

ISSN 1343-8980

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年報

令和二年度
(第24号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University

for the Academic Year 2020

Volume XXIV

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2021・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo・2021

A newly identified Manuscript of the *Mahāprātihāryasūtra* in the Gilgit Buddhist Manuscript: A Critical Edition and Translation¹

Natchapol SIRISAWAD

Abstract:

The *Mahāprātihāryasūtra* or ‘the story of the Buddha’s great miracles at Śrāvastī’ is one of the Buddha’s principal miracles and stands as the prototypical Buddhist miracle story. The narrative is preserved in various recensions and in a variety of languages. Two newly discovered Gilgit Buddhist manuscripts in the New Delhi Collection likely represent the oldest known Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Mahāprātihāryasūtra*. Although scholars have already identified these surviving manuscripts, they have been falsely attributed to the *Divyāvadāna* and have yet to be comprehensively studied. To rectify these issues, this paper gives an overview of the Sanskrit fragments of the Gilgit Buddhist manuscripts, a critical edition and translation and demonstrates that they should be identified with the *Mahāprātihāryasūtra* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition, due to the close relation it has to the Tibetan and Chinese translations of Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*.

Keywords:

Mahāprātihāryasūtra, the Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, a critical edition, translation

Introduction

One particularly notable event associated directly with the Buddha’s principal miracles is the so-called “Great Miracle” or *mahāprātihārya*, which, it is commonly said, the Buddha performed at Śrāvastī to embarrass the *tīrthikas*. While scholars have long been aware of the presence of marvellous events in Buddhist literature, some might argue that miracles do not play an important role in Buddhism, and that the Buddha appealed primarily to reason and even disdained the performance of miracles. Nevertheless, stories of the Buddha’s miracles are numerous, and the narrative of the Great Miracle at Śrāvastī is one piece of evidence among many to conclusively illustrate that the Buddha was characterised as exceptional.

Narratives concerning the Buddha’s performance of the Śrāvastī miracle are popular in both literature and art and were distributed extensively. The stories were widely transmitted, existed in multiple versions and were preserved in a variety of classical languages including Sanskrit, Pāli, Tibetan, Chinese and Mongolian. Most have been translated into a modern language at least once, including English, French, Chinese and Japanese. At present, the oldest Sanskrit version is represented by a set of incomplete fragmentary manuscripts belonging to the Gilgit Finds. In his paper on “The Gilgit Manuscripts: An Ancient Buddhist

⁽¹⁾ This article is part of my doctoral dissertation “The *Mahāprātihāryasūtra* in the Gilgit Manuscripts: A Critical Edition, Translation and Textual Analysis” submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the doctoral degree program in Buddhist Studies Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München (2019).

Library in Modern Research”, Oskar von Hinüber lists the Gilgit manuscripts included in the “New Delhi Collection”,² kept at the National Archives of India in New Delhi.³ Among these manuscripts, two incomplete and unedited manuscripts, listed as serial no. 21 (five folios) and no. 56h (one folio),⁴ have been identified as the *Prātihāryasūtra* of the *Divyāvadāna*. Noriyuki Kudo explains that the “two manuscripts are different from each other. A Sanskrit parallel is found in the *Divyāvadāna* but it does not correspond to the Gilgit manuscripts.”⁵

The *Mahāprātihāryasūtra* appears to originally have circulated as an independent “*sūtra*”. This can be determined on the basis of the *sūtra* being mentioned in the works of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, such as the *Abhidharmakośopāyikāṭīkā* (*Chos mngon pa’i mdzod kyi ’grel bshad nye bar mkho ba zhes bya ba*) by Śamathadeva, an important commentary on Vasubandhu’s *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*. In chapter 4, “penetration of reality according to the Śrāvakas (*Śrāvakatattvāvatāra*)”, of Bhavya’s *Tarkajvālā* composed around the sixth century CE., three texts under the name *Mahāprātihāryasūtra* are cited as belonging to three different *nikāyas*; namely, the Prajñaptivādin-Bahuśrūtīyas (*rtaḡ par smra pa’i mang du thos pa rnams kyi cho ’phrul chen po’i mdo*), the Ārya Caitikas (*’phags pa mchod rten pa’i cho ’phrul chen po’i mdo*) and the Ārya *Gokulika-mahācaitikas(?) (*’phags pa ba lang gnas chen po mchod rten pa rnams kyi cho ’phrul chen po’i mdo*).⁶ Even though there is no title preserved in the Gilgit manuscripts, this specific narrative was named *(*Mahā*)*prātihārya(sūtra)* can be deduced from the scriptures of the three aforementioned *nikāyas*, in addition to another Indian source preserved in the Tibetan translations: Śamathadeva’s *Abhidharmakośopāyikāṭīkā*.

The *Mahāprātihāryasūtra* in the Gilgit Manuscripts: An Overview

There are two manuscripts of the work found among the Gilgit finds, an important collection of Buddhist manuscripts found in Pakistan, listed as serial no. 21 and no. 56h.

Serial no. 21⁷ is an incomplete manuscript comprising 5 birch bark folios (Facsimile Edition 1714–1723; folio nos. extant 3(6),⁸ 37, 39, 41, 46), the material generally preferred in all the north-western regions of ancient South Asia where Sanskrit Buddhist texts are found,⁹ each of which consisting of four lines on both sides with approximately 72–75 letters per line. They are written in a type of Brāhmī script, classified by Lore Sander as “Gilgit/Bāmiyan Type II” and by Oskar von Hinüber as “*Protośāradā*”,¹⁰ which, according to their palaeographic studies, should be dated approximately to the seventh and eighth century CE.¹¹

(2) In von Hinüber 2014: 91 it is called “The Delhi Collection”, while Kudo’s *Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India Facsimile Edition* vol. III (2017) calls it “The New Delhi Collection.”

(3) Previously it was believed that the *avadāna* texts among the so-called Gilgit manuscripts and the folios found at Naupur village near Gilgit were only preserved in Indian collections, including in the “New Delhi Collection”; it has since been uncovered that several other institutions, such as “the Srinagar Collection” (in the Sri Pratap Singh Museum), also contain several such manuscripts or fragments. See Kudo 2017: ix.

(4) Von Hinüber 2014: 101, 110.

(5) Kudo 2017: xxix.

(6) Skilling 1997b: 605–608.

(7) I follow the serial numbers and sub-division numbering introduced by von Hinüber 2014.

(8) This folio no. is different from what has been published in Chandra (1959) and von Hinüber (1979).

(9) Hartmann 1997: 135; Sander 2014: 172. See also von Hinüber 2014: 91 note 58.

(10) Gilgit/Bāmiyan Type II (or *Protośāradā*) is mostly used for non-Mahāyāna works such as *Vinaya* literature, non-Mahāyāna *sūtras*, *avadāna* texts, *gāthās* and so on. There are some exceptions, see Kudo 2013: 256, note 4; Sander 1968 Alphabet m: 137–161, Tafel 21–26, 1983: 113–124, 2007: 129–131.

(11) Sander 1968: 137–161, 1989 (especially p. 111), 2014: 174; Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 37–40.

There is a neatly defined square around the string-hole on the left half-side of each folio between lines two and three, bearing the folio number on the recto. These manuscripts have been variously identified with the *Prasenajidgautamagāthā*, for instance, by Lokesh Chandra and Oskar von Hinüber, as the *Gautamagāthā* by P.V. Bapat or later as the *Prātihāryasūtra*?

Gudrun Melzer has noted that the first line of folio no. 41 verso was added in very small *akṣaras* — it is illegible in both the facsimile and on the microfilm of the Gilgit manuscripts¹² but is legible in the new colour FE, the components of letters being more readily distinguished from the stains on the birch bark. Interestingly the small *akṣaras* written on folio 41 verso, in which the beginning of the Great Miracle story is inserted, continue part of the story in folio 36 recto. Omissions (often haplographies in the narrower sense) in the main text, which are then reproduced on the margin in the small *akṣaras*, are normally found in the Gilgit manuscripts but the omitted passages in 36 recto are not inserted on the same folio but in several pages later. However, on folio 36 recto none of the usual symbols are detected, which would mark the exact location of an omission. It is difficult to decide whether these small *akṣaras* were added by the same or a different scribe, because they were written in a much smaller script due to the limited amount of space that remained available on the manuscript. It is most likely that the scribe added these small *akṣaras* upon realising the first part of the story was missing, although it cannot be ruled out that they were later prepended by another.¹³ At present, this phenomenon cannot be explained.

Serial no. 56h comprises an incomplete manuscript of one birch bark folio (FE 3342–3343; folio no. extant 143), also written in Gilgit/Bāmiyan Type II (*Protośāradā*), but with six lines of approximately 74 letters on both sides. A string hole stands at the centre of a square space on the left half-side of the folio between lines three and four; the folio number is found on the recto. The fragment is datable on palaeographic grounds to a period after the seventh century CE.¹⁴ The fragment has been tentatively identified by Klaus Wille, who refers to the *Divyāvadāna* (pp. 154ff.) because of the occurrence of the name Kāla; beyond this, however, hardly any parallelism between the two texts can be discerned.¹⁵

Since folio no. 41 verso overlaps in two lines with folio no. 143 recto, beginning from *ṣyapraśiṣyair* (41v3, 143r1) to *prakrāntaḥ* (41v4, 143r2), it is clear that there are at least two copies of the *Mahāpratihāryasūtra* in the Gilgit manuscripts collection. It was not possible to determine the dimensions of both manuscripts from the old facsimile edition (see the black/white FE 1714–1723, GBM vol. 10, part 7; FE 3342–3343, GBM vol. 10, part 10) but the new colour facsimile edition with its superior quality offers the possibility of establishing their sizes, which we have calculated as approximately 40 and 30 centimetres for FE 1714–1723 and FE 3342–3343 respectively.¹⁶

The narrative of the Śrāvastī miracle seemingly enjoyed some popularity in the Gilgit

(12) Von Hinüber 2014: 101.

(13) For Diplomatic Edition: **41v** «.. dh[o] bhagavāṃn rājagr̥he viharati veṇuvane kalamndakanivāpe satkr̥to gurukr̥to mānita pūjito rājñāṃ rājamātrāṇāṃ brāhmaṇānāṃ gr̥hapatīnāṃ naigamanaigamajanapadānāṃ dhanināṃ śreṣṭhināṃ sārthavāhānāṃ lābhī ca bhagavāṃ cīvarapiṇḍapātaśayanāsanaglā[napratyaya-bhaiṣaj]yapariṣkārāṇāṃ tīrthyās tu [na] satkr̥tā na [gu]ruk[r]tā [na] mān[i]ta na pūjit[ā] rājñāṃ rājamātrāṇāṃ brāhmaṇānāṃ gr̥hapatīnāṃ naigamajanapadānāṃ dhanināṃ śreṣṭhināṃ sārthavāhānāṃ na ca labhī na cīvara[pi] //»». For the reconstruction see § 1.

(14) See note 11.

(15) Von Hinüber 2014: 101.

(16) See the colour printing of the Gilgit manuscripts in Kudo 2017: 126–129.

area, as evidenced by the fact it was copied at least two times, now extant in the Gilgit manuscripts collection on the basis that folio no. 41 (of what manuscript) verso overlaps in two lines with folio no. 143 recto. The two manuscripts exhibit the usual features definitive of other manuscripts belonging to Gilgit dated approximately to the seventh and eighth centuries CE. They exhibit the usual features definitive of other manuscripts of that time and region. Such features include mere scribal errors that are common to Buddhist Sanskrit texts as well as some vocabulary that is particular to Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit; nonetheless the language of the manuscripts is by and large standardised Sanskrit.

Contents of the *Mahāpratihāryasūtra* in the Gilgit Manuscripts

The narrative of the Śrāvastī miracle of the Mūlasarvāstivāda versions is divided into 17 sections based on my own divisions. Many of these parallel versions, however, have prequels and sequels to the actual account of the Buddha's miracles.¹⁷ The Gilgit manuscripts do not preserve the complete story of the *Mahāpratihāryasūtra*. In the manuscript serial no. 21, the narrative begins with § 1 an opening in folio 41 verso (with very small *akṣaras*) combined with folio 36 recto, which state the Buddha dwelled in the Bamboo grove at the *Kalandakanivāpa* in Rājagṛha and that there he received veneration and offerings from humans, while the *tīrthikas* did not. Then it continues with the story of § 2, 3, 4 (incomplete), 6 (incomplete), 7 (incomplete), 8 (incomplete), 11 (incomplete). In manuscript serial no. 56h, a part of § 8, the *tīrthikas*' search for companions, is preserved, which, when combined with the available part of manuscript serial no. 21 (folio 41r2–v4) and the section of § 9 in which the story of Prince Kāla is found, makes the narrative of this section almost complete.

A Critical Edition and Translation

In order to translate and prepare a critical edition of the manuscripts, I had to consider the related story in the *Kṣudrakavastu* extant in the Tibetan and Chinese translation of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*. The Tibetan translation of the *Vinayakṣudrakavastu* (*'Dul ba phran tshogs kyi gzhi*) [= MSV-T] is attributed to Vidyākaraṇaprabha, Dharmasīrabha and dPal 'byor, who were active in the early ninth century CE. The narrative is located between a regulation concerning the obstacles of ordination and the long story of Mahauṣadha. I compared the Sanskrit manuscripts with the four editions of the Tibetan *bKa''gyur* manuscripts, which fall into two main transmissions: the so-called eastern group, the Tshal pa lineage, and the so-called western group, the Them spangs ma lineage. The Tshal pa lineage is here represented by the *sDe dge* (Derge) xylograph *bKa''gyur* (1733) [=D] from the

⁽¹⁷⁾ The prequels include § 1 the Opening, § 2 Māra's deceptive miracle that recalls the distress of the *tīrthikas*, § 3 The convention of the *tīrthikas* that leads to the Buddha being challenged to perform the miracle and his acceptance of that challenge despite interdicting his disciples from displaying their supernatural powers in public, § 4 The *tīrthikas*' visit to King Bimbisāra, and § 5 King Bimbisāra's visit to the Buddha. There are also several transitional episodes, including, § 6 The Buddha's journey from Rājagṛha to Śrāvastī, § 7 King Prasenajit's visit to the Buddha, § 8 the *tīrthikas*' search for Companions, and § 9 The Story of Prince Kāla. At the site of the miracle, there are main episodes, recounting § 10 the preparation of the miracle pavilion, § 11 Miracles (1), § 12 The sage's visit to the Buddha, § 13 The disciples' asking the Buddha to entrust the work to them, § 14 Miracles (2) (preliminary miracles that are not accepted as part of the actual contest), § 15 Miracles (3) (The Great Miracle), § 16 The destruction of the *tīrthikas*' pavilion, § 17 Pūraṇa's flight, encounters, and suicide. The sequels include the Buddha's ascent to Trāyastriṃśa heaven, where he spends the rain-retreat preaching to his mother, and his subsequent descent from that heaven at Sāṃkāśya, an event still ritually commemorated throughout Southeast Asia and elsewhere.

Lithang group and one from Qianlong xylograph *bKa''gyur* (1717–1720) [=Q] belonging to the Peking edition. The Them spans ma lineage is represented by *sNar thang* (Narhang) xylograph *bKa''gyur* (1730–1732) [=N] and the *sTog pho brang* (sTog Palace) *bKa''gyur* manuscript (ca. 1729) [=S]. The four *bKa''gyur* manuscripts used in this dissertation are as follows: D 'dul ba da 40a1–53b5 [Vol. 11]; Q 'dul ba ne 37a8–51a2 [Vol. 44]; N 'dul ba da 229b5–251b4 [Vol. 11]; S 'dul ba tha 57a5–77b1 [Vol. 10].¹⁸

The Chinese translation of the *Vinayakṣudrakavastu* (根本說一切有部毘奈耶雜事 *Gēnběn shuōyīqīyèyǒubù Pīnàiyē Zāshì*, T. 1451 vol. 24, [卷 juàn 26]: 329a5–333c14) [=MSV-C] was carried out by Yijing (義淨) in 710.¹⁹

Another Sanskrit version, considerably modified and extended, is found in the *Prātihāryasūtra* in chapter 12 of the *Divyāvadāna* [= PrS(Divy)].²⁰ Apart from Cowell and Neil's edition of the *Prātihāryasūtra*, two further manuscripts kept in the National Archives Kathmandu, Nepal were consulted in this article. The first manuscript is the *Divyāvadānamālā* (manuscript no. 3/680) [= PrS(Divy.M)-Ms. I], dated to around the eleventh century CE., which comprises 112 palm-leaf folios written in the *Bhujimola* (Bhujinmol) script and the Sanskrit language. The *Prātihāryasūtra* in this manuscript is incomplete. It constitutes four folios with the colophon at the end of the story. The second is the *Divyāvadānamālā* (manuscript no. 3/295) [=PrS(Divy.M)-Ms. II], dated to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which comprises 265 (paper-?) folios written in the Newari script and Sanskrit language. These two manuscripts show another distinct transmission that was not considered by Cowell and Neil and thus were included in the critical edition and comparative study with the Gilgit manuscripts. Apart from these closely related versions, one recension (arguably two) of the narrative of the Śrāvastī miracle is still preserved in other Sanskrit versions: the “*Pratihāryāvadāna*,” the thirteenth narrative of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* [= Av-klp] collected and arranged in verse in the middle of the eleventh century CE. by the Kashmiri

(18) For D, I use the versions of the Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center [=TBRC] which are available from their website, <http://www.tbrc.org>; Skilling (1997a vol.1: xxxviii), in his study of the Mahāsūtra, consulted D in three versions: the Karmapa reprint, the Berkeley or Nyingma reprint, which is a reproduction of the Karmapa edition (as is the recent Taipei reprint), an original print kept in the Oriental Institute, Prague. Melzer (2010: 105) consulted the Blockprint version kept in the Staatsbibliothek, Munich and stated that TBRC version is based on the Karmapa reprint version. D was catalogued by Hakuju Ui, et al, 1934. For Q I used a reprint edition in Daisetz T. Suzuki., ed. 1955–1961. For N, I used a poor quality paper scan from the microfilm edition provided by Gudrun Melzer. N was listed by Shodo Nagashima, 1975. For S, I use the TBRC version catalogued by Tadeusz Skorupski, 1985. English translation: Fiordalis 2014: 5–33. For information on the catalogue and edition of other *bKa''gyur* texts, see Harrison and Eimer 1997: xi–xiv.

(19) English Translation: Rhi 1991: 270–288; See also Frauwallner 1956: 194.

(20) Edition: Cowell and Neil [Cambridge 1866] reprint. Cambridge 1970, Delhi 1987: 143–166; Vaidya = Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, 20, 1959: 80–103. A Sanskrit e-text of Vaidya's edition is accessible on GRETIL: <http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil.htm>. French translation: Burnouf [1844] 1876: 144–168 [= English translation Buffetrille and Lopez Jr. 2010: 188–209]; English translation: Foucher 1909: 5–78; Rhi 1991: 289–308; Rotman 2008: 34 (summary of the story), 253–287 (trans.); Japanese translation: Miyaji 1979: 117–141; Hiraoka 2007: I, 265–301. For text- critical remarks on the *Divyāvadāna*: Speyer 1902: 115–118; Hiraoka 2009: 53–55.

poet Kṣemendra²¹. The *Prātihārya*, the fifteenth story of the *Avadānaśataka* [= Avś],²² which also occurs under the same name as a *sūtra* in the *Divyāvadāna*.

David Fiordalis has made a significant contribution by translating “The story of the Buddha’s Great Miracle at Śrāvastī from the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*” (2014),²³ into English, from the Tibetan translation of the *Vinayaḥṣudrakavastu* based on three Tibetan editions, the *sDe dge* (Derge), Peking, and *sNar thang* (Narthang). In his rendition, he considered other relevant versions, including the Chinese translation of the *Vinayaḥṣudrakavastu* as well as the *Prātihāryasūtra* of the *Divyāvadāna*. Nevertheless, he used only two editions from the *Tshal pa* and one from the *Them spangs ma* transmission of the Tibetan *bKa”gyur*. I additionally refer to the N and S editions, which were not consulted in his translation. Although the English translation of the Tibetan MSV is primarily based on David Fiordalis, there are several mistranslations in his version. These required some modification and subsequently I offer an alternative English translation. The Chinese translation of the MSV (T. 1451) together with Ju-hyung Rhi’s rendering is also cited against or alongside the Sanskrit or Tibetan passages for comparison. I use the *Prātihāryasūtra* of the *Divyāvadāna* edited by Cowell and Neil (without emending the reading) and Andy Rotman’s English translation.

The Sanskrit text of the folio is reconstructed as far as possible on the basis of any parallel passages found in the Tibetan and Chinese translation of the MSV, and the *Prātihāryasūtra* of the *Divyāvadāna*; footnotes are largely reserved for recording substantial variations between the Gilgit manuscripts and the closely related Tibetan and Chinese translation of the MSV versions; and the *Prātihāryasūtra* of the *Divyāvadāna* is also cited in instances where its content is significant to the reconstruction and translation of the *Mahāprātihāryasūtra*. The Sanskrit text will be separated into sections based on my own divisions, which are made in accordance with the sequence of the story followed by an English translation of the Sanskrit. Wherever the Sanskrit is unavailable, the Tibetan translation of the MSV is rendered into English. Some Sanskrit words in the critical edition of the Gilgit manuscripts are presented as they occur and are not corrected to standard Sanskrit forms, such as, *śāstrīṇām* for *śāstīṇām* 36v4 (§ 3.1), *riddhi*^o for *ṛddhi*^o (in every occurrence), *mahardhika* for *maharddhika* (§ 2.6), *kauśala* (in every occurrence). These have proved essential to the present study and have been utilised for the preparation of a critical edition of the Gilgit manuscripts.

(²¹) Edition of the Sanskrit and the Tibetan: Das and Vidyābhūṣaṇa 1888: 411–429. Another edition of the Sanskrit, based on Das and Vidyābhūṣaṇa, is Vaidya [= Buddhist Sanskrit Texts No. 22–23] 1959 vol. 1: 111–116. English translation: Dās 1895: 17–20. An e-text of the Sanskrit is available on GRETIL. Following a personal discussion with David Fiordalis (18 June 2018), I learned that the Sanskrit text of Kṣemendra’s Av-klp is preserved in a bilingual manuscript dated to around the period of the fifth Dalai Lama in the eleventh century CE. The Sanskrit text was transliterated in the Tibetan script inter-linearly within the Tibetan translation of Kṣemendra’s original poetry. As the basis for any new translation, the pioneering edition of Das and Vidyābhūṣaṇa needs to be reconsidered in light of the manuscriptural evidence. Fiordalis has produced an unpublished article containing a re-edition, translation and comparative analysis of the poetic Sanskrit text preserved in the manuscripts. From his point of view Kṣemendra’s original poetic rendering of the Av-klp is based mostly on the Great Miracle story from the MSV.

(²²) Editions: Speyer [1902–1909]1958: 83–87; Vaidya [=Buddhist Sanskrit Text 19] 1958: 38–40. An e-text is also available on GRETIL. French translation: Feer [1891] 1979: 68–71. English translation: Appleton 2013: 15–17. For a survey of the literature on the Mūlasarvāstivāda affiliation of the Sanskrit and Tibetan *Avadānaśataka(s)*, see Dhammadinnā 2015: 491 with note 22.

(²³) Fiordalis 2014: 1–33.

In order to facilitate reading, the reconstruction utilises the following symbols:

()	restoration in a gap ²⁴
[]	damaged <i>akṣara(s)</i>
<>	omission of (part of) <i>akṣara(s)</i> without a gap in the manuscript
<< >>	interlinear insertion
{ }	superfluous (part of an) <i>akṣara</i>
{ { } }	superfluous (part of an) <i>akṣara</i> , erased by correction mark in the manuscript
+	one lost <i>akṣara</i>
..	one illegible <i>akṣara</i>
.	part of an illegible <i>akṣara</i>
///	beginning or end of a fragment when broken
*	<i>virāma</i>
˙	<i>avagraha</i> , not added in the transliteration, but added without brackets in the critical edition if necessary
•	punctuation mark
:	<i>visarga</i> used as punctuation mark
	double <i>danḍa</i>
○	space for string hole

§ 1 The Opening

The Blessed Buddha dwells in the Bamboo grove at the *Kalandakanivāpa* in Rājagṛha and receives veneration and offerings from humans; the *tīrthikas* do not.

Gilgit Mss.: 41v (small *akṣaras*) +36r1; **MSV-T:** D: 40a1–40a4, Q: 37a8–37b3, N: 229b5–230a3, S: 57a5–57b3; **MSV-C:** 329a8–13; **PrS(Divy):** 143.1–8

Gilgit: (41v)²⁵ (bud)dh(o)²⁶ bhagavā{ṃ}n rājagṛhe viharati veṇuvane kala{ṃ}ndakanivāpe²⁷ satkṛto gurukṛto mānita<ḥ> pūjito rājñāṃ rājamātrāṇāṃ brāhmaṇānāṃ ḡrhapatīnāṃ naigama-
{naigama}jānapadānāṃ²⁸ dhanināṃ śreṣṭhināṃ sārthavāhānāṃ lābhī ca bhagavāṃ<ś> cīvara-
piṇḍapātaśayanāsanaglānapratyayabhaisajyapariṣkāraṇāṃ tīrthyās tu na satkṛtā na gurukṛtā na
mānitā na pūjitā rājñāṃ rājamātrāṇāṃ brahmaṇānāṃ ḡrhapatīnāṃ naigamajānapadānāṃ²⁹
dhanināṃ śreṣṭhināṃ sārthavāhānāṃ na ca labhina<ś> cīvara(piṇḍapātaśayanāsanaglāna-
pratyayabhaisajyapari)(36r1)ṣkāraṇāṃ³⁰ <|>

⁽²⁴⁾ Parentheses are used to signify two forms of restoration. First, for words that can be restored with certainty, parentheses denote the missing *akṣaras*: (bud)dh(o), (sarvajñāḥ), saṃjay(ino vai)raṭṭīputtrasya etc. Second, parentheses are also used for less confident restorations or sometimes suggestions of missing phrases, sentences or lengthier passages.

⁽²⁵⁾ The story begins with the very small *akṣaras* added in the upper margin of 41v.

⁽²⁶⁾ (bud)dh(o): *sangs rgyas*.

⁽²⁷⁾ PrS(Divy) 143.1 *karandakanivāpa* [Mss. BCD *kalandaka*°]. Other possibilities are *kalanda-ni*°, *kalindaka*°, *kalaṇḍaka*°, *karaṇḍaka*°, *kalandaka-nivāsa*, see BHSD 171. In Tibetan translation it is rendered *ka lan da ka*. In GBM vol. 7, FE 1507.8 *Adbhutadharmaparyāya*, there is a parallel sentence which reads, *bhagavān rājagṛhe viharati sma veṇuvane kalandakanivāse*, see Bentor 1988: 32.

⁽²⁸⁾ Ms. °*janapadānāṃ*. *naigama* often appears in compound with *jānapada* (masculine plural) “Stadt- und Landbevölkerung” and with *janapada*, which is probably an error for *jāna*°, see BHSD 312; SWTF III: 61. In 37r1 (§ 3.1), the terms appear to be separated as *naigamānāṃ janapadānāṃ*, cf. MSV-T *grong mi dang ljongs kyi mi dang*.

⁽²⁹⁾ Ms. °*janapadānāṃ*.

⁽³⁰⁾ *cīvara(piṇḍapātaśayanāsanaglānapratyayabhaisajyapari)ṣkāraṇāṃ*: *chos gos dang bsod snyoms dang mal stan dang nad gsos kyi rkyen sman dang yo byad rnams* cf. PrS(Divy)143.5–6, 18–19. MSV-T gives slightly different words to express the same meaning in order to show variety in the translation. There are four different translations of *cīvarapiṇḍapātaśayanāsanaglānapratyayabhaisajyapariṣkāraṇāṃ*: (1) *chos gos dang bsod snyoms dang gzims cha dang snyun gsos kyi rkyen sman dang yo byad rnams* (§ 1); (2) *chos gos dang bsod*

Trans: The Buddha, the Blessed One,³¹ dwelt in Rājagṛha, in the bamboo grove at the Kalandakanivāpa, and, honoured, revered, respected and worshipped³² by kings, royal ministers, brahmins, heads of households, town and country people, the wealthy, guilds’ chiefs and caravan leaders, the Blessed One obtained³³ the requisites of robes, alms-bowls, bedding and seats and medicines to cure illness. However, the *tīrthikas*³⁴ were not honoured, revered, respected and worshipped by kings, royal ministers, brahmins, heads of households, town and country people, the wealthy, the guilds chiefs and caravan leaders and did not obtain the requisites of robes, alms-bowls, bedding and seats and medicines to cure illness.³⁵

§ 2 Māra’s Deceptive Miracle

§ 2.1 Māra attempts to disturb the *tīrthikas*.

Gilgit Mss.: 36r1; **MSV-T:** D: 40a4–40a5, Q: 37b3–37b4, N: 230a3–230a4, S: 57b3–57b4; **MSV-C:** 329a13–15; **PrS(Divy):** 144.14–16, 145.4–6

Gilgit: atha mārasya pāpīyas{s}a etad abhava<t |>dīrgharātram mayā śramaṇo gautamo viheṭhito na ca labdh{av}āvatārah³⁶ <|> yan <n>v³⁷ aham tīrthyān api viheṭhayeyam iti •

Trans: Then Māra, the Evil One, had this thought, “For a long time, I have tried to disturb the ascetic Gautama, but I have never found an opportunity³⁸ [to do so].³⁹ Now, I should disturb the *tīrthikas*.”

snyoms dang mal stan dang nad gos kyi rkyen sman dang yo byad rnams (§ 1, 3.1); (3) *chos gos dang bsod snyoms dang mal stan dang na ba’i rkyen sman dang yo byad rnams* (§ 3.1); (4) *chos gos dang bsod snyoms dang mal stan dang na ba’i gos kyi rkyen sman dang yo byad rnams* (§ 3.1).

⁽³¹⁾ There is no perfect translation of the term *bhagavān* (*bhagavat*), an epithet of a *buddha*. Some scholars translate the term as “Fortunate One,” see Skilling Saerji and Assavavirulhakarn 2016: 163–64, “Exalted One,” see Appleton, 2013: 4 note 9. Here the term *bhagavat* is translated “Blessed One”, or “Blessed” when in an adjectival position modifying *buddha*. See the explanation of the term *bhagavat* in Fiordalis 2014: 5 note 20.

⁽³²⁾ This is a difficult feature when it comes to translation. One word is often followed by several (usually three) synonyms or near synonyms, and accounting for the semantic subtlety of each is a challenge. Thus these several possibilities are reflected in other’s translations: “honoured, praised, respected and worshipped”, see Appleton, 2013: 3, “respected honoured, revered, and venerated”, see Rotman 2008: 253. Fiordalis (2014: 6) translates *rim gro byas bla mar byas phu dud du byas mchod pa byas pas* from MSV-T as “honoured, revered, and worshipped the Blessed One, and furnished him with bountiful offerings”. In MSV-C, Rhi (1991: 270) mentioned only two verbs, including 尊重 and 恭敬供養, which mean, “venerated and honored.”

⁽³³⁾ Fiordalis (2014: 6) does not translate *brnyes so*, which corresponds to *lābhī* in both 41v (§ 1) and PrS(Divy) 143.5.

⁽³⁴⁾ Several English words have been used to translate this term: “heretic” (Rotman 2008); “rival holy-men” (Fiordalis 2014 note 22); “*tīrthyas*” (Burnouf [1844] 1876: 145). I find the term is best left untranslated and therefore I use *tīrthika* in my translation.

⁽³⁵⁾ MSV-T mentions only robes (*chos gos*), alms (*bsod snyoms*), bedding (*gzims cha*) and medicine for curing sickness (*snyun gos kyi rkyen sman*), which are the four necessities of the holy life. It differs slightly from the manuscript and the parallel in PrS(Divy) which mention *āsana* “seat.” In MSV-C, only the four requisites are mentioned, including foods (飲食), monastic robes (衣服), bedding (臥具) and medicines (醫藥), as to be closer to MSV-T.

⁽³⁶⁾ Ms. ^o*tāraṃ*.

⁽³⁷⁾ Ms. *yanv*. I emend to *yan <n>v*: *ma la* cf. PrS(Divy) 144.16, 145.6. In the text of the MSV it is regularly printed *yat tu* (*yat tv aham...*), which is possibly the product of a misreading of *yan* (*yam*) *nu*, see BHSD 444.

⁽³⁸⁾ PrS(Divy)144.16 reads *avatāra: na ca kadācid avatāro labdhaḥ*. Buffétrille and Lopez Jr. (2010: 190) translate this passage as, “but never could I destroy him”, but also suggest another translation, “I never could find the occasion”. They favour the first meaning as it corresponds to the sense of *avatāra* and *avatāraṇa* in the *Prajñāpāramitā*: we could easily justify it with brahmanical authorities, see Burnouf [1844] 1876: 147 note 1 (Transl. Buffétrille and Lopez Jr. 2010: 188 note 171). Rotman (2008: 254) translates it as “a weak point”. MSV-T has *glags*, “opportunity; possibility;” Fiordalis (2014: 6) translates it as “an opening”.

⁽³⁹⁾ The square brackets [] used in the translation signify any words, phrases or sentences added by me.

§ 2.2 The tīrthikas stay near Rājagṛha.

Gilgit Mss.: 36r1–2; **MSV-T:** D: 40a5–40a6, Q: 37b4–37b5, N: 230a4–230a5, S: 57b4–57b5; **MSV-C:** 329a15–17; **PrS(Divy):** 143.9–12

Gilgit: tena khalu samayena ṣaṭ pūraṇādyāś śāstā{ḥ}ro (‘sarvajñāḥ’)⁴⁰ (**r2**) sarvajñābhīmānino rājagṛham⁴¹ upanīśritya⁴² viharanti •

Trans: At that time, the six teachers, starting with Pūraṇa [Kāśyapa], who were not omniscient but imagined themselves to be so, dwelt near⁴³ Rājagṛha.

§ 2.3 Māra transforms himself into the appearance of (1) Pūraṇa Kāśyapa, goes to Maskarin Gośālīputra, displays the miracles of flaming, burning, sending down rain, and blazing with lighting, and answers the question regarding how he had obtained such a number of good qualities.

Gilgit Mss.: 36r2–3; **MSV-T:** D: 40a6–40a7, Q: 37b5–37b7, N: 230a5–230a7, S: 57b5–57b7; **MSV-C:** 329a17–21; **PrS(Divy):** 144.16–145.4

Gilgit: atha māra<ḥ> pāpīyān*⁴⁴ pūraṇa<śya> varṇam⁴⁵ ātmānam abhinirmāya yena maskarī gośālīputras tenopasaṃkrāntaḥ <|> upasaṃkramya maskariṇo gośā(l)ī(putrasya)⁴⁶ (**r3**) purato jvalanatapana varṣaṇavidyotanaprātihāryāṇi vidarśayitum ārabdhāḥ⁴⁷ <|> maskarī gośālīputraḥ kathayati <|> pūraṇa evaṃvidhās tvayā guṇagaṇā adhigatāḥ <|> adhigatā<ḥ> |>

Trans: Then Māra, the Evil One, having magically transformed himself into the appearance of Pūraṇa went to the place of Maskarin Gośālīputra. Having reached, he began to display the prodigies of flaming, burning,⁴⁸ sending down rain, and blazing with lighting in front of Maskarin Gośālīputra. Maskarin Gośālīputra asked, “Pūraṇa, have you obtained such a number of such good qualities?”⁴⁹ “Yes, I obtained [them].”

(40) Cf. PrS(Divy) 143.10 ‘sarvajñāḥ; Tib. thams cad mkhyen pa ma yin par.

(41) Ms. na tva ca grham.

(42) Ms. upanīśritya, see BHSD 138; SWTF I 378.

(43) For MSV-T, Fiordalis (2014: 6) has, “were staying in Rājagṛha”, while Rhi (1991: 270) translates MSV-C as, “were also living in Rājagṛha as their base” (亦於王舍城依止而住). PrS(Divy) reads *prativasanti*. Fiordalis (2014: 6 note 26) states that if *rten cing* gives the sense of the preverb *prati*, then perhaps “based” is a bit too strong for the Tibetan, and the simpler meaning is “dwelling” or “staying”. It is very clear from the manuscript that *upanīśritya*, meaning “near, with accusative so regularly followed by viharati”, agrees with *rten cing* and 依止. Negi (1998: 1776) attests *rten cing bzhugs* as *upanīśritya viharati*. Compared with the *Pravrajyāvastu*, which has *nye bar brten (rten) par [upanīśritya]* with the locative, “near”: *rgyal po ‘i khab na nye bar brten cing gnas so [rājagṛham upanīśritya viharanti sma]*, “they were staying near Rājagṛha” (Vogel 1970: 36).

(44) Ms. pāpīyām*.

(45) Ms. pūraṇavarmam. Here I emend to *pūraṇa<śya> varṇam: rdzogs byed kyi cha byad du*. Cf. 36v1–3 (§ 2.5) *maskariṇo gośālīputrasya varṇam: kun tu rgyu gnag lhas kyi bu ‘i cha byad du*.

(46) *maskariṇo gośā(l)ī(putrasya): kun tu rgyu gnas lhas kyi bu*.

(47) Ms. ārabdho.

(48) The Tibetan translation uses *snang ba*, which expresses a sense of light and illumination, for *bhā*, *avabhāsa* and other terms, see Negi 2001: 3227–3228. It is almost a direct translation of *tapana*, which means “warming, burning, shining (the sun)”.

(49) Fiordalis (2014: 7 note 29) states that *yon tan* is a difficult word to translate, having a semantic range that encompasses such meanings as virtue, good qualities, attributes, excellence, skills and attainment. But the parallel term in Sanskrit manuscripts is *guṇagaṇā*, which can be clearly translated. MSV-C elaborates on the description of good qualities, adding “rare and extraordinary” (希奇殊勝之德).

§ 2.4 *Māra, in the appearance of Pūraṇa Kāśyapa, displays the same miracles in front of Saṃjayin Vairāṭṭīputra, Ajita Keśakambala, Kakuda Kātyāyana and Nirgrantha Jñātiputra, and they ask him the same question.*

Gilgit Mss.: 36r3–v1; **MSV-T:** D: 40a7–40b1, Q: 37b7–37b8, N: 230a7–230b2, S: 57b7–58a2; **MSV-C:** 329a21–24; **PrS(Divy):** -

Gilgit: evaṃ saṃjay(ino vai)(r4)raṭṭīputrasya ajitasya keśakambalasya kakudasya kātyāyanasya nigranthasya jñātiputrasya⁵⁰ purato jvalanatapanavarṣaṇavidyotanaprātihāryāṇi vidarśayitum ārabdhah⁵¹ <|> so 'pi kathayati <|> pūraṇa e(va)m(vidhā)(36v1)s⁵² tvayā guṇagaṇā adhigatāḥ | adhigatāḥ |>⁵³

Trans: In this way, he began to display the prodigies of flaming, burning, sending down rain, and blazing with lighting in front of Saṃjayin Vairāṭṭīputra, Ajita Keśakambala, Kakuda Kātyāyana and Nirgrantha Jñātiputra. He⁵⁴ too asked, “Pūraṇa, have you obtained such a number of such good qualities?” “Yes, I have obtained [them].”

§ 2.5 *Māra transforms himself into the appearance of (2) Maskarin Gośālīputra, (3) Saṃjayin Vairāṭṭīputra, (4) Ajita Keśakambala, (5) Kakuda Kātyāyana, (6) Nirgrantha Jñātiputra and goes towards everyone.*

Gilgit Mss.: 36v1–3; **MSV-T:** D: 40b1–40b3, Q: 37b8–38a3, N: 230b2–231b6, S: 58a2–58a7; **MSV-C:** 329a25–b6; **PrS(Divy):** 145.6–21

Gilgit: evaṃ maskariṇo gośālīputrasya varṇam ātmānam abhinirmāya sarveṣāṃ sakāśam upasaṃkrāntaḥ pūrvavad yāvad⁵⁵ eva(m)vidhās tvayā guṇagaṇā adhigatāḥ | adhigatāḥ⁵⁶ • || evaṃ saṃjayino vairāṭṭīputra(ttrasya varṇa)(v2)m⁵⁷ ātmānam abhinirmāya sarveṣāṃ sakāśam upasaṃkrāntaḥ pūrvavat* || <evaṃ ajitasya keśakambalasya varṇam ātmānam abhinirmāya sarveṣāṃ sakāśam upasaṃkrāntaḥ pūrvavat ||>⁵⁸ evaṃ kakudasya kātyāyanasya varṇam ātmānam abhinirmāya sarveṣā(m) sakāśam upasaṃkrāntaḥ pūrvavat⁵⁹ • <||> evaṃ nigranthasya (jñātipu)(v3)ttrasya varṇam ātmānam abhinirmāya sarveṣāṃ sakāśam upasaṃkrāntaḥ pūrvavat* <||>

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Ms. *jñātaputrasya*.

⁽⁵¹⁾ Ms. *ārabdho*.

⁽⁵²⁾ Cf. 36r3 (§ 2.3) *evaṃvidhās*: 'di lta bu.

⁽⁵³⁾ Cf. 36r3 (§ 2.3) *adhigatāḥ*: thob bo.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Fiordalis (2014: 7) here translates with the plural “they”, as in MSV-T *des kyang*, but the manuscript has the singular form *sas*.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Ms. *yāvan*.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ Cf. 36r3 (§ 2.3) *adhigatāḥ*: thob bo.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ Cf. 36v1–3 (§ 2.5) *maskariṇo gośālīputrasya varṇam*: kun tu rgyu gnag lhas kyi bu'i cha byad.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ Apparently, there is a haplography in the manuscript. Māra's transformation into the appearance of Ajita Keśakambala is accidentally omitted because the same phrase occurs many times in close proximity. At the same time there is a mistake in MSV-T (DQNS) since the sentence about Ajita Keśakambala, the fourth *tīrthika*, is presented after Māra's transformation into the appearance of Maskarin Gośālīputra, the second *tīrthika*, which does not agree with the normal sequence of the *tīrthikas*, see Fiordalis 2014: 7. Therefore, I reconstruct the text in the normal order of the Sanskrit with the help of MSV-T. MSV-C has the standard order of the *tīrthikas*, see Rhi 1991: 270–271.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ Ms. *pūrvavamaha*.

Trans: In like manner, [Māra] having magically transformed himself into the appearance of Maskarin Gośālīputra went towards everyone – as before up to⁶⁰ – “Have you obtained a number of such good qualities?” “Yes, I have obtained [them].”⁶¹ In like manner, [Māra] having magically transformed himself into the appearance of Saṃjayin Vairāṭṭīputra went towards everyone – as before.⁶² In like manner, [Māra] having magically transformed himself into the appearance of Ajita Keśakambala went towards everyone – as before.⁶³ In like manner, [Māra] having magically transformed himself into the appearance of Kakuda Kātyāyana went towards everyone – as before.⁶⁴ In like manner, [Māra] having magically transformed himself into the appearance of Nirgrantha Jñātiputra went towards everyone – as before.⁶⁵

§ 2.6 Each tīrthika thinks that others have supernatural powers except him.

Gilgit Mss.: 36v3; **MSV-T:** D: 40b4, Q: 38a3–38a4, N: 230b6–231a1, S: 58a7; **MSV-C:** 329b6–8; **PrS(Divy):** 145.21–23

Gilgit: teṣāṃ ekaikaḥ saṃlakṣayati <|> sarva ete {na}⁶⁶ mahardhikā mahānubhāvāḥ⁶⁷ sthāpayitvā mām ekam iti <|>

Trans: Each of them felt, “All these have great supernatural power and great might with the exception of me alone.”⁶⁸

§ 3 The Convention of the Tīrthikas

§ 3.1 The tīrthikas discuss their situation in the debate hall.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ It is evident that the omission of the repetition was already present in the manuscript. The ellipses here, or something very similar, are also found in MSV-T: *zhes bya ba'i bar snga ma bzhin no*. More literally, “up to this according to the previous one.” The decision to omit the repetition was taken by the Chinese translators also: 廣說如前 or 如前所說.

⁽⁶¹⁾ MSV-C provides full details of Māra’s transformation into the appearance of Maskarin Gośālīputra. The description is similar to his previous transformation into the appearance of Pūraṇa Kāśyapa but without the omission of the repetition of details, as found in the manuscript and MSV-T, see Rhi 1991: 270.

⁽⁶²⁾ MSV-C gives, “as extensively explained above” (廣說如前), to mark the omission of the repetition of details, followed by “he answered, ‘Yes, I have like this’” (答言我證) (Rhi 1991: 270). The omission in MSV-C agrees with the Sanskrit original, see Rhi 1991: 270 note 2.

⁽⁶³⁾ MSV-C gives, “as was explained above” (如前所說), to mark the omission of the repetition of details of Ajita Keśakambala. MSV-T reads slightly differently to the reconstruction of the Sanskrit passage concerning Ajita Keśakambala: “In the same way, he transformed himself into Ajita Keśakambala and went into the presence of all of them. ‘Have you really attained such abilities as these?’ they asked. ‘I have attained them,’ he said.” And so on, the same as before.” (*de bzhin du bdag nyid mi pham skra'i la ba can <gyi cha byad> du mngon par sprul nas thams cad kyi drung du song nas 'di lta bu'i yon tan gyi tshogs rnams khyod kyiis thob bam | thob bo | zhes bya ba'i bar snga ma bzhin no ||*) (Fiordalis 2014: 7).

⁽⁶⁴⁾ MSV-C neither provides full detail of Māra’s transformation into the appearance of Kakuda Kātyāyana nor the phrase of omission of the repetition.

⁽⁶⁵⁾ MSV-C details Māra’s transformation into the appearance of Nirgrantha Jñātiputra in full, see Rhi 1991: 271.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ I delete *na* in the Ms. because the negation does not exist in MSV-T and MSV-C. It also makes no sense in this context.

⁽⁶⁷⁾ Ms. *mahāmabhāvāḥ*.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ PrS(Divy) 145.22–23 gives a different underlying reading of *evam anyonyaṃ sarve viheṭhitāḥ | ekaika evam āha riddher lābhī nāham iti*, “In this way, the heretics were all troubled by one another. Each one of them said to himself, ‘But I haven’t obtained magical powers.’” (Rotman 2008: 256). The Chinese translation reads slightly differently, “Having seen it, they all thought, ‘They all have great supernatural magic and extraordinary power except for me, who have no such great virtues.’” (見是事已。彼皆自作如是之念。彼並具大威神。有殊勝力。除我一人。無斯威德) (Rhi 1991: 270).

Gilgit: athāpareṇa (samaye)(v4)na⁶⁹ ṣaṇṇāṃ pūraṇādīnāṃ śāstrīnāṃ kutūhalaśālāyāṃ sannī-
ṣaṇṇānāṃ sannipatitānāṃ ayam evam*rūpo⁷⁰ ’bhūd antarākathāsamudāhārah <|> pūrva<ṃ>
vayam* bhavantaḥ satkṛtās⁷¹ cā<sma> {na}⁷² guru{kṛtasya nama + + +}(37r1)kṛtās⁷³ ca
mānitās ca pūjitās ca⁷⁴ rājñāṃ rājamāt{t}rānāṃ brāhmaṇānāṃ gr̥hapatīnāṃ naigamānāṃ
jānapadānāṃ dhanināṃ <śreṣṭhināṃ>⁷⁵ sārthavāhānāṃ lābhinaś cāsma {bhūvaṃś}⁷⁶ cīvara-
piṇḍapātaśayanāsanaglānapratyayabhaisajyapari(ṣkāra)(r2)nāṃ <|> te vaya{ṃ}m etarhi na

(69) *athāpareṇa (samaye)na: de nas dus gzhan zhig na.*

(70) The *virāma* is used as an *anusvāra* for *evamrūpo*.

(71) Ms. *satkṛtoś*.

(72) Ms. *cāna*. PrS(Divy) 143.16 gives *abhūvan* (aorist active 3rd person plural of √*bhū*), which does not correspond to the subject *vayam* (1st person plural). There is no parallel of this word in PrS(Divy), so I emend it to *ā<sma>* (Imperfect active 1st person plural of √*as*) according to the corresponding subject but the correction here is not certain.

(73) Ms. *kṛtaś*.

(74) What is missing in this line is not clear. It seems to have 5 participles: *satkṛtās*, *gurukṛtasya*, *nama?*, *mānitās* and *pūjitāḥ*. I suggest to correct the reading according to PrS(Divy) 143.16: *satkṛta gurukṛta mānita pūjita*, which is a standard Sanskrit stock phrase repeated many times in these manuscripts and other *avadānas*, see Divy. 8, 91.6; 11, 136.2; 20, 290.2; 32, 469.21; Avś i: 31. MSV-T has only three participles: *satkṛta*, *gurukṛta* and *pūjita*: *bkur stīr byas rim gro byas mchod par byas pas* “honoured, revered and worshipped”, while MSV-C gives only two verbs: “venerated and honored” (尊重 恭敬供養). There are several variations of terms of respect in MSV-T. Peter Skilling, Saerji and Prapod Assavavirulhakarn (2016: 179) give Śamathadeva’s Tibetan citation to the Uruvelasutta: *bkur stīr byas bla mar byas rjed par byas mchod par byas te yongs su bsten cing gnas par bya ba*. This represents a longer sequence, probably with four terms: *satkṛtya gurukṛtya mānayitvā pūjayitvā upaniśrāya ca + vi-√har*.

Sanskrit	§ 1	§ 3.1	§ 8.1	<i>Upāyikā</i> (parallel to the <i>Uruvelasutta</i>)
<i>satkṛtas, satkṛtās</i>	<i>rim gro byas</i>	<i>bkur stīr byas</i>	<i>rim gro byas</i>	<i>bkur stīr byas</i>
<i>gurukṛtas, gurukṛtās</i>	<i>bla mar byas</i>	<i>rim gro byas</i>	<i>bkur stīr byas</i>	<i>bla mar byas</i>
<i>mānitas, mānitās</i>	<i>phu dud du byas</i>		<i>bla mar byas</i>	<i>rjed par byas</i>
<i>pūjitas, pūjitās</i>	<i>mchod pa byas</i>	<i>mchod par byas</i>	<i>mchod par byas</i>	<i>mchod par byas</i>
<i>na satkṛtās</i>	<i>rim gro ma byas</i>	<i>bkur stī mi byed</i>		
<i>na gurukṛtās</i>	<i>bla mar ma byas</i>	<i>rim gro mi byed</i>		
<i>na mānitās</i>	<i>phu dud ma byas</i>	<i>bla mar mi byed</i>		
<i>na pūjitās</i>	<i>mchod pa ma byas</i>	<i>mchod par mi byed</i>		

As seen from the table, *rim gro byas* and *bkur stīr byas* are used to translate *satkṛtas* in Sanskrit as well as the negation. Negi (2004: 6461; 1993: 121) has shown these two Tibetan words to have quite similar meanings: *rim gro byas* as *satkaroti* and *bkur stīr byas* as *satkarīṣyāmi*. In the WTS (I: 207), *bkur stīr byas* means “ehren, verehren, achten, rühmen = *stomitaḥ* in Sanskrit.” Three words are used to render the Sanskrit *gurukṛta*, including *bla mar byas rim gro byas* and *bkur stīr byas*. Only *bla mar byas* serves as proof of the nominal stem *guru*, which is glossed by Negi (2002: 3909) as *gurukarīṣyāmi*. Negi (2002: 3501) also correlates *phu dud du byas* with *mānitas*, while two other words, *bla mar byas* and *rjed par byas*, are used to translate *mānitas*. The Tibetan expression used to render *pūjitas* is fixed: *mchod pa byas pas*, which Negi (1995: 1323) glosses as *pūjayati*. Its meaning is given in the WTS (III: 317–319) as “Verehrung erweisen, verehren = *pūjanā*”.

(75) This word is added according to Tib. *tshong dpon dang* and PrS(Divy) 143.18 *śreṣṭhināṃ*.

(76) Ms. *cāsmo bhūvaṃś*. PrS(Divy) 143.18 gives *abhūvaṃś* (aorist active 3rd person plural of √*bhū*), which does not correspond to the subject *vayam* (1st person plural). There is no parallel of this latter word in PrS(Divy), so I emend it to *ā<sma>* (Imperfect active 1st person plural of √*as*), according to the corresponding subject, but the correction here is not certain.

satkṛtā na gurukṛtā⟨ḥ⟩ pūrvavad yāva⟨n⟩ na ca lābhi⟨na⟩ś ca cīvarapiṇḍapātaśayanāsanaglāna-
pratyayabhaisajyapariṣkārāṇām ⟨|⟩ ayam tu bha{ga}vantaḥ śramaṇo gautamaḥ satkṛto guru-
(kṛtaḥ)(r3) pūrvavad yāval lābhī ca śramaṇo gautamaḥ cīvarapiṇḍapātaśayanāsanaglāna-
pratyayabhaisajyapariṣkārāṇām⟨|⟩

Trans: Then, at later time,⁷⁷ when the six teachers, starting with Pūraṇa Kāśyapa, gathered and were seated in the debate hall,⁷⁸ such a discussion occurred among them: “Sirs, formerly we were honoured, revered, respected and worshipped by kings, royal ministers, brahmins, heads of households, town and country people, the wealthy, the guilds chiefs and caravan leaders,⁷⁹ and we were the ones obtaining the requisites of robes, alms-bowls, bedding and seats and medicines to cure illness. Now, we are not honored, revered – as before up to – and do not obtain the requisites of robes, alms-bowls, bedding and seats and medicines to cure illness.⁸⁰ But, sirs, the ascetic Gautama is honored, revered – as before up to –⁸¹ and the ascetic Gautama obtains the requisites of robes, alms-bowls, bedding and seats and medicines to cure illness.

§ 3.2 *The tīrthikas challenge the Buddha to perform a miracle.*

Gilgit Mss.: 37r3–v1; **MSV-T:** D: 41a1–41a4, Q: 38a8–38b3, N: 231a7–231b4, S: 58b5–59a2; **MSV-C:** 329b14–19; **PrS(Divy):** 144.1–14

Gilgit: ete⁸² vyaṃ bhavantaḥ śramaṇaṃ gautamaṃ uttaremanuṣyadharmme⁸³ riddhiprāti-
hā(ryeṇā)(r4)hvāyāmahe⁸⁴ ⟨|⟩ yady ekaṃ śramaṇo gautamaṃ uttaremanuṣyadharmme⁸⁵ riddhi-
prātihāryaṃ vidarśayiṣyati vyaṃ dve ⟨|⟩ dve śramaṇo gautamo vyaṃ catvāri ⟨|⟩ catvāri śra-
maṇo gautamo vyaṃ aṣṭau ⟨|⟩ aṣṭau śramaṇo gau(tamo) (37v1) vyaṃ ṣoḍaśa ⟨|⟩ ṣoḍaśa
śramaṇo gautamo vyaṃ dvātrīṃśa⟨d⟩ iti yāvaca chramaṇo gautamaṃ uttaremanuṣyadharmme
riddhiprātihāryaṃ vidarśayiṣyati⁸⁶ vyaṃ tadvigūṇaṃ tattṛguṇaṃ ⟨uttare⟩manuṣyadharmme

(77) Fiordalis (2014: 7) translates, “At another time soon after that”. He understands this phrase to express continuity rather than discontinuity between the visits of Māra and the meeting of the six rival teachers. Rhi’s translation (1991: 271) is quite normal “at another time” (於異時).

(78) MSV-T reads, *rtog khang*, which means, “ein Ort, an dem gewöhnlich Nichtbuddhisten debattieren = *kutūhalaśālā*”. WTS IV: 103. Fiordalis (2014: 7) translates, “a place where debates were held.” Rotman (2008: 253) renders the Sanskrit as “discussion hall.” Rhi (1991: 271) renders the Chinese as “chanting hall” (誦堂).

(79) The beings paying homage to the Buddha in the manuscript correspond to MSV-T and PrS(Divy). MSV-C mentions the king (國王), ministers (大臣), brahmins (婆羅門), lay people (居士) and merchants (商主) and so forth (之類).

(80) MSV-T gives the string of phrases in full: *bkur sti mi byed rim gro mi byed bla mar mi byed mchod par mi byed* “We are not honoured. We are not revered. We are not worshipped. We are not furnished with abundant offerings” (Fiordalis 2014: 8). The manuscript reads, *na satkṛtā na gurukṛtā⟨ḥ⟩*, followed by the ellipsis marker, *pūrvavad yāva⟨n⟩*, while in MSV-T the marker, *zhes bya ba’i bar snga ma bzhin no*, is placed at the end of the sentence, which may correspond with the manuscript *pūrvavad yāva⟨n⟩*. MSV-C gives, “respect and offering” (恭敬供養), and mentions only foods (飲食) and monastic robes (衣服) as the necessity.

(81) MSV-T gives the ellipsis marker, *zhes bya ba nas ... zhes bya ba’i bar snga ma bzhin no*, here corresponding to the manuscript *pūrvavad yāval*, see Fiordalis’ opinion in 2014 notes 35–36. MSV-C reads, “However, the śramaṇa Gautama receives much respect and offering of abundant necessities (from king and so forth).” (然而沙門喬答摩。為諸王等恭敬供養。資身之具悉皆豐足) (Rhi 1991: 271).

(82) Ms. *eta*.

(83) Ms. *antare*°.

(84) I reconstruct to *riddhiprātihā(ryeṇā)hvāyāmahe*: *rdzu ’phrul gyi cho ’phrul la dgug par bya zhing*. Cf. 39v2 (§ 7.1) *riddhiprātihāryeṇāhvayamte*: *rdzu ’phrul gyi cho ’phrul la spyan ’dren na*; 41r3,4 (§ 8.1) *riddhiprātihāryeṇāhūtaḥ*: *rdzu ’phrul gyi cho ’phrul la bos na*, *rdzu ’phrul gyi cho ’phrul la bos pa ni*.

(85) PrS(Divy) 143.5 reads *’nuttare manuṣyadharme*.

(86) Ms. *vidarśayiṣyati*.

riddhiprāthāryaṃ vidarśayiṣyāma ity <|>

Trans: Sirs, ⁸⁷ we will invite⁸⁸ the ascetic Gautama to a miraculous demonstration of supernatural powers beyond the reach of ordinary humans.⁸⁹ If the ascetic Gautama performs a single miraculous demonstration of supernatural powers beyond the reach of ordinary humans, we will perform two. If the ascetic Gautama performs two, we will perform four. If the ascetic Gautama performs four, we will perform eight. If the ascetic Gautama performs eight, we will perform sixteen. If the ascetic Gautama performs sixteen, we'll perform thirty two. As many miraculous demonstrations of supernatural power beyond the reach of ordinary humans as the ascetic Gautama performs, we will perform two or three times as many miraculous demonstrations of supernatural power beyond the reach of ordinary humans.”

§ 4 The *Tīrthikas*' Visit to King Bimbisāra

§ 4.1 *The tīrthikas go to visit King Bimbisāra and speak to the king.*

Gilgit Mss.: 37v1–2; **MSV-T:** D: 41a4, Q: 38b3–38b4, N: 231b4–231b5, S: 59a2–59a3; **MSV-C:** 329b19–20; **PrS(Divy):** 145.23–25

Gilgit: (atha pūra)(v2)ṇādyāḥ⁹⁰ ṣaṭ cchāstāro yena rājā bimbisāras⁹¹ tenopasaṃkrāntāḥ |> upasaṃkramya rājānaṃ bimbisāraṃ {ca} jayenāyusā ca vardhayitvā idam avocan <|>

Trans: Then, the six teachers starting with Pūraṇa Kāśyapa went to where King Bimbisāra was. Having approached and wished King Bimbisāra longevity and victory,⁹² they said this [to the king]:

(87) MSV-C reads “All of you should know” (諸人當知) (Rhi 1991: 271).

(88) Fiordalis (2014: 8) translates as “rope into”, based on the Tibetan version *dgug par bya*, which has the sense of “draw in, summon”, possibly “invite”. The translation is problematic due to the lack of a clear parallel verb in the sentences in PrS(Divy) 144.4–11 that appear to correspond most closely to this particular passage. Lokesh Chandra (1959, part3: 413) takes the term *dgug par bya* to be a translation of *āvāhayāmi* in the sense of “to marry”, as found in the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa*, and *ākarsana*, ‘to attract’, from the *Mahāvīyutpatti*. Negi (1993: 609) understands the term to be a translation for *ākarsayet*, *karṣayet*, *āvāhayāmi*. See also Rotman 2008: 429–430 note 582, where he admits to adding a verb to make his translation work. However, the problem can be solved by the verb found in the manuscript *āhvāyāmahe*, which can be translated as “call, invite, summon, challenge or invoke (as in a ritual context)”. There is a parallel part of the corresponding passage found in PrS(Divy)-CN 146.25: *uttare manuṣyadharme riddhiprātihārye āhvayiṣyāma ity*. Rotman translates *āhvayiṣyāmaḥ* as “to challenge” and “called on” (*āhūta*), see Rotman 2008: 430 note 586.

(89) The Gilgit manuscript reads *uttaremanuṣyadharmme riddhiprātihāryam*. This corresponds to a Sanskrit expression found repeatedly in PrS(Divy). The manuscripts of PrS(Divy) read *uttaram manuṣyadharmariddhiprātihāryam*, which Cowell and Neil emend to *uttare manuṣyadharme riddhiprātihāryam* (144.4), corresponding to the Gilgit manuscript. The editors' emendation is not consistent. Some retain *uttaram manuṣyadharmam riddhiprātihāryam* (144.28) or *uttaram manuṣyadharmaprātihāryam* (145.18), which are always found in the phrase *aham tadvigūṇam uttaram manuṣyadharmā° vidarśayiṣyāmi*. The problem is how to understand the compound *riddhiprātihārya*. Rotman translates the compound as a coordinative compound (*dvandvasamāsa*), “making use of magical powers and displaying miracles that are beyond the capability of ordinary mortals.” The genitive relation between *rdzu 'phrul (riddhi) gyi cho 'phrul (prātihārya)* is clearly seen in the Tibetan translation. It reads *mi'i chos bla ma'i rdzu 'phrul gyi cho 'phrul*, which translates as “a wondrous display of superhuman powers beyond the capability of ordinary human beings.” It is better to translate the compound *riddhiprātihārya* as a determinative compound (*tatpuruṣasamāsa*), “a miraculous demonstration of supernatural powers beyond the reach of ordinary humans.” See Fiordalis 2014: 8 note 38, Burnouf [1844] 1876: 146 and note 1 (Transl. Buffetrille and Lopez Jr. 2010: 189 note 170), Rotman 2008: 254 and note 582.

(90) (atha pūra)ṇādyāḥ: *de nas rdzogs byed la sogs pa*.

(91) Ms. *bimbisāraḥ*.

(92) MSV-C does not detail any wishes for long life and victory, as in the manuscript and MSV-T, but uses the word 呪願 as an expression of blessing or greeting.

§ 4.2 *The tīrthikas boast of their supernatural power and challenge the Buddha to perform a miracle (first time).*

Gilgit Mss.: 37v2–38r1; **MSV-T:** D: 41a4–41a7, Q: 38b4–38b6, N: 231b5–232a2, S: 59a3–59a7; **MSV-C:** 329b20–26; **PrS(Divy):** 145.25–146.9

Gilgit: vyaṃ smo deva riddhimamto jñānavādinaḥ <|> śr(amaṇo)⁹³ (v3) 'pi gautamo riddhi-
mantam jñānavādinam ātmānaṃ manyate <|> tad arhati jñānavādī jñānavādinā⁹⁴ sārddham
uttaremanuṣyadharmme riddhiprātihāryaṃ vidarśayituṃ⁹⁵ <|> yady ekaṃ śramaṇo gautama
uttare(manu)(v4)ṣyadharmme riddhiprātihāryaṃ vidarśayiṣyati vyaṃ dve <|> dve pūrvavad
yāvad{d} vyaṃ ta<d>dviguṇaṃ ca ta<t>triguṇa{ṃ}m uttaremanuṣyadharmme⁹⁶ riddhiprāti-
hāryaṃ vidarśayiṣyāmo 'rdhamārgaṃ⁹⁷ śramaṇo gautama āgacchatu vyaṃ a(py ardhā)-
(38r1)(mārgaṃ gamiṣyāma iti |)⁹⁸

Trans: “Oh Lord,⁹⁹ we certainly have supernatural power and profess knowledge.¹⁰⁰ The ascetic Gautama, on the other hand, claims himself to have supernatural powers and be a professor of knowledge. Those who [supposedly] profess knowledge together with those who [truly] profess knowledge is worthy of performing a miraculous demonstration of supernatural power beyond the reach of ordinary humans. ⁽¹⁰¹⁾If the ascetic Gautama performs a single miraculous demonstration of supernatural power beyond the reach of ordinary humans, we will perform two,” – as before up to¹⁰² – “We will perform two or three times as many miraculous demonstrations of supernatural power beyond the reach of ordinary humans. Should the ascetic Gautama come halfway along the path, we will also go halfway along the path.”¹⁰¹⁾

§ 6 **The Buddha’s Journey from Rājagṛha to Śrāvastī**

§ 6.2 *The tīrthikas follow the Buddha to Śrāvastī, visit King Prasenajit, boast of their supernatural power and challenge the Buddha to perform a miracle.*

⁽⁹³⁾ śr(amaṇo): *dge sbyong*.

⁽⁹⁴⁾ Ms. *jñānavādina*.

⁽⁹⁵⁾ Ms. *vadarśayituṃ*.

⁽⁹⁶⁾ Ms. *uttaremanuṣyadharmma*. Although the reading in the manuscripts, *uttaremanuṣyadharmma riddhiprā-tihāryaṃ*, seems to be a correct form of *sandhi* when *ri* is treated as lingual vowel (*r*), I still emend *a* to *e* according to the parallels.

⁽⁹⁷⁾ Ms. *rdhamātraṃ*.

⁽⁹⁸⁾ Cf. 39r4 (§ 6.2) *vayam apy ardhmārgaṃ gamiṣyāma iti: bdag cag kyang shul gyi phyed du mchi'o*; PrS(Divy) reads *upārdhamārgaṃ* while Ms. reads *ardhamārgaṃ*, see also Fiordalis 2014: 9 note 41 for the term *shul gyi phyed*.

⁽⁹⁹⁾ MSV-C adds “you should know” (當知) (Rhi 1991: 271) cf. PrS(Divy) *jānīyā*.

⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ MSV-C gives 大智慧 (*dà zhihui*), “great wisdom.” There are many alternative translations of the term *jñānavādin* (Tib: *ye shes can du smra ba*); such as, Rotman’s rather prosaic, “can speak knowledgeably” (Rotman 2008: 254 and note 581); in addition to “nous savons discuter sur la science” (who knows how to debate about science) (Burnouf [1844] 1876: 146 (Transl. Buffetrille and Lopez Jr. 2010: 189)); “possess knowledge” (Fiordalis 2014: 9); “supreme knowledge” (Rhi 1991: 290).

⁽¹⁰¹⁾ (-101) MSV-C reads “If the śramaṇa Gautama shows one miracle, we will show twice or three times as much. If he comes half way, we will also go half way and compete together in the miracle.” (若其沙門現一變時。我當示現二倍三倍神通之事。若彼行至半路之時。我等就彼亦行半路共搆神通) (Rhi 1991: 271).

⁽¹⁰²⁾ PrS(Divy) does not mark ellipsis as in the other manuscripts and MSV-T gives the full passage, “If the ascetic Gautama makes use of his magical powers and displays a single miracle that is beyond the capability of ordinary mortals, we’ll display two. If the ascetic Gautama displays two, we’ll display four. If the ascetic Gautama displays four, we’ll display eight. If the ascetic Gautama displays eight, we’ll display sixteen. If the ascetic Gautama displays sixteen, we’ll display thirty-two.” (Rotman 2008: 257).

Gilgit: (atha pūraṇādyāḥ ṣaṭ cchāstāro)¹⁰³ ...

(yena rājā prasenajit kauśalas tenopasamkrāntāḥ | upasamkramya rājānaṃ prasenajitaṃ kauśalaṃ jayenāyusā ca vardhayitvāvocaṃ | vyaṃ smo deva riddhimamto jñānavādinah |)¹⁰⁴
(39r1) śramaṇo 'pi gautama¹⁰⁵ riddhimantaṃ jñānavādinam ātmānaṃ manyate <|> tad arhati jñānavādī jñānavādinā sārddham uttaremanuṣyadharmme riddhiprātihāryaṃ vidarśayitum <|> yady ekaṃ śramaṇo gautama u(ttaremanuṣyadharmme riddhiprā)(**r2**)tihāryaṃ vidarśayiṣyati vyaṃ dve <|> dve śramaṇo gautamo vyaṃ* {vyaṃ} catvāri <| catvāri> śramaṇo¹⁰⁶ gautamo vyaṃ aṣṭau <|> aṣṭau śramaṇo¹⁰⁷ gautamo vyaṃ ṣoḍaśa <|> ṣoḍaśa śramaṇo¹⁰⁸ gau(tamo vyaṃ dvātrīṃśad iti)¹⁰⁹ (**r3**) yāva<c> śramaṇo¹¹⁰ gautama uttaremanuṣyadharmme riddhiprāti-hāryaṃ vidarśayiṣyati vyaṃ ta<d>dviguṇaṃ ta<t>triguṇa{m}m uttaremanuṣyadharmme riddhiprātihāryaṃ vidarśayiṣyāmo 'rdhamā(rgaṃ śramaṇo gautama)¹¹¹ (**r4**) āgacchatu vyaṃ apy arddhamārgaṃ gamiṣyāma iti <|>

Trans: Then the six teachers, starting with Pūraṇa Kāśyapa ... they went to where king Prasenajit of Kauśala was. Having wished king Prasenajit longevity and victory,¹¹² they said: “Oh Lord,¹¹³ we certainly have supernatural power and profess knowledge. The ascetic Gautama, on the other hand, claims himself to have supernatural powers and professes of knowledge. Those who [supposedly] profess knowledge, together with those who [truly] profess of knowledge, is worthy of performing a miraculous demonstration of supernatural power beyond the reach of ordinary humans. If the ascetic Gautama performs a single miraculous demonstration of supernatural powers beyond the reach of ordinary humans, we will perform two.¹¹⁴ If the ascetic Gautama performs two, we will perform four. If the ascetic Gautama performs four, we will perform eight. If the ascetic Gautama performs eight, we will perform sixteen. If the ascetic Gautama performs sixteen, we will perform thirty-two. As many miraculous demonstrations of supernatural power beyond the reach of ordinary humans the ascetic Gautama performs, we will perform two or three times as many miraculous demonstrations of supernatural power beyond the reach of ordinary humans.¹¹⁴ The ascetic Gautama should come halfway along the path, we will also go halfway along the path.”

⁽¹⁰³⁾ Cf. 37v2 (§ 4.1) *atha pūraṇādyāḥ ṣaṭ cchāstāro: de nas rdzogs byed la sogs pa ston pa drug po rnam.*

⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ Cf. 37v2 (§ 4.1–2) *yena rājā bimbisāras tenopasamkrāntāḥ | upasamkramya rājānaṃ bimbisāraṃ {ca} jayenāyusā ca vardhayitvā idam avocaṃ | vyaṃ smo deva riddhimamto jñānavādinah: rgyal po gzugs can snying po gang na ba der song ste phyin nas rgyal po gzugs can snying po la rgyal ba dang tshe spel ba byas nas 'di skad ces smras so || lha bdag cag ni rdzu 'phrul dang ldan pa | ye shes can du smra ba lags |.* For the reconstruction, I leave out *idam* because it is not attested in MSV-T.

⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ Obviously the sandhi presupposes the lingual vowel (*r*) and not the lingual semi-vowel (*ri*).

⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ Ms. *śravaṇo*.

⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ Ms. *śravaṇo*.

⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ Ms. *śravaṇo*.

⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ Cf. also 37v1 (§ 3.2) *śramaṇo gautamo vyaṃ dvātrīṃśad iti: dge sbyong gau ta mas bcu drug na bdag cag gis sum bcu rtsa gnyis te.*

⁽¹¹⁰⁾ Ms. *śravaṇo*.

⁽¹¹¹⁾ Cf. also 37v4 (§ 4.2) *'rdhamā(rgaṃ śramaṇo gautama): dge sbyong gau ta ma shul gyi phyed.*

⁽¹¹²⁾ MSV-C does not detail the wishes for longevity and victory, as found in the manuscript and MSV-T, but use the word 祝願 as an expression of blessing or greeting.

⁽¹¹³⁾ MSV-C adds “you should know” (當知) (Rhi 1991: 272). PrS(Divy) gives *jānīthā*, corresponding to MSV-C.

⁽¹¹⁴⁾ (–114) MSV-C omits these sentences with the respective formula, “Thus, up to the remark on the thirty two miracles, the detail is the same as above” (如是乃至三十二倍。廣如前說) (Rhi 1991: 272), while PrS(Divy) does not omit these sentences, as in MSV-T.

§ 6.3 The king asks the Buddha for permission.

Gilgit Mss.: 39r4–v1; **MSV-T:** D: 42a4–42a5, Q: 39b4–39b5, N: 232a7–233b1, S: 60b2–60b3; **MSV-C:** 329c15–16; **PrS(Divy):** 149.14–16

Gilgit: rājā prasenajit{vo} kauśalaḥ kathaya{ṃ}ti <|> bhavanto yady evam āgamayata tāvad yāva{da}d ahaṃ bhagavantam avalo(kayā)mīti¹¹⁵ <|> te (kathayaṃti¹¹⁶ | deva śobhana)(39v1)m¹¹⁷ evaṃ bhavatu tiṣṭhāma¹¹⁸ iti¹¹⁹ <|>

Trans: King Prasenajit of Kauśala, said: “Sirs, if this is so, please wait a moment while I ask the Blessed One’s permission.”¹²⁰ They said, “Lord, very good, please may it be so. We will wait.”

§ 7 King Prasenajit’s Visit to the Buddha

§ 7.1 King Prasenajit visits the Buddha and requests he perform a miracle (first time).

Gilgit Mss.: 39v1–3; **MSV-T:** D: 42a5–42a7, Q: 39b5–39b7, N: 233b1–233b4, S: 60b3–60b7; **MSV-C:** 329c16–20; **PrS(Divy):** 149.16–150.6

Gilgit: atha rājā prasenajit kauśalo yena bhagavāṃs tenopasaṃkrāntaḥ <|> upasaṃkramya bhagavataḥ pādaḥ śirasā vanditvaikānte niṣaṇṇaḥ |> ekāntaniṣaṇṇo rājā prasenajit kauśalo bhagavantam eta)(v2)d avocat* <|> ime bhadanta tīrthyā bhagavantam uttaremanuṣyadharmme riddhiprātihāryeṇāhvayaṃte¹²¹ • tad darśayatu¹²² bhagavān uttaremanuṣyadharmme riddhiprātihāryaṃ nirbhatsayitu<ṃ> tīrthyā<ṃ> nandayitu<ṃ> deva(manuṣyāṃs toṣayi)(v3)-tu<ṃ>¹²³ sajjanahṛdayānīti¹²⁴ <|>

Trans: Then king Prasenajit of Kauśala went to where the Blessed One was. Having arrived there, he venerated the Blessed One’s feet with his head and sat to one side.¹²⁵ After he had sat to one side, king Prasenajit of Kauśala, asked this of the Blessed One: “Bhadanta,¹²⁶ these *tīrthikas* invite¹²⁷ the Blessed

(115) *avalokayāmi*: *zhus te*. Cf. PrS(Divy) 146.16; BhīKaVā 3b.5 *yāvad ahaṃ bhagavantam avalokayāmi*.

(116) *te (kathayaṃti)*: *de rnam s kyis smras pa*.

(117) *(deva śobhana)m*: *lha legs kyis*. Cp. 41v4 (§ 8.2) *na śobhanaṃ kṛtam iti: ma legs par byas so*.

(118) Ms. *niṣṭhāma*.

(119) Ms. *ity*.

(120) Rotman (2008: 262) translates *avalokayāmi* as “to see” but this word has various meanings. The meaning that should be proper in this context is “asks permission of (acc.)” BHSD 74. See other examples in Divy 331.18 *nāhaṃ svādhīna upādhyāyam avalokayata*; 331.23; 511.10 *rājānam avalokya*; 439.22, 23 *mātāpitarāv avalokya*, “having asked permission of my parents.” MSV-T reads *zhus te byas*, “make a request”. Rhi (1991: 272) renders the Chinese as “speak to the Buddha” (白佛 *báifō*).

(121) Cf. 37r3–4 (§ 3.2) *uttaremanuṣyadharmme riddhiprātihā(ryam ā)hvāyāmahe*, the noun in 39v2 (§ 7.1) declined in instrumental *riddhiprātihāryeṇa* cf. PrS(Divy) 150.3.

(122) Ms. *darśayitu*. PrS(Divy) 150.3 *vidarśayatu*.

(123) *deva(manuṣyāṃstoṣayi)tu<ṃ>*: *lha dang mi rnam s dga' bar bgyir gsol*.

(124) Ms. *sajjanahṛdayānīty*. PrS(Divy) 150.6 reads *sajjanahṛdayamanāmsi*, “the hearts and minds of good people”.

(125) See Fiordalis 2014: 11 note 47.

(126) The Sanskrit *bhadanta* (*bhadanta*, *bhaddanta* in Pali) is used as a form of respectful address to Buddhist monks or the Buddha. Its Tibetan equivalent is *btsun pa*. Fiordalis (2014: 11) renders it as “Revered One”, see Fiordalis 2014: 11 note 48. Rotman (2008: 263) finds the term is best left untranslated; I follow his translation in my own.

(127) MSV-T reads *spyān 'dren*, which has a formal sense of “invite” instead of *dgug par bya* which is informal and normally occurs in this context. However, the Sanskrit equivalent is the same verb both in 39v2 *āhvayaṃte* and PrS(Divy) 150.3 *āhvayante*. Fiordalis (2014: 11) translates as “invite” based on the Tibetan version *spyān 'dren*. MSV-C reads “to summon” (召).

One with a miracle demonstration of supernatural power beyond the reach of ordinary humans, I ask that the Blessed One please perform a miracle demonstration of supernatural power beyond the reach of ordinary humans so as to¹²⁸ shame¹²⁹ the *tīrthikas*,⁽¹³⁰⁾ bring happiness to gods and humans, and bring joy to the hearts of good people!”¹³⁰⁾

§ 7.2 The Buddha answers (first time).

Gilgit Mss.: 39v3–4; **MSV-T:** D: 42a7–42b2, Q: 39b7–40a1, N: 233b4–233b7, S: 60b7–61a2; **MSV-C:** 329c20–25; **PrS(Divy):** 150.6–11

Gilgit: evam ukte bhagavān rājānaṃ prasenajitaṃ kauśalam¹³¹ idam avocat¹³² <|> nāhaṃ mahārāja śrāvākāṇāṃ evaṃ dharmmaṃ deśayiṣyāmi <|> ete¹³³ yūyaṃ bhikṣava āgatāgatānāṃ (brāhmaṇagr̥ha)(v4)(pat)ī(nā)ṃ¹³⁴ (u)ttaremanuṣyadharmme riddhiprātihāryaṃ vidarśaya-tety¹³⁵ api tv ahaṃ evaṃ śrāvākāṇāṃ dharmmaṃ deśayāmi praticchannakalyāṇā bhikṣavo viharata¹³⁶ <vi>vṛtapāpā¹³⁷ iti <|>

Trans: Having thus been asked, the Blessed One responded to king Prasenajit of Kauśala: “Great king, I have never taught my disciples such a teaching.¹³⁸ ‘Monks, you should perform a miracle demonstration of supernatural power beyond the reach of ordinary humans to the brahmins or heads of households¹³⁹ who come to you.¹⁴⁰ However, I give such a teaching to my disciples: ‘Monks, live with your virtues concealed and your sins uncovered.’”¹⁴¹

⁽¹²⁸⁾ The mood of the verbs in the manuscript and PrS(Divy) is different. In 39v2, the verbs *nirbhatsayituṃ* and *nandayituṃ* are infinitive while the verbs *nirbhatsayatu* *nandayatu* *toṣayatu* in PrS(Divy) are imperative 3rd person singular. MSV-T also uses imperative form *gṣol* which is quite similar to PrS(Divy).

⁽¹²⁹⁾ Both the manuscript and PrS(Divy) use the verb *nir* + √*bharts*, “to threaten, menace, rebuke, blame; to mock, deride, outstrip, surpass.” Rotman (2008: 263) also chooses “put to shame.” MSV-T reads *thag stsal*. This word cannot be found in other texts except in this context of the *Vinayaḥśudrakavastu*. It seems to be no exact equivalent in the Sanskrit version. Rhi (1991: 272) translates MSV-C as “May you defeat the heretics with mercy and compassion!” (唯願慈悲降伏外道).

⁽¹³⁰⁾ MSV-C reads, “May you please devas and human beings! May you make the people with faith leap for joy! May you cause the people without faith to remove the source of sins and evils!” (慶悅人天。令信心者歡喜踊躍。其不信者滅罪惡源) (Rhi 1991: 272).

⁽¹³¹⁾ Ms. *kośalam*.

⁽¹³²⁾ Ms. *avocan*.

⁽¹³³⁾ Ms. *eta*.

⁽¹³⁴⁾ Cf. PrS(Divy) 150.9 *brāhmaṇagr̥hapatīnāṃ*; Tib. *bram ze dang khyim bdag*.

⁽¹³⁵⁾ Ms. *vidarśamyapety*.

⁽¹³⁶⁾ Ms. *viharati*. I emend to *viharata* (Imperative 2nd person plural), according to PrS(Divy) 150.11.

⁽¹³⁷⁾ Cf. PrS(Divy) 150.11.

⁽¹³⁸⁾ The Tibetan reads, *rgyal po chen po nga ni nyan thos rnam la 'di skad du dge slong dag khyed ... ces chos ston par mi byed kyi*. Fiordalis (2014: 11) translates the negation in the wrong position, as “Great king, I tell my disciples: Monks, you should not display...” See above translation.

⁽¹³⁹⁾ MSV-C adds more group of people including *brāhmaṇas* and *śramaṇas* (沙門婆羅門), a lay person (長者居士) and so forth (等).

⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ MSV-C omits. The Sanskrit reads *āgatāgatānāṃ* and its Tibetan equivalent is *'ongs shing 'ongs pa*, “that come near to you”.

⁽¹⁴¹⁾ In the *Kevaddha-sūtra* of the Dīrgha-āgama the Buddha spoke similar words when the head of the household Kevaddha requested that he performs a miracle: “我終不教諸比丘爲婆羅門長者居士而現神足上人法也。我但教弟子於空閑處靜默思道。若有功德當自覆藏。若有過失當自發露” (T. 1 101b21–24). And its equivalent in Kevaddha Sutta of DN: *evaṃ vutte Bhagavā Kevaddhaṃ gahapati-puttaṃ etad avoca: 'Na kho ahaṃ Kevaddha bhikkhūnaṃ evaṃ dhammaṃ desemi: Etha tumhe bhikkhave gihīnaṃ odātavaśānāṃ uttarimanussadhammā iddhipāṭihāriyaṃ karothāti.*” (DN i 211–212). The accounts in the Dīrgha-āgama and those in the Tibetan and Chinese MSV and PrS(Divy) are also contextually similar; the latter may have been borrowed from the former.

§ 7.3 *The king requests that the Buddha perform a miracle (second and third times) and the Buddha answers (second and third times).*

Gilgit Mss.: 39v4; **MSV-T:** D: 42b2–42b5, Q: 40a1–40a5, N: 233b7–234a6, S: 61a2–61a7; **MSV-C:** 329c25–26; **PrS(Divy):** 150.11–15

Gilgit: dvir api tṛr api rājā (prasenajit kau)(40 lost)(śalo bhagavantam etad avocat | ime bhadanta tīrthyā bhagavantam uttaremanuṣyadharmme riddhiprātihāryeṅāhvayamte • tad darśayatu bhagavān uttaremanuṣyadharmme riddhiprātihāryaṃ nirbhatsayitum tīrthyān nandayitum devamanuṣyān toṣayitum sajjanahrdayānīti | dvir api tṛr api bhagavān rājānaṃ prasenajitaṃ kauśalam idam avocat <|> nāhaṃ mahārāja śrāvakāṇāṃ evaṃ dharmmaṃ deśayisyāmi | ete yūyaṃ bhikṣava āgatāgatānāṃ brāhmaṇagrhapatīnāṃ uttaremanuṣyadharmme riddhiprātihāryaṃ vidarśayatety api tv aham evaṃ śrāvakāṇāṃ dharmmaṃ deśayāmi praticchannakalyāṇā bhikṣavo viharata vivṛtapāpā iti |)¹⁴²

Trans: Even a second and a third time, king Prasenajit of Kauśala asked this of the Blessed One: “Bhadanta, these *tīrthikas* invite the Blessed One with a miraculous demonstration of supernatural power beyond the reach of ordinary humans, I ask that the Blessed One please perform a miraculous demonstration of supernatural power beyond the reach of ordinary humans so as to shame the *tīrthikas*, bring happiness to gods and humans, and bring joy to the hearts and minds of good people!” The Blessed One responded a second and a third time to king Prasenajit of Kośala: “Great king, I have never taught my disciples such a teaching: ‘Monks, you should perform a miraculous demonstration of supernatural power beyond the reach of ordinary humans to the brahmins or heads of households who come to you.’ However, I give such a teaching to my disciples: ‘Monks, live with your virtues concealed and your sins uncovered.’”¹⁴³

§ 7.6 *The tīrthikas think the Buddha has perhaps two options, either to run away or to search for companions. The tīrthikas discuss doing the latter.*

Gilgit Mss.: 41r1–2; **MSV-T:** D: 43a2–43a4, Q: 40b1–40b4, N: 234b5–235a1, S: 61b6–62a2; **MSV-C:** 330a7–12; **PrS(Divy):** 151.17–26

⁽¹⁴²⁾ Cf. 39v1–4 (§ 7.1–2) *ekāntaniṣaṇṇo rājā prasenajit kauśalo bhagavantam etad avocat | ime bhadanta tīrthyā bhagavantam uttaremanuṣyadharmme riddhiprātihāryeṅāhvayamte • tad darśayatu bhagavān uttaremanuṣyadharmme riddhiprātihāryaṃ nirbhatsayitum tīrthyān nandayitum devamanuṣyāṃs toṣayitum sajjanahrdayānīti | evaṃ ukte bhagavān rājānaṃ prasenajitaṃ kauśalam idam avocat | nāhaṃ mahārāja śrāvakāṇāṃ evaṃ dharmmaṃ deśayisyāmi | ete yūyaṃ bhikṣava āgatāgatānāṃ brāhmaṇagrhapatīnāṃ uttaremanuṣyadharmme riddhiprātihāryaṃ vidarśayatety api tv aham evaṃ śrāvakāṇāṃ dharmmaṃ deśayāmi praticchannakalyāṇā bhikṣavo viharata vivṛtapāpā iti. phyogs gcig tu 'dug nas bcom ldan 'das la ko sa la'i rgyal po gsal rgyal gyis 'di skad ces gsol to || btsun pa mu stegs can de rnam bcom ldan 'das mi'i chos bla ma'i rdzu 'phrul gyi cho 'phrul la spyān 'dren na de'i slad du bcom ldan 'das kyis mi'i chos bla ma'i rdzu 'phrul gyi cho 'phrul bstan du gsol | mu stegs can rnam thag stsal du gsol | lha dang mi rnam dga' bar bgyir gsol | skyes bu dam pa rnam glo ba rangs par bgyir gsol | de skad ces gsol pa dang | bcom (42b1) ldan 'das kyis ko sa la'i rgyal po gsal rgyal la 'di skad ces bka' stsal to || rgyal po chen po nga ni nyan thos rnam la 'di skad du dge slong dag khyed tshur bram ze dang khyim bdag 'ongs shing 'ongs pa rnam la mi'i chos bla ma'i rdzu 'phrul gyi cho 'phrul ston cig ces chos ston par mi byed (42b2) kyi | 'on kyang nga ni nyan thos rnam la 'di skad du dge slong dag dge ba ni ma sbyoms shig | sdig pa ni shogs te gnos shig ces chos ston to ||.*

⁽¹⁴³⁾ MSV-C abridges the whole paragraph to “king Prasenajit asked the same thing to the Bhagavat again and again. The Bhagavat answered in the same way again and again” (時勝光王如是再三勸請世尊。世尊再三還如是答) (Rhi 1991: 273); whereas PrS(Divy) is akin to MSV-T from the beginning up to the expression, “bring joy to the hearts and minds of good people!”, see Rotman 2008: 263.

Gilgit: (bhavanto)¹⁴⁴ (41r1) yadi vā śramaṇo gautamo niṣpalāyate yadi vā pakṣam samanveṣate <|> katham attra pratipattavyam iti <|> teṣām etad abhavat¹⁴⁵ <|> bhavanto niścayena śramaṇo gautamaḥ pakṣam samanveṣate yadi bhavatām abhipretam vayam (api pa)(r2)kṣam¹⁴⁶ samanveṣāmahe¹⁴⁷ <|>

Trans: “Sirs, perhaps the ascetic Gautama will run away or perhaps he will seek companionship,¹⁴⁸ in which case, how should it be done?”¹⁴⁹ They thought: “Sirs, the ascetic Gautama will certainly seek companionship. If you approve,¹⁵⁰ we too shall seek companionship.”

§ 8 The Tīrthikas’ Search for Companions

§ 8.1 *The tīrthikas visit the mendicant Subhadra in Kuśinagara and request that he become their companion.*

Gilgit Mss.: 41r2–4; **MSV-T:** D: 43a4–43a7, Q: 40b4–40b7, N: 235a1–235a5, S: 62a2–62a6; **MSV-C:** 330a12–20; **PrS(Divy):** 152.22–153.3

Gilgit: tena khalu samayena {yena} kuśinagaryām* subhadraḥ parivrājakaḥ prativasati jīrṇo vṛddho mahallakaḥ kauśināgarāṇām mallānām {;} satkṛto gurukṛto mānitaḥ pūjito (’rhatsam- ma)(r3)taḥ |>¹⁵¹ te kṛtasamketās tasya sakāśam¹⁵² upasamkrāntāḥ kathayaṃti <|> subhadra{s} tvam asmākaṃ sabrahmācārī¹⁵³ bhaviṣyāsmābhiḥ¹⁵⁴ śramaṇo gautama uttare- manuṣyadharmme riddhiprātihāryeṇāhūtaḥ <|> sāhāyyam ka(lpaya)¹⁵⁵ <|> (r4) sa kathaya{m}ti <|> bhavanto na śobhanam yuṣmābhiḥ kṛtam yac chramaṇo gautama{h} uttaremanuṣya- dharmme riddhiprātihāryeṇāhūtaḥ <|> tat kasya hetoḥ <|> mahardhiko ’sau mahānubhāvaḥ <|> katham jñāyate <|> upapattitaḥ <|> kā ’tro(papattiḥ |)¹⁵⁶

Trans: At that time, a wandering mendicant Subhadra, who was old, aged, and infirm¹⁵⁷ lived in

⁽¹⁴⁴⁾ Cf. 41v1 (§ 8.2) *bhavaṃto: shes ldan dag*.

⁽¹⁴⁵⁾ Ms. *abhavad*.

⁽¹⁴⁶⁾ *vayam (api pa)kṣam: bdag cag gis kyang grogs*. Cf. SBV i 174: *athavāsau niṣpalāyitukāmaḥ | athavā pakṣam samanveṣtukāmaḥ | kim atra prāptakālam | vayam api pakṣam samanveṣāmaha iti*.

⁽¹⁴⁷⁾ Ms. *samanveṣāmaha*.

⁽¹⁴⁸⁾ PrS(Divy) 151.21–22: *atha vā pakṣaparyeṣaṇam kartukāmaḥ*. Rotman (2008: 265), “or will he try to find more supporters?”

⁽¹⁴⁹⁾ Fiordalis (2014: 12) translates, *de la ji ltar bsgrub* as “in that case, he will succeed like that.” The Chinese reads, “Then, what shall we do?” (我等諸人欲何所作) (Rhi 1991: 273).

⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ MSV-T reads, *ji ste de ltar gyur na*, “if that should come to pass”, which is quite dissimilar to 41r1: *yadi bhavatām abhipretam*.

⁽¹⁵¹⁾ (*’rhatsamma*)*taḥ*: *dgra bcom par bkur zhing*. Cf. Śrāv-bh ii 148; *Bhaiṣajyavastu* 147v9–10 (GBM 6.963; GM III.1, 26.1–2; Clarke 2014: 56): *śramaṇo gautamaḥ sarvasāmantarājānām satkṛto gurukṛto mānitaḥ pūjito ’rhatsammataḥ*.

⁽¹⁵²⁾ Ms. *sakāśam*.

⁽¹⁵³⁾ Ms. *savrahmācārī*.

⁽¹⁵⁴⁾ Ms. *bhaviṣyasmābhiḥ*.

⁽¹⁵⁵⁾ In 143v1 (§ 8.4) *sāhāyyam kalpayateti* (Imperative 2nd Person Plural): *khyed kyis kyang grogs gyis shig*. Here it is *kalpaya* (Imperative 2nd Person Singular): *grogs gyis shig* cf. SBV i 174: *tvam asmākaṃ sāhāyyam kalpaya*.

⁽¹⁵⁶⁾ Although the Tibetan suggests two different terms, namely *gtan tshigs* for the Sanskrit *hetuḥ* (Negi 1998: 1701) and *’thad pa yin* for *upapadyate*, see Negi 1998: 2143, the number of lost *akṣaras* and the Sanskrit wording speak in favour of reconstructing *upapattiḥ*.

⁽¹⁵⁷⁾ MSV-T reads, “who was aged, weak, and at the end of his life” (*rgas pa ’khogs pa gtugs pa*) (Fiordalis 2014: 12). WTS IV 42 gives *gtugs pa*, “alt, hinfällig, gebrechlich.” It is better to translate *gtugs pa* as “infirm.” MSV-C adds that Subhadra was one hundred and twenty years old (一百二十歲).

Kuśinagara. The Mallas of Kuśinagara honored, praised, respected, worshipped and considered him as an Arhat. Having made an agreement, they went into his presence and said, “Subhadra, you should be our fellow.¹⁵⁸ We have invited¹⁵⁹ the ascetic Gautama [to perform] a miracle demonstration of supernatural powers beyond the reach of ordinary humans. Please become our companion.” He said, “You did not act brilliantly when you invited the ascetic Gautama [to perform] a miracle demonstration of supernatural powers beyond the reach of ordinary humans.” [They asked:] “What is the reason?” [He said:] “Because he has great supernatural power and might.”¹⁶⁰ “How is this known?” [They asked.] “It stands to reason,” [he said.] “What is your reason?” [They asked.]

§ 8.2 Subhadra refuses by explaining the situation of a novice Cunda.

Gilgit Mss.: 41v1–4+143r1¹⁶¹; **MSV-T:** D: 43a7–43b3, Q: 40b7–41a2, N: 235a5–235b3, S: 62a6–62b4; **MSV-C:** 330a20–29; **PrS(Divy):** 153.3–17

Gilgit: (41v1) bhava⟨n⟩to yadā¹⁶² śramaṇo gautamo loke notpannas tadā mama mandākinyām puṣkarīṇyām tīre divāvihāraḥ¹⁶³ ⟨⟩ so ’ham piṇḍapātam ādāyānavataptam mahāsaro gacchāmi paribhoktuṃ ⟨⟩ tatra mamānavataptanivāsinyo devatā ekānte (niṣaṇṇa)(v2)sya¹⁶⁴ pāṇīyam uddhṛtyānuprayaccha⟨m⟩ti ⟨⟩ yadātu śramaṇo gautamo loka utpanna tadā tasya śārīputro nāmāgraśrāvakaḥ ⟨⟩ tasya cundo nāma śrāmaṇerakaḥ ⟨⟩ sa pāṃsukūlikam¹⁶⁵ ādāyānavataptam¹⁶⁶ mahāsaro gac(chatī | ta)(v3)sya tā anavataptanivāsinyo devatās tatpāṃsukūlam¹⁶⁷ śaucayitvā prayacchamti ⟨⟩ tena śaucodakenātmānaṃ¹⁶⁸ siṃcāmti ⟨⟩ tad yasya vyaṃ śi(143r1)¹⁶⁹śyapraśiṣyair api na samāḥ ⟨⟩ sa yuṣmābhīr uttaremanuṣyadharme¹⁷⁰ riddhiprā-(41v4)tiḥāryeṇāhūto na śobhanaṃ kṛtam iti ⟨⟩

Trans: “Sirs, in the time before the ascetic Gautama appeared in the world, I spent a day¹⁷¹ at the side

(158) MSV-T reads *tshangs pa mtshungs par spyod pa*, “practitioner of celibacy or practice celibacy,” see Fiordalis 2014: 13 and note 54, Rotman 2008: 265. The parallel found in the manuscript is *sabrahmācārī*, which I render more generally as “a fellow”. Moreover, *bdag cag tshangs pa mtshungs par spyod pa (asmākaṃ sabrahmācārī* in Sanskrit) means “our fellow” and is not to be understood as “practising the religious life, and so are we”, as in Fiordalis’ translation. Rhi (1991: 274) also translates the Chinese as “you are practicing the brahma conduct as we are” (仁是我輩同梵行者). Rotman (2008: 265) translates PrS(Divy) 152.3–4 *tvam api tāvat sabrahmacārīṇāṃ pakṣaparyeṣaṇam kuruṣva* as “you should find supporters for us among those who follow the religious life with you”. Burnouf ([1844] 1876: 153), “Toi, cependant, cherche aussi à nous faire des partisans parmi ceux qui suivent la même règle religieuse que nous”.

(159) MSV-T reads *bos pa*, which has the sense of “call” instead of *dgug par bya*, which normally occurs in this context. However, the Sanskrit equivalent is *āhūtaḥ*, the past participle form of the former verb *āhvayaṃte* (§ 7.1, 7.3).

(160) See Fiordalis 2014: 13 note 55.

(161) This is the beginning of manuscript serial no. 56h.

(162) Ms. *yathā*.

(163) Ms. *divāvihāras*.

(164) *(niṣaṇṇa)sya: ’dug pa la*.

(165) MSV-T *phyag dar khrod pa* (= Skt. *pāṃsukūlikah*), Mvy. 1131. This should be emended to *pāṃsukūlikam*, “one who wears *pāṃsukūla*”, BHSD 338. PrS(Divy.M)-Ms. I gives a reading that is close to MSV-T *pāṃsukūlikāny*, while PrS(Divy) 153.11 reads *pāṃsukūlāny*.

(166) Ms. *ādāya navataptam*.

(167) Ms. *tatpāṃsukūluṃ*.

(168) Ms. *śaucedakenātmānaṃ*.

(169) From here to the end of 41v4 the texts of the two Gilgit folios, nos. 41v and 143r, overlap.

(170) Cf. 41v3 (§ 8.2) reads °*dharmme*.

(171) MSV-T reads *nyin mo gnas*, which Fiordalis (2014: 13) translates as “meditate.” The Chinese corresponds to the Tibetan and gives “sitting meditation” (宴坐) but the manuscript gives *divāvihāraḥ*, “rest by day” which should be the original meaning.

of the lake Mandākinī.¹⁷² Having taken alms,¹⁷³ I went to the great lake Anavatapta¹⁷⁴ to eat.¹⁷⁵ In that place, having seated on one side, the deities inhabiting lake Anavatapta would draw water and give it to me; but when the ascetic Gautama appeared in the world, his foremost disciple, named Śāriputra, had a novice named Cunda. Having taken a garment of shrouds, he came to the great lake Anavatapta. The gods dwelling at lake Anavatapta washed his garment of shrouds and presented it to him. Then they poured that pure-water over themselves.¹⁷⁶ Therefore, when you invited him, with whose disciple's disciple we are not even equal, [to perform] a miracle demonstration of supernatural powers beyond the reach of ordinary humans, you did not act brilliantly.”

§ 8.3 *The tīrthikas say that Subhadra is on the Buddha's side, then they discuss finding another companion.*

Gilgit Mss.: 41v4+143r2–4; **MSV-T:** D: 43b3–43b6, Q: 41a2–41a5, N: 235b3–235b7, S: 62b4–63a1; **MSV-C:** 330a29–b5; **PrS(Divy):** 153.18–20

Gilgit: te parasparam kathayaṃti <|> bhava<n>ta eṣo 'pi tatpakṣya eva <|> gacchāmo 'nyam¹⁷⁷ samanveṣāma iti <|> te taṃ (143r2) śāthyaśamudācāreṇa saṃmānya¹⁷⁸ prakrāntāḥ¹⁷⁹ <|> anyatamasmiṃ pravivikte pṛthivīpradeśe sthitvā saṃjalpaṃ ku(r)v(anti)¹⁸⁰ /// (pañcā)(r3)bhijñāḥ¹⁸¹ prativasati <|> tasya sakāśaṃ gacchāmaḥ <|> so 'smākaṃ sāhāyyaṃ kalpayiṣyatī¹⁸² <|> apare(ṇa) /// (r4) so 'smākaṃ sāhāyyaṃ kalpayiṣyatī •

Trans: They said to each other, “Sirs, this man is also on his side.¹⁸³ We shall go look for another [companion].” They honored him in a duplicitous manner and left. Having stayed in another isolated place they talked together. ... lives ... five kinds of supernatural knowledge.¹⁸⁴ We should go towards him and make him our companion”¹⁸⁵ Another one ... make him¹⁸⁶ our companion.

§ 8.4 *The tīrthikas visit five hundred sages in a forest of the Himālayas, who possess the five kinds of supernatural knowledge, and request that they become their companions. Their*

(172) MSV-T *dal gyis 'bab* is attested as a translation for “Mandākinī” (Negi 2000: 2125); MSV-C 曼陀枳. This is confirmed by the Sanskrit in the manuscript.

(173) MSV-C adds more information: “early in the morning” (於晨朝時) (Rhi 1991: 274).

(174) MSV-T *ma dros par*; MSV-C 無熱池 (= Skt. Anavatapta) is a name of a lake, the same as the Rāvaṇahrada, see Burnouf [1844] 1876: 152 note 2 (Transl. Buffetrille and Lopez Jr. 2010: 194 note 181).

(175) According to MSV-C, Subhadra went to the lake not only to eat but also for quietude (靜).

(176) The manuscript reads *ātmanam*, “themselves”, but MSV-T reads *bdag nyid kyi mgo bor*, “their own head.” The Chinese here also mentions only 自 (*zi*) “self.” MSV-C adds, “they had deep devotion” (身極生恭敬) at the end of the sentence (Rhi 1991: 273).

(177) Ms. *vyam*. I correct to 'nyam: *gzhan*.

(178) Cf. 41v4 reads *samānya* which should be emended to *saṃmānya*.

(179) 41v4 ends here with line filler symbols || : || : || : || : || : || : ++.

(180) *saṃjalpaṃ ku(r)v(anti): bgros pa*.

(181) Ms. (pañcā)bhijñāḥ. I emend according to PrS(Divy) 152.22, which reads *pañcābhijñāḥ*.

(182) Ms. *kalpayiṣyatī*.

(183) MSV-C reads, “This man is also a friend of the śramaṇa” (此亦是彼沙門朋黨) (Rhi 1991: 274).

(184) MSV-T *lga mngon par shes pa*, “five types of superhuman power and knowledge” (Fiordalis 2014: 13). MSV-C 五通, “five kinds of supernatural powers” (= Skt. *pañcābhijñā*; Pāli *abhiññā*, “a person who has higher or supernatural knowledge; intuition”), see BHSD 50; PTSD 63. For *divyacakṣu*, see Rotman 2008: 448.

(185) MSV-C has slightly different translation: “Let us go to him and talk. It will be certainly helpful” (宜可就彼共為計策必當相助) (Rhi 1991: 274).

(186) In the manuscript it is obviously singular *so*. Fiordalis (2014: 13) translates MSV-T as plural, although there is no plural marker.

request is accepted.

Gilgit Mss.: 143r4–v2; **MSV-T:** D: 43b6–44a3, Q: 41a5–41b1, N: 235b7–236a7, S: 63a1–63a7; **MSV-C:** 330b5–14; **PrS(Divy):** 152.13–22

Gilgit: tena khalu samayenānyatamasmim himavatkandare (v)i(vidha-)¹⁸⁷ ///
(pañcamātrāṇi ṛṣīṣa)(r5)tāni¹⁸⁸ prativasanti <|> yadbhūyasā paṃcābhijñās tanmadhyād ekaḥ
paṃcābhijñō grāmāntaṃ samavasṛtaḥ <|> sa i .. ///
(r6) tena yathāvṛttaṃ samākhyātaṃ <|> te saṃjātasauṃnasyās teṣāṃ sakāśam upasaṃkrāntās
tataḥ parasparaṃ pratisaṃ(jātasauṃnasyāḥ)¹⁸⁹ ///
(bhavanta yūyam asmākaṃ sabrahmacārino bhaviṣyatāsmābhiḥ śramaṇo gautama)¹⁹⁰ (143v1)
uttaremaṇuṣyadharme riddhiprātihāryeṇāhūtaḥ sāhāyyaṃ kalpayateti • te ka(thaya)nti <|>
bhavantaḥ .. ///
(v2) prakrāntāḥ <|>

Trans: At that time, there was a slope in the Himālayas¹⁹¹ ... five hundred sages dwelt. Most of them possessed the five kinds of supernatural knowledge. One sage among them who possessed the five kinds of supernatural knowledge came down to the border of village. ... The sage told them what had happened.¹⁹² Delighted, they went [with that sage] into the presence of the sages. Then, perfectly happy with each other ... “Sirs, you should be our fellow.¹⁹³ We have invited the ascetic Gautama with a miraculous demonstration of supernatural powers beyond the reach of ordinary humans. Please become our follower.¹⁹⁴” The sages said, “Sirs, ... left.

§ 9 The Story of Prince Kāla

§ 9.1 (*One of the queens*) throws (a garland of flowers) which falls upon the shoulder of Prince Kāla, stepbrother to King Prasenajit. The people inform the ministers who then tells the king.

Gilgit Mss.: 143v2–3; **MSV-T:** D: 44a3–44a4, Q: 41b1–41b3, N: 236a7–236b3, S: 63a7–63b3; **MSV-C:** 330b14–20; **PrS(Divy):** 153.21–27

⁽¹⁸⁷⁾ (v)i(vidha-): *sna tshogs*.

⁽¹⁸⁸⁾ (pañcamātrāṇi ṛṣīṣa)tāni: *drang srong lnga brgya tsam zhig* Cf. PrS(Divy) 152.13–14 *pañcamātrāṇi ṛṣīṣatāni*; Tib. *drang srong lnga brgya tsam zhig*.

⁽¹⁸⁹⁾ *pratisaṃ(jātasauṃnasyāḥ)*: *dga' bar byas nas*.

⁽¹⁹⁰⁾ Cf. 41r3 (§ 8.1) *subhadra{s} tvam asmākaṃ sabrahmacārī bhaviṣyāsmābhiḥ śramaṇo gautama*: *shin tu bzang po khyod dang bdag cag tshangs pa mtshungs par spyod pa yin te | bdag cag gis dge sbyong gau ta ma*.

⁽¹⁹¹⁾ MSV-C gives more detail than the manuscript and MSV-T. It reads, “On the snowy mountain, there is a quiet place” (雪山寂靜之處) (Rhi 1991: 274).

⁽¹⁹²⁾ Fiordalis (2014: 14) translates the Tibetan, *de phan tshun 'phyan ba las de rnams kyi drung du 'ongs pa dang | de rnams kyis de la byon pa legs so zhes bya ba kun tu spyad nas khyod gang nas 'dir 'ongs zhes dris pa dang | des ji ltar gyur pa rnams brjod do*, as “(One sage among them who processes the five types of superhuman power and knowledge came into town and) after wandering here and there, returned to where they live, they acted as though it would be good to go there, asking, ‘Will you come there?’ and saying, ‘So, things are going happen in that way.’” I suggest a new and more precise translation, as “One sage among them who possessed the five kinds of supernatural knowledge came down to the border of village. *After wandering here and there, he came near to those ūrthikas. They said to the sage as usual, ‘Welcome’ and asked, ‘From where have you come here?’* The sage told them what had happened.” Unfortunately, there are no clear parallels either in MSV-C or in PrS(Divy).

⁽¹⁹³⁾ See note 158.

⁽¹⁹⁴⁾ Rhi (1991: 274) translates MSV-C with, “Now we want to invite the śramaṇa Gautama to compete with us in the miracle of the superhuman dharma. Would you help us?” (我等今欲喚彼沙門喬答摩共搆神通上人之法。仁與我等爲伴助不).

Gilgit: yāvad rājñāḥ prasenajitaḥ kauśalasya kālo nāma rājakumāro vai(mā)tro¹⁹⁵ bhrātā sa(gandha-)¹⁹⁶ ///

(kṣi)(v3)pto 'ñse nipatitaḥ¹⁹⁷ <|> so 'parair dr̥ṣṭo <|> mitrāri¹⁹⁸ madhyamo lokaḥ <|> tair amātyānām niveditaḥ <|> a(mātyā api)¹⁹⁹ ///

Trans: Then, a step-brother prince of King Prasenajit of Kauśala whose name was Kāla, perfumed ... threw²⁰⁰ ... which others saw²⁰¹ fall upon a shoulder.²⁰² The world consists of friend, enemy, and impartial persons and so [it] was told to the ministers by those people. The ministers, of course ...

§ 9.2 *The king orders the ministers to cut off Prince Kāla's hands and feet. (They lead him into the street, and cut off his hands and feet).*

Gilgit Mss.: 143v3–5; **MSV-T:** D: 44a4–44a6, Q: 41b3–41b5, N: 236b3–236b5, S: 63b3–63b5; **MSV-C:** 330b20–23; **PrS(Divy):** 153.27–154.3

Gilgit: (te)(v4)ṣām ājñā dattā :²⁰³ gacchantu bhavantaḥ parityakto me kālo rājakumārah karacaraṇavikalam²⁰⁴ kur{u}<vantu>²⁰⁵ veti ///

(anyenāpi mahā)(v5)janakāyena²⁰⁶ parivaritas tiṣṭhati •

Trans: ... the command was given to those [ministers]: “Sirs, go!²⁰⁷ I have renounced Prince Kāla! Cut

(195) *vai(mā)tro: mas dben.*

(196) *sa(gandha-): dri dang.*

(197) While the manuscript reads 'ñse, “upon the shoulder”, MSV-T reads *de'i lus la*, “upon his body,” which can be restored to 'ñge. MSV-C reads, “the flower fell over his shoulder,” (花墮肩上) and therefore the Sanskrit text seems to correspond to the Chinese translation in this case. Av-klp 13.29 also reads *aṃse*. There are several examples in Indian Buddhist narrative literature of a woman offering a garland to a man that can be compared with passages in the manuscripts of the *Pravrajyāvastu* and the *Cīvaravastu* of the MSV, see Silk 2007: 5–10. The key expression here is *sragdāmaḥ kṣiptaḥ*, “tossed a garland”. There is only one example of the masculine form *kṣiptaḥ* in Sanskrit in Mvy, *mālāguṇaparikṣiptaḥ*, but this term cannot help in the reconstruction of the manuscript because the Tibetan equivalent of *mālāguṇaparikṣiptaḥ* in the *Mahāvīryūtpatti* is *skyes kyis dus btab pa* (Mvy. 9394), which is not related to MSV-T. In this case the term refers to the offering of a garland by a man to a woman as an indication of an engagement to marry. At present I cannot find a solution to this problem, see Lamotte [1944–1980] 1970–1981: ii.330, 13, ii.800 note 2.

(198) Ms. *mitrāpitu*. This line looks like a quarter of an *anuṣṭubh*, therefore I correct it on the basis of the parallel in the PrS(Divy). However, in MSV-T it is written in prose.

(199) *a(mātyā api): blon pos kyan*. I suggest the reconstruction to the plural *amātyās*, because of *amātyānām* in the previous sentence.

(200) Fiordalis (2014: 14) chooses to translate *bor ba* as “threw away”. The other versions suggest a previous relationship between them, so I choose to translate as “threw”, in order to imply that she threw it intentionally to the prince. Both the manuscript and PrS(Divy) read *kṣipta*.

(201) Prince Kāla and the woman of the King were seen by people according to the manuscript (*so 'parair dr̥ṣṭo*) and MSV-C, “many people saw it” (餘人共見), while the number of people is not mentioned in PrS(Divy) and MSV-T states this occurrence was only seen by someone (*gzhan zhig*).

(202) MSV-C seems to correspond to the manuscript in that the wreath of flowers fell upon the prince's shoulder, see note 197.

(203) It can also be read as *dattāḥ* because this symbol is like a *visarga*. However, I suggest reading *dattā* as corresponding to the subject *ājñā*.

(204) Remarkably, there are variations of the Sanskrit compounds for “hands and feet” in the manuscript and PrS(Divy); namely, *karacaraṇa* in the former and *hastapāda* in the latter. Av-klp 13.34 reads *pāṇicarāṇa*.

(205) Ms. *kuru*. I suggest correcting to *kurvantu* consistent with the previous verb *gacchantu*.

(206) (*anyenāpi mahā*)*janakāyena: skye bo'i tshogs chen po gzhan dag gis kyang*. Cf. PrS(Divy) 154.3 *mahā-janakāyo*.

(207) Fiordalis (2014: 15) translates *deng la* as “immediately” but I translate as “Go!” which can be the

off his hands and feet.”²⁰⁸ ... [He] stood there, surrounded by ... even a large gathering of other people.²⁰⁹

§ 9.3 *Prince Kāla’s relatives call upon the tīrthikas to perform an act of truth to rescue the major and minor limbs of Prince Kāla (but they leave).*

Gilgit Mss.: 143v5; **MSV-T:** D: 44a6–44a7, Q: 41b5–41b6, N: 236b5–236b7, S: 63b5–63b6; **MSV-C:** 330b23–26; **PrS(Divy):** 154.4–14

Gilgit: yāvat tīrthyās tena pradeśena gacchanti <|> te tasya jñātibhir uktā <|> āryāḥ²¹⁰ kālasya rāja²¹¹(kumārasya amṅapratyamṅāni satyopayācanam)²¹² ///

Trans: Then the *tīrthikas*²¹³ came to that place. They were told by his [Prince Kāla’s] relatives: “Noble One,²¹⁴ ... an appeal to the truth [to restore] major and minor limbs of Prince Kāla ”²¹⁵

§ 9.4 *Prince Kāla’s relatives ask venerable Ānanda to speak a word of truth to restore Prince Kāla’s major and minor limbs. (Then venerable Ānanda goes to ask the Blessed One).*

Gilgit Mss.: 143v5–6; **MSV-T:** D: 44a7–44b1, Q: 41b6–41b8, N: 236b7–237a2, S: 63b6–64a2; **MSV-C:** 330b26–c1; **PrS(Divy):** -

imperative form of *'deng ba* “to go, to go away” which corresponds to *gacchantu* in both the manuscript and PrS(Divy).

⁽²⁰⁸⁾ The command of the king is not given in direct speech in MSV-C. Rhi (1991: 275) translates the Chinese as, “the king, without carefully investigating the circumstances, ordered the minister to cut off the hands and feet of the prince” (王聞造次初不詳審。即令大臣別其 画像手足).

⁽²⁰⁹⁾ In the last sentence, Rhi (1991: 275) translates the Chinese as, “Their cries filled the air”, which does not agree with the Chinese text 圍遶而住. I suggest an alternative translation, “they surrounded the prince”, which more closely resembles MSV-T *skye bo'i tshogs chen po gzhan dag gis kyang yongs su bskor cing 'dug go*, “even a large gathering of other people was surrounding him”.

⁽²¹⁰⁾ Ms. *ārya*. A term of address in the singular is inconsistent with the plural noun of the *tīrthikas* in both the manuscript and MSV-T. The Chinese, as rendered by Rhi, has neither a term of address nor a similar adjective describing Prince Kāla. I suggest correcting to *āryāḥ* in correspondence to *tīrthyās*, which is a plural form. Cf. PrS(Divy) 154.5 *āryāḥ*.

⁽²¹¹⁾ Ms. *raja*.

⁽²¹²⁾ Cf. 143v6 (§ 9.4) *rājakumārasya amṅapratyamṅāni satyopayācanam: rgyal bu gzhon nu na gu yan lag dang nying lag ji ltar snga mkho bzhin du 'gyur bar bden pa'i tshig mdzad du gsol*.

⁽²¹³⁾ Fiordalis (2014: 15 note 64) notes that there seems to be some ambiguity as to whether the number of rival ascetics who arrived on the scene is one or more. In MSV-C, it seems to be only one unnamed rival ascetic: “At the time, a heretic was passing by the place” (時有外道在傍直過). But the term *wàidào* (外道) may equally be translated as a singular or plural. MSV-T is unambiguous in supplying a plural marker: “The moment that the *tīrthikas* approached in that place” (*ci tsam na mu stegs can rnam kyang phyogs der 'ongs pa dang*). PrS(Divy) 154 says specifically that Pūrāṇa and the other ascetics arrive: “Meanwhile Pūrāṇa and the other Nirgranthas arrived there” (Rotman 2008: 268) (*pūraṇādayas ca nirgranthās taṃ pradeśam anuprāptāḥ*). The manuscript confirms that the number of rival ascetics is more than one: “Then the *tīrthikas* came to that place” (*yāvat tīrthyās tena pradeśena gacchanti*).

⁽²¹⁴⁾ Fiordalis (2014: 15 note 65) notes that there seems to be some ambiguity in the word *'phags pa*, “noble one.” He suggests that *'phags pa* in MSV-T refers to Prince Kāla due to the lack of a plural marker, and that it implies his innocence and uprightness. But when one compares the parallel passage in the manuscript, reading *ārya* (vocative singular), and PrS(Divy) 154 note 3, which also has some ambiguity in the manuscripts, reading *āryā* rather than *āryāḥ*, it becomes possible to read it as a term of address aimed first at the *tīrthikas* and then at Ānanda, since both sentences in the manuscript and MSV-T are parallel. MSV-C omits this word.

⁽²¹⁵⁾ MSV-C gives more information, “Prince Kāla received the anger of the king, and his hands and feet were severed. Can you make the prince recover the severed hands and feet as before by the power of the words of the truth?” (仁等頗能以實語力。令此王子所截手足平復如故耶) (Rhi 1991: 275).

Gilgit: (yāvad āyusmān āna)(v6)ndaḥ²¹⁶ piṇḍapātam aṭams taṃ pradeśam anuprāptaḥ <|> sa tair uktaḥ <|> ārya kālasya rājakumārasya aṃgapratyaṃg(ā)ni satyopayāca(nam)²¹⁷ ///

Trans: Then the venerable Ānanda, who was wandering for alms food, reached the place. He was told by them [Prince Kāla’s relatives]: “²¹⁸Noble One,²¹⁹ ... an appeal to the truth [to restore] the major and minor limbs of Prince Kāla”

§ 11 Miracles (1)

§ 11.1 (b) *The King asks the young brahmin Uttara to invite the Buddha to display a miracle.*

Gilgit Mss.: 46r1–2; **MSV-T:** D: 45b7–46a3, Q: 43a7–43b3, N: 239a6–239b5, S: 66a3–66b2; **MSV-C:** 331a13–19; **PrS(Divy):** 156.2–5, 156.10–20

Gilgit: (uttaram māṇavam āmantrayate | ehi tvam māṇava yena bhagavāms tenopasamkrāma | upasamkramyāsmākam vacanena bhagavataḥ pādaḥ śirasā vandi)²²⁰(46r1)tvālpābādhatām ca pṛchhālpātamkatām ca²²¹ laghūthānatām ca yātrām ca balaṃ ca sukhaṃ cānavadyatām ca sparśavihāratām ca evaṃ ca vada <|> iha bhadanta tīrthyāḥ saṃniṣaṇṇā<ḥ> {•} sannipatitā<ḥ> • yasyedānīm bhagavām kalam manyata iti²²²<|> e(vaṃ deve)(r2)ty²²³ uttaro māṇavo rājñāḥ prasenajitaḥ kauśalasya pratiśrutya yena bhagavāms tenopasamkrāntaḥ <|> {d} upasamkramya bhagavatā²²⁴ sārḍham saṃmukhaṃ saṃmodanīm saṃraṃjanīm vividhām kathām vyatisāryaikānte niṣaṇṇaḥ <|>

Trans: Then he addressed a young brahmin named Uttara:²²⁵ “Come here, young brahmin, go to where the Blessed One is.²²⁶ Having approached and venerated the Blessed One’s feet with your head and having asked him with our word²²⁷ whether he is healthy, free from illness and feels secure, whether he has had a pleasant journey, whether he is feeling strong and happy and faultless, and whether he is feeling comfortable,²²⁸ speak to him in this way:²²⁹ ‘Bhadanta, the *tīrthikas* have seated and assembled.²³⁰ For this, may the Blessed One think it is the appropriate time.’” “Certainly, my

(216) (yāvad āyusmān āna)ndaḥ : ji tsaṃ na tshe dang ldan pa kun dga’ bo.

(217) satyopayāca(nam) : bden pa’i tshig mdzad du gsol, cf. PrS(Divy) 154.5 satyābhiyācanayā.

(218) MSV-C adds, “The hands and feet of Prince Kāla were severed” (王子哥羅被截手足) (Rhi 1991: 275).

(219) The manuscript reads *ārya*. It corresponds to the word *’phags pa*, “noble one”, which should also be translated as a term of address after the previous passage and MSV-C 聖者.

(220) Cf. PrS(Divy) 156.10–13 *atha rājā prasenajit kauśala uttaram māṇavam āmantrayate | ehi tvam uttara yena bhagavāms tenopasamkrāma | upasamkramyāsmākam vacanena bhagavataḥ pādaḥ śirasā vanditvālpābādhatām.*

(221) Ms. na.

(222) Ms. ity.

(223) e(vaṃ deve)ty: lha de ltaṃ.

(224) Ms. bhagavata.

(225) According to Rhi (1991: 277), the Chinese differs by reading “*māṇava*”, meaning “youth” (摩納 *Mónà*), as the proper name of a young messenger. However, *māṇava* is not a proper name and it does not mean only “youth”, rather “young brahmin / brahmin student”. The manuscript gives the young brahmin’s name “Uttara”, which means “higher”, corresponding with PrS(Divy) and the Tibetan translation *bla ma*.

(226) MSV-C reads, “Go and venerate the Buddha delivering my words” (汝往禮佛當傳我語) (Rhi 1991: 277).

(227) MSV-T reads *bdag gi mchid nas*, “from my words”.

(228) MSV-C gives a shorter passage than that of MSV-T, as translated by Rhi (1991: 278), “ask the Bhagavat whether he is healthy and carefree and feels comfortable in living” (請問世尊少病少惱起居輕利氣力安不).

(229) MSV-T adds *sn̄yun gsol la ’di skad ces*, “After asking about his health, say these words”.

(230) In the Sanskrit version the *tīrthikas* were seated and assembled but in MSV-T they only assembled (*tshogs*) and the term *shing mchis* indicates the progressive form of the action “are waiting”. MSV-C gives only “all *tīrthikas* have assembled” (此諸外道並皆集會) (Rhi 1991: 277).

lord.” Having assented to King Prasenajit of Kauśala, the young brahmin Uttara went to where the Blessed One was. Having approached, he, face to face with the Blessed One, engaged in various delightful and complimentary greetings,²³¹ and then sat to one side.

§ 11.2 *The young brahmin Uttara visits the Buddha and conveys the king’s regards.*

Gilgit Mss.: 46r2–v1; **MSV-T:** D: 46a4–46a6, Q: 43b3–43b5, N: 239b5–240a3, S: 66b2–66b5; **MSV-C:** 331a19–23; **PrS(Divy):** 156.20–26

Gilgit: <ekāntaniṣaṇṇa>²³² u(ttaro) (r3) māṇavo bhagavantam idam avocat* <|> rājā bho gautama prasenajit kauśalo bhagavato gautamasya pādaū śirasā vandate ’lpābādhatām²³³ ca pṛcchaty alpātamkatām ca laghūthhānatām ca yātrām (ca ba)(r4)lam ca sukham cānavadyatām ca sparśavihāratām ca <|> sukhī bhavatūttara rājā prasenajit kauśalas tvaṃ ca <|> rājā bho gautama prasenajit kauśala evam āha <|> tīrthyāḥ prātihāryamaṇḍape sanniṣaṇṇāḥ sanni(patitāḥ)²³⁴ (46v1) yasyedānīm bhagavām kālam manyata iti <|>

Trans: After he had sat to one side, the young brahmin Uttara said these words to the Blessed One: “King Prasenajit of Kauśala , O Gautama,²³⁵ venerated the Blessed One’s feet with his head and asked whether you are healthy, free from illness, and feel secure, whether you have a pleasant journey and whether you are feeling strong and happy and faultless and whether you are feeling comfortable.²³⁶ The Blessed One answered, “Uttara,²³⁷ may King Prasenajit of Kauśala be happy and you as well.” “King Prasenajit of Kauśala , O Gautama, said this as well: ‘The *tīrthikas* have seated and assembled in the pavilion for miracle.²³⁸ For this, may the Blessed One think it is the appropriate time.’”

§ 11.3 *The Buddha says he will come. Then he exercises his supernatural will, causing Uttara to rise up into the sky and fly back to the miracle pavilion.*

Gilgit Mss.: 46v1–4; **MSV-T:** D: 46a6–46b2, Q: 43b5–44a1, N: 240a3–240a5, S: 66b5–67a3; **MSV-C:** 331a23–b1; **PrS(Divy):** 156.26–157.5

Gilgit: bhagavān āha • gacchottarā<ha>m adyāgata ity uttaro²³⁹ māṇavaḥ saṃprasthitāḥ²⁴⁰ <|> bhagavatā tathādhiṣṭhito yathā vitatapakṣa²⁴¹ iva haṃsarājo gaganatalam abhyudgam{is}ya

(231) MSV-C is distinct from the GBM and MSV-T, as translated by Rhi (1991: 278): “Having inquired his health, he sat on one side” (往詣佛所問安隱已。在一面坐).

(232) *ekāntaniṣaṇṇa*: *phyogs gcig tu ’dug go*.

(233) Ms. *alpābādhatām*.

(234) *sanni(patitāḥ)*: *’dus shing mchis*.

(235) MSV-T reads *kye gau ta ma* as the form of address to the Buddha, which corresponds to the manuscript *bho Gautama* (*bho* is vocative form of *bhavat*). This form in MSV-T seems to express a level of equality or familiarity that is a bit surprising or rather archaic translation style? PrS(Divy) and MSV-C use a formal word to address the Buddha, *bhadanta* and 世尊 (*shizūn*) respectively.

(236) MSV-T adds *sn̄yun gsol z̄hing mchis zhes gsol pa dang*, “In this way, he asks about your health”.

(237) MSV-T adds *bram ze ’i khye ’u*, “young brahmin”.

(238) MSV-T reads *cho ’phrul chen po ’i ’dun khang*, “a pavilion for the Great Miracle”, which is different from the manuscript’s reading: *prātihāryamaṇḍape*.

(239) Ms. *uttare*.

(240) Ms. *saṃprasthito*.

(241) Ms. *vinatapakṣa*.

kilikilā²⁴²prakṣve(ḍaṣab)(v2)danādibhir²⁴³ anekai{ḥ} prāṇīśatasahasrai{r} vismayotphulla-
locanair abhivikṣyamāṇo²⁴⁴ vihāyasa²⁴⁵ prātihāryamaṇḍape 'vatīrṇaḥ²⁴⁶ <|> tāṃ vibhūtiṃ drṣṭvā
rājā prasenajit kauśalo vismayāvarjitamanās²⁴⁷ tīr{th}y(ā)(n²⁴⁸ ida)(v3)m avocat* <|> vidarśi-
taṃ bhadaṃta²⁴⁹ bhagavatā uttaremanuṣyadharmme riddhiprātihāryaṃ²⁵⁰ <|> idānīm
yuṣmākam avasaraprāpto yūyaṃ vidarśayateti <|> te kathayaṃti <|> deva mahājanakāyo 'tra²⁵¹
sannipatitaḥ <|> āgamaya tvam <|> ko jānī(t)e (kasya)²⁵² (v4) tat prātihāryaṃ kiṃ śramaṇasya
gautamasyāhosvid asmākam iti <|>

Trans: The Blessed One said, “Go, Uttara, I will come now.” Then the young brahmin Uttara departed. The Blessed One thus exercised his supernatural will,²⁵³ his wings extended like the king of the geese, he, having risen up into the vault of the sky whilst being observed by many hundreds of thousands of living beings who were joyously clamouring and shouting, their eyes wide open in astonishment,²⁵⁴ descended from the sky onto the pavilion for the miracle.²⁵⁵ Having seen such a superhuman power, King Prasena-jit of Kauśala, whose mind was overcome with amazement,²⁵⁶ said to the *tīrthikas*, “Bhadanta,²⁵⁷ the Blessed One has performed a miracle demonstration of supernatural powers beyond the reach of ordinary humans. Now your turn has come, you should display one.” They said, “Please wait, Lord, a great number of people have gathered here.²⁵⁸ Who knows whether it is the miracle²⁵⁹ of the ascetic Gautama or us?”

§ 11.4 Gaṇḍaka brings a *(mango) tree from Mount Gandhamādana

Gilgit Mss.: 46v4; **MSV-T:** D D: 46b2–46b5, Q: 44a1–44a4, N: 240a5–240b6, S: 67a3–67a7; **MSV-C:** 331b1–7; **PrS(Divy):** 157.25–27

Gilgit: tat samanantaram eva gaṇḍakenārāmakena riddhyā gandhamādanāt parvatā{ḥ}d anekāśākhāpraśākhavitataḥ pāṇḍuphalopaśobhito 'nekapakṣigaṇ(a) //²⁶⁰

⁽²⁴²⁾ Von Hinüber (2009: 311) gives the meaning of *kilikilā* “als Onomatopoetium für (fröhliches?) Gelächter” (an onomatopoeia for laughing). It is probably equivalent to the Tibetan *a la la: aho* (Negi 1993: 7591) or *ca co: kalā, kūjitam, ālāpa, kalakalā* (Negi 1993: 1097).

⁽²⁴³⁾ A possible reconstruction is *prakṣve(ḍaṣab)danā : ga zha 'i sgra*. Negi (1993: 464, 848) gives the Sanskrit equivalent of the Tibetan term *ga zha* as *upahāsa, prakṣveda, prakṣvedita, and sgra* as *śabda*.

⁽²⁴⁴⁾ Ms. *abhivekṣyamāṇo*.

⁽²⁴⁵⁾ Ms. *vihāyasa*.

⁽²⁴⁶⁾ Ms. *'vatīrṇas*.

⁽²⁴⁷⁾ Ms. *vismayāvarjitamatāms*.

⁽²⁴⁸⁾ Ms. *tīry.///*.

⁽²⁴⁹⁾ Ms. *bhadaṃto*.

⁽²⁵⁰⁾ Ms. *riddhiprātihāryam*.

⁽²⁵¹⁾ Ms. *ta*.

⁽²⁵²⁾ The gap in the ms. seems too small for two *akṣaras* but *kasya* is the only possibility for the reconstruction.

⁽²⁵³⁾ See Fiordalis 2014: 19 note 85.

⁽²⁵⁴⁾ MSV-C reads slightly differently from the manuscript and MSV-T, as translated by Rhi (1991: 278): “All the people, seeing him flying back in the air, leaped for joy, exclaiming, “Marvelous!” (時諸大眾見乘空來。悉皆踊躍。歎未曾有).

⁽²⁵⁵⁾ MSV-T reads *cho 'phrul chen po 'i 'dun khang*, “a pavilion of the Great Miracle” which is different from the manuscript *prātihāryamaṇḍape*.

⁽²⁵⁶⁾ MSV-T reads *yid dad par gyur te*, “the mind becomes faithful with amazement.” MSV-C also parallels MSV-T, “profound mind to respect and faith” (深心敬信).

⁽²⁵⁷⁾ Ms. reads *bhadaṃta* and MSV-T reads *kye*, “oh”. Compared with § 11.2, Ms. reads *bho* and MSV-T also reads *kye*.

⁽²⁵⁸⁾ MSV-C adds a simile “gathering like clouds” (雲集).

⁽²⁵⁹⁾ MSV-T reads *cho 'phrul chen po*, “the Great Miracle”, which is different from the manuscript *prātihāryam*.

⁽²⁶⁰⁾ The Ms. seems to read *pakṣimaṇa*. The reconstruction here is not sure. It is difficult to reconcile with the

Trans: Immediately, Gaṇḍaka, the grove-keeper²⁶¹ ... to Mount Gandhamādana by means of his supernatural powers. ... whose bough extended with numerous branches, was adorned with yellow fruits,²⁶² and in which many ... birds ...

Conclusion and discussion

This critical edition of the *Mahāprātihāryasūtra* presents new evidence on the Tibetan and Chinese translations of the *Vinayakṣudrakavastu*. Resultantly, the mistakes of previous studies have been corrected and, although the Gilgit manuscripts are incomplete, an examination of these translations, considered alongside the *Prātihāryasūtra* of the *Divyāvadāna*, enabled several important words or phrases to be deduced. Both the provenance of the two Gilgit manuscripts, in addition to the presence of parallels in the terminologies and narrative structures of these different versions, makes the conclusion almost certain that the text from Gilgit was transmitted within the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition. The *sūtra* incorporated into the Tibetan and Chinese witnesses of the *Kṣudrakavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* is lost in the Sanskrit. This work is bulked up by the inclusion of a large quantity of tales;²⁶³ for instance the *Samghabhedavastu* and *Kṣudrakavastu* form complete biographies of the Buddha. Contrarily other schools detached some parts of the Buddha's life from the context of the *Vinaya* and arranged them as independent works, such as, the account of his *nirvāṇa* as related in the *Mahāparinibbānasutta* of the *Suttantapiṭaka*.²⁶⁴ The *Mahāprātihāryasūtra* represents another suitable narrative collected within the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, together with other legends, such as, the destruction of the Śākya by Virūḍhaka (T. 1451: 234a12–244a21), the staying of the Buddha in the Trayastriṃśa heaven and the story of nun Utpalavarṇā (T. 1451: 345c19–350b6) etc.²⁶⁵ In the Tibetan translations of the *Vinayakṣudrakavastu*, the *Mahāprātihāryasūtra* is not placed as part of a coherent Buddha-biography. It is inserted in the *Vinayakṣudrakavastu* before the story of Mahauśadha. Apart from both texts giving six *tīrthikas* or ministers, there is no further concordance between the two.

Due to the fact that the Tibetan and Chinese versions are closely connected, it can be assumed the narratives were translated from a similar manuscript lineage. However, the translations are by no means identical and subsequently, due to discrepancies in their renderings, it can be assumed there were several distinct transmissions of the narrative in Sanskrit, whose original can no longer be determined. It is also certain they do not derive from the same source.

The two manuscripts can hardly originate from a manuscript of the *Kṣudrakavastu* due to

Tibetan translation. MSV-T reads *bya'i tshogs du ma skad 'byin pa*, “many flocks of birds were singing.” Negi (2003: 4913) gives the Sanskrit equivalent of the Tibetan terms *tshog* as *gaṇa*, *sambhāra*, *piṇḍa* and *skad 'byin pa* (1993, vol. 1: 160) as *krośati*, *nardati*, *heṣate*, *vāśitaṃ karoti*.

⁽²⁶¹⁾ MSV-C gives the name of Prince Kāla 哥羅王子 instead of Gaṇḍaka, which corresponds to the previous passage found in MSV-C in which only the name of the grove 分分 is indicated.

⁽²⁶²⁾ MSV-T reads *a mra yal ga dang lo ma dang 'dab ma dkar po du mas klubs pa*, “a mango tree with branches adorned with many leaves and white petals.” The Tibetan *a mra* is equivalent to the Sanskrit *āmra*, *āmraphala* (Negi 1993: 7590), “the mango tree.” The type of the tree is not mentioned in MSV-C. Rhi (1991: 278) renders as, “He rooted up various beautiful trees in the forest which had many flowers and fruits with birds singing in harmony” (取彼種種奇妙林樹。花果資繁好鳥和鳴).

⁽²⁶³⁾ See Sasaki 2017.

⁽²⁶⁴⁾ Frauwallner 1956: 195–197.

⁽²⁶⁵⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 197.

their exhibiting differences from other Gilgit manuscripts containing *Vinaya* texts; for instance they differ in their leaf size, the small number of lines, and – at least in one case – the very low folio numbers (36–37, 39, 41 and 46 in serial no. 21 versus 143 in serial no. 56h). The Gilgit *Vinaya* manuscript preserved in the National Archives of India is inscribed with ten lines on each side, while these two manuscripts, serial no. 21 and 56h, are inscribed with four and six lines respectively.²⁶⁶ Previous research has only identified the *Vinayavastu*, *Prātimokṣa* and *Karmavācanā* in the Gilgit *Vinaya* manuscripts.²⁶⁷ It cannot be a manuscript written for only the *Mahāprātihāryasūtra*, as this text would not be long enough to fill the pages. The *Mahāprātihāryasūtra* does not seem to have found any inclusion in the Sūtrapīṭaka of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins. If our two manuscripts originally belonged to a collection from the region, it was certainly not an Āgama collection like the *Dīrghāgama*; for even though the manuscripts of both share certain similarities in material (birch-bark), script (Gilgit/ Bamiyan Type II or Proto-Śāradā dated after the sixth century CE) and provenance, “the area of Greater Gandhāra and that certain indications point in the direction of Gilgit”²⁶⁸, the size of the *Dīrghāgama*, which is approximately 50 x 10 cm, is larger than the manuscripts of the *Mahāprātihāryasūtra*. They also do not fit the *Samyuktāgama* in the Virginia Collection, which is written with ten lines on each side.²⁶⁹ Therefore the manuscripts cannot belong to either the *Vinaya* manuscripts or the *sūtra* preserved in the Āgama manuscripts. They must have belonged to another class of literature, which presently cannot be identified.

The folio carries the number 36 on its recto side in serial no. 21, even the text begins with the very small *akṣaras* added in the upper margin of folio 41verso. Folio number 36 indicates that the text, or the collection which preceded the *Mahāprātihāryasūtra* on the foregoing 35 folios, was not very long. It appears to either represent a so-called composite manuscript that consists of a number of single texts that do not directly belong together, such as, the mixture of *sūtras* and *avadānas* as seen in the compilation of the *Divyāvadāna*, to contain selected texts in a non-canonical order, or perhaps to include texts that are used in ritual or are regarded as possessing a protective or apotropaic function. Alternatively, it may simply express the personal predilection of their owner for certain texts. One comparable manuscript is found in Hartmann’s article on **Āryikā-sūtra* (2017), which is also handed down in a composite manuscript found in Central Asia, and, interestingly, also has a parallel in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*.²⁷⁰ Hartmann suggests it is “most likely, these manuscripts have more to tell about the needs and interests of the Buddhists at that time than those of the canonical collections.”²⁷¹

Apart from the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition, three versions of the *Mahāprātihāryasūtra* are quoted in Bhavya’s *Tarkajvālā*. He assigns them to three different schools, the Prajñaptivādin-Bahuśrutīyas, the Caitikas and the Gokulikas; but since he does not indicate the immediate source, it remains unclear whether they are works in the Sūtrapīṭaka of those

⁽²⁶⁶⁾ See Clarke 2014; von Hinüber 2014.

⁽²⁶⁷⁾ Some manuscripts in the private Collection such as the Virginia Collection are identified by Klaus Wille as the *Vinayavibhaṅga* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, see Hartmann and Wille 2014: 146–149.

⁽²⁶⁸⁾ Hartmann and Wille 2014: 137.

⁽²⁶⁹⁾ Ibid., p. 147.

⁽²⁷⁰⁾ Hartmann 2017: 76–79.

⁽²⁷¹⁾ Ibid., p. 77.

schools (if they had one at all). The three unfortunately relatively short quotations do not coincide with each other. None of them have any relation to the *Mahāprātihāryasūtra*, which we find in the Mūlasarvāstivāda texts although the wording of the quotes is preserved only in Tibetan translation, similar to the case of Prajñāvarman's *Udānavargavivarāṇa* and Śamathadeva's *Abhidharmakośopāyikāṭikā*. While they cannot contribute to the comparative study of the various versions, they certainly show that the tradition of the Great Miracle narrative is broad and inconsistent. Peter Skilling states that, "The citations show that in addition to the *Prātihāryasūtra* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins – which does not contain the passage or verses – the Prajñāptivādin-Bahuśrutīyas, Caitikas, Gokulika transmitted their own *Mahāprātihāryasūtras*."²⁷² The *sūtra* is not found in the *Vinaya* and/or Suttapiṭaka of the Theravādins. It has been incorporated into the Pāli tradition, but apparently only after completion of canonical collections. This could reinforce the presumption of a late composition.

Previous studies have identified these two Gilgit manuscripts of the *Mahāprātihāryasūtra* with the *Prātihāryasūtra* of the *Divyāvadāna*, and thereby classified the works within the *avadāna* section. Despite obvious relations between the two, and the fact they are Mūlasarvāstivāda works, my study has shown that the Gilgit versions do not depend on the *Prātihāryasūtra*: divergences in the narrative sequence and a lack of coherency in the contents of the latter warrant such a conclusion.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Jens-Uwe Hartmann for serving as a valued supervisor and teacher, for reading these Sanskrit fragments, for introducing me to the methodology required to prepare a critical edition, Prof. Dr. Johannes Schneider and Dr. Gudrun Melzer for commenting on the Sanskrit manuscript and the Tibetan MSV, Prof. Dr. Peter Skilling for his helpfulness, his encouragement, for having passed on to me all of his personal notes and material on the *Mahāprātihāryasūtra*.

Abbreviations

- Av-klp Das, S. C. and Hari Mohan Vidyābhūṣaṇa, eds. 1887. *Avadāna Kalpalatā* with its Tibetan version (Bibliotheca Indica; Collection of Oriental Works). Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press.
- Avś Speyer, J. S., ed. 1958 [1902–1909]. *Avadānaçataka: A Century of Edifying Tales Belonging to the Hīnayāna*. The Hague: Mouton & Co.
- BhīKaVā Bhikṣuṇīkarmavācānā
- BHSD Edgerton, Franklin. 1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, vol. 2: Dictionary. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- cf. confer
- cp. compare
- D *sDe dge* (Derge) xylograph *bKa"gyur* (TBRC)
- Divy Cowell, E. B., and Robert A. Neil, eds. [1866] 1987. *The Divyāvadāna: A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends now first edited from the Nepalese Sanskrit Mss. in Cambridge and Paris*. Delhi: Indological Book House.
- DN Rhys Davids, T. W. and J. Estlin Carpenter, eds. 1890–1911. *The Dīgha Nikāya*. 3 vols. London: Pali Text Society.
- ed. edited (pl. edd.); edition (pl. eds.)
- FE Facsimile Edition
- GBM Vira, Raghu and Lokesh Chandra. 1959–1974. *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)*. Śata-Piṭaka Series Volume 10, parts 1–10. Delhi: The International Academy of Indian Culture (reprinted as: *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, revised and enlarged compact facsimile edition*. Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica Series 150, 151, 152, Delhi 1995 in three parts).

⁽²⁷²⁾ Skilling 1997b: 612–613.

- GM Dutt, Nalinaksha, ed. 1939–1959. *Gilgit Manuscripts*. 4 vols. Srinagar: Calcutta Oriental Press.
- GRETEL Göttingen Register of Electronic Texts in Indian Languages and related indological materials from Central and Southeast Asia (http://www.sub.uni-goettingen.de/ebene_1/fiindolo/gretil.htm).
- Ms. Manuscript (pl. Mss.)
- MSV the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*
- MSV-C the Chinese Translation of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*
- MSV-T the Tibetan Translation of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*
- Mvy Ishihama, Y. and Fukuda, Y. 1989. *A New Critical Edition of the Mahāvīyūtpatti*. *Studia Tibetica* 16.
- N *sNar thang* xylograph *bKa''gyur*
- p. page (pl. pp.)
- PrS(Divy) the *Prātihāryasūtra* of the *Divyāvādāna*, ed. E. B. Cowell and R. A. Neil → Divy
- PrS(Divy.M)-Ms. I the *Prātihāryasūtra* of the *Divyāvādānamālā* from the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project no. 3/680
- PrS(Divy.M)-Ms. II the *Prātihāryasūtra* of the *Divyāvādānamālā* from the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project no. 3/295
- PTSD Rhys Davids, T. W. and W. Stede, ed. 1921–1925. *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary*. London
- Q Peking xylograph *Kanjur-Tanjur*, Qianlong edition
- r recto
- S sTog Palace manuscript *bKa''gyur*
- SBV Gnoli, Raniero, ed. 1977–1978. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu. Being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*. 2 vols. (Serie Orientale Roma 49/1–2). Roma.
- Skt. Sanskrit
- SWTF Bechert, Heinz, ed. 1973–. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*, Begonnen von Ernst Waldschmidt. Göttingen.
- v verso
- WTS Hartmann, Jens-Uwe and Thomas O. Höllmann, eds. 2005–. *Wörterbuch der tibetischen Schriftsprache*. Im Auftrag der Kommission für zentral-und ostasiatische Studien der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- T. Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō (CBETA, 2014)
- Tib. Tibetan language
- Trans. Translation

References

- Appleton, Naomi
2013 “The Second Decade of the *Avadānaśataka*”. *Asian Literature and Translation* 1.7: 1–36.
- Bentor, Yael
1988 “The Redactions of the *Adbhutadharmaparyāya* from Gilgit*”. *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 11.2: 21–52.
- Buffetrille, Katia and Donald S. Lopez Jr., trans.
2010 *Introduction to the history of Indian Buddhism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Burnouf, Eugène
1876 [1844] *Introduction à l'histoire du buddhisme indien*. 2nd. ed. Paris: Maisonneuve.
- Chakravarti, Uma
1987 *The Social Dimensions of Early Buddhism*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Chandra, Lokesh
1959 “A note on the Gilgit manuscripts”. *Journal of the Oriental Institute* (Baroda): 135–140.
- Clarke, Shayne
2014 *Vinaya Texts. Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India. Facsimile Edition, Volume I*. New Delhi/Tokyo: The National Archives of India/The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University.
- Das, Sarat Chandra, and Vidyābhūṣaṇa, Hari Mohan, eds.
1888 *Avadāna Kalpalatā: a Collection of Legendary Stories about the Bodhisattva*, vol. 1. Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press.
- Dās, Bhūṣaṇa Çandra
1897 “Story of Prātihārya”. *Journal of the Buddhist Text and Anthropological Society* 5.3: 17–20.
- Dhammadinnā, Bhikkhunī
2015 “Women's Predictions to Buddhahood in Middle-Period Literature”. *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 22: 481–531.
- Feer, Léon, trans.

- 1979 [1891] *Avadāna-çataka: Cent Légendes Bouddhiques*. Paris: Annales du Musée Guimet 18.
- Fiordalis, David V.
2014 “The Buddha’s Great Miracle at Śrāvastī: a Translation from the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya”. *Asian Literature and Translation* 2.3: 1–33.
- Foucher, Alfred
1909 “Le ‘Grand Miracle’ du Buddha à Çrāvastī”. *Journal Asiatique* 13: 5–78.
- Frauwallner, E.
1956 *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*. L. Petech, trans. Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- Harrison, Paul and Helmut Eimer
1997 “Kanjur and Tanjur Sigla: A Proposal for Standardization”. In Helmut Eimer (ed.). *Transmission of the Tibetan Canon: Papers Presented at a Panel of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies*. Graz 1995 (xi–xiv). Wien: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe
1997 “Studies on the Gilgit Texts: The *Sarvadharmaguṇavyūharājasūtra*”. In: Dhammaratana, Bhikkhu Tampalawela (ed.): *Dharmadūta: Mélanges offerts au Vénérable Thich Huyên-Vi à l’occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*. (135–140). Paris: Éd. You-Freng.
2017 “King Prasenajit Bemoans the Death of His Grandmother: A Study of the Manuscript SHT 7185*”. *International Journal of Buddhist Thought & Culture* 27.1: 73–105.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe and Klaus Wille
2014 “The Manuscript of the Dīrghāgama and the Private Collection in Virginia”. In Paul Harrison and Jens-Uwe Hartmann (eds.). *From Birch Bark to Digital Data: Recent Advances in Buddhist Manuscript Research: Papers Presented at the Conference Indic Buddhist Manuscripts: the State of the Field, Stanford, June 15 - 19, 2009* (137–155). Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe and Thomas O. Höllmann., Herausgeber.
2015 *Wörterbuch der tibetischen Schriftsprache*. 5 Band. München: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- von Hinüber, Oskar
1979 “Die Erforschung der Gilgit-Handschriften. (Funde buddhistischer Sanskrit-Handschriften, I)”. *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen I. Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 12: 329–359.
2009 *Kleine Schriften Teil II*, Herausgegeben von Harry Falk und Walter Slaje. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
2014 “The Gilgit Manuscripts An Ancient Buddhist Library in Modern Research”. In Paul Harrison and Jens-Uwe Hartmann (eds.). *From Birch Bark to Digital Data: Recent Advances in Buddhist Manuscript Research: Papers Presented at the Conference Indic Buddhist Manuscripts: the State of the Field, Stanford, June 15–19, 2009* (79–135). Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Hu-von Hinüber, Haiyan
1994 *Das Poṣadhavastu. Vorschriften für die buddhistische Beichtfeier im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins*. Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalische Fachpublikationen.
- Kudo, Noriyuki
2013 “A Newly Identified Manuscript of the *Pāramitāsamāsa* in the Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts”. *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 16: 255–266.
2017 *Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India Facsimile Edition Volume III Avadānas and Miscellaneous Texts*. New Delhi/Tokyo: The National Archives of India/The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University.
- Lamotte, Étienne
1970–1981 [1944–1980] *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāsāstra)*. 5 vols. Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 25, 26, 2, 12, 24. Louvain: Université de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste.
- Melzer, Gudrun
2010 *Ein Abschnitt aus dem Dīrghāgama Teil 1*. (Ph.D. Dissertation). Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München.
- Miyaji, Akira
1979 “Divyāvadāna dai jūni sho ‘Prātihārya-sūtra’ wayaku”. *Bunka Kiyō (Hirosaki daigaku kyōyōbu)* 13: 117–141.
- Nagashima, Shodo

- 1975 “Taishō Daigaku Shōzō Chibetto Daizōkyō Naruta-ban Kanjūru Mokuroku”. *Taishō Daigaku kenkyū kiyō/ Memoirs of Taishō University* 61: 726–760.
- Nattier, Jan
2007 [2003] *A Few Good Men: The Boddhisattva path Based on the Ugraparipṛcchā, a Mahāyāna Sūtra*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Negi, J. S.
1993–2005 *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary*. 16 Vols. Sarnath: Dictionary Unit Central Institute of higher Tibetan Studies.
- Rhi, Ju-hyung
1991 *Gandhāran Images of the “Śrāvastī Miracle”: An Iconographic Reassessment*. (Ph.D. Dissertation). University of California, Berkeley.
- Rotman, Andy, trans.
2008 *Divine Stories: Part I*. Boston: Wisdom.
- Sander, Lore
1968 *Paläographisches zu den Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Supplementband 8)*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
1983 “Einige neue Aspekte zur Entwicklung der Brāhmī in Gilgit und Bamiyan (ca. 2.–7. Jh. n. Chr.)”. In K. Röhrborn and Wolfgang Veenker (ed.). *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien: Vorträge des Hamburger Symposions vom 2 Juli bis 5 Juli 1981*. (113–124). Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
2007 “Confusion of Terms and Terms of Confusion in Indian Palaeography”. In Karin Preisendanz (ed.). *Expanding and Merging Horizons: Contributions to South Asian and Cross-Cultural Studies in Commemoration of Wilhelm Halbfass (121–139)*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
2014 “Dating and Localizing Undated Manuscripts”. In Paul Harrison and Jens-Uwe Hartmann (eds.). *From Birch Bark to Digital Data: Recent Advances in Buddhist Manuscript Research: Papers Presented at the Conference Indic Buddhist Manuscripts: the State of the Field, Stanford, June 15–19, 2009 (171–186)*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Sasaki, Shizuka
2017 “Why Does the Mūlasarvāda-vinaya Contain a Large Number of Tales?” Paper presented at the 18th Congress of the International Association of Buddhist Studies (IABS) Toronto.
- Silk, J. A.
2007 “Garlanding as Sexual Invitation: Indian Buddhist Evidence”. *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 50: 5–10.
- Skilling, Peter
1997a *Mahāsūtras: Great Discourses of the Buddha*. 2 vols. Oxford: Pali Text Society.
1997b “Citations from the Scriptures of the ‘Eighteen Schools’ in the *Tarkajvālā*”. In Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, eds. *Bauddhavidhyāsudhākarah: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday (605–614)*. Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- Skilling Peter, Saerji and Prapod Assavavirulhakarn
2016 “A Possible Sanskrit Parallel to the Pali Uruvelasutta”. In Jens Braarvig (ed.). *Manuscript in the Schøyen Collection Buddhist Manuscript*, vol. 4 (159–182). Oslo: Hermes Publishing.
- Skorupski, Tadeusz
1985 *A catalogue of the sTog Palace Kanjur* (Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica. Series Maior IV). Tokyo.
- Speyer, J. S., ed.
1902 “Critical Remarks on the Text of the *Divyāvadāna*”. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 16: 103–130 and 340–361.
- Suzuki, D.T., ed.
1955–62 *The Tibetan Tripitaka*. Tokyo: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute.
- Ui, Hakuju. et al.
1934 *Chibetto Daizōkyō Sōmokuoku / A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons* (Bkaḥ-ḥgur and Bstan-ḥgur). Edited by Hakuju Ui, Munetada Suzuki, Yenshō Kanakura, Tōkan Tada. With an index volumn. Sendai: Tōkoku Imperial University [reprinted in one vol. Tokyo 1970].
- Vaidya, P. L., ed.
1958 *Avadānaçataka* (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts No. 19). Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.
1959 *Divyāvadāna* (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts No. 20). Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.
- Vogel, Claus
1970 *The Teachings of the Six Heretics*. According to the Pravrajyāvastu of the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Edited and Rendered into English. Wiesbaden: Kommissionsverlag Franz Steiner GMBH.