# THE JOURNAL

# OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF

# BUDDHIST STUDIES

*Volume 11*          *1988*          *Number 2*

# CONTENTS

## I. ARTICLES

## II. BOOK REVIEWS

# 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.[1] 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.[2] 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.[3] *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*[4] and the *Mahāraṇa Sūtra*,[5] all of which share this common theme.[6] Moreover, the *Pratītyasamutpāda Sūtra*[7] also has elements in common with other texts of this group, although its description[8] 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.[9] 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.[10]

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.[11] The report of Hsüan Tsang on the
making of miniature stūpas can be added to this evidence.[12] 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.[13] A number of texts belong-
ing to the later Avadāna class also provide us with literary sources
for this practice.[14] 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).[15]

## II. Description of the Manuscripts

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

Ms. C: GBMs vol. 7, folio 1691l.2 to end. Script: Gilgit/
Bamiyan—Type I,[21] 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.)

| No.<br>Reference | A | B |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. [4] n. 3 and parallels in [5], [6], [7], [8]. | cāturdiśe (vā)<br>bhikṣusaṃghe | cāturddiśāya vā<br>bhikṣusaṃghāya |
| 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 | yāvac yāvac *deest* | srotāpannebhya(ḥ) sakṛdāgāmibhyo ('nā-gāmibhyo) 'rhadbhy-aḥ pratyekabuddhebh-yaś |
| 7. [7] n.3 [8] n.4 | devānām indrasya | devendrasya |
| 8. [9] n.5 | *deest* | jñānenāprameya |
| 9. [9] n.6 | maitryāprameyaḥ karuṇayāprameya muditayāprameya upekṣayā | *deest* |
| 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 tṛbhir āveṇi-kai smṛtyupasthā-nair mmahākaruṇayā ca |
| 11. [10] n.9 | imaṃ dharmapar-yāyam adbhutam adbhutadharma-paryāya [x]i dhārayazḥ | imaṃ dharmaparyāyam amṛtadundubhir ity api dhārayaḥ adbhu-tadharmaparyāya ity api dhāraya tas-mād asya dharmma-paryāyasya adbhuta- |

dharmaparyāyaḥ
ity adhivacanam

12. [10] n.12       *deest*       kūṭāgārasūtraṃ
samāptaṃ

## 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 vaiśāradyāni*) 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*)[22] and great compassion (*mahākaruṇā*).

According to Vasubandhu in the *Abhidharmakośa*[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. (*aṣṭādaśāveṇikāstu buddhadharmā balādayaḥ. . . katame 'ṣṭādaśa? daśa balāni catvāri vaiśāradyāni 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*[24] says: *ete balādyā mahā-karuṇāntā aṣṭādaśāveṇikā Vaibhāṣikair vyavasthāpyaṃte. balādi-vyatiriktān 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").[25]

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.[26] 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 *Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra (MPPS)* there are two different lists of the 18 *āveṇikabuddhadharmas*.[27] 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.[28] 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,"[29] and *bcug* "put into" with *ring bsrel* "relic."

The Sanskrit ms. A of *Ad*, in which establishing a relic may

be separate from the establishment of a stūpa, may reflect a form of the relic cult not yet associated with a stūpa. This form of the relic cult *sans* stūpa also appears to be mentioned in the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya* from Gilgit and in the *Divyāvadāna*.[30]

V. *Pecularities of the Language*[31]

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), *pratikrāṃtaḥ* [2], *vaijayaṃtaḥ* [7], *kṣāṃtyā* [9], *ekāṃta* [2], *bhagavaṃtam* [2], [10], °*asmiṃ*. 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: *cīvaraṃn ā-* [2], *patākaṃm ā-* [2], *āyuṣmāṃn ā-* [2]. Cf. Kurumiya p. xxiv 1.6; Watanabe p. xiii.

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

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

(b). Before initial gutteral surd (*k*) and labial surd (*p*) the *visarga* is sometimes replaced with *jihvāmūlīya* and *upadhmānīya* respectively (Renou p. 38; Whitney #69, #170d; Sander Tafel 22; Bühler p. 67). I have marked them, after Renou, with *ẖ* and *ḫ* respectively. Examples for *jihvāmūlīya*: *yaẖ kaś* [2], *chrāddhaẖ kulaputro* [2], [5], [7], [8], °*prameyaẖ karuṇayā* (9). An example for *upadhmānīya*: *tataḫ prabhūtataraṃ* [5]. The use of the *jihvāmūlīya* and *upadhmānīya* is far from consistent. Although the phrases *śrāddhaḥ kulaputraḥ* and *tataḥ prabhūtataraṃ* occur in

every section from [1] to [8], *jihvāmūlīya* 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) *doṣaiḥ p-* (*ibid.* folio 1541.4). The *upadhmānīya* also occurs in the *Buddha-balādhānaprātihāryavikurvāṇanirdeśa* written in Gilgit/Bamiyan—Type I Script[32]: *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: *arhatas s-* [6]; cf. *Maitreyavyākaraṇa, 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 *ḥś*. For example: *pratyekabuddhebhyaḥś catur* [3].

(3). *Sandhi*.

(a). Hiatus (#4.51–6).

Hiatus between two vowels is sometimes maintained. For example: *vā īdṛśam* [1], [2], *me etad* [2], *ānanda uttaro°* [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 (*ṛ*) for lingual semi-vowel (*r*) which occurs in B and C, does not occur in A.

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

**Ms. B:**

(1). Nasals and *anusvāra*.

(a). The only example of the use of *anusvāra* for any nasal in B is the spelling *saṃgha* which occurs throughout the ms. In all other cases where A has *ṃ*, B has the expected nasal: B has *piṇḍa* for A's *piṃḍa, pratikrāntaḥ* for A's *pratikrāṃtaḥ* 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). *Jihvāmūlīya* and *upadhmānīya* occur only once each in ms. B: a *jihvāmūlīya* occurs in [5] n. 7, *upadhmānīya* 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 *ḥś* before an initial palatal surd (*c*) in B, again in *pratyekabuddhebhyaḥś 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 (*ṛ*) for lingual semi-vowel (*r*) (#3.97).
Examples for lingual vowel (*ṛ*) used for lingual semivowel (*r*): *tṛsāhasra* for *trisāhasra* [8], *tṛbhir* for *tribhir* [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 *piṇḍa*. 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). *Jihvāmūlīya* 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 īdṛśam* [1].

(4). There is one example of lingual vowel (ṛ) 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.[33] 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 (ẏ) written after the *akṣara* is used. I have indicated it by: ṁ. Its use in both mss. is quite arbitrary. Examples: ms. A: *ārocayeyaṁ* [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*, *āī* [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, *daśabhir 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-bimbakārāpaṇasūtra* 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[1] mayā śrutam[2] ekasmiṃ samaye[3]. bhagavān[4] rājagṛhe viharati sma·[5] veṇuvane kalandakanivāse.

[1]Ms. A has one line preceding the standard opening formula *evaṃ mayā*, etc., which I was not able to read. [2] C: *śrutam*. [3] 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. [4]C: *bhagavāṃn*. [5] C omits.


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


[1] C is difficult to read here. Cf. E. Conze, *Vajracchedikā prajñāpāramitā* (Serie Orientale Roma 13, 1957) 27 etc. [2] The sentence begins with a finite aorist verb, later followed by a gerund of the same root. T omits the first occurrence of this verb. C agrees with A. This verbal construction is perhaps

used for emphasis, but is found fairly often in non-Mahāyāna Sanskrit *sūtra* literature. Cf. E. Waldschmidt, *Das 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. [3] C omits. T agrees with A. [4](4C: *caramāṇaḥ anyatamasmiṃ*. [5] C: *pṛthivīpradeśe*. T agrees with A. [6] C: *upaliptāvaliptam*. [7] For this and the following compound, cf. W. Couvreur, Review of J. Nobel's *Udrāyaṇa, König von Roruka, IIJ* vol. 1 (1957) 312. [8] In C -*dāma*- is an interlinear addition. A plus (+) sign (*kākapada* or *haṃsapada*) 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: *chrāddhaḥ*. [12] A is not clear here, C has *catur*. In the pars to this phrase A almost always uses *cātur* (the only exception is in the par in [5]). [13] In the pars to this and the next compound B always uses a dative for the locative here. In the pars apart from the one in [4] this locative will not be further noted. [14]In all the pars in A this phrase occurs as: *samyaksaṃbuddhasya parinirvṛtasya mṛt/mṛttikāpiṃḍād 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. [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 *prakṣipet*; 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 yang 'di snyam du sems te.* [23]Or *yatv.* This is perhaps intended for *yat tv aham* or *yan nv 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 *ṃ* in A.

[2] athāyu(ṣ)mān āna[ndo rāja] gṛhe¹ [?nagare]² sāvadānaṃ
piṃḍāya caritvā kṛtabhaktakṛtya paścādbhaktapiṃḍapāta-
pratikrāṃtaḥ pātracīvaraṃ pratiśamayya³ pādau prakṣālya
yena bhagavā(ṃs ten)opasaṃkrāṃta.⁴ upasaṃkramya bha-
gavataḥ pādau śirasā vanditvaikāṃte 'sthād. ekāṃtasthita
āyuṣmān ānando bhagavaṃtam idam avocat': ihāhaṃ bha-
daṃta⁵ pūrvāhṇe nivāsya pātracīvaraṃm ādā(1577)ya
(rā)jagṛhaṃ piṃḍāya prāvikṣaṃ. so 'ham adrākṣaṃ⁶, rāja-
gṛhe nagare sāvadāna(ṃ) piṃḍāya caramāṇo 'nyata-
masmiṃ pradeśe kūṭāgāram aśītidvāram ulli(ptā)valiptam
ucchritadhvajapatākaṃm āmuktapaṭṭadāmakalāpaṃ ca
dṛṣṭvā ca punar me etad abhavat': yaḥ kaścic chrāddhaḥ
kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā īdṛśaṃ kūṭāgā(ram)⁷* cāturdiśe

bhikṣusaṃghe niryātayed; yo vā tathāgata(syā)rhataḥ sam-
(yaksaṃbu)ddhasya parini(rvṛ)tasya mṛttikāpiṃḍād āmala-
kapramāṇaṃ stūpaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayet'‖⁸ sūcīmātrāṃ yaṣṭim
āropaye[d bada]rī[patra]mātra[ṃ] cchatra[ṃ], [ya]va[pha-
lapra]māṇāṃ pratimāṃ kārayet' sarṣapaphalapramāṇaṃ
dhātuṃ pratiṣṭhāpayet', <tat ka>[tamam]⁹ tataḥ prabhū-
tataraṃ puṇyaṃ syāt'? tasya mamaitad abhavac: chāstā me
saṃmukhībhūtaḥ, sugato me saṃmukhībhūtaḥ. yanv¹⁰
aham etam evārthaṃ bhagavataḥ <āroca>yeyaṃ. yathā
bhagavāṃ vyākariṣyati [tathāhaṃ]¹¹ dhā(ra)[yiṣ](y)-
[ām]ī[t]y¹².

¹⁾ 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. . .". ²⁾ This is very
uncertain. A appears to have *?ḥisāṭe;* 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 sāvadānaṃ pimḍāya
√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. ³⁾ Cf. *BHSD* 369b.
⁴⁾ This stock phrase was read with the help of T: *bcom ldan 'das ga la ba der
song nas.* ⁵⁾ For this vocative see *BHSD* 405b. ⁶⁾ See [1] n. 2. ⁷⁾ The par in [1]
has *kūṭāgāraṃ kārayitvā.* T also has a verb here. Its absense here in A appears
to be a scribal omission. ⁸⁾ This is perhaps a double *daṇḍa;* 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 kyis bdag la ji skad
bstan pa bzhin du gzung bar bgyi snyam nas.* ¹²⁾ 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 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 ]¹ bhagavānn āyuṣ(m)aṃtam ānandam idam av-
ocat': sādhu sādhv ānanda bahujanahitā[ya] tvam ānanda
pratipanno ca [bahujanasukh]²āya lokānuka[ṃ](pāyai) ar-
thāya hitāya sukhāya devamanuṣyāṇāṃ, yas t(v)aṃ tathā-
gatam etam evārthaṃ paripraṣṭavyaṃ manyase. tena hy
ānanda (śṛṇu) sādhu ca suṣṭhu ca manasikuru, bhāṣiṣye·.
ja[ṃ]būdvīpo hy ānanda dvīpa saptayojanasahasrāṇy āyā-
mavistāreṇa³ (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 pratyekabuddhebhyaḥś⁴
cātu[rd]i(śe vā) [bh]i[kṣu]saṃghe niryātaye[d]; y[o vā ta]-
(th)āgatasyārhataḥ samyaksaṃbuddhasya parinirvṛtasya
mṛttikāpiṃḍād [ā]malakaphalapramā<ṇa>ṃ stūpaṃ pra-
tiṣṭhāpayet' sū[c]ī[mā](tr)ā[ṃ] vā⁵ ya[ṣṭi]m āropa[yed, bada-
rī]patra(mā)traṃ cchatraṃ, yavaphalapramāṇā(ṃ) prati-
mā(ṃ) kārayet' sarṣapaphalapramāṇaṃ dhātuṃ pratiṣṭhā-
<pa>yet', idam evānanda, tataḥ prabhūtataraṃ puṇyaṃ
va(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: *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 (Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra)*
(Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques vol. 13) (Bruxelles, 1965) 304. Note, how-
ever, that the *ca* here is somewhat problematic. ³⁾ On the form *āyāmavistāreṇa*
cf. *BHSG* 19.38. ⁴⁾ For the *sandhi* see introduction V,A, ms. A (2),(d). ⁵⁾ 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 'ṣṭauyojanasahasrā<ny ā>yāma-
vistāreṇa samaṃtād ardhacandrākārapariṇāmita. tam
enaṃ kaścic chrāddhaḥ kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā saptarat-
namayaṃ kṛtva¹'² ³⁾cāturdiśe bhikṣusaṃghe⁽ˢ niryātayed;
yo vā tathāgatasyārhataḥ samyaksaṃbuddhasya parini-
rvṛtasya mṛ[tpiṃ]ḍād āmalakaphalapramāṇaṃ⁴ stūpaṃ
pratiṣṭhāpayet'⁵ sūcīmātrāṃ yaṣṭim āropayed badarīpatra-
mātraṃ cchatraṃ⁶ yavaphalapramāṇāṃ pratimā[ṃ] kāra-
yet⁷ sarṣapaphalapramāṇaṃ dhātuṃ pratiṣṭhāpayet',⁸ idam
evānandaḥ⁹ tataḥ bahutaraṃ¹⁰ puṇyaṃ¹¹ vadāmi'.

¹⁾ 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. ²⁾ B begins here. ³⁾⁽³ B: *cāturddiśāya vā
bhikṣusaṃghāya*. See [1] n. 13. It will not be noted hereafter. ⁴⁾ B: *āmalakapramā-
ṇaṃ*. T agrees with A. ⁵⁾ B: *pratiṣṭhāpayēt*. B uses here a different vowel *mātra*
for the *e*. See Introduction V,B,(3). ⁶⁾ B: *cchatram āropayed*. See [1] n. 19. The

absence of the verb will not be noted hereafter. [7] B: *kāraye.* [8] B: *prakṣiped.*
T: *bcug na,* "put into." [9] B: *evāhaṃ.* T also omits *ānanda.* The difference noted
here between A and B is consistent and will not be noted hereafter. [10] B:
*prabhūtataraṃ* 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: *puṇyaṃ.*

[5] tiṣṭhatv ānanda jambūdvīpo[1] dvīpaḥ[2]*. asty ānandāvara-
godānīyo[3] nāma dvīpaḥ [4]navayoja[na]sa[ha]srāṇy āyāma-
vistareṇa[(4,5] (1579) samantāt pūrṇacandrākārapariṇāmi-
taḥ[6]. ta(m) enaṃ kaś(ci)c chrāddhaḥ[7] kulapurto vā[8] kuladu-
hitā vā saptaratnamayaṃ kṛtvā yāvac[9] caturdi<śe> bhikṣu-
saṃghe niryātayed; yo vā tathāgatasyārhataḥ samyaksaṃ-
buddhasya parinirvṛtasya mṛtpiṃdād āmalakapramāṇaṃ[10]
stūpaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayet[11] sūcīmātrāṃ yaṣṭim ā[r]<opa>-
yet[12] badarīpatramātraṃ cchatraṃ yavaphalapramāṇāṃ
pratimāṃ kārayet[13] sarṣapaphalapramāṇaṃ dhātuṃ prati-
ṣṭhāpayed[14], idam evānandaḥ tataḥ[15] prabhūtataraṃ puṇ-
yaṃ vadā<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 pūrvvavideho dvīpaḥ,* which agrees with the general
pattern of this series of repetitions. T agrees with B. [3] B: *ānanda avaragodānīyo.*
[4](4 B: *navayojana(sa)hasrāṇy āyāmena navayojana(sa)hasrāṇi vistāreṇa.* T has: *de
chur ni dpag tshad dgu stong zheng yang dpag tshad dgu stong ste/* [5] throughout
A *vistareṇa* and *vistāreṇa* are used alternatively; see M-W 1001c. It will not be
noted hereafter. [6] B: *purṇna(ca)ndrākārapariṇāmitastas.* The ending results
from a dittography. [7] B also has *chrāddhaḥ.* [8] B: *vāc,* probably a scribal error
written under the influence of the preceding *jihvāmūlīya* of *chrāddhaḥ kulaputro.*
[9] B: *srotāpannebhya sakṛdāgāmibhyo 'rhadbhyaḥ pratyekabuddhebhyaś.* Note that
*anāgāmibhyaḥ* 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: *āropayed.* [13] B: *kārayet;*
it will not be noted hereafter. [14] B: *prakṣipēd.* The use of this verb in B for
*pratiṣṭhāpayet* in A is consistent and will not be noted hereafter. [15] B: *tataḥ;*
see introduction V,A, ms. A., (2),(b).

[6] tiṣṭhatv ānanda jambū(d)vīpo dvīpaḥ. tiṣṭhatu (pūr)[va-
v]i(de)ho dvīpaḥ. tiṣṭhatv avaragodānīyo dvīpaḥ. asty ānan-
da uttarakurur [nāma][1] dvīpaḥ[2,3] daśayojanasa<hasrāny>
āyāmavistā(re)ṇa[(3] samaṃtāt[4] samaṃ[ta]caturasra[5]*. (ta)m
e(na)ṃ kaścic chrāddhaḥ ku(la)putro vā kuladuhitā vā sap-

taratnamayaṃ kṛtvā yāvac⁶ cātur[d]i[śe] <bhikṣu>(saṃ)-
ghe (ni)ryā(ta)yed; (yo vā) tathāgatasyārhatas⁷
samyaksaṃbuddhasya⁸ parinirvṛ[ta]sya m(ṛt)piṃdād āma-
laka(phala)pramāṇaṃ stūpaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayet⁹ sūcīmātrāṃ
ya[ṣṭ]im āropayet¹⁰ bada(r)ī(patra)[mātraṃ c]cha(t)raṃ,
yavaphalapramāṇāṃ pratimāṃ kāraye(t' sarṣapa)pha(la)-
pramāna(ṃ) dhātuṃ pratiṣṭhāpayet', tataḥ¹¹ prabhūtata-
raṃ puṇyaṃ va<dāmi>.

¹⁾ This reconstruction is uncertain. Possible reading: *nnāma.* ²⁾ B: *dvīpō.* ³⁾⁽³
B. *daśayojanasahasrāṇi vistare(ṇa) daśayojanasahasrāṇy āyāmena.* T: *chur ni dpag
tshad khri/ rgyar yang dpag tshad khri ste/.* See [5] n. 4 where T has *zheng* instead
of *rgyar yang.* ⁴⁾ B: *samantā.* ⁵*⁾ B: *?samametacaturasrapariṇāmitas.* 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.* ⁶⁾ B: *srotāpan-
nebhyaḥ sakṛdāgāmibhyo 'nāgāmibhyo 'rhadbhyaḥ pratyekabuddhebhyaḥ.* Cf. [4] n. 1,
[5] n. 9. ⁷⁾ B: *°arhata.* ⁸⁾ B: *samyaksaṃ[bu]ddhasya.* ⁹⁾ B: *pratiṣṭhāpaye.* ¹⁰⁾ B:
*ā(ro)payed.* Cf. [5] n. 12. ¹¹⁾ 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 jaṃbūdvīpo dvīpas.¹ tiṣṭhatu pūrvavi-
deho dvī(pa)ḥ. tiṣ(ṭha)tv avaragodā[n]īy(o)² [dv]ī[paḥ]. (t)i-
ṣṭhatūttarakuru dvīpaḥ. asty ānanda śakrasya ³⁾de[v]ānām
indrasya⁽³ (1580) vaijayaṃto⁴ nāma⁵ prāsādaḥ. tam enaṃ⁶
śraddhaḥ⁷ kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā⁸*'⁹ cāturdiśe bhi(kṣu)-
saṃ(ghe) niryātayed; yo vā tathāgatasyārhataḥ samyaksaṃ-
buddhasya paranirvṛtasya¹⁰* mṛtpiṃdād āmalakaphalapra-
māṇaṃ ¹¹⁾stūpaṃ pratiṣṭh(āpa)yet' sūcīmātrāṃ ya(ṣṭ)im
ā[ropaye]d badarī(pa)tramātraṃ cchatraṃ, yavaphala-
pramāṇāṃ pratimāṃ kārayet [sa]rṣapaphalapramāṇaṃ⁽¹
dh(ātuṃ) [pratiṣṭhāpa]y[e]d, idam evānanda tataḥ
pra(bhū)tataraṃ puṇya[ṃ va] (dā)[mi].

¹⁾ B: *dvīpaḥ,* as in the pars throughout A and B. ²⁾ B: *avaragōdānīyo.* ³⁾⁽³ B:
*devēndrasya.* ⁴⁾ A: *vaivaijayaṃto.* A scribal dittographical error resulting from
writing an *akṣara* at the end of the last line of the page and repeating it at
the head of the first line of the next page. B: *vaijayantaḥ.* ⁵⁾ B omits. T: *rnam
par rgyal byed ces bya ba.* A agrees with T. ⁶⁾ B: *enaṃ.* ⁷⁾ B: *kaści(c) chrāddha,*
similar to all the pars in A and B. T agrees with B. ⁸*⁾ B: *vā saptaratnamayaṃ
kṛtvā.* This phrase appears to have been inadvertently omitted in A. It is used
in all the pars in A and B and in T here and throughout. ⁹⁾ B adds after its
*vā sapta ratnamayaṃ kṛtvā* (see n. 8) the five religious stages as in [6] n. 6. (The

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

[8] [t]i(ṣṭha)tv ānanda¹ jaṃ(bū)dvīpo dvīpaḥ. tiṣṭhatu pū-rvavideho dvīpaḥ. tiṣṭhatv <avara>godānīyo² dvīpaḥ. ti-(ṣṭha)tūttaraku(ru)³ d(v)īpaḥ. (tiṣṭhat)u śakrasya ⁴⁾(d)evā-nām indrasya⁽⁴ vaijaya(ṃ)taḥ prāsādaḥ. asty ānandas⁵ trisāhasramahāsāhasro lo<kadhā>[tu].⁶ tam enaṃ kaści(c) chr(ā)ddhaḥ kulaputro vā (kula)duhitā vā saptaratnama-yaṃ⁷ kṛtvā srotāpannebhyaḥ sakṛdā(gā)mibhyo 'nāgāmi-bhyo 'rhadbhyaḥ pratyekabuddhebhya<ś> cāturdi[śe vā bh]ikṣusaṃghe niryā(ta)yed; yo [vā ta]thāgatasyārhataḥ samyaksaṃbuddhasya parinirvṛtasya mṛttikāpiṇḍād⁸ āma-lakapramāṇaṃ stūpaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayet⁹ sū<cī>mātrāṃ ya-ṣṭim āropayed badarīpatramātraṃ cchatram āropaye¹⁰* ya-vaphalapramāṇāṃ pratimāṃ kārayet' saraṣapaphalapra-māṇaṃ dhātuṃ pratiṣṭhāpayed, idam evāna<nda> tataḥ¹¹ prabhūtataraṃ puṇyaṃ vadāmi·.

¹⁾ A uses an irregular form for long *ā*. ²⁾ B: *avaragōdānīyo*. ³⁾ B: °*uttaraguru*. ⁴⁾ Bk: *deve(nd)rasya* as in [7] n. 3)(3. ⁵⁾ B: *āna(nda)*. ⁶⁾ B: *[lo]kadhā[tus]* ⁷⁾ B: *sa[ptaratnama]yaṃ*. ⁸⁾ B: *mṛtpiṇḍād*. *Mṛttikā* and *mṛt* are used alternately through-out 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. 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? aprameyo¹ hy² ānanda tathāgato dā[n]e-nāprameyaḥ śīlenāprameyaḥ kṣāṃtyāprameyo³ vīryeṇā-prame[ya]<s⁴ tyāge>(1581)nāprameyo⁵ ⁶⁾maitryāprame-yaḥ karuṇayāprameya muditayāprameya upekṣayā⁽⁶,⁷* ⁸⁾caturbhir vaiśāradyair daśabhis tathāgatabalair⁽⁸ ⁹⁾aṣṭāda-śabhir āveṇikai(r bu)ddhadharm(m)<ai>r⁽⁹ aprameyāpra-meyaguṇasamanvā(gato)¹⁰* hy¹¹ ā(na)ndas¹²* tathāgato 'rhat¹³ samyaksaṃbuddaḥ.

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

*thānair mmahākaru<ṇa>[y]ā ca.* T mentions both the *aṣṭādaśāveṇika-bud-dhadharmāḥ* and the *triṇy āveṇikāni smṛtyupasthānāni.* However the order of the *tathāgata*'s qualities in the Tibetan text is different. [10*] Read *aprameyo 'prameya-;* this is probably a scribal error. B: *aprameyo 'prameyaguṇagaṇai [sa]man(v)āgataḥ.* T agrees with A. [11] B omits. [12*] B: *ānanda.* [13] B: *°arha.*

[10] evam ukto¹ āyuṣmāṃn² ānando bhaga(va)ṃtam idam avocat³: āścaryaṃ bhagavann āśca<ryaṃ> (su)gataḥ yāvad ayaṃ dharmaparyāyaḥ. ⁴⁾[ko nāmāya]ṃ(⁴ dharmaparyā-yaḥ, kathaṃ [cai]naṃ dhārayāmi?⁵ tasmāt⁶ tarhi⁷, tvam āna-nda, imaṃ⁸ dhar[mapa]ryāyaṃ⁹*⁾ adbhutam adbhuta(dha-rma)paryāya [x]i¹⁰ dhārayaḥ(⁹*,¹¹). idam avo(ca)d [bha]ga-[vān ātta] (ma) [nasas te bh]ikṣava ā(yuṣma)ṃś cānando bhagavato [bhās]itam abhyananda[n](¹¹,¹².

¹⁾ In B it is not clear whether it is *ukto* or *ukte.* ²⁾ B: *āyuṣmān.* ³⁾ B also uses *ṭ'* here and this is the only instance of its use in B. ⁴⁾(⁴ B: *ko nāmayaṃ bhadanta.* Cf. Ét. Lamotte, *L'enseignement de Vimalakīrti* (Louvain, 1962) 392, n. 41, for this stock phrase. ⁵⁾ B adds: *·bhagavān āha·.* T agrees with B. ⁶⁾ B: *tasmā.* An assimilation of the final *t* with the initial *t* of *tvam.* ⁷⁾ B omits. ⁸⁾ The *anusvāra* found in A is not clear. B: *ima(ṃ).* ⁹*⁾(*⁹ B: *amṛtadundubhir ity api dhārayaḥ adbhutadharmmaparyāya ity api dhāraya tasmād asya dharmmaparyāyasya adbhuta-dharmmaparyāyaḥ ity adhivacanaṃ.* The *visarga* in *dhārayaḥ* is used as a mark of punctuation. ¹⁰⁾ Possibly [x]*i* = *hi.* This is, however, uncertain. ¹¹⁾(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: *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 Kalan-dakanivāpana.

[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 ¹⁾in the city of Rājagṛha,(¹ at a certain place,² a multi-storied build-ing³ 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 āmalaka⁴ 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.

¹⁾ C omits. ²⁾ C: spot of earth. ³⁾ *kūṭāgāra*, cf. K. de Vreese, "Skr. Kūṭāgāra", *India Antiqua, A Volume of Oriental Studies* (E.J. Brill, Leyden, 1947) 323–325. ⁴⁾ Emblic Myrobalan. M-W 146c. *Āmalaka* and *āmalakaphala* are used alternatively throughout ms. A and B. I have translated it always as āmalaka fruit.

[2] Then the Venerable Ānanda, having walked from one house to the next to collect alms in the city of 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]¹ such a multi-storied building and offer it to the community

of monks of the four directions; or if someone were to establish for the Tathāgata, the Arhat, the Fully Enlightened One, who has attained complete Nirvāṇa, a *stūpa* the size of an āmalaka fruit made from a lump of clay, and were to stick into it a *stūpa*-pole the size of a needle with an umbrella the size of a juniper leaf, were to make an image the size of a grain of barley, and were to establish a relic the size of a mustard seed, which of them would have the greater merit? It occurred to me: The Teacher is readily available to me, the Sugata is readily available to me. What if I were to ask the Blessed One concerning that matter? As the Blessed One will explain it, so I will preserve it.

[1] 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,[1] and concentrate your mind; I shall tell you. Indeed, Ānanda, the continent of Jambūdvīpa 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.

[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[1] 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[2] a relic the size of a mustard seed, I say, Ānanda[3], the merit of the latter is much greater than the former.

[5] Put aside, Ānanda, the continent of Jambūdvīpa. [Put aside the continent of Pūrvavideha][1]. There is, Ānanda, a continent named Avaragodānīya. It is fully nine thousand yojanas in length and in breadth[2], 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[3] 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 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[1] and entirely square.[2] If it were made of the
seven precious substances and some believing son or daugh-
ter of good family were to offer it, as before, up to the
community of monks of the four directions; or if someone
were to establish for the Tathāgata, the Arhat, the Fully
Enlightened One, who has attained complete Nirvāṇa, a
*stūpa* the size of an āmalaka fruit made from a lump of
clay, and were to stick into it a *stūpa*-pole the size of a needle
with an umbrella with size of a juniper leaf, were to make
an image the size of a grain of barley, and were to establish
a relic the size of a mustard seed, I say, the merit [of the
latter][3] is much greater than the former.

[1] B: It is fully ten thousand yojanas in length [and] ten thousand yojanas in
breadth. [2] B: shaped as a square. [3] A omits *idaṃ*. 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[1] Vaijayanta. [2]If a believing son or a daughter of
good family were to offer it to the community of monks

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

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

[8] Put aside, Ānanda, the continent of Jaṃbūdvīpa, 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."[1] 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-en-
terers, once-returners, non-returners, Arhats, Pratyeka-
buddhas, or to the community of monks of the four direc-
tions; 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] On this cosmic system see: Ét. Lamotte, *E'enseignement de Vimalakīrti* (Lou-
vain, 1962) Appendice, Note I.

[9] What is the reason for this? Because,[1] Ānanda, the
Tathāgata is immeasurable through his giving, immeasur-
able through his morality, immeasurable through his pa-
tience, immeasurable through his vigor, immeasurable

through his renunciation (*tyāga*),[2] [3]immeasurable through his friendliness, immeasurable through his compassion, immeasurable through his joy, [immeasurable] through his impartiality.[3] [4]Through the four assurances, through the ten Tathāgata's powers,[4] [5]through the eighteen characteristics unique to a Buddha (*āveṇikas*)[5] he is immeasurable. The Tathāgata, the Arhat, the Fully Enlightened One, Ānanda, is indeed[6] endowed with immeasurable[7] qualities.

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

[10] When this was spoken, Venerable Ānanda said this to the Blessed One: "Marvellous, O Blessed One, marvellous, O Sugata, is indeed this discourse on Dharma![1] And how should I preserve it?."[2] "Because of that you now,[3] Ānanda, [4]should preserve this wonderful discourse on Dharma as The Wonderful Discourse on Dharma (*Adbhutadharmaparyāya*)."[4] [5]This the Blessed One said. The delighted monks and Venerable Ānanda rejoiced in the speech of the Blessed One[5].

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

## NOTES

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 manuscripts 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 Tripiṭaka, 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'apres les Vinayapiṭaka,*" *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. *Tathāgataprativimbapratiṣṭhānuśaṃsavarṇaṇa-dharmaparyāya.* II. *Divyabhojanāvadāna.* 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 *Adbhutadharmaparyāya* appears at the end of Sanskrit ms. B of the *Ad,* a scribe mislabled 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 Indravarman (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 pṛthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet' in the Vajracchedikā: Notes on the cult of the book in Mahāyāna," *Indo-Iranian Journal* vol. 17 (1975) 147–181; Ryojun 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 *Kṣud-rakavastu* of the Sarvāstivādins. See Gustav Roth in n. 3.
2. In the polyglot inscription of the 14th century, Chü-yung-kuan monument, *Kū* is mentioned and very closely paraphrased. See Jiro Murata, *Chü-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-yong-koan," *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, Mīrpūr-khas, 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.*).

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 *Bhikṣuṇī-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*, Śatapiṭaka Series, vol. 10, part 7 (New Delhi, 1974).

18. Lore Sander, *Paläographisches zu den sanskrithandschriften 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. *Mahāvyutpatti (Bon-Zō-Kan-Wa yon'yaku taikō Mahābuyuttopatti)* 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 Vaibhāṣika 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 represen-tation found in the Sanskrit treatise *Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivecana* 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.

27. Lamotte in note 26.

28. This is also the list of the *Mahāvyutpatti* (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(ḥ) 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, *Ratnaketuparivarta* (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 Turfan-
    sammlung* (Wiesbaden, 1968).
G. Bühler, *Indian Paleography,* appendix to *Indian Antiquary* 33 (1904) (repr.
    Delhi: 1973).