

Chapter forty-four of the hundred-thousand chapters of the Ārya

Mahāratnakūṭa:

The **Ārya Ratnarāśivyākaraṇa*

First Bam po.

In Sanskrit: *Ārya Ratnarāśi nāma Mahāyāna-sūtra*

In Tibetan: *'Phags pa rin po che'i phung po zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*

Homage to all Buddhas and Bodhisattvas!

The English Translation: Chapter One

<The Śramaṇa>

I.1

Thus have I heard at one time the Blessed One was staying in Rājagṛha, on the Vulture Peak, together with a great assembly of monks consisting of eight thousand monks, and with sixteen thousand bodhisattvas¹ gathered from various buddhafiels, all of whom were like this: bound to only one more birth before [obtaining] unexcelled perfect awakening,² they had all obtained non-retrogressive tolerance [in the path].³

¹ Chinese adds Mahāsattvas.

² The phrasing in KP §0 is almost identical: “Thus I heard at one time the Blessed One was staying in Rājagṛha, on the Vulture Peak, together with a large group of monks, eight thousand monks, and with sixteen thousand bodhisattvas gathered from various buddhafiels, bound by [only] one [more] birth, that is to say, until unexcelled perfect awakening.” *evam mayā śrutam ekasmiṃ samaye bhagavāṃn rājagṛhe viharati sma / gr̥ddhakūṭe parvate mahatā bhikṣusaṃghena sārddham aṣṭābhir bhikṣusahasraiḥ ṣoḍaśabhiś ca bodhisatvasahasraiḥ nānābuddhakṣestrasaṃnipatītaiḥ ekajātīprabaddhair yad utānutara-syām samyaksambodhau /*. I have translated the opening stock phrase in accord with my understanding of the syntax, or rather of one possible understanding, namely that the specification “at one time” is to be taken with both the verbal expression “heard” and with the verbal expression “was staying.” See Silk 1989.

³ See SP 259.12-13: *gaṅgānādivālukāsamās ca sattvā anuttarāyām samyaksambodhau cittam utpādayisyanty avaiṣvartikakṣāntipratilabdhas ca bhaviṣyanti /*, the last part of which is rendered in Tibetan as *phyir mi ldog pa'i bzod pa yang thob par 'gyur ro //*. Edgerton (BHSD s.v. kṣānti) rendered the expression: “and will become possessed of the intellectual receptivity of non-returners.” But I doubt whether *avaiṣvartika* is a substantive; as far as I can tell, it is used generally as an adjective or attributive. That is, it means “non-retrogressive” (or irreversible), or refers to non-retrogression or the state of non-retrogression, but not directly to those who are in this state, the non-returners. Burnouf 1852: 157 renders it adjectivally: “des créatures en nombre égal à celui des sables du Gange, concevront celle de l'état de Buddha parfaitement accompli, et elles obtiendront la patience qui ne se détourne pas du but.” Lamotte 1975: 120, n. 5 refers to this phrase, which he understands to mean “en possession d'une conviction sans recul.”

It is perhaps unlikely but not completely impossible that we should understand the phrase to mean “the tolerance of [or: which characterizes] the [stage of] non-retrogression,” that is, as a reference to the “Immovable” stage in the Bodhisattva path. (This is usually the eighth, but is the seventh, for example, in the *Avatamsaka*). The “tolerance of the non-arisal of things,” *anutpattikadharmakṣānti*, is the defining characteristic of this stage in the path. On *avaiṣvartika* see Lamotte 1976: 1803-07, Lamotte 1975: 208, n. 209, and Conze 1975: 388ff.

I.2

Then the Reverend Mahākāśyapa spoke thus to the Blessed One: “Blessed One. You often use the word ‘śramaṇa.’ In what sense do you use the word ‘śramaṇa?’”¹ When he had spoken thus, the Blessed One addressed these words to the Reverend Mahākāśyapa: “Kāśyapa, as for the word ‘śramaṇa,’ since [a śramaṇa is]:

- 1) Pacified, and
- 2) Restrained, and

The Chinese of the *Ratnarāsi* seems to refer to a reading something like **avaivartikair anuttarāyām samyaksambodhau ekajātipratibaddhaiḥ* /. The link here between *avaivartika* and *anuttarasamyaksambodhi* is clear from 於, non-retrogressive “with regard to” *anuttarasamyaksambodhi*.

In the Dbh (Kondō 1.9-10) we find a similar formulation of the opening cliché: *mahatā bodhisattvagaṇena sārđham sarvair avaivartikair ekajātipratibaddhair yad utānuttarāyām samyaksambodhau* /.

¹ Exactly the same expression is found at KP §121: *śramaṇa śramaṇa iti kāśyapa ucyate / kiyan nu tāvat kāśyapa śramaṇa śramaṇa ity ucyate* /. Weller 1965: 131 rendered this “Wird . . . ein Religioser als Religioser bezeichnet.” The word *śramaṇa* may indeed be intended here as a nominative form, or even perhaps in the example from the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, a case-less stem form (although it could also be a plain nominative, with loss of final sandhi *ś* before *ś*). The only other possibility to imagine would be a vocative, which is to say the least unlikely. Be that as it may, there is certainly no syntactic relation between the two instances of *śramaṇa* (as Weller for instance understood, “x as y”). The argument that we should understand the terms as nominatives can be made on several grounds. Renou 1975 §224 has stated in his discussion of vocatives “En présence de *iti*, la notion d’appel passe en retrait et le nomin. apparaît presque toujours.” See also Speyer 1886 §498 on nominatives with *iti*. We also have a nearly perfect parallel in MN i.271,11 = 281,5: *samaṇā samaṇā ti vo bhikkhave jano sañjānāti*, where it is clear that we have plural nominatives. An interesting interpretation is found in the *Ekottarāgama* parallel T. 125 (49.8) (II) 801c15-16: “All the people refer to you as śramaṇas” 諸人民皆稱汝等為沙門. (Compare also *Madhyamāgama* T. 26 [182] [I] 724c20.) See also Śikṣ 263.1 = BCAP 588.14-15 *tathatā tathateti kulaputra sūnyatāyā etad adhivacanam*. (We might also point to the constant usage in the *Vajracchedikā* [Schopen 1989b: 103], for instance, of expressions such as: *kṣetravyūhāḥ kṣetravyūhā iti subhūte avyūhās te tathāgatena bhāṣitās tenocyante kṣetravyūhā iti* /.) It is plain that Weller’s understanding is to be rejected, and the repetition attributed to the intention of emphasizing the word. The Sanskrit may be intended to reflect a general statement: people generally use the word ‘śramaṇa,’ and so on, but it seems possible that the Tibetan translators understood the object of the question to be the use of the word by Buddha himself, which they marked with the use of an honorific verb, *bgyi*.

- 3) Noble blooded,¹ and
- 4) One who has purified the constituent elements of morality,² and
- 5) One who knows the entrance into trance,³

I use the word 'śramaṇa';⁴ and [he is]:

- 6) One who possesses wisdom, and
- 7) One who devotes himself to the heart of liberation,⁵ and
- 8) One who is free from doubt regarding the three doors to liberation, and does not give way to uncertainty,⁶ and
- 9) One who dwells in the realm of the saints,⁷ and

¹ Probably items 1, 2, and 3 are *śānta*, *dānta* and *ājanya*. They occur together in KP §153: *dāntaśāntājāneyakuśalaśilpasuniṣṭhitā* [correct from *dāntā*^o with Weller 1965a: 154 (6)]. The Chinese in the *Ratnarāsi* has translated *ājanya* as 受教, which is not one of the usual renderings and may be based on some understanding of *ā* √ *jñā* as "taught." [Note T. 783 (XVII) 720c4. Kāśyapa says to the Buddha: 世尊。唯然受教, "Blessed One, please instruct me." See also T. 670 (XVI) 513c11.] The standard Tibetan translation is based on a (mis-)understanding of the term as connected with the root √ *jñā* when it renders *cang* (= *ci yang*) *shes pa*. But note that the Dunhuang text of the *Ratnarāsi* has rendered *bka' nyan*, "obedient." The word has been discussed in detail by Edgerton BHSD s.v. *ājanya*. To this one may add a reference to the remarks of John Brough 1962: 234 (note to GDhp 173), and for the term in Jaina Prakrit one may refer to Caillat 1985. The entries in Wogihara's Sanskrit-Chinese dictionary (1978: 185b) illuminate some possible confusions. Wogihara cites 調, 易調, 調伏, 調順可化, 善順之相 and others, but a glance at his entries for *dānta* (576b), which are remarkably similar, suggests that especially in this case the correct identifications of the Chinese terms with corresponding Sanskrit terms may not always be easy. [Compare also Wogihara 1978 s.v. *karmanya*.] More investigation is necessary.

² **śilaskandhapariśuddha*? See *Aṣṭa* page 805.15 et seq. See BHSD s.v. *skandha* 3, and PTSD s.v. *śīla*. See Mv ii.353.20, and the *Śrāmaṇyaphalasūtra*. The term for *śīla-skandha* in Chinese 戒身 is termed "archaic" by Lancaster 1968: 383, who refers to its appearance in T 225 (VIII) 486a27, which corresponds to *Aṣṭa* (Wogihara) 327.8. The term here probably refers to one member of a set: *śīla-skandhaḥ*, *samādhi*^o, *prajñā*^o, *vimukti*^o, and *vimuktijñānadarsana*^o. See Oda 1917: 164c.

³ **samādhipraveśa* (-*praviṣṭa*).

⁴ **śramaṇa itī*

⁵ Chinese, agreeing with the Dunhuang Tibetan manuscript: "One who understands things as they truly are and [so] obtains liberation."

⁶ The expression "does not give way to uncertainty" is missing in Chinese. The technical terms here are probably **kāṅkṣā* and *saṁśaya*. The same Tibetan translation equivalents are found for the two terms at SP 49.1

⁷ **āryagocara*. Chinese: one who is fixed in those practices practiced by the saints / nobles.

- 10) One who dwells in the four applications of mindfulness,¹ and
- 11) One who dwells in the four exertions,² and
- 12) One who has cultivated the cultivation of the four bases of magical power,³ and
- 13) One who possesses the faculty of faith,⁴ and
- 14) One who has indissoluble faith⁵ in the Buddha, and
- 15) One who has indissoluble faith in the Teaching, and
- 16) One who has indissoluble faith in the Saṃgha,⁶ and
- 17) One who, because he knows the Buddha, the Teaching and the Saṃgha, possesses faith,⁷ and
- 18) One who possesses knowledge which acquiescent to others,⁸ and
- 19) One who has put forth effort with respect to good Dharmas,⁹ and
- 20) One who has conquered existence, and
- 21) One who is set out,¹⁰ and

¹ **catusmṛtyupasthāna*, or perhaps *catvāri smṛtyupasthānāni*. Chinese instead of “dwell” has “cultivates well.” After this Chinese has another item: “One who is free of all bad dharmas.”

² **catvāri samyakprahāṇāni*. See Gómez and Silk 1989: 87, n. 44, on the term *prahāṇa*.

³ **ṛddhipāda*

⁴ **śraddhendriya*. Chinese rather than “possesses” has “perfects.”

⁵ **abhedyaprasāda* Mhy. 6824. See Dbh (Kondo 1936: 68.6; Rahder 1926: 38.10-11; verse version at Kondo 75.7; Rahder & Susa 1931-32: 351.7; translation in Tatsuyama 1938: 85 and 93), where the second of the ten qualities which matures wisdom is *triratnābhedyaprasādaniṣṭhāgamanatā*, “the state of arriving at perfection of indissoluble faith in the three jewels.”

⁶ The three items 14, 15, 16 are considered as one in Chinese.

⁷ Chinese: “One who perfects firm faith in....”

⁸ **aparapraṇeya* / **pratyaya*. It may also mean “not dependent on others.” Chinese: “One who does not have faith in the teachings of other schools.” Mhy. 2396 has *aparapratyaya* and 2398 *aparapraṇeya*, the Tibetan for both the same. The term *aparapraṇeyatā* appears in the Aṣṭa Mitra 398, Wogihara 788.19-20. See #49, below.

⁹ **vīryam ārabhate*. Chinese: “who endeavors to be free of all defilements.”

¹⁰ **saṃprasthita*. This probably means “who is set out in the Mahāyāna.” Chinese has for 20-21: “one who well cultivates the seven limbs of awakening and is free of all non-good; in accord with reality he cultivates all good dharmas.”

- 22) Mindful and skillful in [maintaining] constant attention,¹ and
 23) Of single-pointed mind,² and
 24) Wise in insight³ due to his wisdom, and
 25) One who possesses the five powers, and
 26) One who is not crushed by all the defilements,⁴ and
 27) One who contemplates⁵ the seven limbs of awakening, and
 28) One who is wise in knowing the basis of [all] things,⁶ and
 29) One who knows the path,⁷ and
 30) One who is wise with regard to the path,⁸ and
 31) One who has correct views,⁹ and
 32) One who is correct in meditation,¹⁰ and
 33) One who is wise in the cultivation of calming and insight,¹¹ and

¹ **smṛta* / *smṛti* and *saṃprajanya* / *saṃprajāna*. The pair of terms is very common in Pāli and Sanskrit. For references see BHSD s.v. *smṛta*, *smṛti*, *smṛtimant*, *saṃprajanya*, *saṃprajāna*.

² Chinese: “one who is single-minded [in attention to] all good dharmas.”

³ **vipāśyanā*.

⁴ Mhy. 5199 *anavamardanīya*. See BHSD s.v. Chinese has here “confused” for “crushed.” Compare the passage in the *Gaṇḍavyūha* (Suzuki and Idzumi 1949: 430.16-18, quoted also in *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 123.4-5): “You, gentle son, should be zealous to make the city of the mind difficult to conquer, difficult to approach, by being uncrushable by all the defilements, the hosts of Māra, evil friends, the circle (?) of Māra.” *cittanagaraduryodhanadurāsadatābhinirhāraprayuktena te kulaputra bhavitavyam sarva-kleśamārahāyikapāpamitramāracakrānavamṛdyatayā*. (Kajiyama et al. 1994: II.259, *māracakra* = 魔の軍勢, the hosts of Māra.)

⁵ Chinese: cultivates.

⁶ Basis is probably **āśraya*, and may well mean, with Chinese, “cause.” I insert “[all]” also on the basis of the Chinese.

⁷ **mārgajñāna*. Mhy. 1241. One technical definition is given by Yaśomitra, quoted by La Vallée Poussin in *Kośa* vii.13, note 3 (ad VII.8). Compare the expression *mārgāmargeṣu kovida* in *Uv.* 33.33b = *Dhp* 403, knowing / wise with respect to what is the proper and improper path.

⁸ See Mhy. 441 *mārgavid* = *Iam mkhyen pa*. Chinese combines 29-30: “skillful in knowing well the noble path.”

⁹ **samyakdrṣṭi*

¹⁰ **samyaksamādhi*

¹¹ Chinese combines 31-33: “skillful in knowing well correct views and correct meditation.” Calming and insight are of course *śamatha* and *vipāśyanā*.

- 34) One who possesses knowledge of the four special knowledges not acquiescent to others,¹ and
- 35) One who relies on the meaning and not on the letter,² and
- 36) One who relies on wisdom and not on discursive knowledge and
- 37) One who relies on the sūtras of explicit meaning, and not on the sūtras of implicit meaning, and
- 38) One who relies on the Teaching and not on persons, and
- 39) One who has completely passed beyond the paths of the four Māras,³ and
- 40) The protector who knows well the aggregates (?),⁴ and
- 41) One who has cleared up his defilements,⁵ and
- 42) One who has obtained his final body,⁶ and

¹ “Special knowledges” renders **pratisamvid*. These are the special qualities of a preacher of the teaching: 1) knowing the meaning of what is to be expounded, 2) knowing the text, 3) knowing etymology, and 4) having eloquence. See BHSD s.v. for references, and Childers 1909: 366 for a lucid discussion. Chinese seems to understand this item # 34 causally as follows: “Obtaining the four special knowledges, one does not have faith in other teachings.” See #18 above. I do not really understand “not acquiescent to others.”

² Mhy. 1546: *arthapratisaraṇena bhavitavyaṃ na vyañjanapratisaraṇena*. On this and the following three items, see La Vallée Poussin’s elaborate note in AKB ix.246 n. 2, and for additional references BHSD s.v. *pratisaraṇa*. See also Lamotte 1962: 380, note 23, and 1944-80: 536ff., and notes. The items are, in Mhy. 1548, 1549, 1547: *jñānapratisaraṇena bhavitavyaṃ na vijñānapratisaraṇena; nītārthasūtrapratisaraṇena bhavitavyaṃ na neyārthasūtrapratisaraṇena; dharmapratisaraṇena bhavitavyaṃ na puḍgalapratisaraṇena*. Chinese has all four items as one item in the list.

³ I think our text corresponds to the terminology found in Gv. 472.15-16: *caturmārapathasamati-kṛānta*^o. BHSD s.v. *Māra* lists the four Māras as *Kleśa-māra*, *Skandha-*, *Mṛtyu-* and *Devaputra-*. See Childers 1909 s.v. *Māro*, Wayman 1959: 112ff, and more recently Fussman 1977.

⁴ I cannot understand the Tibetan. Chinese has: “One who knows well the five aggregates.” Could Tibetan mean “one who preserves the perfect knowledge of the aggregates”? What would that mean? *yongs su shes pa = parijñā* at Mhy. 6910.

⁵ **(saṃ)kleśa-apanīta*?

⁶ Although the terminology is a little non-standard, I think we have to do here with the *carama-bhavika*, the final body obtained before awakening. Mhy 7003 gives *carama-bhavika* as equivalent to *srid pa tha ma <la> pa*, whereas the *Ratnarāsi* reads *tha ma’i lus ’dzin pa*. The standard terminology seems to be closer to that of the AKB (Hirakawa 1973: 155), namely *srid pa tha ma pa*. The term has been discussed by Dantinne 1983: 172-74, but I wonder whether his references to the Abhidharmic literature are necessarily relevant. In brief, it appears that the term can refer to either the last body obtained before

- 43) One who has completely passed over the ways of death,¹ and
 44) One who completely and thoroughly understands suffering,² and
 45) One who rejects all causes of suffering,³ and
 46) One who dwells in the realization of the destruction [of suffering],⁴ and
 47) One who follows the yogic practice of cultivating the path [leading to the destruction of suffering],⁵ and
 48) One who sees the four noble truths, and
 49) One who is not acquiescent to others,⁶ and
 50) One who has done his duty with respect to the Teacher's

buddhahood, or that obtained before arhat-hood. See the references in BHSD s.v. *cārama-bhavika*. Divy 174.1-2 reads: *asthānam anavakāśo yac caramabhavikaḥ sattvo 'samprāpte viśeṣādhiḡame so 'ntarā kālam kuryāt*. Chen 1947:254, n. 17 renders this "It is impossible that a being in his last state of existence should die before obtaining special attainments." He cites the Tibetan as: *srid pa tha ma pa 'i sems can zag pa zad pa ma thob par bar ma dor rgyun chad cing dus byed par 'gyur ba ni gnas ma yin skabs ma yin te*, which he renders "It is impossible for a being in his last state of existence to die and cut off the stream of life before he had obtained the destruction of the āśravas [*sic*]."

¹ **mṛtyupatha-samatikrānta?* Chinese: "free from all the ways of samsāra."

² **duḡkham [samyak?] pariññātam*. Mhy. 1321 gives only *sdug bsgal yongs su shes = duḡkham pariññātam*. Chinese has here: free of all 愛 = *trṣṇā?*

On *pariññā(ta)*, see Tatia 1983. As Tatia points out, the term originally meant "counsel of wisdom" or "discrimination between good and evil." Later it came to mean "abstinence from sinful activities." Depending on the date of a given text and its background, then, the term might imply either understanding of suffering or its removal. In Pāli we find the stock phrase (e.g., SN iv.51,5; v.6,26-27 etc.): *dukkhassa kho āvuso pariññātam bhagavati brahmacariyaṃ vussati*. "Truly, Venerables, one lives carrying out the practice of purity under the Blessed One for the sake of understanding suffering." The rendering of *pariññā* here as "understanding" is supported by *Samyuktāgama* 114 (T. 99 [II] 38b3, parallel to SN iv.51,5, which renders the phrase 我爲知苦故.

³ **sarvasamudayaḥ prahīṇaḥ*. Mhy. 1322 does not include the term "all," **sarva*, but is otherwise identical.

⁴ **nirodhaḥ sāḡṣātkṛtaḥ*. Mhy. 1323 is a little different. It has *'gog pa mngon du byas = nirodhaḥ sāḡṣātkṛtaḥ*. I do not know to what Sanskrit term "dwells," *zhugs pa*, corresponds.

⁵ It is evident from the context that we have here the final member of the formula of the "Four Noble Truths." However, the terminology is non-standard. Mhy 1324 gives *sdug bsgal 'gog pa(r) 'gyur ba 'i lam bsgoms = duḡkhanirodhagāminīpratipad (bhāvitā)*. The latter part of the phrase in the *Ratnarāsi* may reflect some form of **yoga-anuḡgam* or *yoga-anuprāḡviś*. Chinese has combined 44-47 into one item.

⁶ See #18 above, and note.

teachings,¹ and

- 51) One who has done what is to be done,² and
 52) One who has destroyed the depravities,³ and
 53) One who contemplates the eight liberations,⁴ and
 54) One who is greeted by Śakra, Brahmā and the world protectors,⁵
 and
 55) One who has a store of former practice and mental disposition,⁶
 and
 56) One who delights in dwelling in the wilderness,⁷ and
 57) One who dwells in the saintly attitudes,⁸ and

¹ *śāstuh śāsana ... kṛtakṛtya. See Mhy 2435 and 1082. Here Chinese has evidently divided the Indic original differently. The phrase “with respect to the Teacher’s teachings” is included by Chinese in the previous item: “with respect to the Buddha’s teaching, he does not have faith in other paths.”

² *kṛtakaraṇīyah. Mhy 1083. This item is either not included by Chinese or combined with the preceding item. I do not know what the difference is between kṛtakṛtya and kṛtakaraṇīya.

³ *kṣīṇāsrava.

⁴ *aṣṭavimokṣadhyaṇin? SP 180.1 in the edition of Kern and Nanjio is printed as aṣṭavimokṣadhyaṇīnaḥ, with a note that the manuscripts read °vimokṣā°. Edgerton BHSD s.v. vimokṣa rejected the emendation and proposed to read with the manuscripts. However, the printed edition’s °vimokṣa° is also found in the Gilgit text. (Kashgar reads aṣṭavimokṣaprāptāḥ.) KP §83 has na tv evāṣṭavimokṣadhyaṇīṣv arhāṣu = āgra bcom pa rnam par thar pa brgyad la bsam gtan pa de dag la ma yin no: “while not at all (even) in Arhats who have attained the concentration on the eight liberations.”

⁵ I have not yet tracked down a reference. Chinese has “praised” instead of “greeted” (praty-udgam?).

⁶ See SP 46.5, cited by BHSD s.v. sampadā: te āśayasampadāya viśuddharūpāya samanvitā bhūti, translated by Edgerton “they were endowed with a rich store of mental disposition that was pure in form.” Probably the term “former practice” is related to the Sanskrit pūrvacaryā. The LSV §9 verse 7 has sngon gyi spyod pa translating purimacari. Chinese: “one who from the beginning has practiced the way single-mindedly.”

⁷ *aranyavāsābhirati. In KP §25 the Tibetan translation and the commentary of *Sthiramati read: gus par byas te dgon pa la gnas par mngon par dga’ ba dang, which in the extant Indic text corresponds only to satkṛtyāranyavāsah, without the term abhirati occurring. The latter (i.e., mngon par dga’ ba) also is absent in the Mahāyānasamgraha quotation of this passage (II.34A.24; Nagao 1982: 104 for the text, translated at 427).

⁸ See KP §6 for āryavaṃsa. The Sanskrit equivalent for the Tibetan and Chinese translations is certain, but the meaning is less clear. See BHSD s.v., and CPD s.v. ariya-vaṃsa. I follow Edgerton BHSD in translating “attitudes,” thought this is far from etymological, since I think this is a good way of describing what the CPD (loc. cit.) calls the “fourfold traditional practices.” These are: being content with the

- 58) One who dwells in the dhuta ascetic purification practices,¹ and
 59) One whose intelligence is free from distortion², and
 60) One who having gone forth does not mix with the home
 dwellers,³ and
 61) One who wanders alone like a rhinoceros,⁴ and
 62) One who is scared by garrulous association with others, and
 63) One who is liberated from the three worlds,⁵ and
 64) One who is always fearfully aware [of the three worlds],⁶ and
 65) One who dwells in the practice of the perfect śramaṇa, and
 66) One who does not desire anything, and
 67) One who is completely free from the eight conditions of the world
 [namely]: gain and non-gain, fame and non-fame, happiness and

robes one has, the alms one receives, the sleeping accommodations one has, and delighting in meditation.

¹ *dhutaḡaṇa.

² Conze 1967 notes that in *Suvikra* (Hikata 1958: 60.2) *gya gyu med pa* represents *akuṭila*; the same is found in the LSV according to Inagaki 1984: 14 (LSV §38d, Kagawa 1984: 296.15). It is also possible we have to do with *a(vi)kampyacitta, as at Mhy. 5198 or Bbh 240.4, 251.1, but this is less likely. Chinese has: “whose mind is not inverted.”

³ Chinese has “does not closely associate with groups of renunciants or householders.” The same idea as that found here in the Tibetan seems to be expressed in the RP 12.16-13.1 (a passage which is in the Han translation): “A bodhisattva, Rāṣṭrapāla, must be disinterested in the home life. Having gone forth, a bodhisattva, Rāṣṭrapāla, must be disinterested in gains and honors.” *grhāvāsād rāṣṭrapāla bodhisatvenāna-peḡṣeṇa bhavitavyam / pravrajitvā rāṣṭrapāla bodhisatvena lābhasatkārād anapeḡṣeṇa bhavitavyam /*. For an understanding in line with that taken by the Chinese text, see below I.4 (10, 11), and the note there.

⁴ We have here to do with a famous cliché, discussed by Edgerton BHSD s.v. *khadga-viṣāṇa*. See RP 13.7: *ekācarī viharanti khadgavimālāḡ śuddhāsayā nirmalāḡ = bse ltar gcig pur gnas shing bsam pa dri med dag la dri ma bral*. (This is quoted in *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 196.4 with *sadrśāḡ* in place of *vimāla*.) RP 16.7: “He wanders alone just like a rhinoceros, and moreover is not frightened, just like a lion.” *eka viharati yathaiva khadgo na ca punar uttrasate yathaiva simhaḡ = dper na bse ltar gcig pu gnas byed cing // seng ge lta bur 'jigs pa yod ma yin //*. Edgerton gives further references to many other passages. As he points out as well, the reference is not to the horn of the animal, though it is a single, as it were lonely, horn, but to the habit of the rhinoceros to wander alone. The Chinese translation of the *Ratnarāṣi*, however, renders: “whose mind delights in wandering alone like a rhinoceros horn.” The use of this image in comparisons to the lone buddha, the *pratyekabuddha*, is common.

⁵ Chinese appears to have, corresponding to this: “one delights in dwelling in solitary places.”

⁶ The interpolation in brackets is uncertain and based upon the Chinese, which has: “One is always fearful of the three worlds.”

- suffering, praise and blame,¹ and
- 68) One who dwells having produced² a mind [firm] like the earth,
and
- 69) One who defends self and others, and
- 70) One who is without transgression,³ and
- 71) One who is without mental disturbance,⁴ and
- 72) One who lives rightly, and
- 73) One who dwells having attained a mind [clear and vast] like the
sky,⁵ and
- 74) One whose mind is unobstructed with regard to all appearances, as
for example a hand is unobstructed in the sky.⁶

Kāśyapa, if one possesses such qualities as these, characteristic of a śramaṇa, one may say his a 'śramaṇa.'”

¹ The eight *lokadharmāḥ* are given in Mhy. 2341-48: *lābha, alābha, yaśa, ayaśa, nindā, praśamsā, sukha, duḥkha*. The same set is found in Pāli, for example DN iii.260,6-7. See *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 180.1-2, quoting the *Ugradattapariprcchā*: “Again, householder, the householder bodhisattva must be free from attachment and repulsion, unsmearred by the eight conditions of the world.” *punar aparaṃ grhapate grhinā bodhisatvenānūyapratighāpagatena bhavitavyam aṣṭalokadharmānanuliptena*.

² **upa-saṃ* | *hr*.

³ Mhy. 4545 *avyabhicārī*.

⁴ KP §93 *khrug pa med pa = nirupāyāsa*. BHSD s.v *upāyāsa*. Chinese has for this and the previous item: “who is unstained.”

⁵ It is not exactly clear how this comparison of the mind with the sky is to be understood. We find the following comparison at Thag 1156 (trans. Norman 1969): “This mind, well-concentrated inside, is like the sky.” *tad ākāśasamaṃ cittam ajjhataṃ susamāhitam*. Another example is found in KP §99 in which the mind is again compared to the sky, this time in a negative sense: the mind is defiled by adventitious defilements (*āgantukakleśa*) just like the sky is filled with smoke and, as we would say, smog. See also Mori 1987: 254. I follow, nevertheless, Luis Gómez’s suggestion that here the comparison indicates the vastness and clarity of an, as it were, endless sky.

⁶ The sky is a common object of comparison for non-obstruction. See Mori 1987: 522-23.

I.3

Then the Reverend Mahākāśyapa spoke thus to the Blessed One: “Blessed One. It is marvellous¹ that these merits of the perfect śramaṇa were taught by the Tathāgata, Arhat, Perfectly Awakened Buddha, Blessed One in this way. Blessed One. In the future will there arise those monks who destroy the Tathāgata’s awakening perfected over uncountable aeons, who are not śramaṇas but will falsely claim to be śramaṇas, who are not followers of the practice of purity but will falsely claim to be followers of the practice of purity?” The Blessed One said: “Kāśyapa, after I and you and also these great auditors have entered final nirvāṇa, and after these bodhisattvas have also dispersed to other buddhafiels,² the complete destruction of this teaching will be indescribable in words.³ Then, Kāśyapa, there will arise some monks who will not contemplate the body, will not contemplate the precepts, will not contemplate the mind, will not contemplate wisdom,⁴ will be poor fools,⁵ imbeciles, confused,⁶ not calmed,⁷ undisci-

¹ The Tibetan has *ngo mthar*, and the Chinese 未曾有. It is impossible to say whether these both go back to one and the same word; they are both good, attested translations of either *adbhuta* or *āścārya*. These words are quite often used together, in both Pāli and Sanskrit literature. See CPD s.v. *abbhuta*, and for example VKN VI §13, 2, quoted in Sanskrit at *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 269.12: ... *iyam dvitīya āścaryādbhuto dharmah* (Tibetan in Ōshika 62,32: *de ni ngo mthar rmad du byung ba’i chos gnyis pa’o*). Anyway, both terms mean more or less the same thing.

² Note that the bodhisattvas do not go to Nirvāṇa, but rather to other buddhafiels to carry on their work.

³ In Chinese the order of clauses differs significantly: “The crime of such a destruction of the Tathāgata’s bodhi is inexhaustible. Kāśyapa. After I enter nirvāṇa and after you and the other great disciples also all enter nirvāṇa, and all the great bodhisattvas of the world go to buddha worlds of other directions, then in my teaching there will be monks who are mentally very confused about all the practices” The following sentences of the section are also found in an order which differs from that in the Tibetan, but this difference does not seem to affect the meaning as much.

⁴ See Pras 6D [ed. and trans. Harrison 1978, 1990] for future monks who “have not cultivated their bodies, not cultivated their minds, not cultivated morality, not cultivated wisdom.” *lus ma bsgoms pa / sems ma bsgoms pa / tshul khrims ma bsgoms pa / shes rab ma bsgoms pa*. In KP §137, *shes rab sgom pa = prajñābhāvanā*.

⁵ Chinese has **bāla* as “small child,” Tibetan as “fool.”

⁶ Chinese: “turning into darkness.”

⁷ See Weller 1965: 141 (6), and his reference to the KP commentary (Staël-Holstein 1933): 235.15

plined. I will [now] describe their deceit, guile, dishonesty, intrigues, the impurity of the monk, and the offences of the monk.

I.4

“In that regard, Kāśyapa, what are the impurities of the śramaṇa? The following thirty-two items,¹ Kāśyapa, are the impurities of the śramaṇa,² and if he abandons them one may say he is a ‘śramaṇa.’ What are the thirty-two?

- 1) Focus on physical desire is the impurity of the śramaṇa,³ and
- 2) Focus on malicious thoughts is the impurity of the śramaṇa,⁴ and
- 3) Focus on harming [others] is the impurity of the śramaṇa,⁵ and
- 4) Praising oneself is the impurity of the śramaṇa, and
- 5) Despising others is the impurity of the śramaṇa,⁶ and
- 6) Seeking all around for improper possessions is the impurity of the śramaṇa, and
- 7) The desire [to obtain] a possession [by referring to] possessions [obtained from others] is the impurity of the śramaṇa,⁷ and

ff.

¹ Actually, the Tibetan translation has thirty-three items, although the Chinese preserves only thirty-two.

² KP §114 gives two impurities of the renunciant, *pravrajitasya malau*.

³ *kāmavitarka*. The series of this and the next two terms appears below in *Ratnarāśi* V.6. The set is in fact canonical; see, for example, DN iii.226,13 ff., and PTC s.v. *kāmavitarka* for further examples. In Sanskrit see *Aṣṭa* quoted in *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 39.15 = *Mitra* 520 = *Wogihara* 981.10-11: *na kāmavitarkam utpādayāmāsa na vyāpādavitarkam na vihiṃsāvitarkam utpādayāmāsa*, and the *Lalitavistara* (Lefmann 1902: 71.8-9): *na ca kāmavitarkam vā vyāpādavitarkam vā vihiṃsāvitarkam vā vitarkayati sma*. See also Bbh 145.12ff. (Tatz 1986: 54).

⁴ **vyāpādavitarka*. See BHSD s.v. *vyāpāda*.

⁵ **vihiṃsāvitarka*

⁶ See for this and the previous item KP §1 *ātmoṅkarṣi parapaṃsakah*, “he thinks highly of himself, is a disparager of others.” Mhy 2444, 2445. The two terms are also found together at *Aṣṭa* 184 (Wogihara 403.8-9).

⁷ *lābhena lābhaniścikīrṣā*. Mhy 2456. See BHSD s.v. *niścikīrṣā*, “extraction of a profitable gift

- 8) Squandering gifts of faith is the impurity of the śramaṇa,¹ and
- 9) Concealing one's transgressions is the impurity of the śramaṇa,²
and
- 10) Serving householders is the impurity of the śramaṇa, and
- 11) Serving renunciants is the impurity of the śramaṇa,³ and
- 12) Delighting in garrulous association with others is the impurity of

(from a layman, by a monk) by (referring to) a gift received (from others; one of the 5 mithyājīva for a monk." Edgerton refers to Wogihara 1930-36: 25-26, which contains a detailed discussion of the term and its etymology.

¹ *śraddhādeyaṃ vinipātayati*, as in KP §9. See in Pāli Vinaya i.298,2. BHSD s.v. śraddhādeya refers to Divy 336.27-337.1: *vayaṃ śraddhādeyaṃ vinipātayitvā iha pratyekanarakeṣūpapannāḥ*, "we are here fallen into individual hells, having squandered gifts of faith," and in a following sentence (337.3-4): *māyusmanteḥ śraddhādeyaṃ vinipātayisyatha*, "do not squander gifts of faith!" See below in I.9. At 571.6 we have the Tibetan in Nobel 1955: 33.35-34.1: *śraddhādeyaṃ vinipātya* = *dad pas sbyin par bya ba chud gzan pas*. In his translation and note, Nobel 1955: 91 and (2) interprets the term to mean "consume," "aufzeheren, verbrauchen."

² Mhy 8473): *gnas ngan len 'chab pa* = *duṣṭhulapratichchādanam*. In KP §116, two faults (*vraṇa* = *rma*) of the renunciant are mentioned, one of which is *svadauṣapratichchādanatā* = *bdag gi nyes pa 'chab pa*: "covering over of one's own faults."

³ See above I.2 (60), with the note, at which spot the Chinese of *Ratnarāsi* seems to have the same intention. SP 287.11-13 also seems to say exactly the same thing: "Once again, Mañjuśrī, the monk who is a bodhisattva, mahāsattva, living when the Tathāgata has passed into nirvāṇa, at the time of the destruction of the true teaching, who wishes to uphold this preaching of the teachings must dwell as far away as he can from householders and renunciants, and must dwell in friendliness." *punar aparāṃ mañjuśrī bodhisatvo mahāsattvas tathāgatasya parinirvṛtasya saddharmapratikṣayāntakāle vartamāna imaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ dhārayitukāmas tena bhikṣuṇā grhasthapravrajitānām antikād dūreṇa dūraṃ vihartavyaṃ maitrīvihāreṇa ca vihartavyam*. The corresponding expression in the Kashgar manuscript (Toda 1981: 140, 243) of the SP and in Kumārajīva's translation (38c4ff) (the Gilgit manuscript is missing here) expresses an entirely different idea. It is possible that the insertion of this idea into the SP should be considered late.

Another example is found in the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (Dutt 1934: 215.20), in which a list of ten things to be renounced in the fifth bhūmi includes: "Familiarity with householders and renunciants must be renounced." *grhipravrajitasamstavaḥ parivarjitavyaḥ*. See also the **Daśabhūmi-vibhāṣā*: "The bodhisattva who dwells in the wilderness (**āraṇyaka-bodhisattva*) should (first) dwell separating himself from householders and renunciants. [Then continue three more items, elided here]." T. 1521 (XXVI) 114a24: 菩薩住阿練若處者。一遠離在家出家。It seems that the same idea is expressed in the *Mahābhārata* 12.269.16 and in the *Nārada-parivṛjaka Upaniṣad* (Schrader 1912: 183.10, translated in Olivelle 1992: 205): "Let him [= the ascetic] never associate with householders or with hermits." *vānaprasthagrhassthābhyaṃ na saṃsṛjyeta karhicit /*.

Contrast, however, the idea in KP §113: "These two, Kāśyapa, are things which create impediments for a renunciant. Which two? Frequenting those belonging to the group of householders, and hostility toward those belonging to the group of the saints." *dvāv imau kāśyapa pravrajitasāmtarāyakaro dharmau. katamo dvau. grhapatipakṣaseveṇā ca āryapakṣavidveṣaṇatā*.

- the śramaṇa, and
- 13) The false idea that his possessions are imperfect¹ is the impurity of the śramaṇa,² and
- 14) Being dissatisfied with his own possessions is the impurity of the śramaṇa, and
- 15) Being jealous of and avaricious toward what others have easily obtained is the impurity of the śramaṇa,³ and
- 16) Lust for the possessions of others is the impurity of the śramaṇa, and
- 17) Not recognizing his own failings is the impurity of the śramaṇa,⁴ and
- 18) Seeking after the failings of others is the impurity of the śramaṇa,⁵ and
- 19) Not upholding the monastic disciplinary rule and the code of monastic behavior is the impurity of the śramaṇa,⁶ and
- 20) Being noisy like a raven is the impurity of the śramaṇa,⁷ and

¹ **apariniṣpanna*.

² Chinese: “creating the means to obtain what one does not yet possess is the”

³ See KP §7 *irṣyāmātsaryam paralābheṣu = gzhan gyi rnyed pa rnams la phrag dog dang / ser sna byed pa*; in the verse *mātsaryam irṣyā paralābha kurvate = gzhan gyi rnyed la ser sna phrag dog byed*. One of the four “crooked inceptions of mind” is “that having jealousy and envy of the acquisitions of others.” Items 14 and 15 are reversed in order in the Chinese.

⁴ See KP §24 *ātmaskhaliteṣu doṣadarśanatayā*, “the recognition of the fault in one's own mis-steps.” See also Aṣṭa (Mitra 184; Wogihara 403.9) *doṣāntaraprekṣī*.

⁵ See KP §24 *paraskhaliteṣv aruṣṭāpatticodanatayā*, “being without anger or accusation of sin in the mis-steps of others.”

⁶ That is, Prātimokṣa and Vinaya.

⁷ Raven, *khwa*, may be *vāyasa* Mhy. 5057, *kāka* 9310 or *dhvāṅkṣa* 4863. *mu cor smra ba* means to talk nonsense, and Mhy. 2481 gives *mukhara*. On the latter, see BHSD s.v. As Edgerton notes, in Sanskrit this means noisy, or garrulous. Thag (Norman 1969, note to 926) Cy ad Thag 955 offers the following definition: *mukharā ti mukha-kharā khara-vādino*, “mukhara means the oral roughness of a rough talker,” which while clearly a folk etymology, supports the meaning suggested by Edgerton of impudent or scurrilous. In canonical Pāli the term seems to occur usually in the set phrase *uddhatā unnalā capalā*

- 21) Being disrespectful, haughty and arrogant is the impurity of the śramaṇa,¹ and
- 22) Being ensnared by views is the impurity of the śramaṇa,² and
- 23) Contradicting [the teaching of] dependent co-origination is the impurity of the śramaṇa, and
- 24) Dwelling in extreme views is the impurity of the śramaṇa, and
- 25) Delighting in saṃsāra is the impurity of the śramaṇa, and
- 26) Not delighting in nirvāṇa is the impurity of the śramaṇa,³ and
- 27) Grasping after the ideas of the Materialists is the impurity of the śramaṇa,⁴ and

mukharā vikiṇṇavācā. See CPD s.v. uddhata, and see the next note. Chinese has here: “not knowing modesty and shame is the”

¹ See the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā*, quoted in *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 120.4 = BCAP 123.9-11, “One must be sober and sane, steady and constant, unperplexed, not loquacious, not arrogant, humble.” *bhavitavyam amattenānummattenācapalenācañcalenāsambhrāntenāmukhareṇānummaḍenānuddhatena*^o. See La Vallée Poussin’s note in BCAP 123 (3) on *unnāḍa*.

² See Mhy. 862) *nānādrṣṭyanuśayaparyavasthāna*^o = *lta ba tha dad pa dang bag la nyal dang kun nas dkris pa*^o. See BHSD s.v. paryavasthāna.

³ Chinese has Tibetan items 25 and 26 as a single item 26. Item 25 in Chinese is: “Not to be completely calm and not to be free of lust is the”

⁴ See KP §5, 111: *lokāyatanamantraparyeṣṭi* = ‘*jig rten rgyan phan pa’i gsang tshig (yongs su) tshol ba*. According to the commentary of Sthiramati on KP §5 (p. 41), one thinks that through studying worldly literature, and by gaining skills such as facility in debate one will be able to obtain profit and reverence, and thus one loses sight of the true teaching. It is interesting to observe Sthiramati’s comment that the word *lokāyatana* (not *lokāyata!*) is to be explained by the fact that they devote themselves to what is not the domain (*skye mched = āyatana*) of good dharmas. See also KP §13, 111. I believe that the term Materialists, *lokāyata*, is used in a rather generic sense as a criticism of those not properly concerned with spiritual goals. In the *Pratyutpanna* (Harrison 14B) a condition for the bodhisattva to obtain the samādhi is (Harrison’s translation) “not relying on the formulae of the other sectarians,” *gzhan mu stegs can gyi gsang tshig la mi rten pa*, and in 16M in order to obtain it the bodhisattva must “not rely on any of the sectarian schools or on any of the sectarians’ formulas,” *mu stegs can gyi skyed mched thams cad dang / mu stegs can gyi sngags thams cad la mi rten pa dang /*.

On the Materialists see Yuyama 1989. (To the voluminous references given by Yuyama one may add the article by Namai 1967. It is gratifying that in his letter of 15 Feb., 1993 Prof. Namai agreed with my understanding of the meaning of *lokāyata* in the KP passage. Namai’s series of articles of which that cited above is the first has continued, reaching at least seven so far.) One might also consult Mori 1982, a study of the Lokāyata and Vitanḍavāda in the Pāli Aṭṭhakathās. Note that neither Yuyama 1989 nor Weller 1965: 66 (1) were able to suggest what the meaning of the difficult term *mantra* might be here. Yuyama did however refer to some suggestive passages in the *Laṅkāvatāra*, which will bear further examination.

- 28) Being ensnared by obstructions is the impurity of the śramaṇa,¹
and
- 29) Contradicting [the teachings concerning] the maturation of acts is
the impurity of the śramaṇa, and
- 30) Being terrified by the three gates of liberation is the impurity of the
śramaṇa, and
- 31) Rejecting the profound teaching is the impurity of the śramaṇa,
and
- 32) Dwelling in opposition to the teaching is the impurity of the
śramaṇa,² and
- 33) Not honoring the Three Jewels is the impurity of the śramaṇa.

Kāśyapa, these thirty-two are the impurities of the śramaṇa, and if he abandons
them one may say he is [truly] a ‘śramaṇa.’

I.5

“Kāśyapa, these eight obstruct the qualities [which define a true] śramaṇa³.

Which eight?

¹ Chinese has: “The five *āvaraṇas / *nivarāṇas covering over the mind and producing various defilements is” The five are, in Pāli, *kāmacchando*, *vyāpādo*, *thīnamiddham*, *uddhaccakukkuccaṃ*, and *vicikicchā*, at for example DN i.246,17-18, AN iii.63,14-20, and so on. We find in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* 145.8-13 an example of these terms together with what is probably the same verb we have here: *kāmacchandaparyavasthānaduḥkhitānāṃ sattvānāṃ kāmacchandaparavasthānaduḥkham prativinodayati. vyāpādastyānamiddhauddhatyakauḥkṛtyavicikitsāparyavasthānaduḥkhitānāṃ sattvānāṃ yāvat paryavasthānaṃ prativinodayati.*

² Chinese has, for 31 and 32: “slandering the profound teaching and not practicing complete calming is the”

³ Based on the extant Sanskrit from the end of this section, we know that this phrase must be: **ime kāśyapa aṣṭau śramaṇadharmāvaraṇās.*

- 1) Not honoring one's mentors.¹
- 2) Not reverencing the teachings.²
- 3) Engaging in incorrect thinking.³
- 4) Rejecting sūtras one has not learnt [oneself].⁴
- 5) Being terrified by the doctrine [that there is] no self, no living being, no life-force, no person.⁵
- 6) Not comprehending the teaching about unconditioned things, but pursuing only the conditioned.⁶
- 7) Being terrified when one hears that conditioned things are

¹ This is hardly a satisfactory rendering for *bla ma = guru*. But I have failed to find an acceptable alternative. To leave Sanskrit *guru* or Tibetan "lama" would obviously be impossible, given the nuance these terms have acquired in modern English. I am aware that "mentor" has a distinctly contemporary air about it in American English, and this is not, I confess, appropriate, but I have sought in vain for an alternative.

Chinese has for "honor," "honor and obey."

² In KP §1 the qualities which lead to the bodhisattva's loss of wisdom are listed. These include: *agauravau bhavati dharme ca dharmabhāṇake ca*, "he is without a respectful attitude toward the teaching and the preacher of the teaching."

³ **ayoniśomanasikāra*. See BHSD s.v. *yoniśas* and *ayoniśas*.

⁴ KP §5 (and at *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 148.11-12): *āsrutānām anuddiṣṭānām ca sūtrāntānām pratikṣepeṇa*: "Repudiating those sūtra discourses not studied [by oneself] and not explained [to oneself]." I should remark that I have usually translated √*śru* forms such as *śruta* with English verbal forms such as study, learn, etc., although literally the sense is of course "to hear." The aural sense of these terms is very important, but hearing implies so much more than merely having sounds hit one's ear drums that after considerable hesitation I decided against using "hear" in cases such as the present one. In a culture such as our own in which learning is primarily visual it is hard to convey the sense that is meant by such hearing. I only hope that my translations do not, as a result, give a wrong impression of the emphasis of the original.

⁵ See KP §125 *śūnyatādrṣṭyāpy anarthiko bhavati kaḥ punar vāda ātmasatvajīvapauṣapudgala-drṣṭyā*: "He is disinterested even in wrong speculations on emptiness, not to mention in wrong speculations on a self, living being, life-force, human or person." See also KP §52.

⁶ I originally gave this a distinctly Mahāyānist cast by translating as follows: "Not comprehending the teaching about the unconditioned [nature of all] things, but following after only conditioned [objects, rather than *nirvāṇa*]." I now think this is perhaps rather too much. It may be that one could indeed read the expression in this way, but it is probably better and more in keeping with the tone of the sūtra as a whole to give the more conservative rendering I have chosen. Chinese has: "hearing that all *saṃskāras* are originally unproduced he understands the conditioned things (*saṃskṛta*) but does not understand the unconditioned (*asaṃskṛta*)."

unproduced.¹

- 8) The feeling that one is falling into a great abyss [which occurs] when one hears that all things are in their intrinsic nature unproduced.²

Kāśyapa, these eight obstruct the qualities [which define a true] śramaṇa. The renunciant must abandon them.

I.6

“Kāśyapa, I do not explain that a śramaṇa is a śramaṇa by virtue of his physical appearance and attributes,³ but I explain that the śramaṇa who practices virtuous qualities⁴ is a [true] śramaṇa.⁵ Kāśyapa, a śramaṇa must wear the pure monas-

¹ See KP §134: *sa ca ajāti sarvavadharmāṇām śrutvā utrasati samtrasari samtrāsam āpadyate*, “hearing that all things have no arisal he is frightened, scared and afflicted by fear.”

² *G-yang sa = prapāta*. KP §123 *śūnyatānupalambhās ca dharmeṣu śrutvā prapātasamjñī bhavati*. “And hearing that things are inconceivable because of emptiness he feels as if he has confronted an abyss.” Chinese has incorporated Tibetan item 7 into item 6, and has items 7 and 8 corresponding to Tibetan 8: “hearing the preaching of the sequential teaching he falls down into a great abyss. Hearing that all things are intrinsically unborn, without a nature, without ? (無出 = ?), he is mentally confused.”

³ Chinese: “shaven head and dharma-clothes.” See KP §122, in a discussion of those who are not true śramaṇas: *varṇarūpalīngasamsthānaśramaṇa = kha dog dang rtags kyi dbyings kyi dge sbyong*, “one who is a śramaṇa by virtue of his figure, outward form, distinguishing marks and appearance.” Compare the Brahmanical *Nāradaparivṛājaka Upaniṣad* (Schrader 1912: 180.9-10): *na daṇḍadhāreṇa na muṇḍena / na veṣeṇa na dambhācāreṇa muktiḥ //*, translated by Olivelle (1992: 203): “Not by carrying a staff, not by shaving the head, not by a special dress, and not by a hypocritical life does a man become free.” One might also bring to mind the common Buddhist critiques of the “true Brāhmaṇa,” not distinguished by his outer marks, birth or so on, but by his nature and spiritual accomplishments.

⁴ Here in the *Ratnarāsi* we have the Sanskrit available, and it is *guṇadharmā*. Compare the term *śramaṇaguṇasamanvāgata* used in the *Ugra*, quoted *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 198.4 (see Mochizuki 1988: 284-303; T. 310 [XI] 477c28 has 沙門功德). See also below I.8 for *śramaṇaguṇadharmā*. MW defines the term *guṇadharmā* as “the virtue or duty incident to the possession of certain qualities (as clemency is the virtue and duty of royalty).” The RGV (Johnston 1950: 77.1, Takasaki 1966: 303 note 71) has the term. It appears also in AKB 189.12 (ad III.100b), where however it contrasts with *dravyadharmā* of the Vaiśeṣikas, and is therefore not relevant to our case. In the RGV the term is rendered 功德法, in the AKB Xuanzang 德法, Paramārtha 求那法. In the *Ratnarāsi* *guṇadharmāṃ pratipatya* is rendered 有功德儀式具足者, “fully equipped with virtuous qualities and ascetic purification practices.” (儀式 usually is

tic robes on his body with a mind unstained by impurity.¹ Why? Kāśyapa, I prescribe² that the monastic robe is for one without impurities,³ but, Kāśyapa, I say that all of those who, characterized by impurity, wear the pure monastic robes on their bodies burn the monastic robes,⁴ except for those earnest in their intention.⁵ Why? Because this is the banner of the Nobles. These garments,

dhutaṅga or (*saṃ*)*ācāra* in the *Ratnarāsi*; literally the Chinese means “ritual practices.”) It must be admitted that its meaning is not yet totally clear. A hint, however, may be gained from KP §125, quoted in full in the Introduction, in which, after contrasting three types of false śramaṇas including “the one who is an ascetic by virtue of his figure, outward form, distinguishing marks and appearance,” the KP describes the ascetic engaged in real correct practice.

⁵ See the well-known verse: “Neither nakedness, nor tangled hair, nor mud, nor fasting, nor sleeping on the bare ground, nor covering oneself with a coat of dirt, nor religious exercise in a squatting posture can purify a mortal who has not overcome desire. But who even adorned should practice the teaching, restrained, tranquil, self-controlled, practicing celibacy, giving up violence toward all creatures, he is a [true] brahman, he is a [true] śramaṇa, he is a [true] monk.” Uv 33.1-2 = DhP141-2 = Mv iii.412, 15-22 (2nd verse = GDhp 80 = PtDhp 196 = Divy 339.26-29 = CPS 17.16): *na nagnacaryā na jaṭā na paṅkā no 'nāśanam sthaṇḍilāśāyikā vā / na rajomalam notkuṭukaprahānam śodheta martyam hy avitīrṇakāṅkṣam // alāṅkṛtaś cāpi careta dharmam kṣānto dānto niyato brahmacārī / sarveṣu bhūteṣu nidhāya daṇḍam sa brāhmaṇaḥ sa śramaṇaḥ sa bhikṣuḥ //*. MN i.281,31ff. (= *Madhyamāgama* T. 26 [I] 725c18-26c24) has an almost exact parallel: “I do not speak, monks, of the śramaṇa-hood of one who wears the outer monastic robes merely because of his wearing those outer monastic robes. I do not speak, monks, of the śramaṇa-hood of one who is a naked ascetic merely because of his nakedness. ... one who dwells in dust and mud ... the ritual bather ... one who dwells at the foot of trees ... one who dwells in the open air ... one who constantly stands upright ... one who eats only at intervals ... one who concentrates on mantras ... one who has tangled hair” The text, having listed these ascetic practices through which some seek perfection goes on to specify that it is the one who frees himself of negative mental qualities and eventually removes the *āsavas* who is, therefore (284.27-28), “a śramaṇa through the destruction of the *āsavas*.”

¹ Chinese has “a mind free of lust, hatred and delusion.” This totally misses the classical pun here on *kaśāya*, “impurity,” and *kāśāya*, “the ochre monastic robe.” The pun and its meaning are discussed in the Introduction.

² The term rendered here as “stipulate,” *anu*|*jñā*, is commonly translated “allow.” However, in many contexts in which the Buddha speaks he is not so much allowing or permitting as laying down rules. This is commonly the case in the Vinaya literature, and in this context the CPD (s.v. *anu-jānāti*) explicitly recognizes that “(in *Vinaya*) when the *Buddha* speaks, nearly = to ordain or prescribe.”

³ Chinese has here, and for the next “impurities,” “whose mind is without lust, hatred and delusion.”

⁴ The extant Sanskrit for this expression, *kāśāyadagḍha*, is odd if it is meant to mean “burn the robes,” and would more naturally be understood as “are burned by the robes,” as Hoernle (1916) in fact translates in *Manuscript Remains*. But both Tibetan and Chinese are rather clear on the meaning: *de dag thams cad ni ngur smrig thiḡ pa*, 為燒滅袈裟. See the Introduction for a detailed discussion.

⁵ Chinese: “except for those who are single-minded in upholding the precepts but still cannot uphold them.”

which belong to those who are repentant¹ and practice free from passion, conform to their tranquility and are attendant upon their friendliness. In this regard, Kāśyapa, what is the banner of the Nobles?² Kāśyapa, these twelve are the banner of the Nobles. Which twelve? Kāśyapa,

- 1) Monastic discipline is the banner of the Nobles.³
- 2) Mental trance is the banner of the Nobles.
- 3) Wisdom is the banner of the Nobles.
- 4) Liberation is the banner of the Nobles.
- 5) Knowledge and vision of liberation is the banner of the Nobles.⁴
- 6) Entrance into the Truths is the banner of the Nobles.⁵
- 7) Entrance into dependent co-origination is the banner of the Nobles.⁶
- 8) The four concentrations are the banner of the Nobles.

¹ Sanskrit and Chinese omit “repentant.”

² Sanskrit: “In that regard, Kāśyapa, listen to what are the banners of the nobles.”

³ If the reconstructed letter suggested by Thomas and printed by him in brackets is correct, [ta]pa, then the Sanskrit reads: “asceticism.” But, given the fact that this is a stock phrase (see the next note), and that the Tibetan and Chinese agree on having *śīla*, this is rather unlikely. The MS is, however, perfectly clear and there can be no doubt about *pa*. Thomas 118 (7) suggested that the neuter *dhvajam* agrees with *tapas*, but while it is true that *dhvaja* looks to be a neuter, this does not prove we must reconstruct **tapa*. I have no suggestion about how to understand the *-pa* of the manuscript.

⁴ These first five items constitute a group, variously named: *śīla*, *samādhi*, *prajñā vimukti*, and *vimuktijñānadarśana*. This set is classified as a set of *skandhas* (Pāli *khandha*, e.g. at SN i.99,30-100,4; DN iii.279,14-17), also termed *sampadā*. See also Mhy. 104-108.

⁵ Chinese specifies “the four noble truths.”

⁶ Sanskrit rather “awareness of dependent ...” See CPD s.v. *anubujjhana*, “awakening, enlightenment, understanding,” quoting *Paṭisambhidāmagga*. BHSD s.v. *anubudhyana* quotes only the present passage [Edgerton passively hyper-corrects *-buddhya-*]. Not in Waldschmidt et al. 1973-. The translation note (by Thomas or Hoemle, page 120, note 15) suggests however a possible misreading, the correct reading being **avatāra*. While this would agree with Tibetan, it is hard to see how such a confusion could be explained either graphically or phonetically. On the other hand, Chinese 能解十二因緣, “being able to comprehend the twelve-fold causality (= *pratītyasamutpāda*),” could agree with *anubudhyana*. Ultimately either reading gives more or less the same sense, since “enter into” here obviously means “comprehend, understand.”

- 9) The four immeasurables are the banner of the Nobles.¹
- 10) The four formless attainments are the banner of the Nobles.
- 11) The entry into the certainty [to attain nirvāṇa] is the banner of the Nobles.²
- 12) The destruction of the depravities is the banner of the Nobles.³

Kāśyapa, these twelve are the banner of the Nobles.

I.7

“Kāśyapa, I say that whoever,⁴ without possessing these banners, wears the pure⁵ monastic robes, the garments of the saintly attitudes,⁶ practices an erroneous Teaching.⁷ I say that he dwells in contradiction to the teaching.⁸ I

¹ The order of items 8 and 9 is reversed in the Sanskrit and the Chinese.

² Sanskrit reads *niyāmāvakkṛānti*, which is, or is part of, a set phrase, on which see the detailed note in Lamotte 1962: 115-16 (65). Lamotte explains: “*Niyāma* (variants *niyama*, *nyāma*) or, more completely, *samyaktvaniyāmāvakkṛānti* is the entry into the absolute determination to acquire the supreme good. It is concerned with a *kṣānti* by which one enters into possession of a state of predestination relative to the future acquisition of *samyaktva*, that is, Nirvāṇa.” See also Wogihara 1930-36: 28-31, Mochizuki 1932-36: 2664a-2665a, and BHSD s.v. *niyāma*. The form is quoted for Pāli CPD s.v. *avakkanti*. Tibetan *skyon med par zhugs pa = nyāmāvakkṛāntaḥ* at Mhy. 6503. Chinese here in the *Ratnarāsi* has “entry into the four-fold certainty is the banner” I cannot locate any such category in the sources available to me, including the *Sanzang Fashu* 三藏法數.

³ **āsravaḥṣaya*. This item is omitted in the Sanskrit MS, evidently by accident. The numbering in the MS itself, however, would lead one to believe that it is item 11 rather than item 12 which is missing, since the numbering skips from 10 to 12 omitting number 11. But in fact it is item 11 which is listed under number 12, and the real final term is missing.

⁴ Sanskrit and Chinese here specify “monk.”

⁵ Sanskrit and Chinese omit “pure.”

⁶ The Tibetan and the Sanskrit represent slightly different readings; Tibetan *'phags pa 'i rigs gos* seems to equal something like **āryagoṭra-* or **āryavaṃsa-vastra*, while Sanskrit has *āryānām dhvajam*, the banner of the nobles.

⁷ Sanskrit has *vitathadharmapratipanna*, and Tibetan *nor pa 'i chos la zhugs pa*, understanding **vitatha-dharmam pratiṣpad*. It is perhaps preferable to understand as, “he practices the teaching in an incorrect way,” that is, with *vitathadharmā* as an instrumental *tatpuruṣa*, rather than as an adjectival *karmadhāraya*. The Tibetan translator’s practice of following the word order of the Sanskrit compound makes it difficult to understand his rendering correctly without reference to the original. The Chinese has

say that he dwells far from the teachings of the Tathāgata.¹ I say that he dwells in opposition to the side of nirvāṇa. I say he is partial to the side of saṃsāra.² I say he is caught by the hook of Māra.³ I say he has not taken possession of the essence [of the teachings].⁴ I say he has fallen from the teaching. I say he

我說此比丘是邪法行。"I say that this monk is [one who has an] incorrect dharma practice," again very literally with *vitathadharmapratipanna* translated word for word into 邪法行。

⁸ On the form *uḍḍara-*, Edgerton BHSD s.v. refers only to the present passage and says "conjecturally rendered (practicing) heretical (principles)." Perhaps he based himself upon the note of Thomas (121, note 22) in which he says: "The context requires a word with a bad sense, such as 'heretical.' Perhaps derived from *uddara* or *avadara* from *√uddr̥* or *avadr̥*, 'split.'" Tibetan has *chos dang 'gal bar gnas pa*, which regularly stands for *viruddha*. The phonological resemblance between the two forms, *uḍḍara* and *viruddha*, is enough to make me think there may be some connection. Chinese has yet another understanding (apparently), reading 非寂滅行。I cannot immediately see what hint this might provide to solving the problem.

¹ As Thomas points out (121, note 23), Sanskrit *dūsthitam* may be correct, but is perhaps better understood with Tibetan as *dū[ra]sthitam*.

² Sanskrit mistakenly *saṃskāra* for *saṃsāra*! As has been pointed out many times, the Chinese translator Lokakṣema for example regularly renders both *saṃsāra* and *saṃskāra* by 生死, birth and death, usually standard for *saṃsāra*. See Harrison 1990: 153, note 5, and Lancaster 1968: 390. It is worthwhile pointing out that the often appealed to Gāndhāri is obviously not applicable here. In Gāndhāri: *saṃskāra* = *saghara* and *saṃsāra* = *satsara* (Brough 1962: 310. The latter transcription with *-tsa-* is somewhat problematic; see Brough's §17). How Lokakṣema could have justified such a translation remains to be explained, but might not passages such as the present one in Sanskrit contribute to such an explanation?

³ Tibetan has rendered "hook of selfishness or pride," but both Sanskrit and Chinese have "caught by the hook of Māra." Evidently the Tibetan translators read instead of (our Sanskrit text's) *māraḥaḍḍisa-grastam* rather **mānahaḍḍisa*. SN ii.226, 17-18 (XVII.2 [2] 4) has: *bāḷisiko ti kho bhikkhave mārassetam pāpimato adhivacanam*, "hook [or bard], monks, is a designation of Māra, the evil one." See also SN iv.159,9-10 (XXXV.189 [3] 6).

There is, however, a passage in the Chinese *Samyuktāgama* 雜阿含經 T. 99 (966) (II) 248b4-9 in which being caught up by *māna* 慢 is perhaps being compared to being caught by a fish hook 鐵鉤鎖。But the interpretation of the passage, and of the subject of the verbs, is not totally clear. The passage reads:

Those Sentient beings, [the non-Buddhists who you met] previously, have a prideful belief in a self, a deluded pride, and they are tormented by that deluded pride, for deluded pride accumulates more deluded pride. They do not have full understanding [of pride: **mānābhisamaya*]. They are entangled [by pride?] like a dog's intestines, like they are caught on a fish hook. And like disturbed grass [which wafts back and forth in the wind] they gallop back and forth from this world to the other, from the other world to this they gallop back and forth, but they cannot escape [*saṃsāra*]. Pūrṇa. All sentient beings who have destroyed deluded pride without remainder will in the long night [of *saṃsāra*] attain liberation (*kṣema*) and happiness.

先諸衆生。我慢邪慢。邪慢所迫。邪慢集邪慢。不無間等。亂如狗腸。如鐵鉤鎖。亦如亂草。往反驅馳。此世他世。他世此世。驅馳往反。不能遠離。富隣尼。一切衆生於諸邪慢無餘永滅者。彼一切衆生長夜安隱快樂。 Note that the parallel in T. 100 (200) (II) 448a11-16 does not have the same terms.

⁴ The addition within brackets is conjectural, but I do not see what else could be intended here. (I understand that the essence of the teachings would be fundamentally equivalent to the essence of awaken-

dwells in an incorrect path. Therefore, Kāśyapa, if a śramaṇa wears the pure monastic robes on his body he must do so with a mind unstained by impurities.

I.8

If he has not yet obtained the fruit,¹ he should wear the robe on his body with eight [types of] respect. Which eight? [He should wear the robe with]

- 1) The idea that it is a shrine,² and
- 2) The idea that it is the teacher, and
- 3) The idea that it is pacified,³ and
- 4) The idea of friendliness,⁴ and
- 5) The idea of respect [toward the robe as] toward the Buddha, and⁵
- 6) The idea of shame, and
- 7) The idea of modesty, and
- 8) The thought that “I must become free of impurity.”⁶

ing, perhaps the only other real possibility.) Chinese has rendered: “has not passed beyond saṃsāra.” I am far from certain, but it is possible that here the Chinese translation has confused *sāra* and *saṃsāra*. But I do not know what Sanskrit term could lie behind 度, “pass over,” here. At KP §120, one of two causes of the renunciant’s pain is *anādattasārasya kālakriyā* (rendered in Tibetan *snying po ma blangs par ’chi ba’i dus byed pa*), “dying without having undertaken the essence [of the teaching].”

¹ Chinese actually includes the last clause of I.7 with this portion. Chinese consequently has: “Kāśyapa. Therefore, when the renunciant monk wears the monastic robes upon his body, if he has not yet attained the fruit of the śramaṇa,”

² Or, with Chinese, “stūpa.” Tibetan regularly *mchod rten* for both *caitya* and *stūpa*, but Chinese 塔 regularly renders *stūpa*. I have nevertheless understood the Tibetan following the close parallel in the *Ugradattapariprcchā*, quoted in the notes below. There we have the Sanskrit text from the *Śikṣā-samuccaya*, and the reading is *caitya*.

³ **upaśānta*.

⁴ **maitrī*.

⁵ The word “as” is made explicit in Chinese.

⁶ Chinese, as usual, has “lust, hatred and delusion” for “impurity.”

Because the pure monastic robes conform to the conduct proper to a śramaṇa,¹ he should wear them on his body with those eight [types of] respect. Kāśyapa, those who, being careless,² are not given to self-restraint and, having failed to uphold these virtuous qualities of a śramaṇa³ still wear the pure monastic robes on their bodies, do not produce these [types of] respect [toward those robes].⁴

I.9

Kāśyapa, there is an individual hell⁵ named ‘Torture⁶ of one who imitates the

¹ *dge sbyong gi tshul dang ’thun pa* probably reflects *śramaṇasya sārūpya. For the latter expression in a slightly different application, see *Lalitavistara* 383.3-4: *na śramaṇasya sārūpyāni iti kṛtvā tathāgato na pratigrhṇīte sma*, “The Tathāgata did not take [some bowls made of precious substances], thinking that they were not suitable for a śramaṇa.” Just before that (382.22), however, the same idea is expressed with: *tāni na śramaṇapratirūpāni iti kṛtvā*. See also BHSD s.v. sārūpya.

² The term *vaidaryā* (or *vaidarpya*?) is not at all clear. Both the *Ratnarāśi* and the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* render it with Tibetan *lhod*, which as Edgerton BHSD s.v. *vaidaryā* points out, means loose, slack, careless. Should we look etymologically to some derivative of *vi√dṛ*, perhaps in the causative meaning of “to scatter”?

³ So I understand the Tibetan *dge sbyong gi yon tan gyi chos ’di dag las nyams par*, but its correspondence with the extant Sanskrit version's *itah śramaṇaḥ uddharmād uddhurāḥ* is not quite clear to me. In Sanskrit *uddhura* means “freed from a burden, unrestrained,” or more literally “one who has unyoked himself.” Perhaps we should look etymologically to *ud√hr* (a doublet with *ud√dhr*) in the sense of removal, separation. Bendall and Rouse render the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* passage (134) “free from the rule of the ascetic’s virtue.” Chinese has “free from the rules (法) of the śramaṇa.” See the notes to I.6 above.

⁴ From “Kāśyapa, those who ...,” the Chinese text has attached the sentence to the following section, I.9: “Kāśyapa. If they are dissatisfied with their practice of the four saintly attitudes, do not follow the practices of a śramaṇa, and do not respect the monastic robes in these eight ways, then they are counted apart, among the imitation śramaṇas, and fall into minor hells.” See the Introduction for some interesting parallels.

⁵ On the *pratyekanaraka*, see BHSD s.v. *pratyeka*. Edgerton interpreted it as a hell of less severe punishment than that in a regular or great hell, but this is probably not correct. We have a considerable number of references to such hells in Buddhist literature, and the term has been discussed in Mochizuki 1932-36: 1248bc and La Vallée Poussin 1923-31: iii.155, note 1. Both Nakamura 1981: 347c and Oda 1917: 468a follow the AKB (Pradhan 1975: 165.5-7) and understand the term to refer to an individual hell in which one experiences by him or her self the maturation of his or her own karma: “Individual hells are produced by separate individual acts of a large number of people, or of two or of one. Their variety is multifarious, their location unfixed. They are in river, mountain, or desert regions, or in other [locations], and because they are located below.” *pratyekam narakās tu svaiḥ svaiḥ karmabhir abhinirvṛtāḥ / bahūnām sattvānām dvayor ekasya vā / teṣām anekaprakaḥ bhedāḥ sthānam cāniyatam nadīparvata-marupradeseṣv anyeṣu vā ’dhaś ca bhāvāt*. As La Vallée Poussin (op cit.) pointed out, the hells

appearance of a śramaṇa.’ Kāśyapa, in that individual hell, in accord with their imitation of the śramaṇa they are tortured¹ with their garments ablaze, their heads ablaze, their begging bowls ablaze, their sitting mats ablaze, their couches ablaze. Whatever possessions and goods they have are all burned up, set blazing, set afire² and they experience those tortures in accord with their imitations of the appearance of a śramaṇa.³ Why? Because they are thus characterized by impure actions of body, speech and mind, and the future realms of rebirth⁴ of those who are characterized by impure actions of body, speech and mind also become impure.⁵

enumerated at SN ii.254ff. are “individuated,” in the sense that the sufferings of the damned correspond exactly to the sins they committed. This is in fact not an unusual pattern, although the term *pratyekanaraka* is not necessarily used to designate such a situation. The term *pratyekanaraka* is discussed, in addition to the sources given in BHSD, in T. 1506 (XXV) 28a17-19, (translated by Beal 1871: 65), in which the description of “frontier hells” 邊地獄 corresponds with the AKB’s description of the *pratyekanaraka*; see also *Nyāyānusāra* T. 1562 (XXIX) 517a26ff.; and *Yogācārabhūmi* T. 1579 (XXX) 297a26-29; the latter refers for details to the 吉祥問採錄豆子經. So far I have not identified this text. In Pāli the term *paccekaniraya* appears in the commentary to *Suttanipāta Mahāvagga* 10 (*Kokālikasutta*; Smith 1917: 476,27-28) in the following: *abbudo nirayo ti abbudo nāma koci paccekanirayo n’atthi, avīcimhi yeva abbudagaṇanāya paccanokāso pana abbudo nirayo ti vutto, esa nayo nirabbudādisu*. In a verse in the canonical *Jātaka* v.266, 15-16 (XIX *Saṅghinipāta*, 2 *Samkiccajātaka* 530, verse 84), we find what might be associated with this term, if we understand the compound to have been broken for metrical reasons: *icc’ete atṭha nirayā akkhātā duratikkamā / ākiṇṇā luddakammehi paccekā soḷas’ussadā //*. Note that while the Chinese translation of the *Ratnarāsi* has 小地獄, the quotation in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* has just 地獄. Generally speaking the term is rendered in Tibetan as *nyi tshe ba’i sems can dmyal ba*, with the variant *nyi tshe’i sems can dmyal ba*; the latter form is that given in Mhy. 4944.

⁶ Both Sanskrit and Chinese agree in omitting “torture.” Sanskrit has only *śramaṇavarṇaprati-rūpaka*.

¹ See BHSD s.v. *kāraṇā*.

² See *Ratnarāsi* III.14, and compare Mhy. 226: ...*ādīptaḥ pradīptaḥ samprajvalito ’gninā ekajvalībhūto nirvāpyate = (b)sreg(s) shing / cing tshig ste mes rab tu ’bar zhing ’bar ba gcig tu gyur pa zhi bar byed do*. Mhy. 5249: *ādīptaḥ = ’bar*, 5242 *pradīptaḥ = rab tu ’bar*, 5243 *sampradīptaḥ = kun tu / du rab tu ’bar*, 5244 *samprajvalito = kun tu / du rab tu mched / ’ched cing ’bar*, 5245 *ekajvalībhūto dhyāyati = me lce gcig tu gyur cing (b)sreg go*. See the expressions in the Dbh (Rahder 1926: 33.17-18), and Vinaya iii.107,23-26.

³ There is a very interesting parallel in the *Maitreyamahāsimhanādasūtra*, for which see the Introduction.

⁴ I have given a slightly round-about rendering of **gati*, perhaps more usually rendered “destiny.”

⁵ For the whole paragraph see KP §122, quoted in full in the Introduction.

I.10

Kāśyapa, if one who is not śramaṇa but falsely claims to be a śramaṇa and who is not a follower of the practice of purity but falsely claims to be a follower of the practice of purity¹ accepts the praise offered by those who uphold the precepts and those who are endowed with virtuous good qualities,² he³ suffers eight [types of] contempt through that bad action.⁴ Which eight?

- 1) He becomes like a stupid [insensible object],⁵ and
- 2) His position becomes difficult and he becomes slothful, and
- 3) He becomes a woman laughed at by many people, and
- 4) He becomes unfree,⁶ and a slave, and
- 5) He becomes of low caste, and ugly, and

¹ Mhy 9143-44: *āśramaṇaḥ śramaṇapratijñāḥ, abrahmacārī brahmacārīpratijñāḥ = dge sbyong ma yin par dge sbyong du khas 'che/mche ba, tshangs par spyod pa ma yin par tshangs par spyod par khas 'che ba*. The expression is of course also a well-known stock phrase in Pāli: AN i.108,21-22, ii.239,30-31, SN iv.180,31-181,1, Vin ii.236,25 [etc.] = *assamaṇaṃ samaṇapatiññaṃ, abrahmacāriṃ brahmacārīpatiññaṃ*.

² Chinese treats these two qualifications as one: “those who uphold the precepts, endowed with virtuous good qualities.”

³ Chinese adds here: “that precept breaking monk accepting that respect and worship even though he knows himself to be evil, that evil monk through these roots of demerit will suffer”

⁴ Cf. KP §117: *dvāv imau kāśyapa pravrajitasya paridāgho katamo dvau / yad uta ... śīlavantā guṇavantā cāntikād upasthānaparicaryāsvīkaraṇam*. “These two, Kāśyapa, are burning torments for a renunciant. Which two? Namely, ... accepting worship and devotion from those who uphold the precepts and those who uphold the virtues.”

⁵ Both Zhang et al. 1985 s.v. *bem po*, and Das 1902 s.v. *bem* quote the expression *bem po ltar lkuḡ*, “stupid, senseless like a log of wood or physical matter.” It is possible that the term stands for **jāda* (Wayman 1959: 53 gives the equivalence *bem po = jāda* [sic!], but without any reference). Chinese has rendered the eight items of the list as follows: “1) he is stupid; 2) he is dumb (i.e., he cannot speak; **mūka*); 3) he receives a short and ugly body; 4) his face will be ugly, and those who see him face on or askance will laugh in scorn; 5) obtaining a female body, he will become a poor slave or servant; 6) his form will be weak and exhausted, and he will be injured and die young; 7) he will not be respected by others and will always have a bad reputation; 8) he will not be able to encounter a buddha.”

⁶ Probably *rang dbang med* = **asvatantra*.

- 6) He becomes of low caste, of lowly origin,¹ and
- 7) No one will come to meet him, and
- 8) He does not gladden those worthy of respect.

He suffers these eight [types of] contempt. Therefore, Kāśyapa, hearing about such negative things as these, evil monks should not accept the praise offered by others.

I.11

If that one who while not a śramaṇa, Kāśyapa, falsely claims to be śramaṇa, while not a follower of the practice of purity falsely claims to be a follower of the practice of purity, should not obtain on this wide earth so much as that [space] to eject a glob of spit,² how much less [should he expect] a place to lift up and set down his foot.³ Why? Because this wide earth, Kāśyapa, was given by kings of old to those who uphold the precepts, those who are virtuous and those worthy of veneration, in order for them to carry out their practice.⁴

I.12

In that regard, Kāśyapa, that fool is unworthy of any gift of faith at all, even a

¹ Mhy. 6412 *alpeśākhyah* = *dbang chung bar grags pa*. MW s.v. defines this as “named after an insignificant chief or master, of low origin,” citing it as Buddhist, but without source. For Buddhist materials, see BHSD s.v., Mv i.28,7, and Senart’s note i.392.

² For *khetapiṇḍa*, see *Ratnarāsi* §VI.9, quoted *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 130.18.

³ See the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 267.15 (quoting *Ratnamegha*) for the terms *kramān utkṣipati ... niḥṣipati*.

⁴ I suspect that there are in Indian lore references to Kings giving the earth to ascetics, but I have yet to track down such a reference.

place to set down and lift up his foot; and if this applies to a place to set down and lift up his foot, how much more unworthy is he to enjoy all gifts of faith, that is, the couches or the stools, or the promenade walks, or the sitting mats, or the caves, or the monasteries, or the pleasure groves, or the park sites, or the properties, or the bowls, or the monastic robes, or the alms, or the bedding, or the medicaments, or any equipment at all which belongs to the local community or belongs to the universal community. You should have faith in this, Kāśyapa. You should understand it.

I.13

One who while not a śramaṇa, Kāśyapa, falsely claims to be a śramaṇa, while not a follower of the practice of purity falsely claims to be a follower of the practice of purity, cannot purify¹ a gift of faith even as small as the point of the tip of a hair.² Why? Because, Kāśyapa, I teach that the community of the saints³ is like the great ocean,⁴ it is a field of merit and the best of those worthy of rever-

¹ Chinese: “requite.”

² The expression is a stock one: Mhy. 6489 *skra'i rtse mo'i mtha'am cha shas* = *vālagrakoṭiḥ*. Compare Pāli AN iii.403,14-15: *Yāvakiṅvaṇ cāham Ānanda Devadattassa vālaggakoṭinittuddanamattam pi sukkam dhammam addasaṃ*

The *Maitreyamahāsimhanādasūtra* T. 310 (23) (XI) 502c22 has one of 4 微細煩惱 = *rab tu byung ba'i nyon mongs pa cha phra ba*, minor defilements of a renunciant, as accepting the gift of faith from another while knowing oneself that one is a violator of the precepts 自知犯受他信施 = (P 65a7-8, M 130a6, S 158a2): *shes shing rtogs bzhin du* [P /] *dad pas byin pa yongs su longs spyod par byed pa ste*. See La Vallée Poussin's note in AKB v.78 on *anuśaya*.

³ *'phags pa'i dge 'dun* = **ārya-saṃgha*. CPD s.v. *ariya-saṃgha* renders “the noble fraternity,” and of course this is possible. But it is necessary to note that the term could as easily mean “community of the Āryas, that is the noble ones,” and I have followed this. The term seems to be rare in canonical Pāli. For a related discussion, see Norman 1990.

⁴ Compare the following passages: *Da Zhidu lun* 大智度論 T. 1509 (XXV) 225a8-10 (= Lamotte 1944-80: 1399): “The monastic community is like the waters of the great ocean / Bounded by the shores of the precepts. / A precept-breaking monk / At the end of his life will not be counted among the monks / As the waters of the great ocean / Do not give lodging to a corpse.” (The last image is proverbial in Pāli

ence. Faithful brahmins or householders, Kāśyapa, may make offerings to that [false śramaṇa] with the idea that those offerings are infinite. But, Kāśyapa, if a precept-breaking fool were to enjoy a gift of faith even as small as the tip of a hair cleaved in a hundredth portion,¹ because of the purification of the donor and the benefactor, as small as is his enjoyment of a gift of faith as tiny as the mere tip of a hair, so great an ocean of [evil] karma would he amass.² Therefore, Kāśyapa, you must learn that the gift of faith is to be enjoyed by those who are pure in [their practice of] the precepts.”

I.14

When that teaching was preached,³ two hundred yogācāra⁴ monks hearing this teaching wept, and the tears flowing they said: “Even though we may die,⁵ as

and other Buddhist literatures.) At *Ekottarāgama* 增壹阿含經 T. 125 (II) 792a19 the monastic community is compared to the sea. The same text T. 125 (II) 575a22-23 compares the community of saints to the ocean, since both produce rare jewels. (The last passage corresponds more or less to SN i.233,18 [XI.2.6], but without the image of the ocean.) See also the *Sūryagarbhavaipulyasūtra* T. 397 (13) (XIII) 215b24-25, which has the community of monks as a great ocean of merit: 衆僧大功德海.

¹ Compare *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* Dutt 1934: 27.9-10 = *Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* Ghoṣa 1902-13: 81.16: *śatadhā bhinnayā vālāgrakotyā* . . .

² The syntax of this passage (in Tibetan as well as in English!) is rather difficult, and I am not certain that I have understood it correctly. I am especially unsure of the meaning of the expression “because of the purification of the donor and benefactor.” It may be that it should be attached to what follows: the gift of faith given by a donor and benefactor for their own purification — if the precept-breaker consumes even a small portion of that he will reap correspondingly great negative results. The Chinese reads as follows: “If there is a precept-breaking monk, just as one splits a single hair into a hundred bits, if that evil monk were to accept a gift of faith of even the amount of one hair, as small as the hair’s portion which he accepts he subsequently destroys a correspondingly great ocean’s amount of the donor’s meritorious fruit, and he cannot completely repay him. Kāśyapa, therefore [a monk] should purify his mind to accept gifts of faith. Kāśyapa, you should imitate this [behavior].”

³ In the *Suvarṇa(pra)bhāsottama* in Tibetan (Noble 1944: 174.15): *bstan pa 'di bshad pa na = asmin nirdeṣe nirdeśyamāne*, but our Sanskrit text has rather *atha tasyām eva pariṣadi*, “in that very assembly.”

⁴ For the term “Yogācāra monk,” see the discussion in the Introduction.

⁵ I thank David Jackson for his suggestion on this rendering of *bdag cag ni gum yang rung*. The Sanskrit is perhaps a little different, being *kālam vayanā ... kariṣyāmo na punar* . . ., “we shall die, but still

long as we have not obtained the fruit [of the śramaṇa state]¹ we should not enjoy even one rice-ball given by the faithful.” The Blessed One said: “Worthy men,² good! Good! You in this fashion, modest, full of regret,³ fearful of censure in the other world⁴ beautify this preaching.⁵

I.15

I permit⁶ the gift of faith, Kāśyapa, to two śramaṇas. Which two? The one who is intent and the one who is liberated.⁷ And to two others: the one who sees impermanence with respect to all conditioned things, and the one who attains the

....” The Chinese also clearly indicates the future. I wonder whether this means or implies that the monks are willing to starve to death. As monks the only food they might obtain is that offered by donors, so declining such food would doom them to death by starvation, unless they were to renounce the monkhood, as they in fact do in III.19.

¹ After Chinese, and so when the same appears below.

² Tibetan *skyes bu dam pa* is generally (e.g. Mhy. 7358) equivalent to *satpuruṣa*, but here the extant Sanskrit reads *kulaputra*. The Chinese translations of the *Ratnarāsi* and *Śikṣāsamuccaya* also have 善男子 = *kulaputra*. BHSD s.v. *satpuruṣa* is wrong to state that the category refers exclusively to laymen. As far as I can tell, however, almost no attention has been paid to this category by modern scholars, but see La Vallée Poussin 1923-26: vi.218 (AKB ad VI.40). It must remain questionable, however, how far such a scholastic conception of the *satpuruṣa* as that of the AKB may be applied to the sūtras. At least in Chinese there seems to be considerable overlap with terms sometimes equivalent to *mahāsattva*. See Hōbōgirin s.v. Daiji (by the sorely missed Anna Seidel).

³ The two terms *lajjā* and *kaukr̥tya* are associated at Bbh 250.20-21.

⁴ The meaning, of course, is after death, in the next life or in between lives. For the whole expression, see the discussion in the Introduction.

⁵ Chinese: “you are the ornament (literally, necklace or neck ornament) of this present age.” I am not clear how 現世 could correspond to *idaṃ pravacanam*; is it “present dispensation” understood as “this age” (ignoring context)?

⁶ We have here, again, the term *amr̥jñā*, rendered above by “prescribe.” The sense here is surely that these two types of monk are permitted to accept a gift of faith, and no other type of monk is so qualified. In that sense, here too the Buddha is setting down a prescription.

⁷ There is a kind of word play I have not been able to capture in English, between the literal opposites *yuktasya* and *muktasya*, “yoked” and “freed.” The Chinese translators likewise could not express it. Exactly the same expression is found in the *Buddhapitakaduḥśīlanigrahī* (Peking #886: *mdo, tshu* 23b4). The entire passage from that text is quoted *in extenso* in the Introduction.

mind of liberation and friendliness.¹ Monks, in that regard that intent monk, yogācārin,² who practices what I have taught, having enjoyed the robes, begging bowl, sleeping mat, medicaments and equipments³ [obtained] from donors and benefactors, who sees the faults of saṃsāra,⁴ sees the impermanence in all conditioned things, understands that all conditioned things are suffering, zealously applies himself to the [fact that] all dharmas lack a self, and comprehends that nirvāṇa is calm,⁵ even though he enjoys mouthfuls of [food] as great as Mount Sumeru [given as a] gift of faith, still the offerings made to him become completely and totally pure. When [that monk] enjoys a gift of faith from donors and benefactors, the maturation of merit from that [gift] for those donors and benefactors has great power, and the benefit [to them] is great.⁶ Why? Because, monks, the attainment of a friendly attitude is the best of the material objects related to

¹ Sanskrit and Chinese omit: “And two others: the one who sees impermanence with respect to all conditioned things and the one who attains the mind of liberation and friendliness.”

² Chinese has “liberated monk,” omitting “yogācārin.”

³ The list of course is standard, *cīvara-piṇḍapāta-śayanāsana-glāna-pratyayabhaiṣajya-pariṣkāra*. See BHSD s.v. pariṣkāra.

⁴ Chinese has “practices good dharmas and strictly upholds the precepts as I have taught” for “who practices what I have taught, having enjoyed the robes, begging bowl, sleeping mat, medicaments and equipments [obtained] from donors, sees the faults of saṃsāra.” Sanskrit has “practices my teachings.”

⁵ For this standard list, the “seals of the teaching, *dharmamudrā*,” see Lamotte 1970: 1368ff, with of course copious references. See also VKN III.25 (Lamotte 1962: 165, n. 51), and references in his index to *dharmodāna*. In the MRK see *Tathāgataguhyasūtra* T. 312 (XI) 741.b.10-16, *Bodhisattvapīṭaka* T. 316 (XI) 794.c.21-795.a.6.

The list here adds to each item a term signifying the monk’s understanding of the “seal.” The last term in Tibetan is “comprehends,” *rtogs pa*, whereas Sanskrit has “is one who longs for,” *abhikāṅkṣī*.

⁶ As La Vallée Poussin long ago pointed out (1923-31: iv.21, note 1), a sūtra passage is quoted in the AKB with which the present passage should be compared: “A strong monk, upholder of the precepts, possessed of good qualities, consuming alms [from a donor] and bodily realizing and attaining the immeasurable concentrations of mind and dwelling [therein], should for that reason expect for that donor and benefactor immeasurable, overflowing merit, overflowing goodness, a shower of happiness and joy.” The AKB (Pradhan 1975: 197.26-198.1 = Shastri 585.10-586.1) reads: *yasyograbhikṣuḥ śīlavān kalyāṇa-dharmā piṇḍakam paribhujyāpramāṇam cetaḥsamādhim kāyena sāḥsātkṛtvopasāmpadya viharaty apramāṇas tannidāna[m] dāyakasya dānapater puṇyābhiṣyandaḥ kuṣalābhiṣyandaḥ sukhāsvādadhāraḥ pratikāṅkṣitavya iti*. I do not know if this passage has so far been identified.

See also BHSD s.v. maharddhika, mahādyutika and anuśaṃsa.

meritorious action.¹

I.16

Monks, if a monk who having enjoyed the robes, begging bowl, couch and equipments² of a donor and benefactor were to attain the immeasurable mind of liberation, you should know the maturation [of merit] of that donor and benefactor would also be immeasurable.³ Even, Kāśyapa, if possibly the oceans which are in three thousand times many thousands of world systems were to be exhausted, still there will be no exhaustion of all the natural results of that merit.⁴ Whoever, Kāśyapa, having enjoyed the gift of faith from a donor and benefactor should cause [the donor] disaster due to his failure to uphold the precepts, that deluded man must see how much damage he causes later.⁵ Therefore, Kāśyapa, śramaṇas with pure intention⁶ must abandon such qualities as the impurity of the śramaṇa, the sin of the śramaṇa, the dishonesty of the śramaṇa, the deceit of the śramaṇa, the guile of the śramaṇa, and the deception of the śramaṇa.

¹ See Mhy. 1703, *aupadhikaṃ punyakriyāvastu*. List of seven *aupadhika punyakriyāvastu*, for which see Lamotte 1949: 670 note 2, summary of AKVy 353-54 (see La Vallée Poussin 1923-26: iv.15, and notes). Chinese has the sentence as: "Because he always produces merit. There are three types of merit: 1) always donating food. 2) monasteries. 3) practicing friendliness. Among these three merits, friendliness is the best." This three-fold listing does not agree with that given in BHSD s.v. *punyakriyāvastu* and Nakamura 1981: 486d-487a.

² Sanskrit omits "couch and equipments."

³ Virtually the same expression in AN ii.54,23-25: *yassa bhikkhave bhikkhu cīvaram paribhuñjamaṇo appamāṇam cetosamādhim upasampajja viharati appamāṇo tassa puññābhisandho* See BHSD s.v. *cetosamādhi*.

⁴ For *nisyanda* (*rygu mthun pa*) as "natural result," see BHSD s.v.

⁵ The meaning of *phyir zhugs pa* is not completely clear to me.

⁶ Compare KP §30, 47, 33, where we find either *āsayaśuddha* or *śuddhāsaya*.

I.17

Kāśyapa, the title 'śramaṇa' is not something which issues from the eye, nor does it issue from the ear, nor from the nose, nor from the tongue, nor from the body, nor from the mind either; therefore one says 'śramaṇa.' [A śramaṇa] possesses cognition of the six sense spheres and the six superknowledges and the six mindfulnesses, dwells respecting the honorable ones, and dwells in the six dharmas gone beyond,¹ therefore people one says 'śramaṇa.'

The Chapter on the Śramaṇa, the First.

¹ Mhy 5104 (S. 5107) *pha rol tu 'gro ba = pārāyaṇam.*

The English Translation: Chapter Two

<The Monk>

II.1

People, Kāśyapa, use the word “monk.” Because one has overcome the defilements,¹ people call him a “monk.” Because: one has overcome the conception of self, one has overcome the conception of living being, the conception of life-essence, the conception of individuality, the conception of person, the conception of male, the conception of female, the conception of man, the conception of woman,² therefore people call him a “monk.” Because: one contemplates the body, one contemplates the precepts, one contemplates the mind, one contemplates wisdom,³ one is without fear, one has crossed over the flood of existence, one is free of all views and fear with respect to both existence and non-existence,⁴ and one dwells in the path of fearlessness — therefore people call him a

¹ Mhy. 419) *nyon mongs pa bcom pa = bhinnakleśa*. Is the term here a *bahuvrīhi*, meaning “one in whom the defilements are destroyed”? The expression here is a so-called folk etymology, with the *bhi-* of *bhinna* and the *k-* and *-ś-* of *kleśa* to account for *bhikṣu*. The same expression is found in “explanation” of *bhikṣu* in the *Abhisamayālaṅkāraloka* (Wogihara 1932: 8.26), and it is quoted in PTSD s.v. *bhikkhu* as “one of several allegorical etymologies ... which occur frequently in the commentaries.”

² The list is a standard one, and the technical terms are, in order, *ātma-samjñā*, *sattva-*, *jīva-*, *poṣa-*, *pudgala-*, *puruṣa-*, *strī-*, *dāraka-*, *dārikā-*. Compare the variants in the *Ratnacūḍa-sūtra* quoted at *Śikṣā-samuccaya* 236.15-16: *na punar atra kaścīd ātmabhāve satvo vā jīvo vā jantur vā poṣo vā puruṣo vā pudgalo vā manuḥ vā yo jāyate vā jīryate vā cyavate votpadyate vā*; the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā*, quoted at *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 199.8-9: *nāsty atra kāye ātmā vā satvo vā jīvo vā poṣo vā pudgalo vā manuḥ vā mānava vā ...*; KP §142; The formula as a whole does not seem to appear in the Nikāyas, but does in the *Niddesa*, for which see PTC s.v. *poṣa*, for examples.

³ Of these four terms, *kāya-bhāvanā*, *śīla-*, *citta-* and *prajñā-*, only the second and fourth are found in Chinese. This list was, however, already found above at I.3, and see the note there.

⁴ Mhy. 2417) *'byung ba dang 'jig pa la sred pa dang bral ba = vīta-tṛṣṇo bhavābhava*, allows us to suggest here **vīta-sarva-dṛṣṭi-bhavo bhavābhava*. The expression from “crossed over the flood of existence” to here is found in Chinese as follows: “crossed over the three existences (*bhavas*) and four floods (*oghas*), sees the faults of the existences and floods and is free of all existences and floods.”

“monk.”

II.2

If there is someone, Kāśyapa, who does not possess these characteristics but falsely claims “I am a monk, I am a monk,” rejecting zealous cultivation [of the path], I am not his teacher, nor likewise is he my disciple.

II.3

Evil monks, Kāśyapa, will to a great extent¹ bring about the destruction of this teaching of mine but, Kāśyapa, the ninety-five non-believers and all the rival schools are not able to bring about the destruction of this teaching of mine.² On

¹ I am not certain that *phal cher* here should be taken adverbially. Chinese has rather “many evil monks.” Should the Tibetan also be so understood?

² Probably the term translated here as “non-believer” is *pāṣaṇḍa* or *pāṣaṇḍika* (Mhy 3524), and “rival schools” *parapravādin* (Mhy. 2730). The usual translation of *pāṣaṇḍa* as “heretic” is not accurate, since the reference is not to heretical Buddhists but rather to those who do not follow Buddhism. (For a few remarks on *pāṣaṇḍa*, see Halbfass 1988: 191-2, and 514 n. 91.) Oda 435b says there are two types of classifications of 95 or 96 non-buddhist views 外道 (the classification of 95 is mentioned only very much in passing by Mochizuki 911b-913a, and 96 not at all). Oda refers to many examples, of which we may quote a few and add a few more: 95 views: *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* 大般涅槃經 T. 375 (XII) 668a4: 常說一切外學九十五種皆趣惡道. The *Wenshushili niepan-jing* 文殊師利般涅槃經 T. 463 (XIV) 480c16 refers to 95 theses of brahmins: 諸婆羅門九十五種. See also Zhi Yi’s 智顛 *Pusa jieyishu* 菩薩戒義疏 T. 1811 (XL) 579a29 which says there are 95 types of evil non-Buddhists: 外道惡人即九十五種. 96: *Ekottarāgama* T. 125 (20.4) (II) 651c29. *Gaṇḍavyūha* (Suzuki and Idzumi 1949: 181.14-17): “I will go everywhere, Gentle son, to mature those beings, nonbelievers in this land [Jambudvīpa = India] obstinately attached to the ninety-six varieties of items of wrong speculation.” *ye ’pīme kulaputra jambudvīpe ṣaṇṇavatiyo pāṣaṇḍā vividhadṛṣṭigatābhiniṣṭās tatrāpy ahaṃ sarvatrāgacchāmi vividhadṛṣṭigatasaktānāṃ sattvānāṃ paripācanatāyai. Da Zhidu lun* T. 1509 (XXV) 79b29; 228b15, 25; 325c11; 349b22 (62 views at line 26!), etc. The **Sarvāstivādinayavibhāṣā* (T. 1440 [XXIII] 536a22-26; I owe the reference to Wang 1988: 125, note 25) explains (or rationalizes) as follows: There were six non-Buddhist teachers [in canonical accounts]. “Each teacher had fifteen types of teaching, and he gave each disciple a different teaching. The disciples accepted and practiced them, and each evolved a different view (**dṛṣṭi*). In this manner one teacher produced fifteen types of views; the teacher’s [own] teaching (**dharma*) was different from those of his disciples, so teacher and disciples have sixteen views [together]. In this way the six

the contrary, it is those deluded people with minds not given to profound concentration¹ who arise from [within] this [very] teaching of mine who will destroy my teaching.² By way of example, Kāśyapa, the flesh of a dead lion, the king of animals, cannot be eaten even by some wild beast or bird, but those worms born out of the very carcass of that lion eat the flesh of the lion, the king of animals. In this fashion, Kāśyapa, those greedy fools, overcome by passion,³ of illicit view, of uncomprehending mind, feeble, liars, who arise from out of this very teaching of mine will destroy my teaching.⁴

teachers have ninety-six views.” The *Āṅgulimālika* (a Mahāyāna text) T. 120 (II) 541c3-6 also refers to 96 different views. Yijing’s account of pilgrims who travelled to India also refers to 96 (T. 2066 [LI] 6a9, Wang 1988: 114, and 125 note 25, and Chavannes 1894: 91, and note 2), as does the account of Faxian (T. 2085 [LI] 860c19, 861a8-9, Legge 1886: 60, 62). An eleventh century commentary on the *Dharmaguptaka-vinaya*, the 四分律行事鈔資持記 T. 1805 (XL) 165b4, refers to the idea that there are 95 外道 plus Buddhism, for 96.

Another account, the *locus classicus* of which is in the *Brahmajāla-sutta* (DN i.39), places the number instead at 62. See for instance BHSD s.v. *dr̥ṣṭikṛta*, referring to SP 48.6, *dvāṣaṣṭidṛṣṭikṛta nis[ra]yitvā*; the Central Asian text in Toda 1981: 28 reads *dvāṣaṣṭidṛṣṭigatam āśrayitvā*. The *Upāyakaṅśalyasūtra* in the MRK also gives the number of heresies as 62 (T. 310 [38] XI 599b25).

¹ In its positive form the term *nges par sems pa*, refers to *nidhyaptacitta*, which I have translated as “with profound concentration of thought” in VI.5, below. See BHSD s.v. *nidhyapta*, et seq.

² A passage in the *Samyutta Nikāya* says the following: “The earth element does not destroy the True Teaching (*saddhamma*), nor does the water element ... nor does the fire element ... nor does the wind element destroy the True Teaching. Rather, right here [within the community] there arise deluded people and they destroy the True Teaching.” SN ii.224,22-26 (XVI.13.8-12): *na kho kassapa pathavidhātu saddhammam antaradhāpeti // na āpodhātu / pe / na tejodhātu / pe / na vayodhatu saddhammam antaradhāpeti // atha kho idheva te uppajjanti moghāpurisā ye imaṃ saddhammam antaradhāpeti*. The simile, of course, does not appear, but otherwise the passage seems to have exactly the same intent as those just quoted. [The term *moghāpurisā* is not completely clear. First, the reading should be emended either to *moghāpurisā*, or treated as two words in apposition: *moghā purisā*. Second, although *mogha* is defined in both Pāli and Sanskrit as “empty, vain,” it is also equivalent to *moha*, which means deluded or foolish. I do not see how a rendering such as that of C.A.F. Rhys Davids 1922: 152, “futile men,” makes any sense, and have adopted the understanding of *mogha* as = *moha*.] Chinese parallels to the SN passage are found in the *Samyuktāgama* T. 99 (906) (II) 226c10-13 and T. 100 (121) (II) 419b28-c4. Both of these versions clarify that the evil members of the community will “say that dharma is non-dharma, non-dharma is dharma, vinaya is non-vinaya, non-vinaya is vinaya, etc.” and this will cause the gradual disappearance of the Buddha’s True Teaching (*saddharma*) and its replacement with the Semblance Teaching (像法).

³ Compare Mhy. 180, in which a couple of the same terms appear: *kya ma 'jig rten gnas pa 'di ni brkam zhing 'dod pas zil gyis non pa ste chog mi shes shing gzhan gyi nor la 'phrog pa = lubdho lobhābhībhūto vatāyam lokasāmniveśo 'tṛptaḥ paravittāpahāri*.

⁴ The Chinese translation has it a bit differently: “Kāśyapa. There will arise out of my teaching such evil monks, greedy for profits, who conceal their greed, who do not destroy evil things and do not

II.4

If one possesses four qualities, Kāśyapa, he should be known as an evil monk.

Which four?

- 1) Lust, and
- 2) Hate, and
- 3) Delusion, and
- 4) Self-conceit. Those four.¹

II.5

Another four. Which four?

cultivate good things, who are not free of malicious language.”

The simile is found elsewhere: Oda 704a-b refers to the *Lianhuamian-jing*: “For example, when a lion dies all beings whether of the sky, the soil, the water or the land do not dare to eat the flesh of that lion’s body. Rather, from the very flesh of that lion itself are born worms which consume the lion’s flesh. Ananda. This Buddha teaching of mine is not something which can be destroyed by others. It is rather evil monks within my teaching who like a poisoned thorn will destroy the Buddha teaching which I have accumulated through the practice of ascetic penances over three immeasurable aeons.” 蓮華面經 T 386 (XII) 1072c23-28: 譬如 師子命絕身死 若空若地若水若陸所有衆生不敢食彼師子身肉。唯師子身自生諸虫還自噉食師子之肉。阿難。我之佛法非餘能壞是我法中諸惡比丘猶如毒刺破我三阿僧祇劫積行勤苦所集佛法。On the text see Yamada 1955 and 1959: 567-80.

See also the 仁王般若波羅蜜經 T. 245 (VIII) 833b29-c7: “Great king! When the dharma is no longer in the world, there will be monks, disciples of the four groups [bhikṣus, bhikṣunis, upāsakasa, upāsikās], kings (and ministers) who perform many unlawful deeds, transgress against the Buddha, the teaching and the community, perform great unlawful deeds, perform many sins, illegalities and violations of the discipline and bind up monks in the fashion of a prisoner. At such a time the teaching will decay and not remain long. Great king! After my death, in future days there will be in the world four types of disciples, various petty kings, princes, princelets and these protectors and defenders of the Three Jewels will turn and destroy the Three Jewels. Similarly, it is worms in the body of a lion which themselves devour the lion, [so it is monks within the community who destroy it] not non-Buddhists.” 大王 法末世時有諸比丘四部弟子國王 (S, Y, M add 大臣) 多作非法之行橫與佛法衆僧作大非法作諸罪過非法非律繫縛比丘如獄囚法當爾之時法滅不久。大王 我滅度後未來世中四部弟子諸小國王太子王子乃是住持護三寶者轉更滅破三寶 如師子身中虫自食師子非外道也 ... etc.

¹ The list is of course *rāga*, *dveṣa*, *moha*, plus *asmimāna*. On the last see BHSD s.v.

- 1) Arrogance,¹ and
- 2) Impudence,² and
- 3) Being [noisy] like a raven,³ and
- 4) Using obscene language.⁴ Those four.

II.6

Another four. Which four?

- 1) Frivolity,⁵ and
- 2) Conceit, and
- 3) Desire for gain, and
- 4) Desire for the illicit. Those four.

II.7

Another four. Which four?

- 1) Deceit,⁶ and
- 2) Cunning, and

¹ **stambha*, Mhy. 7339.

² **mukhara*, Mhy 2481. Or perhaps garrulousness, scurrilousness? BHSD s.v. See the note to I.4 (20), above.

³ See MW *kākarava*: crying out like a crow, cowardly.

⁴ Chinese: "committing the fault of not taking care in speech."

⁵ *auddhatya*. See BHSD s.v. *auddhatya*. As Edgerton points out, the term means "*frivolity*, in the double sense of *amusement*, *idle sport*, and *mental indolence*, *lack of seriousness of mind*." It is the second of these senses which is more to the fore here, as the Chinese rendering "unsteadiness" emphasizes.

⁶ **jihma* (Mhy. 7324).

- 3) Improper livelihood,¹ and
- 4) Speaking of insignificant matters. Those four.

II.8

Another four. Which four?

- 1) Not to acknowledge what was done [for one by others],² and
- 2) To deprecate what was done [for one by others], and
- 3) Not to recall what was previously done [for one by others], and
- 4) To insult one's friends. Those four.

II.9

Another four. Which four?

- 1) Destruction of the gift of faith, and
- 2) Not upholding the precepts, and
- 3) Contempt for the monastic disciplinary rule, and
- 4) Not upholding the discipline. Those four.

II.10

Another four. Which four?

¹ Probably this does not refer to the category of the five *mithyājīva*, but rather to various types of improper livelihood in general.

² Here and in the following the additions in brackets are based on the Chinese translation.

- 1) [Holding] the doctrine [that there exists] a self, and
- 2) [Holding] the doctrine [that there exists] a sentient being, and
- 3) [Holding] the doctrine [that there exists] a life-essence, and
- 4) [Holding] the doctrine [that there exists] a person.¹ Those four.

II.11

Another four. Which four?

- 1) Not honoring the Buddha, and
- 2) Not honoring the Teaching, and
- 3) Not honoring the Community, and
- 4) Not honoring the [three] teachings.² Those four.

II.12

Another four. Which four?

- 1) Not delighting in the communion of the order,³ and
- 2) Not obtaining delight in the monastery,⁴ and
- 3) Delighting in garrulous association with others, and

¹ We have here of course *ātma-*, *sattva-*, *jīva-* and *pudgala-vāda*.

² It is not certain what *bslab* = **śikṣā* means here. See BHSD s.v. Chinese 戒 suggests the meaning morality or even discipline. I have conjectured that the reference is to the three “instructions,” the *adhiśīla*, *adhicitta* and *adhiprajñā*. The parallelism with Buddha, Teaching and community, however, escapes me.

³ *dge 'dun 'thun pa* = *saṅghasāmagrī*. See BHSD s.v. *sāmagrī*.

⁴ Monastery is *vihāra*. Chinese has: “not delighting in solitary places.”

- 4) Propounding the ideas of the Materialists. Those four.

II.13

Another four. Which four?

- 1) Desire for acquisitions, and
- 2) Desire for fame, and
- 3) Desire for friends,¹ and
- 4) Not obtaining joy in the Teaching.² Those four.

II.14

Another four. Which four?

- 1) To be possessed by Māra, and
- 2) To be overcome by Māra, and
- 3) To be full of torpor and drowsiness,³ and
- 4) Not to dwell in the saintly attitudes.⁴ Those four.

II.15

Another four. Which four?

¹ Or, relatives and friends. Compare *bshes gnyen* = *mitra*. Chinese 求多知識, probably just “searching for many friends.”

² **dharmaprāmodya*^o. The appropriate Chinese rendering of this item is found at II.14.4.

³ **styānamiddha*. See BHSD s.v.

⁴ The appropriate Chinese rendering is found at II.13 (4). The “saintly attitudes” translates *āryavamsā*.

- 1) To adorn the body, although it is rotten,¹ and
- 2) To be afflicted by defilements, and
- 3) Turning one's back on nirvāṇa, and
- 4) To not have obtained the fruit [of the śramaṇa]. Those four.

II.16

Another four. Which four?

- 1) Being burned by burning desire for lust,² and
- 2) Being burned by burning desire for hatred, and
- 3) Being burned by burning desire for delusion, and
- 4) Being burned by burning desire for all defilements. Those four.

II.17

Another four. Which four?

- 1) Dwelling in a bad path, to be one who does not see arisal, and

¹ Chinese: "to rot / decay in the Buddhadharma," or "to cause the Buddhadharma to rot"? Either way, the possible connection with the sense of the Tibetan translation is hard to locate. In the following, item 2 in Tibetan is rendered by Chinese 3, but item 3 does not seem to correspond to Chinese 2, "to have a mind given to deceit."

² See BHSD s.v. *paridāgha*, which offers the meanings "ardent desire" and "torment, anguish." Edgerton cites references to the form *kāmaparidāgha* and its Pāli equivalents (we might add in Tibetan *Sandhinirmocana* II.3). Our passage, however, clearly refers to *rāga*, *dveṣa* and *moha*, along with *sarvakleśa*. For the first three, at least, see *Udāna* 32.25-26. The Buddha surveying the world sees many beings being burned: "being burned by many burning desires, by lusts, by hatreds, by delusions." *anekehi ca pariḷāhehi paridayhamāne rāgajehi pi dosajehi pi mohajehi pi*. [Should we read with MS A °*rajehi* for °*jehi*?]

- 2) Being greedy, having the nature of not sharing with others, and
- 3) Desiring to possess everything, and [so] being unsatisfied, and
- 4) Being unsated, but being devoid of energy for learning.¹ Those four.

II.18

Another four. Which four?

- 1) To descend from darkness to [greater] darkness,² and
- 2) To descend from delusion to [greater] delusion, and
- 3) To have an illicit view because of being ensnared by wrong notions,³ and
- 4) Being bound by the fetters of saṃsāra because one has shut the doors of nirvāṇa.⁴ Those four.

¹ Chinese has: “(1) To engage in sexual play and to not know one is sinning. 2) Not being content, although one is very learned. 3) Not being content with what one possesses.” 4) = Tibetan 2.

² This image is standard, not only in Buddhist materials but even in the Upaniṣads, although the usage and meaning may not be the same. See *Īsopaniṣad* 9 = *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 4.4.10 (and see also *Īśa* 12). *andhaṃ tamaḥ praviśanti yo 'dvīyām upāsate / tato bhūya iva te tamo ya u vidyāyām ratāḥ //*. “They enter blind darkness who are intent on ignorance, and darkness which seems even greater than that enter those who delight in knowledge.” For a Buddhist usage of the image, see the *Anūnatvāpurnatva-nirdeśaparivarta* quoted in the *Ratnagotravibhāga* (Johnston 1950: 28.3-4; the sūtra passage is T. 688 [XVI] 467c23, differing slightly): *tān ahaṃ śāriputra tamasa tamo 'ntaram andhakārān mahāndhakāragāminas tamobhūyiṣṭhā iti vadāmi*, “Śāriputra, I say that they [people who have certain wrong views, specified in the sūtra] go from one darkness to another darkness, from obscurity to greater obscurity, that they are fundamentally characterized by darkness.”

³ Chinese has “not seeing the noble truths and producing much confusion.”

⁴ In the *Da Zhidu lun* T. 1509 (XXV) 206a12-13 = *Traité* (Lamotte 1944-80): 1210, it is stated that there are three doors to the city of Nirvāṇa, these being emptiness, signlessness and wishlessness. This may or may not be the image intended here.

II.19

Another four. Which four?

- 1) Deceitful behavior of body, and
- 2) Deceitful behavior of speech, and
- 3) Deceitful behavior of mind,¹ and
- 4) Deceitful behavior of the [four] modes of deportment.² Those four.

II.20

In that regard, deceitful behavior of body is deceitful behavior of walking slowly; deceitful behavior of lowering one's head;³ deceitful behavior of gazing only a yoke's length ahead;⁴ deceitful behavior of wearing [monastic] garb well; deceitful behavior is like being a forest dweller while not pursuing the good qualities of the forest dweller; deceitful behavior is like accepting alms without dispelling the idea [that one will thus attain] fame; deceitful behavior is like wearing refuse rags without the accompanying shame and modesty; deceitful

¹ See BHSD s.v. *kuhana*. *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 268.1-3 quotes *Ratnameghasūtra*: "Thus he does not behave deceitfully in terms of body ... speech ... mind." *evaṃ kāyakuhanāṃ na karoti / katham vākkuhanāṃ na karoti / ... katham na cittakuhanāṃ karoti /*. Bendall's note quotes the Tibetan as *tshul 'chos*, and refers to *Anargharāghava* IV st. 11.

² See KP §123: "Those modes of deportment are feigned with deceit and boasting [about his spiritual accomplishments]." *spyod lam de dag kyang tshul 'chos pa dang / kha gsag gis yongs su brtags pa yin te / = te cāsyeryāpathāḥ kuhanalapanatayā kalpitā bhavanti*. The four modes of deportment are walking, standing, sitting, lying down. See BHSD s.v. *iryapatha*. (It is perhaps more standard to translate *kuhana* with "hypocrisy," but I think that fundamentally the term refers to a type of trickery or deceit; one fools not oneself [which is hypocritical], but others, and for the sake of a certain end; this is deceit.)

³ Mhy. 7125 *adhomukhaḥ*; Chinese not looking left or right.

⁴ See Mhy. 8539: *gnya' shing gang tsam du blta ba = yugamātradarśinaḥ*. *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 167.15 quotes from the *Ratnamegha* the form *yugamātraprekṣikayā*. Apparently the word in the Mhy.'s shape is not in BHSD. Pāli seems to have equivalents for both terms, according to PTSD s.v. *yuga*.

behavior is like dwelling near a mountain and near a tree without understanding dependent co-origination; deceitful behavior is like trying to obtain decocted medicine but not trying to obtain the immortal medicine of the Teaching.¹ This is what we mean by “deceitful behavior of body.”²

II.21

In this regard, what is deceitful behavior of speech? Saying ‘such-and-such a person knows me, such-and-such a person invited me to a feast,’ or ‘I obtain what I desire, and obtain it with honor. I obtain what is good. I obtain things many times. I am very learned. I uphold the precepts and am of good character.’³ I am worthy to be invited. I am, again, capable of establishing an opposing position.⁴

¹ The four items just listed refer to the four reliances, *nīśraya*, listed for example in Mhy. 8669-73. In Pāli the four *nissaya* is a common classification. Childers s.v. *nissayo* is better here than PTSD. The last item, decocted medicine, is *pūtimuktabhaiṣajya* (Mhy. 8673 *smān bkus ta bor ba*). See BHSD s.v. *pūtimukta*; *Bhikṣuṇī Vinaya* (Roth 1970) §51, 64; Oda 1917: 1211c-12a; Vin. i.58.20 (*Mahāvagga* I.30.4); MN i.316,24-34; *Sarvāstivāda-vinaya* 十誦律 T. 1435 (XXIII) 156c24. See also Yijing’s diary, Takakusu 1896: 139. I have not yet run across other examples of the striking imagery we have here, especially in the last item.

² We may compare here the passage in the *Ekottarāgama* 增壹阿含經 T. 125 (II) 634a24-29 (≈ AN ii.106-107 [§IV.106]), pointed out already in a somewhat different context by Ōno Hōdō 1954: 100-101: “What sort of people are ‘raw / immature’ 生 but imitate the ‘cooked / matured’ 熟? There are some people who wander to and fro and do not move abruptly and carelessly. The way their eyes look [at things] is always in accord with the teachings. Wearing their robes and taking their bowls they wander in accord with the teaching. They look at the ground and do not gaze right or left. But they violate the precepts and do not follow the correct practice. They are not true śramaṇas but rather imitation śramaṇas. They are not followers of the practice of purity (*brahmacarya*) but claim themselves to be followers of the practice of purity. They destroy the true teachings. They are the seed which corrupts the root. These people are called ‘raw / immature’ but counterfeiting the ‘cooked / matured.’”

³ See KP §11 for *śilavat*^o and *kalyāṇadharmā*^o side by side, those who uphold the precepts, and are of good character.

⁴ Mhy. 4448, *samādhāna* or 6593 *pratīvidhāna*? BHSD s.v. *samādhāna* says: “acc. to Tib. lan gdab pa, *making answer, reply*: ... prob. in sense of refutation of an opponent’s argument by way of *establishing* one’s own view....” Still, I am not clear on the meaning. Chinese has: 我善問答。我能順法相。我能逆法相。‘I answer questions well. I can [recite?] the teachings in their forward order and I can [recite them?] in their reverse order.’”

Being endowed with dignity, I have fortune and I have power.¹ I am wise in the teachings which concern the ascertainment of meanings.² Such-and-such a person speaks in such-and-such a way to me, and I speaking in such-and-such a way to him revile him and cause him to lose confidence.³ I please the audience, I receive their congratulations, I receive clothing from them,⁴ and I am invited to come again.’ Whatever sort of vain talk, Kāśyapa, comes from among those whose minds are not given to profound concentration is all deceitful behavior of speech. This applies to those who are unworthy, but does not apply to those who are worthy. This is what we mean by “deceitful behavior of speech.”

II.22

In that regard, Kāśyapa, what is deceitful behavior of mind? Imagining in one’s mind that it is appropriate that one receive robes and bowls, but still verbally saying “I need nothing,” and desiring in one’s mind to obtain [something] but still saying with words that one has few desires — this is what we mean by “deceitful behavior of mind.”

II.23

In that regard it is said:

¹ Chinese omits this sentence.

² **arthaviniścaya*-. Chinese has: “I comprehend meaning and non-meaning in relation to all dharmas.” For a discussion of the meaning of the term *arthaviniścaya* in the context of its appearance as a text title, see Samtani 1971: 57-60.

³ Chinese has the sentence as: “if another asks me in such-and-such a way I can answer him in such-and-such a way, and having answered I reduce him to silence.”

⁴ Chinese omits this clause.

To think in one's mind "Wouldn't it be nice if I got [gifts]?"
 [While] saying aloud "I have no needs at all" —
 One who speaks in that way with a mind that is not sincere
 Will never ever obtain happiness. {a}

One whose thoughts are [characterized by] deceitful behavior of mind,
 Who has the idea that his speech will beguile the gods,
 The nāgas, and those possessed of the Divine Eye, will never become
 pure;
 All the Tathāgatas know him. {b}

II.24

Thus, Kāśyapa, whichever unrighteous¹ monk of this type, who practices evil,
 wrong² practices, will go [in his subsequent rebirths] to hell-being status, or to
 birth as an animal, or to the realm of the king of the dead.³

The Chapter on the Monk; The Second.

¹ **adharmika*.

² Perhaps **anācāraka*? The rendering "wrong" may be too weak in the present context.

³ On Yama, see Wayman 1959.

The English Translation: Chapter Three

<The Outcaste Śramaṇa>

III.1

Now, Kāśyapa, what is the outcaste-like śramaṇa?¹ By way of example, Kāśyapa, the outcaste is one who always frequents charnel grounds.² He hopes [to find] a corpse, looks at living beings with eyes devoid of friendliness, and takes delight in [encountering] a corpse.³ In a similar way, Kāśyapa, the outcaste-like śramaṇa also is one who is always eager to find the house of a friend and the house of one who gives alms. Then, subsisting on the profit and honor [he obtains], he does not incite those householders to undertake the Teaching and the Discipline, but he becomes familiar with them for the sake of profit and not for the sake of [acquiring] the goal;⁴ he is without a loving heart and he always hopes for profit. This, Kāśyapa, is what we mean by “the outcaste-like śramaṇa.”

¹ See the discussion of the *caṇḍāla* in the Introduction.

² *Manusmṛti* X.39 discusses the off-spring of a Niṣāda woman and a Caṇḍāla man, who is called an Antyāvasāyin and who is *śmaśānagocara*, frequenting burning grounds, going about in places for burning the dead: *niṣādastrī tu caṇḍālāt putram antyāvasāyinaṁ / śmaśānagocaram sūte vāhyānām api garhitam //*.

³ I have inserted the words in brackets in line with the Chinese translation. Tibetan *shi ba* usually means just “dead,” but in AKB *mṛtakalpa*, “almost dead,” is rendered *shi ba dang 'dra ba* and, by Paramārtha, 譬如死屍, “like a corpse.” See Hirakawa 1973, 1977, 1978, s.v.

⁴ One of the Brahmanical Saṁnyāsa Upaniṣads, *Maitreya Upaniṣad* 2.3.10 (Schrader 1912: 117.1-2) says: *dravyārtham annavastrārtham yaḥ pratiṣṭhārtham eva vā / saṁnyased ubhayabhraṣṭaḥ sa muktīm nāptum arhati //*. Olivelle (1992: 163) translates: “He who renounces for the sake of wealth, food, clothes, or celebrity, falls from both paths and is unable to attain release.” Schrader’s commentary (427.6) explains *ubhayabhraṣṭaḥ gārhasṭhyāt saṁnyāsac ca bhraṣṭaḥ*, in other words he is no longer a householder but not a renouncer either (see Olivelle note 17).

III.2

By way of example, Kāśyapa: The outcaste deserves to be forever spurned by guild-chiefs, householders, ministers, vassal princes, brahmans, kṣatriyas, townsmen and country-folks.¹ Recognizing the outcaste, even those far away spurn him at a distance.² In a similar way, Kāśyapa, the outcaste-like śramaṇa too deserves to be spurned by monks, nuns, upāsakas and upāsikās who uphold the precepts and are virtuous. Having recognized that the outcaste-like śramaṇa practices evil deeds and breaks the precepts, even those far away spurn him at a distance.³

III.3

By way of example, Kāśyapa: High class people do not touch and do not use an outcaste's flag⁴ or garments, everything used by him. Similarly, Kāśyapa,

¹ See BHSD s.v. kottarājan, and the stock phrases quoted there. See also s.v. naigama.

² The exact sense of *thag ring po ba* is not clear to me. Chinese 遠離不欲共作知識, "stay away and do not desire to become friends with them." Probably Tibetan should be understood in the sense of *dūra*^o, distant,

³ Compare the passage in the *Āṅguttara Nikāya* (AN i.126,14-22): "Here, monks, there is a person who is a precept breaker, of evil behavior, impure, of vile conduct, who acts secretly, who while not a śramaṇa claims to be a śramaṇa, who while not a keeper of the practice of purity claims to be a keeper of the practice of purity, who is internally putrid, internally leaking, internally of a rotten nature. A person such as this, monks, is to be shunned, he is not to be frequented, not to be associated with, not to be attended upon. Why? Because, monks, even though one does not give consideration to the wrong speculation of such a person, still an evil reputation spreads about, that one is a man who has evil friends, evil companions, evil intimates." *idha bhikkhave ekacco puggalo dussīlo hoti pāpadhammo asucisankassa-rasamācāro pañchannakammanto assamaṇo samaṇapaṭiñño abrahmacārī brahmacāripaṭiñño antopūti avassuto kasambujāto. evarūpo bhikkhave puggalo jigucchitabbo na sevitabbo na bhajitabbo na payirupāsītabbo. tam kissa hetu. kiñcāpi bhikkhave evarūpassa puggalassa na dūtṭhānugatim āpajjati atha kho nam pāpako kittisaddo abbhuggacchati pāpamitto purisapuggalo pāpasahāyo pāpasampavaṅko ti.*

⁴ Zhang et al. 1985 defines *kha physis* as a cotton handkerchief or napkin, *gdong phyi byed kyi ras*. This is obscure to me, but I wonder if this refers to the sign the outcaste must display warning those who catch sight of him that they should stay away. The Chinese translation of the *Ratnarāśi* has: "good people absolutely are not pleased by the robes, food and everything used by a caṇḍāla, and do not use it." I cannot suggest a clear resolution of the problem now.

because the outcaste-like śramaṇa's bowl, robes, and everything used by him is sought for through improper livelihood, sought for through injuring body and mind, those who uphold the precepts and are virtuous do not touch and do not use them.

III.4

By way of example, Kāśyapa: An outcaste holds up his 'flag' and goes to another's home in a timid, shrinking way.¹ Similarly, Kāśyapa, the outcaste-like śramaṇa too pays homage to the Tathāgata's stūpa in a timid, shrinking way. He goes about in the assembly in a timid, shrinking way. He goes to a monastery, rest-house and another's home in a timid, shrinking way. He walks, sits, lies down in a timid, shrinking way. Thus, Kāśyapa, all his means of deportment, which conceal his sinful timid, shrinking actions, are imagined based on the unreal.²

It is probable that what Tibetan has as "touch," *reg*, represents some form of $\sqrt{\text{spr}}\acute{s}$, and that this was understood by Chinese in line with the meaning of *phāsu* as 愛樂 "delight in, be pleased with." This would account for the difference in their renderings, and would further suggest that the text available to the Chinese translators was in some form of Middle Indic, rather than Sanskrit. (For a detailed discussion on the term *phāsu*, see Caillat 1960, 1961.)

¹ The Tibetan *zhum zhum* is defined (Zhang et al. 1985) as movement such as that of a cat stalking a bird or mouse, but virtually without question we should interpret it instead in a weak rather than a strong sense. It is possible that we should imagine a form such as **līna / *dīna* here. See BHSD s.v. *alīna* and *līna*, and Wogihara 1964-74 s.v. *alīna*, *adīna*, *dīna*, *līna*. *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 20.15 (quoting the *Bodhisattva-prātimokṣa*) has: *līnaṃ cittāṃ bodhisatvānāṃ na vidyate*, Tibetan (Derge 15a7) ... *zhum pa'i sems med*, Chinese T. 1636 (XXXII) 80a15 菩薩無懈怠心. (懈怠 usually renders *kausīdya*, "laziness.") (The *Bodhisattva-prātimokṣa* is the *Bodhisattva-prātimokṣacatuskanirhāra* Ōtani 914, Tōhoku 248. The quotations in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* have been identified and studied by Fujita Kōkan 1988. Fujita 1988: 124 translates *līnaṃ cittāṃ* [which he writes in compound!] as 消沈した心, "dejected.")

² I am not sure of this rendering. *yongs su brtags pa* surely refers to **parikalpita* or a related form, but what is *rung ba ma yin pa*? Could it stand for **abhūta*?

III.5

By way of example, Kāśyapa: The mind of the outcaste is not set on birth in a good destiny. Why? Through the fault of his very own actions. Similarly, Kāśyapa, the mind of the outcaste-like śramaṇa too is not set on doing the actions necessary to go to a good destiny, and so that other world is lost, and there is no obstacle to his dwelling in the three bad destinies. This, Kāśyapa, is what we mean by “the outcaste-like śramaṇa.”

III.6

Now, Kāśyapa, what is the putrid śramaṇa?¹ By way of example, Kāśyapa: From the excellent drink which is fit for the king the best part² is scooped off [for him to drink], and the remainder becomes putrid and impure, and is not fit to be tasted. Similarly, Kāśyapa, the putrid śramaṇa too is deprived of the taste of the cream of the best teaching, fetid, fit [only] to be thrown away, defiled, cunning and deceitful, full of the stench of broken precepts, deprived of the fragrance of the precepts, soiled by the odor of defilements. Wherever he goes he is concerned with his own benefit, but not with the benefit of others.³ This, Kāśyapa, is what we mean by “the putrid śramaṇa.”

¹ It is possible that the Sanskrit equivalent here is **pūti(ka)*. Tse ring dbang rgyal (Bacot 1930: 170a) writes *puṭima* (the other associated forms are obscure to me). But note that AN i.72,8 (no Chinese equivalent?) discusses two types of assembly: *parisakasaṭo ca parisamaṇḍo ca*, the “dregs” assembly and the assembly of the “cream” or best portion. The former term is also found at SP 44.11 (Tibetan *snyigs ma*). This expression (and see the following note) suggest that the *Ratnarāśi* may be referring to *kaṣaṭ(t)a* rather than **pūti*.

² Probably *maṇḍa*. See Hōbōgirin 640-51 (Daigo 醍醐, by Anna Seidel), in which the imagery etc. is discussed in detail, but without any reference to our particular example.

³ Chinese has: “Wherever he goes he cannot benefit himself and he does not benefit others.”

III.7

By way of example, Kāśyapa, the “putrid” is like this: What is eaten, drunk, or chewed on¹ is excreted, and that putrefies and is evil smelling; for all high class people it is [only] fit to be thrown away. Similarly, Kāśyapa, the putrid śramaṇa too is like excrement, and since [his] behaviors of body, speech and mind are impure noble people should spurn him. This is what we mean by “the putrid śramaṇa.”

III.8

By way of example, Kāśyapa: A putrid seed cannot grow out of the earth. Similarly, Kāśyapa, the putrid śramaṇa too is not produced in the Buddha’s teaching, the noble Teaching is not a possible seed of liberation, and the fruit [of the śramaṇa] will not be obtained. This, Kāśyapa, is what we mean by “the putrid śramaṇa.”

III.9

Now, Kāśyapa, what is the box-like² śramaṇa? By way of example, Kāśyapa: Although one may cleanse a box on the outside, the inside may still be filled with various impurities. Similarly, the box-like śramaṇa too has the appearance of a

¹ Compare Mhy 7040: *zos pa dang 'ihungs pa dang 'chos pa dang myangs pa rnams legs par bde bar 'ju = aśitapitakhādītāsvāditāni samyak sukhena paripākam gacchanti.*

² Mhy. 5891 *karaṇḍaka*. Is there some sort of verbal play here between *karaṇḍaka* and *kuraṇṭaka* in the following section? See below in the notes as well for the term *kāraṇḍava*, rubbish barley śramaṇa.

śramaṇa, and externally he practices cleanliness, but inside he is thoroughly filled with lust, hate and delusion. This, Kāśyapa, is what we mean by “the box-like śramaṇa.”

III.10

Now, Kāśyapa, what is the kuraṇṭaka-like¹ śramaṇa? By way of example, Kāśyapa: If one looks at the color of the flowers called “kuraṇṭaka” they are agreeable, but if one touches them they are rough, they stink of dung-flies, and they stink of the root of the *śilabarka.² The wise do not touch flowers like that, do not pick them, do not smell them, but those who are foolish and do not know their defects pick flowers like that and smell them. Similarly, Kāśyapa, the

¹ Probably *kuraṇṭaka* or *karuntaka* or *kurunṭikā* (?), although Tibetan suggests a pronunciation *kuraṇḍāka*. The term appears not rarely, for example in the *Bṛhatsamhitā* XLIII.33. The *Bukkyō Daijii* 佛敎大辭彙 II.891 discusses the word, giving 拘蘭茶, 俱蘭●, and 紅色華. The word is referred to in the discussion of *Ratnakūṭa* vocabulary in the 一切經音義 of Huilin 慧琳 (a Kashmiri who lived 737-820), T. 2128 (LIV) 400b10, and again 414b7 where it refers to a passage in the *Sūryagarbhasūtra* T. 397 (14) (XIII) 238a1. The latter sūtra passage is peculiar, however, in that it says 俱蘭●華無色無香, in other words the **kuraṇṭaka* is colorless and odorless! I do not know how to reconcile this passage with our description. (The whole expression is completely missing in the Derge edition of the Tibetan translation of the *Sūryagarbhasūtra* Tōh. 257 *mdo sde*, za 104a3.) Also note that the 翻梵語 T. 2130 (LIV) 1050c5 lists the term from the *Ratnarāsi* as 拘蘭茶華. The term *kuraṇṭaka* is discussed in Das 1988: 255 (note 4), 434, 460. There the identification with *barleria prionitis* L. is suggested. This plant is said to be a small spiny bush with plentiful buff colored flowers, yellow when fresh, and of bitter or sour taste. Das (or the appendix's author, G.J. Meulenbeld), as well as Prof. Michio Yano (personal communication), also refer to *celosia argentea* L., but Yano at least concludes that the identifications so far offered by specialists are all inconclusive. Nothing is mentioned in the sources I have seen about the odor of any of these plants, which must be a very noticeable feature of the plant being referred to here in the *Ratnarāsi*. Notice also that further confusion is suggested by the entries in the *Amāraśāstra* and its commentaries. 4.74ab (Vanaśadhivarga) reads *tatra śoṇe kuravakas tatra pīte kuraṇṭakah*.

² I am puzzled by *shi la bar ka'i rtsa ba'i mnam ste* /; Chinese has no equivalent for the expression. It must refer, of course, to some plant with an odoriferous root; more than that I cannot say. I am just guessing, but perhaps **śilavarika* is Sanskrit (?). It does not appear to be a Tibetan word. In the context of the discussion of *kuraṇṭaka*, however, Das 1988: 460, 454 refers to *śitivāraka*, which should be investigated if only for its phonetic similarity to our problematic term. We might also consider the Sanskrit *śilā-vaikā*, but the discussion in the *Śabdakalpadrūma* s.v. makes this look unlikely. Should we compare Hindi *śilāvāk*?

kuraṅṭaka-like śramaṇa too possesses the color and physical appearance of a śramaṇa, but he is not gentle, he uses abusive language, he stinks of broken precepts, he is of wrong livelihood, wrong practice, and wrong view. The wise neither serve nor approach nor honor that kuraṅṭaka-like śramaṇa, but recognizing his character even those far away from him spurn him at a distance. Those who are foolish serve, approach, and honor the kuraṅṭaka-like śramaṇa, and like a fool holding a kuraṅṭaka flower in his hand they are well-disposed toward that [kuraṅṭaka-like śramaṇa]. This, Kāśyapa, is what we mean by “the kuraṅṭaka-like śramaṇa.”

III.11

Now, Kāśyapa, what is the thief-like śramaṇa?¹ By way of example, Kāśyapa: A man whose very nature is craftiness is always desiring, is overcome by lust, is not satisfied with his own possessions, wishes for the wealth of others, is fierce, violent, carries about swords and weapons, is shameless, without compassion, is always malicious and always has a malicious mind; when he enters a marketplace or a village or a town or a city or a district, then this thought occurs to him: “Whatever is the mass of wealth of others, I hope to make it mine,” and thinking to grab it he prowls around secretly.² Similarly, Kāśyapa, the thief-like śramaṇa

¹ See I.12. Chinese has here “the śramaṇa who seeks profit.” See the Introduction for a discussion of thief-monks.

² Chinese has “always conceals his body and does not permit others to see him.” The Tibetan text is perhaps a bit problematic. It reads: *mkhyun bu mkhyun bur rgyu ba*. The term *'khyun bu* is defined (Zhang et al. 1985) as *chung ma min pa'i mdza' mo* = 情婦, adulteress, mistress. This is very dubious. On the other hand, *mkhyud pa* means to “hold in secret,” perhaps rendering *√guh?* Compare the term *gūdhacāra*, “going about secretly.” We may wonder, then, whether *mkhyun* and *mkhyud* are equivalent, or whether our text (all exemplars, without variants!) transmits an error.

too is always desiring, is overcome by lust, is not satisfied with his own possessions, and he wishes for the possessions of others. When he enters a market-place or a village or a town or a city or a district, then he enters for the sake of possessions, not for the sake of the Teaching. All of his modes of deportment too show him to be like a thief. Hiding [things] he is a concealer.¹ He thinks: “If other monks know that I have broken the precepts they will not allow it, and if they come to know, according to the recitation of the monastic disciplinary rule I will be banished,”² and so he is always afraid and fearful. Because he practices all his modes of deportment with guile, gods, nāgas, yakṣas and gandharvas will recognize that “A thief comes, a thief goes. A thief stands. A thief walks. A thief sits, lies down, puts on the religious robes. A thief goes to the village, comes out of the village. A thief eats. A thief drinks. A thief shaves his hair.”

III.12

Thus, Kāśyapa, whatever his modes of deportment may be, since they are all unacceptable gods, nāgas, yakṣas and gandharvas will recognize that he is feigning,³ and having recognized that they will produce great compassion toward him,⁴ and scoffing they will insult him saying: “Oh no! It’s amazing! Such evil

¹ See Mhy. 8492 *gopanam* = *sbed pa*, and 9062-65.

² Mhy. 8644 *pravāsanīya*, BHSD s.v. “action leading to banishment.” Pāli *pabbājanīya*. Chinese contains the technical term in a sentence: 驅我出於善比丘, “eject me from the [group of] good monks.” According to Nakamura 1981: 273b there are two basic terms, 驅出 *kushū* and 驅擯 *kuhin*, while Oda 1917: 147b gives 應滅擯 *ōmetsuhin*. Mochizuki 1932-36 has a discussion s.v. *hinzui* 擯出 4332c-4333c, in which he lists even more synonyms and gives detailed information.

³ Compare the expression in the KP §123: *te asyeryāpathāḥ kuhanalapanatayā kalpitā bhavanti*, “those modes of deportment are feigned with deceit and boasting [about his spiritual accomplishments].”

⁴ Up until here the Chinese reads: “Kāśyapa. Gods, nāgas, yakṣas and gandharvas will know this fool in his going, coming, all his behaviors, and having seen him ... (they will scoff etc.).”

monks as this will destroy the teaching of the Blessed One Śākyamuni.” Gods, nāgas, yakṣas and gandharvas, however, greatly honor those who uphold the precepts and are virtuous, saying: “These [people] understand the teachings.” If, Kāśyapa, the thief-like śramaṇa feels aversion for renunciation in this teaching, and he does not produce even one thought devoid of lust, it goes without saying that the attainment of the fruit [of the śramaṇa is beyond him], and he has no place [here].¹ This, Kāśyapa, is what we mean by “the thief-like śramaṇa.”

III.13

Now, Kāśyapa, what is the weed² monk? By way of example, Kāśyapa:

¹ Chinese understands the last clause as: “there is absolutely no chance that he might obtain it.” It is possible that Tibetan *gnas med do*, which I am not certain I have correctly understood, is intended to render **aniketa*. The term *aniketa* is difficult, and the dictionary meaning of “homeless” doesn’t make much sense here. Moreover, generally speaking the word appears to have a positive sense, which surely cannot be the case here. Régamey 1938b: 87 (166) translates *aniketa* “placeless,” quoting the *Kīrtimālā* commentary to the *Samādhirāja* as *gnas med pa ni gzung ba’i gnas med pa’i phyir ro*, “placeless, because having no attainable place.” This in itself is not absolutely clear, but might be suggestive.

² Note that sections III.13 and 14 are reversed in order in the Chinese translation. The term *shin te ma* appears in Mhy. 7635 (correctly in the new edition): *shin te (ma) med pa’am snyigs me med pa = niṣphalguṃ*. (BHSD s.v. *niṣpula* is thus to be deleted.) This is confirmed by the definition found in the *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo* (Zhang et al. 1985): 1) *nyam chung ba* 衰弱, 無力 [weak, feeble]; 2) *snyigs ma* 沈澱, 濁 [impurity, taint]. The primary sense of *phalgu* is “worthless, insignificant,” and Pāli *pheggu*, apparently the equivalent term, means soft or inferior wood (opposed to *sāra*, hard pith. Cf. Vedic *phalgvā*). But this is not the only possible identification.

The Tibetan *shin te ma* occurs in SP 39.3-4: Tibetan: *nga’i ’khor shin te ma med par gyur te / shā ri’i bu snyigs po ma yin pa med par gyur la dad pa’i snying po la gnas te* Sanskrit: Gilgit: *niṣpulāvā me śāriputra pariṣad<am> apagataphalgu śuddhā sāre pratiṣṭhitā*. Kashgar: *niṣpalāpā me śāradvatīputra pariṣat apalāpā hy apagataphalgu śuddhā sāre pratiṣṭhitā* Chinese: Kumārajīva T. 262 (IX) 7a12-13 has, laconically, 我今此衆無復枝葉純有貞實 (Kubo and Yuyama 1991: 27: “My assembly here is free of useless twigs and leaves; only the pure essence remains.”). The translations of Dharmarakṣa T. 263 (IX) 69b23 have been studied by Karashima (1992: 47, 286). He reports (p. 286) the bewildering array of readings the Nepalese manuscripts have for the word Gilgit and Kashgar have as *niṣpulāvā / niṣpalāpā*, and concludes that the Sanskritic form lying behind the readings, as indicated by Dharmarakṣa’s misunderstanding, is *niṣpulāka*. (But compare Pāli *palāpa / palāsa*, and see the passage quoted in the note to III.14, below.) He also notes that Kumārajīva seems to have understood **niṣpallava* (or **niṣpalāśa*), and further reports that some Nepalese manuscripts read *niṣphala* (we should remember in this context that it is the Nepalese reading of *śradhā* for *śuddha* which Tibetan has rendered with *dad pa*). Where this all

Amongst the grain there are some that are not ripe, are not vigorous, do not bear fruit,¹ but look like grain, and these are called “weeds.” Similarly, Kāśyapa, the weed śramaṇa too, being weak and powerless, is consumed by Māra, overcome by Māra,² overthrown by all defilements, as if shaken by the wind. Kāśyapa, the term “weed śramaṇa” is a designation for evil precept breaking monks, and I style them “weed śramaṇas.”

III.14

Now, Kāśyapa, what is the malicious śramaṇa? ³ By way of example, Kāśyapa:

leaves us we cannot be quite sure. If the Tibetan corresponded perfectly with the consensus of the Gilgit and Kashgar texts (which do not completely agree with each other!), we might suggest that *shin te ma* renders **pulāka* or **palāva*. (Can **palāva* = **pallava*?) But it is far from impossible that the Sanskrit text from which the Tibetan translators worked had instead **niṣphala*. From the context here in the *Ratnarāsi*, however, let us note that *pulāka* is defined by MW as “shrivelled or blighted or empty or bad grain.” Nevertheless, the examples quoted in Böhtlingk and Roth 1855-75 s.v., in Kauṭilya, and so on seem to indicate an already dried and edible, even if not desirable, grain. (We might also want to notice here the vocable *niṣpāva*, found for example in *Amāraśāstra* 2,24 [Samkīrṇavarga]; it is said to mean not only winnowing [of grain], but also a kind of pulse.)

Chinese has here 蒲生沙門, cat-tail (?) śramaṇa. I think the reading 蒲 is preferable to 通, which seems to me impossible (see Morohashi XI.46 [38871]). Chang et al. 1983: 294, however, translated “underdeveloped,” with a note reading “literally, ‘new born.’” I do not understand that rendering, although it is true that Morohashi does list the meaning “slow” for the term 通 (definition 7). Chang et al. seem to have hedged in the following as well, perhaps to justify this understanding. The translation reads “They look like rice, but actually they are not yet rice.” But the Chinese is clear: “They look like rice, but they are not 非 rice.” 非 does not mean “not yet.” A precise identification of 蒲, however, is not easy. Morohashi IX.10179 (31611) seems to identify it with cat-tail, which as far as I know does not look like rice or rice seedlings. It is true, however, that cat-tail looks exactly like pearl millet (*pennisetum typhoides*).

Xuanying (quoted in the notes to the edition of the Chinese text) comments that 通 should be 穉, and he says: “It means that in a field some grain or beans, despite being unplanted, nevertheless grow on their own, and this is called 穉.”

¹ The translation is a conjecture. I do not know the meaning of *'ongs med*, but suppose that it might be something like “do not bring [fruit],” or “do not prosper / grow.” Ms. Miya Shimada suggests to me the meaning in Tibetan of “infertile,” sterile, barren,” based on the idea that, quite literally, “they have no future.” Chinese has no corresponding expression.

² A variant reading in the Tibetan translation adds here: “overcome by all defilements.”

³ Tibetan has *dge sbyong sun par byed pa*, which seems to be related to *√duṣ*. As we will see below, a Pāli parallel might suggest **śramaṇadūsin*. The context, however, strongly suggests that we look

Among the perfect new green shoots of barley¹ grows one that damages the barley, but since its color is similar to that green [of the shoots] and its form and characteristics also are similar, the owners of the barley consider all of them to be barley. However, when sprigs² appear from the barley shoots, then they injure the barley, and [then the farmers] do not consider [the sprigs] to be barley. Similarly, Kāśyapa, since the monks who are malicious śramaṇas indeed sit among the assembly of monks and resemble in figure, outward form and appearance³ those who uphold the precepts, are virtuous, and are worthy of offerings, then donors and benefactors consider them to be monks and consider that they are worthy of offerings. Hence, if a malignancy which is a deluded man who while not a śramaṇa falsely claims to be a śramaṇa, who while not a follower of the practice of purity falsely claims to be a follower of practice of purity, rotting inside, arises out of the community, then dying, having reached the time of death, he will go to hell, and gods, nāgas, yakṣas and gandharvas who possess the divine eye see him born in hell. When they have seen him [there in hell], they feel great compassion for him as they think: “This deluded person formerly with the figure and outward form of a śramaṇa performed evil deeds and so he was born in a great hell. Just as when there is injury to barley the barley’s good qualities⁴ are

for some sort of agricultural reference here. Chinese, in fact, uses the same term here and in the following, “barley śramaṇa.” See the next note.

Note that BHSD s.v. kāraṇḍava has pointed out that the term appears in Mhy. 5669 = *sre de / sre ta*, in a list of cereals. Tse ring dbang rgyal (Bacot 1930: 187b) has the same correspondence (spelled *sre da*).

¹ Zhang et al. 1985 defines *ljang bu* as *gro nas kyi myu gu snon po* 禾苗, 禾本科農作物的青苗. Tse ring dbang rgyal (Bacot 1930: 56b) *stambha* (read *stamba*) = clump of grass, shrub. My friend Prof. Tanaka Kōji 田中耕司, an agronomy specialist at the Tōnan Ajia Kenkyūjo of Kyoto University, kindly informs me that 稗草 is also cultivated as a crop, but initially it was a weed, or it may just refer to malformed weak plants. But the parallel quoted above makes clear what the image should be.

² **mañjarī*, as at Mhy. 5745, 6837. Tse ring dbang rgyal (Bacot 1930: 63a) also has this, but in addition *gundā* = *gundrā*.

³ KP §122: *varṇarūpalingasamsthānaśramaṇa*.

⁴ Probably the term *yon tan* here, translated as good qualities, is *guṇa*. Given this, and the context,

lost, so for him too the fruit of the good qualities of the śramaṇa are lost.” This, Kāśyapa, is what we mean by “the malicious śramaṇa.”

III.15

Now, Kāśyapa, what is the imitation śramaṇa?¹ By way of example, Kāśyapa: There is a certain kind of metal called “great brass.”² When it is made very clean and made very pure, it comes to resemble gold. However, it is not similar to gold in value, to gold in color, in polished appearance,³ or in weight when weighed on a pair of scales. Similarly, Kāśyapa, the monk who is an imitation śramaṇa too washes his body well and puts on good, handsome clothes, purifies all the external practices of a śramaṇa, and is mindful of his coming and going, his looking ahead and looking around, his retraction and extension [of limbs], his holding of the upper monastic robe, begging bowl and monastic robes,⁴ but still

it may be that there is something of a play here on the sense of *guṇa* as the śramaṇa’s good qualities on the one hand and the efficacy or viability of the grain on the other.

¹ See the notes to I.9. Note the passage in the **Daśabhūmivibhāṣā*: “The dissembler: There are some people who dwell in a wilderness (*āraṇyaka*), wear patched robes (*pāṃsukūlika* [robes from a dust heap]), always live on alms food (*paiṇḍapātika*), eat in one sitting (*ekāsānika*), sleep in a sitting posture (*naiṣādika*), and do not eat after noon (*khalupaścādbhaktika*) because they seek material profit and reverence (**lābhasatkāra*). Someone may undertake such *dhuta* ascetic purification practices, thinking: ‘Others undertake these practices and obtain reverence and respect. I will undertake these practices and also obtain these [advantages].’ And so for the sake of material profit and reverence he comports himself behaving in a grave and dignified manner. This is termed dissembling.” T. 1521 (XXVI) 29b10-14: 矯異者。有人貪求利養故。若作阿練若。著納衣。若常乞食。若一坐食。若常坐。若中後不飲漿。受如是等頭陀行。作是念。他作是行。得供養恭敬。我作是行或亦得之。爲利養故改易威儀。名爲矯異。 The passage has also been translated by Dantinne 1991: 46-47, whose understanding differs a bit from mine.

² *ra gan* = *raitya*, Mhy. 5987. Tse ring dbang rgyal (Bacot 1930: 165b) gives in addition *rīrī*, more usually written *rīti*. Chinese: gold gilded (?) copper, 金塗銅。 I do not know what sort of process is indicated by this term, but it is evidently some sort of gilding.

³ The translation is speculative, since the term *bḍar* *’phro* is not in my dictionaries. Probably this is equivalent to 若揩磨時乃知非金, “if you rub and polish it then you will know that it is not gold.” Tibetan *bḍar ba* means to polish, rub, and *’phro ba* to issue from.

⁴ In other words, as the Chinese translation says, all his behaviors as a śramaṇa are carried out

he is overcome by lusts, overcome by anger, overcome by delusion, overcome by defilements, overcome by [love of] profit and honor, overcome by arrogance, haughtiness, pride and conceit, egotism, high opinion of himself, pride of thinking things inferior to himself, and misplaced false pride,¹ enslaved by defilements; devoted to service [of people], but not devoted to the Teaching; he zealously applies himself to adorning his body, but does not zealously apply himself to being adorned by the precepts;² he is devoted to food and clothing, but not devoted to the Noble Teaching; he is not fearful of censure in the other world; he devotes himself here to this world, but does not devote himself to the future state; he relies on nourishing the body, profit, honor and fame, but does not rely on venerating the Teaching; he is stained by various stains, defiled by sin; he applies himself to the business of the house; because he possesses a mind which is like that of a layman, he is both pleased by happy things and afflicted by sufferings, and he is overcome by affection and aversion. All of his śramaṇic natures and

correctly. In the *Śiṅṣāsamuccaya* (120.11-16) the positive external and accompanying internal signs which characterize a good monk are discussed. The *Ratnarāsi* is criticizing here the mere copying of these external signs: "Mindful awareness is discussed in the *Prajñāpāramitā*: Going, he is aware 'I am going,' standing he is aware 'I am standing,' lying down he is aware 'I am lying,' sitting he is aware 'I am sitting,' and he is aware of the situation of his body just exactly as it is. ... Whether he steps forward or steps backwards, he acts with mindful awareness. He acts with mindful awareness in his looking ahead and looking around, in his retraction and extension of limbs, in his holding his upper robe, belt, bowl and robes, in his eating, drinking, chewing, in his shaking off sleepiness and fatigue, in his coming, in his going, in his standing, in his sitting, in his sleeping, in his waking, in his speaking, in his silence, and in his private meditation." *saṃprajanyaṃ tu Prajñāpāramitāyāṃ uktaṃ / caraṃś carāmiti prajānāti sthitaḥ sthīto 'smīti prajānāti śayānaḥ śayita itī prajānāti / niṣaṇo niṣaṇo 'smīti prajānāti yathā yathā cāsyah kāyah sthīto bhavati tathā tathaiva prajānāti // pe // so 'tikrāman vā pratikrāman vā saṃprajānaṃś carī bhavati / ālokite vilokite saṃmiñjite prasārite saṃghātipaṭṭapaṭracīvaradhāraṇe aśite pīte khādite nidrāklama-prativinodane āgate gate sthīte niṣaṇe supte jāgarite bhāṣite tuṣṇibhāve pratisaṃlayane saṃprajānaṃś carī bhavati. Compare to this passage the *Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* Ghoṣa 1902-13: 1429.1 and *Śiṅṣāsamuccaya* 215.9-10. See BHSD s.v. ālokita-vilokita. Pāli commentaries have it as looking ahead and looking all around, with Tibetan. See also CPD s.v. For the next see BHSD s.v. saṃmiñjita and prasārita.*

¹ Mhy. 1946-52: *māna, adhimāna, mānātimāna, asmimāna, abhimāna, ūnamāna, mithyāmāna.*

² Chinese omits "but does not zealously apply himself to being adorned by the precepts."

deportments, and all of his thoughts and mental states, are inclined toward hell, the realm of beasts, the realm of the king of the dead.¹ He is not similar to a śramaṇa in value, in worth or in the measure of a śramaṇa. This, Kāśyapa, is what we mean by “the imitation śramaṇa.”

III.16

Now then, Kāśyapa, in what way is one a monk robbed of vital essence?² By way of example, Kāśyapa: If some man or woman or boy or girl has his vital strength robbed by a non-human, he is weakened, ugly and becomes disfigured. Those whose strength is thus robbed are not healed by medicines, incantations or magical spells,³ and finally their end will be none other than death. Similarly,

¹ From “he applies himself to the business of the house,” the Chinese reads: “he applies himself to the business of the house with the mind of a layman. And according to what he experiences, when it is unpleasant he suffers, when it is pleasant he is pleased. He does not want to practice the practices appropriate for a śramaṇa, except (external) conduct and deportment. He will certainly fall into hell, or rebirth as an animal or hungry ghost.”

² *gzi* = *ojas*. Chinese 血氣. CPD s.v. suggests also “nutritive essence.” Compare *ojohāra*, BHSD s.v., in which demons who sap the strength of individuals are mentioned. Schopen 1978: 262-64 has quoted a number of examples of phrases in which yakṣas and so on carry off the *ojas* of someone, for example SP 450.5 and *Ratnaketu* 140.10. Gonda 1952 offers his habitual encyclopedic treatment in tracing the term *ojas* from the Vedas through the epics and later. It is worth quoting his comments on *ojas* in the medical context (44-45): “As far as *ojas* is concerned, it is important to remember that according to the Indian experts the human body consists of seven essential constituents, to wit: *rasa* - ‘the primary juice or fluid,’ *rakta* - ‘blood,’ *māmsa* - ‘flesh,’ *medas* - ‘fat,’ *asthi* - ‘bones,’ *majja* - ‘marrow,’ and *śukra* - ‘semen.’ The quintessence of these seven ‘elements’ is called *ojas*. It is regarded as the strongest, the most potent power among them It is the bearer of the vital function and constitutes the fundament on which the preservation of the body depends. Without *ojas* the elements of the body do not live As long as it is upheld, the human being continues to exist, when it perishes, man passes away. Anger, hunger, sorrow, weariness are injurious to it; then man becomes timid, weak, lean, pale and sad. In extreme cases the decline of this central vital power results in death.” Filliozat 1964: 166-68 has also discussed the medical concept of *ojas*.

The Chinese term 血氣 appears to be what we might call a “cultural translation.” Morohashi (1955-60: 10.129 = 33964.24) cites the term from as early as the Book of Rites 禮記 and the Confucian Analects 論語, and perhaps it was its “canonical” status which induced the translators of the *Ratnarāsi* to select it as an equivalent for *ojas*.

³ Chinese adds: “sword and staff.” I do not know what sort of medical treatment might be so

Kāśyapa, any monk whose: precepts are without vital essence; concentration is without vital essence; wisdom is without vital essence; liberation is without vital essence; vision and knowledge of liberation are without vital essence; friendliness is without vital essence; compassion is without vital essence; joy is without vital essence; equanimity is without vital essence;¹ liberality, self-control and gentleness are without vital essence; śramaṇa virtues are without vital essence;² dwelling in the saintly attitudes is without vital essence; dhuta ascetic purification practices and austerities are without vital essence; purity of body, speech and mind is without vital essence³ — Kāśyapa, he is what is mean by “the monk robbed of vital essence.”

III.17

Kāśyapa, those robbed of vital essence in that fashion cannot cure⁴ themselves with the medicines prepared by the Tathāgata; that is:

- 1) The medicine of [the contemplation of] impurity [as a curative] for

carried out. Various colleagues have suggested that the first term, at least, refers to some sort of surgery. I owe to my friend Nobuyoshi Yamabe a reference to the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya T. 1425 (XXII) 488b12-25, in which “sword therapy” 刀治 is discussed. The Buddha prohibits the use of surgery on “intimate areas” 愛處; the example refers to hemorrhoid surgery.

¹ Chinese omits “joy is without vital essence; equanimity is without vital essence.”

² Chinese has “gentleness” as “control of actions of body, speech and mind,” and omits “śramaṇa virtues are without vital essence.”

³ At least part of this listing is made up of well known sets of terms: *śīla, samādhi, prajñā, vimukti, vimuktijñānadarśana, maitrī, karuṇā, muditā, upekṣā, dāna, samyama, sauratya, śramaṇaguṇa, ārya-vamśa, dhūtaguṇa, samlekha, kāyavānmanas-parisuddhi*.

⁴ My translation here is a conjecture, since I think the term *tshugs pa* must mean cured, saved, but the dictionaries give only the meaning to injure, to harm. Zhang et al. 1985 s.v. *tshugs pa* has *gzugs po thang por nad kyis mi tshugs pa* = 身体健康疾病不能侵害, to be healthy and disease be unable to injure one. Luis Gómez, however, brought to my attention the entry in Jäschke’s dictionary (s.v. *'dzugs pa*) which refers to the expression *smān ma zug*, “the medicine has not yet taken hold, does not work.” Chinese has 如失氣沙門雖受如來法藥不以自度, “for instance, a śramaṇa who has lost his vital essence, although he received the Tathāgata’s dharma-medicine, does not [is not able to] save himself.”

- lust, and
- 2) of [the contemplation of] friendliness for [as a curative] for hatred, and
 - 3) of [the contemplation of] dependent origination for [as a curative] for delusion; and
 - 4) of correct mental contemplation [as a curative] for the defilements;¹ and
 - 5) of delighting in seclusion [as a curative] for garrulous association with others;² and
 - 6) of dwelling in the wilderness in order to remove all attachments;³ and

¹ See Sakurabe 1980: 308-9; For removal of defilements by *yonisamanasikāra*, see KP §71. *Da Zhidu lun* T. 1509 (XXV) 60a6 = *Traité* (Lamotte 1944-1980): 34-5 (p. 35 n. 1); 227b = 1418, 238c = 1540, 478b. LV 32.21. The first three of the items listed here are a standard set, appearing for example in KP §94. The *Da Zhidu lun* compares them to herbal remedies. For example *Da Zhidu lun* T. 1509 (XXV) 60a21-b1 = *Traité* (Lamotte 1944-80): 34, after discussing such herbal cures says: “La considération de l’horrible (*aśubhabhāvanā*), dans la maladie de l’attachement (*rāgavyādhi*), est un bon remède (*kuśala pratipakṣadharmā*). ... La méditation amicale (*maitrīcittamanasikāra*), dans la maladie de la haine (*dveṣavyādhi*), est un bon remède. ... La considération des causes et conditions [Lamotte has *hetupratyaya-parikṣā*, but probably *pratīyasamutpāda*^o is better], dans la maladie de la sottise (*mohavyādhi*), est un bon remède.” 不淨觀思惟於貪欲病中名為善對治法...思惟慈心於瞋恚病中名為善對治法...因緣觀法於愚癡病中名為善對治法. *Da Zhidu lun* T. 1509 (XXV) 227b8-11 = *Traité* (Lamotte 1944-80): 1417-18: “De la même manière [better: For example], on règle le médicament (*bhaiṣajya*) sur la maladie (*vyādhi*) pour qu’il soit efficace. Il y a des gens particulièrement amoureux (*rāgabahula*), particulièrement haineux (*dveṣabahula*), particulièrement sots (*mohabahula*) Aux amoureux, on prêche la contemplation des horreurs (*aśubhabhāvanā*); aux haineux, on prêche la bienveillance (*maitrīcittā*); aux sots, on prêche la profonde production des phénomènes en dépendance (*gambhīrapratīyasamutpāda*).” 譬如隨病服藥則有益。有婬欲重有瞋恚重有愚癡重...婬重者為說不淨觀瞋重者為說慈心癡重者為說深因緣. See also T. 1509 (XXV) 238c14-16 = *Traité* (Lamotte 1944-80): 1540. I owe these references to Sakurabe 1980, which also contains further references. To my friend Honjo Yoshifumi 本庄良文 I owe references to Sthiramati’s *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyaṭīkāttvārtha* (Ōtani 5895, Tōh 4421) Derge 98a5-7, and to the *Nyāyānusāra* of Saṃghabhadra 阿毘達磨順正理論 T. 1562 (XXIX) 346c26-347a1.

² Compare SP 309.10-11: *ete ’jita kulaputrā vivekārāmā vivekābhiratāḥ. naite kulaputā deva-manuṣyān upanīrāya viharanty asaṃsargacaryābhiratāḥ*. “These sons of good family, Ajita, revel in solitude, delight in solitude. These sons of good family do not dwell near gods and men and are not delighted with the practice of garrulous association with others.”

³ Chinese has: “give up one’s possessions.”

- 7) of purifying body, speech and mind in order to restrain the three;
and
- 8) the medicine of purifying concentration in order to make the mind
capable of work.¹

— they cannot cure themselves with such medicines as these prepared by the
Tathāgata. They will die and will certainly go to hell; there will be no other end
for them.

III.18

Whichever supramundane medicine it might be — namely, knowledge of the
aggregates, knowledge of the spheres, knowledge of the senses, knowledge of
dependent co-origination, knowledge of emptiness, the signless and the wish-
less² — even by such supramundane medicines as these they will not be cured.
And having died, they will certainly go to hell; there will be no other end for
them.³

¹ Chinese combines items 7 and 8: “One should carefully protect the three qualities of the renun-
ciant. Those three are namely: a) to uphold the precepts in purity; b) to restrain the mind; c) to enter
into concentration and not to be distracted.”

Compare KP §153 *dhyānacittakramanīyakarmanīkṛtāḥ*. Pāli PTSD kammaniya, “workable,” fit
for work, often with *citta*, “with active mind.” PTC II.31b, BHSD s.v. karmaniya.

² See KP §94 for a list of therapies similar to this. It is worthwhile noting that the translation 無作
for *apraṇihita* is archaic; 無願 is more standard. 無作 usually renders *avijñapti* in later translations. 無作
occurs for *apraṇihita* however in, for example, the *Da Zhidu lun* T. 1509 (XXV) 95c2, 96b29, 96c3,6, etc.
etc. See further Mochizuki 1932-36: 1498c, 1512c, Oda 1917: 618c, 619a.

³ Here Chinese has instead of “And having died, they will certainly go to hell; there will be no other
end for them” the following: “Such a śramaṇa has a foul smell and is impure because he breaks the
precepts, because he has few virtues, because he is born in the lowest place (?), because he is haughtily
arrogant, when his life ends he will be born nowhere else but will certainly fall into a great hell. A person
such as this who has lost the vital essence will certainly die. Thus such a śramaṇa will upon his death
certainly fall into hell. Kāśyapa. This is called the śramaṇa who has lost his vital essence.”

III.19

When this teaching had been preached, five-hundred yogācāra monks thought: “As we do not purify the precepts, if we were to enjoy the gift of faith it would not be right,” and they became dejected and went back home.¹ Then, a few other monks criticized them saying: “It is very bad that these yogācārins, monks who possess a magnanimous attitude,² are dejected by the teaching.”

III.20

The Blessed One spoke to those monks as follows: “Monks! You must not say “It is very bad that these monks who possess a magnanimous attitude are thus severely dejected by the teaching.” Why? When monks become displeased [with their behavior as monks], this [returning to the] home life is the proper course for those possessed of faith. These monks of great faith and conviction, possessed of remorse, having heard this teaching became despondent, thinking: “We did not purify the precepts and as such it is not right that we enjoy the gift of faith.” Kāśyapa, I predict:³ These monks dying from here will be born among the assembly of gods of Tuṣita, and they will enter into the numbers of the first

¹ Chinese omits “yogācāra” both times in this section, and the expression “... thought: ‘As we do not purify the precepts, if we were to enjoy the gift of faith it would not be right,’ and...” Further, Chinese has 捨戒還俗, “reject the precepts and return to the laity.” The present episode already occurred in *Ratnarāsi* I.13-14. See the Introduction for a detailed discussion of this episode and the problems relating to leaving the monastic community.

² **māhātmya*.

³ This is a *vyākaraṇa*, a prediction of future buddhahood or other high status. See the Introduction for a discussion of the issues here.

assembly of the auditors of the Tathāgata Maitreya.”¹

The Chapter on the Outcaste-like Śramaṇa; The Third.²

¹ Chinese has the section as follows: “The Buddha said to the monks: Do not say this! Why? Such ones are called those who are in accord with the Teaching. Such monks who do not want to receive gifts of faith from others and return to the home life are called those in accord with the Teaching. Because those monks have faith and conviction (*adhimukti*) they produce remorse. When this teaching was taught, they heard it and thought: “Since we cannot practice purely and thus obtain gifts of faith, we should produce remorse and return to the household life.” Kāśyapa. I now proclaim that these monks upon their deaths will be reborn in Tuṣita heaven, in the place where the bodhisattva Maitreya is. And when the Tathāgata Maitreya appears, those monks will be among his first assembly.”

² Tibetan adds here: Beginning of volume two [of the Tibetan translation].

The English Translation: Chapter Four

<On Supervision>

IV.1

Then the Reverend Mahākāśyapa spoke to the Blessed One: “Blessed One, what sort of monk shall superintend?”¹ The Blessed One said: “There are two [types of] monks, Kāśyapa, I allow to superintend. Which two? The monk who is purified, who is fearful of censure in the other world, who has confidence [in the idea that results will come about for him as] the maturation of [his own] deeds,² and who feels shame and feels remorse, and also the one whose depravities are destroyed and who has become an Arhat — Kāśyapa, I allow these two unimpaired monks to superintend.³

IV.2

Why? Because, Kāśyapa, in this well-taught Dharma and Vinaya are renunciants

¹ The term referred to here is *vaiyāprtyakara*. See the discussion in the Introduction.

² We find the identical expression at KP §8: *karmavipākapratisaraṇa*. So too in the *Akṣayamatī-sūtra*, quoted in *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 316.16: “He has confidence in [the idea of] the maturation of deeds, thinking: ‘Whatever act I perform, I will experience the maturation of the fruits of that act.’” *sa karma-vipākapratisaraṇo bhavati yad yat karma kariṣyāmi tasya tasya karmaṇaḥ phalavipākaṃ pratyānu-bhaviṣyāmi*. The Tibetan of the passage is found in Braarvig 1993: I.139,20-22.

³ The Chinese has divided things entirely differently: A): 1) One who can purely uphold the precepts, 2) One who is fearful of the other world, for instance like a vajra. B): 1) One who is aware of and knows the results of karmic actions, 2) One who feels shame and modesty and repents. C): 1) An arhat, 2) One who can practice the eight liberations [*vimokṣa*]. Finally, probably what is “these two unimpaired monks” in Tibetan is rendered in Chinese as “themselves being free of (literally) abscess and pox.” I do not know what Sanskrit might stand behind the latter rendering. There seems to be two types of monk here, one still dutifully on the path, the other having already reached the goal. This is, moreover, the interpretation of the parallel passage in the *Sūryagr̥hasūtra*, discussed in detail in the Introduction.

from various backgrounds,¹ they possess various types of mental predispositions,² and they engage in various types of yogic practices for the sake of renunciation: some delight in the bed and seat of the pacified forest dweller, some are alms beggars, some dwell among the relations from their village, some have a purified way of living,³ some apply themselves to great learning,⁴ some are reciters of the Teaching,⁵ some uphold the monastic discipline,⁶ some uphold the Abhidharma,⁷ and some enter into villages, towns, markets, districts and metropolises and preach the Teaching. Because it is difficult to protectively watch over the thoughts and actions of other beings [I allow only those two types of pure monks to be superintendents].⁸ In this respect, Kāśyapa, the monk who superintends should please the minds⁹ of all the monks of the community.

IV.3

Now, Kāśyapa, whichever wilderness-dwelling monks keep their seat and bed in a

¹ The translation “backgrounds” is a slightly free rendering of *rigs* = **kula*. I do not know if we should limit it strictly to “family,” which would be more literal.

² **nānādhimukti*. BHSD s.v. *adhimukti*.

³ **pariśuddhājīva*.

⁴ **bāhuśrūtya*.

⁵ **dharmakathika*, as below.

⁶ **vinayadhara*.

⁷ **māṅkādharma*, Mhy 5143.

⁸ Chinese has this sentence at the beginning of the section, and logically speaking it makes little difference. The Chinese of this sentence, 護他人意此事難故, is not easy to understand. Nagai 1932: 235, note 15 suggests that it means “respect the intentions of others” (他之人の心を尊重する). Tibetan suggests something like **anyasativānām cittacaritadūrakṣa-*. The Tibetan *sems kyi spyod pa* = **cittacarita* might point to an understanding as a genitive *tatpuruṣa*, but what is evidently the same term appears in the VKN, for example, as a *dvandva* (Ōshika 35.15, 41.8, 49.9: *sems dang spyod pa*). I have translated it as a *dvandva*, although with some reservations. I do not fully understand the term, and if it is actually a *tatpuruṣa* I am truly baffled.

⁹ See CPD s.v. *abhirādheti*, “to satisfy, conciliate.” This is also the standard Sanskrit usage (Böhtlingk and Roth 1855-75: VI.323), “zufriedenstellen, befriedigen.”

border region¹ should not be charged [with tasks] by the superintending monk. The superintendent must look after those forest dwelling monks, and he shall not make requests of them at inappropriate times, he shall not send them on errands at inappropriate times.² If it falls, Kāśyapa, to the turn of the wilderness-dwelling monk to carry out the student's task relating to the community's work, the superintending monk should do that task himself. Or, appointing another monk he should order him to do that task, but should not pressurize³ the wilderness-dwelling monk.⁴

IV.4

Now, Kāśyapa, that superintending monk should allot sumptuous food to those monks who practice alms begging.⁵ Now, Kāśyapa, the superintending monk

¹ BHSD s.v. *prānta* (with numerous references), Mhy 2988 *prāntaśayyāsana*. The term seems to denote dwelling in the wilderness, as at Mv. ii.212,9 *prāntaśayyāsana* (although I do not think we need to understand *-vihārin* with Jones [1952: 2.202] as "content"). In Mv. iii.422,9 *prāntaśayyāsana* replaces *vivittasayana* of Dhṛ. 271 (Uv. 32.31 *vivikṭasayana*, GDhp 65 *vevitasayana*, and see Brough's note). RP 14.14-15 reads *prāntaśayyāsana* *nābhiratiḥ sā ca lābhasatkārānapekṣatayā*, that is, one of the four noble paths which a bodhisattva must follow is to "delight in having his bed and seat in a border region, through indifference to material profit and reverence." This passage is in the Han translation of *Rāṣṭra-pālapariṣcchā* T. 170 (III) 412c4-5. A verse at RP 31.13-14 points to the important role of the wilderness for the Mahāyāna under siege: "Those sons of mine reviled from all sides in the last age, calling to mind my words will then dwell in a border forest region." *nirbhartsatāpi ca samantāt te hi mamaurasās carimakāle / vacanam ca te mama hi smṛtvā prāntavane tadābhinivasanti //*. Chinese of the *Ratnarāsi* has here rather "delight in isolated places."

² This sentence is omitted in Sanskrit and Chinese.

³ I translate the Sanskrit *utpīḍayitavya*, "pressurize, annoy," here, rather than Tibetan *gnod pa*, which renders "harm," another meaning of *utpīḍ*. I do not understand, however, how this might correspond with the Chinese 不應役使阿蘭若比丘. "He should not employ the wilderness-dwelling monk as a servant." Perhaps the latter is interpretive.

⁴ Chinese adds here: "If there is a time he [the forest-dwelling monk] is not practicing the path, then he [the supervisory monk] may assign him [the forest-dwelling monk] a small amount of work."

⁵ According to the *pātayantikā* / *pāccittiya* and *prāṭideśanika* / *pāṭidesanīya* of the various Vinayas, monks are prohibited from begging for sumptuous (*praṇīta*) food: *Sarvāstivāda Prātimokṣa* (Finot and Huber 1913), *pātayantikā* 40 (510.13-511.3; see now von Simson 1986: 223 [and 277], which I print without apparatus): *yāni punas tāni kuleṣu praṇītabhojanāny anujñātāni tadyathā kṣīram dadhi navanitam*

should give to those who are yogācārin monks appropriate paraphernalia, medicine to cure the sick, and personal belongings. In whatever place that yogācārin monk is dwelling the superintending monk should not cry aloud and yell nor permit [others] to do so.¹ The superintending monk should protect that yogācārin monk and also provide him with a bed. He should give him sumptuous food, savories and hard food and soft food² suitable for [one in] the stage of a yogācārin.³ It occurs to that [superintending] monk: “This [yogācāra] monk lives in order to promote the Tathāgata’s teaching. I should generously provide him with all the appropriate personal belongings,” and he should resolve to very carefully protect him from harm.⁴

IV.5

Now, Kāśyapa, the superintending monk should encourage whichever monks apply themselves zealously to great learning, saying: “You must accept the transmitted teachings, you must read them, you must recite them, and I must be

sarpis tailām matsyo māmsavallūrā yaḥ punar bhikṣur evamrūpāṇi kuleṣu praṇītabhojanāny ātmārtham aglāno vijñāpayet pātayantikā: If a monk were to take such pleasing foods as milk, yoghurt, ghee, sesame oil, fish, meat or dried meat, that monk would incur a *pātayantikā* offence. The *prātidēśanīya* is on 525-27. Almost exactly the same rule is found in the following: Mūlasarvāstivāda: Banerjee 1977: 36.7-10, #40; Mahāsāṃghika: Tatia 1975: 22.19-22, #39 = Pachow and Mishra 1956: 25.17-20, Roth 1970: §252, and see Hirakawa 1982: 375ff.; Pāli (Theravāda): *pācittiya* 39 Vin iv.87-89 = Pātimokkha ed. Vedekar 1939: 14.8-10, *pāṭidesaniya* Vin iv.346-48 = Pātimokkha ed. Vedekar 20-21; *Upālipariṣecchāsūtra* (Stache-Rosen 1981: 74) #42..

¹ Sanskrit omits “nor permit [others] to do so,” but Chinese has it.

² The classification is a common one. For Pāli see PTC s.v. *khādāti* (II.80a), and for Sanskrit see BHSD s.v. *khādaniya*.

³ We encounter here a crucial term, *yogācārabhūmi*. I have discussed this in detail in the Introduction. The Chinese translation renders “... yell nor permit other to do so, because he wants to protect that yogācāra monk. The supervisory monk should honor the yogācāra monk thinking of him as the Blessed One.”

⁴ Chinese omits “and he should resolve very carefully to protect him from harm.”

your attendant. The more greatly learned you become, the more you must become an ornament of the community of monks. You must sit down and ornament [the community] with your speech. You must make your own wisdom supreme.” Now, Kāśyapa, the superintending monk shall not send them on errands at inopportune times, and he shall not assign them tasks. The superintending monk shall protect those monks of great learning.

IV.6

Now, Kāśyapa, the superintending monk shall not assign tasks to those who are reciters of the Teaching.¹ He shall cause them to enter villages, towns, markets, districts and royal metropolises and preach the Teaching. He shall inspire the audience.² He shall purify an assembly area.³ He shall arrange an assembly

¹ The meaning of the Tibetan text is quite clear. The Sanskrit text, however, is not as easy to understand. The second clause reads: *teṣāṃ pratihāradharmatā kartavyā*, with *teṣāṃ* referring to *ye dharmakathikā*. Wogihara 1904: 99-100 translated the Chinese of the *Ratnarāsi* corresponding to *pratihāradharmatā kartavyā*, 應事事供給, as “with everything must he supply,” and stated: “We are induced to read *pratikāra-dh*° or ‘h’ in *pratihāra* may be an insertion to avoid hiatus in original prakritic *pratiāra* [sic *pra* cluster with prakritic vowels!].” He refers to the form *jalāhari* (which he writes, for reasons beyond me, with an accent, *jalāhari*) in the *Lalitavistara*, and credits the suggestion to Ernst Leumann. I think, however, that the appeal to a hypothetical underlying Prakrit characterized by loss of intervocalic stops is, at best, a stretch. Such cases do occur, in Aśokan Prakrit and Gāndhārī, for example, but are far from common. The rendering offered in the English translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (Bendall and Rouse 1922: 56), “he must do duty as doorkeeper,” is perhaps correct, since the term *pratihāra* can have that meaning. Perhaps the sense of the Sanskrit is something like “he should do the duty of protecting them as a doorkeeper.” (Incidentally, the rendering of the Tibetan offered by Bendall and Rouse 1922: 56 in note 2, “must make them indefatigable,” is wrong.)

² The Sanskrit for this passage is quoted in *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, and the term here is *udyojayitavya*. See CPD *uyyojeti* (2): to urge, instigate. BHSD s.v. *udyojayati* discusses the present passage, and concludes with the suggestion that the Sanskrit meaning of “arouse” or “inspire” is fitting. The Tibetan of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* has *brtson par ’gyur*, to make zealous. Chinese: “The superintending monk should ... incite and encourage all the people and make them join and listen to the teaching [preached by the monk who is a reciter of the teaching].” I consider, therefore, the meaning of *udyojayati* to be certain. However, I doubt that this can be the meaning of the reading of the Tibetan translation of the *Ratnarāsi*, *bsko bar bya’o*. The Tibetan as is would seem to mean “assign the audience [to him].” This meaning or slant could be inferred from the Chinese, but we might also consider two other possibilities: First, the Tibetan could be

area for the elegant preaching of the Teaching. The superintending monk shall expel those monks who do injury to a monk who is a preacher of the Teaching. The superintending monk shall always greet the monk who is a preacher of the Teaching, and shall congratulate him generously.¹

IV.7

Now, Kāśyapa, that superintending monk shall go before those monks who uphold the monastic discipline and those who uphold the Abhidharma and shall ask them: “How may I be faultless and uncorrupted? How may I superintend in a manner free from offence?” Then those monks who uphold the monastic discipline and those who uphold the Abhidharma, understanding that superintending monk’s intention, shall inform him what he must do, what will happen, and what the means are to carry it out.²

an error for (b)skul ba, “to incite.” Second, and what is perhaps more likely, the Tibetan translation is based on a different (in this case wrong) meaning of the simplex (non-causative) of *udḥyuj*, namely “to prepare.” (I owe the seeds of the latter suggestion to Luis Gómez.)

³ The expression is missing in Chinese, but found in *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and its Chinese translation.

¹ Compare a passage in the *Sāgaramatisūtra*: “Again, Gentle son, serving, adoring, attending upon, rising for, making obeisance to, being respectful toward, reverencing, obeying, protecting, receiving (as a guest), providing with robes, begging bowl, sleeping mat, medicaments and other equipment, applauding, protecting as a master, preserving the virtue of, exposing the merits of, concealing the demerits of those preachers of the Teaching who expound such sūtras as these and who regard correct practice as quintessential is [called] protectively embracing the True Teaching.” The passage is quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 41.15-42-1 (the Chinese of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* is T. 1636 [XXXII] 83c25-84a1): *punar aparaṃ kulaputra ye te dharmbhāṅakā eṣāṃ evaṃrūpāṇāṃ sūtrāntānāṃ deśayitāraḥ pratipattisārās ca teṣāṃ api dharmabhāṅakānāṃ yat sevanāṃ bhajānāṃ paryupāsanaṃ utthānāṃ upasthānāṃ gauravaṃ citrikāraḥ śuśruṣā āraḥṣā parigrahaḥ cīvaraṇḍapātraśayanāsanāglānapratyayabhāṣajyaparīṣkāradānāṃ sādḥukāradānāṃ svāmyāraḥṣā kuśalapakṣaraḥṣā varṇabhāṣaṇam avarṇapraticchādanatā ayam api saddharmaparigrahaḥ.*

² Chinese has “namely: this you should do, this you should not do,” for “what will happen, and what the means are to carry it out.”

IV.8

The superintending monk shall take good care of the monks who uphold the monastic discipline and those who uphold the Abhidharma, and he shall generate faith, respect and high regard [toward them].¹ From time to time the superintending monk shall distribute to the community of monks what is the property of the community, but he shall not hoard the community's property and conceal it. The property is to be given as it was received;² it is to be given without being urged, it is to be given without objection.³ He should not proceed with caprice,⁴ hatred, delusion or fear.

IV.9

He shall devote himself to the community of monks, and he shall not devote himself to the group of householders.⁵ He shall devote himself to the necessities of the community, and he shall not devote himself to his own necessities. He shall not produce any idea that he shall rule over even a single place, but rather, no matter how trifling the matter, he shall act according to the counsel of the

¹ Perhaps the last two terms refer to the common pair *sagaurava* and *sapratīṣa*, on which see BHSD s.v. *sapratīṣa*. At KP §10 *sapratīṣa* is rendered with the spelling which in our edition is found as a variant, *rje sa*.

² I have not fully understood *ji ltar rnyed pa bzhin du sbyin par bya*. Does this mean to emphasize that the monk in charge of distribution should not alter or profit from the donations which pass through his hands, or is that reading too much into the expression?

³ Or, "kindly"? BHSD *avyābādha*, Mhy 1508. Luis Gómez suggests possibly "without coercion / pressure." Chinese has this sentence as: "He should divide up and give out the property. It should be given at an appropriate time, not with a bad mind, not in contradiction to the dharma."

⁴ If the Tibetan translation is consistent, the term is probably **chandās*; anyway, not *rāga* as the usual cliché and the Chinese translation here have it.

⁵ In KP §113, the renunciant is warned against frequenting those associated with the group of householders, and cautioned against hostility toward those belonging to the group of saints. However, the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (Dutt 1934: 215.20) lists in a group of ten things to be renounced in the fifth bhūmi "familiarity with householders and renunciants."

community, not according to his own inclination.

IV.10

Whatsoever are the belongings of the local community, the universal community or the stūpa, he should assign them accordingly, and he shall not mix those of the local community with those of the universal community. Neither shall he mix the possessions of the universal community with that of the local community. He shall not mix the possessions of the local community and universal community with that of the stūpa. Neither shall he mix the possessions of the stūpa with that of the local community and universal community.¹ If the universal community is destitute and the local community has plenty, the superintending monk shall summon the community of monks and make them agree unanimously;² then he shall exchange from the local community's possessions to the universal community.

IV.11

If a stūpa of the Tathāgata is gone to ruin and the possessions of the local community or the universal community are abundant, the superintending monk shall gather all of the community of monks and make them agree unanimously,

¹ See the Introduction for a discussion of the rules concerning distribution of monastic goods in the various Vinayas.

² The Tibetan reads as I have translated, and the Sanskrit has here "make the community to be of one mind," but the Chinese specifies that a vote is to be taken, using the technical term **śalākā*, in Chinese *chou* 籌 (here actually *xingchou* 行籌, a term with identical meaning). For a very detailed discussion of the meaning and uses of *chou*, see *Hōbōgirin* 431a-456a, "Chū," by Hubert Durt.

saying: “The stūpa of the Tathāgata is gone to ruin, but the possessions of the local community and the universal community are abundant. If, Reverends, you have no objection,¹ if you are favorably inclined, if you allow, if you approve, I will take a small amount of supplies from these possessions of the local community and the universal community and I will repair the Tathāgata’s stūpa.” If the community allows it, that superintending monk shall do so. In case the community does not allow it, that superintending monk shall request the donors and benefactors and obtaining [their contribution] he shall repair the Tathāgata’s stūpa.²

IV.12

No matter, Kāśyapa, how vast the possessions of the stūpa, the superintending monk shall not give them to the local community or the universal community. Why? If even so little as a single thread given to the stūpa by those faithful and full of devotion is a shrine for the world together with its gods, what need is there to mention jewels and highly valued objects?³ Whatever clothing is given to a stūpa had best be vanished by wind, sun, and rain; clothes given to a stūpa shall not be exchanged for gold or valuables. Why? Because what belongs to the

¹ The sense of *gnod pa med cing* seems to be **avyābadhya* or the like (BHSD s.v.). Desgodins 1899: 571b defines *gnod med pa* as “inoffensif.”

² The Sanskrit has rather: “inspiring the donor and benefactors he should repair [the stūpa].” Chinese: “The supervisory monk should inspire the lay people and seek material support for repairing the stūpa of the Buddha.” It might be better to understand *gso! ba* not as “request” but as “instigate” or “inspire.”

³ BHSD s.v. *ratnasammatam* refers to Pāli Vin iv.161,26, 162,19, 163,13 for the expression *ratanaṃ vā ratanasammatam vā*, with the definition at 163,21-22: *yaṃ manussānaṃ upabhogaparibhogam etaṃ ratanasammatam nāma*: “what is of profit and use to men is *ratanasammatam*.”

stūpa¹ is totally without price, and because the stūpa² is itself without any want.

IV.13

The superintending monk, Kāśyapa, shall thus purify things,³ and he shall not mix up the belongings of the Three Jewels. He shall be content with his own possessions. He shall not have the idea that those properties controlled by the Three Jewels are his own.

IV.14

Any superintending monk, Kāśyapa, who possesses a mind of anger, if he gets angry toward or rules over and orders about precept keepers, virtuous ones and those worthy of veneration, will, on account of those bad acts, go to hell.⁴ When he is reborn in a human world he will become a slave or servant of another, and he will be beaten and kicked by violent fist blows, slaps and weapons.⁵

¹ Chinese of both the *Ratnarāśi* and *Śikṣāsamuccaya* specify “Tathāgata’s stūpa.”

² Chinese of both the *Ratnarāśi* and *Śikṣāsamuccaya* have “buddha” instead of “stūpa.”

³ Chinese is not very clear, but it might mean “a superintending monk, good and pure in this way” This is more or less how Chang et al. 1983: 298 have taken it (“a good, pure administrative monk”); although Nagai 1932: 238 seems to take it a bit differently, just how he understands the expression is not clear to me (善淨を有[も]てば、營事の人は...).

⁴ Chinese of both the *Ratnarāśi* and *Śikṣāsamuccaya* have “great hell.”

⁵ The term “violent” is based on Sanskrit *pracaṇḍa*. Tibetan *snyems pa* seems rather to mean “arrogant.” The expression is a rather loose stock phrase, for which see BHSD s.v. *khāṭa*. See for example the *Mahākarmavibhāṅga* (Lévi 1932: 37.5-6), *khāṭacapetapradānam*. The term *lag cha* may correspond to *praharaṇa* (Mhy. 6105); is this related to *prahārāṇām*? The verb written *phrad pa* is strange. This means “the meet, encounter,” but we require actually *phra ba*, “to kick, lash out at.” Should we emend the Tibetan text?

IV.15

Moreover, Kāśyapa, if the superintending monk goes beyond the duties [necessary to] the community and commands the monks according to his own inclination, ordering them, punishing them, frightening them, threatening them, giving them untimely commissions or untimely orders, on account of those bad acts he will be born in the individual hell¹ named “many nails.” And being born there his body will be pierced by one hundred thousand iron nails, and they will catch fire and blazing up [the fire] will spread burning everywhere.

IV.16

From the verbal karma which will accrue from his hurtful speech of threatening precept keepers, virtuous ones or those worthy of respect, he will be born there [in that individual hell], and his tongue will be one hundred leagues in size, and one hundred thousand iron nails will be buried² in that tongue of his, and they too will catch fire, blaze up, and thoroughly blazing everywhere [the fire] will spread everywhere, burning, and become a [true] conflagration.³ Why? Because he

¹ Chinese of *Śikṣāsamuccaya* has here “great hell,” while the *Ratnarāṣi* has “minor hell.” That the reading in the Chinese *Śikṣāsamuccaya* is not a misprint is confirmed by the *Jisha* edition (#1521 [vol. 37] 49b2).

² Sanskrit has here *nikhāta*, that is, the nails are “dug into” the tongue. It appears that the Chinese translation of *Śikṣāsamuccaya* has rendered this with 難忍. I wonder whether it is possible that the translators imagined some form of **niś-ksānti* < **nikkhānti* < **nikhānti*? The 難堪, “difficult to bear,” which appears immediately before 難忍 I cannot explain in a similar way. It appears to have no immediate correspondent in Sanskrit. Just from the point of view of the Chinese text, however, the whole expression, “It is difficult to bear and difficult to stand,” does make sense.

³ One may compare here the term 拔舌地獄, “pierced tongue hell.” Both Nakamura 1981: 1112bc and Oda 1917: 1451b refer only to the *Ōjōyōshū* 往生要集, but especially the entry of Nakamura is a bit misleading, since the *Ōjōyōshū* is in fact quoting the *Yogācārabhūmi* T. 1579 (XXX) 296b22ff. here. This entire section of the *Yogācārabhūmi* deals with the sufferings of various hells, and the exact torture described in the *Ratnarāṣi* is mentioned. In addition, the term 拔舌地獄 is also found in the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* T. 376 (XII) 872b29, where it refers to the fate of one who misrepresents a teaching

threatened [the monks] and so produced destructive verbal karma with his speech.¹

IV.17

If any superintending monk, Kāśyapa, collecting the possessions of the community and hoarding what he has collected, does not give it out from time to time, [or] scorning and tormenting he gives it, and some he gives, some he does not give, to some he gives, to some he does not give, then on account of those bad acts he will be born in a hungry ghost realm called “Sunk up to his knees in excrement and mud.”² After he is born there, other hungry ghosts will seize his food and show it to him. And then, when they show it to him, he stares at that food with both eyes unblinking, and pained by hunger and thirst he will experience feelings of suffering. But he will not obtain that food even in one hundred thousand years. Even if at some point, at some time, he were to obtain that food, it would become vomit and pus and blood. Why? Because he did not gratify precept keepers, virtuous ones and those worthy of respect, and he was not content with what he himself possessed.³

of the Buddha concerning the propriety of slave ownership.

Compare the stock expression (for example *Divyāvadāna* 337.9-10) *ādīpta pradīpta samprajvalita ekajvālibhūta*.

¹ The question “why?” and its answer are omitted in the Chinese translation.

² Chinese has “and always eat balls of excrement” instead of “called ‘Sunk up to his knees in excrement and mud.’”

³ Chinese has: “Because he used for himself the goods of monks who uphold the precepts and those who are worthy of respect, and only gave them out with reluctance.”

IV.18

If any superintending monk, Kāśyapa, were to harbor a desire for what belongs to the local community, or the universal community, or the stūpa, the [karmic] maturation of that could not be expressed in words, even if I were to reckon for aeons.¹

IV.19

If any superintending monk, Kāśyapa, having heard of such miserable² destinies as these were to produce anger or abuse or hatred or wrath, I declare that he is incurable.³ Therefore, Kāśyapa, hearing such True Teachings as these,⁴ the superintending monk should purify his body, speech and mind. He should protectively look after himself and others.

IV.20

The superintending monk, Kāśyapa, even if he has to eat his own flesh, should not enjoy the bowls, robes, alms food, medicines or equipments controlled by the

¹ Chinese has the section as: “If a superintending monk were to indiscriminately mix and use the goods of the local community, universal community and buddha, he would receive great suffering as a result, for an aeon or even more than an aeon. Why? Because he infringes upon the possessions of the Three Jewels.”

² *ādinava?

³ Compare the expression in KP §65 *tam aham acikitsyam iti vadāmi*: “Him I declare to be incurable.” Note, however, that this occurs in the context of a monk who, using emptiness to dispose of views about the self, then becomes attached to that emptiness itself. In Pāli in the *Āṅguttara Nikāya* and other texts (AN iii.402,22 = Vin. ii.202,8 [*Cullavagga* VII.4.7] = MN i.393,3-4, and etc.), Devadatta is called *atekicchā*, the Pāli form of *acikitsya*. See CPD s.v. *atekicchā*.

⁴ Chinese has: “hearing about such *adharmā* crimes as this” Is it possible some confusion was caused by the term **sad-dharma* being misunderstood as containing **a-dharma*?

Three Jewels.

IV.21

Then the Venerable Mahākāśyapa spoke thus to the Blessed One: “The Blessed One preaches the teaching for laxness to those who are lax, and the teachings for shame to those who are shameful.”

The Chapter on Supervision; The Fourth.

The English Translation: Chapter Five

<The Wilderness Dweller>

V.1

“Blessed One! Some wilderness-dwelling monks claim ‘I am a wilderness-dweller.’ Blessed One, in what ways is one a wilderness-dwelling monk? In what ways is one an alms-gathering monk? In what ways is one a refuse-rag wearing monk?”¹ And when this had been asked, the Blessed One spoke to the Venerable Mahākāśyapa as follows:

V.2

“The wilderness-dwelling monk, Kāśyapa, should make his bed and seat in a wilderness, an abode in the forest, and a border area.² He should dwell in wilderness border regions such as those without thieves, herdsmen or shepherds,³ without snakes, without wild beasts and flocks of birds, with few flies and stinging insects, with little noise, with few sounds of commotion.

¹ Chinese adds here: “In what ways is one called a monk who dwells at the base of a tree? In what ways is one called a monk who inhabits charnel grounds? In what ways is one called a monk who lives in the open air?” The list in Chinese, then, includes: *āraṇyaka*, *paṇḍapātika*, *pāṃsukūlika*, *vrksamūlika*, *śmāśānika*, and *ābhyavakāśika*, that is, six of the twelve types of practitioners of the *dhutaḡaṇa* ascetic purification practices.

² Mhy 2988 *prāntaśayyāsana*, 2991 *araṇya*, 2993 *vana*.

³ I am not sure, but perhaps **gopāla(ka)* and **paśupāla(ka)*. Chinese: 牧牛羊者.

V.3

If that [monk] is a dweller in that wilderness abode,¹ he should bring about eight deliberations. What are the eight?

- 1) He should not be concerned about his body.
- 2) He should not be concerned about his life.
- 3) He should not be concerned about wealth or honors.²
- 4) He should not be concerned about all garrulous associations with others.³
- 5) He should undertake to die in a wilderness⁴ like an animal.
- 6) He should dwell in the wilderness making use of the advantages offered by the wilderness.⁵
- 7) He should live with his livelihood in accord with the Teaching; he should not live wrongly.
- 8) He should live in accord with a livelihood free from worldly material possessions⁶ and defilements.

He should dwell in a wilderness abode bringing about those eight deliberations.⁷

¹ Chinese: "If that monk wants to dwell in a wilderness area."

² For the first three items Chinese has "I should abandon my body ... life ... wealth and honors."

³ The terms in this and the previous item are **lābhāsatkāra* and **samsarga*.

⁴ Tibetan actually rather has the term in the plural, "wildernesses"!

⁵ I have some doubt about this rendering, but I provisionally understand *dgon pa'i yon tan* as **aranyagūṇa*, a term which however I cannot quote. Chinese: "undertaking the wilderness practices."

⁶ Chinese omits "worldly material possessions."

⁷ Compare this passage with one from the "Twelve Dhūtaguṇa sūtra," 十二頭陀經 quoted in the Introduction.

V.4

If he is a dweller in that wilderness abode, he should produce eight types of friendliness toward all beings. What are the eight?

- 1) The friendliness of benefiting [beings], and
- 2) The friendliness of pleasing [beings], and
- 3) The friendliness without injury¹ [to beings], and
- 4) Correct friendliness, and
- 5) Undifferentiated friendliness, and
- 6) The friendliness of mental calming,² and
- 7) The friendliness of profound concentration on the teaching, and
- 8) The friendliness of completely purified intention.³

He should produce those eight [types of] love toward all beings.⁴

¹ Chinese has “without hatred (**dveṣa*).”

² **samatha*. Chinese has 順慈, which I cannot understand. Perhaps Chang et al. 1983: 300 is right in rendering “to be compliant with sentient beings.” Generally speaking 順 renders *anukūla* or terms with *anu*^o. (In I.7 順 = *dang 'thun pa* =^o *anukūla* [in *samsārānukūla*].) What the connection between this and **samatha* might be I cannot guess.

³ For a possible explanation of the connection between Tibetan *bsam pa yongs su dag pa* = **āsaya(vi)suddha* and Chinese 淨如虛空 = **ākāśavisuddhita*, see the Introduction.

⁴ A passage in the *Akṣayamatīrdeśasūtra*, quoted in *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 212.12-14, rationalizes three degrees of friendliness. The classification in the *Ratnarāsi* does not present the same sort of schematization, but the two are interesting as offering contrasting presentations of similar material from texts which both belong, at least in a broad view, to more or less the same stratum of the tradition. The sūtra reads: “Bodhisattvas who have just raised the first aspiration for awakening have living beings as the object of their friendliness. Bodhisattvas who have perfected their practice have the teaching [or: (all) things] as the object [of their friendliness]. And bodhisattvas who have attained the tolerance of the non-arisal of [all] things have friendliness without any object.” *satvārambaṇā maitrī prathamacittotpādikānām bodhisatvānām / dharmārambaṇā caryāpratipannānām bodhisatvānām / anārambaṇā maitrī anutpattikadharmakṣāntipratilabdhanām bodhisatvānām //*. (The Tibetan text is edited in Braarvig 1993: I.86,30-34, and translated with reference to the commentary II.352. Braarvig’s English rendering differs slightly from mine.)

V.5

If he is a dweller in that wilderness abode, he should think thus: “I have come here on a long path, alone, unaccompanied, without any friend at all to admonish me about things I have done well or done wrong. Whatever gods, nāgas, yakṣas, gandharvas or buddhas, blessed ones, there are who know my mental disposition will be my witnesses if, when I am dwelling in the wilderness abode, I should come under the influence of bad thoughts.”¹

V.6

“I have come on a long path and am alone, unaccompanied, with nothing on which to rely, without possessions, without chattels. If I were to focus with a focus on physical desire, if I were to focus with a focus on malicious thoughts, if I were to focus with a focus on harming [others],² or if I were to focus with a focus on other bad things, I would be no different from those beings who delight in garrulous association with the company of others. I would deceive the gods, nāgas, yakṣas, and gandharvas, and I would not gladden the buddhas, blessed ones, either. I must think: “May it be such that the gods will not censure me and

¹ Sanskrit reads as follows: “While dwelling in that wilderness abode he should think thus: Although I came to the wilderness alone, unaccompanied, with no friend who might admonish me about things I have done well or done wrong, still there are these gods, nāgas, yakṣas and buddhas, blessed ones, who know my mental disposition. They are my witnesses: [They know whether] while I am dwelling here in this wilderness retreat I will come under the influence of bad thoughts.” As an equivalent for the last sentence, the Chinese translation of the *Ratnarāsi* has: “Now I am here practicing the practices of a wilderness dweller. If I do not have a good mental attitude, I will not be able to be free / attain lordship (?)” It seems that the Chinese translations of both the *Ratnarāsi* and the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* have understood *vaśa* with \sqrt{gam} as “become free” 自在. For this rendering see Wogihara 1964-74 s.v. *vaśa* (page 1181a). I cannot understand the Chinese translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* here very well at all.

² The expression up to this point is a stock phrase, for which see for instance LV 71.8-9: *na ca kāmavitarkam vā vyāpādavitarakam vā vihiṃsāvitarkam vā vitarkayati sma*. Aṣṭa 981 quoted *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 39.15f: *na kāmavitarkam utpadyamāsa na vyāpādavitarakam na vihiṃsāvitarkam utpadyamāsa*. See also I.4, above.

buddhas, blessed ones, also will be pleased with me.”

V.7

If he is a dweller in that wilderness abode,

- 1) He should be bound by the vows of the monastic disciplinary rule,¹ and
- 2) He should uphold completely all of the constituent elements of morality,² and he should:
- 3) Be pure in body, speech and mind, and
- 4) Be without deceit, and
- 5) Be without boasting,³ and
- 6) Be of pure livelihood,⁴ and
- 7) Direct himself to acquiring the mind of concentration, and
- 8) Depend on the Teaching as he has learnt it, and
- 9) Be devoted to correct mental reflection,⁵ and
- 10) Seek what is free of despair and desire, [namely] cessation and nirvāṇa, and
- 11) Be fearful of saṃsāra, and

¹ **prātimokṣasaṃvara*.

² **śīlaskandha*. Chinese has 戒衆; see Mochizuki 1932-36: 1288b, Wogihara 1964-74: 1337a.

³ Chinese omits this item; the subsequent numbering is thus offset by one until Chinese inserts an item between 14 and 15, after which the numbering comes back into line between Tibetan and Chinese.

⁴ The two previous items refer to the absence of *kuhanā* and *lapanā*, the first two of the five incorrect manners of livelihood (*mithyājīva*). That makes it likely that we should understand this item, perhaps *(*pari*)*suddhājīva*, to comprise the complete negation of all five. See Wogihara 1936: (Lexical remarks) 21-26, and Lamotte 1944-80: 1182-83, note 2.

⁵ **yonīsamānasikāra*.

- 12) Know the aggregates to be an executioner and enemy, and
- 13) Quickly recognize the four elements¹ to be a poisonous snake,
and
- 14) Take pleasure in the six senses as in an empty village,² and
- 15) Be wise in his understanding of dependent co-origination, and
- 16) Completely reject views of permanence and annihilation, and
- 17) Consider there to be no beings, no life, no individual, no person,
and
- 18) Be convinced of emptiness,³ and
- 19) Have as his domain the signless, and
- 20) Magnify his attitude of wishlessness,⁴ and
- 21) Always possess a mind fearful of the three realms, and

¹ The four elements are the *dhātus*, earth, water, fire and air. The Chinese rendering 大 is more usually a translation of *mahābhūta*, but the meaning is the same.

² The three comparisons given here in items 12, 13, and 14 are a stock set, as discussed in detail by Lamotte (1962: 136-137, with note 28, and in 1944-80: 702-707, with notes.). In Pāli SN iv.172-74 is the *locus classicus*, and see especially 174, 22-23, 25, 32: “Four poisonous snakes of fierce might and frightful venom, monks, is a designation for the four great elements. Five executioners and enemies, monks, is a designation for the five aggregates of appropriation. An empty village, monks, is a designation of the six individual [senses].” *cattāro āsīvisā uggatejā ghoravisā ti kho bhikkhave catunnetam mahābhūtānam adhvācanam ... pañcavadhakā paccatthikā ti kho bhikkhave pañcannetam upādānakkhandhānam adhvācanam ... suñño gāmo ti kho bhikkhave channam ajjhātikānam adhvācanam*. See also VKN III §64 (Oshika 38,20-22) and *Pratyutpanna* 2H (ed. Harrison). In the *Pratyutpanna*, moreover, the previous item, our 11, is also found directly before this list. See also RP 44.15: “The elements are similar to a snake, the aggregates are executioners, and the mind, filled with depravities, is a useless, empty village.” *dhātūś ca sarpaśā vadhakāś ca skandhāḥ cittam ca sāśravam anārthakaśūnyagrāmaḥ*.

Lamotte also points in the above mentioned VKN footnote to the quotation of the *Dharmasaraṅgī-sūtra* in the First *Bhāvanākrama* of Kamalaśīla (Tucci 1958: 222,12-16): *skandheṣu māyāvat pratyavekṣanā ... dhātuṣv āsīviṣavat pratyavekṣanā ... āyataneṣu śūnyagrāmavat pratyavekṣanā*. But the first comparison there seems to be different from the stock expression.

After this item the Chinese translation inserts another item: “To know well skillful means.”

³ Tibetan perhaps **śūnyatādhimukta*. KP §16 *śūnyatām cādhimucyate* = *stong pa nyid la yang mos pa*. Chinese “to understand the empty character of dharmas.” Probably 解 is intended to render *adhimukti*, although without the Tibetan for comparison one would never know this.

⁴ Chinese “gradually eliminate things one [wants to] do, and practice wishlessness.”

- 22) Always exert himself as if his head or clothes were on fire,¹ and
- 23) Not lay down the burden, and
- 24) Investigate his bodily faults in accord with reality, and
- 25) See the arisal and decay of mind,² and
- 26) Make an effort to comprehend suffering, and
- 27) Reject craving for all things which originate [suffering], and
- 28) Set out to realize the cessation [of suffering], and
- 29) Endeavor in the yoga of cultivating the path [to the cessation of suffering],³ and
- 30) Be settled in the applications of mindfulness in the external realm, and
- 31) Be free of bad dharmas and inclined toward good dharmas, and
- 32) Be well settled in correct exertion,⁴ and
- 33) Be bent on the bases of supernatural power, and
- 34) Possess the five faculties,⁵ and
- 35) Possess the five powers,⁶ and

¹ The expression is a stock phrase. See for instance SN i.108,23-24: *appam āyu manussānaṃ hiḷeyya naṃ suporiso / careyyādittasīso va natthi maccussa nāgamo ti //*. See also SN v.440, AN ii.93,18ff, and CPD s.v. ādittacela. KP §2 [3]: “Knowing that wisdom comes through great learning, he strives after learning like one whose head or clothes are on fire.” *bāhuśrutyena ca prajñāgamaṃ veditvā ādīptaśiraścelopama śrutam paryeṣate*. The correct meaning of the expression was pointed out already in 1933 by Staël-Holstein in his edition of the KP Commentary, page v (in the Cy. itself the explanation is found on pages 27-28). The *Mañjuśrībuddhakṣetraḡaṇavyūha* T. 310 (XI) 342c16 in listing six types of bodhisattvas who will quickly attain complete and perfect awakening has as the second type one who, whether householder or renunciant, upholds the precepts even at the cost of his life, ... and does not give up his efforts (*vīrya*), as if his head were on fire.

² Chinese: “He should produce such attitudes as this and contemplate such dharmas.” Should we imagine an expression something like **cittotpatti-bhāṅga-darśana*?

³ This and the previous three items refer of course to the so-called Four Noble Truths.

⁴ **samyak-prahāṇa*.

⁵ Chinese rather “protect.”

⁶ Chinese: “obtain freedom / lordship in the five powers.”

- 36) Concentrate on the seven limbs of awakening, and
 37) Be devoted to the eight-fold noble path,¹ and
 38) Dwell in calming, and
 39) Discern with insight.²

V.8

Having put on these types of armor,³ Kāśyapa, not lying down to sleep in the first half of the night or in the last watch of the night, exerting himself in yoga, he should always dwell in a wilderness abode according to his specific attainment.⁴

¹ Items 30 through 37 comprise the 37 *bodhipākṣika dharmas*: 4 *smṛtyupasthānas*, 4 *samyakprahāṇa*, 4 *rddhipāda*, 5 *indriya*, 5 *bala*, 7 *bodhyaṅga* and the 8-fold path.

² This and the previous item refer to *śamatha* and *vipaśyanā*.

³ This is a common metaphor for the bodhisattva's "girding" himself for the spiritual battle.

⁴ Chinese has here: "he should always be mindful and desire to obtain (the?) *lokottara* dharma(s?)." The term for "specific attainment," probably *viśeṣagāmitā* or *°tva*, although it is rather common in Pāli, is quite problematic. The term appears in KP §6, where its Tibetan translation, as here, is *khyad par du 'gro ba*, which hardly helps. Prof. Nagao has referred to two passages in the *Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra*: VIII.5, with regard to the maturity of compassion (*kṛpāparipāka*) reads: *viśeṣagāmitvaṃ paripākavṛddhi-gamanāt svabhāvaḥ*, which Thurman in his unpublished translation renders "Because it furthers maturity it becomes more excellent. This is its nature." At VIII.6, with regard to the maturity of tolerance (*ksānti*), the text says: *kṣamasya viśeṣagāmitvaṃ kuśalābhirāmatā ca karma*, which Nagao renders "One who has tolerance attains excellence and enjoys the good virtue which is its activity."

In the *Tathāgataguhyasūtra* we have the following: "These four, great King, are the four qualities which are conducive to the supreme advancements and the non-deprivation of those set out in the great vehicle. Which four? Faith, great king, is conducive to the supreme advancements and non-deprivation. Now, which faith? That faith by which one approaches the nobles, and does not do what should not be done. Respect, great king, is conducive to the supreme advancements — that respect by which one listens to what is well-spoken and obeys it and listens to the teachings with unobstructed hearing. Pridelessness, great king, is conducive to the supreme advancements — that pridelessness by which one inclines toward, salutes and will pay homage to the nobles. Energy, great king, is conducive to the supreme advancements and non-deprivation — that energy by which obtains lightness of body and lightness of mind, and carries out all that must be done. These, great king, are the four."

The passage is quoted in Sanskrit at *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 316.5-12, from which I have translated:
catvāra ime mahārāja dharmā mahāyānasamprasthitānām viśeṣagāmitāyai samvartante 'parihāṇāya ca / katame catvāraḥ / śraddhā mahārāja viśeṣagāmitāyai samvartante 'parihāṇāya / tatra katamā śraddhāyā / yayā śraddhāyā āryān upasaṅkrāmati / akaraṇīyaṃ ca na karoti // gauravaṃ mahārāja viśeṣagāmitāyai samvartate / yena gauraveṇa subhāṣitaṃ śṛṇoti śuśrūṣate 'virahitaśrotraś ca dharmam śṛṇoti // nirmānatā mahārāja viśeṣagāmitāyai samvartate / yayā nirmānatayā āryāṇām abhinamati praṇamati namasyati // vīryam mahārāja viśeṣagāmitāyai samvartate 'parihāṇāya / yena vīryeṇa kāyalaghutām

V.9

If he is a dweller in that wilderness abode, he should not endeavor in efforts to adorn his body. He should not endeavor to adorn himself with his bedding. He should not adorn himself with his monastic robes. He should be a dweller in that wilderness abode taking old, dry grasses and spreading them well on the place where he walks and sits, sitting by himself, being contented with his own robes and not taking those of the local community or the universal community.

V.10

Whenever, Kāśyapa, a wilderness-dwelling monk enters a town, village, or city for the sake of alms in order to nourish his body and cultivate the noble path, he should go thither from that wilderness abode with the following state of mind:¹ Even if he does not obtain [alms] he should not be upset, and even if he does obtain them he should not be happy. He should contemplate [these results as] the maturation of acts, and he should cultivate merit. Contemplating the Tathāgata, he should enter a town, village or city for the sake of alms.²

cittalaghutām ca pratilabhate sarvakāryāṇi cottārayati // ime mahārāja catvāra /. The passage is found in Chinese at T. 310 (3) (XI) 50b17-27 = T. 312 (XI) 713c17-28. In Tibetan the passage is found at Peking *dkon brtsegs, tshi*, 138a5-b3 = sTog *dkon brtsegs, ka* 176b3-177a2.

See also AKB (Pradhan 1975: 359.23), where the term *viśeṣagāmitvāt* seems to refer to the same thing, and *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 191.9-10 (quoting the *Akṣayamatīrdeśasūtra*) where the implication is not entirely clear. The commentary on the latter text (Braarvig 1993: II.471, note 1) says: "specific attainment" means wisdom constantly grows greater and greater. *khyad par 'gro ba ni shes pa gong nas gong du phyir zhing cher skyes pa'o*.

¹ Chinese makes the following into an explicitly first person statement.

² See below in the notes to VI.13

V.11

When he practices begging in a town, village or city, he should practice begging having put on the armor of the Teaching. What, then, is the armor of the Teaching? If one sees with the eyes pleasant forms, one should not be attracted. If one sees unpleasant forms, one should not be hostile. Thus with pleasant and unpleasant sounds, smells, flavors, or physical sensations, one should not be attracted to or hostile to them.¹ His senses restrained, eyes averted, looking only a small distance ahead,² with a restrained and noble mind,³ not rejecting the teachings he previously contemplated, he should practice alms-begging with a disposition of mind not stolen away by worldly material possessions. He should take alms in systematic order.⁴ He should not be attracted to that place from which he obtained alms, nor should he be hostile to that place from which he did not receive them.⁵ Even if, when he has already begged at ten houses, he does not

¹ Each item is expanded one by one in the Chinese translation.

² See Mhy. 8535, 8538, 8539 for the terms *susamvṛta*, *anutkṣiptacakṣuṣa* and *yugamātradarśina* given together.

³ I follow the Sanskrit in so rendering, but the Tibetan might better be read “restrained, with a noble mind.”

⁴ Mhy. 8567, BHSD s.v. *sāvadāna*. Edgerton refers to many sources for his definition: “in regular, systematic order, chiefly of monks’ begging rounds, uninterrupted(ly), going from one house to the next in order.” The same stipulation is explicitly stated in one of the Sāṃnyāsa Upaniṣads, the *Bṛhat-sāṃnyāsa Upaniṣad* (Schrader 1912: 265.7-8, trans. in Olivelle: 252): “At the time of begging let him not visit houses both clockwise and counterclockwise. Let him not skip foolishly a house in which there is no fault.” *naiva savyāpasavyena bhikṣākāle viśed grhān / nātīkrāmed grhān mohād yatra doṣo na vidyate //*. Olivelle notes: “This is a prohibition against selecting houses for begging. One should go to each house on a street, moving either clockwise or counterclockwise and not erratically. One can skip a house only if it has a fault, such as impurity caused by a death or birth.” Relevant details may be found in the very detailed note in Lamotte 1962: 150, note 19.

⁵ The same idea is stated in the *Manavadharmaśāstra* 6.57: *alābhe na viśādī syāl lābhe caiva na harṣayet / prāṇayātrikamātraḥ syān mātrāsāṅgādvīnirgataḥ //*. The passage is quoted in the *Nāradapari-vṛjaka Upaniṣad* (Schrader 1912: 181.7-8, translated in Olivelle 1992: 203): “Let him not be elated when he receives food or be dejected when he receives not. Let him beg only as much as will sustain his life without getting attached to his belongings.”

obtain alms from the eleventh either, he should still not be upset. He should produce the calm notion that: “These brahmans and householders¹ have many things to do, and so it is not certain² that they will present [alms] to me. It is very marvellous that they even think of me, much less present alms [to me].” He should thus practice begging for alms without being discouraged.³

V.12

Whatever beings appear in his range of sight, men, women, boys, girls, even down to those who have gone to dwell in the realm of beasts, toward them he should produce a mind of love and compassion. “I shall make it such that, whatever beings appear within my range of sight or give alms [to me] shall go to heaven.” So he should endeavor.

V.13

¹ Actually the Sanskrit text here reads *śramaṇabrāhmaṇagrhapati*, which is most probably an error, motivated by the extremely regular occurrence of the expression *śramaṇabrāhmaṇa*.

² Dantine 1991: 13 understands “il n’est pas impératif pour eux de me faire des dons,” which is also possible, but I prefer to understand *avaśyam* = *nges pa* as “certain.” Chinese seems to omit the term entirely: “These householders and brahmans, having many things to do, do not give me alms.”

³ The Sanskrit text as we have it, quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, reads *aparitapatā*, Tibetan *yongs su yi chad med pa*. If the Sanskrit reading is correct, it would suggest the meaning “feel pain, suffer,” from *pariṅtap*. However, Mhy. 6813 *na paritasyati* = *yongs su yi mi chad pa*. See also BHSD s.v. *aparitasana*, *aparitasyana*, and *paritasyati* (for etymological discussion), and Wogihara 1936 (Lexicon): 32-34. It seems to me clear that rather than *pariṅtap*, as the Sanskrit reads, and as *Śikṣāsamuccaya* Chinese for example seems to have understood with 憂惱 (so too apparently in Kumārajīva’s translation of the *Aṣṭa* T. 227 [VIII] 582a12 = Mitra 494.8 = Wogihara 1932-35: 943.28, 大憂愁), *√iras* as the *Ratnarāsi* Chinese seems to understand with 驚畏, or *√irṣ* as otherwise suggested, at least in the present context we should consider that the actual etymology must be from *√itas*. I do not know if this justifies us emending the reading of the text of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, but in any case I have translated in line with this understanding.

Whether he obtains bad¹ or good alms, he should look around everywhere in the four directions thinking: “Who is the needful poor person in this town, village or city, to whom I should distribute [food] from these alms of mine?” If he sees a poor person, he should distribute [food to him] from those alms. If he does not see [any] poor person he should think thus: “Since no one appears in my sight, I must give the best portion of my alms to those beings who have not appeared, and receiving what was given they should enjoy it.” He then takes those alms and going to that wilderness dwelling he washes his bowl and hands.² Empowered

¹ The meaning of *lūha* was pointed out already by Müller in 1903: 608; see also BHSD s.v.

² Chinese has: “having received the food, he goes to a wilderness area and washes clean his hands and feet.” Sanskrit has here only *dhautapāṇin*, with washed hands, but Tibetan has “washes his hands and bowl.” One possible and immediate explanation might be that the Chinese translators or their source confused *pātra*, bowl, with *pāda*, foot. (Note that if this were true it would argue against the source from which the Chinese translators worked being identical with *Gāndhāri*, in which the cluster *-tr-* tends to be retained. See Burrow 1937: 13.) But in fact, I think the explanation lies elsewhere, in the fluidity of the literary tradition.

One of our alternatives, “wash his hands and bowl,” is not only logical, but agrees exactly with the procedure specified at MN ii.13815-16, in which every action of Gotama is praised as perfectly carried out. This includes that concerning begging and receiving water with which to wash his bowl: “while washing his hands the bowl is washed; while washing the bowl his hands are washed,” *hatthesu dhotesu patto dhoto hoti. patte dhote hatthā dhotā hoti*. The Chinese *Madhyamāgama* T. 26 (161) (I) 687b10-11 says the same thing, as does T. 76 (I) 884a27. CPD cites variant forms (s.v. *oṇitta* and *oṇita* and *oṇita-patta-pāṇi*), *oṇitta-patta-pāṇi* and *oṇita / oṇita-patta-pāṇi*, but gives them different translations. The first is rendered “with hands and bowl washed,” the second “with hand removed from the bowl.” The remark in the entry s.v. *oṇita* is probably correct, however, namely that both compounds (*bahuvrīhis*) in fact mean the same thing, “with hands and bowl washed.” (See CPD for references.) The suggestion in the same remark that the derivation from *apanīta* is less likely than that from *avanīta* is challenged by the actual occurrence in Sanskrit of the expression with *apa-*. (Both *apa-* and *ava-* give Middle Indic initial *o-*.) The *Mahā-parinirvāṇasūtra* (Waldschmidt 1950-51: §6.9, 12.5, 26.17) has *dhautahastam apanītapātram*, “with washed hands and bowl put away.” (I owe this reference to Skilling 1991: 155.) Further examples are cited in Waldschmidt 1973- s.v. *apanīta-pātra*.

On the other hand, Thig 410 refers to a nun’s washing her hands and feet upon approaching her husband. (The text of the verse is problematic; see the Oldenberg and Pischel 1883: 240, and Norman 1971 ad Thig 410.) More to the point perhaps, the Pāli Vinaya (ii.216,20ff. [*Cullavagga* VII.5.3]) notes that it is the duty of the first monk to return from the alms round to ready a seat and the water and stool for foot washing. See also Vin. i.350,19-20 (*Mahāvagga* X.4.1). The *Samyuktāgama* T. 99 (1144) (II) 302c21-22 has the expression: 阿難擧衣鉢洗足已至尊者摩訶迦葉所, namely that Ānanda, with robe and bowl and having washed his feet, approached Mahākāśyapa. (Not in the Pāli parallel at SN ii.218,1ff.) In the **Abhinīskramaṇasūtra* T. 190 (III) 860b18, after eating and drinking is finished the Buddha and the community wash clean their hands and feet 淨洗手足.

I think we can reasonably conclude, then, that there is a divergence in the tradition concerning the

by good practice, endowed with the śramaṇa practice and good conduct,¹ sitting on his haunches he should consume those alms. Having eaten, without desiring, without injuring, not longing, without being greedy, he should think: “In this body there are eighty thousand families of worms,² and by this force [of eating]

cliché, with several possible variants: either the bowl and hands are washed, the hands washed and the bowl put away, or the hands and feet washed. When different recensions of the text one is translating have different variants of the cliché, as is true in the present case, one must just pick one and note the others; there is no way to assign priority to one reading as preferable to others.

¹ The equivalence between the Tibetan and Sanskrit texts here is not completely clear. We might render the Sanskrit: “Taking his alms and going to that wilderness area, with washed hands, with purified good conduct, endowed with the practices and behaviors [fitting to a] śramaṇa, empowered with power, folding his legs he should consume his alms.”

² The 80,000 worms is a well known classification. See Lamotte 1944-80: 1188, note 2, in which he refers to the *Avatamsaka* T. 297 (X) 112c9-18 = T. 278 (IX) 476b9-17 [my translation is indebted to that of Cleary 1984-87: I.489]: “What is the bodhisattva’s partial giving? This bodhisattva by nature is compassionate and kind, and practices giving. If he receives flavorful food, he does not accept it for himself, but rather gives it to beings and only then does he himself eat. And so it is with everything that he may receive. When he eats, he thinks as follows: ‘In my body there are eighty-thousand worms, and they live depending on me. If my body is satisfied, they are also satisfied, and if I suffer, they suffer too. I wish that this food and drink which I now receive may be able to satisfy all beings. I eat this in order to give it to them, not because I lust for the flavor.’ And again he thinks: ‘In the long night [of ignorance] being attached to this body I eat and drink desiring to satisfy it. Now I give this food to beings, wishing that I may cut off lust and attachment in my body forever.’ This is called partial giving.”

The *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* says: “Again, all those eighty thousand families of worms which inhabit the bodies of other beings do not inhabit his body in any way, shape or form. Why? Since his roots of good raise him over the whole world.” Mitra 326 = Wogihara 671: *yāni khalu punar anyeṣāṃ sattvānām āśītiḥ kṛmikulasahasrāṇi kāye sambhavanti tāni tasya kāye sarveṇa sarvaṃ sarvathā sarvaṃ na sambhavanti / tat kasya hetoḥ / tathā hi tasya tāni kuśalamūlāni sarvalokābhyudgatāni bhavanti /*. See also Conze 1975: 391.

A passage from the *Udayanavatsarājaparipṛcchā* is cited in *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 81.15: “Fools do not see the eighty thousand families of worms staying inside them, [since they are] covered by nets of delusion.” *aśītim kṛmikulasahasrāṇi yāni tiṣṭhanti antare / atha bālā na paśyanti mohajālena āvṛtāḥ //*. The passage is found at T. 310 (29) (XI) 545c26 = T333 (XII) 75b26 [missing in T. 332 ?]. In the *Vinaya-kṣudrakavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya (T. 1451 [XXIV] 286c24-25) the monks ask the Buddha how they can carry out a cremation of a body, when it is filled with the 80,000 worms. The Buddha responds that the worms die when the body dies. (The passage has been translated from Chinese by Anna Seidel in *Hōbōgirin* 578a, and from Tibetan by Gregory Schopen 1992: 16; see also La Vallée Poussin, 1937: 286).

Lamotte (see above), among other references, also referred to the *Visuddhimagga* (ed. Warren and Kosambi 1950: 193-94, trans. Nyānamoli 1956: I.253): “This body is shared by many. Firstly, it is shared by the eighty families of worms” Much more detailed is the account in the **Vimuttimaggā* T. 1648 (XXXII) 433b20-434a11 (trans. Ebara et al. 1977: 174-76). One may also consult Bapat 1933-34.

Lin Li-kouang 1949 109-111 discusses in detail the question of “worm lists” and the different traditions found in various texts, concluding that there at least two different lists of the 80 [000] worms. It seems there is some variance between 80 versus 80,000.

they shall dwell happily.¹ Now I shall attract them with material means. [But] having obtained awakening I shall attract them with the teachings.”²

V.14

If, now, he gets poor alms he should think: “By this poor food my body too shall become light, and I will be patient with my renunciation, the output of my feces and urine will become small, and gifts of faith to me will become few.³ Both my body and my mind too will become light. I will come to have little torpor and drowsiness, and I will not be possessed by a mind of passion.” Thus he should think.

V.15

If he obtains generous alms, even then he should eat moderately. He should also follow the rule of giving things away, and placing some of those alms atop a suitable slab of rock he should think: “May whatever groups of animals and birds

A lengthy passage in the *Garbhāvākraṅtī-sūtra* gives a very detailed breakdown of the types of worms included in the number 80,000, where they live in the body and what they eat. T. 310 (13) [XI] 325a15-b28 = *sTog ga* 382a7ff. = T. 310 (14) [XI] 331b1-c22 = *sTog ga* 409b6ff. Just to give the flavor of the passage, I translate the first few lines. “Seven days after birth there appear in the body 80,000 families of worms. They eat it from top to bottom, side to side. Ānanda. There is one worm family called ‘hair eater.’ It dwells at the root of the hair and is always eating that hair. There are two [more] worm families. One is called ... etc.” It is interesting to note that this passage is quoted in the *Ūjyōshu* T. 2682 (LXXXIV) 38b5ff. The *Ajātasatru sūtra* T. 507 (XIV) 775a18-19 has it that the body has 80,000 pores, each of which is filled with 100 worms.

On *krimi*, see further Zysk 1985: 64-69, 188-90, and Müller 1964.

On this expression, *sukkaṃ phāsum vihar*, see Caillat 1960, 1961.

¹ On this expression, *sukkaṃ phāsum vihar*, see Caillat 1960, 1961.

² A close parallel to this passage is found in the “Twelve Dhūtaguṇa sūtra” 十二頭陀經, quoted in the Introduction.

³ Chinese of the *Ratnarāṣi* and *Śikṣāsamuccaya* omit “gifts of faith to me will become few.”

desire material food receive what is given [here] and eat this [food].”

V.16

Having eaten and washed his begging bowl and hands,¹ he should resort to his wilderness and dwell there. And he shall not he cast aside that way of acting which he previously contemplated.

V.17

If,² Kāśyapa, snakes and ferocious beasts approach the wilderness dwelling śramaṇa who has not yet attained the fruit, who is an ordinary being,³ he shall not fear or be afraid of them, but he shall think: “From the very outset forsaking my body and life I came to dwell in the wilderness, so I should not be afraid, not be scared. Rather, I should produce a loving mind, I should thoroughly remove hatred,⁴ I should remove fear.” If having done so still those snakes and beasts deprive him of life and eat him, he should think: “I cannot satisfy these beasts merely with food, but eating my flesh they will dwell happily in a state of comfort,⁵ and I too will obtain a good reward, that is, from an insubstantial body

¹ Chinese adds: “he rinses clean his bowl and wipes it dry with his hands. Then he hangs up his outer cloak, (and resorts to his wilderness to practice).”

² Chinese adds: “when he is practicing the wilderness dwelling practice.”

³ “Ordinary being” is a technical term, *prthagjana*. The wilderness dweller, then, is technically one who is not an *ārya*, noble. A detailed scholastic discussion may be found in AKB i.191ff., and see the index to La Vallée Poussin 1923-31 s.v.

⁴ Notice the interesting use in Sanskrit of the Prakritic form *doṣa* for *dveṣa*.

⁵ The reference here is to an *āmatyāga*, a gift of one's self, one's own body. Perhaps the most famous example is the so-called Tiger jātaka. For references see Lamotte 1944-80: 143, and notes. For the story of King Śibi's gift of his own flesh, with copious references, see Lamotte 1944-80: 255-60, and notes.

I will obtain an essence.¹ Now, I shall attract them with material means. [But]

¹ The order of clauses in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and Chinese of the *Ratnarāsi* and *Śikṣāsamuccaya* differs from that in Tibetan: “If having done so still those snakes and beasts deprive him of life and eat him, he should think: “I will obtain a good reward, that is, from an insubstantial body I will obtain an essence. I cannot satisfy these beasts merely with food, but eating my flesh they will dwell happily in a state of comfort.” Sanskrit has the expressions in the first person: “deprive me of life, I should think”

I was long puzzled about how to understand the term “essence,” *sāra* = *snying po*, here. The Chinese does not really help: 以不堅身當得堅身, “from a non-firm body I will obtain a firm body.” I once wondered whether there might be a reference here to the idea mentioned in Dhṛ 11 = Uv 29.03: “Those who imagine an essence in what is without an essence, who envision no essence in what has an essence, do not understand the essence, they roam in the field of perverted imagination.” *asāre sāramatino sāre cāsāradassino / te sāraṃ nādhigacchanti micchāsaṅkhappagocarā //*. In canonical Pāli, as far as I know body (*kāya*) is characterized as *asāra* only in Thig 458 and 501. LV 242.15 and SuvPr 57.14 also refer to the body as *asāraka*. These ideas are, of course, conventional and not surprising. On the other hand, the idea of a body which has a transcendent essence seems to be rather common in the *Tathāgata-garbha* literature. Takasaki 1974: 137 quotes the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* as saying that the bodies of the gods, humans and asuras are all, except for the *tathāgata-garbha* (*de bzhin gshegs pa'i snying po*), without any pith (*snying po*), like a bamboo or reed.

I was not satisfied with these references, and did not consider the expression explained. I now believe, however, that I can offer a credible explanation for the expression by reference to a passage in the *Ugradattapariprcchā*:

[One produces] the idea that an essence may arise from an insubstantial body, [one produces] the idea that an essence may arise from an insubstantial life, and [one produces] the idea that an essence may arise from insubstantial possessions. How is it that “[one produces] the idea that an essence may arise from an insubstantial body”? Feeling the inclination to do the task of another, and speaking respectfully to gurus, honoring them, bowing to them, doing obeisance to them, and saluting them — this is how “[one produces] the idea that an essence may arise from an insubstantial body.” How is it that “[one produces] the idea that an essence may arise from an insubstantial life”? Not spoiling roots of good created in past [lives], but increasing them more and more — this is how “[one produces] the idea that an essence may arise from an insubstantial life.” How is it that “[one produces] the idea that an essence may arise from insubstantial possessions”?

Destroying stingy thoughts, and increasing great generosity, distributing gifts — this is how “[one produces] the idea that an essence may arise from insubstantial possessions.

sTog 8b7-9a6, Peking 301b3-8: *snying po med pa'i lus las snying po blang bar 'du shes pa dang / snying po med pa'i srog las snying po blang bar 'du shes pa dang / snying po med pa'i longs spyod rnams las snying po blang bar 'du shes pa yin no // de la snying po med pa'i lus las snying po blang bar 'du shes pa gang zhe na / gang gzhan gyi bya'o cog bya bar spro ba dang / bla ma rnams la gus par smra ba dang / phyag 'tshal ba dang / ldang ba dang / thal mo sbyar ba dang / 'dud pa'i las byed pa ste / 'di ni snying po med pa'i lus las snying po blang bar 'du shes pa zhes bya'o // de la snying po med pa'i srog las snying po blang bar 'du shes pa gang zhe na / gang sngon byas pa'i dge ba'i rtsa ba rnams yongs su mi nyams la / gong du yang rnam par 'phel bar byed pa ste / 'di ni snying po med pa'i srog las snying po blang bar 'du shes pa zhes bya'o // de la snying po med pa'i longs spyod rnams las snying po blang bar 'du shes pa gang zhes na / gang ser sna'i sems tshar gcod cing / gtong ba chen po'i sems 'phel bar byed cing sbyin pa yang dag par 'ged pa ste / 'di ni snying po med pa'i longs spyod rnams las snying po blang bar 'du shes pa zhes bya'o //*. The Chinese texts are: T. 310 (19) (XI) 473b26-c4, T. 322 (XII) 16c9-19, T. 323 (XII) 24b5-12.

It seems to me that we may thus legitimately understand the expression here in the *Ratnarāsi* by reference to this passage: the opportunity to create something essential and solid (spiritually speaking) is created through encounters with what is insubstantial in the world. By using one's body, which is of course insubstantial, to do work for others, or in respectful attendance upon a teacher, as in the *Ugra*, or by

having attained awakening, I shall attract them with the Teaching.”¹ The monk, Kāśyapa, who dwells in the wilderness should dwell in the wilderness thus, without regard for his body or his life.

V.18

If while he is dwelling in that wilderness abode non-humans come [there], whether they are attractive or repulsive, he should neither be attracted to them nor should he be repulsed by them.

V.19

If gods who have seen a former Buddha² approach the wilderness monk and ask him a question, then that wilderness monk should preach the Teaching to those gods according to how he has learned it.³ If, however, those gods ask a profound question, and the answer is not evident to the wilderness monk, he must be

offering the body as food, as in the *Ratnarāśī*, one takes the opportunity provided by the insubstantial to use it as a medium for realizing the substantial, which is spiritual progress. Seen in this light this is certainly one of the more beautiful and profound passages in the sūtra.

It may be possible to confirm this reading by reference to the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya T. 1428 (XXII) 587a27-28, in which Dravya Mallaputra expresses his desire to use his insubstantial body in a way that will assure him of substantiality 此身不牢固。我今當以力方便求牢固法耶。 He therefore volunteers to take care of administrative tasks such as the assignment of lodging to monks.

¹ Chinese omits: “Now, I shall attract them with food. After attaining awakening, I shall attract them with the Teaching.”

² The reference here is extremely interesting. The implication of the passage is that there are gods, who are of course often extremely long lived, who might have met the Buddha, and directly heard his teachings. The humble monk, perhaps being tested by these gods, then is instructed to solicit them for their instruction in the case that his own learning is insufficient. The passage and the idea deserves to be explored further.

³ Sanskrit “according to his ability, according to his strength, according to his spiritual realization of the dharma.”

without pride and say: “You should not despise one who is unlearned. Having orally received the Buddha’s teachings, when with effort I come to fully understand those which I do not [now] fully understand, then I will respond to all your questions. With me as the learner of the Teaching, please practice eloquence [expounding the teaching for me].”¹ Kāśyapa, the wilderness monk should explain thus to the gods.²

V.20

Moreover, Kāśyapa, the wilderness monk who dwells in the wilderness shall intensely cultivate the notion of the wilderness. For him this body is similar to grasses, trees, a wall, a clod of dirt, or an illusion, and is without master, possessions or chattels.³ This body is without self, living being, life, or person, and these dharmas are dependently co-arisen; arising from causes and conditions, they are produced from the agglomeration of causes. As he pacifies all items of wrong speculation on a self, so he shall correctly understand by himself. He shall uninterruptedly concentrate on the teachings of emptiness, the signless and the wishless. Thinking thus he should practice.

¹ The addition in brackets is based on the Chinese. The technical term here, “eloquence,” is *pratiḅbhā*, on which see Braarvig 1985 and MacQueen 1981, 1982.

² Chinese has the last sentence as: “He should be grateful for their generosity and say: I beg you not to despise me.”

³ The *Daśabhūmika* (Kondo 1936: 24.6-7) has: “[Though the *duḥkhaskandha* is] without self or what belongs to a self, empty, vain, void, inactive, motionless, like senseless grass, a piece of wood, a plaster wall, a hide or a reflection, still they do not comprehend it thus.” *ātmātmīyavigato riktatucchaḥ śūnyo nirīho niśceṣṭo jaḍatṛṇakāṣṭhakudyacarmapratibhāsopamo na caivam avabudhyanta iti*. See also the next note.

V.21

The one who dwells in that wilderness abode, [wondering] how those grasses, clumps of trees, herbs and woods, arise and how they will decay, recognizes the fact that as these external entities are masterless, without possessions and without chattels, so they are motionless and actionless; and arising and decaying in an empty manner, no one produces them and no one destroys them. In just the same way one should recognize the fact that this body too is like the grasses, a wall, a tree, a clod of dirt, or an illusion, being masterless, without possessions, without chattels, motionless, actionless, arisen from an agglomeration of causes and conditions, and when causes and conditions are not complete unarisen; ultimately there is nothing here which is arisen or destroyed.”¹

¹ An almost exact parallel is found in the *Ugradattapariṣcchā*: “For example, Householder, grasses, shrubs, herbal plants, and trees inhabiting the wilderness are not terrified, not frightened, not scared, not afflicted by fear. Just so, Householder, the renunciant bodhisattva dwelling in a wilderness must think of his body as like the grasses, shrubs, herbal plants, trees, a piece of wood or a plaster wall, that is, as an illusion. (That is: He must consider it as just like an illusion.) Who is terrified here? Who is frightened here? That one who is frightened by fear or scared must correctly examine the body as follows: Here in the body there is no self, or living being, or life-form, or human, or person, or man, or human being. This is imagination of the unreal, namely fear itself. I must not conceptualize that imagination of the unreal. Therefore, as grasses, shrubs, herbal plants, and trees inhabit a wilderness without owning anything, without belongings, just so must I dwell, without owning anything and without belongings, understanding and realizing that all things are nothing but a wilderness. Why? Dwelling in a wilderness is the cutting off of passions, the absence of ownership, the absence of belongings.”

The text is quoted *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 199.3-12, from which I translate: *tadyathā gr̥hapate 'ranye tṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspatayaḥ pravivasanto na bibhyati nottrasyanti na samtrasyanti na samtrāsam āpadyante / evam eva gr̥hapate pravrajītena bodhisatvenāranye viharatā tṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspatikāṣṭhakūdyavad ātmapratibhāsavat samjñā kāye utpādayitavyā / māyāsamatā cittasyotpādayitavyā / ko 'tra bibheti ko 'sminn uttrasyati / tena bhayabhītena vā trastena vā evam yonīśaḥ kāya upaparīkṣitavyaḥ / nāsty atra kāye ātmā vā satvo vā jīvo vā poṣo vā pudgalo vā manujo vā mānavo vā / abhūtaparikalpa eṣa yad uta bhayaṁ nāma / sa mayā 'bhūtaparikalpo na parikalpayitavyaḥ / tena yathāranye tṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspatayaḥ pravivasanti amamā aparigrahāḥ / evam evāmenāparigraheṅāranyam eva sarva-dharmā iti jñātvā upasampādyā vihartavyaṁ / tat kasya hetoḥ / raṇachedo 'ranyavāso 'mamo 'parigrahaḥ //* Along with the Sanskrit, the Tibetan and Chinese texts are quoted in Mochizuki 1988: 284-304 (the passage in question is his paragraph D). The Chinese is found at T. 310 (19) (XI) 478b19-c6 = T. 323 (XII) 29a5-22 = T. 322 (XII) 20c19-21a17. The Tibetan is found at Peking 325b2ff.

[Two remarks: First, I believe that the clause I have placed in parentheses is an attempt to explain the preceding and enigmatic *ātmapratibhāsavat*. The gloss (as I understand it) is not rendered in the Tibetan quoted by Mochizuki. Second, note that the final sentence appears to contain a pun or folk etymology of *āranya*, namely using *araṇa*, and it is hard to imagine that the ancient authors were not at least aware of the

V.22

Thus, Kāśyapa, the wilderness monk should dwell in the wilderness undertaking the practice of such courses of behavior as these.¹ Those dwelling in modes of behavior like that are rapidly distinguished into followers of the vehicle of the auditors, followers of the vehicle of the lone buddhas, or followers of the vehicle of the bodhisattvas.² If [the wilderness monk] should be a follower of the vehicle of the auditors, he will quickly obtain the fruit [of the śramaṇa]. Even if he is obstructed by karmic obstructions and he does not obtain the fruit [in the present life],³ it will not take more than the time of two or three Tathāgatas until his mind will be liberated from the depravities.⁴ If he should be a follower of the vehicle of lone buddhas, he will rapidly become a lone buddha.⁵ If he should be a follower of the vehicle of the bodhisattvas, right now [during this lifetime] he will attain the tolerance of the fact that [all] things are unproduced.⁶ He will see the Buddha⁷ without hindrance. And having seen the Buddha without hindrance

“confusion” between the two terms, if not actually intentionally utilizing it.

¹ I am not sure that I have correctly understood *chos kyi yi dam gyi spyod pa*, perhaps **dharmasamādānacaryā*.

² Chinese omits “Those dwelling in modes of behavior like that are rapidly distinguished into followers of the vehicle of the auditors, followers of the vehicle of the lone buddhas, or followers of the vehicle of the bodhisattvas.”

³ Addition in brackets based on Chinese.

⁴ On this last expression, see the footnote to section V.23.

⁵ Chinese omits “If he should be a follower of the vehicle of lone buddhas he will rapidly become a lone buddha.” It is no doubt significant that the Chinese translation, the older of the two versions of the sūtra by far, and clearly containing fewer interpolations than the Tibetan text, omits this reference to the pratyekabuddha.

⁶ We have here, of course, one of the key ideas in Mahāyāna Buddhism, the *anutpattika-dharmaḥśānti*. See Lamotte 1962: 411-13 (Appendix, note 3).

⁷ Chinese: “future buddhas,” marking the plural explicitly. There is no indication of plural in the Tibetan.

he will quickly attain to unexcelled perfect awakening.¹

V.23

When this chapter on the wilderness dweller had been preached, the minds of five hundred monks, free from clinging, became liberated from the depravities.²

The Chapter on the Wilderness Dweller; The Fifth.

¹ A close parallel is found in the 十二頭陀經 T. 783 (XVII) 720b24-27. The Buddha smiles, and upon Mahākāśyapa asking the reason for his smile, he says: “I look at the wilderness dwelling and see that all the buddhas of the ten directions extol it. It produces infinite merits for all. Those who seek to become auditors will obtain the vehicle of the auditors, those who seek to become lone buddhas will obtain the vehicle of the lone buddhas, and those who seek to become Mahāyānists will quickly obtain unexcelled perfect awakening. Because I now dwell here [in the wilderness] I am happy [and hence my smile].”

² This expression is part of a stock phrase: *anupādāyāsravebhyas cittaṇi vimuktāni*, KP 138, 145, SP 179.17, RP 59.19, and in Pāli at DhṛA i.86,7: *yāva me anupādāya āsevehi cittaṇi vimuccati*. See von Simson 1965 §17.9. It is peculiar that the renderings of what is basically the same expression (with or without *anupādāya*) in V.22 and 23 of the Chinese differ from each other: 得斷一切諸漏 and 斷一切漏心得解脫, respectively.

The English Translation: Chapter Six

<Alms Begging Practice>

VI.1

Now, Kāśyapa, how is a monk one who practices alms-begging? In this regard, Kāśyapa, the monk who practices alms-begging should consider thus: “I dwell on alms food, and having made renunciation into the well-spoken Dharma and Vinaya, I should dwell in [accord with] my previous vows and promises.”¹ That monk who possesses the earnest aspiration to practice alms begging should not be greedy,² should be without deception, without boasting, without any wish for any invitation, should not cling to the possessions of the community, and should be firm in his vows.³

VI.2

In absolutely no way should he have any ideas about taste with regard to good foods. He should train himself, thinking thus:⁴ “In this way I should be like an

¹ Chinese has the clause from “In this regard” as: “If there is a monk who previously established a vow, saying: ‘I renounce the world and live by alms begging. I now dwell according to this former vow.’” The crucial term here and in the Tibetan is *pūrvapranidhāna*. It is odd to notice that it is rendered twice in Chinese in the same sentence in two different ways: 本誓 and 先誓. See Fujita 1970: 379ff, and Hiraoka 1988.

² Chinese omits “not greedy.”

³ Chinese has understood the last expression as “firmly adorns himself,” and the explanation for this provides an opportunity to illustrate the probable Prakritic background of the Chinese translators’ text. I have discussed the problem in the Introduction.

⁴ Chinese has “He should train himself, thinking thus” as: “With regard to the best food, he should endeavor in his mind to contemplate thus:.”

outcaste¹ and purify my body and mind, but I should not purify my body with food. Why? No matter how good the food that is eaten, it all ultimately flows out as pus. Ultimately it is disagreeable. Ultimately it is evil-smelling. Therefore I should not desire good food.”

VI.3

With such very profound concentration of his thoughts,² when he enters a village, town or city in search of alms he shall beg in systematic order. He may think thus:³ “A man gives alms to me, not a woman. Or, a woman gives alms to me, not a man. Or, a boy gives alms to me, not a girl. Or, a girl gives alms to me, not a boy. Or, I obtain something good, not something poor.⁴ Or, I obtain [alms] with respect, not with disrespect.⁵ Or, I obtain [alms] easily, not with exhausting difficulty.⁶ Or, men, women, boys and girls will come to welcome

¹ The Sanskrit text has *caṇḍālakumāra*. Most Tibetan versions translate *gdol pa*, **caṇḍāla*, but a few (D, J, Śikṣ D, P) render more literally *gdol bu*. Chinese supports only **caṇḍāla*. The term *caṇḍālakumāraka* appears in Pāli (AN iv.376,11), where however it is paired with *caṇḍālakumārikā*, — in other words, the reference is clearly to boys and girls. (The passage occurs in Chinese in the *Ekottarāgama* T. 125 [37.6] [II] 713a24, and *Madhyamāgama* T. 26 [3.24] [I] 453a11; the first specifies only **caṇḍālakumārikā* while the second has only **caṇḍālakumāraka*.)

² **nidhyaptacitta*.

³ The Sanskrit has: “he should not think thus:”

⁴ Chinese has two expressions here apparently corresponding to a single expression in Sanskrit and Chinese: “I will obtain fine food, not coarse food; I will obtain sumptuous food, not poor food.” Neither of the Chinese translations, for “fine food” 細食 or “sumptuous food” 美食, is the same as that used in IV.4, 好食, where the same Sanskrit term as that used here, *praṇīta*, appears. Here the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* translation has 美食, but at IV.4 it reads 美膳.

⁵ Edgerton suggested, BHSD s.v. *satkṛtya*, that the term might mean “carefully, thoroughly, zealously,” but at least in the present case the Tibetan rendering *bsti stang du byas na rnyed kyi bsti stang du ma byas par ni ma yin no* suggests that “respectfully,” or even “having honored [the donor],” might be better. Chinese seems not to render the expression.

⁶ From here, for the rest of the paragraph, the ordering of clauses in the Sanskrit text differs from the Tibetan. Note that the Tibetan translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, which is quoting the Tibetan translation of the *Ratnarāśi*, follows the order of clauses in the latter, not the order of clauses in the Sanskrit text. The Sanskrit reads: “As soon as I arrive, they will concentrate their attentions on me; there will be no neglect of

me. Or, as soon as I arrive, they will concentrate their attentions on me. Or, I must be paid attention to. Or, I will obtain what is well prepared. Or, I will obtain sumptuous food possessing a variety of flavors, but I will not obtain inferior food such as that of poor people.”¹ He should not produce all these bad mental reflections.

VI.4

It is the normal way of things² for alms begging monks that they should gird on armor such as this, that they should not be troubled whether they receive [alms] or do not, and that they should not have any idea that [the alms] are good or bad. Why? Beings for the most part are greedy for savories, and performing evil actions for the sake of food, they are then born in the hells.³ Those beings who are content, not greedy, not longing, not covetous of savories, content with their sense of taste, living on even the poorest food, die, and after they die they will be reborn in heaven; they will reach a happy state among gods and men, and having

me. I will obtain what is well prepared. I will obtain sumptuous food possessing a variety of flavors; I will not obtain inferior, poor food. Men, women, boys and girls will come to welcome me.” Chinese has, for the comparable section: “I should be given alms intentionally, not unintentionally. I should obtain alms easily, not with difficulty. I should quickly obtain alms, not slowly. Entering a village I should obtain respectful honor, not disrespect. I should obtain new food, not leftovers. I should obtain food from rich houses, not from poor ones. Groups of men, women, boys and girls will come to welcome me.” The Chinese translation of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* seems to be corrupt here, and I cannot easily sort it out, although Nakano 1935: 101 has read it as it stands. At the very least I suspect that the order of the clauses has become confused. See the edition of the Chinese text.

¹ Unless I have misunderstood the translation, the Tibetan *dbul po'i (kha) zas lta bu ngan pa* seems to gloss *hīnadaridrābhojanam* as **hīnam bhojanam daridrasya iva*. (I purposely do not apply sandhi.) The Sanskrit means not “inferior food of poor people,” but “inferior, poor food.” This is, I suspect, the preferable understanding, but the Chinese quoted in the previous note suggests that it is certainly not the only possible reading.

² **dharmatā*. Chinese has 常所行法, which is a bit problematic.

³ Chinese adds: “or realm of the beasts or hungry ghosts.”

been born as gods they will consume ambrosial nectar.¹

VI.5

A monk, Kāśyapa, who practices alms begging, doing away with desire for savories and with profound concentration of his thoughts, should not be disheartened, even if he [must] pass seven days eating [only] gruel.² Why? Because he thinks: “I will eat³ food in order to nourish my body and accumulate the elements of the noble path.”⁴

¹ On the notion of being reborn in heaven consuming ambrosia, here *sudhā* but perhaps more commonly *amṛta*, see the episode in the Mūla-Sarvāstivāda Vinaya (Sanskrit Gnoli 1978: 155.23-159.10; Chinese due to Yijing 義淨 T. 1450 [XXIV] 189c1-190b23). I have discussed this story in detail in my paper on the origins of the *Guan Wulaingshuo-jing*, in preparation. In both the *Ratnarāsi* and the *Śikṣā-samuccaya sudhā* is translated into Chinese as 天美食. The term is used in the so-called Buddhist creation myth in the 起世因本經 T. 25 (I) 400c13, where we find 天須陀之味, and likewise *sudhā* is described as a heavenly food which comes from trees in the *Yogācārabhūmi* T. 1579 (XXX) 298a29-b2; it is of four kinds, blue, yellow, red and white. I have noticed in Yamabe 1993: 34 that the term 天須陀味 also appears in the *Guanfo sanmei hai-jing* 觀佛三昧海經 T. 643 (XV) 680b24.

² The exact sense of *kulmāṣa* (the form *kulmāsa* is also found) is not quite clear, but it may be something like a half-cooked pulse. Dictionaries define the word as gruel or half-cooked rice and pulse (peas, beans, etc.). The Chinese translation of the *Ratnarāsi* has “beans,” and the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* “cooked beans.” Other Buddhist texts in Chinese also seem to render it in ways that suggest rice or beans was understood: see Wogihara 1964-74, s.v. *kulmāṣa*. It is less likely to mean rice, however, since we find terms such as *odanakulmāsa*, rice and beans, for example in the KP §152 (*odanakulmāśopacitaḥ*). Mhy. 5747 has Tibetan *zan dron* which seems to mean simply “warm food,” or a food made of hot, ground up tsampa, but the *Ratnarāsi* has *lhad zan*. I have not, so far, noticed this equivalent elsewhere. Note that the variant reading *lhag zan*, “left-over food,” seems to be a *lectio facillior*. It is worth drawing attention to the remark of D.D. Kosambi 1963: 184 that, whatever the technical identification of *kulmāṣa* may be, all indications point to it as the lowest, most humble type of food. Thus, the indication that the monk is reduced to eating this type of fare is significant.

The Tibetan qualifies the gruel with the expression *zhag bdun lon pa za yang*, but the Sanskrit has *suparipakvān*, in other words “well cooked.” Chinese supports the Tibetan, rendering “if one eats beans for seven days.” I do not know how to explain the Sanskrit text, if it is, as I suspect, a graphic or phonological error (for **saptāha-* or **saptadivasa-* ?)

³ Sanskrit has “should eat.”

⁴ Compare a passage in the AN ii.40,4-13: “And how, monks, is a monk one who knows the proper amount with respect to food? In this regard, monks, a monk consumes his food with proper care and attention, not for fun, to indulge, for adornment, or ornamentation, but just in order to maintain and nourish this body, to desist from violence and to encourage the life of purity. Therefore, I shall destroy any old feeling and not produce any anew. And I will live long, be irreprouchable, and dwell in ease. Thus, monks,

VI.6

A monk, Kāśyapa, who practices alms begging should eat what comes into his alms bowl, what is put into his alms bowl, which conforms to the Teaching, which is lawfully acquired, sharing it out with the monks who keep to the practice of purity.

VI.7

If, Kāśyapa, a monk who practices alms begging should fall sick, and being without a nurse¹ he is unable to go on his begging rounds, he should think² as follows: “I am friendless, I am alone, unaccompanied. I have renounced the home life. The Teaching is my friend, and I take my refuge in the Teaching.³ Since I am unhappy, suffering and sick, I should correctly pay attention,⁴ according to how I have heard them, to the teachings taught by the Tathāgata as the medicine of the Teaching.”

a monk knows the proper amount with respect to food” *kathañ ca bhikkhave bhikkhu bhojane mattaññū hoti. idha bhikkhave bhikkhu paṭisañkhā yoniso āhāraṃ āhāreti. neva davāya na madāya na maṇḍanāya na vibhūsanāya yāvad eva imassa kāyassa ṭhitiyā yāpanāya vihiṃsūparitīyā brahmacariyānuggahāya. iti purāṇaṃ ca vedanañ paṭisañkhāmi navañ ca vedanaṃ na uppādessāmi yātrā ca me bhavissati anavajjatā ca phāsuvihāro cāti. evaṃ kho bhikkhave bhikkhu bhojane mattaññū hoti.* (This passage is also quoted by Dantinne 1991: 62-63)

¹ **upasthāyaka*. See BHSD s.v. *upasthāyaka*, CPD s.v. *upaṭṭhāka*. It is also possible that the Tibetan *naḍ g-yog* is intended for *glānopasthāyaka*, but Chinese 使人 suggests that *upasthāyaka* without *glāna* was in the original from which the Chinese was translated. Even without *glāna*, *upasthāyaka* means one who takes care of the sick.

² Chinese has “should profoundly concentrate his thoughts,” **nidhyaptacitta-*.

³ Chinese has “I should be mindful of the Teachings” for “I take my refuge in the Teaching.”

⁴ **yonīsa-upalākṣitavya*, Mhy. 7454. The subject of this sentence in Chinese is “monks,” not “I”: “Monks should be mindful of the Teachings as the Blessed One taught them.”

VI.8

Now, Kāśyapa, this true comprehensive reflection¹ about what this body is is correct application.² If one truly comprehensively reflects on this body as a disadvantage,³ he correctly comprehends. And making his mind single pointed he will become mindful and constantly attentive,⁴ and thus the stage of generating the first Concentration will be his.⁵ Having obtained the Concentration, if he desires the bliss of Concentration, he dwells in the enjoyment of the bliss of Concentration for the space of one day, or two days, or from three days up to seven days.⁶ If, even entered into yoga, he is not able to generate the Concentration, then gods, nāgas and yakṣas renowned for their superior knowledge⁷ will offer food to that yogācārin monk, striving in that manner, who dwells in the Teaching. Why? Because it is the natural outcome of yogic practices that he obtain what was possessed by the gods.⁸

¹ *bhūtapratyavekṣā. See KP §52 and following for a discussion of “true comprehensive reflection.”

² *yonisāḥ pravyuj. See RP 12.9 yonisāḥ prayujyate = tshul bzhin rab tu sbyor. This sentence in the Chinese translation runs: “I should correctly consider the teachings I have heard. How should I correctly consider? By true comprehensive reflection on the body.”

³ It is also possible that this may mean “reflect on the faults in this body.” The term kāyadosa is found in Pāli at AN i.112,35ff, but it is not clear whether the signification is the same. Chinese omits this expression.

⁴ The pair of smṛti and saṃprajanya appeared above in I.2 (22).

⁵ *prathamadhyāna.

⁶ In the standard definition of the first Concentration (see BHSD s.v. dhyāna), the enjoyment of bliss, prītisukha, is one of its characteristics. Such a definition is pan-Buddhist.

⁷ *abhijñānābhijñā. Both Chang et al. 1983: 306 and Nagai 1932: 247 have misunderstood 多人所知, an attempt to translate abhijñānābhijñā or abhijñātābhijñā. On this — in certain ways problematic — term, see Fujita 1970: 185 and 1975: 179-80. The expression has two apparently possible interpretations: 1) renowned for superior knowledge (as Tibetan here takes it), or 2) famous (as Chinese here takes it). Compare BHSD s.v. abhijñāta.

⁸ Chinese has the final two sentences as: “If the alms begging monk practices such teachings as this but still does not obtain the Concentration, he should make an effort to practice and establish himself in the

VI.9

If there is a time, Kāśyapa, when because clouds gather and it rains,¹ the monk who practices alms begging is unable to enter upon his begging rounds, then he girds on the armor of the food of friendliness² and fixed in mindfulness of thoughts about the Teaching, if he has no food for two or three nights, he should consider thus: “There are also³ hungry ghosts in the realm of the dead, doers of evil deeds,⁴ who do not even in a hundred years obtain so much as a mere ball of phlegm to eat. Therefore, fixed in correct thoughts on the Teaching, I should not allow my body or my mind to be weakened, nor in any event should I think of hunger or thirst.⁵ I should not slacken my energy⁶ in my cultivation of the

good teachings. There are well-known gods, nāgas, and yakṣas who present him with food, because this is the result of yoga (or: because this is the result of being free of the yokes).” Concerning the rendering 離扼 for *yoga*, see the Introduction.

I do not understand the reference to “what was possessed by the gods.”

¹ Chinese adds: “or there is a great dust storm.”

² The Tibetan has rendered the Sanskrit quite literally: *maitry-āhāra-saṃnaddha*, as a genitive *tatpuruṣa*. The Sanskrit, Chinese of *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, and the Chinese of the *Ratnarāsi* should perhaps be more reasonably understood as: “he girds himself with armor with friendliness as his food.” But I think the Tibetan simply cannot be read in that way.

³ That is, he thinks: in addition to me there are others even worse off.

⁴ The Chinese translations of *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and the *Ratnarāsi* understand this as “who because of their evil deeds” But Sanskrit and Tibetan take it appositionally.

⁵ Tibetan reads so, but Sanskrit and both Chinese versions understand “I will consent to (Chinese: endure) hunger and thirst.” Chinese has the whole expression as: “body and mind are exhausted, but I will now endure hunger and thirst.” The term for “consent” is *adhivāsayiṣyāmi*. The term *adhivāsanatā*, also found in Pāli, is defined by BHSD s.v. as endurance (of suffering) or toleration (of evil, etc.), with quotations of KP §114 and Bbh 288.26 (also Dutt 1978: 195.24-25), *kleśāsevādhivāsanatā*, which occurs in a list of five *hānabhāgiyā dharmā*. The Chinese there T. 1579 (XXX) 546b29 is 於諸煩惱親近執著, and Tibetan reads (Derge, Tōh. 4037, 151b4): *nyon mongs pa la sten pa dang du len pa*. These translations support the suggestion made by Prof. Nagao that something considerably more positive than endurance or toleration is going on here. Even “acquiescence” may be much too weak or neutral. “Consent,” which Edgerton offers as a separate meaning of the word, may be correct here as well. Note the reference in *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* 215.23 to one of ten things to be renounced in the fifth bhūmi, *rāgadveṣamohādhivāsanāḥ parivarjitavyāḥ*: “Acquiescence / consent to lust, hatred and delusion must be renounced.” For *adhivāsanā* in Pāli, see CPD s.v.

⁶ Chinese has “I should not backslide,” using the term usually reserved for *avaivartika* or

noble path.”

VI.10

The monk, Kāśyapa, who practices alms begging should not be intimate with families,¹ with men, with women, with boys or with girls. At a house at which he has [the donor] cleanse the [proffered] alms, he should sit on a seat and preach a discourse on the Teaching until they finish up cleansing the alms. Then taking those alms he should rise from his seat and go.

VI.11

The monk, Kāśyapa, who practices alms begging should not be a giver of hints, should not be boastful, should not be deceitful.² Here what is meant by “being a giver of hints”? Saying to others: “My alms are poor. My alms are coarse. Formerly I did not eat without so satiating myself.³ I shared my alms out among many people. I have eaten but little, and being unsatiated my body is weak.”

avaivartya. I doubt that this can be related other than conceptually (i.e., not verbally) to the *na sraṃsayiṣyāmi* of the Sanskrit text. The Chinese translation of *Śikṣāsamuccaya* appears to be corrupt at the end of this section.

¹ I have not been able to find a really appropriate English expression for the term I render “be intimate,” but the meaning is better conveyed by the slang term “chummy.” The monk should not frequent residences and be on familiar terms with its occupants. For “families,” Chinese has “lay people.”

² The reference is explicitly to two of the five *mithyājīva*, *kuhana* and *lapanā*, and by implication to a third, on which see Lamotte 1944-80: 1182-83. See CPD s.v. *obhāsa-kamma*, which quotes the *Vibhaṅgapakaraṇa* 353,1: *tattha katamā nemittikatā? lābhasakkārasilokasannissitassa pāpicchassa icchāpakatassa yaṃ paresaṃ nimittāṃ, nimittakammaṃ obhāso obhāsakammaṃ sāmanta-jappā parikathā*. See also above I.4 (7), and note, for the term *lābhena lābhaniścikīrṣā*.

³ The Tibetan text, *bdag gis sngon 'di lta bu dang ma 'drangs par ma zos so*, does not seem to agree with the Sanskrit *na ca me yāvadarthaṃ bhuktāṃ*, “what I ate was not of necessity”? I am not sure, but is it possible that we should read **yāpanārtham?*

Whatever is thus characterized by hint giving is called mental deceit. The monk who follows the practice of alms begging should not do any of those things.¹

VI.12

Whatever comes into his begging bowl, whether poor, whether coarse, whether sparse, whether abundant, whether clean, whether unclean — he must eat it. He must eat alms in order to be without affliction, to purify his intention, to have ample profound concentration on the Teaching, to nourish his body, to maintain the path of the saints.

VI.13

If the monk, Kāśyapa, who undertakes alms begging practice begs for alms² in a village, town or city and does not obtain [any], if he returns with his begging bowl as it was when it was washed [clean and empty], he should think to himself: “Contemplating the Tathāgata, the Tathāgata shining bright by the splendor of his merit, who went forth [into the renunciant life] having abandoned the Universal Kingship, who is honored by gods, nāgas, yakṣas and gandharvas,³ who has

¹ Sanskrit adds: “being truly equanimous,” and the Chinese of the *Ratnarāsi* has: “Kāśyapa. The alms begging monk should be equanimous with regard to all things.” Sanskrit has *upekṣakabhūtena*, which the Chinese translation of *Śikṣāsamuccaya* seems to have interpreted in a way beyond my comprehension: “Those monks who practice alms begging should be equanimous. What is true reality?” I think 棄捨 is intended for *upekṣā*, and 真實 for *bhūta*, but how they came to be treated as parts of different sentences I cannot guess. Nakano 1935: 102 takes the question “What is true reality?” as leading into the next paragraph; this is probably the only way to read the Chinese (even though contextually it makes little sense), but it has in that case taken on a life of its own unrelated to the original text which it purports to be translating.

² Chinese adds: “in systematic order.”

³ Chinese omits “who is honored by gods, nāgas, yakṣas and gandharvas.”

abandoned all negative qualities, possessor of all positive qualities, free of all defilements¹ — if even he, when he went to a village for alms, came back with his begging bowl as it was when it was washed, what reason is there to be upset when one like me, of small merit, who has not produced roots of good, returns with begging bowl as it was when it was washed. Why? Because one who has not produced roots of good will not obtain good food.²

VI.14

If, whether through the action of Māra or through the supernatural power of Māra, those Brahmins and householders do not give alms to me,³ I should act so as to distance myself from the four Māras and become free from all defilements.”

Thus, Māra and the gods who are in league with Māra will not get the opportunity to harm one who dwells in the correct practice of my [Teaching]. Kāśyapa, the monk who undertakes alms begging practice must cultivate the saintly attitudes in that way.

The Chapter on Alms Begging Practice, The Sixth.

¹ Chinese omits “free of all defilements.”

² Chinese has the last sentence as: “(Therefore I should not be upset.) Why? Because not having planted roots of good, there is absolutely no way for me to obtain rough or fine food.”

Compare the passage in the “Twelve Dhūtagaṇa sūtra” 十二頭陀經, quoted in the Introduction. See also above, V.10.

³ Chinese has: “I might not obtain alms. Whether it is Māra himself or the servants of Māra, or Māra conceals the Brahmins and householders (from me?), making it such that I do not obtain alms....”

The English Translation: Chapter Seven

<Refuse Robes>

VII.1

Now, Kāśyapa, with what sort of mental attitude should the monk who wears refuse rags¹ collect refuse rags? With the mental attitude cloaked in modesty and bashfulness,² not with the mental attitude which strives with the effort to be adorned by robes.³ [He should collect them] in order to protect himself from being afflicted by the wind, sun, stinging insects, mosquitoes and snakes, not in order to ornament his body.⁴ Dwelling with correct practice in the preaching of the Tathāgata, he takes no delight in pure clothing.⁵ Taking refuse rags from the refuse heap, he should think of two ideas. Which two? The idea of contentment, and the idea that he is easily pleased.

¹ For a discussion of refuse rag robes and related matters, see the Introduction.

² *hrī and *apatrāpya.

³ Chinese has the sentence as: "Because of modesty and bashfulness, not in order to adorn himself."

⁴ Chinese omits "not in order to ornament his body."

The *Madhyamāgama* T. 26 (10) (I) 432b22-24 has the following: "Monks. If one uses a robe for clothing, it is not as a luxury, it is not as an ornament, but only because of mosquitoes, horseflies, wind, rain, cold and heat, and out of modesty and bashfulness." Basically the same at T. 31 (I) 813c18-20, and at *Ekottarāgama* T. 125 (34.9) (II) 741a1-4. The Pāli version of this is in the *Majjhima Nikāya* (MN i.10,5-8): "The monk, with correct and careful consideration, uses a robe, but only for protection from the cold, for protection from heat, for protection from contact with stinging insects, mosquitoes, wind, the heat of the sun, and serpents, or only in order to conceal the private parts." *bhikkhu paṭisaṅkhā yoniso cīvaram paṭisevati yāvad eva sitassa paṭighātāya uṇhassa paṭighātāya daṃsamakasavātātapasirīmsapasamphassānam paṭighātāya yāvad eva hirikopīnapaṭicchādanattham*. This passage is commented upon in some detail in the *Visuddhimagga* I.85-88. In translating *hirikopīnapaṭicchādanattham* I follow the explanation in the *Visuddhimagga* (see Ñāṇamoli 1956: 32 = I.88). In the modern Sinhalese ordination ceremony reported by Dickson 1875: 7, the ordinand while changing into his monastic robes for the first time repeats the expression from the MN, changing only the verb into first person, namely *paṭisevāmi*. See also the passage from the *Ugradattapariprecchā* quoted in the notes to I.8, above.

⁵ Chinese has: "Because he is fixed in the teachings of the Buddha, not because he is seeking something pure and fine."

VII.2

He should, further, produce two [other] ideas. Which two? The idea of being without arrogance, and the idea of dwelling in the saintly attitudes.

VII.3

He should, further, produce two [other] ideas. Which two? [Not] adorning the body,¹ and purifying the mind.

VII.4

If the monk, Kāśyapa, who wears refuse rags, fearing disrepute to himself² when he is seen by those who were formerly his relatives and friends, or intimates, or acquaintances³ in that place when he is taking the refuse rags from the refuse heap, then does not take the refuse rags — Kāśyapa, I say that such refuse rags of a monk who wears refuse rags are not pure.⁴ Why? Because the monk who wears refuse rags should have an rock-like mind,⁵ and he should pick up refuse

¹ The Tibetan text must have dropped a negative here, found in Chinese and required by the sense. There is no trace of any negative, however, in any of the exemplars of the Tibetan version I have consulted.

² Chinese omits “fearing disrepute to himself.”

³ It seems that the implication may be that now that he is a monk such people are no longer to be considered as so related to him; he has broken his social ties with them.

⁴ Chinese has: “If the monk, Kāśyapa, who wears refuse rags is seen in that place at the time that he is picking up refuse on the refuse heap by his relatives or friends, and if being seen he stops picking up [refuse], thinking to himself ‘These people may slander me saying ‘You are not a pure person,’” — Kāśyapa, I say that this monk is not able to practice purely.”

⁵ The reading “adamant-like mind” (**vajropamacitta*) of some Tibetan texts is a *lectio faciliior*; “rock-like” is confirmed by Chinese. However, in the next clause Tibetan reads “adamant-like mind” with no variants in any exemplar I have seen. Chinese has the whole sentence as: “Why? Because the monk

rags being fearless because of his adamant-like mind.

VII.5

Picking up the refuse rags he shall wash them well and make them completely pure and stainless, and shall dye them, and shall patch together a monastic robe. Subsequently, he should wear it patching it well, mending it well, and sewing it up well such that it does not become ruined.¹

VII.6

The monk who wears refuse rags, Kāśyapa, should wear refuse rags upon his body fixed in mental contemplation on impurity in order to thoroughly pacify his lusts. He should wear refuse rags upon his body with a compassionate mental attitude in order to thoroughly pacify hatred. He should wear refuse rags upon his body fixed in [contemplation of] dependent co-origination in order to thoroughly pacify delusion. He should wear refuse rags upon his body with correct mental contemplation in order to remove all defilements.² He should wear refuse rags upon his body well constraining his senses in order to thoroughly know the six spheres. He should wear refuse rags upon his body without deception and without boasting in order to propitiate gods, nāgas, and yakṣas.

who wears refuse rags has a mind firm like a stone, so external things cannot enter it nor can they move it.” I do not know how to reconcile the two versions.

¹ Chinese instead of “such that ...” has “making sure that it does not come apart at the seams.”

² For these items see the classification in III.17, and the note there.

VII.7

Why, Kāśyapa, do people call them “refuse rags”? By way of example, Kāśyapa: refuse is a thing that has been thrown away on a refuse heap, no one desires it, no one wants it and no one picks it up.¹ In this way, Kāśyapa, [refuse rags] are similar to refuse in being without possessions, being without chattels, in being easily acquired, abundant,² in being unnecessary to request of others, in being unnecessary to regard the countenances of others, in not being subject to the control of others,³ and in being thrown away like refuse, and therefore people speak of them as “refuse rags.”

VII.8

This [refuse rag robe] is the lineage of the ṛṣis.⁴ This is the pure lineage of the saints. This is the fixity of the saintly attitudes. This is the refuge of the dhuta ascetic purification practices. This is the guard of all constituent elements of morality. This is the door of the constituent elements of meditative concentration. This is the basis of the constituent elements of knowledge. This is the arisal of

¹ Chinese has: “Kāśyapa, just as no one desires a corpse and no one has the idea that it is their property, the rule is that it should be abandoned. So too, Kāśyapa refuse rag robes”

² I am not clear on the difference between *rnyed sla ba* and *mod pa*. Both would seem to be possible translations of *sulabha* (Mhy. 2656, Tse ring dbang rgyal [Bacot 1930: 131b]). In the LSV, however, *mod pa* is cited as *sphīta* (Inagaki 1984: 93). Another problem is the Chinese equivalent of *mod pa*, which seems to be 非邪命, “not [through] wrong livelihood,” **amithyājīvena* or **na mithyājīvena*. I cannot now make any suggestion which might lead to a possible connection between the Tibetan and Chinese readings.

³ These expressions are not clear to me. The last seems to refer to *aparādhīna* (Mhy. 2397), but the same Sanskrit is offered for the previous term, *gzhan ngor*, in Tse ring dbang rgyal (Bacot 1930: 151a). The equivalent of these three items in Chinese is: “not seeking / requesting them from others, not examining the countenances of others (?)” The latter expression 不觀他顏色 seems to be almost literally equivalent to Tibetan *gzhan gyi ngor blta mi dgos pa*, but the meaning of both is not quite clear to me.

⁴ Chinese for “lineage of the ṛṣis” has here “dharma-banner” 法幢, a term which in the LSV (Inagaki 1984: 34) refers to *dharmadhvaja*.

the constituent elements of liberation. This is in harmony with the agglomeration of the knowledge and vision of liberation.¹ In this way, Kāśyapa, [the monk] who wears refuse rags is full of good qualities, without occasion, without opportunity, lives in the open air,² is stainless,³ and has laid down the burden.⁴

VII.9

Even the gods, Kāśyapa, will be delighted by⁵ a refuse rag wearing monk who is satisfied with robes of refuse rags. Such things do occur,⁶ Kāśyapa, and, thus, if even Śakra, Brahmā and the World-Protectors joining their hands in reverent salute fall at his feet and do homage to a refuse rag wearing monk who wears poor quality robes and who has attained the bliss of Concentration, it goes without saying that the other gods⁷ will do homage to him.

¹ We have, again, the set of *śīla-skandhaḥ*, *samādhi°*, *prajñā°*, *vimukti°*, and *vimuktijñānadarśana°*. The Chinese has the paragraph up to here as follows: “Rag robes [of the monk who wears rag robes] are his dharma banner, because he is a great ṛṣi; they are his gotra because he is an ārya; they are his fixed dwelling because of his saintly attitudes (**āryavaṁśa*); they are his single-mindedness because he follows good behaviors and conduct (**[sam]ācāra*); they are his protection because of the aggregate of morality; they are his door because of the aggregate of concentration; they are his fixed dwelling because of the aggregate of wisdom; they are his body because of the aggregate of liberation; they are his harmony with the teaching because of the aggregate of knowledge and vision of liberation.”

² I do not understand the first two of these three expressions, but it seems clear that there is some sort of verbal play here; I believe the three terms, *skabs med pa*, *go skabs med pa* and *bla gab med pa* may be equivalent to **nirākāśa*, **anavakāśa*, and **ābhyavakāśika*. See *Bodhicaryāvatāra* IX.95b (Weller’s index misprinted as IX.94b) Mhy. 6440, 1136. Chinese has apparently only two terms, “desiring nothing, lusting after nothing.” I do not know how to resolve the problem at present.

³ We have here another interesting case of a misunderstanding by the Chinese translators. The Sanskrit text evidently had **nirmala*, but Chinese 能離慢心, “free from arrogance,” suggests that they read instead **nirmāna*.

⁴ **apahr̥tabhāra*, for which see BHSD s.v. The Tibetan translation here, *khur khyer bar ’gyur ba*, is non-standard; the usual rendering (Mhy. 1084) is *khur bor ba*.

⁵ Chinese: “delighted to see.”

⁶ *’di lta bu’i dus dang / ’di lta bu’i man yod de*. I do not understand the expression. Compare Pāli *okāsa*? There is no equivalent in Chinese. The same occurs again in VII.16.

⁷ Chinese: “minor gods.”

VII.10

Monks¹ who make an effort, Kāśyapa, to adorn themselves with the monastic robes, but who do not exert themselves in yoga, for whom the quintessential thing is the ornamentation of the body, who are given to practices of external purity but who inwardly are full of lust, hatred and delusion — no matter how good the quality of the robes they wear, Kāśyapa, their form does not please the gods.² Why? The gods know the thoughts and mental factors of those who exert themselves with the intention of adorning the body, and knowing that they keep them far away and spurn them.³

VII.11

Kāśyapa.⁴ The novice Cunda after picking up refuse rags polluted by impurity went begging for alms and went to lake Anavatapta.⁵ When he got there the gods who dwell at that excellent lake came forth from a great distance to meet

¹ Chinese: “evil monks.”

² We may compare the expression in Thag 1080-81 (translation Norman 1969): “A conceited and vain bhikkhu, clad in a rag from a dust-heap, does not seem impressive because of it, like a monkey in a lion-skin. One who is not conceited, not vain, zealous, with faculties restrained, does appear impressive because of his rag from a dust-heap, like a lion in a mountain cave.” *uddhato capalo bhikkhu paṃsukūlena pāruto / kapi va sihacamma na so tenupasobhati // anuddhato acapalo nipako samvutindriyo / sobhati paṃsukūlena siho va girigabbhāre //*

³ Chinese has: “... adorn their bodies with the monastic robes, who are given to practices of external purity, but who inwardly are full of lust, hatred, and delusion, although they adorn their bodies in this way, the gods, nāgas and yakṣas do not honor and worship them. Why? [The gods] know that these monks make an effort to adorn their bodies with the robes, not to remove the obstructions of mind and thoughts. Because the gods know that, they spurn them far away.”

⁴ Chinese adds: “you saw that ...”

⁵ Chinese adds: “desiring to wash off [the rags].” There are nearly identical versions of this story in several other Buddhist texts. See the Introduction for a detailed discussion.

him, and paying homage to him by bowing their heads at his feet those gods of pure behavior¹ themselves washed the refuse rags polluted by impurity, and having made them stainless anointed their own bodies with that dirty washing water. Knowing Cunda to have undertaken and attained the virtues of the precepts, the gods of that lake paid homage to him with the five pointed prostration.

VII.12

Observe: The renunciant² named Subhadra, after putting on pure robes, having begged for alms went to lake Anavatapta. And it occurred to the gods who dwell at that lake, “After eating his food here at this excellent lake, when he leaves behind the remains he will make the excellent lake impure,” and they did not permit him to approach to within so much as a perimeter of one *krośa* [around the lake].³

VII.13

You must observe, Kāśyapa, the superiority of his accomplishment of the good

¹ Mhy. 6369, *caukṣasamudācāra*. The term appears in Aṣṭa (Mitra 89 = Wogihara 260.6-7 and Mitra 326 = Wogihara 671.12), but in neither place does it apply to gods. It is defined by Haribhadra in the first location as “of pure behavior because internally pure of all causes of evil,” *sarvapāpākaraṇād adhyātmaśuddhyā caukṣasamudācāraḥ*.

² Chinese calls him a **brahmacārin* rather than a **parivrājaka*, as Tibetan has it.

³ Chinese: “They stopped him far away, five *li* from each of the four sides of the lake, and did not permit him to draw close to the lake, fearing his impure food and leftovers would defile the great lake.”

AK 87d and AKB ad (Pradhan 1975:177.5; La Vallée Poussin 1923-31: iii.179 with note 2) note that an *araṇya* should be one *krośa* from a village. La Vallée Poussin notes: “Eitel (p. 98) observes that the cemetery ascetic may not approach a village closer than the limit of a *krośa*.” I am not sure to what work La Vallée Poussin is referring.

qualities of the noble Teaching,¹ and the gods sprinkling on their own bodies the dirty water with which Cunda's refuse rags were washed, and their not permitting the renunciant Subhadra even to go [to the lake].²

VII.14

"Therefore, Kāśyapa, the refuse rag wearing monk who desires such virtuous qualities as these,³ who is not timid and shrinking,⁴ who dwells in the saintly attitudes, should wear refuse rags upon his body with the idea that they are a shrine, the idea that they are the teacher, and the idea that they are unselfish and without any chattels."⁵

VII.15

"Once again, the body becomes purified through the mind, but the mind does not become purified through the body. Therefore, although one should purify the mind, it is not purified by adorning the body. Since the purification of the mind is spoken of in the teachings of the blessed one as the practice of purity, one should

¹ Chinese has: "because he correctly practices virtuous acts the noble attains this fruit." Tibetan seems to represent something like **āyadharmaguṇasamādānaviṣeṣa*.

² Chinese has "to go within five *li* of the lake," and adds the following: "Kāśyapa. Who, having heard this, would not make an effort to train themselves in the noble teaching? Those nobles and those heavenly beings all will come bowing their heads to him in worship and honor."

³ Chinese: "one who wears the refuse rag robe because he desires such virtuous qualities as these."

⁴ See the note to III.4. Here Chinese has, apparently corresponding, "should not be upset."

⁵ For part of this formulation see the list in I.8, above, in which eight types of respect toward the robe are listed. Only two of the eight, the idea that the robes are a shrine and the idea that they are the teacher, correspond to the present enumeration. Chinese adds after "teacher" "the idea that they are supramundane (**lokottara*)." At the end of the section Chinese adds: "Having contemplated in such a way, the wearer of refuse rag robes should profoundly concentrate his mind in that way."

profoundly meditate on the mind.¹

VII.16

“Therefore, Kāśyapa, the refuse rag wearing monk should imitate² you and me. Kāśyapa, such things do occur. You, Kāśyapa, wear a poor robe and are satisfied with your robe no matter how poor.³ At the time when you are promenading on the promenade walk,⁴ having set down your outer cloak on a seat or on the top of a seat, and wearing your upper robe, many hundreds of thousands of gods will gather there and say: ‘This is an upper robe worn on a body perfumed by the precepts, concentration and wisdom,’⁵ and they will pay homage to that upper robe of yours. Observe, Kāśyapa! If they will pay homage even to [your] monastic robe, how much more so [will they pay homage] to your body!”

VII.17

Kāśyapa. I think that as monks imitate me so they shall succeed.⁶ Giving up the

¹ That is, the purification of the mind is equivalent to the practice of purity, *brahmacarya*.

² **anusīkṣitavyam*.

³ Chinese: “Kāśyapa. If you can gather such poor robes, then you will be satisfied by practicing the saintly attitudes.” The term which at Mhy. 2216 is (*na*) *itaretareṇa saṃtuṣṭiḥ* = *ngan ngon gyis chog (mi) shes pa* is close to the Tibetan here, *ngan ngon gyis chog par 'dzin pa*. But *ngan ngon* is also equivalent to *avaraka* or *avavaraka* (see Mhy. 2701, Tse ring dbang rgyal [Bacot 1930: 40a]), “humble, poor.” On the other hand, the term translated by the Chinese text is almost certainly that found in Mhy. 2371 *āryavaṃśa-saṃtuṣṭa*. I cannot suggest how these two expressions could be ultimately connected.

⁴ See BHSD s.v. *caṅkrama* (cognate construction). The promenade is a walkway for walking meditation. Such promenades are a prominent feature of contemporary Buddhist hermitages.

⁵ The reference is to the triad *śīla*, *samādhi* and *prajñā*. Compare the expression in the *Suvārṇa-bhāsottama* (Sanskrit 206.6 = Tibetan 156.6-7) *śīlaguṇaparivāsita* = *tshul khrims dang yon tan gyis yongsu b(s)gos pa*.

⁶ This sentence is not found in Chinese.

sovereignty of the Universal Emperor I renounced the household life, and rejecting monastic robes made of fine Benares cloth, of Dukūla cotton, of Koṭambaka cotton and of goose-patterned cloth,¹ I wear robes of hempen cotton upon my body because I delight in the saintly attitudes.²

VII.18

I took from you, Kāśyapa, a fine³ silk garment and I gave to you one of hempen

¹ Mhy 9176 *kāsikasūkṣma*, 9162 *daukūlaka*, 9163 *koṭambaka*. See G. Roth 1970: 124, §149 verse 11ab *kadāham kāsikam vastram kṣaumakoṭumbakāni ca* /. Page 179 §181 note 1 refers to *hamsalakṣaṇa-paṭa*, and says “this term is frequently met with in the Jaina Siddhānta.” Roth quotes *Kādambārī* 98.6 in which “*dukūla* garments are described as *hamsasita*.” Roth also refers to *Nāyādhammakahāo* XVI.117 (our 273.4-5) which reads *hamsalakṣaṇam paḍagasāḍagam pariḥenti*. Roth translates “They put round him [the beggar] a garment made of cloth, having the characteristics [of the feathers] of a goose [i.e. of a very fine and soft quality].” In the same text see also 50.15, 51.4, 55.18, 113.1. BHSD s.v. *kauṭumba-* refers to Divy 559.10, to which Nolot 1991: 112, note 93 adds a reference to the *Bhikṣunikarmavacana* (Ridding & La Vallée Poussin) p. 136.5 [folio 22b4-5] which has *kāsīsūkṣmam vā ... dukūlakasūkṣmam vā koṭambaka-sūkṣmam vā*. SP 89.6 has *koṭambakahaṃsalakṣaṇa*. For *hamsalakṣaṇa* see BHSD s.v. The word also occurs in the *Vasudevahimṇī*, see Jamkhedkar 1984: 179-80, note 967, and on *dukūla* 129-30, note 919. See also Chandra 1973: 56 and 115 on *dukūla*, 11 on *koṭumbara*, 157 #45 and 168 #6 on *hamsavādī*, and also his plates after page 179, figure 15. What may be an image of the “goose patterned cloth” is found in Ajanta on the wall of the left corridor of cave 1, *Mahājanaka Jātaka*, illustrated in Takata 1971, plate 86.

² Instead of “because I delight in the saintly attitudes,” Chinese has: “(Having given up all those robes) I now am satisfied practicing the saintly attitudes. For the sake of others I get rid of fine clothes in favor of those gathered in cemeteries.”

³ Actually we have a serious problem here. The Tibetan unequivocally reads not “fine” but rather exactly the opposite, “poor,” *ngan pa*. Chinese has “upper robe of golden thread,” 金縷上衣. I have emended the Tibetan text, believing that the reading of all versions, *ngan*, should in fact be *ngang*, since the term *ngang pa* may mean exactly red-yellow color, completely agreeing with the Chinese. (*ngang pa* usually renders *hamsa*, as it does in VII.17. When it means red-yellow color, I do not know to what Sanskrit term it corresponds. It is also possible, I suppose, that the reference is to the *hamsa* cloth mentioned in VII.17, above.)

If this is not the correct solution, however, it is also possible that the confusion can be explained by hypothesizing the presence of the term *dūṣya*, for which see the detailed discussion in BHSD s.v. 2 *duṣya*. This term, often compounded with a following *-paṭa*, is regularly rendered in Tibetan as *ras bcos bu*. (In the *Ratnaketu* 95.6, 100.10, 14, however, the Dunhuang text has *god 'du sha* instead.) But when we observe that *duṣṭha* has the meaning of spoiled, bad, corrupt, it becomes conceivable to suggest that somehow the intended reading *dūṣya* was understood, either through graphic confusion or otherwise, as *duṣṭha*. The latter could quite correctly be rendered into Tibetan with *ngan pa*.

cotton.¹ This is all because of my compassion directed toward you, not because of my desire and not in order to ornament my body.

VII.19

In this regard, Kāśyapa, some deluded people do not imitate you and me; they are overcome by greed and longing, hoard monastic robes, hoard begging bowls, hoard worldly material possessions, hoard cowries and gold and jewels and grain, amass cows, sheep, chickens, swine, donkeys, horses, and [animals] to draw ploughs and carts,² and they are fully devoted to carrying out the householder's activities. Householders have something special, Kāśyapa, but those foolish men, even though they have crossed the boundary into renunciation, have nothing that is special.³

VII.20

Kāśyapa. Why are householders special?⁴ Householders know that those who are not śramaṇas but falsely claim to be śramaṇas, who are not followers of the practice of purity but falsely claim to be followers of the practice of purity, who wear the monastic robes while busy with affairs, who are polluted by various

¹ The reference here is to a story recounted in the *Samyuktāgama* T. 99 (1144) (II) 303a28-b29 = T. 100 (II) 418b4-c14 ≈ SN ii.219,31-221,21. See Lamotte 1944-80: 1399, with note 1. I have translated the first Chinese version in the Introduction, and discussed the entire episode.

² Such lists, with considerable flexibility in their exact wording, are standard stereotyped expressions for wealth, and are found throughout Buddhist literature.

³ Chinese has: "Kāśyapa, there are wise people who although they dwell in the home are able to increase their good dharmas. Fools [even if they] renounce the home are not able to obtain such a good portion."

⁴ Literally: "As for what makes the householder special?"

pollutions, and who are intent on seeking food and clothes, [nevertheless] wear the monastic robe, and so they respect and honor them, greet them with robes and alms, speak respectfully to them, and rise to pay homage to them. This is what makes those householders special, Kāśyapa, but those renunciants do not possess those [qualities]. Why? Because they are not zealous in practicing [special distinctions], much less do they accumulate them.¹

VII.21

At that time,² Kāśyapa, monks generally will have many begging bowls and robes, many vessels and many possessions, and they will be honored, respected, and revered and worshipped. Why? Because receiving gifts and giving them back from time to time, so I may obtain some in just that way.³

VII.22

Those monks who uphold the precepts, possess good qualities, apply themselves to the destruction of the depravities, are disgusted with the world, full of zeal as if their head and clothes were on fire,⁴ with few goals and few things to do,⁵

¹ Chinese has the passage as follows: "How can the wise householder increase his good qualities? Kāśyapa, there may be a renunciant who wears the monastic robes but who is not a śramaṇa, who is very busy with affairs, very involved in seeking good clothing and food. After he puts on his monastic robe a householder may see him and respectfully pay homage to him, and come to greet him offering robes, food, bedding and medicaments. Kāśyapa, householders have such good qualities, but those renunciants do not. Why? Because those renunciants seek many things, but are not able to give them to others."

² Chinese has, more logically, "In the future there will be monks"

³ Chinese has here: "Why? That is, monks receive many of gifts, and might give some to me. If I wait, I will be able to get them from time to time." I am not sure I have understood the Tibetan correctly.

⁴ For "possess good qualities, apply themselves to the destruction of the depravities, are disgusted with the world, full of zeal as if their head and clothes were on fire," Chinese has: "see the faults and evils

intent on their own benefit, who have completely abandoned friendships¹ — no one at that time will go toward them, no one will be close to them or pay them honor. Why? Because householders, being of lustful nature and intent on the present but not intent on future births, think thus: “If those monks do not provide a livelihood for us, why should we be close to them, bow to them, honor them, respect them?” Nevertheless, there are a few exceptions who have planted good roots, who accomplishing the effort of previous lives² will uphold the precepts, who will be close to those who possess such good qualities, and who will honor them and respect them

VII.23

Such teachings as these, Kāśyapa, with such an approach, please two kinds of people. Which two? (1) Those who, seeing the truth, look upon saṃsāra with fear, and (2) those who, applying themselves to the practice of yoga, wish to obtain the fruit [of the śramaṇa], believe in the maturation of acts, and striving for the Teaching desire the Teaching.³

of the world, make an effort to cultivate good dharmas and get rid of all depravities, as if their heads were on fire.”

⁵ *alpārtha and *alpakaraṇīya. Chinese has: “Their minds will be satisfied, their conditions (? 緣事) few.” I do not really know how to read the last expression, but it seems possible that *alpakaraṇīya* may have been read as *alpa-karaṇa.

¹ I have some reservations about this rendering of *'dris par byed pa yongs su spangs pa*. BHSD s.v. *parijaya* discusses the term, which Edgerton renders “intensive cultivation, thorough acquaintance, familiarity, careful consideration.” Chinese: “who are free from cultivation of evil relations (?).”

² *pūrvayogasampanna.

³ Chinese has: “1) One who sees the four noble truths. 2) One who sees the faults and evils of saṃsāra. Another two. 1) One who endeavors to get rid of the four yokes. 2) One who desires to obtain the fruit of the śramaṇa. Another two. 1) One who single-mindedly contemplates the maturation of acts. 2) One who wants to know the meaning of the teachings.” Probably the text had some form of **dharmārtha*, and the Chinese and Tibetan translators respectively understood *artha* as “meaning” and “for the sake of.”

VII.24

I will shut¹ the doors, Kāśyapa, of all those who do not apply themselves, who look toward what is improper,² who contradict the [fact of] the maturation of acts, who are not fearful of censure in the other world, who exert themselves for the present, who do not exert themselves for the future.³

VII.25

I did not create an opportunity in such a teaching as this, Kāśyapa, for those deluded people who do not produce even so much as one thought imbued with liberation. But nevertheless, when they hear such teachings they understand that they have offended against what I established, and they think to slander it saying:⁴ “These are not what was spoken by the Buddha, but rather they are one’s own personal fabrications, or created by Māra to cause havoc.”⁵ And they will

See KP §156 *dharmārthikatā* and §10v, 15 *dharmakāma*.

¹ Chinese 閉, Tibetan *bshad*, present of *'chad pa* (Zhang et al. 1985: 3160). Jäschke (1881 s.v. *sgo*) refers to the expression *sgo gcod pa*, to shut or lock a door. *gcod pa*, he explains s.v. *'chad pa*, as the transitive form of *'chad pa*.

² Or, “who hold an improper view”?

³ Chinese: “Kāśyapa. I will now shut the doors of all those who are lazy (*kausīdya*), that is: who do not know the fact of action and the maturation of acts, who do not practice good dharmas, who do not see the fault in the other world, for instance like a vajra (see Introduction for this expression), who see the benefit in the present but do not see the benefits in the next world, who do not single-mindedly devote themselves to the gates of liberation.” The final clause is connected in the Tibetan version with the following section VII.25.

⁴ Chinese has rather: “Kāśyapa. I now explain that those evil monks will not desire such a preaching in accord with the teaching or such an opportunity in accord with the teaching. Hearing such teachings, they themselves know what they have practiced, but they do not comprehend the profound teaching and slander it saying”

⁵ Chinese: “they are made up by scholars (? 論師), or preached by Māra.” The rendering “to cause havoc” is slightly free, but undoubtedly we have to do with the term **vihethanā* (*[rnam par] tho 'tsham[s] pa*). See Hirakawa 1973 s.v., Bacot 1930: 73b.

thus mislead many beings. They themselves will be ruined and they will also bring ruin upon others; they themselves will be defiled and they will defile others. And thus, those deluded people are not engaged for the benefit of themselves or for the benefit of others.¹

VII.26

Then the Reverend Mahākāśyapa spoke thus to the Blessed One: “Blessed One. Here in this discourse on doctrine, the *Collection of Jewels*,² the Blessed One, Tathāgata, Arhat, Complete and Perfect Buddha, expansively preached the great compassion of the Buddhas, Blessed Ones, to those persons for whom practice is quintessential,³ for whom the teaching is their Lord.⁴ Blessed One, those beings who, upon hearing this discourse on doctrine, have conviction and perfect⁵ [the teaching] in accord with reality are protectively embraced⁶ by the Buddha.

VII.27

This is a clear instance of a phenomenon common in Mahāyāna literature, namely the “demonization” of teachings with which the author(s) of a given text might not agree. The approach is, in a sense, an extreme variant on the ad hominem argument: “not only is that text / doctrine etc. wrong, it is an expression produced by the embodiment of pure evil, Māra.” For a start at a sociological critique of the issue, see Kent 1982: 318-19, and the remarks of McQueen 1981: 304.

¹ Chinese: “These evil monks cannot benefit themselves nor [can] they benefit others.”

² **Ratnakūṭadharmaparyāya*.

³ **pratipattisāra*. This term is found in KP §2. Chinese has it that they are monks.

⁴ **dharmesvara*. The Chinese translation, 於諸法中得自在者, would be difficult to understand without a comparison with the Tibetan.

⁵ Chinese: “read and recite.”

⁶ **pariṅgrah*.

The Blessed One said: “It is so, Kāśyapa, it is so. Those beings who, upon hearing this discourse on doctrine, have faith and perfect [the teaching] in accord with reality are embraced by the Buddha.”¹

VII.28

Then the Blessed One spoke to the Reverend Ānanda: “Ānanda. You must uphold this chapter of the teaching for the sake of those gentle sons or gentle daughters who have produced roots of good, desire peace, and desire liberation. And those householders and renunciants will also study this teaching and then will eliminate all the attachments to existence and will obtain nirvāṇa.”²

VII.29

[Ānanda] said: “Blessed One. When I uphold this discourse on doctrine, Blessed One, what shall be the name of this discourse on doctrine, how shall I uphold it?”

¹ There is no equivalent for this section in the Chinese translation.

² Chinese has: “At that time the Buddha said to Ānanda: If there are those —namely, gentle sons or gentle daughters— who accept and uphold this sūtra, because they have already planted roots of good under previous buddhas, they now wish to obtain this sūtra, read and recite it, and understand its merits, and [so] they desire to obtain liberation. Whether they study it as renunciants or study it as householders, this teaching can cut off their depravities and enable them to obtain nirvāṇa.”

There are two possible ways to understand the syntax of the Tibetan in the last expression: “they will eliminate all the attachments / bonds to existence and obtain nirvāṇa,” or: “they will obtain the nirvāṇa which is free of all attachments to existence.” The latter would then refer to something like **anutpadhiṣeṣa-nirvāṇa*. The Chinese seems to have translated the first alternative, with the difference that for *phung po* = *skandha* / *upadhi* it has *āsrava*. At LV (Sanskrit 31.21 = Tibetan 33.18) *sarvopadhipratiniḥsargāyāiḥ saṁvartate* = *rdzas thams cad rab tu spong bar 'gyur ro*. Mhy. 2549 *sarvopadhipratinisarga* = *phung po kun spangs pa*. Given the Chinese understanding and the expressions quoted from LV and Mhy. I have followed this interpretation in my translation.

VII.30

The Blessed One said: “Ānanda. Therefore you shall uphold this discourse on doctrine as “The Compendium of all Teachings,”¹ or “Dwelling in the Noble Behaviors and Ascetic Practices,”² or “Protectively Embracing those who Uphold the Precepts,”³ or “Censure of Precept Breakers,”⁴ or “Collection of Jewels,”⁵ or “Heap of Jewels,”⁶ or “Hoard of Jewels,” or “The Chapter of the Jeweled Dharma-Gate.”⁷

VII.31

When the Blessed One had spoken thus, the Reverend Mahākāśyapa, the Reverend Ānanda, and the world with its gods, men, asuras and gandharvas rejoiced and praised what was spoken by the Blessed One.

-
- 1 **Sarvadharmasamuccaya.*
 2 **Āryavaṃśadhūtaguṇa.*
 3 **Śīlavatparigraha.*
 4 **Duḥśīlāvasādana.*
 5 **Ratnakūṭa.*
 6 **Ratnarāśi.*
 7 **Ratnadharmamukha / -dvāra.*