

UCLA

UCLA Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Mahâyâna and the Gift: Theories and Practices

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7kw809f3>

Author

McCombs, Jason Matthew

Publication Date

2014

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Mahāyāna and the Gift: Theories and Practices

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy
in Asian Languages and Cultures

by

Jason Matthew McCombs

2014

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Mahāyāna and the Gift: Theories and Practices

by

Jason Matthew McCombs

Doctor of Philosophy in Asian Languages and Cultures

University of California, Los Angeles, 2014

Professor Gregory Robert Schopen, Chair

This dissertation examines the theory and practice of a crucial aspect of the premodern religions of India: gift giving. Although much has been written on gift giving in India, rarely have the theory and practice of giving in India been considered simultaneously. I focus in particular on the role of the gift in Indian Mahāyāna, a Buddhist movement that appeared around the beginning of the Common Era and lasted until the disappearance of Buddhism from India in the late medieval period. Very little attention has been paid to gift giving and Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism, in part because the scholarship on Indian Mahāyāna has concentrated largely on its origins and early sources.

Mahāyāna gift theory is analyzed through a close reading of a range of textual sources, including both Sūtra and Śāstra, two major genres of Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts. As part of this project, I categorize the various types of discourses on the gift that appear in Mahāyāna Sūtras. I also translate two Mahāyāna Buddhist texts that have until now not been translated

into a Western language. The first text I translate is the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*, which is preserved only in the Tibetan Kanjur. The second is the *Dānapāṭala*, a chapter of a Mahāyāna Śāstric text called the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* that is still extant in Sanskrit. The *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* exhibits parallels with some Mahāyāna Sūtras in their treatment of gift giving, but sharply diverges from others. And even though the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* and *Dānapāṭala* ostensibly address the same topic and come from the same religious tradition, they are markedly different texts. It is clear that Mahāyāna textual discourse on the gift is extremely diverse. There are competing Mahāyāna gift theories rather than a unified Mahāyāna gift theory.

Mahāyāna giving in practice is explored through the epigraphic record. After first establishing how to identify a Mahāyāna inscription, I catalogue and analyze the content of Mahāyāna donative inscriptions. Two key patterns emerge. First, many Mahāyāna donative inscriptions express the wish that all beings attain a kind of knowledge possessed by awakened beings. Second, almost all Mahāyāna inscriptions record gifts of images. In neither pattern do we see much evidence of Mahāyāna textual theory, a discrepancy that raises important questions.

The dissertation of Jason McCombs is approved.

Stephanie J. Watkins

Robert L. Brown

Robert E. Buswell

Gregory Robert Schopen, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2014

For Oona, who doesn't know why but will

Table of Contents

I. Mahāyāna and the Gift: An Array of Sources.....	1
II. Mahāyāna Sūtras and the Gift.....	5
Epithets.....	17
Giving to a buddha.....	19
Rewards for giving.....	24
Giving as a basis for comparison.....	27
Context of awakening.....	32
Giving in relation to the other Perfections.....	36
Redefinitions.....	38
Giving the body.....	42
Giving the Dharma.....	49
Promotion of lay giving.....	55
Ideal recipients and legitimate practice.....	59
Criticism of monastic greed and illegitimate practice.....	64
III. Giving in Theory: The <i>Dānapāramitā-sūtra</i>	88
A. Introduction.....	88
B. English Translation.....	120
C. Tibetan Text.....	184
IV. Giving in Theory: The <i>Dānapāṭala</i>	252
A. Introduction.....	252
B. English Translation.....	274
V. Giving in Practice: The Mahāyāna Epigraphic Record.....	311
VI. A Long View of Indian Mahāyāna History.....	387
Bibliography.....	395

Tables

Table 1: <i>yad atra puṇyaṃ</i> formula without <i>anuttarajñānāvaptaye</i>	356
Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions.	359

Acknowledgements

A few years ago, through poor planning on my part my in-laws attended a talk on the Buddhist site of Borobodur. Afterwards, I jokingly asked my mother-in-law whether she would consider going back to school for a doctoral degree. “That would be the *last* thing I would choose,” she replied cheekily. Later, she asked me about my coursework, and I tried to explain to her that my classes were often very small, with maybe a couple of students and a professor. “Well, that should tell you something,” she said.

Indeed.

With such an odd career choice, I have many people to thank—for their patience as much as their support.

From the academic side of things, there are more people who deserve thanks than I can mention here. I owe special thanks, of course, to my UCLA committee members, Stephanie Jamison, Robert Brown, Robert Buswell, and especially Gregory Schopen, for their suggestions, criticism, and encouragement. I must also thank those away from UCLA who generously helped me in ways big and small with this dissertation—Nick Morrissey, Kazunobu Matsuda, Satoshi Hiraoka, Andy Rotman, Jason Neelis, Paul Harrison, Alexander von Rospatt, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Burkhard Quessel, Bruce Williams, Nobumi Iyanaga, and Gary Thomas.

And I must express my gratitude to my brothers-in-arms and fellow graduate students, Caleb Carter, Ryoji Kishino, and Wayne Bass, who challenged and inspired me more than they know.

I am above all indebted to my friends and family. To my best friends, Aaron and Scott—the *real* writers—for all you have done for me over the years. To my parents, brothers, nieces, nephews, and in-laws (especially my mother-in-law, for that biting sense of humor). And to Peggy, my wife and dear friend, for her constant support and understanding.

Finally, to Oona. You came to us almost four years ago now, and I can say without hesitation that they have been the best years of my life. Things that were bad before are now good. Things that were good are even better. I appreciate every moment I have had with you, and can't wait for everything to come.

Vita

Jason McCombs received his B.S. in Biology and Religion from the University of Michigan, his M.Ed. from Harvard University in 2003, and his M.A. in Buddhist Studies from UCLA in 2009. His main focus lies in Indian religious and intellectual history, particularly of Mahāyāna Buddhism. Other interests include Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Pāli literature, intertextuality, epigraphy, religious identity, and gift theory and practice. He carried out his dissertation research under a fellowship from UCLA. He has been the lecturer for Introduction to Buddhism for the Department of Asian Languages and Cultures at UCLA for six academic terms.

I. Mahāyāna and the Gift: An Array of Sources

It would be difficult to exaggerate the role of the gift in the history of the religions of Ancient and Classical India. Without giving, Indian religious specialists—or, in many cases, the gods themselves—would often have had no means of subsistence, since they were wholly occupied with looking after the spiritual welfare of their followers. Indeed, much the same could be said for religious specialists—priests, monks, what have you—of any religion, from any time period, the world over. Conversely, without giving, Indian donors would have had no opportunities to earn spiritual merit and improve their fate in the afterlife. We should not be surprised, then, that *Manusmṛti* 1.86 describes giving as the primary aspect of religious life of the decadent age of Kali in which we are said to live currently. Nor should we be surprised to find dozens of Vedic passages dealing with gift exchange between donors and sacrificial officiants, or many passages in *Dharmasūtras* and *Dharmaśāstras* attempting to normalize legally the behavior of donors, the character of donees, or the content and timing of gifts.

The Buddhist case was no different. Buddhist monks and nuns in India appear to have always been economically dependent on the donations of lay members (as well as their monastics) to supply requisites necessary for the pursuit of the religious life. Such requisites included, citing a standard Buddhist list, alms food, robes, bedding and seats, and medicine. Buddhist inscriptions from India, numbering in the thousands, largely record gifts such as these to the Saṅgha. The entire monastic Vinaya, whichever version or “sect’s” one chooses to privilege, might best be summarized as a dizzying array of narrative-embedded rules designed by monks in order to regulate the relations between Buddhist monastics and lay members, relations predicated on the reciprocal exchange of material donations and spiritual merit. Moreover, Buddhist doctrinal lists of the *pāramitās* or “Perfections,” though they vary in the

number, order, and content of the Perfections, all begin with *dāna*, “giving” or “generosity.” In perhaps the most famous story known to the Buddhist world, the so-called historical Buddha in his penultimate human life as Prince Vessantara/*Viśvaṃtara* is said to achieve this first Perfection by giving away all his possessions, the white elephant upon which the prosperity of his kingdom depends, and eventually even his own wife and children. It is no accident that the Buddha awakens in the next life as Siddhārtha Gautama, the Perfection of Giving being one of the final steps in a countless succession of lives whereby he is believed to have acquired the prodigious amount of merit necessary to reach enlightenment.

Around the turn of the Common Era, a diffuse Buddhist movement gradually appeared in India. Scholars, sometimes anachronistically, now call this movement the Mahāyāna, though the use of the definite article *the* no doubt reduces complex and still largely unknown historical processes to a unitary phenomenon. Whatever Mahāyāna was or was not, it is only natural to think that giving, since it was central to the maintenance of Buddhism for the 1,500 plus years of its existence in India, could very well have been an important issue for Indian Mahāyāna as well. But there has been no systematic attempt to track the issue of gift giving in Mahāyāna sources, nor any consideration of how Mahāyāna’s relationships to the Indian culture of giving might have shaped its complicated history.

I will endeavor to fill this desideratum by examining how gift giving appears in a range of Mahāyāna sources. Most studies of Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism are limited to texts, and ones that are not limited in this way rarely take textual and nontextual evidence into account at the same time. This dissertation, however, explores Mahāyāna and the gift using textual, epigraphic, and, to a small degree, art-historical data.

Indian gift theory addresses a variety of factors that feature in gift exchange—who should give and receive gifts, what should be given, when and in what situations giving should occur, what results from giving, and so on. Mahāyāna texts formulate gift theories too. They represent one multicolored thread in the Indian theoretical discourse on gift giving. The gift theories propounded in Mahāyāna texts intersect with but also sharply diverge from each other as well as the gift theories of non-Mahāyāna Indian religious texts. Epigraphic and material sources, on the other hand, reflect certain aspects of giving in practice. They allow us to glimpse which facets of gift theory, if any, were actualized in real gift exchanges.

Chapter II looks at the gift theories of what Mahāyāna Buddhism is mostly known by: its Sūtra literature. Because Mahāyāna Sūtra literature is so vast, I only consider what I hope is a representative survey of texts. Mahāyāna Sūtras tend to be repetitive and formulaic, so it is perhaps not unexpected that they refer to and discuss giving in restricted and stereotypical ways. I identify twelve categories related to gift giving in Mahāyāna Sūtras, which occupies most of chapter II. For each category, I provide textual examples, references, and discussion. The end of chapter II considers the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* in light of these twelve categories, attempting to take stock of incongruities between the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* and what other Mahāyāna Sūtras say about giving.

Chapter III presents an annotated translation and study of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*. Although it is one of only a few Mahāyāna texts devoted to the important issue of gift giving, I have yet to see it mentioned in scholarship, let alone studied. Part A of chapter III introduces the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*, affording important background information on the *pāramitās* and outlining the structure and major themes within the text. Part A also dates the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* based on evidence internal to the text and deals with closely related Mahāyāna Sūtras (or

parts of Mahāyāna Sūtras). The text is translated in part B. The edited Tibetan text, based on six recensions from the Kanjur, is given in part C. The *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* seems to be extant only in Tibetan translation, being included in the *mDo* section of the Kanjur.

Chapter IV provides an annotated translation of and brief introduction to another Mahāyāna text on gift giving, the *Dānapāṭala*. The *Dānapāṭala* is the ninth chapter of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, which is itself the fifteenth section of the enormous *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*. The gift theory articulated in the *Dānapāṭala* is quite dissimilar to that of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*, which is largely due to the fact that the two texts belong to different genres. Much of the content and style of the *Dānapāṭala* stems from its being a Śāstric text. The *Dānapāṭala* reveals a great degree of familiarity with Indian custom and law on the part of its author(s). All this will be treated in part A of chapter IV. The translation of the *Dānapāṭala* is in part B.

Finally, chapter V investigates Mahāyāna donative inscriptions. It first reexamines the so-called Mahāyāna epigraphic formula and the *śākyabhikṣu/paramopāsaka* question before establishing criteria for Mahāyāna inscriptions. The relevant inscriptions, which mostly record the gifts of images, are presented in two annotated tables. The content of the inscriptions is then analyzed in consideration of Mahāyāna textual discourse on the gift.

II. Mahāyāna Sūtras and the Gift

The purpose of this chapter is twofold. I will begin, after some theoretical considerations, by presenting a typology of how giving appears in Mahāyāna Sūtras. This is more an attempt at a description than a construction of an argument. Then I will try to situate the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* within or relative to the variegated discourse on giving found within Mahāyāna Sūtra literature. Since this particular text appears to have been composed at a relatively late date, at least when compared to the bulk of Indian Mahāyāna literature, it stands in a unique position in the Mahāyāna textual conversation on the gift.

First of all, a caveat is in order. Anyone familiar with Mahāyāna Sūtra literature knows all too well just how large of a corpus it is. There are several hundred Sūtras known to us, and it does not seem unreasonable to suggest that there were many others that did not survive the ravages of time. Many Mahāyāna Sūtras—whether they were written in Sanskrit or related Prakrits, and/or translated into Chinese or Tibetan—have not even been read by scholars, let alone translated into a modern language or thoroughly studied. So the giving typology that I offer here is necessarily incomplete. Indeed, any “conclusions” scholars make based on Mahāyāna Sūtras will, for the time being at least, be tentative and provisional. (This point cannot be stressed enough. It is no coincidence that almost all characterizations of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India bear a striking resemblance to the sorts of things a small number of Mahāyāna Sūtras—those that, for whatever reason, scholars have chosen to study—happen to say. Based on the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra*, for instance, Mahāyāna in India is portrayed as emphasizing the laity; based on texts advocating meditation, on the other hand, we formulate hypotheses regarding the importance of meditation in the development of Mahāyāna; and so on. This is not even to touch on the sort of skewed historical picture one gets by using textual

sources alone.) In reality, any reliable intertextual study based on Mahāyāna Sūtras might be several decades away and may require the aid of computers, in addition to the sort of modeling coming out of the digital humanities, to deal with the multiple languages in which Mahāyāna Sūtras are preserved and to sort through masses of literary data.

But one does not need to read through every Mahāyāna text to be able to identify patterns. Even a casual acquaintance with them makes it abundantly clear that they repeat themselves and share a great deal of material. Given the fact that Mahāyāna Sūtras, like most Buddhist literature, tend to use similar vocabulary and abound in common formulas, repetition, tropes, numerical lists, and so on, these texts share almost as much as they do not. In this light, it is probably prudent to view Mahāyāna Sūtras as products of related religious communities, not as the literary works of individual, “creative” authors.¹ A thorough

¹ See Jan Nattier, *A Few Good Men: The Bodhisattva Path according to The Inquiry of Ugra (Ugraparipṛcchā)* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2003), 51-59. Paul Harrison prefers to characterize the genesis of Mahāyāna Sūtras as a “creative recasting” of shared materials, with a particular emphasis on the forest setting, the technology of writing, meditative visions, and even dreams in their production. See “Mediums and Messages: Reflections on the Production of Mahāyāna Sūtras,” *Eastern Buddhist* 35.1-2 (2003): 115-151, esp. 141-142.

David Drewes rejects the idea of separate Mahāyāna communities, and therefore I assume he would not think much of what I have to say about intertextuality. He states the following:

The one significant fact cited for the existence of multiple Mahāyāna groups is that Mahāyāna sūtras tend to advocate divergent doctrinal or philosophical views, but it is not clear why this should be taken as evidence for separate communities. . . . Rather than representing the established doctrines and practices of distinct communities, various Mahāyāna sūtras seem more likely simply to represent the views and imaginations of different Mahāyāna authors. Instead of distinct communities, the varying perspectives of Mahāyāna sūtras can better be taken as evidence that the movement encouraged innovation and made room for theoretical diversity.

I cannot follow the evidence Drewes uses for this position. He notes the lack of archaeological evidence for separate Mahāyāna communities, but there is little to no archaeological evidence for Mahāyāna at all in the period Drewes discusses. One could just as easily say that there is no archaeological evidence that Mahāyānists did not live in separate communities. He remarks that “Mahāyānists accept the authenticity of sūtras with a wide spectrum of divergent perspectives today,” but what is going on today has zero bearing on Mahāyānists in India two thousand years ago. That Chinese and Tibetan translators “usually translated multiple sūtras with divergent perspectives” is similarly irrelevant to the Indian situation. Drewes also observes that the anthologists of Mahāyāna Sūtras and authors of Mahāyāna Śāstras quote from multiple Mahāyāna Sūtras. But what the anthologists and Śāstric authors were doing represents a later development of a more homogenous Mahāyāna. And these anthologists

examination of the material shared throughout the entire corpus of Mahāyāna Sūtras, therefore, may help us map out the relationships between them and lead to genealogical models for Mahāyāna texts.² This in turn could lead to a better understanding of early Mahāyāna history, when “composing,” redacting, and interacting with texts—reading them, copying them, worshiping them, etc.—may have been a or *the* dominant form of religious praxis.³

and authors would have been the most learned of monks, i.e., those who would have been most likely to be familiar with many Mahāyāna texts. (And if Drewes refers to the *Sūtrasamuccaya* with “the earliest of which [Mahāyāna Sūtra anthology] may have been composed in some form as early as the second or third century,” the evidence being collected by Paul Harrison will push that text’s date back several centuries and rule out its attribution to Nāgārjuna.) Despite the faulty evidence, I still think Drewes’s overarching idea merits further exploration. See “Early Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism I: Recent Scholarship,” *Religion Compass* 4.2 (2010): 61.

² Of course, Mahāyāna texts were organized several times by Buddhists themselves in the formation of the Tibetan and Chinese Canons. Texts were arranged, for example, into the Perfection of Wisdom, *Ratnakūṭa*, and other Mahāyāna divisions within the Tibetan Kanjur. These divisions, however, are based on thematic content, and as such it may be helpful to highlight a potential parallel from the natural sciences. Early classifications of the Earth’s fauna and flora were based on similarities in the gross morphological characteristics of species. As it turns out, such classifications sometimes came to bear little resemblance to the actual history of life that evolutionary biologists now understand in considerable detail. That is, just because two species look the same does not necessarily mean that they share a close evolutionary history. It remains to be seen whether the Tibetan and Chinese groupings of Mahāyāna texts are related to the historical genesis of those texts on the ground in India. Much the same could be said about the organization of texts produced by modern scholars, perhaps the most thorough example being found in Hajime Nakamura, *Indian Buddhism: A Survey with Bibliographical Notes* (Hirakata, Japan: KUFS Publication, 1980).

³ We are indebted to Gregory Schopen for initiating the conversation almost forty years ago on Mahāyāna texts and the cult of the book in India. See his “The Phrase *sa pṛthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet* in the *Vajracchedikā*: Notes on the Cult of the Book in Mahāyāna,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India: More Collected Papers* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2005), 25-62; some changes in interpretation in his “On Sending the Monks Back to Their Books: Cult and Conservatism in Early Mahāyāna Buddhism,” in *ibid.*, 153, n. 118; and more recently his “The Book as a Sacred Object in Private Homes in Early or Medieval India,” in *Medieval and Early Modern Devotional Objects in Global Perspective*, ed. Elizabeth Robertson and Jennifer Jahner (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 37-60. Recent art-historical work has revealed how one such Mahāyāna book cult may have manifested itself at Ajaṅṭā, which will be dealt with in chapter V. For objections to Schopen, see David Drewes, “Revisiting the phrase ‘*sa pṛthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet*’ and the Mahāyāna cult of the book,” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 50.2 (2007): 101-143; Drewes, “Early Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism I,” 60; Drewes, “Early Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism II: New Perspectives,” *Religion Compass* 4.2 (2010): 68-69. See

Moreover, the relationships between Mahāyāna texts may reflect relationships between the actual Mahāyāna communities that created them. (Jonathan Silk, in fact, defines early Mahāyāna communities precisely by the texts they produced.⁴) That is, reconstructing textual relationships may allow us to get some basic sense of the level of contact between diverse Mahāyāna groups. The growing consensus posits that adherents of Mahāyāna, at least in the early period around and shortly after the turn of the Common Era, were nested within ordination lineages called Nikāyas, living side-by-side with non-Mahāyāna or Mainstream⁵ Buddhists as part of the same institutions (allowing that these terms are more than likely being used anachronistically, since the people we often want to label as Mahāyānist probably did not at first self-identify as belonging to such a group or make any distinction parallel to the

also Daniel Boucher, “The *Pratītyasamutpādagāthā* and Its Role in the Medieval Cult of Relics,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 14.1 (1991): 1-27; Jacob N. Kinnard, *Imaging Wisdom: Seeing and Knowing in the Art of Indian Buddhism* (Richmond, England: Curzon, 1999), 114-175; Kinnard, “On Buddhist ‘Bibliolaters’: Representing and Worshipping the Book in Medieval Indian Buddhism,” *Eastern Buddhist* 34.2 (2002): 94-116; Jinah Kim, *Receptacle of the Sacred: Illustrated Manuscripts and the Buddhist Book Cult in South Asia* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013); James Apple, “The phrase ‘*dharmaparyāyo hastagato*’ in Mahāyāna Buddhist literature: re-thinking the cult of the book in middle period Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 134.1 (2014): 25-50.

⁴ Jonathan Silk, “What, if Anything, is Mahāyāna Buddhism? Problems of Definition and Classification,” *Numen* 49 (2002): 369ff.

⁵ I use the term *Mainstream* out of convenience because it has taken root in the field. I use it to refer to the shared forms of Buddhist thought, literature, practice, and institutions that preceded Mahāyāna in India, that served as the matrix out of which Mahāyāna was formed, and that continued to function as the background for Mahāyāna’s entire existence in India (even as Mahāyāna came to shape that religious landscape). Thus by *Mainstream* I mean both the array of Buddhist traditions and institutions within which Mahāyāna was situated and the forms of non-Mahāyāna Buddhism against which Mahāyāna sometimes defined itself. I understand there are problems with such a catch-all choice, but I am not interested in joining the hair-splitting debate over taxonomic words, much less in muddying the waters by adding new terminology. For a helpful discussion on this topic, see Drewes, “Early Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism II,” 72-73.

modern division of “Mainstream” and “Mahāyāna”).⁶ If this turns out to be the case, presumably there had to be some form of contact between separate Mahāyāna communities spread among the various Nikāyas. I see no other way to explain the similarities in form and content in different Mahāyāna Sūtras. Such contact may have occurred through real living persons sharing ideas between Mahāyāna groups from the same time period, or through the texts themselves, with a given Mahāyāna community having access to an oral or written text created or redacted by other Mahāyāna communities. Even if we cannot pinpoint the provenance of early Mahāyāna communities and their corresponding texts, outside of extremely vague geographic descriptions like “Greater Gandhāra” or “North India,” we can still potentially map out textual similarities and model how one text influenced others, thereby tracing the degree that the ideas and literary habits of one Mahāyāna community impacted those of other communities, both contemporary and across time. Silk is the only scholar I know of to recognize the potential of studying intertextuality, so it is worthwhile to note his suggestions:

When we read this [Mahāyāna] sūtra literature, we should make an attempt to pay particular attention to its lateral internal stratification. By this I intend an analogy to archaeology, and would suggest that we should be able to distinguish not only vertical, which is to say chronological, layers, one text being later than another, but different horizontal strata of texts which may be more or less contemporaneous. Texts dating to

⁶ See especially Heinz Bechert, “Notes on the Formation of Buddhist Sects and the Origins of Mahāyāna,” in *German Scholars on India: Contributions to Indian Studies*, ed. The Cultural Department of the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany (Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1973), 6-18; Paul Harrison, “Searching for the Origins of the Mahāyāna: What are we Looking for?” *Eastern Buddhist* 28.1 (1995): 48-69; Shizuka Sasaki, “A Study on the Origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” *Eastern Buddhist* 30.1 (1997): 79-113; Paul Williams (with Anthony Tribe and Alexander Wynne), *Buddhist Thought: A complete introduction to the Indian tradition*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2012), 71-82; Silk, “What, if Anything, is Mahāyāna Buddhism?” 355-405; Juhyung Rhi, “Early Mahāyāna and Gandhāran Buddhism: An Assessment of the Visual Evidence,” *Eastern Buddhist* 35.1-2 (2003): 183ff. In addition to these few works, many others could be cited that more or less express the same view. Silk, “What, if Anything, is Mahāyāna Buddhism?” carefully and critically outlines the history of this idea.

the same period may still belong to different lineages, and may be products of distinct communities.⁷

The irony of his analogy is that an archaeology of texts is the only sort of archaeology that can tell us anything meaningful about early Mahāyāna, since it is either almost or completely absent in the Indian material record. The term “Mahāyāna,” or any idea that we might associate as being in some way inspired by Mahāyāna, for instance, does not appear in any of the hundreds of Buddhist inscriptions from the first few centuries of the Common Era, including the many inscriptions recording gifts to Nikāyas or to select members of those Nikāyas, a period in which we know Mahāyāna texts were being produced in abundance. This being the unfortunate state of affairs for those of us interested in Indian Mahāyāna, examining Mahāyāna Sūtra literature for intertextual relationships—a kind of, in Silk’s words, textual “archaeology”—is indeed the only way to measure, albeit dimly, the degree of interaction between separate Mahāyāna groups.

One significant complication for the already complicated task of charting intertextual relationships through shared material is the possibility that we would be reconstructing redactional relationships of Mahāyāna texts, not compositional relationships. Mahāyāna Sūtras may not have originally resembled each other as much as they appear to now, the resemblance stemming from textual “leveling” over the course of centuries of re-copying and editing texts. That is, the sharing of vocabulary, stock phrases, and motifs among Mahāyāna texts was the work of the copyist and redactor, not the author. Both processes, of course, could very well have occurred, with the “original” authors of Mahāyāna Sūtras drawing upon a

⁷ Silk, “What, if Anything, is Mahāyāna Buddhism?” 373-374.

familiarity with other texts to devise new ones,⁸ and later material being interpolated from stock Mahāyāna material. Our best hope to sort out the possibly convoluted histories of single texts—or, put more accurately, of the various versions of texts sharing a single title—is through comparing multiple (mostly Chinese) translations made at different points in time, although this is fraught with its own methodological problems.⁹ Daniel Boucher, using all the philological tools at the Buddhologist’s disposal, has shed the most light on just how complex Mahāyāna textual history can be. He has demonstrated in some detail the difficult path the *Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā-sūtra* traveled making its way from India to China, with Dharmarakṣa and his translation team working through—not always successfully—challenging oral and aural barriers to render a text composed in or heavily influenced by Gāndhārī Prakrit in a Chinese vernacular of the 3rd century CE. Boucher has also delineated significant differences between the Chinese translation made by Dharmarakṣa and those made later by Jñānagupta in the 6th century and by Dānapāla in the 10th century, as well as differences between the three Chinese translations and the 9th century Tibetan translation and the very late Nepalese Sanskrit

⁸ Étienne Lamotte, in reference to the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra*, long ago drew attention to the problem this causes the modern scholar who is interested in tracking sources of Buddhist Sūtras:

Mais comme une même formule ou un même cliché apparaît dans quantité de textes, il est pratiquement impossible de savoir auquel d’entre eux le Vkn [= *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*] les a empruntés. Rompu à la lecture des Sūtra, l’auteur du Vkn peut très bien les avoir tirés de sa mémoire, sans se référer, même mentalement à tel ou tel texte particulier.

Cet état de choses rend particulièrement délicat le problème des sources, les Sūtra bouddhiques n’ayant pas l’habitude de décliner leurs références.

See Lamotte, *L’Enseignement de Vimalakīrti (Vimalakīrtinirdeśa)* (Bibliothèque du Muséon 51) (Louvain: Institut Orientaliste, 1962), 60.

⁹ Gregory Schopen, for one, warns that “some—if not a great deal—of what has been said on the basis of Chinese translations about the history of an Indian text has more to do with the history of Chinese translation techniques and Chinese religious or cultural predilections than with the history of the Indian text itself.” See “The Mahāyāna and the Middle Period in Indian Buddhism: Through a Chinese Looking-Glass,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 4.

manuscripts.¹⁰ It will be through painstaking work of the kind done by Boucher that the degree of redaction present in Mahāyāna Sūtras will be able to be sorted out.¹¹ The redactional histories of single texts, in turn, will help to paint a clearer picture of the relationships between different texts.

The goal here is much more modest. I will not really attempt to trace the history of any Mahāyāna Sūtra. The *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*, one of the two primary texts of this dissertation, now only exists in a single Tibetan translation. In the absence of a Sanskrit text or other translations, it is not possible to know if and to what degree this text changed over time. (There is evidence, though, that the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* may have incorporated material from another Sūtra, which I will discuss below. But even if it does contain material from another source, there is no way to know whether that material was incorporated in an original version of the text. The Tibetan translation of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* could very well reflect the “first draft” of a Sanskrit text, despite some of that draft being “plagiarized.”) Nor will I try to tackle the monumental and now impossible task of positing genealogies of texts for the entire body of Mahāyāna Sūtras.

¹⁰ See Daniel Boucher, “Buddhist Translation Procedures in Third-Century China: A Study of Dharmarakṣa and his Translation Idiom,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1996; Boucher, “The Textual History of the *Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā*: Notes on its Third-Century Chinese Translation,” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology for the Academic Year 2000*, 4 (2001): 93-115; Boucher, *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna: A Study and Translation of the Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā-sūtra* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2008), esp. chapter 6. See also his “Gāndhārī and the Early Chinese Buddhist Translations Reconsidered: The Case of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikāsūtra*,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 118.4 (1998): 471-506.

¹¹ Similar studies on the history of “single” Mahāyāna Sūtras have been done, though not usually as detailed as Boucher’s. On the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*, for example, see Lewis Lancaster, “The Oldest Mahāyāna Sūtra: Its Significance for the Study of Buddhist Development,” *Eastern Buddhist* 8.1 (1975): 30-41. On the *Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra*, see Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 51-63.

Due to the constraints of time and space, the task at hand is only to identify patterns in the way a single topic occurs in Mahāyāna Sūtras: giving. Most of the comments above were made merely to flag possible methodological problems and to suggest that similar but more thorough and sophisticated work could lead to an increasingly clearer picture of the web of relationships between Mahāyāna texts and possibly between Mahāyāna communities themselves. But as I stated at the outset, giving has always been central to the survival of religious institutions in India, so understanding an Indian religious movement's relationship with the gift may reveal a lot about its history as an institution. Among the many possible themes to examine within Mahāyāna texts, then, giving has the potential to offer more clues about its institutional history than, say, literary discourses on emptiness, awakening, or other Mahāyāna points of doctrine.

In this effort, I will reveal tendencies in the many Mahāyāna Sūtras dealing with giving, tendencies that are not entirely dissimilar from what one sees when examining literary genres. Reiko Ohnuma has recently analyzed what she considers to be a genre of Indian Buddhist literature: the *Jātakas* or stories of former lives in which the Bodhisattva—he who would become Śākyamuni Buddha—gives away his body. For Ohnuma, what makes this group of stories a genre is not that they can be defined by the specific place and time that gave rise to them, as would be possible for something like the British Gothic novel. Nor do gift-of-the-body *Jātakas* constitute a single genre because we can identify their authors or the social and intellectual characteristics of their readers. Ohnuma's genre is, by her own admission, largely *ahistorical*, being historically delimited only by what was culturally Indian during the entire period Buddhism existed in India. Rather, Ohnuma defines the gift-of-the-body genre by the set of narrative conventions the authors of these *Jātakas* tended to follow and the “horizon of

expectations” present in those stories for the hypothetical competent Indian reader. Based on who the recipient of the Bodhisattva’s body is and whether the Bodhisattva dies because of his sacrifice, gift-of-the-body *Jātakas* fall into two major types, a small “horizon of expectations” against which a learned reader can judge variations.¹²

Despite my aforementioned hope that intertextual studies will in the future illuminate the historical context of more and more Mahāyāna texts, the typology below, like Ohnuma’s study, is historically vague at best and entirely ahistorical at worst. The parameters for the composition of Mahāyāna Sūtras might, perhaps, be narrowed to the Sanskrit and Gāndhārī literary cultures of North and Northwest India, respectively, and to the period from around 0-500 CE.¹³ (However, the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, which I refer to several times below, was written

¹² There is also a third minor type in which the Bodhisattva’s gift is interrupted. See Reiko Ohnuma, *Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood: Giving Away the Body in Indian Buddhist Literature* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), esp. 30-34. Ohnuma borrows the phrase “horizon of expectations” (see *ibid.*, 289, n. 9) from Hans Robert Jauss, “Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory,” in *New Directions in Literary History*, ed. Ralph Cohen (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974), 11-41, who himself adapts the phrase from Karl Popper. Of course, the study of genre and intertextuality has a rich list of publications outside of Buddhist Studies.

¹³ From Chinese translations a *terminus ante quem* for Mahāyāna Sūtras can often be reasonably established. See, for example, Paul Harrison, “The Earliest Chinese Translations of Mahāyāna Buddhist Sūtras: Some notes on the works of Lokakṣema,” *Buddhist Studies Review* 10.2 (1993): 135-177. But to my knowledge there have only been two noteworthy (published) attempts to pinpoint both the geographic and chronological origins of specific Mahāyāna Sūtras. Based on lexical and thematic parallels with the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, some Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions, the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*, and Aśvaghoṣa’s *Buddhacarita*, Gregory Schopen places the *Maitreyasimhanāda-sūtra* in northwest India during the early Kuṣān period (ca. early 2nd century CE). See his “The Bones of a Buddha and the Business of a Monk: Conservative Monastic Values in an early Mahāyāna Polemical Tract,” in *Fragments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 63-107, esp. 80. For a less cogent effort to place another Mahāyāna text, the *Śrīmālādevīsīmanāda-sūtra*, based in my view on very weak epigraphic and textual parallels, see A. Wayman and E. Rosen, “The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism and Inscriptional Evidence at Nāgārjunakoṇḍa,” *Indian Journal of Buddhist Studies* 2.1 (1990): 49-63. It has also come to my attention recently that Stephen Hodge places the origin of the (Mahāyāna) *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* somewhere near Amarāvātī in Southern India during the reign of Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi, the Sātavāhana king, in the 1st century CE. I have not yet had time to examine the evidence Hodge adduces to locate the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* to such a specific place and time. As far as I know his work on this topic is at present only available on the web: see Stephen Hodge, “The Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra: The

several centuries later. It is, though, almost entirely made up of Sūtras that can probably be dated to this 500-year span of time.) These restrictions are certainly more narrow than those of Ohnuma, but are still frustratingly large and do not even take into consideration the wider geographic and chronological contexts in which Mahāyāna Sūtras may have actually been *read*. But, just like Ohnuma’s analysis of gift-of-the-body *Jātakas*, we are here dealing with literary patterns, and because of this her understanding of genre has some overlap with how Mahāyāna Sūtras describe giving. Technically, references to giving within Mahāyāna Sūtras would not constitute a genre. There are not many Mahāyāna works devoted solely to giving, far too few to warrant being characterized as a full-fledged class of literature.¹⁴ The types I will outline below are categories of phrases and passages about giving *within* Mahāyāna Sūtras, not whole works on the subject. Nevertheless, the topic of giving, which one might expect would be an expansive topic conducive to a great variety of textual expressions and interpretations, appears in limited and stereotypical ways in Mahāyāna Sūtras. It therefore seems reasonable to conclude that the authors and redactors of those Sūtras were constrained by certain literary conventions, and that their putative readers likewise had a finite “horizon of expectations”

Text & its Transmission,” http://www.buddhismuskunde.uni-hamburg.de/fileadmin/pdf/publikationen/The_Textual_Transmission_of_the_MPNS.pdf (accessed August 17, 2013). It must be noted that Indian Vinayas, or at least portions of Vinayas, are generally easier to date than Sūtra or Abhidharma texts. Vinaya passages often address “real world” problems and therefore can offer glimpses into life on the ground for Indian Buddhist monks and nuns, glimpses that can sometimes be compared to the archaeological, art-historical, numismatic, and epigraphic records of India. In this vein the works of Gregory Schopen are too numerous to mention, but for convenience see *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters: Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2004). Also see G.M. Bailey, “Historical Construction from Indic Texts,” in *Facets of Indian Culture*, ed. P.C. Muraleemadhavan (Delhi: New Bharatiya Book Corp., 2000), 157-174.

¹⁴ It would be worthwhile to pursue whether Mahāyāna Sūtras constitute their own textual genre. Certainly one who has the misfortune of being intimately familiar with this literature would know, if given a Sanskrit text at random, whether he or she had a Mahāyāna Sūtra almost immediately after beginning to read it.

regarding the phrases and passages dealing with giving. So while the minute phrases and sporadic passages on giving do not qualify as a genre, they obey some of the same rules.¹⁵

What follows is a discussion of those Mahāyāna literary conventions about giving. I identify twelve stereotyped ways in which the gift appears in Mahāyāna Sūtras:

- *Epithets*
- *Giving to a buddha*
- *Rewards for giving*
- *Giving as a basis for comparison*
- *Context of awakening*
- *Giving in relation to the other Perfections*
- *Redefinitions*
- *Giving the body*
- *Giving the Dharma*
- *Promotion of lay giving*
- *Ideal recipients and legitimate practice*
- *Criticism of monastic greed and illegitimate practice*

Except for the pairing of the last two categories, which, as we will see, are really two sides of the same coin, the above organization is not meant to reflect anything from the Mahāyāna Sūtras themselves. I did not arrange them based on how often certain literary conventions appear in the Sūtras compared to others; beginning with the category *Epithets* does not mean that epithets with a word for gift or giving occur more or less frequently than passages about giving to a buddha. Nor does the sequence of categories signify anything about the order of giving content in Mahāyāna texts. There is no Mahāyāna Sūtra that I know of, for example,

¹⁵ On the whole, the patterns I identify below are lexical and conceptual, not narrative in form. Buddhist texts, of course, employ a huge range of narrative clichés. Gift giving in Buddhist narratives can follow patterns simply because it is embedded within a fixed storytelling form. The gift-of-the-body stories that Ohnuma analyzes are a good example of this, as are the many *Avadāna* stories that deal with the rewards of gift giving. On one Buddhist gift-giving narrative cliché, see André Bareau, “La nourriture offerte au Buddha lors de son dernier repas,” in *Mélanges d’Indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou* (Publications de l’Institut de Civilisation Indienne 28) (Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard, 1968), 61-71. On the highly schematic form of Jain gift-giving narratives, see Nalini Balbir, “The Micro-genre of *Dāna*-stories in Jaina Literature: Problems of Interrelation and Diffusion,” *Indologica Taurinensia* 11: 145-61.

that discusses giving to a buddha, then lists the rewards for giving, and then uses giving as a basis for comparison. I have simply organized the topics in a way that I thought would make sense conceptually for the reader. There are representative examples of terms or passages for each category, and I will note when particular passages that I adduce as evidence seem to fit into more than one. For the sake of brevity, the majority of relevant textual samples I have found are not included below. Again, the number of Mahāyāna Sūtras I used was much fewer than what is available in Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese, so it is likely that I have not exhausted all the possibilities for textual categories related to giving. I should also add here that I have found many instances of giving in Mahāyāna Sūtras that resist categorization. These examples may be particular to the Sūtras in which they are found, or they may have intertextual parallels yet to be discovered. All this will have to be sorted out in a more complete survey of the literature.

Minimally, then, this study represents a starting point or prism of interpretation for further work, either on Indian Mahāyāna and giving specifically or on Mahāyāna intertextuality in general, as well as a framework to situate the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*. And I hope that my categorization does not represent my own “horizon of expectations,” my own preconceived notions about what I think Mahāyāna Sūtras *should* say about giving, but instead embodies real organic patterns present in the texts. I will leave it to my reader to determine if this is the case.

Epithets

Occasionally we find references to giving as part of the descriptions or titles of the figures populating Mahāyāna Sūtras. For example, the first chapter of the

Ratnaguṇasaṃcayagāthā explains that part of the reason one can be called a *mahāsattva* is because he is a *mahādāyaka* (<*mahādāyaka*) or a “great giver.”¹⁶ Similarly, the *Suvarṇaprabhāsottama-sūtra* refers to Prince Mahāsattva, the Bodhisattva in a former life who famously sacrificed himself to feed a hungry tigress on the verge of devouring her own cubs, as *sadā dānanirataḥ*, “one who always delights in giving” (referring to the person embodied in the Bodhisattva’s relics), as well as *mahatyāgavanto* (<*mahatyāgavanto*), “very generous.”¹⁷ And at the end of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra*, the Buddha is made to refer to himself as a “giver of the knowledge of the buddha, a giver of the knowledge of the Tathāgata and of the knowledge of the Self-born, a great donor (*buddhajñānasya dātā tathāgatajñānasya svayaṃbhūjñānasya dātā / mahādānapatir*).¹⁸

Despite their presence in Mahāyāna Sūtras, there does not seem to be anything especially related to Mahāyāna or even Buddhism in most of these references. They are merely pan-Indian words of praise for the literary characters being referred to. (Let us recall

¹⁶ See Akira Yuyama, ed., *Prajñāpāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā* (*Sanskrit Recension A*) (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 13, verse 18a. Yuyama also provides the Tibetan for the text, as does E. Obermiller, ed., *Prajñā Pāramitā-Ratna-Guṇa-Saṃcaya-Gāthā: Sanskrit & Tibetan Text* (1937; repr., Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1992). Tib. for Skt. *mahādāyaka* is *gtong ba che*. See Edward Conze, trans., *The perfection of wisdom in eight thousand lines & its verse summary* (1973; repr., San Francisco: City Lights Books, 2006), 11. Also see Yuyama, ed., *Prajñāpāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*, 95, verse 4b, where a bodhisattva is described as *amṛtasya dāyaku*; 126, verse 9d, where he is described as *sarvāstityāgi*; 127, verse 12b, as *dānādhimuktu bhavati sada muktatyāgi*. The *Ratnaguṇasaṃcayagāthā* is not technically a Sūtra, but I am considering it as such because of its obvious relationship to the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*.

¹⁷ Prods Oktor Skjærvø, ed. and trans., *This Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras: The Khotanese Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra*, Vol. I: *The Khotanese Text with English Translation and the Complete Sanskrit Text* (Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures 60) (Cambridge: The Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University, 2004), 331, *18.37 and 351, *18.177.

¹⁸ H. Kern and Bunyiu Nanjio, eds., *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (Bibliotheca Buddhica X) (1908-1912; repr., Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970), 485.2. Cf. H. Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra: Saddharma Puṇḍarīka Sūtra or the Lotus of the True Law* (1884; repr., Surrey, Canada: Eremitical Press, 2011), 308. *Dānapati*, a common word for a donor, literally means “lord of giving.”

just how commonly Indian names end in the past participle *datta*: Viṣṇudatta, “given by Viṣṇu,” Devadatta, “given by the gods or God,” etc.) It would be interesting to pursue, though this is beyond the scope of the current project, how such epithets are applied to figures across Indian literature; e.g., to gods, the Buddha, bodhisattvas, Jain personages, religious benefactors, kings, epic heroes, and so on. For the time being I will merely underscore that these epithets in Mahāyāna Sūtras indicate very Indian values. Being generous is a sign of moral excellence and religious accomplishment. In India, as one scholar recently put it, “[g]iving is what good people do, no matter which particular religious texts they follow.”¹⁹

Giving to a buddha

As the paragon of religious practice, a (or *the*) buddha represents the best recipient of a gift. Not surprisingly, this value placed on a buddha can be seen in both Mainstream and Mahāyāna texts.²⁰ A buddha stands on the receiving end of the most asymmetrical exchange possible, as the giver’s rank is infinitesimal compared to his.²¹ A buddha is consequently the

¹⁹ Maria Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia: Hindu, Buddhist, and Jain Reflections on Dāna* (New York: Routledge, 2004), xv.

²⁰ For instance, at *Majjhima Nikāya* III, 254-255, the Tathāgata is the worthiest of fourteen possible recipients of an offering (*dakkhiṇā*). (All citations of the Pāli Canon refer to the volume and page number of the editions of the Pāli Text Society.) This ranking system is found in medieval Theravāda treatises as well. See Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia*, 64-67.

²¹ In this sense Mahāyāna Sūtras may preserve the Indian “ethics of esteem” that Maria Heim describes so eloquently, which “assumes and renders explicit difference, hierarchy, special classes of persons who are admired apart from others.” See Hibbets (= Heim), “The Ethics of Esteem,” *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 7 (2000): 26-42, and Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia*, 45-55 (quote taken from p. 55). (Interestingly, this paradigm can be reversed in modern Jain contexts, where superior status is achieved among lay families—not between monastics and lay persons—by lavish giving. Laidlaw describes how Jain families in India are very reluctant to accept food from other families, in part because of the polluting nature of food, but “aggressively hospitable themselves when they have guests to entertain.” See James Laidlaw, *Riches and Renunciation: Religion, Economy, and Society among the Jains* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 292-293. In this instance it is the status of the donor and not the

vessel through whom one can earn the most merit (see below under *Ideal recipients and legitimate practice*). In chapter seven of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra*, for example, innumerable Mighty Brahma gods²² make their way to a buddha named Mahābhijñāñānābhībhū, and then give him the flying vehicles from their heaven (*divyāni brāhmāṇi vimānāni*).²³ The episode is repeated several times in the prose and verse portions of the chapter,²⁴ and in one instance the gods clarify their motivation for making the gift:

*vimānāni sucitrāṇi anubhāvena te vibho /
dadāma te mahāvīra pratigrhṇa mahāmune (56) //
asmākam anukampārthaṃ paribhuñja vināyaka /
vayaṃ ca sarvasattvās ca agrāṃ bodhiṃ sprśemahi (57) //*²⁵

Through your power, Mighty One, the flying vehicles are so bright!
We give them to you, Great Hero! Please accept them, Great Sage!
Please use them, Leader, out of compassion for us!
We, along with all beings, would then reach the best awakening!²⁶

recipient that is elevated in the exchange.) However, the ethics of the bodhisattva laid out in many Mahāyāna Sūtras, with their emphasis on compassion and self-effacement, represents a radical departure from this line of thinking, and this may be a purposeful attempt on the part of Mahāyāna authors to undercut normative Indian ideas about a social order that was (and in many ways still is) essentially defined by hierarchy. See below in the section *Promotion of lay giving*.

²² The Mahābrahmā realm is the highest region making up the first meditative level (*dhyāna*) of the realm of form (*rūpadhātu*). See Akira Sadakata, *Buddhist Cosmology: Philosophy and Origins* (Tokyo: Kōsei Publishing Co., 1997), 63-64.

²³ Joseph Walser has drawn a conceptual connection between the *vimāna*, present in a huge swath of Indian religious literature, and the adoption of the imagery of a spiritual vehicle in Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism. See his “The origin of the term ‘Mahāyāna’ (The Great Vehicle) and its relationship to the *Āgamas*,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 30.1-2 (2007): 219-250.

²⁴ Kern and Nanjio, eds., *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, 166.1-4 and 166.7-10; 169.7-11; 172.11-15; 176.2-6; 191.1-2; 191.7-8. Cf. Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra*, 115, 117, 118, 120, 129. Note that Kern, like many others, abbreviates the prose repetitions in translation. Not only does this misrepresent the plodding nature of the text, but it also makes it difficult to discern when the author or redactor himself chose to abbreviate, which occurs frequently, of course, in Sanskrit and Pāli Buddhist texts.

²⁵ Kern and Nanjio, eds., *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, 177.12-15.

²⁶ Cf. Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra*, 121.

Giving to the most excellent of recipients brings the most excellent of rewards.²⁷ By accepting and using their divine gift, this buddha would allow for the *summum bonum* of Mahāyāna soteriological rewards: The Mighty Brahma gods and indeed all beings can reach—literally, “touch” (*spṛśemahi*)—awakening (see below under *Context of awakening*).

I exclude here the many examples that could be adduced involving devotional activity made to a buddha, even though this often entails making various kinds of offerings. Devotional passages in Mahāyāna Sūtras in general appear to say—and I emphasize the word *appear* because the matter warrants closer scrutiny—that a buddha is revered, honored, etc. using various objects *without using a term that we would translate as gift or giving*. Such is the case in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*:

*atha khalu trāyastriṃśakāyikānām devaputrāṇām śatasahasrāṇi
divyapuṣpadhūpagandhamālyavilepanacūrṇavarṣair divyai ratnavarṣair divyaiś ca
vastravarṣair bhagavantam abhyavākirann abhiprākiran / divyaiś cchattrair divyair dhvajair
divyābhir ghaṇṭābhir divyābhiḥ patākābhiḥ samantāc ca divyadīpamālābhir bahuvīdhābhiś ca
divyābhiḥ pūjābhir bhagavantam satkurvanti sma gurukurvanti sma mānayanti sma pūjayanti
sma arcayanti sma apacāyanti sma divyāni ca vādyany abhipravādayām āsuḥ /²⁸*

Then one hundred thousand sons of the gods from the assemblage of the [Heaven of the] Thirty-three strewed and scattered showers of divine flowers, incense, perfumes, garlands, ointments, and aromatic powders, showers of divine jewels, and showers of divine cloth upon the Blessed One. On all sides they paid homage to, revered, venerated, honored, paid tribute to, and showed respect to him with divine umbrellas, divine banners, divine bells, divine flags, rows of divine lamps, and many kinds of [other] honors. They also played divine instruments.²⁹

²⁷ Giving to Tīrthaṅkaras, of course the most excellent of recipients in Jain tradition, brings unique rewards as well. In Jain narrative literature, due to giving food to a Tīrthaṅkara and breaking his fast a donor receives five divine rewards, namely, a cascade of treasures, flowers, and clothing, the beating of the gods’ drums, and a proclamation in the sky that celebrates the gift. See Balbir, “The Micro-genre of *Dāna*-stories in Jaina Literature,” 148-151.

²⁸ Rajendralala Mitra, ed., *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* (Bibliotheca Indica 110) (Calcutta: The Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1888), 158.15-21 (with minor emendations).

²⁹ Cf. Conze, trans., *The perfection of wisdom in eight thousand lines & its verse summary*, 132. Note that the purpose of the whole passage is to promote wisdom, explaining how a certain kind of redirection or “transfer” (*pariṇāma*) brings more merit than the many gifts of bodhisattvas who have reified

I imagine that such a distinction between giving and worship through offerings might not have been made in practice. One would think that giving the Buddha gifts and doing homage to him by making offerings to a stūpa or an image both earn the practitioner merit and, in the end, amount to the same thing. But this is, after all, a Mahāyāna literary world, not a real one. I am making what I hope is not an unwarranted assumption that word choice matters, that the authors and redactors of Mahāyāna Sūtras conceptually differentiated giving and devotion because the literary descriptions of the two behaviors were couched in different language.³⁰ At

perceptions (*aupalambhika*). The devotional offerings made by the gods to the Buddha are not part of the comparison involving the gifts of the bodhisattvas. See below under the categories *Giving as a basis for comparison*, *Recontextualization*, and *Redefinitions*. Also note that much or all of the Perfection of Wisdom literature clearly elevates the physical book to the status of a buddha, advocating that the book be elaborately honored in the same manner as this passage here. See, for example, the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* in *ibid.*, 105 and 299; and the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* in Edward Conze, trans., *The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom, with the divisions of the Abhisamayālaṅkāra* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), 278, 292, and 568. Of course, similar passages can be found outside of Perfection of Wisdom literature. For example, note the passages regarding devotional offerings to the book in Kern and Nanjio, eds., *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, 225.7-8, 226.5-6, 231.11-232.3, 337.3-8, 390.1-391.13, 403.2-6; 418.1-6. On these and other “book cult” passages, again see Schopen, “The Phrase *sa prthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet* in the *Vajracchedikā*.”

³⁰ For what it is worth, Dharmaśāstric literature tends to treat giving and devotion as separate behaviors. For the Dharmaśāstric authors, commentators, and anthologists, giving is defined very narrowly. This is evident in the Śāstric category “non-delivery of gifts” (*dattasyānapākarma /dattāpradānika*), one of the eighteen “titles of law” (*vyavahārapada*) whereby a promised gift was considered to be binding and, in fact, enforceable by the king. Giving here is considered a type of exchange between human actors, a legal and commercial category for which devotion has no relevance. See the useful summary of and chart for the eighteen *vyavahārapadas* in Patrick Olivelle, *Manu’s Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānava-Dharmaśāstra* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 13-16. Also, the Śāstric anthologies (*nibandha*) deal with giving and worship separately. For example, in Lakṣmīdhara’s *Kṛtyakalpataru*, an early and seminal Śāstric compendium, giving and worship make up separate chapters (*Dānakāṇḍa* and *Pūjākāṇḍa*, respectively). See K.V. Rangaswami Aiyangar, *Kṛtyakalpataru of Bhaṭṭa Lakṣmīdhara*, Vol. V: *Dānakāṇḍa* (Gaekwad’s Oriental Series 92) (Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1941), 17-19. Finally, the constituent parts into which Śāstric texts analyze giving—donor, recipient, location, timing, etc.—sometimes do but sometimes do not overlap with the ritual procedures in which worship is embedded. It seems, then, that in both Dharmaśāstric and Mahāyāna Sūtra literature giving and devotional worship are closely related but still conceptually distinct activities. For this reason Ohnuma’s categorization of offerings for the Buddha, such as “the making of ritual offerings to an image, *caitya*, or *stūpa*,” as a “prominent form of Buddhist giving” may need to be tweaked or re-thought. See Reiko Ohnuma, “Gift,” in *Critical Terms for the Study of Buddhism*,

any rate, the topic of devotion in Mahāyāna literature, including the relationship between devotion and giving in Mahāyāna Sūtras, needs to be thoroughly examined.³¹ It would also be helpful to compare devotion to a buddha in non-Mahāyāna and Mahāyāna literature. Certainly the *Divyāvadāna* and *Avadānaśataka* have several stories in which devotional offerings made to the Buddha in the narrative past or present produce great rewards, but I have no sense of trends, if there are any, in the language used for devotional gifts in these and other non-Mahāyāna texts.³²

ed. Donald S. Lopez, Jr. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 103-104; Ohnuma, *Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood*, 159.

³¹ There are clear cases in which a buddha is honored (*pūjā*) through offerings and a word for gift or giving *is* used, but they appear to be exceptions in the Mahāyāna literature I have looked at. See Kern and Nanjio, eds., *Saddharmaṇḍarīka*, 119.8-11 (a verse which includes the line *gilānabhaiṣajya bahuprakāraṃ pūjārtha dadyāt sugatasya nityam*); 227.11-13 (which ends in *upanāmayitavyāḥ*); 229.4 (a verse which uses the phrase *dadeya pūjārtha jinātmajasya*); 408.1-5 (which describes the gift of the body and uses the terms *tathāgatapūjā*, *dharmapūjā*, and *āmiṣapūjā*); 413.7-10 (which describes the gift of the body and also uses the term *tathāgatapūjā*); 431.10-432.7 (which describes the bodhisattva Gadgadasvara's many gifts to the buddha Meghadundubhisvararāja in conjunction with the term *pūjā*, though in this case giving and *pūjā* seem to be conceptually separate: *pūjā kṛtā tāni caturaśītibhājanasahasrāṇi dattāni*). And for one case from the *Maitreyasīṃhanāda-sūtra* (sTog Kanjur, *dkon brtsegs*, Ca 183b6-7): *de dag ni de bzhin gshegs pa'i sku gdung rnams la me tog dang / bdug pa dang / phye ma dang / spos dang / me tog 'phreng ba dang / byug pa dang / gdugs dang / rgyal mtshan dang / ba dan dang / sil snyan dang / mar me'i sbyin pa dag gis mchod pa'i las la brston par 'gyur ro //*. Tib. *sbyin pa* and *mchod pa* are standard equivalents for Skt. *dāna* and *pūjā*, respectively.

³² Though insightful, this is not a topic pursued in John Strong, "The Transforming Gift: An Analysis of Devotional Acts of Offering in Buddhist *Avadāna* Literature," *History of Religions* 18.3 (1979): 221-237; the same can be said for Andy Rotman, *Thus Have I Seen: Visualizing Faith in Early Indian Buddhism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), which explores how gifts function and the psychology behind devotional offerings in *Divyāvadāna* narratives. Also see Ohnuma, *Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood*, 153-154, which classifies offerings made out of devotion (*pūjā*) as a kind of "giving upwards" to a worthy recipient, referring to a passage in the *Abhidharmakośa* as well as descriptions of giving in modern Sri Lanka and Burma.

Rewards for giving

Sometimes rewards for giving are simply listed.³³ According to chapter thirty-two of the *Ratnaḡuṇasaṃcayagāthā*:

*dānena pretagati chindati bodhisattvo
dāridryaṃ ca chinatī tatha sarvakleśān /
bhogāṃś c' anantavipulān labhate caranto
dānena sattva paripācayī kricchraprāptān //*³⁴

Through giving, a bodhisattva cuts off existence as a hungry ghost
And cuts off poverty, likewise all defilements.
And practicing [giving], he attains endless, extensive possessions.
Through giving, he would [spiritually] mature beings who have incurred hardship.³⁵

The *Avalokita-sūtra*, part of both the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and the *Mahāvastu*, also describes the rewards for giving various articles like garlands, cloth, and lamps. In this case, the specified recipient of the gifts is a *stūpa* or a *cetika*, which, since this same recipient is also described as the *lokanātha* or the “lord of the world,” would appear to a physical embodiment of the Buddha himself.³⁶

³³ The listing of rewards for making donations is legion in Indian literature, and it begins with India's earliest texts. *Ṛg Veda* 10.107.2, for instance, states: “Those who make gifts of *dakṣiṇā* [the sacrificial fee] stand high in heaven, those who give horses are in the world of the sun, donors of gold secure immortality, and those who give garments increase the duration of their life.” See Jan Gonda, “Gifts’ and ‘Giving’ in the *Ṛgveda*,” in *Selected Studies*, Vol. IV: *History of Ancient Indian Religion* (Leiden: Brill, 1975) 122-143, esp. 134-135. The enumeration of rewards can also be found in the *Dharmasūtras*, *Dharmaśāstras* (see the reference to the *Manusmṛti* just below in n. 37), epics, *Purāṇas*, and seemingly every other genre of Indian literature one might think to look at. For specific citations, see P.V. Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra (Ancient and Mediaeval Religious and Civil Law)*, Vol. II, Pt. II (Government Oriental Series, class B, no. 6) (Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1941), 837-888, esp. 848-849 and 886. On the *Purāṇas* in particular, see Kala Acharya, *Purāṇic Concept of Dāna* (Delhi: Naga Publishers, 1993).

³⁴ Yuyama, ed., *Prajñāpāramitā-ratna-ḡuṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*, 130, verse 1.

³⁵ Cf. Conze, trans., *The perfection of wisdom in eight thousand lines & its verse summary*, 71.

³⁶ See Cecil Bendall and W.H.D. Rouse, trans., *Śikṣā-samuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhist Doctrine* (1922; repr., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1971), 270-276. Also see *ibid.*, 301-302 (quoting from the *Ratnoladhāraṇī*). For the Sanskrit see Cecil Bendall, ed., *Çikṣhāsamuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhistic*

The rewards for giving can be more closely associated with the type of gift made or how a gift is offered.³⁷ This is especially true for the *Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra* (a chapter of the *Divyāvadāna*), the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*, chapter six of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtra*, and the fifth “imperishable” of the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa-sūtra*. For instance, the *Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra* describes how a gift of food leads to freedom from desire, one of medicine leads to the freedom from old age and death, and a gift of flowers brings the flowers of the branches of awakening.³⁸ Similarly, in the *Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha-sūtra*, the bodhisattva after whom the text is named makes an oath to sate the bodies of the hungry when he attains awakening. But the reward is not the bodhisattva’s, but rather those he provides with “food endowed with (good) color, smell, and flavor” (*varṇagandharasopetāhāra*): After regaining their health

Teaching (Bibliotheca Buddhica I) (1902; repr., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1992), esp. 300. Also see Gregory Schopen, “Burial *Ad Sanctos* and the Physical Presence of the Buddha in Early Indian Buddhism: A Study in the Archaeology of Religions,” in *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks: Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1997), 114-147 and “On the Buddha and His Bones: The Conception of a Relic in the Inscriptions from Nāgārjunikoṇḍa,” in *ibid.*, 148-164.

³⁷ The equivalence between gift and reward is not unique to Buddhist literature. *Manusmṛti* 4.229-232, for example, says the following: “One who gives water obtains satiety; one who gives food, inexhaustible happiness; one who gives sesame seeds, the kind of offspring one desires; one who gives a lamp, the finest eyesight. One who gives land, obtains land; One who gives a house, superb dwellings; one who gives silver (*rūpya*), peerless beauty (*rūpa*); one who gives clothes, residence in the same world as the moon; one who gives a horse (*aśva*), residence in the same world as the Aśvins; one who gives an ox, bounteous prosperity; one who gives a cow, the summit of the sun; one who gives a vehicle or bed, a wife; one who gives security, lordship; one who gives grain, eternal happiness; and one who gives the Veda (*brahman*), equality with Brahman.” See Olivelle, ed. and trans., *Manu’s Code of Law*, 136 (Skt. on pp. 550-551). Note that the equivalence here sometimes takes the form of puns, which occur occasionally in the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* as well.

³⁸ See James R. Ware, “Studies in the *Divyāvadāna*,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 49 (1929): 43 (no. 11), 45 (no. 17), and 45-46 (no. 19). The Sanskrit, Chinese, and Tibetan for this text often vary considerably.

Bhaiṣajyaguruvaīḍūryaprabha vows to establish them in the “endless comfort with the flavor of the Dharma” (*dharmarāsenātyaṃtasukha*).³⁹

In many cases, material gifts result in material rewards, and immaterial gifts likewise bring immaterial rewards.⁴⁰ This trend can be seen in a short quotation of the *Adhyāśayaśaṃcodana-sūtra* in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. Listed here are the advantages for giving a gift that is *nirāmiṣadāna*, “immaterial” or “spiritual” (literally, “not of the flesh”), specifically what results when one gives a gift of the Dharma without longing for acquisitions or honor (*yo lābhasatkāram apratikāṅkṣan dharmadānaṃ dadāmi* [read: *dadāti*]). Of the twenty benefits listed, only a few could be construed as something physical—gaining supernatural protection, having the gods place vigor (*ojas*) in his body, having no place of vulnerability (*avatāra*) for Māra or one’s enemies—and even these are debatable. The majority of the benefits are psychological or intellectual, like becoming mindful (*smṛtimāṃś ca bhavati*) or mentally penetrating otherworldly wisdom (*lokottarāṃ ca prajñāṃ anuvidhyati*), or otherwise immaterial, such as becoming full of cheer and being praised by the learned (*saumanasyabahulaś ca bhavati vidvatpraśastaś ca*).⁴¹ In addition, according to the *Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra*, giving clothes brings one abundant clothes and giving a residence results in various kinds of dwellings and land, clear equivalences between material gifts and material rewards.⁴² As we will see, the *Dānapāramitā-*

³⁹ For the Sanskrit I have consulted the unpublished Gregory Schopen, ed., *A Sūtra for the Failed and Misbegotten: A Complete Version of the Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra in the Schøyen Collection*, section 5.11. Hopefully this important work will eventually see the light of day.

⁴⁰ John Strong refers to “rupalogical” and “dharmalogical” offerings, along with the immediate miraculous responses to those offerings and their more distant karmic fruits, in the *Avadānaśataka*. See “The Transforming Gift,” 230ff.

⁴¹ Bendall, ed., *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, 351.1-8; Cf. Bendall and Rouse, trans., *Śikṣā-samuccaya*, 310.

⁴² Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” 44 (nos. 13 and 14).

sūtra plays with this sort of one-to-one equivalence, matching up physical gift with spiritual reward, the latter either being material too or some kind of otherworldly version of the material object given. In the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* the equation often involves gifts of the body, just as when a son or daughter from a good family (*kulaputra* or *kuladuhitṛ*) gives up his or her body in the *Śrīmālādevīsīṃhanāda-sūtra* it leads to the acquisition of the body of a buddha.⁴³

See below under the sections *Giving the body* and *Giving the Dharma* for overlap with some of the examples here.

Giving as a basis for comparison

The fourth chapter of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra*, known for its parable about a poor, lost son (the so-called prodigal son, to use the language of Biblical translation), ends with verses praising the Buddha. Mahāyāna Sūtras often use strings of superlatives to describe the Buddha, and when this is seemingly insufficient, over-the-top comparisons to drive the point home. This is the strategy the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* employs here to portray the Buddha's might. The Buddha is so powerful that nothing and no one can ever oppose (*pratīkartu śakyam*) his accomplishments, even if one “would give hard food, soft food, cloth, drinks, and bedding and seats with clean covers, would have monasteries made of sandalwood built and give them after covering them with double pieces of calico,” and “would give many kinds of medicine for the sick...giving for as many eons as there is sand in the Ganges.”⁴⁴ The praise of the Buddha in this case hinges on a comparison with an incomprehensible amount of giving.

⁴³ Alex and Hideko Wayman, trans., *The Lion's Roar of Queen Śrīmālā: A Buddhist Scripture on the Tathāgatagarbha Theory* (1974; repr., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2007), 75.

⁴⁴ Kern and Nanjio, eds., *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, 119.8-11: *khādyam daded bhojanavastrapānam śayanāsanam ca vimalottaracchadam / vihāra kārapayi candanāmayān saṃstīrya co dūṣyayugehi dadyāt (57) //*

This example from the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* is an unusual one. Generally comparisons involving giving in Mahāyāna Sūtras take place in the context of weighing the merit resulting from religious activities. In most cases, these kinds of comparisons begin with a consideration of the huge amounts of merit that come from the repeated performance of some “lesser” activity, then state that another religious activity—whatever is being promoted—results in even greater spiritual merit. Although a variety of merit-making activities are employed, it would seem that, more often than not, giving forms the basis for such comparisons in Mahāyāna Sūtras.⁴⁵ For example, chapter twenty-two of the *Ratnaguṇasaṃcayagāthā* states:

*yāvanti sattva nikhilen’ iha jambudvīpe
te sarvi bodhivaracittu upādayitvā /
dānaṃ daditva bahavarṣasahasakoṭīḥ
sarve ca nāmayi jagārtha nidāna bodhiṃ //
yaś caiva prajñavarapāramitābhiyukto
divasmi antamasa ek’ anuvartayeyā /
kalapuṇyu so na bhavatī iha dānaskandho
tad atandritena sada osaritavya prajñā //*⁴⁶

*gilānabhaiṣajya bahuprakāraṃ pūjārtha dadyāt sugatasya nityam / dadeya kalpān yatha gaṅgavālikā naivaṃ
kadācit pratikartu śakyam (58) //*. See verses 55-59 for the entire context. Cf. Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra*, 86.

⁴⁵ These kinds of comparisons in Mahāyāna Sūtras appear to be both old and very Indian. Not only do they occur in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*, *Ratnaguṇasaṃcayagāthā*, and *Vajracchedikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*, all of which seem to be among the earliest Mahāyāna texts, but also in a very old (and relatively large)—dated, in fact, to the 1st or 2nd century CE—Kharoṣṭhī Sūtra fragment from the Bajaur collection. A section of this text, which features the presence of Akṣobhya but is definitely not a Gāndhārī version of the *Akṣobhyatathāgatasyavyūha-sūtra*, extols the teachings of the text itself, like the forbearance of phenomena (*dharmakṣānti*), as being more meritorious than “conventional types of religious activity, such as donations and stupa worship.” For a discussion of the textual fragment, see Ingo Strauch, “More Missing Pieces of Early Pure Land Buddhism: New Evidence for Akṣobhya and Abhirati in an Early Mahayana Sutra from Gandhāra,” *Eastern Buddhist* 41.1 (2010): 23-66, esp. 29. For the date of the fragment, see Ingo Strauch, “The Bajaur Collection of Kharoṣṭhī Manuscripts: A Preliminary Survey,” *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 25 (2008): 111. Moreover, the form of the comparison here, with the benefits of one religious activity being quantified against another, can be found in Brahmanical and Hindu literature too. See the sources cited in Schopen, “On Sending the Monks Back to Their Books,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 126.

⁴⁶ Yuyama, ed., *Prajñāpāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*, 90-91, verses 8-9. Also see *ibid.*, 67-68, verse 4, for a passage very similar to this one; 31, verse 1, where the giving of groups of disciples (*śrāvakaḡaṇāḥ*)

Suppose that as many beings as there are here on the entire Black Plum Continent
Would all, after generating the aspiration for the most excellent awakening,
And after giving gifts for many millions of thousands of years,
Direct everything to awakening on account of the welfare of the world.

But suppose that someone else, intent on wisdom, the most excellent Perfection,
Would conform to it for as little as one day.
That mass of giving is not an infinitesimal fraction of the merit in this case.
Therefore, one must always plunge tirelessly into wisdom.⁴⁷

The *Ratnaguṇasaṃcaya*gāthā advocates following or practicing the Perfection of Wisdom—
though we are not told exactly what that would entail—by comparing it to an
incomprehensible amount of giving and directing the ensuing merit to awakening (see below
under *Context of awakening*). Similarly, the *Śraddhābālādhānāvātāramudrā-sūtra*, quoted in
Śāntideva's *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, explains:

*yaḥ kaścīn mañjuśrīḥ kulaputraḥ kuladuhitā vā sarvalokadhāturajopamānāṃ
pratyekabuddhānāṃ dine dine śatarasam āhāraṃ dadyāt divyāni ca vastrāṇi / evaṃ dadad
gaṅgānadīvālukopamān kalpān dadyāt / yaś cānyo mañjuśrīḥ kulaputraḥ
kuladuhitā vā citra[read: citri or citri]karmalikhitaṃ vā pustakakarmakṛtaṃ vā buddhaṃ
paśyed / ayaṃ tato 'saṅkhyeyataraṃ puṇyaṃ prasavati /⁴⁸*

Suppose that there were a daughter or son from a good family, Mañjuśrī, who day after
day would give hundreds of flavors and divine clothes to Solitary Buddhas equal to the
amount of dust in the entire world sphere, giving in this way for as many eons as there
is sand in the Ganges River. But suppose that another daughter or son from a good
family, Mañjuśrī, would see the Buddha, whether drawn in the form of a picture or
made in the form of a book. The latter produces incalculably more merit than the
former.⁴⁹

is lumped together with ethical conduct and mental cultivation, and then compared to a bodhisattva
rejoicing in a single thought (*anomodati ekacitte*); 120, verse 9, in which giving a three thousand (world
sphere) loaded with jewels is compared to a bodhisattva with forbearance (*kṣamate*); 128, verse 17,
where the mass of gifts in the entire world is compared to a rejoicing (*anomodaku*) bodhisattva.

⁴⁷ Cf. Conze, trans., *The perfection of wisdom in eight thousand lines & its verse summary*, 52.

⁴⁸ Bendall, ed., *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, 311.7-11.

⁴⁹ Cf. Bendall and Rouse, trans., *Śikṣā-samuccaya*, 277-278. Interestingly, the comparison does not end
here, but instead tersely describes other forms of giving that produce even more merit.

Here, the merit from the activity in question, seeing the Buddha, is again compared to giving.

One more text, the *Prasāntaviniścayapratihārya-sūtra*, also taken from the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, reads as follows:

yaś ca mañjuśrīr bodhisatvo gaṅgānadīvālikāsamebhyo buddhebhyaḥ pratyekaṃ sarvebhyo gaṅgānadīvālukāsamāni buddhakṣetrāṇi vaśirājamahāmañiratnapratipūrṇāni kṛtvā dadyād evaṃ dadad gaṅgānadīvālikāsamān kalpān dānaṃ dadyād / yo vā 'nyo [read: vānyo] mañjuśrīr bodhisatva imāṅ evaṃrūpān dharmān śrutvā ekāntena gatvā cittenābhinirūpayed imeṣv evaṃrūpeṣu dharmeṣu śikṣisyāmīti / so 'śikṣito pi mañjuśrīr bodhisatvo 'syāṃ śikṣyāyāṃ chandiko vatataṃ puṇyaṃ prasavati / na tv eva tad dānakriyāvastv iti /⁵⁰

Suppose that a bodhisattva, Mañjuśrī, after filling buddha-fields equal to the amount of sand in the Ganges River with magical gems and great jewels and precious stones, would give them to every single buddha, to as many [buddhas] as there is sand in the Ganges River, giving the gift in this way for as many eons as there is sand in the Ganges River. Or suppose that there were another bodhisattva, Mañjuśrī, who, after hearing teachings such as these, would go off alone and resolve in his mind, “I will train in teachings such as these.” The latter bodhisattva who longs for this training, Mañjuśrī, though not yet trained, produces much more merit, not the case of the action of giving.⁵¹

This quote from the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* does not provide the wider context of exactly which teachings (*Dharmas*) the bodhisattva is here being encouraged to train in. But what is entirely clear is that such training is far superior to an incomprehensible amount of giving, which the text describes with the hyperbole characteristic of comparisons of this sort and of Mahāyāna prose in general. The comparison is made all the more powerful because the recipients of the gifts are buddhas, the most advanced type of being possible in the Buddhist universe (see above under *Giving to a buddha*). The reader is led to expect that nothing could possibly bring a

⁵⁰ Bendall, ed., *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, 16.3-8.

⁵¹ Cf. Bendall and Rouse, trans., *Śikṣā-samuccaya*, 17-18.

greater reward than a prodigious offering like this made to the superlative fields of merit, only to be quickly assured that even greater merit is possible.⁵²

The authors of these texts understood, respectively, the Perfection of Wisdom, seeing the Buddha, and training in Dharma to be far, far superior to giving. There are two equally valid interpretations of these three passages and the many others like them. On the one hand, it might be argued that they sought to downplay giving and discourage the reader from making religious donations. According to the *Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra*, for example, “the mere thought of becoming a renunciant in the well-taught Dharma and Vinaya” surpasses making “offerings as numerous as the sands of the Ganges River for many days” and giving away all one’s belongings. The text then states that “material giving is inferior, since even unbelievers, ingrates, robbers, outcastes, mercenaries of the king, and henchmen of his ministers give gifts.”⁵³ Here, material giving is roundly criticized in favor of the renunciatory program prevalent throughout the whole *Ugraparipṛcchā*.⁵⁴ Most other passages that use giving as a comparison, however, do not come out and directly decry giving, nor do such passages usually occur in texts like the *Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra* that strongly espouse a rigidly ascetic monastic life

⁵² The *Maitreyasīṃhanāda-sūtra* offers some interesting variations on using giving as a basis for comparison. In quick succession this text makes several comparisons between giving a huge amount of material objects and reciting a single verse, presumably from the *Maitreyasīṃhanāda-sūtra* itself (see below under *Giving the Dharma*). In one case the merit that results from the two actions is compared, but in another the text states that reciting a verse exhibits much greater compassion than giving material things, and in yet another it says that reciting a verse has a much greater ability than giving to bring happiness and release one from suffering. For the comparison involving merit, as is the case for all comparisons of this type I have found, the concern is with the giver. But the other comparisons mentioned here weigh the effects on the recipient, contrasting the hypothetical individual who accepts the gifts with the one who hears the verse. For this series of comparisons in the *Maitreyasīṃhanāda-sūtra*, see the sTog Kanjur, *dkon brtsegs*, Ca 169a5-171a4.

⁵³ Nattier, trans., *A Few Good Men*, 272.

⁵⁴ See Nattier’s insightful introduction to the text, especially *ibid.*, 73-136 and 193-197.

devoid of possessions. I would point out, then, that employing the gift as a point of reference for earning merit only works if the reader assumes that giving is highly meritorious in the first place. Quite simply, giving is very good, but other religious behaviors are even better. In this interpretation, giving forms the basis of a majority of these comparisons because, in the eyes of Mahāyāna authors, redactors, and readers, it was highly valued as a religious activity and easily relatable to almost any Indian reader.

Context of awakening

Mahāyāna Sūtras regularly contextualize the merit from giving (and the other Mahāyāna *pāramitās* or Perfections) in terms of awakening. That is, the meritorious deed of giving is not an end in itself but is explicitly reframed as part of the path leading to enlightenment. Sometimes, contextualization occurs in a general sense. Giving is shown to be one way—an important way, but one among many possibilities—a practitioner can pursue his or her soteriological quest. This is perhaps most clear in the first chapter of the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra*, where Maitreya describes the bodhisattvas he sees in innumerable buddha-fields engaged in a variety of activities. Some of the bodhisattvas he describes are giving a host of objects, including food, gardens, many types of precious jewels, animals, slaves, family members, kingdoms, and even their own body parts.⁵⁵ These bodhisattvas give, as verse eighteen explains, “seeking this most excellent awakening” (*paryeṣamāṇā imam*

⁵⁵ Kern and Nanjio, eds., *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka*, 10.10-11.10 (Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra*, 13-14); 13.11-14.2 (Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra*, 15-16). Mañjuśrī explains that what Maitreya sees in the buddha-fields of the narrative present parallels similar giving (among other practices) in the buddha-fields from the narrative past at 24.13-14 (Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra*, 23). The entire first chapter must be understood in terms of the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka*'s position of the one vehicle (*ekayāna*), the view that all practitioners are in fact treading the same path no matter the particular beliefs they hold or religious activities they engage in.

agrabodhim)⁵⁶; or, as verse forty states, “they have set out for the most excellent awakening by means of giving” (*dānena te prasthita agrabodhim*).⁵⁷

More commonly, contextualization occurs in the specific context of merit “transfer.” The merit from giving is “transferred” or “redirected,” using the causative forms of the verbs \sqrt{nam} or $\text{pari}\sqrt{nam}$,⁵⁸ to the soteriological goal “unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening”

⁵⁶ Kern and Nanjio, eds., *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, 11.6.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 14.2.

⁵⁸ These verbs, along with the nominal *pariṇāmanā* and the Pāli *pattidāna*, as well as a host of other related terms, are notoriously difficult to translate. In the past, the most common but by no means the only translation of *pariṇāmanā* has been “merit transfer.” Conze instead describes merit being “turned over.” I prefer “redirection of merit” since the religious agent mentally or verbally sends the karmic merit to another party or goal instead of having it just accrue to him or herself. There are many publications that analyze these terms and the significance of karmic “transfer,” both in Indian religious thought and practice and in the wider Buddhist world (especially of South and Southeast Asia). A useful list of references can be found as an appendix to A. Wezler, “On the Gaining of Merit and the Incurring of Demerit through the Agency of Others: I. Deeds by Proxy,” in *Lex et Litterae: Studies in Honour of Oscar Botto*, ed. S. Lienhard and I. Piovano (Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso, 1997), 567-589. To this I will add the following works: H.G. Narahari, “The Doctrine of Kamma in Popular Buddhism,” *Adyar Library Bulletin* 25 (1961): 360-370; Marcel Zago, *Rites et Ceremonies en Milieu Bouddhiste Lao* (Rome: Università Gregoriana Editrice, 1972), 122-128; Charles F. Keyes, “Tug-of-War for Merit: Cremation of a Senior Monk,” *Journal of the Siam Society* 63.1 (1975): 44-62, Charles F. Keyes and Phra Khrū Anusaranaśāsanakiarti, “Funerary Rites and the Buddhist Meaning of Death: An Interpretative Text from Northern Thailand,” *Journal of the Siam Society* 68.1 (1980): 1-28, and Charles F. Keyes, “From Death to Birth: Ritual Process and Buddhist Meanings in Northern Thailand,” *Folk* 29 (1987): 181-206; Y. Krishan, “Punyaḍāna or Transference of Merit,” *Journal of the Department of Buddhist Studies, University of Delhi* 8 (1984): 55-67 and “Punyaḍāna or Transference of merit—a fiction,” *Journal of the Indian Council of Philosophical Research* 7.2 (1990): 125-137; Heinz Bechert, “Buddha-field and Transfer of Merit in a Theravāda Source,” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 35 (1992): 95-108; Alex Wayman, “The Buddhist Theory of Virtue Consignment,” *Indian Journal of Buddhist Studies* 4.2 (1992): 1-25; Minoru Hara, “Transfer of Merit in Hindu Literature and Religion,” *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* 52 (1994): 103-135; Nicola Tannenbaum, “Blessing and Merit Transfer among Lowland Shan of Northwestern Thailand,” in *Merit and Blessing in Mainland Southeast Asia in Comparative Perspective*, ed. Cornelia Ann Kammerer and Nicola Tannenbaum (New Haven: Yale University Southeast Asian Studies, 1996), 192-195; Juliane Schober, “Religious Merit and Social Status among Burmese Buddhists Lay Associations,” in *Merit and Blessing in Mainland Southeast Asia*, 197-211; Adelheid Herrmann-Pfandt, “Verdienstübertragung im Hīnayāna und Mahāyāna,” in *Suḥṛllekhāḥ, Festgabe für Helmut Eimer*, hrsg. Michael Hahn, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, and Roland Steiner (Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica, 1996), 79-98; Torkel Brekke, “Contradiction and the Merit of Giving in Indian Religions,” *Numen* 45.3 (1998): 287-320, esp. 295-297; Takatsugu Hayashi, “Preliminary Notes on Merit Transfer in Theravāda Buddhism,” *Ronshū: Studies in Religion East and West* 26 (1999): 29-55; James Egge, *Religious Giving and the Invention of Karma in Theravāda Buddhism* (Curzon Studies in Asian Religions

(*anuttarā samyakṣambodhi*) or an equivalent expression for enlightenment. The giver redirecting the merit can seek his own awakening or that of others, especially that of all beings.⁵⁹ Verse fifteen from the section of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra* just mentioned says that the bodhisattvas seen by Maitreya “give gifts with joyful hearts, redirecting [the merit] in this case toward supreme awakening [and thinking], “We will attain the vehicle” (. . . *dadanti dānāni prahr̥ṣṭamānasāḥ / pariṇāmayanto iha agrabodhau vayaṃ hi yānasya bhavema lābhinaḥ //*).⁶⁰ Similarly, a verse from chapter thirty-one of the *Ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*, in a section devoted to giving, reads as follows:

*dānaṃ daditva vidupaṇḍitu bodhisattva
yāvanti sattva tribhave samanāharitvā /
sarveṣa teṣa bhavate ayu dānadatto
taṃ cāgrabodhi pariṇāmayate jagārthaṃ //*⁶¹

After giving a gift, the knowledgeable and learned bodhisattva,
Having considered as many beings as there are in the triple world,
Becomes one who has given a gift to all of them,
And for the sake of the world he redirects that toward the most excellent awakening.⁶²

And from the related *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*: “Giving a gift, he [a bodhisattva] redirects his mental activities, generating of aspirations, and roots of virtue toward unsurpassed, full, and complete

5) (Richmond, UK: Curzon Press, 2002), esp. 57-60, 83-84, 95-98, 111-113, and 115; Ellison Banks Findly, *Dāna: Giving and Getting in Pali Buddhism* (Buddhist Tradition Series 52) (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2003), esp. 272-280; Yukio Hayashi, *Practical Buddhism among the Thai-Lao: Religion in the Making of a Region* (Kyoto: University Press, 2003), esp. 146-153; Rotman, *Thus Have I Seen*, esp. 44ff.; Bhikkhu Anālayo, “Saccaka’s Challenge — A Study of the *Samyukta-āgama* Parallel to the *Cūlasaccaka-sutta* in Relation to the Notion of Merit Transfer,” *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 23 (2010): 39-70; Paul Williams and Patrice Ladwig, eds., *Buddhist Funeral Cultures of Southeast Asia and China* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

⁵⁹ For references to the recontextualization of giving (and other religious actions) to one’s own awakening in the *Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra*, see Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 114-115.

⁶⁰ Kern and Nanjio, eds., *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, 10.13-14. Cf. Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra*, 13.

⁶¹ Yuyama, ed., *Prajñāpāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*, 127, verse 13.

⁶² Cf. Conze, trans., *The perfection of wisdom in eight thousand lines & its verse summary*, 69.

awakening. . . .” (*sa dānaṃ dadat tān manasikārāṃs tāṃś cittotpādāṃs tāni kuśalamūlāni anuttarāyāṃ samyakṣambodhau pariṇāmayati. . .*).⁶³ The examples from the *Ratnaguṇasaṃcayagāthā* and *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* demonstrate that it is not just merit that can directed to awakening, but also the act of giving itself and any associated states of mind. Nor is this sort of “transfer” limited to giving or the other Perfections in Mahāyāna Sūtra literature. Anything meritorious or virtuous, in fact, is commonly earmarked for awakening.⁶⁴

For our purposes, placing giving within the context of awakening is important for a couple of reasons. First, the literary formulas by which Mahāyāna Sūtras express merit “transfer” closely parallel similar sentiments made in what I and others identify as Mahāyāna inscriptions.⁶⁵ I will take up this topic in detail in chapter V below. Second, contextualizing giving in terms of awakening really gets at the heart of what Mahāyāna is, at least as a literary movement. Awakening, of course, was not a Mahāyāna invention but part and parcel of the Buddhism it inherited. The goal of reaching enlightenment can indeed be found throughout non-Mahāyāna or Mainstream texts.⁶⁶ Nevertheless, Mahāyāna literature does seem to have focused its efforts on awakening to a degree not seen in Mainstream texts, even though the Mahāyāna descriptions of what awakening is and how to get there vary widely. This focus is so common in Mahāyāna texts that “unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening” or the like

⁶³ Mitra, ed., *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*, 349.7-8 (with minor emendations). Cf. Conze, trans., *The perfection of wisdom in eight thousand lines & its verse summary*, 212.

⁶⁴ In addition, merit is directed to other ends besides awakening, though in many cases these other ends appear to be awakened qualities like purity, detachment, or compassion. See, for example, Bendall and Rouse, trans., *Śikṣā-samuccaya*, 28-36.

⁶⁵ On the literary and epigraphic parallels, for now see Gregory Schopen, “Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 223-246, esp. 227-231.

⁶⁶ See Jeffrey Samuels, “The Bodhisattva Ideal in Theravāda Buddhist Theory and Practice: a Reevaluation of the Bodhisattva-Śrāvaka Opposition,” *Philosophy East & West* 47.3 (1997): 399-415.

should be construed as the default, generic Mahāyāna objective. According to Mahāyāna Sūtra literature, awakening should motivate all of one’s actions, be they physical, vocal, or mental. Giving is thus one important action, perhaps the most typical religious act in Buddhist and non-Buddhist India, put in the framework of a larger soteriological purpose. The resulting merit of the gift is not for worldly ends like children, wealth, or a long healthy life, but is redirected to the ultimate aim of the Mahāyāna literary (and, as we will see, epigraphic) imagination. There is simply no better use for merit. In the words of the *Ratnamegha-sūtra* (quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*): “That which is the redirection to awakening is the epitome of the protection of merit” (*eṣa tu puṇyarakṣāyāḥ saṃkṣepo yad bodhipariṇāmanā*).⁶⁷

Giving in relation to the other Perfections

Giving frequently occurs in Mahāyāna Sūtras in conjunction with the other Mahāyāna Perfections, usually understood to be ethical conduct (*śīlapāramitā*), forbearance (*kṣāntipāramitā*), exertion (*vīryapāramitā*), meditation (*dhyānapāramitā*), and wisdom (*prajñāpāramitā*). (Giving and wisdom will be dealt with shortly as a special case—see the category *Redefinitions* immediately below.) The Perfections most commonly appear in Mahāyāna Sūtras with little elaboration: They can be referred to merely by name (individually or as a set with the plural declension of *pāramitā*), listed in a group that begins with *dāna* (the number of Perfections being standardized to six but eventually expanded to ten⁶⁸), or described very briefly. Sometimes, though, Mahāyāna Sūtras discuss the Perfections at length,

⁶⁷ Bendall, ed., *Çikṣāsamuccaya*, 158.6. Cf. Bendall and Rouse, trans., *Śikṣā-samuccaya*, 156.

⁶⁸ As with almost all Buddhist lists, there is some variability in the number and content of Perfections between and sometimes even within Mahāyāna texts—standardization would have taken time and would never have been uniformly applied. See Har Dayal, *The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature* (1932; repr., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970), 165-269; Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 153, esp. n. 36.

and in some of these cases the practice of an individual Perfection is related to the others.

Thus in one passage the *Ugrapāriṣṭchā-sūtra* explains how a householder bodhisattva can, by giving to a beggar, fulfill not only the Perfection of Giving, but also all the other Perfections.

Part of this passage states the following:

If he [the householder bodhisattva] gives while relying upon the spirit of enlightenment [**bodhicitta*], in that way his cultivation of the perfection of morality [**śīlapāramitā*] will be fulfilled.

If he gives while bringing to mind loving-kindness toward those beggars and not producing anger or hostility toward them, in that way his cultivation of the perfection of endurance [**kṣāntipāramitā*] will be fulfilled.

If he is not depressed due to a wavering mind that thinks “If I give this away, what will become of me?” in that way his perfection of exertion [**vīryapāramitā*] will be fulfilled.⁶⁹

The *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā* similarly teaches how a bodhisattva can achieve the various Perfections through giving. It has the Buddha tell Subhūti, for instance, that a bodhisattva attains the Perfection of Forbearance by not succumbing to anger if he is vehemently ridiculed while giving gifts, and that he accomplishes the Perfection of Exertion by remaining committed to giving after he is ridiculed in this way.⁷⁰ The *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā* then goes beyond the *Ugrapāriṣṭchā-sūtra* by using the same model for the other Perfections, explaining how practicing ethical conduct develops a bodhisattva’s generosity, forbearance, exertion, meditation, and wisdom; and then how observing forbearance leads to the other five Perfections, and so on.⁷¹ Hence when Subhūti asks the Buddha how a bodhisattva situated in the Perfection of Forbearance can develop the Perfection of Giving, the latter is made to reply:

⁶⁹ Nattier, trans., *A Few Good Men*, 244, §11G(2)-(4). Nattier discusses this passage and the scarce appearance of the Perfections in the *Ugrapāriṣṭchā* in *ibid.*, 111-112.

⁷⁰ Conze, trans., *The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom*, 577-578.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 579-590.

As the bodhisattva—from the first thought of enlightenment [*bodhicitta*] onwards and up to his being seated on the terrace of enlightenment [*bodhimaṇḍa*—gives gifts—if all beings should abuse and revile him, and cut him limb from limb, still, firmly established in the Perfection of Forbearance, he thinks to himself, “I should give to these beings!”; not, “I should not give gifts!” To those who want food he gives food. . . .⁷²

Passages like these from the *Ugraparīṣcchā* and especially the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā* show a great degree of Mahāyāna doctrinal development. Their authors and/or redactors appear to have interpreted the Perfections not as isolated and sequential steps of spiritual development, but as interrelated and even symmetrical components of a Mahāyāna path toward awakening. For a bodhisattva, to give is necessarily to engage in all the other Perfections too.⁷³

Redefinitions

Mahāyāna Sūtras sometimes doctrinally redefine giving. This is most obvious when giving, as well as the other Perfections, are interpreted vis-à-vis wisdom (*prajñā*) and/or emptiness (*śūnyatā*). It is hardly shocking that the Perfection of Wisdom literature, which attempts to reorient seemingly every religious doctrine and practice toward wisdom, redefines giving in this way. The *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* does not mince its words:

*atha khalv āyusmān ānando bhagavantam etad avocat / na bhagavān dānapāramitāyā
varṇaṃ bhāṣate na nāmadheyaṃ parikīrttayati / ... / api nu prajñāpāramitāyā evaikasyā
bhagavān varṇam bhāṣate nāmadheyañ ca parikīrttayati //*
*bhagavān āha / evam etad ānandaivam etat / prajñāpāramitāyā evāham ānanda
varṇam bhāṣe nāmadheyañ ca parikīrttayāmi nānyāsāṃ pāramitānāṃ // tat kasya hetoḥ /
prajñāpāramitā hy ānanda pūrvvaṅgamā pañcānāṃ pāramitānāṃ ... anena yogena antargatāḥ*

⁷² Ibid., 580 (with minor emendations).

⁷³ See Étienne Lamotte, trans., *Le traité de la grande vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra)*, Vol. II (Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 26) (Louvain-la-neuve: Institut Orientaliste, 1949), 750-769, which elaborates on giving in relation to the other Perfections. I hesitate to cite the **Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra*, since its attribution to Nāgārjuna is very likely spurious and especially since there are doubts whether the text is even Indian in origin. It was “translated” by Kumārajīva in 404–405 CE (T. 1509). Nevertheless, Lamotte’s notes to his modern French translation are invaluable.

*pañcapāramitāḥ prajñāpāramitāyāṃ evānanda śaṭpāramitāparipūrṇādhivacanam etad yad uta
prajñāpāramiteti // tasmāt tarhy ānanda prajñāpāramitāyāṃ parikīrtitāyāṃ sarvvāḥ
śaṭpāramitāḥ parikīrtitā bhavanti // . . . / prajñāpāramitāparigrhītatvāc ca
pāramitānāmadheyam labhante // tasmāt tarhy ānanda prajñāpāramitāiva pañcānāṃ
pāramitānāṃ pūrvvaṅgamā nāyikā pariṇāyikā //*⁷⁴

Then the venerable Ānanda said this to the Blessed One: “The Blessed One does not heap praise upon the Perfection of Giving, nor does he celebrate its name. . . . [The text repeats this for the other Perfections]. The Blessed One only heaps praise upon and celebrates the name of the Perfection of Wisdom.”

The Blessed One said: “So it is, Ānanda, so it is! Ānanda, I only heap praise upon and celebrate the name of the Perfection of Wisdom, not the other Perfections. For what reason? Because the Perfection of Wisdom stands in front of the five [other] Perfections.... Consequently, the five [other] Perfections are incorporated in the single Perfection of Wisdom. In particular, Ānanda, the ‘Perfection of Wisdom’ is a synonym for fulfilling the six Perfections. Therefore, Ānanda, when the Perfection of Wisdom is celebrated, all six Perfections are celebrated. . . . And due to the fact that they are contained in the Perfection of Wisdom, they get the name ‘Perfections.’ Therefore, Ānanda, it is just the Perfection of Wisdom that stands in front, is the leader, and is the guide of the five [other] Perfections.”⁷⁵

That is, giving in its perfected form only exists because of wisdom. The Perfections could not even be called Perfections if it were not for wisdom.

Giving is often redefined through concepts related to the Mahāyāna notion of wisdom, such as signlessness (*animitta*), groundlessness (*apraṭiṣṭhita*), and the familiar emptiness (*śūnyatā*). The *Vajracchedikā-sūtra*, for example, explains the proper way to give: “However, Subhūti, a bodhisattva who is fixed on an object must not give a gift. He must not give a gift if fixed on anything” (*api tu khalu punaḥ subhūte bodhisatvena na vastupraṭiṣṭhitena dānaṃ dātavyam / na kvacit praṭiṣṭhitena dānaṃ dātavyam /*).⁷⁶ Similarly, in its definition of the Perfection of

⁷⁴ Mitra, ed., *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*, 80.9-82.2 (with minor emendations).

⁷⁵ Cf. Conze, trans., *The perfection of wisdom in eight thousand lines & its verse summary*, 111-112.

⁷⁶ The Sanskrit transliteration of the Schøyen *Vajracchedikā* is adapted from Paul Harrison and Shōgo Watanabe, eds., “*Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā*,” in *Buddhist Manuscripts*, Vol. 3, ed. Jens Braarvig (Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection 12) (Oslo: Hermes Publishing, 2006), 114. See *ibid.*, 89-90 for a chronological list of the editions for this much-studied text. Cf. Paul Harrison, trans., “*Vajracchedikā*

Wisdom the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* states, in Conze’s translation, that a “[b]odhisattva, when he gives a gift, does not apprehend the gift, the donor, or the recipient.”⁷⁷ Apparently the donor who gives while holding onto any concept whatsoever—of himself, the gift, the recipient, the setting, the rewards, of *anything*—is not earning the full (or any?) amount of merit stipulated by the universal law of karma. The *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*, in fact, explains how little is due bodhisattvas who give for eons and eons when they reify false concepts like these: “Although they have given very many gifts, bodhisattvas with reified conceptions have also figured that there were a ‘good many’” (. . . *upalambhasaṃjñināṃ bodhisattvānāṃ subahv api dānaṃ dattaṃ subahv ity api parisamkhyātaṃ bhavati //*)⁷⁸ and therefore miss out on the merit they could have received.

According to one apparently influential line of Mahāyāna thinking, the gift and any merit resulting from it must not be apprehended precisely because there is nothing to apprehend. Taken to a logical extreme that perhaps only makes sense in a Mahāyāna Sūtra, the merit from a gift can only be so called because, in fact, it is not merit at all. In the words of the *Vajracchedikā*, a *kulaputra* or *kuladuhitṛ* giving incalculable amounts of the seven precious things

Prajñāpāramitā: A New English Translation of the Sanskrit Text Based on Two Manuscripts from Greater Gandhāra,” in *ibid.*, 143; Edward Conze, ed. and trans., *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā: Edited and Translated with an Introduction and Glossary* (Serie Orientale Roma XIII) (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1957), 67.

⁷⁷ Conze, trans., *The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom*, 314. See also *ibid.*, 66, 67, 72, 164, 306, 331, 430, 599, 689, etc. According to Lamotte, *Le traité de la grande vertu de Sagesse*, Vol. I (Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 25) (Louvain-la-neuve: Institut Orientaliste, 1944), 297, n. 2: “Le don superior qui constitue à proprement parler la vertu de don (*dānapāramitā*) repose essentiellement sur le savoir exempt de concept (*nirvikalpakajñāna*) qui le rend triplement pur (*trimaṇḍalaparīśuddha*): il consiste à ne faire aucune distinction entre la chose donnée (*deya*), le donateur (*dāyaka*), et le bénéficiaire (*pratigrāhaka*).” Also see the other sources Lamotte cites there.

⁷⁸ Mitra, ed., *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*, 158.8-9 (with minor emendations). Cf. Conze, trans., *The perfection of wisdom in eight thousand lines & its verse summary*, 132. See n. 29 above. See also Conze, trans., *The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom*, 599.

to buddhas gains a huge mass of merit that is really not a mass: “That son or daughter from a good family would generate a lot of merit because of that. For what reason? That, Blessed One, is indeed a non-mass. Therefore, the Tathāgata calls a mass of merit a ‘non-mass’” (*sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidānaṃ bahu puṇyaṃ prasunuyāt / tat kasya hetoḥ / sa eva bhagavann askandhaḥ / tasmāt tathāgato bhāṣate puṇyaskandhaḥ askandha iti /*).⁷⁹ Carrying the peculiar logic one step further, disinterestedly giving gifts devoid of any reality is an act of compassion. According to the *Gaganagañja-sūtra* (again from the *Sikṣāsamuccaya*), a bodhisattva should “give a gift that is not dependent on any form, just as the sky is formless” (*yathā gaganam arūpi evaṃ sarvarūpānīritaṃ tad dānaṃ dadāti*). Knowing his gift is not ultimately real, the bodhisattva gives it away without any trace of attachment—he is “pure of the sense of I” (*ahaṃkāra-viśuddha*), “pure of the sense of mine” (*mamakāra-viśuddha*), “pure of a reason” (*hetu-viśuddha*), “pure of a motive” (*nimitta-viśuddha*), and “pure of the desire for a karmic reward” (*vipāka-pratikāṅkṣānā-viśuddha*). Giving something without fixed characteristics, without any sense of self or hope for karmic compensation, demonstrates the bodhisattva’s true compassion: His gift is “suffused with kindness for all beings” (*sarvasatvamaitrīsparāṇa*) and “brings life to everyone” (*sarvasatvopajīvyā*).⁸⁰

⁷⁹ Adapted from Harrison and Watanabe, eds., “Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā,” in *Buddhist Manuscripts*, Vol. 3, 118. Cf. Harrison, trans., “Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā,” in *ibid.*, 145; Conze, ed. and trans., *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā*, 70. The text goes on to say that teaching even one of its small verses is vastly superior to making such huge material donations. The whole passage, or variants of it, is something of a refrain in the *Vajracchedikā*. See either the Harrison or Conze translation, sections 11, 13e, 15a, 19, 24, 28, and 32a. Refer to the category *Giving as a basis for comparison* above for similar examples.

⁸⁰ The whole passage can be found in Bendall, ed., *Çikṣāsamuccaya*, 270.9-271.3; Cf. Bendall and Rouse, trans., *Śikṣā-samuccaya*, 247.

Giving the body

Giving in Mahāyāna Sūtras can take extreme forms, not because of its being qualified in relation to wisdom, emptiness, or the like, but because of what is to be given: the body. Several Mahāyāna texts propose, sometimes in gruesome detail, that parts of the body or the entire body itself should be willfully sacrificed. The practice of *dehadāna* or “giving up the body” in Mahāyāna texts is certainly related to other Buddhist literature, especially the *Jātakas*, that promote the bodhisattva career by imitating the self-sacrificial path of the Bodhisattva, the future Buddha Śākyamuni.⁸¹ The *Rāṣṭrapālāpariṣcchā-sūtra*, in fact, alludes to some fifty *Jātakas* (though, interestingly, not in the first Chinese translation made by Dharmarakṣa), half of which highlight the Buddha’s generosity in previous lives. It refers to, for instance, the *Śibi Jātaka*, all of the versions of which tell the story of the Bodhisattva’s sacrificing himself for the sake of others. In one version King Śibi gives away his eyes, in another his head, and in yet another he cuts out part of his thigh to save the life of a dove from a hungry hawk.⁸² The *Suvarṇaprabhāsottama-sūtra* devotes an entire chapter to the *Jātaka* in which the Bodhisattva

⁸¹ Jean Filliozat argues that *dehadāna* episodes in Mahāyāna Sūtras in which bodhisattvas immolate themselves are related not only to *Jātakas*, but also to forms of self-sacrifice in Hindu and Jain literature. See Filliozat, “La mort volontaire par le feu et la tradition bouddhique indienne,” *Journal Asiatique* 251 (1963): 21-51. Reiko Ohnuma has studied the gift of the body in Indian Buddhist literature in depth, though she generally only mentions Mahāyāna literature in passing. See her “*Dehadāna*: The ‘Gift of the Body’ in Indian Buddhist Narrative Literature,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1997; “The Gift of the Body and the Gift of the Dharma,” *History of Religions* 37.4 (1998): 323-359; “Internal and External Opposition to the Bodhisattva’s Gift of His Body,” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 28 (2000): 43-75; *Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood*.

⁸² For a useful list of the *Jātaka* allusions in this text, see Louis Finot, *Rāṣṭrapālāpariṣcchā: Sūtra du Mahāyāna* (Bibliotheca Buddhica II) (St. Petersburg: Academy of Sciences, 1901), vii-viii. For discussion and references, see Boucher, *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna*, 29-33. Specific *Jātaka* references occur in other Mahāyāna Sūtras, though not to the same degree as in the *Rāṣṭrapālāpariṣcchā*. The *Vajracchedikā*, to cite one example, alludes to the *Kṣāntivādin Jātaka* by referring to the moment when the king of Kaliṅga mutilates the Bodhisattva’s body. See section 14e of the Conze or Harrison translation.

throws himself down a mountain in order to feed a hungry tigress and stop her from eating her own offspring.⁸³

Apart from *Jātaka* allusions or full *Jātaka* tales, Mahāyāna Sūtras frequently refer to gifts of the body. Thus the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* tells the well-known story of the bodhisattva Sadāprarudita, who cuts up his own body at a marketplace to sell to a man—really Śakra in disguise, there to test his resolve⁸⁴—to earn enough money to acquire offerings for the bodhisattva Dharmodgata. Later he and a large group of young women, lacking water, pierce themselves with a sword and sprinkle the ground with their blood in order to prevent dust from stirring and falling upon Dharmodgata.⁸⁵ Likewise, the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra* contains the influential chapter on the bodhisattva Bhaiṣajyarāja, who in a former life,⁸⁶ as Sarvasattvapriyadarśana, doused his body in oil and burned himself as an offering to a buddha named Candravimalasūryaprabhāsaśrī. Sarvasattvapriyadarśana is reborn after his body burns

⁸³ Skjærvø, ed. and trans., *This Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras*, Vol. I, 328-359. Also see *ibid.*, 19, 2.12; 251, 12.62; 254, 12.70; 256, 13.2; 280, 15.22; 281, 15.28. The *Samādhirāja-sūtra* has a version of the *Kṣāntivādin Jātaka*—see Andrew Skilton, “An Early Mahāyāna Transformation of the Story of Kṣāntivādin – ‘The Teacher of Forbearance,’” *Buddhist Studies Review* 19.2 (2002): 115-136. In addition, the *Karuṇāpuṇḍarīka-sūtra* tells the story of King Ambara, the Bodhisattva in a previous life who gives away his body piece by piece in a series of grisly acts, only to restore his body through an act of truth (*satyakriyā*) and become a giant mountain of flesh that feeds creatures for a thousand years. King Ambara also goes by the epithet *sarvaṃdada* in this story (see the *Epithets* section above). The Sanskrit for this *Jātaka* can be found in Isshi Yamada, ed., *Karuṇāpuṇḍarīka: The White Lotus of Compassion*, Vol. 2 (London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1968), 376-384. I owe this latter reference to Ohnuma, *Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood*, 83-84, 172, and 281-282. It is extremely likely that there are other *Jātakas* in Mahāyāna Sūtras that have escaped my attention.

⁸⁴ Śakra commonly plays this role in *Jātaka* literature. See Ohnuma, “The Gift of the Body and the Gift of the Dharma,” 324, n. 2; *Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood*, 28-29, 64-73, and 132-136.

⁸⁵ The entire episode can be found in Conze, trans., *The perfection of wisdom in eight thousand lines & its verse summary*, 277-299.

⁸⁶ I am not sure whether former birth stories of bodhisattvas constitute *Jātakas*. Conventionally that title is reserved for accounts of the previous lives of buddhas, especially, of course, of Śākyamuni. *BHSD*, s.v. *jātaka* cites two passages from the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* as examples of the term being used in the former sense, though probably as a “late and secondary extension” of the latter meaning.

for twelve thousand years, and he later publicly incinerates the arm from his new body to honor the stūpas containing the relics of the same buddha, Candravimalasūryaprabhāsaśrī.⁸⁷

It is difficult to determine to what extent such extreme acts of giving were practiced by human Mahāyānists in India,⁸⁸ but their Sūtras would appear to be literal in their encouragement to disregard the body. What the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* calls the *Nārāyaṇapariṣcchā-sūtra*⁸⁹ declares:

*evam eva kulaputra bodhisattvena mahāsattvenāsmiṃś cāturmahābhautike ātmabhāve
bhaiṣajyasamjñotpādayitavyā yeṣāṃ yeṣāṃ satvānāṃ yena yenārthaḥ tat tad eva me harantu
hastam hastārthinaḥ pādamaṃ pādārthina itī pūrvavat //*⁹⁰

In the same way [that a tree does not resist giving up its parts for medicine], son from a good family, the bodhisattva-mahāsattva must conceive of his body—made of the four great elements—as medicine. He thinks the following: “Let various beings take exactly what they want from me. One who wants a hand [can take my] hand. One who wants a foot [can take my] foot.”⁹¹

In a similar vein, the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* remarks on the proper attitude of a bodhisattva in the forest, one of five places, according to the text, that arouse fear:

⁸⁷ See Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra*, 263-274.

⁸⁸ The narrative of the bodhisattva Bhaiṣajyarāja’s self-immolation in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra* and other textual accounts of *dehadāna* certainly affected Buddhists more in China than in India. See James A. Benn, *Burning for the Buddha: Self-Immolation in Chinese Buddhism* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2007). The Chinese pilgrim Yijing does refer to bodily self-sacrifice in late 7th century India. For a discussion and translation of Yijing, see Boucher, trans., *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna*, 35-39.

⁸⁹ Paul Harrison has identified this text as the *Sarvaṇṇasamuccayasamādhi-sūtra*, which survives in Chinese and Tibetan. See “Mediums and Messages,” 125. It should be noted that some of the citations from the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* used in this paper might also be falsely attributed (or been known by alternative titles) by Śāntideva, but this should not negate their applicability as Mahāyāna textual examples.

⁹⁰ Bendall, ed., *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, 21.20-22.

⁹¹ Cf. Bendall and Rouse, trans., *Śikṣā-samuccaya*, 24. For sources on the concept of the body functioning as medicine, see Boucher, *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna*, 230, n. 192.

*punar aparaṃ śāriputra vyāḍakāntāramadhyagatena bodhisattvena mahāsattvena
nottrasitavyaṃ na saṃtrasitavyaṃ na saṃtrāsam āpattavyaṃ // tat kasya hetoḥ / tathā hi
tena bodhisattvena mahāsattvena sarvvaṃ parityaktavyaṃ sarvvasattvānām arthāya tenaivaṃ
cittam utpādayitavyam / yadi cen māṃ vyāḍā bhakṣayeyus tebhya eva tad dānaṃ dattam
bhavatu mama ca dānapāramitāparipūrī bhaviṣyati anuttarā ca me samyakṣaṃbodhir
āsannībhaviṣyati /⁹²*

Moreover, Śāriputra, a bodhisattva-mahāsattva who finds himself in the middle of a forest with wild animals must not be scared, must not be frightened, and must not be reduced to fear. For what reason? Because a bodhisattva-mahāsattva must surrender everything for the sake of all beings. He must think the following: “If the wild animals were to devour me, then a gift would be given to them. I will fulfill the Perfection of Giving and I will be closer to unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening.”⁹³

Indeed, the *Sāgaramati-sūtra* (again from the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*) defines the bodhisattva’s Perfection of Giving as “the abandonment of, surrendering of, and indifference to the body” (*yaḥ kāyasyotsargaḥ kāyaparityāgaḥ kāyānavekṣā / iyam asya dānaparimitā //*).⁹⁴ No matter how the putative Indian reader of such passages may have interpreted them, on the surface at least these and other Mahāyāna Sūtras do not seem to be figurative or symbolic. They do not say that one should act *as if* he would surrender his own life, or that one should merely *intend* to give up his body, or that the willingness to give up the body is *symbolic* of extreme mental detachment.⁹⁵ On the contrary, the bodhisattva must pay no heed to his body and, if the situation arises, simply give it away to whomever asks.

⁹² Mitra, ed., *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*, 361.8-14 (with minor emendations). Cf. Bendall, ed., *Çikṣāsamuccaya*, 349.6-9.

⁹³ Cf. Conze, trans., *The perfection of wisdom in eight thousand lines & its verse summary*, 217; Bendall and Rouse, trans., *Śikṣā-samuccaya*, 308. See also Jonathan Silk, trans., “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism with a Study of the *Ratnarāśīsūtra* and Related Materials,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1994, 352-354, V.17; Nattier, trans., *A Few Good Men*, 304, §25L(1).

⁹⁴ Bendall, ed., *Çikṣāsamuccaya*, 187.5-6; Cf. Bendall and Rouse, trans., *Śikṣā-samuccaya*, 182.

⁹⁵ As far as I can tell, this is true for the majority of Mahāyāna Sūtras. But this corpus is too large, of course, to be uniform. Śāntideva’s quotation of the *Vajradhvaṃja-sūtra* seems to include both literal and symbolic interpretations of gifts of the body. There it says the bodhisattva is to (literally, I think)

Mahāyāna Sūtras frequently portray the gift of the body as the best of all possible gifts. In the chapter just mentioned from the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra*, the Buddha describes gifts like Bhaiṣajyarāja’s in no small terms: Surrendering one’s body (*ātmabhāvaparitāga*) is the best gift (*agraṇadāna*), far better than a series of other possible gifts, such as giving away one’s dear children and wife. Giving up the body, in fact, is the “exceptional, best, most excellent, fine, sublime honoring of the Dharma⁹⁶” (*viśiṣṭāgrā varā pravārā praṇītā dharmapūjā*).⁹⁷ And, again according to the *Nārāyaṇapariṣcchā-sūtra* (= *Sarvaṇyāsamuccayasamādhi-sūtra*), a bodhisattva must think as follows:

*ayaṃ mamātmabhāvaḥ sarvasatvebhyaḥ parityaktaḥ utsṛṣṭaḥ / prāg eva bāhyāni vastūni
yasya yasya satvasya yena yena yad yat kāryaṃ bhaviṣyati tasmai tasmai tad dāsyāmi*

sacrifice his ears, nose, heart, and other body parts, to pledge to give up his marrow and flesh, and so on. But in the same place it also appears to interpret a request for a bodhisattva’s tongue as an invitation for him to speak wisely and affectionately, a sacrifice of his head as a gift of knowledge, and a gift of his hands and feet as the performance of good deeds—respectively, vocal, mental, and physical acts. See Bendall, ed., *Çikshāsamuccaya*, 23.7-26.3 (Bendall and Rouse, trans., *Śikṣā-samuccaya*, 25-28). The choice of this quotation may reflect an ambiguity on the part of Śāntideva regarding *dehadāna*. In *Bodhicaryāvatāra* 7.25-26, Śāntideva does not seem to have any qualms with the notion of sacrificing one’s body, comparing it to giving away a mere vegetable, but in 5.86-87 he explains that the body serves the True Dharma and therefore should only be surrendered to someone whose compassionate disposition is as pure as his own. See Kate Crosby and Andrew Skilton, trans., *Śāntideva: The Bodhicaryāvatāra* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 41-42 and 69. I owe the references to the *Bodhicaryāvatāra* to Ohnuma, “Internal and External Opposition to the Bodhisattva’s Gift of His Body,” 60 and 72, n. 51; Boucher, *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna*, 34. On Śāntideva’s caveats about premature giving in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, see Ohnuma, *Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood*, 227-228 and 329-330, n. 111.

⁹⁶ Note that in this passage the gift of the body is compared to and indeed equated with types of *pūjā*. See n. 32 above.

⁹⁷ Kern and Nanjio, eds., *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, 408.1-5; Cf. Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra*, 265. Later this section of the text explains that burning one’s big toe, a single finger or toe, a single limb, or an arm at a sacred site for Tathāgatas (*pādāṅguṣṭhaṃ tathāgatacaityeṣv ādīpayed ekāṃ hastāṅgulim pādāṅgulim vaikāṅgaṃ vā bāhum ādīpayed*) earns the son or daughter from a good family who has set out on the bodhisattva vehicle and who longs for unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening (*bodhisattvayāna-samprasthitaḥ kulaputra vā kuladuhitā vemām anuttarāṃ samyakṣambodhim ākāṅkṣamāṇo*) much more merit than other kinds of gifts. The text then continues into the now familiar comparison of the merit resulting from a huge amount of giving versus keeping just one verse of the text, about which see above under *Giving as a basis for comparison*. For the entire passage, see Kern and Nanjio, eds., *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, 414.10-415.9 (Cf. Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra*, 269-270).

*satsaṃvidyamānaṃ hastam hastārthikebhyo dāsyāmi pādaṃ pādārthikebhyo netram
netrārthikebhyo dāsyāmi / māmsaṃ māmsārthikebhyaḥ śoṇitaṃ śoṇitārthikebhyo majjānaṃ
majjārthikebhyo ṅgapratyaṅgāny aṅgapratyaṅgārthikebhyaḥ śiraḥ śirorthikebhyaḥ
parityakṣyāmi / kaḥ punar vādo bāhyeṣu vastuṣu yad uta dhanadhānyajātarūparajata-
ratnābharaṇahayagajarathavāhanagrāmanagaranigamajanapadarāṣṭrarājadhānīpattanadāsī-
dāsakarmakarapauruṣeyaputraduhitṛparivāreṣu /⁹⁸*

I have surrendered and relinquished this body of mine to all beings, much more so external objects. I will give any being whatsoever what he needs for any reason at all. When it is deemed right, I will give my hand to those who want a hand. I will give my foot to those who want a foot, and my eye to those who want an eye. I will surrender my flesh to those who want flesh, my blood to those who want blood, my marrow to those who want marrow, my primary and secondary limbs to those who want primary and secondary limbs, and my head to those who want a head; not to mention external objects, such as my wealth, grain, gold, silver, jewels, ornaments, horses, elephants, chariots, vehicles, villages, cities, settlements, rural areas, kingdoms, capitals, towns, female slaves, male slaves, servile workers, servile wage laborers, sons, daughters, and attendants.⁹⁹

The phrases *prāg eva* and *kaḥ punar vāda*—“even more so,” “not to mention,” “not to speak of,” etc.—are telltale signs that the text considers external objects (*bāhyāni vastūni*) to have less value as gifts—whatever their economic worth might be—than the internal objects that, in this case, constitute a bodhisattva’s body.¹⁰⁰ Sacrificing parts of the body is much more difficult than giving away the most expensive material objects or even, as in this example, human property. It therefore brings greater rewards in future lives, including the opportunity to

⁹⁸ Bendall, ed., *Çikshāsamuccaya*, 21.6-12.

⁹⁹ Cf. Bendall and Rouse, trans., *Śikṣā-samuccaya*, 23.

¹⁰⁰ Notice the similar constructions from the *Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra* in Schopen, ed., *A Sūtra for the Failed and Misbegotten*, section 7: *śiraḥkaracaraṇanāyanasvamāmsaśoṇitāni yācanakebhyaḥ pradāsyāmti prāg evānyaṃ dhanaskandham*; from the *Suvarṇaprabhāsottama-sūtra* in Skjærvø, ed. and trans., *This Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras*, Vol. 1, 19, 2.12: *antaśaḥ svaśarīramāmsarudhirāsthimajjayā bubhukṣitāḥ satvāḥ saṃtarpitāḥ prāg evānyena bhojanena*; and from the *Kāśyapaparivarta-sūtra* in Baron A. von Staël-Holstein, ed., *The Kāśyapaparivarta: A Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class. Edited in the Original Sanskrit in Tibetan and in Chinese* (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1926), 177 (§125): *tatra kāśyapa katamo bhūtapratipattiḥ śramaṇaḥ yaḥ kāśyapa bhikṣur anarthiko bhavati kāyena ca jīvitenaṇī / kaḥ punar vādo lābhasatkāraśloke /*. For a short discussion on and other references to these phrases, see Drewes, “Revisiting the phrase ‘sa pṛthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet’,” 113-114.

become a buddha and possess the extraordinary body concomitant with awakening. The distinction between *internal* and *external* gifts—implied in the example from the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* but made explicit in the *Nārāyaṇaparipṛcchā-sūtra*—is not limited to Mahāyāna Sūtras. An array of Buddhist texts on giving, in fact, express the superiority of gifts of the body compared to offering external things. Thus, in the *Sivi-jātaka* from the Pāli collection of birth stories, King Sivi is not content with external gifts but feels compelled to surrender parts of his body.¹⁰¹ As we will see, the inner/outer distinction is also an important theme in the section of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* translated below in chapter IV.

Finally, Mahāyāna Sūtras can imply the superiority of the gift of the body by placing it at the end of a series of gifts listed in a passage, sentence, or even a single compound word. In the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra*, for instance, the Buddha spells out the many items he gave in his past lives when he was seeking awakening. He begins with gold and various gems, continues with several kinds of land, moves to human property like his family members and slaves, goes on with different kinds of animals and vehicles, and finally ends with many types of body parts as well as his actual life.¹⁰² Lists like these are not uncommon in Mahāyāna Sūtras, and although their order is not uniform, they tend to follow a hierarchical pattern.

¹⁰¹ For references see Ohnuma, “The Gift of the Body and the Gift of the Dharma,” 325, n. 5; “Internal and External Opposition to the Bodhisattva’s Gift of His Body,” 45.

¹⁰² This list is squeezed into two compounds, one of them incredibly long: *abhūvam aprameyadānapradaḥ suvarṇamaṇimuktāvaiḍūryaśaṅkaśilāpravāḍajātarūparajatāśmagarbhamusāragalvalohitamuktāgrāmanagara-nigamajanapadarāṣṭrarājadhānībhāryāputraduhitṛdāsīdāsakarmakarapauruṣeyahastyasvarathayāvādātma-śārīraparityāgī karacaraṇaśirottamāṅgapratyaṅgajīvitadātā*. (Note the *yāvād* near the end of the long compound also underscores the significance of surrendering one’s own body.) See Kern and Nanjio, eds., *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, 256.11-257.1 (Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra*, 171). According to Pāṇinian rules, word order in *dvandva* compounds should be determined by phonology, not the meaning of the words or their relative importance. (Many thanks to Stephanie Jamison for pointing this out to me.) Suffice it to say that Buddhist authors rarely, if ever, operated within the confines of strict Pāṇinian grammar.

Indeed, the order of gifts in the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* is remarkably similar to the one here from the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*.

Giving the Dharma

According to many Mahāyāna Sūtras, one should give away the Dharma. For a bodhisattva the gift of the Dharma helps guide other beings along the spiritual journey of the great vehicle. Because it is an extension of his compassion for the welfare of others, this unique gift makes up part of the bodhisattva's own religious path. In the words of the *Ratnaguṇasaṃcaya-gāthā*, “After acquiring the qualities of the Conquerors, for the sake of all beings they [i.e., those on the bodhisattva path] will give the Dharma to the world for the total destruction of suffering” (*sattvārtha te jinaguṇān anuprāpuṇitvā; dāsyanti dharma jagatī dukhasaṃkḥayāye //*).¹⁰³ In a similar vein, the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* says that the irreversible bodhisattva gives the Dharma in order to fulfill the wishes of all beings.¹⁰⁴ The frequent mention of giving the Dharma in Mahāyāna Sūtras like these without a doubt comes out of the larger Mainstream Buddhist tradition that stresses the gift of the Dharma,¹⁰⁵ the texts of which often consider the gift of the Dharma to be the prerogative of monks and nuns after they have received material gifts from the laity.¹⁰⁶ The Buddhist notion of giving the

¹⁰³ Yuyama, ed., *Prajñāpāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*, 102, verse 2c-d. Cf. Conze, trans., *The perfection of wisdom in eight thousand lines & its verse summary*, 57.

¹⁰⁴ Conze, trans., *The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom*, 457.

¹⁰⁵ For just one Mainstream example, see O. von Hinüber and K.R. Norman, eds., *Dhammapada* (Oxford: Pāli Text Society, 1994), v. 354.

¹⁰⁶ Although I have found more references about the exchange of material gifts and the Dharma in Mainstream texts, it is not unheard of in Mahāyāna Sūtras. The *Ugrapariprcchā-sūtra*, in Nattier's translation, says that “material furnishings provide an occasion for Dharma-furnishing” (Nattier,

Dharma is in turn part of the wider Indian emphasis on knowledge and its great value as a gift¹⁰⁷—to be sure, it is because of the gift of knowledge that twice-born men must hold their teachers in such high regard.¹⁰⁸

On occasion Mahāyāna Sūtras sanction making material donations in concert with gifts of the Dharma. Hence the *Longer Sukhāvativyūha* describes how bodhisattvas in the idyllic setting of Sukhāvati are generous with both physical and Dharmic gifts,¹⁰⁹ and the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā* explains how bodhisattvas situated in the Perfection of Meditation (see above under *Giving in relation to the other Perfections*) make and praise both types of gifts.¹¹⁰

Usually, however, Mahāyāna Sūtras describe gifts of the Dharma as utterly superior to material

trans., *A Few Good Men*, 277). The gift of the Dharma is sometimes carefully explained *not* to be a direct reciprocation of a material gift, for this would interfere with a donor’s ability to “cash in” on his gift and earn merit. See Ohnuma, “Gift”; Ohnuma, *Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood*, 144-145. Also see the discussion on the Buddhist Saṃgha’s lack of participation in restricted exchange (a term borrowed from the sociological and anthropological literature, particularly from Lévi-Strauss) in Ivan Strenski, “On Generalized Exchange and the Domestication of the Saṃgha,” *Man* n.s. 18 (1983): 463-477.

¹⁰⁷ Several Indian legal texts declare the gift of knowledge (*vidyādāna*) to be the best gift. *Manusmṛti* 4.233, for one, proclaims: “The gift of the Veda [*brahmadānaṃ*] far exceeds every other gift, whether it is the gift of water, food, cows, land, clothes, sesame seeds, gold, or ghee.” See Olivelle, ed. and trans., *Manu’s Code of Law*, 136 (Skt. on p. 551). For other Brahmanical references, see Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. II, Pt. II, 848. The gift of knowledge is stressed in the Jain tradition as well. One Digambara scholastic classification, for example, lists four things that should be given (*dātavya*) to ascetics, the fourth being the gift of knowledge (*jñānadāna*). See R. Williams, *Jaina Yoga: A Survey of the Mediaeval Śrāvakācāras* (London: Oxford University Press, 1963), 154.

¹⁰⁸ There is an effort in some Śāstric texts to interpret *vidyādāna* or *dharmadāna* figuratively, lest the teacher have to give the fee (*dakṣiṇā*) to the pupil rather than the other way around. According to Śāstric rules, a valid gift must be accompanied by the payment of the *dakṣiṇā* to the gift’s recipient. See Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. II, Pt. II, 842.

¹⁰⁹ Luis O. Gomez, trans., *The Land of Bliss: The Paradise of the Buddha of Measureless Light* (1996; repr., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2002), 101 (§119).

¹¹⁰ Conze, trans., *The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom*, 583. See also *ibid.*, 675ff., which describes how a bodhisattva is to go about winning over others to the religious life by means of material gifts and gifts of the Dharma. The list of the four “ways to win over” (*saṃgrahavastu*) others appears in a number of Sanskrit and Pāli texts, and, as far as I know, always begins with giving.

gifts, an unequal dichotomy that was borrowed from the larger Mainstream Buddhist world of India.¹¹¹ The *Ugrapariṣṭcchā*, the content of which—forsooth, the very organization of which—is designed to encourage those on the bodhisattva path to become ascetic monks, tersely explains that householders value giving material things but that “in renunciant life, one highly esteems giving the Dharma.”¹¹² The *Maitreyasīṃhanāda-sūtra*, in one of its many passages heaping criticism on corrupt monastics (see below under *Criticism of monastic greed and illegitimate practice*), similarly states that “a monk who wants to go to homes [on his alms round] must go with a present of the Dharma, and must not bestow any other present besides that” (Tib. *dge slong khyim rnams su 'ang 'gro bar 'dod pas ni chos kyi skyes kyis 'gro bar bya ba ma gtogs par skyes gzhan bskur bar mi bya ste /*).¹¹³ The *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra* expounds on the point at greater length. In a long section of the text, Vimalakīrti, feigning illness, criticizes the way śrāvakas and bodhisattvas perform many common Buddhist practices. When the Buddha asks Sudatta to visit Vimalakīrti and inquire about his health, Sudatta balks at the idea:

¹¹¹ For instance, *Aṅguttara Nikāya* I, 91 differentiates between *āmiśadāna* (a material gift) and *dharmadāna* (a gift of the Dharma) in much the same way as the passage from the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra* discussed shortly and a passage from the *Maitreyasīṃhanāda-sūtra* cited just below in n. 113. Ohnuma, “The Gift of the Body and the Gift of the Dharma” argues that in many of the *Jātakas* involving *dehadāna*, there is an implied parallel between the Bodhisattva’s material gift of the body in the narrative past and the Buddha’s gift of the Dharma in the narrative present. In this interpretation, the difference between physical and Dharmic gifts disappears because the latter are actually a kind of surrendering of the body of the Dharma (*dharmakāya*).

¹¹² Nattier, trans., *A Few Good Men*, 271, §19U.

¹¹³ sTog Kanjur, *dkon brtsegs*, Ca 168b6-7. The *Maitreyasīṃhanāda-sūtra* makes the same point elsewhere in the text. sTog Kanjur, *dkon brtsegs*, Ca 191b4 -193b3 lauds bodhisattvas who “do not delight in gifts” (*sbyin pa la dga' bar yang mi bgyid*) and who are “not delighted when they see those who incite someone else to give material things [= *āmiśa*] of the world” (*gzhan zhig 'jig rten gyi zang zing stsol bar bgyid pa de dag mthong na 'ang de la dga' ba skyed par mi bgyid pa*). But shortly later the text encourages the bodhisattva to enter various places after he has learned a lot and give the Dharma, for “giving the gift of the Dharma (= *dharmadāna*) was commended and praised by buddhas, blessed ones” (*chos kyi sbyin pa 'di ni sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das rnams kyi bsnags shing bstod pa*). Also see the passage from the *Maitreyasīṃhanāda* discussed in n. 52 above.

. . . *abhijānāmy ahaṃ bhagavan svake paitṛke niveśane mahāyajñam yajāmi sarvadaridra-
duḥkhibhyaḥ sarvaśramaṇabrāhmaṇakṛpaṇavanīyakayācanakebhyaḥ dānam dadāmi
saptadivisān mahāyājñam yajāmi / tatra saptame divase vimalakīrttir licchavis tā
mahāyajñasālām praviśya mām etad avocat na śreṣṭhiputraivam yajño yaṣṭavya yathā tvam
yajase dharmayajñas te yaṣṭavyaḥ kin te āmiṣayajñana. . .*¹¹⁴

Blessed One, I remember I performed a great sacrifice in my father’s house. I gave gifts to all the poor and suffering and to all the ascetics, brahmans, destitute, mendicants, and beggars. I performed the great sacrifice for seven days. Then, on the seventh day, the Licchavi Vimalakīrti came to the dwelling where that great sacrifice was and said this to me: “Guildsman’s son, a sacrifice must not be performed in the way you are performing it. You must perform a sacrifice of the Dharma. What is the point of your sacrificing material things?”

Sudatta then goes on to relate how Vimalakīrti clarified for him what a Dharma sacrifice consists of, an explanation rife with many advanced Mahāyāna philosophical ideas and doctrinal lists.¹¹⁵ In the passage translated here, Vimalakīrti promotes the gift of the Dharma while undermining material gifts. More importantly, the object of his critique would not have been lost on a Buddhist audience. Sudatta is none other than Anāthapiṇḍada, the donor who famously purchased the Jetavana, had a monastery built on its grounds, and gave it and the land to the Buddha and his Saṃgha. But here Anāthapiṇḍada does not even know what constitutes a proper gift. The *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* paints the donor *par excellence* of Buddhist literature (and imagery), he who is labeled as the “best among givers” (Pāli *aggo dāyakānaṃ*),¹¹⁶

¹¹⁴ Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature, The Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism, ed., *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa: Transliterated Sanskrit Text Collated with Tibetan and Chinese Translations* (Tokyo: Taisho University Press, 2004), 168, §68 (with minor emendations).

¹¹⁵ For the entire passage, see Lamotte, trans., *L’Enseignement de Vimalakīrti*, 212-216.

¹¹⁶ See the many sources on Anāthapiṇḍada cited in *ibid.*, 211, n. 135.

as a fool who does not understand the first thing about making gifts. In so doing, the text shows disapproval for the whole system of Indian gift exchange.¹¹⁷

This passage from the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra* describes in considerable detail exactly what a gift (or sacrifice) of the Dharma should look like. The *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā*, too, elucidates what it means when it says a bodhisattva should make a gift of the Dharma. At one point the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā* provides a multifaceted and hierarchical explication of what makes up a gift of the Dharma, dividing it into worldly (*laukika*) and otherworldly (*lokottara*) components¹¹⁸; at another, the text concisely calls establishing an individual of the vehicle of disciples or solitary buddhas (*śrāvakayāna* or *pratyekabuddhayāna*, respectively) on the “paths of the ten virtuous actions” (*daśakuśalakarmapatha*) a gift of the Dharma.¹¹⁹ Generally, however, Mahāyāna Sūtras do not appear to spell out the content of the Dharma that should be given. Nevertheless, it seems quite plausible that by a “gift of the Dharma,” Mahāyāna Sūtras mean an offering of their own ideas or words. My suspicion, that is, is that the slippery term *Dharma* in such cases refers to the concepts or literal words from the particular Mahāyāna Sūtras themselves. I am not aware of any Mahāyāna Sūtra that suggests that its contents be kept to oneself (standing in stark contrast to Vinaya passages that declare in no uncertain terms that the monastic discipline is not to be shared with the laity). On the contrary, Mahāyāna Sūtras tend to be relentless in their call for their propagation in oral or written form. In this light, it does not seem unreasonable to conclude that encouraging the reader to make a gift of the

¹¹⁷ The text also takes aim at Brahmanical sacrifices, a frequent target in Mainstream and Mahāyāna Buddhist literature alike.

¹¹⁸ Conze, trans., *The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom*, 676ff.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 582. Although the *daśakuśalakarmapatha* are prevalent in Mahāyāna Sūtras, they are most definitely not of Mahāyāna origin. I will discuss them below in the introduction to my translation of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*, as they occupy a central position in that text.

Dharma is an exhortation for him or her actually to recite the Mahāyāna Sūtra to others or give them away in some physical “book.”¹²⁰ Indeed, in another rare passage from a Mahāyāna Sūtra that expands upon about the gift of Dharma, the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* says, in Pagel’s translation: “[T]he bodhisattva who preaches this Dharma-treatise and explains it in detail to others accomplishes the perfection of liberality [*dānapāramitā]. Why? Because the gift of the Dharma is the best of [all] gifts.”¹²¹ By “this,” of course, the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa-sūtra* refers to itself. This effort by the authors of the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* and other Mahāyāna Sūtras represents one of the many strategies employed by Mahāyāna communities to carve out textual niches for themselves, the difficulty of which cannot be understated. For the self-promotion of individual Mahāyāna Sūtras took place in environments with predefined understandings of what the Buddha’s authoritative words (*buddhavacana*) were¹²² and

¹²⁰ See the citations in n. 3 above. Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia*, 10, regarding the *Dānakāṇḍa* and *Dānasāgara*, two 12th century Śāstric anthologies on giving, states the following: “The gift of learning was understood as both the production of written books that came to be dedicated to a deity and installed within a temple in a ritual ceremony, and as the transmission of oral knowledge by recitation and exposition. Both types are highly praised and are said to generate great merit for the donor.” Kane, *History of Dharmasāstra*, Vol. II, Pt. II, 883 has literary citations on making gifts of texts and also includes textual and epigraphic references on providing the funds and the space for reading them. Also see Williams, *Jaina Yoga*, 157 and 165 for citations on giving texts in Jain scholastic sources.

¹²¹ Ulrich Pagel, *The Bodhisattvaṅgikā: Its Doctrines, Practices and their Position in Mahāyāna Literature* (Buddhica Britannica Series Continua 5) (Tring, U.K.: Institute of Buddhist Studies, 1995), 147, n. 118.

¹²² On Mahāyāna textual legitimacy, see Donald S. Lopez, Jr., “Authority and Orality in the Mahāyāna,” *Numen* 42.1 (1995): 21-47, and David McMahan, “Orality, Writing, and Authority in South Asian Buddhism: Visionary Literature and the Struggle for Legitimacy in the Mahāyāna,” *History of Religions* 37.3 (1998): 249-274. On the function of “inspired speech” (*pratibhāna*) in opening up new avenues of *buddhavacana* for Mahāyāna Sūtras, see Graeme MacQueen, “Inspired Speech in Early Mahāyāna Buddhism I,” *Religion* 11 (1981): 303-319; MacQueen, “Inspired Speech in Early Mahāyāna Buddhism II,” *Religion* (12): 49-65. Joseph Walser has recently argued that Nāgārjuna’s real project was to prove that early Mahāyāna texts conformed to Buddhist canonical standards in order to tap the resources for their reproduction. I am uncomfortable with the certainty behind Walser’s conclusions regarding the time and place of Nāgārjuna’s life, but his hypothesis on the practical motives behind Nāgārjuna’s writings is an interesting one, though I do not think it has yet met with substantial discussion. See Walser,

potentially had to proceed in the midst of competition from other new Mahāyāna texts making parallel claims for attention and authenticity. I hope to return to this interesting topic in a future paper, but for now I will just remark that the issue of how and to what end Mahāyāna Sūtras define *Dharma* is well worth pursuing.¹²³

Promotion of lay giving

It is remarkable just how little Mahāyāna Sūtras deal with what one might assume would be critical to the success of Mahāyāna monastic groups: lay generosity. It is particularly striking when one considers how frequently Indian religious texts stress giving to monks or other religious specialists. Dharmasāstric works, especially giant legal digests (*nibandhas*) from the medieval period, lay out in great detail (and with a thinly veiled layer of self-interest) the particularities of making gifts to and otherwise supporting and revering the brahman class. Although the three twice-born classes are all enjoined to make gifts, only brahmins have the legal privilege to earn a living by receiving them.¹²⁴ The *Mahābhārata* abounds with references

Nāgārjuna in Context: Mahāyāna Buddhism and Early Indian Culture (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005).

¹²³ Note that the word *dharma* can also take on the more generic adjectival meaning of “religious” or “pious” when referring to gifts. Hence Śāstric compendia (*nibandha*) mean “pious gift” when they use the term *dharmadāna*. See Kane, *History of Dharmasāstra*, Vol. II, Pt. II, 842; Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia*, 35. In addition, the word *deyadharmā*, which is found sometimes in texts and frequently in inscriptions to signify various kinds of donated objects, means “religious gift.” This also appears to be the meaning of *dharma* in Kern and Nanjio, eds., *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, 445.11-446.10, which describes Akṣayamati’s gift of a pearl necklace to Avalokiteśvara as *dharmaprābhṛtaṃ dharmācchādam*. However, what *prābhṛta* and *ācchāda* themselves mean here is less than clear (the Kashgar manuscript and at least one Tibetan version of the text even omit *dharmaprābhṛtaṃ*), so this is in no way certain. See Gregory Schopen, “The Ambiguity of Avalokiteśvara and the Tentative Identification of a Painted Scene from a Mahāyāna Sūtra at Ajaṅṭā,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 278-298, esp. 297, n. 30.

¹²⁴ Kane, *History of Dharmasāstra*, Vol. II, Pt. I, 105-164; Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia*.

to the munificence of its valiant kings, and the Indian epigraphic record, if one interprets inscriptions as a kind of text, proves that Indian rulers took their duty to give very seriously.¹²⁵ Jain scholastic texts detail the procedures for the laity’s making offerings to renunciant monks and nuns, especially their giving of alms food.¹²⁶ Mainstream Buddhist works, too, make frequent mention of the value of giving to the monastic community, the Saṃgha. The *Dakkhiṇāvibhaṅga-sutta*, for example, provides a hierarchical list of fourteen kinds of offerings (*dakkhiṇā*) made to individuals of various levels of spiritual achievement, and also delineates seven types of offerings given to the Saṃgha.¹²⁷ And throughout the Pāli Canon the Buddhist Saṃgha is described as “worthy of donations, worthy of hospitality, worthy of offerings, worthy of veneration, the unsurpassed field of merit for the world” (*āhuneyyo pāhuneyyo dakkhiṇeyyo añjalikaraṇīyo anuttaraṃ puññakkhettaṃ lokassa*).¹²⁸ Needless to say, examples from these and other textual genres—from the Brahmanical, Hindu, Buddhist, or Jain traditions—could be marshaled *ad nauseam*.

But for some reason, such things are rarely found in Mahāyāna Sūtras.¹²⁹ It may be that the monks who composed and redacted these Sūtras were ensconced (happily or not) in

¹²⁵ For some examples, see the chapter on royal charters and other epigraphic grants in D.C. Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy* (1965; repr., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1996), 103-160.

¹²⁶ Williams, *Jaina Yoga*, 149-166; Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia*.

¹²⁷ *Majjhima Nikāya* III, 254-256. For the most recent rendering into English, see Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli and Bhikkhu Bodhi, trans., *The Middle Length Discourse of the Buddha: A New Translation of the Majjhima Nikāya* (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 1995), 1103-1105.

¹²⁸ For a list of citations to this common phrase, see Egge, *Religious Giving and the Invention of Karma in Theravāda Buddhism*, 140, n. 1. And for numerous examples of various kinds of recipients in Pāli narratives, see Jean-Michel Agasse, “Le transfert de mérite dans Bouddhisme Pāli classique,” *Journal Asiatique* 266 (1978): 319.

¹²⁹ On the other hand, the future passive participle *pradakṣiṇīya* is used with some frequency to describe personages in Mahāyāna Sūtras. Although *pradakṣiṇīya* is generally translated as “worthy of reverence”

Mainstream monasteries and were therefore covered under the umbrella of material support those monasteries afforded. Perhaps Mahāyāna monks did not think it was necessary to address lay generosity in their new literature because it had been so thoroughly tackled in the Mainstream Sūtras they had inherited and the Mainstream Vinayas under which they were ordained. Encouraging lay giving, in this scenario, would have felt superfluous to monks who were already well supported under the auspices of patronage that had been institutionalized by time and tradition.

Apart from the historical and institutional circumstances that gave rise to Mahāyāna Sūtras—or, conceivably, in addition to those circumstances—an explanation for the lack of emphasis on lay giving may lie in the Mahāyāna doctrinal emphasis on compassion. On the surface this appears counterintuitive. Doesn't the laity need to show compassion too? Wouldn't lay compassion most naturally find expression by making gifts? But by emphasizing lay gifts, the monks who wrote and redacted Mahāyāna Sūtras would have written themselves into their own texts as the potential recipients of those gifts, a possible problem they may have wanted to avoid. A compassionate bodhisattva showers the world with his gifts. He does not take them. To accept a gift from someone else is to deprive the donor of his or her goods, an act indicative of selfishness and attachment, the very things compassion is supposed to root out.¹³⁰ When Mahāyāna Sūtras do take notice of the recipient, they do so in very restricted

or the like, it is unclear to me whether it should be treated as a synonym of *dakṣiṇīya*. Because of the latter term's obvious etymological relationship to the Vedic *dakṣiṇā*, it can more safely be rendered as "worthy of offerings" and therefore understood as a description of an individual's worth as a potential recipient of gifts.

¹³⁰ I have found Reiko Ohnuma's typology of *giving up* and *giving down* particularly useful. According to her schema, buddhas and bodhisattvas give "down" to unworthy recipients out of compassion and without any hope for worldly or otherworldly rewards. (As we will see below, however, Ohnuma's categorization of *giving down* is not consistent with the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*, where receiving rewards is

ways. They tend either to identify the recipient as a buddha (see above under *Giving to a buddha*)—whose unlimited compassion is never in any doubt—or to bring genuinely ascetic bodhisattva-monks into relief against the depravity of greedy monks who are definitely not following the compassionate path of a bodhisattva (see the next two sections, *Ideal recipients and legitimate practice* and *Criticism of monastic greed and illegitimate practice*).

The *Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra* represents a notable exception to the general dearth of material in Mahāyāna Sūtras on lay giving. It makes a definitive division between the lay and monastic bodhisattva, and the burden of giving in this text falls squarely on the former: Only in the section devoted to lay bodhisattvas is giving discussed in any detail. The *Ugraparipṛcchā* exhorts the lay bodhisattva to give not only to the community of monks and nuns, but also to anyone who asks. This would even include supplicant beggars, which the text singles out as the recipient of gifts on several occasions.¹³¹ In the radical world of the *Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra*, the lay bodhisattva is encouraged to give away anything and everything. When the lay bodhisattva gives indiscriminately to all creatures, he cultivates the compassion necessary for the

integral to the Mahāyāna bodhisattva's gift.) See *Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood*, 152-166. She argues that the Buddhist notion of giving to unworthy recipients has historical roots in the ethos of the kṣatriya warrior-king, since, according to the epics, it is the duty of the kṣatriya to indiscriminately distribute the land and goods he has acquired through warfare. The kṣatriya, though, must never request or receive gifts, as this would be tantamount to his defeat in battle. In linking the compassionate giving of Buddhist literature to the mode of exchange of the kṣatriya warrior, Ohnuma borrows heavily from Minoru Hara, "A Note on the Rākṣasa Form of Marriage," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 94.3 (1974): 302-304, as well as Thomas R. Trautmann, *Dravidian Kinship* (Cambridge Studies in Social Anthropology 36) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 282-285.

¹³¹ Similarly, the lay queen Śrīmālā, in her sixth vow from the *Śrīmālādevīśiṃhanāda-sūtra*, promises to give her future wealth away to "the poor and friendless"; in her eighth vow she pledges to free the downtrodden from their misery by giving them material goods. See Alex and Hideko Wayman, trans., *The Lion's Roar of Queen Śrīmālā*, 64-65. Here the notion of a lay person's giving compassionately to the helpless intersects with pan-Buddhist theories on kingship—or queenship, as the case may be. Contrary to the ethos of Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*, the proper Buddhist king serves as a moral exemplar by governing with unmitigated compassion, even to the point of giving away the kingdom's wealth and renouncing his rule.

bodhisattva path.¹³² More importantly, only by relinquishing all of his property is the lay bodhisattva fit for the renunciant life of a monk, a station this Sūtra undoubtedly prefers.¹³³

Ideal recipients and legitimate practice

Even a Mahāyāna text like the *Ugraparipṛcchā* that devotes considerable space to lay giving seems careful to deflect attention away from the bodhisattva as a recipient. Rather than homing in on the encounter between the lay donor and the monastic bodhisattva who could find himself on the receiving end of the gifts, the *Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra* emphasizes the compassionate intentions of the lay bodhisattva and his self-improvement as he gives up all possessions and renounces the world. When the text does actually describe the lay bodhisattva's visit to a monastery and interaction with the recipients of his donations, it has him giving basic requisites like robes and medicine to generic monks, not to monastic bodhisattvas in particular—if there is a bodhisattva on the receiving end of these gifts, he is hidden from view.¹³⁴ And even when the *Ugraparipṛcchā* takes up the renunciant bodhisattva on his alms round, it wants to limit the connection between the bodhisattva and lay donor. While he begs, the monastic bodhisattva must think to himself: “I should live by my own power, not

¹³² Brahmanical texts will sometimes pause to differentiate between compassionate donations like the sort mentioned in the *Ugraparipṛcchā* and gifts made in agreement with Śāstric rules, which I discuss briefly in chapter IV, part A. According to some Śāstras, formal giving (*dāna*) and receiving (*pratigraha*) must by definition follow prescriptions about the status of the donor and donee, the procedure of gift exchange, the proper occasions for making gifts, and so on. Indiscriminate giving motivated by compassion does not account for these normative conventions and is, in that sense, illegitimate. See Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. II, Pt. I, 116; Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia*, 74-81.

¹³³ For discussion and references see Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 111-117 and 163-164. From the text itself note especially *ibid.*, trans., 315, §31B(1): “O Eminent Householder, the householder bodhisattva who lives at home gives away all things without regard.”

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, trans., 275, §20D.

in dependence upon another. . . . I will not rely on any man, woman, boy, or girl. . . .”¹³⁵ The ideal recipient who treads the bodhisattva path, it would seem, is barely on hand during the transaction of the gift. His presence is muted. The *Ugraparipṛccha-sūtra* appears to be uncomfortable with the idea of a bodhisattva as a recipient, a literary uneasiness that I would guess betrays a real-life worry that a bodhisattva could fall prey to the traps of the everyday social world he should be striving desperately to escape.

Other Mahāyāna Sūtras are more willing to provide details about the ideal recipient of a gift, but in almost all cases he turns out to be quite similar to the figure from the *Ugraparipṛcchā*. The other Sūtras really just expand upon his qualities and make more explicit connections between the capacity to engage rigorously in authentic religious practices and one’s status as a recipient of gifts. In both the *Ugraparipṛcchā* and elsewhere, the ideal recipient is preoccupied with spiritual practice, a preoccupation that contributes to and is informed by a sense of detachment. He is ascetic. What makes him ideal as a recipient is his reluctance to take much from a donor. Thus, according to the *Maitreyasimhanāda-sūtra* those who have “gone forth” (Tib. *rab tu byung nas* = Skt. *pravrajya*) into the “well-spoken Dharma and Vinaya” (Tib. *legs par gsungs pa’i chos ’dul ba*) should be moral beings guided by the Buddhist foundations of training (Tib. *bslab pa’i gzhi* = Skt. *śikṣāpada*) and monastic rules (Tib. *so sor thar pa* = Skt. *prātimokṣa*). When in the presence of a potential donor, moreover, they must be “free of greed, free of hypocrisy, free of smooth talk, free of hints, free of extortion, free of using goods to elicit [a donor to give more] goods” (Tib. *brkam chags med pa dang / tshul ’chos pa med pa dang / kha gsag med pa dang / gzhog slongs med pa dang / thob kyis ’jal ba med pa dang / rnyed pas rnyed*

¹³⁵ Ibid., trans., 287-288, §24B.

par byed 'dod pa med pa dang /).¹³⁶ They live abstemiously in their effort to break the cycle of rebirth, and under no circumstances would they resort to tricking or forcing a donor into giving more. For the model donees of the *Maitreyasimhanāda-sūtra*, gifts are only meant to provide the most basic of needs to continue the religious life, which in this section of the text includes being able to fix the mind correctly upon the many sublime characteristics of the Buddha.¹³⁷ Meditating upon the qualities of the Buddha and undertaking other religious activities endorsed by the *Maitreyasimhanāda-sūtra* only work if practitioners live aloof from the mundane world without hankering after material goods. And it is precisely their commitment to spiritual practice within the context of an ascetic life that makes them proper vessels to receive gifts.

The Mahāyāna Sūtras that address the nature of the ideal recipient want to preserve the relations between lay persons and monastics, even as they are sometimes concerned with limiting contact between the two parties. At the heart of the relationship is the exchange of donations for religious merit, a defining feature of lay/monastic interactions throughout the history of Buddhism in India. (The same could be said for Buddhist traditions outside of India and even for other religions, although in the latter case the form and metaphysical underpinnings of supernatural “merit” certainly vary.) The symbiotic system of exchange depends on the good character and legitimate practice of the potential donee. He must be

¹³⁶ The Skt. for the last four of these items is, respectively, *lapanā*, *naimittikatā*, *naiṣpeṣikatā*, and *lābhena lābhaniścikīrṣā*. Together they make up four of the five “dishonest ways to make a living” (*mithyājīva*) for a monk. It is difficult to translate the series perfectly, but the sense is clear enough: A supplicant must be humble and straightforward during his encounters with possible donors. See BHS, s.vv. and Unrai Wogihara, *Bodhisattvabhūmi: A Statement of the Whole Course of the Bodhisattva (Being the Fifteenth Section of the Yogācārabhūmi)* (Tokyo: Seigo Kenkyūkai, 1930–1936), 21–26.

¹³⁷ The whole Tibetan passage I am referring to from the *Maitreyasimhanāda-sūtra* can be found at sTog, *dkon brtsegs*, Ca 150a1–151a4 (the brief quote is at Ca 150a4–5).

worthy of the donations he receives. In Buddhist terms, the recipient of religious donations must be a fruitful field (*kṣetra*) that can produce the karmic rewards the patron is counting on. (Again, the most fertile recipient for a donor is a buddha—his unsurpassed dedication to religious practice over many lifetimes has led to an awakened state of perfect morality and omniscience. See above under *Giving to a buddha*.) Hence, in the *Sūryagarbha-sūtra* the Buddha is made to explain to King Bimbisāra how donors can expect to benefit from making gifts to “monks who live according to the Dharma” (Tib. *dge slong chos kyis gnas pa rnams*). If they offer such monks monasteries, household goods, slaves, and other gifts, they “will be reborn as kṣatriyas . . . and will be reborn among the gods of the abode of neither perception nor non-perception” (*rgyal rigs . . . dag tu skye bar 'gyur ba nas / 'du shes med 'du shes med min skye mched kyi lha rnams kyi nang du skye ba'i bar du 'gyur ro //*).¹³⁸ Donors to worthy monks “will also be reborn in pure buddha-fields” (*sangs rgyas kyi zhing yongs su dag pa dag tu yang skye bar 'gyur ro //*) and in future lives “will encounter buddhas, blessed ones” (*sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das rnams dang yang phrad par 'gyur ba*).¹³⁹ The *Ratnarāsi-sūtra* is even clearer about who can receive gifts:

I permit the gift of faith, Kāśyapa, to two śramaṇas. Which two? The one who is intent and the one who is liberated. And to two others: the one who sees impermanence with respect to all conditioned things, and the one who attains the mind of liberation and friendliness. Monks, in that regard that intent monk, yogacārin, who practices what I have taught, having enjoyed the robes, begging bowl, sleeping mat, medicaments, and equipments [obtained] from donors and benefactors, who sees the faults of saṃsāra, sees the impermanence in all conditioned things, understands that all conditioned things are suffering, zealously applies himself to the [fact that] all dharmas lack a self, and comprehends that nirvāṇa is calm, even though he enjoys mouthfuls of [food] as great as Mount Sumeru [given as a] gift of faith, still the offerings

¹³⁸ The abode of neither perception nor non-perception (*naivasamjñānāsamjñāyatana*) is the most refined of the Buddhist formless realms and stands on the cusp of awakening. Being reborn there is usually said to require advanced levels of mental concentration (*samādhi*). See Sadakata, *Buddhist Cosmology*, 75-79.

¹³⁹ I have taken the Tibetan from Silk, “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 177-178. He has translated a long section of the *Sūryagarbha-sūtra* in *ibid.*, 162-166 (from the Derge, *mDo sde*, Za 103b5-106b5).

made to him become completely and totally pure. When [that monk] enjoys a gift of faith from donors and benefactors, the maturation of merit from that [gift] for those donors and benefactors has great power, and the benefit [to them] is great. Why? Because, monks, the attainment of a friendly attitude is the best of material objects related to meritorious action.

Monks, if a monk who having enjoyed the robes, begging bowl, couch and equipments of a donor and benefactor were to attain the immeasurable mind of liberation, you should know the maturation [of merit] of that donor and benefactor would also be immeasurable. Even, Kāśyapa, if possibly the oceans which are in three thousand times many thousands of world systems were to be exhausted, still there would be no exhaustion of all the natural results of that merit. . . .¹⁴⁰

The superior field of merit is either one who has already reached liberation or is doggedly intent on doing so, in addition to those who have a profound understanding of the world as it really is. Through them and through them alone can the donor reap large rewards.

In particular, this passage from the *Ratnarāśī-sūtra* singles out the *yogācārin*—he who engages (*ācārin*) in religious practice (*yoga*)—as worthy of gifts. Silk goes to great lengths to show that in the *Ratnarāśī-sūtra* as well as in a bevy of Mainstream and other Mahāyāna texts the *yogācarin* monk is an ascetic figure devoted especially to cultivating his meditative practice.¹⁴¹ What we have, then, is a Mahāyāna Sūtra whose agenda—an agenda put into the authoritative mouth of the Buddha himself—is to promote meditation in the framework of an ascetically oriented monastic life.¹⁴² According to the *Ratnarāśī-sūtra*, a monk who lives up to

¹⁴⁰ Translation adapted from *ibid.*, 287-289 (for the Tibetan and Chinese see pp. 407-410 and 566-567, respectively). Cf. Bendall and Rouse, trans., *Śikṣā-samuccaya*, 135-136 (Bendall, ed., *Çikshāsamuccaya*, 138.2-11).

¹⁴¹ Silk, “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 105-142; Silk, “The *Yogācāra Bhikṣu*,” in *Wisdom, Compassion, and the Search for Understanding: The Buddhist Studies Legacy of Gadjin M. Nagao*, ed. Jonathan A. Silk (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2000), 265-314.

¹⁴² The ascetic nature of early Mahāyāna Sūtras has received considerable scholastic attention in recent years. See, as just a sample of this work, *ibid.*, esp. 69-96; Reginald Ray, *Buddhist Saints in India: A Study in Buddhist Values and Orientations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), esp. 251-292; Harrison, “Searching for the Origins of the Mahāyāna: What are we Looking for?”; Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 73-170;

this ideal not only advances his own spiritual welfare, but also does a great service to donors in search of worthy recipients for their gifts and the ensuing karmic rewards. Although not necessarily focused on the figure of the *yogācārin*, all the Mahāyāna Sūtras that are preoccupied with the ideal (human) recipient appear to be up to the same thing: By adhering to a restrictive set of generally ascetic religious activities, the practitioner preserves the integrity of gift exchange. When each side of the gift equation performs its function, the lay person by giving and the monastic through dedication to practice, both the donor and the recipient can benefit.

Criticism of monastic greed and illegitimate practice

Why do certain Mahāyāna Sūtras seem to be anxious about the system of gift exchange breaking down? What exactly were their authors and redactors so worried about? Well, there is another side to the agenda behind the concern for the ideal donee that I have so far failed to mention. In the last section I referred to the ideal recipients of the *Sūryagarbha-sūtra*, those monks who “live according to the Dharma.” But the model donees of this text, as it turns out, are not alone; in their midst are monks who live by decidedly lower standards. Far from being guided by the Dharma, such “monks of unethical conduct” (Tib. *dge slong tshul khrims 'chal pa*)¹⁴³

Jonathan Silk, “Dressed for Success: The Monk Kāśyapa and Strategies of Legitimation in Earlier Mahāyāna Buddhist Scriptures,” *Journal Asiatique* 291.1-2 (2003): 173-219; Schopen, “The Mahāyāna and the Middle Period in Indian Buddhism,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 15-17; Schopen, “The Bones of a Buddha and the Business of a Monk” and “On Sending the Monks Back to Their Books,” in *ibid.*, 63-153; Daniel Boucher, *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna*, 40-84, and “Sacrifice and Asceticism in Early Mahāyāna Buddhism,” in *Religion and Identity in South Asia and Beyond: Essays in Honor of Patrick Olivelle*, ed. Steven E. Lindquist (New York: Anthem Press, 2011), 197-224.

¹⁴³ The Skt. for “unethical conduct” is *duḥśīla*; when referring to a person, Silk argues that it should be translated more specifically as “precept breaker,” meaning someone who violates the Buddhist rules of

have “given up on the otherworld” (*'jig rten pha rol btang ba*). Rather than legitimately pursuing the religious life, these monks seek their own personal comfort and financial well-being. They are “delighted with acquisitions, honor, and praise” (*rnyed pa dang / bkur sti dang / tshigs su bcad pa la mngon par dga' ba yin /*) and driven by attachments, vices that show up “as soon they get a hold of personal possessions” (*gang zag gir srel bar byed na*) like donated monasteries, slaves, and animals.¹⁴⁴ The concern about self-serving monks shows up in the *Buddhapīṭakaduḥśīlanigrahī-sūtra* as well. The same figures, the “monks of unethical conduct,” are described there as greedily “feeding their bodies with delectable things that were provided by others” (Tib. *gzhan gyis bsags pa'i longgs spyod kyis lus gso bar byed do*). Instead of what the ideal Mahāyāna donee should care about—his own awakening and the welfare of others—the crooked monks of *Buddhapīṭakaduḥśīlanigrahī-sūtra* are “preoccupied with their own livelihood, enslaved by material possessions, and preoccupied with [getting] food and clothing” (*'tsho ba lhur len pa / 'jig rten gyi zang zing gis bkol ba / zas dang bgo ba lhur len pa yin no //*).¹⁴⁵ It is hard to imagine monks who live less “according to the Dharma” than this sorry lot of scoundrels. The “monks of unethical conduct” require gifts to support a lax life, and the only religious acts they might practice are done for show, are vulgar displays of histrionics and sanctimony meant to attract donations.

conduct. See “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 143-145.

¹⁴⁴ I have taken the Tibetan from *ibid.*, 175-176. Again, Silk’s translation of this section of the *Sūryagarbha-sūtra* can be found at *ibid.*, 162-166.

¹⁴⁵ I also owe my awareness of this text to Silk, who translated part of it at *ibid.*, 158-162 (using the Derge, *mDo sde*, *Dza* 23a5-25b1; Peking, *mDo*, *Tshu* 23b3-25b5; sTog, *mDo*, *Kha* 351b7-354b7). The Tibetan can be found at *ibid.*, 172-173.

So we have upstanding monks who serve as ideal recipients on the one hand, and profligate monks not concerned with the welfare of their donors on the other. Whose numbers are greater? To borrow an image from the Christian tradition, is this an equal battle of good versus evil? From the acerbic viewpoint of a number of Mahāyāna Sūtras—not only the *Sūryagarbha-* and *Buddhapīṭakaduḥśīlanigrahī-sūtras* that I just mentioned, but also the *Samādhirāja-*, *Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā-*, *Kāśyapa-parivarta-*, and *Maitreyasiṃhanāda-sūtras*, to name a few Mahāyāna texts—the “good guys,” the virtuous bodhisattvas, were in the minority. Degenerate monks were everywhere, and corruption had seeped into the heart of the monastic order, infecting the very institution that the Buddha was believed to have established. Part of this reflects the rhetorical efforts of many Mahāyāna authors and redactors to represent themselves as being part of an embattled minority suffering at the reprobate hands of the non-Mahāyāna majority. When they take up the imagery of the last days of Buddhism—“in a future time, in the final age, in the final period, in the final five hundred years, in the age when the True Dharma is being destroyed” (*anāgate ’dhvani paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyāṃ pañcaśatyāṃ saddharmavipralopakāle vartamāne*)¹⁴⁶—the sense is that they are not talking about the future at all, but a present in which their beliefs and practices and especially their texts—for them, that which represents the “True Dharma”—are being neglected for illegitimate pursuits. It is rhetoric like this that led Gregory Schopen and others radically to reconceive of

¹⁴⁶ This wording and length of time here have many variations in Mahāyāna texts. The concept is also definitely not of Mahāyāna origin. See Jan Nattier, *Once Upon a Future Time: Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline* (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1991), esp. 33ff. and 106-109.

Mahāyāna as a marginal movement or collection of movements wielding little institutional power in Buddhist India.¹⁴⁷

But there is an insider problem here too. It is not just a question of Mahāyāna dogooders and corrupt “Hīnayāna” monks who, among other things, are not fruitful recipients of gifts. On the contrary, with equal vitriol some Mahāyāna Sūtras level accusations of greed and illegitimate practice against fellow bodhisattvas, or at least against those claiming to be bodhisattvas. In the *Maitreyasimhanāda-sūtra*, Maitreya asks the Buddha:

*bcom ldan 'das de bzhin gshegs pas skyes bu dam pa ma lags pa / byang chub sems dpar mchid
kyis 'che ba / dge sbyong du mchid kyis 'che ba / glen pa blun po rnyed pa dang bkur sti 'tshal
ba / rnyed pa dang bkur sti la gdu ba dang / mdza' bshes kyi sdum pa dang / slongs mo ster ba'i
sdum pa la gdu ba / bsod nyoms la sbyor bar brtson pa / de dag gi nongs pa'i gnas bdag la bka'
stsal du gsol /*

Blessed One, can the Tathāgata tell me the extent of the offenses of those unholy men who claim to be bodhisattvas, who claim to be renunciants [Skt. *śramaṇa*], the stupid idiots who seek acquisitions and honor, who covet acquisitions and honor, who covet the houses of their relatives and the houses that provide donations, and who make strenuous efforts for alms?

The Buddha is then made to explain the four characteristics of such fraudulent bodhisattvas—wanting acquisitions, wanting honor, being deceitful, and making a living with a frivolous livelihood (*rnyed pa 'dod pa dang / bkur sti 'dod pa dang / g.yo byed pa dang / yang ba'i 'tsho bas 'tsho bar byed pa yin te /*)—and subsequently is made to describe their bickering over access to alms-providing homes the way dogs fight over households that offer scraps of food.¹⁴⁸ Bodhisattvas,

¹⁴⁷ A lot of works could be cited here, but I will just note two of the more influential: Stephen A. Kent, “A Sectarian Interpretation of the Rise of the Mahayana,” *Religion* 12 (1982): 311-332; Schopen, “The Mahāyāna and the Middle Period in Indian Buddhism,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 3-24. Even recent publications that are in part attempts to resurrect early Mahāyāna in India do not disagree that it held minority status—see Rhi, “Early Mahāyāna and Gandhāran Buddhism”; Mark Allon and Richard Salomon, “New Evidence for Mahayana in Early Gandhāra,” *Eastern Buddhist* 41.1 (2010): 1-22.

¹⁴⁸ sTog Kanjur, *dkon brtsegs*, Ca 164a1-165a6.

it would seem, are just as capable as any monk of duplicity and greed. They can act like dogs. Suffice it to say that the *Maitreyasimhanāda-sūtra* is not the only Mahāyāna text criticizing the immoral and wayward behavior (and sometimes even stupidity) of bodhisattvas, a fact that will have to be reckoned with if we ever want to identify the intended audience(s) of this literature.¹⁴⁹ For our purposes it is important to underscore that the ideal donees I described in the last section are few and far between. According to some Mahāyāna Sūtras, greed had infiltrated the ranks of non-bodhisattvas and bodhisattvas alike.

Censures like these in certain Mahāyāna Sūtras were attempts at individual and collective reform. On an individual level, such texts attempted to improve the conduct of depraved monastics, or at the very least to strike fear into impressionable monks at risk of becoming depraved themselves. In the *Maitreyasimhanāda-sūtra*, Mahākāśyapa asks the Buddha to tell him about the ways of hypocritical bodhisattvas (*byang chub sems dpa' tshul 'chos pa dag*)—those whom the text has the Buddha describe as “having weak determination and being preoccupied with [getting] food and cloth” (*lhag pa'i bsam pa nyam chung ste / zas dang gos lhur len pa*)—so that other bodhisattvas “could guard themselves” (*de dag nyid kyang srung bar 'gyur ba*) against them.¹⁵⁰ The point was to align individual monastic behavior within the guidelines

¹⁴⁹ All of the early Gāndhārī manuscripts of Mahāyāna texts that we know of have been found within collections of mostly Mainstream texts, which raises several questions about their actual readership (if any) and use. For discussion see Allon and Salomon, “New Evidence for Mahayana in Early Gandhāra,” 13ff.

¹⁵⁰ sTog Kanjur, *dkon brtsegs*, Ca 183a5-183b4.

of the practices that the Sūtras advocated. As I have already stated, the practices that were promoted tended to be ascetic in nature.¹⁵¹

More broadly, the authors and compilers of this group of Mahāyāna Sūtras—again, those which address the character of the recipient of religious donations—appear anxious about the monastic enterprise. They were worried, that is, about the fate of the entire Saṃgha. That Mahāyāna groups, especially early Mahāyāna groups, were motivated to reform the Indian Saṃgha has already been addressed by Schopen and others,¹⁵² so let me just touch on a couple of the relevant points. First, it appears that there were, from the jaundiced perspective of some early Mahāyāna authors, deep structural problems in the monastic community. The frequent criticisms of greed directed at both non-bodhisattva and bodhisattva monks suggest that this subset of Mahāyāna authors and redactors believed that monasteries had accumulated a lot of wealth. Whether this wealth was considered to belong to the greedy monks as individuals or to the Saṃgha as a corporate entity remains an open question, but one verse from the *Rāṣṭrapālāparipṛcchā-sūtra* translated immediately below indicates that it had concerns about the conflation of monastic repositories of wealth that were supposed to remain separate.¹⁵³ The avarice for wealth, particularly in the form of gifts, also means that many monks were thought to be too beholden to generous benefactors, especially lay benefactors. By extension, there is a suspicion lurking behind the Mahāyāna Sūtras in question that the

¹⁵¹ The *Maitreyasīmaṇḍāda-sūtra* in particular promotes meditation and textual recitation for monks. See Schopen, “The Bones of a Buddha and the Business of a Monk,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, esp. 91.

¹⁵² See the works on asceticism in Mahāyāna Sūtras in n. 142 above, which also treat the reformative agendas of early Indian Mahāyāna to varying degrees.

¹⁵³ With regard to this concern in other texts—Mainstream and Mahāyāna—see Silk, “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 247-254.

relationship between the Saṃgha *en masse* and its patrons was much too intimate. (The Saṃgha’s reliance on lay patrons was, of course, nothing new. It formed the basis of its very survival. The problem for these Mahāyāna authors was not that the Saṃgha was reliant on lay donations, but that the donations were now well beyond meeting its basic needs; the problem was one of degree, not kind.) It is hard not to make this conclusion from one of the more trenchant (and frequently cited) passages from the *Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā*:

*vidhyanta hasta tathā pādāṃś cīvarakarṇakā nidhunantaḥ /
kāṣāyakaṇṭha vicarantā grāmakuleṣu madyamadamattāḥ //
buddhasya te dhvaja grhītvā sevakarā grhasthajanatāyām /
lekhaṃ vahanti satataṃ te śāsanadaṃ vihāya guṇarāśim //
gohayagardabhāś ca paśudā[sa] saṃbhavate hi dāsy api teṣāṃ /¹⁵⁴
kṛṣikarmavāṇijyaprayogā yuktamanāś ca te nityam anāryāḥ //
naiśāṃ anāryam api vācyam naiva ca kiṃcid asti yad akāryam /
staupikasāṃghikam hy api ca vittaṃ paudgalikaṃ ca tac ca samam eṣāṃ //
bhikṣuṇa vīkṣya ca guṇādhyam teṣv api cāpy avarṇa kathayanti /
duḥśīlavañcaka praviśya kuhās te strī ca vināśayanti hi sughorāḥ //
grddho grhī na tathā kāmair yādṛśe pravrajitva te grddhāḥ /
bhāryāḥ sutā duhitaraś ca teṣu bhaviṣya grhisamānam //
yatraiva satkṛta kule te cīvarapiṇḍapātaparibhogaiḥ /
tasyaiva dārapariḡddhā kleśavaśānugaḥ sada anāryāḥ //*¹⁵⁵

Waving their hands and feet and shaking the hem of their robes [for attention],
The ochre necks¹⁵⁶ wander among village houses drunk on their intoxicating conceit.
Taking up the banner of the Buddha [i.e., monastic robes], they act as servants around
people of the household.

They always carry letters, having abandoned the teaching with its mass of good
qualities.

They have cows, horses, asses, and [other] livestock, as well as male and female slaves.
Forever ignoble, they are fixated on agricultural work and commercial practices.

¹⁵⁴ I follow the manuscript instead of Finot’s edition for the first *pāda*, at the suggestion of Boucher, *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna*, 234, n. 237.

¹⁵⁵ Finot, ed., *Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā*, 29.1-14 (with minor emendations).

¹⁵⁶ “Ochre neck” (*kāṣāyakaṇṭha*) is a pejorative term for an immoral monk and involves an old pun with *kaṣāya*, “impurity.” See Silk, “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 76-77; Boucher, *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna*, 233, n. 234.

There is nothing that is ignoble or blameworthy to them, nothing that should not be done.

What belongs to the stūpa or the Saṃgha and what has been acquired for individuals is the same to them.

After seeing [other] monks who are rich in good qualities, they criticize them.

Undertaking immoral and deceitful behavior, those awful frauds ruin women.

A householder does not yearn with desires to the extent that they yearn after they have gone forth.

They will have wives, sons, and daughters like householders do.

In a household where they are honored with robes, alms food, and [other] goods,

The ignoble ones, always under the power of the defilements, covet his [the householder's] wife.¹⁵⁷

And the text continues in a similarly caustic tone. If we are to believe the picture painted here, monks had become worse than lay people. Not only are they wandering about town on the lookout for lavish donations, but they also have (living) property, engage in lay occupations, and even have families. They are more enslaved by desire than householders, yet ostentatiously play the part of good, upstanding monks. Since there are, again, so many fraudulent monks populating the world of the *Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā* and similarly themed Mahāyāna Sūtras, one of their underlying premises seems to be that the division between the Buddhist monastic community and the outside world had blurred, if not disappeared altogether.

Thus for our Mahāyāna authors and redactors there appear to have been (at a minimum) two entrenched problems in the Saṃgha—its excessive wealth and its dependence on extravagant patronage. It is this assumed backdrop that explains so much of the criticism of individual monastic abuses. A degenerate Saṃgha, at least as it was conceived in the literary imagination of Mahāyāna Sūtras, was the sum total of immoral acts. Conversely, the Saṃgha's

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Silk, trans., “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 166-167 (and 379-380 for a similar passage in the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra*); Boucher, trans., *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna*, 138. It is important to note that these few verses are part of a section of the text that is not present in the earliest version of the *Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā* available to us, Dharmarakṣa's 3rd century Chinese translation. See *ibid.*, 108-109.

wanton fortunes and reliance on donors allowed for and perpetuated the dissolute behavior of monks. As the collective goes so go its members, and reforming one means reforming the other.

In addition, the reformative agendas of this group of Mahāyāna Sūtras may be more than hot air describing select beliefs and practices as faithful to the Buddha’s original message, more than holier-than-thou rhetoric meant to portray the Sūtras’ adherents as the last marginalized few who still uphold the True Dharma. Instead, the Mahāyāna push for individual and collective reform may reflect historical realities of Indian Buddhist monasticism at the time of the composition and redaction of these Sūtras. Just based on the sheer level of vitriol present in passages like the one from the *Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā-sūtra* above, we might deduce that these would-be Mahāyāna reformers had a legitimate axe to grind. (In the textual world of Indian Buddhism, the condemnation of monastic greed and related problems is not limited to Mahāyāna Sūtras. Mainstream Sūtras and Vinayas make similar critiques,¹⁵⁸ but not with the same ferocity as Mahāyāna Sūtras. One also finds much the same thing in Brahmanical texts.¹⁵⁹) But there is more. To begin with, Mainstream Vinayas spell out and legitimate the sort of infrastructures that would have been necessary to protect the monastic assets—land, goods, money, and so on—the greed for which this collection of Sūtras condemns. As Schopen has shown, the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, to list but a few things, expects monks to be able to pay

¹⁵⁸ See Silk, “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 142ff.; Schopen, “The Bones of a Buddha and the Business of a Monk,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 72; Boucher, *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna*, 68-71.

¹⁵⁹ Compare *Manusmṛti* 4.190-200 in Olivelle, ed. and trans., *Manu’s Code of Law*, 134 (Skt. on pp. 541-543).

their debt,¹⁶⁰ explains how and to whom money should be lent on interest,¹⁶¹ and has several passages on the inheritance of dead monks' former property.¹⁶² Mainstream Vinayas also attempt to regulate the complex web of relationships with lay donors, contact with whom these Mahāyāna Sūtras so desperately want to limit. The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* again and again elaborates on the obligation monks had to generate merit for their patrons by putting their donations to good use. It seems clear, for example, that the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* considers monks obliged to maintain properly and reside in monasteries that lay people donated and, in some cases, still owned.¹⁶³ Few relationships require more careful management and sustained contact between parties than that between property owner and occupant, and one can easily imagine the disdain some Mahāyāna authors might have felt for such a residential arrangement.

The targets of the criticisms in this set of Mahāyāna Sūtras become all the more real when we consider dates. To avoid getting bogged down in chronological minutiae and falling even further afield from discussing the recipient of gifts in Mahāyāna Sūtra literature, I will

¹⁶⁰ See Gregory Schopen, "The Good Monk and his Money in a Buddhist Monasticism of 'the Mahāyāna Period,'" in *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*, 3, and "Dead Monks and Bad Debts: Some Provisions of a Buddhist Monastic Inheritance Law," in *ibid.*, 122-169.

¹⁶¹ From Schopen, see "The Good Monk and his Money," in *ibid.*, 6-7; "Art, Beauty, and the Business of Running a Buddhist Monastery in Early Northwest India," in *ibid.*, 28-31; "Doing Business for the Lord: Lending on Interest and Written Loan Contracts in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*," in *ibid.*, 45-90; also see "On the Legal and Economic Activities of Buddhist Nuns: Two Examples from Early India," in *Buddhist Nuns, Monks, and Other Worldly Matters: Recent Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2014), 95-118. For a range of monastic commercial issues (including loans) addressed in Indian Vinayas, see also Jacques Gernet, *Buddhism in Chinese Society: An Economic History from the Fifth to the Tenth Centuries*, trans. Franciscus Verellen (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), 153-166.

¹⁶² Schopen, "The Good Monk and his Money," in *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*, 4-6 and 9-12, and "Deaths, Funerals, and the Division of Property in a Monastic Code," in *ibid.*, 91-121. See also Gernet, *Buddhism in Chinese Society*, 85-88.

¹⁶³ Schopen, "The Lay Ownership of Monasteries and the Role of the Monk in *Mūlasarvāstivādin* Monasticism," in *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*, 219-259.

offer only the briefest of summaries. There is basic agreement that early Mahāyāna Sūtras date to around the beginning of the Common Era. The Sūtras at hand—the *Ratnarāśi*, *Maitreyasimhanāda*, *Kāśyapaparivarta*, at least an early version of the *Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā*, and so on—all appear to be “early,” meaning their composition more or less belongs to the first few centuries of the Common Era. This period was also witness to the florescence of sedentary, institutionalized monasticism in India. The composition and redaction of much of the Vinaya literature that, in theory at least, regulated monastic life in India stems from this period. That is, the authors and compilers of Mainstream monastic codes were promulgating rules about practices and behaviors for what looks like a very bureaucratic Saṅgha around the time that some Mahāyāna authors were railing against many of those same practices and behaviors.¹⁶⁴

More importantly, the material record points in the same direction. There are scores of Buddhist monastic sites we now know of that date to the first three or four centuries of the Common Era. Most of the major construction at Indian Buddhist sites—including, among the more notable locations, Sahrī-Bahlol and Takht-i-Bāhī in Gandhāra, a series of sites around Mathurā in North India, Ajaṅṭā and Kāñheri in the Western Deccan, and Amarāvātī and Nāgārjunakoṇḍa in the South—dates, in fact, to this period. At these and many other monastic sites stood architecturally impressive and often elaborately decorated structures, like worship halls (*caityagrha*), shrines, and the monasteries (*vihāra*) themselves, all of which would have required extensive planning, trained craftsmen, and a good deal of money to build and

¹⁶⁴ On the overlap in approximate chronology, content, and even wording between Mainstream Vinayas (especially the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*) and Mahāyāna Sūtras, see Schopen, “The Mahāyāna and the Middle Period in Indian Buddhism,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 15, and “The Bones of a Buddha and the Business of a Monk” in *ibid.*, 68-77.

maintain.¹⁶⁵ We also have hundreds of extant inscriptions from the same period that show us how all of this was financed. *Vihāras* and other monastic structures, parcels of land where those structures were to be built, and individual images were commonly donated to monastic groups as one-time gifts. In some cases, the Saṃgha or some of its members was endowed with money, which could generate interest on the principal in perpetuity, or villages, the produce and taxes of which could serve as an indefinite source of revenue.¹⁶⁶ We know from Buddhist inscriptions that donations were often made by the wealthy and powerful. And dozens of inscriptions, not insignificantly, record the gifts of monks and nuns.¹⁶⁷

The textual, archaeological, and epigraphic records—all from Mainstream Buddhist traditions—offer us a pretty clear idea of what these reformative Mahāyāna authors and redactors were responding to: a relatively early phase of well-organized and fully institutionalized Buddhist monasticism (or *monasticisms*). Buddhist monks had become

¹⁶⁵ Among the many works on Indian Buddhist architecture, see H. Sarkar, *Studies in Early Buddhist Architecture of India* (1966; repr., Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1993); Debala Mitra, *Buddhist Monuments* (Calcutta: Sahitya Samsad, 1971); Vidya Dehejia, *Early Buddhist Rock Temples: A Chronological Study* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1972); G. Nagao, “The Architectural Tradition in Buddhist Monasticism,” in *Studies in History of Buddhism: Papers Presented at the International Conference on the History of Buddhism at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, August 19-21, 1976*, ed. A.K. Narain (Delhi: B.R. Publishing 1980), 189-208; Kurt A. Behrendt, *The Buddhist Architecture of Gandhāra* (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

¹⁶⁶ From Schopen, see “Art, Beauty, and the Business of Running a Buddhist Monastery in Early Northwest India,” in *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*, 29; “Doing Business for the Lord,” in *ibid.*, 45-90; “The Mahāyāna and the Middle Period in Indian Buddhism,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 11; “On the Legal and Economic Activities of Buddhist Nuns,” in *Buddhist Nuns, Monks, and Other Worldly Matters*, esp. 103ff.

¹⁶⁷ See Schopen, “Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism: The Layman/Monk Distinction and the Doctrines of the Transference of Merit,” in *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks*, 23-55, and “On Monks, Nuns, and ‘Vulgar’ Practices: The Introduction of the Image Cult into Indian Buddhism,” in *ibid.*, 238-257.

permanently settled in what were for their time well-crafted and expensive monasteries.¹⁶⁸ The Saṃgha was propped up by a glut of land and wealth, and from a conservative Mahāyāna perspective was now too successful—materially, at least—for its own good. The only way to maintain this level of success was to keep the faucet of money, goods, and property running, and then to safeguard all of this once it had been siphoned into monastic hands. The latter required elaborate administrative, legal, and financial organization to handle the incoming capital, and the former was predicated on continual and all too cozy relationships with generous benefactors.¹⁶⁹ Those benefactors were, in many cases, monks and nuns themselves. Business, it seems, was booming, and it was booming at a time when what would come to be called “Mahāyāna” Sūtras were first taking shape in India.

Let us return to the gift. The censures present in conservative Mahāyāna Sūtras are not, to be sure, limited to the giving and receiving of material gifts. In Mahāyāna Sūtras we also find critiques of various monastic rituals, different types of worship, engaging in business transactions, lusting after women, having sex, having families, arrogance, deceit, and simply being all-around misbehaving lowlifes. We saw many of these critiques packed into just a few verses from the *Rāṣṭrapālāpariṣcchā-sūtra*. But even when they are not about giving per se, exchange still lies at the heart of the Mahāyāna textual rebukes. To quote one last time from

¹⁶⁸ But they were not necessarily settled in the same monasteries for their entire monastic lives. See the remarks on monastic itinerancy and multilingualism in Schopen, “Regional Languages and the Law in Some Early North Indian Buddhist Monasteries and Convents,” *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 23 (2009): 171-178.

¹⁶⁹ Among the many works by Schopen just cited in short succession, “Art, Beauty, and the Business of Running a Buddhist Monastery in Early Northwest India,” in *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*, 19-44 in particular shows the lengths to which monks might have gone to attract and maintain close relationships with donors so that their monasteries would prosper.

the *Maitreyasimhanāda-sūtra*: “[W]hat is called ‘poison’ for this well-spoken Dharma and Vinaya is, namely, acquisition” (Tib. *legs par gsungs pa’i chos ’dul ba ’di la dug ces bya ba de ni ’di lta ste / rnyed pa yin*).¹⁷⁰ The statement here, which would be well placed anywhere in this group of Mahāyāna Sūtras, is not explicitly about giving; it is a condemnation of greed and incorrect religious practice (in this case the sale of Tathāgata images). But greed and illegitimate forms of practice are precisely what ruin a monk’s ability to generate merit for the donor who offers him a gift. Such a monk becomes a barren vessel for donations, a fallow field in which the fruit of the gift wastes away, because he is hoarding “poison.”¹⁷¹ And because according to our texts the collective Saṃgha was teeming with monks of the same ilk, it, too, was in grave danger. It, too, was amassing poison. Reformative Mahāyāna Sutras read as a sort of antidote. They were attempts to root out corruption and thereby restore the fabric of gift exchange upon which the Saṃgha depended. As Silk remarks, “Perhaps the key point in all this talk about good and bad

¹⁷⁰ sTog Kanjur, *dkon brtsegs*, Ca 209a7-b1.

¹⁷¹ One is immediately reminded of Brahmanical hesitations to receive gifts because of their ability to transfer impurity from the donor to the recipient, thereby sapping the latter’s ritual potency. *Manusmṛti* 4.186 warns: “Even if he [a twice-born man] is qualified to accept gifts, he should avoid becoming addicted to that practice, for by accepting gifts his vedic energy is quickly extinguished.” See Olivelle, ed. and trans., *Manu’s Code of Law*, 133 (Skt. on p. 540). Such reluctance to receive donations extends all the way to modern times—see Trautmann, *Dravidian Kinship*, 285-288; Gloria Goodwin Raheja, *The Poison in the Gift: Ritual, Prestation, and the Dominant Caste in a North Indian Village* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988); Jonathan Parry, *Death in Banaras* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994). (All work on the gift in India in one way or another stems from Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*, trans. W.D. Halls (New York: W.W. Norton, 1990), especially the influential (if misguided) observation on 146-147, n. 61.) I doubt, however, that Brahmanical notions of “poison in the gift” are in any way related to the reference to poison in the *Maitreyasimhanāda*—the Buddhist case is a warning about the dangers of having possessions, not about the pollution inherent in the physical gift itself. Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia*, 61-62 makes the same conclusion for “contemporary anthropological [and] premodern textual accounts of Jain and Buddhist practices of gift giving.” But for an argument about Brahmanical and Buddhist parallels regarding the potential impurity of a gift, see Liz Wilson, “Beggars Can Be Choosers: Mahākassapa as a Selective Eater of Offerings,” in *Constituting Communities: Theravāda Buddhism and the Religious Cultures of South and Southeast Asia*, ed. John Clifford Holt, Jacob N. Kinnard, and Jonathan S. Walters (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003), 57-70.

monks, in the end, comes down not so much to whether the monk will find liberation for himself . . . but rather whether he will be able to provide an opportunity for lay devotees to generate merit.”¹⁷² With regards to the larger monastic community, what was at stake for this group of Mahāyāna Sūtras was not material success—again, Buddhist monasteries on the ground look to have been flourishing at the time—but, to use a word I suspect Buddhist philosophical traditions would not care for, its soul.

I began the above analysis with an eye not so much on mapping textual patterns regarding the gift within Mahāyāna Sūtra literature, but on positioning the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* relative to other Mahāyāna texts. Knowing beforehand that Mahāyāna literature is so repetitive and formulaic, I had assumed the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* would fall in line with Mahāyāna patterns about the gift. Since the *Dānapāramitā* is one of the few extant Mahāyāna texts written expressly about giving, and since its author(s) and/or redactor(s) may very well have been aware of this, might it not represent or summarize the various positions on the gift found in Mahāyāna Sūtras? The answer is a definitive no. Above I identify twelve ways in which gift giving appears in Mahāyāna Sūtras. Half of them do not show up in the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* at all. There are not any epithets containing a word for gift or giving, nor are there any instances in which something is given to a buddha. The text never uses giving as a basis for comparison to another religious practice, and nowhere do we find any attempt to reinterpret giving through the prism of emptiness or related concepts. The *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*

¹⁷² Silk, “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 171. Also see *ibid.*, 182ff., as well as Boucher, *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna*, 77–78 and 80–83.

also does not promote lay giving, at least not overtly. And there is apparently no concern with rampant greed and illegitimate practices of monks.

For starters, I do not believe the lack of giving epithets in the text signifies much of anything. The presence of a word for *gift* or *giving* in a name or title, something one finds across Indian literary genres from any time period, simply points to the munificence and general rectitude of a literary character. The absence of giving epithets, though, does not mean there is some anti-giving agenda in a particular text, much less in a text like the *Dānapāramitā* that promotes giving. For the rest, we might apply Jan Nattier’s “interpretations of absence” to yield potentially elucidating conclusions about the composition and possible redaction of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*. Nattier has offered some helpful explanations as to why certain ideas or practices are absent in a text where they might be expected to occur. First, a concept or practice might have been so well known that mentioning it was considered to be superfluous. An author could assume the idea or practice as background knowledge for the text’s readers. Second, the item was simply unknown to an author because he lived before it developed or in a place it had not yet reached. Third, an author was aware of an idea or practice but deliberately left it out of a text because he found it somehow unacceptable to his conception of proper religion. And last—a sort of null hypothesis—the missing item was known to an author but deemed uninteresting or irrelevant to the ideas he wanted to express.¹⁷³

The fact that the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* never mentions giving to a buddha or explicitly praises lay generosity, I suspect, falls under Nattier’s first “interpretation of absence”—both would have been assumed to bring religious merit and therefore need not be mentioned in the text. The *Dānapāramitā* actually never uses a word for monk or lay person. Whoever composed

¹⁷³ Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 69-70 (and 171-192 for their application to the *Ugraparipṛcchā*).

the text evidently did not care about the monastic/lay division or thought the duality was counterproductive to the pursuit of awakening. The hypothetical donor throughout the text is called only a bodhisattva, never a *monastic* or a *lay* bodhisattva. If the *Dānapāramitā* can be said to promote lay giving, in almost every case it does so obliquely through a generic bodhisattva. The lone exception may be the text’s exhortation for a king to surrender his sovereignty. But even if we assume that a king must be a layman, the text could be encouraging a monastic bodhisattva to give in his future lives as a king—just as the *Jātakas* recount Śākyamuni doing in many of his former lives—rather than singling out lay generosity as something that needed promotion. As I already stated, Mahāyāna Sūtras take up the topic of lay giving far less than one might expect, possibly because they were loathe to put bodhisattvas in the position of receiving gifts. As the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* focuses almost entirely on the donor and not the recipient of gifts, perhaps it shares a reluctance with other Mahāyāna Sūtras to tackle the consequences of the reception of gifts. In addition to Nattier’s first “interpretation of absence,” this reluctance may also help explain the *Dānapāramitā*’s not addressing giving to a buddha or lay giving.

That the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* never makes giving the basis of a comparison nor attempts to redefine giving most likely points to Nattier’s third type of absence, that of deliberate omission. That is, the author(s) of the *Dānapāramitā* probably chose not to compare giving to a more meritorious religious practice and intentionally refused to reinterpret giving through wisdom or emptiness. As Nattier remarks, the litmus test for deliberate omission is the following: “[D]oes the item in question conflict with any position the author *does* hold?”¹⁷⁴ With regard to the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*, the answer is certainly affirmative. For the entire point

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., 70 (emphasis in the original).

of the Mahāyāna Sūtra passages that use giving as a point of comparison is to elevate other religious practices, if not to discourage giving altogether. Obviously, such passages have no logical place in a text where giving is front and center as a merit-making activity and an important constituent, even the fundamental constituent, of the path to awakening. Likewise, the Mahāyāna Sūtras that try to alter the bodhisattva's perception within the context of emptiness and other abstractions undercut the very reality of giving and its karmic benefits. In stark contrast, the *Dānapāramitā*'s entire agenda is to spell out the very real rewards that various gifts bring—rather than have him call the metaphysical nature of the gift into question, the text would have the bodhisattva give because he knows he receives both worldly and spiritual goals in return. And there is little reason to suspect that the author(s) of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* would have been ignorant of the giving comparisons, which are widespread in Mahāyāna Sūtras, or a basic Mahāyāna doctrine like emptiness, the influence of which can be detected well beyond the early Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras.¹⁷⁵ It is much more likely that the comparisons involving the gift and the doctrinal redefinitions of giving that are present in other Mahāyāna Sūtras were deliberately rejected because they were contrary to the agenda of the *Dānapāramitā*.

It is difficult to make any conclusions about why our text says nothing about monastic greed and the illegitimate practices of wayward monks. I would guess—and that is all that it is—that Nattier's fourth "interpretation of absence" applies: such issues simply had no relevance to a text about the Perfection of Giving that focuses squarely on the bodhisattva-cum-donor. It is not impossible, however, that the conservative, pro-ascetic Sūtras that

¹⁷⁵ Because emptiness rhetoric appears to be pervasive in Mahāyāna texts, it might be a good lens through which to study the issues related to Mahāyāna intertextuality that I touched on at the beginning of this chapter.

address monastic greed and misbehavior all belong to a much earlier period (and different place?) of Mahāyāna history than that of the composition of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*. Due to differences in time or place or because of the limits of education—basically Nattier’s second option—perhaps whoever composed and/or redacted the latter could not have been aware of this reformative group of texts that later would be compiled into the Tibetan Canon right along with the *Dānapāramitā*. It is, after all, only with hindsight that we struggle to weave all of these texts into the tapestry of a variegated but still connected “Mahāyāna” history. Of course, the Mahāyāna Sūtras that deal with greed and illegitimate practice never completely disappeared from Indian Mahāyāna (or Mainstream) view either, if only as representations of dimly felt ideals—several hundred years later Śāntideva neatly brought together the *Ugraparipṛcchā*-, *Candrapradīpa*- (= *Samādhirāja*-), *Rāṣṭrapālāparipṛcchā*-, *Ratnakūṭa*-, and *Ratnarāśī-sūtras* in his chapter praising the forest life (*aranyasaṃvarṇana*) in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. Unfortunately, the questions surrounding this topic are too opaque to allow for anything approaching satisfying answers.

Some of the other gift categories I have outlined turn up in the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*, but in muted form and/or in the last section that may not have been part of the original text. The Mahāyāna Perfections besides giving are mentioned in passing, either in what is basically a list or by the single word “Perfections.” There is not a lot on giving the Dharma either, which usually appears in the text as a reward for some material gift, not as a gift itself. The clearest instance of the Dharma as gift occurs in a single snippet toward the end of the Sūtra: “Because I will give what is immortal by giving the Dharma, it is certain that I am to give the gift of the Dharma” (*chos byin pas ni bdud rtsi byin par ’gyur gyis bdag gis chos kyi sbyin pa sbyin par bya gor ma*

chag snyam mo).¹⁷⁶ This line occurs in the aforementioned section that I suspect was an add-on. And since it comes at the end of a desultory series of terse proclamations about different kinds of gifts and the manner of proper giving, it may imply the superiority of *dharmadāna*, but the text never makes this explicit. In most cases the text actually makes Dharma the spiritual counterpart of some material thing:

*de la lag mthil sbyin pa la ji ltar mngon par brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub
sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / lag mthil sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni byang chub sems dpa'
rnams kyis sems can thams cad la chos kyi lag pa sbyin pa'i tshig bla dags yin gyis / bdag gis lag
mthil sbyin pa sbyin par bya gor ma chag snyam mo // de lag mthil gyi sbyin pa de sbyin pa na /
de bzhin gshegs pas rnam par mkhyen pa'i smon lam bzhin du lag mthil sbyin pa 'dis na / bdag
sems can dman pa dang / long ba dang / bkren pa dang / mgon med pa dang / sdug bsngal ba
dang / dbul po dang / gnas med pa dang / skyabs med pa dang / dpung gnyen med pa rnams
dang / sems can dmyal ba dang / dud 'gro'i skye gnas dang / gshin rje'i 'jig rten dang / ngan
song ngan 'gro log par ltung ba dang / mi khom par skyes pa rnams la chos kyi lag pa sbyin par
byed par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so //*

Then, how does he [a bodhisattva] make strong efforts with regard to giving the palms of his hands [*lag mthil*]? Son from a good family, in this case that bodhisattva thinks this: “That which is called “giving the palms of one’s hands,” because it is a synonym for giving the hand [*lag pa*]¹⁷⁷ of the Law to all beings by bodhisattvas, it is certain that I am to give a gift of the palms of my hands.” When he gives that gift of the palms of his hands, according to an oath that was understood by the Tathāgata, he proclaims the oath: “On account of this gift of the palms of my hands, may I cause the hand of the Dharma to be given to beings who are inferior, blind, poor, without an overseer, suffering, impoverished, homeless, without refuge, and defenseless, and to those born in hell, as animals, in Yama’s world, fallen into the unfavorable destinies and unfavorable states, or born at the inopportune times.”

As I stated earlier in the *Giving the Dharma* section, the normal pattern in both Mainstream and Mahāyāna Sūtras is to describe Dharmic gifts as superior to material ones. But here the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* equates the two. Giving one’s own hands away (more precisely, one’s

¹⁷⁶ See part C of the next chapter for the Tibetan of the full text.

¹⁷⁷ That is, assistance.

palms—admittedly, not the nicest of images) somehow means giving the aid of the Dharma to the downtrodden. The bodhisattva should quite literally give a helping hand.

The *Dānapāramitā* also makes little explicit mention of merit “transfer.” Merit and awakening certainly make up the presumed backbone of the text—giving produces merit and, as such, is an integral part of the path leading to awakening. As is the case in most or possibly all Mahāyāna Sūtras, actions are contextualized in terms of enlightenment. But in only one location in the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* do we encounter the common Mahāyāna formula according to which one should “transfer” the karmic benefit of a religious action to “unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening”:

. . . bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub tu yongs su sngo bar byed de / dge ba'i rtsa ba 'di dang chos kyi phyir yongs su gtong ba 'dis na / bdag sems can ma rgal ba rnams sgrol ba dang / ma grol ba rnams grol bar byed pa dang / dbugs ma phyin pa rnams dbugs 'byin pa dang / yongs su mya ngan las ma 'das pa rnams yongs su mya ngan las zlo bar byed pa dang / 'jig rten long ba 'dren pa med pa dang / skyob pa med pa dang / skyabs med pa dang / gnas med pa dang / gling med pa dang / dpung gnyen med pa rnams kyi 'dren pa dang / yongs su 'dren pa dang / sgrol ba dang / skyabs dang / gnas dang / gling dang / dpung gnyen du gyur cig ces yongs su sngo bar byed do //

He [a bodhisattva] redirects [the merit from giving] toward unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening. On account of totally surrendering [a gift] for the sake of these roots of virtue and righteousness [*chos* = *dharma*], he redirects [the merit], thinking, “May I bring across beings who have not crossed over, liberate the unliberated, give relief to those without relief, cause those who have not become totally extinct to become totally extinct, and become the guide, escort, deliverance, refuge, home, sanctuary, and defense for worlds that are blind, without a guide, without protection, without refuge, homeless, without sanctuary, and defenseless.”

This is very much standard fare for a Mahayana text. One compassionate deed is reframed within the context of the most compassionate goal possible, the ferrying of the suffering masses across the ocean of saṃsāra. But like the short sentence that calls for the immortal gift of the Dharma, this passage also occurs in a section that I believe to be an accretion to an earlier (or at least an alternative) version of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*.

The same can be said for a short paragraph about the bodhisattva's consideration of the character of the recipient of his gift:

*de sbyin pa de lta bu sbyin pa na 'di snyam du 'di ni tshul khirms dang ldan pa yin gyis / bdag
gis sbyin par bya'o // 'di ni tshul khirms 'chal ba yin no // 'di ni dge ba'i chos dang ldan pa yin
no // 'di ni dge ba'i chos ma yin pa dang ldan pa yin no // 'di la byin na ni 'bras bu che ba dang
/ phan yon che ba dang / mthu che bar 'gyur ro // 'di la byin na ni 'bras bu mi che ba dang /
phan yon mi che ba dang / mthu mi che bar 'gyur ro snyam du mi sems so //*

When he [a bodhisattva] gives such a gift, he does not think this: “Because the conduct of so-and-so is ethical, I must give [to him]; [but because] the conduct of such-and-such is unethical, [I must not]. So-and-so has good qualities, [so I must give to him]; [but] such-and-such does not have good qualities, [so I must not]. When one gives to so-and-so, there will be great karmic rewards, great benefits, and great might; [but] when one gives to such-and-such, there will be no great karmic rewards, no great benefits, and no great might.”

According to this passage, the bodhisattva must not base his decision to give on the worth of the recipient, but should instead give to everyone equally. From the perspective of an impartial bodhisattva, there is no such thing as an ideal recipient, no difference between worthy and unworthy donee.¹⁷⁸ Moreover, the bodhisattva should not give with any expectation of karmic payback in this life or future lives. The emphasis on disinterested giving that is clearly present in this passage, though not entirely unknown,¹⁷⁹ is actually not so common in Mahāyāna Sūtra literature. When Mahāyāna Sūtras address the nature of the recipient, they generally differentiate between the good donee who can produce copious merit and the poor one who cannot—they assume that the donor would and should take stock of the recipient's worth (see the sections *Giving to a buddha*, *Promotion of lay giving*, *Ideal recipients and*

¹⁷⁸ The frequently encountered position that recipients have no inherent worth—neither good nor bad—is a related but separate matter. For Perfection of Wisdom and other Sūtras, one must not falsely attribute meaning to gift, giver, or recipient because they are, in truth, empty of real characteristics. See the *Redefinitions* section above.

¹⁷⁹ See, e.g., Pagel, *The Bodhisattvapīṭaka*, 156-157, and Shih Heng-ching, trans., *The Sūtra on Upāsaka Precepts* (BDK English Tripiṭaka Translation Series 45-11) (Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 1994), 124.

legitimate practice, and *Criticism of monastic greed and illegitimate practice*). The stress on disinterested giving is instead much more common in Mahāyāna treatises like the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (see chapter IV), raising the possibility that whoever wrote this passage in the *Dānapāramitā* may have been familiar with texts other than Mahāyāna Sūtras. (One might argue that Mahāyāna Sūtras promote disinterested giving when they exhort the bodhisattva to give to all beings or to perform an act of giving for the sake of all beings. Passages with such exhortations occur with some regularity in Mahāyāna Sūtras—most of the gifts mentioned in the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* itself are in one way or the other to be given for the sake of all beings—more so than those that explicitly discourage calculating the potential payoff of a gift.) And the placement of this passage near the end of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* also raises suspicions.

So we have a short statement encouraging the gift of the Dharma that may imply its superiority compared to material gifts, a paragraph about redirecting the merit of the gift to awakening, and another paragraph explaining that a proper bodhisattva gives with no thought of the worth of the recipient and without any expectation of karmic rewards, all occurring at the end of the text. I will wait until I lay out the structure of the *Dānapāramitā* in the next chapter to justify why I believe that the last section of the text has a different source or possibly even different sources than the other two sections. For the time being I will only stress that my being correct about the last section would not invalidate what it says in any way; the material from these three places in the text are not somehow spurious if it turns out they had a different author. But it *would* mean that the values expressed about *dharmadāna*, merit “transfer,” and disinterested giving belong to another author and/or a redactor who combined two (or more) separate texts, and possibly not to whomever composed the other two sections of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*. Indeed, in some ways the values expressed in some

passages in the last section of the Sūtra appear so at odds with other parts of the text that it is hard to imagine that the whole *Dānapāramitā* was written by the same hand.

So much for what is *not* in the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*. So much for the ways in which it diverges from other Mahāyāna Sūtras. What is in this text? Where does it overlap with other Mahāyāna Sūtras in their treatments of the gift? Of the twelve categories I delineate above, the majority of the content of the *Dānapāramitā* really only fits in two of them: *Rewards for giving* and *Giving the body*. And contrary to the patterns that emerge from the other Mahāyāna Sūtras I have surveyed, the last section of the *Dānapāramitā* also explains *how* a bodhisattva should give, not just what and why. But for more on what the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* actually says, I turn to the next chapter.

III. Giving in Theory: The *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*

A. Introduction

Giving or generosity, both valid translations of *dāna*, carries important weight in Buddhist doctrinal systems, and therefore, as I hope is clear from the last chapter, is a frequent theme in a variety of Buddhist texts. The same can be said for the Brahmanical, Hindu, and Jain traditions. The term *dāna* begins a number of Buddhist doctrinal lists.¹ As *dānamaya*, it is the first member of the “bases of meritorious action” (Skt. *puṇyakriyāvastu*; Pāli *puññakiriyavatthu*), a list that is made up of five items according to the *Mahāvvyūṭṭhā*² and generally either three or ten items in Pāli sources.³ In addition, the act of *dāna* begins the list of four “ways to win someone over” (Skt. *saṃgrahavastu*; Pāli *saṃgahavatthu*).⁴ It may have also headed other lists that, for whatever reason, never gained currency in Buddhist texts.⁵ And perhaps most importantly, *dāna* also represents the first “Perfection” in Sanskrit and Pāli Buddhist texts (Skt. *pāramitā*; Pāli *pāramī*).⁶

The usual Pāli list of *pāramīs* contains ten items: *dāna*, *sīla* (“ethical conduct”), *nekkhamma* (“renunciation”), *paññā* (“wisdom”), *virīya* (“exertion”), *khanti* (“forbearance”),

¹ On *dāna* and the related *tyāga* (Pāli *cāga*) in Buddhist lists, see Dayal, *The Bodhisattva Doctrine*, 172.

² Mvy. 1700-1704.

³ See *PED*, s.vv. *dāna* and *puñña*. For additional references to and explications of the *puññakiriyavatthus* and *puṇyakriyāvastus* in Mainstream and Mahāyāna texts, see also Pagel, *The Bodhisattvapīṭaka*, 372-373, n. 145.

⁴ See *BHSD*, s.v. *saṃgraha-vastu*; Dayal, *The Bodhisattva Doctrine*, 251-259.

⁵ On this possibility, see Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 111, 240 (esp. n. 217), and 247 (esp. n. 257).

⁶ I have tried to remain consistent by capitalizing extremely common doctrinal terms like “Perfection,” which is obviously an arbitrary choice. On the translation of and relationship between the terms *pāramitā* and *pāramī*, see Dayal, *The Bodhisattva Doctrine*, 165-167. On the etymology of *pāramitā*, see *ibid.* and especially Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 153, n. 35.

sacca (“truthfulness”), *adhiṭṭhāna* (“determination”), *mettā* (“friendliness”), and *upekkhā* (“equanimity”).⁷ The alternative but clearly related list of *pāramitās* that is most common in Mahāyāna texts, Sanskrit or otherwise, includes six terms: *dāna*, *śīla*, *kṣānti*, *vīrya*, *dhyāna* (“meditation”), and *prajñā*. The other common Mahāyāna list, which almost certainly came after the list of six, adds four other *pāramitās*: *upāya* (“strategy”) or *upāyakaūśalya* (“skillful strategy”), *praṇidhāna* (“oath” or “vow”), *bala* (“strength”), and *jñāna* (“knowledge”). It is difficult to know the circumstances under which these last four *pāramitās* were added. They may have been invented by the author(s) of the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra*, which makes up part of the unwieldy *Avataṃsaka-sūtra* but also exists as an independent work. As is well known, the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra* describes ten stages (*bhūmi*) of a bodhisattva’s spiritual career, and in doing so maps a *pāramitā* onto each one of these stages. It may be that four more Perfections were needed for the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra* simply to match up with *bhūmis* seven through ten. If this is true, the origin of the list of ten Mahāyāna Perfections dates to the 3rd century CE or perhaps slightly earlier; the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra* was first translated into Chinese in the late 3rd century,⁸ and, given the complexity of its systematization of the bodhisattva path, it is unlikely that it was composed much earlier than that. Dayal, a strong proponent of this hypothesis, suggests the possibility that the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra* added four Perfections due to a rivalry with the already-mentioned Mainstream list of ten *pāramīs*, but proposes that it most likely was the

⁷ Pāli commentaries sometimes break each Perfection down into three grades—“lower Perfection” (*upapāramī*), “Perfection” (*pāramī*), and “higher Perfection” (*paramatthapāramī*)—for a total of thirty Perfections. See I.B. Horner, trans., *The Clarifier of the Sweet Meaning (Madhuratthavilāsini), Commentary on the Chronicle of Buddhas (Buddhavaṃsa) by Buddhadatta Thera* (London: Pāli Text Society, 1978), 89 (and n. 2 for references).

⁸ See Jang-Kil Chun, “A study of the ‘Dasabhumika-sutra’: Its relation to previous Buddhist traditions and the development of *bodhisattva* practice,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1993, 132-141.

result of developments in Indian mathematics: “[I]t is more probable that the number of *pāramitās* (and the *bhūmis*) was raised to ten as a consequence of the invention of the decimal system of computation in the science of arithmetic in the third or fourth century A.D.”⁹ I am not at all sure about the veracity of his statement, nor am I aware of whether the idea has been pursued since Dayal.

The *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* enumerates ten Perfections, one factor that suggests a late date for its composition (or compilation). It begins its second chapter by having the Buddha say the following:

rigs kyi bu gzhan yang byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po dang po sems bskyed pas ni pha rol tu phyin pa bcu la mngon par brtson par bya'o // bcu gang zhe na / 'di lta ste / sbyin pa'i pha rol tu phyin pa dang / tshul khrims kyi pha rol tu phyin pa dang / bzod pa'i pha rol tu phyin pa dang / brtson 'grus kyi pha rol tu phyin pa dang / bsam gtan gyi pha rol tu phyin pa dang / shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa dang / thabs dang / smon lam dang / stobs dang / ye shes kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'o //

Furthermore, son from a good family, a bodhisattva-mahāsattva who has generated the first aspiration [for awakening] is to make strong efforts with regard to the ten Perfections. Which ten? Namely: the Perfection of Giving, the Perfection of Ethical Conduct, the Perfection of Forbearance, the Perfection of Exertion, the Perfection of Meditation, the Perfection of Wisdom, and the Perfections of Strategies, Oaths, Strength, and Knowledge.

The Perfections represent one scheme of the bodhisattva path. They are a set of practices that lead to awakening. According to the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*, the ten Perfections follow directly from the wish to become awakened, something that is certainly not restricted to this text and may, in fact, be pan-Buddhist. The *Nidānakathā*, the well-known Pāli commentarial text (though with little commentary in the traditional sense) that recounts the hagiography of the Buddha, introduces the ten *pāramīs* immediately after the Bodhisatta Sumedha's inspiring encounter with the buddha Dīpaṅkara and the latter's prediction of Sumedha's future

⁹ *The Bodhisattva Doctrine*, 167.

buddhahood: “Having thus made his [Sumedha’s] resolution [to become awakened], ‘I will certainly become a Buddha,’ he searched in due course the entire cosmic order in order to investigate the contributory conditions to Enlightenment. . . .” What Sumedha finds—not in the universe surrounding him, but in his mind—are the Perfections, and the *Nidānakathā* continues at some length with descriptions of each. Then, after Sumedha learns the details of the ten *pāramīs*, the text has him conclude the following: “These alone in this world are the contributory conditions to Enlightenment and have to be fulfilled by Bodhisattas. And besides these ten Perfections there are no others.”¹⁰ It is practicing the Perfections that propels the Bodhisatta to awakening. For the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*, the same logic is at work. Taking up the *pāramitās* propels the bodhisattva, the Mahāyāna bodhisattva in this case, to buddhahood. Immediately following the part just quoted, the *Dānapāramitā* continues with the Buddha’s explanation:

*rīgs kyi bu de la byang chub sems dpa’ sems dpa’ chen po pha rol tu phyin pa bcu po de dag la ji
ltar mngon par brtson par byed ce na / rīgs kyi bu ’di la byang chub sems dpa’ sems dpa’ chen po
ni sbyin pa sbyin par byed / tshul khrims srung bar byed / bzod pa sgom par byed / brtson ’grus
rtsom par byed / bsam gtan la bsam gtan du byed / shes rab ’bar bar byed / thabs la mkhas par
byed / smon lam ’debs par byed / stobs la ’jug par byed / ye shes la ’jug par byed do //*

Son from a good family, in that case how does a bodhisattva-mahāsattva make strong efforts with regard to those ten Perfections? Son from a good family, in this case a bodhisattva-mahāsattva gives gifts, guards ethical conduct, cultivates forbearance, undertakes exertion, meditates in meditation, galvanizes wisdom, becomes skilled in strategies, proclaims oaths, enters into strength, and enters into knowledge.

Our text’s description of the practice of the Mahāyāna Perfections is decidedly terse, to the point, I think, of being opaque. What exactly does it mean to “guard ethical conduct,” much less to “meditate in meditation”? But this same passage occurs elsewhere in Mahāyāna texts—

¹⁰ See N.A. Jayawickrama, trans., *The Story of Gotama Buddha: The Nidāna-kathā of the Jātakatthakathā* (1990; repr., Oxford: Pāli Text Society, 2002), 25-31. Cf. *ibid.*, 58-61.

variations of it can be found, for example, several times in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*¹¹—and the author(s) of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* may have presumed some basic understanding of what the Perfections entailed on the part of the text’s target audience. Besides, the agenda of our text is not to elucidate all the Perfections, so it is not entirely surprising that it does not go into greater detail here. Obviously, the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* homes in on one Perfection in particular.

Buddhist texts almost always list or explain the *pāramīs* or *pāramitās* in the order I gave them above. But that does not necessarily mean the intent was that they should be practiced in this order, with one Perfection being mastered before moving on to the next. On the contrary, the sense is usually that the Perfections are interdependent and should be practiced simultaneously. (See the sections *Giving in relation to the other Perfections* and *Redefinitions* from chapter II.) Nevertheless, giving is somehow fundamental to all the others, and it is probably not insignificant that *dāna* is the first *pāramī* and *pāramitā*. The Perfection of Giving is a major theme in Mainstream Buddhist *Jātakas*. Ten of the thirty-five *Jātakas* in the Pāli *Cariyāpiṭaka* deal with the Bodhisatta’s putting the Perfection of Giving into Practice, and ten of the thirty-four tales in Āryaśūra’s Sanskrit *Jātakamālā* do so for the Bodhisattva.¹² And it is not insignificant that the *Vessantara-jātaka* was placed last among the 547 stories of the *Jātaka* section of the Pāli *Khuddaka Nikāya*. For by giving away everything to his name, even his family members, the Bodhisatta-cum-Vessantara fulfills the Perfection of Giving and finally puts himself in a karmic position to bring an end to a countless succession of rebirths and become awakened in his next and final human life.

¹¹ Mitra, ed., *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*, 101.1-3, 310.9-10, 311.16-17, 322.1-3, etc.

¹² See Ohnuma, *Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood*, 45-46.

The Perfection of Giving thus holds an important place in Buddhist thought and literature. Yet as far as I am aware, only one text has the Perfection of Giving for a title. (Other texts have sections dealing with or chapters entitled *dānapāramitā*. For instance, the Perfection of Giving is the title of one chapter of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*-¹³ and *Pañcapāramitānirdeśa-sūtras*.¹⁴) That text is, of course, our *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*, which puts it in a unique position, I think, to further our understanding of Mahāyāna gift theory, if not Buddhist gift theory in general.

Technically, the title of our text should be accompanied by an asterisk. Better yet, the Tibetan title—the *'phags pa sbyin pa'i pha rol tu phyin pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*—should be used, since there is no extant version of the text in Sanskrit, and to my knowledge the Sūtra was never translated into Chinese either (at least nothing in Chinese has survived). Moreover, I have never seen the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* referenced in another Buddhist work (nor in modern scholarship). That is to say, our text does not seem to appear anywhere outside of the *mDo* section of the Tibetan Kanjur, whether as a whole text, in quotation, or even in reference to its title. The combination of these facts would make it difficult for anyone to justify the position that the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* was an important text in Buddhist India.

We should be careful, therefore, of reading the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* too prescriptively, whatever the intention of its author(s) and/or redactor(s) may have been. It seems extremely unlikely that this text would have been widely circulated and read to influence gift-giving behaviors in a significant way.¹⁵ To be sure, the text represents one normative voice on gift

¹³ Derge Kanjur, *dKon brtsegs*, Ga 56a-61b.

¹⁴ Derge Kanjur, *mDo sde*, Tsa 31b-76b.

¹⁵ Implicit in almost all studies of Buddhist texts is the assumption that they were read by many people. It may strike some as unusual that I am claiming the opposite for the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*. However, the prudent starting point for textual studies should be to assume that a text was *not* read, with the burden

giving, which is of no little consequence because it is one of the few Mahāyāna texts devoted exclusively to the topic. This voice is laden with values that at a minimum embody the ideals of those responsible for the composition and/or redaction of the text. As I stated in chapter II, the values of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* diverge from many interpretations of the gift found in other Mahāyāna Sūtras. One might also think to look at a text like this in a descriptive sense, meaning that it could possibly be a window into a real world of Mahāyāna gift exchange, with the text describing the objects given by actual Mahāyāna Buddhists, the manner in which they were given, and the intentions motivating the gifts. As it turns out, however, certain aspects of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* do not accord very well with what we see in the Mahāyāna epigraphic and material records, a discrepancy I will deal with in chapter V.

I should say a few words about, perhaps, the first thing one wants to know about a text, but which is often the most difficult to pin down with any precision: the date of its composition. As is widely accepted, Mahāyāna Sūtra literature appears in great numbers somewhere around the beginning of the Common Era. But the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* seems to have been composed at a much, much later time, probably around the end of what Gregory Schopen has called the Middle Period of Indian Buddhism, lasting from ca. 0–500 CE. Different data suggest a late date for our text. Doctrinally, the text appears to be quite mature; any sort of doctrinal list appearing in the Sūtra does so in its most developed form. Again, the number of *pāramitās* does not appear in a list of six, but is fully fleshed out to ten. Also, the main body of the text is very organized and hierarchical, with a highly systematized description of the bodhisattva's ten *kuśalakarmapathas* followed by the same for the *pāramitās*. Most significantly,

of proof falling on the scholar to present evidence that it was. That burden of proof would necessarily be heavier for any claim that a text was studied and understood, let alone that it influenced actual behavior.

among the named audience members who listen to the Buddha’s teaching on giving are a series of Hindu goddesses who first appear in India quite late, at least by the standards of Mahāyāna Buddhism.¹⁶ These goddesses include Durgā (Tib. *dka’ bzlog ma*), Mahāśrīdevī (*dpal gyi lha mo chen mo*), and Bhairavī (*jigs byed ma*), among others, goddesses who in other Buddhist contexts would be labeled Tantric, though the loaded term “Tantric” can in no way be meaningfully applied to this text. Although such goddesses make brief appearances in earlier texts, they really come to the fore in works like the *Devī-māhātmya*, which makes up chapters 81–93 of the extant *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* but which also seems to have circulated independently,¹⁷ works that, by all accounts, do not appear in India until the 5th century CE at the earliest.¹⁸ With all due caution, I therefore date the composition of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* to around the 5th or 6th century.

Some of the content of our text—Mahāyāna ideas about the gift, if not actual words—most likely comes before this time. There are at least three Mahāyāna Sūtras that have identical or similar content to parts of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*. One such text is the *Dānānuśaṃsānirdeśa-sūtra* or *The Sūtra on the Teaching of the Benefits of Giving*, perhaps better

¹⁶ I do not see any evidence for the interpolation of these figures into an earlier text. Nevertheless, that this happened cannot be ruled out, since, as Jan Nattier warns, the beginning sections of Mahāyāna Sūtras where audience members are listed “are often among the last to be added (and the first to be updated).” See Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 44–45. But I am attempting to date when the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* took its present form. Because there are no textual witnesses other than what we have in Tibetan, any suggestion about such interpolation into earlier versions of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* amounts to utter speculation.

¹⁷ See Thomas B. Coburn, *Devī-Māhātmya: The Crystallization of the Goddess Tradition* (Columbia, MO: South Asia Books, 1985), 51–69; C. Mackenzie Brown, *The Triumph of the Goddess: The Canonical Models and Theological Visions of the Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990), 158–161.

¹⁸ See Thomas B. Coburn, *Encountering the Goddess: A Translation of the Devī-Māhātmya and A Study of Its Interpretation* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), 13–27; Brown, *The Triumph of the Goddess*, 1–12.

known as chapter thirty-four of the *Divyāvadāna* under an alternate title, the *Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra* (= *Dānādhikāra-sūtra*) or *The Sūtra on the Topic of Giving*.¹⁹ The compilation of the *Divyāvadāna* is generally dated to 200–350 CE and credited to Mūlasarvāstivādins in Northwest India.²⁰ But the *Divyāvadāna*, as Rotman explains, is an extremely complicated and eclectic text: “The *Divyāvadāna* is a compendium of stories most likely produced by multiple authors at different times, whose dates and sites of production are uncertain, whose intended audience is unclear, whose expected use is unknown, and whose intertextual relations are unresolved.”²¹ With such uncertainty, it would be imprudent to date the *Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra* to 200–350 CE based on assumptions about the *Divyāvadāna*. It is likely, in fact, that it was a late, possibly extremely late, addition to the *Divyāvadāna* anthology.²² The only extant Chinese translation of

¹⁹ This text is translated in Ware, “Studies in the *Divyāvadāna*.” It will also be part of Andy Rotman’s upcoming book on the *Divyāvadāna*, which will have annotated translations of sections 18–38 of the text, picking up where his *Divine Stories: Divyāvadāna, Part I* (Boston, Wisdom Publications, 2008) left off. I am grateful to Andy Rotman for providing me with a fresh translation of the *Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra* that will be included in his book. The Sanskrit of the *Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra* can be found at Edward B. Cowell and Robert A. Neil, eds., *The Divyāvadāna: A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends* (1886; repr., Amsterdam: Oriental Press, 1970), 481–483.

²⁰ Rotman, *Divine Stories*, 6.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 8.

²² The compilation of the *Divyāvadāna* may be as late as the 17th century, the approximate date of its earliest known Sanskrit manuscripts, and may even have been produced by Nepalese hands. See *ibid.*, 8–15.

How the *Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra* came to be part of the (or a) *Divyāvadāna* is a bit of a mystery. It and the *Prātihārya-sūtra* are the only sections of the thirty-eight *Divyāvadāna* chapters not called an *Avadāna*. Moreover, the *Dānādhikaraṇa* is the only chapter that includes Mahāyāna in its title—its full title is the *Dānādhikaraṇa-mahāyāna-sūtra*—and it is also the only chapter whose contents are not narrative in form. I posed this problem to Andy Rotman and Satoshi Hiraoka, but neither of them, despite great familiarity with the *Divyāvadāna*, was able to give a satisfactory explanation. Michael Hahn makes clear that the *Maitrakanyaka-avadāna*, now chapter thirty-eight of the *Divyāvadāna*, was not originally included in the latter text. See Hahn, *Haribhaṭṭa and Gopadatta: Two Authors in the Succession of Āryasūra, On the Rediscovery of Parts of their Jātakamālās*, 2nd ed. (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Occasional Paper Series I) (Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1992), 5. The *Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra* was also probably slipped into the *Divyāvadāna* at a late date, but the reason for this addition is anyone’s guess.

the *Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra* (T. 705) was not made until around the end of the 10th century, so this is of little help. Fortunately, Matsuda Kazunobu has recently identified a small leather folio (13.5×5.5 cm) containing about the last third of the *Dānādhikaraṇa* among the Schøyen manuscripts.²³ The manuscript is written in a Gupta Brāhmī script that dates to the 5th or 6th century.²⁴

Some of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* overlaps considerably in wording and content with the *Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra*. Both texts enumerate various objects that should be given and explain the rewards from doing so. In the *Dānādhikaraṇa*, nos. 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, and 25 include objects to be given that are also found in the *Dānapāramitā*; nos. 4, 6, 7, 8, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, and 25 in the *Dānādhikaraṇa* mention rewards that also occur in the *Dānapāramitā* (sometimes the rewards are matched up with the same gifts, sometimes not).²⁵ The majority of the correspondences with the *Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra* come from the last section of the *Dānapāramitā*, which, like the *Dānādhikaraṇa*, has a series of short statements about not only gift objects and rewards, but also the manner in which one should give. The Tibetan of *Dānādhikaraṇa*'s nos. 6, 7, 12, and 16 is nearly identical or exactly the same as the Tibetan of the analogous statements from this last section of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*. In addition, some of the corresponding gift-giving statements come in the same sequence in the *Dānādhikaraṇa* and last

²³ The recto and verso of the folio span Cowell and Neil, eds., *The Divyāvadāna*, 483.5-17.

²⁴ Many thanks to Kazunobu Matsuda for providing me with an image and a transcription of the manuscript from an unpublished talk he gave. I would also like to thank Andy Rotman and Jens-Uwe Hartmann for information about the discovery of the manuscript. I was first made aware of the *Dānādhikaraṇa* fragment from Rotman, *Divine Stories*, 16.

²⁵ See Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna” for the specific type of gift associated with each number. The Chinese translation of the *Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra* has a long ending that has no parallel in surviving Sanskrit and Tibetan sources (ibid., 50-51)—in some cases, ideas or wording in the Tibetan *Dānapāramitā* correspond with things found only in this Chinese coda of the *Dānādhikaraṇa*.

part of the *Dānapāramitā*: nos. 6–8, 11–13, 16–17, and 19–20 from the *Dānādhikaraṇa* have parallels in the final section of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* that are found in the same order (the *Dānapāramitā*'s parallels to nos. 2–4 from the *Dānādhikaraṇa* also occur together, but in reverse order). Undoubtedly, these two Sūtras are closely related. Since the *Dānādhikaraṇa* immediately follows the *Dānapāramitā* in the Tibetan Kanjur, clearly I am not the first one to notice similarities between the two texts. It is not impossible that some of the content of one of the texts slipped into the other when they were copied in Sanskrit, translated into Tibetan and organized in the Kanjur, or when the Tibetan itself was copied. I suspect that the two texts were composed around the same time. The *Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra*, being written, perhaps, not much earlier than the recently identified Schøyen fragment from the 5th or 6th century, may be slightly earlier than the *Dānapāramitā*.

Two other texts with which the *Dānapāramitā* shares similarities, the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa-* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtras*, almost certainly predate our text. The first extant translation of the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa-sūtra* is attributed to Dharmarakṣa and was completed in 308 CE (T. 403). It was also translated by Zhiyan and Baoyun in 427 CE as part of the *Mahāsaṃnipāta* collection of the Chinese Canon (T. 397.12). Chinese catalogs—some of them referring to other catalogs that have been lost—reference several other translations of the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*. These catalogs allege that the first translation of the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa-sūtra* into Chinese as an independent text was completed in 224 CE. The first Chinese translation of the *Mahāsaṃnipāta* collection, which, if it existed, may or may not have contained the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*, was supposedly completed by Lokakṣema in 186 CE.²⁶ It is impossible to know whether any of these

²⁶ All of this information is laid out in detail in Jens Braarvig, *Akṣayamatīrdeśasūtra*, Vol. II: *The Tradition of Imperishability in Buddhist Thought* (Oslo: Solum Forlag, 1993), xvii–xli.

non-extant translations actually existed, but just on the basis of the surviving translations we can conclude with a great degree of confidence that the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* was composed earlier than the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*. How *much* earlier is open to question—using evidence internal to the text that need not detain us, Braarvig surmises that the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa-sūtra* probably “achieved a fairly final form during the first two centuries A.D. . . .”²⁷

The date of the composition of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtra* is more complicated, largely due to the fact that the term *bodhisattvapiṭaka* shows up in many Mahāyāna texts but can evidently mean different things: It can refer to a generic category of texts (like all of Mahāyāna scriptures), a collection of specific texts, or one text in particular (which does not necessarily have to be the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtra* as we have it today).²⁸ The *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtra* was not translated into Chinese until the mid-7th century by Xuanzang (T. 310.12), making up part of the *Ratnakūṭa* collection that was completed in the next century by Bodhiruci. Its other Chinese translation was not made until the 11th century (T. 316). Luckily, different fragments of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtra* have been identified in manuscripts hailing from Bamiyan. Sixteen fragments from a Sanskrit manuscript, written in a late Gupta Brāhmī script dating to the 5th or 6th century, are largely consistent with the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtra*’s Chinese and Tibetan translations.²⁹ In addition, a small part of the ninth chapter (called *Vīryapāramitā* in extant translations) of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtra* has been identified in a single Kharoṣṭhī fragment, also from the Bamiyan area. This identification is, according to Allon and Salomon, “beyond

²⁷ Ibid., xli-xlix (quote taken from p. xlix).

²⁸ See Pagel, *The Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, 7-36; Jens Braarvig and Ulrich Pagel, “Fragments of the Bodhisattvapiṭakasūtra,” in *Buddhist Manuscripts*, Vol. 3, ed. Jens Braarvig (Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection 12) (Oslo: Hermes Publishing, 2006), 21-30.

²⁹ Braarvig and Pagel, ed. and trans., “Fragments of the Bodhisattvapiṭakasūtra,” in *Buddhist Manuscripts*, Vol. 3, 30ff.

any reasonable doubt.”³⁰ The fragment is among the oldest Indian manuscripts that we have, dating to the 2nd or 3rd century CE on palaeographic grounds.³¹ Based on its content and relationship with the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*, Pagel places the composition of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtra* at the end of the second century at the latest.³² While the just-mentioned Kharoṣṭhī fragment lends credence to Pagel’s dating, numerous problems with his line of reasoning about the text remain.³³ Regardless, for our purposes we can say with little doubt that the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtra* in its present form predates the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*, possibly by several centuries.

³⁰ “New Evidence for Mahayana in Early Gandhāra,” 8.

³¹ Kazunobu Matsuda, personal communication. I am greatly indebted to him for sending me his unpublished talk on Mahāyāna fragments in the Schøyen and Hirayama collections

³² Pagel, *The Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, 2 and 6.

³³ Pagel seems to want very badly for the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtra* not only to be an early Mahāyāna text, but also for it to have been critical in the development of Mahāyāna. He says, for example, that “[m]any of its practices have a distinctively ‘early flavour’ . . .” (ibid., 2); “The longest and most important bodhisattva sūtra of the *Ratnakūṭa* is the *Bḍp* [=Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtra]” (ibid., 3); “[S]ome of the structures of its bodhisattva practices . . . had profound bearing on the development of the bodhisattva doctrine” (ibid., 4); “[T]here seems to be a strong case not only for placing the *Bḍp* among the earliest works on the bodhisattva, but also for treating it as a text of fundamental importance to the evolution of the bodhisattva doctrine” (ibid., 4); etc. This kind of thinking colors all of the conclusions Pagel makes about this text’s place in Mahāyāna history.

Pagel thinks that the similarities between the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*- and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtras* are the result of the former text’s borrowing material directly from the latter, as opposed to the other way around or a situation in which both texts took material from the same outside source or sources. All of his evidence for this direction of borrowing hinges on his belief that the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* “deliberately introduced a number of unambiguous doctrinal and editorial adjustments” to the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtra*. Pagel assumes a linear model whereby texts get more complicated and sophisticated, with “simpler” or earlier ideas not being able to show up again as texts change over time. He does not give due consideration to the very real possibility that the “number of interpolations of non-standardised text elements in the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*” are not interpolations at all, but a sign that instead the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka* as we have it was standardized in a process of textual leveling (see ibid., 36-48 and 51-53). For Pagel, the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtra*’s relatively simple content and organization—to be sure, judging any text as “simple” is fraught with subjectivity—“point to a period of composition when the conception of the bodhisattva was still dominated by the spiritual ideal characteristic of early Buddhism” (ibid., 4).

That the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*- and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtras* were first composed before the *Dānapāramitā* is important because all three texts treat gift giving in remarkably similar ways. Chapter two of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* is structured very similarly to chapter six of the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtra*, which also deals with the Perfection of Giving,³⁴ and the first section of chapter five of the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*, which classifies giving as the fifth “imperishable” (*akṣaya*). Each of these three texts discusses *external* before *internal* gifts, *bāhya*- and *ādhyātmika-dāna*, respectively.³⁵ None of the texts marks the division between external and internal giving, but the commentary to the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* (its *ṭīkā*) makes this division explicit.³⁶ All three texts then transition into another section that addresses the manner in which gifts should and should not be given, often putting much emphasis on the intentionality behind gifts. Moreover, the structural order of the gifts enumerated in each text largely overlaps. For example, the sequence of the first nine external gifts in the *Dānapāramitā* matches the order of gifts in the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*, except the fifth gift in the *Dānapāramitā*, that of ornaments, is treated later in the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*; for the eight internal gifts of the body, the sequence is the same in the *Dānapāramitā*- and *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa-sūtras*, except the gift of skin and the gift of flesh and blood are transposed between the two texts (also, the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* includes bones with the gift of marrow but the *Dānapāramitā* does not).

³⁴ This chapter is summarized at Pagel, *The Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, 145-160; Braarvig and Pagel, “Fragments of the Bodhisattvapiṭakasūtra,” in *Buddhist Manuscripts*, Vol. 3, 16-17.

³⁵ See the section *Giving the body* in chapter II for some information on *external and internal* giving, especially in Mahāyāna Sūtras. The *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (see chapter IV) treats the topic in great detail.

³⁶ Braarvig glosses parts of his translation of the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* with explanations from the *ṭīkā* and supplies the Tibetan for the commentary in the footnotes. See Braarvig, trans., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*, Vol. II, 114-130.

In addition to the structure of these three texts, their content on gift giving also bears striking similarities. The rewards for giving particular items in the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*- and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtras* are frequently the same in the *Dānapāramitā*. This is especially true for the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*, whose wording is in many cases parallel to, if not exactly the same as, that of the *Dānapāramitā*. To cite just one example, the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* says the following about the gift of medicine:

*mi rga mi 'chi ba'i bdud rtsi'i bde ba yongs su bskang ba'i phyir na ba dang sman 'dod pa thams cad la sman sbyin pa'o.*³⁷

He [the bodhisattva] gives medicine to everyone who is sick and desiring medicine in order to gratify them with the ease from the immortal nectar that is without old age and death.³⁸

And according to the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*, when a bodhisattva gives medicine, he should say the following:

sman byin pa 'dis na bdag sems can thams cad kyi rga ba dang / 'chi ba med pa'i bdud rtsi'i bde ba yongs su rdzogs par byed par gyur cig.

On account of this gift of medicine, may I make the ease from the immortal nectar that is without old age and death perfect for all beings.

The *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* and *Dānapāramitā* also switch the terminology for giving at the same point: Beginning with the gift of male slaves, female slaves, workers, and wage laborers (just male and female slaves in the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa*), both texts start using *yongs su gtong ba'i sbyin pa* for each type of gift instead of just *sbyin pa*.³⁹ Even what is not in the *Dānapāramitā* is

³⁷ Jens Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīrdeśasūtra*, Vol. I: *Edition of extant manuscripts with an index* (Oslo: Solum Forlag, 1993), 30.34-35.

³⁸ Cf. Braarvig, trans., *Akṣayamatīrdeśasūtra*, Vol. II, 118.

³⁹ I am not sure whether the *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtra* also switches terminology, as its treatment of gift giving only came to my attention recently and I have not had adequate time to study the text. I have had to rely mostly on Pagel's synopsis of its content.

compatible with the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa-* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtras*. None of the texts pays much attention to the gift of Dharma⁴⁰ or the qualities of the recipient of the gift.⁴¹

If I am correct that the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* is more recent than the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa-* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtras*, which seems very likely, this can only mean that the *Dānapāramitā* 1) borrowed material directly from one or both of the other texts, 2) borrowed material indirectly from one or both of the other texts through one or more intermediary sources, and/or 3) all three texts drew from a common stock of Mahāyāna thought on gift giving. More importantly, it would have to mean that part of the structure of and many of the ideas within the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* originated well before the 5th or 6th century, when I suggest it was composed or redacted into the form that is now preserved in the Tibetan Kanjur.

Structure and Content of the Dānapāramitā-sūtra

The *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* divides itself into two chapters. It brackets off chapter one from the rest of the text, saying “The first chapter from the Great Vehicle Discourse named *The Array of Ornamentation, Decoration, and Adornment of All the Characteristics of a Buddha*” (*sangs rgyas kyi chos thams cad kyi rgyan dang / spud pa dang / lhab lhub bkod pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo las le'u dang po*).⁴² Obviously, the title given to the Sūtra is not *Dānapāramitā*, an incongruence that is not at all uncommon—many Mahāyāna Sūtras, within the body of the text, call themselves something other than their official title. The overwrought, embellished

⁴⁰ See the section *Giving the Dharma* in chapter II, as well as Pagel, *The Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, 146-147 and n. 118.

⁴¹ See the sections *Promotion of lay giving* and *Ideal recipients and legitimate practice* in chapter II, and Pagel, *The Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, 150 and 153.

⁴² Depending on how one reads the plural *sangs rgyas kyi chos thams cad* (Skt. *buddhadharma*), the last part could instead be “All the Teachings of a [or the] Buddha.”

title here certainly sounds like the name of a Mahāyāna work, though it has little to no relation to the actual content of our text.

I divide the *Dānapāramitā* into four parts, two in each of the text's chapters. Although this four-part configuration is never spelled out explicitly by the author(s) or redactor(s) of the text, its section on giving has structural parallels in other Mahāyāna texts, including, as I just discussed, the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa-* and *Bodhisattvapīṭaka-sūtras*. The following organization, that is, is not completely arbitrary. The first part of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* is simply the introduction to the Buddha's discourse, in which the interlocutor—who, as we will see, has a curiously long name—and a host of other characters are introduced in a dazzling backdrop of trees, birds, sundry other plants and animals, and the bejeweled accoutrements so familiar to many Mahāyāna Sūtras. The introduction establishes a paradisiacal setting where the Buddha can deliver his teaching on gift giving. However, nowhere does the first chapter, which comprises about a third of the whole text, deal with the Perfection of Giving, or giving at all for that matter. For after the introduction, the rest of the first chapter—part two of the whole text, as I have organized it—takes up the *daśakuśalakarmapatha*, the “paths of the ten virtuous actions,” to follow the Tibetan translation of the term. The Buddha is made to explain, in alternating prose and verse, why a bodhisattva-mahāsattva is to reject doing, causing to be done, or approving of someone else's doing each of the ten Buddhist sins, three of which are physical (taking life, stealing, and sexual misconduct), four of which are vocal (lying, slander, speaking harsh words, and idle chatter), and four of which are mental (covetousness, harmful intent, and incorrect views). The *daśakuśalakarmapatha* can be found throughout Mainstream

Nikāyas/Āgamas and Vinayas, and they even appear in the *Mahābhārata* and *Manusmṛti*.⁴³ They were picked up in Mahāyāna Sūtras early on, showing up in some of the first translations of Mahāyāna Buddhist texts into Chinese, such as the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* and *Ugraparipṛcchā*.⁴⁴ The ten virtues (without *karmaṣaṭha*), in fact, appear in one of the earliest Indian Buddhist manuscripts that we have.⁴⁵ And they continued to hold a not-insignificant place in Mahāyāna Sūtras.⁴⁶ But why are the *daśakuśalakarmaṣaṭha* featured so prominently in a text on gift giving?⁴⁷

First, they are not intended for monks and nuns; or rather, they are not intended *only* for monks and nuns. While the list of ten *kuśalakarmaṣaṭhas* and ten *śikṣāpadas* (“rules of training”) share several items in common, it is only the latter that is designed as a code of conduct for novice monastics. As I mentioned in the last chapter, moreover, nowhere in the *Dānapāramitā* is a word for a monastic or lay person ever used. The individual who is to abide by the ten virtuous actions and he who should give gifts is the same person: a bodhisattva. To

⁴³ For references to the *Mahābhārata* and *Manusmṛti*, see Akira Hirakawa, “The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism and Its Relationship to the Worship of Stupas,” translated from the Japanese by Taitetsu Unno, in *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko*, no. 22 (Tokyo: Toyo Bunko, 1963), 76, nn. 111-112.

⁴⁴ See Jan Nattier, “The ‘Eleven Precepts’ for Laity in the *Ugraparipṛcchā*,” in *Early Buddhism and Abhidharma Thought in Honour of Dr. Hajime Sakurabe on His Seventy-seventh Birthday*, ed. Sakurabe Ronshu Committee (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten, 2002), 33-43 (horizontal section); Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 107-111. Nattier shows in these two works that the list of the *kuśalakarmaṣaṭhas* varied in content and the number of items.

⁴⁵ This Kharoṣṭhī manuscript fragment is part of the Bajaur collection and dates to the 1st or 2nd century CE. The text, which focuses on Akṣobhya but to my knowledge has yet to be identified, speaks of a future time when people in a buddha-field will assume the ten virtues (*daśakuśala*). See Strauch, “More Missing Pieces of Early Pure Land Buddhism,” 51-52, line 1.

⁴⁶ In “The ‘Eleven Precepts’ for Laity in the *Ugraparipṛcchā*,” in *Early Buddhism and Abhidharma Thought*, Nattier lists dozens of examples of the occurrence of the *kuśalakarmaṣaṭhas* in Mahāyāna texts.

⁴⁷ The ending of the *Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra* that is present only in the Chinese translation frames the ten virtues as a gift—keeping each of the virtues brings a specific karmic reward. See Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” 50-51.

modify the question slightly, then: For the author(s) of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*, why should the *daśakuśalakarmapatha* be so important for a bodhisattva donor?

Richard Mahoney argues that Śāntideva's *Sikṣāsamuccaya* and *Sikṣāsamuccayakārikā* put generosity front and center in the bodhisattva path. According to Mahoney, Śāntideva portrays awakening as achievable only by giving away everything one has (*sarvadāna*), which is tantamount to giving away one's body (*ātmabhāva*), possessions (*bhoga*), and merit (*puṇya*). In order to maximize the effect of these gifts and their benefit on others, Mahoney contends, Śāntideva stipulates that the bodhisattva must first and foremost strive to be of pure moral conduct. In other words, the bodhisattva must purify his gifts by acting morally before they can be given away.⁴⁸ I am not convinced that Śāntideva reduces the bodhisattva path in such a straightforward way that hinges solely on gift giving. However, Mahoney's insight into the connection that a key medieval Mahāyāna thinker made between moral behavior and the effectiveness of gifts is invaluable. The same kind of logic seems to be in play in the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*. Our text, that is, would appear to be organized along the lines of an ethical hierarchy. Before a bodhisattva is to go about giving the sorts of things enumerated in chapter two of the *Dānapāramitā*, he must first be able to abstain from the most basic of Buddhist sins. He should not be giving anything without having his moral house in order. The bodhisattva should not give after taking a life, causing a life to be taken, or approving of anyone else's taking a life; he should not give after slandering someone, causing someone to be slandered, or approving of someone's being slandered; etc. And let us recall that the last of the ten virtues is to live without incorrect views, which in the Buddhist world means accepting that persons and

⁴⁸ Richard Mahoney, "Of the Progress of the Bodhisattva: The Bodhisattvamārga in the *Sikṣāsamuccaya*," M.A. Thesis, University of Canterbury, 2002. I owe this reference to Ohnuma, *Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood*, 226-227.

phenomena are selfless, subject to inevitable decay, and defined by suffering. In the world of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*, it would seem that a bodhisattva who gives away even the simplest of everyday items, like a morsel of food or a sip of water, but does not thoroughly understand that such gifts are without an essence, impermanent, and tinged with suffering, has made a great error and trodden the correct spiritual path out of sequence.

The hierarchical nature of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* is confirmed by considering the third part of the text, which comprises the bulk of its second chapter; this is the section of the text that shares so much in common with the chapters on gift giving in the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa-* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtras*. The third section of the *Dānapāramitā* provides a lengthy list of the types of objects a bodhisattva should give. It formulaically proceeds through each type of gift, explaining, again in alternating prose and verse, the spiritual rewards for each. The *Dānapāramitā* begins with modest quotidian objects like food and drink, works its way up to fine gifts like culinary delicacies and precious ornaments, includes human property like one's slaves and family members, and closes with a series of body parts, beginning with the bodhisattva's feet and ending with his bone marrow. What it appears the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* has done is to provide a tacit—the reader is never told this explicitly—ranking of gifts. As the text goes on, the gifts become more expensive and/or more difficult to give away, and the concomitant rewards the gifts bring likewise get better and better.

Part of the hierarchy of the *Dānapāramitā's* treatment of the gift lies in the switch from external objects to internal parts of the body. Less obvious is its change in gift terminology, which I referenced earlier with regard to its relationship with the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*. Midway through the third section of the text, the *Dānapāramitā* starts using the Tibetan equivalent of

Sanskrit *parityāgadāna* (*yongs su gtong ba'i sbyin pa*)⁴⁹ to describe gifts instead of *dāna* (*sbyin pa*).

The gift of the vehicle is actually duplicated in the third section of our text, occurring first with *sbyin pa* and later with *yongs su gtong ba'i sbyin pa*. Rather than this section being redundant, it seems to be delineating two types of gift exchange that had different expectations for karmic rewards and, in some contexts, even legal ramifications. In some examples of Buddhist usage, a type of gift as an accusative of *pari*√*tyaj* marks it as an object over which the donor completely relinquishes ownership, in contrast to a “gift of use,” whereby the donor expects the gift to generate continual merit through its use by the recipient, often the monastic community. This is clearest from a passage in the *Abhidharmakośa* (IV.120), which de La Vallée Poussin translates as follows: “Le mérite du don est de deux sortes: 1) mérite produit par l’abandon (*tyāgānvaya*), le mérite qui résulte du seul fait d’abandonner; 2) mérite produit par la jouissance (*paribhogānvaya*), le mérite qui résulte de la jouissance, par la personne qui reçoit, de l’objet donné.”⁵⁰ Some Vinaya passages, in an attempt to coordinate relations between monastics and the laity, address these two types of merit as well. In a story in the *Śayanāsanavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, for example, monks are enjoined to live in empty monasteries that were given to them by devout donors, since “there was not merit resulting from use for the donors” (*dānapatīnām paribhogānvayaṃ puṇyaṃ na bhavati*).⁵¹ The *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*, of course, is not concerned with regulating the monastic use of lay donations. The term *paribhoga* (“of use”), in fact, does not occur in its treatment of gift giving.

⁴⁹ Note that *parityāga* and *dāna* were not necessarily in compound in the Sanskrit text.

⁵⁰ Louis de La Vallée Poussin, trans. *L’Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*, Vol. 3 (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1924), 244. *Abhidharmakośa* IV.121 explains that a gift to a *caitya* produces merit “par l’abandon”—see *ibid.*, 244-245.

⁵¹ See Schopen, “The Lay Ownership of Monasteries and the Role of the Monk in Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticism,” in *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*, esp. 238-239.

Instead, our text appears to mark a difference in difficulty between a “regular” gift (*dāna*) and a “gift of total surrender” (*parityāgadāna*). We can infer from the *Abhidharmakośa* and *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* that the author(s) of the *Dānapāramitā* considered the former type of gift to involve some degree of continued ties between the donor and the object given, whereas the *parityāgadāna* was thought to entail a complete renunciation of ownership on the part of the donor.⁵² The *parityāgadāna* is more of a sacrifice for the donor and thus constitutes a more advanced bodhisattva practice in the gift-giving scheme laid out in the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*. As a caveat, I should add that there is some fluidity in the *Dānapāramitā*’s use of *sbyin pa* (*dāna*), *gtong ba* (*tyāga*), and *yongs su gtong ba’i sbyin pa* (*parityāgadāna*), especially in its verse passages. While our text does seem to signify a dichotomy between *sbyin pa* and *yongs su gtong ba’i sbyin pa*, I do not believe that it makes the sort of rigid technical distinctions that are present in the aforementioned *Abhidharmakośa* and *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* passages.

Central to the third section of the *Dānapāramitā* is the karmic reward. Unlike the *Dānapāṭala* of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (see chapter IV), which seeks to root out the reward as a motivation for giving, the reward in this section of our text is the gift’s *raison d’être*. The text

⁵² We can detect these two kinds of gifts in the epigraphic record too. Many donative inscriptions have *dāna* or *deyadharmā* (“religious gift”), but some instead use the term *deyadharmāparityāga* (or Prakrit equivalents), “total surrender of a religious gift.” See D.C. Sircar, *Indian Epigraphical Glossary* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1966), s.v. *parityāga*; Th. Damsteegt, *Epigraphical Hybrid Sanskrit: Its Rise, Spread, Characteristics and Relationship to Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit* (Orientalia Rheno-Trajectina 23) (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 163, 184, 245, and related notes (Damsteegt characteristically suggests that the term *deyadharmāparityāga* spread because of “North-Western influence”); Gouriswar Bhattacharya, “Dāna-Deyadharmā: Donation in Early Buddhist Records (in Brāhmī),” in *Investigating Indian Art: Proceedings of a Symposium on the Development of Early Buddhist and Hindu Iconography held at the Museum of Indian Art Berlin May 1986*, ed. M. Yaldiz and W. Lobo (Berlin: SMPK, 1987), 44 and 51-52. And in a 5th-7th century South Indian inscription, we can see the concept of a “gift of use” with the term *tyāgaparibhogānvayam*—see S. Sankaranarayanan, “Two Viṣṇukuṇḍi Charters from Tummalagudem,” *Epigraphia Āndhrīca* 2 (1974): 11, line 20 (this is Tummalagudem A from Table 2 in chapter V; I owe this reference to Schopen, “The Lay Ownership of Monasteries and the Role of the Monk in Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticism,” in *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*, 255, n. 69).

See also n. 8 in chapter IV, part B for an apparent case of this dichotomy of gifts in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*.

spells out how the bodhisattva donor benefits himself and especially other beings for each type of gift. Some of bodhisattva’s gifts result in material or other kinds of mundane rewards. Thus giving food brings about, among other things, a long (or healthy) life, a good complexion, and strength, while giving clothing, according to the verse section, causes the donor to acquire a fortune. (The rewards in the prose and the verse section of each gift frequently differ.) We might classify the rewards for most of the bodhisattva’s gifts as “spiritual,” though that term should be understood loosely because the difference between mundane and spiritual rewards in our text is not clear-cut. Usually the reward functions as a kind of spiritual counterpart to the object given. In the gift-of-medicine example I cited previously, regular medicine is transformed into an elixir for all beings’ souls, so to speak—the ageless and deathless *bdud rtsi* (Skt. *amṛta*), the nectar of the gods. When he gives lamps in the mundane world, on the other hand, the bodhisattva purifies the divine eye of all beings, which, according to Buddhist thought, will allow them to see the deaths and rebirths of other beings. Similarly, when the bodhisattva gives music, he perfects the divine ear for all beings, which grants them the superhuman ability to hear sounds from different types of beings and at great distances.

Our text makes a habit of enhancing the correspondence between gifts and rewards through wordplay. The gift of bedding items, for instance, is linked to removing the coverings of all beings. The Tibetan for “covering” is *sgrib pa*, which corresponds to Sanskrit *āvaraṇa* or *ni/nīvaraṇa*,⁵³ both of which refer to what hinders or obstructs one from seeing the world as it really is. By supplying an item that covers a bed, the bodhisattva can remove what covers the mind. We might say in English that the gift removes the wool that has been pulled over

⁵³ See Mvy. 2146 and 6512.

someone's eyes so that he or she is no longer deceived. Another wordplay occurs with the bodhisattva's (second) gift of a vehicle, which is described as follows:

rta dang / glang po che dang / shing rta'i bzhon pa yongs su gtong ba'i sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni byang chub sems dpa' rnams kyi theg pa chen po dang / theg pa mchog dang / theg pa mi mnyam pa dang mnyam pa dang / sangs rgyas kyi theg pa bla na med pa / gtso bo dam pa rab mchog sdud pa'i tshig bla dags yin. . . .

That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders a vehicle, such as that of horses, elephants, and wagons” . . . is a synonym for assembling the Great Vehicle [*mahāyāna*], best Vehicle, Vehicle equal to the unequalled, and the unsurpassed, chief, ultimate, most excellent Vehicle of an Awakened One. . . .

And when the bodhisattva gives this gift, he should proclaim the following:

rta dang / glang po che dang / shing rta'i bzhon pa yongs su gtong ba'i sbyin pa 'dis na bdag gis sems can thams cad theg pa chen po dang / theg pa mchog dang / theg pa mi mnyam pa dang mnyam pa dang / sangs rgyas kyi theg pa bla na med pa / gtso bo dam pa / rab mchog gis sdud par byed par gyur cig. . . .

On account of this gift that totally surrenders a vehicle, such as that of horses, elephants, and wagons, may I cause all beings to be won over by the Great Vehicle, best Vehicle, Vehicle equal to the unequalled, and the unsurpassed, chief, ultimate, most excellent Vehicle of an Awakened One.

The term for “assembling” and “win over” is the same— Tib. *sdud pa*, Skt. *saṃgraha* or something very close to it. The literal use of *saṃgraha* is the putting together of a vehicle, piece by piece. Figuratively, it means bringing people together into the religious life—giving a vehicle attracts people to Mahāyāna, the great spiritual vehicle that ferries its riders to salvation.

The spiritual rewards that attend the bodhisattva's gifts are meant, directly or indirectly, to lead beings to awakening. The purified divine eye that results from the bodhisattva's gift of lamps enables beings to penetrate into the workings of karma and thereby to appreciate fully the magnitude of suffering in a cyclical existence from which they must escape. More directly, what the bodhisattva really wants by giving physical seats is for each

being to gain his own seat of awakening, a *bodhimaṇḍa* at the center of the particular universe he will one day inhabit. When the bodhisattva gives seats, he should wish to “cause all beings to attain the adamant seat of the terrace of awakening on the surface of each of the thousand-cubed great thousand-world spheres” (*sems can thams cad kyis stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i 'jig rten gyi khams thams cad kyis sa gzhi la byang chub kyis snying po rdo rje'i gdan thob par byed par gyur cig*). Except “wish” is hardly adequate to understand the context of the bodhisattva’s statement. It is really a “vow,” or as I translate it throughout the text, an “oath.” All of the bodhisattva’s gifts in the third section of the *Dānapāramitā* must be accompanied by a *praṇidhāna* (Tib. *smoṅ lam*) that has been approved of in some way by the Buddha. A common usage of *praṇidhāna* in Buddhist texts is the oath to gain awakening, though it can be used for less “noble” goals, like the oath to acquire a better rebirth. In our text, the bodhisattva is in effect willing the effect of his gifts into existence, which usually entails leading all beings to some aspect of awakening. In the examples presented here, the bodhisattva resolves to give others the visual and auditory capabilities of awakened beings and the seat upon which they will defeat Māra and become awakened themselves.

As with the examples of giving lamps and music, this section of the *Dānapāramitā* places much emphasis on attaining the glorious body that is concomitant with awakening, a reward that is at once physical and religious. The reward of the superhuman body is felt most strongly at the end of this section, which describes eight gifts of the body (Skt. *dehadāna*). By giving them away, the bodhisattva is able to parlay his own impure body parts into their awakened counterparts or some other superhuman feature, and not just as a reward for himself. When the bodhisattva gives his eyes, he vows that all beings will obtain Dharma eyes (*dharmacakṣus*), an untrammelled vision of the Doctrine or Truth or Law. When he surrenders his skin, he vows

to perfect the skin of all beings so it will become soft, delicate, and golden, physical qualities that make up some of the thirty-two marks (*lakṣaṇa*) of the body of a *mahāpuruṣa*, the *überman* of Buddhist literature.⁵⁴ And when he sacrifices his bone marrow, the bodhisattva makes a vow in the verse section to “perfect the receptacle of all beings’ putrid bodies [so that] it is indestructible, [like] a diamond” (. . . *sems can thams cad kyi // rnag gi lus kyi za ma tog / rdo rje mi shigs rdzogs byed shog /*). The focus on the perfected body in the *Dānapāramitā* is far from unusual: It is a common theme in Buddhist texts in general and Mahāyāna Sūtras in particular.⁵⁵ In the *Longer Sukhāvativyūha*, for instance, the bodhisattva Dharmākara, who will, of course, become Amitābha, makes the following vow: “Blessed One, may I not awaken to unsurpassable, perfect, full awakening if, after I attain awakening, bodhisattvas born in my buddha-field will not all be endowed with the thirty two marks [*lakṣaṇa*] of the superior human being [*mahāpuruṣa*].”⁵⁶ But the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* does not restrict the ideal body to bodhisattvas in a particular buddha-field, for our bodhisattva is exhorted to make oath after oath to perfect *everyone’s* body, placing our text within a subset of Mahāyāna Sūtras that universalizes the bodhisattva path to all beings.⁵⁷ The bodhisattva of the *Dānapāramitā* magnifies his virtue by spreading it to other beings, whose future superhuman bodies will

⁵⁴ The *mahāpuruṣa’s* marks are probably most well known from the *Lakkhaṇa-sutta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya*. For a detailed analysis of the list of marks, see *BHSD*, s.v. *lakṣaṇa* (especially nos. 11 and 12 of entry no. 4 on p. 459a); see also the voluminous notes in Lamotte, *Le traité de la grande vertu de Sagesse*, Vol. I, 271-281.

⁵⁵ See Boucher, *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna*, 3-19.

⁵⁶ Gomez, trans., *The Land of Bliss*, 71 (§28(20)).

⁵⁷ See Boucher, *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna*, 11.

manifest the accomplishments of their own moral actions that led to their awakening. The generosity of the bodhisattva becomes literally embodied in all beings.⁵⁸

The beginning of the third section of the *Dānapāramitā* has the Buddha tell the bodhisattva-interlocutor that he will explain the gifts of food, drinks, vehicles, clothing, ornaments, and everything else up to (Tib. *bar*, Skt. *yāvat*) one's bone marrow. The end of the passage on giving bone marrow would thus seem like a logical place to conclude the entire text, or at the very least to mark a formal division like a chapter. But instead the text says only the following: "Furthermore, that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this" (*gzhan yang byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te*). This transition brings us to the fourth and last section of the text.

Given the orderly, repetitive nature of the text up until this point, what seems to me as a rather cursory and even sloppy transition betrays the fact that we might have more than one hand at work in our text. This sense is only compounded by reading what comes after the transition. For the tightly organized and hierarchical structure of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* completely breaks down in its last section. Taking up less than a fifth of the second chapter, the last section of the text is composed mostly of a string of terse statements about the sorts of things one should give in addition to the manner in which giving should occur—from one's own hand, respectfully, at the correct time, etc. Like the *Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra*, with which, as I have already stated, it shares a good deal of wording and content, the last section of the *Dānapāramitā* is structured haphazardly. There are twenty-seven gift-giving statements after the transition from the third section and they do not appear to be ordered according to any

⁵⁸ Several scholars have drawn attention to the relationship in Buddhist texts between the body and moral behavior. See especially Ohnuma, *Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood*, 224-231; Susanne Mrozik, *Virtuous Bodies: The Physical Dimensions of Morality in Buddhist Ethics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).

organizing principles, except perhaps the gift of the Dharma might be highlighted because it comes last. Moreover, several of the gift objects from the third section—food, drinks, clothing, lamps, and many others—are repeated in the fourth section. But unlike the situation in the third section in which the gift of the vehicle is repeated with *yongs su gtong ba'i sbyin pa* instead of *sbyin pa*, the repeats between the third and fourth sections do not seem to serve any purpose.

After the hodgepodge of brief statements, there are a few longer sentences that focus mostly on the mental state of the donor—he should give without pride, with joy, with pure intentions, and so on—as well as on the attitude of the donor toward the recipient. The bodhisattva is urged not to feel contempt for or look down on the recipient; he must instead “give with deference and esteem” (*gus pa dang bcas pa dang / zhe sar bcas pas sbyin par byed*). This is followed by a couple passages that I discussed at the end of chapter II. The text discourages the bodhisattva from seeking out virtuous recipients because they will bring more karmic rewards than unethical recipients and from giving in order to be reborn in certain positions. The text then explains that the bodhisattva must instead redirect his merit toward the “unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening” of all beings, before ending with the bodhisattva-interlocutor’s profusely offering praise to the Buddha. The attention to the recipient, the disavowal of certain karmic rewards, and the redirection of merit to awakening can all be found in Mahāyāna texts, but they nevertheless stand out here because the third part of the text makes no mention of them. The sudden repudiation of certain karmic rewards is particularly striking considering that each gift enumerated in the third section, along with some at the beginning of the fourth section, is structured around the reward it will bring. And for many of these gifts our text promises this-worldly, material rewards. Both the structure

and the content of the last section, then, radically diverge from the previous parts of the text.⁵⁹ Indeed, the end of the *Dānapāramitā* reads as if an author or redactor was unaware of or indifferent to the rest of the text, and thus one might reasonably conclude that *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* as it now exists in the Tibetan Kanjur is not the product of a single person.

A Note on the Translation

Apart from proper names, I use only English words in my translation, since it is, after all, a *translation*. (I do, however, freely use untranslated terms or titles in part A of this chapter and in the other chapters of this dissertation, since those are directed toward scholars.) I avoid the italicized Sanskritisms that litter translations of Indian Buddhist texts. Translators should be more mindful of potential readers, such as undergraduate students, who do not have the language training or the specialized background to know what, for example, a *nāga* or *deva* is. Regardless, I sometimes state the Tibetan and/or Sanskrit in the footnotes, and scholars in the field, it seems to me, will know the Sanskrit behind much of the English anyway. And my limited experience with popular culture tells me that Indian words that have entered the English language—like *bodhisattva* or, worse, *yoga*—should be translated in order to cut through the additional connotations they have acquired in Western culture.

I try to remain rigorously consistent in vocabulary choices, with the same English word matching the same Tibetan word (and without overlap—I attempt not to use one English equivalent for more than one Tibetan word). I sometimes break this self-imposed rule when

⁵⁹ The structural divergence in the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* may have antecedents. The *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa-* and *Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtras* enumerate gifts and their rewards in a hierarchical structure before treating the intentionality behind and proper manner of gift giving. However, the content of the last section of the *Dānapāramitā* shares more in common with the *Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra* than the sections on giving in these two other texts.

translating technical terms, which are usually not done justice with literal translations. Like much of Buddhist literature, Mahāyāna Sūtras, which tend to be rendered into Tibetan quite faithfully and literally, are often formulaic, dreadfully repetitive, and, frankly, boring. (Though it seems likely that a need for mnemonic devices within the Indian oral traditions of Buddhist literature contributed to its generally lackluster quality, let us remember that some of the best literature the world has known was also produced orally: Orality is not a dead end to dullness.) It has always struck me as odd that one who has access to Buddhist texts only through translation may get the impression that Mahāyāna Sūtras, to say nothing of Pāli Suttas, possess an aesthetic or linguistic sophistication at least comparable to works like Aśvaghōṣa's *Buddhacarita* or Āryaśūra's *Jātakamālā*. I hope that my effort at consistency helps to avoid such an impression and captures the stylistic simplicity, repetitive nature, and limited vocabulary of the text.⁶⁰

A Note on the Tibetan

The Tibetan text of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* can be found immediately following the translation. It is meant to serve as a reliable foundation on which to base my translation, not as

⁶⁰ For a much rosier picture of the literary formulas and conventions in Mahāyāna Sūtras, especially their use in the *Shorter* and *Longer Sukhāvātīvyūha*, see Gomez, *The Land of Bliss*, 51-55. Needless to say, I do not consider the *Sukhāvātīvyūha*, *Dānapāramitā*, or most any Mahāyāna Sūtra to be “well-wrought, learned works of a well-established literary genre” (p. 51). Paul Harrison describes the *Longer Sukhāvātīvyūha*, rightly in my view, as “interminably tedious to modern sensibilities, with its endless descriptions of the physical features of Sukhāvātī, its flora, its climatic conditions, and the lifestyle of its inhabitants.” He offers the interesting hypothesis that the tedious descriptions in the *Longer Sukhāvātīvyūha* should be viewed as prescriptive blueprints through which a practitioner could properly visualize the complex setting of Sukhāvātī. See Harrison, “Mediums and Messages,” 120-122 (quote taken from p. 121).

a critical edition, which would require the collation of several more recensions of the Tibetan Kanjur.⁶¹ I have collated six recensions, which are as follows:

- D: Derge xylograph Kanjur (*mdo sde*, Tsa 77a1-95b1)⁶²
- L: Shel dkar/London manuscript Kanjur (*mdo*, Za, 245a4-273b7)⁶³
- N: Narthang xylograph Kanjur (*mdo sde*, Ba 121b7-151a5)⁶⁴
- Q: Peking xylograph Kanjur (*mdo sna tshogs*, Mu 87a7-105b4)⁶⁵
- S: Stog Palace manuscript Kanjur (*mdo sde*, Za 240a6-266b7)⁶⁶
- T: Tokyo manuscript Kanjur (*mdo sde*, Za, 222a5-247b8)⁶⁷

⁶¹ I will add, somewhat cynically, that I do not fully understand the amount of work spent recording each variation from every extant recension of the Kanjur, of which there are fifteen or so, in producing a Tibetan critical apparatus. It seems to have as much to do with satisfying the textually biased standards of the Buddhist Studies guild as it does with getting at the underlying Indian text. (Editing texts with more than one version, as in a case with one text from the Kanjur and a parallel text from Dunhuang, is another matter entirely.) In my experience with the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* and other texts, the vast majority of differences between Kanjur recensions are either mistakes or extremely trivial variations. To use Paul Harrison’s terminology, most variations are of the “transmissional” rather than the “recensional” type. The former variations are “errors resulting from scribal lapses or casual attempts to improve or modernise the text (which are indeed usually deliberate, but generally rather trivial in scope)”; whereas the latter “reveal either extensive and deliberate editorial changes to the text, or the adoption of a different text altogether. . . .” See Harrison, *Druma-kinnara-rāja-paripṛcchā-sūtra: A Critical Edition of the Tibetan Text (Recension A) based on Eight Editions of the Kanjur and the Dunhuang Manuscript Fragment* (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series VII) (Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1992), xxv.

⁶² *The Sde-dge Mtshal-par Bka’-’gyur: a facsimile edition of the 18th century redaction of Si-tu Chos-kyi-’byuñ-gnas prepared under the direction of H.H. the 16th Rgyal-dbañ Karma-pa*, Vol. 61 (Delhi: Delhi Karmapae Chodhey Gyalwae Sungrab Partun Khang, 1979).

⁶³ *Shel dkar Manuscript Kanjur kept in the British Library (Or. 6724)*, Vol. 47. Many thanks to Burkhard Quessel of the British Library for sending me an electronic copy of the Shel dkar text.

⁶⁴ *Narthang Kanjur*, Vol. 61. Many thanks to Bruce Williams for giving me access to the Narthang Kanjur volumes housed in Berkeley’s East Asian Library.

⁶⁵ Daisetz T. Suzuki, ed., *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking edition, reprinted under the supervision of the Otani University*, Vol. 34 (Tokyo; Kyoto: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute, 1957).

⁶⁶ *The Tog Palace manuscript of the Tibetan Kanjur*, Vol. 73 (Leh, Ladakh: Smarntsis Shesrig Dpemzod, 1980).

⁶⁷ *Manuscript Kanjur in the Kawaguchi Collection of the Tōyō Bunko*. Many thanks to Caleb Carter and Nobumi Iyanaga for helping me obtain a copy of the Tokyo Kanjur text from the Tōyō Bunko.

I chose these six Kanjurs because they were relatively easy to acquire and because they represent both the Tshal pa and Them spangs ma recensional lines (or the “eastern” and “western” groups, respectively). I have not produced a stemma or checked for “corruption” between recensional lines. I can only offer the observation that in the *Dānapāramitā* many textual variants are shared by the Derge, Narthang, and Peking Kanjurs on the one hand, and the Shel dkar, Stog Palace, and Tokyo Kanjurs on the other. This accords well with the general consensus, if oversimplified, that the Derge, Narthang, and Peking Kanjurs belong to the Tshal pa line, whereas the Shel dkar, Stog Palace, and Tokyo Kanjurs belong to the Them spangs ma line.⁶⁸

Variations in these six recensions of the Tibetan *Dānapāramitā* will be placed in footnotes, along with occasional remarks about the spacing of the syllables and other peculiarities in the appearance of the writing. I adopt the punctuation of the Derge Kanjur for the simple reason that it was the first recension I consulted, though variations in punctuation are also provided in the footnotes. I ignore *pa/ba* and *po/bo* variants in the Peking because they are too difficult to distinguish.

⁶⁸ Information on the recensions of the Tibetan Canon is owed mostly to Helmut Eimer and Paul Harrison. See, e.g., Eimer, “A Note on the History of the Tibetan Kanjur,” *Central Asiatic Journal* 32.1-2 (1988): 64-72; Harrison, “Meritorious Activity or Waste of Time? Some Remarks on the Editing of Texts in the Tibetan Kanjur,” in *Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the 5th Seminar of the International Association of Tibetan Studies, Narita 1989*, Vol. 1: *Buddhist Philosophy and Literature*, ed. Ihara Shōren and Yamaguchi Zuihō (Narita: Naritasan Shinshoji, 1992), 77-93.

B. English Translation

In the Indian language: *Āryadānapāramitā nāma Mahāyāna Sūtra*. In the Tibetan language: The Great Vehicle Discourse named *The Noble Perfection of Giving*. Obeisance to all Awakened Ones and Aspirants to Awakening!¹

I heard this at one time.² For the sake of helping the relations of the Blessed One himself and the men of the region³: In the great city Kapilavastu, [in] the park of King

¹ “Aspirant to Awakening” is, of course, an attempt to translate *bodhisattva*. As Kajiyama demonstrates, one of the main understandings of *bodhisattva* in Mahāyāna texts is a being who seeks (or aspires to) awakening. See Yuichi Kajiyama, “On the Meanings of the words *Bodhisattva* and *Mahāsattva* in Prajñāpāramitā Literature,” in *Indological and Buddhist Studies, Volume in Honour of Professor J.W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. L.A. Hercus et al. (Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies, 1982), 253-270.

There are problems with the etymology of *bodhisattva*. It does not make a whole lot of sense to have the substantives *bodhi* and *sattva* in apposition like this; one has to supply words to connect the two. This is what led Dayal to stress the possibility that *bodhisattva* was an incorrect Sanskritization of Prakrit *bodhisakta*, “one who is attached/devoted to awakening.” (Without having pursued the matter, I wonder whether it could also be a Sanskritization of *bodhisakta*, “one who is capable of awakening”?) See Dayal, *The Bodhisattva Doctrine*, 4-9; Kajiyama, “On the Meanings of the words *Bodhisattva* and *Mahāsattva*,” 253-256. See also Dorji Wangchuk, *The Resolve to Become a Buddha: A Study of the Bodhicitta Concept in Indo-Tibetan Buddhism* (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series XXIII) (Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 2007), 129-134 and the sources cited there.

There is too much emphasis placed on the etymological origins of words for translations. (Likewise, there is too much stress on the authorship of and authorial intent behind texts—something I myself am guilty of—as opposed to their readership and the reception of texts as redacted wholes.) Though Dayal belongs to a different age of scholarship, his sentiment that the best way to understand *bodhisatta/bodhisattva* is “to go back to the Pāli [which he believed to be the source for Buddhist Sanskrit] without attaching much importance to the later lexicographers and philosophers” (*The Bodhisattva Doctrine*, 4) remains with us. I instead try to capture a meaning of the term that carried weight for several Mahāyāna authors at different points in Indian history. Regardless, the semantic range and history of *bodhisattva*, as with any word, get leveled as soon as a translator chooses one equivalent.

Lastly, as I stated in the introduction, I translate all terms except for proper names. I hesitate to translate *bodhisattva*, however, because I consider its usage to be similar to that of a name. It is a religious title, not unlike *Saint* from the Catholic tradition or even a secular title such as *Mr.*, both of which have an array of connotations and are hard to define.

² There is a great deal of scholarship dedicated to the punctuation of this phrase. See the sources cited in Boucher, *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna*, 213-214, n. 4. I follow the punctuation of this Tibetan translation.

³ I am confused by the placement of *bcom ldan 'das nyid kyi rtsa lag dang / yul gyi mi rnams la phan gdags pa'i phyir*, after which there is a *daṇḍa* in L and S. As it stands, it seems like the Buddha's discourse is

Śuddhodana, which was ornamented with many hundreds of thousands of sāḷ trees,⁴ palm trees, garcinia trees, golden shower trees, jujube trees, walnut trees, wild date trees, banyan trees, kadam trees, mango trees, pear trees, myrobalan trees, bael wood apple trees, pomegranate trees, elephant wood apple trees, plantain trees, Indian fig trees,⁵ cluster fig trees, beleric trees, pipal trees, Arabian jasmines, royal jasmines, bamboo,⁶ hiptage creepers, champak trees, ashoka trees, white roses, trumpet flower trees, acacias, arjuna trees, and Indian coral trees,⁷ made beautiful by having banks of foothill and mountain streams, small lakes, ponds, pools, and fragrant springs that were filled with blue lotus, red lotus, white water

done for the sake of the people specified, but it is possible that *phyir* is supposed to link up with some missing verbal phrase.

⁴ For the trees in this list, I use mostly (one of the) common names, employing Sanskrit transliteration only when the common name is derived from Sanskrit. Identification is, of course, tentative: Matching ancient names to living animals and plants is a precarious affair. Clearly, the fauna and flora of India—and the terms describing them—would often have been as foreign to a Tibetan audience contemporary with a translation of the *Dānapāramitā* as it is to non-Indians today.

⁵ Tib. *shing ba ṭa* and *nya gro dha* may be referring to the same tree—Skt. *vaṭa* and *nyagrodha*, respectively. I therefore use two synonyms for the same species, banyan and Indian fig. One should keep in mind that here the text describes a paradisiacal setting, the function of which is to establish a contrast with the humdrum backdrop of everyday life. Such over-the-top descriptions are common in Indian literature. The species are not otherworldly, but we are in a literary world, not a real one. (But on the artificiality of *real* Buddhist *ārāmas*, see Gregory Schopen, “The Buddhist ‘Monastery’ and the Indian Garden: Aesthetics, Assimilations, and the Siting of Monastic Establishments,” in *Buddhist Nuns, Monks, and Other Worldly Matters*, 224-250.) The author(s) probably did not intend for the reader to contemplate the form of each plant and animal in the grove. It is also easy to imagine a writer, of any era, knowing the words for plants and animals without being able to identify every one of them on the ground. In short, a repeat of the same type of tree in this list need not be problematic.

⁶ This is a generic guess. Skt. *dhānuṣkari* indicates that it would have been used to make an archer’s bow.

⁷ The Tibetan here is *shing ljon*, which can translate generic Sanskrit words for tree like *vṛkṣa* and *pādapa*. Given the nature of this list, however, we are most likely dealing with one species or at least one type of tree. In this light Skt. *druma* would make more sense, since it has associations with a particular tree brought to Indra’s paradise. See *MW*, s.vv. *druma* and *pārijāta*.

lily, and white lotus flowers,⁸ made beautiful with hundreds of thousands of singing geese,⁹ peacocks, cranes, shelducks, cuckoos, ospreys, parrots, common mynas, pheasants, partridges, nightingales,¹⁰ and coots,¹¹ and bees, which had water that was endowed with the eight [good] attributes¹² and totally filled with clarity, fragrance, utter coolness, nonturbidity, and absolute purity, which had fields that were green, soft, fresh, and comforting to touch, like silk, wool, cotton, Mon silk, kācilindika,¹³ and linen cloth, a fine area that was delightful, pristine, and without rocks, small stones, gravel, filth, swamps, or refuse, and that supported many kinds of wild animals—groups of deer,¹⁴ spotted deer, monkeys, cats, weasels,¹⁵ rabbits, bears, hyenas, and birds. Hundreds of thousands of gods of the night, daughters of the gods, world guardians, Varuṇa, Śiva, Yama, Virūdhaka, Kubera, Indra, Virūpākṣa, Dhṛtarāṣṭra, demigods, mythical

⁸ The lotus and water lily are common in Buddhist paradisiacal settings. See, e.g., Gomez, trans., *The Land of Bliss*, 87 (§67), 103 (§129), and 182 (§87).

⁹ The identification of birds was made much easier by the Sanskrit index in K.N. Dave, *Birds in Sanskrit Literature* (1985; repr., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2005). What is clear from this well-researched work is that each Sanskrit word usually applies to several species or even types of birds, the problem being only exacerbated by translation to Tibetan and now English.

¹⁰ I treat 'jon mo (T: 'dzon mo) as a variant of or mistake for 'jol mo, “nightingale.”

¹¹ An educated guess that follows Patrick Olivelle, trans., *Life of the Buddha* (New York: New York University Press & JJC Foundation, 2009), 147, verse 5.53. Skt. *kāraṇḍava* is also a generic term for ducks, swans, geese, and mergansers, in addition to a word for several particular species. See Dave, *Birds in Sanskrit Literature*, s.v.

¹² The description of the water brings to mind the ponds in the *Shorter* and *Longer Sukhāvātīvyūha*. Gomez translates the eight attributes of water as “limpid, cool, sweet-tasting, light, soft, placid, healthy, and thirst-quenching” (*The Land of Bliss*, 146 (§9)).

¹³ Kācilindika cloth is commonly used in similes to describe the comforting feel of various objects. See *BHSD*, s.v. *kācilindika*.

¹⁴ Tib. *ldang sko ska* may refer to a species of deer (the identity of which I am unaware), deer in general, or a mythical animal of Indian legend. See *MW*, s.v. *śarabha*.

¹⁵ Here L reads *srin mo* (Skt. *rākṣasī*), “female demons,” which does not fit the context.

eagles, celestial musicians, centaurs, and mighty serpent spirits were supported by and dwelled at [that] place.

There was a great Community of monks. [In total] there were 77,000 monks, including the venerable Śāriputra, the venerable Maudgalyāyana, the venerable Subhūti, the venerable Kapphiṇa, the venerable Gavāṃpati, the venerable Mahākauṣṭhila, the venerable Bharadvāja, the venerable Ājñātakaunḍinya, the venerable Bhadrīka, the venerable Pūrṇa, the venerable Subhadra, the venerable Cūḍapanthaka, the venerable Vakkula, the venerable Rāhula, the venerable Upananda, the venerable Nanda, and the venerable Ānanda. They, as well as the other 77,000 monks, all of them together,¹⁶ to wit, except for one person, the venerable Ānanda, were all Worthy Ones¹⁷ who had destroyed their contaminations,¹⁸ were without defilements,¹⁹ had become powerful,²⁰ had utterly liberated minds²¹ and utterly liberated wisdom,²² were of good breeding,²³ were [like] great elephants,²⁴ had performed their duties,²⁵

¹⁶ The passage describing the monks ends with *sha stag dang thabs cig*. According to Michael Zimmermann, *A Buddha Within: The Tathāgatarbhasūtra, The Earliest Exposition of the Buddha-Nature Teaching in India* (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica VI) (Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University, 2002), 95, n. 7 (3), *sha stag* “emphasizes the comprehensiveness of the group concerned (‘all and not less than all’) . . . but is in most cases introduced by Tibetan translators without any [Sanskrit] correspondence. . . .” The passage on the Aspirants to Awakening that follows this one also ends with *sha stag*.

¹⁷ Skt. *arhat*.

¹⁸ Skt. *kṣīṇāsrava*.

¹⁹ Skt. *niṣkleśa*.

²⁰ Skt. *vaśībhūta*.

²¹ Skt. *svimuktacitta*.

²² Skt. *svimuktaprajña*.

²³ Tib. *cang shes pa*, translating Skt. *ājāneya* or something close to it, really means “all knowing,” not “well bred.” At some point the Tibetan translators misunderstood *ājāneya* to be a derivative of the

performed their tasks,²⁶ laid down their burdens,²⁷ attained their own goals,²⁸ totally destroyed the bonds to existence,²⁹ utterly liberated their minds with correct knowledge,³⁰ and attained the ultimate supremacy in control over the whole mind.³¹

There was a large group of Aspirants to Awakening [including] many myriads of millions³² of Aspirants to Awakening, such as the Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero³³ Maitreya,³⁴ Mañjuśrī the true prince, Avalokiteśvara, Mahāsthāmaprāpta, Samantabhadra,

verbal root √jñā (“to know”) instead of √jan (“to produce” or “to give birth to”). See *BHSD*, s.v. *ājanya*. Chinese translations of the term were not without their problems either—see Silk, “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 260, n. 1.

²⁴ Skt. *mahānāga*.

²⁵ Skt. *kṛtakṛtya*.

²⁶ Skt. *kṛtakaraṇīya*.

²⁷ Skt. *apahr̥tabhāra*. The “burden” is a reference to the five *skandhas*, the aggregates that, according to Buddhist thought, make up living beings who are trapped in cyclical existence. The *Bhāra-sutta* of the *Saṃyutta Nikāya* deals with this idea at some length.

²⁸ Skt. *anuprāptasvakārtha*.

²⁹ Skt. *parikṣiṇabhavasamyojana*.

³⁰ Skt. *samyagājñāsu vimuktacitta*.

³¹ Skt. *sarvacetovaśīparamapāramiprāpta*. This is a standard Buddhist list of *śrāvaka-guṇas* or qualities of the Buddha’s disciples. See Mvy. 1074ff.

³² One should not take these numbers very seriously, here or elsewhere—they are part of the ballooned Mahāyāna cosmos (or *cosmoses*) and mean little more than “inconceivably large.”

³³ This is *bodhisattva-mahāsattva*. See above in n. 1 for remarks and sources on the translation of *bodhisattva*. “Great hero” is one meaning of *mahāsattva* in operation not only in Mahāyāna works, but apparently in Sanskrit epics as well. It is also how the Tibetan translators may have understood the term (*sems dpa’ chen po*, literally something like “great heroic mind”). Of course, there are problems with my rendering *sattva* differently in two successive words.

³⁴ The further down the list of Aspirants to Awakening, the more speculative their Sanskrit names become. In some cases, I am not even sure I divide the names correctly, given the way Tibetan breaks apart Sanskrit compounds. Of course, the variable and sometimes arbitrary nature of Tibetan

Ākāśagarbha, Devamukuṭa, Ratnamukuṭa, Ratnapāṇi, Ratnaprabha, Ratnagarbha, Ratnacūḍa, Ratnasimha, Ratnajāla, Jālinīprabha, Sūryaprabha, Candraprabha, Dṛḍhasthāma, Dṛḍhamati, Dṛḍhavīrya, Dṛḍhavikrama, Dṛḍhotsāha, Mahotsāha, Prāmodyarāja, Bhaiṣajyarāja, Bhaiṣajya-samudgata, Śubhavalaviśuddhacandraprabharāja, Kamaladalavimalanakṣatrarāja-saṃkusumitābhijña,³⁵ Bhramarakālakamayūracāṣastyāyitarājitaṭāmukuṭa,³⁶ Padmacandra-smitaparakāśitottānamukhavarṇa, Nīlaratnātiśobhananetraguṇaratnaketu, Samāviralasūkladanta,³⁷ Rajataśaṅkhacandrakumudadugdhasūkla, Kadalapatratālaparṇajihvaviśālatāmrapaṭṭa, Kokilaśukasārikakunālakalaviṅkakūjanamanojñaghoṣasvaraniḥśrāvaṇa, Kāyacandra, Bālārka, and Rājavr̥kṣasahakārapuṣpākarakadambabhūta, and the Aspirant to Awakening–Great Hero Sūkṣmamṛdutaruṇatanukomalasukumārapuṣpakaracaraṇatāmranakha. They, as well as all the

punctuation can be as misleading as it is helpful. It is certain that some Aspirants to Awakening were literary inventions for this and other Mahāyāna Sūtras—see Paul Harrison, “Mañjuśrī and the Cult of the Celestial Bodhisattvas,” *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 13 (2000): 181-84. Some of the Aspirants to Awakening appear to be named after the superhuman characteristics they possess. Note that these convoluted strings of words must make up names and not be descriptions because the first and last figures are given the title *bodhisattva-mahāsattva*.

³⁵ If this indeed is the Sanskrit represented by *pad ma'i 'dab ma ltar dri ma med pa rgyu skar rgyal po mngon par shes pa'i me tog shin tu rgyas pa*, then this Aspirant to Awakening shares his name with an Awakened One from the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. See *BHSD*, s.v.

³⁶ I am very uncertain about the reconstruction of this name, but the idea is that he has a crown of matted hair with the beautiful dark color of bees, peacocks, etc. Cf. Skjærvø, ed. and trans., *This Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras*, Vol. I, 66, *4.3; 67, *4.7; 363, *19.14. See Klaus Karttunen, “Bhramarotpītādharaḥ—Bees in Classical India,” *Studia Orientalia* 107 (2009): 112, n. 66 for some references in Sanskrit literature to comparisons between black bees and the dark hair of women and boys.

³⁷ Our author(s) evidently named this Aspirant to Awakening after one of the qualities (Skt. *lakṣaṇa*)—actually, three qualities in one according to one version of the list of qualities—of a Great Man (Skt. *mahāpuruṣa*): his teeth were even, without gaps, and white. Not unexpectedly, that this was a mark of superhuman beauty in India does not say much for the health and appearance of the average person’s teeth.

other 99,000 Aspirants to Awakening, were irreversible,³⁸ turned the irreversible wheel of the Law, vanquished Māra and [other] foes, fully passed beyond all the deeds of Māra,³⁹ were skilled in knowing [how to] enter into the regions of all the Thus Come Ones, had the superknowledges,⁴⁰ attained the formula⁴¹ that will bring about entry into the full extent of the Śūraṅgama-concentration, mastered comprehending the skillful strategies with regard to all the Perfections, taught various world spheres, wore the great armor,⁴² and did not have doubt in the qualities of an Awakened One. Having fully vanquished excessive pride together with [mental] impressions and connections⁴³ by means of thinking about all the [mental] impressions of the major and minor defilements, they were disciplined and certain,⁴⁴ entered

³⁸ Tib. *phyir mi ldog pa* translates the familiar Skt. *avaivartika*, an adjective that commonly describes an Aspirant to Awakening who cannot be turned back on the path to awakening. On *avaivartika*, see Étienne Lamotte, *Śūraṅgamasamādhisūtra: The Concentration of Heroic Progress, An Early Mahāyāna Buddhist Scripture*, trans. Sara Boin-Webb (Richmond: Curzon Press, 1998), 185-186, n. 209.

³⁹ These generally number ten—see, e.g., Bendall, ed., *Çikshāsamuccaya*, 151.13-152.19.

⁴⁰ Skt. *abhijñā*.

⁴¹ Skt. *dhāraṇī*, a term whose meaning has generated some debate. Its etymology certainly suggests that it was a method of retaining information. Boucher is correct in noting that *dhāraṇī* is mistakenly understood as a marker for Tantric or Vajrayāna Buddhism. However, I would take issue with his statement that a usage of *dhāraṇī* in the *Rāṣṭrapālāpariṣcchā-sūtra* “confirms” that they are not magical utterances and instead are only mnemonic tools utilized to remember the Dharma (*Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna*, 220, n. 84). At best this only “confirms” that the *Rāṣṭrapālāpariṣcchā-sūtra* uses *dhāraṇī* in this way (and perhaps that is what he meant), but it may merely indicate what the term means in just this one line of text. I see no reason not to think that in the context of pre-modern India, a mnemonic formula could have what we would consider “magical” properties. Indeed, in this passage here the attainment of a *dhāraṇī* is included among a litany of qualities that seem to be anything but ordinary. See also Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 291-292, n. 549.

⁴² A common metaphor used to describe Aspirants to Awakening in a spiritual “war.”

⁴³ Tib. *bag chags dang mtshams sbyor ba*. Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 293, n. 561 conjectures that the Sanskrit here is *vāsanāsambandha*. However, it is more likely *vāsanā(prati)sam̐dhi*—according to Mvy. 2166, *mtshams sbyor ba med pa = apratisam̐dhi*.

⁴⁴ It is difficult to tell whether the Tibetan here reads *nges pa* or *des pa*. If the latter (and D looks much more like *des pa*), the translation of this phrase should instead be “disciplined and gentle.”

into the establishments of mental awareness, the correct exertions, the bases of supernatural power, the faculties, the strengths, the branches of awakening, and the path,⁴⁵ had abundant friendliness, compassion, joy, equanimity,⁴⁶ forbearance,⁴⁷ [good] intentions, and [good] propensities, were free from pride, haughtiness, arrogance, conceit,⁴⁸ self-inflation,⁴⁹ avarice, narcissism, self-possession, intense clinging, attachment, clinging, lassitude, craving thirst, and strong clinging, made strenuous efforts to benefit themselves, benefit others, and [provide] ease for incalculable hundreds of thousands of myriads of millions of eons, had a disposition that completely effected the compilation and accumulation of roots of virtue, and were free from the strong-arming,⁵⁰ threats, quarreling, fighting, contention, strife, dispute,⁵¹

⁴⁵ The last several items make up a list of the thirty-seven qualities conducive to awakening (Skt. *bodhipakṣadharmā*). This includes the four establishments of mental awareness (*smṛtyupasthāna*), the four correct exertions (*samyakpradhāna*), the four bases of supernatural power (*ṛddhipāda*), the five faculties (*indriya*), the five strengths (*bala*), the seven branches of awakening (*bodhyaṅga*), and the eightfold path (*aṣṭāṅgamārga*). The best discussion of these items can be found in Rupert Getzin, *The Buddhist Path to Awakening: A Study of the Bodhi-Pakṣiyā Dhammā* (Leiden: Brill, 1992).

⁴⁶ The last four items, which are extremely common in Mahāyāna Sūtras, are the *brahmavihāras* (*maitrī, karuṇā, muditā, and upekṣā*), about which see n. 131 below.

⁴⁷ Skt. *kṣānti*, about which see Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 244, n. 240.

⁴⁸ Tib. *nyes rtsom* translates *saṃrambha*, a fact that I owe to Sung-Doo Ahn, *Die Lehre von den Kleśas in der Yogācārabhūmi* (Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 55) (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2003), 255, n. 359. According to MW, s.v., the primary definition of *saṃrambha* is “impetuosity,” “wrath,” “violence,” etc. (Ahn’s “Gewalttätigkeit”). However, it can also mean “pride” or “arrogance,” which suits the context here.

⁴⁹ The Sanskrit for *khengs pa* is probably *stambha*. See Mvy. 7339.

⁵⁰ I suspect Tib. *gzings pa* is related to *'dzin pa*, from Skt. $\sqrt{\text{grah}}$, “grab” (or from a related Middle Indic root—see BHS, s.v. *gahanatā*). From a bevy of options, I offer a single, admittedly colloquial possibility, one that seems to fit the context. It is also possible that *gzings pa* means something like “trickery,” for which see BHS, s.v. *gahana*.

⁵¹ On Sanskrit and Tibetan equivalences for terms of the “quarrel series” in some Buddhist texts, see Prods Oktor Skjærvø, ed. and trans., *This Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras: The Khotanese Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra*, Vol. II: *Manuscripts, Commentary, Glossary, Indexes* (Sources of Oriental Languages

and minor defilements on account of deception, guile, lies, slander, harsh words, injury, doing harm, punishment,⁵² and pernicious views.

Together with them, there were also the four world guardians, namely the great king Vaiśravaṇa, the great king Dhṛtarāṣṭra, the great king Virūḍhaka, and the great king Virūpākṣa, each surrounded by a retinue of his respective attendants. There was the great leader of the earth spirits, Pāñcika, accompanied by a retinue of his own sons, as well as the great leader of the earth spirits, Vajrapāṇi,⁵³ accompanied by a retinue of his own earth spirits. There was Hāritī, the mother of mighty ghosts, accompanied by a retinue of her own female earth spirits, as well as Śaṅkhinī,⁵⁴ Śūlinī,⁵⁵ Pītā,⁵⁶ Durgā,⁵⁷ Mahāśrīdevī,⁵⁸ Sarasvatī, Bhairavī,⁵⁹

and Literatures 61) (Cambridge: The Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University, 2004), 163-164, 6.2.48.

⁵² More literally, “binding” (*’ching ba*, from Skt. *√bandh*).

⁵³ Vajrapāṇi is a *yakṣa* here, not an Aspirant to Awakening.

⁵⁴ A female supernatural figure, probably a demon.

⁵⁵ Śūlinī is one of the names for Durgā. Tib. *mdung thogs ma* might also be, in Skt., Śaktidhārī. At any rate, as the Tibetan indicates, this is some female supernatural figure bearing a lance or spear.

⁵⁶ Tib. *ser mo* literally is feminine for the color yellow, i.e., Skt. *pītā*. I am not sure whether she, because of her color, would be associated with the god Viṣṇu. It is also possible that this figure’s name is Vāruṇī, perhaps, according to *MW*, s.v., a wife or daughter of Varuṇa or the wife of Śiva.

⁵⁷ Tib. *dka’ bzlog ma* is probably a literal translation of Durgā. However, it may also represent the goddess Umā. Since Durgā and Umā are two names for the same goddess, or at least can be considered two embodiments of the same figure, it is not difficult to see how their names were conflated under one Tibetan translation.

⁵⁸ This is one designation for the Hindu Goddess (*Devī*), who takes on various forms and names, including some others from the present list. In the *Devī-Māhātmya*, itself embedded within the larger *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*, the Goddess is represented by Kālī, Lakṣmī, Sarasvatī, and Durgā, among others. It is difficult to know whether our author(s) gave much thought to Mahāśrīdevī’s being a goddess with a distinct identity or whether she is merely a name among a hodgepodge of supernatural characters drawn from the Indian pantheon.

Candra, Śakra, the lord of the gods, Maheśvara,⁶⁰ a son of the gods, and Brahmā, ruler of Sahā, accompanied by his own retinue of sons of the gods. There was Anavatapta, an otherworldly snake king, as well as Sāgara, an otherworldly snake king, each accompanied by his own retinue of otherworldly snakes. There was Mahātejas, a lord of mythical eagles, as well as Mahākāya, a lord of mythical eagles, each accompanied by his own retinue of mythical eagles. There was Balin, a lord of demigods, as well as Rāhu, a lord of demigods, each accompanied by his retinue of troops. There was Druma, a centaur king, accompanied by his own retinue of centaurs. There was Pañcaśikha, a son of celestial musicians, accompanied by his own retinue. Other than them, there were immeasurable, incalculable, exceedingly splendid gods, otherworldly snakes, earth spirits, celestial musicians, demigods, mythical eagles, centaurs, humans, and spirits. There were the four social classes: priests, warrior-kings, farmer-traders, and servants. There was the fourfold assembly: monks, nuns, lay brothers, and lay sisters. There were hundreds of thousands of myriads of millions of Śākyans.

Having a visual experience⁶¹ of him [the Awakened One], who was surrounded by and placed at the head of suites of kings, head ministers, townsmen, country folk, householders,⁶²

⁵⁹ The name here could also be a feminine form of Bhaya(m)kara. At any rate, the Sanskrit and Tibetan (*jigs byed ma*) literally mean a “frightening” or “fear-inducing” female.

⁶⁰ This is not the Hindu god Śiva. See *BHSD*, s.v.

⁶¹ This is my best effort at translating *bltas nas*, the Tibetan rendering of the absolutive of the Skt. verbal root $\sqrt{drś}$. Some opt not to translate forms of $\sqrt{drś}$ and instead use something like “to have darśan,” but, again, I avoid all foreign words in my translation outside of proper names. As is well known, although $\sqrt{drś}$ literally means “to see,” this rendering would fall short of capturing its religious nuances. “Seeing” in India carries almost tactile connotations: To see the Awakened One is to touch his divine presence. The classic work to consult is still Diana L. Eck, *Darśan: Seeing the Divine Image in India* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1981), though it is slanted toward the modern period. Gregory Schopen, “Burial *Ad Sanctos*,” in *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks*, 116–117 underscores the importance of *darśan* in the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta*. See also Boucher, *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna*,

ministers, people of the royal court, and doormen, they [the assembly] honored, revered, venerated, and did him homage. The Blessed One obtained a lot of excellent food, bedding and seats, medicine for curing disease, and [other] necessities, and innumerable, immeasurable, incalculable world spheres of the ten directions also extensively celebrated the fame, acclaim, and renown of the Blessed One.

At a level⁶³ spot at the adamantine center [of this setting or of the world], which was delightful, extensive, broad, well sprinkled with water, well swept, well arranged, scented from censers, strewn with blue lotus flowers, as well as the flowers of the red lotus, white water lily, white lotus, hiptage creeper, Arabian jasmine, white rose, trumpet flower tree, aśoka tree, yellow amaranth, royal jasmine, and velvetleaf, and made beautiful with Indian coral trees⁶⁴ of many kinds of precious substances,⁶⁵ he [the Awakened One] was sitting on a lion throne set with jewels,⁶⁶ covered with hundreds of thousands of bejeweled pieces of calico,⁶⁷ decorated with a bejeweled canopy, decorated with a net of bejeweled bells, and hung with bejeweled

178, n. 20 and the other sources cited there. The use of $\sqrt{dṛś}$ and its nominal derivatives in Indian Buddhist texts remains ripe for study.

⁶² “Householder” translates the familiar Skt. term *grhapati*. Jan Nattier makes the case that it indicates not so much an individual’s lay status, but his high social and economic standing. See *A Few Good Men*, 22-25. Its frequent occurrence as an epithet in inscriptions (often in Prakrit form) would seem to support her position, as inscriptions commonly note the exemplary standing, qualities, or accomplishments of donors, but rarely (if ever) their low status, vices, or failures.

⁶³ Flatness is a common characteristic of paradisiacal settings in Buddhist literature.

⁶⁴ See n. 7 above on Indian coral trees.

⁶⁵ Much of the opening setting smacks of descriptions of Sukhāvātī, especially in the *Longer Sukhāvātīvyūha*, which speaks of magnificent trees made of precious substances. See, for instance, Gomez, trans., *The Land of Bliss*, 84-85 (§54-59) and 179-180 (§77-79).

⁶⁶ See *MW*, s.v. *ratnagarbha*.

⁶⁷ “Calico,” a type of Indian cloth, translates *ras bcos bu* (Skt. *duṣya* or *dūṣya*). See *BHSD*, s.v. 2 *duṣya*.

streamers. It was adorned with many kinds of precious things, ornamented with hundreds of thousands of myriads of millions of precious things: precious stones,⁶⁸ gold, diamonds, lapis lazuli, pearls, shells, crystal, coral, sapphires, beryl,⁶⁹ emeralds,⁷⁰ precious rocks,⁷¹ and quartz.

He had obtained serene faculties, a serene mind, discipline, and the ultimate calm, had obtained discipline and the best calm, was the guardian, was the chief, had restrained faculties, was clear, pure, and unsullied, like a lake, was elevated, like a bejeweled staff,⁷² remained brilliant, radiant, and vivid, had a body that was well ornamented with the thirty-two marks of a Great Man, had a body that was made beautiful with the eighty⁷³ secondary characteristics, was totally filled with the water of the True Law, like the great ocean, was imperturbable, like Mt. Meru, was the sustenance for all beings, like the earth, produced roots of virtue, like water,

⁶⁸ I intentionally use a vague translation for *nor bu*, almost certainly the equivalent of Skt. *maṇi*, a very generic term for “gem.” However, in this text *nor bu* sometimes occurs in a list of what appear to be particular types of jewels, as it does here. If the author(s) understood *maṇi* as something more specific than “gem” or “precious stone,” I am currently at a loss as to its identity.

⁶⁹ Tib. *rdo'i snying po* most likely translates Skt. *aśmagarbha*, one of the seven precious substances of Indian Buddhist literature (the Chinese translations for which, by the way, varied widely). While *aśmagarbha* is generally rendered as “emerald,” I choose the translation “beryl,” the mineral for emeralds, simply to avoid using the same word twice in a row.

⁷⁰ Tib. *ma rgad* translates Skt. *marakata*.

⁷¹ Again, I purposefully employ a vague equivalent for a kind of jewel, in this case for Tib. *spug*. *BHSD*, s.v. *musāragalva* (and variants) makes clear that the term was far from uniformly accepted as one type of gem. It is unclear whether our author(s) understood the term as one specific substance, or whether this is just another list, the items of which, despite the modern philologist’s inclinations, should not be given too much consideration, the point instead being to dazzle the reader by its very length.

⁷² I believe the image is that of a pole (Skt. *yaṣṭi*) projecting from the top of the dome of a stūpa. Alternatively, the phrase might be rendered “rose upwards like a bejeweled staff/pillar” (Tib. *rin po che'i mchod sdong ltar mngon par 'phags pa*).

⁷³ D and P omit the expected number eighty for the secondary characteristics (Skt. *anuvyañjana*).

was fair-minded, as in a [just] transaction,⁷⁴ was untainted, like the sky, dispelled the darkness of not knowing, like the sun, perfected the virtuous⁷⁵ qualities, like the moon, totally and completely effected all intentions, like a wish-fulfilling gem, dawned like the sun, radiated with splendor, like the sun, was cool and gratifying, like the moon, was the true source of jewels, like the ocean, was deep, like the ocean, shone like a mass of fire, had an imperturbable body, had unwavering thoughts, was serene and tranquil, did not have wandering faculties, was not self-inflated or supercilious,⁷⁶ was well established within mental awareness, had beautiful physical postures,⁷⁷ was thoroughly concentrating, was always concentrating, fully brought about all the roots of virtue for hundreds of thousands of millions of eons into the extreme future, amassed all the accumulations of merit, had skillful strategies with regard to all the Perfections, was focused on comprehension, amused himself in all the levels of the Awakened Ones and Aspirants to Awakening, and mentally practiced all the practices of an Aspirant to Awakening. So that all beings would benefit and be comforted, with effort⁷⁸ he taught the Law, which was religiously pure, good at the beginning, good in the middle, and

⁷⁴ I am not certain I have the sense of the simile in this phrase, *tha snyad ltar thugs mnyam pa*. The Sanskrit underlying *tha snyad* is probably *vyavahāra*, which often indicates a legal or business procedure. In Buddhist usage, *vyavahāra* frequently means a convention or linguistic designation of little substance, but the context of this passage would seem to suggest something quite different. See both *MW* and *BHSD*, s.v.

⁷⁵ More literally, “white”—hence the simile with the moon.

⁷⁶ Tib. *mi rgod pa* = Skt. *anauddhatya*? See Mvy. 1979 and 5193. According to *BHSD*, s.v., *auddhatya* can mean “mentally frivolous” in Buddhist texts, but that meaning does not seem to work so well in the whole phrase, *ma khengs shing mi rgod pa*.

⁷⁷ “Physical postures” translates *spyod lam*, which in Buddhist usage usually has the technical sense of the four positions the body can assume: walking, standing, sitting, and lying down. See *BHSD*, s.v. *īryāpatha*.

⁷⁸ I loosely translate *brtson pa de* as an agentive noun plus a demonstrative pronoun, but it is not impossible that the *pa* should be ignored and this should be translated as a verb with a continuative particle: “He made efforts and taught the Law so that all beings would benefit and be comforted.”

good at the end, fine in meaning, fine in expression, unadulterated, totally perfect, totally pure, totally immaculate,⁷⁹ without blemish, luminous, delightful, pleasant, brought gratification, brought utter joy, was rousing, brought contentment and expanded the mind, was absolutely pure, fearless, not harsh, enduring, profound, unwavering, unchanging, inscrutable, not within the scope of reasoning, impenetrable by thought, amazing, and indescribable yet beyond indescribable. He taught, explained, analyzed, elucidated and illuminated it.

At that time an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero named Giriguhaśikharagiri-kandarāntarakuñjavijrmbhaṇanādavinardottamasimhanarendracūḍāmaṇi,⁸⁰ who had a good figure, was beautiful, dear to see, had a fine complexion, was expansive, had what was best, had performed services for former Conquerors, produced roots of virtue, paid honor to many hundreds of thousands of myriads of millions of Awakened Ones, continued the lineage of the Three Jewels,⁸¹ was compassionate, had unrestricted eloquence,⁸² affection for people,

⁷⁹ At least this much is a standard list of epithets for Dharma. See Mvy. 1279-1289.

⁸⁰ This is my attempt at a Sanskrit rendering of the interlocutor of this text, who is called in Tibetan: *ri'i phug dang / zom dang / ri sul dang / gseb dang / sman ljongs na seng ge'i mchog rnam par bsgyings shing nga ro rnam par sgrogs pa lta bu'i mi'i dbang po'i gtsug gi nor bu*. In English, his name could be translated something like “the crest jewel of the lord of men who was like the best of lions yawning and sounding a roar at mountain caves, peaks, mountain valleys, passes, and bowers.” However mistaken my reconstructed Sanskrit is, I would bet our character would place well in a contest for the longest name in world literature.

⁸¹ On this idea, Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 214, n. 44 makes the important remark:

The expression ‘lineage of the three jewels’ . . . carries a great deal more weight than at first meets the eye. What is at issue here is not merely the preservation of the teachings of Śākyamuni (for which the simple term *saddharma* would more commonly be used), but the possibility of the rediscovery of the same truths in the future by others who will replicate his career. The underlying idea is, in essence, that if no one in the Buddhist community chooses to become a bodhisattva rather than to strive for Arhatship, there will be no possibility of the appearance of another Buddha in the future, and the lineage to which Śākyamuni himself belonged . . . will become extinct.

excellent faith, virtuous intentions, was enduring, profound, had a loving heart, was compassionate, gentle,⁸³ at ease among company, learned, wise, illuminating, perspicacious, dexterous,⁸⁴ not lazy, utterly disciplined, great in his gentle virtue, not deceptive, guileless, not harsh, not rough, upright, was free from pride, haughtiness, arrogance, hardheartedness,⁸⁵ anger, envy, avarice, narcissism, self-possession, intense clinging, suffering, mental unease, and ignorance, and was endowed with merit, gathered and sat with that very retinue. Then the Aspirant to Awakening–Great Hero Giriguhaśikharagirikandarāntarakuñjavijṛmbhaṇanāda-vinardottamasimhanarendracūḍāmaṇi got up from his mat. After putting his upper robe over one shoulder, he put his right knee down on the center of a red lotus. He bent his cupped hands toward the Blessed One, and then said these words to the Blessed One: “If, for the sake of answering a question after I have asked, the Blessed One grants me the opportunity, I want to ask the Blessed One, the Thus Come One, the Worthy One, the Fully and Completely Awakened One, about a certain matter.” Those words being said, the Blessed One spoke these words to the Aspirant to Awakening–Great Hero Giriguhaśikharagirikandarāntarakuñjavijṛmbhaṇanāda-vinardottamasimhanarendracūḍāmaṇi: “Son from a good family,⁸⁶ because all Awakened Ones

⁸² “Eloquence,” elsewhere “inspired eloquence,” translates Tib. *spobs pa*, the familiar Skt. *pratibhāna*. On the concept of eloquence in Mahāyāna texts, see MacQueen, “Inspired Speech in Early Mahāyāna Buddhism I” and “Inspired Speech in Early Mahāyāna Buddhism II.”

⁸³ See *BHSD*, s.vv. *sūrata* and *sauratya*.

⁸⁴ It is not impossible that this should be translated “has a (spiritual) friend.” It may be that instead of *shes nyen*, Skt. *dakṣa* or *dakṣiṇa*, I should read *bshes gnyen* (following L, S, and T), often the equivalent of Skt. *mitra*. Given the context, though, “dexterous” does seem to fit better. See n. 166 below.

⁸⁵ See *BHSD*, s.v. *khila*.

⁸⁶ “Son from a good family” translates Skt. *kulaputra*, “daughter from a good family” *kuladuhitṛ*. Jan Nattier avoids the “well-established Buddhist Hybrid English expressions ‘son of good family’ and ‘daughter of good family’ both because they are needlessly wooden and because they fail to capture the

and Aspirants to Awakening will always grant you an opportunity, son from a good family, please ask the Blessed One, the Thus Come One, the Worthy One, the Fully and Completely Awakened One, whatever you want. I will gladden your mind with an answer for that particular question.”

Those words being spoken, the Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero Giriguhaśikharagirikandarāntarakuñjavijṛmbhaṇanādavinardottamasimhanarendracūḍāmaṇi said these words to the Blessed One: “Blessed One, indeed with regard to what does a son from a good family or a daughter from a good family who has generated the first aspiration [i.e., for awakening⁸⁷] make strong efforts?”

Those words being said, the Blessed One gave approbation to the Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero Giriguhaśikharagirikandarāntarakuñjavijṛmbhaṇanādavinardottamasimhanarendracūḍāmaṇi, saying, “Son from a good family, well done, well done! Son from a good family, it is wonderful that you thought to ask the Thus Come One about this concern. Therefore, son from a good family, listen well and keep this in mind, and I will explain it!”

nance of the underlying Indian terms.” She instead opts for “gentleman” and “lady,” respectively (or “sir” and “madam” in the vocative). See *A Few Good Men*, 212, n. 33. On her second point, I would say that the expressions “son from a good family” and “daughter from a good family” do capture the sense of the Indian terms. They are used, as one might say in English, “He comes from a good family,” and carry similar socioeconomic baggage (even if they do not refer to a “certain socioeconomic class”—see Schopen, “Burial *Ad Sanctos*,” in *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks*, 117). Though the Sanskrit terms are certainly pan-Indian and are well attested in much of Indian Buddhist literature, Mahāyāna Sūtras employ them with great frequency as a rhetorical device to elevate, socially and spiritually, those within the Mahāyāna fold. On Nattier’s first point, I would agree that the translations sound “wooden,” but as I argue in the introduction to the translation, rendering Mahāyāna texts into smooth, readable English perhaps gives more credit to Mahāyāna authors than they deserve. Mahāyāna Sūtra authors seem to have sat quite low on the Indian sociolinguistic ladder.

⁸⁷ Skt. [*bodhi*]*citta*. On translating this pregnant term, see Wangchuk, *The Resolve to Become a Buddha*, esp. 69-70.

The Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero Giriguhaśikharagirikandarāntarakuñja-vijṛmbhaṇanādavinardottamasimhanarendracūḍāmaṇi, after saying “Wonderful!” to the Blessed One, listened accordingly to the Blessed One, and the Blessed One spoke to him:

“Son from a good family, an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero⁸⁸ who has generated the first aspiration is to make strong efforts with regard to the paths of the ten virtuous actions.⁸⁹

Son from a good family, in that case how does an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero make strong efforts with regard to the paths of the ten virtuous actions? Son from a good family, in this case an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero rejects [everything from] taking life up to incorrect views.

“Son from a good family, how has an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero rejected taking life? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘What is called a “life,” even as little as an ant, is dear, valuable, sweet, and delightful. Because life for me, too, is dear, valuable, sweet, and delightful, may nobody kill me, have me killed, or approve of my being killed. I, too, am not to kill anyone, have anyone killed, or approve of anyone’s being killed.’ In that way, son from a good family, an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero has rejected taking life.” Then this was said:

“Whoever values his own life
Must not kill a living thing,
Even as little as what exists in the womb,
Because life is dear for everything.

⁸⁸ The answer of the Awakened One is about an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero, but the question was about a son or daughter from a good family. Here *bodhisattva-mahāsattva* and *kulaputra/kuladuhitṛ* are apparently interchangeable. Assuming that the Tibetan translation is accurate, the logical conclusion would be that an Aspirant to Awakening could be female (a *kuladuhitṛ*), but I am not sure whether our author(s) intended logic to be taken that far.

⁸⁹ Skt. *daśakuśalakarmapatha*, about which see the introduction.

“Then, how has he rejected taking what is not given? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘What is called “wealth,” even as little as that belonging to someone from a bad family or with a low occupation, is dear, valuable, sweet, and delightful. Because wealth for me, too, is dear, valuable, sweet, and delightful, may nobody rob me, have me robbed, or approve of my being robbed. I, too, am not to rob anyone, have anyone robbed, or approve of anyone’s being robbed.’ In that way, son from a good family, an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero has rejected taking what is not given.” Then this was said:

“For whom a father’s wealth is dear,
He must not steal wealth,
Even as little as wood, dirt,
Or someone else’s garbage.

“Then, how has he rejected sexual misconduct? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘What is called a “wife,” even that of animals, is dear, valuable, sweet, and delightful. Because a wife for me, too, is dear, valuable, sweet, and delightful, may nobody rob me, have me robbed, approve of my being robbed [of my wife], or forcefully subdue and enjoy [my wife] sexually. I, too, am not to rob anyone, have anyone robbed, approve of anyone’s being robbed [of his wife], or forcefully subdue and enjoy her [i.e., someone’s wife] sexually.’⁹⁰ In that way, son from a good family, an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero has rejected sexual misconduct.” Then this was said:

“For whom one’s own wife is dear
He must not rob a wife,
Even as little as she who has become a female slave,
As well as she who has become another’s servant.

⁹⁰ The same word, “rob” (Tib. *’phrog pa* and related forms), is applied to wealth and a wife. Clearly, our author(s) conceived of both as property that could be illicitly taken.

“Then, how has he rejected telling lies? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “truth,” even for earth spirits, ghosts, and demons, is dear, valuable, sweet, and delightful. Because the truth for me, too, is dear, valuable, sweet, and delightful, may nobody disparage me, cause me to be disparaged, or approve of my being disparaged with the telling of lies. I, too, am not to disparage anyone, cause anyone to be disparaged, or approve of anyone’s being disparaged with the telling of lies.’ In that way, son from a good family, an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero has rejected telling lies.” Then this was said:

“For whom telling the truth is dear,
Even for an earth spirit and a ghost,⁹¹
He, a wise one, does not disparage
Living creatures with false words.

“Then, how has he rejected slanderous speech? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘What is called “slanderous speech,” even for slanderous people, is not dear, valuable, sweet, or delightful. Because slanderous speech for me, too, is not dear, valuable, sweet, or delightful, may nobody talk about me, cause me to be talked about, or approve of my being talked about with slander. I, too, am not to talk about anyone, cause anyone to be talked about, or approve of anyone’s being talked about with slander.’ In that way, son from a good family, an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero has rejected slanderous speech.

“Then, how has he has rejected speaking harsh words? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘What are called “harsh words,” even for people

⁹¹ Is it not certain whether the earth spirit and the ghost are the subject of the verse—those who consider the truth dear—or the object of the disparaging words. I have chosen the former since it more closely follows the preceding prose section, though it seems a little odd that they would be described as wise (*shes rab can*).

possessing harsh words, are not dear, valuable, sweet, or delightful. Because harsh words for me, too, are not dear, valuable, sweet, or delightful, may nobody hurt⁹² me, cause me to be hurt, or approve of my being hurt with the speaking of harsh words, or with cruel speech, rough speech, or untrue speech. I, too, am not to hurt anyone, cause anyone to be hurt, or approve of anyone's being hurt with the speaking of harsh words, or with cruel speech, rough speech, or untrue speech.' In that way, son from a good family, an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero has rejected speaking harsh words." Then this was said:

“For any people whatsoever,
Slander and harsh words are not dear.
They do not speak slander
And they guard against harsh speech.

“Then, how has he rejected idle words? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘What are called “idle words,” even for people of idle words, are not dear, valuable, sweet, or delightful. Because idle words for me, too, are not dear, valuable, sweet, or delightful, may nobody bring me up [i.e., in conversation], cause me to be brought up, or approve of my being brought up with the speaking of idle words. I, too, am not to bring anyone up, cause anyone to be brought up,⁹³ or approve of anyone's being brought up with the speaking of idle words.’ In that way, son from a good family, an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero has rejected idle words.

⁹² The Tibetan here, with a lot of variation in spelling, is *(m)tho 'tsham/'tshams/btsam/btsams pa*. I am tempted to translate it as “scoff at,” “jeer,” “insult,” etc., following Jäschke, s.v. *tho 'tsham pa*. According to Mvy. 2114 and 5360, however, the Sanskrit is almost certainly *viheṭhanā* or something close to it, which just means “harm,” “injury,” etc. Obviously, being scoffed at could be construed as a type of verbal injury.

⁹³ Here the Tibetan is missing the expected *par mi bya* after *gzhug*. I assume this is a mistake and translate accordingly.

“Then, how has an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero rejected covetousness? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘What is called “covetousness,” even for covetous people, is not dear, valuable, sweet, or delightful. Because covetousness for me, too, is not dear, valuable, sweet, or delightful, may nobody describe me, cause me to be described, or approve of my being described with covetous words.’⁹⁴ I, too, am not to describe anyone, cause anyone to be described, or approve of anyone’s being described with covetous words.’ In that way, son from a good family, an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero has rejected covetousness.” Then this was said:

“Whoever does not himself like
Either idle words or covetousness,
He does not speak idle words
And guards against covetousness.

“Then, how has he rejected harmful intent? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘What is called “harmful intent,” even for people who have thoughts that become harmful in intent, is not dear, valuable, sweet, or delightful. Because harmful intent for me, too, is not dear, valuable, sweet, or delightful, may nobody refer to me, cause me to be referred to, or approve of my being referred to with words of harmful intent. I, too, am not to refer to anyone, cause anyone to be referred to, or approve of anyone’s being referred to with words of harmful intent.’ In that way, son from a good family, an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero has rejected harmful intent.

“Then, how has he rejected incorrect views? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘What is called an “incorrect view,” even for people who

⁹⁴ I am not certain what it means to describe someone with covetous words. It may mean to describe someone as covetous. More likely, it could mean that the speaker is covetous, using words indicating that he envies the qualities or possessions of the person being described.

have entered into what is incorrect, is not dear, valuable, sweet, or delightful. Because an incorrect view for me, too, is not dear, valuable, sweet, or delightful, may nobody teach me, cause me to be taught, or approve of my being taught with words with incorrect views. I, too, am not to teach anyone, cause anyone to be taught, or approve of anyone's being taught with words with incorrect views.' In that way, son from a good family, an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero has rejected incorrect views." Then this was said:

“Whoever does not in any way like
Either harmful intent or incorrect views,
He does not give rise to harmful intent
And does not anywhere enter into incorrect views.

“In that way, son from a good family, an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero indeed makes strong efforts with regard to these paths of the ten virtuous actions.”

When this teaching on the paths of the ten virtuous actions had been explained, immeasurable, incalculable beings generated the aspiration for unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening.

The first chapter from the Great Vehicle Discourse named *The Array of Ornamentation, Decoration, and Adornment of All the Characteristics of an Awakened One*

“Furthermore, son from a good family, an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero who has generated the first aspiration is to make strong efforts with regard to the ten Perfections. Which ten? Namely: the Perfection of Giving, the Perfection of Ethical Conduct, the Perfection of Forbearance, the Perfection of Exertion, the Perfection of Meditation, the Perfection of Wisdom, and the Perfections of Strategies, Oaths, Strength, and Knowledge. Son from a good family, in that case how does an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero make strong efforts with

regard to those ten Perfections? Son from a good family, in this case an Aspirant to Awakening–Great Hero gives gifts, guards ethical conduct, cultivates forbearance, undertakes exertion, meditates in meditation, galvanizes wisdom, becomes skilled in strategies, proclaims oaths, enters into strength, and enters into knowledge.

“Son from a good family, in that case how does an Aspirant to Awakening–Great Hero make strong efforts with regard to the Perfection of Giving? Son from a good family, in this case an Aspirant to Awakening–Great Hero, having made strong efforts with regard to giving food, drinks, vehicles, clothing, and ornaments, makes strong efforts with regard to [everything] up to giving his marrow.

“Son from a good family, in that case how does an Aspirant to Awakening make strong efforts with regard to gifts of food?⁹⁵ Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving food,” is a synonym⁹⁶ for procuring a [healthy or long] life, a [good] complexion, strength, and ease. Therefore, I must make strong efforts with regard to giving food. It is certain that I am to give gifts of food.’ By giving that gift of food, he would give a [healthy or long] life and would give ease.” Then, at that time, the Blessed One spoke these verses:

“When one gives gifts of food,
Which are given by one possessing wisdom,
There are five [things] as a result:
A [healthy or long] life, a [good] complexion, strength, ease, and inspired eloquence.

“By giving food, they become joyous,
Have a long life and strength, and come to be at ease and well.
They, well and stable,

⁹⁵ See the English translation of the different versions of the *Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra* in Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” 43 (no. 11), and see the introduction to this chapter for a brief discussion of the parallels between this text and ours.

⁹⁶ Tib. *tshig bla dags* = Skt. *adhivacana* (Mvy. 6333).

Become endowed with unrestricted eloquence.

“Having riches, much wealth, and fortune,
A man possesses gentleness and intelligence,
Is endowed with merit, and is learned and serene.
So it is by giving food.⁹⁷

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to giving drinks?⁹⁸ Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving drinks” is a synonym for dispelling all the craving thirst [*sred pa*]⁹⁹ of the defilements.¹⁰⁰ Therefore, it is certain that I am to give gifts of drinks.’ When he gives that gift of drinks, in accordance with an oath that was commended by the Awakened One, he proclaims the oath:

⁹⁷ The association between food and the rewards listed in this section, particularly the five in the first verse, had some currency in India. *Aṅguttara Nikāya* III, 42 gives the same list of five: *Bhojanaṃ bhikkhave dadamāno dāyako paṭiggāhakānaṃ pañca ṭhānāni deti. Katamāni pañca? Āyuṃ deti, vaṇṇaṃ deti, sukhaṃ deti, balaṃ deti, paṭibhānaṃ deti.* As does the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa-sūtra*: *tshē dang / spobs pa dang / bde ba dang / stobs dang / kha dag nye bar bstan pa'i phyir zas 'dod pa rnams la zas sbyin pa'o* (Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 30.10-11). In the ending of *Dānādāhikaraṇa-sūtra* unique to the Chinese translation, strength is said to be a reward for giving food and drinks, and there is a list of five rewards analogous to those of our text for supporting the three jewels with gifts of food and drinks—see Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvādāna,” 50-51. The *Suvarṇaprabhāsottama-sūtra*, in a section on the length of the Awakened One’s life, explains that not killing and giving food are the two causes for his longevity—see Skjærvø, ed. and trans., *This Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras*, Vol. I, 18-19. Note that there is variation among Buddhist texts regarding who receives the reward for giving food—sometimes it is the recipient, other times the donor. In this section of our text it says at one point that the donor gives the rewards (to the recipient) along with the gift of food, but everywhere else to whom the benefits accrue is ambiguous. Outside of Buddhist texts, *Manusmṛti* 4.229 says that the donor of food gains inexhaustible ease: *sukham akṣayam annadaḥ* (from Olivelle, ed. and trans., *Manu’s Code of Law*, 550). And in chapter 17 of the *Bhagavadgītā*, we find an enumeration of the benefits resulting from *sāttvika* foods that are not unlike the rewards of our text—see Barbara Stoler Miller, trans., *The Bhagavad-Gita: Krishna’s Counsel in Time of War* (New York: Bantam Books, 1986), 132, verse 8. In a context not related to food, compare the boon the *kṣatriya* king is to receive in the *Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha-sūtra*: *tasya rājño kṣatriyasya mūrdhābhiṣiktasyāyurvarṇabalārogaīśvavyavivṛddhir bhaviṣyati* (Sanskrit adapted from the unpublished Schopen, ed., *A Sūtra for the Failed and Misbegotten*, section 19).

⁹⁸ Cf. Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvādāna,” 44 (no. 12).

⁹⁹ Skt. *trṣṇā*.

¹⁰⁰ The Tibetan of the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa-sūtra* is extremely close here: *nyon mongs pa dang sred pa thams cad bsal ba'i phyir btung ba 'dod pa rnams la btung ba sbyin pa'o* (Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 30.12-13).

‘On account of this gift of drinks, may I cause all the oceans of the craving thirst [*sred pa*] of the defilements of all beings to dry up and may I satisfy them with drinks that have the flavor of absolute liberation.’” Then there were also additional words:

“After drying up the lakes of craving thirst [*sred pa*] from the defilements,
Which are stirred up by the sea creature of old age and death,
I am to satisfy people with drinks
That have the flavor of absolute liberation.

“Through that learned man’s giving drinks [*skom pa*],
Hungry ghosts, burning and searing [i.e., from extreme thirst],
Will not give birth to mental agitation, and
The harm from thirst [*skom pa*] will not arise.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to giving a vehicle? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving a vehicle,” because it is a synonym for bringing together all the foundations [*gzhi*] of supernatural power, I am to give gifts of vehicles. It is certain that I am to give a wagon, a palanquin, a horse, an elephant,¹⁰¹ or shoes.’ When he gives those gifts of vehicles, in accordance with an oath that was commended by the Awakened One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of a vehicle, may I bring together the ease¹⁰² of all beings and all the foundations [*gzhi*] of supernatural power.’”¹⁰³ Then this was said:

“By giving a wagon,
May all beings always
Attain the Great Vehicle and
Attain the bases [*rkang*] of supernatural power.

¹⁰¹ See the English translation of the Chinese *Dānādīkaraṇa-sūtra* in Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” 44-45 (no. 16), where these first four types of vehicles are listed in a similar context.

¹⁰² Note the old (Vedic) association with Skt. *sukha* (“ease,” “comfort,” or even “happiness”) and vehicular axles (*su-kha* = “good axle hole”) that is also present in the *Dānapaṭala* of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*.

¹⁰³ Cf. Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīrdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 30.13-14: *bde ba dang 'byor pa'i dngos po thams cad bsdu ba'i phyir bzhon pa 'dod pa rnams la bzhon pa sbyin pa'o*.

“By giving a vehicle, a great seer, intelligent,
Goes through space¹⁰⁴ by means of supernatural power,
From an Awakened One’s field to [other] fields,¹⁰⁵
[With force] similar to the force of a bird.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to giving clothing?¹⁰⁶ Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving clothing,” because it is a synonym for cleaning up one’s modesty,¹⁰⁷ decency,¹⁰⁸ and appearance, it is certain that I am to give gifts of clothing.’¹⁰⁹ When he gives that gift of clothing, in accordance with an oath that was assented to¹¹⁰ by the Awakened One, he

¹⁰⁴ I believe there is a wordplay here with “going through space” (*mkha’ la ’gro*) and bird, as some Sanskrit words for bird are literally “sky-” or “space-goer.” According to Mvy. 2403, e.g., *nam mkha’ la ’gro ba = vihāyasaḡāmī*.

¹⁰⁵ The ability to move between *buddhakṣetras* or “fields of Awakened Ones,” where one can worship and listen to various Awakened Ones, provides a cosmological solution to the enormous amount of merit and knowledge required to reach awakening. This is most apparent in the so-called Pure Land texts like the *Shorter Sukhāvativyūha*.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” 44 (no. 13).

¹⁰⁷ See *MW*, s.v. *hrī* (= Tib. *ngo tsha shes pa*).

¹⁰⁸ See *BHSD*, s.v. *apatrāpya* (=Tib. *khrel yod pa*). The lexical items *hrī* and *apatrāpya* can often be found together in Buddhist texts. They are Mvy. 1934 and 1935, respectively.

¹⁰⁹ The idea is that clothing should be used decorously to cover up the body, and thus the reward for giving clothing is an improvement in one’s appearance and visible decorum. See Silk, trans., “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 369, esp. n. 4. Compare also a verse from the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra*: *bhūṣanā lakṣaṇāny eṣāṃ aśītīś cānuvyañjanāḥ / hrīrapatrāpyavastrās te kalyāṇādhyāśayāḥ śubhāḥ* // (Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature, The Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism, ed., *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*, 312, verse 8 (with minor emendations)). Here Vimalakīrti explains that bodhisattvas’ “clothing is modesty and decency” (*hrīrapatrāpyavastrās*). And cf. Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīrdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 30.14-16: *ngo tsha shes pa dang / khrel yod pa dang / gser gyi kha dog lta bu’i mdog yongs su sbyang ba’i phyr gos ’dod pa rnam la gos sbyin pa’o*.

¹¹⁰ This is a soft reading of *gnang ba* (from Skt. *anu√jñā*), which can come closer to “order” or “prescribe” when referring to something said by the Awakened One. Given the parallel oaths in the text, however, I think a softer reading is preferred here.

proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of clothing, may I clean up the modesty, decency, and appearance of all beings.’” Then there were also additional words:

“On account of this gift of clothing, may I
Cleanse the modesty and decency,
As well as clean up the appearance,
Of all beings.

“[By] giving clothing, one gets an utter fortune,
One always possesses a [good] lineage and has a good figure.
That man becomes modest.
The man possesses a [good] reputation and gets a good fortune.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to giving ornaments? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving ornaments,” because it is a synonym for perfecting the thirty-two marks and the eighty secondary characteristics of a Great Man, it is certain that I am to give gifts of ornaments: golden ornaments, or gifts of the ornaments of precious stones, pearls, lapis lazuli, shells, crystal, or coral.’ When he gives that gift of ornaments, in accordance with an oath that was spoken by the Awakened One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of ornaments, may I see the bodies of all beings ornamented with the marks and secondary characteristics.’”¹¹¹ Then there were also additional words:

“By giving a golden ornament,
May I see all beings
Who are ornamented with the marks
And may I seek awakening.

“By giving a precious stone or a pearl,
Wherever one is born,
May it rain jewels
In those places of birth.

¹¹¹ The *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa-sūtra* makes the thirty-two marks the reward for giving precious things and the eighty secondary characteristics the reward for giving ornaments. Cf. Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 30.38-43, and see n. 161 below.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to giving lamps? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving lamps,” because it is a synonym for purifying the divine eye, it is certain that I am to give gifts of lamps.’ When he gives that gift of lamps, in accordance with an oath that was taught by the Awakened One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of lamps, may I act so that the divine eye of all beings will become totally pure.’”¹¹² Then there were also additional words:

“On account of that gift of lamps
That will become omniscient knowledge,¹¹³
May I absolutely purify
The divine eye of all beings.

“By giving lamps, that man,
In [all] worlds at all times,
Successively gets
The five eyes¹¹⁴ of Awakened Ones.¹¹⁵

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to gifts of music? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called a “gift of music,” because it is a synonym for perfecting the divine ear,¹¹⁶ it is certain that I am to give

¹¹² Cf. Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” 46 (no. 25), where gifts of lamps are also connected with the divine eye. The same is true for the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa*: *de bzhin gshegs pa’i lha’i spyan yongs su gzigs par bya ba’i phyir* [mar me ’dod pa rnams la] mar me sbyin pa’o (Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 30.16–18). In *Manusmṛti* 4.229, one who gives lamps obtains great vision (*dīpadaś cakṣur uttamam*). See Olivelle, ed. and trans., *Manu’s Code of Law*, 550.

¹¹³ Tib. *kun mkhyen ye shes* = Skt. *sarvajñajñāna* or the like.

¹¹⁴ N, Q, and T here read *sangs rgyas rnams kyi spyan snga*: “in the presence of Awakened Ones.” While this makes sense in and of itself, it does not agree with the *ldan par ’gyur* in the following foot, nor does it fit with the overall context of the passage in which a donor attains different kinds of vision by giving lamps.

¹¹⁵ The divine eye, according to many doctrinal lists, is the second of the five eyes. See *BHSD*, s.v. *caṅṣus*.

¹¹⁶ The ending of the *Dānādīkaraṇa-sūtra* present only in the Chinese version also includes the divine ear as a reward for giving music—see Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” 50. Also cf. *ibid.*, 46 (no. 24). The reward for giving music in the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* is “purifying the divine ear” (with *lha’i snyan*

gifts of music.’ When he gives that gift of music, in accordance with an oath that the Awakened One entertained, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of music, may I perfect the divine ear of all beings.’” Then there were also additional words:

“On account of that gift of music,
May I perfect the divine ear and
The benefit of proceeding to the awakening of an Awakened One
For all beings.

“On account of giving music,
Wherever one has been born, let him attain through that
The fame of a Completely Awakened One and
The divine ear of [spiritual] heroes.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to giving perfume, aromatic powder, and ointment? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving perfume, aromatic powder, and ointment,” because it is a synonym for being the perfume, aromatic powder, and ointment of ethical conduct, learning, and concentration [respectively], it is certain that I am to give perfume, aromatic powder, and ointment.’ When he gives that gift of perfume, aromatic powder, and ointment, in accordance with an oath that was thought of by the Awakened One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of perfume, aromatic powder, and ointment, may I anoint all beings with the perfume of ethical conduct, learning, and concentration.’”¹¹⁷ Then this was said:

instead of the *lha'i rna ba* of our text): *de bzhin gshegs pa'i lha'i snyan yongs su dag par bya ba'i phyir rol mo 'dod pa rnams la rol mo'i sgra sbyin pa'o* (Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 30.18-19).

¹¹⁷ The *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* is again very close to our text: *tshul khrims dang / thos pa dang / ting nge 'dzin gyi spos kyis byug pa'i phyir spos dang byug pa 'dod pa rnams la spos dang byug pa sbyin pa'o* (Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 30.19-21). The equivalence illustrated here—between fragrances or balms and types of virtuous practices or mental states—is not limited to the *Dānapāramitā-* and *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa-sūtras*. Cf. I.B. Horner, trans., *Milinda's Questions*, Vol. II (Sacred Books of the Buddhists 23) (1964; repr., Oxford: Pāli Text Society, 1991), 61: “[T]hose monks . . . pervade the world with the devas with the lovely perfume of moral habit [*śīlavaragandha*]”; Silk, trans., “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 377: “This is an upper robe worn on a body

“By giving perfume and aromatic powder
And giving ointment,
May living creatures attain
Ethical conduct, learning, and concentration.

“By giving perfume and aromatic powder
And giving ointment,
Through that the faultless one will attain
The divine nose and divine body of the Protectors.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to giving flowers? Son from a good family, in this case, that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called a “gift of flowers and flower garlands,” because it is a synonym for attaining the precious flowers [of] the formulas, inspired eloquence, and the branches of awakening, it is certain that I am to give gifts of flowers and flower garlands.’ When he gives that gift of flowers and flower garlands, in accordance with an oath that was spoken by the Awakened One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of flowers and flower garlands, may I ornament the bodies of all beings with the precious flowers [of] the formulas, inspired eloquence, and the branches of awakening.’”¹¹⁸ Then there were also additional words:

“By giving flowers and flower garlands,
May one quickly and in every way
Ornament all living creatures

perfumed by the precepts, concentration and wisdom . . .”; Daniel Boucher, trans., “Sūtra on the Merit of Bathing the Buddha,” in *Buddhism in Practice*, ed. Donald S. Lopez, Jr. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 67: “May the incense of morality, meditation, and wisdom, and the knowledge and experience of liberation / Constantly perfume every realm in the ten directions.”

¹¹⁸ In the *Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra*, the gifts of flowers (*me tog*) and garlands (*phreng*) are separated. (Notice that in our text the opening line to this gift does not include flower garlands, but the rest of the section does.) Gifts of flowers are connected to the branches of awakening in the *Dānādhikaraṇa*, but there is no mention there of formulas (Skt. *dhāraṇī*) or inspired eloquence (Skt. *pratibhāna*). Cf. Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” 45-46 (nos. 19-20). The *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* includes both flowers and garlands, though in a slightly different way from our text, and has a parallel reward: *gzungs dang / spobs pa dang / byang chub kyi yan lag gi me tog thob par bya ba'i phyir me tog phreng 'dod pa rnam la me tog phreng sbyin pa'o* (Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 30.21-23). There are seven branches of awakening (Skt. *bodhyaṅga*), on which see Gethin, *The Buddhist Path to Awakening*, 146-189.

With the flowers of the branches of awakening.

“By giving flowers and flower garlands,
Wherever one has been born,
Let kings, ministers, and petty kings¹¹⁹
Always pay him homage and exalt him there.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to gifts of delicacies [*ro bro ba*]?

Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving delicacies,” because it is a synonym for the mark of a Great Man that is [called] the height of taste [*ro bro ba*], it is certain that I am to give gifts of delicacies, [such as those that have] the flavor of grapes, the flavor of sugarcane,¹²⁰ the flavor of honey, the flavor of butter, the flavor of oil, or the flavor of salt.’ When he gives that gift of delicacies, in accordance with an oath that was commended by the Awakened One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of flavors [*ro*], may I totally perfect the mark of a Great Man that is [called] the height of taste for all beings.’”¹²¹ Then this was said:

“With a gift of flavors,
May one perfect
The practice leading to awakening¹²² of a Completely Awakened One

¹¹⁹ I translate Tib. *zhang blon* [L, S, and T: *zhang lon*] as the equivalent of Skt. *rājānaka*, “petty king.” It may, however, be a synonym for the previous term, “minister” (Tib. *blon po* usually = Skt. *āmātya*). The sense seems to be that the three personages given here are listed in order of decreasing power. See Mvy. 3669ff.

¹²⁰ Or, following N and Q, just “sugar” (*bu ram* instead of *bu ram shing*).

¹²¹ Just as in English, the Sanskrit word for “taste” (*rasa*) can be applied to either the flavor of food and drink or to the aesthetic sensibilities (including for the erotic) of a human being. This passage plays with the double meaning of the term: By giving something that tastes good, one acquires good taste. In this case, having such refined taste makes up one of the marks of a Great Man. See *BHSD*, s.v. *rasāgra*. The *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* also connects this gift to *rasāgra*: *skyes bu chen po'i mtshan ro bro ba'i mchog yongs su rdzogs par bya ba'i phyir bro thams cad 'dod pa rnams la bro thams cad sbyin pa'o* (Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 30.24-26). Cf. the Tibetan in Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” 43 (no. 8), where there may be a wordplay on *dpe byad bzang po* (Skt. *anuvyañjana*), with its meaning both “secondary characteristic” and “seasoning” or “condiment.” See *MW*, s.v. *vyañjana*.

¹²² Tib. *byang chub kyi spyod pa* = Skt. *bodhicaryā*.

By means of the essence of the flavor of omniscience.

“With a gift of flavors, let him, being perspicacious,
Being mentally aware, and having an intellect like the ocean,
Attain different kinds of flavors and
Effortlessly come to have enjoyment.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to giving a residence? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving a residence,” because it is a synonym for becoming the residence, protection, sanctuary [*gling*], refuge, and defense for all beings, it is certain that I am to give gifts of residences.’ When he gives that gift of a residence, in accordance with an oath that was conceived by the Awakened One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of a residence, may I become the residence, protection, sanctuary [*gling*], refuge, and defense for all beings.’”¹²³ Then this was said:

“By giving a palatial mansion,¹²⁴
May I become the protection, sanctuary [*gling*],
Refuge, and defense for living creatures
In the Black Plum Continents [*'dzam bu'i gling*].¹²⁵

“By giving a palatial mansion,
Wherever one has been born,
He will become the owner and chief [person]
Of a home, a residence [with surrounding grounds],¹²⁶ and a region.

¹²³ Cf. Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 30.26-28): *sems can thams cad kyi gnas dang / skyabs dang / mgon dang / dpung gnyen bya ba'i phyir gnas 'dod pa rnams la gnas sbyin pa'o*; Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” 44 (no. 14).

¹²⁴ Cf. *ibid.* Here and elsewhere in this text “palatial mansion” is an attempt to translate Skt. *vimāna* (Tib. *gzhal med khang* or *gzhal med khang gnas*). An old Vedic term, *vimāna* can refer to a divine chariot or palace, as well as a prodigious palace on Earth. See chapter II, p. 20, where I translate it differently.

¹²⁵ Tib. *'dzam bu'i gling* is a transliteration for *jambudvīpa*, the island or continent of the *jambu* fruit. Skt. *jambu* has traditionally been equated with the Rose Apple tree (*Syzygium jambos*), but the tree native to India has now, in fact, been shown to be the Black Plum (*Syzygium cumini*). See D. Wujastyk, “*Jambudvīpa*: Apples or Plums?” in *Studies in the History of the Exact Sciences in honour of David Pingree*, ed. Charles Burnett, Jan P. Hogendijk, Kim Plofker, and Michio Yano (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 287-301. I owe this reference to Karttunen, “*Bhramarotpītādharāḥ*,” 98, n. 23.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to giving beds and pillows? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving beds and pillows,” because it is a synonym for a gift of bedding and throw pillows¹²⁷ of [for?]¹²⁸ a Noble One who has permanently taken away all the coverings¹²⁹ and a Thus Come One [in?]¹³⁰ a divine, holy state,¹³¹ it is certain that I am to give gifts of beds and pillows.’ When

¹²⁶ It is clear that there is a progression in size in this line of verse. The second item, residence (the generic *gnas*), therefore must refer to more than just a physical house.

¹²⁷ This is a guess for *'phangs pa* or *'phangs*, which are probably the past tense of *'phen pa*, “to throw.” Though there are other possibilities—*phangs* and *'phangs*, which occur earlier in the text, can mean “valuable”—the context of the passage and, more directly, the fact that there is a parallel drawn with *sngas*, “pillow,” suggest that *'phangs pa* must be translating a Sanskrit word denoting some sort of cushion or bedding item. Because the likely Sanskrit equivalents are derived from the roots \sqrt{ruh} and $\sqrt{kṣip}$, I cannot tell whether this “pillow” would have been “thrown” up, onto some kind of bed, or down, onto floor bedding.

¹²⁸ Depending on how one reads the simple genitive particle here, the gift of beds and pillows could be thought of either as having the wonderful quality of the bedding of extraordinary figures—specifically, of an Ārya and a Tathāgata—or as providing these figures with comfort.

¹²⁹ Here we have a play on words: “covering” (*sgrib pa*) means both the material for bedding as well as what clouds the mind. See *BHSD*, s.vv. *āvaraṇa* and *nīvaraṇa*.

¹³⁰ There is no particle separating “Thus Come One” and “divine, holy state” in Tibetan. I suspect these were juxtaposed in a Sanskrit compound that the Tibetan translators did not know how to analyze. Indeed, the translators of the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa-sūtra* must have been looking at something similar and they read it very differently: *sgrib pa thams cad rab tu spang ba dang / lha dang tshangs pa'i gnas dang / de bzhin gshegs pa'i gzims cha thob par bya ba'i phyir mal cha 'dod pa rnams la mal cha sbyin pa'o* (Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 30.28-30). If we also interpret the underlying Sanskrit compound as a simple *dvandva* and supply *dang* liberally to our Tibetan text, it might read as follows: “. . . because it is a synonym for a gift of bedding and throw pillows of a Noble One who has permanently taken away all the coverings, of the gods, of the holy state, and of a Thus Come One, it is certain that I am to give gifts of beds and pillows.”

¹³¹ Tib. *tshangs pa'i gnas* (Skt. *brahmavihāra*) is a Buddhist technical term that is extremely difficult to translate. K.R. Norman suggests that the term may have been borrowed from its original Brahmanical context, where it meant either living in the absolute *brahman* or with the deity Brahṃā. See “Theravāda Buddhism and Brahmanical Hinduism: Brahmanical Terms in a Buddhist Guise,” in *The Buddhist Forum*, vol. II: *Seminar Papers 1988-90*, ed. Tadeusz Skorupski (London: University of London (SOAS), 1991), 195-196. At any rate, here the term refers to both a heavenly location and to the four “immeasurable” (Skt. *apramāṇa*) mental states commonly mentioned in Buddhist literature, on which see Dayal, *The Bodhisattva Doctrine*, 225-229; Lamotte, *L'Enseignement de Vimalakīrti*, 19, n. 66; Pagel, *The*

he gives that gift of beds and pillows, in accordance with an oath that was taught by the Awakened One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of beds and pillows, may I give bedding and throw pillows of [for?] a Noble One who has permanently taken away all the coverings of all beings and a Thus Come One [in?] a divine, holy state.’”¹³² Then there were also additional words:¹³³

“On account of what little merit I have accumulated
By giving beds and pillows,
May I remove the coverings of men [and]
The pernicious intellects of the wicked.

“With the blade of wisdom, may one cut through the net
Of pernicious views of living creatures.
May one give the supportive,¹³⁴ holy state,
The best of beds that is worthy of the Well Gone Ones.

“A man who gives beds and pillows
Will be born skilled in the treatises.¹³⁵
One who attains calm and gives extensively
Will, arising from a lotus,¹³⁶ be resplendent and youthful.

Bodhisattvapitaka, 133-145. There may also be a wordplay going on with *vihāra*, “enjoyment” or “pleasure grounds,” and the imagery of the comfortable bedding.

¹³² Cf. Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” 44 (no. 15).

¹³³ Up to now each Tibetan foot of verse has had seven syllables, but these next verses have nine syllables per foot. I cannot say whether this reflects a difference in the number of syllables in the Sanskrit verses, or whether it was merely the whimsical choice of the Tibetan translators, though one might expect the former. See Skjærvø, ed. and trans., *This Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras*, Vol. II, 122, 3.61.

¹³⁴ Here I follow D’s *bsten pa* against all the others. The *bstan pa* of L, N, Q, S, and T—unless they mean *stan*, “seat”?—instead makes the reading “May one give the teaching of the holy state” or “May one give the revelation of the holy state,” but I opt to continue with the bedding imagery.

¹³⁵ Tib. *bstan bcos* = Skt. *śāstra* (Mvy. 1443).

¹³⁶ It is tempting to suggest that this is a reference to being reborn in a “Pure Land,” especially *Sukhāvatī*, but there is no other information on which to draw a credible conclusion. Given the lavish, almost supernatural setting described at the beginning of our text, we need not resort to a “Pure Land” for such a phenomenal event—in this text’s world being born from a lotus might just as well occur on “Earth.”

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to giving mats? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving mats,” because it is a synonym for attaining the adamantine seat of the terrace of awakening¹³⁷ on the surface of each of the thousand-cubed great thousand-world spheres,¹³⁸ it is certain that I am to give gifts of mats.’ When he gives that gift of mats, in accordance with an oath in agreement with the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of mats, may I cause all beings to attain the adamantine seat of the terrace of awakening on the surface of each of the thousand-cubed great thousand-world spheres.’”¹³⁹ Then this was said:

“On account of this gift of mats,
 May adamantine seats of the terrace of awakening
 That are good, firm, and durable
 Arise for living creatures.

“Made from the seven kinds of precious things, [the seats will be]
 Two miles¹⁴⁰ in height and
 One mile in circumference,
 Striking, like Mt. Meru, and

“Surrounded by a hundred heavenly trees¹⁴¹ of jewels,

¹³⁷ That is, giving a seat allows all beings one day to reach awakening on their own hallowed “terrace” or “circle” or “seat of awakening” (Skt. *bodhimaṇḍa*), as did Śākyamuni.

¹³⁸ Skt. *trisāhasramahāsāhasra lokadhātu*, often translated as “trichiliochosm.” In Mahāyāna cosmology, every world sphere or universe contains a thousand worlds that contain a thousand worlds of their own, and every one of the latter worlds also has a thousand worlds. The total number of worlds therefore equals one thousand cubed, i.e., one billion. See Sadakata, *Buddhist Cosmology*, 93–95. One of the only features consistent across Mahāyāna Sūtras is the gargantuan setting they operate in and the enormous number of characters populating that setting.

¹³⁹ Cf. Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 30.30–32: *stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i sa thams cad kyi byang chub kyi snying po rdo rje'i gdan thob par bya ba'i phyir stan 'dod pa rnams la stan sbyin pa'o*.

¹⁴⁰ Although “league” approximates *dpag tshad* (Skt. *yojana*) more closely than “mile,” I cannot bring myself to use such a stuffy and outdated word in translation. Indian sources disagree on the exact measurement of a *yojana*, as is the case for virtually all weights and measures.

¹⁴¹ Tib. *ljon shing*. There were two earlier instances of *shing ljon*, but I am not sure whether it and *ljon shing* translate identical Sanskrit words. (See nn. 7 and 64 above on Indian coral trees.) At any rate, it

Thoroughly ornamented with palatial mansions,
Covered with a net of bells, and
Adorned and illuminated with precious stones and jewels.¹⁴²

“By giving chairs, mats, and benches
To fellow practitioners,
When cycling in cyclical existences,¹⁴³
One will attain mats similar to those.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to gifts of necessities?¹⁴⁴ Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving necessities,” because it is a synonym for perfecting the necessities of awakening, it is certain that I am to give gifts of necessities.’ When he gives that gift of necessities, in accordance with an oath worthy of the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of necessities, may I make the necessities of awakening perfect for all beings.’”¹⁴⁵ Then there were also additional words:

“With that total surrender of necessities,
May I, moreover, make
The pursuits for the necessities of awakening
Perfect for living creatures.

“By giving forth necessities,
Wherever one has been born,
There he will perfect all the components
That are endowed with the best of all aspects.

made more sense in the two previous contexts to understand the Tibetan as a single species, but here, I believe, as a “tree of paradise” or some sort of “heavenly tree” in general.

¹⁴² The last two verses describe the seats from the first verse.

¹⁴³ Skt. *saṃsāra*.

¹⁴⁴ “Necessities” translates the similarly vague term *yo byad* (Skt. *pariṣkāra*) and often denotes mundane household items like furniture.

¹⁴⁵ Cf. Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 30.32-34: *byang chub kyi yo byad thams cad yongs su bskang ba'i phyir yo byad 'dod pa rnam la yo byad sbyin pa'o*.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to giving medicine? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called a “gift of medicine,” because it is a synonym for perfecting for all beings the ease from the immortal nectar¹⁴⁶ that is without old age and death, it is certain that I am to give gifts of medicine.’ When he gives that gift of medicine, in accordance with an oath that was empowered by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of medicine, may I make the ease from the immortal nectar that is without old age and death perfect for all beings.’”¹⁴⁷ Then this was said:

“With gifts of [medicinal] herbs and medicine,
 May all beings quickly attain
 Immeasurable lifespans as well as
 The immortal nectar of omniscience.

“With gifts of [medicinal] herbs and medicine,
 Men will become long lived, remaining without sickness,
 With little harm, well, and at ease,
 Like the full moon.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders¹⁴⁸ male slaves, female slaves, servile workers, and servile wage laborers?”¹⁴⁹ Son from

¹⁴⁶ This is an attempt to capture the multivalence of Skt. *amṛta*, which literally means “undead” and hence “immortal,” but also means the nectar of the gods and by extension any medicine that brings deathlessness. Cf. Yuyama, ed., *Prajñāpāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*, 95, verse 4b, in which an Aspirant to Awakening is described as *amṛtasya dāyaku*.

¹⁴⁷ The reward for giving medicine in the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* is exactly the same: *mi rga mi 'chi ba'i bdud rtsi'i bde ba yongs su bskang ba'i phyir na ba dang sman 'dod pa thams cad la sman sbyin pa'o* (Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 30.34-35). In the *Dānādhikaraṇa*, a similar reward for giving medicine is promised in the extant Sanskrit version and the Tibetan translation, but not the Chinese (Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” 45 (no. 17)).

¹⁴⁸ I translate forms of *yongs su gtong ba* (Skt. *pari√tyaj*) as “total surrender.” See MW, s.v. *pari√tyaj* and related forms. As I discuss in the introduction, from this point on the text begins using *yongs su gtong ba'i sbyin pa* for most of the gifts, as opposed to the bare *sbyin pa*.

a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders male slaves, female slaves, servile workers, and servile wage laborers,” because it is a synonym for perfecting the knowledge that is independent,¹⁵⁰ self-determined,¹⁵¹ and self-existent¹⁵² by Aspirants to Awakening, it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders male slaves, female slaves, servile workers, and servile wage laborers.’¹⁵³ When he gives that gift that totally surrenders¹⁵⁴ male slaves, female slaves, servile workers, and servile wage laborers, in accordance with an oath that was spoken and taught by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift that totally surrenders male slaves, female slaves, servile workers, and servile wage laborers, may I make the knowledge that is independent, self-determined, and self-existent perfect for all beings.’”¹⁵⁵ Then this was said:

¹⁴⁹ We do not normally conceive of a “worker” (*las byed pa* = Skt. *karmakara* or *karmakāraka*) or a “wage laborer” (*zho shas ’tsho ba* = Skt. *pauruṣeya*) as property that can be given. However, the authors of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* and many other Buddhist texts—see, for example, the passage from the *Sikṣāsamuccaya* on pp. 46-47 of chapter II—clearly did, so I add “servile” to my translation. See Uma Chakravarti, “Of Dasas and Karmakaras: Servile Labour in Ancient India,” in *Chains of Servitude: Bondage and Slavery in India*, ed. Utsa Patnaik and Manjari Dingwaney (Madras: Sangam Books, 1985), 35-75.

¹⁵⁰ Tib. *rang dga’*. I am not sure what the Sanskrit would have been.

¹⁵¹ Tib. *rang dbang* = Skt. *svatantra*.

¹⁵² Tib. *rang byung* = Skt. *svayaṃbhū*.

¹⁵³ The idea is that giving up those in bondage—and I believe this means letting them go instead of transferring them to another owner—somehow brings about unbounded knowledge in all beings.

¹⁵⁴ D and Q omit “totally surrenders.” While there is nothing grammatically incorrect with the plain *sbyin pa*, given the refrain of *yongs su gtong ba’i sbyin pa* in this same passage it is most likely an accidental omission. My translation therefore follows the L, N, S, and T.

¹⁵⁵ The *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa-sūtra* is very similar, except it leaves out “servile workers” and “servile wage laborers” as part of the gift and describes the reward of knowledge as *rang nyam* instead of *rang dga’* (though the Tibetan difference may not reflect one in the underlying Sanskrit—*nyam* and *dga’* can be combined as *nyam(s) dga’*, “joyous”): *rang dbang dang / rang nyam dang / rang ’byung gi ye shes yongs su*

“By surrendering male slaves and female slaves,
May one, in short, perfect the essence
Of self-existent knowledge
For all living creatures.

“By surrendering male slaves and female slaves,
A man is not born as a slave.
He lives with enduring self-determination,
Without dismay and without fear.¹⁵⁶

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders all precious things, [including] gold, silver, precious stones, pearls, lapis lazuli, shells, crystal, and coral? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “total surrender of all the precious things, [including] gold, silver, precious stones, pearls, lapis lazuli, shells, crystal, and coral,” because it is a synonym for limitless hundreds of thousands of myriads of millions of Awakened Ones’ fields being illuminated by Aspirants to Awakening [with] light rays, such as those of the color of blue, yellow, red, white, crimson,¹⁵⁷ glassy white,¹⁵⁸ and silver,¹⁵⁹ it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders all precious things, [including] gold, silver, precious stones, pearls, lapis lazuli,

bskang ba'i phyir byang chub sems dpa' rnam kyī bran pho dang bran mo yongs su gtong ba'i sbyin pa'o
(Braarvig, ed., *Akṣaya-matinirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 30.35-37).

¹⁵⁶ It must be noticed that even if the reader of this passage is being encouraged to give up his human property, there is no hint that the ownership of such property disqualifies one as an Aspirant to Awakening, the spiritual representative of the Great Vehicle “brand” of Buddhism so often associated with compassion.

¹⁵⁷ More literally, “madder” (*btsod ka* = Skt. *mañjiṣṭhā*), the reddish dye derived from the Indian or Common Madder (*Rubia cordifolia*).

¹⁵⁸ Literally “crystal,” “quartz,” or “glass” (*shel*).

¹⁵⁹ Beaming light rays of these colors—often emanating from the Blessed One’s mouth—occur commonly in Mahāyāna Sūtras. See, for instance, Conze, trans., *The perfection of wisdom in eight thousand lines & its verse summary*, 265; Nattier, trans., *A Few Good Men*, 316, §32.

shells, crystal, and coral.”¹⁶⁰ When he gives that gift that totally surrenders all precious things, [including] gold, silver, precious stones, pearls, lapis lazuli, shells, crystal, and coral, in accordance with an oath that was explained and illuminated, and as it was understood, by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of that gift of all the precious things, [including] gold, silver, precious stones, pearls, lapis lazuli, shells, crystal, and coral, may I cause limitless hundreds of thousands of myriads of millions of Awakened Ones’ fields to be illuminated with light rays, such as those of the color of blue, yellow, red, white, crimson, glassy white, and silver.’”¹⁶¹ Then there were also additional words:

“On account of that gift of precious things, may I
Cause all the Awakened Seers’ fields
To be illuminated with many kinds of
Illuminating light rays.

“By giving many kinds of precious things,
Wherever the gentle one has been born,
Let him cause [places] to be illuminated [with] light rays,
Including the intermediate spaces [between] worlds.”¹⁶²

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders a vehicle, such as that of horses, elephants, and wagons? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders a vehicle, such as that of horses, elephants, and wagons,” because it is a synonym for assembling

¹⁶⁰ The idea may be that, after they are given up, one can see these same precious things in the newly illuminated fields of Awakened Ones. Sukhāvātī is certainly full of objects made of such precious substances—see, for example, Gomez, trans., *The Land of Bliss*, 16-17 (§9).

¹⁶¹ The gift in the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* is the same, but the reward is very different—cf. Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīrdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 30.38-41, and see n. 111 above. Cf. Skjærvø, ed. and trans., *This Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras*, Vol. I, 280-281, 15.23 and 15.29; Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra*, 13, verse 14.

¹⁶² The intermediate spaces are gaps between worlds that cannot produce their own light. See *BHSD*, s.v. *lokāntarikā*.

[*sdud pa*]¹⁶³ the Great Vehicle,¹⁶⁴ best Vehicle, Vehicle equal to the unequalled, and the unsurpassed, chief, ultimate, most excellent Vehicle of an Awakened One, it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders a vehicle, such as that of horses, elephants, and wagons.’ When he gives that gift that totally surrenders a vehicle, such as that of horses, elephants, and wagons, in accordance with an oath that was spoken and cultivated by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift that totally surrenders a vehicle, such as that of horses, elephants, and wagons, may I cause all beings to be won over [*sdud pa*] by the Great Vehicle, best Vehicle, Vehicle equal to the unequalled, and the unsurpassed, chief, ultimate, most excellent Vehicle of an Awakened One.’”¹⁶⁵ Then there were also additional words:

“By giving an elephant, may I
Cause all living creatures
To be quickly won over [*sdud pa*] by
The Vehicle of an Awakened One, the Great Vehicle, the best Vehicle.

“By giving an elephant and giving a horse,
That man will become
Illuminating, learned, dexterous,¹⁶⁶
Inclined to the Great Vehicle, and fortunate.

¹⁶³ This passage plays on the meaning of *sdud pa* (Skt. *saṃgraha* or a derivative of it), which can mean to “bring together” or “assemble,” but in Buddhist usage often means to “win over” or “attract” people to the religious life. See *MW*, s.v. *saṃgraha*; *BHSD*, s.vv. *saṃgraha* and *saṃgraha-vastu*; Dayal, *The Bodhisattva Doctrine*, 251-259.

¹⁶⁴ The Tibetan text uses two synonyms for “vehicle,” *bzhon pa* and *theg pa*. I do not care for any of the possible English synonyms for “vehicle,” so I merely capitalize *theg pa* as “Vehicle,” especially because of the use of the technical term *theg pa chen po* (Skt. *mahāyāna*) and its connotation of spiritual transport.

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 30.44-31.2: *theg pa chen po yongs su rdzogs par bya ba'i phyir byang chub sems dpa' rnam kyī rta dang / bal glang dang / shing rta dang / dpung bu chung dang bzhon pa sbyin pa'o*.

¹⁶⁶ I follow the reading *shes nyen can*, which probably translates Skt. *dakṣa* or *dakṣiṇa*. The intended reading, however, may be that of N, *bshes gnyen can*, “having a (spiritual) friend (*bshes gnyen* = Skt. *mitra*),” with the understanding that the *mitra* leads one in a spiritual direction much as an elephant or a horse takes one through physical space. The same variation occurs earlier in the text in a similar list of adjectives—see n. 84 above.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders a garden, a grove for ascetic practice,¹⁶⁷ and a monastery?¹⁶⁸ Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders a garden, a grove for ascetic practice, and a monastery,” because it is a synonym for making¹⁶⁹ the branches of meditation perfect by Aspirants to Awakening,¹⁷⁰ it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders a garden, a grove for ascetic practice, and a monastery.’ When he gives the gift that totally surrenders a garden, a grove for ascetic practice, and a monastery, in accordance with an oath that was praised and commended by the Awakened One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift that totally surrenders a garden, a grove for ascetic practice, and a monastery, may I make the branches of meditation perfect for all beings.’”¹⁷¹

Then there were also additional words:

“By giving a monastery¹⁷² and a garden,

¹⁶⁷ Tib. *dka' thub kyi nags tshal* = Skt. *tapovana*.

¹⁶⁸ The term “monastery” (Skt. *vihāra*) is purely conventional. Not only is it fraught with assumptions of certain modes of living, but can in texts and inscriptions refer to a wide array of building types. There was never any archetypical Buddhist “monastery” in India.

¹⁶⁹ L, S, and T omit *byed par* here, so following their reading this sentence would not be causative. Of course, this would hardly change the meaning.

¹⁷⁰ Here and later Q reads *sems can thams cad kyi yan lag*, “limbs of all beings,” which makes no sense—surely a literal sense of filling out the (damaged) appendages of all beings was not the intended meaning. The “all beings” (*sems can thams cad*) in this instance may be a true variation, but the omission of “of meditation” (*bsam gtan gyi*) is certainly a simple eye-skip from one genitive particle to the next.

¹⁷¹ The reward for an almost identical gift in the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* is also the perfection of the branches or components of meditation (Skt. *dhyānāṅga*): *bsam gtan gyi yan lag dang yan lag gi tshogs yongs su rdzogs par bya ba'i phyir byang chub sems dpa' rnam kyi skyed mos tshal dang / gzhal med khang dang / dka' thub kyi nags tshal dang / gtsug lag khang yongs su gtong ba'i sbyin pa'o* (Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa-sūtra*, Vol. I, 31.2-5). Cf. Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra*, 15, verses 38-39.

¹⁷² The Tibetan in this and the next verse is, without variants, *lha gang*. I suspect this is a mistake for or a variant of *lha khang*. Since the Tibetan letters *ga* and *kha* are mirror images of each other, it is not difficult to see how such a mistake or variation could arise. Although *lha khang* often translates Skt.

May I successively make
The branches of meditation
Perfect for all beings.

“By giving a monastery and a garden,
That man who engages in religious discipline¹⁷³
Will perfect the branches of meditation and
Be a great ascetic in practicing religious discipline.¹⁷⁴

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders his wife, sons, and daughters?¹⁷⁵ Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders his wife, sons, and daughters,” because it is a synonym for wholly and completely awakening to unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening¹⁷⁶ by Aspirants to Awakening, it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders my wife, sons, and daughters.’ When he gives that gift that totally surrenders his wife, sons, and daughters, in accordance with an oath to which the Thus Come One paid honor, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift that totally surrenders my wife,

devakula or “temple” (using that term very loosely, considering that sophisticated temple architecture would have been in its earliest stages when this text was probably written—see the helpful sources and comments in Gregory Schopen, “On the Underside of a Sacred Space: Some Less Appreciated Functions of the Temple in Classical India,” in *Buddhist Nuns, Monks, and Other Worldly Matters*, 442-443, n. 1), more than likely it translates *vihāra* here. The prose section has the more usual Tibetan rendering of *vihāra*, *gtsug lag khang*, so it would seem that the translators chose *lha gang/khang* in the two verses to limit the number of syllables in each foot to seven.

¹⁷³ Tib. *rnal 'byor can* = Skt. *yogin*.

¹⁷⁴ Tib. *rnal 'byor spyod la dka' thub che*, where *rnal 'byor spyod pa* (N and Q actually have *pa* instead of *la*) is equivalent to Skt. *yogācāra*. In Buddhist usage, *yogācāra* often has close associations with meditation—see Silk, “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 97ff.; Silk, “The *Yogācāra Bhikṣu*,” in *Wisdom, Compassion, and the Search for Understanding*, 265-314.

¹⁷⁵ Strictly speaking, the Tibetan text does not mark any of the family members of the Aspirant to Awakening as plural.

¹⁷⁶ L, S, and T follow *byang chub* with *sdud pa* instead of the terminative particle *tu*. This is surely a mistake, for otherwise it would mean something like “. . . awaken to the collection of unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening.”

sons, and daughters, may I cause all beings to wholly and completely awaken to unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening.”¹⁷⁷ Then there were also additional words:¹⁷⁸

“For the sake of each and every being,
May that giver of sons
Quickly cause all beings
To awaken to unsurpassed, ultimate awakening.

“Whenever a man who exerts himself
Effects the surrender of his wife, sons, and daughters,
Then his awakening, without contaminations and without joy,¹⁷⁹
Is to be regarded as not being difficult at all.¹⁸⁰

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders wealth, grain, and supplies? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders wealth, grain, and supplies,” because it is a synonym for filling the provisions of the True Law by Aspirants to Awakening, it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders wealth, grain, and supplies.’ When he gives that gift that totally surrenders wealth, grain, and supplies, in accordance with an oath that was spoken by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift that

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatinirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 31.5-8: *bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub la dga' bar mngon par rdzogs par 'tshang rgya bar bya ba'i phyir byang chubs sems dpa' rnam kyi bu pho dang / bu mo dang / chung ma dang sdug pa yongs su gtong ba'i sbyin pa'o*. If there is a logical connection between awakening and surrendering one's wife and children, it must be that the family was considered an obstacle to the pursuit of the religious life, a widespread and entrenched idea in Classical India, evident, of course, in the life of Siddhārtha. Cf. Skjærvø, ed. and trans., *This Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras*, Vol. I, 81, *5.27 and 280-281, 15.22 and *15.28; Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra*, 13, verse 18.

¹⁷⁸ The following two verses have nine syllables per foot.

¹⁷⁹ I follow D for “without joy” (*dga' ba med*). L, Q, and S have “without difficulty” (*dka' ba med*), which would seem to be redundant with the following line. T combines *dga'* and *dka'* into one nonsensical word, so it is not possible to tell which one is the preferred reading. N, being illegible here, is not helpful.

¹⁸⁰ I take great liberty with the syntax of this verse and my translation is not at all certain.

totally surrenders wealth, grain,¹⁸¹ and supplies, may I make the provisions of the True Law full for all beings.”¹⁸² Then this was said:¹⁸³

“With whatever merit that I have, higher [in amount] than the sky,
From surrendering wealth and treasures,
May the realm of men¹⁸⁴ quickly prosper
With the provisions of the True Law, like the provisions of a king.

“On account of whatever merit I have from surrendering
Wealth, grain, supplies, and a spouse,
May I quickly attain awakening and
May I attain the provisions of the True Law.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders all sovereignty over the four continents, Black Plum Continent, or the kingdom? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders all sovereignty over the four continents, Black Plum Continent, or the kingdom,” because it is a synonym for attaining sovereignty over the kingdom of the True Law by Aspirants to Awakening, it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders all sovereignty over the four continents, Black Plum Continent, or the kingdom.’ When he gives that gift that totally surrenders all sovereignty over the four continents, Black Plum Continent, or the kingdom, in accordance with an oath that was taught by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift that totally surrenders all sovereignty over the four

¹⁸¹ L, S, and T add “provisions” (*mdzod*) here, which does not agree with the parallel phrases in this passage.

¹⁸² The *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* makes the same connection between giving up various provisions and the True Law (Skt. *saddharma*): *dam pa'i chos kyi mdzod dang bang ba yongs su dgang ba'i phyir byang chub sems dpa' rnam kyi nor dang / 'bru dang / mdzod dang / bang ba yongs su gtong ba'i sbyin pa'o* (Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 31.9-11).

¹⁸³ These two verses also have nine syllables per foot.

¹⁸⁴ Tib. *mi rnam rgyud* probably translates Skt. *manuṣyagati*—see Mvy. 9230.

continents, Black Plum Continent, or the kingdom, may I cause all beings to attain the attainment of the sovereignty over the kingdom of the True Law.”¹⁸⁵ Then this was said:¹⁸⁶

“On account of what little merit I have brought about
From the wholesale surrender of the four continents,
May these men attain the full extent of
The attainment of the kingdom of the True Law.

“By giving Black Plum Continent,
The king, who possesses the seven precious things,
Who governs the four continents,
Will win sovereignty.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders the crest jewel¹⁸⁷ and crown? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders the crest jewel and crown,” because it is a synonym for developing the crest of the head that is not looked down upon¹⁸⁸ by

¹⁸⁵ The *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* varies considerably from our text here—see Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa-sūtra*, Vol. I, 31.11-15. Cf. Yuyama, ed., *Prajñāpāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*, 127, verse 12: *tada bodhisattva imi jñātvā daridrasattvān dānādhimuktu bhavatī sada muktatyāgi / catvāri dvīpa samalaṃkṛta kheṭatulyān dattvā udagra bhavate na tu dvīpalabdā //*; Skjærvø, ed. and trans., *This Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras*, Vol. I, 256, 13.1: *sasāgarā tyaktā vasundharā tadā yadā bhabhūva nṛpa cakravartī / catvāri dvīpāni saratnapūrṇā niryātītā pūrvajineṣu mahyam //* (and *ibid.*, 261-262, *13.25-13.26); Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra*, 13-14, verse 20.

¹⁸⁶ The next verse has nine syllables per foot, but the one after has seven.

¹⁸⁷ In several parallel stories that recount the deeds of King Mañicūḍa, he gives away his crest jewel; in the *Mañicūḍāvadāna* he does so to attain *bodhiratna*, the “jewel of awakening.” See Ratna Handurukande, ed. and trans., *Mañicūḍāvadāna, Being a Translation and Edition, and Lokānanda, a Transliteration and Synopsis* (Sacred Books of the Buddhists 24) (London: Pāli Text Society, 1967), 76. For sources on the Mañicūḍa story, see Ohnuma, *Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood*, 276 (entry E). In the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra*, a king’s gift of his crest jewel (Skt. *cūḍāmaṇi*), his most prized possession, is compared to the Awakened One’s teaching of the Lotus Sūtra itself. See Kern and Nanjio, eds., *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, 289.3-292.12.

¹⁸⁸ I follow Hubert Durt’s understanding of *spyi gtsug bltar mi mthong ba* (Skt. *anavalokitamūrdha* or *anavalokitamūrdhatā*), whereby looking down upon (*avalokita*) the crest of the head of an Awakened One (or here, of an Aspirant to Awakening) developed into a sort of “taboo” in early Buddhist literature because one should not—or could not—go beyond or be above his head (even in flight). See his “Note sur l’origine de l’Anavalokitamūrdhatā,” *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 16.1 (1967): 443-450. Such a “taboo” was likely expressed in Indian Buddhist sculpture, with the figure of the Awakened One

Aspirants to Awakening, it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders the crest jewel and crown.’ When he gives that gift that totally surrenders the crest jewel and crown, in accordance with an oath that was spoken by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift that totally surrenders the crest jewel and crown, may I cause all beings to attain a crest of the head that is not looked down upon.’”¹⁸⁹ Then this was said:¹⁹⁰

“On account of whatever merit I have accumulated
From giving the crest jewel¹⁹¹ and crown,
May beings here
Always attain an unobservable crest of the head.

“With that gift of the crest jewel, may I
Have a superb cranial protuberance¹⁹² that has
A wide girth like the Indian fig
[And that] is made of gold and precious stones.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to giving his feet [*rkang pa*]?¹⁹³ Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving one’s feet,” because it is a synonym for going to the terrace of awakening that is the

towering over all others, and possibly in painting as well. See Schopen, “The Ambiguity of Avalokiteśvara and the Tentative Identification of a Painted Scene from a Mahāyāna Sūtra at Ajaṅṭā,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, esp. 285-87 and the other sources discussed there. In some Mahāyāna texts, having a “crest of the head that is not looked down upon” becomes one of the secondary characteristics (Skt. *anuvyañjana*) of a Great Man. Also see Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 287-288, n. 526 and the sources cited there.

¹⁸⁹ In effect, he is making an oath that everyone will acquire a superhuman body, which I discuss briefly in the introduction to the text. Cf. Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 30.43-44: *gtsug tor bltar mi mthong ba thob par bya ba’i phyir byang chub sems dpa’ rnam kyī gtsug gi nor bu dang cod pan sbyin pa’o*.

¹⁹⁰ Once again, the first verse has nine syllables per foot, whereas the second verse has seven.

¹⁹¹ More literally, “head’s jewel” (*mgo bo’i nor bu*): The text substitutes *mgo bo* for *gtsug* in order to give the foot an extra syllable.

¹⁹² The bump atop the head (Skt. *uṣṇīṣa*) is a well-known mark of a Great Man, clearly depicted in many extant images of the Awakened One.

¹⁹³ Here the text switches to *internal* gifts (Skt. *ādhyātmikadāna*).

base [*rkang pa*] of the Law by Aspirants to Awakenings, it is certain that I am to give a gift of my feet.’ When he gives that gift of his feet, in accordance with an oath that was obtained by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of my feet, may men and all beings, having always gone forth quickly from the home, constraining their desires in order to pacify the harm from birth, old age, illness, and death, be extremely joyous, pacify their faculties, and pacify their bodies, like the moonlight that is worthy of [providing] refuge. After illuminating the darkness of men, who are tormented because they dwell in the darkness, including that of the intermediate spaces [between worlds], by means of emitting light rays that arise from compassion, like the splendor of many kinds of suns, the makers of light, may they dispel the suffering of the bodies in the Extremely Hot Hell.¹⁹⁴ May they have lotus feet that are adorned with the mark of thousand-spoked wheels,¹⁹⁵ that are level, and that are soft, toes that are long and connected with a web, like the feet of a goose, toenails that are ornamented like a fine, purely polished mirror and that are like star jasmine flowers,¹⁹⁶ prominent ankles, and lower legs that stand relaxed in a wondrous manner, similar to a reed or the calf of an antelope. On the seat of the terrace of awakening, the seat with an adamantine

¹⁹⁴ This is one of the excruciatingly painful hells in Buddhist cosmology (*rab tu tsha ba* = Skt. *pratāpana*), generally placed above the Avīci Hell. See Sadakata, *Buddhist Cosmology*, 48-50.

¹⁹⁵ Having wheels at the bottom of the feet is an additional mark of a Great Man, another well-attested feature found in many images of the Awakened One. Indeed, even when the Awakened One is absent, the wheel represents his footprint in early, so-called aniconic images. The rest of this passage describes other marks and secondary characteristics related to the foot and leg.

¹⁹⁶ The second half of this phrase—“that are like star jasmine flowers”—reads much differently in L: “that are just the same as all the flowers [of] the terrace of awakening.” This is almost certainly a copying mistake made under the influence of an upcoming phrase.

base,¹⁹⁷ the lion throne of the Law, may they utterly subdue Māra in order to vanquish him.”¹⁹⁸

Then there were also additional words:

“On account of this gift of his feet,
May one, steadfast,¹⁹⁹
With the soles of the feet possessing the mark of the wheel,
Utterly subdue [Māra²⁰⁰] on the good seat of the terrace of awakening.

“On account of this gift of my feet, may I,
After sitting on the best seat of the terrace of awakening,
Tame the Māras,²⁰¹ together with their
Armies, soldiers, and vehicles.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to giving the palms of his hands
[lag mthil]?²⁰² Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That
which is called “giving the palms of one’s hands,” because it is a synonym for giving the hand
[lag pa]²⁰³ of the Law to all beings by Aspirants to Awakening, it is certain that I am to give a gift

¹⁹⁷ There are many possibilities for Tib. *stegs bu*, mostly because there are many Sanskrit words it could be translating. I elect for the sense of “base,” “foundation,” or even “pedestal” (Skt. *piṇḍikā*, *kapoṭamālā*, etc.). It is also possible that the intended meaning is the surface of the seat, a railing around the seat (Skt. *vedikā*), or even the raised ground upon which the seat rests (Skt. *vitardi*).

¹⁹⁸ My translation of this passage is pretty convoluted. So is the Tibetan. The *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* is much more terse and straightforward in its description of the gift of the feet: *dam pa'i chos kyi rkang pas byang chub kyi snying por 'gro bar bya ba'i phyir byang chub sems dpa' rnam kyi rkang pa sbyin pa'o* (Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 31.17-19).

¹⁹⁹ I take *brtan pos* to indicate the subject. It may, however, be adverbial, which is supported by Q's *brtan par*.

²⁰⁰ My guess is that Māra is understood to be the object of “subdue,” as he is in the preceding prose as well as (in the plural) the next verse. Māra might also be understood as the object of “subdue” in the second verse of the next section.

²⁰¹ There are usually but not invariably four Māras enumerated in Sanskrit and Pāli Buddhist sources: in Sanskrit, *Kleśamāra*, *Skandhamāra*, *Mṛtyumāra*, and *Devaputramāra*. See BHSD, s.v. *Māra*.

²⁰² This may be an example of synecdoche, where the palm of the hand is a way to refer to the entire hand.

²⁰³ That is, assistance.

of the palms of my hands.’ When he gives that gift of the palms of his hands, in accordance with an oath that was understood by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of the palms of my hands, may I cause the hand of the Law to be given to beings who are inferior, blind, poor, without a master [to look after them], suffering, impoverished, homeless, without refuge, and defenseless, and to those born in hell, as animals, in Yama’s world,²⁰⁴ fallen into the unfavorable destinies and unfavorable states, or born at the inopportune times.’²⁰⁵ ²⁰⁶ Then there were also additional words:

“By giving the palms of my hands, may I quickly become
A Guide [i.e., an Awakened One] with jewels in my hand,²⁰⁷
Possessing hands that are long and of a golden hue, and
An object of homage for the world.

“Having subdued with compassion,
Praising the hand of the Law,
May I always remove
Living creatures from all the unfavorable destinies.

²⁰⁴ Being reborn in hell, as an animal, or in Yama’s world (*yamaloka*) is a standard triad in Mahāyāna texts for the three worst possible fates. See, for example, Kern and Nanjio, eds., *Saddharmaṣaṣṭikā*, 77.15. The three lower destinies in Buddhist cosmology are those of hell-beings, hungry ghosts, and animals—Yama was regarded as the king of the hungry ghosts (Skt. *preta*), so Yama’s world is equivalent to the realm of hungry ghosts. This triad of unfortunate rebirth states is not unknown in inscriptions either—see A. Ghosh, “A Buddhist Tract in a Stone Inscription in the Cuttack Museum,” *Epigraphia Indica* 26 (1941–42): 173, lines 20–21.

²⁰⁵ Pāli and Sanskrit Buddhist texts enumerate different lists of eight inopportune times when one could be reborn. See *BHSD*, s.v. *akṣaṇa*.

²⁰⁶ The *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* speaks of the “hand of the True Law [*saddharma*]” as the result of giving away the palms of one’s hands: *sems can thams cad la dam pa’i chos kyi lag pa sbyin pa’i phyir byang chub sems dpa’ rnam kyī lag mthil sbyin pa’o* (Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 31.19–21). Cf. Bendall, ed., *Çikshāsamuccaya*, 24.4–6: *bodhisatvo hastapādān parityajan yācanakebhyaḥ śraddhāstaprayuktenānugrahacāritreṇa bodhisatvasiṃhavikramatyāgapratatapāṇinā. . . .*

²⁰⁷ The implied image is one of sparkling or shining jewels being used to help lead beings out of the darkness of suffering. In the *Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha-sūtra*, the protagonist Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, whose name refers to both light (*prabha*) and a kind of jewel (*vaiḍūrya*), makes an oath that, after he has become awakened, he will have a bejeweled body emitting light that will illuminate the way for beings who are traveling through the darkness (Sanskrit text read from the unpublished Schopen, ed., *A Sūtra for the Failed and Misbegotten*, section 5.2).

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders his ears and nose?²⁰⁸ Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders one’s ears and nose,” because it is a synonym for perfecting the intact faculties²⁰⁹ by Aspirants to Awakening, it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders my ears and nose.’ When he gives that gift that totally surrenders his ears and nose, in accordance with an oath that was established by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift that totally surrenders my ears and nose, may I cause all beings to be get all their faculties.’”²¹⁰ Then this was said:

“By surrendering one’s ears and nose,
 May all living things
 Get all their faculties, and
 May all their limbs be complete.

“By surrendering one’s ears and nose,
 Wherever he has been born,
 That man will there become lovely to see, and
 Will come to have a good figure and a beautiful face.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift of his eyes [*mig*]? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving one’s eyes,” because it is a synonym for totally purifying the unobscured vision [*mig*] of

²⁰⁸ The nose and the ears are often treated as a pair in Buddhist texts, especially with regard to cutting them off—see, e.g., Cowell and Neil, eds., *The Divyāvadāna*, 472.4-5. I wonder whether Indians may have understood that the nose and ears are anatomically connected, but I have not looked in the classical medical literature to pursue the matter. I can only say that the compound *karṇanāsā* is listed in *MW*, citing the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

²⁰⁹ Tib. *dbang po tshang ba* = Skt. *sakalendriya*?

²¹⁰ The *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* also relates the gift of one’s ears and nose to attaining sound faculties: *dbang po ma nyams pa rdzogs par bya ba’i phyir byang chub sems dpa’ rnam kyī rna ba dang sna sbyin pa’o* (Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 31.21-22).

the Law²¹¹ by Aspirants to Awakening, it is certain that I am to give a gift of my eyes.’ When he gives that gift of his eyes, in accordance with an oath that was made pure²¹² by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of my eyes, may I totally purify the unobscured vision of the Law for all beings.’”²¹³ Then there were also additional words:

“On account of this gift of my eyes, may I,
After awakening to unsurpassed awakening,
Absolutely purify
The vision of the Law for all beings.

“By that excellent observance²¹⁴ of giving the eyes,
One will attain eyes that are
Without blemish, faultless, pure, broad,
Very beautiful, and serene.

“Similar to a petal of a blue lotus,
Similar to the eyes of a painted snipe,²¹⁵
[With] eyelashes similar to a cow’s,²¹⁶
By that [gift], one will attain eyes similar to those.

²¹¹ Depending on how one renders the slippery term *chos* (Skt. *dharma*), this might be translated as “vision of [all] phenomena.” See *BHSD*, s.v. *dharma-cakṣus*.

²¹² Following N and Q, which insert *yang* before *dag par*, this would instead read “made correct.”

²¹³ In addition to the “vision of the Law,” with the gift of the eyes the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśa* speaks of the “unobscured vision of an Awakened One”: *sems can thams cad la sgrib pa med pa’i sangs rgyas kyi spyan dang chos kyi spyan thob par bya ba’i phyr byang chub sems dpa’ rnam kyi mig sbyin pa’o* (Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 31.22-24).

²¹⁴ Tib. *brtul zhags* is the equivalent of Skt. *vrata*, a term difficult to translate with precision. A modern Hindu or Jain *vrata* (or *vrat*) generally involves making a vow to abstain from certain foods or other indulgences for various occasions or lengths of time. Since we are dealing with making yet another type of gift in this verse, obviously this modern understanding will not suffice. In Buddhist usage *vrata* seems to be much vaguer, and might be translated—vaguely—as a (religious) “deed” or “practice” or, as here, “observance.”

²¹⁵ This is probably the correct identification of Tib. *byi’u ku na la* (Skt. *kuṇāla* or *kunāla*). In the *Divyāvadāna*, Aśoka’s son is named Kuṇāla because of his bright and beautiful eyes. See Dave, *Birds in Sanskrit Literature*, 308.

²¹⁶ This is one of the marks of a Great Man (Skt. *gopakṣman*).

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders his head? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders one’s head,” because it is a synonym for attaining an Omniscient One’s²¹⁷ knowledge, which exceeds the best things in the entire triple [world-]sphere, by Aspirants to Awakening, it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders my head.’ When he gives that gift that totally surrenders his head, in accordance with an oath that was in conformity with the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift that totally surrenders my head, may I cause all beings to attain an Omniscient One’s knowledge, which exceeds the best things in the triple world.’”²¹⁸ Then there were also additional words:

“On account of whatever merit I have
 From the total surrender of my head,
 May all beings
 Attain the unwavering status of an Omniscient One.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders his skin? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders one’s skin,” because it is a synonym for perfecting the skin by Aspirants to Awakening, [so it will be] soft, delicate, and like the color of

²¹⁷ “Omniscient One” could just as well be rendered “omniscient knowledge,” from Tib. *thams cad mkhyen pa’i ye shes*. The difference is negligible, as omniscience is the hallmark of one who has become awakened, that is, a buddha. See Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 215, n. 45. Throughout the text I switch back and forth between the two ideas—the state of omniscience and the being who is omniscient—in order to fit the context.

²¹⁸ As the head sits atop and is the best part of the body, sacrificing it brings omniscience, which is distinct from and exceeds everything in the triple world (Skt. *trailokya* or *traidhātuka*) of Buddhist cosmology. The *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* uses almost identical language: *khamṣ gsum thams cad las khyad par du ’phags pa’i mchog thams cad mkhyen pa’i ye shes thob par bya ba’i phyir byang chub sems dpa’ rnams kyi yan lag gi dam pa mgo sbyin pa’o* (Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīrdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 31.24-26).

gold,²¹⁹ it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders my skin.²²⁰ When he gives that gift that totally surrenders his skin, in accordance with an oath of the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift that totally surrenders my skin, may I make the skin of all beings perfect, [so it will be] soft, delicate, and like the color of gold.’²²¹ Then there were also additional words:

“By the total surrender of my skin,
May I transform living creatures who
Are born from a body with skin
[To those having skin that will be] soft, delicate, [and like] the hue of gold.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders his flesh and blood?²²² Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders one’s flesh and blood,” because it is a synonym for extracting what is substantial from everything that is insubstantial²²³ by

²¹⁹ Having golden skin is one of the thirty-two marks of a Great Man.

²²⁰ Q instead says, “. . . it is certain that the gift that totally surrenders our skin is to be given.” Nowhere else in the text is there a first person plural pronoun, making this reading extremely unlikely.

²²¹ For this gift, the *Akṣayamatīrdeśa* uses a different verb, *yongs su dag pa* (“purify”) instead of *yongs su rdzogs pa* (“perfect”), and describes the future skin using *snum pa* (Skt. *snigdha*, “glossy”, “oily,” “smooth,” etc.) instead of *srab* (“delicate,” “fine,” etc.): *’jam pa dang snum pa dang gser gyi kha dog lta bu’i mdog yongs su dag par bya ba’i phyir byang chub sems dpa’ rnam kyī pags pa yongs su gtong ba’i sbyin pa’o* (Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīrdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 31.29-31).

²²² Cf. Nattier, trans., *A Few Good Men*, 277, §20F: “O Eminent Householder, if a householder bodhisattva sees a sick monk he should cure him of that sickness, even by means of his own flesh and blood.”

²²³ This is a variation on a cliché found in Mahāyāna Sūtras. According to Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 227-228, n. 120, there are three insubstantial things from which Mahāyāna Sūtras speak of “extracting what is substantial”: the body (Skt. *kāya*), life (*jīva*), and possessions/enjoyment (*bhoga*). Our text may therefore refer to all three when it says “everything that is insubstantial” (Tib. *snying po med pa thams cad*), which would imply that a gift of one’s flesh and blood is simultaneously a sacrifice of the body, life, and a possession that can be enjoyed. With regard to a passage in the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra* that encourages the wilderness dweller to willingly give up his body to animals and thereby “take what is substantial from the insubstantial body” (Skt. *’sārāt kāyāt sāram ādattaṃ bhaviṣyati*), Silk, “The Origins

Aspirants to Awakening, it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders my flesh and blood.’ When he gives that gift that totally surrenders his flesh and blood, in accordance with an oath that was created by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift that totally surrenders my flesh and blood, may I cause all beings to take what is substantial from everything that is insubstantial.’”²²⁴ Then there were also additional words:

“Through that [karmic fruit that] I have that matures²²⁵
 From the gift of my flesh and blood,
 May all living beings attain what is substantial
 From the entirety of what is insubstantial.”²²⁶

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to giving his marrow? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving one’s marrow,” because it is a synonym for perfecting the body to be indestructible, like a

and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 353-354, n. 1 makes an incisive remark:

[T]he opportunity to create something essential and solid (spiritually speaking) is created through encounters with what is insubstantial in the world. By using one’s body, which is of course insubstantial, to do work for others, or in respectful attendance upon a teacher, as in the *Ugra[pariṣcchā-sūtra]*, or by offering the body as food, as in the *Ratnarāśī*, one take the opportunity provided by the insubstantial to use it as a medium for realizing the substantial, which is spiritual progress.

The Sanskrit and Tibetan for this passage in the *Ratnarāśī* can be found at *ibid.*, 471. For an additional discussion on the idea of, in Ohnuma’s words, “extracting the essence from this essenceless body,” see her *Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood*, 213-217. Besides the sources cited in Nattier, Silk, and Ohnuma, see also Nattier, trans., *A Few Good Men*, 240-241, §10A-B; Pagel, trans., *The Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, 382.

²²⁴ The gift of the flesh in the *Aksayamatīnirdeśa* also employs the idea of insubstantiality: *snying po med pa’i lus las snying po blang zhing nye bar ’tsho bar bya ba’i phyir byang chub sems dpa’ rnam kyī sha dang khrag yongs su gtong ba’i sbyin pa’o* (Braarvig, ed., *Aksayamatīnirdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 31.27-28). Braarvig misunderstands *snying po med pa’i lus* as “a body without strength” (Braarvig, trans., *Aksayamatīnirdeśa-sūtra*, Vol. II, 121). The *Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra* uses this idea too, but as a reward for giving from one’s own hand. I give the Tibetan for comparison: *snying po med pa’i lus las snying po blang pa’i phyir rang gi lag nas sbyin pa byin no* (Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” 42 (no. 4)). Note that Ware translates *snying po med pa’i lus* as “a body without excellence.”

²²⁵ Tib. *rnam smin* = Skt. *vipāka*.

²²⁶ The Tibetan of the last two feet, with no significant variants, reads as follows: *snying po med pa ma lus las // ’gro kun snying por thob gyur cig /*. It is not impossible that *lus* was originally preceded by a genitive particle, in which case there would be a specific reference to the body: “May all living beings attain what is substantial / From the insubstantial body.”

diamond,²²⁷ by Aspirants to Awakening, it is certain that I am to give a gift of my marrow.’
When he gives that gift of his marrow, in accordance with an oath that was created by the
Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of my marrow, may I make
perfect the bodies of all beings to be indestructible, like a diamond.’”²²⁸ Then there were also
additional words:

“On account of this gift of my marrow,
May I make perfect the receptacle of
All beings’ putrid bodies²²⁹
[So that] it is indestructible, [like] a diamond.

“Furthermore, that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘Because I will get a [good]
complexion [*kha dog*] by giving things that look [*kha dog*] superb, it is certain that I am to give
things that look [*kha dog*] superb.’”²³⁰

“He [also] thinks:

‘By giving superb scents, I will get a well-regarded scent.’²³¹

‘By giving superb delicacies,²³² I will attain excellent necessities.

‘By giving superb objects, my feet and hands will become soft and tender.

‘By giving from my own hand,²³³ I will be paid honor.

²²⁷ Skt. *vajra*.

²²⁸ Cf. Braarvig, ed., *Akṣayamatīrdeśasūtra*, Vol. I, 31.31-33, which combines the gift of marrow with bones and has a very different reward from our text.

²²⁹ L, S, and T instead read “. . . [of] all beings’ own [*rang*, not *rnag*] bodies. . . .”

²³⁰ Cf. Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvādāna,” 42-43 (no. 6), where the donor of the same type of gift is said to attain a beautiful complexion (*kha dog mdzes pa*).

²³¹ Cf. *ibid.*, 43 (no. 7).

²³² Cf. *ibid.*, 43 (no. 8) and pp. 150-151 above.

‘By giving deferentially,²³⁴ I become worthy of honor by some among kinsmen and the like.

‘By giving at the right time,²³⁵ wealth will be procured and will expand at the right time.

‘By giving what is agreeable and delightful, I will think about enjoyable and delightful couches, clothing, and the like.²³⁶

‘By giving without harming others,²³⁷ I will attain enduring enjoyment.²³⁸

‘With a gift of putting up with²³⁹ what is disliked, I will become a beloved companion.²⁴⁰

‘By giving food, I will become strong.²⁴¹

‘By giving drinks [*skom pa*], I will be without thirst [*skom pa*].²⁴²

²³³ Cf. *ibid.*, 42 (no. 4).

²³⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, 41 (no. 3).

²³⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, 41 (no. 2).

²³⁶ I am not at all sure about the purport of this sentence: *'thun pa dang yid du 'ong ba byin pas ni mal dang gos la sogs pa longs spyod yid du 'ong ba rnams la sems 'jug par 'gyur /*. There may need to be a genitive particle added after *la sogs pa*, in which case the sentence might read as follows: “By giving what is agreeable and delightful, I will think about delightful possessions, such as couches and clothing.” This emendation, however, does little to help me understand what the sentence is supposed to mean.

²³⁷ Cf. Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvādāna,” 42 (no. 5), but note that only the Tibetan translation of the *Dānādhikaraṇa* has a phrase parallel to our text.

²³⁸ The second half of this sentence (*longs spyod brtan pa dag 'thob par 'gyur*) could also be read as “I will attain durable possessions.”

²³⁹ See *BHSD*, s.v. *adhivāsayati*. See Silk, “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 365, n. 5 on construing forms of *adhi√vās* (Tib. *dang du len pa*) strongly and in a positive sense as “consent to.”

²⁴⁰ Tib. *'khor* might be better rendered as “attendant” or even “advisor,” rather than “companion.” If there is a logical connection between the gift and karmic reward of this short sentence, its meaning escapes me. Perhaps the mark of a good companion or attendant is to put up with things—many of my friends, I am sure, feel that they have to put up with *me*—but that is pure speculation.

²⁴¹ Cf. Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvādāna,” 43 (no. 11), as well as pp. 142-143 and n. 97 above.

‘By giving clothing,²⁴³ I will get [a good] complexion.

‘By giving lamps, I will get vision.²⁴⁴

‘By giving music,²⁴⁵ I will have unimpaired ears.

‘By giving a vehicle,²⁴⁶ I will come to be at ease.²⁴⁷

‘By giving medicine,²⁴⁸ I will have little sickness.

‘By giving flowers,²⁴⁹ I will become worthy of being paid homage.

‘By giving flower garlands,²⁵⁰ I will become worthy of being exalted by others.

‘By giving praise, I will get the voice of Brahmā.²⁵¹

‘By giving mats,²⁵² I will attain a dignified state.

²⁴² Cf. *ibid.*, 44 (no. 12). The *Dānādhikaraṇa*’s parallel with our text is much closer here compared to the previous passage dealing with giving drinks. See pp. 143-144 above. Cf. *Manusmṛti* 4.229, which says that the donor of water gains satiety: *vāridas tṛptim āpnoti* (from Olivelle, ed. and trans., *Manu’s Code of Law*, 550).

²⁴³ Cf. *ibid.*, 44 (no. 13), as well as pp 136-137 above.

²⁴⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, 46 (no. 25). In the previous passage related to giving lamps, the reward is the divine eye (see p. 147 above). T has “strength” here instead of “vision” (*stobs* instead of *mig*), but this is almost certainly a copying mistake made under the influence of the sentence three lines prior to this one. The association between giving lamps or candles and acquiring good vision is still present in Thailand, if not the larger Theravāda world. See Justin McDaniel, *The Lovelorn Ghost and the Magical Monk: Practicing Buddhism in Modern Thailand* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), 138.

²⁴⁵ Cf. Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvādāna,” 46 (no. 24), as well as pp. 147-148 above.

²⁴⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, 44-45 (no. 16). See pp. 144-145 above and also a few lines below.

²⁴⁷ Once again in a gift of vehicles we have the association between *sukha* and vehicular axles.

²⁴⁸ Cf. *ibid.*, 45 (no. 17) and p. 156 above.

²⁴⁹ Cf. *ibid.*, 45-46 (no. 19).

²⁵⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, 46 (no. 20). The previous passage in our text combines flowers and flower garlands into one gift (see pp. 149-150 above).

²⁵¹ Cf. *ibid.*, 46 (no. 24), where Brahmā’s voice is instead (and perhaps more logically) the reward for giving music or a musical instrument.

‘By giving a vehicle, I will get supernatural power.’²⁵³

‘By giving ointment,²⁵⁴ I will be without wounds.

‘With the gift of sweeping, I will be free from impurity.’²⁵⁵

‘By giving a bell, I will become aware of former lives.’²⁵⁶

‘By giving a residence, I will give everything.’²⁵⁷

‘Because I will give what is immortal by giving the Law, it is certain that I am to give the gift of the Law.’²⁵⁸

²⁵² See pp. 154-155 above.

²⁵³ Cf. *ibid.*, 44-45 (no. 16). In the passage on pp. 144-145 above, the Aspirant to Awakening makes an oath to bring together both ease, the reward for giving a vehicle just a few lines up, and (the foundations of) supernatural power, the reward here.

²⁵⁴ Cf. pp. 148-149 above.

²⁵⁵ More literally, “dust” (Skt. *rajas*)—the image here is the sweeping up of literal and figurative dirt.

²⁵⁶ Here we have a “generalization of an old yogic attainment”—the acquisition of *jātismara* (Tib. *tshe rabs dran pa*), or the memory of former lives—that has nothing to do with meditation. See Gregory Schopen, “The Generalization of an Old Yogic attainment in Medieval Mahāyāna Sūtra Literature: Some Notes on *Jātismara*,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 190-220. The Mahāyāna texts Schopen cites each employ *jātismara* not as the result of deep states of meditation, with which it is usually associated, but as a reward for whatever sort of activity is being recommended—praising the Awakened One, preserving names, copying a text, etc. Our text, a discourse on giving, has plugged in *jātismara* as a reward for—what else?—giving. Cf. Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvādāna,” 46 (no. 23), but note that the *Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra* makes no mention of *jātismara*.

²⁵⁷ I am unsure about the meaning of this sentence, though the Tibetan is quite straightforward. Cf. *ibid.*, 44 (no. 14) and p. 151 above.

²⁵⁸ Cf. *ibid.*, 45 (no. 18). This section begins with “Because I will get a [good] complexion by giving things that look superb, it is certain that I am to give things that look superb”; it ends with “Because I will give what is immortal by giving the Law, it is certain that I am to give the gift of the Law.” The formula is: Because Y results by giving X, it is certain that I am to give X. There are twenty-five intervening statements in this section that follow a shorter formula: by giving X, Y. It is entirely possible that these twenty-five statements are meant to be read with the longer formula of the opening and concluding statements of this section. For instance, what I translated as “By giving a bell, I will become aware of former lives” might be better rendered as “[Because] I will become aware of former lives by giving a bell, [it is certain that I am to give a bell].”

“When he gives such a gift, he does not give with attachment, does not give with hostility, does not give with delusion, does not become irritated and give, does not give while feeling contempt, does not strike [another] and give, does not hold back and give, does not look down upon [another] and give, does not put down [another] and give, does not give while being inflated with pride, and does not give while slighting [another]. He does not give leftovers. Whatever gift that does not [involve] giving rotten and decomposed [things] is given differentially. He gives after having revered, venerated, done homage, and shown respect [to the recipient]. He gives a lot, gives fine [things], gives with extreme joy, gives with joy and contentment,²⁵⁹ gives pristinely and extensively, gives from his own hand,²⁶⁰ and gives with deference²⁶¹ and with esteem. He gives with pure, excellent, and virtuous intentions. He gives without avarice,²⁶² gives without longing, gives without dismay, and gives without fear. He gives extensively and broadly.

“When he gives such a gift, he does not think this: ‘Because the conduct of so-and-so is ethical, I must give [to him]; [but because] the conduct of such-and-such is unethical, [I must not]. So-and-so has good qualities, [so I must give to him]; [but] such-and-such does not have good qualities, [so I must not]. When one gives to so-and-so, there will be great karmic

²⁵⁹ Cf. *ibid.*, 49 (no. 34).

²⁶⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, 42 (no. 4) and p. 175 above.

²⁶¹ We just saw these last two phrases in succession. This section not only (tersely) repeats earlier parts of the text, but is internally redundant.

²⁶² Cf. *ibid.*, 41 (no. 1).

rewards, great benefits, and great might; [but] when one gives to such-and-such, there will be no great karmic rewards, no great benefits, and no great might.²⁶³

“Furthermore, he possesses correct intelligence, so he does not allow this to be thought when he gives that gift because it is not correct²⁶⁴: ‘On account of totally surrendering a gift for the sake of²⁶⁵ roots of virtue and righteousness [*chos*], may I become this or that king, a head minister, a god,²⁶⁶ a son of the gods, or any other god whatsoever.’

“But, how then? Instead, he redirects [the merit from giving] toward unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening. On account of totally surrendering [a gift] for the sake of these roots of virtue and righteousness [*chos*], he redirects [the merit], thinking, ‘May I bring across beings who have not crossed over, liberate the unliberated, give relief to those without relief, cause those who have not become totally extinct to become totally extinct,²⁶⁷ and become the guide, escort, deliverance, refuge, home, sanctuary, and defense for those who are without

²⁶³ I understand the opaque pronoun *'di* in these last few sentences to refer to hypothetical recipients of gifts.

²⁶⁴ While I understand the overall purport of this paragraph, I am not at all clear about how it begins: *gzhan yang yang dag pa'i blo dang ldan gyi yang dag pa ma yin pa'i phyir de sbyin pa de sbyin pa na*.

²⁶⁵ All the editions I have consulted have *sbyin pa 'di dang* here. I have omitted this phrase because it does not make sense to say “surrendering a gift for the sake of this gift . . .” and because it is absent in a parallel construction immediately below.

²⁶⁶ D adds *klu 'am* here, that is, a *nāga* or an “otherworldly snake.”

²⁶⁷ See Nattier, trans., *A Few Good Men*, 213 for the same list of vows in the *Ugrapariṣṭcchā-sūtra*, and *ibid.*, 148-151 for a short discussion about their occurrence in the *Ugrapariṣṭcchā* and other texts, including their adaptation from Mainstream sources.

protection, without refuge, homeless, without sanctuary, and defenseless [in] a world that is blind and without a guide.”²⁶⁸ Then this was said:

“On account of this gift [given] for the sake of righteousness,
May I bring beings
Across the ocean of cyclical existence²⁶⁹
By means of no other than the Great Vehicle.

“May I liberate all men
From the fetters of the defilements.
May I give relief to those without relief and
Show the path to extinction.

“May I become the escort
For the world that is blind and without a guide.
May I become the protection, defense,
Sanctuary, and refuge for living creatures.

“Son from a good family, in that way an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero makes strong efforts with regard to the Perfection of Giving.”

Then the Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero Giriguhaśikharagirikandarāntarakuñja-vijṛmbhaṇanādavinardottamasimhanarendracūḍāmaṇi, after hearing the analytical explanation of the Perfection of Giving from the Blessed One, felt satisfaction, contentment, delight, extreme joy, happiness, and pleasure, and then got up from his mat. After putting his upper robe over one shoulder, he put his right knee down on the center of the red lotus.²⁷⁰ He

²⁶⁸ I stretch the Tibetan syntax from this passage a little, based on the succeeding verses and parallel passages found elsewhere (e.g., J.S. Speyer, ed., *Avadānaśataka: A Century of Edifying Tales Belonging to the Hīnayāna*, Vol. I (Bibliotheca Buddhica 3) (1902; repr., The Hague: Mouton, 1958), 210-211).

²⁶⁹ Q, S, T instead have “May I liberate beings from the ocean of cyclical existence,” using the verb *grol* instead of *sgrol*. The difference in meaning is negligible.

²⁷⁰ Presumably this is the same flower on which he genuflected earlier in the text.

bent his cupped hands toward the Blessed One, and then gave approbation to the Blessed One with melodious verses:²⁷¹

“Making gifts is wonderful! It is wonderful, you who are always like a Father!
Making gifts is wonderful! It is wonderful, you who make this speech, Well Gone One!
It is wonderful, True Kinsman! It is wonderful, Friend and True Teacher!
It is wonderful, you who here alone are the Protection from hell!
It is wonderful, Senior! It is Wonderful, Superior among gods and men!
It is wonderful, Object of homage! It is wonderful, Hero among men!
It is wonderful, Speaker! It is wonderful, Great-Souled, Extremely Disciplined One!
It is wonderful, King of physicians who dispels the poison of the defilements of men!
It is wonderful, Liberator! It is wonderful, Absolute Liberator from the three [levels of] existence!
It is wonderful, Physician! It is wonderful, Ultimate Seeker who benefits [others] and Maker of gifts!
It is wonderful, Glorious One, One who has a mind directed toward auspicious things!
It is wonderful, Fortunate One, One who has a countenance without blemish, similar to the full moon!
It is wonderful, Intelligent One, One with broad, long, and azure eyes!²⁷²
It is wonderful, Magnificent One, One whose nose’s shape is marvelously proportioned!
It is wonderful, Well-spoken One, One whose ear lobes are similar to a golden plumb-line!²⁷³
It is wonderful, One whose teeth are similar to snow and shells! Obeisance!
It is wonderful, Chief, Superior, and Master, that today you have spoken thoroughly about the types of gifts to men, who afterwards will want to learn about ethical conduct, forbearance, strength, knowledge, strategies, meditation, supernatural power, and oaths.”²⁷⁴

After the Blessed One had spoken those words,²⁷⁵ the world, together with those Aspirants to Awakening—the Aspirant to Awakening Mañjuśrī the true prince, the Aspirant to Awakening Avalokiteśvara, Giriguhaśikharagirikandarāntarakuñjavijṛmbhaṇanāda-

²⁷¹ The following verses have eleven syllables per foot.

²⁷² This line has only nine syllables.

²⁷³ That is, they are a golden color and hang down toward the ground.

²⁷⁴ This string appears to be an alternative list of Mahāyāna Perfections appended to giving.

²⁷⁵ This ending is absolutely standard for Mahāyāna Sūtras. The Blessed One was not speaking immediately before this statement, which instead refers to his entire sermon.

vinardottamasimhanarendracūdāmaṇi, as well as the others—those sons of the gods, those four great kings, the gods, men, demigods, and celestial musicians, was delighted, and praised what had been spoken by the Blessed One.

The Great Vehicle Discourse named *The Noble Perfection of Giving* is complete.

Colophon:

Translated, edited, and established in its definitive form by Prajñāvarma, the Indian master,²⁷⁶ reverend Ye-shes-sDe, the chief editor and translator, et al.²⁷⁷

²⁷⁶ Tib. *mkhan po* = Skt. *upādhyāya* (Mvy. 8727).

²⁷⁷ For the Tibetan colophon I follow Florin Deleanu, *The Chapter on the Mundane Path (Laukikamārga) in the Śrāvakaḥūmi: A Trilingual Edition (Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese), Annotated Translation, and Introductory Study*, Vol. I: *Introductory Study, Sanskrit Diplomatic Edition, Sanskrit Critical Edition* (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series XXa) (Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 2006), 73 and 91, n. 2.

C. Tibetan Text

rgya gar¹ skad du / ārya dā na pā ra mi tā² nā³ ma ma⁴ hā⁵ yā na sū tra / bod skad du / 'phags pa sbyin pa'i pha rol tu⁶ phyin pa zhes bya ba theg⁷ pa chen po'i mdo /⁸ sangs rgyas dang⁹ byang chub sems dpa' thams cad la phyag 'tshal lo // 'di skad bdag gis thos pa dus gcig na / bcom ldan 'das nyid kyi rtsa lag¹⁰ dang / yul gyi mi rnams la phan gdags¹¹ pa'i phyir¹² ser skya'i gnas kyi grong khyer chen po na¹³ rgyal po¹⁴ zas gtsang gi kun dga' ra ba shing sā¹⁵ la dang / ta la dang / ta ma la dang / dong ka'i shing dang / rgya shug dang / star¹⁶ ga¹⁷ shing dang¹⁸ / 'bra¹⁹ go dang / shing²⁰ ba ṭa²¹ dang / ka dam²² ba²³ dang / a²⁴ mra dang / nyo ti²⁵ dang / skyu ru ra'i shing dang / bil ba²⁶ dang / bal po se'u dang / ka pid²⁷ tha²⁸ dang / chu shing dang / nya gro dha²⁹ dang / u dum ba³⁰ ra dang / ba ru ra'i shing dang / a shvad³¹ tha dang / bar shi³² ka³³ dang / sna ma dang / dha nu³⁴ ska³⁵ ri dang / a ti mug ta³⁶ dang / tsam pa³⁷ ka dang / mya ngan

¹ L: accidentally conflates *rgya gar*

² L and S: *ta*

³ N: *na*

⁴ T: omits (leaving only one *ma*)

⁵ S: appears to read *mhā* for *ma hā*

⁶ N: illegible; Q: *du*

⁷ L: "e" marker is written in the reverse direction (slanting upwards to the right), which L does occasionally to avoid writing over a letter or *danḍa* from the line above or over a vowel marker atop an adjacent letter

⁸ L, N, Q, and S: double *danḍa*

⁹ L and T: insert *danḍa*

¹⁰ T: *blag*

¹¹ Q: *bdags*

¹² L and S: insert *danḍa*

¹³ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

¹⁴ T: *pos*

¹⁵ L: *sa*

¹⁶ L: *ltar*

¹⁷ S: *ka'i*; T: *kha*

¹⁸ S: omits

¹⁹ L: *'gro*

²⁰ D: *shi*

²¹ L, S, and T: *ta*

²² L, Q, and S: *tam*; T: *ta ma* for *dam*

²³ D and T: *pa*; N: *tamba* for *dam ba*

²⁴ L and T: *am*

²⁵ N: *nyi ta* for *nyo ti*

²⁶ N: *bilba*

²⁷ L, S, and T: *bid*

²⁸ N: *pidtha*

²⁹ L: *da*; T: omits

³⁰ D and T: *bā*; N: *dumba* for *dum bā*; S: *wa* (= *lba*)

³¹ L: *shva*

³² N: *barshi*

³³ T: squeezes in *ka* between adjacent syllables, probably as a correction

³⁴ L: *na*

³⁵ Q: *ka*

³⁶ N: *mugta*

³⁷ L: *tsam ba*; N: *tsampa*

'tshang³⁸ dang / ta ra ni dang / skya³⁹ snar⁴⁰ dang / shi⁴¹ ri sha⁴² dang / a rdzu⁴³ na dang / shing ljon pa brgya stong du mas brgyan pa /⁴⁴ phu chu dang⁴⁵ 'bab chu'i dngo⁴⁶ dang / mtshe'u dang / lteng⁴⁷ ka dang / rdzing bu dang / khron pa dri zhim po dang⁴⁸ ldan pa⁴⁹ dag gis mdzes par byas pa / me tog utpa⁵⁰ la dang / pad ma⁵¹ dang / ku mu da⁵² dang / pad ma⁵³ dkar po dag gis gang ba⁵⁴ ⁵⁵ ngang pa dang / rma bya dang / khrung khrung⁵⁶ dang / ngur pa dang / khu⁵⁷ byug dang / chun lag dang / ne tso dang / ri skegs dang / shang shang te⁵⁸'u dang / tsa go⁵⁹ ra dang / 'jon⁶⁰ mo dang / ka ran da⁶¹ ba⁶² rnams skad 'byin pa / bung ba brgya stong dag gis mdzes par byas pa⁶³ / chu yan lag brgyad dang ldan pa⁶⁴ gsal zhing⁶⁵ dri zhim la shin tu⁶⁶ bsil ba dang / rnyog pa med cing rnam par dang bas yongs su gang ba⁶⁷ gsing ma sngo zhing 'jam la gzhon pa / dar dang / bal dang / srin bal dang / mon dar dang / ka tsa lin di⁶⁸ ka dang / zar ma'i gos ltar reg na bde ba / yid du⁶⁹ 'ong zhing gtsang la⁷⁰ rdo dang / gseg ma dang / gyo⁷¹ mo dang / bkra mi shis⁷² pa dang / 'dam rdzab dang / snyag snyig med pa'i sa phyogs bzang po⁷³ ri dags⁷⁴ sna

³⁸ T: *tshang*

³⁹ L: *skye*

⁴⁰ T: *nar*

⁴¹ Q: *sha*

⁴² N: *shirsha* for *shi ri sha*

⁴³ S and T: *ardzu*

⁴⁴ L, S, and T: omit *danḍa*

⁴⁵ L, Q, and S: insert *danḍa*

⁴⁶ N: *dngos*

⁴⁷ L: *ltang*

⁴⁸ L: inserts *danḍa*

⁴⁹ T: *ba*

⁵⁰ L, Q, and T: *ud pa*

⁵¹ L, N, and S: *padma*

⁵² L: omits; Q: *ta*; T: *dā*

⁵³ L, N, and S: *padma*

⁵⁴ L: *pa*

⁵⁵ Q: extra space may have been intended for a *danḍa*; L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

⁵⁶ T: omits (leaving only one *khrung*)

⁵⁷ T: *kha*

⁵⁸ T: *ti*

⁵⁹ D: *ko*

⁶⁰ T: 'dzon

⁶¹ N: *randa*

⁶² N: *pa*

⁶³ L: *ba*

⁶⁴ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

⁶⁵ Q: inserts *danḍa*

⁶⁶ Q: *du*

⁶⁷ L, N, Q, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

⁶⁸ N: *lindi* for *lin di*; Q: *da*

⁶⁹ T: combines *yid du* into one word, resulting in a *yid* with a "u" marker under the final "d"

⁷⁰ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

⁷¹ L: *gye*

⁷² L: *shes*

⁷³ L and S: insert double *danḍa*; T: inserts *danḍa*

⁷⁴ T: *dvags*

tshogs⁷⁵ ldang sko ska⁷⁶ dang / sha bkra⁷⁷ dang / spre'u dang / byi la dang / sre⁷⁸ mo dang / ri bong dang / dom dang / dred dang / bya'i tshogs kyis bsten pa⁷⁹ mtshan mo'i lha dang / lha'i bu mo dang⁸⁰ / 'jig rten skyong ba⁸¹ dang⁸² /⁸³ chu lha⁸⁴ dang / zhi ba dang / gshin rje dang / 'phags skyes po dang / lus ngan po dang / brgya byin dang / mig mi bzang dang / yul 'khor srung dang / lha ma yin dang / nam mkha'⁸⁵ lding dang / dri za dang / mi 'am ci dang / lto 'phye chen po 'bum dag gnas pa na rten⁸⁶ cing bzhugs te⁸⁷ dge slong gi dge 'dun chen po dge slong bdun khri bdun stong la⁸⁸ 'di lta ste / tshe dang ldan pa shā⁸⁹ ra dva ti'i bu dang / tshe dang ldan pa maud gal⁹⁰ gyi bu chen po dang / tshe dang ldan pa⁹¹ rab 'byor dang / tshe dang ldan pa ka⁹² pi⁹³ na dang / tshe dang ldan pa ba⁹⁴ lang⁹⁵ bdag dang / tshe dang ldan pa gsus po che⁹⁶ dang / tshe dang ldan pa⁹⁷ bha⁹⁸ ra dva⁹⁹ dza¹⁰⁰ dang / tshe dang ldan pa¹⁰¹ kun shes kau ṅḍi¹⁰² nya dang / tshe dang ldan pa¹⁰³ bzang ldan dang / tshe dang ldan pa gang po dang / tshe dang ldan pa rab tu bzang po dang / tshe dang ldan pa lam phran bstan¹⁰⁴ dang / tshe dang ldan pa ba¹⁰⁵ kku¹⁰⁶ la dang / tshe dang ldan pa¹⁰⁷ sgra gcan zin¹⁰⁸ dang / tshe dang ldan pa nye dga' bo dang¹⁰⁹ / tshe dang ldan pa dga' bo dang / tshe dang ldan pa kun dga' bo dang / de dag

⁷⁵ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

⁷⁶ T: omits

⁷⁷ L: *skra*

⁷⁸ Q: *sra*; L: *srin*

⁷⁹ L, Q, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

⁸⁰ N: *dag*

⁸¹ D: omits

⁸² N and Q: omit

⁸³ N: omits *danḍa*

⁸⁴ L, S, and T: *zla*

⁸⁵ L and T: combine the two syllables of this word, leaving what looks like *namkha'* (this occurs frequently in L)

⁸⁶ N: *brten*

⁸⁷ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

⁸⁸ L and T: insert *danḍa*

⁸⁹ D and L: *sha*

⁹⁰ L: *mo'u dgal*; N: *maudgal*; Q: *maud dgal*; S: *mo'u 'gal*; T: *mo'u gal*

⁹¹ T: *ba*

⁹² L and Q: *kab*

⁹³ L and T: *bi*

⁹⁴ T: omits

⁹⁵ N: *ba lang* is illegible

⁹⁶ L: *tshe*

⁹⁷ T: *ba*

⁹⁸ L: *pa*, possibly intended for *ba*; T: *ba*

⁹⁹ N and Q: *dhva*

¹⁰⁰ L, S, and T: *tsa*

¹⁰¹ T: *ba*

¹⁰² L and T: *ko'u 'di*; S: *ko'u di*

¹⁰³ T: *ba*

¹⁰⁴ N and Q: *stan*

¹⁰⁵ Q and T: omit; L: *pa*

¹⁰⁶ L and S: *ku*; T: *sku*

¹⁰⁷ T: *ba*

¹⁰⁸ S: *'dzin*

¹⁰⁹ T: inserts *la*

la sog¹¹⁰ pa dge slong bdun khri bdun¹¹¹ stong la¹¹² 'di lta ste / tshe dang ldan pa¹¹³ kun dga' bo gang¹¹⁴ zag gcig ma gtogs par thams cad kyang dgra bcom pa / zag pa zad pa /¹¹⁵ nyon mongs pa¹¹⁶ med pa / dbang dang¹¹⁷ ldan par¹¹⁸ gyur pa / sems shin tu¹¹⁹ rnam par grol ba /¹²⁰ shes rab shin tu¹²¹ rnam par grol ba / cang shes pa / glang po chen po /¹²² bya ba byas pa / byed¹²³ pa byas pa / khur bor ba / bdag gi¹²⁴ don rjes su¹²⁵ thob pa / srid par kun tu¹²⁶ sbyor ba¹²⁷ yongs su¹²⁸ zad pa / yang dag pa'i shes pas¹²⁹ sems shin tu¹³⁰ rnam par¹³¹ grol ba / sems¹³² thams cad ky¹³³ dbang dam pa'i pha rol tu son pa¹³⁴ sha stag dang thabs cig¹³⁵ go //¹³⁶ byang chub sems dpa'i tshogs chen po¹³⁷ byang chub sems dpa' bye ba 'bum phrag du ma la 'di lta ste / byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po byams pa dang / 'jam¹³⁸ dpal¹³⁹ gzhon nur gyur pa dang / spyan ras gzigs¹⁴⁰ dbang phyug dang / mthu chen thob dang / kun tu¹⁴¹ bzang po dang / nam mkha'¹⁴² snying po dang / lha'i cod pan dang / rin chen cod pan dang / lag na rin chen dang / rin chen 'od dang / rin chen snying po dang / rin chen gtsug phud¹⁴³ dang / rin chen seng ge

¹¹⁰ T: *stsogs*

¹¹¹ T: *pdun*

¹¹² T: omits

¹¹³ T: *ba*

¹¹⁴ T: omits

¹¹⁵ L: omits *danḍa*

¹¹⁶ T: omits

¹¹⁷ L: appears to read *dang*, but the writing here is extremely small and difficult to make out

¹¹⁸ T: *pa*

¹¹⁹ Q: *du*

¹²⁰ Q: omits *danḍa*

¹²¹ Q: *du*

¹²² L, Q, and S: double *danḍa*

¹²³ T: *byes*

¹²⁴ L and N: *gis*

¹²⁵ L and T: combine *rjes su* into one word, resulting in a *rjes* with a “u” marker under the final “s” (this occurs frequently in L)

¹²⁶ Q: *du*

¹²⁷ Q: inserts *danḍa*

¹²⁸ L and T: combine *yongs su* into one word, resulting in a *yongs* with a “u” marker under the final “s” (this occurs frequently in L)

¹²⁹ L and T: insert *danḍa*

¹³⁰ Q: *du*

¹³¹ L: accidentally splits *par* into two syllables, leaving *pa ra*

¹³² Q: inserts *can*

¹³³ S: *kyang*

¹³⁴ T: *ba*

¹³⁵ L, Q, and T: *gcig*

¹³⁶ N, Q, S, and T: single *danḍa*

¹³⁷ L: inserts double *danḍa*; S and T: insert *danḍa*

¹³⁸ T: *'jum*

¹³⁹ L: *dpa'*

¹⁴⁰ N: appears to read *gzags*, either because of an error or because the “i” marker has been effaced

¹⁴¹ Q: *du*

¹⁴² L: *namkha'*

¹⁴³ L and T: *puḍ*

dang / rin chen dra ba can dang / dra ba can gyi 'od dang /¹⁴⁴ nyi¹⁴⁵ 'od dang / zla 'od dang / mthu brtan dang / blo gros brtan dang / brtson 'grus brtan dang / mthu rtsal brtan¹⁴⁶ dang / spro ba brtan¹⁴⁷ ¹⁴⁸ dang / spro ba che ba dang / mchog tu dga' ba'i rgyal po dang / sman gyi rgyal po dang / sman yang dag 'phags dang / dge ba dri ma med pa rnam dag rin chen zla 'od rgyal po dang / pad ma¹⁴⁹;i 'dab¹⁵⁰ ma ltar dri ma med pa rgyu skar rgyal po mngon par¹⁵¹ shes pa'i me tog shin tu¹⁵² rgyas pa dang / bung ba dang /¹⁵³ snag sa¹⁵⁴ dang / rma bya dang / 'jon¹⁵⁵ mo dang / mugs gsal¹⁵⁶ ral pa'i thor tshugs¹⁵⁷ can dang / pad ma¹⁵⁸ dang / zla ba ltar¹⁵⁹ bzhin 'dzum zhing brjid la mdangs gsal ba dang / rin po che¹⁶⁰ mthon¹⁶¹ kha¹⁶² ltar mig shin tu¹⁶³ mdzes pa¹⁶⁴ yon tan rin po che'i tog dang / so mnyam zhing thags¹⁶⁵ bzang la dkar ba¹⁶⁶ dngul dang / dung dang / zla ba dang / ku mu da¹⁶⁷ dang / 'o ma ltar dkar ba dang / lce chu shing gi lo ma dang / ta la'i 'dab¹⁶⁸ ma ltar yangs shing zangs kyi glegs ma lta bu dang / khu byug dang / ne tso dang / ri¹⁶⁹ skegs dang / ku na la dang / ka la ping¹⁷⁰ ka¹⁷¹;i¹⁷² skad 'byin pa lta bur yid du 'ong ba'i nga ro'i gdangs nges par sgrogs pa dang / lus zla¹⁷³ ba dang / nyi ma¹⁷⁴ 'char ka dang / dong ka'i shing dang / sa ha ka ra dang / me tog 'byung ba'i ka¹⁷⁵ dam pa¹⁷⁶ lta bu dang / byang

¹⁴⁴ L: the presence of *dra ba* in the last two names has led to them being mistakenly combined in one line, leaving *rin chen dra ba ba can gyi 'od dang /* (an eye-skip plus the duplication of *ba*)

¹⁴⁵ L: *gnyi*

¹⁴⁶ L: prefix “b” is squeezed in at the upper left corner of the syllable; N: prefix “b” is mostly illegible

¹⁴⁷ N and Q: *bstan*

¹⁴⁸ L, S, and T: insert *pa*

¹⁴⁹ L, N and S: *padma*

¹⁵⁰ Q: *mdab*

¹⁵¹ T: *bar*

¹⁵² Q: *du*

¹⁵³ Q: omits *danḍa*

¹⁵⁴ L and Q: *snags* for *snag sa*

¹⁵⁵ Q and T: *'dzon*

¹⁵⁶ T: *mug gsal* for *mugs gsal*

¹⁵⁷ S: *tsugs*

¹⁵⁸ L, N, and S: *padma*

¹⁵⁹ L: inserts *danḍa*

¹⁶⁰ L: *rin che po* for *rin po che*, with *che* being squeezed in before *po* instead of after it

¹⁶¹ L: *thon*

¹⁶² D: *ka*

¹⁶³ Q: *du*

¹⁶⁴ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

¹⁶⁵ L: *thabs*; T: *thag*

¹⁶⁶ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

¹⁶⁷ Q: *ta*

¹⁶⁸ Q: *mdab*; T: *'dam*

¹⁶⁹ L: *re*

¹⁷⁰ L and S: *bing*

¹⁷¹ N: appears to read either *pingka* or *bingka* for *ping ka*

¹⁷² D, L, S, and T: omit the genitive particle

¹⁷³ N: faint trace of an “l” beneath appears to be there, but otherwise the syllable is *za*

¹⁷⁴ Q: *ma'i*

¹⁷⁵ T: inserts *ma*

¹⁷⁶ N: *ta mba* for *dam pa*

chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rkang¹⁷⁷ lag phra zhing mnyen¹⁷⁸ la gzhon sha chags shing¹⁷⁹
 srab¹⁸⁰ la¹⁸¹ 'jam zhing / me tog ltar shin tu¹⁸² gzhon la¹⁸³ rkang¹⁸⁴ lag gi sen mo zangs^{185 186} kyi
 mdog 'dra ba dang / de dag la sogs¹⁸⁷ pa byang chub sems dpa' dgu¹⁸⁸ khri dgu stong thams cad
 kyang phyir¹⁸⁹ mi ldog pa /¹⁹⁰ phyir mi ldog pa'i chos kyi 'khor lo skor¹⁹¹ ba / bdud dang /¹⁹²
 phyir rgol ba nges par bcom pa / bdud kyi las thams cad las yang dag par 'das pa / de bzhin
 gshegs pa thams cad kyi yul la 'jug pa shes pa la¹⁹³ mkhas pa/^{194 195} mngon par shes pa /¹⁹⁶ dpa'¹⁹⁷
 bar¹⁹⁸ 'gro ba'i ting nge¹⁹⁹ 'dzin gyi mtha²⁰⁰'i sgo bsgrub pa'i gzungs thob pa / pha rol tu²⁰¹ phyin
 pa thams cad la thabs²⁰² mkhas pa rtogs par khong²⁰³ du chud pa / 'jig rten gyi khams tha dad
 pa ston pa / go cha chen po bgos pa / sangs rgyas kyi yon tan la the tsom²⁰⁴ med pa / nyon
 mongs pa dang nye ba'i nyon mongs pa'i bag chags thams cad la sems pas²⁰⁵ bag chags dang²⁰⁶
 mtshams sbyor ba dang²⁰⁷ bcas par mngon pa'i nga rgyal yang dag par bcom²⁰⁸ nas /²⁰⁹ dul ba
 dang /²¹⁰ nges²¹¹ pa dang ldan pa²¹² /²¹³ dran pa nye bar gzhas²¹⁴ pa dang / yang dag par²¹⁵ sponge

¹⁷⁷ D and L: *rka*; T: appears to squeeze “ng” of *rkang* beneath and between the preceding *rka* and the following *lag*, but the writing here is extremely small and difficult to make out

¹⁷⁸ N: appears to read *mnyan*, either because of an error or because the “e” marker has been effaced

¹⁷⁹ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

¹⁸⁰ T: accidentally splits *srab* into two syllables, leaving *sra ba*

¹⁸¹ T: omits

¹⁸² Q: *du*

¹⁸³ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

¹⁸⁴ D, L, and T: *rka*

¹⁸⁵ S: *bzangs*

¹⁸⁶ L: *mongs* for *mo zangs*

¹⁸⁷ T: *stsogs*

¹⁸⁸ T: *dgra*

¹⁸⁹ L: omits

¹⁹⁰ Q: omits the first *phyir mi ldog pa* and the *danḍa*

¹⁹¹ L: “o” marker is only partly legible; S: *bskor*

¹⁹² L, S, and T: omit *danḍa*

¹⁹³ L: *las*

¹⁹⁴ L, N, Q, S, and T: omit *danḍa*

¹⁹⁵ Q: inserts another *mngon par shes pa*; L, S, and T: insert another *mngon par shes pa* / (with a *danḍa*); N: inserts *mngon par shes pas* (with an instrumental)

¹⁹⁶ L, N, Q, S, and T: omit *danḍa*

¹⁹⁷ T: appears to have accidentally written a *danḍa* in the middle of *dpa'*, right after “dp”

¹⁹⁸ L: *par*

¹⁹⁹ T: combines *ting nge* into one word, leaving *tinge* (with the “i” and “e” markers immediately next to each other)

²⁰⁰ L: *mtho*

²⁰¹ Q: *du*

²⁰² S: inserts *la*

²⁰³ Q: *khongs*

²⁰⁴ Q and S: *tshom*; L: *tshem*

²⁰⁵ N and Q: insert *danḍa*

²⁰⁶ L, N, Q, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

²⁰⁷ L: inserts *danḍa*

²⁰⁸ T: squeezes in a tiny prefix “b”

²⁰⁹ Q: omits *danḍa*

²¹⁰ L, S, and T: omit *danḍa*

²¹¹ D and Q: possibly *des*

²¹² T: *ba*

²¹³ N and Q: omit *danḍa*

ba dang / rdzu 'phrul gyi rkang pa dang / dbang po dang / stobs dang / byang chub kyi yan lag dang / lam la zhugs pa²¹⁶ byams pa dang / snying rje dang / dga' ba dang / btang snyoms dang / bzod pa dang / bsam pa²¹⁷ dang / bag la nyal phun sum tshogs pa /²¹⁸ nga²¹⁹ rgyal dang / rgyags pa dang / dregs pa dang / nyes rtsom dang / khengs pa dang / ser sna dang / ngar 'dzin pa dang / nga yir 'dzin pa dang / lhag par zhen²²⁰ pa dang / chags pa dang / zhen pa dang / brgyal²²¹ ba dang / sred pa dang / mngon par²²² zhen pa dang²²³ bral²²⁴ ba²²⁵ bskal pa bye ba khrag khrig 'bum phrag grangs med par²²⁶ bdag²²⁷ la phan pa²²⁸ dang / gzhan la phan pa²²⁹ dang / bde bar sbyor ba la brtson la²³⁰ / dge ba'i rtsa ba shin tu²³¹ bsags²³² shing²³³ tshogs rdzogs par byas pa'i rgyud can²³⁴ sgyu²³⁵ dang / g.yo dang²³⁶ brdzun dang / phra ma dang /²³⁷ ngag rtsub po²³⁸ dang / gsod²³⁹ pa²⁴⁰ dang / gnod par byed pa dang / 'ching ba dang / lta ba ngan pas gzings²⁴¹ pa dang / sdigs²⁴² pa dang / rtsod pa dang / 'thab pa dang / 'breg²⁴³ pa dang / 'khrug long dang / 'gyed pa dang / nye ba'i nyon mongs pa dang bral ba sha stag dang / 'jig rten skyong ba²⁴⁴ bzhi po 'di lta ste / rgyal po chen²⁴⁵ po rnam²⁴⁶ thos kyi bu dang / rgyal po chen po yul 'khor srung dang / rgyal po chen po 'phags skyes po dang / rgyal po²⁴⁷ chen po mig mi

²¹⁴ N: *bzhag*

²¹⁵ N: *pa'i*

²¹⁶ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

²¹⁷ L: *ba*

²¹⁸ N: omits *daṅḍa*

²¹⁹ N: *de*

²²⁰ L: accidentally splits *zhen* into two syllables, leaving *zhe na*

²²¹ S: *rgyal*

²²² T: *bar*

²²³ L and N: insert *daṅḍa*

²²⁴ L: *'bral*

²²⁵ L, Q, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

²²⁶ Q: the woodblock has been re-cut to squeeze in *mang por* here

²²⁷ T: *dga'*

²²⁸ L: *ba*

²²⁹ L: *ba*

²³⁰ L, Q, S, and T: *pa*

²³¹ Q: *du*

²³² L: *bstsags*

²³³ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

²³⁴ N: the letter *ca* of *can* is mostly effaced, but what is present at the top makes the reading seem certain

²³⁵ N: this syllable is impossible to make out, and looks as much like *spru* or *spu* as *sgyu*

²³⁶ L, Q, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

²³⁷ Q: omits the entire phrase *phra ma dang* plus the *daṅḍa*

²³⁸ L: *pa*

²³⁹ L: *bsod*

²⁴⁰ N: *ba*

²⁴¹ L: *gzigs*

²⁴² D and N: *bsdigs*; S: *sdig*

²⁴³ L: possibly *'phreg*; S: *'bregs*

²⁴⁴ N and Q: omit

²⁴⁵ L: accidentally splits *chen* into two syllables, leaving *che na*

²⁴⁶ T: *mams*

²⁴⁷ S: while “p” has accidentally been omitted, the “o” marker is actually present above the right half of the preceding “l”

bzang rang rang gi²⁴⁸ g.yog²⁴⁹ 'khor gyis bskor ba rnam dang / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po
 lngas rtsen rang gi bu'i 'khor dang bcas pa dang / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po lag na rdo
 rje rang gi gnod sbyin gyi 'khor dang bcas pa dang / 'byung po²⁵⁰ chen po'i ma 'phrog ma rang
 gi gnod sbyin mo'i 'khor dang bcas pa dang /²⁵¹ dung can ma dang / mdung thogs ma dang / ser
 mo dang / dka²⁵² bzlog²⁵³ ma dang / dpal²⁵⁴ gyi lha mo chen mo dang / dbyangs can ma dang /
 'jigs²⁵⁵ byed ma dang / zla ba²⁵⁶ dang / lha'i dbang po brgya byin dang / lha'i bu dbang phyug
 chen po dang / mi mjed kyi bdag po tshangs pa rang gi lha'i bu'i 'khor²⁵⁷ dang bcas pa dag dang
 / klu'i rgyal po ma dros pa dang /²⁵⁸ klu'i rgyal po rgya²⁵⁹ mtsho rang rang gi klu'i 'khor dang
 bcas pa dag dang / nam mkha'²⁶⁰ lding gi dbang po gzi chen dang / nam mkha'²⁶¹ lding gi²⁶²
 dbang po lus chen rang rang gi nam mkha'²⁶³ lding gi 'khor dang bcas pa dag dang / lha ma²⁶⁴
 yin gyi dbang po stobs can dang / lha ma yin gyi dbang po sgra gcan rang rang gi tshogs kyī
 'khor dang bcas pa dag dang / mi 'am ci'i rgyal po ljon pa rang gi mi 'am ci'i 'khor dang bcas pa
 dang / dri za'i bu zur phud²⁶⁵ lnga pa²⁶⁶ rang gi 'khor dang bcas pa dang / de las gzhan pa lha
 dang / klu dang / gnod sbyin dang / dri za dang / lha ma yin dang / nam mkha'²⁶⁷ lding dang /
 mi 'am ci dang / lto 'phye chen po dang / mi dang²⁶⁸ mi ma yin pa gzi²⁶⁹ brjid che ba²⁷⁰ dpag tu
 med /²⁷¹ grangs med pa dag dang yang thabs cig²⁷² ste / rigs bzhi po bram ze dang / rgyal rigs
 dang / rje'u rigs dang / dmangs rigs rnam dang / 'khor bzhi po dge slong dang / dge slong ma
 dang / dge bsnyen²⁷³ dang / dge bsnyen ma rnam dang / shākya²⁷⁴ bye ba khrag khrig phrag²⁷⁵

²⁴⁸ L: *gis*

²⁴⁹ Q: inserts *daṅḍa*

²⁵⁰ N: *bo*

²⁵¹ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²⁵² S: *bka'*

²⁵³ D: *zlog*

²⁵⁴ L: *dpa'*

²⁵⁵ L: *'jig*

²⁵⁶ S: inserts *ma*

²⁵⁷ N: *'khar*

²⁵⁸ T: repeats the entire phrase *klu'i rgyal po ma dros pa dang* plus the *daṅḍa*

²⁵⁹ N: *brgya*

²⁶⁰ L: *namkha'*

²⁶¹ L: *namkha'*

²⁶² L: omits

²⁶³ L: *namkha'*

²⁶⁴ N: *mi*

²⁶⁵ T: *pud*

²⁶⁶ D: *ba*

²⁶⁷ L: *namkha'i*

²⁶⁸ S: inserts *daṅḍa*

²⁶⁹ N: *gza*

²⁷⁰ D, L, N, and T: repeat *gzi brjid che ba*. The scribe and/or editor of S has almost certainly made a correction to remove the repetition, since there is a gap in the text here (or more precisely, an inserted series of dots) of just the right size

²⁷¹ L, S, and T: omit *daṅḍa*

²⁷² L, Q, and T: *gcig*

²⁷³ L and T: insert *ma*

²⁷⁴ D: *shā kya*

²⁷⁵ Q: omits

'bum dag dang / rgyal po rnams dang / blon po²⁷⁶ chen po²⁷⁷ rnams dang / grong rdal gyi mi rnams dang / yul gyi mi rnams dang / khyim bdag dang / blon po dang / pho²⁷⁸ brang 'khor gyi mi dang²⁷⁹ / sgo dpon gyi 'khor rnams kyis bskor cing mdun gyis bltas nas²⁸⁰ bkur sti²⁸¹ byas / bla mar byas / ri mo²⁸² byas / mchod pa byas te / bcom ldan 'das kyis na bza' dang / zhal zas dang / gzims cha dang / gdan dang /²⁸³ snyun²⁸⁴ gyi²⁸⁵ gsos²⁸⁶ sman dang / yo byad mang po gya nom pa²⁸⁷ dag brnyes²⁸⁸ shing²⁸⁹ phyogs bcu'i 'jig rten gyi khams rab 'byam²⁹⁰ dpag tu med²⁹¹ /²⁹² grangs med pa dag tu yang²⁹³ / bcom ldan 'das kyi²⁹⁴ grags²⁹⁵ pa dang²⁹⁶ /²⁹⁷ sgra²⁹⁸ dang / tshigs su²⁹⁹ bcad³⁰⁰ pa³⁰¹ rgya cher mngon par grags³⁰² so³⁰³ // rdo rje'i snying po'i³⁰⁴ sa phyogs mnyam zhing yid du 'ong la³⁰⁵ rgya che zhing yangs pa / chag chag legs par btab pa³⁰⁶ / phyag³⁰⁷ dar³⁰⁸ legs par byas pa / legs par rnam par phye ba / pog snod nas bdugs pa / me tog ut³⁰⁹ pa³¹⁰ la dang³¹¹ /³¹² pad ma³¹³ dang / ku mu da³¹⁴ dang / pad ma³¹⁵ dkar po dang / a ti mug ta³¹⁶ ka dang /

²⁷⁶ Q: omits

²⁷⁷ Q: repeats *chen po*

²⁷⁸ N: “o” marker is only partly legible

²⁷⁹ T: *rnams*

²⁸⁰ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

²⁸¹ L: *bsti*

²⁸² L: *mor*

²⁸³ N: omits *danḍa*

²⁸⁴ T: *gsnyun*

²⁸⁵ L, N, Q, S, and T: omit

²⁸⁶ L: *gsol*

²⁸⁷ L: *ba*

²⁸⁸ L: *bsnyes*; N: appears to read *brnyas*, either because of an error or because the “e” marker has been effaced

²⁸⁹ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

²⁹⁰ L, S, and T: *'byams*

²⁹¹ L, S, and T: insert *pa*

²⁹² L, S, and T: omit *danḍa*

²⁹³ N: *'ang*

²⁹⁴ L: *kyis*

²⁹⁵ L: *grangs*

²⁹⁶ Q: omits

²⁹⁷ N: omits *danḍa*

²⁹⁸ N: appears to read *sga*, either because of an error or because the subjoined “r” has been effaced

²⁹⁹ L: combines *tshigs su* into one word, resulting in a *tshigs* with a “u” marker under the final “s”

³⁰⁰ L: *gcad*

³⁰¹ L: repeats *pa*

³⁰² L: *grangs*

³⁰³ T: combines *grags so* into one word, resulting in a *grags* with an “o” marker over the final “s”

³⁰⁴ L: omits the genitive particle

³⁰⁵ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

³⁰⁶ L: *ba*

³⁰⁷ L: *phyad*

³⁰⁸ S: *bdar*

³⁰⁹ Q and T: *ud*; L: *u da* (probably accidentally splitting *ud* into two syllables)

³¹⁰ N and S: *utpa*

³¹¹ Q: omits

³¹² N and Q: omit *danḍa*

³¹³ L and S: *padma*; N: almost completely illegible, but probably read *padma*

³¹⁴ Q: *ta*; T: *dā*

³¹⁵ L, N, and S: *padma*

ka dam³¹⁷ pa³¹⁸ dang / par³¹⁹ shi³²⁰ ka dang / ta ra ni dang / skya snar dang / mya ngan 'tshang dang / ko ran 'da³²¹ ka dang / sna ma dang / u thi³²² ka 'i³²³ me tog dag bkram pa / rin po che³²⁴ sna tshogs kyi shing ljon pas mdzes par byas pa³²⁵ na³²⁶ seng ge'i khri rin po che³²⁷; i snying po dang / rin po che'i ras bcos bu 'bum dag bting ba³²⁸ / rin po³²⁹ che'i bla re bres³³⁰ pa / rin po che³³¹; i dril bu g.yer ka 'i³³² dra ba bres pa / rin po che³³³; i lda ldi spyangs pa /³³⁴ rin po che sna tshogs kyi spras³³⁵ pa /³³⁶ nor bu dang / gser dang / rdo rje dang / bai³³⁷ ḍūrya³³⁸ dang /³³⁹ mu tig dang / dung³⁴⁰ dang / man shel dang / byi³⁴¹ ru dang / an da³⁴² rnyil dang / rdo'i snying po dang / ma rgad dang / spug dang / shel dang / rin po che bye ba khrag khrig phrag³⁴³ 'bum³⁴⁴ dag gis brgyan pa la bzhugs te³⁴⁵ / dbang po zhi ba³⁴⁶ 347 thugs zhi ba³⁴⁸ 349 dul ba dang³⁵⁰ zhi gnas dam pa brnyes pa / dul ba dang zhi gnas mchog brnyes pa / bsrungs³⁵¹ pa / gtso bor gyur pa / dbang po thul ba /³⁵² mtsho ltar dang zhing³⁵³ gsal la rnyog pa med pa³⁵⁴ / rin po che'i mchod

³¹⁶ N: *mugta*

³¹⁷ Q: *tam*

³¹⁸ N: *tampa*

³¹⁹ L, S, and T: *bar*

³²⁰ N: squeezes *shi* beneath and between the surrounding syllables *par* and *ka*

³²¹ D and T: *ran da*; S: *randa* (followed by a small series of dots, indicative of a possible correction)

³²² L, S, and T: *ti*

³²³ L: omits the 'a for the genitive particle, leaving what looks like *ki* with a displaced "i" marker

³²⁴ N and Q: insert *me tog*

³²⁵ Q: omits

³²⁶ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

³²⁷ L: "e" marker is almost or entirely absent

³²⁸ S: inserts *dang*

³²⁹ L: omits

³³⁰ L: 'bres; N: *dres*

³³¹ L: "e" marker is barely legible

³³² L, S, and T: omit the genitive particle

³³³ L: "e" marker is barely legible

³³⁴ N and Q: omit *daṅḍa*

³³⁵ T: *smras*

³³⁶ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

³³⁷ Q: *be*

³³⁸ D: *dūrya*; L: *ḍū rya*; Q: *dū rya*

³³⁹ L: omits *dang* and the *daṅḍa*

³⁴⁰ Q: *gdung*

³⁴¹ N: *byu*

³⁴² N: *anda*

³⁴³ L, S, and T: omit

³⁴⁴ T: 'bu

³⁴⁵ Q: *brgyan cing bzhugs te* for *brgyan pa la bzhugs te*

³⁴⁶ L and T: *pa*

³⁴⁷ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

³⁴⁸ L: *pa*

³⁴⁹ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

³⁵⁰ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*

³⁵¹ Q: *srungs*

³⁵² Q: omits *daṅḍa*

³⁵³ N: inserts *daṅḍa*

³⁵⁴ Q is entirely different here: *mchog rnyed pa thugs dul ba rnyog pa med pa*

sdong³⁵⁵ ltar mngon par 'phags pa³⁵⁶ dpal³⁵⁷ 'bar zhing lham³⁵⁸ me³⁵⁹ lhan³⁶⁰ ner³⁶¹ bzhugs pa /
 sku skyes bu chen po'i mtshan sum cu³⁶² rtsa gnyis kyis legs par brgyan pa / sku dpe byad
 bzang po³⁶³ brgyad cus³⁶⁴ mdzes par byas pa / rgya mtsho chen po ltar dam pa'i chos kyis chus
 yongs su³⁶⁵ gang ba /³⁶⁶ ri rab ltar mi bskyod³⁶⁷ pa / sa ltar sems can thams cad kyis nye³⁶⁸ bar
 'tsho ba /³⁶⁹ chu ltar dge ba'i rtsa ba rab tu skyed³⁷⁰ pa / tha snyad ltar thugs mnyam pa³⁷¹ / nam
 mkha'³⁷² ltar gos pa med pa / nyi ma ltar mi shes pa'i mun pa sel ba / zla ba ltar dkar po'i chos
 yongs su³⁷³ rdzogs pa / yid bzhin gyi nor bu ltar bsam pa thams cad yongs su³⁷⁴ rdzogs par
 mdzad pa³⁷⁵ / nyi ma ltar shar ba / nyi ma ltar gzi brjid kyis lam me ba / zla ba ltar bsil³⁷⁶ zhing
 sim par³⁷⁷ mdzad pa / rgya mtsho ltar rin po che'i 'byung gnas su³⁷⁸ gyur pa³⁷⁹ rgya³⁸⁰ mtsho ltar
 zab pa / me'i phung po ltar snang ba / lus mi bskyod pa / sems mi g.yo ba / zhi zhing rab tu zhi
 ba / dbang po 'khrul pa mi mnga' ba³⁸¹ / ma khengs³⁸² shing mi rgod pa³⁸³ /³⁸⁴ dran pa³⁸⁵ legs
 par³⁸⁶ nye bar bzhag³⁸⁷ pa / spyod lam mdzes pa / legs par mnyam par bzhag³⁸⁸ pa / rtag tu
 mnyam³⁸⁹ par bzhag³⁹⁰ pa / phyi ma'i mtha'i bskal pa bye ba phrag 'bum du³⁹¹ dge ba'i rtsa ba

³⁵⁵ L: *stong*

³⁵⁶ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

³⁵⁷ L: *dpa'*

³⁵⁸ D, N, and Q: *lam*

³⁵⁹ Q: combines *lam me* into one word, leaving *lame*

³⁶⁰ N and Q: *lha*

³⁶¹ N: appears to read *nar*, either because of an error or because the “e” marker has been effaced

³⁶² Q: *bcu*

³⁶³ D and Q: *pos*

³⁶⁴ D and Q: omit *brgyad cus*

³⁶⁵ L: *yongsu*

³⁶⁶ N: omits *danḍa*

³⁶⁷ T: *skyod*

³⁶⁸ L: *nya*

³⁶⁹ L and T: omit *danḍa*

³⁷⁰ L, Q, and S: *bskyed*

³⁷¹ L: *ba*

³⁷² L and T: *namkha'*

³⁷³ L: *yongsu*

³⁷⁴ L: *yongsu*

³⁷⁵ S: *ba*

³⁷⁶ L and T: *bstsil*

³⁷⁷ L and T: *bar*

³⁷⁸ L: combines *gnas su* into one word, resulting in a *gnas* with a “u” marker under the final “s”

³⁷⁹ L, Q, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

³⁸⁰ T: omits

³⁸¹ T: inserts *dang*

³⁸² D: *khangs*

³⁸³ D: inserts *dang*

³⁸⁴ N: either omits the *danḍa* (with possibly some extra space being intended for one) or only the faintest trace of its bottom remains

³⁸⁵ T: *ba*

³⁸⁶ N and Q: *pa*

³⁸⁷ D, L, and T: *gzhaḡ*

³⁸⁸ D and L: *gzhaḡ*

³⁸⁹ L: a large ° in the upper right hand corner either marks an omission or the final “m” of *mnyam*

³⁹⁰ D: *gzhaḡ*

thams cad yang dag par bsgrubs pa³⁹² / bsod nams kyī tshogs thams cad bsags³⁹³ pa / pha rol tu³⁹⁴ phyin pa thams cad la thabs mkhas pa / rtogs par thugs su chud pa / sangs rgyas dang³⁹⁵ byang chub sems dpa'i sa thams cad la rnam³⁹⁶ par rol pa / byang chub sems dpa'i spyod pa thams cad thugs kyis spyad pa / sems can thams cad kyis phan pa dang³⁹⁷ bde ba 'thob³⁹⁸ par³⁹⁹ bya ba'i phyir brtson pa⁴⁰⁰ de⁴⁰¹ chos ston te / tshangs par⁴⁰² spyod pa / thog mar dge ba / bar du dge ba / tha mar dge ba / don bzang po /⁴⁰³ tshig 'bru bzang po /⁴⁰⁴ ma 'dres pa / yongs su⁴⁰⁵ rdzogs pa / yongs su⁴⁰⁶ dag pa / yongs su⁴⁰⁷ byang ba / dri ma med pa / 'od gsal ba / yid du⁴⁰⁸ 'ong ba / yid du 'thad pa / yid sim⁴⁰⁹ par⁴¹⁰ byed pa / yid shin tu⁴¹¹ dga' bar byed pa / yid skul bar byed pa /⁴¹² yid mgu⁴¹³ zhing rgyas par byed pa / rnam par dag pa / 'jigs pa med pa / mi rtsub pa / brtan pa /⁴¹⁴ zab pa / mi g.yo ba / mi 'gyur ba⁴¹⁵ / brtag⁴¹⁶ tu med⁴¹⁷ pa / rtog ge⁴¹⁸ i spyod yul ma yin pa / bsam gyis mi khyab pa / rmad⁴¹⁹ du byung ba / brjod⁴²⁰ du med⁴²¹ pa'i⁴²² yang⁴²³ brjod du med pa /⁴²⁴ ston cing⁴²⁵ 'chad de rnam par 'byed la⁴²⁶ 'grel^{427 428} cing gsal bar

³⁹¹ T: another *phrag* for *du*

³⁹² N: *ba*

³⁹³ L: *bstsags*

³⁹⁴ Q: *du*

³⁹⁵ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*

³⁹⁶ L: *rnam*

³⁹⁷ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*

³⁹⁸ L and T: *thob*

³⁹⁹ T: *bar*

⁴⁰⁰ L: *ba*

⁴⁰¹ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*

⁴⁰² Q: *pa*

⁴⁰³ L and Q: double *daṅḍa*

⁴⁰⁴ L: double *daṅḍa*

⁴⁰⁵ L: *yongsu*

⁴⁰⁶ L: *yongsu*

⁴⁰⁷ L: *yongsu*

⁴⁰⁸ L: combines *yid du* into one word, resulting in a *yid* with a “u” marker under the final “d”

⁴⁰⁹ N: *sims*

⁴¹⁰ L: *bar*

⁴¹¹ Q: *du*

⁴¹² Q: omits the entire phrase *yid skul bar byed pa* plus the *daṅḍa*. There is no evidence that the woodblock was altered

⁴¹³ L: 'gu; S and T: 'gul

⁴¹⁴ N and Q: omit *daṅḍa*

⁴¹⁵ T: *la*

⁴¹⁶ S: *rtag*

⁴¹⁷ L: *mid*

⁴¹⁸ D and Q: insert *ba*

⁴¹⁹ Q: *smad*

⁴²⁰ L: “o” marker is barely legible

⁴²¹ L: “e” marker is almost or entirely absent

⁴²² L: “i” marker is barely legible

⁴²³ L: repeats *brjod du med pa'i yang* (possibly because the first attempt was poorly written)

⁴²⁴ L, S, and T: omit *daṅḍa*

⁴²⁵ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

⁴²⁶ L: inserts a deformed *daṅḍa*; S and T: insert *daṅḍa*

⁴²⁷ L: 'brel

⁴²⁸ L: something has been effaced here, possibly a *daṅḍa*

mdzad do // de'i tshe byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po ri'i phug dang / zom dang / ri sul dang / gseb dang / sman ljongs⁴²⁹ na seng ge'i mchog rnam par bsgyings shing⁴³⁰ nga ro rnam par sgrogs pa lta bu'i mi'i dbang po'i gtsug gi nor bu zhes bya ba /⁴³¹ gzugs bzang ba /⁴³² mdzes pa /⁴³³ blta na⁴³⁴ sdug pa / kha dog bzang po⁴³⁵ / rgyas⁴³⁶ pa⁴³⁷ mchog dang ldan pa⁴³⁸ sngon gyi rgyal ba⁴³⁹ rnams la lhag par bya ba byas pa⁴⁴⁰ / dge ba'i rtsa ba bskyed pa / sangs rgyas bye ba khrag khrig 'bum phrag mang po la⁴⁴¹ bsnyen bkur byas pa⁴⁴² /⁴⁴³ dkon mchog gsum gyi gdung 'tshob pa⁴⁴⁴ / snying rje can /⁴⁴⁵ spobs pa thogs pa med pa⁴⁴⁶ / skye dgu la mnyes gshin pa⁴⁴⁷ / dad pa bzang ba / bsam pa dge ba / brtan pa / zab pa / snying brtse⁴⁴⁸ ba can / snying rje dang ldan pa / des pa /⁴⁴⁹ 'grogs na bde ba / mkhas pa /⁴⁵⁰ mdzangs⁴⁵¹ pa /⁴⁵² gsal ba / yid gzhungs⁴⁵³ pa⁴⁵⁴ /⁴⁵⁵ shes⁴⁵⁶ nyen⁴⁵⁷ dang ldan pa⁴⁵⁸ /⁴⁵⁹ le lo med pa / shin tu dul ba / dge des che ba / sgyu can ma yin pa / g.yo med pa / mi rtsub pa / mi brlang ba / drang ba /⁴⁶⁰ nga rgyal⁴⁶¹ dang⁴⁶² / rgyags pa dang / dregs pa dang / tha ba⁴⁶³ dang / khro ba dang / phrag dog dang / ser sna dang / ngar 'dzin pa dang / nga yir 'dzin pa dang⁴⁶⁴ /⁴⁶⁵ lhag par zhen pa

⁴²⁹ L: *ljon*; T: *ljong*

⁴³⁰ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

⁴³¹ S: omits *danḍa*

⁴³² Q: omits *danḍa*

⁴³³ Q: omits *danḍa*

⁴³⁴ L: accidentally conflates *blta na*, leaving what looks like *bltan*

⁴³⁵ Q: *ba*

⁴³⁶ T: *rgyas* is written over the preceding *danḍa*

⁴³⁷ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

⁴³⁸ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

⁴³⁹ L: *pa*

⁴⁴⁰ N: *ba*

⁴⁴¹ L: inserts *danḍa*

⁴⁴² N: *ba*

⁴⁴³ Q: omits *danḍa*

⁴⁴⁴ L: *ba*

⁴⁴⁵ L and Q: omit *danḍa*

⁴⁴⁶ N: *ba*

⁴⁴⁷ N: *ba*

⁴⁴⁸ L and N: *rtse*

⁴⁴⁹ Q: omits *danḍa*

⁴⁵⁰ Q: omits *danḍa*

⁴⁵¹ L and Q: *'dzangs*

⁴⁵² L and T: omit *danḍa*

⁴⁵³ L and T: *bzhungs*

⁴⁵⁴ Q: *yid gzhung na* for *yid gzhungs pa*

⁴⁵⁵ Q: omits *danḍa*

⁴⁵⁶ L, Q, S, and T: *bshes*

⁴⁵⁷ L, N, S, and T: *gnyen*

⁴⁵⁸ T: *ba*

⁴⁵⁹ N and T: omit *danḍa*

⁴⁶⁰ Q: omits *danḍa*

⁴⁶¹ Q: inserts *ba*

⁴⁶² Q: omits

⁴⁶³ D: *'thab pa* for *tha ba*

⁴⁶⁴ L: omits

⁴⁶⁵ L: double *danḍa*

dang / sdug bsngal ba dang / yid mi bde ba dang / ma⁴⁶⁶ rig pa dang⁴⁶⁷ bral ba dang⁴⁶⁸ / bsod
 nams dang ldan pa⁴⁶⁹ zhig 'khor de nyid du 'dus par gyur te 'dug go // ⁴⁷⁰ de nas byang chub
 sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po ri'i⁴⁷¹ phug dang / zom dang / ri sul dang / gseb⁴⁷² dang / sman
 ljongs⁴⁷³ na seng ge'i mchog rnam par bsgyings shing⁴⁷⁴ nga ro rnam par sgrogs pa lta bu'i⁴⁷⁵
 mi'i dbang po'i⁴⁷⁶ gtsug gi nor bu stan las langs te / ⁴⁷⁷ bla gos phrag pa gcig tu gzar⁴⁷⁸ nas / ⁴⁷⁹
 pus⁴⁸⁰ mo g.yas pa'i lha nga⁴⁸¹ pad ma⁴⁸² i snying po la btsugs te / bcom ldan 'das ga la ba de
 logs⁴⁸³ su thal mo sbyar ba btud⁴⁸⁴ nas / bcom ldan 'das la 'di skad ces gsol to // gal te bdag gis
 zhus nas zhu ba⁴⁸⁵ lan gdab pa'i slad du⁴⁸⁶ / bcom ldan 'das kyis skabs phye na⁴⁸⁷ / ⁴⁸⁸ bcom ldan
 'das de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas la bdag phyogs 'ga'
 zhig zhu bar 'tshal lo // de skad ces gsol pa dang / bcom ldan 'das kyis⁴⁸⁹ byang chub sems dpa'
 sems dpa' chen po ri'i⁴⁹⁰ phug dang / zom dang / ri sul dang / gseb dang / sman ljongs⁴⁹¹ na
 seng ge'i mchog rnam par bsgyings shing⁴⁹² nga ro rnam par sgrogs pa lta bu'i mi'i dbang po'i
 gtsug gi nor bu la 'di skad ces bka' stsal to // rigs kyi bu khyod la sangs rgyas dang / ⁴⁹³ byang
 chub sems dpa' thams cad rtag tu skabs 'byed kyis / ⁴⁹⁴ rigs kyi bu khyod kyis⁴⁹⁵ de bzhin gshegs
 pa dgra bcom pa⁴⁹⁶ yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas la ci dang ci 'dod pa⁴⁹⁷ dris shig dang /
 ngas dris pa de dang de'i lan btab pas⁴⁹⁸ ⁴⁹⁹ khyod kyi sems rangs par bya'o // de skad ces⁵⁰⁰ bka'

⁴⁶⁶ L: *mi*

⁴⁶⁷ L and N: insert *danḍa*

⁴⁶⁸ L, S, and T: omit

⁴⁶⁹ T: *ba*

⁴⁷⁰ N, Q, S, and T: single *danḍa*

⁴⁷¹ N and Q: omit the genitive particle

⁴⁷² N: "e" marker is almost or entirely absent; T: accidentally splits *gseb* into two syllables, leaving *gse ba*

⁴⁷³ L, Q, and T: *ljong*

⁴⁷⁴ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

⁴⁷⁵ Q: omits the genitive particle

⁴⁷⁶ L: omits the genitive particle

⁴⁷⁷ Q: omits *danḍa*

⁴⁷⁸ L and T: *bzar*

⁴⁷⁹ Q: omits *danḍa*

⁴⁸⁰ L: *phus*

⁴⁸¹ T: inserts *sa*

⁴⁸² L, N, and S: *padma*; T: *lad pa* for *pad ma*

⁴⁸³ L: a second, misplaced "o" marker sits atop the final "s"

⁴⁸⁴ L: *btu*; Q: *bdud*

⁴⁸⁵ L, S, and T: *zhus pa'i* for *zhu ba*

⁴⁸⁶ Q: *zhu ba lung bstan pa'i slad du* for *zhu ba lan gdab pa'i slad du*

⁴⁸⁷ Q: *ba*

⁴⁸⁸ Q: omits *danḍa*

⁴⁸⁹ S: inserts *danḍa*

⁴⁹⁰ N: *chen po'i ri* for *chen po ri'i* (i.e., the genitive particle has been displaced)

⁴⁹¹ L, Q, and T: *ljong*

⁴⁹² L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

⁴⁹³ Q and S: omit *danḍa*

⁴⁹⁴ L, Q, and T: omit *danḍa*

⁴⁹⁵ N and Q: *kyi*

⁴⁹⁶ T: *ba*

⁴⁹⁷ N: mostly illegible

⁴⁹⁸ L: *bas*

⁴⁹⁹ L and T: insert *danḍa*

stsal pa dang / bcom ldan 'das la⁵⁰¹ byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po ri'i phug dang / zom dang / ri sul⁵⁰² dang / gseb dang / sman ljongs⁵⁰³ na⁵⁰⁴ seng ge'i mchog rnam par bsgyings⁵⁰⁵ shing /⁵⁰⁶ nga ro rnam par sgrogs pa lta bu'i mi'i dbang po'i gtsug⁵⁰⁷ gi nor bus 'di skad ces gsol to // bcom ldan 'das rigs kyi bu 'am⁵⁰⁸ rigs kyi bu mo dang po⁵⁰⁹ sems bskyed pas⁵¹⁰ gang la mngon par⁵¹¹ brtson par bgyi⁵¹² lags / de skad ces⁵¹³ gsol pa dang / bcom ldan 'das kyi byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po ri'i phug dang / zom dang / ri sul⁵¹⁴ dang / gseb⁵¹⁵ dang / sman ljongs⁵¹⁶ na seng ge'i mchog rnam par bsgyings⁵¹⁷ shing / nga ro rnam par sgrogs pa⁵¹⁸ lta bu'i mi'i dbang po'i gtsug gi⁵¹⁹ nor bu la legs so //⁵²⁰ zhes bya ba byin te / rigs kyi bu legs so legs so⁵²¹ // rigs kyi bu khyod de bzhin gshegs pa la don 'di yongs su⁵²² dri bar sems pa ni khyod yang legs so⁵²³ //⁵²⁴ de'i phyir rigs kyi bu khyod legs par rab tu nyon la⁵²⁵ yid la⁵²⁶ zung⁵²⁷ shig⁵²⁹ dang⁵³⁰ ngas bshad do // byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po ri'i⁵³¹ phug dang /⁵³² zom⁵³³ dang / ri sul dang / gseb⁵³⁴ dang / sman ljongs⁵³⁵ na seng ge'i mchog rnam par bsgyings

⁵⁰⁰ N: *cas*

⁵⁰¹ S: inserts *daṅḍa*

⁵⁰² N and Q: *ri'i sul*

⁵⁰³ L, Q, and T: *ljong*

⁵⁰⁴ T: squeezes *na* beneath and between the surrounding syllables *ljong* and *seng*

⁵⁰⁵ T: *bgyings*

⁵⁰⁶ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

⁵⁰⁷ L: *btsug*

⁵⁰⁸ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

⁵⁰⁹ Q: appears to read *dad pa* for *dang po*

⁵¹⁰ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*

⁵¹¹ L, S, and T: omit *mngon par*; N: *la mngon par* is almost completely illegible, though what can be seen and the apparent size of the syllables would certainly support this reading

⁵¹² Q: *gyi*

⁵¹³ L: omits

⁵¹⁴ N and Q: *ri'i sul*

⁵¹⁵ N: only the prefix “g” and the “e” marker are legible

⁵¹⁶ L, Q, and T: *ljong*

⁵¹⁷ T: *bgyings*

⁵¹⁸ Q: inserts *daṅḍa*

⁵¹⁹ S: *gyi*

⁵²⁰ L, Q, S, and T: omit double *daṅḍa*; N: single *daṅḍa*

⁵²¹ L: combines each *legs so* into one word, resulting in two *legs* with an “o” marker over the final “s”; N: second *legs so* is almost completely illegible; T: combines the second *legs so* into one word, resulting in a *legs* with an “o” marker over the final “s”

⁵²² L: *yongsu*

⁵²³ L: combines *legs so* into one word, resulting in a *legs* with an “o” marker over the final “s” (this occurs frequently in L)

⁵²⁴ Q: single *daṅḍa*

⁵²⁵ T: inserts *rigs*

⁵²⁶ L: appears to read *du* for *la*, but the writing here is extremely small and difficult to make out

⁵²⁷ N: *gzung*; Q: *bzung*

⁵²⁸ T: omits *yid la zung*

⁵²⁹ N and S: *zhig*

⁵³⁰ N and Q: omit

⁵³¹ L: omits the genitive particle

⁵³² N: omits *phug dang* plus the *daṅḍa*

⁵³³ L: *zlom*

⁵³⁴ T: *gsep*

shing /⁵³⁶ nga ro rnam par sgrogs pa lta bu'i mi⁵³⁷; i dbang po'i gtsug gi nor bus⁵³⁸ /⁵³⁹ bcom ldan 'das la legs so zhes gsol nas /⁵⁴⁰ bcom ldan 'das kyi⁵⁴¹ ltar nyan pa dang / bcom ldan 'das kyis de la bka' stsal pa / rigs kyi bu byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po dang po sems bskyed pas⁵⁴² dge ba bcu'i las kyi lam dag la mngon par⁵⁴³ brtson par⁵⁴⁴ bya'o // rigs kyi bu de la byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po dge ba bcu⁵⁴⁵; i⁵⁴⁶ las kyi lam dag la ji ltar mngon par⁵⁴⁷ brtson par byed ce na⁵⁴⁸ rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po ni srog gcod pa spangs pa yin /⁵⁴⁹ log par lta ba⁵⁵⁰; i bar dag spangs⁵⁵¹ pa yin no // ⁵⁵² rigs kyi bu de la byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po srog gcod pa spangs pa ji lta⁵⁵³ bu yin zhe na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / srog ces bya ba ni tha na srog chags grog⁵⁵⁴ sbur yan chad la yang⁵⁵⁵ sdug cing phangs⁵⁵⁶ la dga' zhing yid du 'ong ba yin te / bdag la yang⁵⁵⁷ srog⁵⁵⁸ 'di sdug cing phangs⁵⁵⁹ la dga' zhing yid du 'ong ba yin gyis⁵⁶⁰ su yang⁵⁶¹ bdag la gsod pa 'am / gsod du 'jug pa 'am /⁵⁶² bsad pa la rjes su⁵⁶³ yi⁵⁶⁴ rang bar ma gyur cig⁵⁶⁵ bdag gis kyang su la yang⁵⁶⁶ bsad⁵⁶⁷ par mi bya / gsod⁵⁶⁸ du gzhug par mi bya / gsod⁵⁶⁹ pa la rjes su yi rang bar mi bya'o snyam mo // rigs kyi bu de ltar na byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po srog gcod pa

⁵³⁵ L, Q, and T: *ljong*

⁵³⁶ L, N, S, and T: omit *daṅḍa*

⁵³⁷ L: *ma*

⁵³⁸ L: *bur*

⁵³⁹ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

⁵⁴⁰ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

⁵⁴¹ N: *kyis*

⁵⁴² L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

⁵⁴³ T: *bar*

⁵⁴⁴ T: *bar*

⁵⁴⁵ L: *cu*

⁵⁴⁶ T: inserts *sangs rgyas* (with the final “s” of *rgyas* being almost completely effaced)

⁵⁴⁷ T: *bar*

⁵⁴⁸ L, Q, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

⁵⁴⁹ N: omits *daṅḍa*

⁵⁵⁰ L: omits

⁵⁵¹ Q: *spongs*

⁵⁵² T: single *daṅḍa*

⁵⁵³ L: *ltar*

⁵⁵⁴ L: *grogs*

⁵⁵⁵ L and T: omit; N: 'ang

⁵⁵⁶ S: 'phangs

⁵⁵⁷ N: 'ang

⁵⁵⁸ N: looks like *sreg*, most likely because the right half of the “o” marker has rubbed off

⁵⁵⁹ S: 'phangs

⁵⁶⁰ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

⁵⁶¹ N: 'ang

⁵⁶² N: omits *daṅḍa*

⁵⁶³ L: *rjesu*

⁵⁶⁴ Q: *yid*

⁵⁶⁵ L, Q, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

⁵⁶⁶ N: 'ang

⁵⁶⁷ L and S: *gsad*

⁵⁶⁸ L: *gsad*; S and T: *bsad*

⁵⁶⁹ L: *gsad*; S and T: *bsad*

spangs pa yin no // de la 'di skad ces bya ste /⁵⁷⁰ mngal na gnas pa yan chad kyang //⁵⁷¹ kun la srog ni sdug pa'i phyir //⁵⁷² bdag gi srog phangs⁵⁷³ gang yin pa //⁵⁷⁴ de ni srog chags gsod mi byed //⁵⁷⁵ de la ma byin par len pa⁵⁷⁶ spangs pa ji lta bu yin zhe na / rigs kyi bu 'di la⁵⁷⁷ byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / nor zhes bya ba ni tha na⁵⁷⁸ rigs ngan dang / g.yung po yan chad la yang⁵⁷⁹ ⁵⁸⁰ sdug cing phangs⁵⁸¹ la dga' zhing yid du 'ong ba yin te /⁵⁸² bdag la yang⁵⁸³ nor 'di sdug cing phangs⁵⁸⁴ la dga' zhing yid du 'ong ba yin gyis⁵⁸⁵ su yang⁵⁸⁶ bdag la 'phrog pa 'am / 'phrog tu 'jug pa 'am / phrogs⁵⁸⁷ pa la rjes su⁵⁸⁸ yi rang bar ma gyur cig /⁵⁸⁹ bdag gis kyang su la yang⁵⁹⁰ dbrog⁵⁹¹ par mi bya⁵⁹² / 'phrog⁵⁹³ tu gzhus⁵⁹⁴ par mi bya / phrogs pa la⁵⁹⁵ rjes su yi rang bar mi bya'o⁵⁹⁶ snyam mo //⁵⁹⁷ rigs kyi bu de ltar na byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po ma byin par len pa spangs pa yin no //⁵⁹⁸ de la 'di skad ces bya ste /⁵⁹⁹ shing dang bong ba yan chad la //⁶⁰⁰ gzhan gyi⁶⁰¹ bor⁶⁰² bar⁶⁰³ gyur pa yang //⁶⁰⁴ gang la pha yi⁶⁰⁵ nor sdug pa //⁶⁰⁶ de ni nor la 'phrog mi byed //⁶⁰⁷ de la 'dod pas⁶⁰⁸ log par g.yem pa⁶⁰⁹ spangs pa ji lta bu

⁵⁷⁰ Q: double *daṅḍa*

⁵⁷¹ L and S: single *daṅḍa*

⁵⁷² L and S: single *daṅḍa*

⁵⁷³ S: 'phangs

⁵⁷⁴ L, S, and T: single *daṅḍa*

⁵⁷⁵ L: single *daṅḍa*; Q: omits double *daṅḍa*

⁵⁷⁶ T: *par*

⁵⁷⁷ L: omits 'di la

⁵⁷⁸ L: squeezes in *na* between adjacent syllables (though it is still of normal size), probably as a correction

⁵⁷⁹ N: 'ang

⁵⁸⁰ L: squeezes in *la yang* between adjacent syllables, probably as a correction

⁵⁸¹ Q and S: 'phangs

⁵⁸² Q: omits *daṅḍa*

⁵⁸³ N: 'ang

⁵⁸⁴ S: 'phangs

⁵⁸⁵ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

⁵⁸⁶ N: 'ang

⁵⁸⁷ N and Q: 'phrog

⁵⁸⁸ L: *rjesu*

⁵⁸⁹ N: either omits the *daṅḍa* or only a faint trace of its top remains

⁵⁹⁰ N: 'ang

⁵⁹¹ L, Q, S, and T: 'phrog

⁵⁹² T: *bya'* (as if *bya'o* was meant to be written)

⁵⁹³ N: *phrog*

⁵⁹⁴ N: *gzhus*

⁵⁹⁵ L, N, Q, S, and T: *phrogs pa'i* for *phrogs pa la*

⁵⁹⁶ Q: inserts *daṅḍa*

⁵⁹⁷ N: omits double *daṅḍa*; Q: single *daṅḍa*

⁵⁹⁸ Q: single *daṅḍa*

⁵⁹⁹ Q: double *daṅḍa*

⁶⁰⁰ L and S: single *daṅḍa*

⁶⁰¹ L and T: *gyis*

⁶⁰² S: *bong*

⁶⁰³ L: *ba*

⁶⁰⁴ L: single *daṅḍa*

⁶⁰⁵ N: *phan pa'i* for *pha yi*; Q: *pha'i* for *pha yi*

⁶⁰⁶ L and S: single *daṅḍa*

⁶⁰⁷ L and Q: single *daṅḍa*

⁶⁰⁸ L: *pa*; S and T: *pa la* for *pas*

yin zhe na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te /⁶¹⁰ chung ma zhes bya ba ni tha na dud 'gro'i skye gnas su gyur pa rnam la yang⁶¹¹ /⁶¹² sdug cing phangs⁶¹³ la dga' zhing yid du 'ong ba yin te / bdag la yang⁶¹⁴ chung ma⁶¹⁵ sdug cing phangs⁶¹⁶ la dga' zhing yid du 'ong ba yin gyis / su yang⁶¹⁷ bdag la 'phrog pa 'am / 'phrog tu⁶¹⁸ 'jug pa 'am / phrogs pa la rjes su⁶¹⁹ yi⁶²⁰ rang ba 'am / nan gyis⁶²¹ mnan te /⁶²² dga' dgur yongs su⁶²³ longs spyod⁶²⁴ par ma gyur cig / bdag gis kyang su la yang⁶²⁵ ⁶²⁶ dbrog⁶²⁷ par mi bya / 'phrog tu gzhug par mi bya / phrogs pa la rjes su⁶²⁸ yi rang bar mi⁶²⁹ bya / nan gyis mnan te /⁶³⁰ dga' dgur longs spyod⁶³¹ par mi bya'o snyam mo // rigs kyi bu de⁶³² ltar na⁶³³ byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po 'dod pa la log par g.yem pa spangs pa yin no // de la 'di skad ces bya ste /⁶³⁴ bran mor gyur pa yan chad kyang //⁶³⁵ gzhan gyi⁶³⁶ bzha⁶³⁷ par gyur pa la //⁶³⁸ gang la rang gi chung⁶³⁹ ma sdug / de ni chung ma 'phrog mi byed //⁶⁴⁰ de la brdzun du smra ba spangs pa⁶⁴¹ ji lta⁶⁴² bu⁶⁴³ yin zhe na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / bden pa zhes bya ba de ni tha na gnod sbyin dang /⁶⁴⁴ 'byung po dang / sha za rnam la⁶⁴⁵ yang⁶⁴⁶ sdug cing phangs⁶⁴⁷ la dga'

⁶⁰⁹ L: ba

⁶¹⁰ L and T: omit *danḍa*

⁶¹¹ N: 'ang

⁶¹² L, Q, S, and T: omit *danḍa*

⁶¹³ S: 'phangs

⁶¹⁴ N: 'ang

⁶¹⁵ D, L, S, and T: insert 'di

⁶¹⁶ S: 'phangs

⁶¹⁷ N: 'ang

⁶¹⁸ Q: du

⁶¹⁹ L: rjesu

⁶²⁰ Q: yid

⁶²¹ Q: gyi

⁶²² L, S, and T: omit *danḍa*

⁶²³ L: yongsu

⁶²⁴ D: spyad

⁶²⁵ N: 'ang

⁶²⁶ T: lang for la yang (intended for la 'ang?)

⁶²⁷ L: dbyog; T: 'brog

⁶²⁸ L: rjesu

⁶²⁹ L: squeezes in mi between adjacent syllables, using the left vertical bar of the “b” of bya as the right vertical bar of its “m”

⁶³⁰ L, S, and T: omit *danḍa*

⁶³¹ D: spyad

⁶³² Q: 'di

⁶³³ Q: omits

⁶³⁴ T: double *danḍa*

⁶³⁵ L: single *danḍa*

⁶³⁶ S and T: gyis

⁶³⁷ N: gzhag

⁶³⁸ L: single *danḍa*

⁶³⁹ L: chub

⁶⁴⁰ L: single *danḍa*

⁶⁴¹ L: omits

⁶⁴² L: ltar

⁶⁴³ L: omits

⁶⁴⁴ Q: omits *danḍa*

zhing yid du 'ong ba yin te / bdag la yang⁶⁴⁸ bden⁶⁴⁹ pa 'di sdug⁶⁵⁰ cing phangs⁶⁵¹ la /⁶⁵² dga'
 zhing yid du 'ong ba yin gyis⁶⁵³ / su yang⁶⁵⁴ bdag la brdzun⁶⁵⁵ du smra bas⁶⁵⁶ sun 'byin pa 'am /
 sun 'byin du 'jug pa 'am / sun phyung⁶⁵⁷ ba la rjes su⁶⁵⁸ yi rang⁶⁵⁹ bar ma gyur cig / bdag gis
 kyang su la yang⁶⁶⁰ brdzun du smra bas sun dbyung bar mi bya / sun 'byin du⁶⁶¹ gzhug par⁶⁶² mi
 bya / sun phyung ba⁶⁶³ la rjes su yi rang bar mi bya'o snyam mo // rigs kyi bu de ltar⁶⁶⁴ na
 byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po brdzun du smra ba spangs pa yin no // de la 'di skad
 ces bya ste / gnod⁶⁶⁵ sbyin 'byung po yan chad kyang //⁶⁶⁶ gang la bden par⁶⁶⁷ smra ba sdug /
 shes rab can de brdzun⁶⁶⁸ tshig gis //⁶⁶⁹ lus can rnam la sun mi 'byin //⁶⁷⁰ de la phra ma'i tshig
 spangs pa ji lta bu yin zhe na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te /
 phra ma'i tshig ces bya ba ni /⁶⁷¹ tha na gang zag phra ma can rnam la yang⁶⁷² yid⁶⁷³ mi sdug
 cing mi 'dod la / mi dga' zhing yid du mi 'ong ba yin te⁶⁷⁴ / bdag la yang⁶⁷⁵ phra ma'i tshig 'di mi
 sdug cing mi 'dod la⁶⁷⁶ mi dga' zhing yid du mi 'ong ba yin gyis / su⁶⁷⁷ yang⁶⁷⁸ bdag la phra ma
 zer bas gleng⁶⁷⁹ ba 'am / gleng du 'jug pa 'am / glengs pa la rjes su⁶⁸⁰ yi rang bar⁶⁸¹ ma gyur cig

⁶⁴⁵ Q: omits

⁶⁴⁶ N: 'ang

⁶⁴⁷ S: 'phangs

⁶⁴⁸ N: 'ang

⁶⁴⁹ T: appears almost like *bden*, as if the final “n” was written over what was originally an “m”

⁶⁵⁰ N: appears to read *sdag*, either because of an error or because the “u” marker has been effaced

⁶⁵¹ S: 'phangs

⁶⁵² L, Q, S, and T: omit *danḍa*

⁶⁵³ N: only the “i” marker above is clearly legible

⁶⁵⁴ N: 'ang

⁶⁵⁵ L and T: *rdzun*

⁶⁵⁶ T: *smras pas* for *smra bas*

⁶⁵⁷ L: *byung*

⁶⁵⁸ L: *rjesu*

⁶⁵⁹ T: *rangs*

⁶⁶⁰ N: appears to read 'ang, but the syllable is mostly illegible

⁶⁶¹ L: *tu*

⁶⁶² D and S: *bar*

⁶⁶³ Q: repeats *ba*

⁶⁶⁴ N: “t” is not legible

⁶⁶⁵ L: final “d” is written over another letter or part of a letter, probably as a correction

⁶⁶⁶ L and S: single *danḍa*

⁶⁶⁷ L and S: *pa*; T: *ba*

⁶⁶⁸ N: *de brdzun* is mostly illegible, though what can be seen and the apparent size of the syllables makes this reading almost certain

⁶⁶⁹ L and S: single *danḍa*

⁶⁷⁰ L: single *danḍa*

⁶⁷¹ L, Q, S, and T: omit *danḍa*

⁶⁷² N: 'ang

⁶⁷³ Q: omits *la yang yid*

⁶⁷⁴ N: *gyis* for *te* (most likely under the influence of the following line)

⁶⁷⁵ N: 'ang

⁶⁷⁶ L and T: *pa*

⁶⁷⁷ L, S, and T: insert *la*

⁶⁷⁸ N: 'ang

⁶⁷⁹ L: appears to read *glang*, but a splotch on and above the final “ng” may have been the original “e” marker

⁶⁸⁰ L: *rjesu*

/⁶⁸² bdag gis kyang su la yang⁶⁸³ phra ma zer bas gleng bar mi bya / gleng du gzhug⁶⁸⁴ par⁶⁸⁵ mi bya / glengs⁶⁸⁶ pa la rjes su⁶⁸⁷ yi rang bar mi bya'o snyam mo // rigs kyi bu de ltar na byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po phra ma'i tshig spangs pa yin no // de la ngag rtsub po⁶⁸⁸ smra⁶⁸⁹ ba spangs pa ji lta bu yin zhe na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de⁶⁹⁰ 'di snyam du sems te / ngag rtsub po⁶⁹¹ zhes bya ba ni tha na gang zag ngag rtsub po dang ldan pa rnams la yang⁶⁹² mi⁶⁹³ sdug cing mi 'dod la⁶⁹⁴ mi dga' zhing yid du mi 'ong ba⁶⁹⁵ yin te / bdag la yang⁶⁹⁶ ngag rtsub po 'di mi sdug cing mi 'dod la⁶⁹⁷ mi dga' zhing yid du mi 'ong ba yin gyis /⁶⁹⁸ su yang⁶⁹⁹ bdag la ngag rtsub po smra ba dang / gtum pa⁷⁰⁰ i tshig dang /⁷⁰¹ brlang ba'i tshig dang / mi bden pa⁷⁰² i tshig gis⁷⁰³ tho⁷⁰⁴ 'tsham⁷⁰⁵ pa 'am / tho⁷⁰⁶ 'tsham⁷⁰⁷ du 'jug pa 'am / tho⁷⁰⁸ 'tshams⁷⁰⁹ pa la rjes su⁷¹⁰ yi rang bar ma gyur cig / bdag gis kyang su la yang⁷¹¹ ngag rtsub po smra ba dang / gtum pa⁷¹² i tshig dang / brlang ba'i tshig dang / mi bden pa'i tshig gis⁷¹³ tho⁷¹⁴ btsam⁷¹⁵ par⁷¹⁶ mi bya⁷¹⁷ /⁷¹⁸ tho⁷¹⁹ btsam⁷²⁰ du gzhug⁷²¹ par⁷²² mi bya / tho⁷²³ btsams⁷²⁴ pa la rjes

⁶⁸¹ T: *rangs par* for *rang bar*

⁶⁸² Q: omits *danḍa*

⁶⁸³ N: 'ang

⁶⁸⁴ S: *gzhugs*

⁶⁸⁵ L: *pa*

⁶⁸⁶ L: *gleng*

⁶⁸⁷ L: *rjesu*

⁶⁸⁸ T: *bo*

⁶⁸⁹ L: smudged space to the right of *smra* indicates a correction

⁶⁹⁰ N: *dpa' de* is only partially legible, though what can be seen and the apparent size of the syllables makes this reading almost certain

⁶⁹¹ T: *bo*

⁶⁹² N: 'ang

⁶⁹³ L: omits

⁶⁹⁴ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

⁶⁹⁵ L: *pa*

⁶⁹⁶ N: 'ang

⁶⁹⁷ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

⁶⁹⁸ N and Q: omit *danḍa*

⁶⁹⁹ N: 'ang

⁷⁰⁰ L: *ba*

⁷⁰¹ Q: omits *danḍa*

⁷⁰² T: *ba*

⁷⁰³ N: *gi*

⁷⁰⁴ L: *thob*; N and S: *mtho*

⁷⁰⁵ L: *mtsham*

⁷⁰⁶ N and S: *mtho*

⁷⁰⁷ L: 'tshan

⁷⁰⁸ N: *mtho*

⁷⁰⁹ L, S, and T: *btsams*; N and Q: *brtsams*

⁷¹⁰ L: *rjesu*

⁷¹¹ N: 'ang

⁷¹² L: *ba*

⁷¹³ N: *gi*

⁷¹⁴ N and S: *mtho*

⁷¹⁵ N: 'tsham; Q: *brtsams*

⁷¹⁶ L and T: *bar*

⁷¹⁷ S: *bya'o*

⁷¹⁸ S: double *danḍa*

su⁷²⁵ yi rang bar⁷²⁶ mi bya'o snyam mo //⁷²⁷ rigs kyi bu de ltar na byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po ngag rtsub po spangs pa yin no // de la 'di skad ces bya⁷²⁸ ste⁷²⁹ /⁷³⁰ gang dag su yang⁷³¹ rung ba la //⁷³² phra ma ngag rtsub mi sdug pa //⁷³³ de ni phra⁷³⁴ ma mi zer te //⁷³⁵ rtsub pa'i tshig kyang srung⁷³⁶ bar byed //⁷³⁷ de la tshig kyal⁷³⁸ pa⁷³⁹ spangs pa ji lta bu yin zhe na /⁷⁴⁰ rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po⁷⁴¹ de 'di snyam du sems te / tshig kyal⁷⁴² pa⁷⁴³ zhes bya ba ni tha na gang zag tshig kyal⁷⁴⁴ pa⁷⁴⁵ can dag la yang⁷⁴⁶ ⁷⁴⁷ mi sdug cing mi 'dod la⁷⁴⁸ mi dga' zhing yid du mi 'ong ba yin te / bdag la yang⁷⁴⁹ tshig kyal⁷⁵⁰ pa⁷⁵¹ 'di mi sdug cing mi 'dod la /⁷⁵² mi dga' zhing yid du mi 'ong ba yin gyis /⁷⁵³ su yang⁷⁵⁴ bdag la tshig kyal⁷⁵⁵ pa⁷⁵⁶ smra⁷⁵⁷ bas⁷⁵⁸ dran par⁷⁵⁹ byed pa⁷⁶⁰ 'am / dran par⁷⁶¹ byed du 'jug pa 'am / dran par byas pa

⁷¹⁹ N and S: *mtho*

⁷²⁰ N: 'tsham; Q: *brtsam*

⁷²¹ T: *bzhug*

⁷²² L: *pa*

⁷²³ N and S: *mtho*

⁷²⁴ N and Q: *brtsams*

⁷²⁵ L: *rjesu*

⁷²⁶ Q: omits

⁷²⁷ Q: single *daṅḍa*

⁷²⁸ D: *byas*

⁷²⁹ D: omits

⁷³⁰ T: double *daṅḍa*

⁷³¹ N: 'ang

⁷³² L and T: single *daṅḍa*

⁷³³ L: single *daṅḍa*

⁷³⁴ L: *phrag*

⁷³⁵ L and S: single *daṅḍa*

⁷³⁶ N and Q: *bsrung*

⁷³⁷ L: single *daṅḍa*

⁷³⁸ L: *kyang*; S: *bkyal*

⁷³⁹ L: *ba*

⁷⁴⁰ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

⁷⁴¹ L, S, and T: omit *sems dpa' chen po*

⁷⁴² S: *bkyal*

⁷⁴³ L: *ba*

⁷⁴⁴ S: *bkyal*

⁷⁴⁵ L: *ba*

⁷⁴⁶ N: 'ang

⁷⁴⁷ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*

⁷⁴⁸ S: inserts *daṅḍa*

⁷⁴⁹ N: 'ang

⁷⁵⁰ S: *bkyal*

⁷⁵¹ L: *ba*

⁷⁵² L and T: omit *daṅḍa*

⁷⁵³ N and Q: omit *daṅḍa*

⁷⁵⁴ N: 'ang

⁷⁵⁵ S: *bkyal*

⁷⁵⁶ L: *ba*

⁷⁵⁷ D: *smras*

⁷⁵⁸ D: *pas*

⁷⁵⁹ L: *bar*

⁷⁶⁰ T: inserts *daṅḍa*

la⁷⁶² rjes su⁷⁶³ yi rang bar ma gyur cig / bdag gis kyang su la yang⁷⁶⁴ tshig kyal⁷⁶⁵ pa⁷⁶⁶ smra bas
 dran par mi bya / dran par byed du mi gzhug / dran par byas⁷⁶⁷ pa la rjes su⁷⁶⁸ yi rang bar mi
 bya'o snyam mo // rigs kyi bu de ltar na byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po tshig kyal⁷⁶⁹
 pa⁷⁷⁰ spangs pa yin no // de la byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po brnab sems⁷⁷¹ spangs pa
 ji lta⁷⁷² bu yin zhe na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / brnab
 sems shes⁷⁷³ bya ba ni tha na gang zag brnab sems can rnam la yang⁷⁷⁴ mi sdug cing mi 'dod
 la⁷⁷⁵ mi dga' zhing yid du mi 'ong ba yin te / bdag la yang⁷⁷⁶ brnab sems 'di mi sdug cing mi 'dod
 la⁷⁷⁷ mi dga' zhing yid du mi 'ong ba yin gyis / su yang⁷⁷⁸ bdag la brnab⁷⁷⁹ sems kyi tshig gis
 brjod⁷⁸⁰ pa 'am / brjod⁷⁸¹ du 'jug pa 'am / brjod⁷⁸² pa la rjes su⁷⁸³ yi rang bar ma gyur cig / bdag
 gis kyang su la yang⁷⁸⁴ brnab sems kyi⁷⁸⁵ tshig⁷⁸⁶ gis brjod par mi bya / brjod⁷⁸⁷ du gzhug⁷⁸⁸ par
 mi bya / brjod pa la rjes su⁷⁸⁹ yi rang bar mi bya'o snyam mo // rigs kyi bu de ltar na byang
 chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po brnab sems spangs pa yin no // de la 'di skad ces bya ste /
 kyal⁷⁹⁰ pa⁷⁹¹ i tshig dang brnab sems gnyis // ⁷⁹² gang zhig bdag nyid mi 'dod pa // ⁷⁹³ de ni kyal⁷⁹⁴
 pa⁷⁹⁵ i tshig mi smra // ⁷⁹⁶ brnab sems kyang ni srung bar byed // ⁷⁹⁷ de la gnod sems spangs pa⁷⁹⁸

⁷⁶¹ L: bar

⁷⁶² Q: omits

⁷⁶³ L: rjesu

⁷⁶⁴ N: 'ang

⁷⁶⁵ S: bkyal

⁷⁶⁶ L: ba

⁷⁶⁷ T: byes

⁷⁶⁸ L: rjesu

⁷⁶⁹ S: bkyal

⁷⁷⁰ L: ba

⁷⁷¹ L: inserts dpa'

⁷⁷² L: ltar

⁷⁷³ D, N, and S: zhes

⁷⁷⁴ N: 'ang

⁷⁷⁵ L, S, and T: insert danḍa

⁷⁷⁶ N: 'ang

⁷⁷⁷ S: inserts danḍa

⁷⁷⁸ N: 'ang

⁷⁷⁹ L: rnab

⁷⁸⁰ D, L, and T: rjod; S: squeezes in what appears to be a tiny prefix "b" before rjod

⁷⁸¹ D, L, and T: rjod

⁷⁸² L: prefix "b" is squeezed in at the upper left corner of the syllable

⁷⁸³ L: rjesu

⁷⁸⁴ N: 'ang

⁷⁸⁵ T: inserts tshigs kyi

⁷⁸⁶ N: only part of the "tsh" and the final "g" are visible

⁷⁸⁷ D: rjod

⁷⁸⁸ L: accidentally conflates du gzhug

⁷⁸⁹ L: rjesu

⁷⁹⁰ S: bkyal

⁷⁹¹ L: ba

⁷⁹² L: single danḍa

⁷⁹³ L and S: single danḍa

⁷⁹⁴ S: bkyal

⁷⁹⁵ L: ba

⁷⁹⁶ L: single danḍa

ji lta bu yin zhe na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / gnod sems shes⁷⁹⁹ bya ba ni tha na gang zag gnod sems su gyur pa'i sems dang ldan pa rnam la yang⁸⁰⁰ /⁸⁰¹ mi sdug cing mi 'dod la⁸⁰² mi dga' zhing yid du mi 'ong ba yin te / bdag la yang⁸⁰³ gnod sems 'di mi sdug cing mi 'dod la⁸⁰⁴ mi dga'⁸⁰⁵ zhing yid du mi 'ong ba⁸⁰⁶ yin gyis / su yang⁸⁰⁷ bdag la gnod sems kyi tshig gis 'chad pa⁸⁰⁸ 'am / 'chad du 'jug pa 'am / bshad pa⁸⁰⁹ la rjes su⁸¹⁰ yi rang bar ma gyur cig / bdag gis kyang su la yang⁸¹¹ gnod sems kyi tshig gis bshad par mi bya / 'chad du gzhug par mi bya / bshad pa la rjes su⁸¹² yi rang bar mi bya'o snyam mo // ⁸¹³ rigs kyi bu de lta na byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po gnod sems spangs pa yin no // de la log par lta ba spangs pa ji lta bu yin zhe na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / log par lta ba zhes bya ba ni tha na gang zag log par zhugs pa rnam la yang⁸¹⁴ mi sdug cing mi 'dod la⁸¹⁵ mi dga' zhing yid du mi⁸¹⁶ 'ong ba yin te / bdag la yang⁸¹⁷ log par lta ba 'di mi sdug cing mi 'dod la⁸¹⁸ ⁸¹⁹ mi dga' zhing yid du mi 'ong ba⁸²⁰ yin gyis / ⁸²¹ su yang⁸²² bdag⁸²³ la log par lta ba'i tshig gis ston pa 'am / ston⁸²⁴ du⁸²⁵ 'jug pa 'am / bstan pa la rjes su⁸²⁶ yi rang bar ma gyur cig / bdag gis kyang su la yang⁸²⁷ log par lta ba'i tshig gis bstan par mi bya / ston du⁸²⁸ gzhug par mi bya / bstan pa la rjes su⁸²⁹ yi rang bar mi bya'o snyam mo // rigs kyi bu de lta na⁸³⁰ byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po log par lta ba spangs pa⁸³¹ yin⁸³² no // de la 'di

⁷⁹⁷ L: single *daṅḍa*

⁷⁹⁸ N: *ba*

⁷⁹⁹ D, N, and S: *zhes*

⁸⁰⁰ N: *'ang*

⁸⁰¹ Q and S: omit *daṅḍa*

⁸⁰² L and T: omit *mi 'dod la*

⁸⁰³ N: *'ang*

⁸⁰⁴ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

⁸⁰⁵ L: *dag*

⁸⁰⁶ T: *bar*

⁸⁰⁷ N: *'ang*

⁸⁰⁸ L: *ba*

⁸⁰⁹ L: *ba*

⁸¹⁰ L: *rjesu*

⁸¹¹ N: *'ang*

⁸¹² L: *rjesu*

⁸¹³ Q: single *daṅḍa*

⁸¹⁴ N: *'ang*

⁸¹⁵ S: inserts *daṅḍa*

⁸¹⁶ T: inserts *dga'* and combines it with the following *'ong* into one word

⁸¹⁷ N: *'ang*

⁸¹⁸ T: *pa*

⁸¹⁹ L and S: insert *daṅḍa*

⁸²⁰ L: *pa*

⁸²¹ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

⁸²² N: *'ang*

⁸²³ L: accidentally splits *bdag* into two syllables, leaving *ba dag*

⁸²⁴ L: *stan*

⁸²⁵ L and T: *tu*

⁸²⁶ L: *rjesu*

⁸²⁷ N: *'ang*

⁸²⁸ L and T: *tu*

⁸²⁹ L: *rjesu*

⁸³⁰ Q: omits

skad ces bya ste / gnod sems log par lta ba gnyis //⁸³³ yong⁸³⁴ gis mi 'dod gang yin pa /⁸³⁵ de ni
 gnod sems mi byed de //⁸³⁶ gang la 'ang log par mi 'jug go⁸³⁷ //⁸³⁸ rigs kyi bu de ltar na byang
 chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po ni dge ba bcu'i las kyi lam 'di dag la mngon par⁸³⁹ brtson
 par⁸⁴⁰ byed do // dge ba bcu⁸⁴¹'i las kyi lam bstan pa⁸⁴² 'di bshad pa na⁸⁴³ sems can dpag tu med
 grangs med pa dag bla na med pa⁸⁴⁴ yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub tu sems skyes so⁸⁴⁵ //
 sangs rgyas kyi chos thams cad kyi rgyan dang / spud pa dang / lhab lhub bkod pa zhes bya ba
 theg pa chen po'i mdo las le'u dang po⁸⁴⁶'o⁸⁴⁷ // // rigs kyi bu gzhan yang byang chub sems dpa'
 sems dpa' chen po dang po sems bskyed pas ni⁸⁴⁸ pha rol tu phyin pa bcu la mngon par⁸⁴⁹ brtson
 par bya'o // bcu gang zhe na / 'di lta ste / sbyin pa'i pha rol tu phyin pa dang / tshul khirms
 kyi pha rol tu phyin pa dang / bzod pa'i pha rol tu phyin pa dang / brtson 'grus kyi pha rol tu
 phyin pa dang / bsam gtan gyi pha rol tu phyin pa dang / shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa
 dang⁸⁵⁰ / thabs dang / smon lam dang / stobs dang / ye shes kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'o // rigs
 kyi bu de la byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po pha rol tu phyin pa bcu po de dag la ji ltar
 mngon par⁸⁵¹ brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po
 ni sbyin pa sbyin⁸⁵² par⁸⁵³ byed / tshul khirms srung⁸⁵⁴ bar byed / bzod pa⁸⁵⁵ sgom par byed /
 brtson 'grus rtsom⁸⁵⁶ par byed / bsam gtan la bsam gtan du byed / shes rab 'bar⁸⁵⁷ bar byed⁸⁵⁸ /
 thabs la mkhas par byed /⁸⁵⁹ smon lam 'debs⁸⁶⁰ par byed / stobs la 'jug par byed /⁸⁶¹ ye shes la

⁸³¹ N: *ba*

⁸³² L: reads *ying* (possibly *yid* with the final “d” being cut short by the string hole) *na* for *yin*

⁸³³ L: single *daṅḍa*

⁸³⁴ L: *yongs*

⁸³⁵ N, Q, and T: double *daṅḍa*

⁸³⁶ L and S: single *daṅḍa*

⁸³⁷ T: combines *'jug go* into one word, resulting in a *'jug* with an “o” marker over the final “g”

⁸³⁸ N, Q, S, and T: single *daṅḍa*

⁸³⁹ T: *bar*

⁸⁴⁰ T: *bar*

⁸⁴¹ L: prefix “b” is squeezed in at the upper left corner of the syllable

⁸⁴² L: *ba*

⁸⁴³ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

⁸⁴⁴ Q: omits *dag bla na med pa*

⁸⁴⁵ L: combines *skyes so* into one word, resulting in a *skyes* with an “o” marker over the final “s”

⁸⁴⁶ Q: *bcu pa* (“tenth”) for *dang po*, which must be an error

⁸⁴⁷ L, S, and T: omit 'o

⁸⁴⁸ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

⁸⁴⁹ T: *bar*

⁸⁵⁰ L: omits

⁸⁵¹ T: *bar*

⁸⁵² N and T: *byin*

⁸⁵³ L: accidentally splits *par* into two syllables, leaving *pa ra*

⁸⁵⁴ Q: *bsrung*

⁸⁵⁵ N: illegible

⁸⁵⁶ Q: *brtsom*

⁸⁵⁷ L: 'ba'

⁸⁵⁸ N: appears to read *byad*, either because of an error or because the “e” marker has been effaced

⁸⁵⁹ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

⁸⁶⁰ L: *bdebs*

⁸⁶¹ T: double *daṅḍa* (the first partially written over the final “d” of the preceding *byed*)

'jug par byed⁸⁶² do // rigs kyi bu de la byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po sbyin pa'i pha rol tu phyin pa la ji ltar⁸⁶³ mngon par brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po zas dang / skom dang / bzhon⁸⁶⁴ pa⁸⁶⁵ dang / gos dang / rgyan sbyin pa⁸⁶⁶ la mngon par⁸⁶⁷ brtson par⁸⁶⁸ byed⁸⁶⁹ pa nas⁸⁷⁰ rkang sbyin pa'i bar dag la mngon par⁸⁷¹ brtson par byed do // rigs kyi bu de la byang chub sems dpa' zas sbyin pa dag la ji ltar mngon par⁸⁷² brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / zas sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni tshe dang / kha dog dang / stobs dang / bde ba 'grub par 'gyur ba'i tshig⁸⁷³ bla dags yin no // de lta⁸⁷⁴ bas na bdag gis zas sbyin pa la mngon par brtson par bya dgos te / bdag gis zas kyi sbyin pa⁸⁷⁵ ⁸⁷⁶ ⁸⁷⁷ sbyin⁸⁷⁸ par bya gor ma chag⁸⁷⁹ snyam mo⁸⁸⁰ //⁸⁸¹ des⁸⁸² zas kyi sbyin pa⁸⁸³ de⁸⁸⁴ byin⁸⁸⁵ pas tshe byin pa dang / bde ba byin⁸⁸⁶ par 'gyur ro // de nas de'i tshe bcom ldan 'das kyis tshigs su⁸⁸⁷ bcad pa 'di dag bka' stsal to // kha zas sbyin pa⁸⁸⁸ byin na⁸⁸⁹ ni // des na tshe dang kha dog dang //⁸⁹⁰ stobs dang bde ba lnga⁸⁹¹ pa⁸⁹² spobs⁸⁹³ //⁸⁹⁴ shes rab can gyis byin pa yin // kha zas byin pas⁸⁹⁵ dga' ba dang // tshe ring stobs ldan bde⁸⁹⁶ skyid

⁸⁶² L: *byad*

⁸⁶³ Q: omits *ji ltar*

⁸⁶⁴ L and Q: *gzhon*

⁸⁶⁵ L: *ba*

⁸⁶⁶ L: omits

⁸⁶⁷ T: *bar*

⁸⁶⁸ L: *bar*

⁸⁶⁹ Q: *byad*

⁸⁷⁰ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

⁸⁷¹ T: *bar*

⁸⁷² T: *bar*

⁸⁷³ T: *tshi*

⁸⁷⁴ L: *ltar*

⁸⁷⁵ T: *ba*

⁸⁷⁶ Q: omits *kyi sbyin pa*

⁸⁷⁷ L: inserts *de* by squeezing it in before the next syllable

⁸⁷⁸ N: *byin*

⁸⁷⁹ L: accidentally conflates *ma chag*, leaving what looks like *mchag*

⁸⁸⁰ L: combines *snyam mo* into one word, resulting in a *snyam* with an “o” marker over the final “m” (this occurs frequently in L)

⁸⁸¹ Q: single *danḍa*

⁸⁸² S: *de*

⁸⁸³ Q: *da* or *nga* for *pa*; S: *ba*

⁸⁸⁴ L: omits

⁸⁸⁵ L and S: *sbyin*

⁸⁸⁶ S: *sbyin*

⁸⁸⁷ L: combines *tshigs su* into one word, resulting in a *tshigs* with a “u” marker under the final “s”

⁸⁸⁸ T: *ba*

⁸⁸⁹ T: *no*

⁸⁹⁰ L: single *danḍa*

⁸⁹¹ L, S, and T: *mnga'*

⁸⁹² L, N, S, and T: *ba*

⁸⁹³ L, S, and T: *stobs*

⁸⁹⁴ S: single *danḍa*

⁸⁹⁵ L: *bas*

⁸⁹⁶ L: splits *bde* into two syllables, leaving *ba de*

'gyur // skyid cing brtan⁸⁹⁷ pa de dag ni // thogs⁸⁹⁸ med spobs dang ldan par⁸⁹⁹ 'gyur // phyug
cing nor mang dpal⁹⁰⁰ dang ldan //⁹⁰¹ mi ni des shing blo ldan la // bsod nams ldan zhing
mkhas la zhi⁹⁰² //⁹⁰³ kha zas byin pas⁹⁰⁴ de ltar 'gyur //⁹⁰⁵ de la skom⁹⁰⁶ sbyin pa la ji ltar mngon
par⁹⁰⁷ brtson par byed ce na /⁹⁰⁸ rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te
/ skom sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni nyon⁹⁰⁹ mongs pa'i⁹¹⁰ sred pa thams cad sel bar⁹¹¹ 'gyur ba⁹¹²;i
tshig⁹¹³ bla dags yin te / de lta bas na bdag gis skom gyi sbyin pa sbyin⁹¹⁴ par bya gor ma chag
snyam mo //⁹¹⁵ de⁹¹⁶ skom gyi sbyin pa de sbyin⁹¹⁷ pa na /⁹¹⁸ sangs rgyas kyis bsngags⁹¹⁹ pa⁹²⁰;i
smon lam bzhin du skom gyi sbyin pa⁹²¹ 'dis na /⁹²² bdag sems can thams cad kyi nyon mongs
pa'i⁹²³ sred pa'i rgya mtsho thams cad skems par⁹²⁴ byed par gyur cig /⁹²⁵ rnam par grol ba'i
ro⁹²⁶;i⁹²⁷ skom⁹²⁸ gyis kyang tshim par⁹²⁹ byed par gyur cig ces smon⁹³⁰ lam 'debs so // 'di la tshig
phyi⁹³¹ ma⁹³² yang⁹³³ yod de /⁹³⁴ rga shi'i chu srin gyis dkrugs⁹³⁵ pa'i //⁹³⁶ nyon mongs sred pa'i

⁸⁹⁷ N: probably reads *brten*, though the “e” marker is difficult to see; Q: *brten*

⁸⁹⁸ S: *thobs*

⁸⁹⁹ T: *bar*

⁹⁰⁰ L: *dpa'*

⁹⁰¹ L: single *danḍa*

⁹⁰² L: *zhing*

⁹⁰³ L: single *danḍa*

⁹⁰⁴ L, S, and T: *byas*; N: appears to read *bas*

⁹⁰⁵ L: single *danḍa*

⁹⁰⁶ D and L: *sgom*

⁹⁰⁷ T: *bar*

⁹⁰⁸ Q: omits *danḍa*

⁹⁰⁹ N: appears to read *nyan*

⁹¹⁰ N and Q: omit the genitive particle

⁹¹¹ T: *srel par* for *sel bar*

⁹¹² L and T: *pa*

⁹¹³ N: appears to read *chig*, either because of an error or because part of the first letter has been effaced

⁹¹⁴ N: *byin*

⁹¹⁵ Q: single *danḍa*

⁹¹⁶ N: appears to read *da*, either because of an error or because the “e” marker has been effaced

⁹¹⁷ T: *byin*

⁹¹⁸ T: double *danḍa*

⁹¹⁹ L: *bsngag*

⁹²⁰ N: *ba*

⁹²¹ T: *ba*

⁹²² Q: omits *danḍa*

⁹²³ D: omits the genitive particle

⁹²⁴ L: *bar*

⁹²⁵ Q: omits *danḍa*

⁹²⁶ N: appears to read *ra*, either because of an error or because the “o” marker has been effaced

⁹²⁷ Q: omits the genitive particle

⁹²⁸ L: *sgom*

⁹²⁹ L: *bar*

⁹³⁰ L: inserts *danḍa*

⁹³¹ L: *phyin*

⁹³² L: omits

⁹³³ N and S: *'ang*

⁹³⁴ T: double *danḍa*

⁹³⁵ Q: *bkrugs*

⁹³⁶ N: omits double *danḍa*

mtsho bskams⁹³⁷ nas //⁹³⁸ rnam⁹³⁹ grol ro yi^{940 941} skom gyis ni // mi rnams bdag gis tshim par⁹⁴²
 bya //⁹⁴³ skom⁹⁴⁴ byin pas⁹⁴⁵ ni mkhas pa de // kun tu 'bar⁹⁴⁶ zhing rab 'bar ba⁹⁴⁷'i // yi dags⁹⁴⁸
 nyam ngar mi skye zhing //⁹⁴⁹ skom pa'i gnod pa 'byung mi 'gyur //⁹⁵⁰ de la bzhon pa⁹⁵¹'i sbyin
 pa la ji ltar mngon par⁹⁵² brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di
 snyam du sems te / bzhon⁹⁵³ pa⁹⁵⁴'i sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni bde ba dang /⁹⁵⁵ rdzu⁹⁵⁶ 'phrul gyi
 gzhi thams cad sdud⁹⁵⁷ pa'i tshig bla dags yin gyis /⁹⁵⁸ bdag gis bzhon⁹⁵⁹ pa'i sbyin pa⁹⁶⁰ sbyin⁹⁶¹
 par bya ste / bzhon⁹⁶² pa⁹⁶³ shing rta 'am / bzhon⁹⁶⁴ pa⁹⁶⁵ khyogs sam / bzhon⁹⁶⁶ pa⁹⁶⁷ rta 'am /
 bzhon⁹⁶⁸ pa⁹⁶⁹ glang po che 'am / lham sbyin par bya gor ma chag snyam mo // de bzhon pa'i
 sbyin pa de dag sbyin⁹⁷⁰ pa na⁹⁷¹ / sangs rgyas kyis bsngags pa⁹⁷²'i smon lam bzhin du⁹⁷³ bzhon
 pa'i sbyin pa 'dis na bdag sems can thams cad ky'i bde ba dang / rdzu 'phrul gyi gzhi thams cad
 sdud par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so // de la 'di skad ces bya ste / bzhon⁹⁷⁴ pa⁹⁷⁵ shing rta⁹⁷⁶

⁹³⁷ D: *skems*; T: *skams*

⁹³⁸ N: single *danḍa* (the second one has possibly been effaced)

⁹³⁹ L: *rnal*

⁹⁴⁰ Q: *ni*

⁹⁴¹ L: *ro'i* for *ro yi*

⁹⁴² L and T: *bar*

⁹⁴³ L: single *danḍa*

⁹⁴⁴ L: *sgom*

⁹⁴⁵ L: *bas*

⁹⁴⁶ L: omits

⁹⁴⁷ N: either *pa* or the top of *ba* has been effaced

⁹⁴⁸ T: *drags*

⁹⁴⁹ L: single *danḍa*

⁹⁵⁰ S: single *danḍa*

⁹⁵¹ L: *ba*

⁹⁵² T: *bar*

⁹⁵³ L and Q: *gzhon*

⁹⁵⁴ L: *ba*

⁹⁵⁵ N: omits *danḍa*

⁹⁵⁶ N: appears to read *rju*, either because of an error, a variant spelling, or because part of the letter has been effaced

⁹⁵⁷ D: *spud* (there are a few dots here indicating a correction, in this case a mistaken one); L: *sdug*

⁹⁵⁸ Q: omits *danḍa*

⁹⁵⁹ L and Q: *gzhon*

⁹⁶⁰ T: *ba*

⁹⁶¹ N: *byin*

⁹⁶² L: *gzhon*

⁹⁶³ L: appears to read *pra*, but the writing here is extremely small and difficult to make out

⁹⁶⁴ L: *gzhon*

⁹⁶⁵ L: *ba*

⁹⁶⁶ L: *gzhon*

⁹⁶⁷ L and T: *ba*

⁹⁶⁸ L and Q: *gzhon*

⁹⁶⁹ D and L: *ba*

⁹⁷⁰ T: *byin*

⁹⁷¹ T: *ni*

⁹⁷² S: *ba*

⁹⁷³ L and T: insert *danḍa*

⁹⁷⁴ L and Q: *gzhon*

⁹⁷⁵ T: *ba*

byin pa yis⁹⁷⁷ //⁹⁷⁸ rtag tu sems can thams cad kyis //⁹⁷⁹ theg pa chen po thob gyur cing⁹⁸⁰ //⁹⁸¹
rdzu 'phrul rkang pa thob par shog / bzhon⁹⁸² pa⁹⁸³ sbyin pas drang srong che // sangs rgyas
zhing nas zhing⁹⁸⁴ dag tu //⁹⁸⁵ blo ldan bya yi⁹⁸⁶ shugs 'dra bar //⁹⁸⁸ rdzu 'phrul gyis⁹⁸⁹ ni
mkha' la⁹⁹⁰ 'gro //⁹⁹¹ de la gos sbyin pa la ji ltar mngon par brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu
'di la byang chub sems dpa'⁹⁹² de 'di snyam⁹⁹³ du sems te / gos sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni ngo
tsha shes pa dang //⁹⁹⁴ khrel yod pa dang //⁹⁹⁵ mdog yongs su⁹⁹⁶ dag par byed pa'i tshig bla dags
yin gyis / bdag gis gos kyi sbyin pa sbyin⁹⁹⁷ par bya⁹⁹⁸ gor ma chag snyam mo // de gos kyi
sbyin pa de sbyin⁹⁹⁹ pa na / sangs rgyas kyis gnang ba¹⁰⁰⁰'i smon lam bzhin du¹⁰⁰¹ ¹⁰⁰² ¹⁰⁰³ gos kyi
sbyin pa 'dis na¹⁰⁰⁴ ¹⁰⁰⁵ bdag sems can thams cad kyi ngo tsha shes pa dang / khrel yod pa dang /
mdog yongs su¹⁰⁰⁶ dag par byed par¹⁰⁰⁷ gyur¹⁰⁰⁸ cig ces smon lam 'debs so // 'di la tshig phyi ma
yang¹⁰⁰⁹ yod de //¹⁰¹⁰ gos kyi sbyin pa 'dis na¹⁰¹¹ bdag //¹⁰¹² sems can kun gyi ngo tsha¹⁰¹³ shes //¹⁰¹⁴

⁹⁷⁶ T: most of the bottom of “t” is missing

⁹⁷⁷ T: the final “s” of *yis* also has an “n” written into it, so it is not possible to tell if *yis* or *yin* was intended here

⁹⁷⁸ S: single *daṅḍa*

⁹⁷⁹ L and S: single *daṅḍa*

⁹⁸⁰ N, Q, and T: *cig*

⁹⁸¹ N and Q: single *daṅḍa*

⁹⁸² L and Q: *gzhon*

⁹⁸³ N: *ba'i*; Q: *pa'i*

⁹⁸⁴ L: squeezes *zhing nas zhing* into an extremely small space, probably as a correction

⁹⁸⁵ S: single *daṅḍa*

⁹⁸⁶ L: *yid*

⁹⁸⁷ Q: *bla'i* for *bla yi*

⁹⁸⁸ L: single *daṅḍa*

⁹⁸⁹ N: *gyi*

⁹⁹⁰ L, S, and T: *las*

⁹⁹¹ N: single *daṅḍa* (the first one has possibly been effaced)

⁹⁹² S: omits

⁹⁹³ L: *snyams*

⁹⁹⁴ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

⁹⁹⁵ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

⁹⁹⁶ L: *yongsu*

⁹⁹⁷ N and T: *byin*

⁹⁹⁸ L: omits

⁹⁹⁹ N and S: *byin*

¹⁰⁰⁰ L: *pa*

¹⁰⁰¹ T: omits

¹⁰⁰² L: inserts *daṅḍa*

¹⁰⁰³ T: inserts *'di la*

¹⁰⁰⁴ Q: *ni*

¹⁰⁰⁵ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹⁰⁰⁶ L: *yongsu*

¹⁰⁰⁷ L: squeezes *par byed par* into an extremely small space, probably as a correction

¹⁰⁰⁸ L: *'gyur*

¹⁰⁰⁹ N and S: *'ang*

¹⁰¹⁰ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁰¹¹ Q: *ni*

¹⁰¹² L: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁰¹³ Q: *cha*

¹⁰¹⁴ T: single *daṅḍa*

khrel yod pa ni¹⁰¹⁵ sbyong¹⁰¹⁶ ba dang //¹⁰¹⁷ mdog kyang dag par byed gyur cig /¹⁰¹⁸ gos sbyin
shin tu¹⁰¹⁹ dpal dang ldan // rtag tu rigs ldan gzugs bzang zhing //¹⁰²⁰ mi de ngo tsha shes par
'gyur // mi ni grags¹⁰²¹ ldan skal dang ldan // de la rgyan sbyin pa la ji ltar mngon par brtson
par¹⁰²² byed¹⁰²³ ce¹⁰²⁴ na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / rgyan
sbyin¹⁰²⁵ pa zhes bya ba de¹⁰²⁶ ni skyes bu chen po'i mtshan sum cu¹⁰²⁷ rtsa gnyis dang /¹⁰²⁸ dpe
byad bzang po brgyad cu¹⁰²⁹ yongsu¹⁰³⁰ rdzogs par 'gyur ba¹⁰³¹'i tshig¹⁰³² bla dags yin gyis /
bdag gis rgyan gyi sbyin pa¹⁰³³ gser gyi rgyan nam / nor bu 'am / mu tig gam¹⁰³⁴ / bai dūrya¹⁰³⁵
'am / dung ngam / man shel lam / byi¹⁰³⁶ ru'i rgyan sbyin pa¹⁰³⁷ sbyin¹⁰³⁸ par bya gor ma chag
snyam mo // de rgyan gyi sbyin pa de sbyin¹⁰³⁹ pa na /¹⁰⁴⁰ sangs rgyas kyis gsungs pa'i smon
lam bzhin du /¹⁰⁴¹ rgyan gyi sbyin pa 'dis na¹⁰⁴² ¹⁰⁴³ bdag gis sems can thams cad kyi¹⁰⁴⁴ lus
mtshan dang¹⁰⁴⁵ dpe¹⁰⁴⁶ byad bzang po dag gis brgyan pa mthong bar gyur cig ces smon lam
'debs so // de la tshig phyi ma yang¹⁰⁴⁷ yod de / gser gyi rgyan ni byin pa yis¹⁰⁴⁸ // mtshan¹⁰⁴⁹
rnams kyis¹⁰⁵⁰ ni brgyan pa yi¹⁰⁵¹ // sems can thams cad mthong gyur cing¹⁰⁵² //¹⁰⁵³ bdag kyang

¹⁰¹⁵ N and Q: *pas na* for *pa ni*

¹⁰¹⁶ D: *sbyor*

¹⁰¹⁷ L: single *daṅḍa*

¹⁰¹⁸ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁰¹⁹ Q: *bzhin du* for *shin tu*

¹⁰²⁰ L: single *daṅḍa*

¹⁰²¹ L: *grangs*; T: *skrags*

¹⁰²² T: omits *brtson par*

¹⁰²³ T: *bye*

¹⁰²⁴ T: omits

¹⁰²⁵ D, N, Q, and T: *byin*

¹⁰²⁶ L, S, and T: omit

¹⁰²⁷ Q: *bcu*

¹⁰²⁸ T: omits *dang* plus the *daṅḍa*

¹⁰²⁹ Q and T: *bcu*

¹⁰³⁰ L: *yongsu*

¹⁰³¹ L: *pa*

¹⁰³² L: omits; N: *tshigs*

¹⁰³³ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹⁰³⁴ T: omits (it appears that an “m” has been erased after *tig*, which would have combined *tig* and *gam* into one word, but *gam* was never added as a correction after the erasure)

¹⁰³⁵ D: *dūrya*; L: *ḍū rya*; Q: *dū rya*

¹⁰³⁶ N and S: *byu*

¹⁰³⁷ L, N, Q, S, and T: omit *sbyin pa*

¹⁰³⁸ S: *byin*

¹⁰³⁹ N: *byin*

¹⁰⁴⁰ Q: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁰⁴¹ S: omits *daṅḍa*

¹⁰⁴² L: omits the entire beginning of this line, *rgyan gyi sbyin pa 'dis na*

¹⁰⁴³ S and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹⁰⁴⁴ T: *kyis*

¹⁰⁴⁵ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹⁰⁴⁶ N: appears to read *dpa*, either because of an error or because the “e” marker has been effaced

¹⁰⁴⁷ N and S: *'ang*

¹⁰⁴⁸ T: *yin*

¹⁰⁴⁹ N: appears to read *mtshon*

¹⁰⁵⁰ N: *kyi*

byang chub tshol bar shog / nor bu mu tig byin pas¹⁰⁵⁴ ni // gang dang gang du de skye ba //
 skye gnas de dang de dag tu //¹⁰⁵⁵ rin chen char ni 'bab par 'gyur // de la mar me¹⁰⁵⁶ sbyin¹⁰⁵⁷ pa
 la ji ltar mngon par¹⁰⁵⁸ brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di
 snyam du sems te / mar me sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni lha'i mig yongs su¹⁰⁵⁹ dag par 'gyur ba'i
 tshig bla dags yin gyis /¹⁰⁶⁰ bdag gis mar me'i¹⁰⁶¹ sbyin pa sbyin¹⁰⁶² par bya gor ma chag snyam
 mo // de mar me^{1063,1064} sbyin pa de¹⁰⁶⁵ sbyin¹⁰⁶⁶ pa na¹⁰⁶⁷ sangs rgyas kyis bstan¹⁰⁶⁸ pa'i smon
 lam bzhin du¹⁰⁶⁹ mar me sbyin¹⁰⁷⁰ pa¹⁰⁷¹ 'dis na¹⁰⁷² / bdag sems can thams cad kyi lha'i mig yongs
 su¹⁰⁷³ dag par¹⁰⁷⁴ 'gyur ba'i don byed par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so¹⁰⁷⁵ // de la tshig¹⁰⁷⁶ phyi
 ma yang¹⁰⁷⁷ yod de¹⁰⁷⁸ /¹⁰⁷⁹ kun mkhyen ye shes 'gyur ba yi // mar me¹⁰⁸⁰ sbyin pa des na bdag
 /¹⁰⁸¹ sems can kun gyi¹⁰⁸² lha yi¹⁰⁸³ mig / rnam par dag par byed gyur cig /¹⁰⁸⁴ mi de mar me
 sbyin pa yis // 'jig rten dag na dus kun tu¹⁰⁸⁵ // sangs rgyas rnam kyis spyang lnga¹⁰⁸⁶ dang //
 rim gyis¹⁰⁸⁷ su ni ldan par 'gyur // de la rol mo'i sgra'i¹⁰⁸⁸ sbyin pa la ji ltar mngon par¹⁰⁸⁹ brtson

¹⁰⁵¹ Q: *yis*

¹⁰⁵² N: *cig*

¹⁰⁵³ N: single *daṅḍa*

¹⁰⁵⁴ L and T: *bas*

¹⁰⁵⁵ L: single *daṅḍa*

¹⁰⁵⁶ T: *mi*

¹⁰⁵⁷ T: *byin*

¹⁰⁵⁸ T: *bar*

¹⁰⁵⁹ L: *yongsu*

¹⁰⁶⁰ Q: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁰⁶¹ L, N, and T: omit the genitive particle; Q: *mer*

¹⁰⁶² N and T: *byin*

¹⁰⁶³ N: appears to read *ma*, most likely because the “e” marker has been effaced

¹⁰⁶⁴ N and Q: omit the genitive particle

¹⁰⁶⁵ N and Q: omit

¹⁰⁶⁶ N and T: *byin*

¹⁰⁶⁷ L, Q, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹⁰⁶⁸ L and T: *brten*; N: *brtan*

¹⁰⁶⁹ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹⁰⁷⁰ N: *byin*

¹⁰⁷¹ T: *ba*

¹⁰⁷² N and Q: *ni*

¹⁰⁷³ L: *yongsu*

¹⁰⁷⁴ N: *bar*

¹⁰⁷⁵ T: combines *'debs so* into one word, resulting in a *'debs* with an “o” marker over the final “s”

¹⁰⁷⁶ T: *tshe*

¹⁰⁷⁷ N and S: *'ang*

¹⁰⁷⁸ N: probably reads *do* (only the right half of the “o” marker is legible); Q: *do*

¹⁰⁷⁹ L, N, and Q: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁰⁸⁰ L, S, and T: *me'i*

¹⁰⁸¹ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁰⁸² S: *gyis*

¹⁰⁸³ N: *yis*

¹⁰⁸⁴ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁰⁸⁵ Q: *du*

¹⁰⁸⁶ N, Q, and T: *snga*

¹⁰⁸⁷ L, N, S, and T: *rims kyis* for *rim gyis*

¹⁰⁸⁸ D, N, and Q: omit the genitive particle

¹⁰⁸⁹ T: *bar*

par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / rol mo'i sgra'i sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni¹⁰⁹⁰ lha'i rna ba yongsu¹⁰⁹¹ rdzogs par¹⁰⁹² 'gyur ba'i tshig bla dags yin gyis /¹⁰⁹³ bdag gis rol mo'i sgra'i sbyin pa sbyin¹⁰⁹⁴ par bya gor ma chag snyam mo // de rol mo'i sgra'i sbyin pa de¹⁰⁹⁵ sbyin¹⁰⁹⁶ pa na / sangs rgyas rnam par rol pa'i smon lam bzhin du /¹⁰⁹⁷ rol mo'i sgra'i sbyin pa 'dis na¹⁰⁹⁸ bdag sems can thams cad kyi lha'i rna ba¹⁰⁹⁹ yongsu¹¹⁰⁰ rdzogs par byed par¹¹⁰¹ gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so // de la tshig phyi ma yang¹¹⁰² yod de /¹¹⁰³ rol mo'i¹¹⁰⁴ sgra byin¹¹⁰⁵ des na bdag /¹¹⁰⁶ sems can kun la lha rna¹¹⁰⁷ dang //¹¹⁰⁸ sangs rgyas byang chub 'gro phan pa¹¹⁰⁹ // rab tu rdzogs par byed gyur cig /¹¹¹⁰ rol¹¹¹¹ mo'i¹¹¹² sgra ni byin pas na //¹¹¹³ rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas grags ldan pa //¹¹¹⁴ dpa' bo¹¹¹⁵ rnams kyi lha yi snyan¹¹¹⁶ // gang du skyes pa¹¹¹⁷ de yis 'thob¹¹¹⁸ // de la¹¹¹⁹ spos dang /¹¹²⁰ phye ma dang / byug pa sbyin¹¹²¹ pa¹¹²² la ji ltar mngon par¹¹²³ brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / spos dang / phye ma dang / byug pa¹¹²⁴ sbyin pa¹¹²⁵ zhes bya ba de ni tshul khrims¹¹²⁶ dang / thos pa dang /¹¹²⁷ ting nge 'dzin gyi spos¹¹²⁸ dang / phye ma dang / byug par

¹⁰⁹⁰ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹⁰⁹¹ L and T: *yongsu*

¹⁰⁹² L: *pa*

¹⁰⁹³ Q: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁰⁹⁴ N and T: *byin*

¹⁰⁹⁵ L: *pe*

¹⁰⁹⁶ N and T: *byin*

¹⁰⁹⁷ S: omits *daṅḍa*

¹⁰⁹⁸ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹⁰⁹⁹ L: accidentally conflates *rna ba*, leaving what looks like *rnab*

¹¹⁰⁰ L: *yongsu*

¹¹⁰¹ L, S, and T: omit *byed par*

¹¹⁰² N and S: *'ang*

¹¹⁰³ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹¹⁰⁴ N: "i" marker for the genitive particle has either been effaced or accidentally omitted

¹¹⁰⁵ L and S: *'byin*

¹¹⁰⁶ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹¹⁰⁷ T: *rnams*

¹¹⁰⁸ L: single *daṅḍa*

¹¹⁰⁹ L: *ba*

¹¹¹⁰ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹¹¹¹ L: *mol*

¹¹¹² D and N: omit the genitive particle

¹¹¹³ S and T: single *daṅḍa*

¹¹¹⁴ S: single *daṅḍa*

¹¹¹⁵ S: *ba*

¹¹¹⁶ L: *snyam*

¹¹¹⁷ L, S, and T: *par*

¹¹¹⁸ N and Q: *thob*

¹¹¹⁹ L: omits

¹¹²⁰ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

¹¹²¹ T: *byin*

¹¹²² N: inserts *byin pa*

¹¹²³ T: *bar*

¹¹²⁴ S: *pa'i*

¹¹²⁵ T: *ba*

¹¹²⁶ L: *kham*s

'gyur ba'i tshig bla dags yin gyis / bdag gis spos¹¹²⁹ dang / phye ma dang / byug pa sbyin par¹¹³⁰
 bya¹¹³¹ gor ma chag snyam mo //¹¹³² de spos dang / phye ma dang / byug pa'i sbyin pa de¹¹³³
 sbyin¹¹³⁴ pa na / sangs rgyas kyis¹¹³⁵ dgongs pa'i smon lam bzhin du spos dang / phye ma dang /
 byug pa¹¹³⁶ i sbyin pa 'dis na¹¹³⁷ bdag gis sems can thams cad tshul khirms dang /¹¹³⁸ thos¹¹³⁹
 pa¹¹⁴⁰ dang / ting nge 'dzin gyi spos kyis byug¹¹⁴¹ par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so¹¹⁴² // de la
 'di skad ces bya ste /¹¹⁴³ spos dang phye ma byin pa dang /¹¹⁴⁴ byug pa¹¹⁴⁵ dag ni byin pa yis //¹¹⁴⁶
 tshul¹¹⁴⁷ khirms thos dang ting nge 'dzin // lus can rnams kyis thob gyur cig /¹¹⁴⁸ spos dang
 phye ma byin pa dang //¹¹⁴⁹ byug pa byin pas¹¹⁵⁰ skyob rnams kyi // lha yi shangs dang lha yi
 sku // skyon med de yis thob¹¹⁵¹ par 'gyur // de la me¹¹⁵² tog sbyin pa la ji ltar mngon par¹¹⁵³
 brtson par byed ce¹¹⁵⁴ na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / me
 tog dang / me tog phreng¹¹⁵⁵ gi sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni¹¹⁵⁶ gzungs dang / spobs pa¹¹⁵⁷ dang /
 byang chub kyi yan lag rin po che'i me tog thob par 'gyur ba'i tshig bla dags yin gyis / bdag
 gis¹¹⁵⁸ me tog dang / me tog phreng¹¹⁵⁹ gi sbyin pa¹¹⁶⁰ sbyin¹¹⁶¹ par bya gor ma chag snyam mo //

¹¹²⁷ L: omits the phrase *thos pa dang* plus the *daṅḍa*

¹¹²⁸ L: *spobs*

¹¹²⁹ L: *spobs*

¹¹³⁰ L, S, and T: *byug pa'i sbyin pa sbyin* [T: *byin*] *par* for *byug pa sbyin par*

¹¹³¹ Q: inserts *daṅḍa*

¹¹³² Q: single *daṅḍa*

¹¹³³ N and Q: omit

¹¹³⁴ N and T: *byin*

¹¹³⁵ Q: *kyi*

¹¹³⁶ L: *ba*

¹¹³⁷ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹¹³⁸ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

¹¹³⁹ N: appears to read *thas*, either because of an error or because the “o” marker has been effaced

¹¹⁴⁰ N: *ba*

¹¹⁴¹ L and T: *byugs*

¹¹⁴² L: combines *'debs so* into one word, resulting in a *'debs* with an “o” marker over the final “s” (this occurs frequently in L)

¹¹⁴³ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹¹⁴⁴ Q and T: double *daṅḍa*

¹¹⁴⁵ L: *ba*

¹¹⁴⁶ L: single *daṅḍa*

¹¹⁴⁷ N: appears to read *chul*, either because of an error or because part of the first letter has been effaced

¹¹⁴⁸ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹¹⁴⁹ L and T: single *daṅḍa*

¹¹⁵⁰ L: *bas*

¹¹⁵¹ D: *'thob*

¹¹⁵² L: squeezes in *me* between adjacent syllables, probably as a correction

¹¹⁵³ T: *bar*

¹¹⁵⁴ T: *ci*

¹¹⁵⁵ S and T: *'phreng*

¹¹⁵⁶ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹¹⁵⁷ L: *spos* for *spobs pa* (most likely under the influence of the preceding passage)

¹¹⁵⁸ T: *gi*

¹¹⁵⁹ S: *'phreng*

¹¹⁶⁰ T: *ba*

¹¹⁶¹ N and T: *byin*

de¹¹⁶² me tog dang /¹¹⁶³ me tog phreng¹¹⁶⁴ gi sbyin pa de sbyin¹¹⁶⁵ pa na / sangs rgyas kyis gsungs
 pa'i smon lam bzhin du¹¹⁶⁶ me tog dang /¹¹⁶⁷ me tog phreng¹¹⁶⁸ gi sbyin pa¹¹⁶⁹ 'dis na / bdag gis
 sems can thams cad kyis lus gzungs¹¹⁷⁰ dang / spobs¹¹⁷¹ pa¹¹⁷² dang / byang chub kyis yan lag rin
 po che'i me tog gis brgyan¹¹⁷³ par byed par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so¹¹⁷⁴ // de la tshig phyi
 ma yang¹¹⁷⁵ yod de /¹¹⁷⁶ me tog me tog¹¹⁷⁷ phreng¹¹⁷⁸ byin pas¹¹⁷⁹ //¹¹⁸⁰ myur bar rnam pa¹¹⁸¹
 thams cad du // byang chub yan lag me tog gis //¹¹⁸² ¹¹⁸³ lus can kun la brgyan¹¹⁸⁴ par shog /¹¹⁸⁵
 me tog me tog phreng¹¹⁸⁶ byin pas¹¹⁸⁷ //¹¹⁸⁸ gang dang gang du skyes pa der //¹¹⁸⁹ rgyal po blon
 po zhang blon¹¹⁹⁰ gyis // rtag tu mchod cing rim gro byed // de la ro bro ba'i¹¹⁹¹ sbyin pa la¹¹⁹² ji
 ltar mngon par brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyis bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du
 sems te / ro bro¹¹⁹³ ba¹¹⁹⁴ sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni¹¹⁹⁵ ro bro ba'i mchog¹¹⁹⁶ tu 'gyur ba'i skyes
 bu chen po'i mtshan¹¹⁹⁷ du 'gyur ba'i tshig bla dags yin gyis / bdag gis¹¹⁹⁸ ro bro¹¹⁹⁹ ba'i sbyin pa

¹¹⁶² S: omits

¹¹⁶³ N: omits *daṅḍa*; Q: omits *me tog dang* and the *daṅḍa*

¹¹⁶⁴ S and T: *'phreng*

¹¹⁶⁵ N: *byin*

¹¹⁶⁶ L, Q, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹¹⁶⁷ N: omits *daṅḍa*

¹¹⁶⁸ S: *'phreng*

¹¹⁶⁹ L: omits

¹¹⁷⁰ L and T: *gzugs*

¹¹⁷¹ S and T: *stobs*

¹¹⁷² L: squeezes in *pa* between adjacent syllables, probably as a correction ; S and T: omit

¹¹⁷³ L, Q, and S: *rgyan*

¹¹⁷⁴ L: *'debso*

¹¹⁷⁵ L: omits; N and S: *'ang*

¹¹⁷⁶ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹¹⁷⁷ L: appears to represent the double *me tog* by using single syllables with double vowel markers, i.e. two “e” markers for an otherwise single *me* and two “o” markers for an otherwise single *tog*; T: omits *me tog* (most likely not realizing the text had switched to verse and requires the repetition here for the two extra syllables)

¹¹⁷⁸ S and T: *'phreng*

¹¹⁷⁹ L and N: *bas*

¹¹⁸⁰ Q and S: single *daṅḍa*

¹¹⁸¹ T: *par*

¹¹⁸² S: single *daṅḍa*

¹¹⁸³ L: inserts *de*

¹¹⁸⁴ Q and S: *rgyan*

¹¹⁸⁵ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹¹⁸⁶ S and T: *'phreng*

¹¹⁸⁷ L: *bas*

¹¹⁸⁸ L: single *daṅḍa*

¹¹⁸⁹ L and S: single *daṅḍa*

¹¹⁹⁰ L, S, and T: *lon*

¹¹⁹¹ L: omits *ba'i*; S and T: omit the genitive particle

¹¹⁹² T: omits *sbyin pa la*

¹¹⁹³ L: *bo*

¹¹⁹⁴ L: *pa*

¹¹⁹⁵ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹¹⁹⁶ L: *chog*

¹¹⁹⁷ L: prefix “m” is squeezed in at the beginning of the word

¹¹⁹⁸ L and T: *gi*

¹¹⁹⁹ T: *bro'*

rgun¹²⁰⁰ 1201 gyi ro 'am / bu ram shing gi¹²⁰² ro 'am /¹²⁰³ sbrang rtsi'i ro 'am / mar gyi ro 'am /¹²⁰⁴
 'brum mar gyi ro 'am / lan tshva¹²⁰⁵,i ro¹²⁰⁶ 1207 sbyin¹²⁰⁸ par bya gor ma chag snyam mo // de ro
 bro ba'i sbyin pa de¹²⁰⁹ sbyin¹²¹⁰ pa na / sangs rgyas kyis bsngags pa'i smon lam bzhin du /¹²¹¹
 ro'i sbyin pa¹²¹² 'dis na / bdag gis sems can thams cad la¹²¹³ ro bro ba'i mchog tu 'gyur ba'i
 skyes¹²¹⁴ bu chen po¹²¹⁵,i mtshan yongs su¹²¹⁶ rdzogs par byed par¹²¹⁷ gyur cig ces smon lam
 'debs¹²¹⁸ so¹²¹⁹ // de la 'di skad ces bya ste /¹²²⁰ ro yi¹²²¹ sbyin pas¹²²² sems can kun // kun¹²²³
 mkhyen ro yi snying po yis // rdzogs¹²²⁴ sangs rgyas pa'i¹²²⁵ byang chub kyi¹²²⁶ // spyod pa
 yongs su¹²²⁷ rdzogs gyur cig /¹²²⁸ ro yi sbyin pas¹²²⁹ yid gzhungs¹²³⁰ shing¹²³¹ // dran ldan blo
 gros¹²³² rgya mtsho¹²³³ bzhin // des¹²³⁴ ni¹²³⁵ ro yi sna¹²³⁶ grangs 'thob¹²³⁷ // lhun gyis grub par
 longs spyod¹²³⁸ ldan // de la gnas sbyin pa¹²³⁹ la ji ltar mngon par¹²⁴⁰ brtson par byed ce na /¹²⁴¹

¹²⁰⁰ L, S, and T: *kun*

¹²⁰¹ N and Q: insert *'brum* (*rgun* and *rgun 'brum* both mean “grapes”)

¹²⁰² N and Q: *bu ram gyi* for *bu ram shing gi*

¹²⁰³ Q: inserts another *danḍa* after a large gap in the text

¹²⁰⁴ L: omits the entire phrase *mar gyi ro 'am* plus the *danḍa*

¹²⁰⁵ L: *tsha*; N: appears to read *tsha* or *che*; T: *tsha*

¹²⁰⁶ L: omits; N, S, and T: *ro'i*

¹²⁰⁷ N, S, and T: insert *sbyin pa*

¹²⁰⁸ N and T: *byin*

¹²⁰⁹ L: omits *sbyin pa de*

¹²¹⁰ N and T: *byin*

¹²¹¹ L, S, and T: omit *danḍa*; Q: double *danḍa*

¹²¹² T: *ba*

¹²¹³ L, S, and T: omit

¹²¹⁴ N: appears to read *skyas*, either because of an error or because the “e” marker has been effaced

¹²¹⁵ L: *pa*

¹²¹⁶ L: *yongsu*

¹²¹⁷ Q: omits *byed par*

¹²¹⁸ Q: *'dabs*

¹²¹⁹ T: combines *'debs so* into one word, resulting in a *'debs* with an “o” marker over the final “s”

¹²²⁰ L and T: double *danḍa*

¹²²¹ Q: *ro'i*

¹²²² T: *bas*

¹²²³ D: *gun*

¹²²⁴ N and Q: insert *pa'i*

¹²²⁵ N and Q: omit *pa'i*

¹²²⁶ S: *kyis*

¹²²⁷ L: *yongsu*

¹²²⁸ L: double *danḍa*

¹²²⁹ L: *bas*

¹²³⁰ Q: *bzhungs*

¹²³¹ L: *zhing*

¹²³² L: *glos*

¹²³³ L: *mtshon*

¹²³⁴ Q: *de*

¹²³⁵ N and Q: *na*

¹²³⁶ D: *rnam*

¹²³⁷ N: *thob*

¹²³⁸ N: *sbyod*

¹²³⁹ T: *ba*

¹²⁴⁰ T: *bar*

rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / gnas sbyin pa¹²⁴² zhes bya ba
de ni sems can thams cad kyi¹²⁴³ gnas dang / skyob pa dang / gling dang / skyabs dang / dpung
gnyen du 'gyur ba'i tshig bla dags yin gyis /¹²⁴⁴ bdag gis gnas kyi sbyin pa sbyin¹²⁴⁵ par bya gor
ma chag snyam mo // de gnas kyi sbyin pa de¹²⁴⁶ sbyin¹²⁴⁷ pa na / sangs rgyas kyis¹²⁴⁸ dmigs pa'i
smon lam bzhin du¹²⁴⁹ gnas kyi sbyin pa 'dis¹²⁵⁰ na¹²⁵¹ bdag sems can thams cad kyi gnas dang /
skyob pa dang / gling dang / skyabs dang / dpung gnyen du gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so //
de la¹²⁵² 'di skad ces bya ste / gzhal med khang gnas¹²⁵³ sbyin¹²⁵⁴ pa yis //¹²⁵⁵ bdag ni 'dzam
bu¹²⁵⁶ i¹²⁵⁷ gling dag tu // lus can rnams kyi skyob dang gling // skyabs dang dpung gnyen gyur
par shog /¹²⁵⁸ gzhal¹²⁵⁹ med khang gnas sbyin¹²⁶⁰ pa yis¹²⁶¹ //¹²⁶² gang dang gang du skyes pa na
//¹²⁶³ khyim dang gnas dang yul 'khor gyi //¹²⁶⁴ bdag po dang ni gtso bor¹²⁶⁵ 'gyur // de la mal
dang sngas¹²⁶⁶ sbyin¹²⁶⁷ pa la ji ltar mngon par¹²⁶⁸ brtson par¹²⁶⁹ byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la
byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / mal¹²⁷⁰ dang sngas¹²⁷¹ sbyin pa¹²⁷² zhes bya ba
de ni sgrib pa thams cad gtan spong¹²⁷³ ba'i 'phags pa dang / lha'i tshangs pa'i gnas de bzhin
gshegs pa'i gzims mal dang / 'phangs¹²⁷⁴ pa'i¹²⁷⁵ sbyin pa'i tshig bla dags yin gyis /¹²⁷⁶ bdag gis

¹²⁴¹ Q: double *daṅḍa*

¹²⁴² T: *ba*

¹²⁴³ L and T: *kyi*

¹²⁴⁴ Q: double *daṅḍa*

¹²⁴⁵ N and T: *byin*

¹²⁴⁶ L: squeezes in *de* between adjacent syllables, probably as a correction

¹²⁴⁷ N and T: *byin*

¹²⁴⁸ L and T: *kyi*

¹²⁴⁹ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹²⁵⁰ S: *'di*

¹²⁵¹ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹²⁵² L: accidentally conflates *de la*, leaving what looks like *del*

¹²⁵³ T: *nas*

¹²⁵⁴ T: *byin*

¹²⁵⁵ S: single *daṅḍa*

¹²⁵⁶ N: *dzambu*

¹²⁵⁷ L: omits the genitive particle

¹²⁵⁸ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹²⁵⁹ L: *gzhan*

¹²⁶⁰ T: *byin*

¹²⁶¹ S: *yin*

¹²⁶² L: single *daṅḍa*

¹²⁶³ S: single *daṅḍa*

¹²⁶⁴ S and T: single *daṅḍa*

¹²⁶⁵ L: *bo*

¹²⁶⁶ S: inserts *kyi*

¹²⁶⁷ T: *byin*

¹²⁶⁸ T: *bar*

¹²⁶⁹ T: omits *brtson par*

¹²⁷⁰ N and Q: insert *cha*

¹²⁷¹ D: inserts *kyi*

¹²⁷² T: *ba*

¹²⁷³ L: *sbob*

¹²⁷⁴ L, S, and T: *phangs*

¹²⁷⁵ D, L, S, and T: omit *pa'i*

¹²⁷⁶ Q: double *daṅḍa*

mal¹²⁷⁷ dang sngas kyi sbyin pa¹²⁷⁸ sbyin¹²⁷⁹ par bya gor ma chag snyam mo¹²⁸⁰ // de mal dang
sngas kyi sbyin pa¹²⁸¹ de sbyin¹²⁸² pa na / sangs rgyas kyis bstan¹²⁸³ pa¹²⁸⁴’i smon lam¹²⁸⁵ bzhin
du¹²⁸⁶ mal dang sngas kyi sbyin pa ’dis na^{1287 1288} bdag sems can thams cad kyi sgrib¹²⁸⁹ pa thams
cad gtan spong ba¹²⁹⁰’i¹²⁹¹ ’phags pa dang /¹²⁹² lha’i tshangs pa’i¹²⁹³ gnas¹²⁹⁴ de bzhin gshegs pa’i
gzims mal dang / ’phangs¹²⁹⁵ pa¹²⁹⁶ sbyin¹²⁹⁷ par gyur cig ces smon lam ’debs so¹²⁹⁸ // de la
tshig¹²⁹⁹ phyi ma yang¹³⁰⁰ yod de /¹³⁰¹ mal dang sngas rnam byin pas¹³⁰² bdag la ni // bsod nams
tshogs ni cung¹³⁰³ zad ci yod pa //¹³⁰⁴ des na bdag gis skye bo’i sgrib pa¹³⁰⁵ dag /¹³⁰⁶ sdig pa’i blo
gros¹³⁰⁷ ngan pa ’joms par shog /¹³⁰⁸ lus can rnam kyi lta ba ngan pa yi //¹³⁰⁹ dra¹³¹⁰ ba shes
rab¹³¹¹ mtshon gyis gcod par shog /¹³¹² bde bar gshegs pa rnam la ’os pa¹³¹³ yi // mal mchog
tshangs¹³¹⁴ gnas bsten¹³¹⁵ pa sbyin¹³¹⁶ par shog /¹³¹⁷ mal dang sngas rnam sbyin par byed pa’i mi

¹²⁷⁷ L: squeezes “ma” of *mal* beneath and between the preceding *gis* and the final “l”

¹²⁷⁸ Q: omits *kyi sbyin pa*

¹²⁷⁹ N and T: *byin*

¹²⁸⁰ L: *snyamo*

¹²⁸¹ T: *ba*

¹²⁸² N and T: *byin*

¹²⁸³ L and T: *bsten*

¹²⁸⁴ S: *ba*

¹²⁸⁵ L: squeezes in final smudged “m” of *lam* (though it is still of normal size), probably as a correction

¹²⁸⁶ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹²⁸⁷ T: *byin par* for ’*dis na*

¹²⁸⁸ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹²⁸⁹ L: *sgribs*

¹²⁹⁰ T: *pa*

¹²⁹¹ L: inserts double *daṅḍa*; T: inserts *daṅḍa*

¹²⁹² L and T: omit *daṅḍa*

¹²⁹³ L, S, and T: omit *pa’i*

¹²⁹⁴ L: inserts *pa*

¹²⁹⁵ L, Q, S, and T: *phangs*

¹²⁹⁶ D, L, S, and T: omit

¹²⁹⁷ T: *byin*

¹²⁹⁸ L: ’*debso*

¹²⁹⁹ T: *tshē*

¹³⁰⁰ N and S: ’*ang*

¹³⁰¹ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹³⁰² L: *bas*

¹³⁰³ N: *chung*

¹³⁰⁴ L: single *daṅḍa*

¹³⁰⁵ L: *ba*

¹³⁰⁶ L: omits *daṅḍa*

¹³⁰⁷ L: *glos*

¹³⁰⁸ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹³⁰⁹ S: single *daṅḍa*

¹³¹⁰ L: *dran*

¹³¹¹ T: inserts *nga* or *da*, giving the foot an extra syllable

¹³¹² L: double *daṅḍa*

¹³¹³ L: *ba*

¹³¹⁴ T: *tshang*

¹³¹⁵ L, Q, S, and T: *bstan*; N: *stan*

¹³¹⁶ T: *byin*

¹³¹⁷ L: double *daṅḍa*

// bstan bcos dag la mkhas par skye bar 'gyur //¹³¹⁸ zhi gnas 'thob¹³¹⁹ cing¹³²⁰ rgya cher¹³²¹
sbyin¹³²² pa dang //¹³²³ pad ma¹³²⁴ las byung gzi can gzhon¹³²⁵ nur 'gyur //¹³²⁶ de la¹³²⁷ stan¹³²⁸
sbyin¹³²⁹ pa la ji ltar mngon par¹³³⁰ brtson par byed ce¹³³¹ na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems
dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / stan sbyin¹³³² pa zhes bya ba de ni stong¹³³³ gsum gyi stong chen
po'i¹³³⁴ 'jig rten gyi¹³³⁵ khams¹³³⁶ thams cad kyi sa¹³³⁷ gzhi la / byang chub kyi snying po rdo rje'i
gdan thob par 'gyur ba'i tshig bla dags yin gyis¹³³⁸ / bdag gis stan gyi sbyin pa¹³³⁹ sbyin¹³⁴⁰ par
bya gor ma chag¹³⁴¹ snyam mo // de stan gyi sbyin pa de sbyin¹³⁴² pa na / de bzhin gshegs pa
dang mthun¹³⁴³ pa'i smon lam bzhin du /¹³⁴⁴ stan gyi sbyin pa¹³⁴⁵ 'dis na¹³⁴⁶ bdag gis sems can
thams cad kyi¹³⁴⁷ stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i 'jig rten gyi khams thams cad kyi sa gzhi la¹³⁴⁸
byang chub kyi snying po¹³⁴⁹ rdo rje'i gdan thob par byed par¹³⁵⁰ gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs¹³⁵¹
so // de la 'di skad ces bya ste /¹³⁵² stan¹³⁵³ gyi sbyin pa 'di yis na¹³⁵⁴ //¹³⁵⁵ byang chub snying
po'i¹³⁵⁶ rdo rje'i¹³⁵⁷ gdan // bzung zhing sra la brtan pa dag¹³⁵⁸ /¹³⁵⁹ lus can rnams la 'byung bar¹³⁶⁰

¹³¹⁸ Q: single *danḍa*

¹³¹⁹ N: *thob*

¹³²⁰ L: *cig*

¹³²¹ L: accidentally splits *cher* into two syllables, leaving *che ra*

¹³²² T: *byin*

¹³²³ L and T: single *danḍa*

¹³²⁴ L, N, and S: *padma*

¹³²⁵ T: omits

¹³²⁶ Q: single *danḍa*

¹³²⁷ L: accidentally conflates *de la*, leaving what looks like *del*

¹³²⁸ L: possibly *sten*

¹³²⁹ T: *byin*

¹³³⁰ T: *bar*

¹³³¹ T: *ces*

¹³³² T: *byin*

¹³³³ N: “o” marker is almost or entirely absent

¹³³⁴ L: omits the “i” marker for the genitive particle

¹³³⁵ S: omits

¹³³⁶ L: squeezes “m” beneath and between “kha” and the final “s”

¹³³⁷ L and T: *kyis* for *kyi sa* as a result of conflating the two syllables

¹³³⁸ S: *gyi*

¹³³⁹ T: *ba*

¹³⁴⁰ N and T: *byin*

¹³⁴¹ T: *chags*

¹³⁴² N and T: *byin*

¹³⁴³ D, L, and T: *'thun*

¹³⁴⁴ S: omits *danḍa*

¹³⁴⁵ T: *ba*

¹³⁴⁶ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

¹³⁴⁷ L and T: insert *danḍa*

¹³⁴⁸ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

¹³⁴⁹ N: *pa*; T: *po'i*

¹³⁵⁰ L: omits *byed par*

¹³⁵¹ L: *'deb*; Q: *'dabs*

¹³⁵² L, Q, and T: double *danḍa*

¹³⁵³ Q: *bstan*

¹³⁵⁴ Q: *ni*

¹³⁵⁵ L and S: single *danḍa*

¹³⁵⁶ L, S, and T: omit the genitive particle

shog /¹³⁶¹ sna tshogs rin chen bdun las byas // 'phang du dpag tshad gnyis yod la //¹³⁶² kho ra
 khor yug dpag tshad gcig¹³⁶³ /¹³⁶⁴ ri rab¹³⁶⁵ bzhin du spa ba¹³⁶⁶ dang //¹³⁶⁷ rin chen¹³⁶⁸ ljon¹³⁶⁹
 shing brgyas bskor cing¹³⁷⁰ // gzhal med khang gis legs par¹³⁷¹ brgyan // dril bu g.yer ka'i dra
 bas bkab // nor bu rin chen spras gsal ba //¹³⁷² tshangs pa mtshungs¹³⁷³ par spyod rnam la //
 khri¹³⁷⁴ u dang stan dang stegs byin pas¹³⁷⁵ // 'khor ba dag na 'khor ba'i tshe //¹³⁷⁶ de 'dra¹³⁷⁷ i
 stan¹³⁷⁸ ni¹³⁷⁹ thob par 'gyur // de la yo¹³⁸⁰ byad kyi sbyin pa¹³⁸¹ la ji ltar mngon par¹³⁸² brtson¹³⁸³
 par byed ce na¹³⁸⁴ / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de¹³⁸⁵ 'di snyam du sems te / yo byad
 sbyin pa zhes bya ba¹³⁸⁶ ¹³⁸⁷ de¹³⁸⁸ ni¹³⁸⁹ byang chub kyi yo byad yongsu¹³⁹⁰ rdzogs par 'gyur ba'i
 tshig bla dags yin gyis /¹³⁹¹ bdag gis yo byad kyi sbyin pa sbyin¹³⁹² par bya gor ma chag snyam
 mo // de¹³⁹³ yo byad kyi sbyin pa de sbyin¹³⁹⁴ pa na / de bzhin gshegs¹³⁹⁵ pa la 'os pa'i smon lam

¹³⁵⁷ Q: omits the genitive particle

¹³⁵⁸ N: *dang*

¹³⁵⁹ L, N, and S: double *danḍa*

¹³⁶⁰ L: *par*

¹³⁶¹ L: double *danḍa*

¹³⁶² L: single *danḍa*

¹³⁶³ L: *cig*

¹³⁶⁴ L: double *danḍa*

¹³⁶⁵ L: squeezes in “ra” of *rab*

¹³⁶⁶ L: accidentally conflates *spa ba*, leaving what looks like *spab*

¹³⁶⁷ L and T: single *danḍa*

¹³⁶⁸ T: omits

¹³⁶⁹ Q: *lgon*

¹³⁷⁰ N: *zhing*

¹³⁷¹ T: *bar*

¹³⁷² L and T: single *danḍa*

¹³⁷³ L: *tshungs*

¹³⁷⁴ L and T: *khre*

¹³⁷⁵ L: *bas*

¹³⁷⁶ S: single *danḍa*

¹³⁷⁷ L: *'dri*

¹³⁷⁸ Q: *bstan*

¹³⁷⁹ L: *na*

¹³⁸⁰ N: “o” marker is almost or entirely absent

¹³⁸¹ T: *ba*

¹³⁸² T: *bar*

¹³⁸³ N: “o” marker is almost or entirely absent

¹³⁸⁴ L: accidentally conflates *ce na*, leaving what looks like *cen*

¹³⁸⁵ L: *di*

¹³⁸⁶ T: *de byin pa* for *zhes bya ba*, probably as a result of an eye-skip to an upcoming phrase

¹³⁸⁷ Q: inserts *danḍa*

¹³⁸⁸ T: *ne*

¹³⁸⁹ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

¹³⁹⁰ L: *yongsu*

¹³⁹¹ N: omits *danḍa*

¹³⁹² N and T: *byin*

¹³⁹³ L, S, and T: omit

¹³⁹⁴ T: *byin*

¹³⁹⁵ L: end of *gshegs*, where the second “g” would be, is smudged and completely effaced, with only “gshe” and a subjoined “s” being visible

bzhin du yo byad byin¹³⁹⁶ pa 'dis na¹³⁹⁷ bdag sems can thams cad kyi byang chub kyi yo byad
 yongs su¹³⁹⁸ rdzogs par byed par¹³⁹⁹ gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so¹⁴⁰⁰ // de la tshig phyi ma
 yang¹⁴⁰¹ yod de¹⁴⁰² /¹⁴⁰³ yo byad yongs su¹⁴⁰⁴ btang ba¹⁴⁰⁵ des //¹⁴⁰⁶ bdag gis kyang ni lus can gyi
 //¹⁴⁰⁷ byang chub yo byad btsal ba dag /¹⁴⁰⁸ yongs su¹⁴⁰⁹ rdzogs par byed gyur¹⁴¹⁰ cig /¹⁴¹¹ yo¹⁴¹²
 byad rab tu byin pa yis // gang dang gang du skyes pa der // rnam pa kun gyi¹⁴¹³ mchog ldan
 pa'i // yan lag thams cad rdzogs par 'gyur // de la sman sbyin¹⁴¹⁴ pa la ji ltar mngon par¹⁴¹⁵
 brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / sman
 gyi¹⁴¹⁶ sbyin pa¹⁴¹⁷ zhes bya ba de ni sems can thams cad kyi rga ba dang¹⁴¹⁸ 'chi ba med pa'i
 bdud rtsi'i bde ba yongs su¹⁴¹⁹ rdzogs par 'gyur ba'i tshig bla dags yin gyis / bdag gis sman gyi
 sbyin pa sbyin¹⁴²⁰ par bya gor ma chag snyam mo¹⁴²¹ // de sman gyi sbyin pa de sbyin¹⁴²² pa na
 /¹⁴²³ de bzhin gshegs pas byin gyis brlabs pa'i smon lam bzhin du /¹⁴²⁴ sman byin pa 'dis na¹⁴²⁵
 bdag sems can thams cad kyi rga¹⁴²⁶ ba dang /¹⁴²⁷ 'chi ba med pa'i bdud rtsi'i bde ba yongs su¹⁴²⁸
 rdzogs par byed par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so¹⁴²⁹ // de la 'di skad ces bya ste /¹⁴³⁰ rtsi dang
 sman gyi sbyin pa yis // sems can thams cad¹⁴³¹ tshe dpag med //¹⁴³² thams cad mkhyen pa'i

¹³⁹⁶ L and S: *sbyin*

¹³⁹⁷ L: inserts double *daṅḍa*; S and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹³⁹⁸ L: *yongsu*

¹³⁹⁹ L: omits *byed par*

¹⁴⁰⁰ L: 'debs

¹⁴⁰¹ N: probably 'ang; S: 'ang

¹⁴⁰² L: do

¹⁴⁰³ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁴⁰⁴ L: *yongsu*

¹⁴⁰⁵ T: *bas*

¹⁴⁰⁶ S: single *daṅḍa*

¹⁴⁰⁷ S: single *daṅḍa*

¹⁴⁰⁸ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁴⁰⁹ L: *yongsu*

¹⁴¹⁰ Q: *par*

¹⁴¹¹ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁴¹² L: *yod*

¹⁴¹³ Q: *gyis*

¹⁴¹⁴ Q: *byin*

¹⁴¹⁵ L and T: *bar*

¹⁴¹⁶ N: *kyi*

¹⁴¹⁷ N and T: *ba*

¹⁴¹⁸ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹⁴¹⁹ L: *yongsu*

¹⁴²⁰ N and T: *byin*

¹⁴²¹ L: *snyamo*

¹⁴²² N and T: *byin*

¹⁴²³ Q: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁴²⁴ S: omits *daṅḍa*

¹⁴²⁵ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹⁴²⁶ N: *dga'*

¹⁴²⁷ S: omits *daṅḍa*

¹⁴²⁸ L: *yongsu*

¹⁴²⁹ L: 'debs

¹⁴³⁰ L and T: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁴³¹ L: final "d" is written beneath "ca"

bdud rtsi yang //¹⁴³³ myur¹⁴³⁴ ba nyid du thob gyur cig //¹⁴³⁵ rtsi dang sman gyi sbyin pa yis // zla
 ba nya ltar nad med cing //¹⁴³⁶ gnod¹⁴³⁷ chung skyid cing bde bar gnas // mi rnams tshe ni ring
 bar 'gyur // de la bran dang¹⁴³⁸ bran mo dang /¹⁴³⁹ las byed pa dang /¹⁴⁴⁰ zho shas 'tsho ba yongs
 su¹⁴⁴¹ gtong ba'i sbyin pa la ji ltar mngon par¹⁴⁴² brtson par byed ce na /¹⁴⁴³ rigs kyi bu 'di la
 byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du¹⁴⁴⁴ sems te /¹⁴⁴⁵ bran dang / bran mo dang / las byed pa
 dang / zho shas 'tsho ba yongs su¹⁴⁴⁶ gtong ba'i sbyin pa¹⁴⁴⁷ zhes bya ba de ni¹⁴⁴⁸ byang chub
 sems dpa' rnams kyi rang dga' dang / rang dbang dang / rang byung gi ye shes yongs¹⁴⁴⁹ su¹⁴⁵⁰
 rdzogs par 'gyur ba'i tshig bla dags yin gyis¹⁴⁵¹ /¹⁴⁵² bdag gis¹⁴⁵³ bran dang / bran mo dang / las
 byed pa dang / zho shas 'tsho ba yongs su¹⁴⁵⁴ gtong¹⁴⁵⁵ ba'i sbyin pa¹⁴⁵⁶ sbyin¹⁴⁵⁷ par¹⁴⁵⁸ bya gor
 ma chag¹⁴⁵⁹ snyam mo // de bran dang / bran mo dang / las byed pa dang / zho shas 'tsho ba
 yongs su¹⁴⁶⁰ gtong ba¹⁴⁶¹'i sbyin pa de sbyin¹⁴⁶² pa na /¹⁴⁶³ de bzhin gshegs pas gsungs shing bstan
 pa'i smon lam bzhin du¹⁴⁶⁴ bran dang / bran mo dang / las byed pa dang / zho shas 'tsho¹⁴⁶⁵ ba
 yongs su¹⁴⁶⁶ gtong ba'i sbyin pa¹⁴⁶⁷ 'dis na¹⁴⁶⁸ / bdag sems can thams cad kyi¹⁴⁶⁹ rang dga' dang /

-
- ¹⁴³² T: single *danḍa*
¹⁴³³ T: single *danḍa*
¹⁴³⁴ N: “u” marker is almost or entirely absent
¹⁴³⁵ L: double *danḍa*
¹⁴³⁶ S: single *danḍa*
¹⁴³⁷ T: inserts *du*, giving the foot an extra syllable
¹⁴³⁸ S: inserts *danḍa*
¹⁴³⁹ L and Q: double *danḍa*; N: omits *danḍa*
¹⁴⁴⁰ N and Q: omit *danḍa*
¹⁴⁴¹ L: *yongsu*
¹⁴⁴² L: omits; T: *bar*
¹⁴⁴³ L: double *danḍa*
¹⁴⁴⁴ L: omits
¹⁴⁴⁵ L and N: omit *danḍa*
¹⁴⁴⁶ L: *yongsu*
¹⁴⁴⁷ D: *ba*
¹⁴⁴⁸ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*
¹⁴⁴⁹ T: omits *shes yongs*
¹⁴⁵⁰ L: *yongsu*
¹⁴⁵¹ T: *gyi*
¹⁴⁵² Q: double *danḍa*
¹⁴⁵³ T: *gi*
¹⁴⁵⁴ L: *yongsu*
¹⁴⁵⁵ Q and S: *gtang*; L, N, and T: *btang*
¹⁴⁵⁶ N: *ba*
¹⁴⁵⁷ N and T: *byin*
¹⁴⁵⁸ T: *pa*
¹⁴⁵⁹ L: accidentally conflates *ma chag*, leaving what looks like *mchag*
¹⁴⁶⁰ L and T: *yongsu*
¹⁴⁶¹ D and Q: omit *yongs su gtong ba*
¹⁴⁶² N and T: *byin*
¹⁴⁶³ Q: omits *danḍa*
¹⁴⁶⁴ L and T: insert *danḍa*
¹⁴⁶⁵ N: “o” marker is almost or entirely absent
¹⁴⁶⁶ L: *yongsu*
¹⁴⁶⁷ T: *ba*
¹⁴⁶⁸ S: *ni*

rang dbang dang /¹⁴⁷⁰ rang byung gi¹⁴⁷¹ ye shes yongs su¹⁴⁷² rdzogs par byed par gyur cig ces
smon lam 'debs so¹⁴⁷³ // de la 'di skad ces bya ste /¹⁴⁷⁴ bran dang bran¹⁴⁷⁵ mo btang ba yis¹⁴⁷⁶ //
mdor na lus can thams cad kyi¹⁴⁷⁷ // rang byung gi ni ye shes kyi // snying po yongs su¹⁴⁷⁸
rdzogs gyur cig /¹⁴⁷⁹ bran dang bran mo btang ba yis // mi ni¹⁴⁸⁰ bran du¹⁴⁸¹ mi¹⁴⁸² skye¹⁴⁸³ zhing
// brtan po rang dbang yod pas 'tsho¹⁴⁸⁴ // zhum pa¹⁴⁸⁵ med cing 'jigs pa med // de la gser dang
/ dngul dang / nor bu dang / mu tig dang / bai ḍūrya¹⁴⁸⁶ dang / dung dang / man¹⁴⁸⁷ shel dang /
byi¹⁴⁸⁸ ru dang / rin po che thams cad yongs su¹⁴⁸⁹ gtong ba'i sbyin pa¹⁴⁹⁰ la ji ltar¹⁴⁹¹ mngon
par¹⁴⁹² brtson¹⁴⁹³ par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems
te / gser dang / dngul dang / nor bu dang¹⁴⁹⁴ /¹⁴⁹⁵ mu tig dang / bai ḍūrya¹⁴⁹⁶ dang / dung dang
/ man¹⁴⁹⁷ shel dang / byi¹⁴⁹⁸ ru¹⁴⁹⁹ dang /¹⁵⁰⁰ rin po¹⁵⁰¹ che thams cad yongs su¹⁵⁰² gtong ba zhes
bya ba de ni / byang chub sems dpa' rnam kyi sangs rgyas¹⁵⁰³ kyi zhing bye ba khrag khrig
'bum phrag mtha' yas mu¹⁵⁰⁴ med pa dag tu 'od zer¹⁵⁰⁵ sngon po¹⁵⁰⁶ dang / ser¹⁵⁰⁷ po dang / dmar

¹⁴⁶⁹ L, S, and T: *kyis*

¹⁴⁷⁰ N: omits *danḍa*

¹⁴⁷¹ N: *gis*

¹⁴⁷² L: omits *yongs su*

¹⁴⁷³ L: *'debso*

¹⁴⁷⁴ T: double *danḍa*

¹⁴⁷⁵ L: omits

¹⁴⁷⁶ S: *yin*

¹⁴⁷⁷ L: *kyis*

¹⁴⁷⁸ L: *yongsu*

¹⁴⁷⁹ L: double *danḍa*

¹⁴⁸⁰ N: "i" marker is almost or entirely absent

¹⁴⁸¹ Q: *tu*

¹⁴⁸² N: "i" marker is almost or entirely absent

¹⁴⁸³ L: *skyes*

¹⁴⁸⁴ S: *mtsho*

¹⁴⁸⁵ L and T: *ba*

¹⁴⁸⁶ D and Q: *dūrya*

¹⁴⁸⁷ Q: *mal*

¹⁴⁸⁸ N and S: *byu*

¹⁴⁸⁹ L: *yongsu*

¹⁴⁹⁰ T: *ba*

¹⁴⁹¹ L: accidentally conflates *ji ltar*

¹⁴⁹² T: *bar*

¹⁴⁹³ N: appears to read *brcon*, either because of an error or because part of the letter has been effaced

¹⁴⁹⁴ L: squeezes in *bu dang* at the end of the line

¹⁴⁹⁵ L: omits *danḍa*

¹⁴⁹⁶ D and Q: *dūrya*

¹⁴⁹⁷ Q: *mal*

¹⁴⁹⁸ N and S: *byu*

¹⁴⁹⁹ L: accidentally conflates *byi ru*

¹⁵⁰⁰ N: omits *danḍa*

¹⁵⁰¹ L: squeezes *po* into an extremely small space, probably as a correction

¹⁵⁰² L: *yongsu*

¹⁵⁰³ L: omits

¹⁵⁰⁴ T: *su*

¹⁵⁰⁵ L: *gzer*

¹⁵⁰⁶ T: *bo*

¹⁵⁰⁷ T: *gser*

po¹⁵⁰⁸ dang / dkar po dang / btsod¹⁵⁰⁹ ka¹⁵¹⁰ dang / shel dang / dngul gyi kha dog lta bu snang
 bar 'gyur ba¹⁵¹¹ 'i tshig bla dags yin gyis /¹⁵¹² bdag gis gser dang / dngul dang / nor bu dang / mu
 tig dang / bai dūrya¹⁵¹³ dang / dung¹⁵¹⁴ dang / man shel dang / byi¹⁵¹⁵ ru dang / rin po¹⁵¹⁶ che
 thams cad yongs su¹⁵¹⁷ gtong ba'i¹⁵¹⁸ sbyin pa^{1519 1520} sbyin¹⁵²¹ par bya gor ma chag snyam mo //
 de¹⁵²² gser dang / dngul dang / nor bu dang / mu tig dang / bai dūrya¹⁵²³ dang / dung dang /
 man shel dang / byi¹⁵²⁴ ru dang / rin po che thams cad yongs su¹⁵²⁵ gtong ba'i sbyin pa de¹⁵²⁶
 sbyin¹⁵²⁷ pa na¹⁵²⁸ / de bzhin gshegs pas ji ltar mkhyen cing bshad¹⁵²⁹ de¹⁵³⁰ gsal¹⁵³¹ bar mdzad
 pa'i smon lam bzhin du¹⁵³² gser dang / dngul dang / nor bu dang / mu tig¹⁵³³ dang / bai¹⁵³⁴
 dūrya¹⁵³⁵ dang / dung dang / man shel dang / byi¹⁵³⁶ ru dang / rin po che thams cad byin pa des
 na¹⁵³⁷ bdag sangs rgyas kyi zhing bye ba khrag khrig phrag 'bum mtha' yas mu med pa¹⁵³⁸ dag tu
 'od zer¹⁵³⁹ sngon po dang / ser po dang / dmar po dang / dkar po dang / btsod ka¹⁵⁴⁰ dang / shel
 dang / dngul gyi kha dog lta bus¹⁵⁴¹ snang bar byed par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so¹⁵⁴² // de
 la tshig¹⁵⁴³ phyi ma yang¹⁵⁴⁴ yod¹⁵⁴⁵ de /¹⁵⁴⁶ rin chen byin pa des na¹⁵⁴⁷ bdag /¹⁵⁴⁸ 'od zer¹⁵⁴⁹ sna

¹⁵⁰⁸ L: bo

¹⁵⁰⁹ N: appears to read *bcod*, either because of an error or because part of the letter has been effaced

¹⁵¹⁰ S: *kha*

¹⁵¹¹ L: *pa*

¹⁵¹² N and Q: double *danḍa*

¹⁵¹³ D: *dū rya*; L: *ḍū rya*; Q: *dūrya*

¹⁵¹⁴ L: *dngul*

¹⁵¹⁵ N and S: *byu*

¹⁵¹⁶ L: omits

¹⁵¹⁷ L: *yongsu*

¹⁵¹⁸ Q: omits the genitive particle

¹⁵¹⁹ T: *ba*

¹⁵²⁰ L: inserts *de*

¹⁵²¹ N and T: *byin*

¹⁵²² D and Q: omit

¹⁵²³ D: *dūrya*; Q: *dū rya*

¹⁵²⁴ N and S: *byu*

¹⁵²⁵ L: *yongsu*

¹⁵²⁶ L: squeezes *de* into an extremely small space, probably as a correction

¹⁵²⁷ N: *byin*

¹⁵²⁸ Q: *ni*

¹⁵²⁹ L: *bshed*

¹⁵³⁰ S and T: insert *danḍa*

¹⁵³¹ S: *gser*

¹⁵³² L and T: insert *danḍa*

¹⁵³³ L: accidentally conflates *mu tig*

¹⁵³⁴ Q: *be*

¹⁵³⁵ D and Q: *dūrya*

¹⁵³⁶ N and S: *byu*

¹⁵³⁷ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

¹⁵³⁸ T: *ba*

¹⁵³⁹ L: *gzer*

¹⁵⁴⁰ S: *kha*

¹⁵⁴¹ L, S, and T: *bu*

¹⁵⁴² L: 'debs

¹⁵⁴³ N: "tsh" marker atop the letter is almost or entirely absent; T: *tsh*

¹⁵⁴⁴ N and S: 'ang

tshogs snang ba¹⁵⁵⁰ yis // sangs rgyas drang srong che^{1551 1552} rnams kyi //¹⁵⁵³ zhing rnams thams
 cad snang byed shog /¹⁵⁵⁴ rin chen sna tshogs byin pa yis // des pa gang dang gar skyes pa¹⁵⁵⁵ //
 'jig rten mtshams¹⁵⁵⁶ med yan chad¹⁵⁵⁷ du¹⁵⁵⁸ //¹⁵⁵⁹ des ni 'od zer¹⁵⁶⁰ snang bar byed //¹⁵⁶¹ de la rta
 dang /¹⁵⁶² glang po che¹⁵⁶³ dang /¹⁵⁶⁴ shing rta'i bzhon¹⁵⁶⁵ pa yongs su¹⁵⁶⁶ gtong ba'i¹⁵⁶⁷ sbyin¹⁵⁶⁸ pa
 la ji ltar mngon par¹⁵⁶⁹ brtson par¹⁵⁷⁰ byed ce^{1571 1572} na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa'
 de 'di snyam du sems te / rta dang /¹⁵⁷³ glang po¹⁵⁷⁴ che dang / shing rta'i bzhon pa yongs su¹⁵⁷⁵
 gtong ba'i sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni¹⁵⁷⁶ byang chub sems dpa'¹⁵⁷⁷ rnams kyi theg pa chen po¹⁵⁷⁸
 dang / theg pa mchog dang / theg pa mi mnyam pa dang mnyam pa¹⁵⁷⁹ dang¹⁵⁸⁰ / sangs rgyas
 kyi theg pa bla na med pa /¹⁵⁸¹ gtso bo¹⁵⁸² dam pa¹⁵⁸³ rab mchog¹⁵⁸⁴ sdud pa¹⁵⁸⁵ i tshig bla dags yin

-
- 1545 N: *sod*
 1546 L: double *daṅḍa*
 1547 N: *ni*
 1548 L and Q: double *daṅḍa*
 1549 L: *gzer*
 1550 L: omits
 1551 L and T: *chen* (with the final “n” placed beneath “che” in L)
 1552 T: inserts *po*, giving the foot an extra syllable
 1553 S: single *daṅḍa*
 1554 L: double *daṅḍa*
 1555 N and Q: *skye ba* for *skyes pa*
 1556 N: appears to read *mchams*, either because of an error or because part of the letter has been effaced
 1557 D and Q: *cad*
 1558 Q: *tu*
 1559 L: single *daṅḍa*
 1560 L and Q: *gzer*
 1561 T: omits double *daṅḍa*
 1562 N and Q: omit *daṅḍa*
 1563 Q: *glang chen* for *glang po che*
 1564 N: omits *daṅḍa*; Q: double *daṅḍa*
 1565 Q: *gzhon*
 1566 L: *yongsu*
 1567 L, S, and T: omit the genitive particle
 1568 T: *byin*
 1569 N and T: *bar*
 1570 N: *bar*
 1571 N: *ba*
 1572 L: appears to read *brtson par byad ce*, but the writing here is extremely small and difficult to make out
 1573 Q: omits *daṅḍa*
 1574 D: *bo*
 1575 L: *yongsu*
 1576 L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*
 1577 T: omits
 1578 N: looks like *pe*, most likely because the right half of the “o” marker has rubbed off
 1579 T: *ba*
 1580 L: omits the second *mnyam pa dang*
 1581 Q: omits *daṅḍa*
 1582 N and Q: insert *daṅḍa*
 1583 L, N, Q, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*
 1584 N and Q: insert *daṅḍa*
 1585 T: *ba*

gyis /¹⁵⁸⁶ bdag gis rta dang / glang po che dang / shing rta'i bzhon¹⁵⁸⁷ pa yongs su¹⁵⁸⁸ gtong ba'i sbyin pa¹⁵⁸⁹ sbyin¹⁵⁹⁰ par bya gor ma chag snyam mo // de rta dang / glang po che dang / shing rta'i bzhon pa¹⁵⁹¹ yongs su¹⁵⁹² gtong ba'i sbyin pa¹⁵⁹³ de¹⁵⁹⁴ sbyin¹⁵⁹⁵ pa na¹⁵⁹⁶ de bzhin gshegs pas gsungs shing bsgoms pa'i smon lam bzhin du rta dang / glang po che dang / shing rta'i bzhon pa yongs su¹⁵⁹⁷ gtong ba¹⁵⁹⁸'i sbyin pa¹⁵⁹⁹ 'dis na^{1600 1601} bdag gis sems can thams cad¹⁶⁰² theg pa chen po dang / theg pa mchog dang / theg pa mi mnyam pa¹⁶⁰³ dang mnyam pa dang /¹⁶⁰⁴ sangs rgyas kyi theg pa bla na med pa /¹⁶⁰⁵ gtso¹⁶⁰⁶ bo dam pa / rab mchog gis sdud par byed par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so¹⁶⁰⁷ // de la tshig¹⁶⁰⁸ phyi ma yang¹⁶⁰⁹ yod de /¹⁶¹⁰ bdag gis glang chen byin pa yis //¹⁶¹¹ sangs rgyas theg pa theg pa che // theg pa mchog gis lus can rnam // myur du sdud par¹⁶¹² byed par shog /¹⁶¹³ glang chen byin zhing rta byin pas¹⁶¹⁴ // gsal zhing¹⁶¹⁵ mkhas la shes¹⁶¹⁶ nyen¹⁶¹⁷ can // theg pa che la mos¹⁶¹⁸ pa dang //¹⁶¹⁹ mi de skal ba can du 'gyur // de la skyed¹⁶²⁰ mos tshal¹⁶²¹ dang / dka' thub kyi nags tshal dang / gtsug lag khang yongs su¹⁶²² gtong

¹⁵⁸⁶ Q: omits *danḍa*; S: double *danḍa*

¹⁵⁸⁷ L: *gzhon*

¹⁵⁸⁸ L: *yongsu*

¹⁵⁸⁹ D and T: *ba*

¹⁵⁹⁰ N and T: *byin*

¹⁵⁹¹ N: *ba*

¹⁵⁹² L: *yongsu*

¹⁵⁹³ T: *ba*

¹⁵⁹⁴ D, L, N, Q, and T: omit; S: inserts *de* as a correction—*pa* and *de* are squeezed into the space of one syllable

¹⁵⁹⁵ N, Q, and T: *byin*

¹⁵⁹⁶ L, Q, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

¹⁵⁹⁷ L: *yongsu*

¹⁵⁹⁸ L: *pa*

¹⁵⁹⁹ D: *ba*

¹⁶⁰⁰ T: *ni*

¹⁶⁰¹ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

¹⁶⁰² N: only the final “d” is faintly legible

¹⁶⁰³ L and T: *ba*

¹⁶⁰⁴ T: double *danḍa*

¹⁶⁰⁵ L and T: omit *danḍa*

¹⁶⁰⁶ Q: *btso*

¹⁶⁰⁷ L: 'debs

¹⁶⁰⁸ T: *tshe* (written beneath the preceding *la*)

¹⁶⁰⁹ N and S: 'ang

¹⁶¹⁰ L: double *danḍa*

¹⁶¹¹ S: single *danḍa*

¹⁶¹² Q: *pa*

¹⁶¹³ L and Q: double *danḍa*

¹⁶¹⁴ L: *bas*; S: *byas*

¹⁶¹⁵ T: *zhis*

¹⁶¹⁶ N: *bshes*

¹⁶¹⁷ N: *gnyen*; Q: *nyan*

¹⁶¹⁸ T: *mongs*

¹⁶¹⁹ Q: single *danḍa*

¹⁶²⁰ Q: *bskyed*

¹⁶²¹ S: 'tshal

¹⁶²² L: *yongsu*

ba'i sbyin pa la ji ltar mngon par¹⁶²³ brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems
 dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / skyed¹⁶²⁴ mos tshal dang / dka' thub kyi nags tshal dang /¹⁶²⁵
 gtsug lag khang yongs su¹⁶²⁶ gtong ba'i sbyin pa¹⁶²⁷ zhes bya ba de ni¹⁶²⁸ byang chub sems dpa'
 rnam s kyi bsam gtan gyi yan lag¹⁶²⁹ yongs su¹⁶³⁰ rdzogs par byed par¹⁶³¹ 'gyur ba'i tshig bla
 dags¹⁶³² yin gyis /¹⁶³³ bdag gis skyed¹⁶³⁴ mos tshal dang / dka'¹⁶³⁵ thub kyi nags tshal dang / gtsug
 lag khang yongs su¹⁶³⁶ gtong ba'i sbyin pa sbyin¹⁶³⁷ par bya gor ma chag snyam mo // de
 skyed¹⁶³⁸ mos tshal dang /¹⁶³⁹ dka' thub kyi nags tshal dang / gtsug lag khang yongs su¹⁶⁴⁰ gtong
 ba'i sbyin pa sbyin¹⁶⁴¹ pa na /¹⁶⁴² sangs rgyas kyi bstod¹⁶⁴³ cing bsngags pa'i smon lam bzhin du
 /¹⁶⁴⁴ skyed¹⁶⁴⁵ mos tshal dang / dka' thub kyi nags tshal dang / gtsug lag khang yongs su¹⁶⁴⁶
 gtong ba'i sbyin pa 'dis na¹⁶⁴⁷ bdag sems can thams cad kyi bsam gtan gyi¹⁶⁴⁸ yan lag yongs su¹⁶⁴⁹
 rdzogs par byed par gyur cig ces¹⁶⁵⁰ smon lam 'debs so¹⁶⁵¹ // de la tshig phyi ma¹⁶⁵² yang¹⁶⁵³ yod
 de /¹⁶⁵⁴ lha gang skyed¹⁶⁵⁵ mos tshal byin pas //¹⁶⁵⁶ bdag gis sems can thams cad kyi // bsam
 gtan yan lag rim¹⁶⁵⁷ bzhin du // yongs su¹⁶⁵⁸ rdzogs par byed par shog /¹⁶⁵⁹ lha gang skyed¹⁶⁶⁰

¹⁶²³ T: *bar*

¹⁶²⁴ Q: *bskyed*

¹⁶²⁵ L and T: omit *danḍa*

¹⁶²⁶ L: *yongsu*

¹⁶²⁷ T: *ba*

¹⁶²⁸ L, S, and T: insert *danda*

¹⁶²⁹ Q: *sems can thams cad kyi yan lag* for *byang chub sems dpa' rnam s kyi bsam gtan gyi yan lag*

¹⁶³⁰ L: *yongsu*

¹⁶³¹ L, S, and T: omit *byed par*

¹⁶³² L: accidentally conflates *bla dags*

¹⁶³³ Q: double *danḍa*

¹⁶³⁴ L and Q: *bskyed*

¹⁶³⁵ L: *bka'*

¹⁶³⁶ L: *yongsu*

¹⁶³⁷ N and T: *byin*

¹⁶³⁸ L and Q: *bskyed*

¹⁶³⁹ N: omits *danḍa*

¹⁶⁴⁰ L: *yongsu*

¹⁶⁴¹ N and T: *byin*

¹⁶⁴² L: double *danḍa*

¹⁶⁴³ L: *bsto*

¹⁶⁴⁴ N and S: omit *danḍa*

¹⁶⁴⁵ L and Q: *bskyed*

¹⁶⁴⁶ L: *yongsu*

¹⁶⁴⁷ L, S, and T: insert *danda*

¹⁶⁴⁸ Q: omits *bsam gtan gyi*. Cf. note 1629 above

¹⁶⁴⁹ L: *yongsu*

¹⁶⁵⁰ L: squeezes the final "g" of *cig* and *ces* into an extremely small space, probably as a correction

¹⁶⁵¹ L: *'debso*

¹⁶⁵² T: inserts *dang*

¹⁶⁵³ N and S: *'ang*

¹⁶⁵⁴ L and Q: double *danḍa*

¹⁶⁵⁵ L and Q: *bskyed*

¹⁶⁵⁶ L: omits double *danḍa*; S: single *danḍa*

¹⁶⁵⁷ L, S, and T: *rim s*

¹⁶⁵⁸ L: *yongsu*

¹⁶⁵⁹ L: double *danḍa*

mos tshal byin¹⁶⁶¹ pas // rnal 'byor can gyi¹⁶⁶² mi de ni // bsam gtan yan lag yongs¹⁶⁶³ rdzogs shing // rnal 'byor spyod la¹⁶⁶⁴ dka' thub che // de la chung ma dang¹⁶⁶⁵ bu dang / bu mo yongs su¹⁶⁶⁶ gtong ba'i sbyin pa¹⁶⁶⁷ la ji ltar¹⁶⁶⁸ mngon par brtson par byed¹⁶⁶⁹ ce na¹⁶⁷⁰ / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te /¹⁶⁷¹ chung ma dang¹⁶⁷² bu dang / bu mo yongs su¹⁶⁷³ gtong ba¹⁶⁷⁴ i sbyin pa zhes bya ba¹⁶⁷⁵ de ni¹⁶⁷⁶ byang chub sems dpa' rnam kyi bla na¹⁶⁷⁷ med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub tu¹⁶⁷⁸ mngon par¹⁶⁷⁹ rdzogs par 'tshang rgya bar 'gyur ba'i tshig bla dags yin gyis¹⁶⁸⁰ bdag gis chung ma dang / bu dang / bu mo yongs su¹⁶⁸¹ gtong ba'i sbyin pa sbyin¹⁶⁸² par¹⁶⁸³ bya gor ma chag snyam mo¹⁶⁸⁴ // de chung ma dang /¹⁶⁸⁵ bu dang /¹⁶⁸⁶ bu mo yongs su¹⁶⁸⁷ gtong ba'i¹⁶⁸⁸ sbyin pa de sbyin¹⁶⁸⁹ pa na / de bzhin gshegs¹⁶⁹⁰ pas bsnyen bkur mdzad¹⁶⁹¹ pa'i¹⁶⁹² smon lam bzhin du¹⁶⁹⁴ chung ma dang / bu dang / bu mo yongs su¹⁶⁹⁵ gtong ba'i sbyin pa 'dis na¹⁶⁹⁶ bdag sems can thams cad bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub mngon par rdzogs par 'tshang rgya bar byed par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs

¹⁶⁶⁰ L and Q: *bskyed*

¹⁶⁶¹ T: repeats *byin*

¹⁶⁶² N: appears to read *gyis*

¹⁶⁶³ L: *yongsu*

¹⁶⁶⁴ N and Q: *pa*

¹⁶⁶⁵ L, Q, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹⁶⁶⁶ L: *yongsu*

¹⁶⁶⁷ N: *ba*

¹⁶⁶⁸ N: only the “t” is clearly legible

¹⁶⁶⁹ L: squeezes in the final “d” of *byed*, probably as a correction

¹⁶⁷⁰ L: accidentally conflates *ce na*, leaving what looks like *cen*

¹⁶⁷¹ N: omits *daṅḍa*

¹⁶⁷² L, N, Q, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹⁶⁷³ L: *yongsu*

¹⁶⁷⁴ L: *pa*

¹⁶⁷⁵ L: accidentally conflates *bya ba*, leaving what looks like *byab*

¹⁶⁷⁶ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹⁶⁷⁷ L: accidentally conflates *bla na*, leaving what looks like *blan*

¹⁶⁷⁸ L, S, and T: *sdud pa* for *tu*

¹⁶⁷⁹ T: *bar*

¹⁶⁸⁰ L, Q, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹⁶⁸¹ L and T: *yongsu*

¹⁶⁸² N and T: *byin*

¹⁶⁸³ T: *bar*

¹⁶⁸⁴ L: *snyamo*

¹⁶⁸⁵ L and T: omit *daṅḍa*

¹⁶⁸⁶ Q: omits *daṅḍa* and squeezes in *bu mo* at the end of the line; N: omits *daṅḍa*

¹⁶⁸⁷ L: *yongsu*

¹⁶⁸⁸ L: omits the “i” marker for the genitive particle

¹⁶⁸⁹ N and T: *byin*

¹⁶⁹⁰ L: *gsheg*

¹⁶⁹¹ D, L, N, and Q: repeat *mdzad*; S: series of dots shows a correction, in this case an obvious one that other versions failed to make

¹⁶⁹² L: omits the genitive particle

¹⁶⁹³ T: repeats *mdzad pa'i*

¹⁶⁹⁴ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹⁶⁹⁵ L: *yongsu*

¹⁶⁹⁶ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

so¹⁶⁹⁷ // de la tshig phyi ma yang¹⁶⁹⁸ yod de /¹⁶⁹⁹ bu yi¹⁷⁰⁰ sbyin pa¹⁷⁰¹ des ni¹⁷⁰² myur bar yang //
sems can rnams ni re re'i don¹⁷⁰³ gyi¹⁷⁰⁴ phyir // sems can thams cad bla na med pa yi // byang
chub dam pa 'tshang rgya¹⁷⁰⁵ byed par¹⁷⁰⁶ shog¹⁷⁰⁷ / chung¹⁷⁰⁸ ma bu dang bu¹⁷⁰⁹ mo gtong¹⁷¹⁰
byed pa //¹⁷¹¹ de la byang chub zag med dga'¹⁷¹² ba med¹⁷¹³ // brtson 'grus ldan pa¹⁷¹⁴ 'i mi ni¹⁷¹⁵
gang la yang¹⁷¹⁶ // dka' ba ci yang med par blta bar¹⁷¹⁷ bya //¹⁷¹⁸ de la nor dang /¹⁷¹⁹ 'bru dang
/¹⁷²⁰ bang mdzod yongs su¹⁷²¹ gtong ba'i sbyin pa¹⁷²² la ji ltar mngon par¹⁷²³ brtson par byed¹⁷²⁴ ce
na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / nor dang / 'bru dang /
bang mdzod yongs su¹⁷²⁵ gtong ba'i sbyin pa¹⁷²⁶ zhes bya¹⁷²⁷ ba de ni /¹⁷²⁸ byang chub sems dpa'
rnams kyi¹⁷²⁹ dam pa'i chos kyi mdzod yongs su¹⁷³⁰ rdzogs par¹⁷³¹ 'gyur ba'i tshig bla dags yin
gyis /¹⁷³² bdag gis nor dang / 'bru dang / bang mdzod yongs su¹⁷³³ gtong ba'i sbyin pa sbyin¹⁷³⁴
par bya gor ma chag snyam mo¹⁷³⁵ // de nor dang /¹⁷³⁶ 'bru dang / bang mdzod yongs su¹⁷³⁷

¹⁶⁹⁷ L: 'debso

¹⁶⁹⁸ N and S: 'ang

¹⁶⁹⁹ L and Q: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁷⁰⁰ Q: bu'i

¹⁷⁰¹ T: ba

¹⁷⁰² D: na

¹⁷⁰³ L: 'don

¹⁷⁰⁴ T: *gyi* is written beneath the preceding *don*

¹⁷⁰⁵ N: illegible

¹⁷⁰⁶ N: illegible

¹⁷⁰⁷ N: only the initial "sh" and part of the "o" marker are legible

¹⁷⁰⁸ N: only the final "ng" is legible

¹⁷⁰⁹ L: omits

¹⁷¹⁰ N: only the "o" marker is legible

¹⁷¹¹ L: single *daṅḍa*

¹⁷¹² L, Q, and S: *dka'*; T: includes both *dga'* and *dka'*, combined to look like *dgdk'a'*

¹⁷¹³ N: only *chub* from this line is clearly legible

¹⁷¹⁴ D and T: ba

¹⁷¹⁵ Q: *ldan pa yi ni mi* for *ldan pa'i mi ni*

¹⁷¹⁶ Q: 'ang

¹⁷¹⁷ N: illegible

¹⁷¹⁸ L: omits double *daṅḍa*

¹⁷¹⁹ L, N, Q, and T: omit *daṅḍa*

¹⁷²⁰ N and Q: omit *daṅḍa*

¹⁷²¹ L: *yongsu*

¹⁷²² T: *zhe* has been almost completely erased here (probably as the beginning of a mistaken *zhes bya ba*)

¹⁷²³ T: bar

¹⁷²⁴ T: omits

¹⁷²⁵ L: *yongsu*

¹⁷²⁶ D: ba

¹⁷²⁷ T: omits

¹⁷²⁸ N and T: double *daṅḍa*; Q: omits *daṅḍa*

¹⁷²⁹ T: *kyis*

¹⁷³⁰ L and T: *yongsu*

¹⁷³¹ N and T: bar

¹⁷³² Q: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁷³³ L: *yongsu*

¹⁷³⁴ N and T: *byin*

¹⁷³⁵ L: *snyamo*

¹⁷³⁶ L and N: omit *daṅḍa*

gtong ba'i sbyin pa¹⁷³⁸ de sbyin¹⁷³⁹ pa¹⁷⁴⁰ na / de bzhin gshegs pas gsungs pa'i smon lam bzhin du¹⁷⁴¹ nor dang / 'bru dang /¹⁷⁴² bang mdzod yongs su¹⁷⁴³ gtong ba'i sbyin pa 'dis na¹⁷⁴⁴ / bdag sems can thams cad kyi dam pa'i chos kyi mdzod yongs su¹⁷⁴⁵ rdzogs par¹⁷⁴⁶ byed par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so¹⁷⁴⁷ // de la 'di skad ces bya ste /¹⁷⁴⁸ nor dang dbyig¹⁷⁴⁹ rnams gtong ba'i bsod nams ni // mkha'¹⁷⁵⁰ las lhag¹⁷⁵¹ pa¹⁷⁵² bdag la ci yod pas¹⁷⁵³ // mi rnams rgyud ni dam pa'i chos mdzod kyi¹⁷⁵⁴ // rgyal po'i mdzod ltar myur du rgyas gyur cig /¹⁷⁵⁵ nor dang 'bru dang bang¹⁷⁵⁶ mdzod bud med rnams // gtong ba'i bsod nams bdag la ci yod pa // des na¹⁷⁵⁷ bdag gis byang chub myur 'thob¹⁷⁵⁸ cing // dam pa'i chos kyi mdzod ni thob par shog /¹⁷⁵⁹ de la gling bzhi dang / 'dzam bu¹⁷⁶⁰ i gling dang / rgyal srid kyi¹⁷⁶¹ dbang phyug thams cad yongs su¹⁷⁶² gtong ba'i sbyin pa la ji ltar mngon par¹⁷⁶³ brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / gling bzhi dang / 'dzam bu¹⁷⁶⁴ i gling dang /¹⁷⁶⁵ rgyal srid kyi¹⁷⁶⁶ dbang phyug thams cad yongs su¹⁷⁶⁷ gtong ba'i sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni / byang chub sems¹⁷⁶⁸ dpa' rnams kyi dam pa'i chos kyi rgyal srid kyi dbang phyug 'thob par 'gyur ba'i tshig bla dags yin gyis¹⁷⁶⁹ / bdag gis gling bzhi dang / 'dzam bu¹⁷⁷⁰ i¹⁷⁷¹ gling dang /¹⁷⁷² rgyal srid kyi

¹⁷³⁷ L: yongsu

¹⁷³⁸ D: ba

¹⁷³⁹ N and T: byin

¹⁷⁴⁰ N: ba

¹⁷⁴¹ L, Q, and T: insert *danḍa*

¹⁷⁴² L, S, and T: insert *mdzod dang /*

¹⁷⁴³ L: yongsu

¹⁷⁴⁴ Q: ni

¹⁷⁴⁵ L: yongsu

¹⁷⁴⁶ T: pa'i

¹⁷⁴⁷ L: 'debso

¹⁷⁴⁸ L and T: double *danḍa*

¹⁷⁴⁹ T: has 'brag with both an "i" and a "u" marker, probably as a result of confusing *dbyig* and 'bru

¹⁷⁵⁰ L: mkhas

¹⁷⁵¹ T: lhags

¹⁷⁵² S: *mkha' la sa pa* for *mkha' las lhag pa*

¹⁷⁵³ L and N: bas

¹⁷⁵⁴ L, N, S, and T: kyi

¹⁷⁵⁵ L: double *danḍa*

¹⁷⁵⁶ D: bad

¹⁷⁵⁷ T: ni

¹⁷⁵⁸ N: thob

¹⁷⁵⁹ L: double *danḍa*

¹⁷⁶⁰ N: dzambu

¹⁷⁶¹ L, N, Q, S, and T: omit

¹⁷⁶² L: yongsu

¹⁷⁶³ T: bar

¹⁷⁶⁴ N: dzambu

¹⁷⁶⁵ N and Q: omit *dang* and the *danḍa*, merging the two lines with the genitive particle *gi* ('dzam bu [N: dzambu]'i *gling gi rgyal srid . . .*)

¹⁷⁶⁶ N and Q: omit

¹⁷⁶⁷ L: yongsu

¹⁷⁶⁸ T: inserts *can*

¹⁷⁶⁹ Q: gyi

¹⁷⁷⁰ N: dzambu

¹⁷⁷¹ Q: omits the genitive particle

dbang phyug thams cad yongs su¹⁷⁷³ gtong ba'i sbyin pa sbyin¹⁷⁷⁴ par¹⁷⁷⁵ bya gor ma chag snyam
mo // de gling bzhi dang /¹⁷⁷⁶ 'dzam bu^{1777,1778} i¹⁷⁷⁸ gling dang¹⁷⁷⁹ / rgyal srid kyi dbang phyug thams
cad yongs su¹⁷⁸⁰ gtong ba'i sbyin pa de sbyin¹⁷⁸¹ pa¹⁷⁸² na / de bzhin gshegs pas bstan pa'i smon
lam bzhin du /¹⁷⁸³ gling bzhi dang¹⁷⁸⁴ /¹⁷⁸⁵ 'dzam bu^{1786,1787} i¹⁷⁸⁷ gling dang / rgyal srid kyi dbang
phyug thams cad yongs su¹⁷⁸⁸ gtong ba'i sbyin pa 'dis na¹⁷⁸⁹ / bdag sems can thams cad dam pa'i
chos kyi rgyal srid kyi dbang phyug 'thob pa thob par¹⁷⁹⁰ gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so¹⁷⁹¹ //¹⁷⁹²
de la 'di skad ces bya ste /¹⁷⁹³ gling bzhi ril gyis btang ba 'di dag las //¹⁷⁹⁴ bdag gis bsod nams
cung¹⁷⁹⁵ zad ci bsgrubs pa¹⁷⁹⁶ //¹⁷⁹⁷ des¹⁷⁹⁸ na mi rnams 'di dag dam chos kyi // rgyal srid 'thob
pa'i¹⁷⁹⁹ mtha' ni thob gyur cig /¹⁸⁰⁰ 'dzam bu^{1801,1802} i¹⁸⁰² gling ni byin pa yis /¹⁸⁰³ ¹⁸⁰⁴ rin chen sna bdun
ldan pa yi¹⁸⁰⁵ // rgyal po¹⁸⁰⁶ gling bzhi dbang byed pa¹⁸⁰⁷ /¹⁸⁰⁸ dbang phyug rnam par¹⁸⁰⁹ rgyal bar
'gyur // de la gtsug gi nor bu dang /¹⁸¹⁰ cod pan yongs su¹⁸¹¹ gtong ba'i sbyin pa la ji¹⁸¹² ltar

¹⁷⁷² Q: omits *daṅḍa*

¹⁷⁷³ L: *yongsu*

¹⁷⁷⁴ N and T: *byin*

¹⁷⁷⁵ D: *bar*

¹⁷⁷⁶ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

¹⁷⁷⁷ N: *dzambu*

¹⁷⁷⁸ Q: omits the genitive particle

¹⁷⁷⁹ Q: omits

¹⁷⁸⁰ L: *yongsu*

¹⁷⁸¹ L: omits; N and T: *byin*

¹⁷⁸² D: *ba*

¹⁷⁸³ L, S, and T: omit *daṅḍa*

¹⁷⁸⁴ Q: omits

¹⁷⁸⁵ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

¹⁷⁸⁶ N: *dzambu*

¹⁷⁸⁷ Q: omits the genitive particle

¹⁷⁸⁸ L: *yongsu*

¹⁷⁸⁹ Q: *ni*

¹⁷⁹⁰ L: squeezes the final “b” of *'thob* and *pa thob par* into an extremely small space, probably as a correction

¹⁷⁹¹ L: *'debso*

¹⁷⁹² Q: omits double *daṅḍa*

¹⁷⁹³ T: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁷⁹⁴ Q: single *daṅḍa*

¹⁷⁹⁵ Q: *chung*

¹⁷⁹⁶ D and S: *ba*; Q: *shing*

¹⁷⁹⁷ L: single *daṅḍa*; Q: omits double *daṅḍa*, a clear oversight that merges the two feet of verse

¹⁷⁹⁸ T: *de*

¹⁷⁹⁹ L: omits the “i” marker for the genitive particle

¹⁸⁰⁰ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁸⁰¹ N: *dzambu*

¹⁸⁰² D, N, and Q: omit the genitive particle

¹⁸⁰³ L, N, Q, S, and T: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁸⁰⁴ S: inserts *rigs kyi*, giving the foot too many syllables

¹⁸⁰⁵ Q and S: *yis*

¹⁸⁰⁶ T: *po'i*

¹⁸⁰⁷ L: *ba*

¹⁸⁰⁸ N, Q, S, and T: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁸⁰⁹ S: *bar*

¹⁸¹⁰ Q: double *daṅḍa*; S: omits *daṅḍa*

¹⁸¹¹ L: *yongsu*

mngon par¹⁸¹³ brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du
 sems te / gtsug gi nor bu dang /¹⁸¹⁴ cod pan yongs su¹⁸¹⁵ gtong ba'i sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni
 /¹⁸¹⁶ byang chub sems dpa' rnam kyi spyi gtsug bltar¹⁸¹⁷ mi¹⁸¹⁸ mthong bar 'gyur ba'i tshig bla
 dags yin gyis / bdag gis gtsug gi¹⁸¹⁹ nor bu dang /¹⁸²⁰ cod pan¹⁸²¹ yongs su¹⁸²² gtong ba'i sbyin
 pa¹⁸²³ sbyin¹⁸²⁴ par bya gor ma chag¹⁸²⁵ snyam mo¹⁸²⁶ // de gtsug gi nor bu dang / cod pan yongs
 su¹⁸²⁷ gtong ba'i sbyin pa de sbyin¹⁸²⁸ pa na / de bzhin gshegs pas gsungs pa'i smon lam bzhin¹⁸²⁹
 du /¹⁸³⁰ gtsug gi nor bu dang / cod pan yongs su¹⁸³¹ gtong ba'i sbyin pa¹⁸³² 'dis na^{1833 1834} bdag¹⁸³⁵
 sems can thams cad¹⁸³⁶ kyi¹⁸³⁷ spyi¹⁸³⁸ gtsug bltar mi mthong ba thob par byed par gyur cig ces
 smon lam 'debs so¹⁸³⁹ // de la 'di skad ces bya^{1840 1841} ste /¹⁸⁴² mgo bo¹⁸⁴³ i nor bu¹⁸⁴⁴ cod pan byin
 pa¹⁸⁴⁵ yi¹⁸⁴⁶ // bsod nams tshogs ni bdag la ci yod pa // des na¹⁸⁴⁷ 'dir ni¹⁸⁴⁸ sems can thams cad
 kyi¹⁸⁴⁹ // spyi gtsug bltar¹⁸⁵⁰ med rtag tu thob gyur cig /¹⁸⁵¹ gtsug gi nor bu byin¹⁸⁵² des bdag¹⁸⁵³

¹⁸¹² L: squeezes in *ji* between adjacent syllables, probably as a correction

¹⁸¹³ T: *bar*

¹⁸¹⁴ S: omits *danḍa*

¹⁸¹⁵ L: *yongsu*

¹⁸¹⁶ N: double *danḍa*

¹⁸¹⁷ L: *ltar*; T: *pltar*

¹⁸¹⁸ L: omits

¹⁸¹⁹ T: *gis*

¹⁸²⁰ S: omits *danḍa*

¹⁸²¹ T: *par*

¹⁸²² L and T: *yongsu*

¹⁸²³ T: *ba*

¹⁸²⁴ N and T: *byin*

¹⁸²⁵ T: *chags*

¹⁸²⁶ T: combines *snyam mo* into one word, resulting in a *snyam* with an “o” marker over the final “m”

¹⁸²⁷ L: *yongsu*

¹⁸²⁸ T: *byin*

¹⁸²⁹ L: omits

¹⁸³⁰ S: omits *danḍa*

¹⁸³¹ L and Q: *yongsu*

¹⁸³² T: *ba*

¹⁸³³ Q: *ni*

¹⁸³⁴ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

¹⁸³⁵ L: inserts *gi*

¹⁸³⁶ L: final “d” is written beneath “ca”

¹⁸³⁷ N and Q: *kyi*

¹⁸³⁸ L: *spyo*; T: omits

¹⁸³⁹ L: *'debso*

¹⁸⁴⁰ L: *bye*

¹⁸⁴¹ T: inserts *ba*

¹⁸⁴² T: double *danḍa*

¹⁸⁴³ T: *ba*

¹⁸⁴⁴ D: *pu*; L, S, and T: *bu'i*

¹⁸⁴⁵ L: *ba*

¹⁸⁴⁶ L: accidentally conflates *ba yi*

¹⁸⁴⁷ S: *ni*

¹⁸⁴⁸ L: *des 'di rin* for *des na 'dir ni*

¹⁸⁴⁹ D: *kyi*

¹⁸⁵⁰ Q: *blta'*

¹⁸⁵¹ L: double *danḍa*

/¹⁸⁵⁴ nya gro dha^{1855 1856} ltar chu zheng gab¹⁸⁵⁷ // gser dang nor bu byas¹⁸⁵⁸ pa yi¹⁸⁵⁹ // gtsug tor
 phun¹⁸⁶⁰ sum tshogs par shog /¹⁸⁶¹ de la rkang pa sbyin¹⁸⁶² pa la ji ltar mngon par¹⁸⁶³ brtson par
 byed ce na /¹⁸⁶⁴ rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de¹⁸⁶⁵ 'di snyam du sems te / rkang pa
 sbyin¹⁸⁶⁶ pa zhes bya ba de ni¹⁸⁶⁷ byang chub sems dpa' rnam s kyi chos kyi rkang pa byang chub
 kyi snying por 'gro ba'i tshig bla dags yin gyis / bdag gis¹⁸⁶⁸ rkang pa sbyin pa sbyin¹⁸⁶⁹ par bya
 gor ma chag snyam mo¹⁸⁷⁰ //¹⁸⁷¹ de^{1872 1873} rkang pa sbyin pa de¹⁸⁷⁴ sbyin¹⁸⁷⁵ pa na / de bzhin
 gshegs¹⁸⁷⁶ pas¹⁸⁷⁷ brnyes pa'i smon lam bzhin du¹⁸⁷⁸ rkang pa¹⁸⁷⁹ sbyin¹⁸⁸⁰ pa 'dis na /¹⁸⁸¹ mi rnam s
 dang sems can thams cad rtag tu¹⁸⁸² myur bar khyim nas¹⁸⁸³ mngon par¹⁸⁸⁴ byung nas¹⁸⁸⁵ skye
 ba¹⁸⁸⁶ dang /¹⁸⁸⁷ rga ba¹⁸⁸⁸ dang /¹⁸⁸⁹ na ba¹⁸⁹⁰ dang /¹⁸⁹¹ 'chi ba'i gnod pa zhi bar bya ba'i don gyi
 phyir 'dod¹⁸⁹² bzhin du bag brkyang nas rab tu dga' zhing dbang po zhi la¹⁸⁹³ skyabs su¹⁸⁹⁴ 'os¹⁸⁹⁵

¹⁸⁵² T: inserts *gyi*, giving the foot an extra syllable

¹⁸⁵³ L: *dag*

¹⁸⁵⁴ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁸⁵⁵ D and T: *da*

¹⁸⁵⁶ L: *nye grod* (intended to be *nye gro da*?) for *nya gro dha*

¹⁸⁵⁷ T: *gbab*

¹⁸⁵⁸ N: *byin*

¹⁸⁵⁹ D, L, N, and Q: *yis*

¹⁸⁶⁰ L: *phu*

¹⁸⁶¹ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁸⁶² T: *byin*

¹⁸⁶³ T: *bar*

¹⁸⁶⁴ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁸⁶⁵ L: inserts what appears to be a small *ni*

¹⁸⁶⁶ T: *byin*

¹⁸⁶⁷ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹⁸⁶⁸ Q: *gi*

¹⁸⁶⁹ N and T: *byin*

¹⁸⁷⁰ L: *snyamo*

¹⁸⁷¹ Q: single *daṅḍa*

¹⁸⁷² T: omits

¹⁸⁷³ D, N, and Q: insert *la*, confusing the opening of this refrain with the one that begins each type of gift

¹⁸⁷⁴ Q: omits

¹⁸⁷⁵ N: *byin*

¹⁸⁷⁶ L: *gsheg*

¹⁸⁷⁷ Q: *pa'i*

¹⁸⁷⁸ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹⁸⁷⁹ L: *ba*

¹⁸⁸⁰ L, N, Q, S, and T: *byin*

¹⁸⁸¹ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

¹⁸⁸² L: part of the bottom of “t” and the “u” marker have been effaced

¹⁸⁸³ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹⁸⁸⁴ L: *bar*

¹⁸⁸⁵ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹⁸⁸⁶ L: repeats *ba*

¹⁸⁸⁷ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

¹⁸⁸⁸ L: accidentally conflates *rga ba*, leaving what looks like *rgab*

¹⁸⁸⁹ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

¹⁸⁹⁰ L: accidentally conflates *na ba*, leaving what looks like *nab*

¹⁸⁹¹ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

¹⁸⁹² L: inserts *pa*

pa'i¹⁸⁹⁶ zla ba'i 'od ltar gzugs zhi ba¹⁸⁹⁷ snang byed nyi ma sna tshogs¹⁸⁹⁸ kyi gzi brjid ltar snying rje las byung ba'i 'od zer¹⁸⁹⁹ 'phro¹⁹⁰⁰ bas¹⁹⁰¹ mtshams med pa yan chad¹⁹⁰² mun par zhugs pas nyam thag pa'i mi rnams kyi mun pa snang bar byas nas¹⁹⁰³ lus rab tu tsha¹⁹⁰⁴ ba'i sdug bsngal rnams sel¹⁹⁰⁵ cing¹⁹⁰⁶ 1907 pad ma¹⁹⁰⁸ i rkang pa¹⁹⁰⁹ 1910 'khor lo rtsibs stong dang ldan pa'i mtshan gyis spras¹⁹¹¹ la /¹⁹¹² mnyam zhing 'jam pa¹⁹¹³ dang / sor mo ring zhing ngang pa'i rkang pa ltar dra bas¹⁹¹⁴ 'brel ba¹⁹¹⁵ dang / sen mo me long bzang po dag par phyis pa¹⁹¹⁶ lta bus brgyan te / me tog kun da¹⁹¹⁷ ltar¹⁹¹⁸ 'dug pa dang / long bu mi mngon pa dang / rje ngar smig¹⁹¹⁹ ma dang¹⁹²⁰ ri dags¹⁹²¹ e na¹⁹²² ya'i byin pa 'dra ba'i ya¹⁹²³ mtshan gyi stabs¹⁹²⁴ kyis dal bus dal nas¹⁹²⁵ byang chub kyi snying po'i gdan¹⁹²⁶ rdo rje'i stegs bu'i gdan /¹⁹²⁷ chos kyi seng ge'i khri la bdud rnam par gzhom pa'i phyir shin tu¹⁹²⁸ gnon¹⁹²⁹ par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so¹⁹³⁰ /¹⁹³¹ de la

¹⁸⁹³ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

¹⁸⁹⁴ L: combines *skyabs su* into one word, resulting in a *skyabs* with a “u” marker under the final “s”

¹⁸⁹⁵ S: 'od or 'ong

¹⁸⁹⁶ L, N, S, and T: omit the genitive particle

¹⁸⁹⁷ S and T: insert *danḍa*

¹⁸⁹⁸ L: *tshog*

¹⁸⁹⁹ L: *gzer*

¹⁹⁰⁰ Q: *'phros*

¹⁹⁰¹ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

¹⁹⁰² D and Q: *cad*

¹⁹⁰³ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

¹⁹⁰⁴ N: “tsh” marker atop the letter is almost or entirely absent

¹⁹⁰⁵ L: *bsel*

¹⁹⁰⁶ N: *zhing*

¹⁹⁰⁷ S: inserts *danḍa*

¹⁹⁰⁸ L, N, and S: *padma*

¹⁹⁰⁹ N and Q: *pa'i*

¹⁹¹⁰ L, S, and T: insert *la*

¹⁹¹¹ L: inserts *pa*

¹⁹¹² L, S, and T: omit *danḍa*

¹⁹¹³ L: *ba*

¹⁹¹⁴ Q: *rkang pa lta bur* for *rkang pa ltar dra bas*

¹⁹¹⁵ D and T: *pa*

¹⁹¹⁶ S: *ba*

¹⁹¹⁷ N: *kunda*

¹⁹¹⁸ L: *byang chub kyi snying po me tog kun de ltar* for *me tog kun da ltar* (most likely under the influence of an upcoming phrase)

¹⁹¹⁹ D: *smyig*

¹⁹²⁰ L and T: insert *danḍa*

¹⁹²¹ N and T: *dvags*

¹⁹²² L: *ne*; S: *nya*

¹⁹²³ T: omits

¹⁹²⁴ T: *stobs*

¹⁹²⁵ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

¹⁹²⁶ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

¹⁹²⁷ Q and T: omit *danḍa*

¹⁹²⁸ Q: *du*

¹⁹²⁹ L: *gnod*

¹⁹³⁰ L, S, and T: omit *ces smon lam 'debs so*

¹⁹³¹ L, N, and Q: double *danḍa*

tshig phyi ma yang¹⁹³² yod de¹⁹³³ /¹⁹³⁴ rkang pa¹⁹³⁵ byin pa¹⁹³⁶ 'di yis na¹⁹³⁷ //¹⁹³⁸ rkang¹⁹³⁹ mthil¹⁹⁴⁰
 'khor lo'i mtshan can gyis // byang chub snying po'i gdan bzang¹⁹⁴¹ la // brtan¹⁹⁴² pos¹⁹⁴³ shin
 tu¹⁹⁴⁴ gnon¹⁹⁴⁵ par¹⁹⁴⁶ shog /¹⁹⁴⁷ rkang pa¹⁹⁴⁸ sbyin¹⁹⁴⁹ pa 'dis na bdag / byang chub snying po'i
 gdan mchog la //¹⁹⁵⁰ 'dug nas bdud rnams sde dang dpung //¹⁹⁵¹ bzhon¹⁹⁵² dang bcas par 'dul
 bar¹⁹⁵³ shog /¹⁹⁵⁴ de la lag mthil sbyin pa la ji ltar mngon par¹⁹⁵⁵ brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi
 bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / lag mthil sbyin¹⁹⁵⁶ pa zhes bya ba de
 ni¹⁹⁵⁷ byang chub sems dpa' rnams kyis¹⁹⁵⁸ ¹⁹⁵⁹ sems can thams cad la chos kyi lag pa sbyin pa'i¹⁹⁶⁰
 tshig¹⁹⁶¹ bla dags yin gyis / bdag gis lag mthil sbyin pa¹⁹⁶² sbyin¹⁹⁶³ par bya gor ma chag snyam
 mo // de¹⁹⁶⁴ lag mthil gyi¹⁹⁶⁵ sbyin pa¹⁹⁶⁶ de sbyin¹⁹⁶⁷ pa na / de bzhin gshegs pas rnam par
 mkhyen pa'i smon lam bzhin du¹⁹⁶⁸ lag mthil sbyin pa 'dis na /¹⁹⁶⁹ bdag sems can dman pa dang
 / long ba dang /¹⁹⁷⁰ bkren pa¹⁹⁷¹ dang / mgon med pa dang / sdug bsngal ba¹⁹⁷² dang / dbul po

¹⁹³² N and S: 'ang

¹⁹³³ L: accidentally conflates *yod de*

¹⁹³⁴ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁹³⁵ N: *ba*

¹⁹³⁶ T: *ba*

¹⁹³⁷ Q: *ni*

¹⁹³⁸ L and S: single *daṅḍa*

¹⁹³⁹ T: *rkal*

¹⁹⁴⁰ D: *thil*

¹⁹⁴¹ D, L, Q, S, and T: *bzangs*

¹⁹⁴² S: *rtan*

¹⁹⁴³ Q: *par*

¹⁹⁴⁴ Q: *du*

¹⁹⁴⁵ L: *gnod*

¹⁹⁴⁶ L: *pa*

¹⁹⁴⁷ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁹⁴⁸ T: *ba*

¹⁹⁴⁹ N: *byin*

¹⁹⁵⁰ L: single *daṅḍa*

¹⁹⁵¹ N: single *daṅḍa*

¹⁹⁵² Q: *gzhon*; T: *bzho*

¹⁹⁵³ L: *par*

¹⁹⁵⁴ L: double *daṅḍa*

¹⁹⁵⁵ T: *bar*

¹⁹⁵⁶ T: *byin*

¹⁹⁵⁷ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹⁹⁵⁸ D, N, and Q: *kyi*

¹⁹⁵⁹ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹⁹⁶⁰ L: omits the genitive particle

¹⁹⁶¹ Q: *chig*

¹⁹⁶² T: *ba*

¹⁹⁶³ N and T: *byin*

¹⁹⁶⁴ D, N, and Q: insert *la*, once again confusing the opening of this refrain with the one that begins each type of gift

¹⁹⁶⁵ L and T: *gyis*

¹⁹⁶⁶ S: *ba*

¹⁹⁶⁷ N and T: *byin*

¹⁹⁶⁸ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*

¹⁹⁶⁹ N and Q: omit *daṅḍa*

¹⁹⁷⁰ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

¹⁹⁷¹ L: *ba*

dang / gnas med pa dang / skyabs med pa dang / dpung gnyen med pa¹⁹⁷³ rnam dang / sems can dmyal ba dang /¹⁹⁷⁴ dud 'gro'i skye gnas dang / gshin rje'i 'jig rten dang /¹⁹⁷⁵ ngan song ngan 'gro log par ltung ba dang / mi khom par skyes pa¹⁹⁷⁶ rnam la chos kyi lag pa sbyin par byed par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so¹⁹⁷⁷ // de la tshig¹⁹⁷⁸ phyi ma yang¹⁹⁷⁹ yod de /¹⁹⁸⁰ lag mthil sbyin¹⁹⁸¹ pas¹⁹⁸² myur du bdag /¹⁹⁸³ rnam 'dren¹⁹⁸⁴ lag na rin chen dang //¹⁹⁸⁵ lag pa ring zhing gser mdog¹⁹⁸⁶ ldan // 'jig rten mchod gnas¹⁹⁸⁷ gyur par shog /¹⁹⁸⁸ snying rjes non¹⁹⁸⁹ par gyur nas ni // chos kyi lag pa bstod byas la // ngan song kun las lus can rnam //¹⁹⁹⁰ bdag gis rtag tu 'byin¹⁹⁹¹ par shog /¹⁹⁹² de la rna ba dang¹⁹⁹³ sna yongs su¹⁹⁹⁴ gtong ba'i sbyin pa la ji ltar mngon par¹⁹⁹⁵ brtson par¹⁹⁹⁶ byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / rna ba dang¹⁹⁹⁷ sna yongs su¹⁹⁹⁸ gtong ba'i sbyin pa¹⁹⁹⁹ zhes bya ba de ni²⁰⁰⁰ byang chub sems dpa' rnam kyi dbang po tshang ba²⁰⁰¹ yongs su²⁰⁰² rdzogs par 'gyur ba'i tshig²⁰⁰³ bla dags yin gyis /²⁰⁰⁴ bdag gis rna ba dang /²⁰⁰⁵ sna yongs su²⁰⁰⁶ gtong ba'i sbyin pa²⁰⁰⁷ sbyin²⁰⁰⁸ par bya

-
- ¹⁹⁷² L: omits
¹⁹⁷³ D: *ba*
¹⁹⁷⁴ Q: omits *daṅḍa*
¹⁹⁷⁵ Q: omits *daṅḍa*
¹⁹⁷⁶ S: *skye ba* for *skyes pa*
¹⁹⁷⁷ T: combines 'debs so into one word, resulting in a 'debs with an "o" marker over the final "s"
¹⁹⁷⁸ T: *tshē*
¹⁹⁷⁹ N and S: 'ang
¹⁹⁸⁰ L: double *daṅḍa*
¹⁹⁸¹ N and T: *byin*
¹⁹⁸² Q: *par*
¹⁹⁸³ L: double *daṅḍa*
¹⁹⁸⁴ L: 'drin
¹⁹⁸⁵ L: single *daṅḍa*
¹⁹⁸⁶ Q: *ldog*
¹⁹⁸⁷ L: *gnan*
¹⁹⁸⁸ L: double *daṅḍa*
¹⁹⁸⁹ Q: *rje nan* for *rjes non*
¹⁹⁹⁰ N: single *daṅḍa*
¹⁹⁹¹ S and T: *byin*
¹⁹⁹² L: double *daṅḍa*
¹⁹⁹³ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*
¹⁹⁹⁴ L: *yongsu*
¹⁹⁹⁵ T: *bar*
¹⁹⁹⁶ D: *bar*
¹⁹⁹⁷ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*
¹⁹⁹⁸ L: *yongsu*
¹⁹⁹⁹ T: *ba*
²⁰⁰⁰ L and S: insert *daṅḍa*
²⁰⁰¹ L: *pa*
²⁰⁰² L: *yongsu*
²⁰⁰³ L: *tshigs*
²⁰⁰⁴ L and Q: double *daṅḍa*
²⁰⁰⁵ Q and S: omit *daṅḍa*
²⁰⁰⁶ L: *yongsu*
²⁰⁰⁷ T: *ba*
²⁰⁰⁸ N and T: *byin*

gor ma chag²⁰⁰⁹ snyam mo // de rna ba dang²⁰¹⁰ sna yongs su²⁰¹¹ gtong ba'i sbyin pa²⁰¹² de²⁰¹³
sbyin²⁰¹⁴ pa na / de bzhin gshegs pas rnam par bzhag²⁰¹⁵ pa'i smon lam bzhin du /²⁰¹⁶ rna ba
dang²⁰¹⁷ sna yongs su²⁰¹⁸ gtong ba'i sbyin pa²⁰¹⁹ 'dis na /²⁰²⁰ bdag sems can thams cad²⁰²¹ dbang po
thams cad dang ldan par²⁰²² byed par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so²⁰²³ // de la 'di skad ces bya
ste²⁰²⁴ /²⁰²⁵ rna ba dang ni sna btang bas //²⁰²⁶ srog chags²⁰²⁷ rnams²⁰²⁸ ni²⁰²⁹ thams cad kyang
//²⁰³⁰ dbang po kun dang ldan gyur te // yan lag thams cad rdzogs par shog /²⁰³¹ rna ba dang ni
sna btang bas // gang dang gang du skyes pa der // blta na²⁰³² sdug cing gzugs bzang la²⁰³³ //²⁰³⁴
mi ni de bzhin mdzes par 'gyur // de²⁰³⁵ la mig gi sbyin pa²⁰³⁶ la ji ltar mngon par brtson par
byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / mig sbyin pa²⁰³⁷
zhes bya ba de ni²⁰³⁸ byang chub sems dpa' rnams kyi chos kyi mig²⁰³⁹ sgrib²⁰⁴⁰ pa med pa yongs
su²⁰⁴¹ dag pa'i tshig²⁰⁴² bla dags yin gyis / bdag gis mig gi²⁰⁴³ sbyin pa sbyin²⁰⁴⁴ par bya gor²⁰⁴⁵ ma
chag snyam mo // de mig gi sbyin pa de sbyin²⁰⁴⁶ pa na /²⁰⁴⁷ de bzhin gshegs pas²⁰⁴⁸ dag par

²⁰⁰⁹ L: omits

²⁰¹⁰ L, N, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

²⁰¹¹ L: *yongsu*

²⁰¹² T: *ba*

²⁰¹³ L: omits

²⁰¹⁴ N and T: *byin*

²⁰¹⁵ D and Q: *gzhag*

²⁰¹⁶ Q and S: omit *daṅḍa*

²⁰¹⁷ L, N, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

²⁰¹⁸ L: *yongsu*

²⁰¹⁹ T: *ba*

²⁰²⁰ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²⁰²¹ T: omits

²⁰²² T: *bar*

²⁰²³ L: *'debso*

²⁰²⁴ N: "e" marker is almost or entirely absent

²⁰²⁵ T: double *daṅḍa*

²⁰²⁶ L: single *daṅḍa*

²⁰²⁷ T: *chag*

²⁰²⁸ S: *dang* for *rnams* (followed by a small series of dots, indicative of an emendation)

²⁰²⁹ N: "i" marker is almost or entirely absent

²⁰³⁰ L: single *daṅḍa*

²⁰³¹ L: double *daṅḍa*

²⁰³² L: accidentally conflates *blta na*, leaving what looks like *bltan*

²⁰³³ Q: the woodblock has been re-cut to squeeze in *mdzes pa'i* for *bzang la*

²⁰³⁴ L, Q, and T: single *daṅḍa*

²⁰³⁵ T: *ne*

²⁰³⁶ T: *ba*

²⁰³⁷ D: *ba*

²⁰³⁸ L and Q: insert double *daṅḍa*; N, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

²⁰³⁹ L: *mi*

²⁰⁴⁰ Q: *sgrab*

²⁰⁴¹ L: *yongsu*

²⁰⁴² N: "tsh" marker atop the letter is almost or entirely absent

²⁰⁴³ L and T: *gis*

²⁰⁴⁴ N and T: *byin*

²⁰⁴⁵ L: *go*

²⁰⁴⁶ N and T: *byin*

²⁰⁴⁷ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

mdzad pa'i smon lam bzhin du /²⁰⁴⁹ mig gi²⁰⁵⁰ sbyin pa 'dis na / bdag sems can thams cad kyi
 chos kyi mig sgrib pa med pa yongs su²⁰⁵¹ dag par²⁰⁵² byed²⁰⁵³ par²⁰⁵⁴ gyur²⁰⁵⁵ cig ces smon lam
 'debs so // de la²⁰⁵⁶ tshig²⁰⁵⁷ phyi ma yang²⁰⁵⁸ yod de /²⁰⁵⁹ mig gi sbyin pa 'dis na bdag /²⁰⁶⁰ bla
 med²⁰⁶¹ byang chub sangs rgyas nas // sems can kun gyi²⁰⁶² chos kyi mig /²⁰⁶³ rnam par dag par
 byed gyur cig / mig byin brtul zhugs bzang po des // dri ma med cing skyon²⁰⁶⁴ med la // dag
 cing yangs la mdzes bzang²⁰⁶⁵ dang //²⁰⁶⁶ zhi ba'i mig ni thob par 'gyur // ut²⁰⁶⁷ pala²⁰⁶⁸ sngon
 po'i²⁰⁶⁹ 'dab 'dra dang //²⁰⁷⁰ byi²⁰⁷¹ u ku na²⁰⁷² la'i mig 'dra zhing //²⁰⁷³ mig gi rdzi ma ba yi 'dra //
 de 'dra'i mig ni de yis 'thob // de la mgo bo²⁰⁷⁴ yongs su²⁰⁷⁵ gtong ba'i sbyin pa la²⁰⁷⁶ ji ltar
 mngon par²⁰⁷⁷ brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de²⁰⁷⁸ 'di snyam du
 sems te / mgo bo yongs su²⁰⁷⁹ gtong ba'i sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni /²⁰⁸⁰ byang chub sems dpa'
 rnams kyi khams gsum thams cad las khyad par du 'phags pa'i mchog²⁰⁸¹ thams cad mkhyen
 pa'i ye shes 'thob pa'i tshig²⁰⁸² bla dags yin gyis /²⁰⁸³ bdag gis mgo bo²⁰⁸⁴ yongs su²⁰⁸⁵ gtong ba'i

²⁰⁴⁸ N and Q: insert *yang*

²⁰⁴⁹ S: omits *daṅḍa*

²⁰⁵⁰ L and T: *gis*

²⁰⁵¹ L: *yongsu*

²⁰⁵² Q: *pa*

²⁰⁵³ Q: *byad*

²⁰⁵⁴ N: *bar*

²⁰⁵⁵ L: omits

²⁰⁵⁶ L: omits

²⁰⁵⁷ T: *tshē*

²⁰⁵⁸ N and S: *'ang*

²⁰⁵⁹ L and Q: double *daṅḍa*

²⁰⁶⁰ L: double *daṅḍa*

²⁰⁶¹ L: accidentally conflates *bla med*

²⁰⁶² S and T: *gyis*

²⁰⁶³ L: double *daṅḍa*

²⁰⁶⁴ L: *skyen*

²⁰⁶⁵ D: *bzangs*

²⁰⁶⁶ L: single *daṅḍa*

²⁰⁶⁷ L and Q: *ud*

²⁰⁶⁸ N and S: *utpala*; T: *utpa la*

²⁰⁶⁹ L and T: omit the genitive particle

²⁰⁷⁰ L and T: single *daṅḍa*

²⁰⁷¹ L, S, and T: *bye*

²⁰⁷² L, N, Q, and S: *kuna*

²⁰⁷³ L: single *daṅḍa*

²⁰⁷⁴ N and Q: omit

²⁰⁷⁵ L: *yongsu*

²⁰⁷⁶ L: omits

²⁰⁷⁷ T: *bar*

²⁰⁷⁸ L, S, and T: *des*

²⁰⁷⁹ L: *yongsu*

²⁰⁸⁰ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²⁰⁸¹ L: inserts double *daṅḍa*; T: inserts *daṅḍa*

²⁰⁸² Q: *chig*

²⁰⁸³ L: omits *daṅḍa*

²⁰⁸⁴ N and Q: omit

²⁰⁸⁵ L: *yongsu*

sbyin pa sbyin²⁰⁸⁶ par bya gor ma chag snyam mo // de mgo bo²⁰⁸⁷ yongs su²⁰⁸⁸ gtong ba'i sbyin
 pa de sbyin²⁰⁸⁹ pa na / de bzhin gshegs pa'i rkyen du²⁰⁹⁰ bab pa'i²⁰⁹¹ smon lam bzhin du²⁰⁹²
 mgo²⁰⁹³ bo²⁰⁹⁴ yongs su²⁰⁹⁵ gtong ba'i sbyin pa²⁰⁹⁶ 'dis²⁰⁹⁷ na /²⁰⁹⁸ bdag sems can thams cad 'jig rten
 gsum las khyad par du 'phags pa²⁰⁹⁹ i mchog thams cad mkhyen pa'i ye shes thob par²¹⁰⁰ byed
 par²¹⁰¹ gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so²¹⁰² // de la tshig²¹⁰³ phyi ma yang²¹⁰⁴ yod de /²¹⁰⁵ mgo bo
 yongs su²¹⁰⁶ gtong ba yis²¹⁰⁷ // bsod nams bdag la ci yod pa // des²¹⁰⁸ na sems can kun mkhyen
 gyi // go 'phang mi g.yo²¹⁰⁹ thob gyur cig /²¹¹⁰ de la pags²¹¹¹ shun yongs su²¹¹² gtong ba'i sbyin pa
 la ji ltar mngon par²¹¹³ brtson²¹¹⁴ par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di
 snyam du sems te /²¹¹⁵ pags²¹¹⁶ shun yongs su²¹¹⁷ gtong ba'i sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni /²¹¹⁸ byang
 chub sems dpa' rnam kyi pags²¹¹⁹ pa 'jam zhing srab la gser gyi kha dog²¹²⁰ lta bu yongs²¹²¹ su²¹²²
 rdzogs par 'gyur ba'i tshig bla dags yin gyis²¹²³ /²¹²⁴ bdag gis²¹²⁵ pags²¹²⁶ shun yongs su²¹²⁷ gtong

²⁰⁸⁶ N and T: *byin*

²⁰⁸⁷ N and Q: omit

²⁰⁸⁸ L: *yongsu*

²⁰⁸⁹ N: *byin*

²⁰⁹⁰ L and T: *tu*

²⁰⁹¹ L: squeezes the final “b” of *bab* and *pa'i* into an extremely small space, probably as a correction

²⁰⁹² L and T: insert *daṅḍa*

²⁰⁹³ T: *mgro*

²⁰⁹⁴ N and Q: omit

²⁰⁹⁵ L: *yongsu*

²⁰⁹⁶ T: *ba*

²⁰⁹⁷ S: *des*

²⁰⁹⁸ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²⁰⁹⁹ N: *ba*

²¹⁰⁰ L: *bar*

²¹⁰¹ L, Q, S, and T: omit *byed par*

²¹⁰² L: *'debso*

²¹⁰³ T: *tshe*

²¹⁰⁴ N and S: *'ang*

²¹⁰⁵ Q: double *daṅḍa*

²¹⁰⁶ L: *yongsu*

²¹⁰⁷ Q: *yi*

²¹⁰⁸ N and Q: *de*

²¹⁰⁹ T: accidentally conflates *mi g.yo*

²¹¹⁰ L: double *daṅḍa*

²¹¹¹ L, Q, and S: *lpags*

²¹¹² L and T: *yongsu*

²¹¹³ T: *bar*

²¹¹⁴ L: prefix “b” is squeezed in at the upper left corner of the syllable

²¹¹⁵ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²¹¹⁶ L, Q, and S: *lpags*

²¹¹⁷ L: *yongsu*

²¹¹⁸ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²¹¹⁹ Q: *lpags*; T: *phags*

²¹²⁰ D, L, S, and T: *mdog* for *kha dog*

²¹²¹ D: *yangs*

²¹²² L and T: *yongsu*

²¹²³ S and T: *gyi*

²¹²⁴ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²¹²⁵ Q: reads *bdag cag gi* instead *bdag gis*

ba'i sbyin pa sbyin²¹²⁸ par bya gor ma chag²¹²⁹ snyam mo²¹³⁰ //²¹³¹ de pags²¹³² shun yongs su²¹³³
 gtong ba'i sbyin pa de sbyin²¹³⁴ pa na / de bzhin gshegs pa'i smon lam bzhin du /²¹³⁵ pags²¹³⁶
 shun yongs su²¹³⁷ gtong ba'i sbyin pa 'dis²¹³⁸ na / bdag sems can thams cad kyi pags²¹³⁹ pa 'jam
 zhing srab la /²¹⁴⁰ gser gyi kha dog lta bu yongs su²¹⁴¹ rdzogs par byed par gyur cig ces smon lam
 'debs so²¹⁴² // de la tshig²¹⁴³ phyi ma yang²¹⁴⁴ yod de /²¹⁴⁵ pags²¹⁴⁶ shun yongs su²¹⁴⁷ btang²¹⁴⁸ ba
 yis // bdag gis su ni lus can rnam // pags²¹⁴⁹ shun lus las skyes pa dag /²¹⁵⁰ 'jam srab gser gyi
 mdog sgyur shog /²¹⁵¹ de la sha²¹⁵² dang khrag yongs su²¹⁵³ gtong ba'i sbyin pa la ji ltar mngon
 par²¹⁵⁴ brtson par²¹⁵⁵ byed ce na /²¹⁵⁶ rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa'²¹⁵⁷ de 'di snyam du
 sems te /²¹⁵⁸ sha dang khrag yongs su²¹⁵⁹ gtong ba'i sbyin pa²¹⁶⁰ zhes²¹⁶¹ bya ba de ni /²¹⁶² byang
 chub sems dpa' rnam kyi snying po med pa thams cad las²¹⁶³ snying po²¹⁶⁴ blang ba'i tshig bla
 dags yin gyis /²¹⁶⁵ bdag gis²¹⁶⁶ sha dang khrag yongs su²¹⁶⁷ gtong ba'i sbyin pa sbyin²¹⁶⁸ par bya

²¹²⁶ L, Q, and S: *lpags*

²¹²⁷ L: *yongsu*

²¹²⁸ N and T: *byin*

²¹²⁹ L: *chags*

²¹³⁰ L: *snyamo*

²¹³¹ N: single *daṅḍa*

²¹³² Q and S: *lpags*; L: *lbags*

²¹³³ L and Q: *yongsu*

²¹³⁴ N and T: *byin*

²¹³⁵ N and S: omit *daṅḍa*; Q: omits the entire phrase *de bzhin gshegs pa'i smon lam bzhin du* plus the *daṅḍa*

²¹³⁶ L, Q, and S: *lpags*

²¹³⁷ L: *yongsu*

²¹³⁸ Q: *'das*

²¹³⁹ L and Q: *lpags*

²¹⁴⁰ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²¹⁴¹ L: *yongsu*

²¹⁴² L: *'dabso* (a very faint mark may be intended for the “e” marker)

²¹⁴³ T: *tshe*

²¹⁴⁴ N and S: *'ang*

²¹⁴⁵ L and Q: double *daṅḍa*

²¹⁴⁶ L, Q, and S: *lpags*; N: appears to read *pag*, either because of an error or because the final “s” has been effaced

²¹⁴⁷ L: *yongsu*

²¹⁴⁸ L: *gtang*; Q: *gdang*; S and T: *gtong*

²¹⁴⁹ L, Q, and S: *lpags*

²¹⁵⁰ L: double *daṅḍa*

²¹⁵¹ L: double *daṅḍa*

²¹⁵² L: *shad*

²¹⁵³ L and Q: *yongsu*

²¹⁵⁴ T: *bar*

²¹⁵⁵ D: *bar*

²¹⁵⁶ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²¹⁵⁷ D: *dba'*

²¹⁵⁸ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²¹⁵⁹ L: *yongsu*

²¹⁶⁰ S: *ba*

²¹⁶¹ N: appears to read *zhas*, either because of an error or because the “e” marker has been effaced

²¹⁶² Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²¹⁶³ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*

²¹⁶⁴ D: *bo*

²¹⁶⁵ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

gor ma chag snyam mo // de sha dang khrag yongs su²¹⁶⁹ gtong²¹⁷⁰ ba'i sbyin pa de sbyin²¹⁷¹
 pa²¹⁷² na / de bzhin gshegs pas bskyed²¹⁷³ pa'i smon lam bzhin du /²¹⁷⁴ sha dang khrag yongs
 su²¹⁷⁵ gtong ba'i sbyin pa²¹⁷⁶ 'dis na²¹⁷⁷ bdag gis sems can thams cad snying po med pa thams
 cad²¹⁷⁸ las²¹⁷⁹ snying po²¹⁸⁰ len²¹⁸¹ du²¹⁸² 'jug par byed par²¹⁸³ gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so²¹⁸⁴ //
 de la tshig²¹⁸⁵ phyi ma yang²¹⁸⁶ yod de²¹⁸⁷ /²¹⁸⁸ sha dang khrag gi sbyin pa yi²¹⁸⁹ // rnam smin
 bdag la ci yod des²¹⁹⁰ // snying po med pa²¹⁹¹ ma lus las // 'gro²¹⁹² kun snying por²¹⁹³ thob gyur
 cig /²¹⁹⁴ de la rkang sbyin pa la ji ltar mngon par²¹⁹⁵ brtson par byed ce na /²¹⁹⁶ rigs kyi bu 'di la
 byang chub sems dpa'²¹⁹⁷ de 'di snyam du sems te /²¹⁹⁸ rkang sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni²¹⁹⁹ byang
 chub sems dpa' rnam s kyi lus rdo rje ltar mi shigs²²⁰⁰ pa yongs su²²⁰¹ rdzogs par 'gyur ba'i tshig
 bla dags yin gyis²²⁰² /²²⁰³ bdag gis rkang gi²²⁰⁴ sbyin pa sbyin²²⁰⁵ par bya gor ma chag snyam

-
- 2166 Q: *gi*
 2167 L: *yongsu*
 2168 N and T: *byin*
 2169 L: *yongsu*
 2170 L: *gtog*; Q: *btong*
 2171 N and T: *byin*
 2172 N: *ba*
 2173 Q: *skyed*
 2174 Q and S: omit *danḍa*
 2175 L: *yongsu*
 2176 T: *ba*
 2177 L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*
 2178 T: repeats *snying po med pa thams cad*
 2179 L, S, and T: *la*
 2180 D: *bo*
 2181 T: *leg*
 2182 L and T: *tu*
 2183 D: *bar*
 2184 L: *'debso*
 2185 N: appears to read *chig*, either because of an error or because part of the first letter has been effaced; T: *tshe*
 2186 N and S: *'ang*
 2187 L: accidentally conflates *yod de*; T: combines *yod de* into one word, leaving *yode* (with the “o” and “e” markers immediately next to each other)
 2188 Q: omits *danḍa*
 2189 S: *vis*
 2190 L and S: *de*
 2191 D: *ba*
 2192 N: appears to read *'go*, either because of an error or because the subjoined “r” has been effaced
 2193 Q: *po*
 2194 L: double *danḍa*
 2195 T: *bar*
 2196 Q: omits *danḍa*
 2197 L: *sems dpa'* has been mutilated and now looks like *se da'* or *se pa'*
 2198 Q: omits *danḍa*
 2199 L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*
 2200 T: squeezes “g” beneath and between “shi” and the final “s”
 2201 L: *yongsu*
 2202 Q: *gyi*
 2203 Q: omits *danḍa*
 2204 L: omits
 2205 N and T: *byin*

mo²²⁰⁶ // de rkang gi sbyin pa de sbyin²²⁰⁷ pa na /²²⁰⁸ de bzhin gshegs pas^{2209 2210} bskyed²²¹¹ pa'i smon lam bzhin du /²²¹² rkang gi sbyin pa²²¹³ 'dis na /²²¹⁴ bdag sems can thams cad kyi lus rdo rje ltar mi shigs²²¹⁵ pa yongs su²²¹⁶ rdzogs par byed par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so²²¹⁷ // de la tshig²²¹⁸ phyi ma yang²²¹⁹ yod de /²²²⁰ rkang gi sbyin pa²²²¹ 'di yis na //²²²² bdag gis sems can thams cad kyi // rnag²²²³ gi lus kyi²²²⁴ za ma tog /²²²⁵ rdo rje mi shigs²²²⁶ rdzogs byed shog /²²²⁷ gzhan yang byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / kha dog phun sum tshogs pa byin pas ni²²²⁸ /²²²⁹ kha dog dang²²³⁰ ldan par 'gyur gyis²²³¹ bdag gis kha dog phun sum tshogs pa sbyin²²³² par²²³³ bya gor²²³⁴ ma chag snyam^{2235 2236} sems shing²²³⁷ dri phun sum tshogs pa byin pas²²³⁸ ni grags pa'i dri dang ldan par²²³⁹ 'gyur /²²⁴⁰ ro bro ba phun²²⁴¹ sum tshogs pa byin pas ni²²⁴² yo byad gya nom²²⁴³ pa²²⁴⁴ rnams 'thob²²⁴⁵ par²²⁴⁶ 'gyur /²²⁴⁷ reg²²⁴⁸ pa phun sum tshogs pa

-
- 2206 L: *snyamo*
2207 N and T: *byin*
2208 Q: omits *daṅḍa*
2209 Q: *pa*
2210 Q: inserts *tha* (possibly a mistaken prefix for the following *skyed*?)
2211 Q: *skyed*
2212 Q and S: omit *daṅḍa*
2213 T: *ba*
2214 Q: omits *daṅḍa*
2215 T: squeezes “g” beneath and between “shi” and the final “s”
2216 L: *yongsu*
2217 L: *'debso*
2218 T: *tshe*
2219 N and S: *'ang*
2220 L: double *daṅḍa*
2221 D: *ba*
2222 S: single *daṅḍa*
2223 L, S, and T: *rang*
2224 L, S, and T: *ni*
2225 L: double *daṅḍa*
2226 Q: *mig gis* for *mi shigs*
2227 L: double *daṅḍa*
2228 S: *byin pa nas* for *byin pas ni*
2229 N: omits *daṅḍa*; Q: double *daṅḍa*
2230 Q: omits
2231 L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*
2232 T: *byin*
2233 N: *bar*
2234 S: omits *bya gor*
2235 L: *snyamo*
2236 Q: inserts *du*
2237 L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*
2238 T: *bas*
2239 N: *bar*
2240 Q and T: omit *daṅḍa*
2241 L: squeezes in the final “n” of *phun*, probably as a correction
2242 L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*
2243 L: *non*
2244 L and N: *ba*
2245 L, N, and T: *thob*
2246 T: *pa*

byin pas²²⁴⁹ ni^{2250 2251} rkang²²⁵² lag 'jam zhing²²⁵³ gzhon sha chags par²²⁵⁴ 'gyur /²²⁵⁵ rang gi lag
nas²²⁵⁶ byin pas ni bsnyen bkur byed²²⁵⁷ pa 'thob²²⁵⁸ par²²⁵⁹ 'gyur /²²⁶⁰ gus par byas te²²⁶¹ byin
pas²²⁶² ni²²⁶³ gnyen la²²⁶⁴ sogs²²⁶⁵ pa'i nang du gzhan gyis bkur sti²²⁶⁶ bya bar 'gyur / dus su²²⁶⁷
byin pas²²⁶⁸ ni²²⁶⁹ de'i nor rnamdus su 'grub cing rgyas par 'gyur /²²⁷⁰ 'thun²²⁷¹ pa²²⁷² dang yid du
'ong ba byin pas ni mal dang gos la²²⁷³ sogs²²⁷⁴ pa longs spyod²²⁷⁵ yid du 'ong ba rnamdus la sems
'jug par 'gyur / gzhan la mi gnod par²²⁷⁶ byin pas ni²²⁷⁷ longs spyod brtan pa dag 'thob²²⁷⁸ par²²⁷⁹
'gyur /²²⁸⁰ mi dga' ba²²⁸¹ dang du len pa'i sbyin pas ni²²⁸² 'khor snying nye bar 'gyur /²²⁸³ zas byin
pas ni stobs dang ldan par²²⁸⁴ 'gyur²²⁸⁵ / skom byin^{2286 2287} pas ni skom pa²²⁸⁸ med par 'gyur²²⁸⁹ /²²⁹⁰

²²⁴⁷ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²²⁴⁸ T: *regs*

²²⁴⁹ Q: *pa*; T: *bas*

²²⁵⁰ Q: *na*

²²⁵¹ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

²²⁵² D: *rka*

²²⁵³ D: *la*

²²⁵⁴ N: *bar*

²²⁵⁵ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²²⁵⁶ L: *gnas*

²²⁵⁷ L: *byer*

²²⁵⁸ N: *thob*

²²⁵⁹ N: *bar*

²²⁶⁰ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²²⁶¹ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*

²²⁶² L: *bas*

²²⁶³ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

²²⁶⁴ L and T: *las*

²²⁶⁵ T: *stsogs*

²²⁶⁶ L and T: *bsti*

²²⁶⁷ L: accidentally conflates *dus su*

²²⁶⁸ T: *pa*

²²⁶⁹ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*

²²⁷⁰ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²²⁷¹ N and S: *mithun*

²²⁷² L and N: *ba*

²²⁷³ L and T: *las*

²²⁷⁴ T: *stsogs*

²²⁷⁵ N: *sbyod*

²²⁷⁶ L, S, and T: *pa*

²²⁷⁷ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

²²⁷⁸ N: *thob*

²²⁷⁹ N: *bar*

²²⁸⁰ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²²⁸¹ Q: *ba'i*

²²⁸² S: *na*

²²⁸³ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²²⁸⁴ D: *ba*

²²⁸⁵ N: second half of this line (starting with *stobs*) is barely legible, though the reading appears to be the same

²²⁸⁶ Q: *sbyin*

²²⁸⁷ N: beginning of this line is barely legible, though what can be seen and the apparent size of the syllables makes the reading *skom byin* almost certain

²²⁸⁸ L: *ba*

gos byin²²⁹¹ pas ni kha dog dang ldan par²²⁹² 'gyur / mar me byin pas ni mig²²⁹³ dang ldan par
'gyur / rol mo'i sgra byin pas ni rna ba nyams pa med par 'gyur /²²⁹⁴ bzhon²²⁹⁵ pa byin pas ni
bde ba dang ldan par 'gyur / sman byin²²⁹⁶ pas ni nad nyung bar 'gyur / me tog byin pas²²⁹⁷ ni
gzhan gyis mchod²²⁹⁸ par 'gyur / me²²⁹⁹ tog phreng²³⁰⁰ byin pas ni gzhan gyis rim gro bya bar
'gyur //²³⁰¹ bstod pa²³⁰² byin pas ni tshangs pa'i dbyangs dang ldan par 'gyur / stan byin pas ni
bla ma'i gnas thob par 'gyur / bzhon pa byin pas ni rdzu 'phrul dang ldan par²³⁰³ 'gyur /²³⁰⁴ byug
pa byin pas ni rma med par 'gyur / phyag dar bya ba byin pas ni rdul dang bral bar 'gyur /²³⁰⁵
dril bu byin pas ni tshe rabs²³⁰⁶ dran par²³⁰⁷ 'gyur / gnas byin pas ni thams cad byin par 'gyur /
chos byin pas ni bdud rtsi byin par 'gyur gyis²³⁰⁸ bdag gis chos kyi sbyin pa sbyin²³⁰⁹ par bya gor
ma chag snyam mo // de sbyin pa de lta bu sbyin²³¹⁰ pa²³¹¹ na²³¹² ²³¹³ chags pas sbyin par mi byed
/²³¹⁴ sdang bas sbyin par²³¹⁵ mi byed / rmongs pas sbyin par mi byed /²³¹⁶ tshig pa za zhing sbyin
par mi byed /²³¹⁷ brnyas²³¹⁸ bzhin du sbyin par mi byed /²³¹⁹ rdeg cing sbyin par mi byed²³²⁰ /
tshar bcad²³²¹ de sbyin par mi byed /²³²² khyad du gsod cing sbyin par mi byed /²³²³ smad de
sbyin²³²⁴ par mi byed / nga rgyal gyis khengs bzhin²³²⁵ du sbyin par mi byed / 'gying²³²⁶ bzhin du

²²⁸⁹ N: final “r” is not legible

²²⁹⁰ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²²⁹¹ Q: *sbyin*

²²⁹² T: *bar*

²²⁹³ T: *stobs* for *mig* (most likely under the influence of a preceding line)

²²⁹⁴ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²²⁹⁵ L: *gzhon*

²²⁹⁶ T: *gyis*

²²⁹⁷ L: *bas*

²²⁹⁸ L: *mchog*

²²⁹⁹ N” “e” marker has been effaced

²³⁰⁰ S: *'phreng*

²³⁰¹ L, N, Q, S, and T: single *daṅḍa*

²³⁰² T: *bston par* for *bstod pa*

²³⁰³ T: *bar*

²³⁰⁴ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²³⁰⁵ T: omits *daṅḍa*

²³⁰⁶ N: final “s” appears to be squeezed below the rest of the syllable, but it is only partially legible

²³⁰⁷ L: *bar*

²³⁰⁸ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

²³⁰⁹ N and T: *byin*

²³¹⁰ N and T: *byin*

²³¹¹ L: *ba*

²³¹² L: *ni*

²³¹³ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

²³¹⁴ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²³¹⁵ D: *bar*

²³¹⁶ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²³¹⁷ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²³¹⁸ L: *bsnyas*; T: accidentally splits *brnyas* into two syllables, leaving *brnya sa*

²³¹⁹ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²³²⁰ N: inserts *de*

²³²¹ S: *gcad*

²³²² Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²³²³ L and T: omit *daṅḍa*

²³²⁴ L: squeezes the final “n” of *sbyin* and *par* around the left string hole

sbyin par mi byed / lhag mar gyur pa sbyin par mi byed / rul cing²³²⁷ myags pa sbyin par mi byed kyi²³²⁸ sbyin pa gang dang gang sbyin pa de gus par byas te sbyin par byed / bla mar byas / ri mo²³²⁹ byas /²³³⁰ mchod pa byas shing rjed²³³¹ nas sbyin par byed /²³³² mang du sbyin par byed /²³³³ bzang po sbyin par byed / rab tu dga' bas sbyin par byed /²³³⁴ dga' zhing mgu bas sbyin par byed / gtsang ba dang /²³³⁵ rgya cher sbyin par byed²³³⁶ /²³³⁷ rang gi lag nas sbyin par byed²³³⁸ gus pa dang bcas pa dang /²³³⁹ zhe²³⁴⁰ sar bcas²³⁴¹ pas²³⁴² sbyin par byed / bsam pa²³⁴³ dag²³⁴⁴ cing bzang la dge bas sbyin par byed / ser sna med par sbyin par byed /²³⁴⁵ brkam²³⁴⁶ pa²³⁴⁷ med par sbyin par byed /²³⁴⁸ zhum pa²³⁴⁹ med par sbyin par²³⁵⁰ byed / 'jigs²³⁵¹ pa med par sbyin par byed / rgya che zhing yangs par sbyin par byed do // de sbyin²³⁵² pa de lta bu²³⁵³ sbyin²³⁵⁴ pa na²³⁵⁵ 2356 'di snyam du 'di ni tshul khrim s dang ldan pa yin gyis /²³⁵⁷ bdag gis sbyin par bya'o // 'di ni tshul khrim s 'chal ba²³⁵⁸ yin no // 'di ni dge ba'i chos dang ldan pa yin no // 'di ni dge ba'i chos ma yin pa²³⁵⁹ dang ldan pa yin no // 'di la byin na ni 'bras bu che ba dang /²³⁶⁰ phan yon che ba dang /²³⁶¹ mthu che bar 'gyur ro²³⁶² // 'di la byin na ni 'bras bu mi che ba

²³²⁵ N: appears to read *bzhan*, either because of an error or because the “i” marker has been effaced

²³²⁶ N: appears to read *'gyang*, either because of an error or because the “i” marker has been effaced

²³²⁷ N: appears to read *cang*, either because of an error or because the “i” marker has been effaced

²³²⁸ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

²³²⁹ L, S, and T: *mor*

²³³⁰ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²³³¹ D and L: *brjod*

²³³² Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²³³³ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²³³⁴ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²³³⁵ Q and S: omit *daṅḍa*

²³³⁶ N: “e” marker is almost or entirely absent

²³³⁷ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²³³⁸ L, Q, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

²³³⁹ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²³⁴⁰ T: *zhes*

²³⁴¹ D: *zhe sa dang bcas* for *zhe sar bcas*

²³⁴² L and T: *pa*

²³⁴³ L: *ba*

²³⁴⁴ Q: *dad*

²³⁴⁵ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²³⁴⁶ Q: *rkam*

²³⁴⁷ L: *ba*

²³⁴⁸ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²³⁴⁹ L: *ba*

²³⁵⁰ D: *bar*

²³⁵¹ L: *'jig*

²³⁵² S: *byin*

²³⁵³ D, N, and Q: insert *de*

²³⁵⁴ T: *byin*

²³⁵⁵ T: *ni*

²³⁵⁶ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

²³⁵⁷ N and Q: omit *daṅḍa*

²³⁵⁸ L, S, and T: *pa*

²³⁵⁹ D and T: *ba*

²³⁶⁰ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²³⁶¹ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

dang /²³⁶³ phan yon mi che ba dang /²³⁶⁴ mthu mi che bar 'gyur ro snyam du mi sems so //
gzhan yang yang dag pa'i blo dang ldan gyi²³⁶⁵ yang dag pa²³⁶⁶ ma yin pa^{2367 2368} i phyir de sbyin
pa de sbyin²³⁶⁹ pa na²³⁷⁰ /²³⁷¹ 'di snyam du²³⁷² dge ba'i rtsa ba dang /²³⁷³ chos kyi phyir²³⁷⁴ sbyin
pa²³⁷⁵ yongs su²³⁷⁶ gtong ba²³⁷⁷ 'dis na²³⁷⁸ bdag rgyal por gyur cig ce 'am / rgyal po gzhan nam
/²³⁷⁹ blon po²³⁸⁰ chen po 'am / lha 'am /²³⁸¹ lha'i bu 'am / lha gzhan gang yang rung ba zhig tu
gyur cig ces sems skyed²³⁸² par²³⁸³ mi byed do // 'o na²³⁸⁴ gang du zhe na / gzhan du na²³⁸⁵ bla na
med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub tu yongs su²³⁸⁶ sngo²³⁸⁷ bar byed de²³⁸⁸ /²³⁸⁹ dge ba'i
rtsa ba 'di dang²³⁹⁰ chos kyi phyir yongs su²³⁹¹ gtong ba 'dis na /²³⁹² bdag sems can ma rgal ba
rnams sgrol ba dang / ma grol ba rnams²³⁹³ grol²³⁹⁴ bar byed pa dang / dbugs ma phyin pa
rnams dbugs 'byin pa dang / yongs su²³⁹⁵ mya ngan las ma 'das pa rnams yongs su²³⁹⁶ mya ngan
las zlo bar byed pa dang /²³⁹⁷ 'jig rten long ba 'dren²³⁹⁸ pa med pa dang / skyob pa²³⁹⁹ med pa
dang / skyabs med pa dang / gnas med pa dang / gling med pa²⁴⁰⁰ dang / dpung gnyen med pa

²³⁶² L: combines 'gyur ro into one word, resulting in a 'gyur with an "o" marker over the final "r"

²³⁶³ Q: omits *danḍa*

²³⁶⁴ Q: omits *danḍa*

²³⁶⁵ L, Q, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

²³⁶⁶ T: *par*

²³⁶⁷ T: *ba*

²³⁶⁸ D and Q: repeat *ma yin pa*

²³⁶⁹ N and T: *byin*

²³⁷⁰ L and T: omit

²³⁷¹ Q: omits *danḍa*

²³⁷² D, L, N, Q, S, and T: insert *sbyin pa 'di dang* (L, Q, S, and T then insert a *danḍa*)

²³⁷³ Q: omits *danḍa*

²³⁷⁴ D: omits

²³⁷⁵ D: inserts *de*

²³⁷⁶ L: *yongsu*

²³⁷⁷ T: *bar*

²³⁷⁸ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

²³⁷⁹ Q: omits *danḍa*

²³⁸⁰ D: *bo*

²³⁸¹ D: inserts *klu 'am /*

²³⁸² L: *bskyed*

²³⁸³ D: *bar*

²³⁸⁴ T: accidentally conflates 'o na, leaving what looks like 'on

²³⁸⁵ N: inserts *danḍa*

²³⁸⁶ L: *yongsu*

²³⁸⁷ Q and S: *bsngo* (S squeezes in a tiny prefix "b" before *sngo*)

²³⁸⁸ N: *do*

²³⁸⁹ N: double *danḍa*

²³⁹⁰ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa*

²³⁹¹ L: *yongsu*

²³⁹² Q: omits *danḍa*

²³⁹³ L: omits *grol ba rnams*

²³⁹⁴ D: *dgröl*

²³⁹⁵ L: *yongsu*

²³⁹⁶ L: *yongsu*

²³⁹⁷ L and T: omit *danḍa*

²³⁹⁸ N: appears to read 'dran, either because of an error or because the "e" marker has been effaced

²³⁹⁹ D: *skyo ba* for *skyob pa*

²⁴⁰⁰ L: *ba*

rnams kyi 'dren pa dang / yongsu²⁴⁰¹ 'dren pa dang / sgrol ba dang / skyabs dang / gnas dang / gling dang /²⁴⁰² dpung gnyen du gyur cig ces yongsu²⁴⁰³ sngo²⁴⁰⁴ bar byed do // de la 'di skad ces²⁴⁰⁵ bya ste / chos phyir sbyin pa 'dis na bdag /²⁴⁰⁶ 'khor ba yi ni rgya mtsho²⁴⁰⁷ las //²⁴⁰⁸ gzhan min theg pa chen po yis //²⁴⁰⁹ sems can rnams ni sgrol²⁴¹⁰ gyur cig /²⁴¹¹ skye bo thams cad nyon mongs pa'i // 'ching²⁴¹² ba dag las 'grol bar²⁴¹³ shog / dbugs ma phyin²⁴¹⁴ pa dbugs 'byin cing // mya ngan 'das lam ston²⁴¹⁵ gyur cig /²⁴¹⁶ 'jig rten²⁴¹⁷ long ba 'dren med pa'i // yongsu²⁴¹⁸ 'dren par bdag gyur cig /²⁴¹⁹ lus can rnams la skyob²⁴²⁰ pa dang //²⁴²¹ dpung gnyen gling dang skyabs gyur cig /²⁴²² rigs kyi bu de ltar na byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa'²⁴²³ chen po²⁴²⁴ sbyin pa'i pha rol tu²⁴²⁵ phyin pa la mngon par²⁴²⁶ brtson par byed pa yin no // de nas byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po²⁴²⁷ ri'i phug dang / zom dang /²⁴²⁸ ri²⁴²⁹ sul dang /²⁴³⁰ gseb dang / sman ljongs²⁴³¹ na seng ge'i mchog²⁴³² rnam par²⁴³³ bsgyings shing²⁴³⁴ nga ro rnam par sgrogs pa lta bu'i mi²⁴³⁵; i dbang po'i gtsug gi nor bus /²⁴³⁶ bcom ldan 'das las sbyin pa'i pha rol tu phyin pa'i²⁴³⁷ rnam par dbye ba²⁴³⁸ bshad pa thos²⁴³⁹ nas²⁴⁴⁰ tshim²⁴⁴¹ zhing mgu la yi²⁴⁴² rangs te

²⁴⁰¹ L: *yongsu*

²⁴⁰² Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²⁴⁰³ L: *yongsu*

²⁴⁰⁴ S: *bsngo* (squeezing in a tiny prefix “b” before *sngo*)

²⁴⁰⁵ L: omits

²⁴⁰⁶ L: double *daṅḍa*

²⁴⁰⁷ N: “tsh” marker atop the letter is almost or entirely absent

²⁴⁰⁸ S: single *daṅḍa*

²⁴⁰⁹ S: single *daṅḍa*

²⁴¹⁰ Q, S, and T: *grol*

²⁴¹¹ L: double *daṅḍa*

²⁴¹² L: 'chi

²⁴¹³ L and T: 'grel par for 'grol bar

²⁴¹⁴ T: *pyin* (though a faint trace of a diagonal bar for the correct “ph” may be present)

²⁴¹⁵ L: *sten*

²⁴¹⁶ L: double *daṅḍa*

²⁴¹⁷ N: “e” marker is almost or entirely absent

²⁴¹⁸ L: *yongsu*

²⁴¹⁹ L: double *daṅḍa*

²⁴²⁰ N: *skyobs*

²⁴²¹ L and T: single *daṅḍa*

²⁴²² L: double *daṅḍa*

²⁴²³ T: *dba'*

²⁴²⁴ L: squeezes in *po* between adjacent syllables, probably as a correction

²⁴²⁵ Q: *du*

²⁴²⁶ T: *bar*

²⁴²⁷ L: *po'i*

²⁴²⁸ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²⁴²⁹ N and Q: *ri'i*

²⁴³⁰ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²⁴³¹ L and T: *ljong*

²⁴³² L: *chog*

²⁴³³ D: *bar*

²⁴³⁴ L, N, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

²⁴³⁵ L: *ma*

²⁴³⁶ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²⁴³⁷ N: inserts *daṅḍa*

/²⁴⁴³ rab tu dga' zhing bde ba dang /²⁴⁴⁴ yid bde ba skyes nas²⁴⁴⁵ stan las langs te /²⁴⁴⁶ bla gos
 phrag pa gcig tu gzar nas²⁴⁴⁷ pus mo g.yas pa'i lha nga²⁴⁴⁸ pad ma²⁴⁴⁹'i snying po la btsugs²⁴⁵⁰ te /
 bcom ldan 'das ga la ba de²⁴⁵¹ logs su²⁴⁵² thal mo sbyar ba btud²⁴⁵³ nas / bcom ldan 'das la tshigs
 su bcad pa'i dbyangs kyis legs so²⁴⁵⁴ zhes bya ba gsol to²⁴⁵⁵ // sbyin mdzad legs so²⁴⁵⁶ rtag tu yab
 'dra khyod legs so²⁴⁵⁷ // sbyin mdzad legs so²⁴⁵⁸ gsung²⁴⁵⁹ mdzad bde gshegs khyod²⁴⁶⁰ legs so²⁴⁶¹
 // gnyen gyur legs²⁴⁶² so²⁴⁶³ 2464 mdza' bo²⁴⁶⁵ ston par gyur pa²⁴⁶⁶ legs²⁴⁶⁷ 2468 // gcig pu²⁴⁶⁹ 'di na²⁴⁷⁰
 dmyal ba skyob pa²⁴⁷¹ khyod²⁴⁷² legs so // thu bo legs so²⁴⁷³ lha mi rnams nang bgres pa legs //
 mchod gnas legs so²⁴⁷⁴ 2475 mi rnams nang na dpa' bo legs // gsungs pa legs so²⁴⁷⁶ bdag nyid chen
 po²⁴⁷⁷ rab dul²⁴⁷⁸ legs // mi rnams nyon mongs²⁴⁷⁹ dug²⁴⁸⁰ sel²⁴⁸¹ sman pa'i rgyal po legs // grol ba

²⁴³⁸ Q: *bas*

²⁴³⁹ L: *thob*

²⁴⁴⁰ S: inserts *danḍa*

²⁴⁴¹ L: *tshig*

²⁴⁴² L and Q: *yid*

²⁴⁴³ Q: omits *danḍa*

²⁴⁴⁴ Q and S: omit *danḍa*

²⁴⁴⁵ S: inserts *danḍa*

²⁴⁴⁶ Q: omits *danḍa*

²⁴⁴⁷ L, S, and T: insert *danḍa* (incomplete and faint in L, possibly as a result of being purposefully but only partially erased)

²⁴⁴⁸ T: inserts *sa* (which was probably intended to form *ngas* with the preceding syllable)

²⁴⁴⁹ L, N, and S: *padma*

²⁴⁵⁰ L: *gtsugs*

²⁴⁵¹ L: conflates *ba de*, leaving *bde*

²⁴⁵² L: combines *logs su* into one word, resulting in a *logs* with a “u” marker under the final “s”

²⁴⁵³ L: *tud*

²⁴⁵⁴ L: *legso*

²⁴⁵⁵ L: *te*

²⁴⁵⁶ L: *legso*

²⁴⁵⁷ L: *legso*

²⁴⁵⁸ L: *legso*

²⁴⁵⁹ D: *gsang*; L: *gsungs*

²⁴⁶⁰ N: “o” marker is almost or entirely absent

²⁴⁶¹ L: *legso*

²⁴⁶² N: *gyur legs* is barely legible

²⁴⁶³ Q: *se* (the right half of the “o” marker being accidentally omitted)

²⁴⁶⁴ L: *legso*

²⁴⁶⁵ Q: omits *mdza' bo* (giving the foot two syllables too few)

²⁴⁶⁶ S: inserts *khyod*

²⁴⁶⁷ L: *lags*

²⁴⁶⁸ S: inserts *so* (this and the inserted *khyod* give the foot two extra syllables)

²⁴⁶⁹ N: *po*; Q: *pa*

²⁴⁷⁰ N: *ni*

²⁴⁷¹ L and S: *ba*

²⁴⁷² T: *khyed*

²⁴⁷³ L: *legso*

²⁴⁷⁴ N: “o” marker is almost or entirely absent

²⁴⁷⁵ L: *legso*

²⁴⁷⁶ L: *legso*

²⁴⁷⁷ L: *bor*; N and Q: *por*

²⁴⁷⁸ D: *tu*

legs so²⁴⁸² srid pa gsum las rnam grol legs // sman pa²⁴⁸³ legs so²⁴⁸⁴ phan bzhed dam pa sbyin
mdzad legs // dpal²⁴⁸⁵ yon can legs bkra shis snyoms pa'i thugs mnga' legs // skal ldan zla ba
nya²⁴⁸⁶ 'dra dri²⁴⁸⁷ med zhal mnga'²⁴⁸⁸ legs // blo ldan mthon mthing²⁴⁸⁹ spyang yangs ring ba legs
// dpal ldan shangs 'tsham²⁴⁹⁰ cha byad²⁴⁹¹ rmad du byung ba legs // smra mkhas snyan shal
gser²⁴⁹² gyi 'phyang thag 'dra ba legs //²⁴⁹³ mche²⁴⁹⁴ ba kha ba²⁴⁹⁵ dung 'dra legs la phyag 'tshal lo
// gtso bo bgres²⁴⁹⁶ pa mgon po khyod kyis de ring du // mi rnam sbyin pa dbye ba legs par
gsungs pa legs // slar zhing tshul²⁴⁹⁷ khirms bzod pa stobs dang ye shes dang //²⁴⁹⁸ thabs dang
bsam gtan rdzu 'phrul²⁴⁹⁹ smon lam mnyan²⁵⁰¹ par²⁵⁰² 'tshal //²⁵⁰³ bcom ldan 'das kyis de skad
ces bka' stsal nas /²⁵⁰⁴ byang chub sems dpa' 'jam dpal²⁵⁰⁵ gzhon nur gyur pa dang / byang chub
sems dpa' spyang ras gzigs dbang phyug dang /²⁵⁰⁶ ri'i phug dang /²⁵⁰⁷ zom dang /²⁵⁰⁸ ri²⁵⁰⁹ sul
dang /²⁵¹⁰ gseb dang / sman ljongs²⁵¹¹ na seng ge'i mchog rnam par²⁵¹² bsgyings shing²⁵¹³ nga ro
rnam par sgrogs pa lta bu'i mi'i dbang po'i gtsug gi nor bu la sogs²⁵¹⁴ pa /²⁵¹⁵ byang chub sems

²⁴⁷⁹ L: *mongsu* (following the pattern of combining *yongs su*, *legs so*, etc. into one word, but here done incorrectly)

²⁴⁸⁰ N and Q: *nang*

²⁴⁸¹ N: appears to read *sal*, either because of an error or because the “e” marker has been effaced

²⁴⁸² L: *legso*

²⁴⁸³ L: *ba*

²⁴⁸⁴ L: *legso*

²⁴⁸⁵ L: *dpa'*

²⁴⁸⁶ D: *nyi*

²⁴⁸⁷ L: “i” marker is displaced, leaving what looks like *'dri dra*

²⁴⁸⁸ L: *mang*

²⁴⁸⁹ L, Q, and T: *ting*

²⁴⁹⁰ L: *'tshams*

²⁴⁹¹ L: *bya*

²⁴⁹² N: “e” marker is barely legible

²⁴⁹³ L: single *daṅḍa*

²⁴⁹⁴ N: appears to read *mtshe*

²⁴⁹⁵ L: accidentally conflates *kha ba*, leaving what looks like *khab*

²⁴⁹⁶ N: *bgras*

²⁴⁹⁷ L: *chul*

²⁴⁹⁸ L: single *daṅḍa*

²⁴⁹⁹ T: *'prul* (though a faint trace of a diagonal bar for the correct “ph” may be present)

²⁵⁰⁰ Q: *rdzu 'phrul* is barely legible

²⁵⁰¹ L: *mnyam*

²⁵⁰² L: *bar*

²⁵⁰³ L: omits double *daṅḍa*

²⁵⁰⁴ L: double *daṅḍa*; Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²⁵⁰⁵ L: *dpa'* (under the influence of the preceding word)

²⁵⁰⁶ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²⁵⁰⁷ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²⁵⁰⁸ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²⁵⁰⁹ N and Q: *ri'i*

²⁵¹⁰ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²⁵¹¹ L and T: *ljong*; Q: *ljong* or *ljod*

²⁵¹² D: *bar*

²⁵¹³ L, S, and T: insert *daṅḍa*

²⁵¹⁴ T: *stsogs*

²⁵¹⁵ L, S, and T: omit *daṅḍa*

dpa' de dag dang / lha'i bu de dag dang /²⁵¹⁶ rgyal po chen po bzhi po de dag dang / lha dang
 /²⁵¹⁷ mi dang /²⁵¹⁸ lha ma yin dang /²⁵¹⁹ dri zar bcas pa'i 'jig rten yi²⁵²⁰ rangs te / bcom ldan 'das
 kyis gsungs pa la mngon par²⁵²¹ bstod do //²⁵²² 'phags pa sbyin pa'i pha rol tu²⁵²³ phyin pa zhes
 bya ba theg pa chen po'i²⁵²⁴ mdo rdzogs so²⁵²⁵ // //²⁵²⁶

Colophon:

rgya gar gyi mkhan po pra dznyā²⁵²⁷ bar ma²⁵²⁸ dang / zhu chen gyi lo tsa²⁵²⁹ ba ban de²⁵³⁰ ye
 shes sde²⁵³¹ la sogs²⁵³² pas²⁵³³ bsgyur²⁵³⁴ cing zhus te gtan la phab pa // //²⁵³⁵

²⁵¹⁶ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²⁵¹⁷ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²⁵¹⁸ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²⁵¹⁹ Q: omits *daṅḍa*

²⁵²⁰ L and Q: *yid*

²⁵²¹ T: *bar*

²⁵²² L and Q: insert another double *daṅḍa*

²⁵²³ Q: *du*

²⁵²⁴ L: omits the genitive particle

²⁵²⁵ L, Q, and T: *sho* (the unusual combination of an “s” with a subjoined “h”)

²⁵²⁶ Q: single double *daṅḍa* only

²⁵²⁷ D and Q: *pradznyā*; L: *prad nyā*; N: *pradznya*

²⁵²⁸ D: *barma*; S: *warma* (= *lbarma*); T: *wa rma* (= *lba rma*)

²⁵²⁹ D and Q: have the unusual combination of letters *tstsha*; L: *tsha*; N: *tsā*; T: *lotstsha*

²⁵³⁰ L, S, and T: *ban dhe*; N: *bande*

²⁵³¹ L: *sda* (though a very faint mark may be intended for the “e” marker)

²⁵³² L: *srog* or *svog*

²⁵³³ L and T: insert *daṅḍa*

²⁵³⁴ Q: *sgyur*

²⁵³⁵ N: single double *daṅḍa* only

IV. Giving in Theory: The *Dānapaṭala*

A. Introduction

The *Dānapaṭala* or the *Chapter on Giving* is the ninth section of part one, the *Ādhārayogasthāna*, of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*. The *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, in turn, is the fifteenth section of the first part (**Maulī bhūmiḥ* or **Maulyo bhūmayāḥ?*, Tib. *sa'i dngos gzhi*) of the enormous *Yogācārabhūmi*,¹ the great treatise of the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda philosophical school of Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism. Tibetan tradition attributes the *Yogācārabhūmi* to the famous Indian Buddhist scholar Asaṅga, who is credited with founding Yogācāra along with his half-brother Vasubandhu around the 4th century CE, while Chinese tradition claims that the future buddha Maitreya transmitted the text orally to Asaṅga in the Tuṣita heaven.² Putting aside the legend of Maitreya, based on its size alone it is extremely doubtful that a single person, even a renowned scholar like Asaṅga, could have composed the entire *Yogācārabhūmi*. I say this knowing full well that the colophon of a *Bodhisattvabhūmi* manuscript attributes the work to *ācārya Asaṅgapāda*.³

Deleanu—whose work I rely heavily on, being in my opinion the best treatment of the *Yogācārabhūmi* written in a Western language—notes several inconsistencies in the *Yogācārabhūmi*'s structure and content. He is the most recent scholar to cast doubt on the likelihood that it could be attributed to a single author. Most convincing in my mind is the fact that nowhere in the *Yogācārabhūmi* are there summary verses (*uddāna*) outlining its (five or six,

¹ See Deleanu, *The Chapter on the Mundane Path*, 43-50.

² On the legends of Asaṅga, especially the accounts given by Buston and Tāranātha, Janice Dean Willis, *On Knowing Reality: The Tattvārtha Chapter of Asaṅga's Bodhisattvabhūmi* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979), 4-12.

³ Dutt, 3 (see below for full bibliographic information).

according to the Chinese and Tibetan translations, respectively) major sections, even though there is a summary for the first major section, the **Maulyo bhūmayāḥ*, and for many of the main books making up the **Maulyo bhūmayāḥ* (including the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* as well as the *Dānapāṭala* within the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*). It is hard to believe that such an oversight would have occurred if the *Yogācārabhūmi* were the work of one author.⁴ In addition, the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* was translated into Chinese as an independent text twice in the early 5th century, long before the entire *Yogācārabhūmi* was translated into Chinese. If the *Yogācārabhūmi* were indeed composed by one hand, it seems a little strange that just a fraction of it, the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, would have been selected for translation while the rest was ignored, especially if the *Yogācārabhūmi* were believed to have been the product of a famous Buddhist intellectual. The most satisfying explanation for this set of facts is that the *Yogācārabhūmi*, in Deleanu's words, "was not compiled on the basis of a unitary plan but grew gradually from separate textual units and materials."⁵

The *terminus ante quem* for the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* is 418 CE, when Dharmakṣema completed his translation of the text into Chinese. Dharmakṣema's text had a slightly different title, the **Bodhisattvabhūmyādhāra* (T. 1581). An additional translation of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* into Chinese was done around the same time by Guṇavarman (T. 1582). Guṇavarman's translation must have been completed by his death in 431 CE, though his text may be earlier, as some have argued, than Dharmakṣema's.⁶ Regardless of which translation came first and the relationship between the two, we know that the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* existed in the early 5th

⁴ Deleanu, *The Chapter on the Mundane Path*, 154ff. Deleanu provides a bevy of references to scholars arguing for and against this position on p. 154.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 155.

⁶ See *ibid.*, 230, n. 191 and the sources cited there.

century in roughly its present form, since both translations (and especially Dharmakṣema's) point to a text quite similar to that of the extant Sanskrit manuscripts (see below). The *Bodhisattvabhūmi* was again translated into Chinese as part of the mammoth *Yogācārabhūmi* in the mid-7th century by the famous literati and pilgrim Xuanzang (T. 1579). Xuanzang studied the *Yogācārabhūmi* during his travels and brought it back to China among the hundreds of manuscripts he had acquired in India.⁷ Earlier, in the 6th century, Paramārtha translated part of the *Yogācārabhūmi* into Chinese under a different title, the **Saptadaśabhūmiśāstra*, but this was evidently lost by the time of Xuanzang's translation.⁸

Starting from the premise that the *Yogācārabhūmi* is a historically layered text, Deleanu works out a rather plausible schema for the phases of its development.⁹ Dharmakṣema's translation of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* refers five times to the *Śrāvakabhūmi*, a text that also came to be incorporated into the *Yogācārabhūmi*. It seems unlikely that all five references were interpolated after Dharmakṣema's translation, which means that Deleanu is on fairly solid ground in proposing that the *Śrāvakabhūmi* predates the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*.¹⁰ Without going into the remaining details of Deleanu's study, I will just say that his dating of the *Śrāvakabhūmi* to the early- to mid-3rd century and the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* to the mid- to late-3rd century strikes me as eminently reasonable.¹¹

⁷ See *ibid.*, 106-110 for a brief account of Xuanzang and his history with the *Yogācārabhūmi*.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 196-201.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 154ff.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 162-167 and 183-186.

¹¹ See *ibid.*, 195-196 for Deleanu's chronological outline of the development of the *Yogācārabhūmi*.

Though it is of course not as large as the *Yogācārabhūmi*, the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* is neither small nor uncomplicated. It is composed of three major parts, the *Ādhārayogasthāna*, *Ādhārānudharmayogasthāna*, and *Ādhāraniṣṭhāyogasthāna*, while each part is further divided into *paṭalas* or chapters.¹² Given the complexity of the text, then, the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* itself could also be the creation of multiple authors and redactors over a protracted span of time. Deleanu assumes as much, dating the “compilation” of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* rather than its composition.¹³ Roth argues that the first part of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, the *Ādhārayogasthāna*, was also the first part to be written.¹⁴ If true, this would mean that the *Dānapaṭala* belongs to the first strata of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*’s development, since it is located within the *Ādhārayogasthāna*. At any rate, based on Deleanu and others it does not seem out of line to conclude that the *Dānapaṭala* was composed by the 4th century by the most conservative estimate, which would make it, according to my albeit tentative assessment, considerably earlier than the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*.

A Mahāyāna Buddhist Śāstra

The *Bodhisattvabhūmi* is a Mahāyāna Buddhist Śāstra. By that I mean, with no intended facetiousness, that it is Mahāyāna Buddhist, though most of the *Yogācārabhūmi* (like the *Śrāvakabhūmi*) is not ostensibly Mahāyānist; it also is, or rather is part of, a Śāstra, the

¹² See Dutt, 8ff. for a summary of each *paṭala*. Also see Cecil Bendall and Louis de La Vallée Poussin, “Bodhisattva-Bhūmi: A Textbook of the Yogācāra School, An English Summary with Notes and Illustrative Extracts from other Buddhistic Works,” *Le Muséon* 7 (1906): 213-230.

¹³ Deleanu, *The Chapter on the Mundane Path*, 195.

¹⁴ Gustav Roth, “Observations on the First Chapter of Asaṅga’s *Bodhisattvabhūmi*,” *Indologica Taurinensia* 3-4 (1975–1976): 409-410.

Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra.¹⁵ While scholars have paid much attention to, even celebrated, the Mahāyāna Buddhist character of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*—the very name of the text, after all, tells us that it deals with the spiritual path of the Mahāyāna practitioner—the fact that it is patterned after a certain genre of Indian text is almost completely ignored. No doubt this reflects the unfortunate tendency to treat Indian Buddhism as an entity somehow separate from the social and intellectual history of India.¹⁶ The place of the *Dānaṭāla* in the textual conversation on gift giving is both a testament to where Mahāyāna gift theory lay by the 4th century and how genre can shape and restrict textual discourse.

There are many Mahāyāna features of the *Dānaṭāla*. I will touch on just a few of the more salient ones, especially as they stand in contradistinction to the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*. To begin with, the *Dānaṭāla* is clear that the goal of gift giving is to achieve awakening. For the very first line states the following: “Here a bodhisattva, having fulfilled the six Perfections one by one . . . wholly and completely awakens to unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening (*iha bodhisattvaḥ krameṇa ṣaṭpāramitāṃ paripūryānuttarāṃ samyaksaṃbodhim abhisambudhyate . . .*). There is nothing surprising in the *Dānaṭāla*’s emphasis on awakening: Attaining awakening dominates the Mahāyāna textual landscape (see the *Context of awakening* section in chapter II), and, as we will see, the epigraphic landscape too (chapter V). But the *Dānaṭāla* is also clear

¹⁵ On the *śāstra* part of the title of the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra*, see Wogihara, 8-9 (see below for full bibliographic information).

¹⁶ Tatz attempts to situate bodhisattva ethics, as represented by the *Śīlaṭāla* of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, within and against Buddhist Vinaya rules and Indian systems of renunciation more broadly. He does not broach, however, the importance of the Śāstric genre. See Mark Tatz, *Asaṅga’s Chapter on Ethics With the Commentary of Tsong-Kha-Pa, The Basic Path to Awakening, The Complete Bodhisattva* (Studies in Asian Thought and Religion 4) (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1986), 2-25.

that rewards, whether those of this world or the next, are not the proper goal of a

bodhisattva.¹⁷ For the *Dānapāṭala*, two aspects of the “pure gift” (*viśuddhadāna*) are as follows:

pratīkāraṇapekṣaṃ dānaṃ katamat / kāruṇyacitto ’nukampācitto bodhisattvo dānaṃ dadan na parataḥ pratyupakāraṃ pratyāśaṃsate / sukhakāmāṃ trṣṇādāhena dahyamānām apratibalāṃ prakṛtiduḥkhitāṃ janatāṃ paśyan / vipākānapekṣaṃ dānaṃ katamat / na bodhisattvo dānaṃ dattvā dānasyāyatyāṃ bhogasampadaṃ vā ātmabhāvasampadaṃ vā phalavipākāṃ pratyāśaṃsate / sarvasaṃskāreṣu phalgudarśī paramabodhāv anuśaṃsadarśī /¹⁸

What is giving without hoping for remuneration? When giving a gift, a bodhisattva who has a compassionate and sympathetic heart does not expect anything in return from others. He sees that people desire comfort, burn with the heat of craving thirst, suffer from their nature, [but yet] are helpless [to fulfill their desires or end their suffering].

What is giving without hoping for the maturation [of good karmic fruits]? When giving a gift, a bodhisattva does not expect the maturation of good karmic fruits in the future, whether it be getting superb possessions or a superb body. He sees the lack of substance in all conditioned things [and instead] anticipates the benefits of supreme awakening.

The bodhisattva is not to hold out hopes for payback from the recipients of his gifts. Nor should he sully his generosity by expecting karmic returns. The *Dānapāṭala*’s rejection of expecting “superb possessions or a superb body” stands in sharp relief to much of the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*, where the bodhisattva is encouraged to give in order to bring about rewards for himself and other beings, rewards including various possessions in future lifetimes and especially the attainment of an awakened body. For the *Dānapāṭala* the body and awakening are at odds—the body, like all objects, or rather like any kind of karmic fruit one might hope to gain, is composed of conditioned pieces (*saṃskāra*) that are governed by the law

¹⁷ The *Dānapāṭala*’s distinction between awakening and worldly rewards is reminiscent of Spiro’s delineation between “kammatic” and “nibbanic” Buddhism. See Melford E. Spiro, *Buddhism and Society: A Great Tradition and Its Burmese Vicissitudes*, 2nd ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982). Of course, there is an acute difference between a Buddhist text valuing awakening over karmic rewards and a Western scholar categorizing, even privileging, certain ideas and practices from a Buddhist culture.

¹⁸ Wogihara 135.18-25.

of impermanence. For the *Dānapāramitā*, on the other hand, awakening and the awakened body are two sides of the same coin—awakening means becoming endowed with a glorious body replete with the marks of a superhuman, and any impermanent body part can be traded up for a permanent one through giving.

Another major theme of the *Dānapāṭala* is intentionality. To be sure, the emphasis on the intention behind actions is not unique to Mahāyāna, as it can be found in all manner of Buddhist texts.¹⁹ The intentions behind the gifts in the *Dānapāramitā* are couched in the bodhisattva's *prañidhānas*. But the *Dānapāṭala* really pushes intentionality to the extreme. In several instances the text takes us into the bodhisattva's mind with an *iti* particle. Thus, in a situation where a bodhisattva is unable to obtain the written Dharma for a gift, he must reflect, "I hope my mind is not entangled in the filth of stinginess with regard to the Law. Alas, I am afraid that I do not earnestly want to give the Law in written form!" (*mā me dharmamātsaryamalaparyavasthitam cittam / mā haivāham āśayata eva na dātukāmo 'bhilikhitam dharmam /*).²⁰ And the text goes on to explain what the bodhisattva should do when he finds that he is or is not stingy. Interestingly, much of the focus on intentionality in the *Dānapāṭala* is on the circumstances in which a bodhisattva should *not* give, and not always in ways one might expect. So in the example just mentioned, if the bodhisattva discovers neither stinginess nor defilement in his mind, he should not give the Dharma. If he were to give the written Dharma away, we are told, he only pleases one recipient, whereas if he were to hold on to it, he can

¹⁹ The shift in emphasis from action, especially correctly performed sacrificial action, to intention is well covered in the secondary literature. The theme is taken up in Egge, *Religious Giving and the Invention of Karma in Theravāda Buddhism*. Egge argues that Pāli texts evince a shift in how gift giving was framed in India, with the karmic discourse in which the intentions of the donor were paramount gradually supplanting, but never fully replacing, the more ancient sacrificial discourse exemplified by the offering of alms to the worthy Buddhist mendicant.

²⁰ Wogihara 127.12-14.

acquire knowledge for others and the Dharma has a better chance to grow in the future.

According to the *Dānaṭāla*, as long as the bodhisattva's intentions are good, he should keep the written Buddhist teachings to himself.²¹

Ultimately, the contingency of the bodhisattva's not giving the Dharma is unselfish. Other cases are less clear, at least by the standards of modern Judeo-Christian ethics.²² In one section, the *Dānaṭāla* elucidates the bodhisattva's options when he does not have any objects to give. He can earn money so he can then acquire objects to give, teach others about generosity, or even bring solicitors to wealthy households that can afford to give. The section concludes as follows:

*evaṃ hi bodhisattvaḥ asatsv asaṃvidyamāneṣu bhogeṣu prājñadānasya dātā bhavati yāvad
āśayaviśuddhiṃ nādhigacchati / śuddhādhyśayas tu bodhisattvaḥ [sic] yathaivāpāya-
samatikramaṃ pratilabhate / tathaivākṣayabhogatāṃ janmani janmani pratilabhate /²³*

In this way a bodhisattva indeed becomes the giver of a wise gift when he does not have possessions, [and this is the case] until he develops pure intentions. But when the intentions of a bodhisattva are pure, he transcends the unfavorable destinies and likewise attains inexhaustible possessions in birth after birth.²⁴

If I understand this passage correctly, once the bodhisattva's intentions have become pure, it no longer matters that he does not have anything to give. The act of giving, or the acts that substitute for giving, is a means to an end, not an end in itself. My interpretation of the above

²¹ The entire passage on the gift of the Dharma can be found at Wogihara 127.3-128.8.

²² On what we might call the "selfish" motivations of those pursuing the bodhisattva path, see Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 144-147.

²³ Wogihara 126.25-127.3

²⁴ Even though the *Dānaṭāla* decries worldly rewards as a motivation to give, in no way does it reject classical karmic theory. On the contrary, the bodhisattva is told to trust in the maturation (*vipāka*) of karmic fruits (*phala*), and in many passages similar to this one the text emphasizes how much merit the proper bodhisattva creates.

excerpt would appear to be confirmed by yet another passage exemplifying the *Dānaṭāla*'s stress on intentionality, which I quote in full:

yadi ca bodhisattvaḥ śuddhāśayo bhavati dānam ārabhya so 'pi sattvakārye prabhūte karaṇīye pratyupasthite svadehāṃgapratyaṃgayācanake 'pi pratyupasthite na svadehāṃgapratyaṃgāny anuprayacchati / tat kasya hetoḥ / na hy asya bodhisattvasya dānam ārabhya śuddhāśayasya punaḥ kenacit paryāyeṇa idaṃ dātavyam idaṃ na dātavyam iti bhavati cetasaḥ saṃkocaḥ / tasmād asau bodhisattvo yadāśayaśuddhyartham pratyupasthitam sattvakāryam adhyupekṣya dadyāt so 'syāśayaḥ śuddha iti na pratyupasthitam sattvakāryam adhyupekṣya dadāti /²⁵

If a bodhisattva has pure intentions with regard to giving, he does not give away his own body or his primary and secondary limbs, neither when the many needs of beings to be dealt with have arisen, nor when approached by someone requesting his own body or his primary and secondary limbs. For what reason? For this bodhisattva who has pure intentions with regard to giving, there is by no means cowering from the thought: “This must be given, this must not be given.” Therefore, after he has become indifferent to the needs of beings that have arisen, this bodhisattva would give when it is for the sake of the purification of his intentions; [but] after he has become indifferent to the needs of beings that have arisen, he does not give when he knows that his intentions are [already] pure.

When the bodhisattva is not fazed by the demands that generosity can place on him, even the demand of surrendering his body, he knows that his mind has been purified of ill intentions, at which point he does not heed the day-to-day needs of other beings and does not give his body. And the gift of the body is not just unnecessary for a bodhisattva with pure intentions, but actively discouraged—far from suggesting that the bodhisattva's gift is optional, the text says plainly that “he does not give when he knows that his intentions are [already] pure.” These three examples, taken in total, indicate that the outward gift in the *Dānaṭāla* is important only insofar as it shapes the mind. To turn the Biblical Epistle of James around and adapt it to our text: Deeds without the mind are dead.

Yet Mahāyāna ideals of compassion run through the entirety of the *Dānaṭāla*. We have already seen that a “bodhisattva who has a compassionate and sympathetic heart does

²⁵ Wogihara 116.10-19.

not expect anything in return from others” (*kāruṇyacitto ’nukampācitto bodhisattvo . . . na parataḥ pratyupakāraṃ pratyāśaṃsate*) because he perceives the despair of beings’ desire and suffering.²⁶ Our text goes much further than this. A chief criterion determining the bodhisattva’s gift—or whether he gives at all—is how it affects the potential recipient: The text explains that a “bodhisattva in no way gives all his internal and external objects to beings indiscriminately” (*na . . . bodhisattvaḥ sarvam ādhyātmikabāhyaṃ vastv aviśeṣeṇaiva sarvathā ca sattvānāṃ dadāti*), as the gift must be for their welfare (*hita*).²⁷ This principle is applied to several situations in the *Dānapāṭala*. Our text says, for instance, that the bodhisattva donor would agree to give his own life thousands and thousands of times, but not if he “has been incited with an untoward command to harm, kill, or deceive others” (*parotpīḍanāya paravadhāya paravaṃcanāya cāyogavihitena copanimaṃtritaḥ*).²⁸ He does not give his body to the gods that belong to or are instructed by the retinue of Māra, since this would only cause them to hurt others.²⁹ He can give poison, fire, weapons, or liquor away as long as those objects benefit others.³⁰ He cannot give depressed people the opportunity to commit suicide.³¹ He cannot give gifts that are

²⁶ Wogihara 135.18-21.

²⁷ Wogihara 115.17-116.1.

²⁸ Wogihara 116.3-10.

²⁹ Wogihara 116.20-24.

³⁰ Wogihara 117.6-11. Unfortunately the text does not elaborate on how these items could be used to help others.

³¹ Wogihara 118.23-25.

designed to hurt or kill animals, especially gifts that are connected with animal sacrifice.³² And so on.

Part of the Mahāyāna flavor of the *Dānaṭāla* is the compassion its bodhisattva must show to the recipient of his gifts. In a telling passage that is totally unlike anything found in the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*, the *Dānaṭāla* describes what the bodhisattva should think before being asked for donations. He must play out in his mind a situation in which he is approached by two recipients but only has enough possessions to give to one of them. If one of the solicitors, the text states, “is at ease, not destitute, not needy, has a master [to look after him], and is supported” (*sukhitaś cākṛpaṇo ’varākaḥ sanāthaḥ sapratīsarāṇaḥ*), but the other “is suffering, destitute, needy, does not have a master [to look after him], and is not supported” (*duḥkhitaś ca kṛpaṇo varākaḥ anāthaḥ apratīsarāṇaḥ*), then the bodhisattva should mentally prepare himself to give to the one who is suffering only.³³ The distinction that the *Dānaṭāla* has the bodhisattva make here must be put in the context of normative Indian ethics. In India, the “suffering, destitute, needy,” etc. largely would have been—and in many ways still are—looked upon with contempt. As Heim remarks, “poverty and wretchedness in South Asian culture are markers of demerit and moral want owing to past wrongdoing.” The poor and wretched would not have been considered fruitful recipients for gifts, which explains why many Indian gift-giving texts ignore them and some Dharmaśāstric, Jain, and Buddhist texts are careful to differentiate between making charitable offerings to the needy and giving to venerable recipients.³⁴ But our bodhisattva is supposed to extend Mahāyāna ideals of

³² Wogihara 117.27-118.9; 120.23-24; 134.7.

³³ Wogihara 123.18-124.13.

³⁴ Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia*, 74-81 (quote taken from p. 75).

compassion to the downtrodden, a deliberate inversion on the part of the *Dānapaṭala* of Indian values and customs regarding karmic status and the worthy recipient.

The *Dānapaṭala* calls the two hypothetical recipients in the just-mentioned example a *yācanaka*. But in a few cases we find a slightly different term for the recipient, *yācaka*, as in the following passage:

na ca bodhisattvo vividhavipratipattisthitānām uddhatānām asaṃvṛtātmanām yācanakānām ākrośakānām roṣakānām paribhāṣakānām vipratipattiyā khinnamānaso dānaṃ dadāti / nānyatra teṣāṃ evāṃtike bodhisattvo bhūyasyā mātrayā kleśāveśaparakṛtitām avagamyānukampācittam upasthāpya dānaṃ dadāti /³⁵

Also, there is no offense when a bodhisattva gives a gift to beggars who are engaged in assorted kinds of offensive behaviors, who are rude, who cannot restrain themselves, and who are verbally abusive, enraged, and reviling, and he should not feel troubled about it. On the contrary, a bodhisattva readily gives a gift to them after understanding that being wrapped up in the defilements is natural and then becoming sympathetic toward them.

The *yācaka* here is not exactly cast in a positive light. I translate the term as “beggar,” which I believe goes a long way toward capturing its negative connotations. In the modern United States, we might call a homeless panhandler a “beggar,” but almost no one would use that word for a child who goes door to door peddling cookies and asking for donations for her school. In India, too, not all solicitors were considered equals—it was an act of honor to support a religious specialist like a ritual priest or a member of a Buddhist fraternity, but an act of pity to give to a low-class beggar struggling to survive. On the latter, Schopen asserts that “there can be little doubt that beggary and those who were forced into it were looked upon, in many circles, with opprobrium and disdain. . . .”³⁶ The *Dānapaṭala* seems to

³⁵ Wogihara 120.17-22.

³⁶ Schopen, “On the Underside of a Sacred Space,” in *Buddhist Nuns, Monks, and Other Worldly Matters*, 435. See also Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. II, Pt. I, 130ff.; Vijay Nath, *Dāna: Gift System in Ancient India (c. 600 B.C.–c. A.D. 300), A Socio-Economic Perspective* (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1987), 116-118 (cited

acknowledge as much—its *yācakas* are “engaged in assorted kinds of offensive behaviors,” are “rude,” and so on. But for our text, there is no offense (*vipratipatti*) in giving to such people. Instead of treating them with “opprobrium and disdain,” the *Dānapaṭala* exhorts the Mahāyāna donor to regard them with sympathy (*anukampā*). And lest the bodhisattva look down on the *yācaka* with feelings of superiority, seemingly a natural response to gifts given out of sympathy or pity, later the *Dānapaṭala* says that a “bodhisattva gives a gift with a humble attitude toward the beggar” (*yācanakāya nīcacitto bodhisattvo dānaṃ dadāti*).³⁷ Once again, the *Dānapaṭala* inverts standard Indian values by demanding humility of the bodhisattva in the presence of the lowly *yācaka*.³⁸

The examples regarding the suffering recipient and the immoral and surly *yācaka* bear witness to a kind of Mahāyāna counter-discourse of social protest. I am not the first one to notice this. In her analysis of medieval Dharmasāstric, Jain, and Theravāda gift-giving treatises, Heim makes the following observation:

On matters of structural human relationships . . . Theravāda Buddhist theorists share more with their Jain and Dharmasāstra counterparts than they do with their Mahāyāna cousins. That Theravādins might share more on certain aspects of gift giving ideology with non-Buddhists than with fellow Buddhists may be surprising. But perhaps it is not so surprising after all. The *bodhisattva* ethic is in many ways concerned with rethinking the religious meaning of gift giving, and the Mahāyāna revolution demonstrates a

in Schopen, “On the Underside of a Sacred Space,” 444, n. 15); Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 112-113; and again Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia*, 74-81.

³⁷ Wogihara 134.26-135.1.

³⁸ The term *yācaka* also appears in at least one inscription in a similar context. In a remarkable record of the Viṣṇuṇḍin king Govindavarman, as part of a compound we find *-anāthayācakavyādhitadīnakṛpaṇa-*, which Sankaranarayanan translates as “the helpless, the beggars, the sick, the depressed, and the wretched. . . .” See S. Sankaranarayanan, “Two Viṣṇukuṇḍi Charters from Tummalagudem,” 10 and 12, lines 9-10 (this is Tummalagudem A from Table 2 in chapter V).

radical departure from Theravāda and other traditional Indic modes of hierarchy and social order.³⁹

And similarly:

It is intriguing that the Theravāda shares more with its Jain and Dharmaśāstra neighbors on *dāna* than it does with its Mahāyāna kin. The Mahāyāna texts . . . represent a significant and self-conscious departure from widespread Indic structures of giving to worthy recipients. Not only does this observation shed light on *dāna* as a critical focal point for discerning areas of disagreement between Mahāyāna and Theravāda religious ideas, but it also reconfigures medieval South Asian religious history. Sometimes the differences *within* religions can be greater than *across* them.⁴⁰

Heim is partially correct. Certainly the passages I have adduced from the *Dānaṣaṭṭha* betray a Mahāyāna ethos of compassion that runs counter to premodern Indian ideas of social structure. For Heim, it is the concept of *śraddhā* (Pāli *saddhā*) that explains how Mahāyāna diverges from the predominant South Asian discourse on the gift. The primary meaning of *śraddhā* in the medieval texts Heim examines is “esteem”—that is, the esteem felt by the donor toward the recipient. According to the medieval theorists, the ideal relationship between the donor and the recipient is asymmetrical—the donor is humble, the recipient is morally worthy—and the donor’s attitude of esteem holds this asymmetry in place. Gift exchange predicated on esteem reflects and cements proper human relationships in an inherently hierarchical social structure.⁴¹

But in light of further examination of the *Dānaṣaṭṭha*, Heim’s conclusions about Mahāyāna gift theory must be tempered somewhat. Despite the compassion and humility that the bodhisattva must show the recipient, the *Dānaṣaṭṭha* does not abandon the concept of

³⁹ Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia*, 28.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 81.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, esp. 45ff. Also see Hibbets (= Heim), “The Ethics of Esteem.”

esteem. One of our text's nine types of gifts is the *satpuruṣadāna*, the gift to the *satpuruṣa*. The short passage on this gift reads as follows:

*tatra katamad bodhisattvasya satpuruṣasya satpuruṣadānaṃ / yad bodhisattvaḥ śraddhayā dānaṃ dadāti satkṛtya svahastena kālena parān anupahatya / idaṃ bodhisattvasya satpuruṣasya satpuruṣadānaṃ ity ucyate /*⁴²

Here both the bodhisattva donor and the recipient are qualified as a *satpuruṣa*, a term, literally meaning “good man,” that occurs frequently in Mahāyāna texts but just as commonly in Sanskrit and Pāli (= *sappurisa*) Mainstream texts. The bodhisattva is supposed to give to the *satpuruṣa* recipient with *śraddhā*. Given the context of this passage, the usual rendering of *śraddhā* in Buddhist texts as “faith” is not appropriate.⁴³ On the contrary, excluding the terms bodhisattva and *satpuruṣa*, this passage would fit well in the corpus of texts Heim studies, and a reasonable translation of *śraddhayā* from the above excerpt might therefore be “with esteem,” as Heim would render it, or “with gratitude,” as I have it:

Then, what is a gift to an Upstanding Man by a bodhisattva who is an Upstanding Man. When a bodhisattva gives a gift with gratitude, respectfully, from his own hand, at the right time, and without causing pain to others, this is called a gift to an Upstanding Man by a bodhisattva who is an Upstanding Man.

It is not the recipient who is supposed to feel gratitude for the bodhisattva's generosity; rather, the bodhisattva should be grateful for being provided with the opportunity to give by the recipient. The *satpuruṣadāna* in the *Dānaṭṭala* is basically an exchange between two mannered men. Giving “respectfully,” “from one's own hand,” and “at the right time” are customs of South Asian gift etiquette⁴⁴ that our text evidently wants the Mahāyāna practitioner to follow. And as it turns out, very similar descriptions of the *sappurisdāna* can be found in Theravāda

⁴² Wogihara 132.19-22.

⁴³ On *śraddhā* in Buddhist texts, see Rotman, *Thus Have I Seen*, esp. 29ff. and the sources cited there.

⁴⁴ On some of these customs, see Kane, *History of Dharmasāstra*, Vol. II, Pt. II, 851-856.

compendia (*Saṅgaha*), in which we are told that a *sappurisa* gives with *saddhā*, at the right time, from his own hand, etc.⁴⁵ Perhaps the differences between Mahāyāna and their Theravāda “cousins” are not so great after all.

Any analysis of gift theory must take genre into consideration. Without having pursued the matter in great depth, I suspect that the Pāli Suttas and Mahāyāna Sūtras that deal with gift giving share more in common with each other than with the Pāli commentaries and compendia and Mahāyāna Śāstras that deal with the same.⁴⁶ There is no doubt that the *Dānapaṭala* and *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*—or, for that matter, any Mahāyāna Sūtra that I know of—though overlapping in some areas, address different concerns about the gift. For one, the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* focuses on the recipient only briefly in its last section. The recipient is also not a subject frequently encountered in Mahāyāna Sūtras in general, and when it is, the topic is often treated very differently than it is in Śāstras. By contrast, Śāstric and Indian exegetical works take much notice of the recipient.⁴⁷ As suggested by the topics I have already discussed—the bodhisattva’s compassion for the recipient, including the *yācaka*, and the *satpuruṣa* gift—the *Dānapaṭala* pays almost as much attention to the recipient of the gift as the bodhisattva donor, even as it sometimes inverts the normal Indian relationship between the donor and recipient. We find specific types of potential recipients throughout the *Dānapaṭala*, many of whom are rarely, if ever, found in this context in Mahāyāna Sūtras, such as the insane, the sick,

⁴⁵ See Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia*, 45 (and 153, nn. 36-38 for references) and 91. According to Heim, the *sappurisa* of *sappurisdāna* refers to a donor, but because *satpuruṣa* is repeated in this passage and *satpuruṣasya* clearly agrees with *bodhisattvasya*, the *satpuruṣa* of *satpuruṣadāna* almost certainly refers to a recipient.

⁴⁶ One other example is worth mentioning. The *Dānapaṭala* and Pāli *Saṅgahas* make room for participation in gift giving even when one does not have anything to give. Compare Wogihara 126.8-127.3 to the excerpt of the *Sārasaṅgaha* at Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia*, 92.

⁴⁷ See Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia*, 57-82.

cheats, adherents of other religions (*tīrthika*), enemies, certain gods, and in a remarkable case, beings who live off of vomited food (*vāṃtāsijīvina*). The bodhisattva is said to be capable of detecting a solicitor and giving him what he wants before he even asks for anything.⁴⁸ And close attention must be paid not only to what the recipient wants, but also to what is suitable for him:

yadi yācanakaṃ paśyati yuktarūpaṃ cāsmiṃ yathepsitaṃ deyadharmapratipādanaṃ paśyati / sa nāsti tat kiṃcid buddhabodhisattvānāṃ yat sattveṣv aparityaktaṃ iti viditvā yācanakasyecchāṃ paripūrayati / no ced yuktarūpaṃ samanupaśyati / sa tam eva kalpaṃ upādāya . . . ślakṣṇena vacasā saṃjñāpyainaṃ preṣayati /⁴⁹

If [a bodhisattva] encounters someone requesting something and discerns an offering of religious gifts that is suitable to him and that is just what he wants, knowing that there is nothing whatsoever that has not been surrendered to beings by buddhas and bodhisattvas, he fulfills the wish of the person requesting something. But if [the bodhisattva] does not deem it to be suitable, he, after giving the idea consideration, informs and dismisses him with gentle words. . . .

Hence the bodhisattva should not, for example, give food mixed with onions, meat, or alcohol to ascetics who are prohibited from consuming those items.⁵⁰

The *Dānapāṭala* demonstrates a thorough understanding of Indian custom and law. This is evident on many fronts, of which I will mention only a few. First, the issue of the promised gift comes up several times in our text. It states, for instance:

na ca bodhisattvo yathoktād yathāpratijñātād yācanakāya nyūnaṃ dānaṃ dadāti / nānyatra samaṃ vā adhikaṃ [sic] vā / na ca bodhisattvaḥ praṇītaṃ vastu pratijñāya lūhaṃ pratyavaraṃ dadāti / nānyatra lūhaṃ pratyavaraṃ pratijñāya praṇītaṃ dadāti saṃvidyamāne praṇīte /⁵¹

But a bodhisattva does not give a gift worse than what was described or promised to someone requesting it, [giving a gift] only if it is the same as or better than [what was

⁴⁸ Wogihara 125.20-23.

⁴⁹ Wogihara 128.22-129.2.

⁵⁰ Wogihara 121.10-19.

⁵¹ Dutt 84.7-10 (Sanskrit numeral section). Cf. Wogihara 120.7-11.

described or promised]. After promising an excellent object, a bodhisattva does not give something poor and substandard. After promising something poor and substandard, he gives something excellent only if he has something excellent.

According to Dharmaśāstric law, promised gifts were in most circumstances considered to be legally binding.⁵² Considering the number of times the matter appears in the text, the author(s) of the *Dānapāṭala* must have been well aware of this fact. Conversely, gifts involving deception could be legally invalidated by the standards of Dharmaśāstric law,⁵³ a stricture by which the bodhisattva of the *Dānapāṭala* appears to be bound. The bodhisattva does not “give a gift deceptively” (*na ca śāṭhyād dānaṃ dadāti*),⁵⁴ the text says, nor can he give “in order to mislead others,” (*pareṣāṃ vipralambhāya*), attempting to trick people with his gift.⁵⁵ Finally, the *Dānapāṭala* has rules related to religious purity. A donor should not, we are told, “carelessly give away something that has been thrown away” (*na . . . apaviddham asatkṛtyānuprayacchati*).⁵⁶ He also should not give “leftover food and drink to ascetics, or that which has been mixed or contaminated with excrement, urine, phlegm, mucus, vomit, sweat, pus, or blood” (*yatīnām ucchiṣṭaṃ vā pānabhojanam uccāraprasrāvakhetaśiṃghāṇakavāṃtaviriktapūyarudhirasaṃsṛṣṭaṃ vā abhidūṣitaṃ vā*).⁵⁷ As is well known, discarded or leftover items, especially food, have long been considered highly polluting in India, so it seems that the *Dānapāṭala* wants the bodhisattva to obey normative Brahmanical customs regarding purity. Based on these examples as well as

⁵² See Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. II, Pt. II, 886-887; *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. III, 472-474.

⁵³ Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. II, Pt. II, 887.

⁵⁴ Wogihara 123.1.

⁵⁵ Wogihara 122.7-8. On the other hand, the bodhisattva is supposed to allow others to cheat him—see Wogihara 125.23-126.6.

⁵⁶ Wogihara 120.15-16.

⁵⁷ Wogihara 121.11-13.

others that will be noted in the translation, it is extremely likely that the author(s) of the *Dānapaṭala* was well versed in Dharmaśāstric literature. The same cannot be said of the authors of Mahāyāna Sūtras.

What makes the *Dānapaṭala* a Śāstric text, actually what makes the entire *Bodhisattvabhūmi* a Śāstric text, is not just its content but also its style. The *Dānapaṭala* is a gift-giving manual concerned with technicalities. It uses language economically and can be a bit choppy, both features of Indian Śāstras. And it is very carefully organized, so much so that I think it could only have been composed in written form.⁵⁸ The *Dānapaṭala* is the first of six chapters dealing with the Mahāyāna *pāramitās*, ordered in their traditional sequence. Each of these six chapters is divided into the same nine parts (*navākāra*), which are laid out in the *uddāna*. Within the *Dānapaṭala*, most of the nine types of gifts are further broken down into subtypes. The *viśuddhadāna*, for instance, is divided into ten subtypes. The bulk of the *Dānapaṭala* is dedicated to the *sarvadāna*, the “gift of everything.” The *sarvadāna* is made up of *external* and *internal* gifts (*bāhya-* and *ādhyātmika-dāna*, respectively),⁵⁹ and the text organizes this section along the lines of a brief (*samāsa*) and detailed (*vistara*) analysis or *prabheda*. The analyses of the *sarvadāna* examine various gift-giving situations—what objects should and should not be given, who is and is not a proper recipient, what a bodhisattva should do when he has and does not have objects to give, etc. The organization of the analyses in the *Dānapaṭala* is not something that would ever be found in a Mahāyāna Sūtra, but is instead reminiscent of what can be seen in *Dharmaśāstras*. For example, the first three chapters of the *Dānakāṇḍa*, part of Lakṣmīdhara’s *Kṛtyakalpataru* and the earliest extant Dharmaśāstric digest

⁵⁸ The text even makes cross-references to material it has already covered, which would be very easy to do with a written text but next to impossible with an oral text. See n. 110 in part B.

⁵⁹ See the section *Giving the body* in chapter II.

(*nibandha*) on gift giving (early 12th century), cover, in order, the nature of giving, appropriate and inappropriate gift objects, and proper and improper recipients.⁶⁰

In many ways the content and style of the *Dānapaṭala* does not make Mahāyāna look much like a “revolution,” to use Heim’s words.⁶¹ It is only through a consideration of a range of genres that we will be able to nuance the continuities and discontinuities between Mahāyāna and Mainstream texts, just as it is only through an examination of a variety of sources that we can attempt to locate Mahāyāna within Indian religious history. My translation of the *Dānapaṭala* is but a small step in that direction.

A Note on the Text and Translation

There are two editions of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*. With the page numbers for the *Dānapaṭala*, they are as follows:

- Wogihara: Unrai Wogihara, ed., *Bodhisattvabhūmi: A Statement of the Whole Course of the Bodhisattva (Being the Fifteenth Section of the Yoḡācārabhūmi)* (Tokyo: Seigo Kenkyūkai, 1930–1936), 114-136
- Dutt: Nalinaksha Dutt, ed., *Bodhisattvabhūmi (Being the XVth Section of Asaṅgapada’s Yoḡacarbhūmi)* (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series Vol. VII) (Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1966), 80-94 (Sanskrit numeral section)

Wogihara based his edition of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* on two incomplete Nepalese manuscripts, the Cambridge manuscript and the Kyoto manuscript, filling lacunae with the help of the Tibetan translation.⁶² Dutt collated Wogihara’s edition with an additional, complete

⁶⁰ See David Brick, trans., “The *Dānakāṇḍa* (‘Book on Gifting’) of the *Kṛtyakalpataru*: A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Texas, 2009, 87-114.

⁶¹ *Theories of the Gift in South Asia*, 28.

⁶² Wogihara, i-ii and 3-7. See also Cecil Bendall, *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge, with Introductory Notices and Illustrations of the Palaeography and Chronology of Nepal and Bengal* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1883), XXXIX-LI.

manuscript of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, which was discovered in the Zhva-lu Tibetan monastery in 1938 by the Indian scholar Rāhula Sāṅkrṭyāyana.⁶³ With respect to the *Dānaṣāṭala* text, Wogihara and Dutt are very close. For the translation I generally follow Wogihara, but I will note when I follow Dutt and when their editions present significant disparities. I will occasionally refer to the Derge Tanjur’s Tibetan translation of the *Dānaṣāṭala*, but in an effort to let the Sanskrit stand on its own, I rely on the Tibetan as little as possible. (Citing “the” Tibetan from the Derge is, of course, an oversimplification, as there are five extant recensions of the Tanjur.) I have not consulted the Indian commentaries on the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* that are now extant in Tibetan translation, though this could prove fruitful in a fuller study of the *Dānaṣāṭala*. The **Bodhisattvabhūmivṛtti* (Tib. *byang chub sems dpa’i sa’i ’grel pa*) of Guṇaprabha (7th century) is a commentary that covers eight of the first nine *ṣāṭalas* of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, including the *Dānaṣāṭala*. The **Yogācārabhūmau bodhisattvabhūmivyākhyā* (Tib. *rnal ’byor spyod pa’i sa la byang chub sems dpa’ sa’i rnam par bshad pa*), written by one *Sāgaramegha or *Samudramegha (late 8th century), is a huge commentary on the entire *Bodhisattvabhūmi*.⁶⁴

Just as for the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*, I do not use untranslated Sanskrit terms in the body of my translation of the *Dānaṣāṭala*. Important Sanskrit terms will be provided in the footnotes. The *Dānaṣāṭala* presents a more learned text than the *Dānapāramitā*, which I attempt to reflect with, among other things, greater flexibility in vocabulary choices. The *Dānaṣāṭala* uses about a dozen different words for “give” and I vary the English equivalents accordingly.

⁶³ Dutt, 3; Deleanu, *The Chapter on the Mundane Path*, 51-54.

⁶⁴ See Tatz, *Asanga’s Chapter on Ethics With the Commentary of Tsong-Kha-Pa*, 28-29; Deleanu, *The Chapter on the Mundane Path*, 248-252 and esp. 265, n. 5.

Stylistically, the *Dānapāṭala* reads like a technical manual, which I again attempt to reflect in the translation. Being a Śāstric text, its sentences often omit words that must be supplied using “carryover” words from previous sentences, which I place in brackets. The text rarely explains ideas in detail and the meaning must often be determined from context. I flesh out some of the text’s more laconically expressed ideas by adding words in brackets or brief explanations in the footnotes, neither of which should be presumed to be correct in all cases.

I impose paragraphs on the text based on how I perceive its internal organization and sequence of ideas.⁶⁵ I do not follow the paragraphing of the Wogihara and Dutt editions, which can be extremely misleading. Extra spacing is used to separate the nine types of gifts the text describes.

⁶⁵ Tatz does an admirable job reflecting the organization of the *Śīlapāṭala* in the paragraphing of his translation. See Tatz, trans., *Asanga’s Chapter on Ethics With the Commentary of Tsong-Kha-Pa*, 47-89.

B. English Translation

The Summary:

In brief, these are the nine sorts of giving of an Aspirant to Awakening: being inherently disposed, everything, difficult to carry out, and directed anywhere, related to an Upstanding Man, and also of all sorts, related to those in need and in want, also for ease in this world and the next, and pure.

Here an Aspirant to Awakening, having fulfilled the six Perfections one by one—the Perfection of Giving and the Perfections of Ethical Conduct, Forbearance, Exertion, Meditation, and Wisdom—wholly and completely awakens to unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening.

Then, what is the Perfection of Giving of an Aspirant to Awakening?¹ It is said that the Perfection of Giving of an Aspirant to Awakening means the nine forms of gifts: being inherently disposed to give, a gift of everything, a gift that is difficult to carry out, a gift that is directed anywhere, a gift to an Upstanding Man, a gift of all sorts, a gift to those in need and in want, a gift for ease in this world and the next, and a pure gift.

What is being inherently disposed to give?² It is the intent of an Aspirant to Awakening who has no regard for any belongings or his own body, which is produced together with

¹ On “Aspirant to Awakening” for Skt. *bodhisattva*, see n. 1 in chapter III, part B.

² Skt. *dānasya svabhāva*. The usual translation of *svabhāva* as “self-nature” or “essence” does not seem to fit the context well. This passage does not describe some abstract essence (or lack thereof, the *niḥsvabhāva*) of a gift or process of giving, but rather the natural inclination of an Aspirant to Awakening to give. However, the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* does use *svabhāva* in the Yogācāra technical sense—e.g., Tatz, trans., *Asanga’s Chapter on Ethics With the Commentary of Tsong-Kha-Pa*, 47—and I believe its author took advantage of the term’s range of meaning. There is no hint of the three Yogācāra *svabhāvas* well known from the *Sandhinirmocana-* and *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtras*.

detachment [for material things],³ the physical and vocal action that is motivated by it [the intent] and done for the sake of surrendering objects that can be given, and the irreproachable surrender of all objects that can be given.⁴ When someone wants something, it is also offering those objects to him by one who is established in the ethical restraints, who apprehends the authoritative texts,⁵ and who has the [correct] view of karmic fruits [i.e., by an Aspirant to Awakening].⁶ This should be known as an inherent disposition of an Aspirant to Awakening to give.

Then, what is the gift of everything? In brief, it is said that everything means there are two kinds of objects that can be given: internal and external.

In that regard, the surrender of his own body—up to his marrow—is said to mean the surrender of an exclusively internal object of an Aspirant to Awakening. On the other hand, [when] an Aspirant to Awakening, after having eaten a lot, regurgitates food and drink for the sake of beings who live by eating regurgitated food, that is said to mean a gift of an Aspirant to Awakening of a mixture of both internal and external objects. Aside from what has just been

³ Skt. *alābhasahajā* = Tib. *ma chags pa dang lhan cig skyes pa*. Dutt's edition of this passage is much different and does not at all agree with Tib. The occurrence of *kevalādhyātmikavastuparityāgāya* here in Dutt appears out of place in the organization of the text, as *ādhyātmika* gifts have yet to be introduced.

⁴ The last phrase translates *anavadyaś ca sarvadeyavastuparityāgaḥ*. The intended reading may have been for the masculine *anavadyaś* to agree with the neuter *vastu* within the compound, so that the whole sentence would describe the intention, the actions motivated by the intention, and the faultless objects given as a result of the actions.

⁵ Skt. *āgama*.

⁶ This sentence, with a double relative-correlative construction, is rather difficult to interpret: *saṃvara-sthāyinaḥ āgamadṛṣṭeḥ phaladarśinaḥ yo yenārthī tasya ca tadvastupratipādanā*. I take the three genitive compounds as agreeing with *bodhisattvasya* that immediately follows, rather than *tasya*, the hypothetical recipient. It would be out of line with the ethos of the text to restrict gifts to recipients who are learned practitioners with a correct view of the world.

described, the surrender of the remaining objects that can be given is said to mean strictly the surrender of external objects that can be given.

Then, in brief, an Aspirant to Awakening gives away his own body to others who ask for his body under two conditions. In one case, he gives himself away to others to be under the control of and subject to others, so as to act according to [other beings'] wishes.⁷ As an analogy, suppose someone were to enter into a state of slavery for the purpose of [getting] food and clothes for others. In this very way, a spiritually minded Aspirant to Awakening who desires supreme awakening, desires the good welfare and ease of others, and wants to fulfill the Perfection of Giving gives himself away to be under the control of and subject to others, so as to act according to [other beings'] wishes. To those who ask for as much as his primary and secondary limbs—hands, feet, eyes, head—and to those who ask for as much as his flesh, blood, and ligaments, he [gives away that much]; to those who ask for as much as his marrow, he gives away his marrow.

An Aspirant to Awakening surrenders external objects to beings for two reasons: either he gives away what was requested so that it can be enjoyed as [the recipient] pleases, or with a liberated mind he completely gives it [what was requested] away so that [the recipient] takes ownership of it.⁸

⁷ The line is *yathākāmakaraṇīyaṃ vā paravaśyaṃ paravidheyam ātmānaṃ pareṣāṃ anuprayacchati*. The single *vā* is problematic, and another possible translation is as follows: “He gives himself away to others to act according to their wishes or to be under the control of and subject to others.” However, I believe the outlier *vā* hooks up with a passage in the next section, the “detailed classification” of a gift of everything. From the analogy in the next sentence, the point seems to be that the Aspirant to Awakening can give himself up to others as long as it benefits beings in some way. The second reason he might do so, so that other beings would be hurt, is *verboten*. I translate the first *vā* as “in one case” and supply “[in the second case]” below.

⁸ Skt. *tadvaśitvāya* = Tib. *de dbang bar bya ba'i phyir*. “Takes ownership” may be a strong reading of *vaśitva*. However, because of *paribhogāya*, “for the enjoyment” or “for the use,” there appears to be a distinction

However, an Aspirant to Awakening in no way gives all his internal and external objects to beings indiscriminately. So what does an Aspirant to Awakening give to beings from these two kinds of objects, internal and external? And what does he not give? How does he give? How does he not give? An Aspirant to Awakening does not give to others a gift from those internal and external objects that would be for the ease of beings alone, but not for their welfare, or neither for their ease nor their welfare. However, an Aspirant to Awakening certainly gives to others a gift that would be for their welfare, but not for their ease, or both for their ease and their welfare.⁹

This, then, is the brief teaching about what is and is not a gift [of everything]. Beyond this, the detailed classification [of a gift of everything] should be known.

[In the second case], an Aspirant to Awakening who has been incited with an untoward command to harm, kill, or deceive others in this world does not give himself to be under the control of and subject to others. An Aspirant to Awakening might perhaps agree in the presence of others even to surrender his own life a hundred times, a thousand times, or a hundred thousand times. But he would not harm, kill, or deceive others because he was ordered to by another person or for the sake of pleasing someone else.

If an Aspirant to Awakening has pure intentions with regard to giving, he does not give away his own body or his primary and secondary limbs, neither when the many needs of beings to be dealt with have arisen, nor when approached by someone requesting his own body or his primary and secondary limbs. For what reason? For this Aspirant to Awakening

being drawn between two types of gifts: those to which the donor still has ties versus those over which the donor has completely relinquished ownership. See the introduction in chapter III for a brief discussion of this idea.

⁹ That is, the gift must be given for the welfare of other beings no matter what.

who has pure intentions with regard to giving, there is by no means cowering from the thought: “This must be given, this must not be given.” Therefore, after he has become indifferent to the needs of beings that have arisen, this Aspirant to Awakening would give when it is for the sake of the purification of his intentions; [but] after he has become indifferent to the needs of beings that have arisen, he does not give when he knows that his intentions are [already] pure.

Also, he does not give his own body or pieces of his limbs to the gods belonging to the retinue of Māra who have approached and requested them, their aim being to hurt [others], lest there be excessive injury and pain for them. Just as for the gods belonging to the retinue of Māra, it should be known that the same goes for the beings who are instructed [to hurt others] by them [i.e., the gods belonging to the retinue of Māra].

An Aspirant to Awakening also does not give away his own body or pieces of his limbs to those who are insane and scatterbrained. They are not stable in their own mind. They want something but do not seek it. They only complain. Because of their lack of mental independence, he does not give.¹⁰

Besides these instances, an Aspirant to Awakening, in submission to others, does otherwise surrender his own body or pieces of his primary and secondary limbs to those who ask. What is and is not a gift of an internal object of an Aspirant to Awakening, then, should be known in this way.

¹⁰ The text says that the insane are in a state of *asvatantratva*. The term *asvatantra* had legal implications in India—being *asvatantra* meant that an individual did not have the legal right to act independently. *Manusmṛti* 5.147-149 and 9.2-3 famously describe women as not being able to act with *svātantrya* because they were to be under the guardianship of their fathers, husbands, and sons in the successive stages of their lives. I believe the implication in our text is that insane individuals are legally unfit to be the recipient of gifts. Cf. *Manusmṛti* 8.67, 8.163, and 9.201 on the legal and economic restrictions of the insane.

From external objects, moreover, an Aspirant to Awakening does not give away to those who ask the poison, fire, weapons, or liquor that damages beings or that is requested by those who want to damage themselves or others. But, an Aspirant to Awakening does give to those who ask the poison, fire, weapons, or liquor that benefits beings or that is requested by those who want to benefit themselves or others.¹¹

Moreover, an Aspirant to Awakening does not give away to people unreliable articles that come from others.¹²

An Aspirant to Awakening does not procure other people's wives by means of a go-between and give them away to others.

He also does not give away food or drink that has living things in it.

An Aspirant to Awakening also does not give away to those who ask those objects that can be given to beings if they are associated with pleasure and amusement or if they are associated with misfortune. For what reason? Even if those objects would bring about a measure of serene trust¹³ for them in regard to the Aspirant to Awakening, that gift of his would nevertheless be even more unfortunate since he, incurring [the guilt from their] delight, indulgence, and misbehavior, would be reborn in the unfavorable destinies after

¹¹ *Vasiṣṭha Dharmasūtra* 13.55 says that a brahman should not accept gifts of weapons, poison, or liquor: *śāstram viṣaṃ surā cāpratigrhyāṇi brāhmaṇasya* (Patrick Olivelle, ed., *Dharmasūtras: The Law Codes of Āpastamba, Gautama, Baudhāyana, and Vasiṣṭha* (Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 2000), 404).

¹² Skt. *parakīya*. Dharmasāstric law forbids giving items one does not own. See P.V. Kane, *History of Dharmasāstra (Ancient and Mediaeval Religious and Civil Law)*, Vol. III (Government Oriental Series, class B, no. 6) (Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1946), 462.

¹³ Skt. *cittaprasāda*, which is extremely difficult to translate. It might be better translated as “gratitude,” though I use that for the conceptually related term *śraddhā* in this text. See Rotman, *Thus Have I Seen*, esp. 65ff. and the sources cited there.

death.¹⁴ Moreover, if those objects associated with pleasure, amusement, and the like would not lead to the unfavorable destinies or the accrual of the roots of vice, that Aspirant to Awakening would willingly give away such objects associated with pleasure, amusement, and the like to those who ask so they [would develop] serene trust and for the sake of winning them over and [spiritually] maturing them by means of those objects. What sort of objects associated with pleasure and amusement does an Aspirant Awakening not give to those who ask? What sort does he give? Namely, an Aspirant to Awakening does not give training on how to kill wild animals. He does not himself perform or cause others to perform sacrifices such as the minor sacrifices and major slaughters in which a lot of living creatures, having been brought together into a mass, are deprived of life. Nor does he give away the [opportunity for] killing domestic animals in temples. When requested, he also does not give away areas where many living creatures dwell—those inhabited by living creatures that either live in water or on land—so that those living creatures would be injured. When requested, he does not give away nets or restraining devices, or instructions on how [to use] nets or restraining devices, for injuring living creatures. Nor does he give away an enemy to [the latter’s] enemies for him to be verbally abused, killed, bound, beaten, or tortured. In brief, an Aspirant to Awakening does not give to those who ask any of those objects [associated with] the pleasure and amusement of beings in order to harm or cause anguish to other beings. However, an Aspirant to Awakening gives away objects [associated with] pleasure and amusement, things such as various elephants, horses, wagons, vehicles, or conveyances, clothing and ornaments, excellent food and drink, training for dancing, singing, and instrumental music, equipment for

¹⁴ The “he” (Skt. *asau*), as I understand it, refers to the Aspirant to Awakening, who thus is himself punished by the recipients’ sinful experiences that are related to the gift. If the text instead means that the karmic fate of the recipients is damaged by the gift, then there is a switch in grammatical number.

dancing, singing, and instrumental music, perfume, flower garlands, and ointment, various housewares, gardens, houses, women for sexual intercourse, and training in assorted subjects of arts and craftwork,¹⁵ to those who ask so they [would develop] serene trust.

But an Aspirant to Awakening does not give away too much or unwholesome food and drink, even to someone asking because he is sick. He does not give away excellent food and drink to beings who are satisfied yet still crave more.

Nor does he give beings afflicted with sorrow what they want: [the means] to hang themselves, get beaten up, take poison, or be pushed off a cliff.¹⁶

An Aspirant to Awakening also would in no way give his mother and father away to those who ask, that is to say, the mother and father of an Aspirant to Awakening who represent the most respectable people¹⁷ and who nurtured, nourished, and raised him. Thus, an Aspirant to Awakening is not to grow tired because he has supported them¹⁸ for a long time. Instead, he himself, under the control of and subject to [his parents], must be given for them by pledge, putting himself up as a surety bond, or sale.¹⁹ Thus, how could an Aspirant to Awakening bear to give them away to others? How could he give them up?

Nor does an Aspirant to Awakening, if he is a powerful king whose head has been anointed, take away from others the children or wives that belong to someone else, [the

¹⁵ Skt. *śīlpakarmasthāneṣu śīkṣā*. See BHSD, s.v. *sthāna*.

¹⁶ I.e., he will not help them end their lives.

¹⁷ I follow the *guru* of Dutt instead of the *guhya* of Wogihara. Tib. has *bla ma lta bu mchog yin*.

¹⁸ Literally, “from carrying them on his head” (Skt. *śirasodvahanāt*).

¹⁹ Skt. *ādhamanabandhakasthāpanavikreya* = Tib. *spu gta' dang gtar gzhug pa dang btsong ba'i tshul gyis*. I follow Tib. in reading three items, though I am not at all certain about their meaning. The usual Skt. term for “pledge” is *ādhi*, not *ādhamana*, while the usual term for “surety” is *pratibhū* or a related word, not *bandhaka* or *bandhana*.

children or wives] of beings who along with their property lie within his own territory,²⁰ and give them away to other people. On the contrary, he should give away for use²¹ an entire village or a spot within a village, or an entire city or a spot within a city,²² saying, “As it was for me, may it be the same for you.” An Aspirant to Awakening also does not give away his own children or wife²³ or give away as property his own female slaves, male slaves, servile workers, or servile wage laborers,²⁴ if they are not correctly informed [about the situation], reluctant [to being given away], or averse [to being given away], to others who ask. He also does not offer those who are correctly informed [about the situation],²⁵ content [with being given away], or willing [to being given away] to adversaries, earth spirits and demons, or evil-doers. Nor does he offer a person who is a child or wife, a favorite son, or a child from a good family into a state of slavery.

An Aspirant to Awakening also does not give a kingdom as a gift to evil-doers who beg for one but who are bent on harming others in excess. Rather, he expels such people from the kingdom if he is capable of expelling them.

²⁰ The implication may be that the children and wives taken from outside of the king’s territory, e.g., from war spoils, can be given away freely.

²¹ Skt. *bhogam anuprayacchet*.

²² That is, he should give land, not certain kinds of human property.

²³ Several Dharmaśāstric texts prohibit giving away one’s family members—see Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. II, Pt. II, 849-850.

²⁴ “Property” = Skt. *parigraha*. As in the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*, it is assumed that the Aspirant to Awakening can own human property—see n. 156 in chapter III, part B.

²⁵ Stephanie Jamison has brought to my attention that Skt. *a/samjñaptam* in a sacrificial setting meant “not/made to agree,” a euphemism for “sacrificed” because the animal was considered to have agreed to its own slaughter. It is possible that we have a watered-down version of this meaning here, whereby slaves and the like were forced to consent to their being given away.

An Aspirant to Awakening also does not take away possessions from his mother and father and give them away to those requesting them. Just like for his mother and father, the same goes for his children, wife, female slaves, male slaves, and servile wage laborers. While he does not do so to his mother and father, he also does not cause extensive anguish to servile workers or servile wage laborers and then surrender them to others who requested them as objects that could be given.

An Aspirant to Awakening justly and considerately amasses possessions and gives them as gifts, not unjustly and inconsiderately, and not after having harmed or caused pain to another.

An Aspirant to Awakening, established in the teaching of the Awakened Ones, of the Blessed Ones, also in no way gives a gift after violating his training.

When giving a gift, an Aspirant to Awakening is also even minded with respect to all beings—whether friends, adversaries, or strangers, virtuous or faulty, inferior, equal, or superior to him, at ease or suffering—giving after establishing the opinion that [they are all] worthy of presents.

But an Aspirant to Awakening does not give a gift worse than what was described or promised to someone requesting it, [giving a gift] only if it is the same as or better than [what was described or promised]. After promising an excellent object, an Aspirant to Awakening does not give something poor and substandard. After promising something poor and substandard, he gives something excellent only if he has something excellent.²⁶

²⁶ These last two sentences follow Dutt and Tib. Wogihara is slightly different. The promised gift, an issue that appears several times in our text, is usually legally binding according to Dharmśāstric literature. See the introduction to the translation.

An Aspirant to Awakening also does not give a gift while disagreeable, angry, or mentally agitated.²⁷ Nor does he, after giving a gift, disparage someone by boasting over and over: “With a gift I benefited, profited, or lifted you up in such and such a way.”²⁸

When giving a gift, an Aspirant to Awakening also does not carelessly give away something that has been thrown away, even to a vile man, not to mention to someone virtuous.

Also, there is no offense when an Aspirant to Awakening gives a gift to beggars²⁹ who are engaged in assorted kinds of offensive behaviors, who are rude,³⁰ who cannot restrain themselves, and who are verbally abusive, enraged, and reviling, and he should not feel troubled about it. On the contrary, an Aspirant to Awakening readily gives a gift to them after understanding that being wrapped up in the defilements is natural and then becoming sympathetic toward them.

He also does not give a gift that is grasped with incorrect views. He thus [correctly grasps] the following: One does not encounter the Law through a violent [sacrificial] gift in really savage sacrifices. Nor does one give a gift associated with an auspicious ceremony. Nor does one encounter the purity of dispassion, whether worldly or otherworldly, merely by

²⁷ According to some *Dharmasūtras* and *Dharmaśāstras*, gifts (and other transactions) made under extraordinary mental states like anger are invalid. See Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. II, Pt. II, 887.

²⁸ Some Dharmaśāstric texts also discourage boasting about one’s gifts. See *ibid.*, 849.

²⁹ Skt. *yācaka*. As I discuss in the introduction, the usage of *yācaka* points to a pitiful person with questionable behavior and/or low status. I translate the term as “beggar” because of the negative connotations that word carries in English. But in most cases our text uses the very similar term *yācanaka* for the recipient, which I translate very differently, usually as “one who requests” but occasionally as “solicitor.” Although *yācanaka* does not appear to be used in the same negative contexts as *yācaka*, at least not as consistently, I cannot be sure whether the author(s) of the *Dānapaṭala* saw a significant difference in the two terms. The matter warrants further study.

³⁰ Skt. *uddhāta* = Tib. *rgod pa*. See *BHSD*, s.v. *uddhānana*.

giving all sorts of things, even if the things are very pure.³¹ Otherwise, one could maintain a gift of purity merely by accumulating [material things].³²

Also, he does not give anticipating karmic rewards. Instead, he redirects [the merit of] all gifts toward unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening. An Aspirant to Awakening who has given rise to strong conviction in the maturation of every kind of karmic fruit of every kind of gift as it really is, and who is not dependent on and cannot be led astray by someone else,³³ gives a gift. For example, [he has conviction that] a giver of food becomes strong, a giver of clothing gets a [good] complexion, a giver of a vehicle will be at ease, and a giver of lamps will have vision.³⁴ Such examples as well as others should be known in detail.

An Aspirant to Awakening also does not give a gift frightened from the dread of poverty. On the contrary, he [gives] only because of a compassionate aim.

An Aspirant to Awakening also does not give a gift that is not proper for those requesting it. For example, [he does not give] leftover³⁵ food and drink to ascetics, or that

³¹ I.e., there are other things besides the quantity and quality of the gifts that matter. Note that Tib. renders Skt. *parāmrṣṭa* as *'dzin pa*, “grasped,” and *na pratyeti* as *mi 'dzin pa*, “does not grasp.” I translate *na pratyeti* as “does not encounter,” which is consistent with Wogihara 134.5-9, where two of these views occur with *bhavati* in the same position as *pratyeti* here.

³² Skt. *nānyatra saṃbhāramātrakatayā viśuddher dānaṃ dhārayati* = Tib. *sbyin pa ni rnam par dag par 'gyur ba'i tshogs tsam 'ba' zhig yin par 'dzin to*. Notice that Tib. links *viśuddher* up as a genitive of *saṃbhāra*, not *dāna*, and means something like: “Otherwise, giving is grasped merely as an accumulation of purity.”

³³ Skt. *'parapratyayo 'nanyaneyo*. The terms *aparapratyaya* and *ananyaneya* sometimes come together as a pair—see Mvy. 2396 and 2399, where they are listed under the heading *nānāguṇanāmāni*.

³⁴ The same associations between these rewards and objects given, including the word play on *sukha* with the gift of a vehicle, can be found in the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* (chapter III) and other texts.

³⁵ Skt. *ucchiṣṭa*. Cf. *Manusmṛti* 2.56, about which Olivelle makes the following note (*Manu's Code of Law*, 248):

[T]he word *ucchiṣṭa* is a technical term for the state of impurity resulting from the remnants of food attached to lips and fingers after eating. The same term is used for food that remains after someone has eaten (leftovers), which are also impure because they have come into contact with one's saliva. The extended

which has been mixed or contaminated with excrement, urine, phlegm, mucus, vomit, sweat, pus, or blood. If [the condition of the food] has not been explained and made known, [he does not give ascetics] rice porridge or gruel³⁶ that characteristically causes diarrhea.³⁷ Likewise, [he does not give food] combined or mixed with onions to [ascetics] who do not eat onions. In the same way, [he does not give food combined or mixed with meat] to [ascetics] who do not eat meat. [He does not give drinks] mixed or combined with alcohol to [ascetics] who do not drink alcohol.³⁸ In that way, an Aspirant to Awakening does not give a gift to others after being involved with an improper action. He does not give such kinds of improper gifts.

An Aspirant to Awakening also does not give a gift to those requesting it after being harassed with repeated requests by people who leave and come back in the manner³⁹ of a servant. On the contrary, [he gives] right after he is requested to.⁴⁰

An Aspirant to Awakening also does not give a gift seeking⁴¹ fame, acclaim, or renown. [He does not give] seeking remuneration from others. He does not give seeking⁴² to become

meaning of the term covers also impurities caused by other bodily functions, such as after voiding urine or excrement.

³⁶ Skt. *odanakulmāṣa*. If it were not abundantly clear from the context, rice porridge and gruel are low types of food—see Silk, “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 362, n. 2.

³⁷ Skt. *utsarjanadharmi*.

³⁸ All of the items given as examples would have been impure to Indian ascetics (Skt. *yati*). See Patrick Olivelle, “From Feast to Fast: Food and the Indian Ascetic,” in *Ascetics and Brahmins: Studies in Ideologies and Institutions* (New York, Anthem Press, 2011), 71-89.

³⁹ Skt. *saṃvidhānena* = Tib. *tshul gyis*.

⁴⁰ That is, he only needs to be asked once.

⁴¹ This is a strong reading of Skt. *niśrita*. See *BHSD*, s.vv. *niśrita* and *niśritya*.

⁴² Skt. *saṃniśrita*. See the previous note.

Śakra, to become Māra, to become a wheel-turning king, or sovereignty. He also does not give in order to be sanctimonious⁴³ around others, thinking, “I hope kings, the head ministers to kings, townsmen and countrymen, priests, householders, the wealthy, traders, and merchants, thinking that I am a giver, a donor, would honor, revere, venerate, and give me homage in the future.”

An Aspirant to Awakening also does not give a cheap gift. He gives abundantly even from little, not to mention from much.

He also does not give a gift in order to mislead others, thinking, “Having enticed them with this gift, I will trick them afterwards.”⁴⁴

He also does not give a gift to others in order to drive people apart. For example, [he does not] think, “After causing division within a village or a spot within a village or a region or a spot within a region by means of a gift, I will take [the land] away and seize it from the owners.”⁴⁵

An Aspirant to Awakening who is dexterous, not lazy, accomplished in his efforts, and is himself the first who is ready and prepared to surrender objects that can be given⁴⁶ both

⁴³ Skt. *kuhanā*. See *BHSD*, s.v. *kuhana*; Wogihara, 21ff.

⁴⁴ This is one of several statements in the text discouraging deceitful gifts, about which see the introduction.

⁴⁵ My translation of this paragraph is not at all certain. I read the gift being proscribed as a kind of apple of discord.

⁴⁶ Skt. *svayaṃ ca saṃnaddhaḥ parikare pūrvaṃgamo deyavastuparityāge* is not easy to interpret. Manuscript variants include the compound *saṃnaddhaparikare* and possibly *saṃnaddhaparikarapūrvaṃgamo*.

gives himself and causes others to give. It is not that he orders others to give after displaying indolence himself.⁴⁷

Knowing that a large gathering of a group of ethical and unethical [monks⁴⁸] who want something are seated and gathered together, he offers all the objects that can be given in due order, beginning with the elder end and ending with the junior end [of monks], by leaving and coming back again and again [with appropriate objects].

But an Aspirant to Awakening does not give a meager gift when he has many, numerous, copious possessions.

He does not give a gift to others in order to hurt someone else. He does not give a gift in order to verbally abuse, become enraged at, beat up, threaten, put down, kill, bind, mutilate, restrain, or banish someone.

Immediately before giving, an Aspirant to Awakening becomes agreeable. While giving, he feels gracious.⁴⁹ After giving, he does not become regretful.⁵⁰

He also does not give a gift deceptively, [like giving] counterfeit precious stones, pearls, lapis lazuli, shell, crystal, coral, and the like to beings who trust [they will get] them.⁵¹

There are not any objects that can be given, whether few or many, that an Aspirant to Awakening has not mentally bequeathed beforehand to all beings. Later, a beggar requests

⁴⁷ I.e., others give not because a lazy Aspirant to Awakening commands them to, but because they are inspired by his zealous generosity.

⁴⁸ This would appear to presume a group of Buddhist monks, though it is not impossible it refers to a generic religious group arranged by age or even status.

⁴⁹ Skt. *cittaṃ prasādayati*.

⁵⁰ Cf. *Aṅguttara Nikāya* III, 337.

⁵¹ That is, the beings trust they will receive the genuine articles.

wealth from the Aspirant to Awakening as if it were his own, [since] what is requested has [already] been given out.⁵²

An Aspirant to Awakening also gives a gift at the right time, not at the wrong time.⁵³ He [gives] what is appropriate, both to himself and to others, not what is inappropriate. He [gives] with correct conduct, not with incorrect conduct. He also [gives] without being scatterbrained, not when scatterbrained.⁵⁴

An Aspirant to Awakening also does not laugh at or ridicule someone requesting something. He does not upset him. He does not knit his brows [in a frown]. His demeanor is approachable, a smile precedes him, and he greets one first [out of politeness].⁵⁵

He also does not give a gift slowly, but does so very quickly.

⁵² That is, in a sense the beggar already possesses the object because the Aspirant to Awakening has previously given up ownership of all objects in his mind. Skt. *anupradatta* means “given out” but may also connote a Dharmaśāstric technical meaning here. Olivelle makes the following comment regarding *Manusmṛti* 8.212 (*Manu’s Code of Law*, 317):

[I]t is apparent that the term *datta*, literally “given,” has a technical meaning [in the context of litigation]. It does not refer to what has been given, as the term implies, but to a gift that is pledged but not yet delivered.

This pledge appears to have been legally binding so that the potential recipient was able to move to a court to enforce payment.

The Skt. of *Manusmṛti* 8.212 is pretty similar to our text: *dharmārthaṃ yena dattaṃ syāt kasmaicid yācate dhanam / paścāc ca na tathā tat syān na deyaṃ tasya tad bhavet //* (from *ibid.*, 701). The author(s) of the *Dānaṣāstra* may have been deliberately drawing a contrast with this Brahmanical rule or norm: Whereas the Brahmanical twice-born male could in certain circumstances not deliver a promised gift, the Aspirant to Awakening has promised to give away all possessions in his mind and must do so without exception (or, with a different Mahāyāna set of exceptions).

⁵³ The notion of giving gifts at the right time appears again in our text as well as in the last section of the *Dānaṣāstra-sūtra*. It was a concept shared across the religions of Classical India—proven by the fact that Indian inscriptions frequently record the precise time of the transaction of a gift—though how each tradition defined the correct time certainly varied. See Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. II, Pt. II, 851-854; Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia*, 102-107. Compare Bhagavadgītā 17.20, which explains that *sāttvika* gifts are given at the right time, and 17.22, which says that *tāmasa* gifts are given at the wrong time (Miller, trans., *The Bhagavad-Gita*, 133-134).

⁵⁴ Skt. *avikṣiptena ca cetasā na vikṣiptena*. Earlier in the text, those who are *ṣiptacitta* are described as being in a state of *asvatantratva*. See n. 10 above.

⁵⁵ Skt. *pūrvābhibhāpī* (Dutt = *pūrvābhibhāṣī*). See *BHSD*, s.v. *pūrvābhibhāpin*; *MW*, s.v. *pūrvabhāṣin*.

When there are those who want something, an Aspirant to Awakening, even without being requested, himself [preemptively] selects [what they want] and then gives it to them. But [if they] take it themselves, he allows them to do it.⁵⁶

An Aspirant to Awakening also does not give an unwise gift.⁵⁷ When he gives, he only gives a wise gift.

What is a wise gift of an Aspirant to Awakening? In this regard, when he has religious gifts, an Aspirant to Awakening thinks the following immediately before a person requesting something comes to him: “If two people requesting something were to come up to me, one who was at ease, not destitute, not needy, who had a master [to look after him], and who was supported, and another who was suffering, destitute, needy, who did not have a master [to look after him], and who was not supported, and if for that purpose I had possessions that could satisfy and fulfill the desires of both of them, then I must satisfy both of them and fulfill each of their desires. But if I did not have possessions whereby I could satisfy and fulfill the desires of both of them, a gift should be given to the one who was suffering, leaving aside the one who was at ease. [That is], a gift should be given to the one who was destitute, needy, who did not have a master [to look after him], and who was not supported, leaving aside the one who was not destitute, not needy, who had a master [to look after him], and who was supported.” Having thought this, he puts [his idea] into action just as he had thought. If, however, he is not able to fulfill the desires of the one requesting something who is at ease, he, in consideration of that very idea he thought of earlier in his own mind [i.e., to give only to the

⁵⁶ The text switches grammatical number from *yo/arthī/tasya* to *parān/eṣām*.

⁵⁷ *BHSD*, s.v. *daṣṣprajña* translates *daṣṣprajñadāna* as a “gift to the unwise,” but our text describes the wisdom (or lack thereof) behind making certain gifts, not a recipient.

suffering person], informs and dismisses that beggar [the one who is not suffering] in this way: “I have already granted and promised this object that can be given to this person who is suffering. I offered it to him alone. It is not that I do not want to give it to you. Good sir, please do not become averse to my friendship on account of this [circumstance].”

Furthermore, when an Aspirant to Awakening has religious gifts, after coming up to, greeting, and exchanging pleasantries with those households that are stingy, very stingy, withholding of their belongings, and miserly, those households in which a religious gift is never produced for renunciants or priests,⁵⁸ the Aspirant to Awakening says this: “Could I have your attention? Gentlemen, may you⁵⁹ continue to have inexhaustible riches that benefit you greatly! I have numerous possessions and numerous religious gifts in my house. I myself am seeking a solicitor in order to fulfill the Perfection of Giving. If you meet a solicitor, refuse him [your possessions but] don’t turn him away!⁶⁰ Either accept my wealth as a religious gift and relinquish it to him exactly as you see fit, or else bring that solicitor to me and rejoice in⁶¹ the gift I am giving.” Then they, after assenting to him, will do as [he suggested], thinking, “Because of our inexhaustible, valuable riches, this son from a good family is pleased with us.”

⁵⁸ Skt. *śramaṇabrāhmaṇa*.

⁵⁹ Skt. *te bhavantaḥ*, using the nominative plural in a formal address of politeness. Wogihara notes a manuscript variant of *me* instead of *te*, and Tib. has *nga la*. I read the line as a flattering greeting through which the Aspirant to Awakening can begin to work his way into the misers’ stingy hearts.

⁶⁰ I believe Wogihara’s *vivarjayiṣyatha* is to be preferred over Dutt’s *visarjayiṣyatha*, though they both can work in this sentence. Skt. *mā nirākṛtya vivarjayiṣyatha* = Tib. *bzlog ste ma btang bar*. Skt. *visṛjata* in the next sentence corresponds to Tib. *byin cig*.

⁶¹ Skt. *anumodatha*. Skt./Pāli *anumodanā* and related words in Buddhist texts can carry the special meaning of approving of or rejoicing in another’s meritorious deeds with the intention of acquiring merit for oneself.

In this way, that Aspirant to Awakening will surely plant the seed⁶² for them to remove the filth of stinginess in the future. Because of that skillful strategy [of the Aspirant to Awakening] that is informed by wisdom,⁶³ eventually they will each get used to giving away a limited amount of their wealth to others. Relying on a slight amount of detachment [from material things], they will attain a medium amount [of detachment]; relying on a medium amount [of detachment], they will attain an excessive amount [of detachment].⁶⁴

Furthermore, the teachers, preceptors, co-residential pupils,⁶⁵ and fellow practitioners⁶⁶ of an Aspirant to Awakening—those who are greedy by nature and inherently covetous, but also those who are not inherently covetous—become distressed from desire because they fail [to receive any] religious gifts. In that case, the Aspirant to Awakening, wanting to do things that make merit in the form of giving,⁶⁷ [with the merit from giving] being planted in the Awakened One, the Law, or the Community,⁶⁸ imparts those religious gifts to them [his religious brethren listed above] especially. [But] he has them give [the objects]; he does not do it himself. In this way, that Aspirant to Awakening himself creates a greater amount of merit.

⁶² Skt. *bījam avaropitaṃ bhavati*.

⁶³ Skt. *tena prajñāpūrvakeṇopāyakaśalya*.

⁶⁴ The Aspirant to Awakening initially pleases the selfish households by allowing them to hold on to their wealth, but he gradually wears down their greed and inspires them to be generous through his skillful strategy (*upāyakaśalya*).

⁶⁵ Skt. *sārdhaṃvihāryantevāsin*.

⁶⁶ Skt. *sabrahmacārin*.

⁶⁷ Skt. *dānamayam puṇyakriyāvastu kartukāmas*. The term *dānamaya* is the first item in the Skt./Pāli lists of *puṇyakriyāvastus/puññakiriyavatthus*. See the beginning of chapter III, part A.

⁶⁸ Skt. *buddhāvaropitaṃ vā dharmāvaropitaṃ vā saṃghāvaropitaṃ vā*. The idea is that objects can be given to and merit generated through the Buddha, Dharma, and Saṃgha. Each of the Three Jewels is a distinct recipient for donations.

For some of his fellow practitioners the defilements are subdued. For others the desire for the Law is fulfilled. Beings are won over and [spiritually] matured.

Furthermore, when he has religious gifts, an Aspirant to Awakening, understanding that someone is going to request something merely by an outward hint of his motivations, offers him religious gifts according to his [the recipient's] wishes.

Whoever comes toward him, thinking, “In this way I will cheat him with a fraudulent transaction,” perceiving his [foolishly generous] temperament, immediately conceals his [the cheater's] misbehavior, even from others, not to mention from him [the Aspirant to Awakening]. [The Aspirant to Awakening] fulfills his [the cheater's] wishes. Because of this, he [the cheater] goes away unabashed, elated, sure of himself,⁶⁹ and cheerful, and the Aspirant to Awakening is deceived by his fraudulent swindling. He [the Aspirant to Awakening] does not originally see through this deceit, but he sees through it later. On these grounds, however, he does not reprove and call attention to that cheating person. In consideration for him [the cheater], [the Aspirant to Awakening] also approves of⁷⁰ everything that was accomplished through his scheming⁷¹ and taken without being given.⁷²

These kinds of things should be known as a wise gift of an Aspirant to Awakening when he has religious gifts.

Furthermore, when an Aspirant to Awakening does not have religious gifts, that Aspirant to Awakening who is skilled in this or that subject of arts and craftwork puts such a

⁶⁹ Skt. *viśārada*—see Wogihara, 39-40 for lexical analysis.

⁷⁰ Skt. *anumodate* (Wogihara) or *abhyanumodate* (Dutt).

⁷¹ Skt. *tacchalakṛtam*, which follows Dutt.

⁷² The Aspirant to Awakening turns a Dharmasāstric norm on its head by allowing himself to be cheated.

subject of arts and craftwork to use. Because of this, he, with little difficulty, gains and lives off a large mass of wealth.⁷³ Or an Aspirant to Awakening who is an amazing talker, a sweet-talker, and terrifically eloquent sets forth a teaching on the Law to others so that the desire to give is established both for impoverished beings, not to mention the rich, and also for the stingy, not to mention those accustomed to liberality.⁷⁴ Or he brings beggars who have come [to him] repeatedly to those devout⁷⁵ households in which there especially continue to be, day after day, religious gifts due to the fact that they have copious possessions. After going [there] himself, he, dexterous, not lazy, and accomplished in his efforts,⁷⁶ opens up his heart⁷⁷ when gifts [are being given] and merit is being made, and physically and verbally engages in [those deeds] with all his ability and might. He also causes those gifts to be offered well to those requesting them. Thus, that is indeed a [genuine] gift [of the Aspirant to Awakening]. [But] that which is offered poorly or preferentially to someone because of a lack of due care,⁷⁸ improper behavior, or absent-mindedness is not [a genuine gift of the Aspirant to Awakening].⁷⁹ In this way an Aspirant to Awakening indeed becomes the giver of a wise gift

⁷³ Despite the absence of *vā*, I read this as the first three of options in this paragraph of what an Aspirant to Awakening can do when he does not have gifts. I believe the implication is that he makes money so he can then acquire them.

⁷⁴ I.e., even if he has no gifts himself he can still provide others with Buddhist teachings about generosity.

⁷⁵ Skt. *śrāddha*.

⁷⁶ Skt. *dakṣo 'nalasa utthānasampannaḥ*. The same three terms occur together at Wogihara 122.12-13.

⁷⁷ Skt. *cittam abhiprasādyā*.

⁷⁸ Skt. *upasthāyakavaiguṇyād* (Tib. *zhal ta byed pa dang / mi mthun pa'i phyir*) looks literally like “because of the flaws of an attendant [who delivers the gift?],” but I cannot see how that fits the context.

⁷⁹ When he does not have any religious gifts, the third option of the Aspirant to Awakening is to bring beggars to wealthy homes and make sure the rich people give their gifts in the proper way.

when he does not have possessions, [and this is the case] until he develops pure intentions. But when the intentions of an Aspirant to Awakening are pure,⁸⁰ he transcends the unfavorable destinies and likewise attains inexhaustible possessions in birth after birth.⁸¹

Furthermore,⁸² an Aspirant to Awakening does not give the Law, either from oral explanation or in the form of a book,⁸³ to an adherent of another religion⁸⁴ looking for a defect in it. He also does not [give] a book to someone greedy by nature who wants to sell it or hoard it away, nor to someone not seeking its knowledge. With regard to someone seeking its knowledge,⁸⁵ on the other hand, if [the Aspirant to Awakening] achieves his goal with the book, he himself gives him [the recipient seeking the book's knowledge] exactly what [the recipient] wants. [But] if for whatever reason he does not achieve his goal, an additional book is accordingly supplied⁸⁶—thus this Aspirant to Awakening, after finding or having another copy [of the book] written down, gives another. [But] if he neither finds nor is able to have a copy [of the book] written down, then he must first of all examine his own intention: “I hope my

⁸⁰ Wogihara has *āśayaviśuddhi* and *śuddhādhyāśaya* (but Dutt has *āśayaśuddhi* and *śuddhāśaya*). I do not believe the *āśaya/adhyāśaya* and *viśuddhi/śuddha* differences are significant.

⁸¹ Evidently, the Aspirant to Awakening no longer needs to give if he has pure intentions. The text said earlier that he did not need to give away his body as long as his intentions were pure. The issue of intentionality is discussed in the introduction.

⁸² Here we have a continuation of the section on the wise gift. The remaining portion of the discussion is divided into five parts, each beginning with *punar aparāṃ bodhisattvaḥ* and ending with *idam api . . . prājñādānaṃ veditavyaṃ*. The text summarizes these five parts at Wogihara 131.20-27.

⁸³ Skt. *mukhodesāto vā pustakagataṃ vā*.

⁸⁴ Skt. *tīrthika*.

⁸⁵ The syntax here is confusing: *na tu tena jñānenānārthine jñānenārthine vā*. I believe the *daṇḍa* placed after *jñānenānārthine* in Wogihara is right, even though on the surface it looks as if its placement after *vā* in Dutt would be correct.

⁸⁶ Skt. *anvāvartita* = Tib. *bsgrub pa*. See MW, s.v. *anu√vrt*.

mind is not entangled⁸⁷ in the filth of stinginess with regard to the Law. Alas, I am afraid that I do not earnestly want to give the Law in written form!”⁸⁸ If he, after examining [his intention] in this way, were to conclude, “My motive is [entangled in] the filth of stinginess with regard to the Law,” then that Aspirant to Awakening forms the following intention: “It must certainly be given!” That would be a gift of the Law.⁸⁹ [If he thinks], “If I were confused⁹⁰ in this situation on account of this gift of the Law, I still must not put up with⁹¹ defilement and must certainly give it!” [That also] would be a gift of the Law. This is even more the case if [the Aspirant to Awakening] is deficient in his stock of knowledge.⁹² If he, after examining [his intention], were to conclude, “My motive is not [entangled in] the filth of stinginess with regard to the Law,” then that Aspirant to Awakening must realize this: “I should give this gift of the Law in order to destroy my own defilement, in order to complete my own stock of knowledge, or because of affection for [other] beings. When I do not find [any] defilement [in myself], I will discern that the present and future stock of knowledge is larger from not giving [the Law] away. It is not [larger] from giving [the Law] away. [By giving the Law away, any hope] for an ample gain in the Law in the future is especially dim. But when I do not give [the Law] away, I acquire

⁸⁷ Skt. *pariyavasthita* = Tibetan *kun nas dkris pa*. See *BHSD*, s.v. *pariyavasthāna*.

⁸⁸ The Aspirant to Awakening seems to hope that he did not give because he was unable to, not because he did not want to.

⁸⁹ Wogihara’s . . . *dātavyam eva tad dharmadānaṃ syāt* / is to be preferred over Dutt’s . . . *dātavyam / evaṃ dharmadānaṃ syāt* /.

⁹⁰ Skt. *mūka*, which means “tongue-tied,” “mute,” etc. In this scenario, it is not that the Aspirant to Awakening was unable to speak, but that he was at a loss as to what to do.

⁹¹ Skt. *anadhivāsyā*. See n. 239 in chapter III, part B.

⁹² Skt. *jñānasam̐bhāravikala*—the implication is that the Aspirant to Awakening is deficient in one of the two *sam̐bhāras* (the other being *puṇya*) required for awakening.

knowledge for the sake and welfare of all beings, pleasing both that being [i.e., the specific recipient] and all other beings besides him. When I give [the Law] away, I please this single being only [the specific recipient].” After understanding this as it really is, if the Aspirant to Awakening does not give [but acquires knowledge for others], then he is irreproachable and unregretful, and he does not transgress the way of Aspirants to Awakening.

Moreover, how does he not give? An Aspirant to Awakening could not at all bear to reject someone requesting something with rough words, saying, “I will not give to you!” Instead, he informs and dismisses him tactfully [*upāyakauśalena*]. This [is the application of] a skillful strategy [*upāyakauśalam*] to that [situation].

First of all, with pure intentions an Aspirant to Awakening commits and mentally transfers⁹³ all his belongings and all his religious gifts to the Awakened Ones and Aspirants to Awakening in the ten directions, just as a monk would mentally transfer his own robe to his teachers or preceptors. Since he mentally transfers [these things] in this way, he obtains a hoard of a whole variety of wonderful belongings and religious gifts, and he is called an Aspirant to Awakening who dwells in the lineage of the Noble Ones.⁹⁴ He becomes the creator of immeasurable merit, and the merit for him, who always holds it in high regard, grows accordingly at all times. He keeps those religious gifts as if they were entrusted to Awakened Ones and Aspirants to Awakening.

⁹³ Skt. *vikalpitāḥ* = Tib. *bsngos*.

⁹⁴ Skt. *āryavaṃśavihārī*. The *āryavaṃśa* in Buddhist texts is an ascetic ideal of contentment with four things: 1) any robe, 2) any alms food, 3) any bedding or seats (or lodging, Skt. *śayanāsana*), and 4) any medicine. (The fourth item, according to some sources, is delighting in cutting off (bad qualities) and cultivating (good qualities), Skt. *prahāṇabhāvanārāmatā*.) See Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 127-130. Given the tone of justification in this section on “not giving,” the mental transfer of belongings and religious gifts on the part of the Aspirant to Awakening may be serving as a substitute for living up to the traditional ascetic ideal of the *āryavaṃśa*.

If [an Aspirant to Awakening] encounters someone requesting something and discerns an offering of religious gifts that is suitable to him and that is just what he wants, knowing that there is nothing whatsoever that has not been surrendered to beings by Awakened Ones and Aspirants to Awakening, he fulfills the wish of the person requesting something. But if [the Aspirant to Awakening] does not deem it to be suitable, he, after giving the idea consideration, informs and dismisses him with gentle words, saying, “This belongs to someone else, good sir. This is not permitted to be given to you.”⁹⁵ Or else he dismisses him after showing two or three times more regard and favor for the gift than it [is worth].⁹⁶ Because of this, he [the person requesting the gift] concludes, “It is not because of his greedy character that this Aspirant to Awakening does not want to give it to me. Rather, surely he does not give because he does not have legal control⁹⁷ over this gift of the Law [in the form] of a book.” This, too, should be known as a wise gift of an Aspirant to Awakening, [specifically] with regard to a gift of the Law.

Furthermore, an Aspirant to Awakening, giving away all gifts, [that is], gifts of the Law, material gifts, and gifts of security,⁹⁸ is aware of them as they really are from analogies,

⁹⁵ The Aspirant to Awakening tells what one might interpret as a “white lie.” He uses a Dharmaśāstric excuse by making the solicitor believe that he does not have the legal right to give the gift because it has already been promised to someone else.

⁹⁶ Skt. *taddviguṇaṃ triguṇaṃ dānamānasatkāraṃ kṛtvā*. The *tad* may refer to the solicitor—“than him.” In either case, the Aspirant to Awakening tries to get rid of the solicitor tactfully because the gift is not suitable for him.

⁹⁷ Skt. *asvatantra*. See n. 10 above.

⁹⁸ Skt. *dharmāmiṣābhaya-dāna*. Tib. is slightly different, describing the gifts as *chos dang zang zing gi rang bzhin* (*rang bzhin* = Skt. *svabhāva? prakṛti?*). At any rate, the triad of *dharmā-*, *āmiṣa-*, and *abhaya-*gifts are standard in Mahāyāna Sāstric works, occurring again in this text at Wogihara 133.11-24. The triad also appears in the *Sūtrālaṅkāra* and *Mahāyānasamgraha*—see Pagel, *The Bodhisattvapiṭaka*, 147, n. 118. On *abhaya-dāna*, which also occurs in Dharmaśāstric and Jain texts, see Maria Hibbets, “Saving Them From Yourself: An Inquiry into the South Asian Gift of Fearlessness,” *Journal of Religious Ethics* 27.3 (1999): 437-462. Also see Sircar, *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*, s.v. *abhaya-sāsana*; Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy*, 109. And also

distinguishing traits, etymological explanations, and analyses of karmic cause and effect.⁹⁹

This, too, should be known as a wise gift of an Aspirant to Awakening.

Furthermore, an Aspirant to Awakening gives a gift with a friendly disposition toward malicious beings, a compassionate disposition toward suffering [beings], a joyful disposition toward virtuous [beings], and a serene disposition toward helpful, friendly, and good-hearted [beings].¹⁰⁰ This, too, should be known as a wise gift of an Aspirant to Awakening.

Furthermore, an Aspirant to Awakening is aware of both an obstacle to giving and the counter to the obstacle to giving as they really are. In that regard, there are four obstacles to giving: first, not being in the habit [of giving]; [second], a limitation or deficiency of religious gifts; [third], longing for the best, most delightful objects; and [fourth], reveling in anticipation of the karmic reward of [getting] superb possessions in the future. On account of [these obstacles to giving], when an Aspirant to Awakening has religious gifts, he is not inclined to give when someone requesting something has approached him courteously. [But], through wisdom, he [the Aspirant to Awakening] very quickly comprehends [the situation], thinking, “This was caused by not being in the habit [of giving]. It is my fault.” Moreover, he

note that Avalokiteśvara is sometimes called *abhayaṃdada*, “giver of safety,” in the context of rescuing supplicants from various dangers (e.g., Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra*, 285 and 288).

⁹⁹ Skt. *paryāyato 'pi lakṣaṇato 'pi nirvacanato 'pi hetuphalaprabhedato 'pi*. The same list appears in the *Vyākhyāyukti* as tools to analyze language, except *nirvacana* is replaced by *nirukti* (Tib. *nges pa'i tshig*) and *prabheda* (Tib. *rab tu dbye ba*) occurs without *hetuphala*-. See Richard F. Nance, *Speaking for Buddhas: Scriptural Commentary in Indian Buddhism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 115-116. I am not sure whether *nirvacana* and *nirukti* are synonyms.

¹⁰⁰ This is an application of the four *brahmavihāras*: *maitrī*, *karuṇā*, *muditā*, and *upekṣā*. See n. 131 in chapter III, part B.

comprehends the following: “Surely I did not give a gift previously¹⁰¹ because, [even though] I had possessions at the time when the person requesting it approached me courteously, I was not inclined to give. If I will not give now after I have reflected upon [the situation], then once again I will hate giving in the future.” After comprehending [the situation] in this way, he relies on the counter to the obstacle to giving, reflects upon [the situation], and gives. He is no [longer] influenced by the fault caused by not being in the habit [of giving], nor is he in its power.¹⁰²

Furthermore, if an Aspirant to Awakening, due to having a limited amount of possessions, is not inclined to give when someone requesting something has approached him courteously, then he, through wisdom, very quickly comprehends that the cause of the obstacle to giving is that [the refraining from giving] occurred in a state of adversity. Putting up with that suffering caused by adversity, he reflects upon [the situation] and gives a gift out of compassion. Thus it occurs to him: “Because of the fault of a previous deed or out of submission to others, I have experienced a lot of overwhelming suffering in life, such as hunger and thirst, but have received no help from others. If the present suffering, which was caused by this gift that resulted in helping others, would lead to my death, my end of days,¹⁰³ giving is indeed still more fortunate for me than refusing the solicitor, not to mention [refusing] anyone who lives off of any leafy vegetables [he can find].” Thinking like this, the Aspirant to Awakening puts up with that suffering caused by adversity and gives the gift.

¹⁰¹ Following Dutt, *pūrvam dānam na dattam* (Wogihara = *pūrvam dānam na dattapūrvam*). The *datta* here may be another example of its technical Dharmaśāstric meaning, “promise” or “pledge”: “Surely I did not promise a gift previously. . . .” See n. 52 above.

¹⁰² I follow Dutt’s manuscript, which has *nānabhyāsakṛtadoṣānusārī* and three total negatives in this line. Dutt’s emendation to *nābhyāsakṛtadoṣānusārī* is incorrect.

¹⁰³ I follow Dutt’s *etad dānakṛtam parānugrahahetukam* against Wogihara’s *etad dānam*.

Furthermore, if an Aspirant to Awakening, due to [an object's] being really lovely and exceptional, is not inclined to give the object that can be given when a beggar has approached him courteously, then the Aspirant to Awakening, through wisdom, very quickly comprehends that his fault [i.e., refraining from giving] occurred because of possessiveness. He thinks, “This conceptual error¹⁰⁴ of mine—that there is well-being in suffering—creates future suffering.” On account of thoroughly discerning¹⁰⁵ his error, he rejects that [refraining from giving resulting from his conceptual error], reflects upon [the situation], and gives that object.

Furthermore, if, after giving a gift, the anticipation that the benefit of the karmic effect of giving is having many possessions arises in an Aspirant to Awakening, not [the anticipation that the benefit of the karmic effect of giving is] unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening, then the Aspirant to Awakening, through wisdom, very quickly comprehends that his fault [i.e., the anticipation of having many possessions] occurred because of false views about karmic effects. He examines the insubstantiality of all conditioned things¹⁰⁶ as it really is, thinking, “All conditioned things disintegrate in a moment. The enjoyment of their karmic rewards exhausts itself and disintegrates. They disintegrate into separate components.” After examining [conditioned things] in this way, he quits anticipating karmic rewards. He then gives any gift whatsoever, and gives with all [the merit] being redirected to ultimate awakening alone.

¹⁰⁴ Skt. *saṃjñāviparyāsa*.

¹⁰⁵ Skt. *parijñānāt*. In Buddhist texts, *parijñā* and related words occur frequently in the context of understanding suffering. See Silk, “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 264, n. 2.

¹⁰⁶ Skt. *sarvasaṃskārāṇām asāratām*.

These are the four kinds of obstacles to giving for an Aspirant to Awakening. Thus, the knowledge about the four kinds of counters to the obstacles to giving should be understood: comprehension [of not being in the habit of giving], putting up with suffering [and giving in adversity], thoroughly discerning the error [that there is well-being in suffering], and apprehending the insubstantiality of conditioned things. In that regard, an Aspirant to Awakening consistently and properly gives a gift with knowledge about the first three kinds of counters. He properly grasps¹⁰⁷ meritorious karmic rewards with the knowledge of the last counter. This, too, should be known as a wise gift of an Aspirant to Awakening.

Furthermore, an Aspirant to Awakening who is withdrawn within himself, having a strong propensity [to give] an immeasurable variety of wonderful religious gifts, with pure determination, wholeheartedly, devotedly, and with conviction¹⁰⁸ wants to give and make offerings to beings. Because of this, the Aspirant to Awakening creates immeasurable merit with little difficulty. This, too, should be known as a wise gift of an Aspirant to Awakening.

These are, in fact, very wise gifts of a wise Aspirant to Awakening.

Whether [an Aspirant to Awakening] has or does not have religious gifts, including material gifts, [the gift that is] peculiar to the Aspirant to Awakening alone¹⁰⁹ should, in summary, be known in this way—from¹¹⁰ [what was said about] a gift of the Law,¹¹¹ to [what was

¹⁰⁷ There is a possible double entendre with Skt. *parigraha*, which can mean “understand” but also “receive.” Perhaps the Aspirant to Awakening gets to have his cake and eat it too—he sees through the futility of karmic rewards but gets merit nonetheless.

¹⁰⁸ I follow Dutt’s *prasādena saṃkalpā* against Wogihara’s *prasādaṃ saṃkalpya* (Tib. = *dang bas kun tu rtog pa dag gis*).

¹⁰⁹ Skt. *bodhisattvasyaivāveṇika*.

¹¹⁰ The text uses *upādāya* in a serial expression to refer to its extended discussion of five facets of the wise gift, about which see n. 82 above. On *upādāya*, see *BHSD*, s.v.

said about the fourfold] examination [of all gifts as they really are],¹¹² to [what was said about] a gift [given with] a good mental disposition,¹¹³ to [what was said about] the knowledge of the counters to the obstacles to giving,¹¹⁴ and to [what was said about] a gift [given because of] the propensity [to give] with a good mental disposition.¹¹⁵

This is, for certain, how the analysis of the giving of all internal and external objects [i.e., the gift of everything] of an Aspirant to Awakening should be known in detail.

Following this [section on] the analysis of a gift of everything, the analyses of all the other [types of gifts], beginning with a gift that is difficult to carry out, should be known.

Then, what is a gift of an Aspirant to Awakening that is difficult to carry out? When an Aspirant to Awakening has a limited amount of objects that can be given, he causes anguish to himself and puts up with the suffering [caused by giving away the object], and gives it away to others. This is the first [type of] gift of an Aspirant to Awakening that is difficult to carry out. [When] there is an object that an Aspirant to Awakening likes because he is fond of its characteristics, because he has been acquainted with it for a long time, or because it is really

¹¹¹ Referring to Wogihara 127.3-129.8.

¹¹² Referring to Wogihara 129.8-12. The Skt. for “examination” is *pratisaṃvid*. In Pāli and Sanskrit Buddhist works, there are four *pratisaṃvids*: *artha*, *dharma*, *nirukti*, and *pratibhāna*. See *PED*, s.v. *paṭisaṃbhīdā*; *BHSD*, s.vv. *pratisaṃvid* and *pratisaṃvidā*; Dayal, *The Bodhisattva Doctrine*, 259-267. However, as far as I can tell our text instead refers to the four ways to understand gifts that were mentioned earlier: *pariyāya*, *lakṣaṇa*, *nirvacana*, and *hetuphalaprebheda*. See n. 99 above. If I am correct, this must mean that *pratisaṃvid* is not being used in its technical sense here, especially since the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* discusses the four *pratisaṃvids* elsewhere (in the *Bodhisattvapākṣyapaṭala*—see Dutt, 25).

¹¹³ Referring to Wogihara 129.12-15.

¹¹⁴ Referring to Wogihara 129.16-131.13.

¹¹⁵ Referring to Wogihara 131.14-19.

helpful to him, he dispels his longing for the exceptional and outstanding object that can be given and gives it away to others. This is the second [type of] gift of an Aspirant to Awakening that is difficult to carry out. An Aspirant to Awakening gives away religious gifts to others that he acquired with difficulty. This is the third [type of] gift of an Aspirant to Awakening that is difficult to carry out.

Then, what is a gift of an Aspirant to Awakening that is directed anywhere? After encouraging himself or someone else, an Aspirant to Awakening gives away an object that can be given to his own hired servants, mother, father, children, wife, female slaves, male slaves, servile workers, servile wage laborers, friends, companions, relatives, or kinsmen, or to others who want [the object]. This is called a gift that is directed anywhere.

In summary, [these] are the [first] four forms [of giving] of an Aspirant to Awakening.¹¹⁶

Then, what is a gift to an Upstanding Man by an Aspirant to Awakening who is an Upstanding Man.¹¹⁷ When an Aspirant to Awakening gives a gift with gratitude,¹¹⁸ respectfully,

¹¹⁶ This line follows Wogihara. Dutt's *samāsato bodhisattvasya caturākāraṃ satpuruṣasya satpuruṣadānaṃ* appears to have a copying error, with the *satpuruṣasya satpuruṣadānaṃ* being duplicated from the ensuing line.

¹¹⁷ Skt. *satpuruṣa*, which appears frequently in Mahāyāna texts. In one traditional list, there is a group of sixteen lay Aspirants to Awakening headed by Bhadrāpāla who are called *satpuruṣas*. See Lamotte, *Le traité de la grande vertu de Sagesse*, Vol. I, 428, n. 1; Paul Harrison, *The Samādhi of Direct Encounter with the Buddhas of the Present: An Annotated English Translation of the Tibetan Version of the Pratyutpanna-Buddha-Saṃmukhāvasthita-Samadhi-Sūtra with Several Appendices relating to the History of the Text* (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series V) (Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1990), 6, n. 7. Our text makes no suggestion that the *satpuruṣa* is a lay category, though I am not sure in what contexts the term might appear throughout the rest of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*.

¹¹⁸ Skt. *śraddhayā*. See the comments on this passage in the introduction.

from his own hand, at the right time, and without causing pain to others, this is called a gift to an Upstanding Man by an Aspirant to Awakening who is an Upstanding Man.

Then, what is a gift of all sorts of an Aspirant to Awakening? It is an independent gift, a gift of abundance, a joyful gift, an uninterrupted gift, a gift to a [worthy] recipient, a gift to an un[worthy] recipient,¹¹⁹ a gift of everything, a gift that occurs everywhere, a gift that occurs at all times, an irreproachable gift, a gift of an object that is a being,¹²⁰ a gift of an object that is a place, and a gift of an object that is wealth and grain. These thirteen sorts of gifts are called a gift of all sorts of an Aspirant to Awakening.

Then, what is a gift of an Aspirant to Awakening to those in need and in want. In this regard, an Aspirant to Awakening gives food and drink to those in need and in want of food and drink. He gives a vehicle to those in want of a vehicle, clothing to those in want of clothing, ornaments to those in want of ornaments, and various housewares to those in want of various housewares. He gives perfume, flower garlands, and ointment to those in want of perfume, flower garlands, and ointment, a residence to those in want of a residence, and lighting to those in need and in want of lighting. These should be known as the eight sorts of gifts of an Aspirant to Awakening to those in need and in want.

¹¹⁹ Skt. *pātradānatā apātradānatā*. In all varieties of Indian religious texts, the term *pātra* almost always means a “good” or “worthy” recipient when it occurs by itself without any adjectives or description.

¹²⁰ I follow Wogihāra’s *sattvavastudānatā* against Dutt’s *sarvavastudānatā* because of the parallel with the next two gifts.

Then, what is a gift of an Aspirant to Awakening that is for ease in this world and the next? A material gift, a gift of the Law, and a gift of security should, in brief, be known as a gift that is for the ease of beings in this world and the next. [An Aspirant to Awakening], moreover, gives that excellent, undefiled, and appropriate material gift after removing the filth of stinginess and the filth of hoarding [possessions]. In that regard, removing the filth of stinginess should be acknowledged because someone renounces the intention to withhold [from giving possessions], and removing the filth of hoarding [possessions] should be acknowledged because someone renounces the [actual] withholding of possessions. A gift of security should be acknowledged due to someone's providing protection from the danger from lions, tigers, crocodiles, kings, robbers, water, and the like. A gift of the Law is a teaching on the incontrovertible Law, instruction on logic,¹²¹ and the encouragement [to follow] the rules of training.¹²² As a group all of these make up the nine sorts of gifts of an Aspirant to Awakening that are for the ease of beings in this world and the next. In that regard, the material gift and the gift of security, along with their analyses, correspond to ease in this world, whereas the gift of the Law, along with its analysis, corresponds to ease in the next.

Then, what is a pure gift of an Aspirant to Awakening? These ten sorts [of pure gifts] should be known: without resitance, without grasping [incorrectly], not involving accumulation, without self-inflation, without seeking, without dismay, not inferior, without turning one's back [on anyone], without hoping for remuneration, and without hoping for the maturation [of good karmic fruits].

¹²¹ Skt. *nyāya*.

¹²² Skt. *sikṣāpada*.

Then, what is giving without resistance? In this regard, when someone requesting something has approached him courteously, an Aspirant to Awakening gives quickly and without delay. [But] the quickness of how the Aspirant to Awakening gives does not apply to how the person requesting [the gift should] receive it.¹²³

What is giving without grasping [incorrectly]? An Aspirant to Awakening indeed does not grasp a gift [incorrectly] with the following views: “There is no karmic effect for this gift”; “The Law occurs through a violent [sacrificial] gift”; “Purity, whether worldly or otherworldly, occurs merely through a really superb gift.”¹²⁴

What is giving that does not involve accumulation? An Aspirant to Awakening, after accumulating¹²⁵ [possessions] and forming a stockpile of religious gifts over a long period of time, certainly does not later give them all together as a single gift. For what reason? When an Aspirant to Awakening has religious gifts, he is not capable of refusing someone requesting them who has approached him courteously. Nor does he discern the proper way to refuse him. So how could he form a stockpile [of gifts]? An Aspirant to Awakening also does not consider giving that involves accumulation as a good source for earning merit. He contemplates, “[Suppose] the same objects that can be given are being given to similar people who, either individually or as a group, are requesting them. In what way would one acquire more merit: [giving the objects away] little by little or all together?” The Aspirant to Awakening then

¹²³ This sentence follows Dutt, *na yācanakasya tathā lābham ārabhya tvarā bhavati yathā bodhisattvasya dānam ārabhya*.

¹²⁴ I read the text as providing three incorrect views, even though there are only two *iti* particles. A very similar passage occurs at Wogihara 120.22-121.2, which makes explicit that the violent gift (*himsādāna*) is a reference to a sacrifice (*yajña*).

¹²⁵ Dutt has one *saṃbhṛtya*, which is supported by Tib., while Wogihara has two. Wogihara’s duplication could either be a mistake or have an intensive/frequentive sense.

discerns that giving that involves accumulation is especially reproachable, and he discerns that giving his possessions as he gets them is beyond reproach. For what reason? Because he who gives a gift of what has been accumulated, when asked by solicitors [for his accumulated possessions], first refuses hundreds of solicitors, then becomes upset with, impatient with, and mistrustful of them, and finally gives a gift of what he has accumulated to some of them, even when he is not asked to. Therefore, an Aspirant to Awakening does not give a gift that involves accumulation.¹²⁶

What is giving without self-inflation? An Aspirant to Awakening gives a gift with a humble attitude toward the beggar. He also does not give in order to compete with others. After giving a gift, he also does not think, on account of that gift, “I am a giver, a donor, but others are not.”

What is giving without seeking? An Aspirant to Awakening does not give a gift seeking fame, acclaim, recognition, or renown.¹²⁷ [While giving] he realizes that fame is the product of opinions and talk, is tied to mere words,¹²⁸ and is like a frail leaf.¹²⁹

What is giving without dismay? In this regard, an Aspirant to Awakening becomes agreeable immediately before giving. While giving, he feels gracious. After giving, he does not

¹²⁶ The wrongdoing is not giving one’s accumulations per se, but holding on to possessions without giving them away at the earliest opportunity. Holding on to possessions leads to untoward mental states on the part of the Aspirant to Awakening.

¹²⁷ The same idea occurred earlier at Wogihara 121.22-23.

¹²⁸ I follow Dutt’s *ghoṣamātrapratibaddha* against Wogihara’s *mātrapratibaddha*, which is nonsensical.

¹²⁹ Both Wogihara and Dutt should be emended to *kṛśapattra* or *kṛśipattra* (Tib. *lo ma skam po*). See BHSD, s.v. *kṛśalaka*.

become regretful.¹³⁰ When hearing about the numerous most excellent and wonderful gifts of [other] Aspirants to Awakening, he is not reduced to cowering in disgrace for himself.

What is giving that is not inferior? After serious consideration, an Aspirant to Awakening makes an effort to give away the food, drinks, vehicles, clothing, and other things that are the best and of the highest quality among his religious gifts.

What is giving without turning one's back [on anyone]? An Aspirant to Awakening gives a gift while even minded, impartial, and equally compassionate toward friends, adversaries, and strangers.

What is giving without hoping for remuneration? When giving a gift, an Aspirant to Awakening who has a compassionate and sympathetic heart does not expect anything in return from others. He sees that people desire comfort, burn with the heat of craving thirst, suffer from their nature, [but yet] are helpless [to fulfill their desires or end their suffering].

What is giving without hoping for the maturation [of good karmic fruits]? When giving a gift, an Aspirant to Awakening does not expect the maturation of good karmic fruits in the future, whether it be getting superb possessions or a superb body. He sees the lack of substance in all conditioned things [and instead] anticipates the benefits of supreme awakening.

The gifts of Aspirants to Awakening become pure in these ten ways.

In this way, Aspirants to Awakening rely on these nine sorts of giving, fulfill the Perfection of Giving, and wholly and completely awaken to unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening.

¹³⁰ The exact same wording occurs at Wogihara 122.24-123.1.

Here ends the ninth chapter, which is about giving, in the *Foundation of Discipline* section of the *Stage of the Aspirant to Awakening*.

V. Giving in Practice: The Mahāyāna Epigraphic Record

Up until this point, I have largely restricted myself to textual evidence for Mahāyāna and the gift, specifically giving 1) across Mahāyāna Sūtra literature, 2) in one particular Mahāyāna Sūtra called the *Dānapāramitā*, and 3) in the *Dānapaṭala* of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, a large Śāstric text. I hope I have shown that some of the major differences in what is said about giving in Mahāyāna texts, at a minimum those I have studied in detail, stem from genre: Sūtras and Śāstras, though their respective contents may overlap at points, approach gift giving from radically different angles. But textual evidence is only part of the picture; exactly what part of the picture texts occupy will, I think, continue to be a point of controversy among historians of religion for many years to come.

I should start just by calling out the obvious, something so obvious that it is rarely spoken: In Religious Studies, almost all the physical materials that we treat as evidence—churches, temples, shrines, images, ritual paraphernalia, what have you—were, at one time, gifts. Somebody paid for them, somebody gave them, and somebody or *something* received them. The art-historical sources relevant to Religious Studies (and before the modern era, most “art,” to use the term loosely, was religious in nature), for example, are remnants of exchange between the bygone patrons who paid for them and the recipients who used them for very specific purposes—to be infused with awe, to worship, and so on. Our archaeological sources often represent religious gifts too; when archaeologists unearth some house of worship, they are digging through layers of a religious gift. Gift giving is a topic that is not only important, but also one that can be studied using different kinds of material sources.

For most periods of Indian history, much of our material evidence is accompanied by inscriptions.¹ They come in many forms, but the majority of Indian inscriptions record donations.² With regard to Indian Buddhism specifically, the inscriptions we have number in the thousands (unfortunately, the corpus of what I consider Mahāyāna inscriptions is much smaller), and many of these, of course, are donative.³ With so many extant inscriptions at our disposal, it strikes me as more than a little silly to delve into a study of gift giving without having recourse to the epigraphic evidence, at least as a check on literary sources. Surely inscriptions deserve more than a passing comment in a discussion about “The Buddhist Discourse on Giving,” the title of a chapter in Ohnuma’s authoritative study on Buddhist gift-of-the-body stories. This chapter consists mostly of evidence from Indian Buddhist texts and discussion on Western gift theory, but it also brings in the work of modern anthropologists of India as well as case studies from the modern Theravādin world.⁴ If Ohnuma went outside of Buddhist texts for examples of giving in practice, one would think that inscriptions that record

¹ An up-to-date catalog of Indian inscriptions is sorely lacking, but Lüders’s is still useful—see H. Lüders, *A List of Brahmi Inscriptions from the Earliest Times to about A.D. 400 with the Exception of Those of Asoka* (Appendix to *Epigraphia Indica and Record of the Archæological Survey of India*, Vol. X) (Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, India, 1912). We are now, however, fortunate to have top scholars committed to putting Gāndhārī inscriptions (in addition to manuscripts and coins) up on the web in a user-friendly format and with complete references. I am speaking, of course, of Stefan Baums and Andrew Glass, “Catalog of Gāndhārī Texts,” http://gandhari.org/a_inscriptions.php.

² Richard Salomon puts (non-Aśokan) Indian inscriptions into two broad categories, donative and panegyric, and points out that the panegyric inscriptions that praise kings or other rulers (*praśastis*) were generally written to record donations made by them or on their behalf. See his *Indian Epigraphy: A Guide to the Study of Inscriptions in Sanskrit, Prakrit, and Other Indo-Aryan Languages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 110-111.

³ The two most comprehensive catalogs of Indian Buddhist inscriptions are both in Japanese: Masao Shizutani, *Indo bukkyō himei mokuroku* [Catalogue of Indian Buddhist Inscriptions] (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten, 1979); Keishō Tsukamoto, *Indo bukkyō himei no kenkyū* [A Comprehensive Study of the Indian Buddhist Inscriptions], 3 vols. (Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten, 1996-2003).

⁴ Ohnuma, *Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood*, 140-166 (the epigraphic evidence makes its brief appearance on 145-146).

gifts from actual Indian Buddhists (from the same periods as the texts she uses!) would have as much relevance as Hindus in modern Uttar Pradesh or Buddhists in modern Sri Lanka or Burma. Moving away from scholarship on India, a similar critique could be leveled at James Egge's *Religious Giving and the Invention of Karma in Theravāda Buddhism*. In his book, Egge jumps freely between Pāli texts composed and redacted many centuries ago and secondary research on non-Buddhists in contemporary India and Buddhists in modern Sri Lanka and Southeast Asia. But he all but ignores the mass of inscriptions of Sri Lankans, including those of Sri Lankan Buddhists in India,⁵ the inscriptions from the Pagan, Khmer, Sukhothai, and Campā kingdoms, as well as other Buddhist donative inscriptions from Southeast Asia. In one instance, Egge does use inscriptions to compare the ethics of the *Vessantara-jātaka* to the contents of the edicts of Aśoka⁶ (who, despite the claims of the Theravāda tradition itself, and a long list of scholars who have taken Pāli chronicles as factual accounts, is very unlikely to have been involved in converting Sri Lanka and therefore to have had a hand in establishing Theravāda Buddhism there⁷). And elsewhere he briefly adduces epigraphic evidence to discuss the history of and relationship between dedicating *dakṣiṇā* and dedicating the fruits of good deeds.⁸ But these two cases are very much exceptions. In a study about gift giving and Theravāda Buddhism, on the whole Egge neglects the donative inscriptions from the places

⁵ For an important inscription attesting to Sri Lankans at Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, see J. Ph. Vogel, "Prakrit Inscriptions from a Buddhist site at Nagarjunikonda," *Epigraphia Indica* 20 (1929–30): 22–23 and plate (Second Apsidal Temple inscription F). This inscription refers to the *taṃbapaṃṇaka* (= Sri Lankan) *theriyas*. And for a brief survey of the non-Indian (especially Sri Lankan) presence at Bodhgayā, which lasted almost as long as the history of the site, see Mitra, *Buddhist Monuments*, 62–65.

⁶ Egge, *Religious Giving and the Invention of Karma in Theravāda Buddhism*, 37–39.

⁷ For Pāli accounts of Aśoka, see G.P. Malalasekera, *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*, Vol. I (1937–1938; repr., London: Pāli Text Society, 1960), s.v. Asoka.

⁸ Egge, *Religious Giving and the Invention of Karma in Theravāda Buddhism*, 58–60.

where the label “Theravāda” might be meaningfully applied. (Theravāda, of course, took many centuries to develop, and even after it had, it cannot simply be equated with the Buddhisms of Sri Lanka and mainland Southeast Asia.) His book should really be called *Giving in Pāli Texts*.⁹

This is not to pick on either Ohnuma or Egge. On the contrary, I highlight their respective works because they are otherwise very good and insightful; both have been helpful to my own thinking about gift giving in Buddhist texts. But their nominal use of the inscriptional data, though entirely typical—even for works like theirs that were published relatively recently—should not be repeated. For the value of the donative inscriptions, in conjunction with art-historical and archaeological evidence, is to see certain aspects of giving in practice.¹⁰ They serve as a test, however imperfect, for the many theoretical statements made about gift giving in texts: What objects do texts say should be given, and how does this compare to what we see in the inscriptions? Are the motives behind giving the same in Buddhist inscriptions and texts? Can we detect donors’ attitudes toward their recipients in the inscriptions, and do they agree with the prescriptive positions stipulated in texts? It is for

⁹ At *ibid.*, 122, n. 29, Egge justifies his title and the bias for literary sources in his project:
... I should explain an ambiguity in my title. The doctrinal developments I discuss in the first half of this book probably occurred prior to the formation of the Theravāda as a distinct form of Buddhism. In fact, the term Theravāda only appears for the first time in inscriptions in the third century CE and in literary sources in the fourth century. . . . Even if we define Theravāda as the school of Buddhism for which the Pāli canon is authoritative, it is doubtful whether we can meaningfully speak of Theravāda prior to the Āluvihāra recension in the first century BCE. Nonetheless, I refer to Theravāda Buddhism in my title because I am primarily interested in doctrinal developments reflected in the scriptures considered authoritative by the Theravādin tradition and in how an understanding of these developments can help us better to understand these texts.

But his book is littered with hints or direct claims about how Theravādins outside of the texts think and even behave, for which the inscriptional material would, it seems to me, prove invaluable.

¹⁰ If the utility of the epigraphic material is not beyond doubt, the following, I suspect, will lay that doubt to rest: John Faithfull Fleet, *Indian Epigraphy: The Inscriptional Bases of Indian Historical Research* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907), 3-24; Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy*, 17-23; Gregory Schopen, “Archaeology and Protestant Presuppositions in the Study of Indian Buddhism,” in *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks*, 1-22; Salomon, *Indian Epigraphy*, 3-6.

questions like these that this chapter takes up Mahāyāna gift giving as seen through donative inscriptions.

But before I get to the content of the inscriptions, I must first attempt to answer some other fundamental questions: Can one even determine whether the donor or the recipient of a gift recorded in an inscription identified as a Mahāyāna Buddhist? If so, would that make it a Mahāyāna gift? (And would both the donor and the recipient have to have identified as Mahāyāna Buddhists to make it a Mahāyāna inscription? Or just one or the other?) If an inscription indicates any religious beliefs, can we tell whether those beliefs necessarily follow from a Mahāyāna understanding of the world? This boils down to the basic problem: What, exactly, is an Indian Mahāyāna inscription?

To resolve this problem, I turn to a seminal paper on Mahāyāna in the Indian epigraphical record, first published by Gregory Schopen some thirty-odd years ago and entitled, appropriately enough, “Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions.”¹¹ Schopen argues for the association of an inscriptional formula involving the earmarking of merit for “unsurpassed knowledge” (*anuttarajñāna*) with the presence of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India, a conclusion that had already been reached or at least suggested by others, including Sircar, Burgess, and Shizutani.¹² Schopen goes further by contending that the Sanskrit terms *śākyabhikṣu* (or, in the feminine, *śākyabhikṣuṇī*) and *paramopāsaka* (or *paramopāsikā*) referred to Mahāyāna monastic and lay members, respectively. And most importantly, because these epigraphic markers for Mahāyāna do not appear until the 4th or 5th century CE, he concludes that Mahāyāna did not

¹¹ Now republished in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 223-244.

¹² See *ibid.*, 229 and notes, as well as Masao Shizutani, “Mahayana Inscriptions in the Gupta Period,” *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 10.1 (1962): 358-355.

materialize as a “separate and independent group” in India until hundreds of years after the appearance of Mahāyāna texts.¹³ Apart from a couple of notable objections that will be addressed shortly, Schopen’s positions have more or less gained scholarly traction.¹⁴ Paul Williams, for instance, is in complete accord with Schopen: “It seems that for perhaps five or six centuries—the centuries which saw the production of a great deal of the Mahāyāna sūtra literature, and many of the greatest thinkers of the Mahāyāna—Mahāyāna was not seen ‘on the ground’ as an identifiable ‘institution’ involving inscriptional allegiance.”¹⁵ Schopen and others have made minor additions and emendations to his original paper in subsequent publications, usually by way of footnotes, but for many years the only other significant examination of Mahāyāna inscriptions was mostly a foray into textual traditions of questionable relevance. This is an unfortunate state of affairs for those of us interested in Indian Mahāyāna studies, particularly if we want to go beyond what we can glean from Sūtra and Śāstra texts, which are, admittedly, sometimes impenetrable to questions about how Mahāyāna may have fared institutionally within Indian Buddhist culture and within India at large.

¹³ Quote taken from Schopen, “Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions,” 239.

¹⁴ The related issues of Mahāyāna’s possible marginal status and its relationship with Mainstream monastic orders during the so-called Middle Period in India have proven more controversial. I referred to them briefly in chapter II and will return to them in my conclusion. For now I will say that Schopen, if I understand his argument correctly, errs or at least oversimplifies matters when he puts Mahāyāna on the level of a Buddhist “school” or “sect.” At *ibid.*, 241, n. 22, he states that “there are actually more [epigraphic] references to the Mahāyāna than to any *other school*” (emphasis mine).

¹⁵ Williams (with Anthony Tribe and Alexander Wynne), *Buddhist Thought*, 77. See also Paul Williams, *Mahāyāna Buddhism: The Doctrinal Foundations* (New York: Routledge, 1989), 28. (But compare now the revised edition of the latter—see Williams, *Mahāyāna Buddhism: The Doctrinal Foundations*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2009), 29-30.) I cite Williams here because his books, as much as this can be said for anything on Indian Buddhism, are quite influential, especially to those outside the field, even sometimes being used as textbooks in undergraduate courses.

It is most fortunate, then, that a recent dissertation by Nick Morrissey provides not only an extended discussion of Mahāyāna inscriptions that takes into account forty or so records not in Schopen's original publication, but also a detailed and easy-to-use appendix of pertinent inscriptions from around the 5th–6th centuries CE, including several inscriptions from Piṭalkhorā discovered by the author himself.¹⁶ However, on some crucial points I find Morrissey's study to be lacking. In one section he opines that none of the positions taken against Schopen "has effectively displaced the cogency of the argument which links Mahāyāna Buddhism with *śākyabhikṣus* and *paramopāsakas*, as well as the 'transference of merit' formula ... that so often occur in conjunction with each other." But he does not tell us what was so cogent about that argument in the first place or what was lacking in the others. Morrissey is right to push aside the position that the epigraphic and material data for Mahāyāna is too scarce to warrant making reliable conclusions. The paucity of nontextual evidence (as well as manuscripts actually from India) will almost always be a problem when studying premodern India, but as Morrissey deftly remarks, "you work with what you have and however unscientific, employ the results as best you can." But I would counter his suggestion that the "lack of sufficient data" critique is "perhaps unnecessarily cautious" with the claim that he has perhaps been unnecessarily incautious by not critically reexamining Schopen's line of reasoning in sufficient detail.¹⁷ Indeed, despite Morrissey's warning that the correlations delineated by Schopen are "at present only a hypothesis,"¹⁸ he automatically places any

¹⁶ Nicolas Morrissey, "Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy: The emergence and decline of Mahāyāna Buddhism in early medieval India," Ph.D. Dissertation, UCLA, 2009, esp. 68-89 and 183-217. I am deeply indebted to the author for providing me with an electronic copy of his dissertation.

¹⁷ See *ibid.*, 81-83, esp. his remarks about the sources cited in n. 173.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 120-121.

inscription with *śākyabhikṣu*, *paramopāsaka*, or related term in his “Indian Mahāyāna Inscriptions” appendix.

This being the case, I would like to review Schopen’s argument and its most noteworthy criticisms. I will bring in new epigraphic and textual evidence, either to corroborate his conclusions or to offer new interpretations of the data. Schopen, at the time of his study, was not aware of this material or did not have it at his disposal. The hope is not just to come up with a list of what is or is not a Mahāyāna inscription, but rather, again, to build a solid foundation on which to investigate Mahāyāna giving in practice.

Schopen sets out to show that an epigraphic formula that is present in several dozen donative inscriptions from the Gupta period onwards, which had been described as the “common Mahāyāna formula” by E.H. Johnston and others, did, in fact, correlate with Mahāyāna donors.¹⁹ The formula in question, in its most basic form, is *yad atra puṇyam tad bhavatu sarvvasatvānām anuttarajñānāvāptaye*: “May the merit here be for the attainment of unsurpassed knowledge for all beings.”²⁰ There are several variations of the formula, most importantly the addition of personages—parents, teachers, etc.—that the donor specifies (or hopes?) will benefit from the resulting merit and thereby attain “unsurpassed knowledge.” Generally the formula includes the name of the donor with some religious title. Schopen then draws a parallel between the epigraphic formula and how merit is commonly said to be “transferred” in Mahāyāna textual sources. As I said in chapter II, merit—*puṇya*, *kuśala*, or the like—is “transferred” or redirected in Mahāyāna texts using the causative forms of the verbs

¹⁹ Unless otherwise noted, this material all comes from Schopen, “Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions.” Johnston’s remark can be found at “Some Sanskrit Inscriptions of Arakan,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11 (1943-1946): 366.

²⁰ This is a slight modification to his first thesis. See Schopen, “Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism,” in *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks*, 53, n. 88.

\sqrt{nam} or $pari\sqrt{nam}$. The goal of such “transfers” is usually *anuttarā saṃyakṣambodhi*, “unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening.” The conclusion, by the time Schopen has finished making his case, is that *anuttarajñāna* from the epigraphical formula refers to the same or similar goal as the textual *anuttarā saṃyakṣambodhi*. That is, when one has attained “unsurpassed knowledge,” he has reached awakening.

I agree with Schopen that *anuttarajñāna* and *anuttarā saṃyakṣambodhi* both refer to awakening, even if the former does so indirectly. Others are less convinced. For a paper from the opening remarks at a recent conference on Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism, Paul Harrison expressed his doubts about the credibility of Schopen’s evidence, in particular the association between *anuttarajñāna* and *anuttarā saṃyakṣambodhi*:

Schopen initially implies that the association of this formula [i.e., *yad atra puṇyam . . .*] with the Mahāyāna has no firm basis, but his argument proceeds by throwing weight on the question of “merit-transfer.” This is a red herring, the more salient issue surely being whether *anuttarajñāna* is justifiably to be taken as another way of referring to *anuttarā saṃyakṣambodhi* (especially when shared with all living beings). Schopen passes lightly over this question, but after querying the linkage of the formula with the Mahāyāna, goes on to take it as read for the rest of the paper.²¹

Harrison’s caution, I think, is reasonable. Schopen does point to variations of the epigraphic formula in question in Mahāyāna texts, but his material comes from colophons of Mahāyāna manuscripts—two are from Gilgit and the rest are late Nepalese manuscripts. Although these colophons establish a small non-epigraphic correlation between the term *anuttarajñāna* and Mahāyāna, they do not really get at the problem Harrison raises. In order to strengthen the association between our epigraphic formula and the textual *anuttarā saṃyakṣambodhi*, what we

²¹ From Paul Harrison, “Early Mahāyāna Buddhism: Laying Out the Field,” keynote address at United Kingdom Association of Buddhist Studies (UKABS) Symposium on Early Mahāyāna Buddhism in Honour of Sara Boin-Webb, held in Cardiff, July 7–8, 2012. The conference papers are slated to be published by Equinox Publishing in 2015 in a volume edited by Harrison himself. The part I have quoted here comes from a footnote of a print version of Harrison’s talk. Not having attended the conference myself, I am not sure whether this part was read aloud.

need are examples of *anuttarajñāna* from within the body of Mahāyāna texts. To be fair to Schopen, in a footnote he does actually bring up two examples of *anuttarajñāna* from within Mahāyāna Sūtras,²² and I am not really sure why Harrison passed over this important information. One example is taken from the *Suvikrāntavikrāmipariṣcchā*, which states the following: *ye punar bhagavan satvāḥ sarvajñajñānaṃ prārthayanty asaṅgajñānaṃ svayambhūjñānaṃ asamajñānaṃ anuttarajñānaṃ prārthayante*. Here the text equates the quest for *sarvajñajñāna*—“omniscient knowledge” or the “knowledge of an Omniscient One”—with *anuttarajñāna* and other exalted levels of knowledge. All of these terms could easily be interpreted as descriptions of awakening, especially since *sarvajña* and *svayambhū* could very well refer to a buddha.²³ The more interesting example Schopen notes comes from the *Kāśyapaparivarta-sūtra*. In the prose of (von Staël-Holstein’s) section 4, we have the line *yās ca satvān paripācayati tān sarvān uttarasyāṃ samyaksambodhau samādāpayati*.²⁴ The *Śikṣāsamuccaya* quotes from this passage of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, rendering this line *yāṃś ca satvān paripācayati tān sarvān anuttarāyāṃ samyaksambodhau samādāpayati*²⁵ (we have the correct form *yāṃś*, the complete final verb, and *anuttarāyāṃ* instead of *uttarasyāṃ*): “All those beings whom he [the bodhisattva] matures

²² See Schopen, “Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions,” 241, n. 14 for citations.

²³ Compare Yuyama, ed., *Prajñāpāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*, verse 7, in which the *pāramitās* are said to take on the name “awakening” (*bodhināma*) as they are redirected (*pariṇāmayamāna*) to *sarvajñāta*.

²⁴ Schopen used the old von Staël-Holstein edition. Now also see M.I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya (in collaboration with Seishi Karashima and Noriyuki Kudo), ed., *The Kāśyapaparivarta: Romanized Text and Facsimiles* (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica V) (Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University, 2002), 5-6.

²⁵ Bendall, ed., *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, 53.2-3.

[spiritually] are incited on to unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening.”²⁶ But the verse section makes a curious change to this line: *yāṃś cāpi satvān paripācayati anuttare jñāne samādapeti*. Obviously, the *anuttare jñāne* has been substituted for the prose’s *uttarasyāṃ samyaksambodhau*, I assume *metri causa*.²⁷ To my eyes, there can be only one conclusion: The *Kāśyapaparivarta*’s author or possibly its redactor—there is a good chance the verses are significantly younger than the prose²⁸—understood *uttarasyāṃ* (or *anuttarāyāṃ*) *samyaksambodhau* and *anuttare jñāne* to be functional equivalents. “Unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening” and “unsurpassed knowledge,” if they do not mean the same thing, are close enough in meaning to be interchangeable.

But there is more. I have located other instances of *anuttarajñāna* in Mahāyāna Sūtras that would seem to point in the same direction. One example comes from a quotation of the *Upāliparipṛcchā* in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. In this passage the Buddha is made to explain how a bodhisattva should confess his various sins, if I may borrow two pregnant terms from my Catholic roots, to thirty-five buddhas (all of whom the text lists). In the midst of his confession the bodhisattva must agree to do better, promising the following:

. . . *tat sarvaṃ aikādhyam piṇḍayitvā tulayitvā ’bhisamkṣipyānuttarāyāṃ samyaksambodhau uttarottarayā pariṇāmanayā yathā pariṇāmitam atītair buddhair bhagavadbhir yathā pariṇāmayiṣyanty anāgatā buddhā bhagavanto yathā pariṇāmayanty etarhi daśasu dikṣu*

²⁶ Cf. Bendall and Rouse, trans., *Śikṣā-samuccaya*, 53.

²⁷ Technically, it should be *anuttare jñāni* for the meter—see Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, ed., *The Kāśyapaparivarta*, 6.

²⁸ See J.W. de Jong, “Sanskrit Fragments of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*,” in *Beiträge zur Indieforschung*, hrsg. H. Härtel (Berlin: Museum für Indische Kunst, 1977), 255, and now Jonathan A. Silk, “The Nature of the Verses of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*,” *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 23 (2009): 181-190, which problematizes this notion.

*pratyutpannā buddhā bhagavantaḥ / tathāham api pariṇāmayāmi / sarvaṃ puṇyam anumodayāmi / sarvān buddhān adhyeṣayāmi / bhavatu me jñānam anuttaram /*²⁹

I will take all that [i.e., the good things he has done] and put it into a single mass, weigh it [mentally], bring it together, and redirect [the merit] through more and more redirection [of merit] toward unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening, just as past buddhas, blessed ones have redirected [merit], as future buddhas, blessed ones will redirect [merit], and as current buddhas, blessed ones in the ten directions are redirecting [merit] now. I am going to rejoice in all the merit. I am going to request all buddhas [for help or instruction]. May I have unsurpassed knowledge!³⁰

Here *anuttara* and *jñāna* are out of compound and their syntax is reversed, but their meaning, of course, is the same. As the bodhisattva makes amends for his past misdeeds, he hopes to gain unsurpassed knowledge in the future. Since in this short passage he also vows to use all the virtuous actions he has performed—or the merit resulting from those actions—as a launching pad to “unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening,” it does not seem illogical to conclude that his aspiration for unsurpassed knowledge amounts to the same thing. Though *jñānam anuttaram* probably does not refer directly to awakening here, it appears to be a state of knowledge concomitant with awakening.

The *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra* also uses *anuttarajñāna* out of compound and with much the same meaning. One occurrence comes from chapter 2, called the *Upāyakaūśalyaparivarta* or “The Chapter on Skillful Strategies.” Here the buddhas from the ten directions appear to Śākyamuni and express their approval:

*sādhu mune lokavināyakāgra anuttaram jñānam ihādhigamya / upāyakāūśalya vicintayanto anuśikṣase lokavināyakānām //*³¹

Sage, Supreme Leader of the world, this is wonderful! You have realized unsurpassed knowledge,

²⁹ Bendall, ed., *Çikshāsamuccaya*, 170.14-18.

³⁰ Cf. Bendall and Rouse, trans., *Śikṣā-samuccaya*, 166-167.

³¹ Kern and Nanjio, eds., *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, 55.13-14.

And considering the skillful strategies, you are following the training of the [other]
Leaders of the world!³²

The context of this verse is particularly interesting. Śākyamuni, as is well known, explains how he and all other buddhas use their skillful strategies by teaching multiple vehicles, even though there is only one true vehicle by which everyone is invariably guided to awakening. In so doing, he recounts to Śāriputra an abbreviated version of his own awakening—his enlightenment under a tree, his hesitation to teach ordinary beings the Dharma, the plea by the gods, and so on. It is immediately after this where we encounter the verse with *anuttaram jñānam*, so there can be little question that the other buddhas are applauding Śākyamuni's awakened state of knowledge.

A later verse from the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* is even clearer. In a foregone age, we are told, gods descend from the Mahābrahmā realm, present their *vimāna* vehicles as gifts,³³ and exclaim:

*diṣṭyā kṣemeṇa prāpto 'si buddhajñānam anuttaram /
vayaṃ te anumodāmo lokaścaiva sadevakaḥ //*³⁴

Magnificent! You have securely attained the unsurpassed knowledge of a buddha!
We, as well as the world with its gods, are delighted with you!³⁵

The buddha being addressed here is not Śākyamuni, but Mahābhijñānjñānābhibhū. His “unsurpassed knowledge” is quite clearly qualified as that of a buddha. Evidently it is a state of knowledge that Mahābhijñānjñānābhibhū acquired when he reached awakening, or perhaps the very cause of that awakening.

³² Cf. H. Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra*, 45.

³³ I refer to this episode in chapter II. See p. 20.

³⁴ Kern and Nanjio, eds., *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, 177.10-11.

³⁵ Cf. H. Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra*, 121.

A third and final example from the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* is similarly revealing. Not insignificantly, our last example comes from the fourth chapter, entitled *Adhimukti*—“Disposition” or “Inclination” or “Propensity.”³⁶ The disciples from the audience of the Buddha’s teaching compare themselves via parable to a poor, lost son. They are the son who was not ready to hear the truth about his wealth and heritage; that is, until he worked various menial jobs over the course of two full decades. In verse forty-four, Mahākāśyapa speaks for the disciples when he tells the Buddha:

*sunihṣṛhā sma vaya dīrgharātraṃ buddhasya jñānasya anuttarasya /
prañidhānam asmāka na jātu tatra iyaṃ parā niṣṭha jinena uktā //*³⁷

For a long time we have not longed for the unsurpassed knowledge related to a buddha
[or: unsurpassed Buddhist knowledge];
We have never had the resolution for it. This final conclusion was spoken by the
Conqueror.

It is these disciples who, according to the verses from the same section, have an “inferior disposition” (*hīnādhimuktitva*), and whose “knowledge does not extend beyond conceiving an individual extinction” (*pratyātmiko nirvṛti kalpayāma etāvata jñānam idaṃ na bhūyaḥ*). By contrast, there are the many bodhisattvas who have already knowingly “set out to the ultimate, most excellent awakening” (*prasthitā uttamam agrabodhim*) on the “unsurpassed path” (*anuttaram mārga*) to “become buddhas” (*bhaveyu buddhāḥ*), and who have already “received the prediction” (*vyākriyante*) that they “will become buddhas in this world” (*bhaviṣyathā buddha imasmi loke*).³⁸ It is the latter individuals, those with a superior spiritual disposition or inclination or propensity, who intentionally long for the “unsurpassed knowledge related to a

³⁶ See Yenshu Kurumiya, “Adhimukti in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*,” in *Indological and Buddhist Studies*, 337-351.

³⁷ Kern and Nanjio, eds., *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, 117.5-6.

³⁸ For the entire verse section, see *ibid.*, 110.12-120.8 (and cf. H. Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra*, 81-86).

buddha.” Of course this all needs to be put into the context of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*’s famous doctrine of *ekayāna* or the One Vehicle—the disciples of mean disposition are unwitting bodhisattvas too, and thus have an indirect claim to the “unsurpassed knowledge” characteristic of buddhahood. But this scarcely changes the fact that this Sūtra purposefully juxtaposes an “individual extinction” against the “unsurpassed knowledge” to which the superior vehicle leads.

This is an admittedly small sample size of *anuttarajñāna* or related forms from Mahāyāna Sūtras; I hope I or others will find more. But the sample is also telling. In every example, “unsurpassed knowledge” either refers directly to awakening or is used to describe the awakened state. And the *Kāśyapa-parivarta*, apparently without hesitation, swaps locative forms of *uttarā/anuttarā samyaksambodhi* and *anuttara jñāna*. In my eyes we can therefore accept Schopen’s and his predecessors’ hypothesis and attribute the *yad atra puṇyam* epigraphic formula to Mahāyāna donors, not because of merit “transfer” *per se*—the “red herring,” as Harrison calls it—and not because of its reference to all beings, but because it consigns the merit resulting from the gift to a Mahāyāna goal. (And thus when we are missing the last element of the epigraphic formula, *anuttarajñānāvāptaye*, caution is warranted before associating such an inscription with Mahāyāna.³⁹) As I stated in chapter II, the goal of awakening is one of the many things Mahāyāna inherited from the Buddhist thought that preceded it, and the idea of awakening has continued to exert influence on Buddhisms of every stripe and color up to the present day. Thus it is not surprising that *anuttarañāna* can be found in late Pāli texts, like the *Papañcasūdanī-purāṇa-ṭīkā* and *Paramatthavinicchaya*, referring to the

³⁹ Again see Schopen, “Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism,” in *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks*, 53, n. 88.

“unsurpassed knowledge” of the Buddha or an arahat.⁴⁰ But the degree of emphasis on reaching buddhahood comes to be something of a soteriological obsession in Mahāyāna texts⁴¹ and, as I think is the case here, inscriptions. Although seeking awakening may have been an option for non-Mahāyāna Buddhists, it was very much standard for Mahāyāna. In the pithy words of Boucher, “the bodhisattva path seems to have functioned as a pan-Buddhist option: rare in Mainstream circles, generic in Mahāyāna groups.”⁴² What I propose we have with our epigraphical formula is a generic Mahāyāna aspiration to reach awakening.

Schopen runs into problems in his assertion that *śākyabhikṣus/-bhikṣuṇīs* and *paramopāsakas/-opāsikās* are, respectively, monastic and lay Mahāyānists. He points to correlations between these monastic and lay titles, the *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula, and words for Mahāyāna in the inscriptions. Of the forty-eight records to which Schopen had access that contain both the *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula and a religious title for the donor, thirty-four have the monastic title *śākyabhikṣu* or *śākyabhikṣuṇī*, and ten have the lay title *paramopāsaka* or

⁴⁰ See L.S. Cousins, “Sākiyabhikkhu/Sakyabhikkhu/Śākyabhikṣu: A Mistaken Link to the Mahāyāna?” *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Sambhāṣā* 23 (2003): 21, n. 66. It should not be ruled out that the use of *anuttarañāṇa* in the texts Cousins cites betrays a Mahāyāna influence.

⁴¹ Silk may have overcomplicated the picture in “What, if Anything, is Mahāyāna Buddhism?” with his call for a polythetic definition and classification of Mahāyāna, especially with regard to Mahāyāna Sūtras, where a polythetic class “possesses a large (but unspecified) number of features or characteristics which are considered relevant for membership in that class.” It may prove true that “(t)here is no set of features necessary and sufficient for inclusion in the class” of Mahāyāna Buddhism, but not all features are equal. In Mahāyāna Sūtras, the bodhisattva path to awakening dominates the landscape, even if the Sūtras disagree on what makes up that path and who gets to travel it. I would also argue that the inconceivably large cosmos operating in Mahāyāna Sūtras becomes absolutely standard very early on, whether it is referred to explicitly or becomes part of the assumed setting. (The apparent single world system in which the *Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra* takes place is one of many factors suggesting its early date—see Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 187-188.)

⁴² *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna*, 77.

paramopāsikā.⁴³ In addition, Schopen lists thirteen non-fragmentary inscriptions that refer to Mahāyāna by name. Eleven of these thirteen explicitly state that the donor was a Mahāyānist, using the terms *mahāyānika*, *mahāyānānuyāyin*, etc., and twelve of the thirteen are joined by either the donative title *śākyabhikṣu/-bhikṣuṇī* or *paramopāsaka/-opāsikā*. Even with a small sample size, these are impressive correlations. And I should mention that out of curiosity I checked to see whether these correlations would hold considering the inscriptions that have come to light in the last few decades, essentially repeating Schopen’s methods with a larger corpus of materials. They do: the percentages are more or less the same as in Schopen’s original paper. (In reality, I produced a range of percentages. I paid close attention to the lacunae of fragmentary inscriptions and took into account when an illegible portion of an inscription might or might not contain the title *śākyabhikṣu/-bhikṣuṇī* or *paramopāsaka/-opāsikā*. I also examined the physical spacing of the inscriptions to determine when our donative formula may have been partially clipped or omitted entirely simply because the scribe did not have enough room.) So where does the problem lie?

Schopen relegates some critical information to a footnote.⁴⁴ There are several non-fragmentary inscriptions that include the donative title *śākyabhikṣu* or *paramopāsaka*, but not the *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula. By his count, twelve of the forty-five non-fragmentary inscriptions donated by a *śākyabhikṣu/-bhikṣuṇī* do not have our formula; eight of the eighteen non-fragmentary inscriptions donated by a *paramopāsaka/-opāsikā* do not have the formula either. To his count, I can add several other donative inscriptions made by one of these two

⁴³ I will, whenever possible, avoid using percentages. The fear is that percentages may be cited elsewhere without the context of the relatively small sample size, thereby giving false notions of large numbers. Seventy-five percent, for instance, sounds much more impressive than three out of four.

⁴⁴ This is “Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions,” 242, n. 24. Unless stated otherwise, all citations to Schopen in this section refer to this note.

groups of people that also do not end with the *yad atra puṇyam* formula. Here are a few such inscriptions roughly arranged in chronological order, chosen because they appear to be completely or almost completely intact, meaning that even the inscriptions with illegible parts could not have contained our formula in the epigraphic space allotted:

- An inscription on a fragmented sculpture of a Buddha refers to a *śākyabhikṣu* (and reverend = *bhadanta*) named Suvīra. The inscription hails from Kasiā, Madhya Pradesh, and dates to the 5th century CE.⁴⁵
- There are identical inscriptions on the bases of two separate standing Buddha images from Sārṇāth that date to 476/477 CE. The two inscriptions record the gift of the images by a *śākyabhikṣu* named Abhayamitra. Compared to the other inscriptions under discussion, they end in a rather idiosyncratic way:

yad atra puṇyam pratimāṃ kārayitvā mayā bhṛtam / mātāpitṛor gurūṇāṃ ca lokasya ca śamāptaye //

[May] the merit I have acquired by having an image made [be] for the attainment of the tranquility of my parents, teachers, and the world.⁴⁶

Schopen is right to observe that the inclusion of these two records in this corpus of inscriptions is open to judgment.⁴⁷ He ends up including them in the group of *śākyabhikṣu* inscriptions with our formula.⁴⁸ However, until *śama*⁴⁹ can be tied to Mahāyāna in the way

⁴⁵ J. Ph. Vogel, “Excavations at Kasia,” in *Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India 1906–07* (Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, 1909), 62 (inscription no. 2) (= Tsukamoto, Kasiā 2; see below for a brief description of how I list inscriptions from Tsukamoto’s catalog).

⁴⁶ H. Hargreaves, “Excavations at Sārṇāth,” in *Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India 1914–15*, ed. J. Marshall (Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, 1920), 124–125 (inscriptions 16 and 17) and plates 69 o,p (= Tsukamoto, Sārṇāth 200 and 201).

⁴⁷ “Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions,” 229.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 232.

that *anuttarajñāna* can, this is unwise. As far as I know, there are no other inscriptions that use *śama* in this way. One should note that this inscription is in verse, so *śama* may have been used only for metrical reasons.

- An inscription painted on the first left pillar of Ajaṅṭā's cave 9 almost certainly records the gift of an image that is now lost. It refers to a *śākyabhikṣu* (and reverend) whose name in the inscription is no longer legible.⁵⁰ This and the other Ajaṅṭā inscriptions listed here date to around the late 5th century.
- Another inscription painted on the first left pillar of Ajaṅṭā's cave 9 records the gift of a painted standing Buddha image. The gift was made by a *śākyabhikṣu* whose name has been lost.⁵¹
- An inscription painted on the fourth left pillar of Ajaṅṭā's cave 9 records the gift of a painted standing bodhisattva image. The gift was made by a *śākyabhikṣu* (and reverend) whose name probably ends in *-sena*.⁵²

⁴⁹ At *Ibid.*, 229, Schopen translates *śama* as “cure,” which seems off the mark when applied to the whole world. John Rosenfield renders *śama* as “final emancipation” at “On the Dated Carvings of Sārnāth,” *Artibus Asiae* 26.1 (1963): 11. The implied sense of *śama* may indeed be “final emancipation,” but I find this translation to be overwrought.

⁵⁰ N.P. Chakravarti, “A Note on the Painted Inscriptions in Caves VI-XVII,” appendix to G. Yazdani, *Ajanta: The Colour and Monochrome Reproductions of the Ajanta Frescoes Based on Photography*, Part III (London: Oxford University Press, 1946), 89 (inscription 3) and plate IIa (= Tsukamoto, Ajaṅṭā 16). The information on the lost image comes from Richard S. Cohen, “Ajanta's inscriptions,” appendix to Walter M. Spink, *Ajanta: History and Development*, Vol. 2: *Arguments about Ajanta* (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Vol. 18.2) (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 290 (inscription 30).

⁵¹ Chakravarti, “A Note on the Painted Inscriptions in Caves VI-XVII,” 89 (inscription 4) (= Tsukamoto, Ajaṅṭā 17).

⁵² *Ibid.*, 89 (inscription 5) and plate IIb (= Tsukamoto, Ajaṅṭā 19). According to Cohen, “Ajanta's inscriptions,” 291 (inscription 32), the image may represent Maitreya, as the figure holds a water bottle in his left hand and has an antelope skin draped over his left shoulder.

- An inscription painted on the third right pillar of Ajaṅṭā's cave 9 records some gift, most likely an image. It refers to a *śākyabhikṣu* whose name is no longer legible.⁵³
- An inscription painted on the ninth left pillar of Ajaṅṭā's cave 10 records the gift of a painted standing Buddha image. The gift was made by a *śākyabhikṣu* (who also has the title reverend and probably teacher = *bhadamṭa*-[*ācāryya*]). The donor's name is mostly lost but probably begins with Śa-.⁵⁴
- An inscription painted on the fifth right pillar of Ajaṅṭā's cave 10 records the gift of a painted standing Buddha image. It refers to a *śākyabhikṣu* (and reverend) named Droṇavarman.⁵⁵
- In a 6th century copperplate grant from Valabhī, Gujarāt, the Maitraka king Guhasena is called a *paramopāsaka*. (Interestingly, Guhasena is called a *paramamāheśvara* in a grant preceding this one, suggesting that he was a Śaivite convert to Buddhism.) The grant bequeaths revenue, probably from a local village, to the community of noble monks (or noble community of monks = *āryyabhikṣusaṅgha*) from the eighteen Nikāyas that comes from many places (*nānādigabhyāgatāṣṭādaśanikāyābhyantara*-).⁵⁶
- An inscription on the base of a small stone relief records the gift of a *śākyabhikṣuni*. The inscription ends with the word *śraṇamataḥ* (From a place called Śraṇama? A mistake for

⁵³ Chakravarti, "A Note on the Painted Inscriptions in Caves VI-XVII," 90 (inscription 11) (= Tsukamoto, Ajaṅṭā 25).

⁵⁴ Ibid., 91 (inscription 3) (= Tsukamoto, Ajaṅṭā 32).

⁵⁵ Ibid., 93-94 (inscription 16) and plate VI d (= Tsukamoto, Ajaṅṭā 45).

⁵⁶ G. Bühler, "Grants from Valabhī," *Indian Antiquary* 5 (1876): 206-207 and plate (inscription B) (= Tsukamoto, Waḷā 6). There is a small disagreement as to the date of this grant because of various readings of the second numeral of the year—the year is read as 248, 258, and 268 (of the Gupta era), corresponding to 568–69, 578–79, and 588–89 CE, respectively.

śramaṇā or *śramaṇī?*). The image comes from Kurkihar and is identified as a goddess.

Although there is no plate of the image or rubbing of the inscription provided, the inscription is compared to another record from the late 7th century, which may be slightly early based on other finds from Kurkihar.⁵⁷

- An inscription on the base of an ornate bronze Buddha names two donors. The first is named Saṃkaraseṇa, who is called a great lord of treasures (*mahāgaṃjampati*) and a *paramopāsaka*. The second donor, named Devaśrī, is referred to as being very devout (*mahāśraddhā*) and is called a princess (*rājadhitr*) and evidently a *paramopāsikī* (the instrumental looks to be *paramopāsikyā*, but Tsukamoto has the reading *paramopāsikayā*). The image comes from Kashmir and dates to around the 8th century.⁵⁸
- A ca. 8th century copperplate grant from Neulpur, Orissa records the gift of two villages to a hundred brahmins. The gift was made by a ruler (*mahārāja*) named Śubhākaradeva, who is referred to as a *paramasaugata*, a supreme devotee of the Sugata. The donor's father, Śivakaradeva, is called a *paramatāthāgato*, a supreme devotee of the Tathāgata, and his grandfather, Kṣemaṅkaradeva, is called a *paramopāsaka*.⁵⁹ Admittedly, this inscription may mean very little, since it is not the donor who is called a *paramopāsaka*.
- An inscription on the pedestal of a Buddha image refers to a merchant (= *vanika*) named Haridatta as a *paramopāsaka*. But the reference is to the father of the donor, not the donor

⁵⁷ M.A. Stein, "Notes on an Archaeological Tour in South Bihār and Hazāribāgh," *Indian Antiquary* 30 (1901): 86. I owe this reference to Gregory Schopen, personal communication. On Kurkihar, see n. 90 below.

⁵⁸ Gérard Fussman, "Chilas, Hatun et les Bronzes bouddhiques du Cachemire," in *Antiquities of Northern Pakistan: Reports and Studies*, Vol. 2, ed. Karl Jettmar in collaboration with Ditte König and Martin Bemann (Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1993), 43-47 and plate 31.

⁵⁹ R.D. Banerji, "Neulpur Grant of Subhakara: the 8th Year," *Epigraphia Indica* 15 (1919-20): 1-8 (= Tsukamoto, Neulpur 1).

himself (whose name begins with Pa[la?]- but is otherwise illegible), so this inscription also may not have any bearing on the present discussion. The image comes from Guneriya, Bihar, or rather was found in an early 20th century shrine in Guneriya, and dates to the 9th century.⁶⁰

- An inscription on a copper plate, which was possibly fixed at the bottom of a Buddha image that served as the gift, calls a certain queen named Candalladevī a *paramopāsika* (read: *paramopāsikā*). The inscription comes from Kara, Uttar Pradesh, and dates to the 9th century or later.⁶¹
- An inscription on a bronze Buddha image refers to a *śākyabhikṣu* (and elder = *stha*, short for *sthavira*⁶²) named Guṇadatta. The image comes from Jhewāri in the Chittagong district of Bengal (now Bangladesh), and the inscription dates to the 9th or 10th century.⁶³
- An inscription on the base of a fragmentary sculpture of what Sahni identifies as a triad of deities refers to a [*para*]mopāsaka. The inscription is not complete; we only have the genitive ending of the donor's name (-*syā*), a word indicating that the donor was somebody's son (-*suta*-), and a reference to an accountant or record-keeper (*akṣapatalika-śrī*⁶⁴), possibly the donor's father. I believe Schopen includes this as one of three

⁶⁰ R.D. Banerji, "The Pratīhāra Occupation of Magadha," *Indian Antiquary* 47 (1918): 110 (= Tsukamoto, Guneriya 1).

⁶¹ N.P. Chakravarti, "A Buddhist Inscription from Kara," *Epigraphia Indica* 22 (1933–34): 37–39 (= Tsukamoto, Kara 1).

⁶² This abbreviation is attested elsewhere in inscriptions from the same general region and time period as this one, like in Tsukamoto, Hilsā 3 and Kurkihar 6, 32, and 79.

⁶³ D.C. Sircar, "Indological Notes," *Journal of Ancient Indian History* 10 (1976–1977): 113–114 (inscription E = accession no. 8153) (this does not appear to be listed in Tsukamoto, probably for geographic reasons).

⁶⁴ See Sircar, *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*, s.v. *Akṣapaṭalika*.

fragmentary *paramopāsaka* inscriptions for which the presence of the *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula could not be determined, but he does not enumerate these three inscriptions so I cannot be sure. However, there does not appear to be enough room in the illegible portions of the inscription to fit the formula, and I think the inscription must end with the donor's name in the genitive case. The image is kept at Sārnāth but its provenance is unknown, and it dates to around the 11th century.⁶⁵

This group of inscriptions, whatever its final tally might be, does not make up an insignificant percentage of our totals—inscriptions without the *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula make up about a third or slightly more of the extant, non-fragmentary *śākyabhikṣu/-bhikṣuṇī* inscriptions, and those without the formula about half of the surviving, non-fragmentary *paramopāsaka/-opāsikā* inscriptions (these proportions are both higher than Schopen's estimates). It would thus be ill advised to treat them as statistical outliers. But Schopen explains that we should not be surprised by such records: "It is perfectly legitimate to assume that the intention of some inscriptions was simply to record the donor's name. The formula 'transferring the merit,' while probably encouraged, would undoubtedly have been optional."⁶⁶ The *real* assumption, however, which undoubtedly is *not* perfectly legitimate, is that if donors had happened to write longer inscriptions and expressed their spiritual intentions, they would have used what

⁶⁵ D.R. Sahnī, *Catalogue of the Museum of Archaeology at Sārnāth* (1914; repr., Delhi: Indological Book House, 1972), 138 (inscription B(e)10) (= Tsukamoto, Sārnāth 54). There is an earlier *paramopāsaka* inscription from Sārnāth that also does not contain our formula. I am almost certain that Schopen mistakenly lists it as Sā i D(a) 18 when he meant Sā i D(a) 16 (= Tsukamoto, Sārnāth 81).

⁶⁶ Immediately after this Schopen states the following: "What is much more significant is that while these titles are occasionally found without our formula, they are never found with any of the other formulas or phrases that formally state the intention of the donors . . . [e.g., *sarvvaduḥkḥaprahāṇārtham*, *mātāpitaram udiśya*, *savalokahitasukhāya*, etc.]." By "other formulas or phrases" he means, I think, non-Mahāyāna epigraphic formulas. But see, e.g., Tsukamoto, Ajaṅṭā 39, 40, 41, and Sārnāth 204; Cohen, "Ajanta's inscriptions," 287 (inscription 22 = Tsukamoto, Ajaṅṭā 14, but with a fuller reading) and 330 (inscriptions 88 and 89, neither in Tsukamoto).

Schopen understands (as I do) to be a Mahāyāna donative formula. That is, because *śākyabhikṣus* and *paramopāsakas* are epigraphically correlated with the term Mahāyāna and a certain type of formula, Schopen assumes that all *śākyabhikṣus/-bhikṣuṇīs* and *paramopāsakas/-opāsikās* appearing in the inscriptional record must be Mahāyānists.

But even if this set of inscriptions without the *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula did not exist, Schopen's argument on this point still suffers from a flaw, in my view a fatal one. What he has essentially done is place categories of epigraphic data—monastic and lay titles, words for Mahāyāna, and/or a donative formula—side by side and take it as self-evident that they are causally linked. This will not do. Correlations are not arguments that stand on their own; they are merely interesting statistical observations. That correlation is not tantamount to causation is a sound principle that could and should be applied here. What we need is an argument that causally ties these sets of data together, that explains *why* there is something inherently Mahāyānist to the terms *śākyabhikṣu* or *paramopāsaka*, but to date neither Schopen nor anyone else has provided one.

We should also consider as a sort of null hypothesis that the association between Mahāyāna and these donative titles is mere happenstance. To prove that statistical correlations are causal, one must at the very least show that those correlations are not coincidental. For this set of inscriptions, it could easily be the case that the connection between Mahāyāna and our Indian *śākyabhikṣus* and *paramopāsakas* is a coincidence of place and time. In Morrissey's aforementioned "Indian Mahāyāna Inscriptions" appendix, he lists 109 inscriptions from the 5th and 6th centuries. Over half of these come from the Deccan, and

well over a third come from a single site: Ajañṭā.⁶⁷ Aside from the numerous *yad atra puṇyam* inscriptions at Ajañṭā, it is clear, mostly from art-historical evidence, that Mahāyāna had some presence at this site.⁶⁸ The sculpted figures flanking the many Buddha images that were made during Ajañṭā’s second wave of activity⁶⁹—including the “original” or “programmatic” Buddha images in the main shrines and the “intrusive” ones carved all over the walls of the caves—are commonly identified as Mahāyāna bodhisattvas, as are many paintings, including those beside the doorframes of some of the shrine antechambers as well as the autonomous figures present in several caves. One could plausibly deny that all of these are Mahāyāna bodhisattva images (or that the painted images in caves 9 and 10 that are generally identified as Maitreya were of Mahāyāna inspiration). But what cannot be refuted is that the scene with a central figure

⁶⁷ Morrissey, “Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy,” 183-194 (inscriptions §§1-42).

⁶⁸ This is not to say Mahāyāna had a majority presence at Ajañṭā. The preponderance of Mainstream paintings, especially Jātakas and life stories of the Buddha, led Dieter Schlingloff to conclude that Ajañṭā was a “Hīnayāna” site. See *Studies in Ajanta Paintings: Identifications and Interpretations* (New Delhi: Ajanta Publications, 1988), 175. For identifications of the many paintings at Ajañṭā, see Schlingloff, *Guide to the Ajanta Paintings*, Vol. 1: *Narrative Wall Paintings* (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1999), and Monika Zin, *Guide to the Ajanta Paintings*, Vol. 2: *Devotional and Ornamental Paintings* (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 2003).

⁶⁹ The 5th/6th history of Ajañṭā—including its excavation, artwork, patronage, and monastic occupation, as well as the social and political climate impacting all of the above—has spurred much debate among scholars. Among many works, see: M.K. Dhavalikar, “The Beginnings of Mahayana Architecture at Ajanta,” in *Madhu: Recent Researches in Indian Archaeology and Art History*, ed. M. S. Nagaraja Rao (Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan, 1981), 133-138; Karl Khandalavala, “The Chronology of Caves 16, 17, 19, 26, 1 and 2 at Ajanta and the Ghatotkacha Cave,” in *The Art of Ajanta: New Perspectives*, Vol. 1, ed. Ratan Parimoo et al. (New Delhi: Books & Books, 1991), 105-129; Richard S. Cohen, “Setting the Three Jewels: The Complex Culture of Buddhism at the Ajañṭā Caves,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1995; Richard S. Cohen, “Problems in the Writing of Ajañṭā’s History: The Epigraphic Evidence,” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 40 (1997): 125-148; Walter M. Spink, *Ajanta: History and Development*, 6 volumes (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Vol. 18.1-6) (Leiden: Brill, 2005–2014). Spink in particular has had a disproportionate influence on Ajañṭā scholarship. (And based on my observations, on the site itself: I suspect he had a hand in writing the information provided on the signs placed outside each of the caves.) Although his knowledge about the material evidence at Ajañṭā is unsurpassed, Spink freely intermingles this evidence with his own assumptions and weakly supported hypotheses, especially regarding the dating of the inscriptions germane to the site, the historicity of the events in the *Daśakumāracarita* (a literary work far removed in time and place from Ajañṭā), and the role of the Vākāṭaka ruler Hariṣeṇa.

surrounded by eight panels, which can be found, either painted or in relief, at caves 2, 4, 6 (upper), 11, 17, 20, and 26, and also at a little niche adjacent to cave 10, betrays a Mahāyāna presence at Ajañṭā. Often called the “litany” scene, it depicts the bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara⁷⁰ rescuing human beings from a series of perils, such as shipwreck, fire, and attacks by various wild animals.⁷¹ This notion of Avalokiteśvara as a savior from mortal danger likely originated with, or was at least connected to, chapter 24 of the *Saddharmaṣaṣṭaśāstra* (the *samantamukhaparivarta nāmāvalokiteśvaravikurvaṇanirdeśa*), obviously a Mahāyāna text.⁷² And there appears to be an even more direct connection between Ajañṭā and this text. Now not one but two paintings have been identified, both convincingly in my eyes, as scenes from the *Saddharmaṣaṣṭaśāstra*. The first is a small painting on a pillar from cave 10, a *caityagrha* from the early period of Ajañṭā excavation that pre-dates the painting by several centuries. Schopen identifies this painting as the bodhisattva Akṣayamati’s giving a five-string pearl necklace to Avalokiteśvara, while Śākyamuni, seated upon a cushion atop a rectangular block, and with his

⁷⁰ Tārā, herself associated with Avalokiteśvara, also is credited with being the savior—solely or in conjunction with Avalokiteśvara—from the eight perils. References to and possible images of Tārā in this capacity appear to all post-date Ajañṭā; as far as I am aware, none of the central figures in the Ajañṭā “litany” scenes is female.

⁷¹ Note that the cave 11 “litany” is inscribed. Much of the *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula is still extant (but not *anuttarajñānāvāptaye*) in the inscription. See Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 307 (inscription 63) (not in Tsukamoto). What is clearly a Mahāyāna image is accompanied by an inscription that probably had our full formula originally, but it was donated by an *upāsaka*, not a *paramopāsaka*.

⁷² The *Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra* also has a chapter that describes Avalokiteśvara’s protecting the devout from different hazards. It is interesting that the “litany” scenes in the art-historical record usually have eight perils, whereas all the texts that I know of that depict Avalokiteśvara as a savior name or describe far more than eight. I suspect that the fixing of the number of perils at eight actually originated from the imagery, though this certainly would require research to confirm. There is at least one inscription, this dating to the late medieval period, that refers to the eight “great dangers” (*mahābhayāni*), and here the dangers are connected explicitly with Tāriṇī (i.e., Tārā)—see N.G. Majumdar, “Nalanda Inscription of Vipulasrimitra,” *Epigraphia Indica* 21 (1931–32): 97–101 (= Tsukamoto, *Nālandā* 9). Cf. J.F. Fleet, “Sanskrit and Old-Canarese Inscriptions,” *Indian Antiquary* 10 (1881): 185–190 (= Tsukamoto, *Ḍambaḷ* 1 and 2). See also Debala Mitra, “Ashtamahābhaya-Tārā,” *Journal of the Asiatic Society, Letters and Science* 23.1 (1957): 19–22 and plates.

hands positioned in *dharmacakrapravartanamudrā* and his head encircled with a nimbus, looks upon (or approves of) the gift. The cave 10 painting likely portrays a scene from the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (also chapter 24) in which Avalokiteśvara, after first refusing to take the gift, accepts the necklace out of compassion for Akṣayamati and other beings, then divides it into two and gives one part to Śākyamuni and the other to the stūpa of the buddha Prabhūtaratna.⁷³ The other, rather elaborate painting covers most of the back wall along the circumambulatory path of cave 9, which is located immediately next to cave 10 and is also a *caityagr̥ha* original to the site. Morrissey identifies this as depictions of several episodes from the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra*, including not only another image of Akṣayamati's offering the pearl necklace, but also Śākyamuni's delivering his sermon—i.e., the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* itself—to the assembly on Gṛdhrakūṭa, the famous parable of the burning house, and Prabhūtaratna's appearance within his flying stūpa.⁷⁴ The final evidence for Mahāyāna at Ajaṅṭā is epigraphic. The donor of cave 26 was a monk named Buddhahadra.⁷⁵ We know from his donative inscription made on the porch of cave 26 that Buddhahadra was well connected politically, as he dedicated his act not only to his parents but also to an Aśmaka minister

⁷³ Schopen, "The Ambiguity of Avalokiteśvara," in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 278-298. A reproduction of the painting is on page 279.

⁷⁴ See Morrissey, "Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy," 125-137 and 243-251 (figures 26-34). Morrissey also makes a convincing case that the structural stūpa in cave 9 was co-opted by juxtaposing it with the painting of Prabhūtaratna's stūpa from the visual narratives of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. If Morrissey's position is accepted, it is a total game changer. It opens up the possibility that the entire cave was taken over as the object of a full-fledged Mahāyāna Sūtra cult, the sort of cult that until now has been suggested almost entirely by literary evidence. See n. 3 in chapter II.

⁷⁵ Buddhahadra may have been involved in several other caves as well. Spink proposes that he had almost unilateral control over caves 21-28 along Ajaṅṭā's western extremity. See *Ajanta: History and Development*, Vol. 1: *The End of the Golden Age* (Leiden: Brill, 2005) (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Vol. 18.1), 272-314, and Vol. 3: *The Arrival of the Uninvited* (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Vol. 18.3) (Leiden: Brill, 2005), *passim*.

named Bhavirāja, and judging by the grandeur of cave 26, a *caityagrha*, we can safely assume that Buddhabhadra was extremely wealthy. He also seems to have been a Mahāyānist. The inscription mentions Tathāgatas, Sugatas, and even Bodhisattvas in the plural, all of which points to a Mahāyāna affiliation; one even suspects that when verse 7 of the inscription speaks of “bodhisattvas who desire comfort for the world and who desire liberation” (*bodhisatvair bhavasukhakāmais ca mokṣakāmais ca*), Buddhabhadra was making an oblique reference to himself. And the gift appears to have been made with a Mahāyāna goal in mind, a goal not so different, in fact, from that of the epigraphic formula under discussion in this chapter. Verse 15 states the following: “May the merit here be for the attainment of the fruit of the great awakening and the multitude of all stainless qualities for those worlds” (*yad atra puṇyaṃ tat teṣāṃ jagatāṃ ca bhavatu idam / sarvvāmalaguṇavyātamahābodhiphalāptaye //*).⁷⁶

All this proves beyond a reasonable doubt that Mahāyāna had some, if not a substantial, influence on Ajaṅṭā during its second phase of activity around the late 5th century. Which raises the question of whether the association between *śākyabhikṣus* and Mahāyāna is not heavily skewed by one relatively well-preserved site. If for whatever reason many *śākyabhikṣus* happened to have made donations (and probably lived) at Ajaṅṭā during the 5th or 6th century, might we not expect at least some of them to be Mahāyānist? Might we not expect to find the

⁷⁶ Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 333-334 (inscription 93) (= Tsukamoto, Ajaṅṭā 68). Each possible reading of *-vyāta-* has its problems; I follow Cohen and Chhabra in reading it as *-vrāta-*. Bühler’s reading of *-vyāpta-* (through the intermediary *-vyātta-*) would render the line: “May the merit here be for the attainment of the fruit of the great awakening, which is pervaded by all stainless qualities, for those worlds.”

A case could be made that Upendragupta, a powerful donor at the site, was a Mahāyānist too, though the evidence is not as strong as it is for Buddhabhadra (see Tsukamoto, Ajaṅṭā 59). In addition, a cave 4 donor named Māthura is referred to as a *vihārasvāmin*—“owner of the monastery,” meaning he donated the entire cave?—and he used our standard *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula (Tsukamoto, Ajaṅṭā 12), and an individual who at least donated a pavilion or hall (*maṇḍapa*) at cave 20 probably used our formula and might have been a *paramopāsaka* (Tsukamoto, Ajaṅṭā 65), although this last inscription is extremely fragmentary and for that reason is not included in the tables below.

use of our *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula here by *śākyabhikṣus*? Not because *śākyabhikṣus* and *śākyabhikṣuṇīs* were by definition Mahāyānists, but simply due to the fact that they lived at a place and time where Mahāyāna had gained a degree of currency.

We must also take into consideration the Pāla dynasty, the rule of which was centered in Bihar and Bengal in northeastern India from the 8th to 12th centuries. Many of the Pāla rulers are known to have patronized Buddhism and to have been Buddhists themselves. It was under their aegis that Nālandā continued to operate and Otantapūri and Vikramaśīla, two other so-called monastic universities where Mahāyāna literature was studied and written, were established.⁷⁷ The definitive history of Buddhism under the Pālas remains to be written,⁷⁸ but it seems likely that Mahāyāna Buddhism peaked in India during this time. It was then that so many of the extant Perfection of Wisdom manuscripts, especially of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*, were produced.⁷⁹ It should not be overlooked, then, that almost all of the *śākyabhikṣu* and *paramopāsaka* inscriptions from the late medieval period—when Buddhism in India was on death’s door—come from areas under Pāla control.⁸⁰ One is left wondering whether any

⁷⁷ These sites are in dire need of scholastic reappraisal. For now see the badly outdated Sukumar Dutt, *Buddhist Monks and Monasteries of India: Their History and their Contribution to Indian Culture* (1962; repr., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2000), 328-353. For a summary (based mostly on old scholarship), see Richard S. Cohen, *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, Vol. 1, s.v. “India” (New York: Macmillan Reference, 2004).

⁷⁸ For the time being the following works are useful: R.D. Banerji, *The Pālas of Bengal* (1915; repr., New Delhi: Bhartiya Publishing House, 1973); Susan L. Huntington and John C. Huntington, *Leaves from the Bodhi Tree: The Art of Pāla India (8th-12th centuries) and Its International Legacy* (Seattle: Dayton Art Institute in association with the University of Washington Press, 1990), 75-121; Jhunu Bagchi, *The History and Culture of the Pālas of Bengal and Bihar (Cir. 750 A.D.-Cir. 1200 A.D.)* (New Delhi : Abhinav Publications, 1993); and parts of Ronald M. Davidson, *Indian Esoteric Buddhism: A Social History of the Tantric Movement* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002).

⁷⁹ See Schopen, “The Mahāyāna and the Middle Period in Indian Buddhism,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 5-6 and the sources cited there. On illustrated manuscripts, now see Kim, *Receptacle of the Sacred*.

⁸⁰ See Schopen’s timeline at “Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions,” 237-238.

correlation drawn between our donative titles and Mahāyāna in Pāla India is coincidental to the fact that Mahāyāna was popular at that place and time.⁸¹

Putting aside the possibility that *śākyabhikṣus/-bhikṣuṇīs* and *paramopāsakas/-opāsikās* only appear to be linked to Mahāyāna because of geographical and chronological coincidences, there is a good case militating against an inherent association between these donative titles and Mahāyāna. I agree with Yao-ming Tsai, Lance Cousins, and Richard Cohen that *śākyabhikṣus* and *śākyabhikṣuṇīs* were monks and nuns making kinship claims. The claim, of course, is that they belonged to the same clan as Śākyamuni Buddha himself. Either these monks and nuns employed the term *śākya* as a deliberate attempt to connect themselves to their religious founder, or the epithet *śākya* literally referred to one's Indian clan, meaning that *śākya*-monks and -nuns actually had familial ties to the Buddha's clan or were making false genetic claims that they did. (We should note in this regard that there are at least five inscriptions that refer to *śākyopāsakas/-opāsikās*, *śākya*-lay brother and sister, so some lay persons were evidently making this kinship claim too.⁸²) Tsai points out a passage in the *Ekottarāgama* that states explicitly that those entering the Buddhist path become members of the Śākyā clan, regardless of which clan they were born into biologically.⁸³ Cousins draws attention to the Pāli terms

⁸¹ Cousins brings this up at “Sākiyabhikkhu/Sakyabhikkhu/Śākyabhikṣu,” 17. Regarding Schopen's response, see n. 90 below.

⁸² Tsukamoto, Kuḍā 8, Mathurā 102, and probably Ajaṇṭā 11 (which refers to a *śākya-uṣaka*); two others, which I do not believe are in Tsukamoto's catalog, are also at Ajaṇṭā and are described at Cohen, “Ajanta's inscriptions,” 281 (inscription 13) and 330 (inscription 88); another, also not in Tsukamoto's catalog, might be from Bihar and is described at Herbert Härtel (with contributions from Ernst Waldschmidt), *Indische Skulpturen* (Berlin: Museum für Völkerkunde, 1960), 73 and plate 41 (many thanks to Gregory Schopen for informing me about this last inscription).

⁸³ Yao-ming Tsai, “Searching for the Origins of Mahāyāna and Moving Toward a Better Understanding of Early Mahāyāna,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, 1997, 110-111. (I owe this reference to Walser, *Nāgārjuna in Context*, 37.) Tsai also brings up the fact that epithets equivalent to the Skt. *śākya*

sakyaputta and *sakkaputtiya*, which occur frequently in the *Sutta-* and *Vinaya*piṭaka, where they appear to mean not “son of a Sakyan” or the like, but “member of the Sakya clan.” Cousins argues that phrases like *samaṇo sakyaputtiyo* evolve into the idea “that Buddhist monks (or some of them) are the *dhamma* heirs of the Buddha and hence in some sense themselves members of the Sakya clan,” and he further argues that the term *śākya* is an abridged, Sanskritized equivalent of words like the Pāli *sakyaputtiya*.⁸⁴

Cohen goes into this idea in the greatest depth.⁸⁵ I cannot follow many of his positions. For one, he goes beyond Schopen in presuming that *śākyabhikṣus* identified as bodhisattvas.⁸⁶

were widely adopted by members of the Saṃgha in East Asia, which I do not consider relevant to the problem at hand unless it can be clearly demonstrated that this practice derived directly from an Indian one.

⁸⁴ Cousins, “Sākiyabhikkhu/Sakyabhikkhu/Śākyabhikṣu,” 11-14. In a postscript to his original “Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions” paper, Schopen lambasts Cousins for considering Pāli texts and “a mixed bag of ‘Hindu’ texts” pertinent to “how monks in North India chose to identify themselves” in Buddhist inscriptions (*Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 244-246). Cousins does, in fact, devote the bulk of his rebuttal to Schopen to a dizzying array of texts—Pāli and Sanskrit, secular and religious, Buddhist, Jain, and Hindu—and Schopen is correct to call him out on this.

The relevance of any non-Buddhist text—and this may apply to Pāli Buddhist texts too—to these epigraphic titles is probably impossible to establish. Not only would a hypothetical text have to be located geographically and chronologically to determine that it overlapped with the inscriptions under scrutiny—no small task—but it would also have to be shown that an “outside” author would know enough about Buddhists to tell one Buddhist apart from any other. As far as I know, no non-Buddhist text meets these criteria, which is not entirely surprising considering how seldom Buddhist individuals or even Buddhist ideas appear outside of the tradition’s own literature. For the texts Cousins cites, it is not clear that their authors had any idea what it meant to be called a *śākyabhikṣu* or a *paramopāsaka*, in the same way a modern American Christian might not understand the differences between a Reform or Conservative Jew or be able to apply correctly those labels to real people. As Schopen points out, the *Āgamaḍambara*, a satirical drama written by the Śaivite Jayantabhaṭṭa in the 9th century, refers to Buddhist monks as both *śākyabhikṣus* and *bhikṣus*. But it is not possible to ascertain whether Jayantabhaṭṭa uses the terms *śākyabhikṣu* and *bhikṣu* synonymously, even if one might consider that unlikely, or, again, whether he would be able to differentiate the two meaningfully. He certainly offers us no evidence that he could. If the *Āgamaḍambara* is the most germane “outside” text to our discussion, this only underscores the frustratingly opaque nature of the literary evidence.

⁸⁵ Richard S. Cohen, “Kinsmen of the Son: Śākyabhikṣus and the Institutionalization of the Bodhisattva Ideal,” *History of Religions* 40.1 (2002): 1-31.

He also claims that Mahāyānists at Ajaṅṭā patterned themselves after Rāhula, Śākyamuni's only biological son and heir, and even that they conceptually transformed Rāhula into the bodhisattva *par excellence*, or, as Cohen phrases it, “the paradigmatic Śākyabhikṣu.”⁸⁷ With several leaps of logic, Cohen's argument about Mahāyānists and Rāhula is based primarily on the fact that caves 17, 19, and 26 at Ajaṅṭā have images of Śākyamuni's return to Kapilavastu and Rāhula's induction into his father's Saṃgha that are paired with images of the meeting between the former buddha Dīpaṅkara and the brahman Sumati (or Sumedha/Sumegha, as some traditions call him), the meeting that would famously propel the latter eventually to become Śākyamuni Buddha. Nevertheless, Cohen's analysis of *śākyabhikṣu* as a kinship term is

⁸⁶ Elsewhere, however, Cohen does contest one of Schopen's conclusions, that the *śākyabhikṣu* was exclusively a Mahāyāna figure. Cohen reexamines a *śākyabhikṣu* inscription from cave 22 at Ajaṅṭā. According to his reading, this inscription not only contains the term *śākyabhikṣu*, but also the word *aparaśāila*, a Mahāsāṃghika subgroup commonly listed as one of the eighteen so-called sects into which Indian Buddhism split. This can only mean, in Cohen's eyes, that the donor whose gift the inscription records was both a Mahāyānist and had been ordained into a Mainstream Nikāya. See his “Discontented Categories: Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna in Indian Buddhist History,” *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 63.1 (1995): 1-25, esp. 10-13. Although almost everyone is now in agreement that Mahāyāna and Mainstream Nikāyas were not institutionally exclusive entities, there appear to be serious problems with Cohen's evidence. What is obviously lacking from his paper is an actual rubbing or image of cave 22's inscription. In this regard we are again fortunate to have Morrissey's dissertation, which offers a photo, as well as previously published reproductions, of the inscription. See Morrissey, “Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy,” 226 (figures 9A-C). The photo clearly shows that where Cohen purports to have read *aparaśāila* in the inscription, only the first vowel “a” (of the *akṣara* “ma”) and the medial “ai”-*mātrā* are now visible. (In passing, this also rules out one of the inscriptions listed by Schopen as including a reference to Mahāyāna.) It seems unlikely that the inscription degraded heavily in the short time between Cohen's paper and Morrissey's photo, casting serious doubt on the source of Cohen's argument. Morrissey, *ibid.*, 69-71 surely offers the most probable reading of the inscription as the beginning of the *śākyabhikṣu* donor's name in the genitive case.

⁸⁷ Quote from Cohen, “Kinsmen of the Son,” 22. At *ibid.*, 7, n. 13, Cohen makes a big deal about the fact that Vasumitra is called a *śākyabhikṣu* in the introductory verses of the *Samayabhedoparacakra*, which survives only in translation. The epithet *śākyabhikṣu* appears in the Tibetan translation and two later Chinese translations, but not in the first Chinese translation from ca. 400 CE. Cohen is probably correct that Vasumitra, who is attributed as one of the authors of the famous *Mahāvibhāṣā*, was “Mahāyānized” at some point after this first Chinese translation, as the same translations of the preface to the *Samayabhedoparacakra* also call him a bodhisattva. But Cohen wants to equate *śākyabhikṣu* with Mahāyānist and therefore commits the same category mistake as Schopen. Both make *śākyabhikṣu* coterminous with the category Mahāyāna monk.

extremely helpful. He contextualizes Buddhist notions of kinship within Indian Dharmaśāstric law, which charged adopted sons with carrying out the religious duties of their new families—primarily funeral duties, in this case—meaning that the adopted were legally and socially located as kin through their religious behavior. And with numerous literary examples Cohen is able to demonstrate that there are many Buddhist precedents for spiritual kinship. Cohen also discusses an important scene from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, a text that circulated in North India at the same time as our inscriptions and that seems to have inspired several paintings at Ajaṅṭā.⁸⁸ In this pericope the Buddha is made to tell Udāyin, who had been sent to bring the Buddha home but who is instead persuaded to become a monk, to declare to others from Kapilavastu that he is a *śākyabhikṣu*. What appears to make Udāyin a *śākyabhikṣu* here has nothing to do with the sort of doctrines he follows or the kind of Buddhism he practices, but the mere fact that he has become a monk and happens to be from the Śākya clan.⁸⁹

Like Udāyin in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, *śākyabhikṣus/-bhikṣuṇīs*, at Ajaṅṭā and elsewhere, seem to have included themselves among the ranks of Śākyamuni’s clan. Now it is indeed possible that *śākyabhikṣus* and *śākyabhikṣuṇīs* made up a closed group of Indian monks and nuns, since these terms occur, as Schopen underscores, during the same periods and even in the same places that the titles *bhikṣu/bhikṣuṇī* can be found in inscriptions.⁹⁰ But until new

⁸⁸ For a summary of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* at Ajaṅṭā, see Vidya Dehejia, *Discourse in Early Buddhist Art: Visual Narratives of India* (1997; repr., New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 2005), 210-211.

⁸⁹ This passage is discussed at Cohen, “Kinsmen of the Son,” 9-10, and can be found at Raniero Gnoli, ed., *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Śayanāsanavastu and the Adhikaraṇavastu, Being the 15th and 16th Sections of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādīn* (Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1978), 3.

⁹⁰ In the postscript to his original paper at *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 245-246, Schopen specifically brings up the Kurkihar hoard of images from the Pāla era, most of which are Buddhist. From A. Banerji-Sastri, “Ninety-Three Inscriptions on the Kurkihar Bronzes,” *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 26.3 (1940): 236-251, we can be sure that at least nine (but probably ten)

of the inscriptions on the images record the gifts of monastic donors. Of these nine inscriptions, three were made by *bhikṣus* (Banerji-Sastri, nos. 1, 23, 90, with 23 and 90 likely coming from the same donor, Virjavarman), five by *sthaviras* (nos. 6, 18, 31, 32, and 91, with 6, 31, and 32 probably coming from the same pair of donors, Buddhavarman and Dharmavarman), and the other by a monk who is called both a *śākyabhikṣu* and *sthavira* (no. 51). Another inscription was made by a student of a *sthavira* (no. 52) and has the compound *ācāryopādhyāyasahitaṃ*, so this was almost certainly made by some kind of monk too, though it is possible that he had left the order by the time he donated the image. Schopen misrepresents this epigraphic data slightly, but his overall point is important: of these inscriptions, only the *śākyabhikṣu* one has a reference to Mahāyāna and uses the *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula.

As opposed to adding a footnote to the next paragraph, I will mention here that the titles *upāsaka* and *paramopāsaka* are both present in the Kurkihar data as well. There are six Kurkihar images donated by Buddhist lay persons—three by *upāsakas* (Banerji-Sastri, nos. 20, 22, and 56, with 20 and 56 probably coming from the same donor, Duva) and three by *paramopāsakas* (nos. 5, 53, and 83). (Note that nos. 20 and 56 have *usaki* and no. 22 has *upāsaki* instead of a masculine *upāsaka*; no. 53 has *paramopāsaki* instead of *paramopāsaka*; and no. 83 has *paramopāsaka* for a female donor.) Among these inscriptions, Mahāyāna is referred to only in one of the *paramopāsaka* inscriptions (no. 5).

In no way, however, does this small set of inscriptions eliminate the need for caution when dealing with the Pāla era—during which, as I remarked above, Mahāyāna seems to have flourished—much less warrant the conclusion that by definition *śākyabhikṣu* = Mahāyāna monk and *bhikṣu* = Mainstream monk or the conclusion that *paramopāsaka* = Mahāyāna lay person and *upāsaka* = Mainstream lay person.

The Kurkihar monastic site is in need of thorough study. Alexander Cunningham may have been correct in identifying Kurkihar with the Kukkuṭapādagiri mentioned by Faxian and Xuanzang, where Kāśyapa is said to have attained nirvāṇa and been miraculously encased by three mountain peaks. See Cunningham, *Report of a Tour in Bihar and Bengal in 1879–1880 from Patna to Sunargaon* (Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. XV) (1882; repr., Varanasi: Indological Book House, 1969), 4-5. This could explain its popularity in the Pāla era; at least 150 fine images and dozens of other metallic objects were donated at Kurkihar, and we know that the donors traveled from far and wide, especially from Kāñci in southern India, to give these gifts. For the places mentioned in the Kurkihar inscriptions, see A. Banerji-Sastri, “Kurkihar Bronze Inscriptions,” *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 26.4 (1940): 306. (But K.P. Jayaswal, “Metal Images of Kurkihar Monastery,” *Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art* 2 (1934): 71 is incorrect in identifying a donor as having come from Bali. Jayaswal misreads *balika* for *vaṇika*, “merchant.” See Banerji-Sastri, no. 21.)

I have tried without any luck to match up all the inscriptions mentioned in this note with the images on which they were written. But predictably, Banerji-Sastri, “Ninety-Three Inscriptions on the Kurkihar Bronzes” has no image plates and does not give the catalog or accession numbers from the Patna Museum where the images are housed. And conversely, the works I have consulted on the Kurkihar images provide little to no information about the inscriptions. The one museum catalog to which I had access has information for only a couple of the inscriptions. See Patna Museum, *Guide to the Patna Museum (Stone Sculptures, Bronzes, and Terracottas)* (Patna : Superintendent, Government Printing, 1955), 38-40. I am curious how many images from the Kurkihar trove can be clearly identified as Mahāyāna figures and, if those images have extant inscriptions, whether their donors used the *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula or held any of the titles under scrutiny. Besides several seated and standing Buddha images and some figures of Hindu deities (and the latter were probably used by Buddhists—see Frederick M. Asher, *The Art of Eastern India, 300–800* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1980), 84), art historians have identified forms of Avalokiteśvara, Tārā, Mañjuśrī, Vajrapāṇi, and Prajñāpāramitā in the Kurkihar collection of images. See especially Jayaswal, “Metal Images of Kurkihar Monastery”; Bimal Bandhyopadhyay, *Metal Sculptures of Eastern India* (Delhi: Sundeep Prakashan, 1981), 26ff., 92-98, 121-134, and 143-145; Susan L. Huntington, *The “Pāla-Sena” Schools of Sculpture* (Studies in

evidence emerges, that this potentially closed group can be equated with Mahāyāna must be treated as little more than wishful thinking. Mahāyāna Buddhists' relating themselves, figuratively or perhaps literally, to their religious founder does not preclude the possibility that non-Mahāyānists were as well, and now that I have brought a footnote from Schopen's paper out of the shadows, as it were, this looks very much to have been the case.

With regard to the titles *paramopāsaka* and *paramopāsikā*, I should start by saying that I am not at all sure what their referents are. Certainly they must be *karmadhāraya* compounds, meaning something like “supreme lay brother/sister,” but that does not get us very far. There are what look like parallel terms in the epigraphic record—*paramabhāgavata*, *paramatāthāgata*, *paramavaiṣṇava*, *paramadaivata*, and so on—about which Cousins concludes “indicate either personal affiliation of the individual or a familial to an *iṣṭa-devatā* or something similar.”⁹¹ But the title *paramopāsaka/-opāsikā* does not follow the same pattern because *upāsaka/upāsikā* is a lay status, not a deity or the like with which an individual, family, or lineage of rulers would be affiliated. One epigraphic title that looks similar to *paramopāsaka/-opāsikā* is *paramabrahmaṇya*. But Sircar defines the latter as certain rulers who were “highly devoted to the Brāhmaṇas.”⁹² If he is correct and *paramabrahmaṇya* does not mean “an important brahman” or some such thing, then we are not any closer to understanding what *paramopāsaka/-opāsikā* means. Paul Harrison defines *paramopāsaka* as “supreme lay practitioner” and suggests it refers “to the

South Asian Culture, Vol. X) (Leiden: Brill, 1984), esp. 141-148. The appendix to Huntington, *The “Pāla-Sena” Schools of Sculpture* does identify the images for the minority of Kurkihar inscriptions that are dated.

⁹¹ “Sākiyabhikkhu/ Sakyabhikkhu/ Śākyabhikṣu,” 14-15.

⁹² *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*, s.v.

king, the local ruler or some other dignitary of high status.”⁹³ Although it may signify an individual of some important standing, it is doubtful it refers to a king or even a local ruler. Indian rulers had many characteristics, but modesty was not one of them; we can be almost certain that if a donor had a formal political title, he or she would have told us this in an inscription, rather than hide his or her status behind a weaker title like *paramopāsaka/-opāsikā*. (Indeed, it is much more likely that someone would lie in an inscription and claim a title he or she did not actually have.) This, of course, does not rule out the possibility of an individual’s having a political title in addition to being called a *paramopāsaka/-opāsikā*, which does occur in rare cases.⁹⁴ Harrison’s other proposition is more interesting. Because “the term [*paramopāsaka/-opāsikā*] magnifies the donors, not the object of their devotion,” he suggests it means something akin to the highfalutin labels we attach to generous donors nowadays: “platinum level,” “diamond circle,” etc.⁹⁵ Interesting as his suggestion is, it will have to remain as such until this whole class of *parama*-titles receives fuller study.

For the time being I am not so much interested in what *paramopāsaka/-opāsikā* means as its relationship to Mahāyāna. Here I believe the same logic I applied to *sākyabhikṣu/-bhikṣuṇī* holds for the title *paramopāsaka/-opāsikā*. The data make clear, especially in the Pāla era, that many lay persons aligned themselves with Mahāyāna and carried the adjective “supreme” as

⁹³ “Early Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 8.

⁹⁴ The Maitraka king Guhasena, for example, is called both a *paramopāsaka* and a *mahārāja*. See Bühler, “Grants from Valabhī,” 207 (= Tsukamoto, Waḷā 6). But Duḍḍā, another donor from the extended Maitraka family, is called only a *pāramopāsikā*: she was of royal blood but not a ruler. See Bühler, “A Grant of King Dhruvasena I of Valabhī,” *Indian Antiquary* 4 (1875): 104-107 (= Tsukamoto, Waḷā 1).

⁹⁵ “Early Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 8, n. 21.

part of their religious epithets.⁹⁶ But this does not rule out other donors' self-identifying as "supreme" lay brothers or lay sisters—whatever that might signify—and, again, the epigraphic data hidden in Schopen's footnote would support this.

The best argument against causally linking *śākyabhikṣus/-bhikṣuṇīs* and *paramopāsakas/-opāsikās* with Mahāyāna, I am afraid, comes from silence. As far as I am aware, nowhere in Mahāyāna texts, nor in Mainstream Buddhist texts for that matter, are these terms used as formal titles, much less to mark exclusive groups within the Saṃgha. It strikes me as more than a little odd that a formal distinction marking a certain kind of monk or lay person would never find its way as such into a Buddhist text. Schopen, in his caustic rebuttal to Cousins, correctly asserts that Buddhist textual and inscriptional sources often contradict each other.⁹⁷ However, incongruence between literary and epigraphical data seems to be a direct result of Buddhist texts' offering an abstracted, idealized presentation of religious life. That Buddhist monks would not be wealthy, would not have sex or children, or would be highly involved in contemplating and formulating abstract doctrines, for instance, are the types of value-laden notions likely to have been crafted by monastic, male authors who were heavily invested in their propagation. But it is extremely unlikely that the stakes for formal titles would be nearly so high, and it stretches the imagination to think that our epigraphic terms would have been susceptible to biased textual editing. Indeed, this is not the case for terms like *sthavira*, *vihārasvāmin*, *parivrājaka*, *bhikṣu*, *upāsaka*, and even *prahāṇika* and *arhat*, all of which appear in Buddhist inscriptions and seem to carry the same meaning there as they do in Buddhist texts.

⁹⁶ See the tables in Cousins, "Sākiyabhikkhu/ Sakyabhikkhu/ Śākyabhikṣu," 16 and 23-24.

⁹⁷ *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 245.

In the end, we are still left with the fact that there is a strong epigraphic correlation between *śākyabhikṣus/-bhikṣuṇīs* and *paramopāsakas/-opāsikās*, words for Mahāyāna, and what Schopen and now I have argued is a Mahāyāna donative formula. Assuming the correlation is not a coincidence, the logic regarding the inscriptional epithets needs to be flipped around. It is not a question of automatically identifying *śākyabhikṣus* and *paramopāsikas* as Mahāyānists, but of asking why so many Mahāyānists identified as *śākyabhikṣus* and *paramopāsikas*. Now, who *śākyabhikṣus* and *paramopāsikas* were on the ground is an interesting problem that is far from settled. I have only scratched the surface of this problem here, but I would suggest that future scholars approach the issue anew after first conceptually uncoupling the terms from Mahāyāna.

Before turning to the content of Mahāyāna donative inscriptions, I would like to revisit the questions I posed near the beginning of this chapter. I asked whether it was possible to determine whether a donor or a recipient from an inscription was a Mahāyāna Buddhist. Indeed, it seems possible on four counts. First, some inscriptions just say that the donor or recipient was affiliated with Mahāyāna. Second, the evidence from the last section, building off the work of Schopen and others, led to the conclusion that an individual who used the *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula with *anuttarajñānāvaptaye* was a Mahāyāna Buddhist. For a donor's use of *anuttarajñāna* as a soteriological goal appears to follow from a Mahāyāna system of beliefs. Third, by the same reasoning—that the repeated articulation of the intention to become a buddha in inscriptions was the product of a religious movement whose defining characteristic was striving for awakening—I add to this corpus a third kind of inscription: those that actually

use the Sanskrit equivalent for buddhahood, *buddhatva*, or otherwise express the desire that beings become buddhas. A Jaggayyapeṭa inscription, for example, records the donation of a Buddha image “for the purpose of obtaining buddhahood” (*buddhattvaprāptinimittam*).⁹⁸ Fourth, I also include donative inscriptions that refer to things—that is, a) figures, such as Avalokiteśvara, Tārā, or Amitābha, b) ideas, like the Perfection of Wisdom, and/or c) texts, such as the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*—that are known only (or almost only) from Mahāyāna traditions, so long as the particular inscription suggests that the donor was affiliated with or inspired by Mahāyāna in some way. I say “inspired by” because there are certain inscriptions—Tsukamoto, Ḍambaḷ 1 and Kasiā 126, for example—with obvious Mahāyāna content but for which the donors would most easily be classified as Brahmanical or Hindu. But such religious “crossover” is really only problematic to the modern scholar bent on placing religious ideas and practices into mutually exclusive categories; in most periods of Indian history, an individual could express religiosity through a variety of traditions.⁹⁹ Finally, a fifth possibility, the presence of the title *śākyabhikṣu/-bhikṣuṇī* or *paramopāsaka/-opāsikā*, falls short as a criterion. Until new evidence emerges, I would like to bracket off the inscriptions recording the gifts of *śākyabhikṣu/-bhikṣuṇīs* and *paramopāsakas/-opāsikās* that do not have our full

⁹⁸ James Burgess, *The Buddhist stupas of Amaravati and Jaggayyapeta in the Krishna District, Madras Presidency, surveyed in 1882* (Archaeological Survey of Southern India, Vol. 1) (1887; repr., Varanasi: Indological Book House, 1970), 112 and plate LXIII (inscription no. 4) (= Tsukamoto, Jaggayyapeta 4). These inscriptions are discussed in Shizutani, “Mahayana Inscriptions in the Gupta Period.” As far as I am aware, no extant inscriptions that explicitly state the desire for buddhahood in this way occur in conjunction with *śākyabhikṣu/-bhikṣuṇī* or *paramopāsaka/-opāsikā*.

⁹⁹ This phenomenon is readily apparent, for instance, when looking at the names and titles of the donors in the Sāñcī inscriptions. And it is, of course, not restricted to India. For very good examples of Thai “Buddhist” rituals that resist religious categorization that is rooted primarily in the West, see McDaniel, *The Lovelorn Ghost and the Magical Monk*, 121-160.

epigraphic formula. These titles by themselves are not sufficient to qualify a donor as a Mahāyāna Buddhist.

I also asked what a Mahāyāna inscription was. With regard to donative inscriptions, by definition this epigraphic class should include the records in which a Mahāyāna individual or group was either the donor or the recipient of a gift, whenever, that is, the Mahāyāna affiliation can be ascertained with a degree of confidence. However, in this chapter I will only address the inscriptions in which a Mahāyānist was the donor. In chapter VI I will briefly discuss the few clear epigraphic cases of Mahāyānists as recipients. (From the sources discussed and translated in chapters II, III, and IV, the reader will remember that there appears to have been some discomfort with the idea of Mahāyānists as recipients on the part of Mahāyāna authors.)

Below are two tables of donative inscriptions. For the inscriptions with the *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula, I include only those inscriptions that are legible through *sarvvasatvānām*; in some of these cases *sarvvasatvānām* is only partially legible but can be safely reconstructed. (Rather than *sarvvasatvānām*, several inscriptions have *sakalasetvarāśer* or something close to it, and a few have *sārdhaṃ sarvasatvānām* or the like. For the purposes of this study, I treat these variations as equivalent.) Out of an abundance of caution, I have placed in a separate table the inscriptions in which the *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula does not include the final element, *anuttarajñānāvaptaye* (except when these inscriptions include a word for Mahāyāna), since I consider this to be the Mahāyāna epigraphic marker; the inscriptions in which *anuttarajñānāvaptaye* is partially legible are counted as having the full formula. (There are several epigraphic variations on *anuttarajñāna*, such as *anuttarapadajñāna*, *anuttaram*

buddhajñānaṃ, *anuttarasarvvajñāna*, and *anuttarajñānaphala*, which I treat as equivalent.¹⁰⁰)

In many instances it is almost certain that *anuttarajñānāvaptaye* is missing only because the inscription has degraded and is no longer legible at that spot. Other cases are less clear, as the inscriptions seem intentionally to have been written only through *sarvvasatvānām*. I am not sure whether *anuttarajñānāvaptaye* would have been implied in such inscriptions, so I leave that open for the reader's judgment.¹⁰¹

I have stripped down the inscriptions to their most basic data: geographic site, date, donative name(s), donative title(s), and the object(s) given. I restrict explanatory details and other information to the footnotes. This presentation, I hope, will most readily reveal donative patterns for those who are interested in Indian epigraphy and Mahāyāna Buddhism. Some of these patterns have already been discussed. I have, of course, reviewed the history of the problem with regard to donative titles in some detail, but the reader will also notice from the tables that Mahāyānists in India carried a bevy of titles besides *śākyabhikṣu/-bhikṣuṇī* and *paramopāsaka/-opāsikā*. As far as dates, Schopen's revelation about the epigraphically late

¹⁰⁰ I do not include a rather idiosyncratic inscription that dates to the 2nd century CE and probably originated in or near Mathurā. Falk's reading suggests that the inscription records the gift of a Bodhisattva image. He renders the end of the extant part of the inscription as *im(e)na kuśalamūlena sarvvasa(t)[va a]nuttarasya nirantarasya j(ñā)*. Falk restores this final word to *jñānāvāptaye*, saying that "the restitution is possible, partly because *anuttara* occurs only in this context, and secondly, because the surviving *ja* is written very small and high above the base line, so that it looks like the first part of a ligature." See Harry Falk, "Two New Inscriptions from the Time of Huvīṣka," *Berliner Indologische Studien* 13/14 (2000): 32-35 (inscription II). I exclude the inscription because it does not have the *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula and because I find Falk's restoration conjectural, but it should be kept in mind as a candidate for one of the earliest Mahāyāna inscriptions.

¹⁰¹ An inscription from Ajaṅṭā's cave 10, which is not included below, suggests that this caution is warranted. It begins with *yad atra puṇyaṃ*, includes *sarvvasatvānām*, but then apparently ends with *duḥkhamocāya*, "for the liberation from suffering." See Cohen, "Ajanta's inscriptions," 297-298 (inscription 44) (= Tsukamoto, Ajaṅṭā 31).

appearance of Mahāyāna in India still holds.¹⁰² I will also draw some conclusions about the kinds of things Mahāyāna Buddhists were giving in India to conclude this chapter. With any luck, other scholars will find these tables useful in unearthing patterns about Indian Mahāyāna that I have failed to see.

For geographic reasons, I do not include Mahāyāna inscriptions from Arakan (in present-day Burma)¹⁰³ or Nepal.¹⁰⁴ Both areas were highly Indianized, as is obvious from their

¹⁰² Schopen, “Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions,” 238-239. With regard to Mahāyāna and dating, we have to be careful how we apply the now widely held position that Mahāyāna adherents were embedded within Mainstream Vinaya lineages, lest it become dogma. Allon and Salomon, in “New Evidence for Mahayana in Early Gandhāra,” 18, conclude that the “absence of references to the Mahayana in such [Gandhāran] inscriptions does not prove the non-existence of Mahayana beliefs, practices, and adherents in the [Nikāya] institutions concerned, because their Mahayana doctrinal affiliation (if any) was irrelevant to the form and content of the inscriptions.” But the absence of Mahāyāna beliefs in donative inscriptions *does* prove that either the donors did not have them or that the beliefs were not sufficiently “mainstream” for their free expression in inscriptions. Neither alternative speaks highly of the strength of “Mahayana doctrinal affiliation” in early Gandhāra. With the eventual use of *anuttarajñāna* in inscriptions, I think we do have traces of an actual Mahāyāna belief, but now it is the Nikāya affiliation that is “irrelevant to the form and content of the inscriptions.” In this light, I find Joseph Walser to be much more on the mark: “Mahāyānist . . . may have been able to write *sūtras*, but may not have had the clout to get the name of their movement carved into stone” (*Nāgārjuna in Context*, 38). Mahāyānist were composing texts in India for several centuries before they appear in inscriptions with anything approaching “clout.”

¹⁰³ There appear to be at least three Mahāyāna inscriptions from Arakan. One, dated to the first half of the 6th century, records the gift of Sāvitāṃ-Candraśrīyā, queen of Nīticandra. She is called a *paremopāsika* (*sic*) and the inscription is cut off after *sarvvasatvānāṃ anukama*. The grammar and orthography of this inscription are very poor, and Sircar is probably correct in suggesting that *anukama* is a mistake for *anuttama*, “with the letters *jñānāya* lost at the end of the line.” See D.C. Sircar, “Inscriptions of Chandras of Arakan,” *Epigraphia Indica* 32 (1957-58): 103-109 (inscription no. 1). Another, dated to the early 7th century, records the gift of a bell by a *śākyabhikṣu* whose name has been lost and includes our full *yad atra puṇyam* formula. Schopen includes this inscription in his original paper. A third inscription, which Johnston dates to the 8th century (but which Arlo Griffiths tells me has been dated to other centuries based on paleographic comparisons different from those Johnston relies on), is a long *praśasti* of a ruler named Ānandacandra; it is not a record of one gift, but like most *praśastis* it describes the many gifts of the object of praise, in this case Ānandacandra. This inscription, like that of Buddhabhadrā from Ajaṅṭā, refers to Bodhisattvas and probably Sugatas (it is in compound) in the plural. It also states that Ānandacandra, when he gave many copper bowls and robes of fine silk to monks, said the following: “May I not lack the Perfection of Giving toward all creatures” (*dānapāramitā hīnā mā me bhavatu jantuṣu*). Ānandacandra looks to have been a Mahāyānist, and for what it is worth, the inscription calls him an *upāsaka*, not a *paramopāsaka*. See Johnston, “Some Sanskrit Inscriptions of Arakan,” 373-382 (inscriptions A and B). For a lengthy discussion of the inscriptions and coins from

use of Sanskrit in inscriptions, their adoption of Indian names, and palaeographic comparisons. In cases like this it is somewhat arbitrary where one considers India to end, politically or culturally, and another region to begin. (These inscriptions are not included in Tsukamoto’s catalog of Indian inscriptions.) Indeed, I *do* include Mahāyāna inscriptions from sites in the Northwest like Thalpan and Shatial. One might reasonably argue that Buddhist sites in modern Pakistan and Afghanistan should be classified as Central Asian and not Indian, though the tendency to consider Northwestern sites Indian has only increased with the discoveries of Buddhist manuscripts in Gilgit, Bamiyan, etc. (Tsukamoto’s third volume on “Indian Buddhist Inscriptions” deals with records from the Northwest.)¹⁰⁵

I should also note that I consider all the inscriptions from Vaiśravaṇaseṇa, Kuberavāhana, and Siṅhoṭa, three prominent donors known from the ancient Karakorum

Arakan, see Pamela Gutman, “Ancient Arakan: with special reference to its cultural history between the 5th and the 11th centuries,” Ph.D. Dissertation, Australian National University, 1976, 24-130. According to Arlo Griffiths, personal communication, there are other Arakenese inscriptions to be published in the near future through the École Française d’Extrême-Orient.

¹⁰⁴ Though it records a gift to a Mahāyāna group and thus would not be included in this section anyway, one Nepalese inscription from around the 7th century documents a permanent endowment of land by a *paramopāsikā* named Mṛginī for repairing a perfume chamber (*gandhakuṭī*) and for the use of a universal community of nuns that is said to have “practiced Mahāyāna” (perhaps “went by the Mahāyāna” is more literal) (*cāturvviśā*-[read: *cāturddiśā*-]*mahāyānapratipannāryyabhikṣuṅīsāṅgha*). It is written on the pedestal of a Buddha triad. See D.R. Regmi, *Inscriptions of Ancient Nepal*, Vol. 1: *Inscriptions* (New Delhi: Abhinav Publications, 1983), 88 (inscription XC). Another Nepalese inscription describes the gift of water pipes or channels (*jaladravaṇika*?) and a well and refers to a *śākyo yati* named Priyapāla. Evidently Priyapāla was some sort of ascetic who identified as a Śākyan. See *ibid.*, 110 (inscription CXI). Regmi, *Inscription of Ancient Nepal*, Vol. 2: *Translations* (New Delhi: Abhinav Publications, 1983) has major misreadings of these two inscriptions. He translates *śākyayati* as a “sage belonging to the Śākya tribe.” He also says *śākyayati* just refers to a Buddhist monk in Nepal, being equivalent in meaning to *śākyabhikṣu*, a statement that I can neither deny nor confirm. See Regmi, *Inscriptions of Ancient Nepal*, Vol. 3: *Introduction to the Inscriptions* (New Delhi: Abhinav Publications, 1983), 194-195.

¹⁰⁵ Sometimes the word *Indic* is used to refer to those things that show Indian influence. Although this can be useful, it is also a convenient way to sidestep problems of geographic classification, since at various times in history *Indic* can apply to Sri Lanka, Central Asia, China, Indonesia, and so on.

Highway in Northern Pakistan, as Mahāyāna records. As long as their inscriptions are donative—that is, if they include a word for “gift” or an image with the donor’s name in the genitive case—I include them in Table 2 below. Their Mahāyāna affiliation is beyond doubt. Some of their inscriptions include names of Mahāyāna bodhisattvas, and Kuberavāhana commissioned images of the *Vyāghrī-jātaka* from the Mahāyāna *Suvarṇaprabhāsottama-sūtra* and may have used our full *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula.¹⁰⁶

I have tried not to duplicate inscriptions in the tables. I have also made an effort to be as complete as possible, but I will be little surprised if some published Mahāyāna donative inscriptions escaped my attention. Here are the conventions I follow in the two tables:

- Inscriptions are arranged alphabetically by site.
- Because it is the most complete catalog available, I will, whenever possible, cite the three-volume inscriptional catalog of Keishō Tsukamoto, *Indo bukkyō himei no kenkyū*. Even without knowledge of Japanese, Tsukamoto’s catalog is still fairly easy to use as a reference guide. Tsukamoto arranges his inscriptions by site, with sites being grouped into larger geographical areas. I will list all inscriptions available in his catalog exactly as they are listed there, i.e., by site and number (e.g., Bodh-Gayā 21). Unless otherwise noted, citations refer to Tsukamoto Volume 1. When I refer to Volume 3, I will note this with “V.3” in

¹⁰⁶ On Vaiśravaṇasena, a Dardic king, see Oskar von Hinüber, “Brāhmī Inscriptions on the History and Culture of the Upper Indus Valley,” in *Antiquities of Northern Pakistan: Reports and Studies*, Vol. 1: *Rock Inscriptions in the Indus Valley, Text*, ed. Karl Jettmar in collaboration with Ditte König and Volker Thewalt (Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1989), 57-60. On Kuberavāhana and Siṅhoṭa, see Oskar von Hinüber, “Buddhistische Inschriften aus dem Tal des oberen Indus (Inschriften Nr. 68-109),” in *Antiquities of Northern Pakistan: Reports and Studies*, Vol. 1, 77-87; Jason E. Neelis, “Long-distance Trade and the Transmission of Buddhism through Northern Pakistan, Primarily based on Kharoṣṭhī and Brāhmī Inscriptions,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Washington, 2001, 518-522. I date Kuberavāhana and Siṅhoṭa slightly differently, but they may have been contemporaries: “Die wichtige Frage, ob Siṅhoṭa und Kuberavāhana Zeitgenossen waren, läßt sich gegenwärtig nicht beantworten” (von Hinüber, “Buddhistische Inschriften aus dem Tal des oberen Indus,” 87).

parentheses (e.g., Thalpan 29 (V.3)), which is necessary because some inscriptions appear in both Volume 1 and Volume 3. For a single site, references to Volume 1 will be placed before those to Volume 3.

- For the inscriptions that are not in Tsukamoto’s catalog, I will list the records by site and a capital letter, beginning with the letter A (e.g., Ajaṅṭā B), and provide a note for the source. For each site I will list those in Tsukamoto’s catalog first in numerical order, then proceed with these others.
- Dates, when not stated in the inscriptions, are usually approximated based on the palaeography of the inscriptions and/or the style of donated images. Approximated dates almost always come from the original publications, not from me or Tsukamoto.
- Inscriptions in which the donor is called a Mahāyānist are in bold.
- I will note when an inscription is included for a reason other than the *yad atra puṇyam* formula or a word for Mahāyāna, except for a few of Kuberavāhana’s inscriptions (see above).
- I will usually, but not always, standardize the spelling for names and titles. A blank space in the “Name” or “Title” column indicates that the information was never inscribed or that the inscription is fragmentary.

Table 1: *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula without *anuttarajñānāvaptaye*

Site	Date	Name(s) of donor(s)	Title(s) of donor(s)	Object(s) given
Ajaṅṭā 9	5 th -6 th cent.	Buddhagupta	śākyabhikṣu	image
Ajaṅṭā 39	5 th -6 th cent.	Buddha-	śākyabhikṣu	image
Ajaṅṭā 70	5 th -6 th cent.			image
Ajaṅṭā A ¹⁰⁷	5 th -6 th cent.	Raviprabha		image
Ajaṅṭā B ¹⁰⁸	5 th -6 th cent.		upāsaka	image
Ajaṅṭā C ¹⁰⁹	5 th -6 th cent.	Mitradharmā	upāsaka	image?
Bihar 1 ¹¹⁰	9 th cent.	Pūrṇadāsa	sthavira	images
Calcutta 1	5 th cent.	Dharmadāsa	śākyabhikṣu	image
Fathpur 1	6 th cent.	Dharmapriya	śākyabhikṣu	image

¹⁰⁷ Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 289 (inscription 27).

¹⁰⁸ Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 307 (inscription 63). If Cohen is correct in identifying the image as an Avalokiteśvara “litany” scene, then the Mahāyāna character of this inscription is secure.

¹⁰⁹ Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 307 (inscription 64). This inscription is no longer extant.

¹¹⁰ Technically, Bihar 1 represents two identical inscriptions, as Pūrṇadāsa gave two images, each depicting a different life scene of the Buddha. In all likelihood this record should be placed in Table 2, since it appears to end with a mangled form of our formula: *yat puṇya mātāpitara upādhyāyaṃ pūrvvaṅgamam kṛtvā anuttaram sakalasatvarāśe iti*. I follow a slightly different reading and use an alternative date than that given in Tsukamoto; there is some consensus that the Śūrapāla mentioned in this inscription refers to the ruler from the 9th century. Cf. Bagchi, *The History and Culture of the Pālas*, 12 and the sources cited there.

Table 1: *yad atra puṇyaṃ formula without anuttarajñānāvaptaye*

Site	Date	Name(s) of donor(s)	Title(s) of donor(s)	Object(s) given
Gilgit A ¹¹¹	7 th –8 th cent.	Narāyāsārvati, etc.		image
Guneriya A ¹¹²	11 th cent.	Kevarttaka	paramopāsaka?	image
Kashmir 3	6 th –7 th cent.	Voyatyāsa	śākyabhikṣu	image
Kashmir 4 ¹¹³	6 th –7 th cent.	Sukhavarman	paramopāsaka	image
Kosam A ¹¹⁴	4 th –6 th cent.		śākyabhikṣu	image
Kuḍā 9	5 th –6 th cent.		śākyabhikṣu	image
Mathurā 81	441/442 CE	Jīvā		image
Mathurā 127	5 th cent.	Dharmadāsa	śākyabhikṣu	image

¹¹¹ Oskar von Hinüber, *Die Palola Śāhis: Ihre Steininschriften, Inschriften auf Bronzen, Handschriftenkolophone und Schutzzauber, Materialien zur Geschichte von Gilgit und Chilas* (Antiquities of Northern Pakistan: Reports and Studies, Vol. 5) (Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 2004), 64–66 (no. 31A). Narāyāsārvati is the wife of Dholaka, the *spālapati* (“der Heerführer”). The donation of this bronze image was made together with (*sārdham*) several family members, presumably Narāyāsārvati’s, including the mother Padmasukhā and the sons Āmuḍasiṃgha, Puṇyasiṃgha, and Khukhethāla. A *kalyāṇamitra* named Narendratrāta is also mentioned.

Although the image on which this epigraph is inscribed is now in Khotan, I consider the piece Indian because it most likely comes from Gilgit. The image bears stylistic similarities with other Gilgit bronzes, and according to von Hinüber, the “Eigennamen” in the inscription “verweisen deutlich nach Gilgit” (ibid., 66)—the names on this bronze are similar to those found in inscriptions and manuscript colophons from the Gilgit area. On connections between Gandhāra, Gilgit, and Khotan, see Jason Neelis, *Early Buddhist Transmission and Trade Networks: Mobility and Exchange within and beyond the Northwestern Borderlands of South Asia* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 296–297. Many thanks to Jason for advice on this inscription and for sending me this excerpt from his book.

¹¹² Gouriswar Bhattacharya, “Donors of a few Tārā images from Magadha or South Bihar,” in *Festschrift Dieter Schlingloff: zur Vollendung des 65. Lebensjahres dargebracht von Schülern, Freunden und Kollegen*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm (Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen, 1996), 8–10 and figure 11. Bhattacharya restores *pravaramahāyānāyāyinaḥ* from *pravara ... dīnaṃ*, which I do not understand (and I am unable to make this out in the photograph). Obviously, the late date of the image and its identification as Tārā increase the likelihood that Kevarttaka was indeed a Mahāyānist. Bhattacharya believes that it is not Kevarttaka who was a *paramopāsaka*, but his father. See ibid., 9, n. 29.

¹¹³ This inscription has *yad atra puṇyaṃ tad bhavatu savasatvānā mātāpitrisya*, but then *sakalāsatva-sukhanāya*, “for the comfort of all beings.” I include it here because of its first reference to “all beings.”

¹¹⁴ Morrissey, “Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy,” 201 (inscription §59). The date here is my own crude approximation based on a photograph of the inscription. See Aruna Tripathi, *The Buddhist Art of Kauśāmbī, from 300 BC to AD 550* (New Delhi: D.K. Printworld, 2003), 87, figure 57.

Table 1: *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula without *anuttarajñānāvaptaye*

Site	Date	Name(s) of donor(s)	Title(s) of donor(s)	Object(s) given
Mathurā 136 ¹¹⁵	4 th cent.	Samgharakṣita	śākyabhikṣu	image
Nālandā 15 ¹¹⁶	8 th cent.	Vajjaka	suvarṇakāra	stūpa
Phophnar Kalan 2	6 th cent.	Buddhadāsa	śākyabhikṣu, ācārya, bhadanta	image
Phophnar Kalan 3 ¹¹⁷	6 th cent.	Vidyādhara-svāminī		image
Piṭalkhorā A ¹¹⁸	5 th -6 th cent.	-radha	śākyabhikṣu	image
Piṭalkhorā B ¹¹⁹	5 th -6 th cent.		śākyabhikṣu	image
Piṭalkhorā C ¹²⁰	5 th -6 th cent.	Kama-	śākyabhikṣu, bhadanta	image
Sāñcī 917	6 th cent.	Kulāditya		image
Sārnāth 27 ¹²¹	4 th -6 th cent.			image
Sārnāth 198	4 th -5 th cent.	Dharmade-	śākyabhikṣuṇī	image
Shatial 347 (V.3) ¹²²	5 th -7 th cent.		kṣatrapa, ?	images

¹¹⁵ Given the dates of the other Mathurān inscriptions, the 4th century may be too early for this record.

¹¹⁶ This inscription has a very abbreviated version of our formula, skipping *yad atra puṇyaṃ tad bhavatu* entirely. After the donor's name we have *mātāpitṛ pūrvaṅgamaṃ kṛtvā sakalasatvarāśe nratta*. I believe the formula, at least through *sakasatvarāśe*, can be assumed.

¹¹⁷ This inscription is highly unusual. After *yad atra puṇya tad bhavatu*, we find *aparimitalokadhātusthasarvvānuśaya[ba]ndhanāvabaddhasatvalokasyānāvāraṅajñānāvāptaye*. See Schopen, "Mahāyāna in Indian inscriptions," 228. I am not sure whether the compound *anāvāraṅajñāna* (note that Tsukamoto misprints this as *anāvāraṅajñāna*) should be considered a Mahāyāna term or not. See *BHSD*, s.vv. *anāvāraṅa* and *āvāraṅa*.

¹¹⁸ Morrissey, "Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy," 207 (inscription §77).

¹¹⁹ Morrissey, "Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy," 208 (inscription §80).

¹²⁰ Morrissey, "Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy," 208-209 (inscription §82).

¹²¹ All that remains of this badly damaged inscription is *sarvvasatvānām cānuttara*.

¹²² This inscription, which is fairly long, is highly fragmented. There may be up to a dozen or so names connected to the donation. I should also mention, though it does not appear to be donative—unless it is connected to the donation of the head on the same stone?—Tsukamoto, Shatial 351 (V.3): (b)*dhicattam*

Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

Site	Date	Name(s) of donor(s)	Title(s) of donor(s)	Object(s) given
Ajaṅṭā 11 ¹²³	5 th -6 th cent.	Ram-	śākya-uṣaka	image
Ajaṅṭā 12	5 th -6 th cent.	Māthura	viḥārasvāmin	image
Ajaṅṭā 13 ¹²⁴	5 th -6 th cent.	Taraṅakīrtt-	śākyabhikṣu	image
Ajaṅṭā 53 ¹²⁵	5 th -6 th cent.	Dharmadatta	śākyabhikṣu, bhadanta	image
Ajaṅṭā 54	5 th -6 th cent.	Dharmadatta	śākyabhikṣu, bhadanta	image
Ajaṅṭā 55	5 th -6 th cent.	Bāpuka	śākyabhikṣu, bhadanta	image
Ajaṅṭā 67 ¹²⁶	5 th -6 th cent.	Maṣaraśaila?	śākyabhikṣu	image
Ajaṅṭā 68 ¹²⁷	5 th -6 th cent.	Buddhabhadra	bhikṣu, bodhisattva?	cave 26
Ajaṅṭā 69	5 th -6 th cent.	Guṅākara	śākyabhikṣu, bhadanta	image

[<bodhicittam] ut(p)ādayāmi namo buddhāya. As far as I know, the Mahāyāna idea *bodhicitta* does not appear anywhere else in inscriptions.

¹²³ This inscription records the gift of “1,000 buddhas” on the walls of the shrine antechamber. A fuller reading of the inscription can be found at Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 281-282 (inscription 14).

¹²⁴ Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 285 (inscription 18) reads the donor’s name as Guṅakīrttya.

¹²⁵ Ajaṅṭā 53 and 54 from cave 16 were made by the same donor, Dharmadatta. He made a third inscription that just says *bhadantadharmadattasya*. See Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 315-317 (inscriptions 70-72).

¹²⁶ For the most probable reading of the donor’s name, see Morrissey, “Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy,” 193 (inscription §39). (See n. 86 above in regard to different readings of this inscription.) Gregory Schopen recently brought to my attention that this inscription quotes a verse from a version of the *Prasenajit-gāthā*, which does not appear to be a Mahāyāna text. According to Morrissey, the verse in the inscription reads as follows: *saurupyasaubhāgyaṅopapannā guṅendriyair bhāsvardīptayaṣ (sic) te bhavanti te nayanābhirāmā ye kārayaṅtīha jinasya bim̐bam̐*. See, in the edition of the *Prasenajitpariṣcchā-sūtra* found in Tibet, the more recent Bhikṣuṅī Vinītā (Vinita Tseng), ed. and trans., *A unique collection of twenty Sūtras in a Sanskrit manuscript from the Potala*, Vol. I.1 (Beijing/Vienna: China Tibetology Publishing House/Austrian Academy of Sciences, 2010), 216 (verse 5), which instead has the following: *saurūpyasaubhāgyaṅopapannā guptendriyā bhāskaradīptayas te / bhavanti loke nayanābhirāmā ye kārayaṅtīha jinasya bim̐bam //*. This is a rare Mahāyāna inscription that promises this-worldly rewards—beauty, fortune, and so on—for a gift.

¹²⁷ Buddhabhadra’s inscription records the donation of the whole cave, about which see the brief discussion above.

Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

Site	Date	Name(s) of donor(s)	Title(s) of donor(s)	Object(s) given
Ajaṅṭā D ¹²⁸	5 th –6 th cent.	-gupta	śākyabhikṣu	image
Ajaṅṭā E ¹²⁹	5 th –6 th cent.			image?
Ajaṅṭā F ¹³⁰	5 th –6 th cent.	-bhima		image?
Ajaṅṭā G ¹³¹	5 th –6 th cent.			image
Baliḡāmi 1 ¹³²	1065 CE	Rūpabhaṭṭayya	mahāpradhāna, sāvāsigaḷ- adhiṣṭhāyaka, bhaṅḡāri, sarvvādhyakṣa, daṅḡanāyaka	monastery, land and revenues
Baliḡāmi A ¹³³	1067 CE	Nāḡiyakka		image, land and revenues

¹²⁸ Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 279 (inscription 11).

¹²⁹ Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 283 (inscription 15).

¹³⁰ Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 283 (inscription 16). Cohen notes the possibility that a single donor was responsible for this and two other inscriptions from cave 2 (my Ajaṅṭā 11, E, and F).

¹³¹ Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 308 (inscription 65).

¹³² Rūpabhaṭṭayya gave what is called the *prabauddhavihāra* and provided the means to worship Tārā Bhagavatī as well as the gods (*deva* or *devara*) Keśava, Lokeśvara, and, interestingly, Bauddha. For Rūpabhaṭṭayya’s many titles, see Rice’s translation (see Tsukamoto for the reference) and Sircar, *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*, s.vv.

¹³³ This inscription is included here because it records the gift of an image of Tārā Bhagavatī and because it provides land to fund its worship and to repair a temple that possibly housed the Tārā image. This record, which is referred to but not given a separate entry in Tsukamoto, is connected with Baliḡāmi 1; both inscriptions begin by praising the ruler Āhavamalla in the exact same way, and both record gifts to provide for the same local Buddhists. See B. Lewis Rice, *Epigraphia Carnatica*, Vol. 7, Pt. 1 (Bangalore: Mysore Government Central Press, 1902), 111–112 and 197 (Shikārpur Taluq, no. 169); C. Hayavadana Rao, ed., *Mysore Gazetteer*, Vol. 2, Pt. 1 (Bangalore: Government Press, 1930), 145–149; P.B. Desai, “Buddhist Antiquities in Karnataka,” *Journal of Indian History* 32.1 (1954): 86.

Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

Site	Date	Name(s) of donor(s)	Title(s) of donor(s)	Object(s) given
Bengal A ¹³⁴	9 th –10 th cent.	Dharmamitra	śākyabhikṣu, sthavira, mūlasarvāstivāda- parśadā, pravara- mahājānājāyin	image
Bodh-Gayā 15 ¹³⁵	6 th –7 th cent.	Prakhyātakīrti	bhikṣu	coping stone
Bodh-Gayā 21	6 th cent.	Mahānāman	śākyabhikṣu, sthavira	image
Bodh-Gayā 22	6 th cent.	Dharmagupta and Daṃṣṭrasena	śākyabhikṣus	image
Bodh-Gayā 25 ¹³⁶	10 th cent.	Śakrasena		image
Bodh-Gayā 28	10 th cent.	Vīryendra	vinayavid, sthavira, pravara- mahāyānājāyin	image
Bodh-Gayā 36 ¹³⁷	1230 CE	Aśokavalladeva	mahārāja, paramopāsaka, pravara- mahājānājāyin	shrine? with image

¹³⁴ Debala Mitra, “Lintels with the Figures of Eight Great Bodhisattvas and a Tathāgata—An Iconographical Study,” in *Facets of Indian Culture: Gustav Roth Felicitation Volume*, ed. C.P. Sinha et al. (Patna: Bihar Puravid Parishad, 1998), 282–285 and plate 3. The exact provenance of this piece is unknown. It is extremely rare for an inscription to have the Nikāya to which a donor was affiliated, though the Nikāya of the recipients is sometimes stated. This is the only Mahāyāna inscription that I know of that does so (ruling out the inscription put forth by Cohen—see n. 86 above). Schopen, “The Mahāyāna and the Middle Period in Indian Buddhism,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 22, n. 35 suggests that this inscription is indicative of the “complex, late interrelationship between the Mahāyāna and the Mūlasarvāstivāda. . . .” My sense is that this relationship was predicated mostly on the fact that the Mūlasarvāstivāda was a successful Vinaya tradition at a time in northeastern India when Mahāyāna was the dominant Buddhist vehicle or religious movement.

¹³⁵ The donor in this inscription is described as *buddhatvam abhikāṃṣatā*.

¹³⁶ The donor evidently also went by the name Dharmabhīma (*śrīdhārmabhīma iti ca prathitaḥ prthivyām*)—a monastic name?—and came from the Sindh region (*sindhūdbhavo*). The inscription says that Śakrasena made the image because he “longs for unsurpassed awakening so that the world’s suffering would be appeased” (*kāṅkata [read: kāṅṣatā] ’nuttarām bodhiṃ jagato duḥkhasāntaye*).

¹³⁷ If I interpret this inscription correctly, King Aśokavalladeva paid (and was “in charge” of the merit) for the gift but a number of his subordinates were involved in bringing his donation to pass. I am not sure whether *vihārīyaṃ vuddhapratimāśahitā* indicates a shrine or a monastery with a Buddha image, but Vidyavinoda and Sircar (see Tsukamoto for references) translate *vihārīya* as “shrine.”

Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

Site	Date	Name(s) of donor(s)	Title(s) of donor(s)	Object(s) given
Bodh-Gayā 37 ¹³⁸	1253 CE	Sahaṇasāva	bhāṇḍāgārika, paramopāsaka, pravara- mahāyānayāyin	?
Bodh-Gayā 38 ¹³⁹	12 th cent.	Śrīmitra	sambuddhasiddha	cave with images
Bodh-Gayā A ¹⁴⁰	11 th -12 th cent.	Ripaḍika	pravara- mahājānājāyin	stūpa
Chaṇḍimau 1	10 th -11 th cent.	Saharaṇa	vaṇika, sādhu, paramopāsaka, parama- mahājānānuayāyin	image
Chilās 12 ¹⁴¹	6 th -7 th cent.	Siṅhoṭa		image
Chilās 13 ¹⁴²	6 th -7 th cent.	Siṅhoṭa		image

¹³⁸ According to Sircar, *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*, s.v. *Bhāṇḍāgārika*, the donor Sahaṇasāva would have been some “officer in charge of the treasury or the royal store-house.” The gift is not specified in the inscription. Vidyavinoda and Sircar (see Tsukamoto for references) speculate that the gift was “some votive offerings.”

¹³⁹ This is not only a Mahāyāna record, but I think also one of a small number of inscriptions that can be safely classified as Tantric. (Based on epigraphic evidence alone, Buddhist Tantra seems to have had a limited impact in India. The topic warrants further attention.) I believe the first verse invokes the Buddha; Sanyal says it refers to the *ādi*- or primordial-buddha (see Tsukamoto for the reference), which is not impossible given the context. The second verse invokes Lokeśvara and the third Ekajaṭā. Śrīmitra is described as *sambuddhasiddhānuvaya*[read: *anvaya* for *anuvaya*?]*dhuryyabhūtaḥ* and *sambuddhakṛtya-paramaḥ*.

¹⁴⁰ Gouriswar Bhattacharya, “Notes on Three Inscribed Buddhist Sculptures,” *Journal of Ancient Indian History* 15.1-2 (1985-1986): 195-199 and plate XVI (inscription no. 1). The origin of this piece seems to be an educated guess on the part of Bhattacharya. Note that the inscription describes the donor’s father, Madhumathana, as a *paramopāsaka*.

¹⁴¹ The main inscription says only *devadharmo ’yaṃ kṛtaṃ mayā siṅhoṭena*, but next to it is the inscription *namo āryā maṃjuśrībodhisatvāya*, with representations of a seated bodhisattva and two stūpas on the stone. Cf. Tsukamoto, Chilās 123 and 124 (V.3). Note that the site is rendered “Chilas” in Tsukamoto’s Volume 1 but “Chilās” in Volume 3; I use the latter to standardize the spelling between the two sources.

¹⁴² The main inscription accompanying an image of a stūpa says only *devadharmo ’yaṃ siṅhoṭesya*, but next to it there are representations of two bodhisattvas, one with the inscription [*na*]mo *arya ’valoki*. . . . Under the other bodhisattva, a small inscription also indicates that the image was donated together with (*sārdham*) a certain Gamanaśūra or Śamanaśūra. Cf. Tsukamoto, Chilās 125-128 (V.3). Note that Tsukamoto, Chilās 120 (V.3), which is only partially legible but which includes [*deva*]dharmo *’yaṃ*, may be another Mahāyāna donative inscription of Siṅhoṭa. However, I have not been able to determine the

Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

Site	Date	Name(s) of donor(s)	Title(s) of donor(s)	Object(s) given
Chilās 101 (V.3) ¹⁴³	4 th -5 th cent.	Vaiśravaṇasena		image
Chilās 115 (V.3)	5 th -6 th cent.	Kuberavāhana		image
Chilās 117 (V.3) ¹⁴⁴	5 th -6 th cent.	[Kuberavāhana]		image
Chilās 136 (V.3) ¹⁴⁵	5 th -7 th cent.			image
Chittagong A ¹⁴⁶	11 th -12 th cent.		pravaramahāyāyin	image

content of the image associated with this inscription, nor can I confirm whether von Hinüber is correct in attributing the whole complex of rock drawings to which this image belongs to Siñhoṭa. See von Hinüber, “Buddhistische Inschriften aus dem Tal des oberen Indus,” in *Antiquities of Northern Pakistan*, Vol. 1, 83-86.

¹⁴³ This inscription, which is located next to a drawing of a stūpa, says only *śrīvaiśravaṇasenaśya*. However, one of Vaiśravaṇasena’s inscriptions (Tsukamoto, Thalpan 16 (V.3)) lies to the right of another inscription that says *namo ’kṣobh (sic)*, “homage to Akṣobhya” (Tsukamoto, Thalpan 58 (V.3)), and another that has his name also has the word *lośvarakhatasya (<lokeśvaraḥṣatra)*, a reference to Avalokiteśvara (Tsukamoto, Helor Dās 12-13 (V.3)). Note that there are three other names written next to this image of a stūpa (see Tsukamoto, Chilās 102-104 (V.3)), none of which is written in the genitive case, though they may not all be complete. Also note that Vaiśravaṇasena has another simple inscription with his name in the genitive case (Tsukamoto, Chilās 100 (V.3)), but I cannot tell whether it now accompanies or ever accompanied an image.

¹⁴⁴ This inscription is badly damaged. It has *(ya)[d atra ta]d bhava*, but the rest of that line is lost, so it is uncertain whether it had our full formula. I include it here because it was almost certainly donated by Kuberavāhana, who is named in several nearby inscriptions. In the first line of this short two-line inscription, von Hinüber suggests a reconstruction of *[kueravāha]na[sya]* for the donor’s name. See von Hinüber, “Buddhistische Inschriften aus dem Tal des oberen Indus,” in *Antiquities of Northern Pakistan*, Vol. 1, 81 (inscription no. 74a). This inscription accompanies an image of a stūpa and a worshipping figure—the latter is quite possibly a depiction of Kuberavāhana himself—and is near drawings of the *Vyāghrī-jātaka* from the *Suvarṇaprabhāsottama-sūtra* that were commissioned by Kuberavāhana.

¹⁴⁵ This inscription is extremely weathered, so the identity of the donor(s) cannot be made out. There appear to have been several names in the inscription, at least two of which were connected with *sārdham* (“together with”). It is included here because it is located right next to another inscription (Tsukamoto, Chilās 136 (V.3)) that has parallels in the *Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra* and a (Mahāyāna) collection of *dhāraṇīs* from Central Asia.

¹⁴⁶ Narendra Nath Law, “Some Images and Traces of Mahāyāna Buddhism in Chittagong,” *Indian Historical Quarterly* 8 (1932): 332 and plate I (b).

Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

Site	Date	Name(s) of donor(s)	Title(s) of donor(s)	Object(s) given
Chittagong B ¹⁴⁷	10 th cent.	Sahadeva	prāptapañca- mahāśabda, mahāpratihāra	land and revenues, monastic cell
Ḍambaḷ 1 ¹⁴⁸	1095/1096 CE	many individuals	seṭṭins	land and revenues
Deoriyā 2	5 th cent.	Bodhivarman	śākyabhikṣu	image
Deoriyā 3 ¹⁴⁹	5 th cent.			image

¹⁴⁷ This record was inscribed on the outside of a vase, but the gift specified in the inscription was not the vase itself. Interestingly, the gifts in this inscription were made for the benefit of the community of monks of the Sthāvīrīya Nikāya belonging to the Bela (?) monastery (*velavihārasamvaddhasthāvīrīya-nikāyapratipannāryabhikṣusamgha*). See Gouriswar Bhattacharya, “An Inscribed Metal Vase Most Probably from Chittagong, Bangladesh,” in *South Asian Archaeology 1991: Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference of the Association of South Asian Archaeologists in Western Europe, held in Berlin 1-5 July 1991*, ed. Adalbert J. Gail and Gerd J.R. Mevissen (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1993), 323-338. Sahadeva was a head doorman or someone otherwise involved in defense and was a feudal subordinate to the king, who, according to the inscription, was a *rājādhirāja* named Attākaradeva. See Sircar, *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*, s.vv. *mahāpratihāra* and *pratihāra*, as well as *pañcamahāśabda* and *prāptapañcamahāśabda*. The inscription is included here because Sahadeva’s gift was made “in order to increase merit and for the singular reason of realizing unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening by my parents, myself, and the entire assemblage of living beings” (*mātāpitror ātmanah sakalasya ca satvarāser anuttarāyāḥ samyaksamvodher adhiḡamaikaheṭoḥ puṇyasyābhivṛddhyai* [read: *abhivṛddhaye*]). On *anuttarā samyaksambodhi* in Mahāyāna texts, again see Schopen, “Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions,” 230-231.

¹⁴⁸ This inscription records the gifts by a number of *seṭṭins* (Old Kanarese for *śreṣṭhin*), *vaiśyas* whom the inscription praises at length, to two *vihāras* that they themselves had had built. One of the *vihāras* is called the *buddhavihāra*, the other the *āryyātāradevīvihārī*. The inscription, written on a stone tablet with an image of Tārā, begins with an invocation to Tārā (*tāre namas tubhyaṃ*), lists several “dangers that she extinguishes” (*-bhayaśamani*), and also says, among other things, that she “is called wisdom and provides the Buddha’s power” (*prajñeti yā kathyate yā buddhasya vibhūtidā*). A separate inscription across the top of the stone gives a slightly different list of perils from which Tārā rescues supplicants (see Tsukamoto, *Ḍambaḷ 2*).

¹⁴⁹ I apply Fleet’s estimate for the date of Deoriyā 2 to Deoriyā 3, since the inscriptions are similar paleographically. Alexander Cunningham, *Report for the Year 1871-72* (Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. III) (Calcutta: Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing, 1873), 48 is off considerably in saying that the Deoriyā inscriptions “cannot . . . be later than A.D. 200 or 250. . . .”

Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

Site	Date	Name(s) of donor(s)	Title(s) of donor(s)	Object(s) given
Ghosrāwā 1 ¹⁵⁰	9 th cent.	Vīradeva		caityas, temple
Gopālpur (J) 1 ¹⁵¹	11 th –12 th cent.	Denuvā	dauvārika, pravara- mahājānujāyin	image
Gummidurru 1	5 th cent.	Rāhula	śrāmaṇaka	image
Hilsā 3 ¹⁵²	9 th cent.	Gaṅgādharma	paramopāsaka	image
Hodar 3 (V.3) ¹⁵³	7 th cent.	Vuruṇḍi and Bhita	mātuṃkhira?	image

¹⁵⁰ Vīradeva had two *caityas* built on a hill near Ghosrāwā and also was responsible for the construction of a temple (*bhavana*) for a *vajrāsana*. (The inscription does not say where the temple was, only that it was built “here” (*atra*), which is probably a reference to Nālandā based on the context of the inscription. Since the inscription says elsewhere that Vīradeva visited the *vajrāsana* at Bodh-Gayā, it is unlikely that the temple he built was there.) Vīradeva was evidently a powerful individual. He carried favor with the ruler Devapāla and “was established by an ordinance of the Saṃgha as leader to oversee Nālandā” (*nālandāparipālanāya nayataḥ saṅghasthiter yaḥ sthitaḥ*). The inscription is included in this corpus because of the dedication of Vīradeva’s deed, which is not all that dissimilar from the *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula: “May the merit I have acquired from creating this building [i.e., the temple for the *vajrāsana*], which is like a stairway to the city of liberation, lead the entire multitude of human beings, beginning with the group of my teachers that includes my parents, to complete awakening (*sopānamārgam iva muktīp[uras]ya kīrtim etam vidhāya kuśalam yad upāttam asmāt / kṛtvā ’ditaḥ sapitarām guruvargam asya samvodhīm etu janarāsīr aśeṣa eva /*). I am inclined not to agree with Sircar, *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*, s.v., at least with regards to this inscription, that *kīrti* is “often interpreted as ‘a building or temple’; but [it is] really, ‘any fame-producing work’ . . .” See F. Kielhorn, “A Buddhist Stone-Inscription from Ghosrawa,” *Indian Antiquary* 17 (1888): 312, n. 36.

¹⁵¹ The donor’s father, Subhakta, is called a *paramopāsaka* and scribe (*kāyastha*).

¹⁵² The Tārā image includes the *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula on the pedestal as well as an invocation to Tārā on the top of the backplate: *oṃ tāre oṃ tāre oṃ tāre svāhā* (= Tsukamoto, Hilsā 1). In a delightful aside, the editor of the inscription says that the invocation “would have remained unnoticed had not my attention been drawn to it by my son, a boy of less than ten years, whose meddlesomeness has, now for the first time, produced something good.” See Surendranath Majumdar Sastri, “The Hilsa Statue Inscription of the Thirty-fifth year of Devapala,” *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 10.3 (1940): 32-33.

¹⁵³ This inscription, which has our *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula, begins *mātuṃkhirasya bhāryāvuruṇḍi-(pu)trabhitasya*. On this alone *mātuṃkhira* would appear to be the name of Bhita’s (or Bhīta’s) father. However, Vuruṇḍi and Bhita show up in other inscriptions with one Jīvadharma, who can only be Vuruṇḍi’s husband and Bhita’s father, leaving *mātuṃkhira* to look like a title, though it does not seem to be attested outside of Hodar. It is not impossible that *mātuṃkhira* was an alternative name of Jīvadharma or a title that could stand in for his name—two inscriptions have *only* the title/name *mātuṃkhira* in the instrumental case.

Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

Site	Date	Name(s) of donor(s)	Title(s) of donor(s)	Object(s) given
Icchāwar 1	5 th cent.	Bedikāyā	upāsikā	image
Icchāwar 2	5 th cent.	Mahādevī	rājñī	image
Jaggayyapeta 4 ¹⁵⁴	5 th -6 th cent.	Candraprabha		image
Jaynagar A ¹⁵⁵	12 th cent.	Maharokā	paramopāsikā pravara- mahāyānayāyin	image
Jhewāri A ¹⁵⁶	9 th -10 th cent.	Śubhadatta	sthavira	image
Jhewāri B ¹⁵⁷	9 th -10 th cent.			image
Jhewāri C ¹⁵⁸	9 th -10 th cent.	Kumārabhadra	sthavira, pravara- mahāyānayāyin	image
Kanauj 1	9 th -10 th cent.	Kusuma	śākyabhikṣu, sthavira, pravara- mahāyānayāyita	image?
Kāndī A ¹⁵⁹	12 th cent.	Samudrāditya	rāṇaka, paramopāsaka, pravara- mahājānājaina	image
Kaṇheri 9 ¹⁶⁰	5 th -6 th cent.	Buddharakṣita	ācārya	image

Because I associate the *yad atra puṇyam* formula with Mahāyāna, I am tempted to classify the several other donative inscriptions (accompanying rock drawings) of this family as records of Mahāyāna gifts too. However, doing so on the basis of this single inscription may not be prudent, so I will just leave it as a suggestion. Bhita himself must have been the actual scribe of these inscriptions, as he is elsewhere called a *divira* and *divirapati*. Jason Neelis, personal communication, suggests to me that Bhita was demonstrating his “scribal aptitude” by using the *yad atra puṇyam* formula; in another inscription he uses a different formula with *dharmahetuvaradā*, which is well known from inscriptions in this area, and his inscriptions, somewhat amazingly, are written in both Brāhmī and Proto-Śāradā scripts. Cf. Tsukamoto, Hodar 4-27 and 167-169 (V.3).

¹⁵⁴ Included here because of the compound *buddhattvaprapāptinimittam*.

¹⁵⁵ D.C. Sircar, “Jaynagar Image Inscription of Year 35,” *Journal of the Bihar Research Society* 41.2 (1955): 146 (this inscription and the one referenced in the title of the paper are not the same).

¹⁵⁶ Sircar, “Indological Notes,” 112 (inscription A = accession no. 8141).

¹⁵⁷ Sircar, “Indological Notes,” 112 (inscription B = accession no. 8142).

¹⁵⁸ Sircar, “Indological Notes,” 112-113 (inscription C = accession no. 8145).

¹⁵⁹ D.C. Sircar, “Some Inscriptions from Bihar,” *Journal of the Bihar Research Society* 37.3-4 (1951): 7-10 (inscription C). Read *mahāyānayāyin* for *mahājānājaina* for this and Kurkihar 5. According to Sircar, *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*, s.v., *rāṇaka* is “derived from *Rājanaka*, *Rājānaka*, or *Rājanyaka*” and is a “title of feudatory rulers and, later, of the nobility.”

Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

Site	Date	Name(s) of donor(s)	Title(s) of donor(s)	Object(s) given
Kasiā 125 ¹⁶¹	5 th cent.	Haribala	(aneka)vihāra-svāmin	vessel (with relics?)
Kasiā 126 ¹⁶²	10 th cent.			monastery and shrine?
Kashmir 2	6 th -7 th cent.	Ratnacittin	śākyabhikṣu	image
Kerala A ¹⁶³	9 th cent.	Varaguṇa	deva	land and revenues
Koḷivāḍ 1 ¹⁶⁴	13 th cent.			image
Kosam B ¹⁶⁵	6 th cent.?	Dharmapradīpa	śākyabhikṣu, bhādanta	lamp
Kuḍā 8	5 th -6 th cent.	Vyāghrakā	śākyopāsikā	image
Kuḍā 10	5 th -6 th cent.	Buddhasiṃha	śākyabhikṣu	image
Kuḍā 11	5 th -6 th cent.	Samghadeva	śākyabhikṣu	image
Kura 1 ¹⁶⁶	5 th -6 th cent.	Roṭasiddhavṛddhi	vihārasvāmin	monastery

¹⁶⁰ This inscription ends with *anena sarvvasatvā buddhā bhavantu*.

¹⁶¹ The end of this copperplate inscription, discovered with a copper vessel in the relic chamber of a stūpa, mentions a *śākyabhikṣu* named Dharmananda who “completely rejoices in/approves of [the gift]” (*sarvatrānumodate*).

¹⁶² This inscription begins by invoking Śiva, Tārā, and the Buddha. It records the gift of some ruler whose name has probably been lost; the last ruler named in the inscription’s genealogy is Bhīmaṭa, but there are three destroyed lines after this. The gift, which was probably spelled out in the damaged portion of the inscription, may have been a monastery with a shrine because the inscription was discovered along with a large Buddha image within the ruins of a shrine.

¹⁶³ Part of this interesting charter inscription is written in Tamil. The third verse of the Sanskrit portion appears to praise Avalokita, i.e., Avalokiteśvara. See T.A. Gopinatha Rao, “Two Inscriptions of Vikramaditya Varaguna,” in *Travancore Archaeological Series*, Vol. I (Madras: Methodist Publishing House, 1910–1913), 187–193 (inscription A); S. Subramonia Iyer, “Epigraphical and literary references to Buddhism in Kerala,” in *Explorations in Art and Archaeology of South Asia: Essays Dedicated to N.G. Majumdar*, ed. Debala Mitra (Calcutta: Directorate of Archaeology and Museums, Government of West Bengal, 1996), 249–252.

¹⁶⁴ Included here because the inscription begins *om namo bhagavatyai āryatārāyai*. The partly mutilated image to which this inscription belongs must be Tārā.

¹⁶⁵ Morrissey, “Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy,” 201 (inscription §58).

¹⁶⁶ This inscription is important not only because it singles out Toramāṇa Śāha among the many beneficiaries of the wish for “unsurpassed knowledge,” but also because it uses the Mahāyāna donative formula in a gift for the acceptance of the teachers of the Mahīśāsaka Nikāya. But in his edition to the inscription, Bühler remarks that the portion of the inscription conveying the monastery to the

Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

Site	Date	Name(s) of donor(s)	Title(s) of donor(s)	Object(s) given
Kurkihar 5	1058 CE	Tīkuka	paramopāsaka, pravara- mahāyānajaina	image
Kurkihar 51	10 th cent.	Buddhajñāna	śākyabhikṣu, sthavira, pravara- mahāyānayāyin	image
Kurkihar 66	9 th –11 th cent.	Khaṃgāka		image
Mandhuk 1 ¹⁶⁷	10 th cent.	Jambhalaṃmitra	vṛddhasārthta?	image
Mathurā 8	6 th cent.	Jayabhaṭṭā	śākyabhikṣuṇī	image
Mathurā 54	5 th cent.	Yaśadinna	śākyabhikṣu	image
Mathurā 59	454/455 CE	Devatā	viḥārasvāmin	image
Mathurā 60 ¹⁶⁸	444/445 CE	-māradāsa and Daṇḍa		image
Mathurā 61 ¹⁶⁹	5 th cent.	Dhavaśrīyā		image
Mathurā 79 ¹⁷⁰	153 CE	Nāgarakṣita		image
Mathurā 80	434/435 CE	Samghavarman	bhikṣu	image
Mathurā 119 ¹⁷¹	467/468 CE	Jīvēśvara, Dhanapati, ?	śreṣṭhin	image

Mahīśāsaka teachers was written below “intentionally obliterated” lines. See G. Bühler, “The New Inscription of Toramana Shaha,” *Epigraphia Indica* 1 (1892): 238–241, esp. 240, n. 7. This opens up the possibility that the Mahīśāsaka teachers were not the original recipients of the gift, and Schopen opines that “it is likely that the record originally read not Mahīśāsaka, but Mahāyāna.” See Gregory Schopen, “The Mahāyāna and the Middle Period in Indian Buddhism,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 12–13. Schopen’s idea is interesting, but it may be based on the assumption that a Mahāyāna donor would only make a donation to a Mahāyāna recipient. Finally, on what this inscription says about the Buddha, see Schopen, “The Buddha as an Owner of Property and Permanent Resident in Medieval Indian Monasteries,” in *Bones, Stones and Buddhist Monks*, 264–265 and 282, n. 35.

¹⁶⁷ I am not sure whether *vṛddhasārthta* is a title—meaning “senior trader”?—or whether it should be read as two grandiose adjectives, *vṛddha* and *sārthta*.

¹⁶⁸ I list the names from this inscription as Tsukamoto gives them, though they can be read differently. The beginning of the second line of the inscription is lost, and then we have *māradāsadaṇḍavijñāya-mānasya*.

¹⁶⁹ This inscription ends with *yad atra puṇyaṃ tad bhavatu sarvasatvānāṃ buddhatvāya*.

¹⁷⁰ This is the famous inscription for the Amitābha image that refers to King Huviṣka, edited by Schopen, “The Inscription on the Kuṣān Image of Amitābha and the Character of the Early Mahāyāna in India,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 249–258. Its stated intention is that all beings attain *anut(t)ara(m) bud(dh)ajñānaṃ*, “the unsurpassed knowledge of a buddha.”

¹⁷¹ The *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula is almost completely missing, but I include this inscription here because it refers to the donation of an image of Avalokiteśvara (*deyadharmmo 'yam āryāvalokiteśvarapratimā*

Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

Site	Date	Name(s) of donor(s)	Title(s) of donor(s)	Object(s) given
Mathurā 137 ¹⁷²	4 th cent.	Brahmasoma	śākyabhikṣu, bhadanta	image
Nālandā 9 ¹⁷³	12 th cent.	Vipulaśrīmitra		case, images, temple, etc.
Nālandā 10 ¹⁷⁴	9 th cent.	Devapāladeva	paramasaugata, parameśvara, paramabhaṭṭāraka, mahārājādhirāja	land and revenues
Nālandā 12	10 th -11 th cent.	Bālāditya	paramopāsaka, pravara- māhāyānayāyin	gateway
Nālandā A ¹⁷⁵	8 th -9 th cent.	Gaṅgākā	paramopāsikā	image

pratiṣṭhāpitā). There may have been more than two donors for this gift, as the inscription is quite fragmentary. *Śreṣṭhi* is an occupation, not a name, though it is uncertain whether it applies to multiple donors or just Jīveśvara.

¹⁷² Given the dates of the other Mathurān inscriptions, the 4th century may be too early for this record.

¹⁷³ This inscription is really a *praśasti* of the donor, Vipulaśrīmitra. It has several Mahāyāna elements. It invokes the goddess Tārā, the “savior of the world” (*bhagavatī tārā jagattāriṇī*), and states that Vipulaśrīmitra had a temple (*bhavana*) built for her in order to destroy the “eight great dangers of the world” (*aṣṭau yaś ca mahābhayāni jagatām*). The case (*mañjūṣā*) was for the great temple (*mahāyatana*) of Khasarppaṇa (i.e., Avalokiteśvara) and was to hold the “Mother of the Conquerors” (*jananī jinānām*), evidently a reference to the Prajñāpāramitā embodied in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* text, since elsewhere in the inscription there is a reference to “the Mother of the Buddhas with eight thousand [lines]” (*sahasrair aṣṭābhiḥ . . . sambuddhajananī*). Gregory Schopen argues that the *mañjūṣā* with the “Mother of the Conquerors” was a bookcase that could be turned to “recite” the text mechanically and make merit. See his “A Note on the ‘Technology of Prayer’ and a Reference to a ‘Revolving Bookcase’ in an Eleventh-Century Inscription,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 345-349.

¹⁷⁴ The land was given at the request of a ruler of Suvarṇadvīpa, a *mahārāja* named Bālaputradeva, who according to the inscription had a monastery built at Nālandā. It refers to the Buddha as the abode of the Prajñāpāramitā, to Tārā, and evidently to a group of Tantric bodhisattvas (*tāmtrakavodhisattvaṅga*).

¹⁷⁵ C.S. Upasak, “Inscriptions on Dhelvā Bābā, a Buddha Image in Nālandā Museum,” *Journal of the Bihar Research Society* 53 (1967): 142 (inscription C).

Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

Site	Date	Name(s) of donor(s)	Title(s) of donor(s)	Object(s) given
Patagandigudem A ¹⁷⁶	5 th cent.	Vikramendravarman	mahābodhisattva	land and revenues
Piṭalkhorā D ¹⁷⁷	5 th –6 th cent.	-deva	śākyabhikṣu	image
Raisen A¹⁷⁸	11th cent.	Vattānka	paramopāsaka, pravara- mahāyānayāyin	image
Saheṭh-Maheṭh 6 ¹⁷⁹	12 th –13 th cent.	Vidyādhara	bodhisattva?	monastery
Sāncī 919 ¹⁸⁰	7 th cent.	Tuṅga?		monastery?
Sārnāth 10	4 th –5 th cent.	Buddhapriya	śākyabhikṣu	image
Sārnāth 11	5 th cent.		śākyabhikṣu	image
Sārnāth 21	4 th –6 th cent.	Dharmasena		image
Sārnāth 24	4 th –6 th cent.	Rāmadatta	śākyabhikṣu	image

¹⁷⁶ As far as I am aware, this inscription has yet to be critically edited. For now see B.S.L. Hanumantha Rao et al., *Buddhist Inscriptions of Andhradesa* (Secunderabad: Ananda Buddha Vihara Trust, 1998), 207–210. If I understand the inscription correctly, the donor (or his father, Mādhavavarman?) is referred to as a *mahābodhisattva*. The inscription also has a variation of our formula.

¹⁷⁷ Morrissey, “Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy,” 207–208 (inscription §78).

¹⁷⁸ Michael Willis, “Avalokiteśvara of the Six Syllables: Locating the Practice of the ‘Great Vehicle’ in the Landscape of Central India,” *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 23 (2009): 223.

¹⁷⁹ This is a *praśasti* inscription recounting the exalted lineage and wonderful deeds of the donor, Vidhyādhara. I assume that the primary given object that is described in the inscription was a monastery, though technically it says that Vidyādhara, “in the manner of a monastery, had built and gave, as if it were the single home of his renown, a dwelling that was the foundation of joy for ascetics” (. . . *yaminām ānandamūlālayo nirmmāpyotsarje vihāravidhinā kīrtter ivaikāśrayaḥ*). I include it here because the donor is compared to a “bodhisattva, as had never been before, who took on a body to protect the multitude of living beings” (*satvasārthaparitrāṇakṛtakāyaparigrahaḥ / abhūd abhūtapūrvoyaṃ vodhisattva ivāparaḥ /*). This inscription also gives homage to Tārā, who has “rescuing eyes” (*uttāralocanā*), that is, she surveys the world seeking to rescue beings.

¹⁸⁰ This highly fragmentary inscription is included because its author praises Lokanātha (i.e., Avalokiteśvara), who is described as holding a flower and bearing Amitābha, as well as (the bodhisattva?) Vajrapāṇi (*pāṇau padmaṃ . . . yo ’mitābhañ ca dhatte taṃ vande lokanāthaṃ . . . vande vajrapāṇiṃ*). It appears to record the gift of a monastery with cells (*v[i]hāraḥ sallayanan tato ’tra kāri . . .*), which may have been donated by a certain Tuṅga (. . . *ñcana-Tuṅgasya satka eṣa vi(hāraḥ)*).

Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

Site	Date	Name(s) of donor(s)	Title(s) of donor(s)	Object(s) given
Sārnāth 24 ¹⁸¹	1026 CE	Sthirapāla and Vasantapāla		perfume chamber
Sārnāth 43	5 th cent.	Suyātra	paramopāsaka, viṣayapati	image
Sārnāth 46	11 th cent.	Śāmaṅka	paramopāsaka, pravara-mahāyānānuyāyin	image
Sārnāth 51	11 th -12 th cent.		paramopāsaka, mahāyānānuyāyin	image
Sārnāth 96	4 th -6 th cent.	Siṅhamati	śākyabhikṣu	column?
Sārnāth 111 ¹⁸²	1058 CE	Māmakā	paramopāsikā, mahājānānujaina	text, ?
Sārnāth 112 ¹⁸³	12 th cent.	Kumāradevī		monastery
Sārnāth 184 ¹⁸⁴	11 th -12 th cent.		paramopāsaka, mahāyānānuyāyin	?
Sārnāth 204	6 th cent.	Narṇṇaṇa	paramopāsaka	image
Sārnāth 206	8 th cent.		śākyabhikṣu, sthavira	image
Terai A ¹⁸⁵	6 th -7 th cent.	Pariśuddhamati	śākyabhikṣuṇī	image

¹⁸¹ Though written on the base of a Buddha image, this inscription states that the donors, two brothers who were connected with King Mahīpāla I, “built a new stone perfume chamber [for or related to] the eight great places” (*kṛtavantau ca navīnām aṣṭamahāsthānsāilagandhakuṭīm*). The “eight great places” refers to the eight miraculous events believed to have occurred during the Buddha’s life, so there must have been imagery of these events in or near the perfume chamber, and indeed a stone slab discovered at Sārnāth has these events carved in relief. See Sahni, *Catalogue of the Museum of Archaeology at Sārnāth*, 6-7 and plate XIX(b) (misprinted as XIX(h)). The two brothers also had two buildings at Sārnāth restored. This inscription is included here because the brothers are described as “incapable of turning back from awakening” (*bodhav avinivartinau*). For citations of this concept in Mahāyāna texts, see *BHSD*, s.vv. *avinivarta*, *avinivartanīya*, *avinivartin*, and *avinivartin*.

¹⁸² Read *mahāyānānuyāyin* for *mahājānānujaina*. This important inscription states that Māmakā had a copy of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikāpraññā* written for the community of monks. There was another donation of Māmakā recorded but this part of the inscription is unfortunately no longer legible. Māmakā’s husband, Dhameśvara, is also described as a *paramopāsaka* and *mahājānānujāyin*.

¹⁸³ This inscription is technically a *praśasti* of Kumāradevī, one of the wives of Govindacandra of Kanauj. It is included here because of the patent devotion to Tārā/Tāriṇī, to whom Kumāradevī and her mother, Śaṅkaradevī, are actually compared. In verse 21 Tārā is evidently equated with the goddess Vasudhārā, who is also invoked at the beginning of the inscription.

¹⁸⁴ The gift is not specified in the inscription, nor in Marshall-Konow (see Tsukamoto for the reference). Tsukamoto writes *mahāyānāyāyin* for the *mahāyānānuyāyin* of Marshall-Konow.

Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

Site	Date	Name(s) of donor(s)	Title(s) of donor(s)	Object(s) given
Tetrawan 1 ¹⁸⁶	1073 CE	Īcchara	-āsaka, paravaramahāja-	image
Thalpan 27 (V.3) ¹⁸⁷	5 th -6 th cent.	Kuberavāhana		image
Thalpan 28 (V.3)	5 th -6 th cent.	Kuberavāhana		image
Thalpan 29 (V.3) ¹⁸⁸	5 th -6 th cent.	Kuberavāhana		image
Thalpan 30 (V.3)	5 th -6 th cent.	Kuberavāhana		image
Thalpan 56 (V.3) ¹⁸⁹	5 th -7 th cent.	Guṇaśreṣṭha		image

¹⁸⁵ D.C. Sircar in “Monthly Seminars at the Centre, Thursday, the 18th September, 1969,” *Journal of Ancient Indian History* 3 (1969–1970): 280–281; Stanislaw Czuma, “A Gupta Style Bronze Buddha,” *Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art* 57.2 (1970): 55–67, esp. figure 13. Although much of the Terai area belongs to Nepal in the modern period, this was not the case in the 6th–7th century, so I consider this inscription to be Indian.

¹⁸⁶ The missing parts of the donor’s titles can be filled out to *paravara*[read: *pravara*]*mahājānujāyi-paramopāsaka* or something close to that.

¹⁸⁷ Kuberavāhana’s name, which is usually spelled *kueravāhana*, is instead spelled *kumemravāhana* here.

¹⁸⁸ The *yad atra puṇyam* formula is not completely legible, but this inscription is found with representations of stūpas and seated figures, the latter being labeled as Śākyamuni Tathāgata, Mañjuśrī bodhisattva, Ārya Avalokiteśvara bodhisattva, and Ārya Maitreya bodhisattva. Cf. Tsukamoto, Thalpan 1 and 2.

¹⁸⁹ This inscription begins *namo ’kṣobhya*, “homage to Akṣobhya.”

I should add that there are other donative inscriptions from the Chilās-Thalpan area that might also need to be considered Mahāyāna records. Tsukamoto, Thalpan 41 (V.3) records the donation of a drawing of a stūpa by a donor whose name begins *madana-*, who may be the same as the Thalpan 42 (V.3) donor *madanasihena* from “Altar Rock.” Next to Thalpan 41 (V.3) lies Thalpan 43 (V.3), which gives homage to three Tathāgatas, including Amitābha. The problem is that Thalpan 41 and 43 (V.3) are written in a completely different ductus, so it is uncertain whether they are related. See von Hinüber, “Buddhistische Inschriften aus dem Tal des oberen Indus,” in *Antiquities of Northern Pakistan*, Vol. 1, 89–90 (inscription nos. 90–91). In addition, near the inscribed drawings of stūpas donated by a Varuṇeśvara on “Altar Rock” (Tsukamoto, Thalpan 11–12 (V.3)), there is a separate inscription offering homage to Avalokiteśvara that is not unlike the so-called Avalokiteśvara *dhāraṇī* (Tsukamoto, Thalpan 55 (V.3)). However, I cannot tell whether these inscriptions are related in any way, so Varuṇeśvara’s possible Mahāyāna affiliation remains unclear. The name Varuṇeśvara comes up again in a Chilās inscription together with a donor named Vicitradeva (Tsukamoto, Chilās 94 (V.3)). Finally, Tsukamoto, Chilās 135 (V.3) was written by (*likhitam*) an individual named Priyamitra and gives homage to four Tathāgatas, including Amitābha and Akṣobhya, so the inscription is certainly Mahāyānist. The name Priyamitra shows up in five other inscriptions from the same area (Tsukamoto, Chilās 87–91 (V.3)), at least one of which is donative (Chilās 91 (V.3)). However, there was evidently more than one individual with this name—in three inscriptions a Priyamitra has the title *bhikṣu*, in one a Priyamitra has the title *ācārya*, and in two others we just have the bare name—so it is uncertain which of Chilās 87–91 (V.3), if any, can

Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

Site	Date	Name(s) of donor(s)	Title(s) of donor(s)	Object(s) given
Tippera A ¹⁹⁰	10 th -11 th cent.	Īśvarasiṃha	paramopāsaka, mahāyānayāyin	image
Tummalagudem A ¹⁹¹	5 th -7 th cent.	Govindavarman	mahārāja	land and revenues
Unknown A ¹⁹²	9 th cent.	Buddhapriya	sthavira	image

We can see that the Mahāyāna epigraphic record is dominated by a certain kind of gift. Of the one hundred and eight inscriptions in Table 2, at least eighty record the gift of images. This trend is even more pronounced when one considers some key points. To begin with, some of the inscriptions from Table 1, most of which were written on images as well, were likely made by Mahāyāna Buddhists. Second, for many inscriptions it is just not possible to tell whether the donor was a Mainstream or Mahāyāna Buddhist. It therefore does not seem unreasonable to suppose that many inscribed images after the 5th century (and some perhaps before that time), even though they do not fit the criteria I have established for a Mahāyāna

be connected to Chilās 135 (V.3). See von Hinüber, “Brāhmī Inscriptions on the History and Culture of the Upper Indus Valley,” in *Antiquities of Northern Pakistan*, Vol. 1, 50-51.

¹⁹⁰ N. K. Bhattasali, *Iconography of Buddhist and Brahmanical Sculptures in the Dacca Museum* (Dacca: India Museum, 1929), 25-26 and plate VI(a).

¹⁹¹ This charter inscription is dated to the 37th year of Govindavarman. The wide range of dates is due to differences in opinion in the genealogy of Viṣṇukuṇḍin kings. See Sankaranarayanan, “Two Viṣṇukuṇḍi Charters from Tummalagudem,” 4-20 (Set I); V.V. Mirashi, “New Light on Two Sets of Tummalagudem Plates of the Viṣṇukuṇḍins,” in *Indological Research Papers*, Vol. I (Nagpur: Vidarbha Samshodan Mandal, 1982), 121-141 (inscription II). I include it here because of several apparent Mahāyāna technical terms used to describe the donor (*utpāditamahābodhicitta*), the Āryasaṃgha recipient (*triyānayāyin*), and the Buddha (*aṣṭādaśāveṇikabuddhadharma*, *puṇyajñānasambhāra*, *anāvāraṇasakalajñeya*). Based on the “excessive use of the Buddhist technical terms,” Sankaranarayanan, “Two Viṣṇukuṇḍi Charters,” 8 suggests that the charter was actually written by the monks who resided in the monastery that benefited from the revenues of the villages given in the grant.

¹⁹² Mitra, “Lintels with the Figures of Eight Great Bodhisattvas and a Tathāgata,” 294-297 and plate 7. Although this piece most likely comes from northeastern India, Buddhapriya was from Kāñci, like several donors of the images in the Kurkihar collection (see n. 90 above).

donative inscription, were still given by Mahāyānists. Most importantly, I have not even touched on the hundreds and hundreds of uninscribed images that have been identified either as Mahāyāna figures or as having Mahāyāna content. I have tried to restrict myself to epigraphic matters in this chapter. With the exception of a few pieces at Ajañṭā, I have avoided what are often lengthy yet tenuous art-historical arguments regarding the identity of this or that image. And for now I certainly have no desire to enter beyond the fringes of the larger controversies about Indian Mahāyāna art,¹⁹³ chief among them the content of Gandhāran steles

¹⁹³ What exactly constitutes Mahāyāna art—to say nothing of art itself—is a vexed problem that can be approached from various angles. Generally art is classified by its content. If an image has iconographic features of, say, the bodhisattva Mañjuśrī, it is by definition a Mahāyāna image. But the problem can be looked at from the point of view of the donor too. If a donor of an image was affiliated with or, again, inspired by Mahāyāna in some way—as evidenced by epigraphic information—should the image be classified as Mahāyāna art? If so, then the many images of Śākyamuni Buddha that are inscribed with our *yad atra puṇyam* formula, a word for Mahāyāna, and so on would have to be deemed Mahāyānist. (Obviously, Śākyamuni as a Mahāyāna buddha is not a doctrinal problem.) Another critical but sometimes forgotten angle is the point of view of the audience. If a collective audience—or a single viewer?—gazes upon and ritually engages a piece of art with a Mahāyānist “eye of the beholder,” might we consider it to be Mahāyāna art? And would this have limits? Can an aniconic image of the Buddha made before Mahāyāna existed in India be Mahāyānist? How about a sculpture of a Jain Tīrthaṅkara or a Hindu god?

From whichever angle Mahāyāna as a potential category of Indian Buddhist art is approached, one would be wise to reflect on the questions posed and problems raised by Juhyung Rhi regarding the relationship (or lack thereof) between doctrine and imagery. Rhi’s questions and observations concern Gandhāran art, but they are equally valid for other geographic areas:

When someone who is barely aware of or perhaps cares little about what may be termed exclusively as Mahāyāna at a doctrinal level dedicates an image of a divinity that is monopolized in the Mahāyāna scriptural tradition, is he/she a Mahāyānist? Or is his/her dedication an example of Mahāyāna practice? Does the discussion of his/her activity have anything to do with that of doctrinal agenda that could have obsessed the minds of learned monastics in a limited circle?

... [A]rt serving a religion—although it would inevitably reflect the religion—tends to represent certain segments or aspects of religious ideas and practices better than others. Quite frequently some segment or aspect could be disproportionately magnified, while others could be entirely missing. Therefore, information deduced from artistic materials could have a limited significance, and extreme caution is necessary in linking it to that of the textual tradition. Most of the monuments and objects in Gandhāran art were related to devotional practice, and were quite conventional and stereotyped in form and iconography. There seems to have been little room in them for sophisticated doctrinal or philosophical ideas—such as to be found in the textual tradition—to be projected properly.

See Rhi, “Early Mahāyāna and Gandhāran Buddhism,” 154-155.

that depict a central Buddha surrounded by a host of figures,¹⁹⁴ as well as the identity of what are usually considered to be bodhisattva images, whether the latter are independent statues, flanking a Buddha image in triads, or carved in relief as part of the just-mentioned steles.¹⁹⁵

Wherever one positions himself in these controversies, there can be little doubt that some of these uninscribed pieces are Mahāyāna images, especially those from later periods of Indian Buddhist history.

When the epigraphic and art-historical data are combined, the trend is overwhelming. It is clear that Mahāyāna Buddhists in India, at least by the 5th century or thereabouts, were fully engaged in image cults. They were donating images, particularly Buddha images, in great numbers.¹⁹⁶

Curiously, this level of involvement in image cults is not what one might expect if he reads the Mahāyāna Sūtras discussed in chapter II that promote ascetic lifestyles. Most of these

¹⁹⁴ Just one of the Gandhāran steles, from Muhammed Nari in present-day Pakistan, has been interpreted as Śākyamuni's miracle at Śrāvastī, Śākyamuni surrounded by various bodhisattvas (and possibly about to preach a Mahāyāna Sūtra), Amitābha in Sukhāvātī, Akṣobhya in Abhirati, and an iconographically nondescript buddha in a generic buddha-field. For a recent summary of the scholarship on this stele, see Paul Harrison and Christian Luczanits, "New Light on (and from) the Muhammad Nari Stele," in *2011 nendo dai ikkai kokusai shinpojiumu puroshidingusu: Jōdokyō ni kansuru tokubetsu kokusai shinpojiumu* (BARC International Symposium Series 1: Special International Symposium on Pure Land Buddhism) (Kyoto: Ryukoku University Research Center for Buddhist Cultures in Asia, 2012), esp. 71-73. And for a classification scheme of the Muhammad Nari and other steles, see *ibid.*, 88ff.

¹⁹⁵ The most meticulous work on early Mahāyāna bodhisattva images, though restricted to Gandhāra, is Juhung Rhi, "Bodhisattvas in Gandhāran Art: An Aspect of Mahāyāna in Gandhāran Buddhism," in *Gandhāran Buddhism: Archaeology, Art, Texts*, ed. Pia Brancaccio and Kurt Behrendt (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2006), 151-182. While Rhi offers a careful typology of certain (non-Buddha) Gandhāran figures, he still assumes that all of those figures are bodhisattvas. On the all-but-ignored possibility, based largely on parallels from Greco-Roman art history, that they instead represent regal or other well-to-do *human* patrons of Buddhism, see Benjamin Rowland, "Bodhisattvas or Deified Kings: A Note on Gandhara Sculpture," *Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America* 15 (1961): 6-12. And for a refreshingly skeptical take on the early art-historical material of North India, see Morrissey, "Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy," 15-50.

¹⁹⁶ This has already been noticed by Morrissey, "Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy," 170ff.

texts never mention images at all. One that does, the *Maitreyasimhanāda-sūtra*, is highly critical of monks who are involved in the image cult. Another, the *Pratyutpannabuddhasaṃmukhāvasthitasamādhi-sūtra*, refers to the making of images, but evidently to facilitate entering into the *samādhi* for which the text was written, not to worship them, earn merit, or anything else that we normally associate with image cults. Other, less ascetically inclined Sūtras that also appear to come from early strata of Mahāyāna texts barely mention images either, and the scant references to images that can be found in them might be later additions or, in the case of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*, even Chinese interpolations.¹⁹⁷ All of this, in tandem with similar attitudes toward the stūpa cult in early Mahāyāna Sūtras, led Gregory Schopen to conclude the following:

[Early] Mahāyāna *sūtra* literature had no impact on these external cult forms because its authors were simply not interested in them. They . . . were interested in something else, and this would seem to be an obvious consequence of what everyone seems to agree was their major innovation: they were not interested in worshipping Buddhas; they were interested in becoming Buddhas. They were willing to admit that worshipping Buddhas as relics or images was meritorious, but they consistently asserted that it was far, far more meritorious to, in one of their favorite expressions, “obtain patient acceptance in the face of unfathomable *dharmas*.” They took up the metaphor of the cult because that was apparently the most highly regarded activity of their day, but only, it seems, to subvert it, only, it seems, to turn religious energies away from worship and toward—or back toward (?)—understanding what they thought the Dharma or Teaching was and what it entailed.¹⁹⁸

There are actually at least a few Mahāyāna Sūtras open to these cult practices beyond their use in mere literary metaphors. With regard to the image cult specifically, Rhi notes that

¹⁹⁷ On images and the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* specifically, see Lewis Lancaster, “An Early Mahayana Sermon about the Body of the Buddha and the Making of Images,” *Artibus Asiae* 36.4 (1974): 289.

¹⁹⁸ Schopen, “On Sending the Monks Back to Their Books,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 108-153 (quote taken from p. 138). Schopen’s “obtain patient acceptance in the face of unfathomable *dharmas*” is a translation of Tib. *chos zab mo rnams la bzod pa thob pa* (Skt. *gambhīra-dharmakṣānti* plus a form of *prati√labh*). See *ibid.*, 125 and Mvy. 843. I would render *zab mo* (Skt. *gambhīra*) as “profound” instead of “unfathomable,” reserving the latter for Skt. *anupalambha* in the parallel expression *anupalambhadharmakṣānti*.

the *Sumatidārikāpariṣcchā-*, *Vimaladattāpariṣcchā-*, and *Bhadrakalpika-sūtras* encourage bodhisattvas to make images of the Buddha seated on a lotus, and that the *Sumatidārikā-pariṣcchā-* and *Vimaladattāpariṣcchā-sūtras* also promote making offerings to the Buddha in the form of an image or stūpa. Like the *Pratyutpannabuddhasaṃmukhāvasthitasamādhi-sūtra*, the reward for making images in the *Bhadrakalpika-sūtra* is the attainment of a *samādhi*. For the *Sumatidārikāpariṣcchā-* and *Vimaladattāpariṣcchā-sūtras*, on the other hand, the reward is a miraculous birth (*upapāduka*).¹⁹⁹ Harrison and Luczanits translate a relevant passage from the *Sumatidārikāpariṣcchā-sūtra* in the following way:

With four things, young lady, a bodhisattva is reborn miraculously from a great jewel lotus in the presence of the Buddhas and Blessed Ones. What are the four? They are filling one's hands with powder or blue lilies (*utpala*) or lotuses (*padma*) or night lilies (*kumuda*) or white lotuses (*puṇḍarīka*) and offering them to the image of a Realized One (tathāgata) or to the stūpa of a Realized One; having no malice towards others; commissioning an image of a Realized One seated on a lotus throne; being firmly convinced about the awakening of the Buddha. With those four things, young lady, a bodhisattva is reborn miraculously from a great jewel lotus in the presence of the Buddhas and Blessed Ones.²⁰⁰

Other Mahāyāna Sūtras that seem to sanction the image cult include the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, *Bhaiṣajyaguruvaīḍūryaprabha*, *Buddhabalādhānaprātihāryavikurvāṇanirdeśa*,²⁰¹ and *Dānādhikaraṇa*,²⁰² and two non-Sūtra texts attributed to Nāgārjuna, the *Ratnāvalī* and

¹⁹⁹ Rhi, "Early Mahāyāna and Gandhāran Buddhism," 168-169.

²⁰⁰ Translated from Tib., Derge Kanjur, *dkon brtsegs*, Ca 217a6-b1) *mDo sde*, Za 103b5-106b5). See Harrison and Luczanits, "New Light on (and from) the Muhammad Nari Stele," 116-117.

²⁰¹ Schopen, "On Sending the Monks Back to Their Books," 119 and notes. See also Paul Demiéville, *Hôbôgirin: Dictionnaire encyclopédique du bouddhisme d'après les sources chinoises et japonaises*, Fasc. 3, s.v. "Butsuzō" (Tokyo : Maison franco-japonaise, 1937); Erik Zürcher, "Buddhist Art in Medieval China: The Ecclesiastical View," in *Function and Meaning in Buddhist Art: Proceedings of a Seminar Held at Leiden University 21-24 October 1991*, ed. Karel R. van Kooij and H. van der Veere (Groningen: Egbert Forst, 1995), 1-20 (both cited at Schopen, "On Sending the Monks Back to Their Books," 119-120).

²⁰² See Ware, "Studies in the Divyāvadāna," 47 (nos. 27-29).

Bodhisambhāra-śāstra, also promote making images of the Buddha on a lotus seat.²⁰³ But by the standards of Mahāyāna literature, none of these texts would appear to be early. The *Sumatidārikāpariṣcchā-*, *Vimaladattā-pariṣcchā-*, and *Bhadrakalpika-sūtras* were not first translated into Chinese by Dharmarakṣa until the late 3rd century CE and were probably not composed much earlier than that.²⁰⁴ And the other texts mentioned here were in all likelihood written around the same time or later, if not much later.²⁰⁵

If these texts, though certainly a small proportion of the total corpus of Mahāyāna literature, accurately reflect overall Mahāyāna attitudes in India, then the willingness on the part of Mahāyāna Buddhists to participate in the image cult—a cult of making and ritually interacting with images that was started by their Mainstream brethren—increased gradually, probably over several centuries. From the 5th century onwards, when we find almost all of the donative inscriptions listed in Tables 1 and 2, Indian Mahāyānists on the whole almost certainly were not just willing to participate in the image cult, but had come to embrace it

²⁰³ On the passage in the *Ratnāvalī*, see Walser, *Nāgārjuna in Context*, 79-87. On the *Bodhisambhāra-śāstra*, whose attribution to Nāgārjuna, by the way, is not without doubt, see Rhi, “Early Mahāyāna and Gandhāran Buddhism,” 170.

²⁰⁴ The only “hard” evidence for any of these texts suggests the same. Radiocarbon testing of the Gāndhārī fragments of the *Bhadrakalpika-sūtra* found at Bamiyan gave a range of 210–417 CE with a very high statistical probability. See Mark Allon et al., “Radiocarbon dating of Kharoṣṭhī Fragments from the Schøyen and Senior Manuscript Collections,” in *Buddhist Manuscripts*, Vol. 3, ed. Jens Braarvig (Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection 12) (Oslo: Hermes Publishing, 2006), 289-290.

²⁰⁵ Again see Schopen, “On Sending the Monks Back to Their Books,” 119. On the date of the *Dānādāhikaraṇa-sūtra*, see the introductory material in chapter III above. For a very late and possibly Chinese apocryphal Mahāyāna text on bathing Buddha images, see Boucher, “Sūtra on the Merit of Bathing the Buddha,” in *Buddhism in Practice*, 59-68. Unfortunately I know very little about another text on images, the **Tathāgatapratibimbapratīṣṭhānūsaṃsā-sūtra* (T. 694), other than the fact that it recounts the legend of King Udayana’s first Buddha image and, from the straightforward title, enumerates the benefits of making images of the Tathāgata. According to Sharf, the Mahāyāna version of this text was based on two earlier non-Mahāyāna texts (T. 692 and 693) and was not translated (if there was in fact an Indian original) into Chinese until the late 7th century. See Robert Sharf, “The Scripture on the Production of Buddha Images,” in *Religions of China in Practice*, ed. Donald S. Lopez, Jr. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 261-267.

completely. And if Schopen is right that early Mahāyānists “were not interested in worshipping Buddhas” but rather “were interested in becoming Buddhas,” then Mahāyāna in India looks to have undergone another sea change. For the many images inscribed with the *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula suggest that Mahāyānists were interested in worshipping buddhas and becoming buddhas. By donating images they were making a cult object available for worship, if not for themselves then for other Buddhists, and by inscribing them with the *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula they were expressing the wish that the worshippers—nay, all beings—would achieve *anuttarajñāna*, “unsurpassed knowledge.” By donating images they were hoping that all beings would be able to realize the exalted level of knowledge concomitant with awakening, the quintessential Mahāyāna soteriological goal.

The textual, epigraphic, and art-historical data seem to be in basic agreement about the history of Mahāyāna image donation in India. Most early Mahāyāna texts say nothing about images, and some that do are hesitant about, if not downright hostile toward, the image cult. When these texts were composed, there is almost no epigraphic evidence for the donation of images by Mahāyāna Buddhists, and there is also little evidence—and very little reliable evidence—for Mahāyāna imagery. Later on, however, we begin to find texts—I have mentioned eleven but there are perhaps more—that promote having images made and making offerings to them for various rewards, and eventually Mahāyāna was to make an indelible mark on the epigraphic and art-historical records of India.

I would like to return to where this chapter began: the value of epigraphic sources, especially in comparison to that of texts. Jan Nattier makes some key remarks defending the

importance of textual sources in her book on the *Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra*. She astutely points out that the production and reproduction of texts, and the dissemination of the ideals present in those texts, are in themselves forms of practice, ones to which certain Buddhists in India devoted a great deal of time, thought, and resources. In so doing, she also calls into question the usefulness of epigraphic sources because of, in her words, the “monotony” of their contents. In particular, she challenges some of the assertions made by Gregory Schopen:

Though Schopen has argued that inscriptions and not canonical texts reveal the true sentiments of actual Buddhists, it seems important to point out that the surviving dedicatory inscriptions on which he bases his argument are remarkably limited in both content and form. The fact that such a large body of material is so utterly formulaic suggests that we should perhaps view it not as a reflection of actual Buddhists’ beliefs and practices, but rather as a record of what they thought is acceptable—or perhaps even obligatory—to carve.²⁰⁶

There is no doubt that inscriptions are formulaic. As such, they seem to involve a narrow band of what may have been an array of religious ideas and practices. Rather than dismissing them for their lack of variety, however, I would argue that inscriptions are an indispensable source for precisely this reason. The fact that they tend to express the same or similar things over and over again suggests that the beliefs, feelings, and aspirations they record were widely shared in religious communities and considered important to those who held them. With the *yad atra puṇyam* formula, what we appear to have is the repetition of a or *the* critical religious goal held by a network of Mahāyāna Buddhists in India. Mahāyāna inscriptions, that is, have something to tell us *because* of their formulaic nature, not in spite of it. One might apply the same principle to texts. (As I hope is clear from chapter II above, Nattier surely exaggerates when

²⁰⁶ Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 103-105 (quote taken from p. 104, n. 3). Nattier is referring to Schopen, “Archaeology and Protestant Presuppositions,” in *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks*, 1-22.

she says that Mahāyāna Sūtras are “notable for their variety.”²⁰⁷) For example, the repetitive and stereotyped language used to describe the machinations of karma in Indian Buddhist texts would seem to indicate what Indian Buddhists actually believed (and, correspondingly, what they thought was “acceptable” to write or recite), a widespread belief that no doubt affected behavior outside of the texts. Repetition in texts, as in inscriptions, would appear to point to something crucial. At the very least, it does not seem like variety in texts or inscriptions is a good litmus test for an authentic belief or practice.

It may be fruitful to reflect on Nattier’s suggestion that epigraphic formulas were considered “obligatory” to inscribe, though not for the reason she intended. Epigraphic formulas may have been the written analogs to ritual speech. Like spoken utterances (or performative “speech acts”²⁰⁸) that are believed to be required to bring about the intended results of rituals, perhaps written words were thought necessary to effect the goals of inscriptions. An inscription, in this view, is not unlike the *praṇidhāna* or “oath” of Buddhist texts or the *saṃkalpa* or “declaration of purpose” of Brahmanical rituals.²⁰⁹ If this is true, there is a very good reason for epigraphic formulas: written words were believed to carry

²⁰⁷ *A Few Good Men*, 104.

²⁰⁸ There is extensive literature on the so-called speech act. See especially the discussion on the illocutionary act of the promise in John R. Searle, *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 54ff.

²⁰⁹ Michaels describes the *saṃkalpa* as an utterance that intentionally marks off the sacred space, time, and actor of a Brahmanical ritual. Without it, the ritual is merely a mundane sequence of actions that will not produce the desired effect: “It seems, then, that everyday behaviour has to be intentionally directed towards religious aims in order to be ritually acceptable. Unknowingly, unconsciously and unwillingly performed rituals have no religious result (*phala*, *punya*).” Besides the declaration of the religious goal, donative inscriptions and *saṃkalpas* share other features: Both often state genealogical and other information about the religious actor and the time of the religious deed. See Alex Michaels, “*Saṃkalpa*: The Beginnings of a Ritual,” in *Words and Deeds: Hindu and Buddhist Rituals in South Asia*, ed. Jörg Gengnagel, Ute Hüsken, and Srilata Raman (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2005), 45-63 (quote taken from p. 49).

supernatural potency, so there were disastrous consequences to getting them wrong. The eminent Indian epigraphist Sten Konow clearly saw this in the material he knew so well, proposing that inscriptions “were more or less considered as a kind of charm.”²¹⁰ For some Mahāyānists in India, perhaps the *yad atra puṇyaṃ* was a “kind of charm”—it was not the mental dedication of one’s gift that was thought to lead all beings to “unsurpassed knowledge,” but the words of the *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula themselves. Perhaps it was not or not just the idea contained in the formula that mattered, but the very act of inscribing the idea into or onto what was for all intents and purposes a permanent surface.

There are very real and frustrating limits to what the epigraphic material, especially the Mahāyāna epigraphic material, can tell us. However, the limits have little to do with what the words of the inscriptions say and everything to do with what the inscriptions were written on. The reader will recall from chapter III that the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* enumerates a wide range of objects that should be given by a bodhisattva. Those objects are, more or less in the order that the text introduces them, as follows: food, drinks, vehicles (including wagons, palanquins, horses, elephants, and even shoes), clothing, various precious ornaments, lamps, music, perfume, aromatic powder, ointment, flowers and flower garlands, culinary delicacies, residences, palatial mansions, beds and pillows, chairs, mats, benches, household articles, medicine, slaves and workers, gardens, ascetic groves, monasteries, family members, wealth, treasure, grain, supplies, one’s kingdom, the four continents, the crest jewel and crown, virtually every part of one’s body (beginning with the feet and ending with bone marrow), fine

²¹⁰ Konow, *Kharoshthī Inscriptions with the Exception of Those of Aśoka* (Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. II, Pt. I) (Calcutta: Government of India Central Publication Branch, 1929), cxviii. At *ibid.*, 93, he says much the same thing with regard to the inscriptions on the images recovered from the Jauliān monastic site: “[T]he aim of the votive inscriptions was not, perhaps, that they should be read and understood, but to ensure religious merit through the mystic power of the aksharas. Only very few of those who saw the images were able to read the inscriptions.”

scents, bells, the Dharma, and even the actions of praise and sweeping. Similar items that are to be given show up in other Mahāyāna Sūtras, though almost never in such an exhaustive list of objects as is found in the *Dānapāramitā*. The reader will have noticed, moreover, that the *Dānapāṭala* of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* also discusses the bodhisattva's giving many things, along with myriads of stipulations defining the conditions under which his gifts may be given. (Interestingly, neither the *Dānapāramitā* nor the *Dānapāṭala* says anything about donating images or stūpas. The gift of images in Mahāyāna texts has already been commented on. Mention of stūpas as gifts in Mahāyāna Sūtras does not seem to be infrequent, though I have not surveyed the literature systematically with regard to this issue.) The items in the *Dānapāṭala* include, also in the approximate order that they appear in the text, the following: various body parts, poison, fire, weapons, liquor, elephants, horses, wagons, and other vehicles, clothing, ornaments, food, drinks, training and equipment for dancing, singing, and instrumental music, flower garlands, ointment, housewares, gardens, houses, women (for sexual intercourse), training in assorted subjects of arts and craftwork, villages, cities, smaller pieces of land, family members, slaves and workers, lamps, precious ornaments, the Dharma (in oral and written form), security (from harmful things), wealth, grain, perfume, ointment, and lighting.

Some of these objects are theoretical and we can assume that they were seldom given in India, if at all. The statements about giving away the kingdom, the four continents, and the crest jewel and crown in the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* are part of a larger Buddhist discourse on the ideal king,²¹¹ not descriptions of real gifts. Similarly, the teachings on surrendering the body in

²¹¹ See Peter Khoroché, *Once the Buddha Was a Monkey: Ārya Śūra's Jātakamālā* (1989; repr., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), xviii.; Ohnuma, *Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood*, 242-249.

both texts are primarily meant to highlight the extreme generosity of a bodhisattva, thereby casting him in the mold of *the* Bodhisattva, Śākyamuni, who is said to have sacrificed himself in many of his previous lives.²¹² Most of the objects mentioned in these texts, though, are practical, physical items or other common things that must have been given away with some regularity. We can easily imagine Mahāyāna Buddhists in India giving many of them away with intentions that were colored by a Mahāyāna view of the world. Unfortunately, though, we can do little more than imagine.

Aside from many images in Table 2, there are probably eight grants of land and six monasteries, two temples, two caves, a couple references to texts as gifts, possibly two shrines, and a single stūpa, a perfume chamber, a vessel for relics, a lamp, a gateway, and a few other minor items. That is all. Barely any of the objects in two major Mahāyāna works on giving, one a Sūtra and the other a chapter from a Śāstra, show up in the Mahāyāna epigraphic record as gifts. So while Mahāyāna inscriptions provide a record of giving in practice, that record does not come close to telling us everything we want to know about giving. Maria Heim, in one of her many incisive observations, underscores the limits of epigraphy in understanding gift giving:

Inscriptions are public expressions of a particular sort. They record significant gifts to temples and institutions rather than face-to-face generosity of every day gifts between persons. Donors generally did not hire scribes and artisans to record in stone their placing a bit of food in the alms bowl of a traveling monk who dropped by that morning.²¹³

Heim's caveat very much applies to the Mahāyāna epigraphic record. In general only "big" gifts were deemed worthy to inscribe. For other kinds of objects, we are forced to turn to

²¹² Physical self-sacrifice may have occurred to a limited degree in India. See n. 88 in chapter II.

²¹³ Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia*, 30.

normative, theoretical texts like the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* or *Dānapaṭala* and make assumptions or guesses about the other things that might have changed hands. We know almost nothing about “face-to-face generosity,” about the mundane interactions between Mahāyāna donors and recipients. It is not even possible to surmise whether such interactions—“placing a bit of food in the alms bowl of a traveling monk,” for example—were a common occurrence. The only information we can glean from Mahāyāna inscriptions about the acquisition of daily requisites such as food, medicine, or materials needed for worship comes from land grants to monasteries. But here it is the land or village, not the requisites themselves, that comprises the actual gift; the granted land merely provides monks with a source of revenue to pay for their ongoing needs.

The tendency for inscriptions to document “big” gifts points to another problem. Not surprisingly, Heim has struck on this as well: “[W]hile inscriptions record many different types of donors—religious men and women, merchants, traders, local chiefs and village headmen, soldiers, ministers, kings, queens, and different kinds of brahmans—they are still depicting the prestige and aspirations of those who can afford to give and record noteworthy gifts.”²¹⁴ Almost all the gifts in Table 2 would have been quite expensive. For the images, generally a donor would have had to pay for an artisan to make one and for a scribe to write the inscription, and for free-standing images, the donor would have also had to pay for the precious materials out of which Indian images were wrought. Schopen, in a conclusion with which I very much agree but which Nattier clearly does not like, avers that Buddhist texts record only “what a small, atypical part of the Buddhist community wanted that community to

²¹⁴ Ibid.

believe or practice.”²¹⁵ But most Buddhist inscriptions in India, too, hardly seem to record the activities of a typical part of the community. While textual sources privilege the views of educated male monks, donative inscriptions usually privilege the activities of well-off patrons. Whether we examine the texts or the inscriptions or both, the “poor man’s” religious gift, if that were indeed a real thing, is forever lost to us.

I began this chapter with what I felt was a necessary apology for the use of epigraphic sources—necessary because inscriptions continue to play too small a role in the study of gift giving, necessary because I believe that Indian Buddhist Studies is still in thrall of textual sources. But I will have to finish it, I am afraid, by rolling back that apology just a little bit. Inscriptions *do* provide a view into the real behaviors of foregone donors and the real beliefs motivating their gifts. But only certain kinds of donors, and only certain kinds of gifts. The view inscriptions afford is not panoramic, and in the end they leave us with only part of the picture of Mahāyāna Buddhist giving in practice.

²¹⁵ “Archaeology and Protestant Presuppositions,” in *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks*, 1.

VI: A Long View of Indian Mahāyāna History

The Indian Mahāyāna position on gift giving resists a neat summary. In reality, there is no single Mahāyāna position on gift giving—what one will find is very much a function of the sources she chooses to examine. With regard to the Sūtra literature, I was able to identify twelve patterns related to gift giving because Mahāyāna Sūtras share so much material and draw from the same stock formulas and tropes. At the same time, those twelve patterns cannot all be found in a single Mahāyāna Sūtra. Certain ideas about the gift may not have circulated at the time and place when particular Sūtras were composed and redacted. Moreover, each Mahāyāna Sūtra that addresses some aspect of gift exchange has a specific agenda that its gift theory or theories invariably reflect. Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras interpret the widespread practice of gift giving through the lens of emptiness and related ideas. Mahāyāna Sūtras with reformative agendas criticize profligate and greedy monks while promoting the ascetic lifestyle of the proper bodhisattva, in large part to elevate the Mahāyāna practitioner as a superior field of merit for gifts. And the *Dānapāramitā-sūtra* has its own set of interests—not emptiness or reform, but effecting certain karmic consequences by means of the gift and within the context of the bodhisattva’s vow, most notably the realization of awakening and the simultaneous attainment of the awakened body.

The *Dānapāṭala*, on the other hand, is a Śāstric text with Śāstric concerns. We can see in it the impulse of Indian intellectual traditions to organize and analyze. It breaks the gift down into type and subtype. It examines gift-giving contingencies—possible objects that could be given, potential recipients that could be encountered, various donative situations that could arise—and explains for each the proper course of action of the bodhisattva-cum-donor. It also provides a guide to how the bodhisattva should mentally approach external contingencies of

gift exchange so that he can purify his intentions. All the while, the *Dānapaṭala* reveals a keen awareness of Indian, especially Dharmasāstric, custom and law, conforming to certain norms while flouting others.

Then there are the Mahāyāna donative inscriptions. Many of the inscriptions state that the goal of the gift is to bring about *anuttarajñāna* for all beings, which would appear to be the knowledge possessed by awakened beings, if it is not simply a synonym for awakening. Apart from this emphasis on awakening, we see very little of Mahāyāna textual gift theory in the epigraphic evidence. Since Mahāyāna inscriptions tend to be formulaic—indeed, that is how I have identified many of them—it may be that with the epigraphic data we do not have access to all the ways that Mahāyāna gift theories informed donative practice (or vice versa). But we must also consider the possibility that giving in theory and giving in practice are fundamentally different things, not necessarily because they are at odds, but because Mahāyāna textual theory was unavailable, inaccessible, or otherwise irrelevant to practicing donors. But this is speculative. With the evidence at hand, it is not possible to resolve the thorny issue of the relationship between giving in theory and giving in practice. We can, however, conclude with near certainty that the inscriptions demonstrate Mahāyāna participation in the image cult, as the majority of the inscriptions record the gift of images, especially Buddha images. Presumably, the images placed in open locations were made available for viewing, ritual interaction, and/or worship. But donating images is not a major concern in Mahāyāna texts. Conversely, very few of the objects that are mentioned in Mahāyāna texts as gifts show up in the epigraphic record.

I would like to finish by suggesting that the merit in this dissertation lies as much in the periods of Mahāyāna history under scrutiny as any insights it might offer about the theory and practice of Mahāyāna gift giving. The Mahāyāna Sūtras considered in chapter II were composed and redacted beginning around the turn of the Common Era and for several centuries thereafter. The *Dānapāramitā-sūtra*, the subject of chapter III, seems to be a relatively late Mahāyāna text. I date it to the 5th or 6th century. The *Dānapaṭala* of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, the subject of chapter IV, appears to have been completed by the 4th century. And the inscriptions covered in chapter V almost all come from the 5th to 13th centuries. The evidence used in this dissertation, then, more or less spans the entire history of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India. This is not normal in Mahāyāna studies.

In a recent paper on Mahāyāna in early Gandhāra, particularly its textual history, Mark Allon and Richard Salomon are certainly correct in saying that the origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism “has been a preoccupation, if not an obsession, of academic Buddhist studies for several decades now.”¹ Within the last thirty or forty years, in fact, there have been dozens of discussions on the topic: on early Mahāyāna Sūtras, Paul Harrison, Gregory Schopen, Jan Nattier, Daniel Boucher, Jonathan Silk, Ingo Strauch, and others; on inscriptions, Schopen and Salomon; on visual evidence, Juhyung Rhi; on origins specifically, many of the above, but also Tilmann Vetter, Heinz Bechert, Reginald Ray, Richard Gombrich, Shizuka Sasaki, Noritoshi Aramaki, and Johannes Bronkhorst; with review discussions, Joseph Walser, David Ruegg,

¹ Allon and Salomon, “New Evidence for Mahayana in Early Gandhāra,” 1.

Masahiro Shimoda, Sasaki, and David Drewes.² I have left some names off the list, but the idea, I think, is clear.

As far as I can tell, every recent scholar who has written on Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism has contributed publications on its earliest stages, if not its very origins. For some of these scholars, early Mahāyāna Buddhism is the sole focus of their studies, and if they work on anything else, it is not related to Mahāyāna studies at all. As the field stands today, virtually everything written on Indian Mahāyāna deals with early Mahāyāna and its hazy and diffuse beginnings, its position within or relative to Mainstream Buddhism. Shimoda's 2009 article entitled "The State of Research on Mahāyāna Buddhism," in my opinion the best overview of Mahāyāna scholarship, is particularly telling. Despite this paper's summary of and its contribution to problematizing research about Mahāyāna origins, nowhere really does it go beyond what can be learned from early Mahāyāna literature.³ The reason for this is simple: It is a review article and there is very little work to review in the field that is not about early Mahāyāna and its early texts. In short, it is fairly safe to assume that any publication on Indian Mahāyāna deals with *early* Mahāyāna.

I do not want to suggest that the beginnings of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India are unworthy of study. I would not want to be so jaded as to undermine the curiosity about what is admittedly a fascinating topic. Indeed, the scholars I just listed have advanced Mahāyāna studies immensely. But there are at least two major problems that come with such a narrow focus on early Indian Mahāyāna. First, it leaves the bulk of Mahāyāna history unexplored, as if

² Most of these works have been cited already. I refer the reader to the bibliography for references. I will add that Joseph Walser has informed me that he has an upcoming book on Mahāyāna origins.

³ Masahiro Shimoda, "The State of Research on Mahāyāna Buddhism: The Mahāyāna as Seen in Developments in the Study of Mahāyāna Sūtras," *Acta Asiatica* 96 (2009): 1-23.

a thorough investigation of its earliest stages would reveal everything one might want to know about the sum total of Mahāyāna developments in India. Depending on where one would demarcate the end of Mahāyāna's early period, this would mean ignoring 500 to 1,000 years of its history, leaving aside the period after the first few centuries of the Common Era up to the near-complete disappearance of Indian Buddhism around the year 1300 or so. Second, early Mahāyāna did not leave much of a footprint in India outside the creation of a large body of Sūtra literature. This is true regardless of how one feels about the controversial identification of some artistic works as Mahāyāna pieces, such as certain Gandhāran steles and what are usually assumed to be bodhisattva images.⁴ Given the muted status of early Mahāyāna, one might think it reasonable to expect the publication numbers to be slanted toward later periods in Mahāyāna history, to periods when we can securely identify Mahāyāna images, take stock of Mahāyāna donations, and contemplate the significant influence of Mahāyāna ideas outside of literary circles. Taking this further, one might even think it reasonable if the publication record were essentially the reverse of what I described earlier, with almost all the attention going to a chronologically late, materially relevant, fully developed, and even institutionalized Mahāyāna.

It is probably overweening to demand that Mahāyāna studies reverse course. But it is certainly an understatement to claim that scholarship on Indian Mahāyāna is in dire need of balance, both in the historical periods studied and the types of evidence used. I will leave off with just one example of how broadening our perspective could lead to changes in how Indian Mahāyāna is characterized. It has become generally accepted that differentiating between the Nikāyas and Mahāyāna is a mistake, since the Nikāyas were ordination lineages that included

⁴ See nn. 193-195 of chapter V.

both Mahāyānists and Mainstream Buddhists. Thus we can speak of Sarvāstivādin Mahāyānists, Mahāsāṃghika Mahāyānists, and the like.⁵ However, this should not obscure the possibility that Mahāyāna groups might eventually have separated themselves almost entirely from their Mainstream cousins, regardless of whether the former were still ordained under particular Vinayas. We have known for a long time from the testimony of Faxian and Xuanzang that at least by ca. 400 there were Buddhist monasteries in India that housed only Mahāyānists.⁶ This alone suggests some level of Mahāyāna independence. It seems to me that Mahāyānists' living in spaces solely with their like-minded brethren could psychologically trump any sense of affiliation with non-Mahāyāna Buddhists with whom they shared the same Vinaya lineage.

The epigraphic record, moreover, points in the same direction. We have two early 6th century inscriptions recording land grants to a Mahāyāna—and the term is used explicitly—community of monks, one from Bengal and the other from Orissa. The inscription from Bengal records a gift of land “for the acceptance of a Mahāyānist, irreversible community of monks” (*mahāyānik'vaivarttikabhikṣusaghanām parigrahe*) and also refers to a monastery with the *āśrama* of Avalokiteśvara (*āryyāvalokiteśvarāśramavihāre*).⁷ The inscription from Orissa appears to record an “offering to a Mahāyānist community of monks” (*mahāy[ānīkebhyo] bhikṣusamghāya pratipāditaḥ*) and refer to a monastery that was “inhabited” by Avalokiteśvara

⁵ See the references cited in n. 6 of chapter II.

⁶ See Étienne Lamotte, “Sur la Formation du Mahāyāna,” in *Asiatica, Festschrift Friedrich Weller zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern*, hrsg. Johannes Schubert and Ulrich Schneider (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1954), 392ff.

⁷ Bhattacharyya, D.C. “A newly discovered Copperplate from Tippera [The Gunaighar Grant of Vainyagupta: The Year 188 Current (Gupta Era).” *Indian Historical Quarterly* 6 (1930): 45-60 (= Tsukamoto, Guṇāighar 1).

(*māhātmyātīśayabhagavadāryyāvalokiteśvarāddhyāsita . . . [vi]hāre*).⁸ There also might be a land grant made for a Mahāyāna community from Valabhī, Gujarat dating to the mid-7th century. According to Bhandarkar, the inscription grants part of a village to “the assembly of the reverend mendicant priests of the Mahāyāna (school) coming from the four quarters to the monastery constructed by Divira-pati Skandabhaṭa.” However, Bhandarkar does not provide any kind of reproduction of the copperplate on which the inscription was engraved or even a transliteration of the inscription, so his translation cannot be verified.⁹ In addition, an inscription dating to the early 8th century, from the Chittagong area of present-day Bangladesh, mentions a “field of a Mahāyāna monastery” (*mahāyānavihāraḥṣetra*) as the eastern boundary of a plot of land that was changing hands.¹⁰ Here we have three and possibly four Mahāyāna monasteries described in inscriptions. Each inscription mentions Mahāyāna in the context of a land charter, which is of no small importance. Epigraphic land charters were legal documents granting ownership to the recipients, meaning that Mahāyānists actually owned the monasteries and/or land specified in these inscriptions. Which raises the question: What would be the point of a donor’s singling out a Mahāyāna group as the recipient of his gift (or as owning land bordering his gift) if the category “Mahāyāna” were not meaningful and legally binding? Perhaps this would not constitute a formally separate Mahāyāna “sect,” but it

⁸ P.R. Srinivasan, “Jayarampur Plate of Gopachandra,” *Epigraphia Indica* 39.5 (1972): 141-148 (not in Tsukamoto). The inscriptions from Bengal and Orissa are discussed in detail in Morrissey, “Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy,” 74ff.

⁹ R.G. Bhandarkar, “On Two Copperplates from Valabhī,” *Indian Antiquary* 1 (1872): 45-46 (= Tsukamoto, *Walā* 20). See Morrissey, “Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy,” 72-74.

¹⁰ Gouriswar Bhattacharya, “A preliminary report on the inscribed metal vase from the National Museum of Bangladesh,” in *Explorations in Art and Archaeology of South Asia: Essays Dedicated to N.G. Majumdar*, ed. Debala Mitra (Calcutta: Directorate of Archaeology and Museums, Government of West Bengal, 1996), 241 and 244, line 16 (not in Tsukamoto).

demands that we reconsider exactly what we mean when we talk about religious independence.

But such reconsideration of Mahāyāna is made possible only by widening our gaze. It is imperative that we look at Mahāyāna literature in concert with the Mahāyāna epigraphic and material records. Above all, it is imperative that we step back from our tunnel-vision into Mahāyāna origins in order to take in the whole scope of Mahāyāna history in India.

Bibliography

- Acharya, Kala. *Purāṇic Concept of Dāna*. Delhi: Naga Publishers, 1993.
- Agasse, Jean-Michel. “Le transfert de mérite dans Bouddhisme Pāli classique.” *Journal Asiatique* 266 (1978): 311-332.
- Ahn, Sung-Doo. *Die Lehre von den Kleśas in der Yogācārabhūmi*. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 55. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2003.
- Aiyangar, K.V. Rangaswami, ed. *Kṛtyakalpataru of Bhaṭṭa Lakṣmīdhara*. Vol. V: *Dānakāṇḍa*. Gaekwad’s Oriental Series 92. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1941.
- Allon, Mark, and Richard Salomon. “New Evidence for Mahayana in Early Gandhāra.” *Eastern Buddhist* 41.1 (2010): 1-22.
- Allon, Mark, Richard Salomon, Geraldine Jacobsen, and Ugo Zoppi. “Radiocarbon dating of Kharoṣṭhī Fragments from the Schøyen and Senior Manuscript Collections.” In *Buddhist Manuscripts*, Vol. 3, edited by Jens Braarvig, 279-291. Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection 12. Oslo: Hermes Publishing, 2006.
- Anālayo, Bhikkhu. “Saccaka’s Challenge — A Study of the *Samyukta-āgama* Parallel to the *Cūlasaccaka-sutta* in Relation to the Notion of Merit Transfer.” *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 23 (2010): 39-70.
- Apple, James. “The phrase ‘*dharmaparyāyo hastagato*’ in Mahāyāna Buddhist literature: re-thinking the cult of the book in middle period Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 134.1 (2014): 25-50.
- Aramaki Noritoshi. “Towards a New Working Hypothesis on the Origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism.” *Eastern Buddhist* 35.1-2 (2003): 203-218.
- Asher, Frederick M. *The Art of Eastern India, 300-800*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1980.
- Bagchi, Jhunu. *The History and Culture of the Pālas of Bengal and Bihar (Cir. 750 A.D.–Cir. 1200 A.D.)*. New Delhi : Abhinav Publications, 1993.
- Bailey, G.M. “Historical Construction from Indic Texts.” In *Facets of Indian Culture*, edited by P.C. Muraleemadhavan, 157-174. Delhi: New Bharatiya Book Corp., 2000.
- Balbir, Nalini. “The Micro-genre of *Dāna*-stories in Jaina Literature: Problems of Interrelation and Diffusion.” *Indologica Taurinensia* 11: 145–61.
- Bandhyopadhyay, Bimal. *Metal Sculptures of Eastern India*. Delhi: Sundeep Prakashan, 1981.

- Banerji, R.D. *The Pālas of Bengal*. 1915. Reprint, New Delhi: Bhartiya Publishing House, 1973.
- . “The Pratīhāra Occupation of Magadha.” *Indian Antiquary* 47 (1918): 109-111.
- . “Neulpur Grant of Subhakara: the 8th Year.” *Epigraphia Indica* 15 (1919–20): 1-8.
- Banerji-Sastri, A. “Ninety-Three Inscriptions on the Kurkihar Bronzes.” *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 26.3 (1940): 236-251.
- . “Kurkihar Bronze Inscriptions.” *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 26.4 (1940): 299-308.
- Bureau, André. “La nourriture offerte au Buddha lors de son dernier repas.” In *Mélanges d’Indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou*, 61-71. Publications de l’Institut de Civilisation Indienne 28. Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard, 1968.
- Baums, Stefan, and Andrew Glass. “Catalog of Gāndhārī Texts.” http://gandhari.org/a_inscriptions.php.
- Bechert, Heinz. “Notes on the Formation of Buddhist Sects and the Origins of Mahāyāna.” In *German Scholars on India: Contributions to Indian Studies*, edited by The Cultural Department of the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany, 6–18. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1973.
- Heinz Bechert, “Notes on the Formation of Buddhist Sects and the Origins of Mahāyāna,” in *German Scholars on India: Contributions to Indian Studies*, ed. Cultural Department of the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany, New Delhi (Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1973), 6-18
- . “Buddha-field and Transfer of Merit in a Theravāda Source.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 35 (1992): 95-108.
- Behrendt, Kurt A. *The Buddhist Architecture of Gandhāra*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Bendall, Cecil. *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge, with Introductory Notices and Illustrations of the Palaeography and Chronology of Nepal and Bengal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1883.
- , ed. *Çikshāsamuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhistic Teaching*. Bibliotheca Buddhica I. 1902. Reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1992.
- Bendall, Cecil, and Louis de La Vallée Poussin. “Bodhisattva-Bhūmi: A Textbook of the Yogācāra School, An English Summary with Notes and Illustrative Extracts from other Buddhistic Works.” *Le Muséon* 7 (1906): 213-230.

- Bendall, Cecil, and W.H.D. Rouse, trans. *Śikṣā-samuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhist Doctrine*. 1922. Reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1971.
- Benn, James A. *Burning for the Buddha: Self-Immolation in Chinese Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2007.
- Bhandarkar, R.G. "On Two Copperplates from Valabhi." *Indian Antiquary* 1 (1872): 45-46.
- Bhattacharyya, D.C. "A newly discovered Copperplate from Tippera [The Gunaighar Grant of Vainyagupta: The Year 188 Current (Gupta Era)]." *Indian Historical Quarterly* 6 (1930): 45-60.
- Bhattacharya, Gouriswar. "Notes on Three Inscribed Buddhist Sculptures." *Journal of Ancient Indian History* 15.1-2 (1985-1986): 194-211.
- . "Dāna-Deyadharmā: Donation in Early Buddhist Records (in Brāhmī)." In *Investigating Indian Art: Proceedings of a Symposium on the Development of Early Buddhist and Hindu Iconography held at the Museum of Indian Art Berlin May 1986*, edited by M. Yaldiz and W. Lobo, 39-60. Berlin: SMPK, 1987.
- . "An Inscribed Metal Vase Most Probably from Chittagong, Bangladesh." In *South Asian Archaeology 1991: Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference of the Association of South Asian Archaeologists in Western Europe, held in Berlin 1-5 July 1991*, edited by Adalbert J. Gail and Gerd J.R. Mevissen, 323-338. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1993.
- . "Donors of a few Tārā images from Magadha or South Bihar." In *Festschrift Dieter Schlingloff: zur Vollendung des 65. Lebensjahres dargebracht von Schülern, Freunden und Kollegen*, edited by Friedrich Wilhelm, 1-28. Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen, 1996.
- . "A preliminary report on the inscribed metal vase from the National Museum of Bangladesh." In *Explorations in Art and Archaeology of South Asia: Essays Dedicated to N.G. Majumdar*, edited by Debala Mitra, 237-247 and plates 16.1-10. Calcutta: Directorate of Archaeology and Museums, Government of West Bengal, 1996.
- Bhattachasali, N. K. *Iconography of Buddhist and Brahmanical Sculptures in the Dacca Museum*. Dacca: India Museum, 1929.
- Boucher, Daniel. "The *Pratītyasamutpādagāthā* and Its Role in the Medieval Cult of Relics." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 14.1 (1991): 1-27.
- . "Sūtra on the Merit of Bathing the Buddha." In *Buddhism in Practice*, edited by Donald S. Lopez, Jr., 59-68. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- . "Buddhist Translation Procedures in Third-Century China: A Study of Dharmarakṣa and his Translation Idiom." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1996.

- . “Gāndhārī and the Early Chinese Buddhist Translations Reconsidered: The Case of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 118.4 (1998): 471-506.
- . “The Textual History of the *Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā*: Notes on its Third-Century Chinese Translation.” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology for the Academic Year 2000*, 4 (2001): 93-115.
- , trans. *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna: A Study and Translation of the Rāṣṭrapālapariṣcchā-sūtra*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2008.
- . “What Do We Mean by ‘Early’ in the Study of Early Mahāyāna—and Should We Care?” *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 23 (2009): 33-41.
- . “Sacrifice and Asceticism in Early Mahāyāna Buddhism.” In *Religion and Identity in South Asia and Beyond: Essays in Honor of Patrick Olivelle*, edited by Steven E. Lindquist, 197-224. New York: Anthem Press, 2011.
- Braarvig, Jens, ed. and trans. *Akṣayamatiniṛdeśasūtra*. 2 volumes. Oslo: Solum Forlag, 1993.
- Braarvig, Jens, and Ulrich Pagel, eds. and trans. “Fragments of the Bodhisattvapiṭakasūtra.” In *Buddhist Manuscripts*, Vol. 3, edited by Jens Braarvig, 11-88. Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection 12. Oslo: Hermes Publishing, 2006.
- Brekke, Torkel. “Contradiction and the Merit of Giving in Indian Religions.” *Numen* 45.3 (1998): 287-320.
- Brick, David, ed. and trans. “The *Dānakāṇḍa* (‘Book on Gifting’) of the *Kṛtyakalpataru*: A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation.” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Texas, 2009.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes. “Reflections on the origins of Mahāyāna.” In *Séptimo Centenario de Los Estudios Orientales en Salamanca*, edited by José María Güell and Alberto J. Quevedo, 489-502. *Estudios filológicos* 337. Salamanca, Spain: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 2012.
- Brown, C. Mackenzie. *The Triumph of the Goddess: The Canonical Models and Theological Visions of the Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.
- Bühler, G. “A Grant of King Dhruvasena I of Valabhī.” *Indian Antiquary* 4 (1875): 104-107.
- . “Grants from Valabhī.” *Indian Antiquary* 5 (1876): 204-212.
- . “The New Inscription of Toramana Shaha.” *Epigraphia Indica* 1 (1892): 238-241.
- Burgess, James. *The Buddhist stupas of Amaravati and Jaggayyapeta in the Krishna District, Madras Presidency, surveyed in 1882*. Archaeological Survey of Southern India, Vol. 1. 1887. Reprint, Varanasi: Indological Book House, 1970.

- Chakravarti, N.P. "A Buddhist Inscription from Kara." *Epigraphia Indica* 22 (1933-34): 37-39.
- . "A Note on the Painted Inscriptions in Caves VI-XVII." Appendix to G. Yazdani, *Ajanta: The Colour and Monochrome Reproductions of the Ajanta Frescoes Based on Photography*, Part III, 85-96. London: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Chakravarti, Uma. "Of Dasas and Karmakaras: Servile Labour in Ancient India." In *Chains of Servitude: Bondage and Slavery in India*, edited by Utsa Patnaik and Manjari Dingwaney, 35-75. Madras: Sangam Books, 1985.
- Chun, Jang-Kil. "A study of the 'Dasabhumika-sutra': Its relation to previous Buddhist traditions and the development of *bodhisattva* practice." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1993.
- Coburn, Thomas B. *Devī-Māhātmya: The Crystallization of the Goddess Tradition*. Columbia, MO: South Asia Books, 1985.
- . *Encountering the Goddess: A Translation of the Devī-Māhātmya and a Study of Its Interpretation*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991.
- Cohen, Richard S. "Setting the Three Jewels: The Complex Culture of Buddhism at the Ajaṅṭā Caves." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1995.
- . "Discontented Categories: Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna in Indian Buddhist History." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 63.1 (1995): 1-25.
- . "Problems in the Writing of Ajaṅṭā's History: The Epigraphic Evidence." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 40 (1997): 125-148.
- . "Kinsmen of the Son: Śākyabhikṣus and the Institutionalization of the Bodhisattva Ideal." *History of Religions* 40.1 (2002): 1-31.
- . *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, Vol. 1, s.v. "India." New York: Macmillan Reference, 2004.
- . "Ajanta's inscriptions." Appendix to Walter M. Spink, *Ajanta: History and Development*, Vol. 2: *Arguments About Ajanta*, 273-339. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Conze, Edward, ed. and trans. *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā: Edited and Translated with an Introduction and Glossary*. Serie Orientale Roma XIII. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1957.
- , trans. *The perfection of wisdom in eight thousand lines & its verse summary*. 1973. Reprint, San Francisco: City Lights Books, 2006.

- , trans. *The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom, with the divisions of the Abhisamayālaṅkāra*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.
- Cousins, L.S. “Sākiyabhikkhu/Sakyabhikkhu/Śākyabhikṣu: A Mistaken Link to the Mahāyāna?” *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Saṃbhāṣā* 23 (2003): 1-26.
- Cowell, Edward B., and Robert A. Neil, eds. *The Divyāvadāna: A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends*. 1886. Reprint, Amsterdam: Oriental Press, 1970
- Crosby, Kate, and Andrew Skilton, trans. *Śāntideva: The Bodhicaryāvatāra*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Cunningham, Alexander. *Report for the Year 1871-72*. Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. III. Calcutta: Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing, 1873.
- . *Report of a Tour in Bihar and Bengal in 1879-1880 from Patna to Sunargaon*. Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. XV. 1882. Reprint, Varanasi: Indological Book House, 1969.
- Czuma, Stanislaw. “A Gupta Style Bronze Buddha.” *Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art* 57.2 (1970): 55-67.
- Damsteegt, Th. *Epigraphical Hybrid Sanskrit: Its Rise, Spread, Characteristics and Relationship to Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit*. *Orientalia Rheno-Trajectina* 23. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Dave, K.N. *Birds in Sanskrit Literature*. 1985. Reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2005.
- Davidson, Ronald M. *Indian Esoteric Buddhism: A Social History of the Tantric Movement*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.
- Dayal, Har. *The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature*. 1932. Reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970.
- Dehejia, Vidya. *Early Buddhist Rock Temples: A Chronological Study*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1972.
- Deleanu, Florin, ed. *The Chapter on the Mundane Path (Laukikamārga) in the Śrāvaka-bhūmi: A Trilingual Edition (Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese), Annotated Translation, and Introductory Study*. Vol. I: *Introductory Study, Sanskrit Diplomatic Edition, Sanskrit Critical Edition*. *Studia Philologica Buddhica*, Monograph Series XXa. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 2006.
- Demiéville, Paul. *Hôbôgirin: Dictionnaire encyclopédique du bouddhisme d'après les sources chinoises et japonaises*, Fasc. 3, s.v. “Butsuzō.” Tokyo : Maison franco-japonaise, 1937.
- Desai, P.B. “Buddhist Antiquities in Karnataka.” *Journal of Indian History* 32.1 (1954): 85-92.

- Dhavalikar, M.K. “The Beginnings of Mahayana Architecture at Ajanta.” In *Madhu: Recent Researches in Indian Archaeology and Art History*, edited by M. S. Nagaraja Rao, 133-138. Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan, 1981.
- Drewes, David. “Revisiting the phrase ‘sa pṛthivīpradeśas caityabhūto bhavet’ and the Mahāyāna cult of the book.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 50.2 (2007): 101-143.
- . “Early Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism I: Recent Scholarship.” *Religion Compass* 4.2 (2010): 55-65.
- . “Early Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism II: New Perspectives.” *Religion Compass* 4.2 (2010): 66-74.
- Durt, Hubert. “Note sur l’origine de l’Anavalokitamūrdhatā.” *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 16.1 (1967): 443-450.
- Dutt, Nalinaksha, ed. *Bodhisattvabhūmi (Being the XVth Section of Asaṅgapada’s Yogacarbhūmi)*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series Vol. VII. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1966.
- Dutt, Sukumar. *Buddhist Monks and Monasteries of India: Their History and their Contribution to Indian Culture*. 1962. Reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2000.
- Eck, Diana L. *Darśan: Seeing the Divine Image in India*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1981.
- Edge, James. *Religious Giving and the Invention of Karma in Theravāda Buddhism*. Curzon Studies in Asian Religions 5. Richmond, UK: Curzon Press, 2002.
- Eimer, Helmut. “A Note on the History of the Tibetan Kanjur.” *Central Asiatic Journal* 32.1-2 (1988): 64-72.
- Falk, Harry. “Two New Inscriptions from the Time of Huiṣka.” *Berliner Indologische Studien* 13/14 (2000): 29-35.
- Filliozat, Jean. “La mort volontaire par le feu et la tradition bouddhique indienne.” *Journal Asiatique* 251 (1963): 21-51.
- Findly, Ellison Banks. *Dāna: Giving and Getting in Pali Buddhism*. Buddhist Tradition Series 52. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2003.
- Finot, Louis, ed. *Rāṣṭrapālāpariṣcchā: Sūtra du Mahāyāna*. Bibliotheca Buddhica II. St. Petersburg: Academy of Sciences, 1901.
- Fleet, John Faithfull. “Sanskrit and Old-Canarese Inscriptions.” *Indian Antiquary* 10 (1881): 185-190.

- . *Indian Epigraphy: The Inscriptional Bases of Indian Historical Research*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907.
- Fussman, Gérard. “Chilas, Hatun et les Bronzes bouddhiques du Cachemire.” In *Antiquities of Northern Pakistan: Reports and Studies*, Vol. 2, edited by Karl Jettmar in collaboration with Ditte König and Martin Bemann, 1-60. Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1993.
- Gernet, Jacques. *Buddhism in Chinese Society: An Economic History from the Fifth to the Tenth Centuries*. Translated by Franciscus Verellen. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.
- Gethin, Rupert. *The Buddhist Path to Awakening: A Study of the Bodhi-Pakkhiyā Dhammā*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Ghosh, A. “A Buddhist Tract in a Stone Inscription in the Cuttack Museum.” *Epigraphia Indica* 26 (1941-42): 171-174.
- Gombrich, Richard. “How the Mahāyāna Began.” In *The Buddhist Forum*. Vol. 1, edited by Tadeusz Skorupski, 21-30. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1990.
- Gomez, Luis O., trans. *The Land of Bliss: The Paradise of the Buddha of Measureless Light*. 1996. Reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2002.
- Gnoli, Raniero, ed. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Śayanāsanavastu and the Adhikaraṇavastu, Being the 15th and 16th Sections of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*. Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1978.
- Gonda, Jan. “‘Gifts’ and ‘Giving’ in the Ṛgveda.” In *Selected Studies*. Vol. IV: *History of Ancient Indian Religion*. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Gutman, Pamela. “Ancient Arakan: with special reference to its cultural history between the 5th and the 11th centuries.” Ph.D. Dissertation, Australian National University, 1976.
- Hahn, Michael. *Haribhaṭṭa and Gopadatta: Two Authors in the Succession of Āryaśūra, On the Rediscovery of Parts of their Jātakamālās*. 2nd ed. *Studia Philologica Buddhica, Occasional Paper Series I*. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1992.
- Handurukande, Ratna, ed. and trans. *Mañicūḍāvādāna, Being a Translation and Edition, and Lokānanda, a Transliteration and Synopsis*. Sacred Books of the Buddhists 24. London: Pāli Text Society, 1967.
- Hara Minoru. “A Note on the Rākṣasa Form of Marriage.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 94.3 (1974): 296-306.
- . “Transfer of Merit in Hindu Literature and Religion.” *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* 52 (1994): 103-135.

- Hargreaves, H. "Excavations at Sārṇāth." In *Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India 1914-15*, edited by J. Marshall, 97-131. Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, 1920.
- Harrison, Paul, trans. *The Samādhi of Direct Encounter with the Buddhas of the Present: An Annotated English Translation of the Tibetan Version of the Pratyutpanna-Buddha-Saṃmukhāvasthita-Samādhi-Sūtra with Several Appendices relating to the History of the Text*. Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series V. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1990.
- , ed. *Druma-kinnara-rāja-paripṛcchā-sūtra: A Critical Edition of the Tibetan Text (Recension A) based on Eight Editions of the Kanjur and the Dunhuang Manuscript Fragment*. Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series VII. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1992.
- . "Meritorious Activity or Waste of Time? Some Remarks on the Editing of Texts in the Tibetan Kanjur." In *Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the 5th Seminar of the International Association of Tibetan Studies, Narita 1989*, Vol. 1: *Buddhist Philosophy and Literature*, edited by Ihara Shōren and Yamaguchi Zuihō, 77-93. Narita: Naritasan Shinshoji, 1992.
- . "The Earliest Chinese Translations of Mahāyāna Buddhist Sūtras: Some notes on the works of Lokakṣema." *Buddhist Studies Review* 10.2 (1993): 135-177.
- . "Searching for the Origins of the Mahāyāna: What Are We Looking for?" *Eastern Buddhist* 28.1 (1995): 48-69.
- . "Mañjuśrī and the Cult of the Celestial Bodhisattvas." *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 13 (2000): 157-193.
- . "Mediums and Messages: Reflections on the Production of Mahāyāna Sūtras." *Eastern Buddhist* 35.1-2 (2003): 115-151.
- , trans. "Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā: A New English Translation of the Sanskrit Text Based on Two Manuscripts from Greater Gandhāra." In *Buddhist Manuscripts*, Vol. 3, edited by Jens Braarvig, 133-159. Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection 12. Oslo: Hermes Publishing, 2006.
- . "Early Mahāyāna Buddhism: Laying Out the Field." Keynote Address at United Kingdom Association of Buddhist Studies (UKABS) Symposium on Early Mahāyāna Buddhism in Honour of Sara Boin-Webb, held in Cardiff, July 7-8, 2012.
- Harrison, Paul, and Christian Luczanits. "New Light on (and from) the Muhammad Nari Stele." In *2011 nendo dai ikkai kokusai shinpojiumu puroshidingusu: Jōdokyō ni kansuru tokubetsu kokusai shinpojiumu*. BARC International Symposium Series 1: Special International Symposium on Pure Land Buddhism. Kyoto: Ryukoku University Research Center for Buddhist Cultures in Asia, 2012, 69-127 (English text), 131-194 (Japanese translation), and 197-207 (plates).

Harrison, Paul, and Shōgo Watanabe, eds. “Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā.” In *Buddhist Manuscripts*, Vol. 3, edited by Jens Braarvig, 89-132. Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection 12. Oslo: Hermes Publishing, 2006.

Härtel, Herbert (with contributions from Ernst Waldschmidt). *Indische Skulpturen*. Berlin: Museum für Völkerkunde, 1960.

Hayashi Takatsugu. “Preliminary Notes on Merit Transfer in Theravāda Buddhism.” *Ronshū: Studies in Religion East and West* 26 (1999): 29-55.

Hayashi Yukio. *Practical Buddhism among the Thai-Lao: Religion in the Making of a Region*. Kyoto: University Press, 2003.

Herrmann-Pfandt, Adelheid. “Verdienstübertragung im Hīnayāna und Mahāyāna.” In *Suḥṛllekhāḥ, Festgabe für Helmut Eimer*, hrsg. Michael Hahn, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, and Roland Steiner, 79-98. Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica, 1996.

Hibbets [now Heim], Maria. “Saving Them From Yourself: An Inquiry into the South Asian Gift of Fearlessness.” *Journal of Religious Ethics* 27.3 (1999): 437-462.

———. “The Ethics of Esteem.” *Journal of Buddhist Ethics* 7 (2000): 26-42.

———. *Theories of the Gift in South Asia: Hindu, Buddhist, and Jain Reflections on Dāna*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

von Hinüber, Oskar. “Brāhmī Inscriptions on the History and Culture of the Upper Indus Valley.” In *Antiquities of Northern Pakistan: Reports and Studies*, Vol. 1: *Rock Inscriptions in the Indus Valley, Text*, edited by Karl Jettmar in collaboration with Ditte König and Volker Thewalt, 41-71. Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1989.

———. “Buddhistische Inschriften aus dem Tal des oberen Indus (Inschriften Nr. 68–109).” In *Antiquities of Northern Pakistan: Reports and Studies*. Vol. 1: *Rock Inscriptions in the Indus Valley, Text*, edited by Karl Jettmar in collaboration with Ditte König and Volker Thewalt, 73-106. Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1989.

———. *Die Palola Ṣāhis: Ihre Steininschriften, Inschriften auf Bronzen, Handschriftenkolophone und Schutzzauber, Materialien zur Geschichte von Gilgit und Chilas*. *Antiquities of Northern Pakistan: Reports and Studies*, Vol. 5. Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 2004.

von Hinüber, Oskar, and K.R. Norman, eds. *Dhammapada*. Oxford: Pāli Text Society, 1994.

Hirakawa Akira. “The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism and Its Relationship to the Worship of Stupas.” Translated from the Japanese by Taitetsu Unno. In *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko*, no. 22, 57-106. Tokyo: Toyo Bunko, 1963.

- Hodge, Stephen. “The Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra: The Text & its Transmission.” http://www.buddhismuskunde.uni-hamburg.de/fileadmin/pdf/publikationen/The_Textual_Transmission_of_the_MPNS.pdf (accessed May 17, 2013).
- Horner, I.B., trans. *The Clarifier of the Sweet Meaning (Madhuratthavilāsini), Commentary on the Chronicle of Buddhas (Buddhavaṃsa) by Buddhaddatta Thera*. London: Pāli Text Society, 1978.
- , trans. *Milinda’s Questions*. 2 volumes. 1963–1964. Reprint, Oxford: Pāli Text Society, 1990–1991.
- Huntington, Susan L. *The “Pāla-Sena” Schools of Sculpture*. Studies in South Asian Culture, Vol. X. Leiden: Brill, 1984.
- Huntington, Susan L, and John C. Huntington. *Leaves from the Bodhi Tree: The Art of Pāla India (8th–12th centuries) and Its International Legacy*. Seattle: Dayton Art Institute in association with the University of Washington Press, 1990.
- Iyer, S. Subramonia. “Epigraphical and literary references to Buddhism in Kerala.” In *Explorations in Art and Archaeology of South Asia: Essays Dedicated to N.G. Majumdar*, edited by Debala Mitra, 249-252. Calcutta: Directorate of Archaeology and Museums, Government of West Bengal, 1996.
- Jauss, Hans Robert. “Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory.” In *New Directions in Literary History*, edited by Ralph Cohen, 11-41. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.
- Jayaswal, K.P. “Metal Images of Kurkihar Monastery.” *Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art* 2 (1934): 70-82.
- Jayawickrama, N.A., trans. *The Story of Gotama Buddha: The Nidāna-kathā of the Jātakatṭhakathā*. 1990. Reprint, Oxford: Pāli Text Society, 2002.
- Johnston, E.H. “Some Sanskrit Inscriptions of Arakan.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11 (1943-1946): 357-385.
- de Jong, J. W. “Sanskrit Fragments of the Kāśyapaparivarta.” In *Beiträge zur Indienforschung*, hrsg. H. Härtel, 247-255. Berlin: Museum für Indische Kunst, 1977.
- Kajiyama Yuichi. “On the Meanings of the words *Bodhisattva* and *Mahāsattva* in Prajñāpāramitā Literature.” In *Indological and Buddhist Studies: Volume in Honour of Professor J.W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday*, edited by L.A. Hercus et al., 253-270. Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies, 1982.

- Kane, P.V. *History of Dharmaśāstra (Ancient and Mediaeval Religious and Civil Law)*. 5 volumes. Government Oriental Series, class B, no. 6. Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1930–1962.
- Karttunen, Klaus. “Bhramarotpītādharah—Bees in Classical India.” *Studia Orientalia* 107 (2009): 89–133.
- Kern, H., trans. *The Lotus Sutra: Saddharma Puṇḍarīka Sūtra or the Lotus of the True Law*. 1884. Reprint, Surrey, Canada: Eremitical Press, 2011.
- Kern, H., and Bunyiu Nanjio, eds. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. Bibliotheca Buddhica X. Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970.
- Keyes, Charles F. “Tug-of-War for Merit: Cremation of a Senior Monk.” *Journal of the Siam Society* 63.1 (1975): 44–62.
- . “From Death to Birth: Ritual Process and Buddhist Meanings in Northern Thailand.” *Folk* 29 (1987): 181–206.
- Keyes, Charles F, and Phra Khrū Anusaranaśāsanakiarti. “Funerary Rites and the Buddhist Meaning of Death: An Interpretative Text from Northern Thailand.” *Journal of the Siam Society* 68.1 (1980): 1–28.
- Khandalavala, Karl. “The Chronology of Caves 16, 17, 19, 26, 1 and 2 at Ajanta and the Ghatotkacha Cave.” In *The Art of Ajanta: New Perspectives*, Vol. 1, edited by Ratan Parimoo et al., 105–129. New Delhi: Books & Books, 1991.
- Khoroché, Peter, trans. *Once the Buddha Was a Monkey: Ārya Śūra’s Jātakamālā*. 1989. Reprint, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- Kielhorn, F. “A Buddhist Stone-Inscription from Ghosrawa.” *Indian Antiquary* 17 (1888): 307–312.
- Kim, Jinah. *Receptacle of the Sacred: Illustrated Manuscripts and the Buddhist Book Cult in South Asia*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013.
- Kinnard, Jacob N. *Imaging Wisdom: Seeing and Knowing in the Art of Indian Buddhism*. Richmond, England: Curzon, 1999.
- . “On Buddhist ‘Bibliolaters’: Representing and Worshipping the Book in Medieval Indian Buddhism.” *Eastern Buddhist* 34.2 (2002): 94–116.
- Konow, Sten. *Kharoshthī Inscriptions with the Exception of Those of Aśoka*. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. II, Pt I. Calcutta: Government of India Central Publication Branch, 1929.

- Krishan, Y. "Pun̄yadāna or Transference of Merit." *Journal of the Department of Buddhist Studies, University of Delhi* 8 (1984): 55-67.
- . "Pun̄yadāna or Transference of merit—a fiction." *Journal of the Indian Council of Philosophical Research* 7.2 (1990): 125-137.
- Kurumiya Yenshu. "Adhimukti in the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra." In *Indological and Buddhist Studies: Volume in Honour of Professor J.W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday*, edited by L.A. Hercus et al., 337-351. Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies, 1982.
- Laidlaw, James. *Riches and Renunciation: Religion, Economy, and Society among the Jains*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Lamotte, Étienne, trans. *Le traité de la grande vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sāstra)*. 5 volumes. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 25, 26, 2, 12, 24. Louvain-la-neuve: Institut Orientaliste, 1944-1980.
- . "Sur la Formation du Mahāyāna." In *Asiatica, Festschrift Friedrich Weller zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern*, hrsg. Johannes Schubert and Ulrich Schneider, 377-396. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1954.
- , trans. *L'Enseignement de Vimalakīrti (Vimalakīrtinirdēśa)*. Bibliothèque du Muséon 51. Louvain: Institut Orientaliste, 1962.
- , trans. *Śūraṅgamasamādhisūtra: The Concentration of Heroic Progress, An Early Mahāyāna Buddhist Scripture*. Translated by Sara Boin-Webb. Richmond: Curzon Press, 1998.
- Lancaster, Lewis. "The Oldest Mahāyāna Sūtra: Its Significance for the Study of Buddhist Development." *Eastern Buddhist* 8.1 (1975): 30-41.
- . "An Early Mahayana Sermon about the Body of the Buddha and the Making of Images." *Artibus Asiae* 36.4 (1974): 287-291.
- Law, Narendra Nath. "Some Images and Traces of Mahāyāna Buddhism in Chittagong." *Indian Historical Quarterly* 8 (1932): 332-341.
- Lopez, Donald S., Jr. "Authority and Orality in the Mahāyāna." *Numen* 42.1 (1995): 21-47.
- Lüders, H. *A List of Brahmi Inscriptions from the Earliest Times to about A.D. 400 with the Exception of Those of Asoka*. Appendix to Epigraphia Indica and Record of the Archaeological Survey of India, Vol. X. Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, India, 1912.
- MacQueen, Graeme. "Inspired Speech in Early Mahāyāna Buddhism I." *Religion* 11 (1981): 303-319.

- . “Inspired Speech in Early Mahāyāna Buddhism II.” *Religion* 12 (1982): 49-65.
- Majumdar, N.G. “Nalanda Inscription of Vipulasrimitra.” *Epigraphia Indica* 21 (1931-32): 97-101.
- Malalasekera, G.P. *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*. 2 volumes. 1937-1938. Reprint, London: Pāli Text Society, 1960.
- Mauss, Marcel. *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. Translated by W.D. Halls. New York: W.W. Norton, 1990.
- McDaniel, Justin. *The Lovelorn Ghost and the Magical Monk: Practicing Buddhism in Modern Thailand*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.
- McMahan, David. “Orality, Writing, and Authority in South Asian Buddhism: Visionary Literature and the Struggle for Legitimacy in the Mahāyāna.” *History of Religions* 37.3 (1998): 249-274.
- Michaels, Alex. “*Samkalpa*: The Beginnings of a Ritual.” In *Words and Deeds: Hindu and Buddhist Rituals in South Asia*, edited by Jörg Gengnagel, Ute Hüsken, and Srilata Raman, 45-63. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2005.
- Miller, Barbara Stoler, trans. *The Bhagavad-Gita: Krishna’s Counsel in Time of War*. New York: Bantam Books, 1986.
- Mirashi, V.V. “New Light on Two Sets of Tummalaguḍem Plates of the Vishṇukunḍins.” In *Indological Research Papers*, Vol. I., 121-141. Nagpur: Vidarbha Samshodan Mandal, 1982.
- Mitra, Debala “*Aṣṭamahābhaya-Tārā*.” *Journal of the Asiatic Society, Letters and Science* 23.1 (1957): 19-22 and plates.
- . *Buddhist Monuments*. Calcutta: Sahitya Samsad, 1971.
- . “Lintels with the Figures of Eight Great Bodhisattvas and a Tathāgata—An Iconographical Study.” In *Facets of Indian Culture: Gustav Roth Felicitation Volume*, edited by C.P. Sinha et al., 276-300 and plates. Patna: Bihar Puravid Parishad, 1998.
- Mitra, Rajendralala, ed. *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*. Bibliotheca Indica 110. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1888.
- Morris, Richard, Edmund Hardy, and A.K. Warder, eds. *The Āṅguttara-nikāya*. 5 volumes and index. 1885-1910. Reprint, London: Pāli Text Society, 1955-1961.
- Morrissey, Nicolas. “Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy: The emergence and decline of Mahāyāna Buddhism in early medieval India.” Ph.D. Dissertation, UCLA, 2009.

- Mrozik, Susanne. *Virtuous Bodies: The Physical Dimensions of Morality in Buddhist Ethics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Nagao, G. "The Architectural Tradition in Buddhist Monasticism." In *Studies in History of Buddhism: Papers Presented at the International Conference on the History of Buddhism at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, August 19-21, 1976*, edited by A.K. Narain, 189-208. Delhi: B.R. Publishing 1980.
- Nakamura Hajime. *Indian Buddhism: A Survey with Bibliographical Notes*. Hirakata, Japan: KUFUS Publication, 1980.
- Ñāṇamoli, Bhikkhu, and Bhikkhu Bodhi, trans. *The Middle Length Discourse of the Buddha: A New Translation of the Majjhima Nikāya*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 1995.
- Nance, Richard F. *Speaking for Buddhas: Scriptural Commentary in Indian Buddhism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.
- Narahari, H.G. "The Doctrine of Karma in Popular Buddhism." *Adyar Library Bulletin* 25 (1961): 360-370.
- Nath, Vijay. *Dāna: Gift System in Ancient India (c. 600 B.C.-c. A.D. 300), A Socio-Economic Perspective*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1987.
- Nattier, Jan. *Once Upon a Future Time: Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline*. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1991.
- . "The 'Eleven Precepts' for Laity in the *Ugraparipṛcchā*." In *Early Buddhism and Abhidharma Thought in Honour of Dr. Hajime Sakurabe on His Seventy-seventh Birthday*, edited by the Sakurabe Ronshu Committee, 33-43 (horizontal section). Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten, 2002.
- , trans. *A Few Good Men: The Bodhisattva Path according to The Inquiry of Ugra (Ugraparipṛcchā)*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2003.
- Neelis, Jason E. "Long-distance Trade and the Transmission of Buddhism through Northern Pakistan, Primarily based on Kharoṣṭhī and Brāhmī Inscriptions." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Washington, 2001.
- . *Early Buddhist Transmission and Trade Networks: Mobility and Exchange within and beyond the Northwestern Borderlands of South Asia*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Norman, K.R. "Theravāda Buddhism and Brahmanical Hinduism: Brahmanical Terms in a Buddhist Guise." In *The Buddhist Forum*, vol. II: *Seminar Papers 1988-90*, edited by Tadeusz Skorupski, 193-200. London: University of London (SOAS), 1991.

- Obermiller, E., ed. *Prajñā Pāramitā-Ratna-Guṇa-Saṃcaya-Gāthā: Sanskrit & Tibetan Text*. 1937. Reprint, Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1992.
- Ohnuma, Reiko. “*Dehadāna: The ‘Gift of the Body’ in Indian Buddhist Narrative Literature.*” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1997.
- . “The Gift of the Body and the Gift of the Dharma.” *History of Religions* 37.4 (1998): 323-359.
- . “Internal and External Opposition to the Bodhisattva’s Gift of His Body.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 28 (2000): 43-75.
- . “Gift.” In *Critical Terms for the Study of Buddhism*, edited by Donald S. Lopez, Jr., 103-123. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- . *Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood: Giving Away the Body in Indian Buddhist Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.
- Olivelle, Patrick, ed. and trans. *Dharmasūtras: The Law Codes of Āpastamba, Gautama, Baudhāyana, and Vasiṣṭha*. Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 2000.
- , ed. and trans. *Manu’s Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānava-Dharmaśāstra*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- , trans. *Life of the Buddha*. New York: New York University Press & JJC Foundation, 2009.
- . *Ascetics and Brahmins: Studies in Ideologies and Institutions*. New York, Anthem Press, 2011.
- Pagel, Ulrich. *The Bodhisattvapiṭaka: Its Doctrines, Practices and their Position in Mahāyāna Literature*. Buddhica Britannica Series Continua 5. Tring, U.K.: Institute of Buddhist Studies, 1995.
- Parry, Jonathan. *Death in Banaras*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Patna Museum. *Guide to the Patna Museum (Stone Sculptures, Bronzes, and Terracottas)*. Patna : Superintendent, Government Printing, 1955.
- Raheja, Gloria Goodwin. *The Poison in the Gift: Ritual, Prestation, and the Dominant Caste in a North Indian Village*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- Rao, B.S.L. Hanumantha, N.S. Ramachandra Murthy, B. Subrahmanyam, and E. Sivanagi Reddy. *Buddhist Inscriptions of Andhradesa*. Secunderabad: Ananda Buddha Vihara Trust, 1998.
- Rao, C. Hayavadana, ed. *Mysore Gazetteer*. Vol. 2, Pt. 1. Bangalore: Government Press, 1930.
- Rao, T.A. Gopinatha. “Two Inscriptions of Vikramaditya Varaguna.” In *Travancore Archaeological Series*, Vol. I, 187-195 and plates. Madras: Methodist Publishing House, 1910–1913.

- Ray, Reginald. *Buddhist Saints in India: A Study in Buddhist Values and Orientations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Regmi, D.R. *Inscriptions of Ancient Nepal*. 3 volumes. New Delhi: Abhinav Publications, 1983.
- Rhi Juhjung. "Early Mahāyāna and Gandhāran Buddhism: An Assessment of the Visual Evidence." *Eastern Buddhist* 35.1-2 (2003): 152-197.
- . "Bodhisattvas in Gandhāran Art: An Aspect of Mahāyāna in Gandhāran Buddhism." In *Gandhāran Buddhism: Archaeology, Art, Texts*, edited by Pia Brancaccio and Kurt Behrendt, 151-182. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2006.
- Rice, B. Lewis. *Epigraphia Carnatica*. Vol. 7, Pt. 1. Bangalore: Mysore Government Central Press, 1902.
- Rosenfield, John M. "On the Dated Carvings of Sārnāth." *Artibus Asiae* 26.1 (1963): 10-26.
- Roth, Gustav. "Observations on the First Chapter of Asaṅga's Bodhisattvabhūmi." *Indologica Taurinensia* 3-4 (1975-1976): 403-412.
- Rotman, Andy, trans. *Divine Stories: Divyāvadāna, Part I*. Boston, Wisdom Publications, 2008.
- . *Thus Have I Seen: Visualizing Faith in Early Indian Buddhism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Rowland, Benjamin. "Bodhisattvas or Deified Kings: A Note on Gandhara Sculpture." *Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America* 15 (1961): 6-12.
- Ruegg, D. Seyfort. "Aspects of the Study of the (Earlier) Indian Mahāyāna," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 27.1 (2004): 3-61.
- Sadakata Akira. *Buddhist Cosmology: Philosophy and Origins*. Tokyo: Kōsei Publishing Co., 1997.
- Sahni, D.R. *Catalogue of the Museum of Archaeology at Sārnāth*. 1914. Reprint, Delhi: Indological Book House, 1972.
- Salomon, Richard. *Indian Epigraphy: A Guide to the Study of Inscriptions in Sanskrit, Prakrit, and Other Indo-Aryan Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Salomon, Richard, and Gregory Schopen. "On an Alleged Reference to Amitābha in a Kharoṣṭhī Inscription on a Gandhāran Relief." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 25.1-2 (2002): 3-31.

- Samuels, Jeffrey. "The Bodhisattva Ideal in Theravāda Buddhist Theory and Practice: A Reevaluation of the Bodhisattva-Śrāvaka Opposition." *Philosophy East & West* 47.3 (1997): 399-415.
- Sankaranarayanan, S. "Two Vishṇukunḍi Charters from Tummalagudem." *Epigraphia Āndhrīca* 2 (1974): 4-20.
- Sarkar, H. *Studies in Early Buddhist Architecture of India*. 1966. Reprint, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1993.
- Sasaki Shizuka. "A Study on the Origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism." *Eastern Buddhist* 30.1 (1997): 79-113.
- . "A Basic Approach for Research on the Origins of Mahāyāna Buddhism." *Acta Asiatica* 96 (2009): 25-46.
- Sastri, Surendranath Majumdar. "The Hilsa Statue Inscription of the Thirty-fifth year of Devapala." *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 10.3 (1940): 31-36.
- Schlingloff, Dieter. *Studies in Ajanta Paintings: Identifications and Interpretations*. New Delhi: Ajanta Publications, 1988.
- . *Guide to the Ajanta Paintings*. Vol. 1: *Narrative Wall Paintings*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1999.
- Schober, Juliane. "Religious Merit and Social Status among Burmese Buddhists Lay Associations." In *Merit and Blessing in Mainland Southeast Asia in Comparative Perspective*, edited by Cornelia Ann Kammerer and Nicola Tannenbaum, 197-211. New Haven: Yale University Southeast Asian Studies, 1996.
- Schopen, Gregory. *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks. Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, 1997.
- . *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters. Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004.
- . *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India: More Collected Papers*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005.
- . "Regional Languages and the Law in Some Early North Indian Buddhist Monasteries and Convents." *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 23 (2009): 171-178.
- . "The Book as a Sacred Object in Private Homes in Early or Medieval India." In *Medieval and Early Modern Devotional Objects in Global Perspective*, edited by Elizabeth Robertson and Jennifer Jahner, 37-60. New York : Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

- . *Buddhist Nuns, Monks, and Other Worldly Matters: Recent Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2014.
- , ed. *A Sūtra for the Failed and Misbegotten: A Complete Version of the Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra in the Schøyen Collection*. Unpublished.
- Searle, John R. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Sharf, Robert. "The Scripture on the Production of Buddha Images." In *Religions of China in Practice*, edited by Donald S. Lopez, Jr., 261-267. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Shih Heng-ching, trans. *The Sūtra on Upāsaka Precepts*. BDK English Tripiṭaka Translation Series 45-11. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 1994.
- Shimoda Masahiro. "The State of Research on Mahāyāna Buddhism: The Mahāyāna as Seen in Developments in the Study of Mahāyāna Sūtras," *Acta Asiatica* 96 (2009): 1-23.
- Shizutani Masao. "Mahayana Inscriptions in the Gupta Period." *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 10.1 (1962): 358-355.
- . *Indo bukkyō himei mokuroku* [Catalogue of Indian Buddhist Inscriptions]. Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten, 1979.
- Silk, Jonathan A. "The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism with a Study of the *Ratnarāśīsūtra* and Related Materials." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1994.
- . "The *Yogācāra Bhikṣu*." In *Wisdom, Compassion, and the Search for Understanding: The Buddhist Studies Legacy of Gadjin M. Nagao*, edited by Jonathan A. Silk, 265-314. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2000.
- . "What, if Anything, is Mahāyāna Buddhism? Problems of Definition and Classification." *Numen* 49 (2002): 355-405.
- . "Dressed for Success: The Monk Kāśyapa and Strategies of Legitimation in Earlier Mahāyāna Buddhist Scriptures." *Journal Asiatique* 291.1-2 (2003): 173-219.
- . "The Nature of the Verses of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*." *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 23 (2009): 181-190.
- Sircar, D.C. "Some Inscriptions from Bihar." *Journal of the Bihar Research Society* 37.3-4 (1951): 1-13.

- . “Jaynagar Image Inscription of Year 35.” *Journal of the Bihar Research Society* 41.2 (1955): 143-153.
- . “Inscriptions of Chandras of Arakan.” *Epigraphia Indica* 32 (1957–58): 103-109.
- . *Indian Epigraphy*. 1965. Reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1996.
- . *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1966.
- . In “Monthly Seminars at the Centre, Thursday, the 18th September, 1969.” *Journal of Ancient Indian History* 3 (1969–1970): 280-281.
- . “Indological Notes.” *Journal of Ancient Indian History* 10 (1976–1977): 110-122.
- Skilton, Andrew. “An Early Mahāyāna Transformation of the Story of Kṣāntivādin – ‘The Teacher of Forbearance.’” *Buddhist Studies Review* 19.2 (2002): 115-136.
- Skjærvø, Prods Oktor, ed. and trans. *This Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras : The Khotanese Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra*. 2 volumes. Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures 60-61. Cambridge: The Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University, 2004.
- Speyer, J.S., ed. *Avadānaçataka: A Century of Edifying Tales Belonging to the Hīnayāna*. 2 volumes. Bibliotheca Buddhica 3. 1902–1909. Reprint, The Hague: Mouton, 1958.
- Spink, Walter M. *Ajanta: History and Development*. 6 volumes. Handbook of Oriental Studies, Vol. 18.1-6. Leiden: Brill, 2005–2014.
- Spiro, Melford E. *Buddhism and Society: A Great Tradition and Its Burmese Vicissitudes*. 2nd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.
- Srinivasan, P.R. “Jayarampur Plate of Gopachandra.” *Epigraphia Indica* 39.5 (1972): 141-148.
- von Staël-Holstein, A., ed. *The Kāçyapaparivarta: A Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class. Edited in the Original Sanskrit in Tibetan and in Chinese*. Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1926.
- Stein, M.A. “Notes on an Archaeological Tour in South Bihār and Hazāribāgh.” *Indian Antiquary* 30 (1901): 54-63 and 81-97.
- Strauch, Ingo. “The Bajaur Collection of Kharoṣṭhī Manuscripts: A Preliminary Survey.” *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 25 (2008): 103-136.
- . “More Missing Pieces of Early Pure Land Buddhism: New Evidence for Akṣobhya and Abhirati in an Early Mahayana Sutra from Gandhāra.” *Eastern Buddhist* 41.1 (2010): 23-66.

- Strenski, Ivan. "On Generalized Exchange and the Domestication of the Samgha." *Man* n.s. 18 (1983): 463-477.
- Strong, John. "The Transforming Gift: An Analysis of Devotional Acts of Offering in Buddhist *Avadāna* Literature." *History of Religions* 18.3 (1979): 221-237.
- Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature, The Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism, ed. *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa: Transliterated Sanskrit Text Collated with Tibetan and Chinese Translations*. Tokyo: Taisho University Press, 2004.
- Tannenbaum, Nicola. "Blessing and Merit Transfer among Lowland Shan of Northwestern Thailand." In *Merit and Blessing in Mainland Southeast Asia in Comparative Perspective*, edited by Cornelia Ann Kammerer and Nicola Tannenbaum, 181-196. New Haven: Yale University Southeast Asian Studies, 1996.
- Tatz, Mark, trans. *Asaṅga's Chapter on Ethics With the Commentary of Tsong-Kha-Pa, The Basic Path to Awakening, The Complete Bodhisattva*. Studies in Asian Thought and Religion 4. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1986.
- Trautmann, Thomas R. *Dravidian Kinship*. Cambridge Studies in Social Anthropology 36. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Trenckner, Vilhelm, and Robert Chalmers, eds. *The Majjhima-Nikāya*. 3 volumes and index. 1888–1925. Reprint, London: Pāli Text Society, 1991–2004.
- Tripathi, Aruna. *The Buddhist Art of Kauśāmbī, from 300 BC to AD 550*. New Delhi: D.K. Printworld, 2003.
- Tsai, Yao-ming. "Searching for the Origins of Mahāyāna and Moving Toward a Better Understanding of Early Mahāyāna." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, 1997.
- Tsukamoto Keishō. *Indo bukkyō himei no kenkyū* [A Comprehensive Study of the Indian Buddhist Inscriptions]. 3 volumes. Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten, 1996–2003.
- Upasak, C.S. "Inscriptions on Dhelvā Bābā, a Buddha Image in Nālandā Museum." *Journal of the Bihar Research Society* 53 (1967): 137-142.
- de La Vallée Poussin, Louis, trans. *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu*. 6 volumes. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1923–1931.
- Vetter, Tilmann. "On the origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism and the subsequent introduction of *Prajñāpāramitā*." *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques* 48.4 (1994): 1241-1281.
- . "Once again on the origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 45 (2001): 59-90.

- Vinītā, Bhikṣuṇī (Vinita Tseng), ed. and trans. *A unique collection of twenty Sūtras in a Sanskrit manuscript from the Potala*. Vol. I,1. Beijing/Vienna: China Tibetology Publishing House/Austrian Academy of Sciences, 2010.
- Vogel, J. Ph. “Excavations at Kasia.” In *Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India 1906-07*, 44-67. Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, 1909.
- . “Prakrit Inscriptions from a Buddhist site at Nagarjunikonda.” *Epigraphia Indica* 20 (1929-30): 1-36.
- Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, M.I., ed. (in collaboration with Seishi Karashima and Noriyuki Kudo). *The Kāśyapaparivarta: Romanized Text and Facsimiles*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica V. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University, 2002.
- Walser, Joseph. *Nāgārjuna in Context: Mahāyāna Buddhism and Early Indian Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.
- . “The origin of the term ‘Mahāyāna’ (The Great Vehicle) and its relationship to the Āgamas.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 30.1-2 (2007): 219-250.
- Ware, James R. “Studies in the Divyāvadāna.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 49 (1929): 40-51.
- Wayman, Alex. “The Buddhist Theory of Virtue Consignment.” *Indian Journal of Buddhist Studies* 4.2 (1992): 1-25.
- Wayman, Alex, and E. Rosen. “The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism and Inscriptional Evidence at Nāgārjunakoṇḍa.” *Indian Journal of Buddhist Studies* 2.1 (1990): 49-63.
- Wayman, Alex, and Hideko Wayman, trans. *The Lion’s Roar of Queen Śrīmālā: A Buddhist Scripture on the Tathāgatagarbha Theory*. 1974. Reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2007.
- Wangchuk, Dorji. *The Resolve to Become a Buddha: A Study of the Bodhicitta Concept in Indo-Tibetan Buddhism*. Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series XXIII. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 2007.
- Wezler, A. “On the Gaining of Merit and the Incurring of Demerit through the Agency of Others: I. Deeds by Proxy.” In *Lex et Litterae: Studies in Honour of Oscar Botto*, edited by S. Lienhard and I. Piovano, 567-589. Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso, 1997.
- Williams, Paul. *Mahāyāna Buddhism: The Doctrinal Foundations*. New York: Routledge, 1989.
- . *Mahāyāna Buddhism: The Doctrinal Foundations*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2009.

- (with Anthony Tribe and Alexander Wynne). *Buddhist Thought: A complete introduction to the Indian tradition*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Williams, Paul, and Patrice Ladwig, eds. *Buddhist Funeral Cultures of Southeast Asia and China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Williams, R. *Jaina Yoga: A Survey of the Mediaeval Śrāvakācāras*. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- Willis, Janice Dean, trans. *On Knowing Reality: The Tattvārtha Chapter of Asaṅga's Bodhisattvabhūmi*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1979.
- Willis, Michael. "Avalokiteśvara of the Six Syllables: Locating the Practice of the 'Great Vehicle' in the Landscape of Central India." *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 23 (2009): 221-229.
- Wilson, Liz. "Beggars Can Be Choosers: Mahākassapa as a Selective Eater of Offerings." In *Constituting Communities: Theravāda Buddhism and the Religious Cultures of South and Southeast Asia*, edited by John Clifford Holt, Jacob N. Kinnard, and Jonathan S. Walters, 57-70. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003.
- Wogihara Unrai, ed. *Bodhisattvabhūmi: A Statement of the Whole Course of the Bodhisattva (Being the Fifteenth Section of the Yogācārabhūmi)*. Tokyo: Seigo Kenkyūkai, 1930-1936.
- Wujastyk, D. "Jambudvīpa: Apples or Plums?" In *Studies in the History of the Exact Sciences in honour of David Pingree*, edited by Charles Burnett, Jan P. Hogendijk, Kim Plofker, and Michio Yano, 287-301. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Yamada Isshi, ed. *Karuṇāpūṇḍarīka: The White Lotus of Compassion*. 2 volumes. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1968.
- Yazdani, G. *Ajanta: The Colour and Monochrome Reproductions of the Ajanta Frescoes Based on Photography*. 4 Parts. London: Oxford University Press, 1933-1955.
- Yuyama Akira, ed. *Prajñāpāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā (Sanskrit Recension A)*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Zago, Marcel. *Rites et Ceremonies en Milieu Bouddhiste Lao*. Rome: Università Gregoriana Editrice, 1972.
- Zimmermann, Michael, ed. and trans. *A Buddha Within: The Tathāgatagarbhasūtra, The Earliest Exposition of the Buddha-Nature Teaching in India*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica VI. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University, 2002.

Zin, Monika. *Guide to the Ajanta Paintings. Vol. 2: Devotional and Ornamental Paintings*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 2003.

Zürcher, Erik. "Buddhist Art in Medieval China: The Ecclesiastical View." In *Function and Meaning in Buddhist Art: Proceedings of a Seminar Held at Leiden University 21-24 October 1991*, edited by Karel R. van Kooij and H. van der Veere, 1-20. Groningen: Egbert Forst, 1995.