The Redactions of the
Adbhutadharmaparyāya from Gilgit*

by Yael Bentor

1. Introduction

The importance of the Gilgit collection of Sanskrit Buddhist manuscripts has long been recognized. It provides us with Sanskrit manuscripts of texts which were either previously unknown in their original language or were known only through much later manuscripts which have been found in Nepal, Tibet and Japan. The present work includes an edition of the Adbhutadharmaparyāya (Ad), a text which falls into the former category, based on three Sanskrit manuscripts from Gilgit. The text is preceded by a technical introduction and followed by an English translation of the Sanskrit. There are important redactional differences between the mss. of Ad which seem to represent sectarian differences (see below).

The Ad is a Buddhist canonical text which deals with the making of stūpas and images, and with the cult of relics, as well as the merit resulting therefrom. Despite the great number of actual stūpas and images preserved in the Buddhist world, only a small number of Sanskrit texts entirely devoted to the subject of stūpas and images are known. Ad advocates the establishment of stūpas/images/relics and asserts that such acts produce greater merit than making offerings to the Sāṅgha, the Arhats and Pratyekabuddhas. This canonical work appears to be only one of a larger group of texts, which also includes the Kūṭāgāra Sūtra¹ and the Mahāraṇa Sūtra,² all of which share this common theme. Moreover, the Pratītyasamutpāda Sūtra³ also has elements in common with other texts of this group, although its description⁴ of the stūpas/images/relics differs somewhat. The basic description shared by the four just noted texts is also quoted or
mentioned in several stūpa texts. The seventh century Chinese traveler to India I Ching was also familiar with this description which he quotes, or very closely paraphrases, in explaining the very common practice of making stūpas and images.

Although I Ching and our sūtras may have intended the hyperbolic description of “merely” making a miniature stūpa or an image to be taken in a rhetorical sense, there is abundant archaeological evidence for the actual practice of making small stūpas in large numbers. The report of Hsüan Tsang on the making of miniature stūpas can be added to this evidence. Of special importance are the “excavations” at Gilgit. In the same stūpa where the manuscripts of Ad were deposited hundreds of small stūpas and images were found. A number of texts belonging to the later Avadāna class also provide us with literary sources for this practice. The hyperbolic argument made by Ad and its related sūtras seems to reflect a tension between the cult of stūpas/images/relics and offerings to the Saṅgha/arhats/Pratyekabuddhas as primary “fields of merit” (puṇyakṣetra).

II. Description of the Manuscripts

Three mss. of the Ad have so far been identified in the Gilgit collection, and all three have been published in facsimile in Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, (GBMs). They will be referred to here as mss. A, B and C.

Ms. A: GBMs vol. 7, folio 1507.8 to end and continued on folios 1576.1–1581.4. Script: Gilgit/Bamiyan—Type II. This ms. is complete; however, in GBMs the first line of the text, which occurs as the last line of one leaf, is separated from the rest of the text by about 70 folios. The center of each folio of ms. A is unclear, making the readings partly indistinct.

Ms. B: GBMs vol. 7, folios 1588.1 to 1592.4. Script: Gilgit/Bamiyan—Type II. This ms. contains only the second half of the text. It begins in section [4] according to the divisions I have introduced into the text. On the whole it is clearly readable. Ms. B has, however, been mislabelled by the scribe in the colophon where it is called the Kūṭāgāra Sūtra.

Ms. C: GBMs vol. 7, folio 1691.2 to end. Script: Gilgit/Bamiyan—Type I, although it is in appearance somewhat cur-
III. Editorial Notes

My edition consists of an annotated transliteration of ms. A, the only complete ms. The variants of mss. B and C are supplied in notes. (Ms. B shows greater consistency and standardization.) Since the 3 mss. belong to more than one redaction (see IV. below), my intention was to preserve the text of A. Notes important for the reading of the text of ms. A itself are marked with asterisks. Unreadable akṣaras in ms. A are, however, reconstructed. All reconstructions are marked as such, and are based on parallels within A, and on B or C when available, unless otherwise noted. Only the punctuation of A is indicated. While retaining the punctuation of A, I have also imposed my own punctuation on the edited text when I thought it helpful for reading the text.

IV. Redactional Differences between mss. A and B

a. Citations of differing redactional readings
(The parentheses indicate different readings in parallels within the same ms.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>[4] n. 3 and parallels in [5], [6], [7], [8].</td>
<td>caturdiśe (vā) bhikṣusāṁgha</td>
<td>caturddiśa vā bhikṣusāṁgha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>[4] n. 6 and parallels in [5], [6].</td>
<td>cchataṃ</td>
<td>cchramaḥ āropayed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>[4] n. 8 and parallels in</td>
<td>pratiṣṭhāpayet</td>
<td>prakṣiped</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. [4] n.9 and parallels in [5], [6], [7], [8].


7. [7] n.3 [8] n.4

8. [9] n.5

9. [9] n.6

10. [9] n.8 and n.9

11. [10] n.9
b. Discussion of the Redactional Differences

About half of the differences noted above (2, 4, 5, 6, 7) appear to be simply a matter of “style”, although this is an ill-defined and little studied aspect of Buddhist texts in Sanskrit. As for the rest, in no. 1 the difference is grammatical as well as stylistic (see below, Sanskrit edition [1] n. 13). In no. 11, besides more stylistic differences, ms. B adds another title to the list of alternative titles for the text: Amṛtadundubhiḥ. In no. 12, the colophon of ms. B calls the text Kūṭāgāra Sūtra as well (as was mentioned above). Both no. 8 and 9 concern the qualities of the Tathāgata. Ms. B adds jñāna to the list of qualities of the Tathāgata, while ms. A lists the four immeasurables (aprāmānas) which are lacking in ms. B.

No. 10 appears to involve a sectarian distinction with regard to the Doctrine. The disagreement here concerns the conception of the Buddha. According to ms. A the Tathāgata is endowed with the ten powers (daśabalaṇī), the four assurances (cātvāri vaśāraṇḍyāṇī) and the 18 characteristics unique to a Buddha (aṣṭādaśāvenikāḥ buddhadharmā). Ms. B, like ms. A, begins its list with the ten powers and the four assurances. However, instead of the 18 avenikabuddhadharmas, ms. B gives the three unique applications of mindfulness (trīṇy āvenikāṁ śṛṣṭyupasthānāṁ) and great compassion (mahākaruṇā).

According to Vasubandhu in the Abhidharmakośa the 18 characteristics unique to the Buddha consist of the ten powers, the four assurances, the three unique applications of mindfulness and great compassion. (aṣṭādaśāvenikāṁ buddhadharmā balādayāḥ. . . katame 'ṣṭādaśa? daśa balāṇi cātvāri vaśāraṇḍyāṇi trīṇī śṛṣṭyupasthānāṁ mahākaruṇā ca.) This list is identical to the one given in ms. B.

But Yaśomitra in his commentary to the Abhidharmakośa, the Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośa-vyākhyā says: ete balādyā mahākaruṇānta aṣṭādaśāvenikā Vai bhāṣikair vyavasthāpyaṁte. balādi-vyā- tiriktān kecid anyān aṣṭādaśāvenikān buddha-dharmān varṇayanti.

This might be translated: “The Vaibhāṣikas declare the 18
unique characteristics (āvēnikas) to begin with the powers (balas) and to end with great compassion. Others (kecid) consider the 18 characteristics unique to the Buddha to be different from the powers and so forth.” (Here Yaśomitra lists the 18 āvēnikabuddhadharmas according to these “others”).

Thus, according to Yaśomitra, the list of 18 āvēnikas in the Abhidharmakośa represents the position of the Vaibhāṣikas. This list is also found in other Sarvāstivādin sources as Lamotte has pointed out. On the other hand, “others” recognize 18 āvēnikas which do not include the ten powers and the four assurances. This is the view represented by our ms. A.

In fact, according to the Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra (MPPS) there are two different lists of the 18 āvēnikabuddhadharmas. One list is advocated by the MPPS while the other is rejected there. The list of the 18 āvēnikabuddhadharmas advocated there is common with the Mahāyāna literature. The rejected list, according to Lamotte, belongs to the Sarvāstivādin (Vaibhāṣika) school.

In sum, the controversy about the nature of the āvēnikabuddhadharmas is reflected in a number of important Sanskrit Buddhist scholastic texts. This question seems to have been widely debated. Ms. B reflects the point of view of the Vaibhāṣikas, ms. A that of their opponents. The list of the Tathāgata’s qualities in the two mss. appears to have been adjusted to suit two different sectarian conceptions of the Buddha and appears to reflect this debate.

Of a somewhat different kind, no. 3 may involve a difference in the actual practice discussed in the Ad. Ms. A has: One establishes a stūpa (stūpaṃ pratiśṭhāpayet), makes an image (pratimāṃ kārayet), and establishes a relic (dhātum pratiśṭhāpayet). It is unclear whether three different objects are to be made separately or whether the passage concerns a single stūpa with an image and relic. Ms. B always uses the verb prakṣipet “put into” with dhātu “relic,” thus making it clear, in this case, that the relic is to be put into the object. It is, however, still unclear whether the relic is to be put into both the stūpa and the image or into the stūpa alone. The Tibetan translation of Ad seems to follow Sanskrit ms. B. It uses byas “make” with mchod-rten “stūpa,” and sku-gzugs “image,” and bcug “put into” with ring bsrel “relic.”

The Sanskrit ms. A of Ad, in which establishing a relic may
be separate from the establishment of a stūpa, may reflect a form of the relic cult not yet associated with a stūpa. This form of the relic cult sans stūpa also appears to be mentioned in the Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya from Gilgit and in the Divyāvadāna.¹⁰

V. Peculiarities of the Language¹¹

A. Grammatical Notes

Since the three mss. of the Adbhutadharmaparyaya reflect different grammatical usages, they are treated here separately. The corresponding section numbers from BHSG are given in parentheses. Numbers in square brackets refer to my own added section numbers.

Ms. A:

(1). Nasal and anusvāra (#2.64-71).

(a). The anusvāra is frequently used for any nasal, final or medial (#2.64). For example: sangha (throughout), piṇḍa (throughout), pratikṛāṇtah [2], vairajaṇṭah [7], ksāntyā [9], ekānta [2], bhagavatam [2], [10], ॐasmin. Cf. Kurumiya p. xxiv 1.6, p. xxxix; von Hünüber p. x. As Kurumiya notes, this use of anusvāra is not restricted to Buddhist mss. alone. Cf. Whitney #73b.

(b). A double nasal mn or nm, exclusively before long ā. For example: cīvāramś ā- [2], patākanm ā- [2], āyusmāṇī ā- [2]. Cf. Kurumiya p. xxiv 1.6; Watanabe p. xiii.

(2). Dental sibilant and visarga. (#2.92).

(a). The visarga, or its sandhi equivalent, is sometimes omitted. Cf. Kurumiya p. xxvi 3.1; Mette p. 141; Watanabe pp. xiii-xiv. Omissions of this sort will not be indicated in the notes.

(b). Before initial gutteral surd (k) and labial surd (p) the visarga is sometimes replaced with jihvāmūliya and upadhmāniya respectively (Renou p. 38; Whitney #69, #170d; Sander Tafel 22; Bühler p. 67). I have marked them, after Renou, with ḫ and ƙ respectively. Examples for jihvāmūliya: yaḥ kauś [2], chraddhah kulaputo [2], [5], [7], [8], ṛprameyah karunayā (9). An example for upadhmāniya: tatah prabhūtataram [5]. The use of the jihvāmūliya and upadhmāniya is far from consistent. Although the phrases śrāddhaḥ kulaṇḍuṣṭraḥ and tataḥ prabhūtataram occur in
every section from [1] to [8], jihvāmūlīya and upadhmāniya are
used only in the cases indicated. The same treatment of visarga
frequently occurs in the Maitreyavākaraṇa ms. from Gilgit which
was probably written by the same scribe as our ms. A, e.g.: tataḥ
k- (GMBs part 7, folio 1539.1) devataḥ p- (ibid. folio 1540.4)
dosaiḥ p- (ibid. folio 1541.4). The upadhmāniya also occurs in the Buddha-
balādhanaprātihiyavākuraṇaṃnirdeśa written in Gilgit/Bamiyan—
Type I Script™: kah punar (ibid. folio 1296.8). Cf. Mette pp. 134
and 141.

(c). Before initial dental sibilant (s) visarga sometimes be-
comes dental sibilant. For example: arhatas s- [6]; cf. Mait-
reyavākaraṇa, tatas s- (ibid. folio 1538.1) and Whitney #172.

(d). Before initial palatal surd (c), instead of a final palatal
sibilant (s) we sometimes find ́hś. For example: pratyekabuddhe-
bhyaḥ catur [3].

(3). Sandhi.

Hiatus between two vowels is sometimes maintained. For exam-
ple: vā īḍrāṃ [1], [2], me ētad [2], ānanda uttaro6 [6]. Cf. Kurumiya
p. xxvii 3.9.

(b). A dental nasal (n) preceded by a long vowel and followed
by a vowel is doubled. For example: bhagavān n- [3]. Cf. Kurumiya
p. xxvii 3.4.

(4). The use of lingual vowel (r) for lingual semi-vowel (r) which
occurs in B and C, does not occur in A.

(5). The dropping of a final consonant, which occurs in B, does
not occur in A.

Ms. B:

(1). Nasals and anusvāra.

(a). The only example of the use of anusvāra for any nasal
in B is the spelling saṃgha which occurs throughout the ms. In
all other cases where A has m, B has the expected nasal: B has
piṇḍa for A’s piṇḍa, pratikrāntaḥ for A’s pratikrāntaḥ etc. These
readings of ms. B with this type of variation will not be given
in the notes.

(b). Double nasals such as found in ms. A do not occur in
ms. B.

(2). Dental sibilant and visarga.

(a). The omission of a visarga or its sandhi equivalents is
very common in ms. B. Omissions of this kind in B will not be indicated in the notes.


(c). In B there is no occurrence of a dental sibilant (s) for a visarga before initial dental sibilant such as occurs in A.

(d). There is only one instance of the use of hś before an initial palatal surd (c) in B, again in pratyeabuddhebhyahs cātur [6].

(3). Sandhi: Hiatus.

There is only one example of an unresolved hiatus in ms. B: ānanda avaragodāniyo [5].

(4). The use of lingual vowel (r) for lingual semi-vowel (r) (#3.97).

Examples for lingual vowel (r) used for lingual semivowel (r): trsāhasra for trisāhasra [8], trabhīr for tribhīr [9]. Cf. Kurumiya p. xxvi 2.12. p. xxxix; Mette p. 141; Watanabe p. xiv. This will not be indicated in the notes.

(5). The dropping of final consonants. (#2.90-1) cf. Kurumiya p. xxv section 1.9.

(a). The dropping of final dental surd (t) before initial dental sibilant (s) is very common in ms. B. Examples: kāraye s- [4], pratisthāpaye s- [6], arha s- [9].

(b). There is one example of the dropping of a final consonant when the final consonant is identical to the initial consonant of the following word: tasmā tvam [10] n. 6. Cf. Mette p. 140; Watanabe p. xiii.

Ms. C.

(1). Nasal and anusvāra.

(a). The use of anusvāra for any nasal occurs only twice in ms. C: ekasmīm [0], saṃgha [1]. Like ms. B, ms. C has pīṇḍa. This will not be indicated in the notes.

(b). There is one occurrence of the double nasal in ms. C: bhagavāṃn rāja [0] n.4.

(2). Dental sibilant and visarga.

(a). The visarga is sometimes omitted in ms. C. Examples: ānanda, arhata [1]. This will not be noted.

(b). Jihvāmāliya occurs in ms. C: yah kaś cīc chṛāddhāḥ kulaputro [1].

(3). Sandhi: Hiatus.
The one instance of an unresolved hiatus between two vowels is the same as in ms. A: vā iyāsam [1].

(4). There is one example of lingual vowel (r) used for lingual semivowel (r) uccṛta [1]. Cf. BHSD p. 119b. This will not be indicated in the notes.

(5). The dropping of a final consonant does not occur in ms. C.

B. Paleographical and Orthographical Peculiarities

(1). In both mss. A and B the labial sonant (b) and the labial semivowel (w) are indistinguishable. I have transliterated the aksara as b or w according to the context. Badarī/vadari (see M-W p. 719c, p. 916b), which I have transliterated as badari (cf. Watanabe p. xiv) remains, however, problematic.


(3). Ms. B uses two systems of vowel notation. In addition to the vowel matras of Gilgit/Bamiyan—Type II script in which it is written, ms. B also uses on occasion the vowel matras of Gilgit/Bamiyan—Type I. For example: palatal diphthong (e) [4] n.5, labial diphthong (o) [7] n.2, lingual palatal diphthong (ai) [9] n.9. I have indicated the use of the vowel matras of the second kind with ē, ò, ā for the palatal diphthong (e) vowel matra, see also Sander Tafel 23–4.


C. Punctuation

Three punctuation marks are used in the mss.

(1). A single dot raised a half space above the bottom of the line is used to mark the end of a paragraph. Unfortunately most
paragraphs of ms. A happen to end at points where the ms. is
difficult to read. I have kept these punctuation marks—in so
far as I could read them. Cf. Mette throughout the Tathāgata-
bimbakārāpanasūtra ms. In my edition I have used (as Mette did)
a single dot at the top of the line for this punctuation mark.

(2). (a). Before a pause, ms. C uses a mark which appears to
 correspond to a virāma. Cf. von Hinüber throughout his text;
Mette p. 134, n. 4: and Tripāṭhi p. 157, n. 20. The three texts
of von Hinüber, Mette and Tripāṭhi, like our ms. C, are all
written in Gilgit/Bamiyan—Type I. This “virāma” appears to be
used mostly after labial nasal (m), dental nasal (n) and dental
surd (t).

(b). Ms. A and ms. B once ([10] n.3), both of which are written
in Gilgit/Bamiyan—Type II, use a special mark to note a final
dental surd (t). I have transliterated it with ‘. It is used before
a pause, in a similar way to the use of the “virāma” in C.

(3). The visarga is sometimes used as a punctuation mark. There
are two examples: sugataḥ [10] and dhārayaḥ [10]. In both cases
the readings of A and B are the same. Cf. von Hinüber p. xi;
Mette p. 134, n. 4 and p. 141. I have kept these visargas in the
dition.

(4). Absence of sandhi. In order to denote a pause both mss. A
and B sometimes do not apply the appropriate sandhi rules, but
use instead the corresponding sandhi for final position. In this
case no punctuation mark is used. These occurrences are very
frequent in ms. A. In these instances I have supplied a period.

VI. Edition of the Sanskrit Text

Abbreviations

A: GBMs vol. 7, folio 1507.8 to end and folios 1576.1 to 1581.4.
B: GBMs vol. 7, folios 1588.1 to 1592.4.
C: GBMs vol. 7, folio 1691.2 to end.
T: Tibetan according to the Derge edition.

Damaged akṣaras are marked by enclosing them in brackets and
parentheses.
[ ]: Reconstructions of akṣaras which are damaged or only partially
visible.
< >: Reconstructions of akṣaras of which no trace remains.
( ): Denoting unclear but still readable akṣaras.
x: Denoting the presence of an akṣara which I could not reconstruct with any degree of certainty.
par(s): parallel(s).
note number*: Denoting notes important for the reading of ms. A itself.

[0] (1507.8) evam1 mayā śrūtam2 ekasmiṁ samaye3. bhaga-vān1 rājagrhe viharati sma-5 veṣuvane kalandakanivāse.


1) C is difficult to read here. Cf. E. Conze, Vajracchedikā prajñāpāramitā (Serie Orientale Roma 13, 1957) 27 etc. 2) The sentence begins with a finite aorist verb, later followed by a gerund of the same root. T omits the first occurrence of this verb. C agrees with A. This verbal construction is perhaps
used for emphasis, but is found fairly often in non-Mahāyāna Sanskrit sūtra literature. Cf. E. Waldschmidt, Das Mahāparinirvānasūtra [MPNS] (Berlin, 1951) 5.3 10.7 11.8 20.5 etc.; G. von Simson, Zur Dichtung einiger Lehrtexte des buddhistischen Sanskritkanons (München, 1965) 12.32–36. 15.12f etc. 9) C omits. T agrees with A. \(4^4\) C: caramāṇaḥ anyatamasām. \(5^5\) C: pṛthiṣṭa-pradeṣe. T agrees with A. \(6^6\) C: upalīṭkapāliṭam. 7) For this and the following compound, cf. W. Couvreur, Review of J. Nobel's Udrāyaṇa, König von Roruka, \(IJ\) vol. 1 (1957) 312. 8) In C -dāma- is an interlinear addition. A plus (+) sign (kākapada or hamsapada) marks the place at which the insertion is to be made. 9) C has dental \(t\) with a virāma; see introduction V.C,(2),(a). 10) C: yah \(11^1\) C: chṛddhah. 12) A is not clear here. C has catur. In the pars to this phrase A almost always uses cātur (the only exception is in the par in [5]). 13) In the pars to this and the next compound B always uses a dative for the locative here. In the pars apart from the one in [4] this locative will not be further noted. 14) In all the pars in A this phrase occurs as: sāmyakṣaṃbuḍḍhasya parinirvṛṣṭasya mṛṣī/myākāpiṃḍād āmalakā.... T here agrees with the pars. C here agrees with A, making it unlikely that it is a scribal error in the textual transmission of A alone. 15) In A the \(t\) is an interlinear addition. 16) C: sūcīramāṇām. A here agrees with all the pars. 17) C ends after -ya-. 18) Or vadarī-. see V.B,(1). It will not be further noted. 19') A verb after cchaṭram is absent in all but the past par in A. The verb āroṣaye always occurs in the pars in B. T also uses a verb here and elsewhere in the occurrence of this phrase. The absence of the verb in the pars will not be further noted. 20) As in [1] n. 15, the \(t\) here is an interlinear addition. 21) In all the pars B uses the verb praksīpit; see [4] n. 8. 22) Reconstructed with the help of Ananda's speech in [2], which is in the first person: me etad abhava, T: de yang 'dī sāyam du sens te. 23) Or yato. This is perhaps intended for yat tv āham or yaṃ νāv āham; see BHSD 444b and 104b s.v. ārocyati. 24') The visarga is a "correction" beneath the line. 25) This is the only occurrence of \(ī\) in A.

[2] athāyuṣmān ānāṇḍo rāja: \(1^1\) [?[nagare]],[²] sāvadānam piṇḍāyā caritvā kṛtabhaktakṛtya pāscādbhaktapiṇḍapātam-pratikramtaḥ pātracivaram pratisamayya\(a\) pādau prakṣālya yena bhagavā (ms ten)opasaṃkrānta.\(4^4\) upasaṃkramya bhagavataḥ pādau sīrasā vanditvaikāmte 'sthād. ekāṃtasthitā āyūśmān ānando bhagavantam idam avocat': ihāhām bhadaṁ\(a\)\(5^5\) pūrvāhe nivāsya pātracivaramāṁ ādā (1577)ya (rā)ja-gṛhsmāṇi ṭiṣṭayavaṃ bhiṣpaḥ. so 'ham adrākṣaṃ, rāja-gṛhe nagare sāvadāna(m) piṇḍāya caramāṇo 'nyatamasām pradeṣe kuṭāgāram aśītidvaram uulli(pta)valiṇīputm ucchiradadhvajapatakaṁ āmuktapattadāmakalāpanaṃ ca ċṛṣṭav ca punar me etad abhava: yah kaścī kṛṣṇadhaḥ kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā ċṛṣṭaṁ kuṭāga(ra)m)\(9^9\) cāturdeś
bhiksusanghe niryatayed; yo vā tathāgata(syā)rathaḥ sam-
(yakṣamānu)ddhasya parini(rvr)tasya mṛttikāpinḍād ānala-
kapramāṇāṁ stūpaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayet[10] sūcimātrāṃ yaṣṭīm
āropaye[d bādra][patra]mātra[m] cchatra[m], [ya]va[pha-
lapra)māṇāṁ pratimāṇ kārayet' sarsapahalapramāṇāṁ
bhūtum pratiṣṭhāpayet', <tat ka>[tamam]' tataḥ prabhū-
tatam punyaṃ svaṭ? tasya mamaitad abhavac: cchātā me
saṃmukhibhūṭaḥ, sugato me saṃmukhibhūṭaḥ. yanvā
aham etam evārtham bhagavataḥ <āroca>yeyam. yathā
bhagavām vyākariṣyati [tathāhaṁ]11 dhā[ra][yiṣi][y]−

1) This phrase was read with the help of T: de nas tsho dang ldan pa kun dga'
bo rgyal po khab to... "Then Venerable Ānanda in Rājagrha...", 2) This is very
uncertain. A appears to have ? divisive; the first and third aksaras apparently
scored out as mistakes. Two aksaras which probably were meant to replace
those scored out are written beneath the line. The first of these two aksaras
is not clear, the second is -ga-. The phrase rājugra nagare sāvatānaṃ pīṇḍāya
/ car occurs two more times in [1] and [2]. T does not have grong khyer du
(nagare) here, although it does have rgyal po'i khab kyi grong khyer du (rājugrha
nagare) for the two other occurrences of this phrase. 3) Cf. BHSD 360b.
4) This stock phrase was read with the help of T: bem ldan 'das ga la ba der
song nas. 5) For this vocative see BHSD 405b. 6) See [1] n. 2. 7) The par in [1]
hastāgānaṃ kāraṇītā. T also has a verb here. Its absense here in A appears
to be a scribal omission. 8) This is perhaps a double danyā; if so, it is the only
occurrence of such A, and is somewhat out of place here. 9) This reading
was reconstructed according to the par in [1]. T here has: de gnyis bsd nams
shin tu che ba gang lags. 10) see [1] n. 23. 11) This reading is uncertain. It was
reconstructed according to the par in [1]. T: bem ldan 'das kyi bslag la ji skad
bstan pa bzhi du gzung bar bgyi snyam nas. 12) T has an additional sentence
here: bem ldan 'das la bslag don 'di nyid zhu lags na thugs brtse ba nye bar bzung
stel bem ldan 'das kyi bslag la don 'di nyid legs bar bstan du gsal! "If I were to ask
the Blessed One concerning this particular matter, he, out of compassion,
would fully explain it to me."

[3] [ xxx ]') bhagavām āyuṣ(m)aṃtām ānandaṃ idam av-
ocat': sādhu sādhu ānanda bahujanahita[ya] tvam ānanda
pratipanno ca [bahu janasukha]āya lokānuka[ṃ](pāyai)
arthāya hitāya sukhāya devamanusyaṇāṁ, yas t(v)aṃ tathā-
gatam etam evārtham paripraṣṭavyam manyase. tēna hy
ānanda (ṣṛnu) sādhu ca sūṣṭhu ca manasikuru, bhāṣisye-.
ja[ṃ]būdviḥo hy ānanda dvīpa saptaya janasaḥsrayā āyā-
mavistareṇā3 (1578) uttaraviśalo daksīnena śaṅkṣāmukha-
T: de skad ces gosl ba dang "When thus was said." Although A is completely unreadable here, T makes it fairly certain that it probably had evam ukte. Cf. Vajracchedikā (Pek. vol. 21, 251.1.5): de skad ces gosl ba dang = Conze 28.7 evam ukte; etc.). This also exactly fills the gap. 2) Reconstruction based on T: skye bo mang po la bde ba dang, and occurrences of this cliché elsewhere. See e.g. Ét. Lamotte, La concentration de la Marche Héroïque (Sūramgamasamādhīsūtra) (Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques vol. 13) (Bruxelles, 1965) 304. Note, however, that the ca here is somewhat problematic. 3) On the form āyāmavistārāna cf. BHSG 19.38. 4) For the sanādi see introduction V,A, ms. A (2),(d). 5) This aṣṭara is difficult to read, has no apparent correspondent in the pars, and is therefore uncertain.

[4] tiṣṭhātvā ānanda ja[m](būd)vipo dvipaḥ. as(t)y ānanda pūrvavideho nāma dvipo 'ṣṭauyojanasahasrā<ṃ> yāma-vistāreṇa samantād ardhaçandrāçarpaviṇām. tam enaṃ kaścic chaṛddhāḥ kulaputra vā kuladuhitā vā saptaratnamayaṁ kṛtvā 3) cāturārjye bhikṣusamghacchaddhāḥ niryātaye; yo vā tathāgatasārhaḥ samyaksambuddhavā parinirvāṇasya mitākāpiṇḍad āmalakapralpamānaḥ<ṃ> stūpanāṃ pratiṣṭhāpayaḥ sū[c]ci[m]a[(m)]a[ṃ] ya śṛṭaḥ āropayaḥ badaripatram[d] cchatraḥ, yavaphalapramāṇā(m) prati-mā(m) kārayet' sarṣapahalpapramāṇam dhātuḥ pratiṣṭhā- <pa>yet', idam evānanda, tataḥ prabhūtataram punyam vā(dā)mi.

1) The religious stages srotapanna, sakṛdāgāmin and so forth, which are listed in the pars in [3] and [8], and are referred to with yācas in [5] and [6], are missing here. T lists them. 2) B begins here. 3) B: cāturārjye vā bhikṣusamghāḥ. See [1] n. 15. It will not be noted hereafter. 4) B: āmalakapralpamānaḥ. T agrees with A. 5) B: pratiṣṭhāpayaḥ. B uses here a different vowel mātra for the e. See Introduction V,B,(5). 6) B: cchatram āropayaḥ. See [1] n. 19. The
absence of the verb will not be noted hereafter. 7) B: kārāye. 8) B: praksipēd. T: beug na, “put into.” 9) B: evāham. T also omits ānanda. The difference noted here between A and B is consistent and will not be noted hereafter. 10) B: prabhūtatarām as both A and B have in all other occurrences of the phrase. T also uses here the same expression it uses in all the pars. 11) B: puṇyaṁ.

[5] tiṣṭhatv ānanda jambūdvīpo dvīpaḥ, asty ānandāvara-
godāniyo nāma dvīpaḥ 4) navayojana[na]sa[ha]srāny āyāma-
vistārena 4,5 (1579) samanītā pūrṇacandrākāraparāpinim-
tīhā. ta(m) enaṃ kaś(c)īc chṛāddhaḥ kulapurto vā kuladu-
hitā vā sapārata nanamayaṃ kṛtvā yāvac catuṛṣe bhikṣu-
samṛge nirayaṭeṣāḥyo vā tathāgatsyārhatāḥ samyaksaṃ-
uddhasya parinirvṛtasya mṛtpiṃḍād āmalakapramaṇām
stūpaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayet 11) sūcimārāṃ yāṣṭiṃ a[r]<opa>-
yet 12) badariṣṭiṃ pratiṣṭhāpayet 13) sarṣaṇaprabhūtarpītān vā
dhātum prati-
ṣṭhāpayet 14) idam evaṇandaḥ tataḥ 15) prabhūtatarām puṇ-
yan vādā<mi>.

1) B: jambudvīpo. Both spellings are common elsewhere, see BHSD 238b and M-W 412b. Differences in regard to the spelling of this word will not be noted hereafter. 2) B adds: tiṣṭhatu pūrvavideho dvīpaḥ, which agrees with the general pattern of this series of repetitions. T agrees with B. 3) B: ānanda avaragodāniyo. B navayojana(sa)hasrāny āyāmava
vistārena. T has: de chur ni dpag ṭshad dgu stong zhang yang dpag tshad dgu stong ste 5) throughout A vistārena and vistārena are used alternatively; see M-W 1001c. It will not be noted hereafter. 6) B: puṇyaḥ(c)a)
ndrākāraparāpinimastas. The ending results from a dittography. 7) B also has chṛāddhaḥ. 8) B: vāc, probably a scribal error written under the influence of the preceding pīvāmūlya of chṛāddhaḥ kulaputro. 9) B: srotāpanneḥḥya saktadāvīṃbhya ṭhadbhyaḥ pratekabuddheḥbhyaḥ. Note that anāgāṃbhīḥya is here omitted. T lists the five religious stages as in [3]. 10) T: skyu ru ra'i 'bras bu tsam “the size of an āmalaka fruit.” Āmalaka and āmalakaphala are used alternatively throughout A and B; it will not be noted hereafter. 11) B: pratiṣṭhāpayet; it will not be noted hereafter. 12) B: aropayed. 13) B: kārāye; it will not be noted hereafter. 14) B: praksipēd. The use of this verb in B for pratiṣṭhāpayet in A is consistent and will not be noted hereafter. 15) B: tataḥ; see introduction V.A, ms. A., (2), (b).

[6] tiṣṭhatv ānanda jambū(d)vīpo dvīpaḥ. tiṣṭhatu (pūr)[va-
],(d)eḥo dvīpaḥ. tiṣṭhatv avaragodāniyo dvīpaḥ. asty ānanda uṭṭarākurur [nāma]1 dvīpaḥ 2,3) daṇyojanaṣa<hasrāny> āyāmartā(re)na 5) samamūtām samam[ta]caturṣrāsām. (ta)m e(na)m kaścic chṛāddhaḥ ku(l)aḥputro vā kuladuhitā vā sap-
taratnamayaṃ kṛtvā yāvac6 cātur[di]j[ṣe] <bhikṣu> (sam)-
ghe (ni)ryā(ta)yed; (yo vā) tathāgatasyārhatas7 samyakṣaṃbuddhasya[4] parinirv[ta]syā m(t)pīṃḍād āma-laka(phala)pramāṇaṃ stūpaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayet7 [sūcimātrāṃ ya[ṣṭi]m āropayet16 bada(r)i(patra) [mātraṃ c]cha(t)raṃ, yavaphala[pramāṇaṃ pratiṃmām kārayet(t śṛṣaṇa)pha(la)-
pramāṇaṃ] dhātum pratiṣṭhāpayet’, tataḥ11 prabhūtata-
raṃ punyaṃ va (<dāmi>>).

1) This reconstruction is uncertain. Possible reading: nāma. 2) B: dvīpā. 3) (B: dukṣaṃ)[n]ānānaṃ 

[7] tiṣṭhatvā ānanda jaṃbūdvipo dvīpas.1 tiṣṭhatu pūrvavideho dvīp(a)ḥ. tiṣṭ(tha)tv avaragodā[ṇ]ṇī(y(o)7 [dvī][pah]. 2) tiṣṭhatūtārakuru dvīpāḥ. asty ānanda śakrasya 3) de[va]niṃ 
adrasya5 (1580) vajayarāṃto15 nāma3 prāsādaḥ. tam enaṃ6 śrāddhāḥ7 kulaputro vā kuladuhiṭā vā8.9 cāturdiśe bhiḥ(kṣu) 
śaṃ(ghe) nirvātyaed; yo vā tathāgatasyārhatatā samyakṣaṃ-
buddhasya[4] paranirvāyāsyā10 mātīṃḍād āmalakaphala[
pramāṇaṃ 11] stūpaṃ pratiṣṭhā(āpa)yet [sūcimātrāṃ ya[ṣṭi]m 
āropayet]d bādari(pa)tramātraṃ cchatraṃ, yavaphala-
pramāṇaṃ pratiṃmām kārayet [sa]mprapalaphamaṇaṃ11 
dh(ātu)m [pratiṣṭhāpa]ye’d, idam evānanda tataḥ 
prabhūtataraṃ punya[m vā] (dā)mi[.]

1) B: dvīpā, as in the pars throughout A and B. 2) B: avaragodāṇīya. 3) (B: devāndrasya. 4) A: vai[va]jaya[man]. A scribal ditigraphical error resulting from writing an akṣara at the end of the last line of the page and repeating it at the head of the first line of the next page. B: vajayarāntaḥ. 30 B omits. T: nmaṃ par rgyal byed ces bya ba. A agrees with T. 6) B: enaṃ. 7) B: kaści(c) cṛṇādhva, similar to all the pars in A and B. T agrees with B. 87) B: vā saptaratnamayaṃ kṛtvā. This phrase appears to have been inadvertently omitted in A. It is used in all the pars in A and B and in T here and throughout. 9) B adds after its vā saptaratnamayaṃ kṛtvā (see n. 8) the five religious stages as in [6] n. 6. (The
-ka- in pratye ka (however is mistakenly repeated). 109) Read parinirvānasya; it appears to be a scribal error. 110) B omits. It appears to be a typical homoeoteleuton.

[8] [t̂î]ṣṭha(tv) āṇanda1 jaṁ(bu)dvīpo dvīpaḥ. tiṣṭhatu pūrvavideho dvīpaḥ. tiṣṭhatv <avara> godāniyo2 dvīpaḥ. tiṣṭha(t)ūṭtaraku(ru)3 d(v)īpaḥ. (tiṣṭhatu) sākrasya 4(d)evānām indrasya4 vaijaya(m)itaḥ prāśādāh. asty āṇandas5 trisāhasramahāsāhasro lo<kadha>-[tu].6 tam enaṁ kaści(c) chr(ā)ddhah kulaputro vā (kula)duhiṭā vā saptaratnamanyān7 kṛtvā srotāpannebhyāh sAKrād(ā)gambhiyo 'nāgāmibhiyo rhaḍbhhyā pratyekabuddhebhya<s> cāturdiṣṭe vā bhįjkuṃsaṃghe niṁyā(ta)yaed; yo vā taḥ tāhagatāyārhatāh samyaksamṛddhah saptaratnaa parinirvātasa paritikāpiṇḍādā āma-lakapramāṇam stuṇām pratiṣṭhāpayet8 sū<ci> mātrāṃ yaṣṭiṁ āropayed badarapatrāmātṛam cchatram āropaye10* yavaḥphalapramāṇam pratimām kārayet saracapphalapra-māṇam dhātum pratiṣṭhāpayed, idam evāna<nda> tataḥ11 prabhūtataram puṇyam vādāmī.

1) A uses an irregular form for long ā. 2) B: avaragodānīyo. 3) B: uttaraaguru. 4) Bk: deve(n)āryas as in [7] n. 3. 5) B: āna(nda). 6) B: [lo]kadhā[tus] 7) B: sALpātraṇaḥaMYān. 8) B: mṛṭpūḍādd. Mṛṭikā and mṛṛ are used alternately through-out A and B. Note that here A has puyāḍ; it is the only occurrence of the retroflex nasal n in the word puyāḍ in A. 9) B: pratiṣṭhāpaye. 10*) B: āropayed. This is the only use in A of a verb after cchatram; cf. [1] n. 19. 11) B: tataḥ.

[9] tat kasya heto? ṛṣa śaṣṭa vaitāgata dā[na]nē- namṛṣaṃ śaṣṭa vaitāgata bhavet [Sūrya] sātya<s> (1581) namṛṣaṃ sātya<s> maitrīyamṛṣaṃ karunāyamṛṣaṃ muditāyamṛṣaṃ upekṣāya<s> catubhir vaisāradyāid āsābhiṣ tathāgata-balalā<s> astāda-sābhīr āvēṇikai(r) buḍḍhadharm(m)<ai>r10* ṛṣaṃ śaṣṭa vaitāgata rhatas13 samyakṣamṛddhah. 10* B adds jñānēnāyamṛṣaṃ. List in T differs from both A & B. It gives: jñāna, śila, ksānti, viṃśa, bhāva, and prajñā. 110*) B omits. T agrees with A. 11) The aprameyā may have been inadvertently omitted. In order to be consistent, one should have here upekṣāya aprameyā. 12*) B reverses the order: jñānēna bhalaī (omitting tathāgata) catubhir vaisāradyāid. T agrees with B. 13*) B: tṛṭbhir āvēṇikai sāmyotpas-
thānārīr mmaḥākarū<ra>īyā ca. T mentions both the asūdāsāveṣpa-buddhādharmā and the trīṣyā āvivikāṃ śmyupashāhānī. However the order of the tathāgata’s qualities in the Tibetan text is different. Read aprameyā ‘prameyā; this is probably a scribal error. B: aprameyā ‘prameyagurīyagurīyasūman(v)yāgataḥ. T agrees with A. 11) B omits. 12) B: ānanda. 13) B: ‘arha.


1) In B it is not clear whether it is ukto or ukte. 2) B: āyuśmāṇ. 3) B also uses t' here and this is the only instance of its use in B. 4/8 B: ko nāmāya bhadanta. Cf. Ét. Lamotte, L’enseignement de Vimalakīrti (Louvain, 1962) 392, n. 41, for this stock phrase. 5) B adds: bhagavān āha:. T agrees with B. 6) B: tasmā. An assimilation of the final t with the initial t of team. 7) B omits. 8) The anusūraṇa found in A is not clear. B: ima(m)9. 8/8/9) B: amṣṭadundubhir ēty āpi dhārayāḥ adbhutadharmparyāya ēty āpi dhārayā tasmād aya dharmaparyāyoṣya adbhutadharmparyāya ēty adhivacanāḥ. The visarga in dhārayāḥ is used as a mark of punctuation. 10) Possibly [x]1 = hi. This is, however, uncertain. 11/11 B omits. Reconstruction supported by occurrences of this cliché elsewhere; see e.g. BHSDg2aand Ét. Lamotte, [sec [10] n. 4(4) 393 n. 43. 12) B: kūṭāgārasūtram samāptaḥ; see introduction.

VII. Translation of the Sanskrit Text

[0] Thus have I heard at one time. The Blessed One dwelt in Rājaṇgrha, in the Bamboo Grove, in the Kalan-dakāniṇavaṇa.

[1] At that time Venerable Ānanda, having dressed in the early morning, having taken his robe and his bowl, entered Rājaṇgrha to collect alms. The Venerable Ānanda saw, while walking from one house to the next to collect alms 11 in the city of Rājaṇgrha,1 at a certain place,2 a multi-storied building3 with eighty doors, plastered inside and out, with flags and banners raised aloft, and adorned with cloth hangings
and stringed ornaments. When he had seen that, the thought occurred to him: "If some believing son or daughter of good family were to make such a multi-storied building and offer it to the community of monks of the four directions; or if someone were to establish a stūpa the size of an āmalaka\(^1\) fruit for the Tathāgata, the Arhat, the Fully Enlightened One, and were to stick into it a stūpa-pole the size of a needle with an umbrella the size of a juniper leaf, were to make an image the size of a grain of barley, and were to establish a relic the size of a mustard seed, which of them would have the greatest merit?"

Then it occurred to Venerable Ānanda: The Teacher is readily available to me, the Sugata is readily available to me. What if I were to ask the Blessed One concerning this matter? As the Blessed One will explain it, so I will preserve it.

\(^4\) Emblic Myrobalan. M-W 146c. Āmalaka and āmalakaphala are used alternatively throughout ms. A and B. I have translated it always as āmalaka fruit.

[2] Then the Venerable Ānanda, having walked from one house to the next to collect alms in the city of Rājagrha, having eaten, having returned from collecting alms-food in the afternoon, having put away his bowl and his robe, having washed his feet, approached the Blessed One. Having approached, having prostrated with his head at the Blessed One’s feet, he stood at one side. Standing at one side, Venerable Ānanda said this to the Blessed One. Today, O Honourable, having dressed in the early morning, having taken my robe and my bowl, I entered Rājagrha to collect alms. I indeed saw while I was walking from one house to the next to collect alms in the city of Rājagrha, at a certain place, a multi-storied building with eighty doors, plastered inside and out, with flags and banners raised aloft and adorned with cloth hangings and stringed ornaments. Having seen that, the thought occurred to me: If some believing son or a daughter of a good family were [to make]\(^1\) such a multi-storied building and offer it to the community.
of monks of the four directions; or if someone were to establish for the Tathāgata, the Arhat, the Fully Enlightened One, who has attained complete Nirvāṇa, a stūpa the size of an āmalaka fruit made from a lump of clay, and were to stick into it a stūpa-pole the size of a needle with an umbrella the size of a juniper leaf, were to make an image the size of a grain of barley, and were to establish a relic the size of a mustard seed, which of them would have the greater merit? It occurred to me: The Teacher is readily available to me, the Sugata is readily available to me. What if I were to ask the Blessed One concerning that matter? As the Blessed One will explain it, so I will preserve it.

[3] When he was thus asked the Blessed One said this to Venerable Ānanda: It is good, it is good, O Ānanda, that for the sake of many people you, Ānanda, have acted, and that for the happiness of many people, out of concern for the world, for the sake, the benefit, the happiness of gods and men, you thought that this question should be asked of the Tathāgata. Therefore Ānanda, listen well and duly, and concentrate your mind; I shall tell you. Indeed, Ānanda, the continent of Jaṃbūdvīpa is seven thousand yojanas in length and in breadth. In the north it is broad; in the south it has the shape of a cart. If it were made of the seven precious substances and some believing son or daughter of good family were to offer it to the stream-enterers, once-returners, non-returners, Arhats, Pratyeka-buddhas, or to the community of monks of the four directions; or if someone were to establish for the Tathāgata, the Arhat, the Fully Enlightened One, who has attained complete Nirvāṇa, a stūpa the size of an āmalaka fruit made from a lump of clay, and were to stick into it a stūpa-pole the size of a needle with an umbrella the size of a juniper leaf, were to make an image the size of a grain of barley, and were to establish a relic the size of a mustard seed, I say, Ānanda, the merit of the latter is much greater than the former.

1) Words enclosed in square brackets [ ] represent missing words supplied by the editor.
I have taken the two adverbs to modify śṛṇa, as did the translators into Tibetan. Cf. Śārongamamādhi, Et. Lamotte (Bruxelles, 1965) 125, 225; Sañddhamapuddartha, H. Kern (Dover, 1962) 38. The dimensions of the four continents given in Ad, Kū, and Ma are similar to those given in the Lalitaavistara, P.L. Vaidya (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts no. 1, Darbhanga, 1958) 104.11–12. In the Lalitaavistara, however, Godānīya is 8,000 yojanas in length and in breadth and Pūrvavideha is 9,000 yojanas. This corresponds to the dimensions in Taisho 688; see endnote no. 6. The Abhidharmakośa gives different dimensions for each of the four continents. Abhidharmakośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu, P. Pradhan (Patna, 1975) 161–2. Louis de La Vallée Poussin, L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu Tome II (Mêlanges chinois et bouddhiques, vol. 16, Bruxelles, 1971) 145–6. The literal translation is: If some believing son or a daughter of good family were to make it to consist of the seven precious substances.

[4] Put aside, Ānanda, the continent of Jambūdvīpa. There is, Ānanda, a continent named Pūrvavideha. It is fully eight thousand yojanas in length and in breadth, and is shaped in the form of a half moon. If it were made of the seven precious substances and some believing son or a daughter of good family were to offer it to the community of monks of the four directions; or if someone were to establish for the Tathāgata, the Arhat, the Fully Enlightened One, who has attained complete Nirvāṇa, a stūpa the size of an āmalaka fruit made from a lump of clay, and were to stick into it a stūpa-pole the size of a needle with an umbrella the size of a juniper leaf, were to make an image the size of a grain of barley, and were to establish a relic the size of a mustard seed, I say, Ānanda, the merit of the latter is much greater than the former.

1) B: or to. 2) B always has: put into. 3) B always omits.

[5] Put aside, Ānanda, the continent of Jambūdvīpa. [Put aside the continent of Pūrvavideha]. There is, Ānanda, a continent named Avaragodānīya. It is fully nine thousand yojanas in length and in breadth, and shaped in the form of a full moon. If it were made of the seven precious substances and some believing son or a daughter of good family were to offer it, as before, up to the community of monks of the four directions; or if someone were to establish for the Tathāgata, the Arhat, the Fully Enlightened One, who has attained complete Nirvāṇa, a stūpa the size of an
āmalaka fruit made from a lump of clay, and were to stick into it a stūpa-pole the size of a needle with an umbrella the size of a juniper leaf, were to make an image the size of a grain of barley, and were to establish a relic the size of a mustard seed, I say, Ānanda, the merit of the latter is much greater than the former.

1) A omits. B has this phrase which agrees with the general pattern of these series of repetitions. 2) B: It is fully nine thousand yojanas in length [and] nine thousand yojanas in breadth. (3) B always has: offer it to the stream-enterers, once-returners, non-returners, Arhats, Pratyekabuddhas, or to the community of monks of the four directions. Here, however, the non-returners are omitted.

[6] Put aside, Ānanda, the continent of Jāmbūdvīpa, put aside the continent of Pūrvavideha, put aside the continent of Avaragodāniya. There is, Ānanda, a continent named Uttarakuru. It is fully ten thousand yojanas in length and in breadth¹ and entirely square.² If it were made of the seven precious substances and some believing son or daughter of good family were to offer it, as before, up to the community of monks of the four directions; or if someone were to establish for the Tathāgata, the Arhat, the Fully Enlightened One, who has attained complete Nirvāṇa, a stūpa the size of an āmalaka fruit made from a lump of clay, and were to stick into it a stūpa-pole the size of a needle with an umbrella with size of a juniper leaf, were to make an image the size of a grain of barley, and were to establish a relic the size of a mustard seed, I say, the merit [of the latter]³ is much greater than the former.

1) B: It is fully ten thousand yojanas in length [and] ten thousand yojanas in breadth. 2) B: shaped as a square. 3) A omits idam. It occurs in the parallels and in B.

[7] Put aside, Ānanda, the continent of Jāmbūdvīpa, put aside the continent of Pūrvavideha, put aside the continent of Avaragodāniya, put aside the continent of Uttarakuru. There is Ānanda, a palace of Śakra, the chief of the gods, named¹ Vaijyanta. ²If a believing son or a daughter of good family were to offer it to the community of monks
of the four directions; or if someone were to establish for the Tathāgata, the Arhat, the Fully Enlightened One, who has attained complete Nirvāṇa, a stūpa the size of an āmalaka fruit made from a lump of clay, and were to stick into it a stūpa-pole the size of a needle with an umbrella the size of a juniper leaf, were to make an image the size of a grain of barley, and were to establish a relic the size of a mustard seed, I say, Ānanda, the merit of the latter is greater than the former.


[8] Put aside, Ānanda, the continent of Jambūdvipa, put aside the continent of Pūrvavideha, put aside the continent of Avaragodāniya, put aside the continent of Uttaraku, put aside Vaijayanta, the palace of Śakra, the chief of the gods. There is, Ānanda, a world system consisting of “three thousand great thousand worlds.” If it were made of the seven precious substances and some believing son or a daughter of good family were to offer it to the stream-enters, once-returners, non-returners, Arhats, Pratyeka-buddhas, or to the community of monks of the four directions; or if someone were to establish for the Tathāgata, the Arhat, the Fully Enlightened One, who has attained complete Nirvāṇa, a stūpa the size of an āmalaka fruit made from a lump of clay, and were to stick into it a stūpa-pole the size of a needle with an umbrella the size of a juniper leaf, were to make an image the size of a grain of barley, and were to establish a relic the size of a mustard seed, I say, Ānanda, the merit of the latter is much greater than the former.


[9] What is the reason for this? Because, Ānanda, the Tathāgata is immeasurable through his giving, immeasurable through his morality, immeasurable through his patience, immeasurable through his vigor, immeasurable
through his renunciation (*tyāga*). Through the four assurances, through the ten Tathāgata’s powers, through the eighteen characteristics unique to a Buddha (*āvenikas*) he is immeasurable. The Tathāgata, the Arhat, the Fully Enlightened One, Ānanda, is indeed endowed with immeasurable qualities.

1) B omits. 2) Ms. A has the first four *pāramitās* of the established formula of six or ten *pāramitās* [cf. Har Dayal, *The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature* (Delhi, 1975) 165–172] and *tyāga* [cf. Har Dayal *ibid.* and É. Lamotte, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien* (Louvain, 1958) 79–81]. Ms. B adds to this list *jñāna* which is the last *pāramitā* in the tenfold formula of the *pāramitās*. 3) B omits. 4) B reverses the order in listing these two formulae. 5) B: through the three unique applications of mindfulness and great compassion. 6) B omits: 7) B: immeasurable multitude of qualities.

[10] When this was spoken, Venerable Ānanda said this to the Blessed One: “Marvellous, O Blessed One, marvellous, O Sugata, is indeed this discourse on Dharma! And how should I preserve it?” “Because of that you now, Ānanda, should preserve this wonderful discourse on Dharma as The Wonderful Discourse on Dharma (Ādbhutadharmapar- āyya).” This the Blessed One said. The delighted monks and Venerable Ānanda rejoiced in the speech of the Blessed One.

1) B adds: O Honourable. 2) B adds: The Blessed One said. 3) B omits. 4) B: Should preserve this discourse on Dharma as “The Eternal Drum.” You should preserve it also as “The Wonderful Discourse on Dharma.” Therefore the name of this discourse on Dharma is The Wonderful Discourse on Dharma. 5) B omits and ends with: The *Kūṭāgāra Sūtra* is completed. See introduction.

NOTES

*I would like to express here my deep gratitude to Prof. G. Schopen who assisted me at every stage of this study, starting from my first introduction to the Gilgit collection up until the final draft revisions.*

1. For the Gilgit mss. and their discovery see the following: Nalinaksha Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts* vol. I (Srinagar–Kashmir, 1939) preface; M.S. Kaul
Mythic Society* vol. 30 (July, 1939) #1, 1–12 + plates; M. Sylvain Véli, “Note
dsur des manuscrits sanscrits provenant de Bamiyan (Afghanistan) et de Gilgit
(Cachemire),” *Journal Asiatique* (1932) 13–45; Oskar von Hinüber, “Die Erforschung
der Gilgithandschriften,” *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften
in Göttingen. I. Philologisch-Historische Klasse* vol. 12 (1979) 329–359; Karl
Jettmar, “Zu den Fundumständen der Gilgitmanuskripte,” *Zentralasiatische
by Installments,” *Journal of Central Asia* vol. 4, #2 (Dec. 1981) 1–18 (This
is only an English version of the preceding article); Oskar von Hinüber,
“Namen in Schutzzaubern aus Gilgit,” *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik*
vol. 7 (1981) 163–171; P. Banerjee, “Painted Wooden Covers of Two Gilgit Man-
uscripts,” *Oriental Art* N.S. XIV/2 (1968) 114–118.

2. A Tibetan translation of *Ad* is found in the Kanjur. Derge blockprint
(Delhi, 1976+) vol. 72, pp. 387–392 (Tohoku #319); Peking blockprint, *The
Narthang blockprint (Toyo Bunko), mdo la 305b–308b; Cone blockprint, mdo
mang sa 237b–241a, vol. 28; Lhasa blockprint, mdo la 297a–302a, vol. 72;
Tog Palace manuscripts (Leh, 1980) vol. 59, pp. 737–746; The manuscript
Kanjur in the British Museum, London (Or 6724) mdo na 352a–356a, #36,35
2a4 in E.D. Grinstead, “Index of the Manuscript Kanjur in the British
between the Taisho and each of the three Sanskrit mss., as well as the Peking
version of the Tibetan translation are given by Hisashi Matsumura. “Notes
(130)–131.

*Ad* was made into chapter 1 of the *Anuttarāśrayasūtra*, an important
*Tathāgatagarbhā Sūtra*. See Jikido Takasaki, “Structure of the *Anuttarāśraya-
sūtra* (Wu-shang-i-ching),” *Indogaku Bukkyō gaku Kenkyū* vol. 8, no. 2 [16] (1960)
(30)–(35). The entry on the *Ad* in the *Encyclopedia of Buddhism* ed., G.P.
Malalasekera (Ceylon, 1961) vol. 1, 191–2 is confusing. It does not refer to
*Ad* as we know it from the Sanskrit mss. or from the Tibetan translation.

3. André Bareau, *La construction et le culte des stūpa d'apres les Vina-
Mireille Bénisti, “Etude sur le stūpa dans l'Inde ancienne,” *ibid.*, vol. 50 (1960)
Anna Libera Dallapiccola et al. eds., *The Stūpa its Religious, Historical and
Architectural Significance* (Wiesbaden, 1980); Adrian Snodgrass, *The Symbolism of
the Stūpa* (Cornell, 1985); Akira Hirakawa, “The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism
And Its Relationship to the Worship of Stūpas,” *Memoirs of the Research Depart-
ment of the Toyo Bunko* no. 22 (Tokyo, 1963) 57–106; Robert L. Brown, “Recent
215–232; Sushila Pant, *Stūpa Architecture in India* (Varanasi, 1976) pp. xiv and
6; G. Roth, “Buddhist Sanskrit Stūpa-texts from Nepal,” *Actes du XXIXe congres
81–87.
4. The Kūṭāgāra Sūtra (Kū)—Derge: Delhi 1976+, vol. 72, pp. 519–526; Tohoku Cat. #332; Peking: Suzuki edition #998, vol. 39, pp. 109.4–111.1.4; Narthang: mdo la fols. 410a–415a; Tog Palace: Leh 1980 edition vol. 79, pp. 288–297; Lhasa: mdo la fols. 397b–403a; Tun Huang manuscripts: #60 in Louis de la Vallée Poussin, Catalogue of the Tibetan Manuscripts from Tun Huang in the India Office Library (Oxford University Press, 1962). The Kūṭāgāra Sūtra is available to me only in its Tibetan Translation. However, de la Vallée Poussin, *ibid.* compares the Tibetan text of Kū to a Sanskrit text. No details on the latter are given. In A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Government Collection under the Care of the Asiatic Society of Bengal vol. 1, Buddhist Manuscripts (Calcutta, 1917) 127–28 [No. 81, 4758], M.H.P. Shāstri describes a ms. as having two works, I. *Tathāgatapratīvatimba pratishānuśāsana-vanavāna- dharmacaryāya.* II. *Dīcyabhojanavatādāna.* He says that the ms. has 8 folios numbered 1 and 6 to 12 and adds: “I. comes to an end on 7b, line 1, then begins II.” But this ms. must have contained at least 3 works since the text which Shāstri quotes as the beginning of the *Tathāgatapratīvatimba* is, in fact, not the beginning of this text, but the beginning of the Kūṭāgāra Sūtra. The missing folios 2–5, therefore, must have included at least the rest of the Kūṭāgāra Sūtra and the first half of the *Tathāgatapratīvatimba.* This fragment, however, does not contain the second half of the sūtra which is parallel to the *Ad.*


6. All three texts deal, wholly or in part, with the cult of relics, the making of stūpas and images, and the merit resulting from the same, all in very similar ways. For example, compare the Sanskrit and Tibetan of *Ad* section [3] in my edition (Derge vol. 72, p. 389.3–4) to Kū in Tibetan: Derge vol. 72, p. 523.2–3, and Ma in Tibetan: Derge vol. 62, p. 218.2–3. (This passage of Kū was translated into French by L. Ligeti, in “Le mérite d'ériger un stūpa et l'histoire de l'éléphant d'or,” *Proceedings of the Csoma de Körös Memorial Symposium*, ed., Louis Ligeti (Budapest, 1978) 248. Apparently because of the similarities there has been a good deal of confusion in regard to these texts. As will be mentioned in section II below, although the name *Adbhuta dharmaparāyāya* appears at the end of Sanskrit ms. B of the *Ad*, a scribe mislabeled it as Kū (showing his familiarity with Kū as well). The Chinese translations Taisho 688 and 689, which are supposed to be translations of *Ad* reflect a text much closer to Ma. (I have used a draft translation of the Chinese by P.M. Harrison lent to me by G. Schopen). Curiously, no mention of a kūṭāgāra is found in the Kūṭāgāra Sūtra apart from the title, however, a kūṭāgāna is mentioned in the opening part of both *Ad* and Ma. This longstanding confusion among the three texts makes it extremely difficult to determine the
relations between them.


9. 1. The Stūpa-lakṣayā-hārisā-vivecaṇa, a circa 11th century Buddhist Sanskrit stūpa text from Nepal, quotes Kū along with the Prakṛtyokha-vinaya of the Lokottaravādins and passages from the Stūpa-kalpanā-sūtra in the Kṣudrakavatū of the Sarvāstivādins. See Gustav Roth in n. 3.


A number of Tibetan accounts concerning the construction and consecration of mchod-rten (stūpas) quote our sūtras in order to demonstrate the merit to be achieved by building a stūpa. See Yael Bentor, Miniature Stūpas, Images and Relics; the Sanskrit Manuscripts of the Adhūtadharmaparyyā from Gilgit and its Tibetan Translation (Masters Thesis, Indiana University, Bloomington, 1987).

10. I Ching writes: “Even if a man make an image as small as a grain of barley, or a Cāitya the size of a small jujube, placing on it a round figure, or a staff like a small pin, a special cause for good birth is obtained thereby, and will be as limitless as the seven seas, and good rewards will last as long as the coming four births. The detailed account of this matter is found in the separate Sūtras.” (Emphasis is mine.) See I-Tsung (I Ching), A Record of the Buddhist
11. A good summary with extensive bibliography of the archaeological literature in regard to miniature stūpas and clay tablets is given by Maurizio Taddei in "Inscribed Clay Tablets and Miniature Stūpas from Çañi," *East and West* vol. 20 (1970) 70–86. Here only a few examples will be given. A. Cunningham writes about Bodhgaya: "...there were hundreds of thousands of even smaller offerings in the shape of little clay stūpas, both baked and unbaked, from 2 or 3 inches in height, to the size of a walnut. Scores, and sometimes even hundreds, of these miniature stūpas were found inside the larger stūpas, enclosing small clay seals" (*Mahābodhi or The Great Buddhist Temple under the Bodhi Tree at Buddha-Gaya* (London, 1892) 46–7). Chandra and Dikshit in their report of the excavations at Satyapir Bhītā, 300 yards east of the main establishment of Paharpur say that "...the most important discovery of the season was that of several thousands of miniature votive stūpas made of clay, deposited at the bottom of the relic chamber of a votive stūpa of considerable size...such stūpas encasing the Buddhist creed have been found also at Nālandā, Mirpur-khas, Sārnāth and other Buddhist sites" (G.C. Chandra and K.N. Dikshit, "Excavations at Paharpur," *Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India* 1950–4, pt. 1 (Delhi, 1930) 124–5; K.N. Dikshit *Excavation at Paharpur, Bengal* (Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, no. 55, Delhi, 1938) 83–4; see also F.R.S. Sykes, "On the Miniature Chaityas and Inscriptions of the Buddhist Religious Dogma Found in the Ruins of the Temple of Sārnāth, near Benares," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* vol. 16 (1856) 37–55. Similar evidence is found also in Central Asia, Tibet, Ceylon, Burma, Thailand and Indonesia (see M. Taddei, *ibid.*).


13. N. Dutt (see n. 1) 41; M.S. Kaul Sastri (see n. 1) 9 and plate 1440. In 1958 K. Jettmar bought in the Gilgit bazaar a small stūpa, probably originating from the same discovery. It is illustrated in Gérard Fussman, "Inscription de Gilgit," *Bulletin de l’Ecole française d’Extrême Orient* vol. 65 (1978) 5 and plate ii. It should be noted, however, that the miniature stūpas found at Gilgit contain the "Dharma relic"—the ye dharmā gāthā—in addition to, or instead of, the bodily relics which alone are referred to in the text of the *Ad* found at that same site.


In Tibet, Nepal and Southeast Asia the practice of making small clay objects in the shape of stūpas, images or imprinted tablets, in many instances containing a sacred relic and/or dhāraṇī is very popular. The Tibetan clay stūpas and images called *tsha-tshas*, however, have significances and usages beyond those which small stūpas originally had. See Yael Bentor in n. 9.

15. Besides our texts, a similar controversy occurs in some Vinaya passages related to the cult of the stūpa studied by André Bareau [(see n. 3) 234 and 257] and Akira Hirakawa [(see n. 3) 98–102] as well as in the dispute...
between the sects of the small Vehicle studied by André Bareau in *Les sectes bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule* (Publication de l’École française d’Extrême-Orient, vol. 38, Paris, 1955) 88, 100, 105, 154, 185, 188, 192, 269, 274. This competition between the two practices, the establishment of stūpas/images/relics and offerings to the Sangha/Arhats/Pratvekabuddhas does not necessarily mean a complete dichotomy between these two practices, or between the Sangha and the stūpa/image/relic cult. There is sufficient evidence in the Vinaya and in Buddhist inscriptions from India for the participation of monks in the stūpa and image cults. The Vinaya itself addresses both monks and laymen with regard to the cult of the stūpa [in Bareau (see n. 3) 249]. Moreover, according to the *Mahāsanghika-vinaya*, monks made offerings to a stūpa on four holy days commemorating events in the life of the Buddha (*ibid.* 250); see also *The Stūpa Varga*, the 14th chapter in the *Bhiksuni-Vinaya* ed., G. Roth (Patna, 1970) 332. Donative inscriptions and Buddhist monastic architecture also confirm the participation of monks in the stūpa cult. See Gregory Schopen, “Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism: The Layman/Monk Distinction and the Doctrines of the Transference of Merit,” *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* vol. 10 (1985) 20–30; and *idem*, “Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions,” *Indo-Iranian Journal* vol. 21 (1979) 1–19.


19. As noticed by G. Schopen, in von Hinüber (see n. 16) p. *26*.


21. Lore Sander (see n. 18) pp. 121–136, Tafel IV.

22. *Mahāvyutpatti* (Bon-Zō-Kan-Wa yon'yaku taiō Mahāvyuttapatti) ed., Sakaki Ryōzaburō (Kyoto, 1965) #187–#190; BHSD (see bibliography below) 614b.


25. This list corresponds to the Mahāyāna system, see below.

In the texts which make the various parts of a stūpa correspond to doctrinal categories or the Tathāgata's qualities, the system found in ms. B, the Vaibhasika list, is followed, rather than that of ms. A. For example, see the Mchod-rten-gyi Cha Obye-ba Dul-ba-las Byung-ba'i Mdo Peking no. 3897, vol. 79, pp. 287.2–288.1, which is discussed in G. Tucci, Indo-Tibetica vol. 1 "Mc'od rten" e "ts'a ts'a" nel Tibet indiano ed occidentale (Reale Accademia D'Italia, Roma, 1932) 39–43, and in Gustav Roth, “Symbolism of the Buddhist Stūpa,” in Dallapiccola (see n. 3) 187–193. Roth also adds a similar symbolic representation found in the Sanskrit treatise Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-viveca 193–195 (see also note 9). The Tibetan inscription from the Chü-yung-kuan “Arch” gives a similar set of correspondences; see Jiro Murata, (in note 9) vol. I,233, verse 5.


28. This is also the list of the Mahāvyutpatti (see note 22), #135–#153; see also F. Edgerton, BHSD 108b.


31. A bibliographical list for works referred to in this section is found at the end of the present work.

32. Cf. Gregory Schopen, “The Five Leaves of The Buddhabaladhinana-prāthīhāryavikurvanānīdesa-sūtra Found at Gilgit,” Journal of Indian Philosophy vol. 5 (1978) 332, fol 1296 1.6, where ka(h) should be read kaḥ.
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