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Abstract.

This work is made up of three unequal parts. The first part contains an edition of the Sanskrit text of what I have called 'Redaction A' of the Bhaisajyaguru-Sutra. This edition is based on a single manuscript found at Gilgit, with variants from four other manuscripts, also found at Gilgit, given in the critical apparatus. Stylistically 'Redaction A' seems to represent an 'unrevised' version of the text, perhaps a first attempt at Gilgit to commit an oral tradition to writing.

The second part consists of a critical edition of the Tibetan translation of a Sanskrit text of the Bhaisajyaguru-Sutra. This edition is based on the Derge, Narthang, Peking and Lhasa versions of the 'phags pa bom ldan 'das smon gyi bla bai ıu nya'i 'od kyi shon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa and the 'phags pa de b`in gags pa b`um gyi shon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa. The Derge versions form the basis of the edition.

The first and second parts are preliminary studies to the third and main part, since the whole was not intended as a study of the Bhaisajyaguru-Sutra per se. This third part is devoted to an English translation of the Sanskrit text, with notes; the latter making up the bulk of the work. In these notes I have attempted to show how a literate member of the Gilgit community, assuming he was familiar with the texts known to have been available to him, would have, or could have, understood the Bhaisajyaguru-Sutra. I have also attempted to show what was and what was not unique to the Bhaisajyaguru-Sutra vis-à-vis the Gilgit collection as a whole, and to make the first tentative steps towards reconstructing the 'Buddhism' current at Gilgit in the 5th-6th century.
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The
Bhaiṣajyaguru-Sūtra

*  

The Sanskrit Text of Redaction A

From Gilgit

"Our life is frittered away by detail".

- Thoreau -
I. The manuscripts of the Dhaisajyaguru-sūtra found at Gilgit.

At least five Mss. of Bhy were recovered from Gilgit. Since these are now available in published facsimile there is no need for an elaborate description of the individual Mss., but I must say a few words about the way in which I refer to them. As I have pointed out elsewhere (IIJ 19 (1977) 206) Dutt's use of his identifying letters (A, B and C) is so promiscuous as to render them useless. He not only cites the same Ms. sometimes as A, sometimes as B or C; he also assigns the letter A to two independent Mss. written in two different scripts. This has resulted in a great deal of confusion in the work that has come after him. Neither Lohesh Chandra in his introductions to the facsimile editions, nor the entries in Buddhist Text Information, No. 12 (1977), nor my own note in IIJ 19 have succeeded in fully sorting out the situation. This was largely due to the fact that in all three cases there was an attempt to maintain Dutt's original inadequate "system" of letters. In light of this experience, and with the hope of ending this completely unnecessary confusion, I decided to adopt an entirely new system of letters, which I give here along with a few comments. The folio numbers are those assigned to the facsimile by Chandra, not those of the original Mss.

V = Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts viii, no. 32, fols. 1866-1867. This Ms. consists of a single leaf and is the only Ms. of Bhy written in what Sander (Paligraphisches zu den Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfanammlung (Wiesbaden: 1968)) calls "Gilgit/Bumlynn Type II". It is one of Dutt's A's.

W = Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts x, no. 31, fol. 3261. This Ms. consists of a single fragment of a single leaf and had not previously been identified. It is not impossible that W, rather than being an independent Ms., is a fragment of one of the folios missing from the end of Z. The script and handwriting are very close to Z, and the number of lines agrees. This point can only be settled by a careful examination of the originals.

X = Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts viii, no. 34, fols. 1868-1948. This is virtually a complete Ms. and the only one which preserves a title for our text. Dutt's edition of Bhy is essentially an edition of this Ms. It is usually referred to by him as B.
Y = Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts x, no. 10(2), fols. 1394-1425. This Ms. is almost complete, missing only one leaf near the beginning and a small piece at the very end. It forms part of a bundle which also contained the Vajracchedikā and this bundle has been discussed in some detail by N.P. Chakravarti, "The Gilgit Text of the Vajracchedikā", in G. Tucci, Minor Buddhist Texts, Part I (Rome: 1956) 175-82. It is usually referred to as C by Dutt.

Z = Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts viii, no. 31, fols. 1838-1865. It is missing several folios, and many of those which are preserved are damaged. This is the other Ms. which Dutt refers to as A.

There is one other Ms. which the early inventories and Chandra (GilMax, no. 57, fols. 3257-3258) give as a Ms. of Bhg. But what I can definitely read of this Ms. - the facsimile is very difficult to read, and my microfilm is, if anything, even worse - does not seem to bear this out. Here again only an examination of the original can settle the question.

Before discussing the relationships between these Ms's. it may perhaps be useful to first present a concordance of the material available to us.

Concordance of the Gilgit Ms's. of Bhg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph no. of my edition</th>
<th>Dutt's Ms.V</th>
<th>Ms.W</th>
<th>Ms.X</th>
<th>Ms.Y</th>
<th>Ms.Z</th>
<th>Śīks Śīks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[0] 1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1868.1</td>
<td>1394.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] 1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1868.2</td>
<td>1394.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] 1.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1869.4</td>
<td>1394.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] 2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1871.2</td>
<td>1394.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] 2.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1872.5</td>
<td>1395.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5.1] 3.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1874.4</td>
<td>1395.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5.2] 3.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1875.5)*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>..1838.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5.3] 4.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1876.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1838.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5.4] 4.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1876.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1838.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5.5] 4.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1877.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1839.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5.6] 4.13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1878.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1839.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>Dutt</td>
<td>Ms.V</td>
<td>Ms.W</td>
<td>Ms.X</td>
<td>Ms.Y</td>
<td>Ms.Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5.7]</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1879.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5.8]</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1880.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5.9]</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1881.1</td>
<td>1396.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5.10]</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1881.5</td>
<td>1396.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5.11]</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1883.1</td>
<td>1396.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5.12]</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1883.5</td>
<td>1396.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5.13]</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1885.3</td>
<td>1397.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6]</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1885.5</td>
<td>1397.1</td>
<td>1840.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1888.4</td>
<td>1397.6</td>
<td>1840.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1892.3</td>
<td>1398.6</td>
<td>1842.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9]</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1895.4</td>
<td>1399.6</td>
<td>1844.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>1866.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1899.2</td>
<td>1400.5</td>
<td>1846.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[11]</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1866.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1902.1</td>
<td>1401.4</td>
<td>1848.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>1867.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1906.4</td>
<td>1402.5</td>
<td>1849.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[13]</td>
<td>15.11</td>
<td>1867.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1907.2</td>
<td>1402.6</td>
<td>1849.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[14]</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1911.1</td>
<td>1403.6</td>
<td>1851.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[15]</td>
<td>19.16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1916.3</td>
<td>1405.3</td>
<td>1854.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>20.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1919.4</td>
<td>1406.2*</td>
<td>1855.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[17]</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1925.2</td>
<td>1408.1</td>
<td>1858.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[18]</td>
<td>25.11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1930.4</td>
<td>1409.4</td>
<td>1861.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[19]</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1933.3</td>
<td>1410.3</td>
<td>1862.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[20]</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>...3261R..</td>
<td>1936.5</td>
<td>1411.3</td>
<td>1863.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[21]</td>
<td>29.12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>...3261L..</td>
<td>1940.3</td>
<td>1412.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[22]</td>
<td>31.11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1945.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[23]</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1946.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[24]</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1947.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[For references marked *, see the critical apparatus to my edition; two dots before a reference indicate that the actual beginning of the paragraph is missing from the Ms. in question; two dots after a reference indicate that the beginning of the paragraph is preserved, but material coming after it is missing.]

According to Dutt and Chandra two of our Ms., X and Z, are provided with colophons. But judging by the facsimiles it appears not unlikely that the colophons reproduced as CBMs viii fols. 1864 and 1948 may have belonged to other Ms. There is at any rate nothing to connect them
definitely with our X and Z. In light of this uncertain situation and in light of the fact that these colophons contain a number of problems best studied in relationship with the other colophons found at Gilgit, I have omitted them from my edition and will not here discuss them further. (For some remarks concerning these and other colophons at Gilgit see: Chakravarti, op.cit., pp.179-82; N.P.Chakravarti, "Hatun Rock Inscription of Patoladeva", Epigraphia Indicaa 30 (1953-54) 226f.; B. Prakash, "Gilgit in Ancient Times", Bulletin of Tibetology 7, no.3 (1970) 20f.; Y.Kurumiya, "Hokekyō bonpon shahon okugaku kenkyū nōto", Hokekyō shinkō no shokeitai (Kyōto: 1976) 137-38; 146).

II. On the Redactional Differences in the Gilgit Manuscripts of the Bhaṇḍajyāguru-sūtra.

Determining the relationships between these five Mss. is not easy. We have at our disposal two kinds of evidence: internal evidence, which consists of a large body of variant readings found in the individual Mss., and external evidence. The latter will be dealt with first.

Of the three main Mss., X, Y, and Z, only Y shows no signs of having been "corrected". X has been "corrected" at four places, and Z at fourteen. In almost all cases in both Mss. these "corrections" are interlinear and usually in a different hand. These "corrections" will take on significance if we can determine their source.

In X we find the following instances: ([5.2]1 = paragraph and line number)

1875.5: nāṇādīśām ccheran, to: nāṇādīśām ga-ccheran. [5.2]1
1883.3: tanidānāpā pā kurvanti, to: tanidānanāpā-pām kurvanti [5.11]3
1890.3: yai manuṣyabhūtai śrutām, to: yai pūrva manuṣyabhūtai śrutām [7]39
1896.1: paspaṇx..., to: pa-ṛa-spaxx... [9]3

For our purposes this evidence is totally inconclusive. 1875.5, 1883.3 and 1896.1 represent obvious corrections which could have been made by any reader. In reference to 1890.3, while it is true that both Y and Z have pūrvaḥ here, and therefore could be the source of the "correction" in X, it is also possible that the correction could have been made on the basis of [9]9 where all three Mss. have pūrvaḥ. Note also that all three Mss. at [8]10, [10]10 and [11]6, in the same basic formula, omit pūrvaḥ.
The analysis of the "corrections" in Z produce more interesting results. We have the following cases:

1839.6: jaḍā khelā kā lamsā kujā, to: jaḍā khelā kā-ṇā lamsā, etc. [5.632]. X could not possibly be the source of this correction since it reads: jaḍaitākā-lamsā kujā; Y is missing.

1840.1: bhaiṣajyaguru-prabhasya, to: bhaiṣajyaguru-vaiḍūrya-prabhasya [6.11]. An obvious correction which could have been made by any reader.

1841.3: prāg eva mātāpitrīṇāṁ bhārīputradhītrīṇāṁ dāsyamti prāg eva dāsāśāśkarmakarīṇāṁ prāg evāṇyeśāṁ yācanaṅkānāṁ [7.17]. The underlining here indicates the corrections; dāsyamti is interlinear; the other correction is two lines wedged in a small space which may have been left by an erasure. Y could not be the source of dāsyamti, although X could; both could be the source for the second and longer correction. The situation is complicated by the fact that Z is the only Ms. which has bhārīputradhītrīṇāṁ; X has only prāg eva mātāpitrīṇāṁ dasyanti; and Y has nothing to correspond to either.

1841.5-1842.4: tatra teṣāṁ yamalokasthi-tānāṁ vā tiryagyoniṣṭhi-tānāṁ vā tasya tathāgatasya nāma śāmurībhaviṣyati · sāha smaranā- mātṛena taltaś cavitvā punar api manusya-loke upapatsyanti jātismarāś ca bhaviṣyanti · te durgatibhayabhītā na bhūya(h) kāmagnabhīr bhaviṣyanti · dānābhiraṁ ca bhaviṣyanti [7.11-15]. Here again the underlining indicates the correction which, again, appears to have been written over an erasure. This correction is virtually identical with the reading of the passage in X, and could not have come from Y, which has quite a different reading.

1845.2: nubhavamti · te anekāṁ varṣaṁatasaṁhāranāṁ a- [9.33 is added beneath the line, but the usual '+' indicating where it should be inserted is missing, probably due to the fragmentary nature of the first two lines. In any case, this 'correction' could have come from either X or Y, both having essentially the same reading.

1845.4: vamānā, to: va-ha-mānā [9.36]. An obvious correction.

1847.4: prthagbhūtānāvāhāvanāti, to: prthagbhūtānā-māvāhāvanāti [10.36. In reference to the gen.pl. ending, the reading of Z, which is exactly the same reading as X, has been changed to the reading
of Y. Note, however, that Y reads prthakprthaghbūtā-, while X and Z have only prthaghbūtā-.


1851.5: na ca kenacic chakyamopahati · bhagavān āha etc., to: na ca kenacic chakyamopahati · hṛtam vācakha puṇah praṭyāharati bhagavān āha, etc. [13]5-16. Here the correction is virtually the same as the reading of Y, and X could not possibly be the source, since it shows a different reading.

1852.2: -samanvāgatam upavasitavyah, to: -samanvāgata-m upavāsa-m upavasitavyah [14]5. This correction could have been made on the basis of either X or Y.

1852.3: praveṛte, to: prava-de-ṛte [14]5. An obvious correction.


1854.6: janayisyati bhirūpa, to: janayisyati a-bhirūpa [15]4. This correction is the reading of X; Y has -isyantu abhirūpa.

1858.5: na tv e tasya, to: na tv e-va tasya [16]28. An obvious correction.

Here again the evidence is not conclusive, but it does indicate a few possibilities. It indicates, for example, that the 'corrections' in Z could not have been made on the basis of either X or Y alone. This in turn suggests at least two possibilities: (1) the 'corrections' in Z were made by someone who compared it with both X and Y, and thus in terms of the 'corrections' Z represents a conflated Ms; or (2) the 'corrections' in Z were based on another Ms, no longer extant, which contained readings which sometimes agreed with X, and sometimes agreed with Y. This hypothetical Ms., however, would appear on the basis of its readings to have been itself a conflated Ms. Both possibilities seem to indicate that in terms of the 'corrections' alone, Z represents a conflated Ms. tradition which is to be placed somewhere between X and Y. As we will see below, this pattern conforms very closely to that which emerges from an analysis of the internal evidence.

The internal evidence available to us is in quantity, at least, much richer, although here again a precise analysis of it is not easy. I think it is clear from the material that in the three main Ms. we have at least
two, and probably three, separate redactions of our text. But here already we have a problem: it is one thing to state that we have two, or probably, three redactions of our text, but it is quite another thing to give a precise definition of what constitutes a legitimate redactional difference. A large part of the problem is that we lack parallel examples from other texts, since almost all our Mahāyāna texts in Sanskrit are preserved in only one, usually late, Nepalese redaction. When the Kashgar Ms. of the Saddharma-pundarīka is fully studied and compared with the Gilgit/Nepalese version of the text we may, however, know more about the nature and possible range of redactional variation, especially in regard to prose composition which is not governed by the conservative influence of meter. Apart from the Saddharma, we already know that there are considerable differences, notably in prose, between the Gilgit and Nepalese redactions of the Samādhīrāja-sūtra, but these differences have yet to be analysed. The only other example that I know of — and the one which is perhaps most comparable to Bhg — is that of the Vajracchedikā, where we have both an early Gilgit/Central Asian redaction(s) and a later redaction preserved in Mss. from Japan. But here again, the variations have not yet been systematically studied and are imperfectly marked in Conze's edition. In light of this lack of comparable material — and therefore of anything like established criteria — the best method of procedure seems to be a definition-by-enumeration. That is to say, that it is best to begin, at least, with an enumeration of examples of what appear to be legitimate redactional differences.

In the table below the numbers in square brackets refer to paragraph numbers in my edition. I have also added in parentheses after each reading the letter or letters of the Ms./Mss. in which it is to be found. It should be noted that when a reading is assigned to two or more Mss., this does not necessarily mean that both Mss. have exactly the same reading. There are often minor differences in tense, spelling, etc. Readings under 'Redaction A' are those of my edition and do not, therefore, necessarily correspond exactly to Y or Z, etc. Those under 'Redaction B' are unedited; I have merely added missing letters when necessary.

Redaction A

||
| Clla. bhagavān ... vaisālīṃ anuprāptō a. bhagavān ... nupārvena vaisālīṃ | vaisālīṃ mahānagariṃ · tenānuprāptō bhūt tatra khalu bhagavān vaisālīṃ viharati sma. (Y) |
| viharati sma. (Y) | viharati sma. (X) |

Redaction B
Redaction A

b. devāsūragaruḍakinnaramahoraga-
ṇāṁḥ (Y)

[5.1]a. ekāmsam cūrvarām prāvṛtya (Y)

[5.2]a. ekāmsam uttarāśaṅgam kṛtvā (X)

b. mahatya ca devanāgasya sangam-
adhavāsūragaruḍakinnaramahoraga-
manuṣyāmanuṣyaparassāda (X)

[5.3]a. satvāṁ arthāya hitāya sukhā- 
yeva devamanuṣyānāṁ (Y)

[5.4]a. sāstā devamanuṣyānāṁ (Y)

b. satvāṁ arthāya hitāya sukhāya 
devamanuṣyānāṁ ca hiterthāya (X)

c. tasya maṃjuśrīr bhagavato, etc. (Y)

d. tasya khalu puma maṃjuśrīr bhaga-
vato, etc. (X)

c. pūrve (Y)

d. katamāni dvādasāni (Y)

[5.5]a. b. tasya khalu puna maṃjuśrīr 
bhagavato, etc. (X)

c. purvē (Y)

d. katamāni dvādasāṃśeprāṇi dhānāni (X)

Redaction B

[5.1]a. buddhabodhīṃ abhisambhūdy-
vam (Y)

b. buddhavāsakāmbhūdyevam (X)

[5.2]a. buddhabodhim abhisambhūdy-
vam (Y)

b. buddhabodhim abhisambhūdyevam (X)

c. purvē (Y)

d. katamāni dvādasāṃśeprāṇi dhānāni (X)

[5.3]a. 'haṃ kumārgapratiṣṭhāpīnām
satvā bodhimārga pratiṣṭhāpīye 
ca satvāṁ śrāvakākṣakabuddhapatipānāā
vatayeyena mahāyāne niyojayaena (X)

[5.4]a. 'haṃ ye kunārgrapratiṣṭhāpīnām
satvāḥ kumārgapratiṣṭhāpīye 
ca satvāṁ śrāvakākṣakabuddhapratipānāā
vatayeyena mahāyāne niyojayaena (X)

[5.5]a. tathā cānyo aprameyāsanam-
khīyeśparīmarginā satvāḥ te saṃrūve
akhaṇḍaśilā syūḥ (Z)

b. 'ma ca kasyaci śilapāpānasya 
mama nāmadheyan śrutvā durgatigama-
naṃ syāt (Z)

[5.6]a. te sarve akhaṇḍaśilā syūḥ (X)

b. 'ma ca kasyaci śilapāpānasya mama 
nāmadheyan śrutvā 'ma kaci durgatigama-
naṃ syāt (X)

[5.7]a. ye ca bandhanatadanāv-
ruddhā (Y)

b. ye ca bandhanāśeprāṇi dūrddhā (X)
b. te madhyena puṇyānubhāveṇa
parimucyeran sarvopadravebhyaḥ (Y)

[5.11]a. āhāraparasyeṣṭyabhīyuktāṁ
pāpaṁ krama kurvanti aham teṣāṁ
varṇagandharasopetenāhāreṇa sarīraṁ
santarpayeṣaṁ paścā dharmaṁ antasukhe
pratiṣṭhāpayeṣaṁ (Y)

[5.12]a. dvādaśaṁ mahāprāṇidhānaṁ
abhūt (X)

b. sītoṣṇaṇaṁ sāmakai rāтриṃḍi-
vām duḥkhāḥ vedāntāḥ vedānti (Ms.
vīḍya) aham teṣāṁ vastraparibhogam
upānāmayeṣaṁ (Y)

[7]a. anekāḥ ca te satvāḥ ye svayam
evātmānaḥ na paribhūṃjantī prāg eva
dāsadasīkarmakarāṇāṁ prāg eva
yācanaṇāṁ (Y)

b. tatra teṣāṁ yamaloke sthitāṁ
vā tiryagyonyaḥ sthitāṁ vā tasya
tathāgatasya śāma śrūkhyābhivyāti.
saḥ samaramātreṇa tataś cātuṭvā
punar api manuṣyaloke upapatsyantī,
jātismarāḥ ca bhavyatī nāma dharmatithi
yabhītā na bhūyaḥ kāmagnārthikaṁ
na bhūyaḥ karmagunāḥbhir aśrūthikā
dānābhīrataḥ dānasya ca varṣavādīṁ
sarvāstiparītyāgino 'nupūrveṇa
śīrṣakararaṇaṇayanasmāsāṣaṅkita-
tam yācanaṇaṁ prādasyantī (Y)

b. te mama nāmādhyeṣaṁ śrīvaṁ
madhyena puṇyānubhāveṇa sarvahāyop-
parimucyeran (X)

a. āhārapāṇaparasyeṣṭyabhīyuktaṁ
tanidānam pāpaṁ kurvanti sace te mama
nāmādhyeṣaṁ dharmaṁ aham teṣāṁ
varṇagandharasopetenāhāreṇa sarīraṁ
santarpayeṣaṁ (r) (X)

a. dvādaśaṁ mahāprāṇidhānaṁ
abhūtt (X)

b. sītoṣṇaṇaṁ sāmakai upadrutā
tṛṇdrivam duḥkham anubhavanti sace
te mama nāmādhyeṣaṁ dharmaṁ aham
teṣāṁ vasāṭra paribhogam upasam-
hāreya (X)

a. X: anekāḥ ca satvāḥ ye svayam eva
na paribhūṃjati prāg eva mātāpiṁtīṁ
dāśyantī prāg eva dāsadasīkarmakarāṇāṁ
(prā) g eva yācanaṇāṁ (Y)

a. Z: anekāḥ ca satvāṁ ye svayam eva
maṅgā na paribhūṃjantī prāg eva mātā-
ipīṁtīṁ bhāvyāputradhīṁ tīṁ (dāś-
yantī) prāg eva, etc.

b. tatra teṣāṁ yamaloke sthitāṁ
vā tiryagonyaḥ sthitāṁ vā tasya
tathāgatasya śāma śrūkhyābhivyāti.
saḥ samaramātreṇa taś cātuṭvā punar api
manuṣyaloke upaḥpatsyate jātismarāḥ
ca bhavyatī te ca dharmatithi
yabhītā na bhūyaḥ kāmagnārthikaṁ
na bhūyaḥ karmagunāḥ bhūyākarmagunābhītā
cābhāḥ dānābhīrataḥ dānasya ca varṣavādīṁ
sarvāstiparītyāgino 'nupūrveṇa
śīrṣakararaṇaṇayanasmāsāṣaṅkita-
tam yācanaṇaṁ prādasyantī (X, Z)
a. X: santi satvā ye tathāgatānām udiśya Śikṣāpadaṁ dhārayanti, śilavipannā ācāravipannāḥ drṣṭivipannāḥ; ye punaḥ śilavantaḥ te śilāṁ rakṣanti na bāhuśrutasya paryēṣanti na ca tathāgatānāṁ sūtrāntānāṁ raṁ-bhīraṁ arthaṁ vijāṇanti (Y)

b. yai śrutam bhaviyati tasya bhagavato bhaisajyaguru-vaiduryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmādhīyam (Y, Z)

c. tathāgatānāṁ sāsane pravrajitvānupūrveṇa bodhisatvacārikāṁ caraṁyanti (Y, probably Z)

(9Ja. yai śrutam pūrvam manusya-bhūtaistasya bhagavato bhaisajyaguruvaiduryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṁ (Y, Z)

b. cchindanti mārapāśa bhindanti vidyāndakośaṁ uccchasyanti kleśana-dīṁ parimucyanti jāti-jāmarāmarāpaśoka-dukkha-daunāskyopāśeṣbhūṣaḥ (Y, and generally Z)

(10Ja. sarīravināśaṁ vā kartukāṁ; yai śrutam bhaviyati tasya bhagavato bhaisajyaguruvaiduryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṁ (Y)

a. ye (rd. yai) pūrvam manusya-bhūtaistasya bhagavato bhaisajyaguruvaiduryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṁ śrutam bhaviyati (X)

b. tatra yes tasya bhagavato bhaisajyaguruvaiduryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṁ śrutam bhaviyati (X)

c. tathāgatānāṁ sāsane pravrajitvānupūrveṇa bodhisatvacārikāṁ paripūrasyanti (X)

(9Ja. sarīravinaṇāśaṁ vā kartukāṁ; yai śrutam bhaviyati tasya bhagavato bhaisajyaguruvaiduryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṁ śrutam bhaviyati (X)

b. mārapāśa bhindya vidyāndakośaṁ uccchasyati -kleśana-dīṁ ucchasyati -jāti-jāmarāmarāpaśoka-dukkha-daunāskyopāśeṣbhūṣaḥ (X, Z follows X only in inserting -vyādi- and -parideva-).

a. sarīrāṅkṣaret vā kartukāṁ yai śrutam bhaviyati tasya bhagavato bhaisajyaguruvaiduryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṁ śrutam bhaviyati (X, and probably V)
b. avyāpādacittā viharati (Y)

[VYAYA]
yāḥ punah śrutem bhaviyati
tasya bhagavato tathāgatasya
nāmadheyaṃ (Y, Śiks)

b. te tatta cyutveha manusyaloke
rējāno bhaviyanti (Y,Śiks)

c. te rūpasampanṇā atīvaryasam-
pannā parivārasampanṇā śūrā vīrā
mahānāgna-balavagadāhūriṇo bhaviyanti (Y)

[VYYA]
yāḥ punah śrutem bhaviyati
tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ śrutem
bhaviyati (Y,V)

b. te tasya svutteha manusyaloke
rējāno bhaviyanti (Y,Śiks)

c. t(e) rūpasampanṇāḥ ca bhavi-
yati atīvaryasampanṇāḥ ca bhavyah
parivārasampanṇāḥ ca bhaviyati
śūrāḥ ca vīrāḥ ca mahāvalavaga-
dhāriṇāḥ ca bhaviyati (X,V, probably
Z,Śiks)

[VAYYA]
vena punar mātrigrāmena tasya
tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ śrutem
bhaviyati udgrhitam sa tasya paścima
mātrigrāmabhāvah pratikāṃkṣitavyaḥ
(Y,Z,Śiks)

[VYYAY]
yāḥ ca mātrigrāmas tasya tathā-
gatasya (nāma) grhiṣyantī tasya eva
paścimaka śrībhāvah pratikāṃkṣi-
tavyaḥ

[X]: yāḥ ca mātrigrāma tasya bhaga-
vato bhaisajyaguruvidūryasprabhasya
tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ śrutvām
ca grhiṣyanti tasya ca eva paścimacā
tībhāva pratikāṃkṣitavyaḥ (Y,Z,Śiks)

[VAYAYA]
buddhanāmaṃ karṇaputeśupap-
samkarśiyāmi (Y)

b. sūtraṃ dhārayisyanti (Y,V)

c. pustakalikhitam vā satkarisyanti
(Y)

d. nānāpupadākṣeracchattadhvajapetakābhiḥ
(Y)

e. pariveśṭayitvā (Y)

d. nānāpupadākṣeracchattadhvajapetakābhiḥ (V,X and
probably Z)

e. pariveśtya (V,X)
f. devatākoṭīśatasaḥhasrāṇy upaśam-hariṣyanti (Y)

g. yenaṃ sūtraṃ dhārayiṣyanti tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmaḥyeyam pūrvaśrāṇidhānaviśeṣavistarām ca (Y, and probably Z)

h. na ca kenacic chakyaṃ ojaḥprahar- tum Z: -opahati), ṛtaṃ va ojaḥ punāḥ pratyāharanti (Y,Z. The 2nd clause in Z is added in another hand below the line.)

a. bhagavāṃ āha evam etad mam-juśrī tathā yathā vadasi (Y and probably Z)

b. nirmalacittenākalaśacittenā- vyāpaḍacittenā bhavitavyām (Y)

b. X: nirmalacittenākalaśacittenā sarvasatvesu maitracittenā sarva- satvānām antike samacittenā bhavi- tavyām.

b. Z: nirmalacittenākalaśacittenā śvavāpaḍacittenā maitracittenā sarva- satvesu hitacittenā bhavitavyām karuṇācittenā muditācittenā upeka- cittenā samacittenā bhavitavyām

c. idam sūtraṃ prakāśayitavyām (Y)

c. idam ca sūtraṃ pravartayitavyām (X; Z omits the phrase entirely).

c. idam ca sūtraṃ pravartayitavyām (X, and probably Z)

f. devakotānaṃśatasaḥhasrāṇi tatrasamkramiṣyanti (V,X, and probably Z)

d. yady aiśvaryaṃ prārthayanta alpakrocchena labhanti, yadi putra- bhilāśino bhavanti putralābhaṃ pra- tilabhante. ye pāpakaṃ svapnaṃ paś- yanti yatra vāyaseḥ sthito bhavati, durnimittam vā paśyanti yatra sthāne satam alakṣāṃnām upaṃsthito bhavati.
to tasya bhagavato bhaisajyaguru-
vaidūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya pūjā
prakāreṇa pūjābhiśamakāraṃ kuryanti
sarvaduḥṣavapnadurnīmittam cāmāgala-
bhāvā na paśyanti. yeśām agnībhayam
dakabhayen cāndhastibhayam pīṃha-
vāyaṃvīryabhayan iksataraūśīvīsa-
yūṣkaśātendhayen tais tasya
tathāgatasya pūjā kartavyā (Y and
probably Z, although like X it reads
abhiprāthayati and unlike Y or X
it reads tad alpaśrochana and putra
pratilabhate; it ends at durnīmittam
vā paśyā...)

15.1a. ye yathā purīghṛtiḥū śīkṣānam-
yutāt tato 'nyatarūṇyutaṃśīkṣāpanadhā-
braṣṭā bhavanti durgatyaṃvīryabhaya-
bhātā, yasya bhagavato bhaisajya-
guruvaidūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya
namasyanti pūjāṃ kurvanti, na teṣaṁ
tṛyapāyaduhkhāṃ pratiśākṣitavyām
(Y, but the final clause is taken
from Z)

a. ye ca yathāpurīghṛtiḥū śīkṣānam-
yutāt anvātārūṇyutāṃśīkṣāpana-
hraṣṭā bhavanti / sacet te dūrgati-
bhayabhīṭābhātā

tasya bhagavato bhaisajyaguruvaidūrya-
prabharājasya tathāgatasya nāma-dhēya-
ma dhūryeyur yathāvibhavataś ca pūjāṃ
kuryō (X has only nāmadehe,
ma dhūrayeyur) / na bhūyas teṣāṁ apāyapatiḥ
pratiśākṣitavyā (X and Śīkṣā)

b. yah kaścit mātṛgrāmaḥ prasavana-
+v. yasa ca mātṛgrāmaḥ prasavana-kāle
kāle atīvatiṃvā daṃkhāṃ vedaṇām
tīvṛāṃ daṃkhāṃ kharāṃ kaṭṭukāṃ vedaṇām
vedavyati, yun tasya bhagavato bhaisju-
ja-vedavyati yun tasya bhagavato bhaisajya-
guruvaidūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya
yaguruvaidūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya
namasyati pūjā ca kurvati śīghram
parīṃcayati. (Z, and probably Y)

vaidūryaprabhāya tathāgataya pūjā
kartavyāṃ sarvaduḥṣavapnadurnīmitti-
āṃmadālañā ca bhāva pradasmiyati

eyāṃ agnīmāṇaśīkaṇā śāstraśradāte
caṃḍhastāśīṃgha-vyāgharikā-
raṣkādvīṇikā śīkṣāśīkṣaśātakaṇāda
dāmaṃsakādbhayany na bhavati tena
tasya tathāgatasya pūjā kartavyā (E) (X)

c. na tasya śākyam amānaṃṣa ojo
gruḥītum (X)
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a. tathāgatasya guṇān varṇayiṣyāmi
(Sīkṣ: varṇayiṣyāmi) (Y, Sīkṣ)

b. na me etra (X) kāṃkṣā na (Z, Sīkṣ: vā) vimatir vā vicikitsā vā tathāgata-

bhāṣiteṣu gūtrāntase (X,Z, Sīkṣ)

c. aprīduddhakāyavāmanahāṃśamudā-
cāraḥ (Y,Z)

d. sūryacandramānov...prthivyāṃ

nipatetā (Y,Z)

e. parvatarājā sthānāt samkromet
(Y,Z)

f. teṣāṃ evaṃ bhavati (Y,Z,Sīkṣ)

g. nāmadheyaṃ anumānaṃātrenā (Y,Z)

h. ettakā guṇānuṣamsā (Y,Z,Sīkṣ)

i. anarthayāhitāyāsukhāya vinipatāya (Y,Z,Sīkṣ)

J. yeṣāṃ tasya tathāgatasya nāma-
dheyaṃ karnanite nipateta (Y,Z)

k. asthānam ānandānavakāsō ... yat

tasya durgatiprayāyaṃmanam bhavet
(Y,Z,Sīkṣ)

l. kalpena vā kalpāvaseṣeṇa vā (Y)

bodhisatvacārikaṃ vistareṇa sampra-
kāhyayām (Y,Z)

[17]a. tena ca punaḥ samayena tas-
minn eva parṣādi (Z: tatra pariṣā-
yām) trāṇamukto ... mahāsaṃvā sa

utthāyāsanād ekāṃsaṃ cīvaram prā-
vyṛtya (Y,Z)

a. tathāgatasya guṇān varṇayiṣyāmi
(Sīkṣ: varṇayiṣyāmi) (X, Sīkṣ)
b. yā ca tasya puruṣasya sahajā
pratīṭhānubaddhā devatā, yat tena
kusalam vā akuśalam vā kṛtam bhavet
tac ca sulikhitam kṛtvā (Y)

c. ye tasya bhagavato bhaṣajya-
guruvaidūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya
sārangam ganiṣṭvantī tasyātūrasyārth-
āyadrīṣṭe prayogena pūjām kurvānti
(Y, and Z except that after ganiṣṭ-
yanti it has tena tasyātūrasyāxxāna
prayogena pūjā kartavyā)

d. navacatvārīṃśatime (Y, Z)
e. tasya tathāgatasya pūjā kart-
vyāh (Y, probably Z)

(189a. athāyuṣmān āndandes trāṇāmuk-
tasya bhojāntavyānām ṣāna (Y)
b. sapta rātrīṃdviasan aṣṭāngasa-
manvagatam upasadhasavyām prhitā-
vyan (Y)
c. trīskṛtvā rātrau trīskṛtvā
dīvase tasya bhagavato bhaṣajya-
guruvaidūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya
namavītavyām (Y)
d. navacatvārīṃśatime dīpāḥ pradīpi-
tavyāḥ, sapta pratimā kartavyāḥ, a-
kalśāḥ pratimāvāḥ sapta sapta dīpāḥ
sthāryitavyāḥ (Y)
e. yadi navacatvārīṃśatime dīvase
āloko na kṣiyate pancaramūkṣī ca
patākā navacatvārīṃśāḥ ārtikā (?)
kartavyāḥ (Y)

b. yā ca tasya sātvasya sahajānu-
vaddhā devatā svā yatikmci tena puruṣa-
kusalam akuśalam bā kṛtam bhavati ta
sarvam sulikhitam kṛtvā (Y)

c. tatra xx te mitraṁnātisālohitāsā
tasya tūrasyārthāya taṁ bhagav(x)x
bhaṣajya-guruvaidūryaprabhas tathāgatam
sārangam gaccheyus tasya tathāgatasya
pūjām kurya (X)

d. ekonapamūḍatime (X)
e. tasya bhagavato bhaṣajya-guru-
-vidūryaprabhasa tathāgatasya-nāmuḥccheyam
dhārayeṣṭvāya 'yathā samvidyānāna ca
pūjām kartavyā (X)

c. yadi ekonaaḥ sa dīpā prajāvālītvāyā
saṃkṣara pratiṃdā kartavyā ekākhyā prati-
mayā sapta dīpāḥ prajāvalītvāḥ (X)

d. ekonapamūḍa sa dīpā prajāvalītvāyā
saṃkṣara pratiṃdā kartavyā ekākhyā prati-
mayā sapta dīpāḥ prajāvalītvāḥ (X)

e. yady ekonaaḥ sa dīvase āloko na
kṣiyate veditavyām sarvasona dīta
pancaramūkṣī ca patākā ekonapam-
cam̄kta kartavyā (X)
[19]a. vyādhipīḍā vā svacakra-prapā-
cakrapāḍā vā naksatra-prapāḍā vā nak-
stra-prapāḍā vā kālena vātavṛtīpīḍā vā
anāvṛtīpīḍā vā (Y, perhaps Z)

b. bandhane vā mokṣa tavyā (Y)

c. tathāgatosya pūjā kar-
tavyā yathāpūrvvoktā (Y, Z)

d. pürvaprajādhānavīśesaṇa (Y, Z)

e. kālena vātavṛtīsasyaṃ sam-
patsyati (Y)

[20]a. ānandās trāṇamuktasya vānāha
(Y, Z)

b. santi navākālamaṇaṇāni tena
muntrunāsadhiprayogā upaḍīḍā (Y, Z)

c. yadi vā vaiḍvānō abhaśajyaṃ
kurventy etad prathamān akālama-
raṇām (Y)

d. ye sīmahāvyāghra-gālavyāde-
canḍamārga-madhyagataḥ bhavantī (Y)

e. ete samkṣeṣpāṇa mahantā akāla-
maṇāṇā nava tathāgatena nirdīśāt
anye cāprameyākālamaṇaḥ (Y, W)

[21]a. atha tatra parsadī dvādaśa
mahāyakṣasenāpatayānāṃ samipatītā
abhūvam: kimbhīro mahāyakṣasenāpati,
vētro mahāyakṣasenāpati, etc. (Y)

b. ekavacenna bhagavatam evam śūnya (Y)
In looking at these 'differences' we can immediately make a certain number of general observations. First, for a small text there are a surprisingly large number of differences. Second, apart from one or two ambiguous cases, none of these 'differences' can be explained as the result of scribal errors. This is not to say that scribal error does not occasionally produce differences in our Mss.; but generally the purely scribal nature of the difference is obvious. Obvious cases of this kind I have excluded from the above list since simple scribal errors or mechanical corruptions due to transmission cannot be used as indicators of legitimate redactional differences (although they are often important indicators for determining the relationship of one Ms. to another).

Third, a considerable number of these differences fall into more or less clearly delimitable categories. These categories are of interest and we will look at them in more detail:

*Recasting into standardized sūtra phraseology:* This is perhaps one of the most interesting categories, and its occurrence goes in a uniform direction. It is always redaction A which exhibits the reading in non-standardized phraseology, and always Redaction B which shows the 'recast' and standardized version. I have noted the following examples: [1]a. (esp. the yena ... tenn ... construction), [1]b (which also falls into another category 'variation in lists'), [2]a (although the reading of A is found elsewhere, B represents the more common expression), [5.1]a, [7]b (the change in B to smaranā-), [13]a (cf. [16]13), [13]b and [13]g (the addition of -ratna in B), [13]c, [14]a, [16]k (nedām, etc.), [17]a, [18]a, [18]b (upavāsam, etc.), [20]a, [21]a (yaduta ... nāma, etc.), [21]b (-kānṭhena in B). It should be noted that occasionally the 'recasting' amounts to no more than changing a single word (or the form of a word). Such cases then also fall into the category 'Substitution of a word'.

*Making explicit in one redaction what is implicit in the other:* This again is a very interesting category and here too its occurrence goes in a uniform direction. It is always Redaction B which makes explicit what is only implied in Redaction A. In two cases in A where the referrent of a pronoun is potentially ambiguous, B makes that referrent explicit: [17]c, where A's ye in B appears as te mitrajñātisālohitāsā; and [17]b where A's tenn appears in B as tenn puruṣena. Other cases, not involving pronouns are: [5.1]b (B's tamiḍānam), [5.12]b (B's upadrutā), [11]b (B's upapatsyate), [15]a (B's vacetō), [18]e (B's veditavya, etc.), [19]b
Use of \( \sqrt{bhū} \): Redaction A exhibits a distinct tendency to use \( \sqrt{bhū} \) very sparingly, connecting a whole string of predicate adjectives with a single \( \sqrt{bhū} \), where redaction B uses four \([7]b, [11]c \) or alters the construction considerably \((15)a \). In two cases A does without a \( \sqrt{bhū} \) where B has inserted one \((8)a, [17]b \); in the latter it is not \( \sqrt{bhū} \), but syā[t]). \([13]g \) exhibits a similar pattern with the verb \( \sqrt{dhr} \); where A uses only one, B shows two.


Transposition of the verb to the end of the phrase: Redaction B shows an unwillingness to have the main verb of a phrase or sentence anywhere but at the end; Redaction A shows no such unwillingness. Several of the cases which are to be classified here involve a formula repeated throughout the text. In A this formula always appears as: yai śrutam bhaviṣyati tasya bhagavato bhaisajyaguruvidgūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṁ, while in B it always appears something like: yais tasya bhagavato bhaisajyaguruvidgūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṁ śrutam bhaviṣyati, so \([8]b, [9]a, [10]a, [11]a, [12] \). Other examples of the same phenomenon, not connected with this formula, are to be found at \([5.10]b, [13]g \), and probably at \([19]c \).

Variation in the number of items in a list: This category can be further sub-divided into 1) lists in compound where there are fewer items in A than in B: \([1]b, [5.10]b, [5.11]a, [9]b, [13]f \); 2) lists in compounds where there are fewer items in B than in A: \([7]b, [13]d, [16]k \);
3) Lists not in compound where there are fewer items in A than in B: [8]a, [14]b, [15]b (series of adjs.) [17]e (epithets). There is also one case where in a list not in compound there are more items in A than in B, [19]a; and one passage where in lists both in and out of compound there are more items in B than in A, [14]d. The only observation that can be made here is that there is a tendency, although not unduly strong, for B to show lists with more items than the corresponding lists in A.

We might also add here two cases where there is a difference in the order or sequence of the same items in a list: [7]b, [13]d.


Substitution of one word for another: [5.10]a, [10]a, [12], [14]d, [15]a, [16]b, [16]h, [16]l, [17]b, [18]b, [18]b, [21]b. In virtually all these cases the word in B has a similar or related meaning to the corresponding word in A, and generally there does not appear to be any definite reason - apart from the individual taste of the redactors - to account for the difference. The three possible exceptions are [16]h, [18]b (A: upośadhasamvaram, B: upavāsam) and [21]b, where the reading of B seems to represent a change to a more standardized piece of vocabulary.

Differences in word-order: [5.1]b, [13]g, [16]d, [17]c, [18]c, [19]c. These differences do not seem to exhibit any particular patterns; at most they can only indicate a slight change in emphasis.

Omissions in B of material in A: The three examples in this category must be viewed with some caution. It is not impossible that they might represent cases of simple scribal omission. The only point I can urge against this possibility is that in these Mss. simple scribal omissions - and there are a number of them - generally are not so neat. The omission is hardly ever of an entire self-contained phrase or sentence as in these three cases; it is, rather, almost always purely mechanical, resulting in

Of omissions in A of material in B I can find no firm examples which are not accounted for by other categories. For example, most, if not all, of the examples given under my second category could possibly - but I think wrongly - be described as examples of omissions in A of material in B. There are other instances of the same kind.

Variation in the form of numerals: This is a small category of only three definite examples: [17]d, [18]d, [18]e.

Apart from the one category of doctrinally significant variants which will be dealt with below, the above constitute the major categories or patterns of variation which I am able to discern. However, there are a significant number of examples which do not seem to fit into any pattern; the reading in A simply differs from the reading of B. Examples of this kind are [3]a, [4]c,d, [5.5]b, [5.9]a, [5.12]a, [9]b (although B here appears to be corrupt), [20]b. We should probably also add here [5.4]a and [14]d, where the material in A appears to have been condensed in B. This is an important group. Taken as a whole, the presence of examples of this kind seems to establish the principle that in prose we can expect a significant number of redactional differences which do not follow any pattern and which do not have any obvious explanation.

The final group of variants to be discussed is also the only group which appears to have a definite doctrinal significance. The variation here involves the presence or absence in a given passage of reference to hearing or preserving the name of the Buddha Bhaśajaguru. If we look at the wording of the twelve vows, the first thing we notice is that our data is unfortunately incomplete: In the first four vows there is no reference to the nāmadheya in any of the Mss. The first reference we encounter is in [5.5]4; here both X and Z (= B) have the same basic reading in terms of the name: mā ca kasyaci śīlavipannasya mama nāmadheyaṃ śrutvā (mā kaci, X only) durgatigamanam syāt, with which T only partially corresponds: ...bdag gi mān thos nas / bdag gi mthus ... However, it is important to note that Y, the basis for Redaction A, is here lost. For the 6th, 7th and 8th vow only B is preserved so we have no basis for
comparison except T. For the 6th and 7th T, like B, has reference to the name; but for the 8th, while B has reference to the name, T does not. In none of our sources for the 9th vow (A, B and T) is there mention of the name. For the 10th A has te madhyena punyānubhāvena parimucyeron sarvopadravebyaḥ, and T dbag gi bood nams kyi mthus gnod pa thams cad las yongs su thar bar gyur cig; but B has te mama nāmādhayyaṃ bravaṇa maḍīyena punyānubhāvena, etc. For the 11th A has ahāṃ teṣāṃ varṇagandharasopeteṇāraṇa śatīraṃ santarpayeṣaṃ, and T agrees with A; but B has sacē te mama nāmādhayyaṃ dhārayeyur ahāṃ teṣāṃ, etc. In the 12th vow we find exactly the same pattern, A and T not having reference to the name, but B having it. In terms of the vows alone, for those cases where our data is complete, we can note a distinct difference between Redaction A and Redaction B: in every case the latter incorporates a reference to hearing or preserving the name in its version of the vow where the former has none.

In those passages not directly connected with the vows the pattern, at least initially, is somewhat different. In [7], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12], and [13], in all our sources there is reference to hearing or preserving the name. At [15]a, however, this changes. Here A has ye tasya bhagavato bhaisajyaguruṇaḥ práyaṃprabhasya tathāgatasya namasyanti pūjāṃ kuryaṃ na teṣāṃ tryopayuddhakham pratikāṅkṣaṭeyam; T: ... sman gyi bla bai dū rya'i od de la mchod pa rnam pa sna tshogs byed na ... ; B, on the other hand has sacet te ... tasya bhagavato bhaisajyaguruṇaḥ práyaṃprabhasya tathāgatasya namādhayyaṃ dhārayeyur ... Again at [15]b A has tathāgatasya namasyanti pūjā ca kuryanti, T has ... bai dū rya'i od de la mchod na, but B reads tathāgatasya namādhayyaṃ anumānyai ca pūjā ca kuryo. The same pattern is also to be observed at [17]c where A has tasya tathāgatasya pūjā kartavyaḥ, which T follows exactly. But B has tasya bhagavato bhaisajyaguruṇaḥ práyaṃprabhasya tathāgatasya namādhayyaṃ dhārayeyam yathā saṃviṣyāmāṇā ca pūjāṃ kartavyaḥ. There is one final example which exhibits a pattern not found elsewhere in that A and B agree, but T differs: A and B have: bhaisajyaguruṇaḥ práyaṃprabhasya tathāgatasya namasyitavyam, but T de bzin gsegs pa sman gyi bla bai dūrya'i od de'i mtshan yid la bya'o [18]7.

Any generalization concerning the relationship between Redactions A and B in reference to the presence or absence of references to hearing or preserving the name must be prefaced with the statement that hearing or preserving the name has an important place in both redactions. This is
amply demonstrated by sections [7] through [13]. In addition to this, however, it is clear that in Redaction B this importance receives considerably greater emphasis: the name, judging from the number of references to it, has become increasingly more significant. Incidentally it might be noted that this tendency is not without a certain comparative interest as regards the relationship between the Larger and Smaller Sukhāvatī-vyūha-sūtras in reference to the relative importance that each attaches to hearing the name of Amitābha.

Stepping back from this mass of detail, we can make only a few general observations. We can say with certainty that there were at least two distinct redactions - which I have labelled A and B - of the Bhaiṣajyaguru-sutra circulating at Gilgit at the same time. When we compare these two redactions we observe that in relation to A, B shows a significant tendency to express itself in more standardized sūtra phraseology, to make explicit what is only implied or potentially ambiguous in A, to make increasing use of forms of ṣv bhū in constructing its sentences, to transpose the verb to the end of the phrase or sentence, and to emphasize more strongly the importance of hearing or preserving the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru. Now under different circumstances all these 'tendencies' would argue for the chronological priority of A. If, for example, A was a Gilgit Ms. and B a 13th century Nepalese Ms, such an argument would be obvious. But our situation is different: on the basis of place of origin and script, there is absolutely nothing to indicate that the Mss. of A and the Mss. of B were anything but contemporaneous. This, of course, does not necessarily say anything about the relative chronology of the two redactions which these contemporaneous Mss. contain, but it does indicate the need for some caution. If we are to take B as a later, revised redaction of A - and this is what the 'tendencies' mentioned above would indicate - what we would want is some evidence of a direct dependence of B on A. Here, fortunately, there is one piece of evidence which might establish such a dependence. [20] in A - and here A = Y and B = X, these being the only Mss. which preserve the passage - begins by saying atha tatra pārśadī dvādeśa mahāyakṣaseṇāpatayāḥ sannipatīḥ abhūvan, and then the individual yakṣa-generals are listed by name. But A, in spite of the 'twelve' of its first sentence, gives only eleven names. The corresponding passage in B is exasperatingly fragmentary. Still, and here I quote from my note on the passage [20]n.14, "Although two names are obliterated in X, it is clear that it had contained only eleven names; the number of akṣaras
exactly corresponds (allowing, that is, for the uniform insertion of nāma in X) to the number of aksaras in Y (cf. notes 8 and 13); and in spite of some variation in spelling X appears to have given the names in the same order". In spite of the fact that the fragmentary nature of X precludes absolute certainty, this passage seems to be a clear case of the direct dependence of X on Y. It is virtually impossible to assume that exactly the same highly visible omission could have taken place in exactly the same way in both X and Y independently. It is extremely unlikely, given the 'tendencies' of B noted above, that A was in any way dependent on B. If this evidence is accepted as proof that X is directly dependent on Y, then in light of this dependence, and in light of the clear 'tendencies' of B vis-à-vis A, it seems altogether reasonable to describe B as representing a conscious, primarily stylistic, revision or updating of the text as preserved in A. But the situation found in [20] has one additional important implication. If it shows that the redactor of B based himself on A, it also shows that he did not have access to any other Ms.. tradition or single Ms. which would have allowed him to correct this immediately obvious omission. The importance of this observation becomes obvious when we look at Z.

In considering Ms. Z it is necessary to note again that there is nothing to indicate that it is not roughly contemporaneous with Ms. X and Y. Given this, and given the fact that the redactor of X appears not to have had access to a Ms. or Ms. tradition on the basis of which he could have corrected the omission in [20], there appear to be at least two possibilities in reference to Z: either Z itself had the same reading as Y and was therefore both directly dependent on and slightly later than Y (again, it is virtually impossible to assume that the same omission occurred independently in both); or Z may be slightly later than X (and, therefore, also Y) and would not have been available to the redactor of X. In both possibilities Z appears to be slightly later than Y, so the real question concerns its position in reference to X. As I have indicated above, on the basis of the "corrections" made in it, Z appears to represent a conflated Ms. When we look at the actual readings of Z we find what might appear to be a similar pattern. In nine cases Z shows a reading which agrees with X against Y ([7]b, [11]b,c, [13]a,b,c,d,f, [19]b); in four cases Z has a reading which differs from both X and Y, but is closest to X ([7]a, [8]a, [14]a, [15]a); in thirty-one cases the reading of Z agrees with Y against X ([8]b,c, [9]a,b, [12], [13]g,h, [14]a,d, [15]b, [16]a,b,
c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, l, [17]a, c, d, e, [19]a, c, d, [20]a, b,}; and in four cases Z differs from X, but Y is missing ([5.4]a, [5.5]a, b, [15]c). Since Z shares readings with both Y and X here again there are at least two possibilities: 1) either Z represents an initial revision of Y which was then even further revised to produce X; or 2) Z represents a version which resulted from attempting to combine the version of Y with the version of X. The two possibilities might be represented in the following way:

```
either: Y - earliest version  or Y earliest version
        at Gilgit                          Z combined version
        ↓                                  ↓
Z - initial revision              X revised version
        ↓
X - further revision
```

It is very difficult to choose between these two possibilities. As we have seen above the "corrected" version of Z could not have been arrived at on the basis of either X or Y alone; it presupposes either a comparison of X and Y, or a text, now no longer extant, which already had readings which sometimes agree with X and sometimes with Y. That is to say, on the basis of the "corrections", Z appears to presuppose the existence of a version of the text now represented by X. But I think it is easy to make too much of this. It is perfectly reasonable to suppose that the corrections to Z were added, if we accept the first possibility, after the "further revision" which produced X was already completed. This would only require that the earlier versions (Y and Z) continued to be read after the further revision into X was accomplished. It should also be borne in mind that those "corrections" in Z concern only a very small part of the entire text, and that when we consider the text as a whole, it is obvious that Z is much closer to Y than to X. This, of course, is difficult to explain if Z is the final form of the text at Gilgit. It would mean that someone intentionally restored several instances of non-standardized phraseology, irregular syntax, etc. This is contrary to anything we would expect in a final revision or updating, and argues more or less strongly for the priority of Z to X. This in turn suggests that the first of the two possibilities noted above is the most likely, that we have in our three main Mss. three different stages of the stylistic development of the text: Y represents the earliest form of the text at Gilgit; Z, an initial revision of the text; and X, a further revision
and, as far as we can tell, the final form of the text at Gilgit. It is important to note that this scheme is presented only as "the most likely possibility". The material available does not allow for any stronger statement. It should also be noted that the scheme presented here applies to the development of the text at Gilgit only, and not to any complete history of the text as a whole; such a history would have to take into account the evidence of both the Chinese and Tibetan translations. But even with this restriction, and even allowing for the fact that the evolution of the text as we see it is possibly a purely local development restricted to Gilgit, still the situation is not without some interesting implications. It clearly presents us with an instance where a single text circulated at the same place and roughly at the same time in three stylistically distinct redactions. It is here important to emphasize again that Y, Z and X cannot be separated from one another by anything but a relatively small space of time, and that they were all available to the Gilgit community at least just prior to the time when the stūpa in which they were discovered was sealed. This single, fairly well established instance should serve as a warning that a text may change considerably in style and even in doctrinal emphasis within a very short time, that two or more redactions of a single text may have been circulating at virtually the same time in the same place. It will, in any case, make it necessary to use even greater care in framing chronological arguments on the basis of what might appear to be far reaching redactional differences, or in emending a text on the basis of some hypothetical, single, "original" reading.

Before concluding this section I must say a few words about V and W, and about the quotations from our text in the Śiksāsamuccaya. V consists of a single leaf and therefore any statement in reference to its relation to one or the other of our redactions can be only tentative. It is involved in thirteen of the variants we have set out above in two columns ([10]a to [13]g). In eleven of these its readings agree with X against Y; in one ([12]) it has a reading which differs from both X and Y, but is closer to the former; and in one case it agrees with Y against X ([13]b). This final case is not of great significance; where Y and V have sūtram, X has sūtraratnam. On the basis of the single leaf available, then, it appears that V, like X, preserved a text belonging to our Redaction B. For W our classification can only be even more tentative: it consists of a single small fragment of a single leaf, and represents the last part
of [20] and the beginning of [21]. The only indication of redactional affiliation is that it, like X and unlike Y, inserts nāma after the names of the yakṣasena-patis listed in [21]. In reference to Śiksā the situation, though more complicated, is not any more certain. It contains the text for almost all of [11], the whole of [12], about half of [15], and about three quarters of [16]. Although these quotations represent a not insignificant portion of our text, the readings in Śiksā do not correspond exactly to the readings in any one of our three main Ms. Because the text of Śiksā sometimes shares its readings with Y, and sometimes with X, it is possible to take it, like Z, as representing a transitional state of the text; but although Śiksā, it is by no means identical with it. Two points come to mind in reference to the text as it is found in Śiksā: the lack of agreement between it and any one of our three Ms. may lend some weight to the observation made above that the relationships we discovered among the Gilgit Ms. may in fact represent a purely local development; or, this lack of agreement may be attributable to the fact that Śāntideva may have been quoting from memory and did not actually have a text of Bhāg before him. These possibilities, of course, are not mutually exclusive.

Finally, as a kind of footnote to all that has been said above, I must point out that my observations are entirely based on the written Ms. tradition of Bhāg at Gilgit. I have not taken into account the possible role or influence of a possibly contemporaneous oral 'Ms.' tradition which may have been current there. This, of course, is because it is impossible to know anything definite concerning such an oral tradition, although I readily concede that the possibility of there having been such a tradition is very strong, and acknowledge the fact that it would undoubtedly have had a considerable impact on the written tradition. The only thing I can say here is that it seems to me that Y might represent the earliest attempt at Gilgit to reduce an oral tradition of the text to writing. About the relationship of the further literary 'revisions' or refinements to any oral tradition I can say nothing which would not be pure speculation. On the possible influence of oral on written traditions see the interesting paper recently published by Georg v. Simson, "Zur Phrase yena ... tenopajārajā / upetya und ihren Varianten im buddhistischen Sanskrit", Beiträge zur Indienforschung (Berlin: 1977) 479-88. In addition to this question, Simson's paper raises another question which is directly relevant to the Ms. traditions
This is the question of what does or does not constitute an actual variant of the kind of formula he is discussing. He cites a number of examples of his formula, yena ... tenopasamśkrāmat / upetya ..., yena ... tenopasamakramāt / upasākramya ..., etc. Now I do not think anyone would hesitate to classify X's bhagavām ... yaina vaisālim mahānagarim-tenānaprāptto bhūt at [1]a as a variant of this formula. But when we look at the corresponding reading in Y the situation is much more difficult. Y has bhagavām ... vaisālim anuprāptto. That this is a variant of the formula would, I think, be difficult to maintain. As a matter of fact, it is perhaps best characterized, vis-à-vis X, as a piece of 'preformulaic' prose. Such an instance highlights both the need for establishing some kind of definite limits for the acceptable range of formulaic variation, and the utility of formulaic considerations once such limits are established.

III. Notes On and Towards a Methodology.

It should be made clear from the very beginning that my intention was not to reconstruct the text of a hypothetically conceived 'original' version of Bhg, nor to assemble from the various Ms. a single text which was supposed to present the sum of the 'best' possible readings. This appeared to be both undesirable as well as methodologically impossible given the material before me. As a matter of fact, this material - five Ms. representing at least two, and probably three, redactions, but all of approximately the same date and all coming from exactly the same place - presents an essentially new situation to the text-critic and editor, a situation in which the conventional procedures of text-criticism usually applied to Sanskrit Buddhist texts either do not work or work only imperfectly.

The five Ms. of Bhg found at Gilgit differ among themselves to a greater or lesser degree in almost any given phrase, but - and this is an important 'but' - although they differ, given their virtual identity of date and actual identity of place of origin, we have at present no legitimate criteria which could be applied to justify the selection of one 'correct' reading in preference to another which, though different, is equally 'correct'. There is, in short, no way of declaring one reading more 'valid' or 'correct' than another. And we are here not talking about only one or two places in the text. For the majority of the redactional differences listed above we have no explanation (e.g. 'substitution of
one verb for another', 'substitution of one word for another', etc.). They simply differ. (Cf. the remarks of C. Regamey, "Motifs vichnouites et éviaîtes dans le Kāraṇḍavyūha", Études tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou (Paris: 1971) 418, where it is clear that in editing the Kāraṇḍavyūha he has encountered and is struggling with similar — if exactly the same — problems.)

Confronted by this situation, the only methodologically sound procedure seemed to be to take one of the five Mss. as the basis of an edition, to *in effect edit this one Ms.*, and give the variants from the other Mss. only in the critical apparatus. After studying all the Mss., I chose Y as the one Ms. I would edit for two important reasons: 1) it was one of the two most complete Mss. (X being the other); and 2) it appeared to represent an unrevised, and therefore earlier written redaction of the text. By choosing to edit Y I arrived at what appeared to be the only legitimate criterion for the selection of readings: I chose in effect to prefer the readings of Y over any others. Even in those cases where one or more of the other Mss. had a reading which — assuming a hypothetical 'correct' text — appeared to give a 'better' text in terms of grammar, syntax, style or meaning, I have as a general principle preferred the reading of Y or a reasonable emendation based on that reading. There are very few and only minor exceptions to this. This procedure seemed to me to be the only effective means of bracketing any question of ultimate validity or correctness and of avoiding premature or subjective judgement.

For those portions of the text for which Y was missing — the most important being [5.2] to [5.6] — other procedures were obviously required. In such cases, if I had Z — as I did at [5.2] to [5.6] — and if Z differed from X, I have preferred Z over X. The procedure here is based on the observation that in the variants studied above in two out of every three cases Z agreed with Y against X. Now although I have admitted these readings of Z into the text of Redaction A, they cannot be accepted as legitimate readings of that redaction without reservation. It is possible, for example, that although Z differs from X, it might also have differed from Y (as at [7]a, [8]a, [14]a, and [15]a). Their admission into the text is, therefore, open to doubt. In those cases where I had X alone, its reading was of necessity adopted, *but always in brackets*. That is to say, that it is not meant to be taken as representing the text of Redaction A.
It is perhaps worth pointing out that in choosing to edit a single manuscript, and in taking that manuscript as representative of a separate redaction, I have in fact followed the general procedure adopted in what is to my knowledge the most recent attempt to distinguish redactional differences in the manuscript tradition of a Buddhist text. For this is, in regard to the general principle, exactly what A. Yuyama has done in his recently published Prājñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-pāthā (Sanskrit Recension A) (Cambridge: 1976). Given the almost total lack of discussion in the literature regarding the characteristics and criteria by which redactional differences can or should be established, it is to be all the more regretted that Dr. Yuyama did not give us a detailed discussion of the method and principles by which he worked (cf. my review of this edition in UIJ 20 (1978) 110-24).

My choice of Y as the manuscript I would edit, and the consequent acceptance of it as the criterion for the selection of readings, had important further consequences. As will already be obvious from the table of redactional differences and my comments there, I now think that Y represents an 'unrevised' text, a kind of 'rough draft' (it might, in fact, represent a first attempt at Gilgit to commit an oral tradition to writing). By its very nature then, the text I have established as Redaction A lacks any number of the stylistic conventions and phraseological niceties common to Mahayana Sutra prose. Judged by the standards of similar prose found in late Nepalese manuscripts (i.e., prose which has been subjected to hundreds of years of written conventions) it is syntactically very clumsy and grammatically peculiar. It is, in short, not what we are wont to think of as a 'correct' text. But on the assumption that I was right in thinking that Y represented an 'unrevised' text, then, since the preservation of such an 'unrevised' version is, in my experience, unique, I was very reluctant to make any but minor changes in the text. I only very reluctantly 'corrected' faults in subject-verb agreement, in forms of verbs or verbal endings, in declensional endings, spelling, etc. The same is true of syntax. For example, there were a number of places where X read a pronoun, and where the inclusion of a pronoun would have given an easier, less clumsy reading for the phrase, but I intentionally excluded the pronoun from my text, admitting it only when its absence meant serious ambiguity or unintelligibility. In brief, my intention was to preserve as much as possible of the text's 'unrevised' character and still present a readable text - readable; not fluent, 'correct' or unproblematic.
My treatment of sandhi departs in some ways from the above. In comparing the sandhi found in Y with that found not only in the four other MSS. of Bhg, but also to that found in virtually all the MSS from Gilgit, it seemed to me obvious that Y was, in terms of sandhi, in no way unique. It exhibits the same features, or absence of features, as are found throughout the collection. Since establishing definite criteria would have involved a minute and detailed study of the entire collection, and since neither time nor temperament would allow this, I adopted the following principle out of sheer editorial expediency: if any one Ms. had the correct 'classical' form, I adopted it. If none had the 'correct' form I generally preferred the form found in Y.

In my remarks above on redactional differences I have analyzed, more correctly, classified - however provisionally - the major peculiarities of syntax and style. I have not done the same for the grammatical peculiarities, and this for the following reason: Bhg is a very short text and as a consequence any generalizations which might be generated from an analysis of it alone could have little if any validity. Since the Gilgit texts allow for a definite periodization of the written tradition of Mahāyāna Sūtra prose (i.e., we can see there what this prose actually looked like in the 5th-6th century), what is needed is an analysis of the 'grammar' of the whole collection. Only then will we have definite criteria by which individual variations can be judged. Until then it is perhaps a dubious undertaking to analyze any one individual text in terms, say, of its variation from classical norms, or even those of BHSC (the latter being based to a large degree on verse and on editions - not actual manuscript usage - of late Nepalese material). With this in mind I have left a number of grammatical problems unresolved in my text. Some are treated in notes to the edition or translation, some are not. The latter are not treated because I had nothing intelligent to say about them and because I did not see the point in trying to explain or account for isolated instances of what might turn out to be - when the whole collection is studied - only examples of a common practice. In such cases my own interpretation - not explanation - can be seen in my translation.

I might here take a particular example to illustrate the above remarks. At [5.4.] my edition reads 'ham kunārargapratiṣṭhāpanāḥ satvā bodhimūrga pratiṣṭhāpayeyam śrāvakamārgapratiṣṭhāpanāḥ pratyekabuddhamārgapratiṣṭhāpanā vā sarve mahāyāna niyojya pratiṣṭhāpayeyam'. This is the reading of Z,
but śrāvakārga-pratipannāḥ, etc.] is restored on the basis of the Tib. Obviously, however, the -āḥ is not restored on that basis. I have supplied it on the basis of the preceding -pannāḥ. I could have equally restored it as -ā on the basis of the following -pannā. Or I could have given it as -pannā, the 'correct' form. If I would have taken the last alternative I would have also had to 'correct' the entire passage as well, reading ..kumārgapratipannāḥ satvām ... śrāvakārgapratipannāḥ pratyekabuddhā-
āčārāgpratipannāḥ ... That is to say that I would have had to presuppose that -āḥ and -ā were simply scribal errors for -ān (probably through -ām and the consequent easy omission of the anusvāra for -ā; and through a substitution of visarga for anusvāra for -āḥ; or even some 'rule' of Gilgit sandhi, e.g. [14] n.49, [19] n.27). This is one alternative. Another would have been to read -āḥ and -ā and to see in them instances of masc. acc. pl. endings in -āḥ and in -ā. A third alternative would have been to read -āḥ and -ā, and in translating to take them implicitly as acc.s (context makes it clear that they cannot be anything else), while bracketing the question of whether they should be interpreted as scribal errors or as legitimate declensional endings. Now I am well aware that most people would have almost automatically opted for the first alternative (with the equally automatic assumption that the individuals who actually preserved these texts were a lot of linguistic bumpkins who had nothing like our present wisdom.) I could not take this alternative chiefly for two reasons: first I found it methodologically impossible to presuppose a 'correct' original text for Bhg (if anything the movement in the Mss. of Bhg at Gilgit is not from a 'correct' to an 'incorrect' text, but the reverse); secondly, because acc.s in -āḥ or -ā are found several times in Bhg ([5.9], [10], [14] n.49, etc.), and even a cursory examination of those Gilgit texts which have been carefully edited indicates that such endings are not infrequent (E. Conze, The Gilgit Manuscript of the Aṣṭādaśaśāhas- rikāprajñāpāramitā, Chapters 70 to 82 (Rome: 1974) 25.19, 21; 41.8, 14, 15; 46.12; Y. Kurumiya, Raimakṣaparivarta, Sanskrit Text (Kyoto: 1978) 173.12; etc. etc.). This is not to say that I think the first alternative is wrong (it very possibly is not). It did seem to me, however, that there were more than enough indications to make it clear that to assume it was right was itself wrong. The second alternative was also problematic. Its adoption would have required either that the 'results' of an analysis based on a single small text be accepted as legitimate; or that a grammatical investigation of the entire Gilgit collection be undertaken. Neither
of these - for different reasons - was acceptable. This left the third alternative and, although for those who want in an edition a 'correct' text with all of the problems accounted for this may not be very comforting, I have followed this alternative throughout, both in regard to those accusatives and in regard to a number of other 'grammatical' problems.

Behind much of my thinking on all these matters was an observation the true significance of which I cannot determine. The observation is this: as we have seen above X and especially Z have been "corrected" by someone, but these corrections never concern what appear to us as faults of grammar, sandhi, etc. As a matter of fact the "corrections" themselves sometimes contain such faults. What does this say about the way the individual who took the trouble to correct these Mss. saw what we see as errors of grammar, etc.? This question is perhaps more important than has generally been recognized. The way it is eventually answered will have definite consequences for any theory of editorial procedure.

I must also note here another external factor which influenced my methodology because it, in large measure, accounts for the fact that I may not have been as consistent in my handling of the variants as some might have liked. This factor was the continuous and seemingly inexorable increase in the size of the critical apparatus. I had to constantly attempt to keep it within reasonable bounds. In terms of my handling of the variants from the Mss. this meant basically two things. First that I would attempt to economize on the number of notes by treating, wherever possible, phrases rather than individual words. That is to say rather than, e.g. aneke\(^{27}\) ca te\(^{28}\) satva\(^{29}\) ye\(^{30}\) I would prefer: aneke ca te satva ye\(^{27}\). Second, that I would occasionally ignore trivial variations in spelling in Mss. other than Y.

This same consideration has influenced my handling of the Tibetan in the critical apparatus. But here there was the additional factor that a complete critical edition of the Tibetan text immediately follows the Sanskrit text. This, it seemed to me, justified a restricted use of the Tibetan and, as a consequence, my use of it was intended to be illustrative, not definitive. It is generally cited when it differs significantly from Y. It is also cited when it confirms Y, when Y is 'misspelled' or partly illegible (it then often serves as the basis of my correction), or when Y appears unduly peculiar. It is also cited a number of times when it
differs from all the Mss. and thus appears to represent a separate tradition. I have also attempted to illustrate by selective citation that in addition to sometimes representing a separate tradition, it sometimes agrees with one redaction and sometimes another. When Redaction B is edited, then a detailed study of the relationship of the Tibetan translation vis-à-vis the two redactions will be possible. Until then any general statement on this relationship - obviously a complicated one - would be premature.

The need to keep the critical apparatus within reasonable bounds also lead me to exclude virtually any reference to the previous edition of Bhg done by N. Dutt. This edition is essentially an edition of X and is very carelessly done. It should be clear from the small sample piece of this edition I discussed in IIJ 19 (1977) 208-10, that if I had taken it into account in my notes the critical apparatus would have been twice as large as it already is.

I must also say a few words about the punctuation and the paragraphing found in the edition. There are two problems with the punctuation in the original Ms. It is too sparse and occasionally too erratic to be of use for the purpose of dividing the text into meaningful or manageable parts. It also depends in many cases on conventions which are imperfectly understood or ambiguous. For example, it has already been recognized that : sometimes stands for ṭ and sometimes appears to be used as a mark of punctuation. The same thing, I think, applies to ॐ or ༼. This is the most common punctuation mark in the Gilgit Mss. as a whole, but it also seems to be used sometimes for visarga. With these problems in mind I decided that I would insert into the text my own punctuation (i.e. commas, colons, semi-colons, etc.). Since, however, all imposed punctuation is unavoidably interpretative I have used as little as possible. Where it was possible I have dispensed with it altogether. Where this was not possible I have simply tried to break the text up into manageable pieces, or I have punctuated it in accordance with my understanding of the sense. But in line with my intention to preserve as much as possible of the character of my Ms., I have also marked in my edition the actual punctuation found in Ms. Y (I have ignored all the other Mss.; the five taken together very often do not punctuate in the same way). This has been done by means of two symbols: ( = ṭ or ༼ and ॐ = ༼). These symbols are inserted beneath the line of my edition at the point at which the original
punctuation mark occurs in the Ms. ◦ or ◦ as I have already noted is the most common mark of punctuation at Gilgit and is used anywhere. ◦)) on the other hand appears to have been used chiefly - though not exclusively - to mark the end of a section or 'paragraph', and I have taken this apparent usage into account in the paragraphing I have imposed on the text. This can be seen in the fact that although the division into paragraphs in my edition is my own, in most cases the end of my paragraph corresponds to a point in the Ms. at which a ◦)) occurs.

Finally let me conclude this section by stating what is implied in its title - "Notes On and Towards a Methodology" - as well as in much of what I have said. Given the uniqueness of the Ms. material before me - five Mss. containing at least two, and probably three separate redactions, but all of the same date and all coming from the same place - and given the uniqueness of Y as apparently representing a case where an 'unrevised' version of a text has been preserved, I found myself in unmapped territory, territory in which the usual conventions of text-criticism were very often times of little help. In light of this my general method, my edition and the redactional suppositions which underlie it must be considered in at least some sense experimental. As such they raise more problems than they solve.
The Sanskrit Text
1X: xxxv(x)t(x)bh(x)ṣaṭyaṛuṛxxxxxxxx tathāgat(x)x: T: saṁs rgyas daṅ / byaṅ chub sems dpañ thams cad la phyag 'tshal lo.

[1] evam mayā śrūtam ekasmin samaye: bhagavām janapadacaryāṁ caramāṇo 1 vaisālīṁ anuprāpto; vaisālīyāṁ viharati sma 1 vādyavāre vrksamūle 2 mehata bhikṣuṣamghena sārḍham, astābhir bhikṣuṣahasraṁ satrīṃśatibhiś 3 ca bodhisatvaḥsaḥrasaṁ sārḍham, rājāṃṭaḥbrāhmaṇaṁ-gṛbhaḥpatibhiḥ 4 devaṇaḥgarudakinnaraṁnīramahāraṇaṁ 5 parvṛṭṭah puraskṛto 6 dharman deśayati sma 1

1X: nupurvena yāṁna vaisālīṁ mehānagerīṁ - tenānuprāpto bhūt tatra khalu bhagavāṁn na vaisālīyāṁ viharati sma; T: ... rgyu śiṅ yāṁ na ca can du byon te / yāṁ na ca can na . . . . . 2X: rol mo'i sgra can gyi śiṅ ljon pa'i druṅ na. 3X: saṃrīṃśatīś or saṣṭāṁ-. 4X: -patīrthār mehāya ca -. 5X: devanāga . yakṣaṁgandharvaṁ garudakīrtanīramahāraṇa . manuṣyaṁmanuṣya- yaparṣadā. 6X: -kṛtto.

[2] atha khalu manjuśrīr dharmarājaputro buddhānubhāvenottāthāyaśasanād 1, ekāṃkam citaram prāvṛtya 2, daksīṇam jānumaṇadalāṁ 3 prthiṇyāṁ 4 pratīṣṭhāya, yena bhagavāṁ tenāṃjaliṁ 5 prāṇaṁ 6, bhagavantam etad avocat: devāṇuḥ bhavyaṁ tenaḥ pratīṣṭāḥ prānaḥ sārṣaṅgahāraḥ nāmaḥveṇaḥ prūṇapuruṣottāthāyaśasanād 7 ca yāṁ śrutvā satvāḥ 8 sarvakārmaṇāramaḥ 9 viśodhayaḥ, teṣām paścime kāle paścime samaye sādharmaprātīrṇāke vartamāne satvāṁ 10 anugrahām upādāya 11.

1X: -ennouthāyaśasanād. 2X: ekāṁkam utāraḥ sahaṁ kṛtvā. 3X: jānum-. 4X: prthiṇyācca? 5X: tenāṃjaliṁ. 6X: prāṇaṁ. 7X: -viśeṣaṇa- vistarabhiḥgāṁ. 8X: has sarvasatvā; Y omits sarvasatvā, but has a 3rd pl. for the verb of the clause, which requires something like sarvasatvā for its subject; T (see next note) though constructed differently has also read a satvā. 9X: āvaraṇṇī; T: sems can rnam kyil las kyi agrib pa =
satvānām karmāvarāṇaṁ. 10) X: satvām; T: sens can be daŋ (rjes su guñ bipa'i slad du). For the whole of this speech by Manjusṛi cf. the different word order in T. 11) the phrase pucli me kāle, etc. sandwiched between teṣāṁ and satvānām looks like a later insertion of a well known cliché.

[33] atha bhagavān maṇjuśrīye kumārabhūṭāya sādhukārame adāt: sādhū maṇjuśrīḥ 1 kāruṇikas 2 tvam maṇjuśrīḥ 1 uprameyaṁ kāruṇyām 3 janayitvā mamādhyeṣāṁ nāṇākarmāvaraṇāvrttāṁ satvānām arthāya hitāya sukhāya devamanugyānāṁ. 5 tena hi maṇjuśrīḥ śṛṇu sādhū ca sūṣṭhau ca maṇmikuru bhāṣyāve 6 evam bhagavann īti maṇjuśrīḥ kumārabhūto bhagavataḥ pratyakṣraunīt

1) X: maṇjuśrī. 2) X: mahākāruṇikas; T: omits both mahā-, and also kāruṇikas. 3) X: kāruṇyā. 4) X: -sūṣṭhau ca; T: maṇmikuru bhāṣyāve. 5) X: inserts here ca hitā-yāya; T has structured the whole clause in a slightly different way: sens can las kyi sgrībs pa sna tshogs kyi bsgribs pa rnam daṅ / lha daṅ / mi rnam kyi don daṅ / phan pa daṅ / bde ba'i phyir .... 6) Y: bhāṣyāmahe.

[44] bhagavān asyatad1 avocat: āsti maṇjuśrīṁ purastime2 digbhāge ito buddhakṣetrāṁ3 daśaṇgaṇādadvālukāsamanāṇaṁ buddhakṣetrāṁ4 atikramya vādūryanirbhāsā 5 nāma lokadhātus. tatra bhaiṣajyaguruvaśāyaprabho nāmo tathāgato 'rhan7 samyaksamabuddho 8 viharati, viḍyācaranāsappānnaḥ sugato lokavid anuttaraḥ puruṣadānyasārathī śāśtvak devamanugyānāṁ 9 buddho bhagavān. tasyāṁ maṇjuśrīr bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaśāyaprabhasya tathāgatasya pūrve 11 bodhisatvacārikāṁ carata 12 imāṁ dvādaśamahāprāṇidhānāṁ abhūvan 13 katamāṁ dvādaśāṁ 1h?

1) X: (bhagavān)ṁ asyatad; Y: (bhagavān) asyatad; T: de la 'di skad ces. 2) X: p(x)rx(x)smi; T: sar phyogs. 3) X: -kṣetraṇa. 4) X: -sūṣṭhau ca; Y: -pālaṅkā-. 5) X: -kṣetraṇyā. 6) X: -niḥbhāsā. 7) X: tagatorha; Y: (')rhan. 8) X: -buddha. 9) X: devāṇām ca - manugyānāṁ ca. 10) X: inserts here khalu puna. 11) X: pūrve. 12) X: carataḥ; Y: carata. 13) X: abhūvan-. 1h) X: dvādaśamahāprāṇidhānāṁ; Y: dvādaśāṁ.
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[5.1] prathamā 1 tasya mahāpranidhānām abhūt: yadāham 2 anāgata
dhvani buddhābodhīm 3 abhisambuddhyeyan 4 taddāprameyāsakhyeyāpari-
māṇā lokadhātavo mama śārtrābhaya 4 bhrājerams tapera 5 virocera 6.
dvātramādhbhī mahāpurusālaksanena 8 'samanvāgato asītibhiś cānuvya-
janair alamkṛtadehas tathaiva sarvasatvā... 10.

1) X: prathame. 2) X: dyaham. 3) X: (dhvany)inuittarāJayām samyaksambodhīm;
T: bla na med pa yañ dag par rdzogs pa'i byañ chub. 4) X: taddā mama
śārtr(x)xpprameyā - saṃkhyaṣaṃkhyāṃ lokadhātavo; T: de'i tshe bdag gi
lus kyi 'od kyis 'jig rten gyi khams grais med dpag tu med ciñ dpag gis
mi lañ ba dag. 5) X: taped. 6) X: virocera, or perhaps, -ceta. 7) X: yathā
cāham (dvātṛādād). 8) Fol. 13b of Ms. Y ends here, and fol. 14 is lost,
leaving a gap of 12 lines of about 60 akṣaras each. 9) We give here in
brackets the text of Ms. X. The brackets are necessary in that Ms. X
represents a separate redaction and therefore cannot be taken directly
into the texts. In addition, Ms. X at just this point is distinctly faulty.
Dutt says that "one leaf is here missing", but the pagination is continuous
and it appears rather that the scribe inadvertently omitted a piece of text
equal in size to almost one entire leaf. 10) We have inserted bracketed
ellipsis to mark the omission, although in the Ms. the text is continuous:
satvāxmaṃ, etc. The last sentence of 5.1 in T reads: sems can thams cad
skyes bu chen po'i mtshan sum cu rta s gñis dañ dpe byad bzañ po bryad cus
legs par brygan par gyur te / bdag ci 'dra ba de bāin du sems can thams cad
kyañ de 'dra bar gyur cig ces btab bo.

[5.23] [...Jxmaṃ dišaxx nānādišām gaccheran kāni ca karmānī kuxx 3].
1) Of the text for the 2nd vow this fragment is all we have; it forms the
last part of the last sentence; after kuxx immediately follows (tr̥ṭilīIyām
tasya mahāpranidhāna... 2) Ms. Z fol. 4a starts here. 3) 2: -chantu
karmānī ca kuvantu. In T the 2nd vow reads: de'i sman lam chen po gñis
pa ni / gñi gi tshe bdag ma 'oīs pa'i dus na bla na med pa yañ dag par
rdzogs pa'i byañ chub mdon par rdzogs par sañs rgyas pa de'i tshe bdag
byañ chub thob pa na lus nor bu rin po che bai gã rya ci 'dra bar de 'dra
bar phyi nañ śīn tu yoñs su dag pa dañ / dri ma med la 'od gñal ba dañ /
 kho lag yañs śīñ che ba dañ / dpal dañ / gzi brjīd 'bar ba dañ / legs par
gras pa dañ / fi ma dañ / zla ba bas lhag pa'i 'od zer gñi dra ba rnam
kys legs par brygan par gyur cig / de na sems can gñi dag 'jig rten gñi

52
bar dag tu skyes ba dag dagn gai dag yan mi’i ’jig rten ’di na mtshan mo mun pa mun nag gi na’i na phyogs tha dud par ’gro ba de dag bdag gi ’od kyls phyogs dpag’ mgur ’gro bar gyur cig / lns rmam kyu’ byul par gyur cig ces btob bo /

[5.3] trtIyan tasya mahāpranidhānam abhūt: bodhiprāptasya ca1 
me2 nāpamayaprajñāpānyabalādhiḥānona3 4)–aparimānāḥ satvadhātataḥ
akṣaya–upaḥbhogaparibhoga bhaveyuh4, mā ca5 kasyacia6 satvasya
kenaci7 vaikalyam18 syāt.

1) Reconstructed from X; akṣayas lost in Z. T: gai gi tsho bdag ma ’onu pa’i dus na bla na mod pa yan dag par rūgog pa’i byas chub mān po rūgogs par sānas rgyas pa de’i tsho bdag bya chub thob pa na ... This is formulaic in T, all the vows beginning in the same way (it will not be noted in future notes), and constitutes one of a small number of significant places where T agrees with none of our Mss. 2) X: here inserts ye. 3) So X; Z: ādhanāmā; T: see next note. 4) X: –aparimānasya sānadhātāur [≡ –dhator?] akṣaya upabhogyā paribhogyā syūr; Z: –aparimānāṃ satvadhātāṃ akṣaye–upalbhogaparibhoga bhaveyuh; T: (for the whole passage starting after ca ma): bdag gi sres rab dagn thabs dpag tu med pas (omitting –balādhiḥānonā-) sons can gyi khams dpag gis mi la’i ba dag loša spyod (representing either upabhoga or paribhoga, but omitting one) mi zad pa dagn ldan par gyur te / . Our reading is a conjecture based on T which clearly indicates that the subject of the sentence is –aparimānāḥ satvadhātāvah, and that it is plural. Noting the occasional interchange of –m for –h in our Mss., our emendation of –aparimānāḥ is hardly drastic; –dhatum must simply be a scribal oversight. 5) X: omits mā ca. 6) X: kasyaci. 7) X: kenaci. 8) So X; T: brel ba med par.

[5.4] caturtham tasya mahāpranidhānam1 abhūt2: bodhiprāpto ’ham 
3) kumārgapratipannāḥ satvā bodhimārga pratisthāpayeyam, śrāvakamārga– 
pratipannāḥ pratye kabuddhāmārgapratisipannā va sarve mahāyāne’niyoja 
pratisthāpayeyam5(3

1) Z: –dhanāmā. 2) Z: abhūva. 3)(3X: ye kumārgapratipannāḥ satvānām · 
śrāvakakṣakabuddhāpratipannā ca te satvā stuntere bodhimārga mahāyāne 
niyojayeeyam. T follows Z except in the construction of the verb in the
2nd clause where it has gzu'd par bya'o only. For acc. pl. in -āḥ see Introduction. ¹) Restored on the basis of T. ²) Restored on the basis of preceding pratiṣṭhāpayeyanā.

[5.5] pamoṣamanā tasya⁵ mahāprajñādhānam⁴ abhūt³ bhūti⁴ prajñādhānam⁴ me ye kecit⁵ satvā maśma śāsane brahma⁶ - caryāṃ caranti⁷, ⁸) tathā
cānye aprameyasāmānkhayeṣṭāṃ śatvāṃ, te saṁrāte. akhaṇḍaṣṭāla
syuh⁹ trīṣaṣvāsāṃvṛtā¹⁰; mā ca kasyacī śīlavipannasyā¹¹ mama
nāmadheyaṃ śrutvā¹² durgatigamanāṃ syat¹³.

¹) So X; but the space in Ms. Z would seem to require either 6 or 7 aksaras. ²) Z: -dhānam. ³) Z: abhūva. ⁴) X inserts ca. ⁵) X: has a second ye instead of kecit. ⁶) So Ms. X. ⁷) X: careyu. ⁸) (θ) X: has only to serve. T differs from Z only in omitting one of the three adjectives (sems can gzan) dpag tu med ciṁ dpag gis mi laḥ ba. ⁹) X: syūs; Z: bhavanti. ¹⁰) X: trīṣaṣvām; Z: trīṣaṣvāra-. ¹¹) So Ms. X; Z has what looks like wīrcch(x)la-, part of the 2nd aksara is obliterated; T: teṣāḥ khrims log par ṣugs te / ¹²) In T nāmadheyaṃ śrutvā is placed after saṁrāte and is followed by bdag gi mthuṣ which has no counterpart in any of the Skt Ms. X inserts mā kaci after śrutvā. ¹³) Z: bhavati.

[5.6] saṣṭham¹ tasyaḥ mahāprajñādhānam abhūt² bhūti³ prajñādhānam⁴ me
ye kecit⁵ satvā hiṁnakātyā viṣkalesiṇī dharmāḥ⁶ jagaḥ kheḷā
cānye saṁrāte. ⁷) X: omits kecit. ⁸) (θ) X: -warnā. ⁹) Z: after kujā adds: cixā kā; then there are several folios of Z missing. T: bems po⁶ instead of jadā kheḷā kānāl daḥ / yan lag skyon can (= lamga) daḥ / sug po (= kubjā) daḥ / . ⁰) From this point for several lines of text we have only Ms. X which we here give in brackets. ¹¹) T: sa bkra. ¹²) T: ṣaḥ ba; according to Jā h? žar ba = yan lag ma tshaṃ: "being not in full possession of one's members".
vadhirā. 11) T: smony pa. 12) T: lus la nad kyis btab pa

[5.7] saptaṃ sam tasya mahāpranidhānam abhūt: bodhiprāptasya ca me ye1 nānāvyādhīparipūdita satvā atrāṇā aśaṇā bhaisajyopakaraṇa- virahitā anāthā dārīrdā duḥkhitā, sace teṣām mama nāmadheyam karnapute nipatot2, teṣām sarvavyādhaya praśāmyuh nirogaḥ ca nirupardravād ca syūr3 yāva bodhiparyavasānam4

1) T: sans can gaṇ su dag. 2) X: nipatey(uḥ); T: does not treat this as a conditional clause: saṅga bhānu la gaṇ dag gi ma lam du bāag gi miṅ grag pa. grag pa = nadati, not nipat-. 3) X: syūd. 4) In T this final clause is constructed in a slightly different way: byaṅ chub kyi mthar thug gi bar du nad med ciṅ gnod pa med par gnas par gyur cīg /.

[5.8] astaṃ sam tasya mahāpranidhānam abhūt1: ya kaści mātrgrāmo nānāstrīdasaṇatai saṃkliśtam strībhāvam vijugupṣam2, mātrgrāmayonyini3, parimoktukāmo4, mama nāmadheyam dhārayaṭi, tasya mātrgrāmysa na strībhāvam bhaved yāva bodhiparyavasānam5.

1) T: gives here the full form of the standard formula (see n.5). 2) X: vijugupṣamta; T: bud med kyi dāoa po la smod pa /. 3) X: -yoni; T: skye gnas las. 4) X: parimukta; I have followed T; see next. 5) T preserves this vow in a different form: de'i smon lam chen po bṛgyad pa ni gaṇ gi tshe bāag ma 'ons pa'i dus na / bla na med pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i byaṅ chub mton par rdzogs par saṅs rgyas pa de'i tsea bāag byaṅ chub thob pa na / bud med gaṇ la la bud med kyi skyon bṛgya dag gis kun nas fno moons par gyur pa / bud med kyi dāoa po la smod pa / bud med kyi skye gnas las yoṅs su thar bar 'dod pa de dag bud med kyi dāoa po las log par gyur cīg / byaṅ chub kyi mthar thug gi bar du skyes pa'i dvaṅ po byaṅ bar gyur cīg ces btab bo /.

[5.9] navamam tasya [mahāpranidhānam abhūt]: bodhiprāpto 'ham sarvasatvā māra1-2) pāśaṇī parimeceyam, nānāstrīgahhasamkata-prāptāh tān samyagdrṣṭyām pratisthāpayeyam3, anupūrvam4 bodhisatvācārikāṃ sandarśeyeyam5.
1) Ms. Y (fol.15a) starts here again. 2) (X: -pāsabhandhahādāhā nāma-
dṛṣṭīgahanasmākṣṭāpṛāṇa. saranāraṇapāsādhṛṣṭīgatibhavya vinivarta samyag-
dṛṣṭau nityajñā; Y: samyagdṛṣṭyā; for acc.pl. in -āḥ see Intro.; T: (sems
can thams cad bdud kyi) žaṅs pa mams las yoins su thar þar bya'o / lta ba
tuha dad pa mi mthun pa zhi zin pas mì mthun par gyur pa dag yan dag pa'i
lta ba la dgod par bya'o / 3) X: -āṇupūrveṇa; T: mthar gyis. 4) X: bodhi-
satvacaryāyāṃ; T: bya'i chub sems dpal'i spyod pa. 5) X: samā; Y:-darṣāyeyuh.

[5.10] daśaman tasya mahāpranidhānam abhūt: bodhiprāptasya me ye
kecit satvā rājabhayabhītā ye ca bandhanatādāhāvaruddhā vadhyārthā
anekamānyābhir upadrutā vimānītaḥ kāyikacaitasikadukkhaṁ abhyāhata,
te madhyena punyānubhāvena parimucyeran sarvopadravebhyaḥ.[12]
1) X: abhū. 2) X: inserts ca. 3) So X; Y: kēt. 4) X: rājādhibhaya-. 5) X:
vā. 6) X: bandhanabaddhāvaruddhā; T: (gea dag) boin ba dañ / brdeg pa dañ /
go rar gung pa dañ. 7) X: badhyārthā; Y: bandhyārthā; T: gea par 'os pa.
8) X: -māyābhir. 9) X: vimānītā ca; Y: vimānītaḥ. 10) Y:-duhkher; T: lus dañ
dag dañ sems sdug bṣaṅ gyis. 11) X: inserts here mama nāmadheyam śravanga.
12) (12) X: sarvabhayopadravebhyaḥ parimucyeran.

[5.11] ekādaśaman tasya mahāpranidhānam abhūt: bodhiprāptasya me ye
kecit satvā kṣudhāgnaṁ prajvalitā - śāhāparasyabhīyuktān
pāpaṁ karma kurvanti; aham tesāṁ varṇāngasāyaspotenāḥśreṇa
śarīraṁ santarpayeṣam, 8) paścā dharmārvastuṣṭantakhe pratiṣṭhāpa-
yeṣam.[8]
1) X: inserts ca. 2) X: omits kecit. 3) X: kṣudhā-. T: bkres pa dañ skom
pa'i me rab tu 'bar ba. 4) X: śāhāparāparasyabhīya-. Y:-parasyabhīyuktāň;
T like Y and in spite of its preceding bkres pa dañ skom pa'i me, has here'
only kha sas. 5) (5) X: tanidhānam pāpaṁ kurvanti. 6) X: inserts here: sace
ta mama nāmadheyam dhrāyeyur. 7) X: bārṇa-. 8) (8) X omits entirely this
clause, ending with santarpaye(yu)(r).

[5.12] dvādaśaman tasya tathāgatasya idam mahāpranidhānam a(bhūt)1:
bodhiprāptasya me ye kecit satvā nāgāṁ vasana-virahita daridrā
śītānaṃdayamāśakārā rātrindivaṇ 9) duḥkhāṁ vedanāṁ vodanti (9,10, aham
teṣām vastribhogyam upanāsayaṁ 12 nānāraṁparakt(x)xxx13 vi.ś.ś
dhāśa ca ratnābharenāvibhūsamūrāḥ(y) agandhavilepanavādyatūrtya-

tāḍāvacaraṁ 14 sarvasatvāṁ sarvāḥ prāyāṁ paripūratvayam.

1) (X: dvādaśaṁ tamā sa mahāpranidhānam abhūt. 2) X: inserts ca. 3) T this
time drops bdag byaḥ chub thob pa na from its otherwise strict formulaic
expression of these vows. 4) X: omits nagrā. 5) X: vyasa-. 6) T inserts
/sdug bsīal ba/. 7) X: -maśaker, then adds upadṛta. 8) X: tṛṇdrivaṁ;
Y: -diiva. 9) (X: duḥkhaṁ anubhavanti; Y: duḥkhāṁ vedanāṁ vinīya;
T: sdug bsiāl gyi tshor ba myon ba. 10) X: inserts here sace te mama nāmadheyāṁ
dhārayeyur. 11) X: vasa-. 12) X: upasamārayeyam. 13) X: nānāraṁparaktaṁ-
xxmānupanāyeyam (vividhāśa); Y: nānāraṁparaktaṁ (vividhāśa); Dutt
gives Y (= C) as: nānāraṁparaktaṁ ca kāśinupa-", but the lost, and there-
fore important part of this is impossible; T: (go yod pa spyad par 'os
pa [= paribhogyā ?]) tshon sna tshogs su kha byagur ba (dag sbyin 'sr
bya'o / ji tsho 'dod pa bzin du rin po che'i rgya sna tshogs dan / etc.).
14) X: ratnābhāreṇagandhamālyāṁ.

[5.13] imāṁ dvādaśa maḥāpranidhāni sa bhagavīn śrībhaisajyaugur-
vaidūryaprabhās tathāgato rhan samyaksambuddhaṁ purvam bodhi(satva)-
cārikāṁ caran kṛtyavāṁ.

1) So X; Y is obliterated. 2) It is clear from both X and T that Y is here
faulty: X (sa bhagavāṁ)bhaiṣajyaugurvaidūryaprabhās tathāgatariśa samyak-
sambuddhaṁ purvam bodhicārikāṁ carata kṛtyavāṁ [5] tasya khalu puna maṁjusrīr
bhagavato... T: 'jam dpal / bcom ldam 'das de bzin gūs pa de bcom pa
yaṅ dag par rdo rpa' pa'i saха rgyas sman gyi bla bai dū rya'i 'od de sūn
byaḥ chub sems dpal'i spyad pa spyod pa na smon las chen po bcu gdtis po de
dag btab par gyur to / [55] 'jam dpal / de bzin gūs pa ... The situation
in Y is fairly transparent. As not infrequently happens in our Ms. when a
string of words is closely followed by the same or a similar string, the
two often become fused into one, and the material separatīr, them is
omitted. Thus the scribe of Y starts with the first bhagavāṁ omits
everything following it up to and including the second bhagavāṁ, and then
writes after the first what should have come after the second and continues
in this way. This accounts for Y's bhagavāṁ (nom.) bhaiṣajyaugurvaiprabhāsya
(gen.) tathāgatasya (gen.). In the bracketed material we have put in
parenthesis those cases where X does not agree with T: T has -satva-,
X omits; X has khalu punar, T omits.

1) X: ya ca. 2) X: -vyūhams tām na śakyam. 3) This is very uncertain. Y is partially obliterated: e(k)(x) t(x), but -t- could be subscribed as a part of a lost ligature judging by its shape; X has nothing corresponding to this; T: śin tu. 4) X: omits; Y: -kṣetram; T: saṁs rgyas kyi 6 tā de ni śin tu yoṭs su dag pa ste / [to this point agreeing with Y, but then adds: ] rdo 6 / ges ma dañ / gyo mo med pa / . 5) X: āgata- T: 'dod pa'i skyon med pa, taking kāmadosa as a gen. tatpurusa. 6) X: ān sōñ dañ / sdo bṣaṅ g.yi sgra med pa, taking -āpāyadukha as a dvandva; Y: -sādham. 7) Y: mātri-. T: bud med kyi 6chos po med pa = apagatastrībhāva; cf [12]. 8) X: mahāprthivī. 9) X: kudyanprūkāraprāśādīn- ... - nīvyāh; T includes prākāra- = ra ba, but omits prāśāda-. 10) X: omits stambhakoṭakāh. In T the whole clause is handled differently: sa dañ / rtsig pa dañ / ra ba dañ / rta babs dañ / skar khun gi dra ba dañ / ba gam ni bai ḍū rya'i rañ bzin can / pu šu ni rīn po tče sa na bām g.yi rañ bzin can te /, suggesting that our prthivī should be in compound with kudya, etc., and that vaidūryamayī should modify this, while saṃkurumiyaḥ should refer to stambhakoṭakāh only. 11) X: yādṛśī sukha-vati lokādhatu tādṛśa (tatra vaidūryanirbhāsa-yaḥ lokādhatau dau bodhisatvau...); an omission of the kind noted at 5.13 n.2. T: "jig rten g.yi kham bde ba can ei 'dra ba de bzin du" / jīg rten g.yi kham bai ḍū rya rnow ba'i saṁs rgyas kyi śiṅ gi yon tan bcod pa yeñ de dañ 'dra 'o / . 12) X: tatra vaidūryanirbhāsa-yaḥ lokādhatau, see note 11. 13) X: dau.
[7] punar api 1 bhagavān 2 manjuśrīyam 3 Kumārabhūtam āmantrayati sma 4 santi 5 manjuśrī 6,7 satvā 8 ye 9 na jānanti 10 kuśalākūsālam karman 11,12 lobhābhībhūtā 13, ajānanto 14 dānanā 15 dānasaya 16,17 phalavīpakaṁ, 18 chālaṁ mūrkha 19 śraddhendriyavikalā dhanasapćayarakṣaṇābhiyuktā 20 na ca 21 dānasadvībhage 22 teṣām 23 cīttaṁ 24 kramaṁ 25 dānakāle upasthite svastarūmāsacchedana 24 ivānāttamanaso 25 bhavanti 26, 27) aneke ca te satvā ye 27 svayam evatma 28 na paribhūjanti, 29, 30 prāga eva 31) dāsa- dāsikārmatānām, prāga evāvaiśe yācaḥkānām; te tādṛṣṭā satvā itaś cyutvā 32 pretaloke upapatsyante 33 yadi vā tiryagyona 34) yai 35 pūrvaṁ manusyaḥbhūtāhī 26 śrutam bhavishyati tasya bhagavato bhaisajyaguruvaiv- dūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṁ, tatra teṣām yamaloke 37) sthitānām vā 38 tiryagyona 39) sthitānāṁ vā tasya tathāgatasya nāma Śūkraḥbhavish- yati, saha smaritaṁśtrena 40 tataś cyutvā 41) punar api manusyaloke upa- patsyanti, 42) jātismarāṁ ca bhavīyanti 43, 44) durgatibhavabhītā na bhūyaḥ kāmagnair 45 artikha, 46) dānāvihira 47 dānasaya ca varṇavāditāṁ 48 sarvāṣtī- parityāgino 'nupūrveṇa 49, 50) śīraśaracarananyasvāmācamāśaṁsiṁ (50 yācanaṁ pādaśyanti 51 prāga evāvaiśe 52 dhanavānjanām. 53


X, Y: bhavati. 27) (27) X: aneke ca satvā ye; Y: anekūni ca te satvā ye; Z: anekūni ca satvāni; T: seems can de dag ... du ma. 28) X: omits ātmana; Z: ātmanā; T has only bādag kīd kyaḥ for svayam evātmanā. 29) X: -bhūmijati.

X: inserts prāg eva mātāpiṭṝṇāṁ dāsyanti; Z: prāg eva mātāpiṭṝṇāṁ bhāravyapradhuhitrīṇāṁ dāsyanti; dāsyanti is added as a correction beneath the line; T follows Z. 31) (31) In Z this is written in a smaller hand and partially below the line. 32) X, Z: cavītvā. 33) X: -syate; Z: -syanti.


46) X: inserts bhavisyati, Z: -"anti; T: 'dod pa'i yon tan dag don du mi ṣier ba dañ /.


1) X, Y: -śrī. 2) X: tathāgatāḥ; Z: -gatānāṃm. 3) X, Y: udīṣya; T omits. 4) X, Z: sīkṣāpādānī. 5) X: -ayati; Z omits dhārayanti; T see next note. 6) X: te śīlāvipatim āpadyate dṛṣṭīvipatim ācārāvipatim vā kācācid āpadyate śīlāvipanā ye ye puna śīlāvanto bhavati śīlām rakṣati; Z is even further expanded: te śīlāvipatim āpadyate dṛṣṭīvipatim ācārāvipatim vā kācācid āpadyate te śīlāvipanāḥ ācārāvipanāḥ dṛṣṭīvipanāḥ ye[ellip] śīlāvanto te śīlām rakṣati; T (for the whole of 6) up to and including rakṣati) 'jag dpaḥ / gzaṃ yan / aṣa sa gn dgaḥ dag de / de dag tshul khrims log par žugs šin 'lta ba log par žugs nas gn dag tshul khrims daḥ ldan pa de dag ni tshul khrims aru'i gl. The context as well as T 'jig pa might suggest that dhārayanti be taken in the sense of "suppress, resist" (MW 519); all versions of SūP, however, read 'dzin pa. 7) X and Z insert puna. 8) X: bahuśrutam. 9) Z: paraśeṣį̄panti. 10) X, Z: tathāgatabhāṣātanāṃ. 11) X: gacchitam. 12) X, Z: ājñānti; T: (mi) śes. 13) Z: inserts puna. 14) X: -śrūtas. 15) X: mānā. 16) X: mānā-stambhāḥ; Z: -stambhāḥ; T: na rgyal gyis non pas. 17) (1) X: paraśeṇāṃ, omitting dviṣṭāḥ; Z: paraśeṇāṃ dviṣṭāḥ; T: gzaṃ dag la phrag dag byed ciṅ. 18) X: sa-dharmaṇ. 19) X: manyāti; T: dpaḥ za bar 'gyur. 20) X: -pati; Y: -pañti. 21) X: kumārgahpratī-. 22) Z: anye. 23) Z: -niyuta-. 24) X: mahāpranīxtam; T: gya'i sa chen por. 25) X: pratpata. 26) X: inserts yat before tesaṃ. 27) X: bhūṇatena. 28) X: narekaśvagatasīr; Z: -vāśagatir. 29) T (for the whole sentence): sans can de lta bu de dag ni sans can dryal ba mi bza'd par 'gro bar 'gyur ro / / . 30) X: has tatra yes for yai. 31) X: here śrūtaṃ bhāvyati is transposed to the end of the sentence. 32) X: has sa instead; Z: tasya tasya. 33) X: nāmabhaya. 34) T for this sentence is essentially the same except for the first clause which has gzaṃ dag aṣa sa gya pa na bcom ldan 'das de bzin gzaṃ pa sman gyi bla bai dī rya'i 'od de'i mthaṇ thos par gyur pa ... cf. (7): yai pūrva maṇḍyabhidhāni śrūtam bhāvyati. 35) (35) X: teścvivā; Z: te tataś cavivā. 36) X: -syate. 37) X: -dṛṣṭau. 38) X: omits. 39) Z: -āśayā. 40) X: ghrāṇy. 41) X: utṣaya. 42) X: tathāgatasāsane. 43) Z: -jītvā anupūrvaṇa. 44) X: paripūravyānti; Y: carisyati; Z: obliterated, but length of gap favors carisyati.

1) X: atmanam. 2) X: varṇa. 3) X: matsariṇāx paresāṃ avarṇam niscārayatī. Z: mostly obliterated, but ...fcaharyay[ā]... T: phrag dog gis gān dag la mī sīhan par brjod pa yod de/. 4) X: omits; Z: ob. 5) X: atmakarṣāka. 6) X: satvā. 7) (7) X: paraspaxsaṃkṛtopāyaisū. 8) X: śing; Z: pres. 9) X, Z: ("Z" written in beneath the line): te anekānām. 10) (10) X: taścavitvā; Z: tatas cavitvā. 11) X: gavāvṛṣṭragardabhādiḥ; Z: go-aśvanuṣṭrāxaḥ... 12) X: -yate. 13) X: daśādaṇḍapraḥārēṇa; Y: -prahāre. 14) Y: tādītā. 15) X: kṣutaraṣaṇīḍitā (śarīrā); Y: kṣutaraṣaṇāśarīrā; Z: kṣutaraṣpaḥ... (Ms. Z here is confused; a single line of writing seems suddenly to branch into two lines ?J; T: kres pa dañ / skom pas lus šen pa dañ /. 16) X: vahamānān; Y: vahamāna. 17) X: gacchati; Z: gacchāti; T: 'gro bar 'gyur ro. 18) X: pratilapsyati; Z: pratilapsyante; T (for the whole of clause differs somewhat): gal to brgya la mī'i skye ba rūd na. 19) (19) X: ...-upapatsyate... ca paravaṣāgataḥ bhāvyayati; Y: omits the entire clause; since Y has the first clause of the sentence, this omission probably represents a scribal error and not a legitimate redactional difference. 20) X, Y: ye. 21) X: omits but cf. n. 25; Y: śruta. 22) Y: pūrvaṃ; Z: pūrve. 23) Z: -bhūtai. 24) Ms. X is here badly muddled; the scribe repeats - fused together - parts of fol. 15a.5 to 15b.2, and 15b.3: ta kṣutepidārā mahantam bhāraṃ vahamānaṃ para- vaṣāgataḥ bhāvyayati ye pūrva manusya-bhūtaiḥ tasya. 25) X: hero inserts śrūtaṃ bhāvyayati; Y: -dheyaṃ. 26) X: tena. 27) Z: kuśalana. 28) X, Z: -ebhya. 29) X: paxxasyante. 30) X: -ya sa ca. 31) X: -isyati. 32) X: medhāvi ca; Z: medhāvina. 33) X: -paryestyibhiyuktā; Y: -yuktā. 34) X inserts ca. 35) X:
-vandhānām. 36) X: lamasyati; Z: lapisyanti. 37) X: see n.42; Z: echepayanti. 38) X: see n.42; Z: bhidyanti. 39) T: ma ri pā'i, suggesting that we should read avidyā-; but there is not the slightest indication in any of the three Mss. which would support such a reading. 40) Y: -ya'ti. 41) Z: -nādi. 42) Z: jāti-jarāvyādhimaṇḍakaparivedadvahadaurmanalasopāsyabhyaḥ; T: skye ba dañ / rga ši dañ / mya ŋan dañ / smre sīnāga 'don pa dañ / sdug bāsal ba dañ / yld mi bde ba dañ / 'khrug pa nams las. Beginning with echindanti X treats the whole passage in a somewhat different way: māraṇā sa bhindya vidyāndakosam uucosayati klesanadīm uucosayati jāti-jarāvyādhamanasaṃsoka parivedadvahadaurmanalasopāsyabhyaḥ.

[10] punar asparaṃ maṃjuśrīḥ sanī satvāḥ ye paśuṇyābhiratāḥ satvānām parasparaṃ kalahavigrahasavādām kārāpayanti, te parasparaṃ vigrāhītacittāḥ satvāḥ nānāvādaṃ akusalam abhisamskurvanti kāyena vācā manasānyonyāhitakāmā nityān parasparaṃ anerthāya parakramānti. te vanadavatām āvāhyantī; vyksadevatā girīdevatā śmasāṇesu prthak-prthaghūṭhānam āvāhyantī tīrīgaṇīyogatānām prānīnāṃ jīvitaṃ vyavropayanti māṃsārūdhireṇhākṣāṃ yaksārasāsāṃ pūjayaṃ tasyā śatrusyaṃ nānāṃ vā sarīrapratimān vā kṛtvā tatra ghorāvidyāṃ sadhayantīṃ kākhordsavetānāparyogena jīvitaṃturāyaṃ vā sarīrapravināśaṃ vā kartukāṃ yai śrutam bhaviyati tasya bhagavato bhaisajyagurupābhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheṣyaṃ, teṣāṃ na kāyam kenaḥ antārṣyaṃ kartum te parasparaṃ maitacittāṃ hitacittāṃ avyāpādācitaṃ vihārantiṃ; svakvasvakena parigrāhenaṃ samustāṃ.

1) X, Z: -āri. 2) X: omits ye. 3) X, Y: -ābhīratāḥ. 4) X: -vīyādāḥ; Y: -vīyādāḥ. 5) X: -uṇīti; Z: curvunti. 6) X: vigrāhacittāḥ. 7) X: vidhumān a-. 8) X: -vnti. 9) X: -manāsā anyonyam aḥitakāṃ; Z: -manesā anyonya aḥitakāmāḥ. 10) X: parasparāṃ kaṭṛthayaḥ; Z: paraspa(na)ṭṛthaya. 11) X: -aṭi. 12) X: omits vana- and inserts ca after te. The ending -ām is here problematic; perhaps read: -devatā-ṃ-āvā-, taking -m- as a hiatus-bridge; or take it as a case of anusvāra for visarga and read: -devatāḥ āvā-. 13) X: -yatī. 14) X: prthak-prthaghūṭhānāṃvāhāyati; Y: prthak-prthaghūṭhānāṃvāhāyati; Z: prthaghūṭhānā-
(mā) vāhayanti, -(mā) - is a correction added below the line. The gen.pl. of -bhūta is problematic, but it is difficult to justify emending it. Y is clear and Z has been corrected to -ānām. T structures the sentence differently: de dag nags tshal gyi lha dañ / śīṃ gi lha dañ / ri'i lha 'gugs par byed / dur khrod mams su 'byun po tha dad pa dag 'gugs par byed /.

All three Mss., on the other hand, agree in punctuating te vanadēvatā āvāhayanti as one unit, and vṛkṣadēvatā gūridevatā śmasāneṣu pṛthakprthag-bhūtānā āvāhayanti as another. This consistency among the Mss. is unusual. On acc.pl. in -ā see Introduction. X: -yonigataś; Z: -yonigata-. X: prārino; Z: prārīna; T: (dud 'gro'i skye gnas su son ba'i) srog chags mams kyi (srog good cañ). X: -śīṃ; 19 X: -atī. 20 X: -bhakṣāṇyā; Z: -bhakṣā. 21 X: -rākṣaśasyān(?) Z: -rākṣaśām. 22 X: śāstro; Z: śāstrosya. For -usya, BHS G 12.35. 23 T differs slightly: dra bo de'i mīn nas brjod pa 'am / gzugs byns nas. 24 T: rig śīṃs drag po. 25 X: -yati. 26 X: prayogaina; Mss. Z fol.11b ends here and fol.12 now appears to be lost. All Mss. have the form -vetāda, cf. BHS D 508. 27 After -prayogena Y has an akṣara which could be read as vā, tā or even ca; X has nothing here. 28 X: sarfrādikṣepam, instead. 29 X: yal punas; Y: ye. 30 X puts śrutam bhavis-yati at the end of this clause after ... tathāgatasya nāmadyeyam. See also next note. 31 Ms. V - consisting of a single leaf - begins with bhaisajya-gurvaldūryaprabhasya... It too places śrutam bhavisyati at the end of the clause. 32 X: tayā; Y: tasya. 33 V: omits śakyam. 34 X: kena(n.tarāyaṇam). 35 X: kartu. 36 X: sarve ca te. 37 V: sampradāna. 38 X: maitracita. 39 V: hittā = ? hitacittā. 40 V: avyāpannacittā; X: avyāpannacittā. 41 X: -atī. 42 Y: pagheṣa.

fill punar apramā 20 ete catvāraḥ parisāḥ bhikṣubhiṣuṇyapāśaskopāsikāḥ. 44 ye ca śrāddhān kulaṁputrāḥ vā kuladuhiḥ vā stāṃgasaṃvedaṃ vāgam vā upavāsāṃ upavāsaṃ vā traṁśikām vā śīkaśappadānāṃ dhārayantāḥ, yesām evāvāhīṣyate evaṃ prati dhānāṃ evaṃ avāyām kulaṁputraṇaṃ paścimāsāmāṃ 16 diffāyāṃ 17 sukhāvatīnyāṃ lokadhitāṃ 18 upapadyeyamāṃ yatramitiyūs 20 tathāgatāḥ 21 ; yathā punahāṃ śrutam bhavis-yatiḥ tasya bhagavato 25 bhaisajyagurvaldūryāpādāyām tathāgatasya nāmadeyaṃ, teśām mareskālasamaye astau 29 bodhisattvāḥ rādhyaḥ 30 rājatvā 31 mārgam 32 upadānāvajñayantiḥ, te 33 tatra nānārājayaḥ 35 punaḥmahāpādākāḥ 36
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prādurbhaviṣyanti 37. kecit 38. punar 39. devaloke 40. upapatsyanti 41. āh.

teṣām 42. tatropapannāṇaḥ 43. têtputram 44. kuśālaṁ 45. na kaśyati 46. na ca 47. durgatigamanāḥ 48. bhaviṣyati 49. 50. te tatāṃ cyutveha

manusyaloke 51. rājāno bhaviṣyati 52. 53. caturdvipavārāḥ cakravartino 54. nekānī 55. satvakotindaustatasahasrāni 56. daśānu 57. kuśalesu karma-

patheu 58. pratisthāpyaviṣyanti 59. apare punah 59. kṣatriyaṁmahāsālak-

ulesu 60. grhapatimahāsālakulesu 61. brāhmaṇamahāsālakulesu 62. prabhute-

dhanadāhonyakosaksthāgarasamṛdhesu 63. 64. kulesupapatsyanti 65. te 66.

rūpas ampanā āśivaryaśampannā pariśvārampanā sūrā vīrā mahāna-

balavegadhārino bhaviṣyanti 67.

1) V, Y: -āh. 2) (V: etāh carasarē pariśado; X: etāh catasra-parśado. 3) Y: -āh. 4) Sikṣ 175.3 begins here. 5) V, X, Sikṣ insert -ānye; T: gān yāh,

which very frequently in our text translates punar aparāṇ. 6) V, X: -ē. 7) X: -putro. 8) X, Sikṣ: -āhitaro. 9) X: āryāṇāyāṃ, gacchanāyāto. 10) X: sing.

eka, vāpaśām; Y: ekavārīkām. 12) V: traśmās(ā); Y: tremāsikām; Sikṣ: traśvārīkām. 13) V, X, Sikṣ: -ām. 14) X: dhārayātī. 15) (15) V: eva praṇi-

dhānām evābhīprāyaṃ; X: evam prāṇidhānam evābhīprāyaṃ; Sikṣ: evam abhīpraṇā
evam prāṇidhānam. Y has prāṇinām for prāṇidhānam. 16) V: paścimāyām.


yeṣām and ending here): gaṅ daṅ gis bāsm bād gis dge baṅ tsa baṅ dis
nub phyoga gāṅ na de bōṅ bāng pa ta se dpaṅ maṅ bāng paṅ i jīg rten gyi
khams bā ca bā sāk yar bōṅ sīg gos maṅ lom de lta ba btaṅ pa daṅ lās./ 22) V: yai; X: yai; Y: ye. 23) V, Sikṣ: omit; X: punes (tasya).

24) V and X put śrutām bhaviṣyati at the end of the clause after nāmadheyam. 25) X: bhagavate. 26) V, X: Sikṣ here has bhāṣaṣjayaguruvidyārubhabhāvājaya which is


31) X: gataḥ (this reading seems to result from the fact that X has omitted the mārgam of V, Y and Sikṣ and thus has had to make gataḥ the object of

the following vb. 32) V: omits. 33) X: upadārīṣyati; Sikṣ: upadārīṣyanti. 34) V: teṣām; X: obl. 35) X: -rupampī. 36) X: pādaśūnyapāṇākā; Sikṣ:

-āṅkāh; T: translates the loc. of padma by las. 37) X: sing; Sikṣ: prādurb-
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\(50\) V, Śīkṣa: -loka. \(51\) V, Śīkṣa: upapadyante; X: upapadyate; T: skye bar 'gyur ba. \(52\) Z inserts a ca. \(53\) T: skyes nas. \(54\) V: tat(kuśala-); X: pūrvakām; Śīkṣa: tatpūrvakām; T: sīon gyi dge ba'i rtsa ba de. \(55\) V: tat-kūśalamūlaḥ; X: -mūlāḥ; Z: -xxla. \(56\) V, X, Z, Śīkṣa: -ate. \(57\) V: omits ca. \(58\) V, X: -gāminō. \(59\) V: pl.; Śīkṣa, for the whole clause, differs somewhat: durgātīvināpāthbhavāḥ ca na bhaviṣyatī. \(60\) V: tatāḥ cyutvā iha; X: te taś cavitvā iha; Śīkṣa: te tataś cyutvā iha; T adds kya.n but omits te. \(61\) V: -loka upapatsaya; X: -loke upapatsya; Z: -loke upapatsyani. \(62\) X, Y: sing.; Z: bhavanti; Śīkṣa: bhavanti. \(63\) (53) V: (cakra)dvipesva(x)-varttineḥ; X: caturdīvipesvarāḥ cakravartina; Y: caturdvipesvarāḥ cakrax. \(64\) V: te anekāni; X: te nekāni. \(65\) V: -nayute-; Y: omits -niyute-. \(66\) Śīkṣa: daśa. \(67\) X: -pathaṇu. \(68\) X: pratiśthāpayati; Y: sing.; Śīkṣa: pratiśthāpayanti. \(69\) X: puna. \(70\) V: kṣātyaṁdhānālokaṇuṣṭāpa(t-)-x... (= upapatsyante?); T: (khyim dga' tu) skye bar 'gyur. \(71\) V: -kule; X, Z, T reverse the order of grhapati- and brahmana-. \(72\) V: -kule. \(73\) Z: -kostāḥ; Śīkṣa has -kulesu in the place of samādheṣu. \(74\) X: inserts a ca. \(75\) X: obl.; Z: obl.; Śīkṣa: -upapadyante. \(76\) V: omits te. \(77\) V: rūpaṁsappinnāḥ ca bhaviṣyaṁti aśvayaraspannāḥ ca bhaviṣyaṁti parivāraḥ(-x)xvaḥ ca vīraḥ ca mahānagnabalā mahāgan(dha)dhāriṇāḥ ca bhaviṣyati; X: rūpaṁsappinnāḥ ca bhaviṣyati aśvayaraspannāḥ ca bhaviṣyati mahāvalavagadhāriṇāḥ ca bhaviṣyati; Z: ...xxpannāḥ ca bhaviṣyanti parivāraṁsappinnāḥ xvaḥ... Śīkṣa: rūpaṁsappinnāḥ bhavanti parivāraṁsappinnāḥ bhavanti; T: gzugs phun sum tshogs pa dañ / dbaṅ phyug phun sum tshogs pa dañ / yog phun sum tshogs pa dañ / dpa' ba dañ / rtul phod pa dañ / tshan po che chen po'i stobs kyi sugs dañ ldan par 'gyur ro .
..xxxasyati ugrītaṃ sa eva tasya paścimam mātragram(x)xxx...; Śīkṣa follows Y except that it inserts bhagavato bhaṣajaguruvaṇaḍūrya-prabhāṣasya between tasya and tathāgatasya, and after ugrītaṃ; T: bud med gaṅ gis de bzin gsseg pa de'i mtshan thos śiṅ bzuh ba de'i bud med kyi dnos po de tha ma yin par šes par bya'o /.

[131] atha khalu maṃjuśrīḥ¹ κुमārabhūto bhagavantam etad avocat: 
ahaṃ bhagavan² paścime kāle paścime³ samaye teṣām śrīdāhānām kula-
putrāṇāṃ kulaudhitrāṇāṃ ca tasya bhagavato bhaṣajaguruvaṇaḍūrya-
prabhāṣasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ nānopāyai⁵ samārāvyāṣyāṃ⁶ antaṣān⁷ svapnāntaratāṇāṃ⁸ api buddhānaṃ⁹ karṇaṇapuṭēṣuṣaṃhāryāmi¹⁰ ye idām¹¹ sūtram¹² dārayiṣyanti¹³ vācayiṣyanti¹³ deśaiṣyanti¹³ likhāpaṇiṣyanti¹³ pāreṇyo¹⁵ vistāreṇa samprakāṣayiṣyanti likhāṣyanti¹³ likhāpaṇiṣyanti¹³ pustakalikhitam vā¹⁶ satkariṣyanti¹⁷ nānāpamālyagandhavilepana-
cūṛcīvaracchātraḥvajapatakāḥbhīḥ¹⁸ , [taiḥ]¹⁹ paṃcaraṃgikir²⁰ vastraḥ²¹ pariveṣṭayītvā²² sūcan pradēṣe stāparytavām tatra²³ 
catvāro maṇiḥjaṇaḥ sa-parsevārā anyāni²⁴ ca²⁵ devatākoṭīśastasahasrāṇi²⁶,²⁷ upasamhariṣyaṃ " yatredam sūtram pracariṣyati(²⁸ yeīmaṃ²⁹) sūtram³² dārayiṣyanti³² tasya bhagavato bhaṣajaguruvaṇaḍūrya-
prabhāṣasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ, pūrvaṇaṇidhānāvīṣeṣavistaram ca(³³) na teṣām³⁴ akālamaraṇaṃ³⁵ bhariṣyati, na ca³⁶ kenaṣc chakyam³⁷ ojopahartum³⁸, hṛtām vā ojāḥ punah³⁹ pratīṣhāranti.⁴₀

¹)V,X,Z: -srī; T: for the whole of [131] the sequence of individual sentences and clauses is considerably different in T. ²)V: -aṃ. ³)V,X: paścī. ⁴)V: omits ca; Z: obl. ⁵)V: omits; X,Z: obl., the space in both - certainly in Z - seems to require nānopāyai; both recto and verso of this folio in X, fol.21, is very difficult to read; T: mam pa ma thaṅgs su. ⁶)V: omits sam-; X: obl., but space probably requires it; Z: sa-; T shows no prefix. ⁷)V,Z: antaṣā; X: obl. ⁸)V: -gataṃ; X: xx xpāntaram; Z: -gataṃ. ⁹)V: buddhānaṃ nāma; X: buddhāvīmakaṃ; Y: buddhānaṃ; Z: buddhānaṃmaṃgka(pu)x x.. T: saṃs ryyan kyi mtshan. ¹⁰)V: -e nipatiṣyanti; X: obl.; Z: ..xx rīsyāmi; T: ke bar bar bang par byai'o. ¹¹)V: ya imāṃ; Y: ye idām, but cf. below,
yamam in exactly the same phrase; Z: yedam. 12) X: sūtraratnam; Z: sūtra-
16) V: pustakagatam(m); X: pustakagata(ṇ) vā kṛtvā; Z: ...xxtakagataḥ;
T: gṛhyaḥ bām la bris te. 17) X: sāṃkarśiṣyanti. 18) V, X: nāṇāpuṣpadhūpe-
gandhamālyavilepanacchatraḥvajapataḥkābhiḥ; Z: nāṇāpuṣpa(ḍuḥpa)gandha-
mālaḥ(ya)x... ...xx(chatra)dh(ṇ)ajapataḥkābhiḥ; T: me tog dañ / bdug pa dañ / spos dañ / phreñ ba dañ / byug pa dañ / gduṣ dañ / rgyal mtshan rnam
kysis. 19) Y: omits taiḥ. 20) X: -ramkīkā; Z: from here about hi aksaras
missing; occasionally an aksara can be read. 21) V, X: vastrai. 22) V, X:
26) V: devakāłīnaṣyataśahasraḥrasṛṇi; X: devakālaṃṣyataḥxhasṛṇi; Z: preserves
only ...ṣṛṇ(i). 27) V, X: insert tatro; Z: taretuṃ(?). 28) V: -opasaṅ-
krāmarṣyatiṃ; X: -opasakramavijyati; Z: obl.; T: mchi bar 'gyur ro.
29) (29) X: tatredaṃ sūtraṇāḥ prakṣaṣya(śi); T: gañ na mdo sde 'di gnas pa
der ... (mchi bar 'gyur ro). 30) V: te ca bhagavam imam; X: te ca bhaga-
vannīlmaṇaḥ. 31) V, X: sūtraratnam. 32) X: dhāriṣyati; X: sṛ. 33) V: ..bhagato-
tathāgatasya; the single folio of V ends here. T: tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajya-
yaguruvaidūryaprabhavaya tathāgatasya pūrvaṃpridhānāviśeṣavistaravi-
ghaṇaṃ tasya tathāgatasya nāṇāḥvayam chāyati; T: (gañ dag) boom idan
'das de bzin gṣega pa sman gyi bla dai ḍu rya'i 'od de'i mtshan dañ /
sin gṣa smon lam gyi khyał par ḍug� pa'i mdo 'di dzin pa. T has connected
the mdo of the f'rst clause in Skt with the pūrvaṃpridhānaṃ. 34) X: tasām
na; Z: na tteši ...i. 35) X: kāla-. 36) X: cāsy. 37) X: chukya. 38) X: ojam
ahātum; Z: ojopahati; T: 'phrog par. 39) X: punar api; Z: puṃnah. 40) X:
pratisamkarati; Z: pratyañhyati. The whole of the second clause in Z is
added in another hand below the line.

ye 3 ca mamjusri[3] ārddhāḥ kulaputraḥ 5 va kuladhitaro 6 va tasya tathā-
gatasya 7) pūjākartaḥsiṃ tais tasya tathāgatasya(7 pratimā 8 kārpayi-
tavyāḥ saptaśāntiṃ vasam 9 āryaṃstāṃ samanvajñataṃ 10 upavāsāṃ 11 upa-
prthivipradhāse suvanātagātrena suciṣvimalavasanadharāna[21] 22) nirman-
cittenākaluṣacitāṇaṃvyāpādicitena bhavitavyāṃ[22] vādyatūryasamāti-
tathāgatasya pūrvapranidhānām manasikartavyam(26 27) idam sutram prakaśayitavyam(27) yam cintayanti(28) yam prārthayanti(29) 30 31) tam sarvāhī- 
prāyan(31) paripūrṇayanti(32); yadi(33) dirghāyuṣkatām prārthayanti dirghā- 
yuṣkā bhavanti(33) yadi bhogān(34) prārthayanti bhogasamāḍhī bhavati(36), 
yady asiṃvāyam prārthayanti(37, 38) alpakrochena(39) labhanti(40), yadi putra- 
bhilāsino(41) bhavanti(42) putralabhāṃ(43) pratilabhante(44). ye pāpakaṃ 
svapnam paśyānti(45 46) yatra vāyasah sthito bhavati, durnimittam vā 
paśyānti yatra sthāne satam alaksminām upasthitam(46); te(47) 
tasya bhagavato bhaśacyayurupurvacāt avadhikātām tathāgatasya(48) nānā- 
prakārīnaṃ pūjābhisaṃskāram kurvanti(48 49) sarvāduhvasvapnadurnimittam 
cāmamalabhāvāṃ na paśyānti(49). 50 yeśām agniḥbahyam udakabhahyam candā- 
haftibhayam sīmavyāgrabhayam ikṣataraksāśīvisavārṣīkaṣateśānābhayam 
51 tasya tathāgatasya pūjā kartavyā, sarvebhayaḥ bhayebhayāḥ(50) pari- 
mokṣyānti(51); yeśām(52) paracakrēbhyāṃ carahbhayam taksarabhayam tais(53) 
tasya tathāgatasya pūjā kartavyā(54).

1 X; bhagavāṃ śuāivam eta. 2)(X: evam evam tadyathā vadasi. 3)X; yas.
In all Mss there is a good deal of confusion of number throughout this 
whole paragraph. I have generally preferred to read pl. 4)Z; śraddāhā. 
5)X, Y, Z; -putro. 6)X, Y, Z; -duhitā; Z; obl. 7)X; pūjakartukāmenes tena 
tasya tathāgatāya; Y; omits; this omission is similar to, and to be 
accounted for in the same way, as those noted at 5.13 n.2, 6 n.11; T; (dad 
pati rigs kyi bu 'am / rigs kyi bu mo gna dag) de bzin fgo pa de la mchod 
pa byed pa de dag gis ... 8) X; -ām, 9) X; saptarūtrīśālūṣam saptam; Z; saptarū- 
rātrī.mūvasa; T; mūn żag būn du. 10) X; āryāśāṭiśāṃga-mārgasaṃvāgatam; Y; 
āryāśaṭiśāṃgaśaṃvāgataṃ; Z; āryāśaṭiśāṃgaśaṃvāgatam; T; in reference 
to the presence or absence of the mārga read by X, but rejected by Y, Z, the 
evidence of T is very interesting: N and L of Nāg read 'phags pa'i lam yan 
(N; lam) lag bryad, and so does N of Skt; all other versions follow Skt. 
Y and Z. 11) X; upavāsāṃ was originally omitted and has been written under- 
neath the line by another hand. 12) X; upavasitavāṃ; Y, Z; -ltavyaḥ. 13) X; 
(sulcina suśicm. 1b) X; ahāra. 15) X; bhogāṇāṃ; Z; bhuktvaḥ; T; ba' ŋin. 
16) X, Z; sūcai pradeśe (Z originally read praśe, but the correction -de- 
was added by another hand below the line). 17) X; omits; Z; -puṣpabhikīrṇe;
bka' ra mi sīs pa'i dūnos po thams cad mthon bar mi 'gyur ro / 50)(50X:
yasum agnyumda kaviṣṭaṣastra pradāta-campādescribeṣa-vyāyamāntaikaracakṣa-
ḍīvīkā-sūvīṣaṅgāśiśaṣṭapadādakṣamāsakāhībhavyam na bevatī; T: gaṅ dag
mae 'jigs pa daṅ / chu 'jigs pa dañ / mthon gyis 'jigs pa dañ / dug gis
'jigs pa dañ / g-yān saas 'jigs pa dañ / glaṅ po che gsum pos 'jigs pa dañ /
sen ges 'jigs pa dañ / stag gis 'jigs pa dañ / dom dañ / drey dañ / sbrul
gūng pos 'jigs pa dañ / sbruł dañ/sig pa dañ / rkaṅ lag brya pa 'jigs pa.
55) X: karāpyē.

[15] punar aparam maṇjuśrī ye 1 śrāddhāḥ2 kulaputra3 vē kuladūhitarc
vā yāvejīmaṁ triṣaraṇam5 udṛṣṭaṇi6 ananyadevata7, ye puca śikṣā-
padāni dhārayanti8, 9 ye daça śikṣāpadāni dhārayanti10, ye bodhisatvasamvaram caturthaṃ satam11 śikṣāpad rṛt.12 dhārayanti13; ye punar
nikṣrūtaghāvaseṁ15 bhikṣavaḥ16 dviṣatapamādāśa śikṣāpadāni17 dhāray-
anti18, vā19 bhikṣunyāḥ20 puṃcasaṭaśaśikṣāpadāni21 dhārayanti22; ye23
24) yathā-parighēf śikṣāsamvarā tato 'nyatarānyastara-śikṣāpadā-
bhraṣṭā bhavanti24,25 durgatyapāyabhavahhitā26, ye27 tasya bhac-a-
vato bhaṭśajyaguruvaideśyaprabhavya tathāgatasvaya28 nāmasvānti pūjām
kurvanti, (28 29 30) na tēgam tryapāyudhikhaṃ pratikāmṣātivam (30, yah
kaśi)31 mātygrāmāḥ32 pravayakāle33 34)atīvatīvaṃ duṅkhāṃ (34, 35
vedanām vedayati, yas36 tasya bhacavato bhauṣāṭaguruvaideśyaprabhavya
tathāgatasvaya37 nāmasvānti pūjā ca kurvati (37, 38 (29 śīfrhavam39 pari-
mucyati40, sarvāṃcāparinūram putram janajātīyat41 abhirūpaḥ42 prāṇā-
diko43 darṣaṅgīyāḥ44 tīkṣenārdīyo45 buddhimān nirogo46 līpaṅvūho47, na
durva49 piṅgāyā50 51) nāmānugna ojo prahitum (51

1) Y: omits; T: gaṅ dag. 2) X: áraḍḍhaḥ; Y: áraḍḍhaḥ. 3) X: -putro. 4) Y:
duḥita. 5) X,Y: tr. 6) X: sing. 7) X: inserts bhavati; 7̅ / Iha gaṅ mi 'dzin pa dañ . 8) X: sing. 9) X: inserts the whole phrase. 10) sikṣa: inserts ca. 11) X: caturthaṃ śikṣāpadā
satam. 12) X: ace n.11. 13) X: sing. 14) X: punar api; Y: punah; śikṣa:
punar (abhi-). 15) śikṣa: abhinīkṛante-. 16) X: bhūbhikṣava, 17) X: paṇ-
वृद्धिका द्वि सिक्षापदासनाति; सिक्ष: उक्तवाच्यास्थितं द्वे सिक्षापदासनाति; the
formation of Y is unusual. 18) X: धिन. 19) So X; Y: ये; सिक्ष: यथा ca.
20) X: ब्लक्षणया. 21) X: पाणसिक्षापदासनाति; सिक्ष: पाणसिक्षापदासनाति.
22) X: धिन. 23) X, सिक्ष: insert ca. 24) X: यथापरिवर्तितां सिक्षासयंवरूंd
anyatarā sīkṣāpadā bhraṣṭā bhavati; Z: fol.17a begins here: ...।xpaवासयंवरूं
tato यातरयातराचिक्षापदाधि bhraṣṭā bhavanti; सिक्ष: यथापरिवर्तितां
मितांसिक्षासयंवरूंd anyatarā cिक्षापदाधि bhraṣṭाव bhavanti; T: ga...}

यदि लतर योद्ध सु बुध बाल पाँ लिदो पा दे दग गि नाद नस बुलापा।
श्च गि दग यु दा यु दिस भुग मीन कस पा। 25) X: साचा; Y: ते; सिक्ष:
अन्देक्ते; T: ... गाँ दग... na. 26) X, सिक्ष: दुर्गतिवहयाभिउ; Z: दुर्गति-
पुष्यापि उतिति; Sिक्ष: अमिता विपुष्यापि उतिति; T: नाम 'ग्रो नाम सो ग्लि जिग स्क्रण पा। 27) X, सिक्ष: अनि
मिते। 28) X: नृमदेयाः धारे युयुर; Z: पुञ्जं करुण्वि; सिक्ष: नृमदेयाः
धारे युयुर यथव्विभवाता ca पुञ्जं करुण्वि; T: महोद प्रम प्रा सन ताहे
ब्योद ना. 29)(29) यह मोरमा प्राप्तिकाक्षितावकः सिक्ष: ना भुयाष्टक में पथागतिः प्रतिकाक्षिताव
तवच; the quotation in सिक्ष of 155 वंद एके दे; T: दे दह ला नन ग्लि
यु दरु ब्या में पर या। 31) X: या ca; Z: कुद्री; T: गाँ
ला बु. 32) X: ऋगम. 33) X: तियान दुःखाम
कहार काटिका; T: स्तुर्ज ब्या मा रुपिस पा द्रापो पो मी ब्रद पा, अभी
गिय विन X. 35) Z: inserts te. 36) Y: ये. 37)(37) X: नृमदेयाः अनुमारे पुञ्जा
यु करुण्वि; Z: बोढ़ वसू प्र.; T: महोद ना. 38) X: inserts sa; Z: ते; T: दे.
39) X: सुभहम ca; Z: श्लिम; T: न्यु दु। 40) X: प्रस्वत्यां Y, Z: प्र.; T: योक
सु थर बार] यु दा ro. 41) Y: प्र.; Z, X: -स्त श्री. 42) X, Z: अहिरु; Y:
अहिरुप्रा. 43) X: प्राकुंडिका. 44) X: दशानीया. 45) X: -एंद्रियाम.
46) X: बुधिमान्तम. 47) X: अर्ग्याम. 48) X: अल्पवुधम भुविविययति; Y: 'िधा-
व्यापें; Z: ... वृखा. 49) X: ca instead of तात्या. 50) X: श्रिक्यान. 51)(51) X:
-मजोपचारं, omitting अमूँगण; Y; (अमूँग)अमूँगयति sm; thus
omitting by a simple scribal error: ojo आहित्यम. अथा कहाल भगवान
छुस्मा छुस्मा अनामं अनाम; i.e. the introductory phrase of 163; अमुँगः ojo
न्यत्तम; T: de la मा यिन पस भुढङ पर मी नस so /.

163)1 अथा कहाल2 भगवान छुस्मा अनामं अनामण्यति3 सम्म.
उदाहरणस्यः 4 त्यम अनामं पातिपद्यायिः 5 यद अहम6 तात्या भागवानो
भृगुसमवृद्धिप्रम्प्रहस्या तथागताःतथात्क पहिष मनसान्बुधास्या
7 गुणमुण्डमान 8 वर्गायिमाः 9 अथा वा ते कामका 10 विमातिर विमरी
कित्सा वाला जनम्म हळ्ळथुष्मरोकर, अथायुस्मान अनामः 12 भागवानम्

etad avocat: ma me bhadanta bhagavan kāṃkṣāḥ na vimati na vicikitsā vā tathāgatābhaṣītesu dharmesu tatksasya hetor nāsti tathāgatanām aparīśuddhayāvāḥ manahāmanudācareḥ ima bhagavān sūryāndramasaḥ evam mahārādhikāv evam mahānubhāvau prthivyām nipatsyuḥ; su merger parvatarājā sthānāt samkramet na tv eva buddhānām vacanam anyathā bhavati kim tu bhadanta bhagavan santi satvā śrāddhendriyavikalā idam buddhagocaram śrutvā tesāṁ evam bhavati: katham idam nāmadheyyamaraṇamātrena tasya tathāgatasya etakā guṇānuṣamsā bhavanti; te na śrāddhadhanti na pattiyanti pratikṣipanti, tesāṁ dīrgharātram anarthāyāḥi sukhiṣaḥ vinipātāya bhavisyate bhagavān ētaḥ: asthānam ānandānava-kāśo yesāṁ tasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ karampute nipateta yat tasya durgatypāyaganaman bhavet duḥśrāddhadhānyam ānanda buddhānāḥ buddhagocaram yat tvam ānanda śrāddhāṣi pattiyasi tathāgataśaṅkā 'nubhāvo ārastavya abhūmiś cātra sarvasrāvaka-pratyekebuddhānām sthāpayitvā ekājātipraṭibaddha bodhisatvā mahāsatvā. durlabha ānanda manuṣyapratilabhāḥ; durlabham trisu ratnesu śrāddhāgauravam durlabhataṃ ca tasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaśravam apraṃṇaṃ ānanda tasya bhagavato bhaisajya-guruvidyāprabhasya tathāgatasya bodhisatvacaryam apraṃṇaṃ upāyakauśalyam, apraṃṇaṃ prāṇidhānavistaram. ūkāṃkṣamāno 'ham tasya tathāgatasya kalpena vā kalpāvaśesena vā (77) (78) bodhisatva-cārikā vistaretāṃ samprakāśayeyam kaśyatananda kalpa na tv eva (79) (80) tasya bhagavato bhaisajyaguruvidyāprabhasya tathāgatasya pūrvaprāṇidhānaviśesavistarasya paryanto 'dhīṣṭum.
None of our Ms. - and we have three here - has śakyaṃ, but all unmistakably have the infinitive adhigantutp at the end of the sentence. T also has no śakyaṃ, but it, at least, also does not instruct the main vb. as an infin. In light of the requirements of sense, and in light of parallel passages (Sukh. 37.4, etc.) we have supplied the śakyaṃ. 81) X: -vistarum; T: rgyas pa'i. 82) X: omits; Z: vistaraparyantam.

[17] tena ca1 punah2 samayena3 4) asminn eva parasādi4 trānāmukto nāma bodhisatvo mahāsātvah5; sa utthāyāsanad6 7) ekānunam cīvram prā-vṛtya7 daksīnām jānumandalam prthivyām pratiṣṭhāpya yena bhagavāmas tenāṃjāliṃ prāṇamya bhagavantam etad avacat: bhaviṣyanti bhadanta bhagavan9 paścime kāle paścime10 samaye satvā11 nānāvādhipādītā, dīrghaśānyena12 kaśnagātra13, kuśītassocchuskakantausthā14, māranābhimukха15, rodamāna16 mitrajñātisālohitā17 purīvarītā18, 19) andhakārāṃ diṣṭaḥ paśyanto19 yamapurusair apakarsamānā20; tasya21 kadevaram atra22 śayitam23, vijñānam yamasya dharmajñayasāvatara-m-upa-nilā24; yā ca25 tasya26) puruṣasaya sahaṣā prsthīanubadhā devatā, yat tena kuśalāṃ vā akūśalāṃ vā krtam bhavet26 27) taci ca sulikhitam krtvā27, yamasya dharmajñayasopanāyate26 28, 29 o30 dharmajñās31 tam prechati ganayati, yathākrtam32,33 kuśalāṃ akūśalāṃ vā34 35)tathā-jñāṃ ajñāpayati35, 36) ye tasya bhagavato bhājaīyaguruvaidūrya-prabhaya tathāgataśaṃ samajnyaṃ tasyātmārtvāyādātyāvastaṃ pra-yogenā pūjāṃ kurvanti36 37) satthānaṃ etad vidyante37 yat38 tasya vijñānam39 punar eva40 pratinivarteta41 42) svapnāntara ivātmānam samjñāti42; yadi vā saptate divasane, yadi vaikavīmaśatime divasane, yadi vā pumacatrim-śatime43 divasane, yadi vā navacatvārimśatime44 divasane tasya vijñānam45 nivarteta; smrtim upalabheta46 47) kuśalāṃ akūśalāṃ49 karmavipākāṃ svayam eva pratyekbho bhavati50 51) śivatāhet52 53) api pāpam karma.
na karoti $^{54}$

$tasmā$ chṛddhena kulaputrena vā kulaḍūhātā vā tasya

tathāgatasya pūjnā kartavyāṁ $^{55}$

1) $X$: khalu instead of ca. 2) $X$: pūja. 3) $X$: samaye. 4) $X$: tasyāṁ eva

parśadī; $Z$: tatra parīṣāyāṁ; $T$: 'khor de'i naḥ nas. 5) $X$: mahāsatva sen- 

apiṭito bhūtā śannirantaḥ; $X$ alone makes this addition which is a piece of 

later stereotyped phraseology. 6) $X$: uṣṭhāya−; $Z$: -cauña. 7) $T$: ekām-

sam utarāṃsaṃgam kṛtvā; $Z$: ... pāraṇītvā; $T$: bla gos phrag pa geig tu

gzar nas. $X$ again has a reading conforming to later stereotyped phraseology.

$X$. 8) $X$: omits bhadanta. 9) $X$: although partially obliterated, $X$ appears to 
have here inserted satvā; cf. n.11; $Z$: -kānuma. 10) $X$: pūna. 11) $X$: omits 
satvā; cf. n.9. 12) $X$: dīṛghavyādhīṇāḥ; $T$: (bro nad sna tshogs khyis yongs su 
gzir te/) yun riṅ po'i bro nad khyis. 13) $Y$: -gātra. 14) $X$: akṣugata-sūkṣa-

kaṇṭhoṣṭāḥ; $Y$: kṣutarṣocchusakkaṇṭhoṣṭhaḥ; $Z$: kṣutarṣocchusakkaṇṭhoṣṭaḥ;

$T$: bkres pa dañ / skom pas gro ba dañ / mchu ni skums /'. 15) $Y$: -ābhi-mukha.


$Z$: mitrajñātisalchitēbhī; $T$: mda' bās dañ / ṣe du dañ / snap pi pūjn mtshams

... khyis. 18) $X$: paritā. 19) (19) $X$: andhākārān disāmarṣyato; $Y$:

-āndhākāra- disāmarṣyato; $Z$: andhākāradīśamaṃpacāryoḥ; $T$: phyogs rnam

ni mun par mthon / All three Ms. insist on a final long a for andha, 
an apparent acc.sing. of dis, and the neg. prefix a- for paṣyanto; in 
light of this our emendation is a radical one. It is not impossible that 
andhākāra- represents a case of double sandhi and that we should read 
andhā kārān disaṃ paṣyanto. $T$ could easily have made the mistake that we 
perhaps make in our emendation. 20) $X$: ākāraṃmāṇīḥ; $Z$: vākaraṃmāṇīḥ;

$T$: (gūn rje'i mi rnam khyis ni) dārus te'. 21) $X$: so ca tasya; $Z$: so tasya.

22) $X$: kasaḍeśavarom atra; $Z$: atra atra about 15 akṣaras missing; $T$: de'i

luṣ 'il na nāl. 23) $X$: duṅtla. 24) $X$: upaṅtāmyati; $T$: kheir ciṇ. We have 
taken the -m of -ṛṣṭaṇ ( = ṛṣṭaṇa) as intended for a hıntum-bridger(?)

25) $X$: yaś ca; $Y$: yac ca; $Z$: -śca; $T$: see next note. 26) (26) $X$: satasya 

sahāvaṃvadā hyāṃ yetkṣaśi tena puruṣo ṣa kuśalām akuśalām bā kṛtāṃ 

bhavati; $Z$: manuṣyaḥ ... (about 13 akṣaras) ...ṣa kuśalāmālaṃ vā akuśala-

mālaṃ vā kṛtāmx ... (about 11 akṣaras); $T$: mi de dañ I benz chig skyen pu'il 
lha slad bzin 'bruñ ba mañ legs pa des ni des dge ba dañ / mi dge ba skyis 
pa. 27) (27) $X$: ta sarvaṃ sulikhitam kṛtvā; $T$: de thams cad legs par yi ser 

bris nas. 28) $X$: -opacṣyate; $Z$: -opaṃśayati; $T$: phul ba dañ /. 29) $X$: 

inserts tada. 30) $X$: inserts 'pl. 31) $Y$: -rājā, $Z$: -rājāx ... (about 4 

35) (35z: tathājñāpayati; T: (deng ba 'am / m dge ba ji ltar byigs pa) de bzin du bsgo ba las /). 36) (36x: tatra xx te mitrajñātālohtāsās tasya turyasyārthāya tam bhagav(x)x bhaiṣajyaguru-vaiḍūryaprabhaṃ tathāgataṃ saraṇāṃ gaccheyus tasya tathāgatasya pūjāṃ kuryu; Z: ye tasya bhagavato xxxxrav(ai)dūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya saraṇaṃ samāyati · tena tasyāturyasyāṛtyāṃ prāyogena pūjā kartavyā; T: gaṅ dag nañ pa de' don du bcom ldan 'das de bzin gsegs pa sman gyi bla bai dū rya'i 'od de la skyabs su mchi žin 'di 'dra ba'i sbyor bas mchod pa bgyid na /). 37) (37z: sthānām etac chidyate. 38) (38x: sthanām etac chidyayate. 39) (39x: tadviśānāṃ; Z: viśāna. 40) (40x: api instead of eva. 41) (41x: pratīnivartata. 42) (42x: svapnāntaragata ivātmānam samjñāte; Y: svapnāntaragātā ivātmānam samjñāte; Z: svapnāntaragata ivātmānam samjñāte; T: ruti lam rms pa bzin du bādg ḍid kiyis 'tshal ba'i gnas der mchis te /). 43) (43x: pācattītati; Z: pācattītātme. 44) (44x: ekopācattītātime. 45) (45x: inserts punar api; T: sler ldog cin. 46) (46x: upalabhaṇeta; Z: upalabhātī; T: (dran pa) ḍrīd la). 47) (47x: sa. 48) (48x: kuśalām. 49) (49x: inserts vā; Z: akulaṃ. 50) (for the whole phrase): de dge ba dañ / mi dge ba'i las kyi rnam par smi bo bādg ḍid kyi mion sum du 'grid te. 51) (51x: inserts: jātvā sa. 52) (52x: -hetur. 53) (53x: xxx pēpam akuxxk arma na tasyātyayati. 54) (54x: tsamā (ṣrā-). 55) (55x: bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguru-vaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṃ dhārayetavyam · yathā saṃvidyāmānā ca pūjāṃ kartavyā; Z: (ṣrāx...x) (about 15 or 16 akṣaras) ... xxgata yasya pūjā kartavyāḥ (judging by the number of akṣaras, Z probably had the same reading as Y); T: de lta laga pa'da pa'i rigs kyi bu 'am / rigs kyi bu mos de bzin gsegs pa de la mchod par bgyi'o. [18J athāyuṃnā śānandas trāṇamuktasya bodhisatvasyaivaṃ āha; 3 katham kulaputra tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya pūjā kartavyāḥ trāṇamukto bodhisatva āha; ye bhadantānandaḥ 5 mahato yādhe 6 parimocitukāmāḥ, tais tasyāturyasyārthāyaḥ sapta rātrimīdivaṃ aṣṭāgyasamanvāgyate upośadhasavaram grīḥtavyam, bhikṣusanghasya cāhārapānai sarvopakaranair yathāśāktyā pūjopasthānam kartavyam; 10) trīṣṭṛtvā rātrau trīṣṭṛtvā divase tasya bhagavato bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya namasyātavyam navacatvārikṣadvedaṃ sūtram lanjusmāraiyatvam navacatvārikṣad īdrāṇāṃ pradīpītavyāḥ, sapta pratīma...
kartavyāḥ, 18) ekaikāyāḥ pratimāyāḥ sapta sapta dīpaḥ sthāpayitavyāḥ(18, ekakeva19 dīpaḥ20 sakaṭacakraprayamānaḥ21 kartavyāḥ22. yadi23 navacat-
vārimātame24 divase āloko na kāhyate25 26) pancaramāpi kā ca patakā
navacatvārīmād drillkā(?) kartavyāḥ(26)

1) X: trānanumuktena nāma. 2) X: bodhisatvam etad avacat; T: byāḥ chub sema
dpa' skyabs grol la 'di skad ces smra so. 3) Z: -guruvaigūr(rya)xx. (1 leaf missing). 4) X: bhagavatānanda. 5)(5 X: vyādhitam mahato vyādeh;
Y: mahato vyādhyah; T: gai dag nas cen po las. 6) Y: te; T: de dag gis.
7) X: tasyaturṣavya.- 8) X: sapta divasāṇā; T: hīn bdun mtshan bdun du (cf.
ethe edition of the Tib text [18n.4 for the variants for this passage]).
9) X: āryaśatāmga.- 10) X: upavāsa(m). 11) X: (u)pavasitavya. 12) X: ca
bhaga(vato) bhalasyajūgūdīya(prabhās tathāga trṣkrtva rātrau
trṣkṛtvā divasaṃ nāmaka[ritavyam]; Y: trṣkṛtvā rātrau divasasya tasya ... (cf. Śikṣ 290.10: trṣkṛtvā rātrau trṣkṛtvā divase); T: hīn lan gsum
mtshan lan gsum du/com ldan 'das de bṣin gsga pa sman gry bla bai dū
rūya'i 'od de'i mtshan yid la bya'o. 13) X: nacatvārīmāstadvedanā.
14) X,Y: usmāravyatvā; T: gdon par bya'o. 15) X: ekonapaścēśa. 16) X,Y:
dīpa. 17) X: prajvālayitvā; T: bud par bya'o. 18)(X: ekaikāva prati-
mayāḥ sapta dīpaḥ prajvālayitvā; T: sku gsum re re'i sphyin smar ya mar
me bdun bdun gsga go /. 19) X: ekaiko. 20) X: dīpa. 21) X: sakaṭacakra-
prayamānaḥ; Y: -prayamānaḥ. 22) X: kartavyā; Y: kartavyaṃ. 23) X: yady.
24) X: ekonam. ... 25) T (for the whole clause): ci nas kṣei ṣag bai byu
rtsa dgur mar me mi za pad par bya'o. 26)(26 X: veditavyāṃ sarvasampad iti
pancaramāpi kā ca patakā ekonapa(cma)xktā kartavyā; Y: ... -caturvīpaḥ
drītikā; T: tshon sna līna pa' il ba dan bai byu rtsa dgu las lhag par bya'o /.

[19] punar aparāṃbhadāntananda 1 ye rājām 2 ksatriyānām 3 mūrdhābi-
siktanām 1 upadravoparasargāpāyāsānā 5 pratyupadhitā 6 bhavvyah, vyādhipīdā
vā svacakrapacakrarepidā 7 vā naksatrepidā vā naksatraçrehepidā
vākālena vātavvtipida vā smāvrtipiddā vā hena rājā 9 ksatriyena 10
mūrdhābhishiktena sarvasatesu maitracitena 11 bhavityaṃ, bandhāna-
gatā 12 mokṣitavyā 13 tasya 14 bhagavato bhalsājyaguruvaīdūryaprabhāṣya
tathāgataśya 15 tādāśā pūjā kartavyāyā yastāpūrvakā 15 tasya rājām 16
ksatriyasya 17 mūrdhābhishiktasyaitena 18 kusalamūlāṇa 19 tasya bhagavato
bhaisajyaguruvaidūryaprabhāsya tathāgatasya pūryaprajñānaviśesena
	tatra visaye kṣaṇam bhavisyati, subhikṣam, kālena vātavrṣita-
sasyam sampatsyati, sarve ca visayanivāsinaḥ satvāḥ arogā
sukhitā pāramodyavahulu bhavisyanti; na ca tatra visaye āstakṣa-
rākṣasaḥbhītāpiśācā satvānām vibhethayanti sarvadurnimitā na
paśyanti; tasya rājāḥ kṣatriyasya mūrdaḥbhīṣaḥāyaḥ-
varṇabālaḥrūṣyaṁvāryaḥbhīvṛddhim bhavisyati.

[20] athāyusmān āndandaḥ trānāmuktaśaṅkayaṃ āhaḥ: kathām kulaputra
parikṣitāyaḥ punar eva vivardhate, trānāmukto bodhisatva āhaḥ na
tvayaḥ bhādantānamāha tathāgatayeṅkte śrutam santi navākālamaranānām.
8) tena mantraṣadhiprayoṅga upaṇiṣṭā(8) santi satvā vyādhiḥ, na ca
guruko9 tasya vyādiḥ kim tu10 bhaisajyopasthāya vakravirūhita yādā vā
vaidyā abhaisajyam11 kurvantu etad12 prathamāṃ13 skālamanrāmānāṃ,

dvitiyam skālamanrāmānāṃ yasya rāja adbhaṇḍena kālakriyā14 tritiyam skāla-
amanrāmānāṃ ye 'tiva pramattāṃ prāmādavihārīṇāṃ15 tesaṃ amūṣa ojāṃ
aparānti16 caturtham skālamanrāmānāṃ ye agnīdāhena17 kālām kurvanti,
pancamam skālamanrāmānāṃ ye udakena marisyaṃti18 saṃtham skālamanrāmānāṃ
ye simhavāgrasṛgālavyādāncaṃ suṣmamadhyagata19 bhavanti22 saptamam
skālamanrāmānāṃ ye giriṭāt24 prapatanti25 astamam skālamanrāmānāṃ ye
visāccaksākāvādāpyoṣena maranti, navamam skālamanrāmānāṃ ye ksuttaro-
pahata26 bhārapaṃ alabhamānā27 kālām kurvanti28 ye samkṣepena
mahantā skālamanrāmānā nava tathāgatena nirdistā29, 30 Anye cāprameyā-
kālamanrāmānāṃ30.

1) z: änando. 2) x: trāṇamuktaṁ bodhi(satvam) e(tad av)c(at); Z: trāṇa-
mu(k)t(x)xystxvan āha; T: byni chub sems āpa' skyabs grol la 'di skad
ces smras so. 3) z, y: -āyu. 4) y: omits bhadanta. 5) x: -āntikā. 6) x: sati.
7) x: nakāla-; T (for the whole phrase) btsun pa kun āpa' bo dus ma yin
par 'chi ba dgu yod par/kgyod kyis de bzin gség pa las ma thos sam .
8) (8) x: tesaṃ pratiṣeṣena satraṇasadhiprayoṅgā upaṇiṣṭā; Z: tena mantraṣa-
ḍhiprayogopadīṣṭā; Z: tena mantraṣadhiprayoṅgām upaṇiṣṭā; T: de'ī phyir / sīṅga
sman 'yi sbory or 'Nam mams bstan to / 9) x, z: gurukā. 10) x: ki tu.
Y: omits kim tu; Z: kixxx... (from this point the remainder of Z, except
the last folio containing part of the colophon (in fact this colophon
belongs to Z), is lost); T: (beginning from na ca guruko...) de na dzhabs
mi cher kyi sman dūi, etc. 11) Both X and Y read vaidyābhaisajyam which
could be separated as vaidyā bhaisajyam, but the correct separation is
preserved in the fragment W which begins here: ...xxyā bhaisajyam, and
confirmed by T: yañ na sman pa sman ma yin pa byed pa. The reading of X end
Y represents a case of double sandhi. After -bhaisajyam X adds: xnxīḍānaṃ
kālēṃ?12 kūrvaṇatītī12 X: (i)daṃ; Y: eṣā (?). 13) X: obl.; Y: pra-
thamaṃmām. 14) w, x: kṛyā. 15) x: -vihārineh. 16) Cf. BHSG 16.16, but W:
cispaṃ17 x: -opahaxx...; X: sing. 18) T: mes tshig ste. 19) x:
mṛiyati; T: 'chi ba'o. 20) x: obl.; Y: -maraṇā. 21) X: xx vyāghravāya-
camdofunga; T: sen ge da'i / stag da'i / wa da'i / sbrul da'i / gcen gnan khro bo'i. 22) x: väṣṣān kalpayati marati instead of bhaventi; T: na'i du chud de 'chi ba' o. 23) x: saptam. 24) x: -taṭṭa. 25) x, y: kaṣṭarṣo-. 27) y: -māṇāḥ. 28) T changes the order: gañ dag das dañ skom ma rṇed nas bkres pa dañ / skom pas fen te 'chi ba'i dus byed pa'o. 29) (29) x: xmany sa(p)kṣ(e)p(x)xvāxxxmarāṇāḥi tathāgatena nirdeśāṇi; T: mor na 'di dag ni/de bā'īn ḍēges pas dus ma yin par 'chi ba chen por bstan pa ste /. 30) (30) x: anyāni cāprameyāxxxlamarāṇāḥi; W: anye ca aprameyā-m-akālamaxx...; T: gian yañi dus ma yin par 'chi ba ni graṅs med dpag tu med do /.

[21] athā1 tatra parśadi2 dvādaśa mahāyakṣasenāpataya3 sannipatī4 abhūvān:5 kibhīcro6 mahāyakṣasenāpatir6, vajro7 mahāyakṣasenāpatir6, mekhilo mahāyakṣasenāpatir6 anilo8 mahāyakṣasenāpati9, sanilo9 mahāyakṣasenāpatir6, indilo mahāyakṣasenāpati, pāyilo10 mahāyakṣasenāpati, māhuro mahāyakṣasenāpati, cindilo11 mahāyakṣasenāpati, cochuro12 mahāyakṣasenāpati, vikalo13 mahāyakṣasenāpati14 ete
dvādaśa mahāyakṣasenāpataya15 ekaikaḥ sapta sapta yakṣasahasreparivāra16 ekavācenaiva17 bhagavatam18 evam śuḥ19: śrutam20 asmākaṁ21,22 buddhānubhāvena tasya bhagavato bhaisajyaguruśaiddhyaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṁ;23 na bhūya 'asmākaṁ durgaṁbhayaṁ24, sahitā samaṅgaṁ yāvaṁjīvam buddham śaraṇāṁ25 gacchām,26 dharmaṁ śaraṇāṁ27 gacchāmāḥ,28 saṁgaṁ śaraṇām gacchāmāḥ,29 sarvasatvānāṁ arthāya hitāya sukhaṁ autṣukyam karisyānaḥ30, vīsesena yatra31 grāme va nagare va janapade32 vāraṇyayati vata idām sūtraṁ pracaṁyati33; yo va34 tasya bhagavato bhaisajyaguruśaiddhyaprabhasya tathāgatasya nāmadheyaṁ dhāraṇyayati35,36 vaeyam api te ca raskṣyānaṁ sarvopadravebhayāḥ pari-mūcaṁyāmat samvādāṁ paripūrṇāyāmaḥ36. athā khalu37 bhagavān teśāṁ mahāyakṣasenāpatināṁ38 saṁhukāraṁ adāsit39; saṁcu saṁcu mahāyakṣasenāpatayāḥ40 yad yāyaṁ41 tāsaṁ42 bhagavato bhaisajyaguruśaiddhyaprabhasya tathāgatasya kṛtaṁkām anumānantāḥ43 sarvasatvānāṁ hitāya pratipunnāḥ44.
1) X: inserts khalu. 2) X: parṣāyag. 3) X: -senāpatayā. 4) X: inserts yaduta. 5) X: inserts nāma after the name here and throughout. 6) Throughout the list X has -pati; Y always -patih. 7) X: vajro nāma; X: vajraś ca nāma. 8) X: obl., showing makhilo nāma mehā(yakṣa) xxxxxxxmahāyakṣa, etc.; -senapati anific nāma would fill this space exactly. 9) X: sanilo. 10) X: pā-ī-lo. 11) X: vidālo. 12) X: caundhuro. 13) X: obl., showing caundhuro nāma maxxx- senāpatixxxxxx(yakṣa) senapati(xxx); (ma)hāyakṣa senapati(vikalo) nāma mehā- (yakṣasena(pati)) would fill the space exactly. 14) This is the end of the enumeration in Y in spite of the fact that only eleven yakṣasenāpatis are named. The curious thing is that X appears to have had exactly the same list as Y. Although two names are obliterated in X, it is clear that it had contained only eleven names; the number of akṣaras exactly corres-ponds—(allowing, that is, for the uniform insertion of nāma in X) to the number of akṣaras in Y (cf., notes 8 and 13); and in spite of some variation in spelling X appears to have given the names in the same order. T has twelve names, but since in a number of cases determining the Skt. name to which the individual Tib. names correspond is far from easy, I am now not able to say where in the Skt. list the missing name belonged or to attempt a reconstruction. 15) Y: -senāpatayā. 16) Y: -parivāraḥ; X: -parivāra te (this is the beginning of the 2nd line of fol. 38a; the lat-line is mostly obl.). T: gnod sbyin sde dpon chen po re re la yān / g-yog gnod sbyin bdun 'bum bdun 'bum yod pa ste / de dag gis (supporting X's te). 17) X: ekakaṇṭhena; Y: note the instr. of a stem vāca (unrecorded in BHSG); T: (de dag gis) tshig gcig tu (neither T nor X has an eva). 18) X: bhagavatan. 19) X: ānu. 20) Y: śruto (X also probably read śruto, but it is partially obl.). 21) X: obl.; Y: 'smakan; T: bdag cag gis. 22) X: adds -r bhavavata (the superscribed -r may indicate that X, instead of asmākam (n.21), had asmānāhir). 23) (23T: bdag cag la yān han 'gror mchī ba'i 'jigs pa 'byun bar mi 'gyur ro / . 24) X: inserts te vasaḍ before sahitā; T: de na bdag cag. 25) X: sarana. 26) X: gacchā; Y: gacchāmaḥ. 27) X: dharma sarana. 28) X: gaćāṁ(x)x. 29) X: .xxcāma. 30) X: (kariṣyā- mahe. 31) X: yatraḥgrāme. 32) X: omits janapaḍa. 33) T: spyod pa dañ. 34) T: 'cha' na. 35) X: obl.; Y: pl. 36) X: xxxxstham karisyati tāvat vasaḍ bhagavat satvādakṣāyām(x)xxlayiy(x)xxxxxxya par(i)m(o)cayi(g)- y(x)xxxsaṃ aśaṃ pari-pari-paryayyāme (cf. Dutt 31.57); Y: ... sarvāśa pari-paryayyā; T: (cha' na dañ) / mchod pa dañ / rim grol bgyid pa'i sems con de dag la bdag cag gis bsrūn bar bgyi / yoṣa su bekyaḥ sor bgyi / gnod pa thams cad las yoṣa su that bar bgyi / bsam pa thams cad yoṣa su rdzoṛs par bgyi'o / . 37) T: de nas. 38) X: - senāpatinā. 39) X: adāt; for Y cf. BHSG.
[22] 1) athāyusmān ānando(1 2) bhagavantam etad avocat(2): ko nāmāyām bhagavan3 dharmaparyāya4 katham caina5 dhārayami. bhagavān Eha: tena hy ānanda dharmaparyāya6 bhaisajyaguruuruvaidūryaprabhasya tathā-gatayā pūrvaprameśhannavienāvistaram7 iti dhāraya8; avādaśīnām mahā-yakṣamānātipatiṁ9 pra xxxxxxxx(rava)xxxxxxxti nāma dhāraya10.

1) (1: xxxxxmaṇḍo; T: de nas tshe dān idan pa kun dga' bo. 2) (2: This is expanded - by means of a typical formula - in T: (kun dga' bo) stan la sna te / bla gos phrag pa gsig tu gzar nas/pus mo g-yas pa'i lha āa sa la btsugs te / bcom idan 'das pa la ba de lugs su thal mo sbyar ba btud nas/bcom idan 'das la 'di skad ces gzol to /. 3) (3: x: bhagava. 4) (4: x: dharmaparyāya. 5) (5: x: caina. 6) (6: T: inserts 'di. 7) (7: x: pūrvapramāśvīcesa-; T: smon lam gyi kh Yad par rgyas pa. 8) (8: T inserts here: bya n chub sems dpa' lag na rdo rjes dam bca pa žes bya bar yān sūn sīg / las kyi sgrib pa thams cad rnam par sbyon ži n re ba thams cad yods su skad bo žes bya bar yān sūn sīg /. 9) (9: x: mahāyaxxpatiṁān. 10) (10: T: good sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po bcu gūs kyi dam bca pa žes bya bar yān sūn sīg / (for all of T [22] cf. StP).

[23] idam avocat1 bhagavan2. ātmananā3 manjuśrīt bhūmārabhūtā4
5) āyumāmā caṇandesa trāṇamuktaś ca bodhisatvā nā ca bodhisatvā nā ca mahāśrēvakā nā ca rājāmyabrūhmacārapatayanā sadevānātāsurasax xxxrvnā ca loko bhagavato bhājitaṁ abhyvanandum(5).

1) (1: x: avocat. 2) (2: T: bcom idan 'das kyi de skad ces bka' stsal nas /. 3) (3: x: ātmananā. 4) (4: x: manjuśrībhūmārabhūtā. 5) (5: āyumāmā caṇandesa trāṇamuktaś ca xxxrvnā ātma bhūmārabhūtā craw ātmanā ca bodhisatvā nā ca bodhisatvā nā ca mahāśrēvakā nā ca rājāmyabrūhmacārapatayanā sadevānātāsurasax xxxrvnā ca loko bhagavato bhājitaṁ abhyvanandum(5).
mi dan / lha ma yin dan / dri zār bcaṣ pa'i 'jig rten yi raṅs te/bcom ldan 'das kyis gsum pa la māon par bstdod do / . Tht is again corresponds exactly to the wording of SīP.

[24]  1)āryabhaisajyagurur nāma mahāyānasūṭraṃ sambalpa

1)1X:  āx(x)ṣajyaguru nāma ... T: 'phags pa bcom ldan 'das smon gyi bla bai ḍū rya'i 'od kyi sdon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa ŋes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo rdzogs so /.
The Tibetan Translation of a Sanskrit Text of

The Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra
Introduction.

It will, of course, be obvious from what I have said in the introduction to the Sanskrit text that my interest in the Tibetan translation of Bhg is - at this point in time - secondary. A critical edition of it is here added for the convenience of the reader, for the aid it might offer in approaching the Sanskrit text, and because it has become a convention to edit the Tibetan translation when one edits its Sanskrit 'original'. But its inclusion here should not be taken to imply that I think there is any direct relationship between this Tibetan translation and the Sanskrit text of Redaction A from Gilgit. Any relationship has yet to be determined; and even now it is clear that this Tibetan translation is not a direct translation of the Gilgit text of Redaction A.

I have not studied the Tibetan translation in detail because I was first of all interested in the Bhaisajyaguru-sūtra at Gilgit, and because any detailed study of the Tibetan would have required that Redaction B also be critically edited. In addition to this, a study of the Tibetan text would also have required that a number of other texts be studied in detail. Among these other texts the Ārya-sapta-tathāgata-pūrva-prajñādāna-vibṛṣa-vistara-sūtra (Pek. Vol. 6, no. 135), the Ārya-tathāgata-vaiśāky-prabha-nāma-baladhana-samādhi-dhāraṇi (Pek. Vol. 6, no. 137) and at least three commentaries on the first of these (Pek. Vol. 80, nos. 3953, 3954, 3955) would have to be taken into account (I have read only the first two texts). In short, this would have required a separate project.

Instead of such a project I have simply made an edition of the Tibetan translation of Bhg which I could use in editing my Sanskrit text and in making my translation. This edition is based on the Derge, Nartang, Peking and Lhasa versions of the Kanjur text. And I have taken the Derge version as my main text. The punctuation in my edition is that of this version. Variants from the other versions are marked by 'Arabic' numbers. It is necessary to note this because my edition for paragraphs [4] through [21] has in fact two separate critical apparatuses. The first marked, as I said, by 'Arabic' numbers, gives variants from the versions of Bhg; the second, marked by lower case letters from a to z.
gives variants from the Derge, Narthang, Peking and Lhasa versions of the Arya-septa-tathāgata-pūrva-pranidhāna-vibhaj-vistara-sūtra (Tib.: 'phags pa de bzin gsegs pa ḏaṅ ṣon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa sles bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo) = StP. StP is a text in two

bān po. The first bān po deals with six Tathāgatas, each in the same way: it first gives his name; then the location, name, and description of his buddhfield; then it enumerates in the yada ... tada formula his vows. The pattern is almost exactly the same as that found in Bhg [4] - [6] (for these Buddhas see S. Hummel, "'Der Medizin-Buddha und seine Begleiter' im lamaistischen Pantheon", Sinologica 2 (1950) 81-104). The second bān po deals exclusively with Bhagājyaguru and the text of this bān po - all but the very end - is almost word-for-word the same as the text of the Tibetan translation of Bhg (I am at this point not sure who 'borrowed' from who; arguments could be made to support the priority of either.) I had, then, for the bulk of the text eight separate versions. But in spite of this the number of true varia\(\overline{\text{r}}\) is very small, most of them are scribal errors or 'misspellings'.

To my knowledge there are only two small fragments of a Tibetan translation of this 'text' from Tun-huang, neither of which was positively identified by Lalou (M. Lalou, Inventaire des manuscrits tibétains de Touen-houang, conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale (Fonds Pelletot tibétain) I (Paris: 1939) nos. 247 and 248). Although I cannot say whether these fragments come from Bhg or StP, no. 247 corresponds to the text found at [7]14; and no. 248 to that found at [18]8.

According to the colophons the translation of Bhg was made by Jina-mitra, Dānāśila, Ye sses sde, etc.; that of StP by Jina-mitra, Dānāśila, Śilendrabodhi and Ye sses sde. Both, therefore, were probably translated at the beginning of the 9th century A.D. (J.W. de Jong, "Notes a propos des colophons du Kanjur", Zentralasiatische Studien 6 (1972) 507, 524).

Finally, it should be noted that both Bhg and StP are classified in the Tantra section of the Kanjur. This is a little strange since Bhg contains nothing which could be called Tantric, and StP contains at the most a few short (non-tantric) dhāranis (on both points cf. pp. 270f below). An interesting passage in F.D. Lessing & A. Waymon, Māhas grub rje's Dvālamantalo of the Buddhist Tantras (The Hague: 1968) may provide us with some idea of the kind of thinking which underlies this classification:
"Some claim that the following two works belong to the sūtra category, because they are set down as sutras in former catalogues: 1. the Saptatathāgata-pūrva-pranidhāna-viśeṣavistāra-sūtra...; 2. the Bhagavatō bhaiṣajya-guru-vaiḍūryaprabhasya pūrva-pranidhāna-viśeṣavistāra-sūtra... Others claim that they belong to the mantra category, because the acārya Śāntarakṣita has composed a rite [based on them] (Toh. 3133, no author listed). He composed it consistent with the structure of kriyā-caryā rites, in that he has the preliminaries of observing the Sabbath (uṇḍā), and so on. They claim, moreover, that the two works belong to the Tathāgata family. Our own school places them in the mantra category. They are also explained as belonging to the mantra category in the Sarvadharani-mandala-vidhi (Toh. 3136, by Ratanākīrti), called 'Bright sun-rays'. However, the family to which they belong is not certain."

It would appear that in this case at least the Kanjur classification is based on factors external to the texts themselves.

I add here two concordances of the material on which my edition is based.
Concordance of the Kanjur Editions of the 'phags pa

boom las 'das smon gyi bla bai du rya'i 'od kyi
scon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa sgs bya
ba theg pa chen po'i mdo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph No.</th>
<th>Derge</th>
<th>Narthang</th>
<th>Peking</th>
<th>Lhasa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>da 274a1</td>
<td>tha 470a6</td>
<td>da 253b7</td>
<td>ta 419a3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>274a2</td>
<td>470b1</td>
<td>253b8</td>
<td>419a5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>274a2</td>
<td>470b1</td>
<td>253b8</td>
<td>419a5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>274a4</td>
<td>470b4</td>
<td>254a2</td>
<td>419b1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>274a6</td>
<td>470b7</td>
<td>254a5</td>
<td>419b4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>274b1</td>
<td>471a3</td>
<td>254a7</td>
<td>419b7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>274b4</td>
<td>471a7</td>
<td>254b2</td>
<td>420a5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>274b6</td>
<td>471b3</td>
<td>254b4</td>
<td>420b1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>275a3</td>
<td>471b7</td>
<td>254b7</td>
<td>420b5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>275a4</td>
<td>472a4</td>
<td>255a1</td>
<td>420b7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>275a6</td>
<td>472a4</td>
<td>255a3</td>
<td>421a3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>275b1</td>
<td>472a7</td>
<td>255a5</td>
<td>421a6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>275b3</td>
<td>472b3</td>
<td>255b7</td>
<td>421b2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>275b5</td>
<td>472b6</td>
<td>255b9</td>
<td>421b6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>275b7</td>
<td>473a2</td>
<td>255b4</td>
<td>422a2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>276a2</td>
<td>473a5</td>
<td>255b6</td>
<td>422b4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>276a4</td>
<td>473b1</td>
<td>255b8</td>
<td>422a7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>276a6</td>
<td>473b4</td>
<td>256a2</td>
<td>423b3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>276b2</td>
<td>474a1</td>
<td>256a5</td>
<td>422b7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>276b3</td>
<td>474a2</td>
<td>256a6</td>
<td>423a3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>277a1</td>
<td>474b2</td>
<td>256b3</td>
<td>423b2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>277a5</td>
<td>475a5</td>
<td>257a2</td>
<td>424a3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>277b3</td>
<td>475b4</td>
<td>257a3</td>
<td>424b3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph No.</td>
<td>Derge</td>
<td>Narthang</td>
<td>Peking</td>
<td>Lhowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>da 278b2</td>
<td>tha 476b6</td>
<td>da 258a3</td>
<td>ta 425b6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>279a1</td>
<td>477b2</td>
<td>258b1</td>
<td>426b2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>279a2</td>
<td>477b2</td>
<td>258b2</td>
<td>426b3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>279a6</td>
<td>478a2</td>
<td>258b7</td>
<td>427a3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>280a1</td>
<td>479a1</td>
<td>259a8</td>
<td>428a2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>280a7</td>
<td>479b2</td>
<td>259b6</td>
<td>428b3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>281a3</td>
<td>480b3</td>
<td>260b2</td>
<td>429b5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>281b3</td>
<td>481a6</td>
<td>261a1</td>
<td>430b1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>282a1</td>
<td>481b4</td>
<td>261a6</td>
<td>430b6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>282a6</td>
<td>482a5</td>
<td>261b4</td>
<td>431a7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>282b6</td>
<td>482b7</td>
<td>262a2</td>
<td>432a2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>283b1</td>
<td>483b4</td>
<td>262b3</td>
<td>432b7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>283b4</td>
<td>484a2</td>
<td>262b6</td>
<td>433a5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>283b6</td>
<td>484a4</td>
<td>262b8</td>
<td>433a7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colophon</td>
<td>283b6</td>
<td>484a5</td>
<td>262b8</td>
<td>433b1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph No.</td>
<td>Derge</td>
<td>Narthang</td>
<td>Peking</td>
<td>Lahasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>da 261a5</td>
<td>the 452a6</td>
<td>da 242a3</td>
<td>ta 400a4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>261b1</td>
<td>452b3</td>
<td>242a6</td>
<td>400b2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>261b3</td>
<td>452b6</td>
<td>242a8</td>
<td>400b5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>261b5</td>
<td>453a3</td>
<td>242b3</td>
<td>401a2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>261b7</td>
<td>453a5</td>
<td>242b5</td>
<td>401a5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>262a2</td>
<td>453a7</td>
<td>242b7</td>
<td>401a7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>262a4</td>
<td>453b3</td>
<td>243a1</td>
<td>401b3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>262a6</td>
<td>453b6</td>
<td>243a3</td>
<td>401b6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>262b1</td>
<td>454a3</td>
<td>243a6</td>
<td>402a3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>262b3</td>
<td>454a5</td>
<td>243a8</td>
<td>402a5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>262b5</td>
<td>454b1</td>
<td>243b1</td>
<td>402b1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>262b7</td>
<td>454b4</td>
<td>243b4</td>
<td>402b4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>263a2</td>
<td>454b6</td>
<td>243b5</td>
<td>402b7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>263a4</td>
<td>455a3</td>
<td>243b8</td>
<td>403a4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>263a5</td>
<td>455a5</td>
<td>244a1</td>
<td>403a6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>263b3</td>
<td>455b5</td>
<td>244a6</td>
<td>403b6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>264a3</td>
<td>456a7</td>
<td>244b6</td>
<td>404b2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>264b1</td>
<td>457a1</td>
<td>245a3</td>
<td>405a4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>264b6</td>
<td>457b2</td>
<td>245b1</td>
<td>405b5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>265a4</td>
<td>458a1</td>
<td>245a6</td>
<td>406a5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>265b3</td>
<td>458b4</td>
<td>246a3</td>
<td>407a3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>265b3</td>
<td>458b4</td>
<td>246a3</td>
<td>407a3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>266a1</td>
<td>459a1</td>
<td>247a3</td>
<td>407b2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>267a1</td>
<td>459a1</td>
<td>247b2</td>
<td>409a2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph No.</td>
<td>Derge</td>
<td>Narthang</td>
<td>Peking</td>
<td>Lhasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>da 267b3</td>
<td>tha 461b4</td>
<td>da 248a5</td>
<td>ta 410a4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>268a3</td>
<td>462a7</td>
<td>248b4</td>
<td>411a1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>268b1</td>
<td>462b6</td>
<td>249a1</td>
<td>411a7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>268b6</td>
<td>463a7</td>
<td>249a7</td>
<td>412a1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>269a5-269b6</td>
<td>464a1-464b6</td>
<td>249b5-250a6</td>
<td>412b3-413a7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE

TIBETAN TEXT
[21] de nas saās rgyas kyi mthos chos kyi rgyal bu 'jam dpal sten las laṅs te / bla1 gos phrag pa geig tu bgos2 nas pus mo g-yaś pa'i lha ūa sa la btsugs te / bcom ldan 'das ga la ba de logs su that mo shyar ba btud nas bcom ldan 'das la 'di skad ces gsol to / gaṅ thos pus sems can rnams kyi las kyi sgrib pa yoṅs su byaṅ bar 'gyur ba daṅ / slad ma'i tshe slad ma'i dus su dam pa'i chos ltar bcos pa 'byuṅ ba na / sems can de dag rjes su gzūn ba'i slad du de bžin gṣems pa de dag gi mtshan daṅ / shon kyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa bcom ldan 'das kyi bsten du gsol /


[31] de nas bcom ldan 'das kyi 'jam dpal gzon nur gyur pa la legs so ūes bya ba byin te / 'jam dpal legs so legs so1 / 'jam dpal khyod kyi sfiṅ rje dpag tu med pa bskyed nas sems can las kyi sgrib pa sna tshogs kyi bsgrigs pa rnams daṅ / lha daṅ ni rnams kyi don daṅ / phen pa daṅ bde ba'i phyir gsol ba 'debs pa ni legs so / 'jam dpal de'i phyir legs par rab tu sdon la yid la zuṅ2 ṣig daṅ bsad do / 'jal dpal. gzon nur gyur pas bcom ldan 'das de bžin no ūes gsol nas / bcom ldan 'das kyi ltar sman pa daṅ /

1)N: legs pa legs. 2)l: zuṅa.

[41] bcom ldan 'das kyi de1 la 'di skad ces bka' stsal to / 'jam dpal sar phyogs legs su2,ā saās rgyas kyi sfiṅ 3) 'di nas saās rgyas kyi sfiṅ 3) gaṅ ga'i bā klun bcu'i bye ma sāmed 'das pa na 'jig rten gyi khams lai ūā ryaṅ2,ā sanā ba ūes bya ba yod de / de na de bžin gṣems pa agna bcom pa yad dag par rāzogs pa'i saās rgyas rig pa daṅ sabs su sāl ldan na / bde bar gṣems pa / 'jig rten mkhyen pa / skhyen7 ba 'usl māl'

bra la sngur ba b.t. / bia na rod pa / ś heuristic variants are not applicable
sams rgyas bo'om ldan 'das sman gyi bla bai dū rya'i 'od ces bya ba bzung so / 'jam dpal bo'om ldan 'das de bzin gsegs pa" sman gyi bla bai dū rya'i 'od de / sron byam chub sams dpal'i spyad pa spyod pa na smon lam chen po bcu gnis po 'di dag btab bo / bcu gnis ga'u ze na /

1) L: da. 2) N: logsa; almost always throughout; not noted hereafter.
3) (N: omits 'di nas sahs rgyas kyi šin. 4) N: ganga'i. 5) P: bai dū rya, dental d throughout; D: bai dū rya.

a) N: logsa, almost always throughout; not noted hereafter. b) N: ganga'i. c) P, N, D, L: bai dū rya; P has dental d throughout. d) N: 'absu.

[5.1] de'i smon lam chen po da'n po ni ga'n gi tahe bdag ma 'o'Sa pa'i dus na bla na med pa ye'n dag par 'togs pa'i bya'h chub mion par rdo'rus par sahs rgyas pa de'i tahe / bdag gi lus kyi 'od kyin 'jig rten gyi kham gra'n med dpa'c tu med ci'n dpa'c bia mi la'i ba dag lham mo lhen ne lha'n šer gyur cig / sams can thams cad skyes bu chen po'i mtshan sum cu' rtsa gnis da'n / dpe byad bya'h po bregad cu' legs par bregad par gyur te / bdag ci 'dra ba de' bai'n du sams can thams cad kyi' de 3, f'
'дра бар гюр циг цес бтаб бо /

1) P: bcus. 2) P: omits de. 3) P: inserts da'n after de.

[5.2] de'i smon lam chen po gnis pa ni ga'n gi tahe bdag ma 'o'kSa pa'i dus na / bla na med pa ye'n dag par rdo'rus pa'i bya'h chub a) mion par rdo'rus par sahs rgyas pa de'i tahe' bdag bya'h chub (a) thob pa na' (e) ;
na mar bu rnu po sbe bai dū rya (b) ci' 'dra ba (b) de 'dya ba phyi mi 'd' dga gnis na dang pa da'n / da'n na med ci' 'dra ba (b) de' bai'n du sams can thams cad kyi' de 3, f'
дря бар гюр циг цес бтаб бо /
yab sna che ba dan / dpal dan gzi brijk 'par ba dan / lens par rna: pa
dan / fi ma dan zla ba bas lhag paei² 'od zer gyi dra ba rna: kyi legs
par brgyen⁶ par gyur cig / de na⁷ sens can gao dag 'jig rten gyi bar dag
tu³ skyes pa dag dan / gao dag yai m'li 'jig rten 'di na mtshan mo ram
pa mun nag gi naa na phyogs⁴ tha dad par 'gro ba de dag bdag gi 'od
kylie phyogs² dga' mgur²,⁶ 'gro bar gyur cig / las rna:⁵ kyi byed par
gyur cig ces btab bo /

1) N: has what appears to be de dag. 2) L: ni. 3) P, N: ji. 4) N: bar.
5) N, L: lhag par. 6) N: rgyan. 7) N: de nas. 8) P: bar du. 9) P: dgu;
N: 'gur.

a) (aN, L: omit mon par rdzogs par sahs rgyas pa de'i tshe bdag
bya'i chub. b) (bL: has instead ci 'dra bar phyi naa. c) P, L: mod pa.
he N, D, L: dge ba'i las rnas instead.

[5.3] de'i smon lam chen po gsum pa ni gao gi tshe bdag ma 'loia
pa'i dus na / bla na med pa yan dag par rdzogs pa'i bya'i chub mon par
rdzogs par sahs rgyas pa de'i tshe bdag bya'i chub thob pa na¹ / bdag
gi ses rab daan thabs dpag tu med pas sens can gyi khams dpag gis mi laa
ba dag lois spyod mi zad pa daa lidan par gyur te / su yan cis kyi brel
ba med par gyur cig ces btab bo /

1) P: nas.

[5.4] de'i smon lam chen po bli pa ni gao gi tshe bdag ma 'loia
pa'i dus na / bla na med pa yan dag par rdzogs pa'i bya'i chub mon par
rdzogs par¹ sahs rgyas pa de'i tshe bdag bya'i chub thob pa na / sens
sah byan dag lam jam par thugs pa de dag bya'i chub kyi lam la dgo² par
bya'o / b) sem thon kyi lam du thugs pa de¹ / rei sahs rgyas kyi³ lau,
du thugs pa de dag there mi ni thog pa tshen pa la gsum par lha'o dge
btab bo
1) N: omits rdzogs par. 2) N: bi.

a) P: bgod. b)(b, N, L: instead of 'nan thos kyi lam du fugs pa dañi have only 'nan thos dañi. c) N, L: gyi.

[5.52] de'i smon lam chen po lha pa ni gañ gi tshe bdag ma 'oñs pa'i dus na / bla na med pa yañ dag par rdzogs pa'i a) byan chub mgon par rdzogs par (a) sañs rgyas pa de'i tshe bdag byan chub thob pa na / sms can gañ dag bdag gi gan na tshañs par spyañ pa spyod pa dañ / de bzin du sms can giian dpag tu med ciñ dpag gis mi lañ ba de dag thams land kyañ bdag gi miñ thos nas / bdag gi mthu adom pa gsum gyis bdoms pa dañ / tshul khrims fangs pa med par gyur cig / su yañ tshul khrims log par fugs te / 'nan 'grur b) 'gro bar ma gyur cig ces btab bo /

a)(a, N: omits byan chub mgon par rdzogs par. b) P: 'nan par instead

[5.61] de'i smon lam chen po drug pa ni gañ gi tshe bdag ma 'oñs pa'i dus na / bla na med pa yañ dag par rdzogs pa'i byan chub mgon par rdzogs par sañs rgyas pa de'i tshe bdag byan chub thob pa na / sms can gañ su dag lus 'nan pa dañ / dban po ma tshañ ba dañ / mdog mi sdug pa dañ / bems po dañ / yan lag skyon can dañ / agur 1a po dañ / sa bka
cun dañ / žar ba dañ / loñ ba dañ / 'on pa dañ / 2) smonyon par gyur pa
dañ 2 / giian yañ gañ su dag b) lus la nañ kyis btab pa de dag gis 3 bdag gi miñ thos nas thams ced dban po tshañ ziñ yan lag yonis su rdzogs par gyur cig ces btab bo /

1) N: rgyur po. 2)(2: smonyon bar gyur pa dañ; N, L: smonyon pa dañ
2) (emitting gyur pa). 3) N: gi.


[5.72] de'i smon lam chen po bden pa ni / gañ gi tshe bdag ma 'oñs pa'i dus na / bia na med pa yañ dag par rdzogs pa'i byan chub mgon par rdzogs par sañs rgyas pa de'i tshe bdag byan chub chok su na /
gan su dag nam las nam kyi^a yon 1 gyur ba / skro ba / yon med pa / 'thog chas dam / sman mi bdag pa / dpun 'dgon med po / shuk ha / skro bejal ba gan dag gi rna la m u bdag gi b nia greg po^c de dag ni^d nam^e thams chi rao tu si bar gyur cig / byan chub gzi mtha thug gi bar du nam med cin gnod pa med par gnas par^3 gyur cig sec bsho bo /

1) D: omits yon su. 2) P: has nas for ni nad; N,L: simply yon, omitting ni. 3) N: omits gns par.


[5.8] de'i smon lam chen po brgya pa ni gan gi 'thog pa'i dus na^1 / bla na med pa yan dag par rads pa'i byan chu' dad mohn par rads par sa'as rgya pa de'i tahe bdag byan chub theb pa na / bud na gan la la bud med kyi skyon brgya dag gis kun na 'dun mois par gyur pa / bud med kyi dnos po la amod pa / bud med kyi skyes gnas las yon su 'dun bar 'dod pa de dag bud med kyi dnos po la^2 lo; par gyur cig / byan chub kyi mtha thug gi bar du^2 skyes pa'i dhan po byun^3 b bar gyur (is) am bsho bo /


[5.9] de'i smon lam chen po dag pa ni gan gi 'bhyol bbang pa la pa'i dus na / bla na med pa yan^1 dag par : rads pa'i byan chu' dad mohn par rads par sa'as rgya pa de'i tahe bdag byan chub theb pa na / sems con 'a' cu uad kyi dag pa r'ams las yon su 'bar bar byun^o / ita na thea dad pa^a ni mitun pa xin cim? b) pa ni mitun par gyur pa dag yan dag pa^i lao na 'deog par byun^o / xin cim. b byan chub jerno de'i gya^s pa latun par byun^o zon bsho bo /


[5.10] da'i smon lam chen po bcu pa ni gañ gi tshe bdag ma 'ohns pa'i dus na / bla na med pa yañ dag par rdozogs pa'i byan chub mgon par rdozogs par sañas rgyas pa de'i tsha / bdag byan chub thob pa na sema con gañ su dag rgyal po'i 'jigs pas skrag pa dañ / gañ dag, boin ba dañ / brdag pa dañ / po rar slug pa dañ / bka'2 a par 'tos pa / brgyu3 b du nas kun tu'i gtaos pa / na rgyal dañ bral ba lus dañ áng dañ sema sbug bsnañ rvis šen pa de dag bdag gi bsod nams kyis sthus good pa thams cad las yoñu su thar bar gyur cigs tes btab bo /


[5.11] da'i smon lam chen po bcu goig pa ni / gañ gi tshe bdag ma 'ohns pa'i dus na bla na med pa yañ dag par rdozogs pa'i byan chub mgon par rdozogs par sañas rgyas pa de'i tsha / bdag byan chub thob pa na sema con gañ su dag1 bka'2 pa dañ / skom pa'i me rab tu 'bar ba / kha zas 'shol ba la rab tu brtson pa / sbug pa'i las byed pa de dag bdag gis kha dog dañ / dri dañ / nor ldan pa'i kha zas kyis lus tshas a par byas no3 / phyis chos kyis sini tu bde ba la dgod par bya'o žes btab bo /

4) N,L: sim.

[5.12] de'ii smon lam chen po bcu gling pa ni gañ gi tshe bdag ma 'ohns pa'i dus na / bla na med pa yañ dag par rdozogs pa'i byan chub mgon par rdozogs par sañas rgyas pa de'i tsha / sema con gañ su dag1 agren mo bko ba med pa b dhuñ ba / sbug bsnañ ba / bka' ba dañ / tsha ba dañ / sbruñ ba dañ / ša sbruñ dag gis šin mtshan du sbug bsnañ kyi tshor ba myon ba c) dag la bdag gis (c) gos yoñs su 3 na yon gis (c) sthus good pa 'tos pa tshon (3 sna tshogs su) kha bsgyur5, a ba dag sbyin par bya'o / ji ltar 'dod pa bzin du rin po chö'i rgyan sna tshogs dañ6 / spon pa dañ / phreñ
ba dan / spon dan / byug pa dan / rol mo'i sgra dan / phug rdul pa

rtams kyi sms can rtams kyi sms pa thams cad yoins su rdogs par gyur
cig ces btab bo /

1) N.L: su dag, omitting guñ. 3) P: grad. 3) 3) P: spyed pa tshon,
omitting 'tos pa. 4) N.L: omit su, having instead yoins su (kha bsgyur

a) P.N.D.L: add bdag byad chub thob pa na. b) N: omits bgo ba med pa.
a) (c P.D: de dag la bdag gis; N.L: de dag gis (omitting la bdag). a) P: sgyur.
a) N.L: tshogs pa dani. 1) P, N.D.L: btab sta.

[5.133] 'jam dpal boom ldan 'das de bzin gsogs pa aggra bcom pa yan
dag par rdogs pa'i sañs ragas sman gyi bla bai dū rya'i 'od" de sdon
byad chub sms dpa'i spyed pa spyod pa na snon lam chen po bou gnis po
de dag btab par gyur to /

1) P: 'di dag.
a) P.N.L: add 'od kyi rgyal po.

1.3) 'jam dpal de bzin gsogs pa" sman gyi bla bai dū rya'i 'od" de'i
snon lam gān yin pa dañ / sañs regas kyi sīn gi yon ten bkod pa 1.4) gān
yin pa 1.4) de ni bskal pa 'am / bskal pa las lhag par yan zad par byar ni
nus so / sañs regas kyi sīn de ni sīn tu yoins su dag pa 2 stè / rdo dañ /
gsogs ma dañ / gyo mo med pa / 'dod pa'i skyo sa med pa / 'nam soñ dañ adug
bskal gyi sgra med pa / bud med kyi dnos po med pa / sa 2 dañ / rtsig" pa
dañ / rta ba dañ / rta babs dañ / skar khun gi dra ba dañ / ba gam ni bai
dū rya'i rañ bzin cen / pu su ni 6 rin po che sna bdun gyi rañ bzin cen
tè 3 / 'jig rten gyi kham bde ba cen ci 'dra ba de bzin du" / 'jig rten
gyi kham bai dū ryar snañ 4.5 / bai sañs regas kyi sīn gi yon ten bkod pa
yan de dañ 4.5 / 'dra'o / 'jig rten gyi kham bai byad chub sms dpa'
'grañs med dpag tu med pa de dag gi nañ na / byad chub sms dpa' sms
dpa' chen po gtso bo gnis yod de / sgnig gi míñ ni ni ma ltar rtam par
snañ byed ces bya / gnis pa'i míñ ni zla ba ltar rtam par snañ byed ces
bya / de dag ni boom ldan 'das de bzin gsogs pa sman gyi bia bai dū rya'i
1od de'i dam pa'i chos kyi mazod 'dzin pa'o / 'jam dpal do lta bas na dan 5
pa'i rigs kyi bu 'am / rigs kyi bu mos saṅs rgyas kyi 'zin der skye bar
smon lam thob cig /

1) (1) P: ged yin pa; L: omits gaṅ yin pa. 2) P: dag ba. 3) P: can de.
4) P: bai dū rya'i snañ. 5) P: omits dañ. 6) P: dañ.

a) N, L: insert dgra boom pa yaṅ dag par rdzogs pa'i saṅs rgyas.
a) P: sa rede; D, L: sa rdo. e) P: brtsig. f) P: ka(?) su ni; N, L: sa ści
ni; D: ka su ni. h) P, D: bzin du, instead of de bzin du. 1) P: bai dū

173 yang boom ldan 'das kyis 'jam dpal gzhon nur gyur la bka'
staal pa / 'jam dpal smsa can so so'i skye bo gaṅ dag dge bu dañ mi dge
ba mi ṣes pa dag yod de / de dag ni chags pa'i zil gyis non pa / sbyin
pa dañ sbyin pa'i 'bras bu rnam par' smin pa mi ṣes pa'o / de dag ni
byis pa glen pa dañ pa'i aban po dañ bral ba / nor sog ciṅ²: b / sruṅ
ba³: ci la mion par brtson gyi / sbyin pa yaṅ dag par 'gyed pa la', d de
dag gi' smsa mi 'gro ba ste / sbyin pa'i dus he bar gnas pa na raṅ gi
lus kyi sa las bcad pa²: bèzin du yid mi dga² bar 'gyur ro' 6: g / smsa ca
de dag ni bdag fid kyang du maʰ yoa'su ni spyod na pha ma dañ / chuṅ ma
dañ / bu dañ / bu mo la mi³: ster ba lta j smos kyaṅ ci dgos / bran pho⁷: k
dañ / bran mo dañ / las byed pa rnam laʰ lta smos²: kyang ci dgos / gzan
sloṅ ba rnam la'm lta smos kyaṅ ci dgos / smsa can de lta bu de dag ni
'di nas śi 'phoṅ nas⁹ yi dga¹⁰: n kyi 'jig rten du skye bar 'gyur¹¹: o /
yang na duṅ 'gro¹ skye gnas su¹² skye bar 'gyur ro / de lta gaṅ dag sico
mir gyur pa na / boom ldan 'das de bzin gšags pa sman gyi bla bai dū
rya'i 'od² de'i³ mtshan thos par gyur pa de dag ni gšin rje'i 'jig rten
na gnas kyang ruṅ / duṅ 'gro¹ skye gnas na gnas kyang ruṅ ste / der de
bzin gšags pa de'i mtshan mion du 'gyur 'zin dran r) sma thag pa tsam gyis (r
de nas śī 'phos nas yān mi'i 'jig rten du skye bar 'gyur tsho rabs dran par 'gyur ro
\[13\] / ann 'gro'i 'jigs pas skrag nas yān 'od pa'i yon tan
dag don du mi\[14\] gser ba daṅ / sbyin pa la māon par dga' ba daṅ / sbyin
pa'i baṅga\[15\] pa brjod pa daṅ / dbog pa thams cad yōns su ston bar 'gyur
te\[16\] / rim gyes\[8\] raṅ gi mgo daṅ / lag pa daṅ / rkaṅ pa daṅ / mig daṅ /
cha daṅ / khrag kyan sloc ba rnam la rab tu sbyin par 'gyur na / nor yel
phuṅ po gzan lta smos\[9\] kyan ci dgos /

1)\[N, L\]: rnam pa. 2)\[P\]: brtsegs śin; L: dregs śi'n. 3)\[P, L\]: brun ba.
4)\[P\]: bdod pa la. 5)\[P\]: gcod pa; N: 'bad pa. 6)\[N\]: 'gyur'o. 7)\[N\]: bran po.
8)\[P\]: omits la. 9)\[P\]: śī 'phos na. 10)\[L\]: dvaṅga. 11)\[P, L\]: 'gyur ro.
12)\[N\]: gsasu. 13)\[N\]: 'gyur. 14)\[P\]: ma. 15)\[P\]: shags. 16)\[N, L\]: 'gyur te.

a)\[N, D, L\]: chags pas. b)\[P\]: brtsegs śin; D: sogs śin; L: bsog śin.
c)\[P, D, L\]: brun. d)\[P\]: gcod pa la. e)\[P\]: gis; N, L: omit gis. f)\[P\]: gcod.
g)\[P, N, D, L\]: 'gyur pa'o. h)\[N, L\]: du mas. i)\[N\]: mi omitted. j)\[L\]: la for
lta. k)\[N\]: bran po. l)\[P\]: mos. m)\[P\]: la omitted. n)\[L\]: dvaṅga. o)\[P, D\]:
'gyur ro; N, L: 'gyur te. p)\[N, L\]: insert kyi rgyal po. q)\[N\]: de for de'i.
r)\[P, D\]: have instead ma thag tu rim gyes. s)\[N, L\]: rims gyes. t)\[P\]: mos.

[8] 'jam dpal gzan yān sams can gni dag de bzin gṣogs pa rnam sams kyi
balab pa'i gnas 'jig pa' dag yod de\[1\] / de dag tshul khrims log par 'ugs
śin lta ba log par 'ugs nas / gni dag tshul khrims daṅ idan pa de dag
ni tshul khrims\[b\] srin\[c\] gi man du thos pa yoṅs su mi tshol\[3\] te / de
bzin gṣogs pas gsum pa'i mdo sde rnam sams kyi don zab mo mi sés / gni dag
man du thos pa de\[h\] dag ni lhag pa'i fa rgyal can du 'gyur\[i\] te / na rgyal
gyes\[e\] non pas gzan dag la\[f\] phrag dog byed ci'n dam pa'i chos la dba'i sa
bar 'gyur / spon\[g\] bar 'gyur ro\[5\] / mi blun po de lta bu\[h\] de dag ni būṅ
dkyi\[6\] phyogs\[4\] pa ste / dbag kyi lam 'han par 'ugs la sams can 'gzan\[j\] byes\[k\]
ba khrag khrig brgya ston du ma dag kyi g-yai sa chen por lhun\[l, L\] bar
byed pa'o / sems can de lta bu de dag ni sems can dmyal ba\[m\] mi bzaṅ par
'gro bar 'gyur ro\[8\] / gani dag søñon mir 'gyur pa na bcom ldan 'das de bzin
gṣogs pa\[n\] sman gyi bzin bāl lingeri 'od de'i mtshan thos par 'gyur pa\[9\] de
dag ni sems can dmyal ba na rnas kyi der saṁs rgyas kyi mthus de bzin
gsogs pa de'i mtshan mion du 'gyur te / de dag de nas si 'phos nas yoā
mi'i 'jig rten du skye bar 'gyur / yaṅ dag pa'i lta ba can daṅ / brtsa
'grus daṅ ldan pa daṅ / dge ba'i bsam pa can du 'gyur ro'10 / de dag khyim
spaṅ te de bzin gsogs pa'i lタン pa la rub tu byun nas mthar gyi.11
byan chu bsem dpa'i spyod pa'0 spyod par 'gyur ro'10 //

1) P: yod. 2) P,L: bserū. 3) L: 'tshol. 4) N: omits de. 5) N: omit:
ro. 6) P: kyis. 7) N,L: ltuṅ. 8) N: omits ro. 9) P: 'gyur ba. 10) N:
'gyuro; not noted hereafter. 11) N: mthar gyi.

a) P,N,D,L: 'dzin pa for 'jig pa. b) N,D,L: after tshul khrims add
 f) N: omits in. g) N: apa. h) N,L: omit de ltuŋ ba. 1) L: rtogs. 2) N,D,L: 
insert gaṅ after gyan. k) L: bya. L) P, ltuṅ. m) L: ha rgya-' ba for dγal ba.
 n) N,L: add dγra boom pa yaṅ dag par rdoṅs pa'i saṅs rgyas... 'od kyi
raγal po. o) P: dpa'i spyod.

[9] 'jam dpal gzan yaṅ sams can gaṅ dag bdag gi1 bsniags2,u pa
brjod ciṅ phrag dog gis gzan dag la3 mi aṅan par b) brjod pa yod de / 
bdag la bstod ciṅ gzan la smod pa'i sams can de dag ân soṅ gsum po dag
tu lo stoṅ phrag maṅ por sduṅ bsial wyon bar 'gyur ro / de dag lo stoṅ
phrag du ma 'das nas de nas si 'phos nas ba laṅ daṅ / rta daṅ / rña mo
daṅ / boṅ ba la sogs pa'0 dud 'gro'i skye mas rams su skye bar 'gyur d
lcug lcag5 daṅ / dbyug6,e lcag rams kyis7 brdeg pa8 daṅ / bkres pa daṅ / 
skom pas lus fien pa daṅ / khai chen po bkai f te lam du 'gro bar 'gyur
ro9 / gal te brgya8 la h) mi'i skye ba rned na(h yaṅ rtag tu rig bi sams ba
rams kyi naṅ du skye bar 'gyur ro10,1 / bran du11 'gyur ro / gaṅ dag
sion mir gyur pa na bcom las 'das de bzin gsogs pa'1 sman gyi bla bai ðù
rya'1 'od de'i mtshan thos par gyur pa / de dag ni12 dge ba'i rths ba13
des sduṅ bsial thams cad las yoṅs su thar bar 'gyur / dbaṅ po mo bar
'gyur / mkhas pa daṅ / gsal ba daṅ / yid gsumk pa daṅ / dge ba yoṅs su
bsal14,L ba la sion par brtson15 pa daṅ / rtag tu dge ba'i bses' gken
daṅ 'gros pa rned par 'gyur / bdud kyi zags pa gcod pa daṅ / ma rig pa'i
'gyur / skye ba dañ / rga ži dañ / mya žan dañ / smrg ṣnas / ḏon pa dañ / aďu; bhalsal ba dañ / yid mi bde ba dañ / 'khrugs pa nam sn ma yoñs su thar bar 'gyur ro17 //


103 'jam dpal gžan yam sems can gañ dag1 phra ma la mhon par ḏa? žiñ sems can gañ2 dag phan tshun 'thab pa3 dañ / rtsod pa dañ / b) 'gyed par byed du4 b) 'jug pa dag5 yod cè6 / sems can de7 dag rnam par8 rtsod pa'i sems su5 'gyur pa6 lus dañ dag dañ / yid kyis7 md gse ba rnam pa8 sna tshogs mhon par 'du byed do // gcig la gcig phan pa ma yin pa 'dod ciñ rtag tu phan tshun gnod par bya ba'i phyir brtson te / de dag nags tshal gyi lha dañ / žiñ gi lha dañ / r'i lha 'gugs9,6 par byed / đur khrod rnas su10 'byun po tha dañ pa dag 'gugs11,6 par byed / dud 'gro'i skye gnas su sói ba'i srog ṣnas rnas kyi srog good ciñ sa dañ khrag za ba'i gnod sbyin dañ / srin po rnas mchod par byed de12 / aďa bo de13 miñ nas brjod pa14 am / rguns byas nas der rig sñas drag po agrub15 ciñ / byad stems14,6 dañ / ro lasi kyi sbyor bas srog gi bar Chad bya ba dañ / lus rnam par gcig par 'dod pa la gañ dag gis bcom ldan 'das de bain ṣnas pa sman kyi bla dai dö rya'1 od kyi rgyal po15,6 de1 i mtshan thos par 'gyur pa16 de dag la gañ gis kyañ bar Chad bya bar17 mi nus te / de dag phan tshun byama pa'i sems dañ / phen pa'i sems dañ / gnod pa'i
sems 18,1 med pa'i sans su 5 gnas par 'gyur / 'rañ rñi bdog pas chod
šes par 'gyur ro 19 //

stem. 15) Note the addition of rgyal po to the name. It is found in all

mtshan, omitting kyi rgyal po. 1) P, N, D, L: smod sans.

111 'jam dpal gznün yuñ 'khor bźi po dge sloṅ dañ / dge sloṅ ma
dañ / dge bṣaṅ 1 dañ / dge bṣaṅ ma de dag dañ / gznün yuñ dag pa'ti rigs
kyi bu 'am / rigs kyi bu mo gñi dag yon lag bṛgyad dañ ldan pa'ti bṣaṅ
gnas la ñe bar gñas te n / lo scig gam / zla ba gsum du balab pa'ti gzi b
rnam 'dzin ciñ gñi dag gis 2, c bsam pas bāṅ gis 3, d gne ba'i rtsa b a 'dis
nub phyogs gñi na h de bźin gṣegs pa tshe dpag med bāṅpa pa'ti 'jig rten
gyi kham bā de ba can du skye bar 'hog sīg 5, e ces smon lam de lta bu tbtab
pa6 dag las / gñi dag gis bcom ldan 'das de bźin gṣegs pa sman gyi bla
bai gū rya'i 'od 6 de'i mtshan thos par 'gyur: pa de dag 'chi ba'i dus kyi
tshe byaṅ chub sans dpa' bṛgyad rdzu 'phru rgyis lhags nas ston par /
'gyur te / de dag der padma 8 tshon kha 9 dag na tshogs rnam las 10, h
rzus 11, 1 te skye bar 'gyur ro // gzi la la dag lhai 'jig rten du skye
bar 'gyur ba de dag ni der skyes nas sillon gyi ñe bā'i rtsa ba de zad
par mi 'gyur žiñ 'Nam 'gros 'gro bar mi 'gyur ro / de nas ñi 'phos nas
knañ mi'i 'jig rten 'dir gniñ bźi pa'i ñeñ phyug 'khor los sgyur 12, j
ba'i rgyal por 'gyur te / sans can bye ba khrag khrig 'bṛgya ston k du ma,
ägə ba bu'i los kyi lam la 'gyur pa'n 'gyur ro // gzi du na yun rgyal
rgis žiñ sā la 13, n chen po lta bu'i khyim dag tu skye bar 'gyur / bram
ze žiñ sā la 13, n chen po lta bu'i khyim dag dañ / khyim bdag žiñ sā la 13, n
chen po lta bu'i khyim dag dañ / nor dañ 'bru dañ / sgrub 14 dañ / bu'15
ba ma\textsuperscript{16} po 'byor pa'i\textsuperscript{17} khyim dag tu skye bar 'gyur te / gugs phun sum tshogs pa daň / dbe'a phug phun sum tshogs\textsuperscript{6} pa daň / g-yog phun sun. tshogs pa daň / dpa' ha\textsuperscript{18}, p daň / rtul\textsuperscript{19} phod po daň / tshan po che chen po'\textsuperscript{20} stobs kyis\textsuperscript{1} gugs daň ldan par 'gyur ro //


[12] bud med gaň gis de bźin gšes pa de'i mtshan thos sīn buñ ba
de'i bud med kyi ãnos po de tha ma' yin par ães par bya'o //

a) D: tha ma pa.

[13] de nas bcom ldan 'das la 'jam dpa'l gšon nur gyur pas 'di skad
ces gmos to // bcom ldan 'das slad ma'i tahe\textsuperscript{2} slad ma'i dus na / gaň dag
mdo 'di 'chag ba daň / klog pa daň / 'chad\textsuperscript{1} pa daň / gšan dag la rgya cher
yaň dag par ston pa daň / yi ger 'dri ba daň / yi ger 'dri\textsuperscript{b} steol ba
daň / gšega dam la bris te me tog daň / bdug pa daň / spos daň\textsuperscript{c} / phroey
ba daň / byug pa daň / gđugs daň / rgyal mtshan rmama kyis bkur sti bgyid
pa'i\textsuperscript{2} day pa'i\textsuperscript{3} rigs kyi bu 'tam / rigs kyi bu mo de dag la bdag gis bcom
ldan 'das de bźin gšes pa sman gši bla bai dü rya'i 'od de'i mtshan rmam
pa sna tshogs\textsuperscript{h} su bsgrag\textsuperscript{4} par\textsuperscript{b} bgyi'o // tha na rmi lam du yah\textsuperscript{8} sañs rgyas
kyi mtshan rmama lam du së bar bsgrag\textsuperscript{5} par bgyi'o // tshon sna lña pa'i\textsuperscript{6}
gos\textsuperscript{7} rmama kyis drkis te phyogs gšei mar bdag\textsuperscript{6} na / gaň na mdo sde 'di\textsuperscript{8}
gnas pa\textsuperscript{h} der rgyal po chen po bai 'khor daň bcas pa daň / lha bye ba khrig
khrig brgya ston gšan yaň meñ bar\textsuperscript{9} 'gyur ro // gaň dag bcom ldan 'das de
bzin gseg pa sman gyi bla'i bai dhi rya'i 'od.1 a de'i mtshan dan / sgon gyi sman lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa'i k 'di 'udzin pa de dag dus ma \nlegs par 'gum par mi 'gyur / sus kya'n madras 'phrog par mi mtc te / phrogs \nna ya'n slar 'phrog.11 L par 'gyur ro //

1) L: 'clen. 2) N: bkur stir bgyi ba'i; L: bkur stir bgyi pa'i.
3) N, L: omit dad pa'i. 4) N: tshogsu. 5) P: bar. 6) P: lha na pi (?).
11) P: 'phrog.

d) N, L: bsgrags. e) L: 'sn. f) P: omits he bar and reads bsgrags; N:
sgrags. g) P: giag. h) N, L: insert de dan. i) D: omits sman gyi bla.

[44] bcom ldan 'das kyi bkas' stsal na / 'jam dpal / de de bzin /
ji skad smras pa'1 e bzin no // 'jam dpal dad pa'i rigs kyi bu 'am / rigs 
kyi bu no gan dag de bzin gseg pa de la mchod pa byed pa de dag gis de 
bzin gseg pa de'i sku' gungs bya'c / fin zang bdun du 2, d) phags pa'i yan 
lag bgyad 2, d) dan ldan pa'i bshen gnas la de bar gnas par bya'3, e //
khad zas gtsal ma bza'6 zin lus legs par b' bkru's te / gos bza'n po dri ma 
med pa'5 bgo zin phyogs gtsal mar' me tog sna tshogs sii ma 6 bkram pa / 
spos ana tshogs kyi' bdugs 7, j) pa / ras dan / g thugs dan / rgyal mtshan 
sna tshogs kyi legs par b'ryan. 8, k) pa'i sa phyogs su'9 dri ma med pa'i sams 
dan / mtog pa med pa'i sams dan / gnod sams med pa'i sams dan / byams pa'i 
sams dan / bta'1 sams kyi sams dan / mftam pa'i sams su10 bya / rol mo'i 
sgra dan / sii sman dan / gtu dbang bla' zin de bzin gseg pa'i sku gzaugs 
de la bskor bar bya stell, m / de'i sman gyi sman lam ya' yid la bya' zin 
mlo a2 'di ya' bustan na' gta' buams 12 pa dan / gta' sman pa'i bsum pa'1 
de thams caf yoig su rdiogs par 13 'gyur te / gal te tshe ri'n bar'14 sman na 
ni tshe ri'n por 'gyur ro // gal te lo's spyod 9 dan ldan par sman na ni 
lo's spyod 'byor par 15, r 'gyur ro // gal te dban phyug dan ldan par sman 
nu ni tshogs 16 cha' huns rided par 'gyur ro // gal te bu 'dod na ni'17 bu
med par 'gyur ro // gaṅ dag stū. pa can gyi rmi lam rnis sam / gaṅ du bya khva ta dañ 18,8 / itas ṇam pa mthoṅ ṇam / gnas gaṅ du bkra mi śic pa brgya" dag gnas par gyur pa la / gaṅ dag bcom ldan 'dar de bzin gsheg pa oman gyi bla da î du rya'i 'od" de la mchod pa rnam pa sna tshogs kyis bkur stî byed na rmi lam ṇam pa dañ / itas ṇam pa dañ / bkra mi śic pa'i chos po thams cad mthoṅ bar mi 'gyur ro // gaṅ dag mes 'jigs pa dañ / chus 'jigs pa dañ / [19] mtshon gvis 'jigs pa dañ / dag gis 'jigs pa dañ / g-yaṅ sas 20 'jigs pa dañ / glaṅ po che' stum pos 'jigs pa dañ / sen gis 'jigs pa dañ / stag gis 'jigs pa dañ / dom dañ / tred dañ / sbrul gadug pas 'jigs pa dañ / sbrul dañ [21,x] / sêg pa dañ / rkaṅ lag bṛgya' pos 22 'jigs pa de dag gis de bzin gsheg pa de la mchod pa byas na 'jigs pa thams cad laś yongs su thar bar 'gyur ro / gaṅ dag pa' rol gyi dran tshogs kyis 'jigs pa dañ / rkaṅ pos 'jigs pa dañ / chos pos 'jigs pa de dag gis kyâṅ 23 de bzin gsheg pa de la mchod pa bya'ro //


[15] 'jam dpal gzhan von dpal' bzhin rgyan 'gyi m ba sem gis dpal. 'tab bar su chen meng' gsum la skya brtan "'dzin cii 'bla gzhan vd. 'dzin na da'/. ga/ dag bzhin balab pa'i bzhin pa dag 'dzin pa da'/. ga/ dag balab pa'i bzhin ba/ po dag 'dzin pa da'/ ga/ dag dag bzhin balab pa'i bzhin pa dag 'dzin pa da'/.


[16] de nas boom ldan 'das kyi tashe da'/ da/ mom gan pa kun da/ bo la bka' stsal pa / kun da/ bo gan gi phyir nga/ boom ldan 'das de bzhin sdegs pa sman gii bla ba/ 'du rya'i 'od b/ de' i yon tan brjod par khyod dad dam yid ches sam / yu'i na khyod sams rgyas kyi phyod yul zeb' wo 'di la yid phra
cher yaḥ dag par bṣad par 'tad kyaḥ bskal pa laḥ par 'gyur gyi / bcom ldan 'das de bzin gṣes pa aman gyi bla bai ḡi rya'i 'od x de'i šon gyi amon laṃ gyi khyad par 'gyas pa'i mtshu' rtoqs pa ni ḡa ḡa ni 'gyur ro //


[17] yaḥ de'i tshe 'khor de'i naḥ nas byaḥ chub sems dpa' sems dpa'
chen po skyabs la grol şes bya ba sten las laṅs te / bla gos phrag pa
goig tu gzar nas pus mo g-yas pa'i lha ņa se la btsugs te / bcom ldan 'das ga la ba de logs su thal mo sbyar ba btud nas / bcom ldan 'das la 'di skad ces gso to // bstun pa bcom ldan 'das slad ma'i tshe / alad ma'i dūn na / sems can bro nad sna tshogs kyi c yōns su gzi te / yum riṅ po'i bro nad kyi lus kyi ša bṣiṅ d / bkres pa daḥ skom pas gre ba daḥ / mchu ni skams / 'gun pa la ni mhon d u phyogs / mdza' bṣes' daḥ / śe du daḥ snag gi gšen mtshams šu ba rnam kyi ni bekor / phyogs rnas ni mun par mthoṅ / gšin rje'i ni rnas kyi ni dreṅ te / de'i lus 'di na šal yaḥ rnam par šes pa chos kyi rgyal po gšin rje'i mdun du khrid ciṅ / mi de daḥ lhan ciṅ skyes pa'i lha slad bzin 'braṅ ba gaṅ lags pa des ni dge ba dan / mi dge ba 'j gyis pa de ḡa ḡa thams cad legs par yi ger bris nas chos kyi rgyal po gšin rje la phul ba daḥ / chos kyi rgyal po gšin rjes de la drin šiṅ brtags la dge ba 'am / mi dge ba ji lṭar m gyis pa de bzin
98

du bogo ba lasphants / gañ dag nad pa de'i don du bcom llan 'das de bzhin
gsug pa sman gyi bla hai 'lu ry.'i 'od' de la skyaks su9 mchit ziin 'di
'bra ba'i c'bhor bas mchod pa bgyid10,1q na / de'i rnam par ses pa slar
llog ci'n rm1 lum rim pa bzhin du bdaq, tide kyis11,r 'tshal ba'i gnas der
mchis te12 / yun na ni gduugs bon / yun na ni gduugs fil sku rtsa gcig / yañ
nu ni gduugs sum cu13 rtsa lha / yun na ni gduugs bai lecu rtsa dgu la /
de'i rnam par ses pa slar llog ci'n drun pa rused la / de'g dge la dañ /
mi uso ba'i lan kyi rnam par smin pa bdaq hid kyi rnon sum du 'gyur te
troc gi 'lad da yun / saig pa'i les mi bgyid do14 / de lta lags pas15
wañ pa'i rigs kyi bu 'an / rigs kyi bu mo de bzhin phyas pa de la mchod
par bgyi'o //

1)N: bskyab. 2)P,N,L: def. 3)N: bs-kamr. 4)N: du for nu. 5)P:
bgyido. 15)N,L: bus.


[18] de nas tahe dañ idan pa kun dge' bos / byañ chub sems dpa'
skyaks1,q grol la 'di skad ces suras so2 / rigs kyi bu / bcom idan 'das
de bzhin phes pa sman gyi bla du rya'i 'od' de la / ji ltar mchod par\nbya / byañ chub dems dpa' skyaks1,q grol gyis suras pa / btsun pa kun dga'
bo gañ dag nad chen po lañ yons su thar bar 'dod pa de dag gis nad pa de'i
don du3 / 14'fin bdon mtsan bdon d du yun lag brgyad dañ idan pa'i gso bskyon
ri sdom pa bman' bar bya'oc / dag sloñ gi dge 'dun la saw dañ / skrom rnam
dañ / yo byad thoms cad kyis ci nus su mchod pa dañ rim pro bya'oc / fin lan
rtsun mtsan lan rnon du14 / bcom idan 'das de bzhin phes pa sman gyi bla
bai du rya'i 'od' de'i mtsan yid la bya'oc / mdo 'di lan bai bceu rtsa dgu
don par bya'o / zag bzi bou rtsa dgur mar me bud par bya'o / sku gzaug bdun bya'o / sku gzaug re re'i spyar sahar yan mar me bdun bdun gzaug5,6 go / mar me re re'i stshad kyan sin6 rta'i 'phaön lo tsam du byas te h / ci nas kyan zag bzi bou rtsa dgur mar me ni zad par bya'o / tshon ana \na pa'i7 ba dun bzi bou rtsa dgu las lhag par bya'o //

1) N: bskyab. 2) N: smraso. 3) P: nad chen po de'i don du. 4) (Both N and L omit the passage beginning rin bdun mtshan bdun du ... and ending ... rim gro bya'o. After ... nad pa de'i don du N has rin lan gsun mtshan lan gsun du which is what P and D have immediately following the passage omitted in N. L, on the other hand, following rim gro bya'o has rin lan bdun mtshan lan bdun du. 5) N: bzag. 6) D: seu. 7) P: lāā'i.


[19] btsun pa kun dga' bo gsan yan rgyal po rgyal rigs spyi bo nas dbang bskur ba rnams la / nad kyi1 gnod pa 'am / rañ gi dmag tshogs sam / pha rol gyi dmag tshogs kyi2 gnod pa 'am / rgyu skar gyi gnod pa 'am / gza' ula ba'i gnod pa 'am / gza' fil ma'i gnod pa 'am / dus ma yin pa'i rim dü char gyi gnod pa 'am / than pa'i gnod pa yan rui ste / gnod pa dng / nad 'go ba dng / 'khrug pa zig ke bar gnas par gyur na / rgyal po rgyal rigs spyi bo nas dbang bskur ba des / sems can thams cad la byams na'i sems su3 bya / btsun4 du bzuñ ba5 rnams gtsun bar5,6 bya ziin goñ o. smon pa dbin du bcom ldam 'das de bzin gsges pa sman gya bla ba'di rgya'i ton6 de la7 de lta hur mchod pa8 byas na / rgyal po rgyal rigs spyi bo nas dbang bskur ba de'i dge bai rtsa ba de dlia / bcom ldam 'das de bzin gsges na6 sman gyi bla ba'di rgya'i 'od7 de'i smon gyi sman lan gyi khyad par ryon7 yul bde ba dlia / lo legs par 'gyur / rluñ dña char dus su5 ldam ziin lo top5 'grub par 'gyur8 / yul de na gns pa'i sman can thams cad kyanu med pa dlia / bde ba dlia9 / mchog tu dga' ba mañ bar9 'gyur ro / yul der gnod obzin dlia / srin po dlia / 'byuñ po dlia / sna za ma rnis pas sman can rnams la gste9 bar mi 'gyur ro / ltañ sman pa10 thams cad mthog bar mi
gyur \[ ro / rgyal po rgyal rig \]s 'gyi \[ bo \] nas dpa\[ aN ba \] de'i \[ tshe \] dañ / mdog dañ / stobs dañ / nad med pa dañ / dpa\[ aN phug \] rnas m\[ on \] par 'phel bar 'gyur ro / /

1) \[ P: \] nad kyis. 2) \[ N: \] tshogs kyis. 3) \[ N: \] semsu. 4) \[ P: \] guñ ba. 5) \[ P,N: \] btañ bar. 6) \[ N: \] omits de bzin gægs pa. 7) \[ L: \] between gyis and yul inserts bde ba dañ. 8) \[ N,L: \] 'gyur ro. 9) \[ N: \] omits bde ba dañ (is L n.7 a false correction of this omission ?). 10) \[ N: \] omits nad med pa dañ.

a) \[ P: \] brtson. b) \[ N: \] btañ bar. c) \[ P,N,D,L: \] insert kyi rgyal po. d) \[ N: \] de la omitted. e) \[ P,D: \] par. f) \[ P,N,D,L: \] insert kyi rgyal po. g) \[ P: \] dus du su. h) \[ N,L: \] lo thog. i) \[ N: \] mañ por. j) \[ L: \] btse. k) \[ P: \] omits pa. L) \[ P: \] 'gyur.

[20] de nas tshe dañ ldan pa kun dga\[ aN \] bos byañ chub sms dpa\[ aN \] skyabs\[ aN \] a groñ la 'di skad ces smas so / rigs kyis bu ji ltar na tshe yoñs su zad nas\[ bN \] yañ m\[ on \] par skyes / byañ chub sms dpa\[ aN \] skyabs\[ aN \] groñ gyis\[ cN \] smas pa / btson pa kun dga\[ aN \] bo dus ma yin par 'chi ba dgu yod par / khyod kyis de bzin gægs pa las\[ dN \] ma thos sam / de'i phyir / shags dañ sman gyi abyor ba\[ eD \] rnas beten to\[ eD \] / sms ceñ nad kyis btañ la\[ fN \] / de nad tahabs mi cheñ\[ bN \] kyañ sman dañ rin gro byed pa dañ mi ldan nam / yañ na sman pa sman ma yin pa\[ bN \] byed pa yañ yod de / 'di ni dus ma yin par 'chi ba dañ po'o // dus ma yin par 'chi ba gëis pa\[ cN \] ni / gañ dag\[ bN \] rgyal po\[ iD \] chad pas 'chi ba'i dus byed pa'o // dus ma yin par 'chi ba gsum pa
ni / gañ dag ha çañ bag mod de\[ bN \] bag mod par gsum pas de dag lu mi ma\[ gN \] yin pa dag gis mdña\[ aN \] phrog\[ fN \] pa'o // dus ma yin par 'chi ba bzi pa ni / gañ dag mañ tshig ste\[ dN \] / 'chi ba'i dus byed pa'o // dus ma yin par 'chi ba lañ pa ni / gañ dag chuñ 'chi ba'o\[ bN \] // dus ma yin par 'chi ba drug pa
ni / gañ dag señ ge dañ / stag dañ / va dañ / abrul dañ / gcan gzan\[ bN \] / khrobo'i nañ du chud de\[ mN \] 'chi ba'o / dus ma yin par 'chi ba bdo' pa ni / gañ dag ri khñ\[ nN \] nas g-yañ du lhun bao'o // dus ma yin par 'chi ba bgyad pa
ni / gañ dag dug dañ / byad\[ cN \] dañ / ro lañs kyi abyor bas gsum pa'o // dus ma yin par 'chi ba dgu pa ni / gañ dag ron dañ skom ma rñed nas bktres pa
dañ / skom pas bden te 'chi ba'i dus byed pa'lo // ndor na 'di dag ni / de bzin gzegs pas dus ma yin par 'chi ba chen por bstan pa ste / bzan yan dus ma yin par 'chi ba ni grâns med dpag tu med do //


[211] de nas 'khor der gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po bcu gnis 'dus gyur te / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po ji 'jigs a dañ / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po rdo rje 1 dañ / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po rgyan 2 'dzin dañ / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po gza! 'dzin dañ / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po rluân dañ / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po gnas bcas dañ / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po dge 3 dañ / gnod sbyon gyi sde dpon chen po t梭 'dzin c dañ / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po smra 'dzin dañ / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po bsam 'dzin dañ / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po g-yo ba 'dzin dañ / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po rdzogs byed de / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po bcu gnis po de dag go // gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po re re la 3 yañ / g-yog gnod sbyin bdun 'bum bdun 'bum yod pa ste / de dag gis tshig grig tu bcom ldan 'das la 'di skad ces geol to // 3 sañas rgyas kyi mthun bdag cag gis / bcom ldan 'das de bzin gzegs pa sman gyi bla bai dû rya'î 'od e de'i mtshan thos te / bdag cag la yañ / han 'gror mchî bâ'i 'jigs pa 'byun bar mi 'gyur ro / des na 5 bdag cag lhan cig tu mthun 6, 8 par ji srid 'tsho'î bar du / sañas rgyas la skyabs su mchî'o / chos la skyabs su mchî'o / dge 'dun la skyabs su mchî'o // sesm can thams cad kyi don dañ / sman pa dañ / bde ba'i slad du spro bar bgyi'o / bye brag tu ni grol êam / grol khyer ram / grol rdaî lam / agom pa'i gnas gañ na mdo sde 'di spyod pa dañ / gañ na 7, h bcom ldan 'das de bzin gzegs pa sman gyi bla bai dû rya'î 'od i de'i mtshan 'chañ ba dañ /
mchod pa dañ / rim gro bgyid pa'i sems cen de dag la bdag cag gis¹
bsrum²,³ bar bgyi⁴ / yods su bskyab⁵ bar bgyi / snod pa thams cad las
yods su thar bar bgyi / bsam pa thams cad yods su rdo rza par bgyi'o /
de nas bcom ldan 'das kyis snod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po de dag la /
legs so žes bya ba byin te⁶ / snod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po dag gañ gi
phyr khyed⁰ / bcom ldan 'das de bžin gčegs pa sman gyi bla bai dū rya'i
'od⁰ de la byas pa gzo žin rje su dran la / sems cen thams cad ld¹ phan
pa'i phyr žugs pa legs so legs so /

a) P,D: ci 'jiigs; N,L: omit ji 'jiigs. b)D: dpañ. c)L: omits btui
1)N: bdag gis. 2)N: rsru. 3)P: bgyi'o. 4)N,L: bskyab. 5)P,D: gnan ste

[22] de nas tshê dañ ldan pa kun dga' bo stən las lañs te / bla gos
phrag pa gcig tu gzar nas / pus mo g-yas pa'i lha āa sa la btsugs te /
bcom ldan 'das ga la ba de logs su thal mo sbyar ba¹ btud nas / bcom ldan
'das la 'di skəd ces gser to // bcom ldan 'das chos kyi rnam grañs 'di'i
miñ ci lañs / 'di ji ltar gzn² bar bgyi / bcom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal
pa / kun dga' bo de'i phyr / chos kyi rnam grañs 'di de bžin gčegs pa
sman gyi bla bai dū rya'i 'od kyi sñon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa
žes³ bya bar zun⁴ sig / byañ chub sems dpa' lag na rdo rjes dam bcas pa
žes³ bya bar yañ zun⁵ sig / las kyi sgrib pa thams cad rnam par abhyod žin /
re ba thams cad yods su skon ba žes³ bya bar yañ zun⁵ sig / gnod sbyin
gyi sde dpon chen po bceu gñis kyis dam bcas pa žes bya bar yañ zun⁶ sig //

1)D: pa. 2)N: bzuñ. 3)N: ces. 4)D: inserts yañ. 5)N: bzuñ; L:
zuñs. 6)L: zuñs.

[23] bcom ldan 'das kyis¹ de skəd ces bka' stsal nas / 'jam dpal
ɡзон nur gyur pa dañ / byañ chub sems dpa' de dag dañ / gṣañ ba pa'i²
bdag po lag na rdo rje dañ / thams cad dañ ldan pa'i 'khor de dag dañ /
 lha dañ / mi dañ / lha ma yin dañ / dri zar bcas pa'i 'jig rten yi' rañs
te / bcom ldan 'das kyis gsuñs pa la mñon par bstod do //

1) L: gyis. 2) N, L: gsan ba'i. 3) P: yid.

[24] 'phags pa bcom ldan 'das sman gyi bla ba tû rya'i 'od kyi
sñon gyi smon lam gyi khyad par rgyas pa 'zès bya ba theg pa chen po'i
mdo rdzogs so //

rgya gar gyi mkhan po dzi na mi tra dañ / dâ na1 sî la dañ
zu2 chen gyi lo tsthâ ba bânê3 ye 'fes sde la soâs pas 4) bagyur
ciñ zus te4 / skad gsar chad5 kyis kyan bco s nas 6) gtan la phab pa7 /

1) P: dâ nê. 2) L: zus. 3) P: bân de; N: bân dhe. 4) (N: zus
siñ bagyur ha. 5) N, L: bcad. 6) N: sîñ. 7) D: gtna la la 'pa(?).
THE BHAISAJYAGURU-SŪTRA

AND

THE BUDDHISM OF GILGIT

*  

TRANSLATION AND NOTES

"La philologie indienne, à peine centenaire, est déjà pavée de dogmes"

Louis de la Vallée Poussin.

"Occasionally one is so fascinated by etymological discussions that one forgets that words have not only an etymology but also a history and that the latter may often be more important for the student of Religion. The question in fact is: what do certain words and concepts mean to specific people at specific times?"

R.J. Zwi Werblowsky.
I. More Notes On and Towards a Methodology.

Undoubtedly one of the major problems in the study of Indian Buddhism is the fact that it confronts an enormous mass of primary sources - both in Indian languages and in translations - without having any very reliable means of arranging them in chronological sequences. Out of this arises the situation, by no means rare, that in modern studies of almost any given topic textual sources which might in fact differ in age by hundreds of years and may never have been available at any one time to any one individual or 'community' are drawn together and used to establish some thing called "the Buddhist" conception of 'purity', or 'The Mahāyāna' conception of 'salvation'. 'Conceptions' thus established are open to at least one devastating criticism: they are complete abstractions with no demonstrable connection with historical reality, with time or place. Even if caution dictates that the 'results' of such studies be presented as 'The, or even A Theravādin Conception of Purity'. the critic may legitimately ask which Theravadins and where and when. And if passages cited to establish the conception are taken from the five Nikāyas, as we now have them, that same critic can justifiably ask for a demonstration showing that the hypothetical holders of that conception could have had access to all the sources cited.

There are a number of ways of avoiding those questions or at least ameliorating their impact - temporarily. But, given the nature of our sources, there are very few occasions when they can be confronted directly. And it is just here, I think, that the discovery of the Gilgit manuscripts takes on its greatest significance. This discovery has in fact provided us with a situation where we know perhaps for the first time that a certain number of texts were all available at the same time at the same place to an actual community. Thus, in the same way that this collection provides an ideal situation for a definite periodization of the grammar and language of Mahāyāna śūtra literature, so too it provides that same opportunity for a definite periodization of the ideas and practices which are generally lumped together under the almost meaningless abstraction "Mahāyāna Buddhism". It allows us the opportunity to see, to reconstruct what 'Buddhism' could or would have been in the 5th-6th century in an actual 'Indian' community.
(It should be noted that the exact date of the Gilgit manuscripts has yet to be determined. There are two kinds of evidence, paleographic and 'historical'. The latter consists primarily of the names of several kings which occur in the colophons of our manuscripts, one of which also seems to occur in an inscription from Gilgit. Historians have not yet been able to settle the problems associated with these kings, although the inscriptions from the Gilgit region promised by Fussman (JA 265 (1977) 39 n.59) might hopefully throw some light on these problems. On the basis of the available evidence the Gilgit collection - and by implication the 'community' - has been dated as either early 5th century, or 5th-6th century, or 6th-7th century. For references see above p.4 and IJL 19 (1977) 202 n.37. I use the 5th-6th century for convenience only, without accepting it as established.)

This 'reconstruction' of the 'Buddhism of Gilgit' in the 5th-6th century on the basis of the literary sources known to have been available there could, of course, proceed in any number of ways. But since any attempted reconstruction would be, in effect, an attempt to discover what the term 'Buddhism' could have or would have meant or included at that time and that place, it would require that all presuppositions regarding what 'Buddhism' is be set aside. This in turn would require that the defining characteristics must come from the Gilgit sources themselves, that the sources themselves must be allowed to say what was and what was not 'Buddhism', or what was and what was not significant. This meant that the "dogmes" of "la philologie indienne" be, as far as possible, ignored. But it also meant that that 'reconstruction' would have to have new criteria by which it could select from the mass of material those ideas or concepts which should be dealt with.

Confronted with this situation and admitting from the outset that at this point in time any attempted reconstruction would have to be preliminary and tentative, merely a first attempt to establish a crude map of the territory, the most controlled method seemed to be the following. I would select one text from the collection - by necessity a relatively short one. I would then read through it carefully noting any ideas, themes or topics which received emphasis, occurred repeatedly or appeared in any way to be significant. Having noted these ideas, themes and topics, they would then be taken as the 'new criteria' by which I could select
from the mass of the larger material those ideas or concepts which should be dealt with. By thus allowing my selected text to establish the norms of significance it appeared to me that I could best avoid any presuppositions. Armed with these criteria I could then read through the collection as a whole and collect those passages which were parallel or related in theme, topic and treatment. Having collected and analyzed these passages, and having assumed for the sake of exposition a hypothetical literate member of the Buddhist community at Gilgit, I could then suggest — and this was my first intention in the study I wanted to undertake — how that hypothetical literate member of the community, assuming that he was familiar with the literature known to have been available to him, could have or would have interpreted the one text I had selected from among the collection. But this is only one thing which such a study could suggest. The same procedure could also generate another set of suggestions. As a matter of fact, by surveying the whole collection for passages which were parallel or related in theme, topic or idea to the themes and topics found in the selected text, I could determine both which themes and topics were unique to that selected text, and which had wider currency, as well as the degree of that wider currency. I could, in short, determine some of the elements which were common to the collection as a whole, some, if not all, of the defining characteristics of what could be called 'the Buddhism of Gilgit'. And this was my second intention in the study I wanted to undertake.

Having decided on this method as that best suited to my intentions, I had to decide on a text. I chose the Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra for a number of reasons: it was short; it had received relatively little attention so that a study of it would not be encumbered with too much prior exegetical baggage; it was (or at least it appeared to me when I first started) a relatively straight-forward text; and, finally, it appeared to be relatively representative of the collection as a whole, a sort of middle-of-the-road text in terms of doctrinal developments (how true all this was I, again, did not realize until much later.)

With a method and a text selected I had to make some decisions concerning the presentation. I was first of all concerned with the construction of my 'notes', postponing for the moment the question of where to put them. Since one of my primary intentions was to discover the elements in Bhīṣa which were elements common to the collection as a whole, and since the nature of the commonality had to be clearly shown, I was of necessity required to show
both the number and the kind of parallelisms which could be found in the larger collection. This, coupled with the fact that very few of the texts at Gilgit are well known, almost none of them translated, and some of them not even edited, ruled out the possibility of simply giving references to the various texts, and in effect dictated that I rely very heavily on textual citation. Since I had to depend on textual citations anyhow, it seemed to me that perhaps the least biased method of presentation would be to compile for each topic discussed a kind of small anthology of representative passages from the collection as a whole bearing on that topic. These little anthologies would then be given first with little or no comment. My own views or remarks could then be added at the end of the anthologies as postfaces where I could draw what conclusions I saw. I followed this method whenever practicable.

I also decided - much to my later chagrin - that the 'texts' thus collected should be translated. And it must be noted here that these translations, based as they very often are on uncertain textual traditions, and done by an inexperienced hand, are only intended as tentative, in some cases merely approximate. I have tried both in my translation of Bhg and in the translations in the 'notes' to be as literal as possible. Often - it has been pointed out to me - at the expense of the English language. I can only say that the language of the original texts I was working with was rarely beautiful, often clumsy, sometimes incomprehensible, and to make it appear otherwise in translation would be to misrepresent my documents; although I have undoubtedly added my own characteristic brand of stylistic ugliness.

Once these 'anthologies' were collected and translated, I had to be concerned with the nature and extent of the remarks to be included in the postfaces. Here it seemed to me to be important, given that my 'reconstruction' could only be a kind of preliminary archaeological survey of the literary remains, to note in particular patterns, types and themes which appeared repeatedly, to note, in effect, the structural aspect of the presentation of the doctrine. But since I was also interested in the kind of 'Buddhism' the available presentation of the doctrine could generate, I thought it was equally important to pay close attention to the functional aspect of the ideas and practices which this presentation made available, to pay close attention to the way in which the practices,
especially, were thought to work, and the goal for which they were intended, according to the sources. Here too I wanted to note any functional interchangeability of ideas and practices, and the degree of this interchangeability. These, then, were the major kinds of things I wanted to signal in my remarks.

There were also two other kinds of things which also seemed worth noting. First of all, it became obvious very early on that the picture of "Buddhism" that was emerging from my sources did not correspond at all, or very imperfectly, to what, for the lack of a better term, might be called 'The Buddhism of our handbooks'. It therefore seemed important to note the way and the degree to which these "Buddhisms' differed. A second thing that occurred to me in the process of my research was that the picture I was getting did, in fact, often correspond in some interesting ways with the picture of Buddhism which emerges from anthropological studies of Buddhism in modern South-East Asia. This, it seemed, was also worth noting; although my treatment here - given my unfamiliarity with anthropological literature - could only be suggestive and in no sense systematic.

Obviously 'notes' constructed in this fashion could be very long - the longest, in fact, is forty-three pages. This presented the problem of where to put them. It would have been theoretically possible to write them up as a long, unified, introductory essay; or to add them as a series of appendices at the end of the translation; or take the text paragraph by paragraph, give the translation of each paragraph first and then the note based on or related to that paragraph immediately after; then the next paragraph, etc. I felt that at this time a unified, introductory essay would be premature. I actually tried it but found such an exposition had too many gaps and holes. The second alternative shared with the first the fact that it would result in separating the text of Bhg from the context in which it was best read. I wanted Bhg to be read in light of all the other sources in the collection, as an integral part of that collection. The third alternative therefore best suited my purposes. If someone were to object that because of the way I have presented it it is very difficult, if not impossible, to read the translation of Bhg by itself, I would say that that was exactly what I intended. For the purposes of what I wanted to study, Bhg, by itself, was of very little importance. As a concession to the reader who might not share my interests I have, however, given a
detailed 'Table of Contents', which also gives by means of headings added to each paragraph number a rough idea of what I thought the structure of the text to be. This same 'Table of Contents' provides an approximate guide to the subject of the various notes.
II. Abbreviations, Bibliography and Notes For Textual Sources

AdP i = E. Conze, The Gilgit Manuscript of the Aṣṭādaśaśaṅkā-yāpañāpāramitā, Chapters 55 to 70 Corresponding to the 5th Abhisamaya (Rome: 1962)

AdP ii = E. Conze, The Gilgit Manuscript of the Aṣṭādaśaśaṅkā-yāpañāpāramitā, Chapters 70 to 82 Corresponding to the 6th, 7th and 8th Abhisamaya (Rome: 1974)

Note: For information on the correspondence of Conze's editions to the Mss. see the 'Introduction' to the respective volumes. The translation contained in both volumes is 'reproduced' in E. Conze. The Large Sutra on Perfect wisdom, with the Divisions of the Abhisamayālākāra (Berkeley: 1975) 431-652. My references are always to page and line number of Conze's edition. I used AdP i and ii very little because it, of all the Gilgit texts, is probably the best known.

Aj = Ajitasenaavadākaraṇanirdesa-sūtra


Tib: There appears to be neither a Tibetan nor a Chinese translation of this interesting text. This makes it all the more important that the ed. of the Skt. - which has been rather carelessly done - be corrected.

Note: References which give only page and line (e.g. Aj 106.7) without citing any text are always to Bhattacharya's edition. When textual citations are actually given I have almost always consulted the Ms. and reference to it is also given.

Other works on Aj.

None.
\[ Bbp = \text{Buddhabalādhānaprātihāryavikurvanānirdeśa-sūtra} \]


Tib: 'phags pa sobs rgyas kyi sobs bskyed pa'i cho 'phrub mwan par 'phrub ba utsan po bsa byi ba theg pa chen po'i maö.


Note: References such as Bbp 1289.3 are to the folio and line number of the Ms, as well as to my edition in JIP where folio and line number are indicated in the transliterated text. References such as Bbp 192-3-4 are to the page-leaf-line in the Tib. translation. Since only a small portion of the text is preserved in the Gilgit Ms., most of my references are to the Tib. Judging by the five extant leaves, the Tib. translation represents a text very close to the Skt. text that circulated at Gilgit. Differences between the two are of a very minor nature.

Other works on Bbp

None.

\[ \text{Eka} = \text{Ekādaśamukha-dhāranī} \]


Note: References are to Dutt's edition.

Other works on Ekā
None

*IP = Gilgit Prañāpāravakā (i.e. the Pahavīmaṭṭhāñchaśrīka up to the end of Ch. 37, and then the Ajñādānacārāśrīka up to what corresponds to the end of the 4th Abhisamaya.)


Ed.: An edition of this Ms. is in progress. Professor Lewis Lancaster of the University of California, Berkeley, is editing the 1st and 2nd Abhisamaya. The last word I have had from him indicated that he hoped to have his edition completed by the fall of 1978. I have agreed to edit the 3rd and 4th Abhisamaya, but I have had little time to give to the project and it remains just barely begun.

Note: I noticed only too late that in referring to this Ms. I sometimes used the original folio number and sometimes that assigned to it in the facsimile. Since both numbers are clearly visible on the facsimile, and since I have cited this Ms. only rarely, I did not bother to change this. Some portions of this Ms. are translated in E. Conze, The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom (Berkeley: 1975), but see my review in Ind 19 (1977) 135-52, on his handling of the Gilgit material.

Ka = Kāraṇḍa vyūha-sūtra


Ed.: P.L. Vaidya, "Avalokitośvaragūpa-kāraṇḍa vyūha", in Mahāyāna-Sutra-Sangraha, Part I (Darbhanga: 1961) 254-308. (This, like most of Vaidya's "editions", is essentially a reprint of an earlier edition done by someone else; in this case S. Samaram in 1872.)
Tib: ’phags pa sa ma tog bkod pa ’bes bya ba theg pa chen po’i mdo Die Xerokopie des Dhasa-Kanjur, Vol. 53, 159-3-2 to 196-1-5.

Note: Although I occasionally refer to the Ms., most of my references to and citations from Kv are based on Vaidya’s edition. This “edition”, as far as I can tell, is based on a single late Ms., the language of which Vaidya described as “horribly corrupt” and “horrible Sanskrit”. This edition also differs very often from the Gilgit Ms. – at least in so far as we are able to judge by the fragmentary and chaotic condition of the latter. Regamey, in speaking first of the Nepalese Ms., says they all “…présentent des divergences presqu’à chaque phrase. La découverte de fragments, malheureusement très endommagés, du Karanādavvūha, parmi les manuscrits de Gilgit (Vie-VIIe siècle), au lieu de fournir l’aide tant espérée, porta la confusion à son comble: ce manuscrit, le plus ancien qu’on connaît, est également le plus fantaisiste et le plus incohérent (p. 418 of last item cited below.)”. My own experience with this Ms. all too plainly confirms Regamey’s observations. In light of this unfortunate textual situation I have tried to be very circumspect in my use of Kv. I have, for example, tried never to cite anything from Kv which is not also found in at least one other source at Gilgit. In spite of all this, the evidence from Kv must always be accepted with some reservations.

Other works on the Gilgit Kv.

[All of the following refer to, or give readings from the Gilgit Kv.]


---, "Lexicological Gleanings from the Kāraṇādavyūha", Indian Linguistics (Chatterji Jubilee Volume) 16 (1955) 1-11.


MvK = Maitreyavyākaraṇa


S. Lévi, "Maitreya le consolateur", Études d'orientalisme publiées par le Musée Guimet à la mémoire de Raymonde Linossier, T.II (Paris: 1932) 355-402. [The ed. of a Nepalese Ms., with Tib. text of first 25 verses.]

Tib: 'phags pa byams pa lhuḥ bstan pa
Die Xerokopie des Ihasa-Kanjur, Vol. 74, 247-2-7 to 250-1-5.

Note: References of the kind MvK 42 are always to the verse number of Mazumder's edition, but whenever the text itself is given I cite my own reading of the Ms. I have also occasionally made reference to, or given a reading from, Lévi's ed.

Other works on Gilgit MvK

G. Schopen, "Text-Critical Notes on the Gilgit Redaction of the Maitreyavyākaraṇa", unpublished paper. [The Gilgit MvK represents a redaction somewhat different from that found in the Nepalese text. This, unfortunately, has not been taken into account by Mazumder who, in editing the Gilgit text has adopted - promiscuously it seems to me - many readings from the Nepalese text. (The Tibetan translation agrees in most cases with the latter.) There are also a number of minor and few major wrong readings of the Ms. in Mazumder's edition.]

Rkp = Ratnaketu-parivarta-ūttra


Z. Nakamura, "Gilgit Manuscript of the Mahāsannipātaratnaketu-sūtra kept in the National Archives, Katmandu", Hokke Bunka Kenkyū 1 (1975) 13-37. [5 leaves, the last of which contains the colophon to Ch. 5.]

Y. Kurumiya, Ratnaketuparivarta, Sanskrit Text (Kyoto: 1978).

Tib: 'phags pa 'dus pa chen po rin po che tog gi gzuru tse bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo.


Cf. Y. Kurumiya, Ratnaketuparivarta, Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts, Ph.D. thesis, The Australian National University, 1974. [Kurumiya's ed. of the Skt. text listed above is a revised version of the first part of this thesis. The second part contains an ed. of the Tib. translation based on the Kanjur editions, but also gives interesting variants from the Tunhuang Ms.]

Note: My references, e.g. Rkp 21.6, are always to the page and line number of Kurumiya's published edition. References to the Ms. are always indicated as such.

Other works on the Gilgit Rkp.


Skt = Saṃghāṭa-sūtra

Ed.: An edition of the Gilgit Mss. of Sg· was made by R.A. Guna­tilaka at Cambridge under the supervision of H.W. Bailey; it has, however, not been published and I have not seen it.

Tib: 'phags pa zuh gi mdo'i chos kyi rnam gr alo

Die Xerokopie des Lhama-Kanjur, Vol.50, 179-2-1 to 214-3-2.

Note: Since I did not have access to Gunatilaka’s ed. my knowledge of Sg· is based entirely on the facsimile. I have used two of the four Mss., Nos. 36 and 37, and my references are usually to No. 37, which is the more complete of the two.

Other works on the Gilgit Sg·


ŚmD = Śrīmahādevīvyākaraṇa

Ms.: R. Vira and L. Chandra, Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition) Part 7 (New Delhi: 1974) under No.29 (end) fols. 1316-1327


Tib: 'phags pa τha mo chen mo dpal luṅ bostan pa

Die Xerokopie des Dhasa-Kanjur, Vol. 61, 194-3-6 to 199-1-7.

Note: References such as ŚmD 94.2 are to Banerji's edition. References to the Ms. are so indicated. Note that the colophon of this Ms. gives the title of the text as (dva)daśa(da)jañikanānaśaṭasata-vimāṭikarana nāma mahāyānasūtram (fol. 1326.6; cf. ŚmD 94.11).

Other works on the Gilgit ŚmD

None
SP = Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra


Note: References of the kind SP 114.2 always refer to Watanabe's romanized text. References to the Ms. are always preceded by the abbreviation 'fol.', and again are always to Watanabe's 'Photographic Reproduction'. Since the Gilgit Ms. are not complete, I have cited the missing passages from Kern's edition. The reference then always appears in the form e.g. SP (Kern ed.) 47.2.

Other works on the Gilgit SP

A. Yuyama, A Bibliography of the Sanskrit Texts of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra (Canberra: 1970) 34-36 [a bibliography of work on the Gilgit SP up to 1970.]

Z. Nakamura, "On Four Sheets of Gilgit Manuscripts of Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra in the Bill (etc) Library, Ahjali (Wijesekera Volume), ed. J. Tilakasiri (Peradeniya: 1970) 63-74. [Corresponding to Kern 102.1-15; 177.7-179.1; 479.12-481.5; the fourth is not yet identified.]
H. Bechert, Über die "Marburger Fragmente" des Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, 1972, no. 1 [The Gilgit text in the context of the history of the textual tradition of SP.]

- - -, "Remarks on the Textual History of Saddharmapuṇḍarīka" Studies in Indo-Asian Art and Culture (R. Vira Volume), Vol. 2, ed. P. Ratnam (New Delhi: 1973) 21-27 [The intentions of this paper were "to summarize the main conclusions" of the preceding item.]

Y. Kurumia, "Hokekyō bonpon shahon okugaku kenkyū nōto", in Hokekyō shinkō no shokeitai (Kyōto: 1976) 109-46 [On the colophons of the Skt. Mss. of SP, including the Gilgit colophon.]


SR = Samādhirāja-sūtra


S. Matsunami, "Samādhirāja-sūtra", Taishō Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyou 60 (1975) 244-188 [chs. 1-4]; "Samādhirāja-sūtra (II)", ibid., 61 (1975) 796-761 [chs. 5-7]. [This is an edition of the Nepalese redaction based on 3 Mss. from the Tokyo University Library but variants from the Gilgit Ms. are given in a separate critical apparatus.]

Tib: 'phags pa chos thams oad kyi rhan bzin mdo pa tid ram par spros pa tib ne 'dzin gyi rgyal po dge bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo.

Note: References of the kind SR XXI 23 are always to Dutt's ed., the roman numerals referring to chapter, the arabic to verse number. For references to prose passages I give page and line number of Dutt's ed., e.g. SR 507.2. Note [14]b. sometimes departs from this scheme since there I have occasionally preferred to cite the Ms. reading rather than Dutt's edition. In such cases I have always indicated this.

Other works on the Gilgit SR

J. Filliozat, "La mort volontaire par le feu et la tradition bouddhique indienne", *Journal Asiatique* 251 (1963) 21-51. [Trans. of Ch. 33, with some omissions, and discussion.]

F. Weller, "Der Arme Heinrich in Indien", *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 68 (1973) 437-48. [Trans. of SR 469.5-486.18].

\[ \text{StA} = \text{Sarvatathāgataśāristhāna-sattvāvalokanabuddhakṣetrasandarśanavyūha-sūtra} \]


Tib: 'phags pa de bzhin gṣeṣes pa thams cad kyi byin gyis rlab sems ocn la gṣes kyi sabs rgyas kyi sbs gi bkad pa kun tu ston pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i māo.


Note: References such as StA 75.2 are to Dutt's edition. In addition to the usual weaknesses which characterize all his work on the Gilgit material, Dutt's edition of StA suffers from the fact that
he ignored the second Ms. (No. 35) altogether. This Ms., although very fragmentary, preserves some important variants. Unfortunately, the leaves of this same Ms. are not—in spite of Chandra's statement to the contrary—arranged in their proper order in the facsimile edition. [The correct order, using the numbers assigned to each leaf in the facsimile is as follows: (Since Chandra has placed recto and verso of the same folio side-by-side, I use L and R to refer to the photo which occurs on the left or right hand side of the page; numbers our of sequence are italicized.) 1819L, 1819R, 1820L, 1820R, 1821L, 1821R, 1822L, 1822R, 1823L, 1823R, 1824L, 1824R, 1826L, 1826R, 1827L, 1827R, 1828L, 1828R, 1829L, 1829R, 1818L, 1818R, 1817L, 1817R, 1816L, 1816R, 1830L, 1830R, 1831L, 1831R, 1832L, 1832R, 1835L, 1835R, 1836L, 1836R, 1837L, 1837R.] The longer passages from StA represent my own reading of the Ms.

Other works on Gilgit StA

None.

Vaj = Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra


N. Dutt, "Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā", in Gilgit Manuscripts, Vol. IV (Calcutta: 1959) 141-70 [Ed. of Gilgit Ms. with missing portions supplied from Müller.]

Note: My references are to folio number (original pagination) and line number, and therefore to both the facsimile and Chakravarti's ed. (where folio and line number are inserted into the text). Chakravarti's text is still the best in terms of the Vajracchedikā current at Gilgit.
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General:

Although I have had the use of a microfilm belonging to Professor J.W. de Jong of the entire Gilgit collection, I have taken as my standard of reference the facsimile editions published by Vira and Chandra. In referring to the Ms., I have therefore, unless it is stated otherwise, used the numbers assigned to the 'folios' in the facsimile edition, not the original folio numbers.

When quoting from manuscripts I generally give the text exactly as it occurs in the manuscript with no attempt to 'correct' or edit it. Only when it seemed absolutely necessary have I added missing letters or syllables, corrected spellings, or added punctuation. The original punctuation is represented by a dot raised about a half-space above the normal position of a period, e.g. p.159 lines 3, 5, 6, 7, etc. Any other punctuation is my own. The presence of these dots in a piece of text will always indicate that it is being quoted from the manuscript.
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BEFEQ = Bulletin de l'École française d'extrême-orient

BSOAS = Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies
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Translation

and

Notes
There is some question concerning the name of our Buddha, or at least the full form of his name. The question turns on whether or not -raja is added as the final element. Here in the invocation Y clearly has it and X, though fragmentary, probably had it. The addition of -raja in the invocation is somewhat curious since nowhere in the body of the text is this addition made. The evidence from the Tibetan translations is even more curious. In the Tibetan translation of Bhg the transliterated Sanskrit title is given in all versions without -raja, but in the Tibetan translation of the title P adds rgyal po, while N,D and L do not. Apart from this, in the whole of the Tibetan Bhg – where the name of our Buddha is found again and again – -raja is added to the name only on one occasion([10] n.15), and here all four versions make the addition, although there is nothing to set this passage off from any of the others where the name is mentioned and the addition here seems to be wholly arbitrary. In StP the situation is as follows: rgyal po is added at [5.13]n.a by P, N and L; at [4] n.f and [6] n.b by N, D and L; at [16] n.x and [21] n.e by P, D and L; at [6] n.k, [7] n.p, [8] n.n, [9] n.j, [11] n.g, [13] n.j, [14] n.v, [15] n.m, [16] n.v by N and L; and at [16] n.b, [17] n.o, [18] n.b, [18] n.f, [19] n.c, [19] n.c, [21] n.i and [21] n.p it is added by all four versions. Apart from Bhg, the only other text at Gilgit which refers to our Buddha by name is Bbp. It, in at least its Tibetan translation (the Skt. of the passage in question has not been preserved), refers to him only as sman gyi bla bai dū rya'i 'od. Outside of Gilgit we should note that in the Śikṣāsamuccaya, in the passages it quotes from Bhg, the name is always given as Bhaiṣajyaguruṇaidduryaprabharaja; and the same form is found in the Manjuśrīmūlakalpa (Vaidya ed.) 5.8, in the Tibetan translation of the Arya-tathāgata-vaiduryaprabha-nāma-balādhūna-samādhi-dhāraṇī (Pek. vol.6, no.137) 139-4-4, and in Fonds Pelliot
tibetain nos. 247 and 248. But in Dpal brtsegs' gsum rab rin po che'i<br>gtam rgyud bs kya'i rabs rgyud (Pek. vol.144, no.5844), in his quotation<br>from StP, the name is given simply as sman gyi bla bai gu rya'i 'od<br>(129-5-7), and in his quotation from Bhg as sman gyi bla (181-3-7).<br>About all we can say here is that it appears that -raja was probably not<br>an original part of the name, and that after its initial appearance it<br>was an optional element which in time became increasingly less so.<br><br>All of this would not be of great significance were it not for the<br>citation of our text in the Śīkaśāmacayā. As we have already seen,<br>Śūkṣ 174.1-175.13 quotes almost all of Bhg [11], the whole of [12], about<br>half of [15], and about three quarters of [16]. Here the title of the<br>text from which Śantideva was quoting is given as Bhaiṣajyaaguruṣaiddhyā-<br>prabharāja-sūtra. A problem, however, arises when we note that Śantideva<br>quotes another short passage at Śūkṣ 13.12 from a text he calls the<br>Bhaiṣajyaaguruṣaiddhyāprabha-sūtra. It is natural enough to assume, as<br>Bendall and Edgerton in BHSd have done, that this is the same text as<br>that quoted at Śūkṣ 174.1ff. Such an assumption seems to be supported<br>by the fact that both Mahāvyutpatti 1404 and Dpal brtsegs (181-3-6) refer<br>to, presumably, our Bhg under the title Bhaiṣajyaaguruṣaiddhyāprabha-<br>(sūtra); and the dkar-ög ldan-dkar ma (Lalou, J. (1953) 323) refers<br>to it as the (de bzin gšogs pa) sman gyi bla bai gu rya 'od (kyi shon gyi<br>sman lam gyi khyad par rgyas ra), while the rgyud sr' snppt'i sman par<br>grag pa rgyas par brjod (Lessing and Wayman ed.) 108.9 refers to it as the<br>(de bzin gšogs pa) sman gyi bla bai gu rya'i 'od kyic rgyal po'i (shon<br>gyi, etc.). It would appear that as with the name of the Buddha by itself,<br>so that name in the title of the text could either add the rāja or<br>dispense with it; or put another way, in the same way as both names refer<br>to the same Buddha, so both titles refer to the same text. (X is the only<br>Ms. at Gilgit which preserves a title, and here it is given simply as<br>axx(x)ṣajayaguru nāma mahāyānasūtram.) But our problem arises from the<br>fact that the passage quoted at Śūkṣ 13.12 under the title Bhaiṣajyaaguruṣa-<br>śiṣḍhyāprabha-sūtra, unlike those quoted at Śūkṣ 174.1ff, is not found<br>in any of the Ms. of Bhg found at Gilgit. It reads:<br><br>otac ca bhaisajyaguruśaiddhyāprabha-sūtra draṣṭasyaṃ /
yas tu maḥāsaṅgraḥa uvam śrutvāpi bodhisatvacaryāduskaratāṁ api<br>prajñāpāraghṛtyotsahata eva sakaladuṣkhalanapariturānapadhum<br>avavohum tensa vandannapijanapṝṇadeśana-muṣyaṁmodannabuddhādyhe-<br>ṣāṇayaścanaś bodhiparināmaṇan kṛtvā kalyāṇamitrān (adhyesa; so
This passage is not only not found in the Gilgit Ms. of Bhg, it is also unlike in both tone and content anything that is. It is, more than anything else that I know, similar to the Mahayana 'ordination' formulae discussed by N. Dutt in "Bodhisattva Pratimoksa Sutra", Indian Historical Quarterly 7 (1931) 262ff. It is of course possible that Sántideva was quoting from a redaction of our text which contained this passage, but given the 'tone and content' of the passage, this seems highly unlikely. It also seems unlikely that some other text dealing with 'ordination' procedures, would have had the same name as our text, and the quotation was taken from that. The most likely possibility seems to be that Sántideva gave the wrong title to the source of his quotation, and that the passage in question has nothing to do with our, and probably the only, Bhg.

b. There is one other major point in reference to the name of our Buddha which must be mentioned. As is well known there are a number of other figures, mostly bodhisattvas but at least one Buddha, who have names which have one or two elements in common with that of Bhaśajyaguruvaidūryaprabha. At Gilgit these include the bodhisattvas Bhaśajyaratā, who is mentioned at Sgṭ 2109.6; SP 3.26, ch.X, 156.1, ch.XXII, etc.; Bhaśajyamsudgata, who is referred to at SP 3.27, 173.23, etc.; and Bhaśajyasena, referred to at Ku 258.14 and prominent throughout Sgṭ. Outside of Gilgit we find Bhaśajyaratā as the name of a former Buddha in ch.XII of the Vimalakīrtinirdesa and at Lalitavistara (Lefmann ed.) 172.8 (Lamotte, Nouvelles, 375 n.11. by an oversight gives the name as Bhaśajyaguru).

There have been a number of attempts to connect one or another of these figures - usually the bodhisattva Bhaśajyaratā - with Bhaśajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, usually by arguing that since the bodhisattva Bhaśajyaratā is mentioned several times in SP, and since the SP is supposed to be earlier than Bhg, the Buddha Bhaśajyaguruvaidūryaprabha must have been developed from the figure of the "earlier" bodhisattva. The assumption, of course, behind all such attempts is that since both figures had names with Bhaśajya as the first element and rāja as the final element, they must be related. A further assumption was that any figure which had bhaśajya as a part of his name must have been conceived of as a "healer". Given the nature of the arguments which support them, I think it is entirely unnecessary to discuss these attempts in detail. Note only that
the character of these figures, especially the two most prominent, Bhaisajyagarūḍa and Bhaisajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, have absolutely nothing in common. Bhaisajyagarūḍa, as he is most fully presented in SP ch.XXII, has very much in common with another figure in Buddhist literature, but his name happens to be Kṣemadatta (cf. SR ch.XXIII and J. Filliozat, "La mort volontaire par le feu et la tradition bouddhique indienne", JA 251 (1963) 21-51). The fact that both have Bhaisajya as the first element of their names is completely without relevance. As we will see below in some detail, Bhaisajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, even in Bṛh, the most important text devoted to him, is not conceived of primarily as a "healer". This is even more so in regard to Bhaisajyagarūḍa. The only healing functions mentioned in the whole of the Bhaisajyagarūḍapurvavayoga-parivarta are ascribed not to Bhaisajyagarūḍa, but to the power of the text itself ("ayam saddharmapundarika dharmaparyayaḥ ... vadya ivāturāṇāṁ") ... sarvasattvānāṁ ... sarvavyādhi-chedakāḥ, SP 166.27f; bhaisajyabhūto bhaviṣyati glāṇānāṁ sattvānāṁ vyādhisprātānāṁ; imāṁ dharmaparyayaṁ śrutā vyādhiḥ kāye nākramāṇāṁ ne jārā nākālamātyāḥ, SP 168.18). Finally, the significance of the fact that the names of the two figures sometimes have -rāja in common as the final element is very largely undercut by the additional fact that the evidence indicates that -rāja was not an original part of the Buddha's name and that even after it was added it remained optional. It is of course not impossible that it was added under the influence of the name Bhaisajyagarūḍa at a time when this bodhisattva became prominent. But this would obviously imply that the Buddha Bhaisajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, if anything, preceded the bodhisattva in time.

Implicit in what I have said above is the warning that if we are to avoid misunderstandings we must read texts rather than analyze names. In specific reference to Bṛh this means that we must look very closely at the way in which the text itself presents — and by implication, conceives of — the Buddha Bhaisajyaguruvaidūryaprabha (who for the sake of convenience will from now on be referred to by the shortened form of Bhaisajyaguru).

In reading through our text it becomes obvious that an extremely important component in the complex of ideas which is developed around the figure of Bhaisajyaguru in Bṛh concerns the power of his name. (For the Indian background see J. Gonda, Notes on Names and the Name of God in Ancient India (Amsterdam: 1970).) It is almost exclusively by means of his name that 'he' becomes available and that the individual gains access to his 'power'. It will, therefore, be convenient for our analysis to concentrate on those
passages which concern the name and the power of the name. Such passages almost always involve two basic factors: 1) an individual in a specific situation, perhaps more correctly, a specific predicament; and 2) the result for that individual which follows from hearing Bhaisajyaguru's name. By determining these situations and results we determine the range of Bhaisajyaguru's activity and, by extension, we gain a fairly definite idea of his specific character.

An analysis of these passages is most easily presented in schematic form. I give below the material arranged in two columns: in the first, the situations and individuals for which the power of the name was made available; in the second, the end to which the power of the name was to lead.

The name is available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bhg [2]</th>
<th>for those who live in the 'last period'; to effect the elimination of the obstructions arising from karma.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhg [5.5]</td>
<td>for those who have failed in morality, to prevent unfortunate rebirth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhg [5.6]</td>
<td>for those who are lame, hump-backed, diseased, crippled; to effect their coming to be such as have all their faculties and fully formed limbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhg [5.7]</td>
<td>for those who are sick and without refuge or medicine; helpless, poor; to allay all diseases, restore health and avoid calamities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhg [5.8]</td>
<td>for women who desire to free themselves from existence as a woman; to ensure that this will be their last existence as a woman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhg [5.10]</td>
<td>for those terrorized by kings, jailed, condemned to death, etc.; to deliver them from such calamities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhg [5.11]</td>
<td>for those who, because of hunger and thirst, do evil; to effect their provision with food and satisfy their bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhg [5.12]</td>
<td>for those who are naked, poor, troubled by heat, cold, flies, etc.; to effect their provision with clothes and luxuries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bhg [7]: for those who, from stinginess and the non-giving of gifts, are reborn in the world of ghosts or among animals;

Bhg [8]: for those who undertake the rules of training, but fail in morality, views, etc.; or who guard morality, but do not seek great learning; or who have 'great learning' but are proud on account of it - all of whom are returned in hell;

Bhg [9]: for those who praise themselves and berate others and as a consequence are first reborn in the hells, then among beasts of burden or inferior families or into slavery;

Bhg [10]: for those who are the object of attack by boastful and hateful persons who through compulsion of various devataś, bloody worship of yakṣas, rites of black magic, etc., try to cause obstruction to life or destruction of the body;

Bhg [11]: for monks, nuns, laymen and women and others who have undertaken the 8 part fast and upheld the rules of training, all of whom apply their roots of merit to rebirth in Sukhāvatī;

Bhg [12]: for women; to effect their release from all suffering and their coming to be wise, distinguished, intent on roots of merit; their cutting of the snares of Mara, their escape from old age, suffering, etc.

to effect protection from such obstruction and dwelling in a state of friendliness towards all.

to effect that rebirth in Sukhāvatī, or in a deva-world, or among men as kings, or in rich and high status families.

to ensure that this is their last existence as a woman.
Bhg [13]: for believing sons or daughters of good family in the last time;

*Bhg [15]: for believing sons or daughters of good family who uphold the 3-fold refuge, for those who uphold the 5 or 10 rules of training, the 400 rules of the bodhisattva, the 250 rules of a monk or 500 of a nun, but who fail in one or another of these rules and therefore fear rebirth in an unfortunate destiny or hell;

*Bhg [15]: for a woman experiencing pain in childbirth;

Bhg [16]: for whoever hears the name;

*Bhg [17], **[18]: for one at the moment of death;

Bhg [21]: for the yakṣa-generals;

Bhg [21]: for those who preserve the name;

[**: the effect is ascribed to the agency of the name only in Redaction B; **: the effect is ascribed to the agency of the name only in Tib. On both see Introduction "On the Redactional Differences in the Gilgit Mss. of Bhg."]
If, as we stated above, we can determine the range of Bhaïṣajyaguru's activity, and therefore his basic character, by determining the specific situations in which the power of his name is thought to be potentially operable, then it is very difficult to maintain, in light of the above material, that he was conceived of solely, or even primarily, as a Buddha of healing. Of the twenty-one situations described in the text in which the name of Bhaïṣajyaguru is said to be operable, only two, [5.6] and [5.7], appear to be connected with 'healing'. To these two we could possibly also add [13] (untimely deaths - although most, if not all, of these are accidents, not illnesses) and *[15] (difficulties of childbirth). There might also be a temptation to add *[17] and **[18], which concern the individual at the moment of death, but to do so would be to misunderstand the function of the ritual there described. As we will see below this ritual is not intended to 'heal', to revive the dying man, but to ensure that he obtains a direct awareness of the fact of karma.

If the situations developed in the text do not - apart from these few examples - picture Bhaïṣajyaguru as a 'healer', then it is necessary to ask how, in fact, they do picture him. Here it should be noted that the specific situations presented in the text are, on the surface, of a rather heterogeneous character. They have, however, one thing in common: they all involve an individual in a state of anxiety and unease which arises from the actual or potential rebirth confronting him. That in the second case, that of potential rebirth, this anxiety amounts to a fear of death and its consequences is confirmed by the fact that at Bhg [5.5], [5.8], [7], [8], [11], [12], [15] (1st), [16], *[17], **[18], [21] (and probably [5.6] and [9]) hearing the name of Bhaïṣajyaguru is specifically stated to function in such a way as to meet the fears associated with death: it makes possible the prevention of an unfortunate rebirth or ensures an eventual good rebirth. That is to say that here Bhg pictures Bhaïṣajyaguru as making available, in the form of his name, a means whereby the individual is able to cope with the anxiety associated with death and the predictable consequences of the accumulated mass of his past actions. This is his function, and this is a very different thing from 'healing'. Although we will have more to say about this later, it should here be stated that by the very way in which the Buddhist 'world' is constructed, death, rebirth, and karma are inextricably interlocked: the primary meaning of a Buddhist death is the 'judgement' which is unavoidably implicit in it; i.e. rebirth. And that texts such as Bhg take as a
given this karmatically constructed world is made explicit in Bhg [7], [8], [9], *[17], and **[18] where the 'power' of Bhaiṣajyaguru's name comes into effect after the initial death of the individual concerned and in the hells, the world of Yama, etc. (i.e. after the results of karma have come into effect.) This, in turn, suggests that it is important to once again emphasize that the concern here is not with death in itself, but with the death-experience as the implementation of the full effects of one's past actions. The ultimate concern, then, is with the consequences of one's karma; death is in this sense only the occasion on which these become fully and finally manifested and come into effect.

If in the above set of situations the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru functions in response to the anxieties and fears connected with death and its consequences, then it is fairly easy to see that the remaining group of situations - [5.7], *[5.11], *[5.12], [10], [13], *[15] (2nd), - also responds to what amounts to the same basic anxiety and fear. These situations too have one thing in common: they are all life-threatening. Here Bhaiṣajyaguru's name functions not to remove the anxiety and fear of the consequences of death by assuring that they might be favorable, but it functions to remove the imminent fact of death and therefore the immediacy of its consequences which cause that anxiety and fear. The first set takes death as a given, as being in some sense already present. The second takes it as at least temporarily avoidable; both, however, respond to the same basic fear.

In light of the material in Bhg then, Bhaiṣajyaguru emerges as a figure whose range of activity is in terms of the specific situations highly generalized; he is presented as potentially active in any situation which is connected with the fear of death or the implementation of the effects of one's past actions.

But the reader at Gilgit would not have known Bhaiṣajyaguru from Bhg alone. He would also have known him from Bbp, and it is Bbp which can serve as a check on the picture we have drawn of our Buddha on the basis of Bhg. It is significant that Bbp appears not only to confirm our characterization, but to extend it in some interesting directions. Here again the function of the nāmadheya may serve as our point of departure.

The first references to the 'power of the name' we find in Bbp are concerned with formulating the basic idea. "1, 1296.4f, Tib 191-5-5f, is a good example:
And moreover, O devaputras, through a former vow Tathāgatas (who have been parinirvāṇed for a thousand years), or who have been parinirvāṇed for even a kalpa, or even for a kotī of kalpas, as a result of beings worshipping and honoring and causing the construction of relic stūpas (and causing the construction of images) and holding the name [of those Buddhas; ...nāmadheya-grahana-] and preserving and worshipping the Good Law, they [the Tathāgatas], even though situated in various world-spheres, effect their release from all hells, births among animals, (the world of Yama, inopportune times, unfortunate destinies, bad rebirths and downfalls, from all sufferings, until in due order they are fully and completely awakened ....

Here, 'holding the name' is one of several activities on account of which 'Tathāgatas', through the mechanism of a former vow, assure the eventual release of beings from the hells, unfortunate rebirths, etc. (see also fol.1297.2/Tib.192-1-2; 192-3-8). The point to be noted here is that the text is announcing a general pattern of activity which applies to Tathāgatas, plural, as a category. It is, I think, sufficiently obvious that this general pattern fits perfectly in its essentials with the pattern of Bhaisajyaguru's activity discovered above and it is reasonable to suspect that Bhaisajyaguru is only one of a more general type. Happily enough, Bbp explicitly confirms that suspicion. At Bbp 192-4-6f Prasenajit says to Mañjuśrī:

"Who are the Tathāgatas (de dag gan lags) that, because (beings) have merely heard their name (mtshan thos pa tsam du), or worshipped or honored them, will effect the release of those beings, who have done evil, from the hells, and from birth among animals and from the world of Yama, and will effect their going to a good destiny? In what world-sphere do those (Tathāgatas) live and how are they to be worshipped?"

Mañjuśrī responds saying 'listen, I will tell you who those Tathāgatas are.' (Skt. names are from Chandra, Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary.)

"In the world-sphere Vaiḍūryanirbhāsa a Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyaksambuddha named Bhaisajyaguru vaiḍūryaprabha lives, dwells, abides and is teaching dharma; in the world-sphere gtsug phud can (Śikhanī) a Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyaksambuddha named rin po che'i gtsug phud can (*Ratnaśīkhanī) is; in the world-sphere
dri ma med a Tathāgata ... named dri ma med par 'byun ba;
in the world-sphere ži ba a Tathāgata ... named rab tu ži ba bkod pa; in the world-sphere Sukhāvatī a Tathāgata ...
named Amītābha; (then follow Tathāgatas named pa mo 'byin ba,
rdorje mkhrugs pa (Akṣobhya-prajñābha), mya 'dan bral ba
(Viṣṇuṣokā), 'jigs pa thams cad rab tu ži bar mdzad pa, etc.
up to:) in the world-sphere dbaṅ po there is a Tathāgata
named dbaṅ po'i blo gros; through only preserving his name
(de'i mtshan bzūn ba žid kyis) one comes to be the leader of
devas; in the world-sphere zla ba there is a Tathāgata named
zla ba rgyas pa dri ma med pa; through worshipping and pre-
serving his name (de'i mtshan bzūn žiṅ mchod pas) one comes
to be freed from all impurities; in the world-sphere khyad par
thob pa there is a Tathāgata named 'nan 'gro thams cad ži bar
mdzad pa; through worshipping and preserving his name one comes
to be freed from all unfortunate destinies; in the world-sphere
legs par snaṅ ba there is a Tathāgata named sems can thams cad
sdug par mthoṅ ba; through worshipping and preserving his name
one comes to enjoy all worlds; O Son of good family, in brief,
the Tathāgatas dga' ba'i dpa', tsan dan dpal (Candanaśrī), dpa'
bo (Śūra), bdud thams cad kyi stobs rab tu 'joms pa, gtsug phud
can (Śikhin), thams cad skyob (Viṣṇabhū), log par dad sel
(Krakucchanda), gser thub (Kanakamuni), 'od sruṅ (Kāśyapa) -
O Great King, on account of preserving the name of these
Buddhas, Blessed Ones who have been parinirvāṇed for hundreds
of millions of years, or parinirvāṇed for hundreds of kalpas,
on account of having made (for them) relic-stūpas, paintings
and images, and worshipping and honoring them with lamps and
perfumes and flowers and scents and unguents, and preserving
their teaching, and on account of penances and austerities and
obligations and fasts, these Tathāgatas effect the release of
all beings from all bad rebirths and unfortunate destinies.
Purifying the obstructions of karma which persist for kalpas,
the five acts with immediate retribution, etc.; having gone
to fortunate destinies and not having gone to unfortunate
destinies, in due course they will fully and completely awaken
to utmost, right and perfect awakening."
This passage, then, appears to make explicit what we had already suspected: that Bhaiṣajyaguru at Gilgit would have been seen as one of a category of Buddhas which included, among others, Amitābha and the previous 'historical' Buddhas, Kāśyapa, Śikhin, all of whom made the effects of a former vow potentially available through the instrumentality of, importantly, the power of their name; and who functioned, in this sense, primarily in situations connected with the fear of death, and above all, the fear of the karmatic consequence of death, i.e. future states of rebirth. Here again, and perhaps even more than in Bhg, the power of the name is presented as coming into effect after the initial death of the individual concerned and in the hells, the world of Yama, etc.

We can also cite a few additional passages from at least one other Gilgit text which indicates that there are still other Buddhas who were, or could be, conceived of as belonging to this type. Perhaps some of the most interesting passages in this regard come from the Ajitasena-
vākarmantrdeśa-sūtra

Aj: GBM s 2343.4-2345.4; OMe i 105.13-106.17:

yo lokaṁātasya hi nāmu (yah) śrule
samsāraduṇkhā vinirrmuktu so naro
apāyāgāmi na kadāci bheṣyaṭeJ
śvargaṇ ca so yāsyati śīghram evam //
yo lokaṁātasya hi nāmu yaḥ śrule
dṛḍhapratijñā bahukalpakotiḥbhīḥ
mahānubhāvo sugato mahātmahan
kalpāṇa koṭyo nayutān acintiyān
so bodhisatvo sthita gāndāvalukā
na kadāci so gacchati durgatī bhayam //
yo lokaṁātasya hi nāmu yaḥ śrule
apāyāgāmi na kadāci bheṣyate
kalpāṇa koṭiṅayutā acintiyā
rāja sa bhuti sada cakravartī //
yo lokaṁātasya Chil nāmu dhārayet
yat kiṃci pūrvam sada pāpu yaṭ kṛtām
sarvan kṣayaṁ yāsyatīlaxmat
ākāropi devendru mahānubhāvo
kalpāṇa koṭiṅnayutān acintayā //
sukhāvatīṃ gacchati buddhaksetraṃ
paryāṇakabdho sada bodhisatvo
brahmavaro susvaru maṇjughoṣa
bhavanti varṣāṇa sahasrakotiḥbhiḥ //
apāyagāmī na kadāci bhasyate
yo lokanāthasya hi nāmu dhārayet //

[It is fairly certain that one or more padas have dropped out of some of these gāthās. I have therefore 'punctuated' the text, by means of double dandaśas, in accordance with what seemed to me the sense, and not in accordance with the metrical structure.]

Whosoever would hear the name of the Lord of the World, that man would be freed from the suffering of Samsāra; he will never be one who goes to an unfortunate state; but he will thus go quickly to heaven.

Whosoever would hear the name of the Lord of the World - he who is firm in his promise through many koṭīs of kalpas, one having great might, a Sugata, eminent - that bodhisattva, (though) he remain for unthinkable koṭīs of nayutas of kalpas similar to the sands of the Ganges, he never goes to an unfortunate destiny (or to a state of) fear.

Whosoever would hear the name of the Lord of the World will never be one who goes to an unfortunate state; for unthinkable koṭīs of nayutas of kalpas, he is always a wheel-turning king.

Indeed, who would preserve the name of the Lord of the World, always whatsoever is the bad which was formerly done, all that will be exhausted ... Moreover, he (will be) Śakra, the leader of devas, having great might for unthinkable koṭīs of nayutas of kalpas.

He goes to the buddhafied Sukhāvatī always (as) a bodhisattva sitting cross-legged; for thousands of koṭīs of years he comes to be one having the voice of Brahma, a fine voice, having a charming sound.

He will never be one who goes to an unfortunate
state, (he) who would preserve the name of the Lord of the World.

**Aj**: GBMs ix 2353.3-2355.6; GMs i 109.9-110.20

sваšya m[e]j púrvakṛtena kaśrīmanā
yenāhaṃ jāñcata daridrake gṛhe
karo hi (kā)runyu mamāṃ hi duhkhitā
vi(ni)v(ar)Itāya narakā hi pālā:
karo hi kārunyu mamāṃ hi duhkhitāya
istri bhāva upapānu nāyakā

... ... ... ...

kṛtam hi nātha prāṇidhīṃ tvayā hi
ye keci satvā iha jambudvīpe
tisthānti ye vai daśasu diśāsu
satvā hi sarve sukhīta [kari]ḥye

... ... ...

ye kecita satvā iha jambudvīpe
namāṃ ca vai dhāraya paścakāle
parinirvātasya tata paścakāle
bhaviṣyate sāsanāvpralopaṃ
yatkiṃcī पुपाम tada pūruv yat kṛtam
sarvam kṣayatā yasyati śīghram eftalāt

Inevitably, by an act which was done formerly
by me I am born in a poor household. Have compassion
on my state of suffering! Turn (me) back from hell,
indeed protect (me)!(?) O Leader, have compassion
towards my state of suffering, being reborn as a woman!

... ... ...

Indeed, O Lord, the vow was made by you: 'whichever
soever are the beings here in Jambudvīpa, or which are
they that abide in the ten directions - all those
beings I will indeed make happy'

... ...

Whatsoever being here in Jambudvīpa would in the
last time preserve (your) name, in the last time when
there will be a crumbling of the teaching after (you)
are parinirvāṇed, then whatsoever is the evil which
was formerly done (by him), all that will be quickly exhausted.

Both of these passages are presenting a Buddha which has all the characteristics of our type. It is therefore of considerable interest that the Lokanātha, the Buddha, who is here being described is in fact the Buddha Śākyamuni. As he is presented here there is nothing to differentiate him in his basic features from Bhaisajyaguru, from Amitābha - at least as this latter appears at Gilgit - and from the whole list of Buddhas found in Ebp.

Although other examples could be cited - notably Śmd 95.3-97.15 - I think it is sufficiently clear from Ebp and Aj that Bhaisajyaguru does not appear at Gilgit as an isolated individual. The reader at Gilgit would have been forced, by virtue of the passage in Ebp, to see him as one of a large category of religious figures - in this case Buddhas - all of whom had a certain number of defining characteristics in common. These defining characteristics, if we may summarize here, present a Buddha with the following features: 1) He, or rather, the effect of his vow, is potentially available through a broad category of religious activities undertaken in reference to him; prominent among these activities is the ritualized recollection - whether verbal or mental - of his name. 2) This vow is potentially available in, and responds to, a broad category of situations which have in common the fear of death and the 'judgement' implicit in death. 3) This potential availability functions to assure, negatively, the avoidance of an unfortunate rebirth, or, positively, the achievement of an auspicious rebirth, or, finally, the temporary avoidance of any rebirth at all. This latter again has both a positive and negative aspect. In the former it may function to provide the individual with goods, wealth, etc. [5.11], [5.12]; that is to say, with those things which reduce the constant potential life-threat of his environment, (poverty, starvation, etc., and, what is more typically Buddhist, the possibility of doing evil on account of poverty, etc.). In its negative aspect it may function to remove the possibility, usually presented as imminent, of accidental or violent or 'unnatural' death. Finally, 4) this potential availability is based on a prior assurance, usually in the form of a formalized declaration to the effect that 'if this is done, that will follow'.

There are, of course, other figures in Gilgit literature besides these Buddhas. These others are primarily bodhisattvas, the most important of which is, without a doubt, Avalokiteśvara. It will not be without interest to look at the way in which these figures - particularly Avalokita - are presented. There are two texts at Gilgit which are almost entirely devoted to the figure of Avalokiteśvara, the Kāranḍavyūha and the 24th chapter of the Sādhāraneṇpadarāṣṭa. We might look briefly at both of these, the latter first.

The prose section of SP chapter 24 (SP 304.1-305.20; 286.1-15; Kern 438-46) begins, after the introductory question as to why Avalokita is so called, with a general statement: 'Here, O Son of good family, as many as are the hundreds of thousands of kṣīnas of nītirna of beings who undergo suffering (duḥkhānān pratyanabhavanti), if they would hear the name (nāma-dheyan āryuyus) of Avalokiteśvara, the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, they all would be released from that aggregate of suffering (duḥkhaṇakandhāt)'.

This statement introduces both the general theme and the basic vocabulary which will be developed throughout the chapter. In effect, the reminder of the text is taken up almost solely with making the meaning of the general statement's 'duḥkhānā' more specific by enumerating a series of situations in which hearing the name of or 'invoking' (śkrandam kuryāt) Avalokita has a beneficial result. Here already we can see parallelsisms with the treatment of Bhaisajyaguru in Bhg, both in the method of characterization by means of the situations in which he is thought to be operable, and in the fact that 'he' is presented as available primarily through the power of his name. But if we look at the specific situations it will be clear that the parallelism goes considerably beyond this. All of the situations are presented through a more or less standard formula: if an individual is in such and such a situation, and if he then hears or pronounces the name of, or invokes Avalokita, the otherwise predictable consequence of the situation will not result. Almost all the situations have the same predictable consequence: death. They are almost all what I have previously called life-threatening situations. The threat is by fire: mahatī agniśkandhe prapateyuh; by water: nadībhū r uhyamānā, or shipwreck; by execution: vadhūteṣṭo, by yakṣas and rakṣas; by fetters and shackles: haṇinigāda; by cheats, enemies and thieves: uñāturāt amatraś cauraś ca. In these situations Avalokita responds to a fear of death; but that the essential component in the fear of death is, again, the fear of the 'judgement' implicit in it, is suggested by the next three items
or situations enumerated in the text: 'which beings, O Son of good family, have acted from passion, they, after having done homage to Avalokiteśvara, the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, are freed of passion (ye kulaputra rāga-caritāḥ sattvāḥ te 'valokiteśvarasya bodhisattvasya mahāsattvavya namaskāram kṛtvā vigatarāgā bhavanti); the same formula is then used for dveṣacaritāḥ and mohacaritāḥ. The final situation given in the prose concerns a woman who desires a son or daughter who does homage to Avalokita and as a consequence brings forth either a son or daughter who is lovely, beautiful, and who has 'planted the roots of merit' (avaropitakusalāmūla).

The verse portion of Ch. 24, rather than being a versified version of the preceding prose, appears as if it might instead be an independent text treating the same material. It begins with Aksayamati saying to someone named Cīrtradhvaja, in response to the latter's question as to why Avalokita is so called:

ṣrṇu carithaṁ avalokiteśvare // 2 //
ghukalpaśatā alcintiyā
śabubuddhāna sahasrakoṭibhiḥ
prāṇidhānu yathā vīśodhitas
īśrṇuyanto mama pradesato // 3 //
Śravaṇo atha ārśana pi ca
anupāvan ca tathā anusūrītiḥ
bhavatīṁ anogha prūtinām
naivadhikabhūtyālālokadāvākaḥ // 4 //

This passage is not free of ambiguity, but I think it might be translated something like this:

Listen to the conduct of Avalokiteśvara // 2 //
Hear now from my description how for many unthinkable hundreds of thousands of kalpas under many thousands of ages of Buddhas [he] refined his vow // 3 //
Surely hearing, and also acclam, and so to successively recollecting [this] is here for iiving things an unfailing [source for the]
elimination of all suffering, fear and anxiety // 4 //

Then follows in a manner similar to the prose a list of specific situations expressed in the formula: 'If a man finds himself in such and such a
situation, then 'calling to mind Avalokita' (smarato avalokiteśvaran), the otherwise predictable consequences of the situation will be avoided'. Again, the situations are all life-threatening, the threat being from fire: agnikhāḍya pāṭayet; water: saṃgaradurgā pāṭayet; falling: meruta-lātu pāṭayet; storm: vajrāmayavārto, vidyu and vajra; enemies: śatrugaṇaparārtah; execution: vadhyaṃghāṭana; fetters and shackles: hādinigāga; witchcraft: mantra, vidyu, vetāla; rakṣaṇa, etc. who take away one's vital warmth: ojāharah parārtah yaksanāgūtraubhūta-rakṣasatāḥ; fearful beasts: vyālamṛgaṇaḥ mahābhayaḥ; and poisonous snakes: dyāṭivīṣa. This enumeration is then concluded with another statement:

sarvatra daśaddiśe jage
sarvakṣetreṣu aśeṣa drṣṭyate // 18 //
ye aśeṣaṁādurgatibhāyā
nāraṇaktiryaṁgīlamasya śāsane
jātiṣjarayādhīṣṭā
anupārvarṇa praśamantri prāṇinām // 19 //

Everywhere in the ten directions in the world, everywhere in all fields he shows himself, [and] //18// which, for living things, are the fears of inopportune times [for rebirth], or of unfortunate rebirth in the sphere of the hells or among animals or of Yama, [and which are] the afflictions of birth, old age and disease, [these] are in due order allayed.

It is not difficult to arrive at a general characterization of Avalokita on the basis of this material. As a matter of fact, such a characterization is expressly formulated by Vs.25; Avalokita: maraṇe vyāsunā upādrave / śrānu bhoti śāraṇaṁ parāyanaṁ: 'in death, in disaster, in calamity, is the protector, refuge and recourse'. But this characterization, as we already know, is not specific to Avalokita in the Buddhism of Gilgit. Characterized in this way, he appears as only another example of a much larger group, one example of, in fact, the typified Buddha-figure we have noted above. All the defining characteristics are here: 1) He, or again, the effect of his 'vow', is potentially available through religious activity undertaken in regard to him - here, again there is a decided emphasis on recollection or hearing of his name; 2) this 'vow'
is potentially available in, and responds to, a broad category of situations which have in common the fear of death and the judgement implicit in it; 3) this potential availability functions — in this case overwhelmingly — to remove the possibility of imminent accidental or violent death; and 4) this potential availability is based on a prior assurance, although we are here told very little about this. But there is even more: the shared characteristics of Avalokita and our type, especially more clearly delineated members of our type, go considerably beyond just these general definitional features. For example, at least four of the situations or sets of fears responded to by Bhaiṣajyaguru have an almost exact correspondent (although not necessarily verbally 'exact') in the situations responded to by Avalokita: Bhg [5.10]: execution; Bhg [10]: witchcraft; and Bhg [15]: childbirth. The fourth correspondent in Bhg is perhaps the most interesting. At Bhg [14] we find a list of kinds of fears (bhaya) the removal of which is to be effected by undertaking the ritual activities detailed at the beginning of that section; at Bhg [13] it is stated of those who preserve the Bhg, the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru, etc.: "Not for them will there be an untimely death", and at Bhg [20] a list of these "untimely deaths" is given. The significant point here is that the list of what Bhg [14] calls "fears", and the list of what Bhg [20] calls "untimely deaths", and the lists of situations given by both the prose and verse of SP as those to which Avalokita responds, are all only variant forms of a single more or less standardized list of basic human fears. This list, as we will see below, has a wide distribution in the literature of Gilgit, but for the moment we need only note one thing: in addition to the fact that Avalokita has all the definitional features of our Buddha-type, virtually all the specific situational responses which SP ascribes to Avalokita are also ascribed in Bhg to Bhaiṣajyaguru. They are in this respect functionally interchangeable, and this functional interchangeability is explicitly expressed in the vocabulary available to it by SP itself:

"Who, 0 son of good family, will do homage to the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, Avalokiteśvara, and will preserve his name; and who will do homage to Buddhas, Blessed Ones, equal in number to the sands of sixty-two Ganges rivers, and will preserve their names; and who will do pūjā with robes, alms bowls, couches, seats, and medicines for the sick to as many as are Buddhas, Blessed Ones, (who are now) standing, abiding, dwelling — what do you think, son of good family, would that son or daughter of good family,
on account of that, generate an accumulation of merit?' When that was said, the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, Akṣayamati said this to the Blessed One: 'Great, O Blessed One! Great, O Sugata! That son or daughter of good family on account of that would generate a great accumulation.'

The Blessed One said: 'O son of good family, which, after having done homage to so many Buddhas, Blessed Ones, is the accumulation of merit, and which (is the accumulation of he who) would do even a single act of homage to Avalokiteśvara, the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, and would preserve his name - in both cases the accumulation of merit would be the same, not unequal, not different'.

Here we must state an obvious, but also an important point. The characterization which defined a particular type or conception of a Buddha in Bhg, Bbp, Aś, and elsewhere at Gilgit, is in SP XXIV found applied not to a Buddha, but to a bodhisattva. That is to say, potential membership in the type has been extended or broadened to include 'individuals' of a supposedly different order. We must also note that not only are the characteristics attributed to Bhaiṣajyaguru not specific to him, they are not even specific to Buddhas as a group. The Karandavyūha, I think, only deepens these impressions.

Since Kv is a much longer and more elaborate text than the Avalokita chapter in SP, and since it is riddled with textual problems, I will not treat it in detail. For our purposes it is important to note that by far the greater part of its narrative portion is given over to describing the movement of Avalokita through various hells and spheres of non-human birth - including an outhouse in Benares. The passage concerning this last visit deserves to be quoted in any serious study of Buddhism. In addition to this, it is short and yet a good example of the pattern of activity ascribed to Avalokita in Kv.

Kv 281.24-32; GSBs vii, fol. 1603r.

Then Ārya-Avalokiteśvara, the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, having departed from Simháladvīpa, went to an outhouse in the great city of Vārānasi where many thousands of insects lived. Then Avalokiteśvara, the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, having approached, having seen there those thousands of living things, having transformed
himself into the form of a buzzing bee, then to those (insects) the sound 'namo buddhaya namo dharmaya namah saṃghaya' was manifested (from that buzzing). Having heard that, all those living things are made to recollect the name (iti nāmam anusmārayanti) 'namo buddhaya namo dharmaya namah saṃghaya'. And all of them, through only recollecting the name of the Buddha (budhannamamamāryaṃmattraṇa), having smashed with the vajra of knowledge the mountain of the view of a real individuality which arose with twenty peaks (vimśatiśiṣkha-rasamudgataṃ satkāya-drātisailam; cf. Burnouf, Introduction a l'histoire du bouddhisme indien, deuxième éd. (Paris: 1876) 235 n.2, 242), they all were reborn in the world-sphere Sukhāvatī as bodhisattvas named 'Sweet Smelling Mouth'. They all, in the presence of the Blessed One Amitābha, the Tathāgata, having heard the Mahāyāna [Sūtra] named Kāraṇḍavyūha, and having rejoiced, in various directions their prediction was obtained.

As I have said above this is a good example of the kind of activity ascribed to Avalokita in Ku. The same basic pattern of activity recurs in the accounts of his visits to one sphere of non-human birth after another (Avīcinaraka (260.32f.), pretaloka (263.15f), Simheladvīpa, the home of fierce rakṣas, etc.). This aspect of Avalokita is summed up in the text when Bali, the leader of the Asuras says to him: sukhitās te sattvā bhavah āmūchaḥtavitām, amitābhasya tathāgataṣya dharmam anusmārayanti. And all those beings who recollect your name are freed. They are freed from much suffering due to evil. Well-minded are those beings who recollect your name, Those having been reborn in the Kālinātra (hell) and the Raurava (hell), in the Avīci (hell) and in the city of Pretas who recollect your name are freed. They are freed from much suffering due to evil. Well-minded are those beings who recollect your name. They go to the world-sphere Sukhāvatī. They recollect, they listen to dharma from Amitābha, the Tathāgata' (Ku 275.19; GBMs vii, fol.1597L). In all these passages the power of the name of Avalokita, like that of Bhaiṣajyaguru at Bhg [7], [8], [9], [17], and [18], and that of the Buddhas grouped together at Ebp 192-4-6f, comes into effect after the initial death of the individual concerned and in the hells, world of Pretas, etc.
It is, perhaps, unnecessary to go into further details here, except to note that KV, like SP, explicitly states that Avalokita - like our category of Buddhas - is available through, primarily, the power of his name by virtue of a vow (ārañapratijñā). This vow is expressed twice in KV, na ca tāvajñāntārā samyaksambodhip iñhāmbodhipāyā, yāvat samantād dañabhayo digbhayaṃ suryāsaṃpāramuñca satvā avatāracitopu nirṇaya-āhātau na pratiṣṭhāpitē bhaveyuh, at 266.26, and in very similar terms at 268.11.

But the story does not end here. If the Avalokita of SP XXIV and KV is presented in such a way that he is both structurally and functionally identical with Bhaiṣajyaguru, the Buddhas of Bbp, the Śākyamuni of Aj, etc., the same is true of the Avalokita of StA (66.7f) and EKA, the bodhisattva Vajrapāṇī (StA 57.4f), the Mahāyakṣiṇī Anopamā (StA 71.1f), the MahādevīŚaṅkhinī (StA 74.3f) and Bhīmā (StA 75.7f), etc. These figures, though some are less extensively developed than others, all present the same basic features. This is true even if occasionally these features appear in a slightly different form. Both Avalokita and Bhīmā, for example, are presented as potentially available both through a vow and an 'act of truth' (satyādhiṣṭhāna). This appears to be a new element, but as we will see below these two conceptions are, if not identical, closely related phenomena. Further, almost all the figures in StA are available not through the 'recollection' of their name, but through what is there usually called a mantrapada. That these mantrapadas are the functional equivalent of the nāmaḥsāta will, however, be clear when the rituals they are embedded in are discussed below. There it will also be clear that they are not the meaningless (to us) strings of syllables common in tantric mantras. They are, in fact, invocatory prayers in which the name plays a very prominent part.

What all this means here is that in attempting to characterize Bhaiṣajyaguru, we have come upon a major type, perhaps the major type for the religious figure at Gilgit. That what we have here is a type is, I think, beyond doubt. All these figures - whether Buddha, bodhisattva, or deva - share a basic identity of structure and an essential sameness of function. We have already described the defining characteristics of the type (see above p.139) so that here I think we need add only one thing. With one exception, the individual members of our type are the only figures in Gilgit literature who are the objects of religious activity, and therefore the only ones who could form a part of the
individual's daily experience and with whom he could interact. That is to say, if I may adopt an important distinction from Combrich (Precept and Practice, Traditional Buddhism in the Rural Highlands of Ceylon (Oxford: 1971) 157f), they constitute the actual as opposed to the ideal 'pantheon' of the Buddhism of Gilgit. This is underscored by the fact that the individual at Gilgit had access to specified patterns of approach and interaction with only these figures. These patterns of approach and interaction – as we will see below – constitute the ritual complex current at Gilgit.

c. This leaves the problem of our one exception: Śākyamuni. That there was a cult of Śākyamuni at Gilgit seems almost certain. As a matter of fact there appear to have been at least two major forms of cult associated with him, and, if I am not mistaken, these two forms are in turn associated one with the Hinayāna, the other with the Mahāyāna.

The Hinayāna cult of Śākyamuni is developed most clearly at Gilgit in, oddly enough, the Maitreyaavyākaraṇa. Although I cannot here give my argument, I think it is fairly certain that the Maitreyaavyākaraṇa is a Hinayāna text. This is not as surprising as it might first appear since there are a number of other Hinayāna texts, in addition to the Vinaya, found at Gilgit (the Adbhutadhammaparājya (GBMs vii fol.1507.8 to end, and fol. 1576.1-1581.4; fol.1691.2 to end; fol.1588.1 to 1592.4; the latter is mislabelled, by the scribe, as the Kutagāra-sūtra), the Deva-sūtra (GBMs vii 1542.5f), the Svālpadēvata-sūtra (GBMs vii 1545.3f), the Āyaparyanta-sūtra etc., etc.. None of these texts has been previously identified and they remain for the time being unedited. I hope in the not too distant future to publish an edition of at least some of them together with a detailed discussion of their 'school' affiliation.)

I mention all this here because it is important to take into account the probable tradition to which the Maitreyaavyākaraṇa belongs in discussing its conception of Śākyamuni, since this affiliation is able to explain a number of otherwise possibly puzzling factors. It should also be noted that the text of the passage from Mok that I give below differs sometimes considerably from that found in Majumder's edition. Here again I cannot give the detailed arguments which support my readings. They will be found in a paper entitled "Text-Critical Notes on the Gilgit Redaction of the Maitreyaavyākaraṇa" which I hope to publish in the near future.
The passage in Mārk in which the conception of Śākyamuni is most fully developed is also doctrinally the core of the whole text. The setting is this: it is the time of the future Buddha Maitreya; he has just attained awakening and he is about to give his teaching to all those who at that time will be assembled to hear him; i.e., to those who will have acquired enough merit to be reborn at the time of the appearance of the Buddha Maitreya.

Mārk: GEMs vii 1538.8-1539.7; GMs iv 205.3-207.12; Lévi 387.21-388.6:

supuṣpīte śminn udyāne sannipāto bhāvissiyati
samaṅgataḥ yojanaśatam parśat tasya bhāvissiyati
//
tato kāraṇikāḥ sāstā maitreyāḥ nurūsottamaḥ
sanitiḥ vyavalokeytha imam artham pravakṣiyati
//
sarve me śākyasimhena gaṇiśreṣṭhena tāyinā
arthato lokanāthena parițū bhūrimedhasā
//
pratāhāvajapataḥkābhir gandhamālāyavilepanaṁ
kṛtvā stūpeṣu satkāram āgataḥ hi mamāṃśīkam [Lévi: kṛtvā
śākyamuneḥ pūjāṁ hy āgataḥ mama sāsane]
//
saṅghe datvā ca dānāni cīvaram pāṇabhojanam
vividhāṁ glānabhiṅgajjum āgataḥ hi mamāṃśīkam
//
kunṭumodakasenaṁ ca candanenaṅulepanam
datvā śākyamuneḥ stūpeṣv āgataḥ hi mamāṃśīkam
//
fīksāpadiṇī cādāya śākyasimhasya sāsane [Lévi: śākyamune
muniśāsane]
paripālya yathābhūtam āgataḥ hi mamāṃśīkam
//
upoṣadānāṁ uposyeha āryaṁ aṣṭāṅgikaṁ subhaṁ
caturdaśīṁ paścadaśīṁ pakṣayeṣhāstamim tathā
//
pratīhārikapakṣaṁ cūpy aṣṭāṅgāṁ susamaṁhiṁ
śīlāṁ ca samādāya samprāptā mama sāsanaṁ
//
buddhamaṁ dharmam ca saṁgham ca satve te saraṇaṁ gatāḥ
kṛtvā ca kuśalaṁ karma macchāsanam upāgataḥ
//
tenaiṁ preṣītāṁ satvā pratīṣṭāṁ ca mayāpy āmī
ganiśreṣṭhena mūnīnā parițū bhūrimedhasā
//
prasannāṁ janatāṁ ārṣṭāṁ satyāṁi kathayisyati
śrutvā ca te tato dharmam prāpsyanti padam uttamaṁ
//
pratīhāryatrayeṣuṇāsu śrāvakāṁ vinayisyati
sarve te āṣravāṁ tatra kṣaṇaparyāyanti suratāḥ
//
In that park (named) Cupuyipta there will be a gathering, and his assembly will be a hundred yojanas all around. //

Then the Compassionate One, the Teacher Maitreya, the Best of Men, having surveyed that gathering, will explain this situation: //

"All (these beings) were indeed entrusted to me by the Lion of the Śākyas, the best of teachers, the Holy One, the Wise and Intelligent Lord of the World //

Having done reverence to the stūpas (of Śākyamuni) //

"Having done pūjā to Śākyamuni with umbrellas, flags and banners, with perfumes, garlands and unguents, they indeed have attained to my presence //

Having given gifts to the Sangha, robes, food and drink, various medicines for the sick, they indeed have attained to my presence //

Having given to the stūpas of Śākyamuni a sprinkling with saffron water and a smearing with sandal wood powder, they indeed have attained to my presence //

Having taken on themselves the rules of training in the teaching of the Lion of the Śākyas, having guarded them accordingly, they indeed have attained to my presence //

Having observed here the worthy, auspicious Upoṣadha having eight parts on the fourteenth, the fifteenth, so here on the eighth day of the fortnight; //

And moreover, having taken on themselves (the observance of) 'The Fortnight of Miracles' furnished with eight parts, and the precepts, they have fully attained to my teaching. //

To the Buddha, the Dharma and the Sangha those beings have gone for refuge, and having performed good acts, they have arrived for my teaching. //

By that i.e. the above meritorious actions those beings are impelled; and moreover they are accepted by me, being entrusted [to me] by the Best of Teachers, the Wise and Intelligent Muni (i.e. Śākyamuni)". //

Having seen that those people were devout, (Maitreya) will speak on the truths, and they having heard the dharma, will then obtain the best abode. //
Through the three miracles he will discipline the Śrāvakas, and they there, the mild, will effect the destruction of the outflows. //

The conception of Śākyamuni which is developed here is, I think, rather straightforward: religious activity directed toward him, or undertaken in reference to him, results in rebirth in the 'world' of Maitreya. If, then, there is a 'cult' here, it is surely a cult of Śākyamuni; he is the object of worship, not Maitreya. Maitreya is not the cult figure, but the goal. This interpretation receives confirmation from the fact that Śākyamuni is said 'to entrust' those beings who have undertaken religious activity in regard to him to Maitreya, and from the fact that the text as a whole concludes with an exhortation to have faith in Śākyamuni, not in Maitreya (prasādayati cittāni tasmāc chākyamunā jine / tato dṛṣṭathā maitreyam saṃbuddham dvāpoddattamam //). This view of 'the cult of Maitreya' differs in some important ways from that found in our scholarly sources (e.g. E. Abegg, Der Messiasgläube in Indien und Iran (Berlin 1928) 145-202; J. Przyluski, "La croyance au messie dans l'inde et l'Iran", Revue de l'Histoire des Religions 100 (1929) 1-12; etc.), but in terms of the tradition represented by the Mūk and it is important to note that here my remarks are restricted entirely to it - it is difficult to avoid. The primary source of this difference is the fact that heretofore 'the cult of Maitreya' has been interpreted by means of, and assimilated to, a model or type which in origin is external to the Buddhist context; i.e. the Messiah (usually the Ancient Near Eastern Messiah). It is possible, however, to interpret the data by means of a type which is, in fact, indigenous to the Buddhist world-view, and thus more readily available. This is what, for convenience's sake, might be called the 'paradise cult', the most useful example of which is - although not available at Gilgit in its classic form - the cult of Amitābha. Admitting, even, that the cult of Amitābha is probably later than the tradition concerning Maitreya, still as a type it has, for the purpose of interpretation, the great advantage of being discoverable in the Buddhist world. Its application to the data also has in its favor the fact that it can account for at least one important phenomenon which otherwise remains mysterious. Taking it, then, as a model for the interpretation of the material found in Mūk, we should first note that in its essential form the 'paradise cult' in general, and the cult of
Amitābha in particular, has a very simple structure: it involves a Buddha towards whom religious activity is undertaken and an assurance that that religious activity will result, through the agency of that Buddha, in a future rebirth in that Buddha's buddhafield, e.g. Sukhāvatī, where ideally the individual will be able to more advantageously pursue the religious life. I think it is sufficiently obvious that the cult presented in the Mok has, in one form or another, all these elements: it involves a Buddha (Śākyamuni) towards whom religious activity is undertaken (pujā done to him or his stūpas, etc.), and an assurance that that religious activity will result, through the agency of that Buddha (Śākyamuni is twice said 'to entrust' the beings involved), in a future rebirth in - let us say, for the moment - a particularly auspicious place (the 'world' of Maitreya), where the individual will be able to more advantageously pursue the religious life (Maitreya will teach his dharma, having heard which, the individual 'will effect the destruction of the outflows', etc.). Clearly there is only one element in the cult of Mok which differs from the typified paradise cult and it involves the fact that the individual in Mok has a future rebirth not in a buddhafield belonging to the cult Buddha, but in a future and ideal state of the present world. Here, I think, is where the affiliation of the Mok becomes significant. If it is, as I think it is, a Hinayāna work, then since we think we know that if the idea of a buddhafield was present in Hinayāna literature at all, it was a very late addition (cf. D.Barua, "'Buddhakhetta' in the Apadāna", R.C.Law Vol.1, pt.2 (Poona: 1946) 183-90), it would follow that the author of Mok would not have had access to such an idea. But even if this argument is not entirely accepted, there is still another factor which explains the fact that the individual could not have been reborn in the 'buddhafield' of Śākyamuni: he was already in it; that is to say that the 'buddhafield' of Śākyamuni was already temporally and spatially present and, therefore, could not be projected into the future. On the other hand, if we assume that the author of Mok wrote at a time prior to the development of the conception of 'buddhafields', then it is obvious that his only alternative was to project the desired rebirth to a future and ideal state of the present world. The real question here, however, is whether or not the 'world' of Maitreya is functionally identical with Sukhāvatī. I think an affirmative answer is difficult to avoid. The primary and defining characteristics of Sukhāvatī are again rather simple: its temporal situation in regard
to the individual concerned; its physical description; and its conception as an ideal state for religious progress. All three of these characteristics are found with a surprisingly high degree of similarity in the articulation of the 'world' of Maitreya: both are potential states of future rebirth; the physical description of Ketumati, the city of Maitreya, is characterized by the same kind of ornate and rococo elaboration as is found in the description of Sukhāvatī and, perhaps more importantly, the description of Ketumati is the only thing in Hinayāna literature which is even vaguely like the full-blown descriptions of buddhafields in Mahāyāna texts, it is perhaps the only thing that could have served as a model for these 'later' descriptions (cf. T.Rowell, "The Background and Early Use of the Buddhākārītra Concept", The Eastern Buddhist 6 (1932-35) 419 and n.1; 7 (1936-39) 169). Finally, both Sukhāvatī and the 'world' of Maitreya are, above all else, presented as ideal states for the pursuance of the religious life. In terms of their defining characteristics, then, Sukhāvatī and the 'world' of Maitreya are in fact functionally, even, physically identical. This functional identity is indirectly confirmed by a passage like that from the Ajitasena-vyākāraṇa quoted above where religious activity undertaken towards Śākyamuni is explicitly stated to result in rebirth in Sukhāvatī!

In light of all this it seems reasonable to conclude that what we have in the tradition now represented by Muk is a prototypical form of the Mahāyāna 'paradise cult'. The cult here, as we have said above, is not of Maitreya, but Śākyamuni. Maitreya and the 'world' of Maitreya are simply the functional equivalent of what in the fully developed cult is the buddhafield of the cult Buddha. As I have suggested above this interpretation also has the advantage of allowing us to account for at least one other important fact in the development of Buddhist ideas which otherwise remains mysterious. One of the central problems concerning the 'paradise cult' is that it seems to lack — before its full-blown appearance in the cult of Amṛtaḥha — a prehistory. It is just here that our interpretation of Muk may be significant. If it is accepted that Muk is presenting a prototypical form of the Mahāyāna 'paradise cult', then we have in it the otherwise unavailable prehistory for this important Mahāyāna form. Moreover, we might also be able to conjecturally account for the emergence of the full form. In the cult of Śākyamuni presented in Muk the sought for goal is, of necessity, projected so far into the future that it loses almost all semblance of immediacy, and therefore much of the
functional character of a motive for action. This temporal disadvantage with the 'world' of Maitreya may then have served as the impetus towards the development of ideas concerning the existence of other Buddhas and other buddhafields which existed or could exist simultaneously with Śākyamuni, and therefore could be almost immediately available. This at least is a hypothesis worth testing. For the moment it can simply be noted that both the spatial dimensions and the relative fluidity of Indian cosmological notions could easily be adapted or used in such a development.

Before leaving Mok I think it is necessary to make two further observations. First I began this section with a discussion of the importance of the power of the name for the Buddha Bhaisaljayaguru and others of his type. The power of the name is not a factor in the cult of Śākyamuni as it appears in Mok. This, however, is to be explained by the probable Hinayāna and prototypical nature of the tradition which Mok preserves. Again, if present at all, the power of the name in Hinayāna sources appears not to have been significant. This does not, on the other hand, militate against seeing even in the Śākyamuni of Mok a very close resemblance to other examples of the generalized 'Cult Figure' at Gilgit. For, although this figure is often presented as potentially available through the power of his name, the latter is certainly not the only or exclusive means of realizing this availability. In all the texts so far studied, Bhg, Bbp, etc., recollection of the name is only one - albeit a very important one - of a list of religious activities undertaken in reference to a specific Buddha to obtain an auspicious rebirth, etc. The list of activities found, for example, in Bbp corresponds - apart from recollecting the name - rather closely with that found in Mok. So in spite of this apparent difference the Śākyamuni of Mok, like the Śākyamuni of the Ajitasenavāyākarana, might also be comfortably classified as one of our larger type. Also in reference to our larger type it is perhaps useful to add here that assurance of an auspicious rebirth - the only concern which is explicitly articulated in Mok - has meaning, once again, primarily as a response to the fear or anxiety connected with death and the consequences of death.

Secondly, it should be obvious that apart from the fact that the general element 'fortunate rebirth' receives a more specific characterization here, the elements which define what I have just been calling
'the Mahāyāna paradise cult' are virtually the same elements as those which define our type. This should not be surprising since Amitābha, whose cult is the example par excellence of the 'paradise cult', has already been explicitly classified by Bbp as one of our type. And it is, I think, this latter classification which finally places the cult of Amitābha, which is usually treated as a more or less distinct and isolated phenomenon in the Buddhist tradition, in its proper context. I used the expression 'radise cult' as a provisional designation for a particular configuration of the elements defining our type because it allowed me to highlight clearly certain factors in Mvk which I wanted to explain; but it should probably not be taken as anything more than a provisional designation. The structure provisionally described as a 'paradise cult' clearly belongs within our type. At most it could only be further classified as a particular sub-type which has undergone, perhaps, a greater degree of elaboration in regard to one specific element.

This then is at least one form of the Hinayana cult of Sākyamuni available at Gilgit. The point to be noted is that in spite of the fact that it appears to represent a less advanced stage in the evolution of Buddhist cult forms, it exhibits the same basic structure - both in its organization and its conception of the cult figure - as do the more fully elaborated and definitely Mahāyāna cults current at Gilgit.

d. Of the Mahāyāna cult of Sākyamuni, or at least that which appears to me to be the major form of it, I can here give only a brief outline. It would appear that the Mahāyāna, in spite of all the theoretics (notably, at Gilgit, in SP and Bbp), found it very difficult to make the historical Buddha 'presently available'. He had been rather effectively buried by the earlier tradition and this early tradition was a massive presence confronting the Mahāyāna. What was perhaps the earliest attempt to solve this problem was both ingenious and rooted in the very tradition it was attempting to circumvent. The Mahāyāna, from the very beginning, developed the equation 'the historical Buddha' = the body of his teaching. Developed, but did not invent. This equation is already found in earlier sources in formulas such as yo dhammaṃ passati so bhagavantam passati (for this, and the whole question under discussion see G. Schopen, "The Phrase 'sa prthvipradeśā caityabhūto bhuvoti' in the Vajranoṇadīka: Notes on the Cult of the Book in Mahāyāna", TTI 17 (1975) 147-81; although in what follows I will be pursuing a slightly
different tack). The direction this development took may be seen from a series of random quotations

_Śa 86.7:_ athāyaṃśānāṃ ānandaḥ bhagavantam etad eva-ṣat: udgrhitam mayā bhagavan imaś dharmaparyāyam sāntreṁajñayā dhārayisyāmi pujāryisyāmi sarvasattvebhyaḥ samprakāśasyaṁāmi.

Then the Venerable Ānanda said this to the Blessed One: 'Received by me, O Blessed One, is this discourse on dharma; with the idea that it is the teacher I will preserve, I will worship it, and I will illuminate it for all beings.'

_Śa 87.2:_ tasmat tarhi tvam (khyod kyis) ānandaḥ satkṛtya ayaṃ dharmaparyāyo dhārayitavyaḥ, ayam te tathāgatasyānuttara- nayakanabhodhi, tathāgatakṛtyaṃ karisyati paścime kāle paścime samaye sarvasattvāṇāṃ.

Therefore now, Ānanda, by you, after having honored it, this discourse on dharma is to be preserved; it is for you the utmost, right, and full awakening of the Tathāgata. In the last time, in the last period it will perform the functions of a Tathāgata for all beings.

_SP 239.18:_ dhāreti ya idam "ūtram sa dhāreti jinavigrahaṁ: Who preserves this sutra, he preserves the form of the Jina.

_SP 124.27:_ tathāgataṁ so 'yasena parihaścita ya imaṃ dharmapa-rayam pustakagataṁ kṛtvā aṣeṇa parihaścita.

He would carry the Tathāgata on his shoulder who, after having made this discourse on dharma into a book, would carry it on his shoulder.

_SP 166.26:_ evam eva ... saddharmapuṇḍarīko dharmaparyāyaḥ tathāgatābhuḥ bodhisattvavyānasamprasthitāṇāṁ.

Just so ... the discourse on dharma (called) Saddharmapuṇḍarīka is the true Tathāgata for those who have set out in the bodhisattva-vehicle.

_Vaj 12_ (Conze’s ed., this passage has not been preserved in the Gilgit Ms.): api tu khalu punāḥ subhūte yasmīn pṛthivi-pradeṣa ito dharmaparyāyād antaśāś catuspādīkanāpi gāthāṇ udghya bhāṣyeta vai samprakāśyeta vai, sa pṛthivi-pradeṣaś caitya-bhūto bhavet sadavamānusāsurasya lokasya, kah punār vādo ya
Moreover, Subhūti, on which spot of earth (someone), after having taken from this discourse on dharma a verse of even four lines, would recite or illuminate it, that spot of earth would become a true shrine for the world with its devas, men, and asuras - how are we to speak of those who would preserve this discourse on dharma in its entirety, would recite it, etc., ... they will be possessed of the highest wonder - and on that spot of earth, Subhūti, the Teacher dwells or someone or other representing the wise Guru.

These passages, taken from three texts of a very different character, are representative of any number of others that we could cite. They all point in the same direction: the dhammapāryāya is to be seen as, performs the function of, is the form of, or simply is not only the Tathāgata, but the true Tathāgata. If the dhammapāryāya is present, the Buddha is present and, as is clear from Vaj 12 and other passages, the presence of the dhammapāryāya sacralizes the spot where it is found in the same way as the presence of the Buddha does. All of these equations receive confirmation from the fact that in countless texts it is unequivocally stated that one is to behave towards the dhammapāryāya, usually in the form of a book, in the same way that one behaves toward the Buddha: one is to circumambulate it, to worship it with flowers, incense, banners, etc., and it is here, of course, that these ideas became significant for Buddhist cult practice and are of interest in the present context. But what is perhaps of even greater interest for us is the fact that not only did the individual behave towards the dhammapāryāya as he did toward the Buddha and, significantly, toward the category of cult figures we have outlined above, but the dhammapāryāya itself is presented as having most of the characteristic features of our Buddha or the typified cult figure. It is, for example, available through its name. This is especially prominent in Ky.

Ky 278.30f, GBE vii 1600R: ye satataparigraham kāraṇayuḥhasya mahāyānasūtraratnarājasya nāmaṃ anusmaraṇī mucyante te īḍāt saṃsārikād duṣṭkhāt / jātiyarāvādhimaraṇāsokapari-
devanāduḥkhaśūrmanasâyopāyaśparimukta bhavanti / yatra yatropa-
padyante tatra tatra jātāu jātāu jātisnarā bhavanti ... na
kādācit yāktavaṃ na rūkṣasatvam na pratatvam ... na manusyay-
dāridhyam pratyanubhaviyanti ... ye 'pi keci kulaputrah
sattvā asmat kārandavyūhasmahāyānasūtraratnārājād ekākṣaram apī
nāmaśrōtyaṃ apī caturpādikām apī gāthāṃ likhāpayyantī tāpūm
paścāntaryāṇī karmāṇi niravāśeṣāṃ parikṣyāṃ gamisyanti / te
cābhīrūpā bhaviyanti ... tāpūm na kaścit kāye vyādhiḥ prat-
bhaviyanti / na ca kārṇyogam na śrotarogam, etc.

Who incessantly recollects the name of the Kārandavyūha,
the king of the jewels of the Mahāyāna sūtras, they are freed
from such saṃsāric suffering, they are released from birth,
old age, disease, death, sorrow, etc... wherever they are
reborn, there in every birth they are such as remember their
former births. Never will they experience the state of a
yakṣa or rākṣas or prāta... or human poverty... Moreover,
whosoever son of good family, (whosoever) being will have
copied from this king of the jewels of the Mahāyāna sūtras,
the Kārandavyūha, a single syllable, or the name, or a verse
of four lines, for them the five acts which have immediate
retribution will be exhausted without remainder; they will be
lovely ... no disease whatever will arise in their body, no
affliction of the eye or the ear, etc.

Kv 289.13, GBl vii 1614R: atha sarvanīvaraṇaśīkambhī
bhagavantām etad avocat: yadā bhagavan kārandavyūhasya mahā-
yānasūtraratnārājasya nāmāṁ ānusmaranti tadābhīrprāyā
anusidhyantī / yasya nāmadheyaṁatṛṣṇа īḍrāṇi vastūni prādū-
ratvantī, sukhītāṁ te sattvāḥ ye kārandavyūḥaḥ mahāyānasūtra-
ratnāraṇaṁ śṛngyantī likhāpayyantī ...

Then Sarvanīvaraṇaśīkambhin said this to the Blessed One:
'When, O Blessed One, they recollect the name of the Kāranda-
vūha, the king of the jewels of the Mahāyāna sūtras, then
their wishes are fulfilled; through merely its name such things
appear. Happy are those beings who will hear the Kāranda-
vūha, the king of the jewels of the Mahāyāna sūtras, who will
have it copied, etc.
More importantly the dharmaparyṣya is approached in the same situations or for the same reasons, and fulfills the same function as our typified cult figure. I here give only two examples.

Stā 53.5f, GBMs vii 1752.3, Pek. vol. 27, 272-2-1

When, having prostrated themselves with the five limbs touching [before that] which is the discourse on dharma (chos kyi rnam grags ’di la yan lag thugs phyag byas thík /), having fully adorned it with flowers, incense, perfume, garlands, unguents, umbrellas, flags and banners; having said 'nāmo buddhaya' (sangs rgyas la phyag ’tshal lo ’byas brjod aṅa), they will honor it, they will give applause to it, they will preserve, recite, cause it to be recited, will write, will cause it to be written ... they here and now will be possessed of all qualities. [They will be] handsom ... long lived ... and the scent of sandal wood will waft from such a one's mouth; and day and night for him there will be a vision of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas; and all his obscurations will be exhausted [even after] having committed the five acts with immediate retribution, etc.; and the devatas will protect them; and at the moment of death there will be visions of the Buddhas, visions of the bodhisattvas; they will not die having envious thoughts, scattered thoughts; up to: having passed away they are reborn in the world-sphere Sukhāvatī.
Syāḥ fol.2122.lf: yaḥ sarvaśūra prasannacittaḥ saṃghātam śūtraḥ adhyāśayena namaskariyathi paścānayatkaḷpanā jātou jātismaro bhaviṣyati saṣṭikalpasahāsrāṇi rājā cakravarti bhaviṣyati dṛṣṭeva dharmaḥ sarvaśūra sarveśām priyo bhaviṣyati manāpāḥ na sa sarvaśūra śāstrena kālam karisyati na visena kālam karisyeti kākhortaṃ cāṣya na kramiṣyati maraṇakālasamaye carimanirodhe vartamāne navatibuddhakotyāḥ sammukhan dṛṣṭavyāḥ te ca sarvaśūra buddhā bhagavanta āśvāsayanti mā bhaï śattpuruṣa tvaya saṃghātaṃ śūtraṃ mahādharmaṃaparyāyam subhāṣitaṃ śrutaṃ śrutvā iyā te pūryaskandhaḥ praśūtaḥ, etc.

Who, O Sarvaśūra, having a devout mind, will wholeheartedly reverence the Saṃghāta Sūtra, he in every birth for ninety-five kalpas will be such as remember his former births; for sixty thousand kalpas he will be a cakravartin king. Here and now, Sarvaśūra, he will be dear (and) charming for all. Sarvaśūra, not by the sword will he die. Not by poison will he die. And Kākhordas will not attack him. At the moment of death, when the final suppression occurs, he will see ninety kotis of Buddhas face-to-face. And, Sarvaśūra, those Buddhas, Blessed Ones, will encourage him (thus): 'do not be afraid, good man, by you the Saṃghāta Sūtra, the great and well spoken discourse on dharma was heard; having heard it, this heap of merit was produced for you, etc.'

Here again these references are representative and could easily be multiplied. Enough, however, is given in the above passages to indicate what I wish to establish. The dharmaṃaparyāyya-Buddha - and this is, I think, a good way of indicating the cult-object here - is approached in the same way, is the object of the same patterns of behavior as are directed towards our typified cult-figure. The dharmaṃaparyāyya-Buddha is available through its name or through other forms of religious activity undertaken in regard to it, pūjā, etc. The power of the dharmaṃaparyāyya-Buddha is presented as potentially available in situations which are, above all, concerned with death, dying, karma and rebirth; and that power functions to provide the individual with qualities and material goods intended to lessen or remove the possibility of unmeritorious action performed on account of need, envy, etc.; to remove the threat of 'un-natural' death, and, above all, the judgement implicit in it, to assure -
when death is unavoidable - that this implicit judgement and its consequences, rebirth, are favorable; etc. In short, that the dharmaparīyāṇa-Buddha is conceptually the equivalent of our other cult-figures. A point of detail here is of some interest. I have pointed out above that both Bhaïṣajyaguru and Avalokita are said to respond to a whole list of what are sometimes called fears (bhayas) and sometimes called untimely deaths (akālamaraṇa). I also indicated that these lists are just variants of a single more or less standardized list. The point here is that Sgī presents us with what amounts to a short form of that same list, and that while Bhg asserts that Bhaïṣajyaguru will protect the individual from death by poison or 'demons' or the sword, and SP XXIV asserts that Avalokita will protect him from the same thing, in Sgī it is asserted that protection from exactly those things is effected by the dharmaparīyāṇa, the Samghāṭa Sūtra. Clearly then, from the point of view of the individual, all three are - not only in general terms, but also in points of detail - functionally interchangeable.

e. Hopefully we have now established the context in which Bhaïṣajyaguru would have been seen at Gilgit. But more than that. We have, I think, established a category or, if you will, the type of 'the cult figure' at Gilgit. We have established that behind a great number of 'individual' Buddhas, bodhisattvas, devas, etc., lies a remarkably uniform conceptual model, that all these 'individuals' are constructed on the same basic framework, all are images modelled on a single armature. Their character is essentially the same, the range of their activity, the effect of their 'presence', the manner in which they are approached. My analysis has been limited to the Gilgit material, but if our type is a legitimate one - and I think it is - its usefulness for the analysis for other sutra literature will be obvious. Moreover, whether or not the details of my analysis are accepted, I think it shows the interesting possibilities which the application of 'typing' as a method could produce. It is perhaps unfortunate that the methodological possibilities of a typology - so obviously suited to Mahāyāna studies where one is constantly confronted by a plethora of 'individual' figures - have not been exploited. I know of only one person who has even suggested such a thing (D.Seyfort Ruegg, "Sur les rapports entre le bouddhisme et le 'substrat religieux' indien et tibétain", Journal Asiatique (1964) 77-95).

In addition to the establishment of our type, our analysis brings to light at least one other phenomenon closely connected with it, a phenomenon
the methodological importance of which will become increasingly evident. It is, in fact, the process by which the type was generated. In our analysis we can isolate at least two distinct levels of generalization or non-specificity. Taking Bhaisajyaguru as our point of reference we may note that 1) Bhaisajyaguru's response is situationally non-specific. He responds to a generalized fear or anxiety which can be manifested in any number of specific situations; 2) the response pattern manifested by Bhaisajyaguru is not specific to him. It is a generalized pattern exhibited by any number of specific Buddhas (Bhaisajyaguru, Amitabha, Sakyamuni, Kasyapa, Kanakamuni, etc.), bodhisattvas (Avalokita, Vajrapani, etc.), and other figures. This process where individual cases - whether figures or situations - become only examples of a larger category, or where specificity of function is denied by assigning the same function to an ever increasing number of individuals is what I would understand by the expression 'the process of generalization'. This process, which may operate in a number of different directions simultaneously, is a very widespread phenomenon in Mahayana literature, and we will have occasion to frequently refer to it in what follows.
Thus by me was it heard at one time. The Blessed One, wandering around the circuit of the country districts, arrived at Vaśāli; in Vaśāli he stayed awhile. At the base of a tree having the sound of music he, accompanied by a great community of bhikṣus, accompanied by eight thousand bhikṣus and thirty-six thousand bodhisattvas, surrounded and honored by kings, ministers, brāhmaṇas and householderś, by devas and asuras and garuḍas and kinnaras and mahoragas, taught Dharma.

1) 'in due time arrived there where the great city of Vaśāli was. Then the Blessed One there in Vaśāli stayed awhile.'
2) 'and by a great assembly of devas and nagas and yakṣas and gandharvas and devas and asuras and garuḍas and kinnaras and mahoragas and humans and non-humans, taught Dharma.'

---

a. Three texts at Gilgit offer some interesting data bearing on the formula evam mayā śrutam ekasmin samaye. Both SP 3.2 and SmD 1316.1 open: evam mayā śrutam ekasminaye, and Eka 2417.1, though partially damaged, probably also had the same reading (Dutt, CMs i 35.1, evam mayā śrutam eka) samaye). These three examples seem to indicate that the usual formulā may not have been as standardized as we are in the habit of thinking.

We have now, thanks to Ét. Lamotte, La traité de la grande vertu de nagesse, T.I (Louvain: 1949) 56-114, a detailed picture of the ideas which at least one part of the Buddhist community associated with this formula. We also have the interesting study by J. Brough, "Thus have I heard...", BSOAS 13 (1950) 416-26 (see also A. & H. Wayman, The Lion's Roar of Queen Śrīmatī (New York: 1974) 59 n.1; the Waymans refer to an article by N. H. Samtani, "The Opening of the Buddhist Sūtras", Bharati (Bulletin of the College of Indology) No.8, pt.II (1964-65) 47-63, which I have not been able to see.) Brough treats the phrase from three points of view. On two of these - "(1) the punctuation of the phrase", and
"(3) the significance of the phrase as a whole" — we might add a few observations. With regard to the first, since Brough used only late Nepalese Mss., it might have been expected that the earlier Gilgit Mss. might be able to add something of value to his discussion of the punctuation of the phrase. This expectation, unfortunately, turns out to be false. When the Gilgit punctuation is not entirely erratic (e.g. in Bhg X the first punctuation mark comes after janapadacaryān and before caramana), it is virtually the same as that found in the Nepalese Mss.: "... they write evam mayā ērutam ekasmin samaye and the first punctuation mark normally comes after viharati ēma" (so Bhg Y; Sgṭ (no.37) 2108.1; SP 3.2; Adb (no.18) 1691.2-3, etc.). In reference to Brough’s third point of view I can only point out one aspect of the situation which he seems to have overlooked, an aspect, however, which confirms the essence of what he was saying. Brough (p.424) says: "Now in the Jaina canon there occurs frequently a very similar introductory phrase: suṣṭam ma ūnanā ṭanam bhagavayā evam akkhaṇān, 'It was heard by me, venerable Sir, thus taught by the Blessed One' ... The Jaina phrase, however, is more explicit. Here the first redactor of the scriptures places at the head of his recitation, in order to seal its authenticity, the solemn declaration that he, in person, has heard it taught by the master. It seems to me that there is little doubt that the original sense of the Buddhist phrase is identical." The correctness of Brough’s final sentence is perhaps confirmed if we take into account the fact that if evam mayā, etc., is the ‘standard’ introductory formula to a Buddhist sūtra, then the phrase idam avocat bhagavān is just as surely the ‘standard’ concluding formula. (It in fact is almost always present even when evam mayā, etc. is not; cf. the individual Avadānas in the Divyāvadāna.) Perhaps we can go even further and say that these two phrases are not in fact two separate formulae, that evam mayā, etc. is only the first part, and idam avocat bhagavān the concluding part of a single basic formula. The correspondence between evam mayā ērutam ... idam avocat bhagavān and the Jaina phrase is virtually complete, This, in turn, to some degree renders the problem of the ekasmin samaye to the status of a non-question at least in terms of the "significance" of the phrase: it is no longer necessary to include ekasmin samaye with evam mayā ērutam to show that the speaker of evam mayā, etc., was reporting what he had heard in person. This is not to say that ekasmin samaye as a piece of syntax is not still a problem.
An interesting case bearing on a number of these points, and one which, I think, establishes the general purport of the formula, is found in the Daguttara-Suttanta. This is one of the few suttas contained in the Pāli canon which the tradition admits was not delivered by the Buddha. It opens, following PTS edition (D iii 272): evam me sutam. ekam samayam bhagavā campīyam viharati ...; but concludes: idam avoca āyasma Āṇīruputto. This makes it clear that what the speaker heard, and was reporting, was not that 'at one time the Blessed One dwelt at Campe, etc.', but what Sariputta said when he and the Buddha were there. In this case—and by extension all other cases—ekam samayam could be attached to either what precedes or what follows it without affecting the meaning. The "uncomfortable position" of the adverbial phrase noted by Brough (and Burnouf before him), and the parallel Jaina phrase might, however, argue for attaching it to the following bhagavān, etc. The important thing to be noted is that what the speaker of the formula heard was the speech of the Buddha (and his interlocutors). Everything else—passages describing the setting, action (atha khalu mañjuśrī ... ekāmaṃ cīvaram prāvṛtya, etc.), etc.—are all narrative elements added by the reporter and are not thus, strictly speaking, buddhavacana (cf. Brough, p.425).
Now then Mañjuśrī, the son of the king of Dharma, through the power of the Buddha having risen from his seat, having put his robe over one shoulder, having put his right knee on the ground, having inclined his folded hands towards the Blessed One, said this to the Blessed One: 1 Москвы the Blessed One declare, for the sake of the benefit of those beings in the last time, in the last period, when a counterfeit of the Good Law is current, the names of the Tathāgatas and the extent and excellence of their former vows, having heard which beings would affect the removal of all the obstruction of past acts. 2

1) The construction of the request of Mañjuśrī in both Skt and Tib. is clumsy. This may be due to the fact that the pastime kāle formula is here a later insertion, as I have suggested in the notes to the edition.

---

a. In Bhg, as well as in other texts from Gilgit, the epithet dharma-rajā has at least two distinct applications. Here it is used as an epithet for the Buddha. So also at Sr III 16, VIII 4, X 21, X 7, XXVIII 44, XXXV 25, XXXVII 1, 56; SP 200.15, 218.19, 57.4, 82.13, etc.; Sgṭ 2235.3; Kv 293.17, 298.8; and SmD 99.14, it is either applied to the Buddha Śākyamuni, to Buddhas in general, or used as a name for someone personifying the Buddhist ideal. At Bhg [17], Sgṭ 2100.6, Kv 262.11, 263.12, 276.14 (not in N, but in G fol.1597R), 299.3 and 25 it is used as an epithet of Yama. This second usage is that common to non-Buddhist literature (see A.Wayman, "Studies in Yama and Māra", IJ 3 (1959) 44-73; 112-31; which treats both Buddhist and non-Buddhist sources), and indicates Yama's role as Judge of the dead. This role, as we will see, was well known to the authors of Bhg, Sgṭ and Kv. That the Buddha and Yama shared more than just an epithet might be deduced from passages such as SP 116.1f, Kv 307.2, where it is a Buddha who appears at the moment of death - at least to the devout man - and gives a pronouncement as to the individual's future destiny. It would appear from such passages, which we will discuss more fully below under Bhg [11], that although the Buddha
probably never became an actual judge of the dead, he at least in some ways took on some of the functions of Yama or appeared in place of him in certain situations.

* * * *

b. The passage "Now then Mahājñāti ... through the power of the Buddha having risen from his seat ... said this to the Blessed One: 'May the Blessed One declare, etc!" is perhaps more important than it may appear. The passage asserts that all Mahājñāti's actions, actions which result, in this case, in the preaching of the Mahāyāna-gāthā-sūtra are not undertaken on his own initiative, but are the result of the Buddha's spiritual power. This assertion of Bhog [2] is then reinforced elsewhere in Bhog: at [16] it is said that the fact that Ānanda believes in the teaching of the sūtra is to be seen as resulting from the power of the Buddha (tathā-gatavāno 'nibbhāvo dhammagāña); and at [21] that it is through the power of the Buddha that the Mahāyāna-saṅgha heard the name of Bhaisajya-guru, i.e. the text of Bhog. The presence of these repeated assertions - obviously important to the compiler of Bhog - is difficult to explain unless it is admitted that they presuppose a situation in which such assertions were thought necessary. Their presence, in fact, implies a clear awareness on the part of their author of a problem which confronted the whole of the developing Mahāyāna: the problem of the authority of the literature on which it was based. It has been maintained that to meet the problem the compilers of the Mahāyāna sūtras, by "les pieux anachronismes", placed their work in the mouth of the Buddha Śākyamuni; that these "pieux anachronismes" were accepted "à la lettre" and that a "quantité de légendes ou de demi-vérités" were invented to explain them. This, at least, is what I understand Lamotte to be saying in his discussion of the ways in which the Mahāyānist dealt with the authority problem (St. Lamotte, "Sur la formation du Mahāyāna" Asiaatica. Festschrift Friedrich Wellner (Leipzig: 1954) 381ff). This view is perhaps too simplistic. It fails to distinguish between the compilers or authors of the Sūtras and the authors of Sūtras and commentaries. It is, I think, to the latter group alone that we owe the "quantité de légendes ou de demi-vérités". They are, as far as I know, never found in the Sūtras themselves. It is of course true, as Lamotte has stated, that the composers of the Sūtras made use of an anachronism in attributing their words
to the Buddha; but it is equally true that they did not rely on this
anachronism alone; that they were, or appear to have been, more aware
and concerned with the problem than lamotic implies; and that they
developed a number of ideas which appear to make sense only when they
are taken as attempts - however tentative - to offer some solution. There
are texts at Gilgit which preserve passages in which some of these ideas
are presented. One such passage is found in the Gilgit Prajñāpāramitā.

CBM 111 40a.2 (= fol.253) = N.Dutt, Pañcaśatikāhāranīka
Prajñāpāramitā (London: 1934) 98.6-99.4; Lhasa, Vol.26,
60-3-5f.

atha bhagavān āyusmantaṁ subhūtim āmantryataḥ pratībhāti te
subhūte bodhisatvāṇāṁ mahāśāntvāṇāṁ prajñāpāramitāṁ sārabhyah
dhārtikānkhaṁ kartum kathāṁ bodhisatvāḥ mahāśāntvāḥ prajñāpāramitāṁ
nirvyānāṁ.

atha teṣāṁ bodhisatvāṇāṁ mahāśāntvāṇāṁ teṣāṁ ca mahāśraya-
kaṁyaṁ teṣāṁ ca devaputrāṇāṁ etad abhūt kīṁ punar āyusmān subhūtīs
(tāṁ atmakena) svakāna prajñāpratibhānavalābdhānasannāhena bodhi-
satvāṇāṁ mahāśāntvāṇāṁ prajñāpāramitāṁ upadekṣyate atha buddhānub-
hāvena ...

āthāyusmān subhūtir buddhānubhāvena teṣāṁ bodhisatvāṇāṁ mahe-
satvāṇāṁ teṣāṁ ca mahāśrayakānaṁ teṣāṁ ca devaputrāṇāṁ cetasava
cetāparivitarkām ajñāyusmantaṁ śāradvatpūrṇam āmantryata yat
kīcid āyusmaṇe cārādvatiputra bhagavataḥ sāravāk bhāṣante 'bhila-
pantya udārayatfevat sarvāḥ sa tathāgataya puruṣakāraḥ yāś ca tathā-
gatena dharma desītaḥ sarvāḥ saddharmatvāḥ aḥnīruddha tat tena
kulaputrās tatra dharmaśeṣanāyaṁ śikṣamāṇaṁ tāṁ dharmaṁ sākṣat-
kurvantī • tathāgata uṣṇaḥ avatāra uṣṇaḥ cārādvatiputra 'tīyusmaṇe
bodhisatvāṇāṁ mahāśāntvāṇāṁ prajñāpāramitāṁ upadekṣyate avipayo 'tīyusmaṇe
cārādvatiputra sarvāḥ rājavakapratyekabuddhānāṁ bodhisatvāṁ mahā-
satvāṁ prajñāpāramitāṁ upadeṣṭu[al]

Then the Blessed One addressed the Venerable Subhūti: 'May it
please you, O Subhūti, to make a talk on dharma in reference to the
Perfection of Wisdom for the bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas, (as to) how
bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas, should go forth to the Perfection of
Wisdom !

Then to those bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas, and to those great
disciples, and to those devaputras this thought occurred: 'Will the
Venerable Subhūti teach that Perfection of Wisdom to the bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas (...

Then the Venerable Subhūti, through the power of the Buddha, having known through his mind the mind of those bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas, and of those great disciples, and those devaputras, addressed the Venerable Śāradvatīputra: 'O Venerable Śāradvatīputra, whatsoever the disciples of the Blessed One say, speak, (and) declare, all that is the work of the Tathāgata (T: de thagn end de bīn gāpons pa'i mīnu'o); and which dharma was taught by the Tathāgata, all that is not contrary (reading: aviruddha) to the true nature of things. Therefore, sons of good families training in that teaching, directly experience that (very) nature of things. (As a consequence), it is just the Tathāgata, O Śāradvatīputra, who by means of an expedient will be teaching the Perfection of Wisdom to the bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas. O Venerable Śāradvatīputra, it is not within the sphere of any disciple or pratyekabuddha to teach the Perfection of Wisdom to bodhisattvas, mahāsattvas.

That this passage was not, as Conze seems to imply (The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom (Berkeley: 1975) 89 n.1), simply intended to explain how it was possible for 'disciples' to teach bodhisattvas "who are their spiritual superiors in the Mahayana hierarchy" is perhaps best indicated by the fact that the same argument is elsewhere given to 'explain' the teaching of devas and bodhisattvas. At AdP 1 31.10, for example, we find:

athāyusmataḥ ānandasyaitad abhūt; kim evam śakro devaṁśi indra 

athāyusmataḥ ānandasyaitad abhūt; kim evam śakro devaṁśi indra 

At Sr XII 9 it is asserted of the bodhisattvas in general that:
yathāvadarśi bhoti
vivattabhavancano "nanyathāubhāya"
sarva ca itasya (i.e. a bodhisattva) vacanā
nisčaratī jinānubhāvena

But perhaps the most interesting passage in this regard is from the Daśabhūmikasūtra, and although the Daśabhūmika is not found at Gilgit, it is worth quoting this passage for the light it throws on GāMs iii 40a, etc. When the bodhisattva Vajragarbha is asked to teach the bhumis of a Buddha, he prefaches his exposition (i.e. the body of the Daśabhūmika) with a series of verses, the last four of which read:

J. Rahder, Daśabhūmikasūtra (Louvain: 1926) 10.23-11.8:

etātprāgo gocara durdaśa 'syasya
vaktum na śakyah sa hi svāśayastah /

kiṁ tu pravakṣyamı jinānubhāvataḥ
dharmavantu sarve sahitāḥ sagesavah //

jñānapravesah sa hi tādṛṣa 'syasya
vaktum na kalpair api śakyaśa yat /

sāhasrāca tac chṛṇuta bravāmy uhaṃ
āśharmārthatattvam nikhilam yathāsthitam //

sagesavah santaḥ) sajjā bhavante
vakyāmy uhaṃ sāmnu jinānubhāvataḥ /

udāśyaśe varadharmaghosam
āstāntayuktam sahitam sarāksarantam //

unduṣkaraṃ tāc vacasāpi vaktum
yaśo cāppamayah sugatānubhāvah /

mayi pravijṣata sa ca raśmimūrtih
yasyānubhāvena mamastī saktih //

Of such a kind, difficult to see, is the range of that one (i.e. the Buddha); for he who is dependent on his own mode of thinking it cannot be described. But I, through the might of the Jīna, will explain it. May all, concentrated and with respect, listen!
For the penetration into knowledge of that one (the Buddha) is of such a kind that even during (many) kalpas it is not possible to describe. May you listen! I declare in brief the true meaning of Dharma, complete and as it is.

O you being respectful, being prepared, I will speak well through the might of the Jina, I will utter the sound of the excellent Dharma accompanied with examples, flowing, having balanced syllables.

It is very difficult to describe that through mere speech, but which is that immeasurable might of the Sugata, having entered into me in the form of a ray of light, through the might of that I am able to do so.

In order to fully appreciate the significance of these passages a number of points must be underlined. First, in the 'redactions' of the Larger Prajñāpāramitā's the passage we have quoted concerning Subhūti has been displaced from its original position. Although even here it stands at the beginning of the actual teaching. The corresponding passage in both the Aṣṭasāhasrikā and the Ratnasūlamamcayagāthā is found at the very beginning of their respective texts, and in both the question of the authority on which Subhūti speaks constitutes the very first topic to be discussed. The same is true of the Padabhumīkā and a similar passage, not quoted here, from the Sukhāvatīvyūha (Ashikaga ed. 2.14-5.3). The fact that this topic is given first place indicates its importance for the compilers of these texts. This, of course, need not be surprising since it appears from the above quotations that the argument, rather than being concerned with the authority on which 'disciples' teach Bodhisattvas, is concerned with the authority on which, regardless of the status of the teacher, the teaching for bodhisattvas (i.e. the Mahāyāna) is based.

What is perhaps more surprising is that these passages, by the direction of their argument, strongly imply a tacit admission that the teaching in question, the teaching intended for bodhisattvas (i.e. the Mahāyāna), may not have been the actual (in our sense) work of the historical Buddha, that it was in fact the work of 'disciples', 'kulaputras', or 'Bodhi-
sattvas'. Otherwise the argument of these passages and their placement has no purpose. This is still further emphasized by a second point that should be noted: in the passage cited above (GBMs iii 40a): Subhūti, rather than replying to the specific question framed by those in the assembly - i.e. 'will he teach the Perfection of Wisdom through his own knowledge, or through the power of the Buddha' - makes a general statement: 'whateversor the 'disciples' of the Blessed One say - which must include statements as to what he did or did not teach, etc. - that is the work of the Buddha'. Thus a specific situation is made the occasion for the declaration of a general principle of general application.

In sum then, although the question certainly requires fuller study, these passages and others like them seem to indicate at least two things: one, that the authors or compilers of these sūtras were fully aware of the problem of their authority; and two, that the conception of the Buddha's anubhāva represents at least one response to the problem which was developed by these individuals. This is a very different thing from simply trying to pass off "les pieux anachronismes".

The relevance of all this here is that this whole complex of ideas lies behind the simple passage from Bhq [2] with which we started. Limiting ourselves to the passages we have quoted above, we seem to be able to detect there at least three stages in what appears to be a process of simplification of expression of our basic idea. The most elaborate discussion is also almost certainly the oldest. This is GBMs iii 40a; the fact that virtually the same passage is found at the head of the Aññasāhasrika, and that this passage in turn has a corresponding section in the Ratnagunasāhasyagāthā, guarantees the fact that it probably belongs to the earliest strata of the Prajñāpāramitā Literature. In this passage we have not only an assertion that the teaching of a 'disciple' is in fact the teaching of the Buddha, we also have an explanation of how this is so. In AdP i 33.10, SR XII 9 and Dhā 10.25, on the other hand, we have only the assertion; the explanation has been completely omitted. A final stage in the process of simplification is to be seen in Bhq [2], [16] and [21]; here it seems to me the whole complex of ideas, the fulness of GBMs iii 40a, is invoked by a single word - buddhānubhāvena. Here not only has the explanation dropped out, but even the direct assertion is no longer apparently necessary. Instead it is enough to use 'buddhānubhāvena' as a catch-word for the whole complex, and to insert it at different points in the narrative structure of the text to indicate that all important events
concerning the text - its initial production [2], dissemination [21], and acceptance [16] - were (and are) the work of the Buddha. What we see in our quotations, then, is another good example of the process - very common in Mahāyāna sutra literature - whereby key words and phrases come to stand for entire concepts, so that passages like Bhq [2], which appear to be only pieces of straightforward narrative, all presuppose the sometimes complex, but always more detailed discussions found elsewhere.

Although the concept of the buddhānubhāva was in time diffused and in some sense weakened, I think the above passages indicate its primary and probably original usage. But, without any intention of analyzing its many and probably latter applications, I think at least one of these deserves fuller note. Restricting ourselves to one text which is particularly rich in examples, it is possible to say that the concept of the buddhānubhāva was used, or came to be used, to account for the miraculous: all sorts of wonderful things were said to happen buddhānubhāvena -

Rkp 12.7: tāni ca divyāni tūryāni te ca yāvad alamkāra bhagavata
ṣāḍbhāyabhāvena y u y u n e v a v a r u n u h; Rkp 78.1: tena khalu punah śameyena
dā vīthī buddhānubhāvena y o j a n a s a t a v i s t ī r nāvākāśām saṃprāyatā sa / tatra
cā vīthāmadhye sthaviraḥ śāriputra uttarāmukho niśantāḥ / mahāmaudgāyāñyāṇaḥ paścāmukho niśantāḥ / ... parasparam ardhayojanaśramaṇena nasthūḥ /
tēṣāṁ ca catuḥśaḥ mahāśrāvakaśām madhye pṛthivīpradesasya padā prādur
abhavat paṃcāśaḥ dhaṇastavitāraṃ jāmbūnandasmayena dānāṇaḥ, etc.; cf. 23.19, 24.11, 57.5, 91.7, etc. In passages of this kind the meaning of anubhāva blends into that of pṛddhi, adhiśṭhāna, etc.; and in fact anubhāva is frequently found in close conjunction or in compound with one or another of these terms (e.g. Rkp 12.7). The interesting thing for us is that it is distinctly possible that at least something of this meaning inhere even in what appears to be the primary usage which we have discussed above.

For these and other applications of the concept elsewhere at Gilgit I can here only give some further references: SR IV 19; 123.1; X 46, XII 4, XVII 31, 32, 35, 40, 47; 275.15; XXII 7, XXXII 260, XXXV 20, 38, 56; 644.1; 
Ab 104.11, 105.19, 106.10, 117.10, 11, 134.17, 135.5, 19; SAd 50.6, 54.10; 
NāP 2 7.22, 23; 71.25; BhP 190–1–3, 190–4–8 / 1289.1, 192–2–7, 193–3–4, 193–3–5, 193–3–6, 194–2–2; Mok vas.3, 83; Syy 2140–1ff, 2271–1ff; Rkp 4.2, 13.1, 18.2, 137.2, 152.7; KV 261.123, 263.22, 283.18; SP 16.24, 81.9, 89.10, 236.7, 244.3, 249.12, 280.9.

* * *
c. The phrase "... in the last time, in the last period, when a counterfeit of the Good Law is current" is yet another example where a key phrase or formula comes to stand for an entire complex of ideas. Unfortunately, in this case we have little exact information on what this complex of ideas meant to the compilers of the Mahāyāna sūtras and, more importantly, in exactly what ways and to what degree it influenced the direction in which the overall doctrine was developed. The early phases of these ideas have been studied by Przyluski, especially in his chapter "le développement des idées eschatologiques relatives à la loi" in la Légende de l'empereur Aṣoka (Paris: 1923) 161-85; and by Lamotte, Histoire du bouddhisme indien (Louvain: 1958) 210-22. Lamotte, both in Histoire and later in L'Enseignement de Vimalakīrti (Louvain: 1962) 383 n.23, broadened the inquiry to include at least to some degree the Mahāyāna. However we still do not have anything like a complete study of the problem, and in its absence I can here only touch on a few points concerning the appearance of these ideas at Gilgit.

Taking the Gilgit texts as a whole, one thing is immediately obvious: references to ideas concerning 'the last time' do not occur uniformly throughout. In some of our texts such references are completely absent: Muh, Eka, and Śmd. In others, if such references occur at all, they are extremely rare: AdP, Bdh (only at 194-4-5), SgP (only at 2227.5, 2240.6), Vaj (only at 76.1, but cf below), and Sv (only in the very last section, 307.9f, which appears very much like it had been added as an after-thought, and which refers only to a decline in the quality of the bhikṣus). These eight texts may be taken as constituting a single group. In addition to this group we may note that references to 'the last time' are found three times in Bhg [1], [13], and [17], seven times in Bdh (156.19, 159.19, 160.7, 198.8,16, and 199.4, 16 - but bear in mind that this text at Gilgit is very fragmentary, several whole chapters being missing), twelve times in SūA (50.17, 51.4, 63.2, 65.5,16, 74.6, 80.6, 84.6, 87.4,12,15 and 88.11) and eighteen times in Ad (110.16-18, 114.1.3-4, 15-17, 132.6,17, 133.13, 134.8,10,11, 135.2,7,15 and 136.1,5,7). In these texts ideas concerning 'the last time' are present and firmly established. In addition to these four texts, there are two other texts in which such ideas are not only firmly established, but so prevalent as to constitute a major thematic element: in Sr we find as many as sixty such references, II 14.28,29, II 27,28.29,30,31,36,37,39, IV 23, V 26,27, VIII 11, XI 57,58,60,63, XV 4,6,8, XVI 7,8, XVIII 18,25,30,33,35,39,40,55, XXI 8,19, XXIV 37,63,
XXIX 37,115, XXXI 21,25,30, XXXII 138,141,143,147,279,280,471.1, XXXIV 40, 490.12f, 492.14, XXXV 1, 42,47,98, XXXVI 50, and XXXVII 71,75 (In a few cases the reference may be simply to a later time, and not the technical 'last time'; these are sometimes difficult to distinguish.; while in SP there are even more, 27.2C, 200.22, 206.6, 218.22, 238.20,25,30, 239.3,14, 20,28,30, 247.3,17, 248.28-249.1, 249.10,16,22, 250.10,17,20, 251.3,5, 252.19, 254.18,29, 256.20, 257.1, 108.28, 110.11, 124.23, 125.3,11,28, 126.3,14,23, 128.5,8, 143.24, 149.2, 150.9,18,151.3, 153.16, 154.12,16, 155.10,18, 167.19, 168.14, 174.24, 175.14, 177.8,12 (plus more than a dozen other references which occur in places in the Nepalese redaction, the corresponding text of which has not been preserved in the Gilgit Ms.) These six texts make up a second group.

Perhaps the most interesting thing about the distribution of references to 'the last time' is that, contrary to what one might expect, they do not appear to follow any definite patterns. One might expect, for example, that their occurrence would be heaviest in those texts which are primarily concerned with karma, rebirth, merit and cult (i.e. with what for the moment we might call 'Popular Buddhism', but cf [3], and lightest in those texts primarily concerned with jñāna, prajñā and bodhi (i.e. with what for the moment we will call 'Philosophic Buddhism', cf. [3]). This, however, is not the case. Of the two texts which are most clearly 'philosophic', AdP gives almost no part to ideas concerning 'the last time', while in SR, as I have said, they constitute a major thematic element. Likewise, of those texts which might be called 'popular' we find several, Ṛkṣa, SmD, Ku, Ṯhp and Sṭf in which such ideas either do not occur or are virtually of no consequence, while in Bhg, StA, Aj and SP - all likewise 'popular' texts - they are firmly established and play a prominent role. In the same way, references to 'the last time' do not appear to correspond to even a rough chronological pattern. For example, it is difficult to believe that Ṛkṣa and ṢmD, in which there are no references to 'the last time', were written before SR, in which there are sixty such references; or that Bhg, StA, and Aj, in which such references are firmly established, are necessarily earlier than SP, where such references are far more prominent.

It is also worth noting that even in those texts in which ideas concerning paścimakaḷa constitute a significant presence, these ideas are not necessarily used in exactly the same way, nor do they necessarily play
exactly the same role in all texts. We might look briefly at some of the ways in which these ideas are used or the significance attached to them, beginning at least with the shorter texts. In the three references in Bhg, the idea of 'the last time' is used in basically the same way: in [2] it is for the benefit of those living in 'the last time' that Mañjuśrī asks the Buddha to declare the names and former vows of the Tathāgatas; and again it is for their benefit that he says in [13] that he will cause the name, and by implication the text of Bhg, to be heard. In [17] it is yet again for those living in 'the last time' that the main ritual of Bhg is described. In Bhg, then, it would appear that the teaching it contained was conceived of as primarily intended for 'the last time', the time at which "a counterfeit of the Good Law was current." In Aj it is said that those who preserve the name of Śākyamuni (110.16-18), hear the sound of the striking of the gong and make the name buddhāya (114.15-17), etc. in the last time, will exhaust their former unfavorable karma; that those who teach or preserve this dharma-paryāya in the last time will awaken to full enlightenment (132.6f); that those who reject this dharma-paryāya or cast aspersions on those who preserve or follow it in the last time do incalculable evil (132.17, 133.13); finally, that the mahādravyakta kārīyapa (134.14), Brahma-sahāmapati (135.10) and the Four Great Kings (136.1f) will protect this text in the last time, that Ānanda will protect those who, in the last time, preserve it (134.8-10), that in the last time Pūrṇa-Maitrāyaṇiputra will teach it for the benefit of all living things (135.11), and that those who copy this sutra in the last time will not go to an unfortunate destiny, but will go quickly to heaven (āvarga, 135.7). Clearly Aj contains a number of provisions specifically intended for those living in the last time. That the teaching as a whole was intended for the last time is, however, much less directly expressed than in Bhg, and the claim less comprehensive. The last time here is characterized as taking place after the parinirvāṇa of the Buddha (110.17, 114.1, etc.), a time at which there will be destruction of the teaching (sāsana-vipralopa, 110.18, 114.4), the destruction and disappearance of the Good Law (saddharmavipralopa varṣamāne nuuddharmasyūnturūdāna-kālandasamaye, 114.16), and finally, as a very terrible (subhāraṇa) time (134.8,11). At the beginning of StA we find a situation very similar to Bhg [2]. Here Mañjuśrī says to Avalokiteśvara: santi kulaputra sattvā paścime kāle paścime samaye bhaviṣyanti pāpakāriṇo dāriḍrāh kṛṣā durvarṇa-śāriṇā jāra vyāhchipariśiddhāh purīṣṭabhogā aśparibhūvitakāya aḷāpyaurykṣī.
Avalokita consents to Manjusri's request and addresses the Buddha, saying santi bhagavan sattvai: pascime hahavi~ya.nti' etc.. ... te~am a.haJ!l bha.gavan a:rthaya. hi taya u. tathaga,ta,m adhye~yami (S1.4f) .. Here it is explicitly stated that this teaching is requested for the sake of those living at the last time. This idea is reinforced twice in the text where it is said that in the last time this text (= ayam) will perform the duties or fulfill the function of the Tathāgata (ayam te [= ānanda] tathāgatasāntyutrasanyak- sambodhathātāgataśārdayam kariṣyati paścime kāle paścime samaye sarvasattvānām, 87.3; 87.11), as well as at 88.10, at the conclusion of STA, where the audience says to the Buddha tad yatha sadhu sadhu bhagava.n subhai;;itam idmn mahādharma paryayam sarvasattvānām arthaya tathāgatasasanacirasthity~artham. Apart from these passages, there is another group of passages in STA which are of interest. At 63.1 the Buddha begins a series of verses on the merit of preserving the text and honoring those that do with the words: īśruṇa kulaputra apramattā / mā paśeñkāle pariṭāpya (so Ms.) bheṣyata /; and later in the same series we find: idam ca sūtraḥ ahaJ!l (so Ms.) dharitvayaḥ / sarvāya nityam ca kartavya dharake / gacchaitā ca mālyaiś ca vilapanaiś ca / satkāru kṛtvā ca likhāpayeta ... (butt has changed the order of the verses) ... mā paśeñkāle jaya.yādhipitaḥ / aneka~yācāsahasrayākulaḥ / nareṣaṇu tiryakṣu pariḥramanā / etc. (65.1f). Bearing in mind that in neither Ms., of STA are these verses well preserved, and that the exact significance of the ma construction remains ambiguous (cf. BHS ch.42), these passages might be tentatively translated: 'Listen, son of good family, without distraction, lost in the last time you come to be tormented!', and 'and always this Sūtra is to be preserved / constantly honor is to be paid to its preserver / having honored it with perfumes and garlands and unguents, it should be written / lest in the last time (you) are afflicted with old age and sickness / troubled with many thousands of troubles, wandering in the hells and animal births, etc.' These and similar passages (65.16, 84.6), if I understand them correctly, appear to be suggesting something slightly different from what we have met so far. They seem to suggest that not only was the teaching in question intended for those in the last time, but also that by attending to it now one could avoid the troubles of that period. Compare, in this regard, SR XIV 23: tasmāc chṛṇītvā imu ānu- śamaḥ / janetha chandam atulāya bhoṣhaya / mā naśeñkāle pariṭāpya bheṣyata / rudurlabham sugatavarāṇa ārāṣṭram /.
These three texts, Bhg, Aj and StA, give us a good idea of the roles the conception of 'the last time' could play in Gilgit sutra literature. The major forms in which it appears are virtually all seen here, as well as the major elements of its characterization. References to the idea elsewhere - SR, SP, etc. - add detail and interesting elaborations, but probably, with very few exceptions, no significant major new usages or characterization. One exception, however, deserves to be noted.

At SP 27.20 - although I quote from Kern's ed. 43.4, since the Gilgit text is fragmentary here - we find: ... yatha tathāgata arhaṇṭaḥ sanyaksambuddhā kalpaśaṣṭye votpadyante sattvaṃ kṣaṣye vā klāśaṣṭye vā dhṛtikṣaṣṭye votpadyante / evanṛupeṣu śāriputra kalpaśaṃśobhaṃśaṣṭye bahusattvāḥ alpakuṣadāsāleṣu tadā śāriputra tathāgataḥ sanyaksambuddhā upaśakāsāleṣaḥ tad evaikaṃ buddhānāṃ triyānānirdeśena nirūṣānti. This is the only place that I know of where it is explicitly stated that in time of decline the Buddha makes conscious modifications to the doctrine. This, I think, is important to keep in mind when one is tempted to read this into any number of other passages.

In reference to Bhg [2]’s 'counterfeit of the Good Law' (Saddharmapratirūpaka) it should be noted that this idea is comparatively rare at Gilgit. What it meant in Bhg, though, would have been clear to a reader of SP where it is referred to several times, such as at SP 206.31: tasya khalu punah śāradvatiṣṭutra padmaprabhāṣya tathāgataṣya parinirvṛṭasya dvātrāśaḥ antarakaḷpaḥ saddharmaṣṭasyati / dvātrāśa evaṃantarakaḷpaḥ saddharmapratirūpakaṣṭhaṣṭasyati; or SP 207.31: parinirvṛṭasā pṛthivyasiṃ saṃsthaṣṭati / dvātvṛṣati antarakaḷpa pṛthipyāḥ / saddharmān saṃsthaṣṭati vasiṃ kāle / hitāya lokasya saḍevaṃkasya / saddhāmhi kipī pratiṣṭhitapakā śṛṣṭyā / dvātvṛṣati antarakaḷpaḥ athāṣṭāṣṭi / śastra vaistārikānāṃ saṃsthaṣṭāni / susatkiṣṭaḥ naramarṣṭī sa mityāṃ (cf. 67.9, 69.16, 70.33, 72.7, 73.9, 146.14, 21; and Lamotte, Histoire, 210-17).

The final observation I want to make concerning 'the last time' relates to the suggestion I made above to the effect that the phrase vāṣcime samaye, etc. at Bhg [2] looks very much like a case where a well-known cliché has been mechanically inserted into the text. At least one text at Gilgit gives unmistakable evidence that such a thing could, and did, happen. The text in question is Vaj, and it is worth looking at in some detail for a number of reasons: the occurrences of the formula concerning 'the last time' in Vaj are often cited as examples of the way in which this idea is referred to (both Przybuski and Lamotte cite it);
the standard edition of Vaj - that of E. Conze - is very unsatisfactory in
its treatment of this formula; and, finally, when the later additions are
rejected, we have a version of Vaj which is remarkably different in tone,
if not in content, from that found in our modern editions. We must take
the following material into account: C = E. Conze, Vajracchedikā Prājñā-
pāramitā (Rome: 1957); G - the Gilgit text; T - the Tibetan text; and
P = F.E. Pargiter, "Vajracchedikā in the Original Sanskrit", in A.F.R.
Boernle, Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern
Turkestan (Oxford: 1916) 176-95. It should be noted that when Pargiter
made his edition of the fragmentary Central Asian Ms he had access only
to Müller's published edition, and since the readings of this version very
often did not agree with his Ms, he had difficulty in filling some of the
gaps in his text. With the publication of the Gilgit text, a text much
closer to the Ms which Pargiter used, it has become possible to fill more
confidently at least some of the lacunae left by him.

The paścime kāle formula occurs at four places in Vaj. The first, C & G,
must both be left out of account since this passage in both G and P has
not been preserved. At C 16b we read: ye 'pl te bhagavan sattvā bhavih-
anti anāgata 'dhvani paścime kāle paścime saṃaye paścimayān paścaśatyān
svadharmavipralōpe vartamāṇe ye imam bhagavan dharmaśārayānum ugraśāhyantī...
be paramāścarṣya samanvāgaṭā bhavihṣyantī; G 1.1, which Conze notes,
has ye te bhagavan sattvā imam dharmaśārayānum ugraśāhyantī ... te para-
maścarṣya samanvāgaṭā bhavihṣyantī. What Conze did not note is that T haε
ye 'pl xxxx...xxpaścimāya; n.127 paścimāyaṁ imam dharmaśārayānum avakāśa-
viṣyantī, etc. [we could probably fill the gap at the beginning with
bhagavan sattvā] and that T had only śād ma'ī tache šād ma'ī duś ūc ha
braγa'1 tha ma la. At 16b C has the full formula from paścime te vart-
amāṇe; here he notes that G has only varīme kāle paścimāyaṁ paścimāyaṁ
vartamāṇyaṁ and P carimikāyaṁ paścimikāyaḥ vartamāṇyaṁ; but he does not
note that T agrees with G: phyl ma'ī aus lha bryi'ai thu mar hyur ye na.
At 21b C reads asti bhagavan kecit sattvā bhavihṣyantī anāgata 'dhvani
paścime kāle paścime saṃaye paścimāyaṁ paścimāyaṁ svadharmaśārayānum ugra-
vipralōpe vartamāṇe ye imān evamrūpān dharmān āruvaśāhiśaṛaddaśāhyantī. He notes
that G has only asti bhagavan kecit sattvā bhavihṣyantī anāgata 'dhvani ya
imān evamrūpān dharmān bhāsmaṇāṁ cchurvāśāhiśaṛaddaśāhyantī; what he did
not note is that P probably had virtually the same reading as G: santi
bhagavām kecit sattvā xxxx [1rd: anāgata 'dhvan]i ye ime evamrūpān dharmān,
etc.; and so did T: ma 'oṁs pa'ī dus na. In all three cases where we have
more or less complete evidence it is clear that the full formula found in Conze's edition is a later addition. In two cases in G (and Chakravarti maintains that it is the earliest extant version) not only is the full formula not found, but no reference of any kind to a 'last time' is found. At least two points emerge from all this. First, Conze's handling of these passages in his edition is puzzling. At the end of his 17c he omits a passage of several lines because he says it is not found in Kumārajīva's translation or in P or T - it is also not found in G, though Conze has overlooked this. By his own loose criteria then, should we not also omit paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyām paścimātāyām saddharmavipralopec vartumāne at 21b, since it is omitted not only by G, P and T, but also by Kumārajīva and the old Khotanese translation (although I have not cited the last two above, they in almost every case support the readings of the early Mss and not G)? And should we not also apply the same criteria to 14b and 16b? The second thing which emerges from the above is that in the case of Vaj passages concerning the 'last time' were added to the text not only after the time of the Gilgit text, but even after the beginning of the 9th century, the time at which the Tibetan translation was made. That this was irrefutably the case in Vaj must caution us to the fact that the same may be true for any number of other texts.
Then the Blessed One gave approbation to Mañjuśrī, the true heir-apparent: "It is well done, well done. Mañjuśrī is a compassionate one. You, Mañjuśrī, having generated immeasurable compassion, make this request of me for the benefit of beings obstructed by the various obstructions of past actions, for the advantage and ease of devas and men. Therefore, Mañjuśrī, listen well and fix well your attention! I will speak."

"Even so, O Blessed One", Mañjuśrī, the true heir-apparent, assented to the Blessed One.

On Mañjuśrī see B.Bhattacharya, "Mañjuśrīghora", The Commemoration of Volume (Poona: 1937) 59-69; St.Lamotte, "Mañjuśrī", T'oung Pao 48 (1960) 1-96 (on Kumārābhūta, see pp.13-14). In light of Lamotte's statement that "le Bodhisattva de la dixième terre porte les titres d'ekaṭṭhapratibhāvita et de kumārābhūta", it is interesting to note that the latter epithet is given to Subhūti at An 137.1.

... Both here and at ibid [2] our text mentions 'the obstructions of past actions (karmāvaraṇa)', and this brings up the whole complex problem of karma in Mahāyāna literature. For our purposes it is necessary - and possible - to treat only a very few aspects of the question which are directly related to our text (the best overall treatment is probably still L.de la Vallée Poussin, "Dogmatique bouddhique. La négation de l'âme et la doctrine de l'acte", JA (1902) 237-306; "Dogmatique bouddhique. II. Nouvelles recherches sur la doctrine de l'acte", JA (1903) 357-450. But once again, there has been nothing like a thorough study of the concept and its ramifications as they are expressed in Mahāyāna literature.)

We may begin with a general, but important observation: all the texts at Gilgit, regardless of their general character or 'philosophical' position, accept as a given the karmically constructed world. There is
nowhere an attempt to deny or reject the implications of such a world. This is especially true - contrary to what one is sometimes given to understand - of those texts concerned with puja. It is perhaps worth while to cite a number of examples of the way in which this given is expressed.

SR may be taken as representative of those texts which are generally called 'philosophical'.

*SR XX 3: nasti lañttva manuṣya ca labhayate
kālu kṛṣṭva paralokika gacchi yo
na ca karmakrtu vipraṁśyate
krṣṇa śūkla phala deti tādāya /*

There is no 'being', and no 'man' as apprehended who, after having died, would go to another world, but an act which is done is not destroyed: [whether] black or white, it gives a corresponding fruit.

This is not an isolated passage in SR; very similar passages may be found at XVII 59, 74, 140; XXI 7; XXIV 41; XXIX 15; XXXVII 35; etc. Another interesting passage from a text of the same character is "a, 'a,b:

ye to subhūte kulapītraḥ vai kuladhitāre vai indā
sva-prāpnaṁ sūtrāntāṁ udgrahīyanti yāvat paryāvṛṣyaṁti
śe paribhūtā bhaviṣyaṁti su-paribhūtāṁ yāṁ ca taṁ.
pūrvajenmāṁy aśubhāṁ karmāṁ apāyavānapāṇīyāṁ
ūṛṣṭa eva dharmaṁ paribhūtātayā kaśyapiṣyaṁti buddha-
bodhiṁ ca nuprāpyaṁti.

Subhūti, these sons and daughters of good family who will take up such sūtras, up to: will master (them); they will be despised, much despised; and their unlovely acts which are connected with former births (and) conducive to an unfortunate rebirth will just here and now, through the fact of their being despised, be exhausted, and they will obtain the awakening of a Buddha.
As examples of non-'philosophical' texts we can cite Mā 35.10-30.5:

nākṣaṭāṃ bhagavān samanupasyāṇī evēvaṃ loke rasāvakā
gabrāmakā saśrāmaṇabrāhmaṇikāvāḥ prajāyā yaś anena hṛdayena
raṣṭe kṛte pariḥ parigrahe śāntiśaṣṭayāyaṇa dasaṃparihāre
pariṣṭavahāre viṣa-prahāre kṛte yaś kaścid atikramaṇi na
prāśaṃśau, nenaṃ kathāṃṃ vidyate sthārya pauruṣāṃ param
viparyate.

O Blessed One, I do not observe anything in the world of
men, of brāhmaṇas and brāhmaṇas, together with its dover, māras
or brahmas, which, when through this hṛdaya protection, guarding,
assistance, peace and well-being is effected, (and) when the
lying down of clubs, of swords, the relinquishing of poisons
is effected, (if) it would attack, would not be allayed.

This situation can not occur apart from the maturing of past
action. (It is interesting to note that the same kind of
āthāpayitvā pūrvakarmavipākam proviso is found in the Aṣṭa-
śastrasikā (Mitra ed.) 56.19, but is missing in the corresponding
passage in the Gilgit Prajñāpāramitā.)

Ma īṣṭ 2238.2f; Tib 198-4-l.

avaṃ eva bhaiṣajyasena prathama-cittotpādiḥ bodhisattva
na kaścid vīnaśadharmā bhavati (avaṃ gya sa/ de bāñ du byal
chub sems dpal po bskyed pa'i bci ston by chu sa
b'i chos can du nes yan ni gyur te/): sarṣāiptena sarva-
adharmān prajñātī - āha - kathāṃ bhagavān prathamacittotpādiḥ
bodhisattvāḥ svapnaṃ padyati - bhagavān āha - bahūni bhaiṣajya-
śena prathamacittotpādiḥ bodhisattvāḥ svālamāntaro bhayānī
padyati - tatkaya hetor yādā avamāntare bhayāni padyati
vadā sarva pāpa-kāṇi karmāṇi pariśodhayati (de ci'i phyir ze na /
ras thams cad yon 'dus byo b'i phyir ro/). na šakyam
bhaiṣajyasena pāpakarmanā satvena (semr can sdi pa'i las can
gyis ni) tīvram duṣkham anpanīyitaṃ.

Just so, Bhaiṣajyasena, the roots of merit of a bodhi-
sattva who has produced the first though (towards awakening)
ever have the character of decay (so Tib.). In short, he knows
all dharmas. (Bhaiṣajyasena) said: 'What does the bodhisattva
who has produced the first thought see in a dream? The Blessed
One said: 'Bhaiṣajyasena, the bodhisattva who has produced the first thought sees many terrifying things in (his) dream. What is the reason for that? When he sees terrifying things in a dream, then he effects the purification of all (his) bad actions. It is not possible, Bhaiṣajyasena, for a being having bad actions to avoid acute suffering.'

The final passages we might consider here state the given nature of the karmically constructed world less directly, but no less emphatically. As we have seen already the power of the vow of the Buddhas in Bbp, of Avalokita in Kv and of Bhaiṣajyaguru in a substantial number of cases, is effective only after the initial death of the individual concerned; that is to say, after, or in the process of his undergoing the consequences of his past action. Two examples will suffice.

Bhg [8] Again further, Mañjuśrī, it happens that beings who in the name of the Tathāgata preserve (outwardly) the rule of training are gone-wrong in morality, in behavior, in views. Again, those who are possessed of morality guard morality, (but) they do not seek great learning, etc., etc. ... For such beings again and again there will be a destiny in the hells. By which of those, (however), the name of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguru-vaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, will have been heard [understand: 'when formerly they were men'; So T sgon mir gyur pa na, and Bhg [9], etc.], to them now dwelling in a hell the name of that Tathāgata, through the power of the Buddha, will (again) come to be present. They, having passed away from that place, will once again be born in the world of men. Possessed of correct views ... they, having renounced the household life, etc.

Bbp 193-3-4f: chos kyi rnam graṅs 'di yaḥ bris pa daḥ / 'drir bucug pa daḥ / boāṅs pa daḥ / klangs pa daḥ / mchod pa de'ī phyir sön mon gyi de bzin gseg pa de dag gi smon lam gyi mthu sems can [myal bal mnar med par 'gro ba daḥ / ṇaṃ soḥ gaum du skyes pa de dag gi rna bar mtshan rnas thos par 'gyur ro / chos kyi rnam graṅs 'di'i mthu kyaḥ sūg pa thams cad barab par 'gyur ro / de bzin gseg pa de dag gi gzi brjid kyi mthu daḥ / chos kyi rnam graṅs 'di'i mthu dge ba daḥ mi
On account of copying and having copied and preserving and reading and worshipping this discourse on dharma, through the power of the vows of those former Tathāgatas, (their) names would be heard in the ears of those gone to the Avīcī hell and those born in the three unfortunate destinies. Through the power of this discourse on dharma, moreover, all evil would be checked. Through the power of the majesty of those Tathāgatas, and through the power of this discourse on dharma, having recalled to mind (their) good and bad acts [i.e. the fruits thereof], consequently they would not perform evil acts. From that they would be freed from those sufferings and would go to a fortunate destiny. Until they fully and completely awaken to utmost, right and perfect awakening, they would conform to this practice.

In none of these passages do we find an attempt to avoid the implications of a world governed by kamma. We have instead a number of attempts to come to terms with them. This is underlined especially in Bbp and Bhg by the fact that the ritual acts which are intended to bring into effect the power of the Tathāgata's former vows are not undertaken by the individual concerned, but are undertaken by another for the sake of that individual who is already undergoing the consequences of his previous actions (i.e. has already been reborn in an unfortunate destiny), and that such acts, therefore, do not 'save' the individual from the necessity of undergoing - in at least some form - the fruits of his actions. As a matter of fact, it appears that such ritual activity is undertaken not to avoid the consequences of past action, but precisely because their unavoidability is accepted as given.

Implied in this last statement is the view that the acceptance of the karmically constructed world as a given lies at the root of the whole 'system' developed in such texts as Bhg. This view is perhaps confirmed by another set of passages we might look at. As we have seen at Bhg [2]
Mañjuśrī asks the Buddha for a teaching, "having heard which beings would effect the removal of all the obstruction of past acts (sarvakarmāvarāṇa)".

Here in [3] the Blessed One congratulates Mañjuśrī for making his request "for the benefit of beings obstructed by the various obstructions of past actions", and then says 'listen, I will speak'. The implication here is that what follows, i.e. the text of Tāg, is intended primarily, perhaps solely, for the removal of 'the obstruction of past acts'. We find virtually the same thing in Sūt. Here after the standard nidāna, the Bodhisattva Sarvasūra rises from his seat and says to the Blessed One that many devas, apsaras, bodhisattvas and śrāvakas have assembled to hear dharma and that:

Sūt 2112.5, Lhasa 178-4-1:

$tat$ sañju bhagavan toṣām yathāsamipatīm tathāgato phat samyaksambuddha tathārūpam dharmayapraveṣam desātu yathāya syād dirgharātram arthāya hitāya sukhāya devānaś manuṣyānaṃ ca, yathārūpena dharmayapraveṣena desātena cājñāna-satvānām (samo ca rgen rnam) soha śravaṇenaiva sarvān karmāvarop(ānī te)ṣām par(i)kṣayam gaccheyuh; daharaś ca satvāḥ kuśaḷeṣu dharmasya abhivyayamānā viśeṣam adhigaccheyh na ca hiyere na parinhyerma kuśalām dharmāḥ (Sūt 2112.5;

Tib. 178-4-1. It might be noted incidentally that this passage will be an important one in working out the relative chronology of the scripts used at Gilgit. The present Ms. is written entirely in Sander's Gilgit/Bamiyan Typ I except for those syllables underlined above which are written, probably over an erasure, in Gilgit/Bamiyan Typ II and are obviously a later 'addition' or 'correction'.]

It would be good, O Blessed One, for the Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyaksambuddha, to declare for these as they are assembled such an entrance into a method of dharma as would be for a long time to their benefit, advantage and ease, and to that of devas and men; through such an entrance into a method of dharma being declared, immediately through its being heard by old (so Tib.) beings all their obstructions from past actions would come to be exhausted, and young beings applying themselves to good dharmas would realize excellence, and they would not diminish or decline in good dharmas.
Immediately following Sarvaśūra's request the Buddha, in the usual fashion, says 'listen well, I shall speak', and the text of Sgil follows. Here again the implication is that the text is intended primarily to remove the karma-varana or to ensure, through the application to 'good dharma', that they do not arise. A final example of the same kind of thing is:

StA 51.4; GBMs vii 1747.5; Pek vol. 27, 271-4-3: [Avalokita says to the Buddha:]

santi bhagavan zattvāḥ paścime kāle bhavicyanti jarā- 
vyādhiśokamṛtyukāntara [so Ms.] ukālamṛtyuparipićitāḥ (kṛśā) 
[so Ms. chū bāl durvarāḥ alpāyusā pariśitabhogā aparībhāvita-
kāyāḥ te [so Ms.] parasparaṁ mātscaryadauṣṭāḥśilānīttrāya [so Ms.]
ghātāvisyantī, parasparaṁ dhanabhogolārvarāṇā apahṛṣyantī 
[so Ms.], hāsyalāśyanātyakṛdābhiratāṁ anitye nityasamjñīnaḥ 
asubhe śubhasamjñīnāḥ. te taṁ kheto tannidānā satvā nānāpra-
kārśair viheśya [Tib: sems can rnam la mi dge ba rnam pa sa nā 
tshogs de dag gis gtos nas] narākutiryugoniyamalokeṣu copa-
patsyante, tat teśāṁ aham bhagavan arthāya hitāya sarvaśāpa-
ripūraṁ rthām yāvat tathāgatajñānāharanārthāṁ buddhaśetropa-
pattaye sarvapāpanivāraṁ rthāṁ tathāgatam adhyesyāmi.

There are beings who in the last time will be tormented by old age, disease, sorrow, death, calamities, and untimely deaths; feeble, of bad coloring, shortlived, having meager possessions, undeveloped bodies, they with thoughts of envy and meanness will kill one another, will steal one another's wealth and possessions and power; devoted to laughing and dancing, plays and frivolity, conceiving the permanent in the impermanent, the lovely in the unlovely. From that cause, from that reason, those beings, having done harm in sundry ways, will be reborn in the hells, among animals, or in the world of Yama. It is for their benefit and advantage, for the sake of fulfilling all their hopes, up to: for the sake of conveying the knowledge of the Tathāgata, for their rebirth in a buddhafield, for the sake of suppressing all evil, that I ask the Tathāgata [for this teaching].
Avalokita's request is unmistakably clear concerning the audience for whom the teaching is intended and the goals toward which they are directed. Another passage from the same text makes it equally clear that the 'beings' in question here are precisely those who are karmāvarena, while at the same time it provides us with an unusually rich picture of what was understood by the term karmāvarena.

Skt 54,8; GBMs vii 1754.5 (= A); 1819 L.6 (= B); Pek., vol. 27, z72-3-4: yo tasya [so B] pūrvakarmāvapākona syād rūpavaikalyam bhogavaikalyam buddhavaikalyam paribhāṣyām [vb priyaviprayogam va rūjyakṣobham va te anya samādhier anubhāvena śravaṇena kicc chīrṣarogeṇa kicc bhaktaścchedena kicc kucaḷabhīdhāraṇena kicc kāyaścittapijena kicc duḥkhasaṃspādaśaśaśiyākālaṃkena kicc paribhāṣyām sarvam tat karmāvarenaṃ kṣayaṃ yasyaṃi [B: kṣaṇaṃ kṣayaṃ] ... ye ca tasya kulaputrasya kuladuhitir va cchadbhogaphala- Cb ut B omits bhoga; Tib: loṅs spyod kyi bras bu med par 'gyur pa'i3 -saṃvartaniyam karmāvarenaṃ bhāvīṣyati buddhe va dharme va saṃghe va śrīvakaśrūyaḥkabuddhe va mātāpitṛbhīr va karma kṛtām [Tib: sdig pa'i la byas śīn] upacitaṃ bhāvīṣyati tat sarvam parīkṣayaṃ yāyaṃ, mahāśāvaraṃsaṃdhiḥ bhāvīṣyati; ye ca tasya kulaputrasya va kuladuhitir va duḥkhavanakavodiṇyam karmāvarenaṃ bhāvīṣyati priyaviprayogasamvartaniyam jātyandhaśaṃvartaniyam strīsamaṃvartaniyam dvīvamjannasamvartaniyam īghyāmāne-krodhāvāṇena yumalokapretatiryāgyonismāvartaniyam tat sarvam parīkṣayaṃ yāyaṃ.

Which of them would, through the maturation of their past action, be defective in form, defective in possessions, defective in intelligence, or abused or separated from that which is dear, or troubled by the authorities, they, through the power of this Samādhi, through hearing it - some with sickness of the head, some with starvation, some with poor clothing, some with afflictions of body and mind, some with difficulty in sleeping, some with verbal abuse - all that (being the) obstruction of past actions will come to be exhausted. ... And what of that son or daughter of good family will be the obstruction of past action conducive to the fruit of the interruption of enjoyment, (what) will be the accumulated actions done
toward the Buddha, Dharma or Saṅgha, or toward Šrāvakas and Pratyekabuddhas, or toward one's mother and father, all that will come to be exhausted; there will be a wealth of great power. And what of that son or daughter of good family will be the obstruction of past action which is to be experienced in the hells as suffering, which is conducive to separation from that which is dear, conducive to being born blind, conducive to (rebirth as) a woman, conducive to (rebirth as) a hermaphrodite, which, on account of envy, pride and anger, is conducive to (rebirth in) the world of Yama, among pretas or animals, all that will come to be exhausted.

We can see here that the authors of the texts in which these and similar passages are found explicitly state that these texts are intended to come to terms with the problem of 'the obstruction of past actions'; that is to say that they are texts with a specific purpose, concerned with a specific complex of Buddhist ideas. Such statements of purpose may, I think, provide us with a key to a system of classification which is badly needed for both Mahāyāna canonical literature and Mahāyāna thought, a system of classification which is based, if you will, on the dative of purpose. We have had so far the dichotomies 'popular (= lay)/monastic' or 'popular/philosophic'; but the first, as we will see below, is totally inadequate for a text like Bhg which is intended as much for monks as for laymen; while the second is based on categories, or at least uses a vocabulary, which is without any basis in the texts themselves; and especially the second term in the dichotomy is almost certainly of a tone foreign to the literature or thought it is supposed to be describing. We can, however, avoid the inadequacies and distortions of these categories simply by recognizing that the texts themselves, in their own way and in their own vocabulary, develop an explicit set of classificatory categories which by their very nature are both more legitimate and more useful. A careful reading of our texts will bring to light any number of passages similar to those quoted above where the authors of the individual texts, by means of the dative or adverb of purpose, the ablative of reason, etc., clearly indicate both the audience for whom the text is intended and the problem with which it is concerned or the purpose for which it is taught. Such a reading will, I think, produce two basic classificatory categories. One is exemplified by the passages we have just been looking at. Here a
specific text or teaching is presented by its author as intended to come to terms with the problem of 'the obstructions of past action'; it is intended for the benefit of not only laymen, but also śrāvakas and bodhisattvas, some, if not all, of whom are bhikṣus; it is concerned with karma, merit and demerit, and rebirth. A second category, and one which I will develop below more fully in regard to SR, is exemplified by passages where a text or teaching is presented as intended to come to terms with the problem of the obstructions of knowledge (jñānāvaraṇa, although this specific term is more rarely used than karmāvaraṇa); it is intended for both layman and monk, usually simply kulaputra; it is concerned with jñāna, prajñā or bodhi, and with karma only in so far as it affects the acquisition of jñāna, etc. It should be emphasized that these categories refer both to kinds of texts and kinds of Buddhistisms, and that these are analytical, not historical categories.

Although neologisms are almost always ugly, here I think they are more than a little useful. With this in mind I would adapting a similar classification developed and effectively used by Spiro, Buddhism and Society, A Great Tradition and its Burmese Vicissitudes (New York: 1970) - call the first, Karmatic Buddhism, and the second, Bodhic Buddhism. The utility of these analytical categories can, I think, immediately be demonstrated. It is obvious from the discussion under [O] that those texts which develop the conception of the typified cult figure brought to light are precisely those texts which are to be classified as concerned with Karmatic Buddhism. It will be equally obvious from [14] below that it is that same group of texts which develops the ritual complex which structures the individual's behavior toward such figures. As a matter of fact, it would appear that we have here three components of something like a self-contained 'system': an ideology (the karmically constructed world); the behavior based on that ideology (cult practice and pūjā); and the object of that behavior (the cult figure). Other components of this 'system' will emerge as we go along, but already I think we can say that Karmatic Buddhism is characterized by a preoccupation with karma, merit, and rebirth; that is to say, with the problem of death, since these terms are the major components in a Buddhist conception of death; that it is almost invariably associated with cult and cult practice, and with a specific conception of the Buddha/Bodhisattva figure; and that it is an active concern of both laymen and monks.
Although it is perhaps unnecessary, still it should be noted that by the very nature of our text we have been, and will continue to be, primarily concerned with Karmatic Buddhism or, on the question of pūjā, the reaction to it of Bodhic Buddhism. It might also be added that to a greater or lesser degree these two Buddhisms interpenetrate one another, although in a given text one or the other is invariably dominant. If I am not mistaken, I think that we will find that it is easier to find Karmatic Buddhism in something like a pure form; Bodhic texts, at least at Gilgit (SR, AdP, Vaj), are almost always, at least to some degree, mixed. Future research will undoubtedly modify our classification in the form of intermediate or sub-categories.
The Blessed One said this to him: "There is, Mañjuśrī, in the eastern direction from this buddhafiel, having passed beyond buddhafields equal in number to the sands of ten Ganges Rivers, a world-sphere named Vaiḍūryanirbhāsā. There a Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyaksambuddha named Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiduryaprabha dwells, accomplished in wisdom and conduct, a Sugata, a knower of the world, unexcelled guide of temperate men, the Teacher of devas and men, a Buddha, a Blessed One. Mañjuśrī, of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiduryaprabha, the Tathāgata, when formerly practising the practice of a bodhisattva, there were twelve great vows. What are the twelve?"

a. This entire paragraph is made up of clichés. The description of the position of the world-sphere in reference to this world is standard; the string of epithets applied to the Buddha is standard. Its only significance is that it introduces in Bhāg the concept of the 'vow' (prāṇidhāna). I have already referred several times to the vow and its place in the scheme of things developed in texts like Bhāg, but a few additional points might be added here.

The conception of a vow is expressed in our texts by at least two terms which appear to be virtually interchangeable: prāṇidhāna and pratijñā. This is seen for example in the fact that in SP XXIV it is said that for kalpas Avalokita 'refined his vow (prāṇidhāna)', while at Kv 268. 13, 16 he is said to be one 'having a firm vow (dṛḍhapratijñā); at Aj 105.18 Śākyamuni is referred to as dṛḍhapratijñō, but at Aj 109.19 it is said of him: kṛtam hi nātha prāṇidhīm tvayā hi; etc., etc. I think we might detect a tendency, but only a tendency, for prāṇidhāna to be used in reference to Buddha, and pratijñā with bodhisattvas.

When the vow itself is given it almost always takes the form of a more or less standardized formula: 'when I am awakened (= yadā, gen. absolute, etc.) ... then (tādā, etc.) may (optative) such and such be'
(Bhg [5.1], [5.3], etc., Aj 132.8; Rkp 40.3; 50.4; SP 234.18 (= Kern 242.6), etc.). The really important thing to be noted here, however, is that once the vow is vocalized, and once its conditions (or the yadā clause) are fulfilled, then the thing vowed (the contents of the tada clause) appears to have taken on the qualities of a kind of 'natural' law. It is 'eternally' effective. This is clearly stated at Bbp 191-5-5, where it is said that through the power of their vows (purvaprajñāhānena) Tathāgatas, even if they have been parinirvāṇed (functionally dead) for a thousand years or a kalpa or a koṭi of kalpas, and even though situated in various (other) world-spheres, still they — that is to say, their vow — free beings from the hells, etc. The Stūpanāṇḍarāhāra-parivarīta is a remarkable dramatization of the same basic idea. Here in what is perhaps the central episode in the "mystery play" (so Kern) of SP, as Sākyamuni teaches the Saddharmapundarīkā, a magnificent stūpa appears in the air from which a voice issues giving approbation to Sākyamuni's teaching. When asked for an explanation of this the Buddha says that the Tathāgata Prabhūtaratna formerly made a vow to the effect that yadā khalv anyeṣu buddhaśeṣaḥreṇa buddhā bhagavanta imam saddharmapundarīkā, dharmaparyāyām bhāgavyam tadāyam mamātmaḥbāvavigrāhastūpō 'sya saddharmapundarīkasya dharmaparyāyasya śravaṇīya mcechot tathāgaṭṭānūm antikam (SP 234.18; Kern) 242.6). And it is a result of this vow that the stūpa now appears. The important point here is that Prabhūtaratna has been parinirvāṇed, has been 'dead', for many hundreds of thousands of nayutas of koṭīs of kalpas (SP 235.24). Here again, when a Buddha formally articulates a vow, and when the conditional elements of that vow are fulfilled, then the thing vowed comes to be a kind of 'natural' law: given the conditions, the result follows whether or not the Buddha is present or absent, whether or not he is living or dead; and the pattern of 'conditions/cause' produces 'result/effect' is invariable and 'eternally' operable. Seen from one angle, such a conception appears to be only a special application of the basic principle underlying the karmically constructed world: 'if this is done, then that follows'. That basic principle here, however, works on two distinct levels. On one level, if a Buddha makes a formal declaration, and if the conditions of the declaration are fulfilled, then as a result of the Buddha's declaration, the specified result will follow. On a second level, if an individual, basing himself on the declaration of the Buddha, performs an act which fulfils the conditions, then as a consequence of his action the specified result will follow for him. Seen from a
slightly different angle, the conception being developed here is like nothing in the Indian world so much as the satyakriya, satyavacana or satyādhisthāna: "The Act of Truth". This particular notion has been much studied by W. Norman Brown, most recently in "Duty as Truth in Ancient India", *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 116 (1972) 252-268 (where he gives a good bibliography on the topic; he has, however, among other things, overlooked the short but interesting discussion in J. Przyłuski, *Le concile de Rajagaha* (Paris: 1926-28) 260-67) and again, recently, by A. Wayman, "The Hindu-Buddhist Rite of Truth; An Interpretation", *Studies in Indian Linguistics* [Professor M. B. Emeneau Śaṅtipūrti Volune] (Poona: 1968) 365-69. [For instances of 'the Act of Truth' at Gilgit see SR 464.3f; SP 164.28f; AJP i 5.12f, 6.22f, 7.11f, etc. For the same in Mahāyāna sūtra literature outside of Gilgit see Aṣṭasāhasrika (Mitra ed.) 382.14f, 383.17f; Ét. Lamotte, *La concentration de la marche héroïque* (Śrīvaṃgaśāstra-dīśāutra) (Bruxelles: 1965) 266; A. & H. Wayman, *The Lion's Roar of Queen Śrīmālā* (New York: 1974) 66-67; etc.] For our purposes it is sufficient to note, in Wayman's words, that the Act of Truth "has a traditional form: the performer announces, if such-and-such be true, then let this or that happen" ("Two Traditions of India - Truth and Silence", *Philosophy East and West* 24 (1974) 393). Here, if an individual makes a declaration of truth, and if the conditions making for the truth of that declaration are fulfilled, then the avowed intention of the declaration will be fulfilled. We have then virtually the same basic structure here as we saw in the kind of praṇidhāna discussed above. These two conceptions appear at the very least to be of the same generic type. That the two are closely related is in some ways indicated by the texts themselves. At StA 67.5, for example, in the invocatory prayer to Avalokita he is first asked to smara yat tvayā pūrvam satyādhisthānāṃ kṛtaṃ: 'Remember that formerly an 'Act of Truth' was made by you!', but a few lines later he is asked to smara pratijñā: 'Remember (your) 'vow', and the two terms obviously refer to the same thing. At StA 76.7 Bhīma is asked to smara pratijñām and then almost immediately invoked as satyavacanadevi and satyavacanapratīṣṭhite. At SR XIII 14 a bodhisattva by means of a vow (praṇidhi) extinguishes a raging fire; while at AdP i 5.5f a bodhisattva performs a very similar feat by means of an 'Act of truth' (satyavacamena); etc.

What I am suggesting here is that the satyavacana may serve as a useful model for the interpretation of some kinds of praṇidhāna. In the
same way as there are a number of kinds of satyavacana, so there are a number of kinds of pranidhāna. My remarks above are concerned almost entirely with the kind of pranidhāna found in Bhg and in texts such as the Sukhāvatīvyūha. It should also be noted that there is at least one significant difference between the satyavacana and the pranidhāna: the 'result' of the former is situationally grounded and therefore either of unique occurrence or of limited duration; the latter, as I have already pointed out, is 'eternally' effective. (Cf I. Yamada, Karuṇāpundarīka, Vol.I (London: 1968) 160f. Yamada's suggestions are interesting, but he gives no real evidence to support them.)

The details on all of this remain to be worked out.
His first great vow was: "When I in a future time would fully and completely awaken to the awakening of a Buddha, then may immeasurable, incalculable, unlimited world-sphere, through the splendor of my body, glitter, glow and be radiant. [May all beings be fully ornamented with the thirty-two marks of the Great Man and with the eighty minor marks: as I am, just so may all beings also come to be like that]"  

1) Translated on the basis of the Tibetan.

This vow is most conveniently treated together with the following. Here we might only note in reference to the final sentence a few things about 'the thirty-two marks'. First of all the reference to all beings possessing the marks is a little unusual. At Gilgit I know of only one text similar to Bhg [5.1]; this is a description of the future buddh-field of Purṇamaityāṇāṇaputra which reads in part: tena khalu punar bhikṣavaḥ samayena idaṃ buddhakṣetram apagata-pāpaḥ bhavisyati apagata-mātrarāmaḥ ca / sarve ca te sattvā aupapādūkā bhavisyanti brahmacāriṇo manomayaśāmabhāvah svayaṃprabhā rādhimanto vaiḥśayaśaṅgamā vīryavantaḥ smārtmantāḥ prajñāvantaḥ suvarṇavartaḥ samucchrayair dvātrimśadāhir mahāpurusālakṣaṇaṁ samālaṁkṛtvāvigrāhāḥ. (CP (Kern ed.) 202.4). In addition to this, the reader at Gilgit would have 'known' that these characteristic marks and their interpretation were associated with the Brahmanical tradition: tasya khalu punah kulaputra rājaṃ vimalacandraya gṛhe putro jātah; atha sa rāja vimalacandro lakṣaṇanāmīttikāb cchāstra-pathkād brāhmaṇād sannipātāya kumāram upadarśayāvam eha · kiṃ brāhmaṇa kumārasya nimittān paśyayāḥ sābhānām aśābhānām veti · (SGp 2178.3); and (in reference to the newly born Maitreya): drṣṭvaiva (so Ms.) putrem subrahmā dvātrimśadvamālamānaḥ / pratyavekṣayātha (so Ms.) mantrasu tadā prito bhavisyati // k2 // gatidvayant kumārasya yathā mantreṣu drṣṭaye / ... (Mok vs. 42-3; folio 1536.8). He would also have been familiar with at least one detailed enumeration of both the thirty-two major and the eighty minor marks found at AdP ii 49.21ff. Conze has
already noted that in AdP ii the thirty-two marks are treated "in a way totally different" from that of the Nepalese Pañcavimsatisahasrika. Finally, and above all else, he would have been familiar with the 'marks' as elements in the stock descriptions of the qualities of Buddhas and certain bodhisattvas: SR 34.2, XI 28, XVIII 11, 334.4, XXVII 2, 5, XXIX 102, XXXI 23, XXXII 148, 158, 246, 271, XXXIII 27, XXXIV 46, XXXV 11, 23, 81, etc.; Aj 113.12-13, 128, 6, 7, 134.15, 16; AdP i 3.23; VaJ 5a.2, 3, 9b.2, 3, 10b.4, 5, 6, 11e.1, 2; SP 203.13, 204.13, 241.21, 245.6, 246.3 etc. (cf. S.Konow, The Two First Chapters of the Daśasāhasrīkā Prajñāpāramitā (Oslo: 1941) 48-81; A.Wayman, "Contributions Regarding the Thirty-Two Characteristics of the Great Person", Sino-Indian Studies [Liebenthal Festschrift] 5 (1957) 243-60; R.Conze, "The Buddha's Laksāṇas in the Prajñāpāramitā", Journal of the Oriental Institute (Baroda) 14 (1965) 225-29).
11. His second great vow was: "When I in a future time fully and completely awaken to utmost, right and complete awakening, then after I have obtained awakening, as is the precious vaigûrya gem, so may (my) body be fully purified both inside and out, may it be well adorned with purity and light, with great prominent limbs, with splendor and radiating luminosity, with distinction and with nets of rays of light surpassing the sun and moon. Which are the beings born then in the intermediate zones of the world, and which are those in the world of men moving about in various directions in the pitch dark night, may they through my splendor move about at will in all directions, may they also accomplish their activities."

1) Translated from the Tibetan

a. As I have said above, the first and second vow are best treated together. What they have in common is a concern with the physical description of the Buddha's body and a preoccupation with its radiance and the effect of that radiance. This is of interest because the radiance of a Buddha's body illuminating countless world-spheres came to be a common narrative theme in Buddhist Sanskrit literature. It is especially common in the more elaborate nidanas and as a narrative device used to signal particularly important events. Some aspects of this 'theme' have been studied by Soper ("Aspects of Light Symbolism in Gandhâran Sculpture I, II, & III, Artibus Asiae 12 (1949) 252-83; 314-30; 13 (1950) 63-85), although I think he has gone too far in 'detecting' foreign influences. Here I can give only a few characteristic examples from Gilgit.

JP 78.10f, for example, has a number of points in common with Bhg [5.2]:

"Then again, O bhiksus, at the time, on the occasion when the Blessed One Mahâbhijñâjñâbhisamîha, the Tathâgata, etc.... fully and completely awakened to utmost, right and perfect awakening, in each of the ten directions fifty hundreds of
thousands of nyutas of kotis of world-spheres were shaken in six ways, and were suffused with great splendor (mahatā cāvā-phāsena sphuṭāny abhūyan). And in all those world-spheres the intermediate spaces between worlds, the unfavorable places, enveloped, dark and murky (cf BHCD 3), in which neither the sun nor the moon, though having great might and power and strength, are capable of (producing) light by (their) light, nor color by (their) color, nor radiance by (their) radiance—even there on that occasion there was great splendor. And the beings who were reborn in those intermediate spaces became aware of one another (saying) 'What indeed, there are other beings who have been reborn here! What indeed, there are other beings who have been reborn here!'

Just how common passages of this kind were is indicated by Edgerton's long entry under lokāantarika, (BHSD 464-65). He cites SP 163.8, one case from SR, three from the Lalitavistara, six from the Mahāvastu, three from the Divyāvalī, and four from Pāli canonical literature. Of these, at least five were available at Gilgit: SP 78.10 (= 163.8), SR 24.3, and probably the three passages from the Divyāvalī which occur in the Māndhātāvadāna (there were at least two Ms. of the Avadāna at Gilgit, GBMs vii 1432-52; 1374. My friend Hisashi Matsumura is now working on these Ms.) Bhaiṣajyaguru, then, when he was made to frame this vow, is presented as one aspiring towards something of a commonplace.

At AdP ii 51.20f we find another passage dealing with the characteristics of any Buddha which has much in common with Bhg [5.2]:

ināni tasya bhagavato dvātrmśan mahāpuruṣalokaṃ gāṇāni tois trisānasramahāsāhasram lokadhatum ava(bhā)sena spharati prakṛti-prabhāyā śākāśaṃ asaṃkhyaḥ lokadhatum tām tathāgataḥ sattva-anukampayā vyāmaprabhāyāṃ adhitiḥṣati, na khalu punaḥ sūrya-candramasōḥ prabhā prajāyeta na māsārdhamāsa (na saṃva)tsa(ra) vā.

These are the thirty-two marks of a great man of the Blessed One; through them he covers the three-thousand-great-thousand world-sphere with splendor; through his natural radiance he; if he wishes, (illuminates) incalculable world-spheres; the Tathāgata, out of compassion for beings, sustains
that measure of radiance and the radiance of the sun and the moon (next to it) is not even perceptible, nor is the month or the half month, not a whole year.

Once again, Bhaiṣajyaguru's aspiration is in no sense out of the ordinary.

Other passages concerning the avabhasa or prabha of the Buddha's presence are more elaborate, and some of these elaborations are of particular interest in reference to Bkg. I quote here as a good example a passage from the nidāna of StĀ. The passage in question has not been preserved in the Gilgit Ms. of StĀ, so I cite its Tibetan translation:

Pek. Vol.27, 271-1-5 (cf GMs i 49.16f for Dutt's reconstruction of the Skt.):

de nas de'i tsha bcom ldan 'das sms can thams cad de la dmigs pa skhīn rje chen po'i šes pa la gnas pa šes bya ba'i tiṅ ne 'dzin la sōms par sugs so / tiṅ ne 'dzin de'i mthus ston gsun gyi ston chen po'i 'jig rten gyi kham 'di 'od kyis snaṅ bar gur ciṅ / gzugs thams cad snaṅ bsa khyab par gur nas / sms can dmus lön gāṅ yin pa de dag gis ni mig gis gzugs rnam mthon bar gur to / 'on pa rnam s kyis ni rna bas sgra rnam thos par gur to / na' kyis btob pa rnam s ni nad dag daṅ bral bar gur to / ron mod pa rnam s ni gos dag thob par gur to / smyon pa rnam s ni dran pa thob par gur to / lus sāms pa daṅ dāṅ po ma tshaṅ ba rnam s ni lus daṅ dāṅ po yoṅs su rdzogs par gur to / dbul po rnam s kyis ni nor dag thob par gur to / sms can gāṅ dag nor daṅ yo byad daṅ / loṅs sgyod med pa de dag nor daṅ / yo byad daṅ loṅs sgyod med daṅ lāṁ par gur to / sms can thams cad kyaṅ boṛ ba thams cad daṅ ldan sīṅ bsem pa thams cad yoṅs su rdzogs par gur to / ... sms can gāṅ dag klu daṅ / gnod sbyin daṅ / srin po daṅ / yi dags daṅ / 'a sa rnam s kyis māṅ na ukyes pa de dag rgyas khyen rgyan rjeṅ su drun pa so nor thob nas sūṃs sna lhaṅ mthuṃ cad la byaṅ pa gsum pa daṅ / lus daṅ sms boṛ bar gur nas chos māṅ pa'i phyir bcom ldan 'das ga la ba der lhags so / sms can gāṅ dag gšin rje'i 'jig rten rnam s saṅ mun pa mun nag gi māṅ du ukyes pa de dag khyen sāṅ rgyas kyi mthuṣ yud taṃ zīg dran pa so sor thob nas gcig gis gcig kun tu šes pa gur to / de dag mun pa chen po de nas yoṅs su thar bar gur to / sms can thams cad gcig la
Then at that time the Blessed One entered into the concentration (samaḍhī) called 'Established in the Knowledge of Great Compassion and the Apprehension of all Beings'. Through the power of this concentration the three-thousand-great-thousand world-sphere became illuminated with radiance, and all forms having been pervaded with light, those beings who were blind saw forms with their eyes; those who were deaf, heard sounds with their ears; those tormented by disease were freed from disease; those without clothes obtained clothes; the crazy regained their senses; those with imperfect bodies and impaired faculties were made whole in body and their faculties complete; the poor obtained riches; those without riches and essentials and possessions came to possess riches and essentials and possessions; all beings achieved complete ease and their hopes were fulfilled .... those beings who were reborn among nāgas and yakṣas and rākṣasas and pretas and piśācas also having obtained the recollection of the Buddha, having established friendliness towards all beings and become comfortable in body and mind, assembled there for the sake of hearing dharma; which beings were reborn in the thick darkness of the worlds of Yama, they also, through the power of the Buddha, having obtained a single moment of recollection, became conscious of one another and they were freed from the great darkness; all beings, establishing themselves in mutual friendliness, were rid of their depravities.

A similar but even more elaborate passage of this kind is found at GP 177.4f, where it forms almost the whole of the first chapter (see also the commentary on it, Ét. Lamotte, Le Traité de la grande vertu de sagesse, T.I (Louvain: 1949) 485ff). These passages have much in common not only with Bṛg [5.1] and [5.2], but also with a number of the other vows (e.g. [5.6], [5.7], [5.11], [5.12]), and with the whole tone and much of the content of karmatic Buddhism. They clearly show, especially GP 177.4f, the degree to which such ideas have penetrated even the most abstruse Bodhic texts. And they once again underline the almost total lack of uniqueness in the character of Bhaṭṭajīyaguru: even his most salient
feature, his vows, are made up by and large of the stock-in-trade of Sanskrit canonical literature.
His third great vow was: "And when I have obtained awakening, through (my) attainment of the power of immeasurable wisdom and means, may limitless spheres of beings come to be such as have inexhaustible enjoyment and means of subsistence, and may there not be for any beings an insufficiency in any way."

a. Passages of this kind are often, and I think wrongly, taken to reflect a purely materialistic concern. In fact, in the karmically constructed world material and spiritual well-being are inextricably interwoven to the point that any distinction disappears. This is fully illustrated in the story of the young washerwoman (nagaravālamatikā dārikā) of Śrāvastī recounted at Aj 107.6ff. Here this inextricable interconnection is developed by a set of explicitly stated causal relationships. She herself twice declares avaśyakā me pūrvakṛttena karmāṇaḥ / yaṇāhaṃ [jātā] dārīkā gṛhe /: 'Inevitably, by an act which was done formerly by me I am born in a poor household'. (Aj 109.9 and 111.6 and cf. 111.18f). Because of her present state of poverty she weeps, saying mama gṛhe na kadācit pāṇḍāpathikā āganto 'bhut: 'Never did one who lives on alms come to my house' (Aj 107.9); i.e. she never had the opportunity to perform merit-producing acts. Then after a Śuddhavāsakāyika devaputra supplies her with suitable things and she bestows them on the Blessed One saying anena pāṇḍāpathakusālamūlena mā kunminścūlaidārīkāhe upamādyeyama: 'By the root of merit from these alms may I never be reborn in a poor household', he says to her ekena tvayā dārīkā kuśālamūlena bodhiyākaranam pratilapasya ... tvam dārīke saptame divase kālam kariṣyasi. kālam kṛtvā ... rājā "jitaṣenasya putro janīyase. esa eva tava pāścimo garbhavāso bhavasyati: 'By this single root of merit, daughter, you will obtain a prediction of awakening ... You, daughter, will die on the seventh day. Having died you will be born as the son of the Rājā Ajītāsena [i.e. will be freed from both poverty and existence as a woman]; this will surely be the last time you will enter a womb.' 'Material' and 'spiritual' are here inreparably interlocked and passages of this kind are legion in Buddhist literature. As a matter of fact, in time, a distinct genre came to be devoted to working out in great detail these interlockings (c.f. S.Lévi,
Mahākarmavibhāga (La grande classification des actes) (Paris: 1932); 
D.N. MacKenzie, The 'Sūtra of the Causes and Effects of Nations' in Sogdian 
(London: 1970); at Gilgit this genre is represented by the Ṭhunpargyanta-sūtra (No.19), the Prasenajitgāthā (Nos. 21 and 59), etc., which I have 
not studied.

Yet other aspects of this interconnectedness are recognized in Bhag at [5.11] where Bhaisajyaguru is made to say: 'whichever beings burnt by 
the fire of hunger, intent upon getting food, commit an evil act, may I 
with food possessed of fine color and odor and flavor refresh their body; 
afterwards, may I establish (them) in endless ease through the flavor of 
dharma.' Here Bhag recognizes, first, that want not only limits the 
possibility of performing merit producing acts (as in the case of the 
nagarō[;valambikā), but is, or can be, the cause for performing acts which 
produce demerit; and, second, that there is in the human condition some­ 
thing like a 'hierarchy of needs' - food first, and spiritual food later.

* * *

Perhaps the best source at Gilgit in reference to the place of the 
eprameyaprajñopāya of the Buddha in karmatic Buddhism is Bhag. By a 
fortunate accident the most relevant portion corresponds almost exactly 
to the fragment of the Ms. which has come down to us. I have already 
translated this fragment elsewhere so I need not cite it here (G.Schopen, 
' The Five Leaves of the Buddhabalādhānaprātihāryavikurvāṇanirdeśa-sūtra 
Found at Gilgit', Journal of Indian Philosophy 6 (1978) 1-18.)
His fourth great vow was: "Being one who has obtained awakening, may I establish beings entered on a wrong path on the path to awakening; (those) entered on the path of Disciples, or (those) entered on the path of Pratyekabuddhas, having urged all towards the Mahāyāna, may I establish (them there)."
His fifth great vow was: "When I have obtained awakening, whichever beings undertake religious practice in my teaching\textsuperscript{1}, and likewise immeasurable, incalculable, limitless other beings\textsuperscript{1}, may they all be such as have unbroken morality, restrained by the three (forms of) restraint; may there not be for anyone having gone wrong in morality, after having heard my name\textsuperscript{2}, the undergoing of an unfortunate destiny."

\textsuperscript{1}Redaction B omits this entirely, giving the passage a kind of 'exclusivist' tone totally absent in Redaction A. \textsuperscript{2}T alone adds: '(and) through my power (anubhāva)."

Compare this vow with [8] and [15] below.
His sixth great vow was: "When I have obtained awakening whichever beings are such as have inferior bodies, imperfect senses, dark coloring, are retarded, palsied, one-eyed, lame, hump-backed, leprous, maimed, blind, deaf, crazy, and others having diseases which arise in the body, may they all, after having heard my name, come to be such as have complete senses (and) fully formed limbs."

1) From this point to the beginning of [5.9] we have only Ms.X, the translation of which I have enclosed in brackets.

a. We have already seen in the note on [5.2] two passages, one from Sta and one from GP, in which the prabhā or avabhāsa of the Tathāgata fulfils virtually the same function which hearing the name of Bhaigajyaguru is here intended to fulfil. Even some of the specific conditions to be relieved are exactly the same: blindness, deafness, insanity and general disease. But the reader at Gilgit would have known other passages for some of the other conditions in the list and, therefore, other means to prevent or avoid these conditions. I quote here a few characteristic examples:

Kv 289.17; fol.1614R: ye kāraṇḍavyūhasya mahāyānasūtrarāja-syaśikāsaram api likhāpeisyanti ... na ca hīnendriyā bhavanti; na ca te khaṇḍakubjakordhvanūsagaṇḍalamboṭhāś ca [but Ms: na ca punah lamgakubjakonakholagarudardhōsthūtras ca... ca] sattvāḥ kuṣṭhīnāḥ ca sāntah; na ca teṣām kāye vyādhiḥ saṃkramate.

Those who will have copied even a single syllable of the Kāraṇḍavyūha, the king of the Mahāyāna sūtras, do not come to be such as have inferior faculties; and they are not lame or hump-backed or one-eyed or palsied, etc.... and not leprous; and diseases do not attack their body.

Another passage from Kv condenses these conditions into a single expression, but ascribes their prevention to yet another agency:
These examples are typical of karmatic texts. But perhaps what is more interesting is the fact that we find similar passages also in our Bodhic texts. I give here two examples:

AdP i 41.19: Here, of a bodhisattva who trains (śīkṣ-) in sameness. (samātā), thusness (tathātā), etc., it is said: na kāṇḍo bhavati. na kubjo bhavati. na lamgo bhavati. nonāngo bhavati. na budhiro bhavati. na pāṇkapatito bhavati. na vikalondriyo bhavati. pariṇāṇondo bhavati. nāpariṇāṇondo bhavati: He does not become one-eyed. He does not become hump-backed, lame, defective in limb, deaf, 'utterly destitute' (so Conze), impaired in his senses; he becomes one having complete senses, not incomplete.

SR XXXI 22:

so 'ndho naiva kadāci bhāsyati vidu jātu
  no co adgavihīnu bhāsyati bahukalpān
teno aksaṇa naṭā varjitā imi nityān
  yeno sūtram idam prabhāgītaṃ apramustām

That wise one will certainly never anywhere become blind; and in many kalpas he will not be deprived of a limb. He will always avoid the eight inopportune moments, (he) by whom this sūtra is recited without distraction.

The presence of such passages in texts like SB, AdP, etc., once more indicates the degree to which these texts have been penetrated by, or are preoccupied with, karmatic concerns. The fact that the removal of the same conditions is ascribed to the avabhāsa of the Buddha in concentration, to hearing the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru, to copying even a single syllable from the Kāramayeśuha or giving a single flower to Avalokita,
to training in thusness, etc., is yet another example of what I have called the process of generalization.

Here too, as with the case of poverty (which is often included in the same lists with these physical defects and deformities) the 'physical' and 'spiritual' are irredeemably interlocked. For if the reader at Gilgit knew how to prevent such defects, he also knew exactly how they were incurred. Put simply, in the words of SṭA 54.8, pūrvakamavipākenāsyā rūpavaikalyāṃ: 'his bodily defects arose through the maturation of past acts'. But his texts went beyond this general statement to ascribe one or another of these conditions to more specific causes. Aj 133.8, for example, says that he who rejects the Good Law (saddharmapratikṣepaka) will be burdened with twelve deformities (dvādasahālāṇī pravahiṣṭavyanti). A series of more than twenty verses at SP 219.18f begins kṣipitvā sūtraṃ idam evarūpāṃ / mayi tīṭhāmāne parinirvṛte vā / bhikṣuṇī vā teṣu khilāṇi kṛtvā / teṣāṃ vipākam mamāha śrṇoṣṭha: 'having rejected a sūtra such as this, either while I remain or after I have parinirvāṇed; or having acted harshly towards these monks - hear me! Here is the maturation of those acts'. Then follows a long list among which we find: they will be one-eyed (kāṇakā), cf. 119; retarded (jada), va. 120; lame (laṅgukā), hump-backed (kubja), one-eyed and blind (kāṇāndha) retarded, vs. 122, etc. At Kv 307.28 it says ye saṁghikasyaṁnapānāder anyāyena paribhogam nauranti te 'ipaśruteṣu kuleṣu jāyante. hiṇendriyās ca jāyante, khaṇḍa-cru-laṅgasaḥ as beforel-kubjavāvāmānavās ca jāyante, etc.: "those who improperly make use of food, drink, etc., belonging to the Saṅgha are born into families of little learning; they are born having inferior faculties; they are born lame, hump-backed, one-eyed and dwarfish, etc.'

Again, when any of these passages is taken in isolation it appears to a 'modern' reader confused and naive. But when we take into account the whole literature it is clear that the Gilgit reader would have had a consistent and symmetrical conception of these conditions: he would have known both their causes and the means for their prevention or removal. In regard to these 'means' there is at least one point worth noting. In Kv, AdP, and SR, an individual undertakes a specific action for his own sake, he gives a single flower to Avalokita, etc., and he himself will be reborn with a fully formed body. At SṭA and OP, however, an action is performed by one individual (i.e. the Buddha) for the benefit not of himself, but for others. Seen in light of this distinction this vow and the others which are similarly worded, as well as much
else in Bhg, takes on a particular significance. Bhaisajyaguru here does not vow to prevent or remove these conditions himself; he is not the active agent. His vow is only that if an individual should hear his name, then he should come to be complete in his senses, etc. (in exactly the same way as Prabhutaratna's vow was if a Buddha preaches the Saddharma, then his stupa should appear at the site of that preaching; see above under [4]). If lameness, etc., are to be avoided, then it is necessary for the name of Bhaisajyaguru to be heard by the individual concerned. But for this to take place it must be spoken or recited by another. Hence the importance of Manjuśrī's promise (tathāgataśya nāmaudhayam nānopāyai namottvayāgyāmi) at Bhg [13], and the importance attached to the ritualized recitation and handling of the text (i.e. the source of Bhaisajyaguru's name) by an individual, or individuals, for the sake of another in the primary puja described in Bhg. These remarks foreshadow a central theme in Bhg since, as we will see, it appears to be primarily concerned with action undertaken for another (cf. A. Wayman, "Buddhist Tantric Medicine Theory on Behalf of Oneself and Others", Kailash 1 (1973) 153-58). A final observation here is that if the individual at Gilgit desired to assist others who were maimed he could do so in one of two ways: by becoming a Buddha, or by causing them to hear the name of Bhaisajyaguru.
His seventh great vow was: "And when I have obtained awakening, which beings are tormented by various diseases, are without recourse, without refuge, are deprived of medicine and the requisites for life, helpless, poor, having suffered - if my name should fall on their ears, may all their diseases fade away, may they be healthy and free of calamities until they end by awakening."

---

a. If the usual interpretation of Bhaiṣajyaguru as a, or the, Buddha of healing were correct, we would expect that ideas concerning disease, medicine, and healing would have a prominent place in Bhūg. As a matter of fact, if we exclude [17] and [18] which are concerned almost exclusively with death and therefore incurable disease, the only references to disease in the entire text are found in [5.6], in the present vow, and at [20]. What is more, in none of these three sections is disease the sole or central concern; it is only one of a list of things which are of concern to men: [5.6] is, as we have seen, primarily concerned with physical defects or deformities; [20] with the kinds of 'untimely deaths', which, apart from the first, have nothing to do with disease. [5.7] is as close as we get to a passage concerned primarily with disease, but even here it shares the stage with poverty, helplessness, etc. This lack of emphasis on disease and healing in Bhūg confirms what I have already said in reference to the character of Bhaiṣajyaguru. This, of course, is not to say that disease and healing and ideas surrounding them were not important in the Buddhism of Gilgit: they formed, in fact, a major preoccupation, especially, but not exclusively, of the karmatic Buddhism of Gilgit. For this reason, and because such ideas have played such a prominent part in the previous interpretations of Bhaiṣajyaguru, it will be worth our while to look in some detail at the conceptions of disease and healing current at Gilgit. (For a much broader perspective see P. Demiéville, "Byō: maladie et médecine dans les textes bouddhiques"; Extrait du Hēbōgirin, 3e fascicule (Paris: 1937) 224-65. See also J. Nobel, Ein alter medizinischer Sanskrit-Text
The first point to be noted is that the reader at Gilgit would have 'known' that disease, like poverty and physical deformities, was ultimately caused by his previous actions. Even the practitioner of 'empirical medicine' begins his diagnosis with the reflection that: asya purugasya pāpena karmanā vyādhir utpannah: 'the disease of this man arose through a (former) evil act' (SP 62.11). This ultimate etiology, though not always directly stated, was always implicitly recognized. It is important to take this 'cause' into account because it determines the kind of treatment or means of prevention which are suggested and considered effective. It accounts, in short, for the fact that 'non-empirical medicine' predominated at Gilgit.

The second point to be noted is that the Gilgit reader would have been well aware of the conceptions of 'empirical medicine'. So well aware that they could be used as the first member of a comparison. A good example of both this kind of passage and of what falls into the category 'empirical medicine' is Bṛh 1290.5f. I quote here my published translation and repeat what I said there: I do not really understand much of the technical vocabulary and I have mechanically translated from the dictionary.

For instance, just as, indeed O Son of the Jina, a well trained Doctor, havir, obtained all eight (branches) of the Ayur-veda, being skilled in all [medical] conditions, having engaged in the use of all medicinal substances and (instruments), (of sick people) tormented in body by (various) diseases he knows the condition, knows the strength, knows the limit, knows the [pertinent] herb, [that] related to wind, related to bile, related to phlegm, [that] coming from the derangement of all three, [that] coming from the blood), indigestion, abdominal glandular enlargement, dropsy, heart disease, leprosy, (cutaneous eruptions, abscesses), boils, etc., poison and spreading eruptions, etc., he knows. He, having known all that, (through various types of medical remedies), through the use of (vomitives, purgatives), compound powders, sternutatory treatments, bleeding, ghee, oil, and undeveloped powders, by the means of application of suppuratives and vomitives, of all
beings all those diseases he causes to be allayed [and] he frees them from the fear of the various diseases. Just so, indeed, O Son of Jinas, the Tathāgata, possessed of the Ayur-veda (of) the manifold samādhis, etc. ...

Other interesting passages showing a detailed knowledge of 'empirical medicine' and 'empirical medical' practices and treatments may be seen at SP 62.6ff; 113.3ff; Sgṭ 2128.3ff; etc.

If the reader at Gilgit was well aware of 'empirical medicine', its techniques and treatments, he was even more aware that it has clear and unmistakable limitations:

SR IX 43-45: yathā naro nātri rukāya duḥkhitato
bahuḥ varaṇi na jātul mucyante
sa dirgha-gaṇārya duḥkhone pāḍitaḥ
paryesate vaidyā cikitsanārthikāḥ // 43 //

punah punas tena gavesatā ca
āsādito vaidyā vidu vicakṣaṇaḥ
kārunyatām tena upasthalpetvā
prayuktū bhaiṣajyam idam niṣeṣyumatām // 44 //

gṛhitva bhaiṣajyā prthūm varāṁ varāṁ
na sevāte āturu yena mucyateḥ
na vaidyadoṣo na ca bhaiṣajāṇāṁ
tasyaiva doṣo bhāvi āturasya // 45 //

As a man, sick in body, suffered; (and) through many years was never freed. No, afflicted with suffering through this protracted illness, sought out a physician for a cure. // 43 //

Again and again he searched; (finally) he encountered a wise, experienced physician, who feeling compassion toward him prescribed a suitable medicine. // 44 //

Having taken much of (this) very excellent medicine, it did not help (that) sick man in such a way that he was cured. But that was not a fault of the physician nor of the medicine. That was a fault of the sick man himself.
At SP 221.3, one of the results (vipāka) of rejecting a sūtra such as the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka is that:

\[\text{yaṃ cāpi te tatra bhajanti sausadham} \]
\[\text{suyuktarūpaṃ kusalehi dattaṃ} \]
\[\text{tenāpi tesām ruju bhūya vardhate} \]
\[\text{so vyādhir antaṃ na kadāci gacchati} \]

And moreover they then take well prepared medicaments given to them by those skilled (in such matters), but that only further aggravates their sickness: that disease never comes to an end.

Another passage in SR is transitional in terms of our discussion: it indicates once again that there were limits to the effectiveness of 'empirical medicine', but it goes beyond this and indicates at least one form of the alternative, Buddhist conception of medicine and effective treatment and prevention.

SR XVI 1-6:

\[\text{smarāmi pūrvaṃ carāmānu cāri[kam} \]
\[\text{simhadhvajasya sugatasya] śāsane} \]
\[\text{abhūpi bhikṣu vīdu dharmabhāṇako} \]
\[\text{nāmena so ucyati brahmaḍattabh} \] // 1 //

\[\text{aham tadāśīn mati rājaputro} \]
\[\text{ābhādiko bā[ḍhagilāna duḥkhitah} \]
\[\text{mahyam ca so ācariyo abhūpi} \]
\[\text{yo brahmaḍattas tada dharmabhāṇake} \] // 2 //

\[\text{paṃcottarā vaidyaśātā anūnakā} \]
\[\text{vyādhiṃ cikitsanti udyuktamāna[saḥ} \]
\[\text{vyādhiṃ na śaknanti mama cikitsitum} \]
\[\text{sarve mama jñātaya āśi duḥkhitaḥ} \] // 3 //

\[\text{srutvā ca gailāṇyu sa mahya bhikṣu} \]
\[\text{gilāna procho mama antikāgaitah} \]
\[\text{kṛpāṃ janetvā mama brahmaḍatto} \]
\[\text{imāṃ saṃmādhīṃ varu tatra đeṣayī} \] // 4 //
tasya mamā etu samādhi śrutvā
uppanna prīti ariyā nirāmiṣā
svabhāvavu dharmaścena prajānamūno
ucchvāsī vyādhi tuhul tasmī kāle // 5 //

dīpāṅkaraḥ so caramāṇu cārikāṁ
abhūgī bhikṣur vidu dharmaḥbhānakaḥ
aham ca āśīn mati rājaputraḥ
samādhiḥ jñānena hi vyādhi mocitaḥ // 6 //

I remember formerly pursuing my course in the teaching
of the Sugata Śīhadhvaj. (At that time) there was a wise
bhikṣu, a reciter of dharma. He was called by the name
Brahmadattā. // 1 //

I at that time was a prince (named) Mati, sick,
severely ill, afflicted. He who was Brahmadatta, the
reciter of dharma, was at that time my teacher. // 2 //

Not less than five hundred physicians, feverishly
intent, treated the disease, (but) they were not able
to cure my sickness. All my relatives were saddened. // 3 //

But that bhikṣu, having heard about my illness, came
to me asking about the illness. Pity having arisen in him,
Brahmadatta then taught me this excellent Samādhi (-rāja-
sūtra) // 4 //

Having heard this Samādhi (-rāja-sūtra) from him,
a noble, spiritual joy arose in me. Understanding the
own-being of dharmanas, I indeed recovered from that
disease then! // 5 //

It was Dīpāṅkara pursuing his course who was that
wise bhikṣu, the reciter of dharma; and I was the prince
Mati who was freed from disease through knowledge of this
Samādhi (-rāja-sūtra).

We have here presented in obvious contrast to a limited 'empirical
medicine', a good example of what is undoubtedly the dominant conception
of the effective means of treatment and prevention of illness at Gilgit.
In general discussions of kinds of medicine, 'empirical medicine' is
usually contrasted with 'magical medicine'. In the present context, however, the latter designation seems altogether inappropriate. There is nothing 'magical' about the treatment or the cure, given the accepted etiology of all disease: it is caused by past actions. Since the disease is karmatically caused it calls for karmatic treatment. This, as I have already suggested, explains the origins of the limitations of 'empirical medicine'. In light of this I think it is better to call the conception of medicine which is presented here, and accepted everywhere at Gilgit, 'karmatic', not 'magical', medicine. By so naming it we explicitly recognize that it forms an integral part of what we have called karmatic Buddhism. It is, in fact, one of the major preoccupations of this 'system'. That this conception was not limited to this 'system', however, is already clear from the passage just quoted from SR, one of the predominantly Bodhic texts found at Gilgit. That this is not an isolated passage will be seen from the quotation of a few additional passages from both SR and Ad7.

SR XXXII 174-176:

"āgokātha sālyā tathāriva cittapīḍā
no tasya jātu bhavīyatā pāṇītāntaṁ
ārogyaprāpto bhavīyatā sarvakālaṁ
dhāritva sāntaṁ imu virajaṁ samādhiḥ // 174 //

ye kāyaśūlāṁ tathāriva cittaśūlāṁ
ye dantāśūlāṁ tathāpī ca śīrṣāśūlāṁ
no tasya bhonti vyādhiya jīvaloke
dhāritva sāntaṁ imu virajaṁ samādhiṁ // 175 //

yāvanta rogā bahuvidha martaloke
ye kāyaroḡāṁ tathāriva cittaroḡāṁ
te tasya rogāḥ satataṁ na jātu bhonti
dhāritva sāntaṁ imu virajaṁ samādhiṁ // 176 //

Then there will never be suffering, pain, so also mental torments, for that wise one; at all times he will have achieved a state of health, after having preserved this auspicious, pure Samādhi // 174 //

Which are the afflictions of the body, so also of the mind; which are the afflictions of the teeth, so also
of the head; he has none of these diseases in the world of men, after having preserved this auspicious, pure Samādhi. // 175 //

As many as are the many kinds of illnesses in the world of men, illnesses of body as well as mind, he will continually never have these illnesses, after having preserved this auspicious, pure Samādhi. // 176 //

[To 'preserve the Samādhi' may mean any or all of the following:
1) to 'preserve' the text of the Samādhi-rāja-sūtra; 2) to 'preserve' the teaching contained in the text; 3) to 'preserve' the particular form of concentration named samādhirāja.]

As usual, these passages are representative and many others could be cited. They are sufficient, however, to indicate that even texts such as SR and AdP were concerned with the problem of sickness and disease and presented means considered effective to cope with it. And this, again, is important for showing to what degree these texts are karmatically oriented. But if such concern is a significant presence in these texts, it can be a massive presence in those texts which we have called karmatic. We might look quickly at a number of these karmatic texts, concentrating on the means each prescribes or makes available to prevent or 'treat' sickness and disease.

AdP i 31.2: ime bhikṣor dṛṣṭadhārmikā guṇā bhaviṣyanti tasya bodhisattvasya mahāsattvasyeha gāmbhīrīyām prajñāpāramitāyām carataḥ. tasmin saṃaye yāni tāni sannipātikāni glānīyāni, tadyathā cakṣuroghaḥ śrōtrarogaḥ jīhvārogo dantaśūlaṃ kāyaśūlaṃ cittaśūlaṃ yāvat tāni sarvāni kāye notpatsyante na nipātiṣyante. ime bodhisattvasya mahāsattvasya dṛṣṭadhārmikā guṇāḥ pratikāṃkṣitavyāḥ iha gāmbhīrīyām prajñāpāramitāyām carataḥ

As usual, these passages are representative and many others could be cited. They are sufficient, however, to indicate that even texts such as SR and AdP were concerned with the problem of sickness and disease and presented means considered effective to cope with it. And this, again, is important for showing to what degree these texts are karmatically oriented. But if such concern is a significant presence in these texts, it can be a massive presence in those texts which we have called karmatic. We might look quickly at a number of these karmatic texts, concentrating on the means each prescribes or makes available to prevent or 'treat' sickness and disease.

Aj:

At 118.17, fol.2375.1, we read yo dāsyate asya hi piṇḍapātaṃ / muktā tu [so Ms.1] bheṣyati jāra tu [so Ms.1] vyādhayā /: 'who will give alms to him [a bhikṣu], they indeed will be freed from old age and disease.' At 132.14: ya imaṃ dharma-pāryāyam sakalaṃ samāptaṃ samprākāśayam muktās ca bhaviṣyanti jāti-jārāvyādhipi-deva-vadu-kha-dauryama-nasyopāśe bhavyāḥ parimuktā bhaviṣyanti: 'who will illuminate this
discourse on dharma complete and entire, they will be freed, they will be completely freed from birth, old age, disease, sorrow, suffering, depression and perturbation.

Eka:

At 35.8, the introductory section of the text, Avalokita explicitly says that the first reason for which he speaks [i.e., the first reason for which the text is delivered] is sarvavyūdhipraṣā[ma]nāya: 'for the sake of alleviating all disease'. At 37.1 we find: evam bahukaro 'yam hṛdayam, tasmāi tarhi śrīdhaṇa kulaputreṇa vā kuladūhitreṇa vā saktṛtyāyam hṛdayaṃ sād hayaṃvṛtyāyam, ananyamanasā nītyaṃ sād hayaṃvṛtyāyam; kalyāṃ utthāya aṣṭottara-vāraśātaṃ pravrata-vṛtyāyam, drṣṭādharmikā guṇa-daśā parigrahī[ta-vṛtya]. katume daśā. yaduta nirvyādhir bhaviṣyati, etc....: 'This [ekadasa]-Hṛdaya is thus a doer-of-much. Therefore then, by a devout son or daughter of good family this Hṛdaya is to be zealously effected; constantly, with no other thought, it is to be effected; at dawn it is to be performed 108 times. [From that] ten qualities are to be received here-and-now. Which ten? Namely: He will be free of disease, etc.' At 38.13: mama nāmadheya-graheṇa [sa]rvasatvā ... sarva-vyādhibhiḥ [pa]lāmuṣayate: "through retaining my [Avalokita's] name all beings are completely freed from all diseases'.

RKP:

There are at least two passages in RKP which are of particular interest here:

RKP 40.11-41.1; CMs iv 41.1-9; CBMs vi 1197.2-5; Pek. Vol.32, 187-5-3.

yatra kvaucid grāme vā nagaro vā nīgane vā manuṣya-nāṁ vā-amanuṣya-nāṁ vā catuṣpadānāṁ vaḍhita-nāṁ akālamaraṇāṁ viheṭṭhā vā syāt tātra-yāṃ ratnaketudhāraṇī-pustako mahā-pūjakaraṇa-ḥ praveśayītvāyāḥ / praveśya suṣnātena suvilipta-gātreṇa nava-cīvara-pravrītāṇa brahma-carīṇā nānāpurasamīrīte nānāgandhapradhūpīte nānāraśaparivrte simhasane 'bhūrīya tātra-yāṃ ratnaketudhāraṇī- pustako vācayita-vāḥ / sarve tatra vyādhayo 'kālamaraṇāṇī ca praśamaṃ yāsyanti / sarvāṇi ca tatra bhaya-omahara-śadurnimitāṃ antar-dhāasyanti /

Wherever in a village or city or town there could be [fatal] harm or an untimely death of humans or non-humans or four-footed
creatures who are afflicted with disease, there this book of the Ratnaketudhāraṇī with the requisites for great pūjā is to be brought forth. Having been brought forth, by one being well bathed, having his limbs well anointed, being dressed in new clothes, being continent, having mounted a lion-throne strewn with various flowers, perfumed with various scents, covered with various pastes, this book of the Ratnaketudhāraṇī then is to be read out. There all sicknesses and untimely deaths will be allayed. And there all fears and terrors and ill omens will disappear.

EkP 137.5-138.7; GMs iv 118.7-119.10; GBMs vii 1261.3-1262.4

then kalū punaḥ samayeṇa gamgānādi-vālukāsamāḥ kumārabhūtā bodhisatvā mahāsatvā ekakaṇṭhenaiva āhuḥ / veyam apy asyāt dhāreyāc chandam dadāmo 'dhiṣṭhāmaḥ / yaḥ kaścit kulapūtra vi kuladhūtā vā bhikṣur vā bhikṣuṇi vā upāsako vā upāsiκā vā snātva śucinī cīvarāṇi prāvṛtya nānāpuppratācchannno nānāgaṇḍhapradhīpito nānāranga-pravīrtye nānāvastrābharanaduyaśasamsthite cchatrādvajapatākakchrepīte svalaṃkṛte maṇḍalamāde mṛdusukhasaṃsparśa sīhāsane 'bhīruyeyamān dhāraṇī(ṃ) samprakāśaye / na cāsyā kaści cittasaṃkṣobhaṁ kāyasam-kṣobhaṁ manahsaṃkṣobhaṁ vā kariṣyati / na cāsyā kaścit kāye śvāsam mokṣyati / dīrgharogāṃ kartu(ṃ) śakṣyati / neām sthānām vidyate / na kāyarogāṃ vā na jīvārogaṁ na dantarogāṃ nāsthīrogaṁ na grīvārogaṁ na bāhurogaṁ na prṣṭhirogaṁ nāntrarogaṁ nodararogaṁ na śroṇirogaṁ norurogaṁ na jāmghārogaṁ kaścit kartu(ṃ) śakṣyati / na cāsyā svara-saṃkṣobhaḥ bhaviṣyati / yaśa ca tasyā dharmabhāṣya pūrvāsubha-karmaṇaḥ dhātuṣaṃkṣobhaḥ svarasaṃkṣobhaḥ vā syāt tasyeṇām dhāraṇīḥ vācayataḥ sarvo niḥśeṣam praśamisyati karma-parikṣayat svastir bhaviṣyati / ye 'pi tatra dharmāśraṇaṇikāḥ samipatiyamti teṣām api na kaścid dhātuṣaṃkṣobhaḥ kariṣyati svarasaṃkṣobhaḥ vā / ye ca tatremenām dhāraṇīḥ śroṇyamti teṣā(ṃ) yad aśubhena karmaṇā dīrgha-gailānyam dhātuṣaṃkṣobhaḥ vā svarasaṃkṣobhaḥ vā syāt (t)at sarvam parikṣayam yāsyati.

Then again on that occasion heir-apparent bodhisattvas, mahā-sattvas, equal in number to the sands of the river Ganges with a single voice spoke thus: 'We also give validation to this dhāraṇī, we empower it. Whatever son or daughter of good family, or bhikṣu or bhikṣuṇi, or any man or woman having bathed, having put on clean
clothes, in a circular hall strewn with various flowers, perfumed with various scents, covered with various pastes, formed with various clothes and ornaments and fine cotton, well decorated with umbrellas and flags and banners raised aloft, having mounted a lion throne which is soft and comfortable to the touch, would illuminate this dhāraṇī, of him no one can cause a disturbance of thought or disturbance of body or disturbance of mind; nothing can deprive his body of breath; it is not possible to effect a disease of the head. This situation cannot occur. No one is able to cause a disease of the body or of the tongue or teeth or bones or neck or arms or back or intestines or stomach or buttocks or chest or of the shanks. Of him there will be no disturbance of the voice. And what would be the potential disturbance of the condition of voice of that reciter of dharma due to former unmeritorious acts, all that, from the recitation of this dhāraṇī, will be completely allayed, and from the exhaustion of that karma there will be good fortune. Moreover, which hearers of dharma will assemble there, of them also no one will cause a disturbance of their condition or their voice; and who will there hear this dhāraṇī, of them what would be the potential long illness or disturbance of their condition or voice due to unmeritorious action, all that will go to complete exhaustion.

StA:
At 53.5 (fol.1752.3) we find: yada saddharmaparyayaṃ puṣca- maṇḍalena praṃpataḥ puṣpadūpadhatvā yamāṇavilepanachadṛvajapathamāḥ samalāṃkṛtya nāmo buddhāyaṃ kṛtvā nāmastariṣyanti sādhukāraṃ dāśyanti dhāraṇīṣyanti ... likhāṣ̣ṣ̣aḥyanti paramaḥauravaṃ cittām utpādyā tasya dharmābhaktasāgyāntike te dṛṣṭa eva dharmaṃ sarvagūṇaṃ [so Ms.]-samanvāgatā bhavisyanti abhirūpāḥ prāśāditā darśāṇīya vigatavādhitayā dirghābhāṣāḥ, etc.: 'When, having prostrated themselves through the five-fold prostration before this Saddharmaparyāya, having decorated it with flowers, incense, etc., having made before it the "nāmo buddhāya", they will worship it, will make approbation to it, will preserve ... will have it copied after having produced a thought of great respect in the presence of the reciter of dharma, they just here and now will be possessed of all qualities, (they will be) handsome, agreeable, lovely, freed from disease, long lived, etc. At 55.11 the Blessed One describes
a dhāraṇīmantrapada — in fact an 'invocatory prayer' — as sarvaṅkāla-
myṛtyudāhāvaprasarvavyādhipraśamanāka, as 'the allayer of all untimely
deaths and bad dreams and all diseases', and then describes its ritual-
ized recitation (cf 56.13). At 57.9 Vajrapāṇi says that he would give
an 'invocatory prayer' which even if heard in a dream would protect the
individual from saṁrāte daurbalyaṇaḥ vā kloṣo vā vyādhiraṇaḥ vā jvaro vā
kāyaśūlāṇaḥ vā cītāpiṇḍaḥ vā akālayaṇyā vā, etc. He then describes its
ritualized recitation and says he who performs it: vigatavyādhiṣṭho ciraṇī
dharmapraśamaṇavatābhvajñyati, 59.8. Virtually the same pattern is found
at 66.14 and 69.16 of a 'dhāraṇī' given by Avalokita, and at 75.6f of one
given by Bṛhmaṇa, a Mahādevi (see esp. 77.9; the ritual forms which appear
in all these cases will be given later in detail). At 65.1 we find
idam ca sūtraṁ sada dhāritavyaṁ / satkāru nityaṁ ca kartavya dhārake / ...
mā paścakāle jārayādhipiḥditaḥ, etc. At 78.15: dānam dattvā te sattvā
aparimuktaḥ eva bhavanti jārayādhipaṁsokapariparivadadukhāduraṁnāasya-
pāyāśebyayaḥ ... [but] ... asya drmaparītyasya ārasyaṁ sattvebhyaḥ
kṛtvā rūjanaṁ sarvaprabhāṇaṁ [ca] kṛtvā artheṇ caṣṭaṁvaṭrtya pratipattyā
pratiprayaḥ eva bhavanti jātijārayādhipaṁsokaparipariv-adukhāduraṁnāsyo-
pāyāśebyayaḥ, etc. cf. 61.14; 80.14; 80.19; 84.3. All
of these passages in StĀ follow naturally from the fact that the author
of StĀ, like the author of Eka, explicitly states (through the mouth of
Avalokita) that the teaching (i.e. the text) was requested for the sake of
allaying all diseases' (sarvavyādhipraśamanāya, 50.20; 50.18, 51.5).

Bbp:
At 193-5-4 we find: brom ldan 'das kyis bka' stsal pa / gaṅ
rīs kyi bu 'am rīs kyi bu mo 'am / rgyal po 'am / bloṅ po 'am / dge
sloṅ 'am / dge sloṅ ma 'am / dge bañen nam / dge bañen ma la žig gis
chos kyi rnam graṇs 'di de bṣiṇ gṣega pa la Ḍaṅ pas bcaṅs pa Ḍaṅ / mchod
pa Ḍaṅ / 'drri ba Ḍaṅ / 'drri 'jug pa Ḍaṅ / yaṅ dag pa bstan na des yon
tan chen po brgyad thob par 'gyur te / brgyad gaṅ  śro na / gaṅ dag 'jig
rten na na na Ḍaṅ gnos pa de Ḍaṅ de la thams cad kyi thams cad du mī
'tbyun ba Ḍaṅ / etc.: 'The Blessed One said: If some son or daughter of
good family, or king or minister or monk or nun or lay man or woman,
with faith in the Tathāgata, preserves and worships and copies and has
copied and teaches this discourse on dharma, they will obtain eight
great blessings. Which eight? Which are the diseases and injuries in
the world, they will never anywhere arise in him; etc. See also 194-2-3-4.
Kv

279.6, fol.160r: ye 'pi kocit kulaputrāḥ sattvā asmāt kāraṇḍa-
vṛūṃmahāṁṣāsūtrakataśajād cakāṣṭhām api nāmaudāyana api catṛṣṭuḍikām
api gāthāḥ likhāpayisvayanti ... tesaṁ na kacit kāye vyūhīḥ prabhavisyati /
na caṅṣūrogaṇaḥ na śrotarocgaṇaḥ na ṣhrāṇarocgaṇaḥ na Ṣūvārogaṇaḥ na kāyaṅrogaṇaḥ:

'Whatever son of good family will have copied from this king of the jewels
of the Mahāyāna sūtras, the Kāraṇḍavṛūṃā, even only a single syllable, or
the name, or a gāthā of four lines, in his body no disease whatever will
appear, no illness of the eye, ear, nose, tongue or body. Cf. 278.31,
289.20, 282.25.

See also SP 262.11, 166.30, 167.2, 168.18; Skt 2160.4, etc., etc.

A number of observations are, or have been, suggested by these
passages and others like them. We might summarize these observations in
the following way: 1) Sickness and disease were a major preoccupation
in the Buddhism of Gilgit. 2) Although there are references to 'healing'
in Bhg, they are very few, and, when seen in light of our other texts at
Gilgit, they clearly emerge as of no particular significance: they are
of such a kind as can be found in almost any other text. 3) Although
aware of 'empirical medicine', its techniques, etc., the individual at
Gilgit would also have 'known' its limitations and would have approached
it as less than entirely effective means for the treatment and prevention
of disease. 4) The primary etiology of disease was karmatic; i.e.
connected with the individual's past actions, his accumulation of merit
or demerit. 5) The primary means of cure and prevention were completely
consistent with this primary etiology; they were above all karmatic.
6) These means fall into a number of recognizable categories: a) There
are specific rituals involving the ritualized recitation of a 'dhāraṇī'
or some other verbal component (the 'name', etc.), and usually calling
into play a prior pratiṣṭā on the part of the person who has 'given' the
dhāraṇī, etc. - this is above all the pattern in StA, but applies also
to Ekā and the second passage from Ṛkp. b) There are a number of activi-
ties to be undertaken in regard to texts: recitation (Aj, Ṛkp), worship
(StA, Ṛbp), copying or having copied (Ṛbp, Kv); these activities are also
based on prior assurances of their merit producing potential and their
ability to effect the desired ends. This second category is the most
widely distributed and has an old and established place in the Buddhist
tradition. Most of these activities represent the exact Mahāyāna counter-part to what came to be known in Hinayāna practice as the 'Paritta' - they follow the same form and are undertaken for the same reason. This unbroken continuity between the early 'Paritta' and any number of later Mahāyāna forms has never been fully acknowledged. (On the 'Paritta' see E. Waldschmidt, "Das Paritta. Eine magische Zeremonie der buddhistischen Priester", Baessler-Archiv 17 (1934) 139-50 and recent anthropological works on Buddhism in modern South-East Asia.) c) The last category consists of actions of a somewhat different kind: 'practising in the Perfection of Wisdom' (prajñāpāramitāyām car-), having undertaken vigor (ārabhāvīrya; SR XXVIII 9), etc. are all said to prevent disease and sickness. This dovetailing of conventional religious practice of a bodhic kind with karmatic concerns will be seen again several times below.

7) It is clear from all this that there was at Gilgit nothing like a central 'healing' figure - whether it be Bhaiṣajyaguru or anyone else - nor anything like a separately organized 'healing' cult: the 'healing function', if you will, was part and parcel of karmatic Buddhism.
His eighth great vow was: "Whichever woman, spurning existence as a woman afflicted by the many hundred defects of women, wanting to rid herself of womanhood, would preserve my name, for that woman may there be no (further) existence as a woman until she end by awakening." 1)

1) T: 'His eighth great vow was: 'When I in a future time fully and completely awaken to utmost, right and complete awakening, then after I have obtained awakening, whichever women would be afflicted by the hundred defects of women and, depreciating existence as a woman, would desire to free themselves from womanhood, may they be turned from existence as a woman; until they end by awakening, may the organs of a male be manifested!'

a. Bhg [12] forms a kind of pair with this vow: 'Again, by which woman the name of that Tathāgata [Dhaisajyaguru] will be heard, (will be) taken up, this existence as a woman is to be anticipated as her last'. Passages such as these make it clear that existence as a woman was considered both a negative state and a state to be avoided. This is confirmed by passages which state that existence as a woman is 'an obstruction caused by past action' (karmavārāṇa) and is therefore both implicitly and explicitly classed with poverty, disease, deformities, rebirths in the hells, etc. So StA 55.5, 65.10; Aj 108.19, 109.14, 111.9; Rkp 42.10, etc. And further confirmed in those passages where women themselves declare their desire to be free of their condition (Kv 304.15; Rkp 12.12; etc.). Again, the same basic attitude is expressed in a somewhat different way in yet another kind of passage, one example of which is Bhg [6]. Here we find among the positively valued characteristics of a buddhāfield the fact that it is apagatakāmadosa, apagatāpāyuvādkhasabda, and apagatamātrgrāma, 'free of (even) the word 'unfortunate rebirth' or 'suffering', 'free of women'; at SP (Kern ed.) 202.4 we find the same value placed on virtually the same characteristics: buddhākṣetram apagatapāpañ [but rd. apagata­pāyañ with T: nan soñ med parj bhaviṣyaty apagatamātrgrāmassa ca. (So also 160.19; 290.9 (= Kern 455.3); etc.).
A passage in SP gives us a fairly clear idea of perhaps the major reason for this overwhelmingly negative attitude.

SP 245.13; Kern 264.9: asti kulaputri stri na vinya sarumŚayaJti anekāni ca kalpasahasrāni punyānāni karoti, śatpāramitā (pajri-pūrayati, na ēcādēyāpi buddhatvam prāpnoti. kṣikāraṇām, pañca sthānāni stri adyāpi na prāpnoti, katamānāli (pañca. prathamam brahma-āsthānam. dvitīyam Śakraāsthānam. tritīyam mahārājaāsthānam. caturthā cakravartisthānam. pañcamam avaivartikabodhisattvāsthānam.

'O daughter of good family, it may happen that a woman does not let up in effort and for many thousands of kalpas makes merit, fulfills the six perfections, but even now (a woman) does not obtain the state of a Buddha. Why? There are five states which a woman even now does not obtain. Which five? The first is the state of Brahma; the second is the state of Śakra; the third is the state of a great king; the fourth is the state of a cakravartin; the fifth is the state of an irreversible bodhisattva.'

This is an old and established idea (cf. Majjhima iii 65.24-66.9; Aṅguttara i 28.9-19) and what it means, of course, is that existence as a woman excluded one from the higher state theoretically open to mankind, whether worldly or religious. It is in this sense that a woman is not fully human, since the primary advantage of human birth is that it gives the individual access to these states. This restriction, coupled with the conventional Buddhist view which saw women above all as an obstacle to a man's religious development—the 'seducer' or 'temptress'—(SR XXXII 62-64; 187; 192; SP ch.XIII passim; etc.) largely accounts for the negative attitude towards existence as a woman.

But the situation is not quite so simple because, although our texts never abandon this negative attitude, they all clearly attempt to accommodate or include women in their schemes of 'salvation'. We see this already in Bhq [5.8] and [12] where the text makes explicit provision for the needs of a woman; that is to say, makes available to her a means through which she can escape from her disadvantageous condition. Bhq is in this regard not at all unique and I quote here a few other examples:

Bhp 195-1-7: bud med kyi lus mūn mūn pa dan ba'i mūn mūn pa mūn mūn pur sgyur pa la zig mūn gryi mūn / mūn mūn phyu.
There is, sister, a means through which a woman can quickly reverse her existence as a woman, (through which) an existence as a woman planted in the past can be quickly exhausted without remainder, (through which) she does not again take rebirth as a woman until her utmost parinirvāṇa, apart from her own vow (to do so). And, sister, what then is the means by which a woman quickly becomes a man and (any) existence as a woman planted in the past is quickly exhausted without remainder? Here, sister,
this dhāraṇī named Ratnaketu, of great benefit, blessing, and power, the exhauster of all existence as a woman, exhausts without remainder the depravity which matures in suffering of body, speech and mind. And immediately through hearing this Ratnaketu-dhāraṇī existence as a woman for a woman departs without remainder. The organs of a woman having disappeared, the organs of a man appear; and that man is handsome with fully formed limbs. [Exactly the same idea is narratively expressed at Rkp 42.5, 44.1, 47.22, 50.13.]

SR XXXII 157-58:

mātrārūmo 'pi danā sūtraṁ śrutvā gāthāpi dhārayet
vivartayitvā striībhāvaṁ sa bhaved dharma-bhānapakaḥ //
na sa punopī striībhāvam itaḥ paścād grahaṁyaṁ
bhavet prāsādiko nityamānākṣaṁ samalaṁkṛtāṁ //

Sgt 2158.7; Lhasa 187-3-7: of one zuñ gi mdo'i chos kyi
rnam graṅs 'di gaṅ gi rna lam du graṅs (rd: grags) par
gyur pa [the Ms. is damaged here so I have given the Tib.]
it is said: paṃcadasā kalpasahasrānā na striībhāveṣūpa-
talṣatyate.

SP 167.17: sacet punar naṃṣtrāraṇājasāṅkusaṃhitābhijnā
mātrārūma: imam dharmaparyāyaṁ śrutvodgrahisyati tasya sa
eva paścimastriībhāvo bhaviṣyati.

(For a short paper which is pertinent to at least some aspects of these and similar passages see P.V. Bapat, "Change of Sex in Buddhist Literature", Felicitation Volume Presented to S.K. Belvalker (Banaras: 1957) 209-15).

If our texts provide any number of 'means' by which a woman could escape a repetition of her fate in the future, they are also concerned to provide the 'means' whereby she could cope with her fate in the present. Undoubtedly both the most important and at the same time the most traumatic concern of the woman at Gilgit would have been childbirth. And it is just this concern which our texts try to provide for. A particularly interesting passage of this kind is found in Rkp; it combines both the concern found in the passages quoted above and the concern with childbirth.
If there would be some woman who desires a son, by
her having bathed, having put on new clothes, being continent,
having worshipped this book with flowers and perfumes and
garlands and ungues, herself having mounted a seat strewn
with various flowers, perfumed with various scents, covered
with various pastes, this Ratnaketudhārāṇī is to be recited.
She will come to be one who obtains a son. Just this will
be (her) last existence as a woman until (her) utmost
parinirvāṇa, apart from her own vow for the sake of maturing
beings [which might involve rebirth as a woman].

Bhg also makes provision for the concern with childbirth:

Bhg [15]: '(And) any woman who at the time of giving birth
experiences excessively sharp unpleasant feelings,(and)
who worships and does puja to the Blessed One Bhaisajyaguru-
vaiduryaprabha, the Tathāgata, she is quickly freed. She
will give birth to a son having all his limbs fully formed,
handsome, beautiful, worthy of being seen, etc.'

At SP (Kern) 441.13-442.4 (the Gilgit Ms is damaged here) we find
a similar passage stating that if a woman who desired a son performed
homage (namskāraṃ karoti) to Avalokita, she would bear a son who was
handsome, beautiful, etc.; one who desired a daughter and who saluted
(abhinandati) Avalokita would get a daughter who was handsome, etc.: idaḥ
kulasutrāvalokiteśvarasya bodhisattvasya mahāsattvasya prabhāvaḥ.

We can summarize the material quoted thus far in the following
manner: 1) Existence as a woman was considered as an 'obstruction
arising from past action', and was thus classified as one of the 'un-
fortunate rebirths' which were to be avoided and from which one sought
release. It seems to have been conceived of as being somewhere between rebirth in the hells or among animals and true rebirth as a human. In this sense a woman was considered not fully human. 2) The primary reason for this valuation was the fact that the higher states open to humans, both secular and religious, were not open to women. A secondary, though important, reason appears to have been that since women were conventionally conceived of as obstacles to a man's religious development, to be reborn as a woman meant that one was born into a role in which the accumulation of demerit was especially likely. This is one side of the complex attitude maintained in our texts. The other side is that 3) all our texts exhibit a clear desire to provide for the needs of one born as a woman, both her religious and her secular needs, and to include women within their scheme of things. They provide a variety of means whereby she can escape a repetition of her fate; they also provide an equal variety of means by which she can cope with the anxiety and trauma surrounding her primary secular concern, childbirth.

Although I am aware that there are other aspects of the attitude towards women in Buddhist literature, those which I have indicated above are undoubtedly the most visible and representative of the literature found at Gilgit. I might, however, cite one further passage which is of interest.

The first part of SP ch. XIII, both prose and verse, is taken up with describing the proper behavior of one who wishes to teach this dharmaparyāya, with a decided emphasis on how he should behave in the presence of and towards women: he should avoid contact with them; if he has to preach to them or beg alms from them he should not do so alone; he should do so and not tarry or banter; he should always remain mindful of the Buddha while he is so engaged; etc. All of this is standard fare and, according to vs. 15, ācāragocaro by eka prathamō, 'this is the first form of right conduct' taught by the Blessed One. Vss.16-18 then say:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{yadā na carate dharme hīma-utkṛṣṭamadhyamem} & \quad / / 16 / / \\
\text{samskṛtāsamskṛte capi bhūtābhūte (e ca) sarvāṇaḥ} & \quad / / 16 / / \\
\text{stṛīñi nācarata dhīro puruṣetā na kalpayī} & \quad / / 17 / / \\
\text{sarvadharman ajātatvād gaveṣanto na paśyati} & \quad / / 17 / / \\
\text{ācāro hi ayam ukto bodhisattvāna īdṛṣaḥ} &
\end{align*}
\]
When he never courses in a dharma, whether it be inferior, superior or medium, or conditioned or unconditioned, or true or false, // 16 // he, constant, would not behave (saying) 'This is a woman', nor would he discriminate (saying) 'This is a man'; inquiring, (still) he does not observe any dharma from the fact of its non-production. // 17 //

This, indeed, is declared the kind of behavior for bodhisattvas.

Passages of this sort represent a kind of 'ideal' attitude which is met occasionally in predominantly Bodhic texts (cf. Lamotte, Vimalakirti 280f and n.37), but I have noted only this one occurrence at Gilgit.
His ninth great vow was: "Being one who has obtained awakening, may I effect the release of beings from the snares of Mara; may I establish those beings who have arrived at the impassable thicket of the various views in a correct view; may I gradually show (them) the practice of a bodhisattva."

1) 'having turned all beings bound by the bonds and snares of Mara (and) arrived at the impassable straits of the various views away from all the snares of Mara and views, having urged (them) towards correct views', may I, etc. 2) 'those who are in conflict through confused conflicting multitudinous views'. 3) For -gahanasaśaśakaṇa- the translation is only tentative. I have stuck pretty close to dictionary meanings, but there may be more than this involved; cf. Edgerton's remarks BhsD 211, s.v. gahanātā; also H.V. Guenther "Excerpts from the Gaṇḍavyūha Sūtra", in Tibetan Buddhism in Western Perspective (Emeryville: 1977) 20, 21: "the thicket of theorization", vidyādhāraṇīghana.

There is also a reference to the 'snares of Mara' at Bṛh [9]. There, as one of the results of hearing the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru, men reborn in hell will hear it again, will be reborn again among men, and will then - among other things - echindanti māraṇāṇaṃ (see also Bṛh [8]).

The reader at Gilgit would have been very familiar with Mara and the range of his activities. The defeat or subjugation of Mara is one of the central topics developed throughout Rkp. AdP i 7-10 and 32-35 deal in detail with the kinds of obstructions to the religious life which are 'the deeds of Mara' (cf. SR VI 7, 11), etc., etc.

There is a considerable number of secondary works on Mara. Most of these are cited in a recent article which deals in part with Mara, and which is of particular interest in reference to Gilgit: G. Fussman, "Pour une problématique nouvelle des religions indiennes anciennes", JA 265 (1977) 21-70; esp. 47-60.
His tenth great vow was: "When I have obtained awakening, whichever beings are frightened by a fear of kings, and which are bound or beaten or imprisoned, are condemned to death, tyrannized by numerous deceptions, looked down upon, wounded by sufferings of body and mind, may they, through the power of my merit, be delivered from all (such) calamities."

The present vow is concerned with several situations which occur as items in the various lists of 'untimely deaths' (akālamaraṇas) or 'fears' (bhayas) which will be dealt with below. It also presents one side of the ambivalent attitude taken towards kings in the literature of Gilgit which will be discussed under [19].
His eleventh great vow was: "When I have obtained awakening, whichever beings burnt by the fire of hunger, intent upon getting food, 1) commit an evil act, 2) may I with food possessed of fine color and odor and flavor refresh their body; 3) afterwards may I establish (them) in endless ease through the flavor of dharma."  

1) (X: '... do evil for that reason'. 2) X: 'if they would preserve my name, may I with food, etc.' 3) This entire clause is omitted in X.

This vow also concerns one of the 'untimely deaths', the ninth according to Bhg [20]: navamam akālamarenaṃ ye kṣuttaśopahatā āhārapānam alabhāmānā kālam kurvanti; cf. below.

Two additional points might be briefly noted here. First [5.11], like [5.7], implicitly recognizes - as I have stated above - a 'hierarchy of needs'; it acknowledges the fact that the individual's basic, or 'biological', needs must be met first before his more (conventionally understood) 'religious' needs can be attended to. This, I think, is also the essential meaning of [5.12]. It is important to repeat, however, that in the karmatically constructed world 'biological' and 'religious' are inextricably interlocked and would not have been perceived as separate or distinct categories.

A second and related point is that in [5.11], as in [5.7], [5.8] and [5.9] before it, we see how Bodhic concerns, if they occur at all, are articulated in karmatic texts. In all four passages bodhi, the bodhi-sattvacārikā, etc., are presented as an ultimate or final end or termination (bodhiparyavasāna), or as something arrived at only very gradually (anupurvaṃ, cf. Bhp 1296.4/191-5-5f; 192-4-6f; cited above). Bodhic concerns, therefore, are not denied, they are only relieved of their immediacy, they are indefinitely postponed and projected into the future. It is interesting to observe that the position of bodhi here is virtually the same as the position of nibbana in modern village Buddhism of South East Asia (cf. Spiro, Buddhism and Society, 76-84; Combrich, Precept and Practice, 16-17; etc.).
This was the twelfth great vow of that Tathāgata: *"When I have obtained awakening, whichever beings, naked, without clothing, poor, experience day and night unpleasant feelings from cold and heat and flies and mosquitos, may I offer to them (the enjoyment of garments colored with various colors...), and may I with various jewels and ornaments and decorations and garlands and perfumes and unguents and music and tūryas and tāḍāvacaras fully fulfill all the inclinations of all beings."*

1) *(V: 'His twelfth great vow was:'); thus maintaining, unlike Y, the same formula found in [5.1-11].
2) *X: '.. if they would preserve my name, may I, etc.'.*
3) *(That enclosed in parentheses is uncertain; see note 13 to the edition of the Skt. text.*)
These twelve great vows the Blessed One Bhaisajyaguruviduryaprabha, the Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyaksambuddha, formerly practising the practice of a bodhisattva, has made.
Moreover, Mañjuśrī, it is not possible for that which is the vow and that which is the array of qualities of the buddhafield of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajya-guruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, to be exhausted in a kalpa or even more than a kalpa. That buddhafield is altogether purified, free of the defect of passion, free of (even) the word 'unfortunate rebirth' or 'suffering', free of women; and the earth (there) is made of beryl, the walls and terraces and arches and lattices of windows and turrets are made of the seven precious things, (and also) the enclosure of pillars. As the world-sphere Sukhabhūtīśa is, so is that world-sphere Vaiḍūryā-nirbhāsa. And there in that world-sphere there are two bodhisattvas, maha-bodhisattvas, the foremost of his innumerable and incalculable bodhisattvas, the one called Suryavairocana, the second, Candravairocana, who preserve the store of the Good Law of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajya-guruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata. Therefore then, Mañjuśrī, a believing son or daughter of good family should make a vow for rebirth in that buddhafield.

1) T adds: '(it is) devoid of stones, pebbles and gravel'. 2) T: 'And the earth and walls and fences and arches and lattices of windows and turrets are made of beryl; and the enclosure of pillars is made of the seven precious things.' Stambhakhoṭaka, T: pu-su, has been translated 'enclosure of pillars', but this is a guess; cf. BHSD 206 s.v. khoṭaka. 3) On vaiḍūrya see A.Mastor, "Indo-Aryan and Dravidian", RSOAS 11 (1943-46) 304-307.

a, The reader at Gilgit almost certainly would not have seen anything very special in Bhaiṣajya-guru's buddhafield as it is described here. In fact the description follows a pattern which would have been familiar to him from a number of other Gilgit texts, especially SP. It involves the
enumeration of more or less standard lists of both positive and negative characteristics. Of the negative characteristics we find, for example: apagataśvāhakarakathallam, 'devoid of stones, pebbles and gravel (cf. Tib in n.1 above)'; apagataśvabhārapātām, 'devoid of pits and precipices'; apagataśayandelikāgūthodilam, 'devoid of drains and cesspools', all of the future buddhafield of the Śrāvaka Kāśyapa (SP 67.10); apagatanirayāgyonyamalokāsurakāyam, 'devoid of hells, animal births, the world of Yama and the totality of Asuras', applied to the future buddhafield of the Śrāvaka Mahākātyāyana (SP 70.28); apagataśpāyam, 'devoid of unfortunate rebirths'; apagatamātrgrāmam 'devoid of women', of the future buddhafield of Fürṇa-maitrāyanīputra (SP Kern ed.) 202.5); apagatamātrgrāmam and apagatatiryāgyopretāsurakāya, of a buddhafield of a former Tathāgata; of the future buddhafield of Bali, the Asurendra, tatra tava buddhakṣetre na rāgaśabdo na dvēgaśabdo na mohasabdo bhaviṣyati (Kv 275.26); etc. For the positive characteristics I will cite only one example:

... virajam nāma buddhakṣetram bhaviṣyati saṃsāra mama prāśādikām prasadanīyam pariśuddham ārdham ca sphītan ca kṣicana ca subhikṣam ca bhūnaraṃṣṛṇam rādikām ca vidvīryaṃmayam suvarṇaśūtraśatāpadavinaśdham, sarvatra cāṣṭāpadasmiṃ ratnavṛko bhaviṣyati saptāmaṃ ratnāmaṃ puspaphalaiḥ satatasamitam samaśṛp[l]ītaḥ

... that buddhafield will be named Viraja, (it will be) level, delightful, attractive, charming, very pure, and prosperous and flourishing and secure and abounding in food and crowded with a multitude of men and gods; it will be made of beryl, laid out in a checker-board pattern of eight squares marked with gold thread; in each square there will be a jewel tree filled continually with flowers and fruits of the seven precious things. (SP 205.32; also 67.9, 69.10, 70.28, 72.2, 100.14, 160.18; etc.)

One other case deserves to be mentioned here. I have already indicated above that the descriptions of 'the future world of Maitreya' and the city of Ketumati have much in common with the descriptions of Mahāyāna buddhafields. To what extent this is so can now be seen by citing some of the characteristics of that 'world' from Mbk. The passage in
which the description of 'the world of Maitreya' occurs has not been
preserved in either the Gilgit Ms. or the Nepalese Ms. of Mok, so I give
here Lévi’s translation of the Tibetan: "Et cette Ile-du-Jambu, aplani
sur toute son étendue ... les hommes des pays, prodigieusement multipliés,
sont innombrables ... Le sol est sans épines, uni ... Les arbres, qui ont
à la fois feuilles, fleurs et fruits, poussent à la hauteur d’une portée
de voix ... Ces créatures sont sans tare, sans mal, pleines d'entrain;
leur corps est grand, avec un beau teint; ils ont des forces extraordi-
naires; en fait de maladies, trois seulement se manifestent: les besoins,
l'innovation, la vieillesse. Les femmes, quand elles arrivent à cinc cents
ans, prennent alors seulement un mari ... Cette ville se montre ravissante
... Ses hautes murailles, fautes des sept joyaux, montent à une portée de
voix. Ses terrasses, ses portes sont décorées de toutes sortes de
pierreries, etc." Although the description of 'the world of Maitreya'
is a little more restrained and conservative, a little less developed
than the Mahāyāna descriptions of buddhafields, when seen from the point
of view of the reader at Gilgit it appears highly likely that he would
have immediately assimilated the former to the latter, would in fact,
have seen them as only two examples of the same basic thing. This assimi-
lation would have been made all the easier by the fact that the two – in
addition to being physically similar – were functionally almost identical.
(On the 'Paradise of Maitreya', and especially the development it under-
went, see P.Demiéville, "La Yogācārabhūmi de Saṅgharakṣa", BEFEO 44 (1954)
376-95; for some pictorial representations see L.Bachhofer,"'Maitreya
in Ketumā' by Chu Hao-ku", India Antiqua (Leiden: 1947) 1-7; for the
"Paradise" of Bhaisajyaguru see A.Waley, A Catalogue of Paintings Re-
covered from Tun-Huang by Sir Aurel Stein (London: 1931) 62f, 179, 288.)
b. One other element in the description of Bhaisajyaguru's buddhafield
is of particular interest; this is the simile 'as the world-sphere Sukhā-
vatī is, so is that world-sphere Vaiḍūryanirbhāsā'. At first sight such
a passage seems to indicate a direct influence of the cult of Amitābha
as it is found in texts such as the Sukhāvatīvyūha, and so at least Soper
has taken it (Literary Evidence for Early Buddhist Art in China (Ascona:
1959) 172f.). But I have already indicated that I think something quite
different is involved (G.Schopen, "Sukhāvatī as a Generalized Religious
Goal in Sanskrit Mahāyāna Literature", IIJ 19 (1977) 194f.). In IIJ 19
I was able to cite – in addition to passages from the Ārya-saptatathāgata-
pūrvaprāṇīdhanavibhāqavistara-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra, Pek. vol.6, no.135,
129-3-5f; and the Mahāyāna-buddhakṣetragreyam, Pek. vol.23, no.760(15),
126-5-2 - only one strictly parallel passage from Gilgit. This was Aj
112.14:

atha sā dārikā bhagavāntāṃ trayadakṣīṇāṃ kṛtvāvam āha - kīḍāsaṃ
bhāgyaṃ manm buddhakṣetram bhaviṣyati yattraivāmaḥ buddho bhaviṣyāma
bhagavān āha - apramitāgānasāmayā nama sā budhakṣetram
bhaviṣyati; yādṛśā ca sā sukhātā lokadhātu tāḍāsaṃ tad buddha-
kkōtraṃ bhaviṣyati - paryakāniṣanāṃ nupādākā bodhisatvā
bhaviṣyantī - īḍāśaṃ tad budhakṣetram - //

Then that girl, having three times circumambulated the Blessed One, spoke thus: O Blessed One, what will my buddhāfield be like, where I will be a Buddha? The Blessed One said: Aparamitāgānasāmayā will that buddhāfield be named; and as is that world-sphere Sukhāvatī, so will that buddhāfield be. Bodhisattvas will be miraculously born seated cross-legged. Such is that buddhāfield.

To this I would now add:

Ekb 107.9; Pek. 198-1-6: (atha khalu jyotiraso bodhisattvo mahāsat)-
tvo bhagavāntāṃ etad avocat: kīḍāsaṃ bhāgyaṃ tad buddhakṣetram
bhaviṣyati yatānāṃ dharmaṃ rāmaṃ pravartiyate bhagavān āha:)
... (the Ms is damaged here; Tib. continues thus:) khyod ni bkhal
pa grañs med dpag tu med pa na / byaṅ phyogs su saṅs rgyas kyi žiṅ
me tog rgyas pa'i dri šes bya ba 'byun stey saṅs rgyas kyi žiṅ
de ni ji ltar da ltar gyi 'jig rten gyi khams bde ba can bün du
bkod pa de lta bu daṅ ldan par 'gyur ro /

Then the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, Jyotiśasa said to the Blessed One: 'O Blessed One, of what kind will that buddhāfield be where I will turn the wheel of dharma?' The Blessed One said: 'You, in immeasurable and incalculable kalpas, in the northern direction, will appear in a buddhāfield named me tog rgyas pa'i dri; as is the world-sphere Sukhāvatī now, so that buddhāfield will be possessed of such an array (of qualities).

and:

Sgt 2170.3 (= 2003.3); Lhasa 189-3-1: śrūṇa sarvaśūra ye kecid asmāt
samghāṭadharmaparīyād ekākṣaram api catuṣpadikāṃ gāthāṃ likhiṣyanti
tesām sarvaśūra satvānāṃ tataḥ paścāt [omitted at 2003.5] pagcana-
vatiṣṭhaḥ sahasrāṇi lokadhātūnāṁ atikramya yathā sukhāvatī lokadhātus
tathā teṣām buddhakṣetraṁ bhavisyati - teṣām ca sarvasūra satvāṁ
ca tārasthīḥ kalpasahasrāṇy āyuṣpramāṇaṁ bhavisyati.

Listen, O Sarvasūra: whosoever will copy even a single syllable
(or) a gāthā of four lines from this discourse on dharma (named)
Sāṁghāṭa, for those beings, having passed thence westward beyond
ninety-five koṭis of thousands of world-spheres, as is the world-
sphere Sukhavatī, so will be their buddhafield ...

Sgt 2209.7-2210.5 (= 2037.6-2038.2); Lhasa 194-3-1f: ye sarvasūra
satvā evaṁ vāg bhāṣante: asti dharmāḥ asti dharmāṇāṁ pāraṅgā te
tena kuśalamūlaṁ viṁśatikalpaṁ uttarakurupūpasāyaṁ - paśca-
viṁśatikalpasahasrāḥāni tātāyaṁ sahā bhāvyatāṁ
upāsyaṁ - trayastīṇīndrāhyo devebhūṣyāt uttarakurupūpa-
pāsyaṁ - na ca mātūḥ kukṣāv upāsyaṁ - lokadhātuṇāsahasrāḥ
ca drakṣaṁ - sarve sukhāvatī rāmāṇāṁ sarvabuddhakṣetrasandarśanān
dṛṣṭvā tatraiva pratīṣṭhānam kṛtvā tatraiva bodhim ohīsambhotayate.

Sarvasūra, which beings would speak thus: 'There is dharma;
there is a going to the other shore of dharmas'; they through this
root of merit will be reborn in the Uttarakurus for twenty kalpas.
For twenty-five thousand kalpas they will be reborn together with
the devas of the thirty-three. Having passed away from among the
devas of the thirty-three, they will be reborn in the Uttarakurus,
and they will not be reborn in the womb of a woman. And they will
see hundreds of thousands of world-spheres; all these are named
Sukhāvatī; having seen the appearance of all these buddhafields,
having established a foundation there, just there they will fully
awaken to awakening.

The one other related passage cited in ILJ 19 from Gilgit is from Bhp.
I give here my translation of it as it appeared in JTP 6:

Bhp 1288 (Then at that time by the Blessed One the grove of
Āmrapalī with Jambudvīpa) was magically transformed [so that it
was] of an extension (of as much as several hundreds of thousands
of niyutas of yojanas), being smooth like the palm of a hand,
heavenly, pleasing to the mind, possessed of [fine] color,
(ornamented with) heavenly flower trees and perfume trees and
(fruit trees and jewel trees and wish-fulfilling trees and cloth trees), possessed of heavenly lion thrones, being hung with garlands (of flowers) and cloth and jewels, being adorned with the sound of garlands of bells. Just as (is the world-sphere Sukhāvatī, so [that] was ravishing), satisfying, charming, delightful.

Since I have already discussed a number of those passages, and since Rkp 107.9, Sṛt 2170.3 and 2209.7 only serve to confirm what I have said, it will be sufficient to here quote my conclusions:

"It seems, then, that the idea of Sukhāvatī was generalized to the point that it became a standard literary simile for magnificence, loveliness, etc., much in the same way as comparison with Mt. Meru became the standard literary simile for unshakenbility or imperturbability; and in the same way that the Mt. Meru referred to in the simile has lost any specific association with the old and intricate cosmology of which it originally formed a part, so here Sukhāvatī has lost any specific association with the cult of Amitābha."

These considerations make it fairly sure that, as I have said above, the reader at Gilgit would not have seen anything very special in Bhaiṣajyaguru's buddhafield as it is described in Bhg. It would have been seen only as one example among many. The only thing that is at all unique to it are the proper names: the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru, of the field itself, and of the two chief bodhisattvas, Suryavairocana and Candravairocana. Neither, as far as I know, occur elsewhere at Gilgit or in Mahāyāna literature as a whole.

These passages also indicate that the conception of buddhafields was firmly established and widespread at Gilgit, and that this conception pictured the buddhafield as an ideal state, both materially and spiritually. This, of course, accounts for the fact that rebirth in a buddhafield was both actively sought and presented as a vipāka of religious acts. The former aspect is seen both here in Bhg [6] and later in [11] where individuals form vows (prāṇidhāna) for rebirth in a buddhafield. It is also underscored by the fact that at Sṭā 51.12 Avalokita explicitly says that one of the reasons he asks the Blessed One for the teaching (i.e. Sṭā as a whole) is to make possible a rebirth in a buddhafield for
'beings'; and at StA 56.11 it is said that the particular mantrapadas in question were spoken and empowered (adhiṣṭhita) by the Tathāgatas 'to effect a rebirth in a buddhafield' (buddhaksetrapattaye). These and related points will be discussed further under [11].
Once again the Blessed One addressed Mañjuśrī, the true heir-apparent: 'It happens, Mañjuśrī, that beings who do not understand (the significance of) a good or bad act, overcome by covetousness, not understanding the act of giving nor the maturation of the fruit of the act of giving — childish, dull, having defective faculties of faith — are intent on piling up and protecting possessions, and their thought does not go towards a distribution of gifts. When an occasion for giving arises they are not at all happy, as if in (giving they were) cutting flesh from their own body. And there are many of these beings who even themselves do not themselves enjoy (their possessions)\(^1\). How much less (is that so) of their male and female slaves and workmen, how much less (is that so) of other beggars\(^1\). Beings of that kind, having passed away from here, will be reborn in the world of the pretas or among animals. (But) by which of these, when formerly they were men, the name of that Blessed One Bhaisajyaguruvaśyaprabha, the Tathāgata, will have been heard, to them now dwelling in the world of Yama, or dwelling among animals, the name of that Tathāgata will (again) come to be present. Immediately, through (that name) being merely recalled, having passed away from there, they will once again be reborn among men; and they will be such as have recollection of (their former) births. Terrified by the fear of an unfortunate destiny, no longer seeking for the objects of desire, delighted in the act of giving and proclaimers of the praise of the act of giving, renouncing all their property, in due order they will present to beggars their head or hands or feet or eyes or flesh and blood, how much more other accumulations of material goods.
1) X, Z and T all expand this passage and tighten up the meaning. 
X: 'How much less will they give (them) to their mother and father, how much less to their male and female slaves, how much less to other beggars'. 
Z and T: 'How much less will they give (them) to their mother or father or wife or sons or daughters, how much less, etc.' Y may be corrupt here.

Us. As in most of Mahāyāna sutra literature, there are many references to the act of giving in our Gilgit texts, and we might look briefly at some of these. On the whole these passages tend to fall into three groups. The first group consists of passages in which the practice of giving is recommended and its rewards enumerated. Good examples of this kind of passage are Mūk 71, where the gift of robes, medicine and food to the Sāṅgha is one of the acts resulting in rebirth in Maitreya's 'world'; Aj 118.1.4, where it is said that he who would give gifts to the bhikṣu-sāṅgha is protected from yakṣa, rakṣa, etc.; Aj 118.17, where he who would give alms is freed from old age and disease; Aj 126.8, where the giving of gifts to the bhikṣu-sāṅgha is said to result in going quickly to Sukhāvatī. A good example from a Bodhic text is

SR 329.1ff: 'There are ten blessings for the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, devoted to the practice of giving. What ten? Namely: for him the depravity of envy is suppressed; and his thought is always devoted to giving up (things); and he receives the best of things common to the mass of men; and he is rehorn among families of great wealth; and immediately upon birth the thought of giving up (things) presents itself; he is dear to the fourfold assembly; and self-confident and uncowed he enters into the assembly; everywhere in the world the highest words of praise and fame for him arise; and he has soft and tender hands and feet (mṛdutarunā-hastapādaḥ ca bhavati); he is firmly fixed and flat-footed (sama-caranatalapratīṣṭhitab); and he is never separated from the good spiritual friends until he is seated on the terrace of enlightenment.

Vaj 12a6 is characteristic of the second group:

Once again, Subhūti, which bodhisattva, mahāsattva, having filled immeasurable and incalculable world-spheres with the seven precious things, would give them as a gift; and which son or
daughter of good family, having taken from this Perfection of Wisdom one as much as a verse of four lines, would recite it, would teach, would study it; just this latter would generate a much greater merit, immeasurable, incalculable.

Such passages, where the merit from activity undertaken in reference to a text – reciting, copying, worshipping, etc. – is compared to the merit of giving gifts, always to the latter’s disadvantage, are very common (cf. Vaj 12a.6; Sg! 2165.1; StA 63.8, 63.17, 78.15, 81.6; SR XXXVI 5; SP 123.1f; 129.18; 165.19; etc.). These passages, at first sight, might be taken as an indication of a shift in the value attached to giving. But that this is not altogether the case is clear from the fact that the entire effectiveness of the comparison depends on the practice of dāna being conceived of as highly meritorious. The mere fact it was chosen as the first member of the comparison indicates its continuing importance. It is also interesting to note that this comparison was also applied to things other than activity directed towards texts: at Vaj 11a.4 the comparison is between one who gives gifts and a bodhisattva who would obtain patience in dharmas devoid of a self (nirātmakeśu dharmaśu kṣaṇītaṁ pratilabheta; the later redaction and Pārśu’s Ms. have nirātmakeśv anutpattikeśu dharmaśu, etc.); at SR XXXVI 39-42 it is between one who gives gifts and which bhikṣu, absorbed in emptiness, would honor the Buddhas with his hands in añjali (yaś caiva bhikṣur abhiratu śūnyatāyām / buddhān namasye dasanakhaśprāñjaliyā).

Before moving to the third group of passages it is worth citing an interesting passage from KV which appears as a kind of combination of the characteristics of the first and second group.

KV 271.20f: Then Avalokiteśvara the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, spoke thus to the king Bali, the leader of the Asuras: O Great King, who in the presence of beings produces a thought of non-injury, presents alms to the 'religion' of the Tathāgata (tathāgataśāsane), (and) performs much homage and service, no one can harm them even in a dream. And those who copy this Kāraṇḍavyūha, the king of the jewels of the Mahāyāna sūtras, who have it copied, even as little as its name, (who) listen to this discourse on dharma, (and) present only a single gift of alms to a bodhisattva and to the dharma-reciters and the preservers, reciters, copiers and hearers of this
discourse on dharma, and (who) present alms for only the morning meal-time, or for a single day, in the name of (uddśya) this discourse on dharma of the Tathāgata, they all will obtain the kingship of a cakravartin, and nowhere will they experience suffering from hunger or thirst, and they will nowhere experience the suffering of detention in a hell or that arising from separation from that which is dear. They will be freed from all suffering. They will go to the world-sphere of Sukhāvatī, and having heard dharma face-to-face from the Blessed One Amītābha, the Tathāgata, they will obtain a prediction. And further, O Great King, listen to the fruit of the act of giving: ... [then follows a long series of comparisons, such as:] ... 'I am able to grasp the number of the finest atoms of matter, but, O son of good family, I am unable to calculate the mass of merit from the gift of alms'.

The third and final group of passages is that in which the attitude towards dāna which Bodhic Buddhism wanted to inculcate is expressed. Here we find, for example, as the first of the ten blessings (anuśāmsa) of the bodhisattva who has coursed in wisdom (prajñācaritasya): sarvāsvaparītyaṅgo bhavati na ca dānena sūdhīṁ manvant: 'He gives up all of his possessions, but he does not think that purification (arises) through giving' (SR 340.2); and at SR XXXII 190: na svargahetoṣ ca rati sa brāhma-caryam / na svargulolo dādati sāda nu viṣṭah / sāṃbodhikāmo kuśalacarīṃ carantah (Nepalese redaction: sāṃbodhikāmo dādati sa bodhisattvāḥ /: 'He (the bodhisattva) does not practise the religious life for the sake of heaven; never does a wise one give gifts desiring heaven, (but) seeking complete awakening, practising the good practice, etc. (Nepalese: 'but seeking complete awakening that bodhisattva gives gifts'). We also find passages such as:

SR VI 3: sacet punar jñānti nāsti sattvo
  yo gandha deti tatha yasya diyate
  -tena citṭena dadāti gandham
  āgapya kṣānti nṛdu ānulomikī //

If he understands 'there is no being who gives perfume, so also (none) to whom it is given', (and) with this thought he gives perfume, this of him is the pliant (and) conforming patience.
And, finally:

AdP 174.4: iha subhūte bodhisattvo mahāsattva prathama-
cittoptādān upādāya dānapāramitāyām caran sarvākāraṇaṁ-
(pratisamyuktair manaskāraṁ dānam dadāti) ... na cāsyā dāne
(dānasamajñā bhavati, na pratigrāhake pratigrāhakasamajñā
bhavati, na dāyake dāyakasamajñā bhavati ... na ca dānapalām
āśamsate ya dānapalām sāmāre paribhujita-anātrā sattva-
paritrānātaya sattvaparimocanatāyai dānapāramitāyām carati.

Here, Subhūtī, a bodhisattva, mahāsattva, beginning from
the first thought (directed towards awakening) practising in
the perfection of giving, with thoughts joined to the knowledge
of all modes, gives a gift ... and he has no perception of the
act of giving in the act of giving, no perception of a recipient
in the recipient, no perception of a giver in the giver ... and
he does not hope for a fruit of the act of giving in such a way
that he could enjoy that fruit of the act of giving in saṃsāra.
He practises in the perfection of giving only for the sake of
helping and releasing beings.

In all three kinds of passages dāna is presented as an important
religious practice. But we also see here, especially in passages of the
third kind, an explicit distinction made between one who practises giving
'desiring heaven' (svargalalolā), one who practises it 'seeking complete
awakening' (saṃbodhikāma), and one who practises giving, 'but does not
hope for a fruit from that act of giving' (na ca dānapalām āśamsate).
The implications of this important distinction will be studied below in
detail in reference to the related practice of pūjō. Here it is sufficient
to note that our texts are fully aware of the intentional component
inherent in religious activity, and that some of them (SR, AdP) implicitly
criticize what I would call the karmatic conception of giving (i.e. that
expressed in Mok 71, Aj 118.1-4; 126.8; Ku 271.20).

Finally, it should be added that sarvasvaparityāga, 'giving up the
totality of one's possessions', including wife, sons, daughters, hands,
feet, eyes, etc., as here in Bhq [7], was always the ideal form of giving
in Buddhist literature (for this, and a rich discussion of the place of
dāna in general, see H.Dayal, The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit
Literature (London: 1932) 172-93; also Ét.Lamotte, "La bienveillance
b. A second important point to be noted concerning Bhg [7] is one which we have already had occasion to mention. Both here and in the next few sections the author of Bhg has given us a good idea of the way in which the 'vow' connected with hearing the name of Bhaśajyaguru was thought 'to work', especially in reference to its relationship to the maturation of the individual's 'past action'. The 'idea' is most easily expressed by contrasting two sequences of events. The first is that into which the hearing of the name does not enter: a man is ignorant of karma and the fruits of karma; he avoids his opportunities to make merit and hoards his possessions; as a consequence he is reborn in an unfortunate state. But once born into the hells, among animals, etc., it was difficult to explain how the individual could ever escape from them since the unfortunate states were situations which allowed little opportunity for making merit and great opportunities for accumulating further demerit. This in fact - as is well known - was a major weakness in the karmatic account of things, one which sometimes made it appear, at least, as very close to a kind of determinism. It is interesting to note that the 'vow' of Bhaśajyaguru intervenes at just this weak point. This is clear from a second sequence, the one actually found in Bhg [7]: a man is ignorant of karma and the fruits of karma; he avoids his opportunities to make merit and hoards his possessions; but - and this is the introduction of the new element - at some point in his existence as a man he hears the name of Bhaśajyaguru. This, however, does not affect the next event in the sequence: he is of necessity reborn in an unfortunate state. But here in this second sequence his future course is not ambiguous or uncertain: although he must undergo the maturation of his past acts, because he heard or was caused to hear the name of Bhaśajyaguru when a man, he will recall it again in his unfortunate state; having recalled it he will be again reborn among men and importantly, he will obtain jātisara, 'the recollection of his former birth(s)'. Through this 'recollection' he is fully aware of his former 'fate' (i.e. 'he understands the significance of a good or bad action') and is terrified by the possibility of its repetition; as a consequence he practises dāna, even
in its most austere form, and the circle is broken. The 'vow' of Bhaiṣajya-guru, then, functions to assure the individual who has heard his name of an eventual release from what otherwise appeared as an unavoidable and 'eternal' repetition of his unfortunate 'fate'. A few additional passages will both further clarify the pattern here envisioned and once again establish the fact that Bhaiṣajya-guru was not unique in fulfilling this function.

One of the most interesting texts in this regard is *Bbp*. After describing a ritual very similar to that found in *Bhg* which is to be performed for the sake of those reborn in the *Aviçi* hell or in the three unfortunate destinies the text says:

*Bbp* 193-3-4f (the Tibetan text is cited above p.183-84)

... Through the power of the vows of those former Tathāgatas [i.e. Bhaiṣajya-guru, Amitābha, Śīkhin, Viśvabhū, and the long list of other Tathāgatas named at 192-5-3], (their) names would be heard in the ears of those gone to the *Aviçi* hell and those born in the three unfortunate destinies. Through the power of this discourse on dharma, moreover, all evil would be checked. Through the power of the majesty of those Tathāgatas, and through the power of this discourse on dharma, having recollected (their) good and bad acts [i.e., the fruits thereof], they consequently would not perform evil acts. From that they would be freed from all suffering and would go to a fortunate destiny. Until they fully and completely awaken to utmost, right and complete awakening, they would conform to this practice.

A little further on the same thing is repeated in verse, the important padas for us being: sñon gyi las rnams rjes su dran 'gyur šiṅ / dran nas mkhas pa sdig pa byed mi 'gyur: '(they) would recollect their former acts [i.e. the fruits thereof]; having recollected (that), the wise would not (again) perform evil'.

In addition to this we find two other passages of interest at Gilgit, one from *Sgt* and one from *Rkp*.

*Sgt* 2129.5: evam eva sarvaśūra sa sattvārmapratikṣeṣānaḥ
puruṣo yadā naśake duḥkham smarati tadā sarvapāparparivarja-
yati · yadā sarvapāparparivarjayati tadā sarvadharma ōmukhi-
karisyati sarvadharma amukhirvte sarvakuśaladharma pāripūriṅkarisyati.

Just so, Sarvasūra, the man who rejects the Good Law, when he recollects the suffering in hell, then he avoids all evil; when he avoids all evil, then all dharmas will be made manifest; all dharmas having been made manifest, he will fulfill all good dharmas.

Rkp 18.8: ekaikasmac ca lakṣaṇād bhagavatas tādṛśī prabhā niścacāra yayā prabhajyā (t)ṛṣeṣāḥrasmaḥsāhasri lokadhūtavāraṇādhiṣṭhavāraṇaḥ sāhasraḥprakāraṇaḥpratipādaṇī. 'abhāṅjanmanuṣyaṃ manuṣya nairayika vā taiśyayagonyikā vā yāmānukā vā te sarve bhāgavaṃtām adṛṣṭaḥ... bhūti ca nairayikataiyagonyikayāmānukāksobhyakotiṣṭhasahasrāṇiśmṛtiṃ pratīlēhīre; pūrvavaranpurakulamaṃ (ādīlom) anumṛtyya nāmo buddhaḥyeti kṛtvā te bhūyō 'pāyebhāya cavītvā deveṣūpapannāḥ.

And from each of the marks of the Blessed One such a light was shot forth that the three-thousand-great-thousand world-sphere was suffused with great radiance. And those devas, nāgas, yakṣas etc., who were in the three-thousand-great-thousand world-sphere, and those born in the hells or among animals or in the world of Yama, they all saw the Blessed One... and many akṣobhyas of koṭās of hundreds of thousands of those born in the hells or among animals or in the world of Yama obtained recollection; having obtained recollection of the roots of merit which they had formerly planted, having made the 'nāmo buddhaḥyaya', having passed away from those unfortunate rebirths, they were reborn among devas.

Finally, we may now cite what is, from the point of view of the 'cult' of Bhaśajyaguru, one of the most important passages in the whole of Bhg. Here at [17] it is said that 'friends, relatives and kinsmen' (Y: ye, but X makes this more specific: mitrajñātisālohitā) perform a specific pūja to Bhaśajyaguru for the sake of a man who has just died and undergone his 'judgement' in the presence of Yama. When the pūja is performed, the text says,... 'the case does occur where his consciousness
could just return again (i.e., immediately, punar eva pratiniḥvartetā); he (then) becomes aware of himself (i.e., of his experiences before Yama) as if in a dream. Or if on the seventh day, or if on the twenty-first or thirty-fifth or forty-ninth day his consciousness would be reborn again, he would obtain recollection. He himself is a witness to (the effects of) merit, demerit, (and) the maturation of past actions. (As a consequence) even for the sake of his life he does not do an evil deed'.

In addition to fuller passages like those cited above, we can also note that jātisvarama is often found among the lists of 'blessings' said to follow from religious acts. We might look at a few of these because once again they indicate that the individual at Gilgit had at hand — in addition to the puja directed toward Bhaṣājyaguru, Amitābha, Śikhin, Viśvabhū, etc. — a number of means through which he could obtain this faculty. We find, for example, at Sbp 194-1-1 that 'if someone preserves, worships, copies, etc., this discourse on dharma, they will obtain eight great blessings', the last of which is jī ṭītar 'doṣa' maṣa su skyey śiṅ tshe rabs dran par 'gyur ba ste: 'they are born in a place in accordance with their desire and they will recollect their former births'; at Kv 269.19 those who hear, and having heard, copy, preserve, worship the text: teṣāṁ ca pañcānāntaryāṇi karmāṇi kṣapayanti kṣapayitvā pariśuddhakāyā bhaviṣyanti jātisvarāḥ ca: 'for them the five acts of immediate retribution will be exhausted; after having exhausted (those), they will come to be purified in body and have recollection of their former births'; at Kv 278.32 those who have the text copied: yatra yatropapadyante tātra tātra jātāu jātāu jātisvarā bhavanti; at Sgṭ 212.1 it is said that 'he who will wholeheartedly reverence (adhyāśayena namaskarisyati) the Sgṭ: pumasvavana kelpām jātāu jātisvarā bhaviṣyati; at Sgṭ 2158.7 (= 1991.5), Lhasa 187-3-7, we find: yaṃ (but T: gaṅ) gil samghaṭo dharma-pāryāyaḥ śṛoṭrāvabhāsam āgamiṣyati, so 'śātīḥ kalpāṁ jātisvarā (2159.1: jātyājātismaro; T: tshe rabs dran par) bhaviṣyati; at Sgṭ 2254.3: bhagavān Śrī ... śṛuḥ bhaṣājyaśena sa puruṣo maraṇkālabharamaye jīvitāḥ vyavārogyāmānās tathāgata-yopravicellam pramāṇīnaṃ vacanā yāhāṃ pramāṇām bhaviṣyatām tathāgata-svābhāvahātām samyak-sambhūtasrty ekavacā kṛ( tvā) sa tene bhaṣājyaśena kuśalamālena gatiḥ kalpāṁ tṛṣṭaṃ skṛtāṃ devānāṃ suḥkham anuv bhaviṣyati - aṣṭiḥ kalpāṁ jātyājātismaro bhaviṣyati.
All of our passages indicate that the possession of jātismara was considered beneficial. They also indicate that the individual could obtain it in two ways: as a result of action undertaken for his own benefit (Bṛhā 194-1-1, Kṛt 269.19, 278.32; Śṛṅg 2122.1, 2254.3); and as a result of action undertaken for his benefit by another (Bṛhā [17], and probably [7], Bṛhā 193-3-4, Rkṛ 18.8). We saw the same pattern above under Bṛhā [5.6].

More importantly, these passages, especially the first group, give us a good idea of why jātismara was considered to be important. They indicate the pivotal significance it had, or could have, for the sequential process by which the individual 'determined' his future life-situation, both spiritual and material. Its presence or absence could, or did, have a decided influence on whether or not the individual, once he had again obtained a human birth, would alter his previous course of behaviour. The possession of 'the recollection of one's past births' ensured that the reality or actuality of 'the Law of Karma' was immediately, painfully, irrefutably brought home to the individual. As a result of the certainty, based on recollected 'personal' experience, that one's actions 'determined' one's life-situation, the individual, according to our texts, aware of his past suffering, would alter his behaviour in such a way as to avoid a repetition of that suffering. Although negatively phrased, the result, of course, is positive 'religious' development. (cf. P. Doméville, "Sur la mémoire des existences antérieures", BIFEO 27 (1927) 283-98).

If these passages indicate the pivotal significance of jātismara, they also indicate in what sense the individual can be said to be 'saved' through religious activity undertaken in regard to Bhaiṣajyaguru, Amitābha, etc., or in regard to the dharmapāryṇā-Buddha. Such activity has two significant results. It ensures that the individual, although he must undergo the consequences of his past acts, will at some point obtain a state in which he can alter his course. And it makes it possible for the individual to have a full and direct awareness of the consequences of his acts which is otherwise unavailable to him. This, however, does not relieve the individual of the responsibility for his future development. He is 'provided' with the best possible circumstances and the clearest possible view of the behavioral alternatives and their consequences; that is all. According to the texts, however, that 'clarity of view' almost invariably results in the abandonment of unmeritorious action and, therefore, continued development in a positive direction.
But, and this is important, the individual alone must be the actual agent in any continued development. This is very different from what is generally understood when we say that by such activity the individual is 'saved' and, I think, we are here not nearly as far from the Buddhism of the Nikāyas as might at first sight appear. In fact, obtaining jātismara is, in at least some important ways, the functional equivalent of realizing a central dictum of what has been preserved as Śākyamuni's teaching: imasmīṃ nati idam hoti, imass' uppādā idam uppaṭṭati.
Again further, Mahāyāna\(^1\), it happens that beings who in the name of the Tathāgata preserve (outwardly) the rule of training are gone wrong in morality, in behaviour, in views\(^1\) Again, those who are possessed of morality guard morality, (but) they do not seek great learning and do not know the deep meaning of the sūtras of the Tathāgatas. And those who have great learning, if they will become conceited; stiff with pride, disliked by all, they repudiate, they reject the Good Law. Partisans of Nāga, such deluded men have themselves entered on a wrong path and cause many kṣīra of nayutas of hundreds of thousands of other beings to take a great fall. For such beings almost certainly there will be a destiny in the hells.

By which of those, (however), the name of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, will have been heard [when formerly they were men\(^3\)], to them now dwelling in a hell the name of that Tathāgata, through the power of the Buddha, will (again) come to be present. They, having passed away from that place, will once again be born in the world of men. Possessed of the correct view, of vigor, of good intentions, they, having renounced the household life, having gone forth in the teaching of the Tathāgatas, in due course will practise\(^4\) the practice of a bodhisattva.

\(^1\)\(1\) T: 'Again, Mahāyāna', which are those beings who violate the rule of training of the Tathāgatas, they enter on wrong morality and enter on wrong views'. X and Z differ from Y in 'style', but not in sense. \(^2\) I am sure of neither the form bhūyāśa-tāra, nor its exact significance. I assume that bhūyāśa-tāra was intended, but both Y and Z appear to have -iśa-, although the difference between subscribed -ta- and -tha- in the script is often very slight. T has: 'such beings will go to a/thu intolerable hell'. \(^3\) S. T and Bhg [7] and [9]. \(^4\) X: 'will fulfill'.

\footnote{[8]}
Neither [8] nor [9] require much comment. They are only further illustrations of much that has already been said, especially in the last note. [7], [8] and [9] in fact form a natural group. All three passages are built around the key phrase yai pūrvaṃ manusyaḥḥūtaḥ śrūtaṃ bhaviṣyati; all three have the same basic sequential construction illustrating the fact that the individual must undergo the fruits of his past actions, but that, having heard the name of Bhaisajyaguru, he will at some point achieve a birth that will allow him to avoid an eternal repetition of his 'fate'. It is interesting to note that while jātismara is found only in [7], it has its functional counterparts in each of the other two: in [8] it is the possession of 'the correct view'; in [9] the meeting with the good spiritual friend. All three things represent potentially decisive 'moments' in the individual's progress, and all in virtually the same way: they assure the individual of a means of altering his 'old behavioral patterns. Implicit here is the fact that these passages are not interested in the non-giving of gifts, failure in morality, pride, etc. in themselves. They are only typical examples of the kinds of failings which may occur that - if I am not mistaken - were taken more or less at random to illustrate the essential point; that is to say, the way in which the vow of Bhaisajyaguru was thought to work. And the way in which Bhaisajyaguru's vow works, is the way in which the vow of Amitabha and all the others also works.
Again further, Mahāparī, it happens that beings who speak praise of themselves, through envy utter dispraise of others. Those exalters of themselves, beings who disparage others, they will experience suffering for many thousands of years in the three unfortunate rebirths. They, with the lapse of several thousands of years, having passed away from there, are then reborn among animals, among oxen and horses and camels and asses, etc. Beaten with blows from whips and goads, their bodies tormented by hunger and thirst, carrying great loads, they will go down the path. If at some time they will acquire a human birth, they will always be reborn in inferior families; in servitude they will always be subject to the will of others. (But) by which of these, when formerly they were men, the name of that Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguru-vaiduryaprabha, the Tathāgata, will have been heard, they, through that root of merit, will (eventually) be freed from all suffering; they will come to be possessed of keen faculties, learned, knowledgeable, wise, intent upon searching out the roots of merit. They will always gain a meeting with the good friend. They then cut the snares of Mara; they burst the shell of knowledge, they cause the river of depravities to dry up; they are freed from birth, old age, dying, sorrow, suffering, despair and anxiety.

1) T: 'If once in a hundred times'. 2) I have translated as if the text had śrutam bhavisyanti; so X and T here, as well as the parallel expression at [7] and [8]. 3) T: 'the shell of ignorance' and this is more in line with what we would expect, but as I have said in the notes to the edition, none of the three Mss. support this. The Mss. could, of course, represent the irregular sandhi of loss of initial a- after final -i, but this is not a typical irregularity of the Gilgit Mss. They often have the expected -y a-, or -i a- with hiatus.
Again further, Manjusri, it happens that there are beings who, delighting in backbiting, cause mutual conflicts and disagreements and disputes among beings. These beings, having mutually aggressive thoughts, perform various kinds of unwholesome action through body, speech (and) mind; desiring one another’s disadvantage, they constantly advance for each other’s misfortune. They compel the devātā of the forest, the devātā of trees, the devātā of the mountains, to draw near; in the burning-ground they compel various bhūta to draw near. They deprive living things born among animals of life; they perform puja to yakṣas and rakṣasas which live on flesh and blood. Having made the name or a likeness of the body of their enemy, they then bring into effect terrible spells, desiring to cause to by means of (a) kākhorda or viñjana an impediment to his life or the destruction of his body. (But) by which of those (as attacked) the name of the Blessed One Vaiśravaṇa pāṇḍavaṇāyaṇaprabha, the Tathāgata, will have been heard, to their (life) it is not possible to create an impediment by any means. They dwell mutually with thoughts of friendliness, with thoughts of benefit, with thoughts free of malice, much pleased with each other’s assistance.

1) I have here followed the Tibetan punctuation of the sentence; cf [10] n.15 of the edition. 2) T: ‘Calling upon the name of their enemy, or having made a likeness (of him)’. 3) The referent of te (V and X, sarve te) is left somewhat ambiguous.

a. There are a number of points worth noting here. First, the various devātās mentioned in our passage are well known from early canonical literature (cf. J.Masson, La religion populaire dans la canon bouddhique pāli (Louvain: 1942), esp. 136f; in reference to which Ç.Regamey says: "Une étude analogue mériterait d’être faite également pour la littérature
du Mahāyāna des sept ou huit premiers siècles de notre ère" ("Motifs vichnouites et sivaïtes dans le Kāraṇḍavyūha", Études tibétaines dédicaces à la mémorial Marcelle Lalou (Paris: 1917) 415). At Gilgit see SR X 79 where reference is made to vanavihāraḥ... devatāḥ, 'devatās (that reside) in forests and vihāras'; nagaradevataḥ, 'devatās of the city'; X 80: vanadevataḥ; sañchadevataḥ, 'devatā of rocks'; madidevataḥ, 'devatā of the rivers'; X 81: aṭavimarṣuḥ devatā, 'devatā (residing) in woods and deserts'; giriṣīkhareṇa devatā, 'devatās (dwelling) on mountain peaks', uṭsasaratadāgadēvatā, 'devatā of springs, pools and tanks'; and Kṛp 88.2, veṇuvaṇaperpālikā devatā; 88.12 vihāradēvatā; 88.16 oṣadhīdevatā; 89.7 vṛkṣadēvatā; 89.14, dvārakोṣṭhakadēvatā; "etc. For bhūta (which Wayman, "The Twenty-One Praises of Tārā, A Syncretism of Śaivism and Buddhism", Journal of the Bihar Research Society 45 (1959) 40, translates as "elementary spirits"), Yakṣa (the best overall study of which is still A.K.Coomaraswamy, Yakṣas, Parts I & II (Washington: 1928-31) reprinted, New Delhi: 1971) and Rākṣasas we have a number of passages indicating both their character and the means available for coping with them:

Aj 118.1-4: ye bhikṣusamghasa yatraya dāne pasyata na ca rākṣasah ca
na pretakusmāṃdahoraṇā ca
vighnaṇa na kurvanti kādaci teṣām
Who would give gifts to the community of bhikṣus, for them neither yakṣas nor rākṣasas nor pretas, kusumaṇḍas, nor mahoragas create an obstacle at any time.

Aj 124.1-2: na cāyaṃ ghaṭito yakṣair na bhūtair na ca rākṣasaiḥ
dohisattvo 'py ayaṃ loke jaravyāḍhipramocakaḥ
And this one is not killed by yakṣas or bhūtas or rākṣasas; indeed, this bodhisattva is in the world one who frees from old age and disease.

Eka 38.2 [Avalokita says:] yat sarvadūṣṭayakṣarākṣasānām anena
hrdayena kṛṣṣitvā maitracittān] dayācitītān kṛtvānuttarāyām
samyaksambodhau pratiṣṭhāpayāmi: 'Then having sapped the strength of all malignant yakṣas and rākṣasas through this
[Ekadaśamukha-]hrdaya, having effected thoughts of friendliness
and thoughts of pity (in them), I will establish them in utmost, right and complete awakening.

**Kv 281.18; fol 1603R:** [The rākṣasas of Simhādvipa, after their encounter with Avalokita say] punar api na prānātipātaṁ kurvāmaḥ / yādṛṣeṇā jāmbudvīpaṅkā manusyaṁ jīvantī annena pānena tādṛṣajīvikayā vayam jīvāmaḥ / punar api rākṣasīṛttaṁ na kurvāmaḥ / : 'Moreover, we will not take life. By what kind of food and drink the men of Jambudvīpa live, by that kind of sustenance we will live. Moreover, we will not maintain ourselves as rākṣasas usually do.'

**SP 157.2:** [The bodhisattva Pradānasura says to the Blessed One] aham api bhagavann evaṃrūpāṇām dharmabhaṅgakāṇāṁ hetor dhāraṇīpadāni dāśyāmi yasya śrīśi evaṃrūpāṇām dharmabhāṅgakāṇāṁ na kaścid avatārapreksy avatāragavesy avatāram lapsyate. tadyathā devo va nāgo yakṣo va rākṣaso va pūtano va kṛtya va kumbhāndo va preto va avatārapreksy avatāragavesy avatāram lapsyate: 'I also, O Blessed One, for the sake of such reciters of dharma will give dhāraṇipadasas so that no one watching for, seeking for a chance to do harm to such reciters of dharma will obtain a chance; that is to say, (no) deva, nāga, yakṣa, rākṣasa, etc., watching for, seeking for a chance to do harm will obtain it.' (cf. **SP 158.7**).

**StA 55.13:** The Blessed One describes some dhāraṇīmantrapada intended for the protection of those who maintain the dharma-paryāya for a long time as: sarvayakṣasbhūtamanuṣyavaśeṣkarāṇi, 'the subjugators of all yakṣas, bhūtas and men'; at 57.7 Vajrapāṇi says: tataḥ punah bhagavan nābhijānāmi yasya svapne 'pi sā dhāraṇī karapute nipatitāntargata tasya syāccharīre daurbalyam ... udakām va śastraṁ va viṣaṁ va garam va dākiṇī va bhūto va yakṣo va śatravo va manusyaṁ vāmanuṣyaḥ vā viheṭham vā kartum hīṃsāṁ vā vidhātum vā nedām sthānam vidyate: 'Then again, O Blessed One, in whose ear that dhāraṇī has fallen or entered, even in a dream, of him I do not know the bodily weakness ... the water or sword or poison or noxious drink or dākiṇī or bhūta or yakṣa or enemies or humans or non-humans that would be able to do him injury or effect harm. This situation does not occur.'
SR XI 40: bhūta-gaṇapīṭācarākṣasāḥ ca
parāma sudarśana ye ca māṃsabhākṣaḥ
te 'śya bhayu na jātu samajñentī
susukhāṃ dharma-svabhāvānu

And which are the most dreadful, flesh-eating
troops of bhūtaś and pīśācaś and rākṣasaś,
they never produce fear in him knowing
the very subtle own-being of dharmaṃ.

b. To these passages we might add a few others in which we can focus
more specifically on the terms kākhorḍa and vaśasā:

GP v 14b.6: punar aparāṃ kauṭika sacat sa kulaputro vā
kuladuhitā vā imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ udgrahisyati paryavāpasyati
dhārayisyati ... sarvākāra-jñātācittena cāvirahito bhaviṣyati
tasya kaścid abhaiṣajyam avakiret kākhorḍan vā kuryat, agnī-
khadām vopana-mayec chastreṇa vā dādyād visena vā dādyād udakena
vā ochorayet sarvaṃ tasya na kramisyati - tattasya hetoḥ
mahāvidyāyaṃ kauṭika yad uta prajñāpāramitā - anuttareyaṃ
kauṭika vidyā yaḥ uta prajñāpāramitā - niruttareyaṃ kauṭika
vidyā yaḥ uta prajñāpāramitā - atra ca vidyāyaṃ śikṣamāṇaḥ
kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā nātmavyāvādāya cetayate · na
paścālavyāvādāya cetayate · nabhayavyāvādāya cetayate ·

Agnī further, Kauṭika, if that son or daughter of good
family will take up this Perfection of Wisdom, will study,
will preserve it and will not be separated from a thought of
the knowledge of all modes, whosoever would sprinkle a drug
on him, or would make/perform a kākhorḍa, or would lead him
into a pit of fire, or would strike him with a sword, or would
present him with poison, or would throw him into th. water -
none of these will approach him. What is the reason for that?
This, Kauṭika, is a great spell, that is to say, the Perfection
of Wisdom. This Kauṭika, is the utmost spell, the highest spell,
that is to say, the Perfection of Wisdom. And training here in
that spell a son or daughter of good family does not intend
an injury to himself, does not intend an injury to others,
does not intend an injury to either.
Bkp 168.19: we read that if a certain mantrapada is recited in a town or city, etc., tatra te duṣṭayakṣakaṭapūtanāḥ tāṁ pūrva-vairāṇubaddhāṁ akuśalaṃkāryāṁ prajeyuh / maitrīkaruhāṃṛducitt[āḥ] sarvabhūtaddalījāpanāḥ hitacittā bhuvoyah / tāṁ ca sarvān rāṣṭrakutumbadevanāṃ yaksakaṭapūtanasaṃkṣobhāṁ sarva-candrasūryagrahanakṣatradsāvīṣastraḍāḥkhoradasāgkoḥ.ūn ... praśameyuh

... there those malignant yakṣas and kaṭapūtanās would abandon the performance of unmeritorious acts connected to their former animosity; they would come to be possessed of gentle thoughts of friendliness and compassion, arrived at pity towards all creatures, having thoughts of benefit; and all the disturbances from the devas, nāgas, yakṣas, and kaṭapūtanās of the kingdom and household, all disturbances from planets and stars, sun and moon, civil authority, poison, arms and kākhordas ... they would allay.

Śmd 100.9: here we find sarvakṛtya-kākhordavinaśani, 'the destroyer of all sorcery/sorceresses and kākhordas' as a 'name' of Śrī-mahādevī.

Sgt 2122.3 (text cited above p.159): Of those who 'will wholeheartedly reverence the Sāṃghaṭa-sūtra it is said "not by the sword will he die. Not by poison will he die. And a kākhorda will not affect him"

SP (Kern ed.) 450.2:
mantrābala-balavidya-aṇuṣadhi bhūtavetāla sarvanāśanāḥ
smarato avalokiteśvaraḥ tena gacchanti yataḥ pravartitāḥ /
mantras, powers, spells, and herbs, vetālas (through, or:) and bhūtas which destroy the body - from recollecting Avalokiteśvara they go there whence they came.

Kv 263.9: Yama calls Avalokiteśvara yaksaraṅgaśasabhūtapreta-
vetāladākinīkṣumbhāṅgaṃśarasamtrūsanakara.
Bbp 193-5-7: another of the eight benefits of worshipping, copying, etc., the text is: gan dag rgyed byed dan / byad dan / sgiigs dan / ro lahs gzhan rgyi gnod pa de dag do'i lus la gnod par mi 'gyur ba dan / 'which are the sorceries (kṛtya), the kākhordas, the mantras, the vetādas which harm others, they will not harm his body'.

Finally we have another passage from Bhg itself:

Bhg [20]: "The eighth untimely death is: those who die through the employment of poison, kākhordas and vetādas.

Neither vetāla/vetāda nor kākhorda admits of a very precise definition. Ruegg (review of Macdonald, Matériaux pour l'Étude de la littérature populaire tibétaine, I, ITJ 14 (1972) 137) says: "The Sanskrit word vetāla, which is often translated 'vampire', designates here more precisely a resurrected corpse or 'zombie', the Tibetan equivalent ro lahs meaning literally 'risen corpse'." But he adds in a note: "It may be noted that elsewhere, both in non-Buddhist usage ... and in Buddhist usage ... the term vetāla refers to the revivifying of a corpse, for example by introducing into it a pīḥāṇa" (cf. M.Mayrhofer, Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen, Bd III (Heidelberg: 1976) 255). That is to say, the term can be the name of either a 'thing' resulting from a 'magical' procedure, or the procedure itself. I have already indicated that I think something similar is true for kākhorda (G.Schopen, Review of Conze, The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom, IIJ 19 (1977) 141). Most recently, Mayrhofer (Kurzgefasstes, Bd III 670) defines kākhorda as "Zauberer, Hexenmeister / sorcerer" (see also the literature he cites which appears to confirm that it is an Iranian loanword). But this definition does not seem to fit well with GP v 1406.6, Bhg [10], and Bhg [20] where a kākhorda is something 'made' or 'performed' or 'used'. Here it would seem to be the name for a certain kind of evil charm or malediction, or a procedure involving the use of such a charm. This might also be the case -- judging by the other items enumerated along with it -- at SP 450.2, especially if we take bhūtavetāla as meaning 'the revivifying of corpses (vetāla) by means of bhūtas'; and it would also work well for Bkp 168.19 and Sgṭ 2122.3, where the term occurs in close conjunction with 'things', i.e. poison, swords, etc., and at
Smd 100.9, if kṛtya means here 'sorcery', and with the same condition at Ebp 193-5-7. The Tibetan translation of kākhorda is in this respect particularly interesting. It generally renders the term by byad or byad stems. Jhschke (A Tibetan-English Dictionary (London: 1881, 1968) 375) under byad gives: 1. "enemy"; 2. "a wicked demon"; 3. "also byad stem(s) ... imprecation, malediction, combined with sorcery, the name of an enemy being written on a slip of paper and hid in the ground, under various conjurations"; (dge bṣes chos kyi grags pas brtsems pa'i: brda dag mīn tshig gaz ba bẖugs so (Peking: 1957) 570: byad stems / dmod pa mthu rgyab nas gnod soñ zer.). As I have already said in IJ 19, Jhschke's third meaning could almost be a loose paraphrase of Bhg [10].

Admitting from the outset that the evidence is not conclusive either way, I would tentatively conclude from the above that in the majority of cases kākhorda probably refers to a particular kind of spell, charm, or malediction, or to the procedure in which such a spell is utilized; and secondarily to the 'thing', 'power', or 'creature' which is produced by that spell or procedure. It will, of course, be obvious that in the passages translated above I have either hedged my bets, or translated with this 'conclusion' already in mind.

c. In addition to the passages which present the general character of yaksas, rākṣasas, etc., there is another group which is of interest because it deals with one of their more specific activities, and because this particular activity is referred to on three separate occasions in Bhg. At Bhg [15] it is said that if an expectant mother performs a particular puja to Bhaisajyaguru, she will give birth to a son 'having all his limbs fully formed, handsome, beautiful, etc.'; and that "It will not be possible for his vital warmth to be snatched away by non-human beings (na tasya sākyam amānuṣaṇa ojo grahītum)"; at [13], of those who preserve the sūtra, the name, etc., of Bhaisajyaguru: "not for them will there be an untimely death, and it is not possible for their vital warmth to be stolen away by any means; or else, their vital warmth being stolen, they again recover it (... na ca kenač chakyaṃ ojopahartum, hṛtaṃ vā ojaḥ punaḥ pratyaharanti)"; and at [20]: "The third untimely death is: those who are excessively careless, dwelling in carelessness, non-human beings steal away their vital warmth (... teṣāṃ amānuṣā ojāṃ apaharanti)."
Bhp 193-5-6: Yet another of the eight benefits of worshipping, copying, etc., the text is: gan 'jig rten na mod sbyin dañ / 'byun po dañ / ña za mañs 'phrog pa de dañ thams end byams pa la gnas par 'gyur ba dañ /: 'which in the world are the yakgas and bhutas and písacés that steal away vital warmth, they all will come to dwell in friendliness (towards him)'.

SP (Korn ed.) 140.5:

saci ojanarai pariṣṭo yakṣanāgāsuvadhūtarākṣasaiḥ
smarato avalokiteśvaraṃ romakūpya na prabhonti hiṣāṇum //

'If (he) is surrounded by the yakgas, nāgas, asuras, bhūtas and rūṣanas which carry off (one's) vital warmth, from recollecting Avalokiteśvara they are not able to harm a hair (on his head)'.

Bhp 140.1: The Mahābrāhma Bhūteśvara asks the Buddha's sanction:
yad aham etarhi dharmabhānanām dhārmabrāvanīkānāṃ cārtī cādṛś[a] maṇtrapadāraṇāṃ bhāṣeta / yathā yoḥ kaścit paścime kāle mātīr vā mārāparśad vā devo vā nāga vā nāgī vā ... yāvat pīśāco vā pīśāci vā ... manuṣyo vā manuṣyaṃ vā dharmabhānakānāṃ dharma ṛavaṇīkānāṃ vā avatārapreṣi avatāraśaṃśaḥ pratyaṁikāḥ pratyatikāḥ pratyamitra vā upasaṃ-

kramāortaṣaḥ dharmabhānakānāṃ dhārmabrāvanīkānāṃ vā ekaṃnāmaṇaṃ api vā hiṣṭhayaṃ vihimsayed vipralapayet ojo vāhārec chvaṇam vā kāye prakṣipeṭalā dvṣṭitaṃ vā prekṣetāntasāḥ chakṣaṇam api teṣāṃ ahaṃ mārāparṣad vā pīśāco vā pīśāci vā manuṣyaṃ manuṣyaṃ pratiṣedhāṇaṃ dāṇḍaṇagrahaṃ vā kuryāṃ jambhanam mohanaṃ śapathaṃ dadyāṃ //

So that I now may declare such protection through maṇtrapadās for the sake of the reciters of dharma and the hearers of dharma in order that, in the last time, whatsoever mūra or assembly of mūra or deva or nāga or nāgī ... up to: (whatsoever) pīśācā or pīśāci or human or non-human being, watching for, seeking for a chance to do harm, an enemy, an opponent, would approach those reciters of dharma (and) hearers of dharma, would hurt, harm, or injure even as little as a single hair (on the head) of those reciters and hearers of dharmas, or would carry off their vital warmth, or would project their breath into their body (lus la ḏbugs chen po gtoṅ ḏam), or would look at them with a malignant thought for even a single moment,
I would repulse or punish and contain those maras, up to: those human and non-human beings, I would crush, confuse and curse them. (cf. Bk p 144.8f; 166.18f).

CP (Kimura ed., II-3) 239.14: evam eva kauśika tasya kula-putrasya vā kuladuhitir vā na balavatya śāhare gṛdhir bhavisyati. tat kasya hetos. tathā hi tasyāmanusya ojaḥ kāya upasamparanti. ye cāpi daśasu dīkṣu buddhā bhagavantas te 'pi sadevanāgauyakṣa-gandharvāsurarudakīmnarāmahoragāḥ ojaḥ kāye prakṣiptanti, inmā sa kauśika kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā dṛṣṭādāharmikāṃ gauṣaṃ pari-gṛṇīte ye imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ udṛṣṭiṃ paryavāpnoti dhārayati vācayati yoniśaṃ ca manasikaroti avirahitaṃ ca sarvajñatācittena.

Just so, Kauśika, of that son or daughter of good family there will not be a strong desire for food. What is the reason for that? For just as non-human beings carry away the vital warmth in his body, which are the Buddhas, the Blessed Ones in the ten directions, they together with the devas, nāgas, yakṣas, gandharvas, asuras, garudas, kimnaras and mahoragas project vital warmth into his body. Kauśika, that son or daughter of good family gains this quality here-and-now who takes up this Perfection of Wisdom, studies, preserves, etc., it, and who is not separated from the thought of all knowledge.


d. The picture which all of the above passages present is, however, only half of the total picture. For, although our reader at Gilgit would have been very familiar with devatās, yakṣas, rākṣasas, etc., and would have been well aware of their malignant nature and potential threat, he would also have known them in a different role. This is clear from two further passages in Bhg.

Bhg [21]: Here the twelve great yakṣa generals, each surrounded by thousands of yakṣas, say: "Through the power of the
Buddha the name of the Blessed One Bhaisajyaguruvaishravyaprabha, the Tathāgata, was heard by us; for us there is no longer the fear of an unfortunate destiny. We all together, for as long as we live, go to the Buddha for refuge, we go to the Dharma for refuge, we go to the Sangha for refuge; we will be zealous for the benefit, advantage and ease of all beings. Especially the village or city or district or forest dwelling where this sūtra will circulate; or he who will preserve the name of the Blessed One Bhaisajyaguruvaishravyaprabha, the Tathāgata; we will indeed protect those; we will free them from all misfortune; we will fulfil all their hopes.

*Bhp [13]: "The Four Great Kings together with their retinues, and host of hundreds of thousands of other devatās will approach there where this sūtra will circulate".

Of the many similar passages from other texts at Gālīt we might note the following:

SP 177.26: atha khalu tāmā ca nāma rākṣasī, vilambā ca nāma rākṣasī, kuṭadantī ca nāma rākṣasī, puṣpadantī ca nāma rākṣasī ... sarvasattvaucarjārīṇī ca nāma rākṣasī, hārītī ca saputraparipārā. ettāḥ sarvāḥ rākṣasāḥ yena bhagavān tenaupamakṛyttam upasaṃkramaṇa sarvān tā rākṣasān ekaśvareṇa bhagavantam etad avocat: veyo aprī bhagavāma teśām evamrūpānhāṃ sūtrāntadührākānāṃ dharmaṁbhūpakaṇāṃ rākṣaṇaraṇāpupūtan karīṣyaāh svayamātanāḥ ca karīṣyāno [cyathā] utamaḥ dharmabhūpakaṇānaḥ na kaścid adevārakopakāya advaṭānścavagavya avatāreṇ lopaṃyāhī ... yānā va rākṣasā vā pretā vā pīśāco vā pūtanā vā kṛtyāḥ vā voṭāni vā, vā, etc.

Then further the rākṣāsās named Lāmbā, Viḷambā, Kuṭadantī, Puṣpadantī, ... and the rākṣāsī named Sarvasattvaucarjārīṇī (N.B. 'The Stealer of the Vital Warmth of All Beings'), and Hārītī surrounded by her sons - all these rākṣasās approached there where the Blessed One was; having approached, all those rākṣasās said this with a single voice to the Blessed One: 'We also, 0 Blessed One, will guard, protect and shelter such preservers of the sūtras and reciters of dharma, and we will effect their success in such a way that no one watching for, seeking for a
chance to do harm to those reciters of dharma will obtain a chance ...

neither yakṣa, rakṣasa, preta, pīśāca, pūtana, kṛṣṇa, nor vṛtā, etc. [In the course of this declaration the rakṣasīs give dhāraṇī-padas for the stated purposes to the Buddha].

Stā 71.1: atha khalv anopamā mahāyāksīni yena bhagavāṁ

tenopasarasakramāt. bhagavantaṁ nāṇāpuṣpaduṣṭayugair ācārādyā
bhagavā-ḥ pādayor nipatyā bhagavantam etad avocat. evam samarāmy
aham bhagavan mayā bhagavataḥ kaustubhyām ghōsilasyārāme viharataḥ
purataḥ pratijā samudāhṛtā sarvasattvānām arthāya. aham api
bhagavan sarvādyādharāṇām ṝṣiṇaya jānāmi. ten me bhagavān
mujñāntāt bhuhayahitiya bhuhayasukhāya sarvādyāpīṭurṣārthāya
bhikṣṭuḥṣaṇyapāsakapāsikānāṁ ca.

Then further the Mahāyāksīni Anopamā approached there where
the Blessed One was. Having covered the Blessed One with various
flowers and double lengths of fine cloth, having fallen at the
feet of the Blessed One, she said this to him: 'I, O Blessed One,
remember thus: by me in the presence of the Blessed One when he
was dwelling in Kañṭāśī, in the arāma of Ghośīla, a promise was
declared for the benefit of all beings. I know the 'heart' of
all 'magicians'. May the Blessed One consent to (my giving) that
for the benefit and ease of many men, and for the sake of fulfilling
all the hopes of the monks, nuns, lay men and women! [Then follows
the Ṝṣiṇaya].

[On vidyādhara, 'magician', an old Buddhist term and functionary, see
H. Lidders, "Die Vidyādhāras in der buddhistischen Literatur und Kunst",
Kleine Schriften (Wiesbaden: 1973) 104-19].

GP v 142a.3; Kimura ed., II-2 504.7: punar apraṃ kauśika
yatreyam prajñāpāramitā likhitvā dhārayīṣyatī nodgraḥīṣyate √ na
svādhāryāṣyate √ na bhāvāṣyate na paryāṣyate na yoniso
manasikāryāsyate √ na punas tatra grhe vā grāme vā nagare vā
manuṣya vāmanuṣyo vāvataṃprekṣy avatāraṃ lāpsyante √ tattasya
heto √ tathā hy atra prajñāpāramitāyām [Nepalese ed. inserts here:
pūjā 'ṛṣṭhvāl ye tisa : hārasiṃha Thasre lokadhātou cāturmahārāja-
kāyikā devaputrā yāvat agraṇiṣṭṭhadevaputrā ye pu aprameyāsanka-
hyeyesu lokadhātou(ṣu) cāturmahārājākā devaputrā yāvad agraṇiṣṭṭhā-
devaputras te teśam kulaputrapām kuladuhī"-iṇāmp ca rakṣāvaraṇa-gupti[m] samvidhāṅgantī te ca devaputra śatymāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ saktiḥṣya gurukṛtavyā mānāyitvā pūjāyitvāgamīgyantī [Nepalese: prati-gamiṇīyantī] ya imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ likhitvā dhārayīgyati tasyeyo drṣṭadūrnikā guṇānuśaṃsā bhaviṣyantī.

Again further, Kauśīka, where one, after having written down this Perfection of Wisdom, will preserve it, (even though) he will not take it up, nor study it, nor develop it, nor pursue it, nor fix it well in his mind, there in that house or village or city a human or non-human being watching for a chance to do harm will not obtain a chance. What is the reason for that? Just here near the Perfection of Wisdom the Cāturmalārūjakāyika devaputras, up to: Aghanīṭhadevaputras in the three-thousand-great-thousand-world-sphere, as well as in immeasurable and incalculable other world-spheres, they will look after the guarding, protection and shelter of those sons and daughters of good family. And those devaputras having come there, having honored, revered, paid homage to and worshipped this Perfection of Wisdom, will come again. These are the qualities and blessings here-and-now for him who, after having written down this Perfectio. of Wisdom, will preserve it.

An even more elabor. te versi.on of this kind of passage is found a little later at CP (Kimura ed. II-3) 243.26f. Two of the elaborations found there are worth noting. At 242.25 it is said that the devas from the various world-spheres will come and 'look after the guarding, protection and shelter of the individual' so that nāpy asya kaścit avatārapraśā avatār-gavoṣi avatāram lapayate sthāpayitvā pūrvalaṁvīpaṁ: 'no one watching for, seeking for a chance to harm him will obtain a chance, except as a result of the maturation of the individual's past action' (cf. above p.182). And at 241.4 Śakra, after being told that the devas will come to that spot, says to the Buddha: katha bharāvan kuḷa-puṭro vā kuḷa-duhitā vā jñāṣyati iha cāturmalārūjakāyikā devaputra āgaṇa-chantī yēvaśe śaṇiṣṭhā devaputra āgaṇchantī ... imāṃ prajñāpāramitām udghaṭitum vā ... pūjāyitum vā ... [and the Buddha replies:] saacet kauṇika kuḷa-puṭro vā kuḷa-duhitā vā udārām evaḥhaṃsa jñāṣyantī ... amānuṣam divyaṃ gandham anāgraṭa-pūrvarm āgraṣyati nāṣṭhā tetā gantavyā mahā-jāskā mahānuṭjāskā iha devaputra āgaṇā iti prajñā-
Blessed One, will a son or daughter of good family know The Caturmaharājaśakñika devaputras have come here, up to: the Akanīṣṭha devaputras have come here ... to take up this Perfection of Wisdom ... or to worship it? [The Buddha replies:] 'If Kauśika, a son or daughter of good family shall become aware of a great radiance ... (if) he shall smell a non-human, heavenly perfume not smelled before, he should come to this conclusion: 'devatās having very great vital warmth have come here to recite ... to worship the Perfection of Wisdom'.

And which on that spot of earth are the devatās having only very little vital warmth, they think it best to retreat from there, being unable to endure the splendor and radiance of those devatās with very great vital warmth. And the more those devatās having very great vital warmth will approach, the more those sons and daughters of good family will come to be such as have a great resolve.

In addition to longer passages of this kind we might also note: SE 334.4, XXVIII 2,4, where one of the ten 'blessings' of a bodhisattva who is established in patience (kṣānti) and dwells in friendliness is that devas, nāgas and yakṣas protect him; SR 335.15, XXVIII 7, 13, where one of the ten 'blessings' of a bodhisattva who has undertaken vigor (ārabdhavīryasya) is that he is taken care of by the devatās (devatā-parighita); virtually the same thing is said of one who preserves the Samādhi-śūkṣa-sūtra; at SR XXVIII 84, and at XXX 8 who preserves SR is said to be protected and attended by devas, nāgas, asuras and yakṣas; at StA 53.16 he who worships, preserves, etc., the text is said to be protected by devas; at ŚmD 94.15 it is said of one who will preserve the stotra named The One Hundred and Eight Pure Raises of Śrī-mahādevi' (āriyā mahādevyā niṣṭottarāṇam satam vimalapraṇāhyam nāma stotram) that tasya ca rājñāḥ kṣatriyasya ghe śrīr nivasiṣyati: 'Śrī will dwell in the house of that kṣatriya king'; at Kv 299.1 it is said of a dharma-reciter who preserves the śadākṣari: upasamkrāmanti brahmāviṣṇumahēśvara-candrádityaṃvīvunāmāṇyo yann ca dharmarājo 'nye ca rātvaro mahā-rājñāḥ; see also SP 140.32f; SP (Kern ed.) 288.11; etc. etc.
e. I have cited these passages at such length for a number of reasons. First because they are in our modern sources usually ignored or passed over in a line or two. There is, I think, a very real reluctance on the part of Western scholars to admit that the people who read or wrote texts such as GP or SR actually believed in yakṣas and rākṣasas who stole away one's vital warmth; and yet those same texts continually show this cultural myopia for what it is. Second, such passages are a prominent part of Bhg (involving [10], [13], [15], [20], and [21]) and the Buddhism of Gilgit as a whole. Third, by looking at a sufficiently large sample of such passages some very interesting patterns begin to emerge. We might here collect and expand some of the points which are suggested by an analysis of the above material.

1) The literature available to an individual at Gilgit is saturated with references to devatās, nāgas, yakṣas, rākṣasas, etc. Both the number and nature of these references indicate that fear, especially fear of death as personified in these 'beings', was a prominent, if not pathological component in the Buddhism available at Gilgit.

2) These beings were either a direct threat to the individual, or offered protection from a threat. Again, in either case their presence indicates a predominantly fearful attitude towards one's environment.

3) The magnitude of the threat and the pervasiveness of the fear are indicated by the multiplicity of means intended to cope with them.

4) For protection from devatās, yakṣas, kākhordas and vetādās - whether these last were kinds of charms or magical procedures, or the 'thing' produced by those procedures - the individual could have recourse to the giving of gifts to the Samgha (Ad 118.1-4), hearing the name of Bhaigajyaguru (Bhg [10], [20]), 'recollecting' Avalokita (SP (Kern) 450.2, Kv 263.9), or Śrī-mahādevī (ŚmD 100.9), worshipping copying, preserving, or studying a dharmaparyaya (Sgt 2122.3, Bhp 193-5-7, Ci' v 140b.6) or reciting or hearing a dhāraṇī or mantra padmas (Eka 38.2, SP 157.2, Sīa 55.13, 57.7, Rkp 168.19), or finally, understanding the own-being of dharmas (SR XI 40).

5) While our texts are very often content to simply indicate that such 'beings' were a constant threat to the individual's life, in a number of cases one particular form in which this threat was realized
is singled out. This is the theft of one's vital warmth by devas, yaksas, etc. Here again the individual had recourse to a number of means to prevent such a theft: he could direct pūjā towards Bhaisajyaguru (Bhg [15]) or preserve his name (Bhg [13]); he could worship, preserve, or study a text (Bhg [131], Bṛp 193-5-6, GP (Kimura) 239.14); he could 'recollect' Avalokīta (ŚŚ [Kern] 430.5) or he could recite a dhāraṇī (Ṛkp 140.1).

6) But if the individual required protection from such 'beings', he was also able to acquire protection by or through such 'beings'. In a number of cases we even have yakṣas and rākṣasas protecting the individual from other yakṣas and rākṣasas (ŚP 157.6, STĀ 71.1). Once again the individual could obtain the protection of these beings in a number of ways: he could preserve or worship a text (Bhg [13], [21], Gīt v 142a3, GP (Kimura) 243.26f, FR XXVIII 84, XXX 8, STĀ 53.16, ātt. 94.15, SP 140.32); he could recite or preserve a dhāraṇī (ŚP 157.26, STĀ 71.1, RV 298.1); or he could practice patience, friendliness and vigor (ŚR 334.4, 335.17).

7) This multiplicity of the means intended to cope with these 'beings' is yet another example of what I have called the process of generalization. Expressed differently, we can say that these 'means' or activities are functionally interchangeable, or functionally equivalent. This in turn has important implications for at least one of these activities: the recitation of dhāraṇīs (under which term I lump mantras, mantrapadās, vidyās, etc.). It is clear from our passages that the recitation of dhāraṇīs here belongs to the same category of religious activity as do the giving of ams to the monks, reciting, copying, worshipping texts, preserving the name of Bhaisajyaguru, etc. It differs neither in kind nor quality. All these activities are public, open to all, require no initiation or guru and are concerned with karmatic goals. They all - including in every way the recitation of dhāraṇīs - are non-tantric, if by tantric we mean that system which is secret, esoteric, requiring both complex initiations and the presence of the Guru, and whose immediate goal is bodhi. And these, I think, are the essential definitional characteristics of what can be legitimately called Buddhist Tantrism. Because of its accidental importance for Bhg, and because of its real importance for the characterization of Gilgit Buddhism as a whole, we must expand a little on this point.
Bhg [10] has given rise to an unfortunate characterization of the text as a whole. Dutt summarizes [10] in the following terms: "There are also some who slander others (paśünyābhirata) and instigate people to quarrel among themselves, or kill animals, or practise dreadful (Tantric) practices (ghoravidyām) and so forth;..." (GMs i 55). This becomes, a few years later: "It [Bhg] seems to be one of the late sūtras, the subject of which gradually shifted from philosophical matters to worldly things such as evil doers and protection from them. We find here [the] beginnings of later Tantric sūtras." P.L.Vaidya, Mahāyāna-Sūtra-Saṃghrāha, Part I (Darbhanga: 1961) xiv). A few years later still we find: "This text [Bhg] shows [the] unmistakable influence of Tantricism. It refers to dreadful Tantrika practices, and spells, and includes Ṛkṣasas among deities that were worshipped; those who eat flesh and blood, frequent cemetery and perform sādhanas, ghora vidyās, are also described." (L.Joshi, Studies in the Buddhistic Culture of India (New Delhi: 1967) 319.) The kindest thing that can be said of this series of observations is that it probably results from an unduly sloppy use of the term tantric. Fortunately, a more recent characterization is more accurate. Wayman (Kailash 1 (1973) 157) says: "For example, the scripture which Liebenthal translated from Hsuan-tsang's Chinese rendition under the title, The Sutra of the Lord of Healing (Peiping, 1936), is simply Mahāyāna Buddhism with no admixture of tantric elements, such as incantations." Wayman was apparently unaware of the Sanskrit text of Bhg first published in 1936, and there is in fact a dharani in at least some editions of Hsuan-tsang's text (see buddhist Text Information, No.12 (1977) 11), but in spite of this his characterization is, as I have said, more accurate. I would question it on only one point. He clearly implies that the presence of "incantations" (by which I assume he means dharanaś, mantrapadas, etc.) is a definitional characteristic of that which is 'tantric'. But that this is not the case is gradually being recognized. Already many years ago Waley pointed out that "Just as European writers have tended to connect the practice of Dhyāna solely with the establishment of a separate Dhyāna sect, so they have also tended to connect the use of dharanī (magic word-formulae) only with the esoteric doctrines of the Vairocana sect [n.2: I give this name to what in Japan is called 'Shingon' and in India 'the Vaijayanā'], which did not become established in China until so late a date as the
eighth century. In fact, however, scriptures centering round the use
of spells figure very largely in the lists of works translated in Chinese
even as early as the second century A.D.... Out of this literature grew
what we may call Dhāraṇī Buddhism ... The Buddhism of Tun-huang, then,
as reflected in its paintings and manuscripts is compounded of these two
elements (1) the cult of the Paradises, (2) the dhāraṇī cults." (A. Waley,
A Catalogue of Paintings Recovered from Tun-huang by Sir Aurel Stein
(London: 1931) xiii-xiv). More recently Williams has said: "Similar to
the Swamīprabhāsottama in its mixed doctrine is the Inquiry of Vimala-
prabha... This work also contains an unusually large number of dhāraṇīs,
designed to avert disasters such as those narrated in the sūtra. The
Buddhism of these scriptures which were particularly current in Khotan,
can be described as a kind of proto-tantra. This transitional phase of
doctrine in the 8th century seems not yet to have evolved into Tantra
as it is known in Japan and later Tibet but differs from simple Mahāyāna"
(J. Williams, "The Iconography of Khotanese Painting", East and West 23
(1973) 115). Both Waley and Williams, as I read them, want to distinguish
between a Buddhism which knows and uses dhāraṇīs, and Tantric Buddhism
as such. This, of course, agrees in large part with what I have given
above as the situation at Gilgit. I would only add that both Waley and
Williams give too great an emphasis to the dhāraṇī by itself and thus
fail to take into account the fact that it is, as we have seen, only
one of several functionally interchangeable 'devices' available to the
individual, and is therefore only one part of a larger whole. And this
whole, if I am not mistaken, is what I have called karmatic Buddhism.
For in the same way that the practice of 'medicine', the concern for
a favorable rebirth, the fear of death, poverty, etc., are fully inte-
grated parts of karmatic Buddhism, so too is this use of dhāraṇīs.
This is perhaps further confirmed by the fact that a number of the texts
found at Gilgit which are easily classed as karmatic are of the same
kind - in whole or part - as those mentioned by Waley and Williams,
(e.g. the Swamīprabhāsottara). This is true of Stā, Rka, Rki, Ku,
Hkp, etc. It should also be added here that but for what is undoubtedly
a major weakness in my 'survey' of the Buddhism of Gilgit, such texts
would be seen to have had an even more prominent place there. For
example, there are four Ms of the Mahāpratiṣṭānāvidyārāja in the Gilgit
collection (GBM nos 6, 14, 15 and 19; formerly given the title
Mahāvidyārāja-hādyaya, -dhāraṇī, etc.); at least one Ms. of the
Mahāmaṇḍūkī (M.S.Kaul Shastri, "Report on the Gilgit Excavation in 1938", Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society 30 (1979) 11-12, pl.1443; N.P. Chakravarti, "Hutun Rock Inscription of Patoladeva", Epigraphia Indica 30 (1953-54) 228-29. The whereabouts of this, and a few other Mss. from Gilgit remains a mystery; cf. R.A.Cumatilaka, "A Short Introduction to the Four Incomplete Manuscripts of the 'Samghāṭa-sūtra' kept in the National Archives, New Delhi", Studies in Indo-Asian Art and Culture I (New Delhi: 1972) 75-76. Since one of those missing Mss. is a Ms. of the Samghāṭa-sūtra, a recent article which I have not been able to see, might clear up part of the mystery: O.von Hindber, "The Gilgit Samghāṭa-sūtra in the S.P.S.Museum, Srinagar", Jammu and Kashmir State Research Bimonthl TI No.2 (1976) 40-42. A new edition of the Mahāmaṇḍūkī based on four Nepalese Mss. belonging to the University of Tokyo has recently been published in Japan: S.Takubo, Ārya-Mahā-Maṇḍūkī Viṣṇu-Rāja (Tokyo: 1972); one Ms. of the Hayagrīva-viṣṇu (GMs i 43-46); etc. I have for various reasons included none of these in my 'survey'.

Out of all this at least two important 'conclusions' emerge, one important for the characterization of Gilgit Buddhism, the other of potentially wider significance. The first is that although dhāraṇīs are a significant presence in the Buddhism of Gilgit, there is probably nothing which could be called 'tantric', if we mean by 'tantric' 'that system which is secret, esoteric, requiring both complex initiations and the presence of the Guru, and whose immediate goal is bodhi'. The second is that it appears that the 'Buddhisms' of Gilgit, Tun-huang and Khotan exhibited roughly the same configuration of elements at roughly the same time (say from the 5th to the 8th centuries). This suggests at least the possibility of establishing a definite periodization in the history of Mahāyāna. This in turn could have important consequences for the study of early Tibetan Buddhism given the known contact during this period between Tibet, Gilgit, Khotan and Tun-huang (a re-assessment of this period in the history of Tibetan Buddhism has already been initiated in an interesting article by P.Kvaerne, "Aspects of the Origin of the Buddhist Tradition in Tibet", Numen 19 (1972) 22-40).

This having been something of a digression we must now return to our summary of the points suggested by Bhg [10] and similar passages.

8) In a number of the passages I have cited concerning the means available for protection against yakṣas, rākṣasas, etc., it is stated
that the primary effect of reciting the dhāraṇī, worshipping the text, etc. is that it produces thoughts of friendliness, pity, helpfulness, in the yakṣa or rākṣasa or 'being' who is threatening the individual. This is the case in Eka 38.2, Rkp 168.19, Bbp 193-3-6, StA 50.3, and, in light of these, probably Bhg [10]. And this pattern is an old one, found already in some of the early parittas (cf. C.A.F. Rhys Davids’ introduction to the translation of the Aṭṭhakathā-suttaṇa, T.N. and C.A.F. Rhys Davids, Dialogues of the Buddha, Part III (Oxford: 1921) 184-87; E. Waldschmidt, Das Upasenasūtra, ein Wider der Schlange aus dem Samyuktāgama, Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-hist.Klasse, Nr. 2, 1957, 27-44). It is interesting to note in light of our discussion under (7) that probably no one would be willing to describe either the Aṭṭhakathā-suttaṇa or the Upasenasūtra as 'tantric', and yet they are in fundamentals in no way different from texts like Eka or SmD. All these texts clearly belong to the same genre.

9) As I have said above, there appears to be a reluctance on the part of many modern interpreters of Buddhism to admit that the readers and writers of texts like St and UP actually believed in and were fearful of yakṣas and rākṣasas, and yet we find at UP (Kimura) 239.14 and UP v 140b.6 the assurance given that if one takes up, studies, fixes one's mind on – not, be it noted, if one copies, worships, etc. – the Perfection of Wisdom, then he will retain his vital warmth, and will be protected from fire, swords, poison, kākhordas, etc. And at St 334.4, 335.15, and XI 40 that if one is established in patience, understands the own-being of dharmas, etc., he will be protected from and not be frightened by flesh-eating rākṣasas, etc. And such passages could easily be multiplied. I think, therefore, that it is impossible to deny that such concerns were an integral part of the Buddhist experience at all levels, and that if we ignore this dimension we produce a picture of Buddhism which only a caricature of our own provincial outlook.

10) The final point to be noted here is perhaps an obvious one. The transition from Bhg [7], [8], and [9] to Bhg [10] may at first sight appear to be rather abrupt; it may appear that we have moved from one topic to another of quite different character. But if, as I have already suggested, the ultimate concern of our text – and by extension of karmatic Buddhism as a whole – is death and the fear of death, this transition is perfectly natural. Since death confronts the individual as either
potentially imminent although temporarily avoidable, or as unavoidably present, the response to the fear of death must necessarily come in two forms: it must assure the individual that that potential imminence will not be immediately realized; or it must assure the individual that if death is unavoidably present, its consequence (i.e. rebirth) will be favorable. *Bhy* [7], [8], and [9] are examples of the second form in which the response occurs, while *Bhy* [10] is an example of the first. Virtually all our karmatic texts, like *Bhy*, continually modulate their basic response from one form to another and back again.
Again further, these four assemblies - monks, nuns, lay men and women - and which\(^1\) believing sons or daughters of good family fast the fast possessed of eight limbs, for one year or three months\(^2\) uphold the foundation of training, whose intention, whose vow is thus: 'May we through this root of merit, in the western direction, in the world-sphere Sukhavati, be reborn where the Tathāgata Amitāyus\(^3\) is' - by which of these the name of the Blessed One Bhaisajyaguruśūlīgpuruṣa, the Tathāgata, will have been heard, to them at the moment of death, eight bodhisattvas, having come through magic power, will make visible the way; they, miraculously born, will appear there [in Sukhavati] in many colored rites. Some will also be reborn in the world of devas; of those reborn there that forever root of merit is (still) not exhausted and there will be no undergoing of an unfortunate destiny\(^4\). They, having paused away from there, will come to be kings here in the world of men, lords of the four continents, wheeled-wheelers, and they will establish several kosīs of nīyutas of hundreds of thousands of beings in the ten meritorious paths of action. Others again will be reborn in the houses of great kṣatriya families, of great householder families, of great brāhmaṇa families, in families having abundant wealth and grain and treasure, and stores and prosperity. They will come to be accomplished in form, accomplished in lordship, accomplished in followers, champions, heroes, possessing the force and power of great athletes.

\(^{1)}\) V, X, Śīkṣ and T: 'and which other'. \(^{2)}\) Śīkṣ: 'or three years'. \(^{3)}\) Śīkṣ: Amitānha. \(^{4)}\) Śīkṣ: 'and there will be no fear of an unfortunate destiny or downfall'.


1. The first thing to be noted here is that for reasons which have more to do with the history of Buddhist Studies than with the history of Buddhism, there is a persistent tendency to associate a figure like that of Bhaisajyaguru exclusively with 'lay Buddhism', as opposed to 'monastic Buddhism'. Our text, however, makes it clear that such an association can in no way be maintained. Two of the situations outlined in the text in which the power of the vow of Bhaisajyaguru is potentially active - [11] and [15] - are explicitly and unmistakably those of monastic members of the Buddhist community; and a third, [8], is almost certainly also concerned primarily with monks and nuns. This in itself is enough to indicate that if there was a cult of Bhaisajyaguru, it was as much a 'monastic' cult as it was a 'lay' cult.

And this same pattern is found again and again throughout our texts. It can be seen, for example - and I will restrict myself to passages already cited - at Rhp 193-5-4 (see above p.220) where the eight 'blessings' from preserving, worshipping, etc. the text are said to be for 'sons or daughters of good family, kings, ministers, monks, nuns, lay men and women'; at Rhp 137.5 (see above p.218) where the ritualized recitation of a dhāraṇī for protection from various disease is to be undertaken by a 'son or daughter of good family, or a bhikṣu or bhikṣuṇī, or lay man or woman'; at Nidž 71.1 (above p.266) where a dhāraṇī is given 'for the benefit and case of many men, and for the sake of fulfilling all the hopes of the monks, nuns, lay men and women', etc., etc. When we add to passages of this kind the fact that in the majority of cases our texts are addressed simply to kula-puṭhas and kuladūtis, and that these terms generally "fail to distinguish between the priesthood and the lay follower" (A. Hirakawa, "The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism and Its Relationship to the Worship of Stūpas", Memoirs of the Toyo Bunko 22 (1963) 71; also 73), the point is even more firmly established. It is also worth noting that this is by no means a new situation. The आज्ञात्यं नूतनं (i.e., its dhāraṇīs) is on several occasions explicitly said to be intended for 'bhikṣus, bhikṣuṇīs, lay men and women' (U lli 195, 203, 204, 205); likewise the उपामयाकुलम् is clearly intended for monks. All of this goes to support a recent, and hopefully a continuing trend to question the distinction between a 'lay or popular Buddhism' and 'monastic Buddhism' as a false one. Two good examples of this trend - made, be it noted, from very different points of view, and in reference to widely separated geographical locations -
are worth quoting:

"I find this term ['popular'] dangerously misleading. It implies, I think, a decline by most people, the plebe, from an ideal standard which is maintained by a few spiritual aristocrats, a relationship analogous to that between 'popular' and 'classical' music. By some it might even be understood to imply the religion of the laity as distinct from that of monks. To this latter assumption, which would be especially erroneous, I shall return below ... Monks fought in Dutugemunu's army and sanctioned what he did. And how many Buddhists in Ceylon, even in this post-Dharmapala era, never take part in piriț or transfer merit, practices they brand as 'popular'? I think the only sense in which it is accurate to describe these beliefs and practices as 'popular' is the everyday one of 'widely liked' or 'prevalent'. But if so used 'popular' no longer distinguishes merit transference from, say, the Four Noble Truths or alms-giving."

"In this context reference is made also to a so-called 'lay-Buddhism'. The use of the terms 'Volkreligion' and 'lakenbuddhismus' is no doubt justifiable, although just what they refer to is in the last analysis often not altogether clear, and it is necessary explicitly to exclude any misunderstanding which might lead to the idea that these 'popular' forms belong exclusively, or at least predominantly, to the laity alone. In fact the concepts treated in this chapter are known to, and accepted by, even some of the most learned and orthodox monks; and the fact that they assign such concepts to the worldly ('jig rten pa = lankika) level of convention (tha śāñḍa = vyavāhāra) and surface truth (kun rjöb = saṃvärti), rather than to the level of absolute reality, does not change the fact that they do countenance them; indeed they assign the whole of the conditioned ('dus byas = saṃskṛta) - including their own monastic and philosophic conventions - to this very level. (Conversely, it is not impossible for a layman to show little interest in the so-called lay or popular Buddhism.) Contact with both monks and laymen thus leads one to the conviction
that the familiar concept of 'popular' and 'lay' Buddhism remains in need of more precise structural definition ...


The question here is, of course, directly related to that discussed above concerning the reluctance to admit that the readers and writers of texts like SP and CP actually believed in and were threatened by yakṣas and rākṣasas.

* * * * *

b. I have elsewhere written at some length on BR 11 (ITT 19 (1977) 177-210) and although I do not wish to repeat myself I think it is worthwhile to at least summarize here what I have said. I began by noting that the presence of a passage promising assistance to those seeking rebirth in Sukhavati in a text devoted to Bhaṭajñāguru who has his own buddhafield looks, at first sight, decidedly odd. But I also noted that there were a number of similar or parallel passages from other texts, and that when these other passages are taken into account this oddness substantially disappears. The majority of these similar passages come from Gilgit texts. At Aj 105.13 one of the 'blessings' conferred on those 'who would hear or preserve the name of the protector of the world (i.e. Śākyamuni)' is that "he goes to the buddhafield Sukhavatī"; at Aj 106.14 it is said that "through only the entrance of the Blessed One (i.e., Śākyamuni) into the great city of Śrāvastī ninety nine kotis of nityatas of hundreds of thousands of beings were established in the world-sphere Sukhavatī"; at Aj 126.6 of him 'who gives gifts to the community of monks'..."he goes quickly to that Sukhavatī, to the most excellent buddhafield of Amitāyus". Rebirth in Sukhavatī is said to result from hearing and obtaining a chapter from SP (SP 167.17); from hearing KV (KV 306.33); from hearing, having faith in, copying, worshipping, etc. KV (KV 269.15); from preserving STA (STA 64.6); from hearing SR and preserving the Good Law (SR XVIII 52); from preserving even a single four-lined gāthā from SR (SR XI 49); from hearing and then preserving SR (SR II 28); from reciting Rkā (Rkā 37.11); from worshipping STA (STA 53.5); from performing pūjā to "all the Tathāgatas in the ten directions" (STA 56.11). It is also said to be achieved by
one 'to whom SR is dear', 'who is established in and preserves it', 'who has abandoned all perceptions', is "concentrated", etc. (SR XXXII 268f); and by one who has "obtained the stage of the disciplined", who "realizes the analytical knowing", etc. (SR XXVII 67f). After looking at these passages (and one from the Aparimitāyura-Śrīva-śūtra and the bhadravatīvijnānādīśa) I framed my 'conclusions' in the following way:

"In this sense, then, it must be obvious that the present paper is in no way intended as a complete and systematic study of the phenomenon in question. We have here attempted only to collect enough passages to establish the general currency and basic outline of a peculiar usage of the idea of rebirth in Sukhāvatī, a usage in which it appears that rebirth in Sukhāvatī has become disassociated from a specific cult of Amitābha and has become instead one of a number of generalized rewards or 'blessings' associated with such a wide variety of religious acts that it is virtually open to any member of the Mahāyāna community as a whole."

Now, although I think that it in no way affects the basic interpretation of these passages which I developed in IJJ 19, I must note here a weakness in my treatment there of Kv. This weakness involves two aspects. The first centers on the fact that I was very incomplete in my citations from Kv. In addition to 269.15 and 306.33, similar passages concerning Sukhāvatī are found at 264.11 (tadā tasya [Avalokita] sukhāvyaḥ kāraṇāvyaḥ saññita apratīdra: nāmabhūmatā bhūyanti, tadā teṣaḥ ithe dwellers in pretanavāral vijñānatisāpa samādhiṣṭoṁ sattvadṛṣṭaṁ śāyaṁ jñānavajraḥ bhātvāc sarve te sukhāvatīyāṁ lokadhatvā upapannāḥ), 268.6 (ye avalokiteśvaraṁ ... nāma-bhūyāṁ anumāraṇti ... gacchanti sukhāvatī-lokadhatāṁ amitābhayaṁ tathāgataṁya naśmukham dharmaśravānarāha), 271.20 (cited above p.244), 275.21 (sacchanāṁ te sattvā ye tava nāma-bhūyāṁ anumāraṇti, gacchanti te sukhāvatī-lokadhatāṁ, amitābhayaṁ tathāgataṁya dharmaṁ anumāraṇti śrīvanti), 276.25 (spoken by Avalokita to Bali: api ca mahāraja maṁmaṁkād dharmaśeṣanaṁ śrīvato nirvāraścaṁ śāyatiḥ sāpamokhaṁ ko ca suparīṣvaliṁ, sarvaśuṣṭiḥ saṁśaṁbhaṁ parimuktah, sukhāvatī-lokadhatugamaṁya tava paṁthāṁ pariśuddhaṁ, tatra ca tava yaṁ śatparataramyam padmaṁśaḥ prādūrdhūṁbhāvitiṁ, yatra ratnapadme niśadya tasya bhāgavato 'mitābhayaṁ tathāgatasyāraṁtaṁ samyak-
The second aspect involves the following statement:

"A second and related question is: if these passages are not interpolated, is there any direct connection between the texts in which they occur and the cult of Amitābha and its associated literature? The answer for the majority of these texts is fairly certain: for Bhg, Ap, Aj, Sā, Bbp, and probably for SP there is no evidence, either internal or external, apart from the passages we have studied above, that would even vaguely suggest such a connection. This would also be the case for Ka, Stā, and Eka but for one factor. These three texts (and one late chapter of SP thus accounting for our hesitancy above concerning it) are intimately connected with the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara, and he, in turn, as is well known, is closely connected, at least in some aspects, with both the Buddha Amitābha and Sukhavatī. If he could be shown to be invariably connected with Amitābha and to primarily and chiefly function as the representative of the latter, then this would have some significance for our discussion. As it stands though, both literary and archaeological evidence strongly suggest that he functioned primarily as the center of his own specific and independent cult, and that in spite of the fact that his association with Amitābha in some aspects was, up to a point, commonly in evidence, it was probably secondary in origin and, certainly, in importance. The three texts in question bear this out. In none of them is he characterized as the attendant of Amitābha; a relationship with Amitābha is not even hinted at. He is presented as a powerful and independent 'saviour'." (TII 19 (1977) 200).
emissary of Amitābha and asks in typical fashion, on behalf of Amitābha, concerning Sākyamuni's health. At 275.13 Avalokita is called, among other things, amitābhavimūrti: 'the embodiment/manifestation/incarnation/personification of Amitābha. At 296.1 Amitābha orders (dādasva) Avalokita to give the शादकेशारिमहाविद्या to a Tathāgata who seeks it, and at 297.7 that Tathāgata gives Avalokita a string of pearls, and the latter gives it in turn to Amitābha, who gives it back to the Tathāgata.

Now, without wanting to get fully involved in the question of Avalokita's origins, I think we can make the following observations.

1) Tucci notes: "First of all, I am rather doubtful that the connection between Avalokiteśvara and Amitābha is essential from the very beginning; this may be true as regards some texts, such as the Sukhāvatī, but we have no proof that it was generally accepted ... Moreover, the investigation itself of Mlle Mallmann has shown that the representation of Amitābha on the crest of Avalokiteśvara, as a fixed canon, is not testified by monuments earlier than the 9th century" (G. Tucci, "Buddhist Notes I: A propos Avalokiteśvara", Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques 9 (1951) 174). To this I can add that in both StA and Eka Avalokita is presented as completely independent and there is no reference to a relationship either to Amitābha or Sukhāvatī. Here he acts in reference to Sākyamuni alone. The same is true for the prose of SP XXIV (here, for example, when presented with a necklace, he divides it and gives half to Sākyamuni and half to Prabhūratna). The verse portion of SP XXIV which, as I have said, appears to be not a versified version of the prose, but an independent version of the same basic material, does refer to Amitābha. But this reference is tacked on at the very end and is somewhat incoherent. It is, as a matter of fact, impossible to determine from these final verses how the compiler of SP XXIV wanted the relationship between the two figures to be seen.

2) Apart from these wider questions we can note that in none of the passages referred to above from Kū does rebirth in Sukhāvatī result from religious activity undertaken in regard to Amitābha. He most definitely is not the cult figure. It results, however, from hearing or recollecting the name of Avalokita, hearing the name, copying or worshipping Kū, etc. When we compare this situation with that found in the Sukhāvatīvyūha it is immediately clear that Avalokita in this regard has completely displaced Amitābha as the cult figure: it is towards Avalokita and in reference to him that the individual acts. This means that in Kū we find two sets of relations, a formal one, and a cultic one. In the first,
Avalokita is formally subordinate to Amitābha; but in the second this relationship is reversed: cultically Amitābha is clearly subordinate to Avalokita.

3) Again, in all the above passages Amitābha in Sukhāvatī is the goal of or reward resulting from religious activity undertaken in regard to Avalokita or Kv. And in these passages we see the same basic pattern repeated: activity undertaken towards Avalokita or Kv results in rebirth in Sukhāvatī, which results in hearing dharma face-to-face from Amitābha, which results in obtaining one's prediction.

4) Now I think it is fairly obvious that the reader at Gilgit would have been familiar with an almost completely analogous relationship between two other prominent figures. The relationship on the cultic level between Śākyamuni and Maitreya in Mok is almost exactly parallel to that between Avalokita and Amitābha: as in Kv religious activity undertaken towards Avalokita results in rebirth in Amitābha's buddhafield; so in Mok religious activity undertaken in regard to Śākyamuni results in rebirth in Maitreya's world; as Avalokita is the cult figure in Kv and Amitābha's buddhafield the goal; so in Mok Śākyamuni is the cult figure and Maitreya's world the goal; as in Kv the individual reborn in Sukhāvatī hears dharma from Amitābha and then obtains his prediction; so in Mok the individual hears dharma from Maitreya and then 'effects the destruction of the outflows'. 

5) However the details might eventually be stated, it is clear from the above, that in Kv rebirth in Sukhāvatī has become disassociated from a specific cult of Amitābha. And it is in this sense that the above does not affect my conclusions in IV. This, however, is not to say that the situation in Kv is not in some ways slightly different from that in
the other texts in which we find similar passages. The chief difference seems to be this: \( K \) appears to be a concerted effort to attach the then disassociated reward of rebirth in Sukhāvatī to the cult of Avalokita alone, to de-generalize it. But even this, of course, must be seen in light of all the other parallel passages.

\[ \text{\textbf{c. Having said this much I would now like to turn to a more specific, though related, aspect of \( Bhg \) [11]. If, as I have suggested, death and the fear of death is the central concern of karmic Buddhism, then we would expect that the 'moment of death' would have particular significance. This expectation is fully confirmed by our sources. We will cite first a couple of passages describing what the 'moment of death' is like for those who have not behaved well.} \]

\[ \text{Stā 61.10; folio 1771.2: ta ca suttvāḥ pāpasamācārāḥ khādyapayahāyānyātyābhirātā asubhe suhhasamājīnāḥ kāmakrodhavyāpādebahulaṇā sukhe suhhasamājīnāḥ prahārākrosatarjanatāgaṃbhirātā na jāhāyanti na manasi karisyanti. te tataḥ pānakarmanidānājīnā kalyāṇanitrāparīṣhātā jārāvyādiṣokamṛtyuparipīditā maraṇaṃ kāle paritapyaṃte smaśānasadṛḍhāmācāvalāṃvyamāṇāṃ purasaparāṃ paśyaṇti na ca kuśala-cīttaṃ utpādayiṣyanti nābhodacyprasādām, te tataḥ cyavitvā punar api duṣkhāṇi pratyamabhaviṣyanti.} \]

And those beings practicing evil, delighting in food and drink and laughing and dancing, perceiving the lovely in the unlovely, having much passion and anger and ill-will, perceiving happiness in that which is not happiness, delighting in fighting, abuse, threatening and blows, they will not understand, they will not fix their mind. They, as a consequence, are ignorant of the causes arising from evil action; they are taken hold of by the bad friend, are afflicted by old age, disease, sorrow and death. At the time of death they are tormented: they see one another being laid on their biers fit for the burning grounds and they will not (be able to) produce a good thought nor unbroken serenity. They then having passed away will once again experience sufferings.
Sgt 2247.4 (= 2065.3): evam eva bhāiṣajyasena ye mama śāsane na prasīdante paścāt maraṇakālasamaye parisparīyatamantāḥ paridevato duḥkhāṁ vedānāṁ vedayanti. pūrvakṛtāni ca pūnyāṁ paribhūktvā na bhūyo 'nyāni pūnyāṁ kurvanti suṣṭrīragatāni. tatra tesāṁ pūya-parikṣitānāṁ skhaśalyaparigatahdayānāṁ tena kālana tena samayana narakatiryagyoniyalokopatatiḥ ghorām dāruṇām ābhāvatīśvā maraṇa-kālasamaye evaḥ bhavati. ko me trātā bhaved yad chaṁ narakatiryak-pretayamaṇokaviṣayaṁ na pāśye na ca tāṁ duḥkhāṁ vedānāṁ vedayeṇaḥ. tasyaivaṁ pralapataḥ paralokam ākramataḥ.

Just so, Bhāiṣajyasena, those who do not have faith in my teaching, being tormented at the last moment of death, wailing, experience suffering. Having used up the merit formerly made, they have not made any further merit connected with this fertile field. As a consequence, to those whose merit is exhausted, whose hearts are afflicted by the sting of sorrow, at that time, on that occasion, having seen (for themselves) a dreadful, awful rebirth in the hells, among animals or in the world of Yama, at the moment of death it occurs thus: 'Who could be my protector so that I would not see the region of the hells, animals, pretas, or the world of Yama, and would not experience that suffering?' Thus it occurs to him as, lamenting, he approaches the next world. (Cf. Sgt 2130.3, 2209.6, 222.2.)

StA fol. 1807.4 (= GMs i 84.1), Pek vol. 27, 278-3-6:

tasmā hi sūtram ima dvārayeta
likheta vāceta tathā prakāśaye
imāṁ ca (āru)tvā tathā ānūṣāmā
kṛtvā ca maitraṁ tatha sarvasvatvai //
mā paścakāle pariṭāpyu bheṣyathāṁ
upapādyāṁnāṁ narakeṣu pretayo
jaravyāṇi(mṛ)tyupariṭāpyu pṛṣita
[sdug bañal rāb drag bṛhya yis yоns gduñs la] //
sa mṛtyukāle bheyaḥbhīmāṇanāso
abhikṣaṁ uśvāsata-uśvasantaḥ
mukhe mukham prekṣati bālabuddhiṁ
ekosmābhi trāṇaṁ bhaveta parāyaṇa //
[The text here is more than usually tentative; the whole series of verses of which it forms a part seems to be missing a number of padas; Dutt has completely and - as far as I can see - arbitrarily changed the order of the padas as found in the Ms.; and the Ms. here is difficult to read.]

Therefore, having heard thus the blessings, and having established thus friendliness towards all beings, he should preserve this śūtra, he should thus copy, recite and illuminate it lest at the last time he would be tormented, being reborn in the hells or among pretas, tormented by old age, disease and death, afflicted, pained by hundreds of violent sufferings, (lest) at the moment of death his mind be terrified with fear; repeatedly panting, he with a childish mind looks from face to face (crying) 'through whom could there be protection or refuge!'

The potentially negative character, as well as the importance, attached to the 'moment of death' in Gilgit literature is also indicated by both the nature and number of another group of passages which give assurance to the individual regarding it.

*Kv* 306.33 (text cit. *IIV 19, 183*): "Those beings will be delighted who will hear this Mahāyāna Śūtra, the Kāraṇḍavyūha, the king of jewels ... And at the time of their death twelve Tathāgataś, having approached, encourage ther. (saying): 'Do not be afraid, O son of good family! By you the Kāraṇḍavyūha, the king of the jewels of Mahāyāna Śūtras, was heard. Surely not again by you is samsāra to be undergone. Not again, moreover, will there be for you birth, old age and death. There then will not be a disjunction from the agreeable and lovely, a conjunction with the unlovely. You, O son of good family, will go to the world-sphere of Sukhāvatī. You will repeatedly hear dharma in the presence of the Tathāgata Amitābha'. Thus, O son of good family, of those beings there will be a happy death."

*Kv* 269.19, Lhasa 166-4-3: (said of those who hear, copy, worship *Kv*) maraṇakāle dvādasā tathāgataś upasāmkramiṣyantā, te ca sarve tathāgataś ādiṣṭhānaṃ svāpaṃ ṣaṃprajñataṃ bhūtvā kālaṃ kātuṣṭhānaṃ pravṛttiṃ mahāyānasūtraśaratanāraṇīṃ śrutam, vividhās te 'ṛthaṃśadgānaṇtajajjikṛtāṃ
At the time of their death twelve Tathāgatas will approach, and all those Tathāgatas will encourage them (saying): 'Do not be afraid, o son of good family! By you the Karāṇḍavyūha ... was heard. For you many paths going to Sukhāvatī are prepared; and there in Sukhāvatī for your sake a wonderful umbrella, a lion seat, a heavenly diadem, ear-rings and a garland are prepared'. Such a sign appearing at the moment of death, they will go to Sukhāvatī without an obstacle. [The last sentence is translated from the Tibetan. I do not understand the Sanskrit.]

[It is worth noting that although the individual is to be reborn in Sukhāvatī, in both cases it is not Amitābha that appears to him at the moment of death, but twelve unnamed Tathāgatas. This, of course, is in marked contrast with what is promised at least three times to a follower of the cult of Amitābha (Sukhāvatavyūha (Ashikaga ed.) 13.25, 42.12; Smaller Sukhāvatavyūha (Müller ed.) 96.15), and this, in turn, is another piece of evidence indicating the disassociation of Kō from the Amitābha cult.]

Skt 1960.3 (= 2122.4, although the two differ somewhat; the text of 2122.4 is cited above p. 159): [Said of one who "havi:g a devout mind, will wholeheartedly reverence the Samghāṭa Sūtra"] maranakāle ca navatibuddhakoṭiḥ saṃmukhaṃ drakṣyati te cāṣya sarve buddhābhagavanta śāvāśayiṣyantī: mā bhāṣī puruṣas tveya samghāṭo mahādharma-paryāya īrūto lekhito, mahāpūnyaskandhaṃ ca te prasūtaḥ; tesaṃ pumascanavati buddhakoṭiḥ prthakprthaglokadhātusya vyākariṣyaṃti.

And at the time of his death he will see ninety koṭīs of Buddhas face-to-face; and all those Buddhas, Blessed Ones will encourage him (saying): 'Do not be afraid, man! By you the great dharmaparīṣya (called) Samghaṭa was heard, written, and for you a great heap of merit was produced.' Ninetyfive koṭīs of Buddhas will give them their prediction in various world-spheres.
At the moment of death, when the suppression of the final consciousness occurs, he will not have an inverted perception; he will not be overcome with anger. He will see in the eastern direction Buddhas, Blessed Ones, equal in number to the sands in twelve Ganges Rivers ... [up to:] ... in the nadir he will see face-to-face Buddhas, Blessed Ones, equal in number to the sands in kotis of hundreds of Ganges Rivers. They all will encourage that son of good family (saying): 'Do not be afraid, son of good family! Having heard the dharmaparyaya (called) Samghaṭa there will be so many good qualities and happinesses connected with the future life.'
standing, abiding, remaining and teaching dharma. In the presence of those Buddhas, Blessed Ones, they will hear such teachings of dharma possessed of (good) meaning and sentences and sound that (since) the best of all, the noble, spiritual joy and rejoicing is obtained, all the unmeritorious obstruction from past action in the final consciousness will be equally(?) suppressed through their being in harmony with dharma (las kyi sgrib pa mi dge ba de dag thams cad rnam par gsal pa thun ma in chos dañ lhan pas mgo mtham du 'glog par 'gyur ro /); and in accordance with their intention they are reborn miraculously in very pure buddhafields. In which buddhafields standing, abiding, Buddhas, Blessed Ones, teach pure talks on the Mahāyāna; in those buddhafields those beings will dwell together with those who have set out in the Mahāyāna, etc.

Apart from longer passages of this kind we might note the following: at SP 176.10 we find it said of one who with undistracted mind will copy the text: maraṇakāle cāṣya buddhasahasrāṃ mukham upadāṇaśīgyanti, na ca durgatineśvāranaṃ bhāvyati, itā ca yuvāṇa ca tvāmitraṃ dovānaṃ abhāgatāryapapatsyate, etc.: 'And at the time of death he will see a thousand Buddhas face-to-face, and he will not undergo a downfall or unfortunate destiny; and, passed away from here, he will be reborn among the Tushita devas, etc.' At Eg 2157.6 (= 1990.4), Lhasa 187-3-1: yādā ca bharmeśavena, carigātā tadā samuṃkham tathāgataṃ drakṣayati · rūtridentvā ca tathāgataśāsanam bhāvyati · yādā tathāgataṃ paśyati tadā buddhakṣetram paśyati · yādā buddhaṇaṃ drakṣayati tadā saṃbhāvaniḥ paśyati tadāsamyama (snāmya) · ·· [de 'gum pa'i dam kyi lhun brtag pa mkhyen bar m 'gyur] · na jāti mānāh kumārāh upapatsyate · [nam du 'aṅ mya 'han can du m 'gyur] · na ca a sā ṭogpaśa-buddho bhāvyatī [both Mss. are either fragmentary or difficult to read, so I have filled the gaps from the Tib.]: 'And when he will practise continence, then he will see the Tathāgata face-to-face; and day and night there will be a vision of the Tathāgata. When he sees the Tathāgata, then he sees the buddhafield. When he sees the buddhafield, then he sees the treasures of all dharmas [Tib. has only gter thams cad], then at the moment of his death [fear will not arise;] he will never be reborn in the womb of a woman; [he will never be one who sorrows]; and he will not be bound by the shoves of desire.' At Eka 37.12, Lhasa 236-2-3, as one of the 'blessings' from 'reciting' Eka: maraṇakāle tathāgataśāasanam bhāvyati (de bzin gregs pa mthoṅ bar 'gyur pa) · na
capaye~ipapatsye ... itaś c'lyutaś sukhāvatyām lokadhātāv upapatsye:

'At the time of death there will be a vision of the Tathāgata [Tib., at least, takes it as sing.]; and he will not be reborn in an unfortunate state; passed away from here he will be reborn in Sukhāvatī'. At StA 54.1, Pek. 272-2-8, of one who worships, preserves, etc., StA: marañjakāle

śāya buddhādārṣana(m) bodhisattvadarāṇanām bhāvijñayati (Saṅs. rgyas dañ bya' chub sems dpa' dag mthoṅ bar yah 'gyur ro) • na ɪrynāluko na vikṣepacitta kāla(m) karisyaI/ yāva cyuto sukhāvatya lokadhātāv upapadyate:

'At the time of death there will be for him a vision of the Buddhas, a vision of the bodhisattvas; he will not die having envious thoughts, scattered thoughts, up to: passed away from here he is reborn in the world-sphere Sukhāvatī'; at StA 56.18, Pek. 273-1-2, of one who performs the ritualized recitation of a mantrapaḍa: marañjakāle ca tathāgatadarāṇanām bhāvijñayati (de bzin gregs pa mthoṅ bar yah 'gyur ro) • cyutvā sukhāvatya lokadhātāv upapadyate: 'And at the time of death there will be a vision of the Tathāgata; and having passed away, he will be reborn in the world-sphere Sukhāvatī'. [Note: In the last three passages, although the individual is said to be reborn in Sukhāvatī, it is again not Amitābha who appears to him at the moment of death. In one case it is a plurality of unspecified Buddhas and Bodhisattvas; in the other two it is a single unspecified Tathāgata, and, if we judge by the context, the implication is that this unspecified Tathāgata is Śākyamuni.] At StA 59.10, Pek. 273-4-1, Vajrapāni says concerning the individual who performs the ritualized recitation of mantrapaḍas which he has given: marañjakāle ca buddhām paṣyaṇi (Saṅs. rgyas beom ladan 'dan ston mthoṅ bar 'gyur lags so). chen ca dārśanām dāñyāmi: 'And at the time of death he sees the Buddha (T: 'He would see a thousand Buddhas, Blessed Ones'); and I will give him a vision (of myself)'; at StA 70.4, Pek. 274-4-8, of one who undertakes the ritualized recitation of yet another set of mantrapaḍas: cyavuṣakāle buddhām bhagavantam (Tib. pl. rnam) āryāvalokiteśvaravām paṣyaṇi, maṃtravihāri kālaṃ karoti ḍharmam deśyamānaṃ; yatpiseṣu buddhakṣetreṣu mahācakravartkuleṣu yatvānusmṛṭiṃ karoti tatrāpapadyate:

'At the time of dying he sees the Buddha(s), the Blessed One(s) (and) Avalokiteśvara; he dies dwelling in friendliness and reciting Dharma. In buddhafields (or) families of great cakravartins according with his wishes, wherever he fixes his recollection, there he is reborn'. Finally, at SR IV 21, as one of the results of practising the buddhānu-smṛti which gives the chapter its name, we find: yadāpi so bhoti gilāna
Apart from the fact that these passages richly document the importance of 'the moment of death' in the Buddhism of Gilgit, I have cited them at such length because almost any one of them taken in isolation can be easily misunderstood. This potential misunderstanding arises from the fact that they superficially exhibit a more or less marked resemblance to passages of two different but related kinds. These other passages concern the determining influence of the moment of death on the individual's future rebirth, and what has been called "the dying wish". Both ideas are known from textual sources as well as recent anthropological studies (F. Edgerton, "The Hour of Death, Its Importance for Man's Future Fate in Hindu and Western Religions", Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute 8 (1926-27) 219-49; C. Caillat, "Fasting Unto Death According to the Jaina Tradition", Acta Orientalia 38 (1977) 62; etc. And Spiro, Buddhism and Society, 248; Combrich, Precept and Practice, 219-26; G. Obeyesekere, "Theodicy, Sin and Salvation in a Sociology of Buddhism", In E.R. Leach, Dialectic in Practical Religion (Cambridge: 1968) 25f.). The most succinct expression of the first is from a Jain commentary cited by Edgerton: "maṃsaṃsāmaye yādṛśī matiḥ syāt, tādṛśī gatiḥ syāt, 'As the mental make-up is at the moment of death, so is the future fate' (p.225)"; and this was held to be the case often regardless of the character of the individual's previous actions (p.222). In addition to Jain texts, Edgerton has also shown the currency of this idea in Hindu and in Buddhist - almost exclusively Pāli - literature (to the latter might be added several cases from the Vimānavatthu, nos. 53, 83, and the Petavatthu, nos. 1, etc.) and the attempts in Buddhist scholastic literature to "rationalize" this "belief". The second of these ideas is expressed by Combrich in the following form: "There is a belief that if a person on his death-bed aspires to be reborn in a particular state, his wish may well take effect. (p.219)". Now I would not want to deny that many of the passages I have cited above - especially Ekp 173.11 and StA 70.4 - superficially have much in common with either one or another or both of these ideas. But there seems to be one crucial difference. In the passages discussed by Edgerton et al the state of mind or wish expressed at the moment of death is the determining factor in the individual's
future course. In all of my passages, however, the state of mind or wish expressed at the moment of death is the, or one of the, determinative factor(s) in the individual's future course. That is to say, it is determined by or results, negatively, from 'practising evil', 'not having faith in the Buddha's teaching', etc.; or, positively, from hearing, copying, worshipping etc. Kṣ, Sgu, StA, Eka, SP, Rkp, 'practising continence' or buddhānusmṛti, performing the ritualized recitation of certain mantrapadas, etc. This, I think, is a very different thing. The primary function of the passages I have cited appears to be to assure the individual of, in the words of Kṣ, a sukhamaraṇa, "une mort très douce". This is confirmed by the fact that a number of these passages make no reference at all to the nature of the future rebirth (Sgu 1960.3, 1994.4, 2247.4, StA 1807.4, 59.10, SR IV 21), and with two possible exceptions (Rkp 173.11, StA 70.4), in none of those that do is there any indication that there is a direct causal link between the individual's state of mind and his future state. If the ideas discussed by Edgerton et al have any role here, they are clearly secondary and, in fact, their entire significance is undercut: even if the 'state of mind' or expressed wish at the moment of death remains a determining factor, here both are themselves determined by the previous action or lack of action on the part of the individual, and it is this previous determination which is pivotal. What the exact 'historical' or 'etiological' relationship of passages like those cited from Gilgit is to those cited by Edgerton remains to be determined and will require a close comparison of all the passages involved. Here, however, I think this much is clear: the Gilgit passages represent a much more conservative stance vis-à-vis the karmatically constructed world. They do not, for example, require the additional "rationalizations" found in Pāli scholastic literature.

In spite of the above I do not want to give the impression that the idea that the 'state of mind' at the moment of death is a determining factor for the individual's future rebirth is not found at Gilgit. It is. But only very rarely. I have noted only two instances. (Of the 'dying wish' I have noted no unequivocal case.) The first of these is SR XXXII 103, Pek. 6-4-1:

cyute mṛte kāлагate yasya cintā pravartate
cintānusāri vijñānām nācāno cintānān mucyate //
śi 'phoc dun byna śi ha'i tshe // maŋ ra baṃ pa rab 'jug pa //
bsam pa'i rje s su rnam śes 'braḥ // bsam las de ni ma thar to //
Of whom at the time of passing away, death, dying, a thought occurs, (his) consciousness follows that thought; that in the end is not freed from thought.

Note that viññāna here is to be taken, as we will see below, as that 'thing' which transmigrates. Note also the context in which this verse occurs: it is one verse in a long, finely tuned, pun-filled discussion of samājñā, cintā, acintiya; and is therefore in tone, if nothing else, far removed from the kind of passage cited by Edgerton.

The second instance is in GP; I will also cite the Nepalese version of this passage:

**GP 156b.6**

yesām ca devaputraṇāṃ devakanyāṇāṃ vā cyutikālayānte cātmanā apāyopapati pāyoyus teṣām kausīka purata imāṃ praṇāŚāramitāṃ svādhīnyāṃ kuryās te tena kuśalamūlena praṇāŚāramitāŚāraṇaṃ tatraiva devabha[vā]neśnopapatsyante.

For those devaputras or devakanyas who at the final point of the moment of death appears, in their presence you should perform a recitation. If they will see for themselves a rebirth in an unfortunate state - you, Kausīka, in their presence should perform a recitation of thoughts of rebirth in an unfortunate state will disappear for those hearing the Perfection of Wisdom. They, through that root of merit, through hearing the Perfection of Wisdom, will be reborn just there in the abode of devas (instead).

**Kimura (II-3) 257.13**

yesām ca devaputraṇāṃ devakanyāṇāṃ vā cyutikāla bhavet teṣām api purataḥ svādhīnyāṃ kuryās te yaḍy ātmāno 'pāyopapattiḥ drukṣayanti teṣām enām praṇāŚāramitāṃ śṛṇvatāṃ te 'pāyopa-patticittotpādā antarāŚāsyanti tatraiva devabhavane te utpatsyante.

For which devaputras or devakanyas the moment of death appears, in their presence you should perform a recitation. If they will see for themselves a rebirth in an unfortunate state, the production of thoughts of rebirth in an unfortunate state will disappear for those hearing this Perfection of Wisdom. They will be reborn just there in the abode of devas (instead).

This is the only case I know of at Gilgit of a death-bed ritual whose intention was to immediately influence or alter favorably the future course of the individual's rebirth. In this it contrasts with Bhg [17], the one other death-bed ritual found at Gilgit. As we have seen above (p. 132) and will see again below, the ritual performed at Bhg [17] is intended not to alter the course of the individual's rebirth - in fact it is explicitly stated there that his 'fate' is determined by his
previous acts - but to ensure that the individual will have an opportunity to hear the name of Bhaiṣajyaguru, as a consequence of which wherever he is reborn he will have jātismāra and thus refrain from future unmeritorious action. This again is a long way from the ideas discussed by Edgerton, Combrich, etc.

We will deal with other aspects of the 'moment of death', notably the role of the viśāma, under Bhg [17]. I should also mention here that I do not know who the eight bodhisattvas are who, according to Bhg [11], appear to the individual at the moment of death, nor have I found any other reference to eight bodhisattvas at Gilgit; cf. M.W. de Visser, Ancient Buddhism in Japan, Vol. II (Leiden: 1935) 554f.).
Again, by which woman the name of that Tathāgata will be heard, (will be) taken up, this existence as a woman is to be anticipated as her last.

See above under [5.8].
Then again Manjuśrī, the true heir-apparent, said this to the Blessed One: 'I, O Blessed One, in the last time, in the last period, will cause those believing sons and daughters of good family to hear the name of the Blessed One, Bhaiṣajyaguruvaibūḍyaprabha, the Tathā-gata, through various means, even to the extent that I will recite the Buddha's name in their ears when they have gone to sleep. Who will preserve this sūtra, will recite, teach, will illuminate it in detail for others, will copy or have it copied, or will worship it written as a book with various flowers, garlands, perfumes, unguents, aromatic powders, robes, umbrellas, flags and banners - by them it is to be wrapped with cloths of five colors, on a pure spot it is to be set up: there where this sūtra will circulate the Four Great Kings together with their retinues, and hosts of hundreds of thousands of other devatās will approach. 1) Who will preserve this sūtra, and the name of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaibūḍyaprabha, the Tathā-gata, and the extent of the excellence of his former vows(1) - not for them will there be an untimely death, and it is not possible for their vital warmth to be stolen away by any means; or else, their vital warmth being stolen, they again recover it.

1) (1T: 'Who preserves the name of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaibūḍyaprabha and this sūtra of the extent of the excellence of (his) former vows'.

I think virtually everything of importance in this passage has already been noted.
The Blessed One said: 'That is so, Mañjuśrī, just as you say.

And, Mañjuśrī, which believing sons or daughters of good family have a desire to do pūjā to that Tathāgata, by them an image of that Tathāgata is to be caused to be made; for seven days and nights the fast possessed of eight worthy limbs is to be undertaken; having eaten pure food, on a pure spot covered with various flowers, perfumed with various fragrant substances, on a spot of earth fully adorned with various cloths and umbrellas and flags and banners, with well bathed limbs, wearing pure and spotless garments, they are to be possessed of clear thought, unmuddied thought, thought without malice; with music and cymbals and singing sounded forth that image of the Tathāgata is to be circumambulated; the former vow of that Tathāgata is to be fixed in mind; this sutra is to be proclaimed. What they think of, what they wish for, they accomplish that, the whole of their wish: if they wish for the state of long life, they come to be long-lived; if they wish for objects of enjoyment, there come to be abundant objects of enjoyment; if they wish for lordship, they obtain it with little difficulty; if they are desirous of a non, they obtain a non. Those who see an evil dream in which a crow appears, or see bad omens in which case a hundred misfortunes are imminent, they do the performance of pūjā in various ways to the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaigarbyaprābha, the Tathāgata (and) they do not see any bad dream or bad omen or inauspicious things. Of whom there is a fear of fire, a fear of water, of mad elephants, of lions or tigers, a fear of bears, hyenas, venomous snakes, scorpions, and centipedes - by them pūjā to that Tathāgata is to be performed; from all fears they will be
released. Of whom there is a fear of foreign armies, of robbers, of thieves - by them puja to that Tathagata is to be performed.

1) (X: 'They are to be possessed of clean thought, unmuddied thought, a thought of friendliness towards all beings, an equable thought in the presence of all beings'; Z: 'They are to be possessed of clean thought, unmuddied thought, thought without malice, a thought of friendliness, a thought of advantage towards all beings, a thought of compassion, of sympathetic joy, of evenmindedness, an equable thought'; T: 'They are to be of clean thought, unmuddied thought, thought without malice, friendly thought, evenminded thought, and equable thought'.

2) X: 'vows'.

3) I have usually translated pra-kāś- as 'illuminate', but that does not fit very well here. X's pravartayitavya is also somewhat difficult to translate exactly (cf. Eka 37.4), although it can easily mean something like 'recite'.

4) (X: 'By them puja to the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaibhūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, is to be performed', which gives an easier reading.

5) (X: 'And the occurrence of all bad dreams, bad omens and inauspiciousness will be allayed (?)'.

6) X and T add 'fear of poison, sword and falls'.

a. As I have already indicated in passing, the literature of Gilgit is comparatively rich in what might be called liturgical texts. These 'texts', found above all in the shorter karmatic sutras - Bhg, Bbp, StA, especially - give more or less detailed instructions for the performances of ritual acts. We might here look at some of these texts in detail.

Bhg contains at least two of these liturgical texts. One is, of course, the first part of [14]; the second is Bhg [18]:

'...by them [i.e. friends, relatives and kinsmen] for the sake of that sick man, for seven days and nights the obligation of the Upoṣadha possessed of eight limbs is to be undertaken, and to the community of bhikṣus puja and service is to be performed with food and drink, with all requisites, according to one's abilities; three times in the night, three times in the day, to the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaibhūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, worship is to be performed; forty-nine times this sutra is to be recited; forty-nine lamps are to be lighted; seven images are to be made; for each image seven lamps are to be set up; each lamp is to be made the size of
the wheel of a cart. If on the forty-ninth day the light is not exhausted, forty-nine five-coloured flags are to be made (visible?).

*Bbp* also contains one such text:

*Bbp* 193-2-3f: gal te rigs kyi bu 'lam rigs kyi bu mo ....

sems can dmyal ba mnar med par 'gro ba dañ / 'nan soñ gsum du skyes pa'i sems can rnam kyi don dañ / 'grogs po dañ pshan rnam sugs nu thar bar bya ba'i phyir de bzin gšegs pa de dag gi ri mo'i sku gzugs dañ / 'jim pa'i sku gzugs byed du 'jug ciñ / byed du bcoig nas kyañ sems can thams can la sñin rje ba'i sems gtso bor byas te / 'phags pa'i lam yan lag brygañ pa dañ ldan par gyur nas ała ba yan gyi tashes brygañ nas brtsams te beva lha'i bar du de bžin gšegs pa de dag la me tog dañ / spos dañ / dri dañ / phren ba dañ / byug pa dañ / mar me dañ / sill ašan dañ rgyal mtshan dañ ba dan rnam kyi mtshan lan gsum ŏñ lan gsum du medon de / sems can de dag, thar bar bya ba'i phyir ci nan kyañ snañ rgyan boom ldan 'dans de dag de bžin gšegs pa'i ye ses kyi ni mkyen / lha'i ašan gyis ni gsum / lha'i spyan gyis ni gzigs sñiñ sems can de dag be 'gror 'gro bar 'gyur gyi ŏñ 'gror 'gro bar ni 'gyur ba dañ / legs par bya ba byed kyi ŏñ par bya ba mi byed par yoñ su bñin sšiñ de ltar nams can ŏñ nañ du skyes pa de dag thar bar bgyi ba'i exad du de bžin gšegs pa de dag la gšol ba gšab po / bšangs pa dañ / mthol bas sdiñ pa bšangs par gyur cig / de bžin gšegs pa'i mtshan thos par gyur cig / ŏñ 'gror thams can lañ yoñs su grol bar gyur cig / ji ariñ du bña na med pa yan dag par rdzogs pa'i byañ chub tu mñon par rdzogs par suñs ma rgyas kyi bar du bšad gis[.] spyod pa dañ 'thun par spyod par gyur cig ces de ltar yoñs su bñin bar bya'o // chos kyi rnam grañs 'di yan bris pa dañ / 'driñ bcoig pa dañ / bdañs pa dañ / kbras pa dañ / medon pa de'i phyir ašon gyi de bžin gšegs pa de dag gi smon lan gyi mthos sems can Cāmyal ba mnar med par 'gro ba dañ / ŏñ soñ gsum du skyes pa de dag gi rña bar mtshan rnam thos par 'gyur ro /

If a son or daughter of good family ... for the benefit of those beings who have gone to the Avīci hell, or have been born in the three unfortunate destinies, or for the sake of releasing friends and relatives, has painted images or images of clay of those Tathāgatas made [i.e. of Bhaisajyaguru, Amitābha, Śikhin, Kāśyapa, etc.]; and having had them made also directs the most excellent thought of compassion towards all beings, and having become permeated of the
eight-limbed worthy path, from the eighth day of the waxing moon until the fifteenth, three times a day and three times a night, does pūja to those Tathāgatas with flowers, perfumes, scents, garlands, unguents, lamps, cymbals, flags and banners; and [if], for the sake of freeing those beings, Ṭhe turns over [the resulting merit] as it is known by those Buddhas, Blessed Ones, through the cognition of a Tathāgata, (as it is) heard by (their) deva-ear and seen by (their) deva-eye(1), so that those beings would go to a fortunate destiny and would not go to an unfortunate destiny, and would do good and would not do bad; so, for the sake of releasing those beings born in the unfortunate destinies, those Tathāgatas are to be addressed: 'Through confession and declaration evil must be curbed'! 'The names of those Tathāgatas must be heard!' 'Beings must be released from all unfortunate destinies!' 'As long as [I] am not fully and completely awakened to utmost, right and complete awakening, so long must I practise in conformity with this practice!' — thus in it to be turned over. On account of also writing, having copied, preserving, reading and worshipping this discourse on dharma, through the power of the vows of those former Tathāgatas, (their) names would be heard in the ears of those gone to the Avīci hell and those born in the three unfortunate destinies, etc.

1) The Tibetan text is here very difficult and my translation uncertain. I have translated it in light of such passages as Aṣṭasāhasrikā (Mitra ed.) 153.4f; kathāṃ ca pariṇāmitāṃ su pariṇāmitāṃ bhavaty anuttarāyāṃ samyaksambodhau ... yathā te tathāgata arhataḥ samyaksambuddha buddha- jñānena buddha-akṣāmāsa jānanti paśyanti tatkusālamūlam yajjātiḥkum ... yād略 ... Latāḥ anumade tatkusālamūlam yathā ca te tathāgataḥ ... abhyanujānanti pariṇāmyamāṇam tatkusālamūlam anuttarāyāṃ samyaksambodhau tathāhāṃ pariṇāmavām, but remain doubtful as to whether this represents the most satisfactory solution. 2) Both Sde dge and Snar thān read bsraḥs par gyur cig instead, and this reading is probably to be preferred.

Of all the texts at Gilgit, undoubtedly the richest in terms of liturgical texts is Stā. I can here only give a few examples. In the first two cases I will give the 'mantrapada' both because it is an integral part of the ritual, and because it is important to have a clear idea of its exact nature. These mantrapadas are dhāranīs — they are called both — are not, as I have already noted, the meaningless (to us) strings of
syllables common in Tantric mantras. They are most like invocatory prayers. It is also important to note the role that the recitation of these mantrapadas plays in the rituals of StA vis-à-vis the recitation of texts, the names of Buddhas, etc., in Bhg and Bbp.

First the mantrapada:

\[
\text{namah sarvatathagatānāṁ tadyathā buddhe subuddhe buddhamate}^1 \\
\text{loke viloke lokātikhante satvāvalokane}^2 \\
\text{ṣṭhīte sarvāśāparipūrane āyutindhare naradevapūjite}^3 \\
\text{tathāgata-} \\
\text{jñānadade tathāgatādhiṣṭhāne(na)}^4 \\
\text{ṣṭhīte sarvalokām sukhi bhavatu pūrvakarmam kṣapaya mama rakṣā bhavatu sarvabhayebhya tathāgatādhiṣṭhānenā svāhā} / \\
\]

1) So both Ms & T; Dutt buddhamate. 2) A: -lokena; T: lo ki ni. 3) So A & T; B deest; Dutt nara ke ca pūjite. 4) A: unclear, but almost certainly -ena; B: deest; T: -ona; Dutt: -ṣṭhāne.

Homage to all the Tathāgatas! To wit: O Awakened, O Well Awakened, O One Having Awakened Thought, O One of the World, O One Apart from the World, O One Having Gone Beyond the World, O One who is Looking Down on Beings, O One Empowered with the Power of All Tathāgatas, O One Fulfilling All Hopes, O Brilliant One, O One Worshipped by Men and Devas, O One Giving the Knowledge of a Tathāgata, through the power of the Tathāgata may all the world become happy, may previous karma be caused to be exhausted, may there be for me protection from all fears through the power of the Tathāgata! All Hail!

Then the ritual itself:

StA: GMs 56.11-56.20; Ms. no.30 (= Ms.A), fol. 1760.4-1761.5; Ms. no. 35 (= Ms.B), fol. 18221.5-18231.5, Pel vol. 27, 272-5-6 to 273-1-4.

\[
yah kaścit pāṛṣaṅgaṃ evaṃ jñāṇīyaḥ kathañ ca vayaṃ sarvāṇv evaṃ tathāgata bhāṣiṣṭānāṃ prati lokabheya, tena kalyāṇaṃ evotthāya sarvāṇvānāṃ dvāyacitteṇa karuṇācitteṇa maitrācitteṇa īryānānmaṛga- \\
krodha-parivarjitaṃ ekāgra-citteṇa buddhasyodāratarāṃ pūjāṃ kṛtvā \\
dāsādive sarvatathāgatānām nāma-sūkṣṭāḥ yathākāmaṃ pūjāṃ sāvēṣa sūkṣṭāḥ sāśraddhāṃ sūkṣṭe \\
\]

Whatever assembly would think thus: 'How now may we obtain all those qualities spoken of by the Tathāgata?' By one such, having arisen at dawn, with a mind of sympathy towards all beings, with a mind of compassion, with a mind of friendliness, free from envy, pride, jealous disparagement and anger, with a one-pointed mind, having performed the higher pūjā of the Buddha, having honored all the Tathāgatas in the ten directions, having fixed in mind the courses [of events] according to [his] desire, having intoned a hundred and eight times [the mantrapada], each time a flower is to be given to the Tathāgata. From that there will be fulfilment of all his hopes; and in a dream there will be a vision of the Tathāgata(s); which excellent thing he desires, that he obtains; and at the moment of death there will be a vision of the Tathāgata(s); having passed away, he will be reborn in the world-sphere Sukhāvatī, [and be] possessed of long life, power, color and vigour; all [his] enemies will come into his power.

The mantrapada:

namah sarvatathāgatānām sarvādiśāparipūrakarāṇām / nama āryāva-lokiteśvarasya bodhisattvasya mahākārūṇikasya / tadyathā
ha ha ha ha / mama mama / dhiri dhiri / śānte prāśānte sarvā-pāpakṣayānāre / avalokayā kārūṇika bodhicittam manasikuru / vyaya-lokaya māṁ smaṁ smaṁ yat tvaya pūrvaṁ satyādhiṣṭhānām kṛtam / tena satyena sarvāśām me paripūrṣa / buddhaḥkṣetraṁ pariṣodhaya / mā me kaścida viheṇham karotu / buddhaḥdhiṣṭhānena svāhā / tadyathā
tē jē tē jē maḥāte āye / yon mana khyāduścarītam viḍaṇuścarītām manoduścarītām dāridoryaḥ vā tan me kaṇapaya / ālokaṁ viśokaya /
Homage to all Tathāgatas, the fullfillers of all hopes! Homage to Avalokiteśvara, the Bodhisattva, the Greatly Compassionate One!

To wit:

Indeed, Indeed, Indeed, Indeed. For me, for me. dhiri dhiri. O Tranquil, O Very Tranquil, O Exhauster of all Evil! Look down, O Compassionate One! Fix in mind the thought of awakening! Look all around! Remember me; remember that by you formerly an act of truth was made! Through this truth fulfil all of my hopes! Purify the buddhafielid! May nothing do harm to me! Through the empowerment of the Buddha, all hail! To wit:

O Splendor, Splendor, O Great Splendor. Which of me is the misconduct of body or speech or mind or poverty - cause that to be exhausted for me! Look! Look upon [me]! I desire a vision of the Tathāgatas, a vision of the bodhisattvas - prescor(?) - give me (such) a vision! May all my merit increase more and more! Homage to all Tathāgatas! Homage to Avalokiteśvara! Remember your promise, O Mahāsattva! May these mantrapadas succeed! All hail!

StA: GMs 1 67.19-70.8; Ms. no. 30 (= A), fol. 1780.2-1785.3; Ms. no. 35 (= B), fol. 1825R.7-1834.7; Pek.vol. 27, 275-1-8 to 5-2

avalokiteśvara āha: yah kṣeṣit kulaputra imāṃ pumāṃ abhiḥkṛṣaḥ yathā tathāgatena parikīrtitām, 1) vyākaram abhiḥkṛṣaḥ (1 mamāni anupadyānānāṃ samādhiśabdam buddhabodhinatvādānām bhogaśivar- yalamābham buddhakṣetropapattām, tena suklapakte śucinā susnātātreyāna bhūtvā āryāstāṃgopāvāsopāvasitoneśāyāṃ śārabhya śucau pradeśe buddhādhīṣṭite gundhanupair dhvajapakṣaḥ pūrṇaṃkumbhār abhyarcya 2) tām prthivipradeṣe tām ca dharmadhānākam śucim susnātātreyām śvetavastrapāpyātṛte (2 nānāp업amāṇayagandhair abhyarcya likhāypayitavyah. sarvasvasādāhārenānāṃ kuśalamulāni krtyā sarvasvatvamitra- citena dayīcitena karuṇācitena tathāgataśurugauravam cittam upasthāpya, tama śine dhukāta 3) tāval likhe yāvad ardhadivam. aṣṭāmyām śārabhya yāvat paścëdāśi śine śine saiva pūjā kartavyaḥ. tato anenaśva vidhīna likhitamātreyāṇāṃ parśeṣantaryāṇāṃ karmāṇi sarva- pāpāni cāyasa kṣayanā yāsyanti, kuśalair dharmair 1/2 vivardhiṣyate,
uttapatiyo bhaviyati, sarvadharmesu kāyasukham anuprāpyati, 
tanvi bhaviyamti rūgadesvamāmānakrodhān. Tena likhāpāyitvā 
5) pūrvamukhā saddātuki tathāgatapratimā avalokitesvarapratimā ca 
sadhātuki5 sthāpya saddātuke caityāyatana6 puspadāpaganadhā dīpasī 
ca udāratarā pūjā kartavyā. aṣṭāṇyām ārābhya yāvat paścadaśi sarva-
sattavamākarunācittāna bhaviyate śuciśuklabhojina āryāsattāṃ 
vāslapāvāsanena suḥṛtsthitāyakeṇa māhokrodhāmātsaryaparivarjita 
dine dine udāratarai pūjā krtvā trṣandhyam jāpo aṣṭāṣaṭi kūttāvah; 
dīpāpapanapagandhāni datvā suṣumānapūṣpāṭaṣaṭaṭai(śca) āryāvaloki-
tesvarapratimā trṣandhyam āhantavyā7 vajrapānē ca dhūpo dātavyah; 
dānaśayām abhināmakṛtya paśicīmān bhūmīyā devyāḥ pūrvenāṇopamā yāḥ 
ūrūvēna śāmākhyā yāli(r) nāmārasapāyadasaṃdhyodanaṃ caturdīśam 
keṣṭavaṇyā. tatas tasya na kaścid vikṛṣa karigayati samṛūśa, 
nāṃyathātvam cittaṇyā; sarvaśo’ṣāṃ ca aṣṭāṣaṭi kūttasaṃnu-
puspaiṣ (ca) saṃcodoṇam9 (cana)naśāvā vidhīnā pūrvvam cātṛtvā tataḥ 
pūrpanapacadaṇyāṃ ca tāvārī pūrṇakumbhā sthāpya dhūpanacandi 
videhurupāṇam datvā dīpasī tāvārī11 nāṅgandhadhvajapatarāṅgāvāna 
rūpyabhāṇḍāi tam12 prathivipradaṃ samalakṛtya dādhamadhipuṣyada-
dhyodanaṃ anākā ca yathālīthābena taliṃ caturdīśe datvā nivedya 
suṣumānapuṣpāṣaṭatitair okaṇkām jñyā caturdīśe keṣṭavāṇyā pūrṇvavat 
tataḥ tṛṣaṇātaṇi suṣumājāṭipūṣpāni okaṇkām jñyā āryāvalokitesvara-
pratimā-r-āhantavyā13 tataḥ sā pratimā kampīṣyati, mahānirghoṣo 
ḥaṭhavat, raśmayo niścarīṣyantī, prthivikampah14 tataḥ sarva-
karmanī sarvakāryāṇi cāyaṃ samārohiṣyantī, tathāgatadarśanāṃ bodhi-
saṃtvahumāṇprataṃbhāḥ sarvavastavavānduḥyā bhaviṣyati, 
āhandaḥnīya-
koṣakoṣṭhāgārasaṃrādhāḥ sarvavāpsāḥhiparivarjita cira[ji]15 sarva-
śatavah sarvarājāraṇaṃpratāmityā tasya jārṣesāṃbhikāṃśino bhaviṣyantī 
kiṃkarṣāḥ sarvakāśaragāvanduḥmāṇpratihāni[ḥ]15 na ca jālu prāyuṣvira-
yogam bhaviṣyati; mahārādhvabālāvīrasyannapānaṃ tejavāṃ tiṣṇaudriya 
buddhimaṃ sarvavastavanācittāḥ dāḥma,16 yānāv ca yāvanākāle buddhāṃ 
bhagavantāṃ āryāvalokitesvānaṃ pāṇyati, maitreṣvarīrī kālam karoti 
āharman desayamanī; yatpeterṣu buddhākeṣṭresu mahācakravartikuleśu 
yatrānusārtīṃ karoti tatrōpapadyate; anyāni cūmokkāṃ guṇaḥsaṃcārgū 
āpratilapsyate.

1)1 A: vy(ā)karanam (xx)ma kāṃkṣe (this is written between the 
lines and is not very clear; whether that marked (xx) is the remains 
of two akṣaras or just śaṁdga marks is impossible to tell); B: 
vyākaranam abhikāṃxx... T: (... gaṇ la la ji itar de běin gaṃs pas
yoris su bagrubas pas yon tan de dag mgon par 'dod ciṅ) laṁ bstan pa daṅ / (kho bo yān mgon sum du mthoṅ ba daṅ ...); Dutt gives vyaṅkarannam mama kāṃkṣāte, but it is unlikely that Avalokiteśvara was thought of as able to give predictions. 2)(2A: sa prthivyāradeśo sa ca dharmabhāṣako śuci susnātāgaṅtro śvetavastraprāytaḥ; B: sa prthivyāradeśo sa ca dharmam...xxci susnātāgaṅtro śvetavastraprāṅxa... 3): sa phyogs de daṅ chos smra ba de la yān mchod pa byas nas / lus legs par khrus byas pa gtsaṅ mas gos dkar po byos te / me tog daṅ / bdug spros daṅ spros daṅ / me tog phren ba daṅ / byug pa sna tshogs dag gis mchod nas. Both T (although it differs in some ways from the Skt) and the context indicate that sa prthivyāradeśo, etc., is the object of the following abhyaya; we therefore have to take the string of nominatives as a case of nom. used for acc., or we must take it as a scribal error and emend. We have done the latter although other Gilgit texts show a clear tendency toward the use of nom. for acc.; cf. intro. to the ed.; a more definite grammatical statement must wait for a critical edition of StA. 3) Both Mss. have likhatā but T: bṛi bar bya'o suggests something like likhāpayitaṃya and the pattern (inst. agent) + ger. + ger. + (inst. agent) + fut.pass.part. is extremely common in exhortatory passages of this kind. 4) B: kusala- mūlai...; T: dge ba'i rtsa ba rnam. 5)(5A: pūrvamukhi sādhatukā, etc.; T: de bzin gāgea pa'i sku gzugs sku dūn daṅ bcas pa daṅ / spyan ras gzigs dbaṅ phyug gi sku gzugs sku dūn daṅ bcas pa žal sār phyogs su bstan te dzag la; once again nominatives (here in -I) functioning as accusatives (the -ā endings could be taken formally as either nom. or acc.). 6) Dutt gives caityayatane, which may be a printer’s error; but this form is also listed in the index which gives the impression that it is a legitimate variant of the word caitya. A clearly has caityā—; B: caixx... 7) There is a gap in B beginning after mā. 8) T here gives gtor bar bya'o as the equivalent for āhantavyā. 9) T: bskul bar bya'o, suggesting with the context, a fut.pass.part. 10) eme— is not found in the Ms. but must certainly be supplied; cf. 9): cho ga 'ul kho na, and CMk 1 68.9: laṅo 'nonalva viḍhinā. 11) T: mar me kha bzi. 12) A: sa; cf. n.2 above. 13) T in the Pek. ed. here gives yet another equivalent for āhantavyā: bstan par bya'o but Derge: bsun par bya'o; cf. above n.8. 14) T: sa yān g.yo bar 'gyur ro / 15) 12A: sarvaśatravā sarvarājṛājaputrānātva- dānānābhiḥkākuniṇā bhavāpyayati · klīvakāh sarvakleśarāṇyaḥpyonamohu-
Avalokiteśvara said: 'Whatever son of good family would desire these qualities as they were declared by the Tathāgata, would desire a prediction, a face-to-face vision of me, the obtainment of samādhis, a vision of the Buddhas and bodhisattvas, the obtainment of possessions and overlordship, rebirth in a buddhafield, by him during a bright fortnight, being pure and with well-bathed limbs, having fasted the worthy eight limbed fast, beginning on the eighth day on a pure spot empowered by the Buddha, with perfumes and flowers, with flags and banners, with full jars having worshipped, that spot of earth and that pure reciter of Dharma having well-bathed limbs and covered with white garments, with various flowers and garlands and perfumes having worshipped, [it; i.e. this sūtra or the dharani] is to be caused to be written. Having made the [resulting] root of merit common to all beings, with a thought of friendliness towards all beings, with a thought of sympathy, with a thought of compassion, having established a thought of respect due to a guru towards the Tathāgata, by a day after day it is [to be] written; so long he would write it, down to [only] half a day. Beginning on the eighth day, up to the fifteenth, day after day just that pūjā is to be performed. Then through just this rite, through it being merely written, the five acts having immediate retribution and all evil [done] by him will be exhausted; there will be an increase in meritorious dharma, he will glow with vigour; in all situations he will obtain bodily ease; passion, hatred, delusion, pride and anger will be attenuated. By him after having had it written, having set up facing east an image of the Tathāgata having a relic, and an image of Avalokiteśvara having a relic, on the site of a caitya having a relic, with flowers, incense and perfume, and with lamps, the higher pūjā is to be performed. Beginning on the eighth day, up to the fifteenth, a thought of great compassion towards all beings is to be developed; by one having eaten [only] pure and clean food, having fasted the worthy eight-limbed fast, with a friend or companion, having renounced pride, anger and envy, day after day having done the higher pūjā, morning, noon and night the one hundred and eight intoning [of the mantrapadas] is to be given; having given
lamps, incense, flowers and perfumes, with one hundred and eight sumanā (T: sna ma) flowers, the image of Avalokiteśvara is to be smote morning, noon and night, and incense is to be given to Vajrapāṇī. Having bowed to the ten directions—in the West to the Devī Bhīma, in the East to Anopama, in the upper region to Śāmkhīṇī—an offering of pāyasā and dadhyodana having various flavors to the four directions is to be scattered. Then of him there will not be any distraction, fear, no mental fluctuation; and for all the one hundred and eight intoning with one hundred and eight sumanā flowers is [to be] urged. Through just this rite having performed the first sprinkling, then on the fifteenth, the day of the full moon, having set up four full jnās, having given incense, sandal wood, olibanum, and camphor [an] four lamps, with various perfumes, flags, painted clothes, banners, gold, silver and ornaments having fully adorned that spot of earth, having given, having offered to the four directions dadhi, madhu, pāyasā, and dadhyodana, or other food offerings in accordance with his means, having intoned [the mantrapadas] every single time with one hundred and eight sumanā flowers, they are to be thrown to the four directions as before. Then having intoned every single time with three times one hundred and eight sumanā flowers, the image of the worthy Avalokiteśvara is to be smote. Then that image will tremble, there will be a great noise, rays of light will shoot forth, [and there will be] a shaking of the earth. Then all his acts and all his duties will be successful; he will become one having a vision of the Tathāgatas, obtaining the stage of the bodhisatvas, to be honored by all beings, having abundant wealth, grain, treasuries and stores, having thrown off all disease, long-lived; all [his] enemies, all kings, the sons of kings and ministers will come to desire a sight of him, will be [his] servants having abandoned all the impurities, passion, hatred and delusion; he will never be separated from that which is dear to him, [he will be] possessed of great firmness, strength and vigour, possessed of brilliance, having sharp faculties, possessed of intelligence, having a thought of sympathy towards all beings, one knowing Dharma, up to: at the moment of dying he sees the Buddha, the Blessed One, [and] the Worthy Avalokiteśvara; he dies dwelling in friendliness and reciting dharma; in buddhafields (or) families of great cakravartins in accordance with his wishes, wherever he
fixes his recollection, there he is reborn. [These] and many other thousands of qualities he will obtain.

1) The text here is strangely elliptical, leaving the object of likhāpayitavya to be understood. I have supplied an object on the basis of the sentence which immediately follows the passage I have quoted: evam bhagavam bahugunakaro 'yam dharmaparyaya imāni ta [rd: cal] dhārāṇīmantrapadāni. 2) āhantavya appears to be an expression for what in texts like the Adikarmacāndapa is called tādānavigdhi; cf. L. de la Vallée Poussin, Bouddhisme, Études et matériau (London: 1898) 193; 218-20. There are, as indicated above, several Tibetan equivalents: gtor bar bya, bstan par bya, bsun par bya. 3) Bhīṣma herself presents her own 'dhārāṇī' and ritual at StA 75.7. 4) For the 'dhārāṇī' and ritual given by Anopamā see StA 71.1. 5) The 'dhārāṇī' and ritual given by Śamkīnī occur a' StA 74.4.

The next ritual from StA is also connected with a pratijñā, here made by the mahāyānini Anopamā; cf. StA 71.1f.

GMs 72.3-73.6; Ms. no. 30, fol. 1788.3-1790.4; Ms. no. 35, fol. 1835L.1-1835R.3; Pek. vol. 27, 276-2-1 to 3-5.

1 yah kaścid bhagavān guñārthā diṣṭānaś ca sarvasatvavasaśkrāṇārthā bhave mahādhaśvānārāmaḥ rūjyaṇaḥ vidyādharatvaṁ abhi-kāṅke māmāpi samākhaḍeṣaś ca saṁsāravāpasitena aśleśaṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāsāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣāṁ citrākāreṇa āryāśāṁganopāvāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣā samākhaḍeṣaś ca saṁsāravāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣā samākhaḍeṣaś ca saṁsāravāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣā samākhaḍeṣaś ca saṁsāravāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣā samākhaḍeṣaś ca saṁsāravāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣā samākhaḍeṣaś ca saṁsāravāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣā samākhaḍeṣaś ca saṁsāravāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣā samākhaḍeṣaś ca saṁsāravāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣā samākhaḍeṣaś ca saṁsāravāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣā samākhaḍeṣaś ca saṁsāravāpasitena aśleśāṁ rāngaiṁ navabhājanaiṁ eṣā sanātanaṁ caturdhīkriyāñcata sattāñc mrañc.
Almost three fourths of this passage is missing in B; see below n. 7. 2) Ms omits -dha-, but cf T: nor gyi dbang phug chen po dañ / 3) T: me togz phreñ ba dañ / zla gm gon dañ / se mg dos bryan pa. 4) T: sug pa na pad ma thogs sini yañ dag par dbugs 'byin pa'i tshul du mchis pa bri bar bgyi'o. 5) T: grols dañ ldan pa. 6) Again R in the Pek. ed. has bstan par bgyi'o, but in the Derge ed. bstan par bgyi. 7) Ms. D starts here. 8) I have followed Dutt in reading mrokṣam; A has srokarṣam or spṛkṣam; B: ..xx(kṣ)ān; T sini mu sa dag, which I do not understand, although it is probably the name of a plant. 9) T (Pek.) de lta 'tshal ba, (Derge) gter la 'tshal ba.

Whosoever would come to be desirous of qualities, of possessions and grains, of subjugating all beings, would desire great possessions and lordship, sovereignty, the status of a vidyādhara, a face-to-face vision of me, by him on the eighth day of the bright fortnight, on a new piece of cotton with its fringes uncut and free of nap, he is to have painted by a pure painter who has fasted the worthy eight-limbed fast, with unmixed colors placed in new pots, [the following:] in the middle an image of the Tathāgata teaching Dharma; on the right, the Worthy Vajrakrodha brandishing a vajra, adorned with all ornaments, having a necklace of half-moons and a garland of flowers, covered with white garments; on the left side Anopamū, white as the stem of śara grass, adorned with all ornaments, having white garments, having a lotus in [her] hand, [and in the aspect of] giving confidence. Then by a pure officiant having fasted the worthy eight-limbed fast, at a pure place [devoted to] the Tathāgata and possessed of a relic, having eaten milk and barley, being covered with white garments, together with a second, having performed the first sprinkling on the eighth day, with various flowers, perfumes, incenses and lamps having done pūja, three times the three times one hundred and eight intoning [of the mantrapadas] is to be given; having intoned over one after another sumanā flower, with three times one hundred and eight, that image is to be smote. To the
Tathāgatha and to Vajrapāni the very first flowers, incense and perfumes are to be given, [then] an offering of pāyasa and dadhyodana having various flavors, [and] various drinks in the four directions is to be scattered. On the fifteenth, the day of the full moon, through just this rite an offering and other things such as ground incense, camphor, olibanum and sandal wood, in accordance with his means, are to be given; two lamps with sweet smelling oil are to be given. I there in my actual form will come to stand; I will give excellent things as they are desired: the obtainment of samādhis, [the ability of] travelling through the air, invisibility, sovereignty, the state of a powerful cakravartin, the status of vidyādhara, the ability to locate treasures, the art of alchemy, knowledge of others thoughts, longevity; and he is to become one having thoughts of friendliness towards all beings, etc.

1) The ritual described here connected with the pata has much in common with those from the Manjūsrīmūlakālpa which have been studied by Lalou, Iconographie des étoffes peintes (Pāta) dans le Manjūsrīmūlakālpa (Paris: 1930). The importance of the passage in StA for the history of the development of this ritual lies in the fact that it describes a form of the rite which is much less elaborate, and probably earlier, than those found in the Manjūsrīmūlakālpa.

2) Lalou, p.61: "don't la frange n'a pas été coupée". 3) Lalou, p.53 and n.2: "rase". 4) Lalou, p.30: "des couleurs franches".

A final text from StA is:

StA: GMs i 80.15-22; Ms. no. 30, fol.1805.3-1806.3; Ms. no. 35 deest; Pek. vol. 27, 278-2-4 to 2-8

tasmāt tarhi taïh kulāputraiḥ kuladuhitrbhīr vā sarvāpiyair ātmāṇam parimoktukāmena satkṛtya ayaṁ dharmaparyāyah pūjayitavya

1) dhārabhavatiṣyavāḥ satkṛtyavāḥ śatkarṣayāḥ 1 parebhayaḥ samprakāṣṭayatavyaḥ manasa dhārayitavyaḥ

2) dimbadamāraśvapnadurmimīśeṣu akālārturyogomara- paśumarāṃsamaśreṣṭhṇiḥ nānāvādhibhayopadreṣṭaḥ 2 imeḥ dharma-

paryāyam pūjayitvaiva caṣayaśāyavāḥ dhvaye vā uchrepiṣaṃ kṛtvā pūjayitvā nānāgandhapuṣpadhūpaśvādyayāḥ pravesṭāvayāḥ 3 caturdiseśe balīn datvābhina-

maskṛtya puṣpasthūpaṇḍhāṇaḥ sarvāḥ upadṛṣṭvā prasāsamah yāsyanti.
l) T omits dhārayitavyah satkartavyah. 2) T gives this phrase in a form which differs somewhat in both grammar and vocabulary: khrug khrug dañ / khrug sloñ dañ / rmi lam ŋan pa dañ / ltas ŋan pa dañ / dus ma yin par 'chi be dañ / smag nad dañ / phyugs nad dañ / mi nad dag dañ nad dañ 'jigs pa dañ / gnod pa sna tshogs dag la ...
3) T: 'jug par byas na.

Therefore, in that case, by those sons and daughters of good family, through the desire to free themselves from all unfortunate rebirths, having done honor, this discourse on Dharma is to be worshipped ... to be illuminated for others, to be preserved in mind; [by those desiring to be freed] from brawls, wrangles, bad dreams, and ill omens, from untimely deaths, death through cattle, death through beasts, and death through men, from the many diseases, fears and disasters, having worshipped this discourse on Dharma, it is to be recited or, having raised it on a banner, having worshipped it with various perfumes, flowers, incenses and music, it is to be brought forth (i.e. in procession ?); having given an offering to the four directions, having done homage with flowers, incenses and perfumes, all disasters will come to be allayed.

[For further examples of liturgical texts in Stā see 58.11-13; 74.17-75.3; and 76.11-77.13].

Rkṣ 40.11-41.1; GMs iv 41.1-9; GBMs vi 119.7-5; Pek. 187-5-3
[text cited above p.217]

Wherever in a village or city or town there could be [fatal] harm or an untimely death of humans or non-humans or four footed creatures who are afflicted with disease, there this book of the Ratnaketudhāraṇaḥ with the requisites for great pūjā is to be brought forth. Having been brought forth, by one being well bathed, having his limbs well anointed, being dressed in new clothes, being continent, having mounted a lion-throne strewn with various flowers, perfumed with various scents, covered with various pastes, this book of the Ratnaketudhāraṇaḥ then is to be read out. There all sicknesses and untimely deaths will be allayed. And there all fears and terrors and ill omens will disappear.
Whatever son or daughter of good family, or bhikṣu or bhikṣumī, or lay man or woman having bathed, having put on clean clothes, in a circular hall strewn with various flowers, perfumed with various scents, covered with various pastes, formed with various clothes and ornaments and fine cotton, well decorated with umbrellas and flags and banners raised aloft, having mounted a lion throne which is soft and comfortable to the touch, would 'recite' this dhāraṇī—of him nothing can cause a disturbance of thought or disturbance of body or disturbance of mind; nothing can deprive his body of breath; etc.

Whosoever will preserve, will recite these names of the Tathāgatas (i.e. those listed at ŚmD 96.1f), having risen at dawn, with purity having given flowers and incense to all Buddhas, having given incense of sandal wood to Śrī Mahādevī, [those names] are to be recited. [Then] he will realize all good fortune, he will obtain all ease and peace of mind, and all the devatas will guard, shelter and protect him; there will be success for all his undertakings.

Once again, I think it is possible to make a number of preliminary remarks concerning these passages and the rituals they describe.

1) They indicate that the Buddhism of Gilgit had available to it a rich supply of liturgical texts to structure its ritual activity. That the rituals of Śm were actually practiced at Gilgit is almost certain from the fact that the personal names of the sponsors of the
ritual or manuscript have been inserted into the mantrapadas in one of the two Ms. of StA (no. 30) recovered from Gilgit (cf. GMs i 56.5, 58.3, etc.). And there is no good reason for not assuming that the other rituals described in other texts - which are, it should be noted, much less elaborate - were not also actually performed. They also indicate that the ritual forms current or available at Gilgit were entirely non-tantric in character: they are all public acts; they may be undertaken by anyone, monk or laymen; they require no initiation, nor the instruction of any guru; and their intention is wholly exoteric.

2) There appear to be a number of different features by which the various rituals can be classified. They can be classified according to whether or not they are performed for oneself (Rkp 137.5, SmD, StA, Bhg [14]), or performed for another (Rkp 40.11, Bbp, Bhg [18]). They can be classified according to their position vis-à-vis the fear of death: there are those for which death is already present and which are undertaken to allay the fears associated with the inevitable karmatic consequences of death, or rebirth (Bhg [18], Bbp). There are those which are undertaken to cope with fears associated with imminent, usually 'untimely' death, and those undertaken to cope with fears connected with the want of materials things - poverty, hunger, subjugation - on account of which the threat of death and the possibility for unmeritorious action are greatly increased (Bhg [14], Rkp 40.11, 137.5, StA, etc.). The last two are very often times found lumped together, as at Bhg [14], but both can occur separately.

3) All are undertaken on the basis of a prior assurance of their karmatic efficacy. The assurance is given in the form of a praṇidhāna (Bhg, Bbp), a pratijñā (StA), or a statement on the part of the giver of the ritual. This is particularly important in regard to StA because the rituals it describes, when taken in isolation, can appear to be of a different character from those of Bhg and Bbp; but in the same way that the rituals of Bhg and Bbp are undertaken to bring into effect the vows of Bhaiṣajyaguru, Amičāha, etc., so the rituals of StA are undertaken to bring into effect the pratijñā of Avalokita, Vajrapāṇi, etc. And if it is accepted that when the conditions of a vow or pratijñā are fulfilled, it becomes a kind of natural - karmatic - law, then there is conceptually nothing at all 'magical' involved.
4) In all these rituals the verbal component is central. This verbal component is represented by the 'recitation' of texts (Bhg, Bbp, Rkp 40.11), the 'recitation' of the name or names of one or more Buddhas (Bhg, Bbp, SmD), or the recitation of a 'dhāranī' (StA, Rkp 137.5). This once again underlines the functional interchangeability, and therefore equivalence, of texts, Buddhas’ names, and this kind of dhāranī. All belong in a single category. It is also worth noting that this centrality of the verbal component appears to be a constant in Buddhist ritual of all periods (cf. S.J. Tambiah, Buddhism and the Spirit Cults in North-east Thailand (Cambridge: 1970) 195-222; R.B. Ekvall, Religious Observances in Tibet: Patterns and Function (Chicago: 1969) 98-149; etc.).

5) Almost all of these rituals – especially those described in comparatively greater detail – share a certain number of common features:
(a) There is an insistence on adequate preparation, either the undertaking of the Upoṣadha fast (Bhg [14], [18], StA 67.19, 72.3), or the eightfold path (Bbp), or remaining continent (Rkp 40.11).
(b) The need for a certain state of mind is specified; one is to undertake the ritual after having produced thoughts of friendliness, compassion, etc., toward all beings (Bhg [14], Bbp, StA 56.11, 67.19).
(c) The necessity of physical cleanliness is repeatedly mentioned (Bhg [14], StA 67.19, 72.3, Rkp 40.11, 137.5).
(d) There is a decided emphasis put on the need for the ritual preparation of the site (Bhg [14], StA 67.19, Rkp 40.11, Rkp 137.5).
(e) And most indicate a specific time on or during which the ritual is to take place. All of these common features are in fact preliminary to the ritual itself, and the fact that so much emphasis is placed on these preliminaries is in itself significant. They indicate above all the necessity of firmly establishing the religious, formal, 'sacred' character of the act which is about to be undertaken, and the emphasis on mental preparation is unmistakable. This, of course, accords very well with the primacy given to the mental component in all Buddhist discussions of behaviour or karmatic acts.

If the preliminaries exhibit a common structure, this is equally true of the rituals themselves. Here the basic structure is fairly simple. It involves, as I have said, a verbal component, the recitation of a text, a dhāranī, or a Buddha's name, in conjunction with activity directed towards an image, a book, or a Buddha or Bodhisattva who may or may not be physi-
cally represented (e.g. SmD). The activity consists above all of giving 'gifts' - flowers, perfume, incense, etc. - or of circumambulation, obeisance, etc. This again is the basic structure and it is common to all these rituals. And, again, this is especially important in reference to StA since the rituals there described are in detail more elaborate - there is reference to food-offerings made to the four directions, 'sprinkling', etc. - but when these rituals are compared with those in Bhg, Bbp, Bkp, etc., it is clear that these details do not affect the basic structure nor alter the fundamental character of acts involved. This, of course, is underscored by the fact that the conceptual framework which underlies the rituals of StA is, as I have indicated above, fundamentally the same as that which underlies the rituals of Bhg, Bbp, etc.

6) Finally, I think it is worth noting that in none of these rituals is there reference to the worship of stupas. This tends to confirm what I have suggested elsewhere (IIJ 17 (1975) 180-81), that the stupa cult was not a Mahayana form. As a matter of fact there are only two texts at Gilgit which unqualifiedly advocate the worship of stupas, Mok and the Adhutadhamaparyaya, both of which appear to be Hinayana texts. [This affiliation is especially interesting in terms of the Adhuta, since this text was taken over and made into Ch. I of the Anuttarāśrayasūtra, an important Tathagatagarbha sūtra (cf. J. Takasaki, "Structure of the Anuttaraśrayasūtra (Wu-shang-i-ching)", Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū 16 (1960) 34). Takasaki's somewhat unrestrained speculations regarding the place of origin of the Adhuta can, in light of its three Gilgit Ms., be laid to rest.] Apart from this there are only two definitely Mahayana texts at Gilgit which show any interest in the stupa cult, Bbp and SP, and in both - if I am not mistaken - far from being advocated, the stupa cult is considered at best as an inferior cult form (for Bbp see JIP 6 (1978) n.4; for SP, IIJ 17 (1975) 163-67, 180-81). I might also add that I have here only incidentally referred to the cult of the book. It is, however, as firmly established and pervasive in the literature from Gilgit as it is in Mahayana sūtra literature as a whole. I have not dealt with it at length because I have already written about it elsewhere, and because the Gilgit texts only confirm what I have already said without adding anything essentially new.
b. Regardless of the criteria one might choose to use it seems that the passages studied above represent the dominant and most firmly established view of puja available at Gilgit. It is not, however, the only view. One text in particular, SR, devotes a surprising amount of space to developing other views. I think it is worthwhile to study these other views in SR in some detail because they indicate better than anything else I know the differences between what I have called karmatic and Bodhic Buddhism. I will first give the relevant passages — some of which are quite long — arranged into four separate groups; and then add what comments seem necessary.

Group I.

The whole of Chapter V is in form a pūrvayoga put in the mouth of the Buddha Śākyamuni. It is clear from Matsunami's edition of the Nepalese redaction that there are significant differences between it and the Gilgit text. Since Dutt in his edition has in almost all the important passages accepted the readings of the Nepalese Mss rather than those of the Gilgit text, it seemed advisable to cite the whole of the latter as it occurs in the Ms. The Ms here is not, however, perfectly preserved. I have occasionally attempted to restore the missing portions on the basis of the Nepalese redaction and Tibetan, but only when the restoration appeared relatively certain. I have also often only indicated that a certain spot in the Gilgit Ms was damaged. In a number of cases the nature at least of the missing portion is fairly easy to surmise since it occurs in the middle of long lists of similar or related things: and in spite of the fragmentary nature of the text, enough survives to indicate clearly the nature of the argument as a whole, and to indicate that the argument in the Gilgit Ms was fuller and more detailed than that preserved in the Nepalese text.

I give below the text and translation of the most important passages together with a summary of the rest.

SR Ch. V: GBMs ix (=G) 2498.6-2507.1; GMs ii 55.8-66.16; TDK 61 (= N) 794.7-780.4; Pek. (= T) vol.31, no. 795, 278-4-7 to 280-1-6

c. tena ca kumāra kālena tena samalyena rāja mahābalasya vijīte bhagavān ghosaḍatto nāma tathāgato rhan samyaksambuddho utpanno bhūt
Chi kumāra rājā mahābālāna bhagavān ghoṣadattālaṁ tathāgato rhan sanyaksambuddha paripüṛṇam varṇasahasram nimamtrito bhūt sārdham bodhīsattvabhikṣuṣamghena 1 kalpikena paribhogena navadyena cīvara-piṇḍapātraśayā lānaṇgratayabhasajyapariśkāreṇa. Tena ca kumāra kālēna tena saṃyena tasya bhagavato ghoṣadattasya tathāgataśyārhatā samyaksambuddhasya sabodhisattvasah ghaṣyotsado [lābhha(at)kārālokā bhūt 2. śrāddhā 3 ca brāhmaṇaghapatayo bhagavato ghoṣadattasya tathāgataśyārhatā saṃmyaksambuddhasya sabodhisattvāsah ghaṣyotsado lābhhasatkāra 5 lokam akārsuḥ. te ca śrāddhā brāhmaṇaghapatayo ghoṣadattasya tathāgataśyārhatā samyaksambuddhasya lābhhasaṭkārāyodyuktā adbhūvan yaduta lokāmiṣapūjayā rājña eva ca mahā-balasāya(nu) jīkṣaṃānṛupā dhānanām abhūvad dūrdhūtā prṛjātī-pattyaḥ yaduta śilasamādānād upavā... (at least 18 aksaras missing) ... bhikṣṣubhāvāc ca tathāgatopasamkramanāc ca paryupāsanātaḥ ca (paripṛ) chanaṭaṁ ca parī(pra) śnaka(nata) ca gumbhi ... (about 18 aksaras missing) ... (Dhālgavato 6 ghoṣadattasya tathāgataśyārhatā samyaksambuddhasyaitad abhavantā pariḥṭīyante vate me satvāḥ śilapoṣadhāna... (about 16 aksaras)... (prā) vrajopasamada bhikṣu-bhāvāc ca tathāgatopasamkramanāc ca paryupāsanāc ca paripṛ chanaṭaṁ ca paripṛ śnaka(na)taḥ (Ś)... (about 16 aksaras missing)... nāc ca. Tathārū(ṇa) sukhopadhānāḥ pariḥṣītā tadantaraḥ sukhopadāneparīṣuddhā yaduta lokāmiṣa(pūjayāḥ) te a... (about 16 aksaras missing)... [f 2500] [tatkaḷṣya hetoh tathāpi sukham idam yaduta lokāmiṣa-pūjayāḥ. te ete satvāḥ drṣṭadhammagurukāḥ ca samparīṣṭayagrūkāḥ ca yaduta svargalokāyālambanatayā nātyantaniṣṭhāḥ kuṭālaṃ culāya tatraṣeṣaṁ drṣṭadhammagurukātā yaduta paṃcakāmaṃgamubhir Prajavatā. tatra katamā sāṃparīṣṭayagrūkaḥ... (about 18 aksaras missing)... katamā aṣṭantaniṣṭhe ṣālamālaṃgurukātā yadutātyantaviṣuddhiḥ aṣṭantaviṣuktir atyantayogakṛṣmataḥ aty... (about 18 aksaras missing)... niṣṭhā aṣṭantaperiniṃvānaḥ yat [f]v eham eteṣam satvānāṁ tathā dharmanām deśayeyāḥ... (about 18 aksaras missing)... [dharma]pūjāyā dharmaprātiṣṭayā tathāgataṃ pūjayeyuḥ 8)

1) This is an approximate reconstruction. Matsumani and T have bodhisattvasamghena bhikṣuṣamghena ca kalpikena, etc.; such a reading is too long for the gap in G. Besides, with the reading of G, bhikṣuṣamghena ca would be redundant. One of Matsumani’s Mss has only
sārdham bodhisattvasaṃghena kalpikena, etc. If bhikṣusamghena ca
is set aside, the remaining text of N appears to fit the gap in G.
2) Here again the text of N and T is too long unless we omit there
saśrāvakasaṃghasya ca. 3) N has lābhañgikāraṃ akāryuḥ, but this time
T supports G; rāṣṭra pa ṣaṁkṣaṅgaṃ brahmaṇaṃ pa che bar gyur to.
4) G has chrāvakāḥ ca, but context and the occurrence of the same
phrase a little further on shows this to be a mistake. 5) Again
Matsumani's and T's saśrāvakasaṃghasya must be omitted for the text
in N to fill the gap in G; it here is omitted in two of Matsumani's
Ms. 6)(4) All of this is omitted in N and T. 7) This from N fits
the gap perfectly in terms of space and matches perfectly with the
syllables at the beginning and the end of the gap in G so I have
ventured to insert it here. 8)(8) For the whole of this passage N and
T are much shorter than G: parihiṃyaṃ ca te me sattvāḥ śīlapoṣadha-
saṃdānatas tathāgaṭaṁ upasamākramaṇatas tathāgaṭaparyupāsanato
brahmācyavāsataḥ pravrajyāyā upasampado bhikṣubhāvataḥ ca. ete
sattvās tadantararam sukkhagurukāḥ. tatkaṣaya hetoḥ tathā hi tadana-
taram sukhāṃ ītaṃ yaduta lokamīsāpujāyā, ete sattvā dhṛṣṭadharma-
gurukāḥ samparāyagurukāḥ ca yaduta svargalokāyālambanatayā nātyan-
taniṣṭhāḥ kuśalamūlaḥ. yat tv aham eteṣam sattvāṁ ātyanta-
 bhikṣusā ṣāṃghaṃ bavaḥ, samykaśuddhiḥ ca yaduta svargalokāyālambanatayā nātyan-
taniṣṭhāḥ kuśalamūlaḥ. yat tv aham eteṣam sattvāṁ ātyanta-
taniṣṭhāḥ kuśalamūlaḥ. tat pravrajyāyā upasampado bhikṣubhāvataḥ ca. ete
sattvās tadantararam sukkhagurukāḥ, tatkaṣaya hetoḥ tathā hi tadana-
taram sukhāṃ ītaṃ yaduta lokamīsāpujāyā, ete sattvā dhṛṣṭadharma-
gurukāḥ samparāyagurukāḥ ca yaduta svargalokāyālambanatayā nātyan-
taniṣṭhāḥ kuśalamūlaḥ. yat tv aham eteṣam sattvāṁ ātyanta-

[And, O Crown Prince, at that time, at that period], in the
territory of the king Mahābala, a Blessed One named Ghoṣadatta, a
Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyaksaṃbuddha, appeared. Just so [O Crown
Prince, by that king Mahābala, the Blessed One Ghoṣadatta], the
Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyaksaṃbuddha (N.B. hereafter these 3 epithets,
which are constantly repeated in the text, are ignored), together
with the community of bodhisattva-bhikṣus, was for a full thousand
years presented [with suitable, with appropriate things], with the
standard belongings (of a monk): [robes and alms-bowls and couches
and] seats and medicines to cure the sick. And, O Crown Prince, at
that time, at that period, there was for that Blessed One Ghoṣadatta
together with the community of bodhisattvas an abundance of material
gain and honor and praise; and the believing brahmanas and householders (also) effected [an abundance of material gain and honor] and praise for that Blessed One Ghoṣadatta [together with the community of bodhisattvas]. Those believing brahmanas and householders were zealously active for [the material gain and honor] of Ghoṣadatta, [that is to say, through pūja through things-of-this-world], and there was an excellence of giving having a form imitating king Mahābala, (but) truly far removed from (real) practice, that is to say, from undertaking morality ..... from becoming a monk, and from approaching the Tathāgatas, and from attending to and questioning and asking about profound (dharmas?) ..... (then) to the Blessed One Ghoṣadatta this thought occurred: 'Indeed these beings are deficient in [undertaking] morality and the Upoṣadha ..... in going forth, ordination and becoming a monk, in approaching the Tathāgatas, in attending to and questioning and asking about (deep dharmas?) ..... Being of such kind they are deficient in what is necessary for happiness; (they think) having purified what is necessary for happiness is different from that (i.e., from undertaking morality, becoming a monk, etc.), that is to say, (that it is) from pūja through things-of-this-world ..... [f 2500] what is the reason for that? Just thus (they think) 'This is happiness', that is to say, by pūja through things-of-this-world. And these beings are those who are concerned with the here-and-now, and those concerned with the hereafter, that is to say, through the fact of having the world of heaven, etc., as a basis, (they are) such as have a limited end for their roots of merit. This then is the state of being concerned with the here-and-now, namely: the state of desiring the five qualities of sense pleasures. And what then is the state of being concerned with the hereafter ..... (and) what (on the other hand) is the state of being concerned with roots of merit having an unlimited end? Namely: unlimited purification, unlimited release, the state of unlimited security ..... unlimited parinirvāṇa. Suppose now I, for those beings, should so teach dharma that those beings then ..... through pūja through [dharma], through the practice of dharma, would do pūja to the Tathāgatas.

At this point Ghoṣadatta recites a series of gathas. I cite here those most relevant to the subject matter of the prose section just quoted:
lokāmiṣeṇo nara sevataṁ nyāṁ
sa teṣa sāmṛṣṭiku bhoti arthaḥ
nirāmiṣam dharma niṣevatāṁ hi
[mahāntu artho bhavati narāṇāṁ] // 3 //

na kaścī buddhaḥ) purimeṇa āśīd
anāgato bheṣyatyo 'vatiṣṭhate
yehī sthitair evam āgāramadhye
prūpta īyāṁ uttamaṁ āgrabodhiṁ // 7 //

yo buddhavīrān yatha gamgavālikā
upasthayā bahukalpakotiyaḥ
yaś ca [grhātah] parikhinnamānaso
'bhini[ṣkrameyya] ayu tatra uttamaḥ // 9 //

annehi] pānēhi ca cīvarehi vā
pūṣpehi gandhehi vilepanehi vā
nopasthitā bhonti narottama jinā
yathā pravrajitvā ca[ramāṇa dharmaṁ // 10 //

yaś caiva bodhiṁ pratikākṣamāṇa[ś 2502]-na[ḥ]
satvārtha nirvipaṇa kusamskṛtāto
raṇyāmukho saaptapadāṇi prakrame
nyāṇa tato punyu viśiṣṭu bhoti // 11 //

// 3 // Of those men honoring a man with things-of-the-world, that for them comes to be (only) an advantage connected with the present life. But for men who have recourse to dharma not of the world, [that comes to be a great advantage.]

// 7 // There was no Buddha whatsoever in the past, (nor) one that will be in the future [(or) one who is presently abiding, by whom dwelling thus in the household life] this most excellent, foremost awakening was obtained.

// 9 // Who would attend on Awakened Heroes as numerous as the sands of the Ganges for many koṭīs of kalpas; and who, having
a troubled mind, from the household life] would go forth - this (latter) is the most excellent of the two.

Through food] and drink, through robes or through flowers, through perfumes or through unguents, the Jinas, the most excellent of men, are not (truly) attended on as (they are by one, who) having gone forth, [is practising dharma.

And just who, desiring awakening], for the sake of beings being disgusted with unsatisfactory conditioned things, facing towards the forest-life, would stride forth seven steps - this [latter] is a more excellent merit than the [first].

After these gathās - vs. 11 is the last of the series - there follows another prose section, the contents of which may be summarized as follows: king Mahābala, having heard these verses thinks: "As I understand the meaning of that spoken by the Blessed One, the Blessed One does not praise the perfection of giving. That having an unlimited end the Blessed One fully praises; unlimited purification, etc." (yathāham bhagavato bhāṣitasyārthatām ājānāmi na bhagavān dānapāramitām varṇayati, atyantaniṣṭhām bhagavān samvarṇayati, atyantavisuddhim, etc.). He further reflects: "It is not easy for one dwelling in a house to accomplish the utmost practice of dharma or truly obtain it (nedaṃ sukaśām agāram adhyāvasatānuttarām dharmapratipattīm sampādaśīyattum arthato vānuprāptum)". He then resolves to 'go forth', approaches Ghoṣadatta, obtains the Ṣamādhirāja, shaves his hair and beard, etc., and 'goes forth'. After kotīs of kalpas of studying, developing, etc., the Ṣamādhirāja, pleasing Buddhas, etc., he becomes a Buddha himself. The same series of events is then repeated in reference to the large group of beings who had approached Ghoṣadatta in the company of Mahābala. The chapter is then concluded with a gathā version of the entire pūrvayoga. The core of this gathā version is represented by the following verses:

mahābalasya vijitasmi buddho
uppanna so devamunīṣayapūjitah
labhitva rājā sugatasmi śrājadāhām
upasthahī varṣasahasra pūrṇaḥ // 17 //

tasyānuśikṣī bahu anyi satvāḥ
kurvanītī satkāru tathāgatasya
lokāmiṣṇo na hi dharmaṃ priyayā
saśrāvakasyā atulo 'bhul utsadah // 18 //

abhūṣi cītam puruṣottamaṃ
deśasya dharmam ima dharmakāmāḥ
yāñān nūna sarve prajahhitva kāmān
ihā pravrajeyur mama śāsanāmin // 19 //
sa bhāṣate gāthā j narāṇam uttama
samlekhadharmaṃ sugatāna śiksām
ghravāsadosās ca anantadukkhā
pratipattī dharmasya aya dharmapūjā // 20 //

śrūṣitva gāthām tada rāja pārthivo
eko vicinteltī rahogato nṛpah
na śaṇyā gehasmi sthihitva sarvā
pratipadyitum uttamadharmapūjāḥ // 21 //

sa rāju tyaktvā yatha khetapindam, etc.

// 17 // A Buddha appeared in the territory of Mahābala; he was [worshipped] by devas and men. [The king, having obtained] faith [in the Sugata], attended on him for a full thousand years.

// 18 // Many other beings imitating him did honor to the Tathāgata through things-of-this-world, but not [through pūjā-through-dharma. And there was (also) an immensurable] abundance [for his śrāvakas.]

// 19 // (Then) a thought occurred to the Best-of-men: 'Suppose now I would teach dharma to those desirous of dharma (so that) they all, having given up desires, would here go forth [in my teaching.]
// 20 // [He], the Most Excellent of Men, [spoke these gāthās;]
'An austere dharma is the teaching of the Sugatas; and the defects of dwelling in a household are an endless suffering. Practice in dharmas - this is pūjā-through-dharma.'

// 21 // [Having heard (these) gāthās, then the king, the lord of the earth,] the protector of men, in private, [alone, reflected (thus:)] 'It is not possible for all (those) having remained in a household to accomplish the most excellent pūjā-through-dharma'.

// 22 // He (the king) having renounced his kingdom as (it it were) a wad of spit, etc., etc.

Shorter passages of this type are:

SR XXIV 29-30: GBMs ix 2620.7-8; GMs ii 318.7-10; Pek. vol. 31, 308-3-6 = 3-8 (as a part of a larger description of the decline during 'the last time' the Buddha is made to say):

śīkṣā'vadātavasthāṇām gṛhiniḥ yā mi dāśitā
sā śīkṣā tesām bhikṣuṇām tasmin kāle na bheṣyati // 29 //
bherīśeṣaṁkhaṁrayanecī pūjāṁ kāhonti te mama
yā ca sā uttamā pūjā pratipattir na bheṣyati // 30 //

// 29 // The discipline for the white-rooed householders which was taught by me, (even) that discipline in the last time will not be undertaken by monks, (instead).

// 30 // With kettle-drums, conches and tambours they will perform pūjā to me, but that which is the most excellent pūjā, practice, will not be.

SR XXXV 3-5: GBMs ix 2722.5-2723.1; GMs iii 494.1-12;

buddhāna kōṭīnayutāṇy upaṇiṣṭha
annena pānena prasannacittāḥ
chatraḥ patākābhi dipakriyābhi
kalpāna koṭī yatha gaṅgavālikā // 3 //
Who would do homage to a great number of Buddhas
with food, with drink, having a devout mind; [and so] with
umbrellas, flags and with offerings of lamps for as many koṭis of
kalpas as there are grains of sand in the Ganges;

And who, when the Good Law is being destroyed, when
the teaching of the Sugatas is being obstructed, for a single
day and night would practise the discipline - this [latter]
is a more excellent merit than the [first].

Who now would be indifferent when the Good Law of
those Best of Men is being destroyed - not by them are any of
the Jinas honored, and no respect is shown to the guides.

SR XXXII 278-79: CBMs ix 2692.5-2693.1; JMs i 452.9-16; Pek vol. 32,
9-5 = 5-6

Constantly
pursuing morality, the
samādhis, and so
also the trances, the releases, and the immeasurables;
constantly pursuing the empty and signless - he soon comes to be a Sugata in the world.

// 279 // Which bodhisattva is established in the categories of morality - just this is the most excellent pūjā to me. By him who has taken his stand on the thought of awakening in the final period of destruction are all Buddhas always, indeed, well worshipped.

Group II.

SR Ch VI: GBMs ix 2507.1ff, Gmsi 671.1ff; TDK 61, 779.1ff; Pek. vol. 31, 280-1-7ff.

1 [Then the Blessed One once again addressed the Crown Prince Candraprabha:] Therefore here, Crown Prince, by a bodhisattva, (mahāsattva, desiring this Samādhi and desiring quickly to awaken to utmost, right and full awakening) the preparation for this Samādhi is to be undertaken (samādhipariśamāyāni; tiṇ ē 'dzin 'di yoṇs su sbyaṅ bar bya'o). Then, Crown Prince, what is the preparation for this Samādhi? Here, O Crown Prince, a bodhisattva, mahāsattva, [with a mind firmly established in great compassion] is actively engaged in acts of pūjā directed toward [abiding] or parinirvāṇed Tathāgatas; that is to say, (pūjā) through robes and alms-bowls and couches and seats and medicines to cure the sick [through the standard belongings (of a monk); through flowers and incense and perfumes and garlands and unguents] and aromatic powders and strips of cloth and umbrellas and flags and banners, through (the music) of tūryas and tāḍāvacaras. And the root of merit (resulting from that) he turns over towards the obtaining of this Samādhi (tac ca kuśalamūlam samādhipratilambhāya parināmayati). [He, anticipating no dharma whatsoever] does pūjā to the Tathāgata (sa na kāmuṣdham ākāṅkṣams tathālgaṭam pūjayati; de chos gaṅ la yāṅ re ba'i phyir de bzin g漕s pa la mchod par mi byed de /), not (anticipating) form, nor sense pleasures, nor objects of enjoyment, nor heaven (svarga), nor a retinue, nor (anything) to be found in all the threefold universe. 2 And moreover, [he, having his thoughts on dharma (dharmacittako bhavati)], not 3
anticipating (anything), does not observe, does not apprehend the Tathāgata through the dharmakāya, how much less will he apprehend him through something other than the dharmakāya. Therefore in this case, Crown Prince, [this is the pūjā to the Tathāgatas] ([oṣaḥ sā tathāgatānām pūjā]), that is to say: the non-seeing of the Tathāgatas, and the non-apprehension of a self, and the state of not anticipating the maturation of action (tathāgatasya dārśanam deśmañña cānupalabdhiḥ karmavipākasya cāpratikāṅkṣanatā.) [Having done pūjā to the Tathāgata] through this [pūjā] having the three spheres purified, [the bodhisattva, mahāsattva] obtains this Samādhi. He through this turning-over in which the three spheres are purified, presenting however little (? kiṃparīttatāpi) through flowers, garlands, perfumes, and unguents. ... (G damaged) ... he turns (it) over. For him the roots of merit from that are inconceivable, inconceivable the maturation; and he obtains this Samādhi; and quickly to utmost, right and full awakening [he awakens].

1) I have not given the whole of the Sanskrit text for this passage for a number of reasons: it is rather straightforward prose; it is shorter and therefore less chopped up than the pieces from Ch. V; and the redactional differences do not appear to have been so great as with the latter chapter. I have however inserted the original into the translation between parentheses for all the passages which appear significant for the argument. Although the Gilgit Ms for this passage is again fragmentary, enough survives to indicate that it differed in some ways from the Nepalese redaction. Where all possible I have followed the Gilgit text. Anything based on the Nepalese redaction - whether text or my translation - is enclosed within brackets, and the important points of difference between the two redactions are signalled in the following notes.

2) G: na sarvatraidhātuke vyavacārānīṣṭaḥ; neither the Nepalese redaction nor the Tibetan translation have anything corresponding to this. 3) G is missing here, and although N has sa ākāṅkṣan and T de dod pa na, both what has preceded and what follows seems to suggest that a na has dropped out. I have therefore translated as if the text read sa na-ākāṅkṣan. 4) G: ...rāmakāyato pā tathāgataḥ na-m-anupāsyati nopolabhatē kim anām punar anyam dharmakāyata upalapayate;
but N and T: dharmakāyato 'pi tathāgataṁ nopalabhate, kim aṅga punā rūpakāyata upalapsyate. 5) On the term trimaṇḍalaparīśuddhi see BHSD 258; here it would refer to the door of pūjā, the act of pūjā, and the object to which the pūjā is directed. To say all three are 'purified' is to say that all three are regarded as ultimately empty, cf. the 3rd verse in the gāthās which follow this section. 6) N and T have simply (... samādhiṁ pratilabhate,) ksipram cānuttarām samyak-sambodhim abhisambudhyate. G, however, was fuller: (... samādhiṁ pratilabhate ... so nema trimaṇḍalaparīśuddhena pariṇāmena kṣipram cānuttarāpi puspamālyagandhavilepanena tathā ... (at least 20 akṣaras are probably missing) ... riṇāmayati ... tasya tatkusalamulam acintyaṁ bhavaty acintyaṁvīpākaṁ ... imaṇca samādhiṁ pratilabhate ksipram cānuttarām samyaksambodhi ... 

The last of the three chapters in SR which is wholly devoted to the question of pūjā is Ch. XXXIII. Since Filliozat ("La mort volontaire par le feu et la tradition bouddhique indienne", JA 251 (1963) 21-51) has already published an almost complete translation of this chapter it will be sufficient here to give only a brief summary of its contents and to note those passages which articulate the conception, or conceptions, of pūjā which the chapter wants to establish.

In form Ch. XXXIII is another purvayoga: in a past time there was a Tathāgata named Choṣadatta; after teaching innumerable beings, he parinirvāṇed. A king by the name of Śrīghoṣa then built thousands of stūpas and placed thousands and thousands of lamps on each stupa, and offered incense, perfumes, etc. Being so engaged, he also assembled a large number of bodhisattvas, all of whom were reciters of dharma, and attended on them with the requisites. One night, after doing magnificent pūjā at the stūpa, the king with his followers goes to hear dharma from the assembly of bodhisattvas. Among that assembly there is a young bodhisattva, Kṣemadatta, who sees the illumination of all those lamps and resolves to do pūjā which would surpass that of Śrīghoṣa. He wrappes his arm in cloth, soaks it in oil, and sets it afire. The illumination of his burning arm dims all the lamps of Śrīghoṣa, the earth trembles, etc. Śrīghoṣa, weeping at the loss of Kṣemadatta's arm, praises him in verse, and Kṣemadatta answers him, also in verses, the most important of which are the following:
SR XXXIII 12-15: GBMs ix 2700.2-4; CMs ii 463.9-16; Pek. vol. 32, 11-3-1=3-4

naivam syad apanahino 'sau yasya bahur na vidyate
sa tu devapanahina syad[di] yasya shrna na vidyate // 12 //

acintiyā daksinīyā sarvalokasya cetiyā // 13 //

anantā yas trisāhasrā ratanānām paripūrītā
pradudyālllokanāthebhayo buddhajñānāgaveṣāṅkāḥ // 14 //

asty eṣā laukiki pūjā anyā pūjā acintiyā
ye dharmāṃ eṣā[ti] jānanī tyajante kāya jīvitam // 15 //

// 12 // He for whom an arm does not (in fact) exist could not thus be deprived of a limb; but, O King, he for whom there is no morality would indeed be deprived of a limb.

// 13 // By this foul smelling body are the Tathāgatās worshipped by me - those inconceivable Shrines of All the World which are to be honored;

// 14 // (and) who, (even if) seeking the knowledge of a Buddha, having filled this boundless three thousand (world system) with precious things would present it to the Lords of Men -

// 15 // This (still) is worldly pūjā. The inconceivable pūjā is something (quite) different: those who know dharmas are empty, they reject (even the idea of) body and life.

Kṣemadatta then performs an 'act of truth (satyavākya) and his arm reappears.

Apart from the verses quoted above, the important passages in the chapter are those which express the motivation behind the acts of pūjā of the two individuals. Śrīghoṣa's activity is expressed in the following terms:
tasya tathāgatasya parinirvāṇasya pūjārtham tathāgatadhātugarbhaṁ caturāśīṣṭitistūpakoṭisahasrāṇi kārṇyam āsa (2693.6); that is to say, his activity is undertaken simply "for the sake of worshipping that parinirvāṇed Tathāgata". Kṣemadatta's activity, on the other hand, is expressed thus: yon(ṇv) ahaṁ samāhāṁ ākāśakāmat tathāgatapūjāṁ kuryāṁ (2695.7), "what if I, desiring this Samādhi, would do pūjā to the Tathāgata"; and:

atha kṣemalāttasya bodhisattvasya mahāsattvasyādhyātanuttarāṁ samyaksaṁbodhīṁ paryēṣamāṇasya tathā padāyo daksāīe bāhau nābhiitāṁ cītasya mukhavāṁṣa vānyathātvāṁ, "then since the intention of the bodhisattva, mahāsattva, Kṣemadatta, was to seek utmost, right and perfect awakening, so while his right arm was burning there was not (the slightest) change in his mind or of the expression on his face";

and finally: yonīṁ dīpito bāhau buddhājāmāṇasya kārṇaṁ, "when that arm was burnt for the sake of the knowledge of a buddha".

Shorter passages of the same kind are:

SR XXXV 68: GBMs ix 2739.2-4; GMs ii 522.3-6; Pek. vol. 32, 18-2 =

3-2

pūjāṁ ca atulāṁ karonti muditaṁ puṣṭebhi ṣaṁdhēbhi ca grhyā cchaturāśīṣṭā patāka vividhā saṃgīṭabhaṅgāṁ ca no cāpi abhinanditāḥ bhavagatim jñātvāṁ śūnyāṁ bhavāṁs
tena laṅkapacitraṁ dāśabāṁ bhāsaṁti sarvāṁ diśaṁ 69 // 69 //

69 // Having taken up umbrellas and flags, banners and various implements of music, and with flowers and perfumes they, joyful, perform innumerable pūjās, but they do not rejoice in a state of existence, having known (all) existences as empty. By reason of that all the Buddhas in the (ten) directions appear ornamented with the marks.

And

SR XXXI 19-20: GBMs ix 2662.3-4; GMs ii 400.7-12; Pek. vol. 32,

4-3-5-7

tenā pūjīta bhonti nāyakā dvipadenārā
yo 'saṁ dharmanvahāṁ jānatī sādā śūnyāṁ 19 //
tenā pūjīta sarvā nāyakā ya atitāṁ
tatha te pūjīta ye anāgatā dvipade. ∥∥
tehī satkṛta sarvī nāyakā sthita ye co

ye 'sau dharmasvabhāvā jānatī sada śūnyam // 20 //

// 19 // That one who knows always that the own-being of dharmas is empty - by him are the Guides, the Leaders of men, worshipped.

// 20 // That one who knows always that the own-being of dharmas is empty - by him are all the past Guides worshipped, so also those who are to be the future Leaders of men are worshipped, and by him are honored all the Guides who [just now] abide.

Group III.

SR XXIV 55-59: GBMs ix 2622.5-2623.1; GMs ii 321.15-322.12; Pek. vol. 31, 308-5-6 = 309-1-3:

śilaskandhe sthīhitvā ca bahuṣrūtyam upārjayat
imam samādhiṃ eṣantaḥ pūjāyec chāstu dhātavah // 55 //

chatrair dhvajarāiḥ patākābhīr gandhāmālayailepanair
kārayet pūja buddhasya samādhiṃ śāntvam eṣataḥ // 56 //

rajiṃtyehi turyehi samātiṃ samprayojayet
pūjāyec dhātum buddhasyānavaḷino atandrītah // 57 //

yāvanti gandhāmālāyini dhūpanāna gūrṇacallicān
sarvais tahiḥ pūjayaṃ nāthaṃ buddhajñānasya kārṇat // 58 //

yāvanti pūrvabuddhānāṃ kṛtā pūjā neintiyū
anañāhastena bhūtvānaṃ samādhiṃ śāntam eṣata // 59 //, etc.

// 55 // Having taken his stand on the categories of morality, he would gain great learning; desiring this Samādhi he would do pūjā to the relics of the teacher.

// 56 // With umbrellas, with flags, with banners, with perfumes and garlands and unguents he would do pūjā to the Buddha from a desire for this auspicious Samādhi.
He would perform music with delightful tūryas, he would do pūjā to the relic of the Buddha, confident and unwearied.

As many as are the perfumes and garlands, the incenses, the aromatic powders and strips of cloth, with all these he would do pūjā to the Lord for the sake of the knowledge of the Buddha.

As much as is the inconceivable pūjā done to former Buddhas through seeking for this auspicious Samādhi, having become one not relying on a basis; etc.

In this passage - as in those we have already studied from Chs. VI and XXXIII - one performs pūjā for the sake of obtaining this Samādhi. Samādhi here, as throughout the Samādhirāja, is a multi-valent term; it may mean a particular samādhi - although the Samādhirāja as a particular samādhi is nowhere described or mentioned in the text - or it may mean the Samādhirāja-sūtra. If it refers to a particular samādhi, then 'the intention to obtain the Samādhi' must be understood to mean the intention to realize or incorporate into one's behaviour that particular concentrated insight; if it refers to the Samādhirāja-sūtra, then the intention to obtain that sūtra cannot be understood to mean simply obtaining a particular text, but must also mean the internalization of the 'teaching' contained in that text, the internalization of the response to the world which that text articulates. Since this Samādhi/Sūtra-teaching is in several places in the text explicitly equated with the 'awakening' (bodhi) of the Buddha (see for example XXXVI 15a quoted below), then to seek this Samādhi/Sūtra-teaching is to seek the awakening of a Buddha, and, in line with this, we find in the above passage, as elsewhere in similar contexts, the terms Samādhi, bodhi and buddhajñāna used interchangeably to express the goal toward which one is directed in undertaking pūjā. Passages of this kind are numerically the most significant kind of passage dealing with pūjā in the Samādhirāja as a whole. They are found at II 8, 18; III 12; XIII 26; XV 5, 7, 8, 9; XVII 27; XVIII 9, 21, 50, 52, 53; XXIV 38; XXV 3; XXIX 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55; XXXII 233, 236; XXXVII 2, 78-81. With these should also be grouped XIV 40, 49, 54 (where acts of pūjā precede a vow to become a buddha); XXXII 165, 277 (where pūjā is
preparatory to obtaining this samādhi) and XXIX 114 (where pūja is undertaken bhavantakaraṇe).

Group IV.

SR XI 43-47: GBMs ix 2547.4-7; GMs ii 164.1-16; Pek. vol. 31, 290-4-7 = 5-2.

{[sarva jīna atīta pūjitūs te
  apāl 1 rimitā ya anāgatās ca buddhāt
  daśasu diśasu ye sthitās ca buddhā
  ima vara śānta samādhi dośayitvā // 43 //

  yatha īnaru āha kaścī puṇyokāmo
  daśabājākāruṇīkān upastheyyā
  aparimita ananta kalpakotf-
  r aparimitam ca janetva premu teṣu // 45 //

  āvītiyu naru bhaveta puṇya[ka]mo
  itu paramārthana[yāt tu] 3 gāthā[ml ekām
  dhariya carimakāli vartamāne
  īpurī[ml]ku puṇya kalām na bhoti tasya // 46 //

  para[ma iya viśiṣṭa buddha[pu]jā
   carimakī dāruṇī kāli vartātānāne
   ca[tupadam ita gātha eka śrutvā
   dhārayi pūjita tena sarvabuddhāh // 47 //

1) The Gilgit Ms for this passage is fragmentary so I have given the reconstruction - presumably based on the Nepalese Ms - supplied by Dutt in brackets and will add in these notes the Tibetan translation which appears to correspond to the missing passages.  T: 'das pa'i rgyal ba dpag med thams cad daṅ /.

  2) T: skyes bu la la bsod nams 'dod pas 'dir / stobs bcu ldan pa('i)...

  3) T: bsod nams 'dod pa yis / don dam tshul 'di las nī ...

  4) T: phyi ma mi zad dus su gyur pa'i tshe.

// 44 // Having taught (Nepalese redaction: 'having preserved') this choicest auspicious Samādhi, [all the past Jīnas are worshipped], and which are the innumerable future Buddhas, as well as the Buddhas now in the ten directions.
As [some man desiring merit here] would serve those compassionate [Daśabalaś] for immeasurable, endless koṭīs of kalpas, having generated immeasurable love for them;

(and) there would be a second man [desiring] merit; he during the last time would preserve a single gāthā [from this method of the highest meaning] - that form of merit is not (even a) small part of this (latter's merit).

This is the highest, most excellent pūjā of the Buddha: having heard [during the last terrible times] a single gāthā of [four] lines from this (text, and) then to preserve it - by that all Buddhas are worshipped.

SR XXXVI 14-15a: GBMs ix 2749.4-5; GMs ii 547.7-11; Fek. vol. 32, 21-4-8 = 5-1.

tasmāt kumāreha ya bodhisatvo
ākāṃksate pūjitu sarvabuddhān
atita utpanna tathāgatāṃ ca
dhārutu vācetu imam sāmādhiṃ // 14 //
esā Chiśāḥ sā bodhi tathāgatānāṃ // 15a //

Therefore, O Kumāra, which bodhisatva here desires to do pūjā to all Buddhas, to the Tathāgatas past and present, he should preserve, he should recite this Samādhi[rāja-sūtra].

For this, indeed, is the awakening of the Tathāgatas.

Two further examples may be seen at XXII 135 and 142.

Apart from the passages which have been referred to above, reference to pūjā occurs in the Samādhirāja in only two other forms: in epithets of the Buddha or of bodhisattvas at XVII 29, 165; XXIX 1; XXX 199, 204, etc.; and in narrative contexts where the term is used in a purely conventional sense (this is especially common in the nidānas of individual chapters) at II 5; X passim (the whole of this long chapter is given over to describing how various categories of beings - devas, asuras, etc. - performed pūjā to the Buddha as he entered Rājaśīha); XVI 28; GMs ii 217.5,8; XVII 107; GMs ii 275.2; XX 6,8; XXI 26; etc.]
The following points might be noted in reference to these passages.

1) As I have intimated at the beginning, passages of this kind are found at Gilgit in SR alone. In this sense they undeniably represent the minority view and this position within the literature as a whole must be clearly kept in mind.

2) It is obvious that the compilers of SR were inordinately pre-occupied with the 'problem' of puja. There is perhaps no other single topic which receives so much attention. It is equally obvious that their response to the 'problem' was by no means consistent. The passages in which we find this response in fact fall naturally into no less than four groups.

3) The first kind of response is found in our Group I. I refer here specifically to Ch. V. The construction of the argument of Ch. V is basically rather simple. It consists of the juxtaposition of a series of paired opposites. At the simplest level the opposition is between 'what people do' and 'what people ought to do'. In the first prose section this opposition is expressed in terms of type of behavior - puja through-material-things versus practice or practice of dharma (which at the end of the section is called 'puja-through dharma') - and in terms of difference of intention - concern with things-of-this-world, with the hereafter, with having a limited end for one's roots of merit, versus being concerned with roots of merit having an unlimited end. Verse 3 repeats the first opposition with only slight variation in terminology, while verses 7-9 express it with a new set of opposites: living as a householder versus 'going forth' as a monk. Verses 18 and 20-21 then recapitulate what has gone before, giving final expression to the basic sets of opposites in terms of satkāru ... lokāmyo versus dharmapūjā, and gṛhavása versus pratipatti dharmasa.

At this stage two points can be noted. First, since Ch. V takes as its point of departure 'what people do', and since its entire emphasis is on contrasting this with 'what people ought to do', it seems fairly obvious that what we have in this chapter is a conscious attempt to redefine and redirect what was in fact the pre-existing and prevalent conception of puja. The text is not simply developing a point-of-view, but is reacting to a point-of-view already firmly established. The second point to be noted is that this reaction is in no way a new one in the history of
Buddhist doctrine. If for the sake of simplification we express the opposition in terms of pūjā versus pratipatti, then its similarity, its virtual sameness, with the attitude which - though it only rarely receives formal expression - dominates the entire Pali Canon as we have received it, is strikingly apparent. In the *Mahāparinibbāna-nuttara* V.3, when the Buddha is near his end, the Sāla trees bloom out of season and drop their flowers on him, heavenly flowers fall from the sky, and heavenly music, all for the sake of doing pūjā to the Tathāgata (tathāgatassa pūjaya).

But the Buddha turns to Ānanda and says:

-na kho ānanda etṭāvattā tathāgato sakkato vā hoti gurukato vā mānito vā pūjito vā apacito vā. yo kho ānanda bhikkhu vā bhikkhunī vā upāsako vā upāsikā vā dhammānudhammapatipanno viharati samācāpaṭipanno anudhammadārī, so tathāgataṃ sakkaroti gurukaroti māneti pujeti paramāya pūjaya.

But not, Ānanda, by such is the Tathāgata honored or revered or reverenced or worshipped or adored. But which monk or nun or lay man or woman abides practising in accordance with dhamma, correctly practising, acting in accordance, that one honors the Tathāgata, reveres, reverences, worships and adores him through the most excellent pūjā. (Cf. the 'paraphrase' (?) of this passage at *Jātakamāla* (Kern ed.) 207.13-17.)

Clearly then, the attitude which is being expressed by Ch. V of the *Samādhirāja*, the attempt to substitute for the conception of pūjā-as-worship a conception of pūjā-as-practice defined primarily in the sense of monastic discipline, is not unique to it. As a matter of fact it appears to have been an old attitude which was shared by at least some members of both the Mahāyāna and Hinayāna. This is further illustrated by the fact that the whole of this chapter of a Mahāyāna text could have easily been accepted as doctrinally 'orthodox' by even the most conservative Theravādin monk. That it was not the predominant attitude in Buddhist India, however, is equally well illustrated by our other texts, as well as by the richness of even the mere remnant of surviving Buddhist art and religious architecture.
We also find exactly the same opposition between puṣṇa and practice expressed in the shorter passages cited under Group I and it is important to note that all these passages respond almost exclusively to what can be called the behavioral component of the 'problem' of puṣṇa.

4) A second, more complicated response, is found in the passages cited under Group II. I begin here with Ch. VI. Ch. V, although it refers to a difference of intention, is, as we have seen above, primarily occupied with the behavioral component, with kinds of action - worship versus practice, dwelling in the house versus 'going forth' as a monk. Ch. VI, on the other hand, wants to respond to the problem from quite a different angle, and its response appears to involve at least three different components. First, in terms of the behavioral, Ch. VI does not wish to exclude puṣṇa-as-worship. On the contrary, this is the only type of activity which our chapter envisions, and what it understands by that activity is unmistakably spelled out: it is exactly that which Ch. V called puṣṇa-through-things-of-this-world'. This then - in terms of the behavioral component - is what is to be done. But it is to be done with a particular intention (the intentional component) and with a particular understanding (the cognitive component).

As we have seen, Ch. V had already referred to the intentional component, but it was limited to stating the contrast between the intention behind puṣṇa (concern with things of this world and the hereafter) and the intention behind practice (concern with roots of merit having an unlimited end). Ch. VI, however, goes beyond this. It specifies that puṣṇa is to be undertaken as a "preparation" for this Samādhi/Sūtra-teaching, and that the roots of merit resulting from that puṣṇa are to be turned towards obtaining this Samādhi/Sūtra-teaching. It also expresses the intentional component negatively: it is not undertaken for the sake of objects of the world, heaven, nor anything in the threefold universe. For Ch. V this appears to have been the only possible intention behind puṣṇa-through-things-of-this-world, but Ch. VI, by not accepting this limitation, and by introducing a more acceptable (to it) intention behind puṣṇa, clearly undercuts Ch. V's opposition. It is important to emphasize that the introduction of this more acceptable intention is precisely the factor which allows Ch. VI - unlike Ch. V - to not only accept, but to advocate puṣṇa-as-worship on the behavioral level. But Ch. VI does not stop here.
If puja is to be done (behavioral), but is to be done with a particular intention (intentional), it is also to be done with a particular mental outlook (the cognitive component). What this cognitive component consists of is once again clearly spelled out by Ch. VI, first when it says: He, doing puja, "does not observe, does not apprehend the Tathagata through the dharmakāya, how much less will he apprehend him through something other than the dharmakāya"; and then in its final summation when it says: "This is puja to the Tathagatas, that is to say: the non-seeing of the Tathagatas, and the non-apprehension of a self, and the state of not anticipating the maturation of actions." That is to say, one behaves in such a way, one undertakes religious activity, though in so doing one does not 'apprehend', one does not cognitively acknowledge an agent of this activity nor an object toward which that activity is directed; and one does not anticipate that acting in this way will have a definite result. However, the result of that action, more correctly the repetition of that action - the text is not talking about a single act of puja - is the obtainment of this Samādhī/Sūtra-teaching, i.e., the internalization of the behavioral-cognitive pattern contained therein, and the relatively quick total internalization of this patterned response to the world: religious activity without cognitive acknowledgement, that is to say, Buddhahood. Although much less clearly expressed, there is one other chapter in the Samādhīrāja which is struggling to express something like the same idea. This is Ch. XXXIII.

Clearly the author of this chapter - like that of Ch. VI - wanted to emphasize the intentional component in the action of Kṣemadatta - it is mentioned three times in a relatively short space - and by so doing, presumably, to contrast it with that of Śrīghoṣa. The demonstration of this difference in intention is elsewhere in SR apparently enough for the author to make his point. Here, however, he seems to want to go beyond this, at least this is the impression one gets from vs. 14 where he says that even if one gives material gifts to the Buddha with the intention of gaining the knowledge of a Buddha, this is still laukikī puja. The author also seems to imply in vs. 13 - at least in the way I have understood it - that although much superior to Śrīghoṣa's gifts, Kṣemadatta's apparent gift of his arm is still in the category of worldly puja (this is narratively indicated by the fact that the result of both acts, although quantitatively different are qualitatively the same, i.e. 'illumination' in the
sense of actual light). What our author, in fact, wants to emphasize above all appears to be a cognitive pattern which would underlie even the intention. He indicates what he means by this in vs. 12 where he says in effect that there can be no loss of a limb for someone who has no conception of an arm, and in vs. 15 where he says that the puja acintiyya - obvious the kind of puja he wants to argue for - is where someone knows all dharmas are empty and therefore rejects '(the idea of) body and life'. That such 'knowledge' is the real meaning of Kṣemadatta's 'gift' is also indicated by the last two parts of his three part 'act of truth': yena satyena dharma 'sau bāhur nāma na vidyate / tena satyena me bāhur bhoti kṣipram yathā purā // etc / yena satyena dharma 'sau kṣema-
datto na vidyate, etc.

All of the passages in our Group II then respond to the 'problem' of puja in terms not of the behavioral component, but in terms, first, of the intentional component, and above all in terms of the cognitive component. This means - and it is important to keep this in mind - that puja is unambiguously accepted and advocated if it is undertaken with an acceptable (to the compilers of SR) intention (obtainment of bodhi, internalization of the Samādhi/Sutra-teaching, etc.), and if it is approached and 'perceived' in an acceptable manner.

5) The passages cited under Group III represent yet another kind of response, although it has much in common with that found in Group II passages. It, in fact, represents virtually the same response except that Group III passages do not go beyond the question of intention. All these passages presuppose the point of departure which in Ch.s V, VI and XXXIII is explicitly stated: they begin from what was obviously the prevailing and predominant conception of puja in the environment which surrounded them - a Buddhist environment - that is to say, puja-as-worship undertaken to secure material benefits in this life, or rebirth in 'heaven' in the next. In approaching this situation they do not attempt a radical dis-placement of the behavioral component of puja-as-worship. Acts of puja are, again, not only accepted, but advocated (narratively it is stated that acts of puja have been, are being, or should be undertaken, depending on the individual contexts). 'That these passages want to do is simply redirect the intentional component of puja-as-worship, to substitute for material benefits, rebirth in 'heaven', etc., the obtaining, the inter-
nalization of this Samādhi/Sūtra-teaching. They do not, unlike the
passages in Group II, go beyond this, bracketing as it were the whole
question of a cognitive component. As has already been noted passages
of this type in the Samādhirāja are numerically the most significant.
Whether numerical significance is the same as doctrinal significance is
difficult to say, but the fact that these passages represent the most
common response in the text as a whole is not without interest. Certainly
this is the least innovative of the attempted 'revaluations' of puja
which the text develops and, as a consequence, perhaps stood the best
chance of acceptance in what appears to have been a basically conservative
tradition.

6) Group IV passages represent an approach which plays a much more
important role elsewhere, but which in the Samādhirāja is of minor
importance. There are in fact only four passages in which this approach
is developed. Here we find puja defined in terms of the preservation
of the teaching, i.e. to preserve the teaching, usually in "the last time",
is to worship all Buddhas.

7) Apart from these more specific remarks, we can also add some more
general observations concerning all of these passages taken as a whole.
The first is that their defensive posture is everywhere apparent; every-
where their discussions begin from the same point of departure. They do
not develop their argument on its own terms, but always in reaction to a
given situation and that situation is always the same: Ch. V begins, both
narratively and doctrinally, with Mahābala and his people doing puja to
the Tathāgata through 'things-of-this-world'; Ch. XXXIII in the same way
begins with Śrīghoṣa's elaborate performance of puja at the stūpa of
Choṣadatta; even Ch. VI, the one major discussion which in form is not a
pūrvayoga, clearly begins by taking puja-as-worship as a given. Puja for
the authors of the Samādhirāja was a fact, and because of that, it appears
to have been a problem.

8) The general terms with which we chose to describe these responses
as a group are important. There appear to be at least three possibilities.
They may be said to represent either 1) pieces of theological sophistry
attempting to explain away a doctrinally embarrassing practice; or 2) they
may express established views actually held by their authors and their
readers at the time of their composition; or 3) they may represent tentative
gropings, or the prototypes of arguments not yet perfected in what was a genuine and on-going attempt by the developing śūnyatāvādin world-view to incorporate into itself the accepted and predominant forms of Buddhist praxis. Although there are occasional hints of something like the first possibility, the repetition, the lack of consistency, the multiplication of alternate approaches, strongly implies that the most appropriate characterization is the third.

9) It is also important to note what is and what is not criticized in these passages. There is no explicit criticism of the cult of the book or book-worship, nor the cult of images, nor - significantly - of the ritual use of dharanīs. Nor is there any criticism of puja undertaken for the sake of gaining rebirth in a buddhafield. The great majority of these passages, however, either explicitly or implicitly take as the object of their criticism activity connected with the worship of stupas. They also explicitly criticize puja undertaken for the sake of rebirth in 'heaven' (svarga). I think, therefore, that it is clear that however much the conception of svarga and the conception of a buddhafield may appear to be alike in our eyes, the tradition itself never confused them. They also explicitly criticize puja undertaken for reasons connected with "the here-and-now" and with "the hereafter", with "sense pleasures" and "objects of enjoyment". This, of course, is an explicit criticism of some, if not all, of the fundamental intentions of karmatic Buddhism. (It remains to be seen whether or not 'concern with rebirth in a buddhafield' would be included under the category 'concern with the hereafter' and, therefore, be at least implicitly criticized here.)

10) As I said at the beginning of this section, these passages are important because they illustrate better than anything I know the differences between karmatic and bodhic Buddhism. And I think it will be obvious from all that has been said so far that these differences are not primarily behavioral. The two 'Buddhisms' do not necessarily require two different kinds of religious activity. This is especially clear in SR Chs. VI and XXXIII. The differences are above all differences of intention. In one, religious acts are performed for reasons connected with "the here-and-now" and with "the hereafter"; in the other, the same acts are undertaken for reasons connected with the obtainment of bodhi. The cognitive component, though a significant presence in Chs. VI and XXXIII, is not - when these passages are taken as a whole - of primary importance.
Again further, Māñjuśrī, which believing sons or daughters of
good family take up for as long as they live the threefold refuge
(and) are without another devata; which preserve the five rules of
training; which preserve the ten rules of training; which preserve
the obligations of a bodhisattva, the four hundred rules of training;
again, which monks, having gone forth from dwelling in a house,
preserve the two hundred and fifty rules of training; which more
preserve the five hundred rules of training - which, of these, having
the (rules of) training and obligations in accordance with what they
have undertaken, afterwards come to be fallen from one or another
rule of training 1) (and) are afraid from fear of (rebirth in) an
unfortunate destiny or unfortunate state: which of these worship and
do pūjā to the Blessed One Bhaiṣajya-guruvaiḍūryaprabha, 'he Tathā-
gata'1; for them the suffering of the three unfortunate states is
not to be expected. (And) any woman who at the time of giving birth
experiences excessively sharp unpleasant feelings, 2) (and) who
worships and does pūjā to the Blessed One Bhaiṣajya-guruvaiḍūryaprabha,
the Tathāgata 2, 3) she is quickly freed 3; she will give birth to a
child having all his limbs fully formed, handsome, beautiful, worthy
of being seen, having sharp faculties, possessing intelligence, healthy
having very little trouble; (and) it will not be possible for his
vital warmth to be snatched away by non-human beings.

1) (1x, Śīkṣ: '... if they, afraid from fear of (rebirth in) an
unfortunate destiny, would preserve the name of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajya-
guruvaiḍūryaprabha, the Tathāgata, and would perform pūjā (to him) in
accordance with their resources' (Śīkṣ alone has the final clause); Z has
'... which perform puja to the Blessed One, etc.'; and T: '... which would perform various kinds of puja'. 2) (2X: '(and) who would recollect the name of, and perform puja to the Blessed One, etc.'; T simply 'would do puja'. 3)(3X: she delivers in comfort'.

This section requires only a few brief observations. The first concerns the term ananyadevata. Edgerton, under ananyadeva (BHSD 201), says: "... Burnouf, Lotus 581, followed by BR, not having (recognizing) other gods (implausible)." Although this meaning of ananyadeva as an epithet of the Buddha may be "implausible"; and although I have not met the term elsewhere at Gilgit, it is difficult to believe that this is not the meaning of ananyadevata in the present passage. [Outside of Gilgit see P.M. Harrison, The Tibetan Text of the Pratyutpāna-Buddha-Samānahavasāhita-Samādhi-Sutra (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series I). The Reiyukai Library, in the press, 11B: des saṅh rgyas la skyabs su 'gro bar bya'o // chos la skyabs su 'gro bar bya'o // dge 'dun la skyabs su 'gro bar bya'o // tshul khrims yoṅs su dag par bya'o // balab pa'i gi la yoṅs su gua bar bya'o // lha gšan med par bya śiṅ bam pa saṅh rgyas kyi rjes su soṅ bar bya'o //; 12B: dge bof'en ma gua la skyabs su soṅ śiṅ lha gšan med par bya'o //; 12C: saṅh rgyas chos dge de bzin dge 'dun las / lha gšan med ciṅ, etc.]

A second point to be noted - and one I have already referred to - is that this passage makes it clear that the cult of Bhaisajyaguru was as much a 'monastic' cult as it was a lay one. As a matter of fact, this single passage refers to virtually every possible status within the Buddhist community: lay men and women, monks, nuns and bodhisattvas. This, in turn, further confirms the fact that karmatic Buddhism cannot be equated with "lay Buddhism", and that the concerns of karmatic Buddhism were shared by at least some members of every group within the overall Buddhist community.

A final point concerns the reference to "the four hundred rules of training of the Bodhisattva". This is the only such reference I know of at Gilgit, or anywhere else for that matter. (This same passage is quoted in the Śīkṣasamuccaya.) We have, in fact, very little definite information on a, or the, Mahāyāna Vinaya, and there may be a very good reason for that: there may not have been any. On this whole question there is nothing that
comes close to L. de La Vallée Poussin's "Notes bouddhiques XVII - Opinions sur les relations des deux véhicules au point de vue du Vinaya", *BCLS* 16 (1930) 20-39. And it is interesting to note that the discovery of the Gilgit Mss. goes a long way towards confirming the essentials of what de La Vallée Poussin puts forth as "opinions": we find at Gilgit a collection of literature which is essentially and overwhelmingly Mahāyāna; the Hinayāna texts are both very few and very short. But the Vinaya which apparently governed this same community was that of the Mulasarvāstivāda. This situation is, of course, to a large degree paralleled in the Tibetan Kanjur. [For some other interesting comments on the "Mahāyāna Vinaya" and related topics see L. de La Vallée Poussin, "Notes bouddhiques VII - Le Vinaya et la pureté d'intention", *BCLS* 15 (1929) 201-17; N. Dutt, *Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism and Its Relation to Hinayāna* (London: 1930) 290-322; P. Python, *Vinaya-Vinīśaya-Upāli-Purīṇapāla*, Enquête d'Upāli pour une exégèse de la discipline, (Paris: 1973) 6-18.]
Then again the Blessed One addressed the Venerable Ananda:

'Will you, Ananda, believe, will you have faith when I will proclaim the qualities and blessings of the blessed One Bhaisajyaguruwaṭyaprabha, the Tathāgata, Arhat, Samyakāsrāduḥśuddha, or is there for you an uncertainty, a doubt or hesitation here in the profound range of the Buddha?'

Then the Venerable Ananda said this to the Blessed One: 'Not for me, O Reverend Blessed One, is there an uncertainty, nor a doubt, nor a hesitation in the dharmas spoken by the Tathāgata. What is the reason for that? There is no impure conduct in body, speech or mind of the Tathāgatas. Blessed One, both the sun and the moon, though having great power, though having great might, could fall to the ground; Sumeru, the king of mountains, could move from its established place; but never could the speech of the Buddha's be otherwise (than fact). Still, O Reverend Blessed One, there are beings having imperfect faculties of faith to whom, after having heard this range of the Buddha, it occurs thus: 'How can it be that through merely recollecting the name of that Tathāgata there are so many qualities and blessings?' (And) they do not believe, they do not have faith in it, they repudiate it. For a long time this will be for their non-profit and disadvantage and discomfort, for their downfall.'

The Blessed One said: 'It is impossible, Ananda, it is out of the question that of those on whose ear the name of that Tathāgata should fall there could be (i.e. in the long run) the undergoing of an unfortunate destiny or an unfortunate rebirth. Hard to be believed, Ananda, is the Buddha-range of Buddhas. That you, Ananda,
believe, that you have faith - this is to be seen as the power of the Tathāgata. And here is no place for all disciples and pratyeka-buddhas, putting aside bodhisattvas, mahanāsattvas, bound to one more birth. Difficult, Ānanda, to obtaining human birth. Difficult is belief and devotion in the Three Precious Things. Even more difficult is hearing the name of that Tathāgata. Without measure, Ānanda, is the bodhisattva course of that blessed One Bhaisajyaguruwaitāryaprabha, the Tathāgata; without measure is his skill in means; without measure the extent of his vows. If I wanted to I could illuminate in detail the bodhisattva course of that Tathāgata for a kalpa or more than a kalpa, (and) she kalpa would be exhausted, but it would surely never be possible to reach an end of the extent of the excellence of the former vows of that Blessed One Bhaisajyaguruwaitāryaprabha, the Tathāgata.

1) X, Śīkṣa, and T all have simply 'the qualities'. 2) X, Z and Śīkṣa have instead 'in the sūtras'. 3) Śīkṣa: '... who after having heard the range of the Buddha do not believe. To them it occurs thus: ...'; X: '(who) after having heard the range of the Buddha will speak thus: ...'. 4) X adds: 'This situation does not occur'.

a. I think that there can be very little doubt about the central importance of this passage. In a very real sense it is the king-pin on which all the rest depends since it indicates the authority on which the teaching is to be accepted. It is also interesting to note that the central question being answered here has, even in its phrasing, a very modern ring: 'How can it be that through merely recollecting the name of that Tathāgata there are so many qualities and blessings?' The answer Nikī gives to that question - note that the answer actually precedes the question - is clear, concise and unequivocal: it can be because the Tathāgata says it is so, and 'never could the speech of the Buddha's be otherwise (than fact)'. But before we make too much of this it is important to note what else is asserted in the same
terms in the literature of Gilgit. I give here a few examples and have restricted myself to passages which employ the same anyathā vocabulary:

**Vaj (Conze ed.)** 14f: api tu khalu punāḥ subhūte bodhisattvenai-
vaṃrūpo dānaparītyāraḥ kartavyah sarvasattvānāṁ arthāya. tat kasya
hetoh. yā caiśā subhūte sattvasaṃjñāḥ saivāsaṃjñāḥ ya evam te sarvasattvās
tathāgatena bhāsitās ta evāsattvāh. tat kasya hetoh. bhūtavādī
subhūte tathāgataḥ satyavādī tathāvādy ananyathāvādī tathāgataḥ
na vitathavādī tathāgataḥ.

Moreover again, Subhūti, by a bodhisattva such a giving of a
gift is to be performed for the sake of all beings. What is the
reason for that? Which, Subhūti, is this perception of a being,
just that is a non-perception; which also are all those beings
spoken of by the Tathāgata, just those are non-beings. What is
the reason for that? A speaker of what is, Subhūti, is the Tatha=
gata; a speaker of truth, a speaker of such as it is, a speaker of
that which is not otherwise is the Tathāgata. Not is the Tathāgata
a speaker of that which is not so.

**Sūtra XIV:** (said of the Buddha)

ṣaṇḍanāṁ pateyya saha śaśitārakehi
prthivyā vināśyate sanagaraśailasamsthā
fakāśadhātur api ca sīyānyathātvam
no cāvalī luhyaṁ vitatha bhuvya vaśa // 9 //
drṣṭvā tvam duḥkhitaṁ sattvān upalambharatāh prajāṁ
upalambham deśesi gumbhīram āntaśvāyataṁ // 10 //

... ...

yādṛśe śīkṣito dharme tādṛśeṁ dharmaṁ bhāṣase
abhūmilr atra bālānām yāvanta anyatīrthikāḥ // 12 //
ye sthitā atmasaṃjñāyām te skhalanti aśvān
drṣṭvā dharmaṁ nairātmyaṁ skhalitaṁ te na vidyate // 13 //
bhūtavādī mahāvīra bhūtadharmapratiṣṭhitāh
bhūte satye sthito nātha bhūtāṁ vaṁca praḥāṣase // 14 //

... ...
The sky together with the moon and stars could fall; the earth together with its cities and mountains could disappear; and even the element of ether could otherwise - but of you a speech which is not so could indeed never be. // 9 //

You having seen beings suffering, men intent upon a basis, teach the profound, tranquil emptiness without a basis // 10 //

In what kind of dharma you are trained, that kind of dharma you declare. Here is no place for the stupid, up to: other non-Buddhists. // 12 //

Who are established in the perception of a self, they, the ignorant, falter. (But) having known the absence of a self of dharmas, for you a faltering does not occur. // 13 //

A speaker of what is, O great Hero, abiding in dharmas which are, established in what is, in the true, O Lord you declare speech of what is // 14 //

Who are established in the perception of a self, they are abiding firmly in suffering; they do not understand the absence of a self in which suffering does not occur. // 24 //
(But) you are a teacher of dharma, of a way without faltering. The Lord of the world never falters. You proclaim speech which is not that which is not so — Homage to you, Lord, the deliverer from suffering // 25 //

.......

This earth together with its mountains and forests could be consumed; so also the water of the ocean could be exhausted; even the sun and the moon could fall to the earth — but the Jina could not declare a speech which is otherwise (than fact) // 91 //

(His) sayings are complete, (his) speech is pure, etc.

SÄ XXIX

At the end of a long account of his former meritorious deeds the Buddha says:

```
ve me kumāra kṛta āścariyā
kṛta duskarāṇī bahukalpadaṭā
da ca te māya kṣapaṇa sākya sīyā
kalpāṇa koṭinayutā bhanetaḥ // 69 //
unmatacittabhūmi gacchi nārā
saraddhanta sucatasya carim
kṛtā ye mi duska rā tad āścariyā
imu sāntam eṣata samādhivarum // 70 //
ārocayāmi ca kumāra idāṁ
sraddadhanta me avitathar vacanaṃ.
na hi vāca bhāṣati mṛṣām sugataḥ
sada satyavādi jīnu kāruṇikah // 71 //
```

Kumāra, which were the wonderful things done by me, the difficult things done through many hundreds of kalpas — those could not be exhausted by me speaking for kotīs of nayutas of kalpas // 69 //

A man not believing in the course of the Sugata arrives at a state of distraction — it is wonderful the difficult things I have done seeking for this tranquil, best of samādhis. // 70 //
And I announce this, Kumāra. Believe my speech which is not that which is not so! Indeed, the Sugata does not declare a false speech; always the Jina, the Compassionate One is a speaker of truth. // 71 //

SR XXXVI


tasmāt kumāreha ya bodhisattvo
śāṅkṣate pūjitu sarvabuddhān
atīta utpanna tathāgatāmā ca
dhāretu vācetu imaṃ samādhim // 14 //
eṣā Chiṣ sā bodhi tathāgatānām
śraddhehi mahyām vacanāṃ kumārāḥ
na bhāṣate vācāṃśām tathāgato
na hīḍrāḥ sattva mrṣāṃ vadanti // 15 //

Therefore, Kumāra, which bodhisattva here desires to worship all Buddhas, both past and present Tathāgatas, he should preserve, he should recite this Samādhi[-rāja-śutra], // 14 //

for this is the awakening of the Tathāgatas. Believe my speech, Kumāra! A Tathāgata does not declare false speech; not, indeed, do such beings utter the false // 15 //

SP Ch.II - the essential contents of which concern the fact of ekayāna:

22.8: gambhirodarmāṃ sukhumā mā buddhā
ataṛūkikāḥ sarvi anāsaravāḥ ca
aḥaṃ vijnānīmaḥ yādṛśā hi te
yaṃ [rd. ye] vā jinā loki daśaddīśau // 18 //
yāṃ śāriputraḥ sugata prabhāṣate
adhimuktisampannu bhavesi tatra
ananyathāvādi jino mahāraṣṭi
criṇaś ca bhāṣati uttamārthaṃ // 19 //

Subtle, profound dharmas were awakened to by me; and all are beyond reasoning and without outflows. I here know those as they are, as do the Jinas in the ten directions of the world. // 18 //
Sāriputra, that which the Sugata declares, you there (should) enter into earnest application. The Jina, the great seer is a speaker of that which is not otherwise (than fact). For a long time he declares the highest meaning. // 19 //

25.25: śraddadhata me Śāriputra: bhūtavādy aham asmi tathāvādy aham asmi; durbodhyaṃ Śāriputra tathāgatasya samāhāhāḥvayam: 'Believe me, Śāriputra: I am a speaker of what is. I am a speaker of thus as it is. I am a speaker of that which is not otherwise (than fact). Śāriputra, the hidden meaning of the Tathāgata is difficult to understand.'

192.15: vyapān hi kānāśa tathā samānyam ca
yesām ca keśamcīha kānāśa vidyate
ananyathāvādina kānāyaka
ekaṃ imaṃ yānu dvitiyu nāsti // 70 //

For whomsoever a doubt occurs here, they should dispel (their) doubt and likewise any uncertainty: the Leaders of the world are speakers of that which is not otherwise (than fact): This is the sole vehicle. There is not a second. // 70 //

SP Chs. XIV and XV - which set forth the view that the length of the Tathāgata's life is without measure:

106.12: vicikitsa mā yūya kurudhva sarve
aham hi yūyam parisamsthapemi
ananyathāvādir aham vināyako
jñānam ca me yasya na kāci samkhya // 35 //
gambhiradharmaḥ sugatena buddhā
etarkikā yesa pramāṇu nāsti

You must form no hesitations. I, indeed, will establish you firmly. I, the Guide, am a speaker of that which is not otherwise (than fact). I have a knowledge of which there is no calculation. // 35 //
Profound dharmas are awakened to by the Sugata, beyond reasoning and of which there is no measure.

107.27: Caññāsravam bhūtam imā mi vācām
śrūnitva sarve mama śraddadhadhvam
evaṃ ciraprāpta mayāgrabodhīm
paripācitāḥ ceti mayāiva sarve // 43 //

This speech of mine is without outflows, is of what is. Having heard it all should believe me! Thus, for a long time has the highest awakening been obtained by me, and I have matured all these [countless beings]. // 43 //

108.26; Kern 312.6 [the Bodhisattva Maitreya responds to this saying]:
kim cāpi vayam bhagavām tathāgatasya [K: vacanaḥ] śraddhayā
svamisyāmaḥ, ananyathāvādi tathāgata iti. [K: tathāgata] evaṁ arthaṃ jñāy ān, navayānasampasthitāḥ khalu punar bhagavām bodhisattvā vicikitsām āpatsyante 'tra śthāne, parinirvāte tathāgatā
imām dharmaparyāyaṃ śrutvā na pattiyisyanti na śraddāhāsyanti
nādhimokṣyante: 'And moreover, Blessed One, we proceed through faith in [the speech of] the Tathāgata: 'The Tathāgata is a speaker of that which is not otherwise (than fact)'; surely the Tathāgata would know that. Bodhisattvas newly set out in the vehicle, however, O Blessed One, will fall into hesitations here in this matter; having heard this discourse on dharma after the Tathāgata has parinirvāṇed, they will not have faith in it, they will not believe it, they will not trust in it.

111.2 [The Blessed One responds saying three times]: avakalpa
yadhvam [me] kulaputrā abhiśraddadhadhvam tathāgatasya bhūtām
vācā vyāharataḥ: 'Have confidence in me, sons of good family! Believe when the Tathāgata utters speech of what is!'

112.29: sarve te dharmaparyāyaḥ satyās tathāgataena bhāṣitā:
naṣṭy atra tathāgatasya mrśāvādaḥ: 'All the discourses on dharma spoken by the Tathāgata are true. There is here no false speech of the Tathāgata'.
117.25: अयस्स अने दिस्याम संपत्तिकलप्यत्व
समुदायिनां पुर्वा कार्यम् कुष्यम् // 18 //
मा साध्यायम् अत्र कुरुध्वा प्रांदिताम्
प्रियक्तयां इति जाताहाद्या अभावम्
विश्वाय प्रभृष्टियम् तुम्ह एका अवधाने
मण्ड मामा नि:त्वा कुरुधिवि तत्र भवोत् // 13 //

And my life-span is endless kalpas long, attained
after formerly having practised the (religious)
practice. // 18 //

You who are learned, do not form any doubt in this
matter! Dismiss your hesitations completely! This
speech I proclaim is what is. There could never be of
me a false word.

It, as I have indicated above, Bhg responds to the implied criticism
of its central assertion by unequivocally declaring that its authority
rests on the fact that it was declared by the Buddha, and by the fact
that Buddhas never declare 'that which is otherwise (than fact)', then
these passages from Vaj, SR, and SP - and any number of others - indicate
in turn that such a response is in no way unique to Bhg. And it is particu-
larly important to note both the range and kind of assertions which
appear to require this response. In Vaj and SR, for example, what are
perhaps the central assertions of Bodhis Buddhism - nairātmya and śārayātā
are "justified" on this basis and their truth-claim supported on this
authority. So too in SP, what are perhaps its two most significant
doctrines - ekayāna and the unlimitedness of the Tathāgata's life-span -
base their truth-claim on the same authority. In short, for all these
assertions the only pramāṇa is sabda, and the only response one of faith.
SP, in particular, indicates that these assertions are atakika, 'beyond
reasoning'. All of this, of course, renders any talk about "a Buddhism
of faith" rather dubious.

There is one other point to be noted in reference to Bhg 116], a
point which is rather difficult to evaluate. We have seen over and over
again that virtually all our texts - Eka, Śmd, Aj, STA, Bhp, Kr, SP
SR - assert that one or another 'blessing' follows 'from merely hearing
or recollecting the name' of some Buddha or Bodhisattva or text. This
idea is firmly established and appears to have been taken for granted by all our texts – except for Bhg. Bhg is unique in presenting a 'justification', and the justification of a commonplace seems to be a curious occupation. The problem, then, is to decide what the anomalous position of Bhg vis-à-vis other texts can signify. Here I can only say that we might be able to detect a pattern in Mahāyāna Sūtra literature in which a doctrine receives either the kind of justification found at Bhg [16], or a 'detailed' explanation, only when it is relatively 'new' or in the earlier stages of its incorporation into the accepted body of teaching. This, for example, seems to be the case for the concept of the buddhanu-bhāva discussed above under Bhg [2]. If this pattern can be verified, then it may be that Bhg is older than it is usually thought to be. All of this, however, is only a suggestion.
[17]

And, again, at that time, in that assembly, there was a Bodhisattva, Mahāsattva, named Vimalakīrti. He, having risen from his seat, having put his upper robe on one shoulder, having placed his right knee on the ground, having bent forth his folded hands towards the Blessed One, said this to the Blessed One: 'O Blessed One, in the last time, in the last period, there will be beings afflicted with various diseases, having emaciated limbs from long illness, their lips and throat parched from hunger and thirst, in the presence of death, surrounded by weeping friends and relatives and kindred, seeing darkness in all directions, being driven away by the servants of Yama. The cadaver of such a one being laid out here, the consciousness is led into the presence of Yama, the King of Dharma. And the devata born together with that person 1) which followed behind him 2), having fully written down that which would be the merit and demerit done by him, would present it to Yama, the King of Dharma. Yama, the King of Dharma asks about that; writes it. As merit or demerit was done, so he imposes a direct in accordance. But which friends, relatives and kinmen 3) will go for refuge to the Blessed One Nāgārjunaśrīśāendarsuddha, the Tathāgata, for the sake of that sick man they perform pūjā in a certain way. 4) Now the case does occur where his consciousness could just return again (i.e., immediately), he (then) becomes aware of himself (i.e., of his experiences before Yama) as if in a dream. Or if on the seventh day, or if on the twenty-first or thirty-fifth or forty-ninth day his consciousness would be reborn again, he would obtain recollection. He himself (in either case) is a direct witness to (the effects of)
merit, demerit, (and the motivation of past actions, this is consequence) even for the sake of his life; he does not do an evil deed.

For that reason, by a believing son or daughter of good family,

pujā is to be performed to that Tathāgata.

1) (X omits this. 2) Supplied from X, which clarifies the referent of Y's ye. 3) This sentence is constructed somewhat different in both X and Z. X: 'Then those friends, relatives and kinsmen, would go for refuge to the Blessed One Bhaisajyaguruvaṭṭyahaprabha, the Tathāgata, for the sake of that sick man, would perform pujā to that Tathāgata'; Z: 'which [friends, etc.] will go for refuge to the Blessed One Bhaisajyaguru, by them, for the sake of that sick man, pujā is to be performed in a certain way'. T uses the na or 'if' construction for the final verb. 4) X inserts at the beginning of the sentence: 'having been born (?) jīva), he, etc.' 5) (X: '... the name of the Blessed One Bhaisajyaguruvaṭṭyahaprabha, the Tathāgata is to be preserved, and pujā in accordance with one's means (?) is to be performed.

a. One point must here be dealt with immediately. First of all it will be obvious from the number of parentheses in my translation of the second half of Bhū [17] that the text here is somewhat vague. My translation, then, involves more than the usual amount of interpretation inherent in any translation, and I would not want to suggest that there could not be other possible interpretations. These considerations are important for two interrelated reasons: Bhū [17] is in many ways a key piece in the text as a whole and in the characterization of the figure of Bhaisajyaguru; and my reading of the passage appears to differ from that of virtually everyone else who has written on the matter. [I must add here that I am well aware of the way in which the text was used - and by implication, understood - in, for example, 8th century Japan, but that, of course, need not necessarily have a great deal to do with the meaning of the Sanskrit original, since the text most often used there was Hsuan-tsang's Chinese translation which has a number of significant elements which have no correspondents whatsoever in any Sanskrit Ms. or in the Tibetan translations (cf. under [18], end).] Dutt, Nanayakkara (Buddhism Encyclopedia of Buddhism Vol. II, 667), etc., all state or imply that the action described
in the passage is primarily intended to 'revive a dying man'. Now if
this is not totally wrong, it is certainly a case of misplaced emphasis,
a case of not being able to see the forest for the trees. First of all
it is clear that the individual concerned is dead. The use of the term
kaññevara = cadaver puts this beyond any real doubt. Secondly, whatever
the exact meaning of viññānapunara eva pratini-varteta, it surely does
not mean what we do when we say, for example, of someone in a coma, 'he
regained consciousness'. Viññāna here almost certainly has a technical
meaning, a meaning well attested even in our 'earliest' sources. Wijesekera says, on the basis of a study of passages from Pāli canonical litera-
ture: "In view of such evidence the conclusion is difficult to avoid that
the term viññāna in Early Buddhism indicated the surviving factor of an
individual which by re-entering womb after womb produced repeated births
resulting in what is generally known as saṃsāra", that this viññāna "is
no other than the viññāna which is regarded as the cause for the indi-
vidual's survival after death" (O.H. de A. Wijesekera, "The Concept of
Viññāna in Theravāda Buddhism", JAG 84 (1964) 254–59; cf. his "Vedic
Gandharva and Pāli Gandhabba", University of Ceylon Review 3 (1945) 73f.
(esp. 92f.); L. de La Vallée Poussin, "Démoniaque bouddhique, la négligence
de l'amé ou la doctrine de l'acte", JA (1902) 270f.; Poussin, Viññāna
(Paris: 1925) 27f; R.E.A. Johansson, "Citta, Mano, Viññāna – A Psycho-
semantic Investigation", University of Ceylon Review 23 (1965) 189f.
Passages at Gilgit which appear to be related to this technical meaning
are SR XXII 19, XXXII 103, 106b, 123n; Sgī 2161.3, 2096.6, 2097.7;
Hkp 195.4; most of these have already been quoted.) When this technical
meaning is taken into account it changes the complexion of the entire
passage. But even if we accept the fact that viññānapunara eva pratini-
varteta might refer to the reviving of a dead man, the text itself makes
it clear that 1) this occurs only after the viññāna has been brought
before Yama and been 'judged', and, therefore, undergone the central
trauma of death; and 2) that this is only one possible, by no means
certain, result of the puñā. The second point is beyond any real doubt
on the basis of the construction of the sentence alone: sthānam etad vid-
 Yates yat... yudd vi... yudd vi. This same construction, together with
the small change in the verb from pratini-varteta to nivarteta, and the
change from āmānām saṃjñānāti to smṛtīm upalabhāti, also clearly indicates
that if in the first case the reference is to reviving a dead man, we are
in the second case or group of cases dealing with something different. Again, I think there cannot be too much doubt that the second case or group of cases refers to a return of the vijñāna in a new birth. This is supported by the verb and the use of the term smṛti, as well as by the periods of time involved. It is highly unlikely that a cadaver would be kept for seven days, let alone seven weeks. The important point, however, is that it is not really important whether the vijñāna, after being 'judged', returns to its old body or whether it is reborn in a new birth. The text indicates that in either case the 'return' of the vijñāna is accompanied by an awareness of its experience, a direct awareness of the results of good and bad action. From this direct awareness, in turn, comes the rejection of evil action "even for the sake of his life". The reason, the primary intention for undertaking this puja, then, is to assure the acquirement of this direct awareness. And that this is the correct interpretation of this passage is, I think, supported by such passages as Bhg [7], Bbp 193-3-4 and Rkp 18.8 and what I have said of them above. [I will return briefly to this problem under [20] below.]

b. Apart from this we can note that Bhg [17] represents a clear case of the mythologization or anthropomorphization of the 'natural' law of karmatic retribution. But this, of course, is nothing new. It is already found at Aṅguttara i 138f. and Majjhima iii 178f (cf. J. Masson, La religion populaire dans le canon bouddhique Pali (Louvain: 1942) 86-89; P.R. Barua, "The Conception of Yama in Early Buddhism", Journal of the Asiatic Society of Pakistan 9, no. 2 (1964) 1-14; and for the same in a much broader context, J. Varenne, "La jugement des morts dans l'Inde", Sources orientales 4 (Paris: 1961) 207-30); and in addition to Bhg [17], the same phenomenon can be seen at Gilgit at Ku 275.29f and Sgä 2096.3f. I will not quote either of these passages, the first because it is clear that the Gilgit text, which is fragmentary, differed in some ways from the Nepalese text (e.g. the Nepalese text has atha te yamapuruṣā niṃśvā, but Gilgit (fol. 1597R) yasya dharmaṇāṇo purataḥ niṃśvā); the second because, going on for several pages, it is too long. In any case all these passages agree in essentials and present Yama as 'the judge of the dead'. But I think it is easy to make too much of such passages. If I am not mistaken, the 'mythologization' of karmatic retribution in no way affects the basic conception. It is, for example, the case in Bhg [17]
that the 'fate' of the individual depends ultimately not on a 'judgement' of Yama, but on the character of his acts. Yama simply declares the consequences of these acts, he does not 'judge' them. The 'judgement of the dead' by Yama in such passages is really only a dramatization of an otherwise somewhat abstract, impersonal concept. It involves, as far as I can tell, no real conceptual change. It is also worth noting that in a number of passages cited above in connection with the question of the importance of 'the moment of death', it is the Buddha, or a plurality of Buddhas, who appear before the individual and who declare the nature of his future state (Kv 306.33, 269.19; Sgū 1960.3, 1994.4). Here, in at least some sense, these Buddhas act in Yama's stead.

There is, however, at least one thing in the 'judgement' passage at Bhg [17] which, as far as I know, occurs nowhere else at Gilgit or in the Buddhist literature that I am familiar with. This is the reference to 'the devata born together with the individual which follows behind him (puruṣasya saha jā pṛṣṭhānubaddhā devatā)' and who records his good or bad actions. Waley (A Catalogue of Paintings Recovered from Tun-Huang, p.xliiv) says "many passages in Buddhist literature" refer to this "spirit" (or "spirits", since there are two of them in most of the texts he cites). But he quotes only two of the Chinese translations of Bhg, a Chinese commentary on the Avatārakā Sūtra by Ch'eng-k'uan, and an apocryphal Chinese sutra entitled Ti tsang p'u sa fa hsin yin yulan shih wang ching, which is not exactly reassuring. For my part I can only note that we can find at Gilgit something to correspond to at least each of the elements of puruṣasya saha jā pṛṣṭhānubaddhā devatā. At SR XXI 17, Pek 303-2-2, for example, a king is dissuaded from committing an act of grave demerit by the tasya rājā anubaddha devatā / pūrva jāti sahacīrṇa-[iso Ms. 2605.2]-cārika / rgyal po de phyir 'braṅ ba lha mo ẑig / tse rab sẖa mar lha'n cig spyod pa spyad /: the devata which followed ['was bound to'] that king, (and) had pursued the course [of life] together with him in (a) former birth(s)." At SR 473.3, Pek 12-4-5, a king whose kalyāṇamātra falls ill, has revealed to him in a dream the cure for that illness by anyatarā devatā puruṇāsālohitabhūd anubaddhā [Nepalese pṛṣṭhato 'anuvaddhāl], lha mo sẖon snag gi gten mtshams su gyur pa ẑig (yod de) / de rgyal po de'i phyi bṣiṅ 'braṅ bas: 'a certain devata who had been an old blood relative (and who) followed ['was bound to'] him'. In both cases these devatās appear to have functioned very much like "guardian angels". In
addition to these passages we can also note that devas are elsewhere described as prṣṭānumbaddha in relation to an individual: Rkp 39.14; anekāni ca devanāgayaksagandharvakoṭīnayutasatatasahāṃti tasya rājñāḥ kṣatriyasya prṣṭhataḥ samanubaddhā rāksānuguptaye sthāsyanti; SP (Kern ed.) 288.10: antariksāvacarāś cāsya devatāḥ śrāddhāḥ prṣṭhato 'nubaddhā bhaviṣyanti dharmaśravanāta; etc. Apart from these references I have not found anything else at Gilgit, and nothing at all even vaguely like the reference in Bhg [17] to the recording of the individual's deeds, although something like it is known elsewhere in India (e.g. the figure of Citrgupta in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas).

Then the Venerable Ānanda spoke thus to Trāṇamukta, the Bodhisattva: 'How, Son of good family, is the puṣṭa of the Blessed One Bhaisajyaguruvadūrṇyaprabha, the Tathāgata, to be performed?'

Trāṇamukta, the Bodhisattva, said: 'Who, Reverend Ānanda, desire to effect the release from a great disease, by them [i.e. friends, relatives, etc.] for the sake of that sick man, for seven days and nights the obligation of the Uposadha possessed of eight limbs is to be undertaken, and to the community of bhikṣus puṣṭa and service is to be performed with food and drink, with all requisites, according to one's ability; three times in the night, three times in the day, 1) to the Blessed One Bhaisajyaguruvadūrṇyaprabha, the Tathāgata, worship is to be performed; 49 times this sutra is to be recited; 49 lamps are to be lighted; seven images are to be made; for each image seven lamps are to be set up; each lamp is to be made of the size of the wheel of a cart. If on the forty-ninth day the light is not used, 3) forty-nine five-colored flags are to be made (visible?).

1) (T: '...The name of the Blessed One, the Tathāgata Bhaisajyaguruvadūrṇyaprabha is to be fixed in mind.' 2)Lit. 'to be recollected'. 3) X inserts here 'it is to be known (that) all has succeeded'. Note, however, that Y in the next clause has a ca which is difficult to explain (I have not translated it). Its presence, however, creates no problems if, and suggests that, we should assume that Y had also originally read veditavyām, etc., and that it was accidentally omitted. But T, like Y, also omits it. 4) This is nothing but a filler. Although Y is easy to read and appears to have dṛṣṭīka, I have no idea what the intended meaning might be (the Ms. might also be read dāṭṣṭīka, but that is equally problematic to interpreter.) X at just this point is impossible to read clearly. T, if I understand it correctly, treats the final clause as a separate sentence
unconnected with the preceding clause, and makes it a kind of floating assertions: 'There are more than forty-nine flags of five colors'. I can only add here a further query: in light of X's xkta, and T's lhag par bya' o = (possibly) ati'ktavaya, should we be looking for a word meaning 'to be left' or 'to be left standing'? This, at least, would make reasonable sense.

Bhg [18] provides us with a description of what Shig [17] meant when it said that the friends and relatives of the individual perform, or should perform, puja "in a certain way". And once again there is a certain amount of ambiguity in the text. The ritual is addressed to those "who desire to effect a release from a great disease." But the curiously impersonal tone of this can alone suggest - in spite of the fact that these texts are not known for their literary niceties - that we have here a piece of metaphorical language, "the great disease" being the continued performance of unmeritorious acts. But however this may be, once again the periods of time involved make it very difficult to believe that the ritual was intended to revive a dead or even a dying man. The ritual takes at least seven days and its 'results' are not 'known' until the forty-ninth day. In addition to this there is no reference to a reviving or return to health as a consequence of the puja. As a matter of fact the text of X - and perhaps even the text of Y (see above n.2) - makes it clear that the 'results' of the puja cannot be directly observed. They are to be known by a 'sign', by whether or not the lamps that had been lighted continued to burn on the forty-ninth day. None of this, of course, makes sense if the ritual was intended to revive what Bhg [17] calls a cadaver. But even all of this is - if you will pardon a coinage - academic, because Bhg [17] has already stated what the results of the puja are: whether the vihūna returns immediately or in forty-nine days, the result of the puja in either case is that the 'individual' is himself "a direct witness to (the effects of) merit, demerit, (and) the maturation of past actions", and "(as a consequence) even for the sake of his life he does not do an evil deed." He is, indeed, released from 'a great disease'.

* * * *


For a short note on "flags", especially on the curious expressions used several times in at least two of the Chinese translations of Bhg, Hsū-mīng-fan (T.450), Hsū-mīng-shān-fan (T.449), etc., "bannières qui prolongent la vie", see P. Demieville, "Ban", Ḥbdgirin, fasc. I (Paris/Tōkyō: 1929) 49-50. There is nothing in any of the Skt. Mss. or in the Tibetan translations to correspond to these "bannières qui prolongent la vie". We might also wonder if there is not some connection between the lamp of Bhg [18] and what in Japan is called chōmyōtō; cf. H. Durt, "Chōmyōto", Ḥbdgirin, fasc. IV (Paris/Tōkyō: 1967) 360-65.
Again further, Reverend Ananda, which calamities, foreboding natural phenomena and disturbances threaten anointed kṣatriya kings, whether it be harm from disease or harm through his own or another's army, or from asterisms, or asterisms and eclipses, or from wind and rain out of season, or from no rain at all - by such an anointed kṣatriya king a thought of friendliness is to be developed towards all beings; those imprisoned are to be released; pūjā such as that previously described is to be performed to the Blessed One Bhaiṣaja-guruvaipūrayaprabha, the Tathāgata. Through this root of merit of that anointed kṣatriya king, through the excellence of the former vows of the Blessed One Bhaiṣaja-guruvaipūrayaprabha, the Tathāgata, there will be peace and plenty in his realm; wind and rain and crops will come to pass in their proper season. And all beings residing in that realm will be free of illness, happy, and have much joy; and in that realm malignant yakṣas and bhūtas and piśācas do not ill treat beings; they do not see any bad omens. For such an anointed kṣatriya king there will be an increase of life, good color, strength, health and lordship.

a. Bhg [19] is a 'text' which probably forms a part of the Indian background to what in Japan came to be called chingokokka, "Protection de l'état" (J. May, "Chingokokka", Hōbōgirin, fasc. IV (Paris/Tōkyō: 1967) 322-37.) There are also other texts of this kind at Gilgit, a passage from Akp being perhaps the most interesting.

Akp 39.11-40.11: yaḥ kuścīd bhagīni rājā kṣatriyo mūrdhābhīṣikto janapadasthāmaprāpta imān ratnaketudhāraṇīṃ pustake likhitvā dhārā- yiṣyati tasya rājāḥ kṣatriyasya daśasu dikeśāraḥ kīrtisabāsāloko 'bhuyudgamiṣyati yāvād sarvaṃ rūpadhātum udārīṇ kīrtisabāhānir
Sister, whatsoever anointed kṣatriya king has obtained power over a people, and after having written in book form this *Ratnaketudhararāṇī* will preserve it, for that anointed kṣatriya king great fame and renown and glory will arise in the ten directions, up to: the whole world of form will be filled with (his) great fame and renown. And several koṭis of nayutas of hundreds of thousands of devas, nāgas, yakṣas, and gandharvas will continue to follow behind that anointed kṣatriya king for the sake of guarding and protecting him. And in his realm all faults of discord, contention, famine, illness, invasion by foreign armies, wind, rain, cold and heat will be allayed. And all malignant yakṣas, rākṣasas, lions, buffalo, elephants and wolves will not cause harm (T: gnod par mi 'gyur). All faults to be experienced in conjunction with suffering from poison, from (that which is) bitter, pungent, astringent, tasteless and harsh will be allayed. And all his capital and grain, herbs, and forest trees, (and) fruits and flowers will grow up, will increase, and will be tender and juicy. If an anointed kṣatriya king when a battle is imminent would raise on the top of a standard a book of this *Ratnaketudhararāṇī*, that anointed kṣatriya king will defeat the opposing army. If this book of the *Ratnaketudhararāṇī* will be raised on top of a standard by two anointed kṣatriya kings who have met in battle, they will effect mutual satisfaction and concord. Thus, indeed, this *Ratnaketudhararāṇī* is possessed of many qualities and blessings.
[Cf. Rkp 144.11f; 156.1. For another example of the use of a text in battle cf. GP 141a.10 (text cited in IIJ 19 (1977) 140-41. The differences between GP 141 and Rkp 39.11 are interesting in that in the former it is not the presence of a book which protects the individual; rather it is said that one who studies, etc., the Prajñāpāramitā will, when he goes into battle, be protected.]

Apart from this we can also note:

Śmd 94.9: yāh kaścid avalokiteśvara rājā vā rājamatra vā ... śriyā mahādevyā aṣṭottaram ātama vimalapraḳhyām nāma stotram dhāraṇīyanti tasya rājñāḥ kaśtriyaśya viṣaye teṣām sattvāṁ sarva-bhayetypadraśā praśamiyanti; sarvacoradrājukumārasvamasya-viṣayaḥ na bhaviṣyati; sarvadhanadhānākasaḥkṣaṇaḥgaravirvṛddhir bhaviṣyati; tasya ca rājñāḥ kaśtriyaśya gṛhe śrīr nivāsiyati.

'Avalokiteśvara, whatsoever king or royal authority ... will preserve the stotra named Tha Oua Hundred and Eight Pārśu Prāńa of Śrī-mahādevi, all fears, plagues and calamities for those beings in the realm of that kṣatriya king will be allayed. There will be no fear of robbers, cheats, human and non-human beings. There will be an increase in all capital, grain, stores and provisions. And Śrī will dwell in the house of that kṣatriya king.'

Ebp 194-2-3: de yel lus 'di la ni nad mi 'byum
de'i rgyal srid kun la gnod mi 'byul
khyim dañ groñ dañ groñ khyer 'zi bar 'gyur
gan 'zig io sde 'di ni rtog 'dzin pa /

Whosoever always preserves this sūtra, here in his body a disease does not appear; in all his kingdom no trouble appears; homes and villages and cities will be safe.

Note that in the series of verses of which the above forms a part there appears to be one extra pada, so my division may not be altogether correct. This, however, will hardly affect the sense.

StA 75.12: yāh kaści rājā vā rājāśi vā bhikṣu-bhikṣunyā-saṃkāśa vā dhāraṇīyanti nāma-ṣaṃkāśā dhāraṇīyanti likhāṣaḥ saṃkāśaḥ likhāṣaḥ saṃkāśaḥ tathā-gatagurumauravane pratipattyā yathopadiṣṭāḥ pratipatsyante,
tasyāham bhagavan rakṣisyāmi, paripālane karisyāmi, yathocitaṃ
varam dāsyāmi, bhogaśāvayair avaikalyāṃ karisyāmi, vivāda-
yuddhaṃ bhāyantāṃ jayāṃ karisyāmi, āyuḥṣampadāṃ upaśāmya karisyāmi,
tasya ca viṣayasya maṇḍrasya paripālane karisyāmi.

Whatsoever king or queen or bhikṣu, bhikṣunī, or lay man or
woman will preserve, will worship, will copy or have copied [this
discourse on dharma; or 'these mantrapadās'], will put (it/them)
into practice in the manner indicated with profound respect for the
Tathāgata - I [Bhīma Mahādevī], O Blessed One, will protect, will
guard him. I will give him his choice in accordance with propriety.
Through material things and lordship I will render him faultless.
I will effect his victory in disputes, war, riots and uprisings.
I will bring him accomplishment in life. And I will effect the
protection of his realm and city.

On the basis of these passages and a few others like them it seems
that we might make the following observations:

1) Ideas concerning 'the protection of the state' by means of
religious activity were well known at Gilgit, but one gets the impression
that they were 'floating', that they had not yet gelled into any definite
pattern.

2) In the great majority of cases the religious activity meant to
ensure the protection of the state was limited to activity directed
toward one or another sacred text. The texts were to be preserved,
copied, worshipped - even carried on top of a battle-standard. Bhg [19]
is the only text which refers to anything like a specific ritual and even
here there is some ambiguity. It is, for example, impossible to tell
whether Bhg [19]'s tādṛṣṭā kartavyā yathāpūrvoktā refers to the pūjā
described in [14] or that ēvan in [18]. It is, however, worth noting
that in both pūjās the verbal component (i.e. the text) is prominent,
and so even the more definitely defined ritual forms of Bhg link up with
our other passages.

3) Regardless of their exact form, it would seem obvious that the
ideas and activities connected with the protection of the state are both
conceptually and structurally identical to the ideas and activities
connected with the 'protection' of the individual. This is underlined
by the fact that both the puja of [14] and the puja of [18] are intended for the 'protection' of the individual, but in [19] one of these exact same pujas is given for the protection of the state: the two are wholly interchangeable. In this regard it is also worth pointing out that Bhag [19] once again makes it clear that there is conceptually nothing magical about the process it describes: the activity involved is religious activity (puja); and the desired ends are effected 'through the roots of merit' of the king that initiates that activity, and 'through the excellence of the former vows' of Bhaṣajyaguru. That is to say that the whole enterprise is governed by 'natural' or karmatic law. (This, of course, presupposes that I am right in thinking that conceptually, at least, once a 'vow' is vocalized, and once its conditions are fulfilled, the thing vowed has the effect of what we – rather ethnocentrically-call 'natural' law.)

4) Finally, May has noted in regard to Indian texts which were used in China and Japan for the purposes of protecting the state that "on ne sait s'ils ont servi [in Indian Buddhism] à des cérémonies de Protection de l'Etat". This, of course, may be true, but since the same could be said for almost everything else mentioned in texts connected with the actual practice of Buddhism in India, to follow this argument to its logical conclusion would reduce our field of study almost to zero. I can only say that on the basis of several colophons we do know that the Buddhist community at Gilgit seems to have had close relations with the ruling kings. Several of them are mentioned as the donors of our manuscripts and one of the manuscripts of Bhag may have been sponsored by a king. In another case a manuscript of the Mahāyāna (cf. May, p.322) "was written for ensuring a long life for the king" (P.N. Cakravartī, "Hatun Rock Inscriptio of Patoladova", Epigraphia Indica 30 (1953-54) 229.). This, I think, is good 'circumstantial' evidence, but admittedly nothing more,
Then the Venerable Ānanda spoke thus to Trāṇamukta: 'How, O son of good family, can an exhausted life-span be once again lengthened?'

Trāṇamukta, the Bodhisattva said: 'Reverend Ānanda, was it not heard by you in the presence of the Tathāgata that there are nine untimely deaths? On that account (i.e. for the cases of untimely death only) the use of mantras and herbs was specified. It happens that beings are sick, but their sickness is not serious. However, they are deprived of medicine or nurses, or perhaps the physician prepares what is not [the proper] medicine. This is the first untimely death. The second untimely death is: he for whom there is death by the authority of the king. The third untimely death is: those who are excessively careless, dwelling in carelessness, non-human beings steal away their vital warmth. The fourth untimely death is: those who die by fire and conflagration. The fifth untimely death is: those who will die by water. The sixth untimely death is: those who have died amidst lions, tigers, jackals, beasts of prey and wild animals. The seventh untimely death is: those who fall from mountain sides. The eighth untimely death is: those who die through the employment of poisons, kakhordas and vetādas. The ninth untimely death is: those who, visited by hunger and thirst, not obtaining food and drink, die. These, in brief, are the nine great untimely deaths declared by the Tathāgata; and there are innumerable other untimely deaths.'

a. There are a number of things we can note concerning this passage. The first concerns its overall character. It is, in fact, a general discussion (note the impersonal character of Ānanda's question) with no
necessary connection with Bhaisajyaguru. His name is never mentioned. It is here not presented as a list of the kinds of death in which his 'vow' is potentially operable. It appears, rather, as intended to announce the fact that there are certain kinds of death which are avoidable.

And here again - as at [17] in regard to the effects of recollecting the namadheya - Bhg is unique vis-à-vis the rest of the literature. As we will see in a moment, virtually every other text at Gilgit (and this includes earlier portions of Bhg itself) takes for granted the fact that 'certain kinds of death are avoidable' and the list of the kinds of death falling into this category in these other texts are nothing more than variants of the list given here in Bhg [20]. Here again it seems that Bhg may be earlier than it is usually thought to be. Otherwise it is difficult to account for the fact that it makes a point of 'announcing' as the teaching of the Tathāgata what everywhere else has already been given or taken as such.

The second point is that this passage obviously has important implications for the question of 'reviving a dead or dying man' discussed under [17] and [18], since the essential purport of Ananda's question seems to be exactly that: 'How can an exhausted life-span be once again lengthened?' Now if I understand the text correctly Trāṇamukta answers this question by saying, in effect, that it cannot be lengthened. He indicates that in certain cases - those called akalamarāṇa - 'the use of herbs and mantras was specified', i.e. in these cases death is avoidable. But in saying this he has also clearly said by implication that death by 'natural' causes or disease which is guruka (and that described in [17] is certainly that) are not included in this category. They in fact are not avoidable and such a life cannot be lengthened. If I am right here this again makes the 'reviving' interpretation of [17] very unlikely.

Another point is that those cases for which 'the use of mantras and herbs was specified' are exactly those for which almost all the Gilgit texts 'specify' the 'use' of the namadheya of Buddhas, bodhisattvas and texts, the performance of pūjā, the recitation of dhāranīs, etc. The fact that Bhg [20] does not use the 'current' terminology, taken together with Trāṇamukta's question - 'was it not heard by you in the presence of the Tathāgata' - may indicate that Bhg [20] is either a quotation or a conscious echo of an earlier source.

* * * *
b. What Bhg [20] calls akālamaraṇas, Bhg [14] lists as 'fears' (bhayas), and lists under either one or the other heading are found almost everywhere. In looking at some of these lists we will here reverse our usual order of presentation and look first at some occurrences outside of Gilgit. We know, for example, from literary sources (Sravānu-stotra), inscriptions (one from Dambol dated A.D. 1095 [Indian Antiquary 10 (1881) 185], and one from Nālandā dated c. 12th century [N.C. Majumdar, "Nālandā Inscription of Vipulasrimitra", Epigraphia Indica 21 (1931) 97-101], and from images and reliefs (two from Ratnagiri, one from Ellora, and one in the Dacca Museum) that at a certain stage — say from the 8th century on — Tārā was intimately associated with what came to be known as the astamahābhayas. These 'eight great fears', never fully standardized, are basically the same as Bhg [20]'s akālamaraṇas. But we also know from literary sources (SP Ch.XXIV) and images and reliefs (at Ajanta, Kanherī, Aurangabad, Ellora, and Badami) that at an earlier period this same basic list of fears was intimately associated with Avalokiteśvara (for the details on all this see R. Sen Gupta, "A Sculptural Representation of the Buddhist Litany to Tārā at Ellora", Bulletin of the Prince of Wales Museum of Western India 5 (1955-57) 12-15; D. Mitra, "Ashṭamahābhaya-Tārā", Journal of the Asiatic Society, Calcutta 23 (1957) 19-22, 3 plates). On the basis of this material Mitra (p.22) concludes:

"The profusion of the painted and sculptural representations of Avalokiteśvara in the rôle of a saviour that we come across in the caves of the Deccan leaves no room for doubt that the idea of deliverance from Eight Great Perils, which lead to premature death, originated with Avalokiteśvara ... With the introduction of Tārā who became the companion of Avalokiteśvara, some of the latter's active functions and attributes were completely absorbed by his female counterpart, so much so that in the later Indian sculptures and texts we find Tārā and not Avalokiteśvara in the rôle of the protector from Eight Great Perils.'

The situation, as usual, is not so simple. We have already seen at Bhg [14] that those who perform pūjā to Bhaṣajyaguru will be 'released' from the fear of fire, water, mad elephants, lions, tigers, bears, hyenas, venomous snakes, scorpions, centipedes, foreign armies, robbers and thieves'. Almost all of these have a correspondent in the various lists
attached either to Avalokiteśvara or Tara. Add to this the fact that one or all of the same basic, and usually specific, 'powers' are ascribed to the Ekādaśamukhadhāraṇī and its recitation (Eka 36.3; 37.4; 38.1), to the preservation of the names of Śrī-Mahādevī (ŚMD 99.7), to the ritualized recitation of a dhāraṇī given by Vajrapāṇī (StA 57.10), to the preservation, etc., of Ṛkp (Ṛkp 155.8) or SP (SP (Kern ed) 293.5; SP 158.25; 174.25; 175.22), to worshipping Sgp (Sgp 2122.3), to hearing it (Sgp 2141.4; 2159.7), to -interestingly - being established in patience (kṣānti) and dwelling in friendliness (maitrī; SR 334.2; XXIX 81, 106), to being practised in restraint of the body (śikṣātu kāyasamvara; SR XXXVIII 25-28), to behaving with complete purity of body (pariśuddha-kāyasamcāro; SR 604.7), and finally, to taking up, studying, etc. the Prajñāpāramitā (SR v 1406.6).

The pattern which we see here should by now be familiar. What we see is, in fact, another good example of what at the end of my first note I called 'the process of generalization', the process whereby individual cases become only examples of a larger category, or where specificity of function is denied by assigning the same function to an ever increasing number of individuals. Also see here, as before, the nagging problem of the fear of death. We have, then, by any number of twists and turns arrived back at the point from which we started. The rest of the text requires very little comment.
Then in that assembly the Twelve Great Yakṣa Generals were gathered: the Great Yakṣa General Kīmbhirā, the Great Yakṣa General Vajra, the Great Yakṣa Generals Mekhila, Anila, Sanila, Indala¹, Payila, Māhura, Cidāla, Codhura, and the Great Yakṣa General Vikala, these Twelve Great Yakṣa Generals, each having seven thousand yakṣa followers, with a single voice spoke thus to the Blessed One:

"Through the power of the Buddha the name of the Blessed One Bhaisajyaguru-vaiduryaprabha, the Tathāgata, was heard by us; for us there is no longer the fear of an unfortunate destiny. We all together, for as long as we live, go to the Buddha for refuge, we go to the Dharma for refuge, we go to the Sangha for refuge; we will be zealous for the benefit, advantage and ease of all beings. Especially the village or city or district or forest dwelling where this sūtra will circulate; or he who will preserve² the name of the Blessed One Bhaisajyaguru-vaiduryaprabha, the Tathāgata; we will indeed protect those³; we will free them from all misfortune; we will fulfil all their hopes."

Then, further, the Blessed One gave his approval to those Great Yakṣa Generals: 'It is good, it is good, O Great Yakṣa Generals, that you, remembering ... or gratitude to the Blessed One Bhaisajyaguru-vaiduryaprabha, have set out for the advantage of all beings.'

¹) There are only eleven Yakṣa Generals named; cf. n.14 of the edition. I have not met this or any other list of twelve elsewhere. ²) T: '...who preserves and worships and honors...'; ³) Read te[śam] ca for te ca? ⁴) From here to the end of the text we have only Ms. X.
Then the Venerable Ananda said this to the Blessed One:

'Blessed One, what is the name of this discourse on dharma and how do I preserve it?'

The Blessed One said: 'Now then, Ananda, you should preserve this discourse on dharma as 'The Extent of the Excellence of the Former Vows of the Blessed One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaibhūṣya-prabha, the Tathāgata'. As the '... of the Twelve Great Yakṣa Generals ...' by name you should preserve it.'

1) T: 'Then the Venerable Ananda, rising from his seat, having put his upper robe on one shoulder, placing his right knee on the ground, having bent forth his folded hands towards the Blessed One, said this to the Blessed One: 'Blessed One, what is the name of this discourse on dharma? How is it to be preserved?'

The Blessed One said: 'Therefore, Ananda, this discourse on dharma should be preserved under the name 'The Extent of the Excellence of the Former Vows of the Tathāgata Bhaiṣajyaguruvaibhūṣya-prabha'. It should also be preserved under the name 'The Praise of the Bodhisattva Vajrapāṇi (Bodhisattvavajrapañipratijñā)'. It should also be preserved under the name 'Purifying All the Obstructions of Past Action and Fulfilling All Hopes'. It should also be preserved under the name 'The Promise (pratijñā) of the Twelve Great Yakṣa Generals'.

Of the four titles given by T, X certainly had the first and almost as certainly the fourth; i.e. the gap after pra- could be filled thus: (prā)tiṣṭhā ity api nāma dhāraya. This still leaves room for another title of about 11 aksaras. This could have been either T's second title or either half - but not both - of its third title. The presence of a title referring to Vajrapāṇi in the Skt. text would be as mysterious as its presence is in the Tib. translation, and therefore, perhaps, argues against filling our gap with T's second title. Hsuan-tsang's Chinese translation suggests it may have been the first half of T's third title.
With the Blessed One said. Delighted, Māṇjuśrī, the true heir-apparent, and the venerable Ananda, and Vīramukta, the Bodhisattva, and those bodhisattvas, and those great disciples, and those kings and ministers and brāhmaṇas and householders, and the world together with its devas and men and asuras and ... applauded the speech of the Blessed One.

1) T: 'The Blessed One having spoken these words, Māṇjuśrī, the true heir-apparent, and those bodhisattvas, and Vajrapāṇi, the Guhyakālīpati, and those complete assemblies, and the world together with its devas, men, asuras and gandharvas, rejoiced and praised the speech of the Blessed One.' Here again T makes reference to Vajrapāṇi and I suspect that both the reference here, and the one in [22] are connected somehow to the corresponding passages in StP. Those passages in StP — with the exception of the first title in [22] — are almost exactly the same as those in the Tibetan translation of Bhg. In StP reference to Vajrapāṇi in one of the alternative titles is not totally inexplicable since he, at least, does appear elsewhere in the text, although not in any major role.
[24]

The Mahāyāna Sūtra named Arya-bhaiṣajyaguru is completed.¹


X alone of the five manuscripts preserves a title.