

- Snaith, N. H., donor, June 1925 **MS. Pali a. 52(R) to 56(R)**  
 Sotheby's, vendor, 30 May 1893 **MS. Pali a. 31(R)**  
 Sotheby's, vendor, 26 May 1893 **MS. Pali a. 33**  
 Sotheby's, vendor, 4 Dec. 1900 **MS. Pali b. 12**  
 Sotheby's, vendor, 4 Dec. 1901 **MS. Pali a. 39(R);**  
     **MS. Pali b. 13(R); MS. Pali b. 20(R) & 21(R)**  
 Sotheby's, vendor, 7 Dec. 1901 **MS. Pali d. 1(R)**  
 Sotheby's, vendor, 18 July 1907 **MS. Burmese a. 14(R)**  
 Sotheby's, vendor, 1 June 1908 **MS. Sinh. a. 4(R);**  
     **MS. Sinh. b. 4(R)**  
 Sotheby's, vendor, 17 March 1909 **MS. Pali a. 46(R) to 48(R)**  
 Stark, Miss H. A. W., vendor, 23 March 1909 **MS. Pali c. 3(R)**  
 Stolper, R. L., deposit 27 July 1993 **Dep. Stol. 103;**  
     **Dep. Stol. 109; Dep. Stol. 111 to 114;**  
     **Dep. Stol. 128 & 129; Dep. Stol. 196 to 199**  
 Stolper, R. L., donor, 1993 **MS. Asiat. Misc. a. 18(R) to 22(R)**  
     **MS. Asiat. Misc. a. 26(R) & 27(R);**  
     **MS. Asiat. Misc. a. 29(R) to 38(R)**  
 Stolper, R. L., vendor, 1993 **MS. Asiat. Misc. a. 23(R);**  
     **MS. Asiat. Misc. a. 25(R)**  
 Thompson, J. L., donor, 26 Oct. 1943 **MS. Pali a. 63(R)**  
 Tregaskis, J. & M. L., vendor, 1896 **MS. Burmese a. 4(R);**  
     **MS. Pali g. 1(R)**  
 Tregaskis, J. & M. L., vendor, 26 May 1898 **MS. Pali b. 10**  
 Walker, Mr, donor, 30 May 1930 **MS. Pali a. 59 & 60**  
 Wilson, Sir H. H., vendor, 1842 **Wilson 51; 54 to 56; 304**

Paris

Jacqueline Filliozat

## A Note on King Milinda in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*\*

### A. King Milinda in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*

The citation in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* of a conversation between King Milinda and Sthavira Nāgasena was brought to the attention of the scholarly world in 1893 by Sylvain Lévi.<sup>1</sup> At that time the Sanskrit text of the *Kośabhāṣya* had not yet been recovered, and Lévi's study was based on the Chinese versions of Paramārtha (translated 564–

---

\* The bibliography—historical, numismatic, and literary—on King Milinda and the *Milinda-pañha* is vast. In addition to the works mentioned in the course of the article, I have consulted the following: Paul Pelliot, “Les noms propres dans les traductions chinoises du *Milindapañha*”, *Journal asiatique*, onzième série, tome IV (1914), pp. 379–419; Maurice Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, *Buddhist Literature and Jaina Literature*, [Calcutta, 1933] New Delhi, 1991, pp. 174–83; Siegfried Behrsing, “Beiträge zu einer Milindapañha-Bibliographie”, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* VII (1933–35), pp. 335–48, 517–39; *L'Inde classique* II, §§ 1983, 2148; Étienne Lamotte, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien*, [1958] Louvain-La-Neuve, 1976, pp. 457–69; A.K. Warder, *Indian Buddhism*, Delhi, 1970, pp. 330–31; K.R. Norman, *Pāli Literature* (Jan Gonda [ed.], *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. VII, Fasc. 2), Wiesbaden, 1983, pp. 110–13 (see also references in Norman's Index of Works, p. 203b); Oskar von Hinüber, “The Oldest Dated Manuscript of the Milinda-pañha”, *JPTS* XI (1987), pp. 111–19; “An Additional Note on the Oldest Dated Manuscript of the Milindapañha”, *JPTS* XII (1988), pp. 173–74.; Hajime Nakamura, *Indian Buddhism: A Survey with Bibliographical Notes*, Kansai University of Foreign Studies, Hirakata, 1980, pp. 114–15 and nn., especially n. 5. These articles give detailed bibliographies.

In the following “Q”, followed by a catalogue number, refers to the reprint of the Peking (Qianlong) edition of the Tibetan Tripitaka, ed. D.T. Suzuki, Tokyo-Kyoto, 1955–61.

<sup>1</sup> Sylvain Lévi, “Un nouveau document sur le Milinda-Praçna”, *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 1893, pp. 232–37 (reprinted in *Mémorial Sylvain Lévi*, Paris, 1937, pp. 214–17).

67) and Hsüan-tsang (translated 651–54). Lévi noted that Paramārtha transliterated the name as Min-lin-to, Hsüan-tsang as Pi-lin-to (his transliterations); he explained the latter's substitution of *mī* by *pi* as having been done on the analogy of the name Pilinda-vatsa. He also noted that the passage does not have a parallel in the Pāli *Milinda-pañha* or in the Chinese versions studied by Specht. In 1924, in his magistral study of the corpus of Milinda literature, Paul Demiéville discussed the *Kośabhāṣya* citation in detail (again from the Chinese).<sup>2</sup> He confirmed that the passage is not found in either the Pāli or Chinese versions, and was able to point out a parallel in another Chinese text, the “*Avadāna* of the discussion between King Nanda and Nāgasena”, noting that the relevant passage had been translated by Chavannes in his *Cinq cents contes* (see below). In 1925, Louis de La Vallée Poussin's version of the passage in question appeared in volume V of his epochal translation (again from the Chinese) of the *Kośabhāṣya*. La Vallée Poussin gave the king's name as Milinda, without comment.<sup>3</sup> In a foot-note he referred to the earlier work of Lévi and Demiéville, and such sources as had appeared by the time of his writing.

The Sanskrit text of the *Kośabhāṣya* was first published in 1967. The citation occurs in the ninth *Kośasthāna*, a prose appendix to the *Kośa* proper, devoted to the clarification of misconceptions about the person (*puṅgava*). The Sanskrit text opens with the phrase *sthavīro hi nāgasenaḥ kaliṅgena rājñōpasamkramyoktaḥ*.<sup>4</sup> Neither Pradhan nor

<sup>2</sup> Paul Demiéville, “Les versions chinoises du Milindapañha”, *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* XXIV (1924), pp. 64–67.

<sup>3</sup> Louis de La Vallée Poussin (tr.), *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*, tome V, repr. Brussels, 1971 (Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques XVI), p. 263.

<sup>4</sup> P. Pradhan (ed.), *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu* (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series VIII), [1967], 2nd ed., K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute, Patna, 1975, p. 469.13–24; Swami Dwarikadas Shastri (ed.), *Abhidharmakośa & Bhāṣya of Acharya Vasubandhu with Sphuṭārthā Commentary of Ācārya*

*Continues...*

Dwarikadas list any variant readings, and Yaśomitra does not repeat or comment on the name: we have thus only a single reading, *kaliṅgena rājñā*.<sup>5</sup> The *Puṅgava-viniścaya* has been translated into English three times: by Stcherbatsky from the Tibetan of a Peking edition of the Tanjur<sup>6</sup> by Duerlinger from the Sanskrit,<sup>7</sup> and by Pruden from La Vallée Poussin's French compared with the Sanskrit.<sup>8</sup> The first two translators use the name Milinda, the former without remark, the latter stating in a note “here I use the better known title of this king, ‘Milinda’, rather than ‘Kaliṅga’, which is found in the text”.<sup>9</sup> Pruden has “the King of Kaliṅga”; his n. 91 (p. 1370) reproduces La Vallée Poussin's

---

*Yaśomitra* (Bauddha Bharati Series 9), Part IV, Varanasi, 1973, pp. 1209.10–1210.13.

<sup>5</sup> The only commentary on the *Kośa* that survives in Sanskrit is Yaśomitra's *Vyākhyā*, the celebrated *Sphuṭārthā*. Out of the commentaries preserved in Tibetan translation (excluding that of Yaśomitra's *Vyākhyā*), only Pūrṇavardhana's *Lakṣaṇānusāriṇī* and Dignāga's *Marmapradīpa* comment on the ninth chapter, but neither cites the passage or comments on the name (Q5594, Vol. 118, *mñon pa ñu*, 376b8 and Q5596, Vol. 118, *mñon pa thu*, 284a–b, respectively). It is most unfortunate that Śamathadeva (Q5598, Vol. 118, *mñon pa thu*, 134b–135b) does not include a citation or reference in his indispensable treasure-house of Mūlasarvāstivādin literature, the *Upāyikā-ṭīkā*. Vinitabhadrā's *Kārikā-bhāṣya* (Q5592) and Sthiramati's *Tattvārtha* (Q5875) do not comment on the chapter.

<sup>6</sup> Theodore Stcherbatsky, *The Soul Theory of the Buddhists*, repr. Delhi, 1976, pp. 40–41 (originally published in 1920).

<sup>7</sup> James Duerlinger (tr.), “Refutation of the Theory of Selfhood: A Resolution of Questions about Persons”, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 17/2 (June, 1989), pp. 157–58.

<sup>8</sup> Leo M. Pruden, *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam by Louis de La Vallée Poussin*, Vol. IV, Berkeley, 1990, p. 1332.

<sup>9</sup> Note 34, p. 186. As will be seen in the following, the Tibetan version does not immediately bring to mind the name Milinda. Stcherbatsky (p. 7) notes that his translation from the Tibetan was “carefully compared” with the Chinese translations of Paramārtha and Hsüan-tsang by O.O. Rosenberg: this may explain his use of the name Milinda. Duerlinger's remark implies that “Kaliṅga” is a lesser known title of Milinda: this is quite inaccurate.

bibliographical references to earlier discussions of the passage, but does not address the problem of the name.

The Tibetan translation of the *Kośabhāṣya*, done by Jinamitra and dPal brtsegs at the beginning of the 9th century, has here *rgyal po des 'du sbyin gnas brtan klu'i sde'i thad du 'oñs nas...*<sup>10</sup> There is no problem with the name Sthavira Nāgasena, since *gnas brtan* = *sthavira*, *klu* = *nāga*, and *sde* = *senā*. It is the name of the king that poses difficulties. We have *rgyal po* = *rāja*, then *des*, plus *'du sbyin*.<sup>11</sup> The phrase *'du sbyin* may be explained on the basis of the *Mahāvvyutpatti* and the Tibetan translation of the *Mahāmāyūrī-vidyārājñī*. The former, in a list of names of Nāga-kings, has *ela-melo-nāga-rājā* (var. *ela-melau nāga-rājānau*), in Tibetan *lug dan 'du ba gñis*: “the two [Nāga-kings], Lug and 'Du ba”.<sup>12</sup> The Sanskrit *Mahāmāyūrī* mentions *ela-melau nāga-rājānau*, also in a list of Nāga-kings,<sup>13</sup> the Tibetan translation has here *klu'i rgyal po e la dan, 'dus pa dag dan*: “the Nāga-kings Ela and 'Dus pa”.<sup>14</sup> That *lug* = *ela*, *eda*, *edaka*, etc., is well attested:<sup>15</sup>

<sup>10</sup> *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu, Translated into Tibetan in the 8th century by Jinamitra and Ka-ba Dpal-brtsegs Rakṣita, Reproduced from a mid-15th century manuscript Bstan-'gyur volume from Rgyal-rtse Fort, New Delhi, Tibet House, 1983, p. 767.3 (mñon 'grel gu, 385a3); Q5591, Vol. 115, mñon pa nu, 101a8.*

<sup>11</sup> *rgyal po des* could represent the instrumental, “by that king”, suggesting that the Sanskrit recension upon which the Tibetan was based included the word *tena* (= *des*) to make *tena rājñā*. *des* could also be read *nes*, but that strikes me as unlikely.

<sup>12</sup> R. Sakaki, *Mahāvvyutpatti*, Kyoto, 1926, § 3291. The *Mahāvvyutpatti* published by I.P. Minaev (Bibliotheca Buddhica XIII, [1911] Delhi, 1992, § 167.63 has *edamedo nāgarājā*.

<sup>13</sup> Shūyo Takubo (ed.), *Ārya-Mahā-Māyūrī Vidyā-Rājñī*, Tokyo, 1972, p. 41.6.

<sup>14</sup> Q178, Vol. 7, *rgyud pha*, 108b5 *klu'i rgyal po e la dan, 'dus pa dag dan*: *klu'i rgyal po* = *nāgarāja*; *e la* = *ela*; *dan* = “and”; *'dus pa* = *mela*; *dag* indicates here dual; *dan* = “and”. A manuscript version reproduced in *Tog dan gzuñs grwa lha. The Tibetan Translations of the Mahāsannipātaratnaketuḥārāṇi and*

Continues...

*Mahāvvyutpatti* § 3263: *elo nāga-rājā* = *lug*

*Mahāvvyutpatti* § 3267: *ela-varṇo nāga-rājā* = *lug mdog*

*Mahāvvyutpatti* § 4823: *edakah* = *lug*

*Mahāvvyutpatti* § 6177: *edākṣi-puṣpaṃ* = *me tog lug mig*

*Mahāvvyutpatti* § 7684: *eda-mūkaḥ* = *lug ltar lkug pa*.

That *'du ba* or *'dus pa* = *mela* or related forms derived from the Sanskrit root *MIL* (to come together, meet, join, assemble) is also well established:<sup>16</sup> in the *Hevajra Tantra*, *'du ba* = *milana*, *melā*, and *melāpaka*, and *'dus pa* = *melā*; in the *Nāgānanda*, *'dus pa* = *milita*.<sup>17</sup> We may thus conclude that the *'du* of the *Kośabhāṣya* is equivalent to *mīla* or *mela*.<sup>18</sup> *sbyin* at the end of names in Tibetan regularly translates the Sanskrit *-datta* or *-da*; in this case we will prefer the latter.

The Indian orthography of the king's name has recently been discussed by Fussman, who presents numismatic and inscriptional evidence for “la forme officielle indienne” Menamdra (and also

*Pañcarakṣā*, A reproduction of a six part manuscript from Bhutan calligraphed by one *Nag-dbañ-bsam-grub-rnam-rgyal-don-grub*, published by Ngodrup and Sherab Drimay, Kyichu Monastery, Paro, Bhutan, 1978, p. 407.7 (*ga* 30a7) has only *klu'i rgyal po 'dus pa dag dan*, omitting *ela*.

<sup>15</sup> As before, in the first two cases Minaev's *Mahāvvyutpatti* has *eda*: see his index, p. 152a.

<sup>16</sup> *'dus pa* is the past participle of the infinitive *'du ba*, “to come together”.

<sup>17</sup> The references are from Lokesh Chandra, *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary*, Supplementary Volume 4 (Śāta-piṭaka Series Vol. 374), New Delhi, 1993, p. 989b.

<sup>18</sup> The use of equivalents in *'du* = *MIL* in the Tibetan should rule out Minaev's *meda* (see above, n. 12).

Minamdra), and “la forme déformée” Minedra, influenced by Gāndhārī.<sup>19</sup> As far as I know in Pāli the name is always Milinda.<sup>20</sup>

Unfortunately our researches into the Tibetan do not enable us to reconstruct the name of the King with absolute precision or certainty. They do, however, allow us to establish certain significant points.<sup>21</sup> It is impossible to decide whether the first syllable had as vowel *i* (as in Pāli) or *e* (as in Greek and on Indian coins), since the root *MIL* allows both: although the Chinese of both Paramārtha and Hsüan-tsang suggest the former.<sup>22</sup> It is, however, certain that the second syllable began with *la* (as in Pāli and in Paramārtha and Hsüan-tsang), and not *na* (as in Greek and in the Indian evidence): this is vouchsafed by the derivation of ‘*du*’ from *MIL*. Whether the second syllable had as vowel *a* or *i* is not certain: *mila-* or *mela-* are more obvious, and agree with the Indian evidence supplied by Fussman, but *mili-* or *meli-* might also be possible—and it seems the Indic form transliterated by Paramārtha and Hsüan-tsang was *mili-*.<sup>23</sup> The final syllable must certainly have been *-da* (Tibetan *sbyin*), and was not Sanskritized as (*-in*)*dra* as in some manuscripts of the *Stūpāvadāna* (see

<sup>19</sup> Gérard Fussman, “L’Indo-grec Ménéandre ou Paul Demiéville revisité”, *Journal asiatique* CCLXXXI, 1–2 (1993), pp. 72–73.

<sup>20</sup> For earlier discussions of the king’s name, see e.g. T.W. Rhys Davids (tr.), *The Questions of King Milinda*, Part I (The Sacred Books of the East XXXV), [Oxford, 1890] Delhi, 1975, pp. xviii–xix, and Pelliot, pp. 384–85.

<sup>21</sup> It is important to recall that Jinamitra—described in the colophons of Vinaya translations as a “*vinayadhara* of the Ārya Mūlasarvāstivādins and an *acārya* of the Kashmiri Vaiṣṇavikas”—and dPal brtsegs were two of the greatest translators of the “early diffusion” (*sna dar*) of Buddhism in Tibet. During the period a royally sponsored commission, in which the two translators were leading figures, supervised and regulated translation work and fixed the Tibetan equivalents of Sanskrit terms. Their translation of the *Kośabhāṣya* is thus highly reliable.

<sup>22</sup> As seen above, these are Min-lin-to and Pi-lin-to in Lévi’s transliteration; in that of Demiéville, they are Min-lin-t’o and Pi-lin-t’o.

<sup>23</sup> But it strikes me that other Chinese forms—Mi-lan and Nan-t’o (see below) suggest an *a* against an *i*.

below). We are thus left with a number of possible equivalents for ‘*Du*’ sbyin: \*Milamda or \*Miliṃda, \*Melamda or \*Melimda (and perhaps also \*Milanda, etc., and even Milinda).<sup>24</sup>

What, then, should we make of the reading Kalinga-rāja of the Sanskrit *Kośabhāṣya*? It is important first of all to note here that, so far as I know, Kalinga is always transliterated and never translated into Tibetan. The *Mahāvīyutpatti*, for example, transcribes Kalinga as *ka liṅ ga* (§ 4128) and Kalinga-rāja as *ka liṅ ga’i rgyal po* (§ 3589).<sup>25</sup> While it might be possible to explain *-liṅga* as a scribal error for *-liṃda* or *-linda*, it seems impossible in any script to explain the substitution of *ka-* for *mi-* or *me-*. Furthermore, the final part might well have been *-lamda* and not *-liṃda* (or *-linda*). Still, the dropping of a superscript vowel or its migration from the first to the second syllable—from *Milamda* or *Melamda*, etc., to *Malimda*, *Malinda*, etc.—at some stage is by no means impossible, and a later scribe, faced with an unfamiliar *Malimda*, *Malinda-* or *Maliṅga-rāja* may have substituted the *lectior familiaris* Kalinga-rāja. We do not know how many intermediate copies, in how many scripts, the text went through before arriving at the present reading. Since the two Chinese and one Tibetan translations are unanimous in

<sup>24</sup> Yasunori Ejima, in his “Textcritical Remarks on the Ninth Chapter of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*”, Tokyo, 1987, p. 21, has come to a similar conclusion. He remarks: “rgyal po des ’du sbyin (‘des’ ambiguous. ‘du’ = ‘mela’, cf. *Mahāvīyutpatti* 3291. ‘sbyin’ = ‘da’. Therefore ‘des ’du sbyin’ may be a rendering of something like ‘milinda’). Read ‘milindena rājñā’.” (I am grateful to Bhikkhu Pāsādika for supplying copies of the relevant pages of Ejima and Pruden.)

<sup>25</sup> Cf. also the references in Lokesh Chandra, *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary*, Supplementary Volume 1 (Śata-pitaka Series Vol. 369), New Delhi, 1992, p. 8a; in J.S. Negi, *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary*, Vol. 1, Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, Sarnath, 1993, pp. 9–10; and Edward Conze, *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā* (Serie Orientale Roma XIII), Rome, 1974, p. 41, n. 2, which gives “Tib. Ka-liṅ-ka” for the Kalinga of the text, line 7.

suggesting a name equivalent to Milinda, the form Kalinga must be rejected, and some such explanation adopted.

The *Mahāvvyūtpatti* and the *Mahāmāyūrī* are the only references given by Edgerton for Mela.<sup>26</sup> Outside of the garbled *Kośabhāṣya* reference, mention of Milinda in extant Sanskrit literature—or in Buddhist literature in general—is rare indeed.<sup>27</sup> There is a single mention in Kṣemendra's *Bodhisattvāvadāna-kalpalatā*, composed in the first half of the 11th century in Kashmir. Verse 15 of the *Stūpāvadāna* (Chapter 57) reads as follows:<sup>28</sup>

<sup>26</sup> *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* 439b; cf. also 156b, s.v. Ela and Elamela.  
<sup>27</sup> See here the remarks of Gérard Fussman, “Upāya-kausalya: L'implantation du bouddhisme au Gandhāra”, in Fukui Fumimasa and Gérard Fussman (eds.), *Bouddhisme et cultures locales. Quelques cas de réciproques adaptations*, École française d'Extrême-Orient, Études thématiques 2, Paris, 1994, pp. 25–26. I could not find any references to Milinda or any likely variants in the *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* or in Lokesh Chandra's *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary* (Compact Edition, Rinsen Book Co., Kyoto, 1990). The sole reference in Lokesh Chandra, *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary*, Supplementary Volume 5 (Śāta-piṭaka Series Vol. 375), New Delhi, 1993, p. 1405b is to the Milindra of the *Bodhisattvāvadāna-kalpalatā*. Some scholars have interpreted a passage in Tāranātha as referring to Milinda: see Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya (ed.), Lama Chimpa and Alaka Chattopadhyaya (tr.), *Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India*, Calcutta, [1970] 1980, p. 46. Since in the Tibetan the name of the king is Minara of Thogar and of the arhat monk Dhītika, and since the conversion narrative is quite general, I find the identification unconvincing, and too uncertain to be of any use. For the Tibetan see Antonius Schiefner, *Tāranāthae de Doctrinae Buddhicae in India Propagatione*, St. Petersburg, 1868 (repr. as Suzuki Research Foundation Reprint Series 2, n.d.) p. 18.7 *dus lan cig tho gar gyi yul na rgyal po mi na ra zes bya ba yod do...*

<sup>28</sup> The reference was recorded (as King Millinda, without comment) by Rājendralāla Mitra in his *The Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal* [Calcutta, 1882], Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, Calcutta, 1971, p. 60, and pointed out by Serge d'Oldenbourg to T.W. Rhys Davids: see *The Questions of King Milinda*, Part II (The Sacred Books of the East XXXVI), [Oxford, 1894] Delhi, 1975, p. xvii.

*tatra saṃdarśanāyātam bhagavān indram abravīt  
 milindro nāma rājāsmin deśe stūpam kariṣyati.*<sup>29</sup>

The Blessed One announced to Indra  
 who had come there to see:  
 “A King by name Milinda  
 will build a stūpa in this place”.

De Jong gives two readings from manuscripts in Cambridge, A Milindo, B Milimdo, and recommends the first.<sup>30</sup> Here the Tibetan, as given by de Jong, transliterates the name as *rgyal po mi lin dra zhes pa*: “a king, Milindra by name”. The change from *-inda* to *-indra* might have been a Sanskritization made on the analogy of Indra, a frequent component of royal names or titles.<sup>31</sup>

The identification of our King with Milinda is further supported by the fact that in the Chinese parallel to Vasubandhu's citation mentioned above, the dialogue is between a King \*Nanda and Nāgasena. In addition to Chavannes' French translation, there is an English translation by Takakusu.<sup>32</sup> As noted by Demiéville, the parallel is not from the independent Chinese counterpart of the *Milinda-pañha*, the

<sup>29</sup> P.L. Vaidya/Sridhar Tripathi (edd.), *Avadāna-kalpalatā* (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts No. 23), Vol. II, 2nd ed., Mithila Institute, Darbhanga, 1989, p. 342.3. For textual history, see de Jong's (foll. n.) Introduction. The *Stūpāvadāna* is translated and discussed at length by Demiéville, pp. 36–43.

<sup>30</sup> J.W. de Jong, *Textcritical Remarks on the Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā (Pallavas 42–108)*, Tokyo, The Reiyukai Library, 1979 (Studia Philologica Buddhica II), p. 97.

<sup>31</sup> This was already suggested by Demiéville (p. 39, n. 4).

<sup>32</sup> Édouard Chavannes, *Cinq cents contes et apologues extraits du Tripiṭaka chinois*, tome III, repr. Paris, 1962, § 418, pp. 123–24; J. Takakusu, “Chinese Translations of the Milinda pañho”, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1896, pp. 1–21.

\**Nāgasenabhikṣu-sūtra*,<sup>33</sup> but from the “*Avadāna* of the discussion between King Nanda and Nāgasena”, which is chapter 111 of the *Tsa pao tsang ching*,<sup>34</sup> a collection of 121 *avadānas* translated into Chinese in 472 by \*Kikkāya—who came from the “West”, perhaps Gandhāra or Kaśmīr.<sup>35</sup>

Demiéville compared the brief *avadāna* Milinda text with the Pāli *Milinda-pañha* and the Chinese \**Nāgasenabhikṣu-sūtra*, showing that much of its contents—both narrative and doctrinal—was not found in those texts. This led him to the conclusion that there were further recensions of Milinda texts than those represented by the Pāli and the \**Nāgasenabhikṣu-sūtra*. Indeed, a comparison of the *Kośa* citation with

<sup>33</sup> *Na hsien pi ch'iu ching* (Taisho § 1670a = Korean Buddhist Canon § 1002; Taisho § 1670b = Nanjio § 1358): for detailed studies see Demiéville, pp. 1–264, and Bhikkhu Thich Minh Chau, *Milindapañha and Nāgasenabhikṣusūtra (A Comparative Study)*, Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay, Calcutta, n.d.

<sup>34</sup> Taisho § 203, Nanjio § 1329. The latter gives a Sanskrit title *Samyuktaratnapitaka-sūtra*; La Vallée Poussin (*Abhidharmakośa* V, p. 264, n.), gives *Ratnakaranda-sūtra* with a question mark. Lewis R. Lancaster in collaboration with Sung-bae Park, *The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue* (Berkeley, 1979, § 1001) and the Hōbōgirin *Répertoire* refrain from giving any Sanskrit. C. Willemen, in his valuable study, “A Chinese Kṣudrakapitaka (T. IV. 203)”, in *Études bouddhiques offertes à Jacques May à l'occasion de son soixante-cinquième anniversaire, Études Asiatiques* XLVI-1 (1992), pp. 507–515, rejects \**Samyuktaratnapitaka-sūtra*, and suggests, if anything, \**Kṣudrakapitaka*. Chavannes (tome III, pp. 1–145) translates generous portions of the text; see his remarks, p. 1, n. 1. The Chinese gives King Nan-t'o (Chavannes' transcription) throughout: can this be an abbreviation of something like (Me)nanda? Takakusu, p. 16, concludes that Nanda “represents ‘Menander’ in its disguised form, or at any rate a part of the syllables ‘Menander’”; Pelliot, p. 381, explains the name as “une forme ancienne où le premier n du nom de Ménandre n'était pas passé à l'”; Winternitz, II 177, avers that Nanda is “undoubtedly only a Sanskritized form of the Greek Menandros”.

<sup>35</sup> The translator and his name are discussed by Demiéville, p. 65, n. 4, and by Willemen, pp. 508–509.

the *avadāna* version shows that although they are fairly close, there are differences in framework and certain details. The question posed by the King is different. While in the *Kośabhāṣya* it concerns the identity of the *jīva* and the body, in the Chinese it concerns permanence and impermanence.<sup>36</sup> Thus, although the *avadāna* version and the *Kośa* citation are clearly affiliated, they come from different recensions of a further Milinda tradition.<sup>37</sup>

Willemen (pp. 511–13) points out that many stories of the *Tsa pao tsang ching* take place in Gandhāra or Kaśmīr, and concludes that “the Indian material seems to come from Gandhāra or Kaśmīr, which may be the place of origin of \*Kikkāya”. He states that “the language of the Indian originals seems to have been Sanskrit, as is clear from phonetic renderings and from the few mantras”. Both Willemen and *L'Inde classique* (§ 2148) suggest that the original may have belonged to the Sarvāstivādins.

The original language of the \**Nāgasenabhikṣu-sūtra* is believed to have been a North-western Prakrit. Vasubandhu's citation, from a different text, is in Sanskrit. Was there, then, a Sanskrit recension of the *Milinda-pañha*? As far as I know, Vasubandhu—whether in his *Kośabhāṣya* or in such other works as are available in Sanskrit—does not give any citations in any form of Prakrit, unlike, for example, Candrakīrti in his *Prasannapadā* or Śāntideva in his *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. For the most part Vasubandhu cites (Mūla)Sarvāstivādin texts, which by his time at least were redacted in Sanskrit. In the present case it strikes me as likely that Vasubandhu is citing a Sanskrit, (Mūla)Sarvāstivādin recension of a *Milinda-pañha*.

<sup>36</sup> The phrase is discussed by Demiéville, p. 66, n. 6.

<sup>37</sup> In order that the reader may compare the two versions, I reproduce the relevant texts and translations below.

In the light of the above, and since two translations recorded in Chinese catalogues were later lost,<sup>38</sup> we may suggest that the Milinda corpus was more varied and extensive than previously thought, and list the following versions:

(1) The Chinese “Sūtra on the similes of Nāgasena”, in four rolls (*chüan*). This is the earliest known Milinda text, translated by unknown hands by the 3rd century at the latest, and lost by the 5th. Since no information is available, we cannot say anything about the relation of the text to those we know.<sup>39</sup>

(2) The extant Chinese \**Nāgasenabhikṣu-sūtra*, in two or three rolls. This is an anonymous translation done under the Eastern Chin (317–420), extant in two textual lineages descending from the same translation, but transmitted and revised independently. A portion of the opening and the dialogues proper correspond to the *bāhirakathā* and the first 7 *vaggas* of the Pāli version.<sup>40</sup> The original is believed to have been written in a

<sup>38</sup> See Demiéville, pp. 4–21.

<sup>39</sup> Demiéville, pp. 7–9 and 21.

<sup>40</sup> That is, up to p. 89 of V. Trenckner, *The Milindapañho*, London, [1880] 1962, or p. 96 of the Chatṭhasaṅgīti edition (ChS). The “original” portion of the Pāli is usually described as the first three “Books” (I to III) of the *Milinda-pañha*. This description, as far as I can tell, derives from a division of the text into seven “Books” introduced into his translation by Rhys Davids (see his remark on p. 100, n. 1, at the beginning of his “Book III”: “the chapters go straight on because Books II and III are really only parts of one Book”). No such division is found in Trenckner, or in the ChS or Siamese editions. In fact, the issue of the structure is complex, and the internal table of contents (Trenckner, p. 2, ChS 2.12) divides the work into six parts, with two further subdivisions (the Siamese edition, p. 4.11, also lists six parts and two subdivisions, but with differences in order and phraseology). The “original” text extends beyond the 7th *vagga* (which ends at Trenckner p. 87.20, *sattamo vaggio*; ChS 94, penult *arūpadhammavavathāna-vaggio sattamo*) to what might be called the conclusion, which ends on p. 89 (ChS 96). Since it is unsound to refer to

*Continues...*

North-western Prakrit. The text may be studied in Demiéville’s annotated French translation. The *Na-sien ching* (\**Nāgasena-sūtra*) in 1 roll, translated by Guṇabhadra between 435 and 455, was based on the same original as the preceding. It was lost by 664.<sup>41</sup>

(3) The *bāhirakathā* and the first 7 *vaggas* of the Pāli *Milinda-pañha*.<sup>42</sup> The consensus of scholarship is that these opening sections correspond to the original text, which was brought to Ceylon and translated into Pāli by about the beginning of the Common Era (with the *proviso* that much of the narrative material in the *bāhirakathā* was composed in Ceylon). For example, Pelliot concluded “il me semble certain que le *Milindapañha* primitif s’arrêtait là où les versions chinoises le terminent, c’est-à-dire à la page 136 du tome I de la traduction de M. Rhys Davids” [= Trenckner, p. 89].<sup>43</sup> Norman (p. 111) has “from the fact that the words

---

divisions introduced into a translation (followed also by I.B. Horner in her *Milinda’s Questions*) and not supported by the texts, I rather hope that future discussion of the Milinda will abandon the reference to Rhys Davids’ “Books”.

<sup>41</sup> Demiéville pp. 10–11 and 21.

<sup>42</sup> For the Pāli *Milinda-pañha* we should note that the Siamese recension differs from the Sinhalese and that citations in Buddhaghosa’s works do not always agree with the received text (see e.g. Thich Minh Chau, pp. 33–34). For the different paritta list of the Siamese version see *JPTS* XVI, 1992, Table 1. The Siamese version has recently been reprinted on the occasion of the eightieth birthday of His Holiness the Supreme Patriarch of Siam (Wat Pak Nam, Bangkok, 2536 [1993]). A Pāli manuscript in Mon script dated Sakkarāj 1167 (CE 1805) is noted under the title *Pāli-milindavithāra paṭhamavagga* in *The Mae Klong Basin: Socio-cultural Development*, Silpakorn University, Bangkok, 1992, p. 200. It would be interesting to know to which tradition the manuscript belongs. Cf. also the manuscript described in the colophon as “brought from Siam” (*siyamdesato ānitapothakato*): Jinadasa Liyanaratne, “Pāli manuscripts of Sri Lanka in the Cambridge University Library”, *JPTS* XVIII (1993), pp. 139–40.

<sup>43</sup> Pelliot, p. 418. See also Winternitz, pp. 176–83, who refers to similar conclusions reached by Senart and Bart (p. 177, n. 2). Regrettably, Winternitz’s discussion is marred by modernist prejudices. He remarks of “Books IV–VII”

*Continues...*

*Milindapañhānam pucchāvissajjanā samattā* occur at the end of Book III [i.e., Trenckner p. 89,ult], it has been deduced that this was the end of the original portion of the *Milindapañha*”.

(Geiger, however, stated that “the real contents of the work ended with Chapter 2, at the end of which we find in our Pāli text the remark: *Nāgasena-Milindarāja-pañhā-niṭṭhitā*”.<sup>44</sup> In Trenckner’s edition this statement occurs a short way into the fourth *vagga*, p. 64,ult. The phrase is difficult to explain. Can it refer to the end of the second part listed in the internal table of contents, “Milindapañha”? The statement is not found in ChS, which describes the dialogue as the second of the fourth *vagga*: *nāgasena dutiyo*.)

(4) The remainder of the Pāli *Milinda-pañha*.<sup>45</sup> The consensus of opinion is that the remaining chapters—which are entirely absent in the Chinese \**Nāgasenabhikṣu-sūtra*—were composed in Ceylon, after the basic Indian text had been translated into Pāli, and appended to that text at a later date.<sup>46</sup> While I agree that they are not part of the “original” text, I feel that they may have been composed in India and circulated independently—that is, that they could represent another development of the rich Indian Milinda tradition—and later translated into Pāli and conjoined with the basic text. My reason is that the later books contain

---

(pp. 182–83) that “these legends are permeated with a low conception of the doctrine of Karman, an exaggerated cult of the Buddha (Buddha-Bhakti), and a somewhat crude belief in miracles, which would seem to indicate a later period”.

<sup>44</sup> Wilhelm Geiger, *Pāli Literature and Language* (tr. by Batakrishna Ghosh), [Calcutta, 1943] Delhi, 1968, § 20, pp. 26–27.

<sup>45</sup> That is, from p. 90 of Trenckner’s edition on (p. 97 of ChS), which according to the internal table of contents comprises the *Mendakapañha*, *Anumānapañha*, and *Opammakathāpañha*. These correspond somehow to Rhys Davids’ Books IV to VII.

<sup>46</sup> See Norman, p. 112: “Books IV–VII are different in style, and are clearly later than the first portion and probably by a different author”.

many purportedly canonical citations that are not found in the Pāli canon, as well as citations attributed to different persons than in the Pāli.<sup>47</sup> That is, the author(s) must have consulted a different canon. It seems impossible to decide whether the later part is a compilation from several different works, or a single work.<sup>48</sup>

(5) The *avadāna* version of the *Tsa pao tsang ching*. This short text was translated in 472, probably from Sanskrit. Whether it is an extract of a longer text cannot be said; at any rate, since the *Tsa pao tsang ching* is an anthology of materials from different sources, the *avadāna* would originally have been an independent Milinda text. (Willemen suggests that the actual compilation and arrangement of the *Tsa pao tsang ching* was done in China by the influential editor, the monk T’an-yao.) It has been suggested that the sources of the *Tsa pao tsang ching* as a whole were Sarvāstivādin.

(6) The Sanskrit version cited by Vasubandhu in the 4th century. On the strength of the brief citation, we can only say that the passage in question does not come from the tradition represented by (2), (3), or (4), and that it is affiliated, but not identical to, (5). This *may* have been a (Mūla)Sarvāstivādin version, redacted in Sanskrit. The Chinese of Hsüan-tsang describes Nāgasena in a way that suggests he is being introduced for the first time (see below, n. 55). This has led Lévi (p. 216) to propose that “la discussion rapportée dans le *Koça* se trouvait au début même de la recension employée par Vasubandhu”. The description of Nāgasena’s attainments is not found in the other versions (Sanskrit,

---

<sup>47</sup> See I.B. Horner, *Milinda’s Questions*, Vol. I (Sacred Books of the Buddhists, Vol. XXII), London, [1963] 1969, pp. x foll.

<sup>48</sup> According to Winternitz (p. 177, n. 2) Schrader, in his introduction to his translation (Berlin, 1905), “assumes that there were seven different recensions or revisions of this work”.



Paramārtha, Tibetan), but all versions relate that the King goes to Nāgasena and addresses him.

One other point may be mentioned. Trenckner noted that “the opening phrase [of the *Milinda-pañha*] *taṃyathā ’nusūyate* is not found in any other Pāli writing”.<sup>49</sup> A similar phrase, *tadyathā anuśrūyate*, is used to open the prose of stories in the Sanskrit Buddhist *jātaka* or *avadāna* genre, such as the *Maitrakanyakāvadāna*,<sup>50</sup> the *Jātakamālās* of Āryaśūra, Haribhaṭṭa, and Gopadatta,<sup>51</sup> and the *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā*.<sup>52</sup> (Yaśomitra in his *Abhidharmakośa-vyākhyā* prefers *śrūyate hi*,<sup>53</sup> while the *Suvarṇavarṇāvadāna* opens with *evam anuśrūyate*.<sup>54</sup>)

## B. Translation of Vasubandhu’s citation

King Milinda went to the Elder Nāgasena and said:<sup>55</sup> “I would like to question the respected one, but [you] *śramaṇas* are great talkers: could

<sup>49</sup> Trenckner, p. vii. The Siamese edition (p. 3.18) has here *suṃyati ti* (without *taṃyathā*).

<sup>50</sup> Konrad Klaus, *Das Maitrakanyakāvadāna (Divyāvadāna 38)* (Indica et Tibetica 2), Bonn, 1983, p. 28.5.

<sup>51</sup> Hendrik Kern (ed.), *The Jātaka-mālā* (Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. 1), Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1943, pp. 1.19; 6.13, etc.; Michael Hahn, *Haribhaṭṭa and Gopadatta: Two Authors in the Succession of Āryaśūra: On the Rediscovery of Parts of their Jātakamālās*, The Reiyukai Library, Tokyo, 1977, pp. 10; 31.5 and Tables 7 and 8.

<sup>52</sup> Heinrich Lüders, *Bruchstücke der Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā des Kumāralāta* (Kleinere Sanskrit-Texte Heft II), [Leipzig, 1926] Wiesbaden, 1979, pp. 47, 152.

<sup>53</sup> Swami Dwarikadas Shastri (ed.), *Abhidharmakośa & Bhāṣya of Acharya Vasubandhu with Sphuṭārthā Commentary of Ācārya Yaśomitra* (Bauddha Bharati Series 5), Part I, Varanasi, 1970, p. 7.23, 25.

<sup>54</sup> Sita Ram Roy, *Suvarṇavarṇāvadāna*, K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute (Historical Research Series Vol. VII), Patna, 1971, p. 218.3.

<sup>55</sup> The Chinese of Hsüan-tsang lists several of the Elder’s attainments: “il y eut un Bhadanta nommé Nāgasena, possédent les trois *vidyās*, les six *abhijñās*, les huit

*Continues...*

you respond to exactly what I ask?” “Ask” said [Nāgasena. The King] asked, “Is the life-force (*jīva*) the body, or is the life-force one thing, and the body another?” “That cannot be answered” replied the Elder. The King said, “Did not the respected one promise from the outset not to avoid answering? How then do you speak otherwise, saying ‘that cannot be answered?’” The Elder said, “I also would like to question the Great King, but kings are great talkers: could you respond to exactly what I ask?” “Ask” said [the King. Nāgasena] asked, “Are the mangos from the mango-tree in your inner court sour, or are they sweet?”<sup>56</sup> “There is no mango-tree in my inner court.” “Did not the great king promise from the outset not to avoid answering? How then do you speak otherwise, saying ‘there is no mango-tree?’ “How can I answer regarding the sourness or sweetness of a non-existent mango-tree?” “In the same way, great king, that very life-force does not exist—how can I declare that it is different from or the same as the body?”

## C. The parallel from the *Tsa pao tsang ching*<sup>57</sup>

### C.1. Chavannes

Le roi posa encore la question suivante: “Maintenant je désire vous demander ceci: Le moi qui est constitué par les choses qui sont dans mon corps, est-il permanent ou impermanent? Répondez-moi d’une manière qui me satisfasse.” (*Na-k’ia-*) *sseu-na* demanda à son tour: “Les fruits de l’arbre *ngan-p’o-lo* (âmra) qui est dans le palais du roi sont-ils doux ou

*vimokṣas*. En ce temps-là le roi Milinda vint auprès de lui et dit...” (La Vallée Poussin, p. 263). If I understand Lévi (p. 215) correctly, Paramārtha’s translation refers simply to “*bhadanta* Nāgasena, an arhat”.

<sup>56</sup> For similes with mangos in the *Milinda-pañha*, see Trenckner pp. 46, 72, 77, 263.

<sup>57</sup> Chavannes, *Cinq Centes Contes...*, pp. 123–24, and Takakusu, *JRAS* 1896, p. 20. I reproduce the two translations, including their transliterations of the Chinese names, as they stand.

acides?” Le roi répondit: “Dans mon palais il n’y a aucun arbre de cette sorte; comment pouvez-vous me demander si ces fruits sont doux ou acides?” (*Na-k’ia-*) *sseu-na* reprit: “Je vous répondrai moi aussi de la même manière; tout l’ensemble des cinq viscères ne constitue point le moi; comment pouvez-vous me demandez si ce moi est permanent ou impermanent?”

## C.2. Takakusu

The King: I now turn to the matter concerning our bodies. Am “I” permanent, or am “I” impermanent? Answer me satisfactorily.

In reply Sena raised another question: If there were an an-ba-la (āmra, mango) tree in the Royal Palace, would the fruit be sweet or sour?

The King: There is no such tree in my garden: how can you ask me if the fruit is sweet or sour?

Sena: Even so is your own question. None of the five skandhas (form, sensation, perception, discrimination, and consciousness) is “I”; there is no “I”: then how can you ask me if “I” am (you are) permanent or impermanent?

## D. Vasubandhu’s citation: texts

### D.1. Sanskrit text<sup>8</sup>

eṣa ca granthaḥ pūrvakair<sup>9</sup> eva nirmocitaḥ / sthaviro hi nāgasenaḥ  
kaliṅgena rājñopasaṃkramyoktaḥ / pṛccheyam ahaṃ bhadantaṃ

<sup>8</sup> I reproduce (with a few adjustments) the text as given in Bhikkhu Pāsādika, *Kanonische Zitate im Abhidharmakośabhāṣya des Vasubandhu* (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 1), Göttingen, 1989, § 522, p. 129, except that the opening from *eṣa...* to *...upasamkramyoktaḥ*, not given by Pāsādika, is supplied from Pradhan and Dwarikadas (see n. 4 above).

<sup>9</sup> Yaśomitra 1209,ult *pūrvakair eveti, sthaviranāgasenaḍibhiḥ*; Tibetan in Q5593, Vol. 117, *mñon pa chu*, 391b7 *sna ma dag kho nas zes bya ba ni gnas*

bahubollakāś<sup>60</sup> ca śramaṇā bhavanti / yadi yad eva pṛccheyam tad eva  
vyākuryā iti / pṛcchety uktaḥ pṛṣṭavān<sup>61</sup> / kiṃ nu sa jīvas tac charīram  
anyo jīvo ’nyac charīram iti / avyākṛtam etad ity avocat sthaviṛaḥ / sa āha /  
nanu bhadantaḥ pūrvam eva pratijñāṃ kārīto nānyad vyākartavyam iti /  
kim idam anyad evoktam avyākṛtam etad iti / sthaviṛa āha / aham api  
mahārājāṃ pṛccheyam bahubollakāś<sup>62</sup> ca rājāno bhavanti / yadi yad eva  
pṛccheyam tad eva vyākuryā iti / pṛcchety uktaḥ pṛṣṭavān<sup>63</sup> / yas te  
’ntaḥpure āmravṛkṣas tasya kim amlāni phalāni āhosvit madhurāṇīti /  
naiva mamāntaḥpure kaścid āmravṛkṣo ’stīty āha / nanu mayā pūrvam eva  
mahārājāḥ pratijñāṃ kārīto nānyad vyākartavyam iti / kim idam anyad  
evoktam āmra eva nāstīti / sa āha katham asato vṛkṣasya phalānām

*brtan klu sde la sogs pas so; Lakṣaṇānusāriṇī* (376b8) *sna ma dag kho nas zes  
bya ba ni gnas brtan klu’i sde la sogs pa dag gis so.*

<sup>60</sup> *bahuvollakāś* Pāsādika. Yaśomitra 1209,ult: *bahubollakā iti, bahupralāpā iti*;  
Tib. 391b7 *smra ba mañ ba zes bya ba ni gtsor (!) ba’o*; *Lakṣaṇānusāriṇī*  
(376b8) *smra ba mañ ba zes bya ba ni gtsor ba’o*. (I take the correct reading to  
be *gtsor ba*, for which see *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo*, *Bar cha* [II], 2195a,  
*gtsor ba: rna ba sun par byed pa; don med ku co mañ pos rna ba gtsor bar byed  
pa; mi tshogs mañ du ’dus nas ca co’i sgras gtsor ba*. This suggests something  
like tiresomely or annoyingly garrulous: cf. La Vallée Poussin’s rendering, “mais  
les religieux sont bavards”, and Lévi’s (p. 216) rendering of Yaśomitra’s gloss  
*bahupralāpa* as “qui bavarde beaucoup”. More neutrally the phrase means  
largiloquent or multiloquous; cp. Lévi’s rendering, “or les çramaṇas aiment  
beaucoup à parler”.) As noted by La Vallée Poussin (*op. cit.*, p. 263, n. 2)  
*bahubollaka* occurs in the *Divyāvadāna* (ed. E.B. Cowell and R.A. Neil, repr.  
Delhi, 1987, *Samgharakṣitāvadāna*, p. 338.13, 19: not p. 358 as in La Vallée  
Poussin). This is the only reference given by Edgerton (BHSD 403b, s.v.  
*bollaka*); Lévi (p. 216) refers to the term as “un des exemples les plus anciens du  
thème *bol* consacré par l’hindoustani dans le sens de ‘parler’”. The  
*Pravrajyāvastu* version of the *Samgharakṣitāvadāna* reads *bahullāpaka* (not in  
BHSD, but see 462a, *-lāpika*), which means the same: Nalinaksha Dutt, *Gilgit  
Manuscripts* III–4, [Calcutta, 1950] Delhi, 1984, p. 39.1, 6. The Tibetan, given in  
a footnote, is the same as in our text: *smra ba mañ ba*.

<sup>61</sup> *pṛcchet yuktāḥ pṛṣṭavān* Pāsādika.

<sup>62</sup> *bahuvollakāś* Pāsādika: see above.

<sup>63</sup> *pṛcchet yuktāḥ pṛṣṭavān* Pāsādika.

amlatām madhuratām vā vyākāromīti / evam eva mahārāja sa eva jīvo  
nāsti kuto 'sya śārīrād anyatām ananyatām vā vyākāromīti /

## D.2. Tibetan text<sup>64</sup>

'dud pa<sup>65</sup> 'di ni sña ma dag kho nas kyañ bkrol<sup>66</sup> te/ rgyal po des 'du  
sbyin gnas brtan klu'i<sup>67</sup> sde'i thad du 'oñs nas btsun pa dge sbyoñ<sup>68</sup>  
mams ni smra ba mañ ba lags so// gal te gañ dris pa de ñid (Q101b) lan  
'debs na/<sup>69</sup> bdag 'dri bar 'tshal lo zes smras so<sup>70</sup>// drir gsol zes smras pa  
dañ/ ci lags/<sup>71</sup> srog de ñid lus lags sam/ srog kyañ gžan lags<sup>72</sup> la/<sup>73</sup> lus  
kyañ gžan lags zes dris so// gnas brtan<sup>74</sup> gyis 'di ni lan mi gdab pa yin no  
zes smras pa dañ/ des smras pa/ bdag gis sña nas btsun pa gžan luñ bstan  
par mi bya'o/<sup>75</sup> zes dam 'char gsol<sup>76</sup> ma lags sam/ ci'i slad du 'di skad  
du/<sup>77</sup> 'di ni lan mi gdab pa yin no zes gžan kho na gsuñs<sup>78</sup>/ gnas brtan gyis  
smras pa/ rgyal po chen po rgyal po mams ni<sup>79</sup> smra ba mañ ba lags so//

<sup>64</sup> My text is composite, based on rGyal rtse (G) 385a3 (repr. p. 767.3) and Peking (Q) *mñon pa'i bstan bcos nu*, 101a8. All variants are recorded; the punctuation follows G.

<sup>65</sup> 'dud pa (= *grantha*) G: *bdud pa* Q.

<sup>66</sup> Q adds *zin*: not in G.

<sup>67</sup> *klu'i* G: *klu* Q.

<sup>68</sup> *dge sbyoñ* (= *śramaṇa*) Q: *dge sloñ* (= *bhikṣu*) G.

<sup>69</sup> /G: Q om. /.

<sup>70</sup> *smras so* Q: *smra'o* G.

<sup>71</sup> /G: Q om. /.

<sup>72</sup> *lags* G: Q om. *lags*.

<sup>73</sup> /G: Q om. /.

<sup>74</sup> *gnas brtan* Q: *gnas grtan* G.

<sup>75</sup> Q adds //: not in G.

<sup>76</sup> G adds *ba*: not in Q. See n. 92.

<sup>77</sup> /G: Q om. /.

<sup>78</sup> *gsuñs* Q: *gsuñ* G.

<sup>79</sup> *ni* Q: G om. *ni*.

gal te gañ dris<sup>80</sup> pa de ñid<sup>81</sup> lan 'debs na bdag kyañ 'dri<sup>82</sup> bar 'tshal lags  
so// drir gsol zes smras pa dañ/ khyod kyi slas la śiñ ljon pa a mra<sup>83</sup> <sup>84</sup>  
yod pa gañ yin pa de'i 'bras bu mams/<sup>85</sup> ci skyur ram/<sup>86</sup> 'on te <sup>87</sup> mñar  
lags śes<sup>88</sup> dris so// bdag gi slas<sup>89</sup> la śiñ ljon pa a mra<sup>90</sup> ñid 'ga' yañ med  
do//<sup>91</sup> zes (G385b) smras so// bdag gis sña nas rgyal po chen po gžan luñ  
bstan par mi bya'o// zes dam 'char gsol<sup>92</sup> ma lags sam/ ci'i slad du/<sup>93</sup> 'di  
skad du śiñ ljon pa a mra<sup>94</sup> ñid med do zes gžan kho na gsuñs/ des smras  
pa/ ji ltar na śiñ<sup>95</sup> ljon pa med pa'i 'bras bu mams skyur ba 'am/<sup>96</sup> mñar ba  
ñid du luñ bstan par bya/ rgyal po chen po de bžin du srog de ñid med  
na/<sup>97</sup> ci'i slad du 'di la<sup>98</sup> lus las gžan pa ñid dam gžan ma yin pa ñid du<sup>99</sup>  
lun bstan par bgyi zes bya ba lta bu'o//

Nandapurī

Peter Skilling

<sup>80</sup> *dris* Q: *srid* G.

<sup>81</sup> G adds *la*: not in Q.

<sup>82</sup> 'dri G: *dri* Q.

<sup>83</sup> *a mra* Q: *a smra* G.

<sup>84</sup> Q adds 'bras bu (*phala*): not in G or Sanskrit.

<sup>85</sup> /G: Q om. /.

<sup>86</sup> /G: Q om. /.

<sup>87</sup> Q adds /: not in G.

<sup>88</sup> *lags śes* G: *zes* (om. *lags*) Q.

<sup>89</sup> *slas* G: *slam* Q.

<sup>90</sup> *a mra* Q: *a smra* G.

<sup>91</sup> // G: not in Q.

<sup>92</sup> G adds *ba*: not in Q. See n. 76.

<sup>93</sup> /G: Q om. /.

<sup>94</sup> *a mra* Q: *a smra* G.

<sup>95</sup> *śiñ* Q: G om. *śiñ*.

<sup>96</sup> /G: Q om. /.

<sup>97</sup> /G: Q om. /.

<sup>98</sup> *la* G: Q om. *la*.

<sup>99</sup> *gžan ma yin pa ñid du* Q: G *gžan ma* (om. *yin*) *pa ñid du*, added in small letters below line.