

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 Sprüche*, 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

J. W. de Jong

Richard Hauschild, *Register zur Altindischen Grammatik von J. Wackernagel und A. Debrunner (Bd. I-III)*. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964. 264 pp. bro. DM 40,-, Lw. DM 44,-.

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, 1 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the Old Indian words in volumes I-III and the supplements, with the exclusion of Wackernagel's *Einleitung* which has been replaced by Renou's translation.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-Indo-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

Jikido Takasaki, *A Study on the Ratnagotravibhāga (Uttaratantra). Being a Treatise on the Tathāgatagarbha Theory of Mahāyāna Buddhism* (= *Serie Orientale Roma*, XXXIII). Roma, 1966, xiii + 439 pp. L. 16,000.

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 Asaṅga. 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'e (613-696) in his commentary on the *Samdhinirmocanasūtra*¹ and by Fa-tsang (643-712) in his commentary on the *Dharmadhātuviviseṣasāstra*². 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. XLVI, 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 Sthiramati,³ others have distinguished two Sāramati's.⁴ There are also many obscurities in the Chinese traditions concerning the translator of the Chinese version. Chinese catalogues mention two translations, one by Ratnamati and the other by Bodhiruci.

In 1931 E. Obermiller published a translation of the *Ratnagotravibhāga* from the Tibetan: "The Sublime Science of the Great Vehicle to Salvation", *Acta Orientalia*, Vol. IX, Part II.III, pp. 81-306.⁵ His interpretation of the text is based upon a commentary by Tsoñ-kha-pa's pupil and successor rGyal-tshab Dar-ma rin-chen (1364-1432).⁶ The Sanskrit text has been edited by E. H. Johnston and published by T. Chowdhury: *The Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyānottaratantraśāstra* (Patna, 1950). This edition is based upon two manuscripts found in Tibet by Rāhula Sāmrkṛtyāyana. The edition of the Sanskrit text has given a new impulse to the study of the *Ratnagotravibhāga*. Several passages of the *Ratnagotravibhāga* have been translated by E. Conze (*Buddhist Texts through the Ages*, Oxford, 1954, pp. 130-131, 181-184 and 216-217). In *Die Philosophie des Buddhismus* (Berlin, 1956, pp. 255-264) E. Frauwallner has

¹ P. Demiéville, *BEFEO*, XXIV, 1-2 (1924), p. 53.

² N. Peri, *BEFEO*, XI (1911), p. 350; Takasaki, p. 9.

³ Cf. H. W. Bailey and E. H. Johnston, "A Fragment of the Uttaratantra in Sanskrit", *BSOS*, VIII (1935), pp. 77-89 (esp. p. 81) and Johnston's foreword to his edition of the Sanskrit text, pp. x-xii. To this Sthiramati the Tibetan tradition attributes a commentary on the *Kāśyapaparivarta*. The Chinese translation (*Taishō*, 1523) is due to Bodhiruci. According to Chinese catalogues this commentary, just as the *Ratnagotravibhāga*, has been translated by both Bodhiruci and Ratnamati. Cf. A. Staël-Holstein's edition (*A Commentary of the Kāśyapaparivarta*, Peking, 1933) and P. Pelliot's review, *TP*, XXXII (1936), pp. 75-76. According to Chinese traditions both Bodhiruci and Ratnamati have translated also the *Daśabhūmikasūtraśāstra* (*Taishō*, No. 1522), cf. Noël Peri, "A propos de la date de Vasubandhu", *BEFEO*, XI (1911), pp. 352-353; Stanley Weinstein, "The concept of ālaya-vijñāna in pre-T'ang Chinese Buddhism". *Essays on the History of Buddhist Thought. Presented to Professor Reimon Yūki* (Tōkyō, 1964), pp. 34-35. On the relations between Bodhiruci and Ratnamati see P. Demiéville, "Sur l'authenticité du *Ta tch'eng k'i sin louen*", *Bulletin de la Maison Franco-Japonaise*, II, 2 (Tōkyō, 1929), pp. 30ff.

⁴ See the references given by Ét. Lamotte, *L'Enseignement de Vimalakīrti* (Louvain, 1962), pp. 92-93, n. 2. According to Hattori Masaaki, there is only one Sāramati who lived between Nāgārjuna and Asaṅga-Vasubandhu.

⁵ Cf. La Vallée Poussin's interesting review, *MCB*, I (1931-1932), pp. 406-409.

⁶ Cf. G. Tucci, *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, I (Roma, 1949), p. 119: *A Catalogue of the Tohoku University Collection of Tibetan Works on Buddhism* (Sendai, 1953), No. 5434. Ogawa Ichijō, "Butsu (Nyōrai) to Busshō (Nyōraizō) — Darumarinchen-zō Hōshōron Shakuso o shoe to shite", *IBK*, XIII (1965), pp. 247-250. Id.: "Indo Daijō Bukkyō ni okeru Nyōraizō-Busshō-shisō ni tsuite — Darumarinchen-zō Hōshōron Shakuso no kaidoku o kokoromite —", *Tōhōgaku*, 30 (1965), pp. 102-116. A complete translation of this commentary would be very welcome.

given a summary of the ideas contained in this text and a translation of several verses.⁷ In 1959 Ui Hakuju published a detailed study on the *Ratnagotravibhāga* (*Hōshōron 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).⁹

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 *Buddhagotrāśāstra* (*Taishō*, No. 1610), the *Mahāyānadharmadhātuvaiśeṣaśāstra* (*Taishō*, No. 1626-1627) and the *Anuttarāśrayasūtra* (*Taishō*, No. 669).

The 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 Sāramati 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 *Ratnagotravibhāga*, the commentary on the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, the *Dharmadhātuvaiśeṣaśāstra*, and possibly the *Mahāyānāvātāra* (*Taishō*, No. 1634).¹⁰ In the second section of the introduction Professor Takasaki studies the structure of the text and tries to reconstruct the original text which, according to him, consists of 27 verses of chapter I (cf. pp.

⁷ According to Frauwallner Sāramati lived about 250 A.D.

⁸ For completeness' sake mention must be made of a synoptic edition of the Sanskrit text in Roman letters and the Chinese translation by Nakamura Zuiryū: *The Ratnagotravibhāga-Mahāyānottaratantra-śāstra. Compared with Sanskrit and Chinese. with introduction and Notes* (Tokyo, 1961) (published originally in *Ōsaki Gakuhō*, 103-110, 1955-1959). More important are the following articles: Tsukinowa Kenryū, "Kukyōichijōhōshōron ni tsuite", *Nihon Bukkyō Kyōkai Nenpō*, VII (1935) pp. 121-139; Takata Ninkaku, "Kukyōichijōhōshōron no johon ni tsuite", *Mikkyō Bunka*, 31 (1955) pp. 9-37; Hattori Masaaki, "Busshōron' no ichi kōsatsu", *Bukkyō Shigaku*, IV, 3-4 (1955), pp. 16-36 (I have not been able to consult the last two articles); Takata Ninkaku, "Hōshōron ni okeru tenne (āśrayaparivṛtti) ni tsuite", *IBK*, VI (1958), pp. 501-504; Ogawa Ichijō, "Busshō' to 'buddhatva'", *IBK*, XI (1963), pp. 544-545.

⁹ Not mentioned are two articles published in 1953: "Hōshōron ni okeru nyoraizō no igi", *IBK*, I, pp. 368-369; "Nyoraizō to engi — Hōshōron o tegakari to shite —", *IBK*, II, pp. 244-247.

¹⁰ Ui 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 Ui does not mention anywhere either this passage or Tsukinowa's article. In general, he is very sparing with references to other scholars. Ui'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 Ui in respect of Tibetan Buddhism. Although Ui 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 *-mati* have as first element an adjective or a participle. The name Sāramati does not seem to occur anywhere else.

393-395 which give the text of these verses). Ui has reconstructed a basic text in 187 verses which he gives in Japanese translation (pp. 38-81). The form of the *Ratnagotravibhāga* is, as Johnston remarks, somewhat unusual. It consists of verses and prose but only part of the verses are *kārikās*. The remaining verses either explain the *kārikās* or illustrate them by similes. Moreover, the Chinese translation consists of two parts. The first contains only verses with occasional captions (*Taishō*, vol. XXXI, pp. 813-820) and 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 text are quite justified, however hypothetical they will always be. Both Ui 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 *tathāgatagarbha* theory, in which Professor Takasaki discusses the main texts quoted in the *Ratnagotravibhāga*.¹¹ In the following section it is proved that the *Mahāyānadharmadhātuvaiśeṣaśāstra*, the *Buddhagotrāśāstra* and the *Anuttarāśrayasūtra* depend on the *Ratnagotravibhāga*.¹² 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 Aśaṅga. 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 Aśaṅga and Vasubandhu. Sāramati is the author of the commentary and the systematizer of the *garbha* theory.

Many problems relating to the *Ratnagotravibhāga* are also discussed in the articles mentioned above. These articles as well as the introduction and the notes to the text 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. Ui 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 upon 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 not always a reliable guide. There

¹¹ Ui has studied in great detail the texts quoted (pp. 272-353) and has devoted a special chapter to the *Śrīmālādevīsīmhanādasūtra* (pp. 435-469).

¹² In chapter four of his book entitled "The relations with other sūtras and śāstras" (pp. 354-429) Ui has examined the *Anuttarāśrayasūtra* (pp. 354-366), the *Buddhagotrāśāstra* (pp. 366-389), the *Mahāyānadharmadhātuvaiśeṣaśāstra* (pp. 389-407) and the *Mahāyānāvātāra* (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 *Ratnagotravibhāga* for both Buddhist Sanskrit and Mahāyāna terminology, it would also be very useful to have indexes on the lines of those compiled by Professor Nagao for the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra*.

The *Ratnagotravibhāga* is not always easy to interpret. While reading the translation, I have made a number of notes with regard to the interpretation, the edition of the text and similar matters. I venture to publish them in the conviction that any contribution, however, insignificant, may be of some help in the study 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 Pāli Dictionary* (Copenhagen, 1924-1965).

2.8-10 *sarvaśrāvaka-pratyekabuddhair api tāvac chāriputrāyam artho na śakyah samyak svaprajñayā jñātum vā draṣṭum vā pratyavekṣitum vā | prāg eva bālaprthagjanair anyatra tathāgataśraddhāgamanataḥ |* Tak. "This meaning, O Śāriputra, can neither be known nor be seen, nor be examined correctly through the knowledge of the Śrāvakas and the Pratyekabuddhas. Needless to say, this applies to the case of ignorant and ordinary beings, except when they have faith in the Tathāgata." Tak. has followed the punctuation of the Sanskrit text which is wrong. The *daṇḍa* after *vā* must be deleted, because those who are able to understand through faith (*śraddhāgamaṇa*; T. *dad-pas rtogs-pa*) in the Tathāgata are to be found among the Śrāvakas and Pratyekabuddhas, cf. 22.3-4: *śeṣāṇāṃ devī sarvaśrāvaka-pratyekabuddhānāṃ tathāgataśraddhāgamanīyāv evaitau dharmāv iti*. The Tibetan translation puts a double stroke (*ñis-śad*) before *sarvaśrāvaka* and after *tathāgataśraddhāgamanataḥ*. Ui is right in translating *anyatra* ... as a new sentence, cf. p. 484: *shikashi, nyorai ni taisuru shin ni yotte nomi tsuzuru koto o nozoku*.

4.3 *indriyaparamapāramitāprāptaḥ*; Tak. "brings all faculties [of living beings] to the highest perfection"; T. *dbaṅ-po mchog-gi pha-rol-tu phyin-pa*. See Edgerton, BHSD s.v. *pāramitā* (1). It is not possible to give a causative meaning to *prāpta*. One must translate: "has obtained the supreme perfection of [his] faculties", cf. 31.14 *sarva-dharmānairātmyaparapāramitāprāptaḥ* ("parapāram abhiprāptaḥ has been corrected on p. xvi; T. *dam-pa'i pha-rol-tu phyin-pa brñes*); Tak. "has attained the highest supremacy, [knowing] non-substantiality of all the phenomena"; 87.3-4 *gunaiḥ | viśuddhipāramitāprāptair*; 115.18 *divyabrahmavihārapāramigataḥ*; Tak. "having been transferred to the abode of Brahman in heaven"; T. *lha tshans-gnas mthar-son*. This passage deals with meditation (115.17 *dhyāyēd dhyānam* ...) and must be translated accordingly: "who has arrived at mastery in the divine brahmic states", cf. Ui. p. 643: *Tenteki no shihonjū no higan ni tōtatsu-shi*.

4.5-6 *anābhogabuddhakāryāpratiprasābdho*; Tak. "calmed in the Buddha's effortless acts uninterruptedly". Edgerton gives a more understandable translation, cf. BHSD s.v. *apratiprasābdha*: "unceasing in the effortless activities of a Buddha". This passage must be added to those quoted by Edgerton.

5.6-7 *imaṃ cārthavaśam upādāya*; Tak. "and because of the effect of this meaning". See Edgerton, BHSD s.v. *artha-vaśa* and Ui, p. 488: *soshite, kakaru riyū ni motozuite*.

7.2 *samghe garbho jñānadhātuvāptiniṣṭhaḥ*; Tak. "In the Community exists the Matrix, which is The element of Wisdom, aiming at its acquisition". Both T. (*tshegs-las*) and C. have read *samghād*. Johnston prefers the MS. reading *samghe* "as the Tathāgatagarbha is in each member of the community and by its working leads to the acquisition of knowledge and realisation of the dhātu". Ui remarks that the *tathāgatagarbha* exists in all men and is not restricted to the *samgha*. I believe that the reading *samghād* is preferable also, because it corresponds to the ablatives in the first pāda: *buddhād dharmo dharmataś cāryasamghaḥ*. According to Tak. *taj* in the third pāda (*tajjñānāptiś cāgrabodhir*) refers to *garbha* in the second pāda: "Its acquisition of the Wisdom is the Supreme Enlightenment". T. (*ye-śes de thob byañ-chub mchog*) does not bear out this interpretation. I suggest that these two pādas be translated as follows: "From the Community comes the Matrix which culminates in the obtaining of the Element of Wisdom. The obtaining of that Wisdom is the Supreme Awakening", see Ui's translation, p. 490: *sō kara zō ga ari, chiekai no shōtoku o kikyō to shi, soshite, sono chie no shōtoku wa saijō bodai de ari*.

8.2 *iti smrtam*; Tak. "Thus remembered by tradition". Better "thus it is taught (or declared)".

8.10 *udayo 'trābhisambodho 'bhipretotpādah*; "Here the word 'udaya' means 'perfect enlightenment' (*abhisambodha*), in which the sense 'origination' is implied". T. (P.; D. is quoted by Tak., p. 157, n. 17) *o-ta-ya ni 'dir mñon-par rtogs-pa la 'dod-kyi skyeba ni ma yin-no*; O. "Here the word 'udaya' is to be understood in the sense of 'thorough cognition', but not in that of 'origination'". One must certainly correct the Sanskrit text according to T., which has been misunderstood by Johnston, and add the syllable *no*: *'bhipreto notpādah*; *no* and *to* are almost similar in the script used in the MS. B, so that the omission of *no* is practically a case of haplogy. That Ui follows Johnston's text is certainly due to his ignorance of Tibetan, p. 493: *kokoni kaku o eta to yū no wa, shōgaku shita koto de atte, nozomareta mono o eta koto de aru*.

8.18-19 *tatra duḥkhamūlam samāsato yā kācid bhavēṣu nāmarūpābhiniṣṭtiḥ*; Tak. "Of these, the root of Suffering is, in short, one kind of origination of Individuality (*nāmarūpa*) on the [three] existences"; *yā kācid* means "any whatsoever", cf. Ui's translation, p. 494: *issai*.

10.7-8 *vikriḍitā vividhā sampannavinayopāyamukheṣu supravīṣṭatvāt*; Tak. "[The Compassion is 'named'] mastery (*vikriḍitā*)", because it enters well into the gates of accomplished means of training in various ways (*vividhā*). Ui also translates *vividhā* as an adverb: p. 496: *shuju ni*, but no such adverb exists. As Johnston remarks, T. corresponds to *vividheṣu sampannavineyopāyamukheṣu* (p. 10, n. 2). The simplest solution would be to read *vividhasampanna*.

10.9 *svadharmatādhiḡamasamprāṇāśayatvāt*; Tak. "because [the Buddha] ... has the intention to lead [the living beings] to the acquisition of their own nature". In note 50 Tak. remarks "it seems C. takes 'svadharmatā' as 'Buddha's own nature'". Here *svadharmatā* has indeed the same meaning as in 10.4: *svadharmatāprakṛtinir-viṣṭatathāgatagarbham* and in verse 100 (60.16-17) *vilokya tadvat sugataḥ svadharmatām avicisaṃstheṣv api buddhacakṣuṣā*. Ui gives the same interpretation, p. 496: *jiko no hosshō no shōtoku ni tasseshimen to yū igyō taru ga yue de aru*.

10.12-13 *api khalu jñānena paramanīyopāśāntipadasvābhisambodhisthānagunāt svārthasamput paridipitā*; Tak. "Besides [there is another meaning]. By the word 'Wisdom', the fulfilment of self-benefit is designated, in so far as the highest, eternal and quiescent place has the character of being the basis of his own perfect enlightenment". T. *yañ-na ye-śes-kyis ni mchog-tu rtag-pa dañ | ñe-bar zi-ba'i gnas rañ-ñid mñon-par byañ-chub-la gnas-pa'i yon-tan-gyis na rañ-gi-don phun-sum-tshogs-pa bstan-pa*. T. suggests the following translation of the Sanskrit text; "On the other hand, 'Wisdom'

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 *dvayavikalpāsamudācārayogena*. Tak. translates *samudācāra* by 'origination' just as *samudaya* in 12.3 Elsewhere he translates *samudācāra* 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 spyod-pa* and Ui, p. 499, etc.: *gengyō*. In 13.9 T. (*kun-'byuiba las*) and the context (*ayoniśomanasikārasamudācārāt kleśasamudayaḥ | kleśasamudayāt karmasamudayaḥ*) suggest a reading °*samudayāt*.

13.1-4 *vibandhaḥ punar abhūtavastunimittārambaṇamanasikārapūrvikā rāga dveṣamo-hotpattir anuśayaparyutthānayaogāt | anuśayato hi bālānām abhūtam atatsvabhāvaṃ vastu śubhākāreṇa vā nimittaṃ bhavati rāgotpattitāḥ | pratighākāreṇa vā dveṣotpattitāḥ | avidyākāreṇa vā mohotpattitāḥ*; Tak. "And 'bondage' (*vibandha*) means the origination of Desire, Hatred and Ignorance preceded by the thought which takes its basis of cognition upon the characteristic of unreal things. It is due to the union of the state of tendency (*anuśaya*) with manifested state (*paryutthāna*) [of defilement]. Indeed, people regard the unreal, i.e. 'not of its nature (*atatsvabhāva*)' thing as the [real] characteristic because of its desirable looks (*śubhākāra*) when Desire comes forth from its state of tendency; when Hatred comes forth [from its state of tendency], [they regard the unreal thing as the real characteristic] because of its detestable looks (*prati-ghākāreṇa*); and when Ignorance comes forth, then it is the same because of its obscure looks (*avidyākāreṇa*)". This difficult passage becomes clearer when compared with chapter XXIII of the *Prasannapadā* which is devoted to the *viparyāsas*, see *kārikā 1*: *saṃkalpaprabhavo rāgo dveṣo mohaś ca kathyate | śubhāśubhaviparyāsān saṃbhavanti pratītya hi |* and the commentary (p. 452.4-5): *tatra hi śubham ākāraṃ pratītya rāga utpadyate | aśubham pratītya dveṣaḥ | viparyāsān pratītya moha utpadyate | saṃkalpas tv eṣāṃ trayāṇāṃ api sādharānakāraṇam utpattau |*. The commentary explains that the beautiful aspect (*śubhākāra*), the ugly aspect (*aśubhākāra*), the permanent, the self etc. (*nityātmādī*) have been superimposed (*adhyāropa*), see p. 457.6-8. The *Ratnagotravibhāga* explains that an unreal object (*abhūtaṃ vastu*) becomes something which appears (*nimitta*) as having a beautiful, repulsive or wrongly understood aspect, although it has not the nature of those [three characteristics] because desire, repulsion or delusion arise out of their latent state. For *nimitta* see *BHSD nimitta* (I): "external aspect or feature, appearance"; Jacques May, *Candrakīrti, Prasannapadā madhyamaka-vṛtti* (Paris, 1959), p. 510: "indice de détermination, détermination, cause déterminante", and Haribhadra's *Abhisamayālaṃkāṛālokā* (Wogihara's ed.), p. 333: *sāmānyarūpaparicchedān nimittikuryāt* (transl. by Edward Conze, *Oriens Extremus*, IX, 1962, p. 36, n. 15 by "[treat as a sign] by defining their general marks"). Tak. has wrongly rendered *atatsvabhāvaṃ* at other places too, see 31.12: *sarve hy anyatīrthyā rūpādikam atatsvabhāvaṃ vastv ātmety upagatāḥ*; Tak. "Indeed, all the other Heretics consider the things consisting of form, etc. as the Ego though they are of the unreal nature". One must understand: "For all other heretics consider the object, consisting of matter, etc. as the Self, although it has not the nature of it." See also 86.5-6 (verse 40 c-d): *kriyāsu cintāmaṇirājaratnavad vicitrabhāvo na ca tatsvabhāvaṃ*; Tak. "He has a resemblance, in his acts, to the king of wish-fulfilling gems, appearing in various forms, which, however, have not their own substance." This passage refers to the *saṃbhogakāya* which appears as different beings but without possessing the nature of those [different beings] (T. *sna-tshogs-dños dañ de-yi rañ-bžin min*). In the verses 51 and 52 (87.11-14) which explain verse 40 *atatsvabhāva* occurs once and *atadbhāva* twice: *deśane darśane krtyāsraṃsane 'nabhisamskṛtau | atatsvabhāvākhyāne ca citratoktā ca pañcadhā |* (51) *raṅgapratyayaivaicitryād atadbhāvo yathā maneḥ | sattvapratyayaivaicitryād atadbhāvas tathā vibhoḥ |* (52); Tak. "In teaching, in the visible form, in acting ceaselessly, and acting with no artificial effort, and in its appearance of illusion, the variety of [its manifestation] is said to be five-fold (51). Just

as a gem, being dyed with various colours, does not make manifest its real essence; similarly, the Lord never shows its real nature, though it appears in various forms, according to the conditions of the living beings (52)". Here *atatsvabhāvākhyāne* means "in the manifestation of what is not its nature" (T. *de-yi ño-bo mi-ston-la* = "in the non-manifestation of its nature"). See also Nyāyabindu (ed. Stcherbatsky), 27.3: *yady atatsvabhāve 'nutpādake ca kaścit pratibaddhasvabhāvo*; Stcherbatsky, *Buddhist Logic*, II, p. 75: "If the existence of something could be necessarily conditioned by something else, something that would neither be its cause, not essentially the same reality." Tak.'s translation of *anuśayaparyutthānayaogāt* (13.2) has to be corrected; *yogāt* (T. *dañ-ldan-pas*) does not indicate the union of *anuśaya* with *paryutthāna*, but the union with both.

13.15-17 *ya evam asataś ca nimittārambaṇasyādarśanāt sataś ca yathābhūtasya paramārthasatyasya darśanāt tadubhayor anutkṣepāprakṣepasamatājñānena sarvadharma-samatābhisambodhaḥ*; 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 (*utkṣepa*, T. *bsal-ba*) the non-existing support of the appearance (*asan nimittārambaṇam*) nor establish (*prakṣepa*, T. *bžag-pa*) the existing absolute in its true reality (*sad yathābhūtaṃ paramārthasatyam*) because the first is not seen and the second is seen.

15.1-2 *anāsrave dhātau kuśalākuśalayoś cittayor ekacaratvād dvitīyacittānabhisam-dhānayaogena*; 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 dañ mi-dge-ba'i sems-dag las gcig rgyu-bas sems-gñis-pa mtshams-sbyor-ba med-pa'i tshul-gyi*. O. "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 *ekacara* as "acting together", T. as "acting of one". The usual meaning, however, of *ekacara* 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. Ui seems to understand it in this way: p. 503: *muro no kai ni oitewa, zen to fuzen to wa tandoku no mono de aru kara, dainishin to no ketsugō ni tekishinai node*.

16.17 and 17.2 *°avabhāsapratyupasthitam*; Tak. "standing in the illumination"; *pratyupasthita* means here "engaged in", cf. *BHSD* s.v. *pratyupasthāna*, *pratyupasthita*. In 36.3 Tak. has misunderstood *pratyupasthāpanam*: *buddhadhātuvīśuddhigotrāṃ ... dvividhakāryapratyupasthāpanam bhavati*; Tak. "The Essence of the Buddha, the perfectly pure Germ, ... has the two kinds of foundation of its actions." The meaning is: "The Germ brings about two kinds of effect", cf. *Daśabhūmika* 49.18: *avidyā dvividhakāryapratyupasthānā* which is quoted by Edgerton.

17.4 *ananyapoṣiṅganyam ... āryaśrāvakaṃ*; Tak. "the holy Śrāvakas ... indifferent to the nourishment of others"; J. notes that *poṣin* is recorded by the *PW* only from the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and Tak. that C. probably has misread *poṣa* for *poṣin*. There is no doubt about the meaning of *ananyapoṣin*, cf. Pāli *anaññāposin*, *CPD*: "not supporting others, said of the houseless ascetic, who maintains no family and fosters no passion"; °*ganya* probably has to be interpreted as "belonging to a class" but T. (*gžan rgyas-par byed-pa mi-ldan-pa* according to D.; P. ... *dañ-ldan-pa*, which is certainly wrong) has no word corresponding to it.

20.17 *sarvajagadāśayaśobhānimittatvāt*; Tak. "because they are the cause of beauty intended by the whole world." T. °*gro-ba thams-cad-kyi bsaṃ-pa dge-ba'i rgyu yin-pa'i phyir*, O. "as they are the cause of the virtuous thoughts of all living beings." The

interpretation given by the Tibetan translator is correct; *āśayaśobhā* is literally “the splendour of the thoughts”, cf. also Ui’s translation, p. 512: *issai seken no kesshut-suseru igyō no in taru ga yue de aru*.

21.11-12 *teṣām eva daśabalādīnām buddhadharmānām 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 accordance 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: *sorera jūriki-tō no buppō no ichi-ichi no mujō no gō de atte*.

23.7 *tatopagamikayā mīmāṃsayā samanvāgataḥ*: Tak. “possessed of the skill to approach there (i.e. to the big cloth).” Here *upagamika* has the same meaning as *-upaga* and *-upaka* in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, cf. *BHSD* s.v. *-upaka*: “pertaining, belonging to; suitable, appropriate”. The same expression occurs in the *Daśabhūmikasūtra* (p. 61.15) which has *upagatayā* instead of *upagamikayā*: *tatopagatayā mīmāṃsayā samanvāgato*. In *Vinaya* IV.211: *tatrupāyāya vimāṃsāya samannāgata* (quoted by The Pali Text Society’s *Pali-English Dictionary* s.v. *tatra*) one must probably read *tatrupayāya*. Kern’s explanation has to be rejected (*Toevoegselen op ’t woordenboek van Childers*, II, Amsterdam, 1916, p. 90: *tatrupāya* = *tadūpiya*, suitable, corresponding, SVibh.II.211. Misschien vervorming van *tadrūpiya*).

26.10-11 *pūrvataram tu yenārthena sarvatrāviśeṣeṇa pravacane sarvākāram tadartha-sūcanam bhavati tad apy adhikṛtya nirdeśyāmi*. Tak. notes that T. reads *pravacana* (*gsuñ-rab*) as the subject. However, T. has *gsuñ* (omitted by P.) *-rab thams-cad-du* which corresponds to *sarvatra pravacane*, O. “throughout the whole of Scripture”. I do not believe that Tak.’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 *śūnyatādr̥ṣṭayaś cābhīmānikā yeṣām iha tadvimokṣamukhe ’pi śūnyatāyām mādyamānānām śūnyataiva dr̥ṣṭir bhavati*; T. *mñon-pa’i ña-rgyal-can stoñ-pa-ñid-du lta-ba ste* / *’di-la stoñ-pa ñid-du lta-ba gañ-dag de’i rnam-par thar-pa’i sgo-la yañ stoñ-pa-ñid-du lta-ba ’gyur-ba*. Probably the text at the basis of T. had *śūnyatādr̥ṣṭīnām* instead of *śūnyatāyām mādyamānānām* which is not represented in C., too.

32.10 *ākāśopamasattvabhājanalokanairātmyaniṣṭhāgamanād*; 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 Tak. remarks that *ākāśopama* (T. *nam-mkha’ ltar*) is relating to *niṣṭhāgamaṇa*. However, T. relates it to *nairātmya*: *sems-can dañ snod-kyi ’jig-rten nam-mkha’-ltar bdag-med-pa’i mthar-thug-pa ñid-du rtogs-pa’i phyir* = “because the Tathāgata has realized completely the sky-like non-substantiality of the world of the living beings and the material world.” This interpretation seems more obvious, although Tak.’s interpretation is not precluded. Ui’s translation is ambiguous, p. 530: *kokū no gotoki, shujō-seken to kiseken to no muga no kuyō ni tasshita kara to*.

32.15 *vaśitāprāptānām ca bodhisattvānām*. In note 109 Tak. 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 ‘*vaśitāprāpta*’ as an epithet for Bodhisattvas in general. Tak. refers to *Lañkāvatāra*, p. 274.21: *sarvabodhisattvabhūmiṣu vaśitāprāptāḥ*, but this quotation is from the *Lalitavistara*. The Tibetan commentary (O., p. 170, n. 1) does not limit this qualification to bodhisattvas on the 10th *bhūmi*, but to bodhisattvas who abide in the last three *bhūmis*. The ten *vaśitās* are obtained on the 8th *bhūmi*, cf. *Daśabhūmikasūtra* (ed. J. Rahder), p. 70 and *Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra* 26.2-3: *daśavaśitālābhāt | yathā daśabhūmike ’ṣṭamyaṃ bhūmau nirđiṣṭāḥ*.

33.5-6 *sarvakleśamaladaurgandhyavāsanāpakarṣaparyantaśubhāpāramitāṃ*; J. notes: “Text as in A; °*vāsanāprakarṣa*°, B, which does not make sense; T. seems to have read °*vāsanāyogāt* (*bag-chags* ... *dañ-ldan-pa’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 ‘*paryanta*’ as ‘*atyanta*’ and attach it to *śubhāpāramitā* as an attribute and instead of *apakarṣa* T. has *dañ-ldan-pa’i phyir*. However, *prakarṣa* makes good sense and corresponds to T. *rab*; T. *mthar-thug-pa* corresponds to *paryanta* and not to *atyanta* which is rendered in T. by *šin-tu* (cf. 32.9, 33.8.9). T. *ñon-mñon-pa’i dri-ma dri-ña-ba’i bag-chags thams-cad dañ-ldan-pa’i phyir gtsaṅ* (P. *gsaṅ*) *-ba’i pha-rol-tu phyin-pa rab-kyi mthar-thug-pa* = *sarvakleśamaladaurgandhyavāsanāyogāt prakarṣa-paryantaśubhāpāramitāṃ* / T. confirms the reading of MS. B, but adds *yogāt*. Tak. translates *kleśamaladaurgandhyavāsanā* by the “dusts of defilements with their bad-smelling impressions”. In this case, too, the Tibetan interpretation is to be preferred: “the traces of the bad smell of the impurities of the defilements”.

34.18-19 *anityasaṃsārānapakarṣaṇataś cocchedāntāpatanān nityanirvāṇāsamaropanaś ca śāśvatāntāpatanāt*; Tak. “Because he does not fall into the Nihilistic Extremity through his not diminishing, neglecting the non-eternal Phenomenal Life; nor does he fall into the Eternalistic Extremity through his not intensifying the eternal Nirvāṇa.” In T. (P., D. and N.) *apakarṣaṇa* is rendered by *brid-pa* which has misled both J. and Tak.; it must be corrected into *bri-ba* which corresponds exactly to *apakarṣaṇa*. The terms *apakarṣaṇa* and *samaropana* are synonymous with the more usual terms *apavāda* and *samāropa*, cf. 76.11. *Samāropa* 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 *na ca bhavati tāvad āgantukamalaviśuddhigotraṃ trayāṇām anyatamadharmādhimuktiṃ na sa samudānayaṭi satpuruṣasaṃsargādicatuḥśūklasamavadhānaya yogenā*; Tak. “Really, it cannot take place unless they bring about the Germ which is purified from accidental pollutions and the faith in any one of three Vehicles through being endowed with the four kinds of good actions, beginning with having contact with a personage of high virtue.” The subject is the *gotra* which brings about the *adhimukti* by means of the *catuḥśūkla*. The preceding lines explain that without the *gotra* the *duḥkhadoṣadarśanam* and the *sukhānusaṃsādarśanam* are impossible. T. *ji-srid-du blo-bur-gyi dri-ma rnam-par dag-pa’i rigs skyes-bu dam-pa la brten-pa la sogs-pa ’khor-lo bzi yañ-dag-par ’byor-ba’i tsul-gyis* / *gsum-las gañ-yañ-rui-ba’i chos-la mos-pa* / *skyed-par byed-par ma-yin-pa de-srid-du ni ’gyur-ba yañ ma-yin-no* /.

38.5-7 *bodhisattvakarūṇābhāvanāyā vārisādharmyaṃ tasyāḥ sarvajagati paramasniḡdhabhāvaikarasalakṣaṇaprayogād iti*; J. remarks: “T. om. *lakṣaṇapra*; C either as in text or reading °*lakṣaṇayogad*, which is perhaps preferable.” Both Tak. (p. 226, n. 203) and Ui (p. 538, n. 2) point out that C. corresponds to °*lakṣaṇaprayogād*. T. *de ni* gro-ba *thams-cad-la mchog-tu brlan-pa’i rañ-bzin-gyi ro-gcig-pa dañ-ldan-pa’i phyir-ro*. Tak. renders T. as follows: “its nature of the highest moisture in all the world is endowed with one taste”, but the meaning is: “because it [bodhisattvakarūṇābhāvanā] possesses the unique savour of extreme moisture in regard to all living beings.”

39.2 *prabhāsvaṇas tadubhayāgantukatāprakṛtitaḥ*: Tak. “It (*āśravakṣaya*) is ‘radiant’ by nature because these two Obstructions are merely of an occasional nature.” In note 214 Tak. remarks: “T. reads as ‘*tad-ubhaya-āgantukatā-aprakṛtitaḥ*’ (*glo-bur-pa-ñid-kyi rañ-bzin ma yin-pa’i phyir-ro*, being *āgantukatā*, they are not the innate character).” The Sanskrit text must be interpreted in conformity with the Tibetan translation: “It is radiant because these two, being accidental, do not constitute its nature.” The compound *āgantukatāprakṛtitaḥ* is analysed by T. as *āgantukatayā-aprakṛtitaḥ*, cf. P. °*od-gsal-ba ni de gñi-ga glo-bur-ba ñid-kyis rañ-bzin ma-yin-pa’i phyir-ro* (P. adds *rañ-ñid-kyis* after *ñid-kyis*). See Ui’s translation, p. 539: *myōjō towa kono ryōsha no kyakujin taru mono o jishō to nasanaī kara de aru*.

50.13-15 *sā punar āśravakṣayābhijñābhimukhyasaṅgaprajñāpāramitābhāvanayā mahākarūṇābhāvanayā ca sarvasattvadhātuparitrāṇāya tadasākṣātkaraṇād abhimukhyāṃ bodhisattvabhūmau pradhānyena vyavasthāpyate*; Tak. “And this state is predominantly

established in the 6th stage of Bodhisattva called Abhimukhī. 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 *abhiññā*, 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 *āsravakṣayābhijñābhimukhyām asaṅga* which seems preferable: "And this [pure and impure state (*śuddhāśuddhāvasthā*)] is mainly established on the Stage of the Bodhisattva, called Abhimukhī, 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 *asaṅgaprajñāpāramitābhāvanayā* with *āsravakṣayābhijñābhimukhyām* and *mahākaraṇābhāvanayā* with *asākṣātkaraṇād*, 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 *sarvasattvapariṇāyā* (50.19) and *śaṣṭhyām* (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 *śamasukhānāsvādanatayā tadupāyakṛtaparijayaśya saṁsārābhimukhasattvāpekṣayā nirvāṇavimukhasya bodhyaṅgaparipūraṇāya dhyānair vihr̥tya punaḥ kāmādhātau saṁcintyopapattiparigrahaṇato*; 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 transmigration. Though abiding [in the desireless 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 Desire." Instead of *nirvāṇavimukhasya* both T. and C. have *nirvāṇābhimukhasya* (Tak., p. 252, n. 407). This reading is to be preferred: "Although he has cultivated the means for the bliss of Quiescence without tasting it, [nevertheless] for the sake of the living beings who are turned towards transmigration, he, who is turned towards Nirvāṇa, after having dwelt in meditations in order to obtain fully the factors of Awakening, again voluntarily assumes existence in the sphere of desire." T. *ḥi-ba'i bde-ba'i ro mi-myañ-bar de'i thabs-la byañ-bar byas-pa'i 'khor-ba-la mñon-du phyogs-pa'i sems-can-la bltos-te | myaṇan-las-'das-pa-la mñon-du phyogs-pa | byañ-chub-kyi yan-lag yonś-su rdzogs-par bya-ba'i phyir bsam-gtan dag-gi gnas-nas slar 'dod-pa'i kham-su bsams-bñin-du skye-ba yonś-su 'dzin-pas |* It is exactly the opposition between *saṁsārābhimukhasattva* and *nirvāṇābhimukha* [bodhisattva] which brings fully into relief the great compassion of the Bodhisattva.

51.13-14 *ata eva jagadbandhor upāyakarūṇe pare | yad āryagotrāprāpto dṛśyate bālāgocare ||* (70); Tak. "Having attained the position of the Saints, he is nevertheless seen amongst ordinary beings; therefore, he is, for the friends of all the world, the Highest means and Compassion." Tak. had misunderstood *jagadbandhu* "the friend of mankind", i.e. the bodhisattva. 70a-b = "therefore the means and the compassion of the friend of mankind are supreme". T. *de-ñid-phyir ni 'gro-ba-yi || gñen-gyi thabs dan śñiñ-rje mchog ||*. Ui's translation is correct, p. 555: *seken no shitashiki mono no, saikō no hōben to daihi to no ni o*.

52.8 *jagaty ākāśaparyante*; Tak. "among the world, limitless like the sky". In note

421 Tak. remarks that for *paryanta* T. has *mtha'-klas* (*ananta*) but *mtha'-klas-pa* occurs more often for *paryanta* and *paryavasāna*, cf. G. M. Nagao, *Index to the Mahāyāna-sūtrālaṅkāra*, part I (Tokyo, 1958), p. 150 (*śamudraparyantamahāprthivī*), Friedrich Weller, *Tibetisch-sanskritischer Index zum Bodhicaryāvatāra*, I (Berlin, 1952), p. 182 (*asēśākāśaparyantavāsinām kimu dehinām*), *Mahāvīyutpatti*, No. 371: *ākāśadhātuparyavasānaḥ*. H. A. Jäschke has already noted a case in which *mthas-klas* corresponds to *paryanta*, cf. *A Tibetan-English Dictionary* (London, 1881), p. 240b. Therefore one must translate "in the world bounded by the sky", cf. Ui, p. 556: *kokū o henai to suru seken ni oite*.

60.20 *jalaruham sammiñjitaṃ*; Tak. "a faded ... lotus flower"; T. *padma zum*; O. "a lotus flower with folded leaves". Tak. 's wrong translation is due to the fact that the lotus is described above (60.12) as *vivarṇa*.

61.4-9 *yathā madhu prāṇigaṇopagūḍham vilokya vidvān puruṣas tadarthī | samantataḥ prāṇigaṇasya tasmād upāyato 'pakramaṇaṃ prakuryāt ||* (102) *sarvajñacakṣurviditām maharṣir madhūpamaṃ dhātum itaṃ vilokya |* 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-dañ thabs-kyis srog-chags tshogs* (P. *sogs*) || *kun-nas bral-bar rab-tu byed-pa bñin ||* (102) *drañ-sroñ chen-pos kun-mkhyen-spyan-gyis ni || rigs kham-s sbrañ-rtsi dan-'dra 'di zgigs-nas ||* = "with the help of a strategem he would completely remove the swarm of bees from it. (102). The Great Seer, having seen that this Essence, which he has perceived with his omniscient eye, is like honey ..."

61.13-14 *madhvā ... kuryāt kāryam*; J. notes: "*kuryāt tatvam*, A and B (reading doubtful in both); *bya byed-pa* T." Perhaps one must read *kuryāt kṛtyam*.

61.19 *bhavantī ye 'nnādibhir arthinas tu*: Tak. "Those who wish to utilize it as food and the like." In a note Tak. remarks that *annādibhir* (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. *zas-sogs don-du gñer-ba gañ yin-pa*.

69.4 *kāmaśevānimitatvāt paryutthānāny amedhyavat |* 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 *nimitta*. T. *'dod-pa bsten-pa'i rgyu yin-phyir || kun-nas ldan-pa mi-gtsaṅ 'dra ||*; O. "The outburst of their passions, being the cause for giving way to the desires, is abhorrent like impurities." See also Ui's translation, p. 580: *yoku ni fukeru koto o in to nasu node, ten wa fun no gotoku de aru*.

69.12 *vikośagarbhavaj jñānam avikalpaṃ 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 *vikośagarbha*. Ui (p. 580: *mufun-betsu no chi wa taizō o hanareta mono no gotoku, jukushita mono no gotoku de aru*) takes both *vikośagarbhavat* and *vipākavat* as comparisons. The same interpretation is given by T.: *mñal-sbubs bral-'dra mi-rtog-pa'i || ye-śes rnam-par smin-pa bñin |*, 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 *rūpagateṣu sarvagam*; Tak. remarks that *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra* IX, 15, the source of this quotation, has *rūpagateṣu* instead of *rūpagateṣu*. One must certainly correct *rūpagateṣu* into *rūpagateṣu*; T. has *gzugs-gyur kun-tu*, cf. Nagao, *op.cit.*, I, 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 *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra*!

73.10 *sattvadhātāv iti*; Johnston's correction of the reading of the MS. (*saṁvadyatana-tijā*) is based upon C. However, T. has *yod-do || zes-byā ba'i bar ni || = saṁvidyāta iti yāvāt*.

73.12-14 *yaiva cāsau dharmatā saivātra yuktir yoga upāyaḥ paryāyaḥ | evam eva tat syāt | anyathā naiva tat syād iti* /. J. remarks: "Reading uncertain. *paryāya eva vai tat syāt*, B." and Tak. notes that both T. and C. do not translate *paryāya*. T. *chos-ñid gañ-yin-pa de-ñid ni 'dir gañ-gis de-lta-bu kho-nar 'gyur-gyi gzan-du mi 'gyur-ro zes-byā-ba'i rigs-pa dan sbyor-ba dan thabs yin-te | = yaiva cāsau dharmatā saivātra yuktir yoga upāyaḥ | yayaivam eva tat syāt | anyathā naiva tat syād iti* /.

74.10 *nedam sthānam vidyate*; Tak. "There is [absolutely] no room for it." The meaning is: "This is impossible", cf. *BHSD* s.v. *sthāna* (5).

75.14-15 *sata eva dharmasyottarakālam ucchedo vināśaḥ parinirvāṇam 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'i*; O. "... the destruction of elements which did really exist." Cf. Ui, p. 588: *jitsuu no hō ga goji ni danmetsu-shi metsue-suru no ga sunawachi nehan de aru to kangaeru mono*.

77.18 *ātmāsnehaś cādhiḥ*; Tak. "and besides, affection for one's self." T. *bdag-chags lhag-pa'i* = "excessive self-love." The Tibetan translation is correct. See Ui's translation, p. 591: *tsuyoi jitsuga no aijaku ga*.

78.1 *viviktaṃ saṁskṛtaṃ sarvaprakāraṃ bhūtakotiṣu*; Tak. "all kinds of phenomena, made by causes and conditions ... are ... deprived of reality." In Mahāyāna philosophy *vivikta*, litt. "separated, free from", means "without substance", cf. *Prasannapadā*, p. 349,4: *skandha sabhāvatū śūnya vivikta*. Therefore the translation is as follows: "In the absolute reality everything which is produced by causes is isolated (without substance)." See Ui's translation, p. 591: *shinjitsuzai ni oitewa, issai no shurui no ui wa onri-serarete iiru*.

78.9 *bodhicittodaye 'py asya*; Tak. remarks that T. has *bodhicittodaye yasya* and relates *yasya* to *tasya* in the next verse, but he prefers the reading of the MSS. because in relation to the preceding verse *api* is quite necessary. I am not convinced by this argument and would prefer to follow T.

78.21-22 *tathāgatagarbhādhikāraḥ prathamāḥ paricchedaḥ ślokarthasamgrahavyākhyānataḥ samāptāḥ*; T. *de-bzin-gsēgs-pa'i sñiñ-po'i skabs-te tshigs-su bcad-pa dan-po'i don-gyi bsdus-pa'i bśad-pa rdzogs-so || = tathāgatagarbhādhikāraḥ prathamāślokarthasamgrahavyākhyānam samāptam*. MS. B has °*adhikāraprathamāśloka*°. Chapter II ends with *bodhyadhikāro nāma dvitīyaḥ paricchedaḥ* which corresponds to T. *byañ-chub-kyi skabs zes-byā-ba ste le'u gñis-pa'o*, chapter III with *guṇādhikāro nāma tritīyaḥ paricchedaḥ*; T. omits *nāma*: *yon-tan-gyi skabs-te le'u gsum-pa'o*. Chapter IV ends with *tathāgatakrtyakriyādhikāraś caturthaḥ paricchedaḥ ślokarthasamgrahavyākhyānataḥ samāptāḥ*; T. *de-bzin-gsēgs-pa'i phrin-las mādza-pa'i skabs-te le'u bzi-pa'o || || tshigs-su bcad-pa'i don-gyi bśad-pa rdzogs-so || = ... caturthaḥ paricchedaḥ | ślokarthasamgrahavyākhyānam samāptam*. Finally, chapter V ends with *anuśāsādhikāro nāma pañcamaḥ paricchedaḥ ślokarthasamgrahavyākhyānataḥ samāptāḥ*; T. *phan-yon-gyi le'u ste lña-pa'o || || tshigs-su bcad-pa'i don-gyi bsdus-pa'i bśad-pa rdzogs-so || = ... pañcamaḥ paricchedaḥ | ślokarthasamgrahavyākhyānam samāptam*.

80.5 *dharmānām tad akalpanapracayajñānāśrayād āpyate*; Tak. "and is attained when the elements [of existence] take resort to the non-discriminative and Analytical Wisdom." Tak. considers the reading *dharmānām* as doubtful because both T. and C. connect *dharma* with *avikalpa*. However, T. corresponds quite well to S.: *de ni chos-la mi-rtog rnam-'byed ye-śes-la bten-nas 'thob* = "it (Buddhahood) is obtained by having recourse to non-discriminative and analytical knowledge in regard to the dharmas." See Ui's translation, p. 595: *shohō ni taisuru mufunbetsu to kenchaku to no chi ni eshi-suru koto ni yotte, tasserareru no de aru*.

85.14 *tatprayatnāḥ*: T. *de rtogs-pa = tatprapannāḥ*

88.11 *bālasārthātivāhanāt*: Tak. "toiling excessively for the company of ordinary beings." It is better to render *ativāhana* by "leading, guiding", cf. *BHSD* s.v. *ativāha*. Ui's translation is too literal and he has gone wrong in his interpretation of *sārtha*, p. 606: *bonbu o mokuteki kansei ni hakobu ga yue ni*.

89.13 *nityam āsaraṇānām ca śaraṇābhyupapattitāḥ*; Tak. "and he gives a refuge for those who have no shelter, because of these [10] points, he is 'eternal'." Ui interprets *nityam* in the same way, cf. p. 607: *soshite kiesho no nai hito-bito ni kie o keiyo-suru kara, butsu wa jōjū de aru*. It seems to me impossible to relate *nityam* n. to *lokanāthaḥ* in verse 62 (89.2). The eternity of the Buddha is explained by verse 68 (89.14-15). Both C. and T. relate *nityam* to *āsaraṇānām*, etc. T. *rtag-pa skyabs-med rnam-s-kyi ni || skyabs-la sogs-pa 'thad phyir-ro* /.

89.19 *upamānīrvṛttitāḥ*: T. has read *upamānīrvṛttitāḥ* (*dpe-las 'das-pa'i phyir*). This reading seems preferable.

92.11 *jñeye vastuni sarvathātmaparayor jñānāt svayaṃ jñāpanād*; Tak. "He himself knows and causes others to know all the things cognizable in all their forms." Tak. seems to relate *ātman* to *jñāna* and *para* to *jñāpana*. Also Ui has the same interpretation, p. 613: *ji to ta to no ni ni oite, mizukara shiru kara, ta ni shirashimeru kara*. However, T. relates *ātmaparayor* to *jñeye vastuni*: *bdag-gzan śes-byā'i dños-po rnam-kun śes dan śes-mdzad phyir*. Obermiller's translation ("He knows himself and makes known to others all the things cognizable in their forms") is improbable on account of the position of *bdag-gzan*. It is impossible to translate the Sanskrit text in this way because *svayaṃ* would duplicate *ātman*. Moreover, the caesura after *ātmaparayor* shows also that it is related to *jñeye vastuni*: "In regard to the things to be known completely by himself and others he himself knows and causes others to know."

93.6 *nopekṣāpratisaṁkhyāya*; Tak. "He is not indifferent, nor without consideration." Of course, one must understand: "He has no *apratisaṁkhyāyopekṣā*", cf. T *ma-brtags bñān-sñoms mi-mña'-ste*. *Apratisaṁkhyāya* is a gerund and not a BHS form for *-yāyām* (fem-loc.) as stated by Tak. See Ui's note (p. 615, n. 1) and his translation p. 615: *shichaku-sezu shite no sha no nai to*.

93.11 *svarasādhhyupekṣaṇam*; Tak. "indifference to one's own taste". *Svarasādhhyupekṣaṇam* (T. *ñān-gis gñān-sñoms*), literally "natural indifference", is a synonym of *apratisaṁkhyāyopekṣā*. See Ui's note (p. 615, n. 2) and his translation p. 615: *jinen no sha*. Tak.'s renderings of *svarasa* are not very adequate, cf. 44.13 *svarasayogena*, T. *rañ-gi ñān-gis*, Tak. "with its own essence"; 58.1 °*svarasavāhimārgajñāna*° (*svarasavāhin*, T. *rañ-gi ñān-gis 'jug-pa*). Tak. "the knowledge of the Path ... bearing its own taste". In both places C. translates well by "natural" (*tzū-jan*). *Svarasayogena* means "in its nature" and *svarasavāhimārgajñāna* "the knowledge of the path which proceeds naturally".

93.13 *muktijñānanidarśanāc ca*; Tak. "of the intuition of freedom". In a note Tak. remarks that T. om. *nidarśana* of *muktijñānanidarśana* (reading apparently '*vimuktijñānadarśanāt*'). However, T. has *grol-ba'i ye-śes las* (*muktijñānāt*). Both the Sanskrit text and the Tibetan translation are imperfect renderings of *muktijñānadarśanāt* (cf. 93.7) Metrical exigencies made it impossible for the Sanskrit text to repeat *vimuktijñānadarśanāt* and for T. to translate *darśana*. As one of the *āvenikabuddhadharmas* 'nāsti *vimuktijñānadarśanaparīhāṇiḥ* is mentioned in the *Dharmasaṃgraha*. However, it does not occur in other lists, cf. *Mahāvīyutpatti*, 136-153; *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra*, pp. 187-188. Its authenticity is guaranteed by the fact that it is listed in the *Daśasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, cf. Sten Konow, *The two first chapters of the Daśasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (Oslo, 1941), p. 43. As far as I know, there is no detailed study of these lists. References are given by L. de La Vallée Poussin, *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*, VII (Paris-Louvain, 1923), p. 67; Har Dayal, *The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature* (London, 1932), p. 326, n. 81; Ét. Lamotte, *La somme*

du grand Véhicule, Tome II (Louvain, 1939), p. 61*; *BHSD* s.v. *āveṇika*; *Mochizuki Shinkō's Bukkyō daijiten*, s.v. *jūhachi fūgūhō*, pp. 2361c-2366a.

97.11 *dvātriṃśal lakṣaṇāḥ kāye darśanāhlādakā guṇāḥ*; Tak. “the 32 marks are the properties, visible and causing delight in the body.” T. *mthoñ-na tshim-byed yon-tan gañ || sum-cu-rtsa-gñis zēs bya-ba ||* O. “The other 32 distinctive features, which, being perceived, arouse delight.” T.’s translation of *darśanāhlādakā* is correct. See also Ui’s translation, p. 619: *shin ni sonsuru sanjūnisō wa, kore o mireba kangī o ataeru shokudoku de atte*.

98.8-10 *kṛtsnam niṣpādyā yānam pravaraḡaḡaḡaḡajñānaratnasvagarbham puṇya-jñānārkaśmipravisṛtavipulānantamadhyāmarābham | buddhatvaṃ ... 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 Buddhahood, like space, pervading extensively and of neither limit nor middle ...” Tak. follows T. in making a break after *°raśmi* and in relating *puṇyajñānārkaśmi* to *yānam* and *pravisṛta°* to *buddhatvaṃ*. T. *yon-tan rin-chen mchog tshogs dañ-ldan ye-śes chu-mtsho bsod-nams ye-śes ñi-’od can || theg-pa ma-lus ñes-par bsgrubs-te mtha’-dañ-dbus med rgya-chen nam-mkha’ ltar khyab-pa || sañs-rgyas-ñid ...* C. relates *puṇya°...°bham* to *buddhatvaṃ*. 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.” Ui, also, does not split up *puṇya°...°bham* but relates it to *yānam* p. 620: *fukutoku to chie to no hi no hikari o sosogi, kōdai de, hen mo chū mo naki kokū no gotoki jō no subete o jōju-shita no de, ...* The impossibility of this interpretation is clearly shown by 99.9 *vipulānantamadhyatvād bodhir ākāśadhātuvāt*. A break after *°raśmi* is impossible because the rays of the sun of merit and wisdom cannot illuminate the Vehicle which is compared to an ocean but only the Buddhahood which is likened to the sky.

101.7-8 *svacittapratibhāso ’yam iti naivam pṛthagjanāḥ | jñānty atha ca tat teṣāṃ avandhyaṃ bimbadarśanam ||* 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 (*svacetasi*) when it is pure through faith etc. (*śrad-dhādivimale*) and developed by the virtues of faith, etc. (*śradhdhādiguṇabhāvitē*). [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 *bimbadarśanam* by “the vision of the image (of the Buddha)”. *Bimba* refers to the *nirmāṇakāya*, cf. 86.9.

101.17-18 *vaidūryasvacchabhūte manasi munipaticchāyādhigamane, citrāṇy utpādayanti pramuditamanasas tadvajjinasutāḥ ||* Tak. “Similarly, for obtaining the shadow of the Lord of Sages on their mind which is radiant like the Vaiḍūrya 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 *sems rab-skyed-par byed* (D.; P. *gśegs* instead of *sems*, a mistake due to the preceding *de-bzin*) and C. “they make vows to carry out different acts.” Johnston himself had read *cittāṇy utpādayanti* which was “corrected” by T. Chowdhury (p. ii). I propose to read *cittāṇy utpādayanti* which corresponds well to both C. and T.

102.6 *pūrvasūklānubhāvataḥ*; Tak. “owing to the previous, virtuous experiences”. Here as well as in 107.10 (*śubhānubhāvāt*; Tak. “of the pure experiences”) Tak. has mistaken *anubhāva* for *anubhava*.

102.7 *yatnasthānamanorūpavikalparahitā satī*; Tak. “[the divine drum], being apart from efforts, from a particular place, from forms of mind, and from thought-constructions.” Tak.’s translation is probably the result of the wrong interpretation by T.: *’bad dañ gnas dañ yid-gzugs dañ || rnam-par rtog-pa med*. It is clear from 102.14 (*yatnasthānaśarīracittarahitāḥ śābdah*; P. *’bad gnas lus dañ sems bral-ba’i || sgra*) that one has to translate as follows: “[the divine drum] which is free from thought-con-

structions as to effort, place, mind and matter”. Tak. equates *manorūpa* and *vikalpa* in 102.7 with *śarīra* and *citta* in 102.14, but *manas* and *rūpa* correspond to *citta* and *śarīra*. Perhaps one must translate *sthāna* by “pitch, tone”; C. (818b29) has “use, function” (*yung*).

102.10-11 *vyāpya buddhasvareṇaivam vibhur jagad aśeṣataḥ | dharmam diṣati bhavye-bhyo yatnādirahito ’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-bzin khyab-bdag ’bad-sogs-dañ || bral-dañ ’gro-ba ma-lus-pa || sañs-rgyas gsuñ-gis khyab-mdzad-de || skal-ldan rnams-la 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 Ui’s translation, p. 626: *butsu no koe no hibiki mo, hiroku, amasu tokoro mo naku, seken ni shūhen-shite, doryoku-nado o hanarete itemo, butsu ni narubeki mono-tō ni hō o shisetsu-suru no de aru*.

103.4 *asurādīparacakra°*; Tak. “the invasion of Asuras and others.” One must follow T.: *lha-ma-yin la-sogs-pa pha-rol-ghi tshogs*, O. “the Asuras and the other hosts of adversaries.” Ui translates *cakra* with “weapon” which is possible but less probable, p. 627: *ashura-tō no teki no buki*.

103.5 *asaṭkāmaratisukkhavivecanatayā*; Tak. “owing to its distinguishing bliss from the pleasure caused by evil enjoyment.” See *BHSD* s.v. *vivecayati*: “causes to abandon, dissuades from”. See Ui’s translation, p. 627: *fujitsunaru gokan no yokubō kiraku no raku kara hanareshimeru koto ni yori*.

104.2 *samādhicittārpaṇabhāvavācākam*: T. *tiñ-’dzin sems-gtod bsam-pa skul-byed ñid ||* = *samādhicittārpaṇabhāvavācākam*. This latter reading seems preferable.

104.3-6 *samāsato yat sukhakāraṇam divi kṣitāv anantāsv api lokadhātuṣu | aśeṣaloka-spharaṇāvabhāsanam praghoṣam āgamyā tad apy udāhṛtam ||* Tak. “In short, that which is the cause of bliss, in heaven, on earth, as well as in all the other numberless worlds, is the voice [of the Buddha] which manifests pervadingly in the world leaving no residue; and in respect to those points, thus it is illustrated.” T. *mdor-na ma-lus ’jig-rten khams-su yañ || lha dañ sa-gnas bde-ba’i rgyu gañ-yin || de ni ma-lus ’jig-rten khyab snañ-ba || dbyaṇis-ñid la ni rab-tu brten-par brjod ||*; O. “In short, that which is the cause of bliss, in all the regions of the world, the celestial and the earthly is said to have its foundation in the unique voice which pervades the whole of the world without exception.” Obermiller’s translation corresponds well to the Sanskrit text. For *āgamyā* see *BHSD* 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]”.

104.10 *aparicchinna°*; Tak. “without interruption”; rather “without limitation”.

106.14 *°śraddhānumānyād*; Tak. “because of their following the faith”. Tak.’s translation corresponds to T.: *dad-pa’i rjes-’brañs-nas*. Perhaps one must read *°śraddhānu-sārād*.

108.15-16 *saḍā sarvatra viṣṛte dharmadhātunabhasṭale | buddhasūrye vineyādrītan-nipāto yathārhatāḥ ||* Tak. remarks: “The readings ‘*viṣṛte*’ and ‘*buddhasūrye*’ are to be corrected into ‘*viṣṛto*’ and ‘*buddhasūryo*’, respectively. Also ‘*vineyādrī*’ should be changed into ‘*vineyādrau*’ (loc.) and be separated from ‘*tannipāto*’. So T., C. omit this verse.” There is no need to change this verse in this drastic way. T. corresponds to S.: *rtag-tu thams-cad-la khyab-pa || chos-dbyiñs nam-mkha’i dkyil-du ni || sañs-rgyas ñi-ma gdul-bya-yi || ri-la ji-ltar ’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 *yugapad gocarasthānām sarvābhiprāyapūraṇam | kurute nirvikalpo ’pi pṛthak cintāmaṇir yathā ||* Tak. “Just as the wishfulfilling gem, though itself is of no thought-construction, fulfills all desires of those living in the same region, separately”.

Tak. considers *yugapadgocarastha* as a compound. It seems preferable to relate *yugapad* to *kurute*: "Just as the wishing gem, without discriminations, fulfills simultaneously and separately the wishes of all who are in its reach". T. *ji-ltar yid-bzin nor-bu ni || rtog-pa med-kyan cig-car-du || spyod-yul-gnas-pa rnam-skyi ni || bsam-kun so-sor rdzogs-byed ltar ||*.

115.9 *maṇisaṃskṛtāni kanakakṣetrāṇi*; Tak. "golden lands, constructed by jewels"; preferable "adorned with jewels". T. renders *saṃskṛta* by *spras-pa*, not *spros-pa* as given by Tak. See Ui's translation, p. 642: *manishu ni kazarareta ōgon no kokudo o*.

116.10-11 *asty asau viṣayo 'cintyaḥ śakyaḥ prāptuṃ sa mādrśaiḥ | prāpta evaṃguṇaś cāsāv iti śraddhādhimuktitāḥ ||* Tak. "Indeed, as he is full of devotion and faith that there 'exists' this inconceivable sphere, that it '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* by '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) bdag-'dras thob (P. thos)-nus dan || thob-pa 'di-'dra'i yon-tan dan || ldan zes dad-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, and, having once attained it, becomes endowed with such properties." Also Ui relates *prāpta* to the wise man mentioned in the preceding verse; cf. p. 643: *soshite tasshita toki ni wa, kare wa kakuno gotoki moromoro no kudoku o uru to*. This translation is not possible because *asau* (which is not rendered in T.) can only refer to *viṣaya*.

117.7-8 *dhiyādhimuktyā kuśalopasaṃpadā samanvitā ye ...*; Tak. "Those intelligent people who are endowed with faith and accomplishment of virtues." Tak.'s interpretation corresponds to C. and T.: *gan-dag mos dge phun-sum-tshogs ldan blo ||* but, nevertheless, one must understand *dhiyā-adhimuktyā*: "Those who are endowed with intelligence, faith and the attainment of virtue." See Ui's translation, p. 645: *chi to shinge to o gushi, shuzen bugyō o guseru mono*.

117.18 *śāstaram ekaṃ jinaṃ uddiśadbhiḥ*. Tak. "who refer to the Lord as only Preceptor." See BHSD s.v. *uddiśyati*: "*uddiśyati* (= *uddiśati*; not recorded in this sense), recognizes: Divy. 191.3 (*mām ...*) *śāstaram uddiśyadbhir ...*, those who recognize me as teacher ..."

118.5 *yat svayam eva nītaṃ r̥ṣiṇā sūtraṃ vicāyaṃ na tat*; Tak. "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 *tasmān nābhinivēśadr̥ṣṭimaline tasmīn niveśyā matiḥ*; Tak. "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 *lobhagredhatayā*; Tak. notes that T. has *lābhagredhatayā* (P. *rñed-la brkam*). This reading must be adopted.

In the notes there are many references to the Tibetan text. Tak. has used only the Derge edition. In several cases P. gives a better reading. In some cases the interpretation of the Tibetan translation is not correct. Also quite a few misprints must be corrected. P. 146, n. 27: "For '*svalakṣaṇanūnatāni*', T. as if '*svalakṣaṇasyānugatāni*'". P. *ran-mtshan-ñid-kyis rjes-'brel-ba* corresponds to S. p. 148, n. 51: correct *yon-su* to *yoñs-su*. P. 149, n. 59: correct *ne-bar* to *ñe-bar*. P. 151, n. 74: correct *lal* to *bal*. P. 158, n. 25: correct *šen* to *žen*. P. 166, n. 15: correct *ñe-tshig* to *ñes-tshig*. P. 168, n. 29: correct *brol* to *bral*. P. 170, n. 43: correct *mtshan-par* to *mtshan-mar*. P. 176, n. 25: correct *cig-śes* to *cig-śos*. P. 179, n. 49: correct *gzugs-brñen* to *gzugs-brñan*. P. 183, n. 28: correct *gsād* to *gséd*. P. 184, n. 33: correct *thung* to *thug*. P. 185, n. 49: correct *bsñan* to *brñan*. P. 203, n. 31: read with P. *mun-pa bas kyan ches mun-pa |*

mun-pa nas mun-pa chen-por instead of *mun-pa-las kyan ches, mun-pa chen-por*. P. 209, n. 78: read with P. *gzun* instead of *bzun*; n. 82: correct *ston* to *stōn*. P. 216, n. 123: correct *drir* to *dri-ña*. P. 221, n. 162: *pratyupasthāpana* (not *pratyupasthāna*) corresponds exactly to T. *ñe-bar gnas-par byed-de*. P. 229, n. 225: read with P. *sgo-nas* instead of *sgo-la*. P. 241, n. 310: read with P. '*go-nad* instead of *ngo'i nad*. P. 254, n. 420: correct *sbyod* to *spyod*. P. 264, n. 491: T. does not omit *ākāra*; P. has *de-rnams* which has to be corrected to *de-rnam*. P. 270, n. 21: read with P. *zum* instead of *thum*. P. 272, n. 40: P. has *kun-tu dag-par*. P. 283, n. 115: correct *snin* to *sñin*. P. 294, n. 4: correct *tshas* to *tshad*. P. 295, n. 12: read with P. *ñes-par* instead of *ñe-bar*. P. 299, n. 42: *ñe-bar bzag* (D. *gzags*)-*pa* corresponds to *upasthāpita*, not to *upasthita*. P. 302, n. 63: correct '*phrol* to '*phro-la*. P. 304, n. 76: P. has *mthois*. P. 305, n. 4: correct *lam* to *lan*. P. 306, n. 12: correct *bgag-cag* to *bdag-chags*; n. 17: correct *spral-ba* to *sprul-pa*. P. 318, n. 35: correct *rjas* to *rdzas*. P. 319, n. 49: read with P. *dam-pa* instead of *dag-pa*. P. 322, n. 65: correct *bstan* to *brtan*. P. 326, n. 102: correct *gzugz* to *gzugs*. P. 328, n. 120: correct *ston* to *stōn*. P. 329, n. 133: read with P. '*khōr dgyes-rol-pa* instead of '*khōr-gyis dkyes-rol*. P. 339, n. 18: delete *go-cha*. P. 341, n. 36: correct *nam* to *ñams*. P. 344, n. 69: read with P. *ni* instead of *riñi*. P. 346, n. 95: correct *spu* to *spu*; n. 96: correct *mthor* to *mthon*. P. 357, n. 17: *sgom-pa* renders *bhāvita* P. 358, n. 30: read with P. *lha-bdag* instead of *lha-dag*; T. does not omit *marutām* which is rendered by *lha'i*. P. 362, n. 70: correct *gton* to *gtod*. P. 363, n. 77: correct *rtogs* to *gtogs*. P. 366, n. 110: read with P. *rdo-tshan* instead of *rdo-than*; n. 111: read with P. *sul* instead of *yul* (cf. Mahāvīyutpatti 5260). P. 381, n. 8: read with P. *spras* instead of *spros*; n. 13: *bsgom* renders *dhyāyēd* (115.17). P. 384, n. 33: correct *rje* to *rjes*. P. 386, n. 46: read with P. *rgyal-ba ston-pa* instead of *rgyal-pa'i bstan-pa*. P. 387, n. 63: correct *brtam* to *brkam*. P. 388, n. 71: correct *ñams* to *ñams* (so P.); n. 76: *bya-ba min* renders *acarāṇa*; *vadhācaraṇa* "the bad act of killing".

Due to a slip of the pen is the remark that *abudha* is Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit for Sanskrit *abuddha* (p. 155, n. 5; p. 158, n. 20). In note 417 (p. 254) *Catuḥśubha* must be corrected to *Catuḥstava* and *Minor Buddhist Works*, II, etc. to *Minor Buddhist Texts*, II, pp. 235-246, Roma, 1956. Misprints are rather numerous, especially in Sanskrit words. They will give no difficulties to specialists and it is superfluous to list them here.

The 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.

1 - 141	18 - 180	35 - 219	52 - 253	69 - 282
2 - 142	19 - 182	36 - 221	53 - 255	70 - 284
3 - 144	20 - 183	37 - 224	54 - 257	71 - 286
4 - 147	21 - 186	38 - 226	55 - 258	72 - 288
5 - 149	22 - 188	39 - 228	56 - 261	73 - 291
6 - 151	23 - 190	40 - 230	57 - 262	74 - 296
7 - 153	24 - 191	41 - 232	58 - 264	75 - 298
8 - 156	25 - 193	42 - 234	59 - 266	76 - 300
9 - 158	26 - 197	43 - 237	60 - 269	77 - 303
10 - 160	27 - 200	44 - 238	61 - 270	78 - 306
11 - 163	28 - 202	45 - 240	62 - 271	79 - 310
12 - 166	29 - 205	46 - 242	63 - 272	80 - 314
13 - 169	30 - 207	47 - 244	64 - 273	81 - 316
14 - 172	31 - 209	48 - 246	65 - 274	82 - 318
15 - 174	32 - 212	49 - 248	66 - 276	83 - 320
16 - 176	33 - 215	50 - 249	67 - 277	84 - 321
17 - 178	34 - 217	51 - 252	68 - 280	85 - 323

86 - 325	93 - 341	100 - 356	107 - 368	114 - 379
87 - 327	94 - 342	101 - 357	108 - 369	115 - 380
88 - 329	95 - 345	102 - 359	109 - 370	116 - 381
89 - 332	96 - 347	103 - 361	110 - 372	117 - 383
90 - 334	97 - 347	104 - 362	111 - 374	118 - 386
91 - 336	98 - 351	105 - 364	112 - 375	119 - 388
92 - 339	99 - 353	106 - 366	113 - 377	

A. N. U., Canberra

J. W. de Jong

Studies of Esoteric Buddhism and Tantrism (Mikkyō-gaku mikkyō-shi ronbunshū). In Commemoration of the 1,150th Anniversary of the Founding of Kōyasan. Kōyasan, Japan, Kōyasan University, 1965. 2 + 3 + 428 + 2 + 4 + 438 pp. 4,000 Yen.

The *Studies of Esoteric Buddhism and Tantrism* have been published to commemorate the fact that in 816 Kūkai (774-835) established a monastic centre at Mt. Kōya. Kōyasan has since become one of the most famous religious centres in Japan. Academic studies have been fostered actively since the foundation of the Kōyasan University eighty years ago. Important contributions to Buddhist studies have appeared in the *Mikkyō Kenkyū* (Tantric Studies) and the *Mikkyō Bunka* (Tantric Culture) published in Kōyasan respectively from 1918 to 1944 and from 1946 onwards. The many scholars both Japanese and non-Japanese who have contributed to this volume testify to the importance of Tantric studies. It is unfortunately impossible to enumerate the 47 articles in this volume. Among the contributors of the 19 articles in English, French and German are well-known scholars such as Professors Bailey, Lalou, Gonda, Conze and Wayman. The Japanese section contains 28 articles of which detailed English summaries are given (pp. 347-370 of the English section).

Japanese Tantrism¹ was introduced from China during the T'ang dynasty. Kūkai, 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 eight century by famous Indian masters such as Śubhakarasiṃha (637-735), 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*, II, 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.² 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: *kriyā*, *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

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.

² "Die Stellung der esoterischen Sekten Japans in der Geschichte der buddhistischen Überlieferung", *Ostasiatische Studien* (Berlin, 1959), pp. 81-84.

these, the *Guhyasamāja*, is a good example. Even non-Tantric texts were bowdlerized and amusing examples have been adduced by Professor Nakamura.³ 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 which explains why 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 in the present circumstances. For some time to come it will still be possible 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 historian of religions and a pupil of Joachim Wach Professor Kitagawa examines these two aspects of Kōbō Daishi and illuminates his significance as a "classical figure" of Japanese Buddhism.

Japanese Tantrism is still little known outside Japan. Very few Western specialists in the field of Tantric studies are able to read Japanese publications. This is much to be regretted because, even as concerns Indian Tantrism, more work is done in Japan than in the rest of the world. However, it does not seem likely that the number of Western specialists who read Japanese will increase rapidly. For this reason it would be very welcome if Japanese scholars would undertake to publish in English an introduction to Japanese Tantrism which would take into account the fact that many things which are self-evident for Japanese Buddhists need to be explained for foreign readers.⁴ A work of this kind would be extremely useful not only for Western specialists of Tantrism but also for historians of religions who have hitherto had to

³ "The influence of Confucian ethics on the Chinese translations of Buddhist Sutras", *Liebethal Festschrift* (Santiniketan, 1957), pp. 156-168; "Elegant Attitude on Sexual Matters", *Ways of Thinking of Eastern Peoples* (Hawaii, 1964), pp. 260-264.

⁴ For instance, the *History of Esoteric Buddhism (Himitsu bukkyō-shi)* by Toganoo Shōun (1881-1953), published in 1933, is an excellent introduction for Japanese readers but would have to be expanded and adapted for the English-speaking world.