

Volume 5:

a) p. 180, line 2 from the bottom of the text: the footnote number should be “sunshade¹⁰”.

Suggestions for clearer renderings:

1) BD.1, p. 210, bottom paragraph: I suggest changing the word “emission” to “to be released”, “to be let go”, “freedom” — as at BD.3, p. 48, line 2 from the bottom of the text;

2) BD.2, p. 345: the word *udakadantapona* is better translated as “water and teeth-cleaner”;

3) Miss Horner has consistently misinterpreted the number of bhikkhus comprising a *gaṇa* and a *saṅgha*. A *gaṇa* consists of 2 or 3 bhikkhus, and a *saṅgha* comprises 4 bhikkhus or more: ref. BD.2, p. xii, lines 3 and 6; p. 7, notes 5 & 6; p. 8, note 6; p. 162, note 2; BD.3, p. 13, note 3;

4) In Theravāda countries *aruṇa* is taken to be “dawn” rather than “sunrise”: ref. BD.2, p. 7, line 8; p. 15, line 4 from bottom; p. 23 line 4 from bottom of text and note 1; p. 28, line 15; p. 115, line 15; p. 132, line 12; p. 158, line 10 from the bottom of the text; p. 336, last line of the text.

Kandersteg

Thiradhammo Bhikkhu

THERAVĀDIN LITERATURE IN TIBETAN TRANSLATION*

Contents

Introduction

1.	Theravādin texts in the <i>Kanjur</i>
1.1–13	Thirteen <i>paritta</i> and other texts
	The position of the 13 texts in the <i>Kanjur</i>
	Translators and date of translation
	The 13 texts and modern scholarship
	The original language of the 13 texts
1.1	<i>Dharmacakrapravartana-sūtra</i>
1.2	<i>Jātaka-nidāna</i>
1.3	<i>Āṭānāṭiya-sūtra</i>
1.4	<i>Mahāsamaya-sūtra</i>
1.5	<i>Maitrī-sūtra</i>
1.6	<i>Maitrībhāvanā-sūtra</i>
1.7	<i>Pañcaśikṣānuśamsa-sūtra</i>
1.8	<i>Giri-ānanda-sūtra</i>
1.9	<i>Nandopanandanāgarājadamana-sūtra</i>
1.10	<i>Mahākāśyapa-sūtra</i>
1.11	<i>Sūrya-sūtra</i>
1.12	<i>Candra-sūtra</i>
1.13	<i>Mahāmaṅgala-sūtra</i>
1.14	<i>Ārya-maitrī-sūtra-nāma</i>
1.1–14	General remarks
1.15	<i>Vimuttimagga</i> , Chapter 3: <i>Dhutagaṇa-nirdeśa</i>

* I am grateful to Heinz Bechert, Siglinde Dietz, Paul Harrison, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Donald Lopez, Jampa Samten, Jonathan Silk, and Russell Webb for providing information and materials. Above all, I am indebted to E. Gene Smith, without whose assistance this article would be a much poorer thing, and to David Seyfort Ruegg for his comments.

2.	Theravādin texts and tenets in the <i>Tanjur</i>
2.1	<i>Vimuttimaggā</i> in the <i>Samskṛtāsamskṛta-viniścaya</i>
2.2	Miscellaneous citations in the <i>Samskṛtāsamskṛta-viniścaya</i>
2.3	* <i>Buddhavaṃsa</i> of the Abhayagiri in the <i>Tarkajvālā</i>
2.4	Parallels to Pāli texts in the <i>Udānavarga-vivaraṇa</i>
2.5	Sources for Theravādin tenets
2.5.1	The (Ārya) Sthaviras and their branches
2.5.2	Sthaviras, Tāmraśāṭīyas, Tāmrapaṇḍīyas, and Tāmravaṇḍīyas
	a) Tāmraśāṭīyas and <i>bhavaṅga-viññāṇa</i>
	b) Tāmraśāṭīyas and the constituents of <i>nāma</i>
	c) Tāmraśāṭīyas in the <i>Tarkajvālā</i> of Bhavya
	d) Tāmraśāṭīyas in the <i>Madhyamakaratnapradīpa</i> of Bhavya
	e) Tāmraśāṭīyas in the * <i>Karatalaratna</i> of Bhavya
	f) Tāmraśāṭīyas, Tāmrapaṇḍīyas, and the “heart-basis”
	g) Tāmravaṇḍīyas and the definition of Akanitṭha
	h) Conclusions
2.5.3	Sthaviras and Vibhajyavādins
2.5.4	Sthaviras and Mahīśāsakas
2.5.5	Sthaviras, Kāśyapīyas, and Dharmaguptakas
2.5.6	Sources for Theravādin tenets: conclusions
3.	Modern translations of Theravādin texts
3.1	The <i>Dhammapada</i> and Gedun Chomphel
3.2	<i>Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha</i>
4.	Tibet and Ceylon
	Conclusions
	Abbreviations and bibliography
Table 1	Location of the 13 texts after the arrangement of the Tshal pa <i>Kanjur</i>

Table 2	Location of the 13 texts after the arrangement of the Them spangs ma <i>Kanjur</i>
Table 3	“Epithets of insight” in the <i>Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta</i>
Table 4	Concordance of Uv, Dhṃ, GDhṃ, PDhṃ, and alternate <i>nidānas</i> in the <i>Krodhavarga</i>
Table 5	Contents of <i>Abhidhamma</i> and <i>Suttanta</i> according to the <i>Maitreya-sūtra</i> and Gedun Chomphel
Table 6	Occurrence of the term Tāmraśāṭīya in the <i>Tanjur</i>
Table 7	Affiliation of the Tāmraśāṭīyas and related schools according to Tibetan sources

THERAVĀDIN LITERATURE IN TIBETAN TRANSLATION

Introduction

The Tibetan collection of Buddhist literature in translation is divided into two main parts: the *Kanjur* and the *Tanjur*. The *Kanjur* (*bKa' 'gyur*, “Word [of the Buddha] in translation”) contains texts traditionally held to have been spoken by the Buddha; the *Tanjur* (*bsTan 'gyur*, “Treatises [*bsTan bcos* = *śāstra*] in translation”) comprises treatises and commentaries by Indian and other masters. While the bulk of the contents of the two collections belongs to the Mahāyāna or to the Vajrayāna, both of them also contain a fair number of works of the Śrāvakayāna. These include the voluminous *Vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādin school, along with numerous and often voluminous commentaries; a miscellaneous collection of sūtras and *avadānas*, mostly again of the Mūlasarvāstivādin school; and a number of *Abhidharma* treatises, mainly presenting the tenets of the Vaibhāṣikas, an *Abhidharma* movement within the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin tradition.

In addition, both the *Kanjur* and the *Tanjur* contain translations of Theravādin literature, the former in the form of independent texts, the latter in the form of a duplication of one of the *Kanjur* texts and of citations or references within longer works. Beyond this, two texts have been translated from Pāli to Tibetan in this century.

1. Theravādin texts in the *Kanjur* 1.1–13 Thirteen *paritta* and other texts The position of the 13 texts in the *Kanjur*¹

Thirteen texts, translated by the Sinhalese Ānandaśrī and the Tibetan Thar pa lotsava Ņi ma rgyal mtshan dpal bzañ po (for whom see below), are the only *group* of Theravādin texts in the *Kanjur*. For this study, I have utilized the catalogues of twelve editions of the *Kanjur*, plus several *gSan yigs* (“*Records of Teachings Received*”). The editions fall into two groups, according to the arrangement of the two main lineages of the *Kanjur*, the Tshal pa and the Them spangs ma.

Bu ston Rin chen grub, in his *History of Buddhism* (*Chos 'byun*), completed in 1322 or 1323 — as will be seen below only a decade or two later than the translations — describes the 13 texts as *gsar du 'gyur ba*, “newly translated”. The Lithang xylograph, completed in 1614, the *gSan yig* of gTer bdag gliñ pa 'Gyur med rdo rje (1646–1714), the Derge xylograph, completed in 1773, and the Urga xylograph, completed in Ulan Bator in 1910, give them the same title.² The modern Lhasa xylograph, completed in 1934, does the same, and also calls them

¹ I apologize to the reader unfamiliar with Tibetan, for the fact that in the following pages I must plunge directly into the thick jungle of *Kanjur* studies and Tibetan history. It is necessary to do so in order to understand the transmission of the texts, and to clarify the considerable confusion that has arisen concerning them.

² Lithang Catalogue (Imaeda 1984, p. 26): *śes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa śes rab sna tshogs dan | mdo gsar 'gyur gyi bskor pu sti gcig*; *gsar 'gyur gyi mdo la*; TD, p. 645 ult; Derge Catalogue (*sDe dge bka' 'gyur dkar chag*), folio 118b1 and Urga Catalogue (Bethlenfalvy 1980, p. 11): *śes rab sna tshogs dan mdo gsar 'gyur gyi skor pu sta ka gcig la*. At least one other text (Urga 361, which is not related to the texts studied here) bears the marginal marking *mdo sde gsar 'gyur, ki*: Bethlenfalvy, Introduction, p. 12. For this text see Baron A. von Staël-Holstein, “The Emperor Ch'ien-Lung and the Larger *Śūraṃgamasūtra*”, in *HJAS* I, 1936, pp. 137–46.

the “Group of Thirteen Sūtras” (*mdo tshan bcu gsum po*).¹ The catalogues of the Peking and Narthang *Kanjurs* do not give them any general title; they simply list the titles without further detail.²

The first group consists of eight editions which, in terms of their arrangement of the texts in question, are based primarily on the Tshal pa *Kanjur*, a manuscript compiled in 1347–51 A.C. One of these is a manuscript, that kept at Berlin, while the remaining seven are xylographs. The second group consists of four manuscript editions which agree in general arrangement with the Them spangs ma manuscript *Kanjur* prepared at rGyal rtse in 1431,³ supplemented by two *Records of Teachings Received* (*gSan yig*) which describe the Them spangs ma tradition. It will be seen that the two groups differ in their classification and arrangement of the 13 texts.

Table 1 gives the location of the 13 texts according to the arrangement of the Tshal pa *Kanjur*. In all eight editions, the 13 texts occur at the very end of their respective volumes. The table shows that they occur in the same sequence, as numbers 13 to 25, in all editions except the Urga and the Lhasa (modern xylographs completed in 1910 and 1934 respectively). In the Berlin, Derge, Lhasa, Lithang, Peking, and Urga editions the volume in question is the last volume of the Śer phyin

¹ *Catalog of the Lhasa Kanjur*, reproduced by Lokesh Chandra from the collection of Prof. Raghuvira (*Śata-piṭaka series 324*), New Delhi, 1983, 438a7 (p. 875): *śer phyin sna tshogs dan | mdo gsar 'gyur skor*; 439a5 (p. 877) *mdo tshan bcu gsum po*.

² Peking *Tripiṭaka*, Vol. 151, *Dkarchag I*, 13a4–5; *Catalogue of the Narthang Kanjur*, reproduced by Lokesh Chandra (*Śata-Piṭaka Series Vol. 323*), New Delhi, 1983, *dkar sdus* 9a1–4; *dkar chag ka* 103a5–b1.

³ The dates of the Tshal pa and Them spangs ma manuscripts and of the *Kanjurs* referred to below are from Eimer 1989, pp. 24–25. For the history of the *Kanjur* and bibliographies of *Kanjur* studies, see Helmut Eimer, *Ein Jahrzehnt Studien zur Überlieferung des Tibetischen Kanjur*, Vienna, 1992, and Paul Harrison, *Druma-kinnara-rāja-pariprechā-sūtra*, Tokyo, 1992.

or Prajñāpāramitā division;¹ in the Cone it is the sixth of the eight volumes of Śer phyin.

In the Narthang the 13 texts come at the end of the last volume of the mDo or Sūtra division.² Lhasa follows N. In the *gSan yig* of gTer bDag gliñ pa, they are appended to volume *aḥ*, the last of the Sūtra division;³ otherwise the contents of volume *aḥ* agree with volume *aḥ* of the Lithang and Peking *Kanjurs*, in which it is also the last. (gTer bDag gliñ pa's *gSan yig* agrees with the Lithang and Peking *Kanjurs* on the order and contents of the Sūtra division; like them, it includes the *Parinirvāṇa-sūtra* under Sūtra volumes *ñā* and *ta*, against the Narthang which treats it as a separate division, following the Sūtra. Like the Narthang, it places the 13 texts at the end of Sūtra; the Tantra [*rgyud*] division of Narthang agrees with the *gSan yig* against that of either the other Tshal pa or the Them spangs ma *Kanjurs*.)

¹ They follow the same arrangement in the Mongolian translation of the *Kanjur*: see Ligeti 1942–44, §§ 779–91: end of Vol. 47, the last volume of Śer phyin.

² The Narthang, which is traditionally described as a Tshal pa *Kanjur* (see for example *KD II*, p. 283) agrees with the arrangement of the Lithang and Peking xylographs only in part: in this case it does not. It agrees with the Them spangs ma tradition (see below) in classing the texts under Sūtra, but not in terms of volume number or arrangement. The discrepancy in classification between Peking (Q) and the Berlin Ms (B) on the one hand and Narthang (N) on the other was noted by Lalou in 1929 (pp. 87–88) and in 1949 (*JA* 1949, p. 352): (in the Mongolian *Kanjur*) “les 13 textes traduits du pāli sont groupés à la fin de la section Prajñāpāramitā, comme dans la collection tibétaine de Pékin et le manuscrit de Berlin, tandis qu'ils sont rangés à la fin de la section Mdo dans les éditions de Narthang et de Kumbum”. The discrepancy between Derge, Lithang, Cone, and Peking against Narthang and Lhasa was noted by Imaeda (1982, pp. 18–19); cf. also Paul Pelliot, “Notes à propos d'un catalogue du Kanjur”, *JA*, July–August 1914, p. 146.

³ TD, p. 645 ult. The text implies that the 13 texts made up a separate volume, to which it does not ascribe a number: *mdo gsar 'gyur pu sti gžan du bzugs par ...*

Table 2 gives the location of the 13 texts after the arrangement of the Them spangs ma *Kanjur*. The four manuscripts that follow this order all place the 13 texts in the same position in volume 36 (*chi*), the second last volume of the Sūtra division. Although the texts are divided into two groups, they otherwise maintain the same internal order as that of the Tshal pa *Kanjurs*: numbers 1 to 8 occur as numbers 1 to 8 of the volume, while numbers 9 to 13 occur as numbers 15 to 19 of the volume. Two *Records of Teachings Received* (*gSan yig*), one by Jayapaṇḍita Blo bzañ 'phrin las (born 1642) and one by 'Jam dbyañs bžad pa'i rdo rje (1648–1721), which describe the Them spangs ma *Kanjur*, give the 13 texts in the same volume (*chi*) and the same order. The Them spangs ma editors do not class the texts as Mahāyāna or Śrāvakayāna: while the intervening texts (Stog §§ 297–302) belong to the latter, the two texts that follow the second group are described in their titles as Mahāyāna sūtras (Stog §§ 308–9). Since this is the general pattern in the Them spangs ma, which places texts of Mahāyāna and Śrāvakayāna side-by-side throughout the Sūtra division, the question of classification does not arise.

A reason for the different position of the 13 texts in Narthang may now be suggested. In the Tshal pa *Kanjurs*, apart from Narthang-Lhasa, the 13 texts are placed at the end of the Śes rab sna tshogs or “Miscellaneous Prajñāpāramitā” volume. In terms of contents and order, this volume exists in four different versions:¹ Them spangs ma (HLNST, plus the *gSan yig* of Jayapaṇḍita);² Tshal pa (BCJQ); Derge (which follows Bu ston's *History of Buddhism*); and Phug brag, which is unique. Only the Tshal pa *Kanjurs* (BCJQ, including here D) place the texts at the end of Śes rab sna tshogs; the Them spangs ma *Kanjurs* do

¹ For an earlier note on this volume, see Lalou 1929.

² The volume is missing in U: see Bethlenfalvy 1982, p. 16. The *gSan yig* of Kloñ rdol bla ma, which describes N, agrees with N except that it omits text no. 4: *KD* II 286.

not. We know that the carving of the blocks of the Narthang *Kanjur* began at Lhasa in the time of the 6th Dalai Lama, but was interrupted after only 24 or 28 volumes were completed.¹ The *Kanjur* was finally completed by Pho lha nas, who had the remaining blocks carved at Śel dkar on the basis of a descendent of the Them spangs ma kept at Śel dkar chos sde. The Narthang Śes rab sna tshogs volume must belong to the later set; it therefore follows the Them spangs ma tradition, and does not include the 13 texts in that volume.² As in the *gSan yig* of gTer bdag gliñ pa, the Narthang editors placed the 13 texts at the end of the Sūtra division; to complicate matters, they took them from a manuscript tradition belonging to the Them spangs ma rather than the Tshal pa lineage, since the individual colophons agree with those of the former (see below).

One other recension of the *Kanjur*, the Phug brag manuscript, differs in contents and arrangement from other known *Kanjurs*. The 13 texts are not found in this edition.³ The recently noted O rgyan gliñ *Kanjur* shares certain texts with the Phug brag against the Tshal pa and Them spangs ma *Kanjurs*;⁴ this edition, however, includes the 13 texts in the last volume of the Prajñāpāramitā division, “Miscellaneous

¹ 24 according to *KD* II 453, but 28 according to the Narthang *dkar chag*, 54b2.

² The Narthang *dkar chag* (*loc. cit.*), however, states that the blocks carved at Lhasa started with the Prajñāpāramitā (*śer phyogs*). This is clearly not the case for the “Miscellaneous” volume, which agrees in order and contents with the Them spangs ma.

³ See Samten 1992; cf. also the same author's “Preliminary Notes on the Phug-brag bKa'-'gyur: A Unique Edition of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon”, in Ihara and Yamaguchi 1992, pp. 115–20.

⁴ See Jampa Samten, “Notes on the Bka'-'gyur of O-Rgyan-Gling, the Family Temple of the Sixth Dalai Lama (1683–1706)”, paper delivered at the Sixth International Conference of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Fagernes, August 1992 (unpublished).

Prajñāpāramitā”,¹ and thus agrees in this case with the Tshal pa tradition. The texts do not seem to be included in the extant volumes of the incomplete manuscript *Kanjur* from Batang kept in the Newark Museum.²

In Bu ston’s list of canonical Tibetan translations the 13 texts are catalogue numbers 369 to 380;³ here too they come at the end of the last section of the Sūtra collection properly speaking.⁴ This is Section VII, which comprises “Miscellaneous Mahāyāna Sūtras” (*theg pa chen po’i mdo sde sna tshogs*). After listing the texts, Bu ston expresses doubt about two points: whether or not the texts were duplicates of earlier

¹ *Śes phyin sna tshogs*, 206a–340b: I am grateful to Jampa Samten for providing this information (letter of 23 October, 1992).

² This *Kanjur* awaits analysis and cataloguing. The texts are not listed in the tables of contents attached to 12 of the 15 extant Sūtra volumes, and I did not notice them in a cursory examination of the remaining three volumes. They may, of course, have been included in one of the missing Sūtra volumes, or in the “Miscellaneous Prajñāpāramitā” volume, which is also missing.

³ Bu ston gives them in an order different from that of the Tshal pa *Kanjurs*, and omits number 12, the *Candrasūtra*. That the omission is the result of a scribal error is clear from the fact that Bu ston refers elsewhere to 13 texts (see below).

⁴ Section VII; this is followed by VIII, a collection of prayers and auspicious verses (*bsño ba smon lam bkra śis*), which are placed at the end of *Kanjurs* as benedictions, and section IX, a list of texts “which were definitely translated in the early period but were not included in the *Kanjur*” at the time of Bu ston’s writing (*snar ’gyur nes pa den sañ gi bka’ ’gyur du ma tshud cin ma rñed pa*). The catalogue numbers and sections are from the romanized edition of Nishioka (1980). There is a misprint on p. 76, where the texts in question are given as 367–80, for which read 369–80. This — and the fact that Bu ston lists only 12 titles — has given rise to an error in Szerb 1990, note 19 to p. 106, which lists the texts translated by Ņi ma rgyal mtshan (for whom see below) as Nishioka 368–80, thereby including Nishioka 368 = Q 787, a version of the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* translated from Chinese. His statement “there are no translators indicated in the Peking catalogue except for [Q] 787. Here Ņi ma rgyal mtshan is not mentioned” may be disregarded.

translations, and whether they belonged to “the Greater or the Lesser Vehicle”.¹

Doubts about the first point most probably arose from the fact that early translations of (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin counterparts of some of the 13 texts do in fact exist.² Here we may turn to the colophons of the 13 texts in the Them spangs ma tradition as represented by the London, Narthang, Stog Palace, and Tokyo *Kanjurs*.³ For the *Mahāsamaya-sūtra* (1.4 in the present study), the colophon notes that “the present text agrees completely with the early translation”.⁴ The “early translation” must refer to the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin recension, the *Mahāsamāja-sūtra*, translated ca. 800 by Jinamitra and others. The colophon to the *Maitrī-sūtra* (1.5 in the present study) notes that the text deals with the same subject as the early translation [entitled] *Maitreya-vyākaraṇa*.⁵ The colophon to the

¹ *’Di rnam sñar gyi dañ zlos mi zlos theg pa che chuñ gañ yin dpyad par bya’o*. Sumpa mkhan po Ye śes dpal ’byor more or less reproduces Bu ston’s text, listing 12 titles in abbreviated form, and then noting *mdo rnam sna ma dag dañ zlos mi zlos dañ theg pa che chuñ dpyod*: Sarat Chandra Das, *Pag Sam Jon Zang*, [Calcutta, 1908] Kyoto, 1984, p. 415 (with some misprints). The Derge, Lhasa, and Urga *Kanjurs* also paraphrase Bu ston’s statement, as cited below in note 1 on page 82.

² Full bibliographical details are given below under the appropriate titles. In the present context “early translations” (*sna ’gyur*) refers to those done in the “early period of diffusion of the dharma” (*sna dar*), from the 8th to the first half of the 9th centuries.

³ For the first three I have consulted the actual texts (Skorupski’s transcription of the Stog colophons [Skorupski 1985] contains a few minor inaccuracies), except for in a few cases when I had access only to Skorupski’s catalogue for Stog. I am grateful to Jonathan Silk (Kyoto) for checking the Tokyo Manuscript colophons.

⁴ *Tshig ’dir yod kun snar ’gyur dañ mtshuñs*: L XXXVI(4), 115b7; N 350, 564b2; S 292, 124a1; T 289, 114a2.

⁵ *Snar* (LNS: *sna* T and Skorupski for S) *’gyur byams pa luñ bstan dañ don cig* (LN: *gcig* T and Skorupski for Stog: partly effaced *ga* evident in S): L XXXVI(5), 124a4; N 351, 574b6; S 293, 133b7; T 290, 122b2. The *Maitreya-vyākaraṇa* is a different Maitreya text, probably of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin school, for which cf. Lévi 1932, pp. 355–402 and Schopen 1982, pp. 228–35.

Candra-sūtra (1.12 in the present study) notes that “there is also an early translation”.¹ That this refers to the anonymous translation of a (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin recension of the same title is clear from the colophon to the latter, which in the Stog Palace and Tokyo editions notes that “it is evident that this is the same sūtra as that translated by Thar pa lo tsa [ba]”.² The Them spangs ma editors thus realized that the two *Candra-sūtras* were related. The colophon to the *Mahāmaṅgala-sūtra* (1.13 in the present study) also notes the existence of an early translation; the reference is presumably to the anonymous translation of a *Devaparipṛcchā-maṅgalagāthā* of unknown school.³ The Them spangs

Oddly enough, the *Maitreya-vyākaraṇa* is not included in the Them spangs ma *Kanjurs* (London, Stog, Ulan Bator), nor in Derge, Lithang, or Cone. Nonetheless, it was known and available at rGyal rtse, since the biography of Situ Rab brtan refers to a painting based on the *Byams pa luṅ bstan pa'i mdo*: see *Rab brtan kun bzañ 'phags kyi rnam thar*, Bod ljongs mi mañs dpe skrun khan, 1987, p. 95. The colophon describes it as an early translation by Jinamitra and dPal brtsegs rakṣita; it is listed in Bu ston's Catalogue (§ 83, under Hīnayāna, Theg chuñ), and included in the Phug brag (F 30, in Vol. ca of Avataṃsaka!), Peking (B[82]5, *mdo a*; Q 1011, *mdo hu*), Narthang (N 329, *mdo sa*), and Lhasa (H 350, *mdo sa*) *Kanjurs*. It is not clear whether the *'Phags pa byams pas luṅ bstan pa* listed in the IDan dkar Catalogue as translated from Chinese (Lalou 265) is a version of the text.

¹ *Sñar* (LNT: *sña S*) *'gyur yañ yod*: L XXXVI(18), 196b2; N 358, 595b7; S 306, 217a5; T 303, 195a1.

² Skorupski § 63, T 63, 232b3–4, *'di dañ thar pa lo tsas* (S: *tshas T*) *bsgyur ba de mdo gcig* (S: *cig T*) *tu snañ*. The remark most probably occurs in L, which I was unable to consult. It is not found in N 316 (*mdo la*, 409b), which here follows the Tshal pa lineage. For the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin version, see below, § 1.12; for Thar pa lo tsa ba as a name of Ñi ma rgyal mtshan, translator of the 13 texts, see below.

³ *Sñar* (LNT: *sña S*) *'gyur yañ yod*: L XXXVI(19), 197b3; N 359, 597a4; S 307, 218b1; T 304, 196a2. For the *Devaparipṛcchā-maṅgalagāthā* (*IHas žus pa'i bkra śis kyi tshigs su bcad pa*) see below § 1.13. The text does not seem to be included in the Them spangs ma *Kanjurs*. It is not S 279, since the final line cited by Skorupski (n. 2) is different (I was unable to check L). It is not among the group of *svasti-gāthās* at the end of the Sūtra division (*mdo ji*) in the London (*ji*, 379a1–385a3) or Stog Palace (§§ 328–32, *ji* 385a5–391a7) Ms *Kanjurs*, and

ma colophons also say that there is an early translation of the *Mahākāśyapa-sūtra* (1.10 in the present study);¹ I do not know to which text this might refer. The Them spangs ma editors do not note that the *Dharmacakrapravartana-* and *Āṭānāṭiya-sūtras* — numbers 1.1 and 1.3 of the present study — also have early translation counterparts. The colophon to the *Dharmacakra-sūtra* — the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin early translation counterpart of 1.1 — does, however, note that “it is apparent that this is the same sūtra as that translated by Thar pa lo tsa ba”.² In the case of 1.3, the omission may be due to the fact that the Tibetan titles of the two versions are quite different: *ICaṅ lo can gyi pho brañ gi mdo* for the Theravādin *Āṭānāṭiya*, and *mDo chen po kun tu rgyu ba dañ kun tu rgyu ba ma yin pa dañ mthun pa'i mdo* for the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Āṭānāṭiya*.

(In addition to those cited here, the Them spangs ma colophons — as represented by London, Stog, and [when it is based on the Them spangs ma] Narthang — occasionally give brief notes on the nature of other texts. Another example is “this belongs to the first dispensation” [that is, the Śrāvakayāna] noted for the *Dirghanakhaparivṛājaka-paripṛcchā*, the *Nandappravrajyā-sūtra*, the *Mahāśūnyatā-nāma-mahāsūtra*, and the **Vāsiṣṭha-sūtra*.³ The notes are not systematic, since

Jonathan Silk has informed me that it seems to be missing in the Tokyo Ms. The *IHas žus pa'i bkra śis kyi tshigs bcad* listed in Bu ston (§ 400) is presumably the same text.

¹ *Sñar* (LNT: *sña S*) *'gyur yod*: L XXXVI(16), 195a1; N 356, 594a4; S 304, 215b3; T 301, 193a8.

² Skorupski § 208, T 208, 5a7, *thar pa lo tsa bas* (S: *tstshas T*) *bsgyur ba dañ* (T adds *l*) *mdo'i* (T adds *no* [!]) *gcig tu snañ*. I was unable to consult London. The remark is not in N 322 (*mdo la*, 434a4) which here follows the Tshal pa lineage. For the *Dharmacakra-sūtra* see below, § 1.1.

³ *'Di bka' dañ por gtogs so*, or variants thereof: Skorupski §§ 54, 57, 202, 206, respectively. For the *Mahāśūnyatā-nāma-mahāsūtra* (S 202) — I have been unable to check the others — the remark also occurs in London (*ža* 310a2) and Tokyo (*ža* 309b7), as well as in the as yet unstudied *Nes Don* collection

no such remark is made for other “first dispensation” texts such as the remaining *Mahāsūtras*, which belong to the Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition. A study of these brief remarks would contribute to our understanding of the Them spangs ma tradition. The fact that two of the texts referred to in the colophons studied here — the *Maitreya-vyākaraṇa* and the *Devaparipṛcchā-maṅgala-gāthā* — are not included in the Them spangs ma tradition raises interesting questions.)

Bu ston’s doubts about the second point — whether the 13 texts belong to the Mahāyāna or the Hīnayāna — can be laid to rest, since we know that they belong to the Theravādin school, and hence the Hīnayāna or Śrāvakayāna. Although most Tshal pa editions place the texts in the Prajñāpāramitā divison, the collection of Mahāyāna sūtras of the “Perfection of Wisdom” class, they were not considered to be Prajñāpāramitā texts. This is noted in the catalogue (*dkar chag*) of the Derge *Kanjur*; the note is reproduced in the Urga and Lhasa catalogues. “Although the [13] newly translated *sūtras* do not belong to the Prajñāpāramitā, the translations of the later period were formerly placed together at the end of this volume [that is, the “Miscellaneous Prajñāpāramitā”]. It appears that they were [so] placed without considering whether they belong to the Great or the Lesser Vehicle, or whether or not they are duplicates of early translations. Here we have done the same”.¹ The 13 texts may have been placed there simply due to

(typescript by Gene Smith, Vol. II, text *na*). The statement is not found in Narthang — which in this case follows the Tshal pa transmission — or in any other *Kanjur* (BCDHJQ) including Phug brag and the incomplete manuscript *Kanjur* from Batang kept in the Newark Museum, New Jersey (*va*, 238a6).

¹ Derge 119a1, Bethlenfalvy 1980, pp. 13–14, Lhasa 439a2 (p. 877) (with a few minor variants): *gsar 'gyur gyi mdo rnams ni šes phyin du gtogs pa ma yin mod kyi | dus physis 'gyur ba rnams phyogs gcig tu snar nas glegs bam 'di'i gšam du bkod 'dug cin | theg pa che chuñ gañ yin dañ | sna 'gyur dañ zlos pa yod med sogs kyañ ma brtags par bžag snañ ba bžin | 'dir yañ de ltar byas pa*. See also the remarks in Ryohei Tokuoka, “The Comparison of the Lha-sa Edition with the

exigencies of space: the volume in question contains a number of short Prajñāpāramitā texts (180 folios in the Derge edition), not enough to fill a volume. It is also possible that the editors of the Tshal pa *Kanjur* recognized their status as *paritta*, and placed them there as an auspicious conclusion to the division, just as they placed various prayers and auspicious verses at the end of other divisions.¹

Sde-dge and Peking Editions”, *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, XV, 2 (March, 1967), p. 59.

¹ For this practice, see Skilling 1992, pp. 129–35.

Translators and date of translation

Information about the translators of the 13 texts is given in colophons. For this study, I will utilize the colophons of the Derge (D) edition, in comparison with those of the Berlin (B), London (L), Narthang (N), Peking (Q), and Stog Palace (S) editions.¹ The colophons in these editions may be divided into four groups, given here according to the numbers assigned to the 13 texts in the present article.

1) Colophon to 1.1 in DLNS; no colophon in BQ:

The colophon states that the translation was done “at the behest of the *Ža lu sKu zañ* Grags pa rgyal mtshan, *Du dben śa*, who had unbreakable faith in the Buddha’s teaching,² who was accomplished in the two *gtsug lag*,³ and who had great prestige and authority, like the waxing moon”.

Grags pa rgyal mtshan was the fourth ruler (*dpon*) of the *Ža lu* myriarchy in gTsang province — one of the 13 myriarchies of the period — and a cousin-in-law of the Sa skya pa patriarch bZaṅ po dpal (1262–1322, for whom see below).⁴ *Sku zañ* (“respected uncle”) is a title unique

¹ For DLNQS, I have consulted the original texts: D in the “Karmapa edition”; S in the facsimile edition, compared with Skorupski’s catalogue (which gives the colophons in full); L and N at the Oriental and India Office Collections of the British Library, London. (For the latter I have used the boxed edition [Tib. E 30]). For B I have used the Beckh’s catalogue, which gives summaries of the colophons only. For the final colophon (4) I have also consulted Cone (C): I am grateful to Susan Meinheit (Washington, D.C.) for providing a copy.

² This seems to be a stock phrase: see Kun mkhyen ’jigs med dbaṅ po, *Co ne’i bstan ’gyur dkar chag*, Kan su’u mi rigs dpe skrun khaṅ, 1989, p. 441, where it is applied to Kun dga’ don grub.

³ I have been unable to find a definition of the *gtsug lag gñis*: “two principles”?

⁴ For *Ža lu* (also spelt *Žva lu*), see Tucci 1989–91, pp. 70–72; Ferrari 1958, p. 60 and note 426 (p. 143); Vitali 1990, pp. 89–122; for Grags pa rgyal mtshan, see Tucci 1949, Vol. II, Table XVI; Tucci 1989–91, p. 87, and “List of the Princes of Zha-lu”, facing p. 90; Ruegg 1966, pp. 9–10, 17, 31–32.

to the nobles of *Ža lu*, signifying that they gave daughters in marriage to the Sa skya pas, then rulers of Tibet.¹ In this case, a sister of Grags pa rgyal mtshan was married to bDag űid chen po bZaṅ po dpal, and one of his daughters to Sa skya lama Don yod rgyal mtshan (1310–1344).² *Du dben śa*, which transcribes the Mongol *du uen sha* from the Chinese *tu-yüan shuai*, was a title conferred by the Mongols.³

The encomium is not an exaggeration: Grags pa rgyal mtshan was indeed a man of considerable power. Vitali notes that “no other clan in Tibet was in a similar position of strength and authority... than the *Ža lu pa*”. Furthermore, Grags pa rgyal mtshan, whose power was enhanced through marriage into the powerful Tshal pa clan, was, according to Vitali, “the greatest *sku zañ* of them all”.⁴ He was invested with his fief by Oljadu, successor to Qubilai Khan (Öljaitü = Ch’eng tsung, reigned 1294–1307), from whom he received the title Gu śrī (imperial advisor).⁵ I have not found a source that gives the dates of Grags pa rgyal mtshan’s life or when he became *sku zañ* or received his other titles (note that the colophon does not describe him as *gu śrī*). Vitali (p. 100) suggests that he became *sku zañ* in 1306; if this is so, then the translations (or at least the colophon) would date to 1306 or later. Sources describe Grags pa rgyal mtshan as “a faithful donor considered to be a manifestation of the

¹ Tucci 1989–91, p. 84, note 2; Ruegg 1966, pp. 9–10 and notes thereto; Vitali 1990, pp. 98–99.

² Tucci 1989–91, p. 80.

³ cf. Tucci 1949 p. 33; p. 696, note 393; Ruegg 1966, p. 168, note 1; and Luciano Petech, “Yüan Official Terms in Tibetan”, in Ihara and Yamaguchi 1992, Vol. 2, p. 670: “commanding general in a circuit (*lu*), ranking 2–b. In Central Tibet there were two *tu-yüan-shuai* commanding the Mongol units stationed in the country. In the 14th century this title was freely granted to Tibetan noblemen.”

⁴ Tucci 1989–91, p. 84; Vitali 1990, pp. 99, 100. Tshal pa, in the central province of dBus, was another of the 13 myriarchies.

⁵ Vitali p. 100; Tucci 1989–91, p. 87.

Great King Vaiśravaṇa”.¹ He and his son, Kun dga’ don grub, were the immediate patrons of Bu ston Rinpoche, who spent much of his career as abbot at Ža lu. They sponsored renovations to the gSer khañ at Ža lu; these are described in the biography of Bu ston (Ruegg 1966, pp. 89–94, the most important passage on Grags pa rgyal mtshan in the biography).

The colophon goes on to describe the translators as “the Great *Paṇḍita* Ānandaśrī² — from the isle of Ceylon, a journey of 600 yojanas to the south of Vajrāsana, the Bodhimaṇḍa (i.e., Bodh Gayā), who had properly entered the religious life (i.e., taken lower ordination) from a *brāhmaṇa* family, who had taken full ordination and thoroughly mastered the *Tripitaka* — and the learned (*bahuśruta*) translator, the Śākya *bhikṣu*³ Ņi ma rgyal mtshan dPal bzañ po”, and states that the translation was done “at the seat of translators, the Great Monastery (*mahāvihāra*) of the glorious (*śrī*) Thar pa gliñ”.⁴

¹ Ruegg 1966, p. 89 and folio 14a6, *bstan pa gus pas mchod pa’i sbyin bdag rgyal po chen po rnam thos sras kyi sprul par grags pa*.

² The name is sometimes transliterated as Ānanta- or Ananta-śrī. The colophons in DLNQ clearly read Ānanda-. For variants in the editions of Bu ston’s *Chos ’byuñ*, see Szerb 1990, pp. 106 notes 21, 22 and 112 notes 15, 16.

³ The epithet Śākya *bhikṣu* is already met with in early Indian inscriptions; according to some it means an adherent of the Mahāyāna.

⁴ D 183a4; L 7b8; S 6b6 (I was unable to check N 431b because the pages were stuck together; such as I could see seemed the same): *sañs rgyas kyi bstan pa la mi phyed pa’i dad pa dañ ldan žiñ | gtsug lag gñis la thugs legs par byañ ba | dpal ’byor dbañ phyug dam pa dkar phyogs kyi zla ba ltar ’phel ba’i ža lu ba sku žañ (L 8a) grags pa rgyal mtshan du dben sa’i bka’ luñ gis byañ chub kyi sñiñ po rdo rje’i (S 7a) gdan las | lho phyogs su dpag tshad drug brgya tsam bgrod pa’i gnas | siñ gha gliñ pa bram ze’i rigs las legs par rab tu byuñ žiñ | bsñen par rdzogs pa sde snod gsum la thugs legs par byañ pa’i paṇḍita chen po ā nanda śrī’i žal sñā nas | mañ du thos pa’i lo tsha ba śākya’i dge sloñ ñi ma rgyal mtshan dpal bzañ pos | skad gñis smra ba rnam kyi gdan sa | gtsug lag khañ chen po dpal thar pa gliñ du bsgyur ciñ žus te gtan la phab pa’o. A rather inaccurate attempt at a translation of the whole colophon (from N ?) was made by Feer (1870, pp. 353–55).*

2) Colophons to 1.2–9 in DLNS; no colophons in BQ:

Here the colophons are an abridged form of the preceding, giving only the names of the translators and the place of translation.¹

3) Colophons to 1.10–12 in LNS only; no colophons in BDQ:

Here LNS repeat the “abridged colophon” as in 1.2–9.

4) Colophons to 1.13 in BCDLNQS:

The final colophon in BCDQ is a collective colophon for all 13 texts.² It begins with a six-line verse *prañidhāna*, followed by a list of the 13 titles. After this it is close to the first or longer colophon of DLNS, giving further details about the sponsor. Grags pa rgyal mtshan was lord of the “Holy Self-originated Lokeśvara Monastery”³ at Tshoñ ’dus ’Gur mo, the commercial centre of the Ņañ ro valley in rTsañ (gTsañ) in the

¹ *Paṇḍi ta* (LN 1.5–13 add *chen po* | [|| in LN 1.5,6,11]: not in LN 1.2–4) *ānanda śrī’i žal sñā nas* | (LN 1.2 add here *dañ* |) *mañ du thos pa’i lo tsha ba śākya’i dge sloñ ñi ma rgyal mtshan dpal bzañ pos* || *skad gñis smra ba rnam kyi (kyis LN for 1.3) gdan sa | gtsug lag khañ chen po dpal thar pa gliñ du bsgyur ciñ žus te gtan la phab pa’o*. (I have listed a few selected variants to show the close agreement of L and N, which suggests that N copied the 13 texts from the Šel dkar Ms, even though it placed them in a different volume [see above]. The figures following the variants refer to numbering of the sūtras in the present paper.)

² Beckh’s catalogue of B gives only a brief summary of the colophon; however, since B and Q both belong to the Peking branch of the Tshal pa tradition, I assume here that the colophons are identical. For a translation of the colophon from the Mongolian *Kanjur*, see Bischoff 1968, pp. 337–40; for further notes see de Jong 1972, pp. 536–37 (§ 791).

³ Phags pa rañ byuñ ’jig rten dbañ phyug gi gtsug lag khañ (*Ārya-svayambhū-lokeśvara-vihāra): for the “self-originated” Lokeśvara at Ža lu, “found by a miraculous white goat with a turquoise beard”, see Vitali 1990, p. 97, Ferrari 1958, *loc. cit.*, and the description in the biography of Bu ston: *byañ phyogs kha ba can gyi ljoñs | gañs ri dpal dañ ldan pas bskor ba’i dbus | rje bitsun spyān ras gzigs kyi sku gzugs rañ byon bžugs pa’i gnas ...* (Ruegg 1966, folio 14a4–5; tr. p. 90). The monastery had three other famed Lokeśvara statues housed in the same chapel (Vitali, 92, 97). For this temple see Ruegg 1966, pp. 17–18 and 34.

Land of Tibet,¹ the Mass of Snow Mountains, [which lies] 100 *yojanas* to the north-east of Vajrāsana, the Bodhimaṇḍa [Bodh Gayā] in the Āryadeśa at the centre of Jambudvīpa.²

LNS, of which LS, as seen above, divide the 13 texts into two groups, give here only the “abridged colophon” — identical to those of LNS for texts 1.2–12 — in place of the “collective colophon”.

It is now clear that there are only two different colophons: the Them spangs ma colophon, represented by DLNS in (1) above — of which (2) and (3) are an abbreviation — and the Tshal pa colophon, represented by BCDQ in (4). Although they convey much the same information, often in the same words, they are not identical. Without going into too much detail, the reasons for the difference in the assignation of colophons are most likely as follows. The Tshal pa *Kanjurs* kept the 13 texts together; hence B and Q, which follow the

¹ For the geography of 'Gur mo in Lower Ṇāṅ (Ṇāṅ — also spelt Myaṅ — smad) see Tucci 1989–91, pp. 47 foll. Bu ston took *upasampadā* at “the market town of gTsaṅ called Tshoṅ 'dus 'Gur mo” in 1312: Ruegg 1966, p. 77 and folio 9b, *gtsaṅ tshoṅ 'dus 'gur mo*.

² C 317a3, D 284a4, Q 301b5, *de ltar mdo bcu gsum po 'di rnams ni 'dzam bu 'i gliṅ gi dbus | 'phags pa 'i yul | byaṅ chub kyi sñiṅ po rdo rje 'i gdan las dpag tshad brgya tsam byaṅ śar du* (CD: Q om. *du*) *bgrod pa 'i bod yul | gaṅs ri 'i khrod | rtsaṅ ṅāṅ ro tshoṅ 'dus 'gur mo 'i sa cha | 'phags pa raṅ byuṅ 'jig rten dbaṅ phyug gi gtsug lag khaṅ gi bdag po ||* (CQ: | D) *saṅs rgyas beom ldan 'das kyi bstan pa la lhaṅ par mos śiṅ | dpal 'byor daṅ chab srid du ma la dbaṅ phyug dam pa 'i go 'phaṅ thob pa 'i źal bu* (CQ: źa lu D) *pa sku źaṅ grags pa rgyal mtshan du dben śa 'i bka' luṅ gi* | (from here on the text agrees with colophon [1]). A similar description of the relation of Tibet, in this case Lhasa, to Bodh Gayā is used by the Fifth Dalai Lama: cf. Macdonald 1963, p. 57 and p. 111, note 24, *'phags yul rdo rje gdan nas byaṅ phyogs su dpags tshad brgya bgod pa na gdan sa chen po dpal ldan sa skya daṅ zuṅ du 'brel ba lha sa* Vajrāsana is taken as the point of reference because it is traditionally held to be the centre of the universe.

Tshal arrangement, have only the final, collective colophon.¹ The Them spangs ma *Kanjurs* divide the 13 texts into two groups; therefore L and S, which follow the Them spangs ma arrangement, give colophons for each text.² For the Sūtra division, D follows the Tshal pa arrangement: while the editors of D based themselves primarily on the Lithang recension of the Tshal pa (J), they also consulted a manuscript belonging to the Them spangs ma tradition — as stated in the catalogue (*dkar chag*) of D itself, and confirmed by text-critical studies. In the present case D adopts the Them spangs ma colophons for 1.1–9; hence its agreement with L(N)S. For some reason, D reverts to the Tshal pa tradition for 1.10–12, and gives no colophons. Finally, since it follows the Tshal pa tradition in treating the 13 texts as a single group, it ends with the collective colophon of that tradition at 1.13. In the present case N follows the Them spangs ma in terms of textual transmission, and thus gives a colophon for each text. In terms of arrangement, however, it agrees with the Tshal pa in keeping the 13 texts together at the end of the (albeit different) volume.

The verse colophon to text 1.14 further describes Ānandaśrī as “virtuous, foremost among the many thousands [of monks] in the *saṃgha* of the land of Sinhala; the disciple of Dīpaṃkara (?),³ who

¹ It is likely that the Lithang (J) and Cone (C — which follows J) do the same. For Cone I can confirm that it has the final collective colophon, but not whether it omits the earlier colophons.

² It is likely that the Tokyo (T) and Ulan Bator Them spangs ma (U) manuscripts do the same.

³ *Mar me mdzad = dīpaṃkara* could be taken as an epithet, followed by *slob [dpon] = ācārya*, to mean “illuminator, teacher”. However, such a use of *dīpaṃkara* seems unusual. The passage is in verse: *slob* alone can equal *śaikṣa*, as can *slob pa*; it can also stand for *slob ma = antevāsin, śiṣya*. Since it is a common practice to establish one’s teacher’s credentials or prestige by naming his teacher(s), rather than his disciples, I have taken it in the latter sense. The name Dīpaṃkara is known in Sri Lanka: a Coḷiya Dīpaṃkara was a disciple of a Vanaratna Ānanda: G.P. Malalasekera, *The Pāli Literature of Ceylon*, Colombo, [1928] 1958, p. 220.

resides in Vajrāsana; the great *paṇḍita* Ānandaśrī, the virtuous; the monk endowed with the vision of the dharma (*dharmacakṣu*, “eye of the dharma”), skilled in the two languages; one who seeks the benefit of the [Buddha’s] dispensation (*śāsana*, the excellent one”.¹

The second translator, the Tibetan Ņi ma rgyal mtshan dPal bzañ po, is well known as one of the teachers of the famous scholar Bu ston Rin chen grub (1290–1364).² In his *History of Buddhism (Chos ’byuñ)*, Bu ston states: “My teacher (*guru*) Ņi ma rgyal mtshan dPal bzañ po studied in Nepal for fourteen years; he translated 13 sūtras — the *Giri-ānanda-sūtra*, etc.³ — with Paṇḍita Ānandaśrī. Furthermore, he made many other fundamental translations and corrections to translations.”⁴

Bu ston’s biography, composed by his “spiritual son” (*thugs sras*) Rin chen rnam rgyal and completed in 1366,⁵ does not state exactly

¹ N 328, *mdo sa*, 477a2, Q 1010, *hu* 311b3, *yon tan dañ ldan siñ ga gliñ yul gyi* || *ston phrag mañ po’i dge ’dun kun gyi gtsō* || *mar me mdzad slob rdo rje gdan bžugs pa* || *pañ chen ā nan da śrī yon tan can* || *dge sloñ chos kyi spyān can skad gñis mkhas* || *bstan la phan ’dod bzañ po (de ñid dañ* ||). The colophon is translated from the Mongolian in Bischoff 1968, pp. 537–38; for further notes see de Jong 1972, pp. 537, 543–45.

² *BA* II 793; cf. also p. 800. Ruegg 1966, pp. 80–86, Thar pa lo tsā ba. Gene Smith (oral communication, January, 1993) informs me that according to the *Ñañ chuñ*, Ņi ma rgyal mtshan belonged to the dPyal family, which owned Thar pa gliñ, and that the monastery was named by the Kashmiri *paṇḍita* Śākyaśrībhadra (1140s–1226). (For the dPyal family and the teachings that they transmitted, see *BA* I 395–97.)

³ The list of texts in Bu ston’s catalogue begins with this sūtra (Nishioka 369).

⁴ Lhasa xylograph *ya* 140b2: *bdag gi bla ma ñi ma rgyal mtshan dpal bzañ pos bal por lo bcu bžir sbyaṅs pa mdzad | ri’i kun dga’i mdo la sogs mdo bcu gsum tsam paṇḍita ā nanta śrī spyān drañs te bsgyur ro* || *gžan yañ gži ’gyur dañ ’gyur bcos mañ po mdzad do* ||. (For variants, see Szerb 1990, pp. 106,8–107,2.) Obermiller (1932, p. 224) translates “fourteen sūtras”; all editions consulted by Szerb give thirteen (*bcu gsum tsam*); cf. also Nishioka III (1983), p. 70, where Bu ston refers to *kho bo’i bla ma skad gñis smra ba ñi ma’i mtshan can* (sic).

⁵ Ruegg 1966, pp. 41, 178.

when he studied under Ņi ma rgyal mtshan. It is clear, however, that he did so sometime between 1312, when he was ordained at the age of 23, and 1320, when he arrived in Źa lu to become abbot. During this period he stayed mainly at Khro phu, but also undertook several journeys. The biography states that he visited Ņi ma rgyal mtshan for fourteen months continuously, and also for periods of two, three, or four months, over a period of four years, and that “for this *bla ma* he had special regard, holding him to be the Buddha himself”.¹ It describes him as “the great *upadhyāya* renowned as the ‘Translator from Thar pa [gliñ]’, famed in the East, West, and Centre of India as Tibet’s chief *bhadanta*, who had mastery over the profound meaning of spiritual power, a translator (*lotsava*) who was the eye of the world (*lokacakṣu*)”.²

Ņi ma rgyal mtshan is credited with the translation of several other *Kanjur* texts, all in the Tantra (*rgyud*) division. He translated the *Sarvatathāgata-uṣṇīṣavijaya-nāma-dhāraṇīkalpa* single-handedly (*rañ gis bsgyur ba*, that is, without the assistance of an Indian pandit), also at Thar pa gliñ.³ In the colophon he is again described as the “learned translator” (*mañ du thos pa’i lo tsa ba*) and also as “the elder” (*gnas brtan* = *sthavira*), Śrī Ņi ma rgyal mtshan dPal bzañ po. Bu ston, in his *Tantra Catalogue*, describes him as “the great preceptor” (*mkhan chen* = *mahopadhyāya*).⁴ In the Stog Palace and Derge *Kanjurs*, he is credited with the revision of the *Śrī-Vajrabhairavakalpa-tantrarāja*, “having learned it from the great accomplished one (*grub thob chen po*) Karṇaśrī”.⁵ In the Phug brag *Kanjur* only, he is credited with the

¹ The date of ordination is from Ruegg 1966, p. 77, the date of Bu ston’s arrival in Źa lu from p. 93. Bu ston’s studies under Ņi ma rgyal mtshan are described at pp. 80–86.

² Ruegg 1966, p. 80 and folio 11a1.

³ S 551 (colophon in Skorupski, p. 270); D 598, Q 200.

⁴ Eimer 1989, § 225, p. 98.

⁵ D 470, S 433; Q 106 seems to be the earlier, unrevised translation. Bu ston’s *Tantra Catalogue* (Eimer 1989, § 103) does not name the translators.

translation of the *Śrī-Guhyagarbhatattvaviniścaya-mahātantra*, which he did at Thar pa gliñ at the behest of bCom ldan ral gri (who was active in the compilation of the Old Narthang Manuscript *Kanjur* in the early 14th century).¹

The bulk of his translations are found in various divisions of the *Tanjur*: the Collection of Eulogies (*bstod tshogs*), the Tantra Commentaries (*rgyud 'grel*), Grammar (*sgra mdo*), Medicine (*gso rig*), and Miscellaneous (*sna tshogs*). A number of these were translated during his stay in the Kathmandu Valley in Nepal;² others at Thar pa gliñ,³ at the Cuñ pa Monastery in Ņañ ro,⁴ or at the Śer Monastery.⁵ The Nepalese or Indian masters with whom he worked or studied include “the great grammarian” (*sgra pa chen po*) Jetakarṇa (in Nepal),⁶ *pañḍita* Mañjuśrī,⁷ *pañḍita* Gautamabhadra of Magadha,⁸ *pañḍita* Puruṣottama of Vārāṇasī,⁹ *pañḍita* Buddhaśrī of Eastern India,¹⁰ and *pañḍitas* Gomaśrī and Buddhaśrījñāna.¹¹ In several places Ņi ma rgyal mtshan is described as “accomplished in the divine language”, that is, Sanskrit.¹²

¹ F 754; cf. Samten 1992, pp. xxi–xxii.

² *Bal po yam bu'i groñ khyer du*: at least D 1114, 1234, 4385–86.

³ D 1259–60, 1299–1300, 1585, 2026–27, 2035, 2489, 2615, 3054–56, 3125, 3732–33.

⁴ D 1577–78.

⁵ D 2719, 4306.

⁶ See references in note 2 above, plus presumably D 1273, although the location is not mentioned, and D 1585, translated at Thar pa gliñ after “hearing” the text from Mañjuśrī and Jetakarṇa, and D 3732–33, also translated at Thar pa gliñ after “hearing” the text from rGyal ba'i sñan = Jetakarṇa; D 4270 (location not mentioned); D 4306, where he is described as a *brāhmaṇa*.

⁷ D 1237, 1585 (where he is described as Nepalese, *bal po'i*); cf. de Jong 1972, § 5.

⁸ D 1562–64.

⁹ D 3054–56, 3125.

¹⁰ D 4306, *rgya gar gyi śar phyogs kyi pañḍi ta*

¹¹ Derge Catalogue *śrī* 462a4.

¹² D 2026–27, 2035: *lha'i skad la legs par zugs pa*.

Thar pa gliñ, “Island of Liberation” (*Mokṣadvīpa) is a monastery located in gTsañ in Central Tibet, not far south of Ža lu.¹ As seen above, the colophons to the texts studied herein describe it as “the great monastery” (*gtsug lag khañ chen po = mahāvihāra*) and the “seat of translators” (*skad gñis smra ba rnams kyi gdan sa*). In later literature, such as the two *Records of Teachings Received* referred to above, the monastery and Ņi ma rgyal mtshan were identified with each other: he was called “the translator from Thar [pa gliñ]” (Thar lo [tsa ba]),² and the monastery was famous as “the residence of the Thar pa lotsava”.³ In early December, 1783, Captain Samuel Turner, emissary of Warren Hastings, visited Thar pa gliñ. Chapter IX of his account describes his departure from Teshoo Loombo (Tashilhunpo) and journey to Terpaling (Thar pa gliñ) (via Tsondue [= Tshoñ 'dus] where he and his companion, Mr Saunders, “enjoyed the distinction of having been the first of our nation, that ever signalized themselves by skating in Tibet”). At “Terpaling” he had an audience with the infant “Teshoo Lama” (the 18 month old fourth reincarnation of the Panchen Lama), to whom he delivered the Governor General’s greetings and presents (“a string of pearls and coral”). He notes that the young reincarnation “conducted himself with astonishing dignity and decorum”. At that time there were 300 monks at the monastery, “appointed to perform religious service with the Teshoo Lama”. Chapter X describes Turner’s departure from Thar pa gliñ and return to Bengal.⁴

¹ For Thar pa gliñ, see Tucci 1989–91, p. 70 and Vitali 1990, p. 103. For its location, see Ferrari 1958, endpiece map; *The Nyingma Edition of the sDe dge bKa' 'gyur and bsTan 'gyur*, Dharma Publishing, Berkeley, 1981, Vol. 93, map at front, “Gzhis-ka-rtse, Historic Sites”.

² The two *gSan yigs* call him Thar lo fii ma rgyal mtshan. See also BA I 104 and II 792.

³ Ferrari 1958, p. 60 and p. 144, notes 436, 437.

⁴ Captain Samuel Turner, *An Account of an Embassy to the Court of the Teshoo Lama, in Tibet; Containing a Narrative of a Journey through Bootan, and Part*

Ānandaśrī translated one other text, the *Ārya-maitrī-sūtra*, § 1.14 in the present study. It will be seen below that this is a different translation of a text similar but not identical to § 1.5, the *Maitrī-sūtra*. According to the colophon of 1.14, Ānandaśrī collaborated on the translation with Kun dga' rgyal mtshan Thub bstan dpal bzañ po — “monk, lineage-bearer, successor to the great translators, who through good fortune met Ānandaśrī” — at Sa skya [the seat of the Sa skya pa school]. The work was completed in “the bright half of the first month of winter of a fire-sheep (*me lug*) year, 1850 years and 10 months after the passing away of the Teacher [the Buddha], when Dharmarāja Ha shang was on the throne”.¹ The calculation uses the Theravādin Buddhist era, and is equivalent to 1307 A.C.² The use of the Theravādin era most probably comes from Ānandaśrī himself; the era was, however, already known in Tibet, particularly among the Sa skya pas, from the time of the Kashmiri Śākyaśrībhadrā (Kha che pañ chen).³ The phrase “when Dharmarāja Ha shang was on the throne” may refer to the fact that the Sa skya patriarch bDag ñid chen po bZañ po dpal (1262–1324) had been installed on the throne of Sa skya Monastery in 1306 at the age of 45, after 16 years of exile in southern China (from 1282–98) and eight years

of Tibet, London, 1800. For the historical background, see Tsepon W.D. Shakabpa, *Tibet: A Political History*, [Yale, 1967] New York, 1988, pp. 154–56.

¹ N 328, *sa*, 477a3–b4; Q 1010, *hu*, 311b5–6 (continuation of text given above in note 1 on p. 90) *de'i legs gtugs dge sloñ luñ* (N: Q — altered? — looks like *yuñ*) *rigs 'dzin || skad gñis smra ba mchog gi rjes 'jug pa || kun dga' rgyal mtshan thub bstan dpal bzañ pos || ston pa 'das nas lo ston brgyad brgya dan || lña bcu lhag pa 'i zla ba bcu 'das dus || chos kyi rgyal po ha śaṅ mña' gsol tshe || me lug dgun zla ra ba 'i yar ño la || dpal ldan bla ma kun dga' señ ge yi || sku drin la brten dpal ldan sa skyar ni || sgra don ji bzin legs par bsgyur ba yin ||*

² This date is given by Haarh (1962), p. 205. The calculation of the Buddhist Era, 1850 minus 543 = 1307 would seem to agree with the Siamese calculation, unless the details of the months show otherwise; the Ceylonese calculation would be 1308.

³ For the various calculations of the Buddhist era known in Tibet, see Macdonald 1963, Vogel 1991, and Ruegg 1992, pp. 263–90.

of confinement in Tibet.¹ The title “Ha shang”, “[Chinese] monk”, suggests that he may have received Chinese ordination at some point, but this presents problems because he had children between 1299 and 1312. He received Tibetan ordination in 1313. According to Tucci, he “was only vested with temporal authority and had no religious authority or rank up to the age of 52”, that is, 1313.²

The colophon gives the name of the patron or sponsor, Kun dga' señ ge.³ As the elder brother of 'Jam dbyaṅs Rin chen rgyal mtshan (1258–1306) — in whom power was vested during bZañ po dpal's external and internal exile — Kun dga' señ ge was the paramount religious noble of the Śar pa Bla brañ, one of the main ministerial families of the Sa skya pas. In 1307 he would have been the *de facto* power at Sa skya, and this must be why he is mentioned as patron. The *Blue Annals* (II 633) states that he was at Sa skya in 1309.

The colophon closes with non-historical verses and *pranidhānas*.

¹ cf. BA I 213, Tucci 1949, vol. 2, p. 684, and Vitali 1990, p. 118, note 129; cf. also L. Petech, “Princely Houses of the Yüan Period Connected with Tibet”, in Tadeusz Skorupski (ed.), *Indo-Tibetan Studies: Papers in honour and appreciation of Professor David L. Snellgrove's contribution to Indo-Tibetan Studies*, Tring, 1990, p. 259.

² I am grateful to Gene Smith (Jakarta) for supplying copies of relevant source materials and for guiding me through the historical maze. In a letter dated 12 July, 1992; he notes that “only a careful study of the numerous sources for this extremely complicated period can solve the puzzle”.

³ Beckh (1914) p. 68, mistakenly describes “Lama Kun-dgaḥ-señ-ge” as the translator. Kun dga' señ ge is mentioned in the *rGya bod yig tshañ* of dPal 'byor bzañ po (Chen du, Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khañ, 1985, p. 352).

Some *gSan yigs* and *Kanjur* catalogues¹ mistakenly identify Ānandaśrī's co-translator with the famous Sa skya Paṇḍita, fourth patriarch of the Sa skya pas, who lived from 1182 to 1251, and whose full name is Kun dga' rgyal mtshan dPal bzañ po. This was also done by Sylvain Lévi, who therefore interpreted the *me lug* year as 1247/8.² The identification and date are clearly wrong. Firstly, it is evident from the common elements of the colophons to 1.1, 1.13, and 1.14 that this is the same Ānandaśrī; I have shown above, on the basis of the contemporary evidence of Bu ston, that Ānandaśrī was active in the early part of the 14th century. (Note also that in the roughly chronological lists of Indian scholars and Tibetan translators given by Bu ston in his *History of Buddhism*, completed in 1322 or 23, Ānandaśrī [Szerb 1990, p. 112,5] and Ñi ma rgyal mtshan [*ibid.*, p. 119,2] are fourth last.) Secondly, the name of the co-translator, though partly identical, contains the element Thub bstan, which I have not come across in the name of Sa skya Paṇḍita.³ Thirdly, even if one wishes to consider the difference in names

¹ *Gsan yig* of the Fifth Dalai Lama (*Records of Teachings Received: the gsan-yig of the Fifth Dalai Lama Nag-dban-blo-bzan-rgya-mtsho*, Delhi, Nechung and Lakhar, 1971, p. 374), Ānandaśrī and Lo tsa ba 'Jam dbyaṅs Sa paṅ; Lhasa *Kanjur* Catalogue, p. 916, *byams pa'i mdo | ā nan ta śrī dañ | 'jam dbyaṅs sa paṅ gyi 'gyur*. Note that the identification with Mañjughōṣa ('Jam dbyaṅs) Sa [skya] paṅ [dita] is made only in catalogues and *gsan yigs* and never in the colophons themselves. It is presumably based on a hasty reading of the colophons with their mention of Sa skya and the similarity of the names, without looking further into the dates or other historical details.

² Lévi 1932, pp. 379–80. Lévi transcribes and translates the greater part of the colophon to 1.14. It is not clear whether he was influenced by the *Kanjur* catalogues. The mistaken identification and date are perpetuated in de Jong 1972, pp. 537 and 543.

³ Sa skya Paṇḍita himself gives his name as Śākya Bhikṣu Kun dga' rgyal mtshan dPal bzañ po: see Jackson 1987, I (text) 298, 299, II (translation) 366, 367. The dPal bzañ po = śrībhadrā of Sa skya Paṇḍita's name indicates that he was ordained by the Kashmiri master Śākya Śrībhadrā (see Ruegg 1966, p. 42 note 1, and Jackson 1987, I 27); in general (as in the case of Ñi ma rgyal mtshan

as a poetic embellishment of the verse colophon, and hold that Ānandaśrī was active in Tibet for nearly 70 years, Sa skya Paṇḍita was not at Sa skya in 1247/8: summoned by the Mongols, he had left in 1244, and by 1247 he was at the Mongol court in Liang-chou. He never returned to Sa skya, since he died at Liang-chou in 1251.¹ Fourthly, neither Sa skya Paṇḍita nor his biographers refer to Ānandaśrī. Finally, as shown above, the patron Kun dga' seṅ ge was at Sa skya in the early 14th century.

The 13 *gsar 'gyur* are some of the latest sūtra translations, and the latest group of sūtras, to enter the *Kanjur*. When and how did they, along with the *Maitrī-sūtra*, come to be included? Why do the former occur in two different arrangements, with variant colophons, and why is the latter missing in some *Kanjurs*? I cannot give a satisfactory answer. I can only note that one of the sūtra collections used in the compilation of the first comprehensive *Kanjur*, the Old Narthang manuscript collection, was that of Ža lu, the residence of Ñi ma rgyal mtshan's pupil Bu ston, not far from Thar pa gliñ.² Contact between Narthang and Thar pa gliñ itself is shown in the fact that the Tantra Collection of dGe bśes 'dar phyar of Thar pa gliñ was used in the compilation of the Old Narthang Tantra division,³ and that one of the compilers, bCom ldan ral gri, requested Ñi ma rgyal mtshan to translate a Tantra (see above).

Nothing else is known of Ānandaśrī. We do not know how or when he came to Tibet, or how long he stayed; all we can say is that he collaborated on the translation of fourteen texts in about the first decade of the 14th century: 13 at Thar pa gliñ with Ñi ma rgyal mtshan, and one at Sa skya with Kun dga' rgyal mtshan. It is not reported that Bu ston,

dPal bzañ po) it means ordained within the Vinaya tradition established by Śākyaśrībhadrā.

¹ Jackson 1987, I 28–29 and 31; Ruegg 1966, p. 4.

² Samten and Russell 1987, p. 31,7.

³ Samten and Russell 1987, p. 32,25.

who studied at Thar pa gliñ sometime after 1312, met the *paṇḍita*. The latter's second co-translator, Kun dga' rgyal mtshan, is not credited with any other translations in the *Kanjur* or *Tanjur*, and is otherwise unknown.

It is interesting that Bu ston's biography mentions that at Thar pa gliñ Bu ston learned "the various systems of writing of India, east and west", including that of Sinhāladvīpa (*Siñ ha gliñ*),¹ and that a Sinhālese manuscript of the *Karmavibhāgaya* was photographed by Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana at Sa skya.² These are probably part of Ānandaśrī's legacy in the Land of Snows. The colophon to 1.14 suggests that he was prominent in his homeland; since, however, Ānanda was a popular name in Ceylon (particularly from the Polonnaruva period on, and particularly among the Araññāvāsins), I will not attempt to identify the great *paṇḍita* with any of the Sri Lankans of the same name.³

The 13 texts and modern scholarship

The first reference to the 13 texts in European scholarship was made by the great pioneer of Tibetan studies, the Hungarian Alexander Csoma de Kőrös, who listed and summarized them in his "Analysis of the Mdo" (based on the Narthang xylograph), published in 1836–39.⁴ In his French translation of the preceding, Léon Feer, another pioneer of *Kanjur* and Buddhist studies, described them as "textes traduits du Pāli", and noted their Pāli counterparts.⁵ He published full translations of eight

¹ Ruegg p. 81, text folio 11a7.

² See H. Bechert, P. Kieffer-Pülz, K. Küster, and J. Matsumura, "An Ancient Sinhālese Manuscript Discovered in Tibet and Preserved in Peking", in *The Journal of Pāli and Buddhist Studies (Pārigaku-Bukkyō-Bungaku)*, Vol. 4, Nagoya, May, 1991, pp. 67–83.

³ cf. *DPPNI*, Ānanda, nos. 11–14, and *EB IV*, p. 537, Ānanda (14).

⁴ Originally published in *Asiatick Researches*, Vol. 20, Calcutta; reprinted in A. Csoma de Kőrös, *Analysis of the Kanjur*, Delhi, 1982, pp. 181–82.

⁵ *AMG II* (1881), 288–90.

of the texts (1.1, 6–10, 12, 13, plus a part of 1.2) in 1883, comparing them with the Pāli parallels, when available, and also noting other parallels within the *Kanjur*.¹ In 1929 Lalou gave a tabular list of the 13 texts as found in the Narthang and Peking *Kanjurs*, with cross-references to the Berlin manuscript, Pāli parallels, the *paritta*, and Feer's translations in *AMG*.² The texts are discussed briefly in *L'Inde classique*,³ and referred to and listed in the *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*⁴ and in *Crystal Mirror VII*.⁵ Their Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Mongolian titles, as given in the Mongolian *Kanjur*, are listed by Bischoff, who also translates the

¹ *AMG V*; Feer also described 1.11, which is virtually identical to 1.12. References are given under the appropriate section. I am unable to do justice to the entirety of Feer's work, spread through many issues of *Journal asiatique*, not available to me. See for example Feer 1870, and Imaeda 1982 p. 18 (184) note 17 for a reference to *JA* 1871. Imaeda also refers to a study in Japanese by Enga Teramoto, "Chibetto den no agon-kyō ni tsuite", in *Shūkyō Kenkyū*, New Series, 2, 1929, pp. 505–28.

² Lalou 1929, pp. 99–102.

³ Louis Renou, Jean Filliozat, et al., *L'Inde classique*, tome II, Hanoi, 1953, § 2039.

⁴ *EB III/1*, p. 153.

⁵ Dharma Publishing, Berkeley, 1971, pp. 295–97. Gregory Schopen has devoted a long footnote to them (Schopen 1982, p. 231, note 9: note that the description "13 short texts" is wrong: §§ 1.3–4 are long, and 1.2 very long.). Nos. 1.6, 8, 10, and 13 are discussed (in Japanese) by Yamaguchi Tsutomu, "On Pāli Scriptures in the Tibetan Canon — Peking numbers 752, 754, 756, and 759", in the *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, Vol. XXXI, no. 1, Dec. 1982, pp. 95–98 (391–388). Nattier (1991, p. 59) remarks that "only a handful of texts known to the Theravādin tradition can be matched with equivalents in the Tibetan *Kanjur*"; in note 80 she lists most of the 13 *gsar 'gyur*, followed by Peking numbers 955–58, 962–63, 966, 982, 997, and 1005. This statement needs clarification. The 13 *gsar 'gyur* are themselves Theravādin texts, while the other texts listed by Nattier are all (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin texts (which indeed have Pāli parallels). Furthermore, Peking numbers 959–60, 971, 979, 981, 992, 1003, and 1021, as well as a few others, are also (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin texts with Pāli parallels, and nos. 1010 and 972 (= §§ 1.14 and 15 in this article) are Theravādin texts. A concordance of Śrāvaka literature in Tibetan translation is a desideratum.

colophons from Mongolian.¹ Pāli parallels of 1.1–4 and 1.13 were noted in the Tohoku Catalogue, published in 1934;² the Pāli parallels of 1.1–4, 1.6 (part A only), and 1.8–13 were given in the Otani and Peking Reprint Catalogues, published in 1930–32 and 1961.³ The Pāli parallel of 1.5 and 1.14 was noted by Sylvain Lévi in 1932.⁴ (As far as I know, the Pāli counterpart of 1.7.A is identified here for the first time.) Thus the 13 *gsar 'gyur* have caught the attention of modern scholarship from the time of Feer up to the present; brief remarks have been made by Conze, Lévi, Lalou, Pelliot, Imaeda, Ruegg, Schopen, and Nattier (and no doubt others whose work has escaped my attention), as shown in the notes.

The Tohoku and Otani catalogues also give Chinese parallels, when available. According to the concordance of the Derge and Korean *Tripitakas* given in Lancaster's *Korean Buddhist Canon*,⁵ only D 39 (no. 1.9 below) has a true Chinese parallel, in that it might be a translation of a Theravādin version. Derge numbers 31, 33, 34, 36, and 42 (below 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, and 1.12) also have parallels in Chinese, but these are versions of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins, Dharmaguptakas, or other schools.⁶

¹ Bischoff 1968, §§ 779–91, pp. 333–40; see also § 1105 (pp. 537–39) for § 1.14 with its titles in the same three languages and its colophon translated from Mongolian. Note that all of the texts dealt with in this article — both *Kanjur* and *Tanjur*, but excepting the modern translations of § 3 — are also available in Mongolian translation. For a rare notice that Theravādin literature exists in that language, see David Seyfort Ruegg, “Some Observations on the Present and Future of Buddhist Studies”, *JIAS* 15/1 (1992), pp. 110–11 and note 5, referring to the 13 *gsar 'gyur*.

² *Ui et al.* 1934, pp. 225–29.

³ *A Comparative Analytical Catalogue of the Kanjur Division of the Tibetan Tripitaka*, Otani Daigaku Library, Kyoto, 1930–32, pp. 225–29; Peking Reprint, Vol. 165, Catalogue I, pp. 94–96.

⁴ Lévi 1932.

⁵ *KBC*, p. 697.

⁶ The concordance lists *KBC* 650 (22.8) for both Derge 41 and 42; this seems to refer to the *Sūrya-* and *Candra-sūtras* as parallels of a sole Chinese *Candra-*

The original language of the 13 texts

The Tibetan titles state that the 13 texts were translated from “the language of India” (*rgya gar skad*), which generally means Sanskrit. It seems to have been Feer who first averred that they were translated from Pāli.¹ What should have been only a hypothesis took on the force of fact, and the statement has been repeated in later works.² The opposite extreme was taken by Edward Conze, pioneer of Prajñāpāramitā studies, who stated that “[the 13 texts] are sometimes said to be translated from the Pāli, but they differ too much from the Pāli text, and on closer investigation they turn out to represent Hīnayāna Sūtras from the Canon of the Sarvāstivādins and other Hīnayāna sects in contact with Tibet”.³ It will be seen below that the 13 are without doubt Theravādin texts: perhaps Conze confused them with their (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin counterparts found elsewhere in the *Kanjur*, although only five texts have such counterparts, and they are not in the *Ser phyin* section.

In accordance with *Kanjur* tradition, the titles are transliterated in Sanskrit at the head of each text; they may, however, have been Sanskritized by the translators or by later editors. It is significant that the

sūtra, presumably because the texts are nearly identical. See *KBC* p. 245, and below 1.11 and 1.12.

¹ He describes them as “traduits du pali” at several places under the references cited below; in *AMG* II (1881), pp. 288–90, he refers to “un avertissement inséré entre le texte no. 12 et le texte no. 13, au folio 427 [of the Narthang]” as his source. There is no such remark in the edition of Narthang that I consulted, and I have not found any reference to the language of the texts in the colophons (and indeed wonder what the Tibetan equivalent of Pāli would be). It may be that Feer based his statement on the fact that Ānandaśrī is described as a Sinhalese. See also Lévi, “Les saintes écritures du bouddhisme”, in *Mémorial Sylvain Lévi*, Paris, 1937, p. 78: “treize sūtra ... qui se présentent eux-mêmes comme traduits du pali”, and Schopen's remarks (1982, p. 231, note 9), which go to the opposite extreme.

² See, for example, *L'Inde classique*, *loc. cit.*, “une suite de 13 textes traduits du pali”, and p. 352; Bischoff 1968, p. 333, “13 Pāli-Texte”.

³ E. Conze, *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature*, 2nd ed., Tokyo, 1978, p. 25.

titles of the *Āṭānāṭiya-* and *Mahāsamaya-sūtra* (1.3,4) are given in the Pāli forms *Āṭānāṭiya-* and *Mahāsamaya* against the *Āṭānāṭika/Āṭānāṭiya* and *Mahāsamāja* of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin versions. The fact that Ānandaśrī was a Sinhalese suggests that the originals were indeed in Pāli; this is supported by the fact that the texts agree with the canonical Pāli versions and that Bu ston learned the Sinhalese script at Thar pa gliñ. Since even a novice in Ceylon would know the *paritta* by heart, Ānandaśrī might well have transmitted the *paritta* texts (at least 1.1, 3–6, 8, 10–13) orally. While it is not impossible that some Theravādin texts were circulated in Sanskrit in India, it is quite unlikely that a senior Sinhalese monk, who knew the *paritta* by heart, would have transmitted these canonical texts in Sanskrit, although he may well have used Sanskrit when he explained the texts to his Tibetan co-translators. It is possible, however, that some of the longer texts were in Sinhalese.

In the following, I briefly discuss the contents of the 13 texts and their relationship to their Pāli counterparts. For each text I first give the Sanskrit title, as given at the head of the Tibetan text, followed by the Tibetan translation of the title, and an English translation. The next line gives the catalogue number of the Derge edition (D), which I have utilized for this study; the Derge folio numbers; and, in parentheses, the length of the text in “folio pages”, counting one side of a folio as one folio page.¹ The next line gives the catalogue numbers for eleven other editions: Berlin (B), Cone (C), Lhasa (H), Lithang (J), London (L), Urga (M), Narthang (N), Peking (Q), Stog (S), Tokyo (T), and Ulan Bator (U), plus that of Bu ston’s *Chos ’byuñ* (Bu ston). The next line gives the

¹ For this study I have had continual access to only two editions, Derge (D) and Peking (Q); information about other editions derives from the catalogues listed in the bibliography. While I have used the Derge as the basic edition for the study of the 13 texts, in occasional consultation with the Peking, I have relied on the Peking for the study of 1.14, which is not available in the Derge, for the study of the *Tanjur* texts, and for certain other references. The edition used should be clear from the notes or references.

title and location of the Pāli counterpart; here I give both its position in the *Tiṭṭaka*,¹ and, for those texts that are also *parittas*, their number in a Ceylonese *paritta* collection, the “expanded” *Cātubhānavāra* or *Maha Pirit Pota*.² Bibliographical information about non-Theravādin, i.e. (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin, counterparts in the *Kanjur*, when such exist (that is, for 1.1, 3, 4, 12, 13), is given in square brackets [...] at this point. The next line gives the location of the *sutta*, by whom it was spoken, and to whom it was addressed. After that I briefly compare the Tibetan and Pāli versions. In general I use Pāli equivalents of the Tibetan rather than Sanskrit;³ this is only a device for ease of comparison with the Pāli, and does not absolutely imply that the texts were translated from Pāli.

- 1.1. *Dharmacakrapravartana-sūtra* / *Chos kyi 'khor lo rab tu bskor ba'i mdo*⁴
Sūtra on the Turning of the Wheel of the Dhamma
 D 31, 180b1–183a6 (6 folio pages)
 B (40).13, C 1014, H 32, J 26, L XXXVI(1), M 31, N 347, Q 747, S 289, T 286, U 335, Bu ston 378
Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta, *Samyuttanikāya* V 420.25–424.11; *Maha Pirit Pota* 22
 Translated by Feer, *JA* 1870 pp. 363 foll. and *AMG* V 110–22.

¹ References (by page and line) are to the editions of the Pāli Text Society (PTS), unless otherwise noted.

² Lionel Lokuliyana, *Cātubhānavārapāli, the Text of the Four Recitals or the Great Book of Protections Sinhala-Maha Pirit Pota*, Colombo, n.d. Reference is by text number.

³ Sanskrit equivalents are based on the lexicon composed by a committee of Indian and Tibetan scholars around the year 800, the *Mahāvīyutpatti* (Mvy). For these I give the Pāli counterpart.

⁴ The title in the colophon to DLNS is *Chos kyi 'khor lo bskor ba'i mdo*; the title in the final collective colophon in CDQ is *'Phags pa chos kyi 'khor lo bskor [bkor Q] ba'i mdo*.

[The *Kanjur* also contains an anonymous translation of a (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin recension, entitled *Dharmacakra-sūtra* / *Chos kyi 'khor lo'i mdo*: Q 1003, Vol. 39, *mdo sna tshogs*, śu 283b1–285a7. The text is also incorporated into the *Vinaya* ('*Dul ba*) of the Mūlasarvāstivādins and into the *Abhiniṣkramaṇa-sūtra*, both in Tibetan translation. These versions were translated jointly by Feer side-by-side with the Theravādin versions as embodied in the present text and the Pāli *Samyuttanikāya* (see references above).]

Tibetan, Pāli: spoken by the Buddha at Bārāṇasī, Isipatana, Migadāya, to the “group of five monks” (*pañcavaggiye bhikkhū*).

The Tibetan agrees closely with the Pāli. At 181a1, equivalent to S V 421,21, the Tibetan omits *soka-parideva-dukkha-domanassupāyāsā pi dukkhā*, given in the PTS edition on the basis of one Burmese manuscript (B¹), but, according to note 2, omitted in two Sinhalese (S^{1–3}) and one Burmese (B²) manuscripts.¹ It is also not found in the Siamese edition,² the Burmese Chatṭhasaṅgīti edition,³ or the Ceylonese *Maha Pirit Pota* (p. 72,2). The third and final insight into each of the four truths — that they are *pariññātaṃ, pahīnaṃ, sacchikataṃ, and bhāvitaṃ* (S V 422,3–30) — is missing in the Tibetan. The omission must derive from a faulty manuscript or translation: since the insights are an essential part of the sutta, their omission cannot be deliberate or redactional. At the end of the sutta, the progression of the gods who announce that the Buddha has turned the wheel of the dhamma is the same in Tibetan and Pāli; while the Tibetan (182a3–183a1) gives the formula in full for each group of gods, the PTS (p. 423,28), Siamese (p. 532,2), and Burmese (p. 371,13) editions abbreviate the passage, giving only the names of the gods.

¹ See S V, Introduction, pp. vii–viii, for the manuscripts utilized by the editor.

² *Syāmrāṭṭhassa Tepītakam*, Vol. 19, Third edition, Bangkok, 2523, p. 529,1.

³ *Mahāvaggasamyuttapāli*, p. 369,15.

In order to demonstrate that the Tibetan represents a Theravādin recension, I will contrast a few passages with the Mūlasarvāstivādin version, as preserved in Sanskrit in their *Saṅghabhedavastu* (*Saṅghabh*), and with the Mahāsāṃghika Lokottaravādin version, preserved in “Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit” in their *Mahāvastu*.¹

Table 3 shows the “epithets of insight” according to four recensions: the first column gives the Tibetan, the second column a Pāli translation of the Tibetan, the third column the Pāli of the *Samyuttanikāya*, the fourth the Sanskrit of the *Saṅghabhedavastu*, and the fifth the Sanskrit of the *Mahāvastu*. The Tibetan and Pāli agree in giving the same five synonyms of insight in the same order. The Mūlasarvāstivādin version gives only four, of which three are common to the Tibetan and Pāli, while the Lokottaravādin version gives seven, comprising all five of the Theravādin version, but in a different order, plus two others, one of which is common to the Mūlasarvāstivādin version.²

The first class of gods to proclaim the turning of the wheel of the dhamma is the “gods of the earth” (*sa'i lha*, 182a4; *bhumā devā*, S V 423,18; *bhūmyā devā*, *Mahāvastu* 443,13) in Tibetan, Pāli, and the *Mahāvastu*, but “*yakṣas* of the earth” (*bhaumā yakṣāḥ*, *Saṅghabh* 136,24) in the Mūlasarvāstivādin version. In the Tibetan and Pāli the naming of Koṇḍañña occurs at the very end of the sutta; in the Mūlasarvāstivādin version it comes before the gods' announcement of the turning of the wheel (*Saṅghabh* 136,15); in the *Mahāvastu* it does not occur at all.

¹ R. Basak, *Mahāvastu Avadāna*, Vol. III, Calcutta, 1968.

² The numbers given in parentheses after the *Saṅghabhedavastu* and *Mahāvastu* entries are those of the Tibetan-Pāli entries.

At the end of the Tibetan and Pāli versions, just before the naming of Koṇḍañña, the sutta states that the earth quaked. The Tibetan (D 183a2) and Pāli (S V 424,4) correspond almost exactly:

“This ten-thousand world-system (Tib. *'dir yañ 'jig rten gyi khams ston phrag bcu* = Pāli *ayañ ca dasasahassī lokadhātu*) quaked (*yañ dag par g'yos so* = *samkampī*), shook (*yañ dag par rab tu g'yos so* = *sampakampī*), [and] trembled (*yañ dag par rab tu ldeg go* = *sampavedhi*).”¹

The Lokottaravādin version (*Mahāvastu* 443,2) has *iyam ca mahāprthivī atiriva ṣaḍvikāram kampe chinnam iva sampravedhe*. The Mūlasarvāstivādin version does not contain the passage.

The few examples given here show that the Tibetan version agrees with the Pāli against the Sanskrit versions of the Lokottaravādins and the Mūlasarvāstivādins; many more could be cited.

1.2. *Jātaka-nidāna* / *sKyes pa rabs kyi glen gzi*²

Introduction to the Jātaka

D 32, 183a7–250a5 (137 1/2 folio pages)

B (40).14, C 1015, H 33, J 27, L XXXVI(2), M 32, N 348, Q 748, S 290, T 287, U 336, Bu ston 379

Jātaka-nidāna: Jātaka-aṭṭhakathā, Vol. I 2,1–94,30

Partial translation by Feer, compared with the Pāli, *AMG V* 321–61.

¹ The *'dir yañ* (“here”, “then” = *tatra* ?) of the Tibetan does not exactly correspond to the *ayañ ca* of the Pāli. The Tibetan prefixes *yañ dag par* = *sam*, *rab tu* = *pa*.

² The colophon — D 250a3, L 99a8, N 543a3, S 140b6 — gives the title as *sKyes pa rabs kyi glen gzi* (LNS: D [altered from *gzi'i* ?] reads *gzi ri*) *bsad pa*; the final collective colophon in CDQ reads *sKyes pa rabs kyi glen gzi'i* (CD: *bzi'i* Q) *bsad pa*.

The Tibetan does not contain the opening verses of the Pāli, which belong to the *Jātaka Commentary* as a whole rather than just the *Jātaka-nidāna*. The Tibetan opens with prose:

When the Lord was staying in Anāthapiṇḍika’s Pleasance in the Jeta Grove at Sāvattihī, the Great Elder (*mahāthera*) Atthadassī (*gnas brtan chen po don mthoñ*) went to the Lord, paid homage, circumambulated him, sat to one side, and addressed the Lord: “Sir, I would like to hear the teaching on the lineage of the Lord Buddhas (*sañs rgyas bcom ldan 'das kyi rgyud kyi chos*)”. [The Lord] replied, “Pay attention, Atthadassī, and I will speak”.

This introductory passage (*nidāna*), which accords the following text with the canonical status of a sutta, is not found in the Pāli, which is, of course, a commentary. The Pāli opens with verses in which the commentator explains his reasons for composing the work. In verse 7, he states that he was requested to do so by the Elder (*thera*) Atthadassī, along with (vv. 8, 9) Buddhāmitta and Buddhadeva. Since Atthadassī is not one of the early elders mentioned in the suttas;¹ since the Tibetan prose reflects in other ways the opening Pāli verses; and since the text is not a sutta, the prose introduction must be a later concoction or a mistranslation, based on but altering the sense of the Pāli verses.

After the prose introduction, the Tibetan corresponds to the *Jātaka-nidāna* text. As in Pāli, the career of the bodhisatta is divided into three phases (183b2). These are defined as in Pāli, and lend their structure to the text:

¹ cf. *DPPNI* 55–56.

<i>riṅ po'i gleṅ gzi</i>	= <i>dūrenidāna</i>	D 183b5 foll., <i>Jātaka</i> 2,12 foll.
<i>bar pa'i gleṅ gzi</i>	= <i>avidūrenidāna</i> ¹	D 216a1 foll., <i>Jātaka</i> 47,20 foll.
<i>ñe ba'i gleṅ gzi</i>	= <i>santikenidāna</i>	D 237a1 foll., <i>Jātaka</i> 77,3 foll.

The Tibetan ends, as does the Pāli, with the donation of the Jetavana, verses on the advantages of donating monasteries, and a description of how the past Buddhas also had monasteries on the same spot. The two versions show some differences on the size of the monasteries.

I have not been able to make a complete comparison of the two versions. Such comparison as I have made convinces me that they represent fundamentally the same text: the Tibetan follows the progression of the Pāli throughout, and the passages that I have checked, including many of the verses, agree word for word with the Pāli. This is only natural since the *Jātakanidāna* is a uniquely Theravādin text.

- 1.3. *Āṭānāṭiya-sūtra* / *lCaṅ lo can gyi pho braṅ gi mdo*
*Āṭānāṭiya Sūtra*²
 D 33, 250a5–259b4 (19 folio pages)
 B (40).15, C 1016, H 34, J 28, L XXXVI(3), M 33, N 349,
 Q 749, S 291, T 288, U 337, Bu ston 380
Āṭānāṭiya-sutta, D 32, Vol. III 194–206; *Maha Pirit Pota* 29

¹ Tibetan *bar pa* translates Sanskrit *madhyama* = Pāli *majjhima*. At 237a1, the phrase is rendered as *gleṅ gzi bar ma*; *bar ma* can translate *antara* as well as *madhyama*. If the translation is not a gloss, *antara-nidāna* seems more likely than *majjhima-nidāna*.

² *Āṭānāṭiya*, according to the Pāli commentary, derives from *Āṭānāṭa*, a city mentioned in the sutta (D III 200,24). The Tibetan interprets the title in the same way: *lCaṅ lo can* = *aṭakavatī* / *alakavatī* Mvy 4137 (*lCaṅ lo*, “curl, lock” to Sanskrit *alaka*) + *pho braṅ* = “residence, town” (*dhānī*, Mvy 5510, *pura* Mvy 5511). But there are further complications, for which see Hoffmann (bibliographical information in text) pp. 22–24.

[A (probably) Mūlasarvāstivādin parallel, translated ca. 800 by Jinamitra, Prajñāvarman, and Ye šes sde, occurs twice in the *Kanjur*: *Āṭānāṭiyasūtra-nāma-mahāsūtra* / *mDo chen po kun tu rgyu ba daṅ kun tu rgyu ba ma yin pa daṅ mthun pa'i mdo*, Q 333 (*rgyud ba*), Q 687 (*rgyud ya*). Extensive Sanskrit fragments of a (probably) Sarvāstivādin recension from Central Asia were published by Helmut Hoffmann, and compared with the Tibetan, Chinese and Pāli versions, in *Bruchstücke des Āṭānāṭikasūtra aus dem Zentralasiatischen Sanskritkanon der Buddhisten* (Kleinere Sanskrit-texte Heft V), Leipzig, 1939, reprinted Stuttgart, 1987, in Lore Sander (ed.), *Nachträge zu “Kleinere Sanskrit-texte, Hefte III–V”*, along with further Sanskrit fragments (pp. 193–207). Page references are to the reprint edition.]

Tibetan, Pāli: at Rājagaha, Gijjhakūṭa Mountain; the first part is spoken by Vessavaṇa to the Buddha, the second part by the Buddha to the monks in general.

Like the Pāli, the Tibetan is divided into two parts. The first part ends at D 254b7, *lCaṅ lo can gyi pho braṅ gi mdo las skabs rab mchog daṅ po*, in Pāli at D III 206,4, *paṭhama-bhāṇavāra*; the second part at D 259b2, *skabs rab mchog gñis*, in Pāli *dutiya-bhāṇavāra*.¹ *Skabs rab mchog*, a compound otherwise unknown to me in Tibetan, must somehow correspond to the Pāli *bhāṇavāra*, “recitation”. *Skabs* translates a number of Sanskrit terms, such as *avakāśa*, *sthāna*, *kāṇḍa*, and *pariccheda*, and is probably a gloss. Both *rab* and *mchog* are used in Tibetan to translate *vara*; thus *rab mchog* may represent either a misreading (twice) of *vāra* as *vara*, or a correct translation of a manuscript that read (twice) *vara* for *vāra*.

¹ cf. Chaṭṭhasaṅgīti edition, p. 166,14.

In the Tibetan version, both parts are given in full, without abbreviation; the PTS version abbreviates the second part to six lines (D III 206,7–14), the Siamese edition to two and a half pages (219,5–221,11), while the Burmese Chaṭṭhasaṅgīti edition gives it in full. The correspondence is very close. The Tibetan and Pāli include sections not found in the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin versions: the verses of homage to the seven Buddhas (D 251a3 foll. = D III 195,27–196,17); the prose passage on the spirits (*amanussa*) who do not heed the Four Great Kings, with the simile of the dacoits who do not heed the King of Magadha (253b3 foll. = D III 203,24–204,20); and the prose passage which describes the various ways in which the *yakkhas* take leave of the Buddha (254b4 foll. = D III 205,21–206,4). Conversely, the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin versions contain passages not found in the Theravādin version, Tibetan or Pāli: the opening verse of homage (Hoffmann 48–49), the verse lists of *gandharvas* (72–73), *kumbhāṇḍas* (78–79), *nāgas* (66–67), and so on.

- 1.4. *Mahāsamaya-sūtra* / 'Dus pa chen po 'i mdo
Sūtra of the Great Assembly
 D 34, 259b4–263a4 (7 folio pages)
 B (40).16, C 1017, H 35, J 29, L XXXVI(4), M 34, N 350,
 Q 750, S 292, T 289, U 338, Bu ston 374
Mahāsamaya-sutta, D 20, Vol. II 253–62; *Maha Pirit Pota* 23

[A (probably) Mūlasarvāstivādin parallel, translated ca. 800 by Jinamitra, Prajñāvarman, and Ye šes sde, occurs twice in the *Kanjur*: *Mahāsamājasūtra-nāma-mahāsūtra* / *mDo chen po 'dus pa chen po 'i mdo*, Q 332 (*rgyud ba*), Q 687 (*rgyud ya*). Comparative studies of some of the lists of deities were undertaken by J. Przyłuski and M. Lalou in their “Notes de mythologie bouddhique”: (1) “Yakṣa et gandharva dans le Mahāsamaya-suttanta”, *HJAS* 3 (1938), pp. 40–46, and (3) “Les fils de Brahmā”, *HJAS* 4 (1939), pp. 69–76. Extensive Sanskrit fragments of a

(probably) Sarvāstivādin recension from Central Asia were published by Ernst Waldschmidt, and compared with two Chinese versions, the Pāli, and the Tibetan, in *Bruchstücke Buddhistischer Sūtras aus dem Zentralasiatischen Sanskritkanon* (Kleinere Sanskrit-texte, Heft IV), Leipzig, 1932, pp. 149–206 (repr. Wiesbaden, 1979). A revised edition of the Sanskrit, based on further manuscript fragments, was published by the same author with English translation in his “Central Asian Sūtra Fragments and their Relation to the Chinese Āgamas”, in Bechert 1980, pp. 148–62. The latter was reprinted in Lore Sander (ed.), *Nachträge zu “Kleinere Sanskrit-texte, Hefte III–V”*, along with further Sanskrit fragments (pp. 159–79).]

Tibetan, Pāli: spoken by the Buddha among the Sakkas at Kapilavatthu, Mahāvana, to the monks in general.

A romanized edition of the Tibetan *Mahāsamaya-sūtra* has been published, side-by-side with the Pāli, by Y. Miyasaka, with introduction and comments in Japanese.¹ The Tibetan and Pāli are very close. The Tibetan omits six lines of verse (Miyasaka, p. 117), and adds a single line of verse in a refrain: *miñ ni gcig tu thos pa ste* (Miyasaka 118,1, 12, 23, 34). The line is not found in the Pāli *Mahāsamaya-sutta*, but occurs in the corresponding verse refrain in the Pāli *Āṭānāṭiya-sutta*²: *ekanāmā ti me sutam*.

- 1.5. *Maitrī-sūtra* / *Byams pa 'i mdo*
*Sūtra on [the Next Buddha], Maitreya*³

¹ Miyasaka Yusho, “A Critical Study on the Mahāsamaya-sūtra”, in *Acta Indologica* I, Narita, 1970, pp. 109–35.

² D III 197,10, etc.

³ The Sanskrit title in Tibetan transcription for both this and 1.14, *maitrī*, is not the proper name but the abstract noun for “friendliness”. The usual Sanskrit form of the name is Maitreya (cf. *BHSD*, p. 440 for variant forms). The Tibetan equivalent for both the name and abstract noun is *byams pa*. The Sanskrit title should properly be *Maitreya-sūtra*. In modern Newari, Maitreya is pronounced

D 35, 263a4–270a1 (13 1/2 folio pages)
 B (40).17, C 1018, H 36, J 30, L XXXVI(5), M 35, N 351,
 Q 751, S 293, T 290, U 339, Bu ston 375

**Metteyya-sutta*

Tibetan, Pāli: spoken at Kapilavatthu, Nigrodhārāma, on the bank of the Rohiṇī River.¹

In this section I will also discuss 1.14, which bears the same title prefixed by *Ārya*. This is a different translation of a similar but not identical text.² The basis of the two Tibetan versions is a text corresponding at least in part to the non-canonical Pāli *Metteyya-sutta*, a prose text mixed with the verses of the *Anāgatavaṃsa*. In 1886, Prof. J. Minayeff published an edition of the *Anāgatavaṃsa*, a verse text in 142 verses on the future Buddha, *Metteyya*.³ In 1919, a new edition was published by E. Leumann.⁴ A Burmese manuscript utilized by Minayeff and labelled by him manuscript B is in mixed prose and verse; according to the colophon it is entitled *Metteyyasutta Anāgatavaṃsa*. Minayeff cites

Maitrī, whether it is written Maitreya or Maitrī; since Ñi ma rgyal mtshan spent 14 years in Nepal, the spelling in at least the present title may derive from the Newari pronunciation. This does not explain the title of 1.14, unless the co-translator Kun dga' rgyal mtshan Thub bstan dpal bzañ po also had studied in Nepal. Note that other *Kanjur* titles containing the name Maitreya, such as the *Maitreya-vyākaraṇa* discussed above, use the standard form Maitreya.

¹ cf. *DPPN* II 762 for the location.

² The two texts are briefly discussed in Lévi 1932, pp. 377–80; cf. also Nattier 1991, p. 59.

³ *JPTS* II (1886), pp. 33–53.

⁴ E. Leumann, *Maitreya-Samiti, das Zukunftsideal der Buddhisten*, Strassburg, 1919, pp. 184–226. This work was not available to me for this study; the reference is from Saya U Chit Tin, assisted by W. Pruitt, *The Coming Buddha Ariya Metteyya*, Heddington near Calne, 1988, which reproduces Leumann's text (p. 33, note).

several portions and summarizes the *sutta*, which I will refer to in the following as *Metteyya-sutta*.

(A text [or texts ?] of this title is referred to by Louis Finot, “Recherches sur la littérature laotienne”, *BÉFEO* XVII/5, [1917], pp. 64–65; in G. Coedès, *Catalogue des manuscrits en pāli, laotien et siamois provenant de la thailande*, Copenhagen, 1966, p. 28; and in Charles F. Keyes, “New Evidence on Northern Thai Frontier History”, in Tej Bunnag and M. Smithies (edd.), *In Memoriam Phya Anuman Rajadhon*, Bangkok, 1970, p. 247, item 24. As far as I know, the *Metteyya-sutta* is known only in South-east Asia and not in Ceylon; it is therefore interesting that it was taken to Tibet by a Sinhalese monk. The *Metteyya-sutta* — along with the present text[s] — is related to the *Metteyya* chapter [Ch. 1] of the *Dasabodhisatta-uddesa*, for which see François Martini, “Dasa-bodhisatta-uddesa”, *BÉFEO* XXXVI, [1936], pp. 287–413, and Supaphan 1990, pp. 190–204. Note that the *Maitreya-vyākaraṇa* referred to above [p. 79 and note 5 thereto] is a different, non-Theravādin [probabaly (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin] Maitreya text.)

For comparison, I will give the opening (*nidāna*) of the two Tibetan versions and of the Pāli *Metteyya-sutta*.

1.5, *Maitrī-sūtra* (D 35, 263a5)

*ston pa dus gcig na ser skya'i gzi dañ | nya gro dha'i kun dga'
 ra ba dañ | chu kluñ ro hi ni'i 'gram na bžugs so || de nas tshe
 dañ ldan pa šā ri'i bus ma 'oñs pa'i rgyal ba de'i phyir bcom
 ldan 'das la žus pa |*

At one time the Teacher (*satthā*) was staying at Kapilavatthu, at the Nigrodha Pleasance (*ārāma*), on the banks of the Rohiṇī river. Then Venerable Sāriputta, for the sake of the Conqueror (*jina*) of the future, asked the Lord . . .

1.14, *Ārya-maitrī-sūtra* (Q 1010, 304a5)¹

'di skad bdag gis thos pa dus gcig na / bcom ldan 'das ston pa ser skya'i gnas nya gro dha'i gstug lag khañ ro hi ni'i 'bab chu'i 'gram na bžugs so || de nas tshe dañ ldan pa sā ri'i bus bcom ldan 'das la dri ba 'di skad ces gsol to ||

Thus I once heard: the Lord, the Teacher (*satthā*), was staying at Kapilavatthu, at the Nigrodha Monastery (*vihāra*), on the banks of the Rohiṇī river. Then Venerable Sāriputta asked the Lord this question

Metteyya-sutta (Minayeff p. 33)

evaṃ me sutam ekaṃ samayaṃ bhagavā kapilavatthusmiṃ viharati nigrodhārāme rohaniyā nāma nadiyā tīre. atha kho āyasmā sāriputto anāgatajanam (sic: correct to *jinam*) ārabha bhagavantam pucchi

Thus I once heard: the Lord was staying at Kapilavatthu, at the Nigrodha Pleasance (*ārāma*), on the banks of the Rohiṇī river. Then Venerable Sāriputta questioned the Lord on the topic of the future Conqueror (*jina*)

While the translation of 1.5 is awkward, that of 1.14 is quite smooth. 1.14 and the Pāli open with “thus I once heard”, not given in 1.5. The latter, however, agrees with the Pāli in using *ārāma*, against the *vihāra* of 1.14, and the *ma 'oñs pa'i rgyal ba de'i phyir* of 1.5 probably corresponds to the *anāgatajanam ārabha* of the Pāli, not found in 1.14. These few lines suggest that the unravelling of the relationship between the various versions promises to be a complex task.

¹ cf. 1.14 below for full bibliographical information. Since 1.14 is not available in D, I have used Q.

The *Maitrī-sūtra* (D 263a5) then gives two verses, the first spoken by Sāriputta, the second by the Buddha, corresponding to *Anāgatavaṃsa* verses 2cd–5. Minayeff's *Metteyya-sutta* gives a “history of the previous existences of Metteyya”, not found in the Tibetan versions. The latter (D 263b1 foll., Q 304b1 foll.) open with the five periods (*bar gyi dus*) of the decline of the Buddha's teaching, parallel to the five “disappearances” (*antaradhāna*)¹ of the *Metteyya-sutta* (Minayeff p. 34):

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1) 'bras bu'i bar gyi dus | *phala-antara-kāla | = adhigama-antaradhāna |
| 2) bsgrub pa'i bar gyi dus | *paṭipatti-antara-kāla | = paṭipatti-antaradhāna |
| 3) luñ gi bar gyi dus | *āgama-antara-kāla | = pariyatti-antaradhāna |
| 4) rtags tsam gyi bar gyi dus | *liṅgamatta-antara-kāla | = liṅga-antaradhāna |
| 5) sku gduñ gi bar gyi dus | *dhātu-antara-kāla | = dhātu-antaradhāna |

These are then defined. Under (3), *luñ gi bar gyi dus*, it is said that the *Tipiṭaka* will disappear, starting with the *Abhidhamma*. “When the *Abhidhamma Piṭaka* has disappeared, the *Suttanta Piṭaka* will disappear. . . . Then only the *Jātaka* (*sKyes rabs*) along with the *Vinaya* (*'Dul ba*) will remain. . . . First the *Vessantara-jātaka* (*Thams cad sgröl gyi skyes pa'i rabs*²) will disappear; finally the *Apaṇṇaka-jātaka* (D *Lo ma med pa*, “without leaf” (*paṇṇa*); Q *A pa rna ka*: note the Sanskrit form) will disappear.” The seven books of the Theravādin *Abhidhamma* and the four of the *Suttanta* are listed, with several severe mistranslations and an unconventional order. These are given in Table 5.³

¹ While *bar gyi* = *antara*, *dus* (time, period) = *kāla*, *samaya*, etc., and is hard to reconcile with *-dhāna*. I have given **antara-kāla* as a tentative equivalent.

² *Thams cad sgröl* = *Viśvaṃtara*, Mvy 32.

³ The list of the books of the *Abhidhamma* in the original was probably one long compound; both D and Q confuse the titles by merging them or breaking them up with the addition of *dañ* = *ca*, “and”, given in parentheses in the table. In the table I have given for comparison the titles as translated by the 20th century scholar Gedun Chomphel (for whom see below, § 3.1), which are correct.

(This description of the decline of the Buddha's dispensation seems to be unique to the Theravādins. The closest parallels that I know of are those given by Daśabalaśrīmitra, without naming his source, in his *Saṃskṛtāsamaṅskṛta-viniścaya* and by Bu ston from a *Ṭikā* on the *Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, which speak of 500 years divided into ten somewhat similar periods.¹ Nattier [1991, p. 59] suggests that the "standard figure" of 5000 years accepted in Tibet for the duration of Śākyamuni's dispensation is derived from the *Maitrī-sūtra*. This is incorrect: the source is the *Śatasāhasrikā-ṭikā* [*'Bum ṭik*], as seen from Bu ston's citation and from other citations in Tibetan literature, which never refer to the *Maitrī-sūtra* with its unfamiliar list of Theravādin texts.² The listing of the five periods was very popular in late Theravādin literature, particularly in Siam, where it is given for example in the *Paṭhamasambodhi*, the *Sārasaṅgaha*, and the *Saṅgītiyavaṃsa*.³)

Minayeff (p. 31) then states, "Immediately after this there follows an account of the destruction of the Kappa". This seems to agree with the Tibetan versions, which give here a description of the three *antarakappa* (*bskal pa bar ma*: D 264b7 foll., Q 306a5 foll.).

The stage now being set, the two Tibetan versions go on to describe the aeon that ushers in *Metteyya*, the main theme of the work, as does the Pāli version. Both D and Q close with variations of the stock sutta ending: "When the Lord had spoken thus, the monks applauded the Lord's teaching" (D 269b6); "Thus spoke the Lord; the entire assembly

¹ Daśabalaśrīmitra (see below, § 2.1), *ño*, 265b4–266a5; Vogel 1991, pp. 405–6; Obermiller 1932, pp. 103–4. cf. also Macdonald 1963, pp. 62–66, and especially the table on p. 65.

² See e.g. Ruegg 1992, pp. 268, 284–89, and accompanying notes.

³ cf. Supaphan 1990, pp. 165, 269. For further references, and for the theory of decline in general, see Nattier 1991.

together with Venerable Sāriputta was uplifted, and applauded the Lord's teaching" (Q 311b2).

Like the *Metteyya-sutta*, the two Tibetan versions are in prose and verse. Most of the verses that I have traced have counterparts in the *Anāgatavaṃsa*. Some examples from 1.5, the *Maitrī-sūtra* are:

265b7–267a2	= <i>Anāgatavaṃsa</i> vv. 15–42
267b5–7	= <i>Anāgatavaṃsa</i> vv. 100–102
268a1	= <i>Anāgatavaṃsa</i> v. 57
268a5–6	= <i>Anāgatavaṃsa</i> vv. 110–111
269b5	= <i>Anāgatavaṃsa</i> vv. 141cd, 142

1.6. *Maitrībhāvanā-sūtra* / *Byams pa bsgom pa'i mdo*

Sūtra on the Cultivation of Friendliness

D 36, 270a1–b7 (2 folio pages)

B (40).18, C 1019, H 37, J 31, L XXXVI(6), M 36, N 352, Q 752, S 294, T 291, U 340, Bu ston 376

Translated by Feer, *AMG* V 221–23; translated by W. Rockhill, *Indian Antiquary* 12, 1883.¹

The Tibetan combines two Pāli texts, both of them *parittas*, under one title and one *nidāna*. These will be discussed here as 1.6.A and 1.6.B.

1.6.A. D 270a2–7

Metta-sutta, A V 342,1–14; *Maha Pirit Pota* 11, *Mettānisamsa-sutta*

¹ Information from *Crystal Mirror* Vol. VII, Berkeley, 1971, p. 296.

Tibetan, Pāli: spoken by the Buddha at Sāvattihī, Jetavana, Anāthapiṇḍika's Pleasance, to the monks in general.

The *sutta* lists eleven benefits derived from the practice of friendliness (*metta*); these are the same and occur in the same order in Tibetan and Pāli.

1.6.B. D 270a7–b6

Mūgapakkhajātaka, Jātaka 538, Ja VI 14,5*–25* (vv. 12–21)

Mittānisamsaṃ, Maha Pirit Pota 12

The Tibetan counterpart of the *Mittānisamsa* follows directly upon the preceding, as it does in the *Catubhāṇavāra*, where, however, it is a separate text. The Tibetan versions are linked by a statement made by the Buddha: “Furthermore, monks, I will expound the benefits of friendliness” (*byams pa'i phan yon = mettānisamsa*). The ten verses of the Tibetan correspond closely to the ten of the Pāli. The latter, however, deal with friendship (*mitta*).¹ The Pāli verses end with the single-line refrain *yo mittānaṃ na dūbhati*, “he who does not deceive friends”; the corresponding refrain in Tibetan is *gañ gis byams pa ma spaṅs na 'o*, “he who does not forsake friendliness”. “Forsake” (*spaṅs*) could correspond to Pāli *cajati, jahati, pajahati, vajjeti*, and so on.

The Tibetan (270b6) ends with the stock formula, “Thus spoke the Lord; the monks applauded his teaching”, not found in either the *Jātaka* or the *Maha Pirit Pota*.

¹ It is not uncommon, however, for Pāli manuscripts to give *metta-* rather than *mitta-* in the title: see Oskar von Hinüber, “The Pāli Manuscripts kept at the Siam Society, Bangkok, A Short Catalogue”, *JSS* 75 (1987), pp. 21 (*mettāparitta*), 32 (*mettānisamsa*).

1.7. *Pañcasikṣānuśamsa-sūtra / bSlab pa lña'i phan yon gyi mdo*¹
Sūtra on the Benefits of the Five Trainings

D 37, 271a1–276a5 (10 folio pages +)

B (40).19, C 1020, H 38, J 32, L XXXVI(7), M 37, N 353,
Q 753, S 295, T 292, U 341, Bu ston 377

**Pañcasikkhā-ānisamsa-sutta*

Translated by Feer, *AMG V* 230–43.

This text consists of two parts, labelled here 1.7.A and 1.7.B.

1.7.A. D 271a1–b3

Samajivin, A II 61,15–62,11²

The Tibetan opens with *'di skad bdag gis thos pa dus gcig na / bcom ldan 'das garga ra dañ | chu srin byis pa gsod kyi ri dañ | sman gyi nags ri dags rgyu ba'i gnas na bžugs so*. In order to understand this, we must first compare the Pāli: *ekaṃ samayaṃ bhagavā bhaggesu viharati suṃsumāragire bhesakalāvane migadāye*: “At one time the Lord was staying among the Bhaggas, at Mt. Suṃsumāra, in the Bhesakalā Grove, in the Deer Park”.³ The Tibetan terms correspond to the Pāli as follows:

<i>gargara</i>	(transliteration)	<i>bhagga</i>
<i>chu srin byis pa gsod kyi ri</i>	* <i>suṃsumāramakaragiri</i>	<i>suṃsumāragiri</i>
<i>sman gyi nags</i>	* <i>bhesajja-vana</i>	<i>bhesakalāvana</i>
<i>ri dags rgyu ba'i gnas</i>	* <i>migadāva</i>	<i>migadāya</i>

¹ The colophons to D (276a4), L (132a1), N (584b3), and S (143a3) and the final collective colophon to CDQ give the title as *Tshul khriṃs lña'i phan yon bstan pa'i mdo = *Pañcaśīlānuśamsa-sūtra*. See also Beckh p. 12, note 1. This might be the correct title.

² The title is from the *uddāna*, A II 65,23, *dve ... samajivino*.

³ For these toponyms, see *DPPN* II 1172–73.

There is a fair correspondence for all but the first, the transcription *gargara* equivalent to the Pāli *bhagga*. The text itself corresponds to the Pāli closely, giving a prose introduction followed by verses:

D 271a1–b1	(prose)	= A II 61,15–62,5	(prose)
D 271b1–3	(verse)	= A II 62,6*–11*	(verse)

In the prose of both versions, the Buddha, donning his outer robe (*chos gos* = *cīvara*) and carrying his alms-bowl (*lhuñ bzed* = *patta*) goes in the morning to the home of the householder “Father Nakula” (*Pha na ku la’i khyim bdag* = *Nakulapitā gahapati*). There he is addressed first by Nakulapitā, and then by the latter’s wife, “Mother Nakula” (*Ma na ku la’i khyim bdag mo* = *Nakulamātā gahapatānī*).¹ The gist of their statements is the same in the two versions (there are clearly problems with the Tibetan translation): they have been faithful ever since they were brought together, and they wish to see each other in future lives just as they do at present. The Tibetan then gives the phrase, *de nas bcom ldan ’das kyis bka’ stsal pa*, “Then the Lord spoke”, not found in the Pāli. The Buddha’s reply (271a7) is that such is possible, if a couple is “equal in faith, equal in virtue, equal in giving, and equal in wisdom”. Here the terms correspond directly:

<i>dad pa mñam pa</i>	= <i>samasaddhā</i>
<i>tshul khrims mñam pa</i>	= <i>samasīla</i>
<i>gtoñ ba mñam pa</i>	= <i>samacāga</i>
<i>śes rab mñam pa</i>	= <i>samapaññā</i>

¹ For this couple, renowned for their mutual devotion, see *DPPN* II 3–4. Nakula(-pitṛ) figures in the Chinese *Ekottarāgama*: see *BSR* 7/1–2 (1990), pp. 86–89 (parallel to S III 1–5).

The Buddha then addresses the couple in verse. Here the Tibetan (271b1) introduces the verse with the phrase, *yañ tshigs su bcad pa ’di bka’ stsal te*, “then [the Buddha] uttered these verses”, not found in the Pāli. The verses are similar.

1.7.B. D 271b3–276a5
No Pāli parallel traced.

The Pāli sutta ends with the verses. The Tibetan continues, with the Buddha speaking in prose:

“Therefore, you should guard the five types of training (*bslab pa* = *sikkhā*):

- 1) refraining from killing living beings;
- 2) refraining from theft;
- 3) refraining from sexual misconduct;
- 4) refraining from false speech;
- 5) refraining from drinking intoxicating beverages.”

These are of course the five precepts, which give their title to the Tibetan version. The monks, who have not been previously mentioned, ask the Buddha about the benefits (*phan yon* = *ānisamsa*) of the five virtues (*tshul khrims* = *sīla*) (271b4). The Buddha addresses the monks (271b6): “The killing of living beings should be regarded as like a poisonous snake: bound up with many sufferings, leading to rebirth among *petas*, animals, and hell-beings”. He then describes the sufferings of the Sañjīva Hell (*yañ sros*).¹ If the person is reborn as a human being, he will be short-lived, unattractive, and unintelligent. The section contains a verse of four lines on the faults (*ñes pa* = *dosa*) of killing (272a4), and verses on the twenty benefits (*yon tan* = *guṇa*) of refraining from killing (272a4–7).

¹ cf. *DPPN* II 1001.

The second section (272b1 foll.), on theft, describes rebirth in the Roruva Hell (*ñu 'bod*), which is of two types: Jālaroruva (*'bar ba'i ñu 'bod*) and Dhūmaroruva (*du ba'i ñu 'bod*).¹ If the person is reborn as a human, as a result of his previous theft he will lose his possessions, and have difficulty in obtaining the necessities of existence. "Theft is like a poisonous serpent" The section contains a verse of four lines on the faults of theft (272b7), and verses on the twenty benefits of refraining from theft (273a1–4).

The third section (273a4 foll.) deals with sexual misconduct, which leads to rebirth in the Mahāroruva Hell (*ñu 'bod chen po*),² of which the torments are described in prose and verse (273b2). "Sexual misconduct, monks, is like a poisonous serpent" The section contains a verse of four lines on the faults of sexual misconduct (273b4), and verses on the twenty benefits of refraining from sexual misconduct (273b7–274a3).

The fourth section (274b1 foll.) deals with lying, which leads to the Kālasutta Hell (*thig nag*),³ of which the torments are described. "Lying, monks, is like a poisonous serpent..." The results if the sinner is reborn as a human are described (274b4). A verse of four lines describes the faults of lying (274b6), while thirty-three benefits of refraining from lying are given in verse (274b6–275a2).

The fifth and last section (275a6 foll.) deals with intoxication, which leads to the Tapanā Hell (*tsha ba'i dmyal ba*).⁴ The results if the person is reborn as a human are described (275b3). The section contains

¹ cf. DPPN II 758–59.

² cf. DPPN II 550.

³ cf. DPPN I 580.

⁴ cf. DPPN I 991.

a four-line verse on the faults of drink (275b4), and verses on the thirty-six benefits of refraining from drink (275b5–276a1).

In conclusion (276a2), the Buddha states, "These five virtues (*tshul khrims = śīla*) should be guarded: a man or a woman who does not guard or develop virtue will, at the breaking up of the body, after death, be reborn in the evil destinies, the evil realms, the downfall; those who guard and cultivate virtue will, at the breaking up of the body, after death, be reborn in the happy realms, the heavens, the worlds of the gods". The sutta closes with the stock ending, "Thus spoke the Lord; the monks applauded the Lord's teaching". No mention is made of the devoted Nakulas.

The second part of the sutta, which gives the text its title, has no counterpart in the Pāli canon. The five sections on the five transgressions and their opposites have a similar structure: description of the allotted hell; description of the results if the sinner is reborn as a human; comparison of the transgression to a poisonous snake; a verse of four lines on the faults of the transgression; and verses on the many benefits of its opposite. The style of both prose and verse is late, and may be compared with that of cosmological texts such as the *Lokapaññatti*.

1.8. *Giri-ānanda-sūtra / Ri'i kun dga' bo'i mdo*¹

Sūtra for Giri Ānanda

D 38, 276a5–279a2 (5 folio pages +)

B (40).20, C 1021, H 39, J 33, L XXXVI(8), M 38, N 354,

Q 754, S 296, T 293, U 342, Bu ston 369

¹ The title given in the colophons at D 279a1, L 135b4, N 588b6, and S 147a6, and in the final collective colophon in CDQ is *Tshe dan ldan pa* (DQ: *pa'i C*) *ri'i kun dga' bo'i mdo* = Pāli **Āyasmā-giri-ānanda-sutta*.

Giri, A V 108,18–112,18, *Girimānanda-sutta*, *Maha Pirit Pota* 20¹

Translated by Feer, *AMG V* 145–50.

Tibetan, Pāli: spoken by the Buddha at Sāvathī in the Jetavana, Anāthapiṇḍika's Pleasance, to Ānanda.

The Tibetan lists and then deals in detail with the same ten notions ('*du śes bcu*, *dasa saññā*) as does the Pāli. The sixth notion, '*dod chags dañ bral ba'i 'du śes = virāgasaññā*, is incomplete in the Derge, London, Narthang, Peking, and Stog versions, and merges with the seventh, '*gog pa'i 'du śes = nirodhasaññā*.² At D 276b1, the Tibetan adds *de nas bcom ldan 'das kyis tshe dañ ldan pa kun dga' bo la bka' stsal pa* = "Then the Lord said to venerable Ānanda", not found in the Pāli. In the description of "notion of the unpleasant" (*mi gtsaṅ ba'i 'du śes = asubhasaññā*), reference is made to "the thirty-two impure items" (277a3, *mi gtsaṅ ba'i rdzas sum cu rtsa gñis = *dvattimsa-asubhatthu*); this is not found in the Pāli.

- 1.9. *Nandopanandanāgarājadamana-sūtra* / *Klu'i rgyal po dga' bo ñer dga' 'dul ba'i mdo*³
Sūtra on the Vanquishing of the Serpent King Nandopananda
 D 39, 279a2–281b1 (5 folio pages)
 B (40).21, C 1022, H 40, J 34, L XXXVI(15), M 39, N 355,
 Q 755, S 303, T 300, U 349, Bu ston 370

¹ The A title is from the *uddāna*, 112,22.

² D 277b4–5; L 134a1–3; N 586b7–587a2; Q 294b1–3; S 145b1–3. Since the lacuna occurs in representatives of both Them spaṅs ma (LNS) and Tshal pa (DQ), it almost certainly occurs in other known editions.

³ The final collective colophon in CDQ reads ... *dga' bo dañ ñer* (DQ: *ñe C*) *dga' ...*; LNS read as above (but *ñer LN*, *ñe S*).

**Nandopanandanāgarājadamana-sutta*, *Visuddhimagga* XII § 106–16; *Theragāthā Aṭṭhakathā* (PTS edition) III 177,4–179,20

Translated by Feer, *AMG V* 414–19.

Occurs at Sāvathī, Jetavana, Anāthapiṇḍika's Pleasance.

The account of Mahāmoggallāna's taming (*damana*) of the powerful Nāga Nandopananda by means of a dramatic magical contest is not found in the Theravādin *Tipiṭaka*. It is related in almost identical terms in the *Visuddhimagga* and in the *Theragāthā Aṭṭhakathā*; in both cases it is given as a citation, without naming the exact source, although the event is described in both texts as *Nandopanandadamana*.¹ A Sinhalese version, also very similar, is found in the fourteenth chapter of the *Amāvatura*, a life of the Buddha composed by Guruḷugōmī at about the end of the 12th century.² There is also a Chinese parallel, styled *sūtra* (*ching*) in the title, in an early (pre-Buddhaghosa) translation: the *Lung wang hsiung ti ching*, translated between 223 and 253 A.C.³

¹ *Theragāthā Aṭṭhakathā* III 177,3, 179,19; *Visuddhimagga* (Harvard Oriental Series) 338,5.

² cf. C.E. Godakumbara, *Sinhalese Literature*, Colombo, 1955, pp. 56–61, 49–50 (date of author); cf. translation in Spence Hardy, *A Manual of Buddhism*, repr. Varanasi 1967, pp. 302–3 (from the *Pūjāvaliya*, according to note on p. 141). Feer, pp. 414–15, mentions a parallel in the anthology *Sārasaṅgraha*, composed at the end of the 13th or early 14th century (K.R. Norman, *Pāli Literature*, Wiesbaden, 1983, p. 173).

³ Taishō 597; *KBC* no. 780. I am grateful to Prof. Heinz Bechert for this reference. For the translator, Chih-ch'ien, see Étienne Lamotte, *La concentration de la marche héroïque (Śūraṅgamasamādhisūtra)*, Brussels, 1965, pp. 76–79; Prabodh Chandra Bagchi, *Le canon bouddhique en Chine I*, Paris, 1927, pp. 283–300 (Tche-k'ien); E. Zürcher, *The Buddhist Conquest of China*, Leiden, 1972, pp. 48–51.

The Tibetan is described as a *sūtra* in the title, and indeed opens with the traditional formula, “Thus I once heard: the Lord was staying at Sāvathī”, and closes with the traditional formula, “Thus spoke the Lord; those monks applauded the Lord’s teaching”. The latter, however, is hardly apt, since the text contains no sermon as such, and since the last words are spoken by Anāthapiṇḍika, who offers to provide the Buddha and the monks with food for seven days. Otherwise, the Tibetan, which in this case is quite clearly rendered and relatively free of error, corresponds almost exactly to the *Visuddhimagga* and *Theragāthā Aṭṭhakathā* accounts.

Reference is made to the vanquishing of Nandopananda in the *Jayamaṅgalagāthā*, a popular non-canonical *paritta* that invokes protection through eight victories. The *Ṭikābhūm*, a commentary on the verses, therefore includes the account of the vanquishing of the *Nāga* king.¹ I have not come across any references to the *Nandopanandadama* as an independent sutta in the various catalogues of Pāli manuscripts that I have consulted.² The tale is popular in Burma, where it is represented pictorially by Nandopananda and Mahāmoggallāna in the form of *nāgas* coiled around Mt. Sumeru.

¹ C.E. Godakumbura, *Catalogue of Cambodian and Burmese Pāli Manuscripts*, Copenhagen, 1983, pp. 42–46. A summary (in Thai) from a Thai manuscript is given in Supaphan 1990, p. 308.

² Supaphan (1990) describes the text as *-sutta*, a Thai translation by Nāgapradīpa, *Ṭikā-jayamaṅgala-aṭṭhaka-desanā (Bāhūm)*, Bangkok, 2470 [1927], repr. 2520 [1977], pp. 160–81, as *-sūtra*. Godakumbura, *op. cit.*, p. 43, refers to *Nandopanandanāgarājasutta* in his list of contents of the *Ṭikā-bāhūni*, but transcribes the title as *Nandopanandanāggārāja* (sic) only on p. 45.

- 1.10. *Mahākāśyapa-sūtra* / 'Od sruṅ chen po 'i mdo¹
Sūtra on Mahākāśyapa
 D 40, 281b1–282a6 (–2 folios)
 B (40).22, C 1023, H 41, J 35, L XXXVI(16), M 40, N 356,
 Q 756, S 394, T 301, U 350, Bu ston 371
 S V 79,18–80,18, *Gilāna*;² *Maha Pirit Pota* 17,
Mahākassapatherabojjhaṅgam
 Translated by Feer, *AMG* V 150–52.

Tibetan, Pāli: spoken at Rājagaha, Veḷuvana, Kalandakanivāpa.

The Tibetan gives the text in full, without abbreviation; the Pāli of the PTS and *Maha Pirit Pota* editions is abbreviated. The two versions are very close. The Tibetan (281b4) adds one phrase not found in Pāli (cf. S V 80,1): *de nas tshē dan ldan pa 'od sruṅ chen pos gsol pa*, “Venerable Mahākassapa then said”.

- 1.11. *Sūrya-sūtra* / Ṇi ma 'i mdo
Sūtra on the Sun
 D 41, 282a6–b6 (1 folio page)
 B (40).23, C 1024, H 42, J 36, L XXXVI(17), M 41, N 357,
 Q 757, S 305, T 302, U 351, Bu ston 372
 S I 51, 1–24, *Suriya-sutta*; *Maha Pirit Pota* 15, *Suriyaparitta*

Tibetan, Pāli: spoken at Sāvathī in the Jetavana, Anāthapiṇḍika’s Pleasance.

The Tibetan and the *Maha Pirit Pota* give the Sāvathī *nidāna* in full; in the *Samyutta Nikāya* (PTS) there is no *nidāna*. Where the Pāli, in

¹ The colophons to DLNS and the final collective colophon in CDQ give the title as *gNas brtan 'od sruṅ chen po 'i mdo* = Pāli **Mahākassapathera-sutta*.

² The title is from the *uddāna*, p. 83,4, *gilānā apare tayo*.

both this and the following sutta, has *bhagavantam anussaramāno* only, the Tibetan of this and the following text (*Ñi ma* 282b1; *Zla ba* 283a1) have *bcom ldan 'das rjes su dran pa yid la byas te*, which seems to translate *bhagavantam anussaramāno manasikaronto*. The Tibetan introduces the last verse with *des smras pa*, “he [Rāhu] said”. An equivalent phrase is not found in Pāli. Otherwise the prose and verse of the two versions is similar.

1.12. *Candra-sūtra / Zla ba'i mdo*

Sūtra on the Moon

D 42, 282b6–283a5 (1 folio page)

B (40).24, C 1025, H 43, J 37, L XXXVI(18), M 42, N 358, Q 758, S 306, T 303, U 352, Bu ston *deest*

S I 50,15–35, *Candima-sutta*; *Maha Pirit Pota* 14, *Candaparitta*

Translated by Feer, *AMG V* 410–13, conjointly with the Pāli, side-by-side with a translation of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin version.

[The *Kanjur* also contains an anonymous translation of a (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin recension: *Candra-sūtra / Zla ba'i mdo*, Q 997, Vol. 39, *mdo sna tshogs*, śu 268a2–b3. A fragmentary (probably) Sarvāstivādin recension from Central Asia was published by E. Waldschmidt, “Buddha Frees the Disc of the Moon”, in the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies (BSOAS)*, XXXIII/1, 1970, pp. 179–83 (cf. p. 179 notes 2 and 3 for a full bibliographic account of Feer’s work). The verses of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin version are incorporated into one of the *Pañcarakṣā* texts in Tibetan translation, *Mahāmantrānudharani*, D 536, 154b4–7: cf. Skilling 1992, p. 142.]

The Tibetan and the *Maha Pirit Pota* give the *Sāvattihī nidāna* in full; the *Samyutta Nikāya* (PTS) abbreviates it as *Sāvattihīyam viharati*. The Tibetan (283a5) introduces the last verse with *sgra can 'dzin gyis*

smras pa, **rāhu āha*. An equivalent phrase is not found in the Pāli. Otherwise the Tibetan and Pāli are similar.

In Pāli, the *Suriya-* and *Candima-suttas* are identical, but for the substitution of *suriya / candima* where appropriate and the addition of one extra verse in the *Suriya-sutta*; similarly, in Tibetan the *Sūrya-* and *Candra-sūtras* are identical, but for the substitution of *ñi ma = suriya / zla ba = canda*, and the addition of the extra verse. Chizen Akanuma, *The Comparative Catalogue of Chinese Āgamas & Pāli Nikāyas* (Nagoya, 1929, p. 178), lists Chinese parallels for the Pāli *Candima-sutta* but not for the *Suriya-sutta*. Thus while the former is well represented in the versions of at least two schools (the Theravādins and the [Mūla-]Sarvāstivādin), the latter is not, and may be unique to the Theravādins.

1.13. *Mahāmaṅgala-sūtra / bKra śis chen po'i mdo*

Sūtra on the Great Blessing

D 43, 283a5–284a1 (1 folio page +)

B (40).25, C 1026, H 44, J 38, L XXXVI(19), M 43, M 360,¹ N 359, Q 759, S 307, T 304, U 353, Bu ston 373

Khuddakapāṭha V, pp. 2,25–3,26, *Maṅgala-sutta*; Sn pp. 46,10–47,22, *Mahāmaṅgala-sutta*; *Maha Pirit Pota* 7, *Mahāmaṅgala-sutta*

Translated by Feer, *AMG V* 224–27.

[The *Kanjur* contains an anonymous translation of a recension of another, unknown school: *Lhas žus pa'i bkra śis kyi tshigs su bcad pa / Devapariprcchā Maṅgalagāthā*, Q 442 (*rgyud tsha*), Q 721 (*rgyud ya*),

¹ In the Urga edition only, the text (as M 360) closes the Sūtra Division of the *Kanjur* (cf. Bethlenfalvy 1980, Introduction, p. 12). The colophon is the same as for M 31–43, with the addition of *bu ston phab pa'o*, “edited by Bu ston”. This remark is not found in any of the other editions.

Q 1053 (*'dul ba phe*). This was translated by Feer side-by-side with the present text, under the rubric “Version du Nord”.]

Tibetan, Pāli: located at Sāvathī, Jetavana, Anāthapiṇḍika’s Pleasance.

The prose opening is the same, except that for the Pāli *aññatarā devatā*, “a certain deity”, singular, the Tibetan has *lha du ma rnams*, “many deities”, plural. Both versions open with a verse question spoken by the god(s), asking about blessings (*maṅgala*). Before the first verse of the Buddha’s reply (*Suttanipāta* 259), the Tibetan gives an extra verse (283b1), not found in the Pāli:

lha 'i yañ lha yis bka ' stsal pa ||
sdig pa thams cad rnam par 'joms ||
'jig rten kun la phan pa 'i don ||
bkra śis de rnams khyed la bśad ||

The god of gods (*devātideva*) [the Buddha] replied:
 “I will teach you those blessings (*maṅgala*)
 which overcome all evil (*sabbapāpa*)
 and bring benefit (*hita*) to all the world (*loka*)”.

Otherwise the eleven verses spoken by the Buddha are the same and occur in the same order, with, as usual, many problems of translation. The Tibetan (283b7) ends with, “Thus spoke the Lord; those gods applauded the Lord’s teaching”. The ending is not given in the Pāli. The other Tibetan version, the *Devapariprocchā Maṅgalagāthā*, is a recension of another school, and hence differs in order and number of verses.

- 1.14. *Ārya-maitrī-sūtra-nāma* / *'Phags pa byams pa 'i mdo zes bya ba*
Sūtra on Holy Maitreya (or) *Holy Sūtra on Maitreya*
 Q 1010, *mdo, hu* 304a5–311b3 (15 folio pages, excluding colophon)

The *Ārya-maitrī-sūtra* was translated by Ānandaśrī and Kundga’ rgyal mtshan Thub bstan dpal bzañ po at Sa skya in the year 1307 (see above). As far as I have been able to determine, it is available in only four of the *Kanjurs* used for this study:¹

Berlin	(82).4	Vol. 82 <i>mdo a</i> (30), no. 4
Lhasa	349	Vol. 74 <i>mdo sa</i> (28), no. 3
Narthang	328	Vol. 74 <i>mdo sa</i> (28), no. 3
Peking	1010	Vol. 91 <i>mdo hu</i> (30), no. 4

The text is not listed in Bu ston’s catalogue. As seen above, it is closely related to 1.5, and has at least a partial parallel in the Pāli *Metteyya-sutta*. The first modern note of the sūtra was made by Csoma de Kőrös in his “Analysis of the Mdo”, published in *Asiatick Researches* (Calcutta, 1836–39) in the form of a generally accurate summary. The text was referred to by Sylvain Lévi along with 1.5.² There is also a Mongolian translation.³

Numbers 1.1. to 1.14: General remarks

Nos. 1.1–13 all open with *'phags pa dkon mchog gsum la gus pas phyag 'tshal lo*, 1.14 with *dkon mchog gsum la gus par phyag 'tshal lo*, “I respectfully pay homage to the (Holy) Three Gems (*ariya-*

¹ cf. Haarh 1962, p. 205; Takasaki 1965, p. 31.

² Lévi 1932, pp. 377–80.

³ Ligeti § 1105 = Vol. 90 = *mdo (eldeb)* XXXI, no. 4.

tiratana)”.¹ They seem to be the only texts in the *Kanjur* to do so, the usual formula of homage for sūtras being *dkon mchog gsum la phyag 'tshal lo = namo ratnatrayāya*. Numbers 1.1–1.7 in the Derge edition and numbers 1.2–7 and 1.9–13 in the London, Narthang, and Stog Palace editions end with a short *praṇidhāna*, not found at all in the Peking edition, *sa 'i steṅ du ṅi (ma daṅ) zla (ba) ltar gyur cig*, “May the surface of the earth be like the sun and moon”, also not met with elsewhere in the *Kanjur*.²

I hope in the foregoing to have established that all fourteen texts belong to the Theravādin school. For those texts which have no known counterpart in the canons of other schools, I have tried to show the similarity between the Tibetan and Pāli versions. For those texts that have such a counterpart, I have mentioned the differences between the versions by way of contrast.

Nine out of the 13 texts (nos. 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13) are included in *paritta* collections such as the *Maha Pirit Pota*. Since number 6 comprises two *parittas*, ten Pāli *parittas* are in fact represented. (Feer was presumably the first to recognize their relationship to *paritta*, which is also noted in the Otani catalogue, p. 94, note) Three texts — the *Jātakanidāna* and the two versions of the **Metteyyasutta* — deal extensively with the past lives and final life of the Buddha of the present age, Sakyamuni, and with the future Buddha, Metteyya, respectively; together they constitute a complete Theravādin Buddhology. It is unlikely that either of these, or the *Pañcaśikṣānuśamsa-sūtra*, were classed as *paritta*; the first part of the latter, the *Samajīvin* (1.7.A) is not classed as such by the Theravādins. The *Jātakanidāna* is precluded by its length, while the other two do not have the characteristics of *paritta* (note, however, that the “*Buddhavaṃsa-sutta*” was chanted to bring rain in the

¹ This was noted by Beckh (1914), p. 13, note 1.

² The information for Stog is from Skorupski 1985, pp. 158–60.

Shan state of Jengtung in the 14th and 15th centuries¹). They may have been selected for translation on the basis of popularity, since the life of the Buddha was perennially popular, and the Metteyya cult and cosmological (the latter and main part of the *Pañcaśikṣānuśamsa*) texts were popular at the time in question. The *Nandopanandadamana*, though composed in rather unwieldy prose, might have had *paritta* status, since Mahāmoggallāna’s taming of the Nāga King is one of the “eight victories” of the *Jayamaṅgalagāthā*.²

Only two of the fourteen texts are popular among Tibetans today. These are the *Sūrya-sūtra* (1.11) and the *Candra-sūtra* (1.12), which are included in popular collections of *mantras* and *rakṣās* such as the *mDo maṅ*.³ Here the Theravādin version of the *Candra-sūtra* is chosen over the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin version, also found in Tibetan translation. The same two are popular in Theravādin countries, being included in the *Maha Pirit Pota* (nos. 15 and 14) of Ceylon and in the *Catubhānavāra* collections.⁴

A considerable portion of one text, the *Pañcaśikṣānuśamsa*, has not been traced in Pāli; all the others are available in Pāli (assuming that the **Metteyya-sutta* [1.5, 1.14] does correspond to a Pāli text of the same name).

¹ Sao Sāimōng Mangrāi, *The Pāḍaeng Chronicle and the Jengtung State Chronicle Translated*, Ann Arbor, 1981, Pāḍaeng §§ 194–95, Jengtung § 112.

² *Maha Pirit Pota*, p. xlii, verse 7.

³ Marcelle Lalou, *Catalogue du fonds tibétain de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, quatrième partie, I.—Les Mdo Maṅ, Paris, 1931, nos. 117, 118 (pp. 46–47); R.O. Meisezahl, “Über Zwei Mdo Maṅ Redaktionen und Ihre Editionen in Tibet und China”, *Zentralasiatische Studien* 2, Wiesbaden, 1968, p. 36 (LXIV.tu 111, 112); p. 96 (LXIV.tu 139, 140); p. 107 (LXIV.tu 138, 139); p. 121 (LXIV.tu 110, 111); Concordance, 7a, nos. 176, 177.

⁴ For the latter, see Skilling 1992, pp. 118–20.

Under the individual sūtras I have noted a few discrepancies between the Tibetan and Pāli versions. Some, such as the supplying of a complete opening (*nidāna*) in the Tibetan against an abbreviated or omitted opening in the Pāli sutta versions are only to be expected: in the sutta versions the opening occurs earlier on in the collection; as independent texts, the Tibetan versions give the complete *nidānas*, as do the Pāli *paritta* versions. Other discrepancies such as the introduction of a phrase “so and so said” are relatively minor redactional variants.

All of the fourteen texts show many problems of translation, some of which have been mentioned above. A few further examples:

- 1.1. (D 183a2) *bag yod par gyur*, **appamādo*, “heedful” = S V 424,5 *appamāno*, “limitless”;
- 1.3. (D 250b1) *sñiṅ po daṅ sñiṅ po med pa’i gtaṃ*, **kathaṃ sārāsāraṇīyaṃ* (?) = D III 194,14 *kathaṃ sārāṇīyaṃ*;
- 1.3. (D 253a3, etc.) *draṅ sroṅ chen po*, Skt. *mahārṣi*, Pāli *mahesi* = D III 203,1, etc. *mārisa*, “sir”;
- 1.8. (D 277b2) *mi bsgom par ’gro ba*, **anabhāvanam gacchati*, “is not cultivated” = A V 110,16 *anabhāvaṃ gameti*, “disappears”;
- 1.8. (D 277a1 etc.) *dge sloṅ kun dga’ bo ’di ni* “Bhikkhu Ānanda, this...” = A V 109,19, etc. *idh’ ānanda bhikkhu*, “Here, Ānanda, a monk ...”;
- 1.11. (D 282b1), 1.12.(D 283a1): *thams cad myur du grol bar gyis* = S I 50,20– 51,5 *vippamutto si sabbadhi*; since *myur du* corresponds to Sanskrit *kṣipra*, Pāli *khippa*, the Tibetan seems to translate **khippamutto*.

Many more examples could be cited. At a few places, transliterated letters suggest Sanskrit forms:

- 1.3. (D 252b2) *lcaṅ lo can daṅ ku śa’i groṅ* || *pha rol ku śa’i groṅ daṅ ni* || *nāṭa’i groṅ daṅ pha rol gyi* || *ku śi ta’i groṅ yin no* || = D III 200,24, *āṭānāṭā*, *kusināṭā*, *parakusināṭā*, *nāṭapuriyā*, *parakusitanāṭā*.
- 1.8. (D 277a6) *bitsartsika*, (Q 294a4) *bi tsar rtsi ka* = Sanskrit *vicarcika*; A V 110,6 *vitacchikā*.

Mistranslations can arise from a correct translation of a faulty Indic original, or a wrong translation of a correct Indic original. In the present case, let us suppose that the manuscripts were in Pāli in Sinhalese script, and that Ānandaśrī did not know Tibetan nor Ñi ma rgyal mtshan Pāli or the Sinhalese script. Since the latter had spent fourteen years in Nepal, and since the former is said to have resided in Bodh Gayā (and at any rate would have travelled through Northern India and perhaps Nepal to reach Tibet), they may well have communicated in a mixture of Sanskrit and the North Indian *lingua franca* of the day. This could have given rise to both the mistranslations and the Sanskrit forms. A thorough analysis of the Tibetan versions in comparison with the Pāli might reveal whether the mistranslations arose from a Sanskrit or a Pāli text, or even whether the original was in the Sinhalese script, if it can be shown that the mistranslation was caused by a misreading of that script.

1.15. ***Vimuttimaggā*, Chapter 3: *Dhutagaṇa-nirdeśa***
Vimuktimārga-dhutagaṇa-nirdeśa-nāma / *rNam par grol ba’i lam las sbyaṅs ba’i yon tan bstan pa zes bya ba*

A. Included in the *Kanjur*

A.1. Following the arrangement of the Tshal pa *Kanjur*:

Berlin	(80).6	Vol. 80 <i>mdo sa</i> (28), no. 6
Cone	945	Vol. 52 <i>mdo sa</i> (28), no. 6
Derge	306	Vol. 72 <i>mdo sa</i> (28), no. 6
Lhasa	309	Vol. 72 <i>mdo la</i> (26), no. 6

Lithang	246	Vol. 67	<i>mdo sa</i> (28), no. 6
Narhang	291	Vol. 72	<i>mdo la</i> (26), no. 6
Peking	972	Vol. 89	<i>mdo su</i> (28), no. 6
Urga	306	Vol. 72	<i>mdo sa</i> (28), no. 6

A.2. Following the arrangement of the Them spangs ma
Kanjur:

London	XXV(2)	Vol. 50	<i>mdo ra</i> (25), no. 2
Stog	244	Vol. 76	<i>mdo ra</i> (25), no. 2
Tokyo	244	Vol. 81	<i>mdo ra</i> (25), no. 2
Ulan Bator	292	Vol. 78	<i>mdo ra</i> (25), no. 2
JB	—	—	<i>mdo ra</i> (25), no. 2
JP	—	—	<i>mdo ra</i> (25), no. 2

A.3. Phug brag *Kanjur*:

Phug brag	206	Vol. 82	<i>mdo sa</i> (29), no. 6 ¹
Phug brag	327	Vol. 89	<i>mdo khu</i> (36), no. 15

A.4. Newark *Kanjur*:

Newark	—	—	<i>mdo ra</i> (25), no. 5 ²
--------	---	---	--

A.5. According to Bu ston's *History of Buddhism*:

Bu ston	40		
---------	----	--	--

¹ *sa* is Vol. 29 because two volumes are labelled *ra*. Although the text is *sa* no. 6 in most of the Tshal pa *Kanjurs* as well, this is a coincidence: apart from the first text (the *Abhiniṣkramaṇa-sūtra*), the contents of volumes *sa* in the Tshal pa and Phug brag *Kanjurs* are otherwise different.

² The last text in the volume: information from the table of contents at the end of Vol. *ra*, which should be Vol. 25 of the *Sūtra* section, if there were no irregularities in numbering of volumes.

B. Included in the *Tanjur*:

Cone	—	—	' <i>dul ba su</i> ¹
Derge	4143	Vol. 167	' <i>dul ba su</i>
Golden	—	Vol. 178 ²	' <i>dul ba u</i>
Narhang	3635	Vol. 178	' <i>dul ba u</i>
Peking	5644	Vol. 178	' <i>dul ba u</i>

The lists show that the text is no. 6 of the 28th volume of *Sūtra* (*mDo*) in the Tshal pa tradition, except for in N and (following N) H, in which it is in the 26th volume. The Mongolian translation (Ligeti § 1066) is no. 6 of the 29th volume of *Sūtra*. The text is no. 2 of the 25th volume of *Sūtra* in the Them spangs ma tradition. The work occurs twice in the unique Phug brag *Kanjur*; although attributed to the same translators, the two translations differ.³ This is interesting in the light of Bu ston's remarks about the existence of an earlier translation not accessible to him (see below). In the Newark *Kanjur* it is the last text of volume *ra*. In the *Tanjur* it is classed under *Vinaya* ('*Dul ba*), in the last volume.

The Tibetan text has been edited on the basis of four editions (BCDN) in the Devanāgarī and roman scripts and translated into English by P.V. Bapat, who also discusses the relations between the Tibetan, the *Vimuttimaggā* in Chinese translation, and the Pāli *Visuddhimaggā*.⁴ A romanized edition with Japanese translation and extensive notes has been published by Genjun H. Sasaki.⁵

¹ Folios 161b2–172b7.

² Reprint Vol. 79: see P. Skilling, "A Brief Guide to the *Golden Tanjur*", *JSS* 79/2 (1991), pp. 138–46.

³ Samten 1992, p. xviii.

⁴ P.V. Bapat, *Vimuktimārga Dhutaṅganirdeśa*, Bombay, 1964.

⁵ Genjun H. Sasaki, *Vimuktimārga Dhutaṅganirdeśa*, Kyoto, 1958, based on HNQ, and several other editions not clear to me.

This text, a chapter of the *Vimuttimaggā*¹ dealing with the 13 purifying practices (*dhutaṅga* or *dhutaṅga*),² was translated into Tibetan by the Indian preceptor (*upadhyaḃya*) Vidyākaraprabha and the Tibetan translator dPal brtsegs, well-known scholars active around 800 A.C. The colophon states:³

*rnam par grol ba'i lam las sbyaṅs pa'i yon tan bstan pa zes
bya ba ste kun nas btus pa gsum pa rdzogs so ||*

“The Exposition of Purifying Virtues” (*Dhutaṅganirdeśa*) from the *Path of Liberation* (*Vimuktimārga*), Chapter 3, is completed.⁴

Here (as in the translation of the title) the compound Sanskrit title *Vimuktimārga-dhutaṅga-nirdeśa*, which shows no case endings, has been rendered as “Exposition of Purifying Virtues from (*las*) the

¹ The complete *Vimuttimaggā* is extant only in Chinese translation (Taishō 1648, *KBC* 968). It has been rendered into English by Ehara *et al.* ([1961] 1977). For a recent note on the *Vimuttimaggā*, see H. Bechert, “*Vimuttimaggā* and *Amatākaravaṅṅānā*”, in N.H. Samtani and H.S. Prasad (ed.), *Amalā Prajñā: Aspects of Buddhist Studies (Professor P.V. Bapat Felicitation Volume)*, Delhi, 1989, p. 11. For discussion of the school affiliation of the *Vimuttimaggā*, see K.R. Norman, “The Literary Works of the Abhayagirivihārins”, in V.N. Jha (ed.), *Kalyāṅa-mitta: Professor Hajime Nakamura Felicitation Volume*, Delhi, 1991, pp. 41–50, and P. Skilling, “*Vimuttimaggā* and Abhayagiri: The Form-aggregate according to the *Saṃskṛtāsaṃskṛta-viniścaya*” (forthcoming).

² For these see *BHSD* 285b, *dhuta*, *dhutaṅga*, *dhutadharmā*; *PTSD* 342a, *dhuta*; *EB* IV/4 580–85 (“*Dhutaṅga*”).

³ S 244, Skorupski, p. 139; Q 972, *mdo*, *śu*, 149a2; Newark, *mdo*, *ra*, 249b6. The Newark *Kanjur* lacks the translators’ colophon. A cursory examination of the last folio (*ra* 249b) suggests that it is the same translation.

⁴ *Kun nas btus pa*, which I have taken here in the sense of chapter, is equivalent to the Sanskrit *samuccaya*. Since the *Vimuttimaggā* is not available in the original, whether Pāli or Sanskrit, I cannot say whether this term was used in the original text.

Path of Liberation”. This shows that the translators knew they were dealing with an excerpt from a work entitled *Vimuktimārga* and not an independent text. Otherwise they would probably have rendered the title as “Exposition of Purifying Virtues of” (*gyi*) or perhaps “in” or “in relation to (*la*)¹ the Path of Liberation”, taking the last as a common noun. The chapter in question is indeed the third of the Chinese translation of the *Vimuttimaggā*.²

Since the text is in fact a treatise (*śāstra*) and not the word of the Buddha (*Buddhavacana*), its proper place is the *Tanjur* rather than the *Kanjur*. Bu ston (§ 40) classifies the text in Section II (Hinayāna) of the Word of the Buddha (*bka*’); he notes that “in the great catalogues this is classified as a sūtra, but some hold that it is a *śāstra*” (*’di dkar chag chen mo dag tu mdor byas la kha cig bstan bcos su ’dod*). A similar statement is made in the catalogues of the Derge and Urga *Kanjurs*.³ Bu ston (§ 98) also lists a **Dhutaṅganirdeśa-sūtra* (*sByaṅs pa’i yon tan bśad pa’i mdo*) in Word of the Buddha, Section III, “Texts unavailable at present but definitely translated in the early period” (*śnar ’gyur nes pa da lta ma rñed pa*).⁴ Under *śāstra* (§ 793) he refers to a **Dhutaṅga-anuśaṃsa* (*sByaṅs pa’i yon tan gyi phan yon*) in 100 *ślokas* composed by Ācārya Nāgārjuna (Slob dpon Klu sgrub) which “should be sought” (*btсал bar ’o*). I doubt whether the last-named is related to our text.

Why the text was selected for translation is not clear. Since the Indian translator, Vidyākaraprabha, worked on Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya texts such as the *Vinayavastu*, *Kṣudrakavastu*, and *Bhikṣuṅī-*

¹ Some of the Tibetan transcriptions of the Sanskrit title read *-mārge*.

² Ehara *et al.* [1961] 1977, pp. 27–38.

³ Derge Catalogue, *Lakṣmī*, 134b4; Bethlenfalvy 1980, p. 76, *’di la’aṅ kha cig bstan bcos su dogs pa skyes kyaṅ | śnon gyi dkar chag chen mo rnam las mdor bśad pa ṅid khuṅs su che’o*.

⁴ The Lithang and Lhasa *Catalogues* and the Urga colophon in fact add *mdo* = *sūtra* to the title.

vinayavibhaṅga, it is unlikely that he was a Sthavira. Perhaps such an exposition of the 13 *dhutaṅga* was lacking in the Mūlasarvāstivādin or other traditions, causing the *Vimuttimagga* chapter to be adopted by other schools.

2. Theravādin texts and tenets in the *Tanjur*

The Theravādin literature in the *Tanjur* occurs in the form of citations within larger works; with the exception of the duplicated *Vimuttimagga*, no independent Theravādin texts are found.

2.1. *Vimuttimagga* in the *Saṃskṛtāsaṃskṛta-viniścaya*

The most extensive and significant *Tanjur* source for Theravādin tenets is the *Saṃskṛtāsaṃskṛta-viniścaya* of Daśabalaśrimitra, lost in the original Sanskrit and preserved in Tibetan translation only.¹ In an earlier article I have attempted to show that the author most probably lived in North-eastern India in the 12th or 13th century A.C., and have pointed out that the text is accurately and clearly translated, and that the author's sources, when traceable, are accurately cited.²

Daśabalaśrimitra devotes three full chapters, numbers 13 to 15, to the tenets of the Theravādins; although in each case he names his source as “the tradition (*Āgama*) of the Ārya Sthavira school (Sthavira-nikāya)”,³ in all three cases the chapters are direct citations from the *Vimuttimagga*. Two other passages from the same work are also cited by

¹ Stobs bcu dpal bśes gñen, '*Dus byas dan 'dus ma byas rnam par nes pa*, Peking *Tanjur* 5865, Vol. 146. References in this section are to this edition.

² cf. P. Skilling, “The *Saṃskṛtāsaṃskṛta-viniścaya* of Daśabalaśrimitra”, in *BSR* 4/1 (1987), pp. 3–23.

³ 90b3, '*phags pa gnas brtan pa'i sde pa'i luṅ las 'di ltar rnam par bźag ste*.

Daśabalaśrimitra. The concordance of the citations and the Chinese *Vimuttimagga* (in English translation) is as follows:

1) Daśabalaśrimitra, ch. 13, *gNas brtan pa'i sde pa'i tshul lugs phuṅ po skye mched khams rnam par nes pa*, 90b3–98b7, **Sthaviranikāya-naya-skandhāyatanadhātu-viniścaya*:

“An analysis of the aggregates, bases, and elements according to the Sthavira school”, equivalent to *Vimuttimagga*, ch. 11, section 1, pp. 237–59;

2) Daśabalaśrimitra, ch. 14, *gNas brtan pa'i sde pa'i tshul gyi rten ciṅ 'brel bar 'byuṅ ba rnam par nes pa*, 98b7–106a4, **Sthaviranikāya-naya-pratītyasamutpāda-viniścaya*:

“An analysis of dependent arising according to the Sthavira school”, equivalent to *Vimuttimagga*, ch. 11, section 1, pp. 259–68;

3) Daśabalaśrimitra, ch. 15, '*Phags pa gnas brtan pa'i sde pa'i tshul lugs las 'phags pa'i bden pa la mkhas pa rnam par nes pa*, 106a4–127a3, **Ārya-sthaviranikāya-naya-āryasatyakauśalya-viniścaya*:

“An analysis of mastery of the Four Truths of the Noble according to the Exalted Sthavira school”, equivalent to *Vimuttimagga*, ch. 11, section 2, pp. 269–82 (ch. 12, section 1 omitted), and ch. 12, section 2, pp. 301–26;

4) Daśabalaśrimitra, 177b2–178b4, equivalent to *Vimuttimagga*, p. 6; cf. also p. 10;

5) Daśabalaśrimitra, 179a4–183a1, equivalent to *Vimuttimagga*, ch. 10, pp. 229–36, complete citation.

2.2. Miscellaneous citations in the *Saṃskṛtāsaṃskṛta-viniścaya*

Daśabalaśrimitra cites the views or interpretations of the Sthaviras in ten other cases:

- 1) the length of the *dhanu*, *kosa*, *gavuti*, and *yojana* (in verse), 18a3–4;
- 2) the sixty-four destructions (*saṃvattani*) of the universe by fire, water, and wind, 24a1–5;
- 3) the maximum life-span is unlimited, 25b6–7;
- 4) the “lesser” and “greater” incalculable aeons (*asamkheyya-kappa*), 37a7–b1;
- 5) the Buddhas revered by Sakyamuni as a bodhisatta during twenty great incalculable aeons plus 100,000 [lesser] aeons; the future Buddha Ajita Metteyya; the three types of individual (*puggala*): predominant in faith, in energy, or wisdom (*saddhādhika*, *viriyādhika*, *paññādhika*), 38a4–40b6;
- 6) the seven precious things (*sattaratana*) of a universal emperor (*cakkavatti*); the ten species of elephant (*hatthikula*); the four species of horse (*assakula*); the six types of universal emperor who go to the heavens (**devalokagāmin*), 41b5–42a5;
- 7) five Buddhas arise in a *bhaddakappa*, 42b5;
- 8) five types of aeon in which Buddhas arise (*sāra*, *maṇḍa*, *vara*, *sāraṇḍa*, *bhadda*), 43a2–5;
- 9) the five levels of meditation (*jhāna*), 188b8–189a3;
- 10) where Sakyamuni spent the eighty years and *vassas*, 266a8–b7.

2.3. **Buddhavaṃsa* of the Abhayagiri in the *Tarkajvālā*

Bhavya (c. 500–570 ?),¹ in Chapter 4 of his *Tarkajvālā*, *Śrāvakatattvāvatāra*, gives brief citations from various scriptures of 17 schools, in order to demonstrate that in the Śrāvakayāna

¹ For Bhavya and his date, see Ruegg 1981, pp. 61–66. There is some question about the author and date of the *Tarkajvālā* (see Ruegg 1990), which might bring the date forward to the 8th century. This does not affect the authority of the *Tarkajvālā*, which is an extraordinarily learned and encyclopaedic work.

as in the Mahāyāna homage is to be paid to bodhisattvas.¹ The seventh citation is of four verses from the “*Twelve-thousand Lineage of the Buddhas* of the Ārya Sthavira Abhayagirivāsins” (*’Phags pa gnas brtan pa ’jigs med ri la gnas pa rnams kyi saṅs rgyas kyi rigs khri ṅis stoṅ*). The title may be tentatively rendered into Pāli as **Dvādasa-sahassa-buddhavaṃsa*; it is not clear whether “12000” refers to the number of Buddhas or the number of *ślokas*.² The 16 lines of verse, which I have been unable to trace in Pāli, state that a bodhisatta “should be honoured by all the world”.³ The work was translated by Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna (Atiśa) and Tshul khirms rgyal ba at Lhasa in the first half of the 11th century.

2.4. Parallels to Pāli texts in the *Udānavarga-vivarāṇa*

The *Udānavarga-vivarāṇa*, composed by Prajñāvarman at an uncertain date and preserved in Tibetan translation only (done in the 11th century by Paṇḍita Janārdana and Śākya Blo gros), is a commentary on the *Udānavarga*, the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin counterpart of the Pāli *Dhammapada*. Like the *Dhammapada*, the *Udānavarga* contains only verses; in his commentary, Prajñāvarman states the occasion (*nidāna*) upon which each verse, or set of verses, was spoken. First he gives the “official” *nidāna* of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin tradition; in some cases, he

¹ Q 5256, Vol. 96, *dbu ma’i sñiṅ po’i ’grel pa rtog ge ’bar ba, dbu ma, dza: ṅan thos kyi de kho na ṅid la ’jug pa*, 192b2–6; D 3856, *dbu ma, dza*, 177a7–b2.

² I do not know of any texts which describe a group of 12000 Buddhas. The *Sambuddhe* verses, popular in South-east Asia, refer to the late Theravādin figure of 512,028 Buddhas as 28 + 12,000 + 500,000 (*sambuddhe aṭṭhavisāṅ ca dvādasāṅ ca saḥassake | pañcasata saḥassāni ...*), but I suspect that the figures are so given for reasons of metre, since related prose texts group the numbers differently. See Peter Skilling, “A Note on the *Sambuddhe* Verses and Later Theravādin Buddhology”, *Journal of the Secretarial Office of His Holiness the Supreme Patriarch*, I/2 (Jan.–Mar. 1993), pp. 73–85.

³ For an edition and translation of the verses, see P. Skilling, “A Citation from the **Buddhavaṃsa* of the Abhayagiri School”, *JPTS XVIII* (1993), pp. 165–75.

also briefly cites alternate *nidānas*, which he ascribes simply to “others” (*gzan dag*). Some of these alternate *nidānas* are identical or similar to the brief *nidānas* that open the lengthy stories for each verse or set of verses in the *Dhammapada Commentary*. Here I will give four examples from UvViv Chapter XX, *Krodhavarga* (“On Anger”), equivalent to Dhp Chapter XVII, *Kodhavagga*.¹

1) UvViv II 584–85, commenting on Uv XX,1:

The “official” (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin *nidāna* states that “a naked ascetic (*nirgrantha*), who rejoiced in non-attachment (*asaṅgarata*), asked the Lord ...”. Prajñāvarman also gives an alternate *nidāna* (584,23):

gzan dag ni nya gro dha'i kun dga' ra ba na rgyal rigs kyi bu mo snar ma zes bya ba las brtsams pa'o zes zer ro ||

Others say that this was spoken at the Nigrodha Pleasance (*ārāma*), with reference to (*ārabbha*) a *khattiya* girl named Rohiṇī.

This agrees almost perfectly with Dhp-a III 295,3–5 on Dhp XVII,1:

imaṃ dhammadesanaṃ satthā nigrodhārāme viharanto rohiṇī-nāma-khattiya-kaññaṃ ārabbha kathesi.

The Teacher gave this instruction in the dhamma when he was staying at the Nigrodha Pleasance (*ārāma*), with reference to (*ārabbha*) a *khattiya* girl named Rohiṇī.

¹ *Ched du brjod pa'i tshoms kyi rnam par 'grel pa* = UvViv. For ease of comparison I have given Pāli equivalents for Tibetan names or terms in the alternate *nidānas*. The material is drawn from my perpetually unfinished paper, “The *Nidānas* of the *Udānavargavivarāna*: the *Krodhavarga*”.

2) UvViv II 596–98, commenting on Uv XX,16:

The official *nidāna* states that the verses were spoken at Śrāvastī at the time of dyeing robes, with reference to an old and avaricious monk. The alternate *nidāna* (597,10) states:

gzan dag ni mau dgal gyi bu chen pos zus pa las de'i dbaṅ du mdzad do zes zer ro ||

Others say that this was spoken with reference to a question put by Mahāmoggallāna.

This agrees with Dhp-a III 314,7–9 on Dhp XVII,4 (except that the UvViv does not give the location):

imaṃ dhammadesanaṃ satthā jetavane viharanto mahāmoggallānattherassa pañhaṃ ārabbha kathesi.

The Teacher gave this instruction in the dhamma when he was staying in the Jeta Grove, with reference to a question put by the Elder Mahāmoggallāna.

3) UvViv II 600–01, commenting on Uv XX,19:

Official *nidāna*: “A *brāhmaṇa* named *Asurāyana¹ abused the Lord with offensive language (*asabhyā vācā*). Therefore [the Lord] said ...”. Alternate *nidāna* (600,8):

gzan dag ni u da ri zes bya ba'i dge bsñen ma'i khyim du bcom ldan 'das ñan thos kyi tshogs daṅ bcas pa bśos gsol pa byas na dge bsñen ma u da ri las brtsams te 'di gsuṅs so zes zer ro ||

¹ The name is transliterated in Tibetan as A-su-ra-ya-na.

Others say: when the Lord, together with a group of disciples (*sāvaka-gaṇa*), had been offered a meal at the home (*geha*) of the lay-woman (*upāsikā*) *Udari, he spoke this with reference to the lay woman *Udari.¹

Dhp-a III 302,5–7 on Dhp XVII,3:

*imaṃ dhammadesanaṃ satthā veḷuvane viharanto uttarāya
gehe katabhattakicco uttaraṃ upāsikaṃ ārabha kathesi.*

The Teacher gave this instruction in the dhamma when he was staying in the Bamboo Grove, on having eaten at the home (*geha*) of Uttarā, with reference to the lay woman (*upāsikā*) Uttarā.

4) UvViv II 604,20, commenting on Uv XX,22:

*a gra ta ba ka zes bya ba'i yul na dge sloṅ zig khro ba byuṅ
yaṅ tshig rtsub po mi brjod pa de las brtsams so zes gzan dag
zer ro ||*

Other say this was spoken in the land of *Agratavaka,² with reference to a certain monk who became angry, yet refrained from harsh words (*pāruṣya*).

Dhp-a III 299,13 on Dhp XVII,2 reads as follows:

*imaṃ dhammadesanaṃ satthā aggāḷave cetiye viharanto
aññataram bhikkhuṃ ārabha kathesi.*

¹ Here too the name is transliterated: U-da-ri.

² The name is again transcribed: A-gra-ta-ba-ka.

The Teacher gave this instruction in the dhamma when he was staying at the Aggāḷava Shrine, in connection with a certain monk.

The two *nidānas* bear some resemblance if one takes *Agratavaka to equal Aggāḷava, which is by no means certain. The full Dhp-a story involves a tree-spirit who controls her anger, which initially arises towards a monk who has chopped down the tree in which she lives and accidentally wounded her child. The story does not agree with the UvViv *nidāna*, in which it is the monk himself who controls his anger.

It is noteworthy that formulas similar to the *imaṃ dhammadesanaṃ satthā ... (place) viharanto ... (name)-ārabha kathesi*, which comes at the head of the stories in the *Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā*, are also used in the *Jātaka-aṭṭhakathā*.¹ It may be that these brief *nidānas* are older than the following commentary: that they could have been shared by several schools of the Sthavira fold, but that the full stories would have differed in style, length, and detail. (Note that the stories of the Dhp-a are non-canonical. They are themselves a condensed Pāli translation of the old Sinhalese version, and a new Sinhalese version, much expanded, was produced by Dharmasena Thera in the 13th century.² The form and detail of narrative literature of this type, which was told and retold over the centuries, should not be taken too seriously as an indication of sectarian affiliation.)

The *Udānavarga-vivarāṇa* contains other material relevant to Pāli studies. Commenting on the second verse of the same chapter (UvViv II 585–86 on Uv XX,2), Prajñāvarman opens his “official *nidāna*” with a verse question spoken by a god (*lha zig gis gsol*

¹ Some random examples are Ja I 123,11–12, 126,14–15, 136,10–11, 276,2–3, 364,2–3; II 248,5–6, 321,8–10.

² cf. Ranjini Obeyesekere (tr.), *Jewels of the Doctrine*, Albany, 1991, pp. x–xiii.

pa); the Buddha answers with *Udānavarga* XX,2. The only parallel to this verse noted by Bernhard is found in the *Nettipakaraṇa*, which also opens with the verse question; neither question nor answer is found elsewhere in the Pāli canon or in Buddhist literature.

UvViv 586,1
*skyes ma thag tu ci žig spaṅ
 ci žig skyes nas bzlog par bgyi
 brtan¹ pas ci žig rab tu spaṅ
 gaṅ žig rtogs na bde bar 'gyur*

Uv XX,2
*krodham jahed utpattitaṃ
 rāgam jātaṃ nivārayet
 avidyāṃ prajahed dhīraḥ
 satyābhisamayāt sukham*

UvT XX,2
*skyes ma thag tu khro ba spoṅs
 skyes nas 'dod chags spaṅ bar gyis
 brtan pas ma rig rab tu spaṅ
 bden pa mthoṅ na bde bar 'gyur*

The agreement is very close. The only major variant occurs in line d of the answer: the *Nettipakaraṇa* and the Sanskrit *Udānavarga* agree on *saccābhisamaya* = *satyābhisamaya*;² the Tibetan *Udānavarga* has instead *bden pa mthoṅ* = *satyadarśana*. Prajñāvarman (UvViv 586,20) gives *sdug bsñal mthoṅ ba* = *duḥkhadarśana* as the preferred

¹ Balk reads *bstan*; this should be corrected to *brtan* on the basis of UvT, UvViv 586,17, and the *dhīra* of Nett and Uv.

² The *Udānavarga de Subāṣi* (ed. H. Nakatani, Paris, 1987, p. 57) has *satyābhisamayena*.

reading, but notes an alternate reading (586,26) *bden pa rtogs na* = *satyābhisamaya*. Bernhard notes a Sanskrit variant, *duḥkhābhisamaya*.

For Uv XX,1 (= Dhṛ XVII,1) Prajñāvarman (UvViv 584,18) gives as official *nidāna* a verse question in canonical style that is not found in the Pāli or other parallels. Other *nidānas* have Pāli counterparts. For Uv XX,3 (UvViv 587,1) he gives as official *nidāna* a question spoken by Śakra, and then the Uv verse as answer. Both question and answer are found in the *Sakka-saṃyutta* (S I 237,9–13) with Sakka as interlocutor, as well as in the *Devatā* (S I 41,15–20), *Devaputta* (S I 47,8–12), and *Brāhmaṇa* (S I 161,3–8) *Samyuttas*, with various interlocutors, in the *Nettipakaraṇa* (Nett 145,19), and in the *Gāndhāri Dharmapada* (XVII,15–16). The official *nidāna* to Uv XX,4–14 (UvViv 588–96) gives a parallel to the *Vepacitti-sutta* of the *Sakka-saṃyutta* (S I 220,33–222,19), including the prose introduction. The official alternate *nidāna* to Uv XX,13 (UvViv 596,5)¹ may be related to the *Asurindaka-sutta* (S I 163–64), and the official *nidāna* to Uv XX,20–22 (UvViv 601,13) is similar to the *Akkosaka-sutta* (S I 161–63), both of the *Brāhmaṇa-saṃyutta*.² The commentary also cites sūtras (cf. UvViv 587,20 with A I 200,4) and refers to *jātakas* (UvViv 592,15 [also 1021,27], *Ma he'i skyes pa'i rabs* = *Mahisa-jātaka* [Ja 278]; UvViv 593,10, *Thams cad sbyin pa'i skyes pa'i rabs* = *Sarvaṃdada-jātaka* [Ja 499, *Sivi*]). Balk's Tibetan

¹ I describe this as an “official alternate” because Prajñāvarman does not ascribe it to “some” or “others”, but simply states *'dir yaṅ glen gzi gzan du brjod de*, “here another *nidāna* is also given”. It seems possible that he is referring to a different *nidāna* occurring in another place in the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin scriptures (just as in Pāli the same verse occurs in different places with different *nidānas*) rather than the *nidāna* of another school.

² The *Akkosaka-sutta* has parallels in the two Chinese *Samyuktāgamas* (Chizen Akanuma, *The Comparative Catalogue of Chinese Āgamas and Pāli Nikāyas*, Nagoya, 1929, p. 185), and in the *The Sūtra in 42 Sections*, traditionally held to be the first Buddhist text to have been translated into Chinese (see John Blofeld, *The Sutra of 42 Sections and Two Other Scriptures of the Mahayana*, rev. ed., London, 1977, §§ 7, 8).

and Sanskrit indexes of proper names (II 1056–81) are a useful tool for the study of some of the parallels.

My selection of the *Krodhavarga* for this study was quite arbitrary, but such research as I have done in other *vargas* of the UvViv has led me to conclude that Prajñāvarman's presentation of *nidānas* for this *varga* may safely be taken as representative of the UvViv as a whole. In the *Krodhavarga* he gives no more than two *nidānas* — one official and one alternate — for a single verse. In other *vargas* he sometimes gives three *nidānas*. Commenting on Uv XIX,5 (UvViv II 577,13 foll.) he gives an official *nidāna*, followed by an alternate attributed to “others” (*gʒan dag = anye*), followed in turn by an alternate attributed to “some” (*kha cig = eke*) which has a parallel at Dhp-a III 84,6 on Dhp X,10. At UvViv I 212,5 foll. on Uv III,9, Prajñāvarman gives a *nidāna* attributed to “some” (*kha cig*), which has a parallel at Dhp-a IV 36,3 on Dhp XXIV,1, followed by a *nidāna* attributed to “others” (*gʒan dag*).

The alternate *nidānas* with parallels in the Dhp-a agree so closely with the Pāli that they must go back to a common source. They are direct quotations, and they follow the same “spoken (at ...) with reference to (*brtsams pa = ārabhya, ārabha*) ... ” pattern. Prajñāvarman, living in North India at an uncertain date, drew on a tradition strikingly similar to that of the Theravādins. Regrettably he does not name his source but simply attributes the alternates to “others” (*gʒan dag = anye*).

Who were these “others”? I cannot say: perhaps a branch of the “continental” Sthaviras rather than of the “insular” schools. But a Sthavira origin for the *nidānas* need not be taken for granted. While Prajñāvarman does give alternate *nidānas* for the four verses of the Pāli *Kodhavagga* common to the Uv *Krodhavarga*, only three of them agree with the corresponding Dhp-a *nidānas*. The remaining 10 verses of the

Pāli *Kodhavagga* have parallels not in the *Krodhavarga* but in the *Sucarita-*, *Smṛti-*, and *Yuga-vargas* of the Uv. An examination of Prajñāvarman's commentary on these *vargas* reveals that he does not give any alternate *nidānas* whatsoever for the verses in question. If Prajñāvarman was indeed relying on a *Dharmapada* closely related to the Pāli Dhp and on a commentarial tradition closely related to that of the Dhp-a and belonging to the broader Sthavira tradition, he was selective in his citation of alternate *nidānas*.

Another possibility is that the alternate *nidānas* are from a tradition related to the Gāndhāri *Dharmapada*. (The manuscript of the GDhp is incomplete; it does, however, contain a complete, untitled chapter, mostly dealing with *krodha*, which Brough has tentatively named *Krodhavarga*, and identified as the 17th chapter.¹ The school of the text is unknown, although Brough has suggested the Dharmaguptakas or the Kāśyapīyas, both of which are held by some traditions to belong to the broader Sthavira fold.) Six out of the 16 verses of the “*Krodhavarga*” of the GDhp are common to the Uv; five (GDhp XVII,1,2,7,8,16) to the *Krodhavarga* of the Uv and one to the *Prakīrṇakavarga* (GDhp XVII,11 = Uv XVI,23). Out of the five verses common to the Uv *Krodhavarga*, four (GDhp XVII,1,2,7,8) are those for which Prajñāvarman supplies alternate *nidānas* in the “spoken in connection with” (*de las brstams so, ārabha*) form. While no such *nidāna* is given for the fifth (GDhp XVII,16), in this case the GDhp itself contains the verse question (XVII,15) that constitutes the official *nidāna* of the UvViv (587,1). Prajñāvarman comments on the sixth verse (GDhp XVII,11) at Uv XVI,23 (UvViv I 530–32); here he gives two alternate *nidānas*. The first, in the “*ārabha*” form, is related but not identical to Dhp-a III 113,3 on Dhp XI,5 (but the differences may arise

¹ The Pāli *Kodhavagga* is the 17th chapter of that work; out of the 5 verses of the GDhp “*Krodhavarga*” common to the Uv *Krodhavarga* four are also common to the Pāli *Kodhavagga*, the first two in the same order in GDhp and Dhp.

from the Tibetan translation rather than the original Indic); I have not traced a parallel to the second. Thus all six of the GDhp *Krodhavarga* verses common to the Uv are covered by the UvViv, under five alternate “*ārabha*” and one official *nidānas*.

There does not seem to be any clear relationship between the alternate *nidānas* of the Uv *Krodhavarga* and the Patna *Dhammapada*.¹ This work, which is apparently complete, does not have a *Krodhavarga*; the four verses that it has in common with the Uv *Krodhavarga* are found in three different chapters, nos. XI, XIII, and XVI. As may be seen in Table 4, only two of the “*ārabha*” *nidānas* have corresponding verses in the PDhp (XIII,22, XVI,15); two have no counterparts. Prajñāvarman introduces the third alternate *nidāna* (Uv XX,6, UvViv 590,33; PDhp XI,10) with *'dir gleñ gzi ni gzan dag 'di skad zer to*, “here others give this *nidāna*”. Since the verse in question does not occur at all

¹ The PDhp may well belong to the Sāmmatiya school. Of the four main North Indian Buddhist schools recorded by Hsüan-tsang and others — Sthaviras, (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins, (Lokottaravādin) Mahāsāṃghikas and Sāmmatiyas — the PDhp cannot belong to the first three, whose recensions are known in full or in part (*Dhammapada*, *Udānavarga*, citations in *Mahāvastu*, etc., respectively). The sole manuscript of the PDhp is in proto-Bengali characters. The presence of the Sāmmatiyas in the North-east up to the Pāla-Sena period is attested in a number of sources. The existence of the four schools or orders (*sde pa bzhi*, with only the Mahāsāṃghikas specified) at Nālandā in the time of Devapāla is mentioned in passing by Abhayadattaśrī (Acharya Sempa Dorje, *The Biography of Eighty-four Saints*, Sarnath, 1979, p. 144,1-4); a Sanskrit document from Nepal notes that the (future *siddha*) Maitrīgupta ordained as a Sāmmatiya at Vikramapura (Sylvain Lévi, “Un nouveau document sur le bouddhisme de basse époque dans l’Inde”, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* VI (1931), p. 423 penult) in the first half of the 11th century (for the date, see Mark Tatz, “The Life of the Siddha-Philosopher Maitrīgupta”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 107/4 [Oct.–Dec. 1987], pp. 695–711). Daśabalaśrīmitra cited copiously from their scriptures in the 12th or 13th centuries, and Tāranātha refers to their active existence. The Prakritic language of the PDhp fits that ascribed to the Sāmmatiyas by Tibetan tradition (see Bu ston as discussed by Yuyama: reference in foll. note).

in either the Dhp or the GDhp, it is possible that the *nidāna* belongs to the tradition of the PDhp. The fourth (Uv XX,13 = PDhp XI,9) is that which I have described above as an “alternate official *nidāna*”; if, however, it may be shown to be the *nidāna* of another school, it may also be related to the PDhp, since the verse does not occur in the Dhp or GDhp.

These relationships are very tentative, since they are based on the study of only one of the 33 chapters of the Uv. Are they purely coincidental to the *Krodhavarga*, or do they pertain to the UvViv as a whole? It is important here that Prajñāvarman’s methodology be determined. Under what circumstances does he cite alternate *nidānas*? Would he cite an alternate *nidāna* of another of school if he was aware that that school also had a canonical *nidāna* similar to his own official, Sarvāstivādin *nidāna*? Why, if he was relying on a tradition related to that of the Dhp-a, does he sometimes cite an alternate *nidāna* with a parallel in that text, and sometimes not? Whether Prajñāvarman’s methodology can be discerned and whether these questions can be satisfactorily answered will only emerge when a complete concordance of the alternate *nidānas* of the UvViv with all existing *Dhamma-/Dharma-pada* texts, including all Chinese versions, has been made.

While Prajñāvarman’s alternate *nidānas* cannot be classified as Theravādin, they are an important source for the study of the *Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā*. The examples presented here bring to light the fact that Prajñāvarman utilized several different sources for his *nidānas*, and suggest that he had access to three or more commentarial traditions: the tradition of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins (the “official” *nidānas*); a tradition strikingly similar to that embodied in the Dhp-a of the Mahāvihāravāsin Theravādins; and a tradition (or traditions) as yet unidentified shown when Prajñāvarman cites three *nidānas*.

2.5. Sources for Theravādin tenets

One further source for Theravādin or Sthavira tenets is the vast corpus of *sāstra* and commentarial literature preserved in the Tibetan *Tanjur*. Both treatises and commentaries — on the *Abhidharma* or the *Vinaya*, or on Mahāyāna *sāstras* — make occasional brief references to the Sthaviras or related schools. Outside of the *Tanjur*, there are references to the Sthaviras in the works of Tibetan authors such as Bu ston and Tāranātha, and no doubt elsewhere in Tibetan literature.¹ Here there is the problem — interesting in itself — of the name by which the Sthaviras or Theravādins are designated. In the following I will refer to a number of possible candidates.

2.5.1 The (Ārya) Sthaviras and their branches

The term gNas brtan = Sthavira is found in both early (Asaṅga in the 4th century) and late (Daśabalaśrīmitra in the 12th: above § 2.1, 2) sources.² In the 6th century, Bhavya cites the Ārya Sthavira Abhayagirivāsins (above § 2.3). From the 8th century on, Vinitadeva,³ the *Mahāvvyutpatti*,⁴ Subhūtighoṣa,⁵ and the anonymous *Śrāmaṇera*-⁶

¹ See, for example, Akira Yuyama, “Bu-ston on the Languages Used by Indian Buddhists at the Schismatic Period”, in Bechert 1980, pp. 175–81. There are numbers of references in Tāranātha’s history (Antonius Schiefner, *Tāranāthae de Doctrinae Buddhicae in India Propagatione*, St. Petersburg, 1868; Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya (ed.), *Tāranātha’s History of Buddhism in India*, [1970] Calcutta, 1980) and other works not yet properly studied.

² The earliness of Asaṅga’s reference may be open to question, since it is not found in the Chinese translations, but only in the Tibetan of ca. 800 (see below). Note that “Sthaviravāda”, a term employed by some scholars, is a modern translation from Pāli to Sanskrit: as far as I know it is not attested in any traditional works, which use simply (Ārya) Sthavira(-nikāya). The forms Ārya-sthāvira and Āryasthāviriya-nikāya are known in Sanskrit (*BHSD* 1056).

³ *Samayabhedoparacanacakrasya-nikāyabhedopadarśana-nāma-saṃgraha*, Q 5641, Vol. 127, ‘dul ba’i ‘grel pa, u, 187b6, 190a3.

⁴ Mvy 9095–98.

⁵ *Sarvayānāloka-kara-vaibhāṣya-nāma*, Q 5303, Vol. 102, *dbu ma, ha*, 417a2.

and *Bhikṣu-varṣāgra-prcchās*¹ accurately list the three branches of the Theravādins of Ceylon — Jetavanīyas, Abhayagirivāsins, Mahāvihāravāsins — as the three divisions of the Sthaviras (see Table 7.C).² I-ching also refers to three divisions of the Sthaviras, without naming them.³

2.5.2 Sthaviras, Tāmraśāṭīyas, Tāmraparīyas, and Tāmravarṇīyas a) Tāmraśāṭīyas and *bhavaṅga-viññāna*

The Sthaviras, or a branch thereof, were known as Gos dmar sde pa = Tāmraśāṭīya. In his *Karmasiddhi-prakaraṇa*, Vasubandhu notes that the Bhadanta Tāmraśāṭīyas propound a *bhavaṅga-vijñāna*;⁴ in his commentary thereon Sumatiśīla equates the Tāmraśāṭīyas with the Ārya Sthaviras.⁵ Asaṅga’s *Mahāyānasamgraha*, in the Tibetan version translated ca. 800 A.C. by Jinamitra, Śilendrabodhi, and Ye šes sde, cites

⁶ Q 5634, Vol. 127, ‘dul ba’i ‘grel pa, u, 79a8; C, ‘dul ba, su, 65a1.

¹ Q 5649, Vol. 127, ‘dul ba’i ‘grel pa, u, 318a8. Although later Tibetan sources attribute this and the preceding to Padmasambhava (e.g. *BA* I 30–31), this is not stated in the colophons.

² The order given here is that of all sources except Mvy, which moves the Mahāvihāra from last to first. For a study of these (except Subhūtighoṣa) and related sources, Chinese as well as Tibetan, see Bareau 1955. The present study concentrates on sources not utilized by Bareau.

³ Bareau 1955, p. 24.

⁴ Étienne Lamotte, “Le Traité de l’Acte de Vasubandhu Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa”, *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques*, Vol. 4, Brussels, July, 1936, § 35 (p. 199), *btsun pa gos dmar sde pa rnam ni srid pa’i yan lag gi rnam par šes pa žes ‘jog par byed do*. On the basis of the Chinese (which is, however, corrupt: see p. 250, note 116) Lamotte translates “dans les sūtra du Tāmraparīyanikāya ...”. See below for this term.

⁵ Q 5572, Vol. 114, *sems tsam, ku*, 105a6, *btsun pa gos dmar sde pa rnam žes bya ba ni ‘phags pa gnas brtan pa rnam te*. For this and the preceding see also Ryoshun Kajihama (ed.), *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa by Vasubandhu, Karmasiddhi Tikā by Sumatiśīla*, Sarnath, 1988, pp. 150–51.

a verse of four lines on *bhavāṅga* from the “Āgama of the Ārya Sthaviras” (the earlier Chinese translations do not give the citation):¹

*srid pa'i yan lag lta ba daṅ || śes pa daṅ ni gtod pa daṅ ||
g'yo ba daṅ ni rtogs pa daṅ || bdun pa 'jug par byed pa yi ||*

The verse seems to be a garbled version of one found in the *Samyutta-aṭṭhakathā*:²

*bhavaṅgaṃ āvajjanā c' eva, dassanaṃ sampañcchanam
santiraṇaṃ voṭṭhabbanam javanam bhavati sattamaṃ.*

The verse and the accompanying commentary in the *Upanibandhana* (here both Tibetan and Chinese, both difficult to decipher) are important because they prove that the *bhavāṅga* referred to functions in a process similar to the *citta-vīthi* of the Mahāvihāravāsins and is not simply a link in *pratītyasamutpāda*, a usage known to the Theravāda as well as to other schools.³ The *Upanibandhana* notes that

¹ Étienne Lamotte, *La Somme du Grand Véhicule d'Asaṅga* (*Mahāyānasamgraha*), ([1938], Louvain-la-Neuve, 1973) Vol. I, Ch. 1 § 11.4, 'phags pa gnas brtan pa rnam kyī luṅ; Vol. II, pp. 28–29, “Notes et références”, pp. 8*–10*.

² Spk III (PTS) 191, Mahāmakūṭarājavidyālaya 286,2–3. Since *na / da* and *ba / pa* are frequently indistinguishable in Tibetan, I have amended the *gton ba* (*ut-SRJ, TYAJ, HĀ*) of Lamotte's text to *gtod pa*, equivalent to *BHUI* and also to *āvarjana* (see Akira Hirakawa *et al.*, *Index to the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (*Peking Edition*), Part III, Tokyo, 1978, p. 90b. This gives a sequence “*bhavaṅga* (*srid pa'i yan lag*), vision (*lta ba = dassana*), knowledge (*śes pa = sampañcchana* ?), adverting (*gtod pa = āvajjana*), disturbance (*g'yo ba = javana* ?) ...”. The verse merits further study.

³ See L.S. Cousins, “The Paṭṭhāna and the Development of the Theravādin Abhidhamma”, *JPTS* IX (1981), pp. 22–46; *EB* II/3, p. 402 (“Āvajjana”); III/1, pp. 17–20 (“Bhavaṅga”); O.H. de A. Wijesekera, “Canonical References to Bhavaṅga”, in O.H. de A. Wijesekera (ed.), *Malalasekera Commemoration Volume*, Colombo, 1976, pp. 348–52.

the concept is also found in the “Āgama of the Vibhajyavādins”.¹ Similarly, the *Vijñaptimātratā-siddhi* (translated by Hsüan-tsang in 659 A.C.) attributes the *bhavāṅga-vijñāna* to the Sthaviras and Vibhajyavādins,² and an anonymous commentary on the *Mahāyānasamgraha*, the *Vivṛtagūdhārtha-piṇḍavyākhyā*, ascribes it to the Sthaviras.³ To complicate matters, in his *Pratītyasamutpāda-vyākhyā* Vasubandhu refers the concept of *bhavāṅga-vijñāna* to the Bhadanta Mahīśāsakas (*btsun pa sa ston pa*),⁴ specifically to their **Abhidharma-*

¹ Q 5552, Vol. 113, *sems tsam, li, 245b7, rnam par phye ste smra ba'i luṅ.*

² *KBC* 614; Louis de La Vallée Poussin, *Vijñaptimātratā-siddhi, La Siddhi de Hiuan-tsang*, Vol. I, Paris, 1928, pp. 178–80 and notes; Wei Tat, *Ch'eng Wei-Shih Lun, Doctrine of Mere-Consciousness*, Hong Kong, 1973, p. 199.

³ *Don gsaṅ ba rnam par phye ba bsdu te bśad pa*, Q 5553, Vol. 113, *sems tsam, li, 390b7, gnas brtan pa rnam de kho na bzin du bstan nas srid pa'i yan lag gi rnam par śes pa ston pa lta bu ste*. The work is incomplete; since a similar title appears in the Ldan dkar ma Catalogue (Lalou 1953, § 629, *don gsaṅ ba bsdu pa*), the translation probably dates from about 800 A.C.

⁴ Q 5496, Vol. 104, *mdo tshogs 'grel pa, chi, 24b5*. (The sections containing this and the following passage are not among the preserved Sanskrit fragments published by Giuseppe Tucci, “A Fragment of the Pratītya-samutpāda-vyākhyā of Vasubandhu”, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, London, 1930, pp. 611–23. I use here the title given in the colophons to the Sanskrit manuscript rather than that given at the head of the Tibetan translation: see Tucci p. 612, note 1.) Commenting on this, Guṇamati (end of *bampo 5, chi, 152b7*) refers to the “*Abhidharma* of one particular [sect]” (*ñi tshe ba gzan gyi chos mñon pa las srid pa'i gnas byed par rab tu grags pa ston to*). *Ñi tshe ba* (= *phyogs re ba, thor bu, phran tshogs [Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo I 949b]*, in Sanskrit *prādeśika, pratyeka, avāntara*) *gzan* (*antara, anya, anyatra, apara*, etc.), means “one particular [sect]” in the sense that it is not a doctrine common to all schools. The term *ñi tshe ba* also occurs at Guṇamati 153b6–154a1 in an interesting explanation of how the Word of the Buddha has become scattered (*phros*) (commenting on Vasubandhu 25a3); at Guṇamati 154b6, and at Vasubandhu 32b6, 64b4. Guṇamati also refers to the *Dharmaparyāya* of the Bhadanta Mahīśāsakas (*btsun pa sa ston pa'i chos kyī rnam grags*) at 156b5. In the light of Guṇamati's references, Lambert Schmithausen's identification (in *Ālayavijñāna: On the Origin and the Early Development of a Central Concept of Yogācāra Philosophy*, Tokyo, 1987, Part II, note 69) of the *Abhidharma-dharmaparyāya*

dharmaparyāya (*Chos mñon pa'i chos kyi rnam graṅs*).¹ We may therefore conclude that the concept of *bhavāṅga-vijñāna* was held by the Tāmraśāṭīyas, Vibhajyavādins, Mahīśāsakas (in their **Abhidharma-dharmaparyāya*), and by unspecified Sthaviras, and that it is equivalent to the *bhavāṅga-viññāna* well known in the literature of the Mahāvihāravāsins.

b) Tāmraśāṭīyas and the constituents of *nāma*

In his *Pratītyasamutpāda-vyākhyā*, Vasubandhu mentions the Tāmraśāṭīyas in connection with a *sūtra* citation on the constituents of *nāma*.² In his commentary thereon, Guṇamati repeats the name without comment.³ The constituents (*tshor ba*, 'du śes, *sems pa*, *reg pa*, *yid la byed pa*) agree with those listed in Pāli parallels (S II 3,34, M I 53,11, *vedanā*, *saññā*, *cetanā*, *phassa*, *manasikāra*); the definition in the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin parallels is different.⁴

c) Tāmraśāṭīyas in the *Tarkajvālā* of Bhavya

In his *Tarkajvālā* Bhavya refers to the Tāmraśāṭīyas in at least three different places. In Chapter 3 he cites the Sautrāntikas and Tāmraśāṭīyas (against the Vaibhāṣikas) on the nature of *nirvāṇa*.⁵ This

of the Mahīśāsakas with the *Abhidharma-sūtra* or *Abhidharma-mahāyāna-sūtra* of the *Mahāyānasamgraha* must be rejected.

¹ Q 5496, 25b5.

² Q 5496, (*bam po* 3) 36a5.

³ Q 5497, Vol. 104, *mdo tshogs 'grel pa*, *chi*, 190b8.

⁴ Candrabhāl Tripāthī, *Fünfundzwanzig Sūtras des Nidānasamyukta*, Berlin, 1962, § 16.7; Śamathadeva, *Upāyikā Tikā*, Q 5595, Vol. 118, *mdzod 'grel tu*, 160b8; gold plate version in J.G. de Casparis, *Selected Inscriptions from the 7th to the 9th Century A.D. (Prasasti Indonesia II)*, Bandung, 1956, pp. 109–10; Nālandā brick versions in *EI XXI* (1931–32), p. 198,11; and Chinese version of Hsüan-tsang in the latter, p. 203. These five define the constituents of *nāma* as “the four formless *skandhas*”, which are then listed.

⁵ Iida 1980, p. 196, *mdo sde pa daṅ gos dmar sde pa dag ni phuṅ po med pa tsam ste | mar me ži bar gyur pa ltar || de'i sems ni rnam par thar || ces brjod*

does not suggest that the two schools were affiliated, but only that they agreed in this case. In Chapter 4 — in a section on the origins and affiliation of the “18 schools” that occurs also as an independent treatise — he ascribes to the Tāmraśāṭīyas a single tenet: “the person (*puḍgala*) does not exist”.¹ As noted by Bureau (1955, p. 204), “ceci est aussi peu original que possible dans le Bouddhisme”. Elsewhere in the same chapter Bhavya cites a verse of four lines spoken by Venerable Revata from the “Word of the Buddha of the Ārya Tāmraśāṭīyas”.² I have not been able to trace the verse in Pāli.

d) Tāmraśāṭīyas in the *Madhyamakaratna-pradīpa* of Bhavya

In the *Madhyamakaratna-pradīpa* there is a passage virtually identical to that of the *Tarkajvālā* on the nature of *nirvāṇa*, with the same mention of the Tāmraśāṭīyas.³ The authorship of the work — translated according to the colophon by Dipaṅkaraśrījñāna (Atiśa), brTson 'grus seṅ ge, and Tshul khrims rgyal mtshan at Somapuri Monastery [in Bengal] — is a subject of debate.⁴

do. The two lines of verse are found in the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* of both the Theravādins (D II 157,15, *pajjotass' eva nibbānaṃ vimokho cetaso ahū*) and (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins (Ernst Waldschmidt, *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, [Berlin, 1950–51] Kyoto, 1986, § 44.11, *pradyotasyeva nirvāṇaṃ vimokṣas tasya cetasaḥ*), and are cited by Vasubandhu in his *Kośabhāṣya* (I 327.3) on *kārikā* II,55d Here it is a question of interpretation rather than difference in the canonical text.

¹ *Tarkajvālā* 165b2, *gos dmar ba rnam kyi dam tshig ni gaṅ zag ni med do žes bya ba'o* = Q 5640, Vol. 127, 'dul ba'i 'grel pa, u, 182b5; tr. in Bureau 1956, p. 182.

² *Tarkajvālā* 193b7, 'phags pa gos dmar ba'i saṅs rgyas kyis gsuṅs pa las 'don par byed do.

³ Taipei ed. of the Derge *Tanjur*, Vol. 34, 3859 (= Tōhoku 3854) 267b5, *gos dmar can gyi sde pa dag*; tr. in Christian Lindtner, “Materials for the Study of Bhavya”, in Eivind Kahrs (ed.), *Kalyāṇamitrārāgaṇam: Essays in Honour of Nils Simonsson*, Oslo, 1986, p. 189.

⁴ See Iida 1980, p. 19, and Ruegg 1990.

e) Tāmraśāṭīyas in the **Karatalaratna* of Bhavya

Bhavya's **Karatalaratna* is extant only in the Chinese translation of Hsüan-tsang of 649 A.C.; because of its importance I include it here.¹ In this text he quotes the Tāmraśāṭīyas as maintaining that space (*ākāśa*) is *chidra-rūpa*, and hence conditioned (*saṃskṛta*), against such schools as the Vaibhāṣikas, who hold space to be unconditioned.² The Theravādin rejection of space as unconditioned goes back to the *Kathāvatthu* (Kv 328–30, *ākāsakathā*).

f) Tāmraśāṭīyas, Tāmraparṇīyas, and the “heart-basis”

In the Sanskrit *Abhidharmakośa-vyākhyā*, Yaśomitra refers to the Tāmra-*parṇīyas* twice: once in connection with the “heart-basis” (*hrdaya-vastu*, Pāli *hadaya-vatthu*) and once in reference to the phrase “all schools” (*sarvanikāyāntara*).³ The Tibetan translation, however, reads Gos dmar ba'i sde pa = Tāmra-śāṭīya in both cases.⁴ With regard to the first point, Yaśomitra states:

¹ *Ta ch'eng chang chen lun*, Taishō 1578, *KBC* 620; cf. Iida 1980, p. 18 for a bibliographical note, and Ruegg 1981, p. 63.

² Louis de La Vallée Poussin, “Le joyau dans la main”, *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 2 (1932–33), p. 111; N. Aiyaswami Sastri, “*Karatalaratna*”, *Visva-Bharati Annals* II, Santiniketan, 1949, p. 73.1; see also English summary, p. 24. Both translators give Tāmraśāṭīya. I am grateful to Paul Harrison (letter of 29 December, 1992) for informing me that the reference is at Taishō 1578, 274b24: *t'ung-hsieh-pu-shih*, “the masters of the *t'ung-hsieh* school”, with *t'ung* meaning copper or bronze, *hsieh* ore or ring. There is at least one complication, and the final interpretation of the term, in comparison with the two Chinese translations of the *Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa*, must be left to those competent in the field.

³ *Kośavyākhyā* I 52,16 on *kārikā* I,17cd; IV p. 1204,16. cf. Louis de La Vallée Poussin, *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*, repr. Brussels, 1971, Vol. I, p. 32 note; Vol. V, p. 252, note 2.

⁴ *Chos mñon pa'i mdzod kyi 'grel bśad*, Q 5593, Vol. 116, *mdo 'grel, cu*, 41b4; Vol. 117, *chu*, 388a6. *Hṛdayavastu* is rendered as *sñin gi dnos po*. I have been unable to find the first reference in either *Sthiramati's* (Q 5875) or *Pūṃnavardhana's* commentaries. The latter, in his *Lakṣaṇānusārīṇi Tīkā*, Q 5594, Vol. 118, *ñu*, 374a1 cites the Sa ston pa'i sde pa = Mahīśāsakas as an example in

tāmraparṇīyā api hṛdayavastu manovijñānadhātor āśrayaṃ kalpayanti, tac cārūpyadhātāv api vidyata iti varṇayanti. ārūpyadhātāv api hi teṣāṃ rūpaṃ abhipretam, ārūpya iti ca iṣadathe āṇ āpiṅgalavad iti.

The Tāmraparṇīyas deem that the heart-basis is the support of the mind-consciousness-element, and explain that it exists even in the Formless Realm. They would have it that even in the Formless Realm there is form, taking the *ā* in *ārūpya* to mean “a little”, as in *āpiṅgala*, “slightly red, reddish”.

The theory of the “heart-basis” is accepted by the Mahāvihāravāsins of Ceylon, and also by the *Vimuttimaggā* where it is termed *vatthu-rūpa*. The *Vijñaptimātratā-siddhi* attributes a similar theory to the Sthaviras.¹ It would therefore seem straightforward to interpret Tāmraparṇīya as the residents of Tāmraparṇi, Pāli Tambapaṇṇi, or present-day Sri Lanka. However, while the Mahāvihāravāsins would agree with the definition of the *hrdaya-vastu* as the basis or support of the *mano-vijñāna-dhātu*, they explicitly deny that it — or any type of form — exists in the Formless Realm. This denial goes back to the *Kathāvatthu* (Kv 8:8, pp. 378–80), where the statement *atthi rūpaṃ arūpesu*, attributed by the commentary to the Andhakas, is refuted. At a later date, the *Abhidhammattha-saṅgaha* states the following:²

vatthūni nāma cakkhu sotam ghānaṃ jivhā kāyo hadayavatthu ceti chabbidhāni bhavanti. tāni pana kāmaloke sabbāni pi

the latter case. Note that here Tāmraśāṭīyas and Mahīśāsakas are simply examples of *nikāyas*, not equivalents.

¹ La Vallée Poussin I 281; Wei Tat p. 327.

² Thai script edition, Mahāmakūṭarājavidyālaya, Bangkok, 2516 [1973], p. 18,18–21; *JPTS* 1884, 14,23–26.

labbhanti, rūpaloke pana ghānādittayaṃ n 'atthi, arūpaloke pana sabbāni pi na samvijjanti.

There are six types of *vatthu*: the eye, ear, nose, tongue, body, and the heart-basis. All of them are found in the Sensual World; in the Form World the three starting with the nose do not occur, while in the Formless World none of them occur.

This, then, is the theory of the Mahāvihāra. Yaśomitra is correct in referring the concept of *hrdaya-vastu* to a school affiliated with the Sthaviras, whether the Tāmrāparṇīyas of the Sanskrit = residents of Ceylon = Theravādins or the Tāmrāśāṭīyas of the Tibetan. That he has made a mistake in stating that they hold it to exist in the Formless Realm is possible, but seems unlikely because his opponent's defence in terms of *āpiṅgala* is given as a direct citation. Yaśomitra may be referring to the Abhayagirivāsins, to the Jetavanīyas, or to a branch of the Sthaviras settled in Āndhradeśa, the "Andhakas" of the *Kathāvatthu-aṭṭhakathā*. For the present, we must leave the question open; further research, for example in the Pāli *Ṭikās*, may throw more light on the matter.

g) Tāmravarṇīyas and the definition of Akaniṭṭha

In his *Abhisamayālamkāra-vṛtti*, Ārya Vimuktisena (who himself was ordained as a Kaurukulla Ārya Sāmmatīya) gives a definition of the Akaniṭṭha Heaven according to the Bhadanta Tāmravarṇīyas: *utkr̥ṣṭasampattitvāt naisāṃ kaniṣṭha ity akaniṣṭhā iti bhadantatāmravarṇīyāḥ*.¹ The reading is confirmed by the Tibetan, translated in the second half of the 11th century by Amaragomin and Blo ldan śes rab: *btsun pa zaṅs mdog* (zaṅs = *tāmra*, "copper"; *mdog* =

¹ Pensa 1967, p. 30 ult. Vimuktisena's lineage is given in the Sanskrit colophon: see Pensa p. 1, note 1.

varṇa, "colour").¹ The definition is virtually identical to that of the *Abhidhammattha-vibhāvinī: ukkaṭṭhasampattikattā natthi etesaṃ kaniṭṭhabhāvo ti akaniṭṭhā*,² and close to that of the *Vibhaṅga-aṭṭhakathā* (Nālandā 530,1 = PTS 521), *sabbehi eva guṇehi ca bhavasampattiyā ca jetṭhā natthettha kaniṭṭhā ti akaniṭṭhā*.³

h) Conclusions

The Sanskrit form Tāmrāśāṭīya occurs in only one source: the *Mahāvīyutpatti*, a Sanskrit-Tibetan translation manual compiled by a committee of Indian and Tibetan scholars at the beginning of the 9th century. The Tibetan equivalents Gos dmar (ba'i) sde (pa) or Gos dmar can gyi sde occur in 12 different works by 10 different authors, as listed in Table 6. Five of these are connected with Vasubandhu: nos. 1 and 3 are his own compositions, while nos. 2, 4, and 5 are commentaries on his works. The texts of this group were all translated in the "Early Period" (*śṅa dar*) of Tibetan Buddhism, ca. 800 A. C. Nos. 6 and 7 were translated in the same period: although the translators are not known, they are listed in the Ldan (or Lhan) kar ma catalogue.⁴ Nos. 8 to 12 were translated in the "Later Period" (*phyi dar*), in the first half of the 11th century; two of these (8, 9) are attributed to Bhavya. The 12 works were rendered into Tibetan by 5 known translation teams: in the Early Period Viśuddhasiṃha, (Devendrarakṣita), and dPal brtsegs (1, 2, 5); Surendrākaraprabha and Nam mkha' (3, 4); plus the unknown translators

¹ Q 5185, Vol. 88, *śer phyin, ka*, 31a2. For the translators see Pensa p. 3 and Naudou 1968, pp. 165, 171 foll.

² Mahāmakuṭarājavidyālaya, Bangkok, 2516 [1973], 159,11.

³ cf. Yaśomitra's definition at *Kośavyākhyā* III,2, p. 382,26: *tad utkr̥ṣṭatara-bhūmyantarābhāvān naithe kaniṣṭhā ity akaniṣṭhāḥ jyeṣṭhabhūtatvāt*. A similar definition is given by Vīryaśrīdatta: N.H. Samtani (ed.), *The Arthavinīścaya-sūtra & its Commentary (Nibandhana)*, Patna, 1971, p. 144,3; cf. also the several definitions in the *Sārasamuccaya*, Q 5598, Vol. 119, *mñon pa'i bstan bcos, thu*, 353a3-5; *Arthavinīścaya-ṭikā*, Q 5852, Vol. 145, *no mtshar, jo*, 62b6-8; *Lakṣaṇānusāriṇī*, Q 5594, Vol. 117, *mñon pa'i bstan bcos, ju*, 303b5-7.

⁴ Lalou 1953, § 510, *sde pa bco brygad kyi miñ dañ rim pa slob dpon 'dul ba'i lhas mdzad pa*; § 503, *dge sloṅ ma'i so sor thar pa'i 'grel pa*.

of 6 and 7; in the Later Period Atiśa, brTson 'grus señ ge, and Tshul khrims rgyal ba (8, 9, 10); Subhūtiḥoṣa and Tiñ ñe 'dzin bzañ po (10);¹ and Narayadeva (Nārāyaṇadeva ?) and rGyal ba'i śes rab (11).²

The known translation teams were all made up of skilled and experienced members, both Indian and Tibetan. It begs belief that they all misread Tāmrāṣāṭīya (no doubt in several different Indic scripts) as Tāmraśāṭīya; that they all read Tāmrāṣāṭīya but deliberately translated it as Tāmraśāṭīya; or that later editors systematically changed the (unattested) Tibetan *Lo ma dmar ba'i sde to Gos dmar ba'i sde. In one case, that of Subhūtiḥoṣa, the author translated his own work into Tibetan. In the case of the *Śrāmaṇera-varṣāgra-ṛcchā*, we know that the translator, rGyal ba'i śes rab, consulted two manuscripts: one which he himself had brought from Nepal, and one brought to Tibet by Dharmapāla, a monk from Eastern India who came to Western Tibet at the invitation of King Ye śes 'od.³ rGyal ba'i śes rab studied under two Vinayadharas, Dharmapāla in Tibet and Pretākara in Nepal; he translated the *Śrāmaṇera-varṣāgra-ṛcchā* at Tho liñ in Gu ge with the guidance of Narayadeva in the time of Byañ chub 'od. His translation of another text, the *Śrāmaṇerakārikā*, compared Sanskrit manuscripts from India, Kashmir, and Nepal.⁴ The skill and care of the translators leads to the

¹ For Subhūtiḥoṣa (who is described in the colophon, 425a5, as a *brāhmaṇa*: *bram ze'i btsun pa rab 'byor dbyaṅs*) see Ruegg 1981, p. 120, note 398; for Tiñ ñe 'dzin bzañ po see Naudou 1968, p. 161.

² The colophon in Q reads Narasadeva, in C Narayadeva; DTher I 55.2 (= BA I 31) has *pañḍi ta nā ra yā na de ba*, while the verse at I 116.4 (BA I 86) has *kha che'i mkhan po na ra ya de ba*. For this figure, see Naudou 1968, p. 181.

³ DTher I 116.3, *dge tshul gyi ni lo dri yañ || rgya dpe bal po'i yul nas ni || spyan draṅs tho liñ byon pa na || dharmā pā la'i rgya dpe gzigs || kha che'i mkhan po na ra ya || de ba la ni de žus nas || bsgyur žiñ bśad pa dag kyañ mżad*; BA I 86.

⁴ DTher I 115 ult., *dge tshul rnams kyi kā ri kā || sa manta śrī jñā na la || žus śiñ 'gyur yañ legs bcos nas || rgya gar kha che bal po yi || rgya dpe gsum dan bstan byas nas*; BA I 86.

conclusion that Tāmraśāṭīya must be accepted as the primary form of the great majority of available texts.

The term Tāmraśāṭīya was current from the time of Vasubandhu (4th or 5th century) to that of Bhavya (6th century) to that of Vinīḍadeva (8th century), with Vasubandhu's commentators Sumatiśīla, Guṇamati, and Yaśomitra falling somewhere in between. The dates of the anonymous *Śrāmaṇera-* and *Bhikṣu-varṣāgra-ṛcchās* are not known. The latest author, the 11th century Subhūtiḥoṣa, may well have simply reproduced earlier sources, although Tāranātha refers to the Tāmraśāṭīyas as existing at least through the Pāla period.¹ The form Tāmraśāṭīya occurs only once in a work by Ārya Vimuktisena (6th century);² the Nepalese manuscript in which it occurs dates to about 1100.³ The same Sanskrit form is indirectly attested by the manuscript (presumably from Kashmir) of Vimuktisena's *Vṛtti* employed by the Tibetan translators, since it must have also read Tāmraśāṭīya in order to give rise to the translation *Zaṅs mdog*. That manuscript would date from the latter half of the 12th century; thus the form Tāmraśāṭīya is attested by two manuscripts of about the same period. It need not necessarily be taken as a scribal error for Tāmrāṣāṭīya, since the latter form is attested only in late Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Kośavyākhyā* from Nepal; as noted above, the Tibetan translation reads Gos dmar ba'i sde pa = Tāmraśāṭīya. No Tibetan equivalent of Tāmrāṣāṭīya (*Lo ma dmar ba'i sde ?) is attested, and the Chinese equivalent in the *Karmasiddhi-prakarāṇa* poses difficulties.⁴ The sole Chinese reference to the Tāmraśāṭīyas that I know of is that in Bhavya's **Karatalaratna*, rendered as such by both La Vallée Poussin and N. Aiyaswami Sastri. Perhaps further research into Chinese sources will clarify the question.

¹ Schiefner 208,13–18; Chattopadhyaya 341–42.

² Date from Ruegg 1981, p. 87.

³ Pensa 1967, Introduction, pp. 1–2.

⁴ See above, note 4 on p. 155.

What is the significance of Tāmraśāṭīya? The name means literally “Copper-clothed”; the standard Tibetan form of the *Mahāvvyutpatti* interprets “copper” (*tāmra*) as “red” (*dmar*). Tāranātha includes the Tāmraśāṭīyas among the schools named after their founding Sthaviras,¹ and also gives the name *Tāmraśāṭa (Gos dmar ba) in a verse list of the “great *bhaṭṭārakas*”.² His interpretation is supported by the fact that Vinītadeva’s first verse list of schools refers to Gos dmar slob ma, “the disciples of *Tāmraśāṭa”.³ It follows that Tāmraśāṭīya should be taken as “the followers of *Tāmraśāṭa”; since the latter seems a queer ordination name, it may have been a nickname.⁴ It appears that he was a teacher belonging to the Sthavira ordination lineage, who had sufficient

¹ Schiefner 208,2, *sa ston pa dan | chos bsrub ba dan | gos dmar ba rnams ni de dan de'i mtshan 'chan ba'i gnas brtan rnams kyi rjes 'bran yin*; Chattopadhyaya 341.

² Schiefner 3,4, Chattopadhyaya 14 and note 82 thereto.

³ Q 5641, *'dul ba'i 'grel pa, u*, 187b6.

⁴ A rather queer nickname as well, at least to be adopted as the name of a sect: it seems, after all, to have been the accepted protocol in Buddhist *sāstra* literature to refer to a school under its own name — Vaibhāṣika, Mahāsāṃghika, Mahīśāsaka, etc. (The Vātsīputriyas were in debate sometimes described as Pudgalavādins — a term they themselves did not accept — but when their opponents cited their views or texts they would generally refer to them as Vātsīputriyas or Sāmmatiyas.) It is therefore natural to conclude that the Tāmraśāṭīyas described themselves as “Copper-robed”, which is not altogether likely. Could the name derive from a later misunderstanding or corruption of a toponym? Tāmradvīpa usually meant Sīnhaladvīpa, although (at a date later than most of our references) Tāmradīpa was also a name of Pagan in Burma. Tāmraparṇī usually meant the same, but is also the name of a river in Tirunelvely District; Anuruddha is said to have lived in Tāmratṭha in South India: cf. *BHSD* 251b, “Tāmradvīpa”, “Tāmradvīpaka”; *DPPNI* 995, “Tambapaṇṇī”; D.C. Sircar, *Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India*, 2nd ed., Delhi, 1971, pp. 315–17. There are other toponyms employing Tāmra: Tāmralipti at the mouth of the Ganges, Tāmrapaṭṭana in Arakan, Tāmraliṅga in the central Malay peninsula, and so on: see R.C. Majumdar, *Hindu Colonies in the Far East*, 2nd ed., Calcutta, [1963] 1973, pp. 234, 237. But it is unlikely that any of these are related to the name of our school, and hard to imagine them giving rise to Tāmraśāṭīya.

charisma to establish a following of his own. On the basis of Vasubandhu’s references, he would have lived before the 5th century — but not much earlier since the name Tāmraśāṭīya is unknown to the earliest sources — somewhere in Northern India. *Tāmraśāṭa or his disciples may have composed a treatise incorporating certain tenets of the Sthavira lineage, and the treatise would have gained some celebrity, to be noted by such masters as Vasubandhu and Bhavya. The Tāmraśāṭīyas most probably did not have a distinct Vinaya or Sūtra collection.

(Whether his followers imitated the dress of their teacher — if such be the correct interpretation of his name — and adopted copper-coloured or red robes, and hence deserved the name Tāmraśāṭīya in their own right, cannot be said. Chinese sources give details of the different colours of robes adopted by different schools; while an equivalent of “copper” is not used and the Tāmraśāṭīyas are not mentioned, there are several which fall under the general category of “red”¹ — and *tāmra* is not included in the list of colours forbidden for robes in Theravādin literature.²)

Neither Tāmraśāṭīya, Tāmraparṇīya, nor Tāmravarṇīya are mentioned in the earliest lists of the “18 schools”, such as that of Vasumitra; nor was a sect of any of these names noted by the 7th century pilgrims Hsüan-tsang and I-ching (but note that the former mentions numbers of Sthaviras). No equivalents of Tāmraśāṭīya or Tāmravarṇīya as names of the Theravāda or any other sect are known in Pāli or in inscriptions from India or elsewhere. Tabapanaka occurs in a rail

¹ See Lin Li-Kouang, *L'Aide-Mémoire de la Vraie Loi (Saddharma-smṛtyupasthāna-sūtra)*, Paris, 1949, pp. 71–90, and Étienne Lamotte, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien, des origines à l'ère Śāka*, [1958] Louvain-la-Neuve, 1976, p. 593.

² See the article (in Thai) by Ven. Dhammānanda, *Agramahāpaṇḍitānusarāṇa*, Lampang, 2535 [1992], “Civara”, pp. 172–76; *EB* IV/2, p. 184b (“Civara”).

inscription from Bodh Gayā, but probably not in the sense of adherent of a sect;¹ the toponym Tāmbapaṃṇi occurs in the rock edicts of Aśoka.² A 3rd century Prakrit inscription from Nāgārjunakoṇḍa describes the meritorious deeds of a munificent lay woman (*uvāsikā* = *upāsikā*) named Bodhisiri. The main dedication is to the Tāmbapaṃṇaka Theras (*theriyānaṃ tāmbapa[m]ṇakānaṃ supariḡahe*), “converters” (*pasādaka*) of a number of countries, listed from Kasmira to Tāmbapaṃṇi-dīpa.³ Bodhisiri also erected a shrine for a bodhi tree in the “Sinhalese monastery” (*sīhaḷavihāre bodhirukha-pāsāda*), presumably in the same vicinity (*EI XX*, 22.25). Another Prakrit inscription from Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, dated to the middle of the 3rd century, records the installation of a stone slab bearing the image of the Buddha’s footprints in the monastery (*vihāra*) of “the teachers, the Theras, the Vibhajavādins (*āchariyānaṃ theriyānaṃ vibhajavādānaṃ*) ‘converters’ (*pasādaka*) of Kasmira, Gaṃdhāra, Yavana, Vanavāsa, and Tāmbapaṃnidīpa, the dwellers in the Great Monastery (*mahāvihāravāsinaṃ*)”.⁴ That Theriya here means Theras or Sthaviras in the sense of a sect rather than simply “elders” is suggested by the fact that contemporary Nāgārjunakoṇḍa

¹ *EI X*, 1909–10, Appendix, § 946.

² cf. Lamotte, *Histoire*, pp. 329–30.

³ *EI XX*, 1929–30, p. 22, 13–15. Note that the term *pasādaka* in this and the following inscription has parallels, used in an identical context, in the *pasādayi* of the *Dīpavaṃsa* (Ch. VIII), *pasādayuṃ* of the *Mahāvāṃsa* (XII, 43), and the *abhiprasādita* of the *Mahākarmavibhaṅga*: Sylvain Lévi, *Mahākarmavibhaṅga* (*La Grande Classification des Actes*) et *Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa* (*Discussion sur le Mahā Karmavibhaṅga*), Paris, 1932, p. 61, 11, 12, etc). Similar lists of countries occur in the *Mahākarmavibhaṅga*, the *Dīpavaṃsa* (Ch. VIII), the *Mahāvāṃsa* (Ch. XII, vv. 1–8 and foll.), and the *Thūpavaṃsa* (Ch. 6).

⁴ *EI XXXIII*, 1959–60, pp. 247–50. For an overview of Nāgārjunakoṇḍa and its inscriptions, see Debala Mitra, *Buddhist Monuments*, Calcutta, [1971] 1980, pp. 204–10; P.R. Srinivasan and S. Sankaranarayanan, *Inscriptions of the Ikshvāku Period*, Hyderabad, 1979; and Elisabeth S. Rosen, “Buddhist architecture and lay patronage at Nāgārjunakoṇḍa”, in Anna Libera Dallapiccola and Stephanie Zingel-Avé Lallement (edd.), *The Stūpa: Its Religious, Historical, and Architectural Significance*, Wiesbaden, 1980, pp. 112–26.

dedications to other schools do not employ the term, but rather the phrase “masters of such-and-such a school”: *a*-[or *ā*-]*carīyānaṃ aparamahāvīnaseliyānaṃ, bahusutiyānaṃ, and mahi[sā]sakānaṃ*.¹ If we take the two inscriptions — from two different sites — to refer to the same sect, we get the equation Tāmbapaṃṇaka Theras = Vibhajavādin Theras = Mahāvihāravāsins. Since the epithet Mahāvihāra was applied to numerous monasteries in India and abroad,² and occurs in other Nāgārjunakoṇḍa inscriptions³ including Bodhisiri’s inscription, it is not certain whether “Great Monastery” refers here to one at Nāgārjunakoṇḍa or that at Anurādhapura in Ceylon.

2.5.3. Sthaviras and Vibhajavādins

We have seen above that the *Upanibandhana* on the *Mahāvāṃsagraha* and the *Vijñaptimātratā-siddhi* ascribe the concept of *bhavāṅga* to the Sthaviras and Vibhajavādins, and that the latter are described as Sthaviras in a Nāgārjunakoṇḍa inscription. In the *Abhidharmakośa*, the *Tarkajvālā*, and the *Abhidharmadīpa* the Vibhajavādins are said to reject the fundamental tenet of the Sarvāstivāda, the existence of the dharmas of past, future, and present, and to hold that past karma which has borne fruit and the future do not exist while past karma that has not yet borne fruit and the present do exist.⁴ According to the *Kośa* and the *Tarkajvālā*, this is the origin of their name. In the *Kathāvatthu-aṭṭhakathā* (I 8) the theory that a part of both past and future exist is attributed to the Kassapikas. In his *Tarkajvālā* Bhavya cites a verse of four lines, spoken by Venerable

¹ *EI XX*, 1929–30, pp. 17, 19, 24; *EI XXI*, 1931–32, p. 62.

² See *Hōbōgirin* VI 679 foll. (“Daiji”). The term *mahāvihāriya* is regularly used in the “monastic sealings” of Northern India: see e.g. *EI XXI*, p. 72.

³ *EI XX*, p. 19, *EI XXI*, p. 66, the latter in connection with the *Aparamahāvīnaseliyas*.

⁴ *Kośabhāṣya* III 805, 10 ad *kārikā* V, 25cd; Bhavya in Q 5640, Vol. 127, 178a2; Padmanabh S. Jaini, *Abhidharmadīpa with Vibhāṣāprabhāvṛtti*, Patna, 1977, p. 257, 4.

Kāludāyin (*tshe dan ldan pa nag po 'char ka*) to the Buddha, from the “Word of the Buddha” of the Ārya Vibhajyavādins.¹ Bareau (1955, p. 167) has noted that “la question des Vibhajyavādins est l’une des plus difficiles du problème général des sectes”: I agree, and refer the reader to his study. The only point I wish to make is that in the sources studied here they are related to the Tāmraśāṭīyas and the Sthaviras through the *bhavāṅga-vijñāna*.

2.5.4. Sthaviras and Mahīśāsakas

A Mahīśāsaka theory of the “*skandhas* that endure throughout Saṃsāra” is cited in Yogācāra literature as a Śrāvakayāna parallel to the concept of *ālayavijñāna*.² The *Vivṛtagūḍhārtha* also refers to this theory.³ It is therefore related to the *bhavāṅgavijñāna*, and indeed, as seen above, Vasubandhu also ascribes the use of that term to this school, referring to their **Abhidharma-dharmaparyāya*. In his *Vyākhyāyukti*, the same author notes that the Mahīśāsakas and others do not accept *sūtras* dealing with the “intermediate state” (*antarā-bhava*) as canonical,⁴ in his commentary thereon, Guṇamati states that “others” refers to “Dharmaguptakas, Kāśyapīyas, etc.”⁵ The intermediate state is also rejected by the author of the *Vimuttimaggā* and by the Mahāvihāravāsins; the Mahīśāsaka standpoint is confirmed by Vasumitra, Bhavya, and Vinītaḍeva (Bareau 1955, p. 184). In his *Pratītyasamutpāda-vyākhyā*, Vasubandhu cites the Bhadanta Mahīśāsakas on the relationship between the *aṅga* of *pratītyasamutpāda* and the three times,⁶ their interpretation

¹ *Tarkajvālā*, 194a6–7, ‘*phags pa rnam par phye ste smra ba rnam kyi saṅs rgyas kyi gsuṅs pa*.

² cf. La Vallée Poussin, *La Siddhi de Hiuan-tsang* I 180, and Lamotte, *La Somme du Grande Véhicule* II, pp. 27–28, “Notes et références”, pp. 7*–8*.

³ Q 5553, Vol. 113, *sems tsam*, li, 383a3, b2.

⁴ Q 5562, Vol. 113, *sems tsam*, si, 124a8, *sa ston pa’i sde la sogs pa*.

⁵ Q 5570, Vol. 114, *sems tsam*, i, 153a2, [*sa*] *ston pa’i sde dan, chos sruṅ gi* (!) *sde dan, ’od sruṅs gi sde la sogs pa’o*.

⁶ Q 5496, Vol. 104, 65a8; cf. Guṇamati 271b3.

should be compared with that of the Theravādins. Bhavya cites 12 lines of verse, spoken by Venerable Subhūti (*tshe dan ldan pa rab ’byor*), from the “**Aṣṭavargīya* of the Ārya Mahīśāsakas”.¹ The sect is referred to in an inscription from Nāgārjunakoṇḍa (see above), and its presence is attested in Ceylon.² It thus seems to have lived side-by-side with the Sthaviras in at least Andhra and Laṅka.

2.5.5. Sthaviras, Kāśyapīyas, and Dharmaguptakas

As seen above, Guṇamati states that the Kāśyapīyas reject the theory of the “intermediate state”. Vasubandhu gives brief citations from a *sūtra* of the school in his *Abhidharmakośa*,³ and from a *sūtra* and “a text (*grantha*) of the Bhadanta Kāśyapīyas” in his *Vyākhyāyukti*.⁴ Bhavya cites 16 lines of verse spoken by Ārya Śāriputra (*’phags pa śāri’i bu*) to the Buddha from the “**Pāramitā-mārga* of the Ārya Kāśyapīyas”.⁵ The sect is referred to as Kaśaviyaṅa in Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions from North-western India.⁶

According to Guṇamati, the Dharmaguptakas rejected the theory of the “intermediate state”. According to Yaśomitra and Pūrṇavardhana they asserted “insight [into the four truths] in a single moment” (*ekābhisamaya*),⁷ as did the author of the *Vimuttimaggā*, the Mahāvihāravāsins, the Mahīśāsakas, the Kāśyapīyas (and also the

¹ *Tarkajvālā* 194a3–6, ‘*phags pa sa ston pa rnam kyi tshoms bryad pa*.

² Bareau 1955, p. 181.

³ *Kośabhāṣya* III 941,5, ad *kārikā* VI,34ab.

⁴ VyY 32a7, ‘*od sruṅs pa’i sde pa dag gi mdo las*, 54b6, *btsun pa ’od sruṅs pa’i gzuṅ las* ...

⁵ *Tarkajvālā* 193b3–7, ‘*phags pa ’od sruṅs pa’i pha rol tu phyin pa’i lam*.

⁶ Sten Konow, *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions, Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Vol. II, pt. 1, repr. New Delhi, 1991, pp. 63, 87–89, 121–22; *BÉFEO* 1984, pp. 33 foll.

⁷ *Kośavyākhyā* III 925,13 ad *kārikā* VI,27ab; Pūrṇavardhana, Q 5597, Vol. 119, *mṅon pa’i bstan bcos, thu*, 305b1, ‘*phags pa chos sruṅ ba’i sde pa la sogs pa*.

Mahāsāṃghika schools, all against the Sarvāstivādins, who asserted “insight in stages”, *anupūrvābhisamaya*). Bhavya cites 16 lines of verse, spoken by the Buddha on his prediction by Dīpaṃkara, from the “**Dharmapada* of the Ārya Dharmaguptakas”.¹ The verses are not found in the Theravādin *Dhammapada* or, as far as I know, in any other *Dharmapada*.

2.5.6. Sources for Theravādin tenets: conclusions

The conclusions for this section are rather inconclusive: much more work remains to be done. That there was a close relationship between the Tāmraśāṭīyas and the Sthaviras is certain. The equation is given by Sumatiśīla, and confirmed by the ascription of the *bhavāṅga-vijñāna* to the Sthaviras in the *Mahāyānasamgraha*, its *Upanibandhana*, and the *Siddhi* of Hsüan-tsang and by the ascription of the *hṛdayavastu* to the Tāmraśāṭīyas in the (Tibetan) *Kośavyākhyā* and of a similar tenet to the Sthaviras in the *Siddhi*. These two tenets preclude a connection with the Sarvāstivādins, as suggested by Vinītadeva and others, or with the Sāmmatīyas as given in the *Śrāmaṇera-* and *Bhikṣu-varṣāgraprccās* (see Table 7 and below). The other theories or tenets attributed to the Tāmraśāṭīyas also seem compatible with those of the Theravādins of Ceylon.

The Mahīśāsakas and Vibhajyavādins are also cited in connection with the *bhavāṅga*, and the Tāmraśāṭīyas and Sthaviras in connection with the heart-basis. Bareau and others have shown that the *Vinayas* of the Mahīśāsakas and Dharmaguptakas are affiliated with the *Vinaya* of the Theravādins.² It is likely that doctrines such as *hṛdaya-*

¹ *Tarkajvālā* 194a7–b2, ‘*phags pa chos sbas pa rnamzang kyis chos kyis rkañ pa*. See 198a3–7 for another citation.

² For the language of the *Vinaya* of the Mahīśāsakas, see J.W. de Jong, “Fa-hsien and Buddhist Texts in Ceylon”, *JPTS* IX, 1981, pp. 105–15. Note that there is no

vastu and *bhavāṅga* developed in embryo among the monks of the early Sthavira lineage in India, and that they were refined over the centuries in the branches of that school such as the Theravādins of Ceylon and the Tāmraśāṭīyas and Mahīśāsakas of India, leading to differences of interpretation. It is clear, and only natural, that each branch underwent its own separate development: the texts of the individual schools cited by Bhavya in his *Tarkajvālā* seem to have no parallels in Theravādin literature, and the Mahīśāsakas and Dharmaguptakas held views that were rejected by the Theravādins, as, for example, on the nature of the unconditioned (*asamskṛta*).¹

But periodic contact between the various schools could have brought with it “contamination”. The conservatism of the Thera tradition of Ceylon is often overrated. The *hadaya-vatthu* (not listed in the *Dhammasaṅgani*) and the developed *bhavaṅga* theory (along with the Theravādin *khanikavāda*) appear only with Buddhaghosa. The great *ācariya* was an Indian monk who almost certainly selectively introduced new material from the tenets of the Indian Sthavira schools: he was not only a codifier but also an innovator, but the latter aspect of his career is too frequently ignored.

The Tāmraśāṭīyas, Mahīśāsakas, and Dharmaguptakas may be taken as branches of the Sthavira school.² But what Sthaviras? We cannot, on the basis of the evidence, identify them with the Sthaviras of Ceylon. “Sthavira” as used by Sumatiśīla, Asaṅga, and Hsüan-tsang may well refer to the broader Vinaya lineage of the Tāmraśāṭīyas: that is, they

evidence to suggest that either the Tāmraśāṭīyas or Vibhajyavādins were Vinaya schools.

¹ cf. Bareau 1955, p. 185, and *Kośavyākhyā* II 452 ad *kārikā* III,28.

² I do not think the Mahīśāsakas alone can be taken as “the continental counterpart” of the Theravādins (Bareau 1955, p. 183): it is simplistic to expect the Sthaviras, spread out over a wide area in different countries and conditions, to have sprung only a single branch.

were not *the* Sthaviras but rather one of several schools of the Sthavira fold in India, along with at least the Mahīśāsakas and the Vibhajyavādins. (Note that the Theravādins of Ceylon do not portray themselves as part of a “Greater Sthavira School” of Jambudvīpa, about which they are silent, but rather as the sole repositories of the pristine Sthavira lineage.)

The affiliation of the Sthaviras, Tāmraśāṭīyas, Vibhajyavādins, Mahīśāsakas, Kāśyapīyas, and Dharmaguptakas suggested by the sources cited above does not, however, agree with that given in the later treatises on the “18 schools”. The closest parallel is given by Bhavya, who reports a tradition that places the Tāmraśāṭīyas, Mahīśāsakas, Kāśyapīyas, and Dharmaguptakas under the Vibhajyavādins (Table 7.B).¹ According to this tradition the Vibhajyavādins are distinct from the Sthaviras. Vinītadeva, Subhūtiḥoṣa, and the anonymous *Ārya-sarvāstivādi-mūla-bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa-sūtra-vṛtti* count the Tāmraśāṭīyas as number 6 of the seven branches of the Sarvāstivādins (along with, let us note, the Mahīśāsakas, Kāśyapīyas, Dharmaguptakas, and Vibhajyavādins of Bhavya’s list).² This list must originate with the Sarvāstivādins, to whom it gives prominence. A Sarvāstivādin affiliation for these schools can be rejected since it is contradicted by both other, earlier, sources on the “18 schools” and by the doctrines ascribed to them; the point of interest is that the group is kept together. In the

¹ Q 5640, u, 179a4; *Tarkajvālā* 162b5; Bareau 1956, 171–72.

² *Phags pa thams cad yod par smra ba’i rtsa ba’i dge sloṅ ma’i so sor thar pa’i mdo’i ’grel pa*, Q 5614, Vol. 122, *mdo ’grel, tshu*, 3b8 foll. The Sanskrit title is so presented in the Peking edition. The commentary might be based on a Sarvāstivādin version of the *Bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa* since it describes the Sarvāstivādins as the “root” (*rtsa ba = mūla*) but the Mūlasarvāstivādins as the first of the “seven branches” (*yan lag = śākhā*)(3b8); the author must, however, have been a Mahāyānist since he or she cites *sūtras* of that “school” in the form of excerpts from the *Sūtra-samuccaya*. An interesting feature of the work is that it mentions 22 schools (3b7), referring the reader to the *śāstras* of Ācāryas Vasumitra (dByig gi bśes gñen) and Vinītadeva (Dul ba’i lha) for details (4a5). The latter reference dates the work to the 8th century.

Śrāmaṇera- and *Bhikṣu-varṣāgrapṛcchās*, the Tāmraśāṭīyas are grouped under Sāmmatīya;¹ this too is clearly wrong since it goes against all other sources.

Does this mean that the schools themselves forgot their own Vinaya lineage, or that the mistakes are due to writers of other schools? Both are possible, but the latter seems more likely, since most of the writers clearly belonged to the Sarvāstivādin or other lineages, but certainly not to the schools in question. Further, some schools may have been extinct by the time of the later reports, and some of them always had a limited geographical presence. That the Sāmmatīyas had a clear idea of their own lineage is clear from a citation of Daśabalaśrīmitra.²

Other names must be considered in the quest for Sthavira tenets. Bhavya notes that the Sthaviras “are also called Haimavatas, because they dwell in the Himālayas”;³ Vinītadeva identifies the Tāmraśāṭīyas with another obscure school, the Saṃkrāntivādins.⁴ Tāranātha and other Tibetan writers refer to “Sendhapa Śrāvakas” and “Singhala Śrāvakas”. If derived from Saindhava, the former may refer to Sāmmatīyas who took refuge in Magadha when Sindh fell to the Arabs; but the usage is not always clear, and at times Sendhapa and Singhala seem to be interchangeable.⁵

¹ Q 5634, Vol. 127, *’dul ba’i ’grel pa, u, 79a7*; Q 5649, Vol. 127, *’dul ba’i ’grel pa, u, 318a7*.

² See Peter Skilling, “History and Tenets of the Sāmmatīya School”, *Linhsun*— *Publication d’études bouddhologiques*, No. 19 (June–Sept. 1982), pp. 38–52.

³ Q 5640, 177b8; *Tarkajvālā* 161b6, *de ñid la gaṅs kyi ri pa zes kyaṅ zer te | gaṅs kyi ri la brten nas gnas pa’i phyir ro*. For this school, see Bareau 1955, pp. 111–13.

⁴ Q 5640, u, 189b8, *’pho ba smra ba de dag ni gos dmar gyi sde pa ñid do*; Bareau 1956, pp. 192, 196–99. For this school, see Bareau 1955, Ch. XXII.

⁵ For a different interpretation of Sendhapa, based on the variant Pendapa, see Ruegg 1992, pp. 267–68, and accompanying notes.

In some cases the school may not be named at all, but simply described as “some” or “others”. In his *Vyākhyāyukti*,¹ for example, Vasubandhu, analyses the phrase *su-arthaṃ su-vyañjanam*, the standard form met with in Sanskrit texts. He notes also that “some read **sa-arthaṃ sa-vyañjanam*” (*kha cig ni don dan ldan pa dan | tshig 'bru dan ldan pa zes 'don te*); this agrees with the standard Pāli form *sa-atthaṃ sa-byañjanam* (M I 179,7, etc.). Unfortunately neither Vasubandhu nor his commentator Guṇamati says who these “some” are; they may be Theravādins, but they may also be members of one of the several Buddhist schools whose scriptures have not come down to us. At any rate, the reference shows that the reading preferred by the Theravādins was known to Vasubandhu.

3. Modern translations of Theravādin texts

3.1. The *Dhammapada* and Gedun Chomphel

The *Dhammapada* was translated from Pāli into Tibetan by the modern scholar Gedun Chomphel (dGe 'dun Chos 'phel, 1905–51)² under the title *Chos kyi tshigs su bcaḍ pa* (= *Dhamma-gāthā*, *gāthā* being one of the meanings of *pada*). The first edition has a 3-page preface by George Roerich dated Kulu, 1944. Roerich notes that “the translator is not only a Tibetan scholar of eminence, but a distinguished poet as well, and his translation combines scholarly exactitude with a high literary value”. The translation gives brief *nidānas* extracted from the Dhp-a (of the type discussed in § 2.4 above) at the head of the verses. It has been reprinted several times, and has firmly established itself in the

¹ VyY, Q 5562, *sems tsam*, si, 33a1.

² See Heather Stoddard's biography, *Le mendiant de l'Amdo*, Paris, 1985; according to the authoress (oral communication, August 1992) a revised and expanded English translation is forthcoming. See also D. Snellgrove & Hugh Richardson, *A Cultural History of Tibet*, Boulder, 1980, p. 245, and Heather Karmay, “dGe-'dun Chos-'phel: The Two Latest Versions of his Life Story”, *The Tibet Journal* X/1, (Dharamsala, Spring 1985), pp. 44–48.

wide world of *Dhamma-/Dharmapada* literature.¹ The colophon describes the text as “the *Dhammapada*, the second section of the *Khuddaka-sutta*, from the *Suttanta-piṭaka* of the Ariya Theras”. It states that the translation was done with the assistance of *Mahānaya-kathera Dharmānanda at the monastery of dPal Ral gri'i ri bo of Sinhala.² According to an editorial note in *BSR* 6/2, p. 193, Dharmānanda was Lunupokune Sri Dhammananda Nayaka Thera, Principal of the Vidyalankara Pirivena, Kelaniya, where Gedun Chomphel studied during 1939–40.³ Bhikkhu Pāsādika suggests Khagga-giri/-pabbata as the Pāli equivalent of Ral gri'i ri bo (“Sword Mountain”); another possibility is Asigiri. The colophon of the 1964 Maha Bodhi Society (Sarnath) edition (p. 156) states that that edition was published at the behest of Saṃgharatna Bhikkhu, head of the Mahābodhi [Society] in Vārāṇasī.⁴

¹ The title pages and preface of the first edition (Anagarika Dharmapala Trust Publication Series No. 2, Sikkim Durbar Press, Gangtok, 1946) have been reprinted in facsimile with reset text in *Dge 'dun chos 'phel gyi gsuñ rtsom* (*A Collection of Miscellaneous Writings by Ven. Gedun Chomphel*), Vol. II, New Delhi, 1991. Chomphel's version was reprinted with Tibetan text and English translation by Dharma Publishing (*Dhammapada*, Berkeley, 1985), reviewed in *BSR* 6/2 (1989) by Bhikkhu Pāsādika (pp. 186–88) and Phra Khantipālo (pp. 191–93). Russell Webb, “The *Dhammapada* — East and West”, *BSR* 6/2 (1989), p. 168 lists reprints in New Delhi 1976 and — as an appendix to *The Nyingma Edition of the sDe dge bKa' 'gyur and bsTan 'gyur* — Berkeley 1980.

² *'Phags pa gnas brtan pa rnam kyi mdo sde'i sde snod du bsduḍ pa las | phran tshigs kyi mdo phran gñis pa chos kyi tshigs su bcaḍ pa zes bya ba rdzogs so || | 'dren pa chen po gnas brtan dha rmā nanda'i žabs druḍ du žus te | siṅga la dpal ral gri'i ri bo'i dgon par dge 'dun chos 'phel gyis bsgyur ba rdzogs so || |*.

³ A brief account of Gedun Chomphel's stay in Ceylon is given (in Tibetan) in the biography *Šes rab rgya mtshos bris pa'i dge 'dun chos 'phel gyi rnam thar*, in *Dge 'dun chos 'phel gyi gsuñ rtsom*, Vol. II, p. 369.

⁴ *Va ra nā si ma hā bo dhi'i dbu 'dzin dge sloḅ saḅ gha ratna'i bka' mñags bzin du | sog po chos rje bla mas lcags 'phrul tu par bskrun pa'o*. This is followed by a brief note on the Mahābodhi Society in India and at Sarnath (pp. 157–58).

The *Dhammapada* translation was by no means Gedun Chomphel's sole contribution to the study of the Theravāda in Tibetan. His great work on Madhyamaka, *Ornament of the Significance of Nāgārjuna's Thought*, mentions Bhadanta Buddhaghosa side-by-side with Asaṅga and other Buddhist masters; this may well be the first reference to Buddhaghosa in the philosophical literature of Tibet.¹ His lengthy "History of Sinhala" — recently made available in printed form — gives a long account of Ceylonese history from the beginning up to modern times. The author describes Ceylonese monasteries and monastic regulations; he gives a breakdown of the Pāli canon, and discusses the commentaries, the works of Buddhaghosa such as the *Visuddhimagga* (*rNam par dag pa'i lam*), and so on. (Note that the names of the seven books of the Abhidhamma, for which see Table 5, are correctly rendered.) In what must be the first mention of Pāli (the word is transcribed, not translated) in Tibetan, he discusses that language and the Theravādin belief that it is the language of the Buddha. He discusses the duration of the dhamma and the Theravādin calculation of the *nirvāṇa* era, comparing it with that introduced to Tibet by Kha che paṅ chen.² Stoddard (p. 182) mentions that during his stay [in Ceylon] he translated the *Vinaya* into Tibetan and sent it to a friend in Tibet, explaining the difference between [the Theravādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin *Vinayas*].³ As far as I know this work has not come to light; if he did indeed translate the entire *Vinaya*, this would be an extraordinary feat — but Gedun Chomphel was an extraordinary man.

¹ *Dbu ma'i zab gnad sñin por dril ba'i legs bśad klu sgrub dgoṅs rgyan* (Kalimpong blockprint, 1951) (modern page) 12.4, *btsun pa saṅs rgyas dbyaṅs*: I am grateful to Donald Lopez (Ann Arbor) for this reference and for a copy of the relevant passage.

² *Dge 'dun chos 'phel gyi gsuñ rtsom*, Vol. I, Ch. 14, *siṅgala'i lo rgyus skor*, pp. 427–500.

³ Stoddard, p. 182: "Pendant son séjour, Gedun Ch'omp'el fit une traduction tibétaine du *vinaya* cinghalais et l'envoya à un ami au Tibet, lui expliquant la différence entre les deux systèmes".

3.2. *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha* of Aniruddha

The *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha* of Aniruddha, a popular manual of the Abhidhamma, has recently been translated into Tibetan by Acharya Sempa Dorjee (Sems dpa' rdo rje), accompanied by his own commentary entitled *Abhidhammakaumudini*.¹ Volume I, containing the first five chapters in 705 pages, with Hindi translation, has already been published as Vol. VIII of the Dalai Lama Tibeto-Indological Series by the Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies (Sarnath, 1988); Volume II, containing chapters six to ten, is forthcoming from the same publisher. The introduction describes the seven books of the Theravādin *Abhidhamma*, and the commentary explains the Theravādin system in detail, with frequent references to Pāli sources. Sempa Dorjee's scholarly work is the first extensive description of the Pāli Abhidhamma in the Tibetan language.

4. Tibet and Ceylon

Other material relevant to the history and Buddhism of Ceylon is available in Tibetan sources. Ānandaśrī was not the only Ceylonese to have played a role in the literary and religious history of the Land of Snows (though he may have been the only one to introduce Theravādin texts). The *Tanjur* preserves translations of a commentary on the *Cakrasaṃvara-tantra* and three related ritual texts composed by a Ceylonese monk named Jayabhadrā.² In the 11th century, a Yoginī from Sinhaladvīpa named Candramālā collaborated on the translation of several

¹ *Slob dpon ma 'gags pas mdzad pa'i chos mñon bsdus pa | chos mñon bsdus pa bsdus te bśad pa'i 'grel pa chos mñon kund 'dzum pa'i zla zer zes bya bas brgyan pa bžugs so*.

² P. Cordier, *Catalogue du fonds tibétain de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Part II, Paris, 1909, §§ VII,2, XIII,22,23,33. The Sanskrit of what is presumably the first is preserved in Nepal: see Pratapaditya Pal and Julia Meech-Pekarik, *Buddhist Book Illuminations*, Hong Kong, 1988, p. 35.

Tantras with *bhikṣu Śākya Ye śes* ('Brog mi).¹ 'Brog mi, a teacher of the first Sa skya Lama Sa chen Kun dga' sñin po (1092–1158), was a key figure in the early Sa skya pa lineage; perhaps more information about Candramālā may be found in the texts of that school. An elusive "Arhat of Siṃhaladvīpa" figures in the biography of the Kashmiri *paṇḍita Śākyaśrībhadra* (1140s–1226).² In the second half of the 15th century, a Ceylonese named Chos kyi ñin byed (Dharmadivākara ?) travelled to Tibet, where he travelled and taught extensively. He is held to be a predecessor in the incarnation lineage of the first Jetsundampa of Mongolia. In his homeland he had a vision at "the mountain with the footprint of the Buddha" (Śrīpāda), foretelling his visit to the Mountain of Five Peaks (Wu tai shan) in China. He travelled to Magadha and Vajrāsana, then on to China, where he met some merchants who invited him to Tibet. After a year at sTag luñ he travelled to Lhasa and to Western Tibet and Nepal, where he disrobed to become a Tantric yogi. He died on his way back to Ceylon.³

The travelogues of peripatetic yogis contain information about Ceylon (and also India and South-east Asia). 'Gos lo tsa ba's biography of the Chittagongi monk Vanaratna (born 1384) describes his visit to Ceylon — where he spent six years (from about 1404–10) — and to Śrīpāda.⁴ Tāranātha's biography of Buddhagupta of South India contains an account of that yogi's visit to Ceylon, where he spent five years in the late 16th century, and his pilgrimage to Śrīpāda.⁵ Further references to

¹ Stog § 356, *siñ ga gliñ gi rnal 'byor ma candramāle*; see also §§ 354, 355 (addenda p. 318), 358, 365, 367.

² See Ruegg 1992, p. 267 for references.

³ *Collected Works of Jaya-Paṇḍita Blo-bzañ-hphrin-las*, Vol. 4, New Delhi, 1981, *na*, 50a5–51b2.

⁴ *Mkhas pa chen po dpal nags kyi rin chen gyi rnam thar*, recently reprinted from a Bhutanese Ms. See DTher II 933, BA II 797–801.

⁵ *Grub chen buddha gupta'i rnam thar*: cf. Giuseppe Tucci, "The Sea and Land Travels of a Buddhist Sādhu in the Sixteenth Century", *Indian Historical*

Ceylon may be found in such works as Tāranātha's history of the Tārā Tantra¹ or his *Seven Instruction Lineages*,² in the biography of Dharmasvāmin,³ the biographies of the Eighty-four Siddhas, or in other works not yet examined. A brief but somewhat more modern account of the island was offered by 'Jigs med gliñ pa in 1788.⁴

Conclusions

The Theravādin texts in Tibetan translation are the work of four known translation teams: Vidyākaraṇa and dPal brtsegs near Lhasa, ca. 800 (1.15); Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna (Atīśa) and Tshul khriṃs rgyal ba at Lhasa in the first half of the 11th century (2.3); Ānandaśrī and Ñi ma rgyal mtshan dPal bzañ po at Thar pa gliñ (1.1–13), and Ānandaśrī and Kun dga' rgyal mtshan Thub bstan dpal bzañ po at Sa skya, both in the first decade of the 14th century. The translators of 2.1–2 are not known.

Our knowledge of the development of Buddhism in India suffers heavily from a (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin-Vaibhāṣika bias, since most of the surviving sources for the subject — whether of the Śrāvakayāna or the Mahāyāna, whether in Sanskrit, Chinese, Tibetan, or Central Asian

Quarterly VII/4, (December, 1931), pp. 683–702; a complete translation is forthcoming from David Templeman (Australia). Śrīpāda was an important pilgrimage centre in the ancient Buddhist world. For an account of a visit by Vajrabodhi at the beginning of the 8th century see Chou Yi-liang, "Tantrism in China", *HJAS* 8/3–4, (March, 1945), pp. 314–15, 317. See also *Manimekhalai* (tr. Alain Daniélou, New York, 1989, p. 44), which refers to the footprints on the summit of Samanta-Kuta (I take Ratnadvīpa here to mean Ceylon).

¹ Tr. Martin Willson, *In Praise of Tara: Songs to the Saviouress*, London, 1986, pp. 169–206; tr. David Templeman, *The Origin of the Tārā Tantra*, Dharamsala, 1981.

² *Bka' babs bdun ldan*, tr. David Templeman, Dharamsala, 1983.

³ G. Roerich (ed., tr.), *Biography of Dharmasvāmin*, Patna, 1959.

⁴ *Lho phyogs rgya gar gyi gnam*: an edition and translation are being prepared by Michael Aris (Oxford).

translation — belong to or were influenced by that tradition. The information supplied here from Tibetan sources helps in a small measure to fill that lacuna in our knowledge. The brief citation of a **Buddhavamsa* of the Abhayagirivāsins (2.3) gives us the name of a lost and hitherto unknown text of that school, and shows that it was available in the India of about the 6th century. Tradition holds that Bhavya was born in and spent the greater part of his life in the South, but from where he obtained the text is not certain — and the possibility that he borrowed the citation from another work cannot be ruled out. The translations of portions of the *Vimuttimagga* (1.15, 2.1) show that that text was extant and studied in Northern India from ca. 800 to the early 13th century. The citations from other, unidentified texts given by Daśabalaśrimitra (2.2) show that other Theravādin texts were circulated in Northern India in 12th or 13th century. The alternate *nidānas* cited by Prajñāvarman (2.4) show that he had access to a commentarial tradition on the *Udānavarga* verses that must have derived from a source common to that of the Pāli *Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā*. Some of his “official” *nidānas* give us (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin parallels to canonical Pāli suttas; they also cast a beam of light on the sources of the *Nettipakaraṇa*, one of the riddles of Pāli studies. The references in various *Tanjur* texts (2.5) to tenets of the Sthaviras, Tāmraśāṭīyas, and affiliated schools throw at least a little light on some of the key concepts of the Theravāda, such as the *bhavāṅga-viññāṇa* and *hadaya-vatthu*, and show that such doctrines were known to Indian scholars. The modern translations (3.1, 2) show that the Tibetans still take an interest in the texts and tenets of all Buddhist schools, whether Mahāyāna or Śrāvakayāna, and are still indefatigable in the art of translation.

While a critical edition of the 14 texts translated by Ānandaśrī might be of some value, and would clarify the extent of redactional differences from the Pāli, its preparation would not be an enviable task, considering the many problems of translation in the Tibetan. Four of

them, however, certainly deserve further study. The *Maitrī-sūtra* (1.5, along with 1.14, the *Ārya-maitrī-sūtra*) could be edited in conjunction with the hitherto unedited Pāli *Metteyya-sutta* in Burmese and Siamese manuscripts. The *Pañcaśikṣānuśaṃsa* (1.7) merits study since the second part (1.7B) seems to have no Pāli parallel, and is otherwise unknown. The *Mahāmaṅgala-sūtra* (1.13) could fruitfully be edited along with the Tibetan *Devapariṭṭhā Maṅgalagāthā* of unknown school, in comparison with the Pāli. A comparison of the *Nandopanandadamana* (1.9) in its Tibetan and Pāli versions with the Chinese sūtra of the same title should prove very interesting, since the Chinese version predates Buddhaghosa’s citation by about two centuries. An edition and translation of Daśabalaśrimitra’s citations from the *Vimuttimagga* (2.1), in comparison with the Chinese version, and of the same author’s citations of other Theravādin texts (2.2), is a desideratum, as is a thorough comparison of both the official and alternate *nidānas* of Prajñāvarman (2.4) with Pāli sources. Finally, a concordance of references in Tibetan literature to Theravādin tenets and to Ceylon would be most useful.

Bangkok

Peter Skilling

Abbreviations and Bibliography

References to Pāli texts, unless otherwise noted, are to the editions of the Pāli Text Society (PTS), with standard abbreviations. Tibetan texts are cited by catalogue number under the abbreviations listed below.

Abbreviations

AMG	<i>Annales du Musée Guimet</i>
AMG V	Léon Feer, "Fragments extraits du Kandjour", in <i>Annales du Musée Guimet</i> , V, Paris, 1883
B	Berlin manuscript <i>Kanjur</i> : see Beckh 1914. Since Beckh's catalogue does not assign a sequential catalogue number to each work throughout the entire <i>Kanjur</i> , but only within each single volume, I refer in this paper to the sequential volume number within the <i>Kanjur</i> as a whole (that given by Beckh in parentheses after the sectional volume number), followed by the catalogue number within that volume.
BA	George N. Roerich, <i>The Blue Annals</i> , [Calcutta, 1949] Delhi, 1976 (Eng. tr. of DTher)
BÉFEO	<i>Bulletin d'École française d'Extrême-Orient</i>
BHSD	Franklin Edgerton, <i>Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary</i> , Vol. II (Dictionary), [New Haven, 1953] Delhi, 1972
BSR	<i>Buddhist Studies Review</i>
C	Cone xylograph <i>Kanjur</i> : see Mibu 1959
D	Derge xylograph <i>Kanjur</i> and <i>Tanjur</i> : see Ui <i>et al.</i>
Dhp-a	<i>Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā</i> , PTS edition
DPPN	G.P. Malalasekera, <i>Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names</i> , [1937] New Delhi, 1983
DTher	<i>Deb ther sñon po</i> of 'Gos lo tsa ba g'zön nu dpal, Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khañ, Chengdu, 1984

EB	<i>Encyclopaedia of Buddhism</i> , Colombo, 1961—
EI	<i>Epigraphia Indica</i>
GDhp	John Brough, <i>The Gāndhārī Dharmapada</i> , London, 1962
H	Lhasa xylograph <i>Kanjur</i> : see Takasaki 1965
HJAS	<i>Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies</i>
J	Lithang xylograph <i>Kanjur</i> : see Imaeda 1984
JA	<i>Journal asiatique</i>
JB	<i>gSan yig</i> of 'Jam dbyaṅs b'zad pa'i rdo rje: <i>The Collected works of 'Jam-dbyans-bzad-pa'i-rdo-rje</i> , reproduced by Ngawang Gelek Demo, vol. 4, New Delhi, 1972, folios 29a1–3, 29a6–29b1. No sequential text or volume numbers have been assigned to this work.
JIABS	<i>Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies</i>
JP	<i>gSan yig</i> of Jayapaṇḍita: <i>Collected Works of Jayapaṇḍita blo-bzañ hphrin-las</i> , reproduced by L. Chandra, vol. 4, New Delhi, 1981, folios 235a3–5, and 235b3–5. No sequential text or volume numbers have been assigned to this work.
JPTS	<i>Journal of the Pāli Text Society</i>
JSS	<i>Journal of the Siam Society</i>
KBC	Lewis R. Lancaster, <i>The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue</i> , Berkeley, 1979
KD II	Kloñ rdol bla ma (1719–1805), <i>Kloñ rdol ñag dbaṅ blo bzañ gi gsuñ 'bum</i> , Vol. 2 (Gaṅs can rig mdzod 21), Lhasa, 1991
<i>Kośabhāṣya</i>	<i>Abhidharmakośabhāṣya</i> of Vasubandhu: see Dwarikadas
<i>Kośavyākhyā</i>	<i>Abhidharmakośavyākhyā</i> of Yaśomitra: see Dwarikadas

- L London manuscript *Kanjur*: L.D. Barnett, "Index der Abteilung mDo des Handschriftlichen Kanjur im Britischen Museum (Or. 6724)", *Asia Major*, Vol. VII. No running catalogue numbers have been assigned to the London Manuscript, and the original volume numbers are uncertain: cf. Helmut Eimer, "Zur Anordnung der Abteilungen in der Londoner Handschrift des tibetischen Kanjur", in *Zentralasiatischen Studien* 15 (1981), pp. 537–48.
- M Urga xylograph *Kanjur*: see Bethlenfalvy 1980
- Mvy R. Sakaki, *Mahāvvyutpatti*, Kyoto, 1926
- N Narthang xylograph *Kanjur*: see Takasaki 1965, and A. Csoma de Körös, *Analysis of Kanjur*, reprint Delhi, 1982
- PTSD *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary*
- PDhp Gustav Roth, "Particular Features of the Language of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins and their Importance for Early Buddhist Tradition", Supplement 2, "Text of the Patna Dharmapada", in Bechert 1980, pp. 97–135
- Q Peking xylograph *Kanjur* and *Tanjur*: D.T. Suzuki, ed., *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition*, Catalogue I, Vol. 165, Tokyo-Kyoto, 1961.
- S Stog manuscript *Kanjur*: see Skorupski 1985
- Saṅghabh Raniero Gnoli (ed.), *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu*, Part I, Rome, 1977
- T Tokyo manuscript *Kanjur*: see Saito 1973
- TD *Record of Teachings Received: The Gsan Yig of Gter-bdag-glin-pa 'Gyur-med-rdo-rje of Smin-grol-glin*, reproduced from a unique manuscript preserved in the library of Dudjom Rimpoche by Sanje Dorje, New Delhi, 1974

- U Ulan Bator manuscript *Kanjur*: see Bethlenfalvy 1982
- Uv Franz Bernhard, *Udānavarga*, Vol. I, Göttingen, 1965
- UvT Siglinde Dietz and Champa Thupten Zongtse, *Udānavarga*, Vol. III, Göttingen, 1990
- UvViv Michael Balk, *Prajñāvarman's Udānavargavivaraṇa*, 2 vols., Bonn, 1984
- VyY Vasubandhu, *Vyākhyāyukti*, Q 5562, Vol. 113, *sems tsam*, si

Bibliography

- Bureau 1955 André Bareau, *Les sectes bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule*, Paris
- Bureau 1956 André Bareau, "Trois traités sur les sectes bouddhiques attribués à Vasumitra, Bhavya, et Vinītadeva", Part 2, *JA* 1956, fasc. 2
- Bechert 1980 H. Bechert (ed.), *The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition*, Göttingen
- Beckh 1914 H. Beckh, *Verzeichnis der Tibetischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, Berlin
- Bethlenfalvy 1980 Géza Bethlenfalvy, *A Catalogue of the Urga Kanjur*, New Delhi
- Bethlenfalvy 1982 Géza Bethlenfalvy, *A Hand-list of the Ulan Bator Manuscript of the Kanjur Rgyal-rtse Them Spaṅs-ma*, Budapest
- Bischoff 1968 F.A. Bischoff, *Der Kanjur und seine Kolophone*, Band II, Bloomington
- Dwarikadas Swami Dwarikadas Shastri (ed.), *Abhidharmakośa & Bhāṣya of Acharya Vasubandhu with Sphuṭārthā Commentary of Ācārya Yaśomitra*, Parts I–IV, Varanasi, 1970–73

- Ehara *et al.* [1961] 1977 N.R.M. Ehara, Soma Thera, and Kheminda Thera, *The Path of Freedom (Vimuttimagga)*, [Colombo, 1961] Kandy, 1977
- Eimer 1989 Helmut Eimer, *Der Tantra-Katalog des Bu ston im Vergleich mit der Abteilung Tantra des tibetischen Kanjur* (Indica et Tibetica 17), Bonn
- Feer 1870 "Études bouddhiques. Les quatre vérités et la prédication de Bénarès", *JA* May–June 1870, pp. 345 foll.
- Ferrari 1958 A. Ferrari, *Mk'yen Brtse's Guide to the Holy Places of Central Tibet* (Serie Orientale Roma XVI), Rome
- Haarh 1962 Erik Haarh, "A Comparative List of the Derge and Lhasa Editions of the Kanjur", *Asia Major*, New Series, Vol. IX, part 2
- Ihara and Yamaguchi 1992 Ihara Shōren and Yamaguchi Zuihō (ed.), *Tibetan Studies (Proceedings of the 5th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Narita 1989)*, Narita
- Iida 1980 Shotaro Iida, *Reason and Emptiness: A Study in Logic and Mysticism*, Tokyo
- Imaeda 1984 Yoshiro Imaeda, *Catalogue du Kanjur tibétain de l'édition de 'Jang sa-tham*, part 2, Tokyo
- Jackson 1987 David P. Jackson, *The Entrance Gate for the Wise (Section III)*, Vol. 1, Vienna
- de Jong 1972 J.W. de Jong, "Notes à propos des colophons du Kanjur", *Zentralasiatische Studien* 6
- Lalou 1929 Marcelle Lalou, "La version tibétain des Prajñāpāramitā", *JA*, July–September 1929, pp. 87–102
- Lalou 1953 Marcelle Lalou, "Les textes bouddhiques au temps du roi Khri-Sron-lde-bcan", *JA*, pp. 313–53
- Lancaster see KBC

- Lévi 1932 Sylvain Lévi, "Maitreya le consolateur", *Études d'orientalisme publiés par le Musée Guimet à la mémoire de Raymonde Linossier*, t. II, Paris
- Ligeti 1942–44 Louis Ligeti, *Catalogue du Kanjur mongol imprimé*, Vol. I, Budapest
- Macdonald 1963 Ariane Macdonald, "Préambule à la lecture d'un Rgya-Bod Yig-chañ", *JA* CCLI
- Mibu 1959 T. Mibu, "A Comparative List of the Bkaḥ-ḥgyur Division in the Co-ne, Peking, Sde-dge and Snarthañ Editions", *Taishō Daigaku Kenkyū-kiyō*, No. 44, March, 1959
- Nattier 1991 Jan Nattier, *Once upon a Future Time: Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline*, Berkeley
- Naudou 1968 Jean Naudou, *Les bouddhistes kasmériens au moyen age*, Paris
- Nishioka S. Nishioka, "Index to the Catalogue Section of Bu-ston's 'History of Buddhism'" (I), in *Tōkyō-daigakubungakubu Bunkakōryūkenkyūshisetsu Kenkyū Kiyō* 4 (1980), pp. 61–92; (III), *ibid.* 6 (1983), pp. 47–201
- Obermiller 1932 E. Obermiller, *History of Buddhism (Chos-hbyuñ) by Bu-ston*, II. Part, Heidelberg
- Pensa 1967 Corrado Pensa, *L'Abhisamayālamkāravṛtti di Ārya-Vimuktisena, Primo Abhisamaya*, Rome
- Louis Renou, Jean Filliozat, *et al.*, *L'Inde classique*, tome II, Hanoi, 1953
- Ruegg 1966 David Seyfort Ruegg, *The Life of Bu Ston Rin Po Che* (Serie Orientale Roma XXXIV), Rome
- Ruegg 1981 David Seyfort Ruegg, *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India* (Jan Gonda [ed.], *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. VII, fasc. 1), Wiesbaden

- Ruegg 1990 David Seyfort Ruegg, "On the Authorship of Some Works Ascribed to Bhāvaviveka/Bhavya", in David Seyfort Ruegg and Lambert Schmithausen (ed.), *Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaka*, Leiden, pp. 59–71
- Ruegg 1992 D. Seyfort Ruegg, "Notes on Some Indian and Tibetan Reckonings of the Buddha's Nirvāṇa and the Duration of his Teaching", in Heinz Bechert (ed.), *The Dating of the Historical Buddha*, Part 2, Göttingen
- Saito 1973 K. Saito, "Kawaguchi Ekai-shi Shōraii Tōyō Bunko Shozō Shahon Chibetto Daizōkyō Chōsa Bibō", in *Taishō Daigaku Kenkyū-kiyō*, No. 63 (Sept. 1973)
- Samten 1992 Jampa Samten, *A Catalogue of the Phug-Brag Manuscript Kanjur*, Dharamsala
- Samten and Russell 1987 Jampa Samten Shastri, translated with Jeremy Russell, "Notes on the Lithang Edition of the Tibetan bKa'-gyur", *The Tibet Journal*, Vol. XII, no. 3, Autumn, 1987, pp. 17–40
- Schopen 1982 Gregory Schopen, "Hinayāna Texts in a 14th Century Persian Chronicle", *Central Asiatic Journal* 26
- Skilling 1992 Peter Skilling, "The *Rakṣā* Literature of the Śrāvakayāna", *JPTS* XVI (1992), pp. 109–82
- Skorupski 1985 Tadeusz Skorupski, *A Catalogue of the Stog Palace Kanjur*, Tokyo
- Supaphan 1990 Supaphan na Bangchang, *Vivaḍhanākāra varṇagatī sai braḥ suttantapiṭaka ti daeng nai pradeśa thai*, Bangkok, 2533 [1990]
- Szerb 1990 János Szerb, *Bu ston's History of Buddhism in Tibet*, Vienna

- Takasaki 1965 J. Takasaki, *A Catalogue of the Lhasa Edition of the Tibetan Tripiṭaka in comparison with other editions*, Tokyo
- Tucci 1949 Giuseppe Tucci, *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, Rome
- Tucci 1989–91 Giuseppe Tucci, *Gyantse and its Monasteries*, Part I, General Description of the Temples (Indo-Tibetica IV,1), New Delhi
- Ui et al. 1934 H. Ui et al., *A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Canons*, Sendai
- Vitali 1990 Roberto Vitali, *Early Temples of Central Tibet*, London
- Vogel 1991 Claus Vogel, "Bu-ston on the Date of the Buddha's Nirvana", in Heinz Bechert (ed.), *The Dating of the Historical Buddha*, Part 1, Göttingen, pp. 403–14

Table 1: Location of the 13 texts after the arrangement of the Tshal pa Kanjur

Berlin	(40).13–25	Vol. 40	<i>śer phyin</i>	<i>ka</i>	nos. 13–25
Cone	1014–26	Vol. 78	<i>śer phyin sna tshogs</i>	<i>ka</i>	nos. 13–25
Derge	31–43	Vol. 34	<i>śes rab sna tshogs</i>	<i>ka</i>	nos. 13–25
Lhasa	32–44	Vol. 34	<i>mdo tshan bcu gsum po</i>	<i>ka</i>	nos. 32–44
Lithang	26–38	Vol. 39	<i>gsar 'gyur gyi mdo</i>	— ¹	nos. 13–25
Narthing	347–59	Vol. 76	<i>mdo</i>	<i>a</i>	nos. 13–25
Peking	747–59	Vol. 49	<i>śer phyin</i>	<i>tsi</i>	nos. 13–25
Urga	31–43	Vol. 34	<i>śes rab sna tshogs</i>	<i>ka</i>	nos. 19–31

¹ The catalogue does not assign a letter (*ka*, etc.) to the volume.

Table 2: Location of the 13 texts after the arrangement of the Them spangs ma Kanjur

London	XXXVI, 1–8	Vol. 60	<i>mdo chi</i> (36)	nos. 1–8
	XXXVI, 15–19	Vol. 60	<i>mdo chi</i> (36)	nos. 15–19
Stog	289–96	Vol. 87	<i>mdo chi</i> (36)	nos. 1–8
	303–07	Vol. 87	<i>mdo chi</i> (36)	nos. 15–19
Tokyo	286–93	Vol. 92	<i>mdo chi</i> (36)	nos. 1–8
	300–04	Vol. 92	<i>mdo chi</i> (36)	nos. 15–19
Ulan Bator	335–42	Vol. 89	<i>mdo chi</i> (36)	nos. 1–8
	349–53	Vol. 89	<i>mdo chi</i> (36)	nos. 15–19
JB	—	—	<i>mdo chi</i> (36)	nos. 1–8
	—	—	<i>mdo chi</i> (36)	nos. 15–19
JP	—	—	<i>mdo chi</i> (36)	nos. 1–8
	—	—	<i>mdo chi</i> (36)	nos. 15–19

Table 3: "Epithets of insight" in the *Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta*

Derge 31, 181a6	Tib. tr. into Pali	SV 422,3	Sarighabh I 135,4	Mahāvastu III 441,1
1. mig bskyed pa dan	cakkhum udapādi	1. cakkhum udapādi	cakṣur udapādi (1)	jñānam udapāsi (2)
2. ye śes bskyed pa dan	ñānam udapādi	2. ñānam udapādi	jñānam udapādi (2)	cakṣur udapāsi (1)
3. śes raḥ bskyed pa dan	paññā udapādi	3. paññā udapādi	vidyā udapādi (4)	vidyā udapāsi (4)
4. rig pa bskyed pa dan	vijjā udapādi	4. vijjā udapādi	buddhir udapādi (—)	buddhi udapāsi (—)
5. snaṅ ba bskyed pa 'o	āloko udapādi	5. āloko udapādi	prajñā udapāsi (3)	bhūri udapāsi (—)
			ājlokaṃ prādurbhāsi (5)	

Table 4: Concordance of Uv, Dhp, GDhp, PDhp, and alternate *nidānas* in the *Krodhavarga*¹

	Uv	Dhp	GDhp	PDhp
1) Rohiṇī	1	1	1	XIII,22
2) Moggallāna	16	4	8	XVI,15
3) *Udari	19	3	7	—
4) Bhikkhu	22	2	2	—

¹ I give the name of the chief figure as keyword.

Table 5: Contents of Abhidhamma and Suttanta according to the *Maitreya-sūtra* (1.5, 14) and Gedun Chomphel (3.1)

	1.5 (D 264a1 foll.)	1.14 (Q 305a4 foll.)	Pāli	gSūn rtsom I 453–54 ¹
A. Abhidhamma				
1.	<i>Rab tu byed pa chen po</i>	id.	<i>Mahāpakaraṇā</i> ²	7. <i>Rab tu 'jug pa</i>
2.	<i>Yamakam (gi)</i>	<i>Yamakām (dan)</i>	<i>Yamaka</i>	6. <i>Cha ldan</i>
3.	<i>Tshigs su bcaad pa (dan) gzi (dan)</i>	id.	<i>Kathā-vatithi</i> ³	3. <i>gTam gyi gzi</i>
4.	<i>Gan zag (dan) gdags pa (dan)</i>	<i>Pun ga la (dan) gtsug (dan)</i>	<i>Puggala-paññati</i> ⁴	4. <i>Gan zag gdags pa</i>
5.	<i>skū gdun gi gtam (dan)</i>	<i>Khams kyi tshogs (dan)</i>	<i>Dhānu-kathā</i> ⁵	5. <i>Khams kyi gtam</i>
6.	<i>rNam 'byed (dan)</i>	<i>rNam par 'byed pa</i>	<i>Vibhaṅgā</i> ⁶	2. <i>rNam 'byed</i>
7.	<i>Chos bsdus pa</i>	<i>Chos yan dag par sdud pa</i>	<i>Dhammasaṅgani</i> ⁷	1. <i>Chos kyi tshogs</i>

¹ Chomphel also gives transcriptions of the Abhidhamma titles; these are corrupt in the printed edition. The numbers before the titles refer to the order followed by Chomphel.

² *Rab tu byed pa* = *pakaraṇa*; *chen po* = *mahā*. *Mahāpakaraṇa* is an alternate title of the *Paññāna*.

³ Both D and Q translate “*gāthā* (shigs su bcaad pa) and *vatithu* (gzi)”. In D this is connected to the preceding by the genitive postposition *gi*, making one title of nos. 2 and 3: “the *gāthā* and *vatithu* of the *Yamaka*”.

⁴ D translates, “*gan zag* (= *puggala*) and *gdags pa* (= *paññati*)”; Q transcribes and translates, “*pungala* and *gtsug*”. I cannot explain the use of *gtsug* = *cāḍā*.

⁵ D translates *dhiānu* in the sense of “relic” (*sku gdun*), Q in the sense of “element” (*khams*). D translates *kathā* correctly as *gtam*; the *tshogs* of Q might be a misreading of *kāya* for *kathā*.

⁶ The translation is correct: *rnam (par) 'byed (pa)* is the standard rendering of *vibhaṅga*.

⁷ *Chos = dhamma*; the *bsdus pa* of D = *saṅgaha*; Q has *yan dag par = sam + sdud pa = saṅgaha*.

B. Suttanta

1.	<i>Anḡa pnyi ma 'i sde pa</i>	<i>Anḡo tta ra ni ka yaṃ</i>	<i>Anḡuttara-nikāya</i> ⁸	4. <i>gCig las 'phros pa</i>
2.	<i>Yan dag par ldan pa 'i sde pa</i>	<i>Yan dag par ldan pa 'i luṃ</i>	<i>Samyutta-nikāya</i>	3. <i>Yan dag par ldan pa</i>
3.	<i>Bar ma 'i sde pa</i>	<i>Luṃ bar ma</i>	<i>Majjhima-nikāya</i>	2. <i>Luṃ bar ma</i>
4.	<i>Rin po 'i sde pa</i>	<i>Luṃ rin po</i>	<i>Dīgha-nikāya</i>	1. <i>Luṃ rin po</i>

⁸ D transcribes *aṅga*, and translates *uttara* as *phyi ma*; Q transcribes all. D translates *nikāya* as *sde pa* throughout; here Q transcribes *nikāya*, but in the next three translates it as *luṃ = āgama*. The translations of 2 to 4 are correct; Q uses the standard Tibetan renderings of the four *Āgamas* of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin tradition.

Table 6: Occurrence of the term *Tāmrāsāṭīya* in the *Tanjur*

Author, translators	Title	Subject	Ldan kar ma no.
1) Vasubandhu Tr. Viśuddhasiṃha, Devendrarakṣita; rev. dPal brtsegs	<i>Karmasiddhi-prakarana</i>	<i>bhavāṅga</i>	651
2) Sumatīśīla Tr. Viśuddhasiṃha, Devendrarakṣita; rev. dPal brtsegs	<i>Ṭīkā</i> on preceding	ctry on prec.	652
3) Vasubandhu Tr. Surendrākaraprabha, Nam Mkha'	<i>Prañīyasamutpādavyākhyā</i>	citation	653
4) Guṇānāti Tr. Surendrākaraprabha, Nam Mkha'	<i>Ṭīkā</i> on preceding	ctry on prec.	654
5) Yaśomitra Tr. Viśuddhasiṃha, dPal brtsegs	<i>Kośa-vyākhyā</i>	a) <i>hṛdayavastu</i> b) example of sect	688
6) Vinītadeva Tr. unknown	<i>Samayabheda-saṃgraha</i>	list of sects	510
7) Author unknown Tr. unknown	<i>Bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣa-vṛtti</i>	list of sects	503

8) Bhavya Tr. Añiśa, Tshul khrims rgyal ba	<i>Tar-kajvālā</i>	a) list of sects b) citation	—
9) Bhavya Tr. Añiśa, Tshul khrims rgyal ba, brTson 'grus seṅ ge	<i>Madhyamakaratnapradīpa</i>	citation	—
10) Author unknown Tr. Añiśa, Tshul khrims rgyal ba	<i>Bhikṣuvarṣāgraprccchā</i>	list of sects	—
11) Subhūtiḥoṣa Tr. Rab 'byor dbyaṅs, Tiñ ne 'dzin bzañ po	<i>Sarvavānāloka</i>	list of sects	—
12) Author unknown Tr. Narayadeva, rGyal ba'i śes rab	<i>Śrāmaṇavarṣāgraprccchā</i>	list of sects	—

Table 7: Affiliation of the Tāmraśāṭīyas and related schools according to Tibetan sources

A. Branches of the Sarvāstivādins

Vimitadeva 187b5, 189a2 Mvy 9077–84	<i>Bhikṣuṅgīprātimokṣa-ṅṅṅi</i> 3b8	Subhūtiḅhoṣa 417a1	<i>Bhikṣuvarṣāgra</i> 318a4 <i>Śrāmaṇavarṣāgra</i> 79a5
Sarvāstivādin (7):	Sarvāstivādin (7):	Sarvāstivādin (7):	Sarvāstivādin (4):
Mūlasarvāstivādin	Mūlasarvāstivādin	— ¹	Kāśyapiya
Kāśyapiya	Kāśyapiya	Kāśyapiya	Mahīśāsaka ³
Mahīśāsaka	Mahīśāsaka	Mahīśāsaka ²	Dharmaguptaka
Dharmaguptaka	Avantaka (sruṅ ba pa)	Dharmaguptaka	Mūlasarvāstivādin
Bahuśrutiya	Bahuśrutiya	Bahuśrutiya	—
Tāmraśāṭīya ⁴	Tāmraśāṭīya	Tāmraśāṭīya ⁵	—
Vibhajyavādin	Vibhajyavādin	Vibhajyavādin	—

¹ Subhūtiḅhoṣa states that there are 7 branches, but omits the first.

² Maṅ po ston pa'i sde, rather than the usual Sa ston pa'i sde.

³ Sa ston, *Śrāmaṇera*, sa sruṅ, *Bhikṣu*.

⁴ = Saṅkrāntivādin (Vimitadeva).

⁵ Gos dmar can gyi sde, rather than the usual God dmar ba'i sde.

B. Branches of the Vibhajyavādins (Bhavya) and Sāmmatīyas (*Śrāmaṇavarṣāgra*, *Bhikṣuvarṣāgra*)

Bhavya Q 5640, 179a4
Tarkaṅvālā 162b5

Bhavya Q 5640, 181b8
Tarkaṅvālā 164b8

Śrāmaṇavarṣāgra 79a7
Bhikṣuvarṣāgra 318a7

Vibhajyavādin (4):

Mahīśāsaka (sa ston pa)
Kāśyapiya
Dharmaguptaka
Tāmraśāṭīya

Vibhajyavādin (4):

Mahīśāsaka (maṅ ston pa)
Dharmaguptaka
Tāmraśāṭīya
Kāśyapiya

Sāmmatīya (5):

Tāmraśāṭīya
Avantaka (sruṅ ba pa)
Kurukulla
Bahuśrutiya
Vātsiputriya

C. Branches of the Sthaviras

Vimitadeva 187b6, 190a3, *Śrāmaṇavarṣāgraprccchā* 79a8, *Bhikṣuvarṣāgraprccchā* 318a8, Subhūtiḅhoṣa 417a2

Sthavira (3):

Jetavāmya
Abhayagirivāsīn⁶
Mahāvihāravāsīn

⁶ 'Jigs med rigs (correct to *ri*) gnas sde, Subhūtiḅhoṣa; 'jigs byed ri la gnas pa, *Śrāmaṇavarṣāgra*.