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The Redactions of the
_Adbhutadharmaparāyaṇa_ 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. The present work includes an edition of the _Adbhutadharmaparāyaṇa_ (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 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_ and the _Mahārāṇa Sūtra_, all of which share this common theme. Moreover, the _Pratītyasamutpāda Sūtra_ also has elements in common with other texts of this group, although its description 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" (punyaksetra).

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 16911.2 to end. Script: Gilgit/Bamiyan—Type I, 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 aksaras 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>cāturdiśe (vā) bhikṣusamghe</td>
<td>cāturddiśāya vā bhikṣusamghāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>[4] n.6 and parallels in [5], [6].</td>
<td>cchatraṁ</td>
<td>cchatram āropayed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>[4] n.8 and parallels in</td>
<td>pratiṣṭhāpayet</td>
<td>prakṣipted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[5], [6], [7], [8].

4. [4] n.9 and parallels in [5], [6], [7], [8].
   evānandaḥ
evāham

   navayojanasahasrāṇy
   (replace nava with daśa in [6])
avayojanasahasrāṇy
   ayāmavistareṇa

6. [5] n.9
   [6] n.6
   [7] n.9
   yāvac
   yāvac
deest

7. [7] n.3
   [8] n.4
   devānām indrasya
devendrasya

8. [9] n.5
deeest

9. [9] n.6
   maitryāprameyā
deeest
   karunāyāprameyā
   muditāyāprameyā
   upeksayā

10. [9] n.8
    and n.9
caturbhir vaiśāradya
daśabhī tathāgata-balair asṭā-
daśabhī āvenikair buddhabhargmāir
daśabhī bbalais
caturbhir vaiśārad-
yaiś tṛbhīr āvenikai smṛtyupasthā-
naivmmahākaruṇaya
ca

11. [10] n.9
   imāṃ dharmaprāpyāyam
dhārayaḥ
   imāṃ dharmaprāpyāyam
   amṛtaṃ dhūraddhutām
dhārayaḥ dabhabhutāydharmanā]
jīvī
dhārayayām
api dhārayaḥ dabbhutadharmanāya
ity api dhāraya tas-
mad asya dharmaprāpyāyasya dabhuta-
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: Amr\textit{tundubhi}. In no. 12, the colophon of ms. B calls the text \textit{Kūṭāgāra Sūtra} as well (as was mentioned above). Both no. 8 and 9 concern the qualities of the Tathāgata. Ms. B adds \textit{jnāna} to the list of qualities of the Tathāgata, while ms. A lists the four immeasurables (\textit{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 (\textit{daśabala}), the four assurances (\textit{catvāri vaiśārayāṇi}) and the 18 characteristics unique to a Buddha (\textit{aṣṭādaśāvenikāḥ buddhadharmāḥ}). Ms. B, like ms. A, begins its list with the ten powers and the four assurances. However, instead of the 18 \textit{āvenikabuddhadharmanas}, ms. B gives the three unique applications of mindfulness (\textit{trīṇy āvenikāṁ smṛtyupasthānāni})\textsuperscript{2}\ and great compassion (\textit{mahākarunā}).

According to Vasubandhu in the \textit{Abhidharmakośa}\textsuperscript{23} the 18 characteristics unique to the Buddha consist of the ten powers, the four assurances, the three unique applications of mindfulness and great compassion. (\textit{aṣṭādaśāvenikāstū buddhadharmā balādayāḥ... katame 'ṣṭādaśa? daśa balāni catvāri vaiśārayāṇi trīṇī smṛtyupasthānāni mahākarunā ca.}) This list is identical to the one given in ms. B.

But Yaśomitra in his commentary to the \textit{Abhidharmakośa}, the \textit{Sphujīrthā Abhidharmakośa-vyākhyā}\textsuperscript{24} says: ete balādyā mahākarunānta aṣṭādaśāvenikā Vaibhāṣikāv vyavasthāpyante. balādi-vyātiriktañ kecid anyān aṣṭādaśāvenikān buddha-dharmān varṇayanti.

This might be translated: "The Vaibhāṣikas declare the 18
unique characteristics (āvenikas) 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 Yasomitra lists the 18 āvenikabuddhadharmanas according to these “others”).

Thus, according to Yasomitra, the list of 18 āvenikas 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 āvenikas 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 āvenikabuddhadharmanas. One list is advocated by the MPPS while the other is rejected there. The list of the 18 āvenikabuddhadharmanas 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 āvenikabuddhadharmanas 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 (pratimām 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 praksipet “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 bser “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.50

V. Peculiarities of the Language

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), pimḍa (throughout), pratikrāmtaḥ [2], vaijayaṁtaḥ [7], ksāṇtyā [9], ekāṃta [2], bhagavatam [2], [10], āsmim. Cf. Kurumiya p. xxiv 1.6, p. xxxix; von Hīnuber 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 mm, exclusively before long ā. For example: citvāraṁ ā- [2], patākaṁm ā- [2], āyuṣmāmn 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 jīhvāmūliya and upadhāmāniya respectively (Renou p. 38; Whitney #69, #170d; Sander Tafel 22; Bühler p. 67). I have marked them, after Renou, with a and h respectively. Examples for jīhvāmūliya: yāḥ kaś [2], chrāddhah kulaputraḥ [2], [5], [7], [8], prameyāḥ karunayā (9). An example for upadhāmāniya: tataḥ prabhūtataraṁ [5]. The use of the jīhvāmūliya and upadhāmāniya is far from consistent. Although the phrases śrāddhah kulaputraḥ and tataḥ prabhūtataraṁ occur in
every section from [1] to [8], jihvāmūliya and upadhmāniya are used only in the cases indicated. The same treatment of visarga frequently occurs in the Maitreyavyākarana ms. from Gilgit which was probably written by the same scribe as our ms. A, e.g.: tatah k- (GMBs part 7, folio 1539.1) devatah p- (ibid. folio 1540.4) dosaih p- (ibid. folio 1541.4). The upadhmāniya also occurs in the Buddha-balādhānaprātiḥāryavikurvānanirdesa written in Gilgit/Bamiyan—Type I Script32: kāh punar (ibid. folio 1296.8). Cf. Mette pp. 134 and 141.

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

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

(3). Sandhi.


Hiatus between two vowels is sometimes maintained. For example: vā idṛśam [1], [2], me etad [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 sangha which occurs throughout the ms. In all other cases where A has n, B has the expected nasal: B has pinda for A’s pinda, pratikrāntah for A’s pratikrāmtah 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 hṣ before an initial palatal surd (c) in B, again in pratyekabuddhehpyahṣ cātur [6].

(3). Sandhi: Hiatus.
There is only one example of an unresolved hiatus in ms. B: ānanda avaragodāniyō [5].

(4). The use of lingual vowel (r) for lingual semivowel (r) (#3.97).
Examples for lingual vowel (r) used for lingual semivowel (r): trsāhasra for trisāhasra [8], trbhīr 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: ekasmiṃ [0], saṃgha [1]. Like ms. B, ms. C has pīnda. 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: yah kaś cic chrāddhah kulaputro [1].

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

(4). There is one example of lingual vowel (r) used for lingual semivowel (r) uccaṛta [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. I have transliterated the aksara as b or v according to the context. Badarī/vadārī (see M-W p. 719c, p. 916b), which I have transliterated as badarī (cf. Watanabe p. xiv) remains, however, problematic.


(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].


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 aksaras are marked by enclosing them in brackets and parentheses.

[ ]: Reconstructions of aksaras which are damaged or only partially visible.

< >: Reconstructions of aksaras of which no trace remains.
( ): Denoting unclear but still readable aksaras.

x: Denoting the presence of an aksara 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) evam\(^1\) mayā śrūtam\(^2\) ekasmīṃ samaye\(^3\). bhaga-
vān\(^4\) rājagṛhe viharati sma\(^5\) venuvane kalandakanivāse.

\(^1\)Ms. A has one line preceding the standard opening formula evam mayā, etc., which I was not able to read.  
\(^2\)C: śrūtam.  
\(^3\)For the punctuation of the opening formula cf. J. Brough, "Thus Have I Heard..." BSOAS 18 (1950) 416–26;  
\(^4\): bhagavān.  
\(^5\)C omits.

[1] Athāyuṣmān ānanda pūrvānqa nivā[sa]ya <pā>(1576) (trac)ivara(m) ādāya rājaṄṛham pim pieniądze prāvikṣat\(^1\). adṛ-
khṣid\(^2\) śrīyānu anando rājagṛhe nagare\(^3\) sāvadānāṃ pim-
dāya \(^4\)caramāṇo, 'nyatamasmin\(^4\) pradeśe\(^5\) kūṭāgāram aśi-
tidvāram ulliptāvaliptam\(^6\) [ucçṛtadh]vajā(pa)ṭākam\(^7\) āmu-
tapaṭadāmakalāpam, \(^8\) dr(śtvā) ca pu[nas ta]syaitad abha-
vat': \(^9\) yaḥ\(^10\) kaśic chrodṛdhah\(^11\) kulaputo vā (ku)lauhiță vă 
idṛśam kūṭāgāram k[ărayit]vā (catur)diśe\(^12.13\) [bhikṣusा-
ṃghe niryāltaye[d; yo vā] (tathāgatasyārtha)taḥ samya (ksa-
ṃbuddhaśāyāmalakapramāṇam\(^4\) stūpaṃ pra<tištā>pa-
yet\(^15\) sūcimātrām\(^16\) yaṣṭi>[m\(^17\) ṛopayad badari][patramā-
trām\(^18\) cchatrām\(^19\), yavaphalapramāṇam pratimāṃ kāra-
yet\(^20\) sarṣapaphalapramāṇaṃ dhātum prati<śṭhā>[
[pajyet\(^21\),

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 Mahāparinirvānāsūtra [MPNS] (Berlin, 1951) 5.3 10.7 11.8 20.5 etc.; G. von Simson, Zur Diktion einiger Lehrtexthe des buddhistischen Sanskritkanons (München, 1965) 12.32–36, 15.12f etc. 3) C omits. T agrees with A. 4) C: caramānāḥ anyatāmasmiṃ. 5) C: prthivitpradeṣe. T agrees with A. 6) C: upalitpāvālīmāṇ. 7) For this and the following compound, cf. W. Couvreur, Review of J. Nobel’s Udrāyana, König von Roruka, II 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: yaḥ 11) C: chṛaddhah. 12) A is not clear here, C has catur. In the pars to this phrase A almost always uses catur (the only exception is in the pars 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: samyaksambuddhaya parinirvāṇasya mṛtyu/mṛtiṣṭiḥpāpado amalaka. . . . 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: sūcīpramāṇām. A here agrees with all the pars. 17) C ends after -ya-. 18) Or vadari-; see V,B,(1). It will not be further noted. 19) 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. 20) As in [1] n. 15, the t’ here is an interlinear addition. 21) In all the pars B uses the verb prakṣiptet; see [4] n. 8. 22) Reconstructed with the help of Ānanda’s speech in [2], which is in the first person: me etad abhavat. T: de yâng ‘di snyam du sans te. 23) Or yatv. This is perhaps intended for yat tv aham or yan nu aham; see BHSD 444b and 104b s.v. ārocayati. 24) The visarga is a “correction” beneath the line. 25) This is the only occurrence of ṣ in A.

[2] athāyuy(ṣ)mān āna[ndo rāja] gṛhe’ [?[nagare]’ sāvadānāṃ pimādāya caritvā kṛtabhaktakṛtya paścādbhaktapiṃḍapāt- pratikramatāḥ pātracivaram pratiṣāmayyaṇā pādau prakṣālaya yena bhagava(m) ten(p)opasāmkramta. 4 upasāmkramya bha- gavataḥ pādau sīrāsā vanditvaikāmte sthād. ekāṃtasthitā āyuṣmān ānando bhagavāntam idam avocat: ihāhaṃ bha- dāmtaḥ pūrvāhne nivāsya pātracivaram adā(1577)ya (rā)jagṝḥam pimādāya prāvikṣam. so ‘ham adrākṣam, rāj- gṛhe nagare sāvadāna(m) pimādāya caramāno ‘nyata- masmiṃ pradeṣe kūṭāgaram asītidvāram ulli(pta)valīptam ucchritadhvajapataākamām āṃkutapattādāmakalāpaṃ ca dṛṣṭvā ca punar me etad abhavat’: yaḥ kaścic chhraddhah kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā īḍrṣam kūṭāgā(ram)ṣ cāturdiśe
bhīksusamathe niryātayed; yo vā tathāgata(syā)ṁr̥taḥ sam-
(yakṣambu)ddhasya parini(rṛ)tasya mṛttikāpiṃḍād āmala-
kapramanāṁ stūpaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayet† sūcimatratāṃ yaśīm
āropaye[d bāda]ri[patra]mātra[m] cchatra[m], [ya]va[phala-
pramānāṃ pramīmāṃ kārayet śarṣapaphalapramāṇāṃ
dhātuṃ pratiṣṭhāpayetˌ <tat ka>[tamam]tataḥ prabhū-
tataram puṇyāṃ syāt’? tasya mamaitad abhavac: chāstā me
dsāmukhibhūtāḥ, sugato me sāmukhibhūtāḥ. yanv aham
etam evārtham bhagavataḥ <āroca>yeyaṃ. yathā
bhagavāṃ vyākariṣyati [tathāham] dhā[ra][yī][y]-
[āṃ]j[i[t]y].

1) This phrase was read with the help of T: de nas ishe dang ldan pa kun dga’
bo rgyal po khab to… “Then Venerable Ānanda in Rājagrha…”. 2) This is very
uncertain. A appears to have ?hisāte; 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 rājagrhe nagare śaḍānām pimēdaya
√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 (rājagrha
nagare) for the two other occurrences of this phrase. 3) Cf. BHSD 369b.
4) This stock phrase was read with the help of T: bcom ldan 'das ga la der
song nas. 5) For this vocative see BHSD 405b. 6) See [1] n. 2. 7) The par in [1]
has kūtāgāram kārayitvā. T also has a verb here. Its absence here in A appears
to be a scribal omission. 8) This is perhaps a double danda; if so, it is the only
occurrence of such in A, and is somewhat out of place here. 9) This reading
was reconstructed according to the par in [1]. T here has: de gnyis bsod 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: bcom ldan 'das kyi bdag la ji skad
bstan pa bshin du gzung bar bgyi snyam nas. 12) T has an additional sentence
here: bcom ldan 'das la bdag don 'di nyid chu lags na thugs brtse ba nye bar bzung
ste/ bcom ldan 'das kyi bdag la don 'di nyid legs bar bstan du gsol/ “If I were to ask
the Blessed One concerning this particular matter, he, out of compassion,
would fully explain it to me.”

[3] [ xxx ]’ bhagavān āyuṣ(m)aṁtam ānandam idam av-
ocat’: sādhu sādhu ānanda bahujanahitā[ya] tvam ānanda
pratipanno ca [bahujanasukh]yāya lokānuka[m](pāyai)
ar-thāya hitāya sukhāya devamanuṣyāṇāṃ, yas t(va)m tathā-
gatam etam evārtham paripraṭṭavyām manyaśe. tena hy
ānanda (śṛṇu) sādhu ca suṣṭhau ca manasikuru, bhāṣye-
ja[m]būdvipo hy ānanda dvipa saptayojanasahasrāṇy āyā-
mavistāreṇa† (1578) uttaraviśālo dakṣineṇa sakaṭāmukha-
tam enaṃ kaścic chrāddhaḥ kulaputro vā ku(la) [du]hitā vā sapataratnamayaṃ (kr) [tv]ā sr[ot]āpa(nne)bhyāḥ saktṛ[daṅg]-āmibhyo 'nāgāmibhyo 'rhadbhyaḥ pratyekabuddhebhyaḥś caṭu[rd]i(se vā) [bh]i[kṣu]ṃsамге niryātaye[d]; y[o vā ta]-th(ḥ)āgatasāyārhattaḥ samyaksambuddhasya parinirvṛtasya mṛttikāpiṃḍād [ā]malakapalapramāṇaṃ sūṃṣṭaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayet' sū[ci][mā][tr][ā][m] vā ya[ṣṭijīm] āropa[yed, bada-ri]patra(mā)traṃ cchatram, yavapalapramāṇā(m) prati-mā(m) kārayet' sarṣapaphalapramāṇaṃ dhātuṃ pratiṣṭhā-<pa>yet', idam evananda, tataḥ prabhūtataṃ puṇyam vā(dā)mi.

1) 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. 2) Reconstruction based on T: sū[kṣu]ṃsāyāraḥ, parinirvṛtasya mṛt[tiṣṭhaṃ] caṭu[m] srotapanna, sakṛdgaṃmin and so forth, which are listed in the pars in [3] and [8], and are referred to with yād in [5] and [6], are missing here. T lists them. 2) B begins here. 3) B: caṭu[m] srotapanna, sakṛdgaṃmin and so forth, which are listed in the pars in [3] and [8], and are referred to with yād in [5] and [6], are missing here. T lists them. 4) B: caṭu[m] srotapanna, sakṛdgaṃmin and so forth, which are listed in the pars in [3] and [8], and are referred to with yād in [5] and [6], are missing here. T lists them. 5) B: caṭu[m] srotapanna, sakṛdgaṃmin and so forth, which are listed in the pars in [3] and [8], and are referred to with yād in [5] and [6], are missing here. T lists them. 6) B: caṭu[m] srotapanna, sakṛdgaṃmin and so forth, which are listed in the pars in [3] and [8], and are referred to with yād in [5] and [6], are missing here. T lists them. 7) B: caṭu[m] srotapanna, sakṛdgaṃmin and so forth, which are listed in the pars in [3] and [8], and are referred to with yād in [5] and [6], are missing here. T lists them. 8) B: caṭu[m] srotapanna, sakṛdgaṃmin and so forth, which are listed in the pars in [3] and [8], and are referred to with yād in [5] and [6], are missing here. T lists them. 9) B: caṭu[m] srotapanna, sakṛdgaṃmin and so forth, which are listed in the pars in [3] and [8], and are referred to with yād in [5] and [6], are missing here. T lists them. 10) B: caṭu[m] srotapanna, sakṛdgaṃmin and so forth, which are listed in the pars in [3] and [8], and are referred to with yād in [5] and [6], are missing here. T lists them. 11) B: caṭu[m] srotapanna, sakṛdgaṃmin and so forth, which are listed in the pars in [3] and [8], and are referred to with yād in [5] and [6], are missing here. T lists them. 12) B: caṭu[m] srotapanna, sakṛdgaṃmin and so forth, which are listed in the pars in [3] and [8], and are referred to with yād in [5] and [6], are missing here. T lists them. 13) B: caṭu[m] srotapanna, sakṛdgaṃmin and so forth, which are listed in the pars in [3] and [8], and are referred to with yād in [5] and [6], are missing here. T lists them.
absence of the verb will not be noted hereafter. 7) B: kāraye. 6) B: praksiped. 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: prabhūtataram 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: punyaṁ.

[5] tiṣṭhatv ānanda jambūdvipo 1 dāvīpaḥ2*. asty ānandāvara-godānīyo3 nāma dāvīpaḥ 4 navayoja[na]s[a][ha]srāṇy āyāmavistāreṇa4,5 (1579) samantāt pūrṇacandrākārapariṇāmi-taḥ6. ta(m) enaṁ kaś(c)ic chrāddhāḥ7 kulapuro vā kuladuhitā vā sapataratnamayaṁ krītvā yāvac9 caturdi<se> bhikṣu-samghe niryātayed; yo vā tathāgatasārāhunāt samyaksambuddhasya parinirvṛtasya mṛtpīṇḍad āmalakapramāṇam10 stūpaṁ pratiṣṭhāpayet11 sūcimātrām yaśīṃ ā[r]<opa>-yet12 badaripatramātrām cchätam yavapralapramāṇām pratimām kārayet13 sarṣapaphalapramānaṁ dhātum pratiṣṭhāpayet14, idam evānandah tatah15 prabhūtataram punyaṁ vada<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 pūrṇavāsideho dvīpaḥ, which agrees with the general pattern of this series of repetitions. T agrees with B. 3) B: ānanda avaragodānīyo. 4,4 B: navayojaṇa(sa)hasṛāṇy āyāmĕna navayojaṇa(sa)hasṛāṇi vistāreṇa. T has: de chur ni dpag tshal dgu stong zheng dpag tshal dgu stong stel 5) throughout A vistāreṇa and vistāreṇa are used alternatively; see M-W 1001c. It will not be noted hereafter. 6) B: punya(c)adṛkārapariṇāmītastas. The ending results from a dittography. 7) B also has chrāddhāḥ. 8) B: vāc, probably a scribal error written under the influence of the preceding jihvamūlīya of chrāddhāḥ kulaputo. 9) B: srotāpannebhya sakṛdāgāmībhya yuddhabhyāḥ pratyekabuddhebhyaḥ. Note that anāgāmībhyaḥ 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: ārpayed. 13) B: kārayet; it will not be noted hereafter. 14) B: praksيض. 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).
This reconstruction is uncertain. Possible reading: *mnāma.

2) B: *dvipō. 3) (B) *dasayojanasahasrāṇi vislare(na) dasayojanasahasrāṇy āyāmena. T: chur ni dpag tshad khril rgyar yang dpag tshad khril stel. See [5] n. 4 where T has zheng instead of rgyar yang. 4) B: *samanātā. 5)° B: *samanetacaturasparināmītās. The reading *samaneta is uncertain. The addition of parināmītas in B agrees with the general pattern of this series of repetitions. T: gru bṣhi lham par grub pa. 6) B: *srotāpanneyah sakṛdgāmimbhyo nāgāmimbhyyo ṛhadbhhyah pratyekabuddhebhhyah. Cf. [4] n. 1, [5] n. 9. 7) B: *arhata. 8) B: *samyaksā[bu]ddhasya. 9) B: *pratiṣṭhāpaye. 10) B: *a(ro)payed. Cf. [5] n. 12. 11) B has *idam evāhām tatah here as it has in all the pars. A in all the pars: *idam evānanda tatah. T uses here the same expression it uses in all the pars.


1) B: *dvipah, as in the pars throughout A and B. 2) B: *avaragōdāṇiyo. 3)° B: *devendrasya. 4) A: *vaivaijayamto. A scribal dittographical error resulting from writing an *aksara 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: *vaivaijyamta. 5) B omits. T: *nam par rgyal byed ces bya ba. A agrees with T. 6) B: *enathi. 7) B: *kaṃcic[i] chṛddha, similar to all the pars in A and B. T agrees with B. 8)° B: vā *saptaratanamāyaṃ kṛtva. 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 *saptaratanamāyaṃ kṛtva (see n. 8) the five religious stages as in [6] n. 6. (The
ka- in pratyeka, however is mistakenly repeated). Read parinirvāṇa; it appears to be a scribal error. B omits. It appears to be a typical homoeoteleuton.

[8] [t]ij(ṣṭhā)tv ānanda UNIVERSITY: jamb(bu)dvipo dvīpah. tiṣṭhatu pūrvavideho dvīpah. tiṣṭhatv <avara> godāniyo dvīpah. ti-(ṣṭha)tuttaraku[ru] d(y)ipah. (tiṣṭhatu) śakrasya <7>(d)evānām indrasya <4> vaijaya(m)taḥ prāsādah. asty ānandas <5> trīsāhasramahāsāhasro lo<kadha>[tu]. <6> tam enaṃ kaṣāṃ(c) chr(ā)ddhah kulaputro vā (kula)duhitā vā saparatnma-yaṃ <7> kṛtvā srotāpannebhayaḥ sakrdā(gā)mibhyaḥ 'nāgāmi-bhyaḥ ‘rhadbhyaḥ pratyekabuddhebhyaḥ <8> cāturdi[še vā bh]hikṣusanghe niryā(ta)yaed; yo [vā ta]ḥgatasyārhatatā samyaksambuddhasya parinirvāṇasya mṛṭikāpinḍādā āma-lakapramaṇāṃ stūpam pratiṣṭhāpayet” su<ci>mātrām ya-ṣṭim āropayed badaripatramātram cchatram āropaye <10> ya-vaphalapramāṇam pratimāṃ kārayet’ sarasāpaphalapra- māṇam dhātum pratiṣṭhāpayed, idam evāna<nda> tataḥ <11> prabhūtataṃ puṇyaṃ vādamāṃ.

1) A uses an irregular form for long ā. 2) B: avaragodāniyo. 3) B: ‘uttaraguru.
4) Bk: deve(nd)rasya as in [7] n. 3). 5) B: āna(nda). 6) B: [lo]kadha[tu]. 7) B: sa[paratnama]yaṃ. 8) B: mṛṭipinḍādā. Mṛṭikā and mṛt are used alternately throughout A and B. Note that here A has pinḍād; it is the only occurrence of the retroflex nasal n in the word pinḍād 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? aprameyo <1> hy <2> ānanda tathāgato dā[na]je- nāprameyāḥ śilenāprameyāḥ kṣāmtyāprameyo <3> viryena-prameya[ya] <<4> tyāge(1581)nāprameyo <5> maitryāprameyaḥ karunayāprameya muditayāprameya upekṣaya <6,7> caturbhār vaiśāradayair dasābhis tathāgatabalai <8,9> astēdā- sabbhir āvenikai(r bu)ddhadharm(m)<ai>r <9> aprameyāprameyagunasamavā(gato)<10> * hy <11> ā(na)ndas <12> tathāgato ’rhat <15> samyaksambuddhāḥ.

1) B: aprameya. 2) B omissions. 3) B: ‘aprameyāḥ. 4) B: ‘aprameyāḥ. 5) B: ‘aprameya; B adds jñānenāprameya. List in T differs from both A & B. It gives: jñāna, śīla, kṣānti, virya, dhīya, and prayāṇa. 6) B omits. T agrees with A. 7) The aprameya may have been inadvertently omitted. In order to be consistent, one should have here upekṣayaāprameyaḥ. 8,18 B reverses the order: dasābhīr bhālais emitting tathāgata) caturbhir vaiśāradyaś. T agrees with B. 9) B: tṛbhīr āvenikai smṛtyupas-
VII. Translation of the Sanskrit Text

[0] Thus have I heard at one time. The Blessed One dwelt in Rājadhrā, 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 Rājadhrā to collect alms. The Venerable Ānanda saw, while walking from one house to the next to collect alms \(^1\) in the city of Rājadhrā, \(^1\) at a certain place, \(^2\) a multi-storied building \(^3\) with eighty doors, plastered inside and out, with flags and banners raised aloft, and adorned with cloth hangings.

---

\(^1\) In B it is not clear whether it is ukto or ukte. 
\(^2\) B: āyuśmān. 
\(^3\) B also uses t' here and this is the only instance of its use in B. 
\(^4\) B: ko nāmayam bhadanta. 
\(^5\) Cf. Ét. Lamotte, L'enseignement de Vimalakirti (Louvain, 1962) 392, n. 41, for this stock phrase. 
\(^6\) B adds: bhagavān āha. 
\(^7\) An assimilation of the final t of tvam. 
\(^8\) The anuvāra found in A is not clear. 
\(^9\) B: ima(m). 
\(^10\) Possibly \(x\ji = hi\). This is, however, uncertain. 
\(^11\) 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. 
\(^12\) B: kuḍgārṣūtram samāptaṃ; see introduction.
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 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.


[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] 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,\(^1\) and concentrate your mind; I shall tell you. Indeed, Ānanda, the continent of Jāmbudvīpa is seven thousand yojanas in length and in breadth.\(^2\) 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\(^3\) 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.

\(^{1}\) Words enclosed in square brackets [ ] represent missing words supplied by the editor.
I have taken the two adverbs to modify śṛṇu, as did the translators into Tibetan. Cf. Śūramgamasamādhi, Et. Lamotte (Bruxelles, 1965) 125, 225; Sādharmapūndarīka, H. Kern (Dover, 1962) 38. 2) The dimensions of the four continents given in Ad, Ku, 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 Abhidharmakosa gives different dimensions for each of the four continents. Abhidharmakosābhasyam of Vasubandhu, P. Pradhan (Patna, 1975) 161—2. Louis de La Vallée Poussin, L'Abhidharmakosā de Vasubandhu Tome II (Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques, vol. 16, Bruxelles, 1971) 145–6. 3) 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 Jaṁbūdvīpa. 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 Jaṁbūdvīpa. [Put aside the continent of Pūrvavideha]. There is, Ānanda, a continent named Avaragodāniya. 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 Jambūdvīpa, put aside the continent of Purvavideha, 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, 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] 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 Jambūdvīpa, put aside the continent of Purvavideha, 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 Vaijayanta. 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 much greater than the former.

[8] Put aside, Ānanda, the continent of Jambudvīpa, put aside the continent of Pūrvavideha, put aside the continent of Avaragodāniya, 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.” 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.


[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), immeasurable through his friendliness, immeasurable through his compassion, immeasurable through his joy, immeasurable through his impartiality. 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, Ananda, is indeed endowed with immeasurable qualities.

[10] When this was spoken, Venerable Ananda 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, Ananda, should preserve this wonderful discourse on Dharma as The Wonderful Discourse on Dharma. The delighted monks and Venerable Ananda rejoiced in the speech of the Blessed One.

NOTES

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.

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


*Ad* was made into chapter 1 of the *Anuttarāsrayasūtra*, an important *Tathāgatagarbha Sūtra*. See Jikido Takasaki, “Structure of the *Anuttarāsrayasūtra* (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 ms. or from the Tibetan translation.

4. The Kūṭāgāra Śūtra (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 Śūtra 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. Tathāgataprativimbapraśīṣṭhānusāsavarnāna-dharmaparyāya. II. Divyabhojanāvadānam. 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 Śūtra. The missing folios 2–5, therefore, must have included at least the rest of the Kūṭāgāra Śūtra 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.


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 Kőrös 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 Adbhutadharmaparyāya 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 Śūtra 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.


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


A number of Tibetan accounts concerning the construction and consecration of mcchod-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 Adbhutadharma-pārvyā 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-Tsin (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 Ġazni," *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 Bhitā, 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, Mīrākho, Sārnāth 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 Sārnāth, 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.*).


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 dharmāh 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 dhāraṇi 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 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. *Mahâvrittopatti* (*Bon-Zo-Kan-Wa* yon’yaku taikō *Mahâvrittopatti*) ed., Sakaki Ryôzaburô (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 Vaibhāṣīka 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 “Mchod 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 *Stupa-laksana-kārikā-viveçana* 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. 1, 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 Buddhabaladhāhānaprātiḥāryavikurvāṇanirdeśa-sūtra Found at Gilgit,” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* vol. 5 (1978) 332, fol 1296 1.6, where ka(h) should be read kah.
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