



Australian
National
University

THESES SIS/LIBRARY
R.G. MENZIES LIBRARY BUILDING NO:2
THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY
CANBERRA ACT 0200 AUSTRALIA

TELEPHONE: +61 2 6125 4631
FACSIMILE: +61 2 6125 4063
EMAIL: library.theses@anu.edu.au

USE OF THESES

This copy is supplied for purposes
of private study and research only.
Passages from the thesis may not be
copied or closely paraphrased without the
written consent of the author.

THE
PRATYUTPANNA-BUDDHA-SAMMUKHĀVASTHITA-
SAMĀDHI-SŪTRA

AN
ANNOTATED ENGLISH TRANSLATION
OF THE
TIBETAN VERSION
WITH
SEVERAL APPENDICES

A Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Australian National University
August, 1979

by
Paul Harrison

This thesis is based on my own research
carried out from 1976 to 1979 at the
Australian National University.

Paul A. Harris

ABSTRACT

The present work consists of a study of the Pratyutpanna-buddha-sammukhāvasthita-samādhī-sūtra (hereafter: PraS), a relatively early example of Mahāyāna Buddhist canonical literature. After a brief Introduction (pp. xxi-xli), which attempts to place the PraS in its historical context, the major portion of the work (pp. 1-186) is devoted to an annotated English translation of the Tibetan version of the sūtra, with detailed reference to the three main Chinese translations.

Appendix A (pp. 187-252) then attempts a resolution of some of the many problems surrounding the various Chinese versions of the PraS. These are examined both from the point of view of internal evidence and on the basis of bibliographical information furnished by the Chinese Buddhist scripture-catalogues. Some tentative conclusions are advanced concerning the textual history of the PraS in China.

Appendix B (pp. 253-279) contains a study of the sole surviving fragment of the 'original' Sanskrit text of the PraS. This fragment is edited, translated, and compared with the corresponding portions of the Chinese and Tibetan versions.

Appendix C (pp. 280-327) consists of a Glossary of selected terms found in the PraS, and contains material drawn from all available translations of the work---the Tibetan, the three Chinese versions, and my own English rendering of the Tibetan---arranged according to Sanskrit equivalents and in Sanskrit alphabetical order. This Glossary is intended partly to act as an index to the text, and partly to facilitate further study of the Chinese translations.

TO JULIET

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For more than three years I have been the guest of the Australian National University and the Australian Government. The dissertation which follows is, as it were, the song that I have sung for my supper; I must therefore make it clear that its occasional lack of tunefulness is no reflection upon the generosity of my hosts.

My first personal vote of thanks must go to my supervisor at A.N.U., Prof. J.W. de Jong. He has constantly assisted and advised me, and has freely given me the benefit of his vast erudition. It is to him that I owe the suggestion that I should do research on the Pratyutpanna-buddha-sammukhāvasthita-samādhī-sūtra, a text which, despite its unhealthily distended title, has certainly repaid all the effort I have spent upon it. Prof. de Jong has also looked over several drafts of this thesis, and has made many profitable suggestions and comments.

My joint-supervisor, Dr Tissa Rajapatirana, has been of great help to me, not least because he exemplifies many of the virtues which my sūtra with the monstrous title requires of householder-bodhisattvas. Having gone through the penultimate draft of the present work with a fine-tooth comb, Tissa then---with devotion above and beyond the call of duty---volunteered to proof-read the final copy. As the deadline drew near and my patience grew unreasonably short, he bore my agitated pestering with his invariable good humour, finishing the job as meticulously as he began it. He has been a good friend.

I regard it as one of the greatest pieces of good fortune in my life that my term here in Canberra coincided with that of Gregory Schopen, the well-known nightwatchman. At all stages in the preparation of this work he provided me with liberal amounts of advice and encouragement, and he has inspired me with his own critical approach to various aspects of Buddhist studies. I might also note that it was he who introduced me to the Tibetan language, and thus turned me loose on this branch of the discipline. I thank Greg for the generosity with which he always shared his ideas with me, despite the great difference in our ages and, of course, the language-barrier. With his original cast of thought and his backwoods turn of phrase, he offered me an amusing and stimulating friendship that is now sorely missed. Among the many things which I owe to his liberality are an appreciation of the range and suppleness of the word 'indeed', and the remarkably simple equianal system of character-analysis, which, I understand, is in constant

use among the natives of outback America. I have no doubt that Greg's moccasin-shod feet will make a great mark on the field of Buddhist studies, and that when he emerges from his present provincial obscurity he will do so trailing clouds of glory---and sawdust.

Wives are usually thanked at the end of acknowledgements as a kind of formal afterthought, although this is hardly fair. Throughout my three years in Canberra, especially during the last desperate dash for the finish line, Juliet has sustained me, repeatedly pulled me out of the slough of despond (only to see me stumble back in again), and even gone so far as to give up her chosen role of 'friend' to become more like a 'wife'. The present work is gratefully dedicated to her.

To Dr Luise Hercus, Reader in the Department of South Asian and Buddhist Studies, I am indebted for instruction and assistance of various kinds, always freely given. Luise has done much to make my term at A.N.U. a very pleasant one, and has, among other things, taught me the true meaning of the word guna, 'good quality'.

Mention must be made of Miss Betty Kat, the guiding spirit of the Department of South Asian and Buddhist Studies. Combining the offices of secretary, go-between, keeper of the peace, mailman, confidante, and opponent on the tennis court, she has to an extraordinary degree smoothed the way for me and for many others. In my case she has had the added burden of witnessing that most distressing of human disappointments: the unfulfilled desire to receive mail.

I must also thank Mr John Minford, who, in proof-reading this thesis, exposed himself to dangerously high concentrations of my prose without a murmur of complaint or any apparent ill-effects.

For occasional help with various enquiries thanks are due to Prof. Liu Ts'un-yan, Dr Rafe de Crespigny, Dr Igor de Rachewiltz, Dr Ken Gardiner, Prof. Fujita Kōtatsu, Mr Tso Sze-bong, and Mr. Matsumura Hisashi.

PREFACE

It is in the second century of our era that we can discern the beginnings of a process which was to have a considerable effect on the subsequent history of East Asia, for it was around this time that India and China, the two great civilisations of Asia, first met and joined in a way that was culturally significant. The force which effected this conjunction, and which was later, for a time at least, to provide Asia with a semblance of cultural unity was, of course, Buddhism.

Originating in the Gangetic plain in the sixth century B.C., Buddhism had developed and diversified as it spread over India in succeeding centuries; by the beginning of the Christian era or perhaps even earlier it had given rise to a movement called the Mahāyāna, as well as many other schools or sects. In view of its later predominance in Tibet, China, and Japan, the Mahāyāna is nowadays accorded an importance which it may never have enjoyed in India. Nevertheless its rise and early history constitute one of the most significant riddles of man's religious past. It is difficult, for instance, to know whether it was a radical re-orientation of Buddhism, or whether it merely re-emphasised elements that the faith had possessed since the beginning. Some have even suggested a foreign origin for many of its distinctive ideas and practices. It is possible, however, that some of the questions raised by the Mahāyāna's development may be answered by reference to its first emergence in written records, namely, the appearance of its literature in China in the second and third centuries A.D.

It is not known when the first Buddhists reached China: Chinese history has preserved almost no mention of what must have been for a long time just another strange cult practised by a handful of foreigners, although there is naturally no lack of fanciful and pious legend to compensate for this silence. Only towards the end of the second century A.D. do real figures emerge from the mist. At this time the Kuṣāṇa Empire held sway over Central Asia, and Buddhists of all persuasions had established themselves in the area. From settlements on the fertile rim of the Tarim Basin and from regions further west came increasingly greater numbers of missionaries to China, as the religion slowly spread from the small community of foreign merchants and envoys to the native Chinese themselves. The first Buddhist scriptures began to be translated into Chinese; what was at the outset no more than a trickle was later to turn

into a veritable flood. Although this tidal wave of religious writings bore with it very little of strictly literary worth, its effect in the end was to alter the face of Chinese culture beyond recognition. Nor was its influence confined to China: the cultural history of both Korea and Japan bears its unmistakable imprint.

Our concern here, however, is with the early period, during which some ten foreign missionaries---Parthians, Sogdians, Indians, and Indo-scythians---are known to have been working in the Chinese capital of Lo-yang towards the end of the second century, in the turbulent and bloody years preceding the final collapse of the Han dynasty. In this small group two figures stand out: the Parthian An Shih-kao, who arrived in Lo-yang in 148 and spent more than twenty years there translating works belonging to the Hīnayāna tradition; and the Indo-scythian Lokakṣema, who came to the capital around the year 167 and who is generally credited with the introduction of the Mahāyāna into China. As far as we can tell, Lokakṣema did indeed translate only Mahāyāna sūtras---about a dozen, according to the earliest sources. And to our great good fortune, nine of them appear to have survived---nine works which are undoubtedly some of the oldest surviving examples of Mahāyāna sūtra-literature, and which could conceivably provide us with a valuable means of investigating the early development of that important Buddhist movement.

A critical study of Lokakṣema's works with that end in view would have to begin with the authentication of those translations currently attributed to him, the touchstone for this operation being that work which is definitely his, viz. his rendering of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñā-pāramitā-sūtra, which can be used to determine the distinguishing characteristics of his style. The next step would be to understand Lokakṣema's translations, not at all an easy task, given the fact that the original obscurities of his works have been compounded by the vagaries of centuries of scribal transmission. For this purpose we would have to press into service the most intelligible surviving versions of the sūtras in question, in effect the Tibetan translations, since for all Lokakṣema's works except two the Sanskrit has been lost. For most texts, however, later Chinese versions also exist. In many cases it would be desirable to translate into English these later Tibetan or Chinese versions, which would have the side-effect of broadening the textual basis of current studies of the Mahāyāna. At the same time one ought to look at those sūtras known to have been translated by Lokakṣema but for which his translations have not survived. Relying where possible on other Chinese versions translated in the early period, one would still have to be

circumspect in their use, since we have no way of knowing how much a given text might have changed, even in the short space of a hundred years. Yet these texts cannot entirely be left out of account.

Having determined Lokakṣema's total oeuvre and rendered it accessible and comprehensible, one could then proceed to an analysis of its contents. Here many questions suggest themselves. What kind of ideas do these sūtras articulate? Which aspects of religious theory and practice do they emphasise, and which do they presuppose? Are they doctrinally homogeneous, or do they address themselves to a wide range of different or even unrelated concerns? Do they permit us to draw any conclusions about the ideas prevalent in Lokakṣema's own milieu, i.e. in the Mahāyāna Buddhist communities of the Kuṣāṇa Empire, or do they rather reflect the pre-occupations of nascent Chinese Buddhism? Can one in fact distinguish any of the factors influencing the selection of texts for translation into Chinese? In what way do Lokakṣema's translations differ from later versions of the same texts? Are there certain elements which consistently reveal themselves as later accretions?

In answering questions of this kind an examination of Lokakṣema's translations is likely to yield much interesting information concerning the early development of the Mahāyāna, but such a study should also bear fruit in several other areas. In the first place, although the texts in question were among the first Mahāyāna works to be translated into Chinese, it does not necessarily follow that they were the first to be produced. An appreciation of the doctrinal content or even the structural form of Lokakṣema's sūtras might enable us to see whether they presuppose the existence of other works known to us, and whether other works in turn presuppose their existence. If we were to succeed in discovering such relationships between a given number of texts on the basis of internal evidence, we would, it is to be hoped, be on the way to a clearer idea of the chronology of Mahāyāna sūtra-literature---which hitherto has been derived exclusively from Chinese translation-dates---and this in turn might enable us to discern definite shifts and developments within the Mahāyāna in general. Further, we might also be nearer to understanding the origin and development of the Mahāyāna sūtra as a sacred literary form.

In addition, the linguistic aspects of the texts are far from unimportant. Recent work has shown that they contain a wealth of information on the grammatical features of Late Han Chinese, and are far closer to the spoken language than almost all the other surviving literature of the period. To move in another direction, Lokakṣema's heavy use of trans-

literated proper names and technical terms should enable us to reconstruct, at least partially, the pronunciation of the original language of his texts, presumably some form of Sanskrit. On preliminary indications it is highly likely that they were written (or transmitted orally) in 'Gāndhārī', the name given to the language of the Prākṛt Dharmapada found in Central Asia.

These are some of the many implications of an examination of Lokakṣema's translations for the study of the development of the Mahāyāna, its literary history, and the linguistic aspects of its propagation. It goes without saying that the project briefly outlined here would be attended by many difficulties and complicated by all sorts of obscure factors, but nevertheless one would hope to disengage from the surviving material at least some information that could confer on a largely disembodied set of ideas some semblance of historical development and evolution, and reveal Mahāyāna Buddhism as a growing and changing organism at an early stage of its life.

It is as a tentative first step in this direction that the present work has been conceived and put forward, for it contains an annotated English translation of the Tibetan text of the Pratyutpanna-buddha-saṃmukhāvasthita-samādhi-sūtra (hereafter abbreviated PraS), which was translated into Chinese by Lokakṣema in A.D. 179. Although Lokakṣema's version of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra is often referred to as 'the oldest Mahāyāna sūtra', it must at least share this honour with his version of the PraS, since it is recorded that the two texts were translated, or more probably published, on the same day. Also the PraS is the only other sūtra apart from the Aṣṭa of which a translation is unhesitatingly ascribed to Lokakṣema by Tao-an, earliest and most reliable of the Chinese Buddhist bibliographers. Therefore it must occupy a key position in any study of the Indo-scythian master's oeuvre.

Except for one small fragment discovered in Central Asia, no complete Sanskrit text of the PraS has come down to us---although it is not impossible that tomorrow the sands of Central Asia or the hills of Nepal may deliver up a complete manuscript. However, besides the version attributed to Lokakṣema we have three other Chinese renderings (two of them partial only) and a Tibetan translation dating from the early ninth century. Given the problematical and frequently obscure nature of Lokakṣema's early version, it is imperative that the substance of the work be made available to a wider scholarly public by means of an English translation of the Tibetan version. That is the basic purpose of the present work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
PREFACE	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	xi
ABBREVIATIONS AND WORKS CITED.....	xiii
CORRECTIONS AND EMENDATIONS to <u>The Tibetan Text of the</u> <u>Pratyutpanna-Buddha-Sammukhāvasthita-Samādhi-Sūtra</u>	xx
INTRODUCTION.....	xxi
A. TEXTUAL SURVEY.....	xxi
B. GENERAL REMARKS ON THE CONTENT AND HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE <u>PraS</u>	xxiii
C. THE STRUCTURE OF THE <u>PraS</u>	xxx
D. INTRODUCTION TO THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION.....	xxxvii
THE <u>PRATYUTPANNA-BUDDHA-SAMMUKHĀVASTHITA-SAMĀDHI-SŪTRA</u> :	
AN ANNOTATED ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE TIBETAN VERSION.....	1
Chapter 1.....	2
Chapter 2.....	21
Chapter 3.....	28
Chapter 4.....	40
Chapter 5.....	44
Chapter 6.....	48
Chapter 7.....	55
Chapter 8.....	62
Chapter 9.....	71
Chapter 10.....	79
Chapter 11.....	81
Chapter 12.....	84
Chapter 13.....	86
Chapter 14.....	102
Chapter 15.....	108
Chapter 16.....	117
Chapter 17.....	128
Chapter 18.....	131
Chapter 19.....	138
Chapter 20.....	141
Chapter 21.....	150

Chapter 22.....	153
Chapter 23.....	156
Chapter 24.....	173
Chapter 25.....	180
Chapter 26.....	184

APPENDIX A : SOME REMARKS ON THE TEXTUAL HISTORY OF THE <u>PRATY-</u> <u>UTPANNA-BUDDHA-SAMMUKHĀVASTHITA-SAMĀDHI-SŪTRA</u> IN CHINA.....	187
I. INTRODUCTORY.....	188
II. THE <u>TA-FANG-TENG TA-CHI-CHING HSIEN-</u> <u>HU-FEN</u> (T.416).....	191
III. THE <u>PA-P'O PU-SA CHING</u> (T.419).....	195
IV. THE TWO REDACTIONS OF THE <u>PAN-CHOU SAN-MEI CHING</u> IN THREE <u>CHÜAN</u>	200
1. Preamble : The <u>Pan-chou san-mei ching</u> in Three <u>Chüan</u> and the <u>Pan-chou san-mei ching</u> in One <u>Chüan</u>	200
2. The Two Versions of the <u>Pan-chou san-mei ching</u> in Three <u>Chüan</u> : General Remarks.....	203
3. Variant Readings Between the Two Versions.....	204
4. The <u>Nidāna</u>	208
5. The <u>Gāthās</u>	209
6. The Two Redactions.....	212
V. THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE <u>PAN-CHOU SAN-MEI CHING</u> IN THREE <u>CHÜAN</u>	216
1. Introductory.....	216
2. The Terminology of the <u>Pan-chou san-mei ching</u> and the <u>Tao-hsing pan-jo ching</u> Compared.....	217
3. Conclusions.....	228
VI. THE <u>PAN-CHOU SAN-MEI CHING</u> IN ONE <u>CHÜAN</u> (T.417).....	231
VII. THE TESTIMONY OF THE CATALOGUES.....	236
VIII. TRANSLATIONS POSSIBLY RELATED TO THE <u>PRATYUT-</u> <u>PANNA-BUDDHA-SAMMUKHĀVASTHITA-SAMĀDHI-SŪTRA</u>	248
IX. CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	250
APPENDIX B : THE SANSKRIT FRAGMENT OF THE <u>PRATYUTPANNA-</u> <u>BUDDHA-SAMMUKHĀVASTHITA-SAMĀDHI-SŪTRA</u>	253
APPENDIX C : GLOSSARY.....	280

ABBREVIATIONS AND WORKS CITED

- Akanuma Chizen 赤沼智善, Bukkyō kyōten shiron 佛教經典史論 (Nagoya: 1939).
- Andō Toshio 安藤俊雄, 'Tendai Chigi no jōdokyō---hanjuzanmai kyōgaku no kansei to bannen no kumon' 天台智顗の浄土教一般舟三昧教學の完成と晩年の苦悶, Ōtani daigaku kenkyū nempō 大谷大学研究年報, Vol. XI (1958), pp. 27-90.
- Aṣṭa = Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra (edition cited is that of P.L. Vaidya, Darbhanga: 1960).
- Bailey, H.W., 'Gāndhārī', BSOAS, Vol. XI (1946), pp. 764-797.
- BHSD = Edgerton, F., Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary (New Haven: 1953).
- BHSG = ----, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar (New Haven: 1953).
- Brough, J., The Gāndhārī Dharmapada (London: 1962)
- BSOAS = Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Chavannes, E., 'Jinagupta', T'oung Pao, Vol. VI (1905), pp. 332-356.
- Conze, E., Materials for a Dictionary of the Prajñāpāramitā Literature (Tokyo: 1973).
- , The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom (Berkeley: 1975).
- D = Derge (Sde dge) edition of the Tibetan Kanjur.
- Das = Sarat Chandra Das, A Tibetan-English Dictionary (Reprint edition, Delhi: 1976).
- Dayal, Har, The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature (London: 1932).
- Demiéville, P., 'Les Versions Chinoises du Milindapañha', Bulletin de l'Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient, Vol. XXIV (1924), pp. 1-258.
- Dharmas = Müller, M., ed. Dharmasamgraha (Oxford: 1885).
- DPPN = Malalasekera, G.P., Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, 2 vols. (London: 1937-38).
- Durt, H., 'Note sur l'origine de l'Anavalokitamūrdhatā', IBK, Vol. XVI, No. 1 (Dec. 1967), pp. 443-450.
- Edgerton, F., 'The Meter of the Saddharmapūṇḍarīka', MM. Kuppuswami Sastri Commemoration Volume (Madras: 1935), pp. 39-45.
- ERE = Hastings, J., ed. Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, 12 vols. (Edinburgh: 1908-1921).
- Fugen Kōju 普賢晃寿, 'Ōjōyōshū ni okeru hanjuzanmai no tenkai' 往生要集に於ける般舟三昧の展開, Ryūoku daigaku bukkyō

bunka kenkyūjo kiyō 龍谷大学佛教文化研究所紀要, Vol. I
(1962), pp. 125-128.

Fujita Kōtatsu 藤田宏達, Genshi jōdo shisō no kenkyū 原始淨土思想
の研究 (Tokyo: 1970).

Ghosh, P., ed. Śes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa stoñ phrag brgya pa
(Calcutta: 1888).

Hahn, M., Lehrbuch der klassischen tibetischen Schriftsprache (Hamburg:
1971).

Harrison, P., 'Buddhānusr̥m̥ti in the Pratyutpanna-buddha-sammukhāvasthita-
samādhi-sūtra', Journal of Indian Philosophy 6 (1978), pp. 35-57.

Haseoka Kazuya 長谷岡一也, Ryūju no jōdokyō shisō 龍樹の淨土教
思想 (Kyoto: 1957).

Hayashiya Tomojirō 林屋友次郎, Kyōroku kenkyū 經錄研究 (Tokyo:
1940).

----, Iyaku kyōrui no kenkyū 異譯經類の研究 (Tokyo: 1945).

Hirakawa Akira 平川彰, 'Jūjūbibasharon no chosha ni tsuite' 十住毘
婆沙論の著者について, IBK, Vol. V, No. 2 (March 1957),
pp. 176-181.

-----, 'The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism And Its Relationship to the Wor-
ship of Stupas', Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo
Bunko, No. 22 (1963), pp. 57-106.

----, Shoki daijō bukyō no kenkyū 初期大乘佛教の研究 (Tokyo:
1968).

----, 'Kyōroku no mondaiten' 經錄の問題点, Bukkyōgaku 佛教學,
Vol. V (1978), pp. 28-47.

Hoernle, A.F.R., ed. Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in
Eastern Turkestan (Oxford: 1916).

Honbu Enjō 本部円静, 'Hanjuzanmaikyō ni okeru ichi, ni no mondai'
般舟三昧經における一、二の問題, IBK, Vol. XXII, No. 1
(Dec. 1973), pp. 365-368.

----, 'Hanjuzanmaikyō gyō-hon ni tsuite' 般舟三昧經行品について,
IBK, Vol. XXIII, No. 2 (March 1975), pp. 176-177.

----, 'Hanjuzanmaikyō ni okeru gyōhō ni tsuite' 般舟三昧經における
行法について, IBK, Vol. XXIV, No. 2 (March 1976), pp. 201-203.

----, 'Hanjuzanmaikyō ni okeru satori no shūhen' 般舟三昧經における
さとり周辺の周辺, IBK, Vol. XXV, No. 1 (Dec. 1976), pp. 158-159.

IBK = Indogaku bukyōgaku kenkyū 印度學佛教學研究

Ikeguchi Masakata 池口政方, 'Hanjuzanmai kenkyū josetsu' 般舟三昧

研究序説, Bukkyō ronsō 佛教論叢, Vol. II (Feb. 1945), pp. 62-64.

Izumi Esō 泉惠操, 'Anrakushū-nembustugi to Hanjuzanmaikyō' 安樂集, 念佛義と般舟三昧經, , Shūgaku kenkyū 宗學研究, Vol. XIII (Dec. 1927), pp. 93-114.

Jōdo sanbukyō = Bon-zō-wa-ei gappeki jōdo sanbukyō 梵藏和英合璧淨土三部教 (Reprint edition, Tokyo: 1972).

Jones, J.J., trans. The Mahāvastu, 3 vols. (London: 1949-1956).

K = Korean edition of the Chinese Tripitaka.

Kagawa Takao 香川孝雄, 'Hanjuzanmaikyō ni okeru jōdokyō shisō' 般舟三昧經における淨土教思想, , Bukkyō daigaku kiyō 佛教大學紀要, Vol. XXXV (Oct. 1958), pp. 100-117.

----, 'Hanjuzanmaikyō o meguru ichi-kōsatsu' 般舟三昧經を繞る一考察, Bukkyō ronsō 佛教論叢, Vol. VII (Dec. 1958), pp. 114-115.

----, 'Hanjuzanmaikyō ni okeru nembutsu' 般舟三昧經における念佛, Bukkyō ronsō, Vol. VIII (March 1960), pp. 78-79.

----, 'Kadarikku shutsudo Bhadrāpāla-sūtra no bonbun dankan ni tsuite' カダリク出土 Bhadrāpāla-sūtra の梵文斷簡について, IBK, Vol. X, No. 2 (March 1962), pp. 199-203.

Kawajiri Kōsai 川尻宏濟, 'Hanjuzanmai ni tsuite (shutoshite jōdokyō ni okeru honkyō no ryūden)' 般舟三昧經について(主として淨土教に於ける本經の流傳), Shinshū gakkai kaihō 眞宗學會會報, Vol. V (1931), pp. 1-34.

Kimura Eiichi 木村英一, ed. Eon kenkyū 慧遠研究, 2 vols. (Tokyo: 1962).

Kodama Daien 小玉大圓, 'Hanjuzanmaikyō to Jūjūbibasharon---Chigi no hanjuzanmaizetsu e no ichi-shikō' 般舟三昧經と十住毘婆沙論---智顗の般舟三昧説への一試攷, Nihon bukkyō gakkai nenpō 日本佛教學會年報, Vol. XLI (March 1976), pp. 99-110.

KP = von Staël-Holstein, A., ed. The Kācāpaparivarta (Shanghai: 1926)

Lamotte, E., Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien (Louvain: 1958).

----, L'Enseignement de Vimalakīrti (Vimalakīrtinirdeśa) (Louvain: 1962).

----, La Concentration de la Marche Héroïque (Śūraṅgamasamādhisūtra) (Brussels: 1965).

Lancaster, L., An Analysis of the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitāsūtra from the Chinese Translations (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin: 1968).

L / Lhasa / Lhasa Kanjur = The Xerox Copy of the Lhasa Kanjur (Copy in the Library of the Australian National University).

Ligeti, L., Catalogue du Kanjur Mongol Imprimé (Budapest: 1942-44).

M = Majjhima-Nikāya.

Maspero, H., Mélanges posthumes, Vol. II (Paris: 1950).

Masters, A., 'Indo-Aryan and Dravidian', BSOAS, Vol. XI (1943-46), pp. 297-307.

Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨, Jōdokyō no kigen oyobi hattatsu 淨土教の起原及發達 (Tokyo: 1930).

----, Bukkyō daijiten 佛教大辭典 (Tokyo: 1931-36).

----, Chūgoku jōdo kyōrishi 中國淨土教理史 (Kyoto: 1942).

----, Bukkyō kyōten seiritsushiron 佛教經典成立史論 (Kyoto: 1946).

Mv = Senart, E., ed. Mahāvastu, 3 vols. (Paris: 1882-97).

Mvy = Sakaki Ryōzaburō 榎亮三郎, ed. Mahāvvyutpatti, 2 vols. (Kyoto: 1916-25).

MW = Monier-Williams, M., A Sanskrit-English Dictionary (Oxford: 1899).

N = Narthang (Snar than) edition of the Tibetan Kanjur.

Nakamura Hajime 中村元, 'The Influence of Confucian Ethics on the Chinese Translations of Buddhist Sutras', Liebenthal Festschrift: Sino-Indian Studies, Vol. V, Parts 3 and 4 (Santiniketan: 1957), pp. 156-170.

----, Bukkyōgo daijiten 佛教語大辭典 (Tokyo: 1975).

Naruse Takazumi 成瀬隆純, 'Kannen-hōmon ni inyō-sareta Hanjuzanmai-kyō 觀念法門に引用された般舟三昧經', IBK, Vol. XXV, No. 2 (March 1977), pp. 255-258.

Nishi Giyū 西義雄, 'Hanjuzanmai no kenkyū shiryō to sono igi ni tsuite' 般舟三昧の研究資料と其の意義に就いて, Etani sensei koki kinen Jōdokyō no shisō to bunka 惠谷先生古稀記念淨土教の思想と文化 (Kyoto: 1972), pp. 1265-1286.

Ono Genmyō 小野玄妙, ed. Bussho kaisetsu daijiten 佛書解説大辭典 (2nd ed., Tokyo: 1975-78).

P / Peking = Suzuki Daisetz T., ed. The Peking Edition of the Tibetan Tripitaka (Tokyo-Kyoto: 1955-1961).

Pas, J.F., 'The Kuan-wu-liang-shou Fo-ching: Its Origin and Literary Criticism' in Buddhist Thought and Asian Civilisation, Essays in Honor of Herbert V. Guenther on His Sixtieth Birthday (Emeryville: 1977), pp. 194-218.

PCSMC = Pan-chou san-mei ching (i.e. T.418; the abbreviation PCSMC by itself never refers to T.417)

PraS = Pratyutpanna-buddha-sammukhāvasthita-samādhi-sūtra.

PTSD = The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary (London: 1921-25).

Regamey, C., The Bhāḍṛamāyākāravākarana (Warsaw: 1938).

Sakaino Kōyō 境野黃洋, Shina bukkyō seishi 支那佛教精史 (Tokyo: 1935).

Sakurabe Hajime 桜部建, 'Hanjuzanmaikyō kanken' 般舟三昧經管見, Hashimoto hakushi taikan kinen Bukkyō kenkyū ronshū 橋本博士退官記念佛教研究論集 (Osaka: 1975), pp. 173-180.

----, Hanjuzanmaikyō-ki 般舟三昧經記 (Kyoto: 1975).

----, 'Nembutsu to sanmai' 念佛と三昧, Okuda Jiō sensei kiju kinen Bukkyō shisō ronshū 奥田慈應先生喜寿記念佛教思想論集 (Kyoto: 1976), pp. 889-896.

Schmithausen, L., 'Spirituelle Praxis und philosophische Theorie im Buddhismus', ZMR, Vol. LVII, Heft 3 (1973), pp. 161-186.

----, 'Die vier Konzentrationen der Aufmerksamkeit: Zur geschichtlichen Entwicklung einer spirituellen Praxis des Buddhismus', ZMR, Vol. LX, Heft 4 (1976), pp. 241-266.

SCPPSL = Shih-chu p'i-p'o-sha lun (T.1521).

Śgs = Śūrangama-samādhi-sūtra.

Shio Benkyō 椎尾辨匡, Bukkyō kyōten gaisetsu 佛教經典概説 (Tokyo: 1933).

Shikii Shūjō 色井秀譲, 'Ryūju kyōgaku to hanjuzanmai' 龍樹教學と般舟三昧, IBK, Vol. II, No. 1 (Sept. 1953), pp. 147-148.

----, 'Hanjuzanmaikyō no seiritsu ni tsuite' 般舟三昧經の成立について, IBK, Vol. XI, No. 1 (Jan. 1963), pp. 203-206.

----, 'Hanjuzanmai to jōdokyō' 般舟三昧と淨土教, IBK, Vol. XII, No. 1 (Jan. 1964), pp. 174-177.

----, 'Ryūju iyō no Hanjuzanmaikyō' 龍樹依用の般舟三昧經, Okuda Jiō sensei kiju kinen Bukkyō shisō ronshū 奥田慈應先生喜寿記念佛教思想論集 (Kyoto: 1976), pp. 935-947.

Shizutani Masao 靜谷正雄, 'Hosshi (dharmabhāṇaka) ni tsuite---shoki daijō kyōten no sakusha ni kansuru shiron' 法師(dharmabhāṇaka)について---初期大乘經典の作者に關する試論, IBK, Vol. III, No. 1 (Sept. 1954), pp. 131-132.

----, 'Shoki no daijō kyōdan ni tsuite' 初期の大乘教團について, IBK, Vol. V, No. 2 (March 1957), pp. 101-109.

----, Shoki daijō bukkyō no seiritsukatei 初期大乘佛教の成立過程 (Kyoto: 1974).

Simon, W., 'Vowel Alteration in Tibetan', Asia Major, Vol. XIX, Part 1 (1974), pp. 86-99.

SP = Vaidya, P.L., ed. Saddharmapundarikasūtra (Darbhanga: 1960).

ŚsP = Ghosh, P., ed. Śatasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra (Calcutta: 1902-1910).

Sukh = Ashikaga Atsuuji 足利 惇氏, ed. Sukhāvatīvyūha (Kyoto: 1965).

SYM = 'Three Editions', i.e. the printed editions of the Chinese Tripitaka of the Sung, Yüan and Ming dynasties.

T. / Taishō = Takakusu Junjirō and Watanabe Kaikyoku, ed. Taishō shinshū daizōkyō, 55 vols. (Tokyo: 1924-29).

Takasaki Masayoshi 高崎正芳, 'Bukkyō bunken no jakkan no onshago ni tsuite' 仏教文献の若干の音写語について, IBK, Vol. XXII, No. 1 (Dec. 1973), pp. 72-77.

-----, 'Hanjuzanmai no ichi-kōsatsu' 般舟三昧の一考察, Shūkyō kenkyū 宗教研究, Vol. XLVII-3, No. 218 (March 1974), pp. 122-123.

T'ang Yung-t'ung 湯用彤, Han wei liang-chin nan-pei ch'ao fo-chiao shih 漢魏兩晉南北朝佛教史 (Shanghai: 1938).

TCTL = Ta-chih-tu lun (T.1509).

Text = Harrison, P., ed. The Tibetan Text of the Pratyutpanna-Buddha-Sam-mukhāvasthita-Samādhi-Sūtra (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series I) (Tokyo: 1978).

THC = Tao-hsing ching or Tao-hsing pan-jo ching (T.224).

Tib. = Tibetan.

Tokiwa Daijō 常盤大定, Gokan yori Sō-Sei ni itaru yakkyō sōroku 後漢より宋齊に至る譯經總錄 (Tokyo: 1939).

Traité = Lamotte, E., Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra), 4 vols. (Louvain: 1944, 1949, 1970, 1976).

TSD = Lokesh Chandra, Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary (New Delhi: 1961).

Tsukamoto Zenryū 塚本善隆, Chūgoku bukkyō tsūshi 中國佛教通史 (Tokyo: 1968).

Ui Hakuju 宇井伯寿, Yakkyōshi kenkyū 訳經史研究 (Tokyo: 1971).

Uruma Masanori 漆門正徳, 'Hanjuzanmaikyō seiritsu shikō---toku ni dōgyōhannyakyō to no kankei ni tsuki' 般舟三昧經成立私考特に道行般若經との關係に就き, Jōdogaku 淨土學, Vol. II (April 1937), pp. 71-83.

Uryūzu Takao 瓜生津隆雄 et al., Daizōkyō 大藏經 (Kyoto: 1964).

VKN = Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra.

Weller, F., Tausend Buddhanamen des Bhadrakalpa (Leipzig: 1928).

-----, Zum Kāśyapaparivarta, Heft 2: Verdeutschung des sanskrit-tibetischen Textes (Berlin: 1965).

Yamada Isshi, Karunāpundarīka (London: 1968).

Yoshimura Shūki 芳村修基, 'The People of the Early Mahāyānistic Order', IBK, Vol. XIV, No. 2 (March 1966), pp. (29)-(35).

ZMR = Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft.

Zōbun jiten 藏文辞典 (Tokyo: 1972).

Zürcher, E., The Buddhist Conquest of China (Leiden: 1959).

----, 'A New Look at the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Texts', with Appendix: 'Buddhist Texts of the Later Han Period'---a paper delivered at the Symposium on State, Ideology and Justice in Early Imperial China held in Leiden, September 1-5, 1975.

----, 'Late Han Vernacular Elements in the Earliest Buddhist Translations', Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association, Vol. XII, No. 3 (Oct. 1977), pp. 177-203.

CORRECTIONS AND EMENDATIONS

to

The Tibetan Text of the

Pratyutpanna-Buddha-Sammukhāvasthita-Samādhi-Sūtra

- p.14, 1.26: 'jig rten pa---prefer reading of NPL (n.4): 'jig rten.
- p.15, 1.27: 'jig rten pa---prefer reading of NPL (n.1): 'jig rten.
- p.16, 1.1 : 'jig rten pa---emend to 'jig rten (?).
- p.21, 1.19: gnas pa dan---prefer reading of NPL (n.1): gnas pa /.
- p.30, 1.3 : mñon gyi mtshan ma---prefer reading of N (n.14): sñon gyi mtshan ma.
- p.36, 1.28: 'byuñ ba---prefer reading of D (n.3): byuñ ba.
- p.49, 1.20: 'chan bar---prefer reading of NPL (n.7): 'chad par.
- p.49, 1.29: 'chan bar---prefer reading of NP (n.13): 'chad par.
- p.50, 1.17: 'chan bar---prefer reading of NPL (n.4): 'chad par.
- p.50, 1.18: de dag ni---prefer reading of NPL (n.6): de dag gi.
- p.53, 1.18: noted noted---correct to 'not noted'.
- p.60, 1.24: rtog pa mañ pa---correct to rtog pa mañ ba.
- p.66, 1.6 : byas pas 'gyur---correct to byas par 'gyur.
- p.76, 1.25: med pa'i---prefer reading of NPL (n.4): med pa rnam kyī (?).
- p.80, 1.19: tshol---emend to tshul (cf. n.23).
- p.88, 1.16: sñam du---correct to sñam du.
- p.103, 1.28: bcom ldan 'das la---emend to bcom ldan 'das las.
- p.113, 1.5 : bye ba khrag---correct to bye ba phrag.
- p.113, 1.19: bskal pa bya ba---correct to bskal pa bye ba.
- p.122, 1.23: rnam kyañ---emend to nam kyañ.
- p.123, 1.23: pa spu---correct to ba spu.
- p.151, 1.18: khyod kyis---correct to khyed kyis.
- p.162, 1.15: nam mkha' la---correct to nam mkha' la ni.
- p.170, 1.19: nus pa'i 'khor lo---correct to nus pa'i tshans pa'i 'khor lo.
- p.178, 1.3 : between bar 'gyur ba'i and rgyu insert rgyu yañ dag par rjes su mi mthoñ ste /.
- p.189, 1.22: rnam grans 'di---correct to rnam grans 'dis.
- p.193, 1.9 : de dag lhan---correct to de dag dan lhan.
- p.193, 1.11: skyes ba---correct to skye ba.
- p.199, 1.9 : brgya---emend to brgyad.
- p.221, 1.23: bstad do---correct to bstod do.
- p.234 (Concordance) For T.416 24A correct 877a23 to 897a23, for 24B correct 877b4 to 897b4.

INTRODUCTION

A. TEXTUAL SURVEY

The PraS, an early Mahāyāna sūtra first rendered into Chinese by the Indo-scythian Lokakṣema in A.D. 179, survives at present, either partially or in its entirety, in the following versions:

1. The Tibetan translation, made---or at least revised---circa A.D. 800 by Śākyaprabha and Ratnarakṣita, and entitled 'Phags pa da ltar gyi saṅs rgyas mñon sum du bžugs pa'i tiñ ne 'dzin ces bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo (=Ārya-pratyutpanna-buddha-sammukhāvasthita-samādhi-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra). It is found in the various editions of the Tibetan Kanjur (Bka' 'gyur), e.g.

Derge (Sde dge) Mdo Na 1 - 70b2

Narthang (Snar than) Mdo Tha 1 - 115a6

Peking Mdo Du 1 - 73a5

Lhasa Mdo Tha 1 - 106b4

A critical edition of this Tibetan translation has been made by me and is now available as The Tibetan Text of the Pratyutpanna-Buddha-Sammukhāvasthita-Samādhi-Sūtra, Critically Edited from the Derge, Narthang, Peking and Lhasa Editions of the Tibetan Kanjur and Accompanied by a Concordance and Comparative Table of Chapters of the Tibetan and Chinese Versions (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series I)(Tokyo: 1978); hereafter referred to as Text.

2. T.416: Ta-fang-teng ta-chi-ching hsien-hu-fen 大方等大集經賢護分 (=Mahāvaipulya-mahāsaṃnipāta-sūtra-bhadrāpāla-parivarta) in five chüan (Taishō Vol. XIII, pp. 872a-897c), translated by Jñānagupta et al. in 595 A.D.
3. T.417: Pan-chou san-mei ching 般舟三昧經 (=Pratyutpanna-samādhi-sūtra) in one chüan (ibid. pp. 897c-902c), falsely attributed to Lokakṣema. As this is a secondary abridgement of Redaction B of the following, it is generally not referred to in the notes to the translation. See Appendix A.VI.
4. T.418: Pan-chou san-mei ching 般舟三昧經 (=Pratyutpanna-samādhi-sūtra) in three chüan (ibid. pp. 902c-919c), to be ascribed to Lokakṣema with certain reservations. Two redactions exist: A, which is partial only, and is found in the Korean edition of the Chinese Canon, and B,

which is complete, and is found both in the 'Three Editions' and (in part only) in the Korean edition. The complicated relationship between these two redactions is discussed in Appendix A.

5. T.419: Pa-p'o p'u-sa ching 拔陂菩薩經 (=Bhadrāpāla-bodhisattva-sūtra) in one chüan (*ibid.* pp. 920a-924b). Anonymous, possibly Later Han or soon after. Partial translation only.
6. The Sanskrit fragment: Hoernle MS., No. 143, S.A. 3, probably found on the site of Khadalik in Central Asia at the turn of the century.
Edited by F.W. Thomas and published as the 'Bhadrāpāla Sūtra' in A.F. Rudolf Hoernle, ed. Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature, pp. 88-93 (see also Addenda, pp. 410-411). See Appendix B for edition, translation, and study.
7. The Mongolian version, entitled Qutur-tu edüged-ün burqan iledde sayursan samadi kemegdeküi yeke kölgön sudur, appearing as No. 890 in the Mongolian Kanjur, Vol. 72 (Sūtra 13), 1-94a (see L. Ligeti, Catalogue du Kanjur Mongol Imprimé, p. 234). This version was made on the basis of the Tibetan translation. Although it would conceivably assist in understanding the Tibetan text, I have been unable to consult it.
8. A Japanese translation of T.418 (title transcribed as Hanjuzanmaigyō) appears in Kokuyaku issaikyō, Vol. XLIV, pp. 255-318. The translation, by Mochizuki Shinkō, is in the old style, i.e. kundoku.
9. A Japanese translation of T.417 appears in Sakurabe Hajime, Hanjuzanmaikyō-ki, pp. 47-71, accompanied by an edition of the text, pp. 73-98. This translation is also in the kundoku style.

B. GENERAL REMARKS ON THE CONTENT AND
HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PraS

The PraS resembles the general run of Mahāyāna sūtras in being anonymous and of uncertain date. As is customary, it uses the traditional opening formula evam mayā śrutam, etc., to establish itself as the authentic word of the Buddha as relayed through the prodigious memory of Ānanda. In the body of the text, however, this standard claim to authenticity is re-inforced by an additional claim, namely, that Śākyamuni entrusts the Sūtra to a faithful core of five hundred followers headed by eight lay bodhisattvas under the leadership of Bhadrāpāla (see Chap. 13). These five hundred stalwarts undertake to ensure that the Sūtra re-appears and is propagated in the world during the 'last five hundred years', a fact which probably places the publication of the PraS in the first century A.D. at the earliest. Since the text was first translated into Chinese in A.D. 179, we can tentatively date it sometime between then and the beginning of the Christian era; it is impossible to be any more precise.

The action of the Sūtra takes place at the Veṇuvana in Rājagṛha during the reign of Ajātaśatru: the PraS is thus represented as a teaching delivered during the latter part of the Buddha's ministry. Elsewhere¹ I have already dealt with the principal ideas and practices featured in the text, relating them to some of the key themes of the Prajñāpāramitā literature. Since our Sūtra will be well able to speak for itself in the pages which follow, I do not intend to repeat myself unduly describing in detail the many ideas it contains. It will be enough to note here that in the PraS the Mahāyāna appears as a fully-developed movement, and as a set of concepts needing no special justification or defence; and this in what is supposed to be one of the earliest Mahāyāna sūtras! Although the Sūtra devotes precious little energy to criticising the old dispensation (i.e. the Hīnayāna, a term which---significantly---is completely absent, although other less pejorative designations are found), what it is at pains to get across to its readers and hearers is the same attitude to phenomena that we find emphasised in the Prajñāpāramitā literature---namely, that all phenomena, or rather all dharmas (the basic factors of which phenomena are constituted) are empty (śūnya), that is, devoid of independent existence or 'own-being' (svabhāva). Since this is so, there is nothing which can provide a basis for 'apprehension' (upalambha), by which term is intend-

1 Harrison, 'Buddhānusmṛti'.

ed that process of the mind which seizes on the objects of experience as existing things (bhāva), and regards them as possessing an independent and objective reality. The perception of existing things (bhāva-samjñā) is thus seen as the gravest of errors, in that it leads us to fixate on, and become attached to that which, as a mere construct of our own minds, should not form the basis of any sort of attachment whatsoever. And from this attachment springs all the suffering that characterises the existence of unawakened beings.

This emphasis on the emptiness or the unreality of all dharmas (sometimes referred to as the doctrine of dharma-nairātmya, literally, the 'selflessness of dharmas') is one of the principal thrusts of the Prajñāpāramitā, and of the Mahāyāna in general, and is often held to have been a reaction against the Abhidharma theories of the powerful Sarvāstivādin school. Unlike the Aṣṭa (now held to represent the earliest form of the Prajñāpāramitā), which tends to articulate the theory of emptiness or Śūnyatā as a received truth, as something which needs only to be stated, not proved or demonstrated, the PraS approaches the question from the point of view of meditation-experience. It first underlines the fundamental unreality of the entities experienced during the Samādhi by comparing them with those things perceived in dreams or in the course of the 'meditation on the repulsive' (aśubha-bhāvanā, here understood as a purely imaginary exercise), and then---often without any shift of focus being made explicit---proceeds to emphasise the emptiness of all dharmas, i.e. those factors which supposedly constitute the basis of our experience in the waking state. The process, then, is one of generalisation, in which meditative discipline fosters an awareness of the emptiness of appearances which extends to all phenomena. In this regard we should, I think, note the important place occupied in our Sūtra by the four 'applications of mindfulness' (smṛtyupasthāna; see Chaps. 15 and 18), which suggests that, within the framework of Mahāyāna meditation, this traditional discipline played a key role in the actual development of the understanding that all dharmas are empty². One might also point out that this process of generalisation, when pushed to its logical conclusion, brings us to the so-called 'Buddhist idealism' of the Yogācārins, i.e. the view that all appearances are purely the products of mind (citta-mātra), which is to be distinguished from the previous theory of emptiness, which is more in the nature of an epistemological scepticism. A trace of this 'idealist' view---in fact, one of its

2 See particularly L. Schmithausen, 'Die vier Konzentrationen der Aufmerksamkeit', pp. 259-263, for the use of this practice by the Mahāyāna.

earliest formulations---is indeed to be found in the PraS (in the well-known statement of section 3L, q.v.), but it is not representative of the general tenor of the work. Rather, the attitude to phenomena propounded throughout the Sūtra is one that we might characterise as essentially Śūnyavādin, in that all its more philosophical passages are given over to arguments in favour of the understanding of emptiness; although the word 'philosophical' might lead us into error if we forget that here we have before us no mere exercise in sophistry, but rather a practical endeavour with a clearly defined soteriological purpose.

Turning now from these more general considerations, it is perhaps from this view of the equal nature of all phenomena, in whatever state they may occur, that the PraS arrives at what I believe to be one of its major concerns. As I have pointed out elsewhere³, one of the main aims of the Samādhi⁴ that gives our Sūtra its name is to provide the practitioner with a means of translating himself into the presence of this or that particular manifestation of the Buddha-principle for the purpose of hearing the Dharma, which he subsequently remembers and propagates. It is difficult not to see this as a theoretical justification for the continuing production of Mahāyāna sūtras (or 'dharma hitherto unheard'), and a bold one at that, in that it attempts to remove the necessity for claims to strict historical authenticity; further, there is certainly more than a suggestion here that meditation played a large part in the composition of Mahāyāna sūtras. But whatever the precise function of the pratyutpanna-samādhi itself, throughout the Sūtra we find a continuing emphasis on the related concepts of bāhu-śrutya and dharma-bhāṇaka. In my translation I have given maṇ du thos pa (= bāhuśrutya) as 'great learning', even though this does not satisfactorily render the aural nature of the term. Strictly speaking, bāhu-śrutya refers to the state of having heard much, or, more specifically, to having received a large amount of oral instruction from a teacher---often in the form of memorised texts. The term is quite traditional, but in the PraS, and possibly in other Mahāyāna works as well, the bahu-śruta (or 'one who has heard much', the 'greatly learned') denotes, I believe, particularly the one who has received and memorised Mahāyāna teachings. Insofar as he is bahu-śruta his passive aspect is emphasised;

3 Harrison, 'Buddhānusmṛti', esp. pp. 52-54.

4 In this work the pratyutpanna-buddha-sammukhāvasthita-samādhi is referred to as the pratyutpanna-samādhi, or just 'the Samādhi', and is thereby distinguished from the PraS as the text which propounds that samādhi. It should be noted that no such distinction is maintained in the Sūtra itself.

the term dharma-bhāṇaka shifts the focus to his active function, i.e. as a transmitter of these teachings. Dharma-bhāṇaka ('preacher of the Dharma') is an expression which occurs very frequently in Mahāyāna sūtras, in contexts which make it clear that the Dharma that is being preached is something that is new, not generally accepted, and subject to ridicule and abuse from other supposed followers of the Buddha. References in the PraS to precisely this state of affairs, and its repeated injunctions to respect and follow the dharma-bhāṇaka, even to regard him with the reverence due to a Buddha, point to a period in the development of the Mahāyāna when the new teaching's credentials were not fully established.⁵

Along with the Sūnyavādin attitude to experience and those ideas relating to the revelation and propagation of new teachings, the third main element of the content of the PraS is that concerned with ethics. Much space is devoted to prescriptions for correct behaviour, with attention being given to the differing requirements of monks and nuns, laymen and laywomen. In fact this Sūtra, like certain others (e.g. the Ugra-pari-prcchā) is noteworthy for the importance it accords to lay followers of the Dharma⁶. But at the same time 'going forth from the household life', i.e. entry into the Order as a bhikṣu or bhikṣuṇī, is also strongly emphasised, and in addition we find occasional mention of the spiritual advantages of life as a solitary recluse. In these discussions of the more outward aspects of behaviour, and elsewhere in the text as well, one comes across indications of the religious practices obtaining at the time of the composition of the PraS: for example, the worship of stūpas⁷, the cult of Amitābha⁸, the making of images of the Buddha, and the enshrinement of sacred writings. All these aspects of Buddhist practice appear even in the earliest form of the text, and reveal the PraS as a rich mine of inform-

5 On the role of the dharma-bhāṇaka see Shizutani Masao, 'Hosshi ni tsuite' and 'Shoki no daijō kyōdan ni tsuite'.

6 In this connection see Yoshimura Shūki, 'The People of the Early Mahāyānist Order'.

7 See Hirakawa Akira, 'The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism And Its Relationship to the Worship of Stupas'.

8 The PraS is well-known for containing the earliest mention of the Buddha Amitābha/Amitāyus; however, because of the later history of the text in China and Japan its Pure Land aspect has often been over-emphasised. For a lucid discussion of the relation of the PraS to traditional Pure Land ideas and the ways in which it differs from them, see Kagawa Takao, 'Hanjuzanmaikyō ni okeru jōdokyō shisō'.

ation on the Mahāyāna in its initial phase.

The PraS is, of course, a samādhi-sūtra, and as such belongs to the large group of Mahāyāna sūtras which purport to deal with various aspects of meditation-practice⁹. Our Sūtra is perhaps one of the oldest examples of this type of literature, but despite its venerability there is no hard evidence that it ever enjoyed any great popularity in India. Although the pratyutpanna-samādhi is mentioned by name or referred to obliquely in a number of primary works, some of which are preserved in Sanskrit¹⁰, the Sūtra itself is not, to the best of my knowledge, cited in any of the surviving Sanskrit compendia or treatises such as the Mahāyāna-sūtrālamkāra attributed to Asaṅga, Śāntideva's Śikṣā-samuccaya, or the first Bhāvanākrama of Kamalaśīla. However, several commentarial works which are ostensibly of Indian origin but are preserved only in Chinese refer to or quote from the PraS---namely, the Ta-chih-tu lun 大智度論¹¹

9 On the meditation-sūtras see in particular Akanuma Chizen, 'Sho-san-mai-kyōten', Chap. III of his Bukkyō kyōten shiron, pp. 388-422. A useful discussion of 'visualisation' texts, a sub-category of meditation-sūtras, can be found in Julian Pas, 'The Kuan-wu-liang-shou Fo-ching: Its Origin and Literary Criticism'. On the amalgamation of buddhānusmṛti and samādhi characteristic of the PraS and of visualisation-sūtras in general, see Sakurabe Hajime, 'Nembutsu to sanmai'.

10 See e.g. the Daśabhūmika-sūtra, p. 82, where we find the bodhisattva's samādhi called the pratyutpanna-sarva-buddha-saṃmukhāvasthita listed as one of the various samādhis realised by the bodhisattva who has attained the tenth bhūmi. According to the Sūrangama, however, the pratyutpanna-samādhi is obtained by the bodhisattva when he reaches the eighth bhūmi (see Lamotte, Marche Héroïque, p. 163).

11 The Ta-chih-tu lun (T.1509), ascribed to Nāgārjuna and translated by Kumārajīva in 404 or 405, is a voluminous commentary on the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra. Part of it has been rendered into French by E. Lamotte under the title of Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse. In this massive compendium of the Mahāyāna, the pratyutpanna-samādhi is referred to several times, either directly as the pan-chou(-pan)-san-mei 般舟(般)三昧 or indirectly as the buddhānusmṛti-samādhi (念佛三昧). The appearance of the PraS's chief character, the bodhisattva Bhadrāpāla (Pa-t'o-po-lo 跋陀婆羅), also indicates that material from the Sūtra underlies the discussion. See e.g. 86c3-4 (cf. Traité I, p. 245); 110b9-19 (*ibid.* pp. 425-426; refers to section 3D of the PraS); 111a5-10, 17-19 (*ibid.* pp. 429-430; refers indirectly to sections 1B-G, 2A); 123c29-124a1 (*ibid.* p. 527; refers to 1Y, 3C); 185b24 (Traité II, p. 1023); 262a20-23 (Traité IV, p. 1789; here the TCTL also assigns the Samādhi to the eighth bhūmi); 276a17-cl3 (*ibid.* pp. 1926-1930; here the TCTL summarises much of Chap. 3 of the PraS); 306a15-24 (refers to sections 1Y, 3C); 314a23-25 (here the pratyutpanna-samādhi is described as the 'father of the Buddhas', whereas prajñā, being their 'mother', is said to be more important); 320a10; 335b19; 416a18 (here the pratyutpanna-samādhi is linked with anupattika-dharma-kṣānti).

and the Shih-chu p'i-p'o-sha lun 十住毘婆沙論¹², both attributed to Nāgārjuna¹³, and a commentary on the Sukhāvati-vyūha-sūtra commonly known as the Ching-t'u lun 淨土論 or the Wang-sheng lun 往生論 (T.1524), attributed to Vasubandhu. But given the fact that these works are of doubtful provenance, they cannot be used to demonstrate conclusively that the PraS was ever known or used to any great extent in India, although they do indicate that it was accorded an important place somewhere in the Buddhist world---possibly in Central Asia¹⁴.

12 The Shih-chu p'i-p'o-sha lun (T.1521), also ascribed to Nāgārjuna and also translated by Kumārajīva, is a 17-fascicle commentary on the Daśa-bhūmika which contains huge chunks of the PraS (and also much of the Ugra-pariprcchā, another important early work). It first mentions the pratyutpanna-samādhi at 25c3-10 (where it is described as the 'father' of the Buddhas, mahākaruṇā being the mother in this instance); then at 54a1; in the chapter on buddhānusmṛti (XX) at 68c8-24, where the title of the PraS is explained; in the key chapter on buddhānusmṛti-samādhi (XXV), where much of the PraS is alluded to, paraphrased, or quoted directly---in particular: sections 3K (86b3-6), 3C (b6-15), 4A (b15-25), unidentified (b25-29), 4B (b29-c4), 4C (c4-6), 4D (c7-10), unidentified (c11-13), 16L-16P (c13-20), 16Q-U (c20-28), 11B-C (87a2-13), 9D (a13-18), 9B (a18-22), 9D (a22-b3), 9H (b3-17), 2D (b19-22), 2E (b22-26), 2F (b26-c3), 2G (c3-8), 2H (c8-13), 2I (c13-15), 7E-F (c18-88a2), 14C-I (a2-24), 23E-F (a24-b12; see also b12ff.); also at 109b7ff.; and at 116a10-26 (where sections 5A and 9F-G are quoted).

On the place of the pratyutpanna-samādhi in the thought of the author of the SCPPSL---whoever he may have been---see Haseoka Kazuya, Ryūju no jōdokyō shisō, pp. 117-133; and for a detailed analysis of the actual material from the PraS cited in the SCPPSL see Shikii Shūjō, 'Ryūju iyō no Hanjuzanmaikyō'. Shikii found that the version of the PraS used by the author of the SCPPSL was very close to T.416, less close to T.419, and at quite some variance with the text as preserved by T.418. This confirms the tentative conclusion I arrived at in my discussion of the textual history of the PraS in China (see Appendix A) concerning the sequence of the Chinese translations. Much more work, however, needs to be done on the text of the PraS as it appears in the TCTL and the SCPPSL.

13 Note, however, Hirakawa's article on the authorship of the SCPPSL---'Jūjūbibasharon no chosha ni tsuite'---in which he attempts to show that it and the TCTL were not composed by the same author.

14 It might be pointed out here that the PraS, or at least Jñānagupta's version of it (T.416), forms part of the great sūtra-collection called the Mahāsaṃnipāta. It is difficult to determine what significance this fact has, since so little is known of the compilation of the Mahāsaṃnipāta (as is also the case with the Ratnakūṭa), but a Central Asian origin for these collections has been postulated. At any rate the PraS is certainly one of the oldest texts in the Mahāsaṃnipāta, and probably predates its formation by several centuries.

On the other hand, the PraS has certainly enjoyed considerable prestige in the Far East. Not only was it translated into Chinese several times, but many commentaries on it were composed, both in China and Japan¹⁵; unfortunately nothing has survived of this secondary literature that goes back to the first millennium, with the sole exception of the Pan-chou tsan 般舟讚 (T.1981), a poetic rhapsody on the PraS composed by Shan-tao 善導 (613-681) which has itself spawned a whole range of commentaries but which is of little use for reconstructing the early history of the Sūtra. But despite the loss of the literature devoted specifically to the exegesis of the text, the PraS's popularity amongst devotees of Amitābha and practitioners of meditation is well attested; particularly important in this regard is its explicit statement that the vision of the Buddhas can be accomplished without the possession of the 'divine eye' and other supernormal faculties (see sections 1Y and 3C): thus the benefits of the pratyutpanna-samādhi are available even to laymen who do not have the time to acquire such rare powers. Accordingly the first record of the PraS in use in China relates to Hui-yüan's community on Mt. Lu around the beginning of the fifth century; there its teachings played a prominent part in the activities of the White Lotus Society, formed by Hui-yüan on Sept. 11, 402. This society comprised both monks and laymen, and was dedicated primarily to the worship of Amitābha and to rebirth in Sukhāvati¹⁶.

It is not my intention here to go into the subsequent history of the PraS in the Far East, its influence on religious practice, and its many appearances in treatises on meditation and Pure Land theory by such luminaries as Chih-i 智顗 (538-597), Tao-ch'o 道綽 (562-645), Shan-tao, Chia-ts'ai 迦才 (floruit c. 627-649), Genshin 源信 (942-1017), and Hōnen 法然 (1133-1212). Others have dealt with various aspects of these thinkers' use of the Sūtra in their writings, and I refer the reader to

15 See Ono Genmyō, ed. Bussho kaisetsu daijiten, Vol. IX, pp. 51-58.

16 See Zürcher, Buddhist Conquest, pp. 219-221. In Hui-yüan's famous exchange of letters with Kumārajīva, the Ta-sheng ta-i chang 大乘大義章 (T.1856), the eleventh question-and-answer concerns the practice of the pratyutpanna-samādhi, with reference mainly to matters raised in Chap. 3 of the PraS---see Kimura Eiichi, ed. Eon kenkyū, Ibun-hen, pp. 34-36 (Chinese text) and pp. 164-169 (Japanese translation). See also Kenkyū-hen, esp. pp. 258-267, for a discussion of Hui-yüan's approach to the pratyutpanna-samādhi and to buddhānusr̥ti.

their works¹⁷. But before we return to the text itself it is worth noting that the PraS continues to be studied by Buddhists, and that the pratyutpanna-samādhi is still practised in the twentieth century.

C. THE STRUCTURE OF THE PraS

Despite the process of accretion and alteration which it has undergone, the PraS in its present form exhibits a certain coherence, and is better organised than many other examples of Mahāyāna sūtra-literature. As far as the overall structure of the Sūtra is concerned, there are two recensions, one represented by the Tibetan text, and presumably later, and the other represented by the Chinese versions (which themselves differ from each other in important respects), therefore presumably earlier. The two recensions diverge substantially only after Chap. 19, and where this occurs in the outline of the content of the text which now follows, the Tibetan recension is given on the left-hand side of the page, the Chinese on the right.

The Sūtra opens with a long nidāna (1A-I) describing the assembling of the Buddha's audience in the Venuvana outside Rājagṛha; pride of place is given to eight lay bodhisattvas, who arrive each from one of the eight major cities of the Buddha's world---first comes their leader, the householder Bhadrapāla from Rājagṛha, followed by Ratnākara from Vaiśālī, Guhagupta from Campā, Naladatta from Vārāṇasī, Susīma from Kapilavastu, Mahāsusārthavāha from Śrāvastī, Indradatta from Kauśāmbī, and Varuṇadeva from Sāketa. This neat narrative device serves both to confer a kind of universal validity on the Sūtra's teachings and to earmark them as especially significant for lay people.

17 For a general survey see Kawajiri Kōsai, 'Hanjuzanmaikyō ni tsuite (shutoshite jōdokyō ni okeru honkyō no ryūden)'; additional references may be found in Sakurabe Hajime, Hanjuzanmaikyō-ki, p. 1, n. 1. On the PraS in Chih-i's Mo-ho chih-kuan 摩訶止觀, see Kodama Daien, 'Hanjuzanmaikyō to Jūjūbibasharon---Chigi no hanjuzanmai-setsu e no ichi-shikō', and Andō Toshio, 'Tendai Chigi no jōdokyō-hanjuzanmai kyōgaku no kansei to bannen no kumon'. For the use of the Sūtra in Tao-ch'o's An-lo-chi 安樂集, see Izumi Esō, 'Anrakushū-nembutsugi to Hanjuzanmaikyō'; for Shan-tao's Kuan-nien fa-men 觀念法門, see Naruse Takazumi, 'Kannen-hōmon ni inyō-sareta Hanjuzanmaikyō'; and for Genshin's Ōjōyōshū 往生要集, see Fugen Kōju, 'Ōjōyōshū ni okeru hanjuzanmai no tenkai'.

When everyone is present Bhadrāpāla rises from his seat and, reciting a long list of personal attributes and abilities, asks the Buddha which samādhi a bodhisattva should practise in order to acquire them (1J-Y). After praising Bhadrāpāla for asking the question (2A), the Buddha states that the samādhi required is the pratyutpanna-samādhi, which he defines as entailing a second long list of attributes and attitudes (2B-J). In Chapter 3 the Buddha goes on to give specific instructions for the practice of the Samādhi, while at the same time describing its nature by means of a number of similes relating mainly to dream-experiences; the vividness and yet the complete unreality of that which is perceived during the Samādhi are emphasised (3A-O). In Chapter 4 the Buddha outlines some of the practical and ethical prerequisites for the practice of the Samādhi (4A-E), while in Chapter 5 he stresses the need for reverence for the preacher of Dharma (5A), and describes the great efficacy of the pratyutpanna-samādhi, in terms both of its own results and of the other spiritual benefits which it makes possible (5B-E). Chapter 6 deals with the considerable loss to be suffered by those future followers of the Buddha who will refuse to accept and practise the Samādhi (both the practice and the Sūtra-text itself, a customary ambiguity). Their immorality, their perversity in repudiating the Sūtra, and their maliciousness in deprecating it to others are described and illustrated by various similes, and they are unfavourably contrasted with the wise and virtuous elect, who will of course take up the teaching with joyful alacrity. Great is the merit to be derived from believing in this teaching, the Buddha solemnly avows to his audience (6A-J).

The Buddha continues to praise in the most fulsome terms the excellence of those who take up the Samādhi (7A-G), before returning in Chapter 8 to the practice of the Samādhi itself. Some quite 'philosophical' or theoretical passages deal with various points of doctrine---relating mainly to the perception of phenomena---which the bodhisattva should attempt to internalise in his practice of the Samādhi (8A-K). Following this the Buddha outlines the qualities---moral, attitudinal, practical, social---required of the bodhisattva who has given up the household life (i.e. the Mahāyāna bhikṣu) and who wishes to cultivate the pratyutpanna-samādhi. Particularly emphasised are respect and affection for the preacher of Dharma (dharma-bhāṇaka) or 'good friend' (kalyāṇa-mitra) from whom the bodhisattva hears the Samādhi in the first place (9A-M). Subsequently the Buddha deals in turn with those things

required of the Mahāyāna bhikṣuṇī (10A-C), the householder bodhisattva, i.e. the Mahāyāna upāsaka (11A-D), and the Mahāyāna upāsikā (12A-C).

Bhadrupāla expresses his admiration for the Buddha's munificence in making such a profound teaching available, and asks if it will continue to circulate in Jambudvīpa after the Buddha's demise (13A). The Buddha replies that the Samādhi will disappear sometime after his Parinirvāṇa, but that it will re-appear in the 'last five hundred years' to be taken up and propagated by a few faithful souls (13B). Moved to tears of joy by this revelation, Bhadrupāla and his seven bodhisattva companions undertake to preach the Samādhi in the terrible 'last five hundred years' (13C-F). They are joined by five hundred other followers, who vow to assist them in this task and beseech the Buddha to entrust the Samādhi to the eight bodhisattvas (13G-H). The Buddha responds with one of his winning smiles (13I), and Ānanda, on cue as ever, asks in verse what the reason is for this (13J). By way of reply the Buddha recapitulates in verse, with certain elaborations, what he has just said in prose concerning the future of the Samādhi (13K). The eight bodhisattvas and their five hundred followers rejoice over these revelations, and show their appreciation to the Buddha, who regales them with a religious discourse, presumably for their ears only (14A).

Bhadrupāla then enquires after further prerequisites for correct practice, and the Buddha enumerates four (14B), after which he goes on to detail the many wordly advantages to be derived from the Samādhi, including the capacity to acquire, even in one's dreams, hitherto-unknown teachings (14C-J). Here follows the avadāna of the merchant's son Sudatta, who first heard the Samādhi from the lips of the Tathāgata Kṣemarāja and subsequently pursued it for many incarnations (15A-E). Sudatta is identified with the Tathāgata Dīpaṃkara (15F). Once again the Buddha solemnly advises his listeners to strive for the Samādhi, whose excellence, pre-eminence, and efficacy are underlined (15G-I). Further 'philosophical' passages follow, in which the correct practice of the four smṛtyupasthānas is related to that of the Samādhi, and various statements are made concerning the nature of phenomena and the proper attitude to them (15J-N). Before the verses which restate all this (15P) we find a 'false ending' to the text, in which the Buddha entrusts the Samādhi to the world and various beings realise various attainments (15O---not found in the early Chinese translation).

In Chapter 16 the Sūtra is enlivened by a dramatic interlude, in which the bodhisattva Bhadrapāla invites the Buddha and all his followers to lunch the next day at his house in Rājagṛha (16A-C), and then goes back into town with his seven companions to spend the night making the necessary preparations (16D-E). The next morning Bhadrapāla comes out to the Veṇuvana to inform the Buddha that all is in readiness, whereupon the whole congregation makes its way into the city (16F). By magic the Buddha makes Bhadrapāla's house both big enough to accommodate everyone and transparent so that all the people of Rājagṛha can see in (16G). Lunch is consumed (16H), the Buddha delivers the customary after-dinner speech, and everybody returns to the Veṇuvana (16I-J).

Bhadrapāla next asks the Buddha what things will enable the bodhisattva to acquire the Samādhi successfully (16K). The Buddha details another series of attributes, attitudes, practices, etc. (16L-V), and then recalls the prediction of his own awakening during the time of Dīpaṃkara, the traditional story being considerably altered by the important place occupied in it by the pratyutpanna-samādhi (17A-B). Thus a kind of 'apostolic succession' is established for the teaching.

Bhadrapāla again asks how the bodhisattva should cultivate the Samādhi, and the Buddha in reply discusses the required understanding of 'all dharmas' and the proper attitude to them, with reference to the correct practice of the smṛtyupasthānas (18A-F). He also describes how the Buddhas are to be seen by the bodhisattvas (18G-K).

Chapter 19 contains further instructions on correct practice (19A-B), and lists eight dharmas which the bodhisattva engaged in the Samādhi will acquire (19C). All this is recapitulated in verse (19D).

In addition to these eight dharmas, the bodhisattva will acquire the ten powers of a Tathāgata (20A-K), the four assurances (21A-E), and the eighteen dharmas exclusive to a Buddha (22A-B).	In addition to these eight dharmas, the bodhisattva will acquire the eighteen dharmas exclusive to a Buddha (22A) and the ten powers of a Tathāgata (20A-J).
--	--

At the beginning of Chapter 23 the Buddha propounds four acts of 'rejoicing' which a bodhisattva should formally rehearse with regard to the Samādhi (23A-D). The merit from this, which is to be 'turned over' to others for the sake of perfect awakening, is described as very great indeed (23E-F).

One Chinese version (T.418) only:
23A-F is restated in verse (23G).

Another avadāna follows to illustrate the preceding material. King Viśeṣagāmin hears the Samādhi from the Tathāgata Siṃhamati and rejoices over it. After Siṃhamati's demise Viśeṣagāmin is reborn as Prince Brahmadatta, who hears the Samādhi again from the Tathāgata's disciple Ratna. Having heard it once only Brahmadatta becomes a bhikṣu and follows Ratna for many years, eventually becoming a Tathāgata himself; Brahmadatta's followers also become Buddhas. Such is the merit of their former act of rejoicing under Siṃhamati (23H-0).

The Buddha follows this tale with a solemn injunction to his listeners to go to any lengths to hear and practise the Samādhi, and once again emphasises the respect and obedience due to the preacher of Dharma, the good friend (23P-U). The avadāna of Brahmadatta is recapitulated in verse (23V).

A second avadāna, similar to that of Brahmadatta, is told, in which Śākyamuni appears as an unnamed king who attempts to hear the Samādhi from the bhikṣu Varuṇa after the demise of Varuṇa's master, the Tathāgata Satyanāma, but is thwarted by Māra. The Buddha then dwells on the supreme value of devotion to one's teacher, and the great merit to be derived from accepting such a Samādhi (23W).

The avadāna of the king who attempts to hear the Samādhi from the bhikṣu is recapitulated in verse, together with the accompanying material on devotion to the teacher and the value of the Samādhi (23X).

The Buddha then tells how the Samādhi should be preserved for future believers by being copied out and stored away. It is also to be sealed with the 'seal of the Tathāgatas', the figurative nature of which is explained (24A-B).

Further instructions on behaviour and attitude are given (24C-E; 24H-J; 25A-B), interspersed with more glorification of the greatness

and value of the Samādhi (24F-G; 25C-E; 26A).

Finally, the Buddha addresses himself to Bhadrapāla and his seven companions, their five hundred followers, and the rest of his listeners (26B). He entrusts the teaching to them twice (26C). He tells Bhadrapāla that the Samādhi is to be mastered and taught to others so that it will endure (26D). As a result of the Buddha's preaching various beings realise various attainments (26E).

As a result of the Buddha's preaching, various beings realise various attainments (26E). The Buddha addresses himself to Bhadrapāla and his seven companions, their five hundred followers, and the rest of his listeners (26B). He entrusts the teaching to them twice (26C). He tells Bhadrapāla that the Samādhi is to be mastered and taught to others so that it will endure (26D).

When the Buddha has finished speaking, Bhadrapāla and the rest of the audience rejoice in the usual manner (26F).

In attempting to characterise in more general terms the way in which the PraS organises its material, three structural categories can, I believe, be erected. The first is historical, or, more accurately, pseudo-historical, and includes the description of events which take place before, during, or after the delivery of the teaching. The nidāna and parindanā may be placed in this category, as can the description of the future course of events. Such passages serve of course to provide the framework within which other material may be arranged, and as dramatic elements they also relieve the monotony of the work.

In the second category falls all that material whose basic purpose is advertisement, i.e. the glorification of the teachings themselves. This covers, by virtue of their general intent, all discussions of the perverseness of detractors and opponents and of the fate in store for them, all exhortations to accept, cultivate, realise, and pass on the teachings, all rhapsodies on the great merit to be derived from doing so, all injunctions to respect and worship the source of the teachings, and all avadānas which give past instances of these very things.

Thirdly we have the didactic category, which refers to the message of the text itself, e.g. specific directions for meditational or other practices, descriptions of the required moral behaviour, advice on how to relate to others, statements on the correct way of viewing things,

and general discussions of the nature of phenomena, etc.

These categories are never hard-and-fast, and many instances of overlapping and intermingling can be pointed out. Nor would it ever be sound practice to attempt to isolate the didactic elements in a given work and ignore the other categories, for such works often get their message across in various unexpected ways. Nevertheless, when these categories are applied to the content of the PraS the work's organisation is thrown into high relief, and the symmetry of its composition is revealed: historical elements stand at beginning and end (Chaps. 1 and 26), and also break the text in the middle (Chaps. 13 and 16A-J), while the rest of the text displays a regular alternation of didactic and 'advertising' material.

D. INTRODUCTION TO THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION

As mentioned above in the Preface, the main part of the present work consists of an annotated English translation of the Tibetan version of the PraS, the text of which was established by me and published as The Tibetan Text of the Pratyutpanna-Buddha-Sammukhāvasthita-Samādhi-Sūtra, (Tokyo, 1978). For general remarks on this Tibetan version I refer the reader to Text, Introduction, pp. ix-xix. Suffice it to say here that it was probably made around the beginning of the ninth century, and that the original text on which it was based, which we may presume to have been written in Sanskrit, is for the moment almost entirely lost.

Now, when we refer to an 'original Sanskrit text', we must realise from the outset that we are adopting a convention, and a potentially misleading one at that. For there is, or was, no such thing as a single original Sanskrit text of the PraS, compiled around the beginning of our era and remaining unchanged while various translations, Chinese and Tibetan, were made from it. We know that in general Mahāyāna sūtras underwent some degree of change in the course of the many centuries during which they were in use, being amplified (possibly the most common pattern), shortened, re-arranged, or subject to the introduction or modification of various doctrinal terms. The surviving translations of the PraS exhibit this 'textual fluidity' to a marked degree, and its grosser lineaments (in the form of omissions or insertions of whole sections of text) can easily be seen in the Concordance (Text, pp.225-235). Given the complexities and obscurities of the early Chinese translations, however, it is not always so easy to determine the precise scope of the changes in content, as opposed to structure, which the Sūtra has undergone. An attempt will be made later to sketch the broad outlines of the textual history of the PraS, in as far as they can be discovered.

We must therefore realise that when we speak of 'the original' of the PraS, we are in effect talking about its changing Sanskrit textual tradition, and not about any one entity. This fact will have important implications for our approach to the Tibetan text, in that we must regard

it as not necessarily, or not in all respects based on the same Sanskrit text that underlies the Chinese translations.

Why then have we elected to translate the Tibetan version, in preference, say, to T.418, which being of greater antiquity is possibly of greater historical interest? The answer is simply that the Tibetan is the easiest version to translate, mainly because of the standardised terminology employed by the Tibetan scholars and their Indian colleagues who rendered Sanskrit Buddhist works into Tibetan, or who revised the versions already made by their predecessors. In a sense, our text is not Tibetan at all, but a Tibetan 'translationese' in which many of the terms used are comprehensible only if one has recourse to their Sanskrit referents. And what is often the case at a terminological level is sometimes true at the syntactical level also. Therefore, when I say translation of the Tibetan text, I must admit frankly that what follows is often not a translation of the Tibetan at all, but rather a translation of the Sanskrit that can be supposed to underlie the Tibetan. While this may offend the linguistic purists, my intention here was to furnish the reader with the best indication possible of the meaning of the Sanskrit text at one stage in its long history, rather than show how the Tibetans of the 9th century A.D. understood (or sometimes misunderstood) and expressed that meaning, or, in other words, I had it in mind to remove the Tibetan covering to reveal the meaning of the Sanskrit beneath it. In the attempt to do that, however, I feel that my translation has often, and perhaps inevitably, fallen between two stools.

I have not attempted a reconstruction of the Sanskrit text on the basis of the Tibetan. This kind of activity is, I believe, methodologically unsound, given our present limited knowledge of the finer mechanics of the Tibetan translation process, and has rightly been called a 'rather useless amusement'. In my use of Tibetan-Sanskrit equivalents, I was interested only in probabilities which could be legitimately used to construct an English version, and I would not have wished to produce an ersatz Sanskrit text of the PraS and see it acquire an undeserved life of its own. I might make the same observation for the Sanskrit-Tibetan-Chinese-English Glossary that can be found as Appendix C. It is intended for certain purposes only, and should be used with caution. I do not believe, for example, that material from reconstructions of lost Sanskrit texts on the basis of their Tibetan translations should

be incorporated in general lexicons, the main point being here that we are dealing with probabilities, not certainties: where, for instance, we find chos in the Tibetan we can deduce that dharma most probably stood in the Sanskrit, but we can never be absolutely sure of it while the Sanskrit remains lost. The reader should therefore note that the Sanskrit equivalents which I give in my translation (always to be found within parentheses) are always put forward with a greater or lesser degree of uncertainty, but only those accompanied by the greater degree of uncertainty are distinguished by a question-mark. This does not mean that those not so distinguished are any the less tentative from an over-all point of view.

Throughout my translation I have aimed at reasonable fidelity both to the Tibetan text (or rather to its probable Sanskrit original wherever this could be discerned) and to the English language, thus providing myself with two additional stools to fall between! On the syntactical level I have observed the requirements of English grammatical usage as closely as possible in an attempt to produce a readable translation, but often the extreme length of the Tibetan sentence has militated against clarity. On a terminological level the reader will find many examples of an awkward literalness, especially where terms of technical or semi-technical application have been involved. A definite case can be made for the standardisation of terminology in translating Buddhist works, and I have accordingly done my best to standardise my renderings, although the use in all cases of the same English for the same Tibetan is clearly undesirable, if not impossible. My guides in this regard have been Edward Conze (especially in his Materials) and, to a lesser extent, Franklin Edgerton (BHSD); in some instances, however, I have preferred to find my own way. In the Glossary the reader may acquaint himself with some of my standard English renderings, which are given along with their Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese counterparts.

My main objective has been to make the PraS accessible to the scholarly public in a readable and accurate translation, and this end would have been served neither by slavish adherence to the grammatical and phraseological peculiarities of the Tibetan nor by the use of the turgid esoteric translationese favoured by certain translators these days. Whether my objective has been realised or not, the reader may best judge for himself.

My translation, then, is of the Tibetan text of the PraS. The length of the work has made me disinclined to attempt anything more than that, and I make only passing reference to the Chinese versions, except where they preserve whole sections of text not found in Tibetan: these passages then appear in the body of the translation. Thus my work falls short of the ideal propounded by Constantin Regamey (The Bhadramāyākāravvyākaraṇa, pp. 10-11), that of the 'critical translation', since it does not include all the Chinese variae versiones. Differences between the Chinese and the Tibetan versions are indeed often quite considerable, but to draw attention to them at every point would have made the work intolerably long and tedious. Therefore I have confined myself to noting only the more striking and important variants, and to giving the Chinese readings in those rare places where an obscurity in the Tibetan is clarified by the Chinese text - rather than matched by an equal or worse obscurity! Each of the Chinese translations deserves a full study of its own; this is especially true with regard to T.418 and T.419. What I have tried to do, in my Concordance (see Text), Glossary, and notes, has been to facilitate the future investigation of these Chinese versions. In addition, the translation of the Tibetan text itself will contribute to the elucidation of many of the obscurities which bedevil the early Chinese versions. Despite the limited scope of this study, however, the reader will find in Appendix A a brief preliminary discussion of the Chinese translations, based on internal evidence and on the testimony of the Chinese scripture-catalogues.

To turn now to matters of presentation, the translation is divided up into chapters (arabic numerals) and sections (capital letters) in accordance with the published Tibetan text, e.g. 1A, 3B, 26C, etc. Reference to the text will always be to these chapters and sections, never to page numbers. In this way the reader may easily follow up a reference in the Text, in the translation, or (with the help of the Concordance) in any of the Chinese versions.

As pointed out above, probable Sanskrit equivalents appear within parentheses, the more doubtful among them being indicated by a question-mark. One exception to this is proper names: the Sanskrit is given in the translation, and only discussed in the notes when the restoration involves some uncertainty; such cases are always indicated in the text by a preceding asterisk, e.g. *Vidyuddeva. The Sanskrit equivalents

given do not necessarily possess the form (i.e. number, person, case, tense, etc.) they may have had in the original; and they have been taken, for the most part, from Lokesh Chandra's Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary, although I have tried to be as critical as possible in my use of this, as it includes lexical material derived from reconstructions (e.g. the Samdhinirmocana) or otherwise insufficiently supported (e.g. from Das). For equivalents of individual terms Conze's Materials has also been most useful, while for the Sanskrit wording of the longer formulae so common in sūtra-literature I have had recourse to Lamotte's handy list of these in his L'Enseignement, pp. 481-483 ('Relevé des formules et des clichés'), such borrowings on my part being always indicated thus: (*...*).

Notes to the translation are numbered by chapter, and are referred to as follows: n. 1.20 (=Chap. 1, n. 20); n. 13.5 (=Chap. 13, n. 5); and so on. Verses are denoted thus: 11Dv1 (=Chap. 11, Section D, Verse 1); 23Vv6-9 (=Chap. 23, Section V, Verses 6 to 9); and so forth.

The system used for representing Chinese is that of Mathew's Chinese English Dictionary, except that certain unnecessary diacritical marks have been eliminated.

My own additions to the text I have tried to keep to a minimum, but where the Tibetan is obscure I have inserted explanatory material within square brackets, in conformity with the normal practice. Also within square brackets are to be found translations of chapter titles taken from two Chinese translations, T.418 and T.416. The Chinese originals for these may be found in the Comparative Table of Chapters (Text, pp. 238-239); T.417 and T.419 do not feature because the former merely adopts the chapter titles of T.418 while the latter has none at all. Finally, square brackets enclosing a question-mark signal those unfortunate places where the Tibetan has successfully resisted my attempts to understand it. They are both sobering indications of the text's victory over its translator and invitations to others to see what I have missed. Although as a newcomer to the field I am keenly aware of all the imperfections of the following translation, I nevertheless hope that it removes more difficulties than it creates, and therefore succeeds in making the PraS better known to a wider public.

ADDENDUM : Since completing this work my attention has been drawn to the fact that the PraS is mentioned by name in the third Bhāvanākrama of Kamalaśīla (see Giuseppe Tucci, Minor Buddhist Texts, Part III (Rome: 1971), p. 5); Kamalaśīla does not cite any passages from the Sūtra, but it is clear from the context that he was familiar with its content.