrī mahāboddhāya ।
Karmavibhaṅgasūtra ॥
evaṃ kukkurasūtra ॥ ॥

2.1 (1v.1) .. namaḥ śrī mahāboddhāya ।

2.11 evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmiṃ samaye Bhagavān Śrāvastyām viharati sma <।>
Jetavane mahāvihāre 'nāthapiṇḍadasyārāme mahatā bhikṣusaṃghena
sārdḍhaṃ⁹।

2.14 atha sa Bhagavān pūrvāhne¹⁰ nivāsyā pā + + + (1v.2)[ram¹¹ ā]dāya Śrāvastīm
piṇḍāya prāvīkṣat sāvadānaṃ Śrāvastīm piṇḍāya caran*¹² <।> yena
ŚukamāṇavaTaudēyaputrasya niveśanaṃ tenopasaṃkrāṇitas <।>

2.16 tena khalu punaḥ samayena Śukasya mānavasya Taudēyaputrasya niveśane
śa + + + (1v.3)ro¹³ goṇikāstrīte paryāṅkaṃ¹⁴ niṣaṇṇaḥ । asyāntaropadhyānāyāṃ¹⁵
kāṃsapātrīyā(ṃ) śālimāṃsodanaṃ paribhūṅkte¹⁶ । adrākṣit* śāṅkhakukuro¹⁷
Bhagavaṃtaṃ dvāramūle dṛṣṭvā ca punar bukkatī ।

4.5 atha Bhagavān* śaṃkhaku .. (1v.4)tad¹⁸ avocat* ।
"etaḍ api te śāṅkha na damayasi yad api¹⁹ bhokkārād bukkāram āgataḥ ।"
evaṃ ukte śāṅkhakukuro²⁰ 'bhiṣiktaḥ²¹ kupitaś caṇḍibhūto 'nāttamanā
goṇikāstrītāt paryāṅkāḍ avatīryādhaṣṭāt paryāṅkasya + + + (1v.5)ndanikāyāṃ²²

⁹ MS[B] does not have "mahāvibhāre" and "mahatā bhikṣusaṃghena sārddhaṃ."

¹⁰ For pūrvāhne.

¹¹ Read pā(tracīvā)ram.

¹² = MS[B] 1v.2; [A] 2r.1: carāṇa(ṃ).

¹³ Read śa(ṅkhakukku)ro.

¹⁴ Read paryāṅke, cf. [B] 1v.3.

¹⁵ = MS[B]; [A] reads asmāntaro<pa>dbānāyāṃ (< aśmāntaropadbānāyāṃ).

¹⁶ Here this manuscript exactly corresponds to that of MS[B] while [A] has one more sentence: bhuṅkte । Bhagavān a(2r.3)drākṣit(kṣ)it* [sa]ṃ[kha]kukura goṇikāstrate paryāṅke niṣaṇṇa(b) । । asmāntaropadbānāyā(ṃ) kāṃsapātrīyā(ṃ) paribhūṅjanam.

¹⁷ For °kukkuro.

¹⁸ Read °ku(kkuram)etad.

¹⁹ = MS[B] 1v.4; [A] 2r.4: na damayati yad asi. See also [E] 1v.7 and 2r.6.

²⁰ Read °kukkuro.

²¹ = MS[B] 1v.4; [A] 2r.5: 'tiṣayitaroṣa° for 'bhiṣiktaḥ kupita°

²² Read (dāṇṣya)nda°.

niṣaṇṇaḥ |

4.10 tena khalu punaḥ samayena Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputro bahirnirgato²⁴
'bhūt <l> kenacid eva karaṇīyena |

athāta āgataḥ²⁴ Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputraḥ <l> adrākṣīt* Śuko māṇavas
Taudeyapu .[r].²⁵ + (1v.6)śāṅkhakukuram²⁶ adhastāt paryaṅkastha²⁷
dārusyandanikāyāṃ niṣaṇṇaṃ dṛṣṭvā ca punar antarjanam āmantrayate |

6.2 "kenaivāyaṃ śāṅkhakukurah²⁸ kiṃcid uktaḥ |"
antarjana āha²⁹ |

6.5 "ko 'smākaṃ āryaputra śāṅkhakukuraṃ³⁰ kiṃcid vak[s]. +³¹ <l>
(1v.7) api tv āgato (')bhūc chramaṇo Gauttamaḥ | taṃ³² dvāramūle dṛṣṭvā
cāyaṃ punar³³ bukkati | tam enaṃ śramaṇo Gauttama evaṃ āha |
'etarhy api tvam³⁴ śāṅkha na damayasi yad asi³⁵ bhokkārād bukkāram āgataḥ
|'

evam ukte śāṅkhakuku ..³⁶ (1v.8) (')bhiṣiktaḥ kupitaḥ caṇḍībhūto
(')nāttamaṇā³⁷ goṇikāstrtāt paryaṅkād avatīryādhasat paryaṅkastha³⁸
dārusyandanikāyāṃ niṣaṇṇaḥ |"

6.11 atha Śukamāṇavas Taudeyaputro 'bhiṣiktaḥ kupitaś caṇḍībhūto (')nāttamaṇā
(1v.9) Śrāvastyāṃ niṣkrāmya³⁹ yena Jetavanam Anāthapiṇḍadasyarāmaṃ
tenopasaṃkrāntas <l>

6.14 tena khalu punaḥ⁴⁰ samayena Bhagavān anekasatāyāṃ bhikṣuparṣadi purastān

²³ MS[B]1v.5: *bahī(r)nirgato*; [A]2v.1: *bahirgato*.

²⁴ MS[B]: illegible; [A]2v.1-2: *atbhāgaccha*.

²⁵ Read °*pu(t)[r](ab)*.

²⁶ Read (śa)ṅkhakukkuram.

²⁷ Read *paryaṅkasya*; this reading (probably a scribal error) is same as that of MS[B] 1v.6, see also [E]2r.7 = [B]3r.2 (missing).

²⁸ Read °*kukkurah*.

²⁹ Both MS[A] and [B] lack this sentence.

³⁰ Read °*kukkuram*.

³¹ Read *vakṣ(ati)*, cf. MS[B]2r.1.

³² Both MS[A] and [B] lack this word.

³³ MS[B]2r.1: *dṛṣṭvā ca punar*; [A] 2v.4: 'vaṣṭhitam tam ekha (< eṣa).

³⁴ MS[B]2r.2: missing; [A]2v.5: *etad api te*.

³⁵ = MS[B]2r.2; [A]2v.5: *na damayati yad asi*. Cf. [E]1v.4 and 2r.6.

³⁶ Read °*kukku(rah)*.

³⁷ For (')nāttamaṇā.

³⁸ Read *paryaṅkasya*, see also [E]1v.6; [B] missing.

³⁹ MS[B]2r.3: *Śrāvastyā niṣkrāmya*; [A] omits the word *Śrāvastyā(n)*.

niṣaṇṇo dharman deṣayati | adrākṣīd Bhagavān* Śukam māṇavaṃ
Tau(1v.10)deyaputram dūrād evāgacchantam dṛṣṭvā ca punar bhikṣūnām⁴¹
āmantrayate sma |

8.4 "paśyatha yūyam bhikṣavaḥ Śukam māṇavaṃ Taudeyaputram dūrād
evāgacchantam |"

"evam Bhagavan* |"

8.7 "sacet* Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputro 'smim samaye (1v.11) kālam kuryād
yathā bhallo nikṣipta evam kāyasya bhedāt param maraṇād
apāyadurgativinipātāṃ⁴² narakeṣūpapadyate | tathā hy ane{{.}}na mamāntike
citta(m) pradūṣitam | cittapradūṣaṇahetor⁴³ evam ihaṁ satvāḥ
kā(2r.1)ya bhedāt param maraṇād apāyadurgativinipātāṃ⁴⁴
narakeṣūpapadyante |"

8.13 athānyatamo bhikṣus tasyāṃ velāyāṃ gāthā⁴⁵ bhāṣate |

8.14 pradūṣacittam dṛṣṭvaiva ekatyam⁴⁶ iha pudgalaṃ |
etam artham vyākāṣm⁴⁷ { | } śāstā bhikṣu(2r.2)gaṇāntike | |
idāniṃ bata doṣo (')yam⁴⁸ kālam kurvīta māṇavaḥ |

narakeṣūpapadyate cittam hy etena dūṣitam |

10.1 yathā hy ucitam nikṣiptam evam eva tathāgate |
cittapradūṣaṇahetos⁴⁹ sa<tvā> gacchanti⁵⁰ durgatiṃ | |

10.3 atha⁵¹ (2r.3) Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputro yena Bhagavāṃs tenopasaṅkrānta
upasaṅkramya Bhagavatā sārddham saṃmukham saṃmodanīm vividhāṃ
kathāṃ vyatisāryaikānte niṣaṇṇaḥ | ⁵²Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputro Bhagavantam
etad avo(2r.4)cat* |

"āgamad⁵³ bhavān* Gauttama asmākaṃ niveśanaṃ |"

"āgaman⁵⁴ māṇava |"

⁴⁰ MS[B]2r.4 lacks *punaḥ* while [A]3r.2 has.

⁴¹ For *bhikṣūn*. MS[B]2r.5: + + *ṇām*; [A]3r.4: «*bhikṣū* » *ṇ*. See also [E]3r.2.

⁴² MS[B]2r.6: °*durgatiṃ vinipātān*; [A]3r.5-v.1: °*durgativinipāte*.

⁴³ = MS[B]2r.6: °*pradūṣaṇaheto(r)*; [A]3v.1: °*prady(<ū>ṣaṇād dbeto(r)*.

⁴⁴ MS[B]2r.6: °*durgatiṃ*; [A]3v.2: °*durgatāvīcan* (< -*gatyavīcan*).

⁴⁵ = MS[B]2v.1. For *gāthā(m)*.

⁴⁶ = MS[A]3v.3; [B]2v.1: *ekadyam*.

⁴⁷ For *vyākāṣm*.

⁴⁸ = MS[B]2v.2; [A]3v.3: *idāni(m) batādbikṣepam*.

⁴⁹ = MS[B]2v.2: °*pradūṣaṇa[be](t)e(s)*; [A]3v.4: °*pradūṣaṇād dbetop*.

⁵⁰ Cf. MS[B]2v.2: .. + *[ti]*; [A]3v.4: *satvā gacchanti*.

⁵¹ MS[B]2v.3: missing; [A]3v.5: *adbikṣepya*.

⁵² Before this MS[A] alone has *ekāntaṇiṣa(r)ṇaḥ* (4r.1).

⁵³ = MS[B]2v.4; [A]4r.1: *āgat(o)*.

- "mā bhavatā⁵⁵ Gautameṇa{m}⁵⁶ śaṅkhakukkuram kiṃcid⁵⁷ uktaḥ | "
- 10.11 "ihāham māṇava pūrvāhṇe nivāsyā pātracīvaram ādāya Śrāvastīm piṇḍā(2r.5)ya prāvīkṣam⁵⁸ <|> sāvadānam Śrāvastīm piṇḍāya caran yena tava⁵⁹ niveśanaṃ tenopasaṃkrānta upasaṃkrāmya dvāramūle sthita āsaṃ⁶⁰ | tadāsau māṇava te⁶¹ śaṅkhakukkuro goṇikāstrte mañcake (')dhiruḥ⁶² (')syānta(2r.6)ropadhānāyām kāmśapātryām śālimā(m)sodanaṃ paribhu(m)kte | adrākṣic chaṅkhakukkuro māṃ dvāramūle sthitam⁶³ drṣṭvā bukkarim akarot⁶⁴ tadāham eva⁶⁵ vadāmi | "
- 12.2 'etad api śaṅkha na damayaśi yad api⁶⁶ bhokārā(2r.7)d bukkāram āgataḥ | ' evam ukte śaṅkhakukkuro 'bhiṣiktaḥ kupitaś caṇḍibhūto (')nāttamanā goṇikāstrtāt paryaṅkād avatīryādhasat paryaṅkastha⁶⁷ dārusyandanikāyām niṣaṇṇaḥ | "
- 12.7 "kiṃ punar bha(2r.8)vān* Gautama śaṅkhakukkuram asmākaṃ pūrvasyāṇ jātau⁶⁸ jānīte | "
- 12.9 "alaṃ māṇava tiṣṭha mā me etam arthaṃ pariprākṣīr⁶⁹ mā te bhaviṣyati āghātaś cākṣāntiś ca cetaso daurmanasyaṃ | "
- 12.11 dvir api trir api (2r.9) Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputro Bhagavantam etad avocat* | "kiṃ⁷⁰ punar bhavān*⁷¹ Gautamo 'smākaṃ śaṅkhakukkuram pūrvikāyām jātau saṃjānīte | "
- 12.14 "alaṃ māṇava tiṣṭha mā me etam arthaṃ pariprākṣīr⁷² mā te bhavi(2r.10)ṣyati āghātaś cākṣāntiś ca cetaso daurmanasyaṃ <|> "
- a{r}ddhā va⁷³ māṇava {l} yāvat trir apy etam arthenālabdhāḥ |

⁵⁴ MS[B]2v.4: *āgamat*; [A]4r.1: *āgamaṇa(m)*.

⁵⁵ = MS[B]2v.4; [A] 4r.2: *Bhagavatā*.

⁵⁶ = MS[B]2v.4 (superfluous anusvāra).

⁵⁷ = MS[B]2v.4; [A]4r.2: *kañcid*.

⁵⁸ MS[B]2v.5: *prāvīkṣat** = [A]4r.3.

⁵⁹ = MS[B]2v.5; [A]4r.3: *bha{ga}vat(o) atra*.

⁶⁰ MS[B]2v.5 partly corresponds here (*sthita* [2v.6] + +); [A]4r.4: '*vaṣṭhitaḥ* for *sthita āba*.

⁶¹ MS[B]2v.6: missing; [A]4r.4: *tena khalu puna(h) samayena*.

⁶² = MS[B]2v.6; [A]4r.4: '*dhirūḍho*.

⁶³ = MS[B]2v.6: *stbitan*; [A]4r.5: '*vaṣṭhitaṃ*.

⁶⁴ For *bukkāram akarot*.

⁶⁵ MS[B]3r.1: missing; [A]4r.5: *taṃ eṇaṃ evaṃ*.

⁶⁶ = MS[B]3r.1; [A]4v.1: *na damayati yad asi*. Cf. [E]1v.4, 7.

⁶⁷ For *paryaṅkasya* (MS[B]3r.2: missing), see also [E]1v.6 = [B]1v.6.

⁶⁸ MS[B] lacks this word (3r.2); [A]4v.2: *jāto* (< *jātau*).

⁶⁹ MS[B]3r.2: *pariprākṣīt* = [A]4v.3. See also [E]2r.9 below.

⁷⁰ = MS[B]3r.3; [A] lacks this word.

⁷¹ In MS[B], the aksara "ga" of *bhagavān** is cancelled by the scribe (3r.3); [A]4v.4: *Bhagavān**.

⁷² MS[B]3r.4: *pariprākṣīt* = [A]4v.4-5. See also [E]2r.8 above.

- 14.3 "s}tena hi māṇava śṛṇu sādhu ca suṣṭhu ca manasikuru bhāṣiṣye | yas te māṇava pitā Taudeyaḥ (2v.1) sa eva⁷⁴ kāyasya bhedād dhināyāṃ śvāṇayonāv⁷⁵ upapannaḥ ||"
- 14.6 "kim etad⁷⁶ bho Gautama evaṃ bhaviṣyati | asmākaṃ pitā Taudeya iṣṭayajña āhitāgnir ucchritayūpaḥ | sa niyataṃ⁷⁷ kāyasya bhedāc chubhe⁷⁸ (2v.2) brahmaloke upapanno bhaviṣyati ||"
- 14.9 "anenaiva te māṇava mātābhīmānena pitā Taudeyo hīnāyāṃ⁷⁹ śvāṇayonāv⁸⁰ upapanno 'pi tu⁸¹ māṇava yaḍi me bhāṣitaṃ na śraddadhāsi tena hi tvam māṇava (2v.3) yena svakaṃ niveśanaṃ tenopasaṃkrāma upasaṃkramya śaṅkhaṃ kukkuram evaṃ vada <|>
- 14.13 'saced bhavāṃc chaṅkhakukkuro 'smākaṃ pūrvikāyāṃ jātau pitābhūt Taudeyo 'dhirohatu goṇi<kā>strtaṃ paryaṅkam'
adhi(2v.4)rokṣati⁸² | adhiruha «ntaṃ»⁸³ cainam evaṃ vada <|>
- 14.16 'saced bhavāṃc chaṅkhakukkuro (')smākaṃ pūrvikāyāṃ jātau pitābhūt Taudeyaḥ paribhūṃjita bhavān asyāntaropadhānāyāṃ kāmśapatryāṃ śālimāṃsodanaṃ'
- 16.3 pari(2v.5)bhokṣate⁸⁴ | bhuktavantaṃ cenam⁸⁵ evaṃ vada <|>
- 16.4 'saced bhavāṃc chaṅkhakukkuro (')smākaṃ pūrvikāyāṃ jātau pitābhūt Taudeyo yat te 'smākaṃ maraṇasamaye satta⁸⁶ svāpateyaṃ nopadarśitaṃ

⁷³ = MS[B]3r.4. For *addhā ca* ("In this way"). [A]4v.5: *anyathā tvam*.

⁷⁴ = MS[B]3r.5; [A]5r.1: *esa*.

⁷⁵ MS[B]3r.5: *śvāyonāv*; [A]5r.1: *śvāyonāv* (< *śvā*^o). Cf. also [E]2v.2 below.

⁷⁶ MS[B] alone has *tu* here.

⁷⁷ MS[B]3r.6: missing; [A] 5r.2: *saṃnīyataṃ*. On this form, Lévi corrects it as *saṃnīyate* and Edgerton, basing on Lévi's edition, picks up this word as one of entries of MIndic passive form of a verbal root *jñā-* with a prefix *saṃ-*: "Pass. *saṃnīyate*, is known, 27.27 (BIISG p. 214, §§ 2.015; 37.3, n. 1, Dic.)." However, since the sequence of the akṣaras "*saṃnīyataṃ*" is clear in [A], the above explanation seems doubtful. Judging from the reading in this manuscript, the form "*saṃnīyataṃ*" in [A] seems to be a mere scribal error for "*saṃni niyataṃ*" (additional anusvāra and interchange of *i* and *ī*) and thus it might be read as "*sa niyataṃ*" ("He, inevitably"). If so, the line break here should be changed as in [E]: "*asmākaṃ pitā Taudeya iṣṭayajña āhitāgnir ucchritayūpaḥ | sa niyataṃ kāyasya bhedāc ...*" (Our father, Taudeya, had performed the required sacrifices, ... He inevitably, after his death, ...).

⁷⁸ = MS[B]3r.6. For *chubhre* (*subhre*) as found in [A].

⁷⁹ = MS[B]3r.6; [A]5r.3: *mabādānapati(r)*.

⁸⁰ = MS[B]3r.6; [A]5r.1: *śvāyonāv* (< *śvā*^o). Cf. also [E]2v.1 above.

⁸¹ MS[B]3r.6: *pi tu*; [A]5r.3: *'pitur*, cf. KV[K]: 14, fn. 13 suggested to read "*upapannaḥ | pitur*" but this reading should be changed to "(*'*)*pi tu*" as in [E].

⁸² For *adbirokṣyati* as in MS[A]5r.5 (a verbal form in Fut. is expected); [B]3v.1: + + + .. [te].

⁸³ MS[B]3v.2: + + + *ham*; [A]5r.5: *adbiroḍham*.

⁸⁴ For *paribhokṣyate* as in MS[A]5v.1 (a verbal form in Fut. is expected); [B]3v.3: + + + [kṣ](a)te.

⁸⁵ For *cainam*.

⁸⁶ = MS[B]3.v3; [A]5v.2: *mama santam*. Read *santam* as in [A].

tad upadarśaya <|>
upada(2v.6)rśayiṣyati | "

16.8 atha Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputro Bhagavato⁸⁷ bhāṣita{{m}}m udgrhya
paryavāpya yena svakaṃ nīveśanaṃ tenopasaṃkrānta upasaṃkramya
śaṅkhakukkuraṃ idam avocat* |

"saced bhavāṃc chaṅkhaku(2v.7)kkuro (')smākaṃ pūrvikāyāṃ jātau pitābhūt
Taudeyo 'dhirohatu goṇikāstṛtaṇi paryāṅkaṃ <|>"

adhirūḍho 'dhiruhaṃ⁸⁸ cainam evam āha |

18.2 "saced bhavāṃc chaṅkhakukkuro (')smākaṃ pūrvikāyāṃ jātau pitābhūt
Tau(2v.8)deyaḥ paribhuñjatu bhavān asyātaropadhānāyāṃ kāmśapātryāṃ
śālimāṃsodanaṃ <|>"

paribhuktavān* | bhuktavantam cainam evam āha |

"saced bhavāṃc chaṅkhakukkuro (')smākaṃ pūrvikāyāṃ jātau pitā(2v.9)bhūt
Taudeyo yat te 'smākaṃ maraṇasamaye satta⁸⁹ svāpateyaṃ nopadarśitaṃ
tad upadarśaya | "

19.30 atha śaṅkhakukkuro goṇikāstṛtāt paryāṅkāḍ avatīrya
yenānyattamapurāṇavāsagrhaṃ tenopasaṃkrānta (2v.10) upasaṃkramya
catura⁹¹ paryāṅkapāḍakān pāḍena pari«taḥ samullikhati» {{karṣayati}}⁹²
madhyaṃ ca mukhatuḍakenopajighrati <|> {yataḥ}⁹³
yataḥ Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputro kṛtākṛtasya hiraṇyasavarṇṇasya caturo
lo(3r.1)hīsaṃghāṭān adhigatavān madhyāc ca sauvarṇakamaṇḍalum⁹⁴ |

21.1 atha Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputras tatsavarṇaṃ gopayitvā
hr̥ṣṭatuṣṭodagrapṛitisauṃmanasyajātaḥ <|> Śrāvastyā niṣkramya yena Bhagavāṃs
tenopasaṃ(3r.2)krāntas <|>

21.4 tena khalu⁹⁵ samayena Bhagavān anekāśatāyāṃ bhikṣuparṣadi purastān
niṣaṇṇo dharmaṃ deśayati | adrākṣic Chukaṃ māṇavaṃ Taudeyaputraṃ dūrād
evāgacchantam <|> dṛṣṭvā ca punar bhikṣūn⁹⁶ āmantrayati (3r.3) sma |

⁸⁷ = MS[B]3v.4; [A]5v.3: *bhagavātā* (< *bhagavatā*).

⁸⁸ MS[B]3v.5: *adhirubam* only; [A]: 5v.5: *adhirūḍham* only.

⁸⁹ = MS[B]3v.6-4r.1: *sa* + ; read *santaṇi* as in [A]6r.2: *mama satum* (< *santaṇi*).

⁹⁰ From here transliteration of MS[B] (folio no. 4 onwards) is available in KV[K]: 19ff.
Thus, the page numbers and lines of the transliteration of [B] in KV[K] are given from
here on in squares.

⁹¹ For *caturah*.

⁹² The original reading seems to be "*pāḍena parikarṣayati*" but corrected to "*pāḍena paritaḥ
samullikhati*" ("he digs up with his forepaw"). In MS[B] it runs as follows: *pāḍana*(4r.2) + +
+ + + + .. *kbalita*{*ma*}*dbyaṇ* ca.

⁹³ MS[B]4r.2 also has superfluous word {*yatiḥ*}.

⁹⁴ MS[E] omits a word *daṇḍa* which is found in [A]6r.5; [B]4r.3: missing.

⁹⁵ = MS[B]4r.3; [A] adds *punaḥ* (6v.1).

"paśyatha yūyaṃ bhikṣavaḥ Śukaṃ māṇavaṃ Taudeyaputraṃ dūrata evāgacchantam |"

"evaṃ Bhagavan* |"

"sacec Chuko māṇavas Taudeyaputro 'smin samaye kālaṃ kuryād yathā bhallo nikṣipta <|> evaṃ kāyasya (3r.4) bhedāt* sugatau svargalokadeveṣūpapadyate | tathā hy anena mamāntike cittam prasāditaṃ cittaprasādanā⁹⁷ hetor bhikṣava evaṃ ihaike satvāḥ kāyasya bhedāt sugatau svargalokadeveṣūpapa(3r.5)dyante |"⁹⁸

21.15

athānyatamo bhikṣus tasyāṃ velāyāṃ gāthāṃ bhāṣate |

21.16

prasannacittam dṛṣṭvaiva ekatyam iha pudgalaṃ |

23.1

etam artham vyākārṣic chāstā bhikṣugaṇāntike |

idānīm kālaṃ kurvīta śuko (')yaṃ mā(3r.6)ṇavo yadi |⁹⁹

upapadyeta deveṣu cittam hy etena prasāditaṃ | |¹⁰⁰

yathā dūritaṃ nikṣiptam evam eva tathāgate |

cittaprasādanā¹⁰¹ hetoḥ satvā gacchanti sadgatiṃ¹⁰² | |

23.6

atha Śuko māṇavas Taudeyaputro (3r.7) yena¹⁰³ Bhagavāms tenopasaṃkrānta <|> upasaṃkramya Bhagavatā sārddham saṃmukhaṃ saṃmodanīm samrañjanīm vividhām kathām vyatisāyaikānte niṣaṇṇaḥ | ekānta(m)niṣaṇṇaṃ Śukaṃ māṇavaṃ Taudeyaputraṃ Bhagavā(3r.8)nn idam avocat* |

25.1

"kaccin māṇava tat tathaivaṃ yathā mayā śaṅkhakukkuro vyākṛtaḥ |"

"tathā bho Gautama tat tathaiva yathā Bha<ga>vatā Gautamena śaṅkhakukkuro vyākṛtaḥ | anyad api tāvad vayaṃ Bhaga(3r.9)vantaṃ¹⁰⁴ Gautamaṃ pṛcchema kaccid eva pradeśaṃ saced avakāśaṃ kuryāt* praśnasya vyākaraṇāya Bhagavān*¹⁰⁵ |"

⁹⁶ For *bbikṣūn*. MS[B]4r.4: *bbikṣūnām*; [A]6v.2: *bbikṣūn*. See also [E]1r.10 above.

⁹⁷ = MS[B]4r.6; for °*prasādanā*.

⁹⁸ = MS[B]4r.6. The last sentence beginning from *tathā hy* is omitted in [A], see KV[K]: 21, fn. 9 (the corresponding passage in [B] is found in 2r.6-v.1).

⁹⁹ This line differs from either that of MS[A] and of [B]. [B] reads (4v.1): *idānī(ṃ) kālaṃ kurvīta māṇavaḥ* 1. Probably the scribe of MS[E] follows the reading of [B] (*idānīm kālaṃ kurvīta*) as it is and reconstructs the rest by himself or by using another (unknown) source.

¹⁰⁰ This line is also different from that of MS[A]; in [B] this portion is missing due to the damage of folio (4v.1-2). The reading in [E] might be reconstructed by the scribe on the basis of its corresponding line but in opposite sense found in [E]2r.2 and [B]2v.2: *narakeṣūpapadyate cittam hy etena dūṣitaṃ*.

¹⁰¹ = MS[B]4v.2; for °*prasādanāt*.

¹⁰² MS[B]4v.2: *saṅgatiṃ* (<*sadgatiṃ*>); [A]7r.1-2: *sadgatiṃ*.

¹⁰³ = MS[A]7r.2; [B] omits this word, cf. [E]2r.3.

¹⁰⁴ In MS[B], an akṣara *ga* in Nāgarī script is inserted here (4v.4, cf. KV[K]: 25, fn. 3). The relationship of this insertion and the reading of [E] is unknown.

25.6

"śrṇu .. māṇava¹⁰⁶ yadyad eva kāmṅkṣasi |"

"ko bho Gautama ko hetuḥ <|> kaḥ pratyayo yenehaike satvā (3r.10) alpāyuṣo (')pi dīrghāyuṣo (')pi bahvābādhā api alpābādhā api durvarṇṇā api suvarṇṇā api alpeśākhyā api maheśākhyā api nīcakulīnā api uccakulīnā api anādeya(3v.1)vākyā api | ādeyavākyā api | alpabhogā api mahābhogā api duṣprajñā api mahāprajñā api | kasya nu bho karmaṇo vipākenedaṃ satvānāṃ nānātvaṃ prajñāyate ||"

27.1

¹⁰⁷tatra Bhagavāṃ (3v.2) Śukaṃ māṇavaṃ Tauḍeyaputram idam avocat* |

"karṇavibhaṅgan te māṇava dharmaparyāyaṃ deśayiṣyāmi | tac chṛṇu sādhu ca suṣṭhu ca manasi<kuru> bhāṣiṣye 'haṃ te¹⁰⁸ |"

"evaṃ Bhagavann" iti Śuko māṇavas Tau(3v.3)deyaputro Bhagavataḥ pratyāśrauṣīt* |

27.6

Bhagavān idam avocat* |

"karmasvakān ahaṃ māṇava satvān vadāmi | karmadāyādā karmayonayaḥ karmapratiśaraṇāḥ | karṇa māṇava satvān vibhajati <|> ya(3v.4)d idam hīnotkṛṣṭamadhyamatāyāṃ |"

27.10

tadyathā¹⁰⁹ |

- 1¹¹⁰. asti karmālpāyuḥsaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
2. asti karma dīrghāyussaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
3. asti karma bahvābādhasaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
4. asti karmālpābādhasaṃvartta(3v.5)nīyaṃ |
5. asti karma durvarṇṇasaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
6. asti karma prāsādikasaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
7. asti karma alpeśākhyasaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
8. asti karma maheśākhyasaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
9. asti karma nīcaku(3v.6)lopapattisaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
10. asti karma uccakulopapattisaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
11. asti karma alpabhogasaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
12. asti karma mahābhogasaṃvarttanīyaṃ |
13. asti karma duṣprajñasaṃvartta(3v.7)nīyaṃ |
14. asti karma mahāprajñasaṃvarttanīyaṃ |

29.1

¹⁰⁵ Both MS[A] and [B] omit this word although in [B] the folio is damaged.

¹⁰⁶ MS[A]7r.5: *precha māṇava*; [B]4v.5 is damaged.

¹⁰⁷ This passage exactly corresponds to that of MS[B]5r.1-2 while [A] reads differently. As to the difference between them, it is interesting to note that one of the fragments in the Schøyen Collection preserves a part of this passage corresponding to that of MS[A] (SC 2382/49a, side A).

¹⁰⁸ MS[B]5r.2: + + + + +; [A]7v.4: *maṇasikuru bhāṣiṣye*. As to [B], I suggested to read "(*manasikuru bhāṣiṣye*)" on the basis of [A] but it should be changed to "Read (*manasi<kuru> 'ham te*)" as found in [E] although some akṣaras are supplied (KV[K]: 27, fn. 2).

¹⁰⁹ = MS[B]5r.3; [A] omits this word.

15. asti karma narakopapattisaṃvarttanīyaṃ ।
16. asti karma tiryagyonyupapattisaṃvarttanīyaṃ ।
17. asti karma pretalokopapattisaṃ(3v.8)mvarttanīyaṃ ।
18. asti karma asuralokopapattisaṃvarttanīyaṃ ।
19. asti karma manuṣyalokopapattisaṃvarttanīyaṃ ।
20. asti karma kāmāvacaradevopapattisaṃvarttanīyaṃ ।
21. asti ka(3v.9)rma rūpāvacaradevopapattisaṃvarttanīyaṃ ।
22. asti karma ārūpyāvacaradevopapattisaṃvarttanīyaṃ ।
- 24.¹¹¹ asti karma upacitaṃ na kṛtaṃ ।
23. asti karma kṛtaṃ nopacitaṃ ।
25. asti karma kṛ(3v.10)taṃ upacitaṃ ca ।
26. asti karma naiva kṛtaṃ naivopacitaṃ ।
27. asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalo narakeṣv āyuh kṣapayitvā narakeṣv evopapadyate¹¹² ।
- 28.¹¹³
29. asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ (4r.1) pudgalo narakeṣūpapannamātra evam uktāḥ¹¹⁴ ।
asti karma tiryagyonyupapattisaṃvarttanīyaṃ¹¹⁵ ।
30. asti karma niyatopapattisaṃvarttanīyaṃ¹¹⁶ ।
- 31.¹¹⁷
32. asti karma deśāntaravipakṣaṃ ।
33. asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalaḥ (4r.2) pūrvam sukhito bhūtvā paścād duḥkhito bhavati ।
34. asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalaḥ pūrvam duḥkhito bhūtvā paścāt sukhito bhavati ।
35. asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalaḥ pūrvam sukhito bhū(4r.3)tvā paścād api sukhito bhavati ।
36. asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalaḥ pūrvam duḥkhito bhūtvā paścād api duḥkhito bhavati ।
38. asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalo daridro bhavati tyāgavān* ।¹¹⁸

¹¹⁰ This number corresponds to that given by Lévi in Roman numerals.

¹¹¹ In this list, section headings 23 and 24 are mentioned in reverse as is case in [B].

¹¹² = MS[B]5v.3. This heading is listed in an abridged form; later § 27 starts (9r.2 = [B]14r.6) with a following phrase: *tatra katamaṃ karma yena samānvāgataḥ pudgalo narakeṣūpapannam paripūrṇaṃ nairayikam āyuh kṣapayitvā cyavanti*.

¹¹³ MS[E] omits heading 28 as also in [B].

¹¹⁴ In MS[B], the beginning of 5v.4 is damaged; I suggested to read this missing portion as “e(vopapadyate)” on the basis of [A] (KV[K]: 29, fn. 18) but this should now be changed to “e(vam uktāḥ)” as found in [E].

¹¹⁵ = MS[B]5v.4. This heading is identical to that of 16.

¹¹⁶ = MS[B]5v.4.

¹¹⁷ The heading “anivṛttopabatti” does not appear in this list as in [B] but section 31 starts in

37. (4r.4) asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgala ādhyo bhavati matsarī |
 39A¹¹⁹ asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalo daridro bhavati matsarī |
 39. asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgala ādhyo bhavati tyāgavān* |
 41. (4r.5) asti pudgalo yasya karma kṣīṇaṃ nāyuh |
 40. asti pudgalo yasyāyuh kṣīṇaṃ na karma{h} |
 42.¹²⁰
 43.¹²¹
 43a. asti pudgalo yasya nāyuh kṣīṇaṃ na karmāni ca | api tu kleśāḥ kṣīṇā bhavanti¹²²
 |
 44. asti pudgalaḥ kāyena sukhi(4r.6)to¹²³ na cittena |
 45. asti pudgalo yaś¹²⁴ cittena sukhī na kāyena |
 46. asti pudgalaḥ kāyena ca sukhī cittena ca |
 47. asti pudgalo naiva kāyena sukhī na cittena |
 48. asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalo 'pāyeṣū(4r.7)papanno 'bhirūpo
 bhavati snigdha kāyaḥ snigdhacchaviḥ, nayanābhirāmo darśanīyaḥ |
 49. asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalo 'pāyeṣūpapanno durvarṇṇo bhavati
 rūkṣakāyo ghoradarśanaḥ pratikūladarśanaḥ |
 50. (4r.8) asti karma yena samanvāgataḥ pudgalo ('pāyeṣūpapanno durgandho
 bhavati jihvendriyo¹²⁵ bhavaty avyaktendriyaḥ |
 51. daśānām akuśālānām karmapathānām vipākena daśānām bāhyānām
 bhāvānām abhivṛddhiḥ prajñā(4r.9)yate |
 51A. daśānām kuśālānām karmapathānām vipākena daśānām bāhyānām bhāvānām
 vipattiḥ prajñāyate |¹²⁶
 62. daśānusaṃśās¹²⁷ tathāgatacaityāñjalikarmaṇi |
 63. daśānusaṃśās tathāgatacaityavandanāyāḥ |
 64. daśānusaṃśāḥ(4r.10) chatrapradāne¹²⁸ |

¹¹⁸ The headings 37 and 38 are listed in reverse as is case in MS[B].

¹¹⁹ This number with the capital letter A is given by me. This heading is found only in MS[B]6r.1 and [E]; but this topic is not discussed later.

¹²⁰ Cf. MS[A]9v.2: *aṣṭi* (< *asti*) *pudgalo y(a)syāyuh karmunāni ca kṣīṇāni*. Although this heading is not found in [B]26v.1, the topic is discussed, see KV[K]: 159, 7-9.

¹²¹ Cf. MS[A]9v.2-3: *aṣṭi* (< *asti*) *pudgalo yasyāyuh kṣīṇaṃ pu(ṇy)āni ca*. Neither the heading nor the section itself is found in MS[B], see KV[K]: 161.

¹²² The line division in MS[B] (KV[K]: 31, 19-20) should be changed to "43. / 43a. *asti pudgalo yasyāyuh kṣīṇaṃ na karmāni ca | | api tu kleśāḥ kṣīṇā bhavanti | |*" as in [E].

¹²³ =? MS[B]6r.2-3: *sukhi* + +; [A] 9v.4: *sukhī*. As to [B], I suggested to read "*sukhi(to cit)rena*" but it should be changed to "*sukhi(to na cit)tena*" (KV[K]: 33, fn. 1).

¹²⁴ = MS[B]6r.3; [A] omits this word.

¹²⁵ = MS[B]6r.5; read *jihvendriyo* as in [A]10r.2.

¹²⁶ = MS[B]6r.6 but not in [A]; however this topic is not discussed independently.

¹²⁷ In the following, the word *anusaṃśā* is always (except in the next case) written as *anusaṃśā*.

¹²⁸ MS[E], same as [B], reads °*pradāne* instead of °*pradānasya* as in [A].

85.1

65. daśānusamśā ghaṇṭhapradāne |
 66.¹²⁹
 67. daśānusamśā āsanapradāne |
 68. daśānusamśā bhājanapradāne |
 69. daśānusamśā bhojanapradāne |
 70. daśānusamśā yānapradāne |
 71. daśānusamśāḥ pratiśrayapradāne |
 72. daśā(4r.11)nusamśāḥ pānakapradāne |
 72A. daśānusamśā phalapradāne¹³⁰ |
 73. daśānusamśā mālāpradāne |
 74. daśānusamśā muktapuṣpapradāne |
 75. daśānusamśā dīpapradāne |
 76. daśānusamśā gandhapradāne |
 76A. daśānusamśā dhūpapradāne¹³¹ |
 77. (4v.1) daśānusamśāḥ pravrajyāyāṃ |
 78. daśānusamśā araṇyavāse |
 79. daśānusamśāḥ pañḍapātikatve |
 80. daśa vaiśāradyānāṃ¹³² |

iti samuddeśāḥ¹³³ karmavibhaṅgasya dharmaparyāyasya¹³⁴ || ||

(To be continued)

Convention:

()	restored akṣara(s)
[]	damaged akṣara(s)
< >	omitted (part of) akṣara(s)
{ }	superfluous akṣara(s)
{{ }}	erased akṣara(s)
« »	interlinear insertion
+	one lost akṣara
..	one illegible akṣara

¹²⁹ MS[E], same as [B], omits the heading: *daśānusamśā vastrapradānane*; but this topic is discussed later; see [B]31r.4-6: *katame da + guṇā vastrapradānasya | ucyate ||...*

¹³⁰ = MS[B]6v.2 but not in [A]. Although this subject is listed here, it is not discussed later.

¹³¹ = MS[B]6v.3 but not in [A]. This subject is not discussed later.

¹³² In MS[B], I suggested to read *vaiśāradyā(nī)* on the basis of [A] (KV[K]: 35, fn. 12) but this should now be changed to “*vaiśāradyānāṃ*” as in [E].

¹³³ MS[B]6v.4: + + [m]. *d. śaḥ*. I suggested to read “*(aya)m ud(d)esaḥ*” but this should now be changed as in [E] (KV[K]: 35, fn. 13).

¹³⁴ = MS[B]6v.4 but [A] lacks this word.

.	illegible part of an akṣara
*	virāma
,	avagraha

Abbreviations:

KV:	<i>Karmavibhaṅga</i> (or <i>Mahākarmavibhaṅga</i> in Lévi)
KV/[K]:	See Kudo 2004.
Lévi:	See Lévi 1932.
MS[A]:	No. 4-20
MS[B]:	No. 1-1697
MS[C]:	appended to MS[B]
MS[D]:	appended to MS[A]
MS[E]:	No. 4-951
r	recto
SC:	Schoyen Collection
SIIT:	<i>Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden</i>
v	verso

References:

Diwakar Acharya and Noriyuki Kudo

- 2006 "The First Three Folios of Manuscript B of the *Karmavibhaṅga*," in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the academic year 2005*, vol. IX, pp. 33-42.

Edgerton, Franklin

- 1953 *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, 2 vols., New Haven, 1953.

Hoernle, A. F. R. (ed.)

- 1916 *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan*, Oxford.

Kudo, Noriyuki

- 2004 *The Karmavibhaṅga: Transliterations and Annotations of the Original Sanskrit Manuscripts from Nepal*. (BPPB VII), Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism.
- 2005 「サンスクリット本『カルマ・ヴィバṅガ』テキスト形成の考察」『印度學佛教學研究』53-2, pp. 871-866 (L). ("The Textual History of the Sanskrit *Karmavibhaṅga*," in: *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* [= *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*] 53-2, 2005.3, pp. 871-866(L)).
- 2006 "Brief Communication: A notebook transcribing the manuscript B of the *Karmavibhaṅga* formerly belonged to the private collection of Hemraj Sharman," in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the academic year 2005*, vol. IX, pp. 297-300.

Lévi, Sylvain

- 1932 *Mahākarmavibhaṅga (La Grande Classification des Actes) et Karmavibhaṅgapadeśa (Discussion sur le Mahā Karmavibhaṅga), textes sanscrits rapportés du Nepal, édités et traduits avec les textes parallèles en sanscrit, en pali en tibétain, en chinois et en koutchéen*, Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux.

Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden. Teil IV: Ergänzungsband zu Teil I-3 mit Text-wiedergaben, Berichtigungen und Wörterzeichnissen bearbeitet von L. Sander und E. Waldschmidt, Wiesbaden, 1980 (VOHID Bd.X, 4).

(This research is supported in part by a Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C)(2) from JSPS)

[Keywords] *Karmavibhaṅga*, Nepalese manuscript, NGMPP

The Central Asian Manuscript Collection of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences*

Margarita I. VOROBYOVA-DESYATOVSKAYA

(translated from the Russian by Jan Nattier)

Manuscripts from East Turkestan, Dunhuang and Qara Qoto (northwestern China) began to appear in the Asiatic Museum of the Russian Academy of Sciences at the end of the 1880s. The final influx took place in 1915 as the result of two trips to East Turkestan by S. E. Malov. In 1930 all the manuscript collections of the Asiatic Museum were transferred to the just-established Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.

Since then more than seventy years have passed, and on the whole, the period of restoration and conservation of the manuscripts brought from Central Asia and China has come to an end. A complete count of the manuscripts has been produced and corresponding inventory descriptions composed; thanks to these, we can now say with complete certainty which individual collections are preserved and how many items they contain. It should be mentioned at the outset, however, that the majority of the collection consists not of entire works and complete manuscripts, but only of individual fragments. The other Central Asian collections in Europe and Asia are in a comparable state. Today it is considered a great honor to have fragments of Sanskrit, Tokharian, Khotanese, Uighur, and even Chinese manuscripts dating from the first millennium CE; in the entire world there is only a small number of such antiquities, and at present new discoveries are not expected. Of course, some individual finds have come to light, but as a rule these have not been newly excavated but rather were already preserved in various private collections in Europe,¹ Afghanistan, or Pakistan.

In the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s fragments of Sanskrit manuscripts and inscriptions on ceramic containers and other materials were found during the excavation of Buddhist complexes dating from the first to the eighth centuries CE in the territory of then-Soviet Central Asia: in Tadzhikistan, Turkmenistan, Kirgizia and Uzbekistan. After the break-up of the Soviet Union, the participation of Russian archaeologists in excavations in Central

* This paper originally appeared in a slightly different form in G. M. Bongard-Levin, M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, and E. M. Tyomkin, eds., *Pamyatniki indijskoi pis'mennosti iz Tsentral'noi Azii*, vol. 3 (Moscow: Nauka, Russian Academy of Sciences, 2004), pp. 75-88. The translator would like to thank Mr. Stefan BAUMS and Mr. Kenzō KAWASAKI for help on various technical points.

¹ For a report on the recent discovery of Sanskrit manuscripts owned by a Norwegian collector see Braarvig et al., 1999; the first publications of these manuscripts can be found in Braarvig 2000 and 2002.

Asia effectively came to a halt. Some monuments that had already been discovered were now in zones of armed conflict, and excavations there were discontinued (this applies above all to Termez and the Vaksh river valley of Tadzhikistan). One Sanskrit manuscript in Brāhmī script nonetheless came into the hands of scholars from St. Petersburg: this is the so-called “Merv manuscript,” which came to light in 1966, evidently when an ancient stūpa collapsed. This manuscript, written in Indian Brāhmī of the post-Kushan period, was in all probability copied in the territory of Kashmir; excerpts were recently published (Bongard-Levin et al. 2004: 273-336).

(1) The N. F. Petrovsky collection

At present 582 items are registered in the holdings of this collection, for whose study S. F. Oldenburg was principally responsible. Of these, 266 are Sanskrit manuscripts in Brāhmī script on paper (this figure includes manuscripts, individual folios of manuscripts, and fragments). Another 297 are Khotanese (= Khotan-Saka) manuscripts on paper, of which 59 manuscripts and fragments are Buddhist in content and 238 are economic documents, among them ten documents written on wood.² Another eleven fragments are in Tokharian.³ There are two documents on wood written in northwestern (Gāndhārī) Prakrit in the Kharoṣṭhī script, and one document on wood with two different scripts: Brāhmī on one side (in the Tokharian B language, = Kuchean) and Kharoṣṭhī (in the Gāndhārī language) on the other. Two documents on wood are written in Old Uighur, in the Uighur script. As far as Uighur specialists have been able to tell, these appear to be economic documents; they are unique in the sense that no other old Uighur manuscripts on wood have yet been found. There are three Tibetan manuscript fragments on paper, written in semi-cursive Tibetan script (the so-called “Dunhuang cursive”). The Sanskrit manuscripts in the Petrovsky collection will be surveyed below.

There are also 128 Islamic manuscripts acquired by N. F. Petrovsky, which comprise part of the Arabic-script manuscript collection in the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

In 1995 sixteen manuscripts copied in Khotan were returned to the Petrovsky holdings from the Chinese Dunhuang collection. Of these two can be considered bilingual Chinese-Khotanese texts, and the rest consist of a base text in Chinese together with an explanation in Khotanese written in Brāhmī script.⁴

(2) The N. N. Krotkov collection

Krotkov was the Russian consul in Urumchi and Qulja, and secretary of the consulate

² See Emmerick and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, eds., 1993 and 1995.

³ The honor of having published the first two Tokharian fragments, thus making them the property of world scholarship, belongs to S. F. Oldenburg (*ZVORAO* 1893, vol. 7, pp. 81-82+2 plates). At present these fragments are preserved, as the most esteemed pieces in the collection, under the numbers SI P/1a, 2a. It has been determined that they contain the text of the *Udānavarga*. Two fragments of a Sanskrit-Tokharian B dictionary (no. SI P/65b) were published by V. S. Vorobyov-Desyatovsky (1958); cf. note 18 below and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1997, p. 208. Fragment SI P/141, a document on wood with text in Tokharian B on one side and northwest Prakrit in the Kharoṣṭhī script on the other, has been published; see Schmidt 2001.

⁴ See Kumamoto 2001.

in Girin (Jilin) and Tsitsikar. This collection contains 4,073 items, the majority of which are fragments written in Uighur cursive or semi-cursive script, dating from the 8th-10th centuries CE. The collection also contains fragments of early Uighur xylographs (9th-14th c.). Many of the Uighur manuscripts are written on the reverse of Chinese scrolls which were evidently copied in Kucha and Turfan. Other noteworthy pieces in the collection are 26 manuscript fragments in Sanskrit written in various types of North Turkestan Brāhmī,⁵ and nine manuscript fragments in Tokharian, of which five are in Tokharian B and four in Tokharian A.⁶ The collection also contains 31 Manichaean Sogdian fragments⁷ and two fragments in Syriac.⁸

(3) The M. M. Berezovsky collection

Berezovsky was a mathematician and biologist by training, and a member of the Russian Geographical Society, which organized an expedition to Kucha in 1906-07. The Berezovsky collection long remained unstudied; only in the year 2000 did restorationists complete the task of conserving the fragments in archival-quality Melinex (transparent polyester) film. Before that they had been enclosed in ordinary plastic film, and as a result of being kept there for a long time, they had disintegrated so badly that no work on them was possible. At present 136 items in the collection have been registered; they are manuscript fragments on paper. A distinctive feature of this collection is the association of the fragments with the names of the places where they were found. Among them are 59 fragments in Sanskrit. Some of these have been published,⁹ including one fragment of a didactic work in which the names of the heroes of the *Mahābhārata* are mentioned.¹⁰

Oldenburg had begun to prepare an edition of the eighteen Sanskrit fragments catalogued under the number SI B/18. In the archives is his transliteration of several fragments which he identified as belonging to the “*Dirghāgama-sūtra*.” For the identification of these fragments he made use of the Pāli canon. We have not yet published these fragments, as it is now possible to identify them with greater precision. After the publication of the catalogue of Turfan manuscripts from German collections, it became necessary to collate our fragments not with the Pāli, but with the Sanskrit texts belonging to the canon of the Hīnayāna schools that were prevalent in East Turkestan. It is known that the

⁵ Some of these have been published. See Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1990, pp. 97-99 (two fragments of the *Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna*, SI Kr IV/343b, Kr IV/790), pp. 204-206 (one fragment of the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra*, SI 2 Kr/82[2]), and pp. 185-203 (two fragments of the *Nagaropama-sūtra*, SI 2 Kr/82[1] and 2 KT/9[2]).

⁶ See Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1997, p. 208, n. 7.

⁷ See Ragoza 1980.

⁸ See Pigulevskaya 1940 and Meshcherskaya 1998.

⁹ The first to be published were two fragments of syllabary tablets in slanting Central Asian Brāhmī from Onbashi Ming-öi in the region of Kucha; see Vorobyov-Desyatovsky 1958, Text 2. Twenty fragments of a *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* in the version of the Sarvāstivāda school (SI B/12) were published in Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1990, vol. 2, pp. 185-203. In the same volume were published fragments of a *Mahāvadāna-sūtra* and of a Hīnayāna *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* (SI B/14; pp. 208-244) and three fragments of the *Bodbarājakumāra-sūtra* (SI B/14; Fragments II and III, pp. 245-249; see Hartmann 2004, especially p. 128, n. 30).

¹⁰ Bongard-Levin et al. 2004, pp. 261-263.

number and arrangement of sūtras in the Pāli and Sanskrit canons were different; sūtras that Oldenburg assigned to the *Ādīśāgama* belong to the *Samyuktāgama* in the Sanskrit canon. However, the German scholars did not published the facsimiles and transliteration of their manuscripts from the Sanskrit Hinayāna canon, but only listed them in their catalogue. It was therefore decided to wait until we could compare our fragments with the German ones and be more specific on the identification of the texts.

Very recently four large fragments from different manuscripts on palm leaves (SI B/31) have been published.¹¹ They contain excerpts in Sanskrit from the canonical Abhidharma. These fragments are among the earliest of the manuscripts; based on paleographic analysis they can be dated to the Kushan era. One of the fragments seems to consist of folios from the same manuscript that is held in the German Turfan collection.

The Berezovsky collection also contains 74 manuscript fragments on paper in Tokharian B, in all probability Buddhist in content.¹² To this number we must also add 13 fragments of Tokharian documents which have been catalogued separately (SI B. Toch./1-13). Thus the overall number of Tokharian paper manuscript fragments is 87. The first publication of Tokharian B fragments from the Berezovsky collection was by N. D. Mironov, a student of Oldenburg, who published a bilingual text in Sanskrit and Tokharian B: one folio from the *Dharmapada*, now catalogued under the number SI B/117.¹³ One fragment from the *Udānavarga*, which at that time had not yet been catalogued, was given by Oldenburg to S. Lévi for publication;¹⁴ this fragment is now catalogued as SI B/16,4. Recently the St. Petersburg branch authorized the French scholar G.-J. Pinault to publish four documents from the Berezovsky collection.¹⁵

Berezovsky also brought back from Kucha 79 wooden tablets with text in the Tokharian B language. Many of them are in very poor condition, with the text eroded or obliterated. Historically it came about that these tablets were long kept in the Hermitage in the collection of A. S. Strelkov. They were transferred to the Institute of Oriental Studies only in April of 1935, and at present they are catalogued under the numbers Strel. 1-69 and Strel. 80-89.

(4) The S. F. Oldenburg collection

Here we will consider only the manuscripts brought back by Oldenburg from his first expedition to East Turkestan (1909-10). From the second expedition, which was dedicated to exploring the Buddhist complex at Dunhuang, Oldenburg brought back a huge collection of Chinese manuscripts and fragments of manuscripts dating from the 4th to the 11th centuries CE. At present they are kept in a different archive, that of the Dunhuang collection, which counts some 19,000 items in its holdings. All of the documents registered there were catalogued during the years 1956-1985.

¹¹ See Franco 2004, vol. 1, pp. 331-336 (folios 80 and 82). For ms. SI B/24,14 see Tyomkin 1996.

¹² Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1997, p. 209.

¹³ See Mironov 1909-1910.

¹⁴ Lévi 1933.

¹⁵ These are document nos. SI B/9, 11, 12 and 13; see Pinault 1998.

The manuscripts brought back from the first expedition number 115 in all, most of them fragments. They include 18 Sanskrit manuscript fragments in the Brāhmī script; one in northwest Prakrit in the Kharoṣṭhī script; and three Uighur-Chinese manuscripts. Two of the latter contain fragments of paintings with the remains of an Old Uighur text. From this same expedition were brought back 11 fragments of Old Tibetan manuscripts, written in all probability at Dunhuang, in the local semi-cursive script. Two of these fragments belong to the famous book of divination (*mo*). One fragment in the Turkic Orkhon script also appeared among the items brought by this expedition. Other fragments are in Sogdian, in the Sogdian script. They have been published in the catalogue by A. N. Ragoza mentioned above (see note 7).

In addition to manuscripts, the expedition procured scraps of fabric, pieces of frescoes, and items of material culture, which at present are kept in the Hermitage, where they comprise a marvelous exhibit that has been an object of amazement for Chinese and West European scholars. The reason for this amazement is the fact that Oldenburg arrived in East Turkestan only after dozens of European expeditions had already been there, bringing back to museums in Europe the most valuable and extensive collections of manuscripts, works of art and items of material culture. The members of the Oldenburg expedition picked up whatever their predecessors had left behind: bits of manuscripts, pieces of fallen painted plaster, and fragments of sculptures. The wonderful exhibit is the result of the painstaking efforts of the restorationists and other staff members of the Hermitage.

Of the Indian manuscripts brought back by Oldenburg, thus far only one has been published: a phonetic table in upright Central Asian Brāhmī consisting of 11 folios, catalogued as SI O/20. In all probability they were written in Khotan, as indicated both by the separation of the *akṣaras* and by the fact that it contains an admonition in the Khotanese language: "Study, pupil, lest you feel my rod!" One fragment turned out to be in Khotanese: SI O/77, a piece of an economic document.¹⁶

The Oldenburg expedition also brought back 88 Islamic manuscripts, which are now included in the Arabic-script collection of the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies.

(5) The I. P. Lavrov collection

Lavrov was the secretary of the Russian consulate at Kashgar during the first decade of the 20th century. This collection has its own story. For a long time it was considered to contain only eight items, all of them Sanskrit manuscripts in Brāhmī script. Two of them were published: one folio from the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra*,¹⁷ and one folio from the *Buddhanāma-sūtra*.¹⁸ The remainder of the manuscripts, still uncatalogued, were given to N. D. Mironov to work on in 1915-19. When Mironov emigrated from Russia in 1919, the manuscripts fell into the archive of the Cheka (the Soviet secret police) together with his documents. In 1930, via the Archive of the Academy of Sciences, they were put into

¹⁶ Fragments SI O/20 and SI O/77 have been published in the volumes of *Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum* mentioned above; cf. note 2.

¹⁷ See Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1985, pp. 159-160.

¹⁸ Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, 1990, pp. 289-292.

the Orientalist Archive at the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Due to various circumstances, the Lavrov archive began to be worked on only in 1961. At that time the manuscripts were brought out from the archive and transferred to the Manuscripts section of the Institute. However, they were in a dreadful state, and it was practically impossible to work on them. Preliminary conservation work on the fragments was completed only in 1994. It turned out that there were another eight fragments, now catalogued as SI L/9-L/16.¹⁹ As soon as we were able to look through them, we were able to identify some of the fragments; all of these have now been published.²⁰

(6) The A. I. Kokhanovsky collection

Kokhanovsky worked as a doctor at the Russian consulate in Urumchi from 1906-08. In a letter written to S. F. Oldenburg on December 9, 1904, the ethnographer D. A. Klements, having arrived in East Turkestan in 1898 as one of the first Russians there,²¹ wrote: "Dr. Kokhanovsky, who is going to Urumchi, asked me if he could be of service to me in some scientific capacity. I proposed that he try to gather information on the antiquities of Turkestan and photograph and collect frescoes and manuscripts, because they'll disappear in any case. . . . In Turkestan there is enough work to last a hundred years, for all of Europe."²² Kokhanovsky took Klements' advice and brought several manuscripts back to St. Petersburg. Among them there was only one fragment of a Sanskrit manuscript, written in the Brāhmī script on paper. There was one fragment each in Tibetan and Mongolian, two in Uighur, 9 in Chinese, and 6 in Manichaean Sogdian, for a total of 20 items.

(7) Items brought by D. A. Klements

Klements himself also brought back from Turfan several fragments of Uighur xylographs, including an Old Uighur text transcribed in Brāhmī script. Of particular interest are two small fragments of a xylograph in the Brāhmī script on soft white paper, which comprises the earliest printed edition of a Sanskrit **Buddhist canon**, which can be dated to the 8th-9th century.²³ Within the collection of the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies is kept a special archive called "Frescoes, Stones and Slabs." The foundation for this collection was laid by Klements, who brought from Turfan fragments of plaster with inscriptions in Sanskrit written in North Turkestan Brāhmī and as well as Uighur inscriptions. Some of them were probably captions of frescoes; the rest are visitors' graffiti.

¹⁹ See Tyomkin 1995a and 1995b.

²⁰ See Bongard-Levin et al. 2004, pp. 247-260, 256-272, and 337-342.

²¹ On this expedition, sent by the Russian Academy of Sciences, see *Nachrichten über die von der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu St. Petersburg im Jahre 1898 ausgerüstete Expedition nach Turfan*, Vol. 1 (St. Petersburg), 1899.

²² Archives of the Russian Academy of Sciences, d. no. 269, p. 54.

²³ See Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1980.

(8) The A. A. Dyakov collection

From 1908 to 1913 Dyakov worked (first on a temporary basis, then in a permanent capacity) as the secretary and consul in Qulja; from 1913 to 1915 he held the post of consul at Urumchi. At the site of Astana in the Turfan oasis he found, on August 15, 1908, a collection of manuscripts, which he immediately sent to the Russian Committee for the Study of Central and East Asia in St. Petersburg. At present this collection is kept at the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies. It consists of two manuscripts in all, which are of great rarity: One manuscript contains §§3-15 of a Manichaean prayer of confession, and the other is a translation into Uighur from Chinese of the twenty-fifth chapter of the *Saddharmapundarika-sūtra*, which enjoyed tremendous popularity in Central Asia.

(9) The S. E. Malov collection

Funded by the Russian Committee for the Study of Central and East Asia and at the initiative of V. V. Radlov, Malov carried out two expeditions to East Turkestan, in 1909-11²⁴ and in 1913-15. But the Malov collection was finally restored and made available for scholarly study only in 1994. For a long time it had been considered that the collection contained only Uighur and Chinese manuscripts, as well as a collection of Tibetan documents on wood from Miran which had been brought back by Malov at the time of the second expedition. At the beginning of the 1990s, however, there came to light a box in the Manuscripts Department of the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, that for a long time had not drawn attention. In it there turned out to be the non-Uighur part of the Malov collection; it had evidently been set aside by the Turkologists, who were first and foremost concerned with bringing the Old Uighur manuscripts under scholarly scrutiny. In 1983 there also appeared a package of manuscripts from the Malov archive, containing materials which he had apparently kept at home. As the result of these new discoveries, the Malov collection now contains the following Old Uighur manuscripts and fragments: (1) a group of Old Uighur manuscripts and xylographs, inventoried in 1953-54 by the Turkologist L. V. Dmitrieva and catalogued under the numbers SI M/1-SI M/7; (2) fragments of Old Uighur manuscripts and xylographs received from the Malov archive in 1983, mentioned by M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya as SI MA/1-MA/11. By our count there are a total of 18 items—manuscripts and fragments of manuscripts and xylographs—in the Old Uighur language.

As a result of the restoration work done at the beginning of the 1990s, 38 new items in Khotanese, comprising a total of 60 fragments, were restored. These have been published in *Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum* (see above, note 2). Among them are some unique fragments of the *Suvarṇabhāsa-sūtra*. One economic document, written on paper, had accidentally been catalogued as M-1. This was detected before the discovery of the hidden box, and it is now included in the general collection under the number SI M/1 doc.

In the collection there also came to light Sanskrit manuscripts in the Brāhmī script,

²⁴ On the manuscripts brought by Malov see the Minutes of the Russian Committee, No. 5, 1911, 24 November, §53.

consisting of 8 items—SI M/16-M/19, M/21, M/23, M/24 and M/46—comprising 12 fragments in all.

There are also 12 Old Tibetan manuscript fragments, in the *pothi* style as well as scrolls, which on the basis of orthography ought to date from the 8th-11th centuries; these have not yet been restored.

In 1909-11 Malov gave to the Asiatic Museum 16 fragments of Chinese scrolls dating from the 5th-11th centuries. It is not known exactly where they were found, but in light of their close resemblance to the Chinese manuscripts from Dunhuang they were included in the Dunhuang collection.

As the result of the restoration and investigative research carried out in recent years, the Malov collection has increased significantly, and it now contains not 7 items, but 53: SI M/I-M/53.²⁵

New data on the Sanskrit manuscripts in the N. F. Petrovsky collection

After the publication of *Indian Texts from Central Asia* by G. M. Bongard-Levin and M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya in 1986, work on the Sanskrit manuscripts by its authors continued, and as a result a card catalogue of the N. F. Petrovsky collection was finally completed. For an appraisal of the collection we adopted the statistical method set forth by Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Klaus Wille in their work on the Hoernle collection. This approach also allows us to draw several general conclusions about the character of the Buddhist literature that was popular in the southern oasis towns of East Turkestan during the second half of the first millennium CE.

To characterize our collection from the point of view of paleography, we should first mention that only ten manuscripts (one of which consists of 16 fragments, and the remainder of one fragment each) are written in variants of North Turkestan (or “slanting” in the older terminology) Brāhmī. In all the rest, variants of South Turkestan (or “upright”) Brāhmī are used. The writing of many of our manuscripts exhibits a similarity to the Gilgit varieties of Brāhmī. Only a few fragments of small size, for which palm leaves or birchbark were used for copying, are written in Kushan Brāhmī or early variants of post-Kushan Brāhmī. The great majority of the Petrovsky collection now consists of jumbled palm-leaf manuscript fragments.

Let us now turn to the content of the manuscripts. It seems quite evident that in the Buddhism of the second half of the first millennium significant changes had begun to take place, above all the appearance of the Vajrayāna. In Vajrayāna texts we can perceive two substrata: local folk beliefs and cults, and brahmanical and pre-brahmanical protective charms of Indian origin. A significant proportion of the texts in the Petrovsky collection are *dhāraṇīs*—spells and mantras. We identified 34 different exemplars, comprising up to 200 fragments, which contain various types of spells. Thus, about 13% of our manuscripts are connected with the Vajrayāna. Among these fragments the majority belong to the sūtra *Pañcarakṣā*, the “Five Protections.” These reflect the cult of five tantric mother-goddesses, each one of whom personifies a particular set of magical formulas. These

²⁵ See Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1995a. Four Sanskrit fragments and one Tibetan document on paper are published in this article.

formulas are to be used to summon the goddesses for help. In our collection there are three groups of magical formulas: those directed to Mahāmāyūrīvidyārājñī “Great Peacock, Queen of Spells,” in four exemplars (SI P/30, 38, 39, 58+59), to Mahāsahasrapramardīnīvidyārājñī, in five (SI P/32, 54+56(1), 44a, 44b and 64), and to Mahāpratisarāvidyārājñī, in four (SI P/40, 41f, 41b, 42). Appeals to these three goddesses occupy a total of 13 different exemplars comprising more than 100 fragments, thus constituting about 5% of all the Sanskrit manuscripts in the collection. It must of course be mentioned that a large collection of analogous texts was found at Gilgit, but here the incantations are addressed above all to Mahāpratisarā.²⁶ Fragments of the *Mahā-māyūrīvidyārājñī* were also found among the famous manuscripts of Lieutenant G. Bower, discovered in Kucha in 1890 and edited by R. Hoernle in 1893.²⁷ The *Mahāpratisarāvidyārājñī* and *Mahāsahasrapramardīnīvidyārājñī* are also found in the German Turfan collection (see Catalogue nos. 983, 1008 and 1011).

With this group of sūtras are also connected texts containing a conversation between the Buddha and the *yakṣa* general Mañibhadra (SI P/28, SI P/32, SI P/37), with 25 fragments in all, the majority of them edited by S. F. Oldenburg (cf. above). Their conversation concerns the problem of the protection of monks and other living beings from the harm caused by *yakṣas*. It is interesting that one of the texts on the conversation between the Buddha and Mañibhadra belongs to the literary category of the *Prajñāpāramitā*. It was edited by G. M. Bongard-Levin together with Japanese, German, and American scholars as co-authors.²⁸

Texts of the “Five Protections” in Central Asia, Tibet, China, and the Tangut kingdom of Xi Xia were translated into local languages. But based on the quantity of the translations that have come down to us, we may infer that in the Chinese cultural sphere they did not enjoy great popularity, while in Tibet and in the Tangut kingdom a great number of exemplars of this work have been preserved. These texts were especially influential in Tibet, which departed from the Mahāyāna and adopted Tantra at a comparatively early date. The sūtras of the “Five Protections” are among the best represented compositions in the Tibetan collection of the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, preserved in both manuscripts and xylographs.

As to other texts containing spells, the following compositions are contained in the Petrovsky collection:

1) The *Sumukhanāma-dhāraṇī* in four copies (22 folios and fragments). Two manuscripts—SI P/65a and SI P/77 (six folios)—have been published.²⁹ Two other manuscripts—SI P/18 (6 folios) and P/75 (7 folios) have not yet been edited. Unfortunately they are poorly preserved, but they should nonetheless be published in order to make available all the texts that have been found. Not long ago Klaus Wille discovered three fragments of this dhāraṇī in the Hoernle collection, and he was able to match them with

²⁶ See von Hinüber 1979, fragment nos. 6, 14, 15 and 17.

²⁷ See Hoernle 1893, pp. 222-240e.

²⁸ Bongard-Levin et al., 1996, pp. 67-81; Bongard-Levin 1994.

²⁹ See Bongard-Levin, Tyomkin, and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1967; Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, 1981; Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, 1986; and Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, 1994.

fragments from the Crosby collection.³⁰ Taking into account all the extant/preserved folios and fragments of this *dhāraṇī* and comparing them with the complete Khotanese texts, we can conclude that we have in hand approximately half of the Sanskrit text. Differences between the Khotanese and our unpublished fragments P/18 and P/75 allow us to determine that they represent a different and shorter variant of this text, which differs from the fuller text contained in manuscript P/77, not only in different readings of the *dhāraṇīs* but also in that it has a shorter prose text. In manuscript P/77 there were originally 18 folios (the last folio, containing the colophon, has been preserved). In manuscript P/18 the folios are only half as large, yet it originally consisted of just 23 folios (the penultimate folio, i.e., page 22, has been preserved). Through our joint efforts, we can determine whether there really existed two versions of this *dhāraṇī*.

2) The *Buddhanāma-sūtra* also belongs to those texts that have spells as their basis. In the Petrovsky collection there are a total of five exemplars of this sūtra,³¹ comprising some 30 folios and fragments altogether. Three of them have been studied by Oskar von Hinüber.³² Two new pieces were published by G. M. Bongard-Levin and this writer,³³ and Klaus Wille recently published three new fragments from the Hoernle and Godfrey collections.³⁴ However, this total comprises only an insignificant portion of a sūtra of the *Buddhanāma* type, as the numerous Chinese texts found at Dunhuang attest. In particular, in the Dunhuang manuscript collection at the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies there are three different compositions of the “*Buddhanāma*” type, including some with colored illustrations. In the Hermitage there is also a Tangut text of a *Buddhanāma-sūtra* with colored illustrations.

3) Finally, in the Petrovsky collection there is a certain quantity of unidentified *dhāraṇīs*, comprising 12 exemplars totaling about 25 folios.³⁵ Part of them have been published by Oldenburg (cf. above, 6. SI P/26–2); the rest remain unpublished.

Thus *dhāraṇīs* comprise the most significant part of the Petrovsky collection, testifying to the popularity of these texts in the southern oasis towns of East Turkestan in the second half of the first millennium CE.

In second place, in terms of the number of folios and fragments, is the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra* or *Lotus Sūtra*; in our collection there are 27 different exemplars,³⁶ of which 10 have been published.³⁷ In numerical terms fragments of this

³⁰ Wille 1996.

³¹ Catalogue numbers SI P/60, 61, 70, 71a+116e+116sh; L/2.

³² See von Hinüber 1987–1989.

³³ Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1990, pp. 277–292.

³⁴ See Wille 1999.

³⁵ Catalogue numbers SI P/22, 23, 26, 29, 55+56(2), 71b, 72g, 110, 112, 113 (3 fragments), 116b (3 fragments) + 116c (1 fragment), 116i.

³⁶ Their catalogue numbers are SI P/5, 8, 9, 11, 11(1) + 7, 12 + 13, 10, 20(4), 62(1), 62(10), 62(12), 67(2), 67(3), 67(4), 68, 74 + 67(8), 72b, 76, 79, 82b, 83a, 83b, 90a, 90b(!), 118a, 121c, 151.

³⁷ In a recent monograph Klaus Wille has published a group of fragments of the *Lotus Sūtra* contained in the Petrovsky collection (Wille 2000; the pieces from the Petrovsky collection are published on pp. 161–162). Unfortunately this group turns out to be incomplete, since Wille was not able to make

sūtra comprise about 10% of the entire Petrovsky collection. Among them are represented both versions of the sūtra known at the present time: the so-called “Central Asian” and “Nepalese-Gilgit” recensions. Fragments of the Central Asian version clearly predominate: It is sufficient to point out that this collection contains the most extensive and well known exemplar of all these manuscripts—SI P/5. This copy contained some 500 folios, of which 399 are in our collection, and of these, 324 are continuously paginated. In other depositories elsewhere in the world, a total of 56 folios belonging to the same manuscript have been found. This means that just 12 folios of the sūtra have not yet been located. Paleographic analysis, as well as the surviving colophons in the manuscripts and fragments themselves, show that the *Lotus Sūtra* enjoyed the greatest popularity in the southern oases of East Turkestan. In the German Turfan collection, which comes mainly from the northern oases, thus far only one fragment of it has been found (catalogue no. 622). In other German collections there are about ten fragments, but these too come from the southern oases.³⁸

Among the manuscripts discovered at Gilgit fragments of the *Lotus Sūtra* occupy one of the first places, if not the very first place.³⁹ A certain number of unpublished fragments from the A. Francke collection were found fairly recently in a basement in Munich, where they had been kept in sealed boxes throughout World War II. A report on this collection has been published by R. E. Emmerick.⁴⁰ We must also mention the special popularity of the *Lotus Sūtra* in Khotan, where sections of the text were commissioned by Khotanese donors. Of this we have the testimony of colophons as well as postscripts in Khotanese appended to the Sanskrit sections, such as the Kashgar Petrovsky manuscript SI P/5 (with a large concluding colophon and three postscripts at the end of three chapters), as well as two postscripts appended at the bottom of mss. SI P/7 and SI P/10. The absence of a Khotanese translation of the full text of this sūtra can easily be understood in light of the colophon to chapter 23 of the Khotanese manuscript known as *The Book of Zambasta*, also called “Saka manuscript E” by scholars (Petrovsky collection, SI P/6). In this colophon the author of the Khotanese text complains that the local population was unwilling to recognize the sacredness of a text if it was written not in Sanskrit, but in their mother tongue.⁴¹

In the Chinese Dunhuang collection of the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, the *Lotus Sūtra* stands in second place, in terms of the number of manuscripts, after the *Vajracchedikāsūtra*. In the 7th century the 25th chapter of the *Lotus Sūtra*—entitled “Samantamukha”—began to circulate as an independent work, and the cult of the bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara became especially popular due to the protective *dhāraṇīs* contained in this chapter. We can make this judgement with full confidence use of the latest publication by this writer, which appeared only in 2004 (see Bongard-Levin et al., pp. 256-260). Wille’s work also includes a very useful table, “Concordances: Kashgar MS — Other Central Asian MSS” (see pp. 168-183), in which he was able to register page by page all of the pieces of the *Lotus Sūtra* found to date.

³⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 159.

³⁹ See von Hinüber 1979, nos. 44, 45, and 47-50.

⁴⁰ See Emmerick 1984.

⁴¹ See Emmerick 1968, p. 343.

thanks to the presence in our collection of a large quantity of “pocket books” in which the text of the 25th chapter was copied, evidently for daily use. These booklets date from the 8th-9th centuries. The tradition is still alive today: some followers of the *Lotus Sūtra* in Japan also use such booklets, but in these it is the 2nd and 16th chapters of the sūtra that are printed. Manuscripts from the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies contain examples of the translation of the *Lotus Sūtra* into seven Central and East Asian languages. In the Tangut state of Xi Xia in the 10th-12th centuries, the sutra and its 25th chapter were evidently as popular as they were in Dunhuang.

In third place in terms of quantity of fragments in the Petrovsky collection is the *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*: we have excerpts from 24 different manuscripts of this sūtra, comprising nearly 9% of the entire collection.⁴² Although previously we had said that among our fragments the majority belong to the *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā*, or *The Prajñāpāramitā in 8,000 Lines*, investigations in recent years, in which G. M. Bongard-Levin and our Japanese and German colleagues took part, have shown that our fragments for the most part belong to the tradition of another variant of the sūtra, the *Prajñāpāramitā in 25,000 Lines*. WATANABE Shōgo has stated that the majority of the fragments in the Petrovsky collection “are variant texts deriving from the same source. We could therefore assume the existence of an Urtext of both the *Aṣṭadaśa-sāhasrikā* and the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā*.”⁴³ Bongard-Levin, writing in cooperation with Japanese and German scholars, has published four *Prajñāpāramitā* fragments. They have demonstrated that, compared to the earliest Chinese version (Taishō Tripiṭaka no. 221), the text of one of the published fragments (SI P/19[1]) belongs to a more ancient (and slightly more extensive) version than the early Chinese translation.⁴⁴ An analogous Sanskrit text was found at Gilgit; it differs from the *Prajñāpāramitā in 8,000 Lines* and is noticeably closer to the *Prajñāpāramitā in 25,000 Lines*.

In addition, the study of fragment SI P/19(1) in tandem with the early Chinese translations of the *Prajñāpāramitā* and fragments in other collections, especially the collection from Khotan, has allowed scholars to demonstrate the interrelationship between the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra* and the text of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* that was redacted based on it in the first millennium CE and to isolate the archetype in the appearance of early *māṭṛkā*s.

Having thus distinguished these three groups of manuscripts which together constitute more than 30% of the Petrovsky collection, we can infer that three major schools of Buddhism had spread through the southern oasis towns of East Turkestan during the second half of the first millennium CE: the Vajrayāna, the Mahāyāna school of the *Lotus Sūtra*, and the Mahāyāna school of the *Prajñāpāramitā*. The latter, it would seem, had a tendency in this period to close association with the Vajrayāna. As shown by the numerical superiority of such texts in our collection, both in Sanskrit and in other

⁴² Catalogue numbers SI P/19, 20(5), 46a, 62b, g, e, k, v; 67(7), 67(13), 67(14), 72a, 72b, 82a, 83m, n, z; 84a, b, g, d, v; 116o (5 fragments), 123i (6 fragments), 123k, 145, 146 (2 fragments); 147a, 147 + 148. See Bongard-Levin 1988-1989, Bongard-Levin and Watanabe 1997, Bongard-Levin and Kimura 1995, and Bongard-Levin and Hori 1996.

⁴³ Watanabe 1994, p. 386.

⁴⁴ Cf. Watanabe 1994, p. 35.

languages, it was not extensive texts such as *The Prajñāpāramitā in 8,000 Lines* or *The Prajñāpāramitā in 25,000 Lines* that enjoyed greatest popularity, but the so-called “short” texts of the Prajñāpāramitā category, the majority of which included *dhāraṇīs* in their content. This applies above all to the *Vajracchedikā*, which has the largest number of copies in the Dunhuang collection of the Institute of Oriental Studies in St. Petersburg. This sūtra, like the 25th chapter of the *Lotus Sūtra*, was copied into pocket-size booklets, divided into sections (which are not in the canonical version), and prefaced by opening *stotras* extolling the possibility of receiving protection and aid, thanks to the fact that various deities esteem the sūtra and promised to help living beings. All these processes took place with the *Vajracchedikā* in Central Asia, as much as in the territory of China itself, in the capital, where canonical versions of the sūtras were disseminated. These same processes also took place with another sūtra of the “short texts” category, the *Hṛdaya-sūtra*. In Dunhuang a particular local version was circulated, based on a translation of the sūtra into Tibetan and Tangut. Still another sūtra—the *Kauśika-sūtra*—has been preserved only in Central Asia. Its text is known in manuscripts in Sanskrit, Khotanese, and Tibetan. A great number of Tibetan manuscripts of this sūtra from the 14th century were brought from Qara-Qoto by P. K. Kozlov.

Comparing this set of texts with those discovered at Gilgit, and with the collection of manuscripts from the northern oases of Turfan and Kucha now in the German collections, we can clearly see the differences, evidently connected with basic trends in Buddhism that had taken root in these regions during the period under consideration. In the northern oasis towns it is mainly the Hīnayāna that is represented; thus the basis of the German Turfan collection consists of sūtras from the four āgamas. The predominant school clearly was the Sarvāstivāda. In the southern oases of East Turkestan, by contrast—i.e., in Khotan and Kashgar—the literature of the Vajrayāna and the Mahāyāna predominated. Gilgit, of course, occupied a middle position between India and East Turkestan. If in the northern oases there were found manuscripts of the Vinaya belonging to the Sarvāstivāda school, at Gilgit there was discovered a whole collection of texts of the Mūlasarvāstivādins. And presumably it was this school that held the leading position in Buddhism on Indian territory. This is attested by the translation of their Vinaya into Tibetan carried out in the 9th century by Indian *paṇḍitas* and Tibetan *lotsawas*. The Tibetan Tripiṭaka includes only the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādins. In Gilgit Vajrayāna manuscripts were also found (the sūtra on the “Five Protections”; see above), as well as Mahāyāna sūtras. By its repertoire of Buddhist literature one can posit links between Gilgit and Nālanda.

An exception to the tendencies described above is the Hīnayāna sūtra *Nagaropama*, fragments of which are found in the Petrovsky collection (SI P/33). We have already mentioned these fragments, when we referred to the publication of manuscripts relating the conversation of the Buddha with the *yakṣa* general Mañibhadra.⁴⁵ The first finds of fragments from this manuscript took place in 1896, when a manuscript was acquired at Kashgar by George McCartney and sent to Hoernle, who published it in 1897.⁴⁶ Subsequently Hoernle succeeded in locating folios from the very same manuscript in the Weber collection. A third find was made by Petrovsky. An entire collective of authors,

⁴⁵ See Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2004, p. 52, n. 112.

⁴⁶ See Hoernle 1897.

consisting of Russian, German, Japanese, and American scholars, brought all the folios that had been found into one manuscript and obtained not only the full text of the sūtra, but also a preface. Three folios of the manuscript from the Petrovsky collection comprise the end of the canonical portion of the sūtra, after which follows the afterword: a conversation between the Buddha and the brahman Sanatkumāra, in which the brahman relates to the Buddha the names of *rākṣasas* and other evil spirits, who esteem the *Nagaropama-sūtra* and promise to protect living beings. This unique postscript is not found in the two other manuscripts. Paleography shows that the manuscript was written in Kucha. The afterword contains spells, and for this reason the text long remained unidentified.

As to the remaining manuscripts in the Petrovsky collection, among them are Buddhist sūtras and other texts, which are important for the study of the Buddhist canon: they show how the editing of Buddhist texts in East Turkestan took place, in what periods of time and in what cultural setting.

It is noteworthy that among the Petrovsky manuscripts there is not a single fragment of the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra*, a basic Vinaya text. There are only an insignificant number of excerpts from commentarial texts, such as manuscript fragments on birchbark that are evidently from the *Vinayavastu* (SI P/16 + P/17), or two folios from an unidentified manuscript (SI P/20(1) + P/20(2), folio nos. 42 and 46) of which the colophon is preserved: *vaiyyāpatyakara parivartah caturtha*. In the text the Buddha rules on various disciplinary issues with Kāśyapa, who had arrived in the company of 500 monks.

Of particular interest are two nearly complete *avadāna* texts: the *Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna* (catalogued as SI P/15, 22 folios) and the *Ajitasenavyākaraṇa* (SI P/63, 24 folios). These are the same texts for which Oldenburg established two numbers—13 and 14—and about which he repeatedly mentioned the necessity of publication, offering excerpts from the *Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna* and comparing our manuscript with the folios from the Weber collection published by Hoernle.⁴⁷ Both *avadānas* have now been published.⁴⁸ An analogous manuscript of the *Ajitasenavyākaraṇa* was found at Gilgit. A comparison of our text with the one from Gilgit showed interesting results. Although there are minor/insignificant differences in the texts, which could have come about as the result of the work of editors, in both cases the copyists made use of one and the same original and repeated its errors. These errors are both in the prose portion and in the *gāthās*. The editors of the Gilgit manuscript tried to correct these errors, retaining the original text only in interlinear notes. It seems that it would have been better to do the reverse, putting their improvements in the notes. For example, the Gilgit Sanskrit text (p. 105, *gāthā* 1) reads: *yadā tvaṃ praviśasi piṇḍapātika vimocaye tvaṃ bahavaṃ hi prāṇināṃ*, “when you come [into the city] for alms, you liberate [thereby] many living beings.” But the editors of the Gilgit manuscript corrected the text in accordance with Sanskrit grammar: *yadā tvayā praviśati piṇḍapātiko vimocaye yaṃ bahavohi prāṇināṃ*. A comparison of this redaction of the *gāthās* with our manuscript affirms that the two copyists had before them one and the same original (or copied from one another?).

Among *Mahāyāna* sūtras it is appropriate to draw special attention to two: the

⁴⁷ See Oldenburg 1894, pp. 66-67 and 1900, pp. 31-32.

⁴⁸ See Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1990, pp. 39-184.

Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra, 6 fragments of which have been published by Bongard-Levin,⁴⁹ and the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, attested in one manuscript (SI P/2, 81 folios, containing the complete text) and two fragments (SI P/85a and 85b).⁵⁰ This sūtra is of unique importance for the history of the formation of the Mahāyāna Buddhist canon, of which a Sanskrit version never fully came into being, and for the study of two key ideas of Buddhist philosophy: *madhyamā pratipad* “the middle way” and *śūnyatā*, literally “voidness” or “non-subjectivity and non-objectivity.” On the interpretation of these terms in the two most important Buddhist philosophical schools—the Mādhyamika and the Yogācāra—hinges the overall evaluation of their significance in the history of Indian philosophy. The sūtra also contains an early codification of the moral code of the bodhisattva. The *Kāśyapaparivarta* was apparently known as the *Ratnakūṭa* (“Heap of Treasures”) on the cusp of the first century CE; afterwards this became the name for the entire collection of 49 sūtras. A critical edition of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, together with facsimiles of the text, has now been published.⁵¹

We will not pause to consider here those sūtras that are attested only in single fragments. We will mention only that not all the manuscripts and fragments have been identified. Such items total 23, i.e., around 8% of the collection. It is possible that some of them may yet be identified. For example, in one of the fragments, when the relation between the Buddha and Māra is discussed, the son of Māra is called Jāyapati. As it happens, this topic can also be found in one of the *avadānas*. In another folio of the manuscript (SI P/80) we find a text whose content resembles that of a fragment from the German Turfan collection (no. 1340): *āyusmān Aniruda (!) śrāvastyān viharati sma*. The Turfan text has likewise not been identified. The *gāthās* on the leaf SI P/115 are similar to a Turfan text identified as the “Brahman Nilabhūti *stotra*” (no. 1764).

Taking into account the fact that many manuscripts have simply not come down to us, and that our conclusions concerning the most salient trends in the development of Buddhism in the northern and southern oases of East Turkestan should therefore be considered somewhat provisional and preliminary, we nonetheless consider that our identification of three major trends in the Buddhism of the southern oases (the Vajrayāna, that of the followers of the *Lotus Sūtra*, and that of followers of the *Prajñāpāramitā*), based on the manuscripts that appear in the Petrovsky collection, is substantially correct.

⁴⁹ Catalogue nos. SI P/88a, 88b, 88c, 88d, 88v, 89. See Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1985, pp. 37–64 and Bongard-Levin 1986.

⁵⁰ See Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 1995b.

⁵¹ Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2002; cf. Bongard-Levin et al. 2004, pp. 89–208.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bongard-Levin, G. M., 1986. *Sanskrit Fragments of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- _____, 1988-1989. "A Fragment of the *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā* from Central Asia. In A. Kumar et al., eds., *Studies in Indology: Prof. Rasik Vihari Joshi Felicitation Volume* (New Delhi: Shree Publishing House), pp. 39-42.
- _____, 1994. "A Fragment of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* from East Turkestan." In *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 114, no. 3, pp. 383-385.
- Bongard-Levin, G. M., Daniel J. Boucher, Takamichi Fukita, and Klaus Wille, 1996. "The Nagaropamasūtra: An Apotropaic Text from the Saṃyuktāgama. A Transliteration, Reconstruction, and Translation of the Central Asian Sanskrit Manuscripts." In *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*, Beiheft 6 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), pp. 8-131.
- Bongard-Levin, G. M., and Shin'ichiro Hori, 1996. "A Fragment of the Larger Prajñāpāramitā from Central Asia." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 19-60.
- Bongard-Levin, G. M., and Takayasu Kimura, 1995. "New Fragments of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* from Eastern Turkestan." *East and West*, vol. 45, pp. 355-358.
- Bongard-Levin, G. M., E. N. Tyomkin, and M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, 1967. "A Fragment of the Sanskrit *Sumukhadhāraṇī*." *Indo-Iranian Journal* vol. 10, nos. 2-3, pp. 150-159.
- Bongard-Levin, G. M., and M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, 1981. "A New Fragment of the Sanskrit *Sumukhadhāraṇī* and its Saka Version." *Indologica Taurinensia*, vol. 8-9, pp. 45-49.
- _____, 1984a. "Novye sanskritskie teksty iz Vostochnogo Turkestana (fragmenty *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* sarvastivādinov). *Vestnik drevnei istorii*, No. 4, pp. 56-76.
- _____, 1984b. "Unknown Dhāraṇīs from Eastern Turkestan (*Buddhanāma-sūtra*)." In S. D. Joshi, ed., *Amṛtadhara: Professor R.N. Dandekar Felicitation Volume* (Delhi: Ajanta Publications), pp. 485-492.
- _____, 1985. *Pamyatniki indiiskoi pis'mennosti iz Tsentral'noi Azii: Izdanie tekstov, issledovanie, perevod i kommentarii*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Nauka, Russian Academy of Sciences.
- _____, 1985b. "Indian Texts from Central Asia (*Buddhanāma-sūtra*). *Serie Orientale Roma*, vol. LVI, no. 1 (*Orientalia Josephi Tucci Memoriale Dedicata*), pp. 159-174.
- _____, 1986. *Indian Texts from Central Asia*. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- _____, 1986b. "Fragmenty sanskritskoi 'Sumukha-dkharani.'" *Peredneaziatskii sbornik VI. Drevnyaya i srednevekovaya istoriya i filologiya stran Perednego i Srednego Vostoka*, pp. 156-159.
- _____, 1990. *Pamyatniki indiiskoi pis'mennosti iz Tsentral'noi Azii: Izdanie tekstov, issledovanie, perevod i kommentarii*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Nauka, Russian Academy of Sciences.
- _____, 1994. "Novyi fragment sanskritskoi 'Sumukhanamadkharani.'" *Vostochnoe istoricheskoe vostokovedenie i spetsial'nye istoricheskie distsipliny* (Moscow: Nauka), pp. 43-47.
- Bongard-Levin, G. M., M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, and E. M. Tyomkin, 2004. *Pamyatniki indiiskoi pis'mennosti iz Tsentral'noi Azii: Izdanie tekstov, issledovanie, perevod i kommentarii*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Nauka, Russian Academy of Sciences.
- Bongard-Levin, G. M., and Shōgo Watanabe, 1997. "A Fragment of the Sanskrit Text of the *Śīlapāramitā*." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasien und Archiv für indische Philosophie*, vol. 41, pp. 93-98.
- Braarvig, Jens, ed., 2000. *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection, I: Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. 1. Oslo: Hermes Publishing.
- _____, 2002. *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection, III: Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. 2. Oslo: Hermes Publishing.
- Braarvig, Jens, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Kazunobu Matsuda and Lore Sander, 1999. "Reports from the Kyoto Seminar for the Buddhist Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection, May 10-14, 1999," *Bukkyō daigaku sōgōkenkyūjōhō* 佛教大学総合研究所報, no. 17, pp. 10-15.
- Emmerick, Ronald, ed. and trans., 1968. *The Book of Zambasta: A Khotanese Poem on Buddhism*. London: Oxford University Press.

- _____, 1984. "Newly-discovered Buddhist Texts from Khotan." In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Congress of Human Sciences in Asia and North Africa, Tokyo-Kyoto, 31st August-7th September 1983* (Tokyo), I, pp. 219-220.
- Emmerick, Ronald, and Margarita I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, eds., 1993. *Saka Documents. Vol. VII: The St. Petersburg Collections. Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum*. London: British Library.
- _____, eds., 1995. *Saka Documents Text. Vol. III: The St. Petersburg Collections*. London: British Library.
- Franco, Eli, 2004. *The Spitzer Manuscript: The Oldest Philosophical Manuscript in Sanskrit*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe, 2004. "Contents and Structure of the *Ādīśāstra* of the (Mūla)Sārvāstivādin. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 2003*, vol. VII, pp. 119-137.
- von Hinüber, Oskar, 1979. *Die Erforschung der Gilgit-Handschriften*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- _____, 1987-1989. "Dhāraṇīs aus Zentralasien." *Indologica Taurinensia*, vol. 14, pp. 231-249.
- Hoernle, A. F. Rudolf, 1893. *The Bower Manuscript: Facsimile leaves, nagari transcript, romanized transliteration, and English translation with notes*. Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing.
- _____, 1897. "Three Further Collections of Ancient Manuscripts." *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, LXVI, part 1, no. 4, pp. 237-244.
- Kumamoto, Hiroshi, 2001. "Sino-Hvatanica Peterburgensia, Part I." In *Manuscripta Orientalia* (St. Petersburg), vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 3-9.
- Lévi, Sylvain, 1933. *Fragments de textes koutchéens: Udānavarga, Udānastotra, Udānālankāra et Karmavibhaṅga*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Meshcherskaya, E. N., 1998. "Fragmenty siriiskoi rukopisi sobraniya Instituta Vostokovedeniya RAN." *Pravoslavnyi Palestinskiĭ Sbornik*, vol. 98 (35), pp. 148-158.
- Mironov, N. D., 1909-1910. "Iz rukopisnykh materialov ekspeditsii Berezovskogo v Kuchu." *Mélanges Asiatiques* (Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg), vol. 14, pp. 97-112.
- Oldenburg, S. F., 1894. "Otryvki kashgarskikh sanskritskikh rukopisei iz sobraniya N. F. Petrovskogo, I." *Zapiski vostochnogo otdeleniya russkogo arkheologicheskogo obshchestva*, vol. 8, pp. 47-67 + two tables.
- _____, 1897a. "Otzv o sobranii kashgarskikh rukopisei N. F. Petrovskogo." Minutes of the sessions of the Historical-Philological Department of the Imperial Academy of Sciences for 1897, No. VIII of May 7, Appendix III.
- _____, 1897b. *Predvaritel'naya zametka o buddiiskoi rukopisi, napisannoĭ pis'mom Kkharoshtkhi*. St. Petersburg.
- _____, 1899. "Otryvki kashgarskikh sanskritskikh rukopisei iz sobraniya N. F. Petrovskogo, II." *Zapiski vostochnogo otdeleniya russkogo arkheologicheskogo obshchestva*, vol. 11, pp. 207-264 + two tables.
- _____, 1900. [Untitled review of the publications of the Central Asian Manuscripts by R. Hoernle found in the British Museum.] *Zapiski vostochnogo otdeleniya russkogo arkheologicheskogo obshchestva*, vol. 12, pp. 28-36.
- _____, 1902-1903. "Otryvki kashgarskikh sanskritskikh rukopisei iz sobraniya N. F. Petrovskogo, III." *Zapiski vostochnogo otdeleniya russkogo arkheologicheskogo obshchestva*, vol. 15, pp. 113-122 + three tables.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean, 1998. "Economic and Administrative Documents in Tocharian B from the Berezovsky and Petrovsky Collections." *Manuscripta Orientalia* (St. Petersburg-Helsinki), vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 3-20.
- Pugulevskaya, N. V., 1940. "Siriiskii i siro-tyurkskii fragmenty iz Khara-khoto i Turfana." *Sovetskoe vostokovedenie*, vol. 1, pp. 212-234.
- Ragoza, F. N., 1980. *Sogdiiskie fragmenty tsentral'noaziatskogo sobraniya Instituta vostokovedeniya. Faksimile. Izdanie tekstov, chtenie, perevod*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Schmidt, Klaus T., 2001. "Entzifferung verschollener Schriften und Sprachen. dargestellt am Beispiel der Kučā-Kharoṣṭhi Typ B und des Kučā-Prakrits. *Göttinger Beiträge zur Asienforschung*,

- Heft 1 (Göttingen: Peust & Gutschmidt Verlag), pp. 7-35.
- Tyomkin, E. N., 1995a. "Unique Sanskrit Fragments of the *Sūtra of Golden Light* from the P. I. Lavrov Collection." *Manuscripta Orientalia*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 29-35.
- _____, 1995b. "Fragments of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra* from the P. I. Lavrov Collection." *Manuscripta Orientalia*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 9-15.
- _____, 1996. "Unknown Sanskrit Fragments from Central Asia (M. M. Berezovsky collection)." *Manuscripta Orientalia*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 3-22.
- Vorobyov-Desyatovsky, V. S., 1958. "Pamyatniki tsentral'noaziatskoī pis'mennosti." *Uchenye Zapiski Instituta Vostokovedeniya*, vol. 16, pp. 304-308.
- Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, M. I., 1980. "Pervoe pechatnoe izdanie sanskritskogo buddhiskogo kanona v Tsentral'noi Azii." *Roerich Readings 1979: On the 50th Anniversary of the Institute in Urusvati* (Conference Materials) (Novosibirsk: Siberian Branch of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR), pp. 217-222.
- _____, 1995a. "The S. E. Malov Collection of Manuscripts in the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies." *Manuscripta Orientalia*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 29-39.
- _____, 1995b. "A Unique Manuscript of the *Kāśyapaparivarta-sūtra* in the Manuscript Collection of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences." *Manuscripta Orientalia*, vol. 1, no. 1 (1995), pp. 12-16.
- _____, 1997. "The Ancient Manuscripts from Eastern Turkestan in the St. Petersburg Collection: Some Results of Recent Research." In *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies*, vol. 7, pp. 205-212.
- _____, 2002 (in collaboration with Seishi KARASHIMA and Noriyuki KUDO). *The Kāśyapaparivarta: Romanized Text and Facsimiles*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica V. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University.
- Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, M. I., and E. N. Tyomkin, 2003. "Fragment rukopisi 'Buddhanāma-sūtra' iz kollektsii N. F. Petrovskogo." *Scripta Gregoriana: Sbornik v chest' semidesyatiletiya akademika G. M. Bongard-Levina* (Moscow: Vostochnaya Literatura), pp. 54-59.
- Watanabe, Shōgo, 1994. "A Comparative Study of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 114, no. 3, pp. 386-395.
- Wille, Klaus, 1996. "Die Hoernle-Fragmente in der Turfan Sammlung (Berlin)." In *Turfan, Khotan und Dunhuang. Vorträge der Tagung "Annemarie v. Gabain und die Turfanforschung," veranstaltet von der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin (9.-12.12.1994)*, ed. R. E. Emmerick, W. Sundermann, I. Warnke and P. Zieme. Berichte und Abhandlungen, Sonderband 1 (Berlin), pp. 385-408.
- _____, 1999. "New Fragments of the *Buddhanāmasūtra*." *Indologica Taurinensia*, vols. 23-24 (1997-98), Professor Gregory M. Bongard-Levin Felicitation Volume (Torino 1999), pp. 363-386.
- _____, 2000. *Fragments of a Manuscript of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra from Khādaliq*. Lotus Sūtra Manuscript Series 3. Tokyo: Sōka Gakkai.

A Trilingual Edition of the Lotus Sutra
— New editions of the Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese
versions (4)
(KN. 297.1~11)*

Seishi KARASHIMA

XIV § 1 (KN.297.1~11)

G/N (Gilgit/Nepalese version), based upon D3. 120b11, Bj. 84a6~

(KN.297) (D3. 120b11) atha khalv anyalokadhātāvāgatā_(Bj.84a6) nām¹ bodhisatvānām mahāsatvānām aṣṭau² gaṅgānadīvālikāsamā³ bodhisatvā mahāsatvā tasmīn samaye tataḥ⁴ parśanmaṇḍalād abhyutthitā abhūvan* te aṃjaliṃ⁶ praṅṅhya bhagavato (')bhimukhā bhagavantaṃ namasyamānā bhagavantaṃ etad ūcuḥ / “saced bhagavān asmā_(Bj.84b1) kam⁷ anujānīyād vayam api **bhagavann**⁸ imaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ tathāgatasya parinirvṛtasyāśyāṃ Sahāyāṃ⁹ lokadhātau samprakāśayemo¹⁰ vācayemo¹¹ likhema¹² pūjayema¹³ asmimś ca dharme¹⁴ yogam āpadyemahi / tat sādhu bhagavān asmākam apīnaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ anujānātu¹⁵” // atha khalu bhagavāṃs tāṃ bodhisatvā_(Bj.84b2) n etad avocat* / “alam¹⁶ kulaputrāḥ kiṃ yuṣmākam¹⁷ anena kṛtyena? / santiha¹⁸ mama cāivāśyāṃ¹⁹ Sahāyāṃ²⁰ lokadhātau²¹ saṣṭigaṅgānadīvālikôpamāni²² bodhisatvasahasrāṇy²³ ekasya²⁴ bodhisatvasya parivārah / evaṃrūpānām ca bodhisatvānām saṣṭy²⁵ eva²⁶ gaṅgānadīvālikôpamāni²⁷ bodhisatvasa_(Bj.84b3) hasrāṇi²⁸ yeṣāṃ ekaikasya bodhisatvasya iyanta²⁹ eva parivārah³⁰ ye³¹ mama parinirvṛtasya³² ³³paścime kāle paścime samaye imaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ dhārayiṣyanti vācayiṣyanti³⁴ samprakāśayiṣyanti //”

O (Khādaliq MS. = “Kashgar” MS.) 283a2~

© atha khalv anyā_(283a3) lokadhātāvāgatānām bodhisatvānām mahāsatvānāmm aṣṭau ©

- gaṃgānadī^(283a4)(v)[ā]likāsamā bo[○]dhisatvā mahāsatvā^{gaṃgānavivṛ⁴⁵ttas te bodhisatva(283a5)(v)[a] mahāsatvas}
 tasmin samaye tataḥ pariṣaṇṇaṇḍalād a[○]bhyutthitā ba^(283a6)(bhū)[vu]ḥ te
 daśanaki^{ā<ṇ>jaliṇ³⁶} pragrhya bhagavato (')bhimukhā bhagava[○]nte³⁷ namasyamā^(283a7)(nā
 bhagava)ntam etad avocat* saced bhagavann as(m)ākam³⁸ anujānīyāt vayam apīmaṇ³⁹
 5 dharmapa^(283b1)(ryāyaṃ ta)thāgatasya parinirvṛtasyēmasmi(n) Sa[h](e) lokadhātau
 || prakāśayema^{dhāraye^(283b2)} (vā)cayemaḥ likheyāma⁴⁰ imam ca vayam bhagavan dharmaparyaye⁴¹ pūjayemaḥ
 asmim^(283b3)(ś ca) vayam bhagavan dharme yogam āpadyemas tat sādhu bhagavan^{yat} asmākaṃ
 apīmaṇ dharmapa^(283b4)(ryāyaṃ anujā[○]nīyāḥ⁴² atha khalu bhagavāṃs tan⁴³ bodhisatvān
 mahasatvan etad avoca^(283b5)t* alaṃ kulaputrāhu⁴⁴ kiṃ yuṣmākam etena karaṇīyena santi
 10 kulaputra mama ihā^(283b5)(va) || Sahe lokadhātau śaṣṭigaṃgānadīvālikāsamāni
 bodhisatva^{koṭimayutasa^(283b7)} (hasr)āṇi • ekaikas(ya) ca bodhisatvas(y)āi^{(ttaka-m)-c(va}
 par)j(vā)ra[h] evaṇrūpāṇāṃ ca^{me} bo^(284a1)(dhisat)[v]ānāṃ^{[m](a)h(a)ssatv(anam)} śaṣ[t](i e)va
 ga(m)gā[na]d[ī]vālikāsamāni bodhisatva^{koṭina(284a2)ytutasa} sahasrāṇi yeṣā[m] (e)kaikasya
 bodhisatvasyāittaka-m-eva parivārah ye ma^(284a3)ma parinirvṛtasya paścime kāle paścime
 15 samaye imam dharmaparyāyaṃ^{iha Sahe (284a4) lokadhātau} dhārayi[○]ṣyanti || samprakāśayiṣyanti

Khā (frag. from Khādaliq) (cf. Wille 2000: 91) 67b6

atha khalv anya[loka]dhā[tvāgat]ā[n](āṃ) ...

20 **F (Farhād-Bēg)** 26b7~

- atha khalv anyalokadhātvaṅatānāṃ bodhisatvānāṃ mahāsatvā(m)nāṃ aṣṭ[o]⁴⁵
 gaṃgonadīvālikāsa^(26b8)mā⁴⁶ bodhisatvā mahāsatvāḥ^{gaṃgāna(m)vaivṛttah te bodhisatva mahāsatvas}
 tasmi[m] samaye tataḥ pariṣa<ṇ>maṇḍalād a^(27a1)vyusthitā⁴⁸ babhūvu⁴⁹ te anjālī pragrhya
 bhagavato (')bhimukhā bhagavanta(m) namasyamānā bhagavanta(m) etad avocat* saced
 25 bhagavā⁵⁰ asmā^(27a2)kam anujānīyād vayam apīmaṇ⁵¹ dharmaparyāyaṃ [t]athāgatasya
 parinirvṛtasy[ē]masmi(m) Sahe lokadhātau sampra[k]āśayemaḥ^{dhāraye^{(27a3)mah}} vācayemaḥ
⁵²likheyāmaḥ⁵³ [ima]m ca vayam dharmaparyaya(m) pūjayemaḥ asmi(m)ś ca^{vayam bhagava}⁵⁴ dharme yogam
 āpa[d]yemaḥ^(27a4) tat sādhu bhagavā⁵⁵ yat asmā[○][ka]m a[p]īmaṇ dharmaparyāyam
 anujānīyāt* atha khalu bhagavāṃs tā(m) bodhisatvā(m)^{maha[s]atvan} etad a^(27a5)vocat* alaṃ
 30 kulaputrā[○]ho⁵⁶ kiṃ yuṣmākam etena karaṇīyena santi^{kulaputrah}⁵⁷ mama ih(') eva || Sahe
 lokadhātau sa^(27a6)ṣṭigaṃgānadīvāli[k]āsa[m]ā[n]i⁵⁸ ⁵⁹bodhisatvā^{koṭimayutasa} sahasrāṇi :
 ekaikasya ca bodhisatvasyāi^{ttaka-m-eva} (pa)rivāra⁶⁰ (27a7) evarūpāṇā(m) ca^{me}
 bodhisatvā^{tvā}ā(m)nā(m)^{mahāsatvanam} ⁶¹śaṣṭigaṃgānadīvālikāsamān[i]
 bodhisatva^{koṭimayutasa} sahasrāṇi •^(27a8) yaīśā⁶² aikaiṣa⁶³ bodhisatvasya etta[ka]-m-eva
 35 parivārah ye mama parinirvṛtasya paścime kāle : paścime samaye : i^(27b1)maṃ
 dharmaparyāyaṃ^{iha Sahe lokadhātau} ⁶⁴dhārayiṣyanti || || prakāśayiṣyanti

Tib. Kanjur version, based upon T.140b6~⁶⁵

de nas 'jig rten gyi khams gzhan dag⁶⁶ nas lhags pa'i byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa'
 chen po⁶⁷ gang gā'i klung brgyad kyī bye ma^(T.140b7) snyed de'i tshe 'khor gyi dkyil 'khor
 de nas langs te / de dag⁶⁸ thal mo sbyar nas / bcom ldan 'das la phyag 'tshal te / bcom
 5 ldan 'das la 'di skad ces gsol to // gal te bcom^(T.140b8) ldan 'das kyis bdag cag la gnang na
 / bcom ldan 'das bdag cag gis kyang de bzhin gshegs pa yongs su mya ngan las 'das nas /
 chos kyī rnam grangs 'di⁶⁹ 'jig rten gyi^(T.141a1) khams Mi mjed 'dir // yang dag par rab tu
 bstan par bgyi'o // klag⁷⁰ par bgyi'o // yi ger bri⁷¹ bar bgyi'o // mchod par bgyi'o // chos
 kyī rnam grangs 'di la brtson^(T.141a2) par bgyi'o // bcom ldan 'das kyis⁷² chos kyī rnam
 10 grangs 'di bdag cag la legs par bka' stsal du⁷³ gsol / de nas bcom ldan 'das kyis / byang
 chub sems dpa'^(T.141a3) de dag thams cad la 'di skad ces bka' stsal to // rigs kyī bu dag
 khyed kyis 'di bya ba⁷⁴ ci dgos // 'jig rten gyi khams Mi mjed 'di na⁷⁵ / nga'i⁷⁶ byang
 chub sems dpa' stong phrag⁷⁷ gang gā'i^(T.141a4) klung drug cu'i⁷⁸ bye ma snyed yod de /
 byang chub sems dpa' de lta bu rnams kyī byang chub sems dpa' re re'i g-yog kyang /
 15 byang chub sems dpa' stong phrag⁷⁹ gang gā'i klung drug cu'i⁸⁰ bye ma snyed kho na
^(T.141a5) ste / byang chub sems dpa' de dag re re'i g-yog kyang de snyed do // de dag nga
 yongs su mya ngan las 'das nas / phyi ma'i dus / phyi ma'i tshe na / chos kyī rnam
 grangs 'di⁸¹ 'dzin to // yang dag par rab tu ston^(T.141a6) to⁸² / /

20 **Bth (Bathang Kanjur) 123b3~**

de nas 'jig rten gyi khams gzhan yang dag na<s> : lhag<s> pa'i byang chub sems dpa'
 sems dpa' chen po gang gā'i klung gi brgyad kyis bye ma snyed de'i tshe : 'khor gyi
 [d](kyil)^(123b4) 'khor de nas langs [la] ste : de dag thal mo sbyar [ba] nas : bcom ldan 'das la
 phyag 'tshal te : / bcom ldan 'das la 'di skad ces gsol to // gal te bcom ldan 'das <kyis>
 25 bdag ca(g)^(123b5) la gnang na : bcom ldan 'das bdag cag gis kyang : de bzhin gshegs pa
 yongsu mya ngan las 'das nas / chos kyī rnam grangs 'di 'jig rten gyi khams Mi mjed
 'dir yang dag par^(123b6) || bstan bar bgyi'o || klag par bgyi'o || yi ger bri bar bgyi'o //
 mchod par bgyi'o : chos kyī rnam grangs 'di la brtson bar bgyi'o // bcom ldan 'das kyis
 <chos kyī> rnam grangs 'di bdag^(123b7) cag la⁸³ bka' stsal pa ; du gsol // de nas bcom
 30 ldan 'das kyis byang chub sems dpa' {sems dpa' chen po} de dag thams cad la 'di skad
 ces bka' stsal to // rigs kyī bu dag khyed^(123b8) kyī<s> 'di⁸⁴ ci ., bya || [ci .,] dgo{ng}s : 'jig
 rten gyi khams Mi mjed 'di na⁸⁵ nga'i byang chub sems dpa' stong phrag {ga'i} gang gā'i
 klung drug bu'i bye ma snyed yod de : byang chub sems dpa' de lta bu rnams^(124a1) ☸☸
 // kyis byang chub sems dpa' re re'i g-yog kyang byang chub sems dpa' stong phrag
 35 gang gā'i klung drug bu'i bye ma snyed : kho na ste : byang chub sems dpa' de dag re
 re[i] g-yog kyang de (sny)[e]d do :^(124a2) de dag nga yongsu mya ngan las 'das nas :⁸⁶
 phyi ma'i tshe na : chos kyī rnam grangs 'di 'dzin to // yang dag par rab tu ston to :

Tib. Kho. (Tibetan translation from Khotan) kha 59b4~

- // de nas 'jig rten gyi khams ^(kha 59b5) gzhan || nas lhags pa'i byang cub sems dpa' ○ sems dpa' chen po chu bo gang ga || brgyad gyi bye ma snyed / ○ de 'i tshe 'khor gyi dkyil 'kor⁸⁷ de nas ^(kha 59b6) hyung ste // de dag thal mo sbyar nas bcom ldan 'das la phyag 'tshal
- 5 te // bcom ldan 'das la 'di skad || gsol to // de ste⁸⁸ bcom ldan 'das gyis bdag ^(kha 59b7) cag la bka' stsal na yang / bcom ldan 'das bdag cag gis gyang | chos gyi gzhung 'di | de bzhin gshegs pa yong su⁸⁹ mya ngan las 'das nas / | | Myi mjed | gyi | | 'jig ^(kha 59b8) rten gyi khams | | 'dir yang dag par rab tu bstan to // klag go || bri 'o // mchod par bgyi 'o // chos gyi gzhung 'di la shyor bar bgyi 'o // bcom ldan 'das gyis ^(kha 60a1) ☉ // chos gyi gzhung 'di ||
- 10 | | bka' stsal na | | dge'o⁹⁰ | // de nas bcom ldan 'das gyis byang cub sems dpa' de dag thams cad la 'di skad || bka' stsal to // rigs gyi bu || ^(kha 60a2) | | 'di | | khyed gyis | | 'ci | | bya | | | dgos // | | Myi mjed | | pa'i | | 'jig rten gyi khams | | 'di na / nga'i | byang cub sems dpa' gcig la 'ang g-yog | byang cub sems dpa' | | chu bo gang ga | | stong ^(kha 60a3) phrag | drug cu 'i bye ma snyed yod pa / | | de lta bu'i | | byang cub sems dpa' | | | | chu bo gang
- 15 ga'i | | stong phrag | drug cu 'i bye ma snyed || gyi / byang cub sems dpa' || re re la | | yang | | / g-yog | | de snyed ^(kha 60a4) yod pa de dag { } nga yongsu mya ngan las 'das nas / phyi ma 'i ○ dus phyi ma 'i tshe na / chos gyi gzhung 'di 'dzin to // ○ yang dag par rab du ston to' //

20 **Chin. Dr.** 110b16~25

《正法華經・菩薩從地踊⁹²出品》第十四⁹³

- 於是⁹⁴，他方世界八江河沙等菩薩、大士各⁹⁵異形服⁹⁶來詣佛所，稽首于地，長跪叉手，白世尊曰：“鄙之徒類⁹⁷來造⁹⁸忍界，欲聞斯典，受持⁹⁹、諷、寫，精進供養，奉行如法。惟¹⁰⁰願大聖垂心於我。如來滅度¹⁰¹後，以《正法華經》加哀見¹⁰²付。”世尊
- 25 告曰：“止，族姓子！仁等¹⁰³無乃建發是計。今此忍界自有八江河沙等大士。一大士各有眷屬如六十億江河沙等菩薩、大士。後末世時，皆當受持、分布¹⁰⁴、班宣。”¹⁰⁵

Chin. Kj. 39c18~29

30 《妙法蓮華經・從地踊¹⁰⁶出品》第十五¹⁰⁷

爾時，他方國土諸來菩薩、摩訶薩過八恒河沙數，於大眾中起立¹⁰⁸，合掌作禮，而白佛言：“世尊！若聽我等於佛滅後，在此娑婆世界，勸加精進、護持、讀誦、書寫、供養是經典者，當於此土而廣說之。”

- 爾時，佛告諸菩薩、摩訶薩眾：“止，善男子！不須汝等護持此經。所以者何？
- 35 我娑婆世界自有六萬恒河沙等菩薩、摩訶薩。一一菩薩各有六萬恒河沙眷屬。是諸人等能於我滅後，護持、讀誦、廣說此經。”¹⁰⁹

(to be continued)

Notes:

*The present work was made possible by a grant from the Mitsubishi Foundation in Japan. My heartfelt thanks are due to my friend, Peter Lait, who checked my English. I should like to extend my sincere thanks also to Ms. Naoko Sato, who took great trouble to look over my transliterations of the Tibetan versions.

XIV § 1 Notes:

Notes on the Gilgit/Nepalese version

- ¹ After *anyalokadbārvāgātā*, folios of D3 are missing.
- ² *aṣṭau* : Āśā, *aṣṭa*.
- ³ *gaṅgānadīvālikāsamā* : = C4, N1, C6, Āśā, T7, N2, T8 etc. (= O, F); B. *°vālukāsamā* (= KN); T2. *°vālikāsamāni*; K, C5, T6, StP etc. *°vālikōpamāni*; P3. *°vālukōpamā*.
- ⁴ *bodhisatvā mahāsatvā* : = N2 (= O); C6, Āśā, B, T7, T8 etc. *bo° mahāsatvās* (= KN); P3, R etc. *bo° mahāsatvāḥ* (= F); C4, N1. *bodhisatvās*; K, C5, T2, T6, StP. om.
- ⁵ *parśanmaṇḍalād abhyutthitā* : = C4, C6 etc. (= KN; cf. O. *parīṣanmaṇḍalād a°* [= F]); P3, R etc. *parśatmaṇḍa°* (s.c.); B. *parśanmaṇḍalāt° vyutthitā*; N2, T8. *°lād vyutthitā*; T7. *°lād vyutthitāḥ*; N1. *°lād vyutthita* (s.c.); C5, T2. *°lād abhyutthitāny*; K. *°lā<d a>bhyutthitāny* (s.c.).
- ⁶ *aṇḍalīṇi* : C4, N1, C5, T2 etc. (= KN; cf. O. *daśanakkā<ṇ>jalīṇi*); C6, T6, N2, P3 etc. *aṇḍalī* (= F. *aṇḍalī*); Āśā, B, T8 etc. *aṇḍalīṇ*.
- ⁷ *asmākam* : K. *asmānu* (w.r.); R. *asmān* (w.r.).
- ⁸ *bbagavann* : Bj. *bbagava{ṇ}nu* (s.c.).
- ⁹ *asyāṇi Sabāyāṇi* : = K, C4, N1, T2, T6; C5. (')*syāt°* (s.c.) *Sabāyāṇi*; P3. *asyāṇi Sabā-*; B. *asmiṇi Sabā-*; Āśā, T7, N2, T8. *asmiṇi Sabā-*; R. *tasyāṇi Sabāyāṇi* (= KN). Cf. O, F. *imasmīn Sabā-*.
- ¹⁰ *samprakāśayemo* : = K, C4, C5, C6 etc.; P3, R. *°yemaḥ* (= F); C1, C2 etc. *°yema* (= KN; cf. O. *<saṇi>prakāśayema*); N1. *°yāmo* (s.c.).
- ¹¹ *vācayemo* : = K, C4, T2, T6, B, T8 etc.; P3, R. *°yemaḥ* (= O, F); A2 etc. *°yema* (= KN); N1. *°yāmo* (s.c.); C5. *bbāvacayema* (s.c.); C6, StP. om.
- ¹² *likhema* : = K, C4, N1, C5, StP; C6, T2, B, T7, N2, T8, Āśā etc. *°emaḥ*; P3. *lekhaya<ma>ḥ* (w.r.); R, T9 etc. *lekhayamaḥ* (w.r.); KN. *lekhayama* (≠ MSS.). Cf. O. *likhēyāma*, F. *likhēyāmaḥ*; Tib. Kanj. *yi ger bri bar bgyi'o*; Tib. Kho. *bri 'o*.
- ¹³ *pūjayema* : Bj. *pūjaye<ma>* (s.c.); K, C4, N1, C5, T2, T6 etc. *pūjayema* (= KN); C6, B, T7, N2, T8, P3, R, Āśā etc. *°emaḥ* (= O, F).
- ¹⁴ *dbarme* : Bj, C5, C6, B. *dbarma-* (s.c.); C4, N1, T7, N2, Āśā, T8. *dbarme* (= O, F); K, T2, P3, R etc. *dbarmaparyāye* (= KN; = Tib. Kanj. *chos kyi rnam grangs*; = Tib. Kho. *chos gyi gzbung*); T6. *dbarmaparyāya-*.
- ¹⁵ *anujānātu* : Bj. *°jānūti* (s.c.).
- ¹⁶ *alam* : Bj. *ala<ṇ>* (s.c.); N1. *ayaṇi* (s.c.).
- ¹⁷ *anena kṛtyena* : cf. O, F. *etena karaṇīyena*.
- ¹⁸ *santiba* : KN. *santi kulaputrā iba* (≠ MSS.; cf. O. *santi kulaputrā*).
- ¹⁹ *mama aivāsyāṇi* : = C4, N1; K, C5, C6, R etc. *mamāivāsyāṇi* (= KN); P3. *mamāivāsyāṇi* (s.c.); T2. *mam(°) evāsyāṇi*; T6. *mayāivāsyāṇi* (s.c.); B, T7, T8. *mamāivāsyāṇi*; N1. *mam(°) evāsmīn*.
- ²⁰ *Sabāyāṇi* : B, T7, N2, A1. *Sabā* (w.r.).
- ²¹ *ṣaṣṭi-* : most of MSS., incl. Bj, K, C4, N1 etc. read *ṣaṣṭhi-* (s.c.).
- ²² *ṣaṣṭigaṅgānadīvālukōpamāni* : = T6, B, P3, R etc.; K, C4, C5. *°vālikōpamāni*; N1. *°vālikō{māni bodhisatvako}pamāni* (s.c.); C6. *°vālukāsamāni* (= KN); T2, T7, N2, Āśā, StP, T8. *°vālikāsamāni* (= O, F).
- ²³ *bodhisatvasahasrāṇy* : = K, C4, C5, T6, P3, R etc. (= KN; = Tib. Kanj. etc. *stong phrag*; = Chin. Kj. 六萬 "sixty thousand" [= *ṣaṣṭi ... sahasrāṇy*]); N1, C6, StP. *°satva-koṭi-nayuta-śata-sahasrāṇy*,

°*sabasmāṇi* (= O, F. °*satva-koṭi-nayuta-śata-sabasmāṇi*); T2, B, T7, T8, Āśā. °*satva-koṭi-niyuta-śata-sabasmāṇy*, °*sabasmāṇi*; N2. °*satva-koṭi-niyuta-śata-sabasmāṇy*.

²⁴ *bodhisatvāṣya parivārah* : K. *bodhisatva-pari*° (s.e.).

²⁵ *ṣaṣṭy* : C4, C5, N1, T8, Āśā etc. *ṣaṣṭh*(°) (s.e. for *ṣaṣṭi*(°)).

²⁶ *eva* : Bj. *eca* (s.e.); K. *aiva* (s.e.).

²⁷ *gaṅgānadīvālikāpamāni* : = K, C4, C5, T8 etc.; C6, B, P3, R etc. °*vālukō* (= KN); N1. °*vālukō*{*pamā gaṅgānadīvālukō*}*pamāni* (s.e.). Cf. O, F. °*vālikāsamāni*.

²⁸ *bodhisatvasabasmāṇi* : = K, C4, C5, T6, P3, R etc. (= KN; = Tib. Kanj. etc. *stong phrag*, = Chin. Kj. 六萬 “sixty thousand” [= *ṣaṣṭi* ... *sabasmāṇi*]); C6, T7, N2. °*satva-koṭi-nayuta-śata-sabasmāṇi* (= O, F. °*satva-koṭi-nayuta-śata-sabasmāṇi*); T2, B, T8, Āśā, StP. °*satva-koṭi-niyuta-śata-sabasmāṇi*.

²⁹ *iyanta* : Bj. *imāni* (w.r.); K, C5. *iyanta*; T2, T6, B, T7, StP, T8, R etc. *iyān* (KN. -*ēyān* ≠ MSS); C6, N2, P3. *imān* (w.r.); C4, N1. *imāny* (w.r.). Cf. O, F. *ettaka*, Tib. Kanj. etc. *de snyed*.

³⁰ *parivārah* : KN. *parivāro* (≠ MSS).

³¹ *mama parinirvṛtasya* : an example of a genitive absolute construction; cf. § 12, n. 5.

³² *parinirvṛtasya* : C4, N1. *nirvṛtasya* (w.r.).

³³ *paścime kāle* : = C4, C5, N1, T6, T7, P3, R etc. (= KN; = O, F; = Tib. Kanj., Tib. Kho. *phyi ma'i dus*); K, C6, T2, B, N2, StP, T8 etc. om. (= Tib. Bth.; w.r.).

³⁴ *vācyaṣyaṇṭi* : = C4, C6, T2, T6, B, T7, N2, StP, T8, P3, R etc. (= KN; =? Chin. Dr. 分布 “explains”; = Chin. Kj. 讀誦 “recites”); K, N1, C5 etc. om. (= O, F; = Tib. Kanj. etc.).

Notes on O.

³⁵ *gaṇanāvīṭivṛttās* : ⊃ Chin. Dr. 各異形服 “in various appearance and dress”; see n. 96.

³⁶ *daśanakhā<ṃ>jalini* : cf. F. *aṃjalī*, G/N. *aṃjalini*.

³⁷ *bhagavante* : s.e. for °*vantaṇ*.

³⁸ *anujānīyāt vayan*. F, G/N. °*īyād va*°.

³⁹ *apīmaṇi* : = F; G/N. *api bhagavann imāṇi*.

⁴⁰ *likheyāma* : F. *likheyāmaḥ*, G/N. *likhema*. For the opt. 1 pl. endings -*cyāma*, -*cyāmaḥ*, see BIISG § 29.33.

⁴¹ *dharmaparyāye* : s.e. for °*paryāyaṇi* (= F).

⁴² *anujānīyāb* : s.e. for °*jānīyāt** (= F; cf. G/N. °*jānātū*).

⁴³ *tan* : s.e. for *tān*; cf. F. *tā(ṃ)*, G/N. *tāṃ*.

⁴⁴ *kulaputrābau* : a hyperform for °*putrābo* (= F). For vocative plural -*ābo*, cf. BIISG § 8.88, von Hinüber 2001: § 322 (°*ābo* < °*ā* + *bho*).

Notes on F.

⁴⁵ *aṣṭ[o]* : a hyperform for *aṣṭau* (= O, G/N).

⁴⁶ *gaṅgānadīvālikāsamā* : s.e. for *gaṅgānadī*°.

⁴⁷ *gaṇanā{ṃ}vīṭivṛttāb* : ⊃ Chin. Dr. 各異形服 “in various appearance and dress”; see n. 96.

⁴⁸ *avyutthitā* : s.e. for **abhyutthitā*; cf. O, G/N. *abhyutthitā*. For the confusion of -*v-* / -*bh-*, cf. XIII § 9, n. 85. For *utth-* ∈ *utth-* (< *ut-* + *stbā*), cf. XIII § 11, n. 34, 44; XIII § 25, F. 26b3. *utthabīrvā* / G/N. D3. 120b7. *vyutthibīrvā* / O. 282b2~3. *utthabīrvā*.

⁴⁹ *babbūvu* : For perf. 3 pl. ending -*u* (< -*uḥ*), see BIISG § 33.2. Cf. O. *babbūvuḥ*, G/N. *abbūvan*.

⁵⁰ *bhagavā* : < °*vāṇi* < °*vāṇi*; nom. sg. masc. (cf. XIII § 21, n. 81); cf. O. *bbagavann* (voc.; presumably s.e. for °*vāṇi*), G/N. *bbagavān* (nom.). Cf. also n. 54, 55.

⁵¹ *apīmaṇi* : = O; G/N. *api bhagavann imāṇi*.

⁵² *likheyāmaḥ [imaṇ ca vayan]* : Some *akṣaras* can be restored by reading their inverted images impressed on the adjacent folio, which were formed when the ink transferred to the facing page (e.g., from 5b to 6a or vice versa) during storage. The bold characters here are restored from their inverted

images which are found between the sixth and seventh lines of folio 26 verso.

⁵³ *likbeyāmaḥ* : opt. I pl.; see n. 40.

⁵⁴ *bbagavā* : voc. sg. masc.; cf. O. *bbagavan*, G/N. -. This form occurs also in XIII § 1, F. 14b5 (cf. G/N, O. *bbagavann*). Cf. n. 50.

⁵⁵ *bbagavā* : nom. sg. masc.; cf. O. *bbagavan* (voc.; presumably s.c. for °vān), G/N. *bbagavān* (nom.). Cf. also n. 50.

⁵⁶ *kulaputrābo* : see n. 44.

⁵⁷ *kulaputrāba* : probably s.c. for °ābo.

⁵⁸ *ṣaṣṭigaṅgānadīvālikāsamāni* : The bold character is restored from its inverted image which is found between the third and fourth lines of folio 26 verso.

⁵⁹ *bodhisarvākoṭinayutaśatasahasrāṇi* : s.c. for °sarvakoṭi°.

⁶⁰ *(pa)rīvārā* : s.c. for °vārā (= O, G/N).

⁶¹ *ṣaṣṭigaṅgānadīvālikāsamāni* | *bodhisarvākoṭinayutaśatasahasrāṇi* : The bold characters are restored from their inverted images which are found between the second and third lines of folio 26 verso.

⁶² *yaiṣām* : a hyperform for *yeṣām*.

⁶³ *aikaikasya* : a hyperform for *ekaikasya*.

⁶⁴ *lokadbāto* : s.c. for °dbātau (= O).

Notes on Tib. Kanjur version

⁶⁵ T. 140b6; J. 121b3; S. 163b7; Ph. 310b6; B. 149b7; Pk. 127a3; N. 168b6; D. 110b6; C. 129b4; L. 174b1. From this volume, I use the abbreviations **Ph** and **Pk** for the Phug brag Kanjur (formerly “P”) and for the Peking one (formerly “Q”), respectively. Although the text in the Phug brag manuscript Kanjur (abbr. “Ph”) retains archaisms, which sometimes agree with readings in the manuscript from Khotan, and hence an important piece of material for the editing of the text, it also contains too many omissions, haplographics, dittographics and misspellings. Therefore, single variants in Ph are generally not recorded in footnotes.

⁶⁶ *dag* : T. MS., Ph. om. (= Tib. Kho.). Supplemented from the other Kanjurs.

⁶⁷ *gang gā'i* : S, B, N, L. *gang-gā'i*; Ph. *gang gā'i* (= Bth); the other Kanjurs, incl. T, read *gang gā'i* instead.

⁶⁸ *de dag* : = S, B, Ph, D (= Bth, Tib. Kho.); J, Pk, N, C, L. *de dag la* (w.r.).

⁶⁹ *di* : T. MS., S. om. (w.r.).

⁷⁰ *klaḡ* : D, L. *bklag*.

⁷¹ *bri* : N, L. *'dri* (w.r.).

⁷² *kyis* : = S, Ph; B etc. om.

⁷³ *du* : T. MS., C. *tu* (w.r.).

⁷⁴ *ba* : = S, N, L; J, Ph, B, Pk, N, C. om. (= Bth, Tib. Kho.; w.r.).

⁷⁵ *na* : T. MS. *ni* (w.r.).

⁷⁶ *nga'i* : = S, N, L; Ph. *de'i* (s.c. for *nga'i*); J, B, Pk, D, C. *nga yi*.

⁷⁷ *gang gā'i* : see n. 67. Ph reads here *gang gā'i'i* (s.c.).

⁷⁸ *cu'i* : J, Ph, Pk. *bcu'i* (= Bth).

⁷⁹ *gang gā'i* : see n. 67.

⁸⁰ *cu'i* : J, Ph, Pk. *bcu'i* (= Bth).

⁸¹ *di* : = S, Ph, D, L; J, B, Pk, N, C. om. (s.c.).

⁸² *to* : = J, S, Ph, N, D, C, L; B, Pk. *te*.

Note on Bathang Kanjur

⁸³ - : = Tib. Kho.; cf. Tib. Kanj. *legs par*.

⁸⁴ *ci bya* : = Tib. Kho.; cf. Tib. Kanj. *bya ba ci* (*dgos*).

⁸⁵ *mi* : s.c. for *na*.

⁸⁶ - : cf. Tib. Kanj., Tib. Kho. *phyi ma'i dus*; G/N. *paścime kāle*; v.l. om. (= Tib. Bth.). See n. 33.

Notes on Tib. Kho.

⁸⁷ *'kor* : s.c. for *'khor*.

⁸⁸ *de ste* : "if"; cf. T.140b7. *gal te*; G/N. Bj.84a6. *sacet*. This usage of the word is found also at XIII § 6: Kho. kha 50a2. *de ste*, which is parallel to T.132b5. *gal te* and G/N. D2.75b5. *sacet*.

⁸⁹ *yong su* : = *yongsu*, i.e. *yongs su*.

⁹⁰ *dge'o* : cf. Tib. Kanj. T.141a2. *legs par*; G/N. Bj.84b1. *sādbu*.

⁹¹ *ci bya* : = Bth; cf. Tib. Kanj. *bya ba ci* (*dgas*).

Notes on Chin. Dr.

⁹² 踊 : = J; S(1).- (s.c.); S(2), S(3) etc. 踊.

⁹³ 十四 : = J (= KN. 314.6. *caturdaśamaḥ*; Ten. 174a19. 十四); S(1), S(2), S(3) etc. 十⁴ (= O. *pañcadaśamaḥ*; Kj. 39c18. 十⁴). Cf. Krsh. 175.

⁹⁴ 是 : = J; S(1), S(2), S(3) etc. 是.

⁹⁵ 各 : J. 各 (s.c.).

⁹⁶ 各異形服 : "in various appearance and dress"; *nānā* ("various") + *vīta* ("girt with") + *vyta* ("covered with") ∈ O, f. *gaṇṇānvīṭavytta-*; KN. 297.2.-. Cf. Krsh. 175.

⁹⁷ 鄙之徒類 : "We"; cf. Krsh(1998). 21.

⁹⁸ 造 : J. 造 (s.c.).

⁹⁹ 受持 : "(We shall) receive and keep it." = O. *dhārayema*, f. *°maḥ*; KN. 297.5.-.

¹⁰⁰ 惟 : = J; S(1), S(2), S(3) etc. 唯.

¹⁰¹ 度 : = J; S(1), S(2), S(3) etc.-.

¹⁰² 見 : 見 here indicates an action performed by one person towards another; cf. Krsh(1998). 206.

¹⁰³ 仁等 : "you people, you"; cf. Krsh(1998). 350.

¹⁰⁴ 希 : = J; S(1), S(2), S(3) etc. 別.

¹⁰⁵ "The Scripture of the Blossom of the True Teaching: Chapter Fourteen: Bodhisattvas' Springing out of the Earth:

Thereupon, *bodhisattvas* and great men (*mahāsattvas*) in the worlds of other directions, who were equal in number to the sand-grains of the eight Rivers (Ganges), all in various appearance and dress, came to the Buddha and spoke, kneeling on their knees and pressing their palms together, to the World-Honoured One: "We came to this World of Forbearance (*Sabāloka*), wishing to listen to this scripture, receive it, keep it, recite it, copy it, make offerings to it with fervour and to practise it obediently in accordance with the Dharma. May the Great Sage have mercy upon us and bestow, out of compassion, the *Scripture of the Blossom of the True Teaching* on us after the Thus Come One's extinction!" The World-Honoured One replied: "Stop, O householders! You should never conceive such an idea. In this World of Forbearance, there are great men, equal in number to the sand-grains of the eight Rivers (Ganges), at present. Each great man has *bodhisattvas* and *mahāsattvas*, equal in number to the sand-grains of the six billion Rivers (Ganges), as his followers. They all will receive, hold, explain and proclaim (this scripture) in the last age to come." "

Notes on Chin. Kj.

¹⁰⁶ 踊 : = J; S(1), S(2), S(3) etc. 踊.

¹⁰⁷ 第十⁴ : cf. n. 93.

¹⁰⁸ 是 : = J; S(1), S(2), S(3) etc.-

¹⁰⁹ English translations of this part are found in Murano 228; Kato 237-238; Hurvitz 225; Yuyama/Kubo 221; Watson 212-213.

ADDITIONAL ABBREVIATIONS

Āśā = Fragmentary Manuscripts of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra* kept in the Āśā Archives, Kathmandu, Nepal. Facsimile edition and transliteration: Toda 1997: 657-671.

Ten = *Tiānpū Màoŏ Lánbū Jīng* 添品妙法蓮華經, translated by Jñāgupta and Dharmagupta, in: *Taisbō*, vol.9, No.264, pp.134-97.

Toda, Hirofumi

1997 "Saddharmapuṇḍarika Manuscript Fragments in the Āśā Archives, Kathmandu, Nepal," in: *Bauddhavidyāsudbākarah : Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Swisttal-Odendorf : Indica et Tibetica Verlag (Indica et Tibetica, Bd. 30), pp. 657-671.

Index of Noteworthy Words

Buddhist Sanskrit

<i>kulaputrābo</i> (f; voc. pl.), <i>kulaputrābau</i> (O; ∈ °ābo)	XIV § 1, n. 44, 56, 57
<i>bhagavā</i> (f; nom. sg. masc.)	XIV § 1, n. 50, 55
<i>bhagavā</i> (f; voc. sg. masc.)	XIV § 1, n. 54
<i>likbeyāma</i> (O; opt. 1 pl.), <i>likbeyāmaḥ</i> (f; opt. 1 pl.)	XIV § 1, n. 40, 53

Tibetan

de ste (Kho. kha 59b6: "if") | T.140b7. *gal te* | G/N. Bj.84a6. *sacet* | XIV § 1, cf. n. 88

Index of Grammatical Points Discussed in the Notes

Buddhist Sanskrit

-ā, nominative singular of -ant stems in	XIV § 1, n. 50, 55 (f. 27a1, 27a4. <i>bhagavā</i>)
-ā, vocative singular of -ant stems in	XIV § 1, n. 54 (f. 27a3. <i>bhagavā</i>)
absolute construction : genitive	XIV § 1, n. 31 (<i>mama parinirvṛtasya</i>)
-ābo, -ābau (< °ā + bbo), vocative plural of -a stems in	XIV § 1, n. 44 (O. 283b5. <i>kulaputrābau</i>), n. 56 (f. 27a5. <i>kulaputrābo</i>), n. 56 (f. 27a5. <i>kulaputrāba</i> , presumably s.c. for °ābo)
-bb- / -v-	XIV § 1, n. 48 (f. 26b8-27a1. <i>avyuṣṭhitā</i> ∈ <i>abhyuṣṭhitā</i>)
e / ॐ	XIV § 1, n. 37 (O. 283a6. <i>bhagavante</i> ∈ °vantam), n. 41 (O. 283b2. <i>dbarmaparyāye</i> ∈ °paryāyam)

- <i>cyāma</i> , - <i>cyāmaḥ</i> , opt. 1 pl. endings	XIV § 1, n. 40 (O. 283b2. <i>likbeyāma</i> ; F. 27a3. <i>likbeyāmaḥ</i>)
genitive absolute construction	XIV § 1, n. 31 (<i>mama parinirvṛtasya</i>)
<i>m</i> / <i>e</i>	see <i>e</i> / <i>m</i>
nominative singular of - <i>ant</i> stems in - <i>ā</i>	XIV § 1, n. 50, 55 (F. 27a1, 27a4. <i>bbagavā</i>)
opt. 1 pl. endings - <i>cyāma</i> , - <i>cyāmaḥ</i>	XIV § 1, n. 40 (O. 283b2. <i>likbeyāma</i> ; F. 27a3. <i>likbeyāmaḥ</i>)
perfect 3 pl. ending - <i>u</i> (< - <i>uḥ</i>)	XIV § 1, n. 49 (F. 27a1. <i>babbūvu</i>)
- <i>u</i> , perf. 3 pl. ending (< - <i>uḥ</i>)	XIV § 1, n. 49 (F. 27a1. <i>babbūvu</i>)
<i>usth-</i> ∈ <i>utth-</i> (< <i>ut</i> <i>ṭhā</i>)	XIV § 1, n. 48 (F. 26b8~27a1. <i>avyusthūtā</i> ∈ <i>abhyutthūtā</i> < <i>abhy-ut-</i> <i>ṭhā</i>)
- <i>v-</i> / - <i>bb-</i>	see - <i>bb-</i> / - <i>v-</i>
vocative singular of - <i>ant</i> stems in - <i>ā</i>	XIV § 1, n. 54 (F. 27a3. <i>bbagavā</i>)
vocative plural of - <i>a</i> stems in - <i>ābo</i> , - <i>ābau</i> (< ° <i>ā</i> + <i>bbo</i>)	XIV § 1, n. 44 (O. 283b5. <i>kulaputrābau</i>), n. 56 (F. 27a5. <i>kulaputrābo</i>), n. 56 (F. 27a5. <i>kulaputrāba</i> , presumably s.c. for ° <i>ābo</i>)

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF TIBETAN WORDS FOUND IN THE TIB. KANJUR VERSION AND TIB. KHO.

<i>klung</i> (T.140b6, 141a3, 4. <i>gang gā'i klung</i>) Kho. kha 59b5, 60a2, 3. <i>chu bo</i> (<i>gang ga</i>) G/N. Bj.84a6, b2. (<i>gaṅgā-nadī</i> XIV § 1
<i>gang gā'i klung</i> (T.140b6, 141a3, 4) Bth. 123b3, 8, 124a1. <i>gang ga'i klung</i> Kho. kha 59b5, 60a2, 3. <i>chu bo gang ga</i> G/N. Bj.84a6, b2. <i>gaṅgā-nadī</i> XIV § 1
<i>gal te</i> (T.140b7) Kho. kha 59b6. <i>de ste</i> G/N. Bj.84a6. <i>sacet</i> XIV § 1
<i>chos kyi rnam grangs</i> (T.140b8, 141a1, 5) Kho. kha 59b7, 8, 60a4. <i>chos gyi gzhung</i> G/N. Bj.84b1, 3. <i>dbarma-paryāya~</i> XIV § 1
<i>gnang</i> (T.140b8) Kho. kha 59b7. <i>bka'stsal</i> G/N. Bj.84b1. <i>anuññīyāt</i> XIV § 1
<i>brtson par bgyi'o</i> (T.141a1~2) Kho. kha 59b8. <i>sbyor bar bgyi'o</i> G/N. Bj.84b1. <i>yogam āpadyemahi</i> XIV § 1
<i>lung te</i> (T.140b7) Kho. kha 59b6. <i>byung ste</i> G/N. Bj.84a6. <i>abhyutthūtā</i> XIV § 1
<i>legs par</i> (T.141a2) Kho. kha 60a1. <i>dge'o</i> G/N. Bj.84b1. <i>sādhv</i> XIV § 1

An Old Tibetan Translation of the Lotus Sutra from Khotan

The Romanised Text Collated with the Kanjur Version

(2)*

Seishi KARASHIMA

¹(kha 80a1) ཨྱ // གངས་ / sangs rgyas bye ba khrag khrig brgya stong rin p[o] che'i
 shing ཨྱ drung ཨྱ na // seng ge'i khri la bzhugs pa de dag thams *chad* la / 'thor
 mngon *bar* rab tu 'thor r[o] / [l]

²Kanjur (KN.328.13; T. 157b2; J. 136a6; S. 184a4; Ph. 330a3; B. 167b6; Pk. 142a3;
 N. 190a2; D. 123b1; C. 145a2; L. 195a6) (*jig rten gyi kham's bye ba khrag khrig
 brgya stong de dag na*) / *sangs rgyas bye ba khrag khrig brgya stong rin po che'i*

* The present work was made possible by a grant from the Mitsubishi Foundation in Japan. I should like to express my heartfelt gratitude to Dr. Hakan Wahlquist, Senior Curator for Asia in the Museum of Ethnography, Stockholm, who provided me with coloured slides of the old Tibetan manuscript from Khotan and forwarded the Museum's permission to me for its publication. My deep thanks are due as well to Ms. Naoko Sato (佐藤直子) and Mr. Iwao Ishikawa (石川巖), who took great trouble in looking over my transliterations of the Tibetan versions and pointed out various errors. I should like to extend my sincere thanks also to my friend, Peter Lait, who checked my English.

¹ Only the folio which is of the recto side is still existent, while the one, forming the verso side is missing; cf. ItS. 17; Karashima 2005: 191.

² From this volume, I use the abbreviations **Ph** and **Pk** for the Phug brag Kanjur (formerly "P") and for the Peking one (formerly "Q"), respectively. The abbreviation "Q" which is widely used by Western scholars for the Otani reprint edition (*The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition* 影印北京版西藏大藏經), as standing for the Qianlong emperor (乾隆帝), who reigned from 1736 to 1795, is misleading. The Kanjur division of this edition is based mainly upon the xylograph Kanjur prepared in 1717/20 (under the Kangxi emperor 康熙帝), partly supplemented by the Qianlong Kanjur (prepared in 1737), kept at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (I thank Mr. Shin'ichiro Miyake 三宅伸一郎 for this information), while the Tanjur division is based upon the xylograph Tanjur prepared in 1724 under the Yongzheng emperor (雍正帝). Therefore, it is not appropriate to use the abbreviation "Q" for this edition. Cf. Goshima 2002: 5, n. 8. Although the text in the Phug brag manuscript Kanjur (abbr. "Ph") retains archaisms, which sometimes agree with readings in the manuscript from Khotan, and hence an important piece of material for the editing of the text, it also contains too many omissions, haplographies, dittographies and misspellings. Therefore, single variants in Ph are generally not recorded in footnotes.

*shing ljon³ pa'i drung dag na / seng ge'i kbri la bzbugs pa de dag thams⁴ (T.157b3) cad⁴
la 'thor mngon par rab tu 'thor ro //*

(kha 80a2) bcom ldan 'das | *Shag kya* thub pa₁ | / de bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom *ba*
yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas | ₁ | dang / yongsu mya ngan las 'das pa /
bcom

Kanjur: *bcom ldan 'das de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs
rgyas Shākya thub pa dang / yongsu mya ngan las 'das pa bcom*

(kha 80a3) ldan 'das / | *Rin chen mang* | de bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom *ba* yang dag
par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas | ₁ | / seng ge'i khri la bzbugs pa | de dag | la yang /
'thor

Kanjur: (T.157b4) *ldan 'das de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs
rgyas Rin chen mang seng ge'i kbri la bzbugs pa la yang⁵ 'thor //*

(kha 80a4) mngon *bar* rab *du* 'thor ro // | ₁ | byang chub sems dpa'i tsho⁶gs de | ₁ |
thams *chad* | ₁ | ⁶ *dang / 'khor bzhi po de dag la yang / 'thor mngon bar* rab tu
'thor ro // bar

Kanjur: *mngon par rab tu 'thor ro // thams cad⁷ (T.157b5) dang ldan pa'i byang chub sems
dpa'i tshogs de dang 'khor bzhi po de dag la yang⁷ (KN.329) 'thor mngon par rab tu
'thor ro // bar*

(kha 80a5) snang las ⁸ *phrul gyi* ⁹ *can 'dan* dang / a ga ru'i phye ○ ma yang rab *du bab*
bo // steng gi *nam ka* bar snang las ○ ¹⁰ *rnga chen po* | ma brdungs par / yid du
'ong

Kanjur: *snang las lha'i¹¹ tsan dan dang / a ga ru'i phye ma yang¹² rab tu¹³ bab¹³ (T.157b6) bo //*
steng gi¹⁴ nam mkha'i bar snang las rnga dag¹⁵ kyang ma brdungs par yid du¹⁶ 'ong

³ *ljon* : Pk. *lgon* (s.c.).

⁴ *cad* : T. MS. om. (s.c.).

⁵ *yang* : N, L. 'ang.

⁶ *thams chad* : Tib. Kanj. *thams cad dang ldan pa'i*; KN. 328.17. *sarvāvantam*.

⁷ *yang* : N, L. 'ang; Ph. om. (s.c.).

⁸ *phrul gyi* : Tib. Kanj. *lha'i*; KN. 329.1. *divya*~.

⁹ *can 'dan* : Tib. Kanj. *can dan*; KN. 329.1. *candana*~.

¹⁰ *rnga chen po* : Tib. Kanj. *rnga dag*; KN. 329.2. *mabādundubbayo*.

¹¹ *tsan dan* : = J, S, B, D, C; N, L. *tsan-dan*; Pk. *can dan*.

¹² *yang* : N, L. 'ang.

¹³ *'bab bo* : = S; Ph. *phab po* (s.c.); the other Kanjurs read *bab bo* instead.

¹⁴ *nam mkha'i* : T. MS. *namkha'i*.

¹⁵ *dag* : Ph. *bdag* (s.c.).

¹⁶ *yid du* : J, Pk. *yid tu* (w.r.).

(kha 80a6) ba snyan *ching*¹⁷ *zab*¹⁸ pa'i *dbyangs byung ngo* // steng nas *'pbrul gyi*¹⁹ *gos pbrugs* brgya stong || *yang* ltung ngo // steng gi *nam ka* bar snang *la* [..] se mo do dang / [..do shal dang /..] mu ti(g gi)

Kanjur: *ba snyan cing 'jam pa'i sgra 'byin to* // steng nas *lba'i ras bcos bu zung brgya stong dag kyang ltung ngo* // steng gi *nam* (L.157b7) *mkha'*²⁰ bar snang las rgyan *phreng dang* / se mo do dang / mu tig gi

(kha 80a7) phreng ba dang / nor bu rin po che dang / nor bu rin po || chen po || *yang* phyogs thams *chad* [~~nas~~]²¹ kun nas rab *du* 'phyang ngo // rin thang myed pa'i ²²*bdug* pa [..²³ *bdu*[g] +]

Kanjur: *phreng ba dang / nor bu rin po che dang*²⁴ / nor bu rin po che chen po dag kyang phyogs thams *cad du*²⁵ kun nas rab tu 'phyang ngo // rin thang med pa'i *bdug*²⁶

(kha 80a8) pa'i *snod*²⁷ rin po che *la* byas pa brgya stong || rang rgyu'o // de bzhin gshegs pa re re la yang rin po che'i ²⁸*gdugs brtsegs pa* // Tshangs pa'i 'jig rte(n la)²⁹

Kanjur: *pa'i pog*³⁰ *phor* (L.157b8) *rin po che las byas pa brgya*³¹ stong dag kyang kun nas rang rgyu³²o // de bzhin gshegs pa re re la yang³³ rin po che'i *gdugs kyi phreng ba*³⁴ Tshangs pa'i 'jig rten la

¹⁷ *ching* : s.c. for *cing* (= 'Tib. Kanj.)?

¹⁸ *zab pa* : 'Tib. Kanj. *'jam pa*; KN. 329.3. -*gamibhāra*-.

¹⁹ *'pbrul gyi* : 'Tib. Kanj. *lba'i*; KN. 329.3. *dirya*~.

²⁰ *mkha'i* : T. MS. *mkba'* (s.c.).

²¹ *nas* : these characters seem to have been intentionally rubbed out.

²² *bdug pa* .. *bdu*[g] + *pa* : ≠ 'Tib. Kanj. *bdug pa*; ≠ KN. 329.5. *dhūpasya (gḥaṭikā-)*; =? D1, K, Bj etc. *dhūpasya dhūpa-(gḥaṭikā-)*.

²³ .. : this character seems to have been intentionally rubbed out.

²⁴ *dang* : B. *nang* (s.c.).

²⁵ *du* : = S, Ph, D, L; the other Kanjurs omit this word.

²⁶ *bdug* : T. MS. *'dug* (s.c.).

²⁷ *snod* : 'Tib. Kanj. *pog phor*; KN. 329.5. *gḥaṭikā*-.

²⁸ *gdugs brtsegs pa* : 'Tib. Kanj. *gdugs gyi phreng ba*; KN. 329.6. *chattrāvali*~.

²⁹ The verso side is missing, see n. 1.

³⁰ *pog* : Pk. *phog*.

³¹ *brgya* : S. *srgya* (s.c.).

³² *rgyu* : S. *rgya* (s.c.).

³³ *yang* : N, L. *'ang*.

³⁴ *ba* : Pk. *pa*.

(kha 94a1) ཨོཾ // ¹⁵*rang bzhin gyi .yi sha'i myig g(g)s / sems chan gang + + + + +*
+ + + + +
Kanjur (KN.354.9; T. 168b5; J. 146a1; S. 198a1; Ph. 341b2; B. 180a1; Pk. 152a1; N.
 204a5; D. 132b2; C. 155b7; L. 209a7) *sha'i mig tha mal pas sems can gang dag*
der skyes pa de dag thams cad kyang³⁶ nithong ste / de dag gi las kyī (T.168b6) *mam*
par smin pa yang³⁷ shes so // de nas bcom ldan 'das kyis

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

¹⁵ rang bzhin gyi sha'i myig g(i)s : Tib. Kanj. *sha'i mig tba mal pas*; KN. 354.9. *prākṛtena māmsacaksuśā*.

¹⁶ *kyang* : = S, Ph, D, L; the other Kanjurs omit this word.

³⁷ *yang* : = S, Ph; D, L. 'ang; the other Kanjurs omit this word.

³⁸ *gsungso* : i.e. *gsungs so*.

³⁹ *pa* : Ph, B, Pk. *par.*

¹⁰⁾ *rah 'chad pa*: Pk. *bar chad pa* (s.c.).

⁴¹ *nyon* : N, L. *nyan* (w.r.).

¹² *yis* : = Ph, B, Pk; the other Kanjurs, incl. S, read *yi* instead.

⁴³ *tu* : I, Ph, D, *du*.

⁴⁴ *par* : = S, Ph; the other Kanjurs read *pa* instead.

⁴⁵ *Illun po Ri rab* : = S, Ph, the other Kanjurs read *Illun po'i Ri rab* instead. Cf. KN. 355.5. *Merum Sumeru* (v.l. *Sumerum Meru*).

⁴⁶ *kbo ra* : Ph, C. *kbor*.

+ + + + +

Kanjur: *ba chen po*⁵⁷ *la tbug pa*⁵⁸ *yan chad / srid pa'i rtse mo la tbug* (U.169a5) *pa man chad na*⁵⁹ *phyi nang gi sgra rnam pa mang po gang dag 'byung ba 'di lta ste / glang po che'i sgra 'am / rta'i sgra 'am / rnga mo*

(kha 94b3) 'i sgra 'am // ba lang gi sgra 'am / ra'i sgra 'am / shing rta'i sgra 'a[m] + + + + +

Kanjur: 'i sgra 'am / ba glang⁶⁰ gi sgra 'am / ra'i sgra 'am / *shing rta'i sgra 'am / ngu ba'i sgra 'am /* (T.169a6) *mya ngan gyi sgra 'am / 'jigs pa'i*⁶¹ *sgra 'am / dung gi sgra 'am / dril bu'i sgra 'am / rnga'i sgra 'am /*

(kha 94b4) rtsed mo'i sgra 'am / glu'i sgra 'am / sil snyan gyi⁶² ○ sgra 'a(m) + + + + +

Kanjur: *rtsed mo'i sgra 'am / glu'i sgra 'am / rol mo'i sgra 'am / skyes pa'i sgra 'am / bud med kyi sgra 'am /* (T.169a7) *kbye'u yi*⁶³ *sgra 'am / bu mo'i sgra 'am / chos*

(kha 94b5) [g]yi sgra 'am / chos ma yin ba'i sgra 'am / bde pa'i ○ sgra 'a[m] + + + + +

Kanjur: *kyi sgra 'am / chos ma yin pa'i sgra 'am / bde ba'i sgra 'am / sdug bsngal ba'i sgra 'am / byis pa'i sgra 'am / 'phags pa'i sgra 'am / yid du*⁶⁴ *'ong ba'i sgra* (T.169a8) *'am / yid du*⁶⁵ *mi 'ong*

(kha 94b6) ba'i sgra 'am / lha'i sgra 'am / klu'i sgra 'am / gnod sbyin gyi sgra + + + + +

Kanjur: *ba'i sgra 'am / lha'i sgra 'am / klu'i sgra 'am / gnod sbyin gyi sgra 'am / dri za*'i⁶⁶ *sgra 'am / lha ma yin gyi sgra 'am / nam mkba*⁶⁷ *lding gi sgra 'am / mi 'am* (T.169b1) *ci'i sgra 'am /*

(kha 94b7) lto 'phye chen po'i sgra 'am / myi'i sgra 'am / myi ma yin || gyi sgra 'am /

⁵⁷ *chen po* : Pk. *chen bo* (s.c.).

⁵⁸ *tbug pa* : Pk. *tbug ba* (s.c.).

⁵⁹ *na* : = S, D, L; Ph. *nas* (w.r.); the other Kanjurs omit this word.

⁶⁰ *glang* : Ph, D. *lang* (= Tib. Kho.).

⁶¹ *pa'i* : J. *ba'i* (s.c.).

⁶² *sil snyan gyi* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *rol mo'i*; KN. 356.5. *vāḍya-*.

⁶³ *yi* : = S, Ph; the other Kanjurs read 'i instead (w.r.).

⁶⁴ *yid du* : J, Pk, C. *yid tu*.

⁶⁵ *yid du* : J, Pk. *yid tu*.

⁶⁶ *za'i* : S. *zas* (s.c.); C. *zi'i* (s.c.).

⁶⁷ *nam mkba'* : T. MS. *namkba'i* (w.r.), S. *nam mkba'i* (w.r.).

[illegible]

(kha 95a1) [ᱵᱟ] // gyi stong chen po'i 'jig rten gyi khams gyi [ph]y[i] ..⁶⁸ / [sg]r[a c]i
[by]ung ba [ɰ] de dag [tham]s [chad] [lba]g gi [*xang bzbin gyi*..⁶⁹ rna ba'i
dbang p[o]s [ɰ] ⁷⁰ thos te / [ɰ] 'phrul

(kha 95a2) *gyi* rna ba || mngon bar || myi sgrub *bo* // sems *chan* de *dag*⁷² de *dagi*⁷³ skad ||
rab tu rtogs so / sems *chan* de *dag*⁷⁴ de *dagi*⁷⁵ skad la rnam par rtog go // rnam
par 'byed [d]o // ,rang

Kanjur: 'i rna ba ni mi sgrub mod kyi sems can de⁷⁶ dang de dag gi skad du⁷⁷ rab tu rtogs so
// ⁷⁸sems can de dang de dag gi⁷⁹ (T.169b4) skad la rnam par rtog go / rnam par 'byed⁸⁰
do //

⁸⁰ *rnam par 'byed*: T. MS., S. *rnam par dpyod* (w.r.?); cf. KN. 357.5. *vibhajati*.

(kha 95a3) bzhin gyi⁸¹ rna ba'i dbang po [r̥-] des // [] de dag⁸² de dag gi skad [] thos
gyang // [] rna ba'i dbang po [de] la sgra de dag thams chad gyis zil gyis myi non
to // rtag du⁸³ rgyun [myi] cha[d]

Kanjur: rna⁸⁴ ba'i dbang po tha mal pa des / sems can de dang de dag gi⁸⁵ skad ruams thos
kyang / de'i rna ba'i dbang po la sgra de dag thams cad kyis⁸⁶ zil gyis mi^(T.169b5)
gnon⁸⁷ to // rTag par rgyun du⁸⁸

(kha 95a4) par brtson ba // [de] lta bu⁸⁹ [r̥-] rna ba'i dbang po⁹⁰ byang chub sems dpa'
[] des [r̥-] [r̥-] thob <pa>r gyurd te // re shig 'phrul gyi rna ba ○ ni mngon bar
myi [sgrub] bo // bco(m ldan)

Kanjur: brtson pa⁸⁹ byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po de rna ba'i dbang po 'di lta bu
'thob⁹⁰ par 'gyur te / re shig⁹¹ lba'i rna ba ni mngon par mi sgrub bo⁹² // bcom ldan

(kha 95a5) 'das gyis de skad [] bka' stsal [] / bde bar gshegs pas de skad gsungs nas /
[de] nas ston pas [] [d]i ○ skad [] gsungso⁹³ / // de 'i (rna ba'i)

Kanjur: 'das^(T.169b6) kyis de skad ces bka' stsal te / bde bar gshegs pas de skad gsungs nas /
ston pas⁹⁴ gzhan yang 'di skad ces bka' stsal to // de yi⁹⁵ rna ba'i

(kha 95a6) dbang po [r̥-] [r̥-] rnam [] dag gyurd⁹⁶ // 'di lta r̥ rnyog pa myed pa [r̥-] [r̥-]
rang bzbin gyis⁹⁶ // [r̥-] rnam pa mang po [] sgra ni des [th]os te // [r̥-] 'jig rten
khams 'di [] ma lus [] [r̥-] [de] rnam[so]⁹⁷

⁸¹ rang bzbin gyi : cf. Tib. Kanj. tha mal pa; KN. 357.6. prākṛta~.

⁸² dag : s.c. for dang.

⁸³ rgyun myi cha[d] par : cf. Tib. Kho. kha 54a3. rgyun myi chad par (Karashima 2005: 210).

⁸⁴ rna : B. na (s.c.).

⁸⁵ gi : = S, B, Pk (= Tib. Kho.; = KN. 357.6. sattvānām rutāni); the other Kanjurs read gis instead (w.r.).

⁸⁶ kyis : B. kyi (s.c.).

⁸⁷ gnon : = S; the other Kanjurs read non instead (= Tib. Kho.).

⁸⁸ du : T. MS., Pk, C. tu (w.r.); Ph. om. (s.c.).

⁸⁹ pa : = S (cf. Tib. Kho. ba); the other Kanjurs omit this word.

⁹⁰ thob : = S, B, Pk; the other Kanjurs read thob instead (= Tib. Kho.).

⁹¹ re shig : = J, S, B, Pk, C (= Tib. Kho.); Ph. res shig; N. re zhin (s.c.); the other Kanjurs read re zbig instead.

⁹² sgrub bo : = Tib. Kho.; the other Kanjurs read sgrub po instead.

⁹³ gsungso : i.e. gsungs so.

⁹⁴ pas : T. MS. pas (s.c.).

⁹⁵ de yi : S, Ph, N. de'i (= Tib. Kho.).

⁹⁶ rang bzbin gyis : cf. Tib. Kanj. tha mal pa; KN. 357.10. prākṛtaka~.

⁹⁷ rnam[so] : i.e. rnam[so]. Cf. KN. 357.11. ye (v.l. 'yam).

Kanjur: *dbang po tha mal pa // rnyog pa med cing rnam* (T.169b7) *par dag par 'gyur // 'jig rten khams 'di dag na ma lus par // rnam pa mang po'i sgra rnam des thos te // (= 7)*

(kha 95a7) ⁹⁸*rta dang ban glang*⁹⁹ *dagi*¹⁰⁰ *sgra yang thos //* ¹⁰¹*shing rta* ¹⁰²*ra* ¹⁰³*lug* ¹⁰⁴*yang de bzhing te //* ¹⁰⁵*sm/rji dang ga* ¹⁰⁶*dang* ¹⁰⁷*nga chen* ¹⁰⁸*snyand* ¹⁰⁹*pa* ¹¹⁰*dang // byi na* ¹¹¹*gling bu* ¹¹²*ba la ki* ¹¹³*rnam dang* ¹¹⁴*// 'jam (zh)i(ng)*

Kanjur: (K.N. 358) *nga bo che dang rdza nga sgra snyan dang // pi wang*¹⁰⁴ *gling bu dang ni ba la ki*¹⁰⁴ / *shing rta ba*¹⁰⁵ *glang*¹⁰⁶ *ra* (T.169b8) *dang lug dag dang // rta dang glang chen dag gi sgra yang thos // (= 8) 'jam zhing*

(kha 95a8) *yid du 'ong ba 'i glu* ¹⁰⁷*yang thos // brtan ba de ni de la chags pa myed //* ¹⁰⁸*bye ba snyed gyi mi li* ¹⁰⁹*sgra* ¹¹⁰*thos te* ¹¹¹*ga.. .. .u su* ¹¹²*su smra bya* ¹¹³*de // lha 'i sgra yang* ¹¹⁴*rtag + +*

Kanjur: *yid 'ong glu yi dbyangs kyang thos // brtan pa de ni*¹¹¹ *de la chags pa med // gang dang gang*¹¹² *na su dang su smra ba // bye ba snyed kyi mi* (T.170a1) *yi sgra rnam thos // (= 9) lha yi*¹¹³ *sgra dang*

(kha 95b1) *pa n[a]*¹¹⁴ ¹¹⁵*glu* ¹¹⁶*dbyangs* ¹¹⁷*snyand pa* *yid du 'ong ba* ¹¹⁸*ste* ¹¹⁹*skyes pa*

⁹⁸ For the following verse, cf. ItS. 100~101.

⁹⁹ *ban glang*: cf. Tib. Kanj. *glang chen*, K.N. 358.1. *bastin* ("elephant"); ItS. 100. Cf. also n. 198, 314.

¹⁰⁰ *dagi*: i.e. *dag gi*.

¹⁰¹ *sm/rji dang ga*: a transliteration of K.N. 358.2. *mṛdaṅga*~ ("a kind of drum, tabour" [MW]); cf. Tib. Kanj. *rdza nga*, ItS. 101.

¹⁰² *byi na*: a transliteration of K.N. 358.2. *vīṇā*~ ("Indian lute"); cf. Tib. Kanj. *pi wang* (v.l. *bang*); cf. ItS. 101.

¹⁰³ *pi wang*: = S, Ph, L; B. *wi wang* (s.c.); the other Kanjurs read *pi bang* instead.

¹⁰⁴ *ba la ki*: 'T. MS., S. *ba ka li* (s.c.); Ph. *ba la «ng» ki* (s.c.); cf. K.N. 358.2. *vallakī*~.

¹⁰⁵ *ba*: S. *bal* (s.c.).

¹⁰⁶ *glang*: = Tib. Kho.; the other Kanjurs read *lang* instead.

¹⁰⁷ *li*: s.c. for *yi* (= Tib. Kanj.)?

¹⁰⁸ *ga.. .. .u*: after *ga*, there are six illegible characters. Cf. Tib. Kanj. *gang dang gang na*, K.N. 358.4. *yabim yabim*.

¹⁰⁹ For the following verse, cf. ItS. 101~103.

¹¹⁰ *rtag + +*: read: *rtag par thos* (= Tib. Kanj.)?; cf. ItS. 101.

¹¹¹ *de la*: B. *la yang* (s.c.).

¹¹² *na su dang*: S. *nas* (s.c.).

¹¹³ *lha yi*: Ph, Pk. *lba'i*.

¹¹⁴ *n[a]*: Simonsson (ItS. 101) transcribes this as *ni* instead.

bud myed dagi¹¹⁵ sgra rnam¹¹⁶ dang // khye'u dang bu mo rnam¹¹⁷ gyang de bzhin
te // ¹¹⁶ri dang phug na gag gnas de (dag dang¹¹⁷ //)

Kanjur (KN.358.5; T. 170a1; J. 147a1; S. 199b1; Ph. 342b8; B. 181a6; Pk. 153a1; N. 205b5; D. 133b1; C. 157a3; L. 210b7) *klu yi dbyangs rnam¹¹⁸ dang // snyan cing yid du 'ong ba rtag par thos // skyes pa bud med dag gi sgra rnam¹¹⁹ dang // khye'u dang bu mo'i sgra yang de (T.170a2) bzhin thos // (= 10) ri dang phug na gang gnas de dag dang //*

(kha 95b2) khu byug rma bya ka la bing ka dang // [·...] || ¹¹⁹dzi ba 'dzi ba ka'i [·] bya rnam₁ dang // de dag || gi yang₁ sgra snyan¹²⁰ des thos te // sems chan₁ dmyal bas sdug bsngal ga[ng] (myong)

Kanjur: *khu byug rma bya¹²⁰ ka la bing ka dang // bya rnam¹²¹ gang dag shang shang te'u rnam¹²² dang // de dag rnam¹²³ kyi sgra snyan 'dir¹²⁴ thos so // (= 11) sems (T.170a3) dmyal dag na sdug bsngal gang myong*

(kha 95b3) bas // shin du jigs par sgra rnam¹²⁵ 'byind pa₁ dang // zas gyi sdug bsngal dagis¹²⁶ nyend pa'i // yi dags rnam¹²⁷ gyi sgra phyung de bzhin te // [·...] || ¹²³rgya mtsho ||

Kanjur: *ba // shin tu¹²⁴ mi bzad pa yi sgra rnam¹²⁵ dang // zas¹²⁶ kyi sdug bsngal dag gis nyen pa yi // yi dags¹²⁷ rnam¹²⁸ kyi¹²⁹ sgra phyung de bzhin thos // (= 12) lha ma yin dang (T.170a4) rgya mtsho'i*

(kha 95b4) mchibing rnam dbus na || [·] lha ma yin₁ // || ¹²⁸chos smra || 'di na ○ 'dug

¹¹⁵ dagi : i.e. dag gi.

¹¹⁶ For the following verse, cf. ItS. 103.

¹¹⁷ dag dang : Simonsson reconstructed as dang dag (ItS. 103).

¹¹⁸ dang : = S, Ph (= KN. 358.5. ca). The other Kanjurs read kyang instead.

¹¹⁹ 'dzi ba 'dzi ba ka : a transliteration of jīva-jīvaka~ ("a kind of pheasant"; cf. KN. 358.8. jīvaka-jīvaka~); cf. Tib. Kanj. shang shang te'u.

¹²⁰ ka la bing ka : S, N, L. ka la bingka; B. ka la bingga.

¹²¹ 'dir : T. MS., S. 'di (w.r.); cf. KN. 358.8. bi; v.l. D2. (')ba ("here"; cf. Watanabe 1975: 134, l. 35).

¹²² dagis : i.e. dag gis.

¹²³ rgya mtsho mchibing rnam dbus na lha ma yin : = KN. 358.11. asurās ca ye sāgaramadhyavāsino; ≠ Tib. Kanj. lha ma yin dang rgya mtsho'i nang gnas dang.

¹²⁴ shin tu : J, Pk. shin du (= Tib. Kho.).

¹²⁵ zas : Ph. zad (s.c.).

¹²⁶ yi dags : L. yi dvags.

¹²⁷ kyi : T. MS. kyis (s.c.).

¹²⁸ One pāda or a quarter verse, paralleling to Tib. Kanj. sgra 'byin pa dang de bzhin gzhan dang gzhan // = KN. 358.11. mūcanti (v.l. mūmanti) ghoṣāṇus tattha cānyamanyān, is wanting.

bzhin₁ thams chad₁ gyi // sgra rnam₁ thos₁ par 'gyur₁ ○ te¹²⁹ {«m»} chod
pa myed // ¹³⁰byol song ris gyi (sgra?)

Kanjur: nang gnas dang // sgra 'byin pa dang de bzhin¹³¹ gzhan dang gzhan // chos smra
ba de 'di¹³² na 'dug bzhin du // sgra rnam₁ thams cad thos te chod pa med // (= 13)
dud 'gro'i skye gnas

(kha 95b5) rnam₁ de dag gyang // phan tshun du ni₁ smra bar byed pa ○ rnam₁ //
'di na 'dug bzhin₁ de 'is₁ de dag thos // rnam₁ ○ pa tha dad₁ pa 'i sgra₁
mang po // lha ga(ng)

Kanjur: dag na phan_(T.170a5) tshun du // smra bar byed pa'i sgra rnam₁ gang yin pa //
rnam pa tha dad¹³³ sgra rnam₁ mang po dag / de ni 'di na 'dug bzhin de dag thos //
(= 14)_(KN.359) lha gang

(kha 95b6) Tshangs pa₁ 'jig rten gnas pa dang // 'Og myin Kun [sna]ng dang ba¹³⁴
lha₁ de rnam₁ // phan tshun du ni sgra skad gang 'byin pa // de dag ma lus
thams chad des th[o](s so //)

Kanjur: Tshangs pa'i 'jig rten gnas pa dang // gang dag 'Og_(T.170a6) min dang ni 'Od gsal
lha // phan tshun du ni sgra skad gang 'byin pa // de dag ma lus thams cad des thos
so // (= 15)

(kha 95b7) 'di na¹³⁵ dge slong₁ kha ton byed pa dag // bde bar gshegs gyi
bstan la rab byung nas // 'khor rnam₁ la ni₁ chos¹³⁶ rab ston₁ pa gang // de
dag sgra yang rtag

Kanjur: bde bar gshegs ky¹³⁷ bstan la rab byung nas // dge slong gang dag kha ton¹³⁸ byed pa
_(T.170a7) dang // 'khor gyi¹³⁹ nang na chos ston gang yin pa // de dag sgra yang rtag

(kha 95b8) [d](u) [is thos] // 'jig rten khams 'dir byang [chub s]e(ms dpa)[' gag] //

¹²⁹ mchod pa : l.c. of chod pa?; cf. Tib.Kanj. chod pa “is cut off, blocked” = KN. 358.12. otarīyati (“is overcome”; v.l. ostarīyati “is overwhelmed”; see BHSID, s.v. 2 otarati).

¹³⁰ byol song ris gyi (sgra?) rnam₁ de dag gyang : cf. Tib. Kanj. dud 'gro'i skye gnas dag na ... gang yin pa ... sgra rnam₁ gang yin pa; KN. 358.13. tiryāṇa yonīṣu rutāni yāni.

¹³¹ gzhan dang gzhan : = S (= KN. 358.11. anya-m-nyān); Ph. gzhan dang bzhan(s.c.); the other Kanjurs read gzhan dag dang instead; Tib. Kho.-.

¹³² 'di : S. de (s.c.); Ph. « 'de (s.c.).

¹³³ dad : Pk. dang (s.c.).

¹³⁴ kun [sna]ng dang ba : cf. Tib. Kanj. 'od gsal; KN. 359.1. Ābbāsvaṇa-.

¹³⁵ 'di na : = KN. 359.3. iba.

¹³⁶ rab ston pa : cf. Tib. Kanj. ston = KN. 359.4. deśayate.

¹³⁷ ky¹³⁷ : T. MS. kyis (s.c.).

¹³⁸ kha ton : = S, N, L (= Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read kha don instead.

¹³⁹ 'khor gyi : Pk. 'khor ky¹³⁹.

[₁phan tsh(u)n d(u) ... [₁ni] kha to[n] [] byed pa [₁dag]¹⁴⁰ [₁ ...] // chos la yang dag
¹⁴¹zlug par gang byed pa //

Kanjur: *tu de yis*¹⁴² *thos* // (= 16) *'jig rten khams 'dir byang chub sems dpa' gang // kha ton*¹⁴³ *dag kyang byed cing phan tshun du // chos rnam* (T.170a8) *yang dag* ¹⁴⁴*rjod par gang*¹⁴⁵ *byed pa //*

(kha 96a1) ཨོ // *de 'i* [] [₁ ...] [] rnam pa tha dad [₁ ... sgra] [₁ yang] thos // [₁ ...] sangs rgyas
 bcom ldan myi 'dul kha lo sgyur // 'khor rnam la ni chos mchog [] gsung ba
 [₁dag] // dus gchig tu n[i] de [₁dag] []

Kanjur (KN.359.6; T. 170a8; J. 147a7; S. 200a2; Ph. 343a7; B. 181b5; Pk. 153a7; N. 206a6; D. 133b6; C. 157b2; L. 211a7) *de dag sgra rnam pa tha dad thos* // (= 17) *byang chub sems dpa' mdo 'di gang 'dzin pas*¹⁴⁶ // *sangs rgyas bcom ldan mi 'dul kha lo sgyur // 'khor rnam la* (T.170b1) *yang chos mchog gang* ¹⁴⁷*gsung ba* // *dus gcig*¹⁴⁸ *tu*¹⁴⁹ *ni de yang de yis*

(kha 96a2) thos [₁gyur the]¹⁵⁰ // [₁ ... byang chub sems dpa' mdo [₁sde] 'di [] 'dzin [dag] // [₁ ...] stong gsum gyi ni zhing 'di thams chad na // [₁ ...] sems chan gag gis sgra mang phyung pa dag // [₁ ...] phyi rol

Kanjur: *thos* // (= 18) *mNar med yan chad steng du srid pa'i rtse // stong gsum gyi ni zhing 'di thams cad na // nang logs dag dang phyi logs* (T.170b2) *dag nas kyang // sems can dag*¹⁵¹ *gis sgra mang phyung ba dang* // (= 19)

(kha 96a3) dang [₁ni] nang yang de bzhin te // [₁ ...] bStir myed bar¹⁵³ [₁dang] steng du srid pa'i rtse // [₁ ...] sems chan thams chad gyi [₁nyan] sgra [] thos te // 'on gyang de'i rna

¹⁴⁰ *byed pa dag* : cf. KN. 359.5. *kurvanti* (pl.).

¹⁴¹ *zlug par* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *rjod* (v.l. *rdzogs*) *par*; KN. 359.6. (*saṃ*)*gīti*.

¹⁴² *yis* : Pk. *mis* (s.c.).

¹⁴³ *kha ton* : = S, Ph, N, L (= Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read *kha don* instead.

¹⁴⁴ *rjod par* : = D, L (= KN. 359.6. [*saṃ*]*gīti*); S, Ph. *brjod par*; B, Pk, N, C. *rdzogs par* (w.r.); J. *rdzogs bar* (w.r.). Cf. Tib. Kho. *zlug par*.

¹⁴⁵ *gang* : T. MS. *gad* (s.c.).

¹⁴⁶ *pas* : S. *pa* (s.c.).

¹⁴⁷ *gsung ba* : T. MS. *gsung pa*; Ph, B, Pk. *gsungs pa*.

¹⁴⁸ *gcig* : Pk. *cig*.

¹⁴⁹ *tu* : Ph, B. *du*.

¹⁵⁰ *gyur the* : s.c. for *gyur te*?

¹⁵¹ *dag* : = S; the other Kanjurs read *gang* instead; cf. KN. 359.9. *ye satvā* (m.c. < *satvā*).

¹⁵² *phyi rol dang ni nang yang de bzhin te* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *nang logs dag dang phyi logs dag nas kyang*; KN. 359.10. *abhyantareṇāpi* (v.l. D2 etc. *ṇeātā*) *ca bābireṇa*. Tib. Kanj. *kyang* = KN. *api*; Tib. Kho. *de bzhin te* = v.l. *atba*.

¹⁵³ *bStir myed bar* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *mNar med yan chad*; KN. 359.10. *Avīci-paryanta*.

ba myi 'gago¹⁵⁴ // dbang po gsa[l]

Kanjur: *sems can kun gyi sgra rnam thos gyur kyang* // 'on kyang¹⁵⁵ de yi rna ba 'gag pa med // ¹⁵⁶dbang po gsal

(kha 96a4) zhing gnas dang gnas *gyang shes* // [de yang¹⁵⁷] [rang bzbin¹⁵⁸] ○ rna ba'i dbang po [o] [2←] [1←] // *da rung*^{159 160} *phrul gyi la ni brtson*¹⁶¹ myi bye○d // ¹⁶²*rang bzbin gyi* [ni] rna ba [] de ltar 'du[g] (/)

Kanjur: *zhing gnas dang gnas kyang shes* // ma^(T.170b3) ba'i dbang po tha mal de tsam mo // (= 20) *re shig*¹⁶³ lba yi la ni 'bad mi byed // tha mal rna ba de ni de ltar 'dug /

(kha 96a5) 'jigs myed gang gis mdo [sde] 'di bzung *pa* [] // [] yon ○ tan dag ni de 'dra bar [yang] 'gyur / [g]zhan yang¹⁶⁴ rTag du ○ rgyun *myi chad par brtson ba* [←] / byang chub

Kanjur: 'jigs med gang gis mdo 'di bzung ba yi¹⁶⁵ // de yi¹⁶⁶ yon tan dag ni de 'drar 'gyur // (= 21) ^{(T.170b4) (KN.360)} rTag par rgyun *du*¹⁶⁷ brtson pa¹⁶⁸ gzhan yang / byang chub

(kha 96a6) sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po [de] // chos *gyi gzhung* 'di 'dzind tam // rab *du stond* tam // kha ton byed dam / [] *bris na*¹⁶⁹ [] yon tan¹⁷⁰ brgyad brgya dang ldan zhing //

Kanjur: *sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po chos kyi rnam grangs* 'di 'dzin tam / rab tu bstan¹⁷¹

¹⁵⁴ 'gago : i.e. 'gag go.

¹⁵⁵ de yi : Ph. de'i (= 'Tib. Kho.).

¹⁵⁶ dbang po gsal zbing : ≠ KN. 359.12. *ṣaḍindriya*, = D1, D2, D3. *paṭv-indriya*, O. *ṣaṭukēndriya* (read *paṭukē*); cf. Kṛṣh. 200.

¹⁵⁷ de yang : cf. Tib. Kanj. *de tsam mo*; KN. 359.12. *tāvat*.

¹⁵⁸ rang bzbin : cf. Tib. Kanj. *tha mak*; KN. 359.12. *prākṛtaka-*.

¹⁵⁹ da rung : cf. Tib. Kanj. *re shig*; KN. 359.13. *tāva*.

¹⁶⁰ phrul gyi la : cf. Tib. Kanj. *lba yi la*; KN. 359.13. *dīvyasmi*.

¹⁶¹ brtson : cf. Tib. Kanj. 'bad; KN. 359.13. *yatna-*.

¹⁶² rang bzbin gyi : cf. Tib. Kanj. *tha mak*; KN. 359.13. *prakṛtya*.

¹⁶³ re shig : = J, S, B, Pk, C; the other Kanjurs read *re zbig* instead.

¹⁶⁴ rTag du rgyun myi chad par brtson pa : cf. Tib. Kanj. *rTag par rgyun du brtson pa*; KN. 360.1. *Satatasamitābbiyukta*. Sec n. 51.

¹⁶⁵ ba yi : = S; Ph. *ba'i*; the other Kanjurs read *ba ni* instead.

¹⁶⁶ yi : Pk. *mi* (s.c.).

¹⁶⁷ du : T. MS., Ph, Pk, C. *tu* (w.r.).

¹⁶⁸ pa : J, B, Pk, C, L. om. (w.r.).

¹⁶⁹ bris na : cf. Tib. Kanj. *yi ger 'dri ba de*; KN. 360.2. *likbito*.

¹⁷⁰ yon tan : = KN. 360.2. *guṇa-*; O. (*gbrāṇa-guṇa-*) = Tib. Kanj. *sna'i yon tan*.

¹⁷¹ bstan : = S; the other Kanjurs read *ston* instead (= Tib. Kho. *stond*).

*tam / kha ton byed dam / yi ger 'dri¹⁷² ba de¹⁷³ / sna'i yon tan^(T.170b5) brgyad brgya
dang ldan zhing /*

(kha 96a7) *sna'i dbang po yongsu dag par 'gyur ro / de^[...] yongsu dag pa'i / [...sna'i
dbang po₁ des₁ // stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i / 'jig rten gyi kham sgyi /
phyi nang gi dri rnam*

Kanjur: *sna'i dbang po yongsu dag par 'gyur te / de'i¹⁷⁴ sna'i dbang po yongsu dag pa des
/ stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i 'jig rten gyi kham sgyi¹⁷⁵ phyi nang gi dri rnam*

(kha 96a8) ¹⁷⁶+ + ng [p]o yod +¹⁷⁷ de₁ // 'di l(ta) s[t]e_[...] / yidu¹⁷⁸ 'ong ba'i dri 'am / [...
rul pa'i dri dang₁ / ||¹⁷⁹ men tog¹⁸⁰ rnam pa tha dad pa'i dri de₁ 'di lta ste /
¹⁸¹sbyi mo'i men tog dang / ma [li ka] ..

Kanjur: ^(T.170b6) *pa mang po yod pa 'di lta ste / rul ba'i dri 'am / yid du¹⁸² 'ong ba'i dri 'am /
¹⁸³yid du¹⁸⁴ mi 'ong ba'i dri 'am / me tog rnam pa tha dad pa'i dri 'di lta ste / sna
ma'i me tog dang / ma li ka dang /*

(kha 96b1) (tsa)m pa ka [dang] / ¹⁸⁵pa ta la '[i] dri || yang tshor || // chu las skyes pa'i
men tog rnam pa mang po'i / / dri || yang tsho[r]d t[e] / d(e)₁ '[d](i) lta st(e) /
aud pa la dang / pad ma dang / ku mu da¹⁸⁶ da[ng] / pu '(da)

Kanjur (KN.360.5; T. 170b6; J. 147b4; S. 200b2; Ph. 343b7; B. 182a5; Pk. 153b5;
N. 206b6; D. 134a4; C. 157b8; L. 211b7) ¹⁸⁷tsam^(T.170b7) pa ka dang / skya snar

¹⁷² 'dri : Ph. bri (= Tib. Kho.bris).

¹⁷³ de : B. ste (w.r.).

¹⁷⁴ de'i : Ph. C. de (s.e.).

¹⁷⁵ kyi : Ph. gyi (= Tib. Kho.).

¹⁷⁶ + + ng [p]o : read: pa mang po (= Tib. Kanj.)?

¹⁷⁷ yod + : read: yod pa (= Tib. Kanj.)?

¹⁷⁸ yidu : i.e. yid du.

¹⁷⁹ Cf. Tib. Kanj. yid du mi 'ong ba'i dri 'am, = O. amanaujñagandbā; KN. 360.4.-.

¹⁸⁰ men tog : Tib. Kanj. me tog. Cf. Bhikkhu Pāsādika, "Tib J 380, a Dunhuang manuscript Fragment of the Sūtrasamuccaya," in: *Bauddhavidyāsudbākarāḥ : Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. Petra Kieffer-Pulz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Swistal-Odendorf : Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 1997 (Indica et Tibetica, Bd. 30), p. 489, n. 11.

¹⁸¹ sbyi mo'i men tog : Tib. Kanj. sna ma'i me tog; KN. 360.5. jārika-.

¹⁸² du : J. tu.

¹⁸³ yid du mi 'ong ba'i dri 'am / : B. om. (s.e.).

¹⁸⁴ du : J. tu.

¹⁸⁵ pa ta la : cf. Tib. Kanj. skya snar; KN. 360.5. -pāṭala-.

¹⁸⁶ ku mu da : = KN. 360.6. -kumuda-; Tib. Kanj. ku mu ta.

¹⁸⁷ tsam pa ka : N, L. tsam-pa ka; Ph. om. (s.e.).

*gyi dri*¹⁸⁸ *rnams kyang tshor ro // chu las skyes pa'i me tog rnam pa mang po'i dri*
*rnams kyang tshor te / 'di lta ste /*¹⁸⁹*aut-pa la dang /*¹⁹⁰*pad ma dang / ku mu ta*¹⁹¹
*dang*¹⁹²*pad ma dkar* (T.170b8) *po*

(kha 96b2) *ri ka'i dri* || *yang tshor* || // *men tog dang 'bras bu'i shing rnam pa mang*
po'i men tog dang / 'bras bu'i dri || *yang tshor ro* // 'di lta ste / *tsan 'dan dang /*
ta ma la'i mdab

Kanjur: *rnams kyi dri dag kyang tshor ro // me tog dang 'bras bu'i shing rnam pa mang*
*po'i me tog dang / 'bras bu'i dri rnams kyang tshor te / 'di lta ste /*¹⁹³*tsan dan dang*
ta ma la'i 'dab

(kha 96b3) *ma dang / da ga ra*¹⁹⁴ *dang / a ga ru'i dri zhim po* || *'ang tshor ro* // [·...]
rnam pa tha dad pa'i [·...dri] [sna] *brgya stong / gnas gchig na 'dug pa thams*
chad || *tshor ro // thams chad gyang shes* /

Kanjur: *ma dang /* (T.171a1) *rgya spos dang / a ga ru'i dri zhim po rnams kyang tshor ro*¹⁹⁵ //
*spos rnam pa tha dad*¹⁹⁶ *pa brgya stong gnas gcig na 'dug pa thams cad kyang tshor*
*ro //*¹⁹⁷*thams cad kyang shes* (T.171a2) *so //*

(kha 96b4) *sems chan gyi dri rnam pa mang po yang tshor te / de* [·] *'di lta ste / ban*
*glang*¹⁹⁸ *dang / rta dang ba lang dang / ra lug dang phyug* ○ *gyi dri* || *yang*
tshor ro // byol song [s]u /

Kanjur: *sems can kyi*¹⁹⁹ *dri rnam pa mang po yang*²⁰⁰ *tshor te / 'di lta ste / glang po*²⁰¹ *che*
*dang / rta dang ba lang*²⁰² *dang / ra lug dang / phyugs kyi dri rnams kyang tshor ro*
// dud 'gro'i skye gnas

¹⁸⁸ *dri* : B. *dre* (s.c.).

¹⁸⁹ *aut-pa la* : = S, B, N, L; J, Pk, D, C. *aud pa la* (= 'Tib. Kho.); Ph. *aud dpal la* (s.c.).

¹⁹⁰ *pad ma* : S, B, N, L. *pad-ma*; the other Kanjurs read *pad ma* instead.

¹⁹¹ *ku mu ta* : 'T. MS, S. *aut-pa la* (w.r.).

¹⁹² *pad ma* : S, B, N, L. *pad-ma*; the other Kanjurs read *pad ma* instead.

¹⁹³ *tsan dan* : N, L. *tsan-dan*.

¹⁹⁴ *da ga ra* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *rgya spos*; KN. 360.7. *-tagara-*

¹⁹⁵ *ro* : 'T. MS, S. om. (w.r.).

¹⁹⁶ *dad* : 'T. MS, S. *dang* (w.r.).

¹⁹⁷ *thams cad kyang shes so* : = D1, D2, D3, Bj, K etc. *sarvāṇi ca vindati*; KN. 360.9.-.

¹⁹⁸ *ban glang* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *glang po che*; KN. 360.9. *basti-* ("elephant"); n. 99, 314.

¹⁹⁹ *kyi* : B, N, D, L. *gyi* (= 'Tib. Kho.); Ph. *kyis* (s.c.); 'T. MS., S. (*sems can*) *thams cad kyi* (w.r.); cf.

KN. 360.9. *sattvānām*.

²⁰⁰ *yang* : N, L. *'ang*.

²⁰¹ *glang po* : J, Pk. *glang bo*.

²⁰² *lang* : S, Ph. *glang* (w.r.).

(kha 96b5) gyurd pa / srog chags rnam pa mang po'i / lus gyi dri yang tshor ro //
 skyes pa dang bud med gyi lus gyi dri yang tshor ro // khye'u dang bu mo
 'i lus

Kanjur: song (T.171a3) ba'i srog chags²⁰³ rnam pa mang po'i lus kyi dri rnam kyang tshor ro
 // skyes pa dang bud med kyi lus kyi²⁰⁴ dri rnam kyang tshor ro // khye'u dang bu
 mo'i lus

(kha 96b6) gyi dri yang tshor ro // [²⁰⁵ ring po na 'dug pa'i,] rtswa [d](ang) kbrad
po²⁰⁶ dang / sman dang nags [²⁰⁷ gyi] dri yang tshor ro // [ya(ng) dag par
 [tsh]or te / dri yang dag par shes mod gyi / dri de dag

Kanjur: kyi dri rnam kyang²⁰⁷ tshor ro // rtswa dang shing gel pa²⁰⁸ dang / sman dang
 (T.171a4) nags thag ring po na 'dug pa'i dri rnam kyang tshor ro // dri yang dag par
tshor te / dri yang dag par shes mod kyi / dri de dag

(kha 96b7) gis myi 'phrogs // de dag gis myi bsad [d]o²⁰⁹ // de 'di na 'dug bzhin du
lha²¹⁰ gyi dri yang tshor ro // de 'di lta ste / pa ri ya tra²¹⁰ dang / ²¹¹ko bi da ra 'i
dri yang tshor ro // ma 'da'

Kanjur: gis mi 'phrogs // de dag gis myos²¹² par mi 'gyur ro // de 'di (T.171a5) na 'dug bzhin
du lha dag gi dri rnam kyang tshor te / 'di lta ste / yongs 'du sa brtol gyi dri
rnam kyang tshor ro // me tog ²¹⁴man da

(kha 96b8) ra dang ma 'du' ra chen po dang // ²¹⁵man 'ju sha [k]a dang / «man 'dzu
sha ka» chen po dang / 'phrul gyi²¹⁶ dri chan gyi²¹⁷ dri yang tshor ro // 'phrul

²⁰³ *chags* : T. MS. om. (s.c.).

²⁰⁴ *lus kyi* : T. MS, S. om. (w.r.); cf. KN. 360.11. -*ātmabbāva*-.

²⁰⁵ *ring po* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *thag ring po*.

²⁰⁶ *kbrad po* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *shing gel pa*; KN. 360.12. -*gulma*-.

²⁰⁷ *kyang* : C. om. (s.c.).

²⁰⁸ *pa* : T. MS., S, Ph. *ba*.

²⁰⁹ *myi bsad [d]o* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *myos par mi 'gyur ro*; KN. 360.13. *na saṃmubyati*.

²¹⁰ *pa ri ya tra* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *yongs 'du sa brtol*; KN. 360.13. *pārijātaka*~; D1, B, K etc. *pāriyātraka*~ (≡ Tib. Kho. *pa ri ya tra*). Cf. also n. 213, 335; ItS. 104, 280.

²¹¹ *ko bi da ra 'i* : = KN. 360.14. *kovidārasya*; Tib. Kanj. om. (w.r.).

²¹² *myos* : Pk. *mos* (s.c.).

²¹³ *yongs 'du sa brtol* : T. MS., S. *yongs 'du [dang /] sa brtol* (w.r.); cf. KN. 360.13. *pārijātaka*~; D1, B, K etc. *pāriyātraka*~ (≡ Tib. Kho. *pa ri ya tra*). Cf. n. 210, 335; ItS. 104, 280.

²¹⁴ *man da ra ba* : = S; Ph. *med dā ra ba* (s.c.); J, B, Pk, C, D. *man dā ra*; N, L. *man-da ra*; cf. Tib. Kho. *ma 'da' ra*; KN. 360.14. *māndāra*va-.

²¹⁵ *man 'ju* : s.c. for *man 'dzu*.

²¹⁶ *'phrul gyi* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *lba'i*; KN. 360.14. *dirya*~

²¹⁷ *dri chan gyi* : i.e. *dri can gyi*; Tib. Kanj.-; KN. 360.14. (*diryānām*) *puṣpānām* (*gandbān gbrāyati*);

gyi dri rnam pa tha dad pa /²¹⁸ a ga ru'i phye ma dang /
 Kanjur: *ra ba dang* ²¹⁹*man da ra ba chen po dang* / ²²⁰*many dzu sha ka dang* / (T.171a6)
²²¹*many dzu sha ka chen po rnams kyi lha'i* (KN.361) *dri rnams kyang tshor ro // lha'i*
a ga ru'i phye ma dang /

(kha 97a1) རྩོམ་པ་ཐ་དཔ་པ་འ་ག་ལུ་ཤི་མ་དང་།
 pa tha dad pa / ₁sna₁ brgya stong gi dri ₁na₁ རྩོམ་པ་ཐ་དཔ་པ་འ་ག་ལུ་ཤི་མ་དང་།
 yang shes so // lha'i *sras po* rnams,

Kanjur (KN.361.1; T. 171a6; J. 148a2; S. 201a3; Ph. 344a7; B. 182b4; **Pk. 154a4; N.**
 207a7; D. 134b2; C. 158a7; L. 212b1): ²²²*tsan dan gyi* ²²³*phye ma'i dri rnams*
*kyang tshor ro // lha'i me tog rnam pa tha dad pa brgya stong gi dri dag*²²⁴ *kyang*
 (T.171a7) *tshor ro // de dag gi ming*²²⁵ *rnams kyang shes so // lha'i bu*

(kha 97a2) གཡི་ལུ་གཡི་དྲི་། རྩོམ་པ་ཐ་དཔ་པ་འ་ག་ལུ་ཤི་མ་དང་།
 lus gyi dri yang tshor རྩོམ་པ་ཐ་དཔ་པ་འ་ག་ལུ་ཤི་མ་དང་།
 / ₁de₁ ste₁ ²²⁷rNam par rgyal ba'i khang pa na / rtse *ba*
dang dga' ba dang / yongsu,

Kanjur: *'i lus kyi dri rnams kyang tshor te / 'di lta ste / lha'i dbang po brGya byin gyi lus*
*kyi dri yang*²²⁸ *tshor ro*²²⁹ // rNam par rgyal ba'i ²³⁰*khang pa na* (T.171a8) *rtse dga'*
²³¹*zbing dga' mgur*²³²

D1, K. (*divyānāṃ*) *gandbānām* (*gandbān ghrāyati*) (= Tib. Kho.).

²¹⁸ *dri rnam pa tha dad pa* : Tib. Kanj.-; KN. 361.1.-.

²¹⁹ *man da ra ba* : = S; Ph. *man 'da' ra ba*; J, B, Pk, C, D. *man dā ra*; N, L. *man-da ra*; cf. Tib.
 Kho. *ma 'da' ra*; KN. 360.14. -*māndārava*.-

²²⁰ *many dzu sha ka* : Ph. om. (s.c.); the other Kanjurs, incl. S, read *many-dzu sha ka* instead.

²²¹ *many dzu sha ka* : Ph. *man dzu sha ka* (≠ Tib. Kho. *man 'dzu sha ka*); the other Kanjurs, incl. S,
 read *many-dzu sha ka* instead.

²²² *tsan dan* : Ph. *tsan dān* (s.c.); N, L. *tsan-dan*.

²²³ *phye ma'i* : = S (= Tib. Kho.); Ph. *phyi ma dag gis* (s.c.); the other Kanjurs read *phye ma dag gi*
 instead. Cf. KN. 361.1. -*cūṇānāṃ*.

²²⁴ *dag* : Ph. *rnams*.

²²⁵ *ming* : B. *mi* (s.c.).

²²⁶ *tshoro* : i.e. *tshor ro*.

²²⁷ *de ste* : cf. KN. 361.4. *yadī vā*.

²²⁸ *yang* : T. MS., S. *rnams kyang* (w.r.?). N, L. 'ang.

²²⁹ *ro* : S. om. (s.c.).

²³⁰ *khang pa na* : = S (= Tib. Kho.); Ph. *khang pa rna* (s.c.); J, B, Pk, N, C, L. *khang bzang na*, D.
khang bzangs na; KN. 361.4. *prāsāde*.

²³¹ *zbing dga'* : T. MS. om. (s.c.); Ph. «*zbing dga'*».

²³² *mgur* : T. MS, S. *dgur* (w.r.?).

(kha 97a3) spyod dam // |de ste|^{233 234} Chos [r]ab lha'i 'khor²³⁵ na / Sum chu rtsa gsum
pa'i lha rnam la chos ston tam / |de ste|²³⁶ rtse || ba'i phyir / bskyed mos tshal
gyi gnasu²³⁷ byung ba de

Kanjur: spyod pa 'am / Chos bzang²³⁸ lha'i 'mdun sa na Sum cu²⁴⁰ rtsa gsum pa'i lha
rnam la²⁴¹ chos ston pa 'am / rtse dga'²⁴² ba'i phyir skyed mos tshal gyi sar byung ba
de

(kha 97a4) 'ang shes so // lha'i sras po gzhan rnam gyi so so'i lus gyi dri || yang tshor
ro // lha'i bu mo rnam dang / lha'i m'na' ma rnam gyi lus gyi dri || tshor
ro //

Kanjur: yang²⁴⁴ shes so // lha'i bu (T.171b1) gzhan rnam kyi so so'i lus kyi dri rnam kyang
tshor ro // lha'i bu mo rnam²⁴⁵ dang / lha'i chung ma rnam kyi lus kyi dri rnam
kyang tshor ro //

(kha 97a5) lha'i khye'u rnam gyi lus gyi dri || yang tshor ro // lha'i bu mo rnam
gyi lus gyi dri || yang tshor mod gyi / dri de [da]Og || gyang myi 'phrogs ste / ||²⁴⁶
²⁴⁷de lta bu'i gzbu[ng]

Kanjur: lha gzhan nu rnam kyi lus kyi dri rnam kyang tshor ro // (T.171b2) lha gzhan nu
ma²⁴⁸ rnam kyi lus kyi dri rnam kyang²⁴⁹ tshor te²⁵⁰ / dri de dag gis²⁵¹ kyang mi
'phrogs shing myos par yang mi 'gyur ro // ruam grangs 'dis²⁵²

²³³ de ste : cf. KN. 361.4. yadi vā.

²³⁴ Chos rab : cf. Tib. Kanj. Chos bzang; KN. 361.4. Sudharmā~.

²³⁵ 'khor : cf. Tib. Kanj. mdun sa; KN. 361.4. -sabbā~.

²³⁶ de ste : cf. KN. 361.5. yadi vā.

²³⁷ gnasu : i.e. gnas su.

²³⁸ bzang : = S, N, L; the other Kanjurs read bzangs instead.

²³⁹ mdun sa : S, N, D, L. 'dun sa (w.r.).

²⁴⁰ cu : J, Ph, Pk, bcu.

²⁴¹ la : J, B, Pk, N, C. om.

²⁴² dga' : J, Ph, B, Pk, C. om. (= Tib. Kho.).

²⁴³ mna' ma : Tib. Kanj. chung ma; KN. 361.6. -vadbā~.

²⁴⁴ yang : Ph, N, L. 'ang (= Tib. Kho.).

²⁴⁵ rnam : T. MS., S. om. (w.r.).

²⁴⁶ - : = KN. 361.8.; cf. Tib. Kanj. myos par yang mi 'gyur ro = O. na ca saṃmubyati (!).

²⁴⁷ de lta bu'i gzbu[ng] du : cf. Tib. Kanj. ruam grangs 'dis; KN. 361.8. aṇena paryāyeṇa.

²⁴⁸ ma : C. om. (s.e.).

²⁴⁹ kyang : B. kying (s.e.).

²⁵⁰ te : = S, Ph, B, D, C, L; J, Pk, N. ro.

²⁵¹ gis : T. MS. gi (s.e.).

²⁵² 'dis : T. MS. 'dris (s.e.).

(kha 97a6) *du* srid pa'i rts(e) *mor* [r̥.̥] skyes pa'i [r̥.̥] bar du / sems *chan* || *gyi* lus *gyi* dri
|| *yang* tshor ro // Tshangs ris [gnam] *gyi* lha'i *sras po* rnam²⁵³ dang / Tshangs ||
chen || *gyi* lus *gyi* dri || *yang*

Kanjur: *srid pa'i rtse mo'i bar du skyes pa'i sems can de*²⁵³ *dag* (T.171b4) *gi*²⁵⁴ *lus kyi dri rnam*
kyang tshor ro // Tshangs ris *kyi lha'i bu rnam²⁵⁵ dang Tshangs pa chen po*²⁵⁵ *dag gi*
lus kyi dri rnam²⁵⁶ kyang

(kha 97a7) tshor ro // *de lta bu'i gzhung du* lha'i ris thams *chad gyi* lus *gyi* dri || *yang*
tshor ro // nyan thos dang / rang sangs rgyas dang / byang chub sems dpa'
dang / de bzhin gshegs

Kanjur: *tshor ro* // *rnam grangs 'dis lha'i ris thams cad kyi lus kyi dri rnam²⁵⁷ kyang tshor*
(T.171b4) *ro* // nyan thos dang / rang sangs rgyas dang / byang chub sems dpa' dang /
de bzhin gshegs

(kha 97a8) pa||'i sku'i dri || *yang* tshor ro // de bzhin gshegs *pa' rnam²⁵⁸ gyi* gdan *gyi* dri
|| *yang* tshor ro // de bzhin gshegs *pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par*

Kanjur: *pa dag gi sku'i dri rnam²⁵⁹ kyang tshor ro* // de bzhin gshegs *pa*²⁵⁷ *dag gi gdan gyi*
dri rnam²⁶⁰ kyang (T.171b5) *tshor ro* // de bzhin gshegs *pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par*

(kha 97b1) [rdzo]gs pa[i] sangs rgyas de dag gang na bzhugs pa de 'ang / rab *du* shes
so // || sna'i dbang p[o] d(e) yang dr[i] rnam pa / mang po de dang de dag
*gy(i)s my(i) 'phr[o]gste*²⁵⁸ /

Kanjur (KN.361.12; T. 171b5; J. 148a8; S. 201b4; Ph. 344b6; B. 183a4; Pk. 154b2;
N. 208a1; D. 134b7; C. 158b6; L. 213a2): *rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas de dag gang*
*na bzhugs pa de yang*²⁵⁹ *rab tu*²⁶⁰ *shes so* // de'i sna'i dbang po de *yang*²⁶¹ *dri rnam pa*
*mang po*²⁶² *de dang de dag gis* (T.171b6) *mi 'phrogs te* /

(kha 97b2) nyams pa 'am gnod par 'gyur *ba* yang myed do / de 'dod na dri de dang /
de dag gzhan || la 'ang²⁶³ [lung] ston *mod gyi* / || dran *ba* nyams par 'gyur ba

²⁵³ *de* : = S, D, L; J, Ph, B, Pk, N, C. om.

²⁵⁴ *gi* : S, Ph. *gis* (s.c.).

²⁵⁵ *dag gi* : = S; Ph. *dag gis* (s.c.); the other Kanjurs read *rnam²⁵⁶ kyi* instead.

²⁵⁶ *pa dag gi* : Ph. *pa'i* (= Tib. Kho.).

²⁵⁷ *dag gi* : Ph. *rnam²⁵⁸ kyi dag gis* ! (cf. Tib. Kho. *rnam²⁵⁹ gyi*).

²⁵⁸ *'phr(o)gste* : i.e. *'phrogs te*.

²⁵⁹ *yang* : N, L. 'ang (= Tib. Kho.).

²⁶⁰ *rab tu* : Pk. *rab du* (= Tib. Kho.).

²⁶¹ *yang* : N, L. 'ang.

²⁶² *de dang de dag* : T. MS., C. *dang / de dag* (w.r.; ≠ S); cf. KN. 361.13. *tais tais*.

²⁶³ *lung ston mod gyi* : cf. KN. 361.14. *vyākāroti*; cf. Tib. Kanj. *ston te*.

myed do //

Kanjur: *nyams pa 'am / gnod par 'gyur pa yang²⁶⁴ med do // de 'dod na dri de dang de dag²⁶⁵ gzhan dag la yang²⁶⁶ ston te / de dran pa nyams par 'gyur ba med do //*

(kha 97b3) de nas bcom ldan 'das gyis de'i tshe tshigsu *bchad* pa 'di || *gsungso*²⁶⁷ // རྩུང་སྤྱོད་ // de'i sna'i dbang po rnam dag 'gyur / རྩུང་སྤྱོད་ des ni rnam pa mang po'i dri

Kanjur: ^(KN.362) *de nas bcom ldan 'das kyis* ^(T.171b7) *de'i tshe tshigs su bchad pa 'di dag bka' stsal to //* ²⁶⁸ *de yi* ²⁶⁹ *sna yi dbang po rnam dag 'gyur // gang rnam 'jig rten khams 'di thams cad na // dri zhim dri mi zhim pa ci yod pa // des ni rnam pa mang* ^(T.171b8) *po'i dri*

(kha 97b4) yang tshor // རྩུང་གྲགས་ཀྱི་རྩེ་རྩེ་མཆོད་ཀྱི་འཕྲུལ་མཆོད་ཀྱི་འཕྲུལ་ རྩུང་གྲགས་ཀྱི་རྩེ་རྩེ་མཆོད་ཀྱི་འཕྲུལ་མཆོད་ཀྱི་འཕྲུལ་ dri myi zhim *ba ji* yod pa / རྩུང་གྲགས་ཀྱི་རྩེ་རྩེ་མཆོད་ཀྱི་འཕྲུལ་མཆོད་ཀྱི་འཕྲུལ་ dri // རྩུང་གྲགས་ཀྱི་རྩེ་རྩེ་མཆོད་ཀྱི་འཕྲུལ་མཆོད་ཀྱི་འཕྲུལ་

Kanjur: yang tshor // (= 22) *sna ma'i me tog dri dang ma li ka /* ²⁷² *tsan dan* ²⁷³ *ta ma la yi*

(kha 97b5) *mdab* ma || རྩུང་མཆོད་ཀྱི་རྩེ་རྩེ་མཆོད་ཀྱི་འཕྲུལ་མཆོད་ཀྱི་འཕྲུལ་ / *ta ga ru* || རྩུང་མཆོད་ཀྱི་རྩེ་རྩེ་མཆོད་ཀྱི་འཕྲུལ་མཆོད་ཀྱི་འཕྲུལ་ dri // *men tog* 'bras bu sna mang de dag dang / རྩུང་མཆོད་ཀྱི་རྩེ་རྩེ་མཆོད་ཀྱི་འཕྲུལ་མཆོད་ཀྱི་འཕྲུལ་ rnam gyi dri yang de bzhin shes // རྩུང་མཆོད་ཀྱི་རྩེ་རྩེ་མཆོད་ཀྱི་འཕྲུལ་མཆོད་ཀྱི་འཕྲུལ་ skyes

Kanjur: *'dab ma dang // rgya spos dag dang a ga* ²⁷⁴ *ru yi dri // me tog 'bras bu sna mang de dag dang // (= 23) skyes*

(kha 97b6) pa bud med ring na 'dug pa dang // khye'u rnam dang ni bu mo de *dagi*²⁷⁵ // རྩུང་གྲགས་ཀྱི་རྩེ་རྩེ་མཆོད་ཀྱི་འཕྲུལ་མཆོད་ཀྱི་འཕྲུལ་ des ni dri las shes // ²⁷⁶ *khör lo* || rgyal po rnam gyang de'i shes //

Kanjur: *pa bud med ring na* ^(T.172a1) *'dug pa dang // khye'u rnam dang ni bu mo de dag*

²⁶⁴ *yang* : N, L. 'ang.

²⁶⁵ *dag* : T. MS., S. om. (w.r.).

²⁶⁶ *yang* : N, L. 'ang (= Tib. Kho.).

²⁶⁷ *gsungso* : i.e. *gsungs so*.

²⁶⁸ *de yi* : Ph. *de'i* (= Tib. Kho.).

²⁶⁹ *sna yi* : Ph, B, Pk, C. *sna'i* (= Tib. Kho.).

²⁷⁰ *dbyi mo* : "flax"; cf. Tib. Kanj. *sna ma* ("Jasminum grandiflorum") = KN. 362.4. *jāti*.

²⁷¹ *men tog* : the character "n" was erased. For the archaic form *men tog*, see n. 180.

²⁷² *tsan dan* : N, L. *tsan-dan*.

²⁷³ *ta ma la yi 'dab ma* : T. MS. *ta <ma> la'i mdab ma*, S. *ta ma la'i mdab ma* (w.r.?; = Tib. Kho.); Ph. *ta ma la'i 'dab ma*; KN. 362.4. *tamāla-patra*~.

²⁷⁴ *ru yi* : Ph. *ru'i* (= Tib. Kho.).

²⁷⁵ *dagi* : i.e. *dag gi*.

²⁷⁶ *'khör lo rgyal po* : Tib. Kanj. *'khor los sgyur rgyal*; KN. 362.8. *rājan*~ ... *cakravartin*~.

dang // sems can rnam kyī dri yang de bzhin shes // de yi gnas kyang des ni dri las shes // (= 24) 'khor los sgyur²⁷⁷ rgyal^(T.172a2) rnam kyang de yis shes //

(kha 97b7) stobs *gyi* 'khor *lo skor* dang ²⁷⁸*kor gyi rgyal* || // ²⁷⁹*de'i* ²⁸⁰*btsun mo thams chad* dri las de *'is* shes // *yongsu* longs spyod rin *cen* rnam

Kanjur: stobs *kyi*²⁸¹ 'khor los sgyur²⁸² dang rgyal phran dang // de bzhin kbye'u dang bu mo *de*²⁸³ dag dang // chung ma'i 'khor kun dri las de yis shes // (= 25) yongs su *longs*²⁸⁴ spyod rin chen *rnam*²⁸⁵

(kha 97b8) mang *po* // sba ba *sa la* *'gag na* 'dug *pa* dang // bud med rin po cher gyurd de dag *gyang* // byang chub sems dpa' de *'is* dri las shes // de dag rnam *gyi*

Kanjur: ^(T.172a3) mang dang // ²⁸⁶*sba ba gang dag sa*²⁸⁷ la 'dug rnam dang // bud med rin po cher gyur de dag kyang // byang chub sems dpa' de yis dri las shes // (= 26) de dag rnam kyī

(kha 98a1) ལྷོག་པ་ // *phyang phrul*²⁸⁸ *ji* yod pa // lus la btags pa rnam pa sna tshogs gzugs // gos dang phreng ba byug pa spos rnam *gyang* // dri las byang chub sems dpa' de *'is* shes // *gnas*²⁸⁹

Kanjur (KN.362.12; T. 172a3; J. 148b5; S. 202a4; Ph. 345a6; B. 183b3; Pk. 154b8; N. 208b1; D. 135a5; C. 159a4; L. 213b2): rgyan rnam ci yod pa // lus la ^(T.172a4) btags²⁹⁰ pa rnam pa sna tshogs gzugs // gos dang phreng ba byug pa spos rnam kyang // dri las byang chub sems dpa' de yis shes // (= 27) de bzhin 'greng

²⁷⁷ sgyur : J, C, L. bsgyur.

²⁷⁸ 'kor gyi rgyal : s.e. for 'khor gyi rgyal; cf. Tib. Kanj. rgyal phran; KN. 362.8. rājan~ ... maṇḍalin~.

²⁷⁹ de'i : = KN. 362.9. teṣāṇi; Tib. Kanj.-.

²⁸⁰ btsun mo thams chad : cf. Tib. Kanj. chung ma'i 'khor kun; KN. 362.9. antaḥpura sarva.

²⁸¹ kyī : T. MS., S. kyis (s.e.).

²⁸² sgyur : J, C, L. bsgyur; Ph. om. (s.e.).

²⁸³ de : T. MS. om. (s.e.).

²⁸⁴ longs : T. MS. om. (s.e.).

²⁸⁵ rnam : T. MS. rnam (s.e.).

²⁸⁶ sba ba : ≠ KN. 362.10. kupyāni; = D2, K etc. gopyāni, D1. gobyāni; T. MS., S. spa ba (s.e.).

²⁸⁷ sa : T. MS. la (s.e.).

²⁸⁸ phyang phrul : cf. Tib. Kanj. rgyan rnam; KN. 362.12. ābharaṇā.

²⁸⁹ gnas : cf. Tib. Kanj. 'greng; KN. 362.14. sthita~.

²⁹⁰ btags : ≠ KN. 362.12. āmukta (= D1, D2 etc.); = C6, B, P1, 2, N1, N2 etc. ābaddha. J, C. btab (s.e.).

(kha 98a2) *shing* 'dug dang nyal ba'ang [r̥...de bzhin,] *te* // rtseḍ mo «dga' ba» ²⁹¹*phrul*
stobs thams *chad gyang* // [r̥...] brtan *ba* de'i sna'i stobs *gyis* shes // [r̥...mdo sde
dam pa 'di ni gang 'dzind pa //,] spos mchog

Kanjur: *dang* 'dug dang nyal ba dang // rtseḍ mo dga' ba (T.172a5) *mtbu stobs thams cad*
kyang // mdo sde dam pa 'di ni ²⁹²*gang* 'dzin pa // brtan pa de yi ²⁹³*sna yi stobs*
kyis ²⁹⁴*shes* // (= 28) (KN.364) *spos mchog*

(kha 98a3) [r̥...mar ²⁹⁵*gyi* dri yang de bzhin te // *men tog* 'bras bu rnam pa mang po [r̥...dri
// [r̥...] ²⁹⁶*ldan chig* 'dug nas de bzhin shes shing tshor // [r̥...²⁹⁷*di zhes bya ba yul na*
dri 'di yod //,] ri

Kanjur: 'bru mar dri yang de bzhin te // me tog 'bras bu rnam pa mang po'i dri ²⁹⁸ // (T.172a6)
dri 'di ga ge mo na yod ces *kyang* ²⁹⁹ // 'dug bzhin du ni cig *char* ³⁰⁰*shes shing tshor* //
(= 29) ri

(kha 98a4) [r̥...nams gang] *gi* ³⁰¹*phug* [nang] de dag na // can dan me{{n}} *tho* O g rgyas
ma[ng] de na [y]od [r̥...] // [r̥...de dag kun na...] sems *chan gag* [r̥...] O [r̥...] gnas pa [r̥...]
mkhas *pas* de dag thams

Kanjur: yi *phrag ni rnam pa sna tshogs na* // ³⁰²*tsan dan me tog rgyas mang gang yod dang*
// sems can gang dag de na gnas pa (T.172a7) *yang* // mkhas ³⁰³*des de dag thams*

(kha 98a5) *chad* dri las shes // khor yug [de'i] ngos la [r̥...] gnas pa O dang // rgya mtsho
[r̥...] ³⁰⁴*mching rnam dbus na* [r̥...] 'khod pa dang // sa'i dbus na sems *chan* gang gnas
pa // mkhas

Kanjur: *cad dri las* ³⁰⁵*shes* // (= 30) ³⁰⁶*khor yug ngos la gang dag gnas pa dang* // rgya ³⁰⁷

²⁹¹ *phrul stobs* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *mtbu stobs*; KN. 362.14. *rddbi-bala-*.

²⁹² *ni* : S. *dag* (s.c.).

²⁹³ *sna yi* : Ph. *sna'i* (= Tib. Kho.).

²⁹⁴ *kyis* : Ph. B. *kyi* (s.c.).

²⁹⁵ *mar* : cf. Tib. Kanj. 'bru mar; KN. 363.1. -*taila-*.

²⁹⁶ *ldan chig 'dug nas de bzhin* : cf. Tib. Kanj. 'dug bzhin du ni cig *char*; KN. 363.2. *sakrt-stbita-*.

²⁹⁷ 'di zhes bya ba yul na dri 'di yod : cf. Tib. Kanj. dri 'di ga ge mo na yod ces *kyang*; KN. 363.2. *amukasmī deśasmī inasmī gandhān*.

²⁹⁸ *dri* : S. 'di (s.c.).

²⁹⁹ *kyang* : S, Ph. *bya* (s.c.).

³⁰⁰ *char* : = S; the other Kanjurs read *car* instead.

³⁰¹ *phug nang* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *phrag*; KN. 363.3. *vivaraṅtara-*.

³⁰² *tsan dan* : N, L. *tsan-dan*.

³⁰³ *mkhas* : B. 'khas (s.c.); Pk. *khas* (s.c.).

³⁰⁴ *mching rnam dbus na* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *dbus na*; KN. 363.5. *madbye*.

³⁰⁵ *las* : C. *la* (s.c.).

³⁰⁶ *khor yug* : B. {{ }} *khor yug*; J, Ph, Pk, C. 'khor yug.

mtsho'i dbus na ³⁰⁸*gang dag 'khod pa* ³⁰⁹*dang // sa yi dbus na sems can gang gnas pa*
// mkbas

(kha 98a6) *pa des ni thams chad dri las shes // lha dang lha ma yin gyang de bzhin*
shes // ^[*→*] *lha ma yin* ^[gyi] *bu mo* ^[] ^[*→*] *de 'is* ^[] *shes // lha ma yin gyi rtsed mo*
dga' ba ^[] *shes // de'i sna'i* ^[] *mthu* ³¹⁰

Kanjur: *pa* ^(T.172a8) *des ni thams cad dri las shes // (= 31) lha dang lha ma yin kyang* ³¹¹ *de*
bzhin shes // des ni lha min bu mo dag kyang shes // lha ma yin gyi rtsed mo dga'
ba'ang shes // ³¹² *de yi sna yi* ³¹³ *dbang po'i mthu*

(kha 98a7) *ni* ^[] *'di 'dra'o* ^[] *// nags khrod de na rkang bzhi gang yod pa // seng ge stag*
dang ^[] ³¹⁴ *ban glang klu 'brug* ^[] *dang // de na ma he ba lang ba men rnams // de*
dag gnas kun de'i sna'is

Kanjur: *de 'dra // (= 32) nags* ^(T.172b1) *khrod dag na rkang bzhi gang yod pa // seng ge stag*
dang de bzhin glang chen mchog // de na ma he ba lang ba men rnams // de dag
gnas pa ³¹⁵ *de yi sna yis*

(kha 98a8) *shes // bud med gang gi* ³¹⁶ *rum na bu yod pa* ^[] *// khye'u 'am {/} 'on te bu*
mo gag yin pa // rum na 'chang ba shin du ngal ba ^[] *lus // de la gang yod de'is*
dri las she[s //]

Kanjur: *shes // (= 33) bud med gang dag sbrum mar* ³¹⁷ *gyur pa* ^(T.172b2) *dang // khye'u 'am*
'on te bu mo gang yin pa // rum na 'chang ba shin tu ³¹⁸ *ngal ba'i lus // de la gang*
yod de yis ³¹⁹ *dri las shes // (= 34)*

(kha 98b1) *sems chan mngal du zhugs pa 'ang de 'is shes* ^[] *// rnam par 'jig pa* ^[] *chos*
gyang de'is shes // bud med 'di ni sdug bsngal rnams dang bral // bsod nams
ldan ba ^[] *bu ni 'byung*

³⁰⁷ *rgya* : B. *brgya* (s.c.).

³⁰⁸ *gang dag* : = S, D, L; = KN. 363.5. *ye*; J, B, Pk, N, C. *yang dag* (s.c.).

³⁰⁹ *pa* : J. *ba*.

³¹⁰ *mthu* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *dbang po'i mthu*; KN. 363.8. *bala~*.

³¹¹ *kyang* : = S (= 'Tib. Kho. *gyang*); Ph. *dang* (w.r.); the other Kanjurs read *yang* instead.

³¹² *de yi* : S, Ph. *de'i* (= 'Tib. Kho.).

³¹³ *sna yi* : 'T. MS. *sna yi* [*sna yā*] (s.c.); Ph. *sna'i* (= 'Tib. Kho.).

³¹⁴ *ban glang klu 'brug* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *glang chen mchog*; KN. 363.9. *basti-nāga~*. For *ban glang* = Skt. *bastin* ("elephant"), see n. 99, 198.

³¹⁵ *de yi* : Ph. *de'i* (= 'Tib. Kho.).

³¹⁶ *rum na bu yod pa* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *sbrum mar gyur pa*; KN. 363.11. *gurṣiṇakā~*.

³¹⁷ *sbrum mar* : J, B, C. *sbrum bar*; Pk. *sbrum par*.

³¹⁸ *shin tu* : J, Pk. *shin du* (= 'Tib. Kho.).

³¹⁹ *de yis* : = S; the other Kanjurs read *de yi* instead (s.c.); cf. KN. 363.12. *so* (*jānati*).

Kanjur (KN.363.13; T. 172b2; J. 149a3; S. 202b4; Ph. 345b6; B. 184a2; Pk. 155a6; N. 209a2; D. 135b3; C. 159b3; L. 214a3): *sems can*³²⁰ *mngal du zbugs pa'ang des shes te // rnam par 'jig*³²¹ *pa'i* (T.172b3) *chos kyang de yis shes //* ³²²*bud med 'di*³²³ *ni sdug bsngal rnams dang bral // bsod nams ldan pa'i bu ni 'byung*

(kha 98b2) bar *'gyur*³²⁴ // *skyes bu* || *bsam ba mang po rab du* || *shes* || // ³²⁵*sems pa rkun gyi dri yang* ³²⁶*rab du shes* // 'dod chags || *sdang ba* || *de bzhin 'chab pa dang* // nye bar zhi ba'i *sems gyi*

Kanjur: *bar shes* // (= 35) (KN.364) *skyes bu'i bsam pa mang po*³²⁷ *rab shes te // bsam pa'i dri yang de bzhin de yis tshor* // 'dod chags zhe *sdang de bzhin 'chab pa dang*³²⁸ // nye bar zhi ba'i *sems kyi*³²⁹

(kha 98b3) dri yang tshor // ³³⁰*sa la gag gi gter yod de dag dang* // nor rnams dang ni gse(r) dngul 'gron bu *dang* // lcags *gyi sgrom rnams de bzhin gang ba dag* / dri las byang chub {/}

Kanjur: *dri yang tshor* // (= 36) *sa la gter rnams gang dag yod gyur pa* // nor rnams dang ni gser dngul 'gron (T.172b4) *bu yis* // lcags *kyi sgrom rnams de bzhin gang ba dag* / dri las byang chub

(kha 98b4) *sems dpa' de'is shes* // mu tig nor bu do shal se mo ○ do // rin thang myed pa'i rin chen rnam mang po // [₁'de'is] de da○g thams *chad* || dri las shes // [₂'] rin *tang*³³¹ myed {/}

Kanjur: *sems dpa' de*³³² *yis shes*³³³ // (= 37) *mu tig nor bu do shal se mo do* // rin thang med pa'i rin chen rnam mang po // (T.172b5) *rin thang med*

³²⁰ *sems can* : T. MS., S. *sems can gang dag* (w.r.).

³²¹ *'jig* : T. MS., Ph. *'jigs* (w.r.).

³²² *bud med ... de bzhin de yis tshor* // : In T. MS., these sentences were mistakenly omitted and later inserted in the eighth line.

³²³ *'di* : T. MS., S. *de* (w.r.); KN. 363.14. *iyaṃ*.

³²⁴ *'byung bar 'gyur* : = KN. 363.14. *prasaviṣyate*; ≠ Tib. Kanj. *'byung bar shes*.

³²⁵ *sems pa rkun* : "captivating, charming" (< "a stealer of the mind")? Cf. Tib. Kanj. *bsam pa*; KN. 364.1. *abbiprāya-*.

³²⁶ *rab du shes* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *tshor* = KN. 364.1. *gbrāyate*; O. *jānati* (= Tib. Kho. *shes*).

³²⁷ *po* : = S, Ph (= Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read *por* instead.

³²⁸ *dang* : N, L. *dag* (w.r.).

³²⁹ *kyi* : T. MS., S. *kyis* (w.r.).

³³⁰ *sa la gag gi gter yod de dag dang* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *sa la gter rnams gang dag yod gyur pa*; KN. 364.3. *prthivīya ye cāpi nidhāna santi*.

³³¹ *tang* : s.e. for *thang*.

³³² *de* : S. *'di* (s.e.).

³³³ *shes* : = D3. *jānati*; KN. 364.4. *gbrāyati* (= D2, Bj, K etc.).

(kha 98b5) pa'i mying dang 'od dbyibs kyang // ³³⁴_[r...] de bzhin steng gi lha○'i me
tog rnams // man 'da' ra dang (/) man 'dzu sha ka dang /</> ○ ³³⁵pa ri ya tra
me tog gang || yod || pa // _[r...] 'dir

Kanjur: pa'i ming dang 'od dbyibs kyang³³⁶ // de dag thams cad de yis³³⁷ dri las shes // (= 38)
de bzhin steng gi lha yi me tog rnams // man da ra ba³³⁸ dang many-dzu sha ka
dang // yongs 'du'i me _(T.172b6) tog gang dag yod gyur pa // dpa' bo 'di na

(kha 98b6) 'dug || _[r...] brtan ba³³⁹ 'i _[de'is] ³⁴⁰'di dag tshor // gang gi gzhal myed khang
rnams ji 'dra ba // yangs dang 'bring dang de bzhin ngan pa³⁴¹ ste // de na || sna
tshogs pa'i gzugs yod

Kanjur: 'dug bzhin de dag tshor // (= 39) gang gi gzhal med khang rnams ci 'dra ba //
yangs dang 'bring dang de bzhin chung ngu dang // de na rnam pa sna _(T.172b7)
tshogs gzugs yod

(kha 98b7) pa // 'di na 'dug nas³⁴² sna'i stobs gyis tshor // bskyed mos tshal gyi sa yang
de bzhin shes // ³⁴³Cbos rab chos ston || rNam par rgyal ba'i /[/] khang pa mchog
³⁴⁴gyang de bzhin

Kanjur: pa // 'di na 'dug bzhin sna yi stobs kyis tshor // (= 40) bskyed³⁴⁵ mos tshal gyi sa
yang de bzhin shes // Cbos bzangs³⁴⁶ dang ni rNam par _(T.173a1) rgyal ba yi // khang
bzangs³⁴⁷ mchog na ³⁴⁸lha gang³⁴⁹ 'khod pa dang³⁵⁰ /

³³⁴ For the following verse, cf. ItS. 104.

³³⁵ pa ri ya tra : cf. Tib. Kanj. yongs 'du; KN. 364.8. pārijāta~; v.l. D1, D2, D3, Bj, K etc. pāriyātra~ (= Tib. Kho.); cf. also n. 210, 213; ItS. 104, 280.

³³⁶ kyang : T. MS., S, Ph. dang (w.r.).

³³⁷ de yis : = S; Ph. de'i (w.r.); the other Kanjurs read de yi instead (w.r.); cf. KN. 364.6. so.

³³⁸ mau da ra ba : l.c.? = KN. 364.7. mandāra~; cf. S, N. man-da ra; J, Ph, B, Pk, C, D. man dā ra; L. man-dā ra; Tib. Kho. man 'da' ra.

³³⁹ brtan ba : cf. Tib. Kanj. dpa' bo; KN. 364.8. dhīra~ (= Tib. Kho. brtan ba); v.l. D1, D2, D3, Bj, K etc. vīra~ (= Tib. Kanj. dpa' bo); cf. also n. 928; ItS. 104.

³⁴⁰ de'is : = KN. 364.8. sa; Tib. Kanj.-; cf. ItS. 104.

³⁴¹ ngan pa : cf. Tib. Kanj. chung ngu; KN. 364.9. -bīna~

³⁴² 'dug nas : cf. Tib. Kanj. 'dug bzhin = KN. 364.10. stbīā (read: stbīto).

³⁴³ Cbos rab chos ston : = KN. 364.11. Sudbarmadbarman~; D1, D2, D3, Bj. Sudbarma ye deva (= Tib. Kanj. Cbos bzangs ... lha gang 'khod pa). Cf. Krsh. 204.

³⁴⁴ gyang de bzhin rab du shes : = KN. 364.12. ca tatbā prajānate; D1, D2, D3. ca sadā prajānatī = Tib. Kanj. 'ang rtag tu shes.

³⁴⁵ bskyed : S reads thus (= Tib. Kho.); T. MS. gskyed (s.c.); the other Kanjurs read skyed instead.

³⁴⁶ bzangs : N, L. bzang.

³⁴⁷ bzangs : S, N, L. bzang.

³⁴⁸ lha gang 'khod pa : ≠ KN. 364.11. -dbarman~; = D1, D2, D3, Bj. ye deva. Cf. n. 343.

³⁴⁹ gang : T. MS. ngag (s.c.).

(kha 98b8) *rab du shes*_[1→2] // *de na lha'i*_[1] *bu rnam*_[1] *gang*_[1]³⁵¹ *brtsend*_[1] *pa*_[1] // *'di na*_[1]
*'dug bzhin de'i*_[1] *dri yang tshor* // *lha'i*_[1] *bu rnam*_[1] *des ni dri las shes* // *→1*_[1]
³⁵²_[1] *gang na*_[2] *su dag*_[2→1] *las*_[1] *byed*_[1] *'dug*_[3] *[pa]*

Kanjur: *de na lha bu*³⁵³ *brtsen*³⁵⁴ *pa'ang rtag tu shes*³⁵⁵ // (= 41) *gang zbig gang na las ni*
byed pa

(kha 99a1) ཨོ // 'am // *nyan*³⁵⁶ *pa*_[1] *dang*_[1] *gang du 'gro ba dag* // *→1*_[1] *me tog*
*mang brgyan lha'i*_[1] *bu mo gang* // *phreng ba thogs shing phyang phrul*³⁵⁷ *dag gis*
brgyan // *gang dang gang du brtsend*

Kanjur (KN.364.13; T. 173a1; J. 149a8; S. 203a5; Ph. 346a5; B. 184b2; Pk. 155b4;
 N. 209b3; D. 135b7; C. 160a2; L. 214b3): *'am* // *'dug dang nyal*³⁵⁸ *dang gang*
*du*³⁵⁹ *'gro ba* _(T.173a2) *yang* // *'di na 'dug bzhin de dag dri yang*³⁶⁰ *tshor* // *lha yi*³⁶¹ *bu*
*rnam*_[1] *des ni dri las shes* // (= 42) *me tog mang brgyan*³⁶² ³⁶³*lha yi bu mo gang* //
phreng ba thogs shing lhab lhab rnam kyis brgyan // *gang dang gang du*³⁶⁴ *rtsen*³⁶⁵

(kha 99a2) *ching* *'dong ba dag* // *byang chub sems dpa' de'is* *dri la<s> shes* // *sTe[ng]*
du 'byung ba rtse mo bar gyi lha // *Tshangs pa Tshangs chen gzhal myed*
*khang na*_[1] *spyod*³⁶⁶ // *→1*_[1] *de dag de na* *dri las*

Kanjur: _(T.173a3) *cing*³⁶⁷ *'dong ba*³⁶⁸ *dag / byang chub sems dpa' de yis dri las shes* // (= 43)

³⁵⁰ *dang* : = S, Ph; the other Kanjurs read *dag* instead (w.r.).

³⁵¹ *lha'i bu rnam gang* : = KN. 364.12. *ye ... devaputrāḥ*; cf. Tib. Kanj. *lha bu*.

³⁵² *gang na su dag las byed 'dug pa 'am* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *gang zbig gang na las ni byed pa 'am* // *'dug*; KN. 364.14. *yo yatra karma kurute sthito vā*.

³⁵³ *lha bu* : N, L. *lha'i bu* (= Tib. Kho.).

³⁵⁴ *brtsen* : Ph, D. *rtsen*.

³⁵⁵ *'ang rtag tu shes* : = D1, D2, D3. *ca sadā prajānatī*; KN. 364.12. *ca tatbā prajānate* (= Tib. Kho.); sec n. 344.

³⁵⁶ *nyan* : = KN. 364.14. *ṣṇoti* ≠ Tib. Kanj. *nyal*.

³⁵⁷ *phyang phrul* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *lhab lhub*; KN. 364.15. *-ābharaṇa-*.

³⁵⁸ *nyal* : ≠ KN. 364.14. *ṣṇoti* = Tib. Kho. *nyan*.

³⁵⁹ *du* : B, Pk. *'du* (s.c.); C. *tu*.

³⁶⁰ *dri yang* : = S, Ph, D, L (= Tib. Kho.); J, B, Pk, C, N. *dri yis* (w.r.); KN. 364.13. *gandbu* (*teṣām*).

³⁶¹ *lha yi* : S, Ph. *lha'i* (= Tib. Kho.).

³⁶² *brgyan* : B, Pk. *rgyan*.

³⁶³ *lha yi* : S, Ph. *lha'i* (= Tib. Kho.).

³⁶⁴ *du* : C. *tu*.

³⁶⁵ *rtsen* : J, C. *brtsen* (≠ Tib. Kho. *brtsend*).

³⁶⁶ *spyod* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *rgyu ba*; KN. 365.1. *-cārin-*.

³⁶⁷ *cing* : J, Ph, B, Pk, C. *zbing*.

(KN.365) *sTeng du srid pa'i rtse mo*³⁶⁹ *bar gyi lha // Tshangs pa Tshangs chen gzhal med khang rgyu ba // bsam gtan gnas sam 'on te langs pa* (T.173a4) *yang // de dag der ni dri las*

(kha 99a3) *rab du shes // [bsam gtan gnas shing de ste*³⁷⁰ *langs pa yang //*³⁷¹ *Kun snang dang ba*³⁷² *lha'i sras rnams [shes₋₁] [sna₋₂] // shi 'phos skyes pa gsar du 'ongs pa [sna₋₁] [sna₋₂] // [sna₋₁] sna'i dbang*

Kanjur: *rab tu shes // (= 44) 'Od gsal gyi ni lha yi bu rnams kyang //*³⁷³ *shi 'phos skyes pa gsar du 'ongs pa shes // byang chub sems dpa' mdo 'di*³⁷⁴ *'dzin pa yi // sna yi dbang*

(kha 99a4) *po de 'drar gyurd pa ni // [byang chub sems dpa' mdo ○ sde] 'di 'dzind pa'o //*³⁷⁵ *dge slong gag chig bder gshe○gs bstan pa la // mngon bar brtson*

Kanjur: *po 'di* (T.173a5) *'drar*³⁷⁵ *gyur pa yin // (= 45) dge slong gang rnams bder*³⁷⁶ *gshegs bstan pa la // mngon par brtson*

(kha 99a5) *ba 'chag ching 'dug pa dang // lung nod kha ton mos ○ pa'i dge slong rnams // thams chad byang chub sems dpa' ○ de 'is shes // rgyal ba [sras dang nyan*

Kanjur: *pa 'chag cing 'dug pa dang // lung nod kha ton*³⁷⁷ *mos pa'i dge slong rnams // thams cad* (T.173a6) *byang chub sems dpa' de yis shes // (= 46) rgyal ba'i sras po nyan*³⁷⁸

(kha 99a6) *thos gang yod pa // la la rtag du shing drung*³⁷⁹ *spyod pa dag // [de dag thams chad mkhas pa de 'is shes // [dge slong 'di zhes bya ba 'di na gnas // byang chub sems*

Kanjur: *thos gang yod pa*³⁸⁰ *// la la rtag tu shing drung gnas pa dag / dge slong 'di zhes bya*

³⁶⁸ *'dong ba* : J, Ph, N, D and L read thus (= 'Tib. Kho.); T. MS., S. *dong ba* (w.r.?) ; B, Pk, C. *'dod pa* (s.c.); cf. KN. 364.16. *gacchati*.

³⁶⁹ *mo* : = S (= 'Tib. Kho.); Ph. *mos* (s.c.); the other Kanjurs read *mo'i* instead.

³⁷⁰ *de ste* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *'on te*; KN. 365.2. *atba*.

³⁷¹ For the following verse, cf. ItS. 105-106.

³⁷² *Kun snang dang ba* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *'Od gsal*; KN. 365.3. *Ābbāsvara*; ItS. 106.

³⁷³ *shi 'phos* : = S, Ph (= 'Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read *'chi 'phos* instead.

³⁷⁴ *'di* : T. MS. om. (s.c.).

³⁷⁵ *gyur pa* : = S, Ph (= 'Tib. Kho. *gyurd pa*); the other Kanjurs read *'gyur ba* instead.

³⁷⁶ *bder* : = 'Tib. Kho.; the other Kanjurs read *bde* instead.

³⁷⁷ *kha ton* : = S, N, L (= 'Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read *kha don* instead.

³⁷⁸ *nyan* : J. *nyen* (s.c.).

³⁷⁹ *spyod pa* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *gnas pa*; KN. 365.7. *vibaranti*.

³⁸⁰ *pa* : T. MS. *ba* (s.c.).

*ba*³⁸¹ 'dir'³⁸² *gnas shes* // *de dag thams cad* (T.173a7) *mkhas pa des shes so* // (= 47)
byang chub sems

(kha 99a7) *dpa'* *dran ldan bsam gtan ba* // *rtag du* lung nod *kha ton dga'* *ba* gang ||
 'khor gyi nang *du*³⁸³ *rab du* chos || 'chad pa // *de dag dri las byang chub sems*
dpas {/}

Kanjur: *dpa'* *dran ldan bsam gtan pa* // *rtag tu lung nod*³⁸⁴ *kha ton*³⁸⁵ *dga'*³⁸⁶ *gang dag* /
 'khor gyi nang *na chos kyang rab 'chad*³⁸⁷ *pa* // *de dag dri las* (T.173a8) *byang chub sems*
dpas

(kha 99a8) *shes* // *bde bar gshegs pa thub chen phyogs gang na* // *phan zhing thugs*
brtse rab du chos 'chad pa // *nyan thos dge 'dun* *dbus na* *mdun byas pa*
 // 'jig r[ten]

Kanjur: *shes* // (= 48) *bde bar gshegs pa thub*³⁸⁸ *chen phyogs* *gang na* // *nyan thos dge*
 'dun *mdun gyis*³⁸⁹ *btas dbus na* // *phan zhing thugs brtse* *rab tu* chos 'chad (T.173b1)
pa // 'jig rten

(kha 99b1) *mgon po de dag dri las shes* // *sems chan gang rnams chos 'di nyand pa*
dag / gang rnams thos nas dga' ba 'i yid *gyur ba* // *byang chub*
sems dpa' {/}

Kanjur (KN.365.12; T. 173b1; J. 149b6; S. 203b6; Ph. 346b5; B. 185a2; Pk. 156a2;
 N. 210a4; D. 136a6; C. 160b2; L. 215a5): *mgon po de yang dri las shes* // (= 49)
 (KN.366) *sems can gang rnams chos 'di nyan pa dag / gang rnams thos nas dga' ba* 'i yid
gyur pa // *de na rgyal ba* 'i 'khor rnams thams cad kyang // 'di na 'dug bzhin
*byang chub sems dpa'*³⁹²

(kha 99b2) *'di na 'dug bzhin* shes // *de na rgyal ba* 'i 'khor rnams thams *chad*

³⁸¹ *ba* : = S (= 'Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read *bar* instead.

³⁸² 'dir' : S. 'di (s.e.).

³⁸³ *rab du chos 'chad pa* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *chos kyang rab 'chad pa*; KN. 365.10. *dharmam ca prakāṣayanti*.

³⁸⁴ *nod* : J. *nong* (s.e.).

³⁸⁵ *kha ton* : = S, N, L (= Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read *kha don* instead.

³⁸⁶ *dga'* : D. 'ga' (s.e.).

³⁸⁷ 'chad : J, C. 'chang (s.e.).

³⁸⁸ *thub* : T. MS. *thun* (s.e.).

³⁸⁹ *gang na* : T. MS., S. *dag na* (w.r.); cf. KN. 365.11. *yasyāṃ*.

³⁹⁰ *mdun gyis* : T. MS., S. *gyis ni* (w.r.); cf. KN. 365.12. *purāṣa-(kṛtāḥ)*.

³⁹¹ *rab tu* : T. MS, S. *rtag tu* (w.r.); cf. KN. 365.11. *pra(kāṣeti)*; Tib. Kho. *rab du*.

³⁹² *dpa'* : S, Ph, D, L. *dpas*.

gyang //, ³⁹³de la ₁ de 'dra ₁ sna 'i mthur ₁ gyurd ₁ te // de la 'phrul gyi sna ni
da rung myed // ₁ de 'i sngon du 'gro

Kanjur: shes // (= 50) de yi sna yi stobs ni de 'drar 'gyur // de la lha yi sna ni da dung med
// zag pa med par gyur pa ³⁹⁴lha yi sna // ³⁹⁵de yi ³⁹⁶sngon du 'gro

(kha 99b3) bar 'di 'gyur te // ₁ zag pa myed pa ₁ 'phrul gyi sna yin no //, ☸ //
₁gzhan yang ₁ ³⁹⁷rTag du rgyun myi chad par brtson ba ₁ // rigs gyi bu ₁po
'am / rigs gyi bu mo

Kanjur: bar 'di 'gyur ro // (= 51) _(T.173b3) rTag par rgyun du ³⁹⁸brtson pa ³⁹⁹gzhan yang /
rigs kyi bu 'am / rigs kyi bu mo

(kha 99b4) de / chos gyi gzhung 'di 'dzind tam // ston tam / rab ○ du bshad dam / ₁
bris na / lce'i yon tan ⁴⁰⁰brgya phrag bcu ○ gnyis po de dag dang ldan ba'i / lce'i

Kanjur: de ⁴⁰¹chos kyi rnam grangs 'di 'dzin tam ston tam / rab tu ⁴⁰²chad dam / ⁴⁰³yi ger
'dri na ⁴⁰⁴lce'i yon tan stong nyis brgya po _(T.173b4) de dag dang ldan pa'i lce'i

(kha 99b5) dbang po thob par 'gyur te // de ₁dag ₁ de lta bu ₁ lce'i ○ dbang pos ₁
// ro gag ₁ myangs pa dang / ro gag ₁ la ₁ reg pa da ○ng // ro gag ₁ lce'i dbang
po la bzhang

Kanjur: dbang po thob par 'gyur te / de lce'i dbang po de lta bus ro gang dag myangs pa
dang / ro gang dag ⁴⁰⁵tsbor ba dang / ro gang dag lce'i dbang po la reg

(kha 99b6) pa de // thams chad 'phrul gyi ro ₁ dam par 'gyuro ⁴⁰⁶ // ji nas ⁴⁰⁷yid du myi

³⁹³ de la de 'dra sna 'i mthur gyurd te : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. de yi sna yi stobs ni de 'drar 'gyur; KN. 366.3. *etādīṣaṃ gbrāṇabalāṃ sya bboti*.

³⁹⁴ gyur pa : = S, Ph, D, L; J, B, Pk, N, C. gyur pa'i (l.c.?); cf. 'Tib. Kho. zag pa myed pa 'phrul gyi sna yin no; KN. 366.4. *dīvyasya gbrāṇasya anāṣṭavasya*.

³⁹⁵ de yi : Ph. de'i (= 'Tib. Kho.).

³⁹⁶ sngon du : J, C. sngun du; D, L. sdun (s.c. for sngun) du; cf. KN. 366.4. *pūrvam(gaṃam)*.

³⁹⁷ rTag du rgyun myi chad par brtson ba : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. rTag par rgyun du brtson pa; KN. 366.5. *Satatasamitābbiyukta*. See n. 51.

³⁹⁸ du : 'T. MS., Ph, C. tu (w.r.).

³⁹⁹ pa : = S (= 'Tib. Kho. ba); the other Kanjurs omit this word.

⁴⁰⁰ brgya phrag bcu gnyis po : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. stong nyis brgya po; KN. 366.6. *dvādaśa- (jibvāgūṇa-)śata-*.

⁴⁰¹ de : D. des (w.r.).

⁴⁰² 'chad dam : B. 'chang ngam (s.c.).

⁴⁰³ yi ger 'dri na : = S (= KN. 366.6. *likhamānas*; = 'Tib. Kho. 'driś na); Ph. ye (s.c.) ger 'dri na; J, B, Pk, N, D, C, L. yi ger 'drir 'jug na (= C5, C6. *likhāpayamānas*).

⁴⁰⁴ / : 'T. MS., S. om.

⁴⁰⁵ tsbor ba dang / ro gang dag : S. om. (s.c.).

⁴⁰⁶ 'gyuro : i.e. 'gyur ro.

'ong ba'i ro gang yang myi myong ba // de lta bu myong bar 'gyur ro // gang
yid du myi 'ong ba'i

Kanjur: *pa de thams cad lba'i* (T.173b5) *ro bro ba*⁴⁰⁸ *dam par 'gyur ro // ji lta*⁴⁰⁹ *yid du mi*
*'ong ba'i ro gang*⁴¹⁰ *yang mi myong ba de lta bu myong bar 'gyur ro // yid du*⁴¹¹ *mi*
'ong ba'i

(kha 99b7) ro [←] || de || *yang* / de'i lce'i dbang po || steng du *bzhag pa* / 'phrul gyi ro
'gyur ro // 'khor gyi *dbus su* song nas // chos *gag* bshad pa des / sems *chan* de
(da)g

Kanjur: *ro gang yin pa*⁴¹² *de dag kyang de'i lce'i*⁴¹³ *dbang po'i steng du reg na lba'i* (T.173b6) *ro*
bro bar 'gyur ro // 'khor gyi nang du song nas chos gang bshad pa des (KN.367) *sems*
can de dag

(kha 99b8) dbang po tshim *bar* 'gyur || // mgu ba dang yongsu mgu «ba» dang *rab du*
dga' ba skye'o // de'i sgra yang zab *ching* yid du 'ong *ba* mnyen zhing snyan *pa*
'byung ste // snying la {/}

Kanjur: *dbang po tshim par 'gyur te*⁴¹⁴ / *mgu ba dang / yongs su mgu ba*⁴¹⁵ *dang / mchog tu*
dga' ba skye'o // (T.173b7) *de'i sgra yang*⁴¹⁶ *zab cing yid du 'ong la mnyen*⁴¹⁷ *zhing*
*snyan par*⁴¹⁸ *'byung ste*⁴¹⁹ / *snying la*

(kha 100a1) གྲྀ // 'bab pa dga' bar 'gyur ba des // sems *chan* || *rnam* dga' mgu rangs
pa'i semsu⁴²⁰ 'gyur ro // *gag* || la chos bshad pa de dag || *gyang* de'i dbyangs /
'jam zhing /

⁴⁰⁷ *ji nas* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *ji lta*; KN. 366.8. *yathā*.

⁴⁰⁸ *ba* : T. MS. *bar* (s.c.).

⁴⁰⁹ *yid du mi 'ong ba'i* : B. *yid du 'ong ba'i* (s.c.); Pk. *yid tu 'ong ba'i* (s.c.); cf. KN. 366.9. *a-manaāpam*.

⁴¹⁰ *gang* : = S, Ph (= Tib. Kho.; = KN. 366.9. *kançit*); the other Kanjurs read *gang dag* instead (w.r.).

⁴¹¹ *du* : Pk. *tu*.

⁴¹² *pa* : B, Pk. om. (s.c.).

⁴¹³ *lce'i* : Pk. *le'i* (s.c.).

⁴¹⁴ *te* : D. *ro* (w.r.).

⁴¹⁵ *ba* : Pk. *pa* (s.c.).

⁴¹⁶ *yang* : N, L. 'ang.

⁴¹⁷ *mnyen* : = S, D, C, L (= Tib. Kho.; = KN. 367.1. *madbura-*); Ph. *mnyan* (s.c.); J, B, Pk, N. *gnyen* (w.r.).

⁴¹⁸ *par* : T. MS. *bar* (s.c.).

⁴¹⁹ *snyan par 'byung ste* : = S, Ph (= Tib. Kho. *snyan pa 'byung ste*; = KN. 367.2. *niṣcarisyaṭi*); the other Kanjurs read *snyan par 'gyur te* instead (w.r.).

⁴²⁰ *semsu* : i.e. *sems su*.

Kanjur (KN.367.2; T. 173b7; J. 150a4; S. 204a5; Ph. 347a5; B. 185b1; Pk. 156a8; N. 210b4; D. 136b3; C. 160b8; L. 215b5): *'bab*⁴²¹ *pa*⁴²² *dga*⁴²³ *bar* 'gyur *ba des sems can de dag*⁴²⁴ *dga* 'mgu⁴²⁵ *rangs pa'i sems su* 'gyur *ro*⁴²⁷ // *gang dag* (T.173b8) *la chos bshad pa de dag gis kyang de'i dbyangs 'jam zbing*

(kha 100a2) *snyan pa yid du 'ong ba* || *thos nas* // *lha rnam* *gyang* *blta ba'i phyir* // [ph]yag *bya ba'i phyir* / *bsnyen bkur bya ba'i phyir* / *chos mnyan pa'i phyir* / *de'i drung du 'gro bar sems so* // *lha'i*

Kanjur: *snyan*⁴²⁸ *pa yid du*⁴²⁹ *'ong ba'i sgra*⁴³⁰ *thos nas* / *lha rnam* *kyang* *blta ba dang* / *phyag bya ba dang* / *bsnyen bkur bya ba dang* / *chos mnyan* (T.174a1) *pa'i*⁴³¹ *phyir*⁴³² *de'i drung du 'gro bar sems so* // *lha'i*

(kha 100a3) *sras pa* *dang lha'i sras* *mo rnam* *gyang* *blta ba'i phyir* // *phyag bya ba'i phyir* / *bsnyen bkur bya ba'i phyir* // *chos mnyan pa'i phyir* *drung du 'gro bar semso* // *brGya byin dang* / *Tshangs pa dang* /

Kanjur: *bu dang lha'i bu mo rnam* *kyang* *blta ba dang* / *phyag bya ba dang* / *bsnyen bkur bya ba dang* / *chos mnyan*⁴³³ *pa'i phyir* *drung du 'gro bar* (T.174a2) *sems so* // *brGya byin dang* / *Tshangs pa dang*⁴³⁴

(kha 100a4) *Tshangs ris gyi lha'i bu {mo}*⁴³⁵ *rnam* *gyang* *blta ba'i phyir* / *phyag bya* ○ *ba'i phyir* / *bsnyen bkur bya ba'i phyir* / *chos mnyan ba'i phyir* / *drung du* ○ *'gro bar sems so* // *klu dang klu'i bu mo* || *yang*

Kanjur: *Tshangs ris kyi lha'i bu rnam* *kyang* *blta ba dang* / *phyag bya ba dang* / *bsnyen*

⁴²¹ *'bab* : T. MS., S. *bab* (w.r.); Pk. *'bad* (s.e.).

⁴²² *pa* : = S, Ph (= Tib. Kho.); J, N, D, C, L. *pa dang*; B, Pk. *dang*.

⁴²³ *dga* : = J, S, Ph, B (= Tib. Kho.); Pk, N, D, C, L. *dang dga*.

⁴²⁴ *de dag* : T. MS. om. (s.e.); cf. KN. 367.2. *te satvās*.

⁴²⁵ *mgu* : S. *dgu* (s.e.); B, Pk. *mgur* (s.e.).

⁴²⁶ *rangs pa'i* : = S, Ph (= Tib. Kho.); N, D, C, L. *yi rangs pa'i*; B. *yi rang pa'i* (s.e.); J, Pk. *yid rangs ba'i*; cf. KN. 367.2. *udagra*-.

⁴²⁷ *ro* : B, Pk. om. (s.e.).

⁴²⁸ *snyan* : J. *snyen* (s.e.).

⁴²⁹ *yid du* : J, Pk. *yid tu*.

⁴³⁰ *yid du 'ong ba'i sgra* : = S, D, L (= KN. 367.3. *-nirghoṣaṇ ... -manoḥjāṇa*); J, Ph, B, Pk, N, C. *yid du (v.l. tu) 'ong ba* (= Tib. Kho.).

⁴³¹ *pa'i* : T. MS., J, S. *ba'i* (w.r.?).

⁴³² *de'i drung du 'gro bar sems so* // *lha'i bu dang lha'i bu mo rnam* *kyang* *blta ba dang* / *phyag bya ba dang* / *bsnyen bkur bya ba dang* / *chos mnyan pa'i phyir* : Ph. om. (s.e.).

⁴³³ *mnyan* : T. MS. *nyan* (s.e.).

⁴³⁴ *Tshangs pa* : T. MS. *Tsbings ba* (s.e.).

⁴³⁵ *lha'i bu {mo}* : cf. KN. 367.6. *dezaputra*-.

*bkur*⁴³⁶ *hya ba dang / chos mnyan pa'i phyir drung du 'gro bar sems so // klu dang*
(T.174a4) *klu'i bu mo dag*⁴³⁷ *kyang*

(kha 100a5) *blta ba'i phyir / phyag bya ba'i phyir / bsnyen bkur bya ba'i phyir / «chos mnyan pa'i phyir»* ○ *drung du 'gro bar sems so // lha ma yin dang lha ma yin gyi bu* ○ *mo {} rnam gyang blta ba'i phyir / phyag bya ba'i*

Kanjur: *blta ba dang / phyag bya ba dang / bsnyen bkur bya ba dang / chos mnyan pa'i phyir drung du 'gro bar sems so // lha ma yin dang lha ma yin gyi bu mo rnam kyang blta ba dang / phyag bya ba*

(kha 100a6) *phyir / bsnyen bkur bya ba'i phyir / chos mnyan ba'i phyir / drung du 'gro bar sems so // nam ka lding dang nam ka lding gi bu mo rnam gyang blta ba'i phyir / phyag bya ba'i phyir /*

Kanjur: (T.174a4) *dang / bsnyen*⁴³⁸ *bkur bya ba dang / chos mnyan pa'i phyir drung du 'gro bar sems so // nam mkha' lding dang nam mkha' lding gi bu mo rnam kyang blta ba dang / phyag bya ba dang /*

(kha 100a7) *bsnyen bkur bya ba'i phyir / chos mnyan ba'i phyir / drung du 'gro bar semso // myi 'am chi dang myi 'am chi' bu mo || dang / gnod sbyin dang / gnod sbyin gi bu mo || dang / sha za dang / sha za'i*

Kanjur: *bsnyen bkur bya* (T.174a5) *ba dang / chos mnyan pa'i phyir drung du 'gro bar sems so // mi 'am ci dang mi 'am ci' bu mo rnam*⁴³⁹ *dang / gnod sbyin dang / gnod sbyin gyi bu mo rnam*⁴⁴⁰ *dang / sha za dang* (T.174a6) *sha za'i*

(kha 100a8) *bu mo rnam gyang blta ba'i phyir / phyag bya ba'i phyir / bsnyen bkur bya ba'i phyir // chos mnyan pa'i phyir drung du 'gro bar semso / de dag gyang de la bkur sti byed // sti stang || byed /*

Kanjur: *bu mo rnam kyang blta ba dang / phyag bya ba dang / bsnyen bkur bya ba dang / chos mnyan pa'i*⁴⁴¹ *phyir drung du 'gro bar sems te / de dag kyang de la bkur sti*⁴⁴² *byed // sti*⁴⁴³ *stang* (T.174a7) *du*⁴⁴⁴ *byed /*

⁴³⁶ *bsnyen bkur* : T. MS. *bsnyen kur* (s.c.).

⁴³⁷ *dag* : = S, Ph; the other Kanjurs read *rnam* instead.

⁴³⁸ *bsnyen* : J. *bsnyer* (s.c.).

⁴³⁹ *rnam* : = S; the other Kanjurs omit this word (= 'Tib. Kho.).

⁴⁴⁰ *rnam* : = S; the other Kanjurs omit this word (= 'Tib. Kho.).

⁴⁴¹ *pa'i* : = S; B. (*mnyan*) *pa'i bya ba'i* (s.c.); Ph. om. (s.c.); the other Kanjurs read (*mnyan*) *par bya ba'i* instead (w.r.).

⁴⁴² *sti* : Ph, B, N, D and L read thus (= 'Tib. Kho.); J, Pk, C. *bsti*; T. MS., S. *stir* (w.r.).

⁴⁴³ *sti* : = J, Pk, C (= 'Tib. Kho.); S, B, N, D, L. *bsti*.

⁴⁴⁴ *du* : B, Pk, N, C. om. (= 'Tib. Kho.).

(kha 100b1) ⁴⁴⁵*bla mar* byed / mchod pa dang / gsol ba dang 'bul ba byedo⁴⁴⁶ // dge
slong pha₁ dang / dge slong ma dang / dge *bsnyend* pha₁ dang / dge bsnyen
ma rnam sgyang *blta* 'dod par 'gyur ro // rgyal

Kanjur (KN.367.13; T. 174a7; J. 150b1; S. 204b6; Ph. 347b4; B. 185b8; Pk. 156b6;
N. 211a5; D. 137a1; C. 161a7; L. 216a6): *btsun par byed / mchod pa dang /*
⁴⁴⁷*gsol ba dang / dbul ba*⁴⁴⁸ byed do // dge slong dang / dge slong ma dang / dge
*bsnyen dang / dge bsnyen ma rnam sgyang lta*⁴⁴⁹ 'dod par 'gyur ro // (T.174a8) rgyal

(kha 100b2) po dang rgyal po'i₁ bu dang / rgyal po'i blon «po» rnam sgyang lta 'dod
par 'gyur ro // stobs *gyis* 'khor lo skor ba'i rgyal po dang / 'khor lo skor ba'i
rgyal po rin po che₁₁ bdun

Kanjur: *po dang rgyal bu dang /*⁴⁵⁰*rgyal po'i blon po rnam sgyang lta*⁴⁵¹ 'dod par 'gyur ro //
*stobs kyis*⁴⁵² 'khor los⁴⁵³ sgyur ba'i rgyal po dang / 'khor los⁴⁵⁴ sgyur ba'i rgyal po rin
po che sna (T.174b1) bdun

(kha 100b3) dang ldan ba // bu dang *bchas* pa / blon po dang *bchas* pa / btsun mo₁₁
dang₁₁ 'khor du *bchas* pa yang bkur sti bya ba'i phyir / lta 'dod par 'gyur ro //
chos smra ba de₁₋₂ yang dag pa₁ nyid₁

Kanjur: *dang ldan pa bu dang bcas pa*⁴⁵⁵ / ⁴⁵⁶*blon po dang bcas pa /*⁴⁵⁷*btsun mo'i 'khor dang*
*bcas pa dang / g-yog 'khor dang bcas pa yang*⁴⁵⁸ bkur bstir⁴⁵⁹ bya ba'i phyir lta 'dod
par 'gyur ro // (T.174b2) chos smra ba⁴⁶⁰ de⁴⁶¹ de bzbin gsbebs pas ji skad⁴⁶² gsungs pa

⁴⁴⁵ *bla mar byed* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *btsun par byed*; KN. 367.13. *gurukāraṇ ... kariṣyanti*.

⁴⁴⁶ *byedo* : i.e. *byed do*.

⁴⁴⁷ *gsol ba dang* : = S, Ph (= Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read *gsol bar* (v.l. *par*) *byed* instead.

⁴⁴⁸ *dbul ba* : = S; the other Kanjurs read *dbul bar* instead; cf. Tib. Kho. 'bul ba.

⁴⁴⁹ *lta* : Ph, B, Pk. *blta*.

⁴⁵⁰ *rgyal po'i blon po* : = S, Ph, D, L (= Tib. Kho.; = C4, C5, T2 etc. *rāja-mātrā*); J, B, Pk. *blon po'i blon po* (w.r.); C. *blon bo'i blan bo* (s.c.); N. *blon po* (s.c.); cf. KN. 367.14. *rājāmātyā api rājamabāmātrā api* (= D1 etc.); Bj, NI. *rājamabāmātyā*, C4, C5, T2 etc. *rāja-mātrā*.

⁴⁵¹ *lta* : Ph, B, Pk. *blta*.

⁴⁵² *kyis* : = S (cf. Tib. Kho. *gyis*); the other Kanjurs read *kyi* instead.

⁴⁵³ *los* : = S, D; Ph. *lo'i* (s.c. for *los*); the other Kanjurs read *lo* instead (= Tib. Kho.).

⁴⁵⁴ *los* : = S, D; Ph. om. (s.c.); the other Kanjurs read *lo* instead (= Tib. Kho.).

⁴⁵⁵ *pa* : T. MS., S. om. (w.r.).

⁴⁵⁶ *blon po dang bcas pa* / : B. om. (s.c.).

⁴⁵⁷ *btsun mo'i 'khor dang bcas pa dang / g-yog 'khor dang bcas pa* : = S, D, L (= O. *sāntaḥpurāḥ saparivārā*); J, Ph, B, Pk, N, C. *btsun mo'i 'khor dang g-yog 'khor dang bcas pa* = KN. 367.16. *sa-antahpura-parivārā* = Tib. Kho. *btsun mo dang 'khor du bchas pa*.

⁴⁵⁸ *yang* : N, L. 'ang.

⁴⁵⁹ *bstir* : J, Pk, C. *bsti*; Ph, B, N, L. *sti* (= Tib. Kho.); S, D. *stir*.

⁴⁶⁰ *ba* : B. *pa* (s.c.).

⁴⁶³*bzbin*⁴⁶⁴ yang dag pa

(kha 100b4) ji lta ba₁ dang₁ / ʃ₁ de bzhin gshegs pas ji skad₁ du₁ gsungs ○ pa dang₁ // ₁₁
 snyan pa'i chos 'chad de // ʃ₁gzhan₁ ʃ₁yang₂ bra«m» ze dang khyim ○
 bdag dang / ⁴⁶⁵ljongs gyi 'gro ba _{ʃ₁1} rnam _{ʃ₂} rtag

Kanjur: ji lta ba bzbin du⁴⁶⁶ snyan pa'i chos 'chad do // (KN.368) bram ze dang khyim bdag
 dang / yul gyi mi gzhan dag kyang rtag

(kha 100b5) du₁₁ myi chad par // tshe'i tha mar phyin gyi bar du chos smra ba ○ de'i
 phyi bzbin₁₁ 'brang bar 'gyur ro // de bzhin gshegs pa'i ○ nyan thos rnam
gyang de la lta 'dod par

Kanjur: tu rgyun mi gcod⁴⁶⁷ (T.174b3) par tshe'i mthar⁴⁶⁸ phyin gyi bar du / chos smra ba⁴⁶⁹
 de'i phyi bzbin du 'brang bar 'gyur ro // de bzbin gshegs pa'i nyan thos rnam
 kyang de la lta 'dod par

(kha 100b6) 'gyur ro // rang sangs rgyas rnam gyang de la lta 'dod par 'gyur ro //
 sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das rnam gyang de la gzigs bzhed par 'gyur ro // rigs

Kanjur: 'gyur ro // rang sangs rgyas rnam kyang de la⁴⁷⁰ lta (T.174b4) 'dod par 'gyur ro // rigs
 sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das rnam kyang de la gzigs bzhed par 'gyur ro // rigs

(kha 100b7) gyi bu₁₀₁ 'am / rigs gyi bu mo de / phyogs gag na 'dug pa / de'i phyogsu
 de bzhin gshegs pa gzigs ste chos 'chad do // sangs rgyas gyi chos rnam gyi
 snod du gyurd

Kanjur: kyi bu 'am / rigs kyi bu mo de phyogs gang na 'dug pa de'i phyogs su de bzbin
 gshegs (T.174b5) pa⁴⁷¹ gzigs te chos 'chad do // sangs rgyas kyi chos rnam kyi snod du⁴⁷²
 'gyur

(kha 100b8) par 'ong₁ ste / de lta de'i₁ zab ching yid du 'ong ba'i chos gyi sgra 'byung

⁴⁶¹ de : B. om. (s.c.).

⁴⁶² skad : B. snyed (s.c.).

⁴⁶³ bzbin yang dag pa ji lta ba : Ph, B. om. (s.c.).

⁴⁶⁴ bzbin : Pk. bzbin du.

⁴⁶⁵ ljongs gyi 'gro ba rnam : cf. Tib. Kanj. yul gyi mi; KN. 368.1. naigama-jānapada-.

⁴⁶⁶ bzbin du : Pk. bzbin (s.c.).

⁴⁶⁷ gcod : = S; the other Kanjurs read 'chad instead. Cf. Tib. Kho. chad.

⁴⁶⁸ mthar : = S; Ph. mtha' ma (s.c.); C. mtha' ma (s.c.); the other Kanjurs read mtha' mar instead.
 Cf. Tib. Kho. tha mar; KN. 368.2. (yāvad āyus-)paryavasānaṃ.

⁴⁶⁹ ba : B. pa (s.c.).

⁴⁷⁰ la : T. MS. om. (s.c.).

⁴⁷¹ gzigs te : T. MS. gzugs te (s.c.); cf. KN. 368.4. abhinukhaṃ.

⁴⁷² du : J, Pk, C. tu.

bar 'gyur ro // de nas bcom ldan 'das gyis de'i tshe tshigsu bhad pa 'di gsungs
so / ॐ

Kanjur: *te / de ltar de zab cing yid du*⁴⁷³ 'ong ba'i⁴⁷⁴ chos kyi sgra⁴⁷⁵ 'byin par 'gyur ro // de
nas bcom ldan 'das kyi de'i tshe_(T.174b6) tshigs su bhad pa 'di dag bka' stsal to //

(kha 101a1) ॐ // de'i lce'i dbang po mchog du 'gyur // nam yang ngan pa_{||} r[o] yang
yong myi myong // ⁴⁷⁶bzbag ma thag du 'phrul gyir⁴⁷⁷ rab du 'gyur // 'phrul gyi
ro_{||} [dang] shin du ldan ba y[i]n //

Kanjur (KN.368.8; T. 174b6; J. 150b7; S. 205a7; Ph. 348a4; B. 186a8; Pk. 157a5; N.
211b6; D. 137a6; C. 161b7; L. 216b7): ⁴⁷⁸*de yi lce yi dbang po mchog tu* 'gyur //
*nam yang ngan pa'i ro ni yong*⁴⁷⁹ mi myong // *reg ma thag tu lha yi ro bror* 'gyur⁴⁸⁰
// *lha yi ro* bro⁴⁸¹ shin tu⁴⁸² ldan_(T.174b7) pa yin // (= 52)

(kha 101a2) 'jam zhing⁴⁸³ snyan pa_{||} skad [dbyangs] rab du smra //...⁴⁸⁴ yidu 'ong zbing
nyan du dga' ba ste // [...]⁴⁸⁵ 'khor gyi dbung der dga' bar 'gyur ba yi // zab mo_{||}
[d]byangs ni rtag par rab du smra // [...]⁴⁸⁶ des bshad

Kanjur: *rna bar snyan cing yid*⁴⁸⁶ du⁴⁸⁷ 'ong ba dang // 'jam zbing⁴⁸⁸ mnyen pa'i sgra skad
rab tu smra // 'khor gyi dbus der dga' bar 'gyur ba yi // zab mo'i dbyangs ni rtag
par *rab tu smra* // (= 53)_(T.174b8) *bye ba khrag khrig du ma'i dpe*⁴⁸⁹ rnanus kyi //
*des*⁴⁹⁰ bshad

⁴⁷³ *du* : J, Pk. *tu*.

⁴⁷⁴ *chos kyi* : = S, Ph (≡ Tib. Kho. *chos gyi*); the other Kanjurs read *chos rnanus kyi* instead; cf. KN. 368.5. *dharmā-(śabdo)*.

⁴⁷⁵ *sgra* : T. MS. *smra* (s.c.).

⁴⁷⁶ *bzbag* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *reg*, KN. 368.9. *nikṣipta*~.

⁴⁷⁷ *rab du* 'gyur : = KN. 368.9. *bhavanti (divyā)* ≠ Tib. Kanj. *ro bror* 'gyur.

⁴⁷⁸ *de yi lce yi* : Ph, B. *de'i lce'i*.

⁴⁷⁹ *yong* : = S, Ph, B, D, L (= Tib. Kho.); J, Pk, N, C. *yod* (s.c.). Cf. KN. 368.8. *(na) jātū = nam yang ... yong(mū)*.

⁴⁸⁰ 'gyur : S. 'gyur ro.

⁴⁸¹ *bro* : T. MS., S. *bror* (w.r.).

⁴⁸² *tu* : J. *du*.

⁴⁸³ *snyan pa* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *mnyen pa*, KN. 368.10. *madbura*~.

⁴⁸⁴ *yidu* 'ong zbing *nyan du dga' ba ste* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *rna bar snyan cing yid du* 'ong ba dang; KN. 368.10. *śraṇṇīyam* (D1. *raṇṇīyam*) *istāṃ ca manoranāṃ ca*.

⁴⁸⁵ *dbung* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *dbus*; KN. 368.11. *madhya*~.

⁴⁸⁶ *yid* : Pk. *ying* (s.c.).

⁴⁸⁷ *du* : J, C. *tu*.

⁴⁸⁸ *mnyen pa* : B, Pk. *mnyan pa* (s.c.); Ph. *nyan pa* (s.c.).

⁴⁸⁹ *dpe* : S. *dam* (s.c.).

⁴⁹⁰ *des* : B, Pk. *de* (s.c.).

(kha 101a3) pa la chos rnams gang nyand pa // །bye ba khrag khrig du ma ། dpe'i ste
// ། [d]e na de [da]g mchog du [d]ga' ba skyed // de la mchod pa dpag du myed
pa byed // ⁴⁹¹lha dang klu dang gnod {/}

Kanjur: *pa la chos rnams*⁴⁹² gang nyan pa⁴⁹³ // de na de⁴⁹⁴ la mchog tu dga' ba skyed // de⁴⁹⁵
la mchod pa dpag tu med pa byed // (= 54) lha dang klu dang (T.175a1) gnod

(kha 101a4) sbyin lha ma yin ། // ། ⁴⁹⁶rtag du de །la །lta །bar ། 'dod །par 'gyur ། // chos 'di
shin du gus par nyan[d] pa [d]e // yon [t]an 'di dag ། thams chad de 'ir'gyur //
'dod par gyur[d]

Kanjur: *sbyin lha*⁴⁹⁷ min dang // gsang ba pa dag rtag tu de lta 'dod // chos 'di shin tu⁴⁹⁸ gus
par nyan pa de // yon tan 'di⁴⁹⁹ dag thams cad de yir⁵⁰⁰ 'gyur // (= 55) (KN.369) 'dod
par gyur

(kha 101a5) na 'jig rten khams 'di dag // dbyangs gyis thams ། chad du yang go bar
byed // de'i dbyangs ni mnyen zhing 'jam ། ba ste // zab ching snyan la shin
du dga' {/}

Kanjur: *na 'jig* (T.175a2) rten khams 'di dag / dbyangs kyis thams cad du yang go bar byed //
de yi dbyangs ni mnyen⁵⁰¹ zhing 'jam pa ste // zab cing snyan la shin tu⁵⁰² dga'

(kha 101a6) bar 'gyur // rgyal po sa bdag 'khor la⁵⁰³ skor ba rnams // mchod pa ། phyir
ni de'i drung du 'dong // bu dang chung mar bchas ste thal mo sbyar // rtag du
de la chos rnams

Kanjur: *bar 'gyur* // (= 56) rgyal po sa bdag 'khor (T.175a3) los⁵⁰⁴ sgyur⁵⁰⁵ ba rnams // mchod
pa'i phyir ni⁵⁰⁶ de yi drung du 'dong⁵⁰⁷ // bu dang chung mar bcas te thal mo sbyar //

⁴⁹¹ For the following verse, cf. ItS. 106–108.

⁴⁹² *rnams* : Pk. *rnis* (s.e. for *rnams* = *rnams*).

⁴⁹³ *pa* : B, Pk. *na* (s.e.).

⁴⁹⁴ *de* : B, Pk. *nga* (s.e.).

⁴⁹⁵ *de* : B. *nga* (s.e.).

⁴⁹⁶ – : cf. Tib. Kanj. *gsang ba pa dag*; KN. 368.14. *-gubyakāś(ca)*; Cf. n. 558, 614; ItS. 107.

⁴⁹⁷ *min dang* : Ph. *ma yin dang* (cf. Tib. Kho. *ma yin*).

⁴⁹⁸ *tu* : J, Pk, C. *du*.

⁴⁹⁹ *'di* : S. *de*.

⁵⁰⁰ *de yir* : N, L. *de yis* (w.r.); cf. KN. 368.15. *tasya*.

⁵⁰¹ *mnyen* : B. *mnyan* (s.e.).

⁵⁰² *tu* : J. *du*.

⁵⁰³ *la* : s.e. for *lo*.

⁵⁰⁴ *los* : = S, Ph, D; the other Kanjurs read *lo* instead (= Tib. Kho.).

⁵⁰⁵ *sgyur* : C. *bsgyur*.

⁵⁰⁶ *de yi* : S, Ph. *de'i* (= Tib. Kho.).

rtag tu de la chos ni

(kha 101a7) *nyand* par 'gyur // gnod sbyin rnams *gyis* rtag *du* bkur sti *byas* // klu dang dri za ⁵⁰⁸*mang po de dag* dang // sha za *po* dang sha za mo rnams *gyis* // *sti* stang ri mo mchod pa

Kanjur: *nyan* par 'gyur // (= 57) gnod sbyin rnams *kyis*⁵⁰⁹ rtag tu bkur sti⁵¹⁰ byed // (T.175a4) *klu* dang dri za dag gi *tsbogs* rnams dang // sha za *pbo* dang sha za mo rnams *kyis* // *bsti*⁵¹¹ *stang*⁵¹² ri mo mchod pa

(kha 101a8) rnams *gyang* byas // Tshangs pa rnams la de ni dbang *myed*⁵¹³ 'gyur // ⁵¹⁴*chen* dBang *chen* dBang *po* lha'i bu rnams dang // brGya byin de bzhin lha'i bu gzhan dang // lha'i bu mo

Kanjur: *rnams* kyang byas // (= 58) Tshangs pa rnams la de ni dbang byed 'gyur⁵¹⁵ // lha bu dBang phyug che dang (T.175a5) dBang phyug dang // brGya byin de bzhin lha yi bu gzhan dang // lha yi bu mo

(kha 101b1) mang p(o) drung du 'gro // sangs rgyas 'jig rten phan zhing ⁵¹⁶*snying* brtse gang // nyan thos *bchas* pas de'i dbyangs thos na[s] // ⁵¹⁷*ngo* *bstan* pa dang *bsrung* ba dag *gyang* mdzad // chos

Kanjur (KN.369.8; T. 175a5; J. 151a5; S. 206a1; Ph. 348b3; B. 186b8; Pk. 157b3; N. 212a7; D. 137b4; C. 162a6; L. 217b1): *mang po* drung du 'gro // (= 59) sangs rgyas 'jig rten phan zhing *thugs* brtse⁵¹⁸ gang // nyan thos *bcas* *pas*⁵¹⁹ de yi dbyangs thos nas // (T.175a6) *zhal* ston pa dang *srung*⁵²⁰ ba dag kyang mdzad // chos

(kha 101b2) 'di 'chad pa la ni *dga' bar* 'gyur [/]/ l-gzhan yang... rTag *du* rgyun *myi* *chad* par brtson *ba* l- // byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po / chos kyi *gzhung* 'di 'dzin tañ / klog

⁵⁰⁷ 'dong : B. *dong* (s.e.); C. 'ngos (s.e.); Ph. 'gro (s.e.).

⁵⁰⁸ *mang po de dag* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *tsbogs* rnams, KN. 369.5. -gaṇa-.

⁵⁰⁹ *kyis* : S. *kyi* (s.e.).

⁵¹⁰ *sti* : Pk. *ste* (s.e.); J, C. *bsti*.

⁵¹¹ *bsti* : = S, Ph, B, N, D, L; J, Pk, C. *sti* (= 'Tib. Kho.).

⁵¹² *stang* : 'T. MS. *bstang* (s.e.).

⁵¹³ *myed* : s.e. for *byed*.

⁵¹⁴ dBang *chen* dBang *po* lha'i bu rnams : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *lha bu* dBang phyug che dang dBang phyug, KN. 369.7. *Maheśvaro Īśvara devapatrah*.

⁵¹⁵ 'gyur : C. *gyur*.

⁵¹⁶ *snying* brtse : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *thugs* brtse, KN. 369.9. (*lokabita*-)anukampaka-.

⁵¹⁷ *ngo* *bstan* pa : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *zhal* ston pa, KN. 369.10. *mukha-darśana*-.

⁵¹⁸ brtse : Ph, Pk. *rtse* (s.e.).

⁵¹⁹ *pas* : 'T. MS., S. *pa* (s.e.).

Kanjur: 'di 'chad pa la ni dgyes par⁵²¹ 'gyur // (= 60) rTag par rgyun du⁵²² brtson pa⁵²³ /
gzhan yang byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po chos kyi rnam grangs (T.175a7) 'di
'dzin tam / klog

(kha 101b3) gam / rab du 'chad dam / stond tam / || bris na / de'i lus gyi yon tan
brgyad brgya thob (pa)r 'gyu[r] ro // de'i lus dag pa⁵²⁴ yongsu dag pa /
'phags⁵²⁵ pa'i mdog be du rya ltar

Kanjur: gam / rab tu⁵²⁶ 'chad dam / ston tam / yi ger bris na / de'i⁵²⁷ lus kyi⁵²⁸ yon tan
brgyad brgya thob par 'gyur ro // de'i⁵²⁹ lus yongs su dag ste / ⁵³⁰lpags pa'i mdog
⁵³¹bai dū rya (T.175a8) ltar

(kha 101b4) dag ching sems chan rnam || mthong na dga' bar 'gyur ro // de'i lus
yongsu dag pa de la stong gsum [g]yi stong chen po'i 'jiOg rten gyi kham
tham chad mthong bar {/}

Kanjur: dag cing / (KN.370) sems can rnam kyis⁵³² mthong na dga' bar 'gyur ro // de'i⁵³³ lus
yongs su dag pa de la stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i⁵³⁴ 'jig rten gyi kham thams cad
snang

(kha 101b5) 'gyur ro // stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i 'jig rten O gyi kham na /
sams chan gang || [sh]i 'phos pa dang // skye ba O dang ngan pa dang / bzang
po dang / kha do(g) bzang

Kanjur: ste / stong gsum gyi (T.175b1) stong chen po'i 'jig rten gyi kham na sems can gang
dag⁵³⁵ 'chi 'pho ba⁵³⁶ dang / skye ba dang / ngan pa dang / bzang po dang / mdog

⁵²⁰ srung : = S, Ph; the other Kanjurs read *brung* instead (= Tib. Kho.).

⁵²¹ par : B. om. (s.c.).

⁵²² du : T. MS., Ph. tu (w.r.).

⁵²³ pa : = S (cf. Tib. Kho. ba); the other Kanjurs omit this word.

⁵²⁴ dag pa : = KN. 369.13. *suddhāḥ* (= D1, B1 etc.), v.l. K.- = Tib. Kanj.-.

⁵²⁵ 'phags pa : s.c. for *lpags pa*.

⁵²⁶ 'chad dam : B. 'chang ngam (s.c.).

⁵²⁷ de'i : J, B, Pk, C. de yi.

⁵²⁸ kyi : T. MS., S. kyis (s.c.).

⁵²⁹ de'i : J, B, Pk, C. de yi.

⁵³⁰ lpags pa : = J, S, B; Ph. *lpag pa* (s.c.); Pk. *sbags pa* (s.c.); N, D, C, L. *pags pa*; cf. KN. 369.13. -cchavi-; Tib. Kho. 'phags (s.c. for *lpags*) pa.

⁵³¹ bai dū rya : = S, Ph, B, N, L; J, Pk, D, C. *bai dū rya*. Cf. Tib. Kho. *be du rya*.

⁵³² kyis : S. kyi (s.c.).

⁵³³ de'i : J, B, Pk, C. de yi.

⁵³⁴ po'i : C. po (s.c.).

⁵³⁵ dag : S. om. (= Tib. Kho.).

⁵³⁶ ba : T. MS., S. om. (w.r.).

bzang

(kha 101b6) po dang / kha dog ngan pa dang / bzang 'gro dang / ngan 'gro dang / Kho ra yug dang // Kho ra yug chen (p)o [da]ng / lHun po dang / [Rab lhun po]⁵³⁷ ri'i rgyal po [...] la / sems chan || gnas pa rnam

Kanjur: po dang / mdog ngan pa dang / bde 'gro dang / ngan 'gro dang / ri⁵³⁸ Kho ra khor yug (^{T.175b2}) dang / Khor yug chen po dang / lHun po dang / ri'i rgyal po Ri rab la sems can gang dag gnas pa rnam

(kha 101b7) dang / 'og du⁵³⁹ bStir myed pa'i sems chan dmyal ba la thug pa dang // steng du Srid pa'i rtse mo'i bar du sems chan gang gnas pa // de dag thams chad gyang bdagi lus

Kanjur: dang / 'og tu mNar med pa'i sems can dmyal ba la thug pa dang / steng du Srid pa'i rtse mo'i (^{T.175b3}) bar du / sems can gang⁵⁴⁰ gnas pa de dag thams cad kyang bdag gi lus

(kha 101b8) la mtshong bar 'gyur ro // [gang] stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i 'jig rten gyi kham 'di na / nyan thos sam / rang sangs rgyas sam / byang chub sems dpa'am⁵⁴¹ /

Kanjur: la snang bar 'gyur ro // stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i 'jig rten gyi kham 'di na nyan thos sam / rang sangs rgyas (^{T.175b4}) sam / byang chub sems dpa' 'am⁵⁴² /

(kha 102a1) ☉ // de bzhin gshegs pa [...] la la || bzhugs pa dang / [...gang] de bzhin gshegs pa de dag chos || stond pa dang / sems chan gag || de bzhin gshegs pa de dag la bsnyen bkur byed

Kanjur (KN.370.6; T. 175b4; J. 151b3; S. 206b1; Ph. 349a2; B. 187a8; Pk. 158a1; N. 213a1; D. 138a2; C. 162b4; L. 218a2): de bzhin gshegs pa gang la la dag bzhugs⁵⁴³ pa dang / de bzhin gshegs pa de dag chos gang ston pa dang / sems can gang dag de bzhin gshegs (^{T.175b5}) pa de dag la bsnyen bkur byed

(kha 102a2) pa dang / sems chan de dag thams chad gyi lus so sor thob ba yang / [b](da)gi lus la mtshong bar 'gyur ro // de chi phyir zhe na / 'di lta [ste] de'i lus

⁵³⁷ Rab lhun po : cf. Tib. Kanj. Ri rab, KN. 370.3. -Sumeru-.

⁵³⁸ Kho ra khor yug : = S; the other Kanjurs read Khor yug instead. Cf. Tib. Kho. Kho ra yug, KN. 370.3. Cakravāda-.

⁵³⁹ bStir myed pa : cf. Tib. Kanj. mNar med pa; KN. 370.4. Avici-.

⁵⁴⁰ gang : = S, Ph (= Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read gang dag instead.

⁵⁴¹ dpa'am : i.e. dpa' 'am.

⁵⁴² dpa' 'am : L. dpa' <'>ma (s.e.; haplography).

⁵⁴³ bzhugs : Pk. pa zbugs (s.e.).

yongsu dag pa'i phyiro <//>

Kanjur: *pa dang / sems can de dag thams cad kyi lus so sor thob pa 'ang⁵⁴⁴ bdag gi lus la snang bar 'gyur ro // de ci'i phyir zhe na / 'di ltar de yi⁵⁴⁵ lus* (T.175b6) *yongs su dag pa'i phyir ro //*

(kha 102a3) de nas [r₁-] bcom ldan 'das gyis [r₁-de'i tshe.] tshigsu *bhad* pa 'di [] *gsungso* / [] / [r₁-] (d)e('i) lus [n]i [y]ongsu dag par 'gyur // rnam dag *be du rya las byas* pa ste // [r₁-] sems *chan*

Kanjur: *de nas de'i tshe bcom ldan 'das kyi tshigs su bhad pa 'di dag bka' stsal to // gang zbig rgya chen⁵⁴⁶ mdo 'di 'dzin byed pa // de'i⁵⁴⁷ lus ni yongs su* (T.175b7) *dag par 'gyur // rnam dag⁵⁴⁸ bai dū rya las⁵⁴⁹ grub pa ste // rtag tu sems can*

(kha 102a4) rnams gyis [r₂-rtag du.] mthong na dga' // ⁵⁵⁰[r₁-gang gis] mdo [sde] [yangs pa] 'di 'dzind [] pa // [] mye [long] phyis par gzugs b[] rnyan snang ba bzhin // [r₁-] ⁵⁵¹jig rten [r₁-lus.] [gyang] []

Kanjur: *rnams kyi mthong na dga' // (= 61) me long phyis par gzugs brnyan⁵⁵² snang⁵⁵³ ba bzhin // lus la* (T.175b8) *'jig rten⁵⁵⁴ di dag*

(kha 102a5) de bzhin [de la] snang // sems *chan* gzhan myin rang *'byung* [] de'is mthong // yongsu [da]g pa [] lus ni de 'dra'o // 'jig [] rten kham 'di [] sems *chan ji* yo[d] pa [](/)

Kanjur: *de bzhin snang // sems can gzhan⁵⁵⁵ min rang byung de yis mthong // yongs su dag pa'i lus ni⁵⁵⁶ de⁵⁵⁷ 'dra'o // (= 62)* (KN.371) *'jig rten kham 'di'i sems can ci yod pa //*

⁵⁴⁴ 'ang : = S, N, L; the other Kanjurs read *yang* instead (= Tib. Kho.).

⁵⁴⁵ de yi : = S, C; the other Kanjurs read *de'i* instead.

⁵⁴⁶ rgya chen : = S; the other Kanjurs read *rgya che* instead.

⁵⁴⁷ de'i : = S, Ph (= Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read *de yi* instead.

⁵⁴⁸ bai dū rya : = S, B, N, C, L; J, Pk, D. *bai dū rya*, Ph. *bai du rya*. Cf. Tib. Kho. *be du rya*.

⁵⁴⁹ las : = S, Ph (= Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read *ltar* instead (w.r.); cf. KN. 370.10. (*vaidūrya*)-*mayo*.

⁵⁵⁰ gang gis mdo sde yangs pa 'di 'dzind pa : cf. Tib. Kanj. *gang zbig rgya chen mdo 'di 'dzin byed pa*; KN. 370.11. *yaḥ sūtra dbāreṭi idam udāraṃ*.

⁵⁵¹ 'jig rten lus gyang de bzhin de la suang : cf. Tib. Kanj. *lus la 'jig rten 'di dag de bzhin snang*. KN. 370.12. *loko* (')*śya kāye aya dṛṣyate tathā*.

⁵⁵² brnyan : Pk. *rnyan* (s.c.).

⁵⁵³ snang : T. MS. *snang suang* (s.c.).

⁵⁵⁴ 'di dag : = S, D; the other Kanjurs read *de dag* instead (w.r.); cf. KN. 370.12. *ayu* (m.c.< *ayan*; "this").

⁵⁵⁵ gzhan : J, B, Pk, N, C. *gzhar* (s.c.); cf. KN. 370.13. *anya-*.

⁵⁵⁶ ni : B. *na* (s.c.).

⁵⁵⁷ de : S. 'di (w.r.).

(kha 102a6) lha myi lha ma yin dang ⁵⁵⁸*gnod sbyin* [dang] // sems [chan] dmyal [«ba»
dang] {/} yi dag[s] ⁵⁵⁹*byol so(ng) ris* // lus de la ni gzugs brnyan so sor snang //
srid pa'i rtse bar gzhal myed

Kanjur: lha (T.176a1) ⁵⁶⁰*mi* lha ma yin dang gsang ba pa // sems dmyal yi dags⁵⁶¹ dud 'gro'i
skye gnas rnam // lus de la ni gzugs brnyan so sor snang // (= 63) srid ⁵⁶²*pa'i* rtse
bar⁵⁶³ gzhal med

(kha 102a7) khang gi lha // brag rnam dang ni ri dang ⁵⁶⁴*Ko* ra yug // Gangs ri *Rab*
lhun «po» lHun po chen po rnam // de'i lus la rnam pa thams *chad* snang //
⁵⁶⁵*de'i* lus la ⁵⁶⁶*mtshong*

Kanjur: (T.176a2) *khang gi lha* // brag rnam dang ni ri dang *Kho* ra yug / Gangs ri *Ri rab*
lHun po chen po ⁵⁶⁷*rnam* // ⁵⁶⁸*de yi lus la* ⁵⁶⁹*rnam pa thams cad snang* // (= 64) *de*
yi lus la

(kha 102a8) *ba* ⁵⁷⁰*dus pa dag la* chos sangs rgyas // *gyang* // ⁵⁷¹*nyan thos* sangs rgyas sras
bchas [de bzhin] gzhan // byang chub sems dpa' *gcig* pu *gag* gnas dang //
⁵⁷²*gang gnas dang* // tshogs la gang dag chos

Kanjur: *nyan thos bcas pa yi* // sangs rgyas rnam dang sangs rgyas sras gzhan *yang*⁵⁷¹ //
(T.176a3) *byang chub sems dpa' gcig pu* ⁵⁷²*gang gnas dang* // tshogs la gang dag chos

(kha 102b1) rab gang ston *pa* // de'i rnam dag lus ni de 'dra ste // 'jig rten
kham rnam thams *chad* de la snang // de ni da *rung* 'phrul gyi ma thob st(e)
// de'i rang bzhin lus {/}

Kanjur (KN.371.6; T. 176a3; J. 152a1; S. 207a2; Ph. 349b2; B. 187b8; Pk. 158a7; N.
213b2; D. 138a7; C. 163a3; L. 218b2): *ston rnam kyang snang* // (= 65) *de yi*

⁵⁵⁸ *gnod sbyin* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *gsang ba pa*; KN. 371.1. -*gubya*~. Cf. n. 614; ItS. 107.

⁵⁵⁹ *byol so(ng) ris* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *dud 'gro'i skye gnas*; KN. 371.2. *tiraścayoni*~. Cf. also n. 615.

⁵⁶⁰ *mi* : T. MS., S. *min* (s.c.); cf. KN. 371.1. *manuṣya*~.

⁵⁶¹ *yi dags* : L. *yi dwags*.

⁵⁶² *pa'i* : T. MS. *ba'i* (s.c.).

⁵⁶³ *bar* : = S, Ph, D, L (= Tib. Kho.); J, Pk, N, C. *rab* (w.r.); B. *na* (s.c.); cf. KN. 371.3. *yāvat*.

⁵⁶⁴ *Ko ra* : s.c. for *Kho ra*.

⁵⁶⁵ For the following verse, cf. ItS. 108~109.

⁵⁶⁶ *mtshong ba* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *snang*; KN. 371.5. *paśyati*.

⁵⁶⁷ *chen po* : T. MS. om. (s.c.).

⁵⁶⁸ *de yi lus la rnam pa thams cad snang* : T. MS. om. (s.c.).

⁵⁶⁹ *la* : S and Ph read thus (= Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read *las* instead.

⁵⁷⁰ *dus pa dag la* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *tshogs la gang dag*; KN. 371.6. *gaṇe ca ye*.

⁵⁷¹ *yang* : T. MS., S. *dang* (s.c.); cf. KN. 371.5. *pi*.

⁵⁷² *gcig pu* : J, Pk, C. *gcig bu* (s.c.); Ph. *cig bu* (s.c.).

⁵⁷³*rnam dag lus ni de 'dra ste // 'jig rten khams rnam thams* (T.176a4) *cad de la snang*
// de ni da dung ⁵⁷⁴*lba yi ma* ⁵⁷⁵*thob ste // de yi rang bzhin lus*

(kha 102b2) ni de *'dra'r gyur* / རྩུར་ / *gzhan yang* རྩམས་པར་ *rTag du rgyun myi chad par* brtson
[ba] [r...] // byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po / de bzhin gshe«g»s pa
 yongsu mya ngan las /

Kanjur: *ni de 'dra'o // (= 66) rTag par rgyun du* ⁵⁷⁶*brtson / gzhan yang byang chub sems*
dpa' sems dpa' chen po de bzhin (T.176a5) *gshegs pa yongs su mya ngan las*

(kha 102b3) *'das nas // chos gyi gzhung 'di 'dzind [pa] dang / ston [pa] dang / rab du*
'chad [pa] dang / || bris [sa](m) [/] plags ⁵⁷⁷*na / yid gyi las || yon tan* ⁵⁷⁸*brgya phrag*
bchu gnyis || dang ldan te //

Kanjur: *'das nas / chos kyi rnam grangs 'di 'dzin tam / ston tam /* ⁵⁷⁹*rab tu 'chad dam / yi*
ger 'dr ⁵⁸⁰*'am / klog na / yid kyi las kyi yon tan stong* (T.176a6) *nyis brgya po* (KN.372) *de*
dag dang ⁵⁸¹*ldan zbing*

(kha 102b4) *yid gyi dbang po yongsu dag par 'gyur ro // de yid* ○ *gyi dbang po*
yongsu dag pa des // ⁵⁸²*chung du tsh[i]gsu bchad pa* ○ *gchig mnyan gyang / de'i*
don mang por

Kanjur: *yid kyi dbang po yongs su dag par 'gyur ro // de yid kyi dbang po yongs su dag pa*
des tha na tshigs su bchad pa gcig thos ⁵⁸³*kyang / de'i don mang por*

(kha 102b5) *shes so // des de dag khong du chud nas // de'i* ⁵⁸⁴*gleng gzhi* ○ *las zla ba*
gchig du chos stond // *zla ba bzhir yang rung / lo* ○ *yang [rung] chos stond //*
chos gag

⁵⁷³ *rnam dag*: B. *rnam dang* (s.e.).

⁵⁷⁴ *lba yi*: = S; Ph. *lba'i*; the other Kanjurs read *lba yis* instead (w.r.); cf. KN. 371.8. *divya ta* ([m.c.] < *dīryam tam* [i.e. *kāyam* "body"]); Tib. Kho. *'phrul gyi*.

⁵⁷⁵ *ma*: B. *lus* (s.e.).

⁵⁷⁶ *du*: T. MS., Ph. C. *tu* (w.r.).

⁵⁷⁷ *plags*: cf. Tib. Kanj. *klog*; KN. 371.10. *vācayāt*~ "to read out loud." Cf. n. 637, 843.

⁵⁷⁸ *brgya phrag bchu gnyis*: cf. Tib. Kanj. *stong nyis brgya po*; KN. 371.10. *dvādaśa- (manaskāra-guṇa-)śata*~.

⁵⁷⁹ *rab tu 'chad dam*: B, Pk. *rab tu 'chang ngam* (s.e.); KN. 371.10. *saṃprakāśayāt*~ (most of MSS. read *prakāśayāt*~).

⁵⁸⁰ *'dri*: Ph. *bri*.

⁵⁸¹ *dang*: B. om. (s.e.).

⁵⁸² *chung du*: cf. Tib. Kanj. *tha na*; KN. 372.2. *antaśas*.

⁵⁸³ *thos*: = S, Ph; the other Kanjurs read *thos pas* instead. Cf. Tib. Kho. *mnyan*.

⁵⁸⁴ *gleng gzhi las*: cf. Tib. Kanj. *(de'i) phyir*; KN. 372.2. *(tan-)nidānam*.

Kanjur: ^(T.176a7) *shes so // des de dag khong du chud nas de'i phyir zla ba gcig tu chos ston*⁵⁸⁵
// zla ba bzhi 'am lor yang chos ston to // chos gang

(kha 102b6) *bshad pa de* _{||} / _{||} ⁵⁸⁶*dran ba* ⁵⁸⁷*nyams* par myi 'gyur ro // _{||} ^{(ga)g}_{||} 'jig rten
gyi _{||} *dang* / 'jig rten *[g]yi* ⁵⁸⁸*spyod pa* _{||} ^(s)*skad dam* // *sngags* _{||} *de dag thams*
chad / *chos gyi tshul du* ⁵⁸⁹*yang dag par*

Kanjur: *bshad pa de la de brjed*⁵⁹⁰ *ngas par mi* ^(T.176a8) 'gyur ro // 'jig rten pa'i 'jig rten gyi
tha snyad gang dag skad dam / sngags ci yod pa de dag thams cad chos kyi tshul dang

(kha 102b7) *stond to* // _{||} *ji tsham*_{||} ⁵⁹¹ *stong gsum gyi stong chen po* _{||} 'jig rten gyi
khams na / sems chan 'gro ba drug *du* *skyes shing* // 'khor ba'i sems *chan* _{||} ^(s)
de dag thams chad gyi / sems gyi

Kanjur: *sbyor ro // stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i 'jig rten gyi khams na /* ^(T.176b1) *sems can*
*'gro ba drug tu skyes shing 'khor ba'i sems can gang ji snyed*⁵⁹² *pa de dag thams cad*
*kyi*⁵⁹³ *sems kyi*

(kha 102b8) *spyod pa dang g-yo ba* _{||} *yang sheso* // *g-yos pa dang bsams pa dang bslad*
pa _{||} *yang sheso* // *rab du* ⁵⁹⁴*bye brag phyedo* / _{||} 'phags pa'i ye shes ma thob *gyang*
/ _{||} ^(s)*de lta*_{||} *yid gyi dbang po* _{||} ^(s)

Kanjur: ⁵⁹⁵*spyod pa'i g-yo ba rnam* *kyang shes so* // *g-yos pa dang* ⁵⁹⁶*bsams pa dang spros pa*
^(T.176b2) *rnam kyang shes shing rab tu rtogs so // re shig*⁵⁹⁷ 'phags pa'i ye shes ma
*thob kyang / de'i yid kyi dbang po*⁵⁹⁸ *di lta bur*

(kha 103a1) ཨོཾ // *yongsu dag par 'gyur ro // chos gyi nges pa'i tshig gang dang / gang*

⁵⁸⁵ *ston* : = S, Ph (= Tib. Kho. *stond*); the other Kanjurs read *ston to* instead.

⁵⁸⁶ *dran ba* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *brjed*; KN. 372.4. *smṛti*~.

⁵⁸⁷ *nyams pa* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *ngas pa*; KN. 372.4. *saṃpramāṣa*~.

⁵⁸⁸ *spyod pa* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *tha snyad*; KN. 372.4. *(loka-)vyavahāra*~.

⁵⁸⁹ *yang dag par stond to* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *sbyor ro*; KN. 372.5. *samsyandayisati*.

⁵⁹⁰ *brjed* : Ph, B. *rjed*.

⁵⁹¹ *ji tsham* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *ji snyed pa*; KN. 372.5. *yāvat*~.

⁵⁹² *pa de* : S. om. (s.c.).

⁵⁹³ *kyi* : S. *gyi* (= Tib. Kho.).

⁵⁹⁴ *bye brag phyedo* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *(rab tu) rtogs so*; KN. 372.7. *(pra-)vicinīyati*.

⁵⁹⁵ *spyod pa'i* : = S, D, L; Ph. *spyod pa la* (s.c. for *spyod pa'i*); J, B, Pk, N, C. *spyod pa*. Cf. KN. 372.7. *(citta-)carita-(vispandīnā)*.

⁵⁹⁶ *bsams pa* : = B, Pk; Ph. *bsam gran pa* (s.c.); the other Kanjurs, incl. S, read *bsam pa* instead. Cf. KN. 372.7. *-manyita*~.

⁵⁹⁷ *re shig* : = J, S, B, Pk, C; Ph. *res shig* (s.c.); N, D, L. *re zbig*.

⁵⁹⁸ *dbang po* : Pk. *dbang bo* (s.c.).

[gi] rjesu bsamste⁵⁹⁹ / chos⁶⁰⁰ ston na de dag thams chad gyang yang dag pa [nyid]
stond to // [---] thams

Kanjur (KN.372.8; T. 176b2; J. 152a7; S. 207b2; Ph. 350a2; B. 188a7; Pk. 158b5; N. 214a2; D. 138b5; C. 163b1; L. 219a3): *yongs su dag par 'gyur ro // chos kyi nges*
⁶⁰¹*pa'i tshig* ⁶⁰²*gang dang gang rjes su* (T.176b3) *bsams te / gтам ston pa de dag*⁶⁰³ *thams*
*cad kyang yang*⁶⁰⁴ *dag par ston to // de bzhin gshegs pas gsungs pa thams*

(kha 103a2) *chad* [gyang] [---] de bzhin gshegs pas gsungs pa [] *ste* // sngon gyi rgyal
 bas mdo sde'i *gzhung bstand* pa thams *chad* 'chad do // de nas bcom ldan 'das
gyis de'i

Kanjur: *cad ston to // sngon gyi rgyal bas mdo sde'i rnam grangs bstan pa thams* (T.176b4) *cad*
*'chad do // de nas bcom ldan 'das kyi*⁶⁰⁵ *de'i*

(kha 103a3) *tshe tshigsu bchad* pa 'di || *gsungs so* // ཨྲོ // de'i yid gyi dbang po rnam
 da[g ']*gyur* // ⁶⁰⁶*og 'byung* ⁶⁰⁷*dri ma myed ching* ⁶⁰⁸*gsal ba ste* // [---] de ni *de'is* ||
 rnam || mang ||

Kanjur: *tshe tshigs su bcad* pa 'di dag bka' stsal to // (KN.373) ⁶⁰⁹*de yi yid kyi dbang po rnam*
dag 'gyur // gsal zbing 'od gsal rnyog pa med pa ste // (T.176b5) *ngan pa bzang po de*
bzbin bar ma dang // des ni rnam pa mang po'i

(kha 103a4) *chos rab shes* // [---] ngan pa bzang po *bar ma 'ang de bzbin no* // [] brtan *ba*
 des ni tshigs [*b*]*chad gchig* thos *gyang* // de don rnam pa ○ mang po de 'is shes
 // [---] rtag *du* yang dag

Kanjur: *chos rab shes* // (= 67) *brtan pa des ni tshigs bcad gcig thos kyang* // de don rnam
pa mang po de yis shes // zla ba *bzbi* (T.176b6) *'am de bzbin* ⁶¹⁰*lo yi bar* // rtag tu
*yang*⁶¹¹ *dag*

⁵⁹⁹ *bsamste* : i.e. *bsams te*.

⁶⁰⁰ *chos* : = KN. 372.9. *dharmā*~; D1. *katbā*~ = 'Tib. Kanj. *gtam*.

⁶⁰¹ *pa'i tshig* : S. om. (s.c.).

⁶⁰² *gang dang gang* : B. *gangdag* (s.c.); J, Pk, N, C. *gangdag gang* (w.r.); cf. KN. 372.8. *yām yām*.

⁶⁰³ *dag* : 'T. MS, S. om. (w.r.).

⁶⁰⁴ *yang* : S. om. (s.c.).

⁶⁰⁵ *kyis* : C. *kyi* (s.c.).

⁶⁰⁶ *og 'byung* : probably s.c. for 'od 'byung; cf. 'Tib. Kanj. 'od *gsaḥ* KN. 373.1. *prabbāṣvara*~.

⁶⁰⁷ *dri ma myed* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *nyog pa med pa*; KN. 373.1. *anāvīla*~.

⁶⁰⁸ *gsal ba* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *gsal* (*zbing*); KN. 373.1. *śuddham* (≠ MSS.); D1. *paṭvam* (s.c. for *paṭu<kā>m?*); B) etc. *spaṣṭam*; C4 etc. <s>*paṣṭam*; N1. *sprṣṭam* (s.c.); O. *paṭukam*.

⁶⁰⁹ *de yi* : Ph. *de'i* (= 'Tib. Kho.).

⁶¹⁰ *lo yi* : Ph. *lo'i* (= 'Tib. Kho.).

⁶¹¹ *yang* : 'T. MS. *ying* (s.c.).

(kha 103a5) *'brel pa* rab *du* smra // *┐zla* ba bzhi 'am de bzhin lo'i ○ bar //, sems *chan* gang rna[m]s 'jig rten khams 'di'i // ○ phyi || dang nang na || gnas pa |de dag gyang || lha

Kanjur: *'brel par*⁶¹² rab tu smra // (= 68) sems can gang rnam s 'jig rten khams⁶¹³ 'di yi // phyi rol dag dang nang na gang gnas pa // lha

(kha 103a6) myi lha ma yin dang⁶¹⁴ *gnod sbyin* |dang| // klu dang⁶¹⁵ *byol song risu* gang *gyurd pa* // 'gro ba drug na gnas pa|| sems *chan* rnam s // de dag rnam s *gyis* rnam par ji bsams

Kanjur: *mi lha ma yin* (T.176b7) *dang gsang ba pa* // klu dang dud 'gro'i skye gnas gang⁶¹⁶ *song dang* // (= 69) 'gro ba drug na gnas pa'i sems can rnam s // de dag rnam s kyis rnam par ci bsams

(kha 103a7) *pha*⁶¹⁷ // skad *chig du* ni thams *chad* mkhas pas shes // ⁶¹⁸de yang | mdo | sde 'di ni *bzung ba'i* || yon || / bsod nams brgya || mtshan || sangs rgyas |gang rnam s| *gyis* // |...| chos

Kanjur: *pa* // skad cig tu⁶¹⁹ ni thams cad (T.176b8) *mkhas pas shes* // ⁶²⁰mdo 'dzin pa yi phan yon 'di dag go⁶²¹ // (= 70) bsod nams brgya yi mtshan ldan⁶²² sangs rgyas kyis // 'jig rten kun na⁶²³ chos

(kha 103a8) || rab bshad pa |...| 'jig rten |di| kun *du* // de'i rnam par dag pa|| sgra yang thos // de'is ji bshad pa yang des bzung ste // chos gyi mchog gyang mang du

Kanjur: *gang rab bshad pa* // ⁶²⁴de yi rnam par (T.177a1) *dag pa'i sgra yang thos* // de yis ci

⁶¹² *'brel par* : = Ph, D; S. *'brel bar*; J, B, Pk, N, C, L. *'brel ba* (≡ Tib. Kho. *'brel pa*); cf. KN. 373.4. *sabitam*.

⁶¹³ *'di yi* : Ph. *'di'i* (= Tib. Kho.).

⁶¹⁴ *gnod sbyin* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *gsang ba pa*; KN. 373.6. *-guhyaka-*. Cf. n. 558; ItS. 107.

⁶¹⁵ *byol song ris* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *dud 'gro'i skye gnas*; KN. 373.6. *tiraścayoni-*. Cf. also n. 559.

⁶¹⁶ *gang* : = Ph; = Tib. Kho. = KN. 373.6. *ye (cāpi tiraścayoniṣu)*; B. *ngan* (s.e.); the other Kanjurs read *gar* instead (s.e.).

⁶¹⁷ *pha* : s.e. for *pa*.

⁶¹⁸ *de yang mdo sde 'di ni bzung ba'i yon* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *mdo 'dzin pa yi phan yon 'di dag go*; T. MS., S. *mdo 'di 'dzin pa'i phan yon 'di dag go* (w.r.); KN. 373.8. *dbāretva sūtram ima* (read *imi* [m.c. < ime] with most of the MSS.) *ānuṣṭupāḥ*. The translator(s) of Tib. Kho. seems to have taken the pronoun *imi* wrongly as referring to the noun *sūtram*. Cf. 627.

⁶¹⁹ *tu* : Ph. *du* (= Tib. Kho.).

⁶²⁰ *mdo 'dzin pa yi* : B, Pk, N, D, C and L read thus (= KN. 373.8. *dbāretva sūtram*). T. MS., S. Ph. *mdo 'di 'dzin pa'i* (w.r.). See n. 618.

⁶²¹ *go* : B. *gi* (s.e.).

⁶²² *ldan* : B. *lhan* (s.e.).

⁶²³ *na* : = S, Ph; the other Kanjurs read *la* instead.

⁶²⁴ *de yi* : Ph. *de'i* (= Tib. Kho.).

*bstan pa yang des*⁶²⁵ *bzung ste* // (= 71) *chos kyi mchog kyang mang du*

(kha 103b1) *rnam par sems* // ⁶²⁶*de*_{is} *bshad pa* *rtag par mang du skye* // *de la myos*
par nam yang myi 'gyur ba // ⁶²⁷*de* *yang mdo sde* *'di ni bzung ba* *yon* //
des n(i) mtshams dang tsh(i)gs

Kanjur (KN.373.11; T. 177a1; J. 152b5; S. 208a2; Ph. 350b1; B. 188b6; Pk. 159a3; N. 214b3; D. 139a3; C. 163b8; L. 219b4): *rnam par sems* // *de ni rtag tu mang*
po ston par 'gyur // *de ni*⁶²⁸ *myos par* (T.177a2) *nam yang mi 'gyur te* // *mdo 'dzin pa*
*yi*⁶²⁹ *phan yon 'di dag go* // (= 72) (KN.374) *des ni mtshams dang tshigs*⁶³⁰

(kha 103b2) *gyang*⁶³¹ *rnam par shes* // *thams chad* *chos* *kyi*⁶³² *so so'i mtshan ma*
dang // *don dang nges pa'i tshig gyang rab du shes* // *ji ltar* *shes pa bzhin du*
de la 'chad // *yun ring*

Kanjur: *kyang rab tu shes* // *chos rnams kun gyi mtshan nyid mi mthun*⁶³³ *dang* // *don*
dang nges pa'i tshig kyang (T.177a3) *rab tu shes* // *ji ltar de dag shes pa bzhin du*
*'chad*⁶³⁴ (= 73) // *sngon gyi 'jig rten dag gi slob dpon gyis* // *yun ring*

(kha 103b3) *po na 'dir ni* *gang bshad pa* // *sngon gyi 'jig rten* *slobs phon*⁶³⁵
mdo sde ste // *de* *chos rnams rtag du de smra ba* // *'khor gyi dbusu*
'jigs pa myed par *ro* /</>

Kanjur: *'dir ni mdo sde gang bshad pa* // *de yi chos rnams 'khor gyi dbus su yang* // (T.177a4)
*'jigs*⁶³⁶ *pa med par rtag tu de 'chad do* // (= 74)

(kha 103b4) *de* *yi yid gyi dbang po 'di 'drar 'gyur* // *de ni mdo* *sde* *'di*

⁶²⁵ *des*: Pk. *nges* (s.c.).

⁶²⁶ *de*_{is} *bshad pa rtag par mang du skye*: cf. Tib. Kanj. *de ni rtag tu mang po ston par 'gyur*, KN. 373.11. *babūṃs ca so bhāṣati nityakālam*.

⁶²⁷ *de* *yang mdo sde 'di ni bzung ba yon*: cf. Tib. Kanj. *mdo 'dzin pa yi phan yon 'di dag go*; T. MS., S. *mdo 'di 'dzin pa'i phan yon 'di dag go* (w.r.); KN. 373.12. *dhāretva sūtram imā* (read *imi* [m.c. < ime]) *ānantaśānta*. Cf. n. 618.

⁶²⁸ *myos par*: = S (= Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read *rmongs par* instead. Cf. KN. 373.12. *saṃmoba*.

⁶²⁹ *mdo 'dzin pa yi*: Ph, B. *mdo 'dzin pa'i*; Pk, N, D, C, L. *mdo 'dzin pa yi* (= KN. 373.12. *dhāretva sūtram*). T. MS., S. *mdo 'di 'dzin pa'i* (w.r.). Cf. n. 618, 627.

⁶³⁰ *tshigs*: D. *tshig* (s.c.).

⁶³¹ *rnam par shes*: = KN. 374.1. *vijānate*; ≠ Tib. Kanj. *rab tu shes*.

⁶³² *so so'i mtshan ma*: cf. Tib. Kanj. *mtshan nyid mi mthun*; KN. 374.1. *vilakṣaṇāni*.

⁶³³ *mtshun*: Ph, D. *'thun* (s.c.).

⁶³⁴ *'chad*: Pk. *'chang* (s.c.); cf. KN. 374.2. *bhāṣate*.

⁶³⁵ *slobs phon*: cf. Tib. Kanj. *slob dpon*; KN. 374.3. *-ācariya-*. Cf. n. 641 (on *slobs pon*)

⁶³⁶ *'jigs*: N. *'jig* (s.c.); Ph. *'jig rten* (s.c.).

bzung_{||} ⁶³⁷*plags pas so* //, da *rung* ma chags ye shes ma thob ste // [ʔ→] _{||} de'i
sngon du 'gro ba_{||} [ʔ→] 'di_{||} 'drar_{||}

Kanjur: mdo 'di bzung ba dang ni⁶³⁸ *klags*⁶³⁹ pa yis // ⁶⁴⁰*de yi yid kyi dbang po de 'drar 'gyur*
// da dung ma chags ye shes ma thob ste // 'di ni de yi sngon_(T.177a5) du 'gro bar

(kha 103b5) 'gyur // [ʔ→] 'di ltar_{||} ⁶⁴¹*slobs pon* _{||} sa la 'dug pa yin // ○ sems *chan* thams
chad la 'ang chos smra ste // nges tshi[g] ○ bye ba snyed la mkhas_{||} 'gyur_{||} ba_{||}
// [ʔ→] bde

Kanjur: 'gyur // (= 75) bde bar gshegs pa'i mdo 'di⁶⁴² bzung na⁶⁴³ yang // *slob dpon gyi ni*
sa la 'dug pa yin // sems can thams cad la yang chos smra ste // nges tshig bye ba
*snyed*_(T.177a6) la mkhas par 'gyur // (= 76)

(kha 103b6) bar gshegs *pai*⁶⁴⁴ mdo [sde] 'di bzung *bas* //, sKye mched drug rnam par
dag pa'i _{||} yon gyi le'u zhes bya _{||} ste bco brgyad *do* // : : ཨོ ཨོ // de nas bcom
ldan

Kanjur: ⁶⁴⁵sKye mched drug ⁶⁴⁶*rnam par*⁶⁴⁷ dag pa'i phan yon gyi le'u zhes bya ba⁶⁴⁸ ste bco⁶⁴⁹
brgyad pa'o // (KN.375) // de nas bcom ldan

(kha 103b7) 'das *gyis* / [mThu chen po thob_{||} pa_{||} →] byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa'
chen po [ʔ→] la bka' *stsald* pa // mThu chen [po] thob [pa] [de lta bu'i→]
gzhung du _{||} [ʔ→] rig

Kanjur: _(T.177a7) 'das kyis / byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po mThu chen po⁶⁵⁰ thob la
bka' *stsald* pa / mThu chen thob rnam grangs 'dis kyang⁶⁵¹ 'di ltar rig

⁶³⁷ *plags* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *kags* (v.l. *bklags*); KN. 374.5. *vācayitvā*; cf. also n. 577, 843.

⁶³⁸ *ni* : B. om. (s.c.).

⁶³⁹ *kags* : = Ph, B, Pk; the other Kanjurs read *bklags* instead. See n. 637.

⁶⁴⁰ *de yi* : Ph. *de'i* (= Tib. Kho.).

⁶⁴¹ *slobs pon* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *slob dpon*; KN. 374.7. *ācariya-*. Cf. n. 635 (on *slobs phon*)

⁶⁴² 'di : B. om. (s.c.).

⁶⁴³ *bzung na* : = S (≡ Tib. Kho. *bzung bas*); the other Kanjurs read 'dzin pa instead. Cf. KN. 374.8. *dbārayanto*.

⁶⁴⁴ *pai* : s.c. for *pa'i* (= Tib. Kanj.)?

⁶⁴⁵ *sKye mched drug rnam par dag pa'i phan yon gyi* : = S, Ph (≡ Tib. Kho.); J, B, Pk, N, D, C, L. *Dam pa'i chos pad ma* (B, N, L. *pad-ma*) *dkar po las sKye mched drug rnam par dag pa'i phan yon gyi*.

⁶⁴⁶ *rnam par* : Ph. *rnams bar* (s.c.).

⁶⁴⁷ *par* : C. *pa* (s.c.).

⁶⁴⁸ *bya ba* : = S, D; the other Kanjurs read *hya* instead (= Tib. Kho.).

⁶⁴⁹ *bco* : J, B, Pk. *bcva*.

⁶⁵⁰ *po* : = J, S, Pk (= Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs omit this word.

⁶⁵¹ *kyang* : B. *kying* (s.c.).

(kha 103b8) par bya'o // gang || gis 'di lta₁ chos gyi gzhung 'di lta bu |la₁ || ⁶⁵²smad pa dang / |'di lta bu 'i₁ mdo sde |'dzind pa'i / dge slong |pa₁ dang / dge slong ma dang / dge bsnyen

Kanjur: par bya ste / gang dag kha cig⁶⁵³ chos (T.177a8) kyi rnam grangs 'di lta bu 'di⁶⁵⁴ spong ba dang / mdo sde 'di lta bu 'dzin pa'i dge slong dang / dge slong ma dang / dge bsnyen

(kha 104a1) ☉ // |pa₁ dang / dge bsnyen ma la gshe ba dang / || ⁶⁵⁵kha ngan tshig rtsub po z[e]r na // de dag || ⁶⁵⁶myi bde ba₁ rnam par smyin par || 'gyur te // de ni tshig gis brjod du yang myi nus so //

Kanjur (KN.375.3; T. 177a8; J. 153a3; S. 208b2; Ph. 351a1; B. 189a6; Pk. 159b1; N. 215a4; D. 139b1; C. 164a7; L. 220a5): dang / dge bsnyen ma la gshe zbing mi snyan par smra ba dang / tsbogs par⁶⁵⁷ (T.177b1) mi dbyung ba'i tshig⁶⁵⁸ rtsub po zer ba de dag⁶⁵⁹ gi rnam par smin pa 'dod pa ma yin par 'gyur te / de ni tshig gis brjod du⁶⁶⁰ yang⁶⁶¹ mi nus so //

(kha 104a2) gag || mdo sde 'di lta bu 'dzind pa dang // klog pa dang / ⁶⁶²yongs chud par byed pa dang // || ⁶⁶³gzhan || la yang rgyas par || rab du stond pa / de dag || ⁶⁶⁴bde ba₁ rnam par smyin par ||

Kanjur: gang dag mdo sde 'di lta bu⁶⁶⁵ 'dzin pa dang / klog pa dang / kun (T.177b2) chub par byed pa dang / 'chad⁶⁶⁶ pa dang / gzhan dag la yang⁶⁶⁷ rgya cher yang dag par rab tu

⁶⁵² smad pa : cf. Tib. Kanj. spong ba (L. rjod pa); KN. 375.2. pratikṣeṣyanti.

⁶⁵³ cig : B, Pk. cig ni.

⁶⁵⁴ spong ba : L. rjod pa (s.e.); cf. KN. 375.2. pratikṣeṣyanti; Tib. Kho. smad pa.

⁶⁵⁵ kha ngan tshig rtsub po zer na : cf. Tib. Kanj. tsbogs par mi dbyung ba'i tshig rtsub po zer ba; KN. 375.3. paribhāṣīyanti asatyayā parusayā vācā samudācariṣyanti.

⁶⁵⁶ myi bde ba rnam par smyin par 'gyur te : cf. Tib. Kanj. rnam par smin pa 'dod pa ma yin par 'gyur te; KN. 375.4. aniṣṭo vipāko bhaviṣyati.

⁶⁵⁷ par : = S, Ph, D; the other Kanjurs read pa instead.

⁶⁵⁸ rtsub po : S. rtsun mo (s.e. for rtsub mo); Ph. rtsub mo. Cf. KN. 375.4. parusa-.

⁶⁵⁹ dag : T. MS. bdag (s.e.).

⁶⁶⁰ du : J, Pk, C. tu.

⁶⁶¹ yang : N, L. 'ang.

⁶⁶² yongs chud par byed pa : cf. Tib. Kanj. kun chub par byed pa dang 'chad pa dang ≠ KN. 375.5. deśayīṣyanti paryavāṣyanti; = v.l. B, C4, N1 etc. paryavāṣyanti deśayīṣyanti; D1. paryavāṣyanti = Tib. Kho.?

⁶⁶³ - : cf. KN. 375.5. deśayīṣyanti = Tib. Kanj. 'chad pa; D1.-.

⁶⁶⁴ bde ba rnam par smyin par 'gyur te : cf. Tib. Kanj. rnam par smin pa ni 'dod par 'gyur te; KN. 375.6. iṣṭo vipāko bhaviṣyati.

⁶⁶⁵ bu : = S, Ph (= Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read bu 'di instead.

⁶⁶⁶ 'chad : Ph, Pk. 'chang (s.e.).

⁶⁶⁷ yang : N, L. 'ang.

ston pa de dag gi rnam par smin pa ni 'dod par

(kha 104a3) 'gyur te // ji ltar ngas sngar brjod pa / de lta bu'i myig dang / rna ba dang sna dang / lce dang lus dang yid yongsu dag pa thob par 'gyur ro // mThu chen [po] thob [pa] // ⁶⁶⁸sngon [↗] 'das

Kanjur: 'gyur te / ji ltar ngas sngar brjod pa de lta bur mig dang / rna ba dang / ^(T.177b3) sna dang / lce dang / lus dang / yid yongsu dag pa 'thob⁶⁶⁹ par⁶⁷⁰ 'gyur ro // mThu chen thob sngon byung ba 'das

(kha 104a4) pa'i dus na {/} [↗] byung ba, bskald pa grangs myed pa [↗] grangs ○ myed ba [↗] las 'das pa ⁶⁷¹ / yangs pa tshad myed pa / bsam gyis ○ myi khyab pa / ⁶⁷²de'i pha rol gyi yang pha rol

Kanjur: pa'i dus na bskal pa grangs med pa'i yang ches grangs med pa / yangs pa tshad med pa / ^(T.177b4) bsam gyis mi khyab pa de dag gi yang⁶⁷³ pha⁶⁷⁴ rol

(kha 104a5) na [↗] / [↗] de'i dus [↗] de'i tshe [↗] [↗] / ⁶⁷⁵rNam par dbye' ba'i bskald pa ○ la [↗] Cher 'byung ba'i [↗] 'jig rten gyi khamsu ⁶⁷⁶ [↗] [↗] ⁶⁷⁷Yangs par bsgra○gs [pa'i] dbyangs gyi rgyal po zhes bya ba [↗] /

Kanjur: tu⁶⁷⁸ gyur ba de'i tshe // de'i dus na Tha dad du⁶⁷⁹ gnas pa'i bskal pa la 'jig rten gyi kham Cher 'byung bar

(kha 104a6) de bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom ba / yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs r[gl]yas ⁶⁸⁰mkhyend pa dang / zhabsu ldan ba / bde bar gshegs pa / 'jig rten ⁶⁸¹rig pa [↗] bla na myed

⁶⁶⁸ sngon 'das pa'i dus na {/} byung ba : cf. Tib. Kanj. sngon byung ba 'das pa'i dus na; KN. 375.9. *bhūtapūrvan*.

⁶⁶⁹ thob : = S; the other Kanjurs read thob instead (= Tib. Kho.).

⁶⁷⁰ par : Pk. bar (s.c.).

⁶⁷¹ 'das pa : Tib. Kho. (grangs myed ba) las 'das pa; cf. Tib. Kanj. yang ches (grangs med pa); KN. 375.9. (*asaṃkhyeya*)-*tara*~.

⁶⁷² de'i pha rol gyi yang pha rol na : cf. Tib. Kanj. de dag gi yang pha rol tu gyur ba; KN. 375.10. *tebhyah pareṇa paratareṇa*.

⁶⁷³ yang : = S (= Tib. Kho.); Ph, B, Pk, D, C. yang ches; J. yang tshas (s.c. for ches); N, L. 'ang ches.

⁶⁷⁴ pha : Pk. pa (s.c.).

⁶⁷⁵ rNam par dbye' ba : cf. Tib. Kanj. Tha dad du gnas pa; KN. 376.2. *Vinirbhoga*.

⁶⁷⁶ khamsu : i.e. *khams su*.

⁶⁷⁷ Yangs par : cf. Tib. Kanj. 'jigs; KN. 376.3. *Bhīṣma*-(*garjitasaṃvārājā*).

⁶⁷⁸ tu : J, Pk. du.

⁶⁷⁹ du : J, Pk. tu.

⁶⁸⁰ mkhyend pa : cf. Tib. Kanj. rig pa; KN. 376.1. *vidyā*-(*carapa-saṃpanna*~).

⁶⁸¹ rig pa : cf. Tib. Kanj. mkhyen pa; KN. 376.1. (*loka*)-*vid*~.

Kanjur: ^(KN.376) *de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par* ^(T.177b5) *rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas rig pa dang zhabs su ldan pa / bde bar gshegs pa / 'jig rten mkhyen pa / skyes bu 'dul ba'i kha lo sgyur ba / bla na med*

(kha 104a7) *pa /* _[2] *skyes bu 'dul ba'i kha lo sgyur ba //* _[1] *lha dang myi rnam gyi ston pa // sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das* _[1←] *'jig rten du byung ste / mThu chen po thob pa / bcom ldan 'das /*

Kanjur: *pa / lha dang mi rnam gyi ston pa / sangs rgyas* ^(T.177b6) *bcom ldan 'das 'jigs bsgrags* ⁶⁸² *dbyangs kyi* ⁶⁸³ *rgyal po zhes bya ba 'jig rten du byung ste / mThu chen thob bcom ldan 'das*

(kha 104a8) _[1] *Yangs pa bsgrags pa'i dbyangs gyi rgyal po* _[1←] *de bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom ba yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas* _[1←] */ de* _[1←] *Cher 'byung ba'i* _[1] *'jig rten khamis* _[1]

Kanjur: *de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i* ^(T.177b7) *sangs rgyas 'jigs bsgrags* ⁶⁸⁴ *dbyangs kyi rgyal po de* ⁶⁸⁵ *'jig rten gyi khamis Cher* ^{686 687} *'byung ba*

(kha 104b1) *d(e) na / lha dang my[i] dang lha ma yin du* *bchas* *pa'i / 'jig rten gyi mdun na* *de* _[1] *chos ston* *te* _[1] */ 'di lta ste / nyan thos rnam la ni* _[1] *'phags [p]a'i bden ba* *bzh(i) dang / ldan* *ba* _[1] *'ch(o)[s]*

Kanjur (KN.376.4; T. 177b7; J. 153b1; S. 209a2; Ph. 351a8; B. 189b5; Pk. 159b7; N. 215b5; D. 139b6; C. 164b6; L. 220b6): *de na* ⁶⁸⁸ *lha dang mi dang lha ma yin du bcas pa'i 'jig rten gyi mdun na chos ston* *te* ⁶⁸⁹ */* ⁶⁹⁰ *'di lta ste /* _(T.177b8) *nyan thos rnam la ni*

(kha 104b2) *ston* *te* _[1←] *skye ba dang* ⁶⁹¹ *na ba dang* _[1←] */ rga ba dang /* _[1←] *'chi ba dang /* _[1] *slos pa'i mya ngan dang / snre sngags 'don* *ba* *dang / sdug bsngal ba dang / yid myi bde ba dang /* *'khrugs* *pa las shin* *du* *bzla*

Kanjur: *skye ba dang / rga ba dang / na ba dang / 'chi ba dang / mya ngan dang / snre*

⁶⁸² *bsgrags* : B, Pk. *sgrags* (w.r.).

⁶⁸³ *kyi* : Ph. *gyi* (= 'Tib. Kho.); B, Pk. *kyis* (w.r.).

⁶⁸⁴ *bsgrags* : Ph, B. *sgrags* (w.r.).

⁶⁸⁵ *de* : S. *des* (s.c.).

⁶⁸⁶ *Cber* : B. *su* (s.c.).

⁶⁸⁷ *'byung ba* : = S, Ph (= 'Tib. Kho.); J, N, D, C, L. *byung ba*; B, Pk. *gyur pa*.

⁶⁸⁸ *na* : 'T. MS. *la*; S. om. (s.c.); the other Kanjurs read *na* instead (= 'Tib. Kho.).

⁶⁸⁹ *te* : = S, Ph, D, L; J, B, Pk, N, C. *to* (= 'Tib. Kho.).

⁶⁹⁰ *'di lta ste* : = S, Ph, D, L (= 'Tib. Kho.; = KN. 376.5. *yad idam*); the other Kanjurs omit these words (w.r.).

⁶⁹¹ *na ba dang rga ba dang* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *rga ba dang na ba dang* = KN. 376.5. *-jarā-vyādbi-*.

⁶⁹² *slos pa'i mya ngan* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *mya ngan*; KN. 376.6. *-soka-*.

*sngags 'don pa dang / sdug bsngal ba dang /*⁶⁹³*'yid mi bde ba dang / 'kbrug*⁶⁹⁴*pa las shin tu*⁶⁹⁵*bzla*⁶⁹⁶

(kha 104b3) *ste*⁶⁹⁷ / *mya ngan las 'das ba la* [₁₋₁]⁶⁹⁸ *thug pa'i* [₁₋₁ *bar*]₁ [₁₋₁]⁶⁹⁹ *rkyen dang / 'du ba tshog ste / byu[ng] ba'i rgyud do* [₂₋₁]₁ // *byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rnams la* [₁₋₁]₁ *pha rol du phyin pa*

Kanjur: *ba'i phyir* / (*T.178a1*) *mya ngan las 'das pa'i mthar thug pa / 'phags pa'i bden pa bzhi dang ldan pa rten cing 'brel par*⁷⁰⁰ *'byung ba la 'jug pa'i chos ston to // byang chub sems dpa' sems* (*T.178a2*) *dpa' chen po rnams la ni / bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub la*⁷⁰¹ *brtsams te / pha rol tu phyin pa*

(kha 104b4) *drug dang ldan ba* / [₁₋₁ *bla na myed pa / yang dag par rdzogs pa'i* ○ *byang chub la brtsams nas* [₁ *de bzhin gshegs pa'i ye* ○ *shes la* [₁₋₁]⁷⁰² *thug pa'i* [₁₋₁ *bar*]₁ [₁ *gyi*]₁ *chos ston to /*

Kanjur: *drug dang ldan pa / de bzhin gshegs pa'i ye shes kyi mthar thug pa'i chos* (*T.178a3*) *ston to //*

(kha 104b5) *'di ltar yang*⁷⁰³ *mThu chen po thob pa* / *bcom ldan 'da* ○ *s / 'Yangs par bsgrags pa'i dbyangs gyi rgyal po* [₁ *de* ○ *bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom ba* *yang*

Kanjur: *mThu chen thob bcom ldan 'das de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa*⁷⁰⁴ *yang*

(kha 104b6) *dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas* [₁₋₁ *de'i tshe'i tshad ni* / [₁₋₁ *chu bo gang 'ga'i* *bzhi'i bye ma dang* {/} *mnyam ba'i* [₁₋₁ *bskald* *pa / bye ba khrag khrig brgya stong* [₁ *du gyur to // de yongsu*

Kanjur: *dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas 'jigs bsgrags dbyangs kyi rgyal po de'i tshe'i tshad*

⁶⁹³ *yid mi* : Pk, N. *yad me* (s.c.).

⁶⁹⁴ *'kbrug* : L. *'kbrugs* (= 'Tib. Kho.).

⁶⁹⁵ *tu* : J, C. *du*.

⁶⁹⁶ *bzla* : = J, S, B, Pk, D, C (= 'Tib. Kho.); Ph. *zla* (s.c.); N, L. *'da*. Cf. KN. 376.6. *atikramāya*.

⁶⁹⁷ *shin du bzla ste* : 'Tib. Kanj. *shin tu bzla ba'i phyir* = KN. 376.6. *atikramāya*. The translator of Tib. Kho. seems to have confused the dative *atikramāya* with the gerund *atikramya*.

⁶⁹⁸ *thug pa'i bar* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *mthar thug pa*, KN. 376.6. (*nirvāṇa*-)*paryavasānaṃ*.

⁶⁹⁹ *rkyen dang / 'du ba tshog ste / byung ba'i rgyud do* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *rten cing 'brel par 'byung ba la 'jug pa'i*; KN. 376.6. *pratītya-samutpāda-pravṛttiṃ*.

⁷⁰⁰ *'brel par* : S, B, Pk, C. *'brel bar*.

⁷⁰¹ *la* : 'T. MS., S, Ph, D. *las* (w.r.); the other Kanjurs read *la* instead (= 'Tib. Kho.).

⁷⁰² *thug pa'i bar* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *mthar thug pa*, KN. 376.8. *-paryavasānaṃ*.

⁷⁰³ *'di ltar yang* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj.-; KN. 376.8. *khali punar*.

⁷⁰⁴ *pa* : 'T. MS. *lda* (s.c.).


ni bskal ^(T.178a4) *pa bye ba kbrag kbrig brgya* ⁷⁰⁵ *stong phrag* ⁷⁰⁶ *gang gā'i* *klung bzhi'i*
bye ma snyed du ⁷⁰⁷ *gyur to // de yongs su*

(kha 104b7) *mya ngan las 'das nas gyang* ^[→] *'Dzam bu'i gling gi rdul* ⁷⁰⁸ *shin du phra*
_[] *ba dang* _[] *{/} mnyam ba'i* _[←] *bskald* *pa / bye ba kbrag kbrig brgya stong* _[] *gi*
bar du dam pa'i chos gnas par

Kanjur: *mya ngan las 'das nas kyang bskal pa bye ba kbrag kbrig brgya stong phrag 'Dzam*
bu'i ⁷⁰⁹ *glings gi rdul phra rab* ^(T.178a5) *snyed du* ⁷¹⁰ *dam pa'i chos gnas par*

(kha 104b8) *gyurd to //* _[←] *glings bzhi'i rdul* _[] *shin du phra* _[] *ba dang* _[] *{/} mnyam ba'i* _[←]
_[] *bskal pa bye ba kbrag kbrig brgya stong* _[] *gi bar du ni dam pa'i chos gyi*
gzugs brnyan gnas par gyuro /

Kanjur: *gyur to // bskal pa bye ba kbrag kbrig brgya stong phrag glings bzhi'i rdul phra rab*
snyed du ⁷¹¹ *dam pa'i chos kyi gzugs brnyan gnas par gyur to //*

(kha 105a1)  *// yang* ⁷¹² *mThu chen po thob pa* _[←] *Cher 'byung ba'i* _[←] *jig*
rten _[] *kham* _[] *de na / bcom ldan 'das / Yangs pa bsgrags* _[] *pa'i dbyangs gyi*
rgyal po _[←] *de bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom ba yang*

Kanjur (KN.377.1; T. 178a5; J. 153b6; S. 209b2; Ph. 351b7; B. 190a4; Pk. 160a5; N.
 216a5; D. 140a3; C. 165a4; L. 221a6): ^(KN.377) *mThu chen thob* ^(T.178a6) *jig rten*
gyi kham Cher 'byung ba de na / bcom ldan 'das de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa
yang

(kha 105a2) *dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas* _[←] *de yongsu mya ngan las 'das pa'i dam*
pa'i chos dang / dam pa'i chos gyi *gzugs brnyan yang myed par gyurd nas /*
_[←] *yang* _[←] *Yangs par* *bsgrags*

Kanjur: *dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas 'Jigs bsgrags dbyangs kyi rgyal po de yongs* ^(T.178a7)
su mya ngan las 'das pa'i dam pa'i chos dang dam pa'i chos kyi gzugs brnyan yang
med par gyur nas / de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs

⁷⁰⁵ *stong phrag* : = S, Ph; the other Kanjurs read *phrag stong* instead. Cf. Tib. Kho. *stong*.

⁷⁰⁶ *gang gā'i* : 'T. MS. *gang gā'i* (s.c.); S, B, N, L. *gang-gā'i*; Ph. *gang gā'i*; the other Kanjurs read *gang gā'i* instead. Cf. Tib. Kho. *gang 'ga'i*.

⁷⁰⁷ *du* : J, C. *tu*.

⁷⁰⁸ *shin du phra* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *phra rab*; KN. 376.11. *-paramāṇu-*.

⁷⁰⁹ *'Dzam bu'i* : N, L. *Dzam-bu'i*.

⁷¹⁰ *du* : J, C. *tu*.

⁷¹¹ *du* : J, Pk. *tu*.

⁷¹² *yang* : cf. Tib. Kanj. -; KN. 377.1. *khalu punar*.

⁷¹³ *dam pa'i chos* : ≠ KN. 377.2.-; = D1, K, NI etc. *saddharma-*; 'T. MS. *chos* (s.c.).

*rgyas 'jigs bsgrags*⁷¹⁴

(kha 105a3) *[pa'i] dbyangs gyi rgyal po [zhes bya ba] [11] [11] / [12] de bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom ba yang dag par rdzogs pa'i / sangs rgyas, 'jig rten du 'byungo*⁷¹⁵ // mThu chen *[po] thob [pa] de lta bu gchig*

Kanjur: (T.178a8) *dbyangs kyi rgyal po gzhan yang 'jig rten du*⁷¹⁶ *byung*⁷¹⁷ ngo // mThu chen *thob de lta bu gcig nas gcig*

(kha 105a4) *[nas gchig] du Cher 'byung ba'i 'jig rten gyi kams*⁷¹⁸ *de* ○ *r / [Yangs par] bsgrags [pa'i] dbyangs gyi rgyal po [11] [11] / de bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom ba*

Kanjur: *tu Cher 'byung ba'i 'jig rten gyi kams der*⁷¹⁹ *de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa*

(kha 105a5) *yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas / [11] bye ba khrag ○ khrig brgya stong phrag nyi shu byung ngo // [de la] mThu chen [po] tho ○ b [pa] / rNam par dbye' ba'i bskal* pa /

Kanjur: (T.178b1) *yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas 'jigs bsgrags dbyangs kyi*⁷²¹ *rgyal po bye ba khrag kbrig brgya stong phrag nyi shu*⁷²² *byung ngo // mThu chen thob Tha dad du*⁷²³ *gnas pa'i bskal pa*

(kha 105a6) *la [Cher 'byung ba'i] / [11] 'jig rten gyi kham*⁷²⁴ *su [11] // [Yangs par] bsgrags [pa'i] dbyangs gyi rgyal po / [11] de bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom ba / yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs*

Kanjur: *la 'jig rten gyi kams* (T.178b2) *Cher 'byung ba der*⁷²⁴ */ de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs*

(kha 105a7) *rgyas mkhyend pa dang / zhabsu ldan ba / bde bar gshegs pa / 'jig rten rig pa / [11] bla na myed pa / [12] sskyes bu 'dul ba'i kha lo sgyur ba / [1] lha dang myi [1] 'i ston pa / [1] sangs rgyas*

⁷¹⁴ *bsgrags* : Pk. *sgrags* (w.r.).

⁷¹⁵ *'byungo* : i.e. *'byung ngo*.

⁷¹⁶ *du* : T. MS., C. *tu*.

⁷¹⁷ *byung* : S, Ph, B, Pk. *'byung* (= 'Tib. Kho.). Cf. KN. 377.3. *udapādi*.

⁷¹⁸ *kams* : s.c. for *kham*s.

⁷¹⁹ *der* : C. *der* / *der* (s.c.).

⁷²⁰ *rNam par dbye' ba* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *Tha dad du gnas pa*; KN. 377.7.-.

⁷²¹ *kyi* : Pk. *gyi*.

⁷²² *shu* : B, Pk. *shur* (w.r.).

⁷²³ *du* : J, Pk. *tu*.

⁷²⁴ *der* : T. MS., S. *dang* (w.r.?).

Kanjur: *rgyas rig pa dang zhabs su ldan pa / bde bar gshegs pa / 'jig rten mkhyen pa / skyes bu 'dul ba'i* ^(T.178b3) *kha lo sgyur ba / bla na med pa / lha dang mi rnam ky i ston pa / 'jigs bsgrags dbyangs ky i rgyal po*

(kha 105a8) *bcom ldan 'das* / ₁ ^[1-] *de bzhin gshegs pa /* ₁ ^[gang-] *thog [m]ar* ^[1-] *byung ba* / *bcom ldan 'das yongsu mya ngan las 'das pa de'i dam pa'i chos nub par* *'gyur te* /

Kanjur: *de bzhin gshegs pa thams cad ky i thog mar gang byung ba'i bcom ldan 'das yongsu mya* ^(T.178b4) *ngan las 'das* ⁷²⁵ *pa de'i dam pa'i chos nub par gyur te //*

(kha 105b1) *dam pa'i ch[o]s ky(i) gzugs brnyan yang nub par* *'gyur ba'i tshe //* *de'i bstan pa la / nga rgyal chan gyi dge slong gis shin* ^{[d]u} ^[n] *on par* *'gyur t[e]* / *de na* ^[1-] *rTag du* *brnyas pa /*

Kanjur (KN.377.9; T. 178b4; J. 154a3; S. 210a2; Ph. 352a6; B. 190b3; Pk. 160b3; N. 216b5; D. 140b1; C. 165b1; L. 221b6): *dam pa'i chos ky i gzugs brnyan yang nub par gyur ba'i tshe / de* ⁷²⁶ *i bstan pa la / nga rgyal can gyi dge slong gis shin tu* ⁷²⁷ *non par gyur te /* ⁷²⁸ *de na* ^(T.178b5) *byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rTag tu brnyas pa*

(kha 105b2) *zhes bya ba'i* / ₁ ^[byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po] */ dge slong du gyurd te / mThu chen* ₁ ^[po] *thob* ₁ ^[pa] / ₁ ^[de] ₁ ^[ji] *phyir / byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po /*

Kanjur: *zhes bya ba'i dge slong zbig byung ngo //* *mThu chen thob ci'i phyir byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po*

(kha 105b3) *de / rTag du* *rnyas pa zhes bya zhe na / mThu chen* ₁ ^[po] *thob* ₁ ^[pa] / *byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po des / dge slong* ₁ ^[pa] ^{'am} / *dge slong ma 'am / dge bsnyend* ^[/]

Kanjur: *de rTag tu* ^(T.178b6) *brnyas pa zhes bya zhe na / mThu chen thob byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po des / dge slong ngam* / ^(KN.378) *dge slong ma 'am / dge bsnyen*

(kha 105b4) ₁ ^[pa] ^{'am} / *dge bsnyen ma su mthong yang rung ste /* [○] *de dag gi drung du song nas / 'di skad* ₁ ^[1-] ^{smra} ^{so} // *kho bos* ⁿⁱ [○] *tshe «dang» ldan ba //* *khyed la brnyas par myi byede* ⁷²⁹ /

⁷²⁵ *pa de'i dam* : T. MS. om. (s.c.).

⁷²⁶ *de'i*: B, Pk. *de yi*.

⁷²⁷ *tu* : J, Pk. *du*.

⁷²⁸ *de na* : = S, Ph (= 'Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read *de nas* instead.

⁷²⁹ *byede* : i.e. *byed de*.

Kanjur: *nam / dge bsnyen* ma⁷³⁰ *su mthong yang* (T.178b7) *rung ste / de dag gi drung du song*
*nas 'di skad du*⁷³¹ / *kbo bo ni tshe dang ldan pa khyed la brnyas par mi byed de /*

(kha 105b5) *khyed ni ma brnyas pa'o / «de ci'i phyir zhe [na]» / khyed thams* chad
gyang *byang* ○ *chub sems dpa'i spyad pa spyod* || de / *khyed de bzhin gsheg○
s pa / dgra bcom ba / *yang dag par* {/}*

Kanjur: *khyed ni ma brnyas*⁷³² *pa'o // de ci'i phyir zhe na / khyed thams cad kyis / byang*
chub (T.178b8) *sems dpa'i spyad pa spyod cig*⁷³³ *dang / khyed de bzhin gshegs pa dgra*
bcom pa yang dag par

(kha 105b6) *rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyasu 'gyur ro zh(e)s* nas || *mThu chen* po *thob*
pa / ⁷³⁴*de lta bu'i gzhung du* / *byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po / dge*
slong bar gyurd *pa de /*

Kanjur: *rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas su 'gyur ro zhes smra'o // mThu*⁷³⁵ *chen thob rnam grangs*
'dis⁷³⁶ (T.179a1 = S.210a7)⁷³⁷ *byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po*⁷³⁸ *dge slong*
du gyur pa de

(kha 105b7) *lung nod pa yang myi byed / kha ton yang myi byed de /* gzh *an du na*
sems chan || *ring po na 'dug pa su mthong yang rung ste /* || *drung du song* nas
/ yang dag par sgrog go || {/}

Kanjur: *sams can rgyang ring po na 'dug pa su mthong yang rung*⁷³⁹ *ste /* ⁷⁴⁰*de'i drung du*
*song zbing 'di*⁷⁴¹ *skad du*⁷⁴² *yang dag par sgrog pa ma* (S.210b1) *gtogs par lung yang mi*
*nod / kha ton*⁷⁴³ *yang mi byed* de⁷⁴⁴ /

⁷³⁰ *ma* : 'T. MS., S, Ph. *ma 'am* (w.r.?); the other Kanjurs read *ma* instead (= 'Tib. Kho.).

⁷³¹ *du* : J. *tu*.

⁷³² *brnyas* : L. *brnyes* (s.c.).

⁷³³ *cig* : J, C. *gcig*.

⁷³⁴ *de lta bu'i gzhung du* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *rnam grangs 'dis*; KN. 378.3. *anena ... paryāyena* ("in this way").

⁷³⁵ *mThu* : C. *thub* (s.c.).

⁷³⁶ *'dis* : 'T. MS. *'dris* (s.c.).

⁷³⁷ From here on, the handwriting of the 'T. MS. changes and contains too many scribal errors, therefore the Stog Palace Kanjur (abbr. S) is instead used as the base manuscript of the Kanjur edition for the remainder of the text.

⁷³⁸ *po* : J. *pa* (s.c.).

⁷³⁹ *rung* : 'T. *'dug* (s.c.).

⁷⁴⁰ *de'i* : 'T. *de yi*.

⁷⁴¹ *'di* : the other Kanjurs read *de* instead.

⁷⁴² *du* : J, Pk. *tu*.

⁷⁴³ *kha ton* : = 'T, Ph, N, L (= 'Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read *kha don* instead.

⁷⁴⁴ *de* : S. *do* (s.c.); the other Kanjurs, incl. 'T, read *de* instead.

(kha 105b8) dge slong [pa] 'am / dge slong ma 'am / dge bsnyen [pa] 'am / dge bsnyen ma de dang de dag gi drung du song ste / 'di skad || [ʰsmraso] // kho bos ni tshe dang ldan ba / kbyod la brnyas

Kanjur: dge slong ngam / dge slong ma 'am / dge bsnyen nam / dge bsnyen ma de dang de dag gi drung du song nas / 'di skad du⁷⁴⁵ kho bo ni tshe dang (S.210b2) ldan pa kbyed la brnyas

(kha 106a1) ཨོཾ // par myi byed de / khyed ni ma brnyas pa'o // de ji_{||} phyir zh[e] na / khyed thams chad gyang / byang chub sems dpa'[i] spyad pa spyod chig dang / khyed de bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom ba /

Kanjur (KN.378.6; T. 179a2; J. 154b1; S. 210b2; Ph. 352b5; B. 191a3; Pk. 160b8; N. 217a5; D. 140b5; C. 165b7; L. 222a6): par mi byed de / khyed ni ma brnyas⁷⁴⁶ pa'o // de ci'i phyir⁷⁴⁷ zhe na / khyed thams cad kyi byang chub sems dpa'i spyad pa spyod cig dang / khyed de bzhin gshegs pa dgra (S.210b3) bcom pa

(kha 106a2) yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas «su»'gyur ro || [ʰsmra] // mThu chen [po] thob [pa] de lta bur / byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po des / de'i tshe dge slong [pa] 'am / dge slong ma 'am </>

Kanjur: yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas su 'gyur ro zhes smra'o // mThu chen thob byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po des / de'i tshe⁷⁴⁸ dge slong ngam / dge slong ma 'am /

(kha 106a3) dge bsnyen [pa] 'am / dge bsnyen ma su || su || bsgrags pa || dag thams chad || ⁷⁴⁹mang du khro'o // gnod par sems so / ma dad pa skyes so / de la gshe zhing spyoste⁷⁵⁰ / ji'i phyir / dge

Kanjur: (S.210b4) dge bsnyen nam / dge bsnyen ma⁷⁵¹ su dang su la de skad bsgrags pa de dag thams cad las phal⁷⁵² cher de la khro zhing gnod par sems la ma dad pa skyed de / de la gshe zhing spyos te / ci'i phyir dge

(kha 106a4) slong 'di ma dris par⁷⁵³ ma brnyas pa'i sems skyed // bOrnyas pa'i sems

⁷⁴⁵ du : J, Pk. tu.

⁷⁴⁶ brnyas : S. bsnyas (s.c.).

⁷⁴⁷ phyir : Pk. pyir (s.c.).

⁷⁴⁸ tshe : 'T. om. (s.c.).

⁷⁴⁹ mang du : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. phal cher; KN. 378.9. yadbhūyatvena.

⁷⁵⁰ spyoste : i.e. spyos te.

⁷⁵¹ ma : = 'T, Ph(= 'Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read ma 'am instead.

⁷⁵² phal : 'T. phan (s.c.).

⁷⁵³ ma brnyas pa'i sems skyed : 'Tib. Kanj.- = KN. 378.10.-; v.l. C4, C5, C6, '12 etc. aparibhavacittam

myed do zhes / bdag chag la ston te / ○ / bdag nyid la brnyas par byed ching
'di

Kanjur: ^(S.210b5) *slong 'di ma dris par brnyas pa'i sems med do zhes bdag cag la ston te⁷⁵⁴ /
bdag nyid la brnyas par byed cing / 'di*

(kha 106a5) ltar myed ching mi 'dod par / ₁bdag chag bla na myed pa / ○ yang dag
par rdzogs pa'i byang chub du bdag chag la ○ lung ston _{1to} zhes nas / m'Thu
chen _{1po} thob _{1[pa]}

Kanjur: *ltar ma bsams / mi 'dod par bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i* ^(S.210b6) *byang
chub tu bdag cag la⁷⁵⁵ lung ston ces snura'o // m'Thu chen thob*

(kha 106a6) byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po de / de lta bur gshe zhing spyo
bas lo mang po 'da' ste // su la yang mi khro zhing gnod sems mi skyed do
// de ltar de yang dag

Kanjur: *byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po de⁷⁵⁶ de lta bur gshe⁷⁵⁷ zhing spyo bas⁷⁵⁸ lo
mang po* ^(KN.379) *'das te / su la yang⁷⁵⁹ mi khro zhing* ^(S.210b7) *gnod sems mi skyed⁷⁶⁰ do
// de ltar de yang dag*

(kha 106a7) par sgrog pa la bong pa dang / dbyug pa 'phen gyang / des de dag la thag
ring po nas / sgra chen por byas ste / kho bo khyed la nyas par mi byed do /
zhes yang dag par sgrog go (/)

Kanjur: *par sgrog pa la bong ba dang⁷⁶¹ dbyig pa 'phen kyang des de dag la thag ring po nas
sgra chen por⁷⁶² byas te / kho bo khyod⁷⁶³ la brnyas par mi byed do* ^(S.211a1) *zhes yang
dag par sgrog go /*

(kha 106a8) des nga rgyal chan gyi dge slong _{1pa} dang / dge slong ma dang / dge
bsnyend _{1pa} dang / dge bsnyen ma de dag la rtag du || mi chad par / yang dag
par bsgrags pas //

utpādayati = 'Tib. Kho.

⁷⁵⁴ *te* : B, Pk. *ste*.

⁷⁵⁵ *la* : B, C. om. (w.r.).

⁷⁵⁶ *de* : B, Pk. *der*.

⁷⁵⁷ *gshe* : Pk. *gshegs* (s.c.).

⁷⁵⁸ *bas* : T, Pk. *pas* (w.r.).

⁷⁵⁹ *yang* : N, L. *'ang*.

⁷⁶⁰ *skyed* : = Ph, B, Pk, L (= 'Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read *bskyed* instead.

⁷⁶¹ *dbyig pa* : = T, Ph; the other Kanjurs read *dbyug pa* instead (= 'Tib. Kho.). Cf. KN. 379.2.

danḍa~.

⁷⁶² *por* : = T, Ph, D (= 'Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read *po* instead.

⁷⁶³ *khyod* : = B; T. *byed* (s.c. for *khyed*); the other Kanjurs read *khyed* (= 'Tib. Kho.).

Kanjur: *des nga rgyal can gyi*⁷⁶⁴ *dge slong dang / dge slong ma dang / dge bsnyen dang / dge bsnyen ma de dag la rtag tu rgyun mi 'chad*⁷⁶⁵ *par yang dag* (S.211a2) *par bsgrags*⁷⁶⁶ *pas*

(kha 106b1) *de dag gis de'i mying rTag du* brnyas pa zhes btags so / {*de nas yang*⁷⁶⁷ *mThu'* chen [po] *'thob* [pa] *rTa[g]* *du* brnyas pa_{...}} byang *chub* sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po [r_{...}] [de]

Kanjur (KN.379.4; T. 179b1; J. 154b6; S. 211a2; Ph. 353a4; B. 191b2; Pk. 161a6; N. 217b6; D. 141a3; C. 166a6; L. 222b7): *de dag gis de*⁷⁶⁸ *la ming rTag tu brnyas pa zhes btags so // mThu chen thob byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rTag tu brnyas pa de*

(kha 106b2) ⁷⁶⁹ *dus byed pa nye bar gnas te // 'chi ba'i dus kyi tshe Dam pa'i chos* ⁷⁷⁰ *pun 'da ri ka' »i* chos kyi *gzhung* 'di thos par *gyurd* te / bcom ldan 'das [r_{...}] *Yangs par bsgrags*

Kanjur: *'chi ba'i dus byed pa nye bar* (S.211a3) *gnas te*⁷⁷¹ / *'chi ba'i dus kyi tshe / Dam pa'i chos* ⁷⁷² *pad ma dkar po'i chos kyi rnam grangs* 'di thos par *gyur* te / bcom ldan 'das de *bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs* (S.211a4) *pa'i*⁷⁷³ *sangs rgyas 'Jigs bsgrags*

(kha 106b3) [pa'i] dbyangs kyi rgyal po [r_{...}de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom *ba* yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas.] des chos *gyi gzhung* 'di tshigsu bcad [pa]

Kanjur: *dbyangs*⁷⁷⁴ *kyi rgyal po des / chos kyi rnam grangs* 'di tshigsu bcad pa

(kha 106b4) dkrigs [] bye ba khrag khrig *brgya'* stong [] nyi shus ○ bshad pa de *'ang* / [rTag *du* brnyas pa_{...}] byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po [r_{...}] de

Kanjur: *dkrigs phrag bye ba khrag khrig brgya stong phrag nyi shus*⁷⁷⁵ *bshad pa de yang*⁷⁷⁶ / (S.211a5) *byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rTag tu brnyas pa de*

⁷⁶⁴ *gyi* : T. *gyis* (s.e.).

⁷⁶⁵ *'chad* : T. *chad* (= Tib. Kho.).

⁷⁶⁶ *bsgrags* : B, Pk. *sgrags*.

⁷⁶⁷ *de nas yang* : cf. Tib. Kanj. -; KN. 379.5. *kbalu punar*.

⁷⁶⁸ *de* : Pk. *nga* (s.e.).

⁷⁶⁹ *dus byed pa* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *'chi ba'i dus byed pa*, KN. 379.5. *kāla-kriyā*~.

⁷⁷⁰ *pun 'da ri ka'i* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *pad ma dkar po'i*; KN. 379.6. (*Saddharma*-)*puṇḍarika*~.

⁷⁷¹ *te* : B. om. (s.e.).

⁷⁷² *pad ma* : S, N, L. *pad-ma*; the other Kanjurs read *pad ma* instead.

⁷⁷³ *pa'i* : B. om. (s.e.).

⁷⁷⁴ *dbyangs* : B. om. (s.e.).

⁷⁷⁵ *shus* : = T (= Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read *shu* instead.

⁷⁷⁶ *yang* : N, L. *'ang* (= Tib. Kho.).

(kha 106b5) 'chi ba'i dus nye bar gnas pa'i tshe / bar snang ○ gi sgra las chos gyi
gzhung'di thos so // sus ○ kyang ma snras pa || bar snang las
 Kanjur: 'chi ba'i dus nye bar gnas pa⁷⁷⁷ tshe / bar snang gi sgra las chos kyi rnam grangs
 'di thos so // sus kyang ma snras par^(S.211a6) des bar snang las

(kha 106b6) sgra thos te / chos kyi gzhung'di bzung nas །de lta bu'i །myig rnam
 par dag pa dang / rna ba rnam par dag pa dang / sna rnam par dag pa dang /
 Kanjur: sgra thos te / chos kyi rnam grangs 'di bzung nas mig rnam par dag pa dang / rna
 ba rnam par dag pa dang / sna rnam par dag pa dang /

(kha 106b7) lce rnam par dag pa dang / lus rnam par dag pa dang / yid rnam par dag
 pa །. །⁷⁷⁸so sor །thob bo // rnam par dag «pa» de dag thob ma thag du phyir
 yang lo bye ba khrag khrig brgya
 Kanjur: lce rnam par dag pa dang / lus^(S.211a7) rnam par dag pa dang / yid rnam par dag pa
 de lta bu thob bo⁷⁷⁹ // rnam par dag pa de dag thob ma thag tu / phyir yang lo bye ba
 khrag khrig brgya

(kha 106b8) stong phrag nyi shur / bdagi⁷⁸⁰ ⁷⁸¹tsbo ba'i 'du byed ⁷⁸²gnas par bya ste /
 chos kyi gzhung'di yang dag par bsgragso // །gang །nga rgyal chan །gyi
 sems chan⁷⁸³ / dge slong །pa །am /
 Kanjur: stong phrag nyi shur bdag gi⁷⁸⁴ srog gi 'du byed^(S.211b1) byin gyis brlabs⁷⁸⁵ te⁷⁸⁶ / chos
 kyi rnam grangs 'di yang dag par bsgrags so // (KN.380) dge slong ngam /

(kha 107a1) གྲྀ // dge slong ma 'am / dge bsnyen །pa །am / dge bsnyen ma །. ། gang ||
 sngon khyed la kho bo brnyas par myi byed do zhes bsgrags pa / gang || gis
 de'i mying rTag du brnyas par {/}
 Kanjur (KN.380.1; T. 179b7; J. 155a3; S. 211b1; Ph. 353b3; B. 191b8; Pk. 161b4;
 N. 218a6; D. 141a7; C. 166b5; L. 223a6): dge slong ma 'am / dge bsnyen nam /

⁷⁷⁷ pa'i : S, T, pa de'i (w.r.).

⁷⁷⁸ so sor thob bo : cf. Tib. Kanj. thob bo; KN. 379.11. pratilabdhan.

⁷⁷⁹ bo : J, Ph, B, po (w.r.).

⁷⁸⁰ bdagi : i.e. bdag gi.

⁷⁸¹ tsbo ba : cf. Tib. Kanj. srog; KN. 379.13. jīvita-(saṃskāra~).

⁷⁸² gnas par bya ste : cf. Tib. Kanj. byin gyis brlabs te; KN. 379.13. adbhāṣāya.

⁷⁸³ gyi sems chan : = KN. 380.1. (abhimānikāḥ) sattvā; Tib. Kanj.-

⁷⁸⁴ bdag gi : S, T, Ph. bdag gis (w.r.). Cf. KN. 379.12. ātmano.

⁷⁸⁵ brlabs : T. rlabs.

⁷⁸⁶ te : C. ste (s.c.).

dge bsnyen ma nga rgyal can gang dag la sngon khyed ^(S.211b2) *la kho bo*⁷⁸⁷ *brnyas par mi byed do zhes bsgrags pa gang dag gis de'i ming* ⁷⁸⁸ *rTag tu brnyas par*

(kha 107a2) *btags pa* // *de dag gis de'i rdzu 'phrul gyi sto[b]s gyi mthu /* ₁*rgya chen po*₁ *dang / dam bcas* ⁷⁸⁹ *pa'i stobs gyi mthu dang / spobs pa'i stobs gyi mthu dang / shes rab gyi mthu* ₁*1 *nthong**

Kanjur: *btags*⁷⁸⁹ *pa de dag gis / de'i rdzu 'phrul gyi stobs kyi mthu dang /* ⁷⁹⁰ *dam bcas*⁷⁹¹ *pa'i stobs kyi mthu* _(S.211b3) *dang*⁷⁹² */ spobs pa'i stobs kyi mthu dang / shes rab kyi mthu rgya*⁷⁹³ *chen po nthong*

(kha 107a3) *nas / thams chad gyang chos mnyan pa'i phyir / phyi na 'khod par gyurd* ₁ *to / des gzhan yang srog chags bye ba khrag khrig brgya stong mang po de* ₁ *thams chad gyang / bla na myed pa yang dag*

Kanjur: *nas / thams cad kyang chos mnyan pa'i phyir phyi na 'khod par gyur*⁷⁹⁴ *to // des gzhan yang srog chags* _(S.211b4) *bye ba khrag khrig brgya stong mang po de dag thams cad kyang bla na med pa yang dag*

(kha 107a4) *par rdzogs pa'i byang chub du* ₁ *yang dag par btsud do //* ₁ *de nas yang*⁷⁹⁵ *mThu chen* ₁ *thob* ₁ *pa / byang chub sems dpa' sems* ₁ *dpa' chen po de / de nas shi 'phoste*⁷⁹⁶ ₁ *Zla ba'i*

Kanjur: *par rdzogs pa'i*⁷⁹⁷ *byang chub tu yang dag par btsud do // mThu chen thob byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa'* _(S.211b5) *chen po de / de nas shi 'phos nas de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas Zla ba'i*

(kha 107a5) *dbyangs gyi rgyal po zhes bya* ₁ *ba /* ⁷⁹⁸ *mying 'thun ba'i /* ₁ *de bzhin* ₁ *o*

⁷⁸⁷ *bo* : = 'T (= Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read *bos* instead.

⁷⁸⁸ *rTag tu* : S. <Tag> du (s.e.).

⁷⁸⁹ *btags* : C. *brtags* (s.e.).

⁷⁹⁰ *dam bcas pa'i stobs kyi mthu dang / spobs pa'i stobs kyi mthu dang* : ≠ KN. 380.2. *pratijñā-pratibhāna-bala-stbāman*; = v.l. C4, T6 etc. *pratijñā-bala-stbāma*~ *pratibhāna-bala-stbāma*~; cf. Toda 1984: 254.

⁷⁹¹ *bcas* : S. *cas* (s.e.).

⁷⁹² *dam bcas pa'i stobs kyi mthu dang* : B. *dam bcas pa'i stobs kyi mthu dang* {*dam bcas pa'i stobs kyi mthu dang*} (s.e.; dittography).

⁷⁹³ *rgya* : S, T. om. (w.r.). Cf. KN. 380.2. *udāra* = *rgya chen po*.

⁷⁹⁴ *gyur* : S. 'gyur (w.r.).

⁷⁹⁵ *de nas yang* : = KN. 380.6. *kbalu punar*; Tib. Kanj.-.

⁷⁹⁶ *'phoste* : i.e. *'phos te*.

⁷⁹⁷ *pa'i* : T. *pa'i sangs rgyas* (s.e.).

⁷⁹⁸ *mying 'thun ba* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *mtshan mthun* (v.l. *'thun*); KN. 380.6. (*Candrasvarāja*)-*sabānāman*~.

gshegs pa / dgra bcom ba / yang dag par rdzogs pa'i ○ sangs rgyas. bye ba
brgya phrag nyi shu /

Kanjur: *dbyangs kyi rgyal po zhes bya bar mtshan mthun*⁷⁹⁹ pa bye ba brgya phrag nyi shu

(kha 107a6) mnyes par byaste⁸⁰⁰ / thams chad la || chos gyi gzhung 'di || ⁸⁰¹rab du bshad
nas / de [mthar gyis⁸⁰² →] sngon gyi dge ba'i rtsa ba des / rims gyis [→] rNga
sgra || rgyal po zhes bya ba / ⁸⁰³mying gchig pa

Kanjur: (S.211b6) *mnyes par byas te*⁸⁰⁴ / *thams cad du yang*⁸⁰⁵ *chos kyi rnam grangs* 'di yang
*dag par rab tu ston*⁸⁰⁶ to // de sngon gyi dge ba'i rtsa ba des⁸⁰⁷ / rims *kyis*⁸⁰⁸ de bzhin
gshegs pa dgra bcom pa (S.211b7) *yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas*⁸⁰⁹ rNga *sgra'i*
*rgyal po zhes bya bar mtshan mthun*⁸¹⁰ pa⁸¹¹

(kha 107a7) [→] de bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom ba / yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs
rgyas. bye ba brgya phrag nyi shu [→] mnyes par byaste⁸¹² // de thams chad las
|| Dam pa'i chos pu 'da' ri ka'i

Kanjur: *bye ba brgya phrag nyi shu mthar gyis mnyes par byas*⁸¹³ *nas* / de thams cad du
*yang*⁸¹⁴ *Dam pa'i chos*⁸¹⁵ pad ma dkar po'i

(kha 107a8) chos gyi gzhung 'di bzung ste // 'khor bzhi la yang dag par rab du bshad
do // de sngun⁸¹⁶ gyi dge ba'i rtsa ba des mthar gyis [→] sPrin sgra rgyal po
zhes bya ba / mying 'thun ba / [→] de bzhi[n]

⁷⁹⁹ *mthun* : 'T, D. 'thun (= 'Tib. Kho.).

⁸⁰⁰ *byaste* : i.e. *byas te*.

⁸⁰¹ *rab du bshad nas* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *yang dag par rab tu ston* (v.l. *bstan*) to; KN. 380.8. *saṃprakāśayām āsa*.

⁸⁰² *mthar gyis* : KN. 380.8. *anupūrveṇa*.

⁸⁰³ *mying gchig pa* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *mtshan mthun* (v.l. 'thun) pa; KN. 380.9. (*Dundubhisvararāja*-) *saka-nāman*~.

⁸⁰⁴ *te* : = 'T, Ph, N, D, L; J, B, Pk, C. *ste*.

⁸⁰⁵ *yang* : N, L. 'ang.

⁸⁰⁶ *ston* : 'T, Ph. *stan* (s.c.); the other Kanjurs read *bstan* instead. Cf. 'Tib. Kho. *bshad*.

⁸⁰⁷ *des* : 'T. 'dis (w.r.). Cf. KN. 380.8. *tena*.

⁸⁰⁸ *rims kyis* : = 'T, Ph (≡ 'Tib. Kho. *rims gyis*); the other Kanjurs read *rim gyis* instead.

⁸⁰⁹ *rNga sgra'i rgyal po* : J, B, Pk, C, N. *rNga sgra rgyal po* (= 'Tib. Kho.).

⁸¹⁰ *mthun* : 'T, Ph, D. 'thun.

⁸¹¹ *pa* : B, Pk. *par*.

⁸¹² *byaste* : i.e. *byas te*.

⁸¹³ *byas* : S. *bya* (s.c.).

⁸¹⁴ *yang* : N, L. 'ang.

⁸¹⁵ *pad ma* : S, Ph, B, N, L. *pad-ma*; the other Kanjurs read *pad ma* instead.

⁸¹⁶ *sngun* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *sngon*; KN. 380.11. *pūrvaka*~.

Kanjur: ^(S.212a1) *chos kyi rnam grangs 'di bzung ste / 'khor bzhi la yang dag par rab tu bshad do // de sngon gyi dge ba'i rtsa ba des mthar gyis de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom*
^(S.212a2) *pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas sPrin sgra rgyal po zhes bya bar mtshan mthun*⁸¹⁷ *pa*

(kha 107b1) *gshegs pa / dgra bcom ba / yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas, bye ba brgya phrag nyi shu mnyes par byaste*⁸¹⁸ */ thams chad las gyang Dam pa'i chos pu 'da' r(i)*

Kanjur (KN.380.12; T. 180a6; J. 155b2; S. 212a2; Ph. 354a3; B. 192b1; Pk. 162a2; N. 218b7; D. 141b5; C. 167a5; L. 223b7): *bye ba brgya phrag nyi shu* ^(KN.381) *mnyes par byas nas / thams cad du yang*⁸¹⁹ *Dam pa'i chos* ⁸²⁰ *pad ma dkar*

(kha 107b2) *ka'i chos gyi gzhung 'di nyid bzung ste / 'khor bzhi la yang dag par rab du bshado*⁸²¹ *// thams chad na yang / 'di lta bu'i, myig yongsu dag pa dang ldan bar gyurd to // rna ba yongsu*

Kanjur: *po'i* ^(S.212a4) *chos kyi rnam grangs 'di nyid bzung ste / 'khor bzhi la yang dag par rab tu bshad do // thams cad na yang*⁸²² *mig yongs su dag pa dang ldan par gyur to // rna ba yongs su*

(kha 107b3) «[da]g» *pa dang / sna yongsu dag pa dang / lce yongsu dag pa dang / lus yongsu dag pa dang / yid yongsu dag pa dang* ^(S.212a4) *{/} l[d]an par gyurd to // de lta, mThu chen po, thob pa / rTag du brnyas pa /*

Kanjur: *dag* ^(S.212a4) *pa dang / sna yongs su dag pa dang / lce yongs su dag pa dang / lus yongs su dag pa dang / yid yongs su dag pa de lta bu dang ldan par gyur to // mThu chen thob byang chub* ^(S.212a5) *sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rTag tu brnyas*⁸²³ *pa*

(kha 107b4) *byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po, des / de bzhin gshegs pa / bye ba khrag khrig brgya stong de snyed la sti stang* ^(S.212a5) *byas / bla mar byas / ri mo dang mchod*

Kanjur: *des / de bzhin gshegs pa bye ba khrag khrig brgya stong de snyed la bsti*⁸²⁴ *stang*⁸²⁵

⁸¹⁷ *mtshun* : T, Ph, D. 'thun (= Tib. Kho.).

⁸¹⁸ *byaste* : i.e. *byas te*.

⁸¹⁹ *yang* : N, L. 'ang.

⁸²⁰ *pad ma* : S, N, L. *pad-ma*; Ph. om. (s.c.); the other Kanjurs read *pad ma* instead.

⁸²¹ *bshado* : i.e. *bshad do*.

⁸²² *yang* : N, L. 'ang.

⁸²³ *brnyas* : Ph. *brnyes* (s.c.).

⁸²⁴ *bsti* : = T, B, N, D, L; J, Ph, Pk, C. *sti* (= Tib. Kho.).

⁸²⁵ *stang* : T. *bstang* (s.c.).

*du*⁸²⁶ *byas* / *bla mar byas* / *ri mo dang* / *mchod*

(kha 107b5) *pa dang* / *gsol ba dang* / *dbul ba byaste* / *gzhan yang sang* ○ *s rgyas bye*
ba khrag khrig brgya stong mang po la / *sti* *stang* *du bya ba* ○ *dang* / *bla mar*
bya ba dang / *ri mo dang mchod pa* [*dang*] /

Kanjur: *pa dang* / (S.212a6) *gsol ba dang* / *dbul ba byas te* / *gzhan yang sangs rgyas bye ba*
*khrag khrig brgya stong mang po la bsti*⁸²⁸ *stang*⁸²⁹ *du bya ba dang* / *bla mar bya ba*
dang / *ri mo dang mchod pa dang* /

(kha 107b6) *gsol ba byas nas* / *de dag thanis chad las gyang* / *Dam pa'i chos pu 'da' ri*
ka'i chos gyi gzhang 'di *bzung ste* // *sngon gyi dge ba'i rtsa ba de nyid yongsu*
smyin pas / *bla na*

Kanjur: *gsol pa byas nas* / (S.212a7) *de dag thams cad du yang*⁸³⁰ *Dam pa'i chos*⁸³¹ *pad ma dkar*
po'i chos kyi rnam grangs 'di bzung ste / *sngon gyi dge ba'i rtsa ba de nyid yongsu*
smin pas / *bla na*

(kha 107b7) *myed pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub du mngon bar* || *sangs*
rgyas // *yang*⁸³² *mThu chen po thob pa* / *de'i tshe de'i dus na* / *bcom ldan*
'das / [*...*] *Yangs par bsgrags pa'i dbyangs* {/}

Kanjur: *med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang* (S.212b1) *chub tu*⁸³³ *mngon par rdzogs par*
sangs rgyas so // *mThu chen thob de'i tshe de'i dus na* / *bcom ldan 'das de bzhin*
gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas (S.212b2) *'jigs bsgrags*⁸³⁴
dbyangs

(kha 107b8) *gyi rgyal po* || [*...*] *de bzhin gshegs pa* / *dgra bcom ba yang dag par rdzogs*
pa'i sangs rgyas || *gyi bstan* *pa la* / *'khor bzhi rnam gyis* / *rTag du brnyas par*
⁸³⁵ *shes shing* / *gang*

Kanjur: *kyi rgyal po'i bstan pa la 'khor bzhi rnam kyi rTag tu brnyas par grags shing* /
gang

⁸²⁶ *du* : = T; the other Kanjurs omit this word (= Tib. Kho.).

⁸²⁷ *bla mar byas* / : B. om. (s.c.).

⁸²⁸ *bsti* : = T, B, N, D, L; J, Ph, Pk, C. *sti* (= Tib. Kho.).

⁸²⁹ *stang* : T. *bstang* (s.c.).

⁸³⁰ *yang* : N, L. 'ang.

⁸³¹ *pad ma* : S, B, N, L. *pad-ma*; the other Kanjurs read *pad ma* instead.

⁸³² *yang* : = KN. 381.8. *khalu punas*, Tib. Kanj.-.

⁸³³ *tu* : = T, D, L (≠ Tib. Kho. *du*); the other Kanjurs omit this word.

⁸³⁴ *bsgrags* : T. *sgrags* (w.r.).

⁸³⁵ *shes* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *grags*, KN. 381.11. *sammata*~ (← *samantato* [s.e.]).

(kha 108a1) གེས་ཀྱི་དབུ་མཚན་གསེག་པ་དང་དཀྱིལ་མཚན་པ་འི་
sangs rgyas de snyed ཁྱེད་ཀྱི་མཚན་པ་འི་པུ་ལ་འཕྲུག་པ་འི་
bya'i པུ་ལ་འཕྲུག་པ་འི་པུ་ལ་འཕྲུག་པ་འི་པུ་ལ་འཕྲུག་པ་འི་
bya'i པུ་ལ་འཕྲུག་པ་འི་པུ་ལ་འཕྲུག་པ་འི་པུ་ལ་འཕྲུག་པ་འི་

Kanjur (KN.381.11; T. 180b5; J. 155b7; S. 212b2; Ph. 354b2; B. 192b8; Pk. 162a8; N. 219b1; D. 142a3; C. 167b4; L. 224b1): *gis de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas de snyed mnyes par byas pa / byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rTag tu brnyas pa*

(kha 108a2) sems dpa' chen po གེས་ཀྱི་དབུ་མཚན་གསེག་པ་དང་དཀྱིལ་མཚན་པ་འི་
sam / the *tshom du gyurd* na / mThu chen བུ་ཐོབ་པ་འི་དབུ་མཚན་གསེག་པ་དང་དཀྱིལ་མཚན་པ་འི་
// de ji བུ་ཐོབ་པ་འི་དབུ་མཚན་གསེག་པ་དང་དཀྱིལ་མཚན་པ་འི་དབུ་མཚན་གསེག་པ་དང་དཀྱིལ་མཚན་པ་འི་

Kanjur: *de gzhan*⁸³⁶ *yin snyam du som nyi 'am / yid gnyis dang*⁸³⁷ / *the tsom za bar gyur na* / (S.212b4) *mThu chen thob khyod kyis de ltar mi blta'o // de ci'i phyir zhe na / nga nyid de'i tshe de'i dus*

(kha 108a3) na གེས་ཀྱི་དབུ་མཚན་གསེག་པ་དང་དཀྱིལ་མཚན་པ་འི་པུ་ལ་འཕྲུག་པ་འི་
sangs dpa' chen བུ་ཐོབ་པ་འི་དབུ་མཚན་གསེག་པ་དང་དཀྱིལ་མཚན་པ་འི་དབུ་མཚན་གསེག་པ་དང་དཀྱིལ་མཚན་པ་འི་
// gal te བུ་ཐོབ་པ་འི་དབུ་མཚན་གསེག་པ་དང་དཀྱིལ་མཚན་པ་འི་དབུ་མཚན་གསེག་པ་དང་དཀྱིལ་མཚན་པ་འི་
sngon chos gyi *gzhung* 'di ma blangs ma bzung bar gyur na

Kanjur: *na / byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rTag tu brnyas pa zhes bya bar gyur*⁸³⁹ *to //* (S.212b5) *mThu chen thob gal te ngas sngon chos kyi nam grangs 'di ma blangs ma bzung bar gyur na /*

(kha 108a4) nga བུ་ཐོབ་པ་འི་དབུ་མཚན་གསེག་པ་དང་དཀྱིལ་མཚན་པ་འི་པུ་ལ་འཕྲུག་པ་འི་
/ byang chub *du* mngon *bar* བུ་ཐོབ་པ་འི་དབུ་མཚན་གསེག་པ་དང་དཀྱིལ་མཚན་པ་འི་དབུ་མཚན་གསེག་པ་དང་དཀྱིལ་མཚན་པ་འི་
sangs rgyas par myi 'gyur te / mThu che བུ་ཐོབ་པ་འི་དབུ་མཚན་གསེག་པ་དང་དཀྱིལ་མཚན་པ་འི་དབུ་མཚན་གསེག་པ་དང་དཀྱིལ་མཚན་པ་འི་
thob བུ་ཐོབ་པ་འི་དབུ་མཚན་གསེག་པ་དང་དཀྱིལ་མཚན་པ་འི་དབུ་མཚན་གསེག་པ་དང་དཀྱིལ་མཚན་པ་འི་
de ltar ngas sngon gyi de bzhin

Kanjur: *nga 'di ltar myur du*⁸⁴⁰ *bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub tu*⁸⁴¹ *mngon par rdzogs par sangs* (S.212b6) *rgyas par mi* (KN.382) *'gyur te / mThu chen thob de ltar ngas sngon gyi*⁸⁴² *de bzhin*

(kha 108a5) gshegs pa / dgra bcom *ba* yang dag par rdzogs pa'i / གེས་ཀྱི་དབུ་མཚན་གསེག་པ་དང་དཀྱིལ་མཚན་པ་འི་པུ་ལ་འཕྲུག་པ་འི་
rnams gyi gan nas / chos gyi *gzhung* 'di bzung ste / གེས་ཀྱི་དབུ་མཚན་གསེག་པ་དང་དཀྱིལ་མཚན་པ་འི་པུ་ལ་འཕྲུག་པ་འི་
plags pa dang / *bstand*

⁸³⁶ *gzhan* : = T (= 'Tib. Kho.); Ph. *bzhin* (s.c.); the other Kanjurs read *gzhan zbig* instead. Cf. KN. 381.9. *anyab*.

⁸³⁷ *dang* : = T; the other Kanjurs read *sam* instead (= 'Tib. Kho.).

⁸³⁸ *the tsom* : = T; the other Kanjurs read *the tshom* instead (= 'Tib. Kho.).

⁸³⁹ *gyur* : C. 'gyur (s.c.).

⁸⁴⁰ *du* : B. om. (s.c.); C. *tu*.

⁸⁴¹ *tu* : T reads thus (= 'Tib. Kho. *du*); the other Kanjurs omit this word.

⁸⁴² *gyi* : T. *gyis* (s.c.).

⁸⁴³ *plags pa* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *bklags* (v.l. *klags*); KN. 382.2. *vācitarān*; cf. also n. 577, 637.

pas / de'i phyir

Kanjur: *gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas rnams kyi*⁸⁴⁴ *gan*⁸⁴⁵
nas chos kyi rnam grangs 'di (S.21.2b7) *bzung ste / bklags*⁸⁴⁶ *pa dang bstan pas*⁸⁴⁷ / *de'i*
phyir

(kha 108a6) *nga* _{||} *myur du bla na myed pa // yang dag par rdzogs pa'i / byang chub*
du mngon bar _{||} *sangs rgyaso // mThu chen [po] thob [pa] / [r-] rTag du brnyas*
pa'i _{||} *byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa'*

Kanjur: *nga 'di ltar myur du bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub tu*⁸⁴⁸
mngon par rdzogs par sangs rgyas so // mThu chen thob byang chub (S.21.3a1) *sems dpa'*
*sems dpa' chen po rTag tu brnyas*⁸⁴⁹ *pa*

(kha 108a7) *chen po, des / dge slong [pa]*⁸⁵⁰ *brgya dang / dge slong ma [brgya] dang /*
dge bsnnyend [pa] brgya dang / dge bsnyen ma brgya _{||} *dag* _{||} // *bcom ldan 'das*
de'i bstan pa la / chos gyi gzhung 'di yang dag par

Kanjur: *des*⁸⁵² / *dge slong dang / dge slong ma dang /*⁸⁵³ *dge bsnyen dang / dge bsnyen ma*
brgya phrag mang po dag la / bcom ldan 'das de'i (S.21.3a2) *bstan pa la chos kyi rnam*
grangs 'di yang dag par

(kha 108a8) *bsg(r)ags shing kho bo khyed la brnyas par myi byed do / khyed chag*
thams chad gyang / byang chub sems dpa'i spyad pa spyod chig dang / khyed
*<de> bzhin gshegs pa /*⁸⁵⁴ *bla na myed pa / yang*

Kanjur: *bsgrags shing kho bo khyed la brnyas par mi byed do // khyed cag*⁸⁵⁵ *thams cad*
kyang byang chub sems dpa'i spyad pa spyod cig dang / khyed de (S.21.3a3) *bzhin gshegs*
pa dgra bcom pa yang

(kha 108b1) *dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyasu 'gyuro zhes byas pa dang / gag gis*
byang cub sems dpa' de la gnod sems bskyed par gyurd pa / de dag gis *bskald*

⁸⁴⁴ *kyi* : = 'T, Ph (≡ 'Tib. Kho. *gyi*); the other Kanjurs read *kyis* instead (w.r.).

⁸⁴⁵ *gan* : = 'T, J, Ph, N, D, L (= 'Tib. Kho.); B, Pk, C. *gnan* (w.r.).

⁸⁴⁶ *bklags* : 'T, Ph, B, Pk. *klags*; cf. KN. 382.2. *vācītavān*.

⁸⁴⁷ *pas* : 'T. *pa* (s.e.).

⁸⁴⁸ *tu* : 'T reads thus (≡ 'Tib. Kho. *du*); the other Kanjurs omit this word.

⁸⁴⁹ *brnyas* : 'T. *guas* (s.e.).

⁸⁵⁰ *brgya ... brgya ... brgya* : = KN. 382.4. (*bbikṣu-*)*śatāni* (*bbikṣuṇī-*)*śatāni* (*cōpāsaka-*)*śatāni*, 'Tib.

Kanj.-.

⁸⁵¹ - : = KN. 382.4.-; 'Tib. Kanj. *phrag mang po*.

⁸⁵² *des* : S, 'T. *de* (w.r.).

⁸⁵³ *dge bsnyen dang /* : S. om. (s.e.).

⁸⁵⁴ *bla na myed pa* : s.e.?, cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *dgra bcom pa* = KN. 382.6. *arhantaḥ*.

⁸⁵⁵ *cag* : = 'T, Ph, D, L (≡ 'Tib. Kho. *chag*); the other Kanjurs omit this word.

pa bye ba brgya

Kanjur (KN.382.6; T. 181a5; J. 156a6; S. 213a3; Ph. 355a2; B. 193a8; Pk. 162b6; N. 220a2; D. 142b1; C. 168a4; L. 225a1): *dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas su 'gyur ro zhes byas pa dang / gang gis byang chub sems dpa' de la gnod sems bskyed par gyur pa de dag gis*⁸⁵⁶ *(S.21 3a4) bskal pa bye ba brgya*

(kha 108b2) phrag nyi shur / nam yang de bzhin gshegs pa ma mthong / chos gyi sgra yang ma thos / dge 'dun gyi sgra yang ma thos so / *bskald* pa stong phrag *bchur*⁸⁵⁷ *bStir myed pa'i sems chan dmyal*

Kanjur: *phrag nyi shur nam yang / de bzhin gshegs pa ma*⁸⁵⁸ *mthong*⁸⁵⁹ *chos kyi sgra yang*⁸⁶⁰ *ma thos / dge 'dun gyi*⁸⁶¹ *sgra yang*⁸⁶² *ma thos so // bskal pa stong phrag bcur mNar med* *(S.21 3a5) pa'i sems can dmyal*

(kha 108b3) ba chen por *[...]* myi bzad pa'i *[...]* sdug bsngal *[...]* myong ngo / de dag thams *chad* las gyi *bsgribs* pa de las yongs<u> thar nas / byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po de nyid *gyis*

Kanjur: *ba chen por sdug bsngal mi bzad*⁸⁶³ *pa myong ngo // de dag thams cad*⁸⁶⁴ *las kyi sgrib pa de las yongs su thar nas / byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen* *(S.21 3a6) po de nyid kyis*

(kha 108b4) bla na myed pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub *du* yongsu ○ smyin par byaso // mThu chen *[po]* thob *[pa]* / *[...]* de'i dus *[...]* de'i tshe, *[...]* // sems ○ *chan du gyurd* pa / byang chub sems dpa' /

Kanjur: *bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub tu yongs su smin par byas so // mThu chen thob de'i tshe de'i dus na / sems can du gyur pa / byang chub sems dpa'*

(kha 108b5) sems dpa' chen po la / bsting ba dang 'phyi ba byas pa de da○g gang yin snyam du som nyi dang / yid gnyis *dang* / the *tshom* za ba○r *gyurd* na / mThu chen *[po]* thob *[pa]* / 'khor

⁸⁵⁶ *gis* : B. *gi* (s.e.).

⁸⁵⁷ *bStir myed pa* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *mNar med pa*; KN. 382.8. *Avāci-*.

⁸⁵⁸ *ma* : Ph. om. (s.e.); Pk. *mad* (s.e.).

⁸⁵⁹ *mthong* : J, C. *'thong* (s.e.).

⁸⁶⁰ *yang* : N, L. *'ang*.

⁸⁶¹ *gyi* : T. *gyis* (s.e.).

⁸⁶² *yang* : N, L. *'ang*.

⁸⁶³ *bzad* : T, Ph. *zad* (s.e.).

⁸⁶⁴ *thams cad* : = T, Ph, B, Pk (= Tib. Kho. *thams chad*); the other Kanjurs read *thams cad kyi* instead (w.r.). Cf. KN. 382.9. *(te ca) sarve (tasmā karmāvaranāt)*.

Kanjur: ⁸⁶⁵*sems dpa' chen po* _(S.213a7) *la bsting ba dang / 'phya ba byas pa de dag* ⁸⁶⁶*gang yin snyam du som nyi dang* ⁸⁶⁷ / *yid gnyis sam* / ⁸⁶⁸*the tsom za bar gyur na / mThu chen thob 'khor*

(kha 108b6) *'di nyid gyi nang na / [b]Zang skyong la* *stsogs pa / byang chub sems dpa' lnga brgya dang / Seng ge zla ba la* *stsogs pa / dge slong ma lnga brgya dang /* ⁸⁶⁹*bDe [bar] gshegs [pa] tshor «ba» la* *stsogs pa*

Kanjur: *'di nyid kyi nang na* / _(KN.383) *bZang* ⁸⁷⁰*skyong la sogs* _(S.213b1) *pa byang chub sems dpa' lnga brgya dang / Seng ge* ⁸⁷¹*zla ba la sogs pa dge slong ma lnga brgya dang /* *bDe* ⁸⁷²*gshegs sems pa la sogs pa*

(kha 108b7) *dge bsnyen ma lnga brgya ste / thams* *chad gyang* / *bla na myed pa / yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub las / phyir myi ldog par byas so // mThu chen* _[po] *thob* _[pa] / *chos gyi gzhung* *'di*

Kanjur: *dge bsnyen ma lnga brgya ste / thams cad kyang bla na* _(S.213b2) *med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub las phyir mi ldog par byas so // mThu chen thob chos kyi rnam grangs* *'di* ⁸⁷³

(kha 108b8) *'dzind pa dang / ston pa dang / lhan* _[chig song] *ba'i bsod nams gyi* ⁸⁷⁴*pung po de ltar don che ste / byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rnam* _[] / *bla na myed pa yang dag par*

Kanjur: ⁸⁷⁵*'dzin pa dang / ston pa dang* ⁸⁷⁶*ldan pa'i bsod nams kyi phung po de ltar* _(S.213b3) *don che ste / byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rnam* *kyi* ⁸⁷⁷*bla na med pa yang dag par*

⁸⁶⁵ *sems dpa'* : S. om. (s.c.).

⁸⁶⁶ *de dag* : T. *de <da>g* (s.c.).

⁸⁶⁷ *dang* : = 'T' (= Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read *'am* instead.

⁸⁶⁸ *the tsom* : = 'T'; the other Kanjurs read *the tshom* instead (= Tib. Kho.).

⁸⁶⁹ *bDe bar gshegs pa tshor ba* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *bDe gshegs sems pa*; KN. 383.2. *Sugatacetanā*. 'The translator of Tib. Kho. probably confused Skt. *cetanā* ("intention, will") with Skt. *vedanā* ("feeling, sensation"), due to the close similarity in appearance between *c* and *v*.

⁸⁷⁰ *bZang* : T. *bZong* (s.c.).

⁸⁷¹ *ge* : = 'T', Ph (= Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read *ge'i* instead (w.r.).

⁸⁷² *bDe* : Ph. *bDer*.

⁸⁷³ *'di* : 'T. *des 'di* (s.c.).

⁸⁷⁴ *pung po* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *phung po*; KN. 383.3.-; = D1, D2, K, N1 etc. (*puṇya-*)*skandha-*. Cf. n. 1077.

⁸⁷⁵ *'dzin pa dang / ston pa dang* : = Tib. Kho.; ≠ KN. 383.3. *dhāraṇā vācanā deśanā*; = v.l. D1, B1, K, C4, N1 etc. *dhāraṇā-deśanā-*.

⁸⁷⁶ *ldan pa'i bsod nams kyi phung po* : = Tib. Kho. *lhan chig song ba'i bsod nams gyi pung po*; ≠ KN. 383.3.-; = D1, D2, K, N1 etc. (*deśanā-*)*sabagataḥ puṇyaskandho*. Cf. Krsh. 211.

⁸⁷⁷ *kyi* : S, T. *kyis* (w.r.). Cf. KN. 383.3. *bodhisattvānām mabāsattvānām*.

(kha 109a4) ngan yongs 'das nas // dam chos 'khrugs par gyur⁸⁹² d pa tha ma la // de na byang chub sems dpa' dge slong gyurd⁸⁹² / ○ / de'i mying ni rTag du brnyas shes bya //

Kanjur: *ngan yongs 'das nas //* ^(S.213b7) *dam chos 'kbrugs*⁸⁹³ *par*⁸⁹⁴ *gyur pa tha ma la // de na byang chub sems dpa' dge slong byung //* ⁸⁹⁵ *de yi ming ni rTag tu brnyas* shes⁸⁹⁶ *bya // (= 2)*

(kha 109a5) ⁸⁹⁷de na dge slong gzhan || gyi drung₁ [song₁ ste₁] // de bzhin || dmyigs ○ par lta ba'i ⁸⁹⁸dge slong ma [r₁] // kho bo khyed la || brnyas [p]a [yong⁸⁹⁹] myed ○ [de₁] // khyed gyis byang chub mchog du spyad

Kanjur: *de na dge slong gzhan dang de bzhin du // dmigs par*⁹⁰⁰ ^(S.214a1) *lta ba'i dge slong de gan*⁹⁰¹ *song // kho bos khyed la*⁹⁰² *nam yang brnyas pa med // khyed*⁹⁰³ *kyis byang chub mchog phyir spyad*

(kha 109a6) pa spyod // de bzhin rtag du yang dag bsgrags pa na // gshe zhing brgyad pa de dag bzod par byed // 'chi ba'i du[s] byed nye bar gnas pa dang /</> de'i s mdo sde 'di ni thos gyurd nas // de

Kanjur: *pa spyod // (= 3)* ^(KN.384) *de bzhin rtag tu yang dag bsgrags*⁹⁰⁴ ^(S.214a2) *pa na // gshe zhing brgyad pa de dag bzod par byed // 'chi ba'i dus byed*⁹⁰⁵ *nye bar gnas pa dang // de yis mdo sde 'di ni thos*⁹⁰⁶ *gyur nas // (= 4) de*

(kha 109a7) na mkhas pas 'chi ba₁ dus ma byas // tshe ni shin du ring por ⁹⁰⁷rab gnas ste // [de na mdo [sde₁] 'di || ni rab du bshad // [rnam || 'dren || de'i] bstan pa

⁸⁹² *gyurd* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *byung*; KN. 383.11. *abbūṣī*.

⁸⁹³ *'kbrugs* : S, T, Ph. *'kbrug* (w.r.); the other Kanjurs read *'kbrugs* instead (= Tib. Kho.).

⁸⁹⁴ *par* : T. *ba* (s.e.).

⁸⁹⁵ *de yi* : Ph. *de'i* (= Tib. Kho.).

⁸⁹⁶ *shes* : T, Ph, B, Pk and C read thus (= Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs, incl. S, read *zbes* instead.

⁸⁹⁷ *de na dge slong gzhan gyi dung song ste // de bzhin dmyigs par lta ba'i dge slong ma* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *de na dge slong gzhan dang de bzhin du // dmigs par lta ba'i dge slong de gan song*, KN. 383.12. *upasaṅkramitvā tada bbikṣu anyān upalambhādṛṣṭvā tathārva bbikṣuṇī*.

⁸⁹⁸ *dge slong ma* : = KN. 383.12. *bbikṣuṇī*; ≠ Tib. Kanj. *dge slong de*.

⁸⁹⁹ *yong* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *nam yang*, KN. 383.13. *kaḍācit*.

⁹⁰⁰ *par* : T. *pa'i* (s.e.).

⁹⁰¹ *gan* : B. *gnas* (s.e.).

⁹⁰² *la* : T. om. (s.e.).

⁹⁰³ *khyed* : C. *khyod*.

⁹⁰⁴ *bsgrags* : T. *sgrags* (w.r.); Ph. *rab sgrags* (w.r.).

⁹⁰⁵ *byed* : B. *byas* (s.e.).

⁹⁰⁶ *thos* : T. *chos* {[*tho*]} (s.e.).

⁹⁰⁷ *rab gnas ste* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *byin brlabs te*; KN. 384.3. *adbṣṭhibitvā*.

[de] la 'o // [---] dmyigs pa mang po de dag {/}

Kanjur: *tshe mkhas pas 'chi⁹⁰⁸ ba'i dus ma^(S.214a3) byas // tshe yang shin tu⁹⁰⁹ ring por byin
brlabs te // rnam par 'dren pa⁹¹⁰ de yi bstan pa la // de tshe mdo 'di yang ni rab tu
bshad // (= 5) dmigs can mang po de dag*

(kha 109a8) thams *chad gyang* // de 'is byang chub du ni || smyin [bar] byas // [---]
byang chub sems dpa' [---] de nas, shi 'phos nas // sangs rgyas bye ba phrag
stong mnyes *bya ste⁹¹¹* // mthar gyis bsod nams

Kanjur: *thams cad kyang* // ^(S.214a4) de yis byang chub tu ni yongs smin byas // de nas byang
chub sems dpa' shi 'phos nas // sangs rgyas bye ba phrag stong mnyes byas te // (= 6)
mthar gyis bsod nams

(kha 109b1) byas pa de dag gis // mdo [sde] 'di 'ang || rtag par rab du bshad // rgyal
ba || sras des byang chub yang dag thob // *Shag kya* thub pa nga nyid de yin te
// de na [---] || dmyigs [pa] *chan gyi*

Kanjur (KN.384.7; T. 182a4; J. 157a2; S. 214a4; Ph. 356a4; B. 194b1; Pk. 163b2; N.
221a4; D. 143a4; C. 169a2; L. 226a4): *byas pa de dag^(S.214a5) gis // mdo 'di yang
ni⁹¹² rtag par rab tu bshad // rgyal ba'i sras des byang chub yang dag thob // Shākya
thub pa nga nyid de⁹¹³ yin no // (= 7) de tshe gang dag dmigs can*

(kha 109b2) dge slong [---] gang, || // dge slong ma dang dge bsnyen gang rnam dang
// de na dge bsnyen ma rnam gang 'byung ba // mkhas pas⁹¹⁴ [yang dag]
byang chub bsgrags || pa [de] / de 'is sangs rgyas

Kanjur: *dge slong dang* // dge ^(S.214a6) slong ma dang⁹¹⁵ dge bsnyen gang rnam dang // de na
dge bsnyen ma rnam gang byung ba // mkhas pas de tshe byang chub bsgrags⁹¹⁶ gyur
pa // (= 8) de dag rnam kyis⁹¹⁷ sangs rgyas

(kha 109b3) bye [ba] mang [po] mthong // de dag lnga brgya myi nyung 'di rnamste⁹¹⁸

⁹⁰⁸ 'chi : T. mchi (s.e.).

⁹⁰⁹ tu : J, Ph, Pk. du (= Tib. Kho.).

⁹¹⁰ de yi : Ph, B, Pk. de'i (= Tib. Kho.); T. {pa} de yi (s.e.).

⁹¹¹ mnyes bya ste : s.e. for mnyes *byaste*, i.e. mnyes *byas te* (= Tib. Kanj.); KN. 384.6. *ārāgayī*.

⁹¹² ni : T. mi (s.e.).

⁹¹³ de : B. om. (s.e.).

⁹¹⁴ *yang dag byang chub bsgrags pa de* : = KN. 384.10. *ye bodhi samśrāvita*; ≠ Tib. Kanj. *de tshe byang
chub bsgrags gyur pa*.

⁹¹⁵ dang : T. om. (s.e.).

⁹¹⁶ bsgrags : T. sgrags (w.r.).

⁹¹⁷ kyis : J, N, C, L. kyi (s.e.).

⁹¹⁸ rnamste : i.e. rnam te.

// de bzhin dge slong pa dang {/} dge slong ma // nga⁹¹⁹ i mngon sum dge bsnyen 'di dag ste // thams chad nga⁹²⁰ i chos mchog thos byas {/}

Kanjur: bye⁹¹⁹ mang mtbong // (S.214a7) de dag⁹²⁰ nga brgya mi nyung 'di rnam⁹²¹ dang // ⁹²¹de bzbin dge slong pha dang dge slong ma // ⁹²²nga yi mngon sum⁹²³ dge bsnyen 'di dag⁹²⁴ ste // (= 9) (KN.385) thams cad⁹²⁵ nga yis chos mchog thos⁹²⁶ byas

(kha 109b4) nas // ngas ni 'di dag thams chad yongs smyin byas // ○ ⁹²⁷mya ngan <nga> 'da's⁹²⁸ brtan ba 'di kun gyis // 'di na mdo sde mchog ○ 'di 'dzin par 'gyur // bskal pa mtba yas

Kanjur: nas // ngas ni⁹²⁸ (S.214b1) 'di dag thams cad yongs smin byas // mya ngan nga 'das dpa' bo 'di kun ni // 'di na mdo sde mchog 'di 'dzin par 'gyur // (= 10) bskal pa mtba yas

(kha 109b5) bye ba mang por yang // 'di 'dra_{||} chos ni ⁹²⁹nams gyang myi thos ○ te // sangs rgyas bye ba phrag brgya byung na yang // ⁹³⁰mdo sde de || ni 'di ○ dag myi 'chad do // de lta bas na⁹³¹ {/} de 'dra 'di || {/}

Kanjur: bye ba mang por yang // 'di (S.214b2) 'dra⁹²⁹ i chos ni nam yang mi thos te // sangs rgyas bye ba phrag brgya byung⁹³² na yang // de dag kyang ni mdo⁹³³ 'di mi 'chad do // (= 11) de phyir rang byung nyid kyis brjod⁹³⁴ pa'i chos // 'di lta bu yi (S.214b3) rnam pa

(kha 109b6) ⁹³⁵nyon la // {/}rang 'byung nyid gyis 'di 'dra_{||} [b]rjod pa_{||} chos //, yang

⁹¹⁹bye : 'T. byed (s.c.).

⁹²⁰dag : 'T. tsbe (s.c.).

⁹²¹de bzbin dge slong pha dang dge slong ma // nga yi mngon sum dge bsnyen 'di dag ste // : 'T. de bzbin dge bsnyen ma rnam⁹²¹ dge bsnyen 'di dag ste // (s.c.).

⁹²²nga yi : Ph. nga'i (= 'Tib. Kho.).

⁹²³sum : J. C. sam (s.c.).

⁹²⁴dag : B. lta (s.c.).

⁹²⁵nga yis : Ph. nga yi (= 'Tib. Kho. nga'i) (w.r.); cf. KN.385.1. mayā (= nga yis).

⁹²⁶thos : = KN.385.1. śrāvita; S, T. thob (s.c.).

⁹²⁷mya ngan <nga> 'da's : cf. Tib. Kanj. mya ngan nga 'das, KN.385.2. mayi nirvṛte.

⁹²⁸brtan ba : cf. Tib. Kanj. dpa' bo; KN.385.2. dbīra~ (= 'Tib. Kho. brtan ba); D1, D2, K etc. vīra~ (= 'Tib. Kanj. dpa' bo); cf. n. 339.

⁹²⁹nams gyang : cf. Tib. Kanj. nam yang; KN.385.3. kadācit.

⁹³⁰mdo sde de ni 'di dag : cf. Tib. Kanj. de dag kyang ni mdo 'di; KN.385.4. te p' (v.l. tāv') imañ sūtra.

⁹³¹de lta bas na : cf. Tib. Kanj. de phyir; KN.385.5. tasmāt.

⁹³²byung : = 'T, Ph (= Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read 'byung instead.

⁹³³mdo : B. chos (s.c.).

⁹³⁴brjod : Pk. brngod (s.c.).

⁹³⁵nyon la : cf. Tib. Kanj. thos nas su; KN.385.5. śrūṇitvā.

dang yang ni rab du 'di zung la // mya ngan «nga» 'das mdo sde 'di rab shod
 // rTag du rnyas pa'i le'u zhes byas ste bchu dgu'o //

Kanjur: *thos nas su // yang dang yang ni rab tu 'di bzung⁹³⁶ la // mya ngan nga 'das⁹³⁷ mdo
 sde rab shod cig / (= 12) ⁹³⁸rTag tu brnyas pa'i le'u zhes bya ba⁹³⁹ ste / bcu dgu pa'o
 //*

(kha 109b7) / : : / de nas [gang] [→2] [stong gi 'jig rten gyi kham s gyi⁹⁴⁰ [rd]ul [shin
 du] phra ba'i rdul [dang] // myam [ba'i] →1] byang chub sems dpa' / bye ba
 khrag khrig brgya stong [[1] [2]] «⁹⁴¹sa'i bar nas byung ste» / de dag thams
chad gyis / bcom ldan

Kanjur: (S.214b4) (KN.386) // de nas byang chub sems dpa' bye ba kbrag kbrig brgya stong phrag
 stong gi 'jig rten gyi kham s kyi rdul phra rab snyed⁹⁴² gang dag sa rum nas 'thon⁹⁴³
 pa de dag thams cad kyi / bcom ldan

(kha 109b8) 'das gyi spyan sngar thal mo sbyar nas // bcom ldan 'das la 'di skad []
gsol to // bcom ldan 'das / [bdag chag gis...] de bzhin gshegs pa / yongsu mya
 ngan las 'das nas [/] [←1]

Kanjur: (S.214b5) 'das kyi spyan sngar thal mo sbyar nas / bcom ldan 'das la 'di skad ces gsol to
 // bcom ldan 'das de bzhin gshegs pa yongsu mya ngan las 'das nas / bdag cag gis

(kha 110a1) ☉ // sangs rgyas gyi zhing thams chad du / bcom ldan 'das ⁹⁴⁴gag dang /
 ga⁹⁴⁵gi sangs rgyas gyi <zhing> gang dang / [] gag du / bcom ldan 'das yongsu
 mya ngan las 'das par gyurd pa / de dang ⁹⁴⁶de dag

Kanjur (KN.386.3; T. 182b3; J. 157b1; S. 214b5; Ph. 356b5; B. 195a2; Pk. 164a2; N.
 221b6; D. 143b3; C. 169b1; L. 226b6): *sangs rgyas* (S.214b6) *kyi*⁹⁴⁷ *zhing thams cad*

⁹³⁶ *bzung* : = 'T, Ph, B, D, L; J, Pk, N, C. *zung* (= 'Tib. Kho.).

⁹³⁷ *mdo sde* : = 'T (= KN. 385.6. *sūtra*); the other Kanjurs read *mdo 'di* instead (w.r.). Cf. 'Tib. Kho.
mdo sde 'di.

⁹³⁸ *rTag tu brnyas pa'i* : = 'T, Ph (= 'Tib. Kho. *rTag du rnyas pa'i*); J, B, Pk, N, D, C, L. *Dam pa'i
 chos pad ma* (B, N, L. *pad-ma*) *dkar po las rTag tu brnyas pa'i*.

⁹³⁹ *ba* : = 'T, D; the other Kanjurs omit this word (= 'Tib. Kho.).

⁹⁴⁰ *rdul shin du phra ba'i rdul dang mnyam ba'i* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *rdul phra rab snyed*; KN. 386.1.
paramāṇu-rajah-sama-.

⁹⁴¹ *sa'i bar nas byung ste* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *sa rum nas 'thon pa*; KN. 386.2. *prthivīvivarebhyo
 niṣkrāntāni*.

⁹⁴² *snyed* : S. *nyed* (s.c.); Ph. *stong* (s.c.).

⁹⁴³ *'thon* : J. *'thod* (s.c.).

⁹⁴⁴ *gag dang gagi* : = KN. 386.4. *yāni yāni (bhagavato buddhakṣetrāni)*; 'Tib. Kanj.-.

⁹⁴⁵ *gagi* : i.e. *gag gi*.

⁹⁴⁶ *de dag du* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *der*; KN. 386.4. *tatra tatra*.

⁹⁴⁷ *kyi* : J, 'T. *kyis* (s.c.).

na / bcom ldan 'das kyi⁹⁴⁸ sangs rgyas kyi zhing gang dag lags pa gang du bcom ldan
'das yongs su mya ngan las 'da' bar⁹⁴⁹ 'gyur ba de dang der

(kha 110a2) du chos gyi gzibung 'di rab du bshad par bgyi'o // bcom ldan 'das bdag
chag gyang chos gyi gzibung⁹⁵⁰ yangs pa 'di lta bu bzung ba dang // klag pa dang /
bstan pa dang / rab du {/}

Kanjur: chos kyi rnam grangs 'di rab tu^(S.214b7) bshad par bgyi'o // bcom ldan 'das bdag cag
ni / chos kyi rnam grangs rgya⁹⁵¹ chen po 'di lta bu gzung⁹⁵² ba dang / bklags⁹⁵³ pa
dang / bstan pa dang / rab tu

(kha 110a3) bshad pa dang / || bri bar 'tshal || lo // de nas 'Jam dpal la stsogs pa byang
chub sems dpa' bye ba khrag khrig brgya stong mang po |dang| / gang || |Myi
mjed...| |gyi| 'jig rten gyi kham |...| || na

Kanjur: bshad pa dang / yi ger bri⁹⁵⁴ bar^(S.215a1) 'tshal ba lags so // de nas 'Jam dpal la sogs
pa⁹⁵⁵ byang chub sems dpa' bye ba khrag khrig brgya stong mang po gang dag 'jig
rten gyi kham Mi^(S.215a2) mjed 'di na

(kha 110a4) gnas pa'i / dge slong |pa| 'am / dge slong ma 'am / dge bsnye On |pa| 'am
/ dge snen ma dang / lha dang klu dang gnod sbyin dang / dri O za dang
lha ma yin dang / nam ka lding dang / myi

Kanjur: gnas pa⁹⁵⁶ dang / dge slong dang / dge slong ma dang / dge bsnyen dang / dge
bsnyen ma dang / lha dang / klu dang / gnod sbyin dang / dri za dang / lha ma yin
dang / nam mkha'^(S.215a3) lding dang / mi

(kha 110a5) 'am chi dang / lto 'phye chen po dang / myi dang / myi ma yin ba O
rnams dang / |chu bo 'gā 'gā || snyed gyi...| byang chub se[m]s dpa' O sems
dpa' chen po mang pos |...| / bcom

Kanjur: 'am ci dang / lto 'phye chen po dang / mi dang mi ma yin pa rnams dang / byang
chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po⁹⁵⁷ mang po⁹⁵⁸ gang gā'i klung gi⁹⁵⁹ bye ma snyed

⁹⁴⁸ kyi : = 'T (= KN. 386.4. *bhagavato*; = 'Tib. Kho. *gñ*); the other Kanjurs read *kyis* instead (w.r.).

⁹⁴⁹ 'da' bar : S. 'das nas (s.c.); 'T. 'das bar (= 'Tib. Kho. 'das par).

⁹⁵⁰ yangs pa : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *rgya chen po*; KN. 386.5. *udāra*~.

⁹⁵¹ rgya : Pk. *brgya* (s.c.).

⁹⁵² gzung : = 'T, Ph; the other Kanjurs read *zung* instead (= 'Tib. Kho.).

⁹⁵³ bklags : L. *bklag*; J, T, Ph, C. *klag* (= 'Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read *klags* instead.

⁹⁵⁴ bri : = 'T, J, Ph, B, Pk, D, C (= 'Tib. Kho.); N, L. 'dri.

⁹⁵⁵ pa : S. om. (s.c.).

⁹⁵⁶ gnas pa : = 'T; the other Kanjurs read *gnas pa dag* instead.

⁹⁵⁷ mang po : = 'T (= 'Tib. Kho.; = KN. 386.9. *babu*~); the other Kanjurs omit these words (w.r.).

⁹⁵⁸ gang gā'i : S, B, N, L. *gang-gā'i*; Ph. *gang ga'i*; the other Kanjurs, incl. 'T, read *gang gā'i* instead.

kyis / bcom

(kha 110a6) ldan 'das la 'di skad || *gsold* to // bcom ldan 'das de bzhin gshegs pa / yongsu mya ngan las 'das nas / bdag *chag* gis *gyang* chos *gyi gzhung* 'di yang dag par rab *du* {/}

Kanjur: *ldan 'das* ^(S.215a4) *la 'di skad ces gsol to // bcom ldan 'das de bzhin gshegs pa yongs su mya ngan las 'das nas bdag cag gis kyang chos⁹⁶⁰ *kyi rnam grangs 'di*⁹⁶¹ *yang dag par rab tu**

(kha 110a7) bshad par bgyi'o // bcom ldan 'das lus myi ⁹⁶²*snang* bar / bar *snang* la{s} gnas *ste* / dbyangs *gyis* yang dag par ⁹⁶³*bsgrag go* // dge ba'i rtsa ba ma ⁹⁶⁴*bskrungs* pa'i sems *chan* rnam / dge

Kanjur: *bshad par bgyi'o* // ^{(S.215a5) (K.N. 387)} *bcom ldan 'das lus*⁹⁶⁵ *mi*⁹⁶⁶ *gda*⁹⁶⁷ *bar bar*⁹⁶⁸ *snang la gnas te dbyangs kyis yang dag par bsgrags*⁹⁶⁹ *par bgyi'o // dge ba'i rtsa ba ma bskrun*⁹⁷⁰ *pa'i sems can rnam dge*

(kha 110a8) ba'i rtsa ba bskrun par bgyi'o // de nas bcom ldan 'das *gyis* / *snga ma*⁹⁷¹ *i* byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po *dus pa* dang / *dus pa* chen po dang / *dus pa'i slob* *pon* || *rnam*

Kanjur: *ba'i rtsa ba bskrun*⁹⁷² *par* ^(S.215a6) *bgyi'o // de nas bcom ldan 'das kyis / byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po / snga ma tshogs dang tshogs chen po dang*⁹⁷³ */ tshogs kyi slob dpon de dag*

(kha 110b1) *gyi* gtso bo *gchig* po *sPyod pa*⁹⁷⁴ *i* khyad *bar* || zhes bya ba *...* / byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po *dus pa* || *dus* «*pa*» chen po || *dus pa'i slob*

⁹⁵⁹ *gi* : 'T. *gis* (s.c.).

⁹⁶⁰ *chos* : 'T. *chos kyang chos* (s.c.).

⁹⁶¹ *di* : 'T. *des na* (s.c.).

⁹⁶² *snang bar* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *gda' bar*; KN. 387.1. (a-)dṛṣṭena.

⁹⁶³ *bsgrag go* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *bsgrags* (v.l. *bsgrag*) *par bgyi'o*; KN. 387.1. (saṃ)śrāvayisyāmo.

⁹⁶⁴ *bskrungs pa* : s.c.?, cf. Tib. Kanj. *bskrun pa*; KN. 387.1. (au-)avaropita-(kuśalamūla-).

⁹⁶⁵ *lus* : J, Pk. *las* (s.c.).

⁹⁶⁶ *mi* : B. *ni* (s.c.).

⁹⁶⁷ *gda* : 'T. *mda*' (s.c.); Ph. *'da*' (s.c.).

⁹⁶⁸ *bar* : S. om. (s.c.); haplography).

⁹⁶⁹ *bsgrags* : = 'T, Ph; the other Kanjurs read *bsgrag* instead (= Tib. Kho.). See n. 963.

⁹⁷⁰ *bskrun* : Ph, Pk. *skrun* (w.r.).

⁹⁷¹ *'dus pa ... 'dus pa ... 'dus pa* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *tshogs ... tshogs ... tshogs*; KN. 387.4. *gaṇin~(ṇabā-)gaṇin~ gaṇa-(ācārya~)*.

⁹⁷² *bskrun* : Ph, Pk. *bkrun* (w.r.).

⁹⁷³ *dang* : 'T. om. (s.c.).

dpon la 'di skad_{||} bka' stsald to // _[r-] ⁹⁷⁴dge'o
 Kanjur (KN.387.4; T. 183a3; J. 157b7; S. 215a6; Ph. 357a6; B. 195b2; Pk. 164a8; N. 222a7; D. 144a1; C. 169b7; L. 227a7): gi gtso _(S.215a7) bo gcig⁹⁷⁵ po byang chub
sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po / sPyod pa khyad par can zhes bya ba tshogs dang
⁹⁷⁶tshogs chen po dang tshogs kyi⁹⁷⁷ slob dpon la 'di skad ces bka' stsal to // sPyod pa
khyad par can _(S.215b1) legs so

(kha 110b2) dge'o / _[r-] sPyod pa'i khyad bar. khyed gyis de ltar gyis shig _{||} chos gyi
gzhung 'di'i phyir / khyed de bzhin gshegs pas yongsu smyin par byaso // de
 nas bcom ldan 'das _[r-] Shag kya thub

Kanjur: legs so // khyod⁹⁷⁸ kyis de ltar gyis shig dang⁹⁷⁹ / chos kyi rnam grangs 'di'i phyir
khyed de bzhin gshegs pas yongs su smin par byas so // de nas bcom ldan _(S.215b2) 'das
 de bzhin gshegs pa Shākya thub

(kha 110b3) pa _[r-] de bzhin gshegs pa_{||} dang / bcom ldan 'das _{||} mya ngan las 'das pa
Rin cen mang_{||} de bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i
 sangs rgyas _[r-] de _[dang] / mchod rten

Kanjur: pa dang / bcom ldan 'das yongs su mya ngan las 'das pa de bzhin gshegs pa dgra
bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas Rin chen _(S.215b3) mang de mchod rten

(kha 110b4) gyi dbus na seng ge'i khri la bzhugs ste / gnyi ga _[mnyam du] ⁹⁸⁰○ 'dzum
ba mdzad nas // gnyis ka'i zhal gyi ⁹⁸¹nang nas ljags gyi ○ dbang po phyung
ste // ljags gyi dbang po de gnyi[s]

Kanjur: gyi dbus na seng ge'i khri la bzhugs pa ⁹⁸²gnyis ka 'dzum pa ⁹⁸³mdzad nas / ⁹⁸⁴gnyis
ka'i zhal gyi sgo nas ljags kyi dbang po ⁹⁸⁵phyung ste / ljags kyi dbang po de ⁹⁸⁶gnyis

⁹⁷⁴ dge'o dge'o : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. legs so legs so; KN. 387.5. sādbu sādhu.

⁹⁷⁵ gcig : Pk. cig (s.c.).

⁹⁷⁶ tshogs chen po dang : 'T. om. (s.c.).

⁹⁷⁷ kyi : 'T. kyis (s.c.).

⁹⁷⁸ khyod : 'T, Ph. khyed (= 'Tib. Kho.).

⁹⁷⁹ dang : = 'T, D, L; the other Kanjurs omit this word (= 'Tib. Kho.).

⁹⁸⁰ mnyam du : = v.l. Bj, C5, C6, T2 etc. samam; 'Tib. Kanj.- = KN. 387.8.- (= D1, D2, N1 etc.).

⁹⁸¹ nang : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. sga, KN. 387.9. (nuukha-)vivaraṅtarā~.

⁹⁸² gnyis ka : S. gnyis (s.c.); 'T, N, L. gnyis ka; B, Pk, D. gnyi ka; J, Ph, C. gnyi ga (= 'Tib. Kho.).

⁹⁸³ pa : 'T. om. (s.c.).

⁹⁸⁴ gnyis ka'i : S, D. gnyi ka'i; Ph. gnyi ga'i; T. gnyis ga'i; L. gnyis ka'i (= 'Tib. Kho.); J, B, N, C. gnyis ka; Pk. gnyis ga (s.c.).

⁹⁸⁵ phyung ste / ljags kyi dbang po de : 'T. om. (s.c.).

⁹⁸⁶ gnyis kyi : S. gnyis kyi (s.c.); 'T. gnyis kyi (= 'Tib. Kho. gnyis gyis); the other Kanjurs read nyid kyi instead (s.c.). Cf. KN. 387.9. tābhyām (ca jibvêndriyābhyām).

(kha 110b5) *gyis* Tshangs pa'i 'jig rten gyi bar du phyin *te* / ljags *gyi* ○ dbang po de gnyis las / 'od *gzer* bye ba khrag khrig brgya stong ○ mang po byung ngo // 'od *gzer* de dag || 'od *gzer*

Kanjur: *kyis* Tshangs pa'i (S.215b4) 'jig rten gyi bar du phyin *nas* / ljags *kyi*⁹⁸⁷ dbang po de *gnyis*⁹⁸⁸ las 'od zer bye ba khrag khrig brgya stong mang po byung ngo // 'od zer de dag las 'od zer

(kha 110b6) re re las *gyang* / byang chub sems dpa' bye ba khrag khrig brgya stong mang po / [ṽ] || gser gyi kha *tog lta bu'i* [ṽ-lus] / skyes bu chen po'i mtshan sum *chu* rtsa gnyis dang ldan *ba* /⁹⁸⁹ pad mo snying po'i

Kanjur: re re las *kyang* / byang chub sems (S.215b5) dpa' bye ba khrag khrig brgya stong mang po lus *kyi* mdog gser gyi kha dog 'dra ba / skyes bu chen po'i mtshan sum *cu*⁹⁹⁰ rtsa gnyis dang ldan pa /⁹⁹¹ pad mo'i snying po'i

(kha 110b7) seng ge'i khri la 'khod pa || byung ngo // byang chub sems dpa' de dag *gyang* phyogs dang / phyogs mtshams *gyi* 'jig rten gyi khams brgya stong || *du* dong *nas* /⁹⁹² phyogs || de dag thams *chad* na /

Kanjur: ⁹⁹³ *seng ge'i khri la 'khod pa dag byung ngo* // (S.215b6) *byang chub sems dpa' de dag kyang phyogs dang phyogs mtshams kyi 'jig rten gyi*⁹⁹⁴ *khams brgya stong dag tu dong ste / phyogs dang phyogs mtshams de dag thams cad na*⁹⁹⁵

(kha 110b8) bar snang la 'khod *de* chos ston *te* / ji ltar bcom ldan 'das [ṽ-*Shag kya* thub pa-] / de bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom *ba* yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas [ṽ-] dang / bcom ldan 'das [ṽ-] Rin

Kanjur: bar snang la⁹⁹⁶ (KN.388) 'khod (S.215b7) *nas chos ston to* // ji ltar bcom ldan 'das de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas *Shākya* thub pa dang / bcom ldan 'das de bzhin gshegs pa dgra (S.216a1) bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas Rin

⁹⁸⁷ *kyi* : T. *kyis* (s.e.).

⁹⁸⁸ *gnyis* : S. *gnyis ka* (w.r.?); Ph. *nyid* (s.e.).

⁹⁸⁹ *pad mo snying po* : cf. KN. 387.12. *padma-garbha*~.

⁹⁹⁰ *cu* : J, Ph, Pk. *bcu*.

⁹⁹¹ *pad mo'i* : S. *pad-mo'i*; T. *pang* (s.e. for *pad*) *mo'i*; Ph, B, N, L. *pad-ma'i*; the other Kanjurs read *pad ma'i* instead. Cf. Tib. Kho. *pad mo*.

⁹⁹² *phyogs* : read: *phyogs* <*dang phyogs mtshams*> (= Tib. Kanj.); cf. KN. 387.13. *dig-vidiś*~.

⁹⁹³ *seng ge'i* : S, T. om. (s.e.). Cf. KN. 387.12. *simba-(āsana)*~.

⁹⁹⁴ *gyi* : Pk. *kyi*; T. om. (s.e.).

⁹⁹⁵ *na* : L. om. (s.e.).

⁹⁹⁶ *la* : T. *na*; Ph. *las* (s.e.).

(kha 111a1) ཨ // chen mang །de bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom ba yang dag par
rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas །gyi / ljags gyi dbang pos / ⁹⁹⁷rdzu 'phrul dang cho
'phrul mdzad pa de bzhin du །gang །jig rten gyi kham's bye ba

Kanjur (KN.388.2; T. 183b3; J. 158a6; S. 216a1; Ph. 357b7; B. 196a2; Pk. 164b8; N. 223a2; D. 144a7; C. 170a6; L. 228a2): *chen mang gi ljags kyi dbang*⁹⁹⁸ pos⁹⁹⁹ rdzu
'phrul gyi cho 'phrul mdzad pa de bzhin du / 'jig rten gyi kham's bye ba

(kha 111a2) khrag khrig brgya stong །¹⁰⁰⁰nas / de bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom ba /
yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas །rnams gshegs shing / rin po che'i shing
། drung །¹⁰⁰¹so so །na / seng ge'i khri །la bzhugs pa / de dag

Kanjur: *kbrag* (S.216a2) *kbrig brgya stong gzhan dag nas / de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa*
*yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas gang dag gshegs shing*¹⁰⁰² *rin po che'i shing*¹⁰⁰³
ljon pa'i drung dag na / seng ge'i (S.216a3) *kbri*¹⁰⁰⁴ *so so la bzhugs pa de dag*

(kha 111a3) gis ljags gyi dbang pos rdzu 'phrul ། cho [']phrul mdzad do // de nas
bcom ldan 'das Shag kya thub pa dang / །Rin chen mang །de bzhin gshegs
pa །dang / de bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom ba /

Kanjur: *kyang ljags kyi*¹⁰⁰⁵ *dbang pos*¹⁰⁰⁶ *rdzu 'phrul gyi cho 'phrul mdzad do // de nas bcom*
ldan 'das Shākya thub pa dang de bzhin gshegs pa (S.216a4) *Rin chen mang dang / de*
bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa

(kha 111a4) yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas de ། / thams chad gyis / །lo ¹⁰⁰⁷stong
phrag brgya tshang gi bar du / ། 'phrul mngon bar 'du [b]yed pa །mdzad do
// ¹⁰⁰⁸de ltar lo ¹⁰⁰⁹stong phrag brgya 'das /

⁹⁹⁷ rdzu 'phrul dang cho 'phrul: cf. Tib. Kanj. rdzu 'phrul gyi cho 'phrul; KN. 388.2. rddbi-prātibārya-.

⁹⁹⁸ dbang: J. bang (s.c.).

⁹⁹⁹ pos: S, T. po (w.r.); cf. KN. 388.1. jibvëndriyena = ljags kyi dbang pos.

¹⁰⁰⁰ -: cf. Tib. Kanj. gzhan dag, KN. 388.3. anya-.

¹⁰⁰¹ so so na / seng ge'i kbri la: cf. Tib. Kanj. seng ge'i kbri so so la (v.l. la so sor); KN. 388.4. (ratnavrkṣamūḷeṣu) prthak prthak śimhāsana-(upaviṣṭā).

¹⁰⁰² shing: = T, Ph (= Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read pa'i instead (w.r.). Cf. KN. 388.3. abhyāgatā = gshegs shing.

¹⁰⁰³ shing: B. om. (s.c.).

¹⁰⁰⁴ so so la: = T, Ph; the other Kanjurs read la so sor instead. Cf. KN. 388.4. prthak prthak (śimhāsanaṇpaviṣṭā).

¹⁰⁰⁵ kyi: B, Pk. kyi (w.r.).

¹⁰⁰⁶ pos: S, T. po (w.r.); cf. KN. 388.4. jibvëndriyena = ljags kyi dbang pos.

¹⁰⁰⁷ stong phrag brgya: cf. Tib. Kanj. 'bum; KN. 388.6. śata-sahasraṃ (= D1, D2, K, T2 etc.; Bj, C4, N1 etc. -sahasraṃ).

¹⁰⁰⁸ de ltar: cf. Tib. Kanj. de nas; KN. 388.6. atba khalu (v.l. D1, K etc. atba).

¹⁰⁰⁹ stong phrag brgya: cf. Tib. Kanj. 'bum; KN. 388.7. śata-sahasra- (= D1, K, T2 etc.; Bj, C4, N1

Kanjur: *yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas de dag thams cad kyis lo 'bum tshang gi bar du rdzu 'phrul mngon par 'du byed*¹⁰¹⁰ *pa* (S.216a5) *mdzad do // de nas lo 'bum 'das*

(kha 111a5) *nas / de bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom ba / yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas de dag gis / ljags gyi dbang po || bsdu*¹⁰¹¹ *ste* / *dus gchig du skad chig thang chig yud /*

Kanjur: *nas de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas de dag gis ljags kyi dbang po de dag bsdu te / dus gcig tu* (S.216a6) *skad cig thang cig yud*

(kha 111a6) *tsam || la / thams chad gyis* ¹⁰¹² *seng ge'i skad btsald pa sgra chen po phyung ste / se gol gtogs pa'i sgra gchig mdzad*¹⁰¹³ *// de ltar*¹⁰¹⁴ *skad btsal ba'i sgra || dang se gol gtogs pa'i /*

Kanjur: *tsam*¹⁰¹⁵ *cig*¹⁰¹⁶ *la thams cad kyis*¹⁰¹⁷ ¹⁰¹⁸ *mgur gsal*¹⁰¹⁹ *ba'i sgra chen po phyung ste / se gol gtogs pa'i sgra gcig mdzad do // mgur gsal*¹⁰²⁰ *ba'i sgra chen po de dang / se* (S.216a7) *gol gtogs pa'i*

(kha 111a7) *sgra chen po des / phyogs bcu'i sangs rgyas gyi zhing bye ba khrag khrig brgya stong ji snyed pa de || thams chad g-yos par gyurd to // rab du g-yos / kun || rab du g-yos / 'gul rab du 'gul /*

Kanjur: *sgra chen po des / phyogs bcu'i sangs rgyas kyi zhing bye ba khrag khrig brgya stong ji snyed pa de dag thams cad g-yos par gyur te /* ¹⁰²¹ *rab tu g-yos / kun tu*¹⁰²² *rab tu* (S.216b1) *g-yos / 'gul rab tu 'gul /*

etc. *sahasra*-).

¹⁰¹⁰ *byed* : B. *bye* (s.c.).

¹⁰¹¹ *bsduste* : i.e. *bsdus te* (= Tib. Kanj.).

¹⁰¹² *seng ge'i skad btsald pa sgra chen po* : = KN. 388.8. *mabāsimbōtkāsanaśabdāḥ* (= D1, D2, K etc.); Tib. Kanj. *mgur gsal ba'i sgra chen po* = v.l. Bj, C4, C5 etc. *mabōtkāsanaśabdāḥ*.

¹⁰¹³ *mdzad* : i.e. *mdzad do*.

¹⁰¹⁴ *skad btsal ba'i sgra* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *mgur gsal ba'i sgra chen po*; KN. 388.9. *mabōtkāsanaśabda*~.

¹⁰¹⁵ *tsam* : T. *tsam du*.

¹⁰¹⁶ *cig* : = T, B, Pk, D; J, Ph, N, C, L. *gcig*. Cf. Tib. Kho.-.

¹⁰¹⁷ *kyis* : = T, Ph (= Tib. Kho. *gyis*; = KN. 388.8. *sarvāis*). The other Kanjurs read *kyi* instead.

¹⁰¹⁸ *mgur gsal ba'i sgra chen po* : ≠ KN. 388.8. *mabāsimbōtkāsanaśabdāḥ*; = v.l. Bj, C4, C5 etc. *mabōtkāsanaśabdāḥ*. See n. 1012.

¹⁰¹⁹ *gsal* : S, T, D. *bsal* (w.r.?). Cf. KN. 388.8. v.l. (*mabā*-) *utkāsana*-(*śabda*~).

¹⁰²⁰ *gsal* : S, D. *bsal* (w.r.?). Cf. KN. 388.9. (*mabā*-) *utkāsana*-(*śabda*~).

¹⁰²¹ *rab tu g-yos* : = T (= KN. 388.10. *prakampitāni*; = Tib. Kho.) the other Kanjurs read *g-yos rab tu g-yos* instead (w.r.).

¹⁰²² *tu* : J, Pk. *du*.

(kha 111a8) kun_{||} rab_{du} 'gul / ¹⁰²³*'kbrugs* rab_{du} *'kbrugs* / kun_{du} rab_{du} *'kbrugs* || /
sangs rgyas *gyi* zhing de *dagi*¹⁰²⁴ / lha dang / klu dang gnod sbyin dang / dri za
dang lha ma yin dang / nam *ka* lding dang / myi 'am *chi* dang /

Kanjur: *kun tu*¹⁰²⁵ *rab tu* 'gul / ldeg *rab tu* ldeg / *kun tu*^{1026 1027} *rab tu* ldeg go / sangs rgyas
kyi zhing de *dag na* lha dang / klu dang / gnod sbyin dang / dri za dang / (S.216b2)
lha ma yin dang / nam *mkba* lding dang / mi 'am ci dang /

(kha 111b1) lto 'phye chen po dang / my(i) dang / my[i] ma yin *ba* |dang / sems *chan*
|| ¹⁰²⁸ |de dag thams *chad*_{→1} | _{1→2} | sangs rgyas *gyi* mthus / | _{1→1} || | _{2→} de na 'dug
bzhin du. | Myi mjed_{→3} | ₃ | *gyi* 'jig rten gyi kham _{3→} | 'di mthong ste / de
bzhin {/}

Kanjur (KN.388.12; T. 184a3; J. 158b4; S. 216b2; Ph. 358a8; B. 196b3; Pk. 165a6;
N. 223b3; D. 144b5; C. 170b4; L. 228b4): lto 'phye chen po dang / mi dang mi
ma yin pa sems can ji snyed 'kbod pa dag¹⁰²⁹ de na 'dug bzhin du / sangs rgyas kyi
(S.216b3) mthus de dag thams cad kyis¹⁰³⁰ 'jig rten gyi kham *Mi* mjed 'di¹⁰³¹ mthong
ste / (KN.389) de bzhin

(kha 111b2) gshegs pa bye ba khrag khrig brgya stong rin po che'i shing || drung |so
so_{→1} na / seng ge'i khri | _{1→} | la bzhugs pa de dag dang / bcom ldan 'das | *Shag*
kya thub pa_→ | / de bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom

Kanjur: *gshegs pa bye ba khrag khrig brgya stong rin po che'i shing ljon pa'i drung na /*
seng ge'i kbri so (S.216b4) *so la bzhugs pa de dag dang / bcom ldan 'das de bzhin gshegs*
pa dgra bcom

(kha 111b3) *ba* yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas | _{1→} | dang / bcom ldan 'das || mya
ngan las 'das *ba* / | Rin chen mang_{→1} | de bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom *ba* / yang
dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas | _{1→} |

Kanjur: *pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas Shākya thub pa dang / bcom ldan 'das*
yongs su mya (S.216b5) *ngan las*¹⁰³² 'das pa de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag
par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas Rin chen mang

¹⁰²³ 'kbrugs ... 'kbrugs ... 'kbrugs : cf. Tib. Kanj. ldeg ... ldeg ... ldeg; KN. 388.11. *vedbitāni*
(*pra*-)*vedbitāni* (*sampra*-)*vedbitāni*.

¹⁰²⁴ *dagi* : i.e. *dag gi*.

¹⁰²⁵ *tu* : Pk. *du*.

¹⁰²⁶ *tu* : J, Pk. *du*.

¹⁰²⁷ *rab tu* : C. om. (s.e.).

¹⁰²⁸ - : cf. Tib. Kanj. *ji snyed 'kbod pa dag*, KN. 388.12. *yāvantah*.

¹⁰²⁹ *dag* : = 'T; the other Kanjurs read *de dag* instead.

¹⁰³⁰ *kyis* : B, Pk. *kyi* (w.r.).

¹⁰³¹ 'di : S. *'jig rten* (s.e.). Cf. KN. 388.13. *imāṇ*.

¹⁰³² *las* : S. om. (s.e.).

(kha 111b4) rin po che'i mchod rten chen po de'i dbus na / seng ge'i khri ○ la
bzhugs pa de / bcom ldan 'das [Shag kya thub pa₁] / de bzhin ○ gshegs pa [₁-
,] dang / lhan chig du bzhugs shing /

Kanjur: rin po¹⁰³³ che'i mchod rten chen po de'i dbus na seng ge'i¹⁰³⁴ kbri la bzhugs pa de /
(S.216b6) bcom ldan 'das de bzhin gshegs pa Shākya thub pa dang lhan cig tu bzhugs pa
dang /

(kha 111b5) 'khor bzhi po de dag gyang mthong [ng]o // de mthong nas / ngo ○
mtshar du gyurd / rmad du gyurd / shin du dga' ba thob par gyur○d te // bar
snang las sgra 'di skad ches thos so /

Kanjur: 'khor bzhi po de dag kyang mthong ngo // de mthong nas ngo mtshar du gyur
rmad du¹⁰³⁵ gyur / (S.216b7) shin tu¹⁰³⁶ dga'¹⁰³⁷ ba thob par gyur te / bar snang las sgra
'di skad ces thos te /

(kha 111b6) kye grogs po rnams 'jigs rten gyi kham bye ba khrag khrig brgya stong
¹⁰³⁸tshad myed grangs myed pa [] 'da's pa na / [₁Myi mjed ches bya ba'i₁ -₁] 'jig
rten gyi kham s [₁-₁] [] na / [₁Shag kya thub

Kanjur: kye grogs¹⁰³⁹ po dag 'jig rten gyi kham bye ba khrag khrig brgya stong dpag tu med
/ grangs med pa dag¹⁰⁴⁰ (S.217a1) 'das pa na / 'jig rten gyi kham s Mi mjed ces bya ba de
na /

(kha 111b7) pa zhes bya ba₁ / de bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom ba yang dag par
[rdz]ogs pa'i sangs rgyas [₁-₁] de da ltar Dam pa'i chos pu 'da' ri ka zhes bya
ba'i chos gyi gzhung shin du rgyas pa chen po₁ /

Kanjur: de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas Shākya thub
pa zhes bya (S.217a2) ba de / da ltar Dam pa'i chos¹⁰⁴¹ pad ma dkar po zhes bya ba'i
chos kyi rnam grangs¹⁰⁴² shin tu¹⁰⁴³ rgyas pa¹⁰⁴⁴ chen po'i

¹⁰³³ che'i mchod rten chen po : T. che (s.c.).

¹⁰³⁴ ge'i : T. ge (s.c.).

¹⁰³⁵ du : J. Pk. tu.

¹⁰³⁶ tu : J. du.

¹⁰³⁷ dga' : T. dga (s.c.).

¹⁰³⁸ tshad myed : cf. Tib. Kanj. dpag tu med; KN. 389.6. aprameya-.

¹⁰³⁹ grogs : C. grags (s.c.).

¹⁰⁴⁰ dag : T. de dag (s.c.).

¹⁰⁴¹ pad ma : S, Ph, B, N, L. pad-ma; the other Kanjurs read pad ma instead.

¹⁰⁴² rnam grangs : S, T, D, L. rnam grangs 'di (w.r.); the other Kanjurs read rnam grangs instead (= KN. 389.8. dharmaparyāyaṃ; Tib. Kho. chos gyi gzhung).

¹⁰⁴³ tu : J. du.

¹⁰⁴⁴ pa : Pk. om. (s.c.).

(kha 111b8) mdo sde / byang chub sems dpa' ¹⁰⁴⁵bstan pa / sangs rgyas thams chad
gyis yongsu bzung ba / _[de] byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rnam la
_[de] _[] rab du 'chad gyis / de la khyed gyang

Kanjur: mdo sde / byang chub sems dpa' rnam la gdams¹⁰⁴⁶ pa / sangs rgyas thams cad
_(S.217a3) kyis¹⁰⁴⁷ yongsu bzung ba / byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rnam la
 yang dag par rab tu 'chad kyis¹⁰⁴⁸ de la khyod¹⁰⁴⁹ kyang¹⁰⁵⁰

(kha 112a1) ཨ // lhag pa'i bsam bas rjesu yi rang bar gyis shig // bcom ldan 'das
{[Shag kya} thub pa] / de bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom ba / yang dag par
 rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas _[de] de la phyag

Kanjur (KN.389.9; T. 184b3; J. 159a3; S. 217a3; Ph. 358b8; B. 197a3; Pk. 165b5; N.
 224a5; D. 145a3; C. 171a3; L. 229a5): lhag pa'i bsam pas rjes su yi rang bar gyis
_(S.217a4) shig / bcom ldan 'das de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs
 pa'i sangs rgyas¹⁰⁵¹ Shākyā thub pa de¹⁰⁵² la phyag

(kha 112a2) 'tshol chig / mchod par gyis shig _[] / de [n]as sems chan de dag thams chad
gyis / [b]ar snang las de lta bu'i sgra thos nas // de na 'khod bzhin du / bcom
 ldan 'das _[de] Shag kya thub

Kanjur: 'tshol¹⁰⁵³ cig / mchod pa gyis shig ces thos so / _(S.217a5) _(KN.390) / de nas sems can de dag
 thams cad kyis¹⁰⁵⁴ bar snang las de lta bu'i sgra thos nas / de na 'khod bzhin du /
 bcom ldan 'das de bzhin gshegs pa Shākyā thub

(kha 112a3) pa / _[de] bzhin gshegs pa_] la phyag 'tshalo¹⁰⁵⁵ (zh)es tshig de skad
 smraso // bco[m] ldan 'das _[de] Shag kya thub [pa] / _[de] bzhin gshe[g]s pa_]
 dang /¹⁰⁵⁶ Dam pa'i chos pu 'da' ri ka'i chos gyi gzhung 'di

¹⁰⁴⁵ bstan pa : cf. Tib. Kanj. gdams pa; cf. KN. 389.8. (*bodhisattva-āvarāḍa-*).

¹⁰⁴⁶ gdams : T. bsdams (s.c.).

¹⁰⁴⁷ kyis : Ph. C. kyi (s.c.).

¹⁰⁴⁸ kyis : L. kyi.

¹⁰⁴⁹ khyod : = T; Pk. lyed (s.c.); the other Kanjurs read khyed instead (= 'Tib. Kho.).

¹⁰⁵⁰ kyang : S. kyis nga la (s.c.).

¹⁰⁵¹ rgyas : C. om. (s.c.).

¹⁰⁵² de : C. om. (s.c.).

¹⁰⁵³ 'tshol : = T, Ph, B, D (= Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read tsbol instead.

¹⁰⁵⁴ kyis : S. kyi (s.c.).

¹⁰⁵⁵ 'tshalo : i.e. 'tshal lo.

¹⁰⁵⁶ Cf. KN. 390.5. *Prabhūtaratnasya ca; v.l.* O, D1, B, K, C4, N1 etc. = 'Tib. Kho. = 'Tib. Kanj.-.
 Cf. Krsh. 214.

Kanjur: *pa la phyag 'tshal lo zhes* ^(S.217a6) *tshig*¹⁰⁵⁷ *de skad*¹⁰⁵⁸ *smras so // bcom ldan 'das de bzhin gsbegs pa Shākya thub pa dang / Dam pa'i chos* ¹⁰⁵⁹ *pad ma* *dkar po'i chos kyi*¹⁰⁶⁰ *rnam grangs*¹⁰⁶¹ 'di

(kha 112a4) ¹⁰⁶² *mchod pa'i* *phyir / thal mo sbyar te* *rnam pa mang po'i* *me to* *og dang / bdug pa dang dri* *dang phreng ba dang / byug pa dang / phye ma dang / na bza' dang / gdugs dang rgya<l> mtshan dang /*

Kanjur: ¹⁰⁶³ *la mchod pa'i las kyi phyir thal mo sbyar te* ^(S.217a7) *me tog dang / bdug pa*¹⁰⁶⁴ *dang / spos dang / phreng*¹⁰⁶⁵ *ba dang / byug pa dang / phye ma dang / na bza' dang / gdugs dang / rgyal mtshan dang /*

(kha 112a5) *lha'i ba dan dang / rgyal ba'i ba dan rnam* ^(S.217b1) *Myi mjed* *gyi /* *jig rten gyi khams* *de logsu 'thor ro // rnam pa mang po'i* *phyang* *phrul dang bgo' ba dang se mo do dang / do shal*

Kanjur: *lha'i ba dan dang / rnam par rgyal ba'i ba* ^(S.217b1) *dan* ¹⁰⁶⁶ *rnam pa mang po* *jig rten gyi khams* *Mi mjed*¹⁰⁶⁷ *'di ga la ba der*¹⁰⁶⁸ *logs su 'thor ro //* ¹⁰⁶⁹ *phyang phrul dang / bgo ba dang / se mo do dang / do shal*

(kha 112a6) *dang /* ¹⁰⁷⁰ *nor bu rin po che* *'ang gtord to // me tog dang / bdug pa dang / dri* *dang phreng ba dang / byug pa dang / phye ma dang / chos gos dang / gdugs dang / rgyal mtshan dang lha'i ba dan dang / rgyal ba'i*

Kanjur: *dang / nor bu dang*¹⁰⁷¹ */ rin po che rnam pa mang* ^(S.217b2) *po yang*¹⁰⁷² *gtor ro*¹⁰⁷³ *//*

¹⁰⁵⁷ *tshig* : 'T. om. (s.c.).

¹⁰⁵⁸ *skad* : C. *skad ces* (s.c.).

¹⁰⁵⁹ *pad ma* : S, B, N, L. *pad-ma*; the other Kanjurs read *pad ma* instead.

¹⁰⁶⁰ *kyi* : 'T. *kyis* (s.c.).

¹⁰⁶¹ *grangs* : 'T. *grangs des na* (s.c.).

¹⁰⁶² *mchod pa'i phyir / thal mo sbyar te* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *mchod pa'i las kyi phyir thal mo sbyar te*; KN. 390.2. *añjalin pragrhya* 390.5. *pūjākarmaṇe*.

¹⁰⁶³ *la mchod pa'i* : 'T. om. (s.c.).

¹⁰⁶⁴ *pa* : 'T. *spos* (s.c.).

¹⁰⁶⁵ *phreng* : S, 'T. *'pbreng* (w.r.); the other Kanjurs read *phreng* instead (= 'Tib. Kho.). Cf. KN. 390.3. *-mālyu-*.

¹⁰⁶⁶ *rnam pa mang po* : = 'T, Ph (= 'Tib. Kho.; = KN. 390.2. *vividha-*); the other Kanjurs read *mang po* instead (w.r.).

¹⁰⁶⁷ *mjed* : Ph, N. *'jed* (s.c.).

¹⁰⁶⁸ *der* : = 'T; the other Kanjurs read *de* instead (= 'Tib. Kho.).

¹⁰⁶⁹ *phyang phrul* : 'T. *phyung phrul* (s.c.); C. *phyang 'phrul* (s.c.).

¹⁰⁷⁰ *nor bu rin po che* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *nor bu dang* (v.l. om.) *rin po che*; KN. 390.4. *-maṇi-ratna-*.

¹⁰⁷¹ *dang* : J, Ph, B, Pk, N, C. om. (= 'Tib. Kho.).

¹⁰⁷² *yang* : N, L. *'ang*.

Kanjur: *ba dan dang / se mo do dang / do shal dang / nor bu dang / rin po che gtor ba de*
*dag*¹⁰⁷⁵ *thams cad 'jig rten gyi khamis Mi mjed 'dir 'ongs te*¹⁰⁷⁶ */ me tog dang / bdug*
 (S.217r) *pa dang / spos dang / phreng ba dang /*

Kanjur: *byug pa dang / phye ma dang / na bza' dang / gdugs dang / rgyal mtsban dang / lha'i ba dan dang / nam par rgyal ba'i ba dan* ¹⁰⁷⁸ *gyi phung po* *dang /* _(S.217b5) *se mo do dang / do shal dang / nor bu dang / rin po che de dag gis*

Kanjur (KN.390.8; T. 185a3; J. 159b1; S. 217b5; Ph. 359b2; B. 197b3; Pk. 166a4; N. 224b6; D. 145b2; C. 171b1; L. 229b7): ¹⁰⁸¹*thams cad dang ldan pa'i 'jig rten gyi kham*s ¹⁰⁸²*Mi mjed 'di* ¹⁰⁸³*khebs par gyur to* ¹⁰⁸⁴*/ 'jig rten gyi kham*s gzhan bye (S.217b6)

¹⁰⁸⁴ *to* : 'T' - (see n. 1082); the other Kanjurs read *te* instead.

*ba kbrag kbrig brgya stong de dag*¹⁰⁸⁵ *dang lhan cig tu khebs par gyur nas gcig*¹⁰⁸⁶ *tu gyur te / gang dag na de bzhin gshegs*

(kha 112b2) *pa* _{||} *bzhugs pa* _{||}¹⁰⁸⁷ *de dag thams* *chad na* _{||}¹⁰⁸⁸ / *nam ka* *bar snang la / me tog gi bla re chen pos* *yongsu* *khebs par gyurd to // de nas bcom ldan 'das gyis / sPyod pa'i* *khyad bar* _{||} *la stsogs pa /*

Kanjur: *pa de dag bzhugs pa*¹⁰⁸⁹ *jig rten gyi kham bye ba kbrag kbrig brgya stong* (S.217b7) *de dag*¹⁰⁹⁰ *thams cad kyi*¹⁰⁹¹ *steng gi nam mkha' bar snang la / me tog gi*¹⁰⁹² *bla re chen pos*¹⁰⁹³ *kun tu*¹⁰⁹⁴ *khebs par gyur to // de nas bcom ldan 'das kyi*¹⁰⁹⁵ *sPyod pa khyad par can la sogs* (S.218a1) *pa /*

(kha 112b3) *byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rnam la bka' stsal* *pa / rigs gyi bu* _{||} *de bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom ba* / *yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas rnam gyis //*

Kanjur: *byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rnam la bka' stsal pa / rigs kyi bu dag de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i* (S.218a2) *sangs rgyas rnam ni*¹⁰⁹⁶ /

(kha 112b4) *mthu ni* *bsam gyis myi khyab* _{||} *ste / rigs gyi bu* _{||} *ngas* *bskal* *pa* *bye ba khrag khrig brgya stong mang* *po* *nas* / *chos gyi gzabung* *pa* *'di yongsu gthad* *pa'i phyir* / *chos gyi sgo*

Kanjur: *mthu bsam gyis mi khyab pa ste / rigs kyi bu dag* (KN.391) *chos kyi rnam grangs 'di yongsu*¹⁰⁹⁷ *gtad pa'i phyir / ngas bska pa bye ba kbrag kbrig brgya stong mang*

¹⁰⁸⁵ *dang lhan cig tu khebs par gyur nas gcig tu gyur te* : 'T. *thams cad kyi steng gi kbrig kbrig brgya stong gi nam kha' bar snang la / me tog gi bla re* (s.e.).

¹⁰⁸⁶ *gcig* : Pk. *cig* (s.e.).

¹⁰⁸⁷ - : = KN. 390.10.-; O. *lokadhātukoṭinayutaśatasahasreṣu* = 'Tib. Kanj. *jig rten gyi kham bye ba kbrag kbrig brgya stong*.

¹⁰⁸⁸ - : = KN. 390.10.-; O. *upari (vaibhāyase)* = 'Tib. Kanj. (*thams cad kyi*) *steng gi (nam mkha')*.

¹⁰⁸⁹ *jig rten gyi kham bye ba kbrag kbrig brgya stong* : = O. *lokadhātukoṭinayutaśatasahasreṣu*; KN. 390.10.- = 'Tib. Kho.-.

¹⁰⁹⁰ *de dag* : S. *de dag dang* / (w.r.). Cf. KN. 390.10. *teṣu (sarveṣu)*.

¹⁰⁹¹ *steng gi* : = O. *upari (vaibhāyase)*; KN. 390.10.- = 'Tib. Kho.-.

¹⁰⁹² *bla re* : = 'T, J, Ph, B, Pk, D, C (= 'Tib. Kho.); N, L. *bla bre*. Cf. KN. 390.10. -*vitāna*~.

¹⁰⁹³ *pos* : S. *po* (s.e.).

¹⁰⁹⁴ *tu* : J, Ph, Pk. *du*.

¹⁰⁹⁵ *kyis* : B, Pk. *kyi* (s.e.).

¹⁰⁹⁶ *ni* : = 'T, Ph, D; the other Kanjurs read *kyi* instead. Cf. 'Tib. Kho. *gyis* KN. 390.12. *acintyaprabhāvāḥ ... samyak sambuddhāḥ*.

¹⁰⁹⁷ *gtad pa'i* : B. *gtang ba'i* (s.e.).

por¹⁰⁹⁸ chos kyi (S.218a3) sgo

(kha 112b5) rnam pa tha dad pas / ||¹⁰⁹⁹ yon «tan» gyi gzhung [«nam» pa] mang po bshad mod gyi / ○ [←] chos gyi gzhung 'di'i yo[n] tan bshad gyang / yon tan gyi pha ○ rol du [←ngas] myi phyind to // rigs gyi bu rnam

Kanjur: *nam pa tha dad pa dag gis*¹¹⁰⁰ *phan yon gyi nam grangs mang po bshad mod kyi*¹¹⁰¹ / *ngas chos kyi nam grangs 'di'i yon tan*¹¹⁰² *bshad kyang yon tan gyi pha rol tu*¹¹⁰³ *mi phyin no*¹¹⁰⁴ // *rigs kyi bu dag*

(kha 112b6) mdor na / ¹¹⁰⁵sangs rgyas [thams chad] gyi chos [←] dang // sangs rgyas [thams chad] gyi khyu mchog || [←] dang / sa[ng]s rgyas [thams chad] gyi gsang ba [←] dang / sangs rgyas [thams chad] gyi zab mo'i gnas[te]¹¹⁰⁶ [←] / ngas

Kanjur: (S.218a4) *mdor na / sangs rgyas kyi chos thams cad dang / sangs rgyas kyi khyu mchog tu gyur pa thams cad dang / sangs rgyas kyi*¹¹⁰⁷ *gsang chen thams cad dang / sangs rgyas kyi zab mo'i* (S.218a5) *gnas thams cad ngas*

(kha 112b7) chos gyi gzhung 'di las bshado // [de lta bas na] rigs gyi bu rnam [←] khyed gyis gyang [yang] / de bzhin gshegs pa / yongsu mya ngan las 'da's nas / chos gyi gzhung 'di gus par gzungo¹¹⁰⁸ //

Kanjur: *chos kyi nam grangs 'dir bshad do // rigs kyi bu dag de lta bas na / khyed kyis kyang de bzhin gshegs pa yongsu mya ngan las 'das nas* / *chos kyi* (S.218a6) *nam grangs 'di*¹¹⁰⁹ *gus par gzung bar bya'o //*

¹⁰⁹⁸ *por* : S. po (s.c.). Cf. Tib. Kho. po nas.

¹⁰⁹⁹ *yon «tan» gyi gzhung* : = Tib. Kanj. *phan yon gyi nam grangs*; = D1, D2, Bj, C4, N1, C5, C6 etc. *ānusaṃsā-paryāya-*; ≠ KN. 391.1. *anusaṃsān*.

¹¹⁰⁰ *phan yon gyi nam grangs* : see preceding note.

¹¹⁰¹ *kyi* : C. *kyis*.

¹¹⁰² *bshad kyang yon tan* : T. om. (s.c.).

¹¹⁰³ *tu* : J, D. *du*.

¹¹⁰⁴ *no* : = T; the other Kanjurs read *to* instead (= Tib. Kho.).

¹¹⁰⁵ *sangs rgyas thams cad gyi chos dang // sangs rgyas thams cad gyi khyu mchog dang / sangs rgyas thams cad gyi gsang ba dang / sangs rgyas thams cad gyi zab mo'i gnaste* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *sangs rgyas kyi chos thams cad dang / sangs rgyas kyi khyu mchog tu gyur pa thams cad dang / sangs rgyas kyi gsang chen thams cad dang / sangs rgyas kyi zab mo'i gnas thams cad*; KN. 391.2f. *sarva-buddha-dharmāḥ sarva-buddha-vṛṣabbhitā sarva-buddha-rabasyaṃ sarva-buddha-gambhīra-sthānaṃ*. The translators of Tib. Kho. and Tib. Kanj. interpreted the Sanskrit word *sarva* "all" in different ways.

¹¹⁰⁶ *gnaste* : i.e. *gnas te*.

¹¹⁰⁷ *kyi* : S. *kyis* (s.c.).

¹¹⁰⁸ *gzungo* : i.e. *gzung go*.

¹¹⁰⁹ *'di* : = T, Ph (= Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read *'di la* instead.

(kha 112b8) [b]st[e]n¹¹¹⁰ to / || bri 'o / klag go / rab du bshad do / bsgom mo / mchod
par bya'o // rigs gyi bu rnams sa phyogs gag na / chos gyi gzhung 'di klog gam
/ ston tam / rab du 'chad dam / || bris sam /

Kanjur: *bstan* par bya'o // yi ger bri¹¹¹¹ bar bya'o // ¹¹¹²*bklag* par bya'o // ¹¹¹³*rab tu bshad*
par bya'o // bsgom par bya'o // mchod par bya'o // (S.218a7) rigs kyi bu dag sa phyogs
gang na chos kyi nam grangs 'di klog gam / ston tam / rab tu ¹¹¹⁴*'chad dam* / yi ger
'dri¹¹¹⁵ 'am /

(kha 113a1) ཨོཾ // ¹¹¹⁶*bsams pa* 'am / 'dond tam / kha ton byed dam / glegs bam du byas
pa / ¹¹¹⁷*tsbal bu* 'am / gtsug lag khang ngam / khyim mam / nags sam / shing
drung 'am / khang pa 'am / gnas khang 'am /

Kanjur (KN.391.7; T. 185b3; J. 159b8; S.218a7; Ph. 360a3; B. 198a5; Pk. 166b3; N.
225b2; D. 146a1; C. 171b8; L. 230b2): *sems sam* / 'don tam / kha ton byed dam /
glegs bam (S.218b1) du byas pa / kun dga'i¹¹¹⁸ ra ba 'am / gtsug lag khang ngam /
khyim mam¹¹¹⁹ / nags¹¹²⁰ sam / ¹¹²¹*shing drung ngam* / khang pa 'am / gnas khang
ngam /

(kha 113a2) phug na 'dug gyang rung ste / sa phyogs de[r] / de bzhin gshegs pa'i
phyir / mchod «[rten]» bya'o / de ji'i phyir zhe na / sa phyogs de / de bzhin
gshegs pa / thams chad gyi byang chub gyi snying por /

Kanjur: *phug na 'dug kyang rung ste / sa phyogs der* (S.218b2) *de bzhin gshegs pa'i* phyi¹¹²²
mchod rten bya'o // de ci'i phyir zbe na / sa phyogs¹¹²³ *de de bzhin gshegs pa thams*
cad kyi byang chub kyi snying por

¹¹¹⁰ *bsten* : s.c. for *bstan* (= kha 109a2, 110a2).

¹¹¹¹ *bri* : S. 'bri (s.e.); T, J, Ph, B, Pk, D, C. *bri* (= Tib. Kho.); N, L. 'dri.

¹¹¹² *bklag* : = T, D, L; the other Kanjurs read *klag* instead (= Tib. Kho.).

¹¹¹³ *rab tu bshad par bya'o* : T. om. (s.c.).

¹¹¹⁴ 'chad dam : B. 'chang ngam (s.e.).

¹¹¹⁵ 'dri : Ph. 'bri.

¹¹¹⁶ *bsams pa* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *sems*; KN. 391.7. *cintyeta*.

¹¹¹⁷ *tsbal bu* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *kun dga'i ra ba*; KN. 391.7. *ārvāma~*.

¹¹¹⁸ *dga'i* : = T, D; the other Kanjurs read *dga'* instead.

¹¹¹⁹ *mam* : = T, N, L (= Tib. Kho.); J, Ph, B, Pk, D, C. 'am.

¹¹²⁰ *nags* : Ph reads thus (= Tib. Kho.; KN. 391.8. *vana~*); all the other Kanjurs read *gnas* instead (w.r.).

¹¹²¹ *shing drung ngam* : = Tib. Kho.; = O, D1. *vrkṣamūle vā*; ≠ KN. 391.8. *nagare vā vrkṣamūle vā*.

¹¹²² *phyir* : = Tib. Kho.; = KN. 391.9. *uddiṣya*. S, T. om. (w.r.).

¹¹²³ *phyogs* : S. *phyogs su* (s.e.).

(kha 113a3) rig par bya'o_{||} // sa phyogs der de bzhin gshegs pa / dgra bcom ba / yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas thams chad / bla na myed pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub

Kanjur: rig par bya ba dang / sa phyogs der¹¹²⁴ de bzhin_(S.218b3) gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas thams cad bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub

(kha 113a4) du mngon bar¹¹²⁵_{||} sangs rgyas par rig par bya'o_{||} // sa phyogs der de bzhin gshegs pa thams chad gyis / chos gyi 'khor {ra} lo_{||} bskord pa dang / sa phyogs der de bzhin {}

Kanjur: mngon par¹¹²⁶ rdzogs par sangs rgyas par rig par bya ba dang /_(S.218b4) sa phyogs der de bzhin gshegs pa thams cad kyis chos kyi 'khor lo rab tu bskor ba dang / sa phyogs der de bzhin

(kha 113a5) gshegs pa thams chad yongsu mya ngan las 'das par ○ rig par bya'o_{||} / / de nas bcom ldan 'das gyis de'i tshe ○ tshigsu bcad pa 'di_{||} gsungso_{||} / /

Kanjur: gshegs pa thams cad yongsu mya ngan las 'das par rig par bya_(S.218b5) ba yin pa'i phyir ro //_(KN.392) de nas bcom ldan 'das kyis de'i tshe tshigsu bcad pa 'di dag bka' stsal to //

(kha 113a6) 'jig rten phan ba_{||} chos ni bsam myi khyab //... mngon bar_{||} shes pa'i ye shes rab_{||} gna[s]_{||} gyi // ... mtha' yas spyang gyis rdzu 'phrul ra[b]_{||} bstand_{||} pa_{||} ... lus chan_{||} 'di kun_{||} ... dga' bar bya_{||}

Kanjur: mngon shes ye shes rab tu gnas nams kyi¹¹²⁸ // 'jig rten_(S.218b6) phan pa'i chos ni bsam mi khyab // lus can 'di kun mchog tu dga'

(kha 113a7) ba_{||} phyir // ... ljags gyi dbang pos Tshangs pa'i 'jig rten phyin //... 'od gzer stong rnam¹¹²⁹ rab du_{||} bkye bas na // ... rdzu 'phrul de dag bstan pa_{||} ... ngo mtshar gyurd_{||} ... // byang chub mchog

Kanjur: ba'i phyir // mtha' yas spyang gyis rdzu 'phrul rab tu bstan // (= 1) 'od zer stong rnam¹¹³⁰ rab tu kun 'gyed¹¹³⁰ cing //_(S.218b7) ljags¹¹³¹ kyi dbang pos Tshangs pa'i 'jig rten phyin // byang chub mchog

¹¹²⁴ der : S, T. de (w.r.).

¹¹²⁵ sangs rgyas par : cf. Tib. Kanj. rdzogs par sangs rgyas par = KN. 391.11. (abbi-)sambuddhā.

¹¹²⁶ par : T. om. (s.c.).

¹¹²⁷ dga' bar bya ba : cf. Tib. Kanj. dga' ba; KN. 392.3. pramodya-(hetor).

¹¹²⁸ kyi : T, Ph. kyis (s.c.).

¹¹²⁹ rab du bkye bas na : cf. Tib. Kanj. rab tu kun 'gyed cing; KN. 392.4. pramuñcamānāḥ.

¹¹³⁰ 'gyed : B. 'byed (s.c.).

¹¹³¹ ljags : T. lcags (s.c.).

(kha 113a8) la zhugs pa de dag phyir // ^[12←1] ^[1←1] ¹¹³² *skad sel bar...* ^[yang] ¹¹³³ sangs
rgyas rnam^s *gyis* ^[1←1] mdzad // se gol *gchig* gi sgra // gang phyung ba ^[ni] //
^[1←1] de 'is ^[1←1] 'jig rten // ^[1←1] ¹¹³⁴ *shes par* byas // ^[1←1] // phyogs

Kanjur: *la zhugs pa de dag phyir* // ngo mtsbar gyur pa'i rdzu 'phrul de dag bstan // (= 2)
sangs rgyas rnam^s ni ¹¹³⁵ *ngur sel* ¹¹³⁶ *sgra mdzad cing* // se ^(S.219a1) gol gcig gi sgra
dag gang phyung ba // de dag phyogs

(kha 113b1) *bchu* '(i)g rten j[i] *tsham bar* ^[du'o] // ^[1←1] ^[1←1] de dag dang ni cho 'phrul
gzhan rnam^s dang // ^[1←1] ^[1←1] phan zhing // ¹¹³⁷ *brtse bas* ^[1←1] ^[1←1] yon tan rnam^s *gyang* ^[1←1]
^[1←1] bstan // ^[1←1] ^[1←1] ji nas ¹¹³⁸ *de tshe* ^[1←1] de dag dga' *bas* ^[1←1] na // bd[e gsh](egs)

Kanjur (KN.392.7; T. 186a3; J. 160a7; S.219a1; Ph. 360b3; B. 198b5; Pk. 167a2; N.
226a3; D. 146a6; C. 172a8; L. 231a3): *bcu* 'i 'jig rten ji tsam pa // 'jig rten kham^s
de thams cad go bar byas // (= 3) *ci* ¹¹³⁹ *nas de dag dga' nas phyi dus* ^(S.219a2) *na* ¹¹⁴⁰ //
bde ¹¹⁴¹ *gshegs*

(kha 113b2) mya ngan 'das nas mdo ^[sde] 'dzind // ^[1←1] ^[1←1] ^[1←1] ^[1←1] bskal pa bye
ba phrag stong mang ^[po ru] // ^[1←1] ^[1←1] bde bar gshegs ^[pa'i] sras // ^[1←1] ^[1←1] gyi bsngags ^[1←1]
^[1←1] brjod *gyang* ^[1←1] // ^[1←1] ^[1←1] mdo sde mchog 'di gang rnam^s 'dzind ^[pa'o] // ^[1←1]
^[1←1] '6←1' [8←1]

Kanjur: *mya ngan 'das nas mdo* ¹¹⁴³ *'dzin par* // de dag dang ni cho 'phrul gzhan rnam^s
dang / yon tan rnam^s ni phan zhing thugs brtse ¹¹⁴⁴ *bstan* // (= 4) ¹¹⁴⁵ **'jig rten**
rnam 'dren mya ngan ^(S.219a3) ***'das pa na*** // mdo sde mchog 'di gang dag 'dzin pa
yi // ¹¹⁴⁶ *bder gshegs sras po rnam^s kyi* ¹¹⁴⁷ *bsngags pa ni* // bskal pa bye ba ¹¹⁴⁸ *phrag*

¹¹³² *skad sel bar ... mdzad* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *ngur sel sgra mdzad*, KN. 392.6. *utkāsitam ... karonti*.

¹¹³³ *yang* : = KN. 392.6. *cāpi*; Tib. Kanj.-.

¹¹³⁴ *shes par byas* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *go bar byas*; KN. 392.7. *vijñāpenti*.

¹¹³⁵ *ni* : = 'T, Ph; the other Kanjurs read *kyi* instead. Cf. Tib. Kho. *gyis*.

¹¹³⁶ *sel* : S. *ser* (s.c.).

¹¹³⁷ *brtse bas* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *(phan zbing) thugs brtse*; KN. 392.8. *(bita-)anukampaka~*.

¹¹³⁸ *de tshe* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *phyi dus*; KN. 392.9. *tasmi kāle*.

¹¹³⁹ *ci* : Ph. *ji* (= Tib. Kho.).

¹¹⁴⁰ *na* : C. *nas* (s.c.).

¹¹⁴¹ *bde gshegs* : T. *bder gshegs*.

¹¹⁴² See kha 113b5.

¹¹⁴³ *mdo* : L. *med* (s.c.).

¹¹⁴⁴ *brtse* : = 'T; Ph. *rtse*; N, D, C, L. *brtse*; B, Pk. *rtse* (w.r.). Cf. Tib. Kho. *brtse bas*.

¹¹⁴⁵ The parallel to this *pāda* is found far below in Tib. Kho. kha 113b5.

¹¹⁴⁶ *bder gshegs* : = 'T; the other Kanjurs, incl. Ph, read *bde gshegs* instead. Cf. Tib. Kho. *bde bar gshegs pa*.

¹¹⁴⁷ *kyi* : 'T, Ph. *kyis* (w.r.).

stong mang brjod kyang // (= 5)

(kha 113b3) [¹¹⁴⁹→10¹] [¹¹⁵⁰→11¹] [¹¹⁵¹→12¹] [¹¹⁵²→13¹] [¹¹⁵³→14¹] [¹¹⁵⁴→15¹] [¹¹⁵⁵→16¹] 'jig rten₁ rnam
gyang de₁is mthong ba yin // [¹¹⁵⁶→] *de ring* || nga «*la*» mnyes par [¹¹⁵⁷→] *de₁is* byas
// [¹¹⁵⁸→] *m[g]on po* [¹¹⁵⁹→] *di dag kun* gyang mnyes par byas // [¹¹⁶⁰→] rgyal ba'i dbang
po mya ngan 'das 'di [dang /]

Kanjur: (KN.393) ¹¹⁶⁰*de dag gi ni yon tan* (S.219a4) *mtba' yas te // ji ltar phyogs rnam su*
ni nam mkha' bzhin // gang dag rtag tu mdo sde 'di 'dzin pa // de dag yon
tan bsam gyis mi khyab 'gyur // (= 6) 'jig rten 'dren pa mya ngan (S.219a5)
*'das 'di dang // nga dang 'dren pa 'di dag*¹¹⁶¹ *thams cad mthong // byang*
*chub sems dpa' mang po 'di kun dang // 'khor bzhi rnam kyang*¹¹⁶² *de yis*
mthong ba yin // (= 7) de yis deng 'dir nga (S.219a6) *ni mnyes par byas // rgyal ba'i*
dbang po mya ngan 'das 'di dang //

(kha 113b4) [¹¹⁶³→] gang || →2₁ phyogs *bchu* 'i de₁ *dag* || [¹¹⁶⁴→] gzhan yang ste // [¹¹⁶⁵→] ¹¹⁶⁴ de
bzhin ma ○ byon 'das pa'i sangs rgyas dang // phyogs bcu [¹¹⁶⁶→] *de* dag na [¹¹⁶⁷→] ○
ng→ gang || bzhugs pa [¹¹⁶⁸→] // de [¹¹⁶⁹→] *thams chad*

Kanjur: *phyogs bcu rnam* ¹¹⁶⁵*na gang dag gzhan bzhugs pa // 'dren*¹¹⁶⁶ *pa de dag thams cad*

¹¹⁴⁸ *phrag stong* : = 'T, Ph; the other Kanjurs read *stong phrag* instead.

¹¹⁴⁹ See kha 113b5.

¹¹⁵⁰ See kha 113b6.

¹¹⁵¹ See kha 113b6.

¹¹⁵² See kha 113b6.

¹¹⁵³ See kha 113b6.

¹¹⁵⁴ See kha 113b7.

¹¹⁵⁵ See kha 113b7.

¹¹⁵⁶ *de ring* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *deng*; KN. 393.5. *adya*.

¹¹⁵⁷ Cf. Tib. Kanj. verse (8)d: *'dren pa de dag thams cad mnyes par byas //*.

¹¹⁵⁸ *mgon po* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *'dren pa*; KN. 393.5. *nāyaka*~.

¹¹⁵⁹ *di dag* : KN. 393.5. *ime*; ≠ Tib. Kanj. *de dag*.

¹¹⁶⁰ The parallels to these verses, in boldface, are found further on at Tib. Kho. kha 113b5~7. I assume the scribe of this text had originally omitted them by mistake and, after noticing his error, wrote them furtively in a different place.

¹¹⁶¹ *dag* : S. *dang* (s.e.).

¹¹⁶² *kyang* : = 'T, Ph, D (≠ Tib. Kho. *gyang*, = KN. 393.4. *ca*); the other Kanjurs read *dang* instead (s.e.).

¹¹⁶³ See kha 113b3.

¹¹⁶⁴ Tib. Kanj. *gang zbig mdo sde 'di ni 'dzin byed pa //*. There is no parallel to this *pāda* in Tib. Kho.

¹¹⁶⁵ *na gang* : = 'T, Ph, D, L (= KN. 393.7. *ye* ... [*dasu diāsu*]); J, N. *dang nga* (s.e.); B, Pk, C. *dang de* (s.e.).

¹¹⁶⁶ *'dren* : N. *'dran* (s.e.).

mnyes par byas // (= 8) ¹¹⁶⁷gang zbig _(S.219a7) mdo sde 'di ni 'dzin byed pa // 'das dang ¹¹⁶⁸de bzbin ma byon sangs rgyas dang // phyogs bcu dag na gang dag bzbugs¹¹⁶⁹ pa yang // de kun

(kha 113b5) *inthong zhing shin du mchod // ¹¹⁷⁰'jig rten rnam 'dren mya nga ○n 'das pa na // ¹¹⁷¹de dag rnam gyi yon tan mtha' yas ste // ji ○ Itar phyogs rnamsu ni nam ka'i ¹¹⁷²kba[ms] //*
 Kanjur: *mtshong zhing shin tu¹¹⁷³ mchod par 'gyur // (= 9)*

(kha 113b6) *¹¹⁷⁴de dag yon tan bsam gyis myi khyab 'gyur // ¹¹⁷⁵rtag du mdo sde ¹¹⁷⁶dge ba 'di 'dzin [p]a'o // ¹¹⁷⁷nga dang 'dren pa 'di dag thams chad mthong // ¹¹⁷⁸mya ngan 'das pa 'jig rten de 'dre[n] yang //*

(kha 113b7) *¹¹⁷⁹byang chub sems dpa' mang po 'di kun dang // ¹¹⁸⁰'khor bzhi. [gang-] [gis] mdo sde ¹¹⁸¹'di ¹¹⁸²bzung ba'o // ¹¹⁸³skyes bu ¹¹⁸⁴dam pa rnam gyi ¹¹⁸⁵gsang ba 'ang shes // ¹¹⁸⁶gang rnams byang chub snying po[r]*

Kanjur: *mdo sde yang dag _(S.219b1) chos 'di gang 'dzin pas // byang chub snying por¹¹⁸⁶*

¹¹⁶⁷ *gang zbig mdo sde 'di ni 'dzin byed pa //* : 'There is no parallel to this *pāda* in 'Tib. Kho.

¹¹⁶⁸ *de bzbin* : = T, Ph (= 'Tib. Kho.; = KN. 393.7. *tathā*); the other Kanjurs read *da ltar* instead (s.c.).

¹¹⁶⁹ *bzbugs* : T. *zbugs* (s.c.).

¹¹⁷⁰ Cf. 'Tib. Kanj. verse (5)a: *'jig rten rnam 'dren mya ngan 'das pa na //*.

¹¹⁷¹ Cf. 'Tib. Kanj. verse (6)a, b: *de dag gi ni yon tan mtha' yas te // ji ltar phyogs rnams su ni nam mkha' bzbin //*.

¹¹⁷² *khams* : = KN. 393.1. (*ākāśa*-) *dhātu*-; 'Tib. Kanj.-.

¹¹⁷³ *tu* : J. *du*.

¹¹⁷⁴ Cf. 'Tib. Kanj. verse (6)d: *de dag yon tan bsam gyis mi khyab 'gyur //*.

¹¹⁷⁵ Cf. 'Tib. Kanj. verse (6)c: *gang dag rtag tu mdo sde 'di 'dzin pa //*.

¹¹⁷⁶ *dge ba* : = KN. 393.2. *śubba*-; 'Tib. Kanj.-.

¹¹⁷⁷ Cf. 'Tib. Kanj. verse (7)b: *nga dang 'dren pa 'di dag thams cad mthong //*.

¹¹⁷⁸ Cf. 'Tib. Kanj. verse (7)a: *'jig rten 'dren pa mya ngan 'das 'di dang //*.

¹¹⁷⁹ Cf. 'Tib. Kanj. verse (7)c: *byang chub sems dpa' mang po 'di kun dang //*.

¹¹⁸⁰ Cf. 'Tib. Kanj. verse (7)d: *'khor bzhi (rnams kyang de yis mthong ba yin //)*.

¹¹⁸¹ - : s.c. Cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *yang dag chos*; KN. 393.10. *bhūtaḍḍharmam*.

¹¹⁸² *bzung ba'o* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *'dzin pas*; KN. 393.10. *dhārayet*.

¹¹⁸³ Cf. 'Tib. Kanj. verse (10)c: *skyes mchog rnams kyi gsang chen shes par 'gyur //*.

¹¹⁸⁴ *dam pa* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *mchog*; KN. 393.9. (*puruṣa*-) *uttama*-.

¹¹⁸⁵ *gsang ba 'ang shes* : cf. 'Tib. Kanj. *gsang chen shes par 'gyur*; ≠ KN. 393.9. *rabasya-jñānaṃ* (= Bj, C5 etc.); = D2, K, C4, N1. *rabasya* (D2. *°syu*) *jāne*.

¹¹⁸⁶ *por* : = 'T, Ph (= 'Tib. Kho.); the other Kanjurs read *po* instead (s.c.). Cf. KN. 393.9.

(kha 113b8) ¹¹⁸⁷*btsams pa yang* // [_←•] [_←myur *bar*→] de₁'i [_←•] rjesu s[e]ms [_←par 'gyur
// [_←•] mdo sde ¹¹⁸⁸*yang dag chos* «'di» [_←gang [₁] 'dzind pa // [_←•] de₁'i spobs pa
mtha' yas 'gyur [₁ ba ni // ji ltar rlung ni thogs

Kanjur: *rnam par* ¹¹⁸⁹*gang dgongs pa* // *skyes mchog rnam* *kyi* ¹¹⁹⁰*gsang* ¹¹⁹¹*chen shes par*
'gyur // *de ni de yang myur du rjes su sems* // (= 10) *gang zbig mdo sde* (S.219b2)
¹¹⁹²*dam pa* 'di 'dzin pa // ¹¹⁹³*de yi spobs pa dag ni mtha' yas 'gyur* // *ji ltar rlung ni*
gang du 'ang thogs

(kha 114a1) ཨོ // [_←pa₁ myed [_←pa₁ bzhin // chos dang don dang nges pa'i [tsh]ig *gyang*
shes // [_←gang zbig mdo sde dam pa 'di 'dzin pa₁'o₁ // [_←•] mdo sde rnam *gyi*
¹¹⁹⁴*bar* mtshams rtag *du she[s]* //

Kanjur (KN.393.11; T. 186b3; J. 160b6; S.219b2; Ph. 361a4; B. 199a6; Pk. 167b1;
N. 226b5; D. 146b4; C. 172b7; L. 231b5): *med bzhin* // *chos dang don dang nges*
pa'i tshig kyang shes // (= 11) (KN.394) 'dren pa rnam *kyis* (S.219b3) *dgongs te* ¹¹⁹⁵*gang*
gsungs pa // *mdo sde rnam* *kyi* *mtshams sbyar* ¹¹⁹⁶*rtag tu shes* //

(kha 114a2) [_←'dren *pas* ¹¹⁹⁷*ldem po ngag du* gang *gsungs pa* //, rnam par 'dren pa mya
ngan 'das pa₁'i // mdo sde [_←•] yang dag don [_←rnam₁ de₁'is shes // zla ba nyi
ma 'dra bar de

Kanjur: *rnam par* 'dren pa mya ngan 'das ¹¹⁹⁸*pa yi* // *mdo sde rnam* *kyi* ¹¹⁹⁹*yang dag don*
des ¹²⁰⁰*shes* // (= 12) *zla ba nyi ma 'dra bar* ¹²⁰¹*de* (S.219b4) ¹²⁰²

bodhimaṇḍasmi = *byang chub snying por*.

¹¹⁸⁷ *btsams pa yang* : w.r.? ≠ Tib. Kanj. *rnam par gang dgongs pa*; KN. 393.9. *yaṃ* (*bodhimaṇḍasmi*)
vicinitāśī.

¹¹⁸⁸ *yang dag chos* : ≠ Tib. Kanj. *dam pa*; KN. 393.12. *viśiṣṭa* ~. Cf. Tib. Kanj. verse (10)a. *yang dag*
chos; KN. 393.10. *bbūṭadbarmam*. See n. 1181.

¹¹⁸⁹ *gang dgongs pa* : Ph. *dag dgos la* (s.e.).

¹¹⁹⁰ *kyi* : B, Pk. *kyis* (w.r.); cf. KN. 393.9. *rahasyajñānaṃ puruṣōttamānām*.

¹¹⁹¹ *gsang* : T. *gser* (s.e.).

¹¹⁹² *dam pa* : T. *yang dag dam pa* (s.e.).

¹¹⁹³ *de yi* : Ph. *de'i* (= Tib. Kho.); L. 'di yi (s.e.); cf. KN. 393.11. *taśya*.

¹¹⁹⁴ *bar mtshams* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *mtshams sbyar*; KN. 394.1. *anusamdbi*.

¹¹⁹⁵ *te* : Ph. *ste*; Pk. *ta* (s.e.).

¹¹⁹⁶ *sbyar* : S. *sbyor* (s.e.).

¹¹⁹⁷ *ldem po ngag du* : cf. Tib. Kanj. *dgongs te*; KN. 394.1. *saṃdhāya*.

¹¹⁹⁸ *pa yi* : Ph. *pa'i* (= Tib. Kho.).

¹¹⁹⁹ *kyi* : T. *kyis* (s.e.).

¹²⁰⁰ *des* : S, T, D. *de* (s.e.). Cf. KN. 394.2. *so jñānati bbūṭam artham*

¹²⁰¹ *bar* : T. *ba* (s.e.).

(kha 114a3) 'gyur te // de ni shin du snang zhing ¹²⁰³shard [par] byed // de ni ¹²⁰⁴sa'i
steng na ¹²⁰⁵[kun du] rgyu // byang chub sems dpa' mang po yang dag btsud ¹²⁰⁶
 // de bas byang chub sems {/}

Kanjur: 'gyur te // de ni shin ¹²⁰⁷tu snang zhing gsal byed 'gyur // de ¹²⁰⁸ni sa la rgyu zhing
 de dang der // byang chub sems dpa' mang po yang dag 'dzud // (= 13) de bas byang
 chub sems

(kha 114a4) dpa' mkhas [pa] gang // de 'dra ba'i ○ yon tan 'dir thos nas // mya ngan
 nga 'das mdo sde 'dzind ○ pa ni // de dag [byang chub] [du ni] the tsbom
 myed // [←] //

Kanjur: dpa' ¹²⁰⁹dpa' ¹²¹⁰mkhas gang (S.219b5) dag // 'di 'dra ba yi phan yon 'di thos nas // mya
 ngan ¹²¹¹nga 'das mdo 'di ¹²¹²zung shig dang // de dag ¹²¹³the tsom med par byang
 chub 'gyur // (= 14)

(kha 114a5) // De bzhin gshegs pa'i rdzu 'phrul ○ mng(o)n bar 'du byed pa'i le'u
 zhes byas ste nyi shu ○ // 'o //

Kanjur: ¹²¹⁴De bzhin gshegs pa'i rdzu 'phrul mngon par 'du (S.219b6) byed pa'i le'u zhes
 bya ¹²¹⁵ste nyi shu pa'o //

(kha 114a6) ☉ // Dam pa'i chos pu 'da' ri ka bam po bchu'o // : : ☸

Kanjur: // ¹²¹⁶Dam pa'i chos pad ma ¹²¹⁷dkar po bam po bcu gnyis pa /

¹²⁰² de : S. der (s.e.); B. nge (s.e.).

¹²⁰³ shard par byed : cf. Tib. Kanj. gsal byed 'gyur; KN. 394.3. (*āloka*)-pradyota-karaḥ.

¹²⁰⁴ sa'i steng na : cf. Tib. Kanj. sa la; KN. 394.4. medini.

¹²⁰⁵ kun du rgyu : cf. Tib. Kanj. rgyu zbing; KN. 394.4. vicarantu.

¹²⁰⁶ btsud : cf. Tib. Kanj. 'dzud; KN. 394.4. (*saṃ*)ādapetī.

¹²⁰⁷ tu : J. du.

¹²⁰⁸ de : B, Pk. des (s.e.).

¹²⁰⁹ dpa' : B. dpa'i (s.e.).

¹²¹⁰ mkhas gang dag : = T, Ph, D, L (= KN. 394.5. *ye paṇḍita*; = Tib. Kho. *mkhas pa gang*); J, B, Pk, N, C. yang dag kyang (w.r.).

¹²¹¹ nga 'das mdo : = KN. 394.6. (*dbāreyu*) *sūtram mama nirvṛtasya*, S. 'das mdo sde (w.r.). Cf. Tib. Kho. nga 'das mdo sde.

¹²¹² zung shig : = J, Ph, Pk, D, C; B. zung zbig; T. bzung shig; N, L. gzung zbig. Cf. KN. 394.6. *dbāreyu*. Cf. Tib. Kho. 'dzind pa.

¹²¹³ the tsom : = T, B; the other Kanjurs read *the tsbom* instead (= Tib. Kho.).

¹²¹⁴ De bzhin gshegs pa'i rdzu 'phrul mngon par 'du byed pa'i : = T, Ph; J, B, Pk, N, D, C, L. Dam pa'i chos pad ma (B, N, L. *pad-ma*) dkar po las De bzhin gshegs pa'i rdzu 'phrul mngon par 'du byed pa'i.

¹²¹⁵ bya : D. *bya ba*.

¹²¹⁶ Dam pa'i chos pad ma dkar po bam po bcu gnyis pa : = J, B, N; T. *bam po bcu gnyis pa*, the other Kanjurs omit these words.

Leg zigs bris /

(to be continued)

ADDITIONAL ABBREVIATIONS

D1 = Gilgit MS. of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikāsūtra* kept in the National Archives of India (New Delhi), No. 45.

Goshima, Kiyotaka 五島清隆

2002 “Tibetto yaku Youdenū suowen jing (II): Kōtei tekisuto” 「チベット訳『有徳女所問経』(II)・校訂テキスト」 ([A study on] the Tibetan translation of the *Śrīmātībrāhmaṇīparipṛcchā* II; A critical edition), in: *Bukkyo Gakkai Kiyō* 仏教学会紀要 (Memoirs of the Buddhist Research Association), Bukkyo University), X, pp. 1-39.

Karashima, Seishi 辛嶋静志

2005 “An Old Tibetan Translation of the Lotus Sutra from Khotan: The Romanised Text Collated with the Kanjur Version (1),” in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2004*, March 2005, pp. 191-268 + 21 plates.

Krsh = Seishi Karashima, *The Textual Study of the Chinese Versions of the Saddharmapuṇḍarikāsūtra— in the light of the Sanskrit and Tibetan Versions*, Tokyo 1992 : The Sankibo Press (Bibliotheca Indologica et Buddhologica 3).

Ph = MS. of the *Dam pa'i chos padma dkar po* in the Phug brag Kanjur, No. 94, vol. 60, *mDo sde, ja*.

Pk = MS. of the *Dam pa'i chos padma dkar po* in the Peking Kanjur, No. 781, vol. 68, *mDo, Chu*. Reprint: *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 the Otani University, Kyoto, Tokyo 1955-1961: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute, vol. 30, p. 1f.

TDKR = *Tokushima Daigaku Kyōyōbu Rinri Gakka Kiyō* 徳島大学教養部倫理学科紀要 (Bulletin of the Department of Ethics, the Faculty of Liberal Arts, the University of Tokushima)

Toda, Hirofumi 戸田宏文

1984 A Classification of the Nepalese Manuscripts of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikāsūtra*, in *TDKR* 19, pp. 211-256.

Watanabe, Shōkō 渡辺昭宏

1975 *Saddharmapuṇḍarika Manuscripts Found in Gilgit*, ed. Shoko Watanabe; pt. 2, romanized text, Tokyo: The Reiyukai.

AN ADDITIONAL SYMBOL USED IN THE TRANSLITERATIONS

☸ = a lotus symbol

¹²¹⁷ *pad ma* : J reads thus; B, N. *pad-ma*.

The Names of Amitābha/Amitāyus in Early Chinese Buddhist Translations (1)

Jan NATTIER

The Buddha known in Sanskrit as Amitābha “Limitless Light” or Amitāyus “Limitless Life” has long been a central object of devotion in East Asia. Down through the centuries millions of devotees have cherished the thought of being reborn in his Pure Land, the world of Sukhāvātī. Both ordinary lay Buddhists and ordained monastics have recited his name, composed hymns in his praise, and recorded their hopes of being born in his presence. The more scholarly among them have also composed treatises and commentaries, drawing on translations of Indian scriptures that came to hold a place of honor in the Chinese Buddhist canon. Of these the three scriptures that came to be viewed as most essential in East Asia, as is well known, are the *Wuliangshou jing* 無量壽經 (T360), traditionally attributed to the third-century translator Saṃghavarman but now thought to have been produced by Buddhahadra and Baoyun in 421 CE; the *Amituo jing* 阿彌陀經 (T366), translated by Kumārajīva in 402 CE; and the *Guan Wuliangshou jing* 觀無量壽佛經 (T365), traditionally considered to be the work of the fifth-century translator Kālayāśas but now believed by most scholars to be an apocryphal text composed in China. These three texts have held a central place in East Asian scriptural exegesis and, accordingly, they have received the lion’s share of attention from scholars seeking to understand the scriptural sources of devotion to this important figure.

It has long been recognized, however, that the name of this Buddha—who I will refer to throughout this paper, for convenience, using the Japanese form “Amida” as an all-inclusive reference—appears in countless other scriptures as well. And while some of these translations may have had little impact in China, they are nonetheless precious resources for studying the diversity of views concerning Amida that once circulated in and around the Indian subcontinent. Mentions of Amida are also found, of course, in texts that have survived in Sanskrit, among which the larger and smaller *Sukhāvātīvyūha* are naturally of primary importance. Yet because only a tiny fraction of a once voluminous Mahāyāna literature has survived in any Indic language, and because in many cases recensions predating the surviving Sanskrit texts by many centuries have been preserved in Chinese translation, the Chinese canon is a vital source for the study of the development of Mahāyāna literature in India as well.

To tabulate all of the mentions of Amida in the Chinese Buddhist canon would be a gargantuan task, and that is certainly not what I propose to do here. Instead I would like to take up only a small subset of this literature: those texts produced during the formative

period of Buddhist translation activity in China. More specifically, I would like to survey the names of Amida that appear in scriptures reliably dated to the Eastern Han 東漢 and Three Kingdoms 三國 periods. By doing so we will be able to obtain information both about the form(s) in which Amida's name was first circulated in Chinese Buddhist scriptures and, albeit indirectly, about how he was represented in the Indian sources that served as their basis. As we shall see, these early Chinese texts are not ambiguous, as is commonly thought, but rather point to a very specific understanding of Amida's name.

Precedents and prospects

Given the immense popularity of Amida in East Asia, there is a vast scholarly literature on this subject. And the specific topic proposed here—tracking the names of Amida in early Chinese translations—has been thoroughly investigated in studies published long ago by scholars far more erudite than myself. One might well ask, therefore, why the subject should be taken up again.

Several things have changed, however, since these foundational studies appeared. First is the fact that the entire Chinese Buddhist canon is now available in electronic form,¹ making it possible to search rapidly through vast quantities of material, and thus holding forth the promise that some small piece of relevant data not included in previous investigations might appear. Second, the publication of new Indic-language texts of Buddhist scriptures—ranging from small fragments and individual folios to entire texts, of which the Sanskrit *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* is a recent and spectacular example—has yielded important new material for comparative use.² Third, while it has long been recognized that many scriptures were transmitted to China (especially in the early centuries) in Prakrit vernaculars rather than in literary Sanskrit, recent studies have made significant advances in our understanding of the grammar and phonology of these Prakrits, especially the Gāndhārī language of northwest India. Fourth, the past few years have also witnessed substantial progress in the study of the vocabulary, grammar, and style of the works of specific Chinese translators, thus allowing us to see with far greater clarity the distinctive features that characterize their work. Fifth, there has been a renewed recognition of the fact, pointed out by scholars decades ago, that the traditional translator attributions given in the widely used *Taishō* edition of the canon (and of course in other editions as well) are riddled with errors and cannot simply be accepted at face value.³ The resulting critical re-evaluation

¹ I am referring of course to the edition produced by the Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association (CBETA), whose “gift of the digital Dharma” has so transformed our field.

² See the synoptic edition of the Sanskrit, Chinese and Tibetan texts made available by the Taishō University Study Group (2004). Ongoing publications on Indic-language texts from the German Turfan collection (Clawiter and Holzmann, 1965 and subsequent volumes in the series), the Institute of Oriental Studies in St. Petersburg (Bongard-Levin and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, 1985 and subsequent volumes), the British Library (Salomon 1999; Salomon 2000 and subsequent volumes) and the Schøyen collection (Braarvig 2000 and 2002) have made important new materials available for comparative study.

³ A few statistics will quickly demonstrate the seriousness of the matter. Of the fifty-three texts attributed to An Shigao 安世高 by the Taishō editors, only sixteen are accepted by specialists as genuine (for an overview Zürcher 1991), while in the case of Zhi Qian 支謙 just twenty-two out of his fifty-two supposed translations actually appear to be his (Nattier 2003, pp. 241–242; from the list given there T708,

of traditional attributions, together with a close terminological and stylistic analysis of the texts themselves, has yielded a number of recent proposals for changes in the attribution (and thus in the date) of some of the works that concern us here. As a result, a search carried out today for references to Amida in translations dating from the Han and Three Kingdoms periods will draw on a significantly different body of sources than would have been used in earlier years. In short, the contours of the playing field have changed, and thus it seems an opportune moment to raise this topic once again.

Amida in the works of Lokakṣema 支婁迦讖: the transcription *Amituo* 阿彌陀

Amida is not, of course, mentioned in every translated Chinese scripture, nor even in all Mahāyāna texts. Thus there are a substantial number of early translations in which no examples of his name will appear. Above all—and not surprisingly—there is no mention of Amida in the works of the first Chinese translator whose works are extant, the Parthian An Shigao 安世高 (fl. 148-170), who is well known for having translated only non-Mahāyāna texts.

In chronological order, the first translator in whose corpus a reference to Amida can be found is the Yuezhi 月支 translator Lokakṣema (fl. 165-185). It is not surprising that we should find mentions of Amida in his corpus, for Lokakṣema is renowned as a pioneer in the translation of Mahāyāna sūtras in China.⁴ In previous studies only one text, the *Banzhou sanmei jing* 般舟三昧經, Skt. *Pratyutpanna-buddhasammukhāvasthita-samādhi* (of which two different versions, T417 and T418, are both attributed to Lokakṣema in the *Taishō* canon), was included in discussions of his treatment of Amida's name. Before proceeding with our analysis, however, we must first confront some of the ongoing shifts in perspective mentioned above. In recent decades a leader in the field of research on the translations of Lokakṣema has been Paul Harrison, and among his findings are the following:

- (1) that the version of the *Banzhou sanmei jing* in three *juan* 卷 (i.e., T418), and not the version in one *juan* (T417), is the work of Lokakṣema;⁵
- (2) that this is true, however, only of the prose portion of the *Banzhou sanmei jing* 般舟三昧經; the verse portions, which are completely uncharacteristic of Lokakṣema's usual style, are the result of subsequent emendation;⁶ and

the *Liaoben shengsi jing* 了本生死經, should probably now be deleted; see Zacchetti 2004, 210-212). Thus to accept the labels found in the canon at face value is to build on an extremely shaky foundation, for—especially for translators prior to Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什—the odds are greater than 50% that any given attribution will be false. The story of how this came about is long and complicated, involving decisions made by a host of medieval Chinese cataloguers and their modern scholarly successors. It is clear, though, that the lion's share of the responsibility can be assigned to Fei Changfang 費長房, in whose *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶記 (completed in 597 CE) the majority of these spurious attributions first appear (see Hayashiya 1941, pp. 82-84 and 300-302; Tokuno 1990, especially pp. 43-47; and Tan 1991).

⁴ He should not, strictly speaking, be described as *the* pioneer of Mahāyāna translation in China, for he was a contemporary of the translators of the *Fajing jing* 法鏡經 (T322, *Ugraparipṛcchā*), An Xuan 安玄 and Yan Fotiao 嚴佛調.

⁵ For a concise bibliographical listing of previous scholarship on this topic, most of it by Japanese scholars, see Harrison 1990, p. 221, n. 16.

⁶ Like his predecessor An Shigao, Lokakṣema seems to have rendered any verse passages in his Indian source-texts into Chinese prose. For a detailed discussion of the complex transmissional

- (3) that the *Achufoguo jing* 阿閼佛國經 (T313, *Akṣobhyavyūha*) differs significantly in vocabulary and style from Lokakṣema's genuine works, and that it should therefore be considered either a revision of Lokakṣema's original text or the work of another translator.⁷

Suggestions for additions to the list of Lokakṣema's translations have also been made. This writer has recently proposed that the following texts, each corresponding to a part of the *Pusa benye jing* 菩薩本業經 translated by Zhi Qian and thus in turn to the large *Huayan jing* (*Dafangguang fohuayan jing* 大方廣佛華嚴經, T278 and 279) translated by Buddhahadra and subsequently by Śikṣānanda, are in fact the work of Lokakṣema:

- (4) the *Zhupusa qiu fo benye jing* 諸菩薩求佛本業經 (T282) and *Pusa shizhu xingdao pin* 菩薩十住行道品 (T283), traditionally credited to Nie Daozhen 聶道真 and Zhu Fahu 竺法護 (Dharmarakṣa), respectively, appear instead to be "orphaned texts" (孤經) which became separated from the parent text to which they originally belonged, the *Dousha jing* 兜沙經 (T280), and were subsequently catalogued separately. As the attribution of the *Dousha jing* to Lokakṣema is quite secure, and these two texts share the terminological and stylistic features of Lokakṣema's other work (including certain terms that are virtually unique to his texts), they may also be accepted as translations by Lokakṣema.⁸

Most significant for the project at hand, however, is another proposal for the expansion of Lokakṣema's corpus that has resulted from Harrison's research:

- (5) that the *Amituo sanyesanfo saloufotan guoduren dao jing* 阿彌陀三耶三佛薩樓佛檀過度人道經 (T362, the larger *Sukhāvātīvyūha* attributed to Zhi Qian), was actually produced by Lokakṣema or a member of his school. Conversely, the version of the same scripture entitled *Wuliangqingjing pingdengjue jing* 無量清淨平等覺經 (T361), whose attribution to Lokakṣema in traditional catalogues has long been questioned, is actually a revision by Zhi Qian of Lokakṣema's earlier work.⁹

If the above findings are accepted, the list of Lokakṣema's translations takes quite a different shape than before.¹⁰

history of the *Banzhou sanmei jing* see Harrison 1990, pp. 221-249.

⁷ See Harrison 1993, p. 166. In this connection it is worth mentioning that a very high percentage of this atypical vocabulary is standard in the translations of Zhi Qian. (The same is true, incidentally, of the atypical terms found in the verse sections of the extant *Banzhou sanmei jing*.) Thus it seems possible that, if the *Achufoguo jing* was indeed translated by Lokakṣema, the text as we have it—like the verses of the *Banzhou sanmei jing*—may well have been revised by Zhi Qian or a member of his circle.

⁸ For a detailed discussion of the evidence for this proposal see Nattier 2005.

⁹ This suggestion was first made in Harrison 1998 (see pp. 556-557); further details are given in Harrison 1999 and in Harrison, Hartmann and Matsuda 2002. It should be noted that Harrison does not consider the section on the "Five Evils" (五惡) to be the work of Lokakṣema, but rather an addition drawn from another source. My own findings strongly support Harrison's suggestion that T361 is the work of Zhi Qian; where the terminology used in Lokakṣema's version has been revised, the revisions are quite characteristic of Zhi Qian's style. Moreover, the *Pingdengjue jing* contains a long passage in six-line verse (12.288a-289a), a metric form that is extremely rare in translations dating from this period but is used in a number of Zhi Qian's translations.

¹⁰ In this paper I will draw only upon those texts that may be classified as Lokakṣema's "core

In this revised corpus the Buddha Amida now appears in two texts: the *Da Amituo jing* 大阿彌陀經 (to use the more convenient abbreviated name for T362), where he is of course the main character, and the *Banzhou sanmei jing* (T418) where he has a less central role.¹¹ Though he plays quite different parts in these two scriptures, his name in both texts is the same: he is consistently referred to as *Amituo* 阿彌陀 (?â mjie dâ).¹² That the name occurs in transcription rather than translation is not surprising, for it is a characteristic feature of Lokakṣema's work to represent the sounds, rather than the meaning, of Buddhist technical terms and proper names.

It has long been noted, however, that this transcription does not include the final syllable of either of the longer versions of this name found in extant Sanskrit manuscripts, viz., *Amitābha* or *Amitāyus*. Various explanations for this seemingly truncated form have been proposed. An immediate and obvious solution is to say that the original form was simply *Amita* "limitless," and that the two longer forms were later developments. At first glance the transcription *Amituo* would seem not only to support, but indeed to require, this interpretation, particularly in light of the fact that a translation of the name as *Wuliang*

texts," i.e., those works that seem most likely to be his. Although Sengyou states that thirteen works can be attributed to Lokakṣema (fourteen are actually listed in the catalogue section of the *Chu sanzang jiji*, five of which are no longer extant), he also notes that only three of them—the *Daoxing banruo jing* 道行般若經, the *Banzhou sanmei jing* 般舟三昧經, and the now-lost *Shoulengyan jing* 首楞嚴經—were classified by Dao'an as certain to be Lokakṣema's translations. The others Dao'an describes as merely "looking like" Lokakṣema's work (似識所出; see T2145, 55.95c26-29, and cf. 55.6b27). In light of this report the *Daoxing jing* (T224) and the unrevised portions of the *Banzhou sanmei jing* (T418, prose only) have the greatest claim to authenticity. The *Dousha jing* (T280), though Dao'an could not assign it with absolute certainty to Lokakṣema, exhibits no features that depart from these two benchmark texts. Other attributions, however, are less secure. Of these we may classify the *Achufoguo jing* (T313)—which, as Harrison has pointed out, uses a vocabulary and style that is atypical of Lokakṣema's other translations (1993, p. 166)—and the verse portions of the *Banzhou sanmei jing* as "problematic texts" which are highly unlikely, in their present form, to be the work of Lokakṣema himself. Somewhat less divergent are the *Dun zhentuoluo suowen rulai sanmei jing* 鈍真陀羅所問如來三昧經 (T624) and the *Azheshi wang jing* 阿闍世王經 (T626), yet they use a certain amount of vocabulary (mostly translations rather than transcriptions) that is not standard for Lokakṣema; they also open with the phrase "Thus have [I] heard" (*wen rushi* 聞如是), which has no counterpart in his core texts (cf. Harrison 1990, p. 223 and 232-233 for a discussion of the divergent recensions of the *Banzhou sanmei jing* in this regard). On these grounds I would classify these two translations as "borderline texts" which, if they were indeed the work of Lokakṣema, have apparently been revised. The remaining works that are generally accepted by specialists as his—the *Yiyue monibao jing* 遺日摩尼寶經 (T350), the *Wenshubili wen pusa shu jing* 文殊師利問菩薩藏經 (458), and the *Neizang baibao jing* 內藏百寶經 (T807)—have a few minor features that may indicate either subsequent revision or the input of a different translation committee, but for now there seems to be no reason to remove them from the list. All of the new candidates for admission to his corpus—the *Da Amituo jing* (with the exception of the "five evils" section) and the "missing pieces" of the original *Dousha jing* (the *Zhupusa qiu fo benye jing* [T282] and the *Pusa shizhu xingdao pin* [T283])—are quite congruent with Lokakṣema's usual vocabulary and style, which was indeed the foundation for the original proposals that they be viewed as his work. Throughout this paper, I will exclude the problematic texts (T313 and the verses of T418) and the borderline texts (T624 and T626) from consideration.

¹¹ The name appears eleven times in all, ten times on 905a-b and once on 906c. All of these fall within the prose portion of the text identified by Harrison as belonging to the original, unrevised Lokakṣema translation, and thus they may be counted as genuine Han-period occurrences.

¹² For this reconstructed pronunciation (based on the Qieyun system) see Coblin 1983, #240. For the sake of consistency, all of the reconstructed forms used in this paper are drawn from this same source.

無量 “Limitless” occurs in at least two texts translated in the third century by Zhi Qian.¹³

Yet the idea of a name meaning simply “Limitless” has struck many scholars as odd; should there not be some reference to what aspect, or what quality, of the Buddha is unlimited? This sense of incompleteness is surely one reason for the enthusiastic acceptance in at least some circles of a theory first put forth by WOGIHARA Unrai 荻原雲来 that the underlying term *Amita* might not be a Sanskrit word meaning “Limitless,” but rather a Prakrit word derived from Sanskrit *amṛta*, “the Deathless” (Wogihara 1909).

This theory would harmonize well with one of the two names for Amida found in later Sanskrit texts, *Amitāyus*, reflected in the (likewise later) Chinese translation *Wuliangshou* 無量壽 “Limitless Life.” Yet there are significant problems with this interpretation. In particular, while it would be theoretically possible for *amṛta* to become *amita* in certain Prakrits, in the two Prakrit languages for which we have attested occurrences of the word in Buddhist sources this development does not take place. Instead, *amṛta* regularly becomes *amata* in Pāli, while it appears as *amuda* in at least one Gāndhārī text.¹⁴ Moreover, there appears to be no known exegetical tradition (whether in Indic-language texts or in Chinese or Tibetan translation) that interprets the name of Amida in this way. In sum, while Wogihara’s suggestion is intriguing, there seems to be little concrete evidence to support it. Thus some scholars, arguing against Wogihara’s hypothesis, have held that we should accept the fact that the original name was simply *Amita*.¹⁵

Others, however, have been reluctant to accept this conclusion. Pointing out that there is no example of the name being written as *Amita* alone in any extant Indian text, and moreover that the (admittedly later) Tibetan parallels to the word *Amituo* in translations by Lokakṣema and others have either *Tshe dpag med* (< *Amitāyus*) or *’Od dpag med* (< *Amitābha*),¹⁶ Fujita Kōtatsu 藤山宏達 has argued that the transcription *Amituo* must mask a longer Indic-language form. That is, *Amituo* should not be viewed as a complete transcription of Amida’s name, but only as an abbreviation.¹⁷

Certainly it is not uncommon for long foreign names to be abbreviated in Chinese transcription; examples such as *Anan* 阿難 (?â nân) for Ānanda or *Shewei* 舍衛 (śja- jwāi-) for Śrāvastī are found already in the works of An Shigao 安世高 (fl. 148-170), and indeed it is difficult to find any rendition of a proper name in his corpus that exceeds the standard maximum of three Chinese characters.¹⁸ Abbreviation occurs with translated names as

¹³ This and other translations of the name will be discussed in Part 2 of this paper.

¹⁴ These examples are given in Fujita 1970, p. 290.

¹⁵ Among the most important early studies advocating this view are Mochizuki 1930, Sakaino 1935, and Yabuki 1937.

¹⁶ Though the *Mahāvīyutpatti* prescribes the translation of *Amitābha* as *’Od dpag med* (no. 85), not all Tibetan texts conform to this usage; see for example the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, where the Tibetan version gives the name as *Snang ba mtha’ yas* (Taishō University Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature 2004, pp. 286-287). Interestingly, the name *Amitāyus* is not registered in the *Mahāvīyutpatti* at all.

¹⁷ E.g., Fujita 1970, p. 296, n. 11 and 2001, 116-117.

¹⁸ For a pioneering discussion of An Shigao’s terminology see Ui 1937. The example of 阿若拘

well, with especially abundant examples in the works of Zhi Qian.¹⁹

In Lokakṣema's translations, however, a different standard seems to have applied. In the case of Buddhist technical terms he evidently attempted to convey Indian terms in full, for his corpus abounds in such unwieldy expressions as *ouhejusheluo* 漚和拘舍羅 for *upā[ya]kauśalya*, *banruoboluomi* 般若波羅蜜 for *prajñāpāramitā*,²⁰ and *anouduoluosanmiao-sanputi* 阿耨多羅三藐三菩提 for *anuttarasamyaksambodhi*. Even in the case of personal names Lokakṣema seems to have had no scruples about surpassing the limit of three characters, for in his “core texts” (see n. 10 above) we find many longer names. Thus in the *Daoxing banruo jing* 道行般若經 (T224) he uses four-character names for the bodhisattvas Mañjuśrī (*Wenshushil* 文殊師利), Gandhastin (*Jiantuohejin* 健陀訶盡), and Sadāprarudita (*Satuobolun* 薩陀波倫),²¹ and no fewer than five for the disciple Pūrṇamaitrayaṇīputra (*Fenmantuonifo* 分漫陀尼弗).²² Likewise in the *Dousha jing* 兜沙經 (T280) all of the Buddhas and bodhisattvas of the ten directions have names consisting of at least four characters, while some—e.g., the Buddhas of the south (*Aniluohuiluo* 阿泥羅墮羅) and the southeast (*Azhantuohuiluo* 阿旃陀墮羅)—are written with five.²³ Thus it seems unlikely that Lokakṣema would shrink from representing the full form of *Amitābha* or *Amitāyus* if his sources had contained them.

This being said, however, one cannot claim that Lokakṣema's transcriptions represent every sound of the corresponding Sanskrit words. To characterize his practice in very general terms, he seems to elide short internal vowels and many final ones, especially the vowel *a*, in this (we may infer) replicating a Prakritic pronunciation of the texts. He also regularly omits longer final segments of words, such as *-(i)ka* and *-(i)ta*, which he may have viewed as suffixes not integral to the names themselves. Complex consonant clusters, of course, were impossible to reproduce in full, but in general it seems fair to say that his transcriptions attempt to represent foreign sounds—especially if we assume that many of them were pronounced in Prakrit—as extensively as Chinese phonology would allow.²⁴ Given this general pattern, the fact that *Amituo* is the only form of the name that appears in Lokakṣema's corpus would seem, at first glance, to support the hypothesis that the 鄰 for *Ajñātakaundīya* (cf. Pāli *Aññātakondañña*) adduced by Uī (p. 30) occurs in the *Zhuan fahun jing* 轉法輪經 (T109, 2.503c13), a text whose attribution to An Shigao now appears rather doubtful. If the transcription of **Candrakara* as 遮置迦羅 (T602, 15.163c15) cited by Uī on p. 34 belongs to An Shigao's original work, it would be one of the rare examples in his corpus.

¹⁹ See for example the names of the Buddhas and bodhisattvas of the ten directions given in his *Pusa benye jing* (T281, 10.446c17-447a8), some of which are abbreviated to conform to his chosen format of three characters (for the names of Buddhas) or two characters (for the bodhisattvas).

²⁰ On the rationale for writing *banruo* rather than the commonly used *bore* for the term 般若 see Zacchetti 2005, p. 3, n. 5 and the further references given there.

²¹ T224, 8.425c8, 470a12-13, and 470c19ff.

²² T224, 8.454a21. This transcription is presumably based on a Prakrit form resembling Pāli *Puṇṇamantānīputta*.

²³ T280, 10.445b20-21 and c6-7.

²⁴ Terms inherited from his predecessor An Shigao may be an exception; these should be examined separately.

Indic-language texts from which he was working did indeed read only **Amita*.

Another proposal, however, has recently been made based on the recognition that Lokakṣema was surely working from Prakrit rather than Sanskrit texts. In a brief footnote to his ongoing translation of Lokakṣema's *Da Amituo jing*, KARASHIMA Seishi 辛嶋静志 has observed that the intervocalic consonant *-bh-* of *Amitābha* would be likely to shift to *-h-* (and ultimately even further, to *-'* or *-y-*) in northwest Indian Prakrit. This could imply, in turn, that the transcription *Amituo* might represent not an underlying **Amita*, but a Prakrit form of *Amitābha* such as **Amidāha* or **Amidā'a*.²⁵ This suggestion is phonologically quite plausible, for as noted above Lokakṣema often elides final short vowels (especially *-a*), and a remaining final *-h* or *-'*, even if it was pronounced by Prakrit speakers, would be impossible to represent in Chinese transcription. Thus *Amituo*, it would seem, could equally well be based on an underlying **Amita* or on one of these longer Prakrit forms.

How, then, can we determine the source of Lokakṣema's *Amituo*? Many opinions have been expressed on this issue, yielding a literature far too extensive to summarize here. But in general terms it might be possible to say that most of these studies have approached the question of the Indic antecedent of *Amituo* from one of two perspectives: that of the history of Buddhist thought, on the one hand, and that of Chinese historical phonology on the other. From the former perspective, the basic issue is the role and character of Amida and how this might be reflected in his name; from the latter, the task is to interpret the sounds of the Chinese characters in light of their reconstructed ancient pronunciations, and then to find a good match for these sounds among Indian Buddhist terms.

Studies using each of these approaches have made important contributions to our knowledge, but I would like employ a different method here. Specifically, I will adopt a context-centered approach: given that the name *Amituo* appears for the first time in Lokakṣema's work, I will begin by considering only what is found in his translation corpus. By examining Lokakṣema's treatment of similar terms, we may be able to better understand what the transcription *Amituo* might have represented in the work of the specific translator who appears to have coined the term.

Several general cautions, however, should be stated before proceeding. First, it is quite possible that the texts from which Lokakṣema translated were redacted not in just one, but in two or more Prakrit languages; thus a given word might have appeared in different forms in different source-texts. Second, some of Lokakṣema's terminology was not original, but was borrowed from his predecessor An Shigao. In these cases he often adopted the existing term without modification; thus we should evaluate the possible Indian antecedents of such words from within the framework of An Shigao's corpus and not that of Lokakṣema. Third, in contrast to his successor Zhi Qian, who clearly reveled in

²⁵ Karashima 1999, p. 141, n. 34. Karashima makes the further suggestion that the name was originally understood as meaning "limitless light," and only later—on the basis of a Middle Indic nominative singular form such as **Amidāhu* → *-ā'u* → *-āyu*—gradually evolved into *Amitāyus* "limitless life" (*loc. cit.*). In this connection it is noteworthy that variant readings of both *Amitābhu* and *Amitāyu* appear for the name *Amitābha* in some manuscripts of the *Saddharmapundarika-sūtra* (Kern and Nanjio 1908-1912, p. 454, line 5 and n. 18); I would like to thank KARASHIMA Seishi for this reference.

terminological variety, Lokakṣema took a quite conservative (one might say *Mahāvvyutpatti*-like) approach. That is to say, his terminology is relatively consistent across his corpus (or rather, throughout his authentic “core texts”), suggesting that once he settled on an equivalent for a given Indic term he maintained it in subsequent translations even if its spelling or pronunciation in a new source-text was not the same. Thus we should be cautious about taking an individual transcription found in any given work by Lokakṣema as direct evidence of the identity of the Prakrit language from which that text was translated. Fourth, Lokakṣema’s long and unwieldy transcriptions clearly posed a great challenge to Chinese scribes, who seem to have miscopied them with considerable frequency. With no semantic content to guide them, and without any knowledge of their Indian antecedents, mistakes could easily occur. Thus the transcriptions found in the received texts of Lokakṣema’s translations may have migrated a considerable distance—especially in the case of rare or complicated expressions—from Lokakṣema’s original words.

With these cautions in mind we may begin by examining Lokakṣema’s treatment of words with *-bha* as their final syllable—or rather, of words which would end this way in Sanskrit, as *Amitābha* does. Without introducing any presuppositions concerning what form *-bha* might take in any particular Prakrit, or any assumptions about the language of the texts from which Lokakṣema worked, I would like simply to catalogue the parallels between Sanskrit words ending in *-bha* and their counterparts in Lokakṣema’s corpus. Such terms are not numerous, but several can be found among the names of Buddhist heavens. Fortunately these are well-represented in Lokakṣema’s translations, with one list appearing in his *Daoxing banruo jing* and another in the *Dousha jing*. Moreover, the attribution of both of these works to Lokakṣema is quite solid, so they can serve as reliable sources of information on his transcription style.

Selecting all the heaven-names which end in *-bha* (or *-bhā*) in Sanskrit, we obtain the list given below. While the first four are the names of specific heavens, the last two (*Ābhā* and *Śubha*) are collective names, referring to an entire category or group of such realms.²⁶ In general, though not always, the corresponding Chinese names are followed in Lokakṣema’s texts by the word for “heaven” (*tian* 天), which is not reproduced here.

These names, together with the reconstructed Chinese pronunciations of Lokakṣema’s transcriptions, are as follows:

²⁶ The name *Ābhā* is listed separately in the *Sāleyyaka-sutta* (MN41, i.289.17) and in the *Samikhārūpapatti-sutta* (MN120, iii.102.25). MA explains that *ābhā* is not a separate category but a collective name for the three types of “heavens of radiance” whose names follow, though it is not clear to me that the authors of these two suttas had the same opinion (see Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli and Bhikkhu Bodhi, trans., *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha*, p. 1234, n. 426). *Ābhā* also appears as a separate name in the *Mahāvastu* II.314 (cf. Jones trans., vol. 2, p. 294), 348 (Jones vol. 2, p. 317), and 360 (Jones vol. 2, p. 327).

Śubha is also listed separately in the *Sāleyyaka-sutta* (MN41, i.289.29) and in the *Samikhārūpapatti-sutta* (MN120, iii.102.30); MA again states that this is a collective name. *Śubha* also occurs as a separate heaven-name in the *Mahāvastu* at II.314 (cf. J. J. Jones, trans., vol. 2, p. 294) and 348 (Jones vol. 2, p. 317), and 360 (Jones vol. 2, p. 327).

<u>Sanskrit name</u>	<u>Lokakṣema's transcriptions</u>
Parīttabha	波利陀 pwā lji- dā, ²⁷ 波梨陀 pwā lji- dā ²⁸
Apramāṇabha	盧波摩那 ?āp pwā mwā nā, ²⁹ 盧波摩那 ?āp pwā mwā nā ³⁰
Parīttasubha	波栗多修呵 pwā ljet tâ sjəu xā, ³¹ 波利首訶 pwā lji- śjəu: xā, ³² 波栗羞訶 pwā lji- sjəu xā ³³
Apramāṇasubha	阿波摩修 ?ā pwā mwā sjəu, ³⁴ 阿波摩首訶 ?ā pwā mwā sjəu: xā, ³⁵ 阿波摩羞 ?ā pwā mwā sjəu ³⁶
Ābhā	盧 ?āp, ³⁷ 盧 ?āp ³⁸
Śubha	首呵 śjəu: xā ³⁹

At first glance Lokakṣema appears to be rather inconsistent, sometimes eliding final *-bha* (or rather its Prakrit counterpart, whatever that might have been) and sometimes not. A closer look, however, reveals a distinct pattern in his use. When Sanskrit final *-bha* is preceded by the vowel *u*, *bb* is almost always transcribed as if it were pronounced *b*.⁴⁰ When it is preceded by *a* or *ā*, by contrast, it is always elided, with one sole exception: the word *ābbhā*, where the final vowel is long and which—if the syllable *bbhā* were eliminated—would consist of nothing but *ā*. What these transcriptions seem to show, in other words, is that Lokakṣema's renditions were based on Middle Indic forms in which final *-bha* was generally weakened to *-ha* (and perhaps, in some cases, further to *-ʼa*) when preceded by *u*. When preceded by *a* or *ā*, however, it was consistently weakened to *-ʼa* and thus not transcribed in Chinese at all. Only in the case of the very short word *ābbhā* do we observe a different development, with *bbhā* being shortened to *-p*. This is a far more complex, and yet far more ordered, matter than the casual omission of a final syllable here

²⁷ T224, 8.435a11-12 (Coblin #95), 439c23.

²⁸ T280, 10.446a24 (not listed separately by Coblin).

²⁹ T224, 8.435a12 (Coblin #96; var. 盧-) and 439c23 (var. 盧-).

³⁰ T280, 10.446a24-25 (not listed separately by Coblin).

³¹ T224, 8.435a13 (Coblin #98).

³² T224, 8.439c24 (Coblin #114).

³³ T280, 10.446a25 (not listed separately by Coblin; 波- is omitted in several editions).

³⁴ T224, 8.435a13 (Coblin #99).

³⁵ T224, 8.439c24-25 (Coblin #115); the first character is erroneously written 訶 in most of the editions collated by the *Taishō* editors.

³⁶ T280, 10.446a26 (not listed separately by Coblin).

³⁷ T224, 8.435a11 (Coblin #94b; erroneously written 盧 in several editions); T280, 10.446a24.

³⁸ T224, 8.439c23 (not listed separately by Coblin; most editions read 盧-).

³⁹ T224, 8.435a12 (Coblin #97; var. -阿 in the Yuan edition only), 439c24.

⁴⁰ The fact that both 阿波摩修 and 訶波摩首訶 occur in the same text (i.e., the *Daoxing banruo jing*), suggests that the shorter form may be, at least in this case, the result of copyist's omissions.

and there; instead, Lokakṣema's transcriptions seem to reflect the precise nuances of Prakrit phonological development. In light of this data, it now seems clear that the transcription *Amituo* can indeed represent a Prakrit form of the name *Amitābha*, in which the final syllable had been reduced, in pronunciation if not necessarily in writing, to an almost inaudible *-a*.

We must also, however, consider the reverse possibility: could *Amituo* have served as a transcription of an underlying **Amita* as well? After all, the common-sense approach has suggested that **this would be the most natural interpretation of this transcription**. To evaluate this possibility I will follow the same procedure used above, now asking how Lokakṣema represents words which in Sanskrit end in *-ta*. Once again, this requires no assumptions about what form Sanskrit *-ta* might take in any particular Prakrit, nor any presuppositions about **the source-language of Lokakṣema's texts**. **In contrast to the search for terms ending in *-bha*, which are relatively few in number, dozens of transcriptions of words which end in *-ta/-tā* in Sanskrit can be found in Lokakṣema's work**. In order to **focus on the most relevant examples I have selected only those cases in which final *-ta* (or *-tā*) is preceded by a vowel, as in the postulated name **Amita***. Taking the list of Lokakṣema's transcriptions compiled by W. South Coblin (1983, pp. 242-253) as our point of departure, and again restricting our sources to Lokakṣema's "core texts," we can quickly find numerous examples:

Sadāprarudita	薩陀波倫 sāt dā pwâ ljwen ⁴¹
Dharmodgata	曇無竭 da mju giät ⁴²
Nityagandhaprabhūta ⁴³	尼遮提陀波勿 ni tsja gjen: dā pwâ mjwət ⁴⁴
preta	薛荔 biei- kiei- ⁴⁵
tathāgata	但薩阿竭 tāt sāt ?ā giät ⁴⁶
pāramitā	波羅蜜 pwâ lâ mjiet ⁴⁷
Brahmapurohita	梵弗建 bjwem- pjwət diei-/dai-, ⁴⁸ 梵高樓 bjwem- pjəu- ləu ⁴⁹

⁴¹ T224, 8.470c18ff. (Coblin #138).

⁴² T224, 8.471a8-9ff. (Coblin #141; var. 摩-).

⁴³ Coblin (#140) tentatively proposes **Nityagandhapramuditā*, but the corresponding name in Zhi Qian's version, *zhongshou* 羶香 "mass of scents" (T225, 8.503c23) would suggest *-prabhūta* "numerous" rather than *-pramuditā* "joy" (the interchange of *m* and *b/bh* is unproblematic).

⁴⁴ T224, 8.470c22-23 (Coblin #140).

⁴⁵ T224, 8.448a18 (Coblin #129) and *passim*; T350, 12.193a11; T418, 13.912c14. The term also occurs in T282 (10.453b20) and in T362 (12.301a25 and *passim*).

⁴⁶ T224, 8.429a27 (Coblin #55) and *passim*; T418, 13.906a2 and *passim*; and throughout his corpus.

⁴⁷ T224, 8.425c5 (cf. Coblin #42) and *passim*, and throughout his corpus.

⁴⁸ T224, 8.435a11 (Coblin #92); T280, 10.446a23. Something has gone awry here; I suspect that 逮 diei-/dai- (var. 逮) is a copyist's error, perhaps for 樓 ləu.

⁴⁹ T224, 8.439c22.

mahāyānasamprasthita

摩訶衍三拔致 mwâ xâ jiän sâw bwät ti-⁵⁰

Tuṣita

兜術 tōu dūjwet⁵¹

The above list contains all of the examples given by Coblin of Sanskrit terms ending in a final vowel + *-ta/-tā* from texts that are solidly attributed to Lokakṣema (that is, excluding the “problematic texts” and the “borderline texts” specified in n. 10 above). If the *Da Amituo jing*—a text not used by Coblin—is admitted to this group, we can include an additional example: the name Ajita 阿逸 ṛā jiet,⁵² which occurs for the first time in this text.

Once again we find noticeable variety in Lokakṣema’s usage, but with the exception of the unusual rendition of *preta* as *bili* 薛荔 (an unexpected form whose origin is unclear), we may identify the following patterns in his treatment of words which in Sanskrit end in a vowel + *-ta/-tā*:

- (1) By far the most common occurrence is for Sanskrit final *-ta/-tā* to appear as final *-t* (a sound which was still available in the Chinese phonological repertoire of Lokakṣema’s time).
- (2) When the Sanskrit word ends in *-ita*, however, this entire complex is often (though not always) dropped. We may speculate that in these cases Lokakṣema viewed final *-ita* (if indeed his Prakrit sources retained this ending) as a suffix without semantic content of its own.
- (3) In one case, *-ta* alone is unrepresented (i.e., in *mahāyānasamprasthita* 摩訶衍三拔致, where the syllable *-sthi-* corresponds to 致 ti-).

Other examples not adduced by Coblin could no doubt be identified, particularly if the *Da Amituo jing* and the two “missing pieces” of the *Dousha jing* are consulted as well. But the overall picture is quite clear: Sanskrit final *-ta* does not appear as a separate syllable in Lokakṣema’s transcriptions.⁵³ At most, the *-t* is retained; in other cases *-ta* has no counterpart at all.

In light of these examples it is now clear that *Amituo* cannot be based on **Amita*. On the contrary, given the patterns observed above it seems virtually certain that if Lokakṣema had indeed had been transcribing a Prakrit counterpart of Sanskrit **Amita*, he

⁵⁰ T224, 8. 427c1, 2 and 28 and 429b6-7; T418, 13.910a17-18, c6-7 and c9; the term as a whole does not appear on Coblin’s list, but cf. #48 (for *mahāyāna*) and #49 (there listed as a transcription of *saṃpatti*).

⁵¹ T224, 8.439c6, 451b21, 468b25, 26 and 28; cf. also T362 (12.309c9).

⁵² T362, 12.307c, 308a-309a, 309c, 311a-b, 312c, 313a-b, 315b, 316b-317b (23 occurrences in all).

⁵³ Coblin gives two examples from the *Daoxing banruo jing* that would seem to be exceptions: one occurrence of *tathāgata* in the form 但薩阿竭陀 (T224, 8.464c17) and two instances where *Tuṣita* is written 兜術陀 (T224, 8.435a4 and 468b27). Both of these seem certain, however, to be mere scribal errors. The word 但薩阿竭陀 occurs only once, while in the same text Lokakṣema’s normal four-character transcription 但薩阿竭 occurs two hundred times; likewise the form 兜術陀 occurs just twice, while Lokakṣema’s normal two-character rendition 兜術 appears (again in the same text) five times, sometimes in close proximity to the three-character form. For both *tathāgata* and *Tuṣita* the transcriptions without *-陀* are standard elsewhere in Lokakṣema’s corpus as well. The fact that words for “*Tuṣita*” (兜率陀) and “*Buddha*” (佛陀) ending in *-陀* began to appear in Buddhist texts in subsequent centuries may well have contributed to these scribal slips.

would have produced a transcription similar to the one used for *Ajita* (阿逸 ʔâ jiet), i.e., a form such as *阿蜜 (ʔâ mjiet). The transcription *Amituo*, by contrast, now points clearly to the identity of Amida as Amitābha, the Buddha of Limitless Light.

Amida in other Han-period texts

Extant translations that can be assigned with confidence to the Eastern Han are few in number, and with the exception of the two translations by Lokakṣema discussed above, no text that is certain to date from this period contains the name of Amida in any form. Aside from Lokakṣema's works and those of An Shigao (which, due to their non-Mahāyāna content, naturally do not mention Amida), only a handful of other translations can be dated with assurance to the Eastern Han.⁵⁴ No text in this group contains any name that might be construed as referring to Amida, however, and thus for the Eastern Han period we have firm evidence of only one form of the name—the transcription *Amituo*—attested in two works by a single translator.

It is likely, however—indeed, it is virtually certain—that other Han-period texts have been preserved in the Chinese Buddhist canon as well. During the second and third centuries CE many scriptures circulated without attribution, acquiring a translator's name (if at all) only centuries after the fact. Such texts were duly catalogued by Dao'an and Sengyou, and a significant number can still be found in the canon today. Of these, those that can be associated with scriptures classified by Dao'an as "archaic" (古異經)⁵⁵ have the best chance of being of comparable antiquity, as this list appears to contain only texts translated during the Three Kingdoms period or before.⁵⁶ Most of these works had already disappeared by Sengyou's time, and only a handful have been identified with extant texts. One of this group, however, is thought to be the *Bapo pusa jing* 拔陂菩薩經 (T419), an archaic translation corresponding to most of the chapters 1-4 of the *Banzhou sanmei jing*.⁵⁷ As such it parallels the section where, in Lokakṣema's version, the name of Amida appears, and indeed this same name—in the same transcription—appears a dozen times in the *Bapo pusa jing* as well.⁵⁸

Given the lack of information on the identity of its translator, the *Bapo pusa jing* cannot be dated with precision; as Harrison notes, however, there is widespread scholarly agreement that, based on its archaic language and style, it should be assigned to the around the first half of the third century CE.⁵⁹ If this is the case, it is possible that its use of

⁵⁴ For a working list of Han-period texts (including both Mahāyāna and non-Mahāyāna works) see Zürcher 1993.

⁵⁵ For Dao'an's list see T2145, 55.16c7-18c2.

⁵⁶ Hayashiya 1941, pp. 1153. Dao'an's list is preserved in the *Chu sanzang jiji*; see T2145, 55.15b13-16c6.

⁵⁷ See the *Chu sanzang jiji*, T2145, 55.15b22 and cf. Harrison 1990, 216-217; Harrison concludes that the traditional identification of the text mentioned here with T419 is "in all probability correct."

⁵⁸ See T419, 13.922a-b.

⁵⁹ Harrison 1990, p. 219. The fact that the *Bapo pusa jing* contains passages in six-character verse may be relevant here, for this metric form is otherwise unattested, in texts whose translators are

Amituo was not original, but was borrowed from Lokakṣema's already established use. Be that as it may, the identity of this transcription with that of Lokakṣema means that it casts no new light on the meaning of the name.

If only a few of Dao'an's "Ancient Scriptures" are still extant, those he classified as "Anonymous Translations" (*shiyijing* 失譯經) have fared considerably better.⁶⁰ Dozens of these can be identified with works still found in the canon, though they have received relatively little scholarly attention, presumably because they are so difficult to place in space and time.⁶¹ Nonetheless, texts in this category stand a good chance of being relatively early, and they are worth perusing in this regard. I have not yet undertaken a thorough investigation of the possibility that one of these texts might contain a previously unidentified name of Amida. A brief search for names already known from other sources (in both transcription and translation), however, turned up just one match: a cluster of references, again using the transcription *Amituo*, in the *Taizi Hexiu jing* 太子和休經.⁶²

The Name *Amitāyus* "Limitless Life"

Of the name *Amitāyus*, which eventually came to serve as the basis for the Chinese *Wuliangshou* 無量壽, we have thus far found no traces at all. Nor is any analogous name easy to find, for if Sanskrit names ending in *-bha* are few, the number of those ending in *-āyus* is vanishingly small. A transcription of one such name does occur, however, in a translation dating from the Three Kingdoms period. Among the works of Zhi Qian is a text entitled "The Scripture concerning Brahmāyus" (T76) in which the name of the main character is transcribed as *Fanmoyu* 梵摩渝 (bjwem- mwā jiu, var. -喻).

No transcription that might correspond to *-āyus* in a context where it might refer to the Amida, however, can be found in any Han-period translation, nor has any translation that could be based on *Amitāyus* yet been found. In short, Han-period translations offer no evidence of the existence of the name "Limitless Life" in any form.

Conclusions

An examination of scriptures that can now be assigned with confidence to the Eastern Han has shown that the name of the Buddha Amida appeared in just two texts: the *Da Amituo jing* (T362) and the *Banzhou sanmei jing* (T418). Both may now be considered the work of Lokakṣema, and in both works the name is transcribed as *Amituo*. Two other texts—the *Bapo pusa jing* (T419) and the *Taizi Hexiu jing* (T344)—contain the same transcription. They cannot be dated precisely, though it seems likely that both were produced not long after the fall of the Han. No example of a translated name of Amida has been found in known, before the time of Zhi Qian (fl. 220-252).

⁶⁰ Dao'an's list of one hundred forty-two such "anonymous scriptures" is preserved in Sengyou's *Chu sanzang jiji*; see T2145, 55.16c7-18c2; of these Sengyou reports that ninety-two were still in circulation in his time. Sengyou also compiled an additional list of his own (21b17-37b17), many of which, we may assume, were of later provenance than those catalogued by Dao'an.

⁶¹ The only recent study that I am aware of is Zürcher 1995; the foundational work on this topic is, of course, that of Hayashiya (1941, especially pp. 408-413 and 452ff.).

⁶² See T344, 12.156a2-6. On this scripture see Hayashiya 1941, pp. 511-520.

the literature of this period, and no variant transcriptions have been identified. In this regard—though I have drawn on a different set of scriptures for this study—the results have confirmed the findings of many previous works.

These results have also shown, however, that the transcription *Amituo* is not ambiguous, but points directly to an understanding of the name as “Limitless Light.” Viewed within the context of Lokakṣema’s transcription practices, it is now clear that *Amituo* corresponds to Sanskrit *Amitābha*, very likely in a Prakrit form such as **Amidā’a*. (Such a form would appear to be consistent with a source-text in northwest Prakrit, but there may be other possibilities as well, and I will leave it to Middle Indic specialists to pursue this matter in detail.) We have also seen that, again within the context of Lokakṣema’s *modus operandi*, *Amituo* cannot correspond to the shorter form **Amita* alone.

Our findings thus confirm the view advocated by FUJITA Kōtatsu, based on buddhological considerations, that *Amituo* does not represent the word “Limitless” alone, but must be based on a longer form of the name. They also support the theory set forth by KARASHIMA Seishi, based on philological considerations, that “Limitless Light” (*Amitābha*) and not “Limitless Life” (*Amitāyus*) should be the earlier form. For the appearance of the name “Limitless Life” we must wait at least until the Three Kingdoms period, which will be the subject of the second part of this study.

[keywords] Amitābha, Amitāyus, Lokakṣema, *Dai Amidakyō*, *Hanjuzanmaikyō*, 2nd c. CE, China

Bibliography

- Bongard-Levin, G. M., and M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, 1985. *Pamyatniki indiiskoi pis'mennosti iz Tsentral'noi Azii: Izdanie tekstov, issledovanie, perevod i kommentarii*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Nauka.
- Braarvig, Jens, ed., 2000. *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection, I: Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. 1. Oslo: Hermes Publishing.
- , ed., 2002. *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection, III: Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. 2. Oslo: Hermes Publishing.
- Clawiter, Walter, and Lore Holzmänn, 1965 (edited and with an introduction by Ernst Waldschmidt). *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*. Teil I. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH.
- Coblin, W. South, 1983. *A Handbook of Eastern Han Sound Glosses*. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.
- FUJITA Kōtatsu 藤田宏達, 1970. *Genshi Jōdo shisō no kenkyū* 原始浄土思想の研究 [A Study of Early Pure Land Buddhism]. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店.
- , 2001. *Amidakyō kōkyū* 阿弥陀經講究 [Lecture Explorations of the Sukhāvatīyūha]. Kyoto: Shinshū Ōtani-ha shūmusho shuppanbu 真宗大谷派宗務所出版部.
- Harrison, Paul M., 1990. *The Samādhi of Direct Encounter with the Buddhas of the Present*. Tokyo: The International Institute of Buddhist Studies.
- , 1993. "The Earliest Chinese Translations of Mahāyāna Buddhist Sūtras: Some Notes on the Works of Lokakṣema." *Buddhist Studies Review*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 135-177.
- , 1999. "On the Authorship of the Oldest Chinese Translation of the *Larger Sukhāvatīyūha-sūtra*." Unpublished paper presented at the International Association of Buddhist Studies meeting, Lausanne, Switzerland.
- Harrison, Paul, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, and Kazunobu Matsuda, 2002. "Larger Sukhāvatīyūha." In Jens Braarvig, ed., *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection, III: Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. 2 (Oslo: Hermes Publishing), pp. 179-214.
- HAYASHIYA Tomojirō 林屋友次郎, 1941. *Kyōroku kenkyū (Zenpen)* 經錄研究 (全編). Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店.
- , 1945. *Iyaku kyōrui non kenkyū* 異譯經類の研究. Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko 東洋文庫.
- Jones, J. J., trans., 1949-1956. *The Mahāvastu*. 3 vols. London: Luzac.
- KARASHIMA Seishi 辛嶋静志, 1999. "Dai Amidakyō yakuchū (1)" 「大阿弥陀經」訳注 (一). *Bukkyō daigaku sōgō kenkyūjō kiyō* 仏教大学総合研究所紀要, no. 6, pp. 135-150.
- Kern, Hendrik, and Bunyiu Nanjio, 1908-1912. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 10 (St. Pétersbourg: Imperial Academy). Repr: Osnabrück, Biblio Verlag, 1970.
- MOCHIZUKI Shinkō 望月信亨, 1930. *Jōdokyō no kigen oyobi hattatsu* 浄土教の起原及発達 [The Origin and Development of Pure Land Thought]. Tokyo: Kyōritsu sha 共立社.
- Nattier, Jan, 2003. "The Ten Epithets of the Buddha in the Translations of Zhi Qian 支謙." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2002 [ARIRIAB]*, vol. 6, pp. 207-250.
- , 2005. "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 [ARIRIAB]*, vol. 8, pp. 323-360.
- Nāṇamoli, Bhikkhu, and Bhikkhu Bodhi, trans., 1995. *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Sakaino Kōyō 境野黄洋, 1935. *Shina Bukkyō seishi* 支那仏教精史 [A Spiritual History of Chinese Buddhism]. Reprint Tokyo: Sankibō busshorin 山喜房仏書林, 1972.
- Salomon, Richard, 1999. *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls from Gandhāra: The British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments*. Seattle: University of Washington Press/British Library.
- , 2000 (with a contribution by Andrew Glass). *A Gāndhārī Version of the Rhinoceros Sūtra: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 5B*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Taishō University, Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature, 2004. *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa: Transliterated Sanskrit Text Collated with Tibetan and Chinese Translations*. Taishō University: Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism.
- TAN Shibao 譚世保, 1991. *Han Tang Foshi tanzhen* 漢唐佛史探真. Zhongshan daxue chubanshe 中山大學出版社, Guangzhou.
- Tokuno, Kyoko, 1990. "The Evaluation of Indigenous Scriptures in Chinese Buddhist Bibliographical Catalogues." In Robert E. Buswell, Jr., ed., *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press), pp. 31-74.

- UI Hakuju 宇井伯壽, 1971 [1937]. *Yakukyōshi kenkyū* 譯經史研究 [Studies in the History of Scripture Translation]. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店.
- WOGIHARA Unrai 荻原雲来, 1909. "Mishichū (Viṣṇu) to Amida" 微瑟紐 (Viṣṇu) と阿弥陀 [Viṣṇu and Amida]. *Shin Bukkyō* 新仏教 9, no. 9. Rept. in *Wogihara Unrai bunshū* 荻原雲来文集 [Collected Works of Wogihara Unrai] (Tokyo: Sankibō busshorin 山喜房佛書林, 1972), pp. 221-230.
- YABUKI Keiki 矢吹慶輝, 1937. *Genshi jōdo shisō no kenkyū* 原始浄土思想の研究 [A Study of Early Pure Land Buddhism]. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店.
- Zacchetti, Stefano, 2004. "Teaching Buddhism in Han China: A Study of the *Ahan koujie shi'er yinyuan jing* T 1508 Attributed to An Shigao." *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2003*, vol. VII, pp. 197-224.
- , 2005. *In Praise of the Light: 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*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica VIII. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- Zürcher, Erik, 1991. "A New Look at the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Texts." In Koichi Shinohara and Gregory Schopen, eds., *From Benares to Beijing: Essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religion in Honour of Prof. Jan Yün-hua* (Oakville, Ontario: Mosaic Press), pp. 277-304.
- , 1995. "Obscure Texts on Favorite Topics: Dao'an's *Anonymous Scriptures*." In Helwig Schmidt-Glintzer, ed., *Das andere China: Festschrift für Wolfgang Bauer zum 65. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

The Transmission of Indian Ayurvedic Doctrines in Medieval China:

A Case Study of *Aṣṭāṅga* and *Tridoṣa* Fragments from the Silk Road*

CHEN Ming 陳 明

From the late Han to the Tang dynasties (first—tenth centuries CE), along with the diffusion of Buddhism, ancient Indian medical knowledge and practices, especially the Ayurvedic and Buddhist medical systems, spread into China. Many drugs, prescriptions, remedies, techniques and surgical methods from India (notably the method of *jīnzhen bozhang fa* 金針撥障法, “couching for cataracts”¹) are recorded in the Chinese medical texts that have been handed down from ancient times. The relationship between ancient Indian and Chinese medicine has been an important topic for research in the history of medieval Chinese medicine. With regard to medical doctrines, scholars of medical history have long been well aware of the Indian influence on Chinese medicine. For example, the concepts of *Sida chengshen* 四大成身 (the four great constituent elements of the human body) and *Sibai sibing* 四百四病 (The 404 ailments of the body) are known to be influenced by Indian medicine.² However, up until now there has never been any discussion of the influence of Ayurvedic doctrines.

* I would like to thank Dr. Dominik Wujastyk for many suggestions and Ms. Penelope Barrett for correcting my English.

¹ Vijaya Deshpande, “Indian influence on early Chinese ophthalmology: glaucoma as a case study”, *BSOAS*, 62:3, 1999, pp. 306-322. Vijaya Deshpande, “Ophthalmic surgery: a chapter in the history of Sino-Indian medical contacts”, *BSOAS*, 63:3, 2000, pp. 370-388. Fan Ka Wai 范家偉, “Tangsong shidai Yanneizhang yu Jinzhen Bozhang Shu” 唐宋時代眼內障與金針撥障術 [*Yanneizhang and Jinzhen bozhang fa* during the Tang and Song Periods], *Hanxue Yanjiu* 《漢學研究》 [Chinese Studies], vol. 22: 2, 2004, pp. 271-297. See also Fan, Ka Wai, “Couching for cataract and Sino-Indian medical exchange from the sixth to the twelfth century AD”. *Clinical & Experimental Ophthalmology* 33 (2), 2005, pp. 188-190.

² Unschuld, Paul U., “The Chinese Reception of Indian Medicine in the First Millennium A.D.”, *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 53:3, 1979, pp. 329-345. Shen Junlong 申俊龍, “Fojiao sidashuo dui chuantong yixue de yingxiang” 佛教四大說對傳統醫學的影響 [The influence of the Four Great Elements of Buddhism on traditional medicine], *Nanjing daxue xuebao* 南京大學學報 [Journal of Nanjing University], 2001:3, pp. 73-78. Wang Junzhong 王俊中, “Zhongguo zhonggu fojiao yixue jidian yiti chuyi: Yi Sida he bingyinshuo weizhu” 中國中古佛教醫學幾點論題芻議——以“四大”和“病因說”為主 [A study on some topics of Buddhist medicine in Medieval China], *Gujin lunheng* 古今論衡 [Disquisitions on the Past & Present], vol. 8, 2002, pp. 130-143.

ARIRIAB Vol. IX (March 2006): 201-230.

© 2006 IRIAB, Soka University, JAPAN.

From the end of the nineteenth century to the early twentieth century, many western explorers journeyed along the Silk Road to the so-called Western Regions in North-west China. They found and collected many manuscripts and fragments. We now know that these included medical manuscripts in various languages. These manuscripts certainly constitute important new primary sources for research on the history of Sino-Indian medical interchange. In the recently published *Dunhuang manuscripts collected in the St. Petersburg Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of Russia*,³ there are two fragments, identified as D_x09888 and D_x18173, which deal with *aṣṭāṅga*- and *tridoṣa*-respectively. This paper discusses the content and significance of the two fragments, and the transmission of Ayurvedic doctrines in Dunhuang and Turfan. This is a new page in the history of Sino-Indian medical exchange.

I: D_x09888: Translation and Annotation

D_x09888 is a fragment written in Chinese in six lines on both sides, with about ten to fourteen words in each line. A photograph is published in *Dunhuang manuscripts collected in the St. Petersburg Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of Russia*, vol. 14.⁴

Translation:

1. ... path....
2. ...the man who is poor and lowly...,
3. ...ability and advantage. This is the first mark of a medical professional (doctor), one who is fully versed in the eight methods (of Ayurveda concerning all treatments of diseases).
4. [Question:] What are the eight methods? List their names, please.
5. Answer: The recipes for treating [diseases of] the head and eyes and for introduction into the nose are the first (medical) method.
6. [Answer:] The five viscera and six *fu*-organs, internal disorders, feeling the pulse and the treatment of ... constitute the second (medical) method.
7. ...[Removing evil] *qi*, and removing demonic spirits (or the *qi* of ghosts) is the third (medical) method.
8. The [treatment of] sores (especially injuries to the skin), pyogenic infections of the skin (or painful swellings of the body surface), incised wounds (or metal-

³ *E zang Dunhuang wenxian* 俄藏敦煌文獻 [Dunhuang manuscripts collected in the St. Petersburg Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of Russia], volume 1-17, ed. by St. Petersburg Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of Russia et al., Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1992-2001.

⁴ *E zang Dunhuang wenxian* 俄藏敦煌文獻 [Dunhuang manuscripts collected in the St. Petersburg Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of Russia], vol. 14, Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2000, p. 207.

inflicted wounds, stab wounds) and hemafrica (bleeding before or after defecation) is the fourth (medical) method.

9. Various prescriptions for antidotes to remove all poisons [from inside the body], and the making of elixirs of longevity (or to maintain life indefinitely)...
10. This is the fifth (medical) method. To cure various diseases of children...
11. and so on, this is the sixth branch. To cure surely ..., [This is the seventh branch.]
12. (The following is missing)

Judging from the content and appearance, I think that D̐x09888 and eight other fragments (including D̐x09170, D̐x09178, D̐x09882, D̐x09935, D̐x09936, D̐x10092 and D̐x12495) belong to the same group of manuscripts as T̐IY49R/Ch.3725R *Qipo Wuzang Lun* 耆婆五藏論 [Jīvaka's Treatise on the Five Viscera] and T̐IY49V/Ch.3725V *Zhuyifangsui* 諸醫方髓 [Essential Parts of Various Selected Medical Remedies], now in the Berlin collection, which were unearthed in the ancient city of Jiaohe 交河 by the German explorers A. Grünwedel and A. von Le Coq on their second expedition to Turfan between September 1904 and December 1905.⁵

D̐x09888 lists the first six of the eight branches of Ayurveda. The term *bashu* 八術 (the eight methods) in D̐x09888 is of key importance. The original Sanskrit term corresponding to *bashu* 八術 is *aṣṭāṅga-* (plural *aṣṭāṅgāṇi*). *Aṣṭa-* means eight, while *aṅga-* means branch, part or member. In Ayurvedic texts, *Aṣṭāṅga-* not only refers to the eight parts or branches of Ayurveda, but also becomes synonymous with medical science. In *Suśruta's Suśruta-Saṃhitā*, the eight branches [or Ashtangas] of Ayurveda consist of śalya-tantra, śālākya-tantra, kāya-cikitsā, bhūta-vidyā, kaumāra-bhṛtya, agada-tantra, rasāyana-tantra and vājikaraṇa-tantra.⁶ *Siddhasāra* is an important medical work that was edited by Ravigupta around the mid-seventh century CE. The content of *Siddhasāra* comes from other medical texts. Although it is not as central as *Aṣṭāṅgabhyāsa Saṃhitā* to Indian medicine, *Siddhasāra* exists in several Sanskrit manuscripts, and many versions in other languages such as Tibetan, Khotanese, Uighur and Arabic are found in Central Asia. It reflects the achievements of Ayurveda in India at the time, but its influence extends much further⁷. The first verse of *Siddhasāra* also explains the meanings of *Aṣṭāṅga*-⁸.

⁵ CHEN Ming 陳明, *Shufang yiyao: Chutu wenshu yu xiyu yixue* 殊方異藥 — 出土文書與西域醫學 [Medical Manuscripts Discovered in Dunhuang and the Western Regions: Foreign Medicine in Medieval China], Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2005, pp. 157-167.

⁶ Dominik Wujastyk, *The Roots of Ayurveda: Selections from Sanskrit medical writings*, London: Penguin Books, 2003, p. 205. Cf. C. Vogel, "On Buxton's view of the eight parts of Indian medicine", *ITJ*, VI, 3/4, 1963, pp. 290-295.

⁷ According to the research of late Professor R. E. Emmerick, the Khotanese version of *Siddhasāra* in Dunhuang is a translation from Tibetan text of *Siddhasāra* made around the tenth century CE. In the Khotanese version of *Siddhasāra*, there appears the Sogdian name of Zhang Jinshan 張金山 who was a speaking ambassador from the kingdom of Khotan to Dunhuang. This manuscript was probably written later than D̐x18173. The question of whether the Khotanese version of *Siddhasāra* influenced D̐x18173 still awaits demonstration. See Chen Ming 陳明, "Yindu fanwen yidian Yilijinhua jiqi Dunhuang yutianwen

The branches are listed as follows: śālākya, kāya-cikitsitā, bhūta-cikitsitā, śalya, agada, vayo-rakṣā, bāla-rakṣā and bija-vivardhana. Their sequence differs from that in *Suśruta-Saṃhitā* and *Siddhasāra*. *Baṣhu* is discussed in the Chinese Buddhist canon and the commentaries on the Buddhist canon as well by Chinese monks. In chronological order, these discussions are as follows:

In the sixth folio of the *Daban nibuan jing* 大般涅槃經 [*Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*], translated by Faxian 法顯 (337-422 CE) in the fourteenth year of the Yixi 義熙 period (418 CE) of the Eastern Jin Dynasty, *baṣhu* is rendered as *bazhongshu* 八種術 (eight kinds of [medical] methods).⁹

There are two translations of *aṣṭāṅga-* in *Daban niepan jing* 大般涅槃經 [*Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*], translated by Dharmakṣema 曇無讖 (385-433 CE) in the tenth year of the Xuanshi 玄始 period (421 CE) of the Northern Liang Dynasty: *bazhongyao* 八種藥 (eight kinds of drugs) and *bazhongshu* 八種術 (eight kinds of [medical] methods). The first translation appears in the ninth folio in the sentence “... like a good physician who knows *bazhongyao* 八種藥 (the eight kinds of drugs), which cure all disorders except for certain death.”¹⁰ The second appears in volume twenty-five: “For example, a good physician knows *bazhongshu* 八種術 (the eight kinds of [medical] methods). He first observes the patient’s symptoms, which fall into three types.”¹¹

The *Sāṃkhya* text *Jinqishilun* 金七十論 [*Sāṃkhyakārikā*] was translated by Paramārtha 真諦 (499-569 CE) in the tenth year of the Xuanshi 玄始 period (421 CE) of the Northern Liang Dynasty. It refers to the “eight divisions of medical remedies, which can remove the sufferings of the human body.”¹² According to another extant Sanskrit text of the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, the term corresponding to *bafen yifang* 八分醫方 (eight divisions of medical remedies) is *āyurveda-śāstra*, which means the treatises of *Āyurveda*.

The second folio of *Daban niepan jing yiji* 大般涅槃經義記 [Record of the treatise on *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*] written by Huiyuan 慧遠 (523-592 CE) of Jingying Temple 淨影寺 in the Sui period, provides the following explanation of *baṣhu*:

“*xiēben*” 印度梵文醫典《醫理精華》及其敦煌蘭文寫本 [The Indian medical text *Siddhasāra* in Sanskrit and its Khotanese version from Dunhuang], *Dunhuang Yanjiu* 敦煌研究 [Dunhuang Studies], 2000.3, pp. 115-127.

⁹ “In that (connection), the chapter on the Tantra will be expounded: As for the sections (aṅgāni) of this, they are : (1) cyc-medicines (śālākya); (2) healing the body (kāya-cikitsita-); (3) removing demons (bhūta-cikitsita-); (4) extracting foreign bodies (śalya-); (5) protecting from poison (agada-rakṣā); (6) protecting life (vayo-rakṣā); (7) protecting children (bāla-rakṣā); (8) making sperm increase (bija-vivardhanam).” See R. E. Emmerick, *Siddhasāra of Rāvigupta*, Volume 2: *The Tibetan text with English translation* (= Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, ed. W. Voigt, Supplementband 23.2), Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1982, p. 15

¹⁰ T. 12, p. 893a. (T. points to Takakusu Junjirō, Watanabe Kaigyoku ed., *Taishō shinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經, 100 volumes, Tokyo: Taisho Issaikyo Kankokai, 1924-1934).

¹¹ T. 12, p. 419b.

¹² T. 12, p. 511b.

¹³ T. 54, p. 1245b. Jizang 吉藏 (549-623CE) in *Bailun Shu* 百論疏 [Commentary on *Śatka-śāstra*], volume I, also used this word *Bafen yifang* 八分醫方 (T. 42, p. 244b).

... Whoever knows the eight methods, which are comparable to the dharma of Buddha Tathagata as the basis of medicine. What are the eight methods? The first is the knowledge of the diseased body, The second is the knowledge of pathogeny; the third is the knowledge of the appearance of diseases; the fourth is the knowledge of the location of diseases, whether in the five viscera, or in the limbs and joints; the fifth is the knowledge of the time of diseases, what kinds of diseases arises in the morning, and so forth; the sixth is the knowledge of drugs and the identification of the appearance of drugs; the seventh is the knowledge of treatments, knowing which drugs cure which diseases; the eighth, is the knowledge of the prohibition on drugs, which diseases are compatible with which drugs, food prohibitions, and so forth.¹³

This explanation reflects the intention of the Buddhist author to draw parallels between Buddha dharma and medicine.¹⁴ But it does not help us to understand the original meaning of *bashu* in medicine.

The *Daban niepan jing shu* 大般涅槃經疏 [Commentary on *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*] written by Master Zhang'an 章安 (561-632 CE) in the Sui Dynasty and re-edited by Master Zhanran 湛然 (711-782 CE) in the Tang Dynasty, volume six, glosses *bazhongshu* as follows.

The beginning of this text points out that a physician is familiar with the eight kinds of medical methods (*bashu* 八術), including the treatment of the body (*zhisheng* 治身), the treatment of the eyes (*zhiyan* 治眼), the treatment of the foetus (*zhitai* 治胎), the treatment of children (*zhixiao'er* 治小兒), the treatment of wounds, injuries or trauma (*zhichuang* 治創), the treatment of poisoning (*zhidu* 治毒), the treatment of evil spirits (*zhixie* 治邪), the knowledge of astrology (*zhixing* 知星). The inner meaning of this corresponds to the Buddha's knowing the Noble Eightfold Path and curing the eightfold reversible diseases (*badaobing* 八倒病) and so forth.¹⁵

But in fact Zhang'an's last branch does not correspond to any of the Ayurvedic āngas.

In *Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan* 南海寄歸內法傳 [A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago], volume three, the famous Buddhist scholar and pilgrim I-tsing (Yijing, 義淨) (615-713 CE) calls it the "eight of medicine"

¹³ T. 37, pp. 649c-650a.

¹⁴ With regard to the relationship between the four noble truths and medicine, cf. Hendrik Kern, *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, reprint Varanasi: Indological Book House, 1968, pp. 46-47. Albrecht Wezler, "On the Quadruple Division of the Yogaśāstra, the Caturvyūhatva of the Cikitsāśāstra and the 'Four Noble Truths' of the Buddha," *Indologica Taurinensia* 12, 1984, pp. 289-337. Wilhelm Halbfass, "The Therapeutic Paradigm and the Search for Identity in Indian Thought", *Tradition and Reflection: Explorations in Indian Thought*, State University of New York Press, 1990, pp. 243-63.

¹⁵ T. 38, pp. 72c-73a.

(*bayi* 八醫) and gives a more detailed explanation. Takakusu Junjirō has translated it into English as follows:

The medical science, one of the five sciences (*vidyā*) in India, shows that a physician, having inspected the voice and countenance of the diseased, prescribed for the latter according to the eight sections of medical science (see below). If he does not understand the secret of this science, he will, though desirous of acting properly, fall into mistakes. The following are the eight sections of medical science. The first treats of all kinds of sores 所有所瘡; the second, of acupuncture of any disease above the neck 針刺首疾; the third, of the diseases of the body 身患; the fourth, of demoniac disease 鬼瘴; the fifth, of the Agada medicine (i.e. antidote) 惡揭陀藥; the sixth, of the diseases of children 童子病; the seventh, of the means of lengthening one's life 長年方; the eighth, of the method of invigorating the legs and body 足身力. 'Sores' are two kinds, inward and outward. The diseases above neck are all that is on the head and face; any disease lower down from the throat is called a 'bodily' disease. The 'Demoniac' is the attack of evil spirits; and the 'Agada' is the medicine for counteracting poisons. By 'Children' is meant from the embryo stage until after a boy's sixteenth year; 'lengthening life' is to maintain the body so as to live long, while 'invigorating the legs and body' means to keep the body and limbs strong and healthy.¹⁶

Having stayed in India for many years, I-tsing rightly points out that the eight sections of medicine belong to the Vaidya-sthāna (medical science).

I-tsing translated *Suvarṇaprabhāsottamarājasūtra* 金光明最勝王經 into Chinese in the third year of the Chang'an period (703 CE). In the ninth folio, *Chubing Pin* 除病品 [Chapter on healing illness], he also uses the term *bashu*,¹⁷ which he explains as follows.

You should understand the eightfold treatise on medicine, and grasp various ideas in general. If you are fully versed in this science (medicine), you can heal people's illnesses. By this is meant punctures, wounds and trauma, bodily diseases, ghosts and spirits, evil poisons, children, prolonging life and increasing energy or strength.¹⁸

The last sentence is a simple list of *bashu*. But this is not present in the Sanskrit text

¹⁶ Wang Bangwei 王邦維 ed., *Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan jiaozhu* 南海寄歸內法傳校注 [Notes on A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago], Zhonghua shuju, 1995, p. 151. See Takakusu Junjirō (tran.), *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago*, 1896. Reprint. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1982, pp. 127-128.

¹⁷ "A merchant called Jaṭimdhara, a doctor, a medical man, expert in the chief elements. He was fully versed in the eightfold treatise on medicine." (Translated by Chen Ming).

¹⁸ T. 16, pp. 447c-448b. For discussion of this chapter, see Johannes Nobel, "Ein alter medizinischer Sanskrit-Text und seine Deutung". *Supplement to the Journal of the American Oriental Society*, no. 11, 1951, pp. 1-35.

Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra or another Chinese version made by Dharmakṣetra.

The *Jingguangming zuishengwang jingshu* 金光明最勝經疏 [Commentary on *Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra*] by Huizhao 慧沼 (650-714 CE), volume six, says:

Bashu includes, first, the method of piercing with needles (*Beizhenci fa* 被針刺法); second, the treatment of wounds and injuries (*Poshang fa* 破傷法); third, the treatment of bodily diseases (*Shenji* 身疾), namely the four kinds of diseases; fourth, of harm caused by ghosts (*Guisun* 鬼損); fifth, the treatment of poisons (*Zhongduyao* 中毒藥); sixth, the treatment of children (*Liaobaitong* 療孩童); seventh, prolonging life (*Yanshou* 延壽); eighth, nourishing life (*Yangshen* 養身).¹⁹

In *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 [Pronunciation and meanings of the entire Buddhist canon], a famous dictionary of the vocabulary of Buddhist texts, compiled by Huilin 慧琳 in 783-807 CE, the term “eight kinds of [medical] methods” (*bazhongshu* 八種術) is defined as:

The treatment of the body, of the eyes, of sores, of children, of ghosts, of poisons, of the foetus, by horoscopy, see the *Commentary on Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*.²⁰

In the same folio, the term *Jie bazhong yao* 解八種藥 (understanding eightfold medicine) is also found. This is defined as:

The treatment of the body, of the eyes, of sores, of children, of evil ghosts, of poisons, of illness of the fetus, by horoscopy. This is as stated by Jivaka as follows.²¹

Following the sequence of *aṣṭāṅga-* in *Suśruta-saṃhitā*, the original Sanskrit terms and Chinese translations may be listed as follows:

(1) *śālya-*, *śālya-tantra* or *śāstra cikitsā* means the removal of foreign bodies. It deals with the treatment of wounds and traumas requiring the use of the knife. It corresponds to *Zhichuang* 治創 (treatment of wounds), *Suoyou zhuchuang* 所有所瘡 (all kinds of sores), *Shangpo* 傷破 (wounds and traumas), *Liao poshang fa* 療破傷法 (treatment of traumas and wounds) and *Zhichuang* 治瘡 (treatment of sores).

(2) *śālākya*, *śālākya-tantra*, *urdhvāṅga cikitsā* deals with the treatment of diseases of the head including the eyes, ears, nose, throat and teeth. It has four Chinese translations: *Zhenci shouji* 針刺首疾 (needle treatment of any disorder above the neck), *Zhenci* 針刺 (puncturing with a needle), *Beizhenci fa* 被針刺法 (the method of puncturing with a needle) and *Zhiyan* 治眼 (treatment of eye disease). It should be noted that “needle” here

¹⁹ T. 39, p. 325c.

²⁰ T. 54, p. 466c.

²¹ T. 54, p. 471b.

refers to instruments of surgery, not to the needles used for acupuncture in ancient Chinese medicine.

(3) Kāya-cikitsā, treatment of the body. This branch deals with the treatment of diseases arising from disorders of digestive activity, and other illnesses such as fever that affect the whole body. According to I-tsing, it refers to the treatment of diseases of the body from the neck downwards. It corresponds to the Chinese terms *Zhishen* 治身 (treatment of the body), *Shenbuan* 身患 (diseases of body) and *Shenji* 身疾 (diseases of body).

(4) Bhūta refers to ghosts, the devil, evil spirits or non-human entities. Bhūta-cikitsā, bhūta-vidyā or Graha cikitsā means the treatment of diseases caused by supernatural beings, arising from possession by evil spirits, pathogenic micro-organisms etc. It deals mainly with mental diseases. Chinese equivalents include *Zhixie* 治邪 (treatment of evil spirits), *Guizhang* 鬼障 (ghosts and miasmas), *Guisben* 鬼神 (ghosts and spirits), *Guisun* 鬼損 (harm caused by ghosts) and *Zhigui* 治鬼 (treatment of ghosts).

(5) Bāla-rakṣā, bāla-cikitsā or kaumāra-bhṛtya means to the protection of children and the treatment of diseases of children. It corresponds to *Zhixiao'er* 治小兒 (treatment of children), *Tongzi bing* 童子病 (diseases of children), *Haitong* 孩童 (children) and *Liao haitong* 療孩童 (treatment of children). According to the explanation given by I-tsing, childhood extends from the foetal stage until after a person's sixteenth year. It is therefore worth noting that the treatment of the foetus is in fact included under bāla-rakṣā (paediatrics) in both *Daban niepan jing shu* 大般涅槃經疏 [Commentary on *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*], volume six, and *Yiqiejing yinyi*, volume twenty-five. They are not recognized as two different sections of aṣṭāṅga.

(6) Agada, agada-tantra, agada-rakṣā or daṃṣṭrā cikitsā is the treatment of diseases due to poisons, i.e. toxicology. Agada is transliterated in Chinese as *Ejietuo* 惡揭陀, *Ajietuo* 阿伽陀, *Ajietuo* 阿竭陀 and *Ajietuo* 阿揭陀. It refers to all antidotes. Agada-tantra (toxicology) corresponds to the Chinese terms *Zhidu* 治毒 (treatment of poisons), *Ejietuoyao* 惡揭陀藥 (Agada drugs), *Edu* 惡毒 (evil poisons), *Zhongduyao* 中毒藥 (medicines for poisons).

(7) Vayo-rakṣā, rasāyana-tantra or jarā cikitsā deals with the treatment of diseases of old age, i.e. gerontology or geriatrics. It corresponds to *Changnian fang* 長年方 (elixirs for prolonging life), *Yannian* 延年 (prolonging life), *Yanshou* 延壽 (prolonging life). It refers to practices and regimens for achieving longevity.

(8) Bija means sperm and seed. Bija-vivardhana, vājīkaraṇa-tantra or vṛṣa cikitsā deals with the treatment of conditions such as impotence and sterility, and increasing virility by the use of aphrodisiacs. It corresponds to *Zushenli* 足身力 (invigorating the power of the body), *Zengqili* 增氣力 (increasing potency and strength), and *Yangshen* 養身 (nourishing the body). In fact, it mainly points to increasing sexual potency.

Thus *bashu* in fragment Dlx09888 basically corresponds to aṣṭāṅga- in Ayurveda.

The first section, the recipes for treating [diseases of] the head and eyes, and for introducing into the nose, corresponds to śālākya-tantra or urdhvāṅga cikitsā in Ayurveda. The second section, the five viscera and six *fu*-organs, internal disorders and feeling the pulse, corresponds to Kāya-cikitsā in Ayurveda. Although this passage in Ⅰx09888 mentions “feeling the pulse”, it must be pointed out that there are no records of pulse-taking in Ayurvedic texts until the thirteenth century CE. The first record appears in the *Śārṅgadharasamhitā*. The tradition of pulse-taking is also very different in India and China. The third section, removing demonic spirits or the *qi* of ghosts corresponds to bhūta-vidyā in Ayurveda. The fourth section, the treatment of sores, pyogenic infections of the skin, incised wounds and hemafecia, corresponds to śalya-tantra in Ayurveda. The fifth section, various prescriptions for antidotes to remove all poisons, and the making of elixirs of longevity corresponds to agada-tantra in Ayurveda. However, “the making of elixirs of longevity” can in fact correspond to vayo-rakṣā in Ayurveda. The sixth section, curing various diseases of children, corresponds to kumara-tantra in Ayurveda.

Although the order of the first six sections of *bashu* differs from *Suśruta-samhitā*, the content is fundamentally similar.

As noted above, *Bashu* is mentioned by Buddhist scholars in various Chinese texts and commentaries from the Jin (265-420) to the Tang (618-907) periods. According to *Jiutangshu* 舊唐書 [Old Tang History], the *Taiyishu* 太醫署 (Imperial Medical Office) was the national institution for medical administration and education. The director of *Taiyishu*, known as *Taiyiling* 太醫令 (Imperial Physician), was in charge of four categories of staff, namely physicians, acupuncturists, masseurs and magicians (*jinzhoushi* 禁呪師). Below the physicians, there were various medical doctors who were required to “master medical knowledge to teach students”. This knowledge comprehended:

Studying *Materia Medica* and *Pulse Classic A and B*; the medical courses are divided into five kinds, namely, the treatment of body (*Tiliao* 體療), the treatment of sores and swellings (*Chuangzhong* 瘡腫), the treatment of children (*Shaoxiao* 少小), the treatment of the ears, eye, mouth and teeth (*Ermukouchi* 耳目口齒), and methods using various horns (to remove poisons) (*Jiaofa* 角法).²²

These five categories of medicine of the Tang period are called *Wuye* 五業 (five medical

²² *Jiutangshu* 舊唐書, volume forty-four *Zhiguanzhi* 職官志, edition of Zhonghua shuju, pp. 1875-1876. The record in *Xintangshu* 新唐書, volume forty-eight *Baiguanzhi* 百官志 is identical to this. According to private correspondence with Dr. Lee Jender 李貞德, the method with horns of the Tang is related to the treatment of poisons. There is a method of Zhen Liyan 甄立言 using a bamboo horn to remove the poison of scorpion, which is recorded by Wang Tao 王濤 in his work *Waitai miyao* 外臺秘要 [Arcane Essential Prescriptions from the Imperial Library] volume forty. In some medical texts of the Song and Ming periods, there are other references to the methods with horns for removing poisons, which are sometime called the horn method with water (*shui jiaofa* 水角法) or with mercury (*shuiyin jiaofa* 水銀法).

methods) in *Xintangshu* 新唐書 [New Tang History]²³. They correspond substantially to the eight branches of Ayurveda in India. *Tiliao*, *Chuangzhong*, *Shaoxiao*, *Ermukouci*, and *Jiaofa* correspond to *kāya-cikitsā*, *śālya-cikitsā*, *kūmara-tantra*, *śālākya-cikitsā* and *agada-tantra* in Ayurveda, respectively. The following note appears in *Tangliudian* 唐六典 [Six legal classics of the Tang Dynasty] volume fourteen:

As all physicians have researched different medical classics, teaching is carried out in different courses. Of twenty students in total, there are eleven studying the treatment of the body; three studying the treatment of sores and swellings; three studying the treatment of children; two studying the treatment of diseases of the ears, eyes, mouth and teeth; one studying the methods with various horns (to remove poisons). Those students who study the treatment of the body will graduate in seven years; those who study the treatment of children and of sores and swellings, in five years; those who study the treatment of diseases of the ears, eyes, mouth and teeth and the methods with various horns, in two years.

These then were the regulations governing the number of students studying *Wuye* 五業 and the duration of studying courses in the foremost medical institution of the Tang period. However, no such specific regulations are to be found in the Indian literature.²⁴ Although the sequence of *Wuye* 五業 in Tang China differs somewhat from the eight branches of Ayurveda in India, the terminology provides distinct evidence that some elements of Ayurveda had been absorbed into the system of Chinese medical knowledge by the Tang period.

II: D_x18173: Translation and Annotation

Fragment D_x18173 in the Russian Collection is written on both sides, with seventeen lines on each side. Some lines are missing at the beginning, end and middle of this fragment. On the evidence of the longest line in the extant fragment, there were originally

²³ There was a similar system of medicine in ancient Japan. In *Zhengshi yaolue* 政事要略 [Seiji youryaku] volume ninety-five, the entry “Zhiyao zashi” 至要雜事 (Excellent sundries), about schools, records that the study of medical knowledge consisted of two phases. After two years, the courses are divided into four kinds, namely treatment of the body (internal medicine), treatment of wounds (surgery), treatment of children (paediatrics), and treatment of the ear, eye, mouth and teeth (five organs 五官科). See Wang Jinlin 王金林, *Hantang wenhua yu gudai riben wenhua* 漢唐文化與古代日本文化 [Culture from the Han to Tang Dynasties and the Ancient Culture of Japan], Tianjin renmin chubanshe, 1996, p. 329.

²⁴ The Buddhist texts record that the duration of medical studies was seven years. For example, Jivaka learned from Ātreya for about seven years in *Sifenlu* 四分律 [Vinaya of the Four Categories of the Dharmagupta sect], trans. by Buddhayaśas and Zhu Fonian) and *Foshuo nainu qipojing* 佛說奈女耆婆經. In ancient India, students who studied medicine for a full seven years would receive commendation, while students who studied the treatment of the body in China would complete their course in seven years. This correspondence in the duration of study may hint at an internal relation between Ayurveda and Chinese medicine.

about sixteen words to each line. It is reproduced in *Dunhuang manuscripts collected in the St. Petersburg Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of Russia*, volume 17.²⁵

A literal translation runs as follows:

1. ...Question: What are the three [bodily] humours and seven kinds of basic tissues of the body? [Answer]: The three [bodily] humours are wind, bile and phlegm.
 2. The seven basic tissues of the body consist of (the following), viz., the first, chyle or plasma; the second, blood; the third, flesh; the fourth, fat; the fifth, bone; the sixth, bone marrow and the seventh, brain.
 3. [Question]: When one eats rice (i.e. solid food), once it has entered the stomach via the mouth, how does digestion proceed separately in the receptacle for undigested food and the receptacle for digested food?
 4. [Answer]: As regards the receptacle for digested food, the upper warmer (*shangjiao* 上焦) produces tears, saliva and nasal mucus; while the lower warmer (*xiajiao* 下焦) produces faeces and urine. As regards the receptacle for undigested food,
 5. ...the best chyle of rice enters the marrow,
 6. ...into the marrow, a number of...
 7. ...the cause of the Four Great Elements in the body,
 8. ...Five kinds of [?] are needed inside the Four Great Elements [of the human body] (viz. earth, water, fire and wind).
- (The mid section is missing)
9. There are many diseases resulting from morbid conditions of wind, bile and phlegm respectively and of all three humours. Question...
 10. ...Answer: During the periods of Yin (3-5 a.m.), Mao (5-7 a.m.), and Chen (7-9 a.m.), diseases due to wind [are predominant],
 11. ...[During the periods of Xin (15-17 p.m.), You (17-19 p.m.), and Xu (19-21 p.m.), diseases due to phlegm [are predominant],
 12. ...[Question]: When diseases arise from morbid conditions of [wind], bile and phlegm respectively, [which treatments should be carried out for each one]? [Answer: If there is a disease due to wind],
 13. introducing oily substances [into a patient] should treat it. If there is a disease due to bile,
 14. drinking a decoction of medicinal ingredients [by the patient] should treat it. If there is a disease due to phlegm, treatments inducing vomiting [in the patient] should treat it.
 15. [Question]: What are the signs of a person who is ill, or who is healthy? Answer: If wind, bile, phlegm and the seven kinds of basic tissues are...
 16. ...upper and lower parts. The skin of his (or her) body is glowing and dewy; and the state of the Four Great Elements of the body is relaxed and comfortable.

²⁵ *E zang Dunhuang wenxian* 醫藏敦煌文獻 [Dunhuang manuscripts collected in the St. Petersburg Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of Russia], volume 17, Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2001, p. 176.

When he or she breathes out once, the pulse moves again;

17. when he or she breathes in once, the pulse moves again. During the interval between one exhalation and inhalation, the pulse beats five times (the pulse rhythm is repeated five times). At that moment, the common pulse...

(The subsequent lines are missing)

Дx18173 (2-2)

1. ...[Question]: Where are wind, bile and phlegm each located inside the human body? [Answer]: The wind dwells
2. ...[in the area of] the opening of the intestines. Extending upwards to the ear and downward as far as the leg and foot, this is called the way of wind. The bile dwells inside the receptacle of undigested food.
3. ...The phlegm dwells inside the receptacle of digested food, extending upwards to the chest, throat and as far as the top of the head, and inside all the bones and joints.
4. ...to nourish the person's life. If there are humours in excess of the (normal) wind, bile and phlegm, it will certainly cause damage to these four great elements in the physical body
5. ...Question: What is meant by wind, bile and phlegm...?
6. ...which..., bile is in the middle of...
7. ... in the part of face to know...
8. ...If bile is more predominant [than wind and phlegm] in the body, the patient should take [some medicines]...

(The middle part is missing)

9. ...arise from the chest to the throat...
10. ...[it] takes action from navel to throat, [and causes to]...
11. ...[it] takes action inside the pulse [channels], [and causes to]...
12. ...[it] takes action inside the bones and joints, [and causes to]...
13. ...[it] takes action inside the intestines, and causes faeces and urine to be produced. [Question:]
14. When these four great elements take hold of bile, in what state or condition is it? Answer: This bile tastes like mango (*Mangitera Indica*),
15. pomegranate seed and vinegar. Under these circumstances, body heat begins to increase. If such phlegm takes action, it causes cooked rice to be digested,
16. ... beautify the complexion. Question: When these four great elements take hold of phlegm, in what state or condition is it?
17. [Answer]: The taste of this phlegm is salty, like fat. If such phlegm takes action, it causes the body to be sturdy and strong. ...

(The subsequent lines are missing)

This fragment is mainly concerned with the doctrines of tri-doṣa and sapta-dhātu in

Ayurveda. Below, I offer a commentary on the key terms in this fragment.

Sanju 三俱 (=Skt. tri-doṣa): i.e. the three (bodily) humours, namely wind (vāyu, vāta), bile (pitta) and phlegm (śleṣma, kapha). These three humours circulate in the human body. Without them, existence is impossible.

In the third folio of *Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan*, *Jinyao fangfa* 進藥方法 [Rules on administering medicines], I-tsing states:

Every living creature is subject either to the peaceful working or failure of the Four Great Elements (i.e. Mahābhūta). The eight seasons coming one after another, the development and change of the bodily condition are ceaseless. Whenever a disease has befallen one, rest and care must at once be taken. Therefore the World-honoured (i.e. Lokageṣṭa = the Buddha) himself preached a Sūtra on the Art of Medicine, in which he said: 'Failure of health (lit. moderation) of the Four Great Elements is as follows:

1. The Chū-lu, i.e. making the body slothful and heavy, owing to an increase of the element earth.
2. The Hsieh-po, i.e. having very much eye-mucus or mouth-water, owing to an accumulation of the element water.
3. The Pi-to, i.e. having head and chest very feverish, owing to the overpowering heat caused by the element fire.
4. The P'o-to, i.e. violent rush of breath, owing to the moving influence of the element air.

These are what we call in China, (1) the sinking heaviness, (2) the phlegmatic disease, (3) the yellow fever, (4) the rising breath or air (dizziness, asthma, or cold). But if we discuss sickness according to the common custom, there are only three kinds (instead of four), i.e. disease caused by the air (vāta), fever (pitta), and phlegmatic disease (kapha), and the 'sinking heaviness' (1) is similar to the 'phlegmatic' in its condition, and accordingly the disease of the element earth is not distinguished from that of the element water.²⁶

The Chinese transliterations of tridoṣa are Hsieh-po/*xiebo* 變跛 (kapha), Pi-to/*biduo* 畢哆 (pitta), and P'o-to/*poduo* 婆哆 (vāta) respectively. According to the Ayurveda, the doṣās are material substances present in the body, and they have their own definite quantity, quality and functions. When they are normal they control different functions of the body and so support or maintain it. But they have the tendency to become abnormal, undergoing increase or decrease in their quantity, and in one or more of their qualities and functions. When they become abnormal,²⁷ they vitiate their places of dwelling; and because of this

²⁶ Wang Bangwei, *op.cit.*, 1995, p. 157. Takakusu Junjirō (tran.), *op.cit.*, pp. 131-132.

²⁷ Vasubandhu in *Apidamo jusbe shilun* 阿毘達磨俱舍釋論 [*Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya*], translated by Paramārtha in 563-567 C.E., says: "The abnormal situation refers to one in which wind, bile and phlegm act against each other, and cause disharmony among the Four Great Elements" (T. 29, p. 239a). Also see G. J. Meulenbeld, "The Characteristics of a Dosa", *J.E.ĀS*, vol. 2, 1992, pp. 1-5. H. Scharfe, "The Doctrine of

tendency of vitiation, they are called doṣās, i.e. vitiators. In Buddhist texts, the tri-doṣa are sometimes called *Sandu* 三毒 (three poisons) or *Sanbingxiang* 三病相 (three symptoms of diseases).²⁸ There are altogether seven kinds of disease caused by abnormal doṣās, namely those due to wind, phlegm and bile respectively; three kinds due to dual combinations of humour; and one kind due to a combination of all three humours. In Buddhist texts, these are usually termed wind disease, heat disease, water disease and combination disease.

In Chinese versions of Buddhist texts, two further translations of the term tri-doṣa are found, namely *Sanyin* 三因 (the three causes)²⁹ and *Sanfen* 三分 (the three divisions). For example, in *Suixianglun* 隨相論 [*Lakṣaṇānusāraśāstra*] translated by Paramārtha 真諦 (499-569 CE), Guṇamati 德慧 says:

These are three divisions in the human body. The part from the heart upward is the location of phlegm (kapha). The part from the heart down to navel is the location of heat (pitta). The part from navel down to the feet is the location of wind (vāta). If these three divisions are unobstructed, the human body is healthy. If they are obstructed, one becomes ill.³⁰

These three divisions are phlegm, bile and wind.

Feng 風 (wind, air. Vāyu or vāta in Sanskrit). Saṅgharakṣa's 僧伽羅刹 *Xiuxing daodijing* 修行道地經 [*Yogacārabhūmi(-sūtra)*], translated by Dharmarakṣa in the fifth year of the Taikang Period 泰康 (284 CE) of the Western Jin Period, volume four, states as follows:

What is meant by air? The air is divided into two kinds, inner and outer. What is meant by inner air? The air which the human body receives from above and below and from outside; which arises across the sides, back and waist and passes

the 'Three Humours in Traditional Indian Medicine and the Alleged Antiquity of Tamil Siddha Medicine'. *J.AOS*, 199:4, 1999, pp. 609-630.

²⁸ The "southern text" of the version of *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, volume twenty-three, says: "To understand disease and medicine, and give (the patient) some drugs which accord with the disease. Thus, a good physician who is fully versed in the eight kinds of medical method first observes the symptoms of disease. There are three kinds of symptoms. What are the three kinds? They are called diseases due to wind, heat and water. A patient who is ill due to excess of wind should take ghee. A patient who is ill due to excess of heat (bile) should take sugar. A patient who is ill due to excess of water (phlegm) should take a decoction of ginger" (T. 12, p. 755b).

²⁹ The *Xianbu zhangzhe hui* 賢護長者會 [*Bhadrāpalāśreṣṭhiparipṛcchā(sūtra)*] translated by Jñānagupta (523-600 CE) in *Da baoji jing* 大寶積經 [*Mahāratnakūṭa-sūtra*], volume 110, says: "Desire, anger and ignorance are known as the causes of the three realms of saṃsāra. As well as these, wind, bile and phlegm are also known as the three causes" (T. 11, p. 617a). This sentence is translated in the same way in *Dacheng xianshi jing* 大乘顯識經 [*Bhadrāpalāśreṣṭhiparipṛcchā(sūtra)*], translated by Divakara 地婆訶羅 in the Tang period, volume II (T. 12, p. 186a).

³⁰ T. 32, p. 166a.

through hundreds of channels and inside the bones; which impedes and reduces the power of the sinews; which being urgent and cruel in its rise and movement causes death — all these are known as inner air. Thus, this śloka says: All the airs which are carried by the body are like machinery; various airs moving together can bring about the death of the body; gasping for breath, agitated movement, impeding and contracting the body; all these are known as inner air.³¹

In fact, the five changes of inner wind denote the five kinds of air present in the human body, namely *prāṇa*, *apāna*, *samāna*, *udāna* and *vyāna*. In *Jinqishilun* 金七十論, translated by Paramārtha, the function of these is explained in detail.³² The ebb and flow of the five winds brings about processes in the human body.

Huang 黃 (bile, = Skt. *pitta*). This word is generally translated as heat, fever or yellow fever. In fact, it refers to bile. There are five kinds of bile in the human body, namely *pācaka*, *rañjaka*, *sādhaka*, *ālocaka* and *bhrājaka*.

Tan 痰 (phlegm, = Skt. *śleṣma* or *kapha*). This is usually translated as *tanyin* 痰瘰, *tanyin* 痰飲, *tan* 痰, and *dan* 淡, and so forth.³³ Sometimes it is called water. In Huilin's *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義, volume twenty-nine, it is explained as follows:

Tanyin 痰瘰: The first syllable is pronounced *tan* 談; the second is pronounced *Yin-jin fan* 陰禁反. Comment: The description of *Tanyin* 痰瘰 is not fixed. It refers to disease due to air between the chest and diaphragm. Because air coagulates and does not disperse, the bodily fluid is embroiled and not broken as muscular mucus. It is called phlegm. Of the four root cause of illness, phlegm can cause one hundred diseases which all belong to the diseases of the upper [section of the triple] burner.³⁴

These are five kinds of phlegm in the human body, known as *kledaka*, *avalambaka*, *vodhaka*, *tarpaka* and *śleṣamaka*.

Qijie 七界 (= Skt. *sapta-dhātu*). This refers to the seven kinds of basic tissues in the human body. I-tsing's translation of *Suvarṇaprabhāsottamarājasūtra*, volume nine, "Chapter on healing illness" [*vyādhi-praśamana-parivarta*] states:

³¹ T. 15, p. 207b.

³² *Jin qishi lun* 金七十論 [*Sāṅkhyakārikā*] volume II, the twenty-ninth śloka says: "All the sense organs act together, including the five winds such as *prāṇa* wind and so forth."

³³ In *Dabaoji jing* 大寶積經, volume forty-two *Da pushazang jing* 大菩薩藏經 [*Bodhisattvapitaka-(sūtra)*], translated by Xuanzang, says: "There are many and various afflictions — diseases, insanity, abscesses, furuncles, carbuncle, ringworm, malignant leprosy, wind diseases, and diseases due to bile and phlegm. All the diseases congregate in the human body" (T. 11, p. 243a-b).

³⁴ T. 54, p. 502c.

One (i.e. a physician) must be familiar with the seven kinds of basic tissues in the human body, food and medicine, so as to obviate mistakes. They (sapta-dhātu) are known as chyle, blood, flesh, fat, bone, marrow and brain.³⁵

In classic Ayurvedic texts, sapta-dhātu usually includes chyle (= Skt. rasa), blood (= Skt. rakta, asṛṅk), flesh (= Skt. māṃsa), fat (= Skt. medas), bone (= Skt. asthi), bone marrow (= Skt. majjā) and semen (= Skt. śukra). But in Chinese Buddhist texts, like the last dhātu, śukra is usually translated as brain, not semen. In D18173, the Chinese terms for sapta-dhātu are the same as in I-tsing's version. Why is śukra translated as brain? There are probably two reasons for this. First, a relationship exists between brain and semen in Chinese medicine and Daoism, as can be seen for example in the technique termed *Huanjing bunao* 還精補腦 (making the seminal essence return and restore to the brain)³⁶. The second reason may be that Chinese Buddhist translators were reluctant to use words pertaining to sex in sūtra or abhidharma texts, finding them acceptable only in vinaya texts.

Wei 味 (chyle, = Skt. rasa). This refers to the chyle of sapta-dhātu. Huizhao's *Jingguangming zhuishengwang jingshu* 金光明最勝王經疏 [Commentary on *Suvarṇaprabhāṣottamarājasūtra*], volume six, states:

The first, rasa dhātu, *aluopo* 阿羅婆 (alpa?) in Sanskrit, is located between the spleen and the stomach. Here food is divided into two parts. One is the *Quluo-dhātu* 佉羅界 (= Skt. kṣīra), where residue becomes faeces and urine. The other is rasa-dhātu, namely the fluid from the taste of food that can nourish the body.³⁷

Another meaning of rasa is taste. In Ayurvedic texts, the tastes of drugs or foods are usually divided into six kinds: sweet (madhura), sour (amla), saline (lavaṇa), pungent (kaṭuka), bitter (tikta) and astringent (kaṣāya)³⁸. Ravigupta in *Siddhasāra* describes the functions of the six tastes as follows:

³⁵ T. 16, p. 448a. Huizhao in *Jingguangming zhuisheng wang jing* 金光明最勝王經疏 [Commentary on *Suvarṇaprabhāṣottamarājasūtra*], volume six, lists the same seven elements as in I-tsing's version (T.39, p.325c). But the *vyādhipraśamana-parivarta* in the Sanskrit text of *Suvarṇa-prabhāsa-sūtra* only has six elements (ṣaḍ-dhātu), though there are more usually seven elements (sapta-dhātu). See S. Bagchi ed. *Suvarṇa-prabhāsa-sūtra*, Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate and Research in Sanskrit Learning, 1967, p. 95.

³⁶ Yan Shanzhao 嚴善超, 還精補腦術の形成と展開 [A Study of the Art of Making the Seminal Essence Return and Restore to the Brain], *The Tōhō Shūkyō 東方宗教* [The Journal of Eastern Religions], vol. 103, 2004, pp. 41-60. In Greek medicine, there is a similar view of the relationship between the brain and semen.

³⁷ T. 39, p. 325b.

³⁸ D. Wujastyk, "The combinatorics of tastes and humours in classical Indian medicine and mathematics", *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 28 (5-6), 2000, pp. 479-495.

Si.1.24: (1) As for the sweet taste (*madhuro raso*), it is good for the eye (*cakṣuṣyo*) and makes the body elements (*dhātu-*) increase (*-vivardhanaḥ*). (2) As for the sour (*amlo*) (taste), it causes faecal discharge to be washed out (*anulomano*), is good for the heart (*hr̥dyah*), causes food to be digested (*kledī*) and matured (*pācana-*), and promotes the heat (*-dīpanaḥ*) (of the digestive fire). (3) As for the saline (*lavaṇaḥ*) (taste), it causes cleansing (*śodhanaḥ*) and maturing (*pācanaḥ*), causes digestion (*kledī*) (of food) and loosening of the flesh (*śīthilatva-*). (4) The pungent (*kaṭur*) (taste) removes (*-ghnaś*) (the condition of having) much flesh (*sthaulya-*), laziness (*ālasya-*), and poisons (*viṣa-*), promotes the heart (*dīpana-*), and poisons (*viṣa-*), promotes the heart (*dīpana-*) (of the digestive fire), and causes maturing (*-pācanaḥ*). (5) As for the bitter (*tiktaḥ-*) (taste), it removes (*-ghnas*) fever (*jvara-*) and the disease of thirst (*tr̥ṣṇā-*), promotes the heat (*dīpano*) (of the digestive fire), causes cleansing (*śodhana*), and causes the appetite to expand (*-rocanaḥ*). (6) As for the astringent (*kaṣāyo*) (taste), it causes the flesh to ache (*piḍano*), causes the flesh to be diminished (*lekhana-*), causes dry excrement (*-stambhī*), terminates cleansing (*grāhi-*), and causes wounds to be healed (*-ropaṇaḥ*).

Si.1.27: As for tastes (*rasānām*), after digestion (*pāko*), they develop in two ways (*dvi-vidhaḥ*), sweet (*madhuraḥ*) and pungent (*kaṭur eva ca*). Among those two (*tayor*), as for the former (*ādhyas*), it is heavy (*gurur*); as for the latter (*itarasya*), it is light (*laghutvam*).³⁹

It is worth pointing out that *rasa* is very important in the history of Indian culture. The doctrine of *Rasa* is a representative school of Indian poetics.⁴⁰

Shengzang 生藏 (stomach, = Skt. *āmāśaya*) and *Shuzang* 熟藏 (= Skt. *pakvāśaya*). They respectively refer to two situations and locations for the digestion of food is digested. *Xiuxing daodi jing* 修行道地經 [*Yogacārabhāṃsi(sūtra)*], volume three, says:

After food enters *Shengzang* 生藏 (the stomach, *āmāśaya*), it is cooked by the fire of body, and decomposed by the water of body. The wind blows it about, till it is gradually digested. Then it drops into the intestines. The hard part of it then becomes faeces and the moist part becomes urine, while the froth becomes nasal mucus and saliva. The excellent tastes inside the receptacles can bring benefit to the body. These tastes then flow into and circulate through all the channelss. Afterwards, they nourish the hair, nails, teeth, marrow, blood, flesh, fat, semen, *jingqi* 精氣 (essential *qi*), brain and so forth. It is the Four Great Elements outside the human body that nourish the five faculties (roots) inside the body, and enable all the roots to obtain power.⁴¹

³⁹ p. 19, p. 21.

⁴⁰ Huang Baosheng 黃寶生, *Yindu gudian shixue* 印度古典詩學 [Classical poetics in India], Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1993.

⁴¹ T. 15, p. 199a.

Apidamo jushe shilun 阿毘達磨俱舍釋論 [Abhidharma Storehouse Treatise] translated by Paramārtha, says in the eighth folio: “As to food and drink, none of this food and drink will enter the receptacles before digestion. My guru spoke thus.”⁴² *Sifenlu xingshichao zichiji* 四分律行事鈔資持記, written by Yuanzhao 元照 in the Northern Song (960-1127), volume II, *Shi zhanbing pian* 釋瞻病篇 [Explanation of the chapter on taking care of the patient] further states:

As soon as food enters the stomach, it becomes acid and evil-smelling. Afterward it descends into the receptacles and become faeces and urine... The upper part of the receptacle where food has not yet been transformed is known as *Shengzang* 生藏; while the lower part where food becomes faeces and urine is called *Shuzang* 熟藏.⁴³

Shangjiao 上焦 (the upper energizer, [section of the triple] burner) and **Xiajiao** 下焦 (the lower energizer, [section of the triple] burner) are terms from traditional Chinese medicine. Master Taitai Zhiyi 天臺智顗 in volume eight of the Sui text *Shi chanboluomi cidi famen* 釋禪波羅蜜次第法門 explains them as follows:

The upper energizer is in charge of the clear and warm air (*qi*) of bodily fluids; the middle energizer is in charge of the air of blood, pulse and spirit; while the lower energizer is in charge of the excretory system for faeces and urine. The triple burner keeps the passage between the upper and lower body unblocked.⁴⁴

Master Zhili 知禮, in volume six of the Song (960-1279) text *Jingguangmingjing wenju ji* 金光明經文句記 [Record of Explanatory Passages of *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra*], citing *Huangdi maijing* 黃帝脈經 [Pulse classic of the Yellow Emperor] states: “The upper energizer refers to the part from the head to the heart; the middle energizer, from the heart to the navel; the lower energizer, from the navel to the foot.”⁴⁵ In *Shi zhanbing pian* 釋瞻病篇 [Explanation of the chapter on taking care of the patient] in *Sifenglu xingshichao zichiji* 四分律行事鈔資持記, Yuanzhao explains: “From the top of the head to heart is called the upper energizer; from the heart to the waist, the middle energizer; from the waist to the feet, the lower-energizer. The three sections of the triple burner together constitute one of the (six-) *fu* organs.”⁴⁶

⁴² T. 29, p. 214a.

⁴³ T. 40, p. 389b-c.

⁴⁴ T. 46, p. 532b.

⁴⁵ T. 39, p. 151b.

⁴⁶ T. 40, p. 410c. Ma Boying also has discussed the question of the origins of the triple burner. See Ma Boying 馬伯英 et. al. *Zhongwai yixue wenhua jiaoliu shi: zhongwai yixue kua wenhua chuantong* 中外醫學文化交流史 — 中外醫學跨文化傳通 [The history of exchange of medical culture between China and foreign countries], Wenhui chubanshe, 1993, p. 125.

Sida 四大: This usually refers to the Four Great Elements of the human body, namely earth, fire, water and wind.

Zongjibing 惣集病 (= Skt. *saṃnipātika*, *saṃnipāta-vyādhi*). Those diseases attributed to a combination of three humours are known as **Zongjibing**. This term occurs three times in the ninth folio of I-tsing's translation of *Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtra*⁴⁷. The fifty-seventh folio of *Da baoji jing* 大寶積經 [*Mahāvratnakūṭa-sūtra*], *Foshuo rutaizang bui dishisi* 佛說入胎藏會第十四 [*Anandagarbhāvakraṇṭinīrdeśa(-sūtra)*] also translated by I-tsing, says:

What suffering the human body is subject to! There are 101 kinds of wind disease, 101 kinds of yellow diseases (due to bile), 101 kinds of diseases due to phlegm, 101 kinds of diseases caused by a combination of tri-doṣa (**Zongjibing** 惣集病). In total, there are 404 kinds of diseases which arise from within the human body.⁴⁸

I-tsing usually chose to translate *saṃnipātika* or *saṃnipāta-vyādhi* as **Zongjibing** 惣集病. Various other renditions of *saṃnipāta-vyādhi* occur in other Buddhist sūtras, for example, (1) *Dengfen bing* 等分病. *Jingguangming jing* 金光明經 [*Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtra*], translated by Dharmakṣetra 曇無讖 in the Northern Liang period, volume three, says:

Illnesses due to excess of wind occur in the summer; Disturbances of the bile occur in autumn. Likewise, illnesses due to a combination of factors (*Dengfeng bing* 等分病) arise in winter. Illnesses due to excess of phlegm arise in the hot season. In the rainy season, the (appropriate) tastes are fatty, warm, salty, and sour; in the autumn season, fatty, sweet, and cold; in winter-time, sweet, sour, and fatty; and in summer-time, rough, warm, and bitter.⁴⁹

(2) *Sanzabing* 三雜病. *Dabanruo boluomiduo jing* 大般若波羅蜜多經 [*Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra*] translated by Xuanzang, volume 511, notes: "Many illnesses can be added which

⁴⁷ "There are four kinds of diseases affecting human beings, namely those of wind, bile, phlegm and **Zongjibing** 惣集病. How to cure them?" "Diseases are divided into four kinds, and called the diseases of wind, bile and phlegm, and **Zongjibing** 惣集病." "Those diseases caused by wind, bile and phlegm in concert, are called **Zongjibing** 惣集病 (T. 16, p. 448b).

⁴⁸ *Genben shuoyiqie youbu pinaiye zashu* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶雜事 [*Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya-kṣudraka-vastu*] translated by I-tsing, volume twelve, "There are 101 kinds of wind diseases, 101 kinds of ailments due to bile, 101 kinds of ailments due to phlegm, 101 kinds of ailments of a combination. There are 404 kinds of ailments which arise from the interior of the human body" (T. 24, p. 257b). *Foshuo dakongque zhouwang jing* 佛說大孔雀呪王經 [*Mahāmāyāri(vidyārājī)-sūtra*] also translated by I-tsing, volume II, "The diseases due to wind, bile, phlegm and a combination" (T. 19, p. 468a)

⁴⁹ T. 16, p. 352a. (Translation by R. E. Emmerick, *The Sūtra of golden light: being a translation of the Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtra*, Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2nd. 1990, pp. 75-76).

are considered due to wind, bile, phlegm or a combination of factors.”⁵⁰ (3) *Sanjibing* 三集病. In *Foshuo dakongque zhouwang jing* 佛說大孔雀呪王經 [*Mahāmāyūri(-vidyārājñī)-(sūtra)*], volume I, I-tsing writes: “... for all fear and dread, and diseases due to wind, bile, phlegm, or a combination, or the 404 kinds of diseases. If these diseases arise in succession, one should recite these spells.”⁵¹ (4) *Zhongji sanbing* 總集三病. *Genben shuoyiqie youbu baiyi jiemo* 根本說一切有部百一羯磨 [*Mālasarvāstivāda ekaśatakarmān*] translated by I-tsing, volume one, refers to “dysphoria and pain in the bones or joints, and all malarial diseases due to wind, bile, phlegm and a combination of factors.”⁵²

Biantu 變吐 (= Skt. *vāntāsana, praśama*). This refers to vomiting. The word **bian** 變 (**change**) can also be used in the sense of “vomit”, as a synonym of *tu* 吐 (vomit).⁵³ I-tsing’s translation of the *Suvarṇaprabhāṣottamarājasūtra*, volume nine, says: “A patient suffering from wind disease should take oily and fatty substances. Purging is good for diseases due to bile. For diseases due to phlegm, vomiting should be induced. In the case of diseases due to a combination of factors, drugs endowed with all three attributes should be taken.”⁵⁴

I-tsing’s *Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan*, volume three, also states: “If one feels that there is food remaining in the stomach, one should press or stroke the belly at the navel, drink as much hot water as one can, and insert a finger into the throat to induce vomiting. One should continue drinking and vomiting till all remnants of food are gone.”⁵⁵

Fenbie yuanqi chusheng famen jing 分別緣起初勝法門經 translated by Xuanzang 玄奘 (600-664CE), volume II, says: “Why is it called **Biantu** 變吐 (vomiting)? The World-honored One said: The reason is that all religious practices and afflictions have been eliminated.”⁵⁶

Feng dao 風道路 (the way of wind, = Skt. *vāyu-gocara* or *vāyu-mārga*). This term should be *Fengdao* 風道, i.e. the word “*Lu* 路” is superfluous. According to the Sātra-sthāna of *Suśruta-saṃhitā*, the five winds (*prāṇa, apāna, samāna, udāna* and *vyāna*) are located in different places in the human body and cause the body to move in different ways.⁵⁷

⁵⁰ T. 7, p. 611b.

⁵¹ T. 19, p. 461c.

⁵² T. 24, p. 457b.

⁵³ I would thank Dr. Tang Dailong for this view.

⁵⁴ T. 16, p. 448b.

⁵⁵ Wang Bangwei, *op.cit.*, p. 157. See Takakusu Junjirō (tran.), *op.cit.*, p. 132.

⁵⁶ T. 16, p. 843a.

⁵⁷ Kenneth G. Zysk, “Vital Breath *Prāṇa* in Ancient Indian Medicine and Religion”. In Yosio Kawakita, Shizu Sakai, and Yasuo Otsuka (eds.), *The Comparison Between Concepts of Life-breath in East and West: Proceedings of the 15th International Symposium on the Comparative History of Medicine. East and West*, 1995, pp. 33-65. Tokyo, Bretwood (St. Louis): Ishiyaku EuroAmerica, Inc.

Anmo 奄磨 (= Skt. āmra). This is mango (*Mangitera Indica*). Various different transliterations of āmra are found in Chinese versions of Buddhist texts, including *Anmeiluo* 奄沒羅, *Anluo* 菴羅, *Anmoluo* 菴摩羅, *Anmoluo* 菴末羅, *Anpoluo* 菴婆羅, *Amoluo* 阿末羅, *Amole* 阿摩勒 and so forth. Several explanations of this word are provided in *Yiqie jing yinyi*. Volume five states: “*Anmeiluo* fruit 奄沒羅果 Sanskrit. This is the name of a fruit. It is called *Anpoluo*. In China, it refers to the fruit of *Anluo*.”⁵⁸ Volume eleven states:

Anmoluo shu 菴摩羅樹: Sanskrit. This is the name of a kind of fruit tree. This tree is not found in China. It used to be translated as *Anpoluo* 菴婆羅, or the *Anluo* tree 菴羅樹. They are both the same. The *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* says: “It changes three times a year like āmra. Sometimes, it produces flowers, which are brilliant and flourishing; sometimes, it produces leaves, which grow well and luxuriantly; sometimes, it sheds its leaves and looks like a withered tree. It is said that its flowers are many but the fruits are few”.⁵⁹

Volume twenty-five states: “*Anluo* fruit 菴羅果: There is no correct translation for this word in Chinese. In appearance it resembles a pawpaw. The taste is fragrant and sweet. According to the Buddhist sūtras, it is difficult to tell the difference between an unripe mango and a ripe one.”⁶⁰ Volume twenty-eight states:

Anluo 菴羅, also known as *Anpoluo* 菴婆羅 the name of a fruit. Comment: It has many flowers, but few fruits. The shape of the leaf is similar to the willow leaf. It is over one *chi* in long, and about three fingers in breadth. The shape of the fruit is similar to a pear, but it is crooked at the bottom. In India, it is called the tree of kings. It is said that it was planted in the city of the king. In Buddhist sūtras, it is referred to as the fruit of which it is hard to tell whether it is ripe or unripe. The old translation *Nai* 柰 of this word is wrong. The correct translation is *Anmeiluo* 奄沒羅.⁶¹

Volume fifty-one states:

Anluo guo 菴羅果: The pronunciation of the first syllable is *An-han-fan* 暗含反. Comment: *Anluo* 菴羅 is the name of an Indian fruit. This fruit, which is shaped like a pear, is also found in China but it is smaller than the Indian variety. This translation is based on the pronunciation of the Sanskrit word, and not on its

⁵⁸ T. 54, p. 339b.

⁵⁹ T. 54, p. 371b.

⁶⁰ T. 54, p. 471b.

⁶¹ T. 54, p. 496b.

meaning.⁶²

The taste of āmra referred to in ㄟx18173 is sweet and sour. It is basically the same as the taste of bile as discussed by Ravigupta in *Siddhasāra*.

ㄟx18173 deals with five aspects of the doctrine of tridoṣa in Ayurveda. First, it explains the subject matter of tri-doṣa and sapta-dhātu. Apart from this fragment, there are no references to *Sanju* in the Chinese medical literature. The terms for sapta-dhātu in ㄟx18173 differ from classical Ayurveda, but are identical to those used in I-tsing's translation of the *Suvarṇaprabhāsottamarājasūtra*.

The second aspect is the correspondence method of treating illnesses due to tri-doṣa. ㄟx18173 states:

[If there is a disease due to wind], introducing oily substances [into a patient] should treat it. If there is a disease due to bile, drinking a decoction of medicinal ingredients [by the patient] should treat it. If there is a disease due to phlegm, treatments inducing vomiting [in the patient] should treat it.

I-tsing's translation of the *Suvarṇaprabhāsottamarājasūtra*, volume nine, likewise says:

A patient suffering from wind disease should take oily and fatty substances. Purging is good for diseases due to bile. For diseases due to phlegm, vomiting should be induced. In the case of diseases due to a combination of factors, drugs endowed with all three attributes should be taken.⁶³

The treatment of diseases due to phlegm is the same in ㄟx18173 and *Suvarṇaprabhāsottamarājasūtra*.

The third aspect is the relationship between time and changes of tri-doṣa in the course of the day and night. ㄟx18173 states:

During the periods of Yin (3-5 a.m.), Mao (5-7 a.m.), and Chen (7-9 a.m.), diseases due to wind [are predominant]; ... [During the periods of Xin (15-17 p.m.), You (17-19 p.m.), and Xu (19-21 p.m.), diseases due to phlegm [are predominant].⁶⁴

⁶² T. 54, p. 647c.

⁶³ T. 16, p. 448b.

⁶⁴ *Jin-gang-jing cuanyao kanding ji* 金剛經纂要判定記 recorded by Master Zhixuan in the Song Dynasty, volume three, says "It is said that one day and night is divided into twelve hours or four divisions. The first is the initial division, namely Yin, Mao and Chen when all gods and deities eat food. The second is the middle division, namely Shi, Wu and Wei when people eat food. The third is the daybreak division, namely Xin, You and Xu when ghosts eat food. The fourth is the night division, namely Iai, Zi and Chou when beasts eat food. Now the so-called Chen, is the last period of the initial division. The two translations from the Tang and Wuzhou periods all call it the initial division at sunrise" (T. 33, p.

With regard to the relationship between time of digestion and changes of the tri-doṣas, Ravigupta states as follows in *Siddhasāra*:

Si.1.6-8: As for wind disease (vāyoh), it rises (visarpaṇam) at the time of evening (śāyāhna-kāle) and at the end of digesting food (jīrṇānte). As for disease of the bile (pittasya), it rises (lakṣayet) at midday and at midnight (ahar-niśasyārdhe), and at the time of digesting food (jīryamāṇe ca). As for (disease of the) phlegm (śleṣmaṇo), it rises (bhavet) as soon as food has been eaten (bhukta-mātre), in the evening (pradoṣe) and in the morning (pārvāhṇe). (p.17)

Suvarṇaprabbāsottamarājasūtra also insists on an idea similar to that expressed in *Siddhasāra*:

Diseases due to phlegm arise as soon as one has eaten. Diseases due to heat (bile) arise during digestion. Diseases due to wind arise as soon as food has been digested. One should identify these diseases according to the time.⁶⁵

Although the account of times of illnesses in ㄈx18173 is simpler than that found in *Siddhasāra*, the latter allows a missing sentence to be restored in ㄈx18173, namely “During the periods of Shi (21-23 p.m.), Wu (23 p.m.-1a.m.), and Wei (1a.m-3a.m.), diseases due to bile are predominant.”

The fourth aspect is the location of tri-doṣa in human body. ㄈx18173 asserts:

The wind dwells [in the area of] the opening of the intestines. Extending upwards to the ear and downward as far as the leg and foot, this is called the way of wind. The bile dwells inside the receptacle of undigested food. ...The phlegm dwells inside the receptacle of digested food, extending upwards to the chest, throat and as far as the top of the head, and inside all the bones and joints. ...to nourish the person's life.

As regard the location of tri-doṣa, *Jinqishi lun* states: “It is said in the śāstra on medical treatment that, from the navel downward is known as the location of wind. From the heart down to the navel is called as the location of heat (bile). The part from the heart upward all belongs to phlegm.”⁶⁶

189b).

⁶⁵ T. 16, p. 448a. “Excess of phlegm erupts as soon as one has eaten. Excess of bile erupts during digestion. Excess of wind erupts as soon as one has digested. ... One must know in which period excess of wind, bile or a combination, excess of phlegm (occur)” (Translation of R. E. Emmerick, *The Sūtra of golden light: being a translation of the Suvarṇabbāsottamasūtra*, p. 76).

⁶⁶ T. 54, p. 1245a. Jizang 吉藏 in *Bailunshu* 百論疏 [Commentary on *Śataka-śāstra*], volume one, points out: “The first is called inner suffering due to wind, bile and phlegm and so forth. The part from the navel downward is the location of wind; from the navel up to the heart, the location of bile; from the heart upward, the location of phlegm. The eightfold medicine [of Ayurveda] can cure this inner suffering”

Ravigupta thinks:

Si.1.17-19: As for wind (vāyuh), it resides (āśrayo) in the anus (guda-), the sacrum (trika-), and the region between the thighs (śroṇy-). As for bile (pittam), it resides (-sthitam) in the large intestine (pakvāśaya-). As for phlegm (kaphasya), it resides (sthānam) in the stomach (āmāśayaḥ), neck (kaṇṭha-), chest (uro-), head (mūrdha-), and joints (-sandhayaḥ).

It is obvious that there are many differences between the accounts of the location of tri-doṣa in D̐x18173 and *Siddhasāra*, especially regarding the location of wind in the human body.

Finally, with regard to the nature of tri-doṣa, D̐x18173 states:

This bile tastes like mango (*Mangitera Indica*), pomegranate seed and vinegar. Under these circumstances, body heat begins to increase. If such phlegm takes action, it causes cooked rice to be digested, ... beautify the complexion. ... The taste of this phlegm is salty, like fat. If such phlegm takes action, it causes the body to be sturdy and strong. ...

Ravigupata, however, considers:

Si.1.14-16: As for wind (vāyuh), it is cool (śīto), light (laghuḥ), subtle (śūkṣmaḥ), hard (kharo), rough (rūkṣo), unstable (asthiro), and of great strength (balī). It possesses (five) varieties (prabheda-vān): (1) that which causes the breath to proceed (prāṇa-); (2) that which causes speech to emerge (udāna-); (3) that which arranges well (vyāna-); (4) that which causes movement (samāna-), and (5) that which expels impurities (apāna-). As for bile (pittam), it is sour (amlaṁ), pungent (kaṭu) in taste, produces gentle warmth (uṣṇam), causes digestion (pakty-), produces vital fluid (ojo-), and produces the cause (-kāraṇam) of red complexion (rāga-) of the face. As for phlegm (śleṣmā), it is sweet (madhuro), of saline taste (lavaṇaḥ), soft (mṛdu), heavy (guruḥ), and very viscid (apti-picchilaḥ). (p.17)

However, the account of the nature of the tastes of bile and phlegm is basically the same in both D̐x18173 and *Siddhasāra*.

The five points described above are in substantial conformity with the doctrine of tri-doṣa in classic Ayurveda, for example, the first Chapter of Tantra in *Siddhasāra*. However, some Ayurvedic concepts are explained in terms of Chinese medical theory. This phenomenon is known as “culture misreading”. Obvious instances of “culture misreading” are “feeling the pulse”, “inside the pulse [channels]” and “common pulse”. The so-called common pulse is a normal pulse that manifests itself in 4 beats per respiration.

(T. 42, p. 244b).

The pulse is neither floating nor deep, but even and gentle, with moderate force and regular rhythm. It is characterized by the presence of stomach *qi*, and described using terms such as “vigour” and “force”. There is no account of pulse diagnosis in the teachings of Ayurveda on *aṣṭāṅga*-, *tri-doṣa*-, and *sapta-dhātu*, although similar concepts to those of the channels and points can be found in *Suśruta-saṃhitā*⁶⁷. In Chinese Buddhist versions and commentaries, some translators occasionally use terms such as *Maizhen* 脈診 (examining the pulse, or feeling the pulse), but this is considered to be the result of drawing analogies with Chinese medicine concepts.⁶⁸ The method of feeling the pulse emerges much later in India. The first instance of a Sanskrit term for feeling the pulse is *nāḍi-parīkṣā*, which is recorded in *Śārngadhara-saṃhitā* around the thirteenth century.⁶⁹

᱕x18173 says:

When he or she breathes out once, the pulse moves again; when he or she breathes in once, the pulse moves again. During the interval between one exhalation and inhalation, the pulse beats five times (the pulse rhythm is repeated five times). At that moment, the common pulse ...

In fact, the original source of the above passage is the theories of pulse in the fifth folio of *Huangdi neijing suwen* 黃帝內經素問 [Huang Di’s Inner Classic: Basic Questions]. The original text of *Suwen* [Basic Questions], annotated by Wang Bing 王冰 (627 CE) in the Tang period, reads:

When someone breathes out once, the pulse beats; when someone breathes in once, the pulse moves again; and when he or she breathes in again, the pulse also moves again. If the respiration is kept in a constant state, the pulse has five beats per respiration, followed by a deep breath. This is what is meant by as normal person who is healthy and without disease.

The upper and lower energizer (burner) are terms from Chinese medicine. There is no structure analogous to the triple burner in the Ayurveda. The triple burner and *tri-doṣa* are very different concepts. ᱕x18173 explains foreign concepts in indigenous terms.

The method of explaining foreign terms in ᱕x09888 and ᱕x18173 is very similar

⁶⁷ Liao Yuqun 廖育群, “Yindu yixue de mai yu xue” 印度醫學的脈與穴 [The channels and points in Ayurveda], *Zhongguo keji shiliao* 中國科技史料 [China Historical Materials of Science and Technology], 2001:2, pp. 152-167.

⁶⁸ Tang Yongtong 湯用彤, “Zhenjiu Yindu gu yishu: Kangfu zhaji zhi er” 針灸印度古醫書——康復剎記之：Tang Yongtong Quanjī 湯用彤全集 [Collected papers of Tang Yongtong], vol.7, Hebei renmin chubanshe, 2000, pp. 12-19.

⁶⁹ Ramachandra S. K. ed., *Encyclopaedia of Indian Medicine*, vol. 2, *Basic Concepts*. 1987. New Delhi: Ramdas Bhatkal Popular Prakashan Pvt. Ltd., reprinted 1999, p. 128.

to that of "Matching the meanings" in early translations of Buddhist sūtras from India or Central Asia. Such misreadings illustrate the currents of interaction between two different cultures. These cases also show that the ancient physicians did not accept foreign knowledge wholesale when they encountered heterogeneous cultures. They tried to syncretize Indian Ayurvedic knowledge into indigenous Chinese medicine, although a harmonious reconciliation was not always achieved.

III: The Background of the transmission of Ayurvedic doctrine in Dunhuang and Turfan

The physical appearance of x09888 is different from that of x18173. The question of whether x18173 was unearthed in Turfan cannot be answered without new data. However, the subject matter of both x09888 and x18173 belongs to Ayurvedic doctrine. Both have a question-and-answer structure. In the group of manuscripts unearthed in Turfan to which x09888 belongs, there are four other manuscripts — x09935, x09936, x10092 and x09178 — which also this catechistic structure. Why was this format adopted? The reason may be that it is that it is a simple and rapid way of communicating unfamiliar foreign medical knowledge to the reader⁷⁰. x18173 may be a part of *Zhu yifang sui* 諸醫方髓 [The Essential Part of Various Selected Medical Remedies]. If this were so, we could call x09888 and x18173 "the manuscripts of *Zhu yi fang sui*".

From the preceding discussion of x09888 and x18173, it can be seen that a close relationship exists between these fragments and the Ayurvedic doctrines cited in the Chinese Buddhist versions. The most representative text, citing Ayurvedic doctrines in concentrated form, is I-tsing's translation of the Chapter on healing illnesses of *Suvarṇaprabhāsaottamarājasūtra*. It is beyond question that the source of both x09888 and x18173 lies in Ayurvedic literature. However, the form of these two fragments reflects the fact that they are not direct translations of any one Ayurvedic text. Moreover, there is a strong possibility that they belong to a manuscript that drew on and translated several Ayurvedic texts. The writer(s) also use terms from the Chinese Buddhist versions as a means of elucidating the original texts. According to the usual sequence in Ayurvedic texts, x09888, which discusses aṣṭāṅga-, should be placed before x18173. Taking the Chapter on healing illnesses of *Suvarṇaprabhāsaottamarājasūtra* as a frame of reference, the order of subject matter of Ayurvedic teachings is as follows: the four or six seasons of the year; the seven basic tissues of the human body; the four illnesses; changes in the four illnesses and the prescription of drugs over the four seasons; the relationship between the digestion and the three humours; the principles of administering drugs for the four

⁷⁰ The Chinese medical manuscripts in Dunhuang sometimes also use this style. For example, Dunhuang manuscript P.3287 *Bianmai fa of Shanghan lun* 傷寒論・辨脈法 [Treatise on Cold Damage: Methods of feeling the pulse] uses the question-and-answer format.

illnesses; the qualities required of a good doctor; the content of the eight branches of medicine; dreams and the nature of the patient; omens of death; the curative effects of the three fruits and three pungent medicines. However, the order of contents in ㄟx18173 is the following: the three humours and seven basic tissues; the different locations of the digestion of food; the treatment of illnesses due to the three humours; times and changes of three humours; the location of the three humours in the human body; and the nature of the three humours. By comparing these two sequences, it can be readily seen that ㄟx18173 does not conform to the Chapter on healing illnesses of *Suvarṇaprabhāṣottamarājasūtra*. Thus ㄟx18173 is not a commentary on the Chapter on healing illnesses.

The term *Zongjibing* 總集病, found in ㄟx18173, seems to have been first translated by I-tsing. For example, it is found in *Genben shuoyiqie youbu baiyi jiemo* 根本說一切有部百一羯磨 [*Mūlasarvāstivāda ekaśatakarman*] (volume one) and *Suvarṇaprabhāṣottamarājasūtra* (volume nine) in the third year of the Chang An Period (703 CE), and *Foshuo da kongque zhouwang jing* 佛說大孔雀呪王經 [*Mahāmāyūri(vidyārājñī)-(sūtra)*] (volume one) in the first year of the Shen Long Period (705 CE). This evidence indicates that ㄟx18173 was compiled no earlier than 703CE.

Although, as has already been mentioned, the doctrines cited in ㄟx18173 belong essentially to the first chapter Tantra of *Siddhasāra*, this does not imply that *Siddhasāra* is the direct source of ㄟx09888 and ㄟx18173.

Among the Dunhuang medical manuscripts, there are various drugs and prescriptions from India. Previous research has been confined to the Four Great Element of Buddhist medicine. Now, notice must be taken of the Ayurvedic doctrines in the Chinese medical manuscripts from Dunhuang and Turfan, which are similar in content to *Siddhasāra*.

Some non-medical manuscripts from Dunhuang also use the term *basbu*. For instance, Master Huijing's *Wenshijingsbu* 溫室經疏 [Commentary on the *sūtra* of the hothouse] from Dunhuang, now Shanghai Library catalogue No. 068, which was copied in the Tang period, describes the famous Buddhist physician Jīvaka thus:

Jīvaka understands the roots of the four diseases, and is fully versed in the essence of the eight branches of medicine. If Jīvaka carries out acupuncture on a patient, he or she will surely be cured. If Jīvaka administers medicine to a patient, he or she will be well again.

P.4660 *Jiguangming'si gu Suofalü miaozhenzan bingxu* 金光明寺故索法律邈真贊並序 [Song on the picture of Preceptor Suo of Golden Light Temple and foreword], written by Wuzhen 悟真 in the second year of the Wende 文德 period (889 CE), describes Monk Suo as follows:

He puts meditative effort into the eight kinds of liberation, and is acquainted

with the nature of the three emptinesses. He peacefully controls his heart and has a mind to pursue true law. As a disciple of the Northern branch of Zen under Master Shenxiu, he also guides the Southern branch of Zen. Moreover, he is accomplished in both *Shennong Bencao* 神農本草 [The *Materia Medica* of the Yellow Emperor] and the eight branches of medicine.⁷¹

Thus the monk Master Suo was also a physician, and was familiar not only with Chinese medicine but also Indian Ayurveda.⁷²

The third appended fragment of P.2191V relates a story about medical practice that is set in the time of Shazhou Guiyijun 歸義軍 (Return-to-Allegiance Army) regime:

It is also said: For the sake of comparison. In modern times there was a physician whose surname was Linghu at Saiting in Shazhou (Dunhuang). He was well versed in medical remedies. At Dacheng Temple, there was a Vinaya monk called Suo. When the monk's grandfather became ill, Physician Linghu was invited to his home to treat him. Physician Linghu said: "Your fetch does not know your illness." He then gave the patient a medicinal decoction to drink. As a result, his disease was instantly cured. Finally, Physician Linghu cautioned the patient not to eat garlic again after his recovery. When the autumn came, the grandfather had a craving to eat garlic once more. His disease recurred. This news was at once reported to the physician. The physician asked him: "Have you been eating garlic?" "No!" he replied. The physician came into his room and scrutinised his face, then said: "I am sure that you have eaten garlic!" The grandfather was obliged to reply truthfully: "I have eaten three stalks of garlic." Thereupon, the physician gave him a medicinal decoction of medicine to purge away the garlic. There are such people as the physician Linghu who was accomplished in the eight branches of medicine (*Bashu*, 八術). If that is so, how much more true must it be that Boddhisattva is a great physician!

In this story, the physician Linghu was a accomplished in the "eight branches of medicine". Although we do not know whether or not he had actually studied the eight types of Ayurvedic methods, it is evident that the term *bashu* is used in this manuscript as a synonym for medicine.

As regard the historical background of the transmission of Ayurvedic doctrines in Dunhuang and Turfan, this must be seen in the context of the tidal wave of Indian culture and Buddhism that flowed unceasingly along the Silk Road from the Late Han to

⁷¹ Tsong-yi Jao 饒宗頤 ed., *Dunhuang miaozhenzan jiaolu bing yanjiu* 敦煌道真贊校錄並研究, Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1994, p. 198.

⁷² Zheng Binglin 鄭炳林, Dang Xinlin 黨新命, "Tangdai Dunhuang yiseng kao" 唐代敦煌醫僧考 [A study of Buddhist physicians in Dunhuang in the Tang Dynasty], *Dunhuang xue* 敦煌學 [Dunhuangology], vol. 20, 1995, pp. 31-46. Zheng Binglin 鄭炳林, "Tang wudai Dunhuang de yishi yanjiu" 唐五代敦煌的醫事研究 [A study of medical practices in Dunhuang from the Tang to Five Eras periods], Lanzhou daxue Dunhuang xue yanjiusuo (ed.), *Dunhuang guiyijun zhuanji yanjiu* 敦煌歸義軍史專題研究 [A monograph on the history of Guiyijun in Dunhuang], Lanzhou daxue chubanshe, 1997, p. 517.

the Early Song period. Classic Indian medicine, both the Ayurvedic mainstream and other local medicines influenced by it, including Tocharian, Khotanese and Sogdian medicine from the Western Region, also spread to Dunhuang and Turfan. As an important crossroads of many cultures, Dunhuang absorbed Indian classic medicine. In the famous Buddhist cave library in the Mogao grottoes at Dunhuang, besides a Khotanese version of *Siddhasāra*, there were many other non-Chinese medical manuscripts. These include, for example, a Sanskrit-Khotanese bilingual text of *Jīvaka-pustaka*⁷³, and prescriptions in Sanskrit, Khotanese, Sogdian and Tocharian. Of course, there is a wealth of Chinese medical materials from Dunhuang.⁷⁴ Thus, Dunhuang was a meeting place where many kinds of medical knowledge were collected and syncretized.

Tombs in Astana and Turfan, and the Otani Collection⁷⁵ yield not only Chinese medical manuscripts, but also non-Chinese medical fragments in Sanskrit or Tocharian; for example, the fragments of *Bhela-saṃhitā*,⁷⁶ *Siddhasāra* and *Yoga-śataka*.⁷⁷ Furthermore, the epitaph of *Lüshuai* 旅帥 (Battalion Commander) Zhang Xianghuan 張相歡, from the second year of the Yonglong 永隆 Period (681 CE),⁷⁸ unearthed in Turfan, mentions two famous physicians, Jivaka and Nāgārjuna,⁷⁹ in the Indian Buddhist tradition. These

⁷³ Sten Konow, *A Medical Text in Khotanenses, Ch.ii 003 of India Office Library*, With Translation and Vocabulary (= Avhandlingar Utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademii Oslo, II Hist.-Filos Klasse, 1940 No. 4), Oslo I Kommissjon Hos Jacob Dybwad, 1941. R. E. Emmerick, "Contributions to the Study of the *Jīvaka-pustaka*", *BSOAS* XLII:2, 1979, pp. 235-243. R. E. Emmerick, "The Mahāsauvarcalādi Gṛ̥ṭa in Hoernle's Unpublished Edition of the '*Jīvaka-pustaka*'", *JEĀS* (= *Journal of the European Ayurvedic Society*) 5, 1997, pp. 76-81.

⁷⁴ Vivienne Lo & Christopher Cullen ed., *Medieval Chinese Medicine: The Dunhuang medical manuscripts*, London and New York: Routledge Curzon, 2005.

⁷⁵ Chen Ming 陳明, "Turfan Chutu hanwen yixue wenshu zhong de wailai yinsu" 吐魯番出土漢文醫學文書中的外來因素 [Foreign Elements in Turfan Chinese Medical Manuscripts], *Xin Shixue* 新史學 [New History], vol. 14, No. 4, Taipei, 2003, pp. 1-63.

⁷⁶ Tsutomu Yamashita, "Towards a Critical Edition of the *Bhelasamhitā*", *JEĀS* (= *Journal of the European Ayurvedic Society*) 5, 1997, pp. 19-24.

⁷⁷ H. Lüders, "Medizinische Sanskrit-Texte aus Turkestan". *Aus Indiens Kultur. Festgabe Richard von Garbe*. Erlangen, 1927. S. 148-162.

⁷⁸ A. Stein, *Innermost Asia, Detailed report of Explorations in central Asia, Kan-su and Eastern Iran*, vol. 4, Oxford 1928, p. 125. Chen Guocan 陳國燦, *A. Stein suobuo Turfan wenshu yanjiu* 斯坦因所獲吐魯番文書研究 [A study of Turfan manuscripts obtained by A. Stein] (Revision), Wuhan daxue chubanshe, 1997, p. 383. With regard to the influence of Jivaka in Dunhuang and Turfan, see Chen Ming 陳明, "Qipo de xinxiang yanbian jiqi zai Dunhuang Turfan diqu de yinxiang" 耆婆的形象演變及其在敦煌吐魯番地區的影響 [The changing images of Jivaka and his influence: seen through the manuscripts from Dunhuang and Turfan], Guojia tushuguan shanben tezangbu (ed.), *Wenjing xuezhi* 文津學志, vol. 1, Guojia tushuguan chubanshe, 2003, pp. 138-164.

⁷⁹ Vijaya J. Deshpande, "Nāgārjuna and Chinese medicine", in: Oscar Botto, Colette Caillat, Pierre Delaveau, Pierre-Sylvain Filliozat, Siegfried Lienhard, G. Jan Meulenbeld, Priya Vrat Sharma (ed), *Du corps humain, au carrefour de plusieurs savoirs en Inde. Mélanges offerts à Arion Rosu par ses collègues et ses amis à l'occasion de son 80^e anniversaire / The Human Body, at the Crossroads of Multiple Indian Ways of Knowing. Papers Presented to Arion Rosu by his Colleagues and Friends on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday Studia Asiatica* IV (2003) - V (2004), travaux réunis et édités par Eugen Ciurtin, ouvrage publié avec le concours du CNRS, Paris et sous le patronage du CESMEO, Turin, Paris-Bucarest, Diffusion: Éditions

materials prove that Indian medicine also influenced medical practices in medieval Turfan. It is not, therefore, not surprising that *Zbuyifangsui* 諸醫方髓 [The Essence of Various Selected Medical Remedies] from Turfan has become an illustrious example of Sino-Indian medical interchange.

De Boccard, 2004, pp. 241-257.

不空音譯敦煌出土佛頂尊勝陀羅尼

Amoghavajra's *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dhāraṇī* from Tunhuang

湯山 明 / Akira YUYAMA

目次 / Contents

0. 序 / Introductory

0. はじめに / Prefatory
1. 元代欽定・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼 / The Authorized Version of the Yüan Dynasty
2. 清朝の陀羅尼大全 / A Complete Dhāraṇī Collection of the Ch'ing Dynasty
3. 慈賢音訳・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼・房山石經 / Tz'ü-hsien's Version in the Fang-shan Canon
4. 不空音訳・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼・敦煌出土 / Amoghavajra's Version from Tunhuang
5. 善無畏・金剛智・不空・惠果・空海の伝灯 / *Paraṃparā* of Śubhakarasiṃha – Vajrabodhi – Amoghavajra – Hui-kuo – Kūkai
6. 不空の佛頂尊勝陀羅尼注義 / Amoghavajra's Version with his Commentary

I. 不空・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼・加句靈驗本

Amoghavajra's *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dhāraṇī* from Tunhuang

- I-A. 漢字音訳・俱羅馬字音写 / Text Presented with Transliteration
- I-B. 原典再構・俱語順番 / Text Reconstructed with Words Numbered
- I-C. 試訳 / A Tentative Japanese Translation
- I-D. 字母表 / A Table of Phonetic Alphabet

II. 不空・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼注義

The *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dhāraṇī* Annotated by Amoghavajra

- II-A. 漢字音訳・俱羅馬字音写 / Text Presented with Transliteration
- II-B. 原典再構・俱語順番 / Text Reconstructed with Words Numbered
- II-C. 字母表 / A Table of Phonetic Alphabet

III. 附録 / Appendices

- III-A. 不空・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼念誦儀軌法中之佛頂尊勝陀羅尼 / 漢字音訳・俱羅馬字音写
Amoghavajra's *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dhāraṇī* in his *Vidhi* / Text Presented with Transliteration
- III-B. 傳空海所傳梵本・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼・梵漢字雙書本・俱羅馬字音写
The *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dhāraṇī* in Siddhaṃ Attributed to Kūkai together with that in Chinese Characters / Text Presented with Transliteration in Roman Script
- III-Ba. 傳空海所傳・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼・梵漢字雙書本中之梵本・提婆城書体
Text Presented in Devanāgarī
- III-Bb. 傳空海所傳・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼・梵漢字雙書本中之七佛觀自在菩薩歸依文・俱羅馬字音写
Homage to the Seven Buddhas and Avalokiteśvara Bodhisattva / Text Presented with Transliteration in Roman Script
- III-C. 諸本同音異字比較表
Various Transliterated Indic Sounds in the *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dhāraṇī* Texts D, A, B and Z
- III-D. 不空・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼・加句靈驗本・注義・索引
Index to Amoghavajra's *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dhāraṇī* Texts D and Z

Michael Hahn zum 65. Geburtstag am 7. Mai 2006

まえがき ミヒャエル・ハーン博士の六十五才の誕生日を祝って記念論文集が計画され、筆者も論叢を献呈すべく親切的な誘いを受けた。今は徒に齢を重ねるのみで、多くのやり損ねた案件の締めがつかない時である。小論も締切り期限に間に合わなかったもので、関連の資料にも少し手を広げて概観することにし、俄仕込みの雑録を添えて本誌に投げ祝意を表することにした。欧文にしようかとも考えたが、印刷に面倒な内容というだけではなく、筆者の最近の関心から、少なくとも序説は邦文で書き置きたかったのである。

ミヒャエルに初めて遇ったのは、三十年余の昔である。筆者はアレクサンダー・フォン・フンボルト財団の上級研究員としてゲッティンゲンにあった。当時、彼は正に新進気鋭のボン大学教授で、ある機会に筆者はデュッセルドルフのロシア語文献の専門店を探索した後に、電車で西独の首府・ボンへ向かった。因みに、その郊外のパート・ゴードスベルクにフンボルト財団の本部がある。ミヒャエルとはボン大学近くのライン河に架かるケネディー橋袂の停留所で待ち合わせることになり、彼は約束通り雨の中に立って待っていてくれた。降車して、すぐに互いを認知しあえた。長い付き合いの始まりである。— ところで彼の記憶力は抜群なので、事実には誤りありと修正されるかもしれない。

このところ残念ながら彼我の往来が少し疎くなってきたが、彼の精力的な活躍ぶりは、折に触れて世界の各地から伝わってくる。わが国の多くの同学の土との交友がある。筆者が、小粒ながら国際的な視野に立つての研究機関を創るべく帰国して努力し始めた時には、彼は真つ先に出張先から足を延ばして飛んできて、聖勇を継ぐ作家の斬新な研究で新しい叢書の創刊をも飾ってくれた。また、筆者の演習に出たことのある若手で、後に彼の指導を得て、大いに進展活躍するものがあるのも嬉しい。今後のミヒャエルの益々の健勝と発展を祈念する。

さて、親切にも、祝賀論集へ参加を誘ってくれたミュンヘン大学のイエンス・ウヴェ・ハルトマン教授も、その頃に知り合ったと記憶している。実は、これまた記憶が怪しいが、彼の両親が旅先のネパールで知り合ったとかでミヒャエルの自宅を訪ねていて、偶々私ども夫婦も紹介されて会食した。ウヴェとは色々の機会に恵まれて交流を深めることができた。フンボルト財団の二度目の招聘で、ゲッティンゲンに1984年末から三ヶ月滞留した時は、大いに学術的談話を楽しんだ。悲しいかな今は亡きハインツ・ベッヒェルト教授の研究助手として頭角を現し、すでにハーン教授を親しく輔けて、叢書類の編集などにも特技を発揮していた。— こうした縁を心に刻みながら、記念論集の成功を遙かに念ずる。

0. 序 / Introductory

0. はじめに

0.0. 『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼』については、専門家でもないのに取り上げてきたが、¹ 筆者なりに理由があった。先ずは面白そうな梵語原典があると、ついぞ飛びつくという性癖のなさしめることで、はた迷惑であろうと思う。しかし、長らく私かに考えていたのは、古期・中期インド語の音韻研究の一資料としてのシナ語音写文献

¹ 湯山明, “演福寺銅鐘の梵語銘文覚書”, 東洋學報, LXVI, 1-4 (= 東洋文庫創立 60 周年記念号) (1985), p. 325-362 [— 以下 “Yuyama 1985” と略して引用].

— 小野玄妙『佛書解説大辭典』IX (1933) 所収の関連項目 (p. 322d-326d; 神林隆淨著) を誰しも見逃すまいが、上記拙稿に『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼』に関する書誌を、別の角度からやや詳しく書いたつもりである。

—, “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. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 16. bis 20. September 1985 in Würzburg*, herausgegeben von Esnar von Schuler (= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Supplementband X) (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden, 1989), p. 429-434. — [演福寺 (Yeon-bog-sa)]

—, “The *Uṣṇīṣa-vijayā Dhāraṇī* Transliterated by Tz'ü-hsien”, *Bauddhavidyāsudbārakap: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert On the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. Petra Kieffer-Pülz & Jens-Uwe Hartmann (= *Indica et Tibetica*, XXX) (Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 1997), p. 729-742 (incl. 2 plates).

—, “An *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dhāraṇī* Text from Nepal”, *ARIRIAB*, III: 1999 (2000), p. 165-175.

の発掘であり、延いては日本の梵学資料の探索によって研究史を繙こうということであった。² いうまでもなく、漢語音韻史などは、正に密林であって、迷い込んで出口を見出せなくなることに間違いはないので、この領野に踏み込む積もりも勇気もない。古今東西、数多くの先駆的な業績が光っている。筆者は、ここでは深入りせずに、やっと先学の偉業を仰ぎつつ、若干の資料を蒐集するだけである。

0.1. インド学仏教学の立場から、いわば入口に差し掛かったばかりで、恥ずかしくも中途半端に終わることは必定で、ついぞ成し遂げられそうにないことも明白である。本邦で世紀を隔てて積み上げてきた梵学の伝灯を絶やすことなく、近代インド学仏教学の基礎に立って、極めて精緻に研究調査した高楠順次郎 (1866-1945) の不朽の業績を忘れることはできない。³ この領野は、しかし、実はアジア学全分野の協同なくしてはなし得ないことではある。⁴

0.2. 『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼』に限っても、いうまでもなく原典はインド亜大陸に発するわけだから、彼地に遺る写本類の調査研究も非常に大事であるが、独立の写本が極めて稀で、大部の陀羅尼集などに混在していて、残念ながら量的に矮小の典籍を取り出して入手するのは困難である。⁵ 『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼』は、インド亜大陸から本邦にいたるまでの広範にわたり、複雑に異本・異読を生み出した特異の現象を見せる典籍である。今は将来の組織的な研究調査を待つより仕方ない。

² A. Yuyama 1993, "An Appraisal of the History of Sanskrit Studies in East Asia", *Studies on Buddhism in Honour of Professor A. K. Warder*, ed. N. K. Wagle & F. Watanabe (= *South Asian Studies Papers*, No. 5) (Toronto: Centre for South Asian Studies, University of Toronto, 1993), p. 194-203.

³ この点は最近も述懐したところである: "Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica, III", *ARIRIAB*, VIII: 2004 (2005), §3, esp. §3.2.

⁴ See e.g. A. Yuyama, "On and Around the Japanese *Aisa*, 'Goose'", *Journal of the Oriental Society of Australia*, X (Sydney 1975), p. 81-92.

—, "巖松院貝葉頌末記", 勝又俊教授博士古稀記念論集・大乘仏教から密教へ (東京・春秋社, 1981), p. 1269-1278.

—, "妙法蓮華經の藏字音字による敦煌出土写本断簡二点覚書", 雲井昭善博士古稀記念・仏教と異宗教 (京都・平楽寺書店, 1985), p. 233-247. — [Fonds Pelliot tibétain 1239 et 1269 à la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris].

—, "Remarks on the Kōkiji Fragment of the *Lokaprajñapti*", *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*) (= *Orientalia Lovaniensia, Analecta*, XXV) (Leuven: Departement Oriëntalistiek, Universiteit te Leuven, 1987), p. 215-227.

—, "Classifying Indic Loanwords in Japanese", *Saṃvṛtyamaṅgalam: Studies in Honour of Siegfried Lienhard* (Stockholm: The Association of Oriental Studies, 1995), p. 381-393.

—, "Toward a New Edition of the *Fan-yü Tsa-ming* of Li-yen", *Wisdom, Compassion, and the Search for Understanding: The Buddhist Studies Legacy of Gadjin M. Nagao*, ed. Jonathan A. Silk (= *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, 2000), p. 397-411.

⁵ Cf. e.g. Lionel David Barnett, "Manuscripts from India and Nepal", *The British Museum Quarterly*, XVI, 3 (1951), p. 68 (MS.Or. 11,788) [cf. M.T.M., *Bibl.bouddh.*, XXIV-XXVII (1950-1954), p. 53a: No. 507]; — cf. Yuyama 1985, p. 360b-361a: n. 52; also Yuyama (1999-2000) (*supra* n. 1 end).

1. 元代欽定・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼

1.0. 最初に筆者が接した『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼』の原典は、偶々朝鮮史の權威・末松保和博士 (1904-1992) から調査を勧奨された拓本資料であった。それは高麗朝の首都・開城の演福寺に遺る銅鐘の銘文の一つである。彼が、演福寺と鐘銘に関しての文献学的な論究を試みて、ついに果たせなかったのは残念の極みである。⁶ — 実は、その資料はゼロックスで撮りなおしたもので、いわば裁断されて、順不同で筆者に届いた。狭い自宅の畳の部屋に拡げて謎解きが始まった。悪戦苦闘の結果、やっと話の辻褄が合い、典籍を比定できたときの感慨は一入であった。— 『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼』と判れば、どの異本だろうかと探索するのが次の作業である。

1.1. 有名な居庸關雲台の門洞内面の六体字石刻文と一致するようだ。これは至正五年 (CE 1345) に始めて問もなく、恐らくは翌年には完成していたものといわれる。⁷ 演福寺の銅鐘は、高麗の忠穆二年 (CE 1346) 鑄刻という。しかも両者ともに元の工匠の手になるものである。しかも同一の文面であることからすれば、まさに元代の『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼』の欽定本というべき貴重な資料ということになる。演福寺の銅鐘の梵語銘文は、朝鮮半島にランチャ (Lañ-tsha / Rañjana) 文字資料の東端を知らせるという点、加えて正確な時点を捉えることができるという点でも、紙面に伝承されてきたものとは比較にならないほど重要である。いうまでもなく訳出の年代と鑄刻・彫刻の年代とには時間のずれがある。しかし両年代の差が、より少なく、以後改変を重ねてきたものとは、大きな違いがあり、重要な資料としての意味を持つことになる。してみれば、これは単に陀羅尼を含む典籍資料として、原典や歴史上の文献学的な研究に留まるだけのものではなく、種々の観点から東アジアの仏教を知る上でも見逃せないことになる。⁸

2. 清朝の陀羅尼大全

2.0. さて、皮肉にも興味深いことは、一字一句違わずに暗誦すべき陀羅尼・真言の類に、かえって異読・異本が目立って多いことである。そこで、清の乾隆帝 (CE 1711-1799) が、滿漢蒙藏の四文字をもって正しく真言陀羅尼を蒐集編修すべきと

⁶ 参看・末松保和, “高麗演福寺鐘銘について”, 東洋学報, LXVI, 1-4 (1985), p. 319-324 — 再録・末松保和朝鮮史著作集, V: 高麗朝史と朝鮮朝史 (東京・吉川弘文館, 1996), p. 117-121.

⁷ 居庸関東壁の六字体合璧・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼刻文については、京都大学から優れた研究成果が出ていて、以前に触れたので省略したい; cf. Yuyama 1985, p. 331, cum n. 7-8 (p. 356).

— この拙稿と殆ど同時に、かつて京都大学居庸関研究班の一員であった長尾雅人 (1907-2005) が著した一点は、佛頂尊勝陀羅尼に関するものではないが、居庸関と居庸関刻文全般についても詳述しているので参考になる: Gadjin M. Nagao, “The Tibetan Eulogy at Chü-yung-kuan”, *Tantric and Taoist Studies in Honour of Rolf A. Stein*, ed. Michel Strickmann, III (= *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques*, XXII) (= *Publications de l'Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises*) (Bruxelles-Louvain 1985), p. 835-861, incl. a photo and rubbing in facsimile.

⁸ 参看・鎌田茂雄, 朝鮮仏教史 (= 東洋叢書, I) (東京・東京大学出版会, 1987), p. 3 (cum p. 6, n. 2); — cf. Yuyama, *op.cit.* in: *Bechert Volume* (1997), p. 729 (cum n. 2).

の勅令を発したのが1749年、編纂完成は1759年、印刷完了は1773年である。⁹ この『御製滿漢蒙古西番合璧大藏全咒』は、一世紀半後の1928年に上海で覆刻されたというのが筆者は未見であり、¹⁰ 近年北京で覆刻されたというのも定かではない。この貴重な文献は夙にインドで覆刻されたが、これまた残念なことに久しく絶版となっているようだ。¹¹

3. 慈賢音訳・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼・房山石經

3.0. 確たるものではないにしても、年代を知り得る原資料として、房山石窟の藏經中の四二七八下塔に見出す慈賢本『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼』一点 (= 丁字号一～二) は見逃せない。その拓本も、割合に見やすく写真覆刻されている。¹² 慈賢 (= Mañtrabhadra?) に関して知る所は少ないが、早くに慈賢の訳業に注目した任杰の論攷を挙げておきたい。¹³ 幸いに近年の口中両国の専門家による房山石經の研究には目を瞠はるものが多い。石經の発見から既に長い歳月が過ぎたが、訳經史の専門家により更に批判的な評価で蒙を啓いて安心させて戴きたい。ついであるが、前世紀初頭二三十年ほどの間に撮られた鮮明な写真集が出た。往時の状況を知る貴重な資料だと思う。¹⁴

4. 不空音訳・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼・敦煌出土

4.0.0. 『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼』の古印刷卷文が敦煌から出土していることは、実は早くから知られていた。例によって、ペリオ (Paul Pelliot: 1878-1945) の単行書をなすほどの精緻な書評論文の中に、自ら二十世紀初頭に発見した不空 (Amogha-

⁹ Cf. Walther Heissig, *Die Peking lamaistischen Blockdrucke in mongolischer Sprache: Materialien zur mongolischen Literaturgeschichte* (= *Göttinger Asiatische Forschungen*, II) (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1954), p. 136-138 (mit Abb. 18): Nr. 148.

Nicholas Poppe, Leon Hurvitz & Hidehiro OKADA, *Catalogue of the Manchu-Mongol Section of the Toyo Bunko* (Tokyo: Toyo Bunko – Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1964), p. 52f.: Nos. 61f.

¹⁰ Cf. e.g. A. von Staël-Holstein, “On a Peking, a St. Petersburg, and a Kyōto reconstruction of a Sanskrit stanza transcribed with Chinese characters under the Northern Sung dynasty”, *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology of the Academia Sinica*, Supplementary Volume, I [蔡元培先生六十五歳慶祝論文集] (Peiping 1932), p. 180 n. 2.

¹¹ *Sanskrit Texts from the Imperial Palace at Peking in the Manchurian, Chinese, Mongolian and Tibetan Scripts*, edited by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra in 8 Parts (= *Śatapiṭaka Series*, LXXI, 1-8) (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1966-1968). — cf. Yuyama 1985, p. 355a-356a: n. 6.

¹² 中国仏教協会編・『房山石經 (遼金刻經)』XXI (北京・中国仏教図書館文物館, 1991.5), p. 499: — cf. further A. Yuyama, *Bechert Volume* (1997), p. 730: §03 (cum facs. on p. 742).

『中華大藏經』(漢文部分), LXVIII (1993), p. 460: — cf. further A. Yuyama, *op.cit.*, p. 730: §01 (cum facs. on p. 741).

¹³ 任杰, “房山石經中保存的契丹國慈賢譯經”, 呂鐵鋼編・房山石經研究, III (香港・中國佛教文化出版有限公司, 1999), p. 105-115, esp. p. 110f. [原載・〈法音〉, 1985年第一期].

¹⁴ 國家圖書館善本收藏部編・北京雲居寺与石經山旧影 (北京圖書館, 2004), 90 p. — ISBN 7-5013-2468-9.

vajra: 705-774 CE) 訳なる『一切如來佛頂尊勝陀羅尼』として先ずは紹介されている。¹⁵ 因みに、ペリオの書評の対象は、残念ながら筆者は実は当該の論点部分を検証していないが、中国の印刷史に画期的な貢献をなしたとされ、若くして夭折したトーマス・フランシス・カーター (1882-06.VIII.1925) の名著である。¹⁶ このペリオの遺稿は、ドゥミエヴィル (Paul Demiéville: 1894-1979) が、¹⁷ これまた懇切な補記・注記を施して公刊して江湖に贈ってくれたものだ。就中、ドゥミエヴィルが末尾に付した補遺は、広くインド学仏教学徒の今に座右不可欠の論攷で、筆者もこよなく愛でる書である。¹⁸

4.0.1. この敦煌出土の不空『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼』が、目録に漸くにして載ったのは、番号順からして当然ながら、ほんの一昔前である。参照すべき文献を余すところなく挙げ、典籍に関する記述は精細を極めていく。¹⁹ ここに欠けていて、もの足りないものは、もっとも残念なことに、まさに原典そのものの良質の複写である。

4.1.0. この九～十世紀にまで遡るとされる巻物が、鮮明に覆刻・公刊されたのは誠に有難く、筆者も今回の調査にはこれに頼った。残念ながら、それは専門家でもないと、不注意に見逃してしまいそうな論集の中に埋もれていた。書物の性格からか、原典を比定して詳細を記録しているわけではなく、単に「仏經」と紹介し

¹⁵ *Les débuts de l'imprimerie en Chine* [Avertissement de Robert des Rotours, p. V-VIII] (= *Oeuvres posthumes de Paul Pelliot*, IV) (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale - Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1953), p. 49: "19. Le rouleau imprimé de Paris", cum n. 1 (par Paul Demiéville).

¹⁶ Pelliot ad Thomas Francis Carter, *The Invention of Printing in China and its Spread Westward* (New York: Columbia University Press, June 1925), p. 208. — この名著は、後にコロンビア大学の後継者でドゥミエヴィルと同年輩のグッドリッジ (Luther Carrington Goodrich: 1894-1986) によって大きな改訂増補を加えて公刊され (1955), 幸いに信頼のおける和訳が出ているが、大方の好評を得ていながら絶版になって久しい。著者自身の序文、夫人の手になる第二版への簡略な経緯や訳注者の序も内容理解を助けてくれる: 戴内清・石橋正子(訳注), *中国の印刷術 — その発明と西伝*, 2冊 (= 東洋文庫, 315-316) (東京・平凡社, 1977), xxxiv, 199 p.; ii, 260, 6 p. (incl. num. b/w figs.). — この増訂版も名著として誉れ高い。博学であったグッドリッジは、製紙・印刷に関しても数多くの論考を公表していることが、その次男の手になる書誌記録で知ることができる: cf. Thomas D. Goodrich ("1927), "Luther Carrington Goodrich (1894-1986): A Bibliography", *JAS*, CXIII, 4 (1993), p. 585-592 (also p. 585b, n. 3); further Amy V. Heinrich, "Anne Perkins Swann Goodrich (July 4, 1895-April 22, 2005)", *JAS*, LXIV, 3 (Ann Arbor 2005), p. 812f.

¹⁷ かつて筆者は、ドゥミエヴィル (= 戴密微: 13.IX.1894-23.III.1979) の生没年月日について誤記をしている (Yuyama, *Burnouf*, 2000, p. 190). ここに詫びて訂正しておきたい。極めて温厚な先生に偶々レイデン・パリ・東京で、親しく拝眉の榮を賜ったことを幸いに思う。

¹⁸ P. Demiéville, "Appendice: Notes additionnelles sur les éditions imprimées du canon bouddhique", *op.cit.*, p. 121-138.

= *Choix d'études bouddhiques (1929-1970) par Paul Demiéville* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973), p. 223-240.

¹⁹ *Catalogue des manuscrits de Touen-kouang. Fonds Pelliot chinois de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, V: N°s 4001-6040. Avec le concours de la Fondation Signer-Polignac, Tome I: 4001-4734 (= *Publications hors série de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*) (Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient, 1995), p. 88: N° 4501.

ている。²⁰ 実は、同じ頃に、敦煌石窟からの仏典の宝蔵を折角に編纂刊行して、研究者の渴を癒してくれた膨大な企画による大冊の中に、鮮明さに欠けるが本典籍の写真覆刻はあった。²¹ 最近の中国での貴重資料の覆刻公刊の動きも本当に有難いが、上海古籍とパリの国立図書館の編集刊行する『法藏敦煌西域文献』が、今に至って当該写本の巻に達していないのは残念である。現今の高度な科学技術によって、電子記憶画像の入手が出来るかも知れないが、恥ずかしくも怠って、上記の資料をもとに解説することにした。大半は判読できそうであるので、不鮮明な箇所を再構築は将来の研究に委せたい。原典自体が加句靈驗本と称しているが、厳密には発音上の注記のみであって、いわば句番も注義もない。この「注義」という観点からすると、不空の『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼注義』(T 974D) が、その師・金剛智 (Vajrabodhi: 671-741CE, 入唐・720) の漢字本に拠ったという東寺三密蔵の古写本を底本に編まれた『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼』(T 974B) に近いのが興味深いと思う。

4.1.1. 製紙・印刷・保存 この所、また、内外でアジアの製紙・印刷・保存の問題への関心が再燃してきている。ことにインド学・仏教学の立場からは、見逃せない動きが目立つので、その界限を一度は雑録しておきたいと願っているが手につかないでいる。漢土に問題を探る限りでも、訳経史の上での資料的意味も大きい。とくに日本・中国で興味深い成果が公刊されているのは周知のことであろう。こうした書物の中にひょっこりと貴重な資料が顔を出したりする。上記のように、原典の比定や研究が目的ではないので、いわば見本として挙げてある。とんだ所で、貴重な資料に部分的にではあるが対面して、しかも他の資料で不鮮明な箇所に苛立ちを覚えた者の解説には十分役立つこともある。²²

4.1.2. いうまでもなく不空 (Amoghavajra: 不空金剛) は、八世紀中葉に漢土で活躍したので、『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼』木版本は、訳出後一二世紀のうちに刷られたものということになる。門外漢で歯がゆいが、専家の諸書を見ると、この木版本は

²⁰ Jean-Pierre Drège, “Le livre manuscrit et les débuts de la xylographie”, *Le livre et l'imprimerie en Extrême-Orient et en Asie du Sud: Actes du Colloque organisé à Paris du 9 au 11 mars 1983*, préparés par Jean-Pierre Drège, Mitchiko Ishigami-Iagolnitzer et Monique Cohen (Institut d'Etude du Livre – Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique: Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes – Ministère de la Culture: Direction du Livre) (Bordeaux: Société des Bibliophiles de Guyenne, 1986), [p. 19-39]: p. 35: fig. 5 “Sûtra bouddhique. Xylographie (IX^e-X^e siècle). Pelliot chinois 4501”.

²¹ 黄永武主編, 敦煌寶蔵, 第133冊・伯4062-4608號 (臺北・新文豐出版公司印行, 1986), p. 152: 伯四五〇一號・一切如來尊勝佛頂陀羅尼加句靈驗本。

²² 例えば、内外で久しく活躍する錢存訓 (*1910) の近著・鄭如斯編訂: 中國紙和印刷・文化史 [*Chinese Paper and Printing: A Cultural History*] (桂林・廣西師範大學出版社, 2004.5), p. 137, 圖 53: “敦煌發現的唐刻《陀羅尼經》, 印於 9 世紀。法國巴黎國家圖書館藏”; p. 135: “唐代的印刷實物中, 還有數例值得一提, 如在敦煌發現的其他幾種《陀羅尼經》(圖 53)”。— これは『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼』の最初 16 行の写真覆刻である。

初期のものにしては上出来の印刷物なのであろうか。²³ しかし、結論からいって、とても不空の原本が忠実に漢字音に伝承されたとは思えない。不空が当時の長安の発音研究などに貴重な資料を我々に提供してきたことは、今に参照すべきとされるアンリ・マスpero (Henri Maspero: 1882-1945) の著名な論攷などからも知られている。²⁴ 従って、敦煌本は、恐らくは書写者が単に不注意であったのか、インド語の発音に通じていなかったのか、発音符号は問題にせず漢字音を並べれば原文を暗誦できたのか、文字通り機械的に還梵すれば誤読とされてしまうものが散見される。²⁵ ただ、敦煌本は、印刷の墨の汚れか染みで鮮明さを欠く部分を除いては、原典を容易に復元できると思う。ただし、単語や成句の欠落があったと思しき読みもありそうで、復元したものが正しく本来の原典を伝えているか否かは別の問題である。ところで、マスperoの成果は、幅広い学術環境に育まれながら、夙に安南語の音韻研究を基礎に長安方言を研究して成ったものといわれる。²⁶

5. 善無畏・金剛智・不空・惠果・空海の伝灯

5.0. この敦煌出土の『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼・加句靈驗本』は、不空訳とあるからには、関連の典籍として彼の『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼念誦儀軌』一卷に文字通り儀軌として唱誦する『尊勝陀羅尼』(T No. 972: 漢字陀羅尼梵本, p. 367a25-b28) (cf. Yuyama 1985, p. 346: No. 6) が現存するので、両本の比較が重要となろう。ここで大正蔵が高麗版を底本にし、その校合に用いた甲乙二本うち、いわゆる㊟として脚注されている写本は、文和二年 (1353 CE) の書写になり高野山寶壽院にあったものであるが (T XIX p. 364, n. 8), これが統蔵本 (= Z) の漢字音写に近いことに注意したい。ただし、語・句の番号付が、非常に不注意になされていて、どこに基準を置いたのか理屈はつけられても、その意図が判然としない:

²³ 最近刊行された次著は、少し簡略であろうが、印刷の歴史を鳥瞰するのに参考になった: 米山寅太郎, 図説中國印刷史 (= 汲古選書, XL) (東京・汲古書院, 2005), (i), xix, 283 (incl. num. ills.), 11 p., 4-page pl. [傳嘉年・序/沈燮元・跋]; 参看・陳力 (中国国家図書館副館長), “<中国印刷史>の研究について — 米山寅太郎『図説中國印刷史』発刊に際して —”, 汲古, No. 47 (2005.7), p. 60-64 (含訳者・高橋智・あとがき).

²⁴ Henri Maspero, “Le dialecte de Tch’ang-ngan sous les T’ang”, *BEFEO*, XX, 2 (1920), p. 20 (out of p. 1-124); cf. e.g. W. South Coblin, *Studies in Old Northwest Chinese* (= *Journal of Chinese Linguistics*, Monograph Series, IV) (Berkeley 1991), p. 4: §1.2 (with lit.).

— つい最近には名著も中国に紹介された: 聶鴻音訳・唐代長安方言考 (= 世界漢學論叢) (北京・中華書局, 2005), [(ii), 3, 5, 204 p.], p. 12f: “不空學派的密咒對音”.

²⁵ 不注意な例を二三挙げれば、婆伽羅帝: *bhāgavate* (不要な長音記号) / *bhag°*; 鉢囉底尾始瑟陀野: *parativīṣṭāya* (子音合成記号欠) / *prati°*; 怛你也他: *tad-yatha* (長音記号欠) / *°-yathā*; 等々!

²⁶ それにしても、第二次世界大戦の犠牲になってしまったのは悔やまれる。マスpero (馬伯樂: Paris 15.XII.1882-Buchenwald/Weimar 17.III.1945) の業績については、後継のドゥミエヴィルが、例によって正鵠を得て斯学の未来を考察し示唆に富む: e.g. Paul Demiéville, “Henri Maspero et l’avenir des études chinoises”, *T’oung pao*, XXXVII (1947), p. 16-42.

(367a25) 曩慕^引婆^引謁^引帝^引 恒^引囉^引 路^引 枳^引 也^引 (26) 鉢^引 囉^引 底^引 以^引 三^引 尾^引 始^引 瑟^引 吒^引 也^引 ... (b18) .. 薩
囉^引 薩^引 恒^引 囉^引 四^引 十^引 六^引 難^引 上^引 左^引

namo bhāgavate1 trai-lokya-2prati3viśiṣṭāya4 ... sarva-satvā46nāṃ ca

5.1. ここで更に比較のために極めて重要と思しきものが、京都の教王護國寺・東寺三密藏古写本を底本に編んだ『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼』(T No. 974B: 各欄 30 行・梵漢両字併記の陀羅尼梵本, XIX p. 367b21-385c, end; cf. *Yuyama 1985*, p. 347: No. 9) である。その奥書に、本尊勝陀羅尼に種々九点あり、件の梵本とは弘法大師・空海が留学中に恵果阿闍梨 (746-805 CE) から授かった貝葉梵本であり、さらに過去七佛・觀自在菩薩への歸依文が挿入されていることなどの特徴を明記していて、²⁷ 善無畏 (Śubhaṃkarasimha: 637-735 CE) から金剛智・不空・恵果・空海への師資相承も見てとれ、梵本伝承の経路を知るうえで極めて興味深い資料にもなるろう。²⁸

(T XIX p. 385c20-29): .. 此陀羅尼凡有九本。所謂 ... 不空三藏等所譯本。... 弘法大師所傳梵本等也。之中今以弘法大師梵本。與金剛智三藏所譯加字具足漢字本所雙書也。件梵本是弘法大師在唐之日。惠果阿闍梨所授多羅葉梵本也。七佛及觀音梵號裁干此中。異他梵本也。後人知之 /

5.2. この悉曇字梵本が底本であり、漢字梵本は八世紀に活躍した不空の師・金剛智「所譯加字具足漢字本所雙書」が原典とあれば、正しく比較校合に重要な一点であろうと氣は逸る。この建久二年 (1191 CE) の原本を実見できずに残念であるが、今に現存しているのだろうか、怠って問い合わせてもいない。これが目錄に載っているのかも定かでないが、恐らくは連綿と伝承されて今日に至っているに相違ない。²⁹ もっと欲をいえば、空海将来の貝葉本が、どこかに眠ってはいまいか。建久本を大正藏の編者も忠実に編んでいるようで、十二世紀末の本典籍の性格を知るのにも役立ち貴重である。この梵本は、しかし、脱落・誤写が目につく。³⁰ 特に長音記号を書き忘れていることが多い。³¹ 漢字梵本で氣がつくのは、いわゆる陀羅尼に特徴的な口偏を付けた漢字が少ないことである。³²

6. 不空・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼注義

6.0. 筆者が、異本・異読の対象となり、比較対照の好材料と判断したのは、不空

²⁷ Cf. *infra* III-Bb: “七佛觀自在菩薩歸依文”。

²⁸ この空海に至る師資相承を見るのに最も直截的な資料を提供してくれると思う好著がある：勝又俊教、弘法大師の思想とその源流 (東京・山喜房佛書林, 1981), p. 317-348: “第十章・恵果和尚伝の研究”, esp. p. 331f., et al.

²⁹ 筆者には探索の術がないが、後世も佛頂尊勝陀羅尼が勤修されたり、尊勝陀羅尼衆という寺僧組織ができていたりするようだ：参看・上島有、東寺・東寺文書の研究 (京都・思文閣出版, 1998), c.g. p. 25 et 64.

³⁰ 脱字の一例：समन्त / 三滿 (*saman*) で「多」字を落とす (T XIX 385c9/ 10)。

³¹ 若干の例を挙げれば, āvara ābāra ⇒ āvara ābāra, viśodbaya viśadbaya ⇒ viśodbaya viśodbaya.

³² 例えば, 羅・囉, 隸・隸, 縛・縛, 囉。

の『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼注義』(T No. 974D: XIX p. 388b5-c, end)である。『注義』とあるからには、原典を確認できて、異同を解明できると思ったからである。これは、残念ながら、必ずしも当たっていなかった。両典籍を比較してみて、果たして不空自身に決定した『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼』原典とインド語音の漢字音写法が確立していたのか、今は疑問に思うしかない。しかし比較を試みるに足る典籍が眼前にあることは確かである。なお、『大正新脩大藏經』の編者は、『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼注義』をいわゆる『續藏經』を底本に転写・編纂している。³³ これは、本邦のみに伝承したものであろう。典籍の跋にあるように、寛永二年(1625 CE)、享保三年(1718)、そして文政六年(1823)の書写聯繫の年代が明記してあり、長きに亘って連綿と継承してきた貴重な記録をもつ典籍であることを知る。

6.1. 来歴が判然としているにもかかわらず、誠に残念ながら、この『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼注義』の原写本の在處が今に判然としない。これは探索してみる値打ちが十分にあらう。この探検話は、少しく雑学的にならうから、例によって本号末の雑録に場所を得たいと思う。

7. おわりに

7.0. 不明の案件を多く残しての擱筆である。本論でも、残念ながら更なる追及をする余裕を失ってしまった。また、異なる面での興味も尽きない。本典籍は物語集などの古典文学にも登場する。なお、わが国には、未だに研究者を待って埋もれている梵学資料が極めて多い筈である。思いも寄らぬ所に眠る未知の貴重なもの、ある時期から行方が知れなくなってしまったものなどである。今後の調査・研究に期待したい。

略 号

A = Taisho 972 / 不空・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼念誦儀軌

B = Taisho 974B / 傳空海・金剛智／京都・教王護國寺・東寺三密藏古写本・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼

CBEITA = Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association (Taipei)／臺北・中華電子佛典協會版・大正藏

D = Tunhuang Version／敦煌出土木板刷・不空・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼

T, Taisho = 大正新脩大藏經

Y = Yuan: 居庸關雲台門洞内面六体字石刻・演福寺銅鐘鑄刻碑銘中之佛頂尊勝陀羅尼

Z = Zokuzō／不空・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼注義・『新編・正續藏經』, CIV (臺北・新文豐出版, 1994), p. 672b-673b.

³³ 筆者は台北から出た藏經書院刊行の覆刻版を用いた: 『新編・正續藏經』, CIV (臺北・新文豐出版, 1994), p. 672b-673b. ただし、本典籍は、その目録(目次)の「中國撰述・真言宗著述部」にあるべきを欠いている。編集者が、本典籍を『加句靈驗佛頂尊勝陀羅尼記一卷／唐・武徹述』の中(p. 668a-673b)に包含してしまったとみえる。

I-A.

不空・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼・加句靈驗本*
 Amoghavajra's *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dhāraṇī* from Tunhuang:
 Text Presented with Transliteration

(Line 1) 一切{如來}尊勝佛頂陀羅尼 加句靈驗本

(.2) {○○}朝灌頂國師三藏大廣智不空譯

(.3) 曩謨^引婆去^引 1 誡^引嚩帝^引怛^二嚩^二路^引枳^引 (.4) 也^三鉢囉^二底尾始瑟姪^二野^引
namo bhāgavate trai-lokya-prativiśiṣṭāya

沒駄^引野^(.5)婆^去 1 誡^引嚩帝^引怛^二你也^二他^三嚩^引尾^二式^引 2 (.6) 駄^引 3 野尾^二式^引 駄^引野^(.7)
buddhāya bhāgavate tad-yathā oṃ viśodbhāya viśodbhaya

娑^上麼^上娑摩^三去^(.7)滿^路 嚩^去婆^去娑^去 <娑> 頗^二囉^二拏^五 誡^引誡^引底^引賀^(.8) 曩^引 6
samaṃ sama⁴-samantāvabhāsa-<s>pbaraṇa-gati-gabana-

{薩} 嚩^二婆^去 嚩^引尾^引 秣^{時律} 反^反第^上阿^上 (.9) 鼻^上 {訖} 左^引覲^引 輪^引素^引誡^引哆^引嚩^引囉^引
svabhāva-viśuddhe abhiṣīcatu māṃ sugata-vara-

* Hereunder I will try to transliterate the text from the readings in Chinese characters without inserting missing signs, such numerous examples as long vowels. It is also to be noted at the same time that this text (abbreviated as *D* hereinafter) gives a long vowel sign on wrong places, e.g. *D* 2: 娑^去 誡^引嚩^引帝^引: read *bhagavate*! Further, {} is used for the place with ink blurred, and <> for missing words in the blockprint text. Strictly speaking, this is not a critical edition. Cf. also *infra* III-A: *Text A* (= Taisho No. 972) fn.*!

¹ This long-vowel sign must be deleted, i.e. *bhag*°!

² 式 is a strange character, which should doubtlessly be for 戌, as seen in *Text Z*, i.e. *śo*!

³ This long-vowel sign must be deleted, i.e. °*dbhaya*!

⁴ 娑麼^上娑摩, i.e. *samaṃ sama*-°: cf. *Text Z*, n. 4!

⁵ This may easily be reconstructed with a missing character 娑, due to its duplication: i.e. 娑頗^二囉^二拏, i.e. *spbaraṇa*-: cf. *Text Z* 17: 娑頗^二囉^二拏^上.

⁶ This may again be a simply scribal mistake: 誡^引誡^引底^引賀^引 曩, i.e. °-*gagatiganā*-°, which must be confused with °-*gati-gabanā*-°, i.e. 誡^引底^引誡^引賀^引! It may also be possible to read it: 誡^引底^引誡^引賀^引 曩, i.e. °-*gati-gagana*-, as seen below, i.e. *D* 35: 誡^引誡^引曩, i.e. *gagana*-. Cf. T XIX: 362c3 & 7: 揭底^引嚩^引喝^引娜 & 伽伽那, i.e. *gati-gabana*- & *gagana*-?!

囉左曩(.10)⁷阿蜜哩_合哆鼻囉₇阿_去賀囉(.11)阿_引賀囉

vacanā-amṛtābhisekai ābara ābara

阿_去庚⁸散駄_引囉拈_式駄野(.12)式駄野識識曩尾秬第鄔瑟拈_合灑

āyuh-saṃdhārṇi śodbaya śodbaya gagana-viśuddhe uṣṇīṣa-

(.13)尾{惹野}尾秬第娑賀娑囉_合囉濕茗_合(.14)散祖你帝薩囉

vijaya-viśuddhe sahasra-raśmi-saṃcodite sarva-

怛他_去誡哆囉路_引迦(.15)賴沙_上吒播_合囉弭哆_去跋哩布_引囉(.16)拈

tathāgatāvalokanī śaṭ-pāramitā-paripūraṇi

薩囉怛他_去誡哆訖哩_合娜野_引⁹地(.17)瑟吒_仁曩_引地瑟恥_合哆摩賀

sarva-tathāgata-bydayādhiṣṭhānādhiṣṭhita-mahā-

母捺哩(.18)_合囉日羅_合迦_引野僧_思賀多曩尾秬(.19)第

mudrī vajra-kāya-saṃbatana-viśuddhe

薩囉囉囉_引囉拈_引播野訖_合囉_舌(.20)底跋{哩}尾秬第

sarvāvaraṇāpaya-durgati-pariviśuddhe

鉢囉_合底賴囉囉多_合(.21)野阿_去欲秬第三摩野地瑟恥_合帝麼(.22)拈

pratinivartaya āyuh-śuddhe samayādhiṣṭhite maṇi

麼拈摩賀麼拈怛闍哆_引部哆(.23)句_引致跋哩秬第

maṇi mahā-maṇi tathatā-bbūta-koṭi-pariśuddhe

⁷ Cf. Text Z n. 6 for further details on the reading of this phrase!

⁸ This may well have to be emended to 阿庚, so in Text B (= T XIX 384c18: 阿庚 = āyuh-?). Cf. 周法高(主編), 漢字古今字彙 / A Pronouncing Dictionary of Chinese Characters in Archaic & Ancient Chinese, Mandarin & Cantonese (香港 1973), No. 2315 (庚), 2336 (庚); Bernhard Karlgren, *Grammata Serica Recensa* (Stockholm 1972), No. 746a (庚), 126a/b (庚); also Robert Heinemann, 漢梵・梵漢 二用語用句辭典 / Chinese-Sanskrit Sanskrit-Chinese Dictionary of Words and Phrases as Used in Buddhist Dhāraṇī (Tokyo 1985), p. 40f.: 阿庚・阿欲・阿庚, i.e. āyus-/āyuh! Cf. further Text D Table n. 13!

⁹ 囉路迦賴沙吒播_合囉弭哆_去跋哩布_引囉囉囉囉_合怛他_去誡哆訖哩_合娜野_引 is missing in Z, most probably due to the later scribal miscopying. Cf. also Text Z n. 8!

尾娑普_{二合}吒沒地_{二合}秣_{二合}(.24)第惹野¹⁰尾惹野尾惹野_引¹¹娑麼_{二合}(.25)囉娑麼_{二合}囉
visphuṭa-buddhi-suddhe jaya vijaya vijayā smara smara

薩嚩沒駄_引地瑟恥_{二合}多_{二合}(.26)秣第嚩口哩_{二合}嚩日囉_{二合}_引¹²嚩囉陛_{二合}
sarva-buddhābhiṣṭhita-suddhe vajri vajrā-garbhe

嚩日囉_{二合}(.27)_{二合}_引婆去_引嚩觀¹³麼麼_{二合}設哩嚩薩嚩薩怛_{二合}(.28)嚩_{二合}{難者}
vajrāṃ bhāvatu mama śarīraṃ sarva-satvānāṃ ca

{迦_引}野跛哩尾秣第薩嚩識底_{二合}(.29)跛哩尾秣第薩嚩怛他嚩哆_引室者_{二合}銘
kāya-parivīśuddhe sarva-gati-parīśuddhe sarva-tathāgatāś ca me

三_{二合}(.30)_{二合}麼_{二合}濕嚩_{二合}娑琰觀薩嚩怛他去_引嚩多
samāśvāsāyantu sarva-tathāgata-

(.31) 三_{二合}麼_{二合}濕嚩_{二合}娑地瑟恥_{二合}帝沒地_{二合}(.32)野_{二合}{沒地}野_{二合}¹⁴
samāśvāsādbhiṣṭhite budhya

冒駄野冒駄野¹⁵三_{二合}母哆跛哩_{二合}(.33)秣第薩嚩怛他嚩哆
bodbaya bodhaya samanta-parīśuddhe sarva-tathāgata-

紇哩_{二合}娜野_{二合}地_{二合}(.34)瑟姪_{二合}_引婁地瑟恥_{二合}多摩賀_{二合}母捺哩_{二合}娑_{二合}(.35)嚩_{二合}{賀}
brdayādbhiṣṭhānādbhiṣṭhita-mahā-mudri svāhā

(.36)佛{頂尊勝}陀羅尼一卷

¹⁰ One expects to see 惹野, i.e. *jaya!*, repeated like in some other versions, e.g. Text Z 74-75!

¹¹ The long-vowel sign must be deleted: i.e. 尾惹野: *vijaya!*

¹² This long-vowel sign must be deleted: i.e. 嚩日囉_{二合}: *vajra-°!* Cf. further Text D Table I, N.B.!

¹³ Here *vajrāṃ* is a predicate, not an acc.sg.fem., with the subject *śarīraṃ*, nom.sg. Cf. further Heinemann p. 133: 縛日藍, *vajrāṃ*, acc.sg.fem., p. 135: 縛日藍, *vajrāṃ*, acc.sg.<m.nt.>, for which I have not checked with them in the actual texts. — Cf. further Text D Table I, N.B., also Text Z n. 17!

¹⁴ {沒地}野_{二合} is not repeated here, as is seen in Text Z 103-104, and elsewhere, e.g. Y: *buddhya buddhya!*

¹⁵ Comparing with some others, this version has omitted several phrases after this passage.

I-B.

不空・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼・加句靈驗本
原典再構Amoghavajra's *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dhāraṇī* from Tunhuang
Text Reconstructed

namo bhagavate // trai-lokya-prativīṣiṣṭāya buddhāya bhagavate //
(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)

tad-yathā / / oṃ / viśodbhaya viśodbhaya //
(8) (9) (10) (11) (12)

samaṃ sama-samantāvabhāsa-spharaṇa-gati-gaḥana-svabhāva-viśuddhe /
(13) (14) (15) (16) (17) (18) (19) (20) (21)

abhiśiñcatu māṃ sugata-vara-vacanā-amṛtābbhīṣekaiḥ //
(22) (23) (24) (25) (26) (27) (28)

āhara āhara / āyuh-saṃdhārṇi / śodbhaya śodbhaya //
(29) (30) (31) (32) (33) (34)

gagana-viśuddhe / uṣṇīṣa-vijaya-viśuddhe //
(35) (36) (37) (38) (39)

sahasra-raśmi-saṃcodite / sarva-tathāgatāvalokani / ṣaṭ-pāramitā-paripūraṇi /
(40) (41) (42) (43) (44) (45) (46) (47) (48)

*sarva-tathāgata-hṛdayādhiṣṭhānādhiṣṭhita-mahā-mudri / vajra-kāya-saṃbatana-
viśuddhe //*
(49) (50) (51) (52) (53) (54) (55) (56) (57) (58)
(59)

sarvāvaraṇāpaya-durgati-pariviśuddhe // pratinivartaya // āyuh-śuddhe //
(60) (61) (62) (63) (64) (65) (66) (67)

samayādhiṣṭhite //
(68) (69)

maṇi maṇi mahā-maṇi / tatbatā-bhūta-koṭi-pariśuddhe // viśphuṭa-buddhi-śuddhe //
(70) (71) (72) (73) (74) (75) (76) (77) (78) (79) (80)

jaya vijaya vijaya / smara smara / sarva-buddhādhiṣṭhita-śuddhe //
(81) (82) (83) (84) (85) (86) (87) (88) (89)

vajri vajra-garbhe / vajraṃ bhavatu mama śarīraṃ sarva-satvānāṃ ca //
(90) (91) (92) (93) (94) (95) (96) (97) (98) (99)

kāya-pariviśuddhe // sarva-gati-pariśuddhe //
(100) (101) (102) (103) (104)

sarva-tathāgatāś ca me samāśvāsayantu //
(105) (106) (107) (108) (109)

sarva-tathāgata-samāśvāsādhiṣṭhite / budhya bodhaya bodhaya // samanta-pariśuddhe //
(110) (111) (112) (113) (114) (115) (116) (117) (118)

sarva-tathāgata-hṛdayādhiṣṭhānādhiṣṭhita-mahā-mudri //
(119) (120) (121) (122) (123) (124) (125)

// svāhā //
(126)

I-C.

不空・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼・加句靈驗本

— 試訳 —

A Tentative Japanese Translation

・ 前言 ・

この陀羅尼の試訳は、まさしく本来不翻のものを、文字通り試みに訳したものである。陀羅尼の本意がどこにあるのか、とくに長い語句を連ねた真言は筆者の能力を遙かに超えている。いわば合釋が判らない。まったく自信がもてない。本来は、**専**家に委ねるべきものに相違ない。先ずは、原典の再構築を図ることが大事であった。以下は、**不器用**にして乱雑な、恐らくは誤解・誤謬に満ちた試訳であると思う。かなりの**長編**というべきいわゆる元代欽定版の**佛頂尊勝陀羅尼** (= Y) と比較してみると、解釈の上からも興味深い点が多々浮かびあがるが、これとても疑問を氷解してくれるわけではない。数多くの**真言陀羅尼**を知って、はじめてできる仕事である。佛頂尊勝陀羅尼だけとっても、**諸本**すべてを比較する暇はない。ここでは少なくとも、種々の読みについては、原典二点 (= D・Z) に注記した。本邦に伝わり、はじめて『續藏經』に記録された『注義』があるので、筆者の脚注もこの本に集中して記した。あちこちを参照する不便をお許し戴きたい。

(1-2) 世尊に帰命する。(3-7) 三世において最も勝れた佛世尊に帰命する。

(8-9) それは次のように。(10) 唵。(11-12) よく浄めよ。よく浄めよ。

(13-21) まさに等しく普遍の光明の拡散によって、所帰趣と陰難処の自性の、よく浄められたものよ。

(22-23) 私を灌頂せよ。(24-28) 善逝の選り抜かれた言辞をもつ、甘露の灌頂をもつて。

(29-30) 取り去れ。取り去れ。(31-32) 寿命の保持者よ。(33-34) 浄めよ。浄めよ。

(35-36) 虚空のごとく、よく浄められたものよ。(37-39) 頂尊勝のごとく、よく浄められたものよ。

(40-42) 千もの光線によって啓発されたものよ。(43-45) すべての如来を鑽仰するものよ。(46-48) 六波羅蜜を完満せるものよ。(49-55) すべての如来の心の加持によって加持された、大印もてるものよ。(56-59) 金剛の體の集合のごとく、よく浄められたものよ。

(60-64) すべての**障碍と墮陰の悪趣**から全く浄められたものよ。(65) 転廻せよ。

(66-67) 寿命のごとく、より浄められたものよ。

(68-69) 約定によって加持されたものよ。

(70-73) 宝珠よ。宝珠よ。大宝珠よ。(74-77) 真如の存在の際限にあつて、全く浄められたものよ。

(78-80) 高遠な覚悟によって浄められたものよ。

(81-83) 勝てよ。さらに勝てよ。さらに勝てよ。(84-85) 憶念せよ。憶念せよ。(86-89) すべての仏陀によって加持され、浄められたものよ。

(90-92) 金剛杵をもてるものよ。金剛杵を胎藏とするものよ。(93-99) 金剛杵となれ。私の、そしてすべての衆生の身体は。(100-101) 体軀の全く浄められたものよ。

(102-104) すべての所趣の全く浄められたものよ。

(105-109) また、すべての如来は、私を鼓舞せよ。

(110-113) すべての如来の鼓舞によって加持されたものよ。(114-116) 覚れ。覚らしめよ。覚らしめよ。

(117-118) あまねく全く浄められたものよ。

(119-125) すべての如来の心の加持によって加持された、大印もてるものよ。

(126) 幸あれ！

訳文後注

(3-7) Cf. Y 11-12: *te namah* 「汝に帰命する」と「佛世尊なる汝」に敬礼する。

(11-12) 通常は、この前段に単純に *śodhaya śodhaya* 「浄めよ。浄めよ。」があつて、*viśodhaya viśodhaya* が生きてくる。場合によっては、*pariśodhaya* に連なる。

(13-15) いわば同義語の繰り返し。「まさに」(*samaṃ*, “rightly”)を「比類無く」(*a-sama-*, “incomparably”)と読む例もあり。Cf. also *Text* Z.n. 4.

(22-28) Cf. *A* (T XIX 384c9/11/13-12/14/16: *both in Chinese & Siddham scripts*): *abhiṣṇatu mām sugata-vara-vacana-amṛtābhiṣekai* <h> (missing *sarva-tathāgatā* <h>) *mahā-mantra-padai* <h> (missing *mudrā*); Y 30-42: *abhiṣṇantu mām sarva-tathāgatāḥ sugata-vara-vacanāṃṛtābhiṣekair mahā-mudrā-mantra-padaib*: 「すべての如来は ... 大印真言の句をもった ...」。

(35-36) Cf. e.g. Y 52-54: *gagana-svabhāva-viśuddhe*: 「虚空の自性のごとき、よく浄められた」。

(37-39) Cf. e.g. Y 55-57: *uṣṇīṣa-vijaya-pariśuddhe*: 「佛頂尊勝のごとく、よく浄められたる」。

(43-48) 注義本に欠く。他本には見られる。同類の語群に書写者が惑わされたのであろう: cf. *Text* Z.n. 8.

(66-67) Cf. e.g. Y 91-93: *mamāyur-viśuddhe* / 「わが寿命のごときより浄められたる」。

(68-69) Cf. e.g. Y 94-98: *sarva-tathāgata-samayādhiṣṭhānādhiṣṭhite* / 「すべての如来の約定の加持によって加持されたる」。

(70-73) Cf. e.g. Y 99-113: *oṃ muni muni mahā-muni / vimuni ... / mati ... / mamati sumati* /

(78-80) この読みが古く正しいかも知れない。Cf. e.g. Y 118-119 / 120: *viśphuṭa-buddhe / śuddhe* / (100-104) Cf. e.g. Y 168-176: *kāya-pariśuddhir bhavantu* (read perh. *bhavatu*) *me sadā sarva-gati-pariśuddhiḥ ca* / 「われに常に体軀の清浄とすべての所趣の全き清浄とがあれ!」。これによって、実は、次の *ca* (D 107) に連なっていく。ところが、Y には次の D 110-113 がない!

(117-118) Y 本などは、ここまでかなりの文面を連ねる。ここは、*samanta-raśmi-pariśuddhe* (Y 201-203) となる。

(119-125) Cf. e.g. Y 204-216: *°dhiṣṭhite / mudre mudre mahā-mudre / mahā-mudra-mantra-pade* // 微妙に異なる内容と意図していることになる!

b			沒 ¹⁰				目
bh	婆	鼻	部		[陞]		
m	摩麼 ¹¹	彌	母	蜜 ¹²	銘		謨
y	也野		欲庚 ¹³				
r	羅囉	哩 ¹				囉	
l							路
v	嚩𑖀	尾					
ś	設	始	梳 ¹⁴				𑖑 ¹⁵
ṣ	漉沙				曬		
s	娑𑖑 ¹⁶		素				
h	賀			紇哩𑖑			

2. Nasals /Anusvāra / Visarga:

	<i>aṃ / āṃ / an / aṅ</i>				<i>-in</i>	<i>-uḥ</i>		<i>om</i>
m, n, ñ	𑖓 <i>raṃ</i> , 散 <i>saṃ</i> (<i>san</i> , <i>saṅ</i>), 僧 <i>saṃ</i> ; 𑖓 <i>māṃ</i> , [難] <i>nāṃ</i> ; 滿 <i>maṃ</i> , 𑖓 (=曼) <i>maṃ</i> , 琰 <i>yaṃ</i> .				𑖓 <i>sin</i> ¹⁷			𑖓 𑖑
ḥ						庚欲 ¹³ <i>yub</i>		

3. Consonant Clusters (with or without a sign of compound characters, i.e. 𑖑):

	a	i	u	e	ai	o	aṃ
k-y	<i>k-ya</i> 𑖑 𑖑						
j-r	<i>j-ra</i> 日羅 𑖑 日囉 𑖑	<i>j-ri</i> 日哩 𑖑					<i>j-raṃ</i> 日囉
ñ-c	(<i>si</i>) <i>ñ-ca</i> 𑖑 左 ¹⁷					(<i>sa</i>) <i>ñ-co</i> 散祖	

¹⁰ 沒 in 沒駄, *buddha*, and 沒 in 沒地, *buddhi*.

¹¹ I wonder if there is any rule to distinguish the two characters, i.e. 摩 and 麼: 摩賀, i.e. *mahā-*; 三摩野, i.e. *-samaya-*; 麼拏, i.e. *maṇi-*; 娑麼𑖑娑摩, i.e. *-samam sama-*; 娑麼𑖑囉, i.e. *smara-*; 麼麼, i.e. *mama-*; 三麼𑖑濕𑖑娑, i.e. *samāśvāsa-*. This is true to all the four versions, *D*, *A*, *B* and *Z*.

¹² 蜜 of 阿蜜哩 𑖑𑖑, i.e. *amṛta-*; it may well be mixed up with *amita-*: 阿蜜多!?

¹³ 欲 and 庚 of 阿欲 and 阿庚 respectively: *āyus-*, *āyuh*. Both 欲 and 庚 are used in *B* & *D*, but only 欲 in *A* & *Z*. 庚 of 阿庚 may well be a scribal mistake for 𑖑; cf. *Text D* n. 8!

¹⁴ 𑖑, *śud-*, of 𑖑弟, i.e. *śud-dhe*.

¹⁵ 𑖑 of 𑖑駄野, and 尾𑖑𑖑駄野 i.e. *śodhaya* and *viśodhaya*.

¹⁶ It is to be noted that 𑖑 is used for the Indic original prefix *sam-* in transliteration, and furthermore particularly when followed by the labial, mostly *m-*, at least in Chinese character, i.e. 三摩野, *sam-aya-*; 三滿𑖑 and 三𑖑𑖑, *sam-anta-*; but 三麼𑖑濕𑖑娑, *sam-āśvāsa-*. These phenomena must be universal in other Buddhist texts, e.g. 三摩地/提 (三昧耶, 三昧), *sam-ā-dhi-*; 三眉底與, 三彌底 (*Sammitīya-*), *Sam-matīya-* (<*sam-man-*), 三藐三佛陀, *samyak-saṃbuddha-* (*sam-y-añc-*).

¹⁷ 𑖑 of 阿𑖑鼻 𑖑左觀, i.e. *abhiñcātu* (VI *si-*: *si-ñ-c-*).

t-p	<i>t-pa</i> 吒播 _{二合}						
t-r					<i>t-rai</i> 袒賴 _{二合}		
t-v	<i>(sa)t-t-va</i> (薩)袒疇 _{二合}						
d-dh	<i>(bu)d-dba</i> 沒駄	<i>(bu)d-dbi</i> 沒地		<i>(su)d-dbe</i> 穉第			
d-y	<i>d-ya</i> 你也 _{二合}						
d-r		<i>d-ri</i> 捺哩 _{二合}					
d-dh-y	<i>(bu)d-dh-ya</i> 沒地野 _{二合}						
n-t	<i>(ma)n-ta</i> 滿夥 舅夥		<i>(ya)n-tu</i> 琰覩				
n-dh	<i>(sa)m/n-dba</i> 散駄						
p-r	<i>p-ra</i> 鉢囉 _{二合}						
r-g	<i>(du)r-ga</i> 訥槩 _{二合}						
r-t	<i>r-ta</i> 囉多 _{二合}						
r-bh				<i>r-bbe</i> 囉陸 _{二合}			
r-v	<i>(sa)r-va</i> 薩囉						
ś-c	<i>ś-ca</i> 室者 _{二合}						
ś-m		<i>ś-mi</i> 濕茗 _{二合}					
ś-v	<i>ś-va</i> 濕囉 _{二合}						
ṣ-ṭ	<i>ṣ-ta</i> 瑟吒 _{二合}						
ṣ-ṭh	<i>ṣ-tba</i> 瑟吒	<i>ṣ-tbi</i> 瑟毗 _{二合} ¹⁸					
ṣ-ṇ		<i>ṣ-ṇi</i> 瑟胝 _{二合}					
s-ph	<i>s-pha</i> <娑>頗 _{二合}		<i>s-phu</i> 娑普 _{二合}				
s-m	<i>s-ma</i> 娑麼 _{二合}						
s-r	<i>s-ra</i> 娑囉 _{二合}						
s-v	<i>s-va</i> 娑囉 _{二合}						

¹⁸ 毗, used only in the consonant cluster 瑟毗; cf. Z 毗, a popularized form of 毗; also *Text Z* Table, n. 6!

II-A.

不空・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼注義・校合*

The *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dbāraṇī* Annotated by Amoghavajra
Text Presented with Transliteration

(Z.672b.-7/T.388b.9) 佛頂尊勝陀羅尼注義

(Z.-6/T.10) 大興善寺三藏沙門大廣智 (T.11) 不空奉 詔譯

(Z.-5/T.12) 曩謨婆上識囉帝^{佛命} 怛囉^{世尊} 二合 路枳也^{三世亦} 三界

namo bhagavate trai-lokya-

(T.13) 鉢囉(Z.-4) 二合 底尾始瑟吒¹ 二合 野^{野殊} 2 沒駄^{引野} 大覺者 (T.14) 婆識囉帝
prativīṣṭāya buddhāya bhagavate(Z.-3) 同前 怛你也他^{引所譯} 3 囉^{亦即說} 囉^{亦云一切法本不生(T.15)亦云三} 藏亦云如來無見頂相也

* At the end of this text (abbreviated as Z hereinafter) it says that the text translated (i.e. transliterated) is Sinic in parallel with Indic including comments upon phrases: 如上所譯 店梵敵對 顯句標釋 (Taisho 974D: XIX p. 388c17). This may mean that the original version may have had the Indic text followed by Chinese transliteration in parallel to every line, like e.g. Taisho No. 973: XIX p. 372a28-373a29, or exactly T No. 974B: XIX p. 384b22-385c18; but unlike T No. 973: XIX p. 377a1-b6 (text in Chinese characters), followed by 377b7-c8 (text in Siddham).

— Hereunder I will try to transliterate the text from the readings in Chinese characters without inserting missing signs, such numerous examples as long vowels, i.e. 引, or for consonant clusters, i.e. 二合; e.g. 路枳也 二合, i.e. °lokyā, 曩謨婆上, i.e. °vabhāsa; 怛他 囉多 地瑟吒 二合, i.e. tatbhāgatādbiṣṭhānādbiṣṭhita-. Cf. also I-A: Text D fn.*!

¹ 吒 is used for both *ta* and *tba* in all the versions of this text (with no variant reading). Only one exceptional case of the character 吒 for 吒 is found, i.e. T XIX 372b2: 吒 of 鉢囉 底尾¹ 微室瑟吒 合耶: prativīṣṭāya. Furthermore, D uses 吒 for both *ta* and *tba*, but 吒 only for *ta*!

² So Z: 野殊勝, but D: 最 (of 最殊勝)

³ Read 怛你也 二合他², i.e. tad-yathā. 你 here could be “di”, as 你 in 敬祖你帝, i.e. samcodite, as if 你也 of 怛你也他² did not sound “dya”, but “dya” with an epenthetic -i- to the ears of the copyist/scribe. It may be less probable to see a phonological change of *d* and *n*, which may have meant -n- of a neuter pronoun tad-, tam, *tan? Furthermore, either 你 or 爾, used for 你 *ni*, may be correct in: 鉢囉 底尾 囉多也 (so Z, but 爾 for *ni* in D: 鉢囉 底尾 爾囉多 野), i.e. prativartaya, as long as it stands on the pronunciation at the time when it was copied. Then, it means that the latter represents an early Middle Chinese sound. This question is in actual fact much more complicated: cf. e.g. Edwin G. Pulleyblank, *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin* (Vancouver 1991), p. 223f, *n*: 你, *ēr*: 爾, ss.vv.

Cf. also Heinemann, *op.cit.*, p. 34 怛爾也他, and p. 33 怛姪他! These two are attested in the extant texts, see e.g. 怛爾也 二合他²: T XIX 367a-3, 384b-2/-1 (with tad-yathā in Siddham),

tad-yathā om

(Z.-2) 尾戌駄也^除 尾戌駄也娑摩娑 (T.16) 摩⁴三滿多^上 嚩娑娑
viśodbhaya viśodbhaya sama-sama-samantāvabhāsa-

(Z.-1) 普遍 娑頗^{二合} 囉拏^{六聲} 囉 (T.17) 底⁵ 誡訶曩^{六聲} 娑嚩^{三合} 婆去 (Z.673a1) 嚩
spbarāṇa-gati-gabana-svabhāva-

尾舜^入 弟^{自性} 阿^上 (T.18) 毗洗者觀^{灌頂} 銘^我 素嚩多^善 嚩 (Z.2) 囉
viśuddhe abhiṣīcatu mām sugata-vara-

嚩者曩^{引殊勝} (T.19) 教 阿蜜哩^{二合} 多去 毗灑^六 闍^{甘露灌頂} 亦云不死 (Z.3) 句灌頂露者^{法身解脫}

387b14, c-6; 怛儻野^令 他^引 T XIX 383c7, 怛唎他: T XIX 362c1 (v.l. 姪), 怛姪佗 (with *tad-yathā* in Siddham): T XIX 372b3/4. I wonder if this 怛姪他 is to read 怛姪也他. 姪 here is certainly for 你 or 儻; cf. e.g. Chou, *op.cit.*, Nos. 1631-1632 (姪), Karlgren, *op.cit.*, No. 413o/p (姪).

⁴ 娑摩娑摩, i.e. *sama-sama-*: some versions read *sama-* twice in this way, but some others do not repeat *sama-*. D suggests a reading: *samaṃ sama-samant°*, “equally equal ...”. However, Fa-tien (法天) reads: 阿娑麼娑麼 (T XIX 383c10), i.e. *a-sama-sama-*, “incomparably equal”. This very reading is also found in the Fan-shan (房山石刻) version transliterated by Tz’ü-hsien (慈賢); for details see Yuyama 1997. It is further noteworthy that this specific phrase, *a-sama-sama-*, is found in the inscription in six scripts on the wall at the Chü-yung-kuan (居庸關), carved most probably in 1345, and on the bronze bell at the Temple Yeon-bog-sa (演福寺) of Gae-seong (開城), capital city of the Koryō dynasty (高麗朝), cast by imperial order of King Ch’ung-mok-wang (忠穆王) in 1346. This must exactly be the imperially authorized version of the Yüan dynasty (元朝); cf. *supra* I, §1.1; further Yuyama 1985 & 1997.

⁵ 嚩 of 嚩底 may well be for 嚩 (諸橋轍次·大漢和辭典·修訂版, 1984-86: Vol. IX p. 1025c: No. 32478): i.e. *ga-* of *gati-*, while CBETA may read something different: “?[(薩 — 文 + (立 —))/木]”. It may be explained by the interchange of the radical 卩 (邑偏) = 阜, or 阜 minus 丨 (within the character).

⁶ Originally, this should have made a *sandhi* without the following sound 阿: *a-* of 阿蜜哩^合 多大^引 毗^上: *amṛtābbi°*, i.e. °*vacanāmrta°*. Cf. D: 阿蜜哩^合 多大^引 鼻^上: *amṛtābbi°*, i.e. °*vacanāmrta°*. Further confusion here is the opposite case, i.e. contrary to the preceding liaison, there should have been made a *sandhi* with a long-vowel sign after 多大 (D: 哆): i.e. 阿蜜哩^合 多大 (D: 哆)^引 毗灑闍 (D: 鼻嚩闍): i.e. *amṛtābbiṣekai<h>*!

毗灑闍, so Z, i.e. °*bbiṣekai(h)*: cf. D 闍 (of 鼻嚩闍), written probably for 闍. CBETA does not analyze the character here (with a question mark alone). In this connection further reference can be made to other source texts, e.g. T XIX 362c5: 阿蜜嚩多^合 鼻嚩闍, i.e. both *amṛtābbiṣekai(h)*; T 372b13/14-15/16: *amṛtābbiṣekai<h>* (in Siddham) / 阿謎嚩多^合 鼻嚩闍; T 377b11-12: *amṛtābbiṣekai<h>* (in Siddham); T 383c14-15 (法天): 蜜嚩^合 鼻嚩闍, i.e. °*mṛtābbiṣekai(h)*; T 384c11/12-13/14: *amṛtābbiṣekai<h>* (in Siddham) / 阿蜜嚩多^合 鼻嚩闍; T 387b18-19: 阿蜜嚩多^合 鼻嚩闍^引 闍^引 闍^引, i.e. *amṛtābbiṣekai(h)*. It may be expected to read with a word following it as in A (T XIX 384c9/11/13-12/14/16: both in Chinese and Siddham): *abhiṣīcatu mām sugata-vara-vacana-amṛtābbiṣekai<h>* (missing *sarva-tatbāgatā<h>*)

vacanā-amṛtābbiṣekai<h>

(T.20) 阿^引訶囉阿訶囉^{云唯願攝受唯垂授攝} (Z.4) 阿欲散 (T.21) 駄^引囉拏^{任持}
ābara ābara āyuh-saṃdhārāṇi

戍駄也戍駄也^{清淨} 誡誡曩 (Z.5) 尾戍⁷ (T.22) 第^{如虛空} 鄔瑟膩^{二合} 沙尾惹也
śodbaya śodbaya gagana-viśuddhe uṣṇīṣa-vijaya-

尾舜^入第^{佛頂} 娑訶娑囉^{二合} 囉濕弭^{二合} 散祖你帝^覺 (T.24) 薩^囉
viśuddhe sahasra-raśmi-saṃcodite sarva-

怛 (Z.7) 他^引藥多⁸ 地瑟吒^{二合} 曩^引 地瑟耻^{二合} 多 (T.25) 一切如來^神 力所加持
tathāgatādbiṣṭhānādbiṣṭhita-

(Z.8) 摩訶母捺哩^{二合} 印契若廣釋身印語印^{心印金剛印如理} (T.26) 趣般若說 嚩日囉^{二合} (Z.9) 迦也
mahā-mudrī vajra-kāya-

僧訶多^上曩尾舜第^{金剛鉤鎖} 薩^囉 嚩囉拏 (Z.10) 播野訥藥底¹⁰
saṃbatana-viśuddhe sarvāvaraṇāpaya-durgati-

跋哩尾舜第¹¹ (T.28) 一切諸淨一切障者所謂^{業障報障煩惱障皆得清} (Z.11) 淨也 鉢羅^{二合} 底你鉢多 (T.29) 也
pariśuddhe pratinivartaya

*mahā-mantra-pada*i<h> (missing *mudrā*-); Y 30-42: *abhiṣāntu mām sarva-tathāgatāḥ sugata-vara-vacanāmṛtābbiṣekair mahā-mudrā-mantra-pada*iḥ.

⁷ This single use of the character 戍 for *śu*(d) may simply be a scribal mistake for 舜 in Z.

⁸ Most probably due to the scribal confusion with a similar wording, here is a missing passage, i.e. (a)*valokanī śaṭ-pāramitā-paripūrāṇi sarva-tathāgata-bhṛdaya-*, which is to be found in D 45-53: 嚩路迦賴沙吒播^{二合} 囉弭哆^{二合} 跋哩布^{二合} 囉拏^{二合} 薩^{二合} 嚩囉拏^{二合} 他^{二合} 誡多^{二合} 哩^{二合} 鄔野^{二合}.

⁹ 摩訶母捺哩^{二合}, i.e. *mahā-mudrī*, may well be correct, as other examples shown in varied characters suggest, e.g. T XIX 367b8-9: 祇捺囉^{二合}, b27: 摩賀^{二合} 敵捺囉^{二合}, 373a27/29: 摩訶母姪囉^{二合}; 372c4: 摩訶母姪梨; 384a5-6: 母捺囉^{二合}, 母捺囉^{二合}, 摩賀母捺囉^{二合}; b11-12: 母捺囉^{二合}, 摩賀^{二合} 母捺囉^{二合} (with a wrong 囉 *ra*!), 385a4: 摩賀母捺囉^{二合}, but c16: 摩賀^{二合} 母捺哩^{二合}! 387b29: 摩賀^{二合} 母捺囉^{二合}. However, a few texts may intend a reading *mudre*, e.g. T XIX 37717-18: *mahā-mudre* (Siddham); Y (Gae-seong): °*mudre* (in *Lañ-tsha*)! Cf. but *infra* 摩訶母想囉, cum n. 23, also 15!

¹⁰ 訥藥底 of 薩^囉 嚩囉拏播野訥藥底, i.e. *sarvāvaraṇāpaya-durgati-*, seems to be missing in some versions of this text. Cf. T XIX 387c1-2: 薩^囉 嚩囉拏^{二合} (29) 波耶突囉^{二合} 揭底 (read: °突囉揭^{二合} 底): *sarvāvaraṇāpaya-durgati*. Cf. D 63: 訥藥^{二合} 底.

¹¹ 跋哩尾舜第, *pariśuddhe*, with another example below, may perhaps be better corrected to either 跋哩舜第 or 尾舜^入第, i.e. *pariśuddhe* or *viśuddhe*.

阿欲舜^入第^{壽命增長}三麼^{皆得清淨} (Z.12) 耶地瑟耻^二帝^{12 (T.388c1) 留顯}加持
āyuh-suddhe samayādbhiṣṭite

麼拏麼拏摩訶麼拏^{世實法寶所} (Z.13) 三種^{寶藏} 怛他 (T.2) 多步多句致
maṇi maṇi mahā-maṇi tatbatā-bbūta-koṭi-

跋哩舜^入第^{真如實際}尾薩 (Z.14) 普^內 13 (T.3) 吒沒地舜^入第^{顯現智} 惹也^{慧清淨}
parisuddhe visphuṭa-buddhi-sudhe jaya

惹也^{最勝最勝} 尾 (Z.15) 惹 (T.4) 也尾惹也^悲 娑麼^二囉^{14 智二門}
jaya vijaya vijaya smara

娑麼^二囉^{念持(T.5)定} 薩嚩沒駄^引地瑟耻^二多舜第^{入而佛加}持清淨
smara sarva-buddhādbhiṣṭita-suddhe

嚩日囉^二 15 (Z.17) 菩提心堅固^{如余剛也} 嚩日囉^二 藥陛^{16 證金} 嚩日覽^二 17 (T.7)
vajri vajra-garbhe vajram

娑嚩^顯 (Z.18) 金剛^觀 麼麼^{或義或爲他念} 設哩嚩薩嚩 (T.8) 薩怛嚩^二 難^{(Z.673b1) 引}

¹² 三麼耶地瑟耻^合帝, *samayādbhiṣṭite*, should perhaps be emended to 三麼耶地瑟吒^合帝, *samayādbhiṣṭhānādbhiṣṭite*. Cf. e.g. *supra* 怛他^引嚩多^引地瑟吒^合帝, *tathāgatādbhiṣṭhānādbhiṣṭite*! But cf. also *infra* 薩嚩沒駄^引地瑟耻^合多, *sarva-buddhādbhiṣṭita*-, which may also be emended to 薩嚩沒駄^引地瑟吒^合帝, *sarva-buddhādbhiṣṭhānādb*!

¹³ This word 尾薩普^六 合吒 should be nothing but *visphuṭa*-, i.e. 尾薩普^合吒. The editor expresses his doubt about it: 六疑二. I wonder why the scribe had made a mistake 六 for 二, i.e. 二合, which simply makes it read: *visphuṭa*-.

¹⁴ In the note the editor suggests a correction: 味勝勝疑殊勝殊勝. I am not sure if this emendation is acceptable. Needless to say, the meaning here is quite clear (cf. *Index*, s.v.)!

¹⁵ 嚩日囉^合, i.e. *vajri*, which may not be *vajre* (as in Y 141, 142, 159; cf. also Y 160: *vajriṇi*). One may compare it with D: 嚩日哩, i.e. *vajri* and also with a variously written *ri* of *mudrī*: see further *supra* n. 9! Cf. otherwise 隸 in Karlgren, *op.cit.*, No. 1241m, Chou, *op.cit.*, No. 10690, Pulleyblank, *op.cit.*, p. 189, s.v.! Thus, it may be explained as a vocative form of **vajrī*-, as compared with *vajriṇi*, voc. of *vajriṇī*-, fem. Cf. also Heinemann, *op.cit.*, p. 133: 縛日哩, 縛日哩拏: *vajri*, *vajriṇi*. Cf. however Heinemann, *op.cit.*, p. 154: 嚩日隸, *vajre*, voc.sg. of *vajrā*!

¹⁶ 藥 of 藥陛 may have had a final consonant of -t/-r, but may well be corrected to 藥囉陛 (so D), i.e. *garbhe*. Cf. Z Table, n. 3!

¹⁷ Cf. D: 嚩日覽^合, nom.sg.nt. of *vajra*-, as a predicate. Cf. also Heinemann, *op.cit.*, p. 133: 縛日藍, *vajrāṇi*, acc.sg. of *vajrā*! Cf. Text D n. 13!

¹⁸ This 觀 must come after 娑嚩, which read: 娑嚩觀^顯 金剛, *bhavatu*, 3.imper.sg. It is not a 2.imper.sg., but it goes with the subject *sarīraṇi*, nom.sg.! Cf. Text D 94: *bhavatu*, also Text D n. 13, also Taisho 974B: XIX 385b20/22: 娑嚩^引觀^顯 金剛 (Text B n. 11)!

bbavatu mama śarīraṃ sarva-satvānāṃ

者迦也尾舜弟^{一切有情}薩^(T.9)囉底跛哩尾舜弟¹⁹ (Z.2)^趣薩^{皆清淨}囉怛他
ca kāya-viśuddhe sarva-gati-pariśuddhe sarva-tathā-

囉多三麼濕^(T.10)囉^合娑地瑟耻^帝 (Z.3)^{如來安慰}沒^命棘^合沒^(T.11)棘^合
gata-samāśvāsādbhiṣṭhite budhya budhya

冒駄也^合能覺²⁰舜第^普 (Z.4)^{清淨}薩^係囉怛他^(T.12)囉多^引地瑟^{<吒>} (Z.2)^{二合}囉
bodbaya śuddhe sarva-tathāgatādbhiṣṭhā>nā-

地瑟耻^合多²² (Z.5)^{如來}摩訶母怛^(T.13)囉^{二合} (Z.7)^{大印所謂大印由入毗盧遮那曼荼羅受灌頂已後}
dhiṣṭhita-mahā-mudrī

(Z.6) 灌頂師受得本尊灌頂三 (T.14) 摩地觀智一念淨心瑜伽相 應行者別尊心等同毘盧遮那及諸菩薩能現入相成 (Z.7) 道速證菩提 薩若智也

娑囉 (T.14) 訶者涅槃義。所謂四涅槃。一自性清 (Z.8) 淨涅槃。 (T.15) 二有餘依涅槃。
svābhā

三無餘依涅槃。四無住處涅槃 (Z.9/T.16) 槃。如上所譯。唐梵敵對。顯句標釋

(Z.10/T.17) 寶永二年^西冬十二月十三日以如來藏 (T.18) 本書 (Z.11) 寫竟

兜率谷雞頭院闍梨嚴覺

(Z.12/T.19) 享保三歲戊戌九月令得忍寫校正了

(T.20) 慈泉

(Z.13/T.21) 文政六年癸未六月以東叡山真如院本令 (T.22) 他寫 (Z.14) 自校之了 龍肝

¹⁹ Cf. *supra* n. 11!

²⁰ 冒駄也 here should have been repeated as commented clearly: 令悟能覺 令悟能覺, i.e. 冒駄也 冒駄也 *bodbaya bodbaya*, so in D115-116 冒駄野 冒駄野!

²¹ Cf. *supra* n. 1!

²² Cf. *supra* n. 12!

²³ 怛 may have to be emended to 捺, as it is normally used for *ta-*. For 怛 “*ta*” is probably a scribal mistake for 捺 “*da*”, as proven in this phrase seen above (cf. *supra* n. 9!): 摩訶母捺^合, i.e. *mahā-mudrī*; cf. also D: 摩賀^引母捺哩^合, i.e. *mahā-mudrī*, and further 加句靈驗佛頂尊勝陀羅尼, 摩賀^引母捺哩^合 (T XIX 387c7), i.e. *mahā-mudrī* (read probably °*mudrī*, and not °*mudrī*!). Otherwise, it must possibly be °*mātar*, voc., or °*mātari*, loc., “Prajñāpāramitā, Mother of All the Buddhas Tathāgatas”, and less possibly °*mantra*, °*maṇḍara*? Note also that Amoghavajra comments: 大印由入毘盧遮那曼荼羅! Cf. further *supra* n. 9, also 15!

II-B.

不空・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼注義・原典再構

The *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dhāraṇī* Annotated by Amoghavajra
Text Reconstructed*namo bhagavate // trai-lokya-prativīṣṭāya buddhāya bhagavate //*

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)

tad-yathā / / om / viśodbhaya viśodbhaya //

(8) (9) (10) (11) (12)

sama-sama-samantāvabhāsa-spharaṇa-gati-gaḥana-svabhāva-viśuddhe /

(13) (14) (15) (16) (17) (18) (19) (20) (21)

abhiśīcatu māṇi sugata-vara-vacanā-amṛtābhiṣekaiḥ //

(22) (23) (24) (25) (26) (27) (28)

āhara āhara // āyuh-saṃdhāraṇi śodbhaya śodbhaya //

(29) (30) (31) (32) (33) (34)

gagana-viśuddhe / uṣṇīṣa-vijaya-viśuddhe //

(35) (36) (37) (38) (39)

sahasra-raśmi-saṃcodite / sarva-tathāgatādhiṣṭhānādhiṣṭhita-mahā-mudri / vajra-

(40) (41) (42) (43) (44) (45) (46) (47) (48) (49)

kāya-saṃhatana-viśuddhe //

(50) (51) (52)

sarvāvaranāpaya-durgati-pariśuddhe // pratinivartaya // āyuh-śuddhe

(53) (54) (55) (56) (57) (58) (59) (60)

samayādhiṣṭhite / maṇi maṇi mahā-maṇi / tatbatā-bhūta-koṭi-pariśuddhe //

(61) (62) (63) (64) (65) (66) (67) (68) (69) (70)

viśpṛṣṭa-buddhi-śuddhe //

(71) (72) (73)

jaya jaya vijaya vijaya / smara smara / sarva-buddhādhiṣṭhita-śuddhe //

(74) (75) (76) (77) (78) (79) (80) (81) (82) (83)

vajri vajra-garbhe / vajraṃ bhavatu mama sarīraṇi sarva-satvānāṃ ca // kāya-viśuddhe //

(84) (85) (86) (87) (88) (89) (90) (91) (92) (93) (94) (95)

sarva-gati-pariśuddhe //

(96) (97) (98)

sarva-tathāgata-samāśvāsādhiṣṭhite / budhya budhya bodhaya / śuddhe //

(99) (100) (101) (102) (103) (104) (105) (106)

sarva-tathāgatādhiṣṭhānādhiṣṭhita-mahā-mudri /

(107) (108) (109) (110) (111) (112)

// svāhā //

(113)

¹³ 沒 of 沒駄／沒地／沒職, i.e. *buddha*, *buddhi*, *budh-ya* (poss. for *buddhya*).

m	摩	弭	母	蜜哩 ¹⁴			
y	也 野 敝		欲 ¹⁵				
r	囉					囉	
l							路
v	轉 ¹⁶	尾					
ś	設	始	戍 ¹⁷				戍
ṣ	沙 ¹⁸				灑		
s	娑 ¹⁹ 薩 ²⁰ 一 ²¹		素				
h	訶						

2. Nasals / Anusvāra / Visarga:

	am / āṃ / an / āṇ				i-		om
m	滿 ²² , 覓 ²³ , 嚧 ²⁴ , 散 ²⁵ , 僧 ²⁶ , 難 ²⁷ , 輪 ²⁸				諱 ²⁸ sin/siñ		唵 ²⁸
ṇ			欲 ¹⁷ yuḥ				

3. Consonant Clusters (with or without a sign of compound characters 合):

	a	i	u	e	ai	o	am
k-y	k-ya 枳也						
j-r	j-ra 日囉	j-ri 日囉					j-ram 日覽
ñ-c	(si)ñ-ca 訖者					(sa)ñ-co 散祖	
t-r					t-rai 怛囉		

¹⁴ 蜜哩 合 of 阿蜜哩 合多¹⁴, i.e. amṛta / 甘露; it may well be mixed up with amita-, i.e. 阿蜜多!?

¹⁵ 欲 of 阿欲, i.e. āyuḥ.

¹⁶ 轉 of 轉多, i.e. varta-, in: 鉢羅 合底你轉多也, i.e. pratinivartaya.

¹⁷ 舜 of 舜第 or 舜弟, i.e. śu-dbe. Cf. D: 純第, i.e. suddbe. Furthermore, Z may have mixed it up with 戍 in 誡誡戍尾戍第¹⁷ 誡¹⁷ gagana-viśuddbe! This single use of the character 戍 for śu(d) may simply be a scribal mistake for 舜 śu(d).

¹⁸ 沙 of 鄢瑟賦 合沙, i.e. uṣṇīṣa. In general, it may represent a sound śa!?

¹⁹ 娑 of 娑摩, i.e. sama; cf. 娑 of 娑麼 合囉, i.e. smara. Cf. also next n. 21!

²⁰ 薩 of 薩轉, i.e. sar/sav-/sab-va, 薩怛轉 合難²⁰, i.e. sat-tvānām. Cf. 薩魯吒, i.e. sphuṭa-.

²¹ 三 of 三滿多²¹, 三麼耶, i.e. sa- of samanta-, samaya-; cf. Text D: Table, n. 16!

²² 滿 of 三滿多²², i.e. samanta.

²³ 覓 of 轉日覽, i.e. vajram.

²⁴ 嚧 of 設哩嚧, i.e. śarīraṇi.

²⁵ 散 of 散駄²⁵ 囉泥, i.e. sambhāraṇi, i.e. san-.

²⁶ 僧 of 僧訶多異, i.e. saṃbatana-, i.e. sañ-.

²⁷ 難 of 薩怛轉 合難²⁷, i.e. sattvānām.

²⁸ 輪 = mām / “我”.

t-v	(sa)t-t-va 薩怛囉						
d-dh	(bu)d-dba 沒駄	(bu)d-dbi 沒地		(su)d-dbe 舜成 ¹⁹ ・弟第			
d-y	d-ya 你也 ²⁹						
d-r		d-ri 捺哩/怛囉 ³⁰					
dh-y	(bud)dh-ya 沒𪛗						
n-t	(ma)n-ta 滿多						
n-dh	(sa)n/n-dba 散駄						
p-r	p-ra 鉢囉/鉢羅						
r-g	(du)r-ga 訥𪛗						
r-t	(va)r-ta 𪛗多						
r-bh				(ga)r-bbe 𪛗陸			
r-v	(sa)r-va 薩囉						
ś-m		ś-mi 濕𪛗 ³¹					
ś-v	ś-va 濕囉						
ś-ṭ	ś-ṭa 瑟吒						
ś-ṭh	ś-ṭha 瑟吒	ś-ṭhi 瑟𪛗 ³¹					
ś-ṇ		ś-ṇī 瑟膩					
s-ph	s-pba 娑頗		s-pbu 薩普 ³²				
s-m	s-ma 娑麼						
s-r	s-ra 娑囉 ³¹						
s-v	s-va 娑囉						

²⁹ Cf. Text Z, n. 3 on 你 of 怛你也他, i.e. tad-yathā!

³⁰ Cf. Text Z n. 9 & 23!

³¹ 𪛗 of 怛他𪛗多地瑟𪛗, 𪛗𪛗地瑟𪛗³¹多, i.e. tathāgatādvivīṣṭhānādbiṣṭhita, 三麼耶地瑟𪛗³¹帝, i.e. samayādbiṣṭhite, 薩囉沒𪛗地瑟𪛗³¹多, i.e. sarva-buddhādbiṣṭhita, 三麼濕囉³¹娑地瑟𪛗³¹帝, i.e. samāsvāsādbiṣṭhite, 薩囉怛他𪛗多³¹地瑟𪛗³¹多, i.e. sarva-tathāgatādbiṣṭhānādbiṣṭhita. As mentioned above, 𪛗 is simply a popularized form for 𪛗; cf. supra n. 6 & Text D Table n. 18!

³² As is noted in Z (also in T XIX 388c2, fn. 5), 六 “six” must be a simple mistake for 二 “two”, i.e. 二合: 尾薩普³²𪛗, i.e. viśphuṭa-. Cf. Text Z n. 13!

III-A.

不空・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼念誦儀軌法中之
佛頂尊勝陀羅尼・校合

Amoghavajra's *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dhāraṇī* in his *Vidhi*:*
Text Presented with Transliteration

(.25) 曩^引 暮^引 婆^引 誡^引 囉^引 帝^一 怛^引 嚩^二 路^引 枳^也 二^二 (.26) 鉢^引 囉^二 底^一 以^三 尾^引 始^引 瑟^引 吒^二 也^引 四^四
namo bhāgavate trai-lokya-prativiśiṣṭāya

勃^引 駄^引 耶^(.27) 五^五 婆^引 誡^引 囉^引 帝^六 怛^引 徧^也 二^二 他^引 七^七 唵^八 尾^引 成^(.28) 引^引 駄^也 九^九 三^引 麼^引 三^引 滿^引 多^引 囉^引 婆^引 娑^十
buddhāya bhāgavate tad-yathā oṃ viśodbhāya sama-samantāvabhāsa-

薩^二 頗^二 囉^(.29) 拏^十 一^一 壁^引 底^一 異^二 誡^引 賀^引 曩^{十二} 薩^二 囉^二 娑^(b1) 婆^引 去^引 囉^二 二^二 秣^引 輪^{律反} 下^下 並^並 同^同 第^十 三^三
spbaraṇa-gati-gahana-svabhāva-suddhe

阿^引 鼻^引 誅^左 四^四 鎗^(.2) 引^引 素^引 誡^引 多^引 囉^引 囉^引 左^引 曩^{十五} 蜜^引 嚩^二 多^(.3) 鼻^五 囉^引 囉^{十六} 入^入 阿^引 賀^引 囉^引
abhiśīcatu mām sugata-vara-vacanāṃrātābbiṣekai<ḥ> āhara

阿^引 賀^引 囉^十 七^七 阿^(.4) 引^引 欲^引 散^引 駄^引 囉^引 拏^{十八} 成^引 駄^也 成^引 駄^也 五^(.5) 十^十 誡^引 誡^引 曩^引 尾^引 秣^引 提^{十一}
āhara āyuh-saṃdhārṇi śodbhaya śodbhaya gagana-viśuddhe

* 不空譯・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼念誦儀軌法・一卷 (Taisho 972: XIX p. 364b-368a), in which is found an *Uṣṇīṣa-vijayā Dhāraṇī* Text: XIX 367a25-b25. — Numbering the words in the text is often confused or rather arbitrary. This is not always noted on every incorrect word by the Taisho editor(s), e.g. 薩^引 囉^引 薩^引 怛^引 囉^引 合^合 引^引 四^四 十^十 八^八 難^上 引^引 左^左, i.e. *sarva-sarvā¹⁶nām ca*. Needless to say, the number 46 should come after 難, i.e. *°nām*, or even after 左, i.e. *ca*, in the way this text shows.

— It may also be noteworthy that the second version (= the so-called ㊦) used for collation in the Taisho Edition reads the same characters as in D (see e.g. *infra* n. 4). It is the manuscript copied in 1353 and kept at the Temple Hōjū-in of Kōyasan: 文和二年寫高野山寶壽院本 (T XIX p. 364, n. 8). — Hereunder I will try to transliterate the text from the readings in Chinese characters without making such notes.

¹ No refrain here, whereas D repeats 尾式駄野, i.e. *viśodbhaya*.

² 薩 (v.l. 娑) 囉^二 婆^引 囉^二 (with no v.l. for 囉), i.e. *srabbāva*, may simply be a misprint for 薩囉^二 婆^引 囉^二, i.e. *svabhāva-°*.

³ Read possibly with a prefix 尾, i.e. 尾秣第, i.e. *°viśuddhe*; cf. D 尾秣律反第, Z 尾舜入弟; cf. *infra* n. 8!

⁴ Read most probably read 阿鼻誅左觀 (with ㊦: p. 367, n. 43), i.e. *abhiśīcatu*, as in D 阿鼻誅左觀; but cf. Z 阿鼻誅左觀!

⁵ Cf. D 囉左曩阿蜜哩^二 合^合 多^多, i.e. *vacanā-amṛtā°*.

婆轉觀^{四十} (18) 麼麼^{四十五} 某甲¹³ 薩轉薩恒^{四十六} 難上^左 (19) 迦上^也 尾^第 ^{四十} ¹⁴

bhavatu mama sarva-satvānām ca kāya-viśuddhe

薩轉壁底^{四十八} 跋哩⁽²⁰⁾ 祇^第 ^{四十九} 薩轉恒他^引 摩多^{五十五} 三摩⁽²¹⁾ 濕轉^{二合} 娑^引

sarva-gati-pariśuddhe sarva-tathāgata-samāśvāsā-

地瑟恥^{二合} 帝^{五十} 勃^勃 ⁽²²⁾ ^{五十} 冒^引 駄^也 冒^引 駄^也 ^{五十} 三滿多跋哩^祇 ⁽²³⁾ ^{五十} ^四

dhiṣṭhite budhya bodhaya bodhaya samanta-pariśuddhe

薩轉恒他^引 摩多^{五十五} ¹⁶ 地瑟恥^{二合} 曩^引 ⁽²⁴⁾ ^{十六} 地瑟恥^{二合} 多^{五十} 摩賀^引 敵捺^{二合} 盧^{五十八}

sarva-tathāgatādhiṣṭhānādhiṣṭhita-mahā-mudri

(25) 娑轉^{二合} 賀^引 ^{五十九}

svāhā

¹³ Here misses *A* a word, which *D* reads as follows: 設哩囉, i.e. *śarīraṃ*. It may have to be added here, otherwise it goes with the following *kāya*-°, “body”: “... my (= 某甲, ‘of so-and-so’) body”!

¹⁴ Here misses *A* a prefix, which *D* reads as follows: 跋哩尾^祇第, i.e. *pariśuddhe*.

¹⁵ Here misses *A* a long passage, which *D* reads as follows: 室者^{二合} 銘三^{三合} 麼^{三合} 濕轉^{二合} 娑^引 娑^引 觀^引 薩^引 恒他^引 摩多^{三合}, i.e. “*ca me samāśvāsayaṃtu sarva-tathāgata-sa*”⁹¹. This somewhat long lacuna must have occurred by the scribal confusion of a similar phrase. Cf. also *supra* n. 7!

¹⁶ Here misses *A* a word, which *D* reads as follows: 紇哩^{二合} 娜野^引, i.e. °-*brdayā*°. This is an interesting point to compare with *Texts D & Z*, i.e. *D sarva-tathāgata-brdayādhiṣṭhānādhiṣṭhita*-°, but *Z sarva-tathāgatādhiṣṭhānādhiṣṭhita*-°!

III-B.

傳空海所伝・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼・梵漢字雙書本

The *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dbāraṇī* in Siddhaṃ Script Attributed to Kūkai
Together with that in Chinese characters:*

Text Presented with Corrected Transliteration in Roman Script

(Page 384, column b, line 16) 佛頂尊勝陀羅尼

(17) ॐ नमो भगवते त्रै-लो(19)क्य-

(17) *siddhaṃ namo bhagavate trai-lo(19)kya-*

(18) 曩謨 婆伽縛帝 但路(20)枳也 亦云三界

प्रतिविशिष्टा बुद्धाय भगवते
prativiśiṣṭāya buddhāya bhagavate

鉢羅底尾始瑟吒野勝也 沒駄野婆伽縛帝 已上第一歸(24) 敬譯 秘文

(23) तदथा ॐ (col. c, line 1) विशोधय विशधय (read: विशो०)

tad-yathā om viśodbhaya viśodbhaya

但爾也 他所謂之義。 說之義 陀三身無見頂相 義。 已上第二(p. 384c2) 影表法 身門 尾戌駄也尾戌駄也 淨

सम-सम-समन्तावभस- (read: ०भास-)(5) स्फरण-गति-
sama-sama-samantāvabbāsa-spharāṇa-gati-

娑(4)麼娑麼三滿路縛婆薩 照曜 (6)娑頗羅 轉舌 拏鼻 經遍

गहान- (read: ०-गहन-)(7) स्वभाव-विशुद्धे
gabana-svabhāva-viśuddhe

識底識賀曩 林 娑縛 婆去 縛尾秣第 自然清淨。 已上第三淨(10) 除惡 趣門

(9) अभिषिंचतु मां सुगत- (11) वर-वचन- (read poss.: ०-वचना-०, or ०-वचनामृत० in sandhi with the following अ०) अमृताभि(13) पैकै (read: ०भिपेकै:)

abhiṣiñcatu mām sugata-vara-vacana-amṛtābbiṣekai<ḥ>

阿鼻訖左靚 願我 素識哆 逝 (12) 縛羅縛左曩 殊勝 言教 阿蜜哩 多去鼻 (14) 麗闍

स(15)मयँधिष्टे (read: सयाधिष्टिते) मणि मणि (17) महा-मणि
amayâdhiṣṭhite maṇi maṇi mahā-maṇi

三(16)麼野^引地瑟恥^二帝^{帝額}麼拏麼拏(18)摩賀麼拏^{世寶亦云法寶。所謂二種資糧。已上第六壽命增長門}

त(19)थता-भूत-कोटि-परिशुद्धे (21) विस्फुट-बुद्धि-शुद्धे
tathatā-bhūta-koṭi-parisuddhe visphuṭa-buddhi-śuddhe

恒(20)闍哆^{去引}部多句致跋哩秣^{真如實際(22)遍滿清淨}尾娑普^三吒沒地秣^{順現智}第^{惠清淨}

ज(23)य जय विजय विजय (25) स्मर
jaya jaya vijaya vijaya smara

惹(24)野惹野尾惹野尾惹野^{最勝最勝即是真俗二諦法門} (26)娑麼^二合羅

स्मर स(27)र्व-बुद्धा²
smara sarva-buddhā<dhiṣṭhita-śuddhe>

娑麼^二合羅^{念持定惠相應。已上第七相應門} 薩(28)摩沒駄^{引。一切諸佛} <地瑟恥^二多秣^{加持}第^{清淨}>³

नमो विपश्चिने (read: विपश्चिने) तथा(29)गताय
namo vipaśyine tathā(29)gatāya

曩謨毘婆尸寧怛他(30)嚩多野^{敬禮毘婆尸如來}

नमो शिखिने तथा(col. b, l. 1)गताय
namo śikhine tathā(385b1)gatāya

曩謨尸棄曩⁴ 怛他(385b2)嚩多野^{敬禮尸棄如來}

नमो विशभू (read prob.: विशभूवे or विशभूवे)⁵ तथा(3)गताय

² This is simply a scribal confusion affected by the following list of the names of the Buddhas. It should originally have been: सर्व-बुद्धाधिष्ठित-शुद्धे. This is attested by the words after the vocation to the Buddhas and Avalokiteśvara, although it looks as if the Avalokiteśvara Bodhisattva is combined with the following धिष्ठित-शुद्धे. It may hardly be an accusative. Little possible is a vocative? The textual comment “一切諸佛/all the Buddhas” offers no help to solve the question.

³ Cf. Text in Devanāgarī n. 2!

⁴ Read perhaps 尸棄寧, i.e. śikhine, dat.sg.m., as in Siddham script, for 尸棄曩, i.e. śikhinā!

⁵ Read probably *viśabbhūve tath°*, or possibly *viśabbhūve tath°*, dat.sg.m., as written in Chinese 毘舍浮吠. It may well be confused with Skt. *viśabbhāve*, dat., which one would expect here!

namo viśabbhū<ve> tathā(.3)gatāya

曩謨毘舍浮吠怛他(4)藥多野敬禮毘舍浮如來

नमो क्रकसंधं(.5)य (read prob.: क्रकसंधाय) तथागताय

namo krakasaṃdhā(.5)ya⁶ tathāgatāya

曩謨迦羅拘孫馱(6)野怛他藥多野敬禮拘樓孫如來

नमो कन(.7)कमुणिये (read: °मुनिये, or poss. °मुनये) तथागताय

namo kana(.7)kamuniye⁷ tathāgatāya

曩謨迦曩(8)迦牟曩曳怛他藥多野敬禮拘那含牟尼如來

न(.9)मो काश्यप्यै (read: काश्यपाय) तथागताय

na(.9)mo kāśyapāya⁸ tathāgatāya

曩(10)謨迦葉婆野怛他藥多野敬禮迦葉如來

(.11) *नमो शैक्यमुनिये (read: शाक्य°, and poss. °मुनये) तथागताय*

(.11) *namo śākyamuniye⁷ tathāgatāya*

(.12) 曩謨尺迦牟曩曳怛他藥多野(14)敬禮尺迦牟尼如來

(.13) *नमो आर्यवलोकिते(.15)धर्यै (read: आर्यावलोकितेश्वराय) बोधिसत्त्वय (read: °सत्त्वाय)*

(.13) *namo āryāvalokite(.15)śvarāya bodhisattva<ya>⁹*

曩謨阿利耶合縛路枳帝(16)濕縛合羅野冒地薩多縛合野敬禮聖觀自在菩薩

⁶ Read doubtlessly *krakasaṃdhāya*, dat.sg.m.; = 迦羅拘孫馱野; but the Chinese characters may suggest something like *Kraku(t)sundhāya*, or else; cf. e.g. Edgerton, *BIISD*, p. 196b: *Kraku(c)chanda* (1) (= Pali *Kasumdhā*), s.v., with variant readings *Krakutsanda*, *Kakutsunda*, **Krakutsunda*! Cf. Mahāvīyutpatti, ed. Sakaki, Nos. 90 *Krakucbanda<h>*, 91 *Kakut-sundab*.

⁷ Read probably °*munaye*, dat.sg.m., as correctly in 迦羅迦牟曩曳 and 尺迦牟曩曳 though both the dental *n* and cerebral *ṇ* are written in the same character 曩. Note further that -*ṇi*- (with cerebral *ṇ*) in *Kanakamuniye* must be a scribal mistake in Siddham script, while -*ni*- (with dental *n*) is written in *Śākya*°. This oblique case ending in -*īye* must be analogous to the feminine form (cf. Edgerton, *BIISGr*, §10.90, 10.97).

⁸ Read *kāśyapāya*!

⁹ Read *āryāvalokiteśvarāya bodhisattvāya*; but see next note!

धि(17)ष्टित-शुद्धे (one would here expect a reading like: सर्व-बुद्धाधिष्ठित-°)
 <dhi(17)ṣṭhita-śuddhe>

<地(18)瑟恥_{二合}多秣第_{三合}持_{三合}淨>¹⁰

वज्रि व(19)ज्र-गर्भे वज्रां (read: वज्रं) भाव(21)तु (read: भवतु)
 vajri vajrā-garbhe vajraṃ bhavatu

縛口哩_{二合}縛(20)日羅_{三合}藥_{三合}陛_{三合}藥_{三合}縛日覽_{三合}婆_{三合}浮(22)覩_{三合}藥_{三合}¹¹

मम श(23)रिरं (read: शरीरं) सर्व-सत्त्वनं (read: °-सत्त्वानां) च
 mama śarīraṃ sarva-satvānāṃ ca

麼_{三合}麼_{三合}是我之義自稱姓名。爲他人明稱_{三合}他姓名。已上第八金剛供養門 設(24)哩_{三合}覽_{三合}薩_{三合}縛_{三合}薩_{三合}怛_{三合}縛_{三合}難_{三合}左_{三合}

कय(25)परिविशुद्धे (read: काय-°) सर्व-गति-प(25)रिशुद्धे
 kāya-pariśuddhe sarva-gati-pariśuddhe

迦_{三合}野(26)跋_{三合}哩_{三合}尾_{三合}秣_{三合}第_{三合}薩_{三合}縛_{三合}識_{三合}底_{三合}跋_{三合}(28)哩_{三合}秣_{三合}第_{三合}淨_{三合}

सर्व-तथागता(27)श्च मे समश्वासयंतु (read: समाश्वा°) (col. c, l. 1) सर्व-तथागत-
 sarva-tathāgatāś ca me samaśvāsayantu sarva-tathāgata-

薩_{三合}縛_{三合}怛_{三合}他_{三合}藥_{三合}多_{三合}室_{三合}者_{三合}銘_{三合}三_{三合}麼_{三合}濕_{三合}縛_{三合}娑_{三合}琰_{三合}覩_{三合}(385c2)薩_{三合}縛_{三合}怛_{三合}他_{三合}藥_{三合}多_{三合}

समाश्वा(3)साधिष्ठते (read: °श्वासाधिष्ठिते) बुद्धा (5) बुद्धा विबुद्धा
 samāśvāsādhīṣṭhite budhya budhya vibudhya

三_{三合}麼_{三合}鼻_{三合}濕_{三合}縛_{三合}(4)_{三合}娑_{三合}地_{三合}瑟_{三合}恥_{三合}帝_{三合}沒_{三合}地_{三合}野_{三合}(6)_{三合}沒_{三合}地_{三合}野_{三合}尾_{三合}沒_{三合}地_{三合}野_{三合}

विबु(7)द्धा (read them all four perb.: बुध्, budhya, vi°) बोधय बोधय विबोध(9)य विबोधय
 vibudhya bodhaya bodhaya vibodhaya vibodhaya

尾_{三合}沒_{三合}(8)地_{三合}野_{三合}冒_{三合}駄_{三合}野_{三合}冒_{三合}駄_{三合}野_{三合}尾_{三合}冒_{三合}駄_{三合}(10)野_{三合}尾_{三合}冒_{三合}駄_{三合}野_{三合}能_{三合}令_{三合}覺_{三合}悟_{三合}。能_{三合}令_{三合}有_{三合}情_{三合}速_{三合}得_{三合}覺_{三合}悟_{三合}

¹⁰ This is certainly misplaced. It is not preceded by Avalokiteśvara Bodhisattva, but with all the Buddhas, i.e. sarva-buddhā° before the enumeration of the seven Buddhas; cf. *supra* n. 2.

¹¹ This must be emended to 婆縛覩, as the text in Siddham script suggests, i.e. bhāvatu (incorrectly written bhāvatu, as in other versions!). 婆浮覩 (with 浮, i.e. bhā) may well be influenced by the original root, bhā-?!. Cf. the above mentioned Tathāgata Viśabhū: 毘舍浮! Cf. *Text Z* n. 18!

समन्त-(.11)परिशुद्धे सर्व-तथागत-(.13)हृदया-

samanta-pariśuddhe sarva-tatbāgata-bydayā-

三滿<多>(跛)(.12)跛¹²哩秣第^{普通}薩縛怛他去^引囉多(.14)乞哩^{二合}娜野^引

धिष्टनधि(.15)ष्ट- (read: °धिष्ठानाधिष्ठित-)

°dhiṣṭhānādhiṣṭhita-

地瑟吒^{二合}瑟地(.16)瑟恥^{二合}多^{一切如來}力所加持

महा-मुद्रि

mahā-mudri

麼賀^引母捺哩^{二合}(.18)^{大印。所謂如來大印。已上第九菩薩清淨門。}

(.17) स्वाहा * समप्त (read: समाप्तम् or poss. समाप्ता)

svāhā * samāpam (or read: samāptā)

娑縛^{二合}賀^引吉^上之句。又云成就之義。已(.19)^{上第十成}就涅槃門

(.20)師曰。此陀羅尼凡有九本。所謂杜行鎧月照(.21)三藏。義淨三藏。佛陀波利
善無畏三藏。金剛(.22)智三藏。不空三藏等所譯本。及法崇注釋。弘(.23)法大師。
所傳梵本等也之中今以弘法大師(.24)梵本。與金剛智三藏所譯加字具足漢字本
(.25)所雙書也。件梵本是弘法大師在唐之日。惠(.26)果阿闍梨所授多羅葉梵本也。
七佛及觀音(.27)梵號裁于此中。異他梵本也。後人知之
(.28)佛頂尊勝陀羅尼
(.29) 建久二年辛

¹² 多 is missing, but 跛 is superfluously duplicated instead at the change of lines!

III-Ba.

傳空海所傳・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼・梵漢字雙書本之中

佛頂尊勝陀羅尼梵本¹

Text from Taisho No. 974B: XIX p. 384b17-385c17

Text Presented in Devanāgarī

(Page 384, column b, line 17) ॐ नमो भगवते त्रै-लो(.19)का-प्रतिविशिष्टा(.21)य बुद्धाय भगवते (.23)
 तद्वथा ॐ (col. c, line 1) विशोधय विशोधय (read: विशो०) स(.3)म-सम-समन्तावभस-(read:
 ०भास-)(.5) स्फरण-गति-गहान- (read: ०-गहन-)(.7)स्वभाव-विशुद्धे (.9) अभिषिंचतु मां सुगत-(.11)वर-
 वचन-(read prob.: ०-वचना-०, or ०-वचनामृत० in sandhi with the following अ०) अमृताभि(.13)पैकै
 (read: ०भिषेकैः) महा-मन्त्र-पदै (read prob.: ०पादैः) (.15) आहर अहार (read: आहर २) (.17) आयुः-
 सन्धरणि (read: सन्धारणि) शो(.19)धय शोधय गगन-विशुद्धे (.21) उष्णीष-विजय-विशु(.23)द्धे सहस्र-
 रश्मि-सं(.25)चोदिते सर्व-तथागताव(.27)लोकनि षट्पारमिता-(read: षट्-पारमिता-)(.29)परिपूरणि सर्व-
 तथागत-(p. 385, col. a, l. 1) हृदयाधिष्ठानेधिष्ठि(.3)त-(read: ०ष्ठानाधिष्ठित-)महा-मुद्दि व(.5)ज्ज-काय-संहतन-
 (read: ०-संहतन-०) विशु(.7)द्धे सर्ववरणिपयदु(.9)र्गति-परिविशुद्धे (read: ०सर्वावरणापय-०) (.11)
 प्रतिनिव(.13)र्तय आयुः-शुद्धे स(.15)मय्यधिष्ठते (read: समयाधिष्ठिते) मणि मणि (.17) महा-मणि
 त(.19)थता-भूत-कोटि-परिशुद्धे (.21) विस्फुट-बुद्धि-शुद्धे ज(.23)य जय विजय विजय (.25) स्मर स्मर
 स(.27)र्व-बुद्धा²

नमो विपश्चिने (read: विपश्चिने) तथा(.29)गताय

नमो शिखिने तथा(col. b, l. 1)गताय

नमो विशभू (read prob.: विशभुवे or विशभूवे)³ तथा(.3)गताय

नमो क्रकसंधं(.5)य (read prob.: क्रकुसंधाय) तथागताय

¹ According to the colophon, the Indic text in Siddham script is said to be a copy from a palm-leaf manuscript brought back by Kūkai (弘法大師・空海) and the other in Chinese characters from the one transliterated by Vajrabodhi (金剛智). Hui-kuo (惠果) had conferred the palm-leaf manuscript on Kūkai during his stay in China. As seen in the text, if it had ever existed in Japan, this has been transmitted with scribal miscopying one after another. In this chapter I have copied the text in the Devanāgarī script to see how it has been transmitted. Some mistakes reveal how they take place. To my regret, I have not succeeded to obtain a Siddham script for a word processor. — Let us hope to see the original manuscript recovered somewhere!

² Cf. III-B, n. 2!

³ Cf. III-B, n. 5!

नमो कन(7)कमुणिये (read: ०मुनिये) तथागताय

न(9)मो काश्चप्येय (read: काश्चपाय) तथागताय

(.11) नमो शैकामुनिये (read: शाक्य०) तथागताय

(.13) नमो आर्यवलोकिते(15)धर्येय (read: आर्यावलोकितेधराय) बोधिसत्त्वय (read: ०सत्त्वाय)

धि(17)ष्टित-शुद्धे (one would here expect a reading like: सर्व-बुद्धाधिष्ठित-०) वज्रि व(19)ज्र-गर्भे वज्रां
(read: वज्रं) भाव(21)तु (read: भवतु) मम श(23)रिरं (read: शरीरं) सर्व-सत्त्वनं (read: ०-सत्त्वानां) च
कय-(25)परिविशुद्धे (read: काय-०) सर्व-गति-प(25)रिशुद्धे सर्व-तथागता(27)श्च मे समधसयंतु (read:
समाधा०) (col. c, l. 1) सर्व-तथागत-समाध(3)साधिष्टते (read: ०श्वासाधिष्ठिते) बुद्धा (5) बुद्धा विबुद्धा विबु(7)द्धा
बोधय बोधय विबोध(9)य विबोधय समन्त-(11)परिशुद्धे सर्व-तथागत-(13)हृदयाधिष्ठनधि-(15)ष्टत-(read:
०धाष्ठानाधिष्ठित-)महा-मुद्रि (17) स्वाहा * समप्त (read: समाप्तम्, or poss. समाप्ता)

遊余白

悉曇学に関して、かつて少し触れたことがあるだけだが (e.g. Yuyama in Warder Volume 1993), 日本梵学史の枠内でも興味は尽きない。その後、種々の分野の専門家の論著に、目を惹くものが多い。色々の角度から悉曇を見なければならぬと考えさせられる。¹ ここでは難題を避けて、大企画の最終回を飾った待望の書・源顯兼編『古事談』(13世紀初頭?)の一節に引用されている兼意(*1072)の言葉で、余白を埋めたい。彼は仁和寺寛意に師事、その北院で傳法灌頂、後に師寛意を慕って高野山に入り、遍照光院に人住した仏画・梵字の達人だったという。² 上記の建久二年(1191)の東寺写本に少し先立つ頃の話として興味を惹く。その梵字に関する問答が面白いと思う。成蓮房兼意に触れた辺りで、鳥羽第五皇子・覺性が問うて、兼意が答える件である。³

件の兼意は、高名の梵字書きなり。五宮御室、「梵字は何様に書くべきぞ」と問はしめ給ひければ、「梵字と立石とは、頗るうつぶきたるがよく候ふなり」と申しけれ。

実は、これを読んで、先代の高野山遍照光院主・高野山大学教授・酒井繁創館典博士(1909-1988)の深く豊かな学殖に、専門を異にしながらも折々に触れ、その梵字の達筆にも親しく接することができたことを、いま懐しく幸せに想い起こしている。それにしても先生の急逝は誠に惜しく悲しかった。類焼という大火にあった翌月間もなくであった。

¹ See e.g. Saroj Kumar Chaudhuri, *Siddham in China and Japan* (= *Sino-Platonic Papers*, ed. Victor H. Mair, LXXXVIII) (Philadelphia: Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations, University of Pennsylvania, December 1998), 9, 124 p. — *An elaborate work with lots of information of the relevant topics.*

— Being a Japanologist, he has recently brought out a book: *Hindu Gods and Goddesses in Japan* (New Delhi: Vedams, 2003), (xvii), 184 p. (with no ill.).

Frits Staal, *The Sound Pattern of Sanskrit in Asia: An Unheralded Contribution by Indian Brahmins and Buddhist Monks* ("Sanskrit in Asia" to celebrate the Golden Jubilee of Her Royal Highness Princess Mahachakri Sirindhorn: Inaugural Session, Bangkok, June 23, 2005), A4: 30 pp.

² 川端善明・荒木浩校注、古事談・続古事談 (= 新日本古典文学大系, XLI) (東京・岩波書店, 2005), 『人名一覽』, p. 18a; 参看・三木紀人, “古事談”, 岩波・日本古典文学大系, II (1984), p. 608b-d; 補訂版・国書総目録, III (1965, rev. 1990), p. 432b-c.

³ 上掲書, p. 306f., cum n. 9.

III-Bb.

傳空海所傳梵本・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼・梵漢字雙書本中之

過去七佛・觀自在菩薩・歸依文

Homage to the Seven Buddhas and Avalokiteśvara Bodhisattva

(Taisho 974B: XIX 385a27-b16)

*In the Siddham script quite a few long-vowel signs on proper names are neglected,
while in the Chinese characters a few cluster signs are neglected.*

a27/29-28/30: *namo vipaśyine tathāgatāya* / 曩謨毘婆尸寧怛他藥多野^{敬禮毘婆尸³如來}a29/b1-a30/b2: *namo śikṣine tathāgatāya* / 曩謨尸棄曩¹怛他藥多野^{敬禮尸棄¹如來}b1/3-2/4: *namo viśabhuve tathāgatāya*² / 曩謨毘舍浮吠怛他藥多野^{敬禮毘舍浮²如來}b3/5-4/6: *namo krakusandbhāya*³ *tathāgatāya* / 曩謨迦羅拘孫駄野怛他藥多野^{敬禮拘維孫³如來}b5/7-8/10: *namo kanakamuniye*⁴ *tathāgatāya* / 曩謨迦曩迦牟曩曳怛他藥多野^{敬禮拘那含牟尼⁴如來}b7/9-8/10: *namo kāśyapāya tathāgatāya* / 曩謨迦葉婆野怛他藥多野^{敬禮迦葉⁴如來}b11-12/^{13/14}: *namo śākyamuniye*⁴ *tathāgatāya* / 曩謨尺迦牟曩曳怛他藥多野^{敬禮凡迦牟尼⁴如來}b13/15-14/16: *namo āryāvalokiteśvarāya bodhisattvāya* / 曩謨阿利耶^合縛路枳帝濕縛^合羅野
目地薩多縛^合野^{敬禮聖觀自在菩薩}¹ Cf. III-B, n. 4!² Cf. III-B, n. 5!³ Cf. III-B, n. 6!⁴ Cf. III-B, n. 7!

*This does not claim to be a table made exhaustively,
but is intended to see hints for more practical comparison.
For further details see supra I-D & II-C: Tables of Alphabets in D & Z,
as well as infra III-D: Index to Amoghavajra's Uśnīṣa-Vijaya Dhāraṇī Texts D & Z.*

1. Single Characters:

	<i>D</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>Notes</i>
<i>kai(b)</i>	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	
<i>ko</i>	句	俱	句	句	
<i>ga</i>	𪛗 𪛗	𪛗	𪛗 𪛗	𪛗	E.g. in <i>gati</i> -, <i>°gata</i> -.
<i>ca</i>	左 者	左	左	者	
<i>ti</i>	致	𪛗	致	致	
<i>ta</i>	𪛗 𪛗 𪛗	𪛗 𪛗	𪛗	𪛗 𪛗	
<i>tba</i>	他	他	多	他	
<i>di</i>	你	𪛗	𪛗	你	
<i>na</i>	𪛗	𪛗 𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	A 𪛗 in 𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗 <i>°sambatana</i> °.
<i>ni</i>	𪛗 𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗 𪛗	<i>D</i> 𪛗 is used in the title alone.
<i>dba</i>	𪛗 𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	<i>D</i> 𪛗 is used in the title alone.
<i>dbe</i>	第	提	第	第	
<i>ni</i>	𪛗	一	𪛗	你	
<i>bhi</i>	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	
<i>bbu</i>	部	步	部	步	
<i>mi</i>	𪛗	一	𪛗	𪛗	Phrase ... <i>ṣat-pāramitā</i> °, missing in <i>A</i> !
<i>ya</i>	野 也	𪛗 也	野 也	也 野 𪛗	<i>A</i> 𪛗 in 𪛗𪛗 <i>kāya</i> .
<i>yub</i>	𪛗 欲	欲	𪛗	欲	
<i>ra</i>	𪛗 𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	
<i>ram</i>	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗 𪛗	
<i>va</i>	𪛗 𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗 𪛗	
<i>su</i>	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗 𪛗	
<i>sa</i>	𪛗 沙	沙	𪛗	沙	
<i>se</i>	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗	
<i>ba</i>	𪛗	𪛗	𪛗 𪛗	𪛗	

	D	A	B	Z	Notes
<i>jra</i>	日羅囉	日囉	日羅	日囉	In <i>vajra</i> .
<i>jri</i>	日哩	日哩	日哩	日哩	In <i>vajri</i> .

<i>tadya</i>	怛你也	怛爾也	怛儻也	怛你多	In <i>tad-yatbā</i> .
<i>durga</i>	訥𑖀	—	訥哩𑖀	訥𑖀	<i>A</i> misses a phrase ° <i>paya-durgati-pari</i> °.
<i>pra</i>	鉢羅・鉢囉	鉢囉	鉢羅	鉢羅	
<i>manta</i>	滿哆・毋哆	滿多	滿跢	滿多	
<i>śca</i>	室者	—	室者	—	°- <i>tatbāgatās ca</i> , missing in <i>A</i> & <i>Z</i> .
<i>śmi</i>	濕茗	濕弭	濕茗	濕弭	
<i>ṣṭa</i>	瑟姪	瑟姪	瑟吒	瑟吒	
<i>ṣṭha</i>	瑟姪	瑟佗	瑟姪	瑟吒	
<i>ṣṭhi</i>	瑟恥	瑟恥	瑟恥	瑟耻	
<i>ṣṇī</i>	瑟拏	瑟拏	瑟拏	瑟膩	
<i>siñca</i>	𑖀𑖂左	𑖀𑖂左	𑖀𑖂左	𑖀𑖂者	
<i>spha</i>	娑頗	薩頗	娑頗	娑頗	
<i>sphu</i>	娑普	娑佈	娑普	薩普	In ° <i>sphuta</i> .

3. Variant Readings of Words in Chinese Characters:

	D	A	B	Z	Notes
<i>garbhe</i>	𑖀𑖂𑖀𑖂	𑖀𑖂𑖀	𑖀𑖂𑖀	𑖀𑖂𑖀	
° <i>nivarta</i>	𑖀𑖂𑖀𑖂𑖀	𑖀𑖂𑖀𑖂𑖀	𑖀𑖂𑖀𑖂𑖀	你𑖀𑖂𑖀	In <i>pratinivartaya</i> .
<i>buddha</i>	沒駄	勃駄	沒駄	沒駄	
<i>buddhi</i>	沒地	勃地	沒地	沒地	
<i>budhya</i>	沒地野	勃𑖀	沒地野	沒𑖀	
<i>mudri</i>	母捺哩	𑖀𑖂/𑖀𑖂捺𑖀	母捺𑖀	母捺哩/𑖀𑖂𑖀	Cf. Text <i>Z</i> n. 9 & 23 on 𑖀𑖂𑖀𑖀.
° <i>myta</i>	蜜哩哆	蜜𑖀𑖂𑖀	蜜𑖀𑖂𑖀	蜜哩多	Of <i>amṛta</i> .
<i>suddhe</i>	𑖀𑖂𑖀	𑖀𑖂𑖀	𑖀𑖂𑖀	舜𑖀・𑖀𑖂𑖀	
<i>hṛdaya</i>	𑖀𑖂𑖀𑖀𑖀	—	𑖀𑖂𑖀𑖀𑖀	—	Phrase °- <i>hṛdaya</i> -° missing in <i>A</i> & <i>Z</i> .

III-D.

不空

佛頂尊勝陀羅尼

加句靈驗本・注義

索引

Index to Amoghavajra's *Uṣṇīṣa-Vijayā Dhāraṇī* Texts D and Z

Transliteration in Chinese characters is given hereunder without phonetic signs with few exceptions.

Every Indic Aksara with its corresponding Chinese character(s) is to be found on the Tables of Phonetic Alphabets.

The numbers of word order alone are cited in the column Z when it offers the same characters as D (cf. supra I-D & II-C).

Chinese characters in Z are recorded in gothic italic only where they are different from D.

On account of limited space and ability I have made very little reference to the question of comparison between the Indic and Sinitic sounds. Needless to say, there is a long history of research in the relevant field particularly of the French Sinological circle since Stanislas Julien (1799-1873; cf. Yuyama, *Engène Burouff*, Iachioji-Tokyo 2000, esp. §3.2.5), and among others Henri Maspero in relation to the present concern (cf. supra I, §4.1.2). Since then a number of scholars have grown up under the stimulus of foreign scholars in Peking. At last this fact has just been pointed out by Xiaoqing Diana Lin, *Peking University: Chinese Scholarship and Intellectuals, 1898-1937* (= *SUNY Series in Chinese Philosophy and Culture*) (Albany: SUNY Press, 2005), esp. p. 1124. In China I would cite without hesitation the pioneering works by Lo Ch'ang-p'ei (羅常培: 09.VIII.1899-13.XII.1958; cf. Yuyama, "Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica (III)", *ARIRIAB*, 2004-2005, esp. p. 393; §5.3.0-2), who first contributed to this field with an enlightening article: "梵文韻言五母的藏漢對音研究", 中央研究院歷史語言研究所《集刊》, III, 2 (1931), p. 263-275 (with 2 tables on a large folded folio). This has fortunately been reprinted in a collection of his selected works, for example in the first place in 1963: 羅常培語言學論文選集 (北京・商務印書館, 1963), p. 54-64, with folded tables. One may also consult a new careful edition of his collected works with a foreword by Chou Ting-i (周定一): 羅常培語言學論文集 (北京・商務印書館, 2004), p. 70-84. I must also mention his illuminative work on the subject in voluminous book form published immediately after that from Shanghai (1933): 唐五代西北方言 (= 國立中央研究院歷史語言研究所・甲刊甲種之十二) (上海 1933), (iii), XXIII, 223 p., incl. num. tables, VIII pl. after p. 168, III folded tables after p. 189. For further details on Lo Ch'ang-p'ei and his works see e.g.: 北京市語言學會編／傅懋勳・周定一・羅常培主編／羅常培紀念論文集 (北京・商務印書館, 1983), 447 p., incl. num. tables, photos, & facsimiles; with a very useful chronological list of his works compiled by Chou Ting-i (p. 434-445).

	D	Z	Brief Notes
¹ <i>adhi-ṣṭhā- : adhiṣṭhita-°</i>	53,88,123 °地瑟耶咤 (88: °多!)	46,82,110 °地瑟耶多	° <i>adhiṣṭhānādhī-°</i> , cpd. — D 咤 : Z 咤.
² <i>adhi-ṣṭhā- : adhiṣṭhite</i>	69,113 °地瑟耶帝	62,102 °地瑟耶帝	<i>saṃayā-°</i> , cpd. — D 咤 : Z 咤.
<i>adhiṣṭhāna-°</i>	52,122 °地瑟陀義	45,109 °地瑟陀義	° <i>adhiṣṭhita-°</i> , cpd.
<i>abhi-ṣṭi- : ṣṭīcatu</i>	22 阿鼻訖左觀	22 阿鼻訖左觀	Cf. <i>abhi-ṣṭa-</i>
<i>abhiṣeka- : kaib</i>	28 鼻囉訖	28 毗囉訖	<i>amṛtābhī-°</i> , cpd.; cf. <i>abhi-ṣṭi-</i>
<i>amṛta-°</i>	27 阿蜜哩咤	27 阿蜜哩多	° <i>abhiṣekaib-°</i> , cpd.
<i>avabāṣa-°</i>	16 °鼻婆娑	16	<i>samantā-°</i> , cpd.
<i>avabokana- : ni : °ni</i>	45 °鼻路迦賴	Missing 45 of D	° <i>avabokani</i> , cpd.
<i>abam</i>	⇒ <i>mām, mama, me</i>		
<i>āpaya-°</i>	62 °播野	55	<i>sarvāvaranāpaya-°</i> , cpd.; cf. <i>Y °karmāvarana-°</i>
<i>āvarana-°</i>	61 °鼻囉拿	54	<i>sarvā-°</i> , cpd.
<i>āyus- : āyuh-°</i>	31 阿庚 (read prob. 庚, 66 阿欲)	31 阿欲, 59 阿欲	° <i>saṃdharanī</i> , 31; ° <i>-suddhe</i> , 66/59; cf. <i>Text D n. 8!</i>
<i>ā-bī- : ābava</i>	29, 30 阿賀囉 (refrain)	29, 30 阿賀囉 (refrain)	2 imper.sg.
<i>asūṣa-°</i>	37 鄺瑟吒灑	37 鄺瑟吒沙	First member of a cpd.; ° <i>vijaya-°</i> , cpd.
<i>om</i>	10 唵	10	ॐ
<i>kāya- : kāya-°</i>	57,100 迦野	50,94 迦也	<i>vāja-kāya-samhatana-viśuddhe</i> , cpd.; ° <i>-pariśuddhe</i> , cpd.
<i>koṭi-°</i>	76 句致	69	<i>tathatā-bhūta-°</i> , cpd.
<i>gagana-°</i>	35 誡武曩	35	° <i>-viśuddhe</i> , cpd.
<i>gati-°</i>	18,103 誡底	18,97 嚩底	Cf. <i>Text D n. 6</i> , <i>Z n. 5</i> .
<i>garbha- : °garbhe</i>	92 嚩囉陞 合	86 嚩陞	Cf. <i>Text Z n. 16</i> , & <i>Z Table n. 3!</i> — D 嚩 : Z 嚩.
<i>gabana-°</i>	19 誡賀曩	19 誡訶曩	Cf. <i>Text D n. 6</i> .
<i>ca</i>	99 (者; 107 者)	93; missing 107 of D	Enclitic particle “and”
<i>cud-</i>	⇒ <i>saṃ-cud-</i> , ° <i>codite</i>		
<i>ji-</i>	⇒ <i>jaya, vi-</i>		
<i>ji- : jaya</i>	81 惹野 (not repeated)	74,75 惹也 (refrain)	2 imper.sg.; cf. <i>vijaya</i> .
<i>tathatā-°</i>	74 相圖咤	67 相他多	° <i>bhūta-koṭi-pariśuddhe</i> , cpd.
<i>tathāgata-°</i>	44,50 相他誡咤; 111 °嚩多, 120 °嚩多	Misses 44,50 of D; 100,108 相他嚩多	Used as a stem: <i>sarva-°</i> — D 嚩 : Z 嚩.
<i>tathāgata- : °as ca</i>	106 相他嚩多望者 合	Missing 106 of D	Nom.pl.masc.: <i>sarva-°</i>
<i>tad-°</i>	8 恒怛	8	<i>tad-yatbā</i> 恒怛也
<i>trai-°</i>	3 相囉	3	<i>trai-lokya</i> 相囉路想也
<i>dergati-°</i>	63 訶嚩底	56 訶嚩底	<i>sarvāvaranāpaya-°</i> , cpd. — D 嚩 : Z 嚩.
<i>namas- : namo</i>	1 曩謨	1	

<i>paripāraṇa-</i> , ° <i>ṇi</i> - : ° <i>ṇi</i>	48 跛哩布囉尼	Missing 48 of D	<i>sat-pāramitā-</i> °, cpd.
<i>pari-vi-śudh-</i> : <i>pariśuddhe</i>	64 跛哩尾疏第	57 跛哩尾第	Cf. Z 95 尾第, i.e. ° <i>śuddhe</i>
<i>pari-śudh-</i> : <i>pariśuddhe</i>	77, 104, 118 跛哩疏第	70, 98 跛哩第	Z: °第 & °第 mixed up.
<i>pāramitā-</i> °	47 播囉咄哆	Missing 47 of D	<i>sat-</i> °, cpd.
<i>prati-ni-ṣṛt-</i> : <i>pratinivṛṇya</i>	65 鉢囉底賴囉囉多野	58 鉢囉底你蘇多也	2.imper.sg.; cf. also Text Z n. 3!
<i>prativṛṣṭa-</i> : ° <i>āya</i>	5 鉢囉底尾始瑟吒野	5° 尾始瑟吒野	
¹ <i>buddha-</i> : ° <i>buddha-</i> °	87 沒駄	81	<i>sarva-buddhādhiṣṭhita-śuddhe</i> , cpd.
² <i>buddha-</i> : ° <i>āya</i>	6 沒駄野	6	
<i>buddhi-</i> °	79 沒地	72	<i>visphūta-buddhi-śuddhe</i> , cpd.
¹ <i>budh-</i> : <i>budh-ya</i>	114 沒地野 (not repeated)	103, 104 沒地 (refrain)	IV: 2.imper.sg.; cf. <i>bodhaya</i> .
² <i>budh-</i> : <i>bodh-aya</i>	115, 116 冒駄野 (refrain)	105 冒駄也 (not repeated)	1: 2.imp.sg.caus.; cf. <i>budhya</i> . Cf. Text Z n. 20!
<i>bhagavat-</i> : ° <i>re</i>	2, 7 婆伽婆帝	2, 7	
<i>bhū-</i> : <i>bhavatū</i>	94 婆囉視	88	3.imper.sg.
<i>bhūa-</i> °	75 步哆	68 步多	<i>tathatā-bhūta-koṭi-pariśuddhe</i> , cpd.
<i>manī-</i> : <i>manī</i>	70, 71, 73 麼泥	63, 64, 66	73/66 <i>mahā-</i> °, cpd.
<i>mabar-</i> : <i>mahā-</i> °	54, 72, 124 摩賈	47, 65, 111 摩訶	° <i>mudrī-</i> , ° <i>manī</i> , cpds.
<i>mama</i>	95 麼麼	89	1.pron.gen.sg.; cf. <i>me</i> .
<i>mām</i> : <i>mām</i>	23 鎗	23	1.pron.acc.sg.
* <i>mudrī-</i> : <i>mudrī</i>	55, 125 母捺哩	48; and 112 母但	<i>mahā-</i> °, cpd., voc.f.sg.; Cf. Text Z n. 9 & 23!
<i>me</i>	108 銘	Missing 108 of D	Gen.-dat.sg.pron.encl. (with <i>sam-ā-śvas-</i>); cf. <i>mama</i> .
<i>yathā</i>	9 也他	9	<i>tad-yathā</i> 担你他
<i>rasmi-</i> °	41 囉濕若	41 囉濕弼	<i>sabāsa-</i> °, cpd.
<i>lokyā-</i> °	4 路枳也	4	<i>trāt-lokyā-</i> 担囉路枳也
<i>vacanā-</i> °	26 喇左囊	26 喇者囊	Cf. Text Z n. 6.
¹ <i>vāra-</i> : <i>vāra-</i> °	56 喇日羅; 91 喇日囉	49 喇日囉, 85	° <i>kāya-</i> °, ° <i>garbha-</i> °, cpds.
² <i>vāra-</i> : <i>vāraṇi</i>	93 喇日覽	87 喇日覽	Nom.sg.nt., i.e. ~ <i>bhacatu!</i> Cf. Text Z n. 17!
* <i>vāprī-</i> : <i>vāprī</i>	90 喇日哩	84 喇日哩	Voc.sg.fem. Cf. further Text Z n. 15!
<i>vara-</i> °	25 喇囉	25	
<i>vijaya-</i> : ° <i>vijaya-</i> °	38 尾{惹野}	38 尾惹也	<i>uṣṇīsa-</i> °, a stem in cpd.
<i>vi-jī-</i> : <i>vijaya</i>	82, 83 尾惹野 (refrain)	76, 77 尾惹也 (refrain)	2.imper.sg. (cf. supra <i>jī-</i>).
¹ <i>vi-śudh-</i> : <i>viśodhaya</i>	11, 12 尾式駄野	11, 12 尾成駄也	2.imper.sg.
² <i>vi-śudh-</i> : ° <i>viśuddhe</i>	21, 36, 39, 59 尾疏第	21 尾第, 36° 成第, 39, 52° 第	Last member of cpds.; cf. ° <i>śudh-</i> , Note 第 & 第 in Z.
<i>visphūta-</i> °	78 尾婆普吒	71 尾婆普吒	° <i>buddhi-śuddhe</i> , cpd.; cf. Skt. ° <i>spṛi-</i> , ° <i>spṛiṭa-</i> .

<i>vyt-</i>	⇒ <i>prati-ni-vyt-</i>			
<i>sarira-</i> : <i>sariraṇa</i>	96 設哩囉		91 設哩囉	
¹ <i>śudh-</i>	⇒ ^{1/2} <i>ut-</i> °, <i>pari-</i> °, <i>parit-</i> °, ^{2/3} <i>śudh-</i>			
² <i>śudh-</i> : <i>śudhaya</i>	33, 34 式駄野 (refrain)		33, 34 式駄也 (refrain)	2. imper.sg.
³ <i>śudh-</i> : <i>śuddhe</i>	67, 80, 89 禰弟		60, 73, 83, 106 禰弟	Cf. ² <i>vi-śudh-</i> . Z differs from D: <i>samanta-parisuddhe</i> !
<i>śvas-</i>	⇒ <i>sam-ā-śvas-</i>			
<i>śas-</i> : <i>śat-</i> °	46 沙訶		Missing 46 of D	° <i>pāramitā-paripūrāṇi</i> , cpd.
<i>sambhātana-</i> °	58 僧賀多曷		51 僧詞多曷	<i>vajra-kāya-</i> °, cpd.
<i>sam-cud-</i> : ¹ <i>rodite</i>	42 散祖你帝		42	<i>sam-cud-ayati</i> , caus.
<i>sattva-</i> : <i>sattvānām</i>	98 薩祖囉(囉)		92	
<i>śaṇḍhāraṇa-</i> : ¹ <i>ni</i>	32 散駄囉泥		32	<i>āyub-</i> °, cpd.
² <i>śanda-</i> : <i>śanda-</i> °	14 娑摩		14	
³ <i>śanda-</i> : <i>śamāṇa</i>	13 娑摩		13 娑摩	Cf. both Texts D & Z n. 4.
<i>kamanta-</i> °	15 三滿多, 117 三男哆		15 三滿多; missing 117 of D	Used as a stem in cpds.
<i>śāṇḍhāva-</i> °	68 三摩野		61 三摩耶	° <i>ādhiṣṭhite</i> , cpd.
<i>sam-ā-śvas-</i> : <i>śvācayanta</i>	109 三摩濕囉娑我囉		Missing 109 of D	3. pl. imper. caus. with <i>me</i>
<i>samāktava-</i> °	112 三摩濕囉娑		101	<i>sarva-tathāgata-</i> °
<i>sarva-</i> °	43, 49, 60, 86, 97, 102, 105, 110, 119 薩囉		53, 80, 91, 96, 99, 107; missing 105 of D	Only first member of cpds.; D 43, 49 confused in Z.
<i>sahasra-</i> °	40 娑賀娑囉		40	° <i>rasmi-sammodite</i> , cpd.
<i>śi-</i>	⇒ <i>adbi-śi-</i> ; also <i>abbhaka-</i>			
<i>sugata-</i> °	24 素嚧哆		24 素嚧多	
<i>stbā-</i> : <i>adbi-ṣṭhā-</i>	⇒ <i>adbi-ṣṭhā-</i> : <i>adbiṣṭhita-</i>			Cf. also <i>adbi-ṣṭhāna-</i>
<i>spbarasa-</i> °	17 <娑> 薩囉娑		= 17 娑薩囉娑	
<i>śm-</i> : <i>śmāra</i>	84, 85 娑摩囉 (refrain)		78, 79 (refrain)	2. imper.sg.
<i>śabbhāva-</i> ° : ¹ <i>śvabhāva-</i> °	20 (娑) 薩婆囉		= 20 娑薩婆囉	A long cpd.
<i>śvābā</i>	126 娑囉(賀)		111 娑囉囉	
<i>by-</i>	⇒ <i>ābāra</i>			
<i>brdaya-</i> °	51, 121 總哩娜野		Missing 51, 121 of D	<i>sarva-tathāgata-</i> °, cpd.

Keywords: 不空・佛頂尊勝陀羅尼・Uṣṇīṣa-vijaya Dhāraṇī / 佛頂尊勝陀羅尼注義・上野東叡山真如院・湯島根生院・龍耳

Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica (IV)

湯山 明

§1. 『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼注義』 — 夢路に日本梵学資料を求めて

1.0.0. 不空の『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼』と『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼注義』写本 パリの国立図書館に所蔵される敦煌出土の不空音訳『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼』(Fonds Pelliot chinois: N° 4501) は、かねてから見たいと願っていたが、¹ 一応調査に耐える写真覆刻を得たので、その概略を本号に取りあげた。² この種の典籍には本邦のみに遺る文物に貴重な関連資料が潜んでいることが多い。『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼注義』(T No. 974D: XIX p. 388b5-c, end) もまた、不空の『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼』を考究する上での比較資料になろうと思っても当然であろう。『注義』とあるからには、原典を確認できて、異同を解明できると考えたからである。結果としては、必ずしも大きな期待ほどに応えるものではなかった。両典籍を比較してみると、果たして不空自身に最終決定した『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼』原典とインド語音の漢字音写法が確立していたのか、今は疑問に思うしかない。しかし比較を試みるに足る典籍が眼前にあることは確かであり、参照を怠る手はなく、比較照合に値することに疑いはない。これは、本邦のみに伝承した貴重なものである。大正蔵は、しかし、続蔵を底本に転写・編纂していて、原資料たる写本を基に編んだ気配がない。³ 本典籍は、跋文を見る限り、続蔵編纂者の前には現前したに相違ないが、寛永二年(1625 CE)、享保三年(1718)、そして文政六年(1823)と長きに亘って連綿と受け継がれてきたものだ。そのどれか三点のうち一つでも検分したくなるのは自然であろう。しかし、残念ながら、筆者は何れも実見できないでいる。以下は、一笑に付されそうな資料探索準備にいたる告白文である。

1.0.1. 来歴が判っているにもかかわらず、誠に残念ながら、この『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼注義』の原写本の在處が今に判然としない。また、跋記者に関しても、この分野に暗い筆者の知る由もないが、その最後に「文政六年癸未六月東叡山眞如院本令他寫自校之了」と記述して署名する「龍肝」の名が見える(大正蔵 XIX p. 388c 末: 本号拙稿 II-A 参照)。そこで文政六年・東叡山／眞如院・龍肝という三つの鍵語を頼りに、種々の情報を掻き集めて、その界限を素人流に調べてみたい。怠慢のゆえに、白らは足の労を執らずに、まずは紙の上の散策となる。幸いに、最近は、古地図熱の恩恵に浴すこともできる。筆者の愚鈍な探索法では発掘できる筈もなかろうが、既に在処を知る方が名告り出て、写本の研究成果を公表してくれるかもしれないと、実は密かな期待をこめている。

1.1.0. 上野寛永寺の子院・眞如院 まず、東叡山・寛永寺には、その子院として眞如院が現存する。現在は上野公園十五番地である。上野駅公園口を出て北東方向に進み、両大師橋からの道に突き当たって左折し、東京国立博物館構内の手前で右折して進めば、往時よりも狭くなった境内に寛永寺の十数院の脇寺が立つ。博物館に面して並ぶ最後が眞如院である。今は現龍院・修禪院・泉龍院・吉祥院・林光院・寒松院・眞如院の順となる。江戸末期の地図には、現在よりも広い土地に三十数戸の子院がみえ、その配置も随分と違っていたようだ。当時は、少なくとも今もある見明院と、かつてあった青龍院という寺院の間に眞如院は建っていたらしい。福田千鶴の努力で、首都大学東京図書館所蔵の『水野家文書』が計数情報化されて、電子記憶画像が公開されたので、貴重な賜物『寛永寺古地図』(D1-17-2/154) も見るという恩恵に与った。嘉永四年(1851)に

¹ Cf. Paul Demiéville ad Paul Pelliot, *Les débuts de l'imprimerie en Chine* (= *Œuvres posthumes de Paul Pelliot*, IV) (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale - Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1953), p. 49 n. 1!

² 本号所収拙稿「不空音訳敦煌出土佛頂尊勝陀羅尼」参照。

³ 筆者は台北から出た藏經書院刊行の覆刻版を用いた: 『新編・正續藏經』, CIV (臺北・新文豐出版, 1994), p. 672b-673b. — 上記拙稿注 33 参照。

戸松昌訓が著し、廻町の著名な板元・尾張屋清七が刊行し、その後改版して流布した『東都下谷絵圖』は、関連の場所探しに大いに役立ったことはいまでもあるまい。あるいは現今の観光案内のようなものも役立つことがある。

1.1.1. 何はともあれ、筆者の関心は、この辺りに『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼注義』の原写本が在るかどうかである。確かに、いわゆる彰義隊の上野戦争（慶応四／1868年五月十五日）が発端の江戸大火と、さらに太平洋戦争末期の米軍の東京大空襲（昭和二十／1945年三月十日）は、多くの子院を焼失せしめた。惨い大空襲では、真如院を含む八院が被爆したというので、貴重な典籍も灰燼に帰してしまったかも知れない。東京都教育庁の最近の調査報告を見る限りでは、果たして資料を網羅した綿密な研究成果なのか判らないが、残念なことに若干の資料を垣間見ることが出来るに過ぎない。あるいは難を逃れてもっと多くの貴重な資料があるのではないかと、何か歯がゆい思いがしてならない。少なくともこれに直接関係する資料を見出さない⁴。大正大蔵經の編纂時に近場にあったかもしれない資料を見れずに、續藏經を写し取るしか仕方がなかったのだろうか。もし二度の災難で散佚したとすると、今の望みは龍肝が保管したであろう写本の行方である。

1.2.0. 湯島の靈雲寺 龍肝の名を頼りに探してみると、奇縁というべきか同名の人の筆になる書物に、文政四年（1821）の年号を付す常照和尚述・智定和尚記『秘密儀軌傳授録』（写本一冊）が目に止まった⁵。その解説にいう：「文政四年四月廿七日に開白し、十月二十九日に結願す。總て九十二席、禮懺法により、讀歎法迄智明大和尚の秘密儀軌傳授要記に依りて傳授したり。……傳授阿闍梨は靈雲寺第十世常照大和尚にして、同聽者……龍肝法師（現生院設 舊法華院）……」と。龍肝は、文政六年に、『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼注義』の真如院本を写させて自ら校正したというから、秘密儀軌を靈雲寺で伝授された根生院の龍肝とは、この場の尋ね人と推理してもおかしくあるまい。

1.2.1. ところで靈雲寺は、犬公方と渾名された徳川幕府五代將軍綱吉（1646-1709；在位 1680-1709）が祈願寺院として、湯島聖堂を建立した翌年の元禄四年（1691）に創建した。湯島の靈雲寺と聞けば、日本のみならず西欧の梵學史上にも名高く、不朽の業績を遺した開基・河内の覺彦・淨嚴律師（1639-1702）の活躍した江戸は湯島の名刹である⁶。「覺彦さま」「覺彦さん」と、庶民にも親しまれていたらしい。果たせるかなと思っても当然であろう。江戸に新安（祥寺）流を興し、綱吉の信仰を得たことでも知られる。今に「眞言宗靈雲寺派總本山・寶林山大悲心院・靈雲寺」である。古地図などでは、筆者に知る術がないが、隣に今も立つ湯島小学校（明治三年／1870に東京に六校できたうちの一つで第四校）は大正四年（1915）に本郷の本妙寺から移されて靈雲寺の境内に建てられたというから、かなりの敷地を有していたのであろう。今は鐘樓は境内に跡地が残るのみで、東京都文京区教育委員会が昭和 56 年（1981）かに立てた文化財表示の看板によれば、淨嚴の撰文になる銘を陽刻した銅鐘は創建時の鑄造になる。その鐘は本堂の石の基台の片隅に置かれていて、心ない人々の散歩に連れ添う犬たちの立ち寄り場所になってしまっている。余りにも悲しい光景だ。銅鐘は五字五行を刻む幾つかの区面に分かれているらしい。その区面の一に「一切如來大／乘現證三摩／耶百字眞言」の三行があり、次いで「唵」に始まる悉曇字も縦書きで連なる。この折角に三百年余を経て伝わる梵鐘が、文京区教育委員会のいう「郷土愛をはぐくむ文化財」に相応しい場（鐘樓）を得て、美しい音を街に響かせて欲しい。そして貴重な文化財としての梵學資料が写真覆刻され、研究成果が公刊されるよう願って止まない。

⁴ 東京都教育庁生涯学習部文化課編刊・寛永寺及び子院所蔵文化財総合調査報告、上巻：石造遺物・聖教典籍編（1999.3）。—[典籍班：水上文義・大久保良峻・牧野和夫・門屋温・伊藤聡・滝川善海]。

⁵ 三好龍肝編著・眞言密教靈雲寺派關係文獻解題（東京・国書刊行会、1976）、p. 338; No. 1416。

⁶ Cf. further A. Yuyama, "An Appraisal of the History of Sanskrit Studies in East Asia", *Studies on Buddhism in Honour of Professor A. K. Warder*, ed. N. K. Wagle & F. Watanabe (= *South Asian Studies Papers*, No. 5) (Toronto: Centre for South Asian Studies, University of Toronto, 1993), p. 198 (cum n. 16 on p. 202).

1.2.2. この霊雲寺で上記の儀軌を伝受した多くの面々は、肩書きからして、恐らく真言宗関連の寺院主などの錚々たる人物であったろう。そうした中で、龍肝は根生院の役僧で法壽院の学僧ということか、あるいは法壽院は単に彼の法名なのか。法壽院という寺院は、いかにも在りそうな名であるが、江戸・東京に今に見出せないでいる。

1.3. 神田・下谷・湯島の根生院　そこで根生院の在処を探すと、湯島の霊雲寺から北北東へ湯島の天満宮、いわゆる湯島天神を横目に真如院のある上野の寛永寺へ出る。さらに緑の小江戸・川越の喜多院へ向かうとすると、本郷あたりを抜ける春日通・川越街道へ、右手に傳通院を拝しながら、あるいは上野から不忍通を真直ぐに護國寺に至って、ちょっと西へ下れば朱塗門の根生院に達する。この俗にいう赤門は、今の豊島区高田一丁目になるが、実は根生院は元々下谷の池之端にあったという。もっと遡ると、根生院は徳川幕府三代將軍家光（1604-1651: 在位 1623-1651）が命じて神田白壁町（今の神田鍛冶町二丁目四番辺りか）に建立させたという由緒ある寺院で、創立以来長谷寺や仁和寺などと深い関係があったらしい。因みに、家光の四男が綱吉である。その後、下谷や本郷などを転々として、火災に遭ったりして、享保五年（1720）には池之端七軒丁へ移ったという。この付近には今に幾つかの古寺が在るが、大正寺の北隣り位になろうか。すぐ近く、北北西・根津権現方向に「霊雲寺」が古地図に見えるが、これは湯島の支院であろうか、またも筆者は審らかにしない。さらに明治三十五年（1902）に根生院は現在地へ移転したが、その時には春日通へ切通坂を上がる袂辺りにあったようだ。切通坂を挟んで飛地のような今の湯島三丁目 47 番ではなかろう。湯島天神裏の立派な唐門から石段を下れば、いわば湯島切通町へ出る。確かに江戸末期の尾張屋の地図を見ると、切通坂を挟んで湯島天神の裏手に根生院はある。今の湯島四郵便局（湯島 4-6-11）の一角辺りであろうか。根生院の北東に道を挟んで、福成寺と教證寺が今も並んで立つ。そこは今池之端一丁目となる。随分と移転を繰り返したことになる。しかし龍肝の頃の根生院が、ここ湯島は切通坂あたりとなれば、同じ湯島の霊雲寺も隣の上野寛永寺も、いわば一歩の行動範囲であったことになる。

1.4. 龍肝校了の尊勝陀羅尼注義　ところで、龍肝が不忍池を挟んだ上野の山で写させた『佛頂尊勝陀羅尼注義』は、この今は豊島区にある真言宗豊山派・根生院に現在も保管されているだろうか。また更に、その基になった寛永寺真如院の写本は、上野の山に今も眠っているのだろうか。確かに、東叡山戦争による江戸大火の魔手は、根生院を含む脇寺の多くを、その掌中に収めていることが古地図などからも見て取れる。⁷ 龍肝の行動範囲を窺い、当時の宗旨・宗派を超えて、一宗一派に囚われない交流の姿も見えて感慨深い。ところで続蔵の編者は、龍肝が署名した写本を見て校合・編集したに相違ない。現本の欠陥・不備を補ってくれるかもしれない元本を実見できないのが、まことに悔しく残念の極みである。跋に残る他の伝承者・書写者も氣にかかる。何処に何時まで任ったのか。こうした『大正新脩大藏經』編纂時の調査と校合の記録はあるのだろうか。

番外・雁が飛べば石亀も地団駄・蛇足 (cf. Yuyama, "Misc. Philol. Buddh. (III)", p. 386-391: §3.11.0-14.7):

インド郵政省が 2001 年に、恐らくはバンチャタントラ系の説話集から採ったであろう四話の美しい切手を発売していた。それぞれが 4 ルピーの二連枚 (= Rs.8/-) で、「獅子と兎」「猿と鰐」「番鳥と蛇」「亀と双雁」が柔らかく分かり易い絵になっている。本邦にまで伝承・展開して巷間に親しまれているものの枠物語を浮彫にしている、系統を論う余地もない。ごく自然に心休まる教育的なものだと思う。切手は、いわば各々の国の民度を反映していて、興味が尽きない。誠に残念ながら、筆者は長い年月インドを訪ねる機会を逸して、ニューデリーで換金の必要がある時に行く銀行の向かいの郵便局にちょっと立ち寄っては、美しい切手を鑑賞できたものだったが今は叶わず、情報の入手もままならないでいる。

⁷ 『慶應四年江戸大火全圖』（製作者不明・1868?・木版二色/38 x 52 cm）= 東京大学附属図書館所蔵資料展『地図に見る江戸八百八町』（1996.XI.1-21）: 展示 18 番。因みに、展示 12 番に「谷中本郷駒込小石川邊繪圖」（高柴三雄誌・近江屋吾平板・嘉永三年/1850・木版色刷・再改）がある。この絵図は三色刷りの由で、直後に刊行された戸松昌訓作図・尾張屋清七出版の五色刷の鮮明な絵図（本号拙稿§6.1.0 参照）が遙かに見やすい（展示 13 番には嘉永六年/1853 年版あり）。

§2. ホジソンのネパールにことよせて — 近代仏教学の最初期から未来へ

2.0.0. ブライアン・ホートウン・ホジソン (Brian Houghton Hodgson: Cheshire, 01.II.1800 - London, 23.V.1894) に関する評価は、恐らく既に彼の時代に種々の観点からの相違を見せていたと思う。立場を異にする面々との確執もあったかもしれない。彼が若くしてネパールに赴任しからの二十年余に亘る駐在中 (1820-1843) の政治的背景は複雑で、筆者の理解を遙かに超えていて、いかんともとし難い所である。ただ、仏教文献学の立場からは、少なくとも学問的な端緒を拓いてくれた先駆者として、その功績を高く評価しなくてはならないであろう。ホジソンなかりせば、仏教梵語文献学の基盤づくりは如何ほどに遅れてしまったのだろうか。⁸ ホジソンの蒐集した資料は膨大であったが、筆者には彼は物心両面でネパールの人と国を理解しようとしたのではないかと思えてならない。そのためには多方面に亘る知識を必要とし、彼の論攷は従って多岐に亘り、その結果ネパール研究の今日に至るまでの基礎を成したといえよう。そのモノにしても、並大抵のものではなかった。ホジソンの人となりや業績を理解し、その著作を精査しモノをも整理した当時の王立アジア協会の一副会长・ハンター (Sir William Wilson Hunter: 1840-1900) の著した伝記は、早くからこれを知らしめてくれた労作として極めて重要であろう。⁹

2.0.1. いかに幅広く深くホジソンが資料を渉猟していたかを、下記の論集では夫々の專家が、また如実に示唆している。インド全域を縦横に、早くから先進的な技法をも用いて、幅広い活躍を繰り広げる史家に、人を得たとばかりに編者は前言を依頼している。筆者は彼がロンドンに在ったバシヤム (Arthur Llewellyn Basham: 1914-1986) の許で博士論文を仕上げている頃会ってから暫く交流があったが、その後の筆者の放浪などで残念にも疎遠になってしまったが、彼の仕事には門外漢ながら関心を寄せてきた。¹⁰ ホジソンに関して、本書の内容を見ながら、流石に歴史家らしい分析をしている。ホジソン評価のムズカシさ・フクザツさも読み取れる。われわれ仏教文献学徒にとっては、いうまでもなく、今やアメリカを代表する專家が担当する第四章に細心の注目をしたい。時代を分けて、色々の角度から分析して、ホジソンの造したものものの複雑さを教えてくれる。いうなれば、もっと原典の批判的研究との連関を更に突っ込んで欲しかった。編者については、また幅広く活躍している人であるようだが、筆者の不勉強から余りよく知らない。ただ、時宜を得て、ロンドンのアジア協会と東洋アフリカ学院との協賛を得て、ホジソンを主題に会議を開催したことに敬意を払い、更には速やかに執筆者を激励して良い論集を出してくれたことに感謝したい。実は、学界の動きに疎く、恥ずかしくも残念ながら、これほどに興味深い会議があったことも知らなかった。本書は、いわば問題点を洗い出し、種々の領野の第一線で活躍する專家が評価し、さらに将来に向けての問題を提起している。筆者には力及ばず、調べれば調べるほどに、読めば読

⁸ Cf. further A. Yuyama, *Eugène Burnouf: The Background to his Research into the Lotus Sutra* (= *Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica*, III) (Hachioji/Tokyo: IRIAB, 2000), §3.2.5, 5.2.2, et passim; — see also p. 123f: "Hodgson".

⁹ W. W. Hunter, *Life of Brian Houghton Hodgson, British Resident at the Court of Nepal, ...* (London: John Murray, 1896), ix, 390 p., 1 frontisp., 7 other ill. — for further details see Yuyama, *op.cit.*, p. 125f., also §6.1.4, 7.2.4 (*with more references*). — For Hodgson's manuscript collections see e.g. A. Yuyama, *बौद्धसंस्कृतभाषालिखितपुस्तकालयाः / Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscript Collections: A Bibliographical Guide for the Use of Students in Buddhist Philology* (= *Bibliographia Indica et Buddhica*, Pamphlet No. 2) (Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies Library, 1992) [ISBN 4-906267-31-9], p. 16f.

To my regret, I have never succeeded in consulting W. W. Hunter, *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts Collected in Nepal, and Presented to Various Libraries and Learned Societies by B. H. Hodgson, Esq., F.R.S.* (London: Trübner & Co., 1881), 27 p. (*Unseen!*). — Cf. Yuyama, *Burnouf* (2000), p. 124f: "Hunter 1881".

¹⁰ See e.g. in the first place among others Thomas R. Trautmann, *Kautilya and the Arthaśāstra: A Statistical Investigation of the Authorship and Evolution of the Text*. With a foreword by A. L. Basham (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971), XVIII, 227 p.

むほどに、不明が深まるばかりで、我ながら情けない思いにさせられるのである。無理もないような気もする。何せあの十九世紀を丸々矍鑠と生きた並大抵の人物ではない。しかし、筆者も老軀に鞭打って少しは理解を深めたい。未見の興味津々たる写真・図版も数多ある。大方の賢明の諸兄姉に本書を読んで、著者たちのホジスン評価を評価して載きたいと乞い願う：

The Origins of Himalayan Studies: Brian Houghton Hodgson in Nepal and Darjeeling, ed. David M. Waterhouse¹¹ (= *Royal Asiatic Society Books*) (London-New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 28 October 2004) [Indian repr. 2005], 234 x 156 mm.: 304 p., 84 b/w photos, 24 col. photos & 2 plates.

— *Ilb: 0-415-3121509* (1st ed.). — *£stg. 70.- / Indian repr.: US\$21.-*

From the Contents:

Thomas R. Trautmann, "Foreword", p. xiii-xix.

1. David Waterhouse, "Brian Hodgson - A Biographical Sketch", p. 1-24.

2. John Whelpton, "The Political Role of Brian Hodgson", p. 25-38.

3. Harihar Raj Joshi, "Brian Hodgson - The Unsung Story", p. 39-48.

4. Donald S. Lopez, Jr., "The Ambivalent Exegete - Hodgson's Contribution to the Study of Buddhism", p. 49-76.

5. J. P. Losty, "The Architectural Monuments of Buddhism - Hodgson and the Buddhist Architecture of the Kathmandu Valley", p. 77-110.

Appendix - "B. H. Hodgson's Essay: Architectural Illustrations of Buddhism", p. 111-133.

6. Ann Datta and Carol Inskipp, "Zoology Amuses Me Much", p. 134-153.

7. Ann Datta, "Brian Hodgson and the Mammals and other Animals of Nepal", p. 154-171.

8. Carol Inskipp, "A Pioneer of Himalayan Ornithology, 1848-1850", p. 172-188.

9. David Arnold, "Hodgson, Hooker and the Himalayan Frontier", p. 189-205.

10. Martin Gaenszle, "Brian Hodgson as Ethnographer and Ethnologist", p. 206-226.

11. George van Driem, "Hodgson's Tibeto-Burman and 'Tibeto-Burman Today'", p. 227-248.

12. David Waterhouse, "Hodgson's Legacy", p. 249-252.

"Select Bibliography", p. 253-271:

'Works by Brian Houghton Hodgson', p. 254-262.

補記・本書は、内容からも幸いに王立アジア協会の叢書に入れられたが、最近はその出版物入手に協会の便宜を図ってくれることもなく、刊行を引き受けている出版元からの購入も困難にしている。— また、有名な書店・出版社が自社の刊行物しか取り扱わなくなったりもしている。本書に限らず、折角の良書の個人による入手を阻んでいるとさえ思える出版業界の現況は理解に苦しむところである。— 本書は、筆者も入手を諦めているところヘインドでの再刷のお陰で手に入れることができた。出版予告以来注文を続けて二年越しのことである。

2.1.0. ここでホジスンのことにばかりに紙数を割けないが、かねてから注目して取り上げてきたトリノから刊行が続く『梵語法典集成』(Yuyama, "Misc. Philol. Buddh. (I)", *ARIRIAB*, VI: 2002-2003, p. 351; —, "— (II)", *ARIRIAB*, VIII: 2004-2005, p. 377-379; §1: *CIS*) の中に、彼の時代の理解にも役立つに相違ない材料が含まれたのは誠に慶ばしい。この叢書が余りに多様に資料を拡げすぎずに、若干の変化を見せていることは歓迎して良いのではなかろうか。— ネパール語の原典なので、筆者に内容の是非をいう資格がないが、本書に簡略ながら内容紹介をしているし (p. L-LXIV)、幾つか論文も公刊しているので、将来に專家の出現を期待したい。黒色を基礎に、赤・青や活字・脚注を巧みに使い分けての校訂版の編集に感心した。贅沢であろうが、写本の批判が原典を読みながら一目瞭然たらしめる効果は確かにあるので、今後種々の原典の校訂出版技術に再考を促すかもしれない。

Le code népalais (AIN) de 1853, par Jean Eezas. Avec "Avant-Propos", par Oscar Botto. 2 tomes: Tome I: *Introduction et Textes (Chapitre 1-86)*, Tome II: *Texte (Chapitres 87-167)* (= *Corpus Iuris Sanscriticum: Sanskrit Series on Social and Religious Law*, ed. Oscar Botto, II) [*Patronages: Union Académique Internationale - Unione Accademica Nazionale*] (Torino: Comitato Promotore per la Pubblicazione del Corpus Iuris Sanscriticum, 2000), LXV (une carte du Népal en couleurs), 421 p.; VII, 423-842 p. — *Neither ISSN nor ISBN*.

¹¹ A Vice-President of the Royal Asiatic Society; Formerly British Council Director in Nepal (1972-1977).

補記 1・ついでながら、この場を借りて、本叢書に次の三点の続刊をみたので急ぎ挙げておきたい。叢書名の変化にも注意を払っているのが窺える。筆者は、しかし余り範囲を拡げてしまうことを避けて欲しいと思っている。更には前にも述べたように、仏教の戒律研究者からの貢献を期待して止まない:

III. *Saṃvarta-Tradition: Saṃvarta-Smṛti and Saṃvarta-Dharmaśāstra*. Critically edited with English Translation by K. V. Sarma and S. A. S. Sarma (Torino 2002), XIV, 161 p.

IV. *Sāṅkarasmṛti (Lgbudharmaprakāśikā)*: Introduction, Critical edition, Translation and Appendices by N. P. Unni (2003), XI, 396 p.

V. Donald R. Davis, Jr., *The Boundaries of Hindu Law: Tradition, Custom and Politics in Medieval Kerala* (2005), (xii), 186 p.

補記 2・更に、恐らくは評価がまちまちであろうと思われるが、今日までに名をなした学者のインド法に関わる論題を 31 項目に編集して出たので記録しておきたい。巻末に出典を明らかにしている:

Brajkishore Swain (ed.), *The Dharmaśāstra. An Introductory Analysis* (Delhi: Akshaya Prakashan, 2004), xviii, 556 p. — ISBN 81-88643-13-0.

F. Max Müller, C. K. Raja, M. Hiriyanna, Sri Aurobindo, Swami Bharati K. Tirtha, R. B. Pandey, P. K. Virdi, S. Radhakrishnan, P. N. Prabhu, P. S. S. Aiyer, G. S. Ghurye, P. V. Kane, K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar, D. C. Bhattacharya, J. Chakkanatt, A. S. Altekar, J. H. Mees, V. P. Verma, D. F. Mulla, M. S. Maine, J. D. M. Derrett, Kewal Murwani, A. L. Basham, D. S. Shastri, K. S. Murli, M. Rama Jois, P. T. Raju.

2.1.1. ところで、この法典 (*Ain*) が、1853 年に成ったことに注意を促したい。ホジスンがネパールを去って丁度十年を経た後であるが、ネパール国内外の政治・経済・文化とあらゆる面で西欧勢力との接触による激動の時期であり、またもって筆者には非常に興味がありながら、しかし手に負えぬ難しい時代である。ここでヒンドゥスターニー／ヒンディー系を介してペルシア語に由来する語 *Ain* を法典の意味に用いる。¹² このネパール王国の法規集を制定・発布したのは、かの宰相ジャン・バハードゥル (Jang Bahādur Rāṇā: 1817-1878) の時代である。かつて興味を覚えた二点を紹介しておくに止めたい。¹³

2.2.0. 実は、仏教学の観点から見ても、いうまでもなくネパールの歴史に関する重要な刊行物は決して少なくない。我々が恩恵に浴してきた名著も多い。特に、仏教写本類の調査・報告をなして、貴重な文献を周知せしめてくれたホジスン以後の諸先学には、感謝の一語である。¹⁴ また、筆者には全くお手上げのインド史の年代論・年代比定は、矢張り諸先学の研究の果実を基に進展してきたが、仏教文献学の立場からは梵語仏典写本類の跋にある年代比定という困難な作業を通して得た成果を提供してくれた学者の中で、第二次世界大戦後のペーテック (Luciano Petech: *1914) の

¹² Cf. Ralph Lilley Turner, *A Comparative and Etymological Dictionary of the Nepali Language* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1931; reprinted with corrections by Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1965), p. 59b: ऐन, s.v.; also Horace Hayman Wilson, *A Glossary of Judicial and Revenue Terms, and of Useful Words Occurring in Official Documents Relating to the Administration of British India* (London: William H. Allen, 1855, reprinted in India by Munshiram Manoharlal, 1968), p. 13b: *Ā-in*, *Aen*, *Āyin*, *Ayen*, s.v. — [An earlier Indian reprint with enlargements by A. C. Ganguli & N. D. Basu (Calcutta 1940). — *unseen*].

¹³ Cf. e.g. John Whelpton, *Jang Bahadur in Europe: The First Nepalese Mission to the West* (Kathmandu: Sahayogi Press, 1981), xi, 320 p., 4 folded maps, 24 ills. (including an interesting “Introduction”, by Rishikesh Shaha, p. 1-64, esp. p. 42-45 on Hodgson); —, *Kings, Soldiers and Priests: Nepalese Politics and the Rise of Jung Bahadur Rana, 1830-1857* (New Delhi: Manohar Publications, 1991), xi, 315 p., 1 folded map; — see further Yuyama, *Burnouf* (2000), p. 181: ‘Whelpton 1981’ & ‘Whelpton 1991’, ss.vv.

¹⁴ Cf. e.g. among others *History of Nepal, translated from the Parbatiya by Munsbi Shew Shunker Singh and Pandit Shri Gnanand*. With an Introductory Sketch of the Country and People of Nepal by the Editor, Daniel Wright (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1877; repr. Nepal Antiquated Book Publishers, Kathmandu, 1972; 1958 Calcutta reprint — *unseen* -), xiv, 320 p., X pl. (incl. a frontisp.) [Appendix X (p. 316-320): “List of My Collection of Sanskrit Manuscripts”]; Cecil Bendall, *A Journey of Literary and Archaeological Research in Nepal and Northern India, during the Winter 1884-5* (Cambridge at the University Press, 1886; reprinted in 1974 by Ratna Pustak Bhandar, Kathmandu, in the *Biblioteca Himalayica*, III, 2), xii, 100 p., 16 ills., 1 folded table (Rājas of Nepal, 1008-1457 CE); — otherwise see A. Yuyama, *Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscript Collections* (Tokyo 1992), *passim*.

業績に与るところが極めて大きい。¹⁵ 彼のチベット学に関する研究の数々は、インド仏教の学徒にとっても見逃せないものが多いことは周知の事実であろう。その業績の中で、筆者が学史上から感激して見る労作が、イタリアの宣教師たちの貴重な報告類の上梓で、複製図版もあって、まさしく目を瞠はるばかりの大冊七巻・九百部限定である。¹⁶ 本書から、すでに十八世紀初頭に『波羅提木叉』がチベット語からラテン語訳されていた事実を知って驚いたことがあるが、¹⁷ 他にも貴重な経論類が訳出されているわけで、ヴァティカンの図書館から早く眼を覚まして出てきて欲しい。¹⁸ 実は、かなり以前から、ローマ法王庁の中に非キリスト教の研究で知られる司教で構成する会議があると耳にしたことがあるが、実際に貴重な非キリスト教的な文化財を扱って、会議で討論がなされたという噂を、残念ながら寡聞にして知らない。勿論、今日までに、研究者の努力によって、極めて貴重な貢献を我々も目にしてはいる。¹⁹

2.2.1. さて、パーテックと同時に、筆者は、ホジソンに連繫して、いつもホジソンを思い浮かべせるネパールの学者一人を先ずは挙げずにはいられない。そのネパール魂ともいべき気骨を生涯持ち続けた学者レーグミー (Dilli Raman Regmi/डिल्लीराम रेग्मी : 1914-2001) の業績を、筆者には評価する資格はないが、常に参照してきた。就中、著者のネパール中世史は、パーテックの年代比定結果との比較などに参照する、筆者には必携の書である。;

D. R. Regmi, *Medieval Nepal*, 3 parts (Calcutta: Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 1965-1966): —

Part I: *Early Period 750-1530 A.D.* (1965), xv, 761 p., plates.

Part II: *A History of the Three Kingdoms 1520 A.D. to 1768 A.D.* (1966), xi, 1076 p., maps, figs., plates.

Part III: *Source Materials for the History and Culture of Nepal 740-1768 A.D. (Inscriptions, Chronicles and Diaries etc.)* (1966), vii, 163, 156 p.

補記・同時代に活躍した同姓の歴史学者を思い起こす。もう一人のレーグミー (Mahesh Chandra Regmi: 1929-2003) は、ホジソンの書簡を発掘・公刊してくれた。²⁰ 他のレーグミー (Jagdish Chandra Regmi: *1946) は、まさにホジソン時代を取り上げて、特別な興味を懷かせたので、書誌上の補遺を施しておきたい。実は、これは忠実なハンターのホジソン伝記の関連期間の抜粋集にほかならない。²¹ 将来は、是非とも、ホジソンに関連した研究資料の更なる発掘が望まれるし、今後書誌学的な分析・整理・刊行を期待したい。

¹⁵ Luciano Petech, *Medieval History of Nepal* (c. 750-1480) (= *Serie Orientale Roma*, X) (= *Materials for the Study of Nepalese History and Culture*, III) (Roma: IsMEO, 1958), XI, 238 p.; —, revised edition (= *SOR*, LIV) (1984), x, 254 p.

¹⁶ *I Missionari Italiani nel Tibet e nel Nepal*, a cura di Luciano Petech (= *Il Nuovo Ramusio: Raccolta di Viaggi, Testi e Documenti relativi ai Rapporti fra l'Europa e l'Oriente a cura dell'Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente*, Direzione Scientifica: Giuseppe Tucci, Volume Secondo) (Roma: La Libreria dello Stato, 1952-1956). — 参看・湯山明, “インド学仏教学の黎明”, 印度哲学仏教学, III (札幌 1988), p. 323-348 (cum e.g. p. 347b: n. 42); —, “印度学仏教学史研究資料雑録”, 同誌, VII (1992), p. 299-314; —, “近代仏教学”, 仏教大事典 (東京・小学館, 1988), p. 206b-207c.

¹⁷ See A. Yuyama, *Vinaya-Texte* (= *Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur*, I) (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1979), p. XXII cum n. 4.

¹⁸ Cf. Petech, *I Missionari Italiani*, I (Roma 1952), p. LXXXIXf., et alibi.

¹⁹ See e.g. *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits et imprimés chinois de la Bibliothèque vaticane. A Posthumous Work by Paul Pelliot*, revised and edited by TAKATA Tokio. With a foreword by Antonino Forte (= *Italian School of East Asian Studies, Reference Series*, I) (Kyoto: Istituto Italiano di Cultura, Scuola di Studi sull'Asia Orientale, 1995), XV, 113 p. — ISBN 4-900793-10-8; — 参看・高田時雄, “ヴァティカン図書館の中國関連蒐集について”, (日仏東洋学会) 通信, XXIX (1995), p. 3-6a.

²⁰ Mahesh C. Regmi, “An Unpublished Letter of Brian H. Hodgson”, *Regmi Research Series*, Year 9: No. 9 (1 September 1980), p. 143f. [Letter dated 25.III.1942 (sic: 1842)]; cf. Yuyama, *Burnouf* (2000), p. 154: ‘Regmi 1980’.

²¹ *Nepal during 1816-1846* (= *Nepal-Antiquary: Journal of Socio-Historical Research, Nepal-Studies and Digest*, Joint Issue XXXVI-L [sic: XL] / ISSN 0251-2653), edited and compiled by Jagdish C. Regmi with assistance of Shesharaj Shiwakoti (Kathmandu: Office of Nepal-Antiquary, August 1981, distributed by Ratna Pustak Bhandar / Himalayan Book Centre, Kathmandu), (i), viii, 259 p.

2.2.2. ここでレーグミーに関して、ほんの少しだけ付け足しておきたい。一は、彼が原資料を探索し、それを基に研究を進めていることである。老いてなお貴重な碑文資料を大冊にまとめて公開してくれた業績を多としたい:

D. R. Regmi, *Inscriptions of Ancient Nepal*, 3 vols. (New Delhi: Abhinav Publications, 1983), xx, 190p.; xx, 131 p.; x, 280p., plates.

2.2.3. もう一つは、ディッリーラマンは、今後のネパールにとって貴重な研究拠点になるであろう図書館を遺して公開していることである。ディッリーラマン記念レーグミー図書館 (The Dilli Raman Kalyani Library / डिल्लीरमण-कल्याणि रेग्मी स्मारक पुस्तकालय) は、筆者は残念ながら訪れる機会も失ってしまったが、先端的な機関機能を揃えているようなので紹介しておきたい。レーグミーの遺志がよく反映しているようだ。

補記・実は、もう一人のレーグミー (Jagdish Chandra Regmi) も、第二次大戦後の早い時期から研究の中心を創るべく無謀ともいえる努力を重ねて、ついに私的な機関を創設し、すでに種々の活動拠点を成している。なお、いわば伝統的な体裁をもちながらも“社会科学研究”院 (Social Sciences Bahā / बहा = विहार) ともいえるべき機関が設立され、二三年前から彼を記念した講演も回を重ねているようだ。

2.3.0. すると、ここで本邦におけるネパール史の研究について一瞥しておきたくなる。これほどに重要な資料を物心ともに与えてくれるネパールについて、筆者には知らないことが多すぎると内心嘆いてばかりきた。上の流れから、門外漢の筆者には、独自の方法をとって研究を進めていると見えて、最も関心を惹くのが次の大冊の研究成果である。まさに現時点に至るまでの通史をものしている。筆者に評価の能力がないが、少なくとも将来ともに注意を払いながら参照させて貰いたいと思う:

佐伯和彦, *ネパール全史* (= 世界歴史叢書) (東京・明石書店, 2003), 768 p. — ISBN 4-7503-1788-5.

2.3.1. 更には、意欲的な刊行を続ける出版社は、果たして採算が合うのかと心配するような、ダナバジラ (Dhanavajra Vajracārya: 1932-1994)²² の貴重なリッチャヴィ期の碑文資料集も江湖に送ってくれた。すでに原写本・原碑文に当たってネパール史を研究する時代は始まっている。訳著者もいうように、惜しいかな、余りに大冊になって原文を掲載する余裕がなかった。本書は、しかし、将来のネパール研究に不可欠のものになるであろうが、これまた筆者には評価・批判する力がない。ただ、かねてネパールで原著初版を入手していたので、和訳書の出現は誠に慶ばしく歓迎したい。和訳者は、巻末に「リッチャヴィ関連論文集」と題して、本書のために書き下ろしたと思しき十一篇もの論放を追録してくれている。殆どが短篇であるが、筆者の蒙を啓くもので有難い:

ダナバジラ・バジラチャーヤ編／佐伯和彦訳, *古代ネパール史料／リッチャヴィ時代の銘文集* (東京・明石書店, 1999), A5:982 p. — ISBN 4-7503-1111-1. ¥20000E.

Dhanavajra Bajracharya, *लिच्छवि-कालका अभिलेख / अनुवाद - ऐतिहासिक - व्याख्या-सहित* (Kathmandu: Nepāla ra Esiyāli Adhyayana Samsthāna, 1973), 190 inscriptions: xv, 618 p., 7 maps (of which 4 are folded) / — 2nd ed. (1996) [unseen].

2.3.2. なお、かつて興奮すべき新発見の『維摩経』梵本の年代に因んで、ゴーパーラ王統譜に関して、ネパールで指導的な学者二人ダナバジラ・マッラの共著になる、極めて貴重な書を引用したことがあるので (Yuyama, “Misc.Philol.Buddh. (II)”, *ARIRIAB*, VII: 2003-2004, p. 268, n. 19), ここに改めて書誌を記して置きたい:

Dhanavajra Vajracārya & Kamal P. Malla, *The Gopālarājavanśāvalī: A facsimile edition prepared by the Nepal Research Centre in collaboration with the National Archives, Kathmandu. With an introduction, a transcription, Nepali and English translations, a glossary and indices* (= *Nepal Research Centre Publications*, IX) (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GmbH, 1985), (vi), v, xxvii, 238 p. (+ a sheet of corrigenda).

²² Cf. e.g. Prayag Raj Sharma & Kamal P. Malla, “In Memory: Dhanavajra Vajracarya (1932-1994)”, *Contributions to Nepalese Studies*, XXIII, 1 (Kathmandu: Centre for Nepal & Asian Studies, Tribhuvan University, 1996), p. i-iv (with a photo frontispiece).

2.4.0. こうして老いて今に夢を語るようなものと訝しく思う向きもあるが、実は十年程前までルンビニーに国際的な研究機関を創るべく委嘱された委員として奔走していた。上記のマッラ教授が委員長だった時もあった。ルンビニー図書館の書架の配置などを提案したりしながら、その創設が目前に控えていた頃、できた暁には是非とも打ち立てたかった私かな腹案があった。幸いに「ルンビニー国際研究所」は、キュッペルス所長の誠実な努力で、順調に国際交流の実をあげ、編集主幹の仕事を全うし刊行物も定着してきている。しかし残念にも、出版物があまり知られていないようにも思われるので、若干紙幅を食むが紹介しておきたい。最初に公刊されたものは、まさしくネパールの仏教文化を如実に知る貴重なもので、筆者も非常に歓迎し、将来に大きな期待を胸に膨らませたものだ（残念にも絶版！）。²³ ネパール・シッキム・アッサム・ブータンのいわばヒマラヤの文化帯に、今は縦の上部／北方・チベットが非常に強みを見せている。外野から更なる期待を僭越にも申し述べれば、この縦のいわば下／南方にも広く文化圏を広げた出版も推し進めて貰いたい。就中、インド・アーリヤ系の文献の刊行を鶴首して待つところである：

Publications of the Lumbini International Research Institute:

Monograph Series:

- I. Niels GUTSCHOW, *The Nepalese Caitya: 1500 Years of Buddhist Votive Architecture in the Kathmandu Valley*, with Drawings by Bijay Basukala and an Essay by David Gellner (Stuttgart-London: Edition Axel Menges, 1997), 328 p. — ISBN 3-930698-75-7.
- II. Franz-Karl EHRLHARD, *Early Buddhist Block Prints from Mang-yul Gung-thang* (Lumbini: LIARI, 20009, 182 p. — ISBN 99933-324-2-9 — (a set with Facsimile Series 1 and 2).
- III. Peter SKILLING & Shanti PAKDEKHAM, *Pāli Literature Transmitted in Central Siam: A catalogue based on the Sap Songkbro (= Materials for the Study of the Tpiṭaka, I) [= Lumbini International Research Institute Monograph Series, III]* (Bangkok: Fragile Palm Leaves Foundation / Lumbini: Lumbini International Research Institute, 2002), c, 362 pp., 8 pl. — ISBN 974-13-2148-1.
- IV. *The Relationship Between Religion and State (Chos srid zung 'brel) in 'Traditional Tibet: Proceedings of a Seminar Held in Lumbini, Nepal, March 2000*, ed. Christoph CUPPERS (= LIRI Seminar Proceedings Series, I) (Lumbini: LIRI, 2004), 339 p. (with a frontisp.). — ISBN 99933-769-9-X.
- V. Franz-Karl EHRLHARD, *Life and Travels of Lo-chen Bsod-nams Rgya-mtsho* (Lumbini: LIRI, 2002), 125 p. (incl. 2 b/w figs. as a frontisp. & on the cover)[a set with LIRI Facsimile Edition Series, 3, in a Nepalese paperbox].

Facsimile Series:

- I. *The Oldest Block Print of Klong-chen Rab-'byams-pa's Theg Mchog Mdzod: Facsimile Edition of Early Tibetan Block Prints*, with an Introduction by Franz-Karl EHRLHARD (Lumbini 2000), xx, 510 p. — ISBN 99933-324-0-2.
- II. *Four Unknown Mahāmudrā Works of the Bo-Dong-Pa School: Facsimile Edition of Early Tibetan Block Prints*, with an Introduction by Franz-Karl EHRLHARD (Lumbini 2000), xxi, 385 p. — ISBN 99933-324-1-0.
- III. *A Buddhist Correspondence: The Letters of Lo-chen bSod-nams rgya-mtsho*, with an introduction by Franz-Karl EHRLHARD (Lumbini 2002), xxi, 423 p. — ISBN 99933-324-3-7.

Occasional Papers:

- I. Harry FALK, *The Discovery of Lumbinī* (Lumbini 1998), (ii), iii, 23 p. — [an English translation of the German original published in *Acta Orientalia*, LII (1991):p. 70-90].
- II. Giovanni VERARDI, *Excavations at Gotihawa and a Territorial Survey in Kapilavastu District of Nepal, A Preliminary Report* (Lumbini 2002), 63 p. (incl. 14-page ills.). — ISBN 99933-324-4-5.
- III. Max DEEG, *The Places Where Siddhārtha Trod: Lumbinī and Kapilavastu* (Lumbini 2003), 84 p. (incl. 12 col. photos, 2 b/w photos). — ISBN 99933-769-8-1.
- III. Gudrun BÜHNEMANN, *Buddhist Deities of Nepal: Iconography in Two Sketchbooks* (Lumbini 2003), 125 p. — ISBN 99933-769-7-3.

Lumbini Studies in Buddhist Literature:

- I. Helmut EIMER, *Testimonies for the Bṣod-pa brgyad-cu-pa: An Early Hymn Praising Dīpanakaraśrījñāna (Atiśa)* (Lumbini 2003), 66 p. — ISBN 99933-769-5-7.

²³ See e.g. A. Yuyama, "Some Remarks on Two Texts Related to the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins", *Indologica Taurinensia*, XXVIII (2002), esp. p. 290: §3.5 (cum n. 35).

2.5.0. 良質の梵語写本 こうしてみていると、ネパールには、上に散発的に取り上げただけでなく、ほかに良質の写本・善本を保管する私的な図書館もいくつかある。個人的にネパール人と知り合って、話がその誇るべき写本に及べば、私の家の古い木箱にも貴重なものがあるよということになる。いつも筆者は忙しい短期の出張滞在で、残念ながら実際に見せて貰ったことはない。これらの私的な写本類は、将来の我々の研究にとっても、ネパールでの組織的に親密な提携を結ぶべき重要なものとなるであろう。第二次世界大戦後の困難な時代に、先輩たちが苦勞して現地で調査した報告は、簡略なものではあったが、我々に大きな刺激を与えてくれたもので、いまだにある写本の存在を研究者が時に確認し、行方を探索するために参照することもある。²⁴ ところで今は変遷の末に統合されて目録類もネパールで出ていて見ることもできるが、大正大学の梵文学研究室的の編んだ目録は、恐らくは松濤誠廉 (1903-1979) の指導で成ったと思われるが、単に存在を確認させてくれるだけではなく、少なくとも当時は仲々知る由もなかった東京大学図書館所蔵の河口・高楠蒐集写本の探索にも貢献してくれた。²⁵ 東京大学所蔵の仏教梵語写本は、松濤誠廉の精緻を極めた研究ノートが遺るといわれていたが、謄写版による仮の目録が出たのは暫くしてからであった。²⁶ 待望の目録の公刊は、辻直四郎 (1899-1979) の薦めもあったと耳にしたが、さらに数年後であった。²⁷ その頃、山田一止がロンドンへの留学を決めて、東大写本の情報を持参すべく、マイクロフィルム・リーダーを回して仮目録を作るというので、誘われて手伝ったことがある。その後1963年秋には、筆者も留学してしまい、十六本まで調べた結果をタイプ打ちし、何か当時の特殊な機械で刷った紺色のコピーを若干残しただけに終わっていた。この仮目録は、今や四十余年を経て、果たしてどこかに保管されているのだろうか。マイクロフィルムは、旧番号順で撮られているので、いわゆる『松濤目録』の対照表 (p. 379-382) を見ると判る。²⁸ この作業は短期間で、忙しいアルバイト学生だったので、ほんの僅かの写本しか見られなかったが、中でも奥書に河口慧海 (1866-1945) の自筆メモを読んだ時の感激は今に残る。²⁹ 第二回目のチベット行の途次の明治三十八年 (1905) に入手したことになろう。河口は他にも数本の法華経梵本を将来していて、悲しいかな今は亡き戸田宏文 (1936-2003) の非凡の調査研究で評価・分類もなされて、より良い写本の存在も研究報告されているが、³⁰ 河口慧海の非常な努力の結果に恩恵を受けているわけである：

明治三十八年五月十日ヨリ (バルボ) 旅ノクルマン博士ニ就テ 本經ノ句讀ヲ習始メ 全年九月十五日習了ス 全句讀ハ全博士ノ付ケシモノ也 / 比馬羅耶山ネパールニテ 河口慧海記

2.5.1. ネパールの梵語写本について、筆者は若いころ長い間、もはや夢に見るような写本の出現

²⁴ その好例が長尾雅人、“カトマンドウの仏教写本典籍”，岩井博士古稀記念・典籍論集（東京・東洋文庫内記念事業会／大安，1963），p. 8-25.

²⁵ “Buddhist Manuscripts of the Bir Library”, *Memoirs of Taisho University* / 大正大学研究紀要, XL (1955), p. 55(1)-84(30).

²⁶ *List of Sanskrit Manuscripts (Kawaguchi and Takakusu Collection) in the Tokyo University Library* (Tokyo, Spring 1959), (i), 43 p. (in mimeograph).

²⁷ Seiren MATSUNAMI, *A Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Tokyo University Library* (Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation, 1965), ix, 387 p.

²⁸ *A List of the Microfilms of the Sanskrit Manuscripts (Kawaguchi and Takakusu Collection) in the Attached Library, University of Tokyo, Japan* (B5: 9 p.): Microfilm I (Manuscripts No. 5-6), II (Nos. 7-10), III (11-16, missing 13), IV (20-21), V (22-27), VI (28-1), VII (28-2), VIII (28-3), IX (28-4), X (29), XI (30), XII (31-36, 39-40), XIII (41-44), XIV (45-46), XV (47-49), XVI (50-55).

²⁹ Microfilm Reel No. XV, Manuscript No. 47 (= New Matsunami Number 410): *Saddharmapundarikam dharma-pariyāyam sūtrāntam mahāvaiṣṇvyaṁ*: Black letters on yellowish paper (with pictures), coloured wooden cover, 194 fols., wanting fol. 151.

³⁰ See *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from University of Tokyo General Library* (No. 414): *Romanized Text*, ed. Haruaki KOTSUKI (= *Lotus Sutra Manuscript Series*, V) (Tokyo: Soka Gakkai, 2003), xxxvi, 273 p., ill. (2 col.pl.).

はあり得ないと信じ込んでいた。それを現実に打ち破ってくれたのが、先ずは コンゼ (Edward Conze: 1904-1979) である。彼のおかげで『宝徳藏般若』の古写本を知り、³¹ 拙い原典の批判的な研究を纏めることができた。³² 同時に、いわゆる仏教梵語の典籍類は、エジャトン (Franklin Edgerton: 1885-1963) が総合的な分析をしてくれたので、次は各々の典籍が独立に文法的解析を迫っていると考えていたので、それを上台に不明・誤読があるのを怖れながら、校訂本の文法を記述してみた。³³ この点に関しては、大方の賛同を得ているようだと思っている。³⁴ その後、コンゼとは、渡英の際などに訪ねて、親しくして戴き幸いであった。互いに文献学的方法などに相違を見出して、率直に批判しあひながら、筆者は彼の般若經典類に関する並々ならぬ知識に感歎していたので、仏教学徒必携の書の大規模な改訂版の上梓を説得できたのは、更に幸せであった。実は、正直に言って、専門家による初版の参照はあっても、本増訂版の批判的な引用が余り見られないようにで遺憾に思う。³⁵ それにしても『宝徳藏般若』が、単に『八千頌般若』系の偽文化された提要に過ぎないという定説が確立したかのような中で、特に般若系經典類の思想史専門家の追求があまり見られず残念至極である。すでにコンゼも夙に両者の関係に注目している (cf. Yuyama, Rgs, Cambridge 1976, p. xiv-xix).³⁶ 確かに、この小さな經典ながら異本・改編の多い典籍ではある。その過程の一面は、本典籍の思想的な展開の証でもあり、筆者は他の領域の専門家にも注意を促したい。³⁷

2.5.2. さて、宝徳藏般若の原典批判研究が一段落したころ、筆者に次の衝撃があった。それはほかでもない、すぐ後ムスタンに客死したベルンハルト (Franz Bernhard: 1931-1971) のもたらした情報であった。彼が 1971 年 1 月・南半球の夏にキャンベラの豪州国立大学で催された、いわゆる「東洋学会議」に参加出席した折りに、『マハーヴァストゥ・アヴァダーナ』の良好な写本が発見されたというから、研究してはどうかと勧奨してくれた。筆者は、実はいまだ善本の出現に疑念を懐いていたので、そんな写本が果たして出現するだろうか、いや出たとしても筆者の能力の遙かに及ばざる代物であろうと一笑に付してしまった。一方、彼は極めて真面目に筆者を説得した。その直後に悲報がキャンベラに届いた。思い直して、その写本を実見したいと思った時には、彼に連

³¹ See Edward Conze, "The Calcutta Manuscript of the *Ratnagūṣasamcayagāthā*", *Indo-Iranian Journal*, IV, 1 (1960), p. 37-58. — cf. Franklin Edgerton, "The *Prajñā-Pāramitā-Ratna-Guṇa-Samcaya-Gāthā*", *ibid.*, V, 1 (1961), p. 1-18.

³² See e.g. *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-samcaya-gāthā (Sanskrit Recension A)*, edited with an Introduction, Bibliographical Notes and a Tibetan Version from Tunhuang by A. Yuyama (Cambridge / London-New York-Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1976), lxxii, 214 p., 1 frontisp. — ISBN 0-521-21081-X.

³³ A. Yuyama, *A Grammar of the Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-samcaya-gāthā (Sanskrit Recension A) (= Oriental Monograph Series, XIV)* (Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies in Association with Australian National University Press, 1973), XXXII, 190 p. — ISBN 0-7081-0843-1.

³⁴ Cf. e.g. J. W. de Jong, *A Brief History of Buddhist Studies in Europe and America* (Tokyo: Kōsei Publishing Co., 1997), p. 80f.

³⁵ See Edward Conze, *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature*. Second, revised and enlarged edition (= *Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica*, I) (Published by the Department for Scientific Publications, The Reiyukai, Tokyo, 1978), viii, 138 pages. ISBN 4-89298-797-2. — cf. A. Yuyama, "List of Edward Conze's Publications on the Prajñāpāramitā Literature", *ibid.*, p. 127-138.

³⁶ Cf. further e.g. A. Yuyama, "The First Two Chapters of the *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-samcaya-gāthā*", *Prajñāpāramitā and Related Systems: Studies in Honor of Edward Conze*, edited by Lewis Lancaster (Associate Editor: Luis O. Gómez) (= *Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series*, I) (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, 1977), p. 203-218.

³⁷ Cf. e.g. A. Yuyama, "The inspirational source of the Zhi-byed-pa doctrine", *Les habitants du Toit du monde / Hommages à Alexander W. Macdonald*. Études recueillies par les soins de Samten Karmay et Philippe Sagant (= *Recherches sur la Haute Asie*, XII) (Nanterre: Société d'ethnologie, 1997), p. 299-307.

絡する術はなくなっていた。幸いにも、その後フンボルト財団の研究者として渡独する機会に恵まれたので、かねてから疑問をもっていた『亀と華鬘師』の梵本の調査を、ケルン (Johan Hendrik Caspar Kern: 1833-1917) が用いたパリの国立図書館所蔵の『ジャータカマーラー』写本と当該『マハーヴァストゥ・アヴァダーナ』写本のコピーで原典を比較参照することを許されて研究することができた。³⁸ これは、いわば仏教梵語文献学的に置き去りにされてきた「仏教梵語」定義の案件でもある。この点については前回でも触れた。³⁹ それから二十余年を経て、この善本覆刻の機も熟して、刊行できたのは今に感慨無量であるが、この件をここに詳述する余裕がない。⁴⁰

2.5.3. 筆者が1977年暮にカトマンドゥに出張した折りが、丁度ドイツ東洋学会の企画として出発したネパール研究センターの新旧所長の交替時にあたり、⁴¹ ヴィッツェル (Michael Witzel) とフォン・ヒンユーバー (Oskar von Hintüber) と話が写本に及べば議論は端的に要領よく弾んだ。時間を惜しんで夜分の失礼を顧みず、仏典渉猟で知られていた日本人・高岡秀暢の所へとヴィッツェルが即座に案内してくれた。その後、間もなくして高岡の成果が公刊され、極めて多数の典籍の存在を知らせてくれた。⁴² その資料の大半は、どうやらアーシャー古文書館・図書館所蔵のものであったようで、その後入手したものも含めて既に貴重な資料は計数情報化されて、電子記憶画像が多数の写本を収めた大量のものなので高価ではあるが、購入できるようになったことは嬉しい。

2.5.4. アーシャー古文書館・図書館所蔵の写本に関しては、その後貴重な資料が含まれていることを、二百数十点の選集目録で偶々知ることが得たし、⁴³ 私家版のために手許で参照できないのが

³⁸ Cf. A. Yuyama, "Bemerkungen zur Sanskrit-Version des Kaccapa-Jātaka", XIX. *Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 28. September bis 4. Oktober 1975 in Freiburg im Breisgau: Vorträge*, herausgegeben von Wolfgang Voigt (= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Supplementband III, 2) (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1977), p. 1028-1036.

Further A. Yuyama, *Kaccapa-Jātaka: Eine Erzählung von der Schildkröte und dem Kranzwinder* (= *Studia Philologica Buddhica: Occasional Paper Series*, V) (Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1983), xxii, 42 p.—ISBN 4-906267-15-7.

³⁹ See for further details Yuyama, "Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica (III)", *ARIRIAB*, VIII (2004-2005), p. 386f.; §3.11.0-2.

⁴⁰ See *The Mahāvastu-Āvadāna in Old Palm-Leaf and Paper Manuscripts*. With Introductory Remarks by A. Yuyama (= *Bibliotheca Codicum Asiaticorum*, XV) (Tokyo: The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies for UNESCO, 2001) [actually published in March 2003], Vol. I: *Palm-Leaf Manuscripts*, lxvi + 1 + 217 p. (incl. 431 pl.). / Vol. II: *Paper Manuscript*, iv, 1, 224 p. (incl. 447 pl.). — ISBN 4-89656-614-9/° -615-7.

⁴¹ Cf. in the first instance e.g. Bernhard Kölver, "Das Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project: Bericht über die zwei ersten Kampagnen", *ZDMG*, CXXIII, 1 (1973), *1*-10*; Albrecht Wezler, "Geisteswissenschaftliche Forschung in Nepal (Bericht über das 'Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project' sowie den 'Schwerpunkt Nepalforschung')", von Albrecht Wezler und Bernhard Kölver", *ZDMG*, CXXXVI, 1 (1986), *2*-14*; — further Yuyama, *Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscript Collections* (1992), p. 17: Appendix II.

See further *Nepal Research Center: Development, Results and Prospects 1960-1975*, under the Aegis of the German Oriental Society (Kathmandu: Nepal Research Center, 1975), 41 p. (*printed on Nepalese paper*). — [Nepal Research Center = Nepal Forschungsinstitut: Director, Wolfgang Voigt / Representative in Nepal, Michael Witzel].

Also *Scientific Projects and Himalayan Culture (1960-1992)* (Kathmandu: Nepal Research Centre, 1992), (iii), 26 p.

In order to learn of the rather complicated organizational structure of the German scientific activities in Nepal it is to be recommended to see a brief but clear-cut article by Albrecht Wezler, "German Research in Nepal", *Acta Orientalia*, LVI (1995), p. 169-172.

⁴² *A Microfilm Catalogue of the Buddhist Manuscripts in Nepal*, Vol. I, ed. Hidenobu TAKAOKA (Nagoya/名古屋・仏教資料文庫, 1981), (ix), 143 p.

⁴³ Cf. *Catalogue of Selected Buddhist Manuscripts in Asa Sapbu Kutbi*. Exhibited on the Occasion of the 15th Conference of the World Fellowship of Buddhists, held 27 November – 2 December 1986 in the Kathmandu Valley. Prepared by Janak Lal Vaidya (*1939) & Prem Bahādur Kamsakār (*1917) with a foreword by Charles M. Novak (Patan), (2), 36 p.

非常に残念であるが、吉崎一美の努力による 5,094 点の目録もあり、⁴⁴ 次いで更にはアーシャー古文書館・図書館自体の目録によっても内容を知ることができた。⁴⁵ その直後に、ネパールへ他用で出張した折りに訪問を願い許されて、筆者も急ぎ先ずは法華經の梵本など若干の原典籍を拝見したことがある。⁴⁶ ネパール風ながら整備された図書館で、進取の気象に富んでいる雰囲気を感じた。十数年も前のことであったが、現在は恐らくは上記のような外部の協力者を得て、既に近代的に資料も計数情報化されて、電子記憶画像も存在するという。長い間ネパールから離れていては、筆者の知る情報は時代遅れであること疑いないが、中央アジアからの最近の興奮すべき情報とはいかぬとも、まだまだ貴重な資料を見出すこともあろう。⁴⁷

2.5.5. ほかにネパールの貴重な写本類の複写資料の目録なども存在し、今はマイクロフォームで写本資料を入手して調査研究もできるが、その目録だけでは文献学的に満足の行く書誌が得られないので、隔靴搔痒の思いをさせられるものがある。⁴⁸ 残念ながら、いわば無駄な神経を使い、労力を費やすことになることがある。

2.5.6. 上記のように、カトマンドウで遭遇したフォン・ヒンユーバーから、思いも寄らぬ情報を筆者は得た。シュリーナガルの博物館 (Sir Pratap Singh Museum, Srinagar) で法華經のギルギット写本を見つけた、これまで開かれていない包みだったという。⁴⁹ 誰も驚かないはずはない。「ところでどうして法華經だと判った?」「藥草喻品第五の奥付のある断片が偶々あったんだよ」と。⁵⁰ この頃から彼が仏教梵語にも関心を深めてきたと筆者は見えていたので、話は早い。是非とも二人で行って確かめようではないか! ところが調査依頼で手擦った。どうしても返事が来ない。当たって砕けろ方式で行くより仕方ないと決断。翌 1978 年に二人で乗り込むことにした。案ずるより産むが易し。⁵¹ 調査研究の主役は発見者のフォン・ヒンユーバーが、写真撮影・雑務全般は筆者が引き受けることにした。少なくとも、折角の機会に、撮影の失敗は許されない。素人なりに種々の撮影を試みた。室内は電力不足で照明が足りないの、ついには炎天下の博物館庭の芝生に写本を拡げて写真撮影したが、写本葉は透明紙が貼り付けられていて反射光が乱れる、筆者の周り

⁴⁴ *A Catalogue of the Sanskrit and Newari Manuscripts in the Asba Archives (Asba Sapbu Kutbi), Gwasa Pasa, Kathmandu, Nepal*. Compiled by Kazumi YOSHIZAKI (Kumamoto: Kurokami Library, 1991) 15, 320, 75 p. (—Private circulation only).

⁴⁵ See आशा सफू कुथिया अमिलेख ग्रन्थया वर्णनात्मक धलः (= आशा सफू कुथि पिथना - १) / *A Descriptive Catalogue of Selected Manuscripts Preserved at the Āśā Sapbū Kutbi (Āśā Archives)*, ed. Janak Lal Vaidya & Prem Bahādur Kamsakār (= *The Āśā Archives Publications*, I) (Kathmandu: Cvasāpāsā, 1991), (xii), xxv, xxvi, 456, (iv) p. (incl. 20 facsimile plates on p. 447-456). — about 547 manuscripts catalogued therein.

⁴⁶ Soon after that appeared a welcome article by Hirofumi TōDA, “Saddharmapundarika Manuscript Fragments in the Āśā Archives, Kathmandu, Nepal”, *Bauddhavidyāsudhārakāḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert On the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. Petra Kieffer-Pölz & Jens-Uwe Hartmann (= *Indica et Tibetica*, XXX) (Swisttal-Odendorf 1997), p. 657-671, incl. facsimiles on p. 667-671 (5 folios).

⁴⁷ Regrettably, for example, I have missed seeing their publications such as Raja Sakya's *Asba Archives* (1996), and his *A Short Catalogue of Asba Archives* (2000), which seems to contain 5297 manuscripts.

⁴⁸ Cf. e.g. *Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts: A Title List of the Microfilm Collection of the Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions* (Stony Brook, N.Y., 1975), (i), 27 p.; *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Microfilm Collection of the Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions*, ed. Mana Bajra Bajracharya & Christopher S. George, Part I (n.p., n.d.) [with reference to the preceding catalogue].

⁴⁹ For the launching pads of reference to study Gilgit manuscripts see e.g. Yuyama, *Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscript Collections* (1992), p. 17f.: Appendix III.

⁵⁰ See Oskar von Hinüber, *A New Fragmentary Gilgit Manuscript of the Saddharmapundarikāsūtra* (Tokyo: The Reiyukai, 1982), p.62-63 (also a coloured frontisp. plate): [65a], line 4: [au]sadbhi-parivartab pañcamab //◎//

⁵¹ On the whole story of this expedition see further O. v. Hinüber, *op.cit.* (1982), p. v-vi.

はぐるりと人垣で囲まれ珍奇なものへの質問攻めに遭い、写本の上下表裏の順を教えても捲り方を間違えられ、写本を載せる台紙は野次馬に蹴飛ばされるという中での作業となった。教練を受けていない筆者は、情けなくも忽ちに日射病に罹る始末であった。次の心配は、撮ったフィルムを暑熱の中、どうやって東京まで持ち帰るか？ ニューデリーへ戻ってからは、アメリカの友人宅の冷蔵庫に保管して貰った。もう一つの対策は、多量のフィルムの安全な東京送りである。通関などであらぬ疑いをかけられたら大変だ。その友人の極めて親切的な奔走の甲斐あって、もう少しで非常に安全な方法でフィルムの東京送りは巧く行く筈となったが、結局は自分で持ち帰る羽目になってしまった。欧米の学者たちが羨ましかった。純粋に学問的な資料であったら、外交経路を提供してくれるという。こうして持ち帰った法華經の未発見のギルギット写本断片が、速やかに批判的な校訂を経て出版された時の喜びは一人であった。

2.6.0. ネパール関係文献目録 いままた新しい写本資料の発見・入手を期待してであるが、多分に冗長になり過ぎてしまったので、以下に今後のネパール研究の発展を念じつつ、若干の書誌的な資料を羅列して閉じたいと思う。それぞれの専家の論著の中に優れた文献資料を見出すことがあるのはいうに及ばないが、ここでは単行のものを取り上げるに止めたい。いま書誌学的に、きちんと仕事をする余裕はない。従って、筆者自身の無知と不注意を曝け出すことになる。欠落するものは賢明な読者に拾遺補修していただきたい。

2.6.1. 本邦でネパール仏教を中心にした文献を現地で蒐集整理したものとして、吉崎一美の非常に努力の賜物である下記を挙げたい。詳しい内容分類目録であり、親切な表題・著者名索引が付されている。日本ネパール協会が研究資料集を刊行しているが、筆者は未見である。⁵²

Books on Nepalese Buddhism and Culture in Kurokami Library: Japan (Collected from AD. 1985 to 1993), compiled by Kazumi YOSHIZAKI, Kurokami Library, Japan (Kathmandu: Nepal Bauddha Prakashan Kendra, Nepal, 1994), A4: 124 p. (incl. a frontisp. on p. 3).

2.6.2. ネパールで最初の大がかりな内容分類による文献目録は、筆者の知る限りでは、ネパール王立学士院刊行のものであろう。数多くの参考文献を利用し、詳しい書誌情報を記録した丁寧なものである。分類したものを著者別にアルファベット順に並べて 8327 項目に及び、気遣いをした索引を付す：

Bibliography of Nepal / नेपालको ग्रन्थसूची (Kathmandu: The Royal Nepal Academy / नेपाल राजकीय प्रज्ञा-प्रतिष्ठान, 1975), (iii), (ii), (x), XV, 529 p., 1 frontisp. (photo of King Birendra Bir Bikram Shah Dev).

2.6.3. ネパールの年次文献目録が、1981 年度から、トリブヴァン大学とネパール・リサーチ・センターの協力で出発したが、刊行途次に紆余曲折もあったらしく、筆者の知る限りでは、残念ながら 1994-1996 年度分を最後に終刊したかのようである。中断したが、もしかして再刊を期しているれば幸いである。この目録は、便利なことに、すべてではないが同センター誌に再録されていることである。都合十五年分・七分冊になって出たことになろう (*Years 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984-1986, 1987-1989, 1990-1993, 1994-1996 / ISBN for the Year 1994-1996: 99933-51-008*):

*Nepal National Bibliography for 1981, compiled by Tribhuvan University and Nepal Research Centre (Kathmandu 1983), 54 p. [reprinted in the *Journal of the Nepal Research Centre*, V-VI].*

2.6.4. これに先だった 1951-1981 年度あたりを目処に 1301 項目を主題別に分類し、かなり丁寧に注釈を施して有益な文献目録も存在する。周知のように、仏教学徒にとっての歴史的なホジソンのエッセイは、初版 (1874) 以来何度か再版されてきたが (cf. Yuyama, *Burnouf*, 2000, p. 123f.: “Hodsgon 1874/ 1971/ 1972”, s.v.), 1972 年にカトマンドゥで出た二番目の写真覆刻版を正しく記録して解説に紙幅を割く (Entry No. 218: p. 54f.):

⁵² 『日本ネパール協会所蔵・ネパール国内出版資料目録 / *Bibliography of Source Materials Published in Nepal, kept in the Library of Japan Nepal Society*』(東京・日本ネパール協会, 1973), xv, 186 p.

Nepal: A Bibliography, compiled by Dina Nath Wadhwa, edited by Satkari Mukhopadhyaya (Delhi: Sharada Publishing House, 1991), xi, 344 p. — ISBN 81-85616-00-0.

2.6.4a. 次は筆者未見の文献目録であるので、若干躊躇したが、割愛せずにおこう:

Works on Nepal in the National Library: An Annotated Bibliography, compiled by Thakur Lal Manandhar (Kirtipur-Kathmandu: Institute of Nepal and Asian Studies, Tribhuvan University, 1975).

Nepal National Union Catalogue: UNESCO/DANIDA Supported Project, compiled and edited by Bhanu Pathak and Damodar Adhikari (Kathmandu: Nepal National Library, 1997-) [2 volumes published to date?].

2.6.5. ここで若干場違いといわれそうであるが、ほかで筆者が扱うこともなかろうと思い、珍しい大英図書館の企画を紹介しておきたい。インド学仏教学史に関心のある向きには興味を惹くかもしれない。それはいわゆるイギリスの植民地時代の南アジアを範囲とした地域で、1556年以降に刊行された、つまりはゴアにポルトガル人が印刷機を持ち込んだ年に始まる時代の全出版物を網羅しようという壮大な企画である。奇しくも、ムガル朝の第三代アクバル帝 (1542-1605) が若年で即位した年でもある。第一段階として 1556~1800 年間、第二段階は 1801~1867、そして第三段階は 1868~1900 を、年代順に刊行物を精査しようという 1982 年末に出発した企画で、年輩者にとっては懐かしい旧印度省図書館で練られた。⁵³ 簡にして要を得た解説に加えて、欧米・インド亜大陸の主要図書館の協力を得て、書誌的な情報はいうに及ばず、在庫などに関しても精緻な資料を惜しげなく挙げ、人名・表題・件名索引も充実して、筆者にしているところはない。編者には、実は、すでにインド亜大陸の出版に関して多数の論放がある。しかも彼は、この第一段階の時期のカルカッタの印刷事情についての専著がある。⁵⁴ ただ筆者の嘆きは、かかる企画にわが国の主要な図書館の協力が全くないことと、これに続く第二・三段階分が未刊であることだ。続刊が出れば、いわばホジソンの時代を十分に覆ってくれるわけである:

The South Asia and Burma Retrospective Bibliography (S.ABREB): Stage 1: 1556-1800, compiled by Graham Shaw (London: The British Library, 1987), x, 554 p. — ISBN 0-7123-019-4.

2.6.5a. 上に梵語法典類をあげたので、ジョーンズ (Sir William Jones: 1746-1794) が病を得てカルカッタに客死する年に出たマヌの法典に関しての情報をみると、これまた完璧である (see *op.cit.*, p. 264: MANU, *s.v.*).⁵⁵

2.6.6. 恐らく殆どのインド学徒が、ロンドン大学東洋アフリカ学院図書館の蔵書と書誌情報の恩恵に浴したことがあると思うが、上からの関連で一点だけを挙げておきたい。膨大な数量の蔵書目録カードを捲ったことのある人も、またそのカードを写真覆刻した大冊の目録を繙いたことのある人も、次の目録一冊は更に便利に使用しているであろう。表題の示す通りのものであるが、筆

⁵³ India Office Library & Records, British Library: 197 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 8NG, United Kingdom.

⁵⁴ To my regret, I have not yet been able to see Graham Shaw, *Printing in Calcutta to 1880: A Description and Checklist of Printing in Late 18th-Century Calcutta* (London: The Bibliographical Society / New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), xi, 249 p., ill. — ISBN 0197217923. Neither have I seen his "The History of Printing and Publishing in South Asia: A Survey of Research since 1970", *Leipziger Jahrbuch zur Buchgeschichte*, Jahrgang VII: *Informationen und Berichte* (1997), p. 305-323.

⁵⁵ Incidentally, among many other interesting works on Jones, it is interesting to learn of his contributions and influences, e.g. his discourse on the origin of Sanskrit, in a collection of articles with illustrations, edited by the scholars famed for their works on him: *Objects of Enquiry: The Life, Contributions, and Influences of Sir William Jones (1746-1794)*, ed. Garland Cannon and Kevin R. Brine (New York-London: New York University Press, 1995), Plate No. 28, illustrating the cover of the book in question. In connection with the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra* it may be worth noting that the original manuscript with the translation and notes done in 1789-1792 by Jones is kept in the Bodleian Library at Oxford: cf. Gillian Evison, "The Sanskrit Manuscripts of Sir William Jones in the Bodleian Library", *Sir William Jones 1746-1794: A Commemoration*, ed. Alexander Murray with an Introduction by Richard Gombrich (Published on behalf of the University College, Oxford, by Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 123-141, esp. 125 & 140 (*MS. Samsk. c. 32*).

者には1586年の意味がよく分からない。同図書館所蔵の最古の関連書であろうか。1133点に及ぶ典籍に関する索引も丁寧に作成してあるので、学史に関心のある向きには便利であろう。因みに、先のジョーンズのマサ法典は、同図書館では翌々年のロンドン版を所有する (cf. *op.cit.*, p. 28f.; item No. 134; London: J. Sewell, 1796):

R. C. Dogra, *Catalogue of the Early Printed Books on South Asia from 1586 to 1864 held in the Library of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* (New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan, 1987), xii, 231 p., with "Reproductions of Specimens of Early Printing", 20 page-plates. — ISBN 81-85179-08-5.

2.6.7. 実は、人も良く知るように、この徹底した旧印度省図書館の蔵書目録刊行の歴史は長い。煩を避けて、例えば梵語典籍に関してみると、早くから壮大な企画があった。このような大企画を永続させるのは至難のことである。未だに極めて有用な改訂版が大冊四巻で出てから、既に半世紀余の歳月が流れたが、いうまでもなくその価値は失われたわけではない。詳細な書誌的な記述は、いわゆるエメノーの「ユニオン・リスト / Emeneau's Union List (1935)」と平行して使うことで、屢々より正確な書誌情報を得ることができる。その編集方針が、いわば辞典的目録の作成にあったことを知れば肯けよう。さらに添えていえば、1898年に同図書館に勤め、1903-1927年は館長として活躍して名高いトーマス (Frederic William Thomas: 1867-1956) が基案を作ったことは幸いであった。ネパールに関連して付け加えれば、この種の努力は今に続き、ネーパリー文献についても主題別分類目録を作成し、簡略な解説を付して刊行している:

Prana Natha & Jitendra Bimala Chaudhuri, *Catalogue of the Library of the India Office, Volume II, Part I* (Revised Edition): *Sanskrit Books*, 4 vols.: Section I (A-G) (London: H. M.'s Stationery Office, 1938), xxiv, 990p.; Section II (H – *Kṛṣṇa-līlāmṛta*) (1951), (i), 991-1374 p.; Section III (*Kṛṣṇa-līlāmṛta* – R) (1953), viii, 1375-2220 p.; IV (S – Z) (1957), (i), 2221-3149 p.

Catalogue of Nepali Printed Books in the India Office Library (India Office Library and Records), compiled by Michael Hutt (London: The British Library, Reference Division Publications, 1985), viii, 43 p., plus: "Author Index", 5 p.; "Title Index", 8 p. — ISBN 0-7123-0046-5.

2.6.8. ついでながら、これも年輩の学徒には懐かしい、かつての大英博物館の東洋書籍部に目録があった。筆者は今手許で参照できないが、下に一応挙げておきたい。というのは、恐らくはこれ以後の目録を範として成ったのが、第二次世界大戦後に出たインドの国立図書館の古典文献の蔵書目録で、著者・表題・訳者・叢書などあらゆる角度から探索できるように編まれている。もう一点、範となったのではないかと筆者が推測するのが、恐らく当時のカルカッタの頭脳を集めて結実したと思われる、梵語大学 (Sanskrit College) のあらゆる分野の蔵書目録 (1919年刊) である。これが刊行された時に学長を務めていたのが、仏教学徒の多くが恩恵を受けているであろうヴィダーブーシャナ (Satis Chandra Vidyabhusana: 1870-1920) である:⁵⁶

Ernest Haas, *Catalogue of Sanskrit and Pali Books in the British Museum (Department of Oriental Books and Manuscripts)* (London: Trübner & Co., 1876), viii, 188 p.

A Supplementary Catalogue ... Acquired in the Years 1892-1906, compiled by Lionel David Barnett [Printed by Order of the Trustees of the British Museum] (London: Sold at the British Museum, and by Longmans & Co., Bernard Quaritch, Henry Frowde, 1908), vii p., 1096 cols.

A Supplementary Catalogue ... Acquired in the Years 1906-1928, compiled by L. D. Barnett (London: Sold at the British Museum & by Oxford University Press, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1928), vii p., 1694 cols.

Catalogue of Printed Books in the Sanskrit College Library [Principal of the College: Satis Chandra Vidyabhusana] (Calcutta: The Bengal Secretariat Book Depot, 1919), (i), ii, iv, 535 p. (Non-Bengali), 314 p. (Bengali).

2.6.9. 多くの善本を所蔵する図書館も、それを誇りに収蔵目録 (主題別分類目録) を公刊するよ

⁵⁶ Among many other matters he may be remembered as a pioneer in the field of Indo-Tibetan studies. In connection with this paragraph I would cite an example of Satis Chandra Vidyābhūṣaṇa, "Sanskrit Works on Literature, Grammar, Rhetoric and a Lexicography as Preserved in Tibet", *Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, III, 2 (1907), p. 121-132.

うになる。例えば、マイソールは、早くから善本蒐集に気を配っていたらしく、その実績を第二次世界大戦終結の直前に刊行する。⁵⁷

A Catalogue of Printed Sanskrit Works in the Government Oriental Library, Mysore (1891-1944) / मैसूर प्राच्यकोशालयस्य मुद्रितसंस्कृतपुस्तकप्रदर्शनी / Compiled Under the Supervision of H. R. Rangaswamy Iyengar (Curator-in-charge) by Vidwan S. Sitarama Sastry (Pandit) (Mysore: Printed by the Assistant Superintendent at the Government Branch Press, 1944), iv, 409 p.

2.6.10. 1958 年からは、インド国立図書館が年次目録の公刊を決定し、別途に『梵語典籍部』を編集出版する。その第一巻は、1964 年にニュー・デリーで国際梵語学会が開催されたのを機に 1958～1962 年度分として、第二巻は同市で 1972 年に催された同学会を機に刊行された。第三巻は、これもベナーレスで 1981 年に開かれた同学会の折りに刊行予定だったのが一年遅れになった。これも筆者は後追いが出来ていないが、今も続いて刊行されているものと願っている。その他に、マドラスで、先ずはクップスヴァーミ (Kuppuswami Sastri: 1880-1940) の肝入りで、全世界を相手に写本・刊本など全ての古典籍を網羅しようと、第二次大戦前の 1937 年に小分冊を出して世に問い出発した大企画で、ラーガヴァン (Venkatarama Raghavan: 1908-1979) が継承して 1949 年に本格的な第一巻を出したが更に改訂し(1968)、未だ完結を見ずに続行している。⁵⁸

Catalogue of Sanskrit, Pali and Prakrit Books (National Library), Volume I: A – G, compiled by D. L. Banerjee and Tārakesvara Chatterjee under the Guidance of Y. M. Mulay (Published by B. S. Kesavan, Librarian, National Library, Calcutta, 1951), (i), vi, 333 p.; —, Volume II: H – Q (1956), (i), ii, 427 p. — [Librarian: B. S. Kesavan (*1909)].⁵⁹

राष्ट्रिय-ग्रन्थ-सूचि: । संस्कृत-विभाग: १९५८ - १९६२ (राष्ट्रिय-ग्रन्थालय, कलकत्ता). With a Foreword by Humayun Kabir (Editor-in-Chief: B. S. Kesavan / Editor: N. B. Marathe) (Central Reference Library, National Library, Calcutta, 1964), (i), xxi, 352 p. [N.L.C. 4.58-62/500]; ... 1963-1967 / *Rashtriya Granthasuchi – Sanskritavibhaga 1963-1967*. With a Foreword by Suniti Kumar Chatterji, and an Introduction by C. R. Banerji, Librarian (Editor: N. B. Marathe) (Calcutta: Central Reference Library, Ministry of Education and Social Welfare, Government of India, 1972), (iv), xxii, 282 p.; ... 1968-1977 / *Rashtriya Granthasuchi – Sanskritavibhaga 1968-1977*. With a Foreword by R. N. Dandekar, and an Introduction by H. N. Ananda Ram, Central Reference Librarian (1982), xxiii, 434, xx p.

2.6.10. 米国議会図書館のアジア部門は、収蔵目録を常時公刊して内外の研究教育機関に配布するなど、今日まで関連の学徒に多大の貢献をなしてきた。中でもニューデリー事務所の第二次世界大戦後の活躍には目を瞠るものがある。長い間、個人的にも恩恵に浴した研究者は多いと思う。これは多分に長らく現地所長を務めたジーン・スミス (Eric Gene Smith: *1936) の人柄に負うところが大きい。今となってみると、極めて残念なことに廃刊になってしまった収書目録は、市販の形をとったので個人でも入手できて、外にあって南アジアの全ての言語による出版事情を知る上で非常に役立った。隔月に刊行された目録の創刊号と終刊号を最後に挙げて本節を閉じたい:

The South Asian Bibliographer: A List of Current Publications Compiled by the Library of Congress, New Delhi, Volume I, Number 1: January-February 1998 [1200 items] (New Delhi-Thousand Oaks-London: Sage Publications, 1998), v, 128 p.; —, Vol. V, No. 6: November-December 2002 (2002), (v), 695-832 p. [up to 7200 items]; plus Vol. V: *Author/Title Indexes* (2002), (vi), 833-1010 p. — ISSN 0971-9695. — LC No. 98-900101.

॥ शुभमस्तु नेपालजनस्यार्थय हिताय सुखाय च ॥

⁵⁷ See *op.cit.*, p. 332-334, 405f.: “Baudha-granthāḥ”, which includes *Aneecdota Oxoniensia, Aryan Series*, I, 3 (Oxford 1884); see e.g. No. 29 (p. 333): *Hṛdaya Sūtra*, No. 5 (p. 332): *Uṣṇīṣavijayā Dhāraṇī*, ed. F. Max Müller & Bunyiu Nanjio.

⁵⁸ Cf. e.g. Yuyama, *Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscript Collections* (1992), p. 3: No. 10: *New Catalogus Catalogorum*.

⁵⁹ So far have I been unable to trace the following volume, which should be the last for R-Z. In fact, a supplementary volume has appeared: *Catalogue of Sanskrit, Pali and Prakrit Books, Supplement, 1947-1980: A-Z* (Calcutta: The National Library of India, Government of India, 1980), vii, 583 p. (*unseen*).

§3. 徳格印經院 — 仏教文献学・仏教書誌学確立のための周辺資料を追って

3.0. このデルゲの地は、長い間にわたって地理的にも政治的にも専家の訪問を困難にしてきたので、ごく限られた人たちが調査を許されてきた。しかし、その数は決して今日まで少ないわけでもない。思ったよりは多いといえるかもしれない。そしてそれなりに報告もなされているが、残念ながらあまり組織的・系統的になされてきたとはいえないものがあった。その中には単に興味本位のものもあり、折角の現地調査をしても、隔靴搔痒のもったいなさを感じるものさえあった。また、いうまでもなく、調査する研究者の関心によって報告の違いがあり、万人を満足させるわけにもいかない。下に紹介する書は、筆者にとっては、本邦で出る刊行物の中でも待ち望んだ類の書というべきものである。できる限りの資料にあたる姿勢が見られて、文字通りに活かしている文化遺産を捉えた、まことに有難い報告書である。このような調査研究報告を刊行した出版社に再び感謝したいと思う。実は直ちに uptake するつもりでいたが、遅くなってしまった。これは筆者を大いに刺激する材料が盛り沢山であった。今後に期待するのは、チベット学・仏教学を文献学的に考究する立場からの専門家の追求であろう。

池田巧・中西純一・山中勝次著：『活かしている文化遺産／デルゲパルカン／チベット大蔵経木版印刷所の歴史と現在』（東京・明石書店、2003.VII.15）、214 p., incl. num. col. ill., b/w figs.

3.1. 実は、十数年前から、筆者は仏教文献学を志す学徒のための書誌学骨子を刊行し始めた。これを初心者に演習の中で用いて、じっくりと骨格に肉付けしようと私かに考えていたが、二点のみで刊行は中絶し、それを演習室で使う機会を得ずに終わってしまった。⁶⁰ 次に公開を計画していた中の一が、仏教梵語文献学を攷究するうえで、不可欠のチベット文献資料を発掘するために必要な、いわゆる工具としての骨子の書誌を同様に教科書風に纏めることであった。当時でも、既にチベット学の進歩は膨大な資料を江湖に提供してくれていたが、ここ十数年の急速な進展は追い続けるのも困難どころか不可能なほどである。連綿と生きてきたデルゲの地の印刷になるものだけをとって、甘珠爾・丹珠爾はもとより、全書・単行書の類など、膨大な数量の書誌的資料も刊行されてきている。さらには常に行われてきている版本の象嵌修理などによる印刷の改訂などがあり、これらを一度使う立場から整理してみる必要がある。これはデルゲの印行だけを辿るにしても、相当に骨の折れる仕事になること必定である。

3.1a. 実は一言だけ付け加えておくと、デルゲ版に限らず、どの版を使用するにも、出来れば何時刷られたものか、少なくとも今どこに在る版を用いたかを明記して引用して貰いたい。綿密な文献学的研究成果を期待すれば、読みの異同が重大な結果を生みかねないのだ。一例をデルゲ甘珠爾に挙げれば、誰もがポンのアイマーに負うところが極めて大である。⁶¹ 彼が、ラサ版のような新しいものでも、誤影を修正するために、あるいは何度も印刷に使用して磨(刷)り減った版本を象嵌などで改版することで刷りの違いのあることを比較・証明して専家を驚かせたものだ。⁶² これ

⁶⁰ A. Yuyama, *A Select Bibliography on the Sanskrit Language for the Use of Students in Buddhist Philology* (= *Bibliographia Indica et Buddhica: Pamphlet Series*, I) (Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies Library, 1982), iv, 17 p. — ISBN 4-906267-16-5; *A Revised Edition* (1992), vi, [2], 24 p. — ISBN 4-906267-28-9.

—, *Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscript Collections: A Bibliographical Guide for the Use of Students in Buddhist Philology* (= *Series*, II) (1992), xi, 28 p. — ISBN 4-906267-31-9.

⁶¹ Cf. e.g. among others Helmut Eimer, "Gibt es einen schwarzen Druck des tibetischen Kanjur aus Derge?", *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, N.F., IV (1984), p. 239-242; —, "Die beiden Fassungen des Dkar chag zum Derge-Kanjur", *Indo-Iranian Journal*, XXVIII, 4 (1985), p. 281-286.

⁶² See e.g. H. Eimer, "Two Versions of a Volume within the Lhasa Kanjur", *Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the 4th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies* (Schloss Hohenkammer, Munich, 1985), ed. Helga Uebach & Jampa L. Panglung (= *Studia Tibetica: Quellen und Studien zur tibetischen Lexikographie*, II) (München: Kommission für zentralasiatische Studien, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1988), p. 149-156 (incl. 5 pl.).

ら種々の問題を取り上げたら際限がない。何と言っても、デルゲ大藏經に関しては、万国共通番号(いわゆる東北番号)を世界に提供してくれた、わが国が誇るべき東北目録を挙げねばなるまい。⁶³ 勿論、大谷大学図書館所蔵の北京版西藏大藏經甘珠爾勘同目録の刊行(1930-1932)も手伝って、本邦ばかりでなく、内外の専家の研究を刺激し、多くの見るべき成果が発表されてきた。また、近年の相次ぐデルゲ版の覆刻(時にマイクロフォームでの)刊行や関連の労作は、多くの紙数を割いても枚挙に暇がない。⁶⁴

3.2. 少なくとも今回は、デルゲをまともに取り上げる余裕はまったくないので、せめていくつかのデルゲ・パルカンに関わる最近の周辺資料を、中国の出版物に求めて恣意的に挙げるに止めておこう。最初は、すでに古く極めて簡略な小冊子であるが、白黒ながら実写らしい写真と木刻画の図版もあり、藏文典籍の文化宝庫と称えて紹介している新鮮ささえ感じたものだ。その後二十年してチベット人学者(*1944)が、高度な印刷技術をもって、これまた生き活きとした写真を豊富に豪華な書物に仕立て漢藏英語をもって刊行してくれた。勿論、今や徳格に関する種々の書物も出ているがここで追う紙幅は尽きた:

嚴毓祖・責任編集: 徳格印經院(成都・四川民族出版社, 1981), (iii), 41 p., VII frontisp.-pl., 10 facs. [魏伯勤, “藏族文化寶庫——徳格印經院”, p. 1-7 (俱備影)].

楊嘉銘著・徳格印經院 (= 西南人文書系) (成都・四川民族出版社, 2000), 140 p. (incl. many ills.). — ISBN 7-220-04879-3.

3.3. 北京の民族出版社から、噶瑪隆村・斯塔・曲札・西饒降稱と音写される人々の編訳書で、大藏經・文集に分けて漢藏語で編んだ目録がある。色刷口絵の写真などは現況を知るに便利だ:

Karma Rgyal-mtshan dan / Sri-thar / Chos-grags/ Śes-rab rgyal-mtshan-bcas-khyis bsgrigs-bsgyur-byas: *Sde-dge par-khañ-gi dkar-chag* [徳格印經院・藏版細目] (Mi-rigs dpe-skrun-khañ, 2003.2), 4, 3, 3, 295 p., VII-page plates in colour (24 photos). — ISBN 7-105-05389-5.

3.4. 四川民族出版社の刊行物から二つ拾ってみよう。先ずは司徒・曲吉穹乃と漢字音写される人の著した徳格甘珠爾の目録である。興味深い刷り物も散りばめてある。次は、噶瑪隆村の編訳書で、これは大藏經・叢刊・文集・綜合類に分けて漢藏語で編み、本書の始めに藏漢英語で『徳格印經院簡況』を置き便利である:

Si-tu Chos-kyi 'Byuñ-gnas-khyis brtsams: *Sde-dge'i bka'-gyur dkar-chag* [大藏經《甘珠爾》總目録] (Si-khron mi-rigs dpe-skrun-khañ, 1988), (i), (i), 10, 491 p., 2 col. frontisp. — ISBN 7-5409-0178-X.

Karma Rgyal-mtshan-gyis bsgrigs-bsgyur-byas: *Sde-dge par-khañ-gi par-sin dkar-chag bod-rgya san-shyar* (Si-khron mi-rigs dpe-skrun-khañ, 2004.9), (iii), 6, 13, 13, 8, 416, 2 p., 1 col. frontisp. — ISBN 7-5409-3016-0.

3.5. 北京の中國藏學出版社から徳格印經院の文集 (*Gsun-'bum*) の藏文による細目が出ている:

Sde-dge Par-khañ dan Dkar-mdzes-khul Rtsom-sgyur-cus-khyis bsgrigs / [徳格印經院・甘孜編譯局編]: *Sde-dge Par-khañ-gi Dkar-chag zib-rgyas-su bkod-pa śes-hya-ba'i sgo-'byed* — *Gsun-'bum-skor* / [徳格印經院目録大全. I: 文集類細目] (Kruñ-go'i Bod-kyi Śes-rig Dpe-skrun-khañ / 北京・中國藏學出版社, 1994.10), 8, 2, 3, 5, 679 p., 1 col. frontisp. (a photo of Sde-dge par-khañ building), 1 col. pl. (a portrait of Sroñ-btsan-sgam-po) — ISBN 7-80057-106-8.

— / [—]: — / — *Gter-mdzod-skor* / [—], II: 伏藏典籍 (2000.4), 8, 3, 8, 739, p., 1 col. frontisp. (same as vol. I). — ISBN 7-80057-383-4.

3.6. 徳格版に限って、これ以上紙数を食むわけにはいかないが、中国・北京に関連して想起こ

⁶³ 宇井伯壽・鈴木宗忠・金倉圓照・多田等編, 西藏大藏經總目録 / *A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon*. With an Index Volume. 2 vols. (仙台: 東北帝國大學, 1934), (5), 2, 2, 703, 3 pp.: 124 pp (index).

⁶⁴ After all, those who are interested in the development of Tibetan Kanjur studies are advised to start with a collection of Helmut Eimer's articles: *Ein Jahrzehnt Studien zur Überlieferung des tibetischen Kanjur* (= *Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde*, Heft 28) (Wien: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien, 1992), xl, 202 p. (mit zahlreichen Ills.). — 'The above-mentioned article on the Lhasa Kanjur versions for example can be found in this book, p. 156-163.

すのは、いわば第二次世界大戦後の盟邦関係もあってか、幸運にも若くして北京に留学した俊秀・チェコ共和国学土院東洋学研究所のコルマシュ (Josef Kolmaš / 高馬士: *1933) が祖国にもたらした徳格からの印刷物である。周知のように、彼は徳格に関する優れた著作を数多く公刊しているが、中でも筆者は徳格版本を用いる研究者必携の最新作を、是非とも挙げておきたい。実は、彼に初めて遇ったのは、既に四十余年も前のレイデンで、キャンペラにも客員研究員として来訪し、職場を共にしたことがあるので、学識ある友人として尊敬している。この二冊の書は、若干の誤解を招こうが、その八十余頁に及ぶ序論は徳格とその出版に関して余すところなく説いている:

Prague Collection of Tibetan Prints from Derge, Volume III: Index of Titles. 2 Books (= volumes), compiled and introduced by Josef Kolmaš (= *Dissertationes orientales*, XLVIII) (Prague: Oriental Institute, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, 1996), Book I, ix, 25 p.; Book II, vii, 253-510 p.: Part I, "Introduction", p. 1-88; Part II, "Index of Titles: KA - NA", p. 89-250, —, "PA - A", p. 253-432; Part III, "Index of Names", p. 433-450; Part IV, "Concordances", p. 451-509. — ISBN 80-85425-21-1.

3.7. チベット学の分野で、恐らく多くの仕事をしたジーン・スミス (Ellis Gene Smith: *1936) を忘れらることはできまい。またまた年寄りの懐古趣味と取られそうで困るが、彼はシアトルでチベット学を修めて後、インド学仏教学を磨くべくレイデンへ留学してきた。丁度、筆者の留学と重なって親しくして戴いた。1965年に、ドゥ・ヨング (Jan Willem de Jong: 1921-2000) に誘われて、その研究助手として筆者は職に就くために先にキャンペラ入りし、ジーン・スミスが後から留学して来るのを待っていた。彼は途次フォード財団助成金でインドに立ち寄って、若干の書籍を先にオランダから送っていたが、ついにインドに根を下ろしてキャンペラには現れなかった。しかし米国議会図書館のために務めた間というもの、誰しも異論はないと思うが、彼が印度学・西藏学・仏教学のみならず、東洋学全般の発展に並々ならぬ貢献をなした。彼が若い頃に作成したチベット文献目録は、知る人ぞ知る貢献である。⁶⁵ 1997年に議会図書館を退任して、翌々年に、ハーヴァードの専門家も加わって、貴重な古典籍を発掘・整理し、計数情報化し電子記憶画像で提供を心がけてくれる。⁶⁶ これには徳格版大蔵経も含まれる。彼のチベット文献資料に関する知識は、誇張でなく百科辞典というべきで、いつしか貴重な文献の出版に際して多忙を極めるなか優れた序論・解説を記したのが山積した。これらを集めて一書に纏めてくれたのは、今後の研究者にとっても不可欠の導論となるであろうと信じ、下に書き留めておきたい:

E. Gene Smith, *Among Tibetan Texts: History and Literature of the Tibetan Plateau*, ed. Kurtis R. Schaeffer with a foreword by Jeffrey Hopkins (= *Studies in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism*) Somerville MA / Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2001), xiii, 384 p. — ISBN 0-86171-179-3 / LC Call Number: BQ7674.S65 2001.

⁶⁵ Ellis Gene Smith, *University of Washington Tibetan Catalogue*, Part I. 2 vols. (Seattle: University of Washington, 1969), iii, 160 p.; 161-329 p. — LC Call Number: Z881.W3297 1969.

⁶⁶ The Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center: TBRC at the Rubin Museum of Art, 150 W 17th Street, New York, NY 10011, U.S.A.

Brief Communication:

A notebook transcribing manuscript B of the *Karmavibhaṅga* formerly belonging to the private collection of Hemraj Sharman

Before the Nepal German Manuscript Preservation Project (= NGMPP) was launched, the collection of Hemraj Sharman (1878-1953), the Raj Guru of Nepal, has already been incorporated into the National Archives of Nepal as the fifth series.¹ This collection was sold by his family after his death to the Nepal government of the time for Rs. 300,000.² The Nepal government decided to house his collection in the National Library (or Nepal Rashtriya Pustakalaya); later the government aggregated all the manuscripts kept in governmental institutions such as the National Library, the National Museum, and the Bir Library (or Durbar Library) into the National Archives of Nepal.

I am grateful to Diwakar Acharya who kindly informed me of the fact that in the materials filmed by the NGMPP several manuscripts of the *Karmavibhaṅga* and related historical documents are now available in the form of microfilm.³ Among them, the transcriptions in a western style notebook, probably prepared or supervised by Hemraj Sharman at the request of Sylvain Lévi in 1922, are included.⁴

The notebooks, which formerly belonged to Hemraj Sharman's private collection, are invaluable witness of Lévi's editorial procedure.⁵ In Lévi's edition, I could find many instances that Lévi's reading and his notes concerning the variant readings from the manuscripts differ from those of genuine manuscripts; putting this and his introduction together, I had to conclude that the transcriptions he used for his edition were not a faithful text but one which might have been affected by partial Sanskritization, namely that a scribal or wrong reading was corrected to normal Sanskrit expression/wording. It was, however, mere speculation at that time because we could not know how far this

¹ I am thankful to Diwakar Acharya who kindly gave me this information. The description in this paragraph is mainly based on his information and on Garzilli 2001, "A Sanskrit Letter Written by Sylvain Lévi in 1923 to Hemaraja Śarmā along with Hitherto Unknown Bibliographical Notes," in: *Journal of the Nepal Research Centre* XII, pp. 115-150, especially pp. 119-120.

² Garzilli *op. cit.*, p. 119 and n. 14.

³ There are two original Sanskrit manuscripts. One is the first three folios of manuscript B used by Sylvain Lévi and myself in our respective editions; the other is a newly identified paper manuscript in Newārī script. As to the former, I would like to request readers to refer our paper published in this issue (Diwakar Acharya and Kudo, pp. 33-42); for the latter see another paper in this issue (pp. 43-60).

⁴ We cannot know who made this transcription: Hemraj Sharman himself or someone who worked with him? According to Diwakar Acharya, the transcription of MS[A] bears No. 5-265; on microfilm, B94/3 and that of MS[B] bears No. 5-263; on microfilm, A109/9.

⁵ S. Lévi 1932: *Mahākarmavibhaṅga (La Grande Classification des Actes) et Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa (Discussion sur le Mahā Karmavibhaṅga)*, Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux. Probably the same situation might have happened when Lévi published the *Vijñāptimātratāsiddhi* in 1925, of which the Nepalese manuscripts were also found by Hemraj Sharman. At present we can see the facsimile edition of the original Sanskrit manuscripts along with the transcriptions in a western notebook: *Three Works of Vasubandhu in Sanskrit Manuscript: the Trisvabhāvanirdeśa, the Viṃśatikā with its Vṛtti, and the Triṃśikā with Stbhiramati's commentary*, ed. by K. Mimaki, M. Tachikawa and A. Yuyama (Bibliotheca Codicum Asiaticorum I), Tokyo: The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies, 1989, especially Mss H and I. See also Garzilli *op. cit.*, pp. 121-22.

kind of Sanskritization was introduced into the transcriptions.

Now we have two different materials of the manuscripts: one is the original manuscripts and the other is the transcriptions of them. Comparing each of them *verbatim ad literatim*, we can see that most of the variant readings recorded by Lévi were introduced by the copyist in the process of the transcriptions prepared under the supervision of Hemraj Sharman.

Here, due to the limit of time, I only report on the transcription of MS[B]. According to NGMPP index card, the size of this notebook is 16.5 x 20.5 cm. The text is written only on the right pages, on 42 pages of 20 lines each. This notebook was produced or distributed by a company called “Naran Chandra Pal & Bros., Calcutta”; on the book cover there is a trade name “EMPIRE EXERCISE BOOK” and portraits of Queen Victoria and Albert; between the two portraits the date “1923” is printed.⁶ On the top of the first page of the transcription a succinct memorandum is written by the one who transcribed: “*ādītas tṛtīyapatraparyantaṃ nāsti !*” (“There is no folio from the beginning to the third”). It is certain that at the time when Hemraj Sharman or someone who engaged in preparing this transcription he was not aware of the existence of the first three folios which also belonged to the private collection of Hemraj Sharman.

In the following, romanization of the transcription of fourth folio is given line by line, corresponding to Lévi 1932: 28.9-29.28 = Kudo 2004: 19.1-25.10⁷: wherever this transcription differs from the reading of actual manuscript I put letter(s) in bold italics and give the difference under each line; some letters are underlined in this notebook itself probably for indicating an insertion or correction, which is written in the margin of the notebook.

e.x. *ñjaro* goṇikāstrtāt

MS: kku → ñja

[meaning]: *ñja*. In MS it is written as *kku* but transcribed as *ñja*.

The sigla “x” indicates that letter(s) in bold italics are actually absent in the manuscript. In general, a portion where a line is broken is left open or marked by a dot in this notebook.

Romanized text of the transcript of MS[B].

p. 1 (right page)

ādītas tṛtīyapatraparyantaṃ nāsti | śrīḥ

karmavibhaṅgaḥ ||

1 4A]⁸ ⁹tadupadarśaya | atha śaṅkhaku

2 *ñjaro* goṇikāstrtāt paryaṅkāḍ avatīrya yenānyasta¹⁰mapurāṇavāsagr

MS: kku → ñja¹¹

⁶ This indicates that preparation of the transcription of MS[B] was done at least from 1923 onwards.

⁷ N. Kudo 2004: *The Karmavibhaṅga: Transliterations and Annotations of the Original Sanskrit Manuscripts from Nepal*. (BPPB VII), Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism.

⁸ Folio numbers and sides (A or B) are written in arabic numerals and roman script.

⁹ Before this, a space is left open.

¹⁰ On the right margin, “ta” is found.

¹¹ I have already pointed out that the word *kuñjara* in Lévi 1932 was most probably a mistranscription of

- 3 *baṇi* tenopasaṇkrānta upasaṇkramya catura paryaṇkapādukāt pāda¹²
MS: han → haṇ; saṇ → saṇ; da → du
- 4 tamadhyāṇ ca mukhatuṇḍakeno(pa)jighra<<ti>> yatih yataḥ
5 śuko mānavas taudeyaputro kṛtākṛtasya hiraṇṇyasuvāṇasya catu
MS: ṇa → na; ra → raṇ; rṇṇa → rṇa
- 6 ro lohisaṇghātān adhigatavān madhyāc *ca* sauva . . .¹³ kamaṇḍalum* |
MS: ca → c ca; x → m*
- 7 atha śuko mā(*na*)vas taudeyaputras tatsuvāṇam gopayitvā hr
MS: ṇa → (ṇa); nsu → t su; rṇṇa → rṇaṇ
- 8 ṣṭaṣṭodagrapritisaumanasya jāto¹⁴ śrāvastyā niṣkramya yena bhaga
9 vāms tenopasaṇkrāntas tena khalu samaye . . . vān¹⁵ anekaśatāyāṇ
MS: saṇ → saṇ; sa → śa
- 10 bhikṣuparṣadi purastān niṣaṇṇo dharmam deṣayati | adraṅśic chukam mā
MS: rṇṇo → ṇṇo; rma → rmaṇ
- 11 ṇavam taudeyaputraṇ dūrād evāgacchantam dṛṣṭvā ca punar bhikṣūṇām āmantra
MS: x → ṇ; x → r
- 12 yate sma | paśyatha yū . . . kṣavaḥ¹⁶ śukam māṇavam taudeyaputraṇ dūrata e
MS: x → kṣa; n mā → ṇ mā
- 13 vāgacchantam evam bhagavan* sacce chuko mānavas taudeyaputro smi
MS: m bha → ṇ bha
- 14 n samaye kalam kuryād yathā bhallo nikṣipta¹⁷
15 deveṣūpapadyeta | tathā hy anena mamāntike cittam prasāditam citta
MS: nte → ta |; m pra → ṇ pra
- 16 prasādanā heto bhikṣavaḥ¹⁸ | evam ihaike satvāḥ kāyasya bhedāt *su*
MS: n su → t su
- 17 gatau svargalo¹⁹
18 4B) tasyām velāyāṇ gāthām bhāṣate | ²⁰“prasannacittam dṛṣṭvaiva e
MS: m → ṇ; m → ṇ; x → ṇ
- 19 kadyam iha pudgalam* | etam arthaṇ vyākārśic chāstā bhi<<kṣu>>gaṇānti

kukkura, see Kudo et al 1999“*Mahākarmavibhaṅga* and *Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa* (1): Two Original Manuscripts preserved in National Archives of Nepal,” [with S. KARASUUMA and T. FUKITA] in: *ARIRIAB* II [in Japanese], pp. 93-128, esp. 98-99 and Kudo 2004: 343, s.v. *Śaṅkhakuṇḍjara*.

¹² A space is marked by this type of dot. MS[B]: *pādana*(4r.2) + + + + + .. *kbha*{*ma*}*dhyāṇ*.

¹³ MS[B]: *sauva*(4r.3) + + ..

¹⁴ On the right margin, “*yo | tab*” is found.

¹⁵ MS[B]: *tena khalu samaye*(4r.4) + + + *vān*.

¹⁶ MS[B]: *yū*(4r.5) + + + *vaḥ*.

¹⁷ MS[B]: *nikṣip*.. .. *ṇ* *s. g. [tau] sva*(4r.6) + + + *[nt]e*.

¹⁸ On the right margin, “*r bhi*” is found.

¹⁹ MS[B]: *svargalo* .[c] + + + + + + + + + (4v.1) + + + *s tasyām*. As those missing akṣaras are not indicated in this notebook, Lévi gives a note: “B om. athā ...” (Lévi 1932: 29, fn. 4).

²⁰ A double quotation mark is given in this notebook.

MS: $x \rightarrow m^*$ 20 ke | idānī<<ṃ>> kālaṃ kurvīta māṇavaḥ | upapa²¹MS: $x \rightarrow m$; $n \rightarrow m$

p. 3

1 dūritam nikṣipta evam eva tathāgate | cittaprasādanā heto satvā gaccha
 2 nti saṅgatin*” || atha *śuko māṇava*s taudeyaputro bhagavāṃs tenopasaṅkrā

MS: $su \rightarrow śu$; $māvaṇa \rightarrow māṇa$; $saṃ \rightarrow saṅ$ 3 nta upasaṅkra²² *saṃ*mukhaṃ . . . dānī²³ saṃrañjanī vividhāṃMS: $sa \rightarrow saṃ$; $saṃ \rightarrow saṃ$; $ja \rightarrow ṇja$ 4 *vyatīṣārya*kānte niṣaṅgaḥ | ekāntaniṣaṅgaṃ *śuka*m māṇavaṃ taudeMS: $kathāṃ vya \rightarrow vya$; $ryo \rightarrow ryai$; $rṇṇa \rightarrow ṇṇa$; $su \rightarrow śu$; $vam \rightarrow vaṃ$ 5 yaputraṃ bhavān idam avocat*, kaccin *māṇava* tat tathaiva yathā mayā śaṅkhaMS: $bhagavān \rightarrow bhavān$; $t^* mā \rightarrow n mā$ 6 kuṇjaro vyā²⁴ bho gautama tat tathaiva,²⁵ yathā bhagavatā gautamena śaMS: $kku \rightarrow ṇja$; $bhavatā \rightarrow bhagavatā$ 7 ṅkhakuṇjaro vyākṛtaḥ | anyad api tāvad vayaṃ bhagavantaṃ gautamaṃ prcchema
 kaMS: $kku \rightarrow ṇja$; $m bha \rightarrow m bha$ 8 ṇcid eva pradeśaṃ saced avakāśaṃ kuryāt praśnasya vyākaraṇa²⁶ yadyad evaMS: $sna \rightarrow śna$; $.. + \rightarrow raṇa$ 9 *kāṅk*ṣasi | ko bho gautama ko hetuḥ kaḥ pratyayo yenehaika satvā alpāMS: $kām \rightarrow kāṅ$; $ka \rightarrow kaḥ$ 10 yuṣo pi dīrghāyuṣo pi bahvābādḥā §²⁷ api § alpābādḥā § api § du11 *rvarṇā* § api suvarṇā api²⁸ *ma*heśākhyā api nīcakuMS: $rṇṇā \rightarrow rṇṇā$; $+ \rightarrow pi$; $.. \rightarrow ma$

12 līnā api § uccakulīnā api anādeyavākyaḥ api āde

MS: $nā-m \rightarrow nā$

13 yavākyaḥ api § alpabhogā api mahābhogā § api duṣprajñā § a

14 pi mahāprajñā § api ka(5A) [rest is omitted]

Noriyuki KUDO

(This research is supported in part by a Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C)(2) from JSPS)

²¹ The text ends in the middle. MS[B]: *upa*[p]. + + + + + + + + + (4r.2) + + + *dūritam*.²² MS[B]4v.2: *upasakr*. .. + + + + .[ā]*rdba*.²³ MS[B]: (4r.3) + + .. *nī*.²⁴ Before this, a space is left open. MS[B]: *vyā*(4r.4) + + .. *bho*.²⁵ This comma is written as it is.²⁶ MS[B]: *vyā*[ka] .. (4v.5) + + + + + ..²⁷ This symbol is given as it is.²⁸ Before this, a space is left open. MS[B]: *a*(4v.6) + + + + + .. *beśākhyā*.

活動報告（平成17年3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。
 「ORC検討委員会」を月2回の割合（夏期・冬期休暇中を除く）で開会。
 以下、月日を追って研究所および所長・所員の主要な活動を記す。

平成17年

3月1日(火) 「オープン・リサーチ・センター整備事業」（「仏教文献学研究センター」）の活動の一環として研究所ウェブページ開設 (<http://iriab.soka.ac.jp/orc/>)

3月22日(火)~23日(水) 菅野博史所長、ステファノ・ザケティ、工藤順之
 (財)東洋哲学研究所 第21回学術大会に出席

3月24日(木)~30日(水) 菅野所長 第19回国際宗教学宗教史会議世界大会 (IAIR, 開催地: 東京) に出席。Convenerとして、パネル “New Buddhist Movements as a Response to the Latter Days of the Law in China” を組織するとともに、“Huisi’s Perspective on the *Lotus Sūtra* as Seen through the *Meaning of the Course of Ease and Bliss in the Lotus Sūtra*” と題して発表。また、他のパネルで、“Inclusivism and Religious Tolerance in the *Lotus Sūtra*” と題して発表。

4月1日(金) 辛嶋静志 ストックホルム、国立民族博物館でコータン出土『法華経』チベット語古訳写本調査（三菱財団人文科学研究助成）

4月7日(木) 辛嶋 スウェーデン国立社会科学高等研究院 (The Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study in the Social Sciences) にて“A Project for a Buddhist Chinese Dictionary” と題して講演。

4月9日(土)~12日(火) 辛嶋 ロシア、サンクト・ペテルブルグ、ロシア科学院東方学研究所サンクト・ペテルブルグ支所を訪問し、梵語写本を調査（三菱財団人文科学研究助成）

4月18日(月) 辛嶋 スウェーデン出張（招聘）より帰国
 スウェーデン国立社会科学高等研究院 (The Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study in the Social Sciences) 客員研究員として中国語大辞典プロジェクト (Thesaurus Linguae Sericae: An Historical and Comparative Encyclopaedia of Chinese Conceptual Schemes) に参加し、漢訳仏典資料を担当 (2005.1.21~)

4月26日(火) 年報・研究叢書発送

- ・『創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所・年報』平成16年度(第8号) [3月31日付]
- ・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* (BPPB VIII), 2005, x + 457 pages, ISBN 4-9980622-7-1.

5月14日(土) 菅野所長 東アジア仏教研究会第7回定例研究会に出席（於：東洋大学）

5月12日(木)~26日(木) 辛嶋 アメリカ出張（招聘）
 ワシントン大学アジア言語文化学科にてガンダーラ語仏典について共同研究
 5/18 “A Project for a Buddhist Chinese Dictionary” と題して講演

5月23日(月)~26日(木) 菅野所長 第10回国際法華経会議（開催地：北京）に出席。
 “‘Relative Subtlety’ and ‘Absolute Subtlety’ in Zhiyi and Jizang: Concerning their

Interpretations of the Word 'Subtlety' (*miao* 妙) in the Title of the *Lotus Sūtra* と題して発表。

- 6月11日(土)~25日(土) 辛嶋 ロンドン、ロシア出張 (三菱財団人文科学研究助成)
ロシア、サンクト・ペテルブルグ、ロシア科学院東方学研究所サンクト・ペテルブルグ支所を訪問し、中央アジア出土梵語写本を調査
ロンドン、大英図書館にて中央アジア出土梵語写本を調査
- 6月16日(水) 第5回ORC「仏教文献学研究センター」公開講演会 (= 第31回仏教学懇話会)
ボストン大学、マルコム・デヴィッド・エッケル博士 (Prof. Dr. Malcolm David Eckel, Department of Religion, Boston University) を招聘
テーマ「清弁と彼の論争相手」(Bhavya and His Buddhist Opponents)
- 6月17日(木)~7月27日(水) ダニエル・B・スティーブンソン博士 (Dr Daniel B. Stevenson, University of Kansas) 本研究所客員研究員として滞在
- 7月15日(金)~16日(土) ORC「仏教文献学研究センター」ワークショップ
ピーター・スキリング博士 (Dr. Peter Skilling) を招き、仏教学研究の現状について討議
- 7月20日(水) 第6回ORC「仏教文献学研究センター」公開講演会 (= 第32回仏教学懇話会)
ベルリン・ブランデンブルク科学アカデミー、ペーター・ツィエム博士 (Dr. Peter Zieme, Leader of the research group "Turfan Studies" at the Berlin Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities) を招聘
テーマ「ウイグル語『法華経』—特に観音の変身に着目して—」(The uigur versions of the Lotus Sutra with special reference to the metamorphoses of Avalokiteśvara)
- 7月29日(金)~30日(土) 菅野所長 日本印度学佛教学会第56回学術大会 (於: 四天王寺国際仏教大学) 所長 理事会に出席。また「『法華文句』における四種釈について」と題して発表
- 7月末日 ステファノ・ザケッティ助教授退職 (ヴェネチア大学[カ・フォスカリ]赴任)
- 8月27日(土) 菅野所長 2005年度創価大学夏季大学講座にて「『法華経』を読む(1)—序品・方便品」と題して講演。
- 8月29日(月)~9月3日(土) 菅野所長、辛嶋、王藤
第14回国際仏教学会 (International Association of Buddhist Studies, 開催地: ロンドン) に参加し、それぞれ以下の題目で発表
菅野: "Huisi's Perspective on the Concept of 'Forbearance' as Seen through His *Meaning of the Lotus Sūtra's Course of Ease and Bliss*" [9/2]
辛嶋: "On newly identified Sanskrit fragments from the collections of the British Library and the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies" [8/30]
do.: "Underlying languages of early Chinese 'Translations of Buddhist scriptures'" [8/31]
do.: "Who composed the *Lotus Sūtra*? — Antagonism between wilderness and village monks" [9/2]
王藤: "A textual history of the *Karmavibhaṅga*: Further evidence from the fragments in the Schøyen collection" [8/30]
- 9月5日(月)~10日(土) 辛嶋 ベルリン出張 (招聘)
ベルリン・ブランデンブルク科学アカデミーにて"A Project for a Buddhist Chinese Dictionary"と題して講演。ベルリン国家図書館・インド美術館を訪問。中央アジア出土梵語断簡および美術品を調査

- 9月17日(土) 菅野所長 東アジア仏教研究会第8回定例研究会に出席 (於: 学習院大学)
- 10月7日(金) 菅野所長 ハーバード大学世界宗教研究センター・イェンチン研究所・東洋哲学研究所共催シンポジウム (開催地: アメリカ・ケンブリッジ) に出席。
“The *Lotus Sūtra* and the Dialogue of Religions” と題して発表。
- 10月22日(土) 菅野所長 八王子市「いちよう塾」で、「『法華経』と常不軽菩薩」と題して講演。
- 11月11日(金) 菅野所長 第47回天台宗教学大会 (於: 大正大学) に参加。
- 11月4日(木)~8日(月) 菅野所長 中国・北京に出張
第1回中日仏学会議に出席 (於: 人民大学)
「『大乘止観法門』における本覚・不覚の概念」と題して発表
- 11月27日(日) ORC「仏教文献学研究センター」ワークショップ
ホーカン・ヴァルケスト (Dr. Håkan Wahlquist, Senior Curator of Asian Collection; Keeper of the Sven Hedin Foundation, National Museum of Ethnography, Stockholm), 石川巖 (東方研究会) の両氏を招き、「チベット古訳経典」について討議
- 12月3日(土) 菅野所長 東アジア仏教研究会第4回年次大会に出席 (於: 駒沢大学)
- 12月9日(金) 第7回ORC「仏教文献学研究センター」公開講演会 (= 第33回仏教学懇話会)
ペンシルヴァニア大学教授、ヴィクター・メヤー博士 (Prof. Dr. Victor H. Mair, Pennsylvania University) を招聘
テーマ「中国中世期における仏教と道教の交渉」(Buddho-Taoist Interactions in Early Medieval China)
- 平成18年
1月1日(土) ジャン・ナティエ教授着任 (前インディアナ大学宗教学科教授)

国際仏教学高等研究所所長・所員の著作 (List of Publications of the IRIAB Director and Fellows)

菅野 博史 (Hiroshi KAN'NO) Director

- 『法華經—永遠の菩薩道』(中国語版)台湾:地球書房,2005.1.
 『現代語訳阿含經—長阿含經—』第六卷,共訳,平河出版社,2005.12,ISBN4-89203-330-8,pp.262-271,460-463. (*Annotated Translation of the Chinese Version of the Dīrghāgama*, coauthor, vol. 6, Tokyo: Hirakawa Shuppansha, 2005).
 「『法華經』の現代意義」李四龍・周学農主編『哲学、宗教与人文』,商務印書館,2004.12, pp. 639-649.
 「中国佛教早期經典注釈書の性格」『世界宗教研究』増刊,総第100期,2004.12, pp. 15-20.
 「『法華經』の包容主義と宗教寛容」『世界宗教研究』増刊,総第100期,2004.12, pp. 62-70.
 「『大乗止観法門』における「本覚」・「不觉」の概念」『創価大学人文論集』17, 2005.3, pp. 68-88.
 「初期中国仏教の経疏について」『村中祐生先生古稀記念論文集・大乗仏教思想の研究』,東京:山喜房仏書林,2005.6, pp. 19-36.
 “Inclusivism and Religious Tolerance in the *Lotus Sūtra*,” in: *The Journal of Oriental Studies* 15, 2005.12, pp. 94-108.
 「『法華文句』における四種釈について」『印度学仏教学研究』54-1, 2005.12, pp. 79-87.
 【翻訳】
 任繼愈「現代文明と宗教対話」『東洋学術研究』44-1, 2005.5, pp. 86-94.
 卓新平「現代社会における宗教対話の苦境と希望」『東洋学術研究』44-1, 2005.5, pp. 95-111.
 魏道儒「宗教対話に有益な仏教の伝統的資源」『東洋学術研究』44-1, 2005.5, pp. 112-124.
 魏常海「現代の中日仏教における世間の重視」『東洋学術研究』44-2, 2005.12, pp. 97-115.

I. 学会研究機関等・役員:

1. 日本印度学仏教学会・理事/評議員(2001-).
2. 日本宗教学会・評議員(2004-).
3. 中国人民大学客員教授(2001-).
4. 勸東洋哲学研究所研究員(1985-)/主任研究員(2004-)/評議員(1992-).
5. 勸東京大学仏教青年会評議員(2003-).
6. 東アジア仏教研究会会長(2003-)

湯山 明 (Akira YUYAMA)

- 「楞伽島備忘録記の雑學的拾遺」『創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所・年報』第8号(2004), 2005, pp. 3-20.
 (“Further Notes on the Island of Lanka,” in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 2004*, vol. VIII, 2005, pp. 3-20).
 “Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica (III),” in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 2004*, vol. VIII, 2005, pp. 377-394.

I. 学会研究機関等・役員/研究所員:

1. 立正大学法華經文化研究所・特別所員(1978-).
 Extraordinary Member, Institute for the Comprehensive Studies of the Lotus Sutra at Rissho University (Tokyo).

2. パーリ学仏教文化学会・理事 (1987-).
Member on the Board of Directors of the Japanese Society for the Study of Pali and Buddhist Culture (Administration: Aichi Gakuin University, Nagoya).
3. 仏教伝道協会・外国人留学生奨学金選定委員会・委員 (1990-).
Member on the Selection Committee of the BDK Fellowships for Foreign Students to Promote Buddhist Research in Japan (Buddhist Promoting Foundation, Tokyo).
4. 日本印度学仏教学会・評議員 (理事・評議員: 1990-1995 / 評議員: 2001-).
Member on the Board of Councilors of the Japanese Association of Indian and Buddhist Studies.

II. 学術出版編集委員 :

1. 英訳大蔵経・編集委員会・常任委員 (1982-).
Permanent Member on the Editorial Board of the *BDK English Tripiṭaka* (Tokyo-Berkeley: Buddhist Promoting Foundation, 1991-).
2. 『大英仏教叢書』編集諮問委員会・委員 (1988-).
Member on the Editorial Advisory Board of the *Buddhica Britannica* (Editor: Tadeusz Skorupski / Tring-London 1989-).
3. 『インド・イラン学』誌・協同編集委員 (2000-).
A Joint Editor of the *Indo-Iranian Journal* (Dordrecht: Reidel Publishing).
4. 『アジア学』誌・学術奨励委員会・委員 (2000-).
Member on the Committee of Scientific Patronage of the *Studia Asiatica* (Bucharest: Centre for the History of Religions, University of Bucharest).
5. 『批判的パーリ語辞典』編集諮問委員会 (1988-2000 / 2000-) / 運営委員会・委員 (2000-).
Member on both the Steering Committee and the Advisory Board of *A Critical Pali Dictionary* (Copenhagen: Institute of Asian Studies, University of Copenhagen).
6. 『インド国際仏教学』誌・編集諮問委員会・委員 (2000-).
Member on the Editorial Advisory Board of the *Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies*, edited by A. K. Narain (Sarnath, Varanasi).
7. 『梵語法典集成』学術委員会・委員 (2001-).
Member on the Scientific Committee of the *Corpus Iuris Sanscriticum* under the direction of Oscar Botto (Turin).
8. 『トリノ・インド学誌』学術委員会・委員 (2003-).
Member on the Scientific Board of the *Indologica Taurinensia*, Official Organ of the International Association of Sanskrit Studies, founded and directed by Oscar Botto (Turin).

III. 学会員 :

1. Academy of Religious Studies (Buddhism Section), U.S.A.
2. American Oriental Society (Life Member).
3. Association for Asian Studies (Life Member).
4. 仏教思想学会 / Association of Buddhist Philosophy (Tokyo).
5. Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft.
6. Gesellschaft für Indo-Asiatische Kunst (Berlin).
7. 東方学会 / Institute of Eastern Culture [Tōhō Gakkai] (Tokyo).
8. International Association of Buddhist Studies (Life Member).
9. International Association of Orientalist Librarians.

10. International Association of Sanskrit Studies.
11. International Association of Tibetan Studies.
12. 日本南アジア学会/Japanese Association for South Asian Studies.
13. 日本印度学仏教学会/Japanese Association of Indian and Buddhist Studies (Tokyo).
14. 日本宗教学会/Japanese Association of Religious Studies.
15. 日本パーリ学仏教文化学会/Japanese Society for the Study of Pali and Buddhist Culture (Nagoya).
16. 日本仏教学会/Nippon Buddhist Research Association.
17. Pali Text Society (Oxford).
18. Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland (London).
19. Siam Society (Bangkok).
20. Société Asiatique (Paris).
21. 日仏東洋学会/Société franco-japonaise des études orientales (Tokyo-Kyoto).
22. ジャイナ研究会/Society for Jaina Studies (Kyoto).
23. 大谷大学・仏教学会/Society of Buddhist Studies (Otani University, Kyoto).

IV. アジア研究関連協会員：

1. Asiatic Society of Japan (Tokyo).
2. 国際文化会館/International House of Japan (Tokyo).
3. 日本ブータン友好協会/Japan-Bhutan Friendship Association (Tokyo).
4. 日仏会館/Maison Franco-Japonaise (Tokyo).
5. Ostasiatische Gesellschaft (OAG): Deutsche Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens (Tokyo).

ジャン・ナティエ (Jan NATTIER) [2006.1~]

Selected Publications

[Books]:

- A Few Good Men: The Bodhisattva Path according to the Inquiry of Ugra (Ugraparipṛcchāsūtra)* (University of Hawaii Press, 2003)
- Buddhism Across Boundaries: Chinese Buddhism and the Western Regions* (Taipei, Taiwan: Fo Kuang Shan Publications, 1999) (editor, with John R. McRae).
- Once Upon a Future Time: Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline* (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1991)

[Articles]:

- “The Proto-History of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka*: The *Pusa benye jing* 菩薩本業經 and the *Dousha jing* 兜沙經.” in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2004*, vol. VIII, 2005, pp. 323-360.
- “Qiuluzi 秋露子, An Early Chinese Name for Śāriputra.” in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2004*, vol. VIII, 2005, pp. 361-376 [with Seishi KARASHIMA].
- “The Twelve Divisions of Scriptures 十二部經 in the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations.” in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2003*, vol. VII, 2004, pp. 167-196.
- “The Indian Roots of Pure Land Buddhism: Insights from the Oldest Chinese Versions of the Larger *Sukhāvatīvyūha*.” in: *Pacific World* [memorial volume for Prof. Masatoshi Nagatomi of Harvard University], 3rd series, no. 5 (2003), pp. 179-201.
- “The Ten Epithets of the Buddha in the Translations of Zhi Qian 支謙.” in: *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year*

2002, vol. VI, 2003, pp. 207-250.

"The 'Eleven Precepts' for Laity in the *Ugrapariprcchāsūtra*," in: The Sakurabe Ronshu Committee ed., *Early Buddhism and Abhidharma Thought in Honour of Dr. Hajime Sakurabe on His Seventy-seventh Birthday* (Kyoto, Japan: Heirakuji shoten, 2002), pp. 33-43 [horizontal section].

"The Realm of Akṣobhya: A Missing Piece in the History of Pure Land Buddhism." in: *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* (Lausanne, Switzerland), vol. 23, no. 1 (2000), pp. 71-102.

"Who Is a Buddhist? Charting the Landscape of Buddhist America." in: Charles S. Prebish and Kenneth K. Tanaka, eds., *The Faces of Buddhism in America* (University of California Press, 1998), pp. 183-195 + 318-322.

"The Heart Sūtra: A Chinese Apocryphal Text?" in: *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol. 15, no. 2 (1992), pp. 153-223.

* Japanese synopsis by Noriyuki KUDO, "Hannya shingyō kenkyū no shin tenkai" [New Developments in Research on the Heart Sūtra], in: *Tōbō Zakke*, no. 7 (1994), pp. 27-47.

"Church Language and Vernacular Language in Central Asian Buddhism." in: *Numen*, vol. 37 (1990), pp. 195-219.

"*Eke boluysan*: A Note on the Colophon to the *Bolor Erike*." in: *Acta Orientalia* (Budapest), vol. 44, no. 3 (1990), pp. 395-408.

"The Meanings of the Maitreya Myth: A Typological Analysis." in: Alan Sponberg and Helen Hardacre, eds., *Maitreya, the Future Buddha* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 23-47.

[Review Articles]:

"*The Teaching of Vimalakīrti (Vimalakīrtinirdeśa)*: A Review of Four English Translations." in: *Buddhist Literature*, vol. 2 (2000), pp. 234-258.

"Buddhist Studies in the Postcolonial Age." (a review of Donald S. Lopez, Jr., ed., *Curators of the Buddha: The Study of Buddhism under Colonialism*). in: *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* vol. 65, no. 2 (1997), pp. 469-485.

"History, Subjectivity, and the Study of Buddhism." (a review of *The Vision of Buddhism* by Roger Corless). in: *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, vol. 60, no. 3 (1992), pp. 525-536.

"Nomads, 'Barbarians,' and the Study of Inner Asia." (a review of Denis Sinor, ed., *The Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia*). in: *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 111, no. 4 (1991), pp. 776-784.

辛嶋静志 (Seishi KARASHIMA)

"Two Sanskrit Fragments of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* in the Mannerheim Collection," in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2004*, vol. VIII, 2005, pp. 81-104 + 4 plates.

"A Trilingual Edition of the Lotus Sutra -- New editions of the Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese versions (3)," in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2004*, vol. VIII, 2005, pp. 105-189.

"An Old Tibetan Translation of the Lotus Sutra from Khotan: The Romanised Text Collated with the Kanjur Version (1)," in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2004*, vol. VIII, 2005, pp. 191-268 + 21 plates.

"Qiuluzi 秋露子, An Early Chinese Name for Śāriputra," in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2004*, vol. VIII, 2005, pp. 361-376 [with Jan Nattier].

『『大阿彌陀經』訳注(六)』『佛教大学総合研究所紀要』12, 2005.3, pp. 77-96.

("An Annotated Japanese Translation of the Earliest Chinese Version of the *Sukhāvatīvyūha* (5)," in: *Bulletin of the Research Institute of Bukkyo University* 12, 2005.3, pp. 77-96).

「初期大乘仏典は誰が作ったか—阿蘭若住比丘と村住比丘の対立」『佛教大学総合研究所紀要別冊・仏教と自然』2005.3, pp. 45-70.

(“Who Composed Early Mahāyāna Scriptures?: Antagonism between Wilderness and Village Monks,” in: *Buddhism and Nature* (Supplement to the *Bulletin of The Research Institute of Bukkyo University*), 2005.3, pp. 45-70).

「『佛典漢語詞典』の構想」『中國宗教文獻研究國際シンポジウム報告書：京都大学21世紀COEプログラム：東アジア世界の人文情報学研究教育拠点：漢字文化の全き継承と発展のために』京都 2004.12：京都大学人文科学研究所, pp. 9-15.

(“A Project for a Buddhist Chinese Dictionary,” in: *Proceedings of the International Symposium: Religions in Chinese Script: Perspectives for Textual Research: November 18th - 21st, 2004, Toward an Overall Inheritance and Development of Kanji Culture: East Asian Center for Informatics in Humanities, the 21st Century COE, Kyoto University. Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University*, pp. 9-15).

工藤順之 (Noriyuki KUDO)

「(Mahā-)Karmavibhaṅga 所引経典類研究ノート(2): — Pūrvāparāntakasūtra / Devatāsūtra —」『創仙大学・国際仏教学高等研究所・年報』第8号(2004), 2005, pp. 21-45.

(“Philological Notes on the Quotations in the (Mahā-)Karmavibhaṅga (2): — Pūrvāparāntakasūtra / Devatāsūtra —,” in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 2004*, vol. VIII, 2005, pp. 21-45).

「サンスクリット本『カルマ・ヴィバンガ』テキスト形成の一考察」『印度學佛教學研究』53-2, pp. 871-866 (L).

(“The Textual History of the Sanskrit *Karmavibhaṅga*,” in: *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* [= *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*] 53-2, 2005.3, pp. 871-866(L)).

「十不善業道による世界の損壊—『カルマ・ヴィバンガ』所説の業報を巡って」『佛教大学総合研究所紀要別冊・仏教と自然』2005.3, pp. 83-114.

(“Environmental Deterioration Caused by the Ten Evil Course of Actions: On and around §§ 51-61 of *Karmavibhaṅga* in Comparison with the Texts of the Sarvāstivādins,” in: *Buddhism and Nature* (Supplement to the *Bulletin of The Research Institute of Bukkyo University*), 2005.3, pp. 83-114).

ステファノ・ザケッティ (Stefano ZACCINETTI) [~2005.7]

In Praise of the Light: 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. (= *Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica* VIII), Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University, 2005, x + 457 pages, ISBN 4-9980622-7-1.

“Brief Communication: An Additional Note on the Terms 念 and 待 in the Kongō-ji Manuscript Text of An Shigao's *Shi'er men jing* 十二門經,” in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 2004*, vol. VIII, 2005, pp. 395-396.

受贈受入書籍類 [Books & CD-ROMs Received] (2005.2~2006.1)

* 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.

- DIMITROV, Dragomir, Ulrike ROESLER and Roland STEINER (eds.), *Śikhismuccayah : Indian and Tibetan studies (Collectanea Marpurgensia Indologica et Tibetica)*. (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 53), 2002, Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.
- DRAM DUL (ed.), *Biography of Blo Idan ses rab: the unique eye of the world: the xylo graph compared with a Bbutanese manuscript = jig rten mig gcig Blo-Idan-ses-rab kyi rnam thar bzugs so: bdag nid chen po rnog lo tsa hai rnam par thar pa by Gro lun pa Blo gros byun gnas*. (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 61), 2004, Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien
- ETO, Sukuo, Shohei ICHIMURA (trs.), *Dogen Zenji as founding patriarch (of the Japanese Soto Zen school) = 宗祖としての道元禅師* (North American Institute of Zen and Buddhist Studies series 3), 2001, Washington: North American Institute of Zen and Buddhist Studies.
- GABRIELI, Giuseppe, *Bibliografia: Degli Studi Orientalistici in Italia, dal 1912 al 1934*. Raccolta, con introduzione storica, da Giuseppe Gabrieli.
- HUGON, Pascale (ed.), *Tsbad ma shes rab sgron ma: mtsbur ston gzhon nu seng ge*. (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 60), 2004, Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.
- KEIRA, Ryusei, *Madhyamika and Epistemology: A study of Kamalasīla's method for proving the voidness of all Dharmas: introduction, annotated translations and Tibetan texts of selected sections of the second chapter of the Madhyamakāloka*. (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 59), 2004, Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.
- KRITZER, Robert, *Vasubandhu and the Yogacarabhūmi: Yogacara Elements in the Abhidharmakoshaśāstra*. (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series 18), 2005, Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies of The International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies.
- OUSAKA, Yumi, *Automatic Analysis of the Canon in Middle Indo-Aryan by Personal Computer II in both Japanese and English: with jar files and their programs by java for Macintosh OS X, Windows XP, and Linux on CD-ROM*. (Philologica Asiatica, Monograph Series 21), 2005, Tokyo: The Chuo Academic Research Institute.
- PUINI, Carlo, *Mahāparinirvāṇa-Sūtra ovvero il Libro Della Totale Estinzione del Buddha: Nella Redazione Cinese di Pe-Fa-Tsu*. (Cultura dell'anima), 1919, Lanciano: R. Carabba.
- SCHMITHAUSEN, Lambert, *On the Problem of the External World in the Ch'eng wei shih lun*. (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Occasional Paper Series 13), 2005, Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies.
- VERARDI, Giovanni and Silvio VITA, *Buddhist Asia 1: Papers from the first conference of Buddhist studies held in Naples in May 2001*, 2003, Kyoto: Italian School of East Asian Studies.
- ZACCHETTI, Stefano (trs.), FAZANG, *Trattato sul leone d'oro. a cura di Giangiorgio Pasqualotto e Stefano Zacchetti*, 2000, Padova: Eshedra editrice s.r.l.
- 赤松明彦『楼蘭王国』2005.11, 東京: 中央公論新社
- シルクロード学研究センター編『古シルクロードの軍事・行政システムー河西回廊を中心にして』(シルクロード学研究センター紀要22), 2005, 奈良: シルクロード学研究センター。
- シルクロード学研究センター編『中国沿海地帯と日本の文物交流の研究ー港・船と物・心の交流』(シルクロード学研究センター紀要23), 2005, 奈良: シルクロード学研究センター。
- シルクロード学研究センター編『四川省における南方シルクロード(南伝仏教の道)の研究』(シルクロード学研究センター紀要24), 2005, 奈良: シルクロード学研究センター。
- シルクロード学研究センター編『古代奈良の「住まい」とシルクロード』(シルクロード学研究叢書9, 奈良とシルクロードの語り部たち; 2003), 2005, 奈良: シルクロード学研究センター。
- シルクロード学研究センター編『シルクロードの世界 シルクロード文化セミナー』(シルクロード学研究叢書10, シルクロード文化セミナー), 2005, 奈良: シルクロード学研究センター。
- シルクロード学研究センター編『シルクロードを翔ける: アレクサンドロス大王〜その夢と実像。そしてヘレニズム文化の東漸〜』(シルクロード・奈良国際シンポジウム記録集7), 2005, 奈良: シルクロード学研究

センター.

国際仏教学大学院大学附属図書館編『大正蔵・敦煌出土仏典対照目録』(大蔵経対照目録2), 2005, 東京: 国際仏教学大学院大学附属図書館.

王新生主編『21世紀東方思想の展望: 国際學術検討会論文集』2005, 北京: 北京大学出版社.

積果毅総編集『法鼓山年鑑1989-2001: 総論』2005, 台北市: 法鼓山文教基金會.

積果毅総編集『法鼓山年鑑1989-2001: 記事報導』2005, 台北市: 法鼓山文教基金會.

積果毅総編集『法鼓山年鑑1989-2001: 大事記』2005, 台北市: 法鼓山文教基金會.

積果毅総編集『法鼓山年鑑2004』2005, 台北市: 法鼓山文教基金會.

森章司『原始仏教聖典資料による釈尊伝の研究【10】個別研究篇II』(中央學術研究所紀要モノグラフ篇10), 2005, 東京: 中央學術研究所.

西田龍雄編『ロシア科学アカデミー東洋学研究所サンクトペテルブルク支部所蔵西夏文『妙法蓮華經』写真版(鳩摩羅什訳対照)』(法華經写本シリーズ6) サンクト・ペテルブルグ/東京: IOS RAS/創価学会.

大久保雅行著『日蓮誕生論: 聖なる物語の構造分析』2001, 東京: 山喜房佛書林.

中華電子佛典協會CD-ROM『CBETA 電子佛典集成: 大正蔵1-55冊, 85冊/正續蔵63-73(禪宗著述), 78-87(禪宗史傳)』2005, 台北: 中華電子佛典協會.

佛教大学総合研究所編『仏教と自然』(佛教大学総合研究所紀要別冊), 2005, 京都: 佛教大学総合研究所.

佛教大学総合研究所編『後水尾法皇下賜正明寺蔵初刷『黄檗版大蔵經』目録: 一切經の歴史的研究付録』(佛教大学総合研究所紀要別冊), 2005, 京都: 佛教大学総合研究所.

佛教大学総合研究所編『一切經の歴史的研究』(佛教大学総合研究所紀要別冊), 2005, 京都: 佛教大学総合研究所.

萬金川『佛典研究的語言學轉向: 佛經語言學論集』(德妙文庫11), 2005, 台湾: 正觀出版社.

麥谷邦夫編『三教交渉論叢』(京都大学人文科学研究所研究報告), 2005, 京都: 京都大学人文科学研究所.

智山伝法院『智山の論義: 伝法大会と冬報恩講』(智山伝法院選書11), 2005, 東京: 智山伝法院.

受贈受入雑誌 [Journals Received]

(2005.2～2006.1)

- Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 57/3-4, 58/1
 Annali Di Ca' Foscari 43/3
 Buddhist Studies Review 21/2, 22/1
 Bulletin of the Nanzan Institute for Religion & Culture 29
 CSJR Newsletter 11
- East and West 54/1-4
 Indo-Aziatische Zeitschrift 6-7, 8
- Japanese Religions. 日本の諸宗教 30/1-2
 The Journal of Oriental Studies 15
 List of Publications Received 7
 Mahapitaka Newsletter New Series No. 11
 MINPAKU Anthropology Newsletter 20
 NCC宗教研究所ニュース 20
 Pacific World Third Series 6
 Seminar on the conservation of Asian cultural heritage 2-12
 Zinbun 37
 愛知学院大学文学部紀要 34
 アジア文化財保存修復研究会報告書 1, 2
 アジア文化財保存セミナー会議録 1-5
 アジア流域文化論研究 1
 アップ・トゥー・デート 17, 18
 印度哲学仏教学 20
 インド哲学仏教学研究 12
- 叡山学院研究紀要 27
 大谷大学研究年報 57
 大谷大学真宗総合研究所研究所報 45
 漢語史研究集刊 7
 感性福祉研究所年報 5
 汲古 47, 48
 教化研究 134
 教学研究紀要 11
 キリスト教文化・東洋宗教研究所紀要 23
 現代密教 18
 高野山大学密教文化研究所紀要 18
 国際仏教学大学院大学研究紀要 9
 国際文化財保存修復研究会報告書 3-16
 国立民族学博物館研究報告 29/3, 4, 30/1, 2
 こころ・在家仏教心の研究所紀要 1
 古代オリエント博物館紀要 24
 古代オリエント博物館情報誌 オリエンテ 29, 30, 31
- Akedemiai Kiado
 Università Ca' Foscari Venezia
 UK Association for Buddhist Studies
 Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture
 Centre for the Study of Japanese Religions School of Oriental and African Studies
 Istituto Italiano per L'Africa e L'Oriente
 Museum für Indische Kunst Staatliche Museum zu Berlin
 NCC宗教研究所
 The Institute of Oriental Philosophy
 国際仏教学大学院大学附属図書館
 仏教伝道協会
 国立民族学博物館
 NCC宗教研究所
 Institute of Buddhist Studies
 東京文化財研究所
 Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyusho. Kyoto University
 愛知学院大学文学会
 東京国立文化財研究所国際文化財保存修復協力センター
 東京国立文化財研究所国際文化財保存修復協力センター
 東北学院大学オープン・リサーチ・センター
 大乘慈徳学園附置長谷川佛教文化研究所
 北海道印度哲学仏教学会
 東京大学文学部人文社会系研究科印度哲学研究室
 叡山学院
 大谷大学図書館
 大谷大学真宗総合研究所
 四川大學中文系《漢語史研究集刊》
 東北福祉大学感性福祉研究所
 汲古書院
 真宗大谷派教学研究研究所
 浄土真宗教学研究研究所
 上智大学キリスト教文化・東洋宗教研究所
 智山伝法院
 高野山大学密教文化研究所
 国際仏教学大学院大学
 東京国立文化財研究所国際文化財保存修復協力センター
 国立民族学博物館
 在家仏教こころの研究所
 古代オリエント博物館
 古代オリエント博物館

- 駒沢女子大学研究紀要 11
 駒沢女子短期大学研究紀要 38
 駒澤大學佛教學部論集 36
 三康文化研究所所報 40
 三康文化研究所年報 36
 四天王寺国際仏教大学紀要 38, 39
 種智院大学研究紀要 6
 瞬間を創る 8
 浄土宗學研究 31
 真宗総合研究所研究紀要 22
 西山学報 50
 仙石山論集 2
 創価経営論集 29/1-2, 3
 創価経済論集 34/1-2
 創価大学外国語学科紀要 14, 15
 創価大学人文論集 17
 大正大学綜合佛教研究所年報 27
 大正大学大学院研究論集 29
 大正大學研究紀要文學部・佛教學部 90
 中央學術研究所紀要34
 中華佛學學報 18
 中華佛學研究 9
 中国佛学院学報・法源 23
 鶴見大学佛教文化研究所紀要 10
 天台学報 46
 東方 20
 同朋大学佛教文化研究所紀要 24
 同朋大学論叢 89
 同朋大学佛教文化研究所報 18
 東北福祉大学研究紀要 29
 東洋学研究 41
 東洋學術研究 44/1, 2
 東洋哲学研究所紀要 21
 東洋学論叢 東洋大学文学部紀要 58
 東洋の思想と宗教 11-22
 東洋文化研究所紀要 147
 成田山仏教研究所紀要 28
 南山宗教文化研究所研究所報 15
 二松学舎大学大学院紀要・二松 19
 二松学舎大学東アジア学術総合研究所集刊 35
 二松学舎大學論集 48
 日本西藏學會々報 51
 日本全国書誌 2542
 長谷川仏教文化研究所年報 29
 東アジア仏教研究 3
 北陸宗教文化 17
 佛學研究中心學報 10
 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
 駒澤大學佛教學部
 三康文化研究所
 三康文化研究所
 四天王寺国際仏教大学図書館
 種智院大学図書館・学術情報センター
 財団法人なら・シルクロード博記念国際
 知恩院浄土宗學研究所
 大谷大学図書館
 西山短期大学図書館
 国際仏教学大学院大学
 創価大学経営学会
 創価大学経済学会
 創価大学文学部外国語学科
 創価大学人文学会
 大正大学綜合佛教研究所
 大正大学附属図書館
 大正大学附属図書館
 中央學術研究所
 中華佛學研究所
 中華佛學研究所
 中国佛学院
 鶴見大学図書館
 叡山学院
 東方研究会・東方学院
 同朋大学佛教文化研究所
 同朋学園大学部附属図書館
 同朋大学佛教文化研究所
 東北福祉大学
 東洋大学東洋学研究所
 東洋哲学研究所
 東洋哲学研究所
 東洋大学文学部印度哲学科学研究室
 早稲田大學東洋哲學會
 東京大学東洋文化研究所
 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
 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
 国立国会図書館
 長谷川仏教文化研究所
 東アジア仏教研究会
 金沢大学文学部 北陸宗教文化学会
 國立臺灣大學文學院佛學研究中心

佛教音楽 ニューズレター

佛教研究 33

佛教大学総合研究所紀要 12

佛教大学大学院紀要 33

佛教大学文学部論集 89

佛教図書館館訊 39-41

佛教文化 44

佛教文化研究論集 9

佛教論叢 49

宝仙学園短期大学紀要 30

法華文化研究 29, 30

待兼山論叢 38

身延山大学仏教学部紀要 5

民博通信 107-111

浄土真宗本願寺派教学伝道研究センター 勤式・
仏教音楽研究所

国際佛教徒協會

佛教大学総合研究所

佛教大学大学院

佛教大学文学部

伽耶山基金會圖書資訊中心

東京大学佛教青年会

東京大学佛教青年会

浄土宗教学院

宝仙学園短期大学図書館

立正大学法華経文化研究所

大阪大学大学院文学研究科

身延山大学仏教学部

国立民族学博物館

執筆紹介 [Contributors to this Issue]

湯山 明	Akira YUYAMA	Professor, IRIAB, Soka University, Tokyo
ジャン・ナティエ	Jan NATTIER	Professor, IRIAB, Soka University, Tokyo
辛嶋 静志	Seishi KARASHIMA	Professor, IRIAB, Soka University, Tokyo
工藤 順之	Noriyuki KUDO	Assoc. Professor, IRIAB, Soka University, Tokyo
オスカー・フォン・ヒニューバー	Oskar von HINÜBER	Professor, Freiburg University, GERMANY
マルガリータ・ヴャラビョーヴァ-デシヤトフスカヤ	Margarita I. VOROBYOVA=DESYATOVSKAYA	Deputy Director, Department of South and Southeast Asian Studies, The Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg Branch
ディワカル・アーチャーリヤ	Diwakar ACHARYA	Research Assistant, NGMCP, Hamburg University, GERMANY
陳 明	CHEN Ming	Associate Professor of Research Center of Eastern Literature, Peking University, CHINA

編集後記 (Editorial Postscript)

本誌第9号をお届けします。今号は英文8篇と和文論文2篇の計10篇、更に Brief Communication 1編を掲載することが出来ました。

学外から。フライブルグ大学教授、オスカー・フォン・ヒニューバー博士からは主としてハリー伝典に基づき、仏教僧院で営まれていた日常生活についての論攷をお寄せ頂きました。これは平成16年度本研究所上級客員研究員として御滞在中に講演して頂いたものを増補改訂したものです。北京大学東方文学研究センター準教授、陳明博士は敦煌で発見されたインド医学書の英訳研究をご寄稿頂きました。ハンブルグ大学「ネパール・ドイツ写本カタログ化プロジェクト」のディワカル・アーチャーリヤ博士からはネパール古文書館に所蔵される新たな「カルマ・ヴィパンガ」写本についての報告を、またマルガリータ・ヴァラビョーヴァ-デシヤトフスカヤ博士にはロシア科学アカデミー、東洋学研究所サント・ペテルスブルグ支所に所蔵されている中央アジア出土写本について、写本担当者という立場からコレクション全体を概観して頂きました。

研究所から。湯山教授からは敦煌出土「不空譯佛頂尊勝陀羅尼」の音写テキスト及び関連資料に緻密な註を施した論攷を、また「Miscellanea」では各地で行われている学際的研究の背景を概観して載しました。辛嶋教授は、前号に引き続き『法華経』校訂テキストの第四部、コータン出土の『法華経』チベット古訳写本の校合テキスト及び写真版を用意されました。ナティエ教授はこれまで幾度と無く論争を巻き起こした「アミターバ/アミターユス」問題に新たな考察を行いました。今回はその第1部を発表いたします。また、ヴァラビョーヴァ-デシヤトフスカヤ博士のロシア語論文の英訳を用意されました。平成14年度本研究所客員研究員であったダニエル・スティューヴンソン博士（カンザス大学準教授）は菅野所長と共著でモノグラフ第9巻を出版いたします。

ご多忙の中、寄稿下さった諸先生方にあたためてお礼申し上げます。

「オープン・リサーチ・センター整備事業」《仏教文献学研究センター》。文部科学省の「私立大学学術研究高度化推進事業」に採択されたこの事業では、昨年度末に研究所のウェブページを立ち上げ、プロジェクトの活動や案内、そしてこれまで本研究所から出版された『年報』及びモノグラフをPDFファイルの形で公開してきました (<http://iriab.soka.ac.jp/>)。我々が目指す「仏教文献学の拠点」としての活動をより鮮明にするため、今年度より新たな取り組みを始めることと致しました。それは大英図書館(The British Library)と本研究所とで共同で取り組むことを正式に決定したもので、大英図書館に所蔵されている中央アジアから将来された仏教写本のデジタル化とその公開というものです。同館所蔵のいわゆる「スタイン/ヘルンレ・コレクション」に含まれる仏教梵語写本を全てデジタル化し、それらを「国際敦煌研究プロジェクト」(International Dunhuang Project)と協力してデータベース化し、両者のウェブページで公開してまいります。このコレクションはその全てが知られていたわけではありません。これまでの調査によれば、今回のプロジェクトによって初めて研究者に知られるものも多々存在します。写本に関する研究は本研究所のメンバーを中心に国内外の研究者に参加していただいておりますが、その成果の一部を近く出版致します。予備的な調査結果或いは報告は随時本研究所のウェブページに掲載いたします。原資料の公開によって少しでも学問研究に寄与出来ることを念願しております。

研究所異動について。ステファノ・ザケッティ助教は7月末をもって退職し、母校であるヴェネチア大学(カ・フォスカリ)に新たに職を得て赴任いたしました。在職中に賜りました数々のご厚情に対し御礼申し上げます。その後任としてインディアナ大学教授であったジャン・ナティエ博士が1月に着任致しました。ご存じの如く、博士は主として大乘仏教経典研究では極めて刺激的な、しかも梵藏漢資料の確固たる読解に基づく論攷を次々と発表されており、本研究所にとってもまた日本の仏教学界にとっても大きな貢献をさせていただけるものと思います。小世帯の研究所ではありますが、今後とも宜しく願ひいたします。

研究所の日々の活動は、事務全般担当の栗原章吉、青木一男、川崎健三の三氏と図書管理の林久予さん、蔵書整理の及川広美さん、そして多くの学生・院生・留学生諸氏の献身的な協力なしにはありえません。また関係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。研究を支えて下さる多くの方々にこの場を借りて深くお礼申し上げます。

(17, Feb., 2006/ N.K.)

『創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所・年報』（平成17年度）第9号

2006年3月31日発行

編集主幹 菅野 博史

発行所 創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所

〒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

〒192-8577 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 Buddhology
at Soka University for the Academic Year 2005, Vol. IX*

Editor-in-Chief: Hiroshi KANNO

Published on 31 March 2006

by the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University:

1-236 Tangi, Hachioji, Tokyo 192-8577, JAPAN

Phone: +81-42-691-2695 / Fax: 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 Buddhology, 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 Buddhology*

新刊案内
New Publication

Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica
(= BPPB)

Editor-in-Chief: Hiroshi KAN'NO

Volume IX

*The Meaning of the Lotus Sūtra's
Course of Ease and Bliss:*

An Annotated Translation and Study of
Nanyue Huisi's (515-577) *Fabua jing anlexing yi*

by

Daniel B. STEVENSON

Associate Professor, University of Kansas

and Hiroshi KAN'NO

Professor, Soka University; Director of IRIAB

ISBN 4-9980622-8-X

Available as of 31 March 2006

-----oOo-----

Obtainable on request

*by sending twenty coupons-réponse internationals
to cover the handling and postal expenses at cost*

日本国内郵送代実費：1,500円相当切手

Write to:

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University:

1-236 Tangi, Hachioji, Tokyo 192-8577, JAPAN

〒192-8577 東京都八王子市丹木町1丁目236番地

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所

Phone: (+81-42)691-2695 / Fax: (+81-42)691-4814

E-mail: iriab@soka.ac.jp; URL: <http://iriab.soka.ac.jp/>

Monograph Series:

Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica
[= BPPB]

***Downloadable from our Web page [not all issue]: <http://iriab.soka.ac.jp/>

申込み方法：一冊につき1, 500円分の切手（送料・梱包費用実費）
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

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

- 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 Antarvāptisamarthana 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, ISBN 4-9980622-3-9.
- 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.

