

## Some New Remarks on the *Bodhicaryāvatāra* Chap. V

Chikō Ishida

I. The Tun-huang manuscript<sup>1)</sup> of the *Bodhicaryāvatāra* (BCA) in Tibetan is a different text from the standard version. The BCA from Tun-huang has nine chapters, whereas our present text has ten. In this paper I shall refer to the former text as BCA⑨, and the latter as BCA⑩. Concerning the Tibetan translation of the BCA, there is a study by Dr. Akira Saito<sup>2)</sup>. We don't know, however, why or how BCA⑨ and BCA⑩ were composed and handed down. So, in order to investigate this question, I shall compare these two texts and consider the differences between them. In this paper, I take up chapter 5 of BCA⑩, in which the difference between two texts largely begins.

Since BCA⑨ groups chapters 2 and 3 of BCA⑩ together into one chapter (chapter 2), chapter 5 of BCA⑩ corresponds to chapter 4 of BCA⑨. The difference is mainly that BCA⑨ lacks 15 *kārikās* of BCA⑩ (40, 81, 85, 88-98, 105). Here I discuss some of these *kārikās* because they seem to be important for discerning the traits of BCA⑩.

II. k°40 The mad elephant, or the mind, must be watched with effort in order to be bound with the great pillar which is reflection on the *Dharma* and not to be released from that.

Some *kārikās* before this one say that one must always be conscious of what is to be done and look back over one's own acts while he moves. These *kārikās* are about mental attitude. It seems that this *kārikā* does not follow the natural context of the text. In order to prove it, we shall now look at the next *kārikā*.

k°41 The mind should be examined with the thought, "On what [object] is my mind working?," not to loose the burden of the mind, or contemplation (*samādhi*), even for an instant.

Since this *kārikā* summarizes some *kārikās* before k°40, the text would flow very naturally if k°40 were omitted.

III. Now we shall take *kārikās* 105 and 106 into consideration. k°106 is included in BCA⑨, but it is somewhat different from the corresponding BCA⑩ *kārikā*, therefore it seems that the original *kārikā* must have been different. Here are *kārikās* 105 and 106 as they are contained in BCA⑩ :

k°105 And *Śikṣasamuccaya* is certainly to be looked at again and again, because good conduct is explained there in detail.

k°106 *saṃkṣepanātha vā tāvat paśyet sūtrasamuccayam |*  
*āryanāgārjunābaddham dvitīyaṃ ca prayatnataḥ ||*

Or else, first simply one should learn the *Sūtrasamuccaya* (SS) and the second [writing] composed by the noble Nāgārjuna with effort.

Now <*dvitīyaṃ ca*> in k°106 is not clear, so that <*āryanāgārjunābaddham*> may modify either <*sūtrasamuccayam*> or <*dvitīyaṃ*>. These two interpretations assume the existence of two SSs: one by Nāgārjuna (Nā) and one by Śāntideva (Śā). Since there is a statement that SS was written by Nā in the Tibetan Tripitaka, this passage may read <SS which is a second study by Nā> or <secondly SS by Nā>. k°106 of BCA⑩ is thus very vague, while this *kārikā* in BCA⑩ is very clear, as follows:

*'phags pa na ga rdzu na yis || mdo rnams kun las bsduṣ pa yaṅ ||*  
*rab tu 'bad de blta dgos pas || de'i 'og tu blta bar bya ||<sup>3)</sup>*

Because you need to learn SS by Nā too with effort, SS must be learned after these [*sūtras* which are mentioned in k°104].

This is not difficult at all to read.

IV. Next I shall point out *kārikās* that are related to the *Prātimokṣa* of the early Buddhist schools. BCA⑨ does not include them. Here I compare them with the *Vinaya* of the Dharmaguptaka (『四分律』).

k°85d One ought to throw away everything except for the three [robes of the monk].

⇒Buddha allows monks to have the three robes of the monk, no more than these. (The story about the origin of *patayantikā dharmāḥ*=pd 1<sup>4)</sup>)

k°88 One should not preach the *Dharma* to a person without reverence, or to one who [thinks himself] self-sufficient, or to one who wears a turban; nor

to an[arrogant] person with an umbrella, a rod, or a sword, or whose head is covered.

⇒ One should not preach the *Dharma* to a person who wears clothes on the head (*saṃbahulaḥ śaikṣā dharmāḥ* = ssd 53) [or whose head is covered (ssd 54, 55), with a rod (ssd 96), or a sword (ssd 97), etc.]. (see also ssd 98-100)

k°93ab One ought not to go the same way, lie down or sit down with another's woman [who has no partner].

⇒ If a monk meets a woman and goes the same way to a village, he would commit the *pātayantikā*-crime (pd 30). / If a monk sits in an open space with a woman, he would commit... (pd 45). (see also pd 26, 27)

Space does not permit a full discussion, but it is clear that there is a good correspondence between some *kārikās* of the BCA with some clauses of the *Prātimokṣa*<sup>5)</sup>. Moreover, this kind of *Prātimokṣa* regulation has already been mentioned in k°46.

k°46 One ought to reject useless breaking of earth, mowing and [scratching] lines at once, keeping the discipline of the *Tathāgata* in mind and fearing [retribution due to violating monastic discipline].

⇒ If a monk digs earth by his own hand or make others dig it, he would commit the *pātayantikā*-crime (pd 10). / If a monk destroys the grass and trees, he would commit... (pd 11).

It is unnatural to repeat these clauses here in kk°88-98. Further, some other *kārikās* of kk°88-98 are very concrete norms of life. On the other hand, the tenor of this chapter (chapter 4 of BCA<sup>6)</sup>) emphasizes that mind-fullness (*smṛti*) and awareness (*saṃprajanya*) must be practiced in order to achieve contemplation (*samādhi*) and wisdom (*prajñā*). This is not the norm of life but the general description of mental attitude. So the 15 *kārikās* have a different color from the general context of chapter 4 of BCA<sup>6)</sup>.

Dr. Akira Hirakawa says that Śā doesn't refer to the *Prātimokṣa* in the BCA<sup>6)</sup>, but, based on the above comparisons, I think Śā had the *Prātimokṣa* in mind. It is said that early Mādhyamika's central idea of virtue was the ten good manners of life. Later, during the Mādhyamika of the

middle period, the Bodhisattva's conduct was based on the *Prātimokṣa* regulations. Śā's mention of the clauses of the *Prātimokṣa*, at least in k° 46, is good evidence of this. We might assume that Śā believed that a Bodhisattva was necessarily a monk.

V. In summary, then, the 15 *kārikās* are not clear in meaning nor in harmony with the context of the text. If we omit them and read the BCA according to the BCA⑨ style, the unnaturalness and vagueness disappear. Therefore we may suppose that adding to and changing BCA⑨ caused the unnaturalness found in BCA⑩, so that it must be that BCA⑨ was made first and BCA⑩ later.

---

\*For the original Sanskrit of each *kārika*, see the text edited by La Vallée Poussin (Calcutta, 1901-14). 1) ST 628, 629, 630-I, PT 794. 2) A. Saito, *Bodhisattvacaryāvatāra* ascribed to Ācārya Akṣayamati, *Buddhism and Society in Tibet*, pp. 79-109, Tokyo, 1986. 3) ST 628, Ka 10b3. 4) Taisho 22, No. 1428, p. 601c. About the following clauses, see *Shibunsokaihon* (『四分僧戒本』), Taisho 22, No. 1430. 5) Other correspondence is as follows; k°89ab = pd 9, k°91=ssd 49, 50, k°92 = ssd 37, 38, 41, 42. 6) A. Hirakawa, *Daijyokai to bosatsukaikyō, Fukuihakushi syōjyukinen toyoshisoronsyū*, pp. 522-544, Tokyo, 1960.

〈Key Words〉 Bodhicaryāvatāra, Prātimokṣa, Bodhisattva.

(Graduate Student, Kyoto University)