

SANSKRIT FRAGMENTS  
OF THE MAHĀYĀNA MAHĀPARINIRVĀṆASŪTRA

1. Koyasan Manuscript

Akira Yuyama

STUDIA PHILOLOGICA BUDDHICA  
Occasional Paper Series  
IV

TOKYO • THE REIYUKAI LIBRARY • 1981

*Sanskrit Fragments of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*

*I. Koyasan Manuscript*

STUDIA PHILOLOGICA BUDDHICA

Occasional Paper Series

IV

SANSKRIT FRAGMENTS

OF THE MAHĀYĀNA MAHĀPARINIRVĀṄASŪTRA

1. Koyasan Manuscript

Akira Yuyama

TOKYO

THE REIYUKAI LIBRARY

1981

SANSKRIT FRAGMENTS  
OF THE MAHĀYĀNA MAHĀPARINIRVĀṆASŪTRA

I. Koyasan Manuscript

Akira Yuyama

TOKYO • THE REIYUKAI LIBRARY • 1981

Published by The Reiyukai Library,  
5-3-23 Toranomom, Minato-ku, Tokyo 105, Japan

© Akira Yuyama 1981

First published 1981

*All rights reserved.*

*Apart from any fair dealing for the purpose of private study, research, criticism or review, no part of this booklet may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission. Enquiries should be made to the publishers.*

Printed in Japan by Seikosha Printing Company, Tokyo

*Single copies of the Studia Philologica Buddhica (Occasional Paper Series) are obtainable free of charge on request direct from the Reiyukai Library, Tokyo.*

Correspondence regarding all editorial matters should be sent to the Director of the Reiyukai Library, Tokyo.

*Dedicated to Dr. J. W. de Jong,  
Professor of South Asian and Buddhist Studies  
at the Australian National University of Canberra  
on the occasion of his sexagenarian anniversary  
15 February 1981*



## T a b l e o f C o n t e n t s

Introductory Remarks	1
Kōyasan Manuscript Transcribed	17
Brief Palaeographical Notes	19
Sanskrit Version Reconstructed	20
Notes on the reconstructed text	21
An English Translation of the Sanskrit Version	23
An English Translation	
of the Chinese Version Rendered by Fa-hsien	26
List of Chinese Characters	28
Tibetan Version Translated from the Indic	29
An English Translation	
of the Tibetan Version Rendered from the Indic	31
An English Translation	
of the Chinese Version Rendered by Dharmakṣema	33
List of Chinese Characters	35
Tibetan Version Translated from the Chinese	37
An English Translation	
of the Tibetan Version Rendered from the Chinese	39
Table of Six Flavours	43
Three Kinds of Flavours in the World	
and the Nirvāṇa Meal (table)	44
Supplementary Notes	45





SANSKRIT FRAGMENTS OF THE MAHĀYĀNA MAHĀPARINIRVĀNASŪTRA

I. Koyasan Manuscript\*

Akira Yuyama  
(The Reiyukai Library, Tokyo)

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

1. At present only eight manuscript fragments of the Sanskrit version of the so-called Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* are known to exist throughout the world, namely, one in London, one at Kōyasan, and six in Leningrad.<sup>1</sup>
2. The India Office Library of the British Commonwealth Office in London preserves one, known as the Hoernle Manuscript num-

\* A summary of this study was read at the Third Conference of the International Association of Buddhist Studies held in conjunction with the International Association of the History of Religions at the University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada, on 22 August 1980.

<sup>1</sup> For important bibliographical information about the first two see for example Ryūjō Yamada, *Bongo-Butten-no Shobunken* (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1959, repr. 1977), p. 95; and for the Nirvāṇa-literature in general see among others Hajime Nakamura, "A Critical Survey of Mahayana and Esoteric Buddhism chiefly based upon Japanese studies", *Acta Asiatica*, VII (Tokyo 1964), pp. 49-53, and its revised version "A Survey of Mahāyāna Buddhism with bibliographical notes, Part I", *Journal of the Intercultural Studies*, No. 3 (Hiraoka 1976), pp. 123-126. This has recently been published in book form with revisions and additions: *Indian Buddhism: A Survey of Buddhism with Bibliographical Notes* (Hiraoka: Kansai University of Foreign Studies, 1980), pp. 212-215, also 365. One may also refer to the works quoted under note 31, and the introductions to the translations cited under notes 35-37 below.

bered 143, SA. 4, measuring approximately 31.5 x 9.3 cm. This has been for the first time identified with the Chinese versions by Kaikyoku Watanabe:<sup>2</sup> Taishō edition No. 374, Vol. XII p. 422b6/7-c5 from end; No. 375, XII 663b27-664a12; No. 376, XII 895a2-24/25, and then studied carefully by F. W. Thomas after having received the information from Strassburg.<sup>3</sup> This fragment, bearing the folio number 162 on the obverse side, appears to have been discovered at the ruined site of Khādalik around the year 1903 A.D. (see Hoernle, *op.cit.*, p. 85). According to Thomas, there are seven lines of writing on each side of the folio in the Upright Gupta script. It is my cherished hope to study the fragment in comparison with various versions, after I succeed in obtaining the photocopy of both sides of the folio, since, unfortunately, only the reverse has been published in facsimile (see Hoernle, *op.cit.*, plate XXI.2).

3. Thanks to the painstaking efforts of a Russian scholar, V. S. Vorob'ev-Desjakotovskij (1927-1956), who died a sadly premature death, six fragments of the Sanskrit version of the

<sup>2</sup> Immediately after the identification of this fragment in the autumn of 1908 at Strassburg on the advice of his teacher, Ernst Leumann, who had been requested by F. W. Thomas of London, K. Watanabe published with scholarly excitement in his article a detailed study of the Sanskrit text in comparison with the corresponding Chinese versions found in the then available *Dainippon Kōtei (Shukusatsu) Daizōkyō* (Tokyo 1880-1885): "Daihatsunehangyō-no Bonbun Danpen", *Shūkyōkai*, V, 3 (Tokyo, March 1909). This article has been reprinted in his collected works *Watanabe Kaikyoku Ronbunshū = Kogetsu Zenshū*, I (Tokyo 1933, repr. 1936, 1977), pp. 570-585.

<sup>3</sup> F. W. Thomas, "Miscellaneous Fragments, 3: Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra", *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature found in Eastern Turkestan*, edited by A. F. Rudolf Hoernle (Oxford 1916, repr. St.-Leonards-Amsterdam 1970), pp. 93-97, with plate XXI.2 (verso only).

Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* were discovered among the N. F. Petrovsky Collection in the Leningrad Branch of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences. It is very unfortunate that he passed away before the completion of his study of the manuscripts. A decade later after his death this important discovery was made known to us.<sup>4</sup> Several years have now passed since it was announced that a study of the very six fragments was being prepared for publication.<sup>5</sup> In the meantime, one of these fragments, bearing the inventory number SI $\frac{P}{88}$ (a) and measuring 17 x 9 cm. (text portion), has recently been published together with a photomechanic reproduction.<sup>6</sup> This fragment appears to bear the earlier folio number, most probably 15, although it has not been recorded by Bongard-Levin. With the help of L. N. Men'šikov this incomplete fragmentary text has been identified with Taishō No. 374, Vol. XII p. 369a15-b17, which belongs to the first chapter of Dharmakṣema's translation: Chin. *Shou-*

<sup>4</sup> See among others G. M. Bongard-Levin and E. N. Tyomkin, "New Buddhist Texts from Central Asia" (Moscow 1967: mimeograph), p. 6f., with fig. 7 (p. 15: photomechanic reproduction of only the verso of the fragment mentioned below); almost exactly the same text, but with no plate, is included in G. M. Bongard-Levin, *Studies in Ancient India and Central Asia* (= *Soviet Indology*, VII)(Calcutta 1971), p. 235f. (cf. note 5 below); G. M. Bongard-Levin i E. N. Temkin, "Roboty V. S. Vorob'eva-Desjakotovskogo i issledovanie buddiskix tekstov iz kollekcii N.F. Petrovskogo", *Problemy istorii jazykov i kul'tury narodov indii: Sbornik statej (Pamjati V. S. Vorob'eva-Desjakotovskogo)*(Moskva 1974), p. 19.

<sup>5</sup> See for instance G. M. Bongard-Levin, "Buddhist Texts from Central Asia", *Actes du XXIX<sup>e</sup> Congrès International des Orientalistes* (Paris 1973): *Inde ancienne*, I (Paris 1976), p. 50. The text of this article (with no plate) is almost exactly the same as seen in note 4 above.

<sup>6</sup> G. M. Bongard-Levin, "Sanskritskie rukopisi iz Central'noj Azii (Fragment maxajanskoj Maxaparinirvanasutry)", *Vestnik drevnej istorii / Journal of Ancient History*, IV (134)(Moskva 1975), pp. 75-79, with facsimile (both sides).

ming 'Life span', Skt. *Āyus* (?), so Tib. *Sku-tshe* (= Skt. *āyus*; cf. Lokesh Chandra, *Tib.-Skt. Dict.*, s.v.), while the other two hitherto known fragments of London and Kōyasan belong to Chapter IV: Chin. *Ju-lai-hsing* 'Tathāgatatva'(?), or the original Sanskrit *Tathāgata-garbha* (?), so Tib. *De-b'zin-gśegs-pa'i sñiñ-po* (= Skt. *tathāgata-garbha?*).<sup>7</sup> It is a matter for great regret that the remaining five fragments in Leningrad are still hidden in a veil of mist for so long, since they may well bring light to controversial issues on the history of the textual formation and transmission of this sūtra, and needless to say, to its textual criticism from the linguistic and philological points of view. Incidentally, it seems probable that the London and Leningrad fragments which have so far been published belong to the same manuscript.

4. In the summer of 1916 Junjirō Takakusu found a hanging scroll at the Treasure House of the Temple Hōju-in on Mount Kōya-san. A folio of a paper manuscript had been split into two — recto and verso — and pasted on a hanging scroll, together with a sheet of paper explaining the history of this fragment. This manuscript was not discovered just by accident, but it was one of the fair harvests through Takakusu's careful investigations into the extant Sanskrit materials preserved in Japan.<sup>8</sup> He has then made a very brief but comprehensive

<sup>7</sup> In spite of the Chinese and Tibetan equivalents it has recently been suggested that the original Sanskrit should be *Tathāgata-dhātu*: see in the first place J. Takasaki, *IBK*, XIX, 2 (1971), p. 1022(3). For further details see note 39 (p. 15).

<sup>8</sup> For instance, the Kōyasan manuscript has been reported in his laborious article "Shittan Senjo Mokuroku", *Dainippon Bukkyō Zensho*, XXX (Tokyo 1922), pp. 234b-235a [= Reprinted new edition, XCV, Tokyo 1972: Entry No. 852, pp. 175c-176a]. This work has also been included in his collected works *Takakusu Junjirō Zenshū*, IX (Tokyo 1978), p. 401.

report soon after the discovery of this hanging scroll.<sup>9</sup> It admits of no doubt that the so-called Kōyasan fragment of the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* belongs to a manuscript entirely different from the other two kept in London and Leningrad.

5. According to the explanatory sheet of paper on the scroll, it appears to have been traditionally held that the manuscript was copied by Kūkai, or Kōbō Daishi (774-835 A.D.), the founder of the Japanese Tāntric or Shingon sect. It was then transmitted as a treasured heirloom from teachers to disciples. It has been kept in succession by the Head Priest of the Temple Hōshō-in of Kōyasan. In 1913 the Hōshō-in (Skt. *Ratnamaya*?) was amalgamated with the Muryōju-in (Skt. *Amitāyus*?) under the combined name of Hōju-in (Skt. *Ratnāyus*?). The accompanying sheet of notes, dated 21 March 1354 A.D., further indicates that the manuscript was at that stage possessed by the priest Yūkai by name, who had succeeded his predecessors Kōga after Ryūga. To my greatest regret, I have not had the opportunity to investigate the original manuscript at hand.

6. Takakusu had also informed the Institute of Japanese History at the University of Tokyo of the Kōyasan scroll, which was photomechanically reproduced in the enormous series of historical documents under the third year of the Bunna Era, i.e. 1354 A.D.<sup>10</sup> Since then the manuscript has been photomechanically reproduced, either fully or partially, four times in Japan, and once in India. Shinkō Mochizuki published a photo of the reverse side in his encyclopaedic dictionary on

<sup>9</sup> J. Takakusu, "Hōshōin Shozō-no Bonpon", *Kōyasan Jihō*, No. 82 (January 1917), pp. 14-16.

<sup>10</sup> *Dainippon Shiryō*, Series VI, Vol. XIX (Tokyo 1922), p. 608 (explanatory note on the scroll in printed form), followed by a folded plate of the hanging scroll in reduced size.

Buddhism.<sup>11</sup> The second, a scroll in the same size as the original, is the most beautiful reproduction. It was reproduced by one of the best-known art reprinting company named Benridō of Kyōto. The title portion of the scroll has also been reproduced. It reads *Kōbō Daishi Bonji*, 'Brāhmī Script by Kōbō Daishi', in Chinese characters, which have been blurred in course of time. The reproduction of the scroll was published in October 1936 with a pamphlet containing a very brief introduction by Junjirō Takakusu (pages 1-3) and a commentary by Gyōei Mizuhara (pages 5-9). However, no transcription of the Sanskrit text is given in this pamphlet. Then, three decades later, the verso of the folio has been artistically reproduced by the National Museum of Nara with bibliographical notes by Shunshō Manabe, which, unfortunately, gives incorrect information about the contents of this manuscript fragment.<sup>12</sup> Only very recently the Kōyasan manuscript was photomechanically reproduced in reduced form, together with a much larger reproduction of the verso, in a beautiful collection of reproductions of ancient Sanskrit materials preserved in Japan.<sup>13</sup> This is a kind of publications which has eagerly been awaited by scholars in the relevant field of studies, although it is

<sup>11</sup> S. Mochizuki, *Bukkyō Daijiten*, II (Tokyo 1933, revised ed. 1954, repr. 1973), Plate No. 608 (on graphic page 124); cf. *ibid.*, IV (Tokyo 1933, rev. ed. 1958, repr. 1973), p. 3357c (a brief description).

<sup>12</sup> *Shōrai Bijutsu / Buddhist Art from China, from 6th to 10th Century*, edited and published by the Nara National Museum (Nara 1967), Plate No. 63 (on graphic page 37), with Manabe's notes in the commentary section p. 33f.

<sup>13</sup> *Bonji Kichō Shiriyō Shūsei {A Collection of Precious Sanskrit Materials Preserved in Japan}*, 2 vols. (Tokyo: Tōkyō Bijutsu, December 1980), *Zuhan-hen {Illustration Volume}*, Plate No. 10 (on graphic page 20), *Kaisetsu-hen {Commentary Volume}*, p. 148b.

rather unfortunate that some of the materials have been put in disorder together with some misleading information about them. The anonymous commentator to this work gives a brief description of the Kōyasan manuscript, in which he says that the fragment was copied in India between the seventh and ninth centuries A.D. He also adds another theory which dates it back roughly to the T'ang dynasty. No reference is however given in this connection. Lokesh Chandra of New Delhi has in the meantime published a beautiful reproduction of the text portion of the Kōyasan fragment with a caption reading "Page of a Sanskrit manuscript preserved at the Reihōkan Museum, Kōyasan. 8th century".<sup>14</sup> It is apparent that the manuscript was then kept at the Treasure House, named Reihōkan, of Kōyasan. Based upon the information given in these publications, each page of this manuscript measures 13.6 x 43.3 cm., with seven lines of writing. It seems to be preserved in very good condition.

7. At present it is generally believed that the Kōyasan manuscript was not actually written by Kūkai himself, but was brought back by him to Japan on his return from China, where he had stayed for further studies from 804 to 806 A.D. It is quite possible that this manuscript was written in Central Asia before the ninth century A.D. There is however a possibility that Kūkai copied it during his visit to China. In any case the script used in this manuscript has apparently become a model of the Shittan or Siddham script in Japan, in particular for the traditional Shingon schools (see p. 19 below).

8. Commissioned by J. Takakusu, K. Watanabe had again succeeded in identifying the Kōyasan manuscript as a part of the Ma-

<sup>14</sup> Lokesh Chandra, "India and Japan: A Cultural Symphony", *The Times of India Annual 1973*, p. 45 (Plate No. 9).



hāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra with the Chinese versions. It corresponds to Taishō No. 374, Vol. XII pp. 385c12-386a6; No. 375, XII 625c5-29; and No. 376, XII 868b21-c14. Takakusu then published a romanized text at the end of the so-called Northern Version translated by Dharmakṣema: Taishō Vol. XII (Tokyo 1922), p. 604. It is regrettable, however, that his transcription has some misreadings and emendations without reference to the original. It is even more regrettable that the manuscript has since attracted very little attention from serious scholars in Buddhist philology. All three fragments published so far need more careful textcritical examination. As a part of my projected study on the manuscript fragments of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra, in the present paper I intend to reconstruct the text of the Kōyasan manuscript in comparison with the corresponding Tibetan and Chinese versions, offering the basic materials for the future critical analysis of the relevant texts.

9. One may easily find that the Sanskrit text is amazingly straightforward. It is normally believed that the Chinese version translated by Fa-hsien is the closest to the Sanskrit text of the Kōyasan manuscript. I should think that all the non-Sanskrit versions contain elaborations, and that the Sanskrit under discussion is not just an abridged version.

10. Herewith I would like to give some bibliographic remarks regarding the corresponding Tibetan and Chinese versions:<sup>15</sup>

<sup>15</sup> For catalogue references see further A. Yuyama, *Indic Manuscripts and Chinese Blockprints (Non-Chinese Texts) of the Oriental Collection of the Australian National University Library, Canberra (= Centre of Oriental Studies Occasional Paper, No. VI)* (Canberra 1967), pp. 1-12. This now needs to be revised with corrections and more updated bibliographical information.

10a. In the Kanjur section of the Tibetan Buddhist canon we find two different versions. Both of them bear the same title: 'Phags-pa yoñs-su mya-ñan-las 'das-pa chen-po'i mdo (= Mahā-parinirvāṇasūtra). One was translated from the Indic by Jinamitra, Jñānagarbha and Devacandra, probably at the beginning of the ninth century A.D. (see below). This version can be found, for example, in the following blockprints and manuscripts: Cone edition No. 761, THA 1b1-169a5;<sup>16</sup> Derge 120, THA 1b1-151a4;<sup>17</sup> Lhasa 122, ÑA 1b1-222b5;<sup>18</sup> Narthang 107, ÑA

<sup>16</sup> See Taishun Mibu, "A Comparative List of the Bkaḥ-ḥgyur Division in the Co-ne, Peking, Sde-dge and Snar-thañ Editions with an Introduction to the Bkaḥ-ḥgyur Division of the Co-ne Edition", *Taishō Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō / Memoirs of Taisho University*, No. 44 (Tokyo 1959), p. 23.

<sup>17</sup> See Hakuju Ui, Munetada Suzuki, Yenshō Kanakura and Tōkan Tada, *Chibetto Daizōkyō Sōmoku-roku / A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon*, 2 vols. (Sendai 1934, reprinted in one vol. Tokyo 1977), Vol. I, p. 28. Cf. also I. J. Schmidt, *Bka'-'gyur-gyi dkar-chag oder Der Index des Kandjur* (St.-Petersburg 1845), p. 20. I have consulted a microfiche edition: *The Microfilms of the Sde-dge Edition of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon kept in the Library of the Kōyasan University - Index*, compiled by the Kōyasan University (Osaka 1976), p. 13f. Incidentally, the Tōhoku University Collection of the Derge edition is also held in microform in the Tōhoku University Library of Sendai: *The Microfilms' Index of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons* (Sendai 1978), p. 21 (Sheet Nos. 620-625). I have not seen two recent reproductions of the Derge edition: one in poti form (Delhi Karmapae Chodhey: announcement in 1977) and the other in western binding (Berkeley: Dharma Publishing, 1980).

<sup>18</sup> See Jikidō Takasaki, *Tōkyō Daigaku Shozō Rasa-ban Chibetto Daizōkyō Mokuroku / A Catalogue of the Lhasa Edition of the Tibetan Tripitaka in comparison with other editions* (Tokyo 1965), p. 16. I have consulted the xerox copy made out of the two original sets of the Lhasa Kanjur kept at the State Library (Staatsbibliothek) of the Prussian Cultural Property Foundation (Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz) in West Berlin: see Helmut Eimer, *Die Xerokopie des Lhasa-Kanjur / The Xerox Copy of the Lhasa Kanjur* (= *Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica, Series Minor*, I) (Tokyo 1977, repr. 1979), p. 30 (ad Vol. LIV).

1b1-231b5;<sup>19</sup> Peking 788, TU 1b1-156b6;<sup>20</sup> Urga 120, THA 1b1-297a7;<sup>21</sup> Tog Palace Manuscript Kanjur, Vol. LXXI (repr. Leh 1980), Text No. 2, WA 44b2-251a4 (pages 88-501);<sup>22</sup> Berlin Manuscript Kanjur, Mdo X, THA 1-188;<sup>23</sup> and so on.<sup>24</sup> Out of these I have collated the Derge, Lhasa, Narthang and Peking editions and the Tog Palace Manuscript Kanjur. The Tibetan texts corres-

<sup>19</sup> See Léon Feer, "Analyse du Kandjour et du Tandjour. Recueil des livres sacrés au Tibet par A. Csoma de Kőrös. Traduite de l'anglais et augmentée des diverses additions et remarques", *Annales du Musée Guimet, Grande Bibliothèque*, II (Lyon 1881), p. 247; also Mibu List, p. 23 and Takasaki Catalogue, p. 16. I have consulted the Narthang edition in microfiche published by the Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions (New York 1980).

<sup>20</sup> See Chibetto *Daizōkyō Kanjūru Kandō Mokuroku / A Comparative Analytical Catalogue of the Kanjur Division of the Tibetan Tripitaka*, edited in Peking during the K'ang-hsi era, and at present kept in the Library of the Otani Daigaku, Kyoto, in which the contents of each sutra are collated with their corresponding parts in the existing Sanskrit, Pali and Chinese texts, and page-references of the Narthang and the Derge editions of the Tripitaka are also entered (Kyoto 1930-1932), p. 290f. I have consulted the reprint edition: cf. *Eiin Pekin-ban Chibetto Daizōkyō Sōmokuroku · Sakuin / Catalogue and Index of the Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition*, kept in the Library of the Otani University (Tokyo-Kyoto 1961), p. 118f.

<sup>21</sup> See Geza Bethlenfalvy, *A Catalogue of the Urga Kanjur in the Prof. Raghuvira Collection at the International Academy of Indian Culture (= Śatapiṭaka Series, CCXLVI)* (New Delhi 1980), p. 37.

<sup>22</sup> For this manuscript Kanjur see a forthcoming article by Helmut Eimer, "Zur Beurteilung der Textqualität der Kanjur-Handschrift aus dem Palast in Tog/Ladakh", *Festschrift J. W. de Jong* (Canberra, in press).

<sup>23</sup> For this manuscript Kanjur, which is now kept at the Staatsbibliothek, Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin, see Hermann Beckh, *Verzeichnis der tibetischen Handschriften*, Abteilung I: *Kanjur (Bkah-hgyur)* (= *Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, XXIX) (Berlin 1914), p. 33.

<sup>24</sup> For example, regarding the manuscript Kanjur held at the

ponding to the Kōyasan fragment are to be found in the Derge edition THA 53a7-54a3 (Microfiche Sheet No. 389; cf. Tohoku Microfiche Sheet No. 621), Lhasa ÑA 73a4-74a4 (Xeroxcopy Vol. LIV pp.38.2.4-38.3.4), Narthang ÑA 78b5-79b6 (Microfiche for Vol. LIV, folios 60b-80a: Library of Congress No. LMPj 026,054: 4/24), Peking TU 53b8-54b3 (Reprint edition, Vol. LXXI, pp. 167.4.8-168.1.3), Tog Manuscript, WA 111b2-112b1 (Reprint edition, Vol. LXXI, pp. 222.2-224.1). They belong to Chapter IV: *Byañ-chub-sems-dpa' sna-graṅs b'zīs chos bston-pa*. To my regret, I am at this stage unable to restore the original Sanskrit title of this chapter. The Tibetan title of this sūtra has been recorded in the Denkarma Catalogue (Lalou No. 80, Yoshimura No. 79).<sup>25</sup> Jinamitra was one of the most active translators as is well attested in the Tibetan Tripiṭaka, and his name is found as a compiler of the best-known polyglot dictionary *Mahāvvyutpatti*. This may well be a criterion to determine the date of this translation, namely, at the latest, early ninth century A.D.<sup>26</sup> Unfortunately, there seems to be

British Library of London see L. D. Barnett, "Index der Abteilung mDo des handschriftlichen Kanjur im Britischen Museum (Or. 6724)", *Asia Major*, VII (Leipzig 1932), p. 164 (XX.2: folios 43-239), cf. H. Eimer, "Zur Anordnung der Abteilungen in der Londoner Handschrift des tibetischen Kanjur", *Zentralasiatische Studien*, XV (Wiesbaden 1981, im Druck); for the Kawaguchi Collection of the manuscript Kanjur held at the Tōyō Bunko of Tokyo see Kōjun Saitō, "Kawaguchi Ekai-shi Shōrai Tōyō Bunko Shozō Shanon Chibetto Daizōkyō Chōsa Bibō", *Taishō Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō*, LXIII (1977), p. 360(47): Vol. LXXVI.2.

<sup>25</sup> Marcelle Lalou, "Les textes bouddhiques au temps du Roi Khri-sron-lde-bcan. Contributions à la bibliographie du Kanjur et du Tanjur", *Journal Asiatique*, CCXLI (1953), p. 321; Shūki Yoshimura, *The Denkar-Ma, an Oldest Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon* (Kyoto 1950), reprinted in his collected works *Indo Daijō Bukkyō Shisō Kenkyū* (Kyoto 1974), p. 10/126.

<sup>26</sup> For references regarding the *Mahāvvyutpatti* and *Denkarma Catalogue* see A. Yuyama, *Prajñā-paramita-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā* (Cambridge 1976), p. xxxiif.

no extant Tibetan manuscript from Tunhuang. Incidentally, the Tibetan version was translated into Mongolian and is included in its Kanjur.<sup>27</sup>

10b. The other Tibetan version was translated from the Chinese by Wañ-phab-ñun, Dge-ba'i blo-gros and Rgya-mtsho'i sde: Cone edition, No. 760, ÑA 1bl-412a6, TA 1bl-383a8 (see Mibu Cat. p. 23); Derge 119, ÑA 1bl-343a6, TA 1bl-339a7 (see Tohoku Cat. p. 27, cf. Schmidt Index p. 20); Lhasa 368, KA 1-528a4, KHA 1-529a7 (see Takasaki p. 27, cf. Eimer p. 34f.); Narthang 361, KA 1bl-550a5, KHA 1bl-527a6 (see Feer p. 290f., also Mibu p. 23, Takasaki p. 23); Peking 787, JU 1-363, ÑU 1-355 (see Otani Cat. pp. 287-290, also Reprint Cat.-Index p. 118); Urga 119, ÑA 1bl-343a6, TA 1bl-339a7 (see Bethlenfalvy p. 37); Tog Manuscript, Vols. 89-90-91 (Leh 1979), KA 1a-342a7, KHA 1a-332a7, GA 1a-338a7; Berlin Manuscript, Mdo VIII-IX (60-61), ÑA 1-436, TA 1-423 (see Beckh pp. 32b-33a); etc.<sup>28</sup> This version was apparently translated from the so-called Northern Version of Dharmakṣema. For further details, however, more careful comparative study is needed. Out of those editions and manuscripts I have collated the Derge, Lhasa, Narthang and Peking editions and the Tog Manuscript: Derge ÑA 56a7-57a4 (Koyasan Microfiche Sheet No. 375, cf. Tohoku Microfiche Sheet No. 597), Lhasa KA 85a7-86b3 (Xeroxcopy Vol. LXXVII pp. 44.2.7-45.3.3), Narthang KA 86a7-87b3 (Microfiche for Vol. LXXVII, folios 79b-99a: Library of Congress No. Lmpj 026,077: 5/28), Peking JU 57a5-58a2 (Reprint Vol. XXX p. 157.1.5-3.2), Tog KA 83a7-84b3 (Reprint

<sup>27</sup> Louis Ligeti, *Catalogue du Kanjur mongol imprimé*, I (= *Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica*, III)(Budapest 1942-44), p. 299 (No. 877); also F. A. Bischoff, *Der Kanjur und seine Kolophone*, II (Bloomington 1968), p. 411.

<sup>28</sup> See for example Saitō, *op.cit.*, p. 356(51): Vols. 94.1-96.1, also p. 382(25).

Vol. LXXXIX pp. 165.7-168.3). This part belongs to Chapter III: *Mtshan-gyi yon-tan brjod-pa* (= Chin. *Ming-tzū kung-tê*). The title of this Tibetan version has been added in the Denkarma Catalogue (Lalou No. 249/p. 325, Yoshimura No. 248/p. 24/140).

It seems to be generally accepted that the translation was made most probably in the latter half of the eleventh century A.D.<sup>29</sup>

It has also been translated into Mongolian and is included in its Kanjur (see Ligeti pp. 227-229: Nos. 874-875-876).<sup>30</sup>

11a. The corresponding Chinese texts are found in three extant versions.<sup>31</sup> One is the so-called Northern Version translated by Dharmakṣema during the period between 414 and 421 A.D.<sup>32</sup> from a manuscript brought from Kucha, possibly in collaboration with Buddhahadra: Taishō No. 374, *Ta-p'an-nieh-p'an-ching*: Vol. XII pp. 385c12-386a6. This belongs to Section One of Chapter IV: *Ju-lai-hsing* (cf. paragraph 3 above).

11b. Dharmakṣema's version is believed to have been revised by Hui-yen and Hui-kuan together with Hsieh Ling-yün,<sup>33</sup> bearing

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Paul Pelliot, "Notes à propos d'un catalogue du Kanjur", *JA*, 1914, p. 130f. (ad Beckh); also Otani Cat. p. 287 n. 1-2.

<sup>30</sup> See also Bischoff, *op.cit.*, II p. 409; cf. J. W. de Jong, "Notes à propos des colophons du Kanjur", *ZAS*, VI (1972), p. 539 (ad Bischoff).

<sup>31</sup> For bibliographical information see among others Daijō Tokiwa, "Daihatsunehangyō", *Busho Kaisetsu Daijiten*, VII (Tokyo 1933, repr. 1964, 1971), pp. 414c-425b; Benkyō Shio, *Bukkyō Kyōten Gaisetsu*, rev.ed. (Tokyo 1971), pp. 272-280; Shinkō Mochizuki, *Bukkyō Daijiten*, IV (Tokyo 1933, repr. 1958, 1973), pp. 3353c-3358a; - - , *Bukkyō Kyōten Seiritsushiron* (Kyoto 1946), pp. 247-273.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. P. C. Bagchi, *Le canon bouddhique en Chine*, I (= *Sino-Indica*, I) (Paris 1927), p. 215f., et p. 217 (No. 1).

<sup>33</sup> The name of Hsieh Ling-yün (385-433 A.D.) seems to appear only here in the Taishō Edition: cf. *Hōbōgirin*, fasc. annexe, rev.ed. (Tokyo-Paris 1978), p. 275, "Sha Reiun", s.v.; see in addition Kōichi Obi, *Sha Reiun-den Ron* (Hiroshima 1976), p. 169f.

the same title, which was later called the Southern Version. The corresponding Chinese text, i.e. Taishō No. 375, Vol. XII p. 625c5-29, belongs to Section One of Chapter VII: Chin. *Ssū-hsiang* (Skt. *Catur-lakṣaṇa?*). As far as our texts are concerned, the difference between the two versions, Northern and Southern, is not too great (see my English translations below). llc. Almost at the same time, i.e. 417-418 A.D., Fa-hsien translated the text from a manuscript which he had obtained in the Magadhan capital of Pāṭaliputra: Taishō No. 376, *Ta-p'an-ni-yüan-ching*.<sup>34</sup> Vol. XII p. 868b21-cl4. This portion belongs to Chapter VIII called *Ssū-fa* (Skt. *Catur-dharma?*).

12. The Northern Version was translated into Japanese by Daijō Tokiwa, which has recently been revised by Enichi Ōchō.<sup>35</sup> The Southern Version was translated into Japanese by Daitō Shimaji.<sup>36</sup> There is also an anonymous Japanese translation.<sup>37</sup> Kōshō Yamamoto has made an English translation.<sup>38</sup> Although he states on the title page of his book that it is a translation from the 'classical Chinese language', it was in fact rendered from Shimaji's Japanese version.

13. It should perhaps be added here that, at least, one direct

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Bagchi, *op.cit.*, I, p. 347 (No. 1), also D. Tokiwa, *Gokan-yori Sō-Sei-ni itaru Yakkyō Sōroku* (Tokyo 1938, repr. 1973), p. 778f.

<sup>35</sup> *Kokuyaku Issaikyō, Nehan-bu*, I (Tokyo 1929, rev.ed. 1977). Our corresponding text is found on p. 66f.(90f.). Cf. also E. Ōchō, *Nehangyō (= Tōyō Shisō Sōsho, VII)*(Tokyo 1942).

<sup>36</sup> *Kokuyaku Daizōkyō*, IX (Tokyo 1918, repr. 1975), p. 111f. (199f.).

<sup>37</sup> *Shōwa Shinsan Kokuyaku Daizōkyō, Kyōten-bu*, V (Tokyo 1928, repr. 1977), p. 85f.

<sup>38</sup> *The Mahayana Mahaparinirvana-Sutra: A Complete Translation from the Classical Chinese Language in 3 Volumes*, I (Ube 1973), p. 90f.

citation of the Sanskrit version from the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra has been reported to exist. It is found in the Ratnagoṭravibhāga Mahāyānottaratantraśāstra, otherwise known as the Uttaratantra in short. The author of this treatise, whoever it may be, has quoted the well-known "parable of water sport in summer", which has already been identified with the corresponding Tibetan and Chinese versions.<sup>39</sup> In such a text like the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra, of which only very limited portions of the original Sanskrit version are extant in fragmentary manuscripts, it is vitally important to see if there is any citation of the text in other works written

<sup>39</sup> The passage in question is found in *The Ratnagoṭravibhāga Mahāyānottaratantraśāstra*, edited by E. H. Johnston (assisted by T. Choudhury) (Patna: The Bihar Research Society, 1950), pp. 74.22-75.11; another critical edition has been published with the corresponding Chinese version by Zuiryū Nakamura, *Bon-Kan Taishō Kūkyō Ichijō Hōshōron Kenkyū* (Tokyo: Sankibō, 1961), pp. 145.25-147.13 (Skt.), 146/148 (Chin.). The Sanskrit text edited by Johnston has been translated with critical notes by two scholars, one into Japanese and the other into English: Hakuju Ui, *Hōshōron Kenkyū* (Tokyo: Iwanami, 1959, reprinted as one of his collected works *Daijō Bukkyō Kenkyū*, VI, Tokyo 1979), p. 587f.; Jikidō Takasaki, *A Study on the Ratnagoṭravibhāga (Uttaratantra). Being a Treatise on the Tathāgatagarbha Theory of Mahāyāna Buddhism (= Serie Orientale Roma, XXXIII) (Rome 1966)*, p. 298f. (cf. also p. 104f.: "Synopsis"). The Tibetan version was edited and translated into Japanese by Z. Nakamura, *Zō-Wa Taiyaku Kūkyō Ichijō Hōshōron Kenkyū* (Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation, 1967), pp. 145.21-147.10 (translation on the facing pages 146-148). The Tibetan version had previously been translated by E. E. Obermiller, "Sublime Science of the Great Vehicle to Salvation", *Acta Orientalia*, IX (1931), p. 233f. With reference to the relation of this literature to the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra see among others J. Takasaki, "The Tathāgatagarbha Theory in the Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra", *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū / Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, XIX, 2 (1971), pp. 1024(1)-1015(10). An enlarged version of this article has been published in his voluminous work *Nyoraijō Shisō no Keisei — Indo Daijō Bukkyō Kenkyū* (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1974), pp. 127-186. Just by the way,



in Sanskrit, and to examine these passages from the philological points of view. In this connection a more careful study should be made in the future.

14. In this booklet I intend to offer a faithful transliteration of the Kōyasan fragment followed by a reconstructed text in comparison with the corresponding Tibetan and Chinese versions, together with my English translations of those versions, in the hope that this important material will attract more serious attention of specialists in the relevant field of studies.

15. Last but not least, this humble work is dedicated to my teacher, Dr. J. W. de Jong, Professor of South Asian and Buddhist Studies at the Australian National University of Canberra, on the auspicious occasion of his sexagenarian anniversary on 15 February 1981.

---

Takasaki reports in this book (p. 183 n. 3) that G. M. Bongard-Levin has also mentioned the existence of the six fragments in Leningrad in his lecture "Buddhist Studies in the U.S.S.R. and New Archaeological Excavations in Soviet Central Asia" given at the University of Kyoto in October 1972 (cf. my "Introductory Remarks" paragraph 3, cum p. 3 n. 4-6, above).

## KŌYASAN MANUSCRIPT TRANSCRIBED\*

### Symbols used for textual readings

- [ ] indicates that this part is damaged in the manuscript.  
< > indicates that this part is missing in the manuscript.  
, indicates a virāma written in the manuscript, e.g. ṭ.  
, indicates that the letters before and after this mark are non-separate akṣaras, forming either with the following vowels or as consonant clusters, in the manuscript.  
N.B. Needless to say, unlike the following transcribed text, no space is normally given after words in the manuscript.

(83a1) mama śrāvakā mahāyānnakāṃkṣitās tadā ṣaḍrasavan mahā-  
bhojanam\_iva mahāparinirvvāṇaṃ mahāsūtraṃ deśayāmi ' (.2)  
tatra katame ṣaḍrasā duḥkham\_āṃblaṃ nityaṃ<sup>1</sup> lavaṇam\_anātmakaṃ  
kaṭukaṃ sukhaṃ madhuraṃ sātmakaṃ kaṣāyaṃ nityan\_tti(.3)ktam\_  
iti ' <sup>2</sup> ime ṣaḍrasāḥ kleśendhanena māyāagninā paripācitaṃ  
bhojanaṃ mahāparinirvvāṇaṃ tatvānnamṛṣṭaṃ (.4) mama śrāvakā  
bhujante<sup>3</sup> // punar\_aparaṃ bhagini yathā yūyaṃ parāmantraṇena  
paracūḍākaraṇanimittena vā (.5) paragrāmaṃ gantukāmā duṣputrān\_  
utsrjya satputrāṇāṃ guhyābhiniḍhānāni darśayasi ' āma bhagavaṃ  
du(.6)ṣputrā a[n]ācārāḥ<sup>4</sup> anarthabhāginas\_tesāṃ\_mity\_artham<sup>5</sup> na  
darśayāmi ' satputrās\_tu kuladharāḥ kulanistārakāḥ<sup>6</sup> (.7) te  
dravyārḥāḥ teṣāṃ darśayāmi ' evaṃ\_ahaṃ bhagini mahāparinir-  
vvāṇagamanakriyāṃ yadā karomi ' tadā tathā(83b1)gatavividha-

\* In the following footnotes I have noted the readings given by J. Takakusu: Taishō No. 374, Vol. XII, p. 604 (abbrev. T):

<sup>1</sup> T. *āṃblam* [āṃlam][a-]nityaṃ.

<sup>2</sup> T. omits the punctuation.

<sup>3</sup> T. *bhujante*.

<sup>4</sup> T. *anācārāḥ*.

<sup>5</sup> T. *tesāṃ mityartham!* This does not make any sense.

<sup>6</sup> T. *kulanissarakāḥ!* This is nonsensical too.

guhyaṃ sandhāvacaṇaṃ śrāvakebhyo niravaśeṣaṃ kathayiṣyāmi ' adya putrebhyaścchandaṃ dāsyāmi yathā tvāṃ bhagi(.2)ni pravāśagatāṃ duṣputrā mṛteti kalpayanti na cāpi mṛtā ' āma bhagavaṇ punarapyāgatānte paśyanti ' evam e(.3)va bhagini mayā mānityasaṃjñā<sup>7</sup> kārṣīt adya tathāgataḥ parinirvāsyatīti nevaṃ kalpayitavyaṃ mṛtasamjñā(.4)vaṭ ye sadā nityo ddhruvaḥ<sup>8</sup> śāsva- taḥ tathāgata itī dhārayanti tesāṃ<sup>9</sup> tathāga[ta]lo<sup>10</sup> gr̥he tiṣṭha- ti ['] eṣa (.5) parāddhyāśayā<sup>11</sup> nāma '// pṛcchāvaśā nāma iha kaścit tathagātaṃ arhantaṃ samyaksaṃbuddhaṃ paripṛccheṭ katham a(.6)haṃ bhagavaṃ kīrttiṃ prāpnuyāt loka dāyako viśruta itī<sup>12</sup> na ca dadyāt kasmīṃscitta<sup>13</sup> tathāgataṃ evaṃ<sup>14</sup> vadeṭ niḥ(.7)saṃ- gaṃ pravāraya dāsīdāsaparigraheṇa atyantabrahmacāriṇaṃ kumārī- dānena ' amāṃsabhojinaṃ māṃsabh[...] ]<sup>15</sup>

<sup>7</sup> T. mā 'nityasaṃjñā. His understanding the text, at least as for mā 'nitya-<sup>o</sup>, is right in the context, but not for the gram- matical ending.

<sup>8</sup> T. nityodbhruvaḥ! This does not make any sense either.

<sup>9</sup> T. teṣaṃ (with short a). It should simply be a misprint.

<sup>10</sup> T. tathāgato.

<sup>11</sup> T. parāddhyāśayo[adhyāśaya\*]. I do not see why he has put an asterisk here. Has he intended to show any terminological question?

<sup>12</sup> T. omits the punctuation.

<sup>13</sup> T. kasmīṃś cit[ta]. He is right to omit ta.

<sup>14</sup> T. evam (with -m). It should simply be a misprint.

<sup>15</sup> T. māṃsabha<sup>o</sup>.

## BRIEF PALAEOGRAPHICAL NOTES

(cf. paragraph 7 above)

In his report "Hōshō-in Shozō-no Bonpon" (p. 5, fn. 9 above) Takakusu concludes that the script used in the Kōyasan manuscript seems to belong to the Central Asian type (p. 15f.).<sup>1</sup> The paper of the fragment looks very similar to those found in Central Asian oases - both in size and style, although I have not seen the manuscript itself.

It is also pointed out that the manuscript appears to have been written with a spatula together with a brush. Takakusu is inclined to think that Kūkai himself may have copied it during his stay in the capital city of Ch'ang-an (p. 16). This is highly probable.

It seems to me that the script used in the fragment is a calligraphically evolved style from the so-called Gilgit-Bāmiyān-type II, and not from Turkestan alphabets.<sup>2</sup> It is beautifully written. There is no doubt that it has become a calligraphic model of the Siddham script in Japan.

Needless to say, a more thorough study from every angle is necessary before we draw a hasty conclusion.

<sup>1</sup> Takakusu describes that the letter śa is almost always written as sa (p. 16a). This is not correct. Both are clearly distinguished from each other in the manuscript.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Lore Sander, *Paläographisches zu den Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung (= Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Supplementband VIII)* (Wiesbaden 1968), insbes. Tafeln 21-26. It is hoped that she will in the near future bring out more palaeographical materials from her project investigating Central Asian scripts, especially Khotanese.

SANSKRIT VERSION RECONSTRUCTED

<yadā ...><sup>1</sup> (83a) mama śrāvakā mahā-yāna-kāṅkṣitās<sup>2</sup> tadā ṣaḍ-  
rasavan mahā-bhojanam iva mahāparinirvāṇaṃ mahā-sūtraṃ deśayāmi /  
tatra katame ṣaḍ-rasāḥ / duḥkham āmlam,<sup>3</sup> a-nityaṃ lavaṇam,  
an-ātmakaṃ kaṭukaṃ, sukhaṃ madhuraṃ, sātmakaṃ kaṣāyaṃ, nityaṃ  
tiktaṃ iti / ime ṣaḍ-rasāḥ / kleśendhanena māyā-agninā<sup>4</sup> pari=  
pācitaṃ bhojanaṃ mahāparinirvāṇaṃ tattvāna-mṛṣṭaṃ mama śrāvakā  
bhuñjante<sup>5</sup> // punar aparam bhagini yathā yūyaṃ parāmantraṇena  
para-cūḍā-karaṇa-nimittena vā para-grāmaṃ gantu-kāmā duṣ-putrān  
utsṛjya sat-putrāṇāṃ<sup>6</sup> guhyābhinidhānāni<sup>7</sup> darśayasi<sup>8</sup> //

āma bhagavan duṣ-putrā an-ācārā an-artha-bhāginas, teṣāṃ ity  
arthaṃ na darśayāmi / sat-putrās tu kula-dharāḥ kula-nistāra=  
kāḥ,<sup>9</sup> te dravyārthāḥ, teṣāṃ darśayāmi //

evam ahaṃ bhagini mahā-parinirvāṇa-gamana-kriyāṃ yadā karomi,  
tadā tathā (83b) gata-vividha-guhyāṃ saṃdhā-vacanaṃ śrāvakebhyo  
niravaśeṣaṃ kathayiṣyāmi / ādya putrebhyaś chandaṃ<sup>10</sup> dāsyāmi /  
yathā tvāṃ bhagini pravāsa-gatāṃ duṣ-putrā mṛteti kalpayanti,  
na cāpi mṛtā //

āma bhagavan punar apy āgatānte paśyanti //

evam eva bhagini mayā mānitya-saṃjñāṃ kārṣīt / ādya tathāgataḥ  
parinirvāsyatīti naivaṃ kalpayitavyaṃ mṛta-saṃjñāvat / ye sadā  
nityo dhruvaḥ śāsvatas tathāgata ity dhārayanti, teṣāṃ tathāgato  
gṛhe tiṣṭhati // eṣa parādhyāśayo<sup>11</sup> nāma //

pṛcchā-vaśā<sup>12</sup> nāma //

iha kaś-cit tathāgatam arhantaṃ samyak-saṃbuddhaṃ paripṛcchet:  
katham ahaṃ bhagavan kīrtiṃ prāpnuyāṃ<sup>13</sup> loke dāyako viśruta ity /  
na ca dadyāt kasmims-cit / tathāgatam evaṃ vadet: niḥsaṅgaṃ

pravāraya dāsī-dāsa-parigraheṇa, atyanta-brahma-cāriṇaṃ kumārī-dānena, a-māṃsa-bhojinaṃ māṃsa-bh<o>(84a) <jana-...><sup>14</sup>

Notes on the reconstructed text

<sup>1</sup> Correlative *yadā* with *tadā*: Tib. *gañ-gi tshe ... de'i tshe ...*

<sup>2</sup> MS. °-*yāna*-°, which is taken as characteristic of Central Asian MSS. by Takakusu, "Hōshō-in Shozō-no Bonpon", p. 16a!

<sup>3</sup> MS. *āmbḷam*; *āmbḷam* may well be the true reading here, and the final *m* with a virāma sign should simply be a scribal error. So that the next *a-nityaṃ* could easily be restored. Takakusu's emendation to *āmlam* may be another possibility, since it is attested as one of the six flavours in the *Mahāvvyutpatti* (ed. R. Sakaki, Kyoto 1916, repr. Tokyo 1962), No. 1899; cf. also *Hemakandra's Abhidhānakintāmaṇi: Ein systematisch angeordnetes synonymisches Lexicon*, hrsg., übers. und mit Anmerkungen begleitet von O. Boehtlingk und Charles Rieu (St.-Petersburg 1847, repr. Osnabrück 1972), p. 410: note ad 1388. In the *Dharmasaṃgraha: An Ancient Collection of Buddhist Technical Terms*, prepared by K. Kasawara, and edited by F. W. Max Müller and H. Wenzel (= *Anecdota Oxoniensia, Aryan Series*, I, 5) (Oxford 1885, repr. Amsterdam 1972), p. 8, we read the Section XXXVI: *rasaḥ ṣaḍ-vidhaḥ / tad-yathā // madhuro 'mlo lavaṇaḥ katus tiktah kaṣāyaś ceti //* This section is not found in the Chinese (Taishō No. 764): cf. F. Weller, *Der chinesische Dharmasaṃgraha* (Leipzig 1923). Max Müller and Wenzel refer to the Pāli terms for the six tastes: see "Notes" ad XXXVI on p. 42 (with extensive bibliography); cf. *Critical Pāli Dictionary*, begun by V. Trenckner, I (Copenhagen 1924- ), p. 403, *ambila-*, s.v. On the basis of the reading in the *Dharmasaṃgraha* Unrai Wogihara emends *āmla-* to *amla-* in his edition of the *Mahāvvyutpatti* (2nd ed. Tokyo 1926, repr. 1959, Taipei repr. 1976), "Commentary", p. 21 (Chin. repr. ed. p. 19) ad CI 63. His emendation is unnecessary. The question here in our text is whether we could retain the manuscript reading with slight emendation, i.e. *āmbḷa-*. Takakusu suggests (*ibid.*, p. 16) that *āmbḷa-* is a dialectal form close to Pāli *ambila-*: cf. W. Geiger, *Pali Literatur und Sprache* (= *Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde*, I, 7) (Strassburg 1916, repr. Tokyo 1977), 51.5, where he derives it through an intermediate form *\*ambḷa-*; also R. Pischel, *Grammatik der Prākṛit-Sprachen* (= *Grundriss*, I, 8) (Strassburg 1900, repr. Hildesheim-New York 1973, Tokyo 1977), 137, also 295. One may perhaps compare our

*āmbla-* with Middle Indic *amba-* (cf. Pischel 295, also CPD, I p. 400 s.v.). Incidentally, this does not by any means give a hint to the theory that the original may have been composed in Ardha-Māgadhī: cf. A. Yuyama, "Butten-no Hensan-ni Mochiirareta Gengo-no Tokushitsu", *Okuda Jiō Sensei Kiju Kinen Bukkyō Shisō Ronshū* (Kyoto 1976), esp. p. 875; - - , "Bu-ston on the Languages Used by Indian Buddhists at the Schismatic Period", *Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung (= Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, II) (= Abhandlungen d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Göttingen, Philol.-hist. Klasse, III. Folge, Nr. 117)* (Göttingen 1980), pp. 175-181. It is also to be noted that the word *āmbla-* is at least lexically attested: cf. M. Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, I (Heidelberg 1952- ), p. 45 s.v.; R. L. Turner, *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages* (London 1966) [Fasc. I, 1962], p. 26: No. 579 *āmlā-*. It is generally accepted that the words *āmla-* etc. are etymologically connected with *ānra-* (cf. also Mayrhofer, I, p. 77 s.v.). After all *āmbla-* could well be adopted in our text: *āmla-* : *ānra-* = *āmbla-* : *ānra-*, or *āmla-* : *āmbla-* = *ānra-* : *āmbla-*.

<sup>4</sup> So reads MS. with hiatus. See p. 45 for additional note.

<sup>5</sup> 3 pl. pres. *Ā bhūñjante* (from *bhuj-*) may be noted.

<sup>6</sup> The dative-like genitive with the verb *drś-* (also twice in the next paragraph) is to be syntactically noted: cf. Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar* (New Haven 1953), 7.63; Yuyama, *A Grammar of the Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā* (Canberra 1973), 7.35-42.

<sup>7</sup> It is noteworthy that the word *abhinidhāna-*, nt., is used for *nidhāna-*, nt., meaning 'store, treasury, hoard'.

<sup>8</sup> Non-agreement of 2 pl. pron. *yūyam* with 2 sg. ending in *darśayasi* can be explained as an honorific use. At the same time both are separated too far. Cf. *yathā tvāṃ bhagini pravāsa-gatāṃ* ... in the third paragraph.

<sup>9</sup> The word *nistāraka-*, meaning 'rescuer, savior, preserver', is also lexicographically noteworthy (cf. p. 17 n. 6 above).

<sup>10</sup> For *chanda-*, 'consent', see Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* (New Haven 1953), p. 234b, s.v.; but Tib. *dad-pa*: cf. Lokesh Chandra, *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary* (New Delhi 1959-61, repr. Kyoto 1971, 76), p. 1089b, *dad-pa*, s.v.

<sup>11</sup> From the graphical point of view the scribe must have written *ōyā*, and not *ōyo*, probably by mistake (cf. p. 18 n. 11 above).

<sup>12</sup> This may have also been originally °-vaśo, nom.sg., instead of pl., 'potency, power, ability of questions'. Moreover, it is tempting to think that the original may have been °-vaśān for °-vaśāt, abl., meaning 'by means of, according to questions', as suggested by the Chinese versions of Fa-hsien and Dharmakṣema, reading *nēng-sui-wēn-ta*, 'ability, capacity, to answer according to questions', Sino-Tib. *dris-pa bžin-du lan-debs-pa*, 'answer in accordance with questions'; but cf. Indo-Tib. 'dri-ba'i dbaṅ, 'power, ability, of questions'!

<sup>13</sup> MS. *prāpmuyāt*, 3 sg.opt., for °*yām*, 1 sg., does not seem to be a case of confusion of persons, the subject here being the first person, i.e. *aḥam* (cf. Edgerton, *BHSG* 25.11). It appears to be or to have been confused (or miswritten) by influence of the neighbouring third person singular optatives: *paripṛcchet*, *dadyāt*, *vadet*, in the course of transmission.

<sup>14</sup> It is a great pity that the following interesting passages are not available. Incidentally, I have not noted every minor reading, such as additions of visargas, *naivam* (for *nevam*), and so on. Instead of noting them I have given a faithfully transliterated text. One may also see how the text was reconstructed in comparison with the corresponding Tibetan and Chinese versions.

#### AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE SANSKRIT VERSION

"< When ...> my śrāvakas long for the Mahāyāna, then I teach the great sūtra, the *Mahāparinirvāṇa*, which is like a meal (*bhojana*) possessed of six flavours. What are the six flavours in that case? Suffering (*duḥkha*) is sour (*āmba*), impermanence (*anitya*) is salty (*lavaṇa*), non-selfhood (*anātmaka*) is pungent (*kaṭuka*), happiness (*sukha*) is sweet (*madhura*), selfhood (*sāt-maka*) is astringent (*kaṣāya*), and permanence (*nitya*) is bitter (*tikta*). These are the six flavours. My śrāvakas enjoy the meal (*bhojana*), the *Mahāparinirvāṇa*, the delectable food (*anna*) of the truth, well-cooked on the fuel (*indhana*) of depravity (*kleśa*) and with the flame (*agni*) of illusion (*māyā*).

"Furthermore, o sister, just like you, wishing to go to another village by the invitation (*āmantraṇa*) of others or because



of the tonsure-ceremony (*cūḍā-karaṇa*) of others, show the hidden treasury (*guhyābhinihāna*) to the good sons (*satputra*) after having excluded the bad sons (*duṣputra*)."

"Indeed, o Bhagavat, the bad sons have improper conduct (*an-ācāra*) and share no wealth (*anartha-bhāgin*). To them I do not show the wealth (*artha*). But the good sons are the upholders of the family (*kula-dhara*) and the preservers of the family (*kula-nistāraka*). They are worthy of the property (*dravyārha*). To them I show it."

"Likewise, o sister, when I perform the deed of going to the great Parinirvāṇa, then I will completely declare to the śrāvakas the word of intention (*saṃdhā-vacana*) possessed of the various secrets (*guhya*) of the Tathāgata. Now I will give my consent (*chanda*) to my sons.

"Just as, o sister, when you go on a journey (*pravāsa-gata*), the bad sons imagine that you are dead, but of course you are not dead."

"Indeed, o Bhagavat, they see me again on my return (*āgatā=nte*)."

"Just so, o sister, one should never form<sup>1</sup> any notion of impermanence (*anitya-saṃjñā*) in regard to me (*mayā*)! Just like the notion of death (*mṛta-saṃjñā*) one should not imagine: 'Today

<sup>1</sup> The prohibitive particle *mā* plus the augmentless 3 sg.aor. *kāṛṣīt* together with the voc. *bhagini* appears to offer no grammatical difficulties here. The verb *kāṛṣīt*, 3 sg., is possibly construed with the understood subject *bhagini*: "... o sister, (let the sister = you) never form ...!" Syntactically, it is also possible that this construction with *mā* may be taken as the so-called "lest-clause" (cf. Edgerton, *BHSG* 42.7) together with the following sentence: "... o sister, it should not be imagined thus: ..., lest one should form any notion of impermanence in regard to me!"

the Tathāgata will enter Parinirvāṇa'. The Tathāgata dwells in the house of those who always bear in mind: 'The Tathāgata is permanent (*nitya*), perpetual (*dhruva*) and eternal (*śāśvata*)'. This is the so-called considerateness (*adhyāśaya*)<sup>2</sup> to others.

"The so-called force of questions (*pr̥cchā-vaśa*)<sup>3</sup> < is like this >:-

"Someone here might ask the Tathāgata, the Arhat, the Samyak-saṃbuddha: 'O Bhagavat, how can I obtain fame as a renown giver in the world?' And yet, he would not give to anyone whosoever, and might say thus to the Tathāgata: 'Give (*pravāraya*)<sup>4</sup> to one who is free from clinging (*niḥsaṅga*) the property of female and male servants (*dāsī-dāsa-parigraha*), to one who practises the complete continence (*atyanta-brahma-cārin*) the gift of a maiden (*kumārī-dāna*), to one who does not eat meat (*amāṃsa-bhojin*) < ... > the meal of meat (*māṃsa-bhojana*), ...!

<sup>2</sup> It is very difficult to translate the word *adhyāśaya* in proper sense. It should mean something like 'inclination, considerateness, intention; correcting, education, rectification, etc.': cf. Indo-Tib. *gžan-gyi lhag-pa'i bsam-pa*, 'inclination of/to others'; Fa-hsien *nēng-chēng-t'o-jēn*, 'ability to rectify other people'; Dharmakṣema *chēng-t'o*, 'rectification of others'; Sino-Tib. *tshul bžin-du gžan-du gžan 'chos-pa*, 'rectification of others to some other way justly'(?). Cf. also Edgerton, *BHSD*, p. 17b, *adhyāśaya* 1, s.v.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. p. 23 n. 12 above.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Edgerton, *BHSD*, p. 385ab, 1 *pravārayati*, s.v.

AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE CHINESE VERSION  
RENDERED BY FA-HSIEN\*

"(When ... the śrāvakas ... ) have already increased their thoughts about the path (*tao-hsin*)<sup>a</sup> and accept the Mahāyāna (*Ta-ch'êng*)<sup>b</sup>, then I teach them this Mahāyāna (*Mo-ho-yen*)<sup>c</sup> *Mahāparinirvāṇa* (*Ta-p'an-ni-yüan*)<sup>d</sup> which is the meal of the truth possessed of six flavours — sweet (*t'ien*)<sup>e</sup>, bitter (*k'u*)<sup>f</sup>, pungent (*hsin*)<sup>g</sup>, sour (*tso*)<sup>h</sup>, salty (*hsien*)<sup>i</sup> and thin (*tan*)<sup>j</sup>. Suffering (*k'u*)<sup>f</sup> is of sour flavour. Impermanence (*wu-ch'ang*)<sup>k</sup> is of salty flavour. Non-selfhood (*fei-wu*)<sup>l</sup> is of bitter flavour. Happiness (*yüeh-lo*)<sup>m</sup> is of sweet flavour. Selfhood (*wu-wu*)<sup>n</sup> is of thin flavour. Permanence (*ch'ang-fa*)<sup>o</sup> is of pungent flavour. Fuelling the fire of illusion (*huan-hsing*)<sup>p</sup> with the firewood of depravity (*fan-nao*)<sup>q</sup>, the *Mahāparinirvāṇa* (*Ta-p'an-ni-yüan*), the delectable (*kan-lu*)<sup>r1</sup> meal of the Dharma (*fa-shih*)<sup>s</sup>, is cooked.

"Furthermore, o daughter of good family (*shêng-ju-jên*)<sup>t</sup>, suppose your sisters (*tzü-mei*)<sup>u</sup> have some business, and you leave the house and go on a journey. Visiting another village, you may not return for a long time. You have two sons. One is good, and the other is bad. At the time when you wish to go, you would not speak about the hidden treasury with rare valuables to the bad son but you would give to the good son."

The woman said to the Buddha: "Indeed, o Bhagavat!"

The Buddha asked the woman: "Why would you not speak about the

\* *Ta-p'an-ni-yüan-ching*: Taishō No. 376, Vol. XII p. 868b21-cl4; cf. "Introductory Remarks", paragraph 11c, above.

<sup>1</sup> Original Skt. *amṣṭa* for Kōyasan MS. reading *mṛṣṭa*?

treasury to the bad son?"

The woman said to the Buddha: "As for the bad son, he is the one who behaves improperly. He indulges in indolence, and his food expense is immeasurable. For this reason I would not tell him. As for the good son, he is the one who upholds the family (*mên-hu*)<sup>v</sup> and causes the family (*tsung-tsu*)<sup>w</sup> to flourish. For this reason I would give it to him."

The Buddha said: "Indeed! My teaching (*fa*)<sup>x</sup> is exactly the same. When I wish to enter the Parinirvāṇa (*p'an-ni-yüan*) through skilful means, I will completely give to my disciples the essence of the secret teaching, the treasury of the Tathāgata. I will not bestow it on those who have broken the precepts (*fan-chieh*)<sup>y</sup> and have false views (*hsieh-chien*)<sup>z</sup>. In regard to me, you form the notion of Nirvāṇa (*mieh*)<sup>aa</sup> and form the notion of permanence (*ch'ang*)<sup>ab</sup>."

The woman said to the Buddha: "In regard to the Tathāgata I form the notion of eternity (*ch'ang-chu*)<sup>ac</sup>."

The Buddha said: "O sister, just as you have explained it, you should form this view (*kuan*)<sup>ad</sup>, and never form the notion of Nirvāṇa! You should know that the Tathāgata is indeed the eternal Dharma (*ch'ang-chu-fa*)<sup>ae</sup>, the immutable Dharma (*fei-pien-i-fa*)<sup>af</sup>, and the imperishable Dharma (*fei-mo-mieh-fa*)<sup>ag</sup>! Those living beings, who practise the notion of eternity in regard to the Tathāgata, should know that the Buddha dwells in the house of each of them. This is called the 'ability to correct other people (*nêng-chêng-t'o-jên*)<sup>ah</sup>."<sup>2</sup>

"'Ability to answer according to questions (*nêng-sui-wên-taj*)<sup>ai3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Cf. p. 25 n. 2 above.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. p. 23 n. 12 above.

is like this:-

"If someone comes to ask the Tathāgata: 'How can I obtain fame (*ming*)<sup>aj</sup> as a great donor (*ta-shih*)<sup>ak</sup> renown in the world, and yet not lose my wealth (*ts'ai*)<sup>al</sup>?'

The Buddha addressed the son of good family (*tsung-shêng-tzŭ*):<sup>am</sup>  
'If there is someone who is pure (*ching-su*)<sup>an</sup>, does not keep boy servants (*t'ung-p'u*)<sup>ao</sup> and practises continence (*fan-hsing*),<sup>ap</sup> you just happily give him your male and female servants, wife and mistress (*ch'i-ch'ieh*)<sup>aq</sup>! To the one who abstains from the flavour of meat, you just happily give him meat! ...

#### List of Chinese Characters

a	道心	b	大乘	c	摩訶衍
d	大般泥洹	e	甜	f	苦
g	辛	h	酢	i	醜
j	淡	k	無常	l	非我
m	悅樂	n	吾我	o	常法
p	幻行	q	煩惱	r	甘露
s	法食	t	善女人	u	姊妹
v	門戶	w	宗族	x	法
y	犯戒	z	邪見	aa	滅
ab	常	ac	常住	ad	觀
ae	常住法	af	非變異法	ag	非磨滅法
ah	能正他人	ai	能隨問答	aj	名
ak	大施	al	財	am	族姓子
an	清素	ao	童僕	ap	梵行
aq	妻妾				

TIBETAN VERSION TRANSLATED FROM THE INDIC\*

(D53a7, L73a4, N78b5, P53b8, T111b2) gañ-gi tshe khyod-kyi bu  
 skyes-pa bžin-du ñan-thos chen-por gyur-te / stobs cher skyes-  
 śiñ theg-pa chen-po 'dod-par gyur-pa (D53b) de'i tshe-ni ña-  
 yañ ro drug dañ ldan-pa'i kha-zas chen-po dañ 'dra-ba'i yoñs-  
 su mya-ñan-las 'das-pa (P54a) chen-po'i mdo chen-po ston-to //  
 de-la ro drug-po-rnams gañ že-na / sdug-bsñal-gyi skyur dañ /  
 mi-rtag-pa'i lan-tshva dañ / bdag-med-pa'i tsha-ba dañ / bde-  
 ba'i mñar-ba dañ / bdag-yod-pa'i bska-ba dañ / (N79a) rtag-  
 pa'i kha-ba-rnams-te<sup>1</sup> / ro drug-po 'di-rnams / ñon-moñs-pa'i  
 bud-śiñ dañ sgyu-ma'i mes btsos-pa'i zas yoñs-su mya-ñan-las  
 'das-pa chen-po'i de-kho-na-ñid-kyi 'bran-chan<sup>2</sup> žim-po ña'i  
 ñan-thos-rnams za-bar 'gyur-ro //

(L73b) che-že gžan-yañ dper-na khyod gžan-gyis bos-sam / gžan-  
 gyi<sup>3</sup> gtsug-phud<sup>4</sup> bca'-ba'i phyir groñ gžan-du 'gro-bar 'dod-pa-  
 na bu ñan-pa-rnams bor-te bu bzañ-po-rnams blañs-nas gter gsañ-  
 ba-rnams ston-par byed-dam //

bcom-ldan-'das de-ni bka' mad-de<sup>5</sup> / bu ñan-pa tshul ma mchis-  
 pa nor-gyi skal-ba-can ma lags-pa de-dag-la-ni bdag nor (T112a)  
 ston-par mi bgyid lags-kyi / bdag-ni bu bzañ-po khyim-so  
 'dzin-pa<sup>6</sup> khyim-gyi don sgrub-pa rdzas bstan-par 'os-pa de-  
 dag-la ston-par bgyid lags-so //

\* Sde-dge 120 THA 53a7-54a3 (abbreviated D); Lha-sa 122 ÑA  
 73a4-74a4 (abbr. L); Snar-thañ 107 ÑA 78b5-79b6 (abbr. N);  
 Peking 788 TU 53b8-54b3 (abbr. P); Tog Palace MS. WA 111b2-  
 112b1 (abbr. T); for further details about these editions see  
 "Introductory Remarks" paragraph 10a, above. Minor variants  
 have been neglected in the footnotes.

<sup>1</sup> P looks as if *bab-°* for *kha-ba-°*. <sup>2</sup> P *'bras-can*, N *°-chen*.

<sup>3</sup> T *gžan-gyis* for *°-gyi*.

<sup>4</sup> T *gtsud-pud* for *gtsug-phud*.

<sup>5</sup> P *med-do* for *mad-de*!

<sup>6</sup> T *zin-pa* for *'dzin-°*.

bka'-stsal-pa / che-že de-bžin-du gañ-gi tshe yoñs-su mya-  
ñan-las 'das-pa chen-por 'gro-ba'i bya-ba byed-pa de'i tshe  
de-bžin-gšegs-pa gsañ-ba sna-tshogs-kyi dgoñs-pa'i tshig ma  
lus-par ñan-thos-rnams-la ston-te<sup>7</sup> / der sras-rnams-la dad-pa  
sbyin-par mdzad-do //

che-že dper-na khyod byes-su soñ-ba-na bu ñan-pa-rnams khyod  
ma śi-bar śi'o sñam-du sems-sam //

bcom-ldan-'das de-ni bka' mad-do //

bka'-stsal-pa / de-nas khyod phyr 'oñs-pa de-dag-(N79b)gis  
mthoñ-ba / de-bžin-du che-že ña-la mi rtag-go sñam-du 'du-  
śes ma byed-cig / deñ de-bžin-gšegs-pa yoñs-su mya-ñan-las  
'da'-bar 'gyur-ro / žes śi-ba'i 'du-śes bžin-du de-ltar ma  
'dzin-cig<sup>8</sup> // gañ-dag rtag-tu de-bžin-gšegs-pa rtag-pa dañ /  
brtan-pa dañ ther-zug-pa'o sñam-du 'dzin-pa de-dag-gi khyim-  
na-ni de-bžin-gšegs-pa (D54a L74a) bžugs-te / 'di-ni gžan-  
(P54b)gyi lhag-pa'i bsam-pa žes-bya'o //

'dri-ba'i dbañ žes-bya-ba-ni:

'di-na<sup>9</sup> la-la žig de-bžin-gšegs-pa dgra-bcom-pa yañ-dag-par  
rdzogs-pa'i sañs-rgyas-la žu-bar byed-de / bcom-ldan-'das ji-  
ltar bgyis-na<sup>10</sup> bdag-gis su-la-yañ ci-yañ ma stsal-bar 'jig-  
rten-du sbyin-pa-por grags-pa'i gтам sñan-pa thob-par 'gyur  
lags //

de-bžin-gšegs-pas de-(T112b)la de-skad ces bka' stsal-to //  
chags-pa med-pa-la bran dañ bran-mo blañ-bar stobs-śig / gtan-  
du tshañs-par spyod-pa-la bu-mo'i sbyin-pa gyis-śig / śa mi  
za-ba-la śa-zar chug-cig<sup>11</sup> / ...

<sup>7</sup> T ston-to for °-te.

<sup>9</sup> P 'di-ni, orig. 'dir-ni?

<sup>11</sup> DP °-śig.

<sup>8</sup> N 'dzin-žig for °-cig.

<sup>10</sup> T bgyis-nas for °-na.

AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE TIBETAN VERSION  
RENDERED FROM THE INDIC

"When, as your son grows up and becomes a great śrāvaka who is growing strong, he longs for the Mahāyāna, then I will teach the great sūtra of the Mahāparinirvāṇa which is like a great meal (*zas*) possessed of six flavours (*ro*). What are the six flavours in that case? They are the sour (*skyur*) (flavour) of suffering (*sdug-bsñal*), the salty (*lan-tshva*) (flavour) of impermanence (*mi-rtag-pa*), the pungent (*tsha-ba*) (flavour) of non-selfhood, the sweet (*mñar-ba*) (flavour) of happiness (*bde-ba*), the astringent (*bska-ba*) (flavour) of selfhood (*bdag-yod-pa*), and the bitter (*kha-ba*) (flavour) of permanence (*rtag-pa*). These are the six flavours. My śrāvakas eat the delectable food (*'bran-chan*) of the truth of the Mahāparinirvāṇa, which is the meal cooked with the firewood (*bud-śiñ*) of depravity (*ñon-moñs-pa*) and the flame (*me*) of illusion (*sgyu-ma*).

"O elder sister, furthermore, just like you, wishing to go to another village either by invitation of others or because of the tonsure feast of others, show the hidden treasury (*gter*) after having received the good sons and excluded the bad sons."

"O Bhagavat, it is true! I will not show the wealth (*nor*) to those bad sons who have improper conduct and do not share the wealth. I will show it to those good sons who uphold the house (*khyim-so 'dzin-pa*), gain the welfare (*don*) of the house (*khyim-gyi don sgrub-pa*), and are worthy of being shown the property (*rdzas bstan-par 'os-pa*)."

(The Buddha) said: "O elder sister, likewise, when the Tathāgata performs the deed of going to the great Parinirvāṇa, then



he will completely teach the word of intention (*dgoñs-pa'i tshig*) of various secrets (*gsañ-ba sna-tshogs*) to the śrāvakas, and then will give his consent (*dad-pa*) to the children.

"O elder sister, just as when you go on a journey, the bad sons imagine that you are dead, though you are not dead."

"O Bhagavat, it is true!"

(The Buddha) said: "Then they see you come back. Just so, o elder sister, never form any notion of impermanence in regard to me! Just like the notion of death one must not consider: 'Today the Tathāgata will enter the Parinirvāṇa!' The Tathāgata dwells in the house of those who always bear in mind: 'The Tathāgata is permanent (*rtag-pa*), perpetual (*brtan-pa*) and eternal (*ther-zug-pa*)'. This is called the considerateness to others (*gžan-gyi lhag-pa'i bsam-pa*)<sup>1</sup>."

"The so-called power of questions (*'dri-ba'i dbañ*)<sup>2</sup>:-

"Someone here might ask the Tathāgata, the Arhat, the Samyak-sambuddha: 'O Bhagavat, how can I possibly obtain glorious fame in the world without giving anything whatsoever to anyone whosoever?'"

The Tathāgata spoke thus to him: "Present the property (*blañ-ba*) of male and female servants to one who is free from clinging! Perform the giving of a maiden (*bu-mo*) to one who practises the complete continence (*tshañs-par spyod-pa*)! Prevail upon one who does not eat meat (*śa mi za-ba*) to eat a meal of meat (*śa-za*)! ...

<sup>1</sup> Cf. p. 25 fn. 2 above.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. p. 23 n. 12 above.

AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE CHINESE VERSION

RENDERED BY DHARMAKṢEMA

(Northern Version in comparison with the Southern)\*

"If my disciples (*ti-tzŭ*)<sup>a</sup> who are the śrāvakas are endowed with qualities (*kung-tê*)<sup>b</sup> and are capable of practising the Mahāyāna-sūtra (*Ta-ch'êng ching-t'ien*)<sup>c</sup>, I teach this sūtra as six kinds of flavours (*wei*)<sup>d</sup>. What are the six flavours? I teach that suffering (*k'u*)<sup>e</sup> is the sour flavour (*ts'u-wei*)<sup>f</sup>, impermanence (*wu-ch'ang*)<sup>g</sup> is the salty flavour (*hsien-wei*)<sup>h</sup>, non-selfhood (*wu-wu*)<sup>i</sup> is the bitter flavour (*k'u-wei*)<sup>j</sup>, happiness (*lo*)<sup>k</sup> is like<sup>l</sup> a sweet flavour (*t'ien-wei*)<sup>n</sup>, selfhood (*wu*)<sup>o</sup> is like a pungent flavour (*hsin-wei*)<sup>p</sup>, and permanence (*ch'ang*)<sup>q</sup> is like a thin flavour (*tan-wei*)<sup>r</sup>. In this world there are three kinds of flavours, that is to say, impermanence (*wu-ch'ang*)<sup>g</sup>, non-selfhood (*wu-wu*)<sup>i</sup> and unhappiness (*wu-lo*)<sup>s</sup>. Depravity (*fan-nao*)<sup>t</sup> is the firewood (*hsin*)<sup>u</sup> and wisdom (*chih-hui*)<sup>v2</sup> is the fire (*huo*)<sup>w</sup>. With these conditions (*yin-yüan*)<sup>x</sup> the meal (*fan*)<sup>y</sup> of Nirvāṇa (*nieh-p'an*)<sup>z</sup> is prepared, that is to say, permanence (*ch'ang*)<sup>aa</sup>, happiness (*lo*)<sup>ab</sup> and selfhood (*wu*)<sup>ac</sup>. The disciples will all be made to taste it."

\* *Ta-p'an-nieh-p'an-ching*: Northern Version, Taishō No. 374, Vol. XII pp. 385c12-386a6 (abbreviated N)(see "Introductory Remarks" paragraph 11a, above); Southern Version, Taishō No. 375, Vol. XII p. 625c5-29 (abbrev. S)(see "Introductory Remarks" 11b, above).

<sup>l</sup> S *wei*<sup>l</sup> instead of N *ju*<sup>m</sup> in the following three, while Tib. ... *lta-bu'o* in all cases.

<sup>2</sup> All the other versions read *māyā*, 'illusion' (and not 'wisdom'): so Tib. *sgyu-ma* (= *māyā*), Fa-hsien *huang-hsing* (= *māyā*).

(The Buddha) addressed the woman further: "Suppose you wish to go to another place for some reason. You should drive the bad son (*ê-tzŭ*)<sup>ad</sup> away, making him leave the house. And you should show (*fu-chi*)<sup>ae</sup> the whole treasury (*pao-tsang*)<sup>af</sup> to the good son (*shan-tzŭ*)<sup>ag</sup>."

The woman said to the Buddha: "Indeed, like the holy teaching (*shêng-chiao*)<sup>ah</sup>, I shall show (*chi*)<sup>ai</sup> the treasury (*tsang*)<sup>aj</sup> with rare valuables to the good son, and shall not show it to the bad son."

"O sister, I am also like this. At the time of the Parinirvāṇa (*p'an-nieh-p'an*)<sup>ak</sup> I will not bestow (*yü*)<sup>al</sup> the secret and highest Dharma treasury (*fa-tsang*)<sup>am</sup> of the Tathāgata to my disciples among the śrāvakas, just as you would not show the treasury (*pao-tsang*) to the bad son. I shall bestow (*fu-chu*)<sup>an</sup> the essence (*yao*)<sup>ao</sup> on the bodhisattvas, just as you would give (*wei-fu*)<sup>ap</sup> the treasury (*pao-tsang*) to the good son. Why is it? The disciples who are śrāvakas form (*shêng*)<sup>aq</sup> the notion of transmutation (*pien-i*)<sup>ar</sup>, saying that the Buddha, the Tathāgata, has actually entered Nirvāṇa (*mieh-tu*)<sup>as</sup>, when actually I have not entered Nirvāṇa. Just as when you go afar and have not yet returned, your bad son may say that you are dead, when actually you are not dead. The bodhisattvas say that the Tathāgata is permanent (*ch'ang*) and immutable (*fu-pien-i*)<sup>at</sup>, just as your good son does not say that you are dead. For this reason (*i*)<sup>au</sup> I bestow (*fu*)<sup>av</sup> the treasury (*tsang*) of the highest secret on the bodhisattvas."

"O son of good family, if any living being says that the Buddha is permanent (*ch'ang*) and immutable (*fu-pien-i*), he should know that the Buddha dwells in his house. This is called the correcting others (*chêng-t'o*)<sup>aw<sup>3</sup></sup>."

<sup>3</sup> Cf. p. 25 fn. 2, above.

<sup>4</sup> "'The ability to answer in accordance with questions (*nêng-sui-wên-ta*)<sup>ay5</sup> is like this:-

"If someone comes to ask the Buddha, the Tathāgata: 'How can I obtain fame (*ming*)<sup>az</sup> as a great donor (*ta-shih*)<sup>ba</sup>, the *dāna-pati* (*t'an-yüeh*)<sup>bb</sup>, without losing (*shê*)<sup>bc</sup> my wealth (*ch'ien-ts'ai*)<sup>bd</sup>?'"

The Buddha said: "If there is a *śramaṇa* (*sha-mên*)<sup>be</sup> or Brahmin (*p'o-lo-mên*)<sup>bf</sup>, who has little desire (*yü*)<sup>bg</sup>, knows contentment (*tsu*)<sup>bh</sup> and does not accept or keep impure things (*fu-ching-wu*)<sup>bi</sup>, you should give him male and female servants (*nu-p'i p'u-shih*)<sup>bj</sup>! Give women<sup>6</sup> to the one who practises continence (*fan-hsing*)<sup>bm</sup>! Give liquor (*chiu*)<sup>bn</sup> and meat (*ju*)<sup>bo</sup> to the one who abstains from liquor and meat! ...

#### List of Chinese Characters

a	弟子	b	功德
c	大乘經典	d	味
e	苦	f	醋味
g	無常	h	鹹味
i	無我	j	苦味
k	樂	l	爲
m	如	n	甜味
o	我	p	辛味
q	常	r	淡味
s	無樂	t	煩惱
u	薪	v	智慧

<sup>4</sup> S begins with the appellation to Kāśyapa (*Chia-yeh*)<sup>ax</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. p. 23 n. 12 above.

<sup>6</sup> S *ju-shih*<sup>bk</sup> for N *ju-jên*<sup>bl</sup>.

w	火	x	因緣
y	飯	z	涅槃
aa	常	ab	樂
ac	我	ad	惡子
ae	付示	af	寶藏
ag	善子	ah	聖教
ai	示	aj	藏
ak	般涅槃	al	與
am	法藏	an	付囑
ao	要	ap	委付
aq	生	ar	變異
as	減度	at	不變異
au	義	av	付
aw	正他	ax	迦葉
ay	能隨問答	az	名
ba	大施	bb	檀越
bc	捨	bd	錢財
be	沙門	bf	婆羅門
bg	欲	bh	足
bi	不淨物	bj	奴婢僕使
bk	女色	bl	女人
bm	梵行	bn	酒
bo	肉		

List of Chinese characters quoted in transliterated form in the footnotes on pages 39-41 below:

bp	堪任	bq	堪忍
br	淡	bs	淨
bt	要	bu	生變異想
bv	如來	bw	以是義故

TIBETAN VERSION TRANSLATED FROM THE CHINESE\*

(D56a7, L85a7, N86a7, P57a5, T83a7) ña'i ñan-thos-kyi ñe-gnas  
yon-tan dañ ldan-(T83b)pa theg-pa chen-po'i mdo-la nan-tan-du  
spyod<sup>1</sup> bzod-pa-dag-(L85b)la-ni ñas mdo-sde 'di-ñid-kyi ro rnam-  
pa drug bstan-to // (N86b) ro rnam-pa drug gañ že-na / sdug-  
bsñal-ni skyur-pa'i ro lta-bu'o / mi-rtag-pa-ni lan-(D56b)  
tshva'i<sup>2</sup> ro lta-bu'o / bdag-med-pa-ni kha-ba'i ro lta-bu'o /  
bde-ba-ni mñar-ba'i<sup>3</sup> ro lta-bu'o / bdag-ni tsha-ba'i ro lta-  
bu'o / rtag-pa-ni bska-ba'i<sup>4</sup> ro lta-bu'o // 'jig-rten-na ro  
rnam-pa gsum-ste / mi-rtag-pa dañ / bdag-med-pa dañ / bde-  
ba-med-pa-ste / ñon-moñs-pa-ni śiñ lta-bu'<sup>5</sup> / śes-rab-ni me  
lta-bu-ste / de'i rgyu dañ de'i rkyen-gyis mya-ñan-las 'das-  
pa'i<sup>6</sup> zas-su gyur-pa-ni rtag-pa dañ / bde-ba dañ / bdag dañ /  
yoñs-su dag-pa-ste / ñe-gnas-su gyur-pa-rnams<sup>7</sup> ro de-la dgod-  
do //

yañ bud-med de-la bka'-stsal-pa / (P57b) khyod don gñer-ciñ  
gžan-du 'gro-na khyod-kyi bu ma ruñs-pa khyim-nas phyuñ-la /  
rin-po-che'i gter-rnams bu mdzañs-pa-la<sup>8</sup> gtod-cig //

bud-med-kyis gsol-pa / bcom-ldan-'das 'phags-pa'i bka' bžin-  
te / rin-po-che'i gter-rnams bu mdzañs-pa-la<sup>8</sup> ston-gyi / bu  
ñan-pa-la-ni ma lags-so //

\* Sde-dge 119 ÑA 56a7-57a4 (abbrev. D); Lha-sa 368 KA 85a7-86b3  
(abbrev. L); Snar-thañ 361 KA 86a7-87b3 (abbrev. N); Peking 787  
JU 57a5-58a2 (abbrev. P); Tog KA 83a7-84b3 (abbrev. T). For  
further details see "Introductory Remarks" paragraph 10b above.  
Minor variants have been neglected in the notes.

<sup>1</sup> T spyod-pa.                      <sup>2</sup> P °-tsha'i.                      <sup>3</sup> T dñar-°.  
<sup>4</sup> So L only!; DT bsñal-ba'i, N mñal-ba'i, P ma-ñal-ba'i! Cf.  
Chin. tan 'thin' (of flavour)!                      <sup>5</sup> T °-bu'o.  
<sup>6</sup> T 'da'-ba'i.                      <sup>7</sup> So LN only!; DT gyur-pa'i rnams, P gyur-  
pa'i rtsams.                      <sup>8</sup> P 'dzaiñs-°

bcom-ldan-'das-kyis bka'-stsal-pa / ña-yañ de<sup>9</sup> dañ 'dra-ste /  
yoñs-su mya-ñan-las 'da'-ba-na / de-bžin-gšegs-pas dgoñs-te /  
gsuñs-pa<sup>10</sup> bla-na med-pa'i chos-kyi gter (T84a) ñan-thos-kyi  
ñe-gnas-rnams-la mi ston-pa'añ khyod-kyis rin-po-che'i (L86a)  
gter bu ñan-pa-la mi ston-pa bžin-no // (N87a) byañ-chub-sems-  
dpa'-rnams-la gdams-śiñ gtad-pa-ni ji-ltar khyod-kyis<sup>11</sup> rin-  
po-che'i gter-rnams bu mdzañs-pa-la<sup>8</sup> gtad-pa bžin-no // de'i  
phyir že-na / ñan-thos-kyi ñe-gnas-dag-ni skye-ba dañ 'pho-  
ba'i 'du-śes dañ bcas-pas sañs-rgyas bcom-ldan-'das-ni yañ-  
dag-par mya-ñan-las 'das-so sñam-ste / ña-ni<sup>12</sup> yañ-dag-par  
mya-ñan-las 'das-pa ma yin-no // dper-na khyod lam riñ-por  
soñ-ba-las phyir ma 'khor-gyi bar-du khyod-kyi bu ma ruñs-pas  
khyod ma śi-bar śi žes zer-ba dañ 'dra'o // byañ-chub-sems-  
dpa'-dag-ni de-bžin-gšegs-pa rtag-pa / mi 'pho-ba / mi 'gyur-  
ba'o žes zer-te / ji-ltar khyod-kyi bu mdzañs-pa<sup>8</sup> khyod ma<sup>13</sup>  
śi'o žes zer-ba dañ 'dra'o // don de-lta-bas-na<sup>14</sup> ñas bla-na  
med-pa dgoñs-pa chos-kyi gter byañ-chub-sems-dpa'-rnams-la  
gtad-do //

rigs-(D57a)kyi bu sems-can gañ-žig sañs-rgyas rtag-pa / gnas-  
pa / mi 'pho mi 'gyur-bar 'dzin-na / gnas de-ñid-na sañs-  
rgyas bžugs-par rig-par bya-ste / de-dag-ni tshul bžin-du  
gžan-du gžan 'chos-pa žes-bya'o //

de-la<sup>15</sup> ji-ltar-na dris-pa bžin-du lan-'debs-pa že-na / gal-  
te gañ-zag gcig-gis sañs-rgyas (T84b) bcom-ldan-'das-la 'di-  
skad-du bdag-(L86b, N86b)gis nor dañ / zañ-ziñ ci-yañ ma btañ-  
bar<sup>16</sup> sbyin-bdag chen-po'i<sup>17</sup> miñ-du grags-par 'gyur žes smra-  
na (P58a) bcom-ldan-'das-kyis de-la 'di-skad ces bka'-stsal-

<sup>9</sup> D *da*.

<sup>12</sup> P *da-ni*.

<sup>15</sup> P *da-la*.

<sup>10</sup> T *o-pa'i*.

<sup>13</sup> P *mañ*.

<sup>16</sup> T *gtañ-o*.

<sup>11</sup> PT *o-kyi*.

<sup>14</sup> T omits *na*.

<sup>17</sup> T *o-po*.

to // dge-sbyon dañ bram-ze-la sogs-pa 'dod-pa ñuñ-ñiñ chog  
śes-pa / ma brtags-pa'i yo-byad mi 'chañ<sup>18</sup> mi gsog-pa-la<sup>19</sup>  
bran-pho dañ<sup>20</sup> bran-mo dañ / las byed-pa'i mi byin-pa dañ /  
tshañs-par spyod-pa-la bud-med byin-pa dañ / śa chañ bcad-pa-  
la śa chañ byin-pa dañ / ...

<sup>18</sup> P 'chad.

<sup>19</sup> So L only!; DNT *sogs-°*, P *stsogs-°*.

<sup>20</sup> T omits *dañ*.

AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE TIBETAN VERSION  
RENDERED FROM THE CHINESE\*

"To my disciples (*ñe-gnas*) among the śrāvakas (*ñan-thos*), who are endowed with qualities (*yon-tan*) and are capable (*bzod-pa*)<sup>1</sup> of practising the Mahāyāna-sūtra (*theg-pa chen-po'i mdo*) at their best (*nan-tan-du*)<sup>2</sup>, I teach this very sūtra (*mdo-sde*) as six kinds of flavours (*ro*). What are the six flavours? Suffering (*sdug-bsñal*) is like a sour (*skyur-ba*) flavour. Impermanence (*mi-rtag-pa*) is like a salty (*lan-tshva*) flavour. Non-selfhood (*bdag-med-pa*) is like a bitter (*kha-ba*) flavour. Happiness (*bde-ba*) is like a sweet (*mñar-ba*) flavour. Selfhood (*bdag*) is like a pungent (*tsha-ba*) flavour. Permanence (*rtag-pa*) is like an astringent (*bska-ba*)<sup>3</sup> flavour. In the world there are three kinds of flavours: impermanence (*mi-rtag-pa*), non-selfhood (*bdag-med-pa*) and unhappiness (*bde-ba med-pa*).

\* For the Chinese characters transliterated in the following footnotes see page 36 above.

<sup>1</sup> Tib. *bzod-pa* corresponds to Skt. *kṣānta-* rather than the Kōyasan MS. reading *kāṅkṣita-*! This may have originated from the confusion of the similar Skt. words. Cf. Chin. *k'an-jên*<sup>bp</sup>. The Japanese translators of the Southern Chin. version (see p. 14 fn. 36-37 above) use *k'an-jên*<sup>br</sup>, which should simply be an error. No variant has so far been found or reported.

<sup>2</sup> Equivalent to Skt. *prayatnena*?

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Chin. *tan*<sup>br</sup> 'thin'!



Depravity (*ñon-moñs-pa*) is like firewood (*śiñ*), and wisdom (*śes-rab*)<sup>4</sup> is like fire (*me*). With this cause and this basis (*de'i rgyu dañ de'i rkyen-gyis*) is prepared the meal of the Nirvāṇa (*mya-ñan-las 'das-pa*), which is permanence (*rtag-pa*), happiness (*bde-ba*), selfhood (*bdag*) and pure (*yoñs-su dag-pa*)<sup>5</sup>. So (I shall) put (*dgod*)<sup>6</sup> the disciples into that flavour."

(The Buddha) addressed the woman further: "Suppose you go to another (place) while you are earning money (*don*), you should make your unfit son (*bu ma ruñs-pa*) leave the house (*khyim*), and give (*gtod*) the treasuries (*gter*) of jewels (*rin-po-che*) to the wise son (*bu mdzañs-pa*)".

The woman said: "O Bhagavat! Like the word (*bka'*) of his holiness (*'phags-pa*), (I) shall show the treasuries of jewels to the wise son, and never to the bad son (*bu ñan-pa*)."

The Bhagavat said: "I am also like that. On entering Parinirvāṇa the Tathāgata advises: 'I shall not show the treasury of the Dharma of the highest teaching (*gsuñs-pa*) to the disciples who are the śrāvakas, just as you do not show the treasury of jewels to the bad son. (I) shall bestow (*gtad-pa*) the teaching (*gdams-śiñ*)<sup>7</sup> on the bodhisattvas, in the same way as (you) bestow the treasuries of jewels on the wise son. It is for this reason why the disciples among the śrāvakas imagine with the

<sup>4</sup> Cf. p. 33 n. 2 above.

<sup>5</sup> The Chinese equivalent to Tib. *yoñs-su dag-pa* is found only as a variant reading: cf. Taishō XII p. 385 n. 15: *ching*<sup>bs</sup> 'pure'. Incidentally, it is neither in the Chi-sha edition: *Chung-hua Ta-tsang-ching* (Taipei repr. 1962), p. 6584a4.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. J. Nobel, *Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtra. Die tibetischen Übersetzungen*, II: *Wörterbuch* (Leiden 1950), 'god-pa, s.v.

<sup>7</sup> It may perhaps be translated as 'doctrinal essence'; cf. Chin. *yao*<sup>bt</sup> 'essence'.

notion ('*du-śes*) of birth (*skye-ba*) and death ('*pho-ba*)<sup>8</sup> that the Buddha, the Bhagavat (*bcom-ldan-'das*)<sup>9</sup> enters Parinirvāṇa. I do not actually enter Parinirvāṇa, just as when you go on a journey afar, and as long as you do not return, your unfit son may say that you are dead, though you are not dead. The bodhisattvas say that the Tathāgata is permanent, does not die ('*pho-ba*) and is not mutable ('*gyur-ba*), just as your wise son may say that you are not dead. For this reason (*don*)<sup>10</sup> I advise the highest: I shall bestow the teaching (*gsuñs-pa*), the treasury of the Dharma, on the bodhisattvas'."

"O son of good family, if any living being holds that the Buddha is permanent (*rtag*), is existent (*gnas-pa*), does not die ('*pho-ba*) and is immutable ('*gyur-ba*), he should know that the Buddha dwells (*b'zugs-pa*) in his very abode (*gnas*). Those are called 'Correcting ('*chos-pa*) others (*g'zan*) to some other way (*g'zan-du*) justly (*tshul b'zin-du*)'<sup>11</sup>."

"Thereupon, how about the 'Answer in accordance with questions'?<sup>12</sup> If someone says this to the Buddha, the Bhagavat: 'Can I become famous with the designation of great donor (*sbyin-bdag*) without abandoning (*btañ-ba*) any wealth (*nor*) and goods (*zañ-ziñ*)?', the Bhagavat will say this to him: 'Give a male servant (*bran-pho*) and a female servant (*bran-mo*), and a labourer (*las byed-pa'i mi*) to a śramaṇa (*dge-sbyoñ*), a Brahmin (*bram-ze*) or the like, who has little desire

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Chin. *shêng pien-i hsiang*<sup>bu</sup> 'produce the notion of mutation'!

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Chin. *ju-lai*<sup>bv</sup> 'Tathāgata'.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Chin. *i shih i ku*<sup>bw</sup> 'for this reason / meaning'.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. p. 25 fn. 2 above.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. p. 23 n. 12 above.

('dod-pa), knows contentment (*chog*), and neither holds ('*chañ*) nor keeps (*gsog-pa*)<sup>13</sup> uninspected properties (*ma brtags-pa'i yo-byad*)<sup>14</sup>! Give a woman (*bud-med*) to the one who practises continence (*tshañs-par spyod-pa*)! Give meat (*śa*) and liquor (*chañ*) to the one who abstains (*bcad-pa*) from meat and liquor!

...

<sup>13</sup> Cf. D *mi chañ mi-sogs-pa-la* 'to the people and the like who do not hold ...'?!

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Chin. *fu-ching-wu* 'impure things'!

T a b l e o f S i x F l a v o u r s

Sanskrit (ṣaḍ-rasa)	Fa-hsien (lu wei)	Indo-Tibetan (ro drug-po)	Dharmakṣema (lu wei)	Sino-Tibetan (ro rnam-pa drug)
1. <i>duḥkha</i> 'suffering' <i>ambā</i> 'sour'	First list 4. <i>tso</i> 'sour'	1. <i>sdug-bśhal</i> 'suffering' <i>skyrur</i> 'sour'	1. <i>k'u</i> 'suffering' <i>ts'u</i> 'sour'	1. <i>sdug-bśhal</i> 'suffering' <i>skyrur-ba</i> 'sour'
2. <i>amītya</i> 'impermanence' <i>lavāṇa</i> 'salty'	2. <i>wu-ch'ang</i> 'impermanence' <i>hsien</i> 'salty'	2. <i>mi-rtag-pa</i> 'impermanence' <i>lan-tshwa</i> 'salty'	2. <i>wu-ch'ang</i> 'impermanence' <i>hsien</i> 'salty'	2. <i>mi-rtag-pa</i> 'impermanence' <i>lan-tshwa</i> 'salty'
3. <i>anātmaka</i> 'non-selfhood' <i>kaṭuka</i> 'pungent'	3. <i>fei-wu</i> 'non-selfhood' <i>k'u</i> 'bitter'!	3. <i>bdag-med-pa</i> 'non-selfhood' <i>tsha-ba</i> 'pungent'	3. <i>wu-wu</i> 'non-selfhood' <i>k'u</i> 'bitter'!	3. <i>bdag-med-pa</i> 'non-selfhood' <i>kha-ba</i> 'bitter'!
4. <i>sukha</i> 'happiness' <i>mādhura</i> 'sweet'	4. <i>yüeh-lo</i> 'happiness' <i>t'ien</i> 'sweet'	4. <i>bde-ba</i> 'happiness' <i>mīar-ba</i> 'sweet'	4. <i>lo</i> 'happiness' <i>t'ien</i> 'sweet'	4. <i>bde-ba</i> 'happiness' <i>mīar-ba</i> 'sweet'
5. <i>sātmaka</i> 'selfhood' <i>kaṣāya</i> 'astringent'	5. <i>wu-wu</i> 'selfhood' <i>tan</i> 'thin'	5. <i>bdag-yod-pa</i> 'selfhood' <i>bska-ba</i> 'astringent'	5. <i>wu</i> 'selfhood' <i>hsin</i> 'pungent'!	5. <i>bdag</i> 'selfhood' <i>tsha-ba</i> 'pungent'!
6. <i>nītya</i> 'permanence' <i>tikta</i> 'bitter'	6. <i>ch'ang-fa</i> 'permanence' <i>hsin</i> 'pungent'!	6. <i>rtag-pa</i> 'permanence' <i>kha-ba</i> 'bitter'	6. <i>ch'ang</i> 'permanence' <i>tan</i> 'thin'!	6. <i>rtag-pa</i> 'permanence' <i>bska-ba</i> 'astringent'!

Three Kinds of Flavours in the World and the Nirvāṇa Meal<sup>1</sup>

Dharmakṣema's Chinese Version		Tibetan Version translated from the Chinese	
Three flavours (san-chung wei)	Nirvāṇa meal (nieh-p'an fan)	Three flavours (ro rnam-pa gsum)	Nirvāṇa meal (mya-ñan-las 'das- pa'i zas)
1. <i>wu-ch'ang</i> 'impermanence'	1. <i>ch'ang</i> 'permanence'	1. <i>mi-rtag-pa</i> 'impermanence'	1. <i>rtag-pa</i> 'permanence'
2. <i>wu-wu</i> 'non-selfhood'	2. <i>lo</i> 'happiness'	2. <i>bdag-med-pa</i> 'non-selfhood'	2. <i>bde-ba</i> 'happiness'
3. <i>wu-lo</i> 'unhappiness'	3. <i>wu</i> 'selfhood'	3. <i>bde-ba med-pa</i> 'unhappiness'	3. <i>bdag</i> 'selfhood'
	(4. <i>ching</i> 'purity/pure') <sup>2</sup>		4. <i>yoñs-su dag-pa</i> 'purity/pure' <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> These are not mentioned in the Sanskrit version, Fa-hsien's Chinese translation and the Tibetan version translated from the Indic.

<sup>2</sup> In the Chinese version translated by Dharmakṣema this is found only as a variant reading of the Northern version: cf. p. 40 fn. 5 above.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES:

Page 3, n. 5: See also G. M. Bongard-Levin, "New Sanskrit and Prakrit Texts from Central Asia", *Indologica Taurinensia*, III-IV (1975-76)(= *Proceedings of the Second World Sanskrit Conference*, Turin, June 1975), p. 76: ' ... The six fragments of the Mahāyāna *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* are currently prepared for the press. They are likely to command considerable attention among students of Buddhism.'

Page 9, n. 17: For details about the Indian reprint of the Derge edition one may now refer to Helmut Eimer, "Zu einem Nachdruck des Derge-Kanjur", *Zentralasiatische Studien*, XIV, 2 (1980), pp. 237-246 (mit 4 Abb.).

Page 22, n. 4: Syntactically, *kleśendhanena* could perhaps be taken as a Bahuvrīhi compound with *māyā-agninā*, " ... on the fire of illusion fuelled with depravity"; but compare the Tibetan version translated from the Indic: *ñon-moṅs-pa'i bud-śiñ dan sgyu-ma'i mes* ...

POSTSCRIPTUM:-

*Last but not least I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Professor Shinten Sakai, D.Litt., President of Kōyasan University, who has encouraged me to study the manuscript with his valuable advice.*

YUYAMA, Akira (1933- )

Born in Oyama-chō, Shizuoka-ken, Japan.

Studied Indology at Osaka University of Foreign Studies and the Universities of Tokyo and Leiden: B.A. (Osaka-Gaigo 1957 and Tokyo 1959), M.A. (Tokyo 1961), Ph.D. (A.N.U. 1971).

Research Assistant in South Asian and Buddhist Studies at the Australian National University of Canberra (1965-1966), Lecturer in Sanskrit (1967-1971), Senior Lecturer (1971-1973); University Post-Doctoral Fellow in Asian Languages and Literatures at the University of Auckland (1973-1974); Alexander von Humboldt (Senior) Fellow in Indian and Buddhist Studies at the University of Göttingen (1974-1976); Director of the Reiyukai Library (1976- ).

Part-time Lecturer in Sanskrit at the University of Tokyo (Summer Semester 1977); Part-time Lecturer in Buddhist Philology at the University of Kyoto (Winter Semester 1979); Part-time Lecturer in Indian Civilization at Hokkaido University, Sapporo (Summer Semester 1980).

Publications: *Indic Manuscripts and Chinese Blockprints (Non-Chinese Texts) of the Australian National University Library, Canberra (= Centre of Oriental Studies Occasional Paper, VI)*(Canberra 1967); *A Bibliography of the Sanskrit Texts of the Saddharmapūṇḍarīkasūtra (= Oriental Monograph Series, V)*(Canberra 1970); *A Grammar of the Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā (Sanskrit Recension A)*(= *Oriental Monograph Series, XIV*)(Canberra 1973); *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā (Sanskrit Recension A)*(Cambridge 1976); *Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur*. Im Auftrage der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen herausgegeben von H. Bechert. Erster Teil: *Vinaya-Texte*, von A. Yuyama (Wiesbaden 1979).

Many other articles and reviews.

Department for Scientific Publications  
Promotional Bureau  
THE REIYUKAI

1-7-8 Azabudai, Minato-ku, Tokyo 106, Japan  
Telephone: Tokyo (03) 585-2501  
Telex: J-28653

*Saddharmapundarīka Manuscripts Found in Gilgit*, edited and annotated by Shōkō Watanabe, with a preface by P. V. Bapat. Clothbound in two volumes (1972-1975), 30 x 21 cm. Part One (Photographic reproduction), 85 plates, 2 tables. Part Two, xvii, 307 pages (Romanized texts), 7 plates.

*Saddharma-Pundarīka-Sūtra: Kashgar Manuscript*, edited by Lokesh Chandra, with a foreword by Heinz Bechert. Second impression (1977), 27 x 38 cm., iii, 15 pages, 435 facsimile plates.

兜木正亨・ミョウリン蒐集 敦煌法華經目錄

*Descriptive Catalogue of the Miao-fa-lien-hua-ching from Tun-huang Collected by Aurel Stein and Paul Pelliot*, compiled by Shōkō Kabutogi (1978). Clothbound and boxed, 28 x 20 cm., xvi, 351 pages (including plates in monochrome on 52 odd pages), 8 frontispieces in colour, plus 34 pages (English introduction and conversion tables).

Forewords (accompanied by the Japanese versions) by K. B. Gardner and Bernard Frank.

*An exhaustive catalogue with reference to the Taishō and Kasuga Editions.*

兜木正亨・教維目録 定本 法華經 八卷 春日版

*The Kasuga Edition of the Lotus Sutra*, edited with an introduction by Shōkō Kabutogi (1978). Clothbound and boxed, 28 x 20 cm., 253 pages (plates on odd pages), 2 frontispieces in colour.

*A facsimile edition of the famous 1263 Kasuga Edition kept at the Temple Tōshōdaiji of Nara.*



THE REIYUKAI LIBRARY

5-3-23 Toranomon, Minato-ku, Tokyo 105, Japan

Telephones: Tokyo (03) 434-6953, 438-1079

Cables: REILIB TOKYO

L i s t o f P u b l i c a t i o n s

STUDIA PHILOLOGICA BUDDHICA: Monograph Series

- I. Paul M. Harrison, *The Tibetan Text of the Pratyutpanna-Buddha-Sammukhāvasthita-Samādhi-Sūtra*. Critically edited from the Derge, Narthang, Peking and Lhasa Editions of the Tibetan Kanjur and accompanied by a Concordance and Comparative Table of Chapters of the Tibetan and Chinese Versions (1978). Paper, xxi, 241 pp.
- II. J. W. de Jong, *Textcritical Remarks on the Bodhisattvāvādānakalpalatā (Pallavas 42-108)* (1979). Paper, x, 303 pp.
- III. Jampa Losang Panglung, *Die Erzählstoffe des Mūlasarvāstivādivinaya analysiert auf Grund der tibetischen Übersetzung* (1981). Paper, XXXV, 313 pp.

STUDIA PHILOLOGICA BUDDHICA: Occasional Paper Series

- I. Michael Hahn, *Haribhatta and Gopadatta. Two Authors in the Succession of Āryaśūra. On the Rediscovery of Their Jātaka-mālās* (1977). Paper, iv, 40 pp.
- II. Akira Yuyama and Hirofumi Toda, *The Huntington Fragment F of the Saddharmapundarikāsūtra* (1977). iv, 15 pp. (2 plates ad interim).
- III. Ronald E. Emmerick, *A Guide to the Literature of Khotan* (1979). vii, 63 pp.

BIBLIOGRAPHIA PHILOLOGICA BUDDHICA: Series Maior

- I. Edward Conze, *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature*. Second, revised and enlarged edition (Tokyo: The Reiyukai, 1978). Cloth, viii, 138 pp.

BIBLIOGRAPHIA PHILOLOGICA BUDDHICA: Series Minor

- I. Helmut Eimer, *Die Xerokopie des Lhasa-Kanjur. The Xerox Copy of the Lhasa Kanjur* (1977, reprinted 1980). Paper, iv, 41 pp.

- II. Hirofumi Toda, *Notes on the Kashgar Manuscript of the Saddharmapundarikasūtra* (1977, reprinted 1980). Paper, iv, 39 pp.
- III. David A. Utz, *A Survey of Buddhist Sogdian Studies* (1978, reprinted 1980). Paper, iv, 26 pp.
- IV. Helmut Eimer, *The Tibetan Indexes (dkar chag) to the Collected Works (bka' 'bum) of A kya gsañ 'dzin rdo rje* (1980). Paper, iv, 42 pp.