

# The Redactions of the *Adbhutadharmaparyāya* from Gilgit\*

by Yael Bentor

## I. 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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> *Ad* advocates the establishment of stūpas/images/relics and asserts that such acts produce greater merit than making offerings to the Saṅgha, the Arhats and Pratyekabuddhas. This canonical work appears to be only one of a larger group of texts, which also includes the *Kūṭāgāra Sūtra*<sup>4</sup> and the *Mahāraṇa Sūtra*,<sup>5</sup> all of which share this common theme.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, the *Pratītyasamutpāda Sūtra*<sup>7</sup> also has elements in common with other texts of this group, although its description<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup>

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.<sup>11</sup> The report of Hsüan Tsang on the making of miniature stūpas can be added to this evidence.<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup> A number of texts belonging to the later *Avadāna* class also provide us with literary sources for this practice.<sup>14</sup> 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/Pra-tyekabuddhas as primary “fields of merit” (*puṇyakṣetra*).<sup>15</sup>

## II. Description of the Manuscripts

Three mss. of the *Ad* have so far been identified in the Gilgit collection,<sup>16</sup> and all three have been published in facsimile in *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, (*GBMs*).<sup>17</sup> 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.<sup>18</sup> 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.<sup>19</sup> 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*.<sup>20</sup>

Ms. C: *GBMs* vol. 7, folio 1691.2 to end. Script: Gilgit/Bamiyan—Type I,<sup>21</sup> although it is in appearance somewhat cur-

sive. This ms. has only the very beginning of the text, ending in section [1]. It is on the whole clearly readable.

### 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.)

<i>No. Reference</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>
1. [4] n. 3 and parallels in [5], [6], [7], [8].	cāturdiśe (vā) bhikṣusamṅhe	cāturddiśāya vā bhikṣusamṅhāya
2. [4] n.6 and parallels in [5], [6].	cchatraṃ	cchatram āropayed
3. [4] n.8 and parallels in	pratiṣṭhāpayet	prakṣiped

	[5], [6], [7], [8].		
4.	[4] n.9 and parallels in [5], [6], [7], [8].	evānandaḥ	evāhaṃ
5.	[5] n.4 and [6] no.3 (replace nava with daśa in [6])	navayojanasahas- rāṇy āyāmavis- tareṇa	navayojanasahasrāṇy āyāmena navayojana- sahasrāṇi vistāre- ṇa
6.	[5] n.9 [6] n.6 [7] n.9	yāvaca yāvaca <i>deest</i>	srotāpannebhya(h) sakṛdāgāmibhyo ('nā- gāmibhyo) 'rhadbhy- aḥ pratyekabuddhebh- yaś
7.	[7] n.3 [8] n.4	devānām indrasya	devendrasya
8.	[9] n.5	<i>deest</i>	jñānenāprameya
9.	[9] n.6	maitryāprameyaḥ karuṇayāprameya muditayāprameya upekṣayā	<i>deest</i>
10.	[9] n.8 and n.9	caturbhir vaiś- āradyair daśa- bhis tathāgata- balair aṣṭā- daśabhir āveṇi- kair buddha- dharmmair	daśabhir bbalaiś caturbhir vaiśārad- yaiś ṭrbhir āveṇi- kai smṛtyupasthā- nair mmahākaruṇayā ca
11.	[10] n.9	imaṃ dharmapar- yāyam adbhutam adbhutadharm- aparyāya [x]i dhārayaḥ	imaṃ dharmaparyāyam amṛtadundubhir ity api dhārayaḥ adbhū- tadharmaparyāya ity api dhāraya tas- mād asya dharmma- paryāyasya adbhuta-

dharmaparyāyaḥ  
ity adhvacanam

12. [10] n.12      *deest*

kūṭāgārasūtram  
samāptaṁ

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 (*apramāṇas*) 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 (*daśabalāni*), the four assurances (*catvāri vaiśāradyaṇi*) and the 18 characteristics unique to a Buddha (*aṣṭādaśāveṇikāḥ buddhadharmāḥ*). Ms. B, like ms. A, begins its list with the ten powers and the four assurances. However, instead of the 18 *āveṇikabuddhadharmas*, ms. B gives the three unique applications of mindfulness (*trīṇy āveṇikāni smṛtyupasthānāni*)<sup>22</sup> and great compassion (*mahākaruṇā*).

According to Vasubandhu in the *Abhidharmakośa*<sup>23</sup> the 18 characteristics unique to the Buddha consist of the ten powers, the four assurances, the three unique applications of mindfulness and great compassion. (*aṣṭādaśāveṇikāstu buddhadharmā balādayaḥ. . . katame 'ṣṭādaśa? daśa balāni catvāri vaiśāradyaṇi trīṇi smṛtyupasthānāni 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*<sup>24</sup> says: *ete balādyā mahākaruṇāntā aṣṭādaśāveṇikā Vaibhāṣikair vyavasthāpyante. balādi-vyativriktān kecid anyān aṣṭādaśāveṇikān buddha-dharmān varṇayanti.*

This might be translated: “The Vaibhāṣikas declare the 18

unique characteristics (*āveṇikas*) 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 *āveṇikabuddhadharmas* according to these “others”).<sup>25</sup>

Thus, according to Yaśomitra, the list of 18 *āveṇikas* in the *Abhidharmakośa* represents the position of the Vaibhāṣikas. This list is also found in other Sarvāstivādin sources as Lamotte has pointed out.<sup>26</sup> On the other hand, “others” recognize 18 *āveṇikas* 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 *Mahāprajñāpāramitāsāstra* (*MPPS*) there are two different lists of the 18 *āveṇikabuddhadharmas*.<sup>27</sup> One list is advocated by the *MPPS* while the other is rejected there. The list of the 18 *āveṇikabuddhadharmas* advocated there is common with the Mahāyāna literature.<sup>28</sup> The rejected list, according to Lamotte, belongs to the Sarvāstivādin (Vaibhāṣika) school.

In sum, the controversy about the nature of the *āveṇikabuddhadharmas* 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 pratiṣṭhāpayet*), makes an image (*pratimāṃ kārayet*), and establishes a relic (*dhātuṃ pratiṣṭhāpayet*). 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,”<sup>29</sup> 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 *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya* from Gilgit and in the *Divyāvadāna*.<sup>30</sup>

## V. Peculiarities of the Language<sup>31</sup>

### A. Grammatical Notes

Since the three mss. of the *Adbhutadharmaparyāya* 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: *saṃgha* (throughout), *piṃḍa* (throughout), *pratīkrāntaḥ* [2], *vaijayaṃtaḥ* [7], *kṣāṃtyā* [9], *ekāṃta* [2], *bhagavaṃtam* [2], [10], °*asmim*. Cf. Kurumiya p. xxiv 1.6, p. xxxix; von Hinüber p. x. As Kurumiya notes, this use of *anusvāra* is not restricted to Buddhist mss. alone. Cf. Whitney #73b.

(b). A double nasal *ṃn* or *ṃm*, exclusively before long *ā*. For example: *cīvāraṃn ā-* [2], *patākaṃm ā-* [2], *āyusmāṃn 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 guttural surd (*k*) and labial surd (*p*) the *visarga* is sometimes replaced with *jīhvāmūlīya* and *upadhmānīya* respectively (Renou p. 38; Whitney #69, #170d; Sander Tafel 22; Bühler p. 67). I have marked them, after Renou, with *ḥ* and *ḥ* respectively. Examples for *jīhvāmūlīya*: *yaḥ kas* [2], *chrāddhaḥ kulaputro* [2], [5], [7], [8], °*prameyaḥ karuṇayā* (9). An example for *upadhmānīya*: *tataḥ prabhūtataṃ* [5]. The use of the *jīhvāmūlīya* and *upadhmānīya* is far from consistent. Although the phrases *śrāddhaḥ kulaputraḥ* and *tataḥ prabhūtataṃ* occur in

every section from [1] to [8], *jihvāmūliya* and *upadhmānīya* are used only in the cases indicated. The same treatment of *visarga* frequently occurs in the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* 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) *dośaiḥ p-* (*ibid.* folio 1541.4). The *upadhmānīya* also occurs in the *Buddha-balādihānaprātihāryavikurvāṇanirdeśa* written in Gilgit/Bamiyan—Type I Script<sup>32</sup>: *kaḥ punar* (*ibid.* folio 1296.8). Cf. Mette pp. 134 and 141.

(c). Before initial dental sibilant (*s*) *visarga* sometimes becomes dental sibilant. For example: *arhataḥ s-* [6]; cf. *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*, *tataḥ s-* (*ibid.* folio 1538.1) and Whitney #172.

(d). Before initial palatal surd (*c*), instead of a final palatal sibilant (*ś*) we sometimes find *ḥś*. For example: *pratyekabuddhebhyaḥś catur* [3].

(3). *Sandhi*.

(a). Hiatus (#4.51–6).

Hiatus between two vowels is sometimes maintained. For example: *vā īdrśam* [1], [2], *me etad* [2], *ānanda uttaro*<sup>o</sup> [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: *bhagavānn ā-* [3]. Cf. Kurumiya p. xxvii 3.4.

(4). The use of lingual vowel (*r*) for lingual semi-vowel (*r̥*) 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 *m̐*, B has the expected nasal: B has *piṇḍa* for A's *piṃḍa*, *pratīkrāntaḥ* for A's *pratīkrāṃtaḥ* 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.

(b). *Jihvāmūliya* and *upādhmānīya* occur only once each in ms. B: *ajihvāmūliya* occurs in [5] n. 7, *upādhmānīya* in [8] n. 11.

(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 *pratyekabuddhebhyahś cātur* [6].

(3). *Sandhi*: Hiatus.

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

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

Examples for lingual vowel (*r*) used for lingual semivowel (*r̥*): *trśāhasra* for *trisāhasra* [8], *ṛbhīr* 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], *pratiṣṭhāpaye 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: *ekasmim̐* [0], *saṃgha* [1]. Like ms. B, ms. C has *pinḍa*. 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). *Jihvāmūliya* occurs in ms. C: *yaḥ kaś cic chrāddhaḥ kulaputro* [1].

(3). *Sandhi*: Hiatus.

The one instance of an unresolved hiatus between two vowels is the same as in ms. A: *vā īdrśam* [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 (*v*) are indistinguishable.<sup>33</sup> I have transliterated the *akṣara* as *b* or *v* according to the context. *Badarī/vadarī* (see M-W p. 719c, p. 916b), which I have transliterated as *badarī* (cf. Watanabe p. xiv) remains, however, problematic.

(2). In ms. B and once in ms. A., in addition to the regular mark for an *anusvāra* (a dot above the *akṣara*), a special ligature (𑖑) written after the *akṣara* is used. I have indicated it by: *ṃ̇*. Its use in both mss. is quite arbitrary. Examples: ms. A: *ārocayeyāṃ̇* [1]; ms. B: [4] n.11, [6] n.8, [7] n.6, [8] n.7, [10] n.9. Cf. von Hinüber p. x.

(3). Ms. B uses two systems of vowel notation. In addition to the vowel *mātras* of Gilgit/Bamiyan—Type II script in which it is written, ms. B also uses on occasion the vowel *mātras* 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 *mātras* of the second kind with *ē*, *ō*, *āi* [for the palatal diphthong (*ē*) vowel *mātra*, see also Sander Tafel 23–4].

(4). A single consonant following a lingual semi-vowel (*r*) may be doubled. This happens once in ms. A, and quite often in ms. B. Examples: In ms. A: *dharmma* [10]; in ms. B: *dharmma* (in every occurrence), *cāturddiśāya* (in every occurrence), *pūrvva* [5] n.2. *pūrṇṇa* [5] n.6, *daśabhīr bbalaiś* [9] n.8, *smṛtyupasthānair mmahākaruṇayā* [9] n.9. Cf. Whitney #228, 228c.

### 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 *t'*. 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 edition.

(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. Cf. Kurumiya p. xxxix.

## 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) evaṃ<sup>1</sup> mayā śrūtam<sup>2</sup> ekasmiṃ samaye<sup>3</sup>. bhagavān<sup>4</sup> rājagṛhe viharati sma<sup>5</sup> veṇuvane kalandakanivāse.

<sup>1</sup>)Ms. A has one line preceding the standard opening formula *evaṃ mayā*, etc., which I was not able to read. <sup>2</sup>)C: *śrutam*. <sup>3</sup>) For the punctuation of the opening formula cf. J. Brough, "Thus Have I Heard. . ." *BSOAS* 18 (1950) 416–26; Y. Kajiyama, "Thus Spoke the Blessed One. . ." in L. Lancaster, ed., *Prajñāpāramitā and Related Systems: Studies in Honor of Edward Conze* (Berkeley, Buddhist Studies Series, 1977) 93–99; A. Wayman and H. Wayman, *The Lion's Roar of Queen Śrīmalā* (Columbia University Press, 1974) 59. <sup>4</sup>)C: *bhagavāṃn*. <sup>5</sup>) C omits.

[1] Athāyuṣmān ānanda pūrvāhṇe nivā[s]ya <pā>(1576) (trac)īvara(m) ādāya rājagṛhaṃ piṃḍāya prāvīkṣat<sup>1</sup>. adrākṣīd<sup>2</sup> āyuṣmān ānando rājagṛhe nagare<sup>3</sup> sāvadānaṃ piṃḍāya <sup>4</sup>)caramāṇo, 'nyatamasmim<sup>4</sup> pradeśe<sup>5</sup> kūṭāgāraṃ aśītidvāraṃ ulliptāvaliptam<sup>6</sup> [ucchṛtadh]vaja(pa)tākam<sup>7</sup> āmuktapaṭṭadāmakaḷāpaṃ,<sup>8</sup> dṛ(ṣṭvā) ca pu[nas ta]syaitad abhavat':<sup>9</sup> yaḥ<sup>10</sup> kaścic chrāddhaḥ<sup>11</sup> kulaputro vā (ku)laduhitā vā idṛśaṃ kūṭāgāraṃ k[ārayit]vā (catur)d(iśe)<sup>12,13</sup> [bhikṣusaṃghe niryā]taye[d; yo v]ā (tathāgatasyārha)taḥ samya (ksa)ṃbuddhasyāmalakapramāṇaṃ<sup>14</sup> stūpaṃ pra<tiṣṭhā>payet<sup>15</sup> sūcīmātrāṃ<sup>16</sup> yaṣṭi(m<sup>17</sup> āropayed badarī)[patramātraṃ<sup>18</sup> cchatraṃ<sup>19\*</sup>, yavaphala]pramāṇaṃ pratimāṃ kārayet<sup>20</sup> sarṣapaphalaprāmāṇaṃ dhātuṃ prati<ṣṭhā>[pa]yet<sup>21</sup>, tat katamaṃ tataḥ prabhūtataṃ puṇyaṃ syāt'? a[thā]yūṣmamata ānanda[syaitad a]bhvat':<sup>22</sup> śāstā me saṃmukhībhūtaḥ, sugato me saṃmukhībhūtaḥ. yanv<sup>23</sup> aham etam evārthaṃ bhagavataḥ<sup>24\*</sup> ārocayeyāṃ<sup>25</sup>. yathā me sa bhagavāṃ vyākariṣyati tathāhaṃ dharāyi(ṣyā)mīty.

<sup>1</sup>) C is difficult to read here. Cf. E. Conze, *Vajracchedikā prajñāpāramitā* (Serie Orientale Roma 13, 1957) 27 etc. <sup>2</sup>) 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 Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* [MPNS] (Berlin, 1951) 5.3 10.7 11.8 20.5 etc.; G. von Simson, *Zur Diktion einiger Lehrtexte des buddhistischen Sanskritkanons* (München, 1965) 12.32–36, 15.12f etc.<sup>3)</sup> C omits. T agrees with A.<sup>4)</sup>(<sup>4</sup>C: *caramāṇaḥ anyatasmim*.<sup>5)</sup> C: *pr̥thivīpradeśe*. T agrees with A.<sup>6)</sup> C: *upalīptāvalīptam*.<sup>7)</sup> For this and the following compound, cf. W. Couvreur, Review of J. Nobel's *Udrāyana, König von Roruka, IJJ* vol. 1 (1957) 312.<sup>8)</sup> In C *-dāma-* is an interlinear addition. A plus (+) sign (*kākapada* or *hamsapada*) marks the place at which the insertion is to be made.<sup>9)</sup> C has dental *t* with a *virāma*; see introduction V,C,(2),(a).<sup>10)</sup> C: *yah*<sup>11)</sup> C: *chrāddhaḥ*.<sup>12)</sup> 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]).<sup>13)</sup> 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.<sup>14)</sup> In all the pars in A this phrase occurs as: *samyaksambuddhasya parinirvartasya mṛt/mṛttikāpiṇḍād āmalaka*. . . . 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.<sup>15)</sup> In A the *t'* is an interlinear addition.<sup>16)</sup> C: *sūcīpramāṇām*. A here agrees with all the pars.<sup>17)</sup> C ends after *-ya-*.<sup>18)</sup> Or *vadari-*; see V,B,(1). It will not be further noted.<sup>19\*)</sup> A verb after *cchatram* is absent in all but the past par in A. The verb *āropayet* 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.<sup>20)</sup> As in [1] n. 15, the *t'* here is an interlinear addition.<sup>21)</sup> In all the pars B uses the verb *prakṣipet*; see [4] n. 8.<sup>22)</sup> Reconstructed with the help of Ānanda's speech in [2], which is in the first person: *me etad abhavat*. T: *de yang 'di snyam du sems te*.<sup>23)</sup> Or *yatv*. This is perhaps intended for *yat tv aham* or *yan nv aham*; see BHS 444b and 104b s.v. *ārocayati*.<sup>24\*)</sup> The *visarga* is a "correction" beneath the line.<sup>25)</sup> This is the only occurrence of *ṁ* in A.

[2] athāyu(ṣ)mān āna[ndo rāja] gṛhe<sup>1</sup> [?nagare]<sup>2</sup> sāvadānaṃ piṇḍāya caritvā kṛtabhaktakṛtya paścādbhaktapiṇḍapāta-pratikrāṃtaḥ pātracīvaraṃ pratiśamayya<sup>3</sup> pādaḥ prakṣālyā yena bhagavā(ṃs ten)opasaṃkrāṃta.<sup>4</sup> upasaṃkramya bhagavataḥ pādaḥ śirasā vanditvaikāṃte 'sthād. ekāṃtasthita āyusmān ānando bhagavaṃtam idam avocat': ihāhaṃ bhadamta<sup>5</sup> pūrvāhṇe nivāsyā pātracīvaraṃ ādā(1577)ya (rā)jagrhaṃ piṇḍāya prāvīkṣaṃ. so 'ham adrākṣaṃ<sup>6</sup>, rāja-gṛhe nagare sāvadāna(ṃ) piṇḍāya caramāṇo 'nyatasmim̐ pradeśe kūṭāgāram aśītidvāram ulli(ptā)valīptam ucchritadhvajapatākaṃ āmuktapaṭṭadāmakalāpaṃ ca dṛṣṭvā ca punar me etad abhavat': yah kaścic chrāddhaḥ kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā idṛṣaṃ kūṭāgā(raṃ)<sup>7\*)</sup> cāturdiśe

bhikṣusaṃghe niryāyayed; yo vā tathāgata(syā)rhatāḥ sam-  
(yaksambu)ddhasya parini(rvr)tasya mṛttikāpimḍād āmala-  
kapramāṇām stūpaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayet'<sup>8</sup> sūcīmātrāṃ yaṣṭim  
āropaye[d bada]rī[patra]mātra[m] cchatra[m], [ya]va[pha-  
lapra]māṇām pratimām kārayet' sarśapaphalapramāṇam  
dhātum pratiṣṭhāpayet', <tat ka>[tamam]<sup>9</sup> tataḥ prabhū-  
taraṃ puṇyaṃ syāt'? tasya mamaitad abhavaç: chāstā me  
saṃmukhībhūtaḥ, sugato me saṃmukhībhūtaḥ. yanv<sup>10</sup>  
aham etam evārthaṃ bhagavataḥ <āroca>yeyaṃ. yathā  
bhagavāṃ vyākariṣyati [tathāhaṃ]<sup>11</sup> dhā(ra)[yiṣ](y)-  
[ām]i[t]y<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>1)</sup> This phrase was read with the help of T: *de nas tshe dang ldan pa kun dga' bo rgyal po khab to. . .* "Then Venerable Ānanda in Rājagṛha. . .". <sup>2)</sup> This is very uncertain. A appears to have *ṅhisāfe*; the first and third *akṣaras* apparently scored out as mistakes. Two *akṣaras* which probably were meant to replace those scored out are written beneath the line. The first of these two *akṣaras* is not clear, the second is *-ga-*. The phrase *rājagṛhe nagare sāvadānam piṃḍāya /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 (rājagṛha nagare)* for the two other occurrences of this phrase. <sup>3)</sup> Cf. *BHSD* 369b. <sup>4)</sup> This stock phrase was read with the help of T: *bcom ldan 'das ga la ba der song nas*. <sup>5)</sup> For this vocative see *BHSD* 405b. <sup>6)</sup> See [1] n. 2. <sup>7\*)</sup> The par in [1] has *kūṭāgāraṃ kārayitvā*. T also has a verb here. Its absence here in A appears to be a scribal omission. <sup>8)</sup> This is perhaps a double *danḍa*; if so, it is the only occurrence of such in A, and is somewhat out of place here. <sup>9)</sup> This reading was reconstructed according to the par in [1]. T here has: *de gnyis bsod nams shin tu che ba gang lags*. <sup>10)</sup> see [1] n. 23. <sup>11)</sup> This reading is uncertain. It was reconstructed according to the par in [1]. T: *bcom ldan 'das kyis bdag la ji skad bstan pa bzhin du gzung bar bgyi snyam nas*. <sup>12)</sup> T has an additional sentence here: *bcom ldan 'das la bdag don 'di nyid zhu lags na thugs brtse ba nye bar bzung ste/ bcom ldan 'das kyis bdag la don 'di nyid legs bar bstan du gsoll* "If I were to ask the Blessed One concerning this particular matter, he, out of compassion, would fully explain it to me."

[3] [ xxx ]<sup>1</sup> bhagavānn āyuṣ(m)aṃtam ānandam idam av-  
ocat': sādhu sādhu ānanda bahujanahitā[ya] tvam ānanda  
pratipanno ca [bahujanasukh]<sup>2</sup>āya lokānuka[m](pāyai) ar-  
thāya hitāya sukhāya devamanuṣyāṇām, yas t(v)aṃ tathā-  
gatam etam evārthaṃ paripraṣṭavyaṃ manyase. tena hy  
ānanda (śṛṇu) sādhu ca suṣṭhu ca manasikuru, bhāṣiṣye:  
ja[m]būdviṇo hy ānanda dvīpa saptayojanasahasraṇy āyā-  
mavistāreṇa<sup>3</sup> (1578) uttaraviśālo dakṣiṇeṇa śakaṭāmukha:

tam enaṃ kaścic chrāddhaḥ kulaputro vā ku(la) [du]hitā vā saptaratnamayaṃ (kṛ) [tv]ā sr[ot]āpa(nne)bhyaḥ sakṛ[dāg]-āmibhyo 'nāgāmibhyo 'rhadbhyaḥ pratyekabuddhebhyaḥ<sup>4</sup> cātu[rd]i(śe vā) [bh]i[kṣu]saṃghe niryātaye[d]; y[o vā ta]- (th)āgatasyārhataḥ samyaksambuddhasya parinirvṛtasya mṛttikāpimḍād [ā]malakaphalapramā<ṇa>ṃ stūpaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayet' sū[c]i[mā](tr)ā[ṃ] vā<sup>5</sup> ya[ṣṭi]m āropa[yed, bada-rī]patra(mā)traṃ cchatraṃ, yavaphalapramāṇā(ṃ) pratimā(ṃ) kārayet' sarśapaphalapramāṇaṃ dhātuṃ pratiṣṭhā-<pa>yet', idam evānanda, tataḥ prabhūtaraṃ puṇyaṃ va(dā)mi.

<sup>1)</sup> T: *de skad ces gsol 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 gsol ba dang* = Conze 28.7 *evam ukte*; etc.). This also exactly fills the gap. <sup>2)</sup> 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 (Śūramgamasamādhisūtra)* (Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques vol. 13) (Bruxelles, 1965) 304. Note, however, that the *ca* here is somewhat problematic. <sup>3)</sup> On the form *āyāmvistāreṇa* cf. *BHSG* 19.38. <sup>4)</sup> For the *sandhi* see introduction V,A, ms. A (2),(d). <sup>5)</sup> This *akṣara* is difficult to read, has no apparent correspondent in the pars, and is therefore uncertain.

[4] tiṣṭhatv ānanda ja[ṃ](būd)vīpo dvīpaḥ. as(t)y ānanda pūrvavideho nāma dvīpo 'ṣṭaulyojanasahasrā<ṇy ā>yāmvistāreṇa samamṭād ardha-candrākārapariṇāmita. tam enaṃ kaścic chrāddhaḥ kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā saptaratnamayaṃ kṛtva<sup>1,2</sup> <sup>3)</sup>cāturdiśe bhikṣusaṃghe<sup>3)</sup> niryātayed; yo vā tathāgatasyārhataḥ samyaksambuddhasya parinirvṛtasya mṛ[tpiṃ]ḍād āmalakaphalapramāṇaṃ<sup>4</sup> stūpaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayet<sup>5</sup> sūcīmātrāṃ yaṣṭim āropayed badarīpatra-mātraṃ cchatraṃ<sup>6</sup> yavaphalapramāṇaṃ pratimā[ṃ] kārayet<sup>7</sup> sarśapaphalapramāṇaṃ dhātuṃ pratiṣṭhāpayet<sup>8</sup>; idam evānanda<sup>9</sup> tataḥ bahutaraṃ<sup>10</sup> puṇyaṃ<sup>11</sup> vadāmi.

<sup>1)</sup> The religious stages *srotāpanna*, *sakṛdāgāmin* and so forth, which are listed in the pars in [3] and [8], and are referred to with *yāvad* in [5] and [6], are missing here. T lists them. <sup>2)</sup> B begins here. <sup>3)</sup> B: *cāturddiśāya vā bhikṣusaṃghāya*. See [1] n. 13. It will not be noted hereafter. <sup>4)</sup> B: *āmalakapramāṇaṃ*. T agrees with A. <sup>5)</sup> B: *pratiṣṭhāpayēt*. B uses here a different vowel *mātra* for the *e*. See Introduction V,B,(3). <sup>6)</sup> B: *cchatraṃ āropayed*. See [1] n. 19. The

absence of the verb will not be noted hereafter. <sup>7)</sup> B: *kāraye*. <sup>8)</sup> B: *prakṣipēd*. T: *bcug na*, “put into.” <sup>9)</sup> B: *evāhaṃ*. T also omits *ānanda*. The difference noted here between A and B is consistent and will not be noted hereafter. <sup>10)</sup> B: *prabhūtatarāṃ* 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. <sup>11)</sup> B: *puṇyaṃ*.

[5] tiṣṭhatv ānanda jāmbūdvīpo<sup>1</sup> dvīpaḥ<sup>2\*</sup>. asty ānandāvara-  
godānīyo<sup>3</sup> nāma dvīpaḥ<sup>4</sup> navayoja[n]a[sa][ha]srāṇy āyāma-  
vistāreṇa<sup>(4,5)</sup> (1579) samantāt pūrṇacandrākārapariṇāmi-  
taḥ<sup>6</sup>. ta(m) enaṃ kaś(c)i chrāddhaḥ<sup>7</sup> kulapurto vā<sup>8</sup> kuladu-  
hitā vā saptaratnamayaṃ kṛtvā yāvaca<sup>9</sup> caturdi<śe> bhikṣu-  
saṃghe niryāyayed; yo vā tathāgatasyārhatāḥ samyaksam-  
buddhasya parinirvṛtasya mṛtpiṇḍād āmalakapramāṇaṃ<sup>10</sup>  
stūpaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayet<sup>11</sup> sūcīmātrāṃ yaṣṭim ā[r]<opa>-  
yet<sup>12</sup> badarīpatramātraṃ cchatraṃ yavaphalapramāṇaṃ  
pratimāṃ kārayet<sup>13</sup> sarṣapaphalapramāṇaṃ dhātuṃ prati-  
ṣṭhāpayed<sup>14</sup>, idam evānandaḥ tataḥ<sup>15</sup> prabhūtatarāṃ puṇ-  
yaṃ vadā<mi>.

<sup>1)</sup> B: *jāmbudvīpo*. 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. <sup>2\*)</sup> B adds: *tiṣṭhatu pūrvavideho dvīpaḥ*, which agrees with the general pattern of this series of repetitions. T agrees with B. <sup>3)</sup> B: *ānanda avaragodānīyo*. <sup>4)(4)</sup> B: *navayojana(sa)hasrāṇy āyāmena navayojana(sa)hasrāṇi vistāreṇa*. T has: *de chur ni dpag tshad dgu stong zheng yang dpag tshad dgu stong stel* <sup>5)</sup> throughout A *vistāreṇa* and *vistāreṇa* are used alternatively; see *M-W* 1001c. It will not be noted hereafter. <sup>6)</sup> B: *pūrṇa(ca)ndrākārapariṇāmitastā*. The ending results from a dittography. <sup>7)</sup> B also has *chrāddhaḥ*. <sup>8)</sup> B: *vāc*, probably a scribal error written under the influence of the preceding *jihvāmūliya* of *chrāddhaḥ kulapurto*. <sup>9)</sup> B: *srotāpannebhya sakṛdāgāmibhyo ṛhadbhyaḥ pratyekabuddhebhyaś*. Note that *anāgāmibhyaḥ* is here omitted. T lists the five religious stages as in [3]. <sup>10)</sup> 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. <sup>11)</sup> B: *pratiṣṭhāpayet*; it will not be noted hereafter. <sup>12)</sup> B: *āropayed*. <sup>13)</sup> B: *kārayet*; it will not be noted hereafter. <sup>14)</sup> B: *prakṣipēd*. The use of this verb in B for *pratiṣṭhāpayet* in A is consistent and will not be noted hereafter. <sup>15)</sup> B: *tataḥ*; see introduction V,A, ms. A., (2),(b).

[6] tiṣṭhatv ānanda jāmbū(d)vīpo dvīpaḥ. tiṣṭhatu (pūr)[va-  
v]i(de)ho dvīpaḥ. tiṣṭhatv avaragodānīyo dvīpaḥ. asty ānan-  
da uttarakurur [nāma] dvīpaḥ<sup>2,3)</sup> daśayojanasa<hasrāṇy>  
āyāmavistā(re)ṇa<sup>(3)</sup> samantāt<sup>4</sup> samaṃ[ta]caturasra<sup>5\*</sup>. (ta)m  
e(na)ṃ kaścic chrāddhaḥ ku(la)putro vā kuladuhitā vā sap-



taratnamayaṃ kṛtvā yāvac<sup>6</sup> cātur[d]i[śe] <bhikṣu>(saṃ)-  
ghe (ni)ryā(ta)yed; (yo vā) tathāgatasyārhatas<sup>7</sup>  
samyaksambuddhasya<sup>8</sup> parinirvṛ[ta]sya m(r)tpiṃḍād āma-  
laka(phala)pramāṇaṃ stūpaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayet<sup>9</sup> sūcīmātrāṃ  
ya[ṣṭ]im āropayet<sup>10</sup> bada(r)ī(patra)[mātraṃ c]cha(t)raṃ,  
yavaphalapramāṇaṃ pratimāṃ kāraye(t' sarṣapa)pha(la)-  
pramāṇa(m) dhātuṃ pratiṣṭhāpayet', tataḥ<sup>11</sup> prabhūtata-  
raṃ puṇyaṃ va<dāmi>.

<sup>1)</sup> This reconstruction is uncertain. Possible reading: *nmāma*. <sup>2)</sup> B: *dvīpō*. <sup>3)</sup>(3) B: *daśayojanasahasrāṇi vistare(ṇa) daśayojanasahasrāṇy āyāmena*. T: *chur ni dpag tshad khri/ rgyar yang dpag tshad khri stel*. See [5] n. 4 where T has *zheng* instead of *rgyar yang*. <sup>4)</sup> B: *samantā*. <sup>5\*)</sup> B: *ṣamametacaturasrapariṇāmitas*. The reading *samameta* is uncertain. The addition of *pariṇāmitas* in B agrees with the general pattern of this series of repetitions. T: *gru bzhi lham par grub pa*. <sup>6)</sup> B: *srotāpan- nebhyaḥ sakṛdāgāmibhyo 'nāgāmibhyo 'rhadbhyah pratyekabuddhebhyah*. Cf. [4] n. 1, [5] n. 9. <sup>7)</sup> B: *°arhata*. <sup>8)</sup> B: *samyaksaṃ[bu]ddhasya*. <sup>9)</sup> B: *pratiṣṭhāpaye*. <sup>10)</sup> B: *ā(ro)payed*. Cf. [5] n. 12. <sup>11)</sup> B has *idam evāhaṃ tataḥ* here as it has in all the pars. A in all the pars: *idam evānanda tataḥ*. T uses here the same expression it uses in all the pars.

[7] tiṣṭhatv ānanda jambūdvīpo dvīpas.<sup>1</sup> tiṣṭhatu pūrvavi-  
deho dvī(pa)ḥ. tiṣṭ(ṭha)tv avaragodā[n]iy(o)<sup>2</sup> [dv]i[paḥ]. (t)ṣ-  
ṣṭhatūtтарыkuru dvīpaḥ. asty ānanda śakrasya <sup>3)</sup>de[v]ānām  
indrasya<sup>3</sup> (1580) vajrayamto<sup>4</sup> nāma<sup>5</sup> prāsādaḥ. tam enaṃ<sup>6</sup>  
śrāddhaḥ<sup>7</sup> kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā<sup>8\*</sup> cāturdiśe bhi(kṣu)-  
saṃ(ghe) niryāyayed; yo vā tathāgatasyārhatas<sup>7</sup> samyaksam-  
buddhasya paranirvṛtasya<sup>10\*</sup> mṛtpiṃḍād āmalakaphalapra-  
māṇaṃ <sup>11)</sup>stūpaṃ pratiṣṭh(āpa)yet' sūcīmātrāṃ ya(ṣṭ)im  
ā[ropaye]d badarī(pa)tramātraṃ cchatraṃ, yavaphala-  
pramāṇaṃ pratimāṃ kārayet [sa]rṣapaphalapramāṇaṃ<sup>(11)</sup>  
dh(ātuṃ) [pratiṣṭhāpa]y[e]d, idam evānanda tataḥ  
pra(bhū)taraṃ puṇya[m va] (dā)[mi].

<sup>1)</sup> B: *dvīpaḥ*, as in the pars throughout A and B. <sup>2)</sup> B: *avaragōdānīyo*. <sup>3)</sup>(3) B: *devēndrasya*. <sup>4)</sup> A: *vai vajrayamto*. A scribal dittographical error resulting from writing an *aḥsara* 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: *vajrayantaḥ*. <sup>5)</sup> B omits. T: *ram par rgyal byed ces bya ba*. A agrees with T. <sup>6)</sup> B: *enaṃ*. <sup>7)</sup> B: *kaści(c) chrāddha*, similar to all the pars in A and B. T agrees with B. <sup>8\*)</sup> 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. <sup>9)</sup> B adds after its *vā sapta ratnamayaṃ kṛtvā* (see n. 8) the five religious stages as in [6] n. 6. (The

-ka- in *pratyeka*, however is mistakenly repeated). <sup>10\*)</sup> Read *parinirvṛtasya*; it appears to be a scribal error. <sup>11)(11)</sup> B omits. It appears to be a typical homoeoteleuton.

[8] [t]i(ṣṭha)tv ānanda<sup>1</sup> jam(bū)dvīpo dvīpaḥ. tiṣṭhatu pūrvavideho dvīpaḥ. tiṣṭhatv <avara>godānīyo<sup>2</sup> dvīpaḥ. ti(ṣṭha)tūtтары(ru)<sup>3</sup> d(v)īpaḥ. (tiṣṭhat)u śakrasya <sup>4)</sup>(d)evānām indrasya<sup>4</sup> vaijaya(m)taḥ prāsādaḥ. asty ānandas<sup>5</sup> trisāhasramahāsāhasro lo<kadhā>[tu].<sup>6</sup> tam enaṃ kaści(c) chr(ā)ddhaḥ kulaputro vā (kula)duhitā vā saptaratnamayam<sup>7</sup> kṛtvā srotāpannebhyaḥ sakṛdā(gā)mibhyo 'nāgāmbhyo 'rhadbhyaḥ pratyekabuddhebhya<ś> cāturdi[śe vā bh]ikṣusamghe niryā(ta)yed; yo [vā ta]thāgatasyārhatāḥ samyaksambuddhasya parinirvṛtasya mṛttikāpiṇḍād<sup>8</sup> āmalakapramāṇam stūpaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayet<sup>9</sup> sū<cī>mātrām yaṣṭim āropayed badarīpatramātraṃ cchatram āropaye<sup>10\*</sup> yavaphalapramāṇam pratimāṃ kārayet' saraśapaphalapramāṇam dhātum pratiṣṭhāpayed, idam evāna<nda> tataḥ<sup>11</sup> prabhūtatarāṃ puṇyam vadāmi.

<sup>1)</sup> A uses an irregular form for long ā. <sup>2)</sup> B: *avaragōdānīyo*. <sup>3)</sup> B: *°uttaraguru*. <sup>4)</sup> Bk: *deve(nd)rasya* as in [7] n. 3)(3). <sup>5)</sup> B: *āna(nda)*. <sup>6)</sup> B: [lo]kadhā[tus] <sup>7)</sup> B: *sa[ptaratnama]jyaṃ*. <sup>8)</sup> B: *mṛtpiṇḍād*. *Mṛttikā* and *mṛt* are used alternately throughout A and B. Note that here A has *piṇḍād*; it is the only occurrence of the retroflex nasal *ṇ* in the word *piṇḍād* in A. <sup>9)</sup> B: *pratiṣṭhāpaye*. <sup>10\*)</sup> B: *āropayed*. This is the only use in A of a verb after *cchatram*; cf. [1] n. 19. <sup>11)</sup> B: *tataḥ*.

[9] tat kasya heto<sup>2</sup> aprameyo<sup>1</sup> hy<sup>2</sup> ānanda tathāgato dā[n]enāprameyaḥ śīlenāprameyaḥ kṣāṃtyāprameyo<sup>3</sup> vīryeṇāprame[ya]<s<sup>4</sup> tyāge>(1581)nāprameyo<sup>5</sup> <sup>6)</sup>maitryāprameyaḥ karuṇayāprameya muditayāprameya upekṣayā<sup>(6,7\*)</sup> <sup>8)</sup>caturbhir vaiśāradyair daśabhis tathāgatabalair<sup>(8 9)</sup> aṣṭādaśabhir āveṇikai(r bu)ddhadharm(m)<ai>r<sup>(9)</sup> aprameyāprameyaguṇasamanvā(gato)<sup>10\*</sup> hy<sup>11</sup> ā(na)ndas<sup>12\*</sup> tathāgato 'rhat<sup>13</sup> samyaksambuddhaḥ.

<sup>1)</sup> B: *aprameya*. <sup>2)</sup> B omits. <sup>3)</sup> B: *°aprameyaḥ*. <sup>4)</sup> B: *°aprameyaḥ*. <sup>5)</sup> B: *°aprameya*; B adds *jñānenāprameya*. List in T differs from both A & B. It gives: *jñāna*, *śīla*, *kṣānti*, *vīrya*, *dhyāna*, and *prañā*. <sup>6)(6)</sup> B omits. T agrees with A. <sup>7\*)</sup> The *aprameya* may have been inadvertently omitted. In order to be consistent, one should have here *upekṣayāprameyaś*. <sup>8)(8)</sup> B reverses the order: *daśabhir bbalaiś* (omitting *tathāgata*) *caturbhir vaiśāradyaiś*. T agrees with B. <sup>9)(9)</sup> B: *ṛbhir āveṇikai smṛtyuṣas-*

*thānāir mmahākaru<na>[y]ā ca*. T mentions both the *aṣṭādaśāveṇika-buddhadharmāḥ* and the *trīṇy āveṇikāni smṛtyupasthānāni*. However the order of the *tathāgata*'s qualities in the Tibetan text is different. <sup>10\*)</sup> Read *aṣṭameyo 'prameya-*; this is probably a scribal error. B: *aṣṭameyo 'prameyagunagaṇai [sa]man(v)āgataḥ*. T agrees with A. <sup>11)</sup> B omits. <sup>12\*)</sup> B: *ānanda*. <sup>13)</sup> B: °*arha*.

[10] evam ukto<sup>1</sup> āyusmāṃn<sup>2</sup> ānando bhaga(va)ṃtam idam avocat<sup>3</sup>: āścaryam bhagavann āśca<ryam> (su)gataḥ yāvad ayam dharmaparyāyaḥ. <sup>4)</sup>[ko nāmāya]ṃ<sup>4</sup> dharmaparyāyaḥ, katham [cai]nam dhārayāmi?<sup>5</sup> tasmāt<sup>6</sup> tarhi<sup>7</sup>, tvam ānanda, imam<sup>8</sup> dhar[mapa]ryāyam<sup>9\*)</sup> adbhutam adbhuta(dharmma)paryāya [x]i<sup>10</sup> dhārayaḥ<sup>(9\*,11)</sup>. idam avo(ca)d [bha]ga-[vān ātta] (ma) [nasas te bh]ikṣava ā(yuṣma)ṃś cānando bhagavato [bhāṣ]itam abhyananda[n]<sup>(11,12)</sup>.

<sup>1)</sup> In B it is not clear whether it is *ukto* or *ukte*. <sup>2)</sup> B: *āyusmān*. <sup>3)</sup> B also uses *t'* here and this is the only instance of its use in B. <sup>4)</sup><sup>4)</sup> B: *ko nāmāyam bhadanta*. Cf. Ét. Lamotte, *L'enseignement de Vimalakīrti* (Louvain, 1962) 392, n. 41, for this stock phrase. <sup>5)</sup> B adds: *·bhagavān āha·*. T agrees with B. <sup>6)</sup> B: *tasmā*. An assimilation of the final *t* with the initial *t* of *tvam*. <sup>7)</sup> B omits. <sup>8)</sup> The *anusvāra* found in A is not clear. B: *ima(ṃ)*. <sup>9\*)</sup><sup>(\*)9</sup> B: *amṛtadundubhir ity api dhārayaḥ adbhutadharmmaparyāya ity api dhāraya tasmād asya dharmmaparyāyasya adbhutadharmmaparyāyaḥ ity adhivacanaṃ*. The *visarga* in *dhārayaḥ* is used as a mark of punctuation. <sup>10)</sup> Possibly [x]i = *hi*. This is, however, uncertain. <sup>11)</sup><sup>(11)</sup> B omits. Reconstruction supported by occurrences of this cliché elsewhere; see e.g. *BHSD* 92a and Ét. Lamotte, [see [10] n. 4)(4) 393 n. 43. <sup>12)</sup> B: *kūṭāgārasūtram samāptaṃ*; see introduction.

## VII. Translation of the Sanskrit Text

[0] Thus have I heard at one time. The Blessed One dwelt in Rājagṛha, in the Bamboo Grove, in the Kalandakanivāpana.

[1] At that time Venerable Ānanda, having dressed in the early morning, having taken his robe and his bowl, entered Rājagṛha to collect alms. The Venerable Ānanda saw, while walking from one house to the next to collect alms <sup>1)</sup>in the city of Rājagṛha, <sup>(1)</sup> at a certain place, <sup>2</sup> a multi-storied building<sup>3</sup> 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*<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>1)</sup> C omits. <sup>2)</sup> C: spot of earth. <sup>3)</sup> *kūṭāgāra*, cf. K. de Vreese, “Skr. Kūṭāgāra”, *India Antiqua, A Volume of Oriental Studies* (E.J. Brill, Leyden, 1947) 323–325.

<sup>4)</sup> Emblic Myrobalan. M-W 146c. *Āmalaka* and *āmalakaphala* are used alternately 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 Rājagṛha, 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 Rājagṛha to collect alms. I indeed saw while I was walking from one house to the next to collect alms in the city of Rājagṛha, 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]<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>1)</sup> Words enclosed in square brackets [ ] represent missing words supplied by the editor.

[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,<sup>1</sup> and concentrate your mind; I shall tell you. Indeed, Ānanda, the continent of Jambūdvīpa is seven thousand yojanas in length and in breadth.<sup>2</sup> 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<sup>3</sup> and some believing son or daughter of good family were to offer it to the stream-enterers, once-returners, non-returners, Arhats, Pratyekabuddhas, 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.

<sup>1)</sup> I have taken the two adverbs to modify *śṛṇu*, as did the translators into Tibetan. Cf. *Śūraṅgamasamādhi*, Et. Lamotte (Bruxelles, 1965) 125, 225; *Sād-dharmapūṇḍarīka*, H. Kern (Dover, 1962) 38. <sup>2)</sup> The dimensions of the four continents given in *Ad*, *Kū*, and *Ma* are similar to those given in the *Lalitavistara*, P.L. Vaidya (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts no. 1, Darbhanga, 1958) 104.11–12. In the *Lalitavistara*, however, Godāniya 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. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu*, P. Pradhan (Patna, 1975) 161—2. Louis de La Vallée Poussin, *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu* Tome II (Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques, vol. 16, Bruxelles, 1971) 145–6. <sup>3)</sup> 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<sup>1</sup> 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<sup>2</sup> a relic the size of a mustard seed, I say, Ānanda<sup>3</sup>, the merit of the latter is much greater than the former.

<sup>1)</sup> B: or to. <sup>2)</sup> B always has: put into. <sup>3)</sup> B always omits.

[5] Put aside, Ānanda, the continent of Jambūdvīpa. [Put aside the continent of Pūrvavideha]<sup>1</sup>. There is, Ānanda, a continent named Avaragodāniya. It is fully nine thousand yojanas in length and in breadth<sup>2</sup>, 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<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>1)</sup> A omits. B has this phrase which agrees with the general pattern of these series of repetitions. <sup>2)</sup> 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 Jambūdvīpa, put aside the continent of Pūrvavideha, put aside the continent of Avaragodānīya. There is, Ānanda, a continent named Uttarakuru. It is fully ten thousand yojanas in length and in breadth<sup>1</sup> and entirely square.<sup>2</sup> 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]<sup>3</sup> is much greater than the former.

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

[7] Put aside, Ānanda, the continent of Jambūdvīpa, put aside the continent of Pūrvavideha, put aside the continent of Avaragodānīya, put aside the continent of Uttarakuru. There is Ānanda, a palace of Śakra, the chief of the gods, named<sup>1</sup> Vaijayanta. <sup>2)</sup> If a believing son or a daughter of good family were to offer it to the community of monks

of the four directions<sup>2</sup>; 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<sup>3</sup>were to stick into it a *stūpa*-pole the size of a needle with an umbrella the size of a juniper leaf<sup>3</sup>, were to make an image<sup>4</sup>the size of a grain of barley,<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>1</sup>) B omits. <sup>2</sup> B: As in sections [5], [6] and [8] of ms. B. <sup>3</sup> B omits (homoeoteleuton). <sup>4</sup>) B omits (same).

[8] Put aside, Ānanda, the continent of Jambūdvīpa, put aside the continent of Pūrvavideha, put aside the continent of Avaragodānīya, put aside the continent of Uttarakuru, 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.”<sup>1</sup> 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-enterers, once-returners, non-returners, Arhats, Pratyekabuddhas, 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.

<sup>1</sup>) On this cosmic system see: Ét. Lamotte, *E'enseignement de Vimalakīrti* (Louvain, 1962) Appendice, Note I.

[9] What is the reason for this? Because,<sup>1</sup> 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*),<sup>2</sup> <sup>3)</sup>immeasurable through his friendliness, immeasurable through his compassion, immeasurable through his joy, [immeasurable] through his impartiality.<sup>(3 4)</sup> Through the four assurances, through the ten Tathāgata's powers,<sup>(4 5)</sup> through the eighteen characteristics unique to a Buddha (*āveṇīkas*)<sup>(5)</sup> he is immeasurable. The Tathāgata, the Arhat, the Fully Enlightened One, Ānanda, is indeed<sup>6</sup> endowed with immeasurable<sup>7</sup> qualities.

<sup>1)</sup> B omits. <sup>2)</sup> 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*. <sup>3)</sup> B omits. <sup>4)</sup> B reverses the order in listing these two formulae. <sup>5)</sup> B: through the three unique applications of mindfulness and great compassion. <sup>6)</sup> B omits: <sup>7)</sup> 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?”<sup>2</sup> “Because of that you now,<sup>3</sup> Ānanda,<sup>4)</sup> should preserve this wonderful discourse on Dharma as The Wonderful Discourse on Dharma (*Adbhutadharmaparyāya*).”<sup>(4 5)</sup> This the Blessed One said. The delighted monks and Venerable Ānanda rejoiced in the speech of the Blessed One<sup>(5)</sup>.

<sup>1)</sup> B adds: O Honourable. <sup>2)</sup> B adds: The Blessed One said. <sup>3)</sup> B omits. <sup>4)</sup> 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. <sup>5)</sup> 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. 1 (Srinagar–Kashmir, 1939) preface; M.S. Kaul

Shastri, "Report on the Gilgit Excavation in 1938," *The Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society* vol. 30 (July, 1939) #1, 1–12 + plates; M. Sylvain Lévi, "Note sur 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 Studien* vol. 15 (1981) 307–322; Karl Jettmar, "The Gilgit Manuscripts: Discovery 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 Manuscripts," *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 Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition*, ed., D.T. Suzuki, #985, vol. 39, 83.3.6–84.4.8; Narthang blockprint (Toyo Bunko), mdo la 303b–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 Museum," *Asia Major*, New Series, vol. 13 (1967) 48–70. The correspondences 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 on the Gilgit Manuscripts," *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* vol. 31, no. 2 (1983) (130)–(131).

*Ad* was made into chapter 1 of the \**Anuttarāśrayasūtra*, an important *Tathāgatagarbha Sūtra*. See Jikido Takasaki, "Structure of the \**Anuttarāśrayasūtra* (Wu-shang-i-ching)," *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku 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'après les Vinayapitaka*, "Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême Orient" vol. 50 (1962) 230–274; Mireille Bénisti, "Étude sur le stūpa dans l'Inde ancienne," *ibid.* vol. 50 (1960) 37–116; L. de La Vallée Poussin, "Staupikam," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* vol. 2 (1937) 276–289; Gisbert Combaz, "L'évolution du stūpa en Asie," *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* vol. 2, 163–302; vol. 3, 93–144; vol. 4, 1–123. 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 Department of the Toyo Bunko* no. 22 (Tokyo, 1963) 57–106; Robert L. Brown, "Recent Stūpa Literature: A Review Article," *Journal of Asian History* vol. 20 (1986) 215–232; Sushila Pant, *Stūpa Architecture in India* (Varanasi, 1976) pp. xiv and 6; G. Roth, "Buddhist Sanskrit Stūpa-texts from Nepal," *Actes du XXIX congrès international des orientalistes, Paris, Juillet 1973, Inde ancienne* vol. 1 (Paris, 1976) 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. 109.4.3–111.1.4; 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. *Tathāgataprativimbapratīṣṭhānusaṃsavarnaṇa-dharmaparyāya*. II. *Divyabhojanāvādāna*. 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 *Tathāgataprativimba* 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 *Tathāgataprativimba*. This fragment, however, does not contain the second half of the sūtra which is parallel to the *Ad*.

5. The *Mahāraṇa Sūtra* (*Ma*) is also available to me in Tibetan only. Derge: Delhi 1976 + vol. 62, pp. 217–222; Tohoko cat. #208; Peking: Suzuki edition: #874, vol. 34, pp. 300.3.6–301.4.2; Tog Palace: Leh 1980 edition, vol. 60, pp. 646–656; Lhasa: mdo *ma* fols. 166b–170b, vol. 62. The Sanskrit name of this sūtra varies from one edition to another. It is *Mahāraṇa* in the Derge and Lhasa editions, *Mahāhrāda* in the Peking catalogue, *Mahāravama* in the Peking edition, *Mahāśrutam* in the Tog Palace ms., and *Mahāśruta* in the ms. Kanjur of the British Museum. [See L.D. Barnett, “Index der Abteilung mDo des handschriftlichen Kanjur im britischen Museum (Or 672A),” *Asia Major* vol. 7 (1932) 157–178].

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 *Abhutadharmaparyāya* 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 *kūṭāgāra* 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.

7. The *Pratītyasamutpāda Sūtra* (Pr)—Derge: (Delhi 1976 +) 1. vol. 62, pp. 249–50. 2. vol. 88, pp. 81–83. 3. vol. 96, pp. 197–198; Tohoko cat. nos. 212, 520, 980. Peking: Suzuki edition: nos. 878, 221, Tog Palace: Leh 1980 edition, vol. 60, pp. 656–659 and vol. 102, pp. 81–83. Pr also is known only in translation, however, N.A. Śāstri in *Ārya Śālistamba-sūtra, Pratītyasamutpāda-vibhaṅganirdeśa-sūtra and Pratītyasamutpādagāthā-sūtra* (Adyar Library, 1950) gives, in addition to the Tibetan version (with some mistakes), his rendering of it into Sanskrit.

8. This passage was translated by Richard Salomon and Gregory Schopen, “The Indravarmān (Avaca) Casket Inscription Reconsidered: Further Evidence for Canonical Passages in Buddhist Inscriptions,” *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol. 7 no. 1 (1984) 107–123. The wording here is again quite similar to that of the three texts discussed above. The major change is the substitution of the *ye dharmāḥ. . . gāthā*, the “Dharma relic,” for bodily relics (*dhātu*). Bodily relics and *dhāraṇīs* serve a similar function. The doctrinal development which stressed the Buddha’s teachings at the expense of his physical body is paralleled by the shift from an emphasis on bodily relics to an emphasis on the “Dharma relic.” Cf. Gregory Schopen, “The Phrase ‘sa pṛthivīpradeśāś caityabhūto bhavet’ in the Vajracchedikā: Notes on the cult of the book in Mahāyāna,” *Indo-Iranian Journal* vol. 17 (1975) 147–181; Ryōjun Mitomo, “An Aspect of Dharma-śarīra,” *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* vol. 32, n. 2 (March, 1984) (4)–(9).

9. 1. The *Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivecana*, a circa 11th century Buddhist Sanskrit stūpa text from Nepal, quotes *Kū* along with the *Prakīrṇaka-vinaya* of the Lokottaravādins and passages from the *Stūpa-kalpanā-sūtra* in the *Kṣudrakavastu* of the Sarvāstivādins. See Gustav Roth in n. 3.

2. In the polyglot inscription of the 14th century, Chū-yung-kuan monument, *Kū* is mentioned and very closely paraphrased. See Jiro Murata, *Chū-yung-kuan. The Buddhist Arch of the Fourteenth Century A.D. at the Pass of the Great Wall Northwest of Peking* 2 vols. (Kyoto, 1955–57) [in Japanese with English summary]; L. Ligeti in “Le mérite. . .” (see n. 6) 244–5, and Sylvain Lévi in E. Chavannes and Sylvain Lévi, “Notes préliminaire sur l’inscription de Kiu-yongkoan,” *Journal Asiatique* (1894) 370; a translation into Japanese is found in J. Murata, *ibid.* p. 259.

A number of Tibetan accounts concerning the construction and consecration of *mchod-rtens* (*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 Adbhutadharmaparyāya 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 Caitya 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-Tsing (I Ching), *A Record of the Buddhist*

*Religion* tr., J. Takakusu (Oxford, 1896) 150–1.

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 Ġaznī,” *East and West* vol. 20 (1970) 70–86. Here only a few examples will be given. A. Cunningham writes about Bodhgayā: “. . .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 Bhiṭā, 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, Mirpūr-khas, Sārṇāth and other Buddhist sites” (G.C. Chandra and K.N. Dikshit, “Excavations at Paharpur,” *Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India* 1930–4, pt. 1 (Delhi, 1936) 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 Sārṇāth, near Benares,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* vol. 16 (1856) 37–53. Similar evidence is found also in Central Asia, Tibet, Ceylon, Burma, Thailand and Indonesia (see M. Taddei, *ibid.*).

12. Hsüan Tsang, *Si-yu-ki, Buddhist Records of the Western World* tr., Samuel Beal (Boston, 1885) vol. 2, 146–7.

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'École 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 dharmāḥ 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.

14. Among them is the *Lakṣacaityasamutpatti* which gives a detailed prescription for the ritual of making a hundred thousand caityas (*lakṣacaityavrata*). Tissa Rajapatirana, *Suvarṇavarṇāvadāna translated and edited together with its Tibetan translation and the Lakṣacaityasamutpatti*. (Ph.D. thesis, Australian National University, 1974).

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 Saṅgha/Arhats/Pratyekabuddhas does not necessarily mean a complete dichotomy between these two practices, or between the Saṅgha 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 *Mahāsaṅghika-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 *Bhikkṣuṇī-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.

16. In Oskar von Hinüber, "Die Erforschung der Gilgithandschriften, Nachtrag" *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* vol. 130.2 (1980) \*25\*–\*26\*.

17. Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Śata-piṭaka Series, vol. 10, part 7 (New Delhi, 1974).

18. Lore Sander, *Paläographisches zu den sanskrihandschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung* (Wiesbaden, 1968) Alphabet m, 137–161, Tafel 21–26. See also her "Einige neue Aspekte zur Entwicklung der Brāhmī in Gilgit und Bamiyan (ca. 2.–7. Jh.n.chr.)," *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien* (Vorträge des Hamburger Symposions vom 2. Juli bis 5. Juli, 1981), Klaus Röhrborn and Wolfgang Veenker, eds., (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica, Bd. 16, in Kommission bei Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1983).

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

20. As noticed by G. Schopen, *ibid.* p. \*25\*. It is difficult to accept Hisashi Matsumura's objection to this opinion as expressed in "The Stūpa Worship in Ancient Gilgit," *Journal of Central Asia* vol. 8, (1985) 133–151 (on p. 149).

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

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

23. *Abhidharmakośabhaṣyam of Vasubandhu* ed., Prahlad Pradhan (Patna, 1967; reprint 1975) 411; Louis de la Vallée Poussin, *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu* (Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques, vol. 16, Bruxelles, 1971) ch. VII, 66–67.

24. Unrai Wogihara, *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* by Yaśomitra 2 vols. (Tokyo, 1932–6; reprint: Sankibo Buddhist Book Store, Tokyo, 1971) vol. 2, 640–641.

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

26. Étienne Lamotte, *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse* (Louvain, 1970)

vol. 3, 1605–8, 1625–8, 1697–1701; Louis de la Valée Poussin (see note 23) 66–7, n. 4b; Louis Renou and Jean Filliozat, *L'Inde classique* (Paris, 1953) vol. 2, 537, #2277.

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 Vaibhāsika list, is followed, rather than that of ms. A. For example, see the *Mchod-rten-gyi Cha Dbye-ba 'Dul-ba-las Byung-ba'i Mdo* Peking no. 3897, vol. 79, pp. 287.2.4–288.1.8, 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-vivecana* 193–195 (see also note 9). The Tibetan inscription from the Chū-yung-kuan “Arch” gives a similar set of correspondences; see Jiro Murata, (in note 9) vol. 1, 233, verse 5.

27. Lamotte in note 26.

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

29. With the exception of section [2] having *bgyis pa*, “to make,” an elegant form for *byed pa*.

30. Schopen, *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 10 (1985) 20–21.

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 Buddhabalādhāna-prātihāryavikurvāṇanirdeśa-sūtra Found at Gilgit,” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* vol. 5 (1978) 332, fol 1296 1.6, where ka(h) should be read kaḥ.

33. Géza Uray, “On the Tibetan Letters *ba* and *wa*: Contribution to the Origin and History of the Tibetan Alphabet,” *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* vol. 5 (1955) 101–122.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### I. The Gilgit Manuscripts

#### A. Facsimile Edition (GBMs):

Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts* Śata-piṭaka Series, 10 vols. (New Delhi, 1959–1974).

#### B. Editions cited:

Oskar von Hinüber, *A New Fragmentary Gilgit Manuscript of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīkasūtra* (Tokyo, The Reiyukai, 1982).

Y. Kurumiya, *Ratnaketu-parivarta* (Heirakuji-shoten, Kyoto, 1978).

Adelheid Mette, “Zwei kleine Fragmente aus Gilgit,” *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik*, vol. 7. 1981, 133–152.

Chandrabhal Tripāṭhi, “Gilgit—Blätter der Mekhalā-dhāraṇī,” *ibid.* 153–161.

Shoko Watanabe, *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka Manuscripts Found in Gilgit* part 2 (Tokyo, The Reiyukai, 1975).

*II. Grammatical and Paleographical Works**A. Grammar:*

Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary* (New Haven: 1953. repr. Delhi, 1977). (*BHSD* and *BHSG*).

Louis Renou, *Grammaire Sanscrite* 2nd ed. (Paris, 1975).

William Dwight Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar* (repr. Harvard University Press, 1981).

*B. Paleography:*

Lore Sander, *Paläographisches zu den Sanskrithandschriften der berliner Turfansammlung* (Wiesbaden, 1968).

G. Bühler, *Indian Paleography*, appendix to *Indian Antiquary* 33 (1904) (repr. Delhi: 1973).