

Ratnakūṭa Studies

Volume 1

Edited by
Rafal Felbur

大寶積經并序

大唐太上皇製

新

朕聞天之為大也高上下之容可紀地之為大也廣縱橫之數可推則知無去無來不生不滅拯沉淪於沙劫救焚灼於塵區毒龍懼其威光醉象憚其神力其大則包於宇宙其小則隱於毫芒七十二君先在陶鈞之內萬八千載即為俄頃之間漢日載其通暉周星彰其降誕鷲頭峯下演金口之微言鷄足山中舒玉毫之瑞色干戈不用梵志摧鋒甲冑無施波旬潰旅闢圓明之淨域啓方便之禪門慧晷耀於昏衢慈雲清於朽宅無得而稱者其惟正覺乎然則教自西方法流東夏馬鳴龍樹肇闡瓊編羅什道安承宣寶偈閩中道俗雖傳貝葉之文江左黎元未極蓮花之旨又以元魏迷於釋典宇文扇於魔風開皇

Buddhist Open Philology Project

Edited by

Jonathan A. Silk

Editorial Board

Bhikkunī Dhammadinnā (*Dharma Drum Institute of Liberal Arts,
New Taipei City, Taiwan*)
Paul Harrison (*Stanford*)
Jan Nattier (*Huahin, Thailand*)
Michael Radich (*Heidelberg*)

VOLUME 1

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/bopp

Ratnakūṭa Studies, Volume I

Edited by

Rafal Felbur



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON



This is an open access title distributed under the terms of the [CC BY-NC 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) license, which permits any non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are credited. Further information and the complete license text can be found at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

The terms of the CC license apply only to the original material. The use of material from other sources (indicated by a reference) such as diagrams, illustrations, photos and text samples may require further permission from the respective copyright holder.



The work presented here was supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the Horizon 2020 program (Advanced Grant agreement No 741884), and its Open Access publication was made possible through its financial support.

Andrew West graciously assisted in setting the Chinese type, by locating rare characters within his BabelHan font and designing several previously unavailable characters.

Cover illustration: The image presents a folio from the Second Koryŏ edition of the *Da zangjing*, which contains the opening passages of the preface to the *Da Baoji jing* collection, the Chinese *Mahāratnakūṭa*, attributed to the Tang emperor Xuanzong (r. 712–756). The image is from the “Archives of Buddhist Culture” section of the Dongguk University website (Seoul, South Korea).

https://kabc.dongguk.edu/viewer/view?dataId=ABC_IT_K0022_T_095&imgId=006_0745_

The Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available online at <https://catalog.loc.gov>
LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2024059081>

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: “Brill.” See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 2772-2910

ISBN 978-90-04-69295-4 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-70680-4 (e-book)

DOI 10.1163/9789004706804

Copyright 2025 by Rafal Felbur. Published by Koninklijke Brill BV, Plantijnstraat 2, 2321 JC Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill BV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Schöningh, Brill Fink, Brill mentis, Brill Wageningen Academic, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Böhlau and V&R unipress.

Koninklijke Brill BV reserves the right to protect this publication against unauthorized use.

For more information: info@brill.com.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

For Absent Friends

Karashima Seishi 辛嶋静志
1957-2019

Stefano Zacchetti
1968-2020

∴

Contents

Series Introduction IX

Jonathan A. Silk

Volume Introduction 1

Rafal Felbur / Editor

1 The History of the **Kāśyapaparivarta* in Chinese Translations and Its Connection with the *Mahāratnakūṭa* (*Da Baoji jing* 大寶積經) Collection 16

Jonathan A. Silk and †Gadjin M. Nagao

1 Introduction 16

2 The Versions of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* 18

2.1 Sanskrit and Tibetan Versions 18

2.2 Chinese Versions 21

3 The Dates of the Several Versions of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* 45

4 The Formation of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* 48

Appendix 1 58

Appendix 2 65

Literature 68

2 The *Mahāratnakūṭa* Collection in Indian Buddhist Scriptural Anthologies
Examining the Sūtrasamuccaya, Śikṣāsamuccaya and Mahāsūtrasamuccaya 75

Jonathan A. Silk

1 Introduction 75

2 The Comparisons 83

3 Misattributions in the *Sūtrasamuccaya* and Elsewhere 103

4 Conclusion 117

Literature 118

3 Assembled in China

A Study of the Shi'er toutuo jing 十二頭陀經 122

Jonathan A. Silk, with an appendix on dating by Michael Radich

1 Introduction 122

2 The *dhuta* Scheme 127

3 Mahāyānization? 129

4 Sources 134

5 Influences 135

6 The Edition and Translation 137

7 Citations 183

Literature 187

Appendix (Michael Radich): Computer-Assisted Analysis of Internal Stylistic Evidence for the Composition Scenario of the *Shi'er toutuo jing* 190

4	The <i>Gaṅgottarāpariṣcchā</i> <i>A Small Mahāyāna Buddhist Scripture</i>	198
	<i>Jonathan A. Silk</i>	
1	Introduction	198
2	Format of the Editions and Translations	215
3	Texts and Translations of the <i>Gaṅgottarāpariṣcchā</i>	216
4	Readings	280
5	Indices	302
	Literature	310

Series Introduction

Jonathan A. Silk

This volume is the first in a newly established series of the Buddhist Open Philology Project (BOPP), the publication program of the Leiden University-based Open Philology research project, funded through a generous Advanced Grant from the European Research Council (ERC), under the Horizon 2020 program (Advanced Grant agreement No. 741884). The grant project ran from 2018–2022, and we now begin our monographic publications. We anticipate at this moment some 12 volumes to appear, both in print and simultaneously in Open Access format for free download under a CC-BY-NC license. At the same time, we plan that text editions will, in the future, also be available online in an environment which, ultimately, will allow users to make different editorial decisions than those made by the editor of a particular text. This environment will allow for alternate translations and the additions of materials, and will allow users to manipulate the data in a very broad variety of ways (such that, for instance, linguists can make use of it to study the evolving use and development of the Tibetan verb, to offer one random example).

A grandiloquent aim of this series is to set a standard for the presentation of Buddhist scriptural literature. We plan, in so far as this is possible and practical, to present all the philological evidence for a given text, and moreover to present it in a standardized fashion. One element of this plan is the provision of numeration of texts such that, as has been the case with Bibles since medieval times, it is possible to move as seamlessly as possible between primary language versions, translations, annotations and so on. Standardization of this sort of paratext is essential. Thus we aim to provide, as applicable, chapter, section, sentence and verse numbers. It is not desirable to establish a single system for all texts, since the inherent structures of the texts differ so widely: some are divided into chapters, others not; some have verses, others do not. Moreover, in some text traditions, not all sources necessarily follow precisely the same internal structure. While all of these challenges must be faced on a case-by-case basis, it is one goal of the present project to establish the practice of numerating texts in a sufficiently high level of detail so as to make future references clear and unambiguous.

The series aims to present the sources where possible in generally used scripts, according to the wishes of individual editors. Thus Chinese is printed in full-form characters and one might choose to use Tibetan *dbu can*. At present it has been an editorial choice not to do so, although for one of the contributions to the present volume the author actually prepared a manuscript for the press in this format. In the future we expect that, as on some existing platforms already, it will be possible for users to simply choose whether they wish to read Tibetan in romanization or in *dbu can*. This said, because of the analytical possibilities of romanization, Sanskrit and Pāli will not be presented in an Indian script—and in this regard, it is important to note that in any event the use of *devanāgarī* for Sanskrit and Pāli would be largely ahistorical for Buddhist literature.

The provision of numeration has another advantage. Both the texts and the translations are meant to be as clean as possible. There are no note numbers to disfigure the text

or translation. This does not mean that we do not find it important to document problems with the sources, to offer clarifications and to address difficulties in understanding. But all of these can be offered in a fashion that does not impinge on the text. One model is offered here, but there are other possibilities. Perhaps more robust solutions will emerge as the series continues.

Volume Introduction

Rafal Felbur / Editor

From approximately the turn of the millenium up to roughly 600 CE, the fecund soil of Indian Buddhism gave rise to several hundreds of scriptures which we now label, not always accurately and often anachronistically, as “Mahāyāna sūtras.” By any measure, this is a vast quantity of religious literature, even if the exact number is difficult to determine, if many of these texts no longer survive, and if those that survive are not all equally lengthy.

Given the enormity of this textual corpus, it is then not surprising that, despite the diligent efforts of scholars, East and West, since the emergence of the modern academic study of Buddhism some two centuries ago, still only a small portion of it has undergone careful examination. The texts that have garnered attention so far have been mainly those felt to resonate with Western philosophical sensibilities; those especially salient in living Buddhist traditions, mainly in East Asia, and particularly in Japan; and those for which there happens to be surviving Sanskrit evidence. Most of the others still await their turn.

Such a selective, “prejudiced” approach to the study of the tradition is unavoidable. Nonetheless, especially insofar as one of our goals, as a scholarly community, is to advance the understanding not just of individual scriptures but of “Mahāyāna” as a whole, even as we remain attuned to recent progress in non-scriptural research such as that addressing epigraphy or archeology, we must persevere in our collective long-term efforts to cover more and more ground in the domain of text, by studying the very many still untouched Mahāyāna sūtras, thus pushing back the horizon of the unknown. This can be done based on discoveries of new manuscripts in Sanskrit and other Buddhist languages, exemplified by the recent groundbreaking finds of Gāndhārī manuscripts or of Sanskrit materials preserved in Tibet. But it can also be done based on the very many scriptures preserved in Chinese and Tibetan translation in the respective canonical corpora, or in manuscripts from sites such as Dunhuang.

The *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection, available in the Chinese canon (*Da Baoji jing* 大寶積經) and the Tibetan Kanjur (the *dKon brtsegs* section), is a convenient entry point for such investigations. The collection contains forty-nine sūtras, most of which can be classified as Mahāyāna works.¹ Of these, only a handful have received consistent scholarly attention, each due to some of the factors mentioned above, for instance, the *Sukhāvativyūha* (No. 5), the *Akṣobhyatathāgatasyavyūha* (No. 6), the *Āyusmannandagarbhāvakrāntinirdeśa* (No. 13), the *Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā* (No. 18), the **Kāśyapaparivarta* (No. 43), as well as the *Śrīmālādevīsīṃhanāda* (No. 48). The remaining majority, with just a few notable exceptions (*Ugraparīṣcchā* [No. 19], *Bodhisattvapitaka* [No. 12]), have so far not been systematically examined.²

1 Nos. 29 and 49 may be classified as Mainstream sūtras; Nos. 16, 17, and 38 as *jātakas*, and Nos. 13, 14 correspond to parts of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya.

2 For a full listing of scholarship on *Mahāratnakūṭa* texts available as of 2023, see the online “MRK Bibliography” at <https://bibliography.openphilology.eu/bibliography/>. The aim is to occasionally update this resource.

A central goal of the Buddhist Open Philology Project (BOPP), and of the *Ratnakūṭa Studies* series initiated with the present volume, is to transform this situation, by producing state-of-the-art editions, translations, and studies of individual works in the *Mahāratnakūṭa*, as well as by clarifying the history of the collection as such, thereby seeking to advance the comprehensive study of Buddhism's vast scriptural tradition.

This inaugural volume of the series comprises four studies, authored primarily by Jonathan Silk, with one piece featuring a substantial appendix by Michael Radich and another coauthored by Silk and the late Professor Gadjin M. Nagao (1907–2005). While having a single author dominate a collected volume is unusual, in the present case it is justified. Silk's extensive career, which has produced monograph-length explorations of topics such as monastic administration and Buddhist narratives of incest in a comparative light, in addition to countless articles on philology, history, and method, has always included *Mahāratnakūṭa*-related topics in its ambit: his 1994 dissertation centered on the *Ratnarāśi* (text No. 44 in the *Mahāratnakūṭa*), and he has repeatedly returned to the so-called **Kāśyapaparivarta* as well (No. 43; more on this text below). This makes him a particularly knowledgeable guide to this still largely unexplored terrain.

Although the four studies here each had their own independent point of origin and trajectory of growth, they combine quite effectively into a conceptually coherent whole, as I will show below, one that sets the tone and the standard for future studies in the series.



The first chapter focuses on text Nr. 43 in the collection, known to modern scholarship under the reconstructed Sanskrit title *Kāśyapaparivarta*. Judging by the approximate date of the earliest Chinese translation of this text, it likely originated in India by the 2nd century CE, which, by a very rough calculation, makes it a relatively early Mahāyāna text; it lays out a conception of emptiness (*śūnyatā*) that would exert a lasting influence on later Mahāyāna scholastics; and, as suggested by the frequency with which it was quoted in later *sūtra* anthologies in India (a topic to which we shall return shortly), and, more importantly, by the fact that it is one of the few Mahāyāna *sūtras* on which an Indian commentary was composed, it enjoyed a reasonable degree of authority in the subsequent Indian tradition.

There is good reason why a study of this text out of the collection's forty-nine should open the inaugural volume of *Ratnakūṭa Studies*. While modern scholars refer to this work, as remarked above, as *Kāśyapaparivarta*, Silk confirms that historically the Sanskrit text circulated in India under the title "*Ratnakūṭa*" or included "*Ratnakūṭa*" as part of its title. Evidently, the compilers of the collection adopted the title of this individual work and applied it to the collection as a whole. This fact has long prompted scholars to ponder whether the *Kāśyapaparivarta/Ratnakūṭa* occupies a place of particular importance within the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection. That it gave the collection its title is obvious. In addition, perhaps it also provided its compilers with a kind of basic organizing principle—a conceptual or doctrinal nucleus—around which they constructed the rest. Silk discusses this question of the internal logic of the collection's organization at some length, and notes that its resolution remains a desideratum for future work. Our understanding of this problem will deepen as we gain more insights into the individual

texts in the collection, and into the available external evidence regarding its history, which is particularly rich on the Chinese side.

This opening chapter, which is Silk's thoroughly revised and significantly expanded version of his own English-language translation of a seminal article written originally in Japanese, some fifty years ago, by Professor Gadjin M. Nagao, comprises two main parts.

In the first part, Silk undertakes the formidable task of cataloging and describing all Chinese evidence, both internal and external, for the *Kāśyapaparivarta*. This is no mean feat. While the Sanskrit and Tibetan evidence, as well as, indeed, the Mongolian and Khotanese, is complex enough, it was studied thoroughly by a lineage of scholars going back to Alexander von Staël-Holstein (1926).³ The arguably even more copious and more convoluted evidence on the Chinese side, however, has not yet been subjected to such comprehensive examination. In this section, Silk provides a thorough inventory and critical discussion of all the available Chinese witnesses of the text, totaling seven and produced between the second and the tenth century. He also discusses the rich external evidence for these witnesses, which he culls meticulously from the Chinese bibliographical tradition.

The resulting survey will be an indispensable resource for anyone who should undertake a new edition of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* based on or incorporating the Chinese sources, a task which Silk himself has indicated his intention to carry out.

In this first part of the chapter, one of Silk's crucial contributions lies in his presentation of two "new" Chinese witnesses of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*. Although these two versions had been noticed by Japanese scholars already approximately a century ago, they have remained largely unknown to the broader scholarly community, and have never been treated in any of the modern editions of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* produced so far, including the magisterial studies by Friedrich Weller, who, while translating the four versions found in Staël-Holstein's edition (Weller 1964, 1966a, 1966b, 1970), was not aware of these two "new" versions and, as a result, could not use them in his work.



But if the stated objective in this part of the chapter is to survey the Chinese evidence for the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, towards the end of this section a striking finding emerges as an entirely unintentional yet most valuable byproduct.

The earliest relevant Buddhist sources present the following narrative: first there was an original *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection in India; subsequently this Indian collection was faithfully translated into Chinese by the scholar-monk Bodhiruci (Chn. Putiliuzhi 菩提流志); and it was then published in 713 in Chang'an as the *Da Baoji jing* 大寶積經 under the imperial patronage of the Tang ruling house. The most prominent of these sources is Bodhiruci's biography in the bibliographic tour-de-force *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄 compiled by Zhisheng 智昇 (?-after 740) and published in 730. According to Zhisheng,

3 The Tibetan situation has very recently become more complex with the identification, by James Apple (2017) and Silk himself (2023a, 2023b), of Tibetan manuscript materials from Dunhuang that preserve at least one recension of the **Kāśyapaparivarta* different from that transmitted in the Kanjurs.

work on the *Da Baoji jing* commenced in 706, precisely one year after the forced abdication of the first and only female emperor in Chinese history, Wu Zetian 武則天 (r. 690–705, also known as Wu Zhao 武曩), and was completed in 713, the same year emperor Xuanzong 玄宗 (r. 712–756) took power in a coup, completing the “restoration” of Tang rule. This narrative was never challenged by the Tibetan tradition, and, in recent times, it was by and large taken over by modern scholarship as well.

With regard to this narrative, Silk’s striking finding is this: in his thorough examination of the abundant evidence from the Chinese bibliographic tradition concerning the seven individual versions of the Chinese *Kāśyapaparivarta*, he found no compelling indication, much less proof, that prior to 713 the Sanskrit *Kāśyapaparivarta* was ever considered, either in India or in China, as part of any collection, let alone any collection that we could identify with the received *Mahāratnakūṭa*/*Da Baoji jing*.

The silence of the sources speaks volumes. Although Silk is careful to acknowledge that the Indian tradition produced multiple “*ad hoc*” collections, many of which have apparently not come down to us, and that the *Kāśyapaparivarta* (or rather: the *Ratnakūṭa*) may have been included in one (or more) of them, he does conclude by challenging the traditional narrative, and hence the modern scholarly opinion shaped by it, by arguing that there is no evidence that a *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection—meaning a collection with a similar title and content—ever existed in India, and that therefore, as a compilation, it is most likely entirely a Chinese product. The existence of the Tibetan *dKon brtsegs* section of the Kanjur is no evidence to the contrary, since the Tibetans modeled this part of the Kanjur, both in content and sequence, on the Chinese *Da Baoji jing*.

If there was no *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection before the publication of the *Da Baoji jing* in Chang’an in 713, this prompts us to ask just why, and how, this collection was produced in this specific historical time and place. Additionally, it raises questions about who chose to disguise this Chinese production as an Indian original, and for what reason. These are precisely the questions Silk takes up in the latter portion of the chapter.

In brief, Silk hints at the possibility that Zhisheng’s presentation of the *Da Baoji jing* as an undertaking both begun and completed under the Tang is, in crucial respects, fictional and anachronistic. Against this narrative, while the project may have been completed after the Tang restoration, it likely began during Wu Zetian’s reign, intended as a key textual project of her regime, an attempt to produce a kind of mini-canon of Buddhist scripture, following a pattern seen in many state-sponsored textual projects throughout the history of Buddhism in China, as an ideological counterpart to the formation of state power, a device of religious legitimation, and possibly yet another expression of Empress Wu’s well-documented interest in generating religious literature to support to her extraordinary regime. Although initiated by Empress Wu, the project remained incomplete upon her ousting in 705, and, when the collection was eventually finalized after her death, the Tang rulers, or their agents at court or in the monastery, including perhaps Zhisheng himself, found it expedient to erase any association with the disgraced Empress, by asserting that the work had been a Tang undertaking from start to finish.

This is a compelling hypothesis, and it is based on the kind of against-the-grain reading of the sources that should be a model for all who engage similar material.

Still, questions remain, and it is crucial to note that Silk presents this possibility with due caution and necessary caveats. We will be able to make further progress on this mat-

ter once we have new translations and critical studies of imperial and Buddhist writings pertaining to the *Da Baoji jing*, including the Tang imperial preface to the collection, and when we better understand the intricate motivations of the key actors involved, such as Wu Zetian, Bodhiruci, Xuanzong, and Zhisheng.

One example of a document that could complicate and enrich our understanding of these matters is the “Da Baoji jing shu” 大寶積經述, or “Account of the *Da Baoji jing*,” by a certain Xu E 徐鏐, a regional official in Xuanzong’s administration. The “Account” was not transmitted in the Kaibao lineage of the Chinese Buddhist canon, which accounts in part for its relative obscurity, but also adds to its interest.⁴ For our purposes, the relevant part of this complex document is the section which details the mechanics of production of the *Da Baoji jing*, listing a total of twenty-six participants at various levels of the editorial team.⁵ At the top of this section, the document names two individuals as “translators of the Sanskrit text” 譯梵文者: a certain “*śramaṇa-bhadanta* (?) Sizhong” 沙門大德思忠, as well the “grand staff supervisor, the *brahmin* from Eastern India, Yisheluo [**Íśvara*?]” 東天竺國婆羅門大首領臣伊舍羅. Subsequently, in a list of the “correctors of the Sanskrit meanings” 證梵義者, it names a certain Borequduo [**Prajñāgupta*?] 波若屈多, introduced as a *śramaṇa* from Northern India, as well as the even more enigmatic “*Śramaṇa Dharma*” 沙門達摩. Further, there come passages listing those who “received the text with the brush” 筆授者, proofreaders (lit. “confirmers of the meaning” 證義者), compilers (lit. “arrangers of the text” 次文者), “officials in charge of adorning the text” 潤文官者, and at the end those who “read [the final product] in its entirety” 總而閱之. What is remarkable is that in none of these sections is there even the slightest trace of Bodhiruci: there is no sign that he participated at any stage at all, let alone that he oversaw the entire undertaking.⁶

This detailed, early, and potentially even first-hand evidence conveys a picture significantly different from the traditionally accepted narrative summarized above, which centers itself on Bodhiruci, and which was presented by Zhisheng in 730. Undoubtedly, the last word about the circumstances of the composition of the *Da Baoji jing* has yet to be said, and documents such as the “Account” hold the potential to add detail to this picture, or, even more likely, alter its contours in ways which we cannot at present predict.



4 It was, however, preserved in several editions in the so-called “southern” Fuzhou-Sixi lineage, which are the sources from which the Taishō editors recovered the text, including it in their edition of the *Da Baoji jing* at T. 310 (X1) 1b22–2b6. In addition, the document was collected separately in non-Buddhist compendia, including the *Quan Tang wen* 全唐文. I am reminded by Antonello Palumbo that an insightful analysis of aspects of this document, along with an attempt to establish the date and circumstances of its composition, is in Chen 2007: 406–414, in which Chen (407, drawing on Forte 2002: 104 n. 109) estimates that Xu E wrote the “Account” likely “sometime between 715 and August 17, 716.” If correct, this date would place the the “Account” some 14–15 years prior to Zhisheng’s influential presentation of the compilation of the *Da Baoji jing* in his *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu* (T2154 [LV] 570b2–c14), and some two or three years after the putative presentation of the collection to the throne in 713.

5 T. 310 (X1) 1c21–2a16. A list similar to that in Xu E’s “Account,” and indeed one perhaps adapted from it, is found in Zhisheng’s narrative of the *Da Baoji jing* compilation (T2154 [LV] 570b29–c1).

6 Chen (ibid.) compares the list in the “Account” with that in Zhisheng’s narrative but does not remark on the absence of Bodhiruci.

Regardless of the circumstances under which the collection was compiled in early eighth-century China, however, and acknowledging that future studies on the constitutive texts in the collection may yet challenge this understanding, at present we have no reason to doubt that the individual *sūtras* within it are in fact translations of “genuine” Indian works.

Therefore, while it would be misplaced to inquire about the birth, life, and afterlife of the collection in India, we can, and should, ask such questions about the individual texts collected in it. How were they used? By whom, where, and when? What significance did the individual texts hold in India, irrespective of their eventual translation into Chinese and Tibetan?

In principle, when we attempt to trace the afterlife of a text, we can do that from several angles, even if we limit our gaze to the textual realm only without considering non-textual domains such as material culture or religious practice. One approach involves assessing whether the text in question was used in later *śāstras* or commentaries, that is, in materials in which later scholiasts engaged with the text explicitly and directly. Alternatively, we can investigate whether unique items of technical vocabulary or religious imagery first introduced in the text in question were adopted and adapted by later authorial communities, thus entering the bloodstream of the tradition in a more diffused way. Another possibility still is to look for a text’s later adaptations, rewritings, revisions, as well as critical responses both from within and from without the tradition.

Finally, we can explore later anthologies, and determine if a given text was quoted in such later works, and if so, whether any patterns emerge that could contribute meaningfully to our interpretive endeavors. While an anthology often merely cites its source text without explicit engagement, adopting a pose of at least formal detachment, the very fact that some texts end up anthologized frequently and across many centuries, while others present the opposite picture, is itself valuable information about the texts’ afterlife. Especially when alternative evidence is lacking or scarce, which is the case with most *Mahāratnakūṭa* texts, we must meticulously extract all available information from later anthologies.

This is precisely the main objective of the second chapter in this volume. Here, Silk examines three later Indian scriptural anthologies—the *Sūtrasamuccaya* (attributed questionably to Nāgārjuna), the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* of Śāntideva (fl. 8th c.), and the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya* of Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna (i.e., “Atīśa/Atīśa, perhaps more correctly Adhīśa,” 11th c.)—with the aim of identifying all quotations from the forty-nine *Mahāratnakūṭa* texts within these three compendia.

This undertaking, ambitious enough as it is, is further complicated by the fact that among these three anthologies, only the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* is available in its entirety in Sanskrit (in addition to its Chinese and Tibetan versions): the *Sūtrasamuccaya* is preserved in full only in Tibetan and Chinese translation, with only a handful of Sanskrit fragments published, while the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya* has survived only in Tibetan, in which it may indeed have been composed. Faced with this reality, Silk opts to concentrate mainly on the Tibetan versions.⁷ This choice leads to the practical consequence that, while Silk refers

7 In the future, a comparative look at the Chinese parallels of the *Sūtrasamuccaya* (*Dasheng bao yaoyi lun* 大乘寶要義論, T. 1635) and of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (*Dasheng ji pusa xue lun* 大乘集菩薩學論, T. 1636) may be worth attempting.

to the Sanskrit and the Chinese versions when possible and relevant, his investigation focuses primarily not on the Indian anthologies in their Sanskrit originals, which would in any case be impossible, but rather on their Tibetan translations, and then on the practices the Tibetan translators of these anthologies followed in handling the quoted *sūtra* material.

Silk's findings can be presented in the form of a summary table. Here we must stress that the table simplifies matters significantly, giving only the raw numbers. It does not account for crucial factors such as the relative lengths of the quoted texts (in principle, a longer text is more likely to be quoted more often), and it overlooks the many nuanced observations Silk makes in his analysis.

	Sūtrasa- muccaya	Śikṣāsa- muccaya	Mahāsūtra- samuccaya
1 Trisaṁvaranirdeśa			
2 Anantamukhapariśodhananirdeśa			
3 Tathāgatācintyaguhyanirdeśa	5	9	
4 Svapnanirdeśa			
5 Sukhāvativyūha			
6 Akṣobhyatathāgatasyavyūha			
7 Varmavyūhanirdeśa			
8 Dharmadhātuprakṛtyasambhe- danirdeśa			
9 Daśadharmaka		3	
10 Samantamukhaparivarta			
11 Raśmisamantamuktanirdeśa/ Prabhāsādhana			
12 Bodhisattvapīṭaka	5	1	4
13 Āyusmannandagarbhāvākṛānti- nirdeśa			
14 Nandagarbhāvākṛāntinirdeśa			
15 Mañjuśrībuddhakṣetraḡaṇavyūha		3	1
16 Pitaputrasamāḡama	4	11	
17 Pūrṇapariṇcchā			
18 Rāṣṭrapālapariṇcchā		5	6
19 GṛhapatyUgrapariṇcchā	1	31	4
20 Vidyutprāptapariṇcchā			
21 Bhadramāyākāravākaraṇa	1		
22 Mahāprātihāyanirdeśa			
23 Maitreyamahāsinhanāda	2		11
24 Vinayavinścaya <i>or</i> Upālipariṇcchā		8	2
25 Adhyāśayasamcodana	3	13	4
26 Subāhupariṇcchā			
27 Sūratapariṇcchā			

(cont.)

	Sūtrasa- muccaya	Śikṣāsa- muccaya	Mahāsūtra- samuccaya
28	Viradattagr̥hapatipariṣcchā	3	2
29	Udayanavatsarājapariṣcchā	2	3
30	Sumatidārikāpariṣcchā		
31	Gaṅgottarapariṣcchā		
32	Aśokadattavyākaraṇa		
33	Vimaladattāpariṣcchā		
34	Guṇaratnasam̐kusumitapari- ṣcchā		
35	Acintyabuddhaviṣayanirdeśa		
36	Susthitamatidevaputrapariṣcchā		
37	Simhāpariṣcchā		5
38	Upāyakaśālyajñānottarabodhi- sattvapariṣcchā	1	7
39	Bhadrapālasreṣṭhipariṣcchā		0
40	Dārikāvimalaśraddhā		
41	Maitreyapariṣcchādharmaṣṭaka		
42	Maitreyapariṣcchā		
43	Kāśyāparivarta	2	9
44	Ratnarāśi		9
45	Akṣayamatipariṣcchā		5
46	Saptaśatikā nāma prajñāpāramitā	1	
47	Ratnacūḍapariṣcchā		9
48	Śrīmālādevīsimhanāda	2	3
49	Rṣivyaśāpariṣcchā		3

Even this rudimentary presentation of the data, however, allows for some initial observations. One pattern that strikes us immediately is that a substantial 28 out of the 49 texts (57%) are never quoted in any of the three anthologies. Various reasons may account for the absence of a given text from such later compendia, and the matter must be addressed carefully on a case-by-case basis. Against the backdrop of the silent majority, however, the very fact that a given text *is* quoted at all must be inherently significant. On a more specific level of investigation, it must likewise be meaningful if a given text is quoted more frequently than others, especially if we also consider the relative lengths of the texts compared, although to properly understand the nature of this significance, the raw numbers cannot convey the whole story, and a closer examination of individual passages becomes necessary. Looking at the 21 works which are quoted, Silk points out that it is hard to determine any general patterns. At the very least, it will be uncontroversial to say that the numbers convey surprises, and will challenge our tacit or explicit assumptions as to which texts “should” be influential, as can be seen in the example of texts which have remained

enormously successful in East Asia, but which left only a small mark or no mark at all in the anthologies: the *Śrīmālādevīsīnhanāda*, for instance, is quoted a mere five times in total (although it is quoted substantially in the commentary to the *Ratnagoṭravibhāga*, on which see Silk 2024), while the *Akṣobhyavyūha* and *Sukhāvatīvyūha* are quoted not a single time.

In addition to aiding our exploration of broad questions about the afterlife of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* texts, the anthologies, and the quotations contained therein, are useful for us also on a less theoretical and more immediately practical level: they are a source of potentially useful text-critical material for any scholar who would attempt to edit and study any of these works. Editing, for instance, the Tibetan version of a *sūtra*, the scholar will want to collate, first, the text found in the relevant versions of the Kanjur. In addition, however, the editor should also check the anthology quotations for alternative readings and other evidence that may be useful for text-critical purposes. The same applies to anthologies in Chinese, and, naturally, to whatever remains of the Sanskrit originals.

In his investigation of the three anthologies in their Tibetan translations, building on earlier work on the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* by Paul Harrison (2018), Silk divides the quotations from *Mahāratnakūṭa* texts contained in them into three categories. In “Category A” quotations, the Tibetan translators of a given anthology simply used the text of the preexisting Tibetan translation from the Kanjur version available to them. Though the quotations in this category are thus by and large the same as the text in the Kanjur, even they may yield interesting alternative readings, insofar as the anthology translators may have been privy to copies that differ from those in the Kanjurs available today. In “Category B” quotations, the anthology translators modified the Kanjur text to a limited extent, but, overall, clearly strove to preserve its gist.

“Category C” stands out as potentially the most interesting, since the quotations therein differ entirely from the *sūtra* text preserved in the Kanjurs. In these cases, the anthology translators evidently rendered the quoted *sūtra* material completely anew. This raises the tantalizing possibility that these “Category C” quotations, at least in some cases, may reflect alternative recensions of the *sūtra* in question, i.e., recensions different from those which underlay the translations in the Kanjur. However, Silk concludes that we are dealing here instead with different translations of the same Indic material, not with translations of a different Indic source text.

The distinctions between the three categories aside, quotations in each are indispensable to the editor of today. Thankfully, the arduous task of recovering traces of all forty-nine *Mahāratnakūṭa* texts from the three Indian anthologies in Tibetan translation, with references to Sanskrit and Chinese parallels, has now been completed by Silk, and its results are presented in this second chapter, making it an invaluable reference resource. In addition to being printed in full in this volume, the results are also available, shorn of much of their detail, in digital form online on the Open Philology website, incorporated into the “MRK Bibliography” at <https://bibliography.openphilology.eu/bibliography/>.

One additional insight emerges from this study. While the *Mahāratnakūṭa* texts are quoted overall a total of 219 times throughout the three anthologies studied, in not a single case did their compilers in India (and their Tibetan translators) leave for us any indication that they considered the source *sūtras* to be part of any collection, be it a *Mahāratnakūṭa* or otherwise. This revelation comes in the chapter’s very final paragraph with no advance

warning, which adds to its impact, and it clearly supports Silk's thesis, presented more fully in Chapter One, that the *Mahāratnakūṭa*, as a collection, is entirely a Chinese product.



Above, we remarked on one method for assessing the afterlife of a text: examining its inclusion in later anthologies. Another valuable approach consists in analyzing later rewritings or adaptations of a text. These are cases in which later authors use the original text, either by modifying the whole or by extracting parts, to create their own unique compositions. The authors do not feel compelled to preserve any “true meaning” of that original, but use it merely as a resource, quite often without attribution. While by modern standards such practices strike us as hardly distinguishable from plagiarism, it is of course problematic to apply such modern criteria to the tradition, and in any case such products are in fact extremely useful as barometers of a text's influence over time.

Chapter Three of this volume highlights one such case of a later adaptation of *Mahāratnakūṭa* material. Already in his 1994 doctoral dissertation, Silk noted that several passages from the 5th-century Chinese translation of the *Ratnarāśi* (text No. 44 in the collection), attributed to a certain Daogong 道龔 (end of 4th-beginning of 5th c.) and preserved as the *Baoliang ju hui* 寶梁聚會, are used, without attribution, in an otherwise rather obscure text, titled *Shi'er toutuo jing* 十二頭陀經 (T. 783, *Scripture of the Twelve Dhutas*), a one fascicle discussion of the eponymous twelve forms of stringent asceticism. Silk's investigation of these *Ratnarāśi* quotations in the *Twelve Dhutas* prompted an examination of the entire text, and eventually its full edition, translation, and study, which comprises Chapter Three in this volume.⁸

As Silk discusses in this chapter, his work on the *Twelve Dhutas* revealed its indebtedness not only to the Chinese *Ratnarāśi*, but also to several other works in Chinese translation. Among them, as noted already earlier by Enomoto Masaaki, to whose memory Silk dedicates this study, most prominent is the *Da zhidu lun* 大智度論, the vast, one hundred fascicle encyclopedic compendium with both Sarvāstivādin and Mahāyānist elements produced in the early fifth century in Chang'an under the supervision of Kumārajīva. In fact, the *Twelve Dhutas* owes a greater debt still to the *Da zhidu lun* than it does to the *Ratnarāśi*: out of a total of twenty-five sections into which Silk divides the *Twelve Dhutas*, the *Ratnarāśi* was used in the compilation of five, while the *Da zhidu lun* provides material for as many as ten.

The *Twelve Dhutas*' use of the *Da zhidu lun* materials in this manner is noteworthy especially if we consider the overall, indeed rather surprising, paucity in the Chinese Buddhist tradition of explicit commentarial engagement with the *Da zhidu lun* itself.⁹ We have very

⁸ In the “Appendix on Dating,” Michael Radich determines the approximate time of composition of the *Twelve Dhutas* by using the computational tool TAEL (<https://tael.readthedocs.io/en/latest/>). The tool allows scholars to answer questions of authorship and dating by means of computer-assisted analysis of vast quantities of textual evidence, enabling a degree of precision unavailable otherwise.

⁹ This paucity is surprising if we consider the revered position the *Da zhidu lun* has enjoyed in the history of Buddhism in East Asia up until today. While other *Da zhidu lun* commentaries may have been

few direct commentaries on this all-important work, and evidently the tradition preferred more indirect, diffused ways to make us of its riches, one of which is exemplified precisely by cases such as the present one.

How then does the *Twelve Dhutas* use the *Da zhidu lun* materials? Even a cursory look allows us to make several observations. First, all the quotations from the *Da zhidu lun* in the *Twelve Dhutas* are taken—again, without attribution—from one relatively short passage in the *Da zhidu lun*.¹⁰ The compilers are interested in this one passage only: they use it as a resource for their own needs, while showing no concern with how it fits in the wider fabric of the *Lun* as an integral text. In so many words, they take the material out of context.¹¹ Second, as Silk notes, even as the compilers of the *Twelve Dhutas* adopt the presentation of the twelve practices from the *Da zhidu lun*, they rearrange the sequence of the presentation in line with the needs of their own project, a fact that, as Silk remarks, shows that they did not “consider the sequence canonical in itself.” Finally, the compilers bracket what the *Da zhidu lun* says about the significance of these practices for religious

written throughout the centuries, of which no trace has been preserved (suggested by the recently recovered traces of one long-lost *Da zhidu lun* commentary, for which see Tado 2019), today the only surviving commentary proper is the *Da zhidu lun shu* 大智度論疏 by the Northern Zhou-period (557–581) monk Huiying 慧影 (d.u.), a work originally in twenty-four fascicles, of which only seven are available today.

While it is difficult to speculate about the reasons for this situation, one factor at play may have been the sheer size of the *Da zhidu lun*: at one hundred fascicles, the text may have been (seen as) just too enormous to be easily accommodated into the commentator’s workshop. Added to this were concerns with its technical style, perceived by some as verbose or perhaps even pedantic. All this can be seen already in the earliest document attesting to its reception in China, the “preface” 序 penned by one of the main participants in its production, Sengrui 僧叡 (353–419 or 355–421), in which he addresses its enormous length and “prolix” 煩 character (T. 2145 [LV] 75a14–17). Shortly afterwards, Lushan Huiyuan 廬山慧遠 (334–417) wrote a complex critical discussion of the style of the *Da zhidu lun*, concluding that its “concept[ual distinctions] are too minute” 義微 and its “fundamental purport too distant” 旨遠 for it to be of much use; T. 2145 [LV] 76b8–12: 辭樸而義微。言近而旨遠。義微則隱昧無象。旨遠則幽緒莫尋, “Because the concept[ual distinctions] are too minute, one loses sight of the [highest principle of] the Markless. Because the deep purport is too distant, one is unable to find the thread of Mysteries [i.e. the truth].” Consistent with this judgment, Huiyuan then went on to produce an abridged digest of this work, reducing its length from one hundred fascicles to twenty; this unfortunately has not survived.

10 T. 1509 (xxv) 537b28–538b16.

11 The *Da zhidu lun* passage in question is a discussion of a single section in chapter forty-seven of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā* in Kumārajīva’s translation, the *Dapin banre jing* 大品般若經 (T. 223 [VIII] 320c4–14), which corresponds roughly to Kimura (1986–2007) IV.45.9–20 in the Sanskrit *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā* from the Nepalese manuscripts. In the *sūtra*, the section discusses one item in a long list of many possible incompatibilities between student and teacher, and the resulting obstacles for religious practice, which are labeled as the “work of Māra” (魔事, *mārakarma*). The specific incompatibility in question is that in some cases, the teacher can be skilled in the twelve *dhutas* while the student is not. In the *sūtra*, the focus throughout this passage is on these incompatibilities rather than on the *dhutas* themselves. The corresponding *Da zhidu lun* passage (T. 1509 [xxv] 537b28–538b16) simply fills in the details for each of the twelve practices, but its focus, just as in the *sūtra*, is on the incompatibilities themselves. In the *Twelve Dhutas*, however, the list, along with the details added by the commentary, becomes the sole object of interest, while the idea of incompatibilities between student and teacher, the central concern both of the *sūtra* and of the corresponding commentary, is nowhere in sight.

cultivation, and replace it with their own ideas, a reinterpretation that may have been facilitated by the very decontextualization mentioned above.¹²

In short, then, the *Twelve Dhutas*: uses material from the *Da zhidu lun* without attribution; removes it from its original of context; reorders the sequence of the material without regard for its canonicity; and boldly redefines its religious significance.

What kind of a text, then, is the *Twelve Dhutas*? In what sense was it “assembled in China”? It was “assembled in China” in that it is, evidently, a Chinese compilation text, not a translation in any straightforward sense. Its “assembly” was carried out in a Chinese textual manufacturing plant using, at least in part, imported raw materials: elements from the *Ratnarāśi*, the *Da zhidu lun*, and other Indian texts in Chinese translation.

We should, however, offer one important caveat here. When we refer to a product as “assembled in China,” we usually understand this to mean that the design was done elsewhere, by the R&D department of some foreign entity, which decided to outsource the production, and the production only, to China (as in the ubiquitous label “Designed in California, Assembled in China”). But this is, most emphatically, not the case with the *Twelve Dhutas*. For while its compilers drew freely on foreign—Indian—raw materials, the design itself, as Silk shows very clearly, was not Indian, but Chinese.

The fundamentally homegrown nature of the *Twelve Dhutas* and similar texts was not lost on at least some early Chinese bibliographers. As observed by Antonello Palumbo in

12 At the end of the section under discussion, the *Da zhidu lun* assures the reader (T. 1509 [xxv] 538b14–16) that the ascetic practices presented here, useful as they are, serve merely as a supplementary aid to Buddhist practice, but are not its main focus, the Buddha’s primary emphasis being instead on “wisdom” 智慧. The *Twelve Dhutas* offers a different take. Near the beginning of the text, in what is section §3b in Silk’s edition (T. 783 [xvii] 720b25–26), we read that the twelve practices are the be-all and end-all of Buddhism, in that they do in fact allow for nothing less than a “swift attainment of unsurpassed perfect Bodhi” 速得無上正真之道, in addition to all the standard lower accomplishments for *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas*.

The presence in the text of terms such as 無上正真之道 (*anuttarasamyaksambodhi*) near the beginning in section §3, and of 無生忍 (*anutpattikadharmakṣānti*) near the end in section §23, allows Silk to speak of a “Mahāyāna framing” or “Mahāyānization” to which the compilers of the text would have submitted their twelve *dhutas* material in the process of writing. While there is no doubt that such terminology in the frame portions is of broadly “Mahāyāna” provenance, the compilers combined this terminology in an idiosyncratic way which does not conform to any recognizable emic definition of “Mahāyāna.” For example, in §23f–g we read that the monks who had listened to the Buddha’s sermon on these practices “comprehended in accord with true reality and attained arhatship” 證如實智成阿羅漢, while the bodhisattvas in attendance “attained the mental flexibility which comes to terms with the fact that all things are unproduced, and fully attained the tenth stage” 得無生忍滿足十地. At least if we take the *Da zhidu lun* itself as our criterion of what qualifies as “Mahāyāna,” this is all very unusual. According to the *Da zhidu lun*, “comprehension in accord with true reality” 如實智 is reserved for Buddhas only (T. 1509 [xxv] 650c29); hence, in this light, it is absurd to predicate it of mere arhats. Furthermore, in the same source, the attainment of “the mental flexibility which comes to terms with the fact that all things are unproduced” (無生忍, *anutpattikadharmakṣānti*) is associated with the seventh stage, not with the tenth (T. 1509 [xxv] 132a25, and other references in Zürcher 2007 [1959]: 383n157), and I do not know of any self-professed “Mahāyāna” work in which this attainment would be placed at the tenth stage. In sum, we can speak of such language in the *Twelve Dhutas* as indicative of “Mahāyānization” only in a rather loose sense, which, indeed, should not be surprising, given that the compilers of the text do not seem beholden to any identifiable orthodoxy, Mahāyāna or otherwise.

a lengthy note quoted by Silk in this chapter, already Sengyou 僧祐 (445–518) recognized that this text belongs to a particular category of “abstracts” 抄 which reflect, not the transcendental revelation of the Buddha in India, but the local agency of Chinese compilers. Sengyou describes these works with remarkable accuracy as “all produced by abstracting content from multiple authentic scriptures”¹³ and “by arbitrarily cutting out chapters and *gāthās* from elsewhere, making abridgements, contriving a title, and making it all into a separate book.”¹⁴

But Sengyou does more than merely describe texts of this kind, he passes judgment on them—and his judgment is severe. Precisely because the manufacturing blueprint was local, Chinese, not based in the superior original design of the Buddha, Sengyou issues a stern warning to all potential end-users of products like the *Twelve Dhutas*: “Often, the titles attached to them are superficial and misleading, the title not matching the content. Even should one wish to commence one’s study [of Buddhism on their basis, these texts] would simply obscure the [meaning of the] true scriptural teachings. They are all erroneous, and we must strictly caution against them!”¹⁵

Despite Sengyou’s fervent remonstrations, however, it is not clear just how representative his views were for the broader Chinese tradition. In his own catalog, Sengyou lists over five hundred (!) texts of this nature, tacitly acknowledging that, by his time, not everyone shared his concerns. Furthermore, the *Twelve Dhutas* itself seems to have been reasonably successful over the subsequent centuries, as noted by Silk, who also presents a convenient table listing its numerous influences on later texts. Indeed, compositions like this were, as Silk remarks, overall, far more numerous than once acknowledged. While scholarship on Chinese traditions has long moved past the binary framework of “original translations” versus “apocrypha,” there is still much research needed to understand the true extent of this phenomenon, and the changes it underwent in a broader historical context. Silk’s investigation of the *Twelve Dhutas* is a valuable contribution to this endeavor.



Many of the questions touched on above, and explored in far greater detail in the volume itself—questions about the afterlife of individual *Mahāratnakūṭa* texts in India, China, Tibet, about the history of the collection as such, about the internal logic of its organi-

13 *Chu sanzang jiji* 出三藏記集 (T. 2145 [LV] 21b24–25): 率抄眾經全典.

14 *Chu sanzang jiji* 出三藏記集 (T. 2145 [LV] 21b26–27): 割品截揭。撮略取義。強製名號。仍成卷軸。 . The translation is that of Palumbo.

15 *Chu sanzang jiji* 出三藏記 (T. 2145 [LV] 21b27–29): 集至有題目淺拙。名與實乖。雖欲啟學。實無正典。其為愆謬。良足深誠。 Given that Sengyou voices similar criticisms of this type of text also elsewhere in his work, it is evident that the matter was of considerable concern to him. See also *ibid.*, 37c4–7: 而後人弗思。肆意抄撮。或棋散眾品。或爪剖正文。既使聖言離本。復令學者逐末。 [...] 若相競不已。則歲代彌繁。蕪黷法寶。不其惜歟, “People of the later times do not reflect carefully, and wantonly take passages out [of actual *sūtras*]. As a result, the chapters are thrown into disarray and the authoritative writ is torn to pieces. In this way, the Sage’s Words are severed from the root, and students are forced to grasp for mere branches. [...] If people persist in this practice, trying to outdo one another, then with the passing of generations, the Dharma Treasure will become obscured and defiled. How regrettable!”

zation, and about the reuse of *Mahāratnakūṭa* materials in other contexts and for other purposes, not to mention the basic challenge of actually understanding the constitutive scriptures themselves—can be addressed adequately only through meticulous study of the individual texts in the collection, and the final contribution in this volume is just such a focused exploration of a single *Mahāratnakūṭa* text. Presented here as Chapter Four, although substantial enough to be a stand-alone book, it focuses on the *Garṅgotarapariprcchā*, text No. 31 in the collection, one of the very many so far nearly unstudied Mahāyāna *sūtras* mentioned at the beginning of this introduction. Silk's presentation of this text, based on his critical editions of the Tibetan from as many as twenty-one versions of the Kanjur, of a unique Tibetan manuscript copy from Dunhuang, as well as of a Chinese translation attributed to Bodhiruci, sets the standard for subsequent studies in this series, several of which are currently in preparation.

Literature

- Apple, James. 2017. "The Old Tibetan Version of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* preserved in Fragments from Dunhuang (1)." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 20: 205–230.
- Chen, Jinhua. 2007. *Philosopher, Practitioner, Politician: The Many Lives of Fazang (647–712)* (Leiden: Brill).
- Forte, Antonino. 2002. "The South Indian Monk Bodhiruci (d. 727). Biographical Evidence." In Antonino Forte and Federico Masini, eds., *A Life Journey to the East. Sinological Studies in Memory of Giuliano Bertuccioli (1923–2001)*. Scuola Italiana di Studi sull'Asia Orientale Essays 2 (Kyoto: Scuola Italiana di Studi sull'Asia Orientale): 77–116.
- Harrison, Paul. 2018. "A Reliable Witness? On the Tibetan Translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*." In Lutz Edzard, Jens W. Borgland and Ute Hüsken, eds., *Reading Slowly: A Festschrift for Jens E. Braarvig* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag): 227–242.
- Kimura Takayasu, ed. 1986–2007. *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, I–VIII, 6 vols. (Tokyo: Sankibo Busshorin Publishing Co.).
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2023a. "Further Tibetan Sources of the **Kāśyapaparivarta* from Dunhuang (1)." *Śāntamatih: Manuscripts for Life—Essays in Memory of Seishi Karashima*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica 15 (Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology Soka University): 331–345.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2023b. "Further Tibetan Sources of the **Kāśyapaparivarta* from Dunhuang (11)." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 26: 195–213.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2024. "Remarks on a Recent Study of the *Śrīmālādevīsīmhanādanirdeśasūtra*." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 67.1: 53–80.
- Staël-Holstein, Alexander von. 1926. *The Kāśyapaparivarta: A Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class: Edited in the Original Sanskrit in Tibetan and in Chinese* (Shanghai: Commercial Press).
- Tado Taichi 田戸大智. 2019. "Minobu bunko zō *Daijō gishō shō* shyoin no bunken itsubun ni tsuite" 身延文庫藏「大乘義章抄」所引の文献・逸文について [The Buddhist Texts and the Lost Document Cited in the *Daijō gishō-shō*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 67.2: 563–568.

- Weller, Friedrich. 1964. "Kāśyapaparivarta nach der Tjin-Übersetzung verdeutscht." *Wissenschaft-
enliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig, Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche
Reihe* 13.4: 771–804.
- Weller, Friedrich. 1966a. "Kāśyapaparivarta nach der Djin-Fassung verdeutscht." *Mitteilungen des
Instituts für Orientforschung der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 12: 379–462.
- Weller, Friedrich. 1966b. "Die Sung-Fassung des Kāśyapaparivarta." *Monumenta Serica* 25: 207–361.
Reprinted in Weller 1987: 11.1305–1459.
- Weller, Friedrich. 1970. "Kāśyapaparivarta nach der Han-Fassung verdeutscht." *Buddhist Yearly
1968–1969* (Jahrbuch für Buddhistische Forschung, Halle): 57–221. Reprinted in Weller 1987:
11.1136–1304.
- Zürcher, Erik. 2007 [1959]. *The Buddhist Conquest of China. The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism
in Early Medieval China* (Leiden: Brill).

The History of the **Kāśyapaparivarta* in Chinese Translations and Its Connection with the *Mahāratnakūṭa* (*Da Baoji jing* 大寶積經) Collection

Jonathan A. Silk and †Gadjin M. Nagao

1 Introduction

Mahāyāna Buddhism in India produced a vast number of scriptures, classified primarily into sūtra and tantra.¹ How much of this production has been lost to the vagaries of time it is impossible to know, but even of the extant sūtra literature—the vast majority of which is so far known not in its original Indic forms but only through Chinese and Tibetan translations—it is fair to say that most remains unstudied. Among the exceptions are a number of works that for one reason or another drew the attention of modern scholars. Some of these, such as the *Saddharmapuṇḍarika* (*Lotus Sūtra*) or the Larger and Smaller

¹ This study began life more than 30 years ago as an updated translation of Nagao 1973. It owes its basic frame and some of its data to that now 50-year-old paper, but considerable revision has become possible. For this reason, and because Prof. Nagao had agreed to my translation of the paper in the first place, I [JAS] feel that a claim of joint authorship is justified. However, I must clearly state that I alone am responsible for all errors of fact or interpretation, and overall the article is very different from what Prof. Nagao himself originally published. I have profited, as always, from the corrections of Rafal Felbur and, most especially, Michael Radich. Jan Nattier kindly offered some suggestions, and if I have not adopted all of them, surely I am to blame.

A much shortened version was published in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, whose anonymous reader offered valuable suggestions and corrections. The present version, moreover, is not only longer and more detailed but corrects a number of errors in the earlier paper, many brought to my attention by Rafal Felbur.

My work was supported by the European Research Council (ERC) through their funding, under the Horizon 2020 program (Advanced Grant agreement No. 741884), of the Open Philology project based at Leiden University (www.OpenPhilology.eu).

The following abbreviations of catalogue titles are used below:

- CSZJJ *Chu sanzang jiji* 出三藏記集, T. 2145, 515 CE, by Sengyou 僧祐.
 ZM (I) *Zhongjing mulu* 衆經目錄, T. 2146, 594 CE, by Fajing 法經.
 LSJ *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶紀, T. 2034, 598 CE, by Fei Zhangfang 費長房.
 ZM (II) *Zhongjing mulu* 衆經目錄, T. 2147, 602 CE, by Yancong 彥琮 / 棕.
 DTNL *Da Tang neidian lu* 大唐內典錄, T. 2149, 664 CE, by Daoxuan 道宣.
 GYT *Gujin yijing tuji* 古今譯經圖記, T. 2151, 664–665 CE, by Jingmai 靖邁.
 XGYT *Xu Gujin yijing tuji* 續古今譯經圖記, T. 2152, 769–740 (? 730) CE, by Zhisheng 智昇.
 DZKZM *Da Zhou kanding zhongjing mulu* 大周刊定衆經目錄, T. 2153, 695 CE, by Mingquan 明佺 et al.
 KSL *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄, T. 2154 (LV), 730 CE, by Zhisheng 智昇.
 ZXSM *Zhenyuan xinding Shijiao mulu* 貞元新定釋教目錄, T. 2157, 800 CE.

Quoted Chinese passages are drawn principally from the SAT database of the digitized Taishō edition; the passages therefore have not been critically edited. When I speak of the “attribution” of a translation,

Sukhāvatīvyūha (the Pure Land sūtras), drew attention primarily because, in their Chinese guises, they came to hold a central position in East Asian, and particularly Japanese, Buddhism, although the position of these texts within Indian Buddhist was peripheral.² Other sūtras, however, garnered attention for other reasons, some of them seemingly random, such as a scholar's chance encounter with a manuscript. Of these, the *Kāśyapaparivarta* may be one of the most significant, if by 'significant' we understand, for instance, the frequency with which the scripture was quoted by later authors and the authority it was apparently granted within the Indian tradition itself. It is another question—considered below—how we should understand the current location of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* in the Chinese (and thence Tibetan) *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection, an anthology, as we might think of it, of 49 sūtras, most likely compiled on Chinese soil, and thus not necessarily relevant for the status of the text in its Indian homeland.

Alexander von Staël-Holstein (1877–1937) prepared his *editio princeps* of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* (below, KP), published in 1926, on the basis of a Sanskrit manuscript, found in Central Asia, which he was able to access first in the Imperial Academy in St. Petersburg (see below). In addition to Sanskrit and Tibetan editions, however, Staël-Holstein also presented four Chinese translations of the text. If we include the substantially complete version contained in quotations in the Chinese translation of the commentary on the sūtra, likewise published by Staël-Holstein only a few years later, in 1933, five Chinese versions of the text have been available to scholars in modern editions for almost a century.

However, there also exist two additional Chinese translations, one partial, the other complete, which have remained largely unknown, even to some scholars who have recently commented on the sūtra. Thus, even if for no other reason, a reconsideration of available materials is timely.³ These hitherto often overlooked Chinese sources are not, in fact, newly discovered: the first, an extract of a small section of the sūtra, was discussed already by Ōno Hōdō 大野法道 (1883–1985) in the same year that Staël-Holstein published the

I refer in the first place to the byline in the Taishō edition; such attributions are frequently to be reconsidered. Compilation of discussions of such attributions is one of the main goals of the very valuable <https://dazangthings.nz>.

Finally, a note about the expression *Mahāratnakūṭa* Collection may be helpful. While I believe that the group of 49 texts was only brought together as a collection in early 8th c. China, I do not think it is terribly misleading to refer for convenience to the compilation in both its Chinese and Tibetan forms with this unattested Sanskrit expression.

- 2 On the *Lotus* see Silk 2001, with additional evidence in Mochizuki 2011; aspects of my position are argued against by Apple 2016. For the *Sukhāvatīvyūha*, I am so far unaware of any evidence for its influence in India itself, although its Sanskrit manuscripts were repeatedly copied in Nepal.
- 3 Although six complete and one partial Chinese translation (or version; see the discussion of L below) of the KP are extant, for a total of seven, there are indications that in the past other translations may have existed as well, if the records do not instead point simply to bibliographic confusion. LSJ, 100b16, records that in the sixth year of the Tianhe 天和 reign period of the Northern Zhou 北周 (571), *Jñānayaśas (Shenayeshe 闍那耶舍) translated a three *juan Baoji jing* 寶積經, which 159 years later in 730 KSL (627c5–8; so too ZXSM, 961b5–9) lists as missing and hence not available for examination: 周宇文氏三藏禪師闍那耶舍譯。右一經雖云寶積,既無本可校。不知與何會同本。Regarding this putative translation, if it is indeed more than a bibliographic ghost (and LSJ is notoriously unreliable), nothing can be said at present.

commentary, and positively identified two years later,⁴ and the second, containing the complete sūtra, was again first noticed by Ōno, this discovery published some twenty years further on.⁵ Another 20 years later, unaware of Ōno's remarks Nagao Gadjin 長尾雅人 (1907–2015) and Takasaki Jikidō 高崎直道 (1926–2013) almost simultaneously (and independently of each other) “rediscovered” this otherwise unnoticed translation.⁶ As a result of this scholarship, we now know of seven Chinese versions of the KP (six of which are complete, or almost so), in addition to the materials in Sanskrit, Tibetan, and several other languages.⁷

2 The Versions of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*

2.1 *Sanskrit and Tibetan Versions*

A nearly complete Sanskrit version of the sūtra exists, preserved in a manuscript recovered from the Central Asian site of Khotan and purchased by Nikolaj Fëdorovič Petrovskij (1837–1908), who deposited it in the Russian Imperial Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg in 1895 (catalogued now as SI P/2). It was later studied there and in China (from photographs, the manuscript itself remaining in what became Leningrad) by Staël-Holstein.⁸

4 Ōno 1933: 388–393; 1935; revised ideas in 1954: 106–110. The identification was noted, with reference to Ōno 1935, already by Kuno 1938: 96.

5 Ōno 1954: 102–104.

6 Nagao 1973 and Takasaki 1974: 449. It seems likely that both Professors Nagao and Takasaki, neither of whom had much interest in the Vinaya, simply failed to look into a book—Ōno 1954—titled *Daijō Kaikyō no Kenkyū* 大乘戒經の研究, “A Study of Mahāyāna Vinaya Sūtras,” therefore not realizing its true scope. I recall that Prof. Nagao owned a copy, but it is possible that he might not have even opened it until I brought it to his attention.

Itō 2013a and 2013b was under the impression that he had discovered the existence of an unknown translation, while in fact this had been known for 60 years before him; not only that, the existence of the translation had been rediscovered 40 years before Itō wrote by two of the most prominent Japanese scholars.

7 Although I touch on them briefly below, this is not the place to discuss the Sanskrit and Tibetan in detail, but further information may be found in the bibliography at www.OpenPhilology.eu.

8 Staël-Holstein 1926: xviii13 wrote of the manuscript in the then Leningrad Academy of Sciences: “I studied it before leaving Russia in 1916. The original manuscript remained there, but a photographic reproduction of all of its existing pages (except 1a, 1b, 2a and 2b), which I took with me to the Far East, enabled me to go on with the study of the text in China.” All my efforts to locate these photographs failed. However, the manuscript was later retranscribed, and color photos published, in Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya et al. 2002. Reference should henceforth be made to this edition for the most reliable readings, along with some conjectures in the notes. As well as the materials collected in that volume, some other fragments and quotations of the Sanskrit text are known. The text is quoted by several Indian authors in Sanskrit, including Śāntideva and Candrakīrti. There is no sure way to know whether these authors knew the whole of the (or better: a) KP, but among the quotations given by Candrakīrti is one (§ 71, quoted in the *Prasamnapadā*, La Vallée Poussin 1903–1913: 156.2–157.4) that includes the verses which, found elsewhere only in the Song translation and the Tibetan, are characteristic of the later strata of the sūtra. Thus a version of the sūtra containing these verses added to the text existed already in the seventh century. See Silk 2013.

Regarding the preparation of the edition, already in 1909 Sergey Fyodorovich Oldenburg (Сергей Фёдорович Ольденбург; 1863–1934) published a note in the *Izvestiya Imperatorskoy Akademii Nauk* (Proceedings of the Imperial Academy of Sciences), VI series, 1909, vol. 3, issue 11, pp. 739–740, in which he briefly described the manuscript and its acquisition from Petrovsky, the decision to publish the text in

This manuscript is missing about eight leaves, many leaves are partially damaged, and it contains, as do all manuscripts, a number of mistakes. In 1926, utilizing only this Sanskrit manuscript and his own ingenuity and that of his collaborators, perhaps chiefly Friedrich Weller (1889–1980), Staël-Holstein published the Sanskrit text, together with a version of the Tibetan translation found in the Kanjurs, and four Chinese translations. Whatever annotations and notations of variants Staël-Holstein might have prepared were never published.⁹ The edition, largely following the logical segments of the sūtra itself, divides the text into one paragraph of preamble (§ 0) and 166 paragraphs of text. (Below I adopt the standard form of reference to Staël-Holstein’s paragraphs, referring to § 1 for the first true paragraph of the text, and so on.) Later, in 1933, Staël-Holstein published the commentary in an interlinear edition containing its Tibetan (*’Od srungs kyi le’u rgya cher ’grel pa*) and Chinese (*Da baoji jinglun* 大寶積經論) translations.¹⁰ Subsequently many schol-

Latin letters (due to the impossibility of marking reconstructed letters in devanāgarī), and his hope for the inclusion in the volume of a plate of the manuscript and two tables of the manuscript’s alphabet, “interesting because this manuscript is a fine specimen of the Indian-Kashgarian variant of the Gupta script.” (In this regard one must remember that the volume was planned for the series Bibliotheca Buddhica, founded and directed by Oldenburg.) Evidently already in 1909 Staël-Holstein was studying the manuscript “with the assistance of specialists,” comparing Chinese and Tibetan versions as well. We thus learn that this multi-lingual comparison did not begin later when Staël-Holstein was in Peking, but had already been taking place from the beginning. Oldenburg’s brief entry is titled “Baron A.A. von Staël-Holstein. Mahāratnakūṭadharmaparyāye Kāśyapaparivartaḥ. The Sanskrit text with notes.” (Баронъ А. А. фонъ Стааль-Гольштейнъ. Махāратнакуṭадхармапарыāе Кāśуапараривартаḥ. Санскритскій текстъ съ примѣчаниями); references to a contribution with the title “Mahāratnakūṭadharmaparyāye Kāśyapaparivartaḥ” by Charlotte Speir Manning (1803–1871) are nothing more than bibliographic ghosts, as her date of death should have alerted those who unthinkingly have repeated the reference. I am grateful to my friend Alexander Zorin for clearing up the mistaken attribution and sending me a link to the publication (<http://www.mathnet.ru/links/9835454367a77b7f.647f.2c4ed6e3d74b/im7259.pdf>).

- 9 One notes that throughout the published edition a number of terms in Tibetan and Chinese are marked with an asterisk. As Staël-Holstein 1926:xxi wrote: “The existence of various readings in those [Chinese] editions, as well as in the different editions of the Bkaḥ-gyur, are indicated by asterisks in this volume. The various readings themselves will be given together with the other notes and the indices in the second volume referred to above (page vi),” the latter of which promises that “a second volume, will soon appear.”

While I do not know what might have remained in China, my search in the Harvard-Yenching library for additional materials that might have been left by Staël-Holstein produced no results. However, around 2000, the library disposed of some materials including the handwritten fair copy of the edition for the press, and a highly annotated copy of a proof version of the printed edition. These were given to Leonard van der Kuijp, who passed them to me. They are now on BDRG; see <https://www.bdr.org/blog/2024/02/29/new-insights-from-the-world-of-19th-and-early-20th-century-buddhist-studies>. It is apparent that over long years there were serious reading sessions in Beijing in which a number of specialists in Sanskrit, Tibetan and above all Chinese participated (see the remarks scattered throughout Wang and Deng 2014), but what may have been the notes or memos produced by such study sessions all appear, as far as I know, to be lost, which is indeed a great misfortune. Given that the Harvard-Yenching library saw fit to dispose of the valuable materials which ended up in my hands, one shudders to think what else they may have simply thrown away.

- 10 The title *’Od srungs kyi le’u rgya cher ’grel pa* is evidently based on the title the sūtra bears in the Kanjur, namely as part of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection, in which it is one *le’u* (Chn. *hui* 會). Therefore we learn nothing about the Indic title of the commentary from this Tibetan rendering. On the commentary, see Silk 2019, citing earlier studies as well.

ars studied the sūtra, among whom special attention must be drawn to Friedrich Weller, who published complete Tibetan and Sanskrit indices of the sūtra (1933, 1935),¹¹ translated the Sanskrit text into German (supplementing it from Tibetan when the Sanskrit was missing, 1965) and individually translated all of the four then-known Chinese translations (see below); finally, he did not fail to study even the Mongolian translation in detail (e.g., 1962).

The Tibetan translation of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection of 49 sūtras (below, MRK), within which the translation of KP is to be found, was investigated as a whole by Marcelle Lalou (1890–1967) in 1927 and Sakurabe Bunkyō 櫻部文鏡 (?–1982) in 1930, and although some other individual texts included in the collection have received scholarly attention, for almost 90 years little work had been done on what we now must recognize as the Tibetan versions of the KP, until James Apple identified and published large portions of a recension of the KP recovered from a number of separately catalogued Dunhuang Tibetan manuscripts, these now supplemented with material I subsequently identified.¹² Nothing is known of its translators because the latter portion of the text is lost, although in fact such Dunhuang manuscripts often do not, in any case, contain colophons. As for the translation of the KP preserved in the Kanjurs, catalogues and colophons assert that it was translated into Tibetan by Jinamitra, Śilendrabodhi and Ye shes sde.¹³ The Tibetan

11 We learn from Wang and Deng 2014: 201, 247, that Lin Liguang 林藜光 (1902–1945) compiled a Chinese-Sanskrit index to the KP, completed by Walter Liebenthal (1886–1982), which was intended for the second part of the second volume of the series Harvard Sino-Indian Studies, but was never published. This index was taken as the basis of Liebenthal 1935, which appears to be its only published trace. According to a remark in the *Liebenthal Festschrift, Sino-Indian Studies* Volume v Parts 3 & 4 (Santinetan: Visvabharati, 1957): vii (due I am not sure to whom, but perhaps the general editor, Kshitis Roy), it was apparently lost: “On an invitation from the Sino-Indian Institute of the Harvard-Yenching University of Peking, he [Liebenthal] worked as a research fellow of the Institute during 1934–1936. He prepared during this time a Chinese-Sanskrit index of the Kasyapa-parivarta [*sic*],” to which is attached a note: “In 1937 Peking was occupied by Japanese forces. In the resulting confusion the completed Ms. got lost.” (See also the depressing details in Leutner and Liebenthal 2021: 94–102.) The version of Lin’s index unrevised by Liebenthal may likewise also be lost. Paul Demiéville (in Lin 1949: vii) wrote: “Il [Lin Liguang] se perfectionnait en sanskrit et en tibétain, traduisait les cours de Staël-Holstein à l’Université de Pékin ou l’y suppléait à l’occasion, compilait un index chinois-sanskrit du *Kāśyapaparivarta*, index très détaillé, où les versions chinoises successives de ce texte se trouvaient dépouillées avec leurs équivalents sanskrits (et parfois tibétains), sur plus de 10,000 fiches, phrase par phrase; moins heureux que son parallèle tibétain-sanskrit, cet index n’a jamais vu le jour et doit dormir quelque part à Pékin ou à Harvard, pour le plus grand dommage des études bouddhiques tellement privées encour de concordances lexicales sino-indiennes.” I do not understand how, if as was apparently the case, Demiéville did not actually see the index, he was nevertheless able to characterize it as he did, but Lin could of course have described it to him. Only the discovery of the missing cards, if they still exist, might help clarify the situation. It is in any event clear from Demiéville’s comments that the index did not come to Paris with Lin, otherwise Demiéville would have been able to see it.

We learn again from Wang and Deng 2014: 205, 212n23 that Staël-Holstein intended Weller to assist him in his translation of the KP, and in “der Zusammenstellung eines catalogue raisonne des ganzen Ratnakūṭa (fast ausschliesslich chinesisches und tibetisches)” (tacitly correcting the typos in the transcription of this letter, for which the authors unfortunately do not provide a date). I could not find this letter in Zou 2016, which while containing many letters from Weller to Staël-Holstein, contains but a single one in the opposite direction.

12 Apple 2017, 2018, Silk 2023a, 2023b.

13 It remains a topic for research just what such attributions might mean, since such a large number of texts are attributed to some “translators” that it is simply not credible to imagine them as having

text of the sūtra quoted in the commentary, the names of the translators of which are not recorded, agrees in the main with the sūtra as preserved in the Kanjur, with a few exceptions which show readings different from, and sometimes better than, the readings of the latter.¹⁴ As the Tibetan translations require their own treatment, they are henceforth left aside here.

2.2 Chinese Versions

The four Chinese translations usually referred to by modern scholarship, and included in Staël-Holstein's edition, are as follows, listed in chronological order, as indicated by the reigns under which they were translated,¹⁵ with the titles as usually cited:

- 1) (*Foshuo*) *Yiri monibao jing* (佛說)遺日摩尼寶經. Attributed to Lokakṣema (Zhi Loujiachen 支婁迦讖) of the Later Han 後漢; dated 179 CE. T. 350. (Hereafter H.)¹⁶
- 2) (*Foshuo*) *Moheyan baoyan jing* (佛說)摩訶衍寶嚴經. Attributed to an unknown translator of the [Western] Jin 晉 dynasty, 291–299 CE. T. 351. (Hereafter J.)¹⁷
- 3) *Da baoji jing Puming pusa hui* 大寶積經普明菩薩會. Attributed to an unknown translator of the [Western] Qin 秦 dynasty, 384–431 CE. T. 310 (43) (XI) 631c14–638c4. (Hereafter Q.)¹⁸
- 4) (*Foshuo*) *Dajiashe wen da baoji zhengfa jing* (佛說)大迦葉問大寶積正法經. Attributed to Shihu 施護 (*Dānapāla?) of the Song 宋 dynasty, end of the tenth century. T. 352. (Hereafter S.)¹⁹

played a significant role in the actual nuts and bolts of the production of a translation. They may have served as much, if not more, as signifiers of authority and authenticity than as actual translators; that is, their names may serve as a seal of the reliability of a work rather than as an indication of any actual responsibility for setting translated words on the page.

14 This picture may change as a critical edition of the sūtra is produced, a process now ongoing. For the relation between Tibetan translations of sūtras in the Kanjur and in other Tibetan translations, such as scripture anthologies, and in some cases commentaries, see as a start Chapter 2 in this volume. In short, it is most usual for Tibetan translators to have made use of preexisting translations of scriptures when the works in question were quoted, although this is not a straightforward matter and care must be taken in each and every instance of a citation to compare the transmitted translation with the quotations.

15 As Rafal Felbur carefully points out, “This listing by reign is somewhat misleading, since for none of these translations, with the exception of 4), do we have evidence that they were produced under the patronage of the central authority.” Felbur is of course correct, but for the present moment the dynastic designations are offered more for the sake of convenience of reference than of historical facticity. As noted elsewhere, a thoroughgoing reevaluation of the entire process of translation of Buddhist texts into Chinese is called for.

16 Trans. Weller 1970. It is highly questionable whether *foshuo* was ever an originally integral part of a translation title and therefore I parenthesize it here. See Funayama 2022. Despite its title, Sōma 1978 is not very useful.

The term “attributed” here refers in the first place to the attributions reported by modern editions, such as the Taishō canon. It is now well recognized that many such attributions have little genuine historical basis.

17 Trans. Weller 1966a.

18 Trans. Weller 1964. See also Chang et al. 1983: 387–414.

19 Trans. Weller 1966b.

2.2.1 The Han Translation (H)

Catalogues tell us that the first translation is dated to the Guanghe 光和 reign period (178–184), which establishes that the KP already existed by the second half of the second century CE.²⁰ We will turn to these catalogues in a moment, but first, we must clarify the title of this translation. What is cited above—(*Foshuo*) *Yiri monibao jing* (佛說) 遺日摩尼寶經—is the form in which the text is cited nearly always in modern scholarship.²¹ But, as has been known since the time of Staël-Holstein, this reading of the title is based on several early mistakes or omissions, a fact often overlooked by subsequent scholars.²² In the first place we must note the obvious fact that the characters *ri* 日 and *yue* 曰 are in many styles of writing virtually indistinguishable. Further, the term *yiri* 遺日 in the title (taking it provisionally in this form) occurs in the sūtra itself (§ 52) more fully as *yiriluo* 遺日羅. However, Wogihara Unrai 荻原雲來 (1869–1937) already suggested to Staël-Holstein, while the latter was preparing his *editio princeps*, that this is probably an error for 遺曰羅, “an imperfect transliteration of [the Sanskrit term] *vipula* or of *vaipulya*.”²³ Furthermore, the character 遺 must be read *wei*, rather than *yi*. Staël-Holstein agreed,²⁴ and thus

20 Considerably more cautiously, Rafal Felbur suggests the following: “Dao’an was, after all, not certain about the authorship of this text. He says it resembles or might be a Lokakṣema work, but he stops short of actually ascribing the text to the Kushan translator, a step that Sengyou does not hesitate to make, injecting a potentially misleading sense of confidence into the record. The second issue is that the date given here—Guanghe 2—is not supported by any ‘primary documents’ (prefaces, colophons, commentaries, etc.). Indeed, when we restrict our attention only to the CSZJJ, we see that the phrase 光和二年 occurs in two ‘records’ pertaining to Lokakṣema translations, specifically, to his translation of the *Aṣṭa* and of the *Pratyutpanna*. So, Guanghe 2 was, in a way, the go-to date for Lokakṣema translations (Further, I did not find any other specific dates for his ‘core’ translations). All this can help in our efforts to date the earliest Chinese translation (and indeed the earliest witness) of the KP. It may well be that someone—perhaps Sengyou, perhaps someone else—impressed by Dao’an’s suggestion of a possible link between the *Baoji jing* and the great Lokakṣema, fished through the record for a credible-looking date, and affixed it to the title to give the assertion more credibility. I suspect that, barring a decisive discovery, all we can say with confidence, at present, is that the only thing that our earliest Chinese bibliographic evidence ‘establishes’ is that by Dao’an’s time there was at least one KP translation (*Baoji jing*), perhaps two (including the variant version from Guanzhong’). But that is only by the late 4th century, not in the Han.”

21 I notice that Kuno 1938: 97 repeatedly prints 遺日 without discussion, but since on pp. 80, 108 he also prints 遺日, I am not sure that the former represents a principled decision about the correct reading, which he nowhere explicitly addresses.

It should be stressed, as noted above, that any fine-tuned treatment of the text will demand in the first place as a minimum requirement a comprehensive critical edition of every Chinese source studied. I plan to provide such editions for KP in work in progress.

22 An exception is, unsurprisingly, Karashima 2015, which esp. on pp. 117–119 discusses the data in detail.

23 Wogihara made his suggestion to Staël-Holstein, as the latter reports, 1926: 1X, and XXI note 22, here quoted. Italics are mine. Despite its title, Hashimoto 1977 does not address anything related to this. The article does contain some interesting ideas on the MRK, however, with the bulk of consideration being given over to the Larger *Sukhāvāṭīyūha* and *Akṣobhya* sections. Note that Nattier 2008: 12n20, 84, 88 also noted the necessary correction of 日 to 曰 and the reading *wei* for 遺.

24 He noted that “[t]he Cantonese pronunciation of the character 遺 is *wai* ... and 曰 represents *bu* in the word *itibuttaka* (for *itivuttaka*). 羅 is a very common rendering of the Indian syllable *la*. This gives us *wai-bu-la*, and considering the inexactitude with which Indian words are often transliterated into Chinese, seems to warrant Professor Wogihara’s suggestion.” Despite his seeming innocence here of the details of Chinese historical phonology, Staël-Holstein was anything but naive about such matters. His

it is clear that the solution was already known at the time Staël-Holstein published his edition in 1926.²⁵ It should thus have been clear from early on that the characters 遺曰羅 are most likely to be understood as what we would now write in Pinyin as *weiyueluo*, to be reconstructed following the Late Han reconstructions in Schuessler 2009 as *wi-wat-la*.²⁶ While Pelliot apparently saw this as a phonetic rendering of Prakritic **vivula* = *vipula*,²⁷ the *-t* final in the second element of the string seems to signal a gemination.²⁸ If the first vowel can render also an Indic *-e-*, we might more comfortably have to imagine a Middle Indic equivalent of *vaipulya* than *vipula*.

There is other evidence for *vaipulya* in this period.²⁹ As Tsukinowa noticed already in 1935 in his discussion of Wogihara's suggestion, the Han translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*

keen awareness of the importance of historical reconstruction of Chinese pronunciation is proved by at least one article, written in English and titled "Transliterated Sanskrit Texts and the Ancient Pronunciation of Chinese Characters." This was never published and is probably now lost, but it was published in Chinese translation by a friend who was later to become famous, Hu Shih 胡適 (1891–1962). See Staël-Holstein 1923. Moreover, already in 1913 in his work on the *Gaṇḍīstotra* Staël-Holstein had demonstrated his interest in the relation between Chinese transcriptions and Indic terminology. On the *stotra* itself in Sanskrit, see the improved edition in Johnston 1933.

25 In this light, it is puzzling that Paul Pelliot 1936: 69–70, while better situated than Staël-Holstein to comment on the phonological technicalities, and while agreeing with the conclusions ("je me rallie aux arguments de MM. Wogihara et de St.-H."), yet felt it meaningful to add, "Le caractère 遺 *yi* n'est guère employé en transcription; je ferai seulement remarquer que, outre sa prononciation la plus usuelle *yi*, il en a une autre *wei*, assez fréquente, et qui serait peut-être à adopter ici pour justifier l'emploi du caractère en valeur de *vi*." He presents this idea as if it were his own contribution, though it is in reality little more than a refinement of what had already been presented (puzzling since Pelliot must have read Staël-Holstein's note 22).

26 It is perhaps needless to say that there are disagreements about the reconstructions of medieval Chinese phonology, and in light of my own lack of expertise, I do no more than copy what the specialists say. The anonymous reader for the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* wrote, recommending reference to the work of W. South Coblin: "it is notable and quite important that for the character 曰, the Han phonological data assessed by Coblin is entirely limited to Buddhist sources, one of which is, precisely, the same rendering of **vaipulya* that Tsukinowa and Karashima discuss (see Coblin 1983, 247 [BTD no. 135]). This creates a huge circularity for the reconstruction of the pronunciation of this character in particular, since the [reconstructed—JAS] Han pronunciation seems informed largely by a putative Indic **vaipulya*, and therefore the Han pronunciation can hardly be used to assess the precise form of the Indic word!"

27 It is odd that Weller 1970: 121, 155, 173, 221, persisted in offering "I-ji-lo-Lehretext" in what he numbers §41, and at the end of the text "Von Buddha verkündeter Ji-mo-ni-Lehrtex."

28 Karashima 2015: 118n15 says "曰 was used to render *vu* + stop, such as *vut*, *vud*, *vul*." (I presume that Karashima intended to include phonetic variants here, since while *||* is easily related to */d/*, *-l-* itself is of course not a stop.) Jan Nattier writes to me that she rather considers such cases to involve "overlapping transcriptions," rather than gemination.

29 Antonello Palumbo sent me the following remark: "I think it would be apposite here to mention the transcription 毘曰羅 that Dao'an uses in his preface to the text simply called *Vinaya* (鼻奈耶) at T. 1464 (XXIV) 851a13. Two things seem important here. One is that the underlying Prakrit form must have been the same in both cases (the second and third characters in the transcription are identical, the first one is simply a newer phonogram with the same phonetic value of 遺, see e.g. Zhi Chen's (*Lokakṣema) [school] transcription 遺摩羅涅 for *Vimalanetra at T. 624 (XV) 363c1–2, and cf. the gloss on it in the *Fan fanyu* at T. 2130 (LIV) 101b11 (遺摩羅[涅], 應云毘摩羅涅多羅). The other thing is that Dao'an appears to use this transcription for [a Middle Indic form of] *vaipulya*, specifically in the sense of a class or group of scriptures, as a well known term, even though 毘曰羅 is in fact a hapax

prajñāpāramitā, the *Daoxing banre jing* 道行般若經, a genuine text of *Lokakṣema, contains the term *mohe weiyueluo* 摩訶惟曰羅, which Karashima suggested refers to **Mahāvevulla* < **Mahāvaipulya*.³⁰ Additionally, the *Chu sanzang jiji* 出三藏記集 of Sengyou 僧祐, dating to c. 515, lists a *Da zhenbao ji weiyue jing* 大珍寶積惟曰經.³¹ The same is found in the *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄, which in so many respects simply copies CSZJJ.³² This is extremely similar to the reading in the Han translation of the KP

for us, suggesting that he was privy to a much larger number of occurrences of this term and/or of its close cognate 遺曰羅. One wonders where these occurrences have all gone, but it seems reasonable to assume that in the course of transmission they have been either omitted by those who could not understand the transcription, or silently emended with the equivalent *fangdeng* 方等 by those who could (Dao'an himself, in that preface, uses *fangdeng* in the following parallel sentence)."

30 T. 224 (VIII) 468c12. Tsukinowa 1935: 395; Karashima 2010: 324; 2013: 176, without notice of Tsukinowa. Later Karashima 2015: 117 understands 遺曰(←日)摩尼寶經 (**vevulla-Maniratna-dharmaparyāya*), with the *Daoxing banre jing* usage at 2015: 118n15. In fact, this connection was already noted by Sakaino 1933, on which see below in note 39.

31 CSZJJ, 19b19. This appears under the category of variant versions produced in the Guanzhong region, 關中異經 (that is, the Wei River plain).

Rafal Felbur writes to me: "Strictly speaking Sengyou is here not making a claim of his own. Instead, he is here channeling the authority of Dao'an himself. The title is listed in the section titled 'A new compilation of the list of variant translations from Guanzhong based on Venerable An's catalog.' Incidentally, the lack of the note 今有此經, which Sengyou uses for some affixes to some other items on this list, suggests that Sengyou did not see this text." He further goes on: "The detail about Guanzhong may be significant, because Lokakṣema is known to have been active in Luoyang, but Luoyang does not lie within the Guanzhong area. This is, strictly speaking, from Dao'an's list of 'variant versions,' which gives further chronological specificity, increasing the likelihood that what is referred to is in fact the 'Han translation.' This is non-trivial because Dao'an listed not one (likely) KP, but two: he presented one as 'resembling' or being 'possibly' the work of Lokakṣema (calling it—perhaps—*Baoji jing*, and listing the 'alternative title' *Monibao*), and the other as a 'variant version' from Guanzhong (under the title *Da zhenbao ji weiyue jing*), without suggesting anything about the translator and the date of translation. We can be fairly confident that H is the oldest of the available Chinese translations. Can we be confident, however, which of the two translations listed by Dao'an it corresponds to (assuming it does correspond to one of them)? In fact, if we look only at the titles (and we know how slippery these things are), we may be led to suspect, as speculative as such suspicion would necessarily be, that our H may well be 'closer' to what Dao'an lists as a 'variant version' from Guanzhong, than to what Dao'an lists as Lokakṣema's (or the Lokakṣema-esque) text by the title *Baoji jing*. Can our surviving 'H' translation actually be what Dao'an listed as the 'variant version' from Guanzhong? If yes, then a subsequent issue we would need to address is, just how did this text, listed as *Da zhenbao ji weiyue jing* by Dao'an, eventually acquire the title *Foshuo weiyue monibao jing*? We see this title for the first time in Sengyou's list of anonymous translations; there no indication that he did not see it, so we must presume that he did. We see it also in the *Zhongjing biele* [see below note 37]. In neither of these sources is this title associated with Lokakṣema or with the Guanghe 2 date. Eventually all these elements come together in ZM (1). It is possible that the association of the 'H translation' with the title it currently has, as well as with Lokakṣema and the Guanghe 2 date, happened for the first time sometime during this process, between Sengyou and ZM (1). As a result, the text that Dao'an had originally listed as a 'variant version' from Guanzhong, under the title *Da zhenbao ji weiyue jing*, with no translator or date, acquired a new title (*Foshuo weiyue monibao jing*), a translator (Lokakṣema), and date (Guanghe 2). This is just one possibility, and the situation is, obviously, exceedingly complex. One thing should be relatively clear, however: it is not at all certain that T. 350 can be called a 'Han translation,' and that not just due to the problems connected with the use of dynastic labels."

32 KSL, 518b16, with remarks c1–6.

itself, §52: 極大珍寶之積遺曰羅經.³³ This structural parallel between 惟 and 遺 bolsters the suggestion that the latter is to be read *wei*, which, along with the trivial graphic correction of 日 to 曰, brings us toward the proper title. (It remains unclear whether we need to restore 羅 in the title itself.³⁴) There is other evidence that *vaipulya*, or a Middle Indic version thereof, stood in the title. This is provided by a reference to the KP in the Sanskrit *Sarvabuddhaviṣayāvatārajñānālokālaṃkāra* which includes this element in its expression *sarvai Ratnakūṭavaipulyasūtraparipṛcchākūśalaiḥ*, “[The monks] skilled in inquiring about the *Ratnakūṭa vaipulya-sūtra*.”³⁵

Accepting the proposed revisions in writing and pronunciation; recognizing that the resulting element **vaipulya* is actually a part of the title; leaving aside the palpably later addition of the term *foshuo*;³⁶ and considering that *monibao* 摩尼寶, as later in the tradition, is a standard transcription-cum-translation of *maṇi-ratna*, we may reach the conclusion that the title of H, probably *Weiyueluo monibao jing* 遺曰羅摩尼寶經, is most likely to have represented a title in Middle Indic somehow parallel to Sanskrit **Vaipulya-maṇiratna*.

Paul Pelliot, while offering a discussion of the KP Chinese translations in general, concentrated on this oldest version. He pointed out that the *Chu sanzang ji ji* puts the date of the translation at 179, on the authority of the “lost” catalogue of Dao’an 道安. The passage says: 寶積經, 一卷, then in small characters: 安公云: 一名摩尼寶。光和二年出。舊錄云: 摩尼寶經, 二卷, “*Baoji jing*, in one *juan*. Master [Dao-]An[’s catalogue] says: another title is *Monibao*. Translated in the second year of Guanghe [179 CE]. The Old Catalogue says: *Monibao jing* in two *juan*.”³⁷ Just a few lines before, however, in the text of

33 Rafal Felbur points out that the inclusion of 之 in the sūtra suggests that 大 modifies only 珍寶, and this should probably apply to Sengyou’s usage as well, suggesting a sense of “Collection/accumulation of great jewels,” rather than pointing to the sūtra or collection as “great.”

34 We should keep in mind that it is a common feature of Chinese transcriptions of Indic words that final elements are omitted. I should note that in line with the arguments above, I emend the Chinese text as necessary, and in all relevant citations below where appropriate 日 is corrected to 曰.

35 Edition Kimura et al. 2004: 19.18–19; cp. the trans. by Mattia Salvini at <https://read.84000.co/translation/toh100.html>, section §1.2. I learned of this reference from Karashima 2015: 118, who also cites the Chinese versions, the earliest of which belongs to CE 501. Karashima 2015 discusses in detail a number of sūtras which, he shows, contain *vaipulya* in their titles.

36 See note 16, above.

37 CSZJJ, 6b17. Pelliot 1936: 69–72, who remarks, 72n1, that the mention of the Old Catalogue’s entry is due to the difference in the number of *juan* cited. This conclusion is far from certain, however.

Note that CSZJJ, 29c17, in Sengyou’s list of anonymous translations (失譯雜經錄), has 佛遺曰摩尼寶經 (the beginning of which Karashima 2015: 117n5, without discussion, writes 佛〈說〉遺: he says exactly “The title 佛〈說〉遺曰(←日)摩尼寶經 appears in the *Chusanzangji ji* (29c17) as one of 460 scriptures which could not be found by Sengyou,” but it remains unclear to me what he meant to imply about the title).

Rafal Felbur brings to my attention that the title of the sūtra is in fact attested in (Greene 2023: 128) “the oldest Chinese Buddhist catalog to survive, even partially, as an independent work,” namely the *Zhongjing bielu* 眾經別錄. There we find in Pelliot chinois 3747 (numbered by Greene 2023: 137 as §46, by Bai 1987: 19 as 60 since he gives line rather than item numbers) 佛說遺曰摩尼寶經一卷明佛因果為宗文質均. The gloss seems to mean something like “Clarifying the cause of becoming a Buddha is its main point,” which hardly seems a useful summation of the text. The appraisal 文質均 indicates the judgement, as Eric Greene writes to me, that it is written in a “balanced” style between “elegant” and “unrefined” (terms used in early reflections on differing translation styles).

Sengyou (as we have it) there is reference to a *Vaipulya section (*fangdeng bu*), followed by the (apparent) statement that the *gupin* 古品 speak(s) of a *Weiyue shuo banre jing* 遺日說般若經, some sort of Prajñā sūtra, in one *juan*, perhaps already unavailable to Dao'an at that time: 方等部, 古品曰: 遺日說般若經, 一卷。今闕。³⁸ This appears to be a red herring, however, though one which caused considerable confusion in the tradition.³⁹ What would *gupin* here be?

38 T. 2145 (LV) 6b14. I am much indebted here to the advice of Michael Radich. As Antonello Palumbo reminds me, the identification of this text with a Prajñā[pāramitā] sūtra is plain from CSZJJ 14a1–3: 般若經: 支識出般若道行品經十卷, 出古品遺日說般若一卷。竺佛朔出道行經一卷。道行者, 般若抄也。朱士行出放光經二十卷。一名舊小品。竺法護更出小品經七卷。衛士度抄摩訶般若波羅蜜道行經二卷。曇摩婢出摩訶鉢羅若波羅蜜經五卷。一名長安品經。鳩摩羅什出新大品二十四卷、小品七卷。See Karashima 2015: 126n50. To clarify: this passage from the CSZJJ is from the section on “multiple translations” (異出經), and the reference to 出古品遺日說般若 clearly means that the *Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* was translated (出) with the title 古品遺日說般若.

Rafal Felbur writes to me the following: “At the end of his listing of 13 Lokakṣema texts (6b26), Sengyou says: 其古品以下 ... and so on. Why did Sengyou not say 其方等以下 instead? Usually his practice is to say ‘from text so-and-so on down ...’ (and then there follows some commentary or some further detail). So his practice is to cite the title of the text in question, and then say *yixia* 以下. Now here he cites ‘Gupin’ and not ‘Fangdeng.’ Can we take this to suggest that Sengyou did not see ‘Fangdeng’ as part of the title at all? This would not be all that surprising, especially if we accept that this Fangdeng is a ‘mere’ category marker.” He further observes that the interpretation of *jin que* 今闕 is controversial, noticing the opinion of Antonello Palumbo, who has argued that the formulation, when it occurs in CSZJJ, should be read as Sengyou’s assertion that a given text is not available to him in his library collection. It thus may say nothing about Dao’an at all.

39 The (notoriously unreliable) *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶紀 (53a2–4) of Fei Zhangfang 費長房, dating to 598, cites what must be the same text as *Gupin weiyue shuo banre jing* 古品遺日說般若經. (The Taishō edition [to which Pelliot had no access] notes that the Fuzhou 福州 edition [which it called the “Old Song” or Gong 宮 (Imperial Household Agency [Kunaichō 宮內庁])] includes the term *yue* 曰 after *Gupin*.) A small type note has: 出方等部。一名佛遺日摩尼寶經。一名摩訶衍寶嚴經。一名大寶積經。見祐錄, “This comes from the Vaipulya section. One title is *Fo weiyue monibao jing*; another title is *Moheyan baoyan jing*; [yet] another title is *Da Baoji jing*. [I, Fei, actually] saw [Seng]you’s catalogue [and verified this].”

The *Da Tang neidian lu* 大唐內典錄 (223c16–18), compiled by Daoxuan 道宣 in 664, has two entries side by side. First it lists a *Fo Weiyue monibao jing* 佛遺日摩尼寶經, 一卷, with a small type note: 出方等部, 一名摩訶衍寶嚴經, 一名大寶積經。古品云: 遺日般若經, 見僧祐錄. Then: 大寶積經, with the small note: 余尋此經與前略同 以光和二年初出。道安云: 摩尼寶經, 或二卷。見舊錄及士行漢錄、僧祐錄. DTNL accepts the reading of the CSZJJ, 古品曰, but rephrases it with *yun* 云 for *yue* 曰, that is, this catalogue understands there was some *gupin* which offered information, 古品云: 遺日般若經. This seems to be nothing more than a recycling of the earlier source, as does the remark that the text is “extracted from the *Vaipulya section,” 出方等部. DTNL evidently made sense of the (as we will see) misplaced *yue* 曰 without understanding the source of its error. It must be, however, that the first *yue* in CSZJJ is an error (cf. Nattier 2008: 12n20, 88n21), motivated by the closely following *yue* of the transcription *weiyueluo*, and thence to be deleted. Note further that KSL (478c7–9) reads: 佛遺日摩尼寶經一卷。安公云: 出方等部。初出。與寶積普明菩薩會等同本。一名古品遺日說般若經。一名大寶積經。一名摩訶衍寶嚴經。見僧祐、長房二錄. Here 古品遺日說般若經 is clearly considered one title, and this may be the correct solution. (For some vital suggestions here I am in debt to the reader for the JAOS.)

There are, however, other views. Long ago, Pelliot (1936: 72), whose ideas are always to be taken seriously even if we ultimately cannot agree, understood Sengyou to remark that the list of sūtras begins with *gupin*, and that the sūtras which follow seem to be *vaipulya sūtras*. Pelliot then translated the title as “Le *Vaipulya-Prajñāsūtra*, ainsi nommé par l’ancien texte; [faite partie] de la catégorie *vaipulya*

Both what is evidently the KP and this Prajñā sūtra are listed by Sengyou in the group that Dao'an felt to “resemble translations of Lokakṣema, 似支讖出,”⁴⁰ and as Michael Radich points out to me, the classification *Vaipulya section (*fangdeng bu*) was introduced by Dao'an. Furthermore, Sengyou also lists a one *juan Fo weiyue monibao jing* 佛遺曰摩尼寶經一卷 in the “Newly Compiled Continuation of the Assorted List of Anonymous Translations” 新集續撰失譯雜經錄.⁴¹ Whence the attribution to Lokakṣema?

[*Fangdeng bu*].” Pelliot here also took *gupin* 古品 as some “ancien texte.” Furthermore, he suggested that the compiler of DTNL considered the **Vaipulya-Prajñāsūtra* and the **Vaipulya-Ratnakūṭasūtra* to be one and the same work, and he seemed dubious of the attribution of the KP translation to Lokakṣema at all: “Mais il n'est même pas sûr que cette traduction soit de 179, ni due *Lokakṣema. En effet Tao-ngan [Dao'an], notre plus ancienne source, doutait de ces attributions. D'autre part, *Lokakṣema avait traduit en 179 une Prajñāpāramitā et il se peut que ce soit par confusion avec cette traduction qu'on a indiqué 179 comme date de la traduction du *Vaipulya-Ratnakūṭasūtra* auquel s'était attaché un titre alternatif de *Vaipulya-Prajñāsūtra*.”

More recently, in personal communication Antonello Palumbo proposed that even within the thirteen texts of the school of Lokakṣema (Zhi Chen) listed in CSZJJ, two belong to a category of **vevulla*, and this and other considerations suggested to him that 古品曰遺曰 is a note or gloss. He wrote:

The catalogue entry [in CSZJJ] could then be construed as follows: 方等部古品曰遺曰說般若經一卷 “Scripture discussing Prajñā[pāramitā] of the *Fangdeng* group (original note: in the ancient items called **vevulla*), one scroll.” In other words, Dao'an (who unlike Sengyou had seen this text) may here be saying simply that 遺曰/遺曰羅 **vevulla* was the name given in ancient items (古品, which can mean in turn ancient copies of scriptures, or ancient titles in title lists) to a group of texts otherwise, and presumably in more recent items, called *Fangdeng*. This reading would also solve the issue of redundancy. As we know, Dao'an assigns several other texts to this *Fangdeng* group, including two more by Zhi Chen (文殊問菩薩署經 and 內藏百品經). So far the understanding has been that by *Fangdeng bu* Dao'an meant a category of texts, in other words a type, an abstraction, but it seems to me that he rather talks about an actual group or collection: he says in fact of these texts “issued from the *Fangdeng* group” (出方等部), just as for Āgama texts he says “issued from (this or that) Āgama” (e.g. 出中阿含).

It was only after I had published the shorter version of the present study in JAOS that I came across Sakaino 1933. His conclusions are, after several rather sinuous diversions and a considerable amount of special pleading involving hypothetical misreadings of characters, almost precisely the same as those reached here. Moreover, from Sakaino I learned of Hō 1932, in which the author, criticizing Sakaino 1927: 15 and 1930: 15–18, the arguments of which are essentially repeated unchanged in his 1933 paper, understood 遺曰說般若經 (*sic*) to refer to the *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā*, based on a rather fantastic grasp of reconstructed phonology. Despite the fact that Sakaino's own ideas of phonology likewise seem to be based on the sounds as pronounced in Korean and Japanese, he correctly characterizes Hō's attempts as false reasoning (こじつけ). Evidently neither scholar was aware of the discussions of phonology cited above from the contributions of Wogihara, Staël-Holstein or Pelliot.

40 CSZJJ, 6b27. See Nattier 2008: 84. She places the Han translation in her “Second tier” of texts which resemble those of Lokakṣema and are “at least the products of members of his school.” Much earlier, Harrison 1993: 162 had written, “Despite considerable confusion in the Chinese bibliographies over the title of this work, its style and terminology accord so closely with other translations by Lokakṣema that the current attribution to him is to be maintained.” I suppose that Harrison's conclusion aligns almost entirely, for practical purposes, with that of Nattier.

Rafal Felbur suggests the following: “this formulation [with ‘resemble’] suggests that Dao'an knew that this was not a Lokakṣema text, while recognizing that it is similar to Lokakṣema texts. But I think that 似 here does not mean this. Instead, here (and in other places in CSZJJ where it is used in similar contexts) it means ‘possibly,’ and indicates that Dao'an suspects that this text might have been produced by Lokakṣema.”

41 CSZJJ, 29c17; I adopt the translation of the section from Michael Radich.

This seems to stem from an entry in Fajing's *Zhongjing mulu* (ZM [1]) of 594, in which he says 佛遺曰摩尼寶經一卷。後漢光和年支讖譯, that is, giving the same date of 179 but then explicitly saying that it is a translation of Lokakṣema.⁴² Given all of this, just how many texts are we dealing with here?

The answer must be that the *Weiyue shuo banre jing* 遺曰說般若經, which is to say the **Vaipulya prajñā[pāramitā]*,⁴³ and KP were two different texts (as concluded already by Sakaino 1933: 11), that both were, at least for Dao'an, part of a group of scriptures known as **Vevulla/Vaipulya*, which later came to be known as the *Fangdeng* group, and finally, that from an early date KP was part of some sort of collection (of **Vaipulya* texts), albeit different from the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection. It might be possible to conclude, then, that 方等部古品曰遺曰說般若經, not available to Sengyou but seen by Dao'an, is the same text later listed as an alternate translation of the smaller *Prajñā-pāramitā* text, and that its title is to be construed as “The Old Version of the **Vaipulya* explanation of *Prajñā*, from the *Fangdeng* group,” the title incorporating a simultaneous translation (方等) and transcription (遺曰) of the word **Vevulla = Vaipulya*.⁴⁴ This

42 ZM (1), 118b17. Michael Radich (<https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/1327/>) observes that “This title is treated as anonymous in CSZJJ, so this ought to mean that this interlinear note in Fajing is the first place we see the ascription to **Lokakṣema*.” Fajing in ZM (1) seems to have taken the date from Sengyou's listing of Lokakṣema's works, but then replaced the title with the one Sengyou had listed in his list of ‘anonymous’ translations. Note that this catalogue continues (118b18–20) by listing a 大寶積經一卷 and 摩訶衍寶嚴經一卷, then saying 右三經, 同本異譯, namely that these three translations are different translations of the same original text, although—as Rafal Felbur reminds me—at 6b17, Sengyou clearly says that (according to Dao'an) *Baoji jing* and *Monibao(jing)* were just two different titles for the same translations, not two different translations.

Rafal Felbur suggests that Sengyou indicates his belief that this is a Lokakṣema product (6b25–26), but Sengyou adds that Dao'an was not entirely sure. He lists a *Baoji jing* in the Lokakṣema catalog, saying that it is the same thing as what Dao'an had listed as *'Monibao(jing)'* translated in the 2nd year of Guanghe, and Sengyou lists a *Weiyue monibao jing* also translated in the Guanghe period, in his Anonymous listings. Sengyou may have seen that Dao'an had considered it anonymous (even if ‘perhaps’ as a Lokakṣema product), and so Sengyou included it in his Anonymous listings. But then because he had seen Dao'an speculate that it might be a Lokakṣema work, Sengyou also added it to the Lokakṣema category. One text, then, was listed twice, in two conflicting places in the CSZJJ. Whatever the case may be, ZM (1) is not the first place where we see the ascription of a Chinese KP to Lokakṣema. Fajing's innovation is to link that ‘Lokakṣema’ translation with the title *Weiyue monibao jing* (a title that had belonged to an anonymous translation in Sengyou).

43 However, it is important to stress that this analysis still does not come to terms with the (intrusive?) *shuo* 說. The syntactic place of *shuo* here is hard to explain, since what precedes it must be its agent. But it is hardly likely that *Weiyue* 遺曰 could serve that role.

44 I owe the germ of this summary to the anonymous reviewer for the JAOS.

In answer to the question how many translations our sources are discussing, Rafal Felbur writes to me: “In Dao'an we clearly have two: first, a perhaps *Baoji jing* (but *yi ming Monibao*), in the ‘like Lokakṣema’ category (though not definitively attributed to him), and second, a *Da zhenbao ji weiyue jing*, in the ‘Guanzhong yijing’ section (which Sengyou most likely did not see, because he does not include the note, *jin you ci jing*). In Sengyou, we find the first, as well as a *Yiriluo monibao jing* (in the Anonymous texts section). The title *Da zhenbao ji weiyueluo jing* is very close to what the sūtra calls itself. This places on us an obligation to consider the possibility that our text is precisely this scripture that Dao'an saw and listed as one of the ‘variant versions’ from Guanzhong, and not the text he attributed to Lokakṣema (whatever title Dao'an would have used). In any case, we can see that these early catalogers (Dao'an and Sengyou) saw two KP texts, not one.”

attempt at a solution, however, does not come to grips with the use of *yue* 曰 after *gupin*, which I cannot at this moment explain.

While these considerations may bring some order to the oldest catalogue materials, they do not exhaust the problems. In LSJ (which, we recall, is often unreliable, to say the least, and not among the oldest sources, of course), we have a puzzling set of entries. The catalogue lists a *Weiyue shuo banre jing*, noted above. The following entry is for a *Baoji jing*,⁴⁵ which appears to refer to the presently known Han translation of the KP. But, again as noted above, the small character notes for the entry for the *Weiyue shuo banre jing* in the preceding lines say: “Alternate name: *Fo weiyue monibao jing*; alternate name: *Moheyan baoyan jing*; alternate name: *Da Baoji jing*. [I, Fei, actually] saw Sengyou’s catalogue [and verified this].” In fact, LSJ gives as alternate titles the *actual* titles of the first two translations of the KP.

2.2.2 The Jin Translation (J)

The title recorded for J, for example in the Taishō edition, *Moheyan baoyan jing* 摩訶衍寶嚴經, likely represents an Indic **Mahāyāna-Ratnakūṭa*,⁴⁶ but after the title we find the phrase (going back to KSL), *yiming Dajiashe pin* 一名大迦葉品, “Alternate name: **Mahākāśyapa* section.” The received text, as printed in the Taishō edition, lists no named translator, and catalogues assign it only to sometime during the Western Jin (265–316). Sengyou lists this text as *Moheshang baoyan jing* 摩訶乘寶嚴經 一卷 (29b25), in his listing of Anonymous translations, the identification with KP made clear in KSL.⁴⁷ The earliest catalogue to mention the text by its current title, ZM (1), simply lists it along with a *Fo weiyue monibao jing* 佛遺曰摩尼寶經 and *Da Baoji jing* 大寶積經, as noted above.⁴⁸ The same is found in LSJ.⁴⁹ KSL lists a one *juan Baoyan jing* by an unknown translator dating from the Western Jin, citing earlier catalogues, LSJ and others.⁵⁰ However, the same catalogue also lists a *Moheyan baoyan jing* in one *juan* dating from the Jin, due to an unknown translator.⁵¹ Since this is recorded as extant, it may be different from the *Baoyan jing*. In the second and third *juan* of the *Zongkuo qunjing lu* 總括群經錄 section of KSL, which covers the Western and Eastern Jin periods, only the *Baoyan jing* is listed, without any mention of the *Moheyan baoyan jing*.⁵²

45 LSJ, 53a4.

46 Pelliot 1936: 73 explains the *yan* 嚴 of the title as follows: “Pour rendre compte de l’équivalence *yan* = *kūṭa*, qui a embarrassé M. de St.-H., il ne faut pas oublier que *yan*, outre le sens de ‘sévère,’ a celui d’‘orner’ (cf. *tchouang-yen* [莊嚴]), et s’emploie dans les textes bouddhiques par exemple pour ‘harnacher’ un cheval; le traducteur aura été plus fidèle à l’idée des ornements eux-mêmes qu’à leurs ‘amas.’”

47 KSL, 483c1: The small character note reads: 一名大迦葉品。第二出。與寶積、普明菩薩會等, 同本。中云: 晉言, 合編晉錄, 今且依。舊祐云: 摩訶乘寶嚴經。See Karashima 2015: 127 on the expression 摩訶乘。

48 See above n. 42, and ZM (1) 118b17–19.

49 LSJ, 111c8–9, with a note very similar to that in ZM (1), 上三經, 同本別譯異名。

50 KSL, 501b26: 長房等錄, 西晉失譯; 635b26: 西晉失譯。

51 KSL, 587c17–18: 摩訶衍寶嚴經一卷, then small character note: 一名大迦葉品, followed by 晉代譯失三藏名, with the note 舊在漢錄今且依舊第二譯。

52 Pelliot (1936: 73) notes that LSJ (68a24, 68b1–3: 吳別二錄並直單注。元康年中出。不顯譯人。詳覽群錄未見指的。所以別件猶殊失譯) mentions a *Baoyan jing* among the anonymous transla-

2.2.3 The Qin Translation (Q)

Translation Q, *Da baoji jing Puming pusa hui* 大寶積經普明菩薩會 (of which the actual sūtra title may be better *Puming pusa hui*), appears in the Chinese sūtra catalogues prior to KSL as *Baoji jing* 寶積經 or *Da Baoji jing* 大寶積經. The change of title and the use of *hui* 會 came about by the inclusion of this translation in the *Mahāratnakūṭa* (*Da Baoji jing* 大寶積經) collection, while catalogues produced prior to 713, the date of Bodhiruci's formal presentation of the MRK to the throne, use instead the term *jing* 經.⁵³ DTNL knows neither the translator nor the date of translation, only classifying the text in the category of "Primary Translations of Mahāyāna sūtras" (大乘經正本).⁵⁴ However, KSL lists the translation with the annotation that it was translated during the Western Qin dynasty 西秦 (385–400, 409–431) which, if correct, would place it between 385–431,⁵⁵ this catalogue also duly noting its present inclusion in the MRK as its 43rd section. Concerning the title of this translation, *Puming pusa* 普明菩薩 obviously represents *Samantāloka bodhisattva*, a personage who appears only in one portion of the sūtra (§ 150–156). Bodhiruci (or whatever corporate entity stood behind that name), in editing the 49 texts which make up the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection, utilized translation Q, naming it *Puming pusa hui* evidently with reference to this group of passages. But as Staël-Holstein (1926: x) already pointed out, *Samantāloka bodhisattva* plays only a secondary role in the text as a whole. The chief message of the KP concerns the *bodhisattva* path, especially the contemplation of the truth of the Middle Path freed from the two extremes, and the teaching of what makes one a true or false śramaṇa. Although it is not the case that the section of *Samantāloka bodhisattva* has absolutely nothing to do with this main topic, certainly that section cannot be called the center-point of the text, and thus it makes a strange choice for an overall title. It may be possible, however, that when he compiled the text into the larger MRK col-

tions translated during the Yuankang 元康 period (291–299), relying on the authority of 'the Wu and Bie (吳別) catalogues,' the identity (and even real existence) of which remains unknown. But it is hard to know whether we should even consider this to refer to the same text. Michael Radich informs me that he will argue, in a study in preparation, that this translation should be ascribed to Dharmarakṣa's group on the basis of stylistic features. It is important to stress that Pelliot did not know just how unreliable LSJ is, and his references to this catalogue should be considered in light of the information available to him.

53 KSL tells us this directly: 518c7–8 reads: 大寶積經一卷。今編入寶積當第四十三會。改名普明菩薩會。第三出。與摩訶衍寶嚴佛、遺曰摩尼寶二經，同本異譯。See also 586a22–25, 698a22, 746c9.

54 DTNL, 313b6, 319a15–17: 大寶積經。二十一紙。別譯失人代。右一經。三譯。與支讖佛遺曰寶及摩訶衍寶嚴經同。The term 正本 is used only three times in DTNL (in addition to 313b6, see 246b11, 335c2), perhaps, as Michael Radich points out to me, taken over from LSJ. The reader for the JAOS, however, wrote in their review: "These lists are subsets of what is called (the main title of this section), 歷代眾經舉要轉讀錄 'Catalog of the Essentials of the Canon for the Purpose of Recitation.' For each key Mahāyāna text we thus see that Daoxuan lists only *one* translation, but includes notes indicating that other translations exist. For the other classes of the canon here the qualifier 正本 is evidently not needed because Mahāyāna Vinaya and Abhidharma texts did not usually have multiple translations into Chinese." (Offering a marginal remark on this, Rafal Felbur writes to me that "here Daoxuan clearly does not intend recitation, but [perhaps silent] quick-reading to extract the essential meaning from verbose texts transmitted in multiple versions; see T. 2149, 219b2–3.")

55 KSL, 518c7–8: 大寶積經一卷。今編入寶積當第四十三會。改名普明菩薩會。第三出與摩訶衍寶嚴、佛遺曰摩尼寶，二經同本異譯。

lection, Bodhiruci assigned to the KP the name *Puming pusa hui* in order to distinguish it from another text also included in the MRK, chapter 23, which bears the Chinese title *Mohe jiashe hui* 摩訶迦葉會. According to the Sanskrit recorded in the Tibetan canons, the title of this work is *Maitreyamahāsīṃhanāda-sūtra*, but the Chinese version is reconstructible as **Mahākāśyapaparivarta*. Bodhiruci may have feared that confusion would result from (also) calling the KP **Jiashe hui*, and while such a decision would be understandable, the title *Puming pusa hui* is not, it must be admitted, a very apt choice in view of the main thrust of the sūtra itself. A problem with this suggestion is that there is no evidence that this version of KP was called **Jiashe jing* before being renamed *Puming pusa hui*; rather, KSL tells us that the *Maitreyamahāsīṃhanāda-sūtra* included in MRK was previously called *Jiashe jing*, until this was modified to *Jiashe pin*.⁵⁶

Be this as it may, and whatever the reasons behind the name change may have been, as far as the new title goes, we should also notice a passage in the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā*, in which the bodhisattva Samantaraśmi has a discussion with the Tathāgata Ratnākara. In the Sanskrit text we find *Ratnākaro nāma tathāgata* and *Samantaraśmir nāma bodhisattvo mahāsattva*, names which are rendered in the Chinese translation of Kumārajīva (350–409) as Baoji 寶積 and Puming 普明.⁵⁷ While in Sanskrit Ratnakūṭa is not equivalent to Ratnākara, as far as Kumārajīva's translation goes, the names are the same as those we see in KP. If nothing else, this at least shows a possible connection in the minds of those who knew Kumārajīva's translation between these two names, Baoji and Puming, and it is conceivable that this too served, consciously or not, as some sort of rationale for the name Bodhiruci assigned the KP in the MRK. Furthermore, it is with section §156 that this translation ends (save for the stock closing phrases at §166), and this fact may well have also contributed to the title.

Now, as James Apple noticed, important information is found in a Dunhuang manuscript, IOL TibJ 152. Apple wrote:

The text of the fragment is actually from the *Kāśyapaparivarta* but the Tibetan title given in this colophon is translated as “The Assembly (*'dus pa* = 會) of **Samantaprabhāsa-bodhisattva*.” In other words, the Tibetan text preserved on side 1 of the Dunhuang fragment IOL Tib J 152 indicates the final lines and colophon of this version was [*sic*] translated from the Chinese version of Bodhiruci's renamed version found in his *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection. This evidence indicates that the Tibetans were aware of Bodhiruci's forty-third section of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection with the title **Samantaprabhāsa-bodhisattva-paripṛcchā*. This evidence also indicates that the title *Kāśyapaparivarta* came from an Indian source from either Central Asia or India while the *Ratnakūṭa* Collection circulated in the 8th century. Vulgate versions of Western Kanjurs, such as the Hemis and Basgo Kanjurs, as well as fragments from

56 KSL, 698a14: 迦葉經 二卷 改名摩訶迦葉會.

57 Sanskrit in Dutt 1934: 12.18, 12.21; Kumārajīva, T. 223 (VIII) 218a24ff. Other Chinese translations have Baoshi rulai 寶事如來 and Puming pusa 普明菩薩 in the oldest translation, that attributed to Dharmarakṣa, T. 222 (VIII) 148b6, 12, Zaccchetti 2005: 162–163, §1.78, 80, and the same in the translation of *Mokṣala (circa 300), T. 221 (VIII) 2a9ff; the translation of Xuanzang, T. 220 (VII) 2c19ff. has Baoxing 寶性 and Puguang 普光.

Tabo, preserve in their colophons the alternative title from Bodhiruci's collection in addition to the title from the Indian based Tibetan translation.⁵⁸

With the exception of the fact that *Samantaprabhāsa is evidently a mere oversight for the well-attested Samantāloka of the extant Sanskrit text, this portrayal is in most regards correct. The colophon reads: *'Phags pa dkon mchog brtsegs pa chen po'i mdo stong phrag brgya' pa las || byang chub sems dpa' kun tu snang ba'i 'dus pa ste || 'dus pa bzhi bcu gsum pa rdzogs sho*,⁵⁹ that is, identifying the text as the 43rd section (*'dus pa = hui* 會, as Apple notes, in contrast to *le'u*, on which see below) of the MRK. Furthermore, it names the section *Byang chub sems dpa' kun tu snang ba'i 'dus pa*, which is plainly a calque on 普明菩薩會. Although he points out that the text is translated from Chinese, Apple does not specify that this single manuscript leaf is evidence for the erstwhile existence of a Tibetan translation from Chinese of Q, another example to be added to the list of Tibetan sūtras translated from Chinese.⁶⁰ Apple's conclusion is that "This evidence also indicates that the title *Kāśyapaparivarta* came from an Indian source from either Central Asia or India while the *Ratnakūṭa* Collection circulated in the 8th century." I cannot see any evidence to support this view (and see below).

2.2.4 The Song Translation (S)

The fourth translation, S, *Dajiashe wen da baoji zhengfa jing* 大迦葉問大寶積正法經, is in some respects the least problematic, in others the most. A product of the tenth century translator *Dānapāla, it is the closest to the extant Sanskrit and Tibetan texts in terms of extent and content, and the only Chinese translation to render the verses which follow the prose of each section,⁶¹ but it is often difficult to understand, especially in terms of its relationship to the Sanskrit text. There is evidence that the translators had access to at least some of the earlier translations, but they nevertheless rather often seem to have failed to construe their source correctly.⁶² The translation's title seems very similar to the

58 Apple 2017: 209. In the corresponding note, 209n13, we find: "Hemis, dKon brtsegs, Nga 413a8: // ... *rgya'i le'u sbyor las kun nas snang gi le'u zhes 'byung ...*; Basgo 2, cha 204b6 title, ... *byang chub sems dpa' kun nas snang gis zhu pa ...*, colophon, ... *rgya'i le'u sbyor las kun nas snang gi le'u zhes 'byung ...*; Basgo 3: ... *rgya'i le'u sbyor las kun nas snang gi le'u zhes 'byung ...*; Tabo fragments [...] Ta1.3.1.17: ... *rgya'i le'u sbyor las kun snang gi le'u zhes 'byung ...*; Ta1.3.9.6: ... *byang chub sems dpa' kun nas snang gis zhush pa ...*; Ta1.3.13.14: ... *byang chub sems dpa' kun nas +snang+ gis zhush pa ...*" So far I have only been able to check Tabo Ta1.3.1.17, which contains the translation from Sanskrit.

59 Between *gsum* and *pa* there is a one character erasure.

60 See Silk 2019. To this list we should also add from the Tibetan Stein manuscripts in London that 10L TibJ 165 and 166 contain in fact the opening portion of the *Ratnarāsi* translated from Chinese, previously unidentified as a translation from Chinese and thus not included in my list. Note that while these two sources come from the beginning of the sūtra, and thus cannot necessarily be understood to imply the onetime existence of a complete translation, the fragment 10L TibJ 152 comes from the very end, making it much more likely that a complete translation once existed. I have now edited this fragment in Silk 2023b.

61 On these verses and their status, see Silk 2013. Just to avoid confusion, I do not believe that the Vorlagen of other Chinese translations had verses, which were then not rendered by their translators, but rather that these versions lacked the verses.

62 Clear proof that they had access to a Sanskrit manuscript, almost certainly different from that/those earlier available in China, due to the presence of the verses, comes also from a note at the end

end title of the Tibetan translation (which it, however, post-dates), and we can imagine *Dajiashe wen Da baoji zhengfa jing* 大迦葉問大寶積正法經 representing something like **Mahākāśyapaparipṛcchā Mahāratnakūṭa(-sūtra)*.⁶³

2.2.4.1 The Sanskrit Title

The Indic titles underlying the titles of the four translations listed above may well have been **Ratnakūṭa*, or included **Ratnakūṭa* as a central element. Since the last two leaves of the only nearly complete Sanskrit manuscript are missing, and no additional relevant Indic manuscript evidence has yet come to light, we can only guess at how the manuscripts of the sūtra would have presented its end-title, which we would expect to be found there. However, in section §52 the sūtra refers to itself as the (or a) *Mahāratnakūṭadharmaparyāya*, a term which occurs also in sections §150, 157, 159 and 160. The same term appears in the Tibetan translation, and in the commentary. The commentator makes a point of explaining the meaning of the term *ratnakūṭa* in the beginning of his commentary.⁶⁴ Moreover, when the sūtra is quoted or cited in Sanskrit in the *Madhyāntavibhāga*, *Madhyāntavibhāgaṭikā*, *Prasannapadā*, *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, *Bodhicaryāvatāra-pañjikā* and other sources, it is always under the name *Ratnakūṭa*.⁶⁵ Despite this, when

of the third *juan* in the Korean edition (corresponding to §103 in the edition; I have not yet collated other sources) which reads: 無分別故下, 此處元少一葉梵文. Weller 1966b: 310 translates: “Anfangen von der Stelle nach (den Worten:) weil es unterschiedslos ist, fehlt ein Blatt Sanskrittext.” Section §104–107 are consequently missing in the Song translation. The sentence referring to the absent leaf was already noted by Staël-Holstein 1926: x, and discussed by Tsukinowa 1934.

63 Rafal Felbur writes to me: “In Chinese titling convention, this would have been ‘intended’ as: The Authoritative/True Scripture ‘Great Collection of Jewels’ [given in response to] the Inquiry of Mahākāśyapa—so not necessarily rendering something Indian. That is, it may reflect the Chinese tradition rather than standing as a translation as such.”

64 Staël-Holstein 1933: 2 (and already translated by him in 1926: xiv–xvn8; I translate here from Tibetan): “Question: If you say you desire to explain the *Ratnakūṭa*, then you must explain just what the purpose is in calling this *dharmaparyāya* ‘*Ratnakūṭa*.’ Answer: Because it includes all aspects of the jeweled teachings of the Mahāyāna. Since whatever aspect of the jeweled teachings is included in the jeweled teachings of the Mahāyāna, it is called *Ratnakūṭa* (Heap of Jewels). There is no distinction in meaning between ‘heap’ on the one hand and ‘accumulation,’ ‘mound’ and ‘pile.’” Derge 4009, *mdo ’grel, ji*, 199b3–6: *smras pa | khyod dkon mchog brtsegs pa ’chad ’dod do zhes zer na || chos kyi mam grangs ’di dkon mchog brtsegs pa zhes btags pa ci | dgos pa de nyid ji bshad dgos so || smras pa | theg pa chen po’i chos dkon mchog gi rnam pa thams cad bsdu pa’i phyir ro || theg pa chen po’i chos dkon mchog la chos dkon mchog gi rnam pa ji snyed pa de bsdu pa na | dkon mchog brtsegs pa zhes bya’o || brtsegs pa ni spungs pa dang | phung po dang | bcer ba zhes bya ba dang | don tha dad pa ma yin no ||* The Chinese version is T. 1523 (XXVI) 204a10–14: 問曰：汝欲釋寶積經，應先釋此法。問以何義故名爲寶積。答曰：大乘法寶中一切諸法差別義攝取故。所有大乘法寶中，諸法差別相者，彼盡攝取義故，名曰「寶積」。一，聚。二，積。三，陰。四，合和，義一名異。

65 James Apple 2017: 208 has written in this regard, “Atiśa Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna cites this discourse twice as ‘*Ārya-Kāśyapaparivarta*’ in his *Ratnakaraṇḍodghāṭamadhyaṃakopadeśa*, which Atiśa composed around the year 1037 CE. We can infer, therefore, that a shift of the title from *Ratnakūṭa* to *Kāśyapaparivarta* occurred between the 8th to 11th centuries in Indian sources.” However, I believe there is some confusion here. What Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna’s text cites is an ‘*Od srungs kyis zhus pa*’ (Miyazaki 2007: 25), but this is most naturally understood not as any strict representation of a Sanskrit title *de novo*, but in line, for instance, with the way the title is recorded in the *Lhan kar ma* catalogue (Hermann-Pfandt 2008), § 67: ‘*phags pa ’od srungs kyis zhus pa | 900 slo ka | 3 bam po ||*. This is, one must however note,

Staël-Holstein edited the text he gave it the name *Kāśyapaparivarta*, fearing that if he referred to it as *Ratnakūṭa* it would be confounded with the Mahāratnakūṭa collection (MRK) as a whole.⁶⁶ In the absence of a colophon or end-title in the Sanskrit manuscript, he based his choice on the title found in the Kanjur, namely *Ārya-Kāśyapaparivarta nāma mahāyānasūtra*, in Tibetan *'Phags pa 'od srung gi le'u zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*. Although Kāśyapa as equivalent to *'Od srung* is quite a normal correspondence, there are reasons to doubt the historicity of the Sanskrit suggested here. This is because most—though not all—instances in which *le'u* is actually attested as a translation of *parivarta* refer to chapters of larger works.⁶⁷ The first chapter of the *Lañkāvatāra-sūtra*, for instance, is called *'Bod 'groggs k̄yis gsol ba btab pa'i le'u*, rendering *Rāvaṇādhyeṣaṇāparivarta*, several chapters in other sūtras, including those of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, are also *parivartas*, rendered *le'u*, and in the second chapter of the *Sāratamā* commentary the title *Sarvākārajñātācaryāparivarta* is rendered in Tibetan *Rnam pa thams cad mkhyen pa nyid kyi spyod pa'i le'u*.⁶⁸ All of these, as noted, are portions of larger works. There is, however, at least one counterexample: colophons of Sanskrit manuscripts of the Larger *Sukhāvātīvyūha* read *bhagavato mitābhāsyā guṇaparikārtanam bodhisatvānām avavartikabhūmipraveśaḥ amitābhāsyavyūhaparivartaḥ sukhāvātīvyūhaḥ samāptaḥ*.⁶⁹ We thus see that the title element *parivarta* for an independent text is not absolutely impossible in Sanskrit.⁷⁰ Be that as it may, it seems fully justified to doubt the form *Kāśyapaparivarta*, and to note that the most germane piece of information, and a key to the origin of this title, is that in the extremely influential early 9th c. Tibetan–Sanskrit lexicon, the *Mahāvīyutpatti* (§1334, 1467), *parivarta* is offered as the only equivalent to *le'u*. I believe, therefore, it a very likely scenario that *Kāśyapaparivarta* is a Sanskrit title invented by the Tibetan editors, who largely based their understanding of the status of the text as a chapter of a larger work (hence *parivarta* as chapter) on its presence in the MRK (whether or not they would have conceptualized it with such a Sanskrit title), and on this basis constructed the Sanskrit title from the Tibetan rendering, subsequently offering a Sanskrit title in

not the title in the Kanjurs, which is *'Od srung gi le'u*, though how this might be related more broadly to the milieu of Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna is not clear to me. In any event, there remains not a single piece of *Indic* evidence for a title other than *Ratnakūṭa*.

- 66 As he tells us explicitly, Staël-Holstein 1926: vi, saying “The nomenclature of the Bkaḥ-ḥgyur (Ratnakūṭa for the class and Kāśyapaparivarta for our particular sūtra) must be comparatively modern, but I adopt it nevertheless, in order to avoid confusion.”
- 67 In the case of the *Anūnatvāpūrṇatvanirdeśaparivarta*, discussed in Silk 2015: 4–5, the text does not appear to have been a part of a larger collection, and its title is not rendered in Tibetan with *le'u* when it is quoted (and the text as a whole was evidently never translated into Tibetan).
- 68 The same word, moreover, can render other Sanskrit terms, such as *sarga*, *pariccheda*, *paṭala*, *varga*, or *adhyāya*, and probably others as well. See below for a remark on the *Mahāvīyutpatti*.
- 69 This is the slightly normalized reading of manuscript R, the apparently oldest witness, as transcribed in Fujita 1993: 1471–1473. Other manuscripts are, in terms of the reading *parivarta*, identical. Although this is not the place to enter into a discussion, I read *amitābhāsyavyūhaparivarta* as a compound, though it is not generally printed that way in editions. This title was brought to my attention by Okamoto 1991: 19.
- 70 Of course, one might argue, as is at least strongly implied by Okamoto 1991: 19, that this is evidence for the Indic existence of the *Sukhāvātīvyūha* as part of a *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection, but in this respect, no collection is mentioned, as it is in the Tibetan colophon, but only the word *parivarta*.

line with the equivalents offered by their glossaries.⁷¹ Further evidence for this may be found in the Dunhuang manuscript version of the Tibetan translation of KP, evidently earlier than that preserved in the Kanjur, and which has the title instead as *Aryaradnakūṭa nama mahayana sutra*, in Tibetan *Dkon mchog brtsegs pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*.⁷² The title here in both Sanskrit and Tibetan is transparently *Ratnakūṭa*, and it is quite conceivable that this title was applied to the sūtra when it was first translated, at some point before the structuring principle of the MRK was adopted by the Tibetans.⁷³ This hypothesis fully conforms to the fact, discussed above, that the titles of the four Chinese translations so far treated likewise, on the whole, refer to the title *Ratnakūṭa*, with only the late S reflecting **Mahākāśyapa-paripṛcchā* and J having, in the present Chinese canon, the alternate end-title **Mahākāśyapa Section*.

2.2.5 The *Da baoji jing lun* (T. 1523; Hereafter Cy)

In addition to the four Chinese translations listed above, there is a fifth, embedded in the commentary, which, as noted above, has likewise been long known to scholars: the Chinese version of which is the *Da baoji jing lun* 大寶積經論, attributed to Bodhiruci of the Northern Wei 北魏, between 508 and 535 (T. 1523). Although the sūtra is not contained in either translation of this commentary in its entirety, the vast bulk of it is cited. It is relatively easy to extract the sūtra quotations from the Tibetan translation of the commentary, and the text therein agrees almost completely with the Kanjur translation of the sūtra. There can be very little doubt that the Tibetan translators of the commentary, conforming to normal Tibetan practice, adopted for these quotations the preexisting Tibetan sūtra translation. This evidence therefore is, with very few exceptions, not independent of that found in the Kanjur tradition. But the translator of the Chinese version seems to have been only imprecisely aware of which sentences were quotations of the sūtra, and the work of extracting the sūtra portion is consequently often more complicated than it first appears. There are, moreover, ambiguities in the renderings of sūtra material.

The translation is attributed to Bodhiruci of the Northern Wei, therefore to the years 508–535. This Bodhiruci (entirely distinct from the centuries later Bodhiruci putatively

71 The *Mahāvvyutpatti* lists many names of independent texts from §1325 on, but a serial MRK was unknown to its editors. It is obvious that the MRK known in Tibet, for example as recorded in the *Lhan kar ma*, compiled in the early 9th c., perhaps between 812 and 824 (listed in Herrmann-Pfandt 2008: 18 ff.), and in the much later Kanjurs, is based directly on the Chinese collection. Sakurabe 1930: 549 (169), in discussing the Tibetan decision to organize the MRK according to its Chinese model, speculates that it is “at least after the 至元錄.” This cannot be the *Zhiyuan fabao kantong zonglu* 至元法寶勸同總錄, Taishō vol. 99 #25, a work of Qing Jixiang 慶吉祥 prepared in Peking between 1285–1287, finalized in 1306, as a result of the project to produce the Puning 普寧 canon; see Hua 2016: 164, Franke 1996: 67–124, “Der Kanonkatalog der Chih-yüan-Zeit und seine Kompilatoren.” Rather, we have here a mere misprint, and the intended reference is to the *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄 of 730 (thus 至元錄 misprinted for 開元錄). The *Zhiyuan fabao kantong zonglu* proper is also discussed by Sakurabe 1930: 551–552 (171–172).

72 Edited in Apple 2017: 211. I differ from his reading of 10L TibJ 152 only in seeing instead of a blotted [ta], as he transcribes, an attempt rather to write a reversed *ta*, namely to indicate *ṭa*.

73 That is not to say that this would necessarily have taken place before the actual creation of the MRK in China, since Buddhist texts were just beginning to be translated into Tibetan in the first half of the 8th c.

responsible for the MKK) is well-known for translating the *Ratnagotravibhāga* into Chinese, and for quarreling with his contemporary Ratnamati. According to the sūtra catalogues, these two translators produced competing translations of the KP commentary, and these two translations were combined by later persons.⁷⁴ The vocabulary is very close to that of the Qin translation (our Q). Probably this reflects the fact that the translator of Cy knew Q, but if so, this raises the question why the identification of actual sūtra quotations would have posed a problem, and this question remains to be addressed.⁷⁵

The author of the commentary is not recorded in the Chinese translation, but the Tibetan text attributes it to Blo brtan, which has generally been understood to mean Sthiramati. However, there are serious problems with this hypothesis, which I discuss elsewhere.⁷⁶

So far, we have discussed the previously well-known Chinese translations of the KP, five in number. Among them S dates to the Song dynasty and is by far the latest, but the others all predate the Sui-Tang period and belong to what are sometimes (all too loosely) termed “ancient translations,” *guyi* 古譯 or “old translations,” *jiuyi* 舊譯. To these five well-known translations, we must now make ourselves aware of two others:

- 6) *Jiashe jinjie jing* 迦葉禁戒經. Attributed to Juqu Jingsheng 沮渠京聲 of the Liu-Song 劉宋 dynasty (420–479). T. 1469. (Hereafter L.)⁷⁷
- 7) *Dasheng baoyun jing* 大乘寶雲經, *juan* 7, the *Baoji pin* 寶積品. Attributed to Mantuoluoxian 曼陀羅仙 (*Maṇḍalasena?) and Sengqiepoluo 僧伽婆羅 (*Saṅghapāla? Saṅghavarman?).⁷⁸ T. 659 (xvi) 241b5–283b16. (Hereafter M.)

2.2.6 The *Jiashe jinjie jing* (L)

The *Jiashe jinjie jing* is a very short text, not even a full page in the Taishō edition of the Chinese canon. In terms of content, it corresponds almost word for word with § 111–138 of KP. This correspondence was recognized for the first time by Ōno Hōdō in 1935. Chinese sūtra catalogues (see below) class this short work as a Hīnayāna Vinaya text, and accordingly the Taishō editors in their turn included it in the Vinaya section. Probably

74 See DTNL, 269b28–c7, and KSL, 540b8 ff.; 541a12; 637a19. How likely this is to reflect any historical reality is questionable, but not relevant to our discussion here. See Silk 2015: 7–8.

75 Unless I have overlooked it, Ōtake 2008 does not discuss this issue.

76 Silk 2009, and Forthcoming.

77 This attribution is ahistorical. As Rafal Felbur points out, even assuming the translatorship attribution to be correct, Juqu Jingsheng was from present-day Gansu, from the “northern kingdoms,” and thus not in any way a subject of the Liu-Song. However, the basis of the attribution is Sengyou’s practice of giving southern dynastic reign references for events and individuals from the north, because he was a southern loyalist; he thus considered the northern regimes illegitimate, and as it were replaced the dynastic references with attributions to the—for him—“legitimate” corresponding dynasties.

Note also Dunhuang Stein 4540, reproduced in *Dunhuang baozang* 敦煌寶藏 36:514, containing text equivalent to T. 1469 (xxiv) 912c5–18. In the text found here as Appendix 1, the fragment begins in § 135(c) with 無計. Although entirely legible, it is not well written, with between 17 and 23 characters per line, and lines not straight. Variants are trivial: in § 136(f) between 曉了 is an illegible blur (cancelled letter?); § 137(b) 想 is read 相; § 137(f) 離我所想 is omitted; § 137(h) 汚 is read 汙.

78 I follow Karashima 2015: 118 in giving these possibilities for the Sanskrit equivalent of Sengqiepoluo, but consider the Sanskrit form of the name more than usually uncertain.

the text was so assigned since in it the Buddha instructs Kāśyapa in monastic discipline, or because it was considered a Vinaya text somehow connected with the Kāśyapīya lineage.

Following the analysis of the Cy, the group of passages which makes up L, namely those equivalent to KP § 111–138, falls under four categories from among the sixteen into which the Cy divides the text as a whole. § 111–120 belong to the latter half of category 9, “the category of śrāvaka learning [which is found] within the *bodhisattvapīṭaka*,” expressing the various ways in which the renunciant must maintain his discipline. § 121–133 are included in the categories (in fact split by the Cy into two) of “śramaṇas who are not well-learned and those who are well-learned.” § 134 constitutes the category of “those who dwell in vows conventionally [upholding merely the words of the precepts],” while § 135–138 forms the category of “those who dwell in vows ultimately [honoring the spirit as well as the letter].” This may help one understand the vinaya character of the extracted portion.

Stylistically, L is very close to the Han translation H. As Staël-Holstein already pointed out,⁷⁹ there are many spots in the Han translation which look like mistranslations of its Indic Vorlage, or at which the meaning is not clear, at least to us today, with our still imperfect understanding of this early idiom. At the same time, there are also instances of valuable remnants of an Indic Vorlage. As one example, in § 112 the extant Sanskrit text reads *ātmaḍṛṣṭikṛtabandhana*, which (or the structural equivalent of which) both J and Q render as *jianfu* 見縛 (見 = *drṣṭi*, 縛 = *bandhana*), while the Kanjur texts read *lta bar gyur pa'i 'ching ba*, and the Dunhuang version nearly identically *lta bar byas pa'i 'ch'ing ba*, both likewise without equivalent to *ātma*.⁸⁰ It is only H and L which render 言是我所.⁸¹ While the meaning of the latter is not obvious (“to say ‘this is mine,’” or to assert that there is something which belongs to the self?), with *wo* 我 both H and L evidently correspond to the *ātma*- of the extant Indic text, not reflected in any other extant version. This example and others like it show, among other things, the close relation between H and L.

The similarity between L and H extends to the domain of the sections actually translated. That is, § 126 and § 119 are found only in the newer versions, S and the Sanskrit and Kanjur Tibetan; the older translations H, J, Q and Cy omit them (though § 119 is missing in Tibetan as well). L also omits these passages, conforming to the older pattern. One point that should especially be noticed occurs in § 120, which J, Q, S and Cy omit, but which is found in H, L, Sanskrit and Tibetan. In the manner of the arrangement of sections too we find a close correspondence between H and L. Those topics that are arranged in the Sanskrit text and other translations as § 115–120 are ordered in H as § 116–115–120–117–118 (as mentioned above, § 119 is omitted), and L follows exactly the same ordering. (See Appendix 1.)

79 Staël-Holstein 1926: xxvn35.

80 I use *ī* to transcribe the reversed *gi gu* (*gi gu log*).

81 Weller 1970: 140 rendered “(er) spricht vom Selbsthaften,” itself not very clear. However, in his note to another section (1970: 189) he refers to § 134 of the Sanskrit, in which corresponding to H's 若有比丘著我是我所 (L has the same) we have *ahaṅkāraṣṭhitaḥ* (in the Hoernle/Mannerheim Skt. manuscript fragment we have instead *ahaṅkāramamaṅkāra[ṣṭhitaḥ]*, which appears to be even closer to the Chinese). See also Appendices I and II.

§136–137 are made up of ten verses in the post-Han versions of the KP. These are particularly important, since these verses can be shown to have been included in the earliest stratum of the sūtra now recoverable. In most sections of the sūtra, a set of verses follows the main prose in the Sanskrit and Tibetan Kanjur versions, and the Song translation. These verses are not found in the older translations, not commented upon by Cy, not included in the Sanskrit text in the Ceylonese inscribed plates edited by Paranavithana (1939), in the Central Asian manuscript fragments (in Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya et al. 2002), or in the Dunhuang Tibetan version. They were almost certainly added later, although it is of course possible, and even likely, that versions of the sūtra with and without the verses circulated concurrently (for detailed considerations, see Silk 2013). The verses in §137–138 are original; only in H and L are they reproduced in prose.

As a number of examples show, although L is extremely close to H, it is somewhat abbreviated in its wording. Despite any appearance that L, more concise than H and focused on the sūtra's central theme, might have been the core of KP,⁸² it is virtually certain that, rather than being an independent translation of an Indian (or Central Asian) sūtra, L is an excerpt or abstract of H, containing a number of misunderstandings of, and miscopyings from, the latter.⁸³ There is no good way to understand it as independent of H.

As an example, in §117(d), discussing the “burning torments” for a renunciant, H has the sentence 身不自持戒, 持戒比丘反承事,⁸⁴ while L has 身不持戒, 不承事持戒沙門. The extant Sanskrit has *śīlavantā guṇavāntā cāntikād upasthānaparicaryāsvikaraṇam*, “accepting worship and devotion from those who uphold the precepts and those who uphold the virtues,” the meaning of which is not immediately transparent. Be that as it may, H has the very clear, “One does not oneself uphold the precepts, [but] monks who do uphold the precepts, contrarily, offer [one] service.” The meaning is not, as L has it, that one, not upholding the precepts, does not serve those monks who do uphold the precepts. Following our hypothesis, H appears to have been misunderstood or miscopied. It is hard to know precisely how this might have happened, but if 反承事 became 不承事 (for instance by 不 being miscopied for 反), a scribe or tradent may then have consequently reversed the grammatical relationship of agent and patient in the second

82 This brevity led Ōno Hōdō (1935: 575) to suggest that L contained the original, essential meaning of the sūtra; from this core, he posited, the post-Han versions of the KP developed. The same conclusion was drawn also by Kuno 1938: 97, 108, although it is possible that he simply followed Ōno's conclusions in this regard. However, this idea is to be rejected, as Ōno himself later saw (1954: 107).

83 Rafal Felbur avers that “a statement like this is justified only if we assume that the authors of L were trying to correctly understand or correctly copy H. But are we in a position to make such an assumption? Can we not at least leave open the possibility that they were doing something else entirely (exegesis, rewriting, adaptation, what have you?). Additionally the close relationship between L and T. 622 and T. 623 gives further support to the supposition that L may have played a role in, or represents a stage in, a process of adaptation/appropriation of H in a local context of practice/exegesis etc.” He further writes to me, “L appears to be a rather carefully executed adaptation/rewriting of H, and it would thus be a bit problematic to call it simply, without careful qualification, a ‘misunderstanding’ or botched copy/abstract of H, even if it is true that—as the examples offered show clearly—the resulting product departs quite strikingly from the meaning in the Sanskrit.”

84 Weller 1970: 141: “Hält (er) persönlich die Sittengebote selbst nicht, allem zuwider Dienstleistungen empfangen von Bhikṣu, welche die Sittengebote halten.”

clause in order to make the sentence once again meaningful, even though the result is, contextually speaking, problematic.

Another example of disparity between H and L is found in § 125(g), in which H has 亦無泥洹, while correspondingly L has 於佛法中得泥洹. This passage expresses the attitudes of the true śramaṇa from the viewpoint of emptiness in which, for the true śramaṇa, saṃsāra does not exist, “neither does nirvāṇa exist.” (The Sanskrit text has *na saṃsarati na parinirvāyati*, “he does not circle in saṃsāra, nor does he Parinirvāṇize.”) In contrast to this, L understands that the true śramaṇa “obtains nirvāṇa within the Buddha’s teaching.” This is doctrinally unobjectionable, but shallow and not characteristic of the κP’s thought. Most importantly for our discussion, however, the entire section here in L, while plainly corresponding to H, is significantly different from it.

In § 135(c), H has the sentence 無身所犯, 無口所犯, 無心所犯, “there is no violation of morality by acts of body, there is no violation of morality by acts of speech, there is no violation of morality by acts of mind.”⁸⁵ No such expression appears in other versions, save L, in which the corresponding sentence reads 無身無所犯, 無口無所犯, 無心無所犯, with one too many 無 per phrase. How are we to understand the sentences in L? “There is no body, and nothing that is violated”? This appears to be a mistaken copy of H, but in any event represents a rather significant departure in meaning from what is found in other sources.⁸⁶ Other examples could be quoted, for example in § 111, 113, 116, 118, 120, 128 and 137,⁸⁷ but the point by now seems clearly established.

Given the above, despite some lingering unknowns, we must say that, rather than being an independent translation, L is something similar to an edited or revised excerpt. There are, in fact, many excerpts of sūtras, and actually we find in the catalogues references to both *Chao Baoji jing* 抄寶積經 and *Baoji jing chao* 寶積經抄,⁸⁸ “extract of

85 Weller 1970: 147: “ohne alles Verletzen durch eine Tat, ohne alles Verletzen durch ein Wort, ohne alles Verletzen durch einen Gedanken.”

86 The reviewer for the JAOS stated that “The Chinese here does not pose any problems; it readily construes as ‘There is no body and nothing violated [by the body].’” Even granting the possibility of this reading, the passage still appears to demonstrate a rather serious departure from its apparent source. Rafal Felbur writes to me, “I too grant the possibility of this reading, although I admit it strikes me as rather strange. My own take would be slightly different (and perhaps a bit more ‘Buddhist’): ‘When there is no body, there is no transgression, When there is no mouth ...’ etc. In other words, we may have here an expression of the relatively widespread idea that in order to eliminate a particular form of unwholesome karmic accumulation, it is necessary to remove its causal basis.”

87 Some cases are not without complications. In § 137(d), H reads 不輕於禁戒, but L writes 不轉於禁戒. The reading 轉 is found in the Jin 金 edition (reproduced in the *Zhonghua dazangjing* 中華大藏經 41: 960b8, without any reported variant readings), and thus not a simple misprint in the Taishō, though 轉 here patently makes no sense. However, it is not entirely impossible that L originally read 輕, which was corrupted during transmission, although it seems that no trace of this exists any longer, so it is hard to know when the change might have taken place. I may note that although the JAOS reviewer agrees that we have to do here with an error, they nevertheless suggest “The phrase 不轉於禁戒 construes perfectly sensibly as ‘does not turn away from [the maintenance of] the prohibitions.’” I do not find this convincing.

88 CSZJJ, 18b1; ZM(1), 124c29; ZM(11), 163c2; T. 2148 (LV) 198b8; KSL, 651b19, with note: 出普明菩薩會即舊單卷寶積經抄; ZXSM, 988a17–18, with substantially the same note 出普明菩薩會即單卷寶積經抄.

the *Ratnakūṭa-sūtra*,” with explicit identification with the KP, though this expression is apparently nowhere connected with L.

In addition to the difficulties discussed above, from the point of view of the entries in the Chinese sūtra catalogues too there are various problems connected with L.⁸⁹ The work seems to have been known to Dao’an, according to an entry in the CSZJJ’s section reporting Dao’an’s list of anonymous translations,⁹⁰ which gives two similar titles, *Jiashe jie jing* 迦葉戒經 and *Jiashe jinjie jing* 迦葉禁戒經.⁹¹ For ZM (1), the *Jiashe jinjie jing* belongs to the category of Hīnayāna Vinaya texts (小乘毘尼藏錄).⁹² Despite earlier catalogues having treated this text as of unknown translatorship, the LSJ and DTNL attribute the *Jiashe jinjie jing* to Shi Tuigong 釋退公 of the late Eastern Jin (316–420), inserting a note that alternate titles are *Mohe biqui jing* 摩訶比丘經 or *Zhenwei shamen jing* 真偽沙門經.⁹³ A one *juan* work known by the name *Zhenwei shamen jing* 真偽沙門經, alternately titled *Zhenwei jing* 真偽經, was already listed in the CSZJJ, considered anonymous and not connected to the *Jiashe jinjie jing*.⁹⁴ The DTNL both, as above, identifies the two texts, but also lists them separately.⁹⁵ Since the title expression *Zhenwei shamen jing* can be imagined to refer to the three types of false śramaṇas and one true śramaṇa mentioned above, it is possible to understand this as an alternate title for the *Jiashe jinjie jing*. KSL, following DTNL, lists the “Tuigong” translation as lost.⁹⁶ However, in other places discussing the texts translated by the Liu-Song translator Juqu Jingsheng, it mentions that this is a second translation of Tuigong’s *Jiashe jinjie jing*, this moreover being exactly the same text as the *Zhenwei shamen jing*.⁹⁷

Following a now well-recognized pattern of such later attributions, which appear to be otherwise unattested and largely unjustified, LSJ is the first catalogue to list the *Jiashe jinjie jing* as a translation of Juqu Jingsheng,⁹⁸ but at the same time it also contains separate mention of a *Mohe biqui jing* in one *juan*, also known as the *Zhenwei shamen jing*,

89 The best treatment of the data is Hayashiya 1944: 742–751, and see <https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/1624/>. My sketch in the following is not intended to cover all of the available data. Note that Hayashiya was evidently not aware of Ōno’s earlier identification, and likewise in Ōno 1954: 106–110, no notice is made of Hayashiya’s contribution.

90 *Xinji An gong shiyi jinglu* 新集安公失譯經錄.

91 CSZJJ, 17b5.

92 ZM (1), 140b19.

93 LSJ, 72a18–20, and DTNL, 248a9–11, but also 300b28.

94 CSZJJ, 24a26.

95 DTNL, 310c6, 8; 324b22, 24, and see the entirely separate entry 261a6.

96 KSL, 509a29.

97 The small character notes attached to the catalogue entries read as follows: 531a3: 一名摩訶比丘經, 亦名真偽沙門經。第二出。房云: 見別錄。531a20: 迦葉禁戒上一十五部一十五卷, 見在。c2: 與京聲所出迦葉禁戒經文句全同乃是彼經異名錄家錯上。619b24–26: 宋居士沮渠京聲譯。Small note: 第二譯兩譯一譯。又群錄中更有真偽沙門經一卷。云是宋代沙門慧簡所譯, 與迦葉禁戒經同本。檢尋文句與禁戒經首末全同既無異文, 故不雙出。

98 A first fact to note, as Michael Radich reminds me, is that if a translation appeared in Dao’an’s catalogue, it is impossible that it would have been translated by Juqu Jingsheng. Moreover, as he wrote to me, “Juqu Jingsheng is a kind of ‘usual suspect’ to whom LSJ and later catalogues following it ascribed an inordinate number of new and baseless ascriptions. The upshot seems to be that we do not have a single reliable ascription to him. See ... <https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/678/>.” The JAOS reviewer noted, however, that “4 texts (3 extant) are attributed to Juqu Jingsheng by Sengyou.”

摩訶比丘經一卷,亦云真偽沙門經, following which it lists the *Jiashe jinjie jing* in one *juan*.⁹⁹ In the Taishō edition, the *Jiashe jinjie jing* is considered to be the same text as the *Zhenwei shamen jing*, and is attributed to Juqu Jingsheng, but these indications seem to be based on the information provided in KSL. But our conclusion is beyond doubt: since there is no question that L is an excerpt of H, regardless of who was responsible for the creation of L, that individual cannot be spoken of here as a translator as such.¹⁰⁰

A final interesting point about L is that it was, in its turn, cited at some length by two other early texts. As illustrated in Appendix I, passages from L are cited in both the *Rulai du zheng zi shi sanmei jing* 如來獨證自誓三昧經 (T. 623) and the *Zi shi sanmei jing* 自誓三昧經 (T. 622). This was pointed out by Ōno (1954: 108–110).¹⁰¹ It would take us rather far afield here to discuss the complications of these two obviously closely related texts, which if for no other reason than their early date deserve attention, but it is evident that the *Rulai du zheng zi shi sanmei jing* has some logical and thus chronological priority over the *Zi shi sanmei jing*, and thus it seems that while the former had direct knowledge of and accepted the influence of L, copying it in a manner somewhere between citation and rephrase, the latter took this process further still, evidently basing itself not directly on L but rather on the *Rulai du zheng zi shi sanmei jing*.

2.2.7 The *Baoji pin*, *juan* 7 of the *Dasheng baoyun jing* (M)

A Sanskrit manuscript (albeit incomplete) of the *Ratnamegha-sūtra* has recently become available from Tibet, and an edition is in preparation by Vinītā Tseng in Munich. It is moreover often quoted in Sanskrit in such works as the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, *Prasannapadā* and *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā*. The text exists also in Tibetan,¹⁰² and in four Chinese translations. Only the latter are relevant for us here, and only one of these, for reasons which will shortly become clear. In chronological order these Chinese versions are:

- a) *Baoyun jing* 寶雲經. Attributed to *Maṇḍalasena (Mantuoluoxian 曼陀羅仙) of the 6th century Liang 梁 dynasty. T. 658.¹⁰³
- b) *Dasheng baoyun jing* 大乘寶雲經. T. 659, our M.
- c) (*Foshuo*) *Baoyu jing* (佛說)寶雨經. Attributed to Dharmaruci (Damoliuzhi 達摩流支 = Bodhiruci) of the Tang. T. 660.¹⁰⁴
- d) (*Foshuo*) *Chugaizhang pusa suowen jing* (佛說)除蓋障菩薩所問經. Attributed to *Dharmapāla (Fahu 法護, 963–1058) and others of the Song. T. 489.

Among the very curious points raised by this array of translations is that, as has been pointed out, the third text listed above, T. 660, contains spurious interpolations connected

99 LSJ, 93a2, 119c5–6.

100 This is not to discount the important point that our knowledge of translation processes strongly suggests that most named “translators” of Chinese Buddhist texts were not actually translators in a modern sense; the question of the real (essentially political?) meaning of such attributions certainly requires rethinking.

101 See the detailed discussions at <https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/2085/>.

102 The translation is preserved as Peking ed. Ōtani 897 and Derge ed. Tōhoku 231, among others.

103 While I do not necessarily have any confidence in the equivalent *Maṇḍalasena, I use it here as a convenience.

104 See Forte 2005a: 88n5.

with the political aspirations of the Empress Wu Zhao (武曩, r. 690–705).¹⁰⁵ What makes this interesting, in light of the presumably earlier version T. 659, is that the scholar to whom is attributed T. 660 is the same Bodhiruci who is credited with the overall compilation of the *Da Baoji jing* collection. Leaving this odd situation aside, the four translations are in basic agreement with one another in terms of their content. At the end of T. 659, however, the *Dasheng baoyun jing*, we find a section called *Baoji pin*, no equivalent of or parallel to which is found in the other Chinese translations or in the Tibetan translation. This *Baoji pin* is in fact nothing other than a translation of the KP. What is more, this translation is transmitted only in one known canon, the so-called Fuzhou 福州 edition(s), of which only the 12th c. Pilu 毗盧 (no. 132, dating to 1151), printed in the Kaiyuan 開元 temple, is presently available.¹⁰⁶ This version appears to have remained basically unknown even in China until printed by the Taishō editors in the 20th c., although even the Taishō editors did not recognize the *Baoji pin* as a translation of the KP.

We must first of all investigate the relationship between the *Baoyun jing*, T. 658, and the *Dasheng baoyun jing*, T. 659, which contains the *Baoji jing*. The reason for this necessary consideration is that while sources present both as the work of the Liang translator *Maṇḍalasena, it is not clear whether the same person re-translated one and the same work. All scripture catalogues give the name of the translator of T. 658 as Mantuoluoxian, but the term *Dasheng*, Mahāyāna, is not necessarily found at the head of the title in each case. However, a *Dasheng baoyun jing* in eight *juan* appears in both LSJ and DTNL, but with the notation that it was translated by the śramaṇa *Subhūti (Xuputi 須菩提) of Funan 扶南 for the ruler of Chen 陳主.¹⁰⁷ KSL and the *Zhenyuan xinding Shijiao mulu* 貞元新定釋教目錄 give the name as *Dasheng baoyun jing*, listing it as a lost translation of Subhūti.¹⁰⁸ In sum, the catalogues list the *Baoyun jing* with the appended *Dasheng* at the head as a translation of Subhūti. The attribution of the *Dasheng baoyun jing* to Maṇḍalasena and Sengqiepoluo (梁扶南三藏曼陀羅仙共僧伽婆羅譯) found in the Pilu canon (and thence in the Taishō) does not appear in the catalogues, and it is not clear upon what tradition this identification of shared responsibility would have been based.

As Sakurabe Bunkyō showed,¹⁰⁹ a comparison of the *Dasheng baoyun jing* with the *Baoyun jing* makes it clear that the vocabulary of the two is not the same, and even the contents differ. With regard to the chapter divisions, he wrote, “the originals were not the

105 Forte 2005a: 189 ff., and elsewhere in this splendid book.

106 Although the only available version is the Pilu, in principle the same material should also be found in the Chongning edition 崇寧, upon which the Pilu was modelled. See Wu 2016: 312–313.

107 LSJ, 88b26–29, in a small note has: 第二出與梁世曼陀羅所出者, 七卷寶雲同本異出, and further adds: 周武帝世扶南國沙門須菩提。陳言善吉於楊都城內至敬寺, 爲陳主譯。見一乘寺藏衆經目錄。DTNL, 274a26–29: 大乘寶雲經八卷。第二出與梁世曼陀羅所出七卷同本異出。右周武。扶南國沙門須菩提。陳言善吉。於揚都城內至敬寺爲陳主譯。見一乘寺藏◎衆經目錄。

108 zXSM, 845b25. The small note reads: 第二出與梁世曼陀羅, 七卷寶雲及唐譯十卷寶雨, 並同本見一乘寺藏。KSL, 547a25, with a note that in the 3 editions 雨 = 雲. The small text note a25–26 reads: 第二出與梁世曼陀羅七卷寶雲及唐譯十卷寶雨並同本見一乘寺藏錄。629a26: 大乘寶雲經八卷 陳扶南國沙門須菩提譯。About the translator, 547a28–b2: 沙門須菩提。陳言: 善現, 或云: 善吉, 亦云: 善業。扶南國人。解悟超群, 詞彩逸俗。化物無倦, 遊方屆茲。於楊都城內至敬寺, 爲陳主譯大乘寶雨經一部。

109 In Ono 1932–1935: 10.136c.

same, and moreover they seem not to have passed through the hands of the same translator.” Further, he continued: “The sūtra catalogues and biographies of monks nowhere record that [Maṇḍalasena] translated the text again.” He concluded that although further investigation is required, apparently the present eight *juan* version of the *Dasheng baoyun jing* is due not to Maṇḍalasena but is in fact the “lost” translation of Subhūti. This hypothesis of Sakurabe’s is (at present) the most plausible interpretation of the question. If correct, it would mean that the *Dasheng baoyun jing* has nothing to do with Maṇḍalasena (of around the year Tianjian 天監 2 of the Liang, that is, 503), but belongs instead to Subhūti (of the Chen 陳, 557–589), making it fifty to sixty years later than has generally been thought. Although Maṇḍalasena, Sengqiepoluo and Subhūti were all from Funan, and more or less contemporaneous, and no matter the correct attribution, none of this need necessarily suggest any particular connection of the sūtra itself with Funan.¹¹⁰

The *Dasheng baoyun jing* is divided into seven chapters (*pin* 品), of which the seventh is called the *Baoji pin* 寶積品. None of the other three Chinese translations of the *Ratnamegha-sūtra* divide it into chapters, and in none of the others is this *Baoji pin* included. This fact, along with the fact that the *Dasheng baoyun jing* appears only in Fuzhou (Song period) editions of the Chinese canon and not in other editions, and the supposition that this translation is in fact the “lost” translation of Subhūti, are all worthy of note.

Given that the *Baoji pin* corresponds exactly to the KP, it follows that the *Dasheng baoyun jing* is a composite of the *Ratnamegha-sūtra* and the KP.¹¹¹ What, then, can we say about the KP as it appears in the *Baoji pin*? In both its manner of translation and in its general structure, M bears the closest resemblance to Q. To deal with the question of structure first, both Q and M lack the following sections of the text: § 27, 28, 33, 55, 84, 89, 119, 120, 126. However, Q also omits § 21, 22, 50, 51, which are found in M, while the latter omits § 54, 80, 81, 82, 90, 91, and 92, which are found in Q.¹¹² Especially characteristic

110 Although highly speculative, Antonello Palumbo writes to me: “In southern China during the first half of the 6th c., most foreign Buddhist masters with a knowledge of Sanskrit came from Funan simply because all other directions were closed. But this does not mean that they brought the texts they translated from there, or even that they brought them along at all. They may well have found several such texts already there in Jiankang, which may have been brought from NW India and Central Asia earlier on, in the 5th c., when direct communications were open between the South and the NW. I am pretty sure, for example, that this was the case for the version of the Ashoka legend that Sengqiepoluo translated in 512, the *Da Ayuwang jing* (T. 2043), for which matching Skt. fragments have been found among the Schøyen mss. from Afghanistan.”

111 A possibility, remote as it might be, is that a version of KP was contained in the same manuscript bundle as the *Ratnameghasūtra* manuscript which served as the Vorlage for Subhūti’s translation, and that he mistakenly integrated KP into the latter. There are, however, some reasons to question the likelihood of such a scenario, for which see below.

112 The presence in M of § 21–22 and 50–51, which are missing in H, J, Q and Cy, may indicate that M is later than Cy. In fact, however, Cy does include the text portion of § 21–22, without commenting on it; it is most likely that this was added by some later person(s) after the initial translation of Cy. However, as noted above, at many places in Cy, especially in its Tibetan version, long sections of the sūtra text have been inserted without comment. These too give the impression of being later additions. An initial impression is that the presence in H, J, Q and Cy of § 54, 80–82, 90–92 (§ 92 is missing in H), which are absent in M, is more likely to indicate not that M preserves some older form of the text, but that for some unknown reason these sections dropped out of M, or were not included in its Vorlage. It is

is the fact that the section comprising § 150–156, in which the Bodhisattva Samantāloka appears, while missing in the older translations (namely H, J and Cy), is found in Q and M. On the other hand, § 157–163 appear in J and Cy but are omitted in Q and M. These correspondences make the close affiliation between Q and M obvious. On the basis of these facts, therefore, it is one hypothesis that these two texts are based on a Sanskrit tradition of the KP different from other extant versions. At the same time, there are good reasons not to consider the two translations as entirely independent witnesses.

The extreme similarity in style of translation and choice of vocabulary provides evidence additional to that of structure for a close affiliation between Q and M. For example, in § 41 M is almost a calque of Q, and in remarkable contrast to the other Chinese translations. It is possible to find similar examples virtually everywhere throughout the text. Since M may be considered a later translation than Q, with the language tidied up and certain clarifications added, in some sense it is a better translation than Q, and almost certainly should be considered its revision or amended version, and therefore dependent on Q, even if its creators also had access to a Sanskrit manuscript of KP. For a particularly vivid example, in § 68 we find an analogy: A magician conjures up a magical creation, but then that magical creation turns and devours that very magician. In the Chinese translations we find the creation rendered: H 化作人, J 化作幻人, Q 作幻人, S 作幻化. All of these point clearly to a created, or magically created, person. In contrast, M renders 幻作猛虎, a magically created wild tiger. The term “wild tiger” 猛虎 does not occur in the Sanskrit as we have it, and seems to be either the translator’s interpretation, or to reflect a different Indic tradition. If we imagine a “wild tiger,” certainly the idea that the creation devours the magician makes greater sense. The Sanskrit text (available at present as quoted in the *Madhyāntavibhāgaṭīkā*) contains the term *puruṣa*, but this refers to the magician himself and not to his creation.¹¹³

A problem does arise, however, with regard to the group of passages § 150–156, found in Q and M (and incidently in S), but not in H or J. This set of passages is out of character with the KP taken as a whole. Until this point in the text, KP has consisted of a discourse of the Buddha delivered to Kāśyapa, and for this reason it has made sense to refer to KP as the “Kāśyapa chapter.” Starting with § 150, however, the Buddha begins to preach to the bodhisattva Samantāloka. Herein is preached the homily that just as one rides in a boat and seeks to pass over the Ganges river, so the bodhisattva should swiftly concentrate his energies and seek to pass over to the other shore, not using a boat but instead readying the steady ship of the Dharma.¹¹⁴

possible that in revising Q, those responsible for M had access to a Sanskrit manuscript and followed it in some respects.

113 Yamaguchi 1934: 247.12–16: *tadyathā kāśyapa māyākāraḥ puruṣo māyākṛtan nirmimite, atha sa māyā-nirmītas tam eva māyākāraṁ khādeta. evam eva kāśyapa yogācāro bhikṣur yad yad evāmbanam manaskaroti tat sarvam aśya rīktakam eva khyāti* The passage has been discussed in detail by Chen 2018, with superb insight.

The quotation of the present passage in the *Foxing lun* 佛性論, attributed to Vasubandhu but according to Hattori 1955 actually a composition of Paramārtha (500–569), reads the wording as follows (T. 1610 [xxx1] 809b23–24): 譬如幻師作諸幻像, 所作虎等還食幻師. This suggests a familiarity with M.

114 On these passages see Silk 2010.

Baoji pin, used as the title of M, seems to constitute evidence that the translator (using that term broadly here; perhaps tradent, or even editor, is better)¹¹⁵ knew that this section of the text was in fact the KP. However, although the KP calls itself *Mahāratnakūṭa* in § 52, the wording corresponding to this in M is *Baoyun weimiao jing* 寶雲微妙經, in which the word *baoyun*, **Ratnamegha*, indicates that M itself was completely absorbed into the *Baoyun jing*, the *Ratnamegha-sūtra*. This can only have been a self-conscious choice of the compiler/editor. *Baoji pin* seems to have been applied to the text since the bodhisattva to whom the Buddha directs his preaching from the beginning through the majority of the text is called Baoji. But there is not complete consistency here. In the KP from § 1–140 the Buddha preaches to Kāśyapa, then in the episode from § 141–149 Subhūti enters the picture. In the anomalous section § 150–156, the interlocutor is Samantāloka, and with § 157 Kāśyapa returns. At the beginning and end of the sūtra, the representative listener is Kāśyapa. But in M, Baoji bodhisattva appears only in § 1–135, and the other sections from § 139 on correspond with the description just given. That is, in the first part of the text in M the name Jiashe (Kāśyapa) is replaced by Baoji bodhisattva, but later this is not maintained, and what we might well understand as vestiges of the original text, with the name Jiashe, remain. This suggests a process of revision which was largely but not completely carried through.

Now, as mentioned above, the section with Samantāloka is odd. Among the various versions, H completely lacks § 150–165, in which Samantāloka appears on the scene, and among the Chinese translations these sections are found only in Q, M and S, while in contrast the following § 157–165 are omitted in Q and M but found in J (except § 158) and Cy.¹¹⁶ This situation, in which a set of passages is completely missing in the oldest translation and then sometimes appears and sometimes not in later translations, suggests that we view this section as either a later addition to the sūtra or as representative of a different lineage (or different lineages) of the text, since it is difficult to hypothesize that translators intentionally chose not to translate part of a text that they found in their Vorlage.¹¹⁷

3 The Dates of the Several Versions of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*

Among the seven Chinese translations discussed above, the Song version is the newest. Forming a group together with the Tibetan Kanjur translation and the Sanskrit text, these three versions contain a set of verses attached to almost every section of the sūtra. As indicated above, these verses are either additions to an original core sūtra text, or belong to a lineage of the scripture separate from that transmitted in other versions without these verses (Silk 2013). But even within the group of three late versions—Sanskrit, Kanjur Tibetan and S—we can determine a relative chronology.

115 Although he kindly credits me, refer to the published comments of Rob Mayer, first at <https://blogs.orient.ox.ac.uk/kila/2010/10/09/authors-plagiarists-or-tradents/>, then 2015: 232–233.

116 J contains § 157, 159–163; Q contains § 150–156, 166; M contains § 150–157, 159, S contains all sections through § 166. Cy in Tibetan contains § 157–163, 165–166, while in Chinese § 157–158, 160–162.

117 Leaving aside from this general rule the question of the omission of materials removed for fear of causing offence, such as the omission of sexual references in Chinese translations of Tantras.

The Tibetan Kanjur translation is attributed to Jinamitra, a figure of the early ninth century, of the time of King Ral pa chen, and the translation is already listed in the *Lhan kar ma* catalogue (earlier known to scholarship as the *Ldan kar ma*) and *'Phang thang ma*, both of the early 9th c.¹¹⁸ The Tibetan translation of the KP thus belongs to the eighth or very early ninth century, and is older than the Song Chinese translation. The Song translation is attributed to Shihu, who arrived in the Northern Song in 980, and thus, if this is correct, his KP translation belongs to the end of the tenth century. This does not, however, prove that his Sanskrit Vorlage dates from this period as well.

It is difficult to ascertain the chronological relation between this Song translation and the available Sanskrit text. Staël-Holstein thought that his Sanskrit manuscript belonged to the ninth or tenth century, though more recently Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya et al. (2002: vii) place it in 7th–8th c. Khotan.¹¹⁹ In any event, although differences due to recensional variation must always be considered as well, its contents seem to be later than the text upon which the Song translation was based. For example, in §131 after the verses the main Sanskrit text contains an additional section in prose, not found in any of the other versions, and also missing in other Sanskrit fragments (Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya et al. 2002: 61). In §146 the Sanskrit text is greatly expanded in comparison with all other versions, and the same tendency can be detected in section §103 and elsewhere. Such examples raise the question whether the main Sanskrit manuscript might contain a text representing the newest available version of the text (remembering that while a text in a given material form cannot be newer than that material form, it may well be older), or whether we confront here questions of divergent lineages rather than of chronological priority. Part of the complication is the presence in §33, 84 and 89 of the Song translation of verses absent in all other Chinese versions, which gives the impression that the Song version contains a more developed form of the text. Likewise, in §120 Tibetan contains a verse not in the Sanskrit text, but of course, we must also reckon with the fact that our main Sanskrit manuscript is a *codex unicus*, and therefore in no way should be understood to represent “the” Sanskrit tradition. All of these examples, taken together, suggest that it will be more fruitful to think in terms of divergent textual developments than of a single linear evolution over time.

Notwithstanding whether they should properly be placed in a single line, one linked to the other, the texts we have do belong to different moments in time. Thus, recapitulating what we have said above, we can tentatively place the available versions of the KP in chronological order as follows:

H	Later Han translation:	179
J	(Western) Jin anonymous translation:	291–299
Q	(Western) Qin anonymous translation:	384–431
L	<i>Jiashe jinjie jing</i> :	(400–470)
Cy	Northern Wei, <i>Baoji jinglun</i> :	508–535
M	Chen, <i>Dasheng Baoyun jing</i> :	557–589

118 Herrmann-Pfandt 2008: 38, #67; Kawagoe 2005: 8: #25.

119 Kuno 1938: 108 had earlier offered a range of 6th–8th c.

Sanskrit Manuscript (SI P/2):	7th–8th century
Tibetan Dunhuang version:	8th~9th c.?
Tibetan Kanjur translation:	788–824
S Song translation:	End of tenth century

In addition to the above, we have the Tibetan translation of the commentary, the Chinese version of which is referred to by the abbreviation Cy in the list above. Since the name(s) of the translator(s) is (are) not given, we cannot be sure, but probably the Tibetan translation of the commentary is later than the translation of the sūtra itself. This text also underwent a remarkable change, and the Tibetan version is much expanded in comparison with the Chinese, the views of the teacher Chos kyi bdag po (= Dharmasvāmin?) being introduced for instance. It is not possible, however, to go into detail here (see Silk 2009).

Having examined the dating of the various versions of the KP, we can see that the existence of seven Chinese versions, beginning with that dating to the Later Han, illustrates the interest some Chinese monks, and others (especially in the case of the Song translation, perhaps [also] those in political power) had in the sūtra over a long span of centuries, or at least the interest some of them had in making translations available, for the text never generated the type of attention in China which led to the production of a considerable commentarial literature, such as that produced on the *Lotus Sūtra*, *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra*, the Pure Land sūtras, and the like. The text therefore, despite the existence of these multiple translations, in another sense did not deeply penetrate the Chinese Buddhist intellectual world, and this fact raises a host of questions of its own, which should be addressed separately elsewhere.

While giving due weight to the idea that we most likely do not see here a linear development of a single core text,¹²⁰ it is still possible that in addition to illustrating some (yet undetermined) kind of sustained attention to this text, consideration of the date of compilation and of composition of the different versions would allow us to make some suggestions about the ways that at least this particular sūtra was formed and developed.

First, it is fair to say that even the oldest version of the KP as we have it today, the Han translation, represents a snap-shot of but one form of textual evolution, and certainly not the earliest. It is difficult to imagine that sūtras, even relatively short ones like the KP, were composed in one stroke. Probably the germ of the text developed out of many episodes or pericopes, “elements” (or likewise some sort of “unit”) which served as constituent parts integrated into a composite version. These pericopes or “elements” were gradually collected together until ultimately a single sūtra was formed, but this single sūtra was never frozen into one and only one form. Such a process of collection in some respects accounts for the large and small differences and for the variations in the doctrinal, literary and structural nature of the versions to which we now have access, and of course we know that these versions represent only a—to some extent random—preservation of the once much richer variety of forms of expression of “the same” literary work. Some scholars have, however, imagined a different form of evolution.

¹²⁰ See Silk 2021: 156 for a visualization.

For instance, as noted above (note 82), Ōno Hōdō once suggested that the *Jiashe jinjie jing* (our L, corresponding to § 111–138) represents the earliest form of the KP, finding evidence for this in the fact that the “attainment of merit” section at the end of this group of passages signals the end of a sūtra. But the *Jinjie jing* is clearly an excerpt, a Chinese production based on the Han translation, and therefore certainly not an independent witness to any Indian state of the text. This early suggestion of Ōno, then, as he himself later concluded, can confidently be rejected.

However, it is, of course, theoretically possible to consider a stratum corresponding to the *Jiashe jinjie jing* to have been one of the pericopes which was drawn upon to compile the present KP. Other elements possibly antecedent to the KP as the unit we now know include the stratum comprising the sixteen (or twenty or twenty-two) sections of four qualities concerning the bodhisattva’s practice (§ 1–22) and the stratum in which is described the Middle Way and the practice of seeing things in accord with reality (§ 52–71). Yet, it is hard to argue on any objective ground that any of these, alone or in combination, might represent an “original core” of the KP.

Next, the episode (§ 139–149) of five hundred monks leaving the assembly, having been unable to understand the Buddha’s preaching, is paralleled in a number of other Buddhist scriptures, and while it can be considered as a pericope of the sūtra, it is difficult to consider it too as an original core element peculiar to the KP. Furthermore, the stratum in which the bodhisattva Samantāloka appears (§ 150–156) represents a secondary stratum almost certainly added, as argued above, at a later stage. Therefore, even our earliest witness of the KP shows strong and indeed compelling evidence that it represents a developed form of some evidently earlier forms of the work.

If, then, we cannot be certain about the process of development of the KP, what of its present location within the MRK collection?

4 The Formation of the *Mahāratnakūṭa*

It is possible here only to briefly address the question (or better, questions) of the origins of the collection of 49 sūtras within which the KP is now classified, the MRK. Already Staël-Holstein (1926: xviii) questioned the idea that the Sanskrit text of the MRK was formed in India, pointing out by way of proof, as noted above, that in Indian works the KP is always quoted by the name *Ratnakūṭa*, while other texts included in the MRK series, such as the *Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā*, are quoted as independent texts and not considered to be part of any larger unit. Thus the Sanskrit appellation *Ratnakūṭa* is limited to the KP. But does this adequately demonstrate that no MRK existed prior to the time of Bodhiruci, held to be responsible for the MRK as we now know it?

An important question for understanding the place and status of the KP in China is whether the larger collection into which Q was incorporated—what we now know as the MRK—existed before Bodhiruci presented this collection to the throne in 713. To anticipate the answer to this question, there is little reliable evidence pointing to the existence of an MRK collection before its compilation by Bodhiruci, at least in any unambiguous manner.

One piece of evidence which has been brought forward to argue for the contrary conclusion is a passage in the (let us remember, notoriously unreliable) *Lidai sanbao ji*

歷代三寶紀 (our LSJ) of 598, that is, significantly before the 713 date. There reference is made to *Jñānagupta's having seen a **Ratnakūṭa* (*Baoji* 寶積) in what may be Karghalik (Zhejujia 遮拘迦), in Central Asia.¹²¹ Upon this basis some have placed the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection as a whole in the sixth century. It seems evident, however, that the reference can only be to the single sūtra we know as KP, that is, the *Ratnakūṭa par excellence*, all the more so as immediately following in the list comes *Lengqie* 楞伽, that is, the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*. The LSJ passage refers to the texts as “in all 100,000 verses” 皆十萬偈, and lists side by side with the *Baoji* the *Laṅkāvatāra*, the *Anantamukhadhāraṇī*, the *Mahāmegha-sūtra* and others.¹²² If he expression is taken to mean that each text is 100,000 verses in length—which seems very unlikely—this may allude to the idea that Buddhist scriptures were originally of magnificent lengths, with only much abbreviated versions having survived in this Sahā world. Whether or not that idea is relevant here, it is hardly possible to accept this kind of legendary language as evidence for the historical existence of a collection. While the cited passage, therefore, may well stand as evidence for the existence of KP itself in the 6th century, since the existence of the Han translation makes it virtually certain that it existed already in the 2nd century, we learn nothing new here.¹²³

A more significant complication comes in the story that Xuanzang (玄奘, c. 600–664), at least 50 years before Bodhiruci, planned to translate the serial MRK, but was prevented from doing so by old age. If reliable, this would demonstrate that the collection existed as a collection—in whatever form—before Bodhiruci began his efforts. The relevant passage reads:¹²⁴

麟德元年春正月朔一日翻經大德及彼寺衆懇懃啓請翻大寶積經。法師見衆情專至, 俛仰翻數行訖, 便收梵本, 停住, 告衆曰: 「此經部軸與大般若同。玄奘自量氣力, 不復辦此。死期已至, 勢非賒遠。今欲往蘭芝等谷禮辭俱胝佛像」。於是與門人同出, 僧衆相顧, 莫不潛然。禮訖還寺, 專精行道。遂絕翻譯。

On the first day of the first month, in the spring of the first year of Linde (= 2 February 664), the *bhadanta* monks responsible for translation, as well as the community of that [Yuhua] monastery, earnestly requested [the Master] to translate the *Da*

121 I briefly discussed this in Silk 2019: 231n7, referring to Sakurabe 1930: 134. The *Lidai sanbao ji* passage is found at T. 2034 (XLIX) 103a21, and see Chavannes 1905: 353 for a translation. The full passage is LSJ, 103a20–23: 此國東南二十餘里。有山甚嶮。其內安置大集、華嚴、方等、寶積、楞伽、方廣、舍利弗陀羅尼、華聚陀羅尼、都薩羅藏、摩訶般若、八部般若、大雲經等。

122 Nakamura and Arai 1978: 394 opined that the record of *Jñānagupta/Jñānayaśas of a 100,000 verse *Baoji jing* proves the early existence of a serial MRK. Likewise, Okamoto 1991: 17 rendered the expression 皆十萬偈 “それぞれ十萬偈,” also understanding therefore a reference to a major collection. He further pointed out that in Tibetan sources too the MRK is generally cited as of 100,000 verses. The considerations of Pedersen 1980 are, I think, overly credulous.

123 Although he does not go into any detail, this seems to be the opinion of Takasaki 1961: 3 as well.

124 T. 2053 (L) 276c2–9. The translation is based on that of Li 1995: 331, significantly modified. I accept the following variants from the Taishō apparatus: for 玉華 I read 彼; for 攝, I accept 收; for 禮拜 I accept 禮, all of these based on the readings reported by the editors for a number of witnesses.

Baoji jing. Upon seeing the sincerity of the monks, the Dharma Master, after just a moment translating only a few lines, closed the Sanskrit text and stopped the task. He told the monks, “This sūtra is as voluminous as the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā sūtra*.¹²⁵ Estimating my own strength, I shall not be able to complete this work. I am approaching my death, and my energy will not continue for long. Now I wish to go to the Lanzhi Valley and other places to worshipfully bid farewell to a *koṭi* of Buddha images.”¹²⁶ Then he set off together with his disciples, and when the monks gazed at one another, each and every one of them dissolved in sobbing. After worshipping, [Xuanzang] returned to the monastery and engaged exclusively in practising the Way. From then on, he stopped with translation work.

This passage comes from the well-known *Da cīen si Sanzang fashi zhuan* 大慈恩寺三藏法師傳, a work claimed to have been completed by Yancong 彥棕 in 688, following on the uncompleted task of Huili 慧立 (614–?), though there are significant problems with this traditional account. In any event, the first catalogue to list the work is the KSL of 730, and one cannot entirely rule out the possibility of interpolations made after 688, although a rationale for such an interpolation in the present case is not self-evident. But that does not mean that no such rationale exists. I believe, in fact, that the reference to the *Mahāratnakūṭa* here may well be anachronistic, and the result of later editing. If it is correct (and see note 127) that this account was written as part of the efforts of the future empress Wu Zhao (Wu Zetian 武則天) to consolidate her power, it is also possible that a reference to the *Da Baoji jing* was inserted in the text and connected with Xuanzang as part of an effort to associate him and his charisma directly with the (perhaps then contemporary) project of Bodhiruci to actually produce the collection. As it is, the tone of the passage is hagiographic and we are compelled by modern standards to judge it in at least some respects as fictional.¹²⁷ We need to recall several things about the situation of Xuanzang at the point in time here referred to. Namely, from 659, Xuanzang moved to the Yuhua monastery, a move that, as Liu Shufen points out (2022), was designed to shield him from the political purges going on at the time. Indeed, it was at this monastery that he completed the enormous *Mahāprajñāpāramitā* in 600 *juan*. This is, however, five times larger than the MRK’s 120 *juan*, and thus the authors’ claim that the MRK is in terms of

125 According to Forte 2002: 98n83, relying on KSL, 555b28–29, this translation was completed 25 November 663, a scant four months before he was putatively asked to translate the MRK.

126 I am not certain about the meaning of this sentence. The Lanzhi valley is part of the Yuhua Palace 玉華宮 complex, and Xuanzang died in that complex on 5 February 664, having dwelt there from 659 onwards. On the circumstances see Liu 2022: 256, 264–264. I do not know, however, whether 俱胝佛像 means a *koṭi* of buddha images or is the name of a particular image, nor the particular significance of the valley. Rafal Felbur writes to me that, “there were in fact three ‘valleys’ of note in the area: in addition to Lanzhi valley, there were also Fenghuang Valley 鳳凰谷 and Shanhu Valley 珊瑚谷. But I have not found any trace of an individual Buddha image called 俱胝佛像. The collocation 俱胝佛 emerges in the language of Chinese Buddhist texts precisely in the Tang, with not a *single* instance pre-Tang. All in all, I strongly suspect that the idea here in the biography is that Xuanzang wishes to go to the Lanzhi valley, and the other (two famous) valleys in the area of the Yuhua complex, and bid farewell to the very many Buddha images there.”

127 Kotyk 2019 demonstrates the extent to which some passages in the work can, in comparison with official documents reporting on the same events, be shown to have been fictionalized.

the number of its scrolls equal to the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā* (此經部軸與大般若同) can only be taken as rhetorically driven.

That being said, is it entirely impossible to imagine that Xuanzang knew of something he understood as a *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection? It is difficult to speak of absolute impossibility, but the evidence seems to be against it, and not only the Indian evidence which, alongside a great many references to a *Ratnakūṭa* scripture which is equivalent to our present KP, preserves not a single trace of a collection. Moreover, there is another complication in understanding the passage above as evidence for the existence of the MRK as a collection in 664, and that comes from a spot earlier in precisely the same *Da cǐ'en si Sanzang fashi zhuan*. The relevant passage reads:¹²⁸

丁卯法師方操貝葉，開演梵文。創譯：菩薩藏經、佛地經、六門陀羅尼經、顯揚聖教論等四部。其翻六門經當日了。佛地經至辛巳了。菩薩藏經、顯揚論等歲暮方訖。

On the first day (of the seventh month) the Master started to translate the palm leaf Sanskrit texts. He began [on that day] translating four texts: the *Bodhisattva-piṭaka*, the *Buddhabhūmi*, the **Ṣaṇmukhī-dhāraṇī*, and the *Xianyang shengjiao lun*. Of these, the translation of the *Ṣaṇmukhī-dhāraṇī* was completed on that same day, and the *Buddhabhūmi* was finished on the fifteenth day (of the seventh month), while the *Bodhisattva-piṭaka* and the *Xianyang shengjiao lun* were done only by the end of the year.

The obvious problem here is that while reference is made matter-of-factly to the *Bodhisattva-piṭaka*, no mention is made of its inclusion in any MRK collection, where we find it now. It is hard to imagine that if there had been an awareness of this inclusion it would have been overlooked, especially in light of the passage later in the same work, cited above. Of course, one could argue that while Xuanzang knew a Sanskrit manuscript of *some Mahāratnakūṭa* collection, it did not contain 49 texts, or at any rate did not contain the *Bodhisattva-piṭaka*, which then would have been added to the collection later by Bodhiruci. It is evident, however, that such reasoning adds hypothesis upon hypothesis until almost anything is possible. If we are to be sober, we probably should conclude that the first cited passage—that claiming that Xuanzang had a copy of the complete MRK in Sanskrit—is a later addition, and does not refer to any historical event actually taking place during Xuanzang's lifetime.

Another parallel passage may not after all be independent evidence, and it is difficult to know how to treat the *Da Tang gu Sanzang Xuanzang fashi xingzhuang* 大唐故三藏玄奘法師行狀, the history of which is unclear. The passage relevant for us, which ends with Xuanzang alluding to his impending death, reads:¹²⁹

128 T. 2053 (L) 254a6–10, trans. Li 1995: 181, modified.

129 The passage is T. 2052 (L) 219a13–18. On the text, see Kotyk 2019: 521–524. It is credited to an otherwise unknown Mingxiang 冥詳, and said to date from shortly after 664, but this is highly questionable. Kotyk 2019: 524 is inclined to date it to the early Song.

至麟德元年正月一日, 玉花寺衆及僧等請翻大寶積經。法師辭曰: 「知此經於漢土未有緣。縱翻亦不了」。固請不免。法師曰: 「翻必不滿五行」。遂譯四行, 止。謂弟子及翻經僧等, 有爲之法, 必歸磨滅, 泡幻之質, 何得久停。

In the first year of Linde, on the first day of the first month, the community in the Yuhua monastery and the monks requested [Xuanzang] to translate the *Da Baoji jing*. The Dharma Master demurred, saying: "I understand that as yet there are not the karmic conditions for this scripture in China. Even were I to try to translate it, I would be unable to finish the task." They insistently entreated him, not relenting. But the Dharma Master said: "If I were to translate it, there is no way I could make it through five lines." Thereupon he translated four lines, and stopped, telling the disciples and translator-monks that all conditioned dharmas are certain to end in destruction: since they have the nature of foam and illusion, how could they last for long?

The similarity of this passage to the first passage quoted above from the *Da c'en si Sanzang fashi zhuan*, and the uncertainty over the history of the *Da Tang gu Sanzang Xuanzang fashi xingzhuang* (which is very likely to be considerably later), suggest that we must treat it as a later recounting of the former's account, rather than as independent corroborating evidence.

Also dated many years after the fact is a passage in the *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄, in which we read:¹³⁰

此經都有四十九會。上代譯者, 摘會別翻, 而不終部帙。往者, 貞觀中玄奘法師往遊印度, 將梵本還。於弘福寺, 譯大菩薩藏經, 即是寶積第十二之一會。後於玉華宮寺, 翻大般若竟, 諸德慇懃請翻寶積。奘法師云: 「譯寶積之功不謝於般若。余生涯已窮, 恐不終其事」。固請不已。遂啓夾譯之。可得數行乃嗟歎曰: 「此經與此土群生未有緣矣。余氣力衰竭不能辦也」。因而遂輟。流志來日, 復齎其梵本。和帝命志續奘餘功。

This sūtra consists of forty-nine sections (*hui* 會). The translators of previous dynasties had extracted some of the sections and had translated them separately, so it was not complete. Formerly, during the Zhenguan era, the Master of the Law Xuanzang travelled to India and came back with the Sanskrit text. He translated the *Da Pusazang jing* [*Bodhisattvapitaka*], the twelfth section of the *Baoji* (*Ratnakūṭa*), at the Hongfu Monastery. Then, when he finished the translation of the *Mahāprajñā* [*pāramitā*] at the monastery of the Yuhua palace, the *bhadantas* earnestly implored him to translate the *Baoji*.

The Master of the Law [Xuan]zang said: "The work of translating the *Ratnakūṭa* (*Baoji*) is not inferior to that [necessary for translating the] [*Mahā*] *prajñā* [*pāra*]

130 T. 2154 (LV) 570b3–12. The translation is that of Forte 2002: 97–98, modified, translated earlier by Lamotte 1976: 1844–1845, in the note.

mitā]. My life is going to end and I am afraid that I will not be able to bring this work to completion.” Since he was insistently asked, he opened the [Sanskrit] text to translate it; he was able to translate some lines, then, sighing, said: “This sūtra does not yet have a karmic connection to the beings of this land (China). My energies are weakening and I cannot succeed.” Then he stopped.

When [Bodhi]ruci came, he too brought the Sanskrit text [of this sūtra]. Hedi (Zhongzong) ordered [Bodhiru]ci to continue [Xuan]zang’s remaining work.

I would venture to suggest that the wording of parts of this account are so close to those in the hagiography of Xuanzang quoted above that they either were borrowed from, or at the very least inspired by, it.¹³¹ Furthermore, there is again an apparent incoherence in this account which mirrors that in the hagiography, namely that a distinction is made between the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* and the MRK.

Now, these are not the only sources which present a challenge to a clear picture of the history of the MRK collection, and we must consider one final reference found in a work the Indian origins of which seem fairly secure. Several times in offering quotations, the **Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* 十住毘婆沙論,¹³² traditionally considered to have been translated by a group associated with Kumārajīva,¹³³ refers to a *Baoding jing* 寶頂經, within which are to be found both a Kāśyapa chapter (the reference is 寶頂經迦葉品中)¹³⁴ and an **Akṣayamatibodhisattva* chapter.¹³⁵ The former refers to the present KP (see Appendix II, which illustrates this with KP §134), but interpreting *Baoding jing* here is not straightforward, since the very same *Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* quotes the KP in a number of other places, but it does so without reference,¹³⁶ or by calling it the **Kāśyapa sūtra* 迦葉經,¹³⁷ in these cases without reference to any *Baoding jing*. As just noted, the *Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* also quotes an **Akṣayamatibodhisattva* chapter in the same manner, that is, apparently attributing it to a *Baoding jing*. The passage begins: 寶頂經中無盡意

131 Takasaki 1961: 3, noticed the claim in KSL that Xuanzang was asked to translate the MRK, which is not mentioned in the Imperial Preface to the MRK, and expressed his doubts about the historicity of the account, pointing to the disconnect with the account of his translation of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* as an independent sūtra. He went on to extend this doubt to the veracity of the *Da ci'en si Sanzang fashi zhuan*.

132 See Hachiriki 1988 for a more general treatment.

133 This is not uncontroversial. See Tōdō 1953, and more recently Kuwahara 2016, who inter alia summarizes a number of earlier views.

134 T. 1521 (XXVI) 118c13. On the KP passages, see already Shiomi 1932: 94–95 (1034–1035), although I do not agree with his notion that *Baoding jing* is equivalent to the *Mahāratnakūṭa*. Shiomi evidently felt, as he says explicitly on p. 96 (1036), that a large collection, which he does not apparently necessarily identify with the *Mahāratnakūṭa* as we know it but which included the KP and *Akṣayamati*, existed in the time of Nāgārjuna, a position I think has little to support it, despite the fact that this is also the opinion of Kuno 1938: 89–97. On the/a *Baoding jing*, see also Amano 1965, Sōma 1979. Despite its promising title, there is little to learn from Haseoka 1954.

135 Sūtra catalogues record a five *juan Baoding jing* translated by the Liu-Song period monk Zhu Fajuan 竺法眷, (ZM [II], 175b3; T. 2148 [LV] 213a9; KSL, 634b29; ZXSM, 969a1–2), but by 515, CSZJJ, 13b1, already lists it as unavailable to him. We have no clue as to what might have been the contents of this text, or if this might have something to do with the reference in the *Da zhidu lun*.

136 T. 1521 (XXVI) 67b7.

137 T. 1521 (XXVI) 110c25, citing KP §135.

菩薩第三十品檀波羅蜜義中說,¹³⁸ meaning that the passage which follows this is claimed to come from the *Baoding jing*'s **Akṣayamatibodhisattva*, chapter 30, the explanation of the *dāna pāramitā*. Now, there is an **Akṣayamatiparipṛcchā* included in the MRK as sūtra 45, but the cited text has been identified rather with a passage in a different text called *Akṣayamatinirdeśa*, this found not in the MRK but in another sūtra collection, the *Mahāsaṃnipāta*, and although the passage deals with *dāna*, it appears in the 12th chapter of the sūtra.¹³⁹ In light of these references from the *Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā*, while it is difficult to know what to conclude about its idea of a *Baoding jing*, it is nearly impossible to consider that it might refer to a *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection.

However, the case is not yet complete, since we have a single instance in Kumārajīva's *Da zhidu lun* 大智度論 (**Mahāprajñāparamitopadeśa*) of a citation of the KP (§ 83) under the title *Baoding jing* 寶頂經.¹⁴⁰ However, in the other places in which KP is quoted in this work, the citations are not attributed. It is hard to know what to make of these instances in the *Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* and *Da zhidu lun*, but it seems too great a leap to conclude that, since these works are traditionally ascribed to Nāgārjuna, there existed a large sūtra collection which was the *Baoding jing*, that is, the *Ratnakūṭa*, in the time of Nāgārjuna. The present MRK, according to this way of thinking, would represent a reorganization of this *Baoding jing*, with some differences in terms of which texts are included and in the extent of the collection. I think this idea can be dismissed; it seems to me indisputable that Indian authors of treatises display no knowledge of the MRK as a unit, and certainly not the unit that we know today.

Several further pieces of evidence might also be noted, although they offer no definitive information. In his translation of the *Madhyāntavibhāgabhāṣya*, Paramārtha (499–569) renders *Ratnakūṭa* with none other than *Baoding jing*.¹⁴¹ Likewise, in the Northern Liang 北凉 (397–439) *Ru Dasheng lun* 入大乘論, we find another such usage, though so far I have not identified the sūtra cited,¹⁴² and moreover, when this text actually does quote

138 T. 1521 (XXVI) 50a9–10.

139 Identified already in Shiomi 1932: 93 (1033), in Kuno 1938: 89–93, in Amano 1965: 464 (157), and yet again by Bhikkhu Bodhi in Dharmamitra 2019: 1.673n179 (of whom only Kuno referred to his predecessor, whose ideas he discusses pp. 109–110), as the passage beginning at T. 397 (XIII) 189a18 with 菩薩修行檀波羅蜜, 不可窮盡 (the speaker is Akṣayamati). Note that this passage, while in chapter 12 (無盡意菩薩品第十二之一), occurs in the 27th *juan* of the collection, 大方等大集經卷第二十七. Might we consider the possibility that the translator of the *Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* had a version of the *Mahāsaṃnipāta* in which the *juan* division was slightly different, and that he therefore meant to refer by 30 to the *juan* division of the *Mahāsaṃnipāta* collection? As we have it now, the collection is 60 *juan* in extent. The history of this text is extremely complicated, and cannot be investigated further here. To get a small taste, see <https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/2170/>.

140 T. 1509 (XXV) 266c28. Curiously, the same passage seems to be quoted also at 383b18ff, but without any attribution. Xuanzang's disciple Kuiji 窺基 explicitly cites the *Da zhidu lun* passage in his *Amituo jing shu* 阿彌陀經疏 (T. 1757 [XXXV11] 315b19–20), 智度論引寶頂經, obviously therefore of no value to us here. Similar is the citation by Jizang 吉藏 in his *Bailun shu* 百論疏 of a quotation from the *Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* (T. 1827 [XLI1] 250c5–6): 龍樹十住婆沙引寶頂經.

141 *Zhongbian fenbie lun* 中邊分別論 T. 1599 (XXXI) 462b19, with the title *Ratnakūṭa* in Sanskrit at Nagao 1964: 69.19. That the *Foxing lun* 佛性論 T. 1610 (XXXI) 809a24–b2 cites KP § 66 is not good evidence, since it is well known that this text was created in China, and thus its usage in such an instance is clearly secondary (see above n. 113).

142 T. 1634 (XXXII) 43a20.

KP, it does so under the title *Baoji jing* 寶積經.¹⁴³ One final reference, while not clear, is also certainly not relevant to the KP, namely a passage in Yijing's 義淨 (635–713) translation of the *Kṣudrakavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya 根本說一切有部毘奈耶雜事, which refers to a sūtra in the *Samyuktāgama* as follows: 又於相應阿笈摩佛語品處寶頂經中說, “In the *Baoding jing* of the Buddha's Preaching section of the *Samyuktāgama*.”¹⁴⁴ Though I cannot identify it, the reference is obviously to an Āgama text.

Now, one of the things we know from a number of recent discoveries of Sanskrit manuscripts is that there existed any number of what we might think of as *ad hoc* collections of scriptures (at least: we do not know otherwise). I would venture to suggest the possibility that all such collections were originally *ad hoc*, and it was only their (also *ad hoc*?) canonization that led to a situation in which there is, for instance, a recognized *Mahāsamnipāta* collection, but that when we find other (albeit fragmentary) evidence of multi-text bundles, or we find compilations such as that studied by Bhikṣuṇī Vinitā (2010), we consider them differently from the canonized collections. In this light, it is far from impossible to imagine that there might once have existed a collection, called by some Chinese *Baoding jing*, which contained a number of texts which are not now associated with each other in collections as we have them. I cannot prove this hypothesis, perhaps needless to say, but I also see no good evidence against it.¹⁴⁵

Given the current state of scholarship,¹⁴⁶ we cannot yet say how and why Bodhiruci (or again, whatever corporate entity stood behind this figure) conceived the 120 *juan* MRK around a core of the *Ratnakūṭa-sūtra*, if indeed this is what he (they) did. He (they) plainly rejected the title *Ratnakūṭa-sūtra* for the KP itself, calling it instead *Puming pusa hui*, a title that does not seem—at least to us at a remove of centuries—to imply any connection between the latter and the *Ratnakūṭa*. But other curious problems certainly remain. For instance, the individual named Dharmaruci, credited as the translator of the *Ratnamegha-sūtra*, is the same personage as Bodhiruci, credited as the compiler of the MRK: it is merely that the name Dharmaruci was later changed to Bodhiruci at the command of the Empress Wu Zhao. But although there is a close connection between the KP and (one form of) the *Ratnamegha-sūtra*, as is clear from the KP's presence as the final sec-

143 T. 1634 (XXXII) 48a6 = KP § 88.

144 T. 1451 (XXIV) 413a22.

145 The same logic might apply to a *Dazhi jing* 大智經 in the *Daśabhūmikavibhāṣā* (T. 1521 [XXVI] 102b11), quoting the *Vimaladattāparipṛcchā*, or a *Dasheng jing* 大乘經 in the same text (61b18), quoting the *Ugradattāparipṛcchā*. For both passages see Shiomi 1932: 96–97 (1036–1037). Both the *Vimaladattāparipṛcchā* and the *Ugradattāparipṛcchā* are now included in the MRK.

Be this as it may, it is important to recognize that one manuscript fragment has been brought forward with precisely this argument for the MRK. A single Sanskrit leaf from Dunhuang was identified by Matsuda 1988: 2–3n3 as belonging to the *Maitreyāparipṛcchā*, MRK 41 (Tib.) or 42 (Chn). (This was later published by Matsumura 1993: 143–145, without any attribution of Matsuda's discovery, following a well known pattern of this scholar of failing to acknowledge his reliance on the work of others.) Matsuda noted that the folio is numerated 292, and on that basis drew the conclusion that it was not an independent manuscript of the sūtra, but rather that “there is a high possibility that it is one portion of the large MRK,” 巨大な『宝積経』の一部である可能性が高い。I do not agree with this conclusion; that the sūtra belonged to a *Sammelhandschrift* seems likely, if not certain, but more we cannot say.

146 In this respect, the best we have so far is Forte 2002, 2005b.

tion of the *Dasheng baoyun jing*, still evidently neither Bodhiruci nor any member of the team he led appear to have noticed this. The significance of this remains unclear. Why, to point to another mystery, are there two versions of the *Nanda/Ānanda-Garbhāvkrānti* in the MRK, one after the other? This can hardly be put down to an editing error, but there is no apparent logical reason for this duplication. From another point of view entirely, although scriptures such as the Larger *Sukhāvatīvyūha*, the *Śrīmālādevīsīmhanāda*, and others of various tendencies are included in the MRK, few of them have any clear connection, doctrinally or stylistically, with the KP.¹⁴⁷ From this point of view, rather than viewing the 120 *juan* MRK as some sort of an extension of the KP, it may be better to see it as a collection of texts to which the borrowed name *Ratnakūṭa* was applied, and the principle of compilation of which remains unknown.¹⁴⁸ Yet these are not the only mysteries.

For instance, Bodhiruci in a considerable number of cases retained old and, at least to our eyes, difficult to understand translations of Dharmarakṣa (Zhu Fahu 竺法護, perhaps better, *Dharmarakṣita?),¹⁴⁹ while in other cases he chose to retranslate sūtras which already existed in Chinese. Zhisheng in his KSL tells us:¹⁵⁰

遂廣鳩碩德, 并召名儒, 尋繹舊翻之經, 考校新來之夾。上代譯者, 勸同即附。昔來未出, 案本具翻。兼復舊義擁迷, 詳文重譯。

[Zhongzong] extensively assembled greatly virtuous (monks) and invited famous Classical scholars (*ru* 儒), who deeply studied the formerly translated scriptures, collating them with the Sanskrit texts recently brought. The previous translations that, after examination, revealed themselves to conform [to the new Sanskrit text] were adopted to be a part [of the new version]; texts that had not been published

147 This is however not universally true; the *Ratnarāśi*, for instance, is conceptually obviously very closely related to KP, and there are other less obvious conceptual links with other sūtras, most of which however remain to be carefully studied.

148 Rafal Felbur tells me that there is an intriguing comment about just this question in Xu E's 徐鏗 (d. after 721) *Da Baoji jing shu* 大寶積經述, T. 310 (X1) 2A21: 以類相從撰寫咸畢。We look forward to his study of this text, now initially remarked on in the Introduction to this volume

149 The form Dharmarakṣa does not suggest itself as a common Sanskrit proper name, while Dharmarakṣita is quite easy to understand. Given the tendency of Chinese translators to omit the final element of a name in transcription, the possibility that we should think of this individual's name as more properly Dharmarakṣita seems strong. The name Dharmarakṣita is well attested in Indian inscriptions, both in Sanskrit and in Middle Indic forms.

150 KSL, 570b12–15. I was greatly aided by the translation of Forte 2002: 103, whom I have however not always followed. I have been greatly helped here once again, as so often, by the insightful suggestions of Rafal Felbur. Zhongzong 中宗 here mentioned was the emperor for one month in 684, but then—and this is relevant here—retook the throne after the overthrow of Wu Zetian and the Zhou in 705, ruling until his murder in 710. Although immediately after the passage quoted KSL clearly states that the project was begun only after what is sometimes called the “restoration of the Tang,” (KSL 570b15–16: “The project was begun in the second year of Shenlong [706], and continued up through the reign of Ruizong [r.710–712],” 始乎神龍二年丙午創筵。迄于睿宗 ...), I believe that there would have been clearly discernable political reasons for such an assertion. Despite KSL's claims that the MRK project was started only after the fall of Wu Zetian, I continue to harbor doubts. A motivation for historians to state the matter in this way would be to avoid crediting the overthrown Empress Wu with any part in this imperial project.

in times past were translated in their entirety according to the original. Moreover, when the meaning of the former [translations] contained confusions, they were retranslated after careful examination [of the Sanskrit texts].

One challenge of this portrayal is that at least some of the evidence of the collection as we have it seems not to support the actual implementation of these guidelines. In other words, while we do have two serious limitations in our evaluation here—we do not know what were the forms of the Vorlagen upon which the translations were made, and we cannot judge what was felt to “contain confusions”—we are now able to compare extant versions of sūtras in the MRK in Chinese with Tibetan translations, on the one hand, and with other Chinese sources on the other. And at least in some cases, such comparison unearths interesting problems. Ongoing work of Rafal Felbur, for example, makes clear just how complicated the situation is with the **Sūrata-sūtra*, the MRK version of which differs radically from the earlier translation, most likely by Dharmarakṣa, which in turn agrees quite closely with the Tibetan translation found in the Kanjur.

Although much is known about the KP and about the MRK, a great many questions remain, waiting for proper solutions. What we can say, however, is that the history of the Chinese translations of the KP is becoming clearer. It can only be hoped that a better appreciation of the available evidence will contribute both to more reliable treatments of the sūtra itself, in its historical complexity, but also to an increased awareness of the complications of the history of Chinese Buddhist translation practices more broadly speaking.

佛說遺日摩尼寶經 (H) 迦葉禁戒經 (L) 如來獨證自誓三昧經 (T. 623) 自誓三昧經 (T. 622)

1 a 佛在舍衛國祇洹阿難邠坻阿藍時，與摩訶比丘僧千二百五十人，菩薩萬二千人。

a 聞如是一時佛在舍衛國祇樹給孤獨園時，摩訶比丘千二百五十人，菩薩萬二千人。

112 a 佛語迦葉言：「沙門有二事，墮牢獄中。b 一者，言是我所。c 二者，求人欲得供養。」

a 是時，佛語摩訶迦葉比丘言：「比丘有二事，墮牢獄中。b 一者，言是我所。c 二者，求人欲得供養。」

113 a 沙門復有二事縛。b 何謂二事。c 一者，學外道。d 二者，多欲積衣被及袈裟鉢。

a 比丘有二事。c 一者，反聽外道。d 二者，多欲積衣被袈裟鉢。

113 a 沙門復有二事中道斷。b 何等爲二事。c 一者，與白衣厚善。d 二者，見好持戒沙門反嫉之。

a 比丘復有二事斷。c 一者，與白衣厚善。d 二者，見好持戒沙門反嫉之。

114 a 沙門復有二事墮垢濁中。b 何謂二事。c 一者，常念愛欲。d 二者，喜交結知友。

a 比丘復有二事墮鑊湯中。b 何謂二事。c 一者，常念愛欲。d 二者，喜交結知友。

1 The punctuation of the passages here is more than usually provisional.

116 a 沙門復有二事著。b 何等為二事。c 自有過不肯悔。d 反念他人惡。

a 比丘復有二事。c 一者，自有過不肯悔。d 二者，反念他人惡。

115 a 沙門復有二事，墮泥犁中。b 何等為二事。c 一者，誹謗經道。d 二者，毀傷經戒。

a 比丘復有二事，當墮泥犁中。c 一者，誹謗經道。d 二者，毀傷經戒。

120 a 沙門復有二事。b 何等為二事。c 一者，都犯戒。d 二者，於法中無所得。

a 比丘復有二事。c 一者，於都犯戒。d 二者，於法中無所得。

117 a 沙門復有二事悔。b 何等為二事。c 一者，不應行強披袈裟。d 二者，身不自持戒。持戒比丘反承事。

a 比丘復有二事悔。c 一者，強披袈裟。d 二者，身不自持戒。不承事持戒沙門。

118 a 沙門復有二事病難愈。b 何等為二事。c 一者，心邪亂。d 二者，人有作菩薩道者止斷」。

a 比丘復有二事實難愈。c 一者，心邪亂。d 二者，止人作菩薩道」。

121 a 佛語迦葉：b 「沙門何故『正字沙門』。c 有四事字為沙門。d 何等為四。e 一者，形容被服像如沙門。f 二者，外如沙門，內懷媮爛。g 三者，求索嘩名自貢高。h 四者，行不犯真沙門也。」

a 佛語迦葉：b 「沙門何故『正字沙門』。c 有四事為沙門。e 一者，形容被服，像類沙門。f 二者，外如沙門，內懷媮爛。g 三者，但欲求承事名譽自用貢高。h 四者，行戒不犯。是為真沙門。」

佛說遺日摩尼寶經 (H)

迦葉禁戒經 (L)

如來獨證自誓三昧經 (T. 623) 自誓三昧經 (T. 622)

122 何等為形容被服如沙門者。^a 髡頭剃鬚，著袈裟持鉢，心不正不持戒。^b 但欲作惡，喜學外道。^c 是為被服如沙門。

^a 何等為形容被服者。^b 除鬚髮，被法衣，持應器，心不自政。^c 但欲作惡，喜學邪道。^d 是為外被服像類沙門。

123 何因外如沙門，內懷媮媮者。^a 安徐而行，安徐而出，安徐而入。外道麁惡於山間草屋為廬。^b 內無信，著我、著我所。中有因苦直信者，反自嫉妬。

^a 內諛諂者。^b 安徐而行，徐出徐入。外衣食麁惡，內欲甘美，外居山間草苗為廬。^c 內無信，意自寬賈。若內嫉忠直。²

124 何因為求索嘩名者。^a 媮秀持戒，令他人稱譽。^b 媮學經，令他人稱譽。^c 媮僻處，令人稱譽。^d 不自剋責，求度脫，但有媮秀。^e [嘩 = 譁 (三, 宮, 聖)]

^a 從因緣多索財物。成其承名是為諛諂不持戒。^b 不持戒者，但欲令人稱譽。^c 諛諂僻處欲令人稱譽。^d 不自剋責，求度脫，但有諛諂之，熊是為不持戒。

2 I am more than usually doubtful about this passage.

125

^a何等爲行不犯真沙門。^b不惜壽命損身，何況索歸遣供養者。^c若有比丘守空行，常勸樂追，及悉見諸法淨潔本無瑕穢。^d自作離明不從他人持點明。^e於佛法亦不著，何況常著色，^f亦無結者，亦無脫者。^g本無不見泥洹，亦無死生，亦無泥洹。^h是爲真沙門。

ⁱ佛語迦葉：「至誠沙門常當作是念：^k當効真沙門。^l莫効嘩名諛諂沙門也。」

^a何等爲真沙門。^b持戒行道，不惜壽命，損棄身體，不索萬物，不求供養。^c若有比丘守空行者，常勸樂淨法本無瑕穢。^d自作慧行，不從他人得。^{e-g}於佛法中得泥洹。^h是爲真沙門。

ⁱ佛語迦葉：^{j-k}「欲求道當於真沙門。^l莫効承名沙門，諛諂沙門。」

^a何謂戒證。志在閑寂山澤受法，神真操遠持戒行道。^b不惜壽命，棄捐身體，齊等萬物，不求利養。^c守空行寂常觀淨法，行淨四等慈悲喜護，宣暢四恩惠施人愛，利人等利具無蓋哀，明釋四禪無瑕穢、無點念。

[345b13-17]

^a何謂戒證。志在閑寂山澤受法，神真操遠持戒行道。^b不惜壽命，棄捐身體，齊等萬物，不求利養。^c守空行寂常觀淨法，慈悲喜護四等四恩，具無蓋哀明釋四禪，無瑕、無穢、無點念。^g不從他人法，於佛法中得泥洹道。^h是爲真戒沙門。」

[347c13-18]

127

^a譬如貧人號名大富，但得富名無所有也。^b佛語迦葉：「是人應得爲有是字不」。^c迦葉言：「不也」。^d佛言：「如是。迦葉，雖有沙門字，不行沙門法也。亦如貧人自稱大富」。

^a譬如貧人稱名大富，但有富名內無所有。^b佛語迦葉：「是人應有不」。^c迦葉言：「不應」。^d佛言：「如是。雖有沙門名者，不行沙門法。如貧人稱大富」。

128

^a譬如人爲水所沒溺，反渴欲死。^b沙門如是。多諷經高才，不去情欲。^c於情欲中渴欲死坐，入泥犁、禽獸、薛荔中。

^a譬如有人爲水所沒漂，反渴欲死。^b沙門雖多諷誦高才智，不去情欲。^c爲是情欲飢渴欲死坐，是人泥犁、禽獸、薛荔中。

(cont.)

佛說遺日摩尼寶經 (H)

迦葉禁戒經 (L)

如來獨證自誓三昧經 (T. 623) 自誓三昧經 (T. 622)

129 ^a 譬如醫，滿一具器藥，不能自愈其病。 ^b 雖多諷經，而不持戒。

^a 譬如賢醫師，滿一器藥，不能自愈其病。 ^b 雖多諷經，不持戒。

130 ^a 譬如人病得王家藥，不自護坐死。 ^b 雖多諷經，而不持戒如是。

131 ^a 譬如摩尼珠墮於屎中。 ^b 雖多諷經，而不持戒。

^a 譬如摩尼珠墮於不淨中。 ^b 雖多諷經，不持戒。

132 ^a 譬如死人著金傳飾。 ^b 不持戒，反被袈裟，像如持戒沙門。

^a 譬如死人著金銀珍寶。 ^b 身不持戒，反著袈裟，像類沙門。

133 ^a 譬如長者子服飾，著新衣著新傳飾。 ^b 多諷經持戒好，亦如是。

^a 譬如長者子被服莊飾，著好新衣中外潔淨。多諷經不持戒，如是。

134 ^a 佛語迦葉，^b「有四事。不持戒像類持戒人。何等為四。一者，若有比丘禁戒所說不犯缺也，雖有是有著呼有人。 ^d 二者，若比丘悉知律經，著行是我所行。 ^e 三者，若有比丘著我是我所。 ^f 四者，常行等心，等心於人，著怖畏於死生。 ^g 是為沙門不持戒名持戒。」

^a 佛語迦葉，^b「有四事像持戒人。何等為四。 ^c 一者，有比丘禁戒所語，言我不犯，雖有是語為有著自呼有人。 ^d 二者，若比丘悉知深經著行，自言是我所行。 ^e 三者，若比丘多著言是我所着。 ^f 四者，自言我，常行等心，著怖畏於死生。 ^g 是為沙門自稱譽為持戒。」

135

a 佛語迦葉言：b 「禁戒無形不著三界，何因名為戒。c 無我、無我、無人、無命、無意、無名、無種、無化、無教、無有作者、無所來、無所去、無制、無滅、無身所犯、無口所犯、無心所犯、無世無計、無世所住、亦無有戒、亦不無戒、亦無所念、亦無敗壞、亦無坐立。d 是故，為禁戒矣。」

a 佛語迦葉：b 「禁戒無形不著三界。c 無識、無吾、無我、無人、無命、無意、無名、無種、無化、無教、無所從來、無所從去、無形無滅、無身無所犯、無口無所犯、無心無所犯、無世間、無計、無世事、無所住、亦無戒、亦無所念、亦無敗壞。d 是名為禁戒。」

a 佛告：b 「正士禁戒無形不著三界。c 無識、無吾、無我、無人、無命、無意、無名、無種、無化、無數、無作、無所從來、無所從去、無形、無滅、無身、無犯、無口、無言、無心、無念、無世事、無計、無事、無所住、亦無有戒、無有惑、無所念、無敗壞。d 是名禁戒。」

[347c18-23]

b 無三界想。c 無識、無吾、無我、無人、無命、無意、無名、無種、無化、無數、無作、無所從來、無所從去、無起、無滅、無身、無犯、無口、無言、無心、無念、無世事、無計、無事、無所住、亦無有戒、亦無有持、無成念、無敗壞。d 是名禁戒、內外淨戒。

[345c2-7]

136

a 爾時，佛說曰：b 「戒無瑕穢著也。c 戒者，無奢、無瞋恚，安定就泥洹。d 如是為持戒，不愛身亦不愛命。e 不樂於五道。f 悉曉了人於法，於佛法中，是故為戒。g 適不在中邊止也。中邊不著，不著不縛。」

a 是時，佛說：b 「禁戒無瑕穢，亦無所著。c 戒者，無諸瞋恚，安定就度世道。d 如是為持戒，不愛身形，不愛壽命。e 亦不樂於五道。f 悉曉了人於佛道中，是為持戒。g 亦不在中，亦不在邊不著，亦不轉。」

b 佛禁戒無瑕穢，亦無著戒者。c 無瞋、無恚，安定清淨，就度世道。d 如是為持戒，不受身形，不受壽命。e 亦不樂五道。f 悉曉人於佛法中，是為持戒。g 亦不在中，亦不在邊。亦不著，亦不轉。

[347c23-27]

b 佛禁戒無瑕穢，亦無著。c 戒者，無瞋、無恚，安定清淨，就度世道。

[345c7-8]

Appendix 2

§ 134

DBhV (T. 1521 [xxvi] 118c13-22)

寶頂經迦葉品中：

^a 佛告迦葉：四種破戒比丘似如持戒比丘。何等四。^b (1) 迦葉，有比丘於經戒中盡能具行，而說有我。^c 迦葉，是名破戒似如持戒。^d (2) 復次，迦葉，有比丘誦持律經守護戒行。於身見中不動不離。^e 是名破戒似如持戒。^f (3) 復次，迦葉，有比丘具行十二頭陀，而見諸法定有。^g 是名破戒似如持戒。^h (4) 復次，迦葉，有比丘緣衆生行慈心。聞諸行無生相心則驚畏。ⁱ 是名破戒似如持戒。^j 迦葉，此四破戒人似如持戒。

J

^a 復次，迦葉，有四不持戒似如持戒。云何爲四。^b (1) 若有比丘護持禁戒成就威儀，至微小事當畏懼之。持比丘淨戒，成就威儀禮節，身、口、意行正令清淨，而計吾我。^c 是謂，迦葉，一不持戒似如持戒。^d (2) 復次，比丘，誦律通利察住律法，不斷身見。^e 是謂，迦葉，二不持戒似如持戒。^f (3) 復次，比丘行慈衆生聞說諸法，不起不滅，而懷恐怖。^g 是謂，迦葉，三不持戒似如持戒。^h (4) 復次，比丘行十二法淨功德行，而起見我有我所。ⁱ 是謂，迦葉，四不持戒似如持戒。

Q

^a 又大迦葉，四種破戒比丘似善持戒。何謂爲四。^b (1) 有一比丘具足持戒，大小罪中，心常怖畏，所聞戒法皆能履行。身業清淨，口業清淨，意業清淨，正命清淨，而是比丘說有我論。^c 是初破戒似善持戒。^d (2) 復次，迦葉，有一比丘誦持戒律，隨所說行身見不滅。^e 是名第二破戒比丘似善持戒。^f (3) 復次，迦葉，有一比丘具足持戒。取衆生相，而行慈心，聞一切法本來無生，心大驚怖。^g 是名第三破戒比丘似善持戒。^h (4) 復次，迦葉，有一比丘具足修行十二頭陀，見有所得。ⁱ 是名第四破戒比丘似善持戒。

M

^a 善男子，有四種破戒似善持律。何謂爲四。^b (1) 設有一人具足持戒。大小罪中心，常怖畏，所聞戒法皆能履行。身、口、意業悉皆明白正命清淨。如是之人說有我論。^c 是初破戒似善持律。^d (2) 善男子，復有一人誦持戒律，隨所說行身見不滅。^e 是二破戒似善持律。^f (3) 善男子，復有一人具足持戒。取衆生相，而行慈心，聞一切法本來無生，心大驚怖。^g 是三破戒似善持律。^h (4) 善男子，復有一人具足修行十二頭陀，見有罪相。是四破戒似善持律。

^a catvāra ime kāsyaapa duḥśilā śīlavaiṃ-
tapratirūpakāḥ katame catvāraḥ

^a These four, Kāsyaapa, are those who violate the pre-
cepts while presenting a counterfeit appearance of being
upholders of the precepts. Which four?

^b iha kāsyaapa ekatyo bhikṣuḥ prā-
timokṣasamvarasamvṛto viharati | prava-
ācāragocarasaṃpanna aṇumātreṣv
avadyeṣu bhayadarśi samādāya śikṣate
śikṣāpadeṣu | pariśuddhakāyākarma-
vānmanaskarmanā samanvāgato viha-
rati | pariśuddhājīvaḥ sa ca bhavaty
ātmavādī ^c aya[m] kāsyaapa prathamam
duḥśilāḥ śīlavaiṃtapratirūpakam dra-
ṣṭavyaḥ ||

^b Here, Kāsyaapa, a certain monk dwells restrained by his
vows in accord with the monastic disciplinary rule, per-
fect in behavior and associations, contemplates with fear
[the commission of] even the slightest fault, and hav-
ing undertaken the disciplinary rules he trains them. He
dwells endowed with pure bodily acts, vocal and mental
acts, and he is one of pure livelihood. But he follows the
doctrine of [the real existence of] a self. ^c This, Kāsyaapa,
should be understood as the first of those who violate
the precepts while presenting a counterfeit appearance of
being an upholder of the precepts.

^d punar aparāṃ kāsyaapa ihekatyo
bhikṣur vinayadharo bhavati | prava-
rtavinayo vinayagupṭihpratiṣṭhitah
satkāyaḍḍṣtir asyānucalitā bhavati | ^e
ayaṃ kāsyaapa dvitīyo duḥśilāḥ śīla-
vaimṭhapratirūpakāḥ ||

^d Again, Kāsyaapa, here a certain monk is a specialist in
monastic discipline, engaged in monastic discipline, set in
the preservation of the monastic discipline. But he has not
shaken off wrong speculations on the self being [in] the
body. ^e This, Kāsyaapa, is the second of those who violate
the precepts while presenting a counterfeit appearance of
being an upholder of the precepts.

^d [pu]nar apa[raṃ] kās[y]apa
[iḥ]ai[ka]tyo [bhi]kṣu[r] vva[ina]y[ā] + +
.. bhavati pravṛta .. nayo v[i]naya[gu]-
pt[o] + + + [y]a dṛṣṭim cāsy[ā] nuca-
litam bhavati | ^e ayaṃ kāsyaapa dvitīyo
duḥśila śīlavapratirūpakāḥ ||

1 First published fragmentarily by Kuno 1938, who discusses the language and other matters, then with additional materials by de Jong 1977.

<p>f punar aparām kāśyapa ihekatyo bhikṣuḥ maitrāvīhārī bhavati satvā- <i>raṁbana</i>yā samanvāgataḥ sa ca ajāti sarvadharmāṇām śrutvā utrasati s samtrasati samtrasam āpadyate s ayam kāśyapa ṛṭyo duḥśīlaḥ śīlavantaḥ pratrīrūpakāḥ </p>	<p>f Again, Kāśyapa, here a certain monk dwells in loving kindness and is endowed with [compassion] for beings. But hearing that all things have no arisal he is frightened, scared and afflicted by fear. s This, Kāśyapa, is the third of those who violate the precepts while presenting a counterfeit appearance of being an upholder of the precepts.</p>	<p>f puna aparām k[ā]śyapa [ih]jai[k]atyo <i>bhikṣu</i> maitrāvīhārī bhavati satvā- raṁbana[y]ā + + + samanvāgato bhavati [a]jātim sarvasamskāraṇām śrutvā utrasati sam[t]rasati samtra- sam āpadyate s ayam kāśyapa ṛṭī[y]o <i>duḥśīlaḥ śīlavapratīrūpakāḥ</i> </p>
<p>h punar aparām kāśyapa ihekatyo bhikṣuḥ dvādaśadhutaḥ sa mādhāya <i>vartate</i> upalambhadṛṣṭikāś ca bhavaty ahamkāraṣṭhitaḥ i ayam kāśyapa caturtho duḥśīlaḥ śīlavantaḥ pratrīrūpakāḥ </p>	<p>h Again, Kāśyapa, here is a certain monk who has undertaken the twelve dhuta ascetic practices. But he is one who holds to wrong speculations on objectification and is fixed in the belief in a self. i This, Kāśyapa, should be understood as the fourth of those who violate the precepts while presenting a counterfeit appearance of being an upholder of the precepts.</p>	<p>h pu[na]r aparā[rṇ] kāśyapa ihaikatyo bhikṣuḥ dvādaśa dhutaḥ sa mādhāya vartate [u]palambhadṛṣṭikāś ca bhavati ahamkāramamāikāra + i ayam kāśyapa caturtho duḥśīlaḥ śīlavapratīrūpakāḥ </p>
<p>j ime kāśyapa catvāro duḥ[śī]la śīlavantaḥ pratrīrūpakāḥ </p>	<p>j These, Kāśyapa, should be understood as those who violate the precepts while presenting a counterfeit appearance of being upholders of the precepts.</p>	<p>j ime kāśyapa catvāro duḥśīla śīlavapratīrūpakāḥ </p>

Italics mark reconstructed letters or portions thereof, brackets partially legible letters.

Literature

- Amano Hirofusa 天野宏英. 1956. "Hōchōkyō ni tsuite" 寶頂經について. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 4.2: 464–456 (157–158).
- Apple, James. 2016. "Candrakīrti and the Lotus sutra." *Bulletin of the Institute of Oriental Philosophy* 31.1: 97–122.
- Apple, James. 2017. "The Old Tibetan Version of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* preserved in Fragments from Dunhuang (1)." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 20: 205–230.
- Apple, James. 2018. "The Old Tibetan Version of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* preserved in Fragments from Dunhuang (2)." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 21: 335–357.
- Bai Huawen 白化文. 1987. "Dunhuang xieben *Zhongjing biele* canjuan jiaoshi" 敦煌写本《众经别录》残卷校释. *Dunhuang xue jikan* 敦煌学辑刊 1987.1: 14–25.
- Bhikṣuṇī Vinitā. 2010. *A unique collection of twenty sūtras in a Sanskrit manuscript from the Potala: Editions and translation*. Sanskrit texts from the Tibetan Autonomous Region 7 (Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House/Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences).
- Chang, Garma C.C. 1983. *A Treasury of Mahāyāna Sūtras: Selections from the Mahāratnakūṭa Sūtra* (University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press).
- Chavannes, Édouard. 1905. "Jinagupta (528–605 après J.-C.)." *T'oung Pao* 6/3: 332–356.
- Chen, Ruixuan. 2018. "An Opaque Pun: Tentative Notes on *Kāśyapaparivarta* § 68." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 61.4: 369–395.
- Coblin, W. South. 1983. *A Handbook of Eastern Han Sound Glosses* (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press).
- Dharmamitra, Bhikṣu. 2019. *Nāgārjuna's Treatise on the Ten Bodhisattva Grounds. The Daśa-bhūmika Vibhāṣā By Ārya Nāgārjuna (c. 150 CE). As Translated from Sanskrit by Kumārajīva (c. 410 CE)* (Seattle, WA: Kalavinka Press).
- Dutt, Nalinaksha. 1934. *The Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*. Calcutta Oriental Series 28 (London: Luzac & Co.).
- Forte, Antonino. 2002. "The South Indian Monk Bodhiruci (d. 727). Biographical Evidence." In Antonino Forte and Federico Masini, eds., *A Life Journey to the East. Sinological Studies in Memory of Giuliano Bertuccioli (1923–2001)*. Scuola Italiana di Studi sull'Asia Orientale Essays 2 (Kyoto: Scuola Italiana di Studi sull' Asia Orientale): 77–116.
- Forte, Antonino. 2005a. *Political Propoganda and Ideology in China at the End of the Seventh Century: Inquiry in the Nature, Authors and Function of the Dunhuang Document S.6502, Followed by an Annotated Translation*. Italian School of East Asian Studies Monographs Vol. 1 (Kyoto: Scuola Italiana di Studi sull' Asia Orientale).
- Forte, Antonino. 2005b. "Il monaco indiano Bodhiruci (m. in Cina nel 727). Note biografiche." In Giorgio Amitrano, Lucia Caterina, Giuseppe De Marco, eds., *Studi in onore di Luigi Polese Remaggi*. Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale" Series Minor 69 (Naples: Università degli studi di Napoli L'Orientale): 199–242.
- Franke, Herbert. 1996. *Chinesischer und tibetischer Buddhismus im China der Yüanzeit: Drei Studien*. Studia Tibetica III (Munich: Kommission für Zentralasiatische Studien, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften).
- Fujita, Kotatsu. 1993. *The Larger Sukhāvāṭīvyūha: Romanized Text of the Sanskrit Manuscripts from Nepal*. Part II (Tokyo: Sankibo Press).

- Funayama, Tōru. 2022. "Jizang's 吉藏 Sanskrit." In Jonathan A. Silk and Stefano Zacchetti, eds., *Chinese Buddhism and the Scholarship of Erik Zürcher*. Sinica Leidensia 157 (Leiden: Brill): 233–254.
- Greene, Eric M. 2023. "The Decline and Fall of Chinese Buddhist Literary Historical Consciousness: The Compilation of the *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶記, in Light of the Dunhuang Fragments of the *Zhongjing biele* 眾經別錄." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 143.1: 125–150.
- Hachiriki Hiroki 八力廣喜. 1988. "Jūjūbibasharon' ni okeru 'Kashōbon' no inyō" 「十住毘婆沙論」における「迦葉品」の引用. *Indotetsugaku Bukkyōgaku* 印度哲学仏教学 3: 117–128.
- Harrison, Paul Maxwell. 1993. "The Earliest Chinese Translations of Mahāyāna Buddhist Sūtras: Some Notes on the Works of Lokakṣema." *Buddhist Studies Review* 10.2: 135–177.
- Haseoka Ichiya 長谷岡一也. 1954. "Jūjūbibasharon ni okeru Kācyapaparivarta no inyō ni tsuite" 十住毘婆沙論に於ける Kācyapaparivarta の引用について. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 2.2: 200–203.
- Hashimoto Hōkei 橋本芳契. 1977. "Hōdō (Vaipulya) ji no bukkyō: Daihōshakuyō no tachiba to igi" 方等 (Vaipulya) 時の仏教 — 『大宝積経』の立場と意義. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 25.2: 77–83.
- Hattori Masaaki 服部正明. 1955. "Busshōron' no ichi kōsatsu" 「佛性論」の一考察. *Bukkyō Shigaku* 佛教史學 4.3–4: 16–30.
- Hayashiya Tomojirō 林屋友次郎. 1941. *Kyōroku Kenkyū (Zenpen)* 經録研究—前篇 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店).
- Herrmann-Pfandt, Adelheid. 2008. *Die Lhan kar ma: ein früher Katalog der ins Tibetische übersetzten buddhistischen Texte*. Kritische Neuausgabe mit Einleitung und Materialien (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften).
- Hō Yōnggho 許永鎬. 1932. "Etsuika setsu hannyakyō ni tsuite" 曰遺日説般若經に就て. *Bukkyōgaku kenkyūshitsu* 佛教學研究室 (Taishō daigaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyūshitsu shitsuyū kenkyūkai 大正大學佛教學研究室室友研究會): 8–18.
- Hua, Kaiqi. 2016. *The White Cloud Movement: Local Activism and Buddhist Printing in China under Mongol Rule (1276–1368 CE)*. PhD thesis, University of California, Merced.
- Itō Shinden 伊藤進傳. 2013a. "Daijō hōunkyō Hōshakubon wa Daihōshakkyō 'Fumyō bosatsu e' o sōnyū shita mono ka" 『大乘宝雲経』「宝積品」は『大宝積経』「普明菩薩会」を挿入したものか. *Eizan gakuin kenkyū kiyō* 叡山学院研究紀要 35: 21–39.
- Itō Shinden 伊藤進傳. 2013b. "Hōunkyō to Daijōhōunkyō: Funan bukkyō o kangaeru ichi shiron" 『宝雲経』と『大乘宝雲経』—扶南仏教を考える一試論. *Tendai gakuho* 天台学報 55: 13–23.
- Johnston, E.H. 1933. "The Gaṇḍīstotra." *Indian Antiquary* 62: 61–70.
- Jong, Jan W. de. 1977. "Sanskrit Fragments of the Kāśyapaparivarta." In *Beiträge zur Indienforschung: Ernst Waldschmidt zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Veröffentlichungen des Museums für indische Kunst Berlin 4 (Berlin: Museum für indische Kunst): 247–255. Reprinted in Gregory Schopen, ed., *Buddhist Studies* (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1979): 513–521.
- Karashima, Seishi. 2010. *A Glossary of Lokakṣema's Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* 道行般若經詞典. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XI (Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University).
- Karashima, Seishi. 2013. "Was the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* Compiled in Gandhāra in Gāndhārī?" *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 16: 171–188.

- Karashima, Seishi. 2015. "Who Composed the Mahāyāna Scriptures?—The Mahāsāṃghikas and Vaitulya Scriptures." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* 18: 113–162.
- Kawagoe Eishin 川越英真. 2005. *dKar chag 'Phang thang ma*. Tohoku Society for Indo-Tibetan Studies Monograph Series 3 (Sendai: Tōhoku Indo-Chibetto Kenkyūkai 東北インド・チベット研究会).
- Kimura Takayasu 木村高尉, Otsuka Nobuo 大塚伸夫, Kimura Hideaki 木村秀明, and Takahashi Hisao 高橋尚夫. 2004. "Bonbun kotei 'Chikomyoshogon-kyo' Sarvabuddhaviṣayāvatāra-jñānālokālamkāra nāma mahāyānasūtra Sanskrit Text" 梵文校訂『智光明莊嚴經』: Sarvabuddhaviṣayāvatārajñānālokālamkāra nāma mahāyānasūtra. In: *Onozuka Kichō Hakushi Koki kinen ronbunshū: Kūkai no shiso to bunka* 小野塚幾澄博士古希記念論文集『空海の思想と文化 (Tokyo: Taishō daigaku sōgō Bukkyō kenkyūjo 大正大学総合佛教研究所): 1–89 (596–508).
- Kotyk, Jeffrey. 2019. "Chinese State and Buddhist Historical Sources on Xuanzang: Historicity and the *Da c'en si sanzang fashi zhuan* 大慈恩寺三藏法師傳." *T'oung Pao* 105: 513–544.
- Kuno Hōryū 久野芳隆. 1938. "Saiiki shutsudo bukyō bonpon to sono seitenshironjō no chii (jō): Daihōshakukyō to Zōagonkyō no genten: Daiichi: Uten shutsudo Daihōshakukyō bonpon danpen to sono kachi" 西域出土仏教梵本とその聖典史論上の地位（上）・大寶積經と雜阿含經の原典・第一・于門出土大寶積經梵本断片とその価値 [Some Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts found in Central Asia and their Values in the History of Buddhist Literatures: *Mahāratnakūṭa*]. *Bukkyō Kenkyū* 佛教研究 2.3: 71–110.
- Kuwahara Akinobu 桑原昭信. 2016. "Jūjūbibasharon no seiritu ni kansuru ichikōsatsu" 『十住毘婆沙論』の成立に関する一考察 [The Translation into Chinese of the *Shizhu piposhalun*]. *Indogaku Bukyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 64.2: 173–178 (679–702).
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. 1903–1913. *Mūlamadhyamakakārikās (Mādhyamikasūtras) de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā Commentaire de Candrakīrti*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 4 (St. Pétersbourg: Imperial Academy. Reprint: Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970).
- Lalou, Marcelle. 1927. "La version tibétaine du Ratnakūṭa: Contribution à la bibliographie du Kanjur." *Journal Asiatique* 211.2: 233–259.
- Lamotte, Étienne. 1976. *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse*, Tome IV. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 12 (Louvain: Institut Orientaliste).
- Lamotte, Étienne. 1988. *History of Indian Buddhism: From the Origins to the Śaka Era*. Translated by Sara Webb-Boin. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 36 (Louvain: Université Catholique de Louvain Institut Orientaliste).
- Leutner, Mechthild, and Roberto Liebenenthal. 2021. *Die Entdeckung des chinesischen Buddhismus: Walter Liebenenthal (1886–1982): Ein Forscherleben im Exil*. Berliner China-Studien 57 (Münster: Lit Verlag).
- Liebenenthal, Walter. 1935. "On Chinese-Sanskrit Comparative Indexing." *Monumenta Serica* 1.1: 173–185.
- Li, Rongxi. 1995. *A Biography of the Tripitaka Master of the Great C'en Monastery of the Great Tang Dynasty*, translated from the Chinese of Śramaṇa Huili and Shi Yancong (Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research).
- Lin, Li-kouang. 1949. *L'Aide-Mémoire de la Vraie Loi (Saddharma-Smṛtyupasthāna-Sūtra)*. Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale, Publications du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Études Tome 54 (Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve).

- Liu, Shufen. 2022. "The Waning Years of the Eminent Monk Xuanzang and his Deification in China and Japan." In Jonathan A. Silk and Stefano Zacchetti, eds., *Chinese Buddhism and the Scholarship of Erik Zürcher*. Sinica Leidensia 157 (Leiden: Brill): 255–289.
- Matsuda Kazunobu 松田和信. 1988. *Indoshō Toshokan shozō Chūō Ajia shutsudo Daijō nehanyō Bonbun dankanshū: Sustain Herunre korekushon* インド省図書館所蔵中央アジア出土大乘涅槃經梵文斷簡集: スタイン・ヘルンレ・コレクション. *Studia Tibetica* 14. (Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko 東洋文庫).
- Matsumura, Hisashi. 1993. "Marginalia to the Sanskrit Fragments of Some Buddhist Texts." *Central Asiatic Journal* 37.1/2: 120–149.
- Mayer, Robert. 2015. "gTer ston and Tradent Innovation and Conservation in Tibetan Treasure Literature." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 36–37: 227–242.
- Miyazaki Izumi 宮崎泉. 2007. "Chūgan upadaisha kaihōkyō tekisuto—yakuchū" 『中觀優波提舍開寶篋』 テキスト・訳注 [Annotated Tibetan Text and Japanese Translation of the *Ratnakaraṇḍodghāta-nāma-madhyamakopadeśa* of Atiśa]. *Kyōtō daigaku bungakubu kenkyū kiyō* 京都大學文學部研究紀要 46: 1–126.
- Mochizuki Kaie. 2011. "How Did the Indian Masters Read the Lotus Sutra?" *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 59.3: 1169–1177 (95–103).
- Nagao, Gadjin. 1964. *Madhyāntavibhāga-Bhāṣya* (Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation).
- Nagao Gadjin 長尾雅人. 1973. "Kashōbon" no shohon to 'Daihōshakukyō' Seiritsu no mondai" 『迦葉品』の諸本と『大宝積經』成立の問題 [Some problems of several versions of the *Kāśyapa-parivarta* and the formation of the *Ta pao-chi ching*]. *Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan Kenkyū Nenpō* 鈴木学術財団年報 10: 13–25.
- Nakamura Hajime 中村元 with Arai Keiyo 新井慧誉. 1978. "Daihōshakukyō' kaisetsu" 「大宝積經」解説. In *Hōshakubu 6部 Kokuyaku Issaikyō Indo Senjutsubu 宝積經 六・國譯一切經印度撰述部* (Tokyo: Daitō shuppan 大東出版): 387–430.
- Nattier, Jan. 2008. *A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations: texts from the Eastern Han 東漢 and Three Kingdoms 三國 Periods*. *Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica x* (Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University).
- Okamoto Yoshiyuki 岡本嘉之. 1991. "Daihōshakukyō gentenkō" 大宝積經原典考 [A Consideration of the Original Text of the *Mahāratnakūṭasūtra*] *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 40.1: 17–20.
- Ono Genmyō 小野玄妙. 1932–1935. *Bussho Kaisetsu Daijiten* 佛書解説大辭典. 12 Vols. (Tokyo: Daitō shuppan 大東出版).
- Ōno Hōdō 大野法道. 1933. "Shōjōritsu toshite toriatsukawaretaru Daijō kaikyō: Kashōgonkaikyō, Shaminikaikyō, Daiaidōbikunikyō" 小乘律として取扱われたる大乘戒經一迦葉禁戒經・沙彌尼戒經・大愛道比丘尼經一. In Kishi Kakuyū 岸覚勇, ed., *Imaoka kyōju kan-reki kinen ronbunshū* (Jōdogaku 5–6) 今岡教授還暦記念論文集 (浄土学五・六) (Tokyo: Taishō Daigaku Jōdogaku Kenkyūkai 大正大學浄土學研究會): 386–399.
- Ōno Hōdō 大野法道. 1935. "Kashōgonkaikyō no kenkyū" 迦葉禁戒經の研究. In *Bukkyō Nisen-gohyakunen Kinen gakkai* 佛教二千五百年記念學會, ed., *Bukkyōgaku no Shomondai* 佛教學の諸問題 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten): 567–580.
- Ōno Hōdō 大野法道. 1954. *Daijō Kaikyō no Kenkyū* 大乘戒經の研究 (Tokyo: Sankibō busshorin 山喜房佛書林).
- Ōtake Susumu 大竹晋. 2008. *Daihōshaku kyōron* 大宝積經論. *Shin Kokuyaku Daizōkyō: Shakukyōronbu* 15 新国訳大藏經: 釈經論部 15 (Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大藏出版).

- Paranavitana, S[enarat]. 1939. "A Note on the Indikaṭusāya Copper Plaques." *Epigraphia Zeylanica* 1v/5 (London: Government of Ceylon): 238–246.
- Pedersen, K. Priscilla. 1980. "Notes on the Ratnakūṭa Collection." *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 3.2: 60–66.
- Pelliot, Paul. 1936. Review of Staël-Holstein 1926 and 1933, and Weller 1933. *T'oung-pao* 32: 68–76.
- Sakaino Kōyō 境野黄洋. 1927. *Shina Bukkyōshi kōwa* 支那佛教史講話 (Tokyo: Kyōritsusha 共立社).
- Sakaino Kōyō 境野黄洋. 1930. *Shina Bukkyōshi no kenkyū* 支那佛教史の研究 (Tokyo: Kyōritsusha 共立社).
- Sakaino Kōyō 境野黄洋. 1933. "Hōdōbu Kohon'etsu isetsu hanyakyō ni tsuite" 『方等部古品曰遺説般若經』に就いて [On the *Fanedengbu Gupin Yueyi shuo Banre jing*]. *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgakkai nenpō* 駒澤大學佛教學會年報 3: 2–11.
- Sakurabe Bunkyo 桜部文鏡. 1930. "Chibettoyaku Daihōshakuyō no kenkyū" 西藏譯大寶積經の研究 [The *Mahāratnakūṭa* in Tibetan]. *Ōtani Gakuhō* 大谷学報 11.3: 514–555 (134–175).
- Schuessler, Axel. 2009. *Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese. A Companion to Grammata Serica Recensa* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press).
- Shiomi Tetsudō 鹽見徹堂. 1932. "Ryūju shoin no Daijōkyōten no ni-san ni tsuite" 龍樹所引の大乗經典の二三に就て. *Shūkyō Kenkyū* 宗教研究 New series 9: 91–104 (1031–1044).
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2001. "The Place of the Lotus Sūtra in Indian Buddhism." *Journal of Oriental Philosophy* 11: 89–107.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2009. "Remarks on the *Kāśyapaparivarta* Commentary." In Martin Straube, Roland Steiner, Jayandra Soni, Michael Hahn und Mitsuyo Demoto, eds., *Pāsādikadānaṁ: Festschrift für Bhikkhu Pāsādika* (Indica et Tibetica 52) (Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag): 381–397.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2010. "Test Sailing the Ship of the Teachings: Hesitant Notes on *Kāśyapaparivarta* §153–154." In Eli Franco and Monika Zin, eds., *From Turfan to Ajanta: Festschrift for Dieter Schlingloff on the Occasion of his Eighteenth Birthday*. Lumbini: Lumbini International Research Institute: 11.897–924.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2013. "The Nature of the Verses of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*." *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 23 (Evo ūyayadi: Essays in Honor of Richard Salomon's 65th Birthday): 181–190.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2015. *Buddhist Cosmic Unity: An Edition, Translation and Study of the Anūnatvāpūrṇatvanirdeśaparivarta*. Hamburg Buddhist Studies 4 (Hamburg: Hamburg University Press).
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2019. "Chinese Sūtras in Tibetan Translation: A Preliminary Survey." *Sōka Daigaku Kokusai Bukkyōgaku Kōtō Kenkyūjo Nenpō* 創価大学国際仏教学高等研究所年報/Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University 22: 227–246.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2021. "Editing without an Ur-text: Buddhist Sūtras, Rabbinic Text Criticism, and the Open Philology Digital Humanities Project." *Sōka Daigaku Kokusai Bukkyōgaku Kōtō Kenkyūjo Nenpō* 創価大学国際仏教学高等研究所年報/Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University 24: 147–163.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2023a. (In the Press). "Further Tibetan Sources of the **Kāśyapaparivarta* from Dunhuang (I)." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 26: 195–213.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2023b. (In the Press). "Further Tibetan Sources of the **Kāśyapaparivarta* from Dunhuang (II)." *Śāntamatiḥ: Manuscripts for Life—Essays in Memory of Seishi Karashima*. Bib-

- liothea Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica 15 (Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology Soka University): 331–345.
- Silk, Jonathan A. Forthcoming. “Which Sthiramati Wrote the Commentary on the *Kāśyapaparivarta?”
- Sōma Kazui 相馬一意. 1978. “Yuinichimaniyō ni tsuite” 遺日摩尼經について. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 27.1: 164–165.
- Staël-Holstein, Alexander von. 1913. *Kien-ch’ui-fan-tsan (Gaṇḍīstotragāthā)*. *Сохранившийся в кита́йской транскрипции санскритский гимн Аṣṣвагхоṣ’u*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 15 (St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaja Akademija Nauk)
- Staël-Holstein, Alexander von (Gang Hetai 鋼和泰). 1923. “Yinyi Fanshu yu Zhongguo guyin” 音譯梵書與中國古音 [Transliterated Sanskrit Texts and the Ancient Pronunciation of Chinese Characters]. Trans. Hu Shih 胡適. *Guoxue jikan* 國學季刊 1: 47–56.
- Staël-Holstein, Alexander von. 1926. *The Kāśyapaparivarta: A Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class: Edited in the Original Sanskrit in Tibetan and in Chinese* (Shanghai: Commercial Press).
- Staël-Holstein, Alexander von. 1933. *A Commentary to the Kāśyapaparivarta: Edited in Tibetan and Chinese* (Peking: The National Library of Peking and the National Tsinghua University).
- Takasaki Jikidō 高崎直道. 1961. “Hōshakubu to Bodairushi” 宝積部と菩提流志 [The *Mahāratnakūṭa* section and Bodhiruci]. *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō kain tsūshin* 大正新脩大藏經會員通信 17: 2–3.
- Takasaki Jikidō 高崎直道. 1974. *Nyoraizō Shisō no Keisei: Indo Daijō Bukkyō Shisō Kenkyū* 如來藏思想の形成・インド大乘仏教思想研究 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).
- Tōdō Kyōshun 藤堂恭俊. 1953. “Jūjūbibasharon kan’yakukō” 十住毘婆沙論漢訳攷 [The Chinese Translation of the Daśabhūmivibhāṣā]. *Bukkyō Bunka Kenkyū* 佛教文化研究 3: 51–62.
- Tsukinowa Kenryū 月輪賢隆. 1934. “Daihōshakushōbōkyō no ketsubun ni tsuite” 大寶積正法經の缺文に就て. *Seizan gakuho* 西山学報 7: 64–73. Reprinted in Tsukinowa 1971: 356–363.
- Tsukinowa Kenryū 月輪賢隆. 1935. “Kohon ‘Daihōshakukyō’ ni tsuite” 古品「大寶積經」に就て. In *Bukkyō Nisengohyakunen Kinengakkai* 佛教二千五百年記念學會, ed. *Bukkyōgaku no Shomondai* 佛教學の諸問題 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店): 849–865. Reprinted in Tsukinowa 1971: 393–407, to which I refer.
- Tsukinowa Kenryū 月輪賢隆. 1971. *Butten no Hihanteki Kenkyū* 仏典の批判的研究 (Kyoto: Hyakkaen 百華苑).
- Vongagsorn, Kittipong. 2020. A Study of the composition, transmission, and development of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*. MA thesis, Cornell University.
- Vorob’ev-Desjatovkij, V.S. 1957. “Vnov’ najdennyye listy rukopisej Kashjapaparivarty.” *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 21: 491–500.
- Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, Margarita, Seishi Karashima and Noriyuki Kudo. 2002. *The Kāśyapaparivarta: Romanized Text and Facsimiles*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica 5 (Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University).
- Wang, Qilong and Xiaoyong Deng. 2014. *The Academic Knight Between East and West: A Biography of Alexander von Staël-Holstein* (Andover: Gale Asia/Cengage Learning).
- Weller, Friedrich. 1933. *Index to the Tibetan Translation of the Kāśyapaparivarta*. Harvard Sino-Indian Series I (Cambridge: Harvard-Yenching Institute).
- Weller, Friedrich. 1935. *Index to the Indian Text of the Kāśyapaparivarta*. Harvard Sino-Indian Series II (Cambridge: Harvard-Yenching Institute). Reprinted in Weller 1987: 1.543–605.

- Weller, Friedrich. 1962. *Zum Kāśyapaparivarta, Heft 1: Mongolischer Text*. Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig: Phil.-hist. Klasse 54-2 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag).
- Weller, Friedrich. 1964. "Kāśyapaparivarta nach der Tjin-Übersetzung verdeutscht." *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig, Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe* 13.4: 771–804.
- Weller, Friedrich. 1965. *Zum Kāśyapaparivarta, Heft 2: Verdeutschung des sanskrit-tibetischen Texts*. Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig: Phil.-hist. Klasse 57-3 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag).
- Weller, Friedrich. 1966a. "Kāśyapaparivarta nach der Djin-Fassung verdeutscht." *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 12: 379–462.
- Weller, Friedrich. 1966b. "Die Sung-Fassung des Kāśyapaparivarta." *Monumenta Serica* 25: 207–361. Reprinted in Weller 1987: 11.1305–1459.
- Weller, Friedrich. 1970. "Kāśyapaparivarta nach der Han-Fassung verdeutscht." *Buddhist Yearly 1968–1969* (Jahrbuch für Buddhistische Forschung, Halle): 57–221. Reprinted in Weller 1987: 11.1136–1304.
- Weller, Friedrich. 1987. *Kleine Schriften*. Glasenapp-Stiftung Band 26 (Stuttgart/Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner).
- Wu, Jiang. 2016. "Appendix 1: A Brief Survey of the Printed Editions of the Chinese Buddhist Canon," compiled on the basis of work of Li Fuhua and He Mei. In Jiang Wu and Lucille Chia, eds., *Spreading Buddha's Word in East Asia: The Formation and Transformation of the Chinese Buddhist Canon* (New York: Columbia University Press: 311–320).
- Yamaguchi, Susumu. 1934. *Madhyāntavibhāgaṭīkā: Exposition Systématique du Yogācāravijñaptivāda*. Tome 1—Texte. Suzuki Research Foundation Reprint Series 7 (Nagoya: Librairie Hajinkaku; Reprint: Tokyo: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1966).
- Zou Xinming 邹新明, ed. 2016. *Meiguo Hafo daxue Hafo Yanjing tushuguan cang Gang Hetai weikan wanglai shuxinji* 美國哈佛大學哈佛燕京圖書館藏鋼和泰未刊往來書信集 [The Unpublished Correspondence of Alexander von Staël-Holstein in the Harvard-Yenching Library, Harvard University] (Guilin: Guangxi shifan daxue chubanshe 广西师范大学出版社/Peking: Beijing daxue chubanshe 北京大學出版社).
- Zacchetti, Stefano, 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 Buddhism, Soka University).

The *Mahāratnakūṭa* Collection in Indian Buddhist Scriptural Anthologies

Examining the Sūtrasamuccaya, Śikṣāsamuccaya and Mahāsūtrasamuccaya

Jonathan A. Silk

1 Introduction

The scriptural production of Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism was enormous.¹ In the period of vitality from roughly the beginning of the common era through about the seventh or eighth century CE, a great many sūtras were composed, some originally in Middle Indic, later transformed into Sanskrit, while others were composed from the beginning in Sanskrit.² To date, however, we have access to few of these texts in an Indic language.³ Thus, one impediment to our appreciation of Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism is that we are compelled for the most part to approach sūtras through their translations in Chinese and Tibetan. However, there is another problem as well: while we on the whole have a good idea of which texts, preserved in translation, constitute the extant corpus of Indian Buddhist Mahāyāna scriptural literature, we have little idea how most of this literature was considered within its Indian context, how—and indeed whether—it was used, and how it might have been understood.⁴ There are, it is true, a few Indian commentaries on

1 I am grateful for the careful corrections of Paul Harrison, who offered invaluable guidance and corrections through several drafts. In addition, a number of valuable corrections were kindly offered by Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Michael Radich, to whom appropriate thanks are due. The editor Rafal Felbur offered final corrections and suggestions.

2 The present paper does not deal with tantric scriptural literature, for a variety of reasons, the most important of which is that this literature is not referred to in the anthologies under consideration here, not even in the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya*, a work of the tenth century. On tantric materials in works authored by Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna, who was responsible for the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya*, see Mochizuki 2016: 659–681. Paul Harrison (personal communication) suggests, however, that “a few of the works [the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*] cites or refers to might be considered early tantras.” This, it seems to me, leads us into the extremely unclear area of the definition of tantric literature, which for the moment at least I prefer to avoid.

3 There are high hopes that this situation may gradually change when access to the treasure houses of Tibetan monasteries becomes possible. In addition, we are already gradually getting access to fragments of Mahāyāna scriptures in Gāndhārī as well.

4 In this regard, see the comments of Jens-Uwe Hartmann 2019: 17: “The scholar of ancient India is continually faced with an extreme incongruity between the amazing amount of literature—even in the Buddhist tradition where so much has been lost—and the total absence of knowledge about the ‘Sitz im Leben’ of this literature, about its place in the life of the people using and producing it. Regardless of which specific text among those that later became classified as Mahāyāna *sūtras* we take up, we know nothing about the precise place and the time in which it was produced; we know practically nothing about the people who produced it, about their motives or their economic situation; and, even worse, we know practically nothing about the audience, about the people such a *sūtra* was addressed to, about its purpose and its use. We do not know which people read or studied such a *sūtra*; nor do we even know if each *sūtra* was read and studied at all.”

Mahāyāna sūtras (but surprisingly few, a topic I hope to address in the near future), and these offer often valuable hints as to how scriptures were understood. Another angle of approach is to make surveys of citations, looking in particular at treatises (*śāstra*) and taking note of the proof texts to which they take recourse, which then may again suggest the influence of certain texts. These are a good way to start exploring the question of influence, since when commentators or the authors of treatises refer to a scripture, we can infer that the scripture in question was, in one form or another, directly or indirectly, known to them.

But these are not the only sources, and alongside them we also possess a small corpus of anthologies, three of which will be taken up for consideration here.⁵ The approach to scriptures of these works is essentially different from that of the commentator who deals with a single text or the treatise author who occasionally makes reference to generally shorter passages from a variety of works, for here we encounter extensive collections of sometimes lengthy excerpts. We do not know whether these works discussed below were compiled by scholars with direct access to complete versions of the texts they cite, in a monastic library for instance (indeed, we are far from certain what a “complete version” might have meant), nor do we know the principles through which they selected passages for inclusion in their compendia, this question being obviously related to the question of whether they had access to texts more or less in the form in which we know them today. These remain questions for the future.

The three anthologies dealt with here, in chronological order of their composition, are the *Sūtrasamuccaya*,⁶ attributed (dubiously) to Nāgārjuna, the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* of Śāntideva, and the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya*⁷ of Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna (commonly but probably wrongly called Atīśa/Atīśa, perhaps more correctly Adhīśa). The second of these works, available to modern scholars for more than a century in an edition of the only Sanskrit manuscript so far accessible, that preserved in Cambridge (MS Add. 1478),⁸ has only recently begun to receive the attention it deserves as a fully-fledged work in its own right,⁹

5 On anthologies, see Mochizuki 2015. Although the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and *Sūtrasamuccaya* are also preserved in Chinese translation, these sources are not relevant below and are therefore left aside. Note, however, that they do provide evidence for the establishment of states of the Indic texts that may be otherwise unavailable, and are thus essential in any wider considerations of these sources. Jens-Uwe Hartmann notes in regard to establishing states of texts and relative dating: “This also holds true for the *gSuñ rab rin po che'i gtam rgyud* of sKa ba dPal-brtsegs (rakṣita), if he is indeed the author or compiler (TP No. 5844, TD No. 4357 [= 4362]), which would make the work much earlier than Atīśa's.” In this regard, we might also think of the so-called *Mdo sde bryad bcu khungs* (now edited in Tauscher 2021), the anthology of Phag mo gru pa called *Mdo lung rin chen sprungs pa* (see below note 55), and other such texts, but these too raise challenges best addressed elsewhere.

6 So far only a few fragments have been published in Sanskrit, by Karashima 2009 and Wang et al. 2020.

7 There is no known extant Sanskrit manuscript of the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya*. However, as discussed by Kano 2015: 93–94, a Sanskrit manuscript is mentioned in Tibetan sources.

8 For lovely color photos, see <https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01478/1>. On the manuscript and its scribe, see Sasaki 2007.

9 Thanks at least in part to the work of Paul Harrison, for instance 2007. After a first rendering credited to Bendall and Rouse 1922, the text was translated into English for a second time by Goodman 2016, who frequently observes differences between the Skt. and Tib. in its notes, and these can be helpful to gain a quick picture of some kinds of differences. Note that although Goodman helpfully notes the pages of Bendall's edition, for reasons nowhere explained he in fact used the edition of Vaidya as the basis of his translation.

not merely as a collection of quotations primarily of value for its preservation of Sanskrit sources otherwise either lost or at least inaccessible. Likewise, certainly the organization of both the *Sūtrasamuccaya* and the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya* present implicit positions, but these works might with some greater justification be seen more as resources than as independent works.¹⁰ However, the question has been raised of the use to which we might justifiably put these Tibetan translations, and whether they present evidence independent of that presented in the Tibetan translations of the sūtras themselves for the state of a given sūtra in India.¹¹

Almost thirty years ago, I observed (Silk 1994: 649–651) that in some cases passages in the Tibetan translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* were not independent of the Tibetan translations of the quoted sūtras as preserved in the Kanjur.¹² It was, in fact, evident that the Tibetan translators of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* had in some cases simply borrowed pre-existing translations, but at that time I offered this hypothesis on the basis of no more than some casual observations. If this is indeed what the translators did, I know of little evidence that there were indigenous reflections on this approach. In what is perhaps the only widely known discussion of something related to this issue, the late David Seyfort Ruegg (1973: 253–254) quoted an 18th century work, the *Dag yig mkhas pa'i byung gnas* of Lcang skya Rol pa'i rdo rje (Ye shes bstan pa'i sgron me, 1717–1786), as saying: “In the case of commentaries on the great basic texts, if the respective basic book has been previously translated the words also of the basic text [as quoted] in the commentary are to be made to follow the former; otherwise, the translation [of the commentary] is to be made after the basic book has been translated and fitted in the commentary.” This seems to constitute a suggestion that preexisting translations of base texts should be reused, without consideration of the actual accuracy of the translation in question, or its relation to the commentary work. Further, as tempting as it may be to apply this stricture to the case under discussion here, in fact the context of this work of Rol pa'i rdo rje is that of the translation from Tibetan into Mongolian of the Tanjur, and thus it is not self-evident that the same recommended procedure might have informed the work of those who translated into Tibetan the anthologies now under consideration so many centuries before. But in fact, there is a good and effective *empirical* way to study this issue, namely to carefully study the actual passages quoted in the anthologies, and to compare the Tibetan renderings found there with what we find in their sūtra sources in the Kanjur.

10 That said, it is true that the *Sūtrasamuccaya*, Tōh. 3934, was addressed in the *Sūtrasamuccayabhāṣya-Ratnālokālaṅkāra* of Ratnākaraśānti, Tōh. 3935, ed. Mochizuki 1993–1995, trans. Mochizuki 2005–2010, and the *Sūtrasamuccayasāñcayārtha*, Tōh. 3937, credited to Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna, ed. in Mochizuki 2016: 993–996, study and trans. 301–310.

11 It is for this reason that I limit my attention to the three anthologies, namely because they are preserved in Tibetan. In other words, it is precisely thanks to this preservation that we are able to examine the question of the relation between the translations found in the anthologies and those of the cited sources preserved in the Kanjur. For a further anthology of potentially great interest, see Part 3, below.

12 Although no reference is made to this comment, or indeed to any scholarship, based apparently on a couple of examples to which they refer, Wang et al. 2020: 60 aver, “the translators of the [*Sūtrasamuccaya*] tended not to have translated directly from [the *Sūtrasamuccaya* in] Skt but have copied their citations from the Tibetan translations of the source texts as long as the translators could identify and locate parallel passages in the source texts.” I think it remains to be seen whether indeed the translators only translated themselves when they did not have access to preexisting translations, but I realize that it may never be possible to actually answer this question.

Several years ago, Paul Harrison (2018) took up for reconsideration my old comment, and examined a single chapter of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, the eighth. With all due reservations about the textual bases for his comparisons, Harrison offered three categories through which to evaluate the relationship between the Tibetan found in the Tibetan translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and that of the sūtra being cited. He called these categories A, B and C, and defined the first as that in which the wording of the two sources was “identical, with no differences at all or only a few variations of minor significance.” Category B has “some variation in wording here and there, but overall both texts are too close to be deemed entirely independent translations. Correspondence is verbatim in places, but not all the way through.” Category C, then, is that in which the two “are apparently different translations, with substantial variations in lexical choice and in syntactic structure.” As Harrison himself clearly acknowledges, there is a subjective element here, and I should note that now, in hindsight, I suspect that in producing my classifications, offered below, I tended to consider as belonging to Category A some materials which perhaps should have belonged to Harrison’s Category B.

To illustrate at least something of the nature (and complications) of the first and third categories, it might be helpful to cite brief examples. From the first of the texts noted below, the *Tathāgataguhyaka* (Mahāratnakūṭa 3), we may cite the following, as an example of an entirely different rendering, and thus as belonging to Category C:

Sūtra	<i>Sūtrasamuccaya</i>
D <i>dkon brtsegs, ka</i> , 102b5	24.6–8 = D 155b6
dam pa'i chos yongs su 'dzin pa'i tshogs ni dkon mchog gsum gyi rigs rgyun mi gcod par 'gyur ro	byang chub sems dpa' rnam kyi byang chub kyi sems kyi tshogs ni dkon mchog gsum gyi rigs mi 'chad par 'gyur ro

A passage from the *Pitāputrasamāgama* (Mahāratnakūṭa 16) can illustrate how, when an anthology selectively quotes, its translators, while recognizing and honoring the abbreviations, nevertheless rely for their renderings of the relevant portions on the precise wording of the Kanjur translation, thus belonging in this regard to Category A. The omitted portions of the sūtra are printed in small italics:

Sūtra	<i>Sūtrasamuccaya</i>
D <i>dkon brtsegs, nga</i> , 30a3–b5	124.12–125.10 = D 188a7–b4.
dge slong dag sngon byung ba 'das pa'i dus bskal pa dpag tu med pa bgrang du med pa bsam gyis mi khyab pa mtshungs pa med pa gzhal du med pa brjod du med pa 'das pa de'i tshe de'i dus na de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas <i>rig pa dang zhabs su ldan pa bde bar</i>	dge slong dag sngon byung ba 'das pa'i dus bskal pa dpag tu med pa bgrang du med pa bsam gyi mi khyab pa mtsungs pa med pa gzhal du med pa brjod du med pa 'das

*gshegs pa | jig rten mkhyen pa | skyes bu 'dul ba'i kha lo
 sgyur ba | bla na med pa | lha dang mi rnams kyi ston pa |
 sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das dbang po'i tog ces bya ba
 'jig rten du byung ste | dge slong dag de bzhin gshegs
 pa dbang po'i tog des sems bskyed pa re re zhing gang
 gā'i klung gi bye ma snyed kyi 'jig rten gyi khams kyi sems
 can rnams la phan par dgongs par gyur te don kyang
 mdzad do || de bzhin gshegs pa dbang po'i tog gi
 sangs rgyas kyi zhing yang 'jig rten gyi khams gang
 gā'i klung gi bye ma snyed la sangs rgyas kyi zhing
 gcig tu gyur te | yongs su dag cing ngan song dang mi
 khom pa mas cad yongs su chad pa ste | de bzhin gshegs
 pa dbang po'i tog de'i sangs rgyas kyi zhing de na log par
 ngas pa'i sems can kyi skye ba yong med par gyur to || lta
 ba'i rnam pa yong med par gyur to || mngon pa'i nga rgyal
 can yong med par gyur to || lus dang ngag dang | yid kyi
 las kyi mtha' yongs su ma dag pa dang ldan pa'i sems can
 yong med par gyur to || ngan song gi rgyur 'gyur ba'i nyon
 mongs pa dang las byung ba yong med par gyur to || de
 ci'i phyir zhe na | de bzhin gshegs pa des yun ring po nas
 sems can rnams dge ba'i chos rnams la bcud cing btams
 te rjes su bstan cing bsblabs pa'i phyir ro || de bzhin gshegs
 pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas
 dbang po'i tog gis sangs rgyas kyi zhing de na 'khod
 pa'i sems can rnams kyang bde ba lnga thob par
 gyur te | 'di ltar la la ni 'dod pa'i bde ba dang ldan
 par gyur to || la la ni khyim nas 'byung ba'i bde ba
 dang ldan par gyur to || la la ni bsam gtan gyi bde
 ba dang ldan par gyur to || la la ni snyoms par 'jug
 pa'i bde ba dang ldan par gyur to || la la ni bla na
 med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub kyi
 bde ba dang ldan par gyur te | de dag bde ba de
 la yang spyod la | bde ba de dag la yang mngon
 par zhen pa med par gyur to || 'di lta ste | dper
 na bud ba me tog gi khu bas nye bar 'tsho yang
 de la mngon par zhen pa med do || de bzhin du
 sems can de dag kyang bde ba de la yongs su spyod
 kyang de la mgon par zhen pa med do || 'di lta ste |
 dper na bar snang la rgyu ba'i bya ni bar snang la
 yang rgyu la de la mngon par chags pa yang med
 do || de bzhin du sems can de dag kyang bde ba de
 la yongs su spyod kyang de la mngon par zhen pa
 med do ||*

*pa de'i tshe de'i dus na | de
 bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom
 pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i
 sangs rgyas dbang po'i tog ces
 bya ba 'jig rten du byung ste |
 de bzhin gshegs pa dbang po'i
 tog gi sangs rgyas kyi zhing
 yang 'jig rten gyi khams gang
 gā'i klung gi bye ma snyed
 las | sangs rgyas kyi zhing gcig
 tu gyur to || sangs rgyas kyi
 zhing de na 'khod pa'i sems
 can rnams kyang bde ba lnga
 thob par gyur te | 'di ltar la la
 ni 'dod pa'i bde ba dang ldan
 par gyur to || la la ni khyim
 nas 'byung ba'i bde ba dang
 ldan par gyur to || la la ni bsam
 gtan gyi bde ba dang ldan par
 gyur to | | la la ni snyoms par
 'jug pa'i bde ba dang ldan par
 gyur to || la la ni bla na med pa
 yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang
 chub kyi bde ba dang ldan par
 gyur te | de dag bde ba de la
 yang spyod la | de dag de la
 yang mngon par zhen pa med
 par gyur to || 'di lta ste dper
 na | bung ba me tog gi khu
 bas nye bar 'tsho yang de la
 mngon par zhen pa med do ||
 de bzhin du sems can de dag
 kyang bde ba de la yongs su
 spyod kyang de la mngon par
 zhen pa med do || 'di lta ste
 dper na | bar snang la rgyu ba'i
 bya ni bar snang la rgyu yang
 de la mngon par chags pa yang
 med do || de bzhin du sems
 can de dag kyang bde ba de
 la yongs su spyod kyang de la
 mngon par zhen pa med do ||*

In addition to such examples, complex enough in themselves, there are also even more complicated cases, the nature of which remains to be adequately worked out. An example is provided by the so-called *Upāyakaśalyajñānottarabodhisattvapariṣcchā* (Mahāratnakūṭa 38). Here the Kanjurs preserve two translations of the sūtra. The relation between these two Tibetan translations is very complicated, but they are surely related. As Channa Li (2016: 221, 223) says, “Generally speaking, [the] two recensions of the Tibetan *Upāyakaśalyasūtra* resemble each other, and in some places even track each other word for word. ... it is almost impossible that these two translations were performed independently.”¹³ In the table below, the portions in small italics are skipped by the *Sūtrasamuccaya*, which plainly relies in large part on Sūtra (1), but also, as indicated by the underline, for a portion corresponds in some way with Sūtra (2), but the rest of the passage is rather difficult to identify with either. It is thus a question whether, in light of the similarity in vocabularies, one should classify this passage in Category B, or rather think that the similarities are only what one would expect of any two renderings of a similar source, but the differences are considerable, and thus place it in Category C:

Sūtra (1) D <i>dkon brtsegs, cha</i> , 32b5–7 (Tatz§12, p. 26)	<i>Sūtrasamuccaya</i> 25.21–26.2 = D 156a6–7	Sūtra (2) Tōh. 261 <i>mdo sde, za</i> , 284b7– 285a2
<i>rigs kyi bu gzhan yang byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po'i thabs la mkhas pa ni gal te brgya la <i>brgya lam na</i> dbul por gyur na yang des tha na <i>gzhan gyi las kyang byas te</i> kha zas <i>nal ze gang tsam yang blangs nas zhum pa med pa'i sems kyis dge 'dun nam gang zag la 'bul baryang byed do</i> <i>phul nas kyang de 'di ltar so sor rtog par byed de</i> bcom ldan 'das kyis sems rgya chen pos byin na sbyin pa yang rgya chen por 'gyur ro zhes gsungs pas na 'di ltar bdag gi sbyin par bya ba'i chos 'di ni chung mod kyi thams cad mkhyen pa nyid kyi sems kyis byin pas dpag tu med par 'gyur ro snyam du so sor rtog par byed do </i>	byang chub sems dpa' thabs la mkhas pa gal te brgya la dbul por gyur na de tha na kha zas <u>gzar bu gang zhig sbyin na yang 'di ltar slob ste</u> bcom ldan 'das kyis kyang sems ni rgya che'i sbyin pa ni mi che'o zhes gsungs pas na bdag ni sbyin par bya ba'i chos yongs su btang ba chung mod kyi thams cad mkhyen pa'i sems kyis tshad med par 'gyur ro snyam du sems so	rigs kyi bu gzhan yang byang chub sems dpa' thabs mkhas pa ni nam zhig gal te brgya la dbul por gyur na de'i tshe na de chung ngu na gzhan gyi las kyang byas nas zas <u>gzar bu gang thogs te sems ma zhum pas dge 'dun nam gang zag la sbyin par byed do</u> <u>byin nas kyang 'di ltar slob ste</u> bcom ldan 'das kyis sems che ba'i phyir sbyin pa che bar 'gyur ro zhes gsungs kyis bdag gi sbyin ba chung ngu zin kyang thams cad mkhyen pa nyid kyi sems ni dpag tu med pa'o snyam nas

Given the complications already noted, one may be forgiven for feeling that the materials we find in our anthologies complicate attempts to present a simple philological account

13 Li offers an extensive discussion in Li 2016: 218–224. Unfortunately, while Li considers some citations in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, she does not mention the *Sūtrasamuccaya*.

of any given text or passage. However, the challenges facing our investigations may be even more serious. First, the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* in Sanskrit is known from Bendall's edition, but this is based on a single manuscript, and while this manuscript is excellent, in the sense of but rarely containing very questionable readings, we have little way of knowing at present how other, independent Sanskrit manuscripts might have differed.¹⁴ Second, we know that the versions we have of Tibetan Kanjur texts date almost without exception to periods centuries later than the translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, and so far we have reliable editions which sample a variety of witnesses for only very few sūtras.¹⁵ We know, moreover, that some sūtras circulated in multiple versions, as we just saw. Other challenges might also be considered, not least of which is that lacking a large-scale corpus-based study of the variations of Tibetan manuscript traditions, it is often hard to know what to consider "normal variation."

In an effort to take Harrison's work forward, I chose here to look at the ways in which citations from all sūtras belonging to the Mahāratnakūṭa collection (Tibetan *Dkon brtsegs*) are treated. The sūtras are listed, in the following, in order of their occurrence in the Mahāratnakūṭa collection in the Derge edition, and numbered as such.¹⁶ Moreover, in an effort to add another dimension to the question, I have widened the scope of the inquiry by including not only the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, to which Harrison limited himself, but also the *Sūtrasamuccaya* and the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya*. This leads to a consideration of citations from some 21 sūtras, some of which are cited only once, others a great number of times. It is of further interest, and a topic for future investigation, that there is minimal overlap between the citations among the anthologies.¹⁷ It is particularly interesting that, despite his obvious debt to the *Sūtrasamuccaya*, which he knew and made use of,¹⁸ there are very few cases in the corpus examined here of Śāntideva taking over quotations

14 We also do not know the source of the marginalia in the manuscript, at least some instances of which were ignored by Bendall, and from this and other perspectives, it is clear that a new edition of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, accompanied by its Tibetan and Chinese translations, identification of quotations, and consideration of the relation between quotation and sūtra source, is a real desideratum. As Paul Harrison has discovered, Bendall also failed, more frequently than one would wish, to report the manuscript's readings correctly, sometimes rather radically so. Note that Wogihara 1904–1906 already offered many valuable corrections and suggestions, and in this series of articles, inter alia, Bendall himself corrected some of his errors in reading the manuscript. See above note 8.

15 To be clear, what I mean here is that as we have them the Kanjurs themselves, while relying on old materials—translations made perhaps in the 9th to 12th centuries—date to centuries later, and even after the advent of printing most transmission was by manuscript copying, adding further complications.

16 Note that the Peking edition orders the sūtras within the collection slightly differently.

17 I count, in fact, only the following: *Tathāgataguhyaka* (Mahāratnakūṭa 3), one extremely short passage shared by the *Sūtrasamuccaya* and *Śikṣāsamuccaya*; *Pitāputrasamāgama* (Mahāratnakūṭa 16), one small overlap; *Ugradatta* (Mahāratnakūṭa 19), the *Sūtrasamuccaya*'s citation is found in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*; *Adhyāśāyasamcodana* (Mahāratnakūṭa 25), two shared passages. In the first two cases, the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* quotes more text than is quoted in the corresponding passage of the *Sūtrasamuccaya*, and thus cannot be wholly dependent on it. This very small scale of correspondence in the case of Mahāratnakūṭa quotations is also perhaps to be remarked.

18 On the much discussed verse of Śāntideva in which he recommends study of the *Sūtrasamuccaya*, see Filliozat 1964. I do not think that any subsequent studies have challenged this understanding. For other studies of the relationship between the texts, see Sasaki 1965, Asano 1995, Harrison 2023.

from the *Sūtrasamuccaya*, although as discussed in part 3 below, there is one remarkable set of passages which demands attention. This is especially interesting since, overall, regarding the relation between Śāntideva and the *Sūtrasamuccaya*, Harrison stated (2009: 89), “Śāntideva’s indebtedness to the *Sūtrasamuccaya* amounts in places to what we would nowadays call plagiarism, with entire sequences of sūtra citations lifted from the earlier commentary ...” On the other hand, some centuries later Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna (c. 980?–1054) compiled another lengthy anthology, and one might wonder whether the methods of translation of the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya* differed from those deployed for the Tibetan renderings of the two earlier anthologies.¹⁹ To anticipate our answer, they do not.

Although the textual basis, then, is slightly enlarged, my procedure was the same as Harrison’s: I looked at each citation, and compared the translation of a given passage in the anthology with that in the sūtra as we now find it in the Derge Kanjur. (The only exception is that, when sūtras have been edited, I use the published edition rather than the Derge edition.) For the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* I used the text in the Derge Tanjur, for the *Sūtrasamuccaya* the edition of Pāsādika (1989) and for the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya* that of Mochizuki (2004).²⁰ For the last named, I was greatly assisted by the identifications already offered by Mochizuki (2002).²¹

For the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, the first set of numbers refers to page and line in Bendall (1897–1902), the second to the folio, side and line in the Derge Tanjur, Tōhoku 3940, this then equated with the source in the Derge Kanjur’s *Dkon brtsegs* section. For the *Sūtrasamuccaya*, the first number is to page and line in Pāsādika (1989), the second the place of this in the Derge Tanjur, Tōhoku 3934, followed again by the sūtra, and finally for the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya*, the first number is the section established in Mochizuki (2002, 2004), then the location of the passage in the Derge Tanjur, Tōhoku 3961, and finally the corresponding sūtra passage. I make no representation about the correct title of a given text, and cite Sanskrit titles in a conventional manner only for convenience.

19 In a few notes below (27, 28, 35, 36, 37, 40), I report the results of a small side study. I was curious whether in his own works, and in the first place in the **Bodhipathapradīpa* and its commentary the **Bodhīmārgadīpapañjikā* (I follow the traditional reconstructed titles, although there is clearly some disconnection here), the same author made use of the sūtra citations he had collected in his anthology. It is a puzzling result that very clearly he did not. While elsewhere his debt to Śāntideva and his *Śikṣāsamuccaya* is crystal clear, there is almost no overlap between the proof texts adduced in the *Bodhipathapradīpa* and *Bodhīmārgadīpapañjika* and citations in the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya*. This, I believe, requires some explanation. My notes in this regard, I should stress, are not intended to be comprehensive.

20 I am aware, thanks to the remarks of Harrison 2018: 237–240, that there also exist versions of the *Sūtrasamuccaya* and *Śikṣāsamuccaya* in the Phug brag Kanjur (although Harrison mentions only the latter), and that for the latter we also have a few fragmentary sections from Tabo. These materials will require careful consideration, but such an examination is outside the scope of the present paper.

21 Some of the passages below were noted by Asano 1995, 2003. I do not always agree with his conclusions.

2 The Comparisons

3. *Tathāgatācīntyaguhyānirdeśa*, Tōh. 47.

Sūtrasamuccaya:

- 9.16–10.6 = D 151a2–5 = D *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 175b5–176a1.²² Category B.
 10.7–9 = D 151a5–b4 = D *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 120b2. Category A. See Śikṣ. 316.5–12.
 24.6–8 = D 155b6 = D *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 102b5. Category C.
 24.10–17 = D 155b6–7 = D *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 202b6 [first verse], 130b6 [second verse].
 Category A.
 138.17–24 = D 193a3–4 = D *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 130b7–131a1. Category A.

Śikṣāsamuccaya:

- 7.20–8.4 = D 6b4–7 = D *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 192b1–3. With some variations in vocabulary, Category B.
 126.5–8 = D 72b1–3 = D *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 112a4–5, b4, 6–7, with omissions. Category A.
 158.16–159.6 = D 89a5–b1 = D *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 106a7–b3. As in Harrison, Category B.
 159.7–17 = D 89b1–6 = D *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 109a3–b1. As in Harrison, Category B.
 242.7–9 = D 133b1–2 = D *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 161b1–2, only small vocabulary differences. Category A.
 274.3–11 = D 151a3–7 = D *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 190b5–191a3. Category A. However, Skt. has an additional sentence (274.10–11) not in Tib. Śikṣ., nor in the sūtra, but perhaps reflected in the older Chinese translation, T. 310 (3) (X1) 76a18–21; less clear is T. 312 (X1) 745c15–17. These Chinese versions require further consideration.
 316.5–12 = D 170a7–b4 = D *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 120b1–5. The final sentence in Tib. copies the sūtra but is not quoted in Skt. Category A. See *Sūtrasamuccaya* 10.7–9.
 357.1–11 = D 191b5–192a3 = D *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 178a6–7, 178b2–4, 179a4–7, 179b2, with considerable omissions, the longest marked with *la sogs pa*. Category A.
 357.13–14 = D 192a3–4 = D *dkon brtsegs, ka*, 202a1–2. Category A.²³

Mahāsūtrasamuccaya:

No quotations.

22 See Mochizuki 1995: 2, and 2517 (where he could not identify the citation).

23 Although Goodman 2016: 418nxiv avers that the Tibetan trans. differs from the Skt., in fact the only difference is the order of the four feet of the verse; otherwise it is a quite literal translation.

9. *Daśadharmaka*, Tōh. 53.

Sūtrasamuccaya:

No quotations.

Śikṣāsamuccaya:

5.8–11 = D 5a1–2 = D *dkon brtsegs, kha*, 166a2–3. Śikṣ. Skt., and following it Tib., skip the second of the three verses found here in the sūtra source, and the translation is almost entirely different.²⁴ Category C.

8.8–15 = D 7a1–5 = D *dkon brtsegs, kha*, 168a1–7, with unmarked abridgements of the sūtra text. Category B.

116.16–17 = D 67a4–5 = D *dkon brtsegs, kha*, 166a7–b1. Category C.

Mahāsūtrasamuccaya:

No quotations.

12. *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, Tōh. 56.

Sūtrasamuccaya:

3.10–11 = D 149a2–3 = Unidentified.²⁵

12.17–13.24 = D 152a3–b1 = D *dkon brtsegs, kha*, very abbreviated summary of selected sentences from 283b7–284b1, 285a2–4, 285b4–5, 286b3.²⁶ Category C.

28.6–15 = D 157a3–4 = D *dkon brtsegs, ga*, 51a7–b2, with vocatives removed, otherwise very close. Category B.

28.16–17 = D 157a4–5: *bdag gi 'khrul pa la so sor rtoḡ cing | gzhan gyi 'khrul pa la snying rje ba'o* = D *dkon brtsegs, ga*, 106b6: *bdag gis byas pa la so sor brtag par bya'i || gzhan gyis byas pa la ma yin pa dang || sems can gzhan la snying rje ba'i 'du shes bskyed par bya ba dang ||*. Category C.

140.23–144.6 = D 193b6–194b7 = D *dkon brtsegs, ga*, (140.23–141.14 =) 161b1–5; (141.15–144.6 =) 162a2–b7. Category A.

Note also these misattributed passages, which belong instead to what we now have as different texts (thus they are not classified here into any category):

24 Śikṣ. in its turn was quoted in the *Durbodhālokā* of “Dharmakīrti of Kedah,” identified in Sinclair 2021: 14, pointing out that this identification was overlooked by Isoda 1988: 102 (41) (it is the passage in the middle of the page; Isoda’s numbering system baffles me).

25 See Mochizuki 1993: 22, and 33n65, who was likewise unable to identify the putative citation. See also Braarvig and Pagel 2006: 22n12.

26 See Mochizuki 1995: 16 and 48n99 (where he points to *kha*, 103b7–106b6, but no such passage exists in this sūtra; I think his reference to Chinese [T. 316 (X1) 206c21–207c20] more or less corresponds to the passages I identify here in Tibetan).

107.13–20 = D 182b3–5 = Tōh. 101, *mdo sde, nga*, 225b2–4, *Kuśalamūlasaṃparigraha-sūtra*. Identified by Matsuda Kazunobu in Braarvig and Pagel 2006: 2110, and see Harrison 2023, note 69.

107.21–108.7 = D 182b5–7. This and the passage immediately above (107.13–20) are both found in Chinese, that above T. 657 (xvi) 207a26–29, and this latter passage (107.21–108.7) at b11–15, but apparently not in Tibetan, according to Braarvig and Pagel 2006: 2110.

135.2–136.5 = D 191b7–192a5 = Tōh. 101, *mdo sde, nga*, 134a1–b3. Identified by Matsuda Kazunobu in Braarvig and Pagel 2006: 2110.

Śikṣāsamuccaya:

311.13–16 and 17–312.2 = D *dkon brtsegs, ga*, 167b4–5 and 167b5–7. These are the same as two of the misattributed quotations in the *Sūtrasamuccaya*, thus see above under *Sūtrasamuccaya* 107.13–20, 107.21–108.7.

Mahāsūtrasamuccaya:²⁷

§ 2.1 = D 7b6–9a2 = D *dkon brtsegs, ga*, 121a6–122b1. Category B, largely the same but with more than a few variations.

§ 5.7 = D 32b6–34a7 = D *dkon brtsegs, ga*, 109b4–111a6. Category A.

§ 11.12 = D 73a3–7 = 93b1–6 = D *dkon brtsegs, ga*, 83a7–b3. Category B, edging toward C.

§ 37.6 = D 195b2–197a3 = D *dkon brtsegs, ga*, 57b3–59a7. Category A.

15. *Mañjuśrībuddhakṣetragaṇavyūha*, Tōh. 59.²⁸

Sūtrasamuccaya:

No quotations.

Śikṣāsamuccaya:

13.18–14.12 = D 10b3–11a1 = D *dkon brtsegs, ga*, 279a7–b5, with one verse skipped by Śikṣ. at 279b4. Otherwise Category A.

53.14–16 = D 35a7–b1 = D *dkon brtsegs, ga*, 267a4–6, with two omissions, only the first of which is marked with *de bzhin du sbyar te = peyālam*. Category B.

175.17–176.2 = D 99a1–2 = Unidentified. The Sanskrit appears to be an *anuṣṭubh* stanza, but Tibetan translates as prose, as does the Chinese of the Śikṣ., *Dasheng jipusaxue lun* 大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (xxxii) 110a21–24. The closest I find in the sūtra is at D *dkon brtsegs, ga*, 288b5 ff., but while it does contain the

²⁷ The sūtra is cited in the *Bodhimārgadīpapañjikā* (Sherburne 2000: 254–255), but the cited passage is not found in the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya* (in the sūtra it is at 167b1).

²⁸ Although this text is cited in both the *Bodhipathapradīpa* and *Bodhimārgadīpapañjikā* (Eimer 1978: 116–119; Sherburne 2000: 178–179), it does not appear in the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya*.

relevant names, this is not what we find in the Sanskrit. The second part also does not correspond, but see D *dkon brtsegs, ga*, 290b3–4, also in prose.²⁹

Mahāsūtrasamuccaya:

§ 37.8 = D 197b3–5 = D *dkon brtsegs, ga*, 267b3–4. Category B.

16. *Pitāputrasamāgama*, Tōh. 60.

Sūtrasamuccaya:

23.13–24.3 = D 155b2–5 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga* 29b4–30a2. Category C.

124.12–125.10 = D 188a7–b4 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 30a3–b5. Massive omissions, but the text of the sūtra which remains is quoted exactly, thus Category A.

125.11–14 = D 188b5 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 33a1–2. Category B.

144.9–146.13 = D 195a1–b4 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 129a2–b4, Category B, with two interesting points. First, the passage at 146.1–2, *rlung gis gtor ba'i tshe yang lhang ma cung zad kyang mi mngon par 'gyur te*, appears to be a gloss, absent in the sūtra as we have it (129b2), and second, the entire end of the passage, 146.9–13, seems to be a brief summary of what is in the sūtra an extended treatment.

Śikṣāsamuccaya:³⁰

181.12–182.16 = D 102a1–b5 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 79b5–80b3. At 182.1 = 102a5 the *pe[yālam]* is duly translated with *de bzhin du sbyar te*, but the translators did not skip anything from the source sūtra. Category A.

244.11–256.3 = D 134a5–142b3 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 127b3–128a2, abbreviated (in Śikṣ. 134b3) until sūtra 128a4. At 134b4 *de bzhin du sbyar* skips 128a5–6, and again in the same line of Śikṣ., *la sogs pa* skips from 128a7 to 128b2. Then

134b4–136a4 = 128b2–129b7, after which Śikṣ. has *de bzhin du sbyar*, skipping until 130a2.

136b7 skip from 130b4 to 130b5 with omission of number sequence, and then repeatedly quotes a few words, only to skip a whole line or more, and repeats this until 131a3, again then skipping two sentences at 131a3–4.

29 Harrison 2018: 234 offers important notes on the passage, and adds in a personal communication: “Note that Bendall left out an *anusvāra*, turning two names into one: *jñānottaraprabhāketuṃ*, [for what the manuscript reads as] *jñānottaraṃ prabhāketuṃ*. Observe there is no *iti* at the end.” Harrison considers this Category C, but in cases where Śāntideva’s presentation is so far from its putative source, I wonder if even this might be misleading, since it might not really correspond at all.

30 Much of the material is repeated in the *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā* of Prajñākaramati, which, as is well known, borrows heavily from the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. See for the first passage *ad* vi.14 (La Vallée

137a3	<i>zhes bya ba snga ma bzhin no</i> indicates a skip of only a single clause (131a7).
137a5	<i>la sogs pa'o</i> indicates a skip of one line 131b2–3.
137b7	<i>la sogs pa'o</i> indicates only the omission of a single sentence (131b5). This usage, along with <i>la sogs pa snga ma bzhin no</i> , continues throughout the passage, with typical skips of one to one and a half lines.
139b1	with <i>de bzhin du sbyar te Śiḱṣ.</i> skips from 134a5 to 134a7, offering what may be intended as a summary of the skipped material: <i>chos thams cad ni rlom sems dang bral ba'o</i> .
139b3	<i>la sogs pa</i> skips a single sentence at 134b3, and the same again soon thereafter.
139b7	there is a similar skip of two lines 135a2 to the very end of a3 with only <i>bzhin no</i> .
141a4	with <i>bzhin no</i> there is a skip from 136b1 to 137a1.
141b2	<i>la sogs pa snga ma bzhin no</i> indicates a skip from 137a5 to b6.
141b6–7	in the sūtra 138a4. Śiḱṣ. follows <i>la sogs pa snga ma bzhin no</i> with what seems to be a summary, <i>de bzhin du dri la sogs pa la yang rnam pa gsum gsum du rig par bya'o</i> , after which <i>de bzhin du sbyar te</i> points to a skip to 151b1. One sentence (<i>de la 'khor los sgyur ba'i rgyal po grags pa mtha' yas kyi gtam rgyud las mtho ris nas lung ste de'i tshe rgyal po chen po dang grong khyer pas bskor ba las 'di skad 'byung ste</i>) at 142a3 apparently represents, without any other indication, all material from 151b3 to 155a6, where the exact quotation resumes.
142b1	= 155b3, there is an unmarked jump to 155b5.
142b2	again unmarked, a jump from 155b5 to 165b7.
142b3	the passage ends with <i>zhes bya ba la sogs pa'o</i> = 166a1.

Poussin 1901–1914: 177.1–13 = Śiḱṣ 181.12–182.6, with a slight abridgement), for the second *ad* IX.88 (La Vallée Poussin 1901–1914: 508.7–511.2), only partial, and so on. I do not further note overlap between the Śiḱṣāsamuccaya and *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā*.

Throughout the passage there are a number of spots at which the Tibetan translation of Śiḱṣ contains a sentence or two not found in the Sanskrit as we have it (see the notes in Goodman 2016: 403–407). The passages cited are, however, Category A.

- 256.4–8 = D 142b3–7 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 60b3–61a1. A number of terms omitted in Skt. without indication are quoted from the sūtra, which is overall quoted verbatim. Category B.
- 256.9–18 = D 142b7–143a2 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 61b5–7. Category A.
- 257.1–8 = D 143a2–6 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 63b2–64a5. At 143a4 = 63b3–4 there is a slight unmarked abbreviation, and at 143a5–6 there appears to be no more than a summary of 63b3–64a4, then a small skip until the final sentence. Category A.
- 257.9–14 = D 143a7–b4 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 66b4–68b7, with skip at 143b1 from 66b5 to 67a1, another skip 67a2–3; at 143b3 skip from 67a3 to 68b6. What is quoted is Category A.
- 257.19–259.8 = D 143b5–144a6 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 73a4–74a1, after the first verse Śiḱṣ. skips two verses, quotes a further two, then skips two, quotes 3 and skips two and a half, then continuing until the end. Occasional lines are translated differently, but almost all are verbatim. As an example of a difference, Skt. 258.10 reads *vimṛṣatu yathā yaṣṭi te 'nga śūnyās tathā tvaya dṛṣṭa maharṣi sarva-dharmāḥ*, which Śiḱṣ. 144a1–2 has as 'ja' 'drar yan lag de dag stong pa nyid || *drang srong che khyod de bzhin chos kun gzigs* ||, while the sūtra 73b3–4 has *nam mkha'i 'ja' bzhin khyod gyis yan lag stong || drang srong chen pos de bzhin chos kun gzigs* ||. Category B.
- 259.9–261.4 = D 144a7–b5 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 81a4–82b4. At 144b3 = 81a7 Śiḱṣ. skips to 81b2 (end), agreeing with Skt. 260.7–8. After one verse, a skip to 82b3, then two more verses. Category A.
- 261.4–9 = D 144b5–145a2 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 86a3–87b2. 144b5–7 = 86a3–4; 144b7–145a2 = 87a6–87b2. Category A.
- 261.11–14 = D 145a2–3 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 110b3 (first verse), then a skip of 11 feet (thus oddly not three verses in total!), then second verse at 110b5. What is cited is Category A.
- 261.15–262.11 = D 145a4–145b1 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 50a7–51b3. Although Bendall considers the initial portion of the passage prose, both the Tibetan of the Śiḱṣ. and the sūtra source consider it verse.³¹ I have not been able to identify a metre in Sanskrit. From 145a4–5 = 50a7–b1, identical. The first half of the next verse is rendered differently.³² After one further verse, the source jumps to 50b7, quotes one verse, then jumps to 51b1, continuing to 51b3. There are a number of instances of entirely different metrical feet. Category B.

31 See Wogihara 1904–1906: 215.

32 I cite this only as an example, for there are a number of others as well: Śiḱṣ. 145a5: *dper na rang bzhin stong pa yi || me long dkyil 'khor yongs dag la || gzugs brnyan snang ba de bzhin du || ljon pa chos rnamshes par gyis* ||. From the Sūtra 50b1: *me long shin tu yongs dag la || ji ltar rang bzhin med pa yi || gzugs brnyan snang ba de bzhin du || ljon pa chos rnamshes par gyis* ||. This is equivalent to Skt. 261.18–262.1: *yat svabhāvasūnyam ādarśamaṇḍale supariśuddhe saṃdṛṣyate pratibimban̄ tathaiva druma jānīhī-mān dharmān*. If this is metrical, I cannot identify its metre.

Mahāsūtrasamuccaya:

No quotations.

18. Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā, Tōh. 62.*Sūtrasamuccaya:*

No quotations.

Śikṣāsamuccaya:

54.17–55.2 = D 36a3–4 = Finot 20.5–8 = Ensink 79.9–16. Category A.

153.2–5 = D 86b1–2 = Finot 35.19–20 = Ensink 95.33–36. Category C.

196.1–6 = D 109b2–3 = Finot 13.4–9 = Ensink 72.3–14. Although with small variations, basically Category A.

203.9–10 = D 114a7–b1 = Finot 18.15–16 = Ensink 77.17–20. Category A.

318.5–322.4 = D 171b4–173a4 = Finot 50.9–53.18 = Ensink 113.1–116.32. Category A.

Mahāsūtrasamuccaya:

§ 3.3 = D 12b6–13a1 = Finot 17.3–7 = Ensink 75.25–33. Category B.

§ 8.9 = D 59a1–5 = Finot 31.1–12 = Ensink 91.5–28. Category A.

§ 11.4 = D 71a3–b4 = Finot 35.11–36.14 = Ensink 95.17–96.28. Category A.

§ 13.2 = D 78a4–b1 = Finot 17.8–17 = Ensink 76.1–20. Category A.

§ 15.1 = D 83a7–84a3 = Finot 31.13–33.6 = Ensink 91.29–93.24. Category A.

§ 32.2 = D 162b6–7 = Unidentified.

19. Ugrapariṣcchā, Tōh. 63.*Sūtrasamuccaya:*³³

51.11–52.3 = D 165a3–5 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 260a7–b2 (Nattier 5A). See Śikṣ.

267.12–13, 144.5–6. Category A.

33 This has now been found in Sanskrit, edited in Wang et al. 2020: 81 (I quote the text as given by the editors): *ugrapariṣcchāsūtre coktam | iha gr̥hapate gr̥hī bodhisatvo 'gāramadhyāva satpuruṣakarmāṇi karotī | na kāpuruṣakarmāṇi | dharmeṇa bhogān paryeṣate | nādharṇeṇa | samena | na viṣameṇa | samyāgājīvo bhavati | na mithyājīvaḥ | parān aviheṭṭhayan sa tebhya dharmapratilabdhebhya bhāgebhyaḥ | anityasamjñābhāvanākuṣalaḥ | sārām ādadāti | yad uta tyāgayan vṛhīhāyan mātṛāpitṛñām upasthānena putrabhāryādāsīdāsakarmakarapauruṣeyāñām samyagparipālanena mitrāmātyajñāti-sālohitānā(m) satkāreṇa uttari ca dharmāni yojanāya. Péter Szántó will shortly publish newly available Sanskrit materials from this sūtra, including a revision of this passage.*

Note that the relation between this newly available passage and the material in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* is not entirely straightforward. The latter reads (I cite the manuscript, but in Bendall 1897–1902: 267.12–13): 117a3: *iha gr̥hapate gr̥hī bodhisatvo dharmeṇa bhogān paryeṣate | nādharṇeṇa | samena |*

Śikṣāsamuccaya:

- 19.1–7 = D 14a1–6 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 264b7–265a4 (Nattier 10A–B). At Skt. 19.2 = 14a2 two expressions found in the Kanjur at 264b7 do not appear. At 19.6 two expressions found in Skt. are missing in Śikṣ. Tib. and in the sūtra. Otherwise, Category A.
- 19.8–17 = D 14a6–b5 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 269a3–b2 (Nattier 14A–C).³⁴ At the end of Skt. 19.13 the text, without indication, skips what is in Nattier 14B, but the Tib. trans. follows the sūtra in quoting without skipping anything. Otherwise Category A.
- 19.17–20.9 = D 14b5–15a4 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 269b4–270a3 (Nattier 14E–15B). Category A.
- 37.7–12 = D 26b1–4 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 283b2–5 (Nattier 26C). Śikṣ. in the Derge edition uses an archaic spelling *tshogs stsogs pa* (26b2), but Peking (32a8) has *tshogs sogs pa*. Śikṣ. skips several clauses in the sūtra, and especially at the end is an entirely different rendering. Category B and C.
- 78.7–13 = D 49b3–6 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 261b6–262a2 (Nattier 7A). Almost all Category A, but with some variations, perhaps indicative of an attempt to reflect the Skt.
- 78.14–16 = D 49b6–7 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 267a1–2 (Nattier 13B). With slight abbreviation of wording, Category B.
- 78.17 = D 49b7–50a1 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 267b5–6 (Nattier 13M). Tibetan differs from Skt., but Śikṣ. Tib. follows the sūtra. (See Nattier 2003: 257–258n322.) Category A.
- 78.17–18 = D 50a1 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 268a7–b1 (Nattier 13X). Category A.
- 120.3–5 = D 69a2–3 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 262a3–4 (Nattier 7A). Category A.
- 120.5–6 = 69a3–4 = *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 278b5 (Nattier 25B). This equivalence was evidently overlooked by Nattier (2003: 291n548). Category A.
- 131.10–12 = D 75b2 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 277b7–278a1 (Nattier 24B). The Śikṣ. Tib. trans., the sūtra, and the Śikṣ. Skt. all differ from each other. Category C.
- 136.1–7 = D 77a1–5 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 277a6–b2 (Nattier 24A). Both Tib. versions contain a clause missing in Skt. With only slight editing, Category A.
- 144.1–4 = D 81a2 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 260b5, 6 (Nattier 5B, C) *shin tu brtags te las byed pa dang = susamikṣitakarmakāritā; legs par bya ba'i las byed pa = sukṛtakarmakārita*. Category A, but entirely extracted from the context. (Not previously identified.)
- 144.5–6 = D 81a4 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 260b1 (Nattier 5A). Category A.

na viṣameṇa | samyagājīvo bhavati na viṣamājīva iti |. Then: 71a4–6 (Bendall 144.5–8): *putrabhāryādāsī-dāsakarma*_[5]*karapauruṣeyāṇāṃ samyakparibhogeneti |* [Then Śāntideva's own words:] *tathā svapara-bodhipakṣaśrutādyanta-* (margin: *jīvitaparikṣārasvāpi tyāgo na kāryaḥ | kāryavyagrātāyā atyāgo pi na kāryaḥ*)-*rāyakarau tyāgātyāgau na kāryau | adhikasatvārthaśaktes* (margin: *svārthena*) *tulyaśakter vā bodhisatvasyādhikatulyakuśalāntarāyakarau tyāgā-* (margin: *anantaroktau*) *-tyāgau na kāryāv iti si-ddham bhava*_[6]*tīti |*.

34 See Wogihara 1904–1906: 97–98.

- 145.10 = D 82a1 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 260b6 (Nattier 5C). Category B.
- 147.20 = D 83b4–5 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 275a5 (Nattier 20G). Category A.
(Misidentified by Nattier 2003: 245n242 as belonging to 11G5.)
- 180.1–6 = D 101a2–5 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 266a5–b1 (Nattier 12A). At 180.3 the Skt. has *praharṣitavyām*, which the sūtra (266a6) has as *dga' bar yang mi bya*, but which Śikṣ. Tib. (Derge 101a3, Peking 118a8) omits. There are several other variations as well. Category B.
- 180.14 = D 101a6–7 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 260b5 (Nattier 5B). Category B.
- 196.7–8 = D 109b5–6 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 279a5–6 (Nattier 25E). Category A.
- 198.1–6 = D 110b2–3 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 298b3–5 (Nattier 25A). Category A.
- 198.6–19 = D 110b4–111a5 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 279b1–280a4 (Nattier 25F). Category A.
- 198.19–21 = D 111a5–6 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 280b2 (Nattier 25H). Category A.
- 198.21–199.2 = D 111a6–b2 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 280b2–5 (Nattier 25H). Category A.
Although Śikṣ. Tib. has *de bzhin du sbyar te* between this and the previous section, and Śikṣ. Skt. has no equivalent for what is almost a line in Tibetan, Śikṣ. Tib., while meant to be a trans. of Śikṣ. Skt., actually contains all text found in the sūtra in the Kanjur. That is, Śikṣ. Tib., while blindly copying the indication of an omission, in fact omits nothing.
- 199.2–3 = D 111b2–3 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 280b6–7 (Nattier 25I). Category A.
- 199.3–12 = D 111b3–112a4 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 280b7–281b2 (Nattier 25J). Although Śikṣ. has *de bzhin du sbyar te* between this and the previous section, it does not omit any text from the sūtra, although Śikṣ. Skt. itself indeed omits what is almost a line in Tibetan. Tib. adds three lines from the sūtra which are not in Skt. as we have it. It seems that the translators rendered *pe[yāla]*, but then did not apply the abbreviation when they took over the Kanjur text. Category A.
- 199.12–15 = D 112a4–5 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 282b7–283a1 (Nattier 25M). Category A.
- 199.15–200.6 = D 112a5–b3 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 283a2–6 (Nattier 26A–B). Category A.
- 200.7–11 = D 112b3–5 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 278b1–3 (Nattier 24E). Category A.
- 267.12–13 = D 147b7–148a1 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 260a7 (Nattier 5A). Category A.
- 271.9–11 = D 149b6–7 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 262a5–6 (Nattier 7A). Category A.
- 315.14–15 = D 159a4 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 270b2 (Nattier 16B). Category C.

Mahāsūtrasamuccaya:³⁵

- § 0.2 = D 2b7–3a1 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 274b4 (Nattier 20E). Category B.
- § 1.10 = D 5b4–7 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 273b7–274a3 (Nattier 20A). Category C.
- § 16.3 = D 89b3–92a3 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 271a7–273b7 (Nattier 18B–19U). Category A, with only a small number of differences.

35 The same sūtra is cited by Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna in the *Bodhimārgadīpapañjikā* (Sherburne 2000: 88–89), but the passage cited there does not correspond to anything quoted in the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya*.

§ 17.8 = D 94b1–95a7 = 320a5 = D *dkon brtsegs, nga*, 276a5–277a5 (Nattier). Category A.

21. *Bhadramāyākāravāyākaraṇa*, Tōh. 65.

Sūtrasamuccya:

154.13–20 = D 198a5–7 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 30b4–5 = Régamey 1938: 44 (§ 105). Category C.

Śikṣāsamuccaya:

No quotations.

Mahāsūtrasamuccaya:

No quotations.

23. *Maitreyamahāsimhanāda*, Tōh. 67.

Sūtrasamuccaya:

35.22–36.12 = D 159b4–7 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 86b6–87a6. Category C.
 112.6–14 = D 184a5–7 = constructed out of separate portions, D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 103b1: *sangs rgyas su 'du shes pa la ni sangs rgyas mthong ba yang med na mchod pa'i las lta smos kyang ci dgos te de ni gnas med do || gzhan yang de bzhin gshegs pa mchod par 'dod pas ni bdag nyid mchod par bya'o ||*; 103b6: *de ltar na de bzhin gshegs pa mchod par 'gyur ro || gang 'du shes dang | mtshan ma skyed par mi byed pa de ni de bzhin gshegs pa mchod pa yin no ||*; 104a2: *gang la sems med pa dang | sems las byung ba'i chos rnams med pa dang ||*; 104a5–6: *gang sangs rgyas su 'du shes mi 'jug pa dang | chos su ma yin | dge 'dun du ma yin | gang zag tu ma yin | bdag tu ma yin | gzhan du ma yin pa de ni de bzhin gshegs pa mchod pa yin no ||*. Otherwise, Category A.

Śikṣāsamuccaya:

No quotations.

Mahāsūtrasamuccaya:

§ 1.2 = D 3a5–6 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 90a1–3. Category C.

§ 1.11 = D 5b7–6b2 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 81a1–b3. Category A.

§ 2.5 = D 10a1–11a2 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 78a6–79a5. Mostly Category A/B, with some significant variations.

§ 3.4 = D 13a2–16a4 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 70b5–73b7. Category A.

- § 6.2 = D 34b4–35b2 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 86b3–87b1. (See § 11.7, below). Category A.
 § 10.1 = D 67b4–7 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 73b2–6. Category A.
 § 11.7 = D 72a3–5 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 86b3–86b6 (see § 6.2, above). Category A.
 § 21.5 = D 112b6–113b3 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 90b3–91b1. Category A.
 § 21.6 = D 113b3–116a7 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 96b1–97b1 (114a7, noted with *zhes gsungs pa na*), 103a2–105b6 (115b4), 107b5–108a4 (116a2), 108b2–109a1. Category A.
 § 21.7 = D 116b1–7 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 113b6–114a6. Category A.
 § 29.13 = D 156b1–5 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 84a7–b4. Category A.

24. *Vinayaviniścaya/Upāliparipṛcchā*, Tōh. 68.

Sūtrasamuccaya:

No quotations.

Śikṣāsamuccaya:

- 164.9–11 = D 92a1–2 = Python § 42 (49.11–18) = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 126a2–3. Category B/C.
 164.12–14 = D 92a2–3 = Python § 42 (49.18–24) = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 126a3–5. Category C.
 164.14–15 = D 92a3 = Python § 43 (50.9–15) = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 126a7–b1. Category C.
 164.16–165.1 = D 92a5–6 = Python § 43 (50.16–51.6) = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 126b2–3. Category C.
 168.15–16 = D 94b2 = Python § 21 (31.6–9) = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 119b4. Category A (Harrison B).
 168.16–171.4 = D 94b2–96a3 = Python § 22–28 (31.21–37.16) = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 119b7–121b3. Harrison 2018: 232 classifies this section as “Category B for the most part ... with one substantial piece of Category A.” He seems to refer to the section in Python § 23. While some parts may indeed be B, I would classify much, though not all, of the rest somewhat closer to Category C.
 171.4–6 = D 96a4–5 = Python § 32 (39.16–21) = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 122b3–5. Harrison categorized this passage as Category B, but I would classify it as Category C.
 178.9–16 = D 100a3–b2 = Python § 39 (44.15–45.21) = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 124a7–b7. Category C.

Mahāsūtrasamuccaya:

- § 1.14 = D 7a5–b3 = Python § 20 (30.16–31.3) = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 119a4–b1. Category A.
 § 35.1 = D 170a6–b4 = Python § 20 (30.16–31.3) = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 119a4–b1. Category A.

25. *Adhyāsayasaṁcodana*, Tōh. 69.*Sūtrasamuccaya*:

- 95.3–9 = D 178b3–4 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 144b7–145a3, with very substantial abbreviations. Category B.
- 95.13–96.16 = D 178b5–179a3 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 150a4–b5, with significant omissions. Category B.
- 98.24–99.15 = D 179b7–180a3 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 142a6–142b7? There are very substantial omissions and I am not certain where the passage is meant to end. Category B. See Śikṣ. 105.3–106.10 and *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya* § 11.3.

Śikṣāsamuccaya:

- 15.13–22 = D 11b5–12a2, = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 139a7–b2, 139b3–7. Category B.
- 97.19–99.2 = D 59b7–60b1 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 133b1–134b4. Two sentences skipped with *de bzhin du sbyar te* at 60a6–7. Although some small differences from Skt., Category A.
- 104.9–16 = D 62b3–5 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 135a1–5. Category A, with an abbreviation at 62b5 of *zhes bya ba snga ma bzhin no*.
- 104.17–105.3 = D 62b6–63a1 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 141b3–6. Category A. Despite *de bzhin du sbyar te* at 62b6, in fact no text is skipped.
- 105.3–106.10 = D 63a1–b7 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 142a5–143a7. Category A, with only a few variations, and one clause omitted by Śikṣ.
- 106.11–108.4 = D 63b7–64a5 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 143b6–144b2. Category A, but skipping a verse at Śikṣ. Skt. 107.10 = 64a4 = 144a3, then after a single verse, skipping six verses at 144a4–b1.
- 108.6–111.4 = D 64a6–65a1 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 145a7–146a4. Category B, with some variants and skipping a verse at 64b4 = 145b6, two verses skipped with *de bzhin du sbyar te* at 64b6.
- 111.6–112.11 = D 65a1–7 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 146b7–147b6. Category B, with omission of two verses at 65a3 = 147a6–b1, and one with *de bzhin du sbyar te* at 65a6 = 147b4.
- 112.13–113.14 = D 64b7–65b4 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 149a4–b6. Category A, with omission of two verses with *de bzhin du sbyar te* at 65b3 = 149a6–b1, then the last six verses at 65b4 = 149b2–6.
- 113.15–114.12 = D 65b4–66a7 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 149b6–150b6. Category B and C. Omissions with *de bzhin du sbyar te* of five sentences at 66a4 = 150a5–b2, and two at 66a5 = 150b3–4.
- 114.14–115.22 = D 66a7–b5 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 151b6–152a7. Category B/C, with a verse omitted with *de bzhin du sbyar te* at 66b7 = 151b6–7, three at 66b4 = 152a4–6.
- 116.1–5 = D 66b5–7 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 135a5–b1. Category A.
- 351.1–8 = D 189a5–b1 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 135b1–7. Category B, some grammatical changes and other variations.

Mahāsūtrasamuccaya:³⁶

- § 2.4 = D 9a5–10a1 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 132b4–133a7. Category A.
 § 7.3 = D 48a2–b6 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 149b6–150b3. Category A.
 § 11.3 = D 70a2–71a3 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 142a3–143a7. Category A. Substantially overlaps with Śikṣ. 105.3–106.10 and see *Sūtrasamuccaya* 98.24–99.15
 § 25.4 = D 114b1–3 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 135a3–5. Category A. Substantially overlaps with Śikṣ. 104.14–16.

28. *Vīradattagrhapatipariṣcchā*, Tōh. 72*Sūtrasamuccaya*:

- 28.20–29.9 = D 157a5–b1 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 195b7–196a4, which is, with considerable flexibility, the text until 29.6, after which the *Sūtrasamuccaya* paraphrases continuing text. Category B.
 71.17–72.12 = D 171a7–b4 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 197b4–198a1, Category A with a few vocabulary differences.
 72.15–73.6 = D 171b4–7 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 198a7–b2 Category A.

Śikṣāsamuccaya:

- 34.16–17 = D 25a2 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 198a6–7. Category C.
 230.10–232.5 = D 129a2–b6 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 197a2–6, then at 129a6 with *de bzhin du sbyar te* skip one line (but a line is skipped earlier without any indication), and the same is repeated several times, until *yang gsungs pa* at 129b2 signals a jump from 197b3 to 198a7, in Sanskrit 231.8, the beginning of the verse portion, continuing to 129b4 = 198b2, after which without indication the text jumps to 198b7, skipping again, in the middle of a sentence, to 199a2–3, without indication. Immediately thereafter with *de bzhin du sbyar te* the text skips to 199b1, then abbreviating the text for the next few lines, following this with (129b6) *zhes te rgya cher ni de nyid las shes par bya'o*, which closes the citation at 199b3. Category B.

Mahāsūtrasamuccaya:

- § 29.14 = D 156b5–7 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 202b3–5. Category A.
 § 30.2 = D 157b5–6 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 202b5–6.³⁷ Category A.

36 The sūtra is cited in the *Bodhimārgadīpapañjikā* (Sherburne 2000: 178–179, 194–199), but the cited passages are not found in the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya*, save for a small part (Sherburne 2000: 198–199) in § 7.3.

37 The second verse here is also quoted in the *Bodhipathapradīpa* of Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna (Eimer 1978: 110 and 111 note). However, the two additional verses (Eimer 1978: 112, 113 note) quoted in the same place are not found in the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya*.

29. *Udayanavatsarājaparipṛcchā*, Tōh. 73.

Sūtrasamuccaya:

54.15–55.22 = D 166a2–b1 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 207b7–208b4. A drastic abbreviation, virtually a summary. Category C.

56.1–23 = D 166b1–6 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 210a1–7. Again, a drastic abbreviation, virtually a summary. Category C.

Śikṣāsamuccaya:

80.13–82.14 = D 50b5–51a7 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 212a6–215a7. Category C. The relation between Śikṣ. and the sūtra as we have it is far from clear here. The sūtra has 75 verses in full, while the Śikṣ. quotes something like 15 in this section, continuing in the next section (83.1–19). The two translations appear to be based on considerably different Vorlagen.

82.15–21 = D 51a7–b3 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 211b6–212a4. Category B.

83.1–19 = D 51b3–52a1 = D *dkon brtsegs*, ca, 215a2–7. My provisional estimate of the identification of the verses sees the second section begin with what I number as verse 69. Category C.

Mahāsūtrasamuccaya:

No quotations.

37. *Simhaparipṛcchā*, Tōh. 81.

Sūtrasamuccaya:

No quotations.

Śikṣāsamuccaya:³⁸

5.16–17 = D 5a4 = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 28b5–6. Verse 33. The fourth line is different. Category B.

5.18–19 = D 5a4–5 = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 28b6. Category A.

53.6–7 = D 35a5 = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 28a2–3. Verse 16. Category A.

53.9–10 = D 35a6 = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 28b7–29a1. Verse 37. Category A.

53.12–13 = D 35a6–7 = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 29a1. Verse 38. Category A.

Mahāsūtrasamuccaya:

No quotations.

³⁸ For the verse numbers I refer to the forthcoming reedition of the sūtra by Péter-Dániel Szántó.

38. *Upāyakaūsalyajñānottarabodhisattvapariṭṭchā*, Tōh. 82.

Sūtrasamuccaya:

25.21–26.2 = D 156a6–7 = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 32b5–7 (Tatz § 12, p. 26); cf. Tōh. 261 *mdo sde, za*, 284b7–285a2. Category B.

Śikṣāsamuccaya:

66.9–14 = D 43a2–5 = (Tatz § 22, p. 30) = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 34b6–35a2. Category B/C. Either it is a different rendering which happens to appear similar, or a considerably different version of the same translation. In any event, rather different.

165.5–9 = D 92a7–b2 = (Tatz § 45, pp. 37–38) = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 39b2–6. Category C. Although there is some relation between the versions, they are very different.

167.3–7 = D 93b2–3 = (Tatz § 33, p. 34) = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 37b3–5. Category C.

167.7–10 = D 93b3–5 = (Tatz § 35, pp. 34–35) = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 37b7–38a1. Category C.

167.11–13 = D 93b5–6 = (Tatz § 30, p. 33) = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 37a1–3. Category C.

167.14–20 = D 93b6–94a3 = (Tatz § 20, p. 29) = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 34a7–b5. Category C.

168.4–10 = D 94a5–7 = (Tatz § 57, pp. 44–45) = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 43a2–4, 6–7. Category C.

Mahāsūtrasamuccaya:

No quotations.

43. **Kāśyapaparivarta*, Tōh. 87.

Sūtrasamuccaya:

22.19–23.3 = D 155a6–b1 = Staël-Holstein § 90.³⁹ Category A/B.

23.3–10 = D 155b–2 = Staël-Holstein § 88 (including a sentence not in the extant Sanskrit). Category A.

Śikṣāsamuccaya:

52.12–15 = D 34b7–35a1 = Staël-Holstein § 3. Category A, with some slight variations.

52.16–53.4 = D 35a1–4 = Staël-Holstein § 4. Category A, but with inversion of one clause.

39 Although Staël-Holstein 1926 is no longer the standard edition of the Sanskrit, its numbering remains standard and is thus quoted here.

- 53.18 = D = 35b1 = Staël-Holstein § 24, 25. The quotation includes one clause from § 24, and then jumps to the last word of § 25. Category A.
- 54.11–15 = D 36a1–3 = Staël-Holstein § 11. Slight rewording which brings the Tibetan more closely into line with the Sanskrit of Śikṣ. Category A.
- 55.3–5 = D 36a5–6 = Staël-Holstein § 6. The sūtra Tib. trans. agrees more closely with the Skt. in Śikṣ. than that in the single manuscript used for Staël-Holstein's edition. The Śikṣ Tib. is close to but not entirely identical with the sūtra. Nevertheless, very close to Category A.
- 146.4–5 = D 82a7–b1 = Staël-Holstein § 15. While the quotation is abbreviated, it is Category A.
- 148.8–12 = D 84a1–2 = Staël-Holstein § 5. Category A.
- 196.11–14 = D 109b6–110a1 = Staël-Holstein § 128. Category A.
- 233.15–234.18 = D 130b4–131b2 = Staël-Holstein § 97–102. At 130b7 Śikṣ. reflects Skt. *pe[yālam]*, noticing the omission of one item, with *de bzhin du sbyar te*, but in fact skips no text. However, at the next instance at 131a2, the same correctly reflects the omission of several items. At 131a5 a phrase is skipped without note, and in fact while the whole section § 100 is rather different in Śikṣ., this difference is not reflected in the Tib. trans. which closely follows the sūtra translation. There are other instances demonstrating this reliance on the sūtra without adjustment to conform to Śikṣ., at least as far as we can tell from the single available Skt. manuscript of that text. Category B.

Mahāsūtrasamuccaya:⁴⁰

- § 11.10 = D 72b1–7 = Staël-Holstein § 111–114. Category A. Note that in contrast to the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, here the verses of the sūtra are also quoted.
- § 14.1 = D 78b5–79b7 = Staël-Holstein § 121–125. Category A.
- § 29.11 = D 155b7–156a4 = Staël-Holstein § 84, 88. Category A. The citations of the two sections are separated by *zhes gsungs pa na*. Here the verse in § 88 is not included.
- § 31.4 = D 161b2–5 = Staël-Holstein § 3. Category A, with only the addition of *mkhan po* before *slob dpon*.

44. *Ratnarāśi*, Tōh. 88.

Sūtrasamuccaya:

No quotations (but see part 3, below).

40 The sūtra is cited by Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna in the *Bodhimārgadīpapañjikā* (Sherburne 2000: 100–101, 298–299), the first part of which corresponds to *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya* § 31.4, though it continues also into the next section of the sūtra. The second passage does not appear in the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya*, but corresponds to *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 55.3–5.

Śikṣāsamuccaya:

- 55.8–57.10 = D 36a7–37b3 = Silk § IV.2–17 (D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 163a4–168b5). Śikṣ. omits some vocatives found in the sūtra. In a number of places, although Śikṣ. Skt. omits material, if Skt. does not have *pe[yālam]*, Śikṣ. Tib. does not have *de bzhin du sbyar te*, and simply continues the quotation from the sūtra. In quite a number of other cases, however, the trans. is adjusted to reflect the text found in the Skt., sometimes whole sentences being different. Category B.
- 128.3–129.15 = D 73b2–74b1 = Silk § V.11–15 (D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 167b3–168b3). There is one skipped sentence duly noted with *de bzhin du sbyar te*, and several places where the text has been adjusted slightly to conform to the Skt., otherwise Category A.
- 129.16–130.15 = D 74b1–75a2 = Silk § VI.2–5 (D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 170a2–b4). Two omissions duly marked with *de bzhin du sbyar te*. Category A.
- 130.15–131.9 = D 75a2–b2 = Silk § VI.9–12 (D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 171a3–b3). One omission duly marked with *de bzhin du sbyar te*. Category A.
- 136.10–14 = D 77a5–7 = Silk § I.9 (D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 155a1–3). One difference, *ekajvālibhūta* rendered *me lce gcig tu gyur* rather than the sūtra's *mer gyur*, otherwise Category A. Note that this and the following reference appear in the sūtra itself in reverse order.
- 136.9–10 = D 77a5 = Silk § I.8 (D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 154b7–155a1). Category A.
- 137.17–138.211 = D 77b7–78a6 = Silk § I.14–16 (D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 155b7–156b1). In § I.14 Śikṣ. Tib. has *de nas 'khor de nyid nas* agreeing with *atha tasyām eva parṣadi*, in contrast to the sūtra's *bstan pa 'di bshad pa na*. There is also an added *bcom ldan 'das* agreeing with Skt. *bhagavan*, not found in the sūtra, and elsewhere similar small omissions of vocatives *'od srungs* and *dge slong dag*. Otherwise Category A.
- 200.12–201.11 = D 112b5–113a5 = Silk § V.17–21 (D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 168b4–169b3). Several omissions are duly marked with *de bzhin du sbyar te*, but one sentence at the end of § V.19, before the marked omission of all of § V.20, is included in the Tib. of Śikṣ., even though omitted in Skt. On the other hand, most of § V.21 is missing in the Tib. of Śikṣ., even though it is found in Skt. Where the text is found, however, it belongs to Category A.
- 201.12–19 = D 113a5–7 = Silk § V.5–6 (D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 166b1–6). Category A.

*Mahāsūtrasamuccaya:*⁴¹

- § 3.6 = D 16b3–17b1 = Silk § II.19–24 (D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 158a1–b5). In § II.19, there are only small differences, but with § II.20–24 we get an entirely different translation. Category C.
- § 7.2 = D 45a2–48a2 = Silk § IV.1–21, the entire chapter (D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 163a2–166a1), with a small number of trivial differences. Category A.

⁴¹ Note that the sūtra is cited in every instance here as *'Od srungs kyis zhus pa*, a Tibetan rendering we would expect to be equivalent to **Kāśyapaparipṛcchā* (generally known as the **Kāśyapaparivarta*), not *Ratnarāśi*.

§ 9.2 = D 65b5–66b1 = Silk § III.1–5 (D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 158b5–159b1). Category A.

§ 9.4 = D 67a2–b4 = Silk § III.11–12 (D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 160a5–b7). Category A.

§ 15.2 = D 84a3–85a5 = Silk § VII.17–25 (D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 174b5–175b7). Category A.

For additional passages from the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya*, and for the *Sūtrasamuccaya*, see the discussion below in section 3.

46. *Saptaśatikā nāma prajñāpāramitā*, Tōh. 90

Sūtrasamuccaya:

156.20–157.13 = D 199a3–6 = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 185b3–6. Category B.

Śikṣāsamuccaya:

No quotations.

Mahāsūtrasamuccaya:

No quotations.

47. *Ratnacūḍaparipṛcchā*, Tōh. 91.

Sūtrasamuccaya:

No quotations.

Śikṣāsamuccaya:

120.7–10 = D 69a4–5 = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 239b6–240a1. Category B. The quotation abbreviates the sūtra, but with largely the same vocabulary.

229.13–230.9 = D 128b5–129a2 = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 224a5–225a1. At 129a1 = 224b1, skip until b7, without indication. Otherwise Category A.

232.6–233.5 = D 129b7–130a7 = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 225b4–226a5. Category A. Slight vocabulary differences, but nearly identical.

235.1–8 = D 131b2–6 = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 226b6–227a3. Category A.

235.8–12 = D 131b6–132a1 = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 227b3–4. Category A. At 235.9 Sanskrit prints *pe[yālam]*, and as Bendall (235n5) points out the Tibetan trans. of Śikṣ. and the source sūtra have here two additional similes.

236.13–237.2 = D 132a7–b3 = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 228a6–b1. Generally Category A, with slight variations.

237.3–4 = D 132b3. = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 230a7. Category A.

272.9–273.4 = D 150a7–b7 = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 219a4–222a1. At 150b1 = 219a5 with

merely *de bzhin du* (Skt. *tathā*, 272.10) there is a jump to 220b2. At 150b2, *sbyin pa ma tshang ba med pa nas thabs ma tshang ba med pa'i bar* is given in full at 220b3–4. At 150b4–5, *de bzhin du sbyar te* skips from 220b6 to 221a4. At 150b6 = 221a6 with *rigs kyi bu 'di ni* there is a jump to 221b7, without any indication. Category B. Although much of the citation is verbatim, there is much moving around. Likewise, there is material apparently added from the sūtra not originally in the Śikṣ. citation in Skt.

317.13–17 = D 171a6–b2 = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 234a2–4. One clause skipped at 234a3, otherwise Category A.

Mahāsūtrasamuccaya:

No quotations.

48. *Śrīmālādevīsīmhanāda*, Tōh. 92.

Sūtrasamuccaya:

131.7–11 = D 190b2–3 = (first sentence) D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 264a5 = 6–7 = 264b1, b3 (Tsukinowa 1940: 76).⁴² Category A; (second sentence) 268b7–269a1 (Tsukinowa 1940: 108). Category B.

139.3–7 = D 193a5 = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 263a1–2 (Tsukinowa 1940: 64–66). Category A.

Śikṣāsamuccaya:

42.12–14 = D 30a3–4 = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 258b3–4 (Tsukinowa 1940: 32). Category C.

42.14–43.1 = D 30a4–6 = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 262a6–b1 (Tsukinowa 1940: 60). Category C.

43.1–4 = D 30a6–b1 = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 262b2–4 (Tsukinowa 1940: 62). Category C.

Mahāsūtrasamuccaya:

No quotations.

49. *Rṣiyāsaparipṛcchā*, Tōh. 93.

Sūtrasamuccaya:

No quotations.

42 This passage is in fact quoted in Sanskrit in the *Ratnagotravibhāga* (Johnston 1950: 56.16–17): *nirvāṇam iti bhagavann upāya eṣa tathāgatānām iti*.

Śikṣāsamuccaya:

No quotations.

Mahāsūtrasamuccaya:

§ 32.3 = D 162b7–163a1 = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 281a7. Category C.

§ 35.6 = D 187a4–188a2 = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 282a3–283a1. Category A.

§ 36.3 = D 190b7–192a7 = D *dkon brtsegs, cha*, 280b5–282a3. Category A.

Discussion

What can we conclude from the data above, and what questions does it lead us to ask? Perhaps first of all, with specific regard to the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, which he dealt with nearly exclusively, we notice that our samples fully confirm the conclusions of Harrison (2018: 236), namely that the translators of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* “took a patchwork, *ad hoc* approach to their work, drawing liberally on the achievements of their predecessors.” The very same may be said likewise of the translators of the *Sūtrasamuccaya* and *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya*. However, so far lacking access to Sanskrit texts of these two works (with only a few exceptions for the former), it is harder to explore the question whether the respective translators (of course, we had better say ‘translation teams’) meant, here and there, to adjust their translations to conform to their Sanskrit Vorlagen. We have good reason to believe that an extensive, even if not complete, manuscript of the *Sūtrasamuccaya* exists (thanks to indications in Wang et al. 2020: 60–61), although when it will become available remains unknown, but when the text is further published, the Sanskrit will certainly invite investigation of its relation to its Tibetan translation and the sūtra sources.

It is more than interesting that we can discern no clear overall pattern in the way that even the individual translation teams dealt with their primary source text in the anthology and its relation to the further, ultimate sources of passages in the sūtras. When one simply runs an eye over the categories suggested for each citation, it is obvious that no clear regularities appear. It might, of course, be possible that there is some pattern to be found, especially if instead of sampling, as done here, the entirety of each text would be examined. But this remains a task for the future, and most likely, for more than a single scholar. What is particularly puzzling is that the same anthology translation when quoting the same source scripture is in some places highly congruent with the version of the scripture transmitted in the canonical collections, and yet elsewhere is not. So far I cannot think of any hypothesis to account for this sometimes quite radical variation. Of course, in some cases we can imagine that the translators simply felt that the available translation did not accurately represent the meaning of the text as they understood it, but—again, so far—I have not been able to detect any patterns or regularities in their treatments. As we so often say, more study is needed.

3 Misattributions in the *Sūtrasamuccaya* and Elsewhere

Although I believe that the materials above are, in their own right, valuable and interesting, examination of the Mahāratnakūṭa collection citations in the three anthologies brought up, here and there, unidentified quotations. The list above set aside the most interesting set of examples, and it is to these that we now turn.

A number of quotations attributed to the (or it might be better not to prejudge the case and to say a) *Ratnarāśi* in the *Sūtrasamuccaya* prove not to be found in the extant sūtra, and two of these, identically attributed, occur also in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*.⁴³ The latter fact is perhaps easy to explain, given the strong dependence of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* on the *Sūtrasamuccaya*, though it does raise an interesting question. While it seems that none of the citations in the *Sūtrasamuccaya* attributed to the *Ratnarāśi* are now found there, alongside the two misattributed passages the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* also frequently correctly quotes the sūtra. While it is hard to offer a compelling hypothesis to explain these facts, some possibilities do suggest themselves.

First, it is possible that the author of the *Sūtrasamuccaya* simply made an error in attributing, perhaps from memory, the passages in question to the *Ratnarāśi*, and they had instead another source, though I have so far failed to locate any material parallel to the misattributed passages. However, while this hypothesis might be defensible in the case of the *Sūtrasamuccaya* alone, in which *none* of the passages cited as being from the *Ratnarāśi* in fact belongs to the extant sūtra, it would be harder to make this argument for the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, which does quote much material from the text we know as the *Ratnarāśi*—unless we were to regard Śāntideva as having failed to take the basic step of confirming his source in materials otherwise apparently available to him. It appears, however, that this was precisely the case. I will return to this issue below.

A second possibility is that the *Ratnarāśi* known to the author of the *Sūtrasamuccaya* (and to Śāntideva?) contained the quoted passages, but later they either dropped out of the recension translated into Chinese and Tibetan, or were part of an entirely different recension (or entirely different text under the same title), which has not come down to us. As far as I know, as yet we lack a census of all such unlocatable passages. Be that as it may, at least as far as the present case is concerned, the character of the passages seems (impressionistically, to be sure) of a type rather foreign to the flavor of the known *Ratnarāśi*, which makes the possibility that the compiler knew a version of “our” *Ratnarāśi* which in fact had the passage in question, in my opinion, not very likely. For Asano (1996: 143), the close similarity of the series of quotations in *Sūtrasamuccaya*

43 The absence of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*'s so-called *Ratnarāśi* quotation from the extant Chinese translation of the *Ratnarāśi* was noted by Wogihara 1904–1906: 258. The titles under which the passages are quoted make it quite clear that a text named *Ratnarāśi* is being referred to: the Sanskrit of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* has exactly *Ratnarāśisūtra*, all Tibetan versions *Rin po che'i phung po'i mdo*, and the ninth century Chinese translations of both *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and *Sūtrasamuccaya* have 寶積經. Only the last could be considered at all problematic, as it is also used to render *Ratnakūṭa*. The **Kāśyapaparivarta* is often cited in Chinese by this name. But by the ninth century in China the *Ratnarāśi* was of course known as part of the Mahāratnakūṭa collection, and there can be little question that *Ratnarāśi* is in fact intended here. I noted the *Sūtrasamuccaya* and *Śikṣāsamuccaya* passages in Silk 1994: 693–702.

chapter 8 and *Śikṣāsamuccaya* chapter 17 suggests that since the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* also contains a number of passages in fact found in the present *Ratnarāśi*, it drew both directly from that sūtra itself, and from the *Sūtrasamuccaya* for the passages not now found in the sūtra, and this seems to be correct. However, going even further (p. 144), Asano suggests that the title *Ratnarāśi* could refer to any collection of valuable teachings, and need not refer to a specific text, a conclusion he reaches in light of the similarity of terms such as *ratnarāśi*, *ratnakūṭa*, *ratnākara* and *ratnamegha*. This last idea seems to me a sort of *cri de coeur*. However, as long as the passages in question remain unlocated in any other sources, it seems difficult to move forward decisively, and no possibilities should be rejected.

I present below the text of the passages erroneously attributed to the *Ratnarāśi* in the *Sūtrasamuccaya* in Tibetan, and in the case of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* passages, Sanskrit.⁴⁴

1) *Sūtrasamuccaya* 22.1–16 (D 155a3–6):⁴⁵

rin po che'i phung po'i mdo las kyang | kun dga' bo 'di ji snyam du sems | mi rkang lag bcad na 'tsho 'am | gsol pa bcom ldan 'das 'tsho'o || bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | ji ltar snying phyung na 'tsho 'am | gsol pa bcom ldan 'das de ni mi 'tsho'o || bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | kun dga' bo lag pa dang rkang pa lta bur nga'i shā ri'i bu dang | maud gal gyi bur lta'o || snying lta bu ni byang chub sems dpa' rnams lta'o || kun dga' bo gal te byang chub sems dpa' shing rta'i nang du zhugs te | 'dod pa'i yon tan lngas rtse dga' zhing dga' dgur spyod la | de'i shing rta 'dren pa gzhan med na | kun dga' bo byang chub sems dpa' de'i shing rta ni de bzhin gshegs pa'i dbu la yang bskur ro || gal te gnas brtan shā ri'i bu dang maud gal gyi bu rnam par thar pa'i sgo gsum la bskal pa 'am bskal pa las lhag par gnas kyang | de la de bzhin gshegs pa rim gro dang g yog bya bar brtson par mi mdzad do zhes gsungs so ||.

From the *Ratnarāśisūtra*: [The Buddha said:] “Ānanda, what do you think? If the legs and hands of a man are cut off, can he still live?” [Ānanda] replied: “Blessed One, he can live.” The Blessed One said: “If, for instance, one were to tear out his heart, could he live?” [Ānanda] replied: “Blessed One, then, he would not live.” The Blessed One said: “Ānanda, my [disciples] Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana are like the hands and feet. The bodhisattvas are like the heart. Ānanda, if a bodhisattva were to climb aboard a cart, and were to sport with the five objects of desire (**pañcākāmaguṇa*) and indulge in sensual pleasures, but if there were to be no other driver of that cart, Ānanda, then the Tathāgata would take charge of that cart of the bod-

44 Where the Sanskrit is available, I translate it; otherwise I translate the Tibetan. Although the Chinese evidence is important, in keeping with the approach of this article, and to save space, I give only the locations of the relevant passages in notes. I further do not engage in detailed comparisons of the different versions, yet another task for the future.

Note that although in case 4, below, we do have some Sanskrit of the *Sūtrasamuccaya*, we do not have the portion of the text in which the title of the quoted material would have been given.

45 Also in Chinese, 大乘寶要義論 T. 1635 (XXXII) 52b22–c3.

hisattva. Even if the Elders Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana dwell in the three gates of liberation for aeons or more, still the Tathāgata will not make efforts to take care of or serve them.”

2) *Sūtrasamuccaya* 27.2–11 (D 156b4–6):⁴⁶

yang rin po che'i phung po'i mdo las | dgra bcom pa'i 'bras bu 'dod pa'i mi gang la la
zhig gis | nor bu rin po che dag gis 'jig rten gyi khams mtha' yas pa bkang ste | sbyin
pa byin pa bas | byang chub sems dpa' gang gis byang chub sems dpa' theg pa pa'i
gang zag mthong nas thams cad mkhyen pa nyid dang ldan pa'i sems kyi rjes su yi
rang na rjes su yi rang ba dang ldan pa'i bsod nams 'di la snga ma'i sbyin pa'i bsod
nams kyi phung po des | brgya'i char yang nye bar mi 'gro ba nas rgyu'i bar du yang
mi bzod do zhes gsungs so ||

Again, from the *Ratnarāśisūtra*: If there were a certain man who aspired for the fruit of arhatship, and he were to fill the limitless world-realms completely with great treasures and give them as a gift, and if a bodhisattva, seeing a person belonging to the bodhisattva vehicle, were to delight in his possession of an aspiration for omniscience, then the mass of merit of the former gift would not approach even a hundredth part of this merit of delighting [in aspiration for omniscience] ... it would not bear any comparison (**upanīṣad*) at all.

3) *Sūtrasamuccaya* 96.18–97.1 (D 179a4–5):⁴⁷

yang chos sgrub pa ni | rin po che'i phung po'i mdo las 'byung ba | 'od srungs 'di lta
ste dper na | rgya mtsho chen por 'jug par 'dod pa'i tshong pa ni rin po che'i gling
nas | bdag gi yul du bde bar phyin gyi bar du de gru la shin tu rtog par byed do || 'od
srungs de bzhin du byang chub sems dpa' thams cad mkhyen pa'i rgya mtsho la 'jug
par 'dod pas | ji tsam byis pa so so'i skye bo dang | nyan thos dang rang sangs rgyas
thams cad kyi sa las 'das te | bdag gi pha'i spyod yul du 'jug pa'i bar du'o || pha rol tu
phyin pa drug gi gru shin tu rtog par bya'o || zhes gsungs so ||

Again, regarding accomplishment of the Dharma, from the *Ratnarāśisūtra*: For instance, Kāśyapa, as an example, a merchant desiring to go to sea (to seek priceless jewels) will keep a careful eye on his boat until he has travelled safely from the island of jewels back to his own country. Just so, Kāśyapa, the bodhisattva desiring to go out to the sea of omniscience must keep a careful eye on the boat of the six perfections, until he passes over the stages [lands] of common people, disciples and lone buddhas and enters the realm of his father [Chinese: the state of Buddhahood].

46 大乘寶要義論 T. 1635 (xxx11) 53a18–22.

47 大乘寶要義論 T. 1635 (xxx11) 61b19–24.

4) *Sūtrasamuccaya* 103.17–104.5 (D 181a7–b3; for the underlining, see Sanskrit below):

rin po che'i phung po'i mdo las kyang | 'od srungs 'di lta ste | dper na rgya mtsho'i nang du gru zhig na | gang dag shing leb bam | gzhan ci yang rung ba zhig la brten pa de dag ni bde bar 'gram du phyin par 'gyur ro || 'od srungs de bzhin du byang chub sems dpa'i theg pa pa thams cad mkhyen pa'i sems kyi gru zhig ste | byang chub las rab tu nyams kyang | gang dge ba'i bshes gnyen gyi shing leb la brten pa de dag ni | yang thams cad mkhyen pa'i sems rab tu thob ste | chos thams cad kyi pha rol tu song nas chos kyi dbyings kyi gling du phyin to || de bas na 'od srungs bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub ni dge ba'i bshes gnyen la brten to || zhes gsungs so ||

大乘寶要義論 T. 1635 (xxx11) 62b6–16:

如寶積經云：佛言：迦葉，如人乘船，入其大海，而於中流船忽破壞。是中或有依一版木或餘橡木，隨得所依，安隱到岸。迦葉，菩薩乘於一切智心之船亦復如是。忽於中流壞失菩薩乘法。若遇善知識，而以依止，彼即還得一切智心，乘諸波羅蜜多法運載，而行到法界洲。迦葉，所有阿耨多羅三藐三菩提法，而悉依止善知識故。

From the *Ratnarāśīsūtra*: For instance, Kāśyapa, as an example, if a ship were to be wrecked in the midst of an ocean, with the help of a plank or of anything else whatsoever some people might easily reach the shore. In just this way, Kāśyapa, the ship of the mind of omniscience, [which carries] the followers of the bodhisattva vehicle, might founder, and although [those followers of the bodhisattva vehicle] might lose their awakening, still some, with the help of a plank which is the good friend (**kalyāṇamitra*), might recover the mind of omniscience. Going to the distant shore beyond all things, they arrive at the island of the essence of reality (**dharmadhātu*). Therefore, Kāśyapa, [the acquisition of] unexcelled perfect awakening depends on the help of the good friend.

A portion of this passage has been fortuitously preserved in a Sanskrit fragment from Khādalik in Central Asia, kept in London (10L San 964 recto), which Karashima 2009: 266 identified and edited. The underlined portions above correspond to the extant Sanskrit (I cite the text as given by its editor).

- 1 /// [s]āmudrikāyām nāvāyām bhināyām ye phal[ak]. ///
- 2 /// bodhisatvayānīyām: pranaṣṭhabodhayo [y]e (ka)[l](yāṇamitra~) ///
- 3 /// .[m]. tarhi kāśyapa kalyāṇamitra s[a] + + + + ///

5) *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 138a2–4 = Bendall 312.3–6:

uktañ cāryaRatnarāśīsūtre | ye tribhavaparyāpannāḥ satvās te sarvve pratyekaṁ tathāgatastūpān kārayeyur evaṁrūpān uccaīṣṭvena tadyathā sumeru_[3]ḥ parvatarājah | tāṁś ca gaṅgānadīvālikāsamān kalpān pratyekaṁ sarvvasatkāraiḥ satkuryuḥ |

yaś ca bodhisatvo 'virahitasarvvajñātācittenaikapuṣṣam apy āropa_[4]yet | ayan tas-
māt pūrvvakāt puṇyaskandhād bahutaram puṇyam prasavet ||

Śikṣāsamuccaya:⁴⁸

rin po che'i phung po'i mdo las kyang | gang dag srid pa gsum du gtogs pa'i sems can
de dag thams cad so so nas de bzhin gshegs pa'i mchod rten 'phang du 'di lta ste |
ri'i rgyal po ri rab lta bu byed la de dag la yang so so nas gang gā'i klung gi [P adds:
bye ma] snyed kyi bskal par bsti stang bya ba thams cad kyis bsti stang byed pa bas
byang chub sems dpa' gang thams cad mkhyen pa nyid kyis sems dang ma bral bas
me tog gcig 'dor na | de ni bsod nams kyi phung po snga ma bas bsod nams ches
mang du bskyed do zhes gsungs so ||

Sūtrasamuccaya 109.8–17 (D 183a5–7):⁴⁹

rin po che'i phung po'i mdo las | sems can gang dag srid pa gsum du gtogs pa de dag
thams cad kyis | so so nas de bzhin gshegs pa'i mchod rten 'phang du ri'i rgyal po ri
rab tsam bya ste | de dag la bskal pa gang gā'i klung gi bye ma snyed du so so nas bsti
stang du bya ba thams cad kyis bsti stang byas pa bas | byang chub sems dpa' thams
cad mkhyen pa nyid kyi sems dang ma bral ba gang gis me tog gcig phul na | de ni
bsod nams kyi phung po snga ma bas ches mang du bskyed do zhes ji skad gsungs
pa lta bu'o ||

And as is said in the Noble *Ratnarāśīsūtra*: Suppose those beings filling the three states of existence were all, individually, to have stūpas constructed for the Tathāgata, in form and height like Sumeru, the king of mountains, and were to worship all of those [stūpas] individually with all varieties of worship for as many aeons as there are grains of sand on the banks of the Ganges river. And [on the other hand] if some [single] bodhisattva, with a mind that has not lost [the aspiration for] omniscience, were to offer even a single flower, then the latter [act] would generate merit far exceeding the mass of merit of the former [act].

6) *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 138a4–b5 = Bendall 312.7–21:

atraivoktaṃ | ye khalu punas trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau satvās te sarvve
mahāyānasamprasthi_[5]tā bhavēyuh <|> sarvve ca cakravartirājyasamanvāgatā bha-
veyur ekaikaś ca rājā cakravartī mahāsamudrapramāṇadīpasthālīm kṛtvā sumeru-
mātrām vartim ādīpya pratyekam evaṃ_[6]rūpān dīpapūjām tathāgatacaityeṣu pra-
varttayet | yaś cābhiniṣkrāntagṛhāvāso bodhisatvas tailaparakṣiptām vartim kṛtvā
'dīpya tathāgatacaitye dhārayet | asyās tailaparakṣiptā_[7]yā vartter etat pūrvvakam

48 Derge Tōhoku 3940 *dbu ma, khi* 167b7–168a2 and Peking Ōtani 5336 *dbu ma, ki*, 195a8–b3; I do not indicate the several trivial variants from the latter. 大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (xxxii) 134a23–27.

49 大乘寶要義論 T. 1635 (xxxii) 63a25–b1.

pradīpadānaṃ śatataṃ api kalāṃ nopaiti | yāvad upaṇiṣadam api na kṣamata
iti | *peyālarā* ||

yaś ca khalu punas te rājānaś cakravarttino buddhapramukham bhikṣusaṃ^[b1]
ghaṃ sarvvasukhopadhānaḥ satkuryur yaś cābhiniṣkrāntagr̥hāvāso bodhisatvaḥ
piṇḍapātaṃ caritvā pātraparyāpannaṃ pareṣāṃ samvibhajya paribhuñjīta | idan
tato bahutaraṃ ca mahārgātaraṃ ca | yac ca te^[2] rājānaś cakravarttinaḥ sumerumā-
traṃ cīvararāśim buddhapramukhāya bhikṣusaṃghāya dadyur yac cābhiniṣkrānta-
gr̥hāvāso bodhisatvas⁵⁰ tricīvarabahirdhā | mahāyānaśprasthitāya buddhapra-
mukhyāya bhikṣusaṃghāya vā | tathāgatācāyite vā dadyād idam bhikṣoś cīvaradā-
naṃ^[4] etat pūrvvakacīvararāśim abhibhavati || yac ca te rājānaḥ pratyekaṃ
sarvvaṃ jambūdvīpaṃ puṣpasamstṛtaṃ kṛtvā tathāgatācāyite niryātayet | yac cā-
bhiniṣkrāntagr̥hāvāso bodhisatvaḥ^[5] antaśa ekapuṣpaṃ api tathāgatācāyite āro-
payet | asya dānasyaitat pūrvvakan dānaṃ śatataṃ api kalāṃ nopaiti | yāvad
upaṇiṣadam api nopaitīti ||

Śikṣāsamuccaya:⁵¹

yang de nyid las | gang stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i 'jig rten gyi khams na sems can
gang dag yod pa de dag thams cad theg pa chen po la yang dag par zhugs par gyur
la | thams cad 'khor los sgyur ba'i rgyal srid dang ldan par gyur te | 'khor los sgyur ba'i
rgyal po re res kyang mar me'i snod rgya mtsho chen po tsaṃ byas te | ri rab tsaṃ
gyi mar me'i snying pos mar me bus la | so so nas 'di lta bu'i mar me'i mchod pas [P
adds: *de bzhin gshegs pa'i*] mchod rten mams la mchod pa bas | byang chub sems
dpa' khyim gyi gnas nas 'byung ba gang gis mar me'i snying po 'brus mar gyis bskus
te de bzhin gshegs pa'i mchod rten gyi drung du 'dzin na | ras 'bru mar gyis bskus pa'i
mar me 'di la snga ma'i mar me phul ba des brgya'i char yang mi phod pa nas rgyu'i
bar du yang mi bzod do ||

'khor los sgyur ba'i rgyal po de dag gis sangs rgyas la sogs pa'i dge slong gi dge
'dun la bde bar sbyar ba thams cad kyis phu dud byed pa bas | byang chub sems dpa'
khyim gyi gnas nas mngon bar byung ba gang gis bsod snyoms blangs te | lhung bzed
du chud pa de gzhan dag dang bgo bsha' byas te zan de ni de bas ches mang zhing
ches rin che'o || gang yang rgyal po chen po de dag gis ri rab tsaṃ gyi gos kyi phung
po sangs rgyas la sogs pa dge slong gi dge 'dun la phul ba bas | byang chub sems dpa'
khyim gyi gnas nas mngon par byung ba gang gis phyi rol du byung ste | sangs rgyas
la sogs pa theg pa chen po la yang dag par zhugs pa'i dge slong gi dge 'dun dang | de
bzhin gshegs pa'i mchod rten la chos gos gsum phul na | dge slong gi chos gos byin
pa 'dis gos sbyin pa snga ma de zil gyis non par 'gyur ro || yang rgyal po de dag re res
'dzam bu'i gling thams cad me tog gis mdzes par byas te | de bzhin gshegs pa'i mchod
rten la phul ba bas | byang chub sems dpa' khyim gyi gnas nas byung ba gang gi tha

50 The manuscript has here, enclosed in parentheses, (*ḥ piṇḍupātaṃ caritvā pātraparyāpannaṃ pare-
ṣāṃ* ^[3] *samvibhajya paribhuñjīta | idan tato bahutaraṃ ca*), that is, after *bodhisatva* the scribe copied a
sentence from earlier, then noticed his mistake.

51 Derge Tōhoku 3939 *dbu ma, khi* 168a2–b2 and Peking Ōtani 5336 *dbu ma, ki*, 195b3–196a3; I do not
indicate the several trivial variants from the latter. 大乘集菩薩學論 T. 1636 (XXXI1) 134a27–b14.

na de bzhin gshegs pa'i mchod rten la me tog gcig phul na sbyin pa 'di la sbyin pa
snga ma bas des brgya'i char yang mi phod pa nas rgyu'i bar du yang mi phod do ||
zhes gsungs so ||

Sūtrasamuccaya 109.18–110.6 (D 183a7–183b7):⁵²

yang *rin po che'i phung po'i mdo* nyid las | gang stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i 'jig
rten gyi khams kyis sems can de dag thams cad theg pa chen po la yang dag par zhugs
te | thams cad 'khor los sgyur ba'i rgyal srid dang ldan par gyur la | 'khor los sgyur
ba'i rgyal po re res kyang | rgya mtsho chen po tsam gyi mar me'i snod byas te | ri
rab tsam gyi snying po bsregs la so so nas 'di 'dra ba'i mar mes de bzhin gshegs pa'i
mchod rten la mchod pa byas pa bas | gang khyim gyi gnas nas mngon par byung
ba'i byang chub sems dpas mar me'i snying po yungs mar gyis bskus te | de bzhin
gshegs pa'i mchod rten gyi drung du bzung na | mar me phul ba snga mas snying po
yungs mar gyis bskus pa de'i brgya'i char yang mi chog pa nas | rgyu'i bar du yang mi
chog go ||

gang yang 'khor los sgyur ba'i rgyal po de dag gis | sangs rgyas la sogs pa dge slong
gi dge 'dun la | bde ba'i yo byad thams cad kyis bsti stang du byas pa bas | gang yang
khyim gyi gnas mngon par byung ba'i byang chub sems dpas bsod snyoms blangs te |
lhung bzed du 'ongs pa | gzhan dang bgos te zos na | de ni de bas ches ches 'phags so ||
gang yang 'khor los sgyur ba'i rgyal po de dag gis | ri rab tsam gyi chos gos kyis phung
po sangs rgyas la sogs pa | dge slong gi dge 'dun la phul ba bas | gang yang khyim gyi
gnas nas mngon par byung ba'i byang chub sems dpa' chos gos gsum po ma gtogs
par gzhan theg pa chen po la yang dag par zhugs pa dang | sangs rgyas la sogs pa dge
slong gi dge 'dun dang | de bzhin gshegs pa'i mchod rten la phul na snga ma'i chos
gos kyis phung po de | dge slong la chos gos byin pa 'dis zil du brlag go || gang yang
'khor los sgyur ba'i rgyal po de dag re res 'dzam bu'i gling thams cad me tog gis bkang
ste | de bzhin gshegs pa'i mchod rten la phul ba bas | gang yang khyim gyi gnas nas
mngon par byung ba'i byang chub sems dpas de bzhin gshegs pa'i mchod rten la tha
na me tog gcig phul na | sbyin pa sna mas sbyin pa 'di'i brgya'i char yang mi chog pa
nas rgyu'i bar du yang mi chog go || zhes gsungs so ||

From the same source: And again, if all beings in the three billion world realms were to set out in the Mahāyāna, and all were to be endowed with the royal majesty of a universal emperor, and each universal emperor might set up oil lamp basins as vast as the great ocean, and lighting wicks as large as Mount Sumeru might perform appropriate worship with those lamps at each and every one of the shrines to the Tathāgata. And a [single] bodhisattva who has gone forth from the household life might set up and light [only] an oil-dipped wick, and dedicate it to a shrine of the Tathāgata. The former gift of lamps does not approach even a hundredth part of the [merit] from this [gift of] an oil-dipped wick ... it does not bear any comparison at all. ...

52 大乘寶要義論 T. 1635 (xxxii) 63b1–19.

And again, those universal emperors might pay homage with all things which conduce to happiness to the community of monks headed by the Buddha, [while on the other hand] a bodhisattva who has gone forth from the household life might eat [only] having begged for alms and shared with others what has fallen into his bowl—this is much more, has much greater value than that. And again, those universal emperors might present to the community of monks headed by the Buddha a pile of robes as great as Mount Sumeru, or [on the other hand] a bodhisattva who has gone forth from the household life might present [robes], other than the triple robe [he is enjoined to wear],⁵³ to the community of monks just set out in the Mahāyāna headed by the Buddha, or to a shrine of the Tathāgata; this gift of the monk's robes surpasses that former [gift of a] pile of robes. And again, individually those kings might cover over the whole continent of Jambudvīpa with flowers and present it to a shrine of the Tathāgata, or [on the other hand] a [single] bodhisattva who has gone forth from the household life might offer [only] so much as a single flower to a shrine of the Tathāgata, but the former gift does not approach even a hundredth part of the [merit] of this [latter] gift ... it does not bear any comparison at all.

We can notice a few things about these passages, in relation to a possible connection with the *Ratnarāśī*. None of the passages presents itself as looking like a lost or missing

53 Our hint to understanding this comes from the note in Wogihara 1904–1906: 258: “312.16. tricivara(m)bahirdhā. ‘Any thing other than the three robes.’ (72b). A bhikṣu should not be covetous, but he must always keep his *tricivara*. *tricivarabahirdhā* in Bodhic° v, 85 and our text *tricivarabahirdhā(m)* seems to mean ‘anything other than the three robes.’” The *Bodhicaryāvatāra* verse reads: *vinīpātāgatānāthavratasthān saṁvibhajya ca | bhūñjīta madhyamāṁ mātrāṁ tricivarabāhis tyajet*, “One should share with those fallen into unfortunate states of existence, the unprotected and those who have undertaken vows, and then should eat himself only middling portions (of food), and donate [everything else], save for his triple robe.” The commentary of Prajñākaramati (La Vallée Poussin 1901–1914: 141.15–142.10) clarifies: *vasanādibhir ātmarakṣāmāha | tricivarabāhis tyajet iti || saced āgatya kaścīd bodhisattvaṅ pātracivaraṅ yāceta | tenātityāgo na kartavyaḥ | kiṁ tu yat tad anujñātāṁ bhagavatā | tricivaraṅ śramaṇakalpaḥ | tato ’tiriktaṁ ca yad bhavet tyaktavyam arthine | nānyathā | uktaṁ ca bodhisattvaprātimokṣe | sacet punaḥ kaścīd āgatya pātraṅ vā cīvaraṅ vā yāceta sacet tasyātiriktaṁ bhaved buddhānujñātāt tricivaraṅ | yathā parityaktaṁ dātavyam | sacet punas tasya īnaṁ tricivaraṅ bhavet yan nīṣṛitya brahmācaryāvāsaḥ | tan na parityaktavyam | tat kasmād dhetoḥ | avisarjanīyaṁ hi tricivaram uktaṁ tathāgatena | sacce chāriputra bodhisattvas tricivaraṅ parityajya yācanaguruko bhavet | na tenālpeccatā āsevītā bhavet iti*. In fact, the quoted passage is found in similar form in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (I cite only the most relevant portion, MS 71b2–3; Bendall 1897–1902: 144.17–145.3): *sacet punaḥ kaścīd evāgatya pātraṅ vā cīvaraṅ vā yāceta | tasyātiriktaṁ bhaved buddhānujñātāt tricivaraṅ yathā parityaktan dātavyam sacet punas tasyonaṁ cīvaraṅ bhaved yan nīṣṛitya brahmācaryāvāsaḥ | tan na parityakta[3]yyaṅ | tat kasya hetor avisarjanīyan tricivaram uktaṁ tathāgatena | sacet punaḥ śāriputra bodhisattvaḥ tricivaraṅ parityajya yācanakaguruko bhaven na tenālpeccatā āsevītā bhavet*, “Suppose, again, that someone were to come and beg for one's bowl or robe. If one would have an extra beyond the three robes stipulated by the Buddha, then he should give that up and donate it. But if he were then to be in need of a robe [were he to give one away], the robe upon which the life of celibacy relies, then he is not to give it up. Why? The Tathāgata has said that the triple robe is not to be abandoned. What is more, Śāriputra, if a bodhisattva, giving up his triple robe, were to become focused on begging, he would not be cultivating the state of having few wishes.” See on the text Fujita 1988: 121–122 (although his translation is off the mark).

One can see, incidentally, that the unusual expression initially bothered even La Vallée Poussin, who in 1896: 316 note 2 queried whether to read *tricivaraṅ na hi tyajet* in place of *tricivarabāhis tyajet*.

part of the *Ratnarāśi* in terms of its tone or character, and we would be hard pressed to locate a suitable place to insert any one of these passages in the extant sūtra. Their overwhelmingly “Mahāyānistic” tone also sets them apart from the general atmosphere of the *Ratnarāśi*. The constant negative comparisons of the disciples or arhats with the bodhisattvas is not to be found in the extant *Ratnarāśi*. Likewise the similes, so common in the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, for example, are not in character with the literary style of the *Ratnarāśi*. Finally, although the importance of stūpas in the world of the *Ratnarāśi* is very clear, especially in Chapter IV the type of reverence for stūpas evident in the sūtra is entirely different from that in these passages. All of these things combine to suggest that, rather than representing materials now lost from the *Ratnarāśi* as we have it, none of these passages in fact ever actually belonged to the text we now know as the *Ratnarāśi*.

It is, of course, true that finding the “source” of a passage or idea does not necessarily put one any closer to actually understanding the passage itself, especially if one is interested in how it is being used and given meaning in its new environment (although comparison is usually illuminating). In the present case, however, in which we are explicitly dealing with anthologies, it is therefore reasonable to suggest that the author(s) of the *Sūtrasamuccaya* (and in his turn Śāntideva) either actually quoted (or paraphrased) the passages from somewhere. To further explore the history of Buddhist literature in India, to understand the history of the anthologies themselves, and to try to understand the ways the passages might have changed meaning as they changed context, locating the source(s)—should this ever prove possible—promises to be of significant help.

These two earlier anthologies are not, however, the only sources in which we find passages attributed to a *Ratnarāśi*, but whose content does not seem to belong to the text as we know it. We thus turn now to the chronologically latest of the anthologies taken up here, the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya* of Dipamkaraśrījñāna. There we find five passages attributed to the *Ratnarāśi*, at least if we understand that the Tibetan *’od srungs kyis zhus pa* is meant to designate this text, as it does in all five authentic citations of the sūtra in the *Mahāsūtrasamuccaya*, as seen above, a fact which is itself puzzling since, as noted above, this rendering can hardly refer to anything other than what we now know as the *Kāśyapaparivarta* (more historically, surely *Ratnakūṭa* in its Indian contexts, here perhaps closer to **Kāśyapaparipṛcchā*). Several of the following passages may perhaps be identified, even if only very tentatively, and it is not entirely impossible that the first is something like a vague summary of material in fact found in our *Ratnarāśi*. The passages are as follows:

Passage 1—§ 1.7 (D 4b2–3):

’od srungs kyis zhus pa las kyang | dge slong dgon pa pa’i dbang du byas te | cha gcig grong khyer thams cad kyī dbul po la sbyin par bya’o || gnyis pa ni dgon pa na gnas pa’i dud ’gro’i skye gnas su gtogs pa rnams la sbyin par bya’o zhes gsungs so.

Also from the **Questions of Kāśyapa*: Concerning the wilderness dwelling monk, one portion [of his alms] he must give to all the poor people of the city. A second [portion] he must give to those who belong to the realm of animals, who dwell in that wilderness.

It may perhaps be possible to understand this as a terse paraphrase of *Ratnarāśi* v.13, which we find quoted in Skt. in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 128.16–129.4:

tena lūham vā pranītam vā piṇḍapātaṁ saṁgrhya samantāc caturdiśaṁ vyavalokayitavyaṁ | ka iha grāmanagaranigame daridraḥ sattvaḥ | yasyāsmāt piṇḍapātāt samvibhāgaṁ kariṣyāmi | yadi daridraṁ sattvaṁ paśyati | tena tatpiṇḍapātāt samvibhāgaḥ kartavyaḥ | atha na kañcit sattvaṁ daridraṁ paśyati tenaivaṁ cittam utpādayitavyaṁ | santy anābhāsatātḥ sattvā ye mama cakṣuṣa ābhāsan nāgacchanti | teṣāṁ itaḥ piṇḍapātād agrāṁ pratyaṁśaṁ niryātayāmi | dattādānāḥ paribhuñjātāṁ |

Whether he obtains bad or good alms, he should look around everywhere in the four directions, thinking: “Who is the needful poor person in this town, village or city, with whom I should share [food] from these alms of mine?” If he sees a poor person, he should share with him from those alms. If he does not see any poor person, he should think thus: “There are unseen beings who do not appear in my sight, I must give the best portion of my alms to them. May they enjoy what I have given!”

Passage 2—§ 1.15 (D 7b4–5):

rin po che'i phung po'i mdo las kyang | de ci'i phyir zhe na | shā ri'i bu byang chub sems dpa' rab tu byung bar gtogs pa rnam ni | chos sbyin par byed pas gnas par 'gyur la | byang chub sems dpa' khyim pa rnam ni | zang zing thams cad yongs su gtong ba dag la ser sna med pas gnas par 'gyur ro || shā ri'i bu de'i phyir chos kyi sbyin pa dag gis bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub tu mngon par sangs rgyas par nus kyi | de ltar zang zing gi sbyin pa dag gis ni ma yin no zhes gsungs so ||

Also from the *Ratnarāśisūtra*: Why? Śāriputra, bodhisattvas who renounce the household life live making the gift of the teaching, while householder bodhisattvas live free of stinginess in abandoning all material things. Śāriputra, therefore, while gifts of the teaching make possible the attainment of unexcelled perfect awakening, material gifts do not.

Similar is the following passage in the *Kusumasañcaya*, Tōh 266, *mdo sde*, 'a, 302a1–2:

de ci'i phyir zhe na | shā ri'i bu gang dag chos kyi sbyin pa la 'dzud par byed pa'i byang chub sems dpa' chos kyi sbyin pa la dpa' ba de ni bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub tu nye bar gyur pa yin no || de bas na shā ri'i bu chos kyi sbyin pa mchog la gzud par bya'i zang zing gi sbyin pa la gzud par mi bya'o || gang dag skyes bu dam pa de dag la sbyin pa sbyin par byed na de dag gis chos kyi sbyin pa nyid sbyin par bya'i | zang zing gi sbyin pa ni ma yin te |

Passage 3—§ 6.6 (D 39b5–40a1):

rin po che'i phung po'i mdo las kyang | gang byang chub sems dpa' gang zhid byang chub sems dpa' la mnar sems pa'i sems bskyed pa de ni | de bzhin gshegs pa la mnar

sems pa'i sems bskyed par 'gyur ro || sha ra dva ti'i bu mtshams med pa lnga po las mtshams med pa gang yang rung ba zhid byas pa ni bla'i | byang chub sems dpa' la mnar sems pa'i sems bskyed pa ni ma yin pa nyid do || de ci'i phyir zhe na | shā ri'i bu 'di ltar rnam pa thams cad mkhyen pa nyid ni byang chub sems dpa' las nges par byung ngo || gal te byang chub sems dpa' sems can rnams la mnar sems pa'i sems bskyed na thams cad mkhyen pa nyid du mi 'gyur ro || de ltar na byang chub sems las byang chub sems dpa' byung zhing | byang chub sems dpa' las de bzhin gshegs pa byung ngo || shā ri'i bu de'i phyir byang chub sems dpa' | byang chub sems dpa' la mnar sems pa'i sems bskyed par mi bya zhing | byang chub sems dpa' byang chub sems dpa' la brnyas par mi bya'o zhes gsungs so ||

Also from the *Ratnarāsīsūtra*: Whichever bodhisattva produces a hostile attitude toward another bodhisattva produces [thereby] a hostile attitude toward the Tathāgata. Śāriputra, it would be better even if one were to perform some sin of immediate retribution from among the five sins of immediate retribution than to produce a hostile attitude toward a bodhisattva. Why? Śāriputra, in this manner, omniscience with respect to all aspects is born from the bodhisattvas. If a bodhisattva were to produce a hostile attitude toward beings, this would not produce omniscience. In this manner, bodhisattvas are born from the aspiration to awakening, and Tathāgatas are born from bodhisattvas. Śāriputra, therefore bodhisattvas must not produce a hostile attitude toward bodhisattvas, nor look down on them.

Passage 4—§ 29.9 (D 155a1–b5); this is the same basic text as *Sūtrasamuccaya* passage 1, above, here somewhat extended in comparison with that earlier passage:

rin po che'i phung po'i mdo las kyang | kun dga' bo de lta bas na dkon mchog gsum yongs su 'dzin par 'dod pas byang chub sems dpa' rnams yongs su gzung bar bya'o || byang chub sems dpa' rnams yang dag par sdud par bya'o || kun dga' bo don gyi dbang 'di gzigs nas de bzhin gshegs pa rnams nyan thos dang rang sangs rgyas dag la bu'i 'du shes yang dag par skyed par mi mdzad do || de ci'i phyir zhe na | kun dga' bo gal te stong gsum gyi stong chen po 'di nyan thos dang rang sangs rgyas rnams kyis gang bar gyur la | de dag las gang bdag gis sems can khyed cag rnams mgron du gnyer bar bya'o || bdag nyid bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub tu mngon par rdzogs par sangs rgyas nas 'khor ba na spyod pa rnams sdug bsngal thams cad las thar bar bya'o zhes sems can thams cad dbugs 'byin par byed pa 'ga' yang med do || kun dga' bo 'di ji snyam du sems | lag pa dang rkang pa dag bca'd na mi de gson par 'gyur ram | gsol pa | bcom ldan 'das gson par 'gyur lags so || bka' stsal pa | yang 'ga' zhid snying phyung bar gyur na gson par 'gyur ram | bcom ldan 'das de ni ma lags so || bka' stsal pa | kun dga' bo lag pa dang rkang pa ji lta ba de bzhin du nga'i shā ri'i bu dang maud gal gyi bu dag yin la | snying ji lta ba de bzhin du nga'i byang chub sems dpa' rnams yin no || kun dga' bo gal te byang chub sems dpa' shing rta la zhon nas | sil snyan yan lag lnga dang ldan pas rtse rol dga' bar byed la | 'ga' zhid de'i shing rta 'dren par mi byed na | kun dga' bo de bzhin gshegs pa kho nas byang chub sems dpa' de'i shing rta mgo bos 'dren par mdzad do || kun dga' bo gal te gnas brtan shā ri'i bu dang maud gal gyi bu gnyis bskal pa'am | bskal pa las lhag par rnam par thar

pa'i sgo gsum la gnas na yang | de la de bzhin gshegs pa rim gro dang bsnyen bkur
 gyi phyir spro bar mdzad par mi 'gyur ro || kun dga' bo gang byang chub sems dpa'
 'dod pa'i yon tan lnga la smad de | nyon mongs pa thams cad pham par byas nas | de
 bzhin gshegs pa'i stobs bcu yongs su rdzogs par byed | mi 'jigs pa bzhi dang | sangs
 rgyas kyi chos ma 'dres pa bco brgyad yongs su rdzogs par byed pa'i dus de ni yod la |
 yang nyan thos ni sangs rgyas kyi chos rnams la mi 'jug cing | sems can gyi khams
 thams cad kyi don du go cha chen po gyon par nus pa'ang ma yin no || des na de
 bzhin gshegs pa ni 'di lta ste sems can thams cad la thugs brtse ba nyid kiyis sems
 can thams cad la phan pa dang bde ba'i phyir byang chub sems dpa' yang dag par
 gzung ba gsung bar mdzad do || kun dga' bo 'di lta ste | dper na 'khor los sgyur ba'i
 rgyal po'i btsun mo dam pa ma yin pa'i bu de bzhin du nga'i shā ri'i bu dang maud
 gal gyi bu gnyis dang de las gzhan pa'i nyan thos rnams yin par lta bar bya'o || dper
 na btsun mo dam pa'i bu 'khor los sgyur ba'i mtshan nyid dang ldan pa de bzhin du
 byang chub sems dpa' yin par blta bar bya'o zhes gsungs so ||

Also from the *Ratnarāśīsūtra*: “Ānanda, therefore, one who wishes to hold fast to the Three Jewels should embrace the bodhisattvas. He should gather up the bodhisattvas. Ānanda, being aware of this fact, Tathāgatas do not have the idea that the disciples and lone buddhas are their [real] sons. Why? Ānanda, even if this billion-fold universe were filled with disciples and lone buddhas, not a single one among them would be able to comfort all beings, saying ‘I will take care of you beings. Having myself attained unexcelled perfect awakening, I will release from all sufferings those who move through the rounds of transmigration.’

“Ānanda, what do you think? Will a man with his hands and feet cut off survive?”
 [Ānanda] said: “Blessed One, he would survive.”

[The Buddha] said: “And what of one whose heart is taken out, could he survive?”
 [Ānanda said]: “Blessed One, he would not survive.”

[The Buddha] said: “Ānanda, just as hands and feet are my disciples, Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana, but as my heart are my bodhisattvas. Ānanda, if a bodhisattva mounts a cart and, with the five kinds of instrumental music were to disport himself as he pleased, no one [else] would lead that cart of his, Ānanda, only the Tathāgata would lead forward that cart of the bodhisattva. Ānanda, even if the Elders Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana were to dwell in the three gates of liberation for an aeon or more than an aeon, the Blessed One will not be inclined to reverence or serve them. Ānanda, there may be an occasion on which a bodhisattva who sports with the five objects of desire [nevertheless] masters all the defilements, perfects the ten powers of a Tathāgata, and perfects the four fearlessnesses and the eighteen special qualities of a Buddha, but still, a disciple, not understanding the Buddha's teachings, will not be able to don the great armor for the sake of the totality of beings. Therefore the Tathāgata in this manner, out of compassion for all beings, and in order to benefit and please all beings, preached about embracing the bodhisattvas. Ānanda, to take an example, my two disciples Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana, as well as the other disciples, should be seen as like the son of a Universal Emperor's secondary consort. The bodhisattvas should be seen as like [true] son of the chief consort, who possess the marks of the Universal Emperor [just as they possess the marks of a Buddha].”

Passage 5—§ 30.4 (D 157b7–158a6):⁵⁴

rin po che'i phung po'i mdo las kyang | de la bcom ldan 'das kyang gnas brtan shā ri'i bu
la bka' stsal pa | shā ri'i bu 'di ltar byang chub sems dpa' chos thams cad zil gyis gnon
par 'gyur te | shā ri'i bu rang sangs rgyas de dag gi tshul khirms gang yin pa dang |
sams can thams cad de dag gi tshul khirms gang yin pa des ni byang chub sems dpa'i
tshul khirms thams cad mkhyen pa nyid kyi sems las byung ba'i brgya'i char yang
nye bar mi 'gro ba nas | rgyu'i bar du yang nye bar mi 'gro'o || shā ri'i bu de lta bas na
byang chub sems dpa'i tshul khirms kyi pha rol tu phyin pa yongs su dag par blta bar
bya'o ||rang sangs rgyas de dag gi bzod pa gang yin pa dang | byang chub sems dpa'i
bzod pa gang yin pa las bzod pa snga ma des ni bzod pa 'di'i brgya'i char yang nye
bar mi 'gro ba nas | rgyu'i bar du yang mi 'gro'o *zhes de bzhin du sbyar te* | de bzhin du
byang chub sems dpa'i brtson 'grus dang | bsam gtan dang | shes rab dang | byams pa
dang | snying rje dang | dga' ba dang | btang snyoms dang | byang chub kyi phyogs kyi
chos thams cad ni mchog ces bya'o zhes bya ba nas gong na med pa zhes bya'o zhes
bya ba'i bar dang | shā ri'i bu de ltar na sems bskyed pa mchog mams la | gang zhig
bar du gcod par brtson pa de ni bsod nams ma yin pa mang du skyed do || gang zhig
rang sangs rgyas de dag gi rang gi byang chub la bar chad bya ba'i phyir brtson pa
dang | gang zhig byang chub sems dpa' la bar chad bya ba'i phyir brtson pa de gnyis
las | 'di ni bsod nams ma yin pa'i phung po ches mang du skyed do zhes gsungs so ||

Also from the *Ratnarāsīsūtra*: In that regard, the Blessed One spoke to the Venerable Śāriputra: “Śāriputra, a bodhisattva will outshine [others] in all aspects. And Śāriputra, the discipline of those lone buddhas, and the discipline of all those beings, does not reach even a hundredth part of the discipline of the bodhisattva, which arises from the mind of omniscience—it does not permit any comparison. Śāriputra, therefore one should see the bodhisattva's perfection of discipline as [extremely] pure. As far as the patience of the lone buddhas goes, it does not reach even a hundredth part of the patience of the bodhisattva—it does not permit any comparison. ... As for the bodhisattva's energy, concentration, wisdom, compassion, love, joy, equanimity [the qualities constituent of a buddha]—all the qualities of a bodhisattva are proclaimed to be superior, without equal. ... Therefore, Śāriputra, those who strive to create hindrances for the supreme aspirants [to awakening, that is, bodhisattvas] will generate much demerit. Of the two, those who strive to create hindrances to self-awakening of those lone buddhas and those who strive to create hindrances to bodhisattvas, the latter generates a much bigger heap of demerit.”

A final source worth mentioning here is the *Dasheng xiuxing pusa xingmen zhujing yaoji* 大乘修行菩薩行門諸經要集 (T. 847), a work translated into, or compiled in, Chinese in 721 by Zhiyan 智嚴.⁵⁵ Although Harrison (2023) considers it without doubt to be an

54 I am in debt to Péter Szántó for his help with this passage.

55 By saying that this is the final source to mention here, of course, I do not mean to imply that the sources treated here would cover all problematic attributions even of this same sūtra. Tibetan sources, for instance, also contain problematic passages. In the *Mdo lung rin chen dpung pa* of Phag mo gru pa

Indian work, I would be more hesitant.⁵⁶ Be that as it may, this anthology contains a passage credited to a **Ratnarāśi* (or at least to a text with a Chinese title identical with that of the current *Ratnarāśi*, namely *Baoju jing* 寶聚經), and one that seems to correspond conceptually to several of the, otherwise unidentified, passages quoted and translated above. The passage reads:⁵⁷

初發菩提心，校量聲聞、羅漢與修行菩薩數量，輕重不同。

爾時，佛告長老舍利弗言：「若此三千大千世界衆生，皆得阿羅漢果，復有三千大千世界衆生，皆得成佛。是諸佛前各置一羅漢。各各供養是諸如來。或經一劫、百劫、千劫乃至經於恒河沙劫。舍利弗，於意云何。況復供養無量無邊諸佛如來，其福甚多，說不可盡。佛言：若有如是無量阿羅漢供養如是無量諸佛，復有初發菩提心者，是人功德多於是數羅漢。況以菩提無斷故，供養諸佛及諸弟子、師僧、和尚、善知識等，乃至畜生，施其一團之食，此之功德比阿羅漢供養功德，百分千分不如供養初修菩提心者。」

The respective weight [of the merit produced by] the initial aspiration to awakening, compared with the quantities [of merit] of disciples arhats and practicing bodhisattvas, is different.

At that time, the Buddha spoke to the Elder Śāriputra, saying: “Imagine that all beings in the billion-fold cosmos were to become arhats, and then suppose that all beings in the billion-fold cosmos were to become buddhas, and imagine that before each one of those buddhas stood a single one of those arhats, and each one of those arhats were to make offerings to those respective Tathāgatas, whether for one aeon, a hundred aeons, a thousand aeons ... up to ... for aeons as many as the sands of

rdo rje rgyal po (1110–1170), his sūtra compendium, we read the following, with a verse attributed to a *Ratnarāśi*: *a ti yo ga ni | Rin po che'i phung po'i mdo las | sangs rgyas kun gyi gsang ba'i don | spros pa gcod cing dngos po med | rang bzhin med cing 'gyur ba med | rnal 'byor pa yis shes par bya | ces so ||*. This does not point to anything, verse or prose, in the current *Ratnarāśi*, and I have not been able to identify it elsewhere. See the Golden Manuscript Bka'-bum, vol. 3, p. 218r, transcribed by Dan Martin, who very kindly shared his text with me. I checked BDRC W23860, page 666, line 6; in W3CN22944 folio 3r7–v1 (my thanks to Charles Ramble for deciphering the script for me; it reads almost identically to the other [to me more legible] edition). At the website “Dans le sillage d'Advayavajra” (<https://hridayartha.blogspot.com/2015/06/tout-baigne-dans-legalite-fonciere.html>), the passage is quoted and translated: “Extrait du *Ratnarasi-sutra*: «La germe cachée de tous les Éveillés/Est sans élaboration et sans réalité concrète/Elle n'a pas de nature et ne change pas/Elle est connue par le yogi.»” The difference in tone and thought between this and anything in the extant *Ratnarāśi* is stark, not to mention that the sūtra as we have it has only two verses.

56 I find somewhat suspicious that of the forty some citations, fully 10 come from texts found now in the Mahāratnakūṭa collection. Since I believe (though of course I may be wrong!) that this collection did not exist as such before 713, when it was presented to the throne by Bodhiruci, for an anthology created in 721 to have such a high percentage of citations from texts from a single collection at the very least should raise questions. Perhaps the only important study of this text before Harrison 2023 was Asano 1998.

57 T. 847 (XVII) 956b17–c1. I rely here only on the Taishō edition. My profound thanks to Rafal Felbur for his invaluable guidance in the reading of this passage, to Paul Harrison for a valuable key suggestion, and to Michael Radich for further corrections. If I have not understood or followed their suggestions, of course I am to blame.

the Ganges river. Well then, Śāriputra, what do you think? Even more, if they were to make offerings [not to a single Tathāgata but] to limitless, boundless buddhas, Tathāgatas, then the merit from that would be enormous, it would be inexpressible.⁵⁸ The Buddha said: Suppose that in such a manner limitless arhats were to make offerings to equally limitless buddhas, but then again, on the other hand, suppose that there is someone who has made the initial aspiration to awakening [that is, a beginner bodhisattva], then this person's merit is greater than that of those numerous arhats. Even if, with the goal of preventing the severance of the lineage of awakening, one were to offer but a single portion of food [riceball?] to all the buddhas and their disciples, to teachers, preceptors, good friends and so on, even down to animals, the merit of this act, in comparison with the merit produced by the offerings of those arhats [to innumerable buddhas], would not equal even a hundredth or a thousandth of the merit generated by the offering to one who has made the initial aspiration to awakening.”

4 Conclusion

The materials we have examined above do not lead us to a grand conclusion. We have learned that Tibetan translators, some working centuries apart, followed much the same method, if we are even justified to use the word “method” to refer to what Harrison rightly called an often *ad hoc* (or more cautiously we should perhaps say, seemingly *ad hoc*) approach to preexisting translations, sometimes adopting them outright, even to the point of copying into their translation materials which the Sanskrit source evidently abbreviated, whether that be a single clause or sentence, or even whole verses or longer units of text. At other times, it appears that the translators were much more careful, removing vocatives, for instance, not found in their Sanskrit source, or making other similar small-scale changes. And yet again, there are cases in which they chose to offer an entirely different translation. At this point, we remain unable to penetrate further into the translation practices of these Tibetan scholars, and it is hard, at this remove, to imagine what sorts of evidence we might explore that could move us significantly closer to the clear answers we wish for. Of course, extending the type of work presented here to the entirety of the three anthologies would provide us a greater evidential basis, but it is unlikely that further such investigations will fundamentally alter the picture that we have already sketched. We must therefore, perhaps, rest content with our awareness of the challenges we face, and the humility they call for as we make use of these sources in our studies of sūtras. That is to say, we have learned that we often have no reason to consider the anthologies as witness to a specific form of a text independent of the Tibetan translation of that text as transmitted in the Kanjurs. This, then, is a firm result, even if it is a negative one, that brings with it a caveat we must keep in mind as we make use of these materials. Any future editor of a sūtra, for instance, should bear this in mind and be duly cautious in drawing conclusions about textual history from such translated citations.

58 It is possible that there was a change of speaker, otherwise it is not clear why the Buddha is again named, but this is not certain.

From another perspective, it is interesting and potentially significant to notice which of the forty-nine texts of the Mahāratnakūṭa collection were deemed by the compilers of the anthologies to have materials of interest and value to them. The absence of reference to a text tells us nothing: there could certainly have been myriad reasons why any of the compilers did not find in any of those works any passage relevant for their particular agendas, and given that we still do not know much about the working methods of the compilers, unless and until research sheds further light on those methods we are unable to say more. That said, one thing is certain: despite the citation of a number of texts which now, in Chinese and Tibetan, are included in this collection, none of the anthologies—nor, we may mention, any other Indian source known to us—shows any awareness that these scriptures are associated with each other in belonging to any collection. This, of course, is not a new finding, but it nevertheless continues to be relevant to our thinking about the Mahāratnakūṭa as a collection.

Literature

- Asano Morinobu 浅野守信. 1995. “Sūtrasamuccaya to Śikṣāsamuccaya: inyō-kyōten yori mita eikyō-kankei.” *Sūtrasamuccaya* と *Śikṣāsamuccaya*: 引用経典より見た影響関係 [The *Sūtrasamuccaya* and the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*: their relation in light of the texts quoted]. *Bukkyōgaku* 仏教学 37: 56–74.
- Asano Morinobu 浅野守信. 1996. “Śikṣāsamuccaya ni okeru Ratnarāsisūtra no inyō” *Śikṣāsamuccaya* における Ratnarāsisūtra の引用 [The *Ratnarāsisūtra* Quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 44/2: 141–145 (840–836).
- Asano Morinobu 浅野守信. 1998. “*Daijō shugyō bosatsu-gyōmon shokyō yōshū* ni tsuite” 大乘修行菩薩行門諸経要集について [On another *Sūtrasamuccaya*]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 47.1: 182–186 [329–325].
- Asano Morinobu 浅野守信. 2003. “*Daijō shūdōron no keifu: Kyō no shūsei kara Daijōshūbosatsugakuron e*” 大乘修道論の系譜: 『経の集成』から『大乘集菩薩学論』へ [From *Sūtrasamuccayas* to *Śikṣāsamuccaya*]. *Kokushikan tetsugaku* 国土館哲学会 7: 115–137.
- Bendall, Cecil. 1897–1902. *Ākṣāsamuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhist Teaching Compiled by Āntideva, Chiefly from Earlier Mahāyāna-sūtras*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 1 (St. Petersburg: Imperial Academy. Reprint: Osnabrück, Biblio Verlag, 1970).
- Bendall, Cecil, and W[illiam] H[enry] D[enham] Rouse. 1922. *Śikṣā-samuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhist Doctrine* (London: John Murray).
- Braarvig, Jens, and Ulrich Pagel. 2006. “Fragments of the Bodhisattvapiṭakasūtra.” In *Buddhist Manuscripts* Volume III. Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection (Oslo: Hermes Publishing): 11–88.
- Eimer, Helmut. 1978. *Bodhipathapradīpa. Ein Lehrgedicht des Atiṣa (Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna) in der tibetischen Überlieferung*. Asiatische Forschungen 59 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz).
- Ensink, Jacob. 1952. *The Question of Rāṣṭrapāla* (Zwolle: J.J. Tijl).
- Filliozat, Jean. 1964. “*Śikṣāsamuccaya* et *Sūtrasamuccaya*.” *Journal Asiatique* 252.4: 473–478.
- Finot, Louis. 1901. *Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā: Sūtra du Mahāyāna*. Bibliotheca Buddhica II (St. Petersburg: Imperial Academy. Reprint: Indo-Iranian Reprints II. The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1957).
- Fujita Kōkan 藤田光寛. 1988. “*Bodhisattvaprātimokṣacatuṣkanirhāra*’ ni tsuite” 〈*Bodhisattvaprā-*

- timokṣacatuṣkanirhāra*について [On the *Bodhisattvaprātimokṣacatuṣkanirhāra*]. *Mikkyō Bunka* 密教文化 163: 132–117 (sic).
- Goodman, Charles. 2016. *The Training Anthology of Śāntideva: A Translation of the Śikṣā-samuccaya* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Harrison, Paul. 2007. “The Case of the Vanishing Poet: New Light on Śāntideva and the *Śikṣā-samuccaya*.” In Konrad Klaus & Jens-Uwe Hartmann, eds., *Indica et Tibetica: Festschrift für Michael Hahn, zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden und Schülern überreicht*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 66 (Vienna: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien Universität Wien): 215–248.
- Harrison, Paul. 2009. “Verses by Śāntideva in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*: A New English Translation.” *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 23 (Evo ūyadi: Essays in Honor of Richard Salomon’s 65th Birthday): 87–103.
- Harrison, Paul. 2018. “A Reliable Witness? On the Tibetan Translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*.” In Lutz Edzard, Jens W. Borgland and Ute Hüsken, eds., *Reading Slowly: A Festschrift for Jens E. Braarvig* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag): 227–242.
- Harrison, Paul. 2023. “Anthologizing the Great Way: Remarks on the *Sūtrasamuccaya* attributed to Nāgārjuna and its congeners.” In Vincent Eltschinger, Jowita Kramer, Parimal Patil and Chizuko Yoshimizu, eds., *Burlesque of the Philosophers: Indian and Buddhist Studies in Memory of Helmut Krasser*. Hamburg Buddhist Studies Series (Bochum/Freiburg: project verlag): 93–134.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe. 2019. “The earliest ‘Mahāyāna’ sūtra manuscripts and what they tell us.” *Hōrin* 20: 13–22.
- Isoda Hirofumi 磯田熙文. 1988. “*Durbodhālokā ni tsuite*” 『*Durbodhaloka*』 について [On the *Durbodhālokā*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 37.1: 413–406 (100–107).
- Johnston, E.H. 1950. *The Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyānottaratantraśāstra* (Patna: Bihar Research Society).
- Kano, Kazuo. 2015. “The Transmission of Sanskrit Manuscripts from India to Tibet: The Case of a Manuscript Collection in the Possession of Atiśa Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna (980–1054).” In Carmen Meinert, ed., *Transfer of Buddhism Across Central Asian Networks (7th to 13th Centuries)*. Dynamics in the History of Religions 8 (Leiden: Brill): 82–117.
- Karashima, Seishi. 2009. “A Sanskrit Fragment of the *Sūtrasamuccaya* from Central Asia.” In Martin Straube, Roland Steiner, Jayandra Soni, Michael Hahn und Mitsuyo Demoto, eds., *Pāsādīkadānam: Festschrift für Bhikkhu Pāsādika*. Indica et Tibetica 52 (Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag): 263–273.
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. 1896. “Bodhisattvacaryāvātāra: Exposition de la pratique des bodhisavvta.” *Le Muséon* 15: 306–318.
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. 1901–1914. *Bodhicaryāvātārapañjikā, Prajñākaramati’s Commentary to the Bodhicaryāvātāra of Śāntideva*. Bibliotheca Indica 983, 1031, 1090, 1126, 1139, 1305, 1399 (Calcutta: Asiatic Society).
- Li, Channa. 2016. “Authorship Lost in Transmission: Elusive Attributions of Two Tibetan Sūtra Translations.” *Revue d’Etudes Tibétaines* 37: 207–230.
- Mochizuki, Kaie 望月海慧. 1993–1995. “Ratnākaraśānti’s SūtrasamuccayabhāṣyamRatnālokālaṃkāra 1–111.” *Seishin* 棲神 65: 1–40; 66: 1–38; 67: 1–62.
- Mochizuki, Kaie 望月海慧. 2002. *A Study of the Mahāsūtrasamuccaya of Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna*. A Report of Grant-in-Aid for Encouragement of Young Scientists (Project 127100009). Privately printed.

- Mochizuki, Kaie 望月海慧. 2004. *A Study of the Mahāsūtrasamuccaya of Dīpaṅkarāśrījñāna* II. Tibetan Text. A Report of Grant-in-Aid for Encouragement of Young Scientists (Project 14510028). Privately printed.
- Mochizuki, Kaie 望月海慧. 2005–2010. “Ratonākārshānti *Kyōjū kaisetsu Hōmyō shōgonron* wayaku (1–6)” ラトナーカラシャーンティ 『経集解説・宝明莊嚴論』和訳(1–6). *Minobu Ronsō* 身延論叢 10: 1–40; 11: 1–50; 12: 29–64; 13: 65–130; 14: 21–42; 15: 1–90.
- Mochizuki, Kaie. 2015. “Sūtra Anthologies.” In Jonathan A. Silk, ed, *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, Vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill): 292–303.
- Mochizuki Kaie 望月海慧. 2016. *Dīpankarashurjūnyāna kenkyū* デイーバンカラシユリージュニャーナ研究 [Dīpaṅkarāśrījñāna studies]. PhD diss., Rissho University.
- Nattier, Jan. 2003. *A Few Good Men: The Bodhisattva Path according to The Inquiry of Ugra* (Ugraparipṛcchā) (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press).
- Pāsādika, Bhikkhu. 1989. *Nāgārjuna’s Sūtrasamuccaya: A Critical Edition of the Mdo kun las btus pa*. *Fontes Tibeticæ Havnienses* 2 (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag).
- Régamey, Konstanty. 1938. *The Bhādrāmāyākāraṅkāraṇa: Introduction, Tibetan Text, Translation and Notes*. The Warsaw Society of Sciences and Letters, Publications of the Oriental Commission 3 (Warsaw: Nakładem Towarzystwa Naukowego Warszawskiego Wydano z Zasiłku Funduszu Kultury J. Piłsudskiego).
- Sasaki Kazunori 佐々木一憲. 2007. “Śikṣāsamuccaya no bonbun shahon ni tsuite: Seiritsu to den-shō ni oite hatashita gakushō Vibūticandora no yakuwari” Śikṣāsamuccaya の梵文写本について: 成立と伝承において果たした学匠ヴィブーティチャンドラの役割 [On the Sanskrit Manuscript of the Śikṣāsamuccaya: Vibhūticandra as the scribe and the transporter]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 55.2: 92–96 (937–933).
- Sasaki Kōken 佐々木孝憲. 1965. “Śikṣāsamuccaya to Sūtrasamuccaya no kankei ni tsuite” シクシャ・サムツチャヤとストラ・サムツチャヤの關係について [On the relationship between the Śikṣāsamuccaya and the Sūtrasamuccaya]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 14.1: 180–183.
- Seyfort Ruegg, David. 1973. “On Translating the Buddhist Canon (a dictionary of Indo-Tibetan terminology in Tibetan and Mongolia: the *Dag yig mkhas pa’i byuñ gnas* of Rol-pa’i-rdo-rje).” In Perala Ratnam, ed., *Studies in Indo-Asian Art and Culture* 3. *Commemoration Volume of the 71st Birthday of Acharya Raghuvira*. Śata-Piṭaka Series, Indo-Asian Literatures 209 (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture): 243–261.
- Sherburne, Richard. 2000. *The Complete Works of Atīśa Śrī Dīpaṅkara Jñāna, Jo-bo-rje. The Lamp for the Path, the Commentary, together with the newly translated Twenty-five Key Texts* (New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan).
- Silk, Jonathan A. 1994. *The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism, With a Study of the Ratnarāśīsūtra and Related Materials*. Ph.D. thesis, The University of Michigan.
- Sinclair, Iain. 2021. *Dharmakīrti of Kedah: His Life, Work and Troubled Times*. Temasek Working Paper Series 2. (Singapore: Temasek History Research Centre/ISEAS—Yusuf Ishak Institute).
- Stäel-Holstein, Alexander Wilhelm, Baron von. 1926. *The Kācāpaparivarta: A Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class: Edited in the Original Sanskrit in Tibetan and in Chinese* (Shanghai: Commercial Press).
- Tauscher, Helmut. 2021. *Spug ye shes dbyangs, Mdo sde brgyad bcu khungs: An early Tibetan sūtra anthology*. *Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde* 99 (Vienna: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien Universität Wien).

- Wang, Junqi, and Meifang Zhang, Xiaofang Lü, Xin Song, Kawa Sherab Sangpo, Dazhen. 2020. "A Preliminary Study on a Newly Discovered Sanskrit Manuscript of Nāgārjuna's *Sūtrasamuccaya*." *Journal of Buddhist Studies* (Centre for Buddhist Studies, Sri Lanka & The Buddha-Dharma Centre of Hongkong) 17: 59–88.
- Wogihara, Unrai. 1904–1906. "Bouddhisme. Notes et Bibliographie: Contributions to the study of the Śikṣāsamuccaya derived from Chinese sources (1), (Continuation), and (end)," *Le Muséon* (New Series) 5: 96–103, 209–215; 7: 255–261.

Assembled in China

A Study of the Shi'er toutuo jing 十二頭陀經

Jonathan A. Silk, with an appendix on dating by Michael Radich

In Memory of Enomoto Masaaki 榎本正明



1 Introduction¹

Chinese Buddhist traditions have transmitted, from remote times, a treasure-trove of scriptural documents, many of which were, from early on, given various types of official statuses, among which was the acceptance that the work in question presented genuine teachings of the Buddha, and was therefore worthy of acknowledgement as a Buddhist classic, *jing* 經, a title element often paired, at least in later representations, with a prefixed *foshuo* 佛說, ‘preached by the Buddha.’² At the same time, the tradition itself was aware, again from early times, that not all works claiming such a status equally merited recognition as translations of works that had been sanctioned in their Indic regions of origin as *buddhavacana*, that is, as sacred writ. Some, in fact, were quite plainly Chinese creations, and various catalogues and other works sometimes classify these as ‘questionable’ or ‘false’ scriptures, respectively *yijing* 疑經 and *weijing* 偽經. One sort of text,

1 I could not have written this alone. Most basically, this study took its inspiration from the work of the late Enomoto Masaaki 榎本正明, who first discovered the debt of the sūtra to the *Da zhidu lun*. I was offered valuable clues to understanding the text many years ago by Funayama Tōru 船山徹, and the much missed Stefano Zacchetti. Also many years ago Florin Deleanu was kind enough to send me photocopies of images of several manuscript sources, for which I again thank him. More recently, I am grateful as well to Zhang Meiqiao 張美喬 for her kind assistance. Most recently, I have a profound debt to my friend and colleague Rafal Felbur, whose numerous corrections, especially to my translation, have greatly improved the study in a number of places. Thereafter, I received invaluable comments from Eric Greene and Antonello Palumbo. Only someone who has similarly received suggestions from Michael Radich can fully appreciate what a rich mine of gems and precious substances his observations offer. I am delighted to be able to include his Appendix on dating of the text. My debt to all of the above is deep.

2 On *foshuo*, and its clearly secondary status, not reflective of any Indian antecedents, see Funayama 2022. Likewise, Chinese sources reflexively attach *jing* to works they considered “scripture,” and *lun* 論 to those they considered treatises or, more broadly, anything other than scripture as such. The all too common practice of ‘reconstructing’ *lun* as *śāstra* is almost entirely baseless; among Buddhist works in Sanskrit, the only exception I know of is the *Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyānottaratantraśāstra*, a title attested in the colophon of the unique Sanskrit manuscript of that text. (I do not mean that śāstric texts were not explicitly recognized as śāstras by Indian writers, only that the term *śāstra* is not a normal part of a title, although *sūtra*, while also not common, is more frequently attested in Indic sources as part of a title.)

however, is a kind of hybrid: it is clearly built in China, but largely from parts that at least its compilers believed to be of genuine Indian origin. Such creations were usually not (at least explicitly) recognized as non-translations by traditional bibliographers, who tended (at least before the *Lidai sanbao ji*, on which see below) to attribute works of this type to translators the names of whom are lost (*shiyi* 失譯), that is, which are anonymous. One example is the work under consideration here, the *Shi'er toutuo jing* 十二頭陀經, the *Scripture on the Twelve Dhuta* [*Ascetic Purification Practices*].³

The *Shi'er toutuo jing* 十二頭陀經 presents us with many problems, and its history sets the stage for the questions it poses. When examining Chinese translations, our first stop (or our second, after the text itself) should always be the catalogues, which are our main, and often only, source for the history of a text. In this particular case, already in the earliest intact extant work which includes a catalogue, the *Chu sanzang ji ji* 出三藏記集, dating to 515,⁴ we find reference to an independent scripture called *Shi'er toutuo jing* 十二頭陀經—or rather, to this and immediately thereafter to what the compiler Sengyou 僧祐 (445–518) evidently considered a different text, the *Shamen wei shi'er toutuo jing* 沙門爲十二頭陀經, both in 1 *juan*.⁵ Sengyou did not ascribe this text (or these texts) to any translator: he placed them in his accounting of “Newly Compiled Continuation of the Assorted List of Anonymous Translations” 新集續撰失譯雜經錄.⁶ Less than a century later, however, in the *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶記 of 598, its compiler, Fei Zhangfang 費長房, attributed the text to the translator Guṇabhadra 求那跋陀.⁷

While many modern scholars continue to refer to the *Shi'er toutuo jing* as if it were a genuine Indian work,⁸ already in 1935 Sakaino Kōyō 境野黃洋 had argued that this attribution is spurious.⁹ Michael Radich agrees that “The ascription of [what is now published as] T. 783 to Guṇabhadra found in the present canon (the Taishō) probably dates back to [the *Lidai sanbao ji*], which cites no particular source. A similar title, 沙門頭陀經, identified with an alternate title 十二頭陀經, is treated as anonymous in Fascicle 14.¹⁰ An

3 This text in the heretofore standard edition is Taishō 783.

4 Strictly speaking, the text was finalized at this date. As Palumbo 2011: 13 clarifies, the text is now in 15 *juan*: *Juan* 1, 13, 14, and 15 are taken from the original recension in 16 *juan*, released in early 503. *Juan* from 2 to 11 and the first section of *juan* 12 are taken from a revised edition in 10 *juan*, including only a bibliography, which was issued in late 515–early 516. The extant recension in 15 *juan*, including additional material by Sengyou in *juan* 12, was compiled between 695 and 730.” These details aside, for our purposes here it is sufficient to consider the text as evidence for the situation in the early 6th century.

5 T. 2145 (LV) 30b12–13.

6 I borrow this translation of the expression from Michael Radich.

7 T. 2034 (XLIX) 91b25, and 92b15.

8 As an example of a recent publication, entirely uncritical in its treatment of all Chinese evidence, see Kim 2019, who discusses the *Shi'er toutuo jing* on p. 74. I have unfortunately no access to Kyōngsōng 2005, which, according to Kim, discusses the text on pp. 68–81, but, again according to Kim 2019: 7019, “Or, l’ouvrage ne proposant, ni une étude philologique, ni une lecture historico-critique des textes présentés, son objectif principal semble être la présentation de divers textes bouddhiques canoniques exposant le toutouxing.” Another example of a relatively recent study which simply assumes the *Shi'er toutuo jing* to be a genuine translation of an Indian text is Kobayashi 2010: 19. Such examples could easily be multiplied.

9 Sakaino 1935: 636, and see Atsushi Iseki at <https://dazangthings.nz/abc/text/306/>.

10 That is, of the *Lidai sanbao ji*, T. 2034 (XLIX) 117b15, which reads: 十二頭陀經一卷 一名沙門頭陀經—JAS.

apparent hybrid of these two titles, 沙門為十二頭陀經, is also listed among anonymous E[astern] Han texts.¹¹ As we will see, it is entirely impossible that the attribution to Guṇabhadra is correct, not because the translator was earlier considered anonymous (which is an example of the pattern of Fei's reattributions of interest to Radich), but since the sūtra has been demonstrated to be a Chinese composite creation, and is thus not a translation at all.¹²

In fact, we should have known as much, because this conclusion was already implicit in the earliest extant catalogue, the CSZJJ. Antonello Palumbo writes as follows:¹³

The long list of anonymous translations taking up all of *juan 4* in the CSZJJ, in which the *Shi'er toutuo jing* is also mentioned, reflects a process of acquisition of texts from the imperial library to Sengyou's monastery. Sengyou clearly divides the list into two parts, distinguishing those texts he had seen and had already been copied (已寫) for the monastic library (the *Shi'er toutuo jing* among them) from those he had not seen yet (未見) and had not been copied yet (未寫), but were evidently extant at some other library, almost certainly the imperial one. In the preface to this section, Sengyou identifies the greatest part of the texts in one scroll among those he had seen within this list as having been excerpted from other scriptures (其一卷以還五百餘部, 率抄眾經全典). However, these were no ordinary excerpts, and were not presented as such (in fact, the CSZJJ has a separate catalogue of excerpts at the beginning of *juan 5*); Sengyou explains instead that these texts were produced by arbitrarily cutting out chapters and gāthās from elsewhere, making abridgements, contriving a title, and making it all into a separate book (割品截偈, 撮略取義, 強製名號, 仍成卷軸). Now it seems to me, first of all, that this correctly describes a text such as the *Shi'er toutuo jing*; but it also shows that Sengyou was aware of this *sui generis* genre; and, finally, it would seem that this genre, this type of assembled text, was fashionable among the palace Buddhist literature; in fact, quite a few of these texts may well have originated from the court.

In this respect, there is another circumstance in the CSZJJ list that may deserve attention. If one looks carefully at the list in *juan 4*, apart from the multiscroll texts at the beginning (1–26), one will see that the hundreds of single-scroll texts (again, including the *Shi'er toutuo jing*) are arranged by topic and in a sort of hierarchy, in a way that is reminiscent of the sequence of the entries in the *Mahāvīyūtpatti* much later. Thus we have Buddhas (27–62), bodhisattvas (63–130), great disciples of the Buddha (131–157) and so on, down to gāthās and verses (774–784) and *dhāraṇīs* and spells (785–842); the *Shi'er toutuo jing* is evidently in a section on numerical items (693–728). Since Sengyou does not follow such a topical arrangement of scriptures in any part of his catalogue (or indeed anywhere else in his writings), it seems rea-

11 <https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/306>. Although he does not refer to Sakaino, whose work he may well not have known, the same conclusion was reached by Enomoto 1997: 248. Issues around the reliability of the *Lidai sanbao ji* are discussed by Radich 2019, and see below.

12 On this, inter alia, see Radich 2019. One should also notice the important recent work of Greene 2023.

13 Personal correspondence.

sonable to assume that the books were so arranged in the catalogue of the library from which they were taken, and quite possibly in that library itself. But if so, one wonders whether some, or perhaps many, of these texts were not produced *ad hoc* for that very library. In fact, the logic behind the production of these excerpts is to a good extent a topical logic: it bypasses the authority of the translator and the holiness of the act of transmission, which ultimately was supposed to guarantee the correct reproduction, in Chinese, of the discourses of the Buddha, and it takes liberties instead with those discourses by arbitrarily selecting what seemed relevant precisely to a particular topic. Briefly, this may have been the broader background for the assembling of a text such as the *Shi'er toutuo jing*.

The main scholar to have carefully studied the *Shi'er toutuo jing* was the late Enomoto Masaaki 榎本正明.¹⁴ Having noted an earlier observation of close similarities with the *Da zhidu lun*, Enomoto concluded that the *Shi'er toutuo jing* was created in China between the time of the *Da zhidu lun* in roughly 402–405 and the compilation of the *Chu sanzang jiji* (which he dates to 510–518, for reasons he does not state). Further research has come to show other parallelisms, and the situation ultimately became quite clear in its general outlines, even if we still do not know when, where or by whom the *Shi'er toutuo jing* was compiled. What we do know is that, as we have it, the *Shi'er toutuo jing* is not an Indic text, but belongs rather to the (probably larger than once suspected) class of works which were built on Indian bases, but assembled in China. In the present case, we can identify the work's core sources rather closely.¹⁵ These central sources are the *Da zhidu lun* 大智度論 (**Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa*, T. 1509) and the Chinese translation of the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra* (T. 310 [44]). The former is a work of, or at the very least closely associated with, Kumārajīva (ca. 344–413), and the latter a translation of Daogong 道龔 (end of 4th–beginning of 5th c.).¹⁶

14 Prof. Enomoto studied this text beginning in the early 1990s in the context of investigations of the treasures of the Nanatsudera canon. See in particular Enomoto 1992, 1996a, 1997, 1998, 2003. Concerning its sources, as he wrote to me on 22 February 1999 (private letter), he was aware of close parallels with the *Da zhidu lun*, and upon reading my 1994 dissertation, he discovered that I had observed the correspondences between the *Shi'er toutuo jing* and the *Ratnarāśi*. He mentioned this in print in 1998: 6. At the time that I wrote my thesis, I was still under the impression that the *Shi'er toutuo jing* was a genuine translation, and I had wondered what the relation between the two texts might be (Silk 1994: 92–93). Prof. Enomoto had already speculated in print that the *Shi'er toutuo jing* was a Chinese compilation, but I was unaware of this.

Enomoto 1997: 247 noted that eight similar spots were noticed between the *Shi'er toutuo jing* and the *Da zhidu lun* already by Miyamune Takamasa 宮宗孝正 1922–1923, but in fact Miyamune did not refer to any overall parallelism between the two texts, nor hazard an explanation for the similarities he saw. As examples, at 115: 21, citing a *Da zhidu lun* passage, Miyamune writes 十二頭陀經... 殆同レ之, “this is nearly identical with the *Shi'er toutuo jing*,” with the inverse formulation on p. 24. He offers (at my count) the same wording in seven other places as well (I thus count one more than did Enomoto). Miyamune did not neglect references to the *Ratnarāśi*, but he nowhere connected it with the *Shi'er toutuo jing*.

15 This is sometimes the case with typologically similar creations (see e.g. Shinohara 2015), sometimes not (Silk 2010).

16 On this figure, see Silk 1994: 666–672. This dissertation contains editions of the sūtra and an annotated translation. A revision is forthcoming.

While it is possible to show that, here and there, a number of expressions are also found in other texts, whether these short phrases have also been borrowed as such, or whether they might better be considered floating pieces of text not indicative of any direct borrowing, is probably impossible to prove, and in the edition which follows, I have placed only longer or what seem to me more characteristic parallels alongside the *sūtra* passages in the edition itself. In such cases, I have cited only texts which we can know to have existed before the first datable reference to the *Shī'er toutuo jing*. I also consider, however, another possible hypothesis of a later date below. In any event, the relationship between the *Shī'er toutuo jing*, the *Da zhidu lun* and the *Ratnarāśi* (and two other less sure sources) can be easily illustrated in a simple table, which coordinates sections of the *Shī'er toutuo jing* (according to the divisions I have imposed on the text) and its sources. In the following, DZDL = *Da zhidu lun* (T. 1509 [xxv]), RR = *Ratnarāśi* (paragraphs of my edition in Silk 1994):

§ 1	—
§ 2	—
§ 3	T. 353 (XI) 218b12–14
§ 4	—
§ 5	DZDL 537a19–24
§ 6	RR § V.3
§ 7	DZDL 537c2–7 RR § V.2
§ 8	RR § V.11 RR § VI.4 RR § VI.13
§ 9	DZDL 537c7–12
§ 10	DZDL 537c12–15
§ 11	DZDL 538b2–4
§ 12	DZDL 537c20–24
§ 13	RR § V.15 RR § V.13 T. 281 (X) 447c7–8
§ 14	DZDL 537c24–538a4
§ 15	DZDL 538a6–11
§ 16	RR § VII.5 DZDL 537c15–20
§ 17	DZDL 538b4–7 ¹⁷

17 Almost immediately after this passage, bringing to a close its discussion of these practices, the *Da zhidu lun* has the following (T. 1509 [xxv] 538b9–16; I adopt several readings from the Taishō apparatus): 是十二頭陀，佛意欲令弟子隨道行捨世樂。故讚十二頭陀。是佛意常以頭陀為本，有因緣不得已，而聽餘事。如轉法輪時，五比丘初得道，白佛言：「我等著何等衣」。佛言：「應著納衣」。又受戒法盡壽著納衣，乞食，樹下住，弊棄藥。於四聖種中，頭陀即是三事。佛法唯以智慧為本，不以苦為先。是法皆助道隨道故，諸佛常讚歎，「With these twelve *dhuta* [ascetic purification practices], the Buddha intended to have his disciples follow

- § 18 DZDL 538a11–16
 § 19 DZDL 538a16–20
 § 20 DZDL 538a20–27
 § 21 DZDL 538a27–b2
 § 22 T. 475 (XIV) 540b27–28
 § 23 T. 374 (XII) 433c26–434a1?
 § 24 —
 § 25 —

2 The *dhuta* Scheme

Much of interest can be learned from this table, in which we immediately notice the pre-dominance of the *Da zhidu lun*, but also that its text has not been adopted in sequential order. In fact, it has been drastically reorganized. This has resulted in an anomaly, connected with the ordering of the central items of the text, namely the *dhutas* themselves. The sūtra offers the following twelve items:

1. 在阿蘭若處: *āraṇyaka* ‘wilderness-dwelling’
2. 常行乞食: *paiṇḍapātika* ‘always begging for alms food’
3. 次第乞食: *sapadānacārika* ‘accepting alms in strict order.’
4. 受一食法: *aikāsanika* ‘eating only a single meal per day’
5. 節量食: **bhojanamātra?* ‘eating in moderation’¹⁸

the practice of the path and reject worldly pleasures. Therefore he praised the twelve *dhuta* ascetic purification practices. It was the intention of the Buddha always to promote the *dhuta* [ascetic purification practices] as fundamental, but when owing to circumstances that was not possible, [only] then did he allow other practices. Thus, at the time when [the Buddha] turned the wheel of the Teaching [for the first time], [the first] five monks thereupon attained the path, and they said to the Buddha: ‘What garments should we wear?’ The Buddha replied: ‘You should wear the rag robes.’ Furthermore, he instructed them in the monastic restrictive practices (**śīla*), [namely] that as long as one lives one should wear rag robes, beg for alms food, dwell beneath a tree, and use fermented urine as medicine. Among these four bases of holiness (**āryavaṃśa*), the *dhuta* [ascetic purification practices] make up three of them. The Teaching of the Buddha solely takes wisdom as fundamental, and does not prioritize asceticism. All of these practices help one make progress in the path, and thus the buddhas always praise them.”

I suspect that the term 弊棄藥 (this seems to be its unique appearance) is an error for 陳棄藥, the normal rendering of *pūtimukta-bhaiṣajya*, and I have made this assumption in my translation. See *Hōbōgirin* IV.329–335, s.v. Chinkiyaku. Further, note that the Taishō prints 於古四聖種中, with the note that one Shōgōzō manuscript omits 古, which I follow here.

Rafal Felbur points out that “the DZDL cited here seems to include two mutually contradictory passages, in close proximity to one another, regarding what the *ben* 本 of the Buddha’s teaching is. Could it be that the second assertion was added by some zealous Chinese scribe, who wanted to make sure that nobody reading all this effusive praise of the 12 *dhutas* came away with the impression that self-mortification is the way to go, and to reaffirm that, instead, the highest teaching is that of ‘wisdom’ 慧?”

- 18 This is structurally, and in some respects in terms of explanation, parallel to what is in Pāli *pattapiṇḍika*. (The putative equivalence to *nāmantika* [Wogihara 1964–1974: 668b] is obviously wrong.) The term is discussed in the **Vimuktimārga*, cited in the commentary on the translation.

6. 中後不得飲漿: *khalupaścādbhaktika* ‘not drinking juice after the noon meal’
7. 著弊納衣: *pāṃśukūlika* ‘wearing rag robes’
8. 但三衣: *traicīvarika* ‘wearing only the three robes’
9. 塚間住: *śmāsānika* ‘dwelling in a charnel ground’
10. 樹下止: *vrkṣamūlika* ‘remaining beneath a tree’
11. 露地坐: *ābhyavakāśika* ‘sitting in open spaces’
12. 但坐不臥: *naiṣādika* ‘just sitting and not lying down’

It is striking that while the contents of this list are evidently borrowed from the *Da zhidu lun*, the ordering is not. The correspondences between the sequences of the *dhutas* in the two texts (*Shi'er toutuo jing* on the left, *Da zhidu lun* on the right) may be illustrated in a table, in which non-matching orderings are italicized:¹⁹

1 = 1
 2 = 2
 3 = 11
 4 = 4
 5 = 5
 6 = 6
 7 = 3
 8 = 12
 9 = 7
 10 = 8
 11 = 9
 12 = 10

As far as I can see, the ordering in our text appears nowhere else.²⁰ Mizuno's suggestion (1954: 304) that our text's order has some relation with that in the *Ekottarikāgama* 增一阿含經 is hard to credit, as shown by the table below, in which the numbers indicate the ordering of the twelve *dhutas* of our text, corresponding to two different lists in the *Ekottarikāgama*.²¹ It is also interesting, finally, that this organization bears no apparent connection with the six *dhuta* items mentioned in the *Ratnarāsi* §v.1.

19 Note that there is also another listing of *dhutas* in the *Da zhidu lun* (T. 1509 [xxv] 595c20–23): 1. 阿蘭若行 2. 乞食 3. 納衣 4. 中後不飲漿 5. 一坐食 6. 一鉢而食 7. 死屍間住 8. 露地住 9. 樹下住 10. 常坐不臥 11. 如敷坐 12. 但受三衣 13. 少欲若知足. This corresponds to our sūtra's listing as follows (sūtra number followed by the list here): 1 = 1; 2 = 2; 3 = ∅; 4 = 5; 5 = ∅; 6 = 4; 7 = 3; 8 = 12; 9 = 7; 10 = 9; 11 = 8; 12 = 10. Thus, our sūtra's items 3 and 5 have no correspondents here, and it has no equivalents to this list's 6, 11 and 13.

20 There is a table in Mizuno 1954: 304 comparing a number of texts. However, as its presentation of our text is wrong (noted also by Enomoto 2003: 113, 127n4), it evidently requires careful rechecking throughout; moreover, it does not include the *Da zhidu lun*. Enomoto 2003: 112–114 discusses the correspondences of the lists, and *passim* the relation between the *Shi'er toutuo jing* and *Da zhidu lun* in particular. He also expresses his disagreement with the suggested grouping of the lists in the *Ekottarikāgama* and *Shi'er toutuo jing*, p. 115. Abe 2001 collects the author's relevant papers, among which the chapters on Prajñāpāramitā are the most relevant here.

21 The first is translated in Thich 1989: 123–124.

T. 125 (11) 569c16– 570a16 (12.5)		T. 125 (11) 795a26–29 (49.2)		<i>Ratnarāśi</i> § v.1	
阿練若	1	阿練若	1	阿蘭若	1
乞食	2	乞食	2	乞食	2
獨坐	12	一處坐	12?	畜糞掃衣	7
一坐一食	4	一時食	4	樹下	10
坐樹下	10	正中食	6	塚間	9
露坐	11	不擇家食	3	露處	11
空閑處	—	守三衣	8		
五納衣	7	坐樹下	10		
持三衣	8	露坐閑靜之處	11		
在塚間坐	9	著補納衣	7		
一食	5?	若在塚間	9		
正中食	6				

It is very hard to know what to make of all of this, and we can perhaps conclude nothing more than that the compilers of the *Shi'er toutuo jing* did not feel the ordering of the items to be canonical in itself. (This is not to say that there is no internal logic in the order whatsoever. In the sequence of items 10, 樹下止, 'remaining beneath a tree,' and 11, 露地坐, 'sitting in open spaces,' since 11 is said to be superior to 10, it must follow it, a pairing retained from the *Da zhidu lun* source, where the items are 8 and 9.) It is, in any event, not my goal here to evaluate the details of the *Shi'er toutuo jing*'s understanding of the *dhuta* ascetic purification practices, something which is best left to a comprehensive study of the system more broadly. Rather, I am primarily interested in the *composition* of the text, using this expression in the dual meaning of its production and its structure. Our considerations of the sources of the core content of the text, namely its accounting of the twelve practices, suffice to demonstrate its near total dependence on the two earlier works, the *Da zhidu lun* and the *Ratnarāśi*. But this is not the end of what may be hypothesized about the process of composition of the text.

3 Mahāyānization?

Above we considered the origins of the *Shi'er toutuo jing* in light of the evidence in several early catalogues. But the catalogues raise another interesting question. Enomoto (1997: 250; 1998: 3) observed that the catalogues with the exception of the *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄 of 730 and the late 8th c. *Zhenyuan xinding Shijiao mulu* 貞元新定釋教目錄 considered the text to belong to the Hīnayāna (or more strictly, *xiaosheng* 小乘, which may not map precisely onto the Indic notion), which suggested to him that the compilers never actually saw the text, the contents of which demonstrate it to be, as the *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu* and *Zhenyuan xinding Shijiao mulu* consider it, a Mahāyāna work. Indeed, it is beyond question that some cataloguers simply took over, without any further infor-

mation, entries from prior catalogues, and therefore their data is, from this perspective, worthless, given that there is no reason to think that they examined the text directly. But this cannot be the whole explanation, since even if they did no more than copy earlier catalogues, they did get their information from somewhere. We can see what the extant catalogues present in the following list:

- 515: *Chu sanzang jiji* 出三藏記集 (T. 2145 [LV] 30b13): 沙門爲十二頭陀經一卷, placed in the category (21b17) 新集續撰失譯雜經錄, “Newly Compiled Continuation of the Assorted List of Anonymous Translations.”²²
- 594: *Zhongjing mulu* I 衆經目錄 (T. 2146 [LV] 131b12): 十二頭陀經一卷一名沙門頭陀經, where it stands in the category (127c25): 小乘修多羅藏錄第二, list of Hīnayāna sūtras.
- 597: *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶記 (T. 2034 XLIX] 117b15): 十二頭陀經一卷一名沙門頭陀經, where it stands within the listing (116c04): 小乘修多羅失譯錄第二, Hīnayāna sūtras attributed to anonymous translators.²³
- 602: *Zhongjing mulu* II 衆經目錄 (T. 2147 [LV] 155a15): 十二頭陀經一卷一名沙門頭陀經, classified among Hīnayāna sūtras translated only once (154a03): 小乘經單本.²⁴
- 664: *Da Tang neidian lu* 大唐內典錄 (T. 2149 [LV] 323c9): 十二頭陀經五紙一名沙門頭陀經, listed under the category of Hīnayāna sūtras (321c28): 小乘經.²⁵
- 664: *Zhongjing mulu* 衆經目錄 (T. 2148 [LV] 187b25): 十二頭陀經一卷一名沙門頭陀經五紙, listed under Hīnayāna sūtras translated only once (186b09): 小乘經單本.²⁶
- 695: *Dazhou kanding zhongjing mulu* 大周刊定衆經目錄 (T. 2153 [LV] 467c26): 十二頭陀經一名沙門頭陀經, here under (467a26): 小乘修多羅藏, Hīnayāna sūtras.²⁷

730: *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄 (T. 2154 [LV] 605c6–7): 十二頭陀經一卷一名沙門頭陀經 宋天竺三藏求那跋陀羅譯, followed by a note: 605c18–19: 舊錄之中皆編小乘部內。今檢尋文理, 多涉大乘, 編在小中, 恐乖至理, 故移於此, “In the Old Catalogues, these [sūtras listed above, including the 十二頭陀經] are arranged in the Hīnayāna section. Now, upon examination of their style and doctrinal content, [I find that] they are for the most part related to the

22 Also listed at 30b12: 十二頭陀經一卷.

23 Also listed at 55b15: 沙門爲十二頭陀經一卷; 91b25: 十二頭陀經一卷; 91c6: 十三[vl: 二]頭陀經一卷; 138c29: 頭陀經二卷. This may of course refer to a different text (there are several references below to a two *juan* 頭陀經).

24 Also listed at 175a3: 頭陀經二卷.

25 Also listed at 225c22: 沙門爲十二頭陀經; 259a12: 十二頭陀經; 259a20: 十二頭陀經; 299c25: 十二頭陀經五紙一名沙門頭陀經; 308b13: 十二頭陀經.

26 Also listed at 212c11: 頭陀經二卷.

27 Also listed at 412c24: 十二頭陀經一卷沙門頭陀經; 右宋文帝代西域沙門求那跋陀羅譯。出長房錄; 412c27: 十三[vl: 二]頭陀經一卷 右宋文帝代求那跋陀羅譯。出長房錄; 439a1: 沙門爲十二頭陀經一卷.

Mahāyāna. [Although] they are arranged among the Hīnayāna works, I think that this deviates from the tenor of their doctrinal content, and therefore I shift them to here.”²⁸

late 8th c. *Zhenyuan xinding Shijiao mulu* 貞元新定釋教目錄 (T. 2157 [LV] 939a2–3): 十二頭陀經一卷一名沙門頭陀經宋天竺三藏求那跋陀羅譯, followed further down, at the bottom of the longer section, by (939a12–13): 今檢尋文理, 多涉大乘, 編在小乘, 至理, 故編移於此, “Now, upon examination of their style and doctrinal content, [I find that] they are for the most part related to the Mahāyāna. [Although] they had been arranged among the Hīnayāna works, given the tenor of their doctrinal content, I have shifted them here.”²⁹

Now, it is certainly possible that most of the cataloguers before Zhisheng 智昇 (?–after 740), who was responsible for the *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu*, simply never saw the text, and that when Zhisheng read it, he felt the need to reclassify it, based on its evident Mahāyānistic content. However, this is not the only possibility. Antonello Palumbo suggests the following:³⁰

The first catalogue to list the *Shi'er toutuo jing* as a Hīnayāna text is the *Zhongjing mulu* of 594 (T. 2146), followed by all the others up to the *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu*. Now, T. 2146, by admission of its very authors, was compiled in haste, in just a few weeks, on imperial order, and exclusively relying on other catalogues; Fajing and the others clearly had not seen most of the texts they list. It seems likely that such attributions were based simply on impressions Fajing and the others drew from the title (and *Scripture of the Twelve Dhutas* admittedly does not come across as a Mahāyāna title). It should also be noticed that the *Da Tang neidian lu* (T. 2149) and the *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu* in contrast to each other respectively refer to the *Shi'er toutuo jing* as a Hīnayāna or a Mahāyāna text, yet they both describe the scripture manuscript as consisting of five sheets, which in turn is consistent with the size of the received text (2096 characters in the Taishō text, which would have taken five sheets based on the Tang average manuscript from Dunhuang, with 28 columns of 17 characters per sheet).

28 Also listed at 484a18: 沙門爲十二頭陀經一卷; 528a21: 十二頭陀經一卷房云見別錄; 528c12: 十二頭陀經一卷房云見別錄; 642c22–23: 十二頭陀經一卷 宋天竺三藏求那跋陀羅譯; 643a12: 沙門爲十二頭陀經一卷 後漢失譯; 689a02: 十二頭陀經一卷一名沙門頭陀經五紙; 712b23: 十二頭陀經一卷一名沙門頭陀經五紙. I adopt the variant 乖 for 乘, thanking Eric Greene for his advice in this regard.

29 It is obvious that this passage is essentially a close paraphrase of the *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu* passage cited immediately above. Also listed at 781b9: 沙門爲十二頭陀經一卷; 825a12: 十二頭陀經一卷房云見別錄; 825c06: 十二[vl: 三]頭陀經二卷房云見別錄; 978b16–17: 十二頭陀經一卷宋天竺三藏求那跋陀羅譯; 978c8: 沙門爲十二頭陀經一卷後漢失譯; 1036b20: 十二頭陀經一卷一名沙門頭五紙.

Not relevant for the present discussion is the *Gujin yijing tuji* 古今譯經圖紀 of 664/5 (T. 2151 [LV] 351a8): 沙門爲十二頭陀經一卷; 362b17: 十二頭陀經一卷.

30 Personal communication.

From this, we gather that there is perhaps less to identification of a text as belonging to the category of Mahāyāna or Hīnayāna than we might have assumed. That is, while the *Kaiyuan Shijiao lu* uses the expression *wenli* 文理, which I have understood as “style and doctrinal content,” and on this basis assigns the text to the Mahāyāna, there is no reason to think on this basis alone that anything had changed in the text itself. To these considerations of Palumbo, we should add the warning shared with me by Eric Greene,³¹ namely that:

The *Kaiyuan* catalogue frequently re-attributes as “Mahāyāna” texts that earlier catalogues had considered “Hīnayāna” (or some other category); for example, the *Fa chang zhu jing* 法常住經, which is listed in the *Kaiyuan* catalog very close to the *Shi'er touduo jing* 十二頭多經 and like it classified as a Mahāyāna sūtra (T. 2154 [LV] 712b27), was similarly classified as a Hīnayāna sutra in all earlier catalogues (see, e.g., *Da Tang neidian lu*, T. 2149 [LV] 299b16). Like the *Shi'er touduo jing*, this text has what we would likely consider some “Mahāyāna elements.” It seems, then, that early Chinese cataloguers did not always take such elements alone as enough to classify a text as “Mahāyāna”—they had their own approaches to this doxographical problem, which often revolved around the complicated Chinese *panjiao* 判教 theories of their days. For example, these often concerned arguments about *audience*—a text addressed primarily to monks in the audience was sometimes for this reason seen as a “Hīnayāna” text, irrespective of its doctrinal content. Precisely what the criteria were is not something that has been completely worked out, I think, especially in the case of “minor” texts like this.

The catalogue evidence, then, seems to be a red herring; the shift in attribution is not after all significant. This said, we certainly do find elements in the text which suggest (at least from an Indic perspective) a Mahāyāna framing. We can draw attention to several passages in particular:

- §3b: 求聲聞者, 得聲聞乘; 求緣覺者, 得緣覺乘; 求大乘者, 速得無上正真之道, “Those who seek to become disciples gain the vehicle of disciples; those who seek to become lone buddhas gain the vehicle of lone buddhas; those who seek the great vehicle quickly gain the awakening of unexcelled perfect truth.” This is paralleled in an old translation of the *Śrīmālādevī* (T. 353 [XI] 218b12–14): 求聲聞者, 授聲聞乘; 求緣覺者, 授緣覺乘; 求大乘者, 授以大乘, which may indeed be our sūtra’s source. (Note that I do not mean to imply here or elsewhere that the sūtra’s compilers used a given expression in the same sense as it had in the source upon which [I hypothesize] they drew. In fact, there is good reason to believe that this is sometimes not at all the case.)
- §23g: 諸菩薩等思惟法已, 得無生忍, 滿足十地, “The bodhisattvas, deeply contemplating this teaching, attained the mental flexibility which comes to terms with the

³¹ Personal communication.

fact that all things are unproduced, and fully attained the tenth stage.” Similar reference to the tenth bhūmi in particular is found elsewhere only in a work attributed to Amoghavajra, and in any case dating to the Tang, the *Dasheng Wenshushili pusa Focha gongde zhuangyan jing* 大聖文殊師利菩薩佛剎功德莊嚴經 (T. 319 [X1] 913b16–17): 又過六十殞伽沙劫, 得無生法忍, 從此已, 後滿足十地, 具足十力. Be this as it may, the reference to a bhūmi system, at least from an Indic perspective, surely is “Mahāyānistic.”

While the first of these two examples corresponds to a text which would predate the putative date of composition of the sūtra, the second does not. Several further Mahāyāna-like expressions likewise seem to be found outside of the *Shi'er toutuo jing* only in works which apparently post-date it. As we will see below, however, this evidence is not nearly as significant as it might seem:

- § 4b: 利益弘深, “advantages are broad and profound.” I have found this expression in only a few later texts: in the *Fayuan zhulin* 法苑珠林 of Daoshi 道世 (d. 681) (T. 2122 [LIII] 382b14), the *Shi jingtu qunyi lun* 釋淨土群疑論 of Huaigan 懷感 (d. before 701; Marchman 2015: 124) (T. 1960 [XLVII] 38b29, 49a28), and the *Wanshan tonggui ji* 萬善同歸集 of Yongming Yanshou 永明延壽 (904–975) (T. 2017 [XLVIII] 962b17). I have not seen it in earlier secular literature either.
- § 4c: 開示我等, “teach us,” appears in the early 7th c. *Ratnaketudhāraṇī* (寶星陀羅尼經, T. 402 [XIII] 539c7): 如來最上神通智 開示我等為勝導, translated by Prabhā[kara]mitra 波羅頗蜜多羅, and in the problematic, perhaps 8th c., **Sūramgamasamādhi* (T. 945 [XIX] 113a25): 開示我等覺心明淨.
- § 23f: 知此五陰從本以來空、無所有。滅除諸相, 證如實智, 成阿羅漢, “One knows that the five aggregates from their very origins are empty, and possess nothing. Rejecting all [such] characteristics, one will comprehend in accord with true reality and attain arhatship.” The phrase 證如實智 occurs only in texts translated by Xuanzang 玄奘 (ca. 602–664).³²

Now, when we think about the location within the sūtra of these problematic passages, we immediately notice one thing: they stand at the beginning and end of the text, rather

32 I do note, however, that another part of the expression, the string 空無所有滅, is found in the *Da zhidu lun* (T. 1509 [XXV] 529c10–11): 或說般若波羅蜜空無所有。滅一切法無可行處.

We note one further case: § 22c: 計有我人眾生壽命, “they assume the idea that there is a self, a person, a being, a life principle.” [Paul Harrison comments that “this is very close to Kumārajīva’s somewhat puzzling way of rendering the sequence *ātma-sattva-jīva-pudgala* (e.g. in his translation of the *Vajracchedikā*).”] Although the sequence 我人眾生壽命 is tolerably common, the whole phrase is found rarely. It occurs in the *Prajñāpradīpa* commentary (般若燈論釋, T. 1566 [XXX] 19b8), whose translation, made between 630–633, is recorded under the name of the foreign monk *Prabhā[kara]mitra (564–633) (Akahane 2015, Yasui 2018), and slightly earlier in Zhiyi’s 智顗 (538–597) *Jingguangming jing xuanju* 金光明經文句 (T. 1785 [XXXIX] 67b24–25): 攬陰成身計有我人眾生壽命. However, Zhiyi quotes from the sūtra’s § 5 in his *Shi chanboluomi cidi famen* 釋禪波羅蜜次第法門 (T. 1916 [XLVI] 490c10–16), and therefore the expression in Zhiyi’s work might conceivably have been influenced by his awareness of the sūtra’s idiom.

than in occurring in its central core. This could perhaps be understood to suggest that, even if all catalogue references to similarly named scriptures are in fact correctly to be linked to the extant *Shi'er toutuo jing*, a core, without 'Mahāyāna' elements, could nevertheless have been, at some later time, expanded or altered to 'Mahāyānize' the sūtra, and such emendation would have most easily been carried out by additions or changes at the beginning or end of the text.

However, in fact, the extensive study of Michael Radich, presented here as an Appendix, makes very clear that the vocabulary of the frame portion of the text, that is, the material at the beginning and end which encloses that borrowed, in the main, from the *Da zhidu lun* and the *Ratnarāśi*, belongs firmly to the fifth century. What this means is that the compilation of the *Shi'er toutuo jing* almost without doubt took place in the fifth century, and not later. This further supports the supposition that the *Shi'er toutuo jing* referred to in the catalogues is nothing other than the text as we have it now.

4 Sources

The text is transmitted in a number of manuscript and printed canons. Our earliest sources include a manuscript from the Shōsōin 正倉院, and a Dunhuang manuscript fragment, although neither of these gets close to the fifth/early 6th century date by which time the text, on the evidence of Sengyou, apparently existed. In addition to the canonical collections, interestingly, the sūtra is also preserved in the Nanatsudera collection, once independently (Na1), and once as part of what we might call a *Sammelhandschrift* (Na2).³³ This is a scroll containing several texts, the first of which is, by content, the *Shi'er toutuo jing*, but either without title, or titled *Foshuo Toutuo jing* 佛說頭陀經. This is the head title of the scroll, and our sūtra is found in its first 124 lines;³⁴ it is not clear if *Foshuo Toutuo jing* is meant to be the title of the compilation as a whole, or only of its first text, which we know otherwise as the *Shi'er toutuo jing*. The remaining texts copied into the manuscript are the *Da biqiu sanqian weiyi* 大比丘三千威儀 (T. 1470), erroneously attributed to An Shigao 安世高 (lines 125–142), the final portion of the *Youposai wujie weiyi jing* 優婆塞五戒威儀經 (T. 1503; lines 143–199, 207–239, 242–256), and other materials Enomoto (1996b) was unable to identify on lines 257–547.³⁵

Above it became clear why attributions of the *Shi'er toutuo jing* to Guṇabhadra as translator are entirely fictional. But that skepticism is not reflected in the manuscript and printed canons. We find in our sources the following:³⁶

33 The first general introductions were Enomoto 1992, 1993a.

34 Edited, with photos, in Enomoto 1996a.

35 See Enomoto 1993a, 1993b, 1994, 1996b. Both of the identified works here may themselves well be Chinese compilations. See respectively <https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/1648/> and <https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/1656/>.

36 Sources Kg, L, M1, M2, Na2, Sai, Shō and St. have no indication.

宋天竺三藏求那跋陀羅譯 in F, Fz: “Translated by the Song Tripiṭaka Master Guṇabhadra from India.”

宋于闐國三藏求那跋陀羅譯 in K, Na1: “Translated by the Song Tripiṭaka Master Guṇabhadra from Khotan.”

劉宋天竺三藏求那跋陀羅譯 in Q, S: “Translated by the Liu Song Tripiṭaka Master Guṇabhadra from India.”

Our manuscripts also do not perfectly agree about the title, and as is evidently the case with the attribution, here too the influence of the catalogues is obvious. The treatment in Na2, as just mentioned, is problematic. Otherwise we find 佛說十二頭陀經, to which L, M1, M2, Q, S add: 一名沙門頭陀經. Only Fz and Sai have merely 十二頭陀經.

5 Influences

The text is cited in some later works, not in fact very frequently, but still more frequently than many other texts in the canon, which to judge by their afterlife in East Asia remained highly obscure. In the notes to the edition and translation, I have tried to supply reference to such citations, although the list is far from complete.³⁷ It may be useful for an overview of both the sources for, and influences of, the sūtra to offer a table. In this table, I have listed the sources since in some cases, it might not be entirely clear whether a given reference is to the *Shi'er toutuo jing* or to its source.

	Probable sources	Parallels	Citations and possible citations
1	—	T. 525 (XIV) 800a6; T. 1331 (XXI) 532b11–12	
2	—	T. 415 (XIII) 860b17; T. 349 (XII) 186c24–25; T. 656 (XVI) 77a20–21	
3	T. 353 (XI) 218b12–14	T. 221 (VIII) 142c25; T. 224 (VIII) 472a20	T. 2127 (LIV) 263a29–b2; X 361 (XX) 515c15–16
4	—	T. 189 (III) 622b27–28	

37 Further, there also exist references which are not citations as such. On example is in the work of Youxi Chuandeng 幽溪傳燈 (1554–1628), his *Yongjia chanzong ji zhu* 永嘉禪宗集註 (X 1242 [LXIII] 292c14–19): 事具十二頭陀經。既依阿蘭若樹下塚間露地常坐不臥。則能於住處臥具而修正足也。既依常乞食一坐食次第乞。則能於飲食而修正足也。既但三衣糞掃衣不畜餘長。則能於衣服而修正足也。既依腐爛藥而治病。則能於醫藥而修正足也。此為比丘入道之行門。三乘聖賢之標幟也。 On this author, see Ma 2011. In general, I have not noted sporadic later imperial period references, not to mention modern ones. On the other hand, Enomoto 1998: 16–17 points to a number of Chinese works which treat the topic of *dhuta* but do not make any reference to the *Shi'er toutuo jing*. It is not possible to offer any good hypotheses why this might be so.

(cont.)

	Probable sources	Parallels	Citations and possible citations
5	DZDL 537a19–24		T. 1916 (XLVI) 490C10–16; X 638 (XXXIV) 371b12–15
6	RR § V.3		卍 Vol. 34: 33a9–11
7	DZDL 537c2–7 RR § V.2		T. 1848 (XLIV) 396b2–4; X 369 (XXI) 231c9–12
8	RR § V.11 RR § VI.4 RR § VI.13		T. 1848 (XLVIII) 396b12–14
9	DZDL 537c7–12		T. 1848 (XLVIII) 396b15–16; T. 2025 (XLIX) 320a27–b1; T. 2127 (LIV) 275b8–12; 卍 Vol. 34: 33a11–12
10	DZDL 537c12–15		T. 2025 (XLIX) 320b1–3; T. 2127 (LIV) 275b12–14
11	DZDL 538b2–4		卍 Vol. 34: 33a12–13
12	DZDL 537c20–24		T. 1848 (XLVIII) 396b20–21; 卍 Vol. 34: 33a13–15
13	RR § V.15 RR § V.13 T. 281 (X) 447c7–8	T. 281 (X) 447c7–8	T. 1848 (XLVIII) 396b16–18; T. 2122 (LIII) 611a24–b2; T. 2123 (LIV) 44a13–20; 卍 Vol. 34: 33a15–16
14	DZDL 537c24– 538a4		T. 1848 (XLVIII) 396b18–20; 卍 Vol. 34: 33a16–18
15	DZDL 538a6–11		T. 1848 (XLVIII) 396b22; 卍 Vol. 34: 33a18–20
16	RR § VII.5 DZDL 537c15–20		T. 1848 (XLVIII) 396b25–27; 卍 Vol. 34: 33a20–22
17	DZDL 538b4–7		T. 1848 (XLVIII) 396b23–25; 卍 Vol. 34: 33a22–24
18	DZDL 538a11–16	T. 276 (IX) 38816, 25, b4	卍 Vol. 34: 33a24–b1
19	DZDL 538a16–20		T. 1848 (XLIV) 396b5–7; 卍 Vol. 34: 33ab1–3
20	DZDL 538a20–27		T. 1848 (XLIV) 396b9–11; 卍 Vol. 34: 33ab3–5
21	DZDL 538a27–b2		T. 1848 (XLIV) 396b4–5; 卍 Vol. 34: 33ab5–7

(cont.)

	Probable sources	Parallels	Citations and possible citations
22	T. 475 (XIV) 540b27–28	DZDL 727b19	T. 310 (XI) 144a14–15; T. 1785 (XXXIX) 67b24–25; T. 233 (VIII) 739c15–17
23	T. 374 (XII) 433c26–434a1?	T. 482 (XIV) 658b29–c1	T. 614 (XV) 281b26–29; T. 1646 (XXXII) 255a29–b1; T. 839 (XVII) 908b3; T. 319 (XI) 913b16–17
24	—		
25	—		

6 The Edition and Translation

In the following, I offer a critical edition of the text, a translation, and sparse notes. As mentioned above, I do not attempt a study of the text's presentation of the *dhuta* ascetic purification practices. I have established the text based on the editions listed below, and in all cases the readings I cite are based on my own examination of photographs of the relevant blockprints, manuscripts or rubbings. For the *Shi'er toutuo jing*, I have not referred to readings cited in the apparatus of the Taishō or *Zhonghua dazang jing* editions, which are, according to my experience, not thoroughly reliable. However, when I cite or rely on variant readings for the *Da zhidu lun*, the main text of which I cite from the Taishō edition, I do rely on its collations. As far as I know, there is no critical edition of this fundamental text, and to edit anew the passages I cite I found a bridge too far. When different readings of the *Shi'er toutuo jing* itself are possible, I have decided what to place into the main text on the grounds of connection with the putative source text of individual passages, and my impressions of inherent plausibility. When questions remain, I have discussed these in the Commentary. All variants are listed in the apparatus, but it should be noted that in some cases I have not referred to variant character forms.

Sources used:

F Fangshan 房山 666. Vol. 14: 133–135.

Fz Fuzhou 福州.³⁸

K Second Koryō 高麗 canon 504. In *Zhonghua dazang jing* 24:310–313; *Tripitaka Koreana* 14: 26.

Kg Kongōji 金剛寺, called 貞 0636–001.³⁹ The manuscript is damaged and in part illegible.

38 Found at db.sido.keio.ac.jp/kanseki/. I do not know whether our sūtra comes from the Chongning 崇寧 or the Pulu 毗盧 canon, but perhaps the latter.

39 This classification refers to the *Zhenyuan xinding Shijiao mulu* 貞元新定釋教目錄.

- L Longzang 龍藏 = Qianlong Dazangjing 乾隆大藏經 448. Vol. 45: 99–103.⁴⁰ Qing period.
- M1 Hongwu “Southern” 洪武南藏 475. Vol. 68: 506–511. Ming period (carved 1372–1398).⁴¹
- M2 Yongle “Northern” 永樂北藏 478. Vol. 53: 237–243.⁴² Ming period.
- Na1 Nanatsudera 佛說十二頭陀經, called 貞 0636–001. In part damaged.
- Na2 Nanatsudera text in the *Foshuo Toutuo jing* 佛說頭陀經 multitext manuscript; called 錄外, indicating its absence from the *Zhenyuan xinding Shijiao mulu* 貞元新定釋教目錄. Edited in Enomoto 1996a, here reedited from photos.
- Q Qisha 磧砂 537. Vol. 42: 10–13.⁴³
- S Sixi 思溪, Song 宋 edition (also called Yuanjuechang 圓覺藏) (completed 1132) 531.
- Sai Saihōji 西方寺, called 貞 0636–001, here only until §18(c), where the photos to which I have access end.
- Shō Shōsōin 正倉院, 第6類 乙種 写經 第 106 号 十二頭陀經 No. 2910. Nara period.
- St Dunhuang manuscript Stein 1063 (in the catalogue of Giles 1957, #1347). ±20 characters per line; 9 lines extant, through §3(c).
- T. 783 [XVII] 720b17–722a7 I give this only for reference, and have not used this edition.

For the *Da zhidu lun*, I rely on Taishō 1509, adopting in some cases the variants in the Taishō apparatus.

For the *Ratnarāsi*, I cite my own edition (Silk 1994, reedition forthcoming but the internal divisions of the text will remain stable).

All other texts are cited according to the Taishō and/or CBETA texts.

The apparatus uses the following abbreviations:

- F Fangshan
 Fz Fuzhou
 K Second Koryō
 Kg Kongōji
 L Longzang
 M1 Hongwu “Southern” Ming
 M2 Yongle “Northern” Ming
 Na1 Nanatsudera
 Na2 Nanatsudera *Foshuo Toutuo jing*
 Q Qisha
 S Sixi
 Sai Saihōji
 Shō Shōsōin
 St Stein 1063

40 Edition published by Xinwenfeng 新文豐, Taipei, 1991.

41 Edition published by Sichuansheng Fojiao xiehui 四川省佛教協會, Chengdu, 1999.

42 Yongle beizang zhengli weiyuanhui 永樂北藏整理委員會, ed., Peking: Xianzhuang shuju 線裝書局, 2000.

43 Yanshengyuan dazangjing ju 延聖院大藏經局, ed., Taipei: Xinwenfeng 新文豐, 1987.

The Scripture on the Twelve *Dhuta* Ascetic Purification Practices

§1

a) 如是我聞：一時，佛在舍衛國給孤獨園精舍，與八千比丘僧、菩薩萬人，皆著衣，持鉢，遊行乞食。b) 食已，至阿蘭若處，加趺而坐。

a) 皆著] St: 俱皆著
持鉢] Na2: 持益

b) 食已] F, K: 食已; Sai: 已; St: 食時
阿蘭若處] Na2: 阿練若

加趺而坐] F, Kg, L, Nai, Naz, Sai: 跏趺而坐; Shō: 智跏趺而坐; St: 者踰化終也

Translation

^a Thus I have heard: At one time the Buddha was staying in a vihāra in Śrāvastī, in the garden of Anāthapiṇḍada, together with a community of 8,000 monks and 10,000 bodhisattvas. All put on their robes, picked up their bowls, and went to beg for alms food. ^b Having eaten, they came to the *araṇya* [wilderness dwelling] and, folding their legs, they sat down.

Commentary

Although there is no way to say whether it is (directly or indirectly) based on this, the opening phrase in precisely the same words is found, for instance, in the *Zhangzhezi aonao sanchu jing* 長者子懊惱三處經, attributed wrongly to An Shigao, but listed already by Sengyou (T. 2145 [LV] 25c20) and thus early enough to have been known to the creator of our text. There we find the text beginning (T. 525 [XIV] 800a6): 聞如是一時佛在舍衛國祇樹給孤獨精舍. Something similar to the next phrase is found in the *Guanding bachu guozui shengsi dedu jing* 灌頂拔除過罪生死得度經 (T. 1331 [XXI] 532b11–12), 與八千比丘眾菩薩三萬六千人俱, reportedly rendered by Huijian 慧簡 in 457 (T. 2145 [LV] 39a21–23; <https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/4323/>).

§ 2

a) 爾時, 世尊怡然微笑。 b) 時, 長老摩訶迦葉從座起, 整衣服, 長跪合掌, 而白佛言: 「 c) 世尊, 我從昔來未曾見佛無緣而笑。 d) 願見哀愍, 告示我等」。

- a) 怡然] Na2: 處怡然; Shō: 怡憮
微笑] Na2, Sai: 微笑
- b) 座起] Kg, Na1, Na2, St: 坐起; Sai: 坐而起
整衣服] Kg: 彥衣服; Na2: 慙衣服; Sai: 杏衣服
- c) 昔來未曾見] Na1: 昔未來曾見; Sai: 昔來曾見; St: 昔未曾見
而笑] Na2, S, St: 而咲
- d) 哀愍] Sai: 哀

Translation

^a At that time, the World Honored One happily smiled. ^b Then the Elder Mahākāśyapa got up from his seat, arranged his robe, knelt down on both knees erect with straight back, folded his hands together, and spoke to the Buddha: ^c “World Honored One! I have never in my entire life seen the Buddha smile without a reason. ^d Please have mercy upon us and tell us [the reason for your smile].”

Commentary

Many texts refer to the Buddha's smile. In the *Dafangdeng Dajijing Pusa nianfo sanmei fen* 大方等大集經菩薩念佛三昧分 (T. 415 [XIII] 860b17), we have exactly the wording 爾時, 世尊怡然微笑.

In several places we find an expression similar to what follows, namely in the *Mile pusa suowen benyuan jing* 彌勒菩薩所問本願經 (T.349 [XII] 186c24–25): 爾時, 彌勒菩薩從座起, 整衣服, 長跪叉手, 白佛言, and *Pusa yingluo jing* 菩薩瓔珞經 (T. 656 [XVI] 77a20–21) 時, 大迦葉便從座起, 整衣服, 長跪叉手, 前白佛言: 世尊...

§ 3

- a) 佛告迦葉：「見阿蘭若處，十方諸佛皆讚歎：『無量功德皆由此生。』^{b)} 求聲聞者，得聲聞乘；求緣覺者，得緣覺乘；求大乘者，速得無上正真之道』。^{c)} 我今住此，是故喜耳」。
- b) 求聲聞者，授聲聞乘；求緣覺者，授緣覺乘；求大乘者，授以大乘。
- T. 353 (XII) 218b12–14

- a) 佛告迦葉] St: ∅
見阿蘭若 F, K, Kg, Nai, St] ; Naz: 是阿練若; Fz, L, M1, M2, Q, S: 我見阿蘭若; Sai: 是阿蘭若十方] St: 上方
諸佛皆] Naz, Sai: 諸佛皆共
無量功德皆由此生] St: ∅
- b) 求聲聞者] Sai: 求聲聞乘者
得緣覺乘] St: 得緣覺乘
正真之道] Kg: 正真道; St: 正真无上之道
- c) 我今] With these characters ends the St. fragment

Translation

^a The Buddha said to Kāśyapa: “Seeing an *araṇya* [wilderness dwelling], all the buddhas of the ten directions praise it [saying]: ‘Immeasurable virtues all emerge from here: ^b those who seek to become disciples gain the vehicle of disciples; those who seek to become lone buddhas gain the vehicle of lone buddhas; those who seek the great vehicle quickly gain unexcelled perfect awakening.’ ^c It is because I now dwell here [in a wilderness dwelling] that I am happy!”

Commentary

a)
The expression 十方諸佛皆讚歎 is found in two early Prajñāpāramitā texts, *Daoxing banre jing* 道行般若經 (T. 224 [VIII] 472a20), and *Fangguang banre jing* 放光般若經 (T. 221 [VIII] 142c25).

The reading in several witnesses (Fz, L, M1, M2, Q, S: 我見阿蘭若) cannot be correct; the agent is the buddhas of the ten directions, not the Buddha who is speaking.

b)
The *Śrīmālādevī* passage cited here (see also the edition in Tsukinowa 1940: 42–43) is credited to Guṇabhadra, and although this has been questioned, the period of the text’s translation is clearly that of Guṇabhadra. It has a very similar later parallel in T. 310 [48] (XI) 674a16–17: 求聲聞者，授聲聞乘；求獨覺者，授獨覺乘；求大乘者，授以大乘。

§ 4

a) 爾時，摩訶迦葉聞佛所說，歡欣踊躍，歎未曾有。 b) 重白佛言：「世尊，此阿蘭若處利益弘深，能令衆生依此修學，成三乘道。 c) 唯願世尊：開示我等阿蘭若法。」

- a) 歡欣] F, Na2, Sai: 歡喜
踊躍] K, Kg: 踴躍
- b) 此阿蘭若] Na2: 此阿練若
- c) 唯願世尊] Q: 果唯願世尊; Fz, L, M1, M2, S, Sai: 惟願世尊
開示我等] Fz, Kg, Na1, Shō: 示我等

Translation

^a When Mahākāśyapa had heard what the Buddha said, he was delighted and ecstatic, and exclaimed at the wonder. ^b Again, he spoke to the Buddha, saying: “World Honored One! The advantages of this *araṇya* [wilderness dwelling] are broad and profound, [since it] allows beings who practice in it to thus attain the awakenings of the three vehicles. ^c I ask the World Honored One to teach us the methods of *araṇya* [wilderness dwelling].”

Commentary

a)
In the *Guoqu xianzai yinguo jing* 過去現在因果經 (T. 189 [III] 622b27–28), attributed to Guṇabhadra, we find: 于時，善慧闍斯記已，歡欣踊躍。The following 歎未曾有 is extremely common.

b)
The expression 利益弘深 seems to appear in only a few later texts: In the *Fayuan zhulin* 法苑珠林 of Daoshi 道世 (d. 681) (T. 2122 [LIII] 382b14), the *Shi jingtu qunyi lun* 釋淨土群疑論 of Huaigan 懷感 (d. before 701; Marchman 2015: 124) (T. 1960 [XLVII] 38b29, 49a28), and the *Wanshan tonggui ji* 萬善同歸集 of Yongming Yanshou 永明延壽 (904–975) (T. 2017 [XLVIII] 962b17). I have not traced it in earlier secular literature either.

The expression 成三乘道 occurs already at least as early as the *Da zhidu lun* (T. 1509 [XXV] 483c20–21, 512a9–10), in the contexts 無漏法，成三乘道，入涅槃，and 令得漏盡，成三乘道，入無餘涅槃，respectively.

c)
The expression 開示我等 appears, for instance, in the early 7th c. *Ratnaketudhāraṇī* (寶星陀羅尼經, T. 402 [XIII] 539c7): 如來最上神通智 開示我等為勝導, translated by Prabhā[kara]mitra, and in the problematic, perhaps 8th c., **Śūraṅgamasamādhi* (T. 945 [XIX] 113a25): 開示我等覺心明淨。I have not found the expression before the Sui-Tang period.

§5

- a) 佛告迦葉：「諦聽，善思念之。b) 我當爲汝略說其義」。
- c) 迦葉白佛言：「世尊，唯然受教」。
- d) 佛告迦葉：「阿蘭若比丘遠離二著。e) 形心清淨，行頭陀法。f) 行此法者，有十二事：
- g) 一者，在阿蘭若處；
二者，常行乞食；
三者，次第乞食；
四者，受一食法；
五者，節量食；
六者，中後不得飲漿；
七者，著弊納衣；
八者，但三衣；
九者，塚間住；
十者，樹下止；
十一者，露地坐；
十二者，但坐不臥。
- f) 復次，須菩提，說法者，受十二頭陀：
一，作阿蘭若。
二，常乞食。
三，納衣。
四，一坐食。
五，節量食。
六，中後不飲漿。
七，塚間住。
八，樹下住。
九，露地住。
十，常坐不臥。
十一，次第乞食。
十二，但三衣。
- (DZDL 537a19-24)

- a) 諦聽] L, M1, M2, Na2, Q, S, Sai: 諦聽諦聽
- b) 略說] Shō: 毗說
- c) 唯然受教] Sai: 唯然受
- d) 遠離二著] Na2, Shō: 遠離二者
- e) 形心清淨] Kg, Nai, Shō: 戒心清淨⁴⁴
- g) 在阿蘭若處] Sai: 阿蘭若處
 二者] Fz, M1, M2, Na2, Q, S: 二
 常行乞食] Kg: 常行食; Na2: 行常乞食
 三者] Fz, M1, M2, Na2, Q, S: 三
 四者] Na2: 四
 五者] Nai: 五

44 This form of 形 appears to be a Japanese style of writing: <https://wcd-ihp.ascdc.sinica.edu.tw/union/en/index.php?c=search&moji=%E5%BD%A2>.

不得飲漿] Na: 不得飲掬水, corrected between lines with addition of 次, which I do not understand; Naz: 不得飲漿
 著弊納衣] Kg: 著; Shō: 著樂納衣
 但三衣] Naz: 具三衣
 塚間住] Fz: 冢間住; Shō: 冢間住
 樹下止] Kg: 樹下; Shō: 樹下上
 但坐不臥] Sai: 但坐下臥

Translation

^a The Buddha said to Kāśyapa: “Listen carefully and ponder this well! ^b I will explain the sense to you briefly.”

^c Kāśyapa spoke to the Buddha, saying: “World Honored One! Yes, please instruct us.”

^d The Buddha said to Kāśyapa: “The *araṇya* [wilderness-dwelling] monk separates himself from two attachments. ^e His body and mind are purified, [because] he practices the *dhuta* [ascetic purification practices]. ^f There are twelve modes for those who practice these methods:

- ^g 1) Dwelling in the *araṇya* [wilderness];
- 2) Always begging for alms food;
- 3) Begging in strict order;
- 4) Taking one meal a day;
- 5) Moderation in eating;
- 6) Not drinking [even] juice after the noon meal;
- 7) Wearing rag robes;
- 8) Possessing only three robes;
- 9) Dwelling in a charnel ground;
- 10) Staying beneath a tree;
- 11) Sitting in an unsheltered place;
- 12) Only sitting, never lying down.

Commentary

a)

It does not seem possible on intrinsic grounds to decide between the forms 諦聽, 諦聽, 善思 and 諦聽, 善思, both attested in our witnesses and which appear to be equally common.

§6

a) 一者: 阿蘭若比丘行頭陀時, 應作是念: 「^b 我今在此空閑之處, ^c 爲無上道捨身、命、財, 修三堅法。 ^d 死當如鹿死, 不生顧戀」。 ^e 若至病苦須人之時, 當作是念: 「^f 我今一身, 爲法出家, 法爲我伴。 ^g 若勤行法者, 即是救護」。 ^h 是爲阿蘭若法行者。

彼比丘若欲至阿蘭若處, 應當思惟八法。何等八。

^c 一者, 我當捨身;
 二者, 應當捨命;
 三者, 當捨利養;
 四者, 離於一切所愛樂處;
^d 五者, 於山間死當如鹿死;
 六者, 阿蘭若處當受阿蘭若行;
 七者, 當以法自活;
 八者, 非以煩惱自活。

迦葉, 是名八法, 阿蘭若比丘所應思惟。思惟已, 當至阿蘭若處。

(RRV.3)

- a) 應作是念] Naz: 應住作是念?
 c) 三堅法] Naz: 三堅法
 d) 當如鹿死 Naz] F: 當如獸死; Fz, L, M1, M2, Na1, Q, S: 當如獸死; K: 當如禱死; Kg: 當如輟死; Sai: 當知 (damaged by worm hole, probably 鹿) 死; Shō: 當如厭屍
 顧戀] F: 顧伏, K, Kg, Na1, Sai, Shō: 顧戀⁴⁵
 e) 若至病苦] Naz: 若死病苦; Sai: 若至病重
 須人] Kg, Na1: 煩人; Naz: 頂人
 f) 法爲我伴] Kg: 法爲口伴. Kg then repeats one line (with errors): 時當作是念我今一身法爲出家我伴
 g) 若勤行法] Naz: 若懃行法

Translation

^a “¹) When an *aranya* [wilderness-dwelling] monk practices the *dhuta* [ascetic purification practices], he should consider in this way: ^b ‘I am now here in this isolated spot, ^c where for the sake of unexcelled awakening I will abandon my body, my life and my wealth, and [instead] cultivate the three stable things. ^d My death should be like the death of a forest animal, and I should not produce any affection [for life].’ ^e If it comes to the point where he, suffering from sickness, must rely on others, he should think: ^f ‘I am now

45 This appears to be a quite normal way of writing this character: <https://wcd-ihp.ascdc.sinica.edu.tw/union/en/index.php?c=search&moji=%E6%88%80>

alone. For the sake of the Teaching I left the home, with the Teaching as my companion. § If I vigorously practice the Teaching, then precisely this will be my salvation.’^h This is [the definition of] one who practices the *araṇya* [wilderness-dwelling] practice.

Commentary

c)

See Oda 1917: 425c. In the *Ratnacūḍaparipṛcchā* 寶髻菩薩會, questionably attributed to Dharmarakṣa (T. 310 [47] [X1] 661b27–28), we find: 三堅法: 一曰, 身要。二曰, 命要。三曰, 財要. In the *Dasazhe niganzi suoshuo jing* 大薩遮尼乾子所說經 (**Satyakapariivarta/Bodhisattvagocaropāyaviṣayavikurvāṇanirdeśa*; T. 272 [IX] 348c24–25; see Silk 2013), attributed to Bodhiruci, we find 三堅法: 一, 修身堅。二, 修命堅。三, 修財堅. A Chinese commentary to the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, the *Zhu Weimojie jing* 注維摩詰經, contains a passage attributed to Sengzhao 僧肇 (374–414) (T. 1775 [XXXVIII] 365c18–21): 堅法, 三堅法: 身命財寶也。若忘身命, 棄財寶, 去封累, 而修道者必獲無極之身, 無窮之命, 無盡之財也。此三, 天地焚而不燒, 劫數終而不盡。故名堅法.

d)

forest animal: While Chinese *lu* 鹿 has the basic meaning of ‘deer,’ there is little question that as a translation term it reflects something like Indic *mṛga*, a broad term for (four-legged) ‘animal,’ but those that are prey rather than predator, hence the translation choice here. A number of witnesses replace *lu* with *shou* 獸, quadruped, but a term which may have the wider semantic domain of “wild beast,” but whose stricter meaning has been defined as “quadruped furred creatures” (Valenti 2020: 609) which in the present context would work equally well.

Rafal Felbur draws my attention to the *Chan miyaofa jing* 禪祕要法經 of ‘Kumara-jiva’ (Greene 2021: 238–239), “After my death, monks, nuns, laymen, or laywomen who wish to study the teachings [of this sutra] ... throughout the night and day ... must sit upright without lying down, and must not doze off or allow their bodies to lean to the side. They always happily dwell in graveyards, beneath trees, or in a forest hermitage, sustaining themselves as the deer do, and dying like them as well,” with the key expression being (T. 613 [xv] 268a6) 死若鹿死.

e)

It is possible that we should prefer after all the unique reading of Sai, 若至病重, which seems to mean “If it comes to the point where he, suffering from a heavy sickness, must rely on others ...,” but from the point of view of the textual history of the work this seems to me less likely to be original.

§7

a) 本以居家多惱, 捨父母、妻子, 出家行道, 而師徒、同學, 還生結著, 心復多燒亂。b) 是故, 受阿蘭若法。c) 令身遠離憤鬧, 住於空閑。d) 遠離者, 離衆鬧聲, 若放牧處。e) 最近三里, 能遠益善。f) 若得身遠離已, 亦當令心遠離五欲、五蓋。g) 阿蘭若比丘法當如是。

十二頭陀者, a) 行者以居家多惱亂。故捨父母、妻子、眷屬, 出家行道, 而師徒、同學, 還相結著, 心復燒亂。b) 是故, 受阿蘭若法。c) 令身遠離憤鬧, 住於空閑。d) 遠離者, e) 最近三里, 能遠益善。f) 得是身遠離已, 亦當令心遠離五欲、五蓋。

(DZDL 537C2-7)

所謂: 無大聲。d) 無衆鬧聲。離麀鹿虎狼及諸飛鳥。遠諸賊盜及牧牛羊者。
(RR V.2)

- a) 多惱] Naz: 多愆
出家行道] Shō: 出家行遺
而師徒同學] Na1: 而師徒同學; Sai: 如徒同學
還生結著] Naz: 還結著
復多燒亂] Sai: 復名燒亂
- b) 受阿蘭若法] Naz: 應受阿蘭若法
- c) 遠離憤鬧] Kg: 遠離憤雨; Naz: 遠離憤雨
- d) 遠離者] Sai: 遠嘴者
離衆鬧聲] Kg, Naz: 離衆雨聲; Sai: 立衆聲
若放牧處] Sai: 若放枚處; Shō: 若放救處
- e) 最近三里] Sai: 最近三重
- f) 若得身遠離已] Kg: 若得遠離已; Na1: 離 is corrected in upper margin but I cannot read what was first written; Naz: 得身遠離已; Sai: 若得遠嘴已
- g) 法當如是] F: 法當如是學

Translation

^a “In principle, because dwelling at home has many vexations, one abandons one’s father and mother, wife and children, and leaves the home to cultivate awakening, and yet [even having renounced the home life], since teachers, pupils and fellow students [in their turn] once again produce fetters and attachments, one’s mind is again, after all, still much distressed. ^b Therefore one [should] adopt the practice of *aranya* [wilderness dwelling]. ^c

One [should] isolate oneself from crowds and dwell in a deserted spot. ^d Isolation means separation from much garrulous commotion, as in a pasture. ^e The closest distance [one should dwell to a village] is three *li*; if one can go farther away than that, so much the better. ^f If one has been able to isolate oneself physically, then one should also isolate one's mind from the five desires and the five obstructions. ^g The practice of the *araṇya* [wilderness-dwelling] monk should be carried out like this.

Commentary

a)

The *Da zhidu lun* reads 還相結著, which may be preferable, but the sūtra witnesses all have 還生結著.

c)

crowds: *kuinao* 憤鬧 may render something like *ākīrṇa*, *saṃkīrṇa*, *saṃsarga* or the like.

d)

I think the sense is that a pasture filled with animals is a place filled with chaotic noises.

f)

five obstructions: **nīvaraṇa*

§8

a) 二者: 欲入聚落乞食之時, 當制六根, 令不著色、聲、香、味、觸、法。b) 又, 不分別男女等相。c) 得與不得, 其心平等。d) 若好若惡, 不生增減。e) 不得食時, 應作是念: 「f) 釋迦如來捨轉輪王位, 出家成道。g) 入里乞食, 猶有不得。h) 況我無福薄德之人, 而有得耶」。i) 是為乞食法。

a) 若見適意色, 不應染著。見不適意色, 亦不生瞋。若聞適意聲, 不適意聲。若嗅適意香, 不適意香。適意味, 不適意味。適意觸, 不適意觸。適意法, 不適意法。心無染著, 亦不生瞋。攝護根門諦視一尋調伏其心。(RR V.11)

迦葉, 乞食比丘應如是自莊嚴。此是乞食常所行法。若乞食時, c) 得與不得, 無有憂喜。不應生於麤細食想。(RR VI.4)

a) 迦葉, 乞食比丘或時入於城邑聚落, 次第乞食。e) 若不得食空鉢而出, 應念: f) 「如來有大威德。捨轉輪王位, 而行出家。斷一切惡法, 成一切善法。g) 入村乞食, 尚空鉢出。h) 況我薄福, 不種善根。不空鉢還也」。是故, 不應生憂。何以故。不種善根能得麤食細食, 無有是處。(RR VI.13)

- a) 欲入聚落] Sai: 欲人聚落
令不著色] Nai: 合不著色; Naz: 令不貪著色; Sai: 不令著色
- c) 得與不得] Naz: 得以不得
- d) 若好若惡] Nai: 若如若要
- f) 轉輪王] Naz: 轉輪聖王
- g) 入里乞食] Sai: 入里乞食
- h) 況我無福薄德] Sai: 況我薄福無得
而有得耶] Sai: 而能得也; Shō: 而有得邪

Translation

^a “2) [The practitioner always begging for alms food,] when he is about to enter a village for alms food, should control the six senses, so as not to cling to material form, sound, smell, taste, the tangible or mental objects. ^b Moreover, [in terms of donors] he does not discriminate between characteristics such as male and female, ^c and whether he does or does not receive [alms food], his mind should be impartial. ^d Whether [the alms food] is good or bad, he is neither elated nor dejected. ^e When he does not obtain alms food, he should think: ^f “The Tathāgata Śākyamuni gave up Universal Emperorship to renounce the world and attain awakening. ^g Still, [even] he had the experience of entering a town to beg for alms food, and yet obtaining none. ^h How can I, a man bereft of merit and lacking virtue, [expect to] obtain any [alms food]?” ⁱ This is the practice of begging for alms food.

Commentary

a)

the practice of begging for alms food: *paiṇḍapātika*.

The expression 制六根 appears already in the *Fanguang banre jing* 放光般若經 (T. 221 [VIII] 29a19).

d)

neither elated nor dejected: The usage here of *busheng zengjian* 不生增減 is not clear to me. *Zengjian* 增減 usually means “increase and decrease.” Dantinne (1991: 67–68) translated the passage: “Que cela soit bon ou mauvais, cela m’engendre ni augmentation, ni diminution.” But I do not see how this makes any sense here. My sorely missed friend Stefano Zacchetti, however, pointed me to several suggestive passages: *Saṃyuktāgama* 別譯雜阿含經 (T. 100 [200] [11] 448a5–6, 9): 將不違佛所說教法致於謗毀生增減耶, and 汝說真實, 非為毀謗, 不增不減. *Kalpamaṇḍitika* 大莊嚴論經 (T. 201 [IV] 26ab7–10): 我等於毀譽 不生增減心 / 但令彼檀越 獲得於罪過 / 又於僧福田 誹謗生增減 / 我等應速往 起發彼檀越. *Zuisheng wen pusa shizhu duanjie jing* 最勝問菩薩十住除垢斷結經 (T. 309 [X] 990c13; evidently a Chinese composition: <https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/1814/>): 終不懷恨生增減心.

Rafal Felbur suggests the possibility of linking this with the preceding c): “Whether he does or does not receive food, his mind should be impartial, [and/i.e.] there should be in it/him neither growth nor diminution of either liking or disliking.” He connects this with his understanding of RR VI.4c: 無有憂喜.

§ 9

a) 行者, 若受請食、若衆僧食, 起諸漏因緣。所以者何。 b) 受請食者, 若得食, 便作是念: c) 「我是福德好人, 故得」。 d) 若不得食, 則嫌恨請者: e) 「彼無所別識。不應請者, 請。應請者, 不請」。 f) 或自鄙薄, 懊惱自責, 而生憂苦。 g) 是貪憂法, 則能遮道。

(DZDL 537C7-12)

- a) 若受請食] Na1, Shō: 若受諸食; Sai: from 食 next line is an interlinear addition
起諸漏因緣] Naz: 則起諸漏因緣
- b) 受請食者] Naz: 若受請食者; Shō: 受諸食者
便作是念] Sai: 便作是食
- c) 我是福德] Naz: 我福德; Sai: 我是福德 = reading of *Da zhidu lun* in Ishiyamadera
- d) 則嫌恨請] Naz: 則嫌恨請; Shō: 則嫌恨請
- e) 不應請者] Shō: 不應請者
不請] Sai: 而不請
- f) 或自鄙] Sai: 或自鄙
懊惱自責] Naz: 懊惱自情; Sai: 懊秒自情; *Da zhidu lun*: Fz: 懊惱自情; Shōgōzō, Ishiyamadera: 懊惱自憤
- g) 是貪憂法 F, Fz, L, M1, M2, Na1, Na2, Q, S] K, Kg: 是貪憂法; Sai: 是食憂法; *Da zhidu lun*:
Ming: 是貪憂法

Translation

^a “For the practitioner, whether eating [at the home of a donor] having received an invitation, or eating with the monastic community, [both of these alternatives to begging] are occasions for the generation of defilements. Why? ^b One who eats [with donors] upon receiving an invitation, when he obtains food [in this way] then thinks: ^c “I obtain [this food] because I am a very meritorious and worthy person.” ^d When he does not obtain food, then he will be displeased with the inviter[, thinking]: ^e “He lacks discernment: he invites those who are not to be invited, and does not invite those who should be invited [namely, me].” ^f Or [on the contrary,] he despises himself, is annoyed and blames himself, thus producing pain. ^g These things, greed [for more food] and distress [at not obtaining any], can obstruct the path.

Commentary

One might compare here a passage in the **Vimuktimārga* (解脫道論; T. 1648 [xxxii] 405a4–13): 云何受乞食。若受他請，則妨自業，不為悅人。不與非法比丘，接膝共坐。知是過患，復見乞食功德。我從今日，斷受他請，受乞食法。云何乞食功德。依心所願，進止自由。不希供饌。消除懈怠，斷滅憍慢，不貪滋味。饒益衆生。常於四方，心無限礙。善人所行是業無疑。問：請有幾種。云何為受，云何為失。答：請有三種。一，似食請。二，就請。三，過請。除此三種請受乞食。若受三請是失乞食，“How does one adopt the practice of begging for alms food? If one accepts an invitation from someone else, then this hampers one’s own activity, and does allow one to please people [by accepting alms in the alms round]. One should not sit closely together with monks who do not follow proper behavior (**adharmika*). Understanding these disadvantages, one can see the virtue of begging for alms food [and thinks]: ‘From today onwards, I will stop receiving invitations from others, and adopt the practice of begging for alms food.’ What are the virtues of adopting the practice of begging for alms food? One can go wherever one wishes. One does not hope for someone who will offer a meal to him, [one’s practice] destroys the feeling of sloth, extirpates arrogance, and one does not covet succulent flavors. It amply profits beings, and in every direction, one’s mind is unimpeded. What sages (**satpuruṣa*) practice is this activity, of that there is no doubt.”

“Question: How many kinds of invitations are there? How does one adopt the practice of begging for alms food, and how does one lose that opportunity?”

“Answer: Invitations are of three types: 1. Invitation to ? [以 unclear] food; 2. Invitation to go [to eat]; 3. Invitation to visit [to eat]. Rejecting these three types of invitations, one should adopt the practice of begging for alms food. If one accepts these three types of invitation, this constitutes loss of the opportunity afforded by begging for alms food.”

(Cp. Ehara et al. 1961: 30. Miyamune 1923: 115; 16 points out the similarity of these passages in the *Shi'er toutuo jing* and *Vimuktimārga*.)

g)

As the readings apparatus shows, there is a variation here between *yōu* 憂 and *ài* 愛. The semantics of these terms, their possible graphical confusion, and the difficulties of deciding readings in other contexts have been discussed in some detail by Zhao 2020: 285–290. The details of this discussion apply to an entirely different set of conditions, but what is of interest and value for us here is the fact that it can be difficult to decide which reading is correct, and our case seems to show that there is a rather wide overlap between the terms. Nevertheless, Michael Radich suggests the following understanding, which I adopt: “I think 貪憂法 summarises the two main points of the paragraph as a whole: what happens either (a) if one gets the food one wants 若得食, or (2) if one doesn’t 若不得食. In the first case, one falls into greed 貪, or is motivated by it. In the second case, one suffers 憂.” Rafal Felbur suggests the additional possibility that we have to do with “貪 the thought (arrogant, greedy) that he deserves food because he is meritorious; 憂 the anxiety and self-blaming (‘low self-esteem’), i.e. the 憂苦 above. The key points therefore are arrogance and self-loathing.”

§10

a) 僧食者, 入衆中, 當隨衆法, 斷事擯人, 料理僧事, 處分作使。 b) 心則散亂, 妨廢行道。 c) 有如是等惱亂事故, 應受常乞食法。

a) 僧食者, 入衆中, 當隨衆法, 斷事擯人, 料理僧事, 處分作使。 b) 心則散亂, 妨廢行道。 c) 有如是等惱亂事故, 受常乞食法。

(DZDL 537C12–15)

- a) 入衆中] Naz: 入衆; Sai: 人僧中
 擯人] F, Fz: 擯人; Na1, Na2: 擯人; *Da zhidu lun*: Fz, Shōgōzō ×2: 擯人
 料理] Fz: 撩理; Naz: 斷理; *Da zhidu lun*: Fz, Ishiyamadera, Shōgōzō ×2: 斷理
- c) 惱亂事故] Naz: 惣亂事是故
 常乞食法] Sai: 常乞法

Translation

^a “Concerning [the second case, that of] one who eats with the monastic [community], when he has entered in a community, he should follow the community’s rules, [including the duties to] judge matters and expel [violators], manage monastic affairs, carry out sanctions and perform [necessary] tasks. ^b One’s mind consequently becomes distracted [due to these obligations], and this hinders one’s progress on the path. ^c Because of [the danger of] such distractions, one should adopt the practice of always begging for alms food.

§ 11

-
- a) 三者: 頭陀比丘不著於味, 不輕衆生, b) 等心憐愍, 不擇貧富, 故受常次第乞食法。
- a) 行者, 不著於味, 不輕衆生。 b) 等心憐愍故, 次第乞食, 不擇貧富, 故受次第乞食法。
- (DZDL 538b2-4)
-

- a) 不著於味 L, M1, M2, Na2, Q, S, Sai] F, Fz, K, Kg, Na1, Na2: 不著於色
- b) 等心] Na2: 心
不擇貧富故] Na2: 不釋貧富是故 (Na1 damaged and missing here)
受常] Na2: 應受常
次第乞食法] Sai: 次第乞者法

Translation

^a “3) Because the monk who follows the *dhuta* [ascetic purification practices] does not attach himself to flavors, and does not despise beings, and ^b because with an equanimous mind he commiserates [with all], not discriminating rich from poor, he adopts the practice of always accepting alms food in strict order.

Commentary

a)
The reading in some witnesses, 不著於色, makes very little sense in the context of food, and it is hard to understand how it could have come about. The words 味 and 色 are graphically and phonologically entirely distinct. However, it is possible that 色, as the first item of the habitual list of six sense objects (see above in § 8), was felt by some scribe(s) to be more logical than the fourth, 味.

§ 12

a) 四者: 應作是念: b) 「我今求一食, 尚多有所妨, 何況小食、中食、後食。c) 若不自損, 則失半日之功, d) 不能一心行道。為佛法故, 為行道故, 不為身命, 如養馬養豬。e) 是故, 斷數數食」。f) 應受一食法。

a) 行者作是念: b) 「求一食, 尚多有所妨, 何況小食、中食、後食。c) 若不自損, 則失半日之功, d) 不能一心。行道佛法, 為行道故, 不為益身, 如養馬養豬。e) 是故, 斷數數食」。f) 受一食法。

(DZDL 537C20-24)

- b) 我今求一食] Kg: 我求一食; Nai: 我今救一食
尚多有所妨] Nai: 而多有所妨; Na2: 尚多有所方; Sai: 常有所妨
小食中食後食] Kg: 小食中食後; Nai: 小食中食復食
- d) 為行道故] Sai: 道行道故
不為身命] Sai: 不為身
如養馬養豬] Nai, Na2: 如養馬養賭; L, M1, M2, Q, S: 如養馬養豬法; Fz, Sai: 如養馬養賭(?)法
- e) 斷數數食] F: 數數食

Translation

^a “4) [The practitioner who practices taking one meal a day] should think: ^b ‘If even seeking only a single meal, as I do now, I still have so many hindrances, then how much more [would be the hindrances caused by seeking three meals,] breakfast, lunch and dinner! ^c If I were not to reduce my own [mealtimes], then I would lose half a day’s effort. ^d I would not be able to practice the path single-mindedly. Because [I practice] for the sake of the Buddha’s teaching, and because it is for the sake of practicing the path, [my eating] is not [merely] for the sake of physical life, as is the case when one feeds horses or pigs. ^e Therefore, I disengage from repeated eating.’ ^f [Thinking thus,] one should adopt the practice of taking one meal a day.

Commentary

c)
Rafal Felbur wonders whether we might also understand: “If this [seeking three meals] does not lead to my own destruction, it will [at least] cause me to lose half a day’s effort.” In support he points out that “while there are numerous instances of *zisun* 自損 used in a clearly positive sense, referring to a virtue like restrain, self-discipline, etc, it can also be used in an obviously pejorative meaning, i.e. ‘self-damage,’ ‘self-harm,’ in general self-destructive behavior, as in T. 1428 [XXII] 1b22–25.”

d)

I punctuate DZDL in accord with the normal rhythm of four character groups, but note that the sūtra adaptation calls for a different word division. Rafal Felbur wonders whether this parsing might also work for the DZDL: “I would be unable to practice the *dao*/path singlemindedly. The Buddha’s Dharma is about practicing the *dao*/path, not about ...”

The sense of the image, I believe, is that animals lead physical lives not devoted to a higher purpose, and the author wishes to draw a contrast to that here.

§13

a) 五者: 得一食時, 應作是念:
 b) 「我今若見渴乏衆生, 以一分施之。」
 c) 我爲施主, 彼爲受者」。
 d) 施已, 作是願言: 「e) 令一切衆生興福, 救之莫墮慳貪」。
 f) 持食至空靜處, 減一搏食, 著淨石上, 施諸禽獸。
 g) 亦如上願。
 h) 若欲食時, 當敷尼師壇淨手。
 i) 作是念言: j) 「身中有八萬戶蟲」。
 k) 蟲得此食, 皆悉安隱。
 l) 我今以食施此諸虫。
 m) 後得道時, 當以法攝汝」。
 n) 是爲不捨衆生。

迦葉, 阿蘭若比丘, 若得鹿食若得細食, 受是食已, 應觀四方。此村邑中誰貧窮者, 當減此食以施與之。
 b) 若見貧人所可乞食, 即分半與 [...] c) 我爲施主。彼爲受者。(RR V.13)

e) 當願衆生興福, 救之莫墮慳貪。(T. 281 [X] 447c7-8)

迦葉, 阿蘭若比丘, 若乞食得多, 應生知足想, f) 應於食中減取一搏, 置淨石上, 如是思惟。有諸鳥獸能噉食者, 我以施之, 彼爲受者。(RR V.15)

臨欲食時, 如是思惟: j) 今此身中有八萬戶蟲。k) 蟲得此食皆悉安樂。l) 我今以食攝此諸蟲。m) 我得阿耨多羅三藐三菩提時以法攝取。(RR V.13)

- a) 應作是念] Kg: 應作日/曰?念; Sai: 應作是食
 b) 渴乏衆生] Sai: 渴之衆生
 以一分施之] Sai: 一分施
 c) 我爲施主] Na2: 爲我施主
 d) 作是願言] Na2: 作如是願言
 e) 令一切衆生] Kg: 合一切衆生
 興福救之] Na1: 興救之; Na2: 與富救乏; L, M1, M2, Q, S: 與覆救之
 莫墮慳貪] Kg: 莫隨噉貪; Na1: 莫隨慳貪; Sai, Shō: 莫墮慳貪
 f) 持食至空靜處] Fz: 持食至空靖處; Na1: 持食至空請處; Sai: 至空淨; 處; Shō: 持食至空靖處
 減一搏食著 L, M1, M2, Q, S] F, Fz, K, Kg, Na1, Na2, Shō: 減一段著; Sai: 減一揣著
 施諸禽獸] Na1: 施諸禽亦 [see next]; Na2: 施諸禽狩
 g) 亦如上願] Na1: 獸如上願 [see above]; Na2: 亦獸亦[marginal correction: 如]上願; Sai: 亦知上願
 h) 若欲食時] Sai: 欲食時
 壇淨手] F, Na1, Na2, Shō: 檀淨手
 j) 八萬戶蟲] F: 八萬戶虫; Kg, Na1, Na2, Shō: 八萬戶虫

- k) 蟲得此食] F, Fz: 虫得此食; Kg, Na₁, Na₂, Shō: 虫得此食
安隱] Shō: 安穩
- l) 施此諸虫] Na₁: 施此諸虫; Na₂: 攝此諸虫; Fz, L, M₁, M₂, Q, S: 施此諸虫; Sai: 攝此諸虫
- m) 當以法攝汝, with Na₂, Sai] F, Fz, K, Kg, L, M₁, M₂, Q, S, Shō: 當以法施汝; Na₁: 當以法施
法
- n) 是爲不捨衆生] Na₁: 是爲不捨衆[
衆生; Sai: 是爲不捨, and see §14(a)

Translation

^a “5) When [the practitioner who practices moderation in eating] obtains a single meal, he should think thus: ^b ‘Now, if I see needy beings, I will donate to them a portion [of my alms food]. ^c I will be the donor, and they will be the receivers.’ ^d And having given, he makes a vow, saying: ^e ‘May this cause all beings to generate merit, and rescue them so that they will not fall into stinginess.’ ^f And taking his food to a lonely, quiet spot, removing one ball of food [from his own], he places it atop a clean rock, and donates it to the birds and beasts. ^g And again he makes a vow as before. ^h When he wants to eat, he should spread out his sitting mat and clean his hands. ⁱ Then he should think thus: ^j ‘In this body there are 80,000 parasites. ^k When the parasites get their nourishment, they all become totally at ease. ^l Now I make this gift of food to these parasites. ^m Later, when I have obtained awakening, I will attract you [parasites] with the Teachings.’ ⁿ This is [what is meant by] not abandoning beings.

Commentary

b) needy: *kefa* 渴乏, which represents the source's *pin* 貧, poor.

c) donor: *dānapati*.

e) The possible source is T. 281 (X) 447c7–8, in the *Pusa benye jing* 菩薩本業經, accepted as a work of Zhi Qian by Nattier 2008: 137–139.

m) I will attract you [parasites] with the Teachings: The alternate reading, “I will make the gift of the Teachings to you,” appears to have been influenced by the preceding expression in l). However, given the source in RR, the reading I have chosen (with thanks to the observation of Rafal Felbur) is evidently closer to the source. The two characters 攝 and 施 are not homophones, suggesting that the replacement was not due to any phonological confusion.

§14

a) 若不見困乏者, 但食三分之二, 以自支身命。所以者何。b) 行者, 若貪心極噉, 令腹脹氣塞, 妨廢行道。c) 若留一分, 則身輕安隱, 易消無患。d) 於身無損, 則行道無廢。e) 是故, 應受節量食法。

有人雖一食, b) 而貪心極噉, 腹脹氣塞, 妨廢行道。是故, 受節量食法。e) 節量食法者, c) 略說隨所能食三分留一分, 則身輕安穩易消無患。d) 於身無損, 則行道無廢。

(DZDL 537C24-538a4)

- a) 若... 支] Sai: with the 衆生 from §13(n), a total of 17 characters (one line) have been skipped, until 身 (see below)
 若不見困乏者] Kg: 若不見固乏者
 以自支身命] Naz: 以自支身; Sai: (see above for omission of 以自支) 身
- b) 若貪心極噉] Kg, Na1, Na2: 若貪心極噉; Sai: 若貪心極噉
 令腹脹氣塞] K: 令腹脹胸塞; Fz, Kg, Na1, Shō: 令腹脹匈塞; Q, Sai: 腹脹氣塞
- c) 若留一分] Na1: 若[留 with 一 beneath as one character] 分 (many manuscripts write 留)
 身輕安隱] Kg, Shō: 身輕安穩
 易消無患] Sai: 湯消無患
- e) 節量食法者] In *Da zhidu lun*, I adopt the reported reading of two Shōgōzō manuscripts, rather than the printed text's 節量者

Translation

^a “If [the practitioner of eating in moderation] does not see needful beings [with whom he might share his food, then still] he eats only two-thirds, in order to sustain his own life. Why? ^b If the practitioner has a greedy attitude and eats with gusto, this will cause his belly to swell up and his vital force to be obstructed, which will create difficulties for his practice of the path. ^c If he leaves aside one portion [eating only two-thirds], then his body will be light and at ease, and he will easily digest, without distress. ^d There being no impairment to his body, he can practice the path without difficulties. ^e Therefore, one should adopt the practice of eating in moderation.

Commentary

This category is rarely mentioned in the literature. One place it is, however, discussed is in the **Vimuktimārga* (解脫道論; T. 1648 [XXXII] 405b5-13) as follows:

云何受節量食。若飡飲無度, 增身睡重。常生貪樂, 爲腹無厭。知是過已, 見節量功德。「我從今日, 斷不貪恣, 受節量食」。云何節食功德。籌量所食, 不恣於腹。多食增羸。知而不樂。除貪滅病, 斷諸懈怠。善人所行是業無疑。問: 云何受節量食。云何爲失。答: 若受飯食應自思惟:

所須多少，以爲常准。不取長食。善知籌量，斷無期度。調節量食。若不
如是，此則爲失。

How does one adopt the practice of eating in moderation? If one eats and drinks without bounds, this greatly increases one's physical sleepiness and torpor. One continually desires [food], such that one's stomach is never full. Understanding these disadvantages, one can see the virtue of eating in moderation [and thinks]: "From today onwards, I will stop with my indulgences and adopt the practice of eating in moderation." What are the virtues of adopting the practice of eating in moderation? By keeping track of what is eaten, one does not give in the whims of one's stomach. Eating too much ruins one physically. Knowing this, one should not wish [to eat more]. This will eliminate greed, dispel one's illnesses and rid one of indolence. What sages (**satpuruṣa*) practice is this activity, of that there is no doubt.

Question: How does one adopt the practice of eating in moderation? How does one fail to do so?

Answer: If one receives food and drink, one should consider: "Just how much I need is determined by a constant norm." He should not take surplus food. He knows well how much to take, and does not ever exceed those bounds. This is called the practice of eating in moderation. If one does not behave in such a manner, then he fails [to carry out the practice].

Cp. the trans. in Ehara et al. 1961: 31–32. See Bapat 1937: 20. The similarity to the *Sh'ier toutuo jing* was noticed already by Miyamune 1923: 115: 27.

A much briefer but not dissimilar characterization is offered in the *Aṅguttaranikāya* (AN ii.40.4–13): *kathaṅ ca bhikkhave bhikkhu bhojane mattaññū hoti. idha bhikkhave bhikkhu paṭisaṅkhāyoniso āhāraṃ āhāreti. neva davāya na madāya na maṇḍanāya na vibhūsanāya yāvad eva imassa kāyassa ṭhītiyā yāpanāya vihiṃsūparatīyā brahmacariyānuggahāya. iti purāṇaṅ ca vedanaṃ paṭihaṅkhāmi navaṅ ca vedanaṃ na uppādessāmi yātrā ca me bhavissati anavajjatā ca phāsuvihāro cāti. evaṃ kho bhikkhave bhikkhu bhojane mattaññū hoti*, "And how does a bhikkhu observe moderation in eating? Here, reflecting carefully, a bhikkhu consumes food neither for amusement nor for intoxication nor for the sake of physical beauty and attractiveness, but only for the support and maintenance of this body, for avoiding harm, and for assisting the spiritual life, considering: 'Thus I shall terminate the old feeling and not arouse a new feeling, and I shall be healthy and blameless and dwell at ease.' It is in this way that a bhikkhu observes moderation in eating" (trans. Bodhi 2012: 427).

§15

- a) 六者：節量食後，過中飲漿，則心生樂著。b) 求種種漿，果漿、蜜漿等。c) 求欲無厭，不能一心修習善法。d) 如馬不著轡勒，左右噉草，不肯進路。e) 若著轡勒，則噉草意斷，隨人意去。f) 是故，受中後不飲漿法。
- a) 有人雖節量食，過中飲漿，則心生樂著。b) 求種種漿，果漿、蜜漿等。c) 求欲無厭，不能一心修習善法。d) 如馬不著轡勒，左右噉草，不肯進路。e) 若著轡勒，則噉草意斷，隨人意去。f) 是故，受中後不飲漿法。
- (DZDL 538a6-11)

- a) 節量食後] Naz, Sai: 已節量食後
過中飲漿] Naz: 過中飲漿; Sai: 復過中飲漿
則心生樂著] *Da zhidu lun*, reading with Fz, Ishiyamadera, Shōgōzō ×2, Ming, Song, Yuan, against printed text which omits 生
- b) 蜜漿等] Nai: 密漿等
- c) 求欲無厭] K: 求欲無厭; Kg: 欲無厭; Sai: 求欲無厭
修習善法] Sai: 修習是法
- d) 如馬不著轡勒] Fz, K, Kg, L, M1, M2, Na1, Q, S, Shō: 如馬不著勒; Naz: 如馬不著鞞勒; Sai: 如馬不者鞞; *Da zhidu lun*, reading with printed text; Fz, Ishiyamadera, Shōgōzō ×2 omit 轡, with many of the witnesses to the sūtra. Either reading seems possible, without much difference in meaning.
左右噉草] Kg, Sai: 左右敢草; Naz: 則左右敢草
- e) 若著轡勒] Sai: 修者鞞勒
則噉草意斷隨人意去] F: 則噉草意隨人意去; Kg, Sai, Shō: 則敢草意斷隨人意去; Naz: 則散草意絕隨人意去; *Da zhidu lun* reading with Fz, Ishiyamadera, Shōgōzō ×2, Ming, Song, Yuan, against printed text which has 不噉
- f) 受中後不飲漿法] Naz: 應受中後不飲漿法, Sai: 應中後不飲漿法

Translation

^a “6) If, after having eaten in moderation, one drinks juice after noon, then his mind will become attached to [such] pleasures. ^b He will seek after all sorts of juices, fruit juice, honey sweetened juice and the like. ^c His desires insatiable, he will not be able to single-mindedly cultivate good qualities. ^d [The case] is like a horse that, when not fitted with reins and bit, grazes on grasses right and left, and refuses to proceed down the road. ^e But if it is fitted with reins and bit, its will to graze the grasses is impeded and it goes off where the rider wishes. ^f Therefore one [should] adopt the practice of not drinking juice after the noon meal.

§16

a) 七者: 應入聚落中, 捨故塵棄物, 浣之令淨, ^{b)} 作弊納衣, 覆除寒露。c) 有好衣因緣, 則四方追求, 墮邪命中。d) 若得人好衣, 則生親著。e) 若不親著, 檀越則恨。f) 若僧中得衣, 如上說僧中之過。g) 有好衣是未得道者生貪著處。h) 好衣因緣招致賊難, 或至奪命。i) 有如是等患故, 應受弊納衣法。

c) 好衣因緣故, 四方追逐, 墮邪命中。d) 若受人好衣, 則生親著。e) 若不親著, 檀越則恨。f) 若僧中得衣, 如上說衆中之過。g) 又好衣是未得道者生貪著處。h) 好衣因緣招致賊難, 或至奪命。i) 有如是等患故, 受弊納衣法。

(DZDL537C15-20)

a) 捨糞掃中物。應淨浣濯, 令無垢膩。浣已好染。染已, ^{b)} 作僧伽梨。
(RR VII.5)

- a) 應入聚落中] Sai: 應人聚落中
捨故塵棄物] Na2, Sai: 捨塵故棄物; Shō: 捨故塵棄物
浣之令淨] Kg: 浣之令淨; Sai: 洗之令淨
- b) 作弊納衣 ... 求墮邪命中] Kg: 17 characters (1 line) from 弊 to 求 missing
- c) 有好衣因緣] Na2, Sai: 又好衣因緣
墮邪命中] Nai: 隨邪命中; Na2: 隨耶命中
- d) 則生親著] Sai: 則生食著
- e) 若不親著] Sai: 若不食著
- f) 若僧中得衣] Shō: 若僧中捋衣
如上說] Na2: 亦如上說
- g) 有好衣是] Na2, Sai: 又好衣是
生貪著處] Sai: 生食著處
- h) 好衣因緣] Kg: 好衣回緣
招致賊難] Sai: 招致則難
或至奪命] Na2: 或致奪命
- i) 有如是等患故] Na2: 有如是等患是故
應受弊納衣法 Na2] All other versions: 應受弊納衣; Na2 reading agrees with *Da zhidu lun*.

Translation

^a “7) [The practitioner of wearing rag robes] should enter a village, pick up old dirty and abandoned things, wash them clean, ^b and make a rag robe to cover himself to keep off the cold and dew. ^c If he were motivated by [the desire to possess] good robes, then he would chase after them everywhere, and would fall into wrong livelihood. ^d If [a practitioner] were to obtain [such] good robes from someone, then he would become fond of [the robes], ^e and if he were not fond of them, then the donor would feel resentful. ^f If one were to obtain a robe from within the community, then [he would fall prey to] the shortcomings within the community already discussed above [in § 10]. ^g For [the practitioner] who has not yet attained awakening, having good robes is an occasion for producing attachment. ^h On account of [one’s possessing] good robes, one may call upon oneself the disaster of [encountering] thieves, or even the loss of life. ⁱ Because of the existence of such misfortunes, one should adopt the practice of wearing rag robes.

Commentary

f)

already discussed above: Note that in the source, the *Da zhidu lun*, this section comes immediately after what is here § 10, and thus this deictic reference makes perfect sense in its original context, while here it is hard to construe.

§17

a) 八者：應少欲知足。b) 衣趣蓋形，不多不少。c) 白衣爲好故，畜種種衣。d) 或有外道苦行裸形無恥。e) 是故，佛弟子應捨二邊，處中道，受但三衣法。

a) 行者少欲知足。b) 衣趣蓋形，不多不少故。c) 白衣求樂故，多畜種種衣。d) 或有外道苦行故，裸形無恥。e) 是故，佛弟子捨二邊，處中道行。

(DZDL 538b4-7)

- b) 衣趣蓋形] L, M1, M2, Q, S: 衣取蓋形; Na1, Shō: 衣趣蓋形; Sai: 衣耶蓋形
 c) 畜種種衣] Sai: 多畜種種衣
 d) 或有外道] Kg: 或有未道
 裸形無恥] Kg: 裸形無耻; Na1: 裸形無耻; Na2: 深形無恥
 e) 應捨二邊處中道] Sai: 應捨二邊處在中道
 中道受但三衣法] Na2: 於中道應但受三衣法

Translation

^a “8) [The practitioner who wears only three robes] should be of few desires. ^b The robes are to cover the body, no more no less. ^c Because lay people think it good, they accumulate all variety of clothes. ^d Alternatively, there are non-Buddhist sectaries who engage in ascetic practices, baring their bodies without shame. ^e Therefore, disciples of the Buddha should reject the two extremes and take the middle path, adopting the practice of wearing only the three robes.

Commentary

a)
 of few desires: 少欲知足 is a standard rendering of *alpeccha-saṃtuṣṭa-* or some variant thereof. It might perhaps be rendered more literally “satisfied with only few desires,” but without the implication that even a few desires are acceptable, or “of few desires and moderate,” knowing when enough is enough. This is really nothing more than an question of how to express in English what is quite clear in the text.

d)

It is not absolutely clear that this is a reference to Digambara Jains, although this is probably a good first guess. Other possibilities include Ājīvikas, or even varieties of Brahmanical ascetics. However, what is equally—if not more—likely is that the author of the *Da zhidu lun* did not have any specific sect in mind, and may simply have deployed a trope indicative of one type of asceticism the Buddha himself rejected, according to his *vita*.

§18

a) 九者: 若佛在世, 若滅度後, 應修二法。b) 所謂: 止觀。c) 無常、空觀是佛法初門, 能令厭離三界。d) 塚間常有悲啼哭聲。死屍狼藉, 眼見無常。e) 又火燒, 鳥獸所食, 不久滅盡。f) 因是屍觀, 一切法中易得無常想。g) 又塚間住, 若見死屍臭爛不淨, 易得九想觀。是離欲初門。h) 是故, 應受塚間住法。

c) 無常、空觀是入佛法初門, 能厭離三界。d) 塚間常有悲啼哭聲。死屍狼藉, 眼見無常。e) 後或火燒鳥獸所食, 不久滅盡。f) 因是屍觀, 一切法中易得無常相、空相。g) 又塚間住, 若見死屍臭爛不淨, 易得九想觀是離欲初門。h) 是故, 受塚間住法。

(DZDL 538a11-16)

- a) 若滅度後] Naz: 若滅^後後
 b) 佛法初門] *Da zhidu lun*, reading with Yuan, Ming, against printed text which omits 初
 c) 無常空觀] Sai: with 觀 end the available photos of Sai.
 能令厭離三界 F, Fz, K, L, M1, M2, Q, S, Shō] Kg: 能全厭離三界; Na1: 能令厭離三界; Naz: 能令行者厭離三界
 d) 塚間常有] Fz, Q, S: 冢間常有; Shō: 家間常有
 悲啼哭聲] Kg: 悲帝哭聲
 死屍] Na1, Na2, Shō: 死尸
 e) 又火燒鳥獸] Kg: 又大燒鳥獸; Naz: 有為火燒鳥狩
 所食不久滅盡] Kg: 所不久滅盡
 f) 因是屍觀] Kg: 回是屍觀; Naz: 因是尸觀
 一切法] Shō: 一切性
 易得無常想] Kg: 易得無啼想; Naz: 易得無常想空想
 g) 塚間] Fz, Na1, Shō: 冢間
 死屍] Na1, Na2, Shō: 死尸
 臭爛不淨] Kg: 臭爛未淨
 易得九想觀 ... 塚間住法] Kg: 16 characters (1 line) from 易 to 間 missing
 離欲] Na1: 欲
 h) 塚間] Fz, Na1, Na2, Shō: 冢間

Translation

^a “g) Whether while the Buddha is in the world, or after he has passed into extinction, one should practice two practices: ^b Calming and insight. ^c Contemplation of impermanence and of emptiness is the first gate of entrance into the Buddha’s teachings, and can allow one to flee the three realms [of desire, form and formlessness, that is, saṃsāra]. ^d Char-

nel grounds are always filled with voices of lament. Corpses are scattered all about, and one can see impermanence with one's own eyes. ^e Moreover, [the corpses] are burned, or eaten by birds and beasts, and they quickly disappear. ^f Thanks to this contemplation of the corpse, it is easy to grasp the notion of the impermanence inherent in all things. ^g Further, dwelling in a charnel ground, if one sees a corpse decomposing and impure, it is easy to obtain the nine contemplations [of the impure]. This is the first gate of freedom from desire. ^h Therefore, one should adopt the practice of dwelling in a charnel ground.

Commentary

a)

In the *Wuliangyijing* 無量義經 (T. 276 [IX] 38816, 25, b4) and elsewhere, we find precisely the expression 若佛在世若滅度後.

b)

It is evident, and interesting, that calming and insight actually have nothing to do with the rest of this passage, or the scripture in toto. I'm not sure what they are doing here, other than as perhaps a reflexive addition after "two practices"?

f)

inherent in all things: I do not know quite how to express the idea here well in English. The intent of the passage is that by contemplating a corpse one can perceive that all things are impermanent. The stress is perhaps less on the inherence of this impermanence than on its universality: it extends to each and every thing. One might more literally translate "with regard to all things," but I feel that this does not work very well in English, although the meaning is correct.

g)

On the nine contemplations, see the detailed discussion in Lamotte 1944–1980: III.1311–1328.

§19

a) 十者: 行人已作不淨、無常等觀, 得道事辦。b) 若未得道者, 心則大厭。c) 是故, 應捨至樹下, 思惟求道。d) 又如佛生時、成道、轉法輪、般涅槃時, 皆在樹下, 行者隨諸佛法常處樹下。e) 有如是等因緣故, 應受樹下坐法。

a) 能作不淨、無常等觀已, 得道事辦。捨至樹下。b) 或未得道者, 心則不大厭。c) 取是相, 樹下思惟。d) 如佛生時、成道時、轉法輪時、般涅槃時, 皆在樹下, 行者隨諸佛法常處樹下。e) 如是等因緣故, 受樹下坐法。

(DZDL 538a16–20)

- a) 能作不淨] In *Da zhidu lun*, Fz, Ming, Song, Yuan reported to read only 不淨; the sūtra text has 作不淨
得道事辦] Na2: 則得道事詳
- b) 心則大厭] K: 心則大厭
- c) 思惟求道] Na1: 思惟惟求道; Na2: 止思惟求道
- d) 成道] Na2: 成道時
轉法輪] Na2: 轉法輪時; Shō: 轉法轉
皆在樹下] Na2: 皆坐樹下
行者隨諸佛法] F, K, Kg, Na1, Shō: 行者隨諸法; Fz: 行者隨諸佛
- e) 因緣故] Kg: 回緣故; Na2: 因緣是故

Translation

^a “10) A practitioner who has already performed the contemplation of impurity, impermanence and the rest will obtain awakening, [that is,] will have accomplished what is to be done. ^b But if he has not yet attained awakening, he will [still] feel great repugnance [for *saṃsāra*] in his mind. ^c Therefore, he should retire to beneath a tree and pursue awakening by concentrating his thoughts. ^d Furthermore, as when the Buddha was born, attained awakening, set rolling the wheel of the Teaching and obtained nirvāṇa, all these [four great events of his life] took place beneath a tree, [and just so] the practitioner, in imitation of the precedent set by the Buddha, [should] always take his place beneath a tree. ^e For such reasons, one should adopt the practice of sitting beneath a tree.

Commentary

a) impurity, impermanence and the rest: If we follow a certain interpretation of §18, “the rest” should include emptiness.

accomplished what is to be done: I interpret *shiban* 事辦 in this way with the understanding that it renders something like *kṛtakaraṇīya* or *kṛtakṛtya*, one of the expressions signifying buddhahood (or arhatship).

b)

feel great repugnance: The *Da zhidu lun* frames things slightly differently, reading 心則不大厭, while the sūtra text has 心則大厭. The *Da zhidu lun* means something like: “[because] he [still] does not have the great revulsion in his mind.” Michael Radich (who along with Eric Greene and Rafal Felbur offered valuable suggestions) offers the following: “Those who have not yet attained awakening, through the contemplation of the body/corpse/impurity, have *at least* attained a sufficient level of repugnance for the conditions of worldly embodied existence that they have the drive to engage in the practice to which the text now turns—sitting down under a tree etc. In the DZDL version, I would read the text as indeed saying something different, but still according to the same reading of this word: the practitioner *has not yet* attained (sufficient) repugnance, and therefore *takes this image/these features* (of the body), and sits down under a tree to contemplate (them further, and develop the practice better so it really takes).”

d)

It is possible that rather than understanding the pluralizing *zhu* 諸 as indicating “the precedents set by the Buddha” we should understand “precedents(s) of the buddhas,” since all buddhas are said to follow precisely the same course. But given that immediately above when the passage begins there is no indication of plural buddhas, the interpretation taken in the translation seems more likely.

§ 20

a) 十一者: 在樹下住, 如半舍無異, 蔭覆涼樂, 又生愛著。b) 「我所住者好。彼樹不如」。如是等生漏故, 至露地住。c) 作是思惟: 「樹下有種種過。d) 一者, 雨漏濕冷。e) 二者, 鳥屎污身, 毒蟲所住。有如是等過」。f) 空地則無此患。g) 露地者, 著脫衣裳, 隨意快樂。h) 月光遍照, 令心明利, 易入空定。i) 是故, 應受露地坐法。

(DZDL 538a20-27)

- a) 如半舍無異] Kg: 如半舍無蔭覆] Naz: 蔭覆
又生愛著] Nai: 又生生受著; Naz: 有生愛著; In *Da zhidu lun*, the printed text has 又生愛者; only Shōgōzō is reported to read 又生愛著, which I adopt.
- b) 彼樹不如] F, Fz, K, Nai: 彼樹下; Kg: 被樹下; Naz: 彼樹不如有如; L, M1, M2, Q, S: 彼樹下不好; Shō: 彼樹不是等生漏故] Naz: 是等生偏緣故
- d) 雨漏濕冷] Naz: 雨偏緣濕冷
- e) 鳥屎污身毒蟲所住] F, Fz, L, M1, M2, Q, S: 鳥屎汗身毒蟲所住; Kg: 鳥屎汗身毒王所住; Nai: 鳥屎汗身毒虫所住; Naz: 鳥屎汗身三者毒虫所住; Shō: 邊屎汗身毒虫所住
- g) 露地者] Naz: 又露地
- h) 月光遍照] Kg: 同光遍照; L: 月光徧照

Translation

^a “11) [However, even] dwelling beneath a tree is no different than [taking shelter in] a lean-to, [since both] cast a cool and pleasant shadow, and as a consequence [the practitioner] becomes attached [and thinks]: ^b ‘Where I live is good. That other tree is not as good.’ Because one may produce such destructive ideas as this, one should go to live in open spaces. ^c Then he thinks as follows: ‘Places beneath trees have all sorts of shortcomings: ^d First, the rain seeps down, and soaks and freezes one. ^e Second, bird excrement fouls one’s body, and poisonous insects dwell there. There are such kinds of shortcomings as these.’ ^f Open spaces have no such worries. ^g In open spaces, one may comfortably don or doff ones garments as one wishes. ^h The moonlight shines and sharpens one mind, and it is easy to enter into the concentration of empty space. ⁱ Therefore, one should adopt the practice of sitting in open spaces.

Commentary

a)

The term *banshe* 半舍 is a bit tricky. While it appears in dictionaries, it never does so (as far as I can see) in a sense plausible here. However, looking at the parallel in the *Qi xin lun shu bixiao ji* 起信論疏筆削記, quoted below, we find there *banwu* 半屋 which, along with the context, seems to support the tentative interpretation I offer here. This seems to be supported also by a passage in the *Dapiluzhena jing gongyang cidi fashu* 大毘盧遮那經供養次第法疏 (T. 1797 [xxxix] 792c8–10): 然彼多有哭泣等聲妨修止觀。故來樹下, 繫念思察。又樹蔭覆事同半舍, 安身修道。故在樹下。

b)

destructive ideas: With this I render *lou* 漏, undoubtedly Skt. *āsrava*, a notoriously difficult term, and my translation is quite interpretive.

f)

It is quite possible that the quotation actually continues, perhaps only sentence i) remaining outside the quoted thoughts, or, as I have taken it, that this is the narrative voice (that is, the Buddha's voice, in the scripture). I do not at this moment see a good way to decide the matter.

g)

The point here seems to be that, being being out in the open, while exposing one to the elements, also enables one to don and doff one's clothes as one wishes (or to use one's outer robe as a sort of tent), and therefore one can easily adapt one's dress to the circumstances of the weather. While perhaps in some respects being entirely outdoors is a difficulty or challenge, it is easily met.

h)

contemplation of empty space: The reference is to the first of the four formless absorptions, *ārūpya-samāpatti*, namely that of the sphere of infinity of space, *ākāśānantya-āyatana*.

§ 21

a) 十二者: 身四威儀中, 坐爲第一。 b) 食易消化, 氣息調和。 c) 求道者大事未辦, 諸煩惱賊常伺其便。 d) 不宜安臥。 e) 若行若立, 心動難攝, 亦不可久。 f) 是故, 應受常坐法。 g) 若欲睡時, 脇不著席。 h) 是爲十二頭陀之法。

a) 身四儀中, 坐爲第一。 b) 食易消化, 氣息調和。 c) 求道者大事未辦。 諸煩惱賊, 常伺其便。 d) 不宜安臥。 e) 若行若立, 則心動難攝, 亦不可久故。 f) 受常坐法。 g) 若欲睡時, 脇不著席。

(DZDL 538a27-b2)

- b) 食易消化] Kg: 食易消化
氣息調和] Na2: 氣自調和
- c) 求道者] Na2: 又求道者
- d) 不宜安臥] F, K, Kg: 不宜安臥
- e) 若行若立] Fz: 若行若上
心動難攝] Na2: 則心動難攝
亦不可久] Na1: 亦不久; Na2: 亦若不可久
- f) 應受常坐法] Na2: 應當受常坐法
- g) 若欲睡時] Kg: 若欲聽時
脇不著席] Na2: 脇不著 **席**

Translation

^a “12) Of the body’s four postures, sitting is the best: ^b Digestion is easy, and breathing is in balance. ^c As long as one who seeks awakening has not yet accomplished the Great Task, the defilements, like robbers, constantly seek their opportunity [to attack]. ^d [Thus] one should not just peacefully lie down. ^e [Likewise,] when one walks or stands, the mind is agitated and difficult to control, and in any case one will not be able to [continue walking or standing] for long. ^f Therefore, one should adopt the practice of constant sitting. ^g When one finds oneself getting sleepy, one should not [even lean over so that either] side touches the sleeping mat. ^h These are the methods of the twelve *dhuta* [ascetic purification practices].”

Commentary

- a)
The four postures are walking, standing, sitting, and lying.
- c)
Great Task: this refers to the pursuit of buddhahood, or perhaps also Arhatship.

§ 22

a) 佛告比丘：「汝等今者，繫心一處，無令散亂。b) 禪定功德從是得生。c) 一切凡夫以顛倒故，計有我、人、衆生、壽命。d) 隨逐假名起諸妄見。e) 從本以來五陰清淨、空、無我所、不生、不滅、不出、不在、非凡夫、非不凡夫、非聖人、非不聖人，f) 離諸名數，言語道絕。g) 諸佛不能行，不能到。h) 汝等今者，宜各靜緣，諦觀身相」。

e) 非凡夫、非離凡夫法、非聖人、非不聖人。

(T. 475 [XIV] 540b27–28)

g) 佛不能行，不能到。

(DZDL 727b19)

- a) 汝等今者] Fz, K, Na1, Q: 汝等念者
繫心一處] Na1: 繫心一所
無令散亂] Na1: 無合散亂; Na2: 無合散亂
- c) 計有我 Fz, Kg, L, M1, M2, Na2, Q, S] F, K, Na1: 繫有我; a phonological confusion since in Middle Chinese both 計 and 繫 are reconstructed as *kiei*.
衆生壽命] F, K, Kg, Na1, Shō: 衆生受命; Na2: 衆生壽受命
- d) 起諸妄見] Kg: 諸妄見
- e) 從本以來] Na2: 從本已來
無我所] Na1: 無所我
- f) 離諸名數] Kg: 離諸爲數
言語道絕] Kg: 言語道, Na2: 言語道斷
- h) 宜各靜緣] F, K, Kg: 宜各靜緣, Na2: 宜各淨緣

Translation

^a The Buddha said to the monks: “You now [should] fix the mind to a single place, and not let it be scattered. ^b The meritorious results of meditation spring from this [control over the mind]. ^c Because all ordinary people suffer from inverted misconceptions, they fantasize the idea that there is a self, a person, a being, a life principle. ^d Their pursuit of [such] merely denominational [entities] gives rise to wrong views. ^e From the very beginning, the five aggregates are pure, empty, without any properties of a self, unproduced and unperishing, not emerging and not abiding, neither ordinary being nor not ordinary being, neither sage nor not sage, ^f free of names and categories, exhausting [the limits of] language. ^g Buddhas cannot practice it, cannot arrive at it. ^h Now each of you should still the objects of your perceptions and minutely observe his bodily characteristics.”

Commentary

Michael Radich suggests that at least some of the technical vocabulary in this passage, apparently the author's/compiler's own contribution, would have been quite new, perhaps even trendy (?), at the time the text was constructed, since 顛倒, 假名, 妄見 and maybe 緣 (see below, note to h) were new around the time of Kumārajīva.

a)

The expression 繫心一處 is found repeatedly in relatively early texts, including in the *Da zhidu lun*, but I have not found a close parallel to the exact sequence here.

c)

In the *Fajie tixing wufenbie hui* 法界體性無分別會 (T. 310 [8] [X1] 144a14–15), we read: 大德, 汝凡夫顛倒故, 執我、我所, 而起於心.

In the *Da zhidu lun* (T. 1509 [XXV] 198c15–17), we find: 凡夫人未入道時, 是四法中邪行, 起四顛倒: 諸不淨法中淨顛倒。苦中樂顛倒。無常中常顛倒。無我中我顛倒, “Ordinary people, when they have not yet entered the path, practice with respect to four things in a perverted way, and thus create four inverted misconceptions: The inverted misconception of purity with respect to things which are actually impure; the inverted misconception of pleasure with respect to what is actually suffering; the inverted misconception of permanence with respect to things which are actually impermanent; the inverted misconception of a self in regard to things which actually lack a self.” (See Lamotte 1944–1980: III.1150.)

Although the timing makes it unlikely to have influenced this text, we find in a work of Zhiyi 智顓 (538–597) the following (*Jingguangming jing wenju* 金光明經文句, T. 1785 [XXXIX] 67b24–25): 攬陰成身計有我、人、衆生、壽命.

fantasize: This renders *ji* 計, which probably represents a form of Skt. $\sqrt{k}lp$, which refers to wrong ideas which one nevertheless imagines to be true.

d)

Note in the *Da zhidu lun* (T. 1509 [XXV] 607c1) the expression 菩薩隨逐假名字, 計以爲我.

e)

The cited passage is from Kumārajīva's translation of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, *Weimojie suoshuo jing* 維摩詰所說經 (T. 475). See also the passage in the *Wenshushili suoshuo banre boluomi jing* 文殊師利所說般若波羅蜜經, credited to Sengjiapoluo 僧伽婆羅 (*Saṃghabhara? *Saṃghavarman? *Saṃghapāla?) (T. 233 [VIII] 739c15–17): 無作、無滅、非凡夫法、非聖人法、非生死法、非離生死法、非涅槃法、非離涅槃法、無得、無失、非可思議、非不可思議.

without any properties of a self: Probably *wuwosuo* 無我所 reflect *anātmīya*, not meaning here “without possessions belonging to a self” (that is, *ātmīya* in its common sense of “mine”), but rather more philosophically, without anything related to the self.

f)

I am not entirely sure how to understand *mingshu* 名數 here. The sense could very well equally be “name and number, or numbered categories.” The combination is not rare, but given that we have here, for all intents and purposes, no context, it is hard to determine the intended sense.

Likewise, it is possible that here we should consider a parallel with the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, which in Kumārajīva's translation reads (T. 475 [XIV] 555a14–15) 一切言語道斷,

corresponding to Sanskrit *sarvarutayāhārasamucchinna*. Even if this is relevant, however, it is not clear whether the two clauses might be mutually informative, and if so, how.

g)

The “it” in the *Da zhidu lun* is *pingdengxing* 平等性, the most profound dharma that is beyond words, non-dual, and so on. Because it is nondual, there cannot be any distinction between it and buddhas, and it is for this reason, and in this sense, that (even) buddhas cannot practice it, cannot reach it, for if they could practice it, this would mean that it was a dualistic dharma, and so on. This however is manifestly absent from the sūtra, which has adopted the expression out of context. (Special thanks here to Rafal Felbur.)

h)

still the objects of your perceptions: I am in some doubt about *jingyuan* 靜緣, in which *faute de mieux* I take *yuan* in the sense of **ālambana*, object of perception. But I remain unsure.

§ 23

a) 時，諸比丘聞佛所說，心生歡欣。即觀此身：b) 皮、膚、血、肉、膿、爛、穢惡、筋、骨、脈、髓、肪、膏、腦、膜、目、淚、涕、唾、肝、膽、脾、腎、心、肺、痰癢、生熟二藏、小腸、大腸、大小便利、髮、毛、爪、齒、胞、垢污等，三十六物九孔不淨。c) 從外至內，從內至外，推求我相，了不可得。d) 精勤不已，遂見其心念念生滅，如水流燈焰。e) 生無所從來，滅無所至，現在不住。f) 知此五陰從本以來空、無所有。滅除諸相，證如實智，成阿羅漢。g) 諸菩薩等思惟法已，得無生忍，滿足十地。

觀察是身從頭至足。b) 其中唯有髮、毛、爪、齒、不淨、垢穢、皮、肉、筋、骨、脾、腎、心、肺、肝、膽、腸、胃、生熟二藏、大小便利、涕、唾、目、淚、肪、膏、腦、膜、骨、髓、膿、血、腦、骸、諸脈。

(T. 374 [XII] 433c26–434a1)

- a) 心生歡欣] Na2: 心生歡喜
- b) 皮膚血肉] Kg: 皮膚面肉; Na1: 皮膚肉血; Na2: 皮膚血穴; Shō: 皮膚而肉
 筋骨脈髓] Fz, K, Kg, L, M1, M2, Na1, Q, S: 筋骨脉髓; Na2: 筋脈骨髓
 膏腦] Na2: 膈臆
 目淚涕唾] Na2: 目淚涕唾
 心肺痰癢] Kg: 心筋痰癢; Na1: 心昏痰_法; Na2: 心肺澹陰
 生熟二藏] Na1: 生就二藏
 小腸大腸] Na2: 小腹大腹
 爪] Na2: 抓
 胞垢污等] F, K, Kg, Na1, 胞垢汗等; Na2: 胞垢汗等; Fz: 胞胎肝等; L, M1, M2, Q, S: 胞胎垢汗等
- c) 從外至內] Kg: 皮外至內
- d) 精勤不已] Kg: 精勤不已; Na2: 精勤不已
 遂見其心 L, M1, M2, Q, S] F, Fz, K, Kg, Na1, Na2, Sai, Shō: 遂見色心
 如水流燈焰] Kg: 如求流燈焰; Na1, Na2: 如水流燈炎; Shō: 如水流燈芙
- e) 生無所從來] Na1: 生所從來; Na2: 生無所從; Shō: 生無所送來
- f) 從本以來] Na2: 從本已來

Translation

^a When the monks heard what the Buddha had said, they were happy, ^b and they contemplated their bodies: the impurities of outer skin, derma, blood, flesh, pus, ulcers, filth, sinews, bones, blood vessels, marrow, fat, grease, brain, membranes, eyes, tears, saliva, mucus, liver, gall bladder, spleen, kidneys, heart, lungs, phlegm, stomach, small intestine, large intestine, feces, urine, head hair, body hair, nails, teeth, placenta, and so on—[they contemplated that] the thirty-six [body] parts and nine orifices are impure. ^c From outside to inside, from inside to outside, searching for any sign of a self, [the monks] absolutely could not find it. ^d Making energetic efforts without stopping, subsequently they saw that the arising and ceasing of states of mind from moment to moment is like the flow of water, the flame of a lamp. ^e [That is, when states of mind] arise, they come from nowhere, when they perish they go nowhere, and when they are present they do not abide anywhere. ^f [The monks] knew that these five aggregates [that is, the putative self] from their very origins are empty, and do not exist. Eradicating all [such] characteristics, they comprehended in accord with true reality and attained arhatship. ^g [Likewise,] the bodhisattvas and others, deeply contemplating this teaching, attained the mental flexibility which comes to terms with the fact that all things are unproduced, and fully attained the tenth stage.

Commentary

	十二頭陀經	T. 26 [I] 583b6–9 中阿含經	T. 125 (II) 568a18–21 增一阿含經	T. 374 (XII) 433c26–434a1 [= 675b11–14] 大般涅槃經	T. 614 [XV] 281b26–29 坐禪三昧經
1	皮	髮 = 31	毛 = 32	髮 = 31	骨 = 9
2	膚	毛 = 32	髮 = 31	毛 = 32	肉 = 4
3	血	爪 = 33	爪 = 33	爪 = 33	皮 = 1
4	肉	齒 = 34	齒 = 34	齒 = 34	膚 = 2
5	膿	麤細薄膚 = 2	皮 = 1	不淨 = 38?	筋 = 8
6	爛	皮 = 1	肉 = 4	垢 = 36	脈 = 10
7	穢惡	肉 = 4	筋 = 8	穢 = 7	流血 = 3
8	筋	筋 = 8	骨 = 9	皮 = 1	肝 = 20
9	骨	骨 = 9	髓 = 11	肉 = 4	肺 = 25
10	脈	心 = 24	腦 = 14	筋 = 8	腸 = 28/29
11	髓	腎 = 23	脂 —	骨 = 9	胃 —
12	肪	肝 = 20	膏 = 13	脾 = 22	屎 —
13	膏	肺 = 25	腸 = 28/29	腎 = 23	尿 —
14	腦	大腸 = 29	胃 —	心 = 24	涕 = 18
15	膜	小腸 = 28	心 = 24	肺 = 25	唾 = 19
16	目	脾 = 22	肝 = 20	肝 = 20	三十六物 = 37
17	淚	胃 —	脾 = 22	膽 = 21	九想不淨 = 38
18	洩	搏糞 —	腎之屬 = 23	腸 = 28/29	
19	唾	腦及腦根 = 14	屎 —	胃 —	

	十二頭陀經	T. 26 [I] 583b6–9 中阿含經	T. 125 (II) 568a18–21 增一阿含經	T. 374 (XII) 433c26–434a1 [= 675b11–14] 大般涅槃經	T. 614 [XV] 281b26–29 坐禪三昧經
20	肝	淚 = 17	尿 —	生熟二藏 = 27	
21	膽	汗 —	生熟二藏 = 27	大小便利 = 30	
22	脾	涕 = 18	目 = 16	涕 = 18	
23	腎	唾 = 19	淚 = 17	唾 = 19	
24	心	膿 = 21	唾 = 19	目 = 16	
25	肺	血 = 3	涕 = 18	淚 = 17	
26	痰癢	肪 = 12	血 = 3	肪 = 12	
27	生熟二藏	髓 = 11	脈 = 10	膏 = 13	
28	小腸	涎 —	肪 = 12	腦 = 14	
29	大腸	膽 / 痰 = 26	膽 = 26	膜 = 15	
30	大小便利	小便 = 30		骨 = 9	
31	髮			髓 = 11	
32	毛			膿 = 5	
33	爪			血 = 3	
34	齒			腦 = 14	
35	胞			骸 —	
36	垢污			諸脈 = 10	
37	三十六物				
38	九孔不淨				

On such lists, see also Fukunaga 1990: 18–20.

b)

While the expression 常觀此身九孔不淨 appears in the *Madhyamāgama* (T. 26 [I] 453c5), in the *Ekottarikāgama* commentary *Fenbie gongde lun* 分別功德論 (T. 1507 [xxv] 48a4–5) we find the juxtaposition 身形穢漏九孔不淨, 三十六物無一可貪也.

Concerning phlegm, and problems around (what in our text turn up as variant readings) 痰, 澹 and related terminology, see Köhle 2016. (Note that, as do other scholars, Köhle appears to implicitly treat our text as a genuine translation, although for her argument this probably does not matter much.)

Concerning “stomach, small intestine, large intestine,” note the observations of Eric Greene 2021: 116n25: “The ‘receptacle of undigested food’ (生藏) and ‘receptacle of digested food’ (熟藏) are common Chinese Buddhist calques of the Indian anatomical terms *āmāśaya* and *pakvāśaya*, respectively.” Further, he continues (117n31): “Though I retain the expected translations “stomach” (胃) and “large intestine” (大腸), vomiting is here described as food flowing from the former to the latter and then up the throat ‘Large intestine’ thus denotes our ‘stomach.’ This is, in fact, typical of medieval Chinese Buddhist texts (if not other Chinese sources as well).”

Further note, as Greene points out to me (personal communication), that “hair, nails, teeth here come at the *end* of the list. This is unheard of in Indian Buddhist lists of body parts for meditation, where head hair is invariably first. I would take it as another sign of the composite nature of the text.”

placenta, and so on: I would have expected the “and so on” to extend the list of organs etc., but it comes after 垢污, which is slightly odd.

c)

In the *Nirvāṇa-sūtra* 大般涅槃經 (T. 374 [XI] 434a1–3) there follows a similar though differently worded discussion, which begins: 菩薩如是專念觀時, 誰有是我。我為屬誰。住在何處。誰屬於我。復作是念: 骨是我耶, 離骨是耶 ... Likewise, in the *Zuochan sanmei jing* 坐禪三昧經, a compilation scripture attributed to Kumārajīva, after the items quoted in the table above, we find (T. 614 [XV] 281b28–29): 專心內觀, 不令外念。外念諸緣, 攝之令還. This is translated by Yamabe and Sueki 2009: 64: “He devotes his mind to the inner contemplation without letting his mind be distracted by other objects. If his mind is distracted, he concentrates it and returns it [to the original objects of meditation].”

d)

We find in the *Chishi jing* 持世經 (T. 482 [XIV] 658b29–c1) the expression 心念念生滅. The expression 水流燈焰 is found already in the *Pinimu jing* 毘尼母經 (T. 1463 [XXIV] 805c28).

In the *Zhancha shan'e ye bao jing* 占察善惡業報經 (T. 839 [XVII] 908b2–4, of problematic provenance and probably too late to have influenced our text: <https://dazangthings.nz/cbc/text/363/>) we find: 若於坐時, 隨心所緣。念念觀知唯心生滅。譬如水流燈炎, 無暫時住.

e)

In the *Chengshi lun* 成實論 (**Tattvasiddhi*; T. 1646 [XXXI] 255a29–b1), we find 又經中說: 眼生無所從來, 滅無所至.

f)

In the *Da zhidu lun* (T. 1509 [XXV] 529c10–11) we find: 或說般若波羅蜜空無所有。滅一切法無可行處.

f-g)

Rafal Febur suggests: “Let me propose another take on this bit (note the different punctuation): 滅除諸相證如實智, 成阿羅漢、諸菩薩等思惟法已, 得無生忍, 滿足十地, “They expunged all such characteristics, they comprehended in accord with true reality; having attained (成 ... 已) the methods of contemplation of the arhats and of the various bodhistvas, they attained the mental flexibility, and fully attained the tenth stage.’ I admit this is conceptually a bit wild, and that 成阿羅漢 very often comes at the end of the sentence not followed by anything else, but we must remain mindful of the fact that we are dealing here with the Chinese author’s/authors’ creative outpouring, not with a translation of anything Indic, so odd things should not surprise us. The big problem is that 思惟法已 is not a thing: as a phrase, it never occurs in the Taishō, and I would not know how to cogently parse its syntax. So, it ‘must’ be part of something bigger. Hence my suggestion. But I am not sure. Maybe the text is corrupt here, but we have no way of knowing. Still, determining the matter either way may have implications for our efforts to reconstruct the intended audience

of the text, the assumptions held by its authors as to who is capable of what attainments, etc.”

g)

In the *Dasheng Wenshushili pusa focha gongde zhuangyan jing* 大聖文殊師利菩薩佛剎功德莊嚴經 (T. 319 [x1] 913b16–17) we read: 又過六十殞伽沙劫, 得無生法忍, 從此已, 後滿足十地, 具足十力。

§ 24

-
- a) 佛告諸大衆：「誰能於後像法之中，護持此經，廣宣流布，使求佛道者，識其要妙」。
- b) 時，天帝釋與龍神八部，聞佛宣告，從空而下。c) 稽首佛足，而白佛言：「d) 世尊，若像法之中有三乘人，在空閑處求佛道者，我等爲作衛護。e) 不令諸惡鬼神得擾亂之」。
- f) 文殊師利法王子白佛言：「g) 世尊，我當承佛威神，於未來世護持此經，使不斷絕。h) 有修學者，爲作開導」。
-

- a) 護持] Nai: 誰持
- d) 若像法之中] Nai: 若像之中
求佛道者] Nai: 佛道者
我等爲作衛護] Na2: 我等與作衛護
- f) 不令諸惡鬼神] Kg: 不令諸惡鬼神
- g) 我當承佛威神] Kg: 我留承佛威神
於未來世] Kg, Nai, Shō: 於未來
- h) 爲作開導] Kg: 爲作開作道; Nai: 爲作開道

Translation

^a The Buddha said to the great assemblies [namely, of monks and bodhisattvas]: “Who will be able to safeguard this scripture in the latter time of the Semblance Teaching, propagating it so that those who seek the Buddha’s awakening will understand its essential wonder?”

^b When Śakra and the eight types of beings, nāgas, gods and so on, heard what the Buddha had proclaimed, they descended from the sky, ^c bowed at the Buddha’s feet, and spoke to him saying: ^d “World Honored One, if in the time of the Semblance Teaching there are followers of the three vehicles who seek the Buddha’s awakening in isolated places, we will serve as their guardians. ^e We will prevent malicious demons and spirits from harrassing them.”

^f The Dharma Prince Mañjuśrī spoke to the Buddha saying: ^g “World Honored One, through the Buddha’s power I will uphold this scripture in a future time, and prevent its disappearance. ^h If there are those who would practice and cultivate it, I will serve as their guide.”

Commentary

- a) The expression 像法之中 is found early on, for instance in the *Beihua jing* 悲華經 (T. 157 [111] 225b21–22): 般涅槃後像法之中. For a far reaching study of the idea of the Semblance Teaching, see Nattier 1991.

The term *yaomiao* 要妙 is found already in (the received version of the) *Laozi* 27, and other ancient texts. Relevant excerpts from Chinese commentaries on *Laozi* are found in Chen 2020: 187–188.

§ 25

-
- a) 爾時, 阿難前白佛言: 「^b 世尊, 當何名此經。云何奉持」。
 c) 佛告阿難: 「此經名為『頭陀苦行』。^d 亦名『離著集諸善本』。^e 汝當奉持」。
 f) 爾時, 天龍八部、一切大眾聞佛所說, 歡喜奉行。
-

- c) 此經名為] Na1: 此經為
 頭陀苦行] Shō: 頭陀告行
 d-e)
 諸善本汝] Na2: 諸善汝本

Translation

^a At that time, Ānanda came forward and spoke to the Buddha saying: ^b “World Honored One, what shall we name this scripture? How shall we champion it?”

^c The Buddha said to Ānanda: “This scripture will be called ‘Ascetic Practice of the Dhutas.’ ^d It will also be called ‘Removal of Attachments and Accumulation of Roots of Good.’ ^e Thus you should champion it.”

^f At that time, the eight types of beings, nāgas, gods and so on, and all the assemblies, having heard what the Buddha taught, rejoiced, had faith and practiced it.

Commentary

The ‘title’ 頭陀苦行 does not seem to appear as a title elsewhere, although the collocation itself is known; see *Saṃyuktāgama* 雜阿含經 (T. 99 [I1] 115b1-3): 復有尊者大迦葉, 與衆多比丘, 於近處經行。一切皆是少欲知足, 頭陀苦行, 不畜遺餘; *Aṅgulimālīya-sūtra* 央掘魔羅經 (T. 120 [I1] 521b13-14): 出家學道行沙門法, 受行十二頭陀苦行; *Baiyu jing* (T. 209 [IV] 548b26-27): 見他頭陀苦行, 山林曠野塚間樹下; *Ekottarikāgama* 增一阿含經 (T. 125 [I1] 789a13-15): 過去久遠釋迦文佛弟子, 名曰迦葉。今日現在頭陀苦行, 最爲第一。

7 Citations

§3 Daocheng 道誠 (early 11th c.), *Shishi yaolan* 釋氏要覽 (T. 2127 [LIV] 263a29–b2): 十二頭陀經云: 佛言: 阿蘭若處十方諸佛皆共讚歎, 無量功德皆由此生。

Zongxiao 宗曉 (1151–1214), *Jingguangming jing zhaojie* 金光明經照解 (x 361 [xx] 515c15–16): 十二頭陀經云: 佛言: 阿蘭若處十方諸佛皆共讚歎, 無量功德皆由此生。

§5 Zhiyi 智顛 (538–597), *Shi chanboluomi cidī famen* 釋禪波羅蜜次第法門 (T. 1916 [XLVI] 490c10–16): 行者, 若能修十二頭陀, 即是具足身心精進。如佛告迦葉: 阿蘭若比丘遠離二著, 形心清淨行頭陀。頭陀者, 有十二事: 一, 阿蘭若處。二, 常行乞食。三, 次第乞食。四, 受一食法。五, 節量食。六, 中後不飲漿。七, 著弊衣。八, 但三衣。九, 塚間住。十, 樹下止。十一, 露地坐。十二, 常坐不臥。是名十二頭陀。

Qifu 栖復 (Late Tang), *Fahua jing xuanzan yaoji* 法華經玄贊要集 (x 638 [xxxiv] 371b12–15): 按十二頭陀經云。一, 阿蘭若。二者, 常乞食。三, 次第乞。四, 一坐食。五, 節量食。六, 中後不飲漿。七, 著弊納衣。八, 持三衣。九, 塚間住。十, 樹下止。十一, 露地坐。十二, 常坐不臥。其妻於後, 亦證阿羅漢。

Huiyin 慧因 (Song period), *Fanwang jing pusa jiezhū* 梵網經菩薩戒注 (x 691 [xxxviii] 584b5–10): 正云杜多此云除棄有十二種頭陀行一一皆十種功德勝用如十二頭陀經說且常坐十種者, 一, 不貪身樂, 二, 不貪睡眠樂, 三, 不貪臥具樂, 四, 無臥時勝著席苦, 五, 不隨身欲, 六, 易得坐禪, 七, 易讀誦經典, 八, 少睡眠蓋, 九, 身輕易起, 十, 求座臥具衣服心薄。

Daocheng 道誠 (early 11th c.), *Shishi yaolan* 釋氏要覽 (T. 2127 [LIV] 261b22–26): 頭陀十二功德。一, 阿蘭若處。二, 常乞食。三, 次第乞。四, 一受食。五, 節量食。六, 中後無飲漿。七, 弊衣。八, 但三衣九塚間。十, 樹下坐。十一, 露地坐。十二, 長坐不臥。彼經廣有說文。

§6 Laizhou 來舟 (Qing period), *Dasheng Bensheng xindiguan jing qianzhu* 大乘本生心地觀經淺註 (卅 Vol. 34: 33a9–11): 一住阿蘭若處。梵語阿蘭若。此云寂靜處。謂比丘當住於空閒寂靜之處。身離憤鬧。心離欲塵。永絕攀緣。求無上道。是為第一頭陀行也。(Although not a citation as such, this may nevertheless be related to our text.)

§7 Wōnch'ūk 圓測 (613–696) *Haesim milgyōngso* 解深密經疏 (x 369 [xxi] 231c9–12): 頭陀經云: 阿練若法令身遠離憤鬧, 住於空閒。遠離者, 離眾惱亂, 若放牧處。最近三里, 能遠益善。身遠離已, 亦當令心遠離五欲、五蓋。名阿練若。智論亦同。We should not overlook that Wōnch'ūk observed here the similarity between the sūtra and the *Da zhidu lun*, although he does no more than note it.

Zixuan 子璿 (965–1038), *Qi xin lun shu bixiao ji* 起信論疏筆削記 (T. 1848 [XLIV] 396b2–4): 一住空閒處。謂離眾鬧, 居阿練若, 身遠離故, 心離欲蓋, 益諸善故。

§8 Zixuan 子璿 (965–1038), *Qi xin lun shu bixiao ji* 起信論疏筆削記 (T. 1848 [XLVIII] 396b12–14): 一常乞食。謂依法乞當制六根, 不著六塵。亦不分別男女等相。得與不得, 若好若惡, 不生憎愛。

§9 Zixuan 子璿 (965–1038), *Qi xin lun shu bixiao ji* 起信論疏筆削記 (T. 1848 [XLVIII] 396b15–16): 若請食者, 或得不得, 貪恨易生。若同僧食處分, 使人心則散亂, 不入道故。

Daocheng 道誠 (early 11th c.), *Shishi yaolan* 釋氏要覽 (T. 2127 [LIV] 275b8–12): 十二頭陀經云: 食有三種。一, 受請食。二, 眾僧食。三, 常乞食。若前二食起諸漏因緣。所以者何。受請食者, 若得請, 便言我有福德好人。若不請, 則嫌恨彼。或自鄙薄是貪憂法, 則能遮道。

Zhipan 志磐 (1220–1275), *Fozu tongji* 佛祖統紀 (T. 2025 [XLIX] 320a27–b1): 有三種: 一, 受請食。二, 眾僧食。三, 常乞食。前二食起諸陋因緣。若得請, 便言我有德。若不請, 則嫌恨彼。或自鄙薄是貪法, 則能遮道。

Laizhou 來舟 (Qing period), *Dasheng Bensheng xindiguan jing qianzhu* 大乘本生心地觀經淺註 (卍 Vol. 34: 33a11–12): 二常行乞食。謂比丘離諸貪求。不受他請。常行乞食。以資色身。助成道業。若得食時, 或好或惡。不起分別增減之念。若不得食, 亦無嫌恨。得與不得, 心常平等。是為頭陀行也。

§10 Daocheng 道誠 (early 11th c.) *Shishi yaolan* 釋氏要覽 (T. 2127 [LIV] 275b12–14): 若僧食者, 當隨眾法, 斷事擯人, 料理僧事。心則散亂, 妨廢行道有如是等惱亂因緣應受乞食法。

Zhipan 志磐 (1220–1275), *Fozu tongji* 佛祖統紀 (T. 2025 [XLIX] 320b1–3): 若僧食者, 當隨眾法, 斷事擯人, 料理僧事。心則散亂, 妨廢行道。有如是惱亂。應受乞食法。

§11 Laizhou 來舟 (Qing period), *Dasheng Bensheng xindiguan jing qianzhu* 大乘本生心地觀經淺註 (卍 Vol. 34: 33a12–13): 第三次乞食。謂比丘乞食之時, 不著於味, 不輕眾生, 不擇貧富, 平等一心, 次第而乞。是為頭陀行也。

§12 Zixuan 子璿 (965–1038), *Qi xin lun shu bixiao ji* 起信論疏筆削記 (T. 1848 [XLVIII] 396b20–21): 三, 一坐食。謂若重食者失半日功。不為養身斷數數食。

Laizhou 來舟 (Qing period), *Dasheng Bensheng xindiguan jing qianzhu* 大乘本生心地觀經淺註 (卍 Vol. 34: 33a13–15): 四, 一食。謂比丘修道, 應作是念: 我求一食, 尚有所妨。何況小食、後食。若不自損, 則失半日之功。不能一心行道。是故, 斷數數食, 受一食法。是為頭陀行也。

§13 Daoshi 道世 (?–683), *Fayuan zhulin* 法苑珠林 (T. 2122 [LIII] 611a24–b2): 十二頭陀經云: 若得食時, 應作是念: 見渴乏眾生, 以一分施之。我為施主。彼為受者。施已, 作是願言: 令一切眾生興福救之。莫墮慳貪。持至空靜處, 減一段著淨石上, 施諸禽獸。亦如上願。正欲食時, 作是念言: 身中有八萬戶蟲。蟲得此食, 皆悉安隱。我今以食施此諸蟲。後得道時, 當以法施汝。是為不捨眾生。

Daoshi 道世 (?–683), *Zhujing yaoji* 諸經要集 (T. 2123 [LIV] 44a13–20): 依十二頭陀經云: 若得食時, 應作是念。見渴乏眾生, 以一分施之。我為施主。彼為受者。施已, 作是願言: 令一切眾生興福救之。莫墮慳貪。持至空靜處, 減一段著淨石上, 施諸禽獸。亦如上願。正欲食時, 作是念言: 身中有八萬戶蟲。蟲得此食, 皆悉安隱。我今以食施此諸蟲。後得道時, 當以法施汝。是為不捨眾生。

Zixuan 子璿 (965–1038), *Qi xin lun shu bixiao ji* 起信論疏筆削記 (T. 1848 [XLVIII] 396b16–18): 二節量食。謂念身中八萬戶蟲。蟲得此食, 皆悉安隱。我今以食攝此諸蟲。後得道時, 以法攝彼。

Laizhou 來舟 (Qing period), *Dasheng Bensheng xindiguan jing qianzhu* 大乘本生心地觀經淺註 (卍 Vol. 34: 33a15–16): 五節量食。謂比丘所乞之食。當作三分。若見渴乏者, 以一分施之。又減一搏食, 至空靜處, 置淨石上, 施諸禽獸。

§ 14 Zixuan 子璿 (965–1038), *Qi xin lun shu bixiao ji* 起信論疏筆削記 (T. 1848 [XLVIII] 396b18–20): 又雖一食。恣貪極噉腹脹氣塞, 妨廢行道。隨所得食三分食二, 身則輕安。名節量食。

Laizhou 來舟 (Qing period), *Dasheng Bensheng xindiguan jing qianzhu* 大乘本生心地觀經淺註 (卍 Vol. 34: 33a16–18): 若不見困乏者, 但食三分之二。亦留一分不得盡食。如此則身輕安隱, 易消無患, 不廢行道。若貪心極噉, 則腹脹氣塞, 妨損道業。是故, 節食為頭陀行也。

§ 15 Zixuan 子璿 (965–1038), *Qi xin lun shu bixiao ji* 起信論疏筆削記 (T. 1848 [XLVIII] 396b22): 頭陀經中云: 中後不飲漿。

Laizhou 來舟 (Qing period), *Dasheng Bensheng xindiguan jing qianzhu* 大乘本生心地觀經淺註 (卍 Vol. 34: 33a18–20): 六, 過中不飲漿。漿即果漿、蜜漿之類。謂比丘行道於種種漿, 日若過中, 悉不得飲。若飲者, 則心樂著, 貪求無厭。不能一心修習善法。是故, 過中不飲漿。是為頭陀行也。

§ 16 Zixuan 子璿 (965–1038), *Qi xin lun shu bixiao ji* 起信論疏筆削記 (T. 1848 [XLVIII] 396b25–27): 又離多求及守護故, 二糞掃衣。謂捨糞掃物, 納作衣故。以此覆寒障露離貪, 遠賊無奪命難故。

Laizhou 來舟 (Qing period), *Dasheng Bensheng xindiguan jing qianzhu* 大乘本生心地觀經淺註 (卍 Vol. 34: 33a20–22): 七著弊衲衣。謂比丘不貪服飾。不求好衣。但於聚落中。捨陳舊廢棄之物。浣濯令淨。作為衲衣。禦寒蔽體而已。若貪新好, 則多追求, 以損道行。又能招致賊盜。是故, 著弊衲衣。為頭陀行也。

§ 17 Zixuan 子璿 (965–1038), *Qi xin lun shu bixiao ji* 起信論疏筆削記 (T. 1848 [XLVIII] 396b23–25): 白衣好畜種種衣。外道苦行裸形而已, 今佛弟子應捨二邊, 但三衣也。

Laizhou 來舟 (Qing period), *Dasheng Bensheng xindiguan jing qianzhu* 大乘本生心地觀經淺註 (卍 Vol. 34: 33a22–24): 八, 但三衣。三衣即僧伽黎。鬱多羅僧, 安陀會也。謂比丘少欲知足。衣取蓋形, 不多不少。如白衣之人, 畜種種衣, 及外道苦行裸形無恥。皆不合中道。是故, 佛弟子捨此三過, 但受三衣。是為頭陀行也。

§ 18 Laizhou 來舟 (Qing period), *Dasheng Bensheng xindiguan jing qianzhu* 大乘本生心地觀經淺註 (卍 Vol. 34: 33a24–b1): 九, 塚間坐。謂無常苦空之觀。是佛法之初門。能令厭離三界。比丘住於塚間。常見死屍。臭爛狼藉。火燒鳥啄。則無常不淨之想。易得成就。是故, 塚間坐。為頭陀行也。

§ 19 Zixuan 子璿 (965–1038), *Qi xin lun shu bixiao ji* 起信論疏筆削記 (T. 1848 [XLIV] 396b5–7): 三, 樹下坐, 謂順佛法故。如佛成道, 轉法輪, 入涅槃, 皆在樹下。能治房舍貪, 易入道故。

Laizhou 來舟 (Qing period), *Dasheng Bensheng xindiguan jing qianzhu* 大乘本生心地觀經淺註 (卍 Vol. 34: 33ab1–3): 十, 樹下坐。謂比丘於塚間不得道者, 當至樹下, 思惟求道。如佛生時。成道轉法輪般涅槃皆在樹下。有如是因緣。是故比丘如佛所行。當於樹下坐。是為頭陀行也。

§ 20 Zixuan 子璿 (965–1038), *Qi xin lun shu bixiao ji* 起信論疏筆削記 (T. 1848 [XLIV] 396b9–11): 五, 露地坐。謂樹如半屋, 愛著猶生。又雨濕鳥喧, 污穢不淨。若露地處, 光明遍照, 令心明利, 空觀易成。

Laizhou 來舟 (Qing period), *Dasheng Bensheng xindiguan jing qianzhu* 大乘本生心地觀經淺註 (卍 Vol. 34: 33ab3–5): 十一, 露地坐。謂比丘在樹下坐。如住半舍, 蔭覆涼樂, 故生愛著。又慮雨漏濕冷, 鳥屎污身, 毒蟲所擾。於是思惟: 露地而坐, 隨意快樂。月光遍照, 令心明利, 易入空定。是故, 露地坐。為頭陀行也。

§ 21 Zixuan 子璿 (965–1038), *Qi xin lun shu bixiao ji* 起信論疏筆削記 (T. 1848 [XLIV] 396b4–5): 二, 端坐不臥。謂若行若立, 心動難攝, 然亦不久。應受常坐, 若欲睡時, 脇不著席。

Laizhou 來舟 (Qing period), *Dasheng Bensheng xindiguan jing qianzhu* 大乘本生心地觀經淺註 (卍 Vol. 34: 33ab5–7): 十二, 但坐不臥。謂比丘四威儀中。坐為第一。食易消化, 氣息調和, 可以入道。若懈怠睡眠, 諸煩惱賊常伺其便。若行若立, 心動難攝。是故, 比丘常當安坐。脅不至席。是為頭陀行也。

Literature

- Abe Jion 阿部慈恩. 2001. *Zuda no Kenkyū: Pāri Bukkyō o chūshin to shite* 頭陀の研究: パーリ仏教を中心として (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).
- Akahane Ritsu. 2015. "Prabhākaramitra: His Name and the Characteristics of his translation of the Prajñāpradīpa." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 63.3: 1295–1301 (201–207).
- Bapat, P.V. 1937. *Vimuttimaggā and Visuddhimaggā: A Comparative Study* (Calcutta: J.C. Sarkhel, Calcutta Oriental Press Ltd.).
- Bapat, P[urośottam] V[īśvanath]. 1964. *Vimuktīmārga Dhutaḡaṇa-nirdeśa*, Delhi University Buddhist Studies 1 (Bombay etc.: Asia Publishing House).
- Bodhi, Bhikkhu. 2012. *The Numerical Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Aṅguttara Nikāya* (Boston: Wisdom Publications).
- Chen, Guying. 2020. *The Annotated Critical Laozi: With Contemporary Explication and Traditional Commentary*. Modern Chinese Philosophy 19 (Leiden: Brill).
- Ehara, N.R.M., Soma Thera and Kheminda Thera. 1961. *The Path of Freedom, By the Arahant Upatissa* (Colombo. Reprinted in Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society, 1977).
- Enomoto Masaaki 榎本正明. 1992. "Shinshutsu Nanatsuderazō Zudakyō: Eiin, honkoku (1)" 新出・七寺蔵『頭陀經』-影印・翻刻(1) [*Fo-shuo Tou-ta [sic] Jing* 佛說頭陀經: A Hitherto Unknown Buddhist Sūtra Preserved in Nanatsu-dera Temple, Text and Facsimile, 1]. *Kachō Tanki Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 華頂短期大学研究紀要 37: 1–16.
- Enomoto Masaaki 榎本正明. 1993a. "Shinshutsu Nanatsuderazō Zudakyō ni tsuite: taiō kyōten to sono naiyō ni tsuite (1)" 新出・七寺蔵『頭陀經』について: 対応經典とその内容について(1) [*Foshuo toutuo jing* 佛說頭陀經: A Hitherto Unknown Buddhist Sūtra Preserved in Nanatsu-dera Temple: Related texts and their content]. *Bukkyō Ronsō* 佛教論叢 37: 12–15.
- Enomoto Masaaki 榎本正明. 1993b. "Shinshutsu Nanatsuderazō Zudakyō: Eiin, honkoku (2)" 新出・七寺蔵『頭陀經』-影印・翻刻(2) [*Fo-shuo Tou-ta [sic] Jing* 佛說頭陀經: A Hitherto Unknown Buddhist Sūtra Preserved in Nanatsu-dera Temple, Text and Facsimile, 11]. *Kachō Tanki Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 華頂短期大学研究紀要 38: 27–45.
- Enomoto Masaaki 榎本正明. 1994. "Shinshutsu Nanatsuderazō Zudakyō: Eiin, honkoku (3)" 新出・七寺蔵『頭陀經』-影印・翻刻(3) [*Fo-shuo Tou-ta [sic] Jing* 佛說頭陀經: A Hitherto Unknown Buddhist Sūtra Preserved in Nanatsu-dera Temple, Text and Facsimile, 111]. *Kachō Tanki Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 華頂短期大学研究紀要 39: 1–18.
- Enomoto Masaaki 榎本正明. 1996a. "Shinshutsu Nanatsuderazō Zudakyō: Eiin, honkoku, kōkan, jundoku (4)" 新出・七寺蔵『頭陀經』-影印・翻刻・校勘・順讀(4) [*Fo-shuo Tou-ta [sic] Jing* 佛說頭陀經: A Hitherto Unknown Buddhist Sūtra Preserved in Nanatsu-dera Temple, Photographic reproduction and transcription, Summary of the *Tou-ta jing* IV]. *Kachō Tanki Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 華頂短期大学研究紀要 41: 1–26.
- Enomoto Masaaki 榎本正明. 1996b. "Zudakyō: Eiin, honkoku, jundoku, kaidai" 頭陀經-影印 翻刻 訓讀 解題 [Dhuta sūtra: Photographic reproduction, transcription, summary, explication]. In Makita Tairyō 牧田諦亮 and Ochiai Toshinori 落合俊典, eds., *Nanatsudera koitsu kyōten kenkyū sōsho Dainikan Chūgoku senjutsu kyōten (sono ni)* 七寺古逸經典研究叢書 第二卷 中國撰述經典(其之二) (Tōkyō, Daitō shuppansha 大東出版社): 539–620.
- Enomoto Masaaki 榎本正明. 1997. "Bussetsu jūni zudakyō to Daichidoron ni tsuite" 『仏説十二頭陀經』と『大智度論』について [On the *Foshuo shi'er toutuo jing* and the *Da zhidu lun*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 46.1: 247–251.

- Enomoto Masaaki 榎本正明. 1998. "Bussetsu jūni zudakyō no seiritsu ni tsuite" 『仏説十二頭陀經』の成立について [On the Formation of the *Foshuo shī'er toutuo jing* 仏説十二頭陀經]. *Kachō Tanki Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 華頂短期大学研究紀要 43: 1–21.
- Enomoto Masaaki 榎本正明. 2003. "Zudasetzu no shosō ni tsuite: Bussetsu jūni zudakyō to Daichidoron no zudasetzu o chūshin toshite" 頭陀説の諸相について: 『仏説十二頭陀經』と『大智度論』の頭陀説を中心として [Aspects of dhuta: the explanations in the *Foshuo shī'er toutuo jing* and the *Da zhidu lun*]. In Kimura Kiyotaka 木村清孝, ed., *Bukkyō no Shugyō-hō: Abe Jion Hakase Tsuitō Ronbunbunshū* 仏教の修行法: 阿部慈園博士追悼論集 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社): 111–129.
- Fukunaga Katsumi 福永勝美. 1990. *Bukkyō igaku jiten: ho, Yōga* 仏教医学事典: 補・ヨ一ガ (Tokyo: Yūzankaku Shuppan, 雄山閣出版).
- Funayama, Tōru. 2022. "Jizang's 吉藏 Sanskrit." In Jonathan A. Silk and Stefano Zacchetti, eds., *Chinese Buddhism and the Scholarship of Erik Zürcher*. *Sinica Leidensia* 157 (Leiden: Brill): 233–254.
- Giles, Lionel. 1957. *Descriptive Catalogue of the Chinese Manuscripts from Tunhuang in the British Museum* (London: The Trustees of the British Museum).
- Greene, Eric M. 2021. *The Secrets of Buddhist Meditation: Visionary Meditation Texts from Early Medieval China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press).
- Greene, Eric M. 2023. "The Decline and Fall of Chinese Buddhist Literary Historical Consciousness: The Compilation of the *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶紀, in Light of the Dunhuang Fragments of the *Zhongjing biele* 眾經別錄." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 143.1: 125–150.
- Kim, Kyong-Kon. 2019. "La pratique ascétique (dutahaeng) dans l'ordre bouddhique coréen Jogye." *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 236: 65–98.
- Kobayashi Sōjin 小林崇仁. 2010. "Nihon kodai ni okeru sanrin shugyō no shiryō (1): kojiki, soshoku" 日本古代における山林修行の資糧(1) 乞食・蔬食 [Livelihood of the mountain ascetics in ancient Japan (1) Begging and eating the products of trees]. *Rengeji Bukkyō Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 蓮花寺佛教研究所紀要 3: 15–61.
- Köhle, Natalie. 2016. "A Confluence of Humors: Āyurvedic Conceptions of Digestion and the History of Chinese 'Phlegm' (*tan* 痰)." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 136.3: 465–493.
- Kyōngsōng 京性. 2005. *Pulgyo suhaeng ūi tut'ahaeng yōn'gu* (Seoul: Changgyōnggak 藏經閣). [not seen]
- Lamotte, Étienne. 1944–1980. *Le Traité de la grande Vertu de Sagesse*. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 25, 26, 2, 12, 24 (Louvain: Université de Louvain; reprint, 1970–1981).
- Ma, Yungfen. 2011. *The Revival of Tiantai Buddhism in the Late Ming: On the Thought of Youxi Chuandeng* 幽溪傳燈 (1554–1628). PhD thesis, Columbia University.
- Marchman, Kendall R. 2015. *Huaigan and the Growth of Pure Land Buddhism during the Tang era*. PhD thesis, University of Florida.
- Mitani Mazumi 三谷真澄. 2018. *Ōtani-tai Doitsu-tai shūshū kanji Butten dampen mokuroku* 大谷隊ドイツ隊収集漢字仏典断片目録 [A Catalogue of Chinese Buddhist Fragments Collected by Otani and German Turfan Expedition]. Ryūkyoku Daigaku Sekai Bukkyō bunka kenkyū sentā. Bukkyō bunka kenkyūjo 'Saiiki bunka kenkyūkai.' Kotenseki dejitaru ākaibu kenkyū sentā 龍谷大学 世界仏教文化研究センター・仏教文化研究所「西域文化研究会」古典籍デジタルアーカイブ研究センター. Apparently unpublished.
- Miyamune Takamasa 宮宗孝正. 1922–1923. "Zuda gaiyō" 頭陀概要 [A sketch of dhuta practices]. *Misshū gakuō* 密宗學報 112: 1–21; 113: 10–38; 114: 13–39; 115: 13–31; 116: 51–80.

- Mizuno Kōgen 水野弘元. 1954. "Daijō kyōten to buha bukkyō to no kankei" 大乘經典と部派佛教との關係. In Miyamoto Shōson 宮本正尊, ed. *Daijō Bukkyō no Seiritsushiteki Kenkyū* 大乘仏教の成立史的研究 (Tokyo: Sanseidō 三成堂): 273–313.
- Nattier, Jan. 1991. *Once Upon a Future Time: Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline*. Nanzan Studies in Asian Religions 1 (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press).
- Nattier, Jan. 2008. *A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations: texts from the Eastern Han 東漢 and Three Kingdoms 三國 Periods*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica x (Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University).
- Oda Tokunō 織田得能. 1917. *Bukkyō Daijiten* 佛教大辭典 (New Corrected Edition: Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大藏出版, 1974).
- Palumbo, Antonello. 2011. "What Chinese sources really have to say about the dates of the Buddha." Paper distributed at the xviith Congress of the International Association of Buddhist Studies Dharma Drum Buddhist College, Jinshan, Taiwan, 22 June 2011.
- Radich, Michael. 2019. "Fei Changfang's Treatment of Sengyou's Anonymous Texts." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 139.4: 819–842.
- Sakaino Kōyō 境野黄洋. 1935. *Shina Bukkyō seishi* 支那佛教精史 (Tokyo: Sakaino Kōyō Hakushi Ikō Kankōkai 境野黄洋博士遺稿刊行會).
- Shinohara, Koichi. 2015. "Rethinking the Category of Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha." *Studies in Chinese Religions* 1.1: 70–81.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 1994. The Origins and Early History of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism, With a Study of the *Ratnarāśīsūtra* and Related Materials. Ph.D. thesis, The University of Michigan.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2010. "The *Jīfayue sheku tuoluoni jing*—Translation, Non-translation, Both or Neither?" *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 30.1–2 [2008 date, published 2010]: 369–420.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2013. "The Proof is in the Pudding: What is Involved in Editing and Translating a Mahāyāna Sūtra?" *Indo Iranian Journal* 56: 157–178.
- Thich, Huyên-Vi. 1989. "Ekottarāgama (X), traduit de la version chinoise." *Buddhist Studies Review* 6.2: 122–129.
- Valenti, Federico. 2020. "Explicit and hidden zoological categories in early Chinese taxonomies." *Asiatische Studien—Études Asiatiques* 74.3: 609–634.
- Wogihara Unrai 荻原雲來. 1964–1974. *Kanyaku Taishō Bonwa Daijiten* 漢訳対照梵和大辞典 [A Sanskrit-Japanese dictionary with Chinese equivalents] (Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation).
- Yamabe, Nobuyoshi, and Fumihiko Sueki. 2009. *The Sutra on the Concentration of Sitting Meditation (Taishō Volume 15, Number 614)* (Moraga, CA: BDK America Inc.).
- Yasui Mitsuhiro 安井光洋. 2018. "Chūron chūshakusho no kan'yaku ni tsuite" 『中論』注釈書の漢訳について [Chinese Translations of Commentaries on the *Mūlamadhyamakārikā*]. *Chisan gakuho* 智山学報 67: 21–33.
- Zhao, You. 2020. "The Wheel Unturned: A Study of the *Zhuan falun jing* (T109)." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 43: 275–346.

Appendix: Computer-Assisted Analysis of Internal Stylistic Evidence for the Composition Scenario of the *Shi'er toutuo jing*

Michael Radich

In the study above, Silk has shown that the *Shi'er toutuo jing* 十二頭陀經 (T. 783) was compiled or “assembled” in China, on the basis of materials from earlier Chinese translations. When we discover any case like this, it is natural next to ask whether we can determine, even approximately, when, where, and by whom the text may have been assembled.

Silk has already presented various basic considerations that seem, *prima facie*, to give us a set of limits within which it is initially most reasonable to look for the “scene of production.” With the exception of Zhi Qian’s “Smaller *Buddhāvataṃsaka*” T. 281,¹ all the other sources (or possible sources) identified by Silk fall in the early fifth century: the **Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa* T. 1509, Daogong’s *Ratnarāśi* T. 310 (44), Kumārajīva’s *Vimalakīrtinīrdeśa* T. 475, *Dharmakṣema’s *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra* T. 374, and “Guṇabhadra’s”² *Śrīmālādevīsīṃhanāda*. Depending on which of these texts we regard as genuine sources of the *Shi'er toutuo jing*, this provides a rough *terminus post quem* between 411 (for Kumārajīva), and 432 (for T. 374)³ to 436 (for T. 353).⁴ On the other hand, Sengyou lists a text with the same title,⁵ giving a *terminus ante quem* of 515.⁶

Here, I attempt to find internal stylistic evidence that might confirm or deny the possibility that the composition of the text falls into this period. The analysis was conducted using TACL, a software tool for the analysis of Chinese Buddhist texts that I have developed in collaboration with Jamie Norrish.⁷

Silk had the least success in discovering sources for the frame narrative portions of the *Shi'er toutuo jing*. This makes it most likely that stylistic traits of the context in which the text was composed will be found in the frame narrative (by contrast, borrowed material will evince the stylistic traces typical of their sources, which could be quite remote). First, then, I combed the frame narrative for items of phraseology (words, phrases, formulae, etc.) that might be indicative of a distinctive compositional style. I did this by a combination of two techniques: (1) I used TACL to look for relatively rare, but still recurring, items

1 Nattier 2005, 2007.

2 I mark the ascription to Guṇabhadra with “scare quotes,” because it is more likely that, in our terms, the actual work of “translation” was achieved by Baoyun 寶雲 (?–449?), on whom see Glass 2008, Lettere 2020.

3 Chen 2004.

4 大宋元嘉十三年歲次玄枵八月十四日, T. 2145 (LV) 67b6.

5 T. 2145 (LV) 30b12.

6 See Silk’s, n. 4, above, referring to Palumbo 2011.

7 For the TACL code, see <https://github.com/ajenhl/tacl>. For documentation, see <http://pythonhosted.org/tacl/>. For examples of applications, see Radich 2014, 2017, 2018, 2019. For an explanation of how to apply TACL functions to selected research problems, see Radich 2019, Appendix 11 (271 ff.). For a User’s Guide to TACL, see https://dazangthings.nz/documents/3/TACL_users_guide_NJRyp14.pdf.

of phraseology that were shared with “translation” texts⁸ other than the main sources of the *Shi'er toutuo jing*; (2) I supplemented this exercise by eyeballing the frame narrative myself, on the basis of my experience with other TACL-based stylistic analyses, looking for turns of phrase of types that have proven evidentially significant in other cases. The result was a longlist of 55 words or phrases representing *possible* distinctive stylistic traits.⁹ I then searched the entire (“translation” portion of the) canon for these items, using a TACL function called “search.” This function searches for all items on a user-defined list at the same time, and then generates a result list showing how many items, and which ones, occur in every text targeted by the search. This procedure allows the user to quickly find texts in which the search strings concentrate in the largest numbers.

I then subjected the raw results of this procedure to further analysis, including digital searches (in CBETA's CB Reader) for individual terms, to find and examine specific texts and contexts in which they occurred. We can examine the results of this investigation from two perspectives.

First, items on my longlist of 55 possible phraseological markers tended to appear in greatest number in large early- to mid-fifth-century texts: first and foremost (in order of texts with the most items), Dharmakṣema's *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra* (16–17 items) T. 374;¹⁰ Kumārajīva's *Lotus* T. 262 (12 items);¹¹ Zhu Fonian's *Ekottarikāgama* T. 125 (10–12

8 By “translation texts,” I here mean texts presented in the Chinese canon as translations from Indic sources (mainly, the portion of the canon spanning T. 1 to T. 1692, with some loose change scattered elsewhere). I put “translation” in scare quotes to mark the fact that, as with the *Shi'er toutuo jing* itself, it often turns out, on philological analysis, that texts so presented or understood in the tradition were in fact wholesale or partial Chinese compositions.

9 I emphasise that at this stage of the analysis, these items were treated only as *possible* evidence of style. Judgements as to which of them were most useful in determining the context of production for the *Shi'er toutuo jing* only followed on the basis of investigation of the distribution patterns for each through further searches in the canon, as described below. Some of these items turned out not, in fact, to be helpful in locating the text in a historical context. My longlist of possible stylistic markers comprised these items: 加趺而坐, 給孤獨園精舍, 菩薩萬人, 聞佛所說心生歡(欣 etc.), 露地坐法, 著衣持鉢遊行, 時阿難前白佛言, 文殊師利法王子白佛言, 文殊師利法王子, 無所從來滅無所至, 世尊唯然受教, 諦聽善思念之我當為汝, 歡欣踊躍, 四方追求, 從空而下, 三分之二, 所謂止觀, 長跪合掌而白佛言, 灑, 廣宣流布, 放牧處, 汝當奉持, 入聚落乞食, 中後不得, 從座起整衣服, 作是念我今若 (...), 諸惡鬼神, 無上正真之道, 要妙, 護持此經, 像法之中, 亂禪定, 當何名此經, 為法出家, 天龍八部, 龍神八部, 我從昔來, 佛告阿難此經名 (...), 爾時世尊怡然微笑, 三十六物, 阿難前白, 至阿蘭若處, 無緣而笑, 願見哀愍, 告示, 諸菩薩等, 使不斷絕, 諸善本, 求佛道者, 念念生滅, 佛告諸大眾, 九孔不淨, 思惟法, 作衛護, 重白佛言.

10 The exact number of items found in the text can vary a little, depending upon which of the witnesses documented in the Taishō apparatus one examines (because of variant readings). The longest list of items shared with some witness of T. 374 (and also the copy-cat T. 375), however, was: 三十六物, 九孔不淨, 佛告諸大眾, 作是念我今若 (...), 使不斷絕, 廣宣流布, 念念生滅, 我從昔來, 文殊師利法王子, 求佛道者, 無上正真之道, 當何名此經, 諸善本, 諸惡鬼神, 諸菩薩等, 重白佛言, 長跪合掌而白佛言. Interestingly, the majority of these items (12) are in portions of T. 374 unique to Dharmakṣema's version, but this is also numerically probable, given that these portions of the text are three times as voluminous as the portions shared with other independent witnesses (T. 376, Tibetan, Sanskrit fragments).

11 佛告諸大眾, 作衛護, 使不斷絕, 天龍八部, 廣宣流布, 從座起整衣服, 我從昔來, 文殊師利法王子, 求佛道者, 諸善本, 諸菩薩等, 護持此經, 重白佛言. These items are also largely found in the copy-cat T. 264 of *Jinagupta/Jñānagupta.

items);¹² Guṇabhadra's *Saṃyuktāgama* T. 99 (10 items);¹³ and Kumārajīva's *Kuśalamūlasaṃparigraha* T. 657 (10 items).¹⁴

Text length is apparently a factor here: obviously, longer texts have more in them, and so the chances are greater that a large text will share phrasing with any given point of comparison. A similar number of items is also found in a smattering of later texts, so such concentrations of this phraseology are not quite a monopoly of this period; but the later texts in question tend to be of dubious composition and provenance.¹⁵ It is also noteworthy that the fifth-century texts in which these markers concentrate are the products of a number of different translation groups, so that this evidence by no means constitutes a “smoking gun” pointing to one particular group. In combination, however, the fact that these items of phraseology cluster in texts of this period already strongly suggests that the *Shi'er toutuo jing*, too, belongs to the same context.

As we see above, a small group of five stylistically closest neighbouring texts emerges from this analysis, featuring a subset of 31 items of phraseology. In fact, 17 of these 31 items occur in more than one of the five texts just listed,¹⁶ leaving only 14 items that are shared by the *Shi'er toutuo jing* with only one text among the five.¹⁷ Many of the items in question, moreover, are particular ways of rendering common formulaic narrative elements, including elements characteristic of frame narratives.¹⁸ This all suggests further that the combinations of phraseology in question comprise evidence of a style characteristic of this period.

We can also examine the results of my tests in a second perspective, that of individual items of phraseology. The following table lists a number of items whose distribution is particularly characteristic and telling for the fifth-century context.

-
- 12 三十六物, 佛告阿難此經名 (...), 使不斷絕, 從座起整衣服, 思惟法, 時阿難前白佛言, 無上正真之道, 諸善本, 諸菩薩等, 重白佛言, 阿難前白, 禰.
- 13 入聚落乞食, 從座起整衣服, 思惟法, 我從昔來, 所謂止觀, 放牧處, 為法出家, 當何名此經, 諸惡鬼神, 重白佛言.
- 14 佛告阿難此經名, 告示, 廣宣流布, 念念生滅, 我從昔來, 文殊師利法王子, 求佛道者, 當何名此經, 諸善本, 諸菩薩等.
- 15 Jinagupta/Jñānagupta's extended (and cannibalistic) Buddha biography, the **Abhiniṣkramaṇa-sūtra* (?) T. 190, 12 items (世尊唯然受教, 入聚落乞食, 加趺而坐, 告示, 天龍八部, 從空而下, 念念生滅, 思惟法, 我從昔來, 當何名此經, 諸菩薩等, 重白佛言); a Tang “state protection” text, T. 997 (a probable Chinese composition itself; Tsukinowa 1954: 438), 11 items (使不斷絕, 天龍八部, 廣宣流布, 念念生滅, 思惟法, 文殊師利法王子, 汝當奉持, 當何名此經, 諸惡鬼神, 諸菩薩等, 護持此經); a Tantric text ascribed to Amoghavajra (Tang), T. 1177A (also probably a Chinese composition; Gimello 1998, cited in Iain Sinclair and Dan Lusthaus, *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism* (DDb) s.v. 大乘瑜伽金剛性海曼殊室利千臂千鉢大教王經), 11 items (使不斷絕, 像法之中, 告示, 天龍八部, 念念生滅, 汝當奉持, 諸惡鬼神, 諸菩薩等, 重白佛言, 長跪合掌而白佛言, 龍神八部).
- 16 4 texts: 諸菩薩等, 重白佛言, 諸善本, 我從昔來; 3 texts: 從座起整衣服, 使不斷絕, 廣宣流布, 文殊師利法王子, 當何名此經, 求佛道者; 2 texts: 佛告諸大眾, 三十六物, 念念生滅, 無上正真之道, 諸惡鬼神, 佛告阿難此經名 (...), 思惟法.
- 17 長跪合掌而白佛言, 作衛護, 天龍八部, 時阿難前白佛言, 阿難前白, 禰, 入聚落乞食, 所謂止觀, 放牧處, 為法出家, 告示, 九孔不淨, 作是我今若 (...), 護持此經.
- 18 E.g. “said again to the Buddha” 重白佛言; “from times long past, I ...” 我從昔來; “at that time Ānanda said to the Buddha” 時阿難前白佛言; “arose from his seat and straightened his robe” 從座起整衣服; “what should we call this *sūtra*?” 當何名此經; “the Buddha said to the great assemblies” 佛告諸大眾; “the Buddha said to Ānanda, ‘This *sūtra* is entitled ...’” 佛告阿難此經名 (...). For further consideration of some of these items, see the Table below.

TABLE 1 Formulaic phrasing in the *Shi'er toutuo jing*
 “Copy-cat” texts (e.g. T. 375 on the basis of T. 374) are listed in parentheses after their probable models. Texts are listed in approximate chronological order in both columns. References giving supporting information about the treatment of an ascription, the identification of a text as a Chinese composition, etc., are given in footnotes the first time the text in question appears in the table. Abbreviations (in approximate chronological order): ZQ = Zhi Qian; Dhr = *Dharmarakṣa; ZFn = Zhu Fonian; EĀ = *Ekottarikāgama* T. 125; MĀ = *Madhyamāgama*; Kj = Kumārajīva; DĀ = *Dīrghāgama* T. 1; Dhkṣ = *Dharmakṣema; Guṇ = Guṇabhadra; SĀ = *Saṃyuktāgama*; JñG = *Jinagupta/Jñānagupta; Ny = Narendrayaśas.

	Fifth century	Other/unknown
爾時阿難前白佛言 “at that time, Ānanda advanced and said to the Buddha ...”	ZFn EĀ 49(9), EĀ 52(1); ZFn T. 212	“ZQ” T. 200; Dhr T. 266; Anon T. 1494 ¹⁹
從座起整衣服 “arose from his seat and straightened his robe”	ZFn T. 656; Kj T. 223, T. 262 (T. 264); Dhkṣ T. 387; Guṇ SĀ T. 99 (copious); Anon SĀ T. 100; Anon T. 156; ²⁰ Anon T. 277; ²¹ Anon T. 452; ²² Anon T. 463; ²³ Anon T. 1463; Saṃghavarman T. 1547	Dhr T. 154, T. 349, T. 636; ²⁴ Anon T. 158; “Jijiaye” T. 308; Anon T. 1339; ²⁵ JñG T. 1353, T. 1354; Tang: T. 159, T. 1082, T. 1450; Song: T. 3; Anon T. 1357
佛告諸大眾 “the Buddha said to the great assemblies”	ZFn T. 212; Kj T. 262 (T. 264), T. 475; Dhkṣ T. 157, T. 374 (T. 375), T. 397(6); Anon T. 409; ²⁶ Anon T. 1332; ²⁷ Anon T. 1336 ²⁸	Ny T. 444; JñG T. 1353; Putideng T. 839; Anon T. 1156A; Tang: T. 310(14), T. 1451

19 Ōno 1954: 114.

20 Chinese composition. Funayama 2013: 138–139; Funayama 2016, with further references.

21 Chinese composition. Fujita 1990: 155, 161–162; Ōno 1954: 130–131.

22 Fujita has argued that this text was compiled in the Turfan region; Fujita 1990: 155, 157, 161.

23 Treated as anonymous in Fajing, T. 2146 (LV) 121a5; the usual ascription to Nie Daozhen probably dates back to LDSBJ, T. 2034 (XLIX) 65c7 (but cf. 112c21); Kanakura 1972 points out that it anachronistically begins with the formula 如是我聞 (though Kanakura’s own interpretation of this fact is rather credulous and far-fetched—he speculates that Nie Daozhen worked in a transitional period when this new rendering of the formula was on the ascendant).

24 Added by Sengyou to the list of Dhr works, i.e. not ascribed to him by Dao’an; T. 2145 (LV) 8c7–11.

25 Ōno 1954: 353.

26 Chinese composition. Silk 2008 (2010): 381, citing further literature.

27 Chinese composition. Silk 2008 (2010): 381, citing further literature.

28 Possible Chinese composition. Silk 2008 (2010): 397; Lowe 2014.

TABLE 1 Formulaic phrasing in the *Shi'er toutuo jing* (cont.)

	Fifth century	Other/unknown
佛告阿難此經名(為)“The Buddha told Ānanda, ‘This <i>sūtra</i> is entitled ...’”	ZFn DĀ 18, EĀ 40(10), 46(8), 48(4); KJ T. 420, T. 586, T. 613, T. 653, T. 657, (Kj?) T. 1489; ²⁹ Zhiyan T. 268; Baoyun/Zhiyan? T. 397(12); ³⁰ Anon T. 365; ³¹ Anon T. 156; ³² Anon T. 643; ³³ Anon T. 1342	Dhr T. 403 (cf. T. 397[12]); Anon T. 701; ³⁴ Anon T. 747a; Anon T. 644; *Saṅghabhara T. 468; JñG T. 690; Tang: T. 310 (20), T. 310(21), T. 310(22), T. 840; Song: T. 543; Anon T. 1159B; Anon T. 1494; Anon T. 1496 ³⁵
給孤獨園精舍 ³⁶ “(in) Anāthapiṇḍada’s pleasure garden (* <i>anāthapiṇḍadasyārāme</i>)”	Zhiyan T. 268; *Nandin T. 310(38); ³⁷ Saṅghabhadra T. 1462 ³⁸	<i>never</i>
文殊師利法王子 ³⁹ 白佛言“Mañjuśrī <i>kumārabhūta</i> said to the Buddha”	Kj T. 586 (T. 587), T. 650; Zhiyan T. 268	“Nie Daozhen” T. 310(33); “Dhr” T. 325; Anon T. 633; Anon T. 1494; Song: T. 472

29 Ōno 1954: 115–116.

30 Sakaino 1935: 589–592 argued that this text may in fact be by Fajuan 法眷; Hasuzawa agrees; Hasuzawa Seijun 蓮澤成淳 in Ono and Maruyama 1933–1936/1999: 7:477–483 s.v. *Mujin'i bon* 無盡意品. However, the text is already listed by Sengyou, which is the most important thing for our purposes, since it places it in the right period.

31 Fujita 1990; Silk 1997.

32 See n. 20.

33 Yamabe 1999.

34 It has been suggested that this text could be by Dharmarakṣa; Heirman and Torck 2012: 33–34, 56–57 n. 39, Salguero 2014: 46–47; 161 n. 14; 76–78; 166 n. 28; 126.

35 T. 1496 is regarded by Ōno (1954: 365) as a text developed on the basis of T1341 (ascribed to Jinagupta/Jñānagupta).

36 Even 園精舍, which may be a hesitant double translation attempting to reflect both **ārāma* and **vihāra*, is quite particularly distributed. In the 5c: “Kj” (?) T. 310 (17), Kj T. 1435, *Nandin T. 310 (38), Buddhajīva/Daosheng T1421, Buddhabhadra/Faxian T. 1425, Guṇ sĀ T. 99, Zhiyan T. 268, Saṅghabhadra T. 1462, Anon sĀ T. 100, Anon T. 156, Anon T. 202, Anon T. 1507; after the fifth century, only a very few instances: (Wei) Bodhiruci T. 575; JñG T. 418; Tang: T. 187, T. 1177A; Song: T. 763, T. 1671; in texts problematic or difficult to place: T. 196(!); T. 794 (Kamata 1982: 285–286), Anon T. 1440, Anon T. 1465. The colophon to T. 620, ascribed to Juqu Jingsheng, also speaks of a 竹園精舍 (*“Jetavana *vihāra*”?) as the locus where the text was copied, so referring to a place in China, T. 620 (XV) 342b12–14, T. 2145 (LV) 66a29–b2; perhaps the same institution is mentioned in the biography of the nun Dele 德樂 (d. 501), T. 2063 (L) 944c15, Li 2002: 133–134.

37 Listed as anonymous in CSZJJ; ascription to *Nandin first recorded in Fajing; Ōno tentatively accepts the ascription; Ōno 1954: 335.

38 Pinte 2010 suggests that the source text might have been a text reportedly recited by Dharmayaśas eighty years earlier than the reported translation, when he arrived in Canton in 402.

39 文殊師利法王子 appears in nine texts ascribed to Kj, but appears to be unknown before him.

TABLE 1 Formulaic phrasing in the *Shi'er toutuo jing* (cont.)

	Fifth century	Other/unknown
長跪合掌而白佛言 “prostrated himself with his palms together and said to the Buddha”	T. 360 (5c?); ⁴⁰ Dhkṣ T. 374 (T. 375), T. 397 (2), T. 397 (6); Buddhayaśas T. 405; Anon T. 383; ⁴¹ Anon T. 643; ⁴² Anon T. 1331(7), T. 133(9), T. 1331(10) ⁴³	Anon t1339; JñG T. 310(39), T. 408, T. 647, T. 834; Tang: T. 187, T. 261, T. 457, T. 945, T. 971, T. 1177A; Song T. 364; Anon T. 749
入聚落乞食 “went into the town to beg for food”	Kj T. 650, T. 1435; ZFn T. 1428; Buddhayaśas/Daosheng T. 1421; Dharmagupta/Dharmayaśas T. 1548; Buddhābhadrā/Faxian T. 1425; Guṇ sĀ T. 99; Saṅghavarman T. 1441; Anon T. 203; Anon T. 1463; Saṅghābhadrā T. 1462 ⁴⁴	JñG T. 190; Tang T. 1424, T. 1448, T. 1458

These examples suffice to demonstrate a general pattern. These particular renderings of formulaic phrases typical of frame narratives concentrate principally in texts of the fifth century. Thereafter, distribution peters off into a sputtering afterlife, largely in contexts that we have good reason to suspect of frequently recycling earlier materials (some Sui translations, Tang Tantric “translators,” Song translators); with the possible exception of Jinagupta/Jñānagupta, the same turns of phrase are strikingly absent from the principal translations securely ascribed to all major later translation groups. In the fifth century, meanwhile, these items also appear with striking frequency in Chinese compositions (T. 156, T. 277, T. 383, T. 409, T. 1331, T. 1332) or hybrid works (T. 365, T. 452, T. 643, T. 620).

In isolation, none of these items individually could serve as a “smoking gun” placing the *Shi'er toutuo jing* in the fifth century. In combination, however, especially in such a short selection of text (mainly in the frame narrative), these items make it overwhelmingly probable that the text was produced in that context. This conclusion also dovetails with the other evidence already treated by Silk, as discussed above. We should consequently regard the *Shi'er toutuo jing* as a Chinese composition of the fifth century.

40 The problem of the ascription and dating of T. 360 has attracted much attention in secondary scholarship, but one persistent theory holds that it was produced by Baoyun, mainly on the strength of reports in CSZJJ; see for example Gómez 1996: 126, 129; Gotō 2006; Harrison, Hartmann and Matsuda 2002: 180; Yoshikawa and Funayama 2009: 273 n. 4.

41 Chinese composition. Radich 2018; Utsuo 1954.

42 See n. 33.

43 Chinese composition; Strickmann 1990.

44 See n. 39.

Bibliography

- Chen, Jinhua. 2004. "The Indian Buddhist Missionary Dharmakṣema (385–433): A New Dating of his Arrival in Guzang and of his Translations." *T'oung Pao* 90: 215–263.
- Fujita, Kōtatsu. 1990. "The Textual Origins of the Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching: A Canonical Scripture of Pure Land Buddhism." In *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, edited by Robert Buswell (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press): 149–173.
- Funayama Tōru 船山徹. 2013. *Butten wa dō Kan'yaku sareta no ka: sūtorā ga kyōten ni naru toki* 仏典はどう漢訳されたのか スートラが経典になるとき (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten).
- Funayama Tōru 船山徹 [Chuanshan Che]. 2016. "Da fangbian Fo bao'en jing bianzuan suoyinyong de Hanyi jingdian 《大方便佛報恩經》編纂所引用的漢譯經典." Translated by Wang Zhaoguo 王招國. *Fojiao wenxian yanjiu* 佛教文獻研究 2: 175–202.
- Glass, Andrew. 2008. "Guṇabhadra, Bāo'yūn, and the Saṃyuktāgama." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 31.1–2: 185–203.
- Gimello, Robert M. 1998. "The 'Cult of the Mañjuśrī of a Thousand Arms and a Thousand Bowls' in T'ang Dynasty Buddhism." In Qi Meijian 戚美肩, ed. *Renjian jingtu yu xiandai shehui: Di san jie Zhonghua guoji Fo xue shilu* 人間淨土與現代社會: 第三屆中華國際佛學實錄 [The "Earthly" Pure Land and Contemporary Society: Proceedings of Third Chung-Hwa International Conference on Buddhism] (Taipei: Fagu Wenhua chubanshe 法鼓文化出版社): 154–155.
- Gómez, Luis O. 1996. *The Land of Bliss: The Paradise of the Buddha of Measureless Light: Sanskrit and Chinese Versions of the Sukhāvativyūha Sutras* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press).
- Gotō Gijō 後藤義乘. 2006. "Jiku Hōgo no yakugo to Hōun, Buddabadora no yakugo" 竺法護の訳語と宝雲・ブツダバドラの訳語. *Shūkyō kenkyū* 宗教研究 79.7: 244–245.
- Harrison, Paul, Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Kazunobu Matsuda. 2002. "Larger *Sukhāvativyūhasūtra*." In Jens Braarvig, ed., *Buddhist Manuscripts, Volume 11: Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection III* (Oslo: Hermes Publishing): 179–214.
- Heirman, Ann and Mathieu Torck. 2012. *A Pure Mind in a Clean Body: Bodily Care in the Buddhist Monasteries of Ancient India and China* (Ghent: Academia Press).
- Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄. 1982. *Chūgoku bukkyōshi, daiikkan: Shodenki no bukkyō* 中国仏教史第一卷 初伝期末の仏教 (Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai).
- Kanakura Enshō 金倉円照. 1972. "Hoke kyō ni okeru Hōgo to Rajū no yakugo" 法華經における法護と羅什の訳語. In Sakamoto Yukio 坂本幸男, ed., *Hokekyō no Chūgokuteki tenkai* 法華經の中国的展開 (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten): 445–470.
- Lettere, Laura. 2020. "The Missing Translator: A Study of the Biographies of the Monk Baoyun 寶雲." *Rivista degli studi orientali*, nuova serie 93.1–2: 259–274.
- Li, Rongxi. 2002. "Biographies of Buddhist Nuns: Translated from the Chinese of Baochang (Taishō Volume 50, Number 2063)." In Li et al., *Lives of Great Monks and Nuns*, BDK English Tripiṭaka 76–111, IV, V, VI, VII (Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research): 55–154.
- Lowe, Bryan D. 2014. "The *Scripture on Saving and Protecting Body and Life*: An Introduction and Translation." *Journal of Chinese Buddhist Studies* 27: 1–34.
- Nattier, Jan. 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* 8: 323–360.
- Nattier, Jan. 2007. "Indian Antecedents of Huayan Thought: New Light from Chinese Sources." In Imre Hamar, ed., *Reflecting Mirrors: Perspectives on Huayan Buddhism* (Wiesbaden; Harrassowitz Verlag): 109–138.

- Nattier, Jan. 2008. *A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations: Texts from the Eastern Han 東漢 and Three Kingdoms 三國 Periods*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica x (Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University).
- Ono Genmyō 小野玄妙, Maruyama Takao 丸山孝雄, eds. 1933–1936. *Busho kaisetsu daijiten* 佛書解説大辭典 (rev. ed. Tokyo: Daitō shuppan, 1999).
- Ōno Hōdō 大野法道. 1954. *Daijō kai kyō no kenkyū* 大乘戒經の研究 (Tokyo: Risōsha 理想社).
- Pinte, Gudrun. 2010. "On the Origin of Taishō 1462, the Alleged Translation of the Pāli Samantapāsādikā." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 160: 435–449.
- Radich, Michael. 2014. "On the Sources, Style and Authorship of Chapters of the Synoptic *Suvarṇaprabhāsottama-sūtra* T664 Ascribed to Paramārtha (Part 1)," *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism* 17: 207–244.
- Radich, Michael. 2017. "On the *Ekottarikāgama* 增壹阿含經 T 125 as a Work of Zhu Fonian 竺佛念." *Journal of Chinese Buddhist Studies* 30: 1–31.
- Radich, Michael. 2018. "A Triad of Texts from Fifth-Century Southern China: The **Mahāmāyā-sūtra*, the *Guoqu xianzai yinguo jing*, and a *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* ascribed to Faxian." *Journal of Chinese Religions* 46.1: 1–41.
- Radich, Michael. 2019. "Was the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* 大般涅槃經 T7 Translated by 'Faxian'? An Exercise in the Computer-Assisted Assessment of Attributions in the Chinese Buddhist Canon." *Hualin International Journal of Buddhist Studies: E-journal* 2.1: 229–279.
- Sakaino Kōyō 境野黄洋. 1935. *Shina Bukkyō seishi* 支那佛教精史 (Tokyo: Sakaino Kōyō Hakushi Ikō Kankōkai).
- Salguero, C. Pierce. 2014. *Translating Buddhist Medicine in Medieval China* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press).
- Silk, Jonathan A. 1997. "The Composition of the Guan Wuliangshoufo-jing: Some Buddhist and Jaina Parallels to Its Narrative Frame." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 25: 181–256.
- Silk, Jonathan. 2008 [2010]. "The *Jifayue sheku tuoluoni jing*: Translation, Non-Translation, Both or Neither?" *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 31.1–2: 369–420.
- Strickmann, Michel. 1990. "The Consecration Sutra: A Buddhist Book of Spells." In Robert E. Buswell, Jr., ed., *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press): 75–118.
- Tsukinowa Kenryū 月輪賢隆. 1954. "Hannya sanzō no hon'yaku ni taisuru higi" 般若三藏の翻經に対する批議. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 4.2: 434–443.
- Utsuo Shōshin 撫尾正信. 1954. "*Makamaya kyō* Kan'yaku ni kansuru gigi" 摩訶摩耶經漢訳に關する疑義. *Saga Ryūkoku gakkai kiyō* 佐賀龍谷学会紀要 2: 1–28.
- Yamabe, Nobuyoshi. 1999. "The Sutra on the Ocean-like Samadhi of the Visualization of the Buddha: The Interfusion of the Chinese and Indian Cultures in Central Asia as Reflected in a Fifth Century Apocryphal Sutra." Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University.
- Yoshikawa Tadao 吉川忠夫 and Funayama Tōru 船山徹, 2009. *Kō sō den (ichi)* 高僧伝(一) (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten).

The *Gaṅgottarāparipṛcchā*

A Small Mahāyāna Buddhist Scripture

Jonathan A. Silk

1 Introduction

The *Gaṅgottarāparipṛcchā* is a short Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist scripture, preserved in both Chinese and Tibetan as one of the forty-nine sūtras in the Mahāratnakūṭa collection.¹ While there remains no direct Indic evidence for the sūtra—that is, no Sanskrit manuscript has been found, nor has any quotation been identified in an Indian work—its Indian (and almost equally certainly Sanskrit) origin is nonetheless beyond doubt.

The text is preserved in one Tibetan translation transmitted in the Kanjur tradition, a Chinese translation, and a unique manuscript Tibetan translation of this Chinese translation. All of these sources are edited and translated in the present study.

This fascinating text presents a dialogue between the Buddha and a female lay disciple named Gaṅgottarā. Although she is a layperson and a woman, her attitude toward the Buddha is, as admiring divinities proclaim (§16c), wonderful in its fearlessness and vigor, and it is perhaps this feature which has drawn to the work some slight modern attention, seemingly limited, however, to discussions of Buddhism and gender.² Despite this, even if we cannot locate the text's composition chronologically or geographically (as is indeed the case with almost all such works), the doctrinal presentation and rhetoric deserve attention on their own, and in this respect it is a pity that we lack access to Sanskrit sources which, one senses, would have been composed in an interesting style.

1 My debts for all the vital help and advice I have received in the preparation of this volume are many. In the first place, the core Open Philology team was vital. I mention here, therefore, the names of Bai Yu, Rafal Felbur, Gregory Forgues, Jiang Yixiu, and Péter-Dániel Szántó. Channa Li, now in Vienna, was an eager help, and was kind enough, given the delays in her own project on the sister-text to this one, the *Maitreya-paripṛcchā*, to set aside our original plan to publish the two parts of Pelliot tibétain 98 together. I look forward to her full study of the much longer portion she undertook to examine, now being investigated in the context of a project funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF Esprit no. 125).

I received many valuable suggestions from my much missed friend Stefano Zacchetti, including one observation on Chinese grammar, the notes to which I inexcusably misplaced, and which now simply remains to be discovered by someone else. Leonard van der Kuijp offered several valuable suggestions and materials, as did, as members of our editorial board, Paul Harrison, Jan Nattier and Michael Radich. The volume editor Rafal Felbur deserves, as always, very special thanks.

I am quite sure that with my increasingly bad memory in my old age, and (as just mentioned) with my horrible note-taking and organizing skills, I am now forgetting more than one friend who made some vital contribution. I hope all of those whom I have forgotten will forgive me, as they so very kindly find themselves doing far too often.

As the Introduction makes clear, this is nothing more than a first attempt to study this sometimes difficult text, and I look forward to suggestions and corrections from readers.

2 For instance, Schuster 1981; Faure 2003: 121–122; Collett 2017: 560.

Following the stock opening, Gaṅgottarā approaches the Buddha, who politely inquires where she has come from. She somewhat pedantically or punctiliously (although with didactic intent) demands of the Buddha whether he would ask such a question of an artificial creation, a **nirmāṇa* (or similar term). When the Buddha avers that this would indeed not make sense, she reminds him that all phenomena are similar to such an artificially created being. Granting this, the Buddha asks her in turn whether this means that she does not either transmigrate through saṃsāra or attain nirvāṇa. Her answer is pure Madhyamaka: if she were to imagine her own intrinsic nature (**svabhāva*) to be different from that of an artificial creation, then indeed she would either transmigrate through saṃsāra or attain nirvāṇa, but since she does not so imagine her own intrinsic nature (which would be a fundamental mistake, from the point of view of the nature of ultimate reality), it is not possible to say this. She then equates her own status to that of the ultimate reality, the *nirvāṇadhātu*, the quintessence of nirvāṇa.

The Buddha then asks: does she then not strive for nirvāṇa? On the contrary, this question is once again nonsensical, since asking this question to her is the same as asking it to one as yet unborn. Agreeing with the Buddha that all phenomena are the same as nirvāṇa, Gaṅgottarā returns to the question of attaining nirvāṇa, and asks whether one artificially created being might ask another about the latter's attainment of nirvāṇa. The Buddha responds that such a question lacks a referential object (**ālambana?* **upalabdhi?*), and that he asked his question only in order to educate those who can be spiritually cultivated thereby. This teaching is certainly beyond rational understanding and inconceivable (*acintya*). Although the Buddha has spoken of corporeality, sensation and so on to characterize the 'person' in the absence of a self, in fact, such things—the *skandhas* or 'aggregates' that constitute the Abhidharmic individual—do not ultimately exist. The same is true of saṃsāra and nirvāṇa. Those who understand this understand correctly. Those who understand incorrectly might develop an abhorrence for those who preach these doctrines, and wish to hurt them, but this reaction will only lead them to hell.

The Buddha then smiles because he recalls that (or is profoundly aware that; the term **abhiṣṅā* is pregnant with significance) a thousand past buddhas also had an assembly led by a female lay follower named Gaṅgottarā, and this same sermon led the entire audience (or in the Kanjur version, only the lay women) to renounce the household life and attain nirvāṇa. After a standard appreciation of the sermon, divinities praise Gaṅgottarā, as noted above.

There is much in this brief dialogue that reminds one of episodes in other sūtras, in particular the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*,³ but it is not possible to say with certainty whether our text directly relies on that much more famous scripture. The very beginning of the text, with its discussion of artificially created beings, for instance, brings to mind the following from the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* (in order to illuminate the structure, my translations here are intentionally somewhat wooden.):⁴

3 See Silk 2014b a for a characterization of this and other texts relevant for localizing the rhetoric of the *Gaṅgottarāparipṛcchā*.

4 §VI.16 (Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature 2006): *āha: itas tvan devate cyutā kutropapatsyase | āha: yatraiva tathāgatanirmita upapatsyate, tatraivāham upapatsye | āha: tathāgatanirmitasya na cyutir nopapattiḥ | āha: evam eva sarvadharmānām na cyutir nopapattiḥ |*.

[Śāriputra] said: “Dying from here, Goddess, where will you be reborn?”

[The Goddess] said: “Precisely where an illusory creation of the Tathāgata will be reborn, there I will be reborn.”

[Śāriputra] said: “Illusory creations of the Tathāgata neither die nor are they reborn.”

[The Goddess] said: “Just so, all things neither die nor are they reborn.”

Another similar passage reads:⁵

The Venerable Śāriputra spoke to the Licchavi Vimalakīrti as follows: “Where did you die that you were reborn here?”

Vimalakīrti said: “Is there any death or rebirth of a phenomenon realized by the Elder?”

[Śāriputra] said: “There is no death or rebirth of that phenomenon.”

[Vimalakīrti] said: “It being the case, Reverend Śāriputra, that all phenomena are free of death and rebirth, why does it occur to you [to ask]: ‘Where did you die that you were reborn here?’? If, Reverend Śāriputra, an illusorily created woman or man were asked ‘Where did you die that you were reborn here?’ what should he reply?”

[Śāriputra] said: “Gentle Sir, an illusory creation has no death or rebirth; what will he answer?”

[Vimalakīrti] said: “Has not the Tathāgata taught, Reverend Śāriputra, that all phenomena have the intrinsic nature of an illusory creation?”

[Śāriputra] said: “Just so, Gentle Sir.”

[Vimalakīrti] said: “It being the case, Reverend Śāriputra, that all phenomena have the intrinsic nature of an illusory creation, [when you ask me] ‘Where did you die that you were reborn here?’ this [word] ‘death’ has as its characteristic mark the cessation of activity; this [word] ‘rebirth’ [indicates] continuity of activity. When a bodhisattva dies, the activity of his roots of good does not cease, and when he is reborn, his unwholesome [karmic seeds] do not continue.”

5 XI.2 (Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature 2006): *athāyusmāñ śāriputro vimalakīrtim licchavim etad avocat: kutas tvañ kulaputra cyutvehopapannaḥ | vimalakīrtir āha: yaḥ sthavireṇa dharmāḥ sāḥsātḥkṛtaḥ, kaccit tasya dharmasya cyutir upapattir vā | āha: na tasya dharmasya kācic cyutir upapattir vā | āha: evam acyutikānām anutpattikānām bhadanta śāriputra sarvadharmāṇām kutas tavaivaṃ bhavati—kutas tvañ cyutvehopapanna iti | yañ bhadanta śāriputra nirmitām striyañ puruṣaṃ vā pṛccheḥ—kutas tvañ cyutvehopapanna iti, sa kiñ vyākuryāt | āha: na kulaputra nirmitasya cyutir nopapattiḥ, sa kiñ vyākariṣyati | āha: nanu bhadanta śāriputra nirmitasvabhāvāḥ sarvadharmās tathāgatena nirdiṣṭāḥ | āha: evam etad kulaputra | āha: nirmitasvabhāveṣu bhadanta śāriputra sarvadharmeṣu—kutas tvañ cyutvehopapanna iti | cyutir iti bhadanta śāriputra abhisamkāraṣanalakṣaṇapadam etad | upapattir ity abhisamkāraprabandha eṣaḥ | tatra bodhisatvaś cyavate, na kuśalamūlābhisamkāraṃ kṣapayati | upapadyate ca, na cākuśalam prabadhnāti |*

Both of these passages, not unimportantly, also have close parallels in the *Candrottarādārikā-vyākaraṇa*, and in several other texts.⁶ An important aspect of these parallels is the presence in so many of these texts of a female protagonist, just as we find in the *Gaṅgottarāparipṛcchā*. It is certainly possible that part of the rhetorical force of the antinomial message of these sūtras comes from the gender of the Buddha's interlocutor, although as I have argued (Silk 2014b), it is naive to assume that our categories and expectations should be applicable to Indian Buddhist literature, and we should tread cautiously especially in making assumptions about the ways in which Indian audiences might have received a text.

In terms of understanding the Indian Buddhist context of the presentation, one should perhaps not overlook not only the way in which the main character is portrayed, but also her very name, Gaṅgottarā. Is it justified to speculate that this is some reference to, or reflex of, Gaṅgadevī, who appears in the 19th chapter of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*?⁷ This character is a woman who preaches the Teaching in the presence of the Buddha, having made an aspiration to buddhahood at the same moment that Śākyamuni himself did. If this figure is somehow to be invoked here, one understanding of the name Gaṅgottarā *might* be that she is superior (*uttara*) even to Gaṅgadevī, who was predicted for buddhahood in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*. But given that we know nothing of the circumstances of the composition of the *Gaṅgottarāparipṛcchā* (although it certainly post-dates the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*, perhaps significantly), we cannot go farther in this speculation.

A final note on the contents of the text concerns the key term rendered in Tibetan with *dmigs pa* and in Chinese sometimes with *pānyuán* 攀緣, sometimes with *(bù)kědé* (不)可得. This surely points to Sanskrit terminology related to the roots *upa√labh* or *ā√labh* (and their negation), but its meaning is often difficult to pin down precisely, and it is more than likely that the text intentionally uses this 'slipperiness' in its rhetorical manipulations. I have translated this term (or family of cognate terms) with "referential objectification" or "apprehension," understanding the meaning to be the apprehending of something as a real object, an apprehension that is, from the ultimate point of view, incorrect. The mistake lies in attributing objective existence to things, which are, from a Buddhist philosophical perspective, not really real. One could hardly do better in this context than refer to the discussion of Steinkellner (1992), who very clearly investigated this difficult term. Although Steinkellner's central focus is the thought of the philosopher Dharmakīrti (±600 CE), and he does not consider Mahāyāna sūtra literature in detail, he does reach back into the Pāli canonical and post-canonical literature to establish that although Dharmakīrti honed and refined the notion of (*an*)*upalabdhi*, his interpretation of its central thrust does not appreciably change from its earlier Buddhist sense. Steinkellner writes:⁸

6 Derge Kanjur 191, *mdo sde, tsa* 236a6–b2; T. 480 (XIV) 620b1–8. I have discussed these passages in Silk 2014b. My student Nobuyuki Suzuki is currently studying the *Candrottarādārikā-vyākaraṇa* for his PhD thesis.

7 Wogihara 1932–1935: 744 ff. (and for convenience, Conze 1973: 219 ff.). As Paul Harrison points out to me, Edgerton 1953: sv Gaṅgadevī bhaginī notices this form of the name alongside Gaṅgadevā (also spelt Gaṅgadevā). Harrison wittily emphasizes that the name makes her no more a goddess than Āryadeva is a god.

8 Steinkellner 1992: 400. I omit Steinkellner's references to the primary sources he quotes in this passage.

Dharmakīrti widened the conceptual frame and distinguished—with a view to their epistemological value—between two basic kinds of non-perception (*anupalabdhi*) that can be made use of in different ways for statements on the existence and non-existence of something:

The two kinds of non-perception are an unqualified general non-perception as a “non-perception of something imperceptible (*adrśya*)” and a qualified non-perception as a “non-perception of something perceptible (*drśya*).” The former results in “negation of cognition, word and activity with reference to existence,” while the latter results in “certain cognition of non-existence.” And while the latter includes of course the result of the former, it is important [...] to stress that a “non-perception of something imperceptible” cannot produce a certain cognition of its non-existence.

What Steinkellner goes on to emphasize, moreover, is that although the two-fold distinction made here is clearly an innovation of Dharmakīrti, its overall ontological and epistemological orientation is nevertheless clearly implicit in the earlier tradition. Steinkellner quotes an interesting passage from the so-called *Kāśyapaparivarta*, perhaps not entirely incidentally the core text of the Mahāratnakūṭa collection (§ 102):⁹

Truly the mind, Kāśyapa, which is being sought after is not found. That which is not found is not met with. That which is not met with is not past, not future, not present. That which is not past, not future, not present has transcended the three times. That which has transcended the three times neither exists nor does not exist. That which neither exists nor does not exist is unborn. That which is unborn has no intrinsic nature.

Steinkellner comments on this passage as follows:¹⁰

Here there is no question of the non-perception of mind being the same as its non-existence. For it is based on its unavailability which—here again—remains unclear as to whether it is due to its non-existence or to its imperceptibility. But the important thing is, that its non-perception serves as a reason for rejecting it as an object for an affirmation of its existence as well as of its non-existence.

In terms of the precise denotation of this (class of) terms in the *Gaṅgotarāparipṛcchā* itself, however, we probably have simply to accept what Steinkellner says in making his

9 Steinkellner 1992: 401–402; here, however, I cite my own translation and draft edition, with abbreviated notes (editio princeps Staël-Holstein 1926): *cittaṃ hi kāśyapa parigaveṣ[ya]amāṇaṃ*^a *na labhyate* 30 *yan na labhyate tan nopalabhyate [yan nopalabhyate]*^b *tan nātītaṃ nānāgataṃ na pratyutpannaṃ · yan nātītaṃ nānāgataṃ na pratyutpannaṃ ta[t] tr[ya]adhvasamatikrāntaṃ*^c *ya[t]*^d *tryadhvasamati-krāntaṃ · tan naivāsti neva nāsti · yan naivāsti na nāsti · tad ajātaṃ yad ajātaṃ · tasya nāsti svabhāvaḥ*

a) MS °gaveṣamā°; b) MS ∅, added from *Prasannapadā* and *Śikṣāsamuccaya* quotations; c) MS *tatrādhva*°; d) MS *yatrya*°.

10 Steinkellner 1992: 402.

claim that Dharmakīrti's use *is* clear, namely:¹¹ “The semantic history of a word within a conceptual community such as Buddhism may be indeterminable to some extent at certain periods.” A more positive way of looking at the situation, however, might be to say that as we study more of the texts which appear to be—historically, typologically or for other reasons—related to the *Gaṅgottarāparipṛcchā*, we can reasonably expect that our appreciation of the text's rhetoric and the nuances of its doctrinal positions will become ever clearer. For the time being, perhaps the best I can say is that I have struggled both to understand the text's intention and to render my understanding in English, and I readily concede that improvement is possible.

1.1 Sources

1.1.1 Tibetan

In the Tibetan Kanjurs, our text is found as the 31st work in the Mahāratnakūṭa collection, in a translation credited to Jinamitra, Dānaśīla and Ye shes sde,¹² with the title *Gang ga'i mchog gis zhus pa* (or some similar form), the text itself offering the alternative title (§ 15b) *Dri ma med pa*, **Vimala* (in Chinese *Ligou qingjing* 離垢清淨, **Vimalaśuddhi*?). Turning to the witnesses edited here, in general I harbor profound doubts about the ‘price/earnings ratio’ or ‘cost effectiveness’ of collations of a vast number of Kanjur editions, which from the perspective of the overall thrust of the text and its intended meaning usually produce little information worthy of the effort involved in the process.¹³ However, some things may be learnt from such collations, and in particular since I have had access (as of 2019) to a number of editions which have either not yet been consulted, or only rarely, by modern scholars, I collated the following (all belong to the *dkon brtsegs* section of the respective Kanjur, with the exception of the Tabo text, the organization of which is unclear):¹⁴

- A: Tabo (Ladhak) 1.3.12.7 (263), *ga-nga* 8–11¹⁵
- Cz: Chizhi (Bhutan) Cz022–013, ca. 385a5–390b4
- D: Derge 75, ca. 222a3–225b3
- Dd: Dodedrak (Bhutan) Dd064–012, ca. 329a4–334a1
- Dk: Dongkarla (Bhutan) Dk006–013, ca. 427a2–431b7
- F: Phug brag 61, ca. 260b7–265b3

11 Steinkellner 1992: 404.

12 In some witnesses, the expression “and others” is added. See the readings apparatus to § 19(a).

13 However, from the perspective of documenting the literary history of the text and contributing to an appreciation of Tibetan literary culture in general, ultimately such an accounting will be a necessary task.

14 It should be noted that there are quite a few other known Kanjurs; however, as they do not preserve our text, they are not considered here.

15 I would especially like to thank Paul Harrison for his help obtaining photos of the Tabo and several other editions. For Cz, Dd, Dk, Gt, He, Hi, J, Np, Pj, Pz, R, my source has been the invaluable “Resources for Kanjur & Tanjur Studies” website (<https://www.istb.univie.ac.at/kanjur/rktsneu/sub/index.php>), and the sources prepared by Helmut Tauscher and largely catalogued by Bruno Lainé. This site also embeds resources from the Endangered Archives Programme of the British Library (<https://eap.bl.uk/>). Unfortunately, I collated the Tabo text some time before Helmut Tauscher established the siglum Ta for Tabo, and it was too late to go back and change all references from A. I beg the reader's understanding.

- Go: Gondhla (Ladhak) vol. 8 text 12, *ca-na* 96b8–99b7¹⁶
 Gt: Gangteng (Bhutan) Gt061–013, ca. 338b6–343b2
 He: Hemis (I) (Ladhak) He36.6, *nga* 94a8–99b7
 Hi: Hemis (II) (Ladhak) Hi38.12 ca. 317a4–322a2
 J: 'Jang sa tham/Lithang J330, ca. 249a1–253a5 (vol. 82)
 N: Narthang 62, ca. 377b2–382b6
 Np: Neyphug (Bhutan) Np095–013, ca. 398a4–403b4
 P: Peking 760 (31), *zi* 231b1–235a3¹⁷
 Ph: Phugthar (Zanskar) Ph30, ca. 178a3–181a9
 Pj: Phajoding I (Bhutan) = Phajoding Ogmin Lhakhang, Pj018–012, ca. 273a6–277b2
 Pz: Phajoding II (Bhutan) = Phajoding Khangzang Lhakhang Pz019–012, ca. 242a6–246a5
 R: Ragya 1820 R75, ca. 222a3–225b3 (vol. 43) [only title collated]¹⁸
 S: Stog (Ladhak) 11,31, ca. 373b5–378b3
 T: Tokyo 33,30, ca. 307b5–312a1¹⁹
 V: Ulan Bator 62, ca. 327a–331b5²⁰

One result of this effort should be a picture, small as it is, of the relations of these various editions, and along with the results of other collations, ideally from different sections of the respective Kanjurs, it should become increasingly clear which editions should be consulted by editors in order to reveal a fair picture of the transmissional history of a particular Tibetan translation, and which can be safely left aside as not effectively repaying the effort required for collation.

As a matter of principle, I have edited the text with the aim of establishing what I imagine to have been its early form in Tibetan translation. One must note, however, in this regard that although it would seem reasonable to suppose that the translators employed “archaic” forms such as the *da drag* and spellings such as *myi*, for the sake of legibility these have not been presented in the edition of the Kanjur text. This means that I have relegated readings such as those representing Sanskritizations (e.g., *gang gā'i mchog* with the long vowel) to the list of alternative readings, since I consider them to be later rationalizations. For the most part, the apparatus records transmissional artifacts, many of which are either free variants, especially in regard to punctuation, or mere errors in the tradition

16 My thanks to Helmut Tauscher for his generosity. See Tauscher 2008 for catalogue.

17 I have used the text from the National Library of Mongolia, reproduced in lovely color photos by the Digital Preservation Society in Tokyo, in 2010 (http://tibet-dps.org/peking_kangyur.htm).

18 The print quality of the available exemplar (https://www.istb.univie.ac.at/kanjur/rktsneu/digit/affiche_0.php?vol=dkon%20brtsegs%20ca&beg=450&coll=ragya&rkts=76) is so poor that I did not collate this edition past the title section.

19 I collated this many years ago at the Tōyō Bunko in Tokyo, and have not had any chance to check my notes on its readings since that time. However, after I had completed this edition, which has remained unpublished for several years, thanks in part to collaboration with the Open Philology project, the Tōyō Bunko produced digital photographs of the *dkon brtsegs* section of this Kanjur, which are now accessible at https://app.toyobunko-lab.jp/s/manuscript_kanjur/page/home.

20 As with the Peking edition, I have used the text from the National Library of Mongolia, reproduced in lovely color photos by the Digital Preservation Society in Tokyo, in 2010.

which can be removed from a critical edition, although they may well be very useful for other purposes, such as dialect studies, and thus must be somewhere preserved. The few instances in which there are significant variant readings are discussed in the Commentary.

In some cases it must be confessed that my choice of readings in the Kanjur edition has an element of the arbitrary, or at least the provisional, based in part perhaps on our (my!) current ignorance of the Tibetan language. This is particularly the case with certain verbs, and with prefixes which seem (as far as I know) to appear without well understood patterns.²¹ Examples include *gzod/bzod* (§ 2a, c), *gzar/bzar* (§ 14a), *gsad/bsad* (§ 11a), *gzung/bzung* (§ 15a), *mchi/chi* (§ 4b), and the like (perhaps slightly different is *sngangs/dngangs/bsngangs* in § 10c). There is, moreover, a consistent inconsistency in the presentation of the verb *rma* in contrast to *smra* (and forms thereof), the former indicating ‘ask’ rather than the simple ‘say’ of the latter (see §§ 2c, 3c, 5b, 6ab, 7b). My presumption on the whole has been that the former, being a rarer verb, represents the older form, that was—intentionally or not—modified later (in § 3c we find that P actually replaces the verb with *gsung*; in § 5b HeHi have *dris*). Broader studies will be necessary to evaluate this hypothesis. On the whole, however, questionable cases are not common, and the text is generally extremely stable, with the vast majority of apparent variants revealing themselves in comparative light to be, again, mere transmissional errors. This may well be a result of the fact that, as discussed below, the text seems to have been of quite little interest in the tradition, and it is no more than expected that texts which were rarely studied display less variation in their textual transmissions than do those which received ample attention.

My collation of the text transmitted in the Kanjurs, as noted above, makes use of several newly available sources, including the Tabo text (A), and the Gondhla (Go) and the Ulan Bator (V) Kanjurs. More recently, as noted above, it became possible to access a number of newly photographed witnesses from Bhutan and Ladakh, chiefly, and these are discussed below. The manuscript from Ulan Bator has long been known, but was until recently inaccessible. However, it turns out to be of some interest. Several years ago Onoda Shunzō collated the Tibetan translation of the Larger *Sukhāvāṭīvyūha* making use of this version,²² and while his initial hypothesis was that the Ulan Bator manuscript and that kept in the Tōyō Bunko were closely related, in the end he was led to the conclusion that Ulan Bator rather has a special relation to the Narthang edition: “[T]he Ulaanbaatar MS and Tokyo Kawaguchi MS are not simply brother recensions. And the Ulaanbaatar MS has some characteristics, which are closest to the Narthang edition of the Kagyur, published in 1730–1732.”²³ The results of my collations of the present text confirm Onoda’s results

21 While I do not know what other relevant work has been published, see Terjék 1972 for valuable considerations of variations in, among other things, the use of prefixes.

22 However, no information from the Ulan Bator manuscript is included in the collations in Onoda 1999, nor was it employed in the collation of the Smaller *Sukhāvāṭīvyūha* in Onoda 2001.

23 Onoda 2008: 67; 2003. In contrast to the case with the Larger sūtra, in so far as I can make use of it, the collation of the Smaller *Sukhāvāṭīvyūha* in Niisaku 2010 does not seem to support a close relationship between the Ulan Bator manuscript and the Narthang blockprint. Another case is that studied by Miyazaki 2017, which in regard to the **Ajātaśatrukaukṛtyavinodana* connects the Ulan Bator manuscript with the Tokyo and Stog Palace manuscripts, slightly less closely with the London manuscript,

with regard to the close relation here between Narthang and Ulan Bator. Otherwise, it is not terribly surprising to find Tabo (A) and Gondhla (Go) very closely related, since geographically their respective sources are also quite proximate.

In terms of the Bhutanese Kanjurs, it is no surprise that some, in particular that from Dodedrak (Dd) and two from Phajoding (Pj and Pz), agree with each other, but it is noteworthy that these closely agree with Derge (D) and 'Jang sa tham/Lithang (J) (the former an edited copy of the latter, as is well known). It is likewise not surprising from a geographical perspective that Phugthar (Ph) from Zanskar finds itself in agreement with Tabo (A) and Gondhla (Go) from Ladhak. The place of the two Hemis Kanjurs, which naturally agree between themselves quite frequently (but interestingly, not always), is harder to determine with relation to other traditions. It remains only to note that, as expected, Phug brag (F) is somewhat idiosyncratic, and remains outside the main Kanjur textual lineages. As mentioned above, however, since almost all variations in our short text are in the way of punctuation or trivial spelling differences, very little can actually be learnt of textual transmission from this inadequate sample.

1.1.2 Chinese

In Chinese the text is preserved as the *Gengheshang youpoyi hui* 恒河上優婆夷會, translated by, or perhaps better attributed to, the Tang dynasty monk Bodhiruci (in the Taishō edition T. 310 [31]).²⁴ The Mahāratnakūṭa collection (*Da Baoji jing* 大寶積經) as a whole was presented to the throne by Bodhiruci on 7 May 713 (Xiantian 先天 2.4.8), and thus the translation somewhat predates this time. I have been able to collate only the following witnesses:²⁵

F: Fangshan 房山石經, 大寶積經 *juan* 98 (Beijing: Huaxia chubanshe 華夏出版社, 2000), vol. 8, p. 538, engraved between 1042 and 1056.

K: Second Koryō 高麗, reproduced in the *Zhonghua Dazangjing* 中華大藏經 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 中華書局, 1985), vol. 9, pp. 241–243.²⁶

P: Dunhuang manuscript preserved as Pelliot chinois 3354, verso lines 527–567.²⁷

Q: Qisha 磧砂 (Taipei: Xinwenfeng 新文豐, 1987), vol. 6, pp. 79–80.

and not at all with Narthang. It is well known that the Narthang Kanjur drew upon multiple sources, and it seems evident that the respective sources for its versions of the Larger and Smaller *Sukhāvātīvyūha* belonged to different lineages. On the other hand, the close relation between N and V found in both the Larger *Sukhāvātīvyūha* and the *Gaṅgottarāparipṛcchā* might suggest that we look further for a section-wise consistency throughout the Mahāratnakūṭa collection, to which both sūtras belong.

24 I read 恒 as *gèng*, rather than the more common *héng*, in light of its evident transcription value, and in line with its LHan reading *gəŋ*, ОСМ *gəŋ* (Schuessler 2009: § 6–1d).

On the translation team, see Chen 2007: 406–414.

25 The text is not available in the collection of old Japanese manuscripts, the so-called Shōgozō 聖語藏.

26 The reproduction of the Second Koryō here means that we do not have any available witness from the Jin canon.

27 See Soyminié 1983: 291 (I do not know why this catalogue counts the lines as 526–566). As the catalogue explains, the manuscript, which is fragmentary, generally preserves extracts from a number of portions of the Mahāratnakūṭa. In our case, however, the entire sūtra is preserved.

With the exception of a few short apparent abbreviations in P, no significant variants are found. The existence of P makes clear that the text was known in Chinese in Dunhuang, where it formed part of the Mahāratnakūṭa collection. Since it was translated by Bodhiruci, who is credited with the compilation of the collection, we would not expect the sūtra to have had any circulation apart from this context. However, it is interesting that the Tibetan translation made from Chinese (see below) represents (very closely indeed) the version of the sūtra as transmitted in the formal printed editions, rather than the, as just mentioned, slightly abbreviated version found in P, and this remains to be explained, perhaps as part of a larger study of Pelliot chinois 3354, which also contains material from a number of other Mahāratnakūṭa sūtras.

1.1.3 Tibetan from Chinese

Although it is generally believed that the norm for Tibetan translations of Buddhist scriptures made in pre-modern times is that they were produced from Indic sources, in principle in Sanskrit, in fact a not inconsiderable number of translations of Mahāyāna sūtras were also made from Chinese originals. By my count, some 40 or so can be identified.²⁸ Many of these have long been known, noticed either in indigenous catalogues, translation colophons or on other bases, and many are in fact included in the Kanjurs. However, some such translations are available to us only in (often unique) manuscripts, discovered at the beginning of the 20th century at the cave site of Dunhuang, and unknown until quite recently. One such example is edited here for the first time.²⁹

The Dunhuang manuscript of the Tibetan translation made from Chinese is preserved as Pelliot tibétain 89. This manuscript contains two texts, the *Maitreyaparipṛcchā* and the *Gaṅgottarāparipṛcchā*.³⁰ Lalou's catalogue (1939: 29) says the following:

Deux textes complets du *Ratnakūṭa* sans titres initiaux:

- 1) *Maitreyaparipṛcchā*, *nidāna* à Benarès: *yul pa-ra-ṅa-sir rig-dags phyin-ba'i chal-ña ...* Fin, f. *ta*, verso: *'phags-pa dkon-m'chog-br'cegs-pa čhen-po'i mdo stoñ-phrag-brgya'-pa-las/bya[n]-čhub-sems-dpa' byams-pas źus-pa'i 'dus* (partie grattée)-*pa rjogs-so*. Cf. Ōtani, 760 (42).
- 2) *Upāsikā-gaṅgottarā-paripṛcchā*. Fin: *dkon-m'chog-br'cegs-pa čhen-po'i mdo stoñ-phrag-brgya'-pa-las//dge-bsñen-ma gañ-ga'i m'chog-gi 'dus* (partie grattée)-*pa rjogs-so*. Cf. Ōtani 760 (31).
11 f. (8.2 × 42) pag. *ka-da*; 8 l., règl. jaunes, trou central cerclé de rouge. Cursive. Bel exemplaire complet en très bon état.

28 A listing is offered in Silk 2019. I have now noticed that the two Dunhuang Tibetan manuscript fragments of the opening of the *Ratnarāsi* are also translations from Chinese. I will discuss these in my forthcoming edition. See also the very important contribution of Li 2021.

29 I believe that I published the first correct identification of this manuscript in Silk 2014a.

In the edition, *i* indicates the *gi gu log*. All deviations from the manuscript readings are noted in the Readings section found after the Texts and Translations.

30 An edition of the *Maitreyaparipṛcchā* is under preparation by Channa Li.

It is not clear to me whether Lalou recognized that the translations which she (correctly) identified were not identical with the versions in the Peking Kanjur to which she made comparative reference. The manuscript is, as Lalou noted, extremely well and regularly written, no doubt by a professional scribe, possibly working in an official capacity, although we have no colophon or other evidence aside from the materiality of the manuscript itself to support this supposition. In the typology of van Schaik 2013, the writing seems to me closest to the ‘headless official style.’ It seems clear that the text must have been copied into this manuscript from another source; in other words, this is highly unlikely to be an autograph of the translator, whoever that may have been. I worked from very clear color photographs of the manuscript available on the website of the International Dunhuang Project³¹ and Artstor (www.artstor.org), but have not seen the original.

Although such materials are obviously very difficult to date precisely (and as far as I know relatively little physical investigation has taken place),³² it is reasonable in light of all the information available to us to place this manuscript between the 8th and 10th centuries, and perhaps even in the later rather than the earlier portion of this time span.

I have commented in detail in the notes on some specific characteristics of the Tibetan translation from Chinese, and its fidelity to its source. As further studies are carried out on these translations, we will gain a better picture of the vocabulary and grammatical choices made by the translators, and thus it is best to defer detailed discussions to some future occasion. It should be noted, however, that these Tibetan translations offer us an invaluable insight into the way that the Chinese texts were understood at the time by educated readers. In this respect, it is particularly noteworthy that the technical terms in the Chinese texts were understood quite precisely by their Tibetan translators. Further studies of such works should continue to shed light on the extent to which we might see these Chinese translations less as free interpretations of their Indic sources and more as sometimes quite close and precise renderings.

1.2 *Traditional Notices*

While our main clue to the status of this sūtra in Dunhuang, along with Pelliot chinois 3354, is the existence of the Tibetan translation made from Chinese, which obviously suggests a certain level of attention and some value having been placed on the text, there is at the same time quite little evidence for the significance of the text elsewhere in extant archives or as cited in literature. I know of only two citations in East Asian works. The first comes in a Song period Chan reference work, the *Zuting shiyuan* 祖庭事苑 (Garden of Topics from the Patriarchs’ Hall), compiled by Mu’an Shanqing 睦庵善卿 around 1108.³³ The second appears in a text of the 17th century Chan figure Hanke Zuxin 函可祖

31 <https://idp.bl.uk/collection/ECC1D1EE53C950458B1A0F3DB6F9F0A4/?return=%2Fcollection%2F%3Fterm%3DPelliot%2520tibetain%252089>.

32 As far as I can see, the studies carried out so far on the topic of paper, mostly by Agnieszka Helman-Ważny, determine their dates to a great extent from the content of the texts examined (for instance, dating Chan texts to a particular period). I expect that in future these studies will yield more precise results.

33 § 8c-f: 無心: 寶積。恒河上優婆夷言: 所說無心欲明何義。世尊告曰: 此法非思惟之所能知,

心 (1612–1660),³⁴ the *Qianshan Shengren heshang yulu* 千山剩人和尚語錄 (Recorded Sayings of the Chan Master Shengren of Mount Qian).³⁵

The sūtra is, however, naturally noticed in the analytical catalogues of the Mahāratnakūṭa collection, four of which are known to me, three in Tibetan, one in Chinese. In Tibetan, the Mahāratnakūṭa collection has been the subject of two indexical tables of contents, one authored by a Tibetan scholar, the other by a Mongolian writing in Tibetan. In addition, another work is a detailed analytical catalogue of the entire Kanjur. Of the two works limited to the Mahāratnakūṭa collection, the first is authored by Bo dong paṅ chen Phyogs las rnam rgyal (1376–1451),³⁶ the second by Cha har dge bshes Blo bzang tshul khriṃs (1740–1810). The first is called *Dkon rtsegs le'u 'bum gyi mdo 'grel* (Sūtra commentary on the Ratnakūṭa section), and concerning the *Gaṅgottarāparipṛcchā* it says the following:³⁷

Now I will explain the *Gaṅgottarā sūtra*: In this regard, to briefly state the subject-matter, the text says [§ 1a] “Thus” and so on. In expansive explanation by way of

亦非思惟之所能得。何以故。此中心尚不可得。何況心所生法。以心不可得，是即說名不思議處。此不思議處無得，無證，非染，非淨。x 1261 (LXVI) 410C20–24 [text from the CBETA digital collection]. I owe this reference to Michael Radich.

34 On this fascinating figure, see Yim 2005 (upon whom I rely for the dates). It is interesting that Hanke quotes this sūtra, for as Yim 2005: 108 states: “Seldom would Hanke systematically expound on sūtras or philosophical doctrines. I found no more than a dozen instances in the whole book of *Yulu* in which Hanke quotes directly from sūtras ... while preaching.”

35 This is found in the Jiaying 嘉興 canon B407, 232a16 and following; I mark the quoted sections of the text according to the edition below [text from the CBETA digital collection]: 小參，云：「四生如水泡，三界若空花。迷時分種種，覺後沒些些。大眾，既是沒些些，即今現前拱立僧是僧、俗是俗、老是老、少是少、男是男、女是女，畢竟喚作有？喚作無？

昔日，有個恒河上優婆夷來見佛，[§ 2a] 佛問：『恒河上，汝從何來？』[§ 2bc] 恒河上即白佛言：『若問化人汝從何來，當云何答？』

[§ 2d] 佛言：『夫化人者，無有往來，亦無生滅，云何言彼有所從來？』[§ 3ab] 又問：『諸法豈不皆如化耶？』佛言：『如是，如是。』

[§ 3c] 恒河上言：『若一切法皆如化者，云何應問汝從何來？』[§ 4a] 佛言：『是幻化者，不往惡趣、不生天上、不證涅槃。恒河上，汝亦爾耶？』

[§ 4bc] 恒河上言：『我若見身異於幻化，方可說言往善惡趣及般涅槃。我不見身異於幻化，云何說言往善惡趣及大涅槃？』

大眾，你看者婦女有甚麼本領，向佛前恁地賣弄？如今，且勿論在家，便是出家三五十年頭童齒豁，尚自聚首商量：恁般便墮惡趣、恁般便生天上，又恁般經多少劫便成正覺、證大涅槃。似此見解，便與者優婆夷提裙挈履他也不要。要識恒河上麼？便是佛來他也不管，學道人須具者個眼目始得。你莫見恁麼說，謂是撥有歸無。若撥有歸無，又墮在豁達空，永劫出他地獄不得。須是你真實具者眼目、真實見得本來真性中畢竟無有惡趣可墮、畢竟無有善趣可生、畢竟無有涅槃可證，然後，不妨僧自僧、俗自俗、老自老、少自少、男自男、女自女，隨緣任運，任運隨緣。徒事空言，有損無益。」下座。

36 I follow the indications on the BDRC website for the dates of both authors. I have not been able to see the 2005 unpublished dissertation by Chok Tenzin Monlam, “An Analytical Study on the Life and Works of Bodong Chokley Namgyal,” submitted to the University of Delhi. On Bo dong paṅ chen Phyogs las rnam rgyal see Renchung 1983.

37 Tenzin 1972: 23b4–6: da ni gang ga'i mchog gi mdo bshad par bya ste | de la gleng gzhis mdor stan pa ni | 'di skad zhes sogs so || chos zab mo dris lan gyis rgyas par bshad pa ni | * de'i tshe grong khyer zhes sogs so || phan yon gyis don sdu ba ni | de nas bcom ldan 'das kyis 'jam dpal zhes sogs so || gang ga mchog gi mdo 'grel * rdzogs so || ||.

question and answer concerning the profound teachings, it says [§ 1b] “*At that time in the city*” and so on. Concluding the meaning by explaining the benefits [of listening to the text, copying it, etc.], it says [§?] “*Then the Blessed One [said] to Mañjuśrī*” and so on. This is the end of the commentary on the *Gaṅgottarā sūtra*.

This is interesting both in its brevity, to the point where no reader could have the slightest idea of the content of the text, and because it cites (by naming Mañjuśrī) something which does not actually appear in the text. I cannot explain this at the moment, but perhaps fuller study of the work will reveal some clues.

The second work, that of Cha har dge bshes, titled *'Phags pa mdo sde dkon brtsegs kyi [d]kar chag brjed byang* (Memorandum indexical catalogue of the Noble Sūtra Ratnakūṭa), is extremely brief (17a):³⁸

Gaṅgottarā-Gaṅgottarāparipṛcchā-sūtra: A teaching [set] at Śrāvastī containing questions about emptiness [asked] by the Female lay disciple Gaṅgottarā, and the answers [to them]. It ends on page 235.

Considerably more lengthy, but nevertheless consisting almost entirely of quotations of the text, rather than analytical input from its author, is the account found in a work of the fifteenth century scholar Pad dkar bzang po, the *Bstan pa spyi'i rgyas byed las mdo sde spyi'i rnam bzhag bka' bsdu ba bzhi pa zhes bya ba'i bstan bcos* (Treatise called “Four Collections of Extensive Presentations of the Sūtras from the Extensive Collection of Teachings”).³⁹ The pertinent passage reads:⁴⁰

38 gang god ta ra gang ga'i mchog gis zhus pa'i mdo | mnyan yod na dge bsnyen ma gang ga'i mchog gis stong nyid kyi dri ba dang | de'i lan bcas bstan pa | shog nyis brgya so lnga par rdzogs |. Note that this text is obviously based on the Peking Kanjur, a conclusion we draw from the provided page number.

39 On the figure, see van der Kuijp 2009: 8–10; the text is in Mi nyag mgon po 2006: 94–95. Characterizing the text overall, van der Kuijp writes (2009: 9): “In the entries in his work, Pad dkar bzang po usually, but not consistently, divides his comments on each individual *sūtra* into three sections. In the first, he provides a summary of its contents; in the second, he identifies its *grub mtha'*; and in the third, he gives, when pertinent, his own ‘replies to controversies’ (*rgal lan*) that surrounded the *sūtra*.” The full title of the text is *bstan pa spyi'i rgyas byed las mdo sde spyi'i rnam bzhag bka' bsdu ba bzhi pa zhes bya ba'i bstan bcos*, TBRC WIPD76588.

40 My thanks are due to Gregory Forgues for his help in understanding the author's intention, especially as expressed at the end of this passage.

le'u so gcig pa 'phags pa gang gā'i mchog gis zhus pa lung bstan pa'i mdo | *sangs rgyas dang byang chub sems dpa' thams cad la phyag 'tshal lo* | 'phags pa dkon mchog brtsegs pa chen po'i chos kyi rnam grangs le'u stong phrag brgya pa las le'u sum cu rtsa gcig pa ste | 'phags pa gang gā'i mchog gi zhus pa lung bstan pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo | bka' 'khor lo tha mar gtogs pa 'di gsungs pa'i gnas dang 'khor ni go sla'o | zhu ba po byung pa'i tshul ni | [§ 1b] *de'i tshes grong khyer chen po mnyan yod na | dge bsnyen ma gang gā'i mchog ces bya ba zhi gnas so* | [§ 1c] *de nas dge bsnyen ma gang gā'i mchog mnyan yod nas byung nas rgyal bu rgyal byed kyi tshal mgon med zas sbyin gyi kun dga' ra ba ga la ba der song ste phyin nas bcom ldan 'das kyi zhabs la mgo bos phyag 'tshal te | phyogs gcig tu 'dug go* | [§ 2a] *phyogs gcig tu 'dug pa dang zhes pas bstan to | ston pas bka' yang stsal du gang gā'i mchog la sgro btags pa'i sgo nas dris shig | gang gā'i mchog gis sgro btags kyis dben pa'i ngos nas lan gsol ba ni* | [§ 2a] *bcom ldan 'das kyi mkhyen bzhin du dge bsnyen ma gang gā'i mchog la gang gā'i mchog khyod da bzod ga nas 'ongshes smras so* | [§ 2b] *gang gā'i mchog gis gsol pa* | [§ 2c] *bcom ldan 'das gang zhi gis sprul pa la smras te | khyod da bzod ga nas 'ongshes de skad bgyis na ji skad lan 'debs par 'gyur lags zhes pa nas* [§ 6b]

Chapter 31, the *Ārya-Gaṅgottarāparipṛcchā-vyākaraṇa-sūtra. [§ 0c] *Homage to all buddhas and bodhisattvas! Chapter 31 from the 100,000 chapters of the the Teaching of the Dharma called the Great Mahāratnakūṭa, the Mahāyāna sūtra called Ārya-Gaṅgottarāparipṛcchā-vyākaraṇa.* The place where this [sūtra] belonging to the Last Turning of the Wheel of the Teaching was spoken and the retinue are easy to understand. With regard to the manner in which the questioner appears, it is taught by this passage: [§ 1b] *At that time, in the great town of Śrāvastī there lived a female lay disciple named Gaṅgottarā. [§ 1c] The female lay disciple Gaṅgottarā left Śrāvastī, came to the pleasure park of Anāthapiṇḍada in Jeta's grove, and having arrived bowed with her head at the feet of the Blessed One, and sat down to one side. [§ 2a] When she was sitting to one side.* The teacher using speech asks Gaṅgottarā by means of hyperbole

bcom ldan 'das su zhiḡ gis sprul pa la smras te | khyod yongs su mya ngan las 'das pa la yang dag par ma zhugs sam zhes de skad bgyis na ji skad lan 'debs par 'gyur lags zhes pa'i bar gyis bstan to | slar yang bcom ldan 'das kyis sgro btags kyis dben pa'i ngos nas chos bstan la | gang gā'i mchog gis sgro btags kyis sgro nas spyod pa'i tshul gyis zhus pa ni | [§ 7a] bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | gang gā'i mchog dri ba 'di ni dmigs pa med pa'o | [§ 7b] gsol pa ci bcom ldan 'das kyis dmigs pa dang bcas pa'i smra bas smras lags sam | [§ 7c] bka' stsal pa | gang gā'i mchog dri ba 'di ni dmigs pa med mod kyi | 'on kyang 'khor 'di na rigs kyis bu'am rigs kyis bu mo 'dus pa dag yod de | de dag gi don chen por 'gyur pas dris so | [§ 7d] de cīi phyir zhe na | gang gā'i mchog de bzhin gshegs pa ni chos nyid ces bya ba yang mngon par rdzogs par sangs ma rgyas na | gang de las byung pa'i chos yongs su mya ngan las 'das pa la gnas pa lta ga la yod | [§ 8a] gsol pa gal te bcom ldan 'das kyis chos nyid ces bgyi ba yang mngon par rdzogs par sangs ma rgyas te | de las byung ba'i chos lta ga la zhiḡ mchis par 'gyur na | bcom ldan 'das kyis byang chub kyis slad du ji ltar dge ba'i rtsa ba yang dag par bsgrub pa lags | [§ 8b] bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | gang gā'i mchog gang dmigs pa de ni | dge ba'i rtsa ba ma yin te | byang chub sems dpa'i dge ba'i rtsa ba de ni | gang gi tshe yang dag par sgrub pa de'i tshe yang bsam gyis mi khyab pa nyid mi 'dor ro | gang gi tshe yang dag par ma bsgrub pa de'i tshe yang bsam gyis mi khyab pa nyid mi 'dor ro | zhes pa nas | [§ 12a] gang gā'i mchog gis gsol pa | bcom ldan 'das rgyud chad pa zhes bgyi ba cīi slad du rgyud chad pa zhes bgyi | [§ 12b] bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | gang gā'i mchog chos 'di ni rgyud bcad pa'am | dbye ba'am | nmam par zhiḡ pa ma yin te [§ 12c] de'i phyir rgyud chad pa zhes bya ste | 'di ni yang dag pa'i mtha' zhes bya | bsam gyis mi khyab pa'i rgyud ces bya'o zhes pa'i bar gyis chos phun sum tshogs pa bstan te | bsdus pa'i don yang yin no | tshig gi don ni gzhung ji lta na bzhin no | dgos pa'i don ni | [§ 13a] de nas bcom ldan 'das kyis 'dzum pa mdzad pa'i tshe [§ 14a] kun dga' bos 'dzum pa mdzad pa'i rgyu mtshan dris pa na | [§ 14c] bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | kun dga' bo ngas mngon par shes te sa phyogs 'di nyid du | de bzhin gshegs pa stong gis gang gā'i mchog ces bya ba kho na'i dge bsnyen ma sha stag las rtsams te | chos kyis nmam grangs 'di bshad do | [§ 14d] dge bsnyen ma de dag thams cad ni rab tu byung nas phung po med pa'i mya ngan las 'das pa'i dbyings su yongs su mya ngan las 'das so | zhes pa nas | [§ 16e] bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | lha'i bu dag de de bzhin no | 'di ni sngon gyi rgyal ba la lthag par bya ba byas pa dge ba'i rtsa ba bskyed pa | yun ring du tshangs par spyad pa la gnas pa'o | zhes pa'i bar gyis bstan to | rgal lan ni kha cig gi bsam pa la | ston pa dang | gang gā'i mchog gi dri ba dang dri lan gyi skabs su rten 'brel gyi sgro nas dpyad pa dang | rten 'brel gyis dben pa'i stong pa nyid gyi sgro nas lan bstan pa yin te | snyam du sems na | de ni ma yin te | rten 'brel gyis dben pa ni chos kyis gnas lugs ma yin pa'i phyir | sgo btags kyis dben pa tsam gyis chos kyis gnas lugs yin pa'i phyir | sgro btags kyis sgo nas dpyad la gnas lugs kyis sgo nas lan btab pa'o | yang rgal lan ni | sgro btags kun rdzob kyis bden pa dang | des dben pa don dam gyi bden par bstan cing | rgal bas dngos smra ba'i tshul dang | lan gyis dbu ma'i lugs bstan pa yin la nyan rang dbang brtul gyis chos kyis bdag med ma rtogs par bstan la | nyan rang dbang rnon gyi chos kyis bdag med rtogs par bstan pa yin no |

de ltar bstan pa'i dge ba yis |

mkha' mnyam 'gro ba thams cad kyis |

zab mo stong pa nyid rtogs nas |

thams cad mkhyen pa thob par shog |

(**samāropa*). Gaṅgottarā answered from a perspective without hyperbole. [§ 2a] *Although he knew, the Blessed One said to the female lay disciple Gaṅgottarā: “Gaṅgottarā, where have you come from just now?”* [§ 2bc] *Gaṅgottarā said:* [§ 2c] *“Blessed One, if someone were to say to an artificially created being, ‘Where have you come from just now?’ how should he answer?”* And then it teaches up to [§ 6b] *“Blessed One, if someone were to ask an artificially created being, ‘Have you not set out for parinirvāṇa?’ how would he answer?”* Once more the Blessed One teaches the Teaching from a perspective without hyperbole, and Gaṅgottarā requests him in a manner assuming hyperbole, and [§ 7a] *The Blessed One said: “Gaṅgottarā, this question has no referential object.”* [§ 7b] *She asked: “Does the Blessed One ask this with a question possessing a referential object?”* [§ 7c] *He said: “Gaṅgottarā, although this question has no referential object, still there are gentle men and gentle women in this assembly who can be converted, and I ask because it will be of great benefit to them.* [§ 7d] *Why? Gaṅgottarā, if the Blessed One is not perfectly and completely awakened even to ‘the Nature of Phenomena,’ how much less would there be some phenomenon arisen from that resting in parinirvāṇa.”* [§ 8a] *She asked: “If the Blessed One does not completely and perfectly awaken to what is called ‘Reality,’ much less some phenomena which arise from that, how did the Blessed One perfect his roots of virtue for the sake of Awakening?”* [§ 8b] *The Blessed One said: “Gaṅgottarā, referential objectification is not the roots of virtue. Neither when the bodhisattva’s roots of virtue are collected does he abandon the inconceivable, nor when they are not collected does he abandon the inconceivable.”* After this [§ 12a] *Gaṅgottarā asked: “Blessed One, when you speak of ‘cutting off the continuum,’ why do you call it ‘cutting off the continuum?’”* [§ 12b] *The Blessed One said: “Gaṅgottarā, this teaching is not a cutting off, interrupting or destroying of the continuum; [§ 12c] therefore it is called ‘cutting off the continuum,’ it is called ‘the limit of existence,’ it is called ‘the inconceivable continuum.’”* This passage teaches the perfection (**sampat*) of the teaching, and is also the condensed meaning (**piṇḍārtha*). The literal meaning (**padārtha*) is what the text says [without need to interpret it]. As for the purpose (**prayojanārtha*) [§ 13a], after that when the Blessed One smiled, [§ 14a] when Ānanda asked about the reason for the smile, [§ 14c] *The Blessed One said: “Ānanda, I fathom that on just this spot one thousand tathāgatas preached this exposition of the teaching regarding none other than a female lay disciple called precisely Gaṅgottarā.* [§ 14d] *All of those female lay disciples left the household life and attained parinirvāṇa in the realm of nirvāṇa without remainder of the aggregates.”* Then, [§ 16e] *The Blessed One said: “O divinities, exactly! She performed services for past victors, planted roots of virtue and practiced the holy life for a long time.”* The aim of the teaching (**prayojana*) is taught by this passage.

As for the replies to controversies, some think that, as an exchange of questions and answers between the teacher and Gaṅgottarā, [this sūtra] represents an inquiry from the point of view of dependent arising and a response [to this inquiry] from the point of view of emptiness [understood] as what is devoid of dependent arising.⁴¹

41 Gregory Forgues adds: “This position implies a strict separation between the two truths and ascribes an ontological status to conventional truth (i.e., the domains of the conditioned and the unconditioned are mutually exclusive). This is the doctrine of the *dn̄gos por smra ba*, ‘the theory that a thing exists.’”

[We refute the objection:] This is not so. Since (1) what is devoid of dependent arising is not the true condition of phenomena and since (2) [emptiness] is the true condition of phenomena merely on account of being devoid of hyperboles, [this sūtra] represents an inquiry from the point of view of hyperboles and a response [to this inquiry] from the point of view of the true condition [of phenomena].

Another objection and refutation points out that hyperboles represent the conventional truth and what is devoid of those [hyperboles], the ultimate truth. It shows that [this] objection expounds the view of inherent existence, while the refutation [of this objection expounds] the doctrine of Madhyamaka. It points out that śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas with dull faculties do not realize the selflessness of phenomena, while śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas with sharp faculties do.

Thus, through the virtue resulting from this explanation
 May the entire [realm of] beings as [vast] as space
 Realize profound emptiness, and
 Attain omniscience!

Finally, the Chinese work belonging to the same general class of summaries is the *Yuezang zhijin* 閱藏知津 (Reading the Canon to Know the Path) by the Ming period cleric Ouyi Zhixu 藕益智旭 (1599–1655),⁴² generally known for his work on the Yogācāra and considered one of the “Four Great Masters” (*si da gaoseng* of the Ming 四大高僧). This work too deals with the entire canon, and its treatment of individual texts within the Mahāratnakūṭa varies from the cursory to the quite detailed. However, in the case of the *Gaṅgottarāparipṛcchā*, Zhixu provides no more information than do the two Tibetan works dedicated to the Mahāratnakūṭa:⁴³

Gaṅgottarāparipṛcchā, 31. The Buddha was in Anāthapiṇḍada’s grove. This laywoman came and did homage at the Buddha’s feet, and engaged in dialogue with the Buddha over the ultimate truth. The Buddha predicted her to buddhahood.

Despite the evident marginal status of the sūtra in the historical forms of Buddhism which we can access, then, as is evident from the near total absence of citations, this text has been translated in modern languages times several times. One rendering was

42 See McGuire 2019. According to McGuire 2019: 749, this work was “printed in China in 1664, 1709, and 1892, and in Japan in 1709, 1782, and 1897/98.”

43 This appears in the Jiaying 嘉興 canon, J31nB271, 804c20: 恒河上優婆夷會第三十一 佛在給孤獨園。此優婆夷來禮佛足，與佛問答第一深義。佛為授記。

Jan Nattier notes the following: “some of what Zhixu says is not actually in the text. First, instead of just giving the location and other mundanities, he actually gives a very concise summary of the subject matter. But second, he says that the Buddha predicted Gaṅgottarā to Buddhahood. And this is precisely what *should have happened* in a Mahāyāna sūtra of this type—and does in many other such sūtras with leading female characters—but it did not. Instead, quite surprisingly (to me at least), the text talks about how all of the lay women in the audience (or the whole audience, in the Chinese and its Tibetan translation) will leave the household and attain final nirvāṇa. NB: not buddhahood, this is a reference to Arhatship! This (to me) is a sign of the distinct lack of imagination and Mahāyānic inspiration on the part of the author of this sūtra.”

made from Chinese by a team headed by Garma C.C. Chang and published in a selection of works from the Mahāratnakūṭa, *A Treasure of Mahāyāna Sūtras* (Chang 1983: 37–40). Another version in Tibetan, Chinese and English is found on the website of the Thesaurus Literaturae Buddhicae (TLB).⁴⁴ While doing a final read-through of this contribution, I learned of a translation, partially related to that on the TLB website, published by Peter Skilling (2021: 341–352).⁴⁵ At least one additional, anonymous, translation from Chinese is now available on the web (<https://lapislazulitexts.com/tripitaka/T0310-LL-31-gangottara>). However, whatever may be the merits of any of the above, even the Oslo translators seem to have been unaware of the existence of Pelliot tibétain 89, and none have ventured a critical edition. Therefore, it seems that little apology is needed for the editions and translations offered here.

44 See <http://www2.hf.uio.no/polyglotta/index.php?page=volume&vid=204>, where it is credited to a team consisting of Jens W. Borgland, Jens Braarvig, Shayne Clarke, Fredrik Liland, Peter Skilling, David Welsh, and Sumittra Witoonchatree (June 2012). It is stated that the translation was made on the basis of the Tibetan and Chinese during a series of workshops at the University of Oslo.

The Chinese text was given a mechanical rendering into Japanese in the Kokuyaku Issaikyō already in Nagai 1931, but this should not be considered a translation as such.

45 Skilling writes (2021: 559n769), “My understanding of the text benefited from a series of workshops on the Tibetan and Chinese versions held at the University of Oslo in June 2012.”

2 Format of the Editions and Translations

What follows are editions of the Tibetan Kanjur text, Chinese translation and Tibetan translation of the latter. They are arranged as below:

Verso/Left-hand page

Recto/Right-hand page

<p>Kanjur text (D. 75)</p> <p>Translation of Kanjur text</p>	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td> <p>Chinese (T310 [31])</p> </td> <td> <p>Pelliot tibétain 89</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td> <p>Translation of Chinese</p> </td> <td> <p>Translation of P. tib. 89</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<p>Chinese (T310 [31])</p>	<p>Pelliot tibétain 89</p>	<p>Translation of Chinese</p>	<p>Translation of P. tib. 89</p>
<p>Chinese (T310 [31])</p>	<p>Pelliot tibétain 89</p>				
<p>Translation of Chinese</p>	<p>Translation of P. tib. 89</p>				

Commented terms in the translations are marked with an asterisk*.

3 Texts and Translations of the *Gaṅgottarāparipṛcchā*

§ 0

a rgya gar skad du | ārya gang god ta ra ba ri bri
tstsha nā ma ma hā yā na sū tra |

a In Sanskrit: *Ārya-Gaṅgottarā-paripṛcchā
nāma mahāyāna-sūtra**

b bod skad du | 'phags pa gang ga'i mchog gis
zhus pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo |

b In Tibetan: *The Noble Mahāyāna sūtra called
the Questions of Gaṅgottarā*

c sangs rgyas dang byang chub sems dpa' thams
cad la phyag 'tshal lo ||

c Homage to all buddhas and bodhisattvas!

C: Chinese

Dh: Dunhuang Tibetan translation of C

K: Kanjur translation

Mvy.: *Mahāvyutpatti*, ed. Sakaki 1916; Ishihama and Fukuda 1989.

a-b)

AFGoHeHi attest in Sanskrit the title **Ārya-Gaṅgottara* [sic!] *nāma sūtra*; P originally perhaps had this as well. In Tibetan this title is found in AFNV, and P perhaps had it originally as well. Note that Go in Tibetan however attests the fuller title with **paripṛcchā*.

§ 0

<p>a 恒河上優婆夷會第三十一 b 大唐三藏菩提流志奉 詔譯</p>	
<p>a The Section on the Female Lay Disciple Gaṅgot- ttarā, number Thirty-One. b Translated at imperial behest and presented by the Tripiṭaka Master of the Great Tang, Bodhiru- ci.</p>	

§1

a 'di skad bdag gis thos pa'i dus gcig na | bcom ldan 'das mnyan yod na | rgyal bu rgyal byed kyi tshal mgon med zas sbyin gyi kun dga' ra ba na bzhugs te | b de'i tshe grong khyer chen po mnyan yod na | dge bsnyen ma gang ga'i mchog ces bya ba zhig gnas so ||

a Thus I heard at one time* the Blessed One was dwelling in Śrāvastī, in prince Jeta's grove, in the pleasure park of Anāthapiṇḍada. b At that time, in the great town of Śrāvastī there lived a female lay disciple named Gaṅgottarā.

c de nas dge bsnyen ma gang ga'i mchog mnyan yod nas byung nas | rgyal bu rgyal byed kyi tshal mgon med zas sbyin gyi kun dga' ra ba ga la ba der song ste phyin nas | bcom ldan 'das kyi zhabs la mgo bos phyag 'tshal te | phyogs gcig tu 'dug go |

c The female lay disciple Gaṅgottarā left Śrāvastī, came to the pleasure park of Anāthapiṇḍada in Prince Jeta's grove and, having arrived, bowed with her head at the feet of the Blessed One, and sat down to one side.

a)

at one time: More than half the Kanjurs have *thos pa dus gcig na*, rather than *thos pa'i dus gcig na*, though I believe the intended meaning is precisely the same. I will discuss this opening formula in a study in preparation.

§1

<p>^a 如是我聞：一時佛在舍衛國祇樹給孤獨園。^b 時舍衛城有優婆夷，名恒河上。</p>	<p>^a 'dī skad bdag gis thos pa dus gcig na bcom ldan 'das mnyan yod na rgyal bu rgyal byed kyī tshal mgon myed zas sbyin gyī kun dga' ra ba na bzhugs te ^b de'i tshe grong khyer mnyan yod na dge bsnyen ma gang ga'i mchog ces bya ba zhig yod de </p>
<p>^a Thus I heard: at one time the Buddha was at Śrāvastī, Jeta's grove, Anāthapiṇḍada's pleasure park. ^b At that time in Śrāvastī there was a female lay disciple called Gaṅgottarā.</p>	<p>^a Thus I heard at one time: The Blessed One was in Śrāvastī, in Prince Jeta's grove, in the pleasure park of Anāthapiṇḍada. ^b At that time in the town of Śrāvastī there was a female lay disciple named Gaṅgottarā.</p>
<p>^c 從其住處，來詣佛所。頂禮佛足，退坐一面。</p>	<p>^c de gnas nas phyir byung ste bcom ldan 'das ga la ba der song ste bcom ldan 'das kyī zhabs la mgo bos phyag byas nas phyogs gcig du 'dug go </p>
<p>^c She came from where she was staying to where the Buddha was. Bowing her head at the Buddha's feet, she withdrew and sat to one side.</p>	<p>^c She left that place and came to where the Blessed One was and, bowing her head at the Blessed One's feet, sat down to one side.</p>

§ 2

^a phyogs gcig tu 'dug pa dang | bcom ldan 'das
kyis mkhyen bzhin du dge bsnyen ma gang ga'i
mchog la | gang ga'i mchog khyod da gzod gang
nas 'ongs shes smras so ||

^a When she was sitting to one side, although he
knew,* the Blessed One said to the female lay
disciple Gaṅgottarā: “Gaṅgottarā, where have
you come from just now?”*

^b gang ga'i mchog gis gsol pa | ^c bcom ldan 'das
gang zhig gis sprul pa la smras te | khyod da
gzod gang nas 'ongs shes de skad bgyis na | ji
skad lan 'debs par 'gyur lags |

^b Gaṅgottarā said: ^c “Blessed One, if someone
were to say to an artificial creation,* ‘Where
have you come from just now?’ how should he
answer?”

a)

Although he knew: DhK *mkhyen bzhin du*, not in C. Probably Dh added it because it is a stock phrase, Mvy. § 9136 *jānantaḥ pṛcchanti = mkhyen bzhin du 'dri*. The background is of course that the Buddha is omniscient, and yet is frequently portrayed as asking questions. It is a rhetorical strategy of authors to avoid uncomfortable questions about his omniscience to add this phrase.

just now: K *da gzod*, attested as *sāmpratam* in the *Suvarṇabhāsottama* (§ xviii vs. 10d, Tib. Nobel 1944: 161.3, Skt. 1937: 215.6), but perhaps also *sāmprati*. In the *Ratnaguṇasamcayagāthā* xxx.13d (Yuyama 1976), *da bzod* translates *adya*. There is no equivalent in CDh.

c)

artificial creation/artificially created person: K *sprul pa*, **nīrmitaka*; C 佻人, Dh *sprul pa'i skyes bu*. Dh might seem as if it were translating something like **nīrmitapuruṣa* or *nirmāṇapuruṣa*, but there can be no doubt that it simply mechanically renders both elements of the binome *huārén* 佻人. One might be potentially misled because the term *sprul pa'i skyes bu* does exist in the lexicon of Tibetan equivalents of Sanskrit terminology, as in the *Vigrahavyāvartanī* of Nāgārjuna in which (Yonezawa 2008: 256–257, ad vs. 23) *ji ltar sprul pa'i skyes bus sprul pa'i skyes bu zhig don 'ga' zhig gi phyir 'ong bar byed pa la 'gog par byed pa dang* renders *yathā nīrmitakaḥ puruṣo 'nyam nīrmitakaṁ puruṣaṁ kasmīṁś cid arthe vartamānaṁ pratīṣedhayet*, “It is like the case in which an artificially created man would restrain another artificially created man engaged in some activity.”

such a question: C 如是問者 is not rendered in Dh.

§2

<p>^a 爾時, 世尊問恒河上: 「汝從何來。」</p>	<p>^a de nas bcom ldan 'das kyis mkhyen bzhin du dge bsnyen ma gang ga'i mchog la khyod gang nas 'ongs zhes bkas rmas pa dang </p>
<p>^a At that time, the Blessed One asked Gaṅgottarā: “Where have you come from?”</p>	<p>^a Then the Blessed One, although he knew,* asked the female lay disciple Gaṅgottarā: “Where have you come from?”</p>
<p>^b 彼優婆夷即白佛言: ^c 「世尊, 若問化人『汝從何來』, 如是問者, 當云何答。」</p>	<p>^b dge bsnyen ma des bcom ldan 'das la 'di skad ces gsol to ^c bcom ldan 'das gal te la la zhig sprul pa'i skyes bu la khyod gang nas 'ongs shes rmas par gyur na des ci skad lan 'debs par 'gyur lags </p>
<p>^b That female lay disciple then spoke to the Buddha saying: ^c “Blessed One, if one were to ask an artificially created person,* ‘Where have you come from?’ how should he answer such a question?”*</p>	<p>^b That female lay disciple asked the Blessed One: ^c “Blessed One, if someone were to ask an artificially created person,* ‘Where have you come from?’ how should he answer?”</p>

§ 2

d bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | gang ga'i
 mchog sprul pa la ni 'greng ba med | 'dug pa
 med | nyal ba med | 'ong ba med | 'gro ba med |
 'chi 'pho med | skye ba med na | 'di nas 'ongs so
 zhes de ci zhig ston par 'gyur |

d The Blessed One said: “Gaṅgottarā, if an artificial creation has no standing, no sitting, no lying,* no coming, no going, no death, no birth, how could it be indicated ‘He has come from here?’”

d)

In C. *fú ... zhě* 夫 ... 者, I understand this to topicalize the intervening words, ‘artificially created person.’

no standing, no sitting, no lying: K: *'greng ba, 'dug pa, nyal ba*. In the *Yogācārabhūmi* we find *'greng ba dang 'dug pa dang nyal ba* rendering *sthitaḥ niṣaṃmaḥ śayitaḥ* (Deleau 2006: § 3.28.5.2.7). Absent in CDh.

not have any coming or going: C 無有往來, Dh *phan tshun 'gro zhing 'ong ba myed*, has no going and coming here and back. When the expression 無有往來 occurs in the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* XVI.2d, it renders *nāsti kaḥ saṃsaṃsāryati, de gang ci zhig 'khor bar 'gyur*.

§2

<p>ᵀ 世尊告言：「夫化人者，無有往來，亦無生滅，云何當說有所從來。」</p>	<p>ᵀ bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa' sprul pa'i skyes bu gang yin ba de la ni phan tshun 'gro zhing 'ong ba myed skyed ba dang 'gag pa yang myed na gang nas 'ong zhes ci ltar bshad pa yod par gyur </p>
<p>ᵀ The Blessed One said: “An artificially created person does not have any coming or going,* nor have birth or destruction. How could one state that he comes from somewhere?”</p>	<p>ᵀ The Blessed One said: “If an artificially created person has no going and coming here and back, no being born, and no cessation, how could one state, ‘He has come from somewhere?’”</p>

§ 3

^a gang ga'i mchog gis gsol pa | bcom ldan 'das ci
chos thams cad sprul pa lta bu ma lags sam |

^a Gaṅgottarā asked: “Blessed One, are not* all
phenomena like an artificially created being?”

^b bka' stsal pa | gang ga'i mchog de bzhin no ||

^b He said: “Gaṅgottarā, just so!”

^c gsol pa | bcom ldan 'das gal te chos thams cad
sprul pa lta bu lags na | gang ga'i mchog khyod
da gzod gang nas 'ongs zhes ci'i slad du rma ||

^c She asked: “Blessed One, if all phenomena
are like an artificial creation, why do you ask,*
‘Gaṅgottarā, where have you come from just
now?’”

a)

are not: In K witnesses CzGtNpPhPjPzST (note that stemmatically this appears to be a rather idiosyncratic array of sources) read *ma lags sam*, the remainder of the Kanjurs having *lags sam*, without the negation. While the meaning ultimately does not change, since it is a question in either case, positively or negatively, C (不 ... 耶) and Dh (*ma lags sam*) present a text with the negation. Since we do not have other evidence that K was influenced by Dh, the reading in CDh may be taken as independent confirmation of the reading with the negation.

c)

you ask: Or, ‘you say,’ depending on which form of the verb attested in various editions we accept: *smra(s)*, *rma*, *gsung*. The last (only in P) seems obviously a replacement (perhaps unconsciously by a scribe). On the principle that *rma* (found in AGoHeHi) is more likely to be original, as the rarer form, I print it in the main text. Note that C has *wèn* 問, ask, but Dh only *bka' stsal*, honorific for *smra ba*, ‘say.’

§3

<p>a 又問：「諸法豈不皆如化耶。」</p>	<p>a yang gsol pa ci chos thams cad sprul pa lta bu ma lags sam </p>
<p>a She again asked: “Surely all phenomena are like an artificial creation, aren’t they?”</p>	<p>a She again asked: “Are not all phenomena like an artificial creation?”</p>
<p>b 佛言：「如是，如是。如汝所說。」</p>	<p>b bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa' de de bzhin no de de bzhin te khyod kyis ci skad smras pa bzhin no </p>
<p>b The Buddha said: “Just so, just so! It is as you have said.”</p>	<p>b The Blessed One said: “Just so, just so! It is as you have said.”</p>
<p>c 恒河上言：「若一切法皆如化者，云何問言：『汝從何來』。」</p>	<p>c gang ga'i mchog gis gsol pa gal te chos thams cad sprul pa lta bu lags na ci'i slad du khyod gang nas 'ongs shes bka' stsal lags </p>
<p>c Gaṅgottarā said: “If all phenomena are like an artificial creation, why do you ask, ‘Where have you come from?’”</p>	<p>c Gaṅgottarā asked: “If all phenomena are like an artificial creation, why do you say, ‘Where have you come from?’”</p>

§4

^a bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | gang ga'i
 mchog sprul pa ni ngan song du mi 'gro | mtho
 ris su mi 'gro | yongs su mya ngan las 'das par mi
 'gro na | ci gang ga'i mchog kyang ngan song du
 mi 'gro | mtho ris su mi 'gro | yongs su mya ngan
 las 'das par mi 'gro 'am |

^a The Blessed One said: “Gaṅgottarā, if an artificial creation does not go to evil destinies, does not go to heaven, does not go to parinirvāṇa, do not you, Gaṅgottarā, also not go to evil destinies, not go to heaven, not go to parinirvāṇa?”

§4

<p>^a 世尊告曰：「是幻化人不往惡趣，不生天上，不證涅槃。恒河上，汝亦爾耶。」</p>	<p>^a bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa sprul pa'i skyes bu gang yin ba de ni ngan song du yang 'gro bar myi 'gyur la mtho ris su yang skyes bar myi 'gyur te mya ngan las 'das pa yang mngon du myi byed na cī gang ga'i mchog khyod kyang de bzhin nam </p>
<p>^a The Blessed One said: “This illusorily artificial person does not go to evil destinies, is not born in heaven, does not attain nirvāṇa. Gaṅgottarā, are you also like this?”</p>	<p>^a The Blessed One said: “If that artificial person will not go to an evil destiny, nor be born in heaven, nor achieve nirvāṇa, are you, Gaṅgottarā, also like that?”</p>

§4

<p> _b 白言：「我若見身異於幻化，乃可說言：往善惡趣，證於涅槃。_c 我不見身異於幻化，云何說言：『往諸惡趣，乃至涅槃』。_d </p>	<p> _b gsol pa gal te bdag gi lus sgyu ma dang sprul pa dang tha dad par mthong na ni bde 'gro dang ngan 'gror mchi zhing mya ngan las 'da's pa yang mngon du bgyid pa zhig na _c bdag gi lus sgyu ma dang sprul pa dang tha myi dad par mthong bas c'i slad du ngan 'gro nams su 'gro zhes bgyi ba nas mya ngan las 'das pa zhes bgyi ba'i bar du bka' stsal lags </p>
<p> _b She said: "If I were to view myself* as different from an illusory artificial creation,* then I would be able to state that I go to good or evil destinies, or attain nirvāṇa. _c [But,] not viewing myself as different from an illusory artificial creation, why do [you] speak of 'going to evil destinies ... up to ... nirvāṇa'?"* </p>	<p> _b She asked: _c "If I were to see my body* as different from an illusion and an artificial creation, having gone to good destinies and bad destinies, I would achieve nirvāṇa too. _c But since I see my body as not different from an illusion and an artificial creation, why do you speak of 'going to bad destinies' ... up to ... 'nirvāṇa'?" </p>

§4

d bcom ldan 'das de lta lags kyis kyang | g.yo ba dang | rlom sems dang | bskyod pa dang | spros pa mchis na | 'di snyam du bdag ngan song du 'gro ba 'am | mtho ris su 'gro ba 'am | yongs su mya ngan las 'das par 'gro ba'o snyam du sems lags te | bcom ldan 'das mya ngan las 'das pa'i dbyings ni nams kyang ngan song du mchi ba 'am | mtho ris su mchi ba 'am | yongs su mya ngan las 'das par mchi ba ma lags te | bcom ldan 'das dge bsnyen ma gang ga'i mchog kyang de lta bu'i dbyings can lags so ||

d “Moreover, Blessed One, just because this is the situation,* if one is wavering, conceited, vacillates, or given to verbal discursiveness,* one thinks, ‘I go to evil destinies, or I go to heaven, or I go to parinirvāṇa.’ But the quintessence of nirvāṇa,* Blessed One, never goes to evil destinies, never goes to heaven, never goes to parinirvāṇa. The female lay disciple Gaṅgottarā too, Blessed One, has such a quintessence.”

d)

because this is the situation: The expression *de lta lags kyis kyang* may to be picked up in DDDJPjPz (and P[pc]) with *ji ltar*. It may render something like *tasmād api*.

if one is wavering, conceited, vacillates, or given to verbal discursiveness: K *g.yo ba dang | rlom sems dang | bskyod pa dang | spros pa mchis na*. In the *Kāśyapaparivarta* (Staël-Holstein 1926) §136: *g.yo ba dang ni rlom sems kun dang rnam bral ba = sarveñjanāmanyānavipramuktaḥ*. In the *Gaṇḍavyūha* (Suzuki and Idzumi 1949: 128.6) *sarveñjanamanyānaspandanaprapañcanāpagatacitta*. A *Critical Pali Dictionary* (Trenkner et al 1924–) s.v. *iñjana* cites Ps III 171,22 (ad M I 454,28) *iñjanam calanam phandanam*; s.v. *iñjanā* Pj II 245,14 *kāyassa iñjanā calanā phandanā*. Vide Edgerton 1953 s.v. *iñjanā*.

quintessence of nirvāṇa: K *mya ngan las 'das pa'i dbyings*, C *niepan xing* 涅槃性, Dh *mya ngan las 'das pa'i ngo bo nyid*. Probably all these translations go back ultimately one way or another to **nirvāṇadhātu*. As Michael Radich points out, the rendering 涅槃性 might speculatively be connected to the use of *foxing* 佛性 for **buddhadhātu*. This would seem to indicate that some kind of awareness was still alive in Bodhi-rucci's group of the connection between *-xing* and **-dhātu*. The corresponding Dh rendering is rare, if not unparalleled.

I view my body: See above 4b.

§4

<p>ḍ 「復次, 世尊, 如涅槃性畢竟不復生善惡趣, 及般涅槃, 我觀己身, 亦復如是。」</p>	<p>ḍ gzhan yang bcom ldan 'das cī ltar mya ngan las 'das pa'i ngo bo nyid nam yang bde 'gro dang ngan 'gror skye bar myi 'gyur zhing yongs su mya ngan las 'da' bar myi 'gyur ba de bzhin du bdag gi lus kyang de bzhin du mthong lags so </p>
<p>ḍ “Moreover, Blessed One, as the quintessence of nirvāṇa* will absolutely never again be reborn in good or evil destinies, nor reach parinirvāṇa, when I view my own body,* [I see that] it is also just like this.”</p>	<p>ḍ “Moreover, Blessed One, as the essential nature of nirvāṇa* will never be born in a good destiny or a bad destiny, and never attain parinirvāṇa, in the same way I view my body* too as just like this.”</p>

§5

^a bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | gang ga'i
mchog khyod ci yongs su mya ngan las 'das pa
la yang dag par ma zhugs sam |

^a The Blessed One said: “Gaṅgottarā, have you
not set out for parinirvāṇa?”*

^b gsol pa | bcom ldan 'das su zhig gis mi skye ba
la rmas te | khyod yongs su mya ngan las 'das pa
la ma zhugs sam | zhes de skad bgyis na | ji skad
lan 'debs par 'gyur lags |

^b She asked: “Blessed One, if someone were to
ask one who is unborn, ‘Have you not set out
for parinirvāṇa?’* how would he answer?”

^c bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | gang ga'i
mchog mi skye ba zhes bya ba ni mya ngan las
'das pa'i tshig bla dags yin na | de ci zhig lan
'debs par 'gyur |

^c The Blessed One said: “Gaṅgottarā, if ‘unborn’
is a synonym* for nirvāṇa, what would he
answer?”

a)

not set out for parinirvāṇa/turn yourself toward the realm of nirvāṇa/applying yourself toward the realm of nirvāṇa: K *mya ngan las 'das pa la yang dag par ma zhugs*, **nirvāṇam na samprasthita*. C 不趣涅槃界, Dh *mya ngan las 'da's pa'i dbyings la gzhol bar myi byed*. The full Chinese sentence is 汝豈不趣涅槃界耶, rendered in Dh *ci khyod mya ngan las 'da's pa'i dbyings la gzhol bar myi byed dam*, literally rendering the negation in the Chinese. I take the Chinese as “Is it not, certainly, the case that you turn yourself toward the realm of nirvāṇa?” and Dh as “Are you not applying yourself toward the realm of nirvāṇa?” with perhaps some difference in meaning between *qù* 趣 and *gzhol ba*. K has no mention of the realm of nirvāṇa (**nirvāṇadhātu*), although the sense is not ultimately different.

§5

<p>a 佛言：「汝豈不趣涅槃界耶。」</p>	<p>a bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa ci khyod mya ngan las 'da's pa'i dbyings la gzhol bar myi byed dam </p>
<p>a The Buddha said: "Is it not, certainly, the case that you turn yourself toward the realm of nirvāṇa?"*</p>	<p>a The Blessed One said: "Are you not applying yourself toward the realm of nirvāṇa?"*</p>

<p>b 恒河上言：「如以此問問無生者，應云何答。」</p>	<p>b gang ga'i mchog gis gsol pa ci ltar 'dri 'di dag gis skye ba ma mchis pa la rmas par gyur na ci skad du lan 'debs par 'gyur lags </p>
<p>b Gaṅgottarā said: "If one were to ask this question* to one who is unborn, how should he answer?"</p>	<p>b Gaṅgottarā asked: "If one were to ask these questions* to one unborn, how would he answer?"</p>

<p>c 佛言：「無生者，即涅槃也。」</p>	<p>c bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa skye ba myed pa gang yin ba de nyid ni mya ngan las 'da's pa yin no </p>
<p>c The Buddha said: "The unborn is precisely* nirvāṇa."</p>	<p>c The Blessed One said: "What is unborn is itself* nirvāṇa."</p>

b)

not set out for parinirvāṇa: Several Kanjurs (DDd[pc]JPPjPz) read, in contrast to the simple *ma zhugs sam* of other witnesses, *yang dag par ma zhugs sam*, thereby, as I see it, bringing this expression into line with (that is, rationalizing) what is found above in 5a in all witnesses.

this question/these questions: In lieu of a plural marker, I take C in the singular, but Dh is marked with the particle *dag*: 'dri 'di dag gis. As Hahn 1978 has argued, this indicates a totality. Its sense can often be represented by a plural, but here we might even be better off understanding something like 'all questions of a such a type.'

c)

synonym/precisely/itself: K *tshig bla dags*, **adhivacana*. In CDh, this expression is treated as an equation: "The unborn is precisely/itself nirvāṇa."

§5

^d gang ga'i mchog gis gsol pa | bcom ldan 'das
ci chos thams cad mya ngan las 'das pa dang
mtshungs pa lags sam |

^d Gaṅgottarā asked: “Blessed One, are all phe-
nomena the same as nirvāṇa?”

^e bka' stsal pa | gang ga'i mchog de de bzhin te |
chos thams cad ni mya ngan las 'das pa dang
mtshungs so ||

^e He said: “Gaṅgottarā, just so! All phenomena
are the same as nirvāṇa.”

§5

<p>^d 恒河上言：「諸法豈不皆同涅槃。」</p>	<p>^d gang ga'i mchog gis gsol pa' cī chos thams cad ni mya ngan las 'da's pa dang mtshungs pa lags sam </p>
<p>^d Gaṅgottarā said: "Surely it is the case that all phenomena are the same as nirvāṇa, isn't it?"</p>	<p>^d Gaṅgottarā asked: "Are all phenomena the same as nirvāṇa?"</p>
<p>^e 佛言：「如是，如是。」</p>	<p>^e bcom ldan 'da's kyis bka' stsal pa de de bzhin te de de bzhin no </p>
<p>^e The Buddha said: "Just so, just so!"</p>	<p>^e The Blessed One said: "Just so, just so!"</p>

§6

^a gsol pa | bcom ldan 'das gal te chos thams cad
mya ngan las 'das pa dang mtshungs pa lags na |
gang ga'i mchog khyod yongs su mya ngan las
'das pa la yang dag par ma zhugs sam zhes nga
ci zhig rma ste |

^a She asked: “Blessed One, if all phenomena are the same as nirvāṇa, who is the ‘I’ who asks, ‘Gaṅgottarā, have you not set out for parinirvāṇa?’

^b bcom ldan 'das su zhig gis sprul pa la rma te |
khyod yongs su mya ngan las 'das pa la yang dag
par ma zhugs sam zhes de skad bgyis na | ji skad
lan 'debs par 'gyur lags |

^b “And Blessed One, if someone were to ask an artificially created being, ‘Have you not set out for parinirvāṇa?’ how would he answer?”

§6

<p>^a 「世尊, 若一切法同涅槃者, 云何問言: 『汝豈不趣涅槃界耶』。」</p>	<p>^a bcom ldan 'da's gal te chos thams cad mya ngan las 'da's pa dang mtshungs pa lags na cī'i slad du khyod mya ngan las 'da's pa'i dbyings la gzhol bar myi byed dam zhes bka' stsal lags </p>
<p>^a “Blessed One, if all phenomena are the same as nirvāṇa, why do you ask: ‘Surely you turn yourself toward the realm of nirvāṇa, don’t you?’”</p>	<p>^a “Blessed One, if all phenomena are the same as nirvāṇa, why do you say, ‘Are you not applying yourself toward the realm of nirvāṇa?’”</p>
<p>^b 「復次, 世尊, 譬如化人謂化人曰: 『汝豈不趣涅槃界耶』。彼於是問, 當云何答。」</p>	<p>^b gzhan yang bcom ldan 'das 'dī lta ste dper na sprul pa'i skyes bu zhīg gis sprul pa'i skyes bu la cī khyod mya ngan las 'da's pa'i dbyings la gzhol bar myi byed dam zhes de skad rmas par gyur na des ci skad lan 'debs par gyur lags </p>
<p>^b “Moreover, Blessed One, as an example: an artificially created person may say to another artificially created person, ‘Surely you turn yourself toward the realm of nirvāṇa, don’t you?’ How should he answer that question?”</p>	<p>^b “Moreover, Blessed One, as an example: if an artificially created person were to ask another artificially created person, ‘Are you not applying yourself toward the realm of nirvāṇa?’ what would he answer?”</p>

§ 7

^a bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | gang ga'i
mchog dri ba 'di ni dmigs pa med pa'o ||

^a The Blessed One said: “Gaṅgottarā, this question has no referential object.”*

^b gsol pa | ci bcom ldan 'das kyis dmigs pa dang
bcas pa'i rma bas rmas lags sam |

^b She asked: “Does the Blessed One ask this with a question possessing a referential object?”

a)

no referential object: K *dmigs pa med pa* = Dh *dmyigs pa myed pa*, C 無有攀緣. In the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* § IV.14 (Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature 2006): *tasyādhyāmbanatayā kā pariññā yad idam ālambanānupalambhaḥ | yañ hi nopalabhyate tañ nālambate; lhags par dmigs pa'i gzhi yongs su shes pa gang zhe na | dmigs pa med cing mi dmigs pa'o || gang mi dmigs pa de ni lhag par mi dmigs pa'o ||*. In the translation attributed to Kumārajīva (T. 475 [XIV] 545a19–20): 云何斷攀緣以無所得。若無所得，則無攀緣。何謂無所得。 Later I render the same terminology with forms of ‘to apprehend.’

b)

because he has [something] which could be referentially objectified: I understand the grammar of C 如來豈以有所攀緣，而致斯問 to imply that *pānyuán* 攀緣 is verbally passivized. Neither Dh nor K appear to reflect this, however.

§7

<p>^a 世尊告言：「此所問者，無有攀緣。」</p>	<p>^a bcom ldan 'da's kyis bka' stsal pa 'dri ba 'di ni dmyigs pa myed pa'o </p>
<p>^a The Blessed One said: "Here, what is asked has no referential object."*</p>	<p>^a The Blessed One said: "This question has no referential object."*</p>
<p>^b 恒河上言：「如來豈以有所攀緣，而致斯問。」</p>	<p>^b gang ga'i mchog gis gsol pa' cī de bzhin gshegs pa la dmyigs pa mnga' ba'i slad du bka's rmas pa 'di rmas lags sam </p>
<p>^b Gaṅgottarā said: "Surely the Tathāgata does not ask this question because he has [something] which could be referentially objectified,* does he?"</p>	<p>^b Gaṅgottarā asked: "Does the Tathāgata ask this question because he has a referential object?"</p>

§ 7

c bka' stsal pa | gang ga'i mchog dri ba 'di ni
dmigs pa med mod kyi | 'on kyang 'khor 'di na
rigs kyi bu'am | rigs kyi bu mo 'dul ba dag yod
de | de dag gi don chen por 'gyur bas dris so ||

c He said: “Gaṅgottarā, although this question has no referential object, still there are gentle men and gentle women in this assembly who can be converted, and I ask because it will be of great benefit to them.

d de ci'i phyir zhe na | gang ga'i mchog de bzhin
gshegs pas ni chos nyid ces bya ba yang mngon
par rdzogs par sangs ma rgyas na | gang de las
byung ba'i chos yongs su mya ngan las 'das pa la
gnas pa lta ga la zhig yod ||

d “Why? Gaṅgottarā, if the Blessed One is not perfectly and completely awakened even to what is termed ‘the Nature of Phenomena,’* how much less* would there be some phenomenon, resting in parinirvāṇa, arisen from that [Nature].”

d)

the Nature of Phenomena: K *chos nyid*, **dharmatā*. There is some play here between *dharmatā* and specific *dharmas*. K and CDh diverge significantly. C and Dh both render 法/*chos* twice.

how much less: *lta ga la zhig*. The same expression is found also as *lta ga la yod*. It no doubt translates Sanskrit *kutas*. In the *Ratnāvalī* (Hahn 1982: 28–29, 38–39) 1.68, we find *skad cig yin na ril med phyir || rnying pa 'ga' lta ga la zhig || brtan phyir skad cig min na yang || rnying pa 'ga' lta ga la zhig ||*, rendering *kṣaṇike sarvathābhāvāt kutaḥ kā cit purāṇatā | sthairyād akṣaṇike cāpi kutaḥ kā cit purāṇatā* ||. In 1.99c, *'byung med gzugs lta ga la yod* renders *bhūtair vinā kuto rūpaṃ*.

does/will not apprehend: C *bükédé* 不可得, Dh *dmyigs par myi 'gyur*. Above C had *pānyuán* 攀緣 for what Dh understands as the same term. There is no parallel in K. This is yet another illustration of the high level of understanding demonstrated by the translator(s) of Dh.

§7

<p>c 世尊告言：「然我所問亦無攀緣，但爲此會有善男子及善女人應可成熟故，發斯問。」</p>	<p>c bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa' ngas rmas pa la dmyigs pa yod pa ma yin mod kyi 'on kyang 'khor 'di na yod pa'i rigs kyī bu dang rigs kyī bu mo dag yongs su smyin par bya ba'i phyir 'dri ba 'di dris pa yin no </p>
<p>c The Blessed One said: “Although what I asked is without referential object, it is only because this assembly has gentle men and gentle women who can be cultivated that I bring up that question.”</p>	<p>c The Blessed One said: “Although what I asked does not have any referential object, still, in order to fully cultivate the gentle men and gentle women in this assembly, I ask this question.”</p>
<p>d 「何以故。如來於彼諸法名字，猶不可得。何有諸法及彼能趣般涅槃者。」</p>	<p>d de cīi phyir zhe na de bzhin gshegs pa ni chos de dag gi mying yang dmyigs par myi 'gyur na chos rnams dang mya ngan las 'da's pa la gzhol ba de dag lta yod par ga la 'gyur </p>
<p>d “Why? The Tathāgata still does not apprehend* even the name of those phenomena; how could there [then] be actual phenomena and those who would turn themselves toward parinirvāṇa?”</p>	<p>d “Why? If the Tathāgata will not apprehend* even the name of those phenomena, how much less the phenomena and those who dedicate themselves to nirvāṇa.”</p>

§8

^a gsol pa | gal te bcom ldan 'das kyis chos nyid
ces bgyi ba yang mngon par rdzogs par sangs
ma rgyas te | de las byung ba'i chos lta ga la zhig
mchis par 'gyur na | bcom ldan 'das kyis byang
chub kyi slad du ji ltar dge ba'i rtsa ba yang dag
par bsgrubs lags |

^a She asked: “If the Blessed One does not completely and perfectly awaken to what is called ‘the Nature of Phenomena,’ much less to some phenomena which arise from that [Nature], how then did the Blessed One perfect his roots of virtue leading to Awakening?”

^b bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | gang ga'i
mchog gang dmigs pa de ni dge ba'i rtsa ba ma
yin te | byang chub sems dpa'i dge ba'i rtsa ba de
ni gang gi tshe yang dag par sgrub pa de'i tshe
yang bsam gyis mi khyab pa nyid mi 'dor | gang
gi tshe yang dag par mi sgrub pa de'i tshe yang
bsam gyis mi khyab pa nyid mi 'dor ro ||

^b The Blessed One said: “Gaṅgottarā, what is referentially objectified is not a root of virtue. When the bodhisattva's roots of virtue are collected he does not abandon the inconceivable,* and when they are not collected he does not abandon the inconceivable.”

b)

If: C *ruò* 若 is misunderstood by the Kokuyaku Issaikyō translation (Nagai 1931: 262) as ‘if this is so,’ かくのごときは.

the **inconceivable/without intention**: K *bsam gyis mi khyab pa nyid*, **acintyatva*. This seems at least structurally to correspond to C *wúxīn* 無心, Dh *sems myed pa*.

§8

<p>a 恒河上言：「若如是者，云何爲菩提故，積集善根。」</p>	<p>a gang ga'i mchog gis gsol pa' gal te de ltar na ci ltar byang cub kyī ched du dge ba'i rtsa ba stsogs par bgyid lags </p>
<p>a Gaṅgottarā said: “If that is the way it is, how did you collect roots of virtue for the sake of awakening?”</p>	<p>a Gaṅgottarā asked: “If that is the way it is, how did you collect roots of virtue for the sake of awakening?”</p>
<p>b 「若諸菩薩及彼善根皆不可得，積集之時，即無心故，非積集時，亦復如是。」</p>	<p>b bka' stsal pa byang cub sems dpa' mams dang dge ba'i rtsa ba de dag kyang dmyiḡs su myed de bstsags pa nyid kyī tshe sems myed pa'i phyir bstsags pa ma yin ba'i tshe yang de bzhin no </p>
<p>b “If* the bodhisattvas and their roots of virtue are both inapprehensible, then when [these roots] are collected, this is precisely because [the bodhisattvas] are without intention*; when they are not collected, it is again the same.”</p>	<p>b He said: “Bodhisattvas and the roots of virtue are both inapprehensible. When [these roots] are collected, this is because [the bodhisattvas] are without intention*; when they are not collected, it is again the same.”</p>

§ 8

c_e gsol pa | bcom ldan 'das bsam gyis mi khyab pa
 la bsam gyis mi khyab pa zhes bgyi ba ci'i slad
 du bsam gyis mi khyab pa la bsam gyis mi khyab
 pa zhes bgyi |

c_e She asked: “Blessed One, you often speak of the inconceivable;* why do you speak of the inconceivable?”

d_d bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | gang ga'i
 mchog chos 'di ni sems pas thob par bya ba ma
 yin te | sems pas thob par bya bar mi nus so ||

d_d The Blessed One said: “Gaṅgottarā, this phenomenon is not obtainable* by means of thought, it is not possible to obtain it by means of thought.

c)

often speak of the inconceivable: K *bsam gyis mi khyab pa la bsam gyis mi khyab pa*, while C has 恒河上言: 「所說『無心』, 欲明何義」。Leonard van der Kuijp wonders whether there might have been some confusion between *acintya* (*bsam gyis mi khyab pa*) and *acetanā* (無心), but we might also think of the graphically more similar *acint(y)a* and *acitta*—but such attempts assume that the two versions indeed go back to a common original, which is by no means certain.

What meaning did you wish to elucidate: C 欲明何義, Dh *don gang zhig ston par mdzad lags*, What is the meaning of what you stated? Dh did not translate *yù míng* 欲明, “wish to elucidate.”

there is no intention: C 無心, Dh *sems ma mchis pa*, but in 8b above the equivalent was *sems myed pa*.

d)

not obtainable .../apprehendable/knowable ...: K apparently reflects two gerundives, one conditional, while CDh has at this place two different verbs, to know and to grasp/obtain. As Michael Radich points out, it is not unlikely that C is using *de* 得 here to echo ideas of (*an*)*upalabdhi*, and I have followed his suggestion and translated “apprehendable” here in an effort to bring this out. He also remarks that somewhat uncharacteristically Dh understands only literally with *thob pa*, to obtain.

§8

<p>c 恒河上言：「所說『無心』，欲明何義。」</p>	<p>c gang ga'i mchog gis gsol pa sems ma mchis pa zhes bka' stsal pa des don gang zhig ston par mdzad lags </p>
<p>c Gaṅgottarā said: "What meaning did you wish to elucidate* by stating that "There is no intention?"*</p>	<p>c Gaṅgottarā asked: "What is the meaning* expressed by saying, "There is no intention?"*</p>
<p>d 世尊告曰：「此法非思惟之所能知，亦非思惟之所能得。」</p>	<p>d bcom ldan 'da's kyis bka' stsal pa' chos 'di ni bsam ba dag gis shes par 'gyur ba yang ma yin la bsam ba dag gis 'thob par 'gyur ba yang ma yin no </p>
<p>d The Blessed One said: "This phenomenon is not knowable by thoughts, nor is it apprehendable by thoughts.*"</p>	<p>d The Blessed one said: "This phenomenon is not knowable by conceptions, nor is it obtainable by conceptions.*"</p>

§8

e de ci'i phyir zhe na | 'di ltar 'di la ni sems nyid
kyang mi dmigs na | gang sems las rab tu byung
ba'i chos lta ga la yod | gang ga'i mchog sems mi
dmigs pa ni bsam gyis mi khyab pa'i rgyud ces
bya'o ||

e “Why? If even the mind itself is not referentially objectified in this fashion, how much less a phenomenon arisen from some mind. Gaṅgotarā, the referential non-objectification of thought is called ‘the continuum of the inconceivable.’*

f bsam gyis mi khyab pa'i rgyud gang yin pa de
ni thob pa ma yin | mngon par rtogs pa ma yin |
shes pa ma yin | mngon sum du byas pa ma yin
te | de ni thob par bya ba ma yin | kun nas nyon
mongs pa ma yin | rnam par byang ba ma yin
no ||

f “The continuum of the inconceivable is not obtained, not understood, not known, not directly perceived, it is not obtainable, not defiled, not purified.

e)

the continuum of the inconceivable/inconceivable basis: K *bsam gyis mi khyab pa'i rgyud*. C 不思議處, inconceivable basis, Dh *bsam gyis myi khyab pa'i gnas*. While both *rgyud* and *gnas* may represent a number of different Sanskrit terms, no good candidate occurs to me to represent a single underlying Indic source term here.

§8

<p>e 「何以故。此中心尚不可得。何況心所生法。以心不可得,是即說名不思議處。」</p>	<p>e de ci'i phyir zhe na 'di la sems kyang dmyigs par myi 'gyur na sems las byung ba'i chos lta smos kyang ci dgos te 'di lta sems dmyigs su myed pa gang yin ba de nyid la bsam gyis myi khyab pa'i gnas shes bstan to </p>
<p>e “Why? In this regard, if even the mind is inapprehensible, how much less so phenomena born from the mind. Precisely because the mind is inapprehensible, it is spoken of with the name ‘inconceivable basis.’* ”</p>	<p>e “Why? In this regard, if even the mind is not referentially objectified, how much less so phenomena which arise from mind. Thus, it is precisely with reference to that mind which is free of referential objectification that the inconceivable basis* is taught.</p>
<p>f 「此不思議處無得,無證,非染,非淨。」</p>	<p>f bsam gyis myi khyab pa'i gnas de dag la ni thob pa yang myed mngon bar rtogs pa yang myed de kun nas nyon mos pa yang ma yin rnam par byang ba yang ma yin no </p>
<p>f “There is no obtaining, no realization of this inconceivable basis; it is not defiled, not purified.</p>	<p>f “There is no obtaining, no realization of those inconceivable bases; in their entirety they are neither defiled nor purified.</p>

§8

g de ci'i phyir zhe na | gang ga'i mchog 'di ltar de
 bzhin gshegs pas ni chos thams cad nam mkha'
 ltar nges par thugs su chud de | gang ga'i mchog
 chos thams cad ni nam mkha' dang mtshungs
 pa gnyen po med pa'o ||

g “Why? Gaṅgottarā, in this way the Tathāgata
 thoroughly understands that all phenomena
 are like the sky: Gaṅgottarā, all phenomena,
 just like the sky, are unobstructed.”

g)

because: the place of 故 at the end of the clause could indicate the reason for the whole sentence, answering the ‘why?’ question, but Dh takes it, apparently, twice, with *phyir* and then again with *zhes gsung pa*, which I render with both ‘since’ and ‘because,’ and it would perhaps be possible to read the Chinese in this was as well. In any event I think the overall logic is not in dispute.

always: I think that the places of C 常 and Dh *rtaḡ tu* differ: C 常說 ‘always state,’ Dh *rtaḡ tu ... mtshungs* ‘always the same.’ However, it is not impossible that we are meant to take Dh’s *rtaḡ tu* also with the main clause.

§8

<p>^g 「何以故。如來常說一切諸法, 猶如虛空, 無罣礙故。」</p>	<p>^g de ci'i phyir zhe na de bzhin gshegs pas rtag du chos thams cad ni nam mkha' dang mtshungs te thogs pa myed pa'i phyir ro zhes gsungs pas so </p>
<p>^g “Why? Because* the Tathāgata always* states that all phenomena are just like the empty sky, [since] they are without obstruction.”</p>	<p>^g “Why? Since* the Tathāgata says that all phenomena are always* just like the sky, because* they are unobstructed.”</p>

§9

a gsol pa | bcom ldan 'das gal te chos thams
 cad nam mkha' dang mtshungs pa gnyen po ma
 mchis pa lags na | bcom ldan 'das kyis gzugs
 shes btags pa dang | tshor ba dang | 'du shes
 dang | 'du byed rnams dang | mam par shes pa
 zhes btags pa dang | phung po rnams dang |
 khams rnams dang | skye mched rnams dang |
 rten cing 'brel par 'byung ba dang | zag pa dang
 bcas pa dang | zag pa ma mchis pa dang | kun
 nas nyon mongs pa dang | mam par byang ba
 dang | 'khor ba dang | mya ngan las 'das pa zhes
 btags pa ji lta bu lags |

a She asked: “Blessed One, if all phenomena, being just like the sky, are unobstructed, how is it that the Blessed One designates corporeality, designates sensation, ideation, conditioning factors, awareness, designates the aggregates, sense objects, sense domains, dependent arising, the corrupt and that free from corruption, defilement and purification, transmigration and nirvāṇa?”

a)

sense domains, sense objects: As Michael Radich notices, C and Dh agree in this ordering, namely *dhātu*, *āyatana*, which is odd.

the twelve fold causation, with corruption and without corruption/corrupt twelve-fold dependent arising and that free from corruption: I have understood C in line with Dh, but Michael Radich suggests to read the Chinese “twelfefold causation, [things] with ‘outflows’ (**āsrava*) and without outflows,” suggesting that “**sāsravānāsrava* is a pseudo-*dvandva* pair of concepts with their own autonomous status as items in the longer list, not modifiers of *pratīyasamutpāda*. If that is right, it appears to mean that Dh misread.” I am somewhat less sure of this, though it could well be right. My punctuation of the Chinese follows my understanding of the sense here.

this is defiled: The Tibetan translators have omitted an equivalent for *shijing* 是淨, “this is pure.”

§9

<p>^a 恒河上言：「若一切法如虛空者，云何世尊說有諸色、受、想、行、識及於界、處、十二因緣，有漏、無漏，是染，是淨，生死，涅槃。」</p>	<p>^a gang ga'i mchog gis gsol pa gal te chos thams cad nam mkha' lta bu lags na c'i'i slad du bcom ldan 'da's kyis gzugs dang tshor ba dang 'du shes dang 'du byed dang rnam par shes pa dang khams dang skye mched dang rten cing 'brel par 'byung ba bcu gnyis zag pa dang bcas pa dang zag pa ma mchis pa rnams mchis par bka' stsal cing 'di ni kun nas nyon mongs pa'o 'di ni 'khor ba'o 'di ni mya ngan las 'da's pa'o zhes bka' stsal lags </p>
<p>^a Gaṅgottarā said: “If all phenomena are like empty space, why did the Blessed One state that there are corporeality, sensation, ideation, conditioning factors, awareness, and the sense domains, sense objects* and the twelvefold causation, with corruption and without corruption,* [and why did he say] ‘this is defiled, this is pure, [this is] transmigration, [this is] nirvāṇa’?”</p>	<p>^a Gaṅgottarā asked: “If all phenomena are like the sky, why did the Blessed One say that these are corporeality, sensation, ideation, conditioning factors, awareness, sense domains, sense objects,* corrupt twelve-fold dependent arising and that free from corruption,* and say, ‘This is defiled.* This is transmigration. This is nirvāṇa.’?”</p>

§9

b) bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | gang ga'i mchog 'di lta ste | dper na bdag bdag ces 'dogs kyang bdag gang yang mi dmigs pa de bzhin du | gang ga'i mchog ngas gzugs shes btags te | gzugs gang yang mi dmigs so || de bzhin du ngas tshor ba dang | 'du shes dang | 'du byed rnam dang | rnam par shes pa zhes btags te | rnam par shes pa gang yang mi dmigs so || phung po rnam dang | khams rnam dang | skye mched rnam dang | rten cing 'brel par 'byung ba dang | zag pa dang bcas pa dang | zag pa med pa dang | kun nas nyon mong pa dang | rnam par byang ba dang | 'khor ba dang | mya ngan las 'das pa zhes bya ba yang ngas btags te | mya ngan las 'das pa gang yang mi dmigs so ||

b) The Blessed One said: “Gaṅgottarā, as an example: Although I often use the term ‘self,’ no self is referentially objectified. In the same way, Gaṅgottarā, I designate ‘corporeality,’ but no corporeality whatsoever is referentially objectified. In the same way, I designate sensation, ideation, conditioning factors, and awareness, but [...]” no awareness whatsoever is referentially objectified. I designate as well aggregates, sense objects, sense domains, dependent arising, the corrupt and that free from corruption, defilement and purification, transmigration and nirvāṇa, but [...] no nirvāṇa whatsoever is referentially objectified.

b)

[...]: K abbreviates the list, negating only its last member but without an explicit marking of this abbreviation. **the defining characteristic ‘self’:** *bdag gi mtshan ma* is attested as *ātmanimitta* in *Buddhacarita* 9.64a.

and the rest: C 諸色, Dh *gzugs rnam*, which suggests that the expression is meant to cover the whole list starting with corporeality. Thus I translate the plural marker as ‘and the rest.’

§9

<p>ᵇ 佛告：「恒河上，譬如說『我』，雖有言說，而實無有我相可得。我說諸色，實亦無有色相可得，乃至涅槃，亦復如是。</p>	<p>ᵇ bcom ldan 'da's kyis bka' stsal pa' gang ga'i mchog 'di lta ste dper na bdag bdag ces 'dogs pa la tshig gis brjod pa yod kyang yang dag par bdag gi mtshan nyid myi dmyigs pa de bzhin du ngas gzugs mams shes brjod kyang yang dag par gzugs kyī mtshan nyid kyang dmyigs par myi 'gyur la mya ngan las 'da's pa zhes bya ba'i bar du yang de bzhin no </p>
<p>ᵇ The Buddha said: "Gaṅgottarā, as an example: in saying 'self,' although there is verbal expression, there is actually no mark 'self' which can be apprehended. In the same manner I speak of corporeality and the rest,* but actually there is no mark 'corporeality' which can be apprehended ... up to ... nirvāṇa.</p>	<p>ᵇ The Blessed One said: "Gaṅgottarā, as an example: while I often use the term 'self,' although there is a verbal expression, since actually the defining characteristic 'self'* cannot be apprehended, although I speak of corporeality and the rest,* in the same manner, actually the defining characteristic of corporeality is also not referentially objectified ... up to ... nirvāṇa.</p>

§9

c gang ga'i mchog 'di lta ste | dper na smig rgyu rnams la ni chu yong med de mi dmigs so || gang ga'i mchog de bzhin du ngas gzugs shes bya ba btags kyang gzugs gang yang mi dmigs so || ngas tshor ba dang | 'du shes dang | 'du byed rnams dang | rnam par shes pa zhes bya ba btags kyang rnam par shes pa gang yang mi dmigs so || phung po rnams dang | khams rnams dang | skye mched rnams dang | rten cing 'brel par 'byung ba dang | zag pa dang bcas pa dang | zag pa med pa dang | kun nas nyon mongs pa dang | rnam par byang ba dang | 'khor ba dang | mya ngan las 'das pa zhes bya ba ngas btags kyang | don dam par na de dag thams cad med cing mi dmigs so ||

c “Gaṅgottarā, as an example: In mirages, there being no water,* it is not referentially objectified. In the same manner, Gaṅgottarā, although I specify ‘corporeality,’ no corporeality at all is referentially objectified. Although I specify sensation, ideation, conditioning factors, and awareness, no [...] awareness at all is referentially objectified. Although I specify aggregates, sense domains, dependent arisal, the corrupt, that free from corruption, the defiled, the pure, transmigration and nirvāṇa—in the ultimate sense, they all, not existing, cannot be apprehended.

c)

there being no water: *K chu yong med de*. This use of *yong* is found in the *Laṅkāvatāra* (Nanjio 1923: 149.4 [111.16a]) *na bhāvo vidyate satyaṃ* = Derge Kanjur 114a7 *bden pa'i dngos po yong med de*, and (Nanjio 1923: 168.2 [111.49c]) *na hi kaśyacid upannā* = Derge 122a1 *su kyang skyes pa yong med*.

corporeality: Both C and Dh mark this with a plural marker, which I suppose is meant in Chinese to indicate the whole list, though it can hardly be understood that way in Tibetan.

§9

<p>c 「又如陽焰無水可得。我說諸色乃至涅槃,亦復如是。</p>	<p>c gzhan yang 'dī lta ste dper na cī ltar smyug rgyu la chu myī dmyigs pa de bzhin du ngas gzugs rnams nas mya ngan las 'da's pa'i bar du bstan pa yang de bzhin no </p>
<p>c “Or again, as with a mirage, there is no water which can be apprehended. I speak of corporeality* ... up to ... nirvāṇa again in just the same way.</p>	<p>c “Again, as an example, as in a mirage water is not referentially objectified, just so I teach corporeality* ... up to ... nirvāṇa again just in this way.</p>

§10

a gang ga'i mchog gang chos la mchog tu 'dzin
pa med par tshangs par spyad pa spyod pa de lta
bu ni legs par gsungs pa'i chos 'dul ba la tshangs
par spyod pa la gnas pa yin no ||

a “Gaṅgottarā, like one who upholds the holy
life without cleaving to the teaching, he is set-
tled in the holy practice in the well-taught
teaching and discipline.*

a)

in the well-taught teaching and discipline/my communion: *K legs par gsungs pa'i chos 'dul ba la* = *svākhyāte dharmavinaye* (*Prasannapadā*, La Vallée Poussin 1903–1913: 540.12–541.1), C 於我法中, Dh *nga ṛ bstan pa la*, the latter two referring simply to ‘my communion,’ Tibetan at least clearly attested (see *Ratnarāṣi* §1.15) as a rendering of *mama śikṣāyām*. Note the very close expression 於佛法中. In the *Sarvadharmā-pravṛttinirdeśa*, 於佛法中 corresponds to *de bzhin gshegs pa'i bstan pa la* (Braarvig 2000: 134.13–14 = T. 650 [xv] 753c7). I have struggled to find a way to express in English this idea of reference to a community, but distinct from saṅgha.

then one can say/it is said: C 乃可說名, Dh *gdod ... zhes bya'o*. The word *gdod* seems to have a wide semantic range, as does the *nāi* 乃 which it renders. In the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* (§111.63; Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature 2006), *tataḥ śakṣyasi svabhavanarṇ gantum* is rendered in Tibetan *gdod bdag gi gnas su 'gro nus par 'gyur ro* and in the two older Chinese translations 乃可得去, suggesting ‘then.’ In §111.13 we find *paścād ātmanā paribhūñjīta*, *gdod bdag gis bzha ba*, rendered 然後自食 and 然後可食, here suggesting ‘later on, afterwards.’ In the Old Tibetan Chronicle (line 212), we find: *sngon ji 'i nang du yang ma zhugs pas || gdod 'jug par gsol ba yin no zhes byas so ||*, which Hill (2010: 555) renders: “[I] am requesting to be put (into a bag) for the first time, since [I] have never stayed in anything previously.” It is clear that here *gdod* contrasts with *sngon*. I do not know if the *de lta bu ni* in K is somehow parallel to this *gdod*, but is it possible we have a difference between *tadā/tataḥ* and *tathā* in the respective Sanskrit Vorlagen?

§10

<p>^a 「恒河上, 於我法中修梵行者, 見一切法皆無所得, 乃可說名真修梵行。」</p>	<p>^a gang ga'i mchog gang gis nga 'i bstan pa la tshangs par spyod pa mngon bar bsgrub pa de dag chos thams cad dmyigs su myed par yang dag par rjes su mthong na gdod yang dag par tshangs par spyod pa mngon bar bsgrub pa zhes bya'o </p>
<p>^a “Gaṅgottarā, those practicing the holy life within my communion* see that all phenomena are not at all apprehended; then one can say* that they truly practice the holy life.”</p>	<p>^a “Gaṅgottarā, if those within my communion* who have practiced the holy life correctly view all phenomena as not referentially objectified, then it is said* that they have correctly practiced the holy life.”</p>

§10

b gang ga'i mchog mngon pa'i nga rgyal can gnas
 la dmigs nas tshangs par spyad pa spyod pa de
 dag gi tshangs par spyod pa de ni yongs su ma
 dag pa'o zhes nga smra'o || c gang dag tshangs
 par spyod pa yongs su ma dag pa de dag ni zab
 mo rgyud chad pa'i chos 'di lta bu 'di thos nas
 sngangs skrag par 'gyur te | de dag skye ba dang |
 rga ba dang | na ba dang | 'chi ba dang | mya
 ngan dang | smre sngags 'don pa dang | sdug
 bsngal ba dang | yid mi bde ba dang | 'khrug
 pa rnams las yongs su mi 'grol te | de dag ni
 sdug bsngal gyi skal ba can du 'gyur ro zhes nga
 smra'o ||

b “Gaṅgottarā, I say that when arrogant persons
 practice the holy life while referentially objec-
 tifying an object, their holy life is impure. c I say
 that those impure in the holy life, hearing such
 a profound teaching as this one, which cuts off
 the continuum, become terrified. They will not
 be liberated from birth, old age, illness, death,
 misery, lamentation, suffering, depression, and
 agitation,* and their lot will be suffering.

c)

birth ...: *K skye ba dang | rga ba dang | na ba dang | 'chi ba dang | mya ngan dang | smre sngags 'don pa dang | sdug bsngal ba dang | yid mi bde ba dang | 'khrug pa*, paralleled in the *Laṅkāvatāra* (Nanjio 1923: 174.1–2): *jātijarāvīyādhimaraṇaśoka-paridevaduḥkhadaurmanasyopāyāsādi*. See also Mvy. § 2253 *jāra*, § 2254 *śoka*, § 2255 *parideva*, § 2256 *duḥkha*, § 2257 *daurmanasya*, § 2258 *upāyāsa*. My translation is influenced by such parallels.

§10

<p> _b 「增上慢者,說有所得,是則不名住真梵行。_c我說如是增上慢人聞此深法,生大驚疑。不能解脫生、老、病、死、憂、悲、苦、惱。 </p>	<p> _b mngon ba'i nga rgyal can dmyigs pa yod par ston pas na yang dag par tshangs par spyod pa la gnas pa zhes myi bya ste _c ngas de lta bu'i mngon ba'i nga rgyal can gang yin ba de dag ni chos zab mo 'di lta bu thos na shin du skrag pa dang the tsom chen po skye bar 'gyur bas skye ba dang rga ba dang na ba dang 'chi ba dang mya ngan dang smre sngags 'don pa dang sdug bsngal ba dang 'khrug pa las mam par grol bar myi 'gyur ro zhes bstan to </p>
<p> _b “Arrogant ones who state that there is something apprehended then are not called those who dwell in the true holy life. _c I state that such arrogant persons, hearing this profound teaching, are greatly shocked and doubtful. They cannot liberate themselves from birth, old age, sickness, death, grief, lamentation, suffering and agitation.* </p>	<p> _b “Because an arrogant one indicates that there is referential objectification, he is not to be called one who dwells in the holy life. _c I indicated that such arrogant ones, hearing such a profound teaching, becoming terrified and producing deep-seated doubt, will not be liberated from birth, old age, illness, death, misery, lamentation, suffering and agitation.* </p>

§11

a gang ga'i mchog da ltar ram | nga 'das pa'i phyi
 na yang rung ste | gang dag zab mo rgyud chad
 pa 'di lta bu'i chos ston pa de dag la | mi gti mug
 pa dag gsod pa po'i 'du shes skyed par 'gyur te |
 de ltar mi gti mug pa de dag log par zin pas bsad
 pa'i zhe sdang bskyed nas | ngan song du 'gro
 bar 'gyur ro ||

a “Gaṅgottarā, it is possible that either now or after my death, stupid people will conceive the idea that they should murder those who teach such profound teachings* which cut off the continuum; those stupid persons, because they take things in the wrong way like this, produce the rage to kill and will [thus] go to evil destinies.”

a)

conceive the idea that they should murder/will produce anger and harmful intention/out of anger has the intent to harm: Skilling 2021: 350 understands K quite differently: “ignorant people with wrong apprehension—perceiving as murderers those who teach this profound Dharma that severs the continuum—produce murderous hatred” I feel that at least the understanding of C supports my understanding of K, but if I follow Skilling’s idea correctly, he sees behind the expression the notion that the ignorant people misunderstand the teaching of the severing of the continuum to be a form of murder. Paul Harrison suggests, likewise: “conceive the notion of murderers with regard to those who teach dharmas like this which are profound and cut off the continuum.” Perhaps I am being stubborn in not seeing this as the more likely solution.

§11

<p>^a 「恒河上, 若我滅後, 有能宣說如是甚深斷流轉法, 有愚癡輩由惡見故, 於是法師生瞋、害心。以是因緣, 墮諸地獄。」</p>	<p>^a gang ga'i mchog nga yongs su mya ngan las 'da's pa'i 'og du gang dag 'di lta bu'i zab mo'i chos 'khor ba'i rgyun gcod pa ston pa yod na yang blun po kha cig lta ba ngan pa la gnas pa'i dbang gis chos 'chad pa'i gang zag dag la zhe sdang gis gnod sems skyed pas na rgyu dang rkyen des sems can dmyal ba mams su ltung bar 'gyur ro </p>
<p>^a “Gaṅgottarā, [even] if, after my extinction, there will be those able to widely expound such a profound teaching which cuts off the cycling in the flood [of existence], there will [also] be fools who, due to evil wrong views, will produce anger and harmful intention toward these preachers of the teaching,* and for this reason they will fall into hells.”</p>	<p>^a “Gaṅgottarā, after I attain parinirvāṇa, even if there are those who teach such a profound teaching as this that cuts off the continuum of transmigration, if some fool, due to being set in wrong views, out of anger has the intent to harm preachers of the teaching,* he will fall into hells because of those causes and conditions.”</p>

§12

^a gang ga'i mchog gis gsol pa | bcom ldan 'das rgyud chad pa rgyud chad pa zhes bgyi ba ci'i slad du na rgyud chad pa zhes bgyi |

^a Gaṅgottarā asked: “Blessed One, when you speak of ‘cutting off the continuum,’ why do you call it ‘cutting off the continuum?’”

^b bcom ldan 'das kyes bka' stsal pa | gang ga'i mchog chos 'di ni rgyud bcaḍ pa 'am | dbye ba 'am | rnam par gzhiḡ pa ma yin te | ^c de'i phyir rgyud chad pa zhes bya ste | 'di ni yang dag pa'i mtha' zhes bya | bsam gyis mi khyab pa'i rgyud ces bya'o ||

^b The Blessed One said: “Gaṅgottarā, this teaching is not a cutting off,* interrupting or destroying of the continuum; ^c therefore it is called* ‘cutting off the continuum,’ it is called ‘the limit of existence,’ it is called ‘the inconceivable continuum.’”

b)

cutting off ...: What K takes as a Prajñāpāramitā-like negation CDh take as a more rational negation.

c)

therefore it is called/I will call it/indicate it: I am not at all sure how to understand or explain the reading in CzDks here: *nga 'das pa'i phyi na'ang rung ste.*

§12

<p>^a 恒河上言：「如佛所說斷流轉法，以何義故，名斷流轉。」</p>	<p>^a gang ga'i mchog gis gsol pa' bcom ldan 'das kyis ci skad du 'khor ba rgyun gcod pa'i chos shes gang gsungs pa de don gang gi slad du 'khor ba rgyun gcod pa zhes bgyi lags </p>
<p>^a Gaṅgottarā said: “The teaching to cut off the cycle, as it was expounded by [you], the Buddha—in what sense did you call it ‘the cutting off of the cycle?’”</p>	<p>^a Gaṅgottarā asked: “The teaching to cut off the continuum of transmigration as [you] the Blessed One spoke of it—for what purpose did you call it ‘cutting off the continuum of transmigration?’”</p>
<p>^b 世尊告言：「斷流轉者，所謂實際，不思議界。此法不可穿鑿沮壞。^c是故，說名斷流轉法。」</p>	<p>^b bcom ldan 'da's kyis bka' stsal pa' de la 'khor ba rgyun gcod pa zhes bya ba ni 'di lta ste yang dag pa'i mtha' dang bsam gyis myi khyab pa'i dbyings kyis chos gang yin ba de ni dbug cing gzhiḡ du myed pas ^c de'i phyir 'khor ba'i rgyun gcod pa'i chos shes bstan to </p>
<p>^b The Blessed One said: “Cutting off* the cycle is what is spoken of as the true limit, the inconceivable realm. This teaching is impenetrable and indestructible. ^c Therefore, I call it* the teaching that cuts off the cycle.”</p>	<p>^b The Blessed One said: “In this regard, ‘cutting off* the continuum of transmigration’ is like this: because it is the teaching of the ultimate limit and the inconceivable realm, being impenetrable and indivisible, ^c therefore I indicate it* as ‘the teaching that cuts off the continuum of transmigration.’”</p>

§13

^a de nas bcom ldan 'das kyis de'i tshe 'dzum pa
 mdzad do || ^b de nas bcom ldan 'das kyi zhal gyi
 sgo nas 'od zer kha dog sna tshogs kha dog du
 ma 'di lta ste | sngon po dang | ser po dang |
 dmar po dang | dkar po dang | btsod ka dang |
 shel dang | dngul gyi kha dog lta bu dag byung
 nas | de dag gis 'jig rten gyi khams mtha' yas mu
 med pa dag snang bar byas te | 'od kyis khyab
 par byas nas | tshangs pa'i 'jig rten gyi bar du
 mngon bar byung ste | slar log nas bcom ldan
 'das kyi zhal gyi sgor nub bo ||

^a Then at that time the Blessed One smiled.
^b Many variously colored rays of light—such
 as blue, yellow, red, white, vermilion, crystal
 and silver*—came out of the Blessed One's
 mouth, and illuminated the endless, boundless
 worlds of the universe. The light penetrated
 the worlds, ascended to the world of Brahmā,
 and returned to disappear back into the Blessed
 One's mouth.

b)

blue, yellow, red, white, vermilion, crystal and silver: For the equivalents see the table. It appears that Dh has accidentally dropped an equivalent to *bái* 白, normally *dkar po*, perhaps because of confusion with the immediately preceding *dmar po* (དྲུག་པོ་/ དམར་པོ་). The variants in Chinese do not materially affect the meaning. We can present all correspondences easily in a table:

K	C	Dh	*Sanskrit
sngon po	青	sngon po	nila
ser po	黄	gser po	pīta
dmar po	赤	dmar po	lohita
dkar po	白		avadāta
btsod ka	紅/v.l. 紅紫	leb rgan	māñjiṣṭha
shel	頗梨/v.l. 玻瓈	chu shel	sphaṭika
dngul			rajata

§13

<p>^a 爾時，世尊熙怡微笑。^b 從其面門放種種光，青、黃、赤、白、紅、頗梨色。其光普照無量國界，上至梵世，還從如來頂上而入。</p>	<p>^a de'i tshes bcom ldan 'da's kyis 'dzum ba mdzad de ^b zhal gyi sgo nas 'od zer kha dog sngon po dang gser po dang dmar po dang leb rgan dang chu shel gyi kha dog lta bu rnam pa sna tshogs bkye bas 'od zer des 'jig rten gyi khams tshad myed pa snyed kun khyab par gsal bar byas te tshangs pa'i 'jig rten gyi bar du mngon bar byung nas de bzhin gshegs pa'i dbu'i gtsug du nub par gyur to </p>
<p>^a At that time, the Blessed One joyfully smiled. ^b All kinds of rays of light radiated from his mouth—blue, yellow, red, white, rose, and crystal colored.* Those rays of light shone throughout immeasurable realms, ascending to the world of Brahmā, returning and entering from the crown of the Tathāgata's head.</p>	<p>^a At that time, the Blessed One smiled. ^b Various sorts of colored rays of light radiated from his mouth—such as blue, yellow, red, saffron, and crystal colored.* Those rays of light shone penetratingly through all the innumerable world realms, up to the world of Brahmā, then disappeared back into the crown of the Tathāgata's head.</p>

The Buddha's smile is described in a stock phrase which varies by source, but for example in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (Wogihara 1932–1935: 865.18–25) we have: *atha khalu bhagavāms tasyāṃ velāyāṃ smitaṃ prādurakarot | dharmatā khalu punar eṣāṃ buddhānāṃ bhagavatāṃ yadā smitaṃ prāduṣkurvanti atha tadā nānāvarṇā anekavarṇā raśmayo bhagavato mukhadvārān niścāranti | tad yathā nīlapītalohitāvadātamañjīṣṭhasphaṭīkarajatasuvarṇavarṇās te niścaryānantāparyantān lokadhātūn ābhayā 'vabhāsyā yāvad brahmalokam abhyudgamya punar eva pratyudāvṛtya bhagavantāṃ triḥ pradakṣiṇīkrtya bhagavato mūrdhany antardhīyante ||*. A more compact version, perhaps closer to that of our sūtra, is found in the *Saṃghāṭasūtra* (von Hinüber 2021: § 215 [p. 90]): *atha tāvad eva tasmin samaye bhagavato mukhadvārāc caturaśīti raśmisahasrāṇi naścāranti smānekavarṇāni nānāvarṇāny anekasātasahasravarṇāni | tad yathā [nīla]pītalohitāvadātamañjīṣṭhāsphaṭīkarajatavarṇāni | tā anantāparyantāni lokadhātavo vabhāsyā punar eva pratyudāvṛtyā bhagavantāṃ tṛṣ pradakṣiṇīkrtya bhagavato mūrdhany antardhīyanta ||*.

According to some schemes, the location of the return of the rays of light into the Buddha's body indicates the nature of his prediction. In the *Dīvyavadāna* (Rotman 2008: 146), for instance, light returning to the mouth indicates prediction as a disciple, while that into the *uṣṇīṣā* indicates buddhahood.

§14

^a de nas tshe dang ldan pa kun dga' bos bla gos
 phrag pa gcig tu gzar te | pus mo gyas pa'i lha
 nga sa la btsugs nas | bcom ldan 'das ga la ba de
 logs su thal mo sbyar ba btud de | bcom ldan
 'das la 'di skad ces gsol to || ^b bcom ldan 'das de
 bzhin gshegs pa rnam ni rgyu ma mchis par
 'dzum pa mi mdzad na | 'dzum pa mdzad pa'i
 rgyu gang lags | rkyen gang lags |

^a Then the Venerable Ānanda, placing his upper
 robe on one shoulder, planted his right knee on
 the ground, with his hands respectfully placed
 together bowed toward where the Blessed One
 was, and asked the Blessed One: ^b “Blessed
 Ones, tathāgatas, do not smile for no reason.
 What is the reason for your smile? What is its
 cause?”

§14

<p>^a 爾時,尊者阿難見是事已,心自念言:「如來、應、正等覺,非無因緣而現微笑。」作是念已,即從座起,偏袒右肩,右膝著地,合掌向佛,而作是言:^b「以何因緣現此微笑。」</p>	<p>^a de nas tshe dang ldan ba kun dga' bos dngos po de lta bu dag mthong nas 'di snyam du de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom ba yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas ni rgyu dang rkyen myed par 'dzum ba myi mdzad do snyam du sems nas stan las langste bla gos phrag pa gcig du bzar nas phus mo g.yas pa'i lha nga sa la btsugs ste bcom ldan 'da's ga la ba de logs su thal mo sbyar nas 'di skad ces gsol to ^b rgyu dang rkyen gang gi slad du mdzum ba mdzad lags </p>
<p>^a At that time, when the Venerable Ānanda had seen these events, he thought to himself: 'A tathāgata, arhat, perfect buddha does not display a smile without a reason.' Having thought this, he got up from his seat, removed his robe from his right shoulder, placed his right knee on the ground, joined his hands together respectfully toward the Buddha and said: ^b "What is the reason that you display this smile?"</p>	<p>^a Then the Venerable Ānanda, seeing such events as these, and thinking: 'A tathāgata, arhat, complete and perfect buddha does not smile without a reason and a cause,' getting up from his seat and placing his upper robe over one shoulder, planting his right knee on the ground, placing his hands together respectfully toward the Blessed One, spoke as follows: ^b "What is the reason and the cause that you smiled?"</p>

§14

c bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | kun dga' bo
ngas mngon par shes te | sa phyogs 'di nyid du
de bzhin gshegs pa stong gis gang ga'i mchog
ces bya ba kho na'i dge bsnyen ma sha stag las
brtsams te | chos kyi nam grangs 'di bshad do ||

c The Blessed One said: “Ānanda, I fathom*
that on just this spot one thousand tathā-
gatas preached this exposition of the teaching
regarding* none other than a female lay disci-
ple called precisely Gaṅgottarā.

d dge bsnyen ma de dag thams cad ni rab tu
byung nas | phung po lhag ma med pa'i mya
ngan las 'das pa'i dbyings su yongs su mya ngan
las 'das so ||

d “All of those female lay disciples left the
household life and attained parinirvāṇa in the
realm of nirvāṇa without remainder of the
aggregates.”*

c)

fathom/mindful/recall: K *mgon par shes te*, see Edgerton 1953 s.v. *abhijānāti*, who explains that rather than ‘remember,’ the meaning points to supernatural knowledge—not remembering the past but perceiving it at present. Despite this, in C we find 念往, rendered in Dh *mngon bar dran te*. In the last at least the sense of memory is predominant. This translation is attested for *abhijānāmi* in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (Kern and Nanjio 1908–1912: 200.8 = Derge Kanjur 119a3).

regarding/as its head/led by: K *las brtsams*, C *wéi shàngshǒu* 为上首, Dh *gtso bor gyur pas*. Evidently the respective Vorlagen of K and C differed, with the latter specifying that Gaṅgottarā was the leader of the community (**prāmukhya*). For a study focused on the Pāli expression *buddhapamukha bhikkhusaṅgha*, but with some wider scope, see Mori 2008. The English chosen here is not beyond reproach; Jan Nattier (personal communication) objects to the expression that the community was “led by” Gaṅgottarā: “this makes it sound like she’s in charge of the entire assembly, which would be an amazingly singular statement (a lay woman leading the saṅgha?) in a Mahāyāna sūtra if so. I would instead read this as meaning simply that she was ‘pre-eminent’ (presumably pre-eminent among lay women is what is meant, but I won’t push the point, since the sūtra is not explicit—and perhaps is just being sloppy—on this point). ‘Lead’ suggests that she had an active role in organizing, mobilizing, and perhaps even teaching the community. All of the relevant Chinese and Tibetan terms, however, can be understood in the sense of simply ‘pre-eminent, foremost.’”

§14

<p>c 佛言：「我念往昔有千如來，亦於此處說如是法。彼諸衆會各各亦有恒河上優婆夷，而爲上首。」</p>	<p>c bcom ldan 'da's kyis bka' stsal pa' ngas mngon bar dran te sngon 'da's pa'i dus su gnas 'dir de bzhin gshegs pa stong de lta bu'i chos bshad de 'khor 'dus pa de dag kun du yang so so nas dge bsnyen ma gang ga'i mchog ces bya ba dag gtso bor gyur pas </p>
<p>c The Buddha said: "I am mindful* that in the past one thousand Tathāgatas also preached such a teaching in this place. Their assemblies each respectively also had a female lay disciple Gaṅgottarā as its head.*"</p>	<p>c The Blessed One said: "I recall* that in past times, a thousand tathāgatas taught such a teaching in this spot. Each and every one of their assemblies was respectively led by* a female lay disciple called Gaṅgottarā."</p>
<p>d 「彼優婆夷及諸大衆聞是法已，皆悉出家，於無餘涅槃而得滅度。」</p>	<p>d dge bsnyen ma de dag dang 'khor 'dus pa rnams chos thos nas thams cad khyim nas khyim myed par rab du byung bas lhag ma byed pa'i mya ngan las 'da's pas yongs su mya ngan las 'da's par gyur to </p>
<p>d "Those female lay disciples and the great assemblies, having heard this teaching, all renounced the household life, and obtained extinction in nirvāṇa without remainder."*</p>	<p>d "Those female lay disciples and those assemblies having heard the teaching, all renounced the home for the homeless life, and attained parinirvāṇa in nirvāṇa without remainder."*</p>

d)

the realm of nirvāṇa without remainder of the aggregates: K *phung po lhag ma med pa'i mya ngan las 'das pa'i dbyings*, C 無餘涅槃, Dh *lhag ma byed pa'i mya ngan las 'da's pa*, nirvāṇa without remainder [the reading *ma byed* is clear, but perhaps an error for *myed*?]. CDh without doubt represent *nirupadhiśeṣa-* or *anupadhiśeṣa-nirvāṇa*. In K only NV read with *lhag ma*, equivalent for *śeṣa*, although it evidently originally stood also in Dd and has been added below the line in Pj. Either only these witnesses preserve the correct original rendering (which seems perhaps more likely to me), or their mutual source has (hyper)corrected the text, to bring it into line with the standard equivalent as found for instance in the *Mahāvvyutpatti* (§ 1727), in which *phung po lhag ma med pa'i mya ngan las 'das pa* is cited as the equivalent of *nirupadhiśeṣanirvāṇa*. So far as I know, the form we find in the other witnesses is not attested elsewhere.

We should also note that K has only the female lay disciples attain nirvāṇa, while CDh extend this to the communities as well; this may represent a recensional difference, or some ideologically motivated change. See n. 42 above in the Introduction to this chapter.

§15

^a de nas bcom ldan 'das la tshe dang ldan pa
kun dga' bos 'di skad ces gsol to || bcom ldan 'das
chos kyi rnam grangs 'di'i ming ci lags | 'di ji ltar
bzung bar bgyi |

^a Then the Venerable Ānanda asked the Blessed One: “Blessed One, what is the name of this exposition of the teaching? How should we hold it in mind?”

^b bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | kun dga' bo
chos kyi rnam grangs 'di ni dri ma med pa zhes
bya ste | 'di dri ma med pa zhes bya bar zung
shig |

^b The Blessed One said: “Ānanda, this exposition of the teaching is called ‘Stainless’;* hold it in mind as ‘Stainless.’”

a)

sūtra/exposition of the teaching: C 經, Dh *chos kyi rnam grangs* (usually a rendering of **dharmaparyāya*).

Despite what might appear to be different vocabulary here, I think that until we obtain a better overall picture of translation equivalents and language use it is wrong to make any assumptions about whether the translators of Dh might have had some other source in mind than one which read 經. That we usually think of this as some sort of “equivalent” of *sūtra*, and that we normally think of the Tibetan equivalent of *sūtra* as *mdo* (*sde*) may say more about us than about actual usages.

b)

Stainless/Stainless Purity: K *dri ma med pa*, C 離垢清淨, Dh *dri ma myed pa'i rnam par dag pa*. K probably represents something like *vimāla*, while C and Dh conceivably could render *vaimalyaviśuddhi* or *vaimalya-pariśuddhi*, as attested in the *Ratnagotravibhāga* (Johnston 1950: 80.16 and 34.13 respectively).

§15

<p>^a 阿難白佛言：「當何名此經。我等云何受持。」</p>	<p>^a bcom ldan 'da's la tshe dang ldan ba kun dga' bos 'dī skad ces gsol to bcom ldan 'da's chos kyī rnam grangs 'dī ni mying ci lags bdag cag gīs cī ltar gzung bar bgyī </p>
<p>^a Ānanda said to the Buddha: “What should we call this sūtra?* How shall we hold it in mind?”</p>	<p>^a The Venerable Ānanda asked the Blessed One: “Blessed One, What is the name of this exposition of the teaching?* How shall we hold it in mind?”</p>
<p>^b 佛言：「此經名為離垢清淨。以是名字，汝當受持。」</p>	<p>^b bcom ldan 'da's kyīs bka' stsal pa chos kyī rnam grangs 'dī ni dri ma myed pa'i rnam par dag pa zhes bya ste mying de ltar khyod kyīs gzung par bya'o </p>
<p>^b The Buddha said: “This sūtra is called ‘Stainless Purity.’* Under this name you should hold it in mind.”</p>	<p>^b The Blessed One said: “This exposition of the teachings is called ‘Stainless Purity’;* you should hold it in mind with such a name.”</p>

§16

^a chos kyi mam grangs 'di bstan pa na | dge slong
bdun brgya dang | dge slong ma bzhi brgya len
pa med par zag pa rnams las sems rnam par grol
lo ||

^a When this exposition of the teaching had been taught, seven hundred monks and four hundred nuns, their minds free from clinging, became liberated from the corruptions.*

^b de nas 'dod pa na spyod pa dang | gzugs na
spyod pa'i lha'i bu rnams kyis lha'i me tog rnams
dang | tsan dan gyi phye ma rnams mngon par
sprul te | bcom ldan 'das la gtor nas tshig 'di skad
ces ^c 'di ltar grong khyer mnyan yod na | dge
bsnyen ma 'di lta bu gnas la | de de bzhin gshegs
pa dang lhan cig smra yang | de'i lus ngal bar
yang mi 'gyur ba dang |

^b Then, the divinities belonging to the desire realm and those belonging to the form realm conjured up heavenly flowers and sandalwood powders, and having strewn them on the Blessed One, they spoke saying: ^c “In the town of Śrāvastī lives such a female lay disciple who, even though she spoke together with the Tathāgata, did not experience physical exhaustion.*

a)

their minds free from clinging, became liberated from the corruptions: K *len pa med par zag pa rnams las sems rnam par grol lo*, Mvy §2538: *anupādāya āsravebhyāś cittāni vimuktāni*.

b)

exclaimed: Dh comes in §16d: *ched du brjod pa ched du brjod par gyur to*, **udānam udānayati*.

c)

did not experience physical exhaustion/attained [the state of] fearlessness: K *lus ngal bar yang mi 'gyur ba*, perhaps reflecting something like **kāyaklamatha*. The parallel in C has 得無所畏, 'attained [the state of] fearlessness,' Dh *myi 'jigs pa thob par gyur ba*, this perhaps representing *vaiśāradya(-prāpta)*. I do not believe that the two characterizations in K and C can go back to a common source. As Paul Harrison suggests, this may refer to the four modes of fearlessness/self-assurance.

§16

<p>^a 說此經時, 七百比丘衆, 四百比丘尼衆, 諸漏永盡, 心得解脫。</p>	<p>^a chos kyi nam grangs 'di bstan pa na dge slong bdun brgya' dang dge slong ma bzhī brgya zag pa rnam s gtan zad nas sems nam par grol ba thob par gyur to </p>
<p>^a When this sūtra was preached, the assembly of seven hundred monks and the assembly of four hundred nuns, their corruptions completely exhausted, obtained liberation of mind.</p>	<p>^a When this exposition on the teaching had been taught, seven hundred monks and four hundred nuns, their corruptions completely destroyed, attained liberated minds.</p>
<p>^b 爾時, 欲界諸天子化作種種天諸妙花, 而散佛上。作如是言:^c 「此優婆夷甚為希有, 能與如來共相誦對, 得無所畏。」</p>	<p>^b de'i tshe 'dod pa'i khams kyi lha'i bu rnam lha'i me tog gya nom ba nam pa sna tshogs mngon bar sprul nas bcom ldan 'da's la mngon bar gtor te 'di skad du ^c dge bsnyen ma 'di de bzhin gshegs pa la phan tshun lan 'debs shing myi 'jigs pa thob par gyur ba nī shin du ngo mtshar che ste </p>
<p>^b At that time, the divinities of the realm of desire artificially created various wondrous heavenly flowers and scattered them over the Buddha. They said: ^c “This female lay disciple is exceedingly wonderful; she is able to engage in question and answer together with the Tathāgata, attaining [the state of] fearlessness.*”</p>	<p>^b At that time, the divinities of the desire realm artificially created a variety of pleasing heavenly flowers, and broadcast them on the Blessed One. They exclaimed:* ^c “That this female lay disciple engaged in dialogue back and forth with the Tathāgata and attained [the state of] fearlessness* is extremely wonderful!”</p>

§16

ᵀ ji ltar yang gang ga'i mchog 'di sngon gyi rgyal
 ba la lhag par bya ba byas shing | dge ba'i rtsa ba
 bskyed pa dang | yun ring po nas dge ba spyad
 pa dang | yun ring po nas tshangs par spyad pa
 dang | sangs rgyas mang po la bsnyen bkur byas
 pa 'di ni ngo mtshar to zhes smras so ||

ᵀ “Since this Gaṅgottarā performed services for
 past victors,* planted roots of virtue, since long
 ago performed good deeds, since long ago prac-
 ticed the holy life, and made offerings to many
 buddhas—this is marvelous!”

ᵉ bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa | lha'i bu dag
 de de bzhin te | 'di ni sngon gyi rgyal ba la lhag
 par bya ba byas pa | dge ba'i rtsa ba bskyed pa |
 yun ring du tshangs par spyad pa la gnas pa'o ||

ᵉ The Blessed One said: “O divinities, exact-
 ly! She performed services for past victors,
 planted roots of virtue and practiced the holy
 life for a long time.”

e)

performed services for past victors: *K sngon gyi rgyal ba la lhag par bya ba byas pa*, attested in the *Suvarṇa-
 bhāṣottama* (Nobel 1937: 68.9) as *pūrvajinaḅṅtādhikāra*, while in the *Lalitavistara* (Lefmann 1902: 393.6, in
 verse) we find the virtually identical *purimaḅjinaḅṅtādhikāra*.

§16

<p>ḍ 是人已曾無量佛所親近、供養， 種諸善根。』</p>	<p>ḍ 'dis nī sngon de bzhin gshegs pa tshad myed pa snyed la bsnyen bkur dang rim 'gro dang mchod pa byas nas dge ba'i rtsa ba bskyed pa yin no zhes ched du brjod pa ched du brjod par gyur to </p>
<p>ḍ “This person previously brought herself close to innumerable buddhas, worshipped them and planted roots of virtue.”</p>	<p>ḍ “She earlier honored innumerable tathāgatas, served them, and made offerings to them, plant- ing roots of virtue!”</p>

§17

^a bcom ldan 'das kyis de skad ces bka' stsal nas |
 dge bsnyen ma gang ga'i mchog dang | lha dang
 mi dang | lha ma yin dang | dri zar bcas pa'i 'jig
 rten yid rangs te | bcom ldan 'das kyis gsungs pa
 la mngon par bstod do ||

^a After the Blessed One had spoken thus, the female lay disciple Gaṅgottarā and the whole world—gods, men, titans, and heavenly musicians—rejoiced, and delighted in what the Blessed One had said.

a)

heavenly musicians: C actually transcribes something equivalent to gandharva.

§17

<p>^a 佛說是經已, 恒河上優婆夷, 及諸天、人、阿修羅、乾闥婆等聞佛所說, 皆大歡喜, 信受奉行。</p>	<p>^a bcom ldan 'das kyis de skad ces bka' stsal nas dge bsnyen ma gang ga'i mchog dang lha dang myi dang lha ma yin dang dri zar bcas pa'i 'khor rnams bcom ldan 'da's kyis gsungs pa la rab du dga' bas mngon bar bstod do </p>
<p>^a When the Buddha had finished preaching this sūtra, all [those present]—the female lay disciple Gaṅgottarā, and the gods, men, asuras, heavenly musicians* and the rest—having heard what the Buddha had preached, were delighted, and received it in faith.</p>	<p>^a When the Blessed One had spoken thus, the female lay disciple Gaṅgottarā and the assembly consisting of gods, humans, asuras and heavenly musicians, delighted by the preaching of the Buddha, praised it.</p>

§18

^a 'phags pa dkon mchog brtsegs pa chen po'i
chos kyi rnam grangs le'u stong phrag brgya pa
las | ^b gang ga'i mchog gis zhus pa'i le'u zhes bya
ste | ^c sum cu rtsa gcig pa rdzogs so ||

^a From the hundred thousand expositions of
the teaching of the Noble Great Collection of
Jewels, ^b the chapter called “The Inquiry of
Gaṅgotarā,” ^c number thirty-one, is complete.

§19

^a rgya gar gyi mkhan po dzi na mi tra dang | dā
na shī la dang | zhu chen gyi lo tstsha ba ban
de ye shes sdes bsgyur cing zhus te | ^b skad gsar
bcad kyis kyang bcos nas gtan la phab pa || ^c shu
lo ka brgya dang bcu'o ||

^{a-b} Translated and revised by the Indian pre-
ceptors Jinamitra and Dānaśīla, and the chief
revisor Bandhe Ye shes sde, and finalized hav-
ing been put into the new terminology. ^c One
hundred and ten ślokas [in length].

§18

大寶積經卷第九十八	<p>^a ལྷོ། ། ། 'phags pa dkon mchog brtsegs pa chen po'i mdo sde stong phrag brgya' pa las ། ། ^b dge bsnyen ma gang ga'i mchog gi 'dus pa rdzogs s.ho །</p>
Scroll 98 of the Mahāratankūṭa.	<p>^a From the hundred thousand sūtras of the Noble Great Collection of Jewels, ^b the section on the Female Lay Disciple Gaṅgottarā is complete.</p>

4 Readings

4.1 Chinese Readings

Sigla:

- F Fangshan 房山石經
 K Second Koryō 高麗
 P Pelliot 3354 lines v527–567.
 Q Qisha 磧砂

- § 0(a): 恒河上優婆夷會第三十一] P: 第九十八恒河上優婆夷會第
 (b): P, Q: ∅
 § 2(a): 恒河上] P: 恒河上言
 (b): 彼優婆夷即白佛言] P: 彼白佛言
 § 3(b): 如是如是] P: 如是
 § 4(a): at the beginning of the section P has a red circle in line 535.
 不往惡趣] F: 不住惡趣
 § 5 (b): 如以此問] F: 如以問
 (c): 如是如是] P: 如是
 § 6 (b): 彼於是問] F: 彼於是問 [line break] 彼於是問
 § 9(c): 陽焰] P: 陽 炎
 § 12 (a): 名斷流轉] K: 名爲斷流轉
 (c): At the end of the section P has a red circle in line 557
 § 13 (a): 紅] Q: 紅紫;
 頗梨] K: 玻瓈
 § 14(a): 阿難] P: 阿[line break]阿難, at 558/559
 偏袒右肩右膝著地] P: ∅
 § 16(a): 比丘尼衆] P: 比丘尼
 (b): 化作] P: 化 would come at bottom of line but is not visible
 (c): 酬對] FPQ: 酬對
 (d): 無量佛所] P: ∅
 § 17(a): 優婆夷及] P: at least 優婆夷 is absent; 及 would come at the bottom of the line and is
 not visible
 人] P: ∅
 乾闥婆等聞佛所說] P: ∅
 § 18: P: ∅, but see § 0(a)

4.2 Dunhuang Pelliot Tibétain 89 Manuscript Corrections

- § 1 (a): thos pa dus gcig na ||] MS: thos pa du gcig na ||
 § 3 (a): lta bu ma lags sam ||] MS: ma added below line
 § 4 (b): mya ngan las 'da's pa] MS: mya ngan las 'das' pa
 § 8 (g): chos thams cad ni] MS: chos thams can ni
 § 9 (a): bcom ldan 'da's kyis] MS: bcom ldan 'da:s kyis
 (c): dper na] MS: dpen na
 § 10 (a): nga 'i bstan pa la] MS nga 'i bstan pa las
 § 11a: yongs su mya ngan las] MS: yongs su gya ngan las
 snod sems skyed pas na] MS: snod semd rkyed (?) pas na

§15 (b): chos kyi rnam grangs] MS: chos kyi rnams grangs

§16 (a): chos kyi rnam grangs] MS: chos kyi rnams grangs

§18 (a): dkon mchog brtsegs¹ pa] MS: dkon mchog brtsags pa

(b): gang ga'i mchog gi 'dus pa] MS: gang ga'i mchog gi 'dus [erasure of ~14 characters] pa

4:3 *Tibetan Kanjur Readings*

Sigla:

A	Tabo
Cz	Chizhi
D	Derge
Dd	Dodedrak
Dk	Dongkarla
F	Phug brag
Go	Gondhla
Gt	Gangteng
He	Hemis (I)
Hi	Hemis (II)
J	'Jang sa tham/Lithang
N	Narthang
Np	Neyphug
P	Peking
Ph	Phugthar
Pj	Phajoding (I)
Pz	Phajoding (II)
R	Ragya [only title collated]
S	Stog
T	Tokyo
V	Ulan Bator

§ 0

a)

rgya gar skad du |] ADGo: rgya gar skad du ||; DDdPzR: 'phags pa dkon mchog brtsegs pa chen po'i chos kyi mam grangs le'u stong phrag brgya pa las le'u sum cu rtsa gcig pa ste | gang ga'i mchog gis zhus pa lung bstan pa | bam po phyed pa || rgya gar skad du | [DdR: bam po phyed pa |]; Ph: 'phags pa dkon mchog brtsegs pa chen po 'i chos kyi rnams grangs | le'u stong phrag brgya pa las | le'u gsum bcu gcig pa ste | gang 'ga'i mchog gi mdo' | bam po byed do || rgya gar skad du |
 ārya gang god ta ra ba ri bri tstsha nā ma ma hā yā na sū tra |] A: ā rya gang god ta ra nā su tra ||;
 CzDkGtNp: ārya gang god ta ra pri tstsha ma hā yā na nā ma sū tra |; DR: ārya ganggo tta ra ba ri pri tstsha nā ma ma hā yā na sū tra |; DdPj: ārya ganggotta ra pa ri pri tstshā nā ma ma hā yā na sū tra |; FPh: ārya gang god ta ra na ma su tra ||; Go: ā rya gang god ta ra na ma su tra |; HeHi: ārya gang god ta ra nā ma ma hā yā sū tra ||; J: ārya gang god ta ra ba ri pri tstshā nā ma ma hā yā na sū tra |; NS: ārya gang god ta ra pri tstsha ma hā yā na nā ma sū tra |; P: ārya gang god ta ra ba [written in 9 spaces: ri bri tstsha nā ma ma hā yā na sū tra]; Pz: ārya ganggo tta ra pa ri pri tstshā nā ma ma hā yā na sū tra |; T: ā rya gang god ta ra pri tstsha ma hā yā na nā ma sū tra |; V: ārya gang god ta ra bri tstsha ma hā yā nā nāma sū tra |

b)

bod skad du |] A: bod skad du ||

gang ga'i mchog gis zhush pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo |] A: gang ga'i mchog ces bya ba'i mdo ||; DDdJPzPzR: gang gā'i mchog gis zhush pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo | [R: ||]; F: dkon mchog brtsegs pa chen po chos kyi mam grangs le'u stong phrag brgya pa las gang gi'i mchog ces bya ba'i mdo |; Go: gang 'ga'i mchog gis zhush pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo |; He: gangga'i mchog gis zhush pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo ||; Hi: ganggā'i mchog gis zhush pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo ||; N: gangga'i mchog ces bya ba'i mdo |; P: gang gā'i mchog [cramped: gis zhush pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo |]; Ph: gang 'ga'i mchog gis zhush pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo' ||; V: gangga'i mchog ces bya ba'i mdo ||

c)

'tshal lo ||] V: 'tshalo ||

§1

a)

thos pa'i dus gcig na |] ACzDdDkGtHeJNpPzPzST: thos pa dus gcig na |; F: thos pa'i thos gcig na | mnyan yod na |] ADDdJPzPz: mnyan yod na

tshal mgon med zas sbyin gyi kun dga' ra ba na bzhugs te |] APh: tshal mgo myed zas sbyin gyi kun dga' ra ba na bzhugs te |; Go: tshal mgon myed zas sbyin pa gyi kun dga' ra ba na bzhugs te |; Hi: 'tshal gon med zas sbyin gyi kun dga' ra ba na bzhugs te |

b)

mnyan yod na |] DDdFHeJPzPz: mnyan yod na

dge bsnyen ma] Ph: dge snyen ma; T: dge msnyen ma

gang ga'i mchog ces bya ba zhig gnas so ||] APh: gang 'ga'i mchog ces bya ba zhig gnas so ||; DDdJPzPz: gang gā'i mchog ces bya ba zhig gnas so ||; HeNV: gangga'i mchog ces bya ba zhig gnas so ||; Hi: ganggā'i mchog ces bya ba zhig gnas so ||; P: gang gā'i mchog ces bya ba cig gnas so ||; T: gang ga'i mchog ces bya ba zhig gnaso ||

c)

dge bsnyen ma] FPh: dge snyen ma

gang ga'i mchog] APh: gang 'ga'i mchog; DDdJPPzPz: gang gā'i mchog; F: gang gi'i mchog; HeNV: gangga'i mchog; Hi: ganggā'i mchog

mnyan yod nas byung nas |] DJPzPz: mnyan yod nas byung nas; Dd: nas byung nas rgyal bu *written in ±six spaces, but no erasure visible*; Ph: gnyan yod nas byung nas |

tshal mgon med zas sbyin gyi] A: tshal | mgon myed zas sbyin gyi; Go: tshal mgon myed zas sbyin gyi; He: tshal mgon med zas sbyin kyi; Ph: mtshal mgon myed zas sbyin gyi; V: tshal mgon med zas sbyin gyis

kun dga' ra ba ga la ba der] DP: kun dga'i ra ba ga la ba der; F: kun dga' ra ba na ga la ba der; He: kun dga' ra ba ga la de

song ste phyin nas |] A: song ste | phyind nas ||; DDdPPzPz: song ste phyin nas; Go: song te phyind nas; J: song ste [r space] phyin nas

mgo bos] Hi: mgo bo

'tshal te |] CzDDdDkGtJNpPzPzS: 'tshal te; Hi: tshal te |; T: 'tshal te ||

phyogs gcig tu 'dug go |] AFHeNT: phyogs gcig tu 'dug go ||; Hi: phyogs cig tu 'dugo ||; P: phyogs gcig tu 'dug go |

§ 2

a)

phyogs gcig tu 'dug pa dang |] P: phyogs gcig du 'dug pa dang |

mkhyen bzhin du] A: mkhyend bzhin du; Go: mkhyend bzhin du |; HeHiP: mkhyen bzhin du |; Ph: mkhyend bzhin tu |

dge bsnyen ma] Ph: dge snyen ma

gang ga'i mchog la |] A: gang ga'i mchog la; DDdJPz: gang gā'i mchog la; F: gang gi'i mchog la; He: gangga'i mchog la; Hi: ganggā'i mchog la; NV: gangga'i mchog la |; P: gang gā'i mchog la |; Ph: gang 'ga'i mchog la

gang ga'i mchog khyod da gzod] DDdJPPj: gang gā'i mchog khyod da gzod; Go: gang ga'i mchog khyod da bzod; He: gangga'i mchog khyod da gzod; Hi: ganggā'i mchog khyod da gzod; NV: gangga'i khyod da gzod; Ph: gang 'ga'i mchog khyod da bzod

gang nas 'ongs shes smras so ||] A: gang nas 'ongs shes rmas so ||; CzDkGtNpS: gang nas 'ongs shes smras |; DDdFPPz: gang nas 'ongs zhes smras so ||; Go: gang nas 'ongs zhes rmas so |; Hi: gang 'ongs shes smras so ||

b)

gang ga'i mchog gis gsol pa |] AGo: gang ga'i mchog gis gsold pa |; DDdJPz: gang gā'i mchog gis gsol pa |; He: gangga'i mchog gis gsol pa; Hi: ganggā'i mchog gis gsol pa; NV: gangga'i mchog gis gsol pa |; P: gang gā'i mchog gis gsol ba ||; Ph: gang 'ga'i mchog gis gsold pa |

c)

gang zhig gis] Ph: gang zhig gyis

sprul pa la smras te |] AGoPh: spruld pa la rmas te |; F: sprul pa la smas te |; HeHi: sprul pa la dris te |; NV: sprul pa la smras te

da gzod gang nas 'ongs shes de skad bgyis na |] DDdJPz: da gzod gang nas 'ongs zhes de skad bgyis na; Go: da bzod gang nas 'ongs shes de skad bgyis na |; HeP: da bzod gang nas 'ongs shes de skad bgyis na |; Hi: da bzod gang nas 'ongs shes de skad smras na |; Ph: da bzod gang nas 'ongs shes de skad bgyis na

ji skad lan 'debs par 'gyur lags |] FPhT: ci skad lan 'debs par 'gyur lags |; HeHi: ji skad lan 'debs par 'gyur |; Np: ji skad len 'debs par 'gyur lags |; P: ji skad lan 'debs par 'gyur lags ||

d)

bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa |] AGoPh: bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa |; F: bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa |; P: bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal ba ||

gang ga'i mchog] APh: gang 'ga'i mchog; DDdJPPz: gang gā'i mchog; F: gang gi mchog; HeNV: gangga'i mchog; T: gang ga'i phyogs mchog

sprul pa la ni 'greng ba med |] GoPh: spruld pa la ni 'greng ba myed |; P: sprul pa la ni 'greng pa med |; T: sprul pa la ni 'greng pa te |

'dug pa med |] AGoPh: 'dug pa myed |; HeHi: 'dug pa med; P: 'dug ba med |

nyal ba med |] AGoPh: nyal ba myed |; P: nyal ba med

'ong ba med |] AGoPh: 'ong ba myed |; HeHi: 'ong ba med; T: 'ongs ba med |

'gro ba med |] AGoPh: 'gro ba myed |

'chi 'pho med |] AGoPh: 'chi 'pho myed |; HeHi: 'chi 'pho med

skye ba med na |] APh: skye ba myed na |; CzDDdDkGtHeHiJNpPzST: skye ba med na; Go: skye ba myed na

'di nas 'ongs so] AHe: 'di nas 'ongs; Go: 'di nas 'das so; Hi: 'di nas 'ongs; Ph: 'di nas 'das so ||; V: 'di nas 'ongso

zhes de ci zhig ston par 'gyur |] A: shes ci zhig ston par 'gyur; Go: zhes de ji zhes ston par 'gyur |;
 He: shes de ci zhig ston par 'gyur |; Hi: shes de ci zhig ston bar 'gyur |; P: zhes de ci zhig ston par
 'gyur ||; Ph: zhes de ci zhig ston par 'gyur |; V: zhes de ci zhig ston par 'gyur ||

§ 3

a)

gang ga'i mchog gis | APh: gang 'ga'i mchog gis; DDdJPjPz: gang gā'i mchog gis; F: gang gi'i mchog
 gis; HeNV: gangga'i mchog gis; Hi: ganggā'i mchog gis
 gsol pa |] AGoPh: gsold pa |; HeHi: gsol pa; P: gsol pa ||
 ci chos] J: [1~2 spaces] chos
 sprul pa lta bu] AGoPh: spruld pa lta bu; F: sprul lta bu
 ma lags sam |] ADDdFHeHiJNV: lags sam |; GoP: lags sam ||

b)

bka' stsal pa |] AGoPh: bka' stsal pa |
 gang ga'i mchog] APh: gang 'ga'i mchog; DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; F: gang gi'i chog; HeNV:
 gangga'i mchog; Hi: ganggā'i mchog
 de bzhin no ||] GoJ: de bzhin no |; HeHi: de de bzhin no ||; T: de bzhino ||

c)

gsol pa |] APh: gsold pa |; FHeHi: gsol pa; Go: gsold pa
 gal te] GoP: gal te |
 sprul pa lta bu lags na |] AGoPh: spruld pa lta bu lags na |; He: sprul ba lta bu lags na |
 gang ga'i mchog] DDdJPPz: gang gā'i mchog; F: gang gi'i mchog; HeHi: ganggā'i mchog; NV: gangga'i
 mchog; Ph: gang 'ga'i mchog
 da gzod] F: gzod da; HeHiPPhS: da bzod; J: [1 space] da gzod
 'ongs zhes] AFGoHeHiNPhV: 'ongs shes; J: 'ong shes
 ci'i slad du rma ||] AHeHi: ci'i slad du rma |; CzDDdDkGtJNpPhPjPzS: ci'i slad du smra |; F: ci'i
 slad du |; Go: ji slad du rma ||; NV: ci'i slad du smras |; P: ci'i slad du gsung ||; T: ci'i sladu
 smra |

§ 4

a)

bka' stsal pa |] APh: bka' stsal pa |; F: bka' btsal pa |; HeHi: bka' stsal pa
 gang ga'i mchog] DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; F: gang gi'i mchog; HeNV: gangga'i mchog; Hi:
 ganggā'i mchog; Ph: gang 'ga'i mchog; T: ganga'i mchog [*Having to rely on my old notes of T,
 which I made in romanization, I am now not entirely sure what I meant to transcribe here*]
 sprul pa ni ngan song du mi 'gro |] APh: spruld pa ni ngan song du mi 'gro |; Go: spruld pa ni ngan
 song du mi 'gro |; Hi: sprul pa ni ngan song du mi 'gro ||; T: sprul pa ni ngan song du mi 'gro | [*4
 spaces*];
 mtho ris su mi 'gro |] AGoPh: mtho ris su mi 'gro; HiPj: mtho ris su mi 'gro ||
 yongs su mya ngan las 'das par mi 'gro na |] A: yongs su mya ngan las 'da' bar mi 'gro na |; DDdJPjPz:
 yongs su mya ngan las 'das par mi 'gro na; Go: yongs su mya ngan las 'da' par mi 'gro na |; Ph:
 yongs su mya ngan las 'das par mi 'gro na; TV: yongsu mya ngan las 'das par mi 'gro na |
 ci gang ga'i mchog kyang] CzS: gang ga'i mchog kyang |; DDdJPPjPz: ci gang gā'i mchog kyang; F: ci
 gang gi'i mchog kyang; Gt: gang ga'i mchog kyang; HeNV: ci gangga'i mchog kyang; Hi: ci ganggā'i
 mchog kyang; Ph: ci gang 'ga'i mchog kyang

ngan song du mi 'gro |] AGo: ngan song du myi 'gro |; F: ngan song du mi 'gro ||; Ph: ngan song du myi 'gro ||

mtho ris su mi 'gro |] AGo: mtho ris su myi 'gro |; Ph: mtho ris su myi 'gro ||; V: mtho risu mi 'gro |
yongs su mya ngan las 'das par mi 'gro 'am |] A: yongs su mya ngan las 'da' bar myi 'gro 'am |; fv:
yongsu mya ngan las 'das par mi 'gro 'am |; GoPh: yongs su mya ngan las 'das par myi 'gro 'am |;
P: yongs su mya ngan las 'das par mi 'gro 'am ||

b)

gang ga'i mchog gis] DDdJPjPz: gang gā'i mchog gis; F: gang gi'i mchog gis; Go: gang 'ga'i mchog gis;
HeNTV: gangga'i mchog gis; Hi: ganggā'i mchog gis; Ph: gang 'ga'i mchog gis
gsol pa |] APh: gsold pa |; F: gsol po ||; Go: gsold pa ||; HeHi: gsol pa; P: gsol pa ||
gal te |] P: gal te |

gang ga'i mchog] APh: gang 'ga'i mchog; DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; F: gang gi'i mchog; Hi:
ganggā'i mchog; NTV: gangga'i mchog
sprul pa'i rang bzhin las gzhan] AGoPh: spruld pa'i rang bzhin las gzhan; J: sprul ba'i rang bzhin
las gzhan

lags par mthong na ni |] DDdJPjPz: lags par mthong na ni; P: legs par mthong na ni ||

dge bsnyen ma gang ga'i mchog] A: dge bsnyen ma gang 'ga'i mchog [*below here and above the next*
bsnyen ma gang *is an interlinear addition*: ma mthong ste |; *it is not clear where this belongs*];
DJPj: dge bsnyen ma gang gā'i mchog; He: dge bsnyen ma gangga'i mchog; Hi: dge bsnyen ma
ganggā'i mchog; NV: dge bsnyen ma gangga'i mchog |; P: dge bsnyen ma gang gā'i mchog |; Ph:
dge bsnyen ma gang 'ga'i mchog

ngan song du mchi ba 'am |] DDdJPjPz: ngan song du 'chi ba 'am; NV: ngan song du 'gro ba 'am |; P:
ngan song du 'chi ba 'am |

mtho ris su mchi ba 'am |] DDdJPjPz: mtho ris su mchi ba 'am; F: ∅; P: mtho ris su 'chi ba 'am |; T:
mtho risu mchi ba 'am |

yongs su mya ngan las 'das par] TV: yongsu mya ngan las 'das par

mchi ba ma lags so zhes |] A: mchi ba ma lags so | zhes; CzDDdDkGtJNpPjPzS: mchi ba ma lags
so zhes; GoHeHi: mchi ba ma lags so || zhes; NTV: mchi ba ma lags so zhes; P: 'chi ba ma legs so
zhes |; Ph: 'chi ba ma lags so || zhes

c)

bdag sprul pa dang bstun du yang] AGo: bdag spruld pa dang bstund tu yang; CzDkGtS: bdag sprul
pa dang bstun du'ang; FHeHiT: bdag sprul pa dang bstun tu yang; J: bdag sprul pa dang bstun
pa yang; NV: bdag sprul pa dang | bstan du'ang; Np: bdag sprul pa dang | bstun du'ang; P: bdag
sprul pa dang bstan du yang; Ph: bdag spruld pa dang stund tu yang

mi rung lags na |] AF: rung lags na |; GoPh: myi rung lags na |; Hi: mi rang lags na |; NV: mi rung lags
na |; P: rung legs na ||

bdag gis ni] DDdPjPz: bdag gis; P: bdag gis ni |

dge bsnyen ma] Go: dge bsnyen pa ma; Ph: dge snyen ma

gang ga'i mchog] DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; F: gang gi'i mchog; HeNTV: gangga'i mchog; Hi:
ganggā'i mchog; Ph: gang 'ga'i mchog

sprul pa'i rang bzhin las] AGoPh: spruld pa'i rang bzhin las; J: sprul ba'i rang bzhin las; NV: sprul
pa'i rang bzhin nas

gzhan lags par ma mthong ste |] FT: gzhan lags par mthong ste |; P: gzhan lags par ma mthong ste
de ltar bdag gis] Go: de ltar bdag gyis; Ph: de ltar bdag gis [*bdag written in 1 letter space*]; T: bdag
de ltar bdag gis

ma mthong na |] A: de ltar ma mthong na |; DDdJPjPz: ma mthong na; HeHi: ma thos na |
 dge bsnyen ma] FPh: dge snyen ma; V: bge bsnyen ma
 gang ga'i mchog] A: [folio torn] 'ga'i mchog; DDdJPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; HeNTV: gangga'i mchog;
 Hi: ganggā'i mchog; P: gang ga'i mchog |; Ph: gang 'ga'i mchog
 ngan song du mchi ba 'am |] Go: ngan song du mchi 'am |; P: ngan song du 'chi ba 'am |; Ph: ngan
 song du mchi' ba 'am |
 mtho ris su mchi ba 'am |] Go: mtho ris su mchi pa 'am |; P: mtho ris su 'chi ba 'am |; TV: mtho risu
 mchi ba 'am |
 yongs su mya ngan las 'das par mchi ba] F: yongs su mya ngan las 'das par mchi ba 'am |; NP: yongs
 su mya ngan las 'das par 'chi ba; T: yongsu mya ngan las 'das par mchi ba; V: yongsu mya ngan
 las 'das par 'chi ba
 zhes ji skad bstan par bgyi |] A: zhes ji skad bstand par bgyi |; F: zhes ji skad bstan bar bgyi |; Go:
 zhes ji skad stand par bgyi |; HeHi: zhes ji skad ces bstan par bgyi |; P: zhes ji skad bstan par
 bgyi ||; Ph: zhes ji ltar bstand par bgyi |
 d)
 de lta lags kyis kyang |] ADDdJPhPjPz: de lta lags kyis kyang; Go: de ltar lags kyis kyang |
 g.yo ba dang | rlom sems dang |] Go: g.yo' ba dang | rlob sems dang |; Hi: g.yo ba dang | rlom sems
 dang |; P: g.yo [*cramped*: ba dang rlom] sems dang |; Ph: g.yo ba dang rlom sems dang |
 bskyod pa dang |] T: skyod pa dang
 spros pa mchis na |] A: spros pa [*folio torn*]; DDdGoJPj: spros pa mchis na; NV: spros pa ma mchis
 na |
 'di snyam du] A: [*folio torn, but not enough space for ji ltar*] 'di snyam du; DDdJPjPz: ji ltar 'di snyam
 du; P: [*cramped*: ji ltar 'di] snyam du
 bdag] HeHi: bdag du bdag
 ngan song du 'gro ba 'am |] A: ngan song du mcho ba 'am |; T: ngan song du 'gro ba' 'am |; V: ngan
 song du 'gro ba 'am |
 mtho ris su 'gro ba 'am |] F: mtho ris su 'gro ba 'am |; Go: Ø; P: mtho rigs su 'gro ba 'am |; Hi: mtho
 ris su 'gro ba 'am | mtho ris su 'gro ba 'am |; Ph: mtho' ris su 'gro ba 'am |; T: mtho risu 'gro ba 'am |
 yongs su mya ngan las 'das par] FV: yongsu mya ngan las 'das; T: yongsu mya ngan las
 'gro ba'o snyam du] F: 'gro ba'o | snyam du; T: 'gro ba'o zhe snyam du
 sems lags te |] Dd: sems lags ste |; FP: sems lags te ||
 mya ngan las 'das pa'i dbyings ni] A: mya ngan las 'das pa'i dbyings na |; NPV: mya ngan las 'das pa'i
 dbyings ni |
 nams kyang] P: nam yang
 ngan song du mchi ba 'am |] D: ngan song du mchi pa 'am |; P: ngan song du 'chi ba 'am |; Ph: ngan
 song du mchi' ba 'am |
 mtho ris su mchi ba 'am |] A: mtho ris [*folio torn*] ba 'am |; Go: mtho ris su mchi ba 'am |; N: mtho
 risu mchi ba 'am; P: mtho ris su 'chi ba 'am ||; Ph: mtho' ris su mchi ba 'am |
 yongs su mya ngan las 'das par] FTV: yongsu mya ngan las 'das par
 mchi ba ma lags te |] A: mchis pa ma lags te |; P: 'chi ba ma lags ste ||
 dge bsnyen] Ph: dge snyend
 gang ga'i mchog] APh: gang 'ga'i mchog; DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; HeNTV: gangga'i mchog; Hi:
 ganggā'i mchog
 kyang de lta bu'i dbyings can lags so ||] F: de lta bu'i dbyings can lags so ||; Hi: kyang de lta bu'i
 dbyings can lags so |; P: kyang de lta bu'i dbyings can legs so ||; T: kyang de lta bu'i dbyings can
 lagso ||

§ 5

a)

bka' stsal pa |] AGo: bka' stsald pa |; P: bka' stsal pa ||; Ph: bka' stsald pa
gang ga'i mchog] APh: gang 'ga'i mchog; DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; HeNV: gangga'i mchog; Hi:
ganggā'i mchog

khyod ci] Go: khyod

yongs su mya ngan las 'das pa la] A: yongs su [*folio torn*] las 'das pa la
yang dag par ma zhugs sam |] GoP: yang dag par ma zhugs sam ||

b)

gsol pa |] A: gsold pa |; HeHiF: gsol pa; P: gsol pa ||; Ph: gsold pa
su zhig gis] F: su zhig gis

mi skye ba la rmas te |] AGoPh: myi skye ba la rmas te |; CzNPz: mi skye ba la smas te |; DPV: mi
skye ba la sbras te |; DdJPj: mi skye ba la smras te |; HeHi: mi skye ba la dris te |

yongs su mya ngan las 'das pa la] DGoHeST: yongs su mya ngan las 'das ba la; P: yongs su mya ngan
la [*space*] 'das ba la; V: yongsu mya ngan las 'das pa la

ma zhugs sam |] CzDkGoGtHeHiNNpSTV: ma zhugs sam; DDd(pc)JPjPz: yang dag par ma zhugs
sam; P: yang dag par ma zhugs sam | [*after la (see above) all written in 13 spaces*]

zhes de skad bgyis na |] DDdJPjPz: zhes de skad bgyis na; F: zhes de skad ces bgyis na |; He: zhes
de skad smras na; Hi: de skad smras na |

lan 'debs par 'gyur lags |] HeHi: lan 'debs par 'gyur ba lags; P: lan 'debs bar 'gyur lags sam ||; Ph: lan
'debs bar 'gyur lags sam |

c)

bcom ldan 'das kyis] A: bco[*folio torn*] 'das kyis

bka' stsal pa |] A: bka' stsald pa ||; Go: bka' stsald pa |; P: bka' stsal pa ||; Ph: bka' stsald pa
gang ga'i mchog] DDdJPjPz: gang gā'i mchog F: gang gi'i mchog; HeNV: gangga'i mchog; Hi: ganggā'i
mchog; Ph: gang 'ga'i mchog

mi skye ba zhes bya ba ni] AGoPh: myi skye ba zhes bya ba ni; F: mi skye ba zhes bya ba ni |; T: mi
skye ba ni

mya ngan las 'das pa'i tshig bla dags yin na |] A: mya ngan las 'das ba'i tshig bla dags yin na |; DdHe-
HijJPjPz: mya ngan las 'das pa'i tshig bla dags yin na; N: mya ngan las 'das pa'i tshig bla dwags [?]
yin na |

de ci zhig lan 'debs par 'gyur |] JP: de ci zhig lan 'debs par 'gyur ||; NV: de ni ci zhig lan 'debs par
'gyur |; Np: de ci zhig len 'debs par 'gyur |

d)

gang ga'i mchog gis] APh: gang 'ga'i mchog gis; DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog gis; F: gang gi'i mchog
gis; HeNV: gangga'i mchog gis; Hi: ganggā'i mchog gis

gsol pa |] AGo: gsold pa |; HeHi: gsol ba; PT: gsol pa ||; Ph: gsold pa

bcom ldan 'das ci] He: bcom ldan 'das

chos thams cad] JPj: chos thams cad ni

mya ngan las 'das pa] DP: ni mya ngan las 'das pa

dang mtshungs pa lags sam |] A: dang mtshungs lags sam |; F: dang mtshungs pa ma lags sam |; Hi:
dang mtshungs pa lags sam ||; NV: dang | mtshungs pa lags sam |; P: dang mtshungs [*space*] lags
sam

e)

bka' stsal pa |] A: bka' stsald pa |; F: bka' skal pa |; GoPh: bka' stsald pa; P: bka' stsal pa ||

gang ga'i mchog] DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; F: gang gi'i mchog; He: gangga'i mchog de de bzhin te |; Hi: ganggā'i mchog; NV: gangga'i mchog; Ph: gang 'ga'i mchog de de bzhin te |] Go: de bzhin te |; Ph: de de bzhin te dang mtshungs so ||] T: dang mtshungsso ||; V: mtshungs so ||

§ 6

a)

gsol pa |] AGo: gsold pa |; HeHi: gsol pa; P: gsol pa ||; Ph: gsold pa bcom ldan 'das] Ph: bcom ldan

gal te chos thams cad] P: [space] gal te chos thams cad; Ph: gal te gal te chos thams cad dang mtshungs pa lags na |] DDdJPPjPz: dang mtshungs pa lags na; NV: dang | mtshungs pa lags na |; T: dang mtshungs pa lags lags na |

gang ga'i mchog] DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; F: gang gi'i mchog; HeNV: gangga'i mchog; Hi: ganggā'i mchog; Ph: gang 'ga'i mchog

khyod] Ph: ∅

yongs su mya ngan las 'das pa la] F: yongsu mya ngan las 'das pa la; Go: yongs su myi ngan las 'das pa la; TV: yongsu mya ngan las 'das pa la

yang dag par ma zhugs sam] F: ma zhugs sam |; PV: yang dag par ma zhugs sam |

zhes nga ci zhig rma te |] A: zhes da ci zhig rma ste |; CzDkGtJNNpPjSV: zhes da ci zhig smra ste |; DDdPz: zhes nga ci zhig smra ste |; F: zhes nga ci zhig rma ste |; GoPh: zhes de ci zhig rmas te |; HeHi: zhes de ji zhig smras te |; P: zhes nga ci zhig smras te ||; T: zhes ci zhig smra ste |

b)

zhig gis] HeHi: zhig

sprul pa la rma ste |] A: spruld pa la rma ste |; CzDDdDkGtJNNpPjPzSTV: sprul pa la smras te |; F: sprul pa la rma ste |; GoPh: spruld pa la rmas te |; HeHi: sprul pa la smras te |; P: sprul ba la smra [space] ste ||

yongs su mya ngan las 'das pa la] A: yongs su mya ngan las 'das ba la; FV: yongsu mya ngan las 'das pa la; GtST: yongs su mya ngan las 'das par; Np: yongs su mya ngan 'das par; Ph: yongs su mya ngan las 'das pa

yang dag par ma zhugs sam zhes] F: yang dag par ma zhugs sam | zhes; P: yang dag par ma zhugs sam zhes |; Ph: yang dag par zhus sam | zhes; T: ma zhugs sam zhes

de skad bgyis na |] DDdJPPjPz: de skad bgyis na; FNV: de skad ces bgyis na |

ji skad lan 'debs par 'gyur lags |] FGoT: ci skad lan 'debs par 'gyur lags |; He: ji skad lan 'debs par 'gyur lags; Hi: ji skad lan 'debs pa lags; J: ji skad lan 'dabs par 'gyur lags |; P: ji skad lan 'debs par 'gyur lags ||; Ph: ci skad lan 'debs pa lags |

§ 7

a)

bka' stsal pa |] AGo: bka' stsald pa |; P: bka' stsal pa ||; Ph: bka' stsald pa

gang ga'i mchog] APh: gang 'ga'i mchog; DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; F: gang gi' mchog; HeNV: gangga'i mchog; Hi: ganggā'i mchog

dri ba 'di ni dmigs pa med pa'o ||] A: dri ba 'di ni dmyigs pa myed pa'o ||; GoPh: 'dri pa 'di ni dmyigs pa myed pa'o ||

b)

gsol pa |] AGo: gsold pa |; HeHi: gsol pa; P: gsol pa ||; Ph: gsold pa

ci bcom ldan 'das kyis] A: bcom ldan 'das kyis; Hi: ci *added very small below line*; Ph: ci bcom ldan 'das kyis

dmigs pa dang bcas pa'i rma bas] A: dmyigs pa dang bcas pa'i rma bas; CzDDdDkGtJNNpPjPzSV: dmigs pa dang bcas pa'i smra bas; F: dmigs pa dang bcas pa'i rma pas; Go: dmyigs pa dang bcas pa'i rma pas; HeHi: dmigs pa dang | bcas pa'i smra bas; Ph: dmyigs pa dang bcas pa'i rma bas |; T: dmigs pa dang bcas pa'i smra ba'i [sa *below* ba]

rmas lags sam |] CzDDdDkGtHeHiJNNpPjPzSTV: smras lags sam |; F: smas lags sam |; Go: rmas lags sam ||; P: smras lags sam ||; Ph: rmas lags pasam [pa+sa+ma]

c)

bka' stsal pa |] AGoPh: bka' stsal pa |; F: bka' stsal pa; P: bka' stsal pa ||

gang ga'i mchog] DDdJPPjPzT: gang gā'i mchog; F: gang gi'i chos; HeNV: gangga'i mchog; Hi: ganggā'i mchog; Ph: gang 'ga'i mchog

dri ba] Ph: 'dri ba

dmigs pa med mod kyis |] APh: dmyigs pa myed mod kyis |; Go: dmyigs myed mod kyis |; HeHi: dmigs pa med mod kyis |; P: dmigs pa med mod kyis ||

'on kyang] Ph: 'ond kyang

'khor 'di na] GoP: 'khor 'di ni

rigs kyi bu'am |] AFGoHeHiNPhV: rigs kyi bu'am

rigs kyi bu mo] HeHi: rigs kyis bu mo

'dul ba dag yod de |] DJPjPz: 'du ba dag yod de |; P: 'du [*1~2 spaces at line end*] ba dag yod de |; T: 'dul ba dag yod de

de dag gi don chen por 'gyur bas dris so ||] HeHi: de dag don chen por 'gyur ba'i phyir dris so ||; Ph: de dag ni don chen por 'gyur bas dris so ||; T: de dag gi don chen por 'gyur bas driso ||; V: de dag gis don chen por 'gyur bas dris so ||

d)

de ci'i phyir zhe na |] P: de ci'i phyir zhe na ||

gang ga'i mchog] APh: gang 'ga'i mchog; DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; F: gang gi'i mchog; HeNV: gangga'i mchog; Hi: ganggā'i mchog

de bzhin gshegs pas ni] A: de bzhin gshegs pas ni; F: de de zhin gshegs pas ni; P: de bzhin gshegs pas ni |; V: de bzhin gshegs pas ni

chos nyid ces bya ba yang] CzS: chos nyid ces ba'ang; DkGtNp: chos nyid ces pa'ang

mngon par rdzogs par sangs ma rgyas na |] DFGoJPjPz: mngon par rdzogs par sangs ma rgyas na; Dd: mngon par rdzogs par sangs ma rgyas na [*space of one letter with three tshegs*]

gang de las byung ba'i chos] F: yang de las byung ba'i chos; Hi: gang las byung ba'i chos

yongs su mya ngan las 'das pa la] FTV: yongsu mya ngan las 'das pa la; S: yongs su mya ngan las 'das pa

gnas pa lta ga la zhig yod ||] CzGtHeHiSTV: gnas pa lta ga la zhig yod |; D: gnas pa lta ga la yod ||; F: gnas pa | lta ga la yod |; JPjPz: gnas pa lta ga la yod |; Np: gnas pa [*2~3 spaces*] lta ga la zhig yod |

§ 8

a)

gsol pa |] AGo: gsold pa |; FHeHi: gsol pa; Ph: gsold pa

bcom ldan 'das kyis] P: bcom ldan 'das kyis |

chos nyid ces bgyi ba yang] CzDkGtNpS: chos nyid ces bgyi ba'ang; F: chos nyid cis bgyi ba yang;

Ph: chos nyid ces bgyi ba yang |

mngon par rdzogs par sangs ma rgyas te |] AT: mngon bar rdzogs par sangs ma rgyas te |; P: mngon
par rdzogs par rdzogs par sangs ma rgyas te |
de las] Hi: gang de las; Ph: de nas
lta ga la zhig mchis par 'gyur na |] DDdJPjPz: lta gang zhig mchis par gyur na; FHeHiPhS: lta ga la
zhig mchis par gyur na |; NV: lta ga la zhig mchis par 'gyur na |; P: lta [5 spaces at beginning of
line] ga la mchis par 'gyur na ||
bcom ldan 'das kyis] V: bcoms kyis
byang chub kyis slad du] J: byang chub gyi slad du; Np: byang chub [1 space] kyis slad du; P: byang
chub kyis slad du |
ji ltar] F: ci ltar; He: ji
yang dag par bsgrubs lags |] Go: yang dag par bsgrubs pa lags ||; HeHi: yang dag par bsgrubs lags;
P: yang dag par bsgrubs lags ||
b)
bka' stsal pa |] AGo:Ph bka' stsal pa |; Hi: bka' 'stsal pa |; P: bka' stsal pa ||
gang ga'i mchog] AGoPh: gang 'ga'i mchog; DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; HeNV: gangga'i mchog;
Hi: ganggā'i mchog
dmigs pa de ni] AGoPh: dmyigs pa de ni
dge ba'i rtisa ba ma yin te |] F: ~~dmigs~~ pa dge ba'i rtisa ba ma yin te |; Ph: dge ba'i rtisa ba'i ma yin
te |
byang chub sems dpa'i dge ba'i rtisa ba de ni] DDdJNPhPjPzV: byang chub sems dpa' dge ba'i rtisa
ba de ni; F: byang chub sems dpa' dge ba'i rtisa ba ma yin te | byang chub sem de ni [cancellation
in red? hard to see]; P: byang chub sems dpa' dge ba'i rtisa ba de ni ||
gang gi tshe] HeHi: gang gis tshe; NTV: gang gi tshe |
yang dag par sgrub pa] CzDkGtNpS: yang dag par sgrub pa'i; FPh: yang dag par bsgrub ba; HeHi:
yang dag par bsgrub pa'i; T: yang dag par bsgrub pa'i [see next]
de'i tshe yang] A: de'i tshe yang |; CzDkGtNpS: tshe'ang; F: de'i tshe yang dag; HeHi: tshe de'i tshe
yang; T: tshe yang [see immediately above]
bsam gyis] He: bsam kyis
mi khyab pa nyid mi 'dor |] A: myi khyab pa nyid mi 'dor ro |; DDdHeHiJNPjPzV: mi khyab pa nyid
mi 'dor ro ||; GoPh: myi khyab pa nyid mi 'dor |; P: mi khyab pa nyid mi 'dor ||
gang gi tshe] F: gang tshe; T: gang gis tshe
mi sgrub pa] AGo: myi sgrub pa; Ph: myi bsgrub ba
de'i tshe yang] AGo: de'i tshe yang; CzDkGtNpS: de'i tshe'ang; T: de'i tshe na yang
bsam gyis] Hi: bsam gyi
mi khyab pa nyid mi 'dor ro ||] AGoPh: myi khyab ba nyid mi 'dor do ||; HiS: mi khyab pa nyid mi
'dor ro |
c)
gsol pa |] A: gsold pa |; FHeHi: gsol pa; GoPh: gsold pa
mi khyab pa la] DHeHiNPV: mi khyab pa la |; F: mi khyab pa; Go: myi khyab pa la; Ph: myi khyab
pa
bsam gyis mi khyab pa] AGo: bsam gyis myi khyab pa; FPh: ∅
zhes bgyi ba] Go: zhes bgyi pa; HeHiNPV: zhes bgyi ba |
ci'i slad du] ACzDkGtHeHiNpS: ci'i slad du |; J: [3 spaces at beginning of line] ci'i slad du; T: ci'i
sladu | [From here through the end of § 8c, Np extremely cramped]
mi khyab pa la] APh: myi khyab pa la

mi khyab pa zhes bgyi |] APh: myi khyab pa zhes bgyi |; F: mi khyab pa zhes gyi |; P: mi khyab pa zhes bgyi ||

d)

bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa |] AGo: bka' stsal pa |; P: bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa ||; Ph: bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa |

gang ga'i mchog] DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; HeNV: ganggā'i mchog; Hi: ganggā'i mchog; Ph: gang 'ga'i mchog

chos 'di ni] Go: chos 'di la; P: chos 'dis ni

sems pas thob par bya ba ma yin te |] F: sems pas thob par bya bar mi nus so ||; Go: sems pas thob par bya ba ma yin te |; HeHi: sems pas thob par bya ba ma yin te |; P: sems pas thob par bya ba ma yin te |; Pj: sems pas thob par bya ba yin te |

sems pas thob par bya bar mi nus so ||] A: sems pas thob par bya bar mi nus so ||; DdHiPPjPz: sems pas thob par bya bar mi nus so ||; Go: sems pas thob par bya bar mi nus so ||; J: [*±1 space at beginning of line*] sems pas thob par bya bar mi nus ||; Ph: sems pas thob par bya bar mi nus so ||

e)

de ci'i phyir zhe na |] P: de ci'i phyir zhes na |

'di ltar 'di la ni] DkFNNpSTV: 'di ltar 'di ni

sems nyid kyang mi dmigs na |] AGoPh: sems nyid kyang mi dmyigs na |; DdJPPjPz: sems nyid kyang mi dmigs na

rab tu byung ba'i chos lta ga la yod |] GoPh: rab tu byung ba'i chos de lta ga la yod ||; He: rab tu byung ba'i chos de lta ga la yod |; Hi: rab tu byung ba'i chos de lta ga la yod; P: rab tu byung ba'i chos lta ga la yod ||

gang ga'i mchog] DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; HeNV: ganggā'i mchog; Hi: ganggā'i mchog; Ph: gang 'ga'i mchog

sems mi dmigs pa ni] A: sems mi dmyigs pa ni |; F: sems mi dmigs ba ni; GoPh: sems mi dmyigs pa ni

mi khyab pa'i rgyud ces bya'o ||] AGoPh: myi khyab pa'i rgyud ces bya'o ||; Fj: mi khyab pa'i rgyud ces bya'o |

f)

bsam gyis mi khyab pa'i rgyud] AGoPh: bsam gyis myi khyab pa'i rgyud; F: bsam gyis pa'i rgyud;

Hi: bsam gyis khyab pa'i rgyud

gang yin pa] GoT: gang yin ba

de ni thob pa ma yin |] Hi: de ni thob par ma yin |; T: de ni | thob pa ma yin |

mngon par rtogs pa ma yin |] A: mngon par rdzogs pa ma yin |; He: mngon bar rtogs pa ma yin |; NV: mngon par rtog pa ma yin |; T: mngon bar rtogs pa ma yin |

shes pa ma yin |] A: shes pa ma yin

mngon sum du byas pa ma yin te |] A: mngon sum du byas ma yin te |; GoPhT: mngon gsum du byas pa ma yin te |; He: mngon sum du byas ba ma yin te |; P: mngon [*2 spaces*] sum byas pa ma yin te |

de ni thob par] HeHi: de ni thos par

kun nas nyon mongs pa ma yin |] DDdJPPjPz: kun nas nyon mongs pa ma yin; F: kun nas nyon mongs pa mnam min [*probably mnam with s > m*] |

mnam par byang ba ma yin no ||] J: mnam par byang ba ma yin no |; P: mnam par byang pa ma yin no ||; T: mnam par byang ba ma yino ||

g)

gang ga'i mchog] A: gang 'ga'i mchog; DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; Hi: ganggā'i mchog; NV: gangga'i mchog

'di ltar de bzhin gshegs pas ni] P: 'di ltar de bzhin gshegs pas ni |

nam mkha' ltar nges par thugs su chud de |] FTV: namkha' ltar nges par thugs su chud de |; He: nam mkha' ltar nges bar thugs su chud de |; N: namkha' ltar nges par thugs su chud de |

gang ga'i mchog] DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; HeNV: gangga'i mchog; Hi: ganggā'i mchog; Ph: gang 'ga'i mchog

chos thams cad ni] NV: chos thams cad

nam mkha' dang mtshungs pa] A: nam mkha' dang mtshungs pas; FNV: namkha' dang mtshungs pa; Hi: nam mkha' dang tshungs pa; Ph: namkha' dang mtshungs pa; T: namkha' dang mtshungs pa med

pa med

gnyen po med pa'o ||] AGo: gnyen po myed pa'o ||; FJ: gnyen po med pa'o |; Hi: med pa'o ||

§ 9

a)

gsol pa |] AGo: gsold pa |; HeHiT: gsol pa; Ph: gsold pa

gal te] P: gal te |

chos thams cad] Go: chos thams can

nam mkha' dang mtshungs pa] AP: nam mkha' dang mtshungs pa |; FNTV: namkha' dang mtshungs pa

gnyen po ma mchis pa lags na |] DDdJPjPz: gnyen po ma mchis pa lags na; Go: gnyen po ma mchis lags na |; Np: gnyen pos ma mchis pa lags na |; P: gnyen po ma mchis pa lags na ||; S: gnyen po ma mchis pa lags te |

gzugs shes btags pa dang |] DDdPPhjPz: gzugs zhes btags pa dang |; NV: gzugs shes gtags pa dang | tshor ba dang |] A: tshor ba dang

'du byed rnams dang |] ADDdPjPz: 'du byed rnams dang; J: 'du [1 space] byed rnams dang

rnam par shes pa] Ph: rnam par shes par shes pa

zhes btags pa dang |] A: zhes gdags pa dang |; F: zhes btags pa dang

rten cing 'brel par 'byung ba dang |] AGoPh: rtend cing 'brel par 'byung ba dang |; DJPV: rten cing 'brel bar 'byung ba dang |

zag pa dang bcas pa dang |] T: bzag pa dang bcas pa dang |

zag pa ma mchis pa dang |] F: zag pa ma chis pa dang |; He: zag pa ma mchis ba dang |; Ph: ∅

rnam par byang ba dang |] DV: rnam par byed ba dang |; P: rnam par byed pa dang |

mya ngan las 'das pa] F: mya ngan las 'ngas ba

zhes btags pa ji lta bu lags |] GoT: zhes btags pa ci lta bu lags |; He: zhes btags pa ji lta ba lags |; Hi: zhes btags pa ji lta ba lags na |; P: zhes btags pa ji lta bu legs ||

b)

bka' stsal pa |] AGoPh: bka' stsald pa |; P: bka' stsal pa ||

gang ga'i mchog] DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; HeNV: gangga'i mchog; Hi: ganggā'i mchog; Ph: gang 'ga'i mchog

'di lta ste | dper na] ADDdJPjPz: 'di lta ste dper na; FNV: 'di lta ste | dper na |; GoHeHiPPhT: 'di lta ste dper na |

bdag bdag ces 'dogs kyang] F: bdag ces 'dogs kyang; GtHeNpS: bdag bdag ces 'dogs kyang |; Hi: bdag bdag ces 'dogs kyang | [second bdag added small below line]; Ph: bdag gcag ces 'dogs kyang; T: bdag ces 'dogs kyang |

bdag gang yang mi dmigs pa] AGoPh: bdag gang yang myi dmyigs pa; F: bdag gang yang mi dmigs
ba

de bzhin du |] DDdHeJNPPhPzV: de bzhin du; Hi: de bzhin du [*1 space erasure*]

gang ga'i mchog] DDdJPPj: gang gā'i mchog; HeNV: gangga'i mchog; Hi: ganggā'i mchog; Ph: gang
'ga'i mchog

ngas gzugs shes btags te |] DDdJPjPz: ngas gzugs zhes btags te; Go: ngas gzugs zhes btags te |; Hi:
ngas gzugs shes gtags te |; NV: ngas | gzugs shes btags te |

gzugs gang yang mi dmigs so ||] APh: gzugs gang yang myi dmyigs so ||; Go: gzugs gang yang myi
dmyigs so |; Hij: gzugs gang yang mi dmigs so |; T: gzugs gang yang mi dmigso ||

de bzhin du] Hi: de bzhin gshegs du

ngas tshor ba dang |] HeHi: tshor ba dang |

'du byed rnam dang |] NV: 'du byed

rnam par shes pa zhes btags te |] DDdJPjPz: rnam par shes pa zhes btags te; F: rnam par shes pa
zhes btags te ||; NV: rnam par shes pa zhes btags te | rnam par shes pa zhes btags te |; Ph: rnam
par shes pa zhes btags pa te |

rnam par shes pa gang yang mi dmigs so ||] APh: rnam par shes pa gang yang myi dmyigs so ||; Go:
rnam par shes pa gang yang myi dmyigs so |; J: rnam par shes pa gang yang mi dmigs so |; T:
rnam par shes pa gang yang mi dmigso ||

phung po rnam dang |] Go: phung po rnam dang; J: phung po [*1 space*] rnam dang |

skye mched rnam dang |] T: skye mched rnam dang |

rten cing 'brel par 'byung ba dang |] AGoPh: rtend cing 'breld par 'byung ba dang |; DHiPV: rten
cing 'brel bar 'byung ba dang |

zag pa dang bcas pa dang |] Go: zag pa bcas pa dang |

zag pa med pa dang |] AGoPh: zag pa myed pa dang |; F: zag pa med pa'i dang |; P: this and next
three clauses cramped

rnam par byang ba dang |] T: rnam pa byang ba dang |

'khor ba dang |] NPV: 'khor ba dang

zhes bya ba yang ngas btags te |] A: dengs bya ba yang bas btags te |; CzDkGtNpS: zhes bya ba'ang
ngas btags te |; DDdPjPz: zhes bya ba yang ngas btags te; F: zhes bya ba yang ngas btags te |;
J: zhes bya ba yang [*1 space*] ngas btags te; NV: zhes bya bar yang ngas btags te |; P: zhes bya ba
yang ngas btags ste |

mya ngan las 'das pa] F: mya ngan 'das pa

gang yang mi dmigs so ||] AGoPh: gang yang myi dmyigs so ||; J: gang yang mi dmigs so |; T: gang
yang mi dmigso ||

c)

gang ga'i mchog] DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; HeNV: gangga'i mchog; Hi: ganggā'i mchog; Ph: gang
'ga'i mchog

'di lta ste | dper na] AGoHeHiJNPhTV: 'di lta ste dper na |; DDdPjPz: 'di lta ste dper na; P: 'di lta ste |
dper na [*space*]

smig rgyu rnam la ni] APh: smyig rgyu rnam la ni; Go: smyig rgyu la ni

chu yong med de mi dmigs so ||] AGoPh: chu yong myed de myi dmyigs so ||; N: chu yang med de
mi dmigs so ||; HeP: chu yod med de mi dmigs so ||; J: chu yong med de mi dmigs so |; T: chu
yongs med de mi dmigs so ||; V: chu yang med de mi dmigso ||

gang ga'i mchog] DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; HeNV: gangga'i mchog; Hi: ganggā'i mchog; Ph: gang
'ga'i mchog

gzugs shes bya ba btags kyang] DDdPjPz: gzugs zhes bya bar btags kyang; F: gzugs shes bya ba btags kyang |; GoPh: gzugs shes bya bar btags kyang; Hi: gzugs gang yang mi dmigs; NV: gzugs shes bya bar btags kyang |; P: gzugs shes bya ba btags kyang |
 gzugs gang yang mi dmigs so ||] AGoPh: gzugs gang yang myi dmyigs so ||; He: gzugs gang yang mi dmigs gang yang mi dmigs so ||; Hi: gang yang mi dmigs so ||; J: gzugs gang yang mi dmigs so |; T: gzugs gang yang mi dmigso ||
 ngas tshor ba dang |] A: de bzhin du ngas tshor ba dang |
 mam par shes pa zhes bya ba btags kyang] DDdPjPz: mam par shes pa zhes btags kyang; F: mam par shes pa zhes bya ba btags kyang |; GoPh: mam par shes pa zhes bya bar btags kyang; J: mam par shes pa [1 space] zhes bya ba btags kyang; NV: mam par shes pa zhes bya bar btags kyang |; P: mam par shes pa zhes btags kyang |
 shes pa gang yang mi dmigs so ||] AGoPh: shes pa gang yang myi dmyigs so ||; J: shes pa gang yang mi dmigs so |; TV: shes pa gang yang mi dmigso ||
 rten cing 'brel par 'byung ba dang |] A: rtend cing 'brel bar 'byung ba dang |; FP: rten cing 'brel bar 'byung ba dang |; GoPh: rten cing 'brel par 'byung ba dang |; J: rten cing 'brel bar 'byung ba dang |
 zag pa med pa dang |] AGoPh: zag pa myed pa dang |; P: zag pa med pa dang bcas pa dang | zhes bya ba ngas btags kyang |] A: zhes bya ba ngas btags kyang; DDdJpPz: zhes bya bar ngas btags kyang; FNV: zhes bya bar ngas btags kyang |; Hi: zhes bya ba ngas brtags kyang | med cing mi dmigs so ||] APh: myed cing myi dmyigs so ||; Go: kyang myed cing myi dmyigs so ||; J: med cing mi dmigs so |; TV: med cing mi dmigso ||

§10

a)

gang ga'i mchog] DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; HeNV: gangga'i mchog; Hi: ganggā'i mchog; Ph: gang 'ga'i mchog
 gang chos la] FV: gang la; HeHi: gis chos la; P: [in 7 spaces: gang chos la mchog tu, see next]
 mchog tu 'dzin pa med par] AGoPh: mchog tu 'dzind pa myed par; P: [in 7 spaces: gang chos la mchog tu] 'dzin pa med par
 tshangs par spyad pa spyod pa] F: 'tshangs par spyad pa spyod pa; Hi: tshangs bar spyad pa spyod pa; P: tshangs par spyad pa spyod pa |; Ph: tshangs par spyad par spyod pa
 de lta bu] He: lta bu
 legs par gsungs pa'i chos] P: legs par gsungs ba'i chos
 'dul ba la tshangs par spyod pa la gnas pa yin no ||] F: 'dul ba la tshangs par spyod pa la gnas gnas pa yin no ||; HiJ: 'dul ba la tshangs par spyod pa lags pa yin no |; V: 'dul ba la tshangs par spyod pa la gnas pa yino ||

b)

gang ga'i mchog] DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; F: gang ga'i chog; HeNV: gangga'i mchog; Hi: ganggā'i mchog; Ph: gang 'ga'i mchog
 mngon pa'i nga rgyal can] AT: mngon ba'i nga rgyal can
 gnas la dmigs nas] AGoPh: gnas dmyigs nas; DdHeHiJPz: gnas dmigs nas; P: gnas dmigs nas |; T: gnas pa la dmigs nas; NV: gnas la dmigs nas |
 tshangs par spyad pa spyod pa] DJ: tshangs par spyad par spyod pa; NV: tshangs pa spyad pa spyod par
 de dag gi tshangs par spyod pa de ni] F: de ni; GoHeHi: de dag gis tshangs par spyod pa de ni; Ph: de dag gi || tshangs par spyod pa de ni

yongs su ma dag pa'o] F: yongs su ma dag pa 'o |; TV: yongsu ma dag pa'o
zhes nga smra'o ||] J: zhes nga smra'o |; NV: zhes ngas smras so ||; P: zhes da smra'o ||
c)

yongs su ma dag pa de dag ni] Go: de yongs su ma dag pa de dag ni; J: yongs su ma dag pa de dag
ni [1 space]; Ph: yongs su ma dag pa de ni; TV: yongsu ma dag pa de dag ni
rgyud chad pa'i chos] F: chud chad pa'i chos; P: [cramped: rgyud chad] ba'i chos; Ph: rgyun chad
pa'i chos

'di lta bu 'di thos nas] DDdJPjPz: 'di lta bu 'di thos na; F: 'di lta bu 'di thos na |; HeHi: 'di lta bu 'di
thams cad ni |; NV: 'di lta bu 'di thos nas |; P: 'di lta bu 'di thos na |; Ph: lta bu 'di thos nas
sngangs skrag par 'gyur te |] DDdHeHiJPjPz: dngangs skrag par 'gyur te |; NV: bsngangs skrag par
'gyur te |; T: sdangs skrag par 'gyur te |

rga ba dang | na ba dang | 'chi ba dang |] F: rga ba dang na ba dang 'chi ba
mya ngan dang |] Hi: mya ngan las dang |

smre sngags 'don pa dang |] APh: smre sngags 'dond pa dang |; Go: smre bsdags 'dond pa pa dang |
yid mi bde ba dang |] AGoPh: yid myi bde ba dang |; HeHi: yid mi bde ba dang

'khrug pa rnams las] F: 'khrugs pa rnams las; Go: 'khrul pa rnams las

yongs su mi 'grol te |] A: yongs su myi 'grol te |; D: yongs su mi 'grols te |; GoPh: yongs su myi 'grol
te |; Hi: yongs su mi 'gril te |; TV: yongsu mi 'grol te |

de dag ni] N: da dag ni

sdug bsngal gyi skal ba can du 'gyur ro] FHeHi: sdug bsngal gyi skal ba can du 'gyur ro ||; GoP: sdug
bsngal gyi skal pa can du 'gyur ro; N: sdug bsngal gyi bskal pa can du 'gyur ro; Ph: sdug bsngal
gyi bskald pa can tu 'gyur ro ||; V: sdug bsngal gyi bskal pa can du 'gyuro
zhes nga smra'o ||] Hi: zhes nga mi smra'o ||; Ph: zhes nga myi smra'o |

§ 11

a)

gang ga'i mchog] DDdJPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; HeNV: gangga'i mchog; Hi: ganggā'i mchog; Ph: gang
'ga'i mchog

da ltar ram |] ADDdGoJPjPz: da ltar ram

nga 'das pa'i phyi na yang rung ste |] CzDkGtNpS: nga 'das pa'i phyi na'ang rung ste |; Hi: nga 'das
pa'i phyi na yang rung te |; P: ma 'ongs ba'i phyin yang rung ste |; Ph: ngam 'das pa'i phyi na yang
rung ste |

rgyud chad pa] AGoHiPh: rgyun chad pa

'di lta bu'i chos ston pa de dag la |] APh: 'di lta bu'i chos stond pa de dag la; DDdFHeJNPjPzV: 'di
lta bu'i chos ston pa de dag la; Go: 'di lta bu'i chos bstond pa de dag la |; Hi: 'di lta bu chos ston
pa de dag la

mi gti mug pa dag] APh: myi gti mug pa dag; Go: myi gti mug pa dag la; Hi: mig gi mug pa dag

gsod pa po'i 'du shes skyed par 'gyur te |] ACzDkGtNpST: gsod pa'i 'du shes skyed par 'gyur te |; F:
gsod pa pa'i 'du shes skyed par gyur te |; Go: gsod pa po'i 'di 'du shes bskyed par 'gyur te |; NV:
gsod pa'i 'du shes bskyed par 'gyur te |; P: gsod pa po'i 'di shes bskyed par 'gyur te |

de ltar] HeHi: de ltar ni

mi gti mug pa] AGoPh: myi gti mug pa

de dag log par zin pas] FNHeHiPTV: de dag log par zin pas |; Ph: de dag log par zind pas

bsad pa'i zhe sdang bskyed nas |] AFGoPh: gsad pa'i zhe sdang bskyed nas; DDdJPjPzT: bsad pa'i
zhe sdang bskyed nas; Hi: gsad pa'i zhe sdang bskyed nas |; P: gsad pa'i zhe sdang skyed nas |

ngan song du 'gro bar 'gyur ro ||] Ph: ngan song tu 'gro bar 'gyur ro ||; TV: ngan song du 'gro bar 'gyuro ||

§12

a)

gang ga'i mchog] DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; HeNV: gangga'i mchog; Hi: ganggā'i mchog; Ph: gang 'ga'i mchog

gsol pa |] AGo: gsold pa |; HeHi: gsol pa; PT: gsol pa ||; Ph: gsold pa

rgyud chad pa rgyud chad pa zhes bgyi ba] A: rgyud chad pa rgyud chad pa zhes bgyi | ba; Go: rgyun chad par rgyud chan pa zhes bgyi ba; He: rgyud chad pa zhes bgyi ba; Hi: rgyun chad pa zhes bgyi ba; NV: rgyud chad pa rgyud chad pa zhes bgyi ba |; P: rgyud chad pa rgyud chad pa zhes bgyi ba'i [see next]; Ph: rgyun chad pa rgyun chad pa zhes bgyi ba; T: rgyum chad pa rgyud chad pa zhes bgyi ba

ci'i slad du na] DDdGoHeJPz: ci'i slad du; F: bci'i slad du na; P: slad du; Ph: ci'i slad tu; T: ci'i sladu na

rgyud chad pa zhes bgyi |] F: rgyu chad pa zhe bgyi |; Go: rgyun chad pa bgyid ||; HiPh: rgyun chad pa zhes bgyi|; P: rgyud chad pa zhes bgyi ||; T: rgyud [*originally written* rgyun] chad pa zhes bgyi |

b)

bka' stsal pa |] AGoPh: bka' stsal pa |; FP: bka' stsal pa ||

gang ga'i mchog] DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; HeNV: gangga'i mchog; Hi: ganggā'i mchog; P: gang 'ga'i mchog [*space*]; Ph: gang 'ga'i mchog

chos 'di ni rgyud bcad pa 'am |] ADJPjPz: chos 'di ni rgyud gcad pa 'am |; Go: chos 'di ni rgyun bcad pa dang |; He: chos 'di ni rgyun gcad pa 'am |; Hi: 'di ni rgyun gcad pa 'am |; Ph: chos 'di ni rgyun bcad pa 'am |

dbye ba 'am |] Ph: dbye' ba 'am |

c)

rgyud chad pa zhes bya ste |] CzDkS: nga 'das pa'i phyi na'ang rung ste |; GoPh: rgyun chad pa zhes bya ste |; GtNpST: rgyud bcad pa zhes bya ste |; He: rgyun chad pa zhes bya ste |

'di ni yang dag pa'i mtha' zhes bya |] Go: 'di ni yang dag pa' mtha' zhes bya |; P: 'di ni yang dag pa' mtha' zhes bya ||; Ph: 'di ni yang dag pa'i mtha' zhes bya'o ||

mi khyab pa'i rgyud ces bya'o ||] AGoPh: myi khyab pa'i rgyud ces bya'o ||; He: mi khyab pa'i rgyun ces bya'o ||; J: mi khyab pa'i rgyud ces bya'o |; T: mi khyam [*corrected*] pa'i rgyud ces bya'o ||

§13

a)

bcom ldan 'das kyis] F: bcom ldan 'das kyis

de'i tshe] NV: Ø

'dzum pa mdzad do ||] A: 'dzum ba mdzad do ||; F: mdzum ba mdzad do |; GoP: mdzum pa mdzad do ||; T: 'dzum pa mdzad do ||

b)

bcom ldan 'das kyis zhal gyi sgo nas] F: bcom ldan 'das kyis zhal gyi sgo nas; P: bcom ldan 'das kyis zhal gyi sgo nas |; NV: bcom ldan 'das kyis zhal gyi sgo nas |

'od zer kha dog sna tshogs] AGoPh: 'od zer kha dog sna tshogs |; F: 'od zer kha dog sna tshogs ||; HeHi: 'od gzer kha dog sna tshogs; P: 'od [*space*] zer kha dog sna tshogs |; T: 'od zer kha dog du [*originally: sna*] ma sna tshogs dang |

kha dog du ma 'di lta ste |] F: kha dog du ma 'di lta ste ||; P: kha dog du ma 'di lta ste
dkar po dang |] F: ∅

lta bu dag byung nas |] ADDdJPjPz: lta bu dag byung nas; CzDkFGtNpSTV: lta bu dag kyang byung
nas |

'jig rten gyi khams] Ph: 'jig rtend gyi khams

mtha' yas mu med pa dag] AGoPh: mtha' yas mu myed pa dag; Hi: mtha' yang mu med pa dag; Np:

[6 spaces with *tshegs*] mtha' yas mu med pa dag; T: mtha' yas mu med pa dag *kyang*

snang bar byas te |] DDdJPjPz: snag bar byas te

khyab par byas nas |] DDdJPhPjPz: khyab par byas nas

tshangs pa'i 'jig rten gyi bar du] P: tshangs pa'i 'jig rten du bar du; Ph: tshangs pa'i 'jig rtend gyi bar
du

mngon bar byung ste |] DDdHiJPjPz: mngon par byung ste; CzGtNPSV: mngon par byung ste |

slar log nas] F: slar logs nas |; GoPh: slar log nas |; T: slar logs nas

bcom ldan 'das kyi zhal gyi sgor nub bo ||] AV: bcom ldan 'das kyi zhal gyi sgor nub po ||; F: bcom
ldan 'das gyi sgor nub bo ||

§14

a)

tshe dang ldan pa kun dga' bos] A: tshe dang ldan ba kun dga' bos; FT: tshe dang ldan pa kun dga'
bos |; Hi: tshe dang ldan pa [pa *small below line*] bkun dga' bos

phrag pa gcig tu gzar te |] AFHeHiNTV: phrag pa gcig tu bzar te |; DDdJPjPz: phrag pa gcig tu gzar
te; Go: phrag pa gcig tu gzard te |; P: [*space*] phrag pa gcig du gzar ste ||

pus mo] F: pus [*new line, 4 spaces*] mo; P: bus mo

btsugs nas |] DDdGoJPhPjPz: btsugs nas

de logs su] Pj: [*1 space*] de logs su; TV: de logsu

sbyar ba btud de |] DDdJPjPz: sbyar ba btud de; GoPh: sbyard pa btud de |; NV: sbyar ba btud te |;
P: sbyar ba btud de ||

'di skad ces gsol to ||] AGoPh: 'di skad ces gsold to ||; F: 'di skad ces gsol to |; Hi: 'di skad da ces gsol
to ||

b)

bcom ldan 'das] F: bcom [*new line 3 spaces*] ldan 'das

de bzhin gshegs pa rnams ni] P: de bzhin gshegs pa rnams ni |

rgyu ma mchis par] He: *between mchis and par, below the line in another hand is added* rkyen ma
mchis

'dzum pa mi mdzad na |] APh: 'dzum ba myi mdzad na |; DDdJPjPz: 'dzum pa mi mdzad na; F:
'dzum pa mi mdzod na |; Go: 'dzum pa myi mdzad na |; Hi: 'dzum pa 'dzad na |; NV: 'dzum par
mi mdzad na |; P: mdzum pa mi mdzad na |; T: 'dzum ba mi mdzad na |

'dzum pa mdzad pa'i rgyu gang lags |] A: 'dzum ba mdzad pa'i rgyu gang lags |; DDdJPhPjPz: 'dzum
pa mdzad pa'i rgyu gang lags; FGoP: mdzum pa mdzad pa'i rgyu gang lags |; NV: 'dzum par mdzad
pa'i rgyu gang lags |

rkyen gang lags |] AGoPh: rkyend gang lags |

c)

bka' stsal pa |] APh: bka' stsald pa |; Go: bka' stsald pa; P: bka' stsal ba ||

kun dga' bo] Dd: kun dga' bo [*1 space, evident erasure, probably sa*]; Hi: kun dga' bos

mngon par shes te |] AFT: mngon bar shes te |; P: mngon par shes te |

stong gis] NV: stong gis |
 gang ga'i mchog] DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; NV: gangga'i mchog; Hi: ganggā'i mchog; Ph: gang
 'ga'i mchog
 ces bya ba] F: ces bya ba'i
 kho na'i dge bsnyen ma] F: kho na'i dge snyen ma; Ph: kho na'i dge snyend ma
 sha stag las brtsams te |] CzDkGtNpTS: sha stag las btsams te; F: sha stag las btsams te |; NV: sha
 stag la brtsams te |
 chos kyi nram grangs] S: chos kyi nram grang
 'di bshad do ||] FHi: 'di bshad do |; Ph: 'di bshad de |
 d)
 dge bsnyen ma] Ph: dge snyend ma
 rab tu byung nas |] ADDdFHeHiJPz: rab tu byung nas; T: rab tu byung ta nas |
 phung po lhag ma med pa'i mya ngan las 'das pa'i dbyings su] AGoPh: phung po myed pa'i mya
 ngan las 'das pa'i dbyings su; CzDDkGtHeJNpPPzST: phung po med pa'i mya ngan las 'das pa'i
 dbyings su; Dd: phung po [*3 letter space with evident erasure*] med pa'i mya ngan las 'das pa'i
 dbyings su; F: phung po med pa'i mya ngan las 'das pa'i dbyingsu; Hi: phung po med pa'i mya
 ngan las 'das pa'i dbyings su |; Pj: phung po [*added below line in a similar hand: lhag ma*] med
 pa'i mya ngan las 'das pa'i dbyings su
 yongs su mya ngan las 'das so ||] F: yongsu mya ngan las 'das so |; TV: yongsu mya ngan las
 'daso ||

§15

a)

bcom ldan 'das la] CzDkGtNpS: bcom ldan 'das la |; F: bcom ldan 'das la
 tshe dang ldan pa] A: tshe dang ldan ba; T: tshe dang ldan 'das ba
 ces gsol to ||] AGoPh: ces gsold to ||
 'di'i ming ci lags |] AGoPh: 'di'i mying ci lags |
 'di ji ltar bzung bar bgyi |] CzDkFGtHeHiS: 'di ji ltar gzung bar bgyi |; DDdJPjPz: ji ltar gzung bar
 bgyi |; GoPh: 'di ji ltar bzung par bgyi |; P: 'di 'ji ltar bzung bar bgyi ||; T: 'di ci ltar bzung bar
 bgyi |
 b)
 bka' stsal pa |] AGoPh: bka' stsal pa |; F: bka' tsal pa |; P: bka' stsal pa ||
 kun dga' bo] Hi: kun dga' bos
 chos kyi nram grangs 'di ni] CzDDkGtNpST: chos kyi nram grangs 'di; Hi: chos kyi nram grangs
 'di ni |; N: chos kyi nram grangs 'di'i ming ni; Ph: chos kyi nram grangs | 'di ni; V: chos kyi nram
 grangs 'di'i ni
 dri ma med pa zhes bya ste |] AGoPh: dri ma myed pa zhes bya ste |; F: dri [looks corrected from
 'di 'dri] ma med pa zhes bya ste ||; HeHi: dri ba zhes bya ste |; P: dri ma med pa zhes bya ste ||
 'di dri ma med pa] AGo: 'di dri ma myed pa; HeHiNV: 'di ni dri ma med pa; Ph: 'di ni dri ma myed
 pa
 zhes bya bar zung shig |] A: zhes bya bar zung shig ||; CzDkGtNpPjS: zhes bya bar zung zhig |;
 He(ac): zhes bya bar zung shig |, (pc): zhes bya bar bzung shig |; P: zhes bya bar bzung shig |; Ph:
 zhes bya bar zung shig ||

§16

a)

'di bstan pa na |] AGo: 'di bstand pa |; CzDDdDkGtJNpPjPzST: 'di bstan pa na; F: 'di bstan pa na ||
 Ph: 'di bstand pa na |
 bzhi brgya len pa med par zag pa rnams las] AGoPh: bzhi brgya lend pa myed pas zag pa rnams;
 HeHi: bzhi brgya len pa med pas zag pa rnams las; P: bzhi brgya len pa med pa [*space*] las |; V:
 bzhi brgya len pa med pa zag pa rnams las
 sems rnam par grol lo ||] F: sems rnam par grol bo ||; Hi: sems rnams par grol lo ||

b)

'dod pa na spyod pa dang |] Dk: *from* de nas *until the second* spyod pa *written small in ten spaces,*
but erasure is evident; F: 'dod pa na spyod pa dang ||; P: 'dod pa spyod pa dang |
 gzugs na spyod pa'i lha'i bu rnams kyis] Go: gzugs kyi spyod pa'i lha'i bu rnams kyis; PPh: gzugs na
 spyod pa'i lha'i bu rnams kyis |; T: *from* bu *until* 'di skad ces *written in another hand on a piece of*
paper pasted over the original: gzugs na spyod pa'i lha'i bu kyis [*continuing* lha'i me tog rnams
 dang |, *as in the next lemma*]
 lha'i me tog rnams dang |] Go: lha'i mye tog rnams dang |
 tsan dan gyi phye ma rnams] Go: tsan dan gyi phye mas rnams; T: tsan dan gyis phye ma rnams
 mngon par sprul te |] AGoPh: mngon par spruld te |; F: mngon par sprul te ||
 bcom ldan 'das la] P: bcom ldan 'das ma
 gtord nas] A: gtord nas; FHeHiP: gtord nas |; Ph: gtord nas |

c)

tshig 'di skad ces] F: tshigs 'di skad ces; PNV: tshig 'di skad ces |
 'di ltar grong khyer mnyan yod na |] CzDDdDkGoGtJNpPjPz: 'di ltar grong khyer mnyan yod na; N:
 'di ltar grong khyer mnyan [*space*] yod na |; Ph: 'di ltar grong khyer gnyan yod na |
 dge bsnyen ma] He: dge snyen ma
 'di lta bu gnas la |] DDdJPjPz: 'di lta bu gnas la; Go: 'di lta bu gnas pa la |; Hi: 'di lta bu gnas pa
 la |
 de de bzhin gshegs pa dang] A: de de bzhin gshegs pa; P: de de bzhin gshegs pa dang |; Ph: de bzhin
 gshegs pa dang
 lhan cig smra yang |] AFHeHiPh: lhan cig smra yang; DDdJPjPz: lhan cig tu smra yang; DkGtS: lhan
 cig smra'ang |; Go: lhan gcig smra yang; P: lhan [*cramped*: gcig] tu smra yang |; T: lhan cig smra
 dang |
 de'i lus ngal bar yang] P: de'i lus ngal bar
 mi 'gyur ba dang |] AGoPh: myi 'gyur ba dang |; P: mi 'gyur ba dang [*space*]

d)

ji ltar yang] F: ci ltar yang; GtS: ji ltar; P: ji [*cramped*: ltar yang]; T: ci ltar
 gang ga'i mchog] DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog; NTV: gangga'i mchog; Hi: ganggā'i mchog; Ph: gang
 'ga'i mchog
 'di sngon gyi rgyal ba la] Go: 'di ni sngon gyi rgyal ba dag la
 lhag par bya ba byas shing |] A: lhag par bya ba byas [*2 spaces*]; CzDDdDkGtHeHiJNpPjPzT: lhag
 par bya ba byas shing
 bskyed pa dang |] GoPh: skyed pa dang |
 dge ba spyad pa dang |] A: dge ba'i rtsa ba spyad pa dang |; DF: dge ba spyad pa dang ||; Go: dge' ba
 spyod pa dang |; Hi: dge ba spyang pa dang ||
 tshangs par spyad pa dang |] AGoPh: tshangs par spyod pa dang |

bsnyen bkur byas pa] A: bsnyend bkur byas pa; HeHi: bsnyen bkur byas pa |; Ph: dsnyen [*sic!*] bkur byas pa
 'di ni ngo mtshar to] A: 'di ni ngo mtshard to |; F: 'di ni ngo mtshar to |; GoPh: 'di ni ngo mtshard to; P: 'di ni ngo mtshar to ||
 zhes smras so ||] J: zhes smras so |; T: zhes smraso ||
 e)
 bka' stsal pa |] AGoPh: bka' stsald pa |; V: [*4 space erasure, filled with tshags*] bka' stsal pa |
 lha'i bu dag] A: lha'i bu
 de de bzhin te |] F: de de bzhin no ||; Go: de bzhin te |
 lhag par bya ba byas pa |] F: lhag par bya ba byas pas; N: lhag par bya bar byas pas; T: lhag par bya ba byas pas |; V: lhag par bya bar byas pas |
 dge ba'i rtsa ba bskyed pa |] HeHi: ∅; Ph: dge ba'i rtsa ba skyed pa
 yun ring du] F: yun ning du; NV: yun ring po
 tshangs par spyad pa la gnas pa'o ||] D: tshang par spyad pa la gnas pa'o ||; F: tshangs par spyad pa la gnas pa'o ||; GtST: tshangs par spyod pa la gnas pa'o ||; HeHi: tshangs par spyad pa | yun ring du tshangs par spyad pa la gnas pa'o ||; J: tshangs par spyad pa [*1 space*] la gnas pa'o |

§17

a)

de skad ces bka' stsal nas |] AGoPh: de skad ces bka' stsald nas |; P: de skad ces bka' stsal nas ||
 gang ga'i mchog dang |] DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog dang |; F: gang ga'i mchog dang; HeNV: gangga'i mchog dang |; Hi: ganggā'i mchog; Ph: gang 'ga'i chog dang |
 lha dang] CzDDdDkGoGtJNpPhPjPzS: lha dang |
 mi dang |] DFPj: mi dang; GoPh: myi dang |
 lha ma yin dang |] Go: lha ma yin dang
 dri zar bcas pa'i 'jig rten] F: dri zar bcas pa'i yid ga [yi-da-ga] rten; Ph: dri zar bcas pa'i 'jig rtend
 yid rangs te |] CzDDdDkGtHeJNNpPjPzST: yi rangs te |; F: yid rangs te |
 mngon par bstod do ||] AGo: mngon bar bstod do ||; FPPh: mngon par stod do ||

§18

a)

'phags pa] FN: || 'phags pa; P: || ∞ || 'phags pa; Ph: phags pa
 dkon mchog brtsegs pa] He: dkon mchog rtsegs pa; Hi: dkon mchog [*mchog added below line*] rtsegs pa
 mam grangs le'u] CzDDkGtNNpSTV: mam grangs
 stong phrag brgya pa las |] DdJpPzT: stong phrag brgya pa las; F: stong phrag brgya pa las ||; P: stong phrag rgya pa las |
 b)
 gang ga'i mchog gis] CzDkGtNpST: 'phags pa gang ga'i mchog gis; DDdJPPjPz: gang gā'i mchog gis; Hi: ganggā'i mchog gis; N: 'phags pa gangga'i mchog gis; Ph: gang 'ga'i mchog gis; V: [*from here rewritten very small*] gangga'i mchog gis
 zhus pa'i le'u] GoPh: zhus pa [*see next*];
 zhes bya ste |] DJNPjPz: zhes bya ste; Dd: zhes bya [*1 space erasure*] ste; FHeHi: zhes bya ste ||; GoPh: zhes bya pa'i le'u ste ||

c)

sum cu rtsa gcig pa] A: sum bcu rtsa gcig pa; CzDkGtNNpV: 'dus pa sum cu rtsa gcig pa; GoJPh:
 gsum bcu rtsa gcig pa; P: sum bcu rtsa gcig pa |; ST: 'dus pa sum cu rtsa gcig pa;
 rdzogs so ||] AF: rdzogs s.ho ||; GoPPhT: rdzogs s.ho || ||; HeHi: rzdogs s.hyo || ||; S: rdzogs so || ||

§19

FGo: ∅

a)

Ph: ∅

rgya gar gyi mkhan po] ADVN: || rgya gar gyi mkhan po; P: || || rgya gar gyi mkhan po [*space*]
 dzi na mi tra dang |] A: 'dzi na myi tra dang |; Hi: 'dzi na mi tra dang |; J: [*r space*] dzi na mi tra
 dang |

dā na shī la dang |] A: da na shi la dang |; CzHeHi: dā na shi la dang |; NV: da na shī la dang |

zhu chen gyi lo tstsha ba] A: zhu cen gyi lo tsa ba; DkGtHeNpS: zhu chen gyi lo tsa ba; NV: zhu
 chen gyi lo tstsha ba |

ban de ye shes sdes bsgyur cing zhus te |] A: ban de ye shes sdes bsgyurd cing zhus te |; DDdJPz:
 ban de ye shes sde la sogs pas bsgyur cing zhus te; Hi: ban d.he ye shes sdes bsgyur cing zhus
 te |; P: ban de ye shes sdes [*cramped through* phab pa] la sogs pa'i bsgyur cing zhus te; S: bande
 ye shes sdes bsgyur cing zhus te |

b)

Ph: ∅

skad gsar bcad kyis kyang] A: skad gsar cad kyis kyang; DDdJNPjPzV: skad gsar chad kyis kyang; P:
 skad gser chad kyis kyang

bcos nas gtan la phab pa ||] A: bcos nas | gtan la phab pa ||; HeHi: bcos te gtan la phab pa ||; P: bcos
 nas | gtan la phab pa || ||; GtS: bcos nas gtan la phab pa |

c)

shu lo ka brgya dang bcu'o ||] ADDdHeHiJPPjPz: ∅; CzDkGtNpS: shlau ka brgya dang bcu'o ||; Ph:
 shu log brgyad bcu ||

5 Indices

In principle in these indices only the first reference is given for each citation, even if the terms occur multiple times.

1 Chinese–Tibetan Index

- 一切, thams cad, 6a
 一切諸法, chos thams cad, 8g
 一時, dus gcig na, 1a
 一面, phyogs gcig du, 1c
 七百, bdun brgya', 16a
 上至, bar du mngon bar byung, 13b
 上首, gtso bor gyur, 14c
 不可得, dmyigs par myi 'gyur, 7d
 不可得, dmyigs su myed, 8b
 不可得, dmyigs par myi 'gyur, 8e
 不往, 'gro bar myi 'gyur, 4a
 不思議界, bsam gyis myi khyab pa'i dbyings, 12b
 不思議處, bsam gyis myi khyab pa'i gnas, 8e
 不生, skyes bar myi 'gyur, 4a
 不見... 異, tha myi dad par mthong ba, 4c
 不證, mngon du myi byed, 4a
 乃, gdod, 10a
 乃至, bar du, 4c
 乾闥婆, dri zar, 17a
 事, dngos po, 14a
 云何, ci ltar, 2d, 8a
 云何, ci'i slad du, 3c
 亦復, kyang, 4d
 亦復, yang, 8b
 亦無, yang myed, 2d
 人, myi, 17a
 以何, gang gi slad du, 14a
 以有, mnga' ba'i slad du, 7b
 但, 'on kyang, 7c
 住, gnas pa, 10b
 何以故, de ci'i phyir zhe na, 7d
 何況, lta smos kyang ci dgos, 8e
 佛, bcom ldan 'das, *passim*
 作如是言, 'di skad du ... zhes ched du brjod, pa ched du brjod par gyur, 16b
 來, 'ongs, 2a
 供養, rim 'gro dang mchod pa byas, 16d
 修, mngon bar bsgrub pa, 10a
 偏, bzar, 14a
 優婆夷, dge bsnyen ma, 14c
 光, 'od zer kha dog, 13b
 光, gsal bar byas, 13b
 共相訓對, phan tshun lan 'debs, 16c
 熙怡微笑, dzum ba mdzad, 13a
 出家, khyim nas khyim myed par rab du byung ba, 14d
 化, sprul pa, 3a
 化人, sprul pa'i skyes bu, 2c, 2d, 6b
 化作, mngon bar sprul, 16b
 十二因緣, rten cing 'brel par 'byung ba bcu gnyis, 9a
 千, stong, 14c
 即, de nyid ni, 6c
 又, yang, 3a
 又, gzhan yang, 9c
 受, tshor ba, 9a
 受持, gzung bar bgyi, 15a
 右, g.yas pa, 14a
 各各, kun du yang so so nas, 14c
 合掌, logs su thal mo sbyar, 14a
 同, mtshungs pa, 5d
 名字, mying, 7d
 告曰, bka' stsal pa, 4a
 問, rmas pa, 2a
 問, 'dri, 5b
 問, mas par gyur, 5b
 問, rmas pa, 7c
 問言, bka' stsal lags, 3c
 善女人, rigs kyī bu mo, 7c
 善惡趣, bde 'gro dang ngan 'gro, 4b
 善根, dge ba'i rtsa ba, 8a
 善男子, rigs kyī bu, 7c
 四百, bzhi brgya, 16a
 因緣, rgyu dang rkyen, 11a
 國界, 'jig rten gyi khams, 13b

- 地, sa, 14a
 地獄, sems can dmyal ba, 11a
 增上慢人, mngon ba'i nga rgyal can, 10c
 增上慢者, mngon ba'i nga rgyal can, 10b
 墮, ltung ba, 11a
 大...疑, the tsoṃ chen po, 10c
 大歡喜, rab du dga' ba, 17a
 大眾, 'khor 'dus pa, 14d
 大驚, shiñ du skrag pa, 10c
 天, lha, 17a
 天上, mtho ris, 4a
 天子, lha'i bu, 16b
 天諸妙花, lha'i me tog gya nom ba, 16b
 如來, de bzhin gshegs pa, 7b
 如來頂, de bzhin gshegs pa'i dbu'i gtsug, 13b
 如是, de de bzhin, 3b
 如是, de ltar, 8a
 如是, de lta bu, 10c
 害心, gnod sems, 11a
 實, yang dag par, 9b
 實際, yang dag pa'i mtha', 12b
 尊者, tshe dang ldan ba, 14a
 尚, kyang, 8e
 已曾, sngon, 16d
 常, rtag tu, 8g
 幻化, sgyu ma dang sprul pa, 4b
 幻化人, sprul pa'i skyes bu, 4a
 座, stan, 14a
 彼諸, de dag, 7d
 往, mams su 'gro, 4c
 往來, phan tshun 'gro zhing 'ong ba, 2d
 後, 'og du, 11a
 得滅度, yongs su mya ngan las 'da's par gyur,
 14d
 得無所畏, myi 'jigs pa thob par gyur ba, 16c
 從何, gang nas, 2a
 從其住處, de gnas nas, 1c
 復次, gzhan yang, 4d
 微笑, 'dzum ba ... mdzad, 14a
 心, sems, 8e
 心所生法, sems las byung ba'i chos, 8e
 心自念, 'di snyam du, 14a
 念往, mngon bar dran, 14c
 思惟, bsam ba, 8d
 性, ngo bo nyid, 4d
 悲, smre sngags 'don pa, 10c
 惡見, lta ba ngan pa, 11a
 惡趣, ngan song, 4a
 惱, 'khrug pa, 10c
 想, 'du shes, 9a
 愚癡輩, blun po kha cig, 11a
 憂, mya ngan, 10c
 應, dgra bcom ba, 14a
 應可成熟, yongs su smyin par bya ba, 7c
 成熟, yongs su smyin pa, 7c
 我, bdag, 4b
 我, nga, 10c
 我法, nga 'i bstan pa, 10a
 我相, bdag gi mtshan nyid, 9b
 所能及, 'thob par 'gyur ba, 8d
 所能及, shes par 'gyur ba, 8d
 所說, skad smras pa, 3b
 所說, zhes bka' stsal pa, 8c
 攀緣, dmyigs pa, 7a
 放, bkye ba, 13b
 故, phyir, 7c
 散...上, mngon bar gtor, 16b
 斯, 'di, 7c
 斷, gcod pa, 11a
 明, ston par mdzad, 8c
 昔, sngon 'da's pa'i dus su, 14c
 是即, de nyid, 8e
 是故, de'i phyir, 12c
 時, de'i tshe, 1b
 時, tshe, 8b
 普照, kun khyab par, 13b
 曰, rmas par gyur, 6b
 會, 'khor, 7c
 有所得, dmyigs pa yod pa, 10b
 有漏, zag pa dang bcas pa, 9a
 染, kun nas nyon mongs pa, 9a
 梵世, tshangs pa'i 'jig rten, 13b
 梵行, tshangs par spyod pa, 10a
 欲界, 'dod pa'i khams, 16b
 正等覺, yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas,
 14a
 此, 'di, 7c
 死, 'chi ba, 10c
 比丘尼衆, dge slong ma, 16a
 比丘衆, dge slong, 16a

- 水, chu, 9c
 永盡, gtan zad, 16a
 汝, khyod, 2a, 3b
 沮壞, gzhiḡ, 12b
 法, chos, 3a
 法師, chos 'chad pa'i gang zag dag, 11a
 流轉, 'khor ba'i rgyun, 11a
 涅槃, mya ngan las 'das pa, 4a
 涅槃界, mya ngan las 'da's pa'i dbyings, 5a
 深, zab mo, 10c
 滅, yongs su mya ngan las 'da's pa, 11a
 漏, zag pa, 16a
 無 ... 可得, myi dmyigs pa, 9c
 無得, thob pa yang myed, 8f
 無心, sems myed pa, 8b
 無心, sems ma mchis pa, 8c
 無所得, dmyigs su myed pa, 10a
 無攀緣, dmyigs pa yod pa ma yin, 7c
 無有, myed, 2d
 無有 ... 可得, myi dmyigs pa, 9b
 無漏, zag pa ma mchis pa, 9a
 無生者, skye ba ma mchis pa, 5b
 無生者, skye ba myed pa, 5c
 無證, mngon bar rtogs pa yang myed, 8f
 無量, tshad myed pa snyed, 13b, 16d
 無餘涅槃, lhag ma byed pa'i mya ngan las
 'da's pa, 14d
 然, mod kyi, 7c
 爲 ... 故, ched du, 8a
 爾, de bzhin, 4a
 爾時, de nas, 14a
 猶, yang, 7d
 猶如, mtshungs, 8g
 甚深, zab mo, 11a
 甚爲希有, shin du ngo mtshar che, 16c
 生, skye bar 'gyur ba, 10c
 生, skye ba, 10c
 生, skyed pa, 11a
 生死, 'khor ba, 9a
 生滅, skyed ba dang | 'gag pa, 2d
 由 ... 故, dbang gis, 11a
 界, khams, 9a
 界, dbyings, 12b
 畢竟, nam yang, 4d
 異, tha dad pa, 4b
 病, na ba, 10c
 發斯問, 'dri ba 'di dris pa, 7c
 白言, gsol pa, 4b
 皆, thams cad, 3a
 相, mtshan nyid, 9b
 眞, yang dag par, 10a
 瞋, zhe sdang, 11a
 種, bskyed pa, 16d
 種種, rnam pa sna tshogs, 13b
 積集, stsogs par bgyid, 8a
 積集之時, bstags pa nyid kyi tshe, 8b
 積集時, bstags pa ma yin ba'i tshe, 8b
 穿鑿, dbug, 12b
 答, lan 'debs pa, 2c, 5b
 紅, leb rgan, 13b
 經, chos kyi rnam grangs, 15a
 罣礙, thogs pa, 8g
 義, don, 8c
 老, rga ba, 10c
 而, kyang, 9b
 聞, thos, 10c
 肩, phrag pa, 14a
 膝, phus mo ... lha nga, 14a
 致斯問, bka's rmas pa 'di rmas lags, 7b
 舍衛國, mnyan yod, 1a
 色, gzugs, 9a
 若, gal te, 2c
 苦, sdug bsngal ba, 10c
 菩提, byang cub, 8a
 菩薩, byang cub sems dpa', 8b
 著, btsugs, 14a
 處, skye mched, 9a
 虛空, nam mkha', 8g
 衆會, 'khor 'dus pa, 14c
 行, 'du byed, 9a
 袒, bla go, 14a
 見, mthong, 4b
 見, yang dag par rjes su mthong, 10a
 親近, bsnyen bkur, 16d
 觀, mthong, 4d
 解脫, rnam par grol ba, 10c
 解脫, rnam par grol ba thob par gyur, 16a
 言, gsol pa, 8a
 言說, tshig gis brjod pa, 9b
 說, bshad pa, 2d

說, bstan, 10c
 說名, zhes bya, 10a
 諸, rnams su 'gro, 8b
 諸, rnams su, *passim*
 證, mngon du brgyid pa, 4b
 識, rnām par shes pa, 9a
 譬如, 'di lta ste dper na, 6b
 赤, dmar po, 13b
 起, lang, 14a
 趣, gzhol ba, 5a
 足, zhabs, 1c
 身, lus, 4b
 退坐, 'dug, 1c

阿修羅, lha ma yin, 17a
 阿難, kun dga' bo, 14a
 陽焰, smyug rgyu, 9c
 離垢清淨, dri ma myed pa'i rnām par dag pa,
 15b
 青, sngon po, 13b
 非, ma yin, 8d
 非染, kun nas nyon mos pa yang ma yin, 8f.
 非淨, rnām par byang ba yang ma yin, 8f.
 面門, zhal gyi sgo, 13b
 頂禮, mgo bos phyag byas, 1c
 頗梨, chu shel, 13b
 黃, gser po, 13b,

II *Tibetan-Chinese Index*

- kun khyab par, 普照, 13b
 kun dga' bo, 阿難, 14a
 kun du yang so so nas, 各各, 14c
 kun nas nyon mongs pa, 染, 9a
 kun nas nyon mos pa yang ma yin, 非染, 8f
 kyang, 亦復, 4d
 kyang, 尚, 8e
 kyang, 而, 9b
 bka' stsal pa, 告曰, 4a
 bka' stsal lags, 問言, 3c
 bka's rmas pa 'di rmas lags, 致斯問, 7b
 bkya ba, 放, 13b
 skad smras pa, 所說, 3b
 skye mched, 處, 9a
 skye ba, 生, 10c
 skye ba ma mchis pa, 無生者, 5b
 skye ba myed pa, 無生者, 5c
 skye bar 'gyur ba, 生, 10c
 skyed pa, 生, 11a
 skyed ba dang | 'gag pa, 生滅, 2d
 skyes bar myi 'gyur, 不生, 4a
 bskyed pa, 種, 16d
 khams, 界, 9a
 khyim nas khyim myed par rab du byung ba,
 出家, 14d
 khyod, 汝, 2a, 3b
 'khor, 會, 7c
 'khor 'dus pa, 衆會, 14c
 'khor 'dus pa, 大衆, 14d
 'khor ba, 生死, 9a
 'khor ba'i rgyun, 流轉, 11a
 'khrug pa, 惱, 10c
 gang gi slad du, 以何, 14a
 gang nas, 從何, 2a
 gal te, 若, 2c
 dge bsnyen ma, 優婆夷, 14c
 dge ba'i rtsa ba, 善根, 8a
 dge slong, 比丘衆, 16a
 dge slong ma, 比丘尼衆, 16a
 dgra bcom ba, 應, 14a
 mgo bos phyag byas, 頂禮, 1c
 'gro bar myi 'gyur, 不往, 4a
 rga ba, 老, 10c
 rgyu dang rkyen, 因緣, 11a
 sgyu ma dang sprul pa, 幻化, 4b
 nga, 我, 10c
 nga 'i bstan pa, 我法, 10a
 ngan song, 惡趣, 4a
 ngo bo nyid, 性, 4d
 dngos po, 事, 14a
 mnga' ba'i slad du, 以有, 7b
 mngon du brgyid pa, 證, 4b
 mngon du myi byed, 不證, 4a
 mngon ba'i nga rgyal can, 增上慢者, 10b
 mngon ba'i nga rgyal can, 增上慢人, 10c
 mngon bar bsgrub pa, 修, 10a
 mngon bar gtor, 散 ... 上, 16b
 mngon bar rtogs pa yang myed, 無證, 8f
 mngon bar dran, 念往, 14c
 mngon bar sprul, 化作, 16b
 sngon, 已曾, 16d
 sngon 'da's pa'i dus su, 昔, 14c
 sngon po, 青, 13b
 ci ltar, 云何, 2d, 8a
 ci'i slad du, 云何, 3c
 gcod pa, 斷, 11a
 bcom ldan 'das, 佛, *passim*
 chu, 水, 9c
 chu shel, 頗梨, 13b
 ched du, 爲 ... 故, 8a
 chos, 法, 3a
 chos kyī rnam grangs, 經, 15a
 chos 'chad pa'i gang zag dag, 法師, 11a
 chos thams cad, 一切諸法, 8g
 'chi ba, 死, 10c
 'jig rten gyi khams, 國界, 13b
 mnyan yod, 舍衛國, 1a
 bsnyen bkur, 親近, 16d
 gtan zad, 永盡, 16a
 rtag tu, 常, 8g
 rten cing 'brel par 'byung ba bcu gnyis, 十二
 因緣, 9a
 lta ba ngan pa, 惡見, 11a
 lta smos kyang ci dgos, 何況, 8e
 ltung ba, 墮, 11a
 stan, 座, 14a

stong, 千, 14c
 ston par mdzad, 明, 8c
 bstan, 說, 10c
 tha dad pa, 異, 4b
 tha myi dad par mthong ba, 不見 ... 異, 4c
 thams cad, 皆, 3a
 thams cad, 一切, 6a
 the tsom chen po, 大 ... 疑, 10c
 thogs pa, 罣礙, 8g
 thob pa yang myed, 無得, 8f
 thos, 聞, 10c
 mtho ris, 天上, 4a
 mthong, 見, 4b
 mthong, 觀, 4d
 'thob par 'gyur ba, 所能得, 8d
 dus gcig na, 一時, 1a
 de c'i phyir zhe na, 何以故, 7d
 de nyid, 是即, 8e
 de nyid ni, 即, 5c
 de lta bu, 如是, 10c
 de ltar, 如是, 8a
 de dag, 彼諸, 7d
 de de bzhin, 如是, 3b
 de nas, 爾時, 14a
 de gnas nas, 從其住處, 1c
 de bzhin, 爾, 4a
 de bzhin gshegs pa, 如來, 7b
 de bzhin gshegs pa'i dbu'i gtsug, 如來頂, 13b
 de'i phyir, 是故, 12c
 de'i tshe, 時, 1b
 don, 義, 8c
 dri ma myed pa'i mnam par dag pa, 離垢清淨,
 15b
 dri zar, 乾闥婆, 17a
 gdod, 乃, 10a
 bdag, 我, 4b
 bdag gi mtshan nyid, 我相, 9b
 bdun brgya', 七百, 16a
 bde 'gro dang ngan 'gro, 善惡趣, 4b
 'di, 斯, 7c
 'du byed, 行, 9a
 'du shes, 想, 9a
 'dug, 退坐, 1c
 'dod pa'i khams, 欲界, 16b
 'dri, 問, 5b

'dri ba 'di dris pa, 發斯問, 7c
 sdug bsngal ba, 苦, 10c
 na ba, 病, 10c
 nam mkha', 虛空, 8g
 nam yang, 畢竟, 4d
 gnas pa, 住, 10b
 gnod sems, 害心, 11a
 mnam pa sna tshogs, 種種, 13b
 mnam par grol ba, 解脫, 10c
 mnam par grol ba thob par gyur, 解脫, 16a
 mnam par byang ba yang ma yin, 非淨, 8f
 mnam par shes pa, 識, 9a
 rnams su, 諸
 rnams su 'gro, 往, 4c
 rnams su 'gro, 諸, 8b
 dmyigs pa, 攀緣, 7a
 dmyigs pa yod pa, 有所得, 10b
 dmyigs pa yod pa ma yin, 無攀緣, 7c
 dmyigs par myi 'gyur, 不可得, 7d, 8e
 dmyigs su myed, 不可得, 8b
 dmyigs su myed pa, 無所得, 10a
 sprul pa, 化, 3a
 sprul pa'i skyes bu, 化人, 2c, 2d
 sprul pa'i skyes bu, 幻化人, 4a
 sprul pa'i skyes bu, 化人, 6b
 phan tshun 'gro zhing 'ong ba, 往來, 2d
 phan tshun lan 'debs, 共相訓對, 16c
 phus mo ... lha nga, 膝, 14a
 phyir, 故, 7c
 phyogs gcig du, 一面, 1c
 phrag pa, 肩, 14a
 bar du, 乃至, 4c
 bar du mngon bar byung, 上至, 13b
 byang cub, 菩提, 8a
 byang cub sems dpa', 菩薩, 8b
 bla go, 袒, 14a
 blun po kha cig, 愚癡輩, 11a
 dbang gis, 由 ... 故, 11a
 dbug, 穿鑿, 12b
 dbyings, 界, 12b
 ma yin, 非, 8d
 mas par gyur, 問, 5b
 mod kyi, 然, 7c
 mya ngan, 憂, 10c
 mya ngan las 'das pa, 涅槃, 4a

mya ngan las 'da's pa'i dbyings, 涅槃界, 5a
 myi, 人, 17a
 myi 'jigs pa thob par gyur ba, 得無所畏, 16c
 myi dmyigs pa, 無有 ... 可得, 9b
 myi dmyigs pa, 無 ... 可得, 9c
 mying, 名字, 7d
 myed, 無有, 2d
 dmar po, 赤, 13b
 gzhan yang, 復次, 4d
 gzhan yang, 又, 9c
 gzhig, 沮壞, 12b
 gzhol ba, 趣, 5a
 rmas pa, 問, 2a, 7c
 rmas par gyur, 曰, 6b
 smyug rgyu, 陽焰, 9c
 smre sngags 'don pa, 悲, 10c
 gtso bor gyur, 上首, 14c
 btsugs, 著, 14a
 stsogs par bgyid, 積集, 8a
 bstsags pa nyid kyī tshe, 積集之時, 8b
 bstsags pa ma yin ba'i tshe, 積集時, 8b
 tshangs pa'i 'jig rten, 梵世, 13b
 tshangs par spyod pa, 梵行, 10a
 tshad myed pa snyed, 無量, 13b, 16d
 tshig gis brjod pa, 言說, 9b
 tshe, 時, 8b
 tshe dang ldan ba, 尊者, 14a
 tshor ba, 受, 9a
 mtshan nyid, 相, 9b
 mtshungs, 猶如, 8g
 mtshungs pa, 同, 5d
 dzum ba mdzad, 熙怡微笑, 13a
 'dzum ba ... mdzad, 微笑, 14a
 zhabs, 足, 1c
 zhal gyi sgo, 面門, 13b
 zhe sdang, 瞋, 11a
 zhes bka' stsal pa, 所說, 8c
 zhes bya, 說名, 10a
 bzhi brgya, 四百, 16a
 zag pa, 漏, 16a
 zag pa dang bcas pa, 有漏, 9a
 zag pa ma mchis pa, 無漏, 9a
 zab mo, 深, 10c
 zab mo, 甚深, 11a
 gzugs, 色, 9a

gzung bar bgyi, 受持, 15a
 bzar, 偏, 14a
 'di, 此, 7c
 'di skad du ... zhes ched du brjod pa ched du
 brjod par gyur, 作如是言, 16b
 'di skad bdag gis thos pa, 如是我聞, 1a
 'di snyam du, 心自念, 14a
 'di lta ste dper na, 譬如, 6b
 'og du, 後, 11a
 'ongs, 來, 2a
 'od zer kha dog, 光, 13b
 'on kyang, 但, 7c
 yang, 又, 3a
 yang, 猶, 7d
 yang, 亦復, 8b
 yang dag pa'i mtha', 實際, 12b
 yang dag par, 實, 9b
 yang dag par, 真, 10a
 yang dag par rjes su mthong, 見, 10a
 yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas, 正等覺,
 14a
 yang myed, 亦無, 2d
 yongs su mya ngan las 'da's pa, 滅, 11a
 yongs su mya ngan las 'da's par gyur, 得滅度,
 14d
 yongs su smyin pa, 成熟, 7c
 yongs su smyin par bya ba, 應可成熟, 7c
 g.yas pa, 右, 14a
 rab du dga' ba, 大歡喜, 17a
 rigs kyī bu, 善男子, 7c
 rīgs kyī bu mo, 善女人, 7c
 rim 'gro dang mchod pa byas, 供養, 16d
 langs, 起, 14a
 lan 'debs pa, 答, 2c
 lan 'debs pa, 答, 5b
 lus, 身, 4b
 leb rgan, 紅, 13b
 logs su thal mo sbyar, 合掌, 14a
 shīn du skrag pa, 大驚, 10c
 shin du ngo mtshar che, 甚為希有, 16c
 shes par 'gyur ba, 所能知, 8d
 bshad pa, 說, 2d
 sa, 地, 14a
 sems, 心, 8e
 sems can dmyal ba, 地獄, 11a

sems ma mchis pa, 無心, 8c
 sems myed pa, 無心, 8b
 sems las byung ba'i chos, 心所生法, 8e
 gsal bar byas, 光, 13b
 gser po, 黃, 13b
 gsol pa, 白言, 4b
 gsol pa, 言, 8a
 bsam gyis myi khyab pa'i gnas, 不思議處, 8e
 bsam gyis myi khyab pa'i dbyings, 不思議界,
 12b

bsam ba, 思惟, 8d
 lha, 天, 17a
 lha ma yin, 阿修羅, 17a
 lhag ma byed pa'i mya ngan las 'da's pa, 無餘
 涅槃, 14d
 lha'i bu, 天子, 16b
 lha'i me tog gya nom ba, 天諸妙花, 16b

Literature

- Braarvig, Jens. 2000. "Sarvadharmāpravṛttinirdeśa." In Jens Braarvig, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Kazunobu Matsuda and Lore Sander, eds., *Buddhist Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection 1* (Oslo: Hermes Publishing): 81–166.
- Chang, Garma C.C., et al. 1983. *A Treasury of Mahāyāna Sūtras: Selections from the Mahāratnakūṭa Sūtra* (University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press).
- Chen, Jinhua. 2007. *Philosopher, Practitioner, Politician: The Many Lives of Fazang (643–712)*. Sinica Leidensia 75 (Leiden: Brill).
- Collett, Alice. 2017. "Buddhism and Women." In Daniel Cozort and James Mark Shields, eds. *Oxford Handbook of Buddhist Ethics* (New York: Oxford University Press): 552–566.
- Conze, Edward. 1973. *The Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines & Its Verse Summary* (Bollinas, CA: Four Seasons Foundation).
- Deleanu, Florin. 2006. *The Chapter on the Mundane Path (Laukikamārga) in the Śrāvakabhūmi: A Trilingual Edition (Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese), Annotated Translation, and Introductory Study*. Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series 20 (Tōkyō: International Institute for Buddhist Studies).
- Edgerton, Franklin. 1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Faure, Bernard. 2003. *The Power of Denial: Buddhism, Purity, and Gender* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- Hahn, Michael. 1978. "On the function and origin of the particle dag." In Martin Brauen & Per Kværne, eds., *Tibetan Studies: Presented at the Seminar of Young Tibetologists, Zurich, June 26-July 1, 1977* (Zürich: Völkerkundemuseum der Universität Zürich): 137–147.
- Hahn, Michael. 1982. *Nāgārjuna's Ratnāvalī: Vol. 1, The Basic Texts (Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese)*. Indica et Tibetica 1 (Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag).
- Hahn, Michael. 1996. *Lehrbuch der klassischen tibetischen Schriftsprache*. Indica et Tibetica 10. 7th ed. (Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag).
- Hill, Nathan W. 2010. "Personal Pronouns in Old Tibetan." *Journal Asiatique* 298/2: 549–571.
- Hinüber, Oskar von. 2021. *The Saṃghāṭasūtra: A Popular Devotional Buddhist Sanskrit Text: editio maior. Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2020*, Vol. XXIV, Supplement.
- Ishihama, Yumiko and Yoichi Fukuda. 1989. *A New Critical Edition of the Mahāvīyutpatti*. Studia Tibetica 16. Materials for Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionaries 1 (Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko).
- Johnston, E.H. 1950. *The Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyānottaratantraśāstra* (Patna: Bihar Research Society).
- Kazi, Sonam T. 1969–1981. *Encyclopedia Tibetica: The collected works of Bo-doñ Pañ-chen Phyogs-las-rnam-rgyal*. Within this work is the "Dkon rtsegs le'u 'bum las| dang po sdom pa bstan pa' mdo 'grel nas drang srong rgyas pas zhus pa'i mdo 'grel gyi bar sde tshan (47)." The work reproduced is the Gsung 'bum of Phyogs las mam rgyal (New Delhi: Tibet House): 18: 11–72. (TBRC W22103.)
- Kern, Hendrik, and Bunyiu Nanjio. 1908–1912. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 10 (St. Pétersbourg: Imperial Academy. Reprint: Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970).
- Kuijip, Leonard W.J. van der. 2009. "On the Vicissitudes of Subhūticandra's *Kāmadhenu* Commentary on the *Amarakoṣa* in Tibet." *Journal of the International Association of Tibetan Studies* 5: 1–105.

- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. 1903–1913. *Mūlamadhyamakakārikās (Mādhyamikasūtras) de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā Commentaire de Candrakīrti*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 4 (St. Pétersbourg: Imperial Academy. Reprint: Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970).
- Lalou, Marcelle. 1939. *Inventaire des Manuscrits tibétains de Touen-houang conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale*. Vol. 1. (Paris: Maisonneuve; Bibliothèque Nationale).
- Lefmann, Salomon. 1902–1908. *Lalita Vistara: Leben und Lehre des Çākya-Buddha* (Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses; reprint: Tokyo: Meichō-Fukyū-kai, 1977).
- Li, Channa. 2021. “A Survey of Tibetan Sūtras Translated from Chinese, as Recorded in Early Tibetan Catalogues.” *Revue d’Etudes Tibétaines* 60: 174–219.
- McGuire, Beverley. 2019. “Ouyi Zhixu.” In Jonathan A. Silk, ed., *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism II: Lives* (Leiden: Brill): 748–751.
- Mi nyag mgon po, ed. 2006. *Mdo sde spyi’i mam bzhag* (Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang).
- Miyazaki, Tensho. 2017. “Relationship among the Ulaanbaatar Kangyur Manuscript and the other Them spans ma Kangyur Manuscripts: The Case of the Tibetan Version of the *Ajātasatrukauṣṭyavinodana.” *Nihon Chibetto Gakkai Kaihō* 日本西蔵学会々報 62:55–64.
- Mori Shōji 森章司. 2008. “Hotoko o jōshu to suru sanga to butsudeshi o jōshu to suru sanga” 「仏を上首とするサンガ」と「仏弟子を上首とするサンガ」 [‘A Saṅgha Led by the Buddha’ and ‘Saṅghas Led by His Disciples’]. [Genshi Bukkyō Seiten Shiryō ni yoru Shakusonden no Kenkyū 原始仏教聖典資料による釈尊伝の研究] *Chūō Gakujutsu Kenkyūjo Kiyō Monograph* 中央学術研究所紀要 モノグラフ 13: 1–44.
- Nagai Makoto 長井眞琴. 1931. “Gōga jōubai-e” 恒河上優婆夷會. In Kokuyaku Issaikyō: Hōshakubu 5 國譯一切經・寶積部 5 (Tokyo: Daitō shuppan 大東出版): 260–263 (1780–1783).
- Nanjio, Bunyiu. 1923. *The Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*. Bibliotheca Otaniensis 1 (Reprint: Kyoto: Otani University Press, 1956).
- Niisaku Hiroaki 新作博明. 2010. *Chibettogoyaku Amidakyō no shohon taishōhyō* チベット語訳阿弥陀經の諸本対照表/Comparative Table of the Various Versions of the Tibetan translation of the Smaller Sukhāvātīvyūha (Tokyo: Yuishōji Bukkyō Bunka Kōryū Kenkyū 唯称寺仏教文化交流研究/Yuishoji Buddhist Cultural Exchange Research Institute).
- Nobel, Julius Adolf Johannes. 1937. *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra: Das Goldglanz-sūtra, ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus* (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz).
- Nobel, Julius Adolf Johannes. 1944. *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra: Das Goldglanz-sūtra, ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus. Die tibetischen Übersetzung mit einem Wörterbuch*. Vol. 1 (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- Nōnin Masaaki 能仁正顕. 2013. “Chibetto ni okeru Amidakyō no juyō: yakkyō no shiten kara” チベットにおける阿弥陀經の受容: 訳經の視点から [On the Reception of the Smaller Sukhāvātīvyūha-sūtra in Tibet: A Study Based on Its Tibetan Translation]. *Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 仏教学研究 69: 27–49.
- Onoda Shunzō 小野田俊蔵. 1999. *Zōyaku Muryōjūkyō ihon kōgōhyō (kōhon)* 蔵訳無量寿經異本校合表(稿本). Jōdokyō no Sōgōteki Kenkyū Kenkyūhan 浄土教の総合的研究研究班編 (Kyoto: Bukkyō Daigaku Sōgō Kenkyūjo 佛教大学総合研究所).
- Onoda Shunzō 小野田俊蔵. 2001. “Zōyaku Amidakyō kōgōhyō” 蔵訳阿弥陀經校合表 [Some Variants in the Texts of the Tibetan Smaller Sukhāvātīvyūhasūtra]. In Kagawa Takao Sensei Koki Kinenkai 香川孝雄先生古稀記念会, ed. *Bukkyōgaku Jōdogaku Kenkyū: Kagawa Takao Hakushi Koki Kinen Ronshū* 仏教学浄土学研究: 香川孝雄博士古稀記念論集 (Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō 永田文昌堂): 65–93.

- Onoda Shunzō 小野田俊蔵. 2003. “Zōyaku Muryōjyū Uranbātoru shahon” 蔵訳無量寿経ウランバートル写本 [The Ulanbator Manuscript of the Tibetan Translation of the Sukhāvativyūha]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 52/1: 1–7.
- Onoda Shunzō 小野田俊蔵. 2008. “The Sukhāvativyūhasūtra of the Ulaanbaatar Manuscript Kagyur.” In Darrol Bryant and Susan Bryant, eds. *Mahayana Buddhism History and Culture*. Sambhota Series xv (New Delhi: Tibet House, Cultural Center of H.H. the Dalai Lama): 61–70. This is the published version of “On the Smaller Sukhāvativyūhasūtra of the Ulan Bator Manuscript Kagyur,” a paper read at the International Conference on Mahayana Buddhism—History and Culture, held in New Delhi, 4 November, 2005. Apparently the same was presented at 12th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, University of British Columbia, 15th–21st August, 2010.
- Rechung, Jampal Kunzang 1983. “Bodong Phyoglas Rnam Rgyal.” *Bulletin of Tibetology* (Namgyal Institute of Tibetology, Gangtok, Sikkim): 20/2: 16–22.
- Rotman, Andy. 2008. *Divine Stories: Divyāvadāna* Part 1. Classics of Indian Buddhism (Boston: Wisdom Publications).
- Sakaki Ryōsaburō 榊亮三郎. 1916. *Mahāvīyūtpatti* (Kyoto: Kyōto Teikoku Daigaku Bunka Daigaku Sōsho 京都帝國大學文科大學叢書 3. Numerous reprints.)
- Schuster, Nancy. 1981. “Changing the Female Body: Wise Women and the Bodhisattva Career in Some *Mahāratnakūṭasūtras*.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 4/1: 24–69.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2014a. “Out of the East: Tibetan Scripture Translations from Chinese.” *Bod rig pa'i dus deb/Zangxue xuekan* 藏學學刊 / *Journal of Tibetology* 9: 29–36.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2014b. “Taking the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* Seriously.” *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 17: 157–188.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2019. “Chinese Sūtras in Tibetan Translation: A Preliminary Survey.” *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 22: 227–246.
- Skilling, Peter. 2021. *Questioning the Buddha: A Selection of Twenty-five Sutras* (Somerville, MA: Wisdom Publications).
- Soymié, Michel. 1983. *Catalogue des Manuscrits chinois de Touen-houang: Fonds Pelliot chinois de la Bibliothèque Nationale*. Volume 3 (Paris: Éditions de la Fondation Singer-Polignac).
- Staël-Holstein, Alexander Wilhelm, Baron von. 1926. *The Kāṣyapaparivarta: A Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class: Edited in the Original Sanskrit in Tibetan and in Chinese* (Shanghai: Commercial Press).
- Steinkellner, Ernst. 1992. “Lamotte and the concept of anupalabdhi.” *Asiatische Studien/Études asiatiques* 46: 398–410.
- Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature. 2006. *Bonbun Yuimakyō: Potarakyū shozō shahon ni motozuku kōtei* 梵文維摩經—ポタラ宮所蔵写本に基づく校訂 / *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa: A Sanskrit Edition based upon the Manuscript Newly Found at the Potala Palace* (Tokyo: Taisho University Press).
- Suzuki, Daisetz Teitaro, and Hokei Idzumi. 1949. *The Gandavyūha Sutra* (Kyoto: The Society for the Publication of Sacred Books of the World. Originally published 1934).
- Tauscher, Helmut. 2008. *Catalogue of the Gondhla proto-Kanjur*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 72 (Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien).

- Tenzin, Chatring Jansar. 1972. *The Collected Works (gsung-'bum) of Cha-har Dge-bshes Blo-bzang-tshul-Khrims: Reproduced from a set of xylographic prints from the Peking blocks*. Volume 4. (New Delhi: Chatring Jansar Tenzin).
- Terjék, J[ózsef]. 1972. "Colloquial Influences on Written Tibetan." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 25: 39–51.
- Trenckner, Vilhelm, et al. 1924–. *A Critical Pāli Dictionary* (Copenhagen: Royal Danish Academy).
- Tsukinowa Kenryū 月輪賢隆. 1955. *Bonzōkanwa Gappeki Bussetsu Amidakyō 梵藏漢和合壁 佛說阿彌陀經* (Kyoto: Nishi Honganji 西本願寺).
- van Schaik, Sam. 2013. "Dating Early Tibetan Manuscripts: A Paleographical Method." In Brandon Dotson, Kazushi Iwao and Tsuguhito Takeuchi, eds., *Scribes, Texts and Rituals in Early Tibet and Dunhuang* (Weisbaden: Reichert Verlag). 119–135.
- Wogihara, Unrai. 1932–1935. *Abhisamayālaṅkāraloka Prajñāpāramitāvākyā*. Tōyō Bunko Publications Series D, 2 (Tokyo: The Tōyō Bunko. Reprint: Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林, 1973).
- Yim, Lawrence C.H. 2005. "Political Exile and Chan Buddhist Master: A Lingnan Monk in Manchuria during the Ming-Qing Transition." *Journal of Chinese Religions* 33/1: 77–124.
- Yonezawa, Yoshiyasu. 2008. "Vigrahavyāvartanī: Sanskrit Transliteration and Tibetan Translation." *Journal of Naritasan Institute for Buddhist Studies* 31: 209–333.
- Yuyama, Akira. 1976. *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṁcaya-gāthā (Sanskrit Recension A)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist traditions produced hundreds of scriptures and treatises, only a small number of which have received serious scholarly attention. The present volume inaugurates the Buddhist Open Philology Project (BOPP) publication series, which aims to produce state-of-the-art critical editions, translations, and studies of individual works, thereby seeking to advance the comprehensive study of Buddhism's vast literary tradition.

This volume collects four studies on the composition and impact of the collection of scriptures called the *Mahāratnakūṭa* ("Great Heap of Jewels"), including critical editions and translations of two scriptures.

Contributors are:

Jonathan A. Silk, †Gadjin M. Nagao, and Michael Radich.

Rafal Felbur, Ph.D. (2018), Stanford University, is Assistant Professor in Buddhist Studies at the University of Heidelberg. He works on the intellectual, cultural, and social dynamics of the encounter between India and China in the first millennium CE.

