gnomic sources are well-known to the specialists. Probably no other scholar would have been able to quote so many additional sources. Henceforth Dr. Sternbach's supplement will be an indispensable tool for every user of Böhtlingk's *Indische Sprache*, even if he does not share Dr. Sternbach's expectation that "the specification of additional sources in which an aphorism occurs may one day help in the determination of the authorship of that aphorism".

A.N.U., Canberra


Several generations of scholars have witnessed the growth of Wackernagel's grammar of which volume I was published in 1896. Only in 1957, with the publication of the supplements to I and II, I by Albert Debrunner and the annotated translation of Wackernagel's general introduction by Louis Renou, were volumes I-III completed. In this voluminous work of almost 2800 pages the only index of words consists of three pages at the end of volume III, published in 1930. In the preface to the same volume Wackernagel proposed the publication of a detailed index after the completion of the entire work.

After the last war Debrunner realized that it would not be desirable to postpone the compilation of an index of volumes I-III. He found Richard Hauschild, who had already contributed the brief index to volume III, willing to undertake this tremendous task. The *Register zur Altindischen Grammatik* lists the Old Indian words in volumes I-III and the supplements, with the exclusion of Wackernagel's *Einzeldung* which has been replaced by Renou's translation. References are given to the pages and not to the paragraphs. According to a rough estimate the index contains about 30,000 words. We must be extremely grateful to Richard Hauschild for having compiled this index which unlocks the treasures of this monumental work.

In the preface Richard Hauschild informs us that an index of the Middle Indian, New Indian, non-Indian Indo-European and non-Indian European words has been planned from another hand. With the publication of this index nothing remains to be desired in regard to the volumes I-III. We can only look forward to the publication of volume IV which will deal with the verb and the adverb. Let us hope that it may be possible to find a scholar willing to complete and elaborate Wackernagel's materials on syntax. Debrunner remarked in the preface to volume II, 2 that after the fundamental work of Delbrück there was no urgent need for a syntax. Nevertheless, in this field the last word has certainly not been said by Delbrück, and a grammar of this scope would be incomplete without a syntax.

A.N.U., Canberra

J. W. de Jong

---


For several reasons the *Ratnagotravibhāga* deserves our attention. It is the only text on the *tathāgatagarbha* which has been preserved in Sanskrit. There are many problems connected with its place in the history of Mahāyāna philosophy and with its authorship.

---

The Tibetan tradition attributes the verses to Maitreya and the prose commentary to Asanga. This text is held in high regard as one of the five treatises composed by Maitreya. However, the Chinese tradition attributes the whole work to Sāramati. This tradition is mentioned by Yüan-ts'ei (613-696) in his commentary on the *Samantabhadra-sūtra* and by Fa-tsang (643-712) in his commentary on the *Dharmadhvajavijayapātrasūtra*. Probably the earliest reference to Sāramati as author of the *Ratnagotravibhāga* is to be found in Chih-i's Mo-ho chih-kuan (*Taishō*, Vol. XLI, Nr. 1911, p. 31b18-26) which has been dictated by him in 594 (cf. p. 125 of Tsukinowa's article mentioned in note 8). The identity of Sāramati raises many problems. Some scholars have identified him with Śthiramati, others have distinguished two Śthiramatis. There are also many obscurities in the Chinese traditions concerning the translator of the Chinese version. Chinese catalogues mention two translations, one by Ratnāmati and the other by Bodhiruci.


---

4 See the references given by Ét. Lamotte, *L'Enseignement de Vimalakirti* (Louvain, 1962), pp. 92-93, n. 2. According to Hattori Masaaki, there is only one Sāramati who lived between Nāgārjuna and Asaṅga-Vasubandhu.
given a summary of the ideas contained in this text and of several verses.7 In 1959 Ui Hakaju published a detailed study on the Ratnagotravibhāga (Hoshōron Kenkyū) which contains a complete translation (pp. 471-648), together with a Sanskrit-Japanese glossary (pp. 1-60 with separate pagination).8 Professor Takasaki’s translation was undertaken during his stay in India (1954-1957) and continued afterwards. Apart from this book he has published between 1958 and 1964 ten articles relating to the Ratnagotravibhāga (a list is given on pp. xii-xiii).

The translation is preceded by a long introduction (pp. 5-62) and a synopsis (pp. 63-133) which indicates the divisions of the chapters, the main topics, the numbers of the verses, the page numbers in Sanskrit, Tibetan (Derge edition) and in Chinese, quotations and comparisons with passages in the Buddhagotārastra (Taishō, No. 1610), the Mahāyānamahādāvatīvivekāsāstra (Taishō, No. 1626-1627) and the Anuttarārājasūtra (Taishō, No. 669).

I think that this introduction deals briefly with the Tibetan and Chinese traditions concerning the authorship of the Ratnagotravibhāga, but refrains from discussing the theories of modern scholars. The latest discussion of the problems connected with Saramati is to be found in Ui’s book (pp. 89-97), in which the author acrimoniously attacks Johnston’s hypothesis of an older Sthiramati, to whom are due the verses which he gives in Japanese translation (pp. 38-81). The second agrees on the whole with the Sanskrit text but omits many verses which occur in the first part (pp. 820-848). There is a number of omissions and additions in the Sanskrit as compared to the Chinese translation. The main differences between the two texts are listed on page 19 of the introduction and the less important ones are pointed out in the notes to the translation, but not exhaustively (cf. for instance, my remark below apropos of p. 50. 13-15). It would have been helpful to have a synopsis of the two parts of the Chinese translation with the Sanskrit text. In view of the form of the Sanskrit text and the complicated hybrid structure of the Chinese translation, attempts to reconstruct an original eschatological hypothesis, justified by the writings of modern scholars, are unlikely to be successful as they are not always possible. Thus both Original and Professor Takasaki rely exclusively on internal evidence. For a more reliable reconstruction this should be combined with a detailed comparison of the Ratnagotravibhāga with related texts.

Section III of the introduction is devoted to an exposition of the main doctrines of the text and section IV to the genealogy of the Ratnagotravibhāga theory, in which Professor Takasaki discusses the main texts quoted in the Ratnagotravibhāga.10 In the following section it is proved that the Mahāyānamahādāvatīvivekāsāstra, the Buddhagotārastra and the Anuttarārājasūtra depend on the Ratnagotravibhāga.11 In the last section Professor Takasaki considers the place of the Ratnagotravibhāga in Mahāyāna Buddhism. As to the date and the authorship he arrives at the following conclusions: (1) The original verses were composed before Asaṅga. Most probably they are to be attributed to Maitreya. (2) The present form of the text dates from the early 5th century A.D. and after Asaṅga and Vasubandhu. Sāramati is the author of the commentary and the systematizer of the eschatological hypothesis.

Many problems relating to the Ratnagotravibhāga are also discussed in the articles mentioned above. These articles as well as the introduction and the notes contain a wealth of information. We may expect that they form the prelude to a systematic treatment of the garbha theory and its history. With his profound knowledge of the Sanskrit, Chinese and Tibetan texts and of the results of Japanese scholarship, Professor Takasaki is eminently qualified to give us an exhaustive study of this important chapter of Mahāyāna philosophy.

The translation of the Ratnagotravibhāga by Professor Takasaki is the first to be based on the Sanskrit text and the Chinese and Tibetan translations. Obermiller utilized only the Tibetan version and his translation, excellent as it is, contains a number of mistakes which are obvious in the light of the Sanskrit text. Uı utilized both the Sanskrit text and the Chinese translation, but he was unable to consult the Tibetan translation directly. His knowledge of it was based on a Japanese translation, made for him by Tada Tōkan, and upon Obermiller’s English translation. It is clear from many indications that the Chinese translation is closer to the original than both the Sanskrit text and the Tibetan translation. However, as concerns the interpretation of the text, the Chinese translation is now always a reliable guide. There

---

7 According to Frauwallner Sāramati lived about 250 A.D.
9 Not mentioned are two articles published in 1953: “Hōshōn no okuru nyorairo no igi”, IBK, I, pp. 368-369; “Nyorairo to engi — Hōshōn o tegakari to shite —”, IBK, II, pp. 244-247.
10 Uı dwells at great length on the fact that Johnston gives the Chinese translation of Sāramati’s name as Chien I and not as Chien Hui, and insists that Hui and I must be sharply distinguished. However, Tsukinowa quoted as early as 1934 a passage of Chih-i’s Mo-ho chih-kuan (see above, p. 37) where Sāramati is translated by Chien-I. As far as I can see Uı does not mention anywhere either this passage or Tsukinowa’s article. In general, he is very sparing with references to other scholars. Uı’s bitter attack on Johnston culminates in the remark that Johnston treats Chinese Buddhism and the history of Chinese Buddhism with too much ease. He adds that without knowledge of Chinese Buddhism, it is impossible to understand Indian Buddhism and Buddhism in general. One could make a similar remark about Uı in respect of Tibetan Buddhism. Although Uı states that the translation of sāra by chien is quite usual and not limited to personal names, nevertheless Johnston is quite right in remarking that Sāramati is a somewhat unusual form. Usually, personal names ending in -māti have as first element an adjective or a participle. The name Sāramati does not seem to occur anywhere else.
11 Uı has studied in great detail the texts quoted (pp. 272-353) and has devoted a special chapter to the Śrīmaddeviśvināhūdāstra (pp. 435-469).
12 In chapter four of his book entitled “The relations with other sūtras and sāstras” (pp. 354-429) Uı has examined the Anuttarārājasūtra (pp. 354-366), the Buddhagotārastra (pp. 366-389), the Mahāyānamahādāvatīvivekāsāstra (pp. 389-407) and the Mahāyānaviśāstra (pp. 407-423).
are several places where Professor Takasaki has been too much influenced by it but in general he indicates very well the wrong interpretations which are to be found in the Chinese translation. For the Tibetan translation Professor Takasaki has consulted only the Derge edition. A comparison of the passages quoted in the notes with the corresponding passages in the Peking edition (the only one at my disposal) shows that the Derge edition does not always give a satisfactory text. An edition of the Tibetan translation based on the Derge, Peking and Narthang editions would be highly desirable. In view of the importance of the vocabulary of the Ratnagotravibhagha for both Buddhist Sanskrit and Mahayana terminology, it would also be very useful to have indexes on the lines of those compiled by Professor Nagao for the Mahayanasutradharmakara.

The Ratnagotravibhagha is not always easy to interpret. While reading the translation, I have made a number of notes with regard to the interpretation, in the text and the similar matters. I venture to publish them in the conviction that any contribution however, insignificant, may be of some help in the interpretation of this very important text. At the same time my remarks are meant as a tribute to Professor Takasaki's scholarship for which I have the greatest respect. I have used the following abbreviations: T. = Tibetan translation (my quotations of T. are taken from the Peking edition. Whenever necessary, I refer to the Derge, Peking and Narthang editions by the initials D., P. and N.); J. = Johnston's edition of the Sanskrit text; O. = Obermiller's translation of the Tibetan translation; BHSD = Edgerton's Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary (New Haven 1953): CPD = A Critical Pali Dictionary (Copenhagen, 1924-1965).

2.8-10 sarvaravikalpakeyakabuddhaini api tavae chatirputrayam ortho na sanka samya svaprajhayat jahum va dhrasum va prataveksitum va jpraj eva balauprathajnanin anyatra tathagataraasadhammanatai tak. "This meaning, O Sauritap, can neither be known nor be seen, nor be examined correctly through the knowledge of the Sravakas and the Pratyekabuddhas. Needless to say, this applies to the case of ignorant and ordinary beings, except when they have faith in the Tathagata." Tak. has followed the punctuation of the Sanskrit text which is wrong. The danau after va must be deleted, because those who are able to understand through faith the Tathagatagarbha: 'Todas (roga-po) in the Tathagatas are to be found among the Sravakas and Pratyekabuddhas, cf. 22.3-4: se^ganu dem sarvaravikalprakabuddhaham tathagataaraddhammanaanay evatut dharma^viti. The Tibetan translation puts a double stroke (nis-sad) before sarvaravakuva and after tathagataraasadhammanatai. Uj. is right in translating anyatra ... as a new sentence, cf. p. 484: shikhashi, nyorai ni taisuru shi n yotte nomi taisuru koto o nozoku.

4.3 indriyaramaparamapirtipra2; Tak. "brings all faculties [of living beings] to the highest perfection?; T. dbod-po mcchog-gha phol-ro tu phyin-po. See Edgerton, BHSD s.v. parimitt (1). It is not possible to give a causative meaning to prapti. One must translate: "has obtained the supreme perfection of [his] faculties", cf. 31.14 sarvar-dharmanirddhirmanyaarpaparamapritipra2; (parapram abhirpa2) has been corrected on p. xvi; T. dam-po's phol-ro tu phyin-po briles; Tak. "has attained the highest supremacy, [knowing] non-substantiality of all the phenomena?; 87.3-4 guna= viisuddhirmanyaarpapram-pripta: 115.18 dharmadhanaparaparamapritipra2; Tak. "having been transferred to the abode of Brahman in heaven?; T. las tshangs-gnos mthar-sod. This passage deals with meditation (115.17 dhyyan dhyanam ... and must be translated accordingly: "who has arrived at mastery in the divine brahmic states", cf. Uj. p. 643: Tenteki no shihonj8 no higan ni totatsu-shi.

4.5-6 anbbhagabhuddhakaryaarpapra2rabdho; Tak. "calmed in the Buddha's effortless activities of a Buddha?; This passage must be added to those quoted by Edgerton.
elucidates the accomplishment of one's own purpose, because it has the property of being the basis for the self-realisation of the supreme and eternal place of Quiescence.*

12.4 dvayavikalpaSamauddacKaryageya. Tak. translates samuddacDr as 'origination' just as samudyaa in 12.3 Elsewhere he translates samuddacDr by 'takes place' (13.6), 'produce' (13.9) and 'arising' (33.8). Better is the translation 'manifestation' in 50.12. Everywhere T. has kun-tu spyyad-pa and U., p. 499, etc.; gnyen-gy. In 13.9 T. (kun-’byun­ba las) and the context (avyayamanaksasamauddacDrati klesasamudyaya | klesasamudyatkarmanasaumadhava) suggest a reading 'samudyaya.'

13.1-4 vibhandha punar abhavana-vasvinmitarbhamana-samamaparivakht rakdagevasmo-hotapati anusarayaparyutthanyovagyt a’cayayato hi bhalan abhima atavasvabhavam vastu ‘ubhakarena va nimittam bhavati rago-uptiit and pratipakpahre va avidyakarena va mohopatitah; Tak. "And ‘bondage’ (vibhandha) means the originination of Desire, Hatred and Ignorance preceded by the thought which takes its basis of avidyaikiirii/Ja vii mohotpattital; so...

13.15-17 ya evam asata ca nimittarabhandyakaritam sataat ca yathabhutasya paramarthaasayatyad sarvadhyayon atulyatprapakpraksmamatprajalBhavan sarvadharma-samutdhakam sadhambahvah. Tak. "And thus, this realization of all natures by Wisdom, as being equal without any addition nor diminution because of these two facts, i.e. because we cannot see any characteristic nor basis of non-being, and we can see the real character of being as the absolute truth." This passage explains that the realization of the sameness of all dharmas is due to the knowledge of the sameness which does neither reject (utksepa, T. bsal-ba) the non-existing support of the appearance (asam nimittarabhamam) nor establish (praksepa, T. bzag-pa) the existing absolute in its true reality (sad yathabhuta paramadharsayatam) because the first is not seen and the second is seen.

15.1-2 anarave dhatau ca kalashaaka-la-sayor eka-cara evacaratarva dhivyacittani-bhadhanayo-ya. Tak. "In the immaculate sphere there is no succession of a second mind because both minds, good and bad, act together as one and the same." T. dge-ba dan mi-de-ba’i sems-dag las gcig rgya-bas sa-sam-dag sams-ab sems-gsang-dag med-pa’i tshul-kyi. O. "For when one of the two forms of the Spirit, either the defiled or the undefiled, manifests itself, it has no (real) contact with the other (its counterpart)." Tak. understands eka-cara as "acting together," T. as "acting of one." The usual meaning, however, of eka-cara is "wandering or living alone." In the immaculate sphere the good and bad thoughts are isolated from each other and therefore there is no relation of a second thought with a first thought, i.e. a bad thought cannot arise from a good thought and vice versa. U. seems to understand it in this way: p. 530: muro no kai ni oter, sen zu fen zu wo tan doku no de oro kara, danishin to no kettugel ni tekkishin node.

16.17 and 17.2’avahsasaprutypadhita; Tak. "standing in the illumination"; praputypadhita means here "engaged in," cf. BHSD s.v. prapatypadhita, praputypadhita. In 36.3 T. has misunderstood praputypadhanam; buddhadhamuttisvisiddhigatram; devivibhakaryaprutypadhitan bhavati; Tak. "the Essence of the Buddha, the perfectly pure Gemini, there are two kinds of foundation of its actions." The meaning is: "The Gemini brings about two kinds of effect," cf. Dalabhakamika 49.18: avidya avivadnaakaryaprutypadhitah which is quoted by Edgerton.

17.4 ananyapapayo'gam ... aryastavakam; Tak. "the holy Sravakas ... indifferent to the nourishment of others;" J. notes that pa’gin is recorded by the PW only from the Kathasaritsagara and Tak. that C. probably has missed pa’gin for pa’gin. There is no doubt about the meaning of ananyapapayo, cf. Pali anupapaso, CPD: "not supporting others, said of the houseless ascetic, who maintains neither family and fosters no passion;" gnyen-gy. probably has to be interpreted as "belonging to a class" but T. (gnyen-gy apo byed-pa mi-ladan-pa according to D. P. dan-ladan-pa, which is certainly wrong) has no word corresponding to it.

20.17 sarvajagadlasyo’abhahminittavat; Tak. "because they are the cause of beauty intended by the whole world." C. ’gro-ba thams-chu-kyi bsum-pa dge-ba’i t’gyun yin-pa’i phyir, O. "as they are the cause of the virtuous thoughts of all living beings."
interpretation given by the Tibetan translator is correct; 
āṣṭaśयaḥ śaḥ is literally “the splendour of the thoughts”, cf. also UI's translation, p. 512: isāt sei kek no kṣesuṣu
ṣu yogyo no in tāru ga yue de aru.

21.11-12 teṣṭa eva daśabaidāniṃnā ṛtadhiḥārmanāṃ pratisvam anuttaram karma; 
Tak. "the automatic, highest act of these Qualities of the Buddha — 10 Powers, etc." 
The meaning of pratisvam is "one by one", not “automatic” as given by Tak. in ac-
cordance with C. One must translate: “the single supreme acts of these qualities of the 
Buddhas as the ten powers, etc”, cf. UI’s translation, p. 513: soerā jukį-kė no bupuo no ichi-iči no mujo no go de aru.

23.7 tattrepamagikāyā mānātayā samanvāgaḥ: Tak. “possessed of the skill to approach 
there (i.e. to the big cloth)." Here upagikā has the same meaning as
-upa and -upaka in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, cf. BHSD s.v. -upaka: “pertaining, 
belonging to; suitable, appropriate.” The same expression occurs in the Daśabhūmik-
āsūtra (p. 61.15) which has upagikātaya: tattrepamagikāyā mānātayā samanvāgaḥ.
In Vaiśnava IV.211: tattrepasyāṁ vīmaṇasūtra samanyagata (quoted by The Pali Text Society's
Dictionary s.v. tatra) one must probably read tattrepasyāṁ. 
Kern’s explanation has to be rejected (Toevseogen op 't woorden-
boek van Childers, II, Amsterdām, 1916, p. 90: tattrepaya = tadiṣṭāyā, suitable, 
corresponding, SVih.I.211. Misschien vervorming van tāḍāṭpyāṇā)

26.10-11 pārvataṃ tu yenthetāna sarvaśrāvīśeṣaṇa pravacane sarvākāraṁ tadartha-
suṣeṣaṇaṁ bhavati tad api adhitṛtya nirdeṣyāmi. 
Tak. notes that T. reads pravacane (goṣṭha) as the subject. However, T. has gosu (omitted by P.) -raḥ tans-cud-dāu-
du aṣṭaśyāṃmāṇaṇāṃ pravacane pravacane, O. “throughout the whole of Scripture”.
I do not believe that T.’s translation and explanation (p. 198, n. 13) of this sentence are 
correct, but the text (26.1-11) is clearly in disorder as noted by J. and Tak.

28.10-11 śānttātṛatātṛasyāヴァ cāmyānā yaśa śodvviṃsāṃsuṭke ‘pi śāntaṅgāyā 
mādyāntāmāṃ śāntaṅgata deṣṭi bhavati; 
T. mho-pa‘i ha-yagcil can stoh-pa-nil-du lita-ba ste / ‘di’ stoh-pa-nil-du lita-ba gu-dag de rnam-bar thar-pa‘i sgo-la yah stoh-
-pa-nil-du lita-ba gur-yi. 
Probably the text at the basis of T. had śāntaṅgastātṛāṁ inscribed; the text or reading 
not represented in C. is not translated in C.

31.10 akāśopaṇasattvaśakājśalokakāraṇātmyātjanīyāṅgamanāḥ; Tak. “[the Tathāgata] 
has realized perfectly the non-substantiality of living beings and of the material world, 
just as the sky [reaches up to the limit of the world].” 
In a note T. remarks that akāśopaṇa (T. nam-mkha’ -litar) is relating to niṣṭhāgamanā. However, T. relates it to 
nārāmyaṃ: sems-pa da-n snod-kyi yjig-rten nam-mkha’ -litar bha-mad-po’i mho-
traḥ-pa-nil-du rga-sam po’i phyir = “because the Tathāgata has realized completely 
the sky-like non-substantiality of the world of the living beings and the material 
world, just as the sky [reaches up to the limit of the world].” 
This interpretation is not translated in C. However, T. acknowledges that the translation is ambiguous, p. 530: kokū no gotoki, sjuo-seken 
to kiseken to no mugu no kukyō ni tashitta kara to.

32.15 vaśīṣṭrapātīṇām ca bodhisattvatā; 
In note 109 T. remarks that it is not necessary to limit this qualification to those Bodhisattvas who abide on the 10th bhūmi as 
mentioned in the Tibetan commentary and that we can regard this ‘vaśīṣṭrapātī’ 
as an epithet for Bodhisattvas in general. Tak. refers to Lankāvatāra, p. 274.21: saṃsāraḥ 
vaśīṣṭrapātīḥ, but this quotation is from the Lokayogasūtra.

The Tibetan commentary (O., p. 170, n. 1) does not limit this qualification to bodhis-
attvas on the 10th bhūmi, but to bodhisattvas who abide in the last three bhūmis. The ten 
vaśīṣṭra are obtained on the 8th bhūmi, cf. Daśabhūmikāsūtra (ed. J. Rahder), p. 70 
and Mahāyānāsūtraśāstra 26.2-3: daslavāśāltābāḥ / yathā daśabhūmikē śaṃstāyām 
ābhūmī naṁdiṣṭāḥ.

35.3-5 sarvakāśalokadīnaprajāsādhyāvyānānaṇapokarśaponarāyamāṇahupāramāṇī; 
J. notes: “Text A: yācba pa’i phyir, B, which does not make sense; T. seems to have 
read ‘vānasāyagīt (bag-chags ... das-ladan-po’i phyir), which would bring the sentence 
into the same form as the following ones.” According to Tak. (p. 216, n. 122) both T. 
and C take ‘parṣyanta as ‘ayantana’ and attach it to ‘subhāpāramāṇa’ as an attribute 
and instead of apakarṣa T. has das-ladan-po’i phyir. However, apakarṣa makes good 
sense and corresponds to T. ṛaḥ; T. mhaṭ-thug-pa corresponds to parṣyanta and not to 
ayantana which is rendered in T. by śiṅ-tu (cf. 32.9, 33.9, 9). T. ṛon-mois-pa’i drī-ma 
ṛi-ba-ba’i bag-chags thams-cad das-ladan-po’i phyir gzhan (O. dzhan) bha’i pha-rol-tu 
phyin-pa ṛab-kyi mhaṭ-thug-pa = sarvakāśalokadīnaprajāsādhyāvyānānaṇapokarśa 
parṣyanta. 
In T. (P., D. and N.) apakarṣa is rendered by ‘bṛd-pa which has misled 
both Tak. and T.; it must be corrected into ‘bṛ-da which exactly corresponds to 
apakarṣa. The terms apakarṣa and sarvakāśa are synonymous with the more 
usual terms apavāda and sarvāropa, cf. 76.11. Sarvāropa is the superimposition of 
non-existing ideas and entities upon the absolute reality; apavāda is the opposite of 
it. For these two terms see Jacques May, op. cit., p. 187, n. 609.

36.13-15 ma ca bhavati tāpatī kārdvāv āttuṣṭaṅkumālaṇāpāramāṇāḥ 
which brings about the Germ which 
possesses the unique savour of extreme moisture in regard to all living 
beings." The subject is the 
Gotama. He does not fall into the Nihilistic 
Extreme through his not diminishing, nor the non-eternal 
Extremistic Life; nor does it bring about the Germ which 
possesses the unique savour of extreme moisture in regard to all living 
beings. In T. (P., D. and N.) apakarṣa is rendered by ‘bṛd-pa which has misled 
both Tak. and T.; it must be corrected into ‘bṛ-da which exactly corresponds to 
apakarṣa. The terms apakarṣa and sarvakāśa are synonymous with the more 
usual terms apavāda and sarvāropa, cf. 76.11. Sarvāropa is the superimposition of 
non-existing ideas and entities upon the absolute reality; apavāda is the opposite of 
it. For these two terms see Jacques May, op. cit., p. 187, n. 609.
established in the 6th stage of Bodhisattva called Abhimukhi. Because, [in this Stage], the Bodhisattva, facing the acquisition of the Extinction of Evil Influences through his practices of unobstructed Highest Intellect and Great Compassion, still does never realize that acquisition in order to protect all living beings. Tak. has omitted the word abhijñā, which is missing in C, although both T. and S. give it. I would prefer to follow T. and S. The MS. B has the reading śrāvakāavyabhājībhāhūṁkhāyaṁ asaṅga which seems preferable: “And this [pure and impure state (śuddha śādhisuddhaśādhaśat)] is mainly established on the Stage of the Bodhisattva, called Abhimukhi, which approaches the superknowledge of the extinction of the defilements on account of the practice of the unobstructed perfection of wisdom [but does not obtain it] because [the Bodhisattva] on account of the practice of the great compassion has not realized it in order to protect all living beings.” T. gives no clue which would allow to choose between the readings of the MSS. A and B but palaeographically it is more likely that the reading of MS. A is corrupt as against that of MS. B. It is necessary to connect asaṅgaprajñāpāramītābhāvanāya with śrāvakāavyabhājībhāhūṁkhāyaṁ and mahākālaṁ bhānavaṇṇayā with āśūkṣākāraṇadūḥ, see the commentary (50.16-51.9) which explains that on the sixth stage the Bodhisattva approaches the extinction of the defilements because he has produced the unobstructed wisdom, but that, out of compassion, he is born in the Kāmadhatu, thus being at the same time in the pure and impure state. In his translation Tak. has followed T., whereas C. gives the right interpretation (Tak., p. 251, n. 395). In the Chinese translation the passage between sarvāvatuparitāārāya (50.19) and sātyāyaṃ (51.1) is missing. In its place there is a different passage (834c27-835a3) which has been translated by UI (pp. 554-555) who combines both S. and C.

51.5-7 samasukhānāvadantāya tadāpyākyaprāparajāya sansārābhāhūṁkhāsartvāpekyāya nirvānaśvāhyāṁ bodhīyānāgīpāprasārayaāyānāvāśāya punah kāmadhatu samācyupapattipariprahāsta. Tak. “While cultivating the means for the bliss of the Quiescence, but not in order to taste it [by himself] he turns his face away from Nirvāṇa, for the sake of the living beings who are facing the world of migration. Though abiding in [the desirous World of Form] with [4 kinds of] contemplations in order to accomplish the factors for the acquisition of Enlightenment, he voluntarily assumes again existence in the World of the Highest means and the lotus is described above (60.12) as lotus flower, but not in order to taste it [by himself] he turns his face away.”

It is impossible to relate the meaning of this part, which brings fully into relief the great compassion of the Bodhisattva, called Abhimukhi, which seems preferable: “in the world bounded by the sky,” cf. UI, p. 556: koṣṭha o henzel o suru seken ni ahte. 60.20 jalarāhaṃ samānipitaḥ; Tak. “a faded lotus flower”; T. padma zum; O. “a lotus flower with folded leaves.” T. ’s wrong translation is due to the fact that the lotus is described above (60.12) as vivarṇa.

61.4-9 yathā madhuḥ prāgaṇagopagāhūṁ vilākṣaḥ vidvān purupas tadarthi [samaṇaṇaḥ prāgaṇgocasas tasmād upāyaḥ “pakranmaṇaṃ prakarṇyāḥ” (102) sarvajñācaicāryaśādhaṃ nubhūṣaṃ samādiṣaṃ dātrain innam vilākṣaḥ] Tak. “Suppose a clever person, having seen honey surrounded by cloudy bees, and wishing to get it, with skillful means, would deprive the bees completely of it;—(102) Similarly, the Great Sage, possessed of the eyes of the Omniscience, perceiving this Essence known as akin to honey.” T. ... de-daṁ thābs-kyis srog-chags tshogs (P. sogs) | kun-nas bral-bar rab-tu byed-pa bzin | (102) draṅ-sron chen-pos kun- mkhyen-spyan-gyis ni | rigs kham sbrug-rtsi dain-’dra ’di gzig-nas | “with the help of a strategem he would completely remove the swarm of bees from it. (102). The Great Seer, having seen this Essence, did so, as he has perceived with his omniscient eye, like honey ...”

61.13-14 madhāḥ ... kuryāt kāryat; J. notes: “kuryāt tattva, A and B (reading doubtful in both); bhaṭa byed-pa T.” Perhaps one must read kuryāt kṛtyam.

61.19 bhavante ‘yān’ madhāḥ bharmas itaḥ: Tak. “Those who wish to utilize it as food and the like.” In a note Tak. remarks that annādābhī (instr.) is grammatically peculiar (usually in loc.). However, in classical Sanskrit the instrumental is normal and in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit arthika also is constructed with the instrumental, cf. BHSD s.v. The meaning of this pāda is: “those who want food, etc.;” T. sas-sogs don-du kech o byed po (in to); bhaṭa byed-pa T.”

64.9 kāmanavāmāntivatāḥ paryayathādhyānāmedhyavat | Tak. “Being characterized as devoted to [such] Passion, the outburst of Passions is repulsive like impurities.” Tak.’s translation is based upon C. which has misunderstood niṣrata. T. ’dod-pa bsten-po’i rgyu sbyin-phir | kun-nas ldan-pa mi-tson ‘dra | O. “The outburst of their passions, being the cause for giving way to the desires, is abhorrent like impurities.” See the definition of niṣrata in UI’s translation, p. 500: yoku ni fukeru koto o in to na ku node, ten wa fun no gotoku de aru.

61.12 vikosaṅgarbhavah jñānam avikalpam vipākavat; Tak. “And the non-discriminative Wisdom has a resemblance to the matured form of an embryo delivered from its covering.” It is impossible to relate vipākavat to vikosaṅgarbhav. UI (p. 580: mun-bzhes nu chi ma taizō o hanareta mono no gotoku, jukshita mono no gotoku de aru) takes both vikosaṅgarbhav and vipākavat as comparisions. The same interpretation is given by T.: nukal-thubs bral-’dra mi-rtags-pa | ye las-nam par smin-pa bzin | “but this does not make sense. One has to take vipākavat as a possessive adjective relating to jñāna “the ripened knowledge,” i.e. the knowledge obtained in the last three stages of the bodhisattva.

71.3 rīpagaṇeṣu sarvaṇeṣu; Tak. remarks that Mahāyānasaṁśālakāra IX, 15, the subject of this quotation, has riṣipagaṇeṣu instead of rīpagaṇeṣu. One must certainly correct rīpagaṇeṣu into ripagaṇeṣu; T. has gzig-stser kun du. Cf. Nagao, op. cit., p. 208. This correction is not listed in Nagao’s corrigenda to Lévi’s edition. UI (p. 582) has changed the reading of the Ratnagotravibhāga according to the Mahāyāna-saṁśālakāra!”
73.10 sattvadhātāv iti; Johnston's correction of the reading of the MS. (sarvadayatānato) is based upon C. However, T. has yod-do // ḋesa-bya bā' bar ni // = samvidyata iti yvat.

73.12-14 yaiva caśau dharmātāt śaivalāt yuktir yuga upāyaḥ paryāyaḥ / evam eva tat syāt / anyathā naivat tat syāt iti //. J. remarks: "Reading uncertain. paryāyā eva va tat syāt, B." and Tak. that both T. and C. do not translate paryāyā. T. chaso-ḥid gaṅ-ya-ni pa de-ḥid ni 'dir gaṅ-giś de-ṣa-bu kho-nar 'gyur-giś gzan-du mi 'gyur-ro ḋesa-bya-bā' riṣga-pa daḥ bhor-ba daḥ thabs yin-te // = yaiva caśau dharmātāt śaivalāt yuktir yuga upāyaḥ // yavaivam eva tat syāt / anyathā naivat tat syāt iti //

74.10 nedan samāhām vidyute; Tak. "There is [absolutely] no room for it." The meaning is: "This is impossible", cf. BHSD s.v. sitāhā (sūtra).

74.15-14 sata eva dharmasyottārakaḥ akṛdhaḥ viṇādhaḥ pariṇāmaḥ iti; Tak. "thinking that the perfect Nirvāṇa means the Extinction, i.e. the destruction of the elements [for the Phenomenal Existence] in future." Tak. has omitted sata eva, T. yod-pa'; O: "... the destruction of elements which did really exist." Cf. UI, p. 588: jittsu no hō ga goji ni dannetsu-shi metsure-su no ga sunawanachi nehan de aru to kangaeru mono.


80.5 dharmānām tad akalpanāpravicayajñhānārādyādyāyate; Tak. "and is attained when the (elements) has its existence) take result to the non-discriminative and Analytical Wisdom." Tak. considers the reading dharmānāṃ as doubtful because causes and conditions ... are ... deprived of jifsuu no p. 349,4: "In the Mahāyāna philosophy, split, separated from, "means without substance", cf. Prasannapadā, p. 349,4; skanda sabbhatu sānyā ṣvākṣa. Therefore the translation is as follows: "In the absolute reality which everything is caused by is isolated without substance." See UI's translation, p. 591: shinjutsu ni oitewa, issai no sharin ni no wa onri-sererete iru.

89.19 upamāṇyārthītāḥ: T. has read upamāṇīrthītāḥ (de-la 'dus-pa' phyir). This reading seems preferable.

93.6 svarasāyasvabhāma (fem-Ioc.) as stated by Tak. "He himself knows and causes others to know all the things cognizable in all their forms". Tak. remarks to relate ātman to Jñāna and para to Jñāpān. Also UI has the same interpretation, p. 613: jīva to ta no ni oite, mizukara shiru kara, ta ni shirasihemeru kara. However, T. relates ātmaparayor to jīve vastsu: bdag-ghan śes-bya'i dlos-po rnam-kun śes an śes-mdzad phyir. Obermiller's translation ("He knows himself and makes known to all the things all the other things in their forms") is improbable on account of the position of the word ḡṣad-ghan. It is impossible to translate the Sanskrit text in this way because svāyaṃ would duplicate ātman. Moreover, the causata after ātmaparayor shows also that it relates to jīve vasti: "In regard to the things to be known completely by himself and others he himself knows and causes others to know.

93.6 svarasāyasvabhāma (fem-Ioc.) as stated by Tak. "He is not indifferent, nor without consideration." Of course, one must understand that "He has no apratīṣṭhaṃ khyayekāḥ", cf. T. 13,8.11 bhāṇaṃ shom mor ma-dje-ste. Apratīṣṭhaṃ khyayekāḥ is a gerund and not a BHS form for -yāyān (ferm-lc.) as stated by Tak. See UI's note (p. 615, n. 1) and his translation p. 615: shichaku-sezu shite no sha no ni to.

88.11 bālsārāhāvīnāhaḥ: Tak. "toiling excessively for the company of ordinary beings." It is better to render avatārānaḥ by "leading, guiding", cf. BHSD s.v. avatāra. UI's translation is too literal and he has gone wrong in his interpretation of śārira, p. 607: soshi kiesho no hai hito-bito ni kie ko keisyuro kara, butsu wa jōja de aru. It seems to me impossible to relate nityam n. to lokaniḥāṇah in verse 62 (89.2). The eternity of the Buddha is explained by verse 68 (89.14-15). Both C. translates nityam to āsārāndam, etc. T. riṣ-ga-pa skyas-bad-med rnas-kyi ni // skyas-sa-pa 'phad phyir-rig-po yir-ii.

88.11 bālsārāhāvīnāhaḥ: Tak. "toiling excessively for the company of ordinary beings." It is better to render avatārānaḥ by "leading, guiding", cf. BHSD s.v. avatāra. UI's translation is too literal and he has gone wrong in his interpretation of śārira, p. 607: soshi kiesho no hai hito-bito ni kie ko keisyuro kara, butsu wa jōja de aru. It seems to me impossible to relate nityam n. to lokaniḥāṇah in verse 62 (89.2). The eternity of the Buddha is explained by verse 68 (89.14-15). Both C. translates nityam to āsārāndam, etc. T. riṣ-ga-pa skyas-bad-med rnas-kyi ni // skyas-sa-pa 'phad phyir-rig-po yir-ii.

88.11 bālsārāhāvīnāhaḥ: Tak. "toiling excessively for the company of ordinary beings." It is better to render avatārānaḥ by "leading, guiding", cf. BHSD s.v. avatāra. UI's translation is too literal and he has gone wrong in his interpretation of śārira, p. 607: soshi kiesho no hai hito-bito ni kie ko keisyuro kara, butsu wa jōja de aru. It seems to me impossible to relate nityam n. to lokaniḥāṇah in verse 62 (89.2). The eternity of the Buddha is explained by verse 68 (89.14-15). Both C. translates nityam to āsārāndam, etc. T. riṣ-ga-pa skyas-bad-med rnas-kyi ni // skyas-sa-pa 'phad phyir-rig-po yir-ii.

88.11 bālsārāhāvīnāhaḥ: Tak. "toiling excessively for the company of ordinary beings." It is better to render avatārānaḥ by "leading, guiding", cf. BHSD s.v. avatāra. UI's translation is too literal and he has gone wrong in his interpretation of śārira, p. 607: soshi kiesho no hai hito-bito ni kie ko keisyuro kara, butsu wa jōja de aru. It seems to me impossible to relate nityam n. to lokaniḥāṇah in verse 62 (89.2). The eternity of the Buddha is explained by verse 68 (89.14-15). Both C. translates nityam to āsārāndam, etc. T. riṣ-ga-pa skyas-bad-med rnas-kyi ni // skyas-sa-pa 'phad phyir-rig-po yir-ii.
du grand Véhicule, Tome II (Louvain, 1939), p. 61; BHSD s.v. āvenika; Mohchizuki Shinkō's Bukkyō daijiten, s.v. jāhachi fuguho, pp. 2361c-2366a.

97.11 ādvarāṃśala lañkaññā kāya daśārāndhālakā gudāññā; Tak. “the 32 marks are the properties, visible and causing delight in the body.” T. mitho-na tshim-byed par-gi tsho-ston gan // sum-cu-rta-gi tri-sa bya-ba // C. "the other 32 distinctive features, which, being perceived, arouse delight.” T. 's translation of daśārāndhālakā is correct. See also U's translation, p. 619: shin ni sansūrā sanjunisū wa, kore o mirahe kangi o ataeu shokudoku de aite.

98.8-10 kṛṣṇaṃ nispāda yānāṃ pravargaganajanānaranatamavargabhaṃ puṣyayājñānkāraśīmāpratīvansūpulananatamadīyanārābhīṃ buddhāvatvam... vilokya; Tak. “Having completely established the Vehicle, the ocean of knowledge filled with the multitudes of the excellent virtues and endowed with the rays of the sun of Merit and Knowledge, and having perceived that Buddhism is like the sky, space, pervading extensively and of neither limit nor middle...” Tak. follows T. in making a break after “raśmi” and in relating puṣyayājñānkāraśā to yānāṃ and pravraśā” to buddhāvatvam. T. yon-tan rin-chen mchog tshogs dan-lan ye-ses chu-mtsha bsod-nams ye-ses hi-'od can // theg-pa ma-lus nes-par bsgro-'gro-tsa-mtsho-dan-dbus med rgyu-chen nam-mkha’ ltar khyab-pa // sans-rgyas-rid... C. relates puṇya...”bham to buddhāvatvam. I prefer to follow this interpretation and to translate: “Buddhahood, which is like the sky without end and middle and pervaded by the rays of the sun of merit and knowledge.”

U’s also, does not split up puṇya...”bham but relates it to yānāṃ p. 620: fukutoku to chie to no hi no hiki o sosogi, kōda de, hen mo chō mo naka no go toki jō no subete o jō-shita no de, ... The impossibility of this interpretation is clearly shown by 99.9 vipulāntamadīyanārābhīṃ bodhi akāśadīyaṃwar. A break after “raśmi” is impossible in the sun of merit and wisdom that illuminates the Vehicle which is compared to an ocean but only the Buddhahood which is likened to the sky.

101.8 svacittapratibhāsa 'yaṃ iti nāivāṃ prajñānāṃ / jānānti atha ca ta tēṣām avandhyal!l bimbadrśānam // Tak. “Ordinary people do not notice that this is merely a reflection of their mind; still this manifestation of the Buddha’s features is useful for fulfilling their aim.” A preceding verse (100.16-17) explains that one sees the Buddha appear in one’s own mind (svacitā) when it is pure through faith etc. (śradādharmacittarpabhadābhir bhūtā, etc. śraddhāyata, etc. śraddhārāṇayaśantir). Tak’s (translation of this verse is rather too free.) Therefore, I think that it is better to translate svacittapratibhāsa “by an appearance in their own mind” and bimbadrśānam “by the vision of the image of the Buddha.” Bimba refers to the nirmanakāya, cf. 86.19.

101.18 vai śūryāvacchāhīte maṇasi muni-patichchāyādhikmanām, citrāṇy utpādayanti pramudarmanamātras tadāvajinaśū الي. Tak. “Similarly, for obtaining the shadow of the Lord of Sages on their mind which is radiant like the Viṣṇu stone, the sons of the Buddha, with minds full of delight, produce various pictures showing the Buddha’s life, etc.” The reading citrāṇy utpādayanti gives no good sense. T. has sens rab-skyed-par byed (D.; P. gieng instead of sens, a mistake due to the preceding de-btin) and C. “they make vows to carry out different acts.” Johnston himself had read citiṇān vutpādayantī which was “corrected” by T. Chowdhury (p. ii). I propose to read citiṇān utpādayantī which corresponds well to both C. and T.

102.6 pārvatākāntavrāhato; Tak. “owing to the previous, virtuous experiences”. Here as well as in 107.10 (ubhāvanābhāvā) Tak. "of the pure experiences”) Tak. has mistaken anubhūtā for anubhavā.

102.7 yaśasthānammanorupāvikvalparahitā sati; Tak. “[the divine drum], being apart from efforts, from a particular place, from common matter, and from thought and constructions.” Tak.'s translation is probably the result of the wrong interpretation by T.: ‘bad dan gnas dar yid-gzugs dan // rnam-par riogs-pa med.’ It is clear from 102.14 (yaśasthānammanorupāvitattaraḥo) that T. ‘bad gnas lus dan sens brol-ba’i // grol) that one has to translate as follows: “[the divine drum] which is free from thought-constructions as to effort, place, mind and matter”. Tak. equates manorūpā and vikalpa in 102.7 with śāriṅa and citta in 102.14, but manas and rūpa correspond to citta and śāriṅa. Perhaps one must translate sātāna by “pitch, tone”; C. (181b92) has “use, function” (yong).

102.10-11 yasṛṣya buddhavasraṇavaiṃśṛṃ bhabhur jagad aṣeṣatāḥ | dharmam diṣṭāt bhyaṃbhya yatnāḍarāho ‘pi san // Tak. “Similarly in this world, the Buddha who is all-pervading and free from effort and the rest, reaches the Doctrine by his voice towards the worthy without exceptions.” I prefer T.’s interpretation: de-btin khyab-bdag ‘bad-sods-dan // bral-dan ‘gro-ba ma-lus-pa // sans-rgyas gsun-gis khyab-mdzad-de // skal-ldan rnam-las chos-ston-to // = “In the same way, the Lord who pervades the world entirely with his Buddha-voice teaches without effort etc. the Law to the worthy.” See U’s translation, p. 626: buts tu no koe no hibiki mo, hirokō, amasu tokoro mo nauku, seken ni shāhen-shite, doryoku-nado o hanarete ite, buts ni nasubeki mono-tō ni hō o shisetsu-nō su no aru.

103.4 asurādiparacakra; Tak. “the invasion of Asuras and others.” One must follow T.: lha-ma-yin la-sogs-pa pho-ral-gi tshogs, O. “the Asuras and the other hosts of pleasures.” U’s translates cakra with “weapon” which is possible but less probable, p. 27: ashura-tō no teki no buki.

103.5 asatkāmarasilukhukavinecanatayā; Tak. “owing to its distinguishing bliss from the pleasure caused by evil enjoyment.” See BHDS s.v. vivecaiyā: “causes to abandon, dissuades from”. See U’s translation, p. 627: fulltsunara gokan no yokubō kiraku no raku kara hanareshimeru koto ni yori.

104.2 samādhīcittaprajñābhavāvacakam; Tak. tīdizin sems-gtoid bams-pa skyl-byed 'ni // = samādhićittaprajñābhavaścakām. This latter reading seems preferable.

104.3 agāmyavirūpeyati; Tak. “seeing the distinguishing bliss from the pleasure caused by evil enjoyment.” See BHDS s.v. vivecaiyā: “causes to abandon, dissuades from”. See U’s translation, p. 627: fulltsunara gokan no yokubō kiraku no raku kara hanareshimeru koto ni yori.

104.4 agāmyavirūpeyati; Tak. “owing to its distinguishing bliss from the pleasure caused by evil enjoyment.” See BHDS s.v. vivecaiyā: “causes to abandon, dissuades from”. See U’s translation, p. 627: fulltsunara gokan no yokubō kiraku no raku kara hanareshimeru koto ni yori.

104.6 aparičchāna; Tak. “without interruption”; rather “without limitation”.

106.4 śradādhūnāmanātyā; Tak. “because of their following the faith”. Tak.’s translation corresponds well to the Sanskrit text. For āgamiya see BHDS s.v. “with reference to, owing to, because of, on account of, thanks to”, “that which is the cause of bliss is said to be due to the voice [of the Buddha].”

108.2 aparicchāna; Tak. “without interruption”; rather “without limitation”.

108.15-16 sād svarātra viṣṛṣṭā dharmadhatunabhastale // buddhāsārye vineyādritanipāto yathāhathā // Tak. remarks: “The readings ‘viṣṛṣṭ’ and ‘buddhāsārye’ are to be corrected into ‘viṣṛṭ’ and ‘buddhāsārya’, respectively. Also ‘vineyādṛ’ should be changed into ‘vineyādrama’ (loc.) and be separated from ‘taniśpāto’. So T. omit this verse. There is no need to change this verse in this drastic way. T. corresponds to S.: rtag-tu thams-cod-la khyab-pa // chos-dbyin nam-nkha’i dkyil-du na // sanks-rgyas ni-ma gdul-bya-yi // ri-la ctil-tar ‘os-par ‘bab // The fact that T. does not render the locative absolute and has ri-la does not mean that the Tibetan translator has made use of a different Sanskrit text.

109.15-16 yogyoṣad gocorvasthānāṃ sarvābhprayapāyām // kurte nirvikalpo ’pī pṛthuk cintāmaṇī yathā // Tak. “Just as the wishfulfilling gem, though itself is of no thought-consideration, fulfills all desires of those living in the same region, separately”.

50 REVIEWS

51
Tak. considers yugaprococarathaka as a compound. It seems preferable to relate yugapod to kurste: “Just as the wishing gem, without discriminations, fulfills simultane­ously the wishes of all who are in its reach”. T. translates nor-bu ni // rtag-pa med-khyan cib-car-du // spyod-yul-gnas-pa rnam-sti ni // bsam-kun so-sor rdog-bys-mey litar //.

115.9 mañjasanātīti kanakakṣetrapā; T. “golden lands, constructed by jewels”; preferable “adorned with jewels”. T. renders sanskīrta by bbras-pa, not bbras-pa as given by Tak. See Uī’s translation, p. 642: manisā ni kāreṣṭro igo na kokudo o.

116.10-11 aty asau viṣaye cintātya śaktya prāptam su maśākṣet prāptam evaṃgañur evaśī śaktyābhāveśāhāvākṣī / T. “Indeed, as he is full of devotion and faith that there ‘exists’ this inconceivable sphere, that ‘can’ be realized by one like him, and, this sphere, endowed with such virtues’, has been attained.” The context shows that it is impossible to translate prāpta as ‘has been attained’. I suggest to translate: “that it (this sphere), when attained, has such good qualities.” This interpretation agrees with C: “that it has such good qualities.” T. bsam mi-khyab-pa’i yul ‘di ni // yod-pa (P. yon-tan) bsag-dräs thob (P. thos)-nus dan // thob-pa ‘di-dräs yon-tan dan // ldan zhes pad-pas mos-pa’i phyir // O. “Indeed, he is full of devotion and faith that this inconceivable sphere exists, that one like himself can realize it.”

117.8 dhyāyādhyāmyyata kusāla pránapādā samantvitā ye ...; T. “Those intelligent people are endowed with faith and accom­plishments in the practice as if they were ...” T. ’s inter­pretation corresponds to C. and T.: gud-dag mo ghi-hun-tsangs ldan blo // but, nevertheless, one must understand dhiya-adhyāmyyata: “Those who are endowed with intelligence, faith and the attainment of virtue.” See Uī’s translation, p. 645: chi to shinge to o gushi, shuken bugyo o guseni mono.

118.18 lāstam aṃkān jñānam uddīśādibhiḥ, T. “who refer to the Lord as only Pre­ceptor.” See BHS śv. uddāśayati: “uddāśayīti (= uddāśati; not recorded in this sense), recognizes: Divy. 191.3 (mām ...) lāstam uddīśādibhiḥ ..., those who recognize me as teacher ...”

118.5 yut svayam eva niśam cīṇa sthitam vicitryam na tat; T. “the Scripture should not be inter­polated, which is discoursed by the Sage himself.” Vi-cal: means “to depart or deviate from”. Therefore, it would be better to translate: “One must not deviate from the discourse taught as final doctrine by the Sage himself.”

118.9 tasmin nābhinivṛddhiśrīmālās tasmin nīveṣyā matīḥ; T. “Therefore, your mind should not be attached to the dirt of the prejudiced conception.” More precisely: “to that which is soiled by a prejudiced conception”.

118.13 lobha-gredhatāyāt; T. notes that T. has lābha-gredhatāyā (P. rīd-la brkam). This reading must be adopted.


This translation does not indicate the pages of the Sanskrit text. For this reason a concordance of the page numbers of the text and the translation may be helpful. The first number refers to the text, the second to the translation.
Japanese Tantrism was introduced from China during the T'ang dynasty. Kōkai, better known under the posthumous title Kōbō Daishi conferred upon him in 921, sojourned from 804 to 806 in Ch'ang-an where he studied the Tantric texts translated in the eighth century by famous Indian masters such as Śūbakārasiṃha (673-735), Vajrabodhi (671-741) and Amoghavajra (705-774). Sino-Japanese Tantrism is distinguished from Indo-Tibetan Tantrism by its absence of erotic elements. Professor Demiéville has pointed out that the Chinese Buddhist canon was subject to the supervision of the state, and consequently of Confucian prudishness (L'Inde classique, H. Paris-Hanoi, 1953, p. 424). Helmuth von Glasenapp, who was much interested in Tantrism, tried to disprove this and to show that in India also there were older forms of Tantrism which were free from erotic elements. von Glasenapp was rather too rash in stating that only this older, non-erotic Tantrism was introduced to China and Japan. Tantric literature is traditionally divided into four classes: kūryā, caryā, yoga and anuttarayoga. The erotic elements are mainly to be found in the anuttarayoga class. Texts of this class were translated in China but deprived of erotic elements. The most famous of these, the Guhyasamāja, is a good example. Even non-Tantric texts were bowdlerized and amusing examples have been adduced by Professor Nakamura. On the other hand, in due justice to von Glasenapp one must point out that Tantric texts such as the Guhyasamāja were translated into Chinese only during the Sung dynasty, when Chinese Buddhism had lost much of its vigour. This is undoubtedly another reason why the explanation of the anuttarayoga class of Tantras did not have any influence in China or Japan. In recent times Japanese scholars have come to realize that the Tantric tradition as it has been handed down and developed in Japan does not represent the whole range of Tantric doctrines and practices which were once current in India. They can only be studied from Sanskrit manuscripts and, above all, from Tibetan translations. Indian Tantrism is at present intensively studied in Japan. Professor Matsunaga presents an excellent survey of recent Japanese studies in this field (pp. 229-242 of the English section). One may expect that these researches will lead to a re-appraisal of the Japanese Tantric tradition as an offshoot of Indian Tantrism which, during its long history in China and Japan, has developed in its own way.

In the West, interest in Tantrism is growing, as is evident from several excellent studies which have appeared since the Second World War. This interest, however, is almost exclusively concentrated upon Indian and Tibetan Tantrism. It is to be hoped that this volume may help to draw the attention of Western scholars to Japanese Tantrism. Just as Japanese scholars have benefited very much from studying Indo-Tibetan Tantrism, Western specialists would derive much profit from carefully studying Japanese Tantrism. Even though this branch of Tantrism has been subject to the influence of Confucian ethics and other doctrines, nevertheless it represents a tradition which goes back via China to Indian Tantrism. In India itself Tantrism survived here and there in a debased form. In Tibet it has always been very powerful, but it is to be feared that it will be unable to outlive the pressures brought to bear upon it by present circumstances. For it will still for some time to come be necessary to learn the Tibetan Tantric tradition from Tibetan lamas in exile, but in the future one will have to fall back on texts alone. Therefore the Japanese form will become increasingly important for our understanding of Tantrism as a living religion. In this volume will be found many excellent articles by Japanese scholars on different aspects of Japanese Tantrism. For English readers the most interesting of these is Professor Joseph Kitagawa's study on Kōbō Daishi as master and saviour. As a historic example of Kitagawa's and a pupil of Joachim Wach, who is a good example.

In Japan the expression "Esoteric Buddhism" is preferred to Tantrism. However there is no valid reason for not using the term Tantrism which has the advantage of stressing the fact that Japanese Tantrism is derived from Indian Tantrism in the same way as Tibetan Tantrism, although they differ as to the elements which they have adopted from it.

1 In Japan the expression "Esoteric Buddhism" is preferred to Tantrism. However there is no valid reason for not using the term Tantrism which has the advantage of stressing the fact that Japanese Tantrism is derived from Indian Tantrism in the same way as Tibetan Tantrism, although they differ as to the elements which they have adopted from it.
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