

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Pre-institutional Buddhist Traditions in the *Arthapada*:

A Comparative Study and Complete Annotated Translation of

Its Chinese Translation *Yizujing* (義足經), Derived from an Indic Recension,

and Its Pāli Recension *Aṭṭhakavagga*

by

Seongryong Lee

2024

© Copyright by

Seongryong Lee

2024

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Pre-institutional Buddhist Traditions in the *Arthapada*:
A Comparative Study and Complete Annotated Translation of
Its Chinese Translation *Yizujing* (義足經), Derived from an Indic Recension,
and Its Pāli Recension *Aṭṭhakavagga*

by

Seongryong Lee

Doctor of Philosophy in Asian Languages and Cultures

University of California, Los Angeles, 2024

Professor Robert E. Buswell, Chair

This dissertation illuminates the protracted period of pre-institutional Buddhist traditions through a comparative analysis of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, the Pāli recension of the *Arthapada*, and its Chinese counterpart, the *Yizujing* 義足經 (the *Sūtra of Poetic Aphorisms*, T198), translated from another Indic recension in the late third century CE. I suggest the content of this rich textual composite spans several centuries and can be broadly divided into two contrasting chronological layers: verses composed during the pre-institutional phase of Buddhist traditions and those crafted during the incipient stages of Buddhist institutionalization. I argue that the composers of the earlier verses did not yet possess an acute sense of a distinctive Buddhist identity. Even during the early institutionalization process, multiple contradicting ideas coexisted with minimal overt conflict among the compilers who canonized this ancient text.

To substantiate my argument, I examine epithets used in the text to depict the spiritual paragon and marshal a range of statistical data on these epithets, including terms that may blur the line between epithets and adjectives. The data reveal that the text employs epithets that were shared among other Indian religious subgroups of the time. It also lacks epithets considered emblematic of Buddhism and commonly found in other canonical Buddhist literature. This evidence suggests that the *Arthapada* derives from an early phase of the religion, a period I designate as ‘pre-institutional phase of Buddhist traditions.’

As a vital component of this research, I offer an annotated translation of the Chinese *Yizujing* alongside its Pāli parallel verses from the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. A significant portion of the contribution this dissertation makes to Buddhist studies stems from this annotated translation of the *Yizujing*. This aspect is particularly notable given that the *Yizujing* has received scant attention in the field since P. V. Bapat’s problematic 1951 translation. Furthermore, Bapat’s translation, while groundbreaking at the time of its publication, relies far too much on its Indic-language parallel and does not fully capture the nuances of early Chinese literary idioms and conventions.

By providing a statistical analysis of epithets in the *Arthapada*, this research has the potential to invigorate scholarship on early Indian religious traditions, such as Brahmanism, Jainism, and Ājīvikism. These traditions, like early Buddhism, most likely experienced formative stages when their denominational identities were not yet fully established. Additionally, this study may stimulate wider discourse in the field of History of Religions, particularly within theoretical studies of the emergence of religious traditions. As such, the impact of this work extends beyond Buddhist studies, potentially informing and reshaping our understanding of the formation and institutionalization of religions more broadly.

The dissertation of Seongryong Lee is approved.

Karen Lang

Stephanie J. Watkins

Gregory Robert Schopen

Robert E. Buswell, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2024

Table of Contents

Part I. Pre-institutional Buddhist Traditions in the Arthapada	1
1. Introduction.....	2
1.1. The Background of this Thesis	2
1.2. The Arthapada and Its Various Extant Recensions.....	4
1.3. Potential of My Annotated Translation of the Yizujing	6
1.4. Epithets in the Arthapada.....	8
1.5. Lack of Buddhist identity.....	10
1.6. Scope of Research.....	11
2. Literature Review of the Four Recensions of the Arthapada.....	13
2.1. The Pāli Aṭṭhakavagga.....	13
2.1.1. The Antiquity of the Aṭṭhakavagga.....	13
2.1.2. The Atypicality of the Aṭṭhakavagga in Pāli Literature.....	18
2.2. The Yizujing 義足經 (Sūtra of Poetic Aphorisms)	32
2.3. Fragmentary Versions in Sanskrit and Gāndhārī.....	41
3. Rationale for Using ‘Pre-Institutional Phase of the Buddhist Traditions’ instead of ‘Early Buddhism’ or ‘Earliest Buddhism’?	42
3.1. ‘Early Buddhism’ for Describing the Formative Period of Buddhist Traditions.....	42
3.2. ‘Earliest Buddhism’ for Describing the Formative Period of Buddhist Traditions	50
3.3. ‘Buddhism’ Versus ‘Buddhist Traditions’	53
4. Statistical Analysis: Lack of a ‘Buddhist’ Identity in the Arthapada	55
4.1. ‘Buddha,’ ‘Bhagavant,’ and ‘Tathāgata’	55
4.2. The Rare Occurrence of ‘Buddha’ in the Aṭṭhakavagga.....	60
4.3. Secondary Status of ‘Buddha’ to ‘Bhagavant’ in the Mahānidessa	65
4.4. Semantic Development of ‘Bhagavant/Bhagavat’ in Other Religious Literature	77
4.5. Distinctive Discourses Do Not Presuppose a Distinctive Identity.....	84
5. A Theoretical Framework for Understanding Religious Identity Formation in Ancient India	87
5.1. Illusory Nature of Religious Identity	87
5.2. The Pre-Institutional Phase of Asceticism in Ancient India.....	97
5.3. Epithets Representing the Pre-Institutional phase of Buddhism.....	106
Part II. Annotated Translation of the Yizujing (義足經, T198) with Its Pāli Recension, the Aṭṭhakavagga	112
Discourse 1: King Jietan (Aṭṭhakavagga.1)	114

Discourse 2: King Udayana (Aṭṭhakavagga.2)	153
Discourse 3: Sundarī (Aṭṭhakavagga.3)	171
Discourse 4: Brahmin Mojie (Aṭṭhakavagga.4)	203
Discourse 5: King Ādāsamukha (Aṭṭhakavagga.5).....	219
Discourse 6: The Old and Young All Die (Aṭṭhakavagga.6).....	235
Discourse 7: Maitreya's Disputations (Aṭṭhakavagga.7)	253
Discourse 8: Brahmin Yongci (Aṭṭhakavagga.8).....	270
Discourse 9: Mākandika's Daughter (Aṭṭhakavagga.9).....	289
Discourse 10: Miracle Contest with Heretics (Aṭṭhakavagga.11)	311
Discourse 11: Brahmin Meng-guan (Aṭṭhakavagga.12)	354
Discourse 12: Brahmin Faguan (Aṭṭhakavagga.13).....	385
Discourse 13: Brahmin Dou-le (Aṭṭhakavagga.14)	418
Discourse 14: Nun Utpalavarṇā (Aṭṭhakavagga.16)	473
Discourse 15: Reunion of Son and Father (Aṭṭhakavagga.10)	531
Discourse 16: King Virūdhaka (Aṭṭhakavagga.15).....	569
Appendix. Comparison between the Yizujing (義足經) and the Aṭṭhakavagga	616
Bibliography	620

List of Tables

Table 1: Metric Comparison between the <i>Aṭṭhakavagga</i> and the <i>Dhammapada</i> .	15
Table 2: Frequency of Pāli Epithets Compared with the Commentaries and the Four <i>Nikāyas</i>	57
Table 3: Frequency of Pāli Epithets Compared with Three Pāli Poetic Canonical Texts	58
Table 4: Frequency of Chinese Epithets in the <i>Yizujing</i>	60
Table 5: Typical Collocations of the Epithet ‘ <i>buddha</i> ’ in Commentaries	68
Table 6: Collocation ‘ <i>buddha bhagavant</i> ’ in Related Pāli Literature	69
Table 7: Annotations of Two Epithets in the <i>Mahāniddesa</i>	74

Abbreviations and Conventions

The *Yizujing* Editions

- K: K800 of the Koryō Canon II 高麗大藏經 再雕本
T: T198 of the Taishō Canon 大正新脩大藏經
Z: Z863 of the Zhonghua Canon 中華大藏經

Variant readings provided in the T198 Apparatus

- S: Song Canon 宋藏 (Sixi Canon 思溪藏, compiled, 1123-1175 CE)
Y: Yuan Canon 元藏 (Puning Canon 普寧藏, 1269-1286) = P
M: Ming Canon 明藏 (Jiaxing Canon 嘉興藏, 1277-1290) = J

Variant readings provided in the Z863 Apparatus

- P: Puning Canon 普寧藏 (1269-1286) = Y
J: Jingshan Canon 徑山藏 (1277-1290) = M
Q1: Qisha Canon 磧砂藏 (circa 1231-1322)
N: Nan Canon 南藏 (1372-?)
Q2: Qing Canon 清藏

The *Yizujing* verses numbering

Ym.n(a/b/c/d): It indicates the ‘n’th verse of the ‘m’th *sūtra* of the *Yizujing*. In the footnotes, the letters ‘a,’ ‘b,’ ‘c,’ and ‘d’ following the verse numbering specify the first, second, third, or fourth line of the verse, respectively.

Pāli parallel numbering

Sn#(a/b/c/d): *Sutta Nipāta* verse numbering according to the Pāli Text Society edition. In the footnotes, the letters ‘a,’ ‘b,’ ‘c,’ and ‘d’ following the verse numbering specify the first, second, third, or fourth line of the verse, respectively.

AN#, etc.: Other references from the Pāli canon are detailed in the footnotes. ‘AN’ denotes the *Āṅguttara Nikāya*.

* The capital letters ‘Q,’ ‘A,’ ‘K,’ ‘B,’ etc., used under the verse numbering, clarify whose voice is speaking or singing the verse. Here, they represent ‘Question,’ ‘Answer,’ ‘King,’ and ‘the Buddha,’ respectively.

Reference to related footnotes

Y#.fn.#: It refers to the *Yizujing sūtra* number and footnote number therein.

Online Chinese Dictionaries

- DDB: Digital Dictionary of Buddhism (<http://www.buddhism-dict.net>)
CJKV-E: Chinese-Japanese-Korean-Vietnamese/English Dictionary

- (<http://www.buddhism-dict.net>)
- CCAMC:** Complete Collection of Ancient and Modern Characters (古今文字集成) (<http://ccamc.co/index.php>)
- DCBT:** A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms by William Edward Soothill and Lewis Hodous (<https://mahajana.net/texts/soothill-hodous.html>)

Rare Chinese Characters Resources

- DCVPDE:** Dictionary of Chinese Variants Provided by the Department of Education 教育部異體字字典 created by the Taiwanese government (<https://dict.variants.moe.edu.tw/>)
- KM:** Konjaku Mojikyō (今昔文字鏡), a comprehensive collection of East Asian characters developed by the Mojikyō Institute (文字鏡研究会) in Japan.

Eastern Han Dynasty Pronunciation Reconstruction Resources

- Pulleyblank (1991):** *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver: The UBC Press.

Online Early Chinese Literary Resources

- CTP:** Chinese Text Project (<https://ctext.org>)
- ANL:** *Analects*. Charles A. Muller trans. (<http://www.acmuller.net/con-dao/analects.html>)
- CQZZ:** *Chunqiu Zuozhan*: Andrew Miller trans. Published by The Institute for Advanced Technologies in the Humanities (Anne Kinney and the University of Virginia). (<http://www2.iath.virginia.edu/saxon/servlet/SaxonServlet?source=xwomen/texts/chunqiu.xml&style=xwomen/xsl/dynaxml.xsl&chunk.id=d2.9&toc.depth=1&toc.id=0&doc.lang=bilingual>)

Online Pāli Dictionaries

- CPD:** Critical Pāli Dictionary (<https://cpd.uni-koeln.de/search>)
- PTSD:** Pāli Text Society Dictionary (<https://dsal.uchicago.edu/dictionaries/pali/>)
- DPPN:** Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names, by G. P. Malalasekera (1937). (https://www.palikanon.com/english/pali_names/dic_idx.html)

Online Gāndhārī Dictionary:

- GD:** A Dictionary of Gāndhārī, by Stefan Baums and Andrew Glass (<https://gandhari.org/dictionary>)

Digitized Early Indian Religious Discourses

- GRETEL:** Göttingen Register of Electronic Texts in Indian Languages (<https://gretel.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretel.html>)

Acknowledgement

Now in my mid-fifties, I reflect on my lifelong pursuit of knowledge, both in academia and as a Buddhist monastic. This is certainly not a privilege granted to all and has profoundly enriched my life. My journey toward this doctoral degree has been driven by unwavering passion and enthusiasm at every turn. Such a path would have been unimaginable without the incredible support and encouragement from many cherished individuals who have guided and inspired me along the way.

Professor Robert Buswell has been a pivotal figure in both my academic and personal growth. He is the scholar and writer I have always aspired to emulate, and his timely and thorough reviews have greatly enhanced this final draft. Attuned to my enthusiasm for the early stages of Buddhist traditions, he skillfully guided me beyond the conventional academic niches within Korean Buddhism. His mentorship was thoughtfully tailored to nurture my interests, opening vast territories of thought. Under his wise and gentle guidance, I have been able to cultivate my passions and make a unique contribution to the field.

Professor Gregory Schopen, a beacon of inspiration and rigorous scholarship, has always been there during moments of doubt, fortifying my resolve and encouraging me to pursue my intellectual passions with authenticity and bravery. Professor Stephanie Jamison, an eminent Indo-Iranian philologist, graciously dedicated her time to pore over the Pāli *Aṭṭhakavagga* in the early stages of my research. Her astute feedback was invaluable, helping me to navigate and analyze those 210 ancient verses with meticulous care. Professor Karen Lang, my advisor during my master's studies at the University of Virginia, expertly guided me through the intricate landscapes of Indian religious traditions. Her mentorship was instrumental in sparking my

interest in the *Atthakavagga* and its Chinese counterpart, the *Yizujing* (義足經; T198). The late Professor Diego Loukota, a peer and mentor in my PhD program, left an indelible mark on my heart and work. His generous provision of resources has left a lasting legacy on both my dissertation and me. Rest in peace, dear Diego. In your memory, I pledge to strive even harder in my academic endeavors.

Not only academic but also monastic mentors and supporters have played pivotal roles in my dissertation journey. Venerable Wonin (圓印) Sunim, who accepted me as his disciple in 1997, provided his utmost support for my master's studies in the US, generously donating all the money from the temple's bank account at that time. His substantial support, along with the timely scholarships from the Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism, appeared providentially timed to meet my needs. Venerable Misan (彌山) Sunim, an Oxford University PhD and my constant mentor, has generously shared his wisdom, helping me balance my dual life as a monk and scholar. Venerable Dukmin (德旻) Sunim, a specialist in Seon poetry from the Tang and Song dynasties and deeply respected within our Order, has been a pillar of support and encouragement in my pursuit of academic aspirations. Venerable Subul (修弗) Sunim, a Kanwha Seon (看話禪) Master and the founder of An-guk Sunwon (安國禪院), generously supported my academic endeavors during my master's degree, for which I am deeply appreciative. Venerable Myoung-In (明仁) Sunim, my dharma brother under Venerable Wonin Sunim, has consistently supported me, listening attentively whether my writing process flowed smoothly or encountered difficulties. Venerable Hyunjo (玄照) Sunim, a senior professor and researcher in the field of science, has provided her sage advice, helping me navigate challenging times with grace.

Soyeon Kim (金小然), a dedicated lay supporter, has been a pillar of generosity over the past six years. Her efforts have ensured that I lacked for nothing during my academic journey. As I approached the culmination of my studies, her unwavering support continued, highlighted by her leadership in a non-profit religious organization where I now serve as abbot. Linda Yoo (金敬淑), Philip Chang (張秉權), Eunyoung Lee (李恩英), and all the followers of Bupbo Seonwon (法寶禪院) in Garden Grove offered caring support during my dissertation writing and monastic inauguration, to which I am heavily indebted.

My parents, Kitae Lee (李基泰) and Chilsoon Sim (沈七順), endured much agony when I became a Buddhist monk in my late twenties without their permission. Now, I am deeply grateful that they can witness their son's flourishing as both a monk and scholar. I hope this dissertation and my PhD degree can partly make amends for the filial impiety over the past three decades.

I am deeply grateful for the fellowships that have enriched my research, particularly the 2020 Dissertation Fellowship from the Robert H. N. Ho Family Foundation, which allowed me to focus entirely on my preliminary translation of the *Yizujing*. The UCLA Dissertation Year Fellowship for 2023-2024 enabled me to complete my work without the distraction of teaching duties, providing a focused and fruitful end to my doctoral journey. I have also had the honor of being the inaugural recipient of the Min Family Scholarship, along with two consecutive awards over the past three years, which significantly boosted my morale and accelerated my progress.

To all who have walked this path with me, thank you from the depths of my heart. Your guidance, support, and encouragement have not only propelled my academic endeavors but have also profoundly enriched the fabric of my life, weaving together a story of community, learning, and growth.

Vita

Education

University of California Los Angeles (UCLA) 09/ 2019–Present
Ph.D. Candidate, Asian Languages and Cultures, Buddhist Studies

University of Virginia May 2015
M.A. History of Religions

University of Peradeniya Sri Lanka 2009—2010
Postgraduate Diploma in Buddhist Studies

Kyunghee University South Korea 1996
Oriental Medical School, Withdrew in 1996 to become a monk

Seoul National University South Korea 1989—1994
B.S. in Computer Science and Statistics

Teaching
Teaching Fellow at UCLA 2016—2022

Awards & Grants

- The Min Family Scholarship in Korean Buddhist Studies 2024, 2023, 2022
- The Dissertation Year Fellowship 07/2023–03/2024
- ACLS / Robert H. N. Ho Family Foundation Dissertation Fellowship in Buddhist Studies October 2020—July 2021
- Daehaeng Fellowship Summer Research Stipend Summer 2020, 2018, 2017
- The Temple of Modern Buddhism Inc. Scholarship 2019—2024
- GSRM (Graduate Summer Research Mentorship)
Research on the Pāli Aṭṭhakavagga, Prof. Stephanie Jamison Summer 2018
Research on Chinul & Hyesim, Prof. Robert E. Buswell Summer Summer 2017
- The Jogye Order of Korean Buddhism Scholarship 2013—2018

Monastic Experience

Trained in Zen Meditation September 2001 – August 2006
Received Higher Ordination April 2001
Mahāyāna Monastic Education April 1997 - February 2001
Received the Novice Precepts April 1997

Part I. Pre-institutional Buddhist Traditions in the *Arthapada*

1. Introduction

1.1. The Background of this Thesis

Recent decades have provided new perspectives on the rise of religious orthodoxies. Scholars are well aware that our understanding of a particular religious tradition might diverge significantly from its historical reality during its prolonged formative process. The emergence of a new religion often reflects a dynamic, multi-dimensional process rather than a static, one-off event deriving solely to a founder's innovation. Over time, a religious tradition is constantly being negotiated and reinterpreted, and our modern perception of it is the outcome of a lengthy history of reconstructing the past.

In the field of Chan Buddhism, for instance, Albert Welter (2006 and 2008) documents Linji Yixuan's 臨濟 義玄 (?–866) gradual posthumous elevation from a relatively peripheral figure in Chinese Buddhism during his time to a paragon of the 'Golden Age of Chan' during the late Tang dynasty (618–907) and the early Song dynasty (960–1279). This ascendancy is largely attributable to the expanding influence of the Linji faction at the Song court and the fabrication of their lineage. Welter's meticulous examination of the *Linji lu* 臨濟錄 (*Recorded Sayings of Linji*) elucidates the integral role that political patronage and the Confucius intellectual milieu played in the birth of this new orthodoxy. Additionally, his research underscores the fact that the posthumous veneration of certain religious personalities was often propelled by lineage claims made by their supposed monastic heirs.

In similar fashion, Mario Poceski (2007) offers an insightful examination of the early literary works of the Hongzhou school 洪州宗 during the Tang dynasty. Traditionally, this school has been perceived as a bastion of radicalism within the Chan tradition, a perception

shaped largely by the iconoclastic teaching methods attributed to Mazu Daoyi 馬祖道一 (709–788) and his disciples, as depicted in subsequent encounter-dialogue literature. However, Poceski challenges this widely held belief, asserting that the school initially struck a balance between the prevailing Chinese Buddhist traditions of the time and the emergent intellectual and religious milieu. In this light, Poceski's work reveals that the rise of a new orthodoxy involves a continuous negotiation between pre-existing traditions and innovative ideas sparked by changing social environments and evolving needs.

These recent reassessments of Chan Buddhism's development and the shifting perceptions of its pivotal figures have stimulated my interest in re-exploring the early evolution of Buddhism in ancient India. Contrary to the traditional narrative in Buddhist historiographies, which posits that the Buddha's teachings were precisely compiled following his death and minimally altered by his disciples subsequently, it now seems more likely that the actual process entailed a lengthy and complex journey of identity formation, doctrinal systematization, and literary reconstruction following the time of the founder Gautama or Śākyamuni Buddha.

Unraveling such a hidden narrative in the early history of Buddhism proves to be a formidable task, especially considering the scarcity of hard evidence in the study of ancient Indian religions. Early Buddhist literature may need to be reevaluated against the backdrop of the contemporaneously flourishing Indian religious traditions, which encompass not only Buddhist, but Ājīvika, Jain, and Upaniṣadic traditions, to say the least. This requires a high level of linguistic proficiency to traverse various religious literary traditions. Moreover, this literature should be scrutinized in light of the social dynamics of ancient India, such as the thriving urban environment and competition between different religious traditions for patronage. This is indeed an ambitious project for a single doctoral dissertation. From this viewpoint, I proposes focusing

my research into these issues on a text widely known through its Pāli recension, the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, and its Chinese translation from another Indic recension, the *Yizujing* 義足經 (*Sūtra of Poetic Aphorisms*, T198). This text, which I collectively refer to as the *Arthapada*, reveals many intriguing features of nascent Buddhist traditions, particularly in the epithets it deploys to describe the spiritually ideal person.¹

1.2. The *Arthapada* and Its Various Extant Recensions

The *Arthapada* provides an invaluable window into the pre-institutional phase of Buddhist traditions, during which the identity of what would later solidify as the Buddhist religion was not yet firmly established, and its doctrines were somewhat uncharacteristic of the systematized Buddhist tenets. Despite these differences from the mature tradition, this text appears to have

¹ I use the title ‘*Arthapada*’ generically when referring to the text without specifying any extant recension—three extant Indic recensions and a Chinese translation derived from an extinct Indic recension. Among the extant recensions, the Pāli *Aṭṭhakavagga* is its best-known recension, and the *Yizujing* 義足經 (*Sūtra of Poetic Aphorisms*, T198) is its Chinese translation during the third century CE. There are also two more Indic recensions—one in Sanskrit (A. F. Rudolf Hoernle, 1916) and the other in Gāndhārī (Harry Falk, 2011); however, they are too fragmentary to be of use in this study.

Choosing ‘*Arthapada*’ to represent all related versions presents several complexities and layers of interpretation. This text is known under many similar but distinct titles. The ‘*Aṭṭhakavagga*’ from the *Sutta Nipāta* is the most well-known in Pāli sources. However, the Pāli term ‘*Aṭṭha*’ can derive from two Sanskrit words: ‘*Artha*’ (aphorisms/meaning/purpose) and ‘*Aṣṭa*’ (eight/octet), and there is ongoing debate about which meaning is correct. In Sanskrit sources, Vasubandhu’s *Abhidharmakośa* refers to the text with the title ‘*Arthavargīya*’ (Collection of Aphorisms).

Reconstructed Sanskrit titles from Chinese sources suggest two different interpretations of the Pāli term ‘*Aṭṭha*.’ From the terms *Babaqi* 八跋耆, *Babazhi* 八跋祇, or *Baqun* 八群 in the Mahāsaṅghika Vinaya, we can derive ‘**Aṣṭavarga*’ (Collection of Octet), where 八 signifies ‘eight’ or ‘octet.’ Here, 跋耆 and 跋祇 are transcriptions, while 群 translates ‘*varga*’ (collection). However, more reconstructions align with the meaning ‘*Artha*.’ For instance, ‘**Arthavarga*’ can be reconstructed from *Yipin* 義品 (Chapter of Aphorisms) in the Mahīśāsaka Vinaya, where 義 translates as ‘aphorisms’ and 品 as ‘chapter’ (*varga*). We can also reconstruct ‘**Arthapada*’ from *Yiju* 義句 (Verses of Aphorisms) found in the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya and from Chinese translation the *Yizujing* (義足經; *Sūtra of Poetic Aphorisms*). In these instances, ‘句’ and ‘足’ denote ‘verses’ or ‘lines’ but ‘足’ could also imply ‘sufficient’ or ‘full of.’

Given the diversity of titles and the distinct meanings they imply across various sources, selecting a single generic title to encompass all extant and nonextant versions of the text is challenging. Out of necessity, I have chosen ‘*Arthapada*’ from Bapat’s reconstruction of the *Yizujing*, although I acknowledge the potential limitations this title may entail.

enjoyed high esteem in the incipency of Buddhist traditions too. Thus, it is likely that the early tradition, as presented in the *Nikāya/Āgama* literature, took shape over a prolonged period. The innovative ideas expressed throughout the Buddhist canon may not be the product of a single ‘Great Man’ but rather represent the accumulated wisdom of many contributors, refined over centuries.

The *Arthapada* is extant in four different language versions. The Pāli *Aṭṭhakavagga* and the Chinese *Yizujing* are complete, whereas its Sanskrit and Gāndhārī recensions only survive as fragments. The *Aṭṭhakavagga* is recognized as being one of the earliest Pāli canonical texts, because it distinguishes itself through its unique themes and the archaic features of its language and meters. The antiquity of this text and its esteemed position in the canon are corroborated by its frequent references within the Pāli Canon, as well as by the fact that a commentary to the collection, the *Mahāniddeśa*, is itself included in the canon. These characteristics have drawn substantial scholarly attention, beginning with Viggo Fausböll’s English translation in 1898 as part of the larger *Sutta-nipāta* anthology.

While the *Aṭṭhakavagga*’s antiquity certainly piques interest, its distinct thematic elements, which diverge considerably from other Nikāya literature, are equally captivating. The text primarily portrays the life of a hermit, one disentangled from all views and free from desire, providing a marked contrast to the meticulously systematized doctrines of later monastic Buddhism as presented in other canonical texts. Only a handful of *suttas* within the *Aṭṭhakavagga* give such enticing hints of the initial phase of Buddhist institutionalization and doctrinal systematization. These thematic idiosyncrasies become exceptionally noticeable to those acquainted with the typical Nikāya ethos, which features a systematic doctrine inclusive of the Four Noble Truths, the Noble Eightfold Path, and Dependent Origination, among others.

The esteemed status of the *Arthapada* is not exclusive to the Pāli tradition. Its Sanskrit titles, such as *Arthavargīya*, have a significant presence in numerous non-Pāli Indic Buddhist texts and their Chinese translations. In 1915, Sylvain Lévi expanded the scope of this ancient text beyond the Pāli tradition, exploring its numerous references in the *Vinayas* of mainstream Buddhist schools and Buddhist treatises by distinguished scholars such as Nāgārjuna (ca. 150–250 CE), Vasubandhu (fl. 4th–5th century CE), and Asaṅga (fl. 4th–5th century CE). Subsequent years saw the publication of three more extant versions of this text for an English audience. A. F. Rudolf Hoernle, in 1916, published a fragmented Sanskrit version of the *Arthapada* found in five consecutive folios. In 1951, P. V. Bapat released an English translation of the *Yizujing* (義足經), a Chinese Buddhist text whose verses parallel those in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. More recently, in 2010, Harry Falk identified a birch-bark fragment from the ‘Split’ collection (2011, figure 1 & 2), which contains several Gāndhārī stanzas written in Kharoṣṭhī letters corresponding to some verses of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* or the *Yizujing*.

1.3. Potential of My Annotated Translation of the *Yizujing*

Given its attributes, including the existence of four extant versions, its significant antiquity, and its distinctiveness within the early Buddhist canon, the *Arthapada* emerges as an invaluable resource for probing the early stages of Buddhist institutional development. While the Pāli *Aṭṭhakavagga* version has attracted significant scholarly attention since the latter half of the twentieth century, the Chinese *Yizujing* and the fragmentary Sanskrit and Gāndhārī versions have remained largely underexplored within Buddhist Studies. Despite the *Yizujing*’s significant potential to shed light on the growth and dissemination of the *Arthapada*, it has largely remained sidelined in academic discussions since Bapat introduced it to the English-speaking academia in

1951. Only sporadic references to the *Yizujing* exist within academic literature that focuses on the *Aṭṭhakavagga* or its translations.

Interestingly, Vetter's 1990 paper openly dismisses the *Yizujing*'s relevance to the study of early Buddhism, citing alleged deficiencies in the quality of the Chinese translation. Contrary to Vetter's assessment, I aim to showcase the intricate and sophisticated nature of the Chinese translation, carefully tailored for a Chinese audience. Moreover, I will argue that what may initially seem to be translation errors within the *Yizujing* could instead be considered invaluable resources for exploring the textual history of the *Arthapada* and the early phase of the Chinese Buddhist translation project.

The seven-decade lacuna in academic discourse on the *Yizujing* can be largely attributed to the absence of an accurate translation. Bapat's 1951 translation, while a pioneering effort in Buddhist studies, now appears outdated, offering considerable scope for correction and further exploration. In particular, Bapat frequently circumvented unique or condensed Chinese phrases present in tetra-, penta-, or hexa-syllabic verses, instead replacing them with his translations of corresponding phrases in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. In some cases, this substitution spanned an entire verse, so that in all too many cases, Bapat's translation represents better the Pāli recension rather than the Chinese. To rectify this, my translation includes the original Sinographic text of the *Yizujing*, along with detailed parsing of its phrases in my annotation.

Moreover, the *Yizujing* is steeped in Chinese literary idioms and allusions, elements that would have been familiar to the literati of its era. Bapat's translation, unfortunately, appears to have overlooked this facet, leading to a decontextualized rendering of the *Yizujing* that can sometimes provoke confusion. To bolster my context-driven interpretation, I will cite instances of specific Chinese phrases from early Chinese Buddhist translations or the Chinese literary

corpus that was prevalent during and before the Three Kingdoms period (220-280 CE), when the *Yizujing* was translated into Chinese.

By offering an annotated translation of the Chinese text of the *Yizujing*, I aim to contest the Indo-centric bias inherent in Bapat's translation and Vetter's discrediting of the text, thus enriching a more nuanced examination of the *Arthapada*. In doing so, my translation seeks to stimulate academic discourse on this text by facilitating a deeper understanding of the early phases of Buddhism and the initial stages of Chinese Buddhist translation.

1.4. Epithets in the *Arthapada*

Though the *Arthapada* exhibits numerous features that suggest the existence of a pre-institutional phase in the Buddhist traditions, to make this case, I have chosen to focus on the epithets for the spiritual paragon as presented in the text for the narrative part of my dissertation. This choice is driven by the fact that these epithets provide clear and quantifiable evidence of an extended period during which emerging ancient Indian religious traditions had not yet crystalized into distinctive Buddhist denominational identity. Even after the composition of the text, I suspect, the emergence of a distinct Buddhist identity might have taken several more centuries.

For instance, the *Aṭṭhakavagga* presents a broad array of epithets for its ideal person, significantly differing from those found in the four Nikāyas. Well-known titles such as 'tathāgata' (Thus Gone) are notably absent, and 'bhagavant' (Blessed One) and 'buddha' (Awakened One) appear only once, despite their ubiquity in other Pāli literature. Instead, the *Aṭṭhakavagga* predominantly uses epithets such as 'muni' (sage), 'brāhmaṇa' (brahmin), and 'dhīra' (wise one) to laud the ideal person. In stark contrast to the usage of 'brāhmaṇa,' the term 'samaṇa' (ascetic) appears four times but is consistently portrayed negatively, referring to

groups embroiled in constant disputes due to their firm adherence to dogmatic beliefs. This depiction contrasts markedly with the Pāli canon, especially the Vinaya Piṭaka, where the title ‘*mahāsamaṇa*’ (great ascetic) is casually used for the Buddha, and where the Buddha criticizes *brāhmaṇas* for their claims of supremacy and their practice of animal sacrifice. This discrepancy significantly challenges the common perception that Buddhism, as one of the *śramaṇa* traditions, emerged in opposition to the *brāhmaṇa* traditions.²

In the *Yizujing* verses, we find parallels to this case in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*: the epithet ‘*fo* 佛’ (Buddha) is used only once, and ‘*rulai* 如來,’ generally a Chinese translation of ‘*tathāgata*,’ is utilized thrice as a translation of ‘*bhagavant*.’ The common Chinese translation for ‘*bhagavant*’ is ‘*shizun* 世尊,’ but it occurs only once. Contrasting with the sporadic appearance of these terms in the Chinese verses, the primary epithet used for the ideal person is ‘*zun* 尊’ (Honorable One). In the *Yizujing*, ‘*zun*’ serves not only as a translation of the Indic ‘*muni*,’ but also sees wider usage: the text commonly adopts ‘*zun*’ when referring to the speaker of the *Arthapada*. Other frequently used terms include ‘*xia* 黠’ and ‘*hui* 慧,’ both signifying ‘Wise One.’

The narrative portion of the *Yizujing* employs epithets that differ markedly from those found in the verses. The title ‘*fo* 佛’ is consistently the most common epithet for the instructor of the text. This frequent use of ‘*fo*’ is understandable, given that the *Yizujing* narrative parallels the *Paramatthajotikā II*, a post-canonical commentary on the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, which utilizes epithets akin to those found in *Nikāya/Āgama* and *Vinaya* literature of mainstream Buddhist schools. Despite the common occurrence of ‘*buddha*,’ it is worth noting that, in the Pāli literature, this is

² This divergence in the usage and interpretation of *śramaṇa* is especially telling and merits further exploration, especially to critique the widely held view that Buddhism identified with the *Śramaṇa* movement in opposition to the *Brāhmaṇa* traditions. I intend to revisit this topic in future work following this dissertation.

not the most prevalent title for the instructor of the Buddhist discourses. Instead, the epithet ‘*bhagavant*’ outnumbers any other epithets across the mainstream canonical literature. The epithet ‘*tathāgata*’ appears just once in the *Paramatthajotikā II*, but is as frequent as ‘*buddha*’ in the four *Nikāyas*. This highlights a divergence between mainstream Pāli literature and the *Yizujing* narratives, as both ‘*rulai* 如來’ and ‘*shizun* 世尊’ are almost unnoticeable compared to the number of usages of the term ‘*fo*.’

1.5. Lack of Buddhist identity

Utilizing the data gathered on epithet usage, I explore the extent to which the composer(s) of the *Arthapada* might have identified themselves with the denomination known as ‘Buddhists.’

Drawing on recent publications that delve into the formation of religious identity, I expand the implications of the rare presence of the terms ‘*buddha*,’ ‘*bhagavant*,’ and ‘*tathāgata*’ in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* or ‘*fo*,’ ‘*shizun*,’ and ‘*rulai*’ in the *Yizujing* verses, to encompass broader religious traditions. I contend that religious discourses could thrive prior to the establishment of a specific religious denominational identity. I support this notion by examining Nathan McGovern’s study on the epithet ‘*brāhmaṇa*’—a term seen not as opposing ‘*śramaṇa*,’ but as an ideal contested by many ancient Indian religious literary traditions. I also consider Piotr Balcerowicz’s works on the intertwined histories of Jainism and Ājīvikism to provide context for the ascetic traditions in ancient India that predate religious denominations, and from which Buddhism may not have been alien. Martin Gerald Wiltshire’s suggestion that the epithet ‘*paccekabuddha*’ may be a key to unlocking the pre-Buddhist tradition of venerating spiritually awakened individuals further contributes to this argument. From a theoretical standpoint, I invoke Jean-François Bayart’s thesis on the illusory nature of cultural identity. I argue that religious identity, as a form of

cultural identity, is not a fixed or primordial construct but is continually negotiated and reconstructed in response to pre-existing religious heritage and the evolving needs of an ever-changing social environment.

In the course of my discussion, I contest the prevailing assumption held by numerous Pāli scholars that Buddhist literary development moved from homogeneity to diversity. Alternatively, I propose that the historical progression often reversed this course: transitioning from initial diversity towards increasing uniformity through the process of literary normativization. The *Arthapada* not only demonstrate the absence of a distinctive Buddhist identity but also a lack of systematized Buddhist doctrines. I suggest that early authors created a vast corpus of religious discourses often without strict hermeneutical precision. These early authors appeared to be less concerned about doctrinal inconsistencies compared to the later compilers of the Buddhist canonical literature, a fact that is evidenced in the ancient text ‘*Arthapada*’ and its ensuing commentaries. To reflect this viewpoint more aptly, I use the term ‘pre-institutional period of the Buddhist traditions’ instead of commonly utilized labels such as ‘early Buddhism’ or ‘earliest Buddhism’ when referring to the timeframe of the *Arthapada*.

1.6. Scope of Research

Given the extensive range of this comparative study, it is necessary to limit the scope of my dissertation. To this end, I have chosen to exclude the Sanskrit and Gāndhārī recensions of the text from my dissertation. Due to the fragmentary nature of both of these recensions, they do not align with the objectives of my study. In the case of the Sanskrit version, sand abrasion renders more than two-thirds of the content on each folio—typically, one third on the left and another third on the right—unrecognizable. The Gāndhārī recension, which may well be the earliest

extant written version of the *Arthapada*, has the potential to be of particular importance in the study of early Buddhist textual traditions. Unfortunately, however, the currently available material is not only limited to just a few verses; but of these seven verses, only two are complete, with the remainder being fragments. In the future, I plan eventually to incorporate these two incomplete recensions into my research, particularly as Stefan Baums has indicated his intention to publish more Gāndhārī verses, corresponding to the *Aṭṭhakavagga* verses 863–908.

Next, numerous research themes such as metrical analysis, technical terms, doctrinal positions, and comparisons between the narratives of the *Yizujing* and the *Paramatthajotikā* II all justify a thorough study of the *Arthapada*. Nevertheless, my dissertation centers predominantly on the examination of epithets employed in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* and other related Pāli sources. I delve into the contrasting perceptions of certain epithets at the time of the textual composition and trace the evolution of their connotations within the history of Buddhist literary traditions. By scrutinizing statistical data on the epithets from the two complete recensions, I explore the premise that the ancient Indian religious identity, as often envisioned by modern Buddhist scholars, was not as clear-cut and conspicuous during the formative stages of the Buddhist traditions.

2. Literature Review of the Four Recensions of the *Arthapada*

2.1. The Pāli *Aṭṭhakavagga*

The Pāli *Aṭṭhakavagga* is an intriguing text. Although considered one of the oldest Buddhist works, it is markedly different from other Pāli canonical literature in numerous respects. Its antiquity is evident through its linguistic features and the references to and citations of this text within the Pāli Canon. The *Aṭṭhakavagga* extols the ideal of a sage detached from society, suggesting it was composed before the establishment of Buddhist monasticism. However, the text does not align with typical expectations of early Buddhism, lacking the emblematic epithets and doctrines prevalent throughout the rest of the Pāli Canon. Moreover, its teachings appear to contradict a set of well-structured cardinal doctrines of early Buddhism that are recurrent across *Pāli* canonical literature.

2.1.1. The Antiquity of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*

The *Aṭṭhakavagga* first attracted scholarly attention in Buddhist Studies when Viggo Fausböll (1898) translated the *Sutta Nipāta* into English, which incorporates the *Aṭṭhakavagga* as its fourth chapter. Fausböll contended that the linguistic features of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* prove its antiquity, from a time far earlier than any other texts in the Pāli Canon. For example, the text exhibits characteristic Vedic grammatical features in its declensions, conjugations, and syntax. It also includes contracted or protracted forms, unusual structures, irregular constructions, and highly condensed expressions that are characteristic of the Vedic language. As for its content, Fausböll observes that the *Aṭṭhakavagga* does not portray Buddhist monastic life; instead, it idealizes the lifestyle of generic hermits. Furthermore, the text adopts a doctrinal stance opposing all views, seemingly even the ‘right view,’ which is a fundamental doctrine in the rest of the

Nikāya literature. This internal evidence, as suggested by Fausböll, remains widely accepted as an indication of the text's antiquity.

Some Pāli philologists have examined the metrical features of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* to assess its antiquity. The text comprises 210 verses (848 lines) in six different meters, with the majority in *triṣṭubh* (487 lines; 57.43%) followed by *śloka* meter (232 lines; 27.36%).³ Occasionally, *triṣṭubh* verses or *suttas* are infiltrated by a similar meter, *jagatī*.⁴ The infiltration of *jagatī* into *triṣṭubh* first caught the attention of early 20th-century Indologists like Edward Vernon Arnold (1905), who observed this rare occurrence in the *R̥gveda*.

Nearly a century after Arnold, Ānandajoti (2004: 26–7) revisited this topic in his studies of Pāli meter, suggesting that the infiltration of *jagatī* into *triṣṭubh* occurs less frequently in earlier Pāli literature. Based on my calculations, for example, the ratio of *jagatī*/(*triṣṭubh* + *jagatī*) in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* is approximately 1.62%, while in the *Dhammapada*, it is around 17.81%.⁵ This data reveals a dramatic increase in the ratio in the *Dhammapada* compared to the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. Thus, Ānandajoti claims that this ratio rises in later Pāli literature, eventually leading to the treatment of these two meters as a *triṣṭubh-jagatī* family meter in much of later Pāli. If Ānandajoti's proposition is correct, this metrical feature could support the idea of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*'s antiquity, suggesting that it predates the *Dhammapada*. I provide a table below comparing the percentages of the meters in both the *Aṭṭhakavagga* and the *Dhammapada*.

³ *Triṣṭubh* and *śloka* are syllable-based meters. *Triṣṭubh* consists of 11 syllables per line, while *śloka* have 8, each with their respective characteristic line-ending rhythms.

⁴ *Jagatī* is similar to *triṣṭubh* but features 12 syllables in each line, with an additional syllable at the penultimate position of each line of *triṣṭubh*.

⁵ In this analysis, I follow Norman (2001) for the identification of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* meters and Ānandajoti (2004) for the *Dhammapada* meters. The ratio of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* is derived from 8/(487 + 8) and that of the *Dhammapada* from 26/(120 + 26). Norman was the first to scan all the *Aṭṭhakavagga* verses.

Table 1: Metric Comparison Between the *Aṭṭhakavagga* and the *Dhammapada*

Meters	<i>Aṭṭhakavagga</i>	Jagatī ratio to Triṣṭubh+Jagatī	<i>Dhammapada</i>	Jagatī ratio to Triṣṭubh+Jagatī
<i>Triṣṭubh</i>	487 (57.43%)		120 (7%)	
<i>Jagatī</i>	8 (0.94%)	1.62% (0.81%) ⁶	26 (2%)	17.81% (13.04%)
<i>Śloka</i>	232 (27.36%)		1482 (86%)	
<i>Vaitālīya</i>	40 (4.72%)		94 (5%)	
<i>Aupacchandasaka</i>	1 (0.12%)		11 (0.5%)	
<i>Ārya</i>	80 (9.43%)			
Total	848 lines		1733 lines	

However, using Ānandajoti’s suggestion as evidence for the *Aṭṭhakavagga*’s comparative antiquity might involve circular reasoning, given that his proposition is itself based on the text’s assumed age—specifically, that it is older than the *Dhammapada*. These presumed relative ages are derived from the linguistic, thematic, and doctrinal features of the two texts.

Numerous scholars have attempted to determine the antiquity of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* by analyzing its metrical features, but these efforts often fall into the same methodological trap. They heavily rely on chronological assumptions derived from textual characteristics other than the meters themselves, which fundamentally weakens their arguments and often leads to ill-reasoned conclusions. For example, A. K. Warder (1967: 224) claims that the *Aṭṭhakavagga* is later than both the *Pārāyanavagga* and the *Devatā Saṃyutta*, citing that 85% of its verses use the more recently developed *upajāti* rhythm in the *tuṭṭhubha* [= *triṣṭubh*] meter, compared to 81% in the *Devatā Saṃyutta*. He also points out that, unlike the *Pārāyanavagga*, which includes many *ślokas*, the *Aṭṭhakavagga* is predominantly in *tuṭṭhubha*. This assumption—that a higher percentage of *upajāti* rhythm signifies a later composition—reflects a general trend identified by Ānandajoti (2004), who observed that the *triṣṭubh-jagatī* family was replaced by three fixed

⁶ The ratio in parentheses exclude independent *jagatī* ‘verses’; it represents the infiltration of *jagatī* ‘lines’ into *triṣṭubh* ‘verses’.

classical meters: *upajāti*, *vaṃsaṭṭhā*, and *rucirā*.⁷ However, I question whether a 4% difference is statistically significant enough to serve as a reliable chronological indicator. Additionally, Norman's scansion reveals that the *Aṭṭhakavagga* also contains a considerable number of *śloka* meter verses (232 lines; 27.36%). Moreover, the *ślokas* in the *Pārāyanavagga*, considered to be later narrative interpolations into a body of question-based (*pucchā*) verses, further complicate the analysis. Vetter (1990) also refutes second argument. Both Warder and Ānandajoti based their analyses on the metrical features of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, yet they arrived at opposing conclusions. This discrepancy underscores that metrical features alone cannot reliably serve as definitive evidence for determining its chronological placement.

Other scholars, such as Tilmann Vetter (1990) and Grace G. Burford (1991), suggest it may be possible to discern chronological or ideological layers within the *Aṭṭhakavagga* based on its varied metrical features. I will delve into this topic in the next subchapter when discussing the *Aṭṭhakavagga*'s atypical nature within the Pāli Canon. It is sufficient to note here that both N. A. Jayawickrama and Johannes Bronkhorst offer a caveat regarding the comparative dating of *suttas* within the text. Jayawickrama (1976a: 77–79) argues that meter serves as secondary evidence for a text's antiquity and is not decisive: metrical features can increase the likelihood of dating a text but may not provide definitive confirmation. Bronkhorst (2007: 180) provides additional insight on this matter, explaining that preservation of archaic language, style, and meter often occurs in religious or liturgical contexts, even in scriptures that belong to much later periods. If their lines of reasoning are correct, it would be counterproductive to attempt to prove the antiquity of the

⁷ *Upajāti*, *vaṃsaṭṭhā*, and *rucirā* have 11, 12, and 13 syllables, respectively, with few variations—few instances of resolution, replacement, etc. Resolution is the usage of two light syllables instead of one heavy syllable; replacement is the usage of one heavy syllable for two light syllables. The former usually occurs at the beginning of a *pada* (each line), while the latter takes place after a caesura (pause) in the middle.

Aṭṭhakavagga or classify different chronological layers within the text based solely or principally on metrical evidence.

Strong evidence supporting the relative antiquity of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* comes from the existence of both canonical and post-canonical commentaries on this text. The *Aṭṭhakavagga* is a chapter of the *Sutta Nipāta*, which is itself a text within the fifth collection, called the *Khuddaka Nikāya* (Small Collection) of Pāli *sutta* literature.⁸ Although the *Aṭṭhakavagga* is not included in the four major *Nikāyas*, the *Mahāniddesa*, another canonical work within the fifth *Nikāya*, is devoted to annotating words and phrases from the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. The fact that there is canonical commentary to the text demonstrates the early appreciation of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* within the Pāli tradition. Furthermore, the *Paramatthajotikā II*, part of the Pāli commentarial tradition, provides annotations on the *Aṭṭhakavagga* with references to the *Mahāniddesa*. This post-canonical text also offers narratives on the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, explaining the origin of the individual sixteen *suttas* within the text. These narratives arguably may suggest that the *Aṭṭhakavagga* was part of the early Buddhist monastic education curriculum, and monastic lecturers would provide the background stories of the individual *suttas* to their monastic students.

The antiquity of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* is further supported by numerous references to and citations of this text throughout Pāli canonical literature. There are many instances of praise for the text in the *Samyutta Nikāya*, *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, *Udāna*, and *Vinaya*. It is noteworthy that such praise can be found in the two aforementioned *Nikāyas* too, even though the *Aṭṭhakavagga*

⁸ Although the *Aṭṭhakavagga* is widely cited across Buddhist literature, it is interesting to note that the earliest known reference to the title ‘*Sutta Nipāta*’ comes from the *Milindapañha* (Questions of King Milinda), which some Theravāda traditions consider canonical and place within the *Khuddaka Nikāya*. However, Bhikkhu Bodhi (2017: 11) points out that the four references to the title ‘*Sutta Nipāta*’ in the *Milindapañha* (at 369, 385, 411, and 414) are found in a section of the work recognized as relatively late. The considerable gap between the early composition of individual *suttas* or groups of *suttas* in the *Sutta Nipāta* and the later compilation of the *Sutta Nipāta* as a whole is intriguing.

is not included in the four major *Nikāyas*. A typical example of the Buddha’s praise is as follows: “Excellent, excellent, bhikkhu! You have learned well, attended well, memorized well the texts of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*” (Bodhi trans., 2017: 29; Vinaya I 197–198). Sometimes citations provide an exact number of *suttas* in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*: “*soḷasa aṭṭhakavaggikāni* (the sixteen texts of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*)” (Udāna 23, 59). Beyond Pāli literature, there are also numerous citations of this text. For instance, Sylvain Lévi (1915; as cited in Bapat: 1–3) identifies 11 citations of this text across various strata of Buddhist literature. Lévi’s findings include *Vinayas* of different mainstream Buddhist schools, a Mahāyāna *sūtra*, and three Mahāyāna treatises. This number of citations is likely just the tip of the iceberg, and it is probable that many more citations await discovery. As but one example, the earliest inscriptional evidence of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*’s *suttas* might be found in the Aśokan Bhābra Edict. According to this edict, King Aśoka (fl. 3rd century BCE) recommends seven texts for study, and Rhys Davids (1898: 639–640) has argued that three of them can potentially be identified as those found in the *Sutta Nipāta*, albeit with some reservations. One of these three is the *Upatisapasina*, which he identifies as the *Sāriputta Sutta* of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. However, this identification remains speculative.

2.1.2. The Atypicality of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* in Pāli Literature

The *Aṭṭhakavagga* is part of the *Nikāya* collections, but its doctrines diverge from other *Nikāya* literature. Specifically, the theme of ‘no view’ in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* seems to undermine the position of ‘right view’ in the *Nikāya* doctrine. Consequently, the text has been the subject of extensive scholarly study, with individual scholars presenting markedly different interpretations. These range from the belief that the text represents: 1) a proto-Madhyamaka antecedent (an early Mahāyāna doctrinal stream) within the Pāli canon; 2) a non-Buddhist text that later became

influential and orthodox in Buddhist circles; 3) an ancient Buddhist text, whose full meanings can only be understood in the context of Nikāya tenets; and 4) a pre-institutional stage of Buddhist doctrine. Some of these viewpoints are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

To begin with, Luis O. Gómez (1976) introduces the term ‘mystical silence’ to describe the *Aṭṭhakavagga*’s doctrine of ‘freedom from any view or contention.’ He believes the text’s repeated emphasis on the negative consequences of forming any view aligns with the mystic religious tradition that truth is ineffable and beyond verbal expression. In his interpretation of the text, even the Buddha’s own knowledge and vision appear to be detrimental to the ascetic goal of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. Forming a view from experience results from individuals’ fixation on the apperception (*saññā*) of things. Consequently, an ideal person as depicted in the text does not moor (*nivesana*) in any type of apperception and does not allow it to proliferate (*papañcasāṅkhā*) in their mind. Gómez suggests that this strand of teachings might have been a precursor to later Mahāyāna Buddhist thought, including the Perfection of Wisdom literature, Prāsaṅgika Mādhyamika, and some lineages within the Chan 禪 tradition.

Tilman Vetter (1990) generally concurs with Gómez’s proposal that the ‘no view’ doctrine in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* may be linked to later Mahāyāna traditions. However, he delves further back in time to investigate the origins of the *suttas* containing this doctrine. His primary tools for analysis are the metric license of the verses and the known trajectory of Buddhist doctrinal development. Employing these tools, he dismisses nine of the sixteen *suttas*, considering them as later additions to the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, and contends that the remaining seven *suttas* (Sn. IV-4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 13) essentially have non-Buddhist origins. According to Vetter, these *suttas* were incorporated into the Buddhist canonical literature when non-Buddhist ascetics subsequently joined the Buddhist community.

Specifically, Vetter singles out the *Pasūra Sutta* (Sn. IV-8), which emphasizes the futility of trying to win a debate by clinging to one's views. He posits that this *sutta* originally belonged to Sañjaya Belaṭṭhiputta's teachings of 'higher peace,' achievable through non-involvement in any dispute. When these newcomers from the non-Buddhist ascetic tradition became influential within the Buddhist community, they expanded upon this doctrine, producing more texts on the theme. In the process, they attempted to adapt their pre-Buddhist doctrines to the early teachings of the Buddha. Vetter suggests that the six suttas (Sn. IV-4, 5, 9, 11, 12, and 13) exemplify this effort. These *suttas* are based on the doctrine of 'no view' and 'non-dispute' but were later adulterated by systematized Buddhist doctrines. For instance, the *Kalahavivāda Sutta* (Sn. IV-11) exhibits a series of later additions: a causal chain from apperception to disputes, criticism against ascetics who strive for non-becoming, and the usage of the later technical term 'anupādisesa' (one who has no impure residues), which is employed here surprisingly in a negative context.

Vetter expands upon Gómez's thesis by introducing chronological layers within the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. From Vetter's perspective, Gómez oversimplifies the text's features by emphasizing certain phrases that support his thesis, as represented in his article title "Proto-Mādhyamika in the Pāli Canon?". According to Vetter, the text cannot be reduced to the concept of 'mystical silence'; it is a far more intricate text that reveals various editorial hands at different stages of Buddhist institutional development.

While I agree with Vetter that the *Aṭṭhakavagga* is a composite, his theory of specific chronological layers within the text goes beyond the scope of textual evidence. As I have previously argued, metric license alone is not decisive evidence. A. K. Warder's 1967 work, *Pali Metre*, contains numerous inaccuracies, as Pāli verses were not fully scanned at the time. The

tool of metrical analysis is not precise enough to distinguish the chronological layers of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* as effortlessly as cutting through butter with a hot knife. Next, the trajectory of Buddhist doctrinal development he employs is often arbitrary. Since Lambert Schmithausen's 1981 work, it has been widely accepted that the discriminating-insight (*paññā*) tradition emerged later than the meditative (*dhyāna*) tradition in the history of Buddhist doctrinal development. Based on this thesis, Vetter classifies *suttas* or verses with elements of discriminating insight as later additions to the Buddhist literary tradition. However, his application of this criterion is inconsistent and frequently arbitrary. For example, Vetter excludes the *Guhaṭṭhakasutta* (Sn. IV-2) from the group of texts on 'mystical silence' because it contains a phrase of discriminating insight, '*phassaṃ pariññāya*' (having fully understood sensory contact). Conversely, he includes the *Māgandiyasutta* (Sn. IV-9) in this group, arguing that *paññā* in the phrase '*paññavimutta*' (one who is liberated by wisdom) refers not to discriminating insight but to general wisdom. This is just one of many arbitrary judgments in his article.

While Gómez and Vetter investigate the distinctiveness of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* within the Pāli Canon, many Theravāda Buddhist scholars have defended the text's coherence within the Pāli literary tradition. For instance, P. D. Premasiri (1972) adapts the 'no-view' stance of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* to the doctrine of 'right view' (*sammādiṭṭhi*), which is the first component of the Noble Eightfold Path in mainstream Buddhist doctrine. According to Premasiri, the problem lies not in the views themselves but in the attachment to those views. While views can serve as useful means, they become seeds of dispute and conflict when people regard them as ends and grow attached to them. He identifies numerous passages from the *Aṭṭhakavagga* that support his view. For example, the *Aṭṭhakavagga* emphasizes '*viveka* (detachment or seclusion)' five times across

four *suttas*. Based on the occurrences of this technical term, he argues that the *Aṭṭhakavagga* cautions against attachment to views not against the views themselves.

Premasiri's perspective aligns with how the *Aṭṭhakavagga*'s commentaries reframe the 'no view' theme to fit it into the broader context of the Theravāda doctrinal tradition. For example, its canonical commentary, the *Mahāniddesa*, glosses the compound 'diṭṭhīnivesa (the shelters of views)' in Sn.785 as "... 'nti abhinivesa-parāmāso (adhering to and being attached to such a view ...)." ⁹ Bhikkhu Bodhi and Paul Fuller also adopt this commentarial interpretation and defend the cohesive system of Theravāda doctrines. Bodhi acknowledges the emphasis on the 'no view' doctrine in some passages of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* but asserts that their full meanings can only be understood within the context of Theravāda thought, not by taking them literally (2017: 29). Fuller contends that Gómez and Vetter misinterpret the *Aṭṭhakavagga*'s 'anti-views' passages, which coexist alongside the doctrine of right view within the Pāli canon without any contradiction (2005: 152).

While Premasiri, Bodhi, and Fuller reconcile the *Aṭṭhakavagga* with a unified system of Theravāda thought, numerous scholars are intrigued by the text's atypical nature and investigate its potentially diverse origins. As previously discussed, Vetter is one of the most prominent theorists in this trend, suggesting that there is a non-Buddhist text included within the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. He theorizes how this foreign text became assimilated within the systematic and ever-expanding Buddhist doctrines. P. V. Bapat (1951: 3) identifies four thematic layers within

⁹ The *Mahāniddesa* provides a list of 10 typical wrong views to explain the term 'diṭṭhīnivesa.' One example is as follows: 'sassato loko, idameva saccaṃ moghamañña'nti abhinivesaparāmāso diṭṭhīnivesanaṃ. (Diṭṭhīnivesa: being firmly attached to a view, "The world is everlasting. This alone is the truth, and everything else is false.")

the text: anti-desire; anti-views; aging; and the life of the *muni* (sage), though he does not explicitly claim these layers have independent origins.

Grace G. Burford (1991: 45, 60) also proposes that the *Aṭṭhakavagga* is a composite. Unlike Vetter or Bapat, she contends that the text originally comprised two independent works: one with an ‘anti-views’ theme and the other with an ‘anti-desire’ theme. According to her classification, four *suttas* (Sn. IV-1, 2, 6, 7) are ‘desire-oriented,’ while five *suttas* (Sn. IV-3, 4, 5, 8, 9) are ‘views-oriented.’ The remaining seven *suttas* (Sn. IV-10–16) appear to fall into a ‘grey area’ addressing a range of topics. These *suttas* present various stances concerning the ‘anti-views’ doctrine: some are indirectly related to the ‘views (*diṭṭhī*)’ theme, while others hold ambiguous positions. By acknowledging this third group, Burford may concede that her binary classification may not be entirely clearcut or all-encompassing.

The *Aṭṭhakavagga* addresses various themes beyond the two that Burford identifies. For example, Sn. IV-14 and Sn. IV-16 discuss the appropriate behavior for monks (*bhikkhū*), outlining what they should and should not do. Although she classifies Sn. IV-6 as having a ‘desire-oriented’ theme, Bapat (1951: 3) categorizes it as an independent theme of ‘true conception of old age and death.’ Burford classifies Sn. IV-9 as a ‘views-oriented’ theme, but my reading of this *sutta* suggests that its primary theme is about ‘inner peace (*ajjhātasanti*),’ which may be related to ‘anti-views’ theme. Before delving into the hindrances to inner peace, however, this *sutta* also engages with the ‘anti-desire’ theme. Therefore, these examples demonstrate that the *Aṭṭhakavagga* cannot be easily subsumed within only two discrete topics.

Burford relies on metrical evidence to support her suggestion of the two origins within the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, but the text’s metrical features are more intricate than her analysis implies. She argues (*Ibid.* 61) that “for the most part, the two teachings occur in clearly delineated

segments that coincide closely with the *sutta* groupings of the verses.” As she asserts, the five ‘views-oriented’ *suttas* are consistently composed primarily in *triṣṭubh*. I use ‘primarily’ because Sn. IV-8 and Sn. IV-9 contain some verses or lines in *jagatī* and *aupacchandasa*, which are respectively considered a variation and a later development of *triṣṭubh*. Although these inclusions can be considered minor, her suggestion of the two origins based on metrical evidence has a more significant issue: the four ‘desire-oriented’ *suttas* she identifies lack consistency in their meters. Two (Sn. IV-1 and Sn. IV-7) are in *śloka*, one (Sn. IV-2) in *triṣṭubh*, and another (Sn. IV-6) in *vaitālīya*. Consequently, the *Aṭṭhakavagga* does not display the ‘clearly delineated segments’ in terms of meter that Burford proposes. In addition to the five meters mentioned, according to Norman’s scansion, the old *ārya* meter is also used in Sn. IV-14, which Burford implicitly classifies into the grey area. Altogether, the *Aṭṭhakavagga* features a variety of topics in six distinct meters, suggesting a more complex historical development of the text.

Nonetheless, Burford’s main argument is not about the classification of themes in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. Instead, she primarily focuses on how later Theravāda tradition distorts the early teachings of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. She investigates this by comparing the *Aṭṭhakavagga*’s own context and its commentarial interpretation found in the *Mahānidāsa* and the *Paramatthajotika II*. According to Burford, the commentaries transform the ‘this-worldly’ concerns of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*—both anti-views and anti-desire—into metaphysical, cosmological, and transcendental ones—*nibbāna* or the cessation of existence (*Ibid.* 90, 185). They also remove or limit the negative connotations of ‘knowledge and vision (*ñāṇadassana*)’ in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. This effort aims to secure the status of the Buddha’s ‘knowledge and vision’ and establish the position of ‘right view,’ one of the most essential teachings of later institutionalized Buddhism (*Ibid.* 99).

In this vein, Burford's central thesis brings to mind the 'seven commentarial presuppositions' presented by John B. Henderson (1991: 106-121). According to Henderson, one of these presuppositions is the commentarial assumption that the canon is coherent and free of contradictions. As a result, the primary objective of later commentators is to demonstrate its coherence and devise a comprehensive doctrinal framework. Consequently, these commentators play a significant role in shaping and reshaping the religious tradition. Seen from Henderson's perspective, we can observe the work of editorial hands in the commentaries on the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, attempting to adapt the text to the ever-developing doctrinal tenets of the Theravāda commentarial tradition.

K. R. Norman (2003) also posits that the *Aṭṭhakavagga* is most likely a composite text, but he criticizes Burford's and Vetter's ideas that the text represents the earliest Buddhist teachings before the more structured Nikāya doctrines emerged. Norman agrees that the *Aṭṭhakavagga* has multiple authors, was composed at different times, targets different audiences, and features various styles. He even suggests its sixteen *suttas* likely had an independent existence before their compilation into the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. However, he disagrees with Burford and Vetter, arguing that the *Aṭṭhakavagga* is neither the earliest discourse of the Buddha nor does its atypical nature represent pre-institutional Buddhist doctrines that contradict the fundamental tenets of the Nikāya literature. According to Norman, the distinctive features of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* are perfectly acceptable within Pāli literature because they merely reflect stylistic diversity, and individual *suttas* do not need to present all aspects of Buddhist tenets (512–513). In other words, the absence of specific teachings, such as the Four Noble Truths, in a *sutta* (or in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* as a whole) does not necessarily imply that they were unknown to its composers. On the contrary, he believes there are good reasons to think that the systematized

teachings of the *Nikāyas* were already current at the time. For example, he points out that what Burford regards as commentarial reinterpretations of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* in the *Mahāniddeśa* often include citations from other canonical texts, such as the *Theragāthā* and the *Therīgāthā*.¹⁰ Thus, he contends that what she considers to be later Buddhist doctrines may not be as late as she assumes.

However, Norman's contention raises an issue: he assumes all the canonical texts predate commentarial texts. This assumption may not necessarily be accurate. While the *Mahāniddeśa* is a commentary on the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, it is also a canonical text, placed alongside the *Theragāthā* and the *Therīgāthā* within the *Khuddaka Nikāya*, the fifth miscellaneous canonical collection. Even if we limit his contention to the specific texts, his argument still lacks sufficient evidence. He considers the *Theragāthā* and the *Therīgāthā* as wholes to be earlier texts than the *Mahāniddeśa*. However, this assumption may not be as unquestionable as he claims. If it is true that the *Aṭṭhakavagga* is a composite, why couldn't other canonical texts in verses, like the *Theragāthā* and the *Therīgāthā*, be also composites, containing different chronological layers? Consequently, we cannot rule out the possibility of commentarial infiltration into the *Theragāthā* and the *Therīgāthā*.

Norman's argument is rooted in his belief in the traditional narrative found in the *Vinaya* and the Sinhalese Chronicles, which describe the successful compilation and transmission of the Buddha's words shortly after his passing. According to Norman, Buddhism could not have emerged without the historical Buddha, his religious inspiration, and his well-structured innovative teachings. Consequently, he asserts that no other discourses could take precedence over *suttas* such as the *Ariyapariyesana Sutta* (Discourse on the Noble Quest, MN 26) and the

¹⁰ Both of these texts are canonical works within the *Khuddaka Nikāya* and comprise the collections of verses attributed to elder monks and nuns, respectively.

Dhammacakkappavattana Sutta (Discourse on Setting in Motion the Wheel of the Dhamma, SN 56.11), which depict the Buddha's spiritual quest and his initial teachings, respectively.¹¹ These *suttas* feature a transcendental orientation and systematized doctrines aimed at achieving their goals. Based on his belief, Norman thus contends that if the *Aṭṭhakavagga* is indeed a Buddhist text, it would have been impossible for its poets to have been unfamiliar with the core tenets expressed in the aforementioned *suttas*.

Norman identifies traces of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*'s awareness of central Buddhist tenets. For example, phrases like '*sambodhikāmassa*' (for one who seeks awakening; Sn 963) and terms such as '*nibbāna*' (Sn. 822 and Sn. 940) appear in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, aligning with the other-worldly goal orientation of the *Ariyapariyesana Sutta* and the *Dhammacakkappavattana Sutta*. With these examples, he criticizes Burford, who suggests that the *Aṭṭhakavagga* has a this-worldly and life-affirming orientation, while its commentaries superimpose onto the text transcendental and life-negating tenets that developed later in Buddhist history.

Norman's criticism may seem appealing at first glance. However, he appears to overlook his own view that the *Aṭṭhakavagga* is a composite. Since it consists of various layers composed at different periods, a few examples from a later period cannot overshadow the this-worldly orientation of its earlier layers.

Norman's interpretation of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* in the context of the Nikāya tenets may resonate with Premasiri, Bodhi, and Fuller. However, Norman adopts a different approach. While Premasiri, Bodhi, and Fuller doctrinally accommodate the *Aṭṭhakavagga*'s anomalous position toward the structured Buddhist tenets, Norman suggests stylistic and thematic diversity within the Pāli canon. For Norman, the Pāli literary corpora are extensive, and different texts

¹¹ The antiquity of these *suttas* finds some contemporary supporters, like Vetter, Johannes Bronkhorst, and Alexander Wynne (2007: 2).

have varying emphases, sometimes appearing to conflict with each other in their doctrines or linguistic features. Nevertheless, the seeming doctrinal contradictions are minor and can be understood within the context of the core Buddhist tenets.

In response to Burford and Vetter, Norman claims that not all *suttas* need to be comprehensive discourses, containing all the features of systematic Buddhist doctrines. Furthermore, although the negative position on views is prominent in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, the text does not solely focus on the ‘anti-views’ theme, just as other *suttas* in the Nikāyas are not exclusively about ‘right view.’ To support his argument, he provides examples of terms and phrases in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* that reveal its orientation toward a transcendental goal. All in all, he contends that the *Aṭṭhakavagga* may represent an aspect of *early* Buddhist teachings, but we should not romanticize the text as being the *earliest* Buddhist teaching.

However, Norman’s argument has an additional issue: it hinges on his proposition that “if the *Aṭṭhakavagga* is a Buddhist text at all,” which leaves open the possibility that some parts of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* may have non-Buddhist origins. As I have already discussed, Vetter explores the possibility of non-Buddhist origins for some *suttas* within the text. Hajime Nakamura (1980: 45), quoting Mizuno Kōgen (*Bukkyō kenkyū* IV. 3. p 55f), asserts that there are “various Vedic and Jain features and wording (grammatical formations and vocabulary) which cannot be traced in later Buddhist literature.” Regarding vocabulary, Buddhism and Jainism share such terms as *buddha*, *pratyeka-buddha*, *jina*, *nirvāṇa*, *tathāgata*, *bhāvanā*, *dhuta*, *yoga*, *kevalin*, *āsrava*, *karman*, *gati*, *mokṣa*, *śramaṇa* (Norman, 1997), which suggest the pan-Indian heritage that nurtured the two religions. In their comparative study on early Indian ascetic traditions, Willem B. Bollée (1980) and Nakamura (1983) identify parallels between the *Aṭṭhakavagga* and ancient Jain canonical verses. While the examples they provide are limited in number, the close

similarity between them is sufficient to demonstrate their shared literary foundation, upon which they built their respective literary traditions.

Inspired by Norman's ideas on stylistic diversity in the Pāli canon, Eviatar Shulman (2012–2013) critiques the interpretations of Gómez, Vetter, and Burford regarding the atypical doctrines of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. Shulman contends that the verses of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* should not be compared with prose discourses in doctrinal terms because poetry is meant to express personal sentiments, whereas prose is used to articulate doctrinal positions. Thus, he suggests that the *Aṭṭhakavagga* should be read as Buddhist poetry, not as an expression of Buddhist doctrine that reveals the historical realities of early Buddhists (ibid., 406-7). However, Shulman might overly generalize by categorizing the issue within the binary of prose versus poetry. Poetic style in canonical literature is also diverse, and the *Aṭṭhakavagga* differs markedly from texts like the *Theragāthā* (*Verses of the Elder Monks*) and the *Therīgāthā* (*Verses of the Elder Nuns*), which focus primarily on personal experiences and sentiments. Instead, the *Aṭṭhakavagga* offers a broader doctrinal scope and serves as a series of instructional guides, much like other prose discourses in the *Nikāyas*. For example, Sn.874 presents a sophisticated doctrinal position: “Not perceiving [ordinary] perceptions, not perceiving extraordinary perceptions, not devoid of perceiving [faculty], nor perceiving what have disappeared—for one who has practiced thus, physical imprints disappear, because conceptual proliferation originates from perception.” In this way, the *Aṭṭhakavagga* is rich in doctrinal presentations and moral guidelines. Additionally, the frequent use of the optative mood in verbs throughout the text imparts a didactic tone, similar to that found in prose discourses within the Pāli canon.

Gil Fronsdal (2016), the most recent scholar to work on the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, authored a book titled *The Buddha Before Buddhism*, implying that the *Aṭṭhakavagga* reflects Buddhist

traditions prior to the institutionalization of the community and the systematization of doctrines. Like Burford, Vetter, and Norman, Fronsdal considers the text to be a composite. He categorizes it into four thematic groups: letting go of views; sensual craving; description of the sage; and training. His classification is similar to Bapat's, with the only differences being the addition of the 'training' theme and omission of the 'aging' theme. The *Jarāsutta* (Sn. IV-6; 10 verses) deals with the 'aging' theme but also includes elements of 'views,' 'craving,' and 'sage.' Thus, the theme 'aging' is not as prominent as the 'training' theme, which is elaborated upon in the *Tuvaṭṭakasutta*, *Attadaṇḍasutta*, and *Sāriputtasutta* (Sn. IV-14, 15, 16; 61 verses). These three *suttas* outline the appropriate attitudes and behaviors for renunciants, and this theme pertains to 'monastic' decorum, providing a drastically different context from the other thirteen *suttas* in the text, which discuss the peaceful life of 'wandering' renunciants. According to Fronsdal, the three *suttas* are most likely to be later addition after or during the establishment of Buddhist monasticism. It is no wonder that Norman heavily draws examples of the transcendental orientation from these three *suttas*.

Considering the two different chronological layers suggested by Fronsdal—the pre-institutional phase and the ongoing institutionalization phase—I propose that during the earlier phase, Buddhist compilers of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* may not have yet developed a keen sense of a unique Buddhist identity. This lack of a Buddhist identity is evident in the epithets for the ideal person in the text. Epithets such as *bhagavant* (the Blessed One) and *tathāgata* (the Thus Gone) never occur, even though they are ubiquitous in the other Pāli literature. The epithet '*buddha* (the Awakened One)' appears just once in the *Sāriputtasutta*, which, according to both Fronsdal's and my classification, represents the later phase of ongoing monastic development.

Instead of using these well-known Buddhist epithets, the text employs epithets such as

muni (sage), *bhikkhu* (monk), *brāhmaṇa* (brahmin), and *dhīra* (wise one), which were not exclusive to Buddhism but were common among other religious subgroups of the time.¹² The anomalous term *yakkha* (the Spiritual One), in particular, seldom appears as an epithet for the ideal person elsewhere in Pāli literature.¹³ The usage of the term *samaṇa* (mendicant) in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* also contrasts with its usage found elsewhere in *Nikāya* literature: while the Buddha is described as a (great) *samaṇa* in other Pāli texts, the *samaṇa* in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* refers to a misguided ascetic who becomes entangled in disputes with others due to their unwieldy attachment to their dogmatic views.

The absence of uniquely Buddhist epithets, the prevalence of cross-denominational epithets, the rare usage of the epithet ‘*yakkha*,’ and the negative portrayal of the epithet ‘*samaṇa*’—all these features point to the pre-institutional phase of the Buddhist traditions when a distinctive Buddhist identity had not yet been established.

¹² In the list of the pan-Indian religious epithets, I have excluded one-time occurrences, such as *mahesi* (the great sage), *cakḥhumant* (the one with vision), *ādiccabandhu* (the kinsperson of the Sun), *nāga* (the elephant, dragon or hero), etc.

¹³ We also encounter the epithet *yakkha* (Skt. *yakṣa*, the spiritual one) twice in the phrase ‘*yakkhassa suddhiṃ* (the purity of the Spiritual One)’ as an epithet for an ideal person in the *Kalahavivādasutta* (Sn. IV-11). The term *yakkha* originally means ‘a ghost in the forest,’ and Buddhist literature often portrays *yakkhas* as wrathful supernatural beings, usually threatening and sometimes devouring people. To the best of my knowledge, this usage of the epithet appears only in this *sutta* and the *Sundarikabhāradvājasutta* (Sn. III-4) of the *Sutta Nipāta*. The presence of the epithet ‘*yakkha*’ as an ideal person in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* has perplexed many scholars in the field of Buddhist studies.

2.2. The *Yizujing* 義足經 (Sūtra of Poetic Aphorisms)

The *Yizujing* is a Buddhist *sūtra* translated from an Indic language into Chinese by the Kushan émigré descendant Zhi Qian 支謙 (fl. 222-252 CE) during the Wu 吳 dynasty (222–280 CE). It consists of 16 sub-*sūtras* that correspond to the 16 *suttas* of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, and the Chinese translation has 306 verses, which is 96 verses more than the Pāli text. According to my identification, the text shares 206 verses with the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. The remaining 100 verses are not found in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, but many of them have parallels in other Pāli texts—ranging from canonical texts to non-canonical commentaries such as the *Dhammapada*, *Udāna*, *Hemavatasutta* (Sn. I-9), *Paramatthajotikā II*, and *Visuddhimagga*. Others are found in the Sanskrit *Divyāvadāna*.¹⁴ These diverse sources in Indic languages serve as a reminder of the fluid nature of such ancient collections and perhaps of what Gregory Schopen (2009) calls “the absence of an Urtext”: the fluid nature of an ancient text makes it impossible or even meaningless to search for its original form.¹⁵

While the *Aṭṭhakavagga* consists only of verses, the *Yizujing* contains both verses and prose narratives that frame individual *sūtras* or clusters of verses within *sūtras*. Most of these narratives have parallels in the *Paramatthajotikā II*, a non-canonical Pāli commentary on the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. According to Bapat, nine narratives in both texts are similar, but at least seven

¹⁴ Additional parallels in other sectarian canons likely exist, but they are yet to be identified.

¹⁵ Schopen’s argument aligns with Salomon’s (2000: 38–52) insights from his comparative study of the Gāndhārī, Pāli, and Sanskrit versions of the *Rhinoceros Sūtra*. Salomon contends that the different versions cannot be definitively ranked in terms of authenticity or originality, as each reflects distinct historical processes of standardization and canonization. He also critiques the traditional Western approach to text criticism, which aims to reconstruct a single urtext, as it may not be feasible or beneficial in the context of these texts.

For example, Jayawickrama (1949: 22–31) postulates that the Sanskrit version, with its 12 verses, represents the nucleus from which the longer Pāli version, containing 41 verses, developed. He also points to some apparent doctrinal contradictions within the Pāli version to support his position. However, Salomon argues that the brevity of the Sanskrit version does not guarantee its antiquity. Some features of the Gāndhārī version appear derivative of the Pāli version, while others seem closer to a hypothetical archetype than the Pāli version.

narratives of the *Yizujing* differ significantly from those found in the *Paramatthajotikā II* (1951: 10-12). However, based on my assessment, seven narratives in both texts closely match, four differ noticeably, and the remaining five are related to some extent.¹⁶ Some *Paramatthajotikā II* narratives are brief, but their themes or backgrounds can be found in the equivalent *Yizujing* narratives in a much more elaborate form.

The *Yizujing* can be confidently dated to the 3rd century CE, while the *Paramatthajotikā II* is originally anonymous and undatable, except for the colophon of Buddhaghosa, who was active in Sri Lanka during the 5th century CE (von Hinüber 1996: 129–130). Assuming Buddhaghosa redacted the full commentary based on the transmission of the Mahāvihāra tradition in Sri Lanka, we may infer that the stories circulated from quite an early period, probably serving pedagogical purposes. Given that many *Yizujing* narratives are more elaborate than their concise *Paramatthajotikā II* counterparts, we may assume that these narratives held greater popularity and authority in the extinct Indic textual tradition—the source from which the *Yizujing* was translated into Chinese—than in the Pāli tradition.

The *Yizujing* serves as an invaluable textual resource for studying the early phase of Buddhism. Its verses parallel the *Aṭṭhakavagga* whose antiquity has been noted due to its philological features and internal citations within the Pāli canonical literature. Additionally, the *Yizujing* includes later narratives that eventually appeared in the *Paramatthajotikā II* sometime before the 5th century CE. In summary, the *Yizujing* reveals the extensive trajectory of Buddhist textual development, spanning from the ancient verses of pre-institutional Buddhism to the 3rd century CE, when the fully expanded verses and narratives were translated into Chinese.

¹⁶ The *Yizujing* narratives in *sūtras* 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, and 9 closely resemble the *Paramatthajotikā II* stories in *suttas* 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, and 9. The *Yizujing* narratives in *sūtras* 6, 7, 15, and 16 significantly differ from the *Paramatthajotikā II* stories in *suttas* 6, 7, 10, 15. The *Yizujing* narratives in *sūtras* 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 share certain similarities with the *Paramatthajotikā II* stories in *suttas* 11, 12, 13, 14, and 16.

Even though the *Yizujing* is a significant literary work for studying early Buddhist development, it remained unexplored in Western scholarship until the early 1950s when Bapat first introduced the text to an English-speaking audience. However, his groundbreaking work leaves room for investigation and correction. Firstly, Bapat does not provide the Sinographic text, let alone analyze it; he only offers his English translation and a Sanskrit reconstruction of the Chinese that is derived from the readings in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. In contrast, my project not only provides the Sinographic text with its variant readings from multiple editions but also delves into an analysis of the text.

Next, Bapat's English translation—especially of the verses—often seems out of context or even misleading. This is because Bapat overlooks the fact that the *Yizujing* abounds with Chinese literary idioms that were prevalent among the literati at the time of its translation. Moreover, Chinese poetry is generally terse and open to diverse interpretations. Unlike Indic languages, Chinese characters can serve multiple grammatical functions without inflections. To complicate matters further, these characters are compressed into four, five, six, or seven characters per line in each verse, which frequently obscures their meaning. Therefore, I analyze the text by drawing on examples from the Chinese literary corpora that circulated before and around the 3rd century CE in China. These examples help to clarify the rich context in which Zhi Qian selected the Chinese renderings.

Recovering the intended meanings of the *Yizujing* is not simply about shifting from Bapat's Indo-centric translation to a Sino-centric one. My approach to translating the *Yizujing* is nuanced and transcends such binary distinctions. The primary goal of my translation is to approximate the lost Indian original through a thorough translation of the *Yizujing* itself. Given that the Indic original of the *Yizujing* is no longer extant, achieving this goal poses a significant

challenge without a complete understanding of the *Yizujing*. In discussing my perspective somewhere previously, I have referred to ‘Bapat’s Indic-centric approach.’ This was not meant to focus on the reactions of a Chinese audience, but rather to emphasize the importance of translating the *Yizujing* into English faithfully, preserving its authentic Chinese phrasing, which may be fully appreciated only by those well-versed in Chinese scholarship.

I concur that the *Yizujing* might not have been as widely circulated or highly regarded among Chinese intellectuals, a view supported by the absence of discernible textual variations, retranslations, or commentaries in the extant Chinese Buddhist corpus. As for the character variations noted in the Taishō and Zhonghua editions are just minor and do not significantly alter the core content. These factors collectively suggest that the *Yizujing* occupies a less prominent position in Chinese Buddhist literature. Therefore, the manner in which Chinese literati perceived the *Yizujing* may be less important than understanding its potential Indic original. Indeed, reconstructing the lost Indian original holds immense value in Buddhist studies, particularly when connected with the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, one of the earliest Buddhist texts.

While I fully recognize the importance of uncovering the Indic original of the *Yizujing*, I contend that a genuine understanding of the Chinese *Yizujing*—rather than forcing it to align with its Pāli equivalents—will bring us closer to its original essence. Notably, while the *Yizujing* and the *Aṭṭhakavagga* sometimes mirror each other verbatim, they often diverge significantly in theme, content, and phrasing, sometimes appearing as distinct entities. Bapat’s approach of forced alignments not only misrepresents the *Yizujing* but also obscures the true nature of its Indic original, which likely exhibited significant differences from its Pāli counterpart. As a result, his Sanskrit reconstructions, influenced by this alignment method, are often skewed. By recognizing and understanding the disparities between the *Yizujing* and the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, we

can better appreciate the historical significance of the extinct Indic original. In my work, I have strived to adopt Zhi Qian's mindset during his translation of the *Yizujing*, aiming ultimately to illuminate its Indic origins.

When the *Yizujing* first gained scholarly attention following Bapat's translation, academic interest in the text was primarily due to the growing recognition of the Pāli *Aṭṭhakavagga* in the field of Indian Buddhism. However, this attention did not last long. Since Bapat's English translation, there have been no significant secondary works on the *Yizujing*. Japanese scholars, like Asayama Yukihiro 朝山幸彦 (1983, 2000), Katsuzaki Yūgen 勝崎裕彦 (1985, 1987), Satō Yoshihiro 佐藤義博 (1994), and Sattō Takanobu 齊藤隆信 (2000) have written articles on Zhi Qian's translation style, but none focused specifically on the *Yizujing*. Mizuno Kōgen 水野弘元 (1951) introduced the *Yizujing* to a Japanese audience, but his work only provided basic information about the text and Bapat's English translation. Beyond these contributions, the *Yizujing* has remained largely unexplored in both Western and Asian academia.

Vetter (1990: 42) makes a brief and critical evaluation of the *Yizujing*. At the beginning of his discussion of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, he explains why he does not take the *Yizujing* seriously: he believes it is full of mistranslations, making it unsuitable for his argument. He arrives at this conclusion based on just one example, which I will examine in the following paragraphs. Contrary to his judgment, I suggest the text was meticulously translated by Zhi Qian, who was proficient in both Indic languages and Chinese. Furthermore, when carefully analyzed, what may appear as incorrect translations or discrepancies between terms in the *Yizujing* and those in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* can serve as invaluable resources for investigating the *Arthapada*' textual history

and the early phase of Chinese Buddhist translation.¹⁷ Additionally, substantial data can be adduced to identify features of the Indic language from which the *Yizujing* was translated.

Let me take a close look at the example Vetter chose. This examination might suggest Zhi Qian had a valid reason for translating the Indic phrase in a way that Vetter perceives as of ‘doubtful quality.’ The example at issue is the Pāli phrase ‘*sātaṃ asātan ti*’ in Sn.867, 869, and 879, and its Chinese rendering ‘*souyouwu* 所有無’ or ‘*youyiwu* 有亦無’ in Y.10.6, 10.8, and 10.9. The *Mahāniddeśa* interprets this Pāli phrase as “what people consider as ‘agreeable’ or ‘disagreeable.’” However, its Chinese rendering ‘*souyouwu* 所有無’ carries a different meaning, literally translating to “that which exists or does not exist.” Vetter deems this translation to be far from the original and hastily concludes that the *Yizujing* holds little value for his study.

However, there may be a reason for this seemingly offbeat translation. The Pāli ‘*sātaṃ asātan ti*’ can either be ‘*sātaṃ aśātan ti*’ or ‘*sattaṃ asattan ti*’ in Sanskrit. The former means ‘agreeable or disagreeable,’ while the latter means ‘existence or non-existence.’ Thus, I suspect that the Middle Indic source for the *Yizujing* or Zhi Qian’s reading of the phrase may be akin to ‘*sattaṃ asattan ti*’ in Sanskrit. This conjecture is possible because Sanskrit consonants ‘ś,’ ‘s,’ and ‘ṣ’ are all reduced to ‘s’ in Pāli. According to Professor Diego Loukota (personal communication, July 15, 2019), Gāndhārī written in Kharoṣṭhī manuscripts usually does not mark long vowels and double consonants, and Brāhmī manuscripts are also pretty bad at long vowels. Additionally, these two Sanskrit readings have the same metric license and are chanted

¹⁷ Daniel Boucher (2006) presents a similar argument when examining Dharmarakṣa’s (Zhu Fahu 竺法護) translations from both philological and historical perspectives. Drawing on Seishi Karashima’s (辛嶋靜志, 1992) comparative study of Dharmarakṣa’s translation of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkāsūtra* and the extant Sanskrit manuscripts of the *sūtra*, Boucher analyzes apparent phonetic, semantic, and syntactic misinterpretations of the Indic original in Dharmarakṣa’s translation. For Boucher, these errors provide invaluable insights into the linguistic features of the Indic original and the spoken idioms of North Central China. Moreover, they shed light on the roles of numerous participants in the collaborative translation process.

in the same rhythm—heavy; heavy; light; heavy; heavy; light. In summary, Vetter’s example may not be the result of Zhi Qian’s awkward translation. Instead, it is possible that the Indic source for Zhi Qian read it as ‘*sattam asattan ti*’ (‘existence or non-existence’), giving it more philosophical sophistication.

Now let’s shift our focus to the translator, Zhi Qian. Born and raised in a prominent Yuezhi (月氏) immigrant family in northern China, Zhi Qian’s exceptional Chinese literary skills marked a turning point in the development of Chinese Buddhist translations.¹⁸ Prior to Zhi Qian, Chinese Buddhist translations were produced by non-Chinese individuals from the *Xiyu* 西域 (Western Regions, viz., India and Central Asia), primarily targeting first/second generation Buddhist immigrants from those regions as their audience. As a consequence, many transcriptions were adopted, adding an extra layer of unfamiliarity to the foreign religious ideas in ancient China. After Zhi Qian, Chinese Buddhist translations began to reach a wider audience

¹⁸ Jan Nattier (2008) offers a comprehensive study of Zhi Qian in her book, *A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations*. This book examines Chinese Buddhist translations during the Eastern Han 東漢 (25–220 CE) and Three Kingdoms 三國 (220–280 CE) periods, organizing its content around the prominent translators of the era. Zhi Qian’s translations are landmark achievements in the history of Chinese Buddhist translations, warranting a significant portion of her book (*Ibid.*, 116–148). Nattier’s entry on ‘Zhi Qian’ (2019: 818–825) in *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism* offers a concise summary of her research on Zhi Qian. In these works, she presents an overview of Zhi Qian’s biography, his attributed works, and translation style, based on different sources—the *Chu sanzang ji ji* (出三藏記集, T.2145), his autobiographical preface to the *Fajujing* 法句經 (*Dharmapada*, T210) and the translations credited to him.

The *Chu sanzang ji ji*, the earliest surviving catalog of Chinese Buddhist translations, was completed in 515 CE by Sengyou (僧祐; 435–518). This catalog incorporates an earlier, now non-extant, catalog compiled in 374 CE by Dao’an (道安; 312/314–385). As a result, the earliest source of information about Zhi Qian can date back to the late 4th century, slightly over a century after Zhi Qian’s prolific period.

Although the *Fajujing* is not credited to Zhi Qian in Chinese Buddhist catalogs, Nattier identifies him as the final editorial hand. Specifically, the *Chu sanzang ji ji* lists the *Faju jing* as anonymous. The Taishō canon credits Fa Jiu 法救 as the editor of the *Faju jing* and Wei Qinan 維祇難 etc. as its translators (尊者法救撰 吳天竺沙門維祇難等譯). However, Nattier asserts that “substantial external evidence points to Zhi Qian as responsible for putting the text in its final form.” (2008: 134) Based on her identification, the text’s autobiographic preface offers invaluable information of Zhi Qian in his own words.

in China, and translators came up with better Chinese equivalencies for Buddhist ideas, which resonated with the Chinese literati.

Zhi Qian's translation work exhibit several distinctive features. Firstly, his works cover a wide spectrum of Buddhist scriptures. As a native Chinese speaker, he studied Buddhism in a community founded by his predecessor, Lokakṣema (Zhi Loujiachen 支婁迦讖), a prolific Chinese Buddhist translator in the late 2nd century CE. When Zhi Qian began his translation career, he primarily worked independently, focusing on revising previous translations.¹⁹ As a result, his corpus encompasses a broad range of Buddhist scriptures, including “both Mahāyāna and non-Mahāyāna sūtras as well as didactic verses [the *Yizujing* and the *Fajujing*], *jātaka* and *avadāna* style texts and a biography of the Buddha” (Nattier, 2008: 117). This scriptural variety is striking when compared to the narrower focus of his predecessors: An Shigao (安世高; fl. c. 148–170) worked on scriptures from the mainstream Sarvāstivāda Buddhist school, while Lokakṣema concentrated on lengthy Mahāyāna sūtras.

Secondly, Zhi Qian employed an extensive range of sophisticated Chinese vocabulary. Refining numerous previous translations, he occasionally adopted Buddhist renderings from them, while, at other times, he devised his own renderings when necessary. According to Nattier (*Ibid.*: 118), he also demonstrated “a predilection for variety” in his own translations. This leads to his use of a wide variety of renderings for specific Buddhist terms. For example, in the case of the Indic word *arhat* (an epithet of awakened people in Buddhism), he employs at least eight different translations and transcriptions.

¹⁹ According to Zhi Qian's autobiographical narrative in the preface to the *Fajujing*, he “does not describe himself as working with others, but rather as polishing and completing an already existing work” (Nattier, 2008: 125).

Furthermore, Zhi Qian experimented with various Chinese literary styles. In didactic verses, such as the *Fajujing* and the *Yizujing*, he sometimes employs meter and rhyme. He favored a four-character style for prose passages and five-, six-, or seven-character styles for Indian poetry (*Ibid.*: 4). In fact, hexasyllabic prosody was rare in his time and its presence is considered “a virtual fingerprint of his work” (*Ibid.*: 119).²⁰

Finally, Zhi Qian had a strong command of both Chinese vernaculars and the classical vocabularies of the Chinese literati. For instance, the term *zuonu* 坐女 in Y1.21 verse literally means ‘sitting girl.’ Bapat seems to be confused about this term; he evaded this translation and filled out the line with the unrelated rendering ‘that stupid fool.’ However, I consider this term to be a Chinese vernacular term for a ‘virgin.’ In my reading, *Zuonu* refers to a lady who has not ‘married (出家),’ but stays in her parents’ house (在家 or 坐家). Its earliest usage in the Chinese literary corpus is found in the biography of Guo Chen (郭陳列傳; fl., 1st century CE?) in the *Hou Han Shu* (後漢書). This text is redacted more than a century later than the translation of the *Yizujing*, but it may imply an earlier current usage of this idiom. This reading also aligns with early Indian customs found in Buddhist discourses, such as the *Brahmajāla Sutta* and the *Sāmaññaphala Sutta* from the *Dīgha Nikāya*.²¹

²⁰ The *Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳 (Biographies of Eminent Monks)—a compendium of monastic biographies compiled in 530 CE—associates this hexasyllabic verse with Indian song (*liuyin fanbai*, 六音梵唄) (*Ibid.*: 120).

²¹ For example, we find the following moral disciplinary regulation in the *Sāmaññaphala Sutta*: “He abstains from accepting uncooked grain, raw meat, *women and girls*, male and female slaves, ...” (translated by Bhikkhu Bodhi, 1989: 35).

2.3. Fragmentary Versions in Sanskrit and Gāndhārī

In addition to the Pāli *Aṭṭhakavagga* and the Chinese *Yizujing*, there are two other recensions of the *Arthapada*: one in Sanskrit and the other in Gāndhārī. While these two fragmentary Indic scriptures have been identified and published, they have not been extensively studied. Despite their incomplete nature, they could offer valuable insights into the textual and linguistic evolution of the *Arthapada*.

In 1916, Hoernle published a Sanskrit version of the *Arthapada* contained in five fragmentary consecutive folios. According to him, this fragmented material is equivalent to *suttas* 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* or *sūtras* 7, 8, 9, and 11 of the *Yizujing*. The order of the Sanskrit *sūtras* in the folios resembles the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, but the Sanskrit *sūtras* 7, 9, and (probably) 10 have introductory narratives, much like the *Yizujing*.²²

In 2010, Falk identified one birch-bark fragment in the ‘Split’ collection containing several Kharoṣṭhī stanzas in Gāndhārī language corresponding to the *Aṭṭhakavagga* verses 841–844 and 966–968 or the *Yizujing* verses 10.7–10 and 14.30, 31, & 36. The verse sequence in the fragment more closely resembles the *Aṭṭhakavagga* than the *Yizujing*.²³

²² The Sanskrit fragments include the narrative of the *Māgandiya sūtra* (*sūtra* 9), which has parallels in the Pāli commentary on the *Dhammapada* and the Sanskrit *Divyāvadāna*. A cross-textual study of these texts could uncover the textual and linguistic evolution of these texts.

²³ The Gāndhārī fragments exhibit orthographic peculiarities—unlike any other Kharoṣṭhī manuscript, this fragment contains some unusual letters—which are, of course, beyond the scope of this project.

3. Rationale for Using ‘Pre-Institutional Phase of the Buddhist Traditions’ instead of ‘Early Buddhism’ or ‘Earliest Buddhism’?

To delineate the temporal context for the archaic verses in the *Arthapada*, I employ a term of my own creation: ‘pre-institutional phase of the Buddhist traditions.’ I coined this phrase to circumvent such conventional labels as ‘early Buddhism’ and ‘earliest Buddhism,’ which are prevalent in secondary literature on the religion. In this chapter, I expound on the necessity for this novel chronological marker and its alignment with the era when these archaic verses were composed and recited. First, I concentrate on the first segment of my chosen term and discuss my preference for ‘pre-institutional period’ over the conventional descriptors ‘early’ or ‘earliest.’ During this analysis, I scrutinize varying chronological presumptions associated with the widely used terms ‘early Buddhism’ and ‘earliest Buddhism.’ I contend that the descriptors ‘early’ and ‘earliest’ are imprecise when defining what is early or earliest in Buddhist history. Scholars use these adjectives with ‘Buddhism’ and conveniently employ the resulting phrases to depict their perceived early or earliest stages of Buddhism. The ambiguity of these adjectives is not the sole motivation for creating my unique term: I next proceed to examine the latter portion of my label and discuss why I deem ‘Buddhist traditions’ more appropriate than "Buddhism" when referencing its genesis. I argue that the non-sectarian strains of thought in the *Arthapada* do not comfortably align with the structured collection of religious doctrines and practices expected from the term ‘Buddhism.’

3.1. ‘Early Buddhism’ for Describing the Formative Period of Buddhist Traditions

In adherence to the longstanding academic tradition initiated by T. W. Rhys Davids (1843-1922), numerous Buddhist scholars construe the term ‘early Buddhism’ as ‘pre-sectarian Buddhism’ or, in a broader sense, as ‘mainstream Buddhism.’ Pre-sectarian Buddhism pertains to Buddhism

prior to the first schism, which, according to traditional chronology, divided the Buddhist Saṅgha into the Sthaviravādin (Sect of the Elders) and the Mahāsaṅghika (Sect of the Majority) approximately a century after the Buddha's passing. Mainstream Buddhism encompasses sectarian Buddhism, spanning the era of multiple Buddhist schools that emerged following the successive divisions within the Buddhist community (*saṅghabhedā*). This academic categorization is more commonly recognized in the Mahāyāna sūtras as the derogatory term 'Hīnayāna (Small Vehicle),' in contrast to the innovative religious aspirations embodied by the so-called 'Mahāyāna (Great Vehicle).'

Whether scholars interpret 'early Buddhism' as 'pre-sectarian' or 'mainstream,' they generally rely on the chronological accounts presented in the Pāli Vinaya and the Sinhalese Chronicles, which assert that the historical Buddha's 'original' teachings were meticulously compiled and transmitted through Buddhist canonical literature, particularly the Nikāya/Āgama (Discourses) and Vinaya (Monastic rules) collections. Scholars may also acknowledge that, despite the schisms within the Buddhist community, multiple Buddhist schools preserved these collections largely intact, albeit with occasional reorganization of their discourses and monastic regulations in their canonical structures.²⁴ Although this assumption is somewhat reductive, it continues to endure within the historiography of Buddhism.

Richard F. Gombrich, for instance, subscribes to the general acceptance of the term 'early Buddhism.' In his book *How Buddhism Began* (2006; 1st ed. 1996: 57), he contrasts 'early

²⁴ This consensus is corroborated by Anālayo (2011: 9) in his work, *A Comparative Study of the Majjhima-nikāya Vol. 1 & 2*, published by Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation. Comparing the Chinese *Madhyama-āgama* (T 26) with the Pāli *Majjhima-nikāya* and other *Nikāya* collections, he reveals that 96 out of 152 discourses in the Pāli collection have parallels in the Chinese collection, while others find their counterparts in alternative Chinese *Āgama* collections or individually translated Chinese discourses. This parallelism may reinforce the assumption of a "well-compiled-and-transmitted" Vinaya and Nikāya/Āgama literature. However, Gregory Schopen (1997: 80) proposes an entirely different possibility, stating that "if uniformity is ever achieved, it is achieved over more or less long periods of time through a complex process of mutual influence, borrowing, and sometimes violent leveling that works on originally discrete and competing groups and voices."

Buddhism' with Mahāyāna Buddhism, stating, "In early Buddhism, the Buddha was a saviour only in the sense that he taught the way to salvation. In the Mahāyāna, both Buddhas and bodhisattvas saved more directly, by transferring merit." In this context, he employs 'early Buddhism' to signify 'pre-Mahāyāna Buddhism' or 'mainstream Buddhism.' As a Pāli specialist, however, Gombrich primarily uses the term to refer to the Buddhism represented in the Pāli canonical literature. This narrower sense of the term is evident in his assertion (Ibid. 4): "... This has sometimes been interpreted to mean that early Buddhism, like the much later Yogācāra school, was idealistic; but that is a mistake: the ontology of the Pali Canon is realistic and pluralistic; it does not deny that there is a world 'out there'." For Gombrich, 'early Buddhism' is principally synonymous with Pāli Buddhism, as it is the only surviving comprehensive canonical collection from a school within mainstream Buddhism. He believes that the Pāli Canon is the nearest representation of the unaltered and unequivocal discourses of the historical Buddha.

Although Gombrich does not place significant emphasis on the chronological stratification of the Pāli canonical texts, it is evident what he considers to be the earliest layer of Buddhist literature. Throughout his book, he persistently argues that Buddhism emerged as a reaction to orthodox Brahmanism, positioning the Buddha as a reformer within a world dominated by brahmins. From his perspective, the Buddha's ingenious counterarguments against the Brahmanic worldview form the essence of Buddhism, with related Pāli accounts representing the earliest stratum in Buddhist literature. Gombrich posits that Buddhism originated with the ideological innovations of the Buddha, and that the Buddha's confrontations with distinguished brahmins were historical realities.

Cognizant of the conventional association of the term "early Buddhism" with "Pāli literature," Kenneth Roy Norman (1997: 174) cautions us that the Pāli Canon is merely one

representation of early Buddhism among numerous mainstream Buddhist canons: “There was a tendency to think that Pāli sources gave the most reliable picture of early Buddhism, being the oldest and the most complete, while Sanskrit sources, being mainly Mahāyāna, were late and suspect... This view had, of course, been quite untenable since the discovery of Sanskrit Hīnayāna material in Chinese Turkestan and Gilgit, etc...” Oskar von Hinüber (2013) asserts that many of these Sanskrit manuscripts even date back to the end of the first millennium BCE, predating any extant versions of the Pāli canonical scriptures.²⁵ Consequently, the emergence of these new publications prompts us to reevaluate our prior convention of equating the term "early Buddhism" with Pāli canonical Buddhism.

Although Norman moves beyond the Pāli-centric convention in discussions of early Buddhism, the Pāli philologist reveals his specific assumptions regarding the term ‘early Buddhism.’ While discussing the archaic text *Aṭṭhakavagga*, Norman (2003: 518) asserts: “If the Buddha obtained *bodhi* by means of *jhāna*, and thereby attained release from *saṃsāra*, and subsequently taught the *paṭicca-samuppāda*, the four Noble Truths and an eight-fold path leading to the cessation of *dukkha*, then all these aspects are features of the earliest form of Buddhism, irrespective of whether they are mentioned in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* or not.”²⁶ However, his argument is founded on his personal beliefs and may even be considered circular. He presumes that these doctrinal elements of Buddhism emerged simultaneously with the existence of the historical Buddha, his religious inspiration, and his discourses. Consequently, he returns to his belief as the basis for his conclusion that these features should be considered early Buddhism.

²⁵ See Von Hinüber, Oskar (2013). “The Gilgit Manuscripts: An Ancient Buddhist Library in Modern Research,” in *From Birch Bark to Digital Data: Recent Advances in Buddhist Manuscript Research*, edited by Paul Harrison and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, published by Verlag de Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: 79-136.

²⁶ See Norman, K. R. (2003). “The *Aṭṭhakavagga* and Early Buddhism,” in *Jainism and Early Buddhism: Essays in Honor of Padmanabh S. Jaini*, edited by Olle Qvarnström, published by Asian Humanities Press.

So, how does Norman address the atypical nature of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*? He (*Ibid.*) contends that the text represents an early form of Buddhism, but not necessarily the earliest. He has confidence in the historicity of the biographical accounts of the Buddha and his significant spiritual discoveries as depicted in the Pāli Canon. Consequently, he asserts that these accounts in the Nikāya must be the earliest. He then rationalizes the atypical features of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, noting that Pāli literature encompasses diverse styles and content, so the text does not have to be a comprehensive representation of the Buddha's early teachings that encompass all the foundational Buddhist doctrines. Although I appreciate his insight into the diversity within Pāli literature, his claim seems rather too convenient and fails to resolve the issue. The *Aṭṭhakavagga* not only lacks the Buddhist doctrines that Norman considers to be emblematic of early Buddhism, but also contradicts them in many ways, primarily by advocating the avoidance of forming any views at all.²⁷ This radical departure undermines the 'right view' component of the Eightfold Path, which is one of the essential teachings of the Nikāya literature.

As demonstrated by the citations from Gombrich and Norman, the term 'early Buddhism' carries a certain implication that warrants reconsideration. They imply that Buddhism was a unitary and unadulterated tradition before its ongoing schisms and the emergence of successive Mahāyāna movements. This assumption is based on the accounts of the First and Second Buddhist Councils in the extant *Vinayas* of mainstream Buddhist schools and the Sinhalese Chronicles. They believe that the Buddha's words were meticulously compiled at the First Council just after his passing and were carefully transmitted for about a century before the Second Council and the subsequent schism. This schism is followed by further divisions and the

²⁷ Refer to Gómez, Luis O (1976). "Proto-Mādhyamika in the Pāli Canon," in *Philosophy East and West*, Vol.26, No. 2, University of Hawai'i Press (pp. 137-165). In this article, Gómez suggests that the doctrines in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* may align more closely with the Mādhyamika (Middle Way) teachings than with the Theravāda teachings. The Mādhyamika philosophy is regarded as one of the two most influential Mahāyāna philosophies.

emergence of approximately twenty different mainstream Buddhist schools. Although these schools originated from disputes over monastic rules, they each interpreted the words in their own way and created their unique *Abhidharma* (analysis of the Buddha's words) corpora.

This assumption may be reinforced by the emergence of Mahāyāna *sūtras* and treatises, which are considered further divergences in Buddhist doctrines and practices filled with intricate metaphysics and mythological imaginations. However, this implicit model of historical progression ‘from uniformity to diversity’ requires qualification in light of evidence from the *Arthapada* and a series of recent scholarly works on the rise of different śramaṇic traditions. In Part I, Chapter 3 of my dissertation, I argue that the institutionalization of Buddhism involved a trajectory that moved ‘from initial diversity to increasing uniformity.’ Rather than a narrative of the Buddha’s revelation being well-compiled and well-transmitted by his disciples from the outset, I suggest the compilation process likely underwent a lengthy and arduous journey of identity formation after the legendary Gotama or Śākyamuni Buddha. I maintain that the *Arthapada* present evidence of this extended process.

Not all scholars who use the term ‘early Buddhism’ adhere to the ‘well-compiled-and-transmitted’ narrative. Some employ this term with more nuanced assumptions within their own contexts. For instance, Greg Bailey and Ian Mabbett (2003: 8) utilize the term to describe ‘pre-sectarian’ or ‘mainstream’ Buddhism but propose that early Buddhism, or the Pāli Canon, took shape over an extended period, likely from the fifth to the first centuries BCE. They reach this conclusion based on the fact that the canon reflects not only the early ascetic ideal but also later monastic development. According to them, these two distinct stages of Buddhist development could not have been concurrent.

On one hand, the wandering ascetic ideal—a radical dissociation from society—embodies the backlash against social unrest rampant in the Gangetic plains, caused by the so-called 'second urbanization' during the mid-first millennium BCE. On the other hand, monastic regulations in the *Vinaya* reveal well-established Buddhist monasticism within an already mature urban environment. They argue, “... it seems better to treat the *Vinaya*, and this concords with archaeological findings relating to the earliest *stūpas* and monasteries, as generally representing a later stage of development, when the monks were not typically wandering virtuosi seeking enlightenment but domesticated within society.” As they contend, the *Vinaya* does not depict the time when asceticism gained popularity in response to the accelerated transition from rural to urban settings. Instead, it provides ample evidence of various types of relationships between monastics and laypeople in a settled urban environment.

Thus, according to them, early Buddhism (or the Pāli Canon) is not solely about the records of what happened around the time of the Buddha. Rather, it refers to a prolonged period when Buddhist monasticism gradually took root in ancient India. The Pāli Canon represents later full-fledged monasticism more than the time of the wandering disciples of the Buddha.

Gregory Schopen, a well-known skeptic of the common assumption that the Pāli Canon represents the earliest phase of Buddhism, posits that it may have developed independently from the broader religious traditions within ancient India. He (2004: 170–192) examines monastic rules regarding the inheritance of lay family property by monks in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*, contrasting them with the total absence of such rules in the Pāli *Vinaya*. Schopen contends that this absence suggests the Pāli *Vinaya* may have developed in isolation from ancient Indian culture, which required numerous monastic rules to resolve conflicts with Brahmanic *dharmaśāstra* (Brahmanic treatises on laws) rulings. In contrast, the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* is

replete with cases negotiating Brahmanic laws. Given the *Mūlasarvāstivāda's* status as one of the most influential Buddhist schools on the Indian subcontinent, this should have been the norm for Buddhist monastic codes developed within the broader Indian culture.

Some scholars interpret the absence of Buddhist laws addressing conflicts with Brahmanic laws in the Pāli *Vinaya* as evidence of its antiquity, believing it originated in ancient India before Brahmanic laws gained prominence. According to these scholars, the Pāli *Vinaya* preserves the earliest Buddhist laws intact, potentially established by the Buddha himself. However, Schopen counters this argument by noting that some *dharmasāstras* date back to the sixth century BCE, which is as early as the inception of Buddhism. In his view, the lack of Buddhist laws in the Pāli Canon contesting Brahmanic laws suggests that canon evolved in a distinct culture, specifically Sri Lanka, where Brahmanic laws were not present until later and Buddhist monasteries maintained strong ties with the Sinhalese state. While resolving this scholarly disagreement may prove challenging, Schopen's proposal offers an intriguing alternative perspective on ancient Buddhist canonical texts.

The discussions presented thus far offer just a few examples of the diverse and contrasting assumptions surrounding the term 'early Buddhism.' These discussions demonstrate that scholars have employed the term without reaching a firm consensus on what constitutes the early development of Buddhist traditions. The term 'early Buddhism' typically refers to Buddhism as portrayed in the *Nikāya/Āgama* and *Vinaya* literature, often contrasted with Mahāyāna. Using this term, Gombrich emphasizes the doctrinal innovation of the Buddha in a world dominated by Brahmanic ideologies and practices. Norman contends that the Buddha, his inspiration, and his teachings should be considered the early features of Buddhism, justifying any abnormal features within the canon as simply 'stylistic diversity.' However, Bailey and Mabbett

argue that early Buddhism, as we know it from the Pāli Canon, developed over several centuries and largely represents a later period when Buddhism established a monastic tradition in well-developed urban environments. Schopen asserts that the Pāli *Vinaya* may have been redacted later in Sri Lanka, as it does not reflect the ancient time when Brahmanic laws dominated everyday Indian lives.

3.2. ‘Earliest Buddhism’ for Describing the Formative Period of Buddhist Traditions

Aware of the diverse assumptions underlying the term ‘early Buddhism,’ Lambert Schmithausen introduces another term, ‘earliest Buddhism,’ with the hope of identifying the earliest layer in canonical Buddhist literature. He and David Seyfort Ruegg (1990) edited *Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaka*, a collection of papers from the Panels of the 7th World Sanskrit Conference at the Kern Institute in August 1987. In the book’s preface, Schmithausen reveals his cautious optimism regarding the methodology of ‘higher criticism,’ which scholars use to classify related texts synchronically and diachronically, and to investigate how specific ancient thoughts or texts developed throughout history.²⁸

²⁸ In relation to the methodology of higher criticism, I align my perspective with Schmithausen, Vetter, and Aramaki regarding the gradual development of mainstream Buddhist literature. However, I do not apply this methodology in my dissertation in the same manner as Schmithausen does in his distinguished article (1981), “Liberating Insight and Enlightenment in Early Buddhism,” which addresses the question of ‘how liberating insight became a part of the Buddhist path.’ In his article, he accomplishes this by comparing parallel versions of related texts, examining homogeneous or heterogeneous components, investigating consistencies or inconsistencies, isolating accretions, and stratifying different textual layers. His methodology is viable because there is multilayered textual evidence with varying perspectives on ‘liberating insight’ across different mainstream Buddhist canons. According to Schmithausen, this path presented many technical issues with the preexisting Buddhist soteriology of *absorptive meditation*, necessitating a deliberate effort by canonical compilers to reconcile the conflict. Consequently, we observe different stages or strategies of this reconciliation throughout mainstream canonical Buddhist literature.

As for the *Arthapada*, however, we have few citations of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* that can be employed for criticism, modification, or reiteration of a specific thesis, and only a dozen tributes to the *Aṭṭhakavagga* verses in the Pāli canon. I suspect that its main theme, ‘the release from desire and views,’ is too generic a claim to provoke any technical issues with other specific Buddhist doctrines. Indeed, Gómez (1976), Vetter (1990), and Grace G. Burford (1991) emphasize the doctrinal conflict between the *Aṭṭhakavagga*’s complete abdication of any view and the rest of the canonical emphasis on Buddhist right view. However, Pāli canonical literature was able to find an easy

At the conference where Schmithausen facilitated the discussion on ‘earliest Buddhism,’ Vetter employed this methodology and suggested that some *suttas* of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* might have originated from another *śramaṇa* (ascetic) tradition. In his view, the text’s thesis on the absolute negation of any view is inconsistent with other Nikāya discourses. Aramaki argued that the *Attadaṇḍa sutta* of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* should be considered one of the oldest suttas in Buddhist literature. He even proposed that later textual and doctrinal developments in Buddhism should be appraised in terms of this earliest sutta.

However, Vetter and Aramaki faced staunch criticism from Gombrich and Norman, which was expected given their previous arguments. Gombrich defended the remarkable homogeneity of the Nikāya literature, while Norman argued that the evidence provided by Vetter and Aramaki merely represented normal stylistic diversity within the genealogical uniformity of the Nikāya. Neither side could persuade the other. From Gombrich and Norman’s perspective, the term ‘earliest Buddhism’ may appear superfluous because what they call ‘early Buddhism,’ as represented in the *Nikāya/Āgama* literature, should be the earliest witness to the Buddha’s teachings. From Vetter and Aramaki’s standpoint, on the other hand, the *Nikāya/Āgama* literature comprises multiple layers with diverse origins that developed throughout the history of Buddhist literature. By using the term ‘earliest Buddhism,’ they typically refer to the time of the Buddha or, at most, his direct disciples, distinguishing it from the term ‘early Buddhism,’ which might include several generations that followed. Vetter and Aramaki assume these subsequent generations modified and developed the Buddha’s initial teachings, resulting in the *Nikāya/Āgama* literature.

resolution by reinterpreting the complete abdication as ‘no attachment to any view’—that is, it is acceptable to have the ‘right view’ as long as one does not become attached to it. Thus, in my view, this doctrinal conflict rarely surfaced in traditional Buddhist doctrinal discussions until modern Western scholarship began grappling with it.

Whether fitting or gratuitous, the term ‘earliest Buddhism,’ like ‘early Buddhism,’ may imply that Buddhism was a unified tradition from its inception. It also posits that this single tradition diversified over a millennium after the Buddha’s time, giving rise to numerous competing Buddhist schools, each reinterpreting, articulating, and systematizing the earliest doctrines and monastic rules in their own unique ways. I have previously addressed this assumed trajectory from uniformity to diversity, proposing that this may not reflect historical reality. At this moment, I problematize another common assumption found in the secondary literature on Buddhist history, which underlies the use of these two chronological terms: the notion that early or earliest Buddhists—specifically, the Buddha and his immediate disciples—had a distinctive denominational identity. This assumption is deeply ingrained in academic discourse, where the Buddha’s revelation was the only one of its kind and is often said to have instantly distinguished him and his followers from other *śramaṇic* contemporaries. This enduring academic presumption stems from the study of the Pāli canon and the Sinhalese chronicles, both of which portray the Buddha’s intense rivalry with other religious denominations in ancient India.

However, this presumed Buddhist identity ‘from the outset’ is called into question by a multitude of counterevidence found in the *Arthapada* and other early Indian religious literary traditions. The absence of emblematic Buddhist epithets in the verses of the *Arthapada*, which I will examine in Part I, Chapter 4, is a typical example of a time when Buddhist identity had yet to form. Specifically, the text lacks uniquely Buddhist epithets such as ‘*buddha* (佛; awakened one),’ ‘*bhagavant* (世尊; blessed one),’ and ‘*tathāgata* (如來; thus-gone one).’ Instead, it abounds with generic epithets common across many religious subgroups of the day, such as ‘*muni* (尊; sage),’ ‘*brāhmaṇa* (ideal ascetic),’ and ‘*dhīra* (黠/慧; wise one).’

My thesis aligns with numerous recent academic publications over the last few decades that unveil new contexts in which ancient Indian *śramaṇic* traditions emerged. Two notable examples are Nathan McGovern’s (2019) study on the contested epithet ‘*brāhmaṇa*’ across different *śramaṇic* denominations and Piotr Balcerowicz’s (2016) research on the shared memory between the Ājīvika and Jain traditions. These studies illustrate the illusory nature of religious identities in the early period of their respective traditions. All these findings point in the same direction: religious identity formation took a long time, likely spanning several centuries or more. In Part I, Chapter 3 of my dissertation, I will draw on these recent scholarly works on Indian religions and argue that Buddhism may not have originated with a distinctive denominational identity. Rather, the formation of a distinctive Buddhist identity likely required a considerable amount of time to accomplish.

3.3. ‘Buddhism’ Versus ‘Buddhist Traditions’

Taking all these factors into account, I deviate from the academic convention of using ‘early Buddhism’ or ‘earliest Buddhism’ to define the temporal context for the archaic verses in the *Arthapada*. Instead, I employ what I believe to be the more precise chronological term ‘pre-institutional phase of the Buddhist traditions.’ In my phrasing, I replace the vague descriptors ‘early’ or ‘earliest’ with the more definitive ‘pre-institutional phase.’ This is because the *Arthapada*, one of the oldest Buddhist texts, represents a time even before the period typically referred to as ‘early Buddhism’ or ‘earliest Buddhism.’ The text does not exhibit a clear Buddhist identity nor structured Buddhist doctrines, which I consider features of the institutional phase of Buddhism. I also substitute ‘Buddhist traditions’ for ‘Buddhism’ because the former allows for the fluid nature of religious phenomena in their incipient stages, while the latter renders these

phenomena fixed and abstract by using the suffix ‘-ism.’ Additionally, I use ‘Buddhist traditions’ in the plural rather than ‘Buddhist tradition’ in the singular, as it is not a single, fixed tradition, but rather multiple streams of religious thought that eventually became the raw material for later Buddhist institutionalization. By combining the terms ‘pre-institutional period’ and ‘Buddhist traditions,’ I propose that we should consider an alternative historical trajectory: one that moves from an initial state of nascent diversity to increasing uniformity by means of normativization, before then embracing the commonly presumed progression from uniformity to diversity in Buddhist history.

4. Statistical Analysis: Lack of a ‘Buddhist’ Identity in the *Arthapada*

4.1. ‘Buddha,’ ‘Bhagavant,’ and ‘Tathāgata’

The *Arthapada* reveals many features of religious adepts who had not yet formed a clear identity as Buddhists. Notably, the epithets for the ideal religious adept appearing in the text imply a different self-perception compared to that found in other Buddhist literature. For example, the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, the Pāli recension of the *Arthapada*, hardly describes its ideal person with the emblematic epithet ‘*buddha*’; the epithet occur only once in an introductory verse within the last sutta (Sn.957). ‘*Bhagavant* (Blessed One),’ a pervasive epithet in the Pāli canon, appears just once (Sn.934), while ‘*tathāgata* (Thus-gone),’ the Buddha’s self-epithet found throughout the canon, is absent from this ancient text.²⁹ Instead, the most frequent epithet in the text is ‘*muni* (Sage),’ appearing 17 times,’ followed by ‘*brāhmaṇa* (Ideal Ascetic[?])’ with 9 occurrences, and ‘*dhīra* (Wise One)’ mentioned 7 times.³⁰ These epithets are not exclusive to Buddhist literature but are shared across various ancient Indian religions.

We observe a similar case in the *Yizujing*, the Chinese recension of the *Arthapada*. Its verses never use the epithet ‘*fo* 佛 (Buddha)’ except once in an introductory verse (Y10.1) where an interlocutor requests the Buddha’s teaching. ‘*Rulai* 如來,’ typically a Chinese translation of ‘*tathāgata*,’ is used as a translation of ‘*bhagavant*’ three times in verses (Y13.46, 13.47, &

²⁹ As for the number of occurrences of ‘*bhagavant*,’ I exclude the phrase ‘*ti bhagavā* (thus [said] the Blessed One; it occurs 11 times)’ because they are not within the metric of verses and are likely later editorial additions. In fact, the Chatṭha Saṅgāyana (the Sixth Council, 1954–1956) Tipiṭaka consistently puts this phrase in parentheses.

³⁰ The number of occurrences of ‘*brāhmaṇa*’ includes the compound of *samaṇabrāhmaṇā* in Sn859, though it is used as the generic classification of people into *puthujjanā* (common folks) and *samaṇabrāhmaṇā* (religious experts). Apart from these epithets, we encounter the usage of ‘*Gotama*’ (Sn.848 & 933), ‘*tādin* (Such a sublime one; Sn.803, 957),’ ‘*ahibhū* (Conqueror; Sn.934),’ ‘*mahesi* (Great Sage; Sn.915),’ ‘*ādiccabandhu* (Kinsman of the sun; Sn.915),’ ‘*nāga* (Snake or Elephant; Sn.845),’ ‘*yakkha* (Spiritual being; Sn.875 & 876),’ and *cakkhumant* (Seer; Sn 956). ‘*Gotama*’ is the Buddha’s family name, and ‘*yakkha*’ is used as a representative of ‘*suddhi* (religious purity).’ I will discuss these epithets later.

15.5).³¹ The common Chinese translation for ‘*bhagavant*’ is ‘*shizun* 世尊’ (World Honored One) which appears only once in the compound ‘*shizundashi* 世尊大師 (the World Honored One, the Great Teacher; Y13.26).’ However, the Pāli parallel to this verse comes not from the *Aṭṭhakavagga* but from the *Hemavatasutta* (Sn.179) of the *Sutta Nipāta*, with this compound being a Chinese translation of the Pāli term ‘*satthā anuttara* (incomparable teacher).’ Contrary to the rare occurrences of these terms in the Chinese recension, the overriding epithet for the ideal person is ‘*zun* 尊 (Honorable One),’ appearing 61 times in the verses.³² In the *Yizujing*, *zun* is not only used as a translation of the Indic ‘*muni*’ but is employed more widely: when referring to the instructor of the *Arthapada*, the text conveniently adopts the term ‘*zun*.’ Other broadly employed terms are ‘*xia* 點 and *hui* 慧’ both of which literally mean ‘Wise One.’ There are 31 instances of *xia* and 44 occurrences of *hui* in the verses of the *Yizujing*.³³

The data on epithets gathered from both the *Aṭṭhakavagga* and the *Yizujing* verses provide insights into the self-perception of *Arthapada*’s composers. The analysis is detailed across three tables below. Table 1 lists the number of occurrences of relevant epithets in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, its two commentaries, and the four *Nikāyas*. The macro data from the four *Nikāyas* suggest that the *Aṭṭhakavagga* uniquely diverges from common trends, while its

³¹ We do not find any Pāli parallel verse to Y15.5 in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* or perhaps even within the entire Pāli Canon.

³² The number ‘61’ for ‘尊’ in the verses excludes the ‘1’ usage of ‘世尊,’ considering 世尊 as a translation of ‘*bhagavant*’ rather than ‘*muni*.’ Similarly, Table 2 in the following page shows the number ‘16’ for ‘尊’ in the narratives, and this number excludes the ‘7’ usages of ‘世尊’ in the same row. However, I include instances of ‘尊’ that can be considered as either an epithet or an adjective meaning ‘worthy’ in both the numbers (‘61’ and ‘16’) because Chinese words can perform various grammatical functions, and many of its usage lie somewhere between an epithet and an adjective.

³³ In addition to these three prevalent terms, we find five usages of ‘*Qutan* 瞿曇 (Chinese transcription of *Gotama*; I include *tanqu* 曇瞿 in Y13.46, which should be a typo of 瞿曇),’ one usage of ‘*shijiazi* 釋家子 (the Son of the Śākya clan),’ ‘*dashi* 大師 (the Great Teacher),’ and ‘*zhengjiao* 正覺 (the Rightly Awakened One).’

commentaries align with those observed in the four *Nikāyas*. Numbers exceeding three digits in the rows for the *Nikāyas* are approximations, indicated by a tilde (~). The ratios in parentheses in Table 1 are calculated by dividing the number of occurrences of each epithet by the page numbers of the respective texts, as shown in the last column.

Table 2: Frequency of Pāli Epithets Compared with the Commentaries and the Four *Nikāyas*³⁴

	<i>Buddha</i>	<i>Bhagavā</i>	<i>Tathāgata</i>	<i>Muni</i>	<i>Brāhmaṇa</i>	<i>Dhīra</i>	# of Pages in PTS ed.
<i>Aṭṭhakavagga</i>	1 (0.026)	1 + [11]	0	17	9	7	39
<i>Mahāniddesa</i>	153 (0.3)	672 (1.32)	66 (0.13)	185	212	77	510
<i>Paramatthajotikā II</i>	37 (0.57)	115 (1.77)	1	20	4	9	65
<i>Dīgha Nikāya</i>	~544 (0.6)	~1745 (1.93)	~444 (0.49)	5	~1240	2	902
<i>Majjhima Nikāya</i>	~388 (0.36)	~2625 (2.40)	~431 (0.39)	27	~1385	4	1092
<i>Saṃyutta Nikāya</i>	~484 (0.29)	~3250 (1.93)	~595 (0.35)	29	~865	18	1686
<i>Āṅguttara Nikāya</i>	~404 (0.22)	~2383 (1.30)	~840 (0.46)	14	~1268	17	1840

Even at first glance, Table 1 reveals intriguing data. Compared to the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, there is a dramatic increase in the use of the epithets ‘*buddha*,’ ‘*bhagavant*,’ and ‘*tathāgata*’ in the commentaries and the four *Nikāyas*. An exception is the singular use of ‘*tathāgata*’ in the

³⁴ I have generated this data primarily using the digitized PTS (Pāli Text Society) editions from the GRETEL (Göttingen Register of Electronic Texts in Indian Languages) website, with input credited to the Dhammakaya Foundation. However, the *Paramatthajotikā II* has yet to be digitized on the website, so I utilized my own OCR (Optical Character Recognition) scanned PDF file of the PTS (Pāli Text Society) published text.

Figures in Table 1 encompass not only obvious epithetic usages but also adjectival usages and, in many cases, compound usages. Often, it is challenging to determine whether a Pāli nominal should be translated into English as a noun or an adjective because they belong to the same grammatical category with identical declensions in Pāli. For example, the *Mahāniddesa* presents *dhīra* (wise; a Wise One) in ‘*khandhadhīra*,’ which can be interpreted as either ‘well-versed in the [five] constituents,’ or ‘a person who is well-versed in the [five] constituents.’ The text features 12 additional compounds with a similar structure, such as ‘*dhātudhīra* (well-versed in the [eighteen] elements), ...’

In the case of compounds like “*munimunayo*, or *munimunino* ([foremost] sages among [many] sages),” I consider each compound as one epithet.

The last column of Table 1 displays the number of pages of the related texts in the PTS edition. These figures are used to calculate the ratios in parentheses, providing a sense of the ‘frequency’ of each epithet in the texts. It should be noted that the *Aṭṭhakavagga* is entirely in verse, making it difficult to directly compare its page numbers with those of its commentaries, which include both verse and prose. For example, page 2 of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* in the PTS edition has 110 words, while page 2 of the *Mahāniddesa* has 151 words. I selected these sample pages to avoid section titles included on the first pages. My counting excludes the apparatuses in the footnote of the PTS editions, which detail reading variations in different Pāli versions.

Paramatthajotikā II, which stands in sharp contrast to its frequent use in the *Mahāniddesa*. I will discuss this contrast in detail later. For now, it is important to note that the epithet ‘*tathāgata*’ is primarily used when the Buddha refers to himself, a context absent in the commentaries.

However, the *Mahāniddesa* employs this epithet in five specific formulaic contexts, whereas the *Paramatthajotikā II* does not use it at all. For instance, the *Mahāniddesa* repeatedly features a formula containing the epithet, appearing 39 times across the commentary, in a series of so-called ‘ill-formulated questions’ such as asking ‘whether the Tathāgata exists after death.’ The epithet ‘*brāhmaṇa*’ is frequently found in the four *Nikāyas* but is mainly used to denote individuals from the hereditary brahmin class rather than as an idealized person in the texts.

One might critique this methodology by noting, as Norman (2003) and Shulman (2012-2013) have suggested, that verse and prose differ stylistically to the extent that this comparison might seem meaningless. I acknowledge that these different styles likely served varied intentions and targeted distinct audiences, which could lead to the use of unique vocabularies. To address a possible distinction between poetic and narrative vocabularies, I have compiled additional data in Table 2. This table compares the occurrences of epithets within Pāli verses—specifically in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* versus the *Dhammapada*, *Theragāthā*, and *Therīgāthā*. Here, the ratios in parentheses are calculated by dividing the number of occurrences of each epithet by the number of verses in the respective texts, as shown in the last column.

Table 3: Frequency of Pāli Epithets Compared with Three Pāli Poetic Canonical Texts ³⁵

*	<i>Buddha</i>	<i>Bhagavā</i>	<i>Tathāgata</i>	<i>Muni</i>	<i>Brāhmaṇa</i>	<i>Dhīra</i>	# of verses
<i>Aṭṭhakavagga</i>	1 (0.0048)	1 + [11]	0	17	9	7	210
<i>Dhammapada</i>	23 (0.0540)	2	2	6	4 + [45]	19	423
<i>Theragāthā</i>	133 (0.1033)	20	11	38	27	15	1288
<i>Therīgāthā</i>	55 (0.1050)	6	1	7	17	4	524

³⁵ In compiling data from the *Dhammapada*, *Theragāthā*, and *Therīgāthā*, I referenced their PDF versions from the *Chaṭṭha Saṅgayāna Tipiṭaka*.

Upon initial examination, the distinctive epithetic features of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* within the Pāli canon are confirmed, whether compared with those compiled from the four *Nikāyas*, the *Aṭṭhakavagga*'s commentaries, or other poetic texts in the canon. Focusing on the epithet 'buddha,' the *Dhammapada* contains numerous Pāli compounds and phrases involving 'buddha' that allude to the existing Buddhist institution. Terms such as 'buddhāsāsana' (the teachings of the Buddha), 'buddhasāvaka' (the disciple of the Buddha), 'sammāsambuddha' (the Perfectly Awakened One), and the tripartite phrase 'buddha dhamma saṅgha' are recurrent. Notably, 11 of these references are found in just one chapter (Chapter 14, the *Buddhavagga*) out of the 26 chapters. However, the remaining 12 occurrences, along with the contexts in which they are employed, provide sufficient evidence to conclude that the composers of the *Dhammapada* verses possessed a strong sense of Buddhist identity. In the *Theragāthā* verses, the term 'buddha' appears 133 times, with the phrase 'buddha sāsana' or the compound 'buddhasāsana' occurring 43 times. This suggests that the composers of the *Theragāthā* verses likely had a strong Buddhist identity, a trend that is similarly evident in the *Therīgāthā*.

As I will discuss later, the singular use of 'buddha' in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* is an exception, allowing us to assert that the text is largely devoid of the epithet 'buddha.' In contrast, verse-style texts such as the *Dhammapada*, *Theragāthā*, and *Therīgāthā*, as well as prose-style texts including the four *Nikāyas* and the *Aṭṭhakavagga*'s commentaries, frequently use the epithet 'buddha' with institutional connotations. Despite Norman and Shulman's emphasis on the diverse styles and intentions within the Pāli canon, I argue that the consistent absence of a distinct Buddhist identity in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* contrasts sharply with the prevalent expression of Buddhist identity in other Buddhist discourses, whether in verse or prose.

The *Yizujing*, the Chinese translation of *Arthapada*, exhibits a similar trend to the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. Like the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, the *Yizujing* includes both verses and narratives, which can respectively be compared with the *Aṭṭhakavagga* and its post-canonical commentary, the *Paramatthajotikā II*. Table 3 displays the number of occurrences of Chinese epithetic counterparts found in the verses and narratives of the *Yizujing*.

Table 4: Frequency of Chinese Epithets in the *Yizujing* ³⁶

	<i>Fo</i> 佛	<i>Shizun</i> 世尊	<i>Rulai</i> 如來	<i>Zun</i> 尊	<i>Fanzhi</i> 梵志	<i>Xia</i> 黠, <i>Hui</i> 慧	# of Characters
<i>Yizujing</i> Verses	1	1	3	61	1	31 + 44	6976
<i>Yizujing</i> Narratives	292	7	2	16	65	0 + 5	12822

Table 3 demonstrates that in the *Yizujing* narratives, the epithets for the ideal person predominantly converge on ‘*fo*’ (the Buddha), although this term is rarely used in the verses. By contrast, ‘*fanzhi*’ (brāhmaṇa) as the ideal person is uncommon in both verses and narratives; in the narratives, most instances of ‘*fanzhi*’ refer not to the ideal person but to the hereditary Brahmin class. In subsequent sections, I will explore individual epithets across the different Pāli texts listed in Table 1, beginning with the most significant epithet, ‘*buddha*.’

4.2. The Rare Occurrence of ‘*Buddha*’ in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*

The most revealing aspect in Table 1 is the single occurrence of the epithet ‘*buddha*’ in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, which stands in stark contrast to its plentiful usage in the canonical and post-

³⁶ I have produced this data by working with the digitized text (T198) from the SAT Daizōkyō Text Database website.

The last column in Table 2 provides the number of Chinese characters in the verses and the narratives to give a sense of the ‘frequency’ of each epithet in the verses and the narratives of the text. The narratives have approximately 1.84 times the number of characters found in the verses.

canonical commentaries on the text. This suggests a wide gap between these texts in terms of the development of Buddhist identity and the process of Buddhist institutionalization. Examining the single, atypical usage in this ancient text makes the discrepancy even more evident. This single instance comes from one of the introductory verses of the *Sāriputta Sutta*, which is the last sutta of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*.

*Na me diṭṭho ito pubbe [icc-āyasmā Sāriputto] na-ssuto uda kassa ci
evaṃ vagguvado satthā Tusitā gaṇi-m-āgato*

*Sadevakassa lokassa, yathā dissati cakkhumā
sabbaṃ tamaṃ vinodetvā eko va ratim ajjhagā*

*Tam **Buddhaṃ** asitaṃ tādīṃ akuhaṃ gaṇim āgataṃ
bahunnam idha baddhānaṃ atthi pañhena āgamiṃ*

Never before have I seen, nor have I heard from anyone, of the teacher with such lovely speech, coming from Tusita Heaven accompanied by a host of followers.
[Thus, said the Venerable Sāriputta.]

The One with Vision has never been revealed to the world or to the gods therein. He alone has attained bliss, after dispelling all darkness.

To the **Buddha**—such a sublime one, unattached, not deceitful, coming with a host of followers—I approach with a question on behalf of the many people here who are bound [to this world].

(Sn.955–7)

These laudatory verses describe the Buddha as descending from the Tusita (Skt. Tuṣita) Heaven to this world, accompanied by a large retinue. Waiting on the Buddha, Sāriputta praises his virtues and requests his instruction. This mythological motif of the Buddha coming from heaven to deliver a specific discourse is rather uncharacteristic of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*: it contrasts with the laconic moral or doctrinal instructions consistently found throughout the text. Instead, this motif aligns more closely with the post-canonical commentary, the *Paramatthajotikā II*,

where various Buddhist mythological narratives provide the context for discourses. For this reason, I suspect that these verses may be a later addition to the main body of this sutta.

The Buddha's sojourn in heaven and his descent to this world is a recurrent theme in Buddhist literature, often providing the backdrop for a specific discourse. Several such mythologies can be found in other texts within the Pāli canon. For example, the *Acchhariya-abbhūta Sutta* (*Wonderful and Marvelous*; MN.123) recounts the Buddha's stay in the Tusita Heaven before his conception in his mother's womb, which could be understood as the backdrop for his lifelong pedagogic career. In the *Lomasakangiya-bhaddekaratta Sutta* (*Lomasakangiya and A Single Excellent Night*; MN.134), a young deity named Candana recites a stanza that the Buddha had previously expounded in full to the gods of the Tāvatiṃsa (Thirty-Three; Sanskrit. Trāyastriṃśa) Heaven. This *Bhaddekaratta* stanza is the theme of the three previous suttas (MN.131–3) in the *Majjhima Nikāya*, and MN.134 ultimately consecrates the stanza with this mythological motif.

When we broaden our search to Pāli commentarial literature for mythologies similar to that of the *Sāriputta Sutta*, we find many are related to the authentication of the Abhidhamma genre within the canon.³⁷ The introductory verses of the *Aṭṭhasālinī* (*The Expositor*) and the *Dhammapada Aṭṭhakathā* (*Dhammapada Commentary*) elaborate on the tale of the Buddha's rains retreat in the Tāvatiṃsa Heaven.³⁸ The *Aṭṭhasālinī* is Buddhaghosa's (ca. 5th century CE) commentary on the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī* (*Summary of the Dhamma*), the first of the seven Abhidhamma texts in the Pāli literary tradition. Consequently, the commentary needs to explain

³⁷ The Pāli literature incorporates the Abhidhamma genre as part of its canonical collection, although it arguably might not be the Buddha's discourse, but rather an analysis of it.

³⁸ See the *Aṭṭhasālinī*, p.2, vv. 13–16, and the *Dhammapada Commentary* vv. 180–181, in the PTS editions.

why the Abhidhamma genre should be included in the Buddhist canon. According to these two commentaries, the Buddha ascended to the Tāvātimsa Heaven soon after his performance of the Twin Miracle.³⁹ In the heaven, the Buddha expounded the Abhidhamma to the gods led by his deceased mother, Māyādevī. During his retreat in the heaven, the Buddha descended to the Himālayas for his daily alms round and delivered the Abhidhamma again to Sāriputta, who was waiting on him. Subsequently, Sāriputta transmitted this unprecedented discourse of the Buddha to his fellow monks, and Ānanda, the repository of the Buddha's discourses, rehearsed the Abhidhamma during the First Council. In this way, both the commentaries authenticate the Abhidhamma as *Buddhavacana* (the Word of the Buddha) and advocate its inclusion in the Tipiṭaka (Threefold Collection; Buddhist Canon).

In this manner, the mythology of the Buddha's return from the Tusita Heaven and Sāriputta serving him as his attendant, as depicted in the *Sāriputta sutta*, closely resembles the later developed mythology associated with the incorporation of the Abhidhamma genre into the Buddhist Canon.

This mythology seems even more peculiar in the context of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* when considering the metrical features of the *Sāriputta Sutta*. This sutta consists of 21 verses with two different meters: the first part (8 verses; Sn. 955–62) is in *śloka*, and the second part (13 verses; Sn. 963–75) is in *triṣṭubh*.⁴⁰ When chanted, the two meters are noticeably distinct, making it impossible to overlook the unusual metric shift in the middle of the sutta. In fact, such a

³⁹ The Twin Miracle refers to the Buddha's supernormal power of emitting fire and water simultaneously. This mythological event is prevalent in mainstream Buddhist traditions and has a parallel in the narrative of the tenth discourse of the *Yizujing*.

⁴⁰ Generally, Indic verses employ a variety of meters based on the weight of syllables, whether they are heavy or light. *Śloka* consists of 8 syllables in each foot. The weight of the penultimate syllable in its odd feet (a and c) is noticeably different from that in its even feet (b and d), creating a typical rhythmic alteration. *Triṣṭubh* consists of 11 syllables with no significant metric differences between odd and even feet. This metric shift cannot go unnoticed when chanted.

distinctive metric switch in the middle of a *sutta* is not found anywhere else in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* except in this *Sāriputta sutta*. The first 8 verses constitute a request for instruction on monastic discipline, while the latter 13 verses provide a list of disciplinary guidance for monks. To clarify the interlocutors, the later Pāli tradition added three sentences: ‘*iccāyasmā Sāriputto* (Venerable Sāriputta said thus; Sn.955),’ ‘*Sāriputtā ti Bhagavā* (‘O, Sāriputta,’ said the Blessed One; Sn.963),’ and ‘*ti Bhagavā ti* (Thus said the Blessed One; Sn.975).’ Placed outside the *sutta*’s meter, these additions make it clear that the initial 8 verses in *śloka* are Sāriputta’s request, and the subsequent 13 in *triṣṭubh* are the Buddha’s discourse.

From these two disparate layers of the *Sāriputta sutta*, both thematic and metric, we have good reason to speculate that the first eight verses have a different origin from the rest of the *sutta*. At the very least, the mythological verses within the eight could have been a later addition to the main body of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. The same could be true for the sole usage of the epithet ‘*buddha*’ in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. Consequently, the single incongruous occurrence of the epithet ‘*buddha*’ in Sn. 957 does not undermine my contention that the epithet ‘*buddha*’ had not yet become established for the ideal person in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*.

The nearly negligible usage of the epithet ‘*buddha*’ in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* becomes even more striking when compared to its abundant usage in its commentarial work. We find 153 occurrences of the ‘*buddha*’ in its canonical commentary, the *Mahāniddeśa*, and 37 times in its post-canonical commentary, the *Paramatthajotikā II*. Here, there is no significant difference in the ratio between the figures ‘153’ and ‘37’ because the *Mahāniddeśa* is nearly eight times more voluminous than the *Paramatthajotikā II*. As shown in Table 1, we see a higher rate of occurrence (0.57) in the *Paramatthajotikā II* than the rate (0.3) in the *Mahāniddeśa*. When we expand the count to the four *Nikāyas*, the two commentaries on the *Aṭṭhakavagga* align with the

main sutta literature of the four *Nikāyas*. The rate of the epithet's appearance in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* is almost zero, but those in the other texts lie consistently between 0.2 and 0.6 per page.

Thus, we may conclude that the data I gathered regarding the epithet '*buddha*' sets the *Aṭṭhakavagga* apart from the other Pāli canonical and commentarial literature. Furthermore, this may imply that the composers of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* verses might not have had a distinct self-perception as Buddhists but may have considered themselves as one among a diverse set of philosophers or religious practitioners of the day. On the other hand, its commentarial works, which align with the four *Nikāyas* regarding the rate of occurrences of the epithet '*buddha*,' show that the later institutionalized Buddhist traditions accommodated and revived this ancient text, crediting the preacher of the text as being their alleged founder, the *Buddha* (Awakened One) or the *Sammāsambuddha* (Perfectly Awakened One) himself.

4.3. Secondary Status of '*Buddha*' to '*Bhagavant*' in the *Mahāniddeśa*

Though the *Mahāniddeśa* uses the epithet '*buddha*' 153 times, this significant number is surpassed by the 672 occurrences of the epithet '*bhagavant*' (see Table 1). The predominance of '*bhagavant*' over '*buddha*' is evident even in the way '*buddha*' is used in the commentary. Thus, we first need to examine how the two commentaries use the epithet '*buddha*' when they recount the narrative settings of individual *suttas* of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* or comment on individual words and phrases of the script. Table 3 below displays the number of occurrences of '*buddha*' in typical compounds or collocations. They are listed in descending order, from the highest number of occurrences to the lowest.

Table 5: Typical Collocations of the Epithet ‘*buddha*’ in Commentaries

<i>Mahāniddeśa</i>	#	<i>Paramatthajotikā II</i>	#
<i>Buddha bhagavant</i> (Buddha, Blessed One)	43	<i>Nimmitabuddha</i> (mind-created buddha)	6
<i>Buddha bhagavant</i> (*standalone usage)	38 (12)	<i>Buddha</i> (*standalone usage)	6
<i>buddhañāṇa</i> (Knowledge of the Buddha)	15	<i>Buddhādi</i> (the Buddha and so forth; <i>buddhādīnaṃ</i> & <i>buddhādayo</i> & <i>buddhādīni</i>)	5
<i>Buddhacakkhu</i> (Eye of the Buddha)	11	<i>Buddhacakkhu</i> (Eye of the Buddha)	4
<i>Sammāsambuddha</i> (Perfectly Awakened One) * <i>Buddhadesita</i> (Taught by ...) x 4 included*	7	<i>Buddhamātar</i> (the Buddha’s mother)	2
<i>Buddhasāvaka</i> (Disciple of the Buddha)	7	<i>Buddhapitar</i> (the Buddha’s father)	2
<i>Buddhadhamma</i> (Doctrine of the Buddha)	7	<i>Buddhamuni</i> (the Buddha-sage)	2
<i>Buddha dhamma saṃgha</i> (Threefold Refuge)	7	<i>Buddhakula</i> (Kinsperson of the Buddha)	1
<i>Paccekabuddha</i> (Solitary Buddha)	5	<i>Buddharakkhita</i> (protected by the Buddha)	1
<i>Abhisambuddha</i> (Thoroughly Enlightened One)	4	<i>Buddhūpaṭṭhana</i> (serving the Buddha)	1
<i>Buddhānussati</i> (Remembrance of the Buddha)	4	<i>Buddhantara</i> (an interval between buddhas)	1
<i>Buddhamāma</i> (Taking Buddha as mine)	2	<i>Buddhaloka</i> (the Buddha’s realm)	1
<i>Buddhasāsana</i> (Dispensation of the Buddha)	2	<i>Buddhasamaṇa</i> (the Buddha-ascetic)	1
<i>Buddhasubodhi</i> (Perfect enlightenment of the Buddha)	2	<i>Sambuddha</i> (Fully Enlightened One)	1
		<i>Buddhūpagamana</i> (Approaching the buddha)	1
– Duplication (<i>Sammāsambuddha bhagavant</i>)	–1	<i>Buddhasāsana</i> (Dispensation of the Buddha)	1
		<i>Buddhasāvaka</i> (Disciple of the Buddha)	1
Sum	153	Sum	37

As presented in Table 3, the epithet ‘*buddha*’ is extensively used in both the *Mahāniddeśa* and the *Paramatthajotikā II*, with distinct usages in the two commentaries. A noticeable item in the list from the *Mahāniddeśa* is ‘*buddha bhagavant*,’ which combines the two prevalent epithets. When the commentary refers to the *Aṭṭhakavagga*’s preacher using the term ‘*buddha*,’ it does so 43 times in conjunction with the more common epithet ‘*bhagavant*.’ Regarding the standalone usage of ‘*buddha*,’ ‘38 times’ is an overstatement; the adjusted figure is a mere ‘12 times’ after deducting ‘22 occurrences’ in a single paragraph and ‘4 instances’ in other related paragraphs that elaborate on the term ‘*taṃ buddhaṃ*.’⁴¹ These instances come from the comments on Sn.957, a verse we already explored in the previous chapter concerning the one

⁴¹ I exclude ‘*abhisambuddho*’ in line 8 and ‘*buddhānaṃ bhagavantānaṃ*’ in line 12 of the following Pāli text, because they are calculated in different categories in Table 3. In addition to the 22 instances of ‘*buddha*’ usage in the cited paragraph, there are 4 more references to ‘*taṃ buddhaṃ*’ within the comments on Sn.957. In total, the 26 occurrences of ‘*buddha*’ in the comments on Sn.957 are not for proper epithetic purposes.

and only usage of ‘*buddha*’ in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. Presented below is the *Mahānidessa*’s paragraph with ‘22 occurrences’ of the epithet ‘*buddha*’ to demonstrate how the concentrated occurrences of term ‘*buddha*’ could distort the number of its standalone usage. For now, I will provide only the Pāli text, and its corresponding English translation will be given later in the discussion when the content is addressed.

*Taṃ **Buddhaṃ** asitaṃ tādin ti. **Buddho** ti yo so Bhagavā sayambhū anācariyako pubbe ananussutesu dhammesu sāmaṃ saccāni abhisambujji, tattha ca sabbaññutaṃ patto, balesu ca vasībhāvaṃ patto. **Buddho** ti ken'; atthena **Buddho**? Bujjhita saccānī ti **Buddho**. Bodhetā pajāyā ti **Buddho**. Sabbaññutāya **Buddho**. Sabbadassāvitāya **Buddho**. Anaññeyyatāya **Buddho**. Vikasitāya **Buddho**. Khīṇāsavaṣaṅkhātena **Buddho**. Nirupakkilesaṅkhātena **Buddho**. Ekantavītarāgo ti **Buddho**. Ekantavītadoso ti **Buddho**. Ekantavītamoho ti **Buddho**. Ekantanikkilesa ti **Buddho**. Ekāyanamaggam gato ti **Buddho**. Eko anuttaraṃ sammāsambodhiṃ abhisambuddho ti **Buddho** ti; abuddhivihatattā buddhipaṭilābhataṃ **Buddho**. **Buddho** ti n'; etaṃ nāmaṃ mātaraṃ kataṃ, na pītarā kataṃ, na bhātaraṃ kataṃ, na bhagīniyā kataṃ, na mittāmaccehi kataṃ, na ñātisālohitehi kataṃ, na samaṇabrāhmaṇehi kataṃ, na devatāhi kataṃ; vimokkhantikam etaṃ Buddhānaṃ Bhagavantānaṃ bodhiyā mūle saha sabbaññutañāṇassa paṭilābhā sacchikā paññatti yadidaṃ **Buddho** ti, taṃ **Buddhaṃ**.*
(The *Mahānidessa*’s comment on ‘*taṃ buddhaṃ*’ in Sn.957)

As seen in the Pāli text above, the standalone usage of ‘*buddha*’ occurs 22 times to define what qualifies the epithet ‘*buddha*.’ These instances are used to explain the concept of ‘*buddha*’ and do not directly designate the speaker of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. The additional 4 references to ‘*taṃ buddhaṃ*’ in the comments on Sn.957 should not be considered as epithetic usage either. Altogether, the 26 instances of non-epithetic standalone usage of ‘*buddha*’ from the comments on Sn.957 are staggering and surpass the 12 instances of its epithetic standalone usage in the rest of the commentary. Thus, it is reasonable to exclude the 26 instances and contrast the remaining 12 with the 43 instances of the paired usage of ‘*buddha bhagavant*’ in the commentary. In summary, we see the commentary’s marked preference: it favors ‘*buddha bhagavant*’ over ‘*buddha*’ when designating the speaker of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*.

This commentarial preference for ‘*buddha bhagavant*’ is even more striking when we find that the usage of the pair is rare across the four *Nikāyas*, except for the following two formulaic phrases: the formula of *buddhānussati* (the remembrance of the Buddha) practice and the formula of the threefold refuge.

*Iti pi so Bhagavā arahaṃ sammāsambuddho vijjācaraṇasampanno sugato lokavidū
anuttaro purisadammasārathi satthā devamanussānaṃ **buddho bhagavā** ti*

For the following [reasons] indeed, he is the Blessed One: because [he is] an arahant, perfectly awakened, accomplished in wisdom and conduct, a well-farer, knower of the world, unsurpassed leader of people to be tamed, teacher of gods and humans, awakened, and blessed.⁴²

(Remembrance formula 1)

Tathāgato loka uppajjati arahaṃ .. buddho bhagavā

The Thus Gone has arisen in the world. He is an arahant ... awakened and blessed.

(Remembrance formula 2)

*Sammāsambuddho **Bhagavā** svākkhāto Bhagavatā dhammo supaṭipanno saṅgho*

The Blessed One is perfectly awakened! The Dhamma is well expounded by the Blessed One! The Saṅgha is following the good path!

(Refugee formula)

The pair ‘*buddha bhagavant*’ in the four *Nikāyas* is found exclusively within the two fixed contexts of the citations cited above. In contrast, the *Mahāniddesa* uses the pair in various contexts to designate the speaker of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. It does not contain the Remembrance formulae but has just one instance of the Refuge formula, with the word, ‘*bhagavatā* (by the Blessed One)’ omitted. The following Table 4 summarizes the points discussed.

⁴² My translation of ‘*iti pi so*’ is based on the Critical Pāli Dictionary’s reading of the formula. See the entry ‘*iti*’ in the dictionary: “~ pi so bhagavā: arahaṃ sammā-sambuddho . . .” (“for the following reasons, too, he is a bhagavā: because he is arahant . . .”).

Table 6: Collocation ‘*buddha bhagavant*’ in Related Pāli Literature ⁴³

	Total # of usage (#/Pages)	Remembrance formulae (<i>iti pi so bhagavā / tathāgato loke uppajjati</i>) (<i>arahaṃ... buddho bhagavā [ti]</i>)	Refuge formula (<i>sammāsambuddho bhagavā ... dhammo ... saṅgho</i>)	Flexibly used in diverse narrative sentences	# of Pages in PTS ed.
<i>Mahāniddesa</i>	43 (0.084)	0	1	42	510
<i>Paramatthajotikā II</i>	0 (0)	0	0	0	65
<i>Dīgha Nikāya</i>	20 (0.022)	19 (= 16 + 3)	1	0	902
<i>Majjhima Nikāya</i>	44 (0.04)	20 (= 15 + 5)	24	0	1092
<i>Saṃyutta Nikāya</i>	65 (0.039)	65 (= 63 + 2)	0	0	1686
<i>Aṅguttara Nikāya</i>	41 (0.022)	40 (= 31 + 9)	1	0	1840

As Table 4 shows, we do not see the pair ‘*buddha bhagavant*’ in the *Paramatthajotikā II*; the usage of the pair in the four *Nikāyas* is limited to being a component in the two long formulae. However, the pair in the *Mahāniddesa* is used flexibly in diverse contexts. The commentary treats the two elements in the pair as if they form a single nominal compound in various sentences, although they are not a compound, since each has its own declension. The diverse declensions of the pair in the commentary represent the various contexts of its epithetic usage: it appears in a nominative singular ‘*buddho bhagavā*,’ a nominative plural ‘*buddhā bhagavanto*,’ five accusative singulars ‘*buddhaṃ bhavagantaṃ*,’ two instrumental singulars ‘*buddhena bhagavatā*,’ 27 genitive singulars ‘*buddhassa bhagavato*,’ and 7 genitive plurals ‘*buddhānaṃ bhagavantānaṃ*.’

For example, we encounter this pair in the following sentences: “*Manussā buddhaṃ bhagavantaṃ upasaṅkamitvā pañhaṃ pucchanti*” (“Approaching the Buddha, the Blessed One,

⁴³ In the Pāli texts, repetitions are casually omitted replacing them with “|| *pe* ||.” To reduce the practical difficulty in counting, I do not count in the cases of passages that have ‘*buddho bhagavā*’ elipsed due to the repetition.

19 (=16 +3) at 3rd column and 4th row, for example, means that we find 16 occurrences of *iti pi so bhagavā arahaṃ ... buddho bhagavā [ti]* and 3 occurrences of *tathāgato loka uppajjati arahaṃ ... buddho bhagavā [ti]*. Altogether, we have 19 occurrences of Remembrance formula.

15* includes a variant sentence as follows: *samaṇo Gotamo ... [iti pi so] ... pe buddho bhagavā*.

9* includes 4 variant sentences as follows: *tathāgato ca loka uppanno ... buddho bhagavā*.

people ask a question”: in a comment on Sn.915); “*Sabbam kāyakammaṃ buddhassa Bhagavato ñāṇānuparivattati*” (“All the bodily actions of the Buddha, the Blessed One, are accompanied by knowledge”: in a comment on Sn.834); *Pasūro paribbājako na-ppaṭibalo dhonena Buddhena Bhagavatā saddhiṃ yugam samāgamā ...* (“The wanderer Pasūra is unable to engage in a contest with the Immaculate One, the Buddha, the Blessed One ...”: in a comment on Sn.834). As we see in these three examples, the collocation ‘*buddha bhagavant*’ in the *Mahāniddeśa* is flexibly used as a nominal set phrase in diverse sentences but we do not observe these flexible usages of the pair in the four *Nikāyas* and in the *Paramatthajotikā II*.⁴⁴

The *Mahāniddeśa* demonstrates a clear preference in employing epithets to designate the preacher of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, which offers insight into the self-perception of the commentator or their institutional identity. In general, the commentary favors the single epithet ‘*bhagavant*’ (445 times; = 672 – 184 – 43) over the dyad ‘*buddha bhagavant*’ (43 times), and only occasionally it chooses the standalone epithet ‘*buddha*’ (12 times; = 38 – 26).⁴⁵ This preference in the *Mahāniddeśa* aligns with the overall predominance of the epithet ‘*bhagavant*’ over ‘*buddha*’ across the four *Nikāyas* that Table 1 shows.

We may wonder why the *Mahāniddeśa* appears hesitant to adopt ‘*buddha*’ alone and instead relies on the more commonly circulating term ‘*bhagavant*,’ opting for the pair ‘*buddha*

⁴⁴ The epithetic usage of the pair ‘*buddha bhagavant*’ is not a signature feature of the *Mahāniddeśa*. If we look at Pāli literature as a whole, we have its abundant usage somewhere other than the four *Nikāyas*. Most of these flexible usages of the pair ‘*buddha bhagavant*’ come from the *Vinaya* literature and some texts from the fifth *Nikāya*—the *Khuddaka Nikāya*. I believe the study of epithets in the canonical literature could be supportive, but not decisive, evidence of different hands or different stages of institutionalization behind the composition of the literature.

⁴⁵ The single epithet ‘*bhagavant*’ is used 445 times, which is calculated by subtracting the total usage of ‘*bhagavant*’ (672 times) by the 184 occurrences of ‘*ti bhagavā [ti]*’ annotations and the 43 occurrences of the dyad ‘*buddha bhagavant*.’ For the full annotation of ‘*ti bhagavā [ti]*,’ found in a comment on Sn.815, the term ‘*bhagavant*’ appears 28 times. Thus, the number 184 comes from the 6 times of its full annotation (168 times; = 28 x 6) and 5 times of its omitted presentation (*peyyāla*), which altogether accounts for 16 occurrences of the term.

bhagavant’ when referring to the speaker of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* verses. To answer this question, we need to examine how the commentary defines the epithets ‘*buddha*’ and ‘*bhagavant*.’ Let’s revisit the *Mahāniddesa*’s annotation on ‘*taṃ buddhaṃ*’ in Sn.957. The Pāli text was previously cited in this chapter, and here, we quote its abridged English translation by Bhikkhu Bodhi (2016: pp. 1208–9). In his translation of the comment, he omits most of the recurrent phrases ‘[*ti*] *buddho* [*ti*] (... so [he was] a buddha)’ and ‘*taṃ buddhaṃ*’ (quotation from Sn.957). As a result, we see only 5 instances, not 22, of ‘*buddha*’ in this translation.

To the **Buddha**: The Blessed One who is self-accomplished, who without a teacher awakened by himself to the truths among things not heard before, who attained omniscience in regard to them and mastery over the powers. In what sense was he a **buddha**? He was a **buddha** as one who awakened to the truths, as one who awakens this population, as all-knowing, as all-seeing, as not being guided by others, as one who has opened up, as one whose influxes are destroyed, as one without defilements, as one utterly devoid of lust, hatred, and delusion, as one utterly without defilements, as one who has gone to the one-way path, as one who awakened to the unsurpassed perfect enlightenment. “**Buddha**” is not a name given by mother, father, brother, sister, friends and companions, family members and other relatives, ascetics and brahmins or deities. “**Buddha**” is a name pertaining to the end of emancipation, a designation accruing to the buddhas, the blessed ones, along with realization, with the obtaining of the omniscient knowledge at the foot of the bodhi tree.

(Bhikkhu Bodhi’s translation of the *Mahāniddesa*’s comment on ‘*taṃ buddhaṃ*’ in Sn.957)

Although the *Mahāniddesa* uses the single epithet ‘*buddha*’ 12 times intermittently elsewhere (see Table 3), this commentary extensively explains who deserves to be designated with the epithet ‘*buddha*.’ This elaboration seems to fully acknowledge the one and only encounter of ‘*buddha*’ in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* and the need to comprehensively define this novel epithet for its target audience, likely Buddhist monastic scholars. The intriguing aspect here is the way the commentary annotates the phrase ‘to the Buddha.’ It simply adopts the most prevalent epithet ‘*bhagavant* (the Blessed One)’ in the Pāli literature and adds a list of qualifications: the Buddha is the Blessed One who is self-awakened to the truth, omniscient,

spiritually mighty, the teacher of all beings, without any mental defilements, and fully liberated. Defining ‘*buddha*’ by anchoring it to ‘*bhagavant*’ resonates with the number of occurrences of ‘*bhagavant*,’ ‘*buddha bhagavant*,’ and ‘*buddha*’—445, 43, 12 occurrences, respectively—in the *Mahāniddesa* to designate the preacher of the verses, as we have previously explored.

The *Mahāniddesa* provides annotations for not only ‘*buddha*’ but also the epithet ‘*bhagavant*.’ In fact, it does so 11 times, either in full elaboration (6 times) or by using *peyyāla* (omission of a large repeated chunk of a formulaic description; 5 times). Although the commentary employs the epithet ‘*bhagavant*’ throughout, when it first encounters ‘*ti bhagavā* [*ti*] (thus said the Blessed One)’ in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* (Sn.815), it offers an encyclopedic annotation of the term ‘*bhagavant*.’ Thereafter, the commentary just either copies/pastes the entire annotation or employs *peyyāla* for the remaining 10 instances of ‘*ti bhagavā* [*ti*]’ in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. Below is Bhikkhu Bodhi’s abridged translation of the comment on the term ‘*bhagavant*’ in Sn.815 (Bodhi, 2016: pp. 1086–7).

The Blessed One: This is a term of reverence. Further, he is the Blessed One (*bhagavā*) because he has demolished (*bhagga*) lust, demolished hatred, demolished delusion, demolished conceit, demolished views, demolished the thorn, demolished defilements. He is the Blessed One because he has divided up (*bhaji*), analyzed, classified the gem of the Dhamma; he is the Blessed One because he has made an end to states of existence; he is the Blessed One because he is developed in body, developed in good behavior, developed in mind, and developed in wisdom; or he is the Blessed One because he resorts to (*bhaji*) remote lodgings in forests and woodlands, places with little sound, little noise, far from the crowd, isolated from people, suitable for retreat; or he is the Blessed One because he partakes of (*bhāgī*) robes, almsfood, lodgings, and medicinal requisites; or he is the Blessed One because he partakes of the taste of the meaning, the taste of the Dhamma, the taste of liberation, the higher good behavior, the higher mind, the higher wisdom; or he is the Blessed One because he partakes of *the four jhānas, the four measureless states, the four formless meditative attainments*; or he is the Blessed One because he partakes of *the eight emancipations, the eight bases for overcoming, and the nine attainments of sequential dwelling*; or he is the Blessed One because he partakes of *the ten developments of perception, the ten kasīṇa attainments, concentration through mindfulness of breathing, and the attainment of unattractiveness*; or he is the Blessed One because he partakes of *the four establishments of mindfulness, the four right kinds of striving, the four bases for spiritual potency, the five faculties, the five powers, the seven*

factors of enlightenment, and the noble eightfold path; or he is the Blessed One because he partakes of the ten Tathāgata powers, the four grounds of self-confidence, the four analytical knowledges, the six superknowledges, and the six buddha qualities. “Blessed One” is not a name given by mother, father, brother, sister, friends and companions, family members and other relatives, ascetics and brahmins or deities. “Blessed One” is a name pertaining to the end of emancipation, a designation accruing to the buddhas, the blessed ones [*buddha bhagavant*], along with realization, with the obtaining of the omniscient knowledge at the foot of the bodhi tree.
(Bhikkhu Bodhi’s translation of the *Mahāniddesa*’s comment on ‘*bhagavā ti*’ in Sn.815)

Upon initial examination, this commentary appears more comprehensive than that on ‘*buddha*.’ Rather than relying on another term to define ‘*bhagavant*,’ the commentary begins with the statement that ‘*bhagavant*’ is an honorific epithet (*gāravādhivacana*). It then enumerates the mental defilements that the Blessed One has eradicated, similar to what we see in the early part of the annotation of ‘*buddha*.’ It continues by describing his good qualities: he is well-versed in the Dhamma, has no more rebirths, has attained to the culmination of the mental cultivation (proper conduct, mental composure, and wisdom), lives in isolation relying on the four requisites, and knows every taste of the Dhamma.

Up to this point, the commentary has been relatively unsurprising. However, from here on, the elaboration of the *Bhagavant*’s qualities takes on a new level of sophistication. The commentary encompasses over 20 sets of numerically defined technical terms related to Buddhist practice, ranging from the four meditative states (*jhānas*) to the six qualities of the Awakened One (*buddhadhamma*). Providing a detailed enumeration of all these terms would be tangential in this context, so I will simply list them in Table 5 without itemizing them and then continue with my main argument. The list of these categorized technical terms suggests that by the time of this commentarial composition, the Buddhist tradition had established the efficient system for transmitting Buddhist doctrines and practices to the next generation of monastics.

After completing the reiteration of technical terms, the commentary concludes with the same formulaic expression that is found at the end of the annotation on ‘*buddha*’: this (*bhagavant*) is not an epithet given by birth or by anyone but is achieved independently through obtaining omniscience. The following Table 5 presents a comparison between the two annotations in the commentary—one on ‘*buddha*’ and the other on ‘*bhagavant*.’

Table 7: Annotations of Two Epithets in the *Mahāniddeśa*

<i>Buddha</i>	<i>Bhagavant</i>
Self-accomplished	Demolished all the defilements
[Spiritually] mighty	Well-versed in the Dhamma
Awakened to the <i>sui generis</i> truths	This is his last life.
Awakens others	Well-cultivated his body, conduct, mental composure, and wisdom
Omniscient & clairvoyant	Lives in isolation
No defilements remain	Lives on the minimum necessities
	Knows all the taste of the Dhamma
	Has 4 <i>jhānas</i> ; 4 Immeasurables (<i>brahmavihāras</i>); 4 formless meditations; 8 emancipations; 8 bases for overcoming; 9 attainments of sequential dwelling; 10 developments of perception; 10 perceptual objects for meditation (<i>kaṣinas</i>); foundation of mindfulness (<i>ānāpānasatippatthāna</i> , 4 <i>satippatthanas</i>); unattractiveness; 4 right strivings; 4 bases of spiritual potency; 5 faculties; 5 powers; 7 factors of enlightenment; Noble Eightfold Path; 10 Tathāgata’s powers; 4 grounds of self-confidence; 4 analytic knowleges; 6 super knowledges; 6 buddha qualities
Not a name given by mother but is achieved by obtaining the omniscience	

Both annotations begin and end with the similar description of the qualities of ‘*buddha*’ and ‘*bhagavant*.’ In the beginning, they state that both ‘*buddha*’ and ‘*bhagavant*’ are for one who is immaculate and devoid of any mental defilements. At the end, they state that they are meritocratic epithets: they are used for one who accomplished omniscience on their own through religious practice, and they are not given by others. Despite these descriptions in common, each epithet has its own points of emphasis too.

The annotation of ‘*buddha*’ distinguishes the Buddha from other religious leaders in several ways. First, the Buddha has awakened to the truths by himself (*sayambhū*, *sāmaṃ*

saccāni abhisambujjhi) without guidance from other teachers (*anācariyaka, anaññeyyata*). This sets the Buddha apart from his awakened disciples (*buddhasāvaka*), who have discovered the truths following his teachings. Second, the Buddha has a group of disciples to enlighten (*bodhetar pajāya*), distinguishing him from solitary Buddhas (*paccekabuddhā*), who discovered the truths on their own but do not have a community of followers to transmit their teachings. Third, the Buddha was the first to discover unprecedented truths (*pubbe ananussuta dhamma*) and only he had the initial access to them. This positions the Buddha at the pinnacle of ancient Indian religious elitism both within and beyond the boundary of the Buddhist traditions. Lastly, the Buddha knows and sees everything (*sabbaññutā, sabbadassāvitā*) and is all-powerful (*balesu vasībhāvaṃ patta*). The commentary highlights his divine and charismatic qualities, emphasizing that he embodies all the powerful religious attributes that ordinary people would expect and find worthy of worship. In this regard, the Buddha is a leader not only for monastic members but also for ordinary people.

In summary, the annotation on ‘*buddha*’ asserts that the Buddha is an unparalleled leader within the entire ancient Indian religious landscape. In a sense, the comment seems to intentionally use the term ‘*buddha*’ as a shorthand for the categorized epithet ‘*sammāsambuddha*’ (the Perfectly Awakened One) as opposed to ‘*buddhasāvaka*’ (the disciples of the Buddha)’ and ‘*paccekabuddhā*’ (Solitary Buddhas without any religious followers). Though these three types of Buddhist leaders are not explicitly mentioned in the commentary, we can infer this connection from the phrase, “*anuttaraṃ sammāsambodhiṃ abhisambuddho ti buddho ti* (He is the Buddha because he is awakened to the unsurpassed perfect enlightenment).” Both the terms ‘*sammādamabuddha*’ and ‘*sammāsambodhi*’ share the same root ‘*√budh* (to wake)’ and the same

emphatic prefixes ‘*sammā-*’ and ‘*sam-*.’ The only difference between them is that the former refers to a person, while the latter refers to the awakening itself.

Based on this commentary, we could even hypothesize that the categorical epithet ‘*sammāsambuddha*’ might not be a later deified concept of the preexistent and firmly established epithet ‘*buddha*.’ Rather, both the epithets might have emerged and circulated side by side as a growing consciousness of their religious identity developed during the period when the *Mahāniddeśa* was composed. Though this hypothesis requires further investigation, it is supported by several pieces of circumstantial evidence from the *Aṭṭhakavagga* and the *Mahāniddeśa* that we have discussed so far: the rare occurrence of the epithet ‘*buddha*’ in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*; the epithet ‘*buddha*’ outnumbered by the more general honorific epithet ‘*bhagavant*’ in the *Mahāniddeśa*; the epithet ‘*buddha*’ heavily relying on ‘*bhagavant*’ in the commentary, as evidenced by the pair usage ‘*buddha bhagavant*’; and the definition of ‘*buddha*’ based on the concept of ‘*sammāsambuddha*’ in the commentary.

By defining the term ‘*buddha*’ in this manner, the commentary establishes the Buddha as the founder of their religious institution and identifies the commentators or intended audience of the commentary as followers of the Buddha. It then positions their founder and followers as the in-group and those unaware of these unprecedented truths as the out-group. The *paccekabuddhā* occupy a space somewhere between the in-group and the out-group. They hold an ambiguous position because they are presented as a type of *buddha* indirectly related to the current Buddhist institution, yet their knowledge was unknown to the commentarial generation. Consequently, it is unclear whether their knowledge and vision correspond to the same unprecedented truths the commentary claims. Regardless, the commentary demonstrates an awareness of the in-group and

out-group, establishes the boundaries of the early Buddhist institutional identity, and reveals a sense of belonging to the Buddhist community at the time of its composition.

Unlike the commentary on ‘*buddha*,’ the commentary on ‘*bhagavant*’ barely reveals any awareness of the boundary between the in-group and the out-group. Instead, it simply enumerates a list of numerically defined technical terms in the Buddhist doctrine and practice that the in-group may have endorsed and transmitted to the next generation. This list is so comprehensive that it leads us to wonder why these exhaustive monastic technical terms are included in the definition of ‘*bhagavant*,’ rather than in that of ‘*buddha*.’

4.4. Semantic Development of ‘*Bhagavant/Bhagavat*’ in Other Religious Literature

In fact, the epithet ‘*bhagavant*’ does not solely denote a strong sense of Buddhist denominational identity. Instead, this word is pervasive in ancient Indian religious literature and has undergone a semantic evolution over time. Initially, it appeared only as an adjective in the earliest Indian literature, but later it developed into an honorific epithet across various Indian religious traditions. For instance, its Sanskrit form ‘*bhagavat*’ can be found seven times in the *R̥gVeda*, the earliest known Indic literature. Intriguingly, all these occurrences are used in an adjectival context rather than an epithetic one. Provided below are all the verses containing the term, accompanied by their English translations as rendered by Stephanie W. Jamison and Joel P. Brereton (2014: 358, 936, & 1473).

Sūyavasād bhagavatī hi bhūyā atho vayam bhagavantaḥ syāma |
addhi tṛṇam aghnye viśvadānīm piba śuddham udakam ācarantī || RV_1,164.40
Because you would **become blessed**, feeding upon good pasturage, so then we would also **be blessed**. Feed on grass always, o inviolable cow [=Speech]! Coming here, drink pure water! (JPB)

Utedānīm bhagavantaḥ syāmota prapitva uta madhye ahnām |

utoditā maghavan sūryasya vyaṁ devānām sumatau syāma || RV_7,041.04
And just now might we be **possessed of portion** [/accompanied by Bhaga], and at evening and at the middle of the days, and at the rising of the sun, o bounteous one, might we be in the good grace of the gods. (SWJ)

Bhaga eva bhagavān astu devās tena vyaṁ bhagavantaḥ syāma |
taṁ tvā bhaga sarva ij johavīti sa no bhaga puraetā bhaveha || RV_7,041.05
Let Bhaga himself be **possessed of portion**, o gods. In this way might we be **possessed of portion** [/accompanied by Bhaga]. Each and every one constantly calls on you, Bhaga. Become our guide here, Bhaga. (SWJ)

Ayam me hasto bhagavān ayam me bhagavattaraḥ |
ayam me viśvabheṣajo 'yaṁ śivābhimarśanaḥ || RV_10,060.12
Here is my hand **that brings good fortune**; here is my (other hand) **bringing better fortune**. Here is my all-healing one; here the one of propitious touch. (SWJ)

In the *ṚgVeda*, the term ‘*bhagavat*’ is not utilized in an epithetic manner. Both Jamison and Brereton translate it as an adjective by parsing it into ‘*bhaga* (good fortune, blessing, boon)’ and ‘*-vat* (possessing, bringing, being full of).’ Brereton’s translation of the term is ‘to be blessed’ and Jamison’s is ‘possessed of portion’ and ‘bringing good fortune.’ Moreover, the comparative form ‘*bhagavattara*’ is present in the last verse, further solidifying the non-epithetic usage of ‘*bhagavat*’ in the *ṚgVeda*. Although the scripture’s hymns are dedicated to various gods, such as Agni, Indra, Soma, and others, the term ‘*bhagavat*’ is never employed as an honorific epithet for them.

In the *Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad*, the term ‘*bhagavat*’ appears 22 times in an epithetic context. Most Indologists consider this text as one of the earliest Upaniṣadic scriptures, predating the emergence of a Buddhist tradition.⁴⁶ In this ancient text, the term ‘*bhagavat*’ is employed as an epithet, which markedly differs from its adjectival usage in the *ṚgVeda*. Nevertheless, it does not precisely resemble the usage of ‘*bhagavant*’ in the *Mahāniddesa* either. In the *Mahāniddesa*, the term ‘*bhagavant*’ is dedicated to the speaker of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, primarily referring to him

⁴⁶ Nonetheless, the chronology of ancient Indian literature may be uncertain, as it typically relies on sparse evidence and ambiguous assumptions.

in the third person, often, but not exclusively, in the nominative case as ‘*bhagavā*.’ On the other hand, the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* uses ‘*bhagavat*’ as a respectful form of the second person ‘you,’ which could refer to anyone a speaker converses with. It is mainly, but not solely, used in the vocative case, either in singular form as ‘*bhagavan*’ or plural form as ‘*bhagavantaḥ*.’ Below are a few examples from the Sanskrit text and their translations by Patrick Olivelle (1998: 67, 77, 85, 111–121).

Yad eva bhagavān veda tad eva me brūhīti (BṛhU 2.4.3)
"Tell me instead, **sir**, all that you know."

Nāhaṃ tad bhagavan vedeti (BṛhU 2.4.3)
'That, **my lord**, I do not know,'

Brāhmaṇā bhagavanto yo vo brahmiṣṭhaḥ sa etā gā udajatām iti (BṛhU 3.1.2)
"**Distinguished** Brahmins! Let the most learned man among you drive away these cows."

Abhayaṃ tvā gacchatād yājñavalkya yo no bhagavann abhayaṃ vedayase (BṛhU 4.2.4)
May that freedom be yours too, Yajnavalkya, **you** who have taught us that freedom from fear.

So 'haṃ bhagavate sahasraṃ dadāmi (BṛhU 4.3.14 / 4.3.15 / 4.3.16 / 4.3.33 / 4.4.7)
"Here, **sir**, I'll give **you** a thousand cows!"

Olivelle's translations of ‘*bhagavat*’ vary, sometimes rendered as epithets such as ‘sir,’ ‘my lord,’ and other times as the second person pronoun ‘you.’ These examples demonstrate that the epithet ‘*bhagavat*’ appears in this Sanskrit scripture when the speaker respectfully addresses the second person or people. In the third example, he translates ‘*brāhmaṇā bhagavanto*’ as ‘Distinguished Brahmins!’ which occurs three times throughout the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*. He interprets ‘*bhagavat*’ as the adjective ‘distinguished’ due to its pairing with another epithet ‘*brāhmaṇa* (brahmin).’ However, as ‘*bhagavat*’ appears 19 times as an independent epithet in the text, it could be considered another epithet. I would prefer to translate it as ‘Reverend,’ an

honorific title for a member of the clergy. In this manner, we could use the title either by itself or combined with another epithet—‘Reverends!’ or ‘Reverend Brahmins!’.

The paired epithet ‘*brāhmaṇa bhagavat*’ is reminiscent of ‘*buddha bhagavant*’ in the *Mahāniddeśa*, which we examined earlier. Following the Bhikkhu Bodhi’s translation, I rendered the latter as ‘the Buddha, the Blessed One’ since both ‘*buddha*’ and ‘*bhagavant*’ are well-established, independent epithets in Buddhist literature. It seems plausible that the pre-Buddhist paired usage of ‘*brāhmaṇa bhagavat*’ in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* may have served as a precursor to the Buddhist paired usage of ‘*buddha bhagavant*’ in the *Mahāniddeśa*. This repetition could indicate a long-standing linguistic practice in ancient India. Yet, there is a significant distinction between the two pairs: ‘*brāhmaṇa bhagavat*’ is a set of generic titles used for anyone among the religious elite class in ancient India, while ‘*buddha bhagavant*’ is a pair of epithets reserved exclusively for the figure believed to have founded the Buddhist community.

In the *Bhagavad Gītā*, the epithet ‘*bhagavat*’ is attributed to the god Kṛṣṇa, who serves as the divine mentor of the protagonist Arjuna. The epithet appears twice within the meter of verses addressing Kṛṣṇa. The following two verses, accompanied by their English translation by W. J. Johnson (1994: 46), exemplify this:

Sarvaṃ etad ṛtaṃ manye yan māṃ vadasi keśava |
*Na hi te **bhagavan** vyaktiṃ vidur devā na dānavāḥ || Bhg_10.014*
All this you have told me I believe to be the essential truth, Keśava;
For neither gods nor demons, **Lord**, know your manifestation.

Kathaṃ vidyām ahaṃ yogiṃs tvāṃ sadā paricintayan |
*Keṣu keṣu ca bhāveṣu cintyo 'si **bhagavan** mayā || Bhg_10.017*
Yogin, how, in constant meditation, may I know you?
And in what various states of being should I meditate on you, **Lord**?

In both examples, ‘*bhagavat*’ is used in the vocative singular, which Johnson translates as ‘Lord,’ a title of God. Apart from these two instances, the phrase ‘*śrībhagavān uvāca* (The Holy Lord said)’ appears 28 times in the *Gīta*. Positioned outside the meter of verses, this phrase clarifies that Kṛṣṇa is the speaker of subsequent verses. This phrase is reminiscent of the phrase ‘*bhagavā ti*’ in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. Both ‘*śrībhagavān uvāca*’ in the *Gīta* and ‘*bhagavā ti*’ in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* might have been added by later editors.

In contrast to the usage of ‘*bhagavat*’ in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, the epithet in the *Bhagavad Gīta* is not a title for any cleric person or people, but it is attributed to the god Kṛṣṇa. Thus, the epithet ‘*bhagavat*’ sheds its mortal aspects and takes on divine characteristics in the *Gīta*. Through the epithet, the *Gīta* conveys the speaker’s devotional nuance, while the *Upaniṣad*’s usage demonstrates politeness and mutual respect among the elite classes in ancient India. As the *Bhagavad Gīta* is part of the colossal epic the *Mahābhārata*, it is worth examining the usage of ‘*bhagavat*’ throughout the entire narrative. Kṛṣṇa is not the lone character with the title ‘*bhagavat*’ in the *Mahābhārata*; the epithet applies to the entire Indian pantheon of divine mentors and objects of devotion. While the *Gīta* presents only singular cases of the epithet, we find its occasional plural cases in the *Mahābhārata*. Consequently, the *Mahābhārata* uses the term to refer to gods, either individually or collectively. Overall, the epic genre adapts the preexisting epithet ‘*bhagavat*’ by restricting its application to divine beings.

At this point, we might wonder how non-Brahmanic traditions (from today’s perspective) may have used the epithet ‘*bhagavant*.’ Let’s examine the Jain Canon authorized by the Śvetāmbara sect. They believe that their founder, Mahāvīra, left twelve sections of his discourses; however, only one section, the *Āyārāṅga Sūtra*, has survived, while the remaining eleven sections were lost early in Jain history. Based on the digitized portion of the sūtra on the

GRETIL website, which covers approximately half of the *sūtra*, I find 33 occurrences of the epithet ‘*bhagavant*,’ all of which refer to Mahāvīra. A typical example is as follows. It is written in Ardha-Māgadhī, a Prakrit used in ancient Northeast India, and here, I provide my own translation. We have a translation of the *Ācārāṅga Sūtra* by Hermann Georg Jacobi (1884), but it is somewhat outdated and, in my opinion, needs to be updated.⁴⁷

*Suyam me, āusaṃ, teṇaṃ bhagavayā evaṃ akkhāyaṃ: ||Āyā *1.1||*
O my fellows, I have heard the following discourse [delivered] by the **Blessed One**.

In contrast to the previous usages of ‘*bhagavat*’ in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* and the *Bhagavad Gīta*, the epithet in the *Āyārāṅga Sūtra* is dedicated specifically to their religious founder Mahāvīra. It is not an overused title for religious elites, nor a substitute for the names of gods who are recipients of religious devotion. Instead, it is an epithet reserved for one and only one person, who is believed to have delivered the Jain canonical discourses and initiated Jain traditions. By using the epithet, this *sūtra* attests to the authenticity of the discourse: its source is a man called Mahāvīra himself, and through the authority of his own words, this *sūtra* outlines the exemplary conduct of Jain ascetics.

In terms of this usage of ‘*bhagavant*,’ there is a parallel between Jain and Buddhist literature. Just as the epithet is dedicated to Mahāvīra in the *Āyārāṅga Sūtra*, it is reserved exclusively for Gotama, the Buddha, in the four *Nikāyas*. Similar to the legend of the Buddha, legend has it that Mahāvīra was born as a man but attained to the highest awakening through his own strenuous effort. Subsequently, a religious community was set up around him, and he was revered by those who followed his path. Finally, his followers codified his discourses and passed

⁴⁷ Hermann Georg Jacobi’s translation of the *Ācārāṅga Sūtra* (1884) is available both in a printed book, *Jaina Sutras Part I* and on a website ‘sacred-texts.com’.

them on to future generations. In this sense, both the Buddha and Mahāvīra are deserving of the epithet ‘*bhagavant*.’

We find some older unconventional scriptures in both literary traditions as well, revealing the pre-institutional phase of Buddhist and Jain traditions. In such scriptures, the epithet ‘*bhagavant*’ is rarely used. For example, just as ‘*bhagavant*’ appears only once within the meter of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* verses, it is also rare in one of the oldest Jain scriptures, the *Isibhāsiyaim Suttaim*. Instead, the old Buddhist text prefers the epithet ‘*muni*,’ and the old Jain text uses the epithet ‘*isi* (seer).’ The *Isibhāsiyaim Suttaim* is a collection of 45 discourses of different seers from Jain or non-Jain traditions. Out of the 45, only two seers, Vakkalacīri (chapter 6) and Ambaḍ (chapter 25), are referred to as ‘*bhagavant*.’ The two occurrences appear in the following verses, and I provide my own translation here since they have never been translated into English by anyone.

*Viyatte **bhagavaṇ** vakkalacīri ugga-tave tti* (Isibh 6.5)

The **Blessed One**, Vakkalacīri, accomplished [emancipation after] enduring severe penance.

*Te -aṃ, **bhagavaṇ**, sutta-maggāṇusārī khīṇa-kasāyā dantendiyā* (Isibh 25.29)

O Blessed One, they embarked on the path of sacred texts, eliminated impurities, and subdued [their] sense faculties.

According to Kalanath Shastri and Dinesh Chandra Sharma (1988: 26; 51–52), who translated the commentary on the *Isibhasiyaim Suttaim* into English, Vakkalacīri was highly respected in the Jain tradition, which is why the honorific title ‘*bhagavant*’ is attributed to him. They also provide some information about Ambaḍ, who is described in one Jain scripture as a future *Tīrtāṅkar* (Ford-maker; the founder of the Jain tradition, equivalent to the ‘*Sammāsambuddha*’ in Buddhism); and in another as a monk who performed *Sallekhana* (the

ritual of voluntary death by fasting).⁴⁸ Despite these two occurrences of ‘*bhagavant*’ in the *Isibhasiyaim Suttaim*, it is not the main epithet of the text. As mentioned earlier, it is overshadowed by the 66 occurrences of ‘*isi* (seer)’ throughout the scripture. Much like in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, the epithet ‘*bhagavant*’ is not well established in the *Isibhasiyaim Suttaim*, which reflects the pre-institutional phase of Jain traditions in ancient India.

So far, I have briefly examined the usage of ‘*bhagavant/bhagavat*’ in various religious scriptures from ancient India. This cursory exploration reveals its semantic evolution over time. The term’s development began with its adjectival usage in the *ṚgVeda*. The term became a title used between religious elites as a routine of politeness in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*. Ultimately, the term surfaced in Buddhist, Jain, and epic literature as an epithet dedicated to their religious founders, spiritual mentors, or objects of devotion.

This exploration leads us to conclude that the term ‘*bhagavant/bhagavat*’ evolved into a generic epithet during the formative period of the Buddhist, Jain, and Brahmanic religious corpora. From this point on, this trans-denominational epithet was no longer courteous, common parlance used among religious people to address one another, as it was in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*. Instead, it became reserved for the unique, central figure of their religiosity in each canonical scripture.

4.5. Distinctive Discourses Do Not Presuppose a Distinctive Identity

In the *Mahāniddeśa*, the epithet ‘*bhagavant*’ predominates over ‘*buddha*,’ which carries significant implications for the development of Buddhist identity. Although both epithets are

⁴⁸ According to Kalanath Shastri and Dinesh Chandra Sharma (*Ibid.* 27, 51), we find similar names in Buddhist literature, but they are brahmins portrayed negatively and do not merit the title ‘*bhagavant*.’ Thus, their characterizations in Buddhist sources may not be relevant to Vakkalacīri and Ambaḍ in the *Isibhāsiyaim Suttaim*.

rarely used in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, they become more prominent in its canonical commentary. However, even within this commentary, the specifically Buddhist identity suggested by '*buddha*' remains in its formative stages, overshadowed by the broader Indian religious identity conveyed by '*bhagavant*.' While '*buddha*' or '*sammāsambuddha*' specifically denotes an emerging Buddhist identity, emphasizing distinctions between insiders (Buddhists) and outsiders (non-Buddhists), '*bhagavant*' is a pan-Indian honorific and devotional term applicable to any awakened teacher or supreme deity, not exclusive to Buddhism. The prevailing use of '*bhagavant*' in the commentary suggests that the commentators were more comfortable with the traditional pan-Indian religious identity conveyed in the generic overarching epithet '*bhagavant*' than with a newly emerging, distinct Buddhist identity.

At this point, some may argue that the prominence of '*bhagavant*' over '*buddha*' in the canonical commentary does not undermine the significance of Buddhist denominational identity. It is because the unique set of doctrines and practices, as listed within Table 5, sufficiently demonstrate the distinctiveness of the Buddhist tradition. Moreover, they could question my characterization of the terms '*buddha*' or '*sammāsambuddha*' as representing an '*emerging* Buddhist identity' or '*growing* awareness' of their denominational identity, criticizing the idea that the formation of a Buddhist identity was an ongoing process during the composition of the *Mahāniddeśa*.

However, does the distinctive discourse truly indicate that the author(s) possessed a denominational mindset? This may not necessarily be the case. While I recognize the doctrinal and disciplinary innovations that the ancient Buddhist traditions brought to the Indian religious landscape, it is crucial to reevaluate the assumption that distinctive discourses inherently result from, or lead to, a well-defined denominational identity. Contrary to popular belief, I argue that

doctrines and practices can proliferate and be systematized within a religious community without developing a clear sense of denominational identity. This incongruity between discourse and identity is apparent in the *Mahāniddesa*'s annotations on '*bhagavant*' and '*buddha*.' The author(s) of the canonical commentary may have unintentionally characterized the generic epithet '*bhagavant*' with highly sophisticated Buddhist doctrines and practices shown in Table 5. In contrast, they defined the term '*buddha*' without reference to specific Buddhist doctrinal and disciplinary matters, even though the epithet '*buddha*' is closely related to the more denominationally nuanced epithet '*sammāsambuddha*.'

In the next chapter, I will discuss the relationship between religious discourses and denominational identities. Drawing on various recent monographs, I will argue that, at the inception of ancient Indian religions, discourses flourished prior to the emergence of denominational identities.

5. A Theoretical Framework for Understanding Religious Identity Formation in Ancient India

5.1. Illusory Nature of Religious Identity

The historiography of ancient Indian religions is pervaded by the tacit assumption that these religions have had clear-cut religious identities from their inception. As deeply imbedded as this assumption is in the scholarly literature, it demands reconsideration in light of new insights brought into the field over the last few decades. An example of these insights can be found in Nathan McGovern's *The Snake and the Mongoose* (2019, 23). McGovern, citing Jean-François Bayart, questions the very premise that ancient Indian religious traditions began with the distinct denominational identities we perceive today:

... Bayart has argued that the cultural identities we take for granted in the modern world are not primordial, as they claim to be, but rather fabrications of the recent past, reflecting particular contingencies therein, rather than essences deriving from some distant origin. What I am proposing, then, is that the illusory nature of identity is just as operative in ancient times as it is in the modern world. The ancient Indian discourse that we study does not reflect preexisting, metahistorical identities such as Brahmanical or non-Brahmanical; instead, ancient Indian discourse is the raw material out of which such identities emerge—both, over time, within the discourse itself and for those of us in the present who study that ancient discourse from historical distance. *In other words, identity does not precede discourse; discourse precedes identity.*

As a social scientist focused on African politics, Bayart (2005) demonstrates in his book *The Illusion of Cultural Identity* how cultural identities are being fabricated within a society. His argument is based on the widely accepted anthropological thesis that culture is a social construct deriving from people's collective memory. Drawing on this thesis, he attacks political discourses rooted in the misconception that the culture of a country is timeless, definite, and unique, determining a specific political orientation of the people. Contrary to this presumption, he asserts, culture oscillates between transmitted heritage and new inventions; it is constructed by

the ‘dialectic of permanence and change’; and it ‘is being negotiated’ with foreign elements (*ibid*, 65–71).

Thus, instead of the often-misconstrued term ‘culture,’ Bayart adopts the concept of ‘social *imaginaire*,’ which is defined by Charles Taylor (2004, 6) as ‘the way our contemporaries imagine the societies they inhabit.’ Using this concept, Bayart demonstrates how politics manipulates social *imaginaires* to create cultural identities. By drawing upon various streams of Western philosophical thought and myriad other researchers’ studies on recent history, he demonstrates how all kinds of hegemonic leaders—political, religious, pop-cultural, etc.—are consciously constructing, propagating, and maintaining cultural identities out of the raw materials of the social *imaginaire*. These constructed cultural identities arouse public emotions and alter general perceptions, which contribute towards setting a political agenda and structuring domestic lives and foreign policies.

Bayart’s interpretation of cultural identity within political dynamics readily applies to the field of religion, and it reinforces McGovern’s thesis about the fallacy of asserting a primordial religious identity. Just as political discourses abound under the illusion of fixed cultural identities, so too do academic works on ancient religions that assume religious identities are primeval. Just as cultural identity is intentionally constructed out of the social *imaginaire*, religious identity is also constructed out of the past religious *imaginaire* that is reflected, to a limited extent, in religious discourses. In this vein, McGovern argues that religious discourse flourishes at the outset of a tradition, before religious identity is created, and not the other way around. He summarizes this point succinctly: ‘Identity does not precede discourse; discourse precedes identity.’ And finally, just as cultural identity is constructed to set political agendas,

McGovern suggests that religious identities are constructed long afterward amid intense rivalry between well-established religious institutions for religious and political hegemony.

Both scholars may probe the illusory nature of cultural and religious identity, but there is a noticeable discrepancy between their two different approaches. While Bayart investigates the theoretical side of cultural-identity formation in politics, McGovern is more concerned with examining diverse ancient Indian religious corpora to explore the semantic trajectory of the epithet ‘*brāhmaṇa*’ rather than focusing on sociological theory. Based on this trajectory, he argues that the epithet represented a common ideal type across different Indian religious traditions at the dawn of the Buddhist and Jain traditions. Therefore, the conventional narrative of Buddhism/Jainism against Brahmanism may not accurately reflect the reality of these śramaṇa (ascetic) traditions at their incipency. Rather, these two religious traditions identified themselves as *śramaṇas* only after the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE, when the hereditary brahmin class claimed the epithet as its own.

McGovern supports his argument with evidence from a wide range of ancient Indian literary traditions. First, he shows that the epithet ‘*brāhmaṇa*’ as the ideal person abounds across the earliest strata of what we classify as śramaṇic religious literature. This includes early Buddhist oral texts, such as the *Aṭṭhakavagga* and the *Pārāyanavagga*, and early Jain scriptures, such as the *Āyāraṅga Sutta* and the *Sūyagaḍaṃga Sutta*.⁴⁹ He claims that these early texts adopt the epithet not as outsiders appropriating the ‘*brāhmaṇa*’ ideal in the Brahmanic tradition, but as insiders who have internalized the Brahmanic worldview. In other words, they are fundamentally

⁴⁹ I show in Part II (Table 1) that the *Aṭṭhakavagga* uses the epithet *brāhmaṇa* 9 times as its ideal person. In contrast, it rarely uses the epithets ‘*buddha*’ ‘*bhagavant*’ or ‘*tathāgata*,’ though they are everywhere in the other Buddhist canonical texts.

part of the Brahmanic world, integrating the epithet into their own religious framework and showing no hint of conflict between the śramaṇa and brāhmaṇa traditions in these ancient texts.

Next, McGovern demonstrates how the *brāhmaṇa* ideal was manipulated and made its own by the hereditary brahmin class in the subsequent centuries by drawing on the accounts of *āśrama* (stages of life) and *varṇa* (classes of people) systems from the *Dharmasūtras*.⁵⁰ This literary genre establishes laws that govern the social system and human conduct in ancient India, and it proliferated during the few centuries before the common era.⁵¹ By composing these texts, he argues, the hereditary brahmin took ownership of the *brāhmaṇa* ideal by placing it within the four stages (*āśrama*) of the brahmin life, and they claimed their religio-political supremacy by establishing a hierarchical social system (*varṇa*) with the brahmin class at its pinnacle.

According to Patrick Olivelle (1993, 73–81), the *āśrama* system originally did not involve the four stages of life that male brahmins pass through during their lifetimes. Instead, the system initially involved four alternative ways of lifelong commitment for adults. As one of the four alternatives, the *brahmacarya* (celibate life for religious purposes) underwent a related transition in the *Dharmasūtras*, and its meaning came to be reduced to the celibate studentship before adulthood. Thus, McGovern suggests that the epithet *brāhmaṇa* originally meant one who chooses ‘celibate asceticism (*brahmacarya*)’ out of the four different modes of life. Around the time of the *Dharmasūtras*’ composition, however, the epithet *brāhmaṇa* came to be monopolized by the brahmin class who spent their studentship (*brahmacarya*) during their adolescence. Once the hereditary ecclesiastic householders claimed the epithet ‘*brāhmaṇa*,’ and their ideology of

⁵⁰ According to the *Āpastamba Dharmasūtra*, the *āśrama* system has four stages—*brahmacārī* (studentship), *grhastha* (householder), *bhikṣu* (mendicant), and *vaikhāṇasa* (hermit). The *varṇa* system has four classes of people—*brāhmaṇa* (brahmin), *rājanya* (ruler), *vaiśya* (free person), and *śūdra* (servant).

⁵¹ Patrick Olivelle (2000: 10) dates this literary genre roughly from the time between the third century BCE to the common era.

priestly supremacy put ever-increasing pressure on the celibate renunciants, the latter began to identify themselves instead as the ‘*śramaṇa*,’ the ascetic, in opposition to the ‘*brāhmaṇa*.’ The altered relationship between the two groups began to be represented in the Sanskrit compound ‘*śramaṇabrāhmaṇa*’ which is omnipresent in Indian religious discourses. This compound originally refers to all sorts of religious professionals in ancient India who are worthy of offerings, and no antagonistic nuance is attached to it: the 3rd-c. BCE Aśokan edicts demonstrate this early usage of the compound. However, according to McGovern, we begin to encounter its antagonistic nuance in the *Mahābhāṣya* (composed. 2nd c. BCE), Patañjali’s commentary on Pāṇini’s Sanskrit grammar treatise, the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. This commentary uses the compound ‘*śramaṇabrāhmaṇa*’ as an example of an oppositional compound (*virodhadvandva*), which means that the two types of religious people—the *śramaṇa* and the *brāhmaṇa*—were competitors and mutually exclusive.

In summary, McGovern argues that the epithet *brāhmaṇa* was neither exclusive to Brahmanical schools nor opposed to the *Śramaṇic* traditions during the mid-first millennium BCE. Only after the hereditary brahmins claimed the epithet as their own around the post-Mauryan period (185 BCE—), did the Buddhist, Jain, Ājīvika, and many other religious traditions began to assert their alternative identities as *śramaṇas* (ascetics), as a way of criticizing their competitors’ ideology and competing for lay sponsorship. Thus, according to him, it would be anachronistic to describe the emergence of Buddhism and Jainism as movements in opposition to the Brahmanic orthodoxy of the time. Nevertheless, this narrative has been repeatedly echoed in the historiography on ancient Indian religious traditions, which is just a modern scholarly retrospective projection into the past. This projection has its root not in

ancient history but in later scriptures that pronounce the hostility between the two categories of religious people in ancient India.

McGovern's argument compelled Indologists to reexamine religious identity formation in ancient India, but he could not totally convince the mainstream of scholarship. His central chronological thesis is twofold: 1) the celibate renouncer was an earlier phenomenon than the hereditary brahmin; 2) the ascendancy of the hereditary brahmin pushed the later celibate renouncers to re-identify themselves as the *śramaṇas*. In this thesis, the ascendancy stage is most crucial, and he finds the earliest testimony to it from the word '*varṇa*' in the *Dharmasūtras*. However, we have the earliest reference to the four classes, but without using the term *varṇa*, in the *Puruṣasūkta* (Ṛgveda X.90): that hymn describes the four classes as being created out of the four different *hierarchical* body parts of the mythic Man (*Puruṣa*). Michael Witzel (1995) dates its composition to the Middle Vedic period, which is markedly earlier than the emergence of Buddhism and Jainism, probably by several centuries or more.⁵² Thus, the text shows that the social stratification and the expression of priestly supremacy was a pre-Buddhist phenomenon. Joseph Walser draws on this same evidence to refute McGovern's chronology and adds other counterexamples (2019, 330–332): i.e., the *Ṛgveda* frequently uses the term '*brahmán*' as a masculine noun denoting 'the person or god who formulates a prayer,' and nowhere in the text do we find it meaning 'one who practices celibate renunciation (*brahmacarya*).' Further, the Vedic *śākhās* (branches) spread to the east under the thriving Kuru-Pañcāla state during the Middle Vedic period, transmitting their own collection of specific *Brāhmaṇas*, *Āraṇyakas*, and

⁵² Michael Witzel (1995: 2–5) posits a Middle Vedic period in "Early Sanskritization: Origins and Development of the Kuru State." He uses the term to bridge the Early Vedic period and the Late Vedic period: the former is when the *Ṛgveda* was composed (1500–1000. BCE); the latter is when the later *Brāhmaṇas*, *Āraṇyakas*, *Upaniṣads*, and most *Sūtras* were produced (7th–1st c. BCE). He defines the Middle Vedic period as follows: "... [it] is represented by the Mantras and the expository prose of the YV *Samhitās* (MS, KS/ KpS, TS) and by several older *Brāhmaṇas*—texts composed in the Kuru-Pañcāla area, between Eastern Panjab and Kausambi/Allahabad."

Upaniṣads.⁵³ Thus, he argues against McGovern's thesis that the celibate renunciant brahmin was a later phenomenon than the settled householder brahmin who belonged to the Vedic branches.

In a June 2023 personal communication, Stephanie Jamison critiques McGovern's portrayal of the term '*brāhmaṇa*' as evolving from associations with '*brahmacarya*' to signify 'one who opts for celibate asceticism' among the four life modes in the dharma sūtras. She notes that the *varṇa* system, though unnamed, predates the dharma sūtras, as evidenced by the presence of '*brāhmaṇá*' in the late Ṛg Veda and in middle Vedic ritual literature. Jamison argues that although '*brāhmaṇa*' originally served as a broad honorific, it became restricted to the brahmin-dharma tradition by the last centuries BCE, thus excluding outsiders.

McGovern acknowledges the presence of the brahmins and the expansion of their ideology during the pre-Buddhist era (*Ibid*, 140–151). However, he downplays their influence upon the early Buddhist and Jain traditions because their religious identities were not prominent enough to provoke reactions from these emerging religious traditions. He finds the tipping point in the word '*varṇa*' and related expressions that denote the firm establishment of the *varṇa* system, whose exact terminology is absent in the *Rgveda*. He aligns himself with recent scholarship, such as Talal Asad, Tomoko Masuzawa, and Daniel Boyarin, indicating that, before the time around the composition of the *Dharmasūtras*, *brāhmaṇa* referred to a meritorious status that was accessible to the warrior and the working classes too by observing the *brahmacarya* practice. Thus, such a nonrigid class division with a certain degree of social mobility in religious traditions could not create sufficient pressure on the early Buddhist and Jain traditions. Only when the *varṇa* system surfaced in Indian literary traditions did the hereditary priestly

⁵³ Michael Witzel (1995) calls this process of Brahmanic expansion in that location 'Early Sanskritization.'

supremacy get a tight grip on ancient Indian social reality, and many Śramaṇic traditions reacted systematically and fought back ideologically.

With all due respect to both sides, I believe the ‘which-precedes-which’ debate need not be so central to the main thesis of McGovern’s book. Rather, McGovern is principally concerned with demonstrating that the epithet *brāhmaṇa* served to express the religious ideal across various ancient Indian religious scriptures, because their separate religious identities were not so prominent yet at the time of their composition. To support this thesis, he theorizes the semantic trajectory of the epithet: its original meaning was the meritorious status found in the term ‘*brahmacarya*’; however, it took on the hereditary connotations of the *varṇa* system during the emergence of what he calls ‘Neo-Brahmanism’ in the post-Mauryan period.⁵⁴ Other scholars have been less persuaded by this chronological argument than by other parts of McGovern’s reasoning, because they believe the Vedic corpora verify the existence of a settled brahmin class and its Vedic *śruti* (oral transmission) tradition, and this Vedic testimony is far earlier than the emergence of Buddhism and Jainism. Therefore, I suggest that the issue at stake is not ‘one after the other’ but ‘from a lack of awareness to a growing awareness’ of denominational identities in the ever-thriving religious discourses of the time. Multiple ideas about the epithet *brāhmaṇa* could have existed side by side in a certain location, over a certain period, among diverse people in India who were less denominationally conscious. The pre-institutional phase of Buddhist and Jain traditions may well have borrowed the epithet from the Vedic designation to represent their religious ideal, but this does not imply that the epithet *originally* meant ‘celibate renunciant.’ Instead, these groups simply adopted a common term because they were less aware of their

⁵⁴ McGovern (21) accepts the concept of ‘New Brahmanism’ that Bronkhorst coined to refer to the post-Mauryan Brahmanism, but he prefers his slightly modified term ‘Neo-Brahmanism.’ These terms represent the Brahmanic tradition during the post-Mauryan time when the tradition got the royal patronage, increased their political power, and propagated their framework of Brahmanic supremacy.

denominational identities when they started to compose their religious discourses. This borrowing also does not imply that the hereditary Vedic ecclesia did not exist at the outset of the Buddhist and Jain traditions. The brahmins in the Vedic *śruti* traditions may have been hereditary, but the early Buddhists and Jains would not have been so sensitive to the ‘class’ connotation of the epithet. They did not hesitate to use the epithet *brāhmaṇa* because they did not need to compete fiercely with the brahmins during that period and thus had not developed their distinct religious identities yet. I believe my suggestion fits well with McGovern’s claim that “identity does not precede discourse; discourse precedes identity.” In this wise, McGovern does not need to swim against the current of the relatively well-founded chronological thesis; however, he still compels us to reconsider our unfounded assumption of primordial religious identities at the dawn of ancient Indian religious traditions.

I agree with McGovern’s claim that discourse precedes identity, but with qualifications. This claim holds true at the inception of a religious tradition and offers new insights into the protracted process of identity formation and institutionalization. Burgeoning discourses in a certain religious tradition pave the way for religious identity formation down the road. Once the religious identity begins to coalesce in the tradition, however, the emerging identity could motivate the tradition to compose discourses, too. When the ever-expanding Vedic *śruti* tradition finally led to the intense rivalry in the Northeast during the post-Mauryan period, Buddhists began to produce discourses, such as what McGovern calls the ‘encounter dialogs’ in the Nikāya literature.⁵⁵ In these discourses, we find specific signs of confrontation surfacing between the *brāhmaṇa* and the Buddha as a *śramaṇa*. In the *Ambaṭṭha sutta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya*, for

⁵⁵ McGovern (53) defines the ‘encounter dialog’ as the interlocution between brahmins and the Buddha as a *samaṇa* (Skt. *śramaṇa*).

example, the Buddha's interlocutor, a young brahmin named Ambaṭṭha, takes too much pride in his Vedic lineage and behaves arrogantly towards the Buddha. The Buddha does not just endure the disgrace: in response, he turns the tables with the antithesis to Ambaṭṭha's claim of priestly supremacy—the warrior class (*kṣatriya*) has had the upper hand over the priest class (*brāhmaṇa*) since their origins.⁵⁶ However, the *sutta* discloses not only the Vedic *śruti* tradition's hostile reception to the Buddha but also the sanguine atmosphere surrounding the encounter. Hearing of the sterling reputation of the *samaṇa* Gotama, the renowned brahmin Pokkharasāti holds no prejudice at all against the new religious leader and desires to see him. He is the one who sends his disciple Ambaṭṭha to the Buddha in advance. Upon receiving a report from his disciple about the fraught meeting, he scolds Ambaṭṭha for having been so disrespectful to the Buddha. This time, Pokkharasāti personally comes to meet the Buddha and asks for his forgiveness for his disciple's misdemeanor. What is most intriguing in this *sutta* is that the brahmin gauges the Buddha's spirituality on the scale of the thirty-two marks of a Great Man that, according to him, has been transmitted in his Vedic mantra tradition.⁵⁷ Once he has witnessed that the Buddha possesses all the thirty-two marks, he takes refuge in the Buddha. According to this narrative, the brahmin perceives the Buddha as a new religious leader, but not as a total outsider to his own Vedic tradition—or perhaps, the Vedic mantra tradition simply does not demarcate a clear enough boundary to keep outsiders at bay. The following two *suttas* in the *Dīgha Nikāya* also describe two renowned brahmins who have an audience with the Buddha.⁵⁸ Their attitude shows

⁵⁶ McGovern (194) calls this an 'unwanted side-effect': while refuting Neo-Brahmanism's framework, the Buddhist authors reproduced a similar framework only to naturalize the framework.

⁵⁷ There is no consensus on the definition of '*mantra*' yet because the term has been used with many different connotations in diverse religious traditions of Indic origin. When limited to the Vedic tradition, it should refer to Vedic hymns or sacrificial formulas, and the Vedic mantra tradition should be synonymous with the Vedic *śruti* tradition. See Jan Gonda (1980: 9).

⁵⁸ The *Soṇadaṇḍa sutta* and the *Kūṭadanta sutta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya*.

a certain ambivalence—a mixed feeling of pride in their Vedic heritage and an open-mindedness towards the new rising religious leader. They ask the Buddha some questions about Vedic preoccupations and are pleased with his answer. From these encounter dialogs, we find an emerging consciousness of denominational identities, but such identities are subordinated to the camaraderie and mutual respect that accrue between religious leaders in ancient India.

5.2. The Pre-Institutional Phase of Asceticism in Ancient India

McGovern's thesis on pre-denominational Indian religious discourses accords with the early Ājīvika-Jain history reconstructed by Piotr Balcerowicz (2016). In his monograph, *Early Asceticism in India: Ājīvikism and Jainism*, Balcerowicz theorizes that the Ājīvika and Jain traditions share a common ancient history lasting over several centuries before they developed their respective religious identities. During this formative period, the Ājīvika played a significant role in the constitution of the Jain doctrines and practices. When their religious identities dawned in the later generations, they developed an institutional rivalry, and the Jains sought to erase or distort the shared memories that might have desacralized their tradition. Nonetheless, the total obliteration is inconceivable, and Balcerowicz marshals relevant pieces of textual and archeological information to demonstrate the Ājīvika traces surviving in Jain logic, epistemology, doctrine, practice, and culture. His proposition matches McGovern's claim that the Brahmanic, Buddhist, and Jain traditions, in the beginning, coexisted without marking their sectarian boundaries and shared the epithet *brāhmaṇa* in their discourses to describe their spiritual paragons. As McGovern (2019, 222) puts it, they 'brought each other into existence' during that prolonged formative period. After several centuries, once the Brahmanic tradition established religio-political hegemony in India, the Buddhist and Jain traditions re-identified

themselves as *śramaṇa* traditions to resist the Brahmanic domination. Taken together, both scholars question the conventional narrative of ancient Indian religions beginning with the distinctive features of their founders, doctrines, and practices. Instead, they propose those hagiographies and unique features took shape over a long period, during which ancient Indian religious identities were still unclear, and their doctrines and practices were still fluid.

To support his thesis on the shared early history of Ājīvikism and Jainism, Balcerowicz threads his way through the affinities between the two traditions, such as their shared cosmology, early scriptures, prevalence of divination, and their ritual of a terminal fast, to name a few.⁵⁹ First, the two traditions share a distinctive common cosmology. As an example, they differ from the other contemporary Indian religious traditions in that both consider plants as sentient beings which migrate through the endless rounds of rebirth.⁶⁰ Then, both the Ājīvika and Jain traditions call their ancient scriptures the *Puvva* (Skt. *Pūrva*). The Jain tradition claims their *Puvvas* were consigned to oblivion from time immemorial; however, they insist their *Puvvas* were unique, developed independently of the Ājīvika *Puvvas*. However, Balcerowicz suspects the *Puvvas* may have been one and the same textual heritage that loosely existed in the beginning and evolved into the two separate textual traditions over the subsequent several centuries. As evidence, he draws on some epigraphic clues. In a famous rock inscription dated about 600 CE, for example, an early Jain author Bhadrabāhusvāmin (fl. ca. 4th century BCE) refers to the *Books of Great*

⁵⁹ In this sentence, I use ‘Ājīvikism and Jainism’ because they designate what scholars in the field imagine the two religious traditions to be. As I have discussed in the previous chapter (Part I, Chapter 2), however, I reckon ‘Jain tradition(s)’ is a more apt term than ‘Jainism’ when describing the earliest phase of their history. It is because the former leaves room for the fluid nature of the earliest period of their religious phenomena, while the latter makes the phenomena fixed and abstract by using the suffix ‘-ism.’ For the same reason, I prefer ‘Ājīvika tradition(s)’ and Buddhist tradition(s) to Ājīvikism and Buddhism when I portray the formative period of their history.

⁶⁰ Balcerowicz makes an exception of the earliest Buddhism, citing Schmithausen (1991; 2009), and Findly (2008). By analyzing early Buddhist texts that deal with the monastic rule against harming plants and seeds, Schmithausen claims that the early Buddhists may have perceived plants as sentient beings.

Omens (Mahā-nimittas) as their own tradition, which are in fact known as the manuals for divinatory practice within the Ājīvika *Purvvas*. Next, we find in the Jain canon that divination was widely practiced in the tradition, though much condemned by its founder Mahāvīra Vardhamāna and his apostles. Balcerowicz suspects the Jain claim of omniscience (*kevalajñāna*) makes more sense considering its development under the influence of the Ājīvika belief in determinism and their practice of divination.⁶¹ Finally, the Jain tradition has an optional monastic vow known as *sallekhanā* (ritual of voluntary fasting to death). The tradition deems this practice heroic, demonstrating one's complete control of their body, speech, and mind, as well as one's total inactivity to prevent any further karmic accrual. Gośāla Maṅkhaliputra, known as the founder of Ājīvikism, seems to have gone through this ritual. The *Bhagavatī* [Venerable] *Sūtra*, a Jain canonical text, gives a rather cryptic description of his final days. This is, according to Balcerowicz, nothing but the *sallekhanā* ritual transmitted in the Jain tradition. In this manner, Balcerowicz explores the common features of the two ancient ascetic traditions and suggests that they were the same religious tradition in their long formative period.

While maneuvering between the common features, Balcerowicz also seeks to revise Gośāla's position in the history of Jainism. Though Buddhist and Jain literature primarily mock, criticize, and vilify him, ancient Indians seem to have venerated Gośāla with the Jain title *tīrthāṅkara* (ford-maker; P. *tiṭṭhākara*). This title connotes that the person built a spiritual ford for people to cross the river of endless rounds of rebirth. Later, it became settled as a Jain epithet reserved for founders of Jainism, having a similar position to the title *sammāsambuddha* (perfectly awakened one) in Buddhism. Basham (1951: 79, as cited in Balcerowicz, 2016: 39), contends “both the *Bhagavatī Sūtra* and the *Sāmañña-phala Sutta* mention him [Gośāla] as

⁶¹ See chapters 5 and 12 (Balcerowicz, 2016: pp. 65–67; 171–173).

claiming the title of *tīrthaṅkara*.” He adds that Gośāla in the *Bhagavatī Sūtra* also “called himself *jina* [victorious one], *arhant* [worthy one], and *kevalin* [omniscient one].” These titles also abound in the Jain literature when describing their founder or Jain saints in the following generations. The *Sāmaññaphala Sutta* (*Discourse on the Fruit of Asceticism*), a Buddhist canonical discourse, uses the epithet *tīrthaṅkara* as a component of a stock phrase for six non-Buddhist spiritual teachers of the day. For example, the *sutta* describes Gośāla:

*Ayam, deva, makkhali gosālo saṅghī ceva gaṇī ca gaṇācariyo ca ñāto yasassī **titthakaro** sādhusammato bahujanassa rattaññū cirapabbajito addhagato vayoanuppatto*
Your majesty there is Makkhali Gosāla, the leader of an order, the leader of a group, the teacher of a group, well-known and famous, **a spiritual leader** whom many people esteem as holy. He is aged, long gone forth, advanced in years, in the last phase of life.⁶²

Here, we should note the term *titthakara* is not exclusive to any sectarian tradition but is just a generic epithet to describe a charismatic figure adored by a religious congregation. Thus, this passage testifies to the non-denominational phase of Indian ascetic traditions: it demonstrates that the well-known Jain sectarian epithet may have been once a descriptive word for any leader of a religious congregation. For this reason, Balcerowicz (p. 39) admits the usage of *titthakara* in the Buddhist text may be weak evidence for Gośāla’s firm standing in the early Jain tradition.

Balcerowicz examines the relation between the two founders and argues Gośāla may have been an early teacher of Mahāvīra, which contradicts the later Jain description of Gośāla as a treacherous disciple of Mahāvīra. Balcerowicz takes evidence from Mahāvīra’s adoption of nudity, bald head, and eating alms from cupped hands soon after his encounter with Gośāla (p. 43). Before this encounter, Mahāvīra began his renunciation in the Pārśva tradition following the

⁶² This translation is from Bhikkhu Bodhi’s [Bold type is added]. Bodhi translates *titthakara* as ‘spiritual leader, while Basham as ‘founder of a sect’ and Balcerowicz as ‘ford-maker.’

religious affiliation of his family (*Āyāraṅga sutta* 2.15; Balcerowicz, 2016: 14).⁶³ The Pārśva tradition was a longstanding *śramaṇa* tradition by the time, and the renunciant in this tradition wore clothes, let their hair grow, and used bowls for alms round. Gośāla was, on the other hand, known as a naked (*acelaka*), bald (*muṇḍa*) recluse who accepted food with his bare hands.

According to the *Bhagavatī Sūtra*, Mahāvīra encountered Gośāla in his early religious career and spent six years living together. Thus, Balcerowicz claims Gośāla was the source of inspiration for Mahāvīra in his taking up these ascetic practices during this cohabitation. Walther Schubring (1962: 33-34; as cited in Balcerowicz: 21) describes Mahāvīra's adoption of nudity as his first move out of the Pārśva tradition. Despite his drastic transition to nudity, a majority in the Jain tradition may have worn clothes. Johannes Bronkhorst (2000: 513; as cited in Balcerowicz: 21) makes this suggestion because the Pāli Buddhist canon never describes the Jain renunciant as naked.

What is now emblematic of Jainism may not have been so at the beginning of its history. In the latter part of his book, Balcerowicz devotes six chapters (Chapters.13–18) to the Jain doctrinal landmark, '*anekānta* (multiplexity of reality),' and its related epistemology and logic. This doctrine assumes the ultimate reality has multifarious aspects so that one cannot judge it from a single perspective. The all-encompassing vision of the multiplexity is, in the Jain creed, the domain of the *Jina* (Victor) who has achieved omniscience. This worldview is a powerful weapon in epistemological debates giving the Jains an edge over the followers of other traditions: they could neutralize a non-Jain epistemological claim by taking it as a partial truth and putting it under some specific conditions. To specify such qualifications, Jain discourses capitalize on the Sanskrit optative verb '*syāt* (it may be... [on condition that...])' in their

⁶³ The Pārśva tradition may have been intricately related to the Jain tradition. The Jain tradition considers Pārśvanātha—the founder of the Pārśva tradition—the 23rd Tīrthankara, while Mahāvīra the 24th.

classification of all the entailed complementary aspects of reality. Having such a nature, this doctrine appears to have contributed to the development of distinctive ancient Indic epistemology and logic. According to Balcerowicz, however, this proposition is anachronistic: all this Jain metaphysical articulation was a later phenomenon than the maturation of Indian epistemology and logic. He provides circumstantial evidence: Indian epistemology and logic date back to the middle of the first millennium BCE, but it is only from the 4th–6th century CE that Jain works present the idea of the *anekāntavāda* and its computationally structured modal reasoning. Mahāvīra’s discourses in the Jain canon also show he rarely engaged in scholastic pursuits; his primary concern was ascetic practice and monastic regulations. Here, Balcerowicz’s argument has a further implication than the late formation of Jain epistemological doctrine and its ancillary logic. Though the historiography of ancient Indian religions takes Mahāvīra and Gośāla as the founders of Jainism and Ājīvikism, they may not have established these religious traditions once and for all. Instead, Balcerowicz suggests multiple figures who succeeded them must have engaged in the gradual process of identity formation, doctrinal systemization, and institutionalization of the two ancient religious traditions (*ibid.* 9). If I may say so, I have a hunch those figures belonging to the earliest period may not have envisioned the sort of full-fledged doctrinal edifice that the later Jains have deep faith in and take so much pride in.

Balcerowicz’s reasoning based on the affinities of the two traditions would fall short of proving the same identity at their beginning. Ancient Indian religious studies are fraught with scant evidence and ill-founded chronologies. For the ancient Jain and Ājīvika traditions, the circumstance is even worse. Though the Jain tradition has valuable literary sources, both canonical and commentarial, early Jainism is an understudied field compared with Vedic studies or early Buddhist studies. Hence, we do not have sufficient secondary literature on early Jain

history. Even pioneers in the field have to be super cautious when using thin literary sources as historical data. Our knowledge about the Ājīvika tradition is even more limited because it faded away at a certain point in time in India, with almost no surviving literary corpus of its own. All our textual information of the bygone tradition comes from the fragmented and prejudiced accounts in Buddhist and Jain literary sources. Despite the dearth of reliable literary evidence, it does not require intensive research to appreciate how influential the Ājīvika tradition may have been during the formative period of the Buddhist and Jain traditions. The epigraphic evidence from the Aśokan edicts, the Barābār Hills, and the Nāgārjunī Hills indicates it should have been more influential than the Jain tradition, probably next to the Buddhist tradition in those days (*ibid.* Chapter 19). In light of its leading position in ancient Indian religiosity, Arthur Llewellyn Basham presented a historical reconstruction of the extinct tradition, *History and Doctrines of the Ājīvikas: A Vanished Indian Religion* (1980; 1st ed. 1951). His book explores a diverse range of topics, such as early charismatic figures, scriptures, doctrines, and practices of the lost tradition by referring to the Buddhist and Jain scriptures as well as the Tamil religious literature. This publication certainly opened the way for Balcerowicz: six decades and a half after its appearance, Balcerowicz takes Ājīvika studies a step further by taking up the early intersecting elements of the Ājīvika and Jain traditions. As to the chronology, Indologists put most historical events in ancient Indian religious traditions in the timeline calibrated from the illusive dating of the Buddha. Depending on this relative chronology, any reconstruction of their history is inherently debatable. As Olivelle (1998; 12) puts it regarding Upaniṣadic texts, any attempts to date them with ‘a precision closer than a few centuries is as stable as a house of cards.’ Given this difficulty, we should consider any reconstruction of ancient Indian religious traditions as preliminary, however viable as it may be.

Balcerowicz admits his argument is inevitably hypothetical and does not mean it to be watertight (*ibid.* 5); nevertheless, he maneuvers scanty resources into a coherent argument that the two traditions were indistinguishably related in their early history. His book comprises twenty chapters encompassing a wide range of loosely interconnected topics in each chapter. Though handled discreetly, each topic leaves much room for controversy without firm evidence or indisputable chronology of the two traditions. What is telling, however, is the wide range of topics combined: each topic makes for a likely possibility, but the whole body of circumstantial evidence points to the same direction, twisting the pieces of straw into a more reliable rope. Jain history, doctrines, or many other aspects become clearer and more understandable when explained in the context of mutual influence with the Ājīvika tradition in their formative period. With the comprehensive shared features, he increases the level of plausibility that the Ājīvika and Jain traditions originated from and were brewed in the same religious environment for a prolonged time span in ancient India. In this manner, he does not mean for his reasoning to serve as a rigorous test, but for offering a more viable explanation of the symbiotic connections between the Jaina and Ājīvika traditions.

If Balcerowicz's hypothesis is tenable, it should have wider implications for the early history of Indian ascetic traditions generally. He limits his work to the earliest history of the Ājīvika and Jain traditions, and we are left with a question: what about Buddhism, another prosperous *śramaṇic* tradition in ancient India? In this dissertation, I have explored the epithets and doctrines of the *Arthapada* and claim the Buddhist tradition may not be an exception: there also should have been a long process during which the Buddhist traditions shaped their distinctive identity, doctrines, and practices. As one of the oldest Buddhist canonical scriptures, the *Arthapada* demonstrates the pre-institutional phase of the Buddhist traditions when they

lacked their own epithets for the ideal person and their own well-structured set of doctrines. Specifically, as I discussed previously, this text rarely uses such epithets as ‘*buddha* (佛; awakened one),’ ‘*bhagavant* (世尊; blessed one),’ and ‘*tathāgata* (如來; thus-gone)’ that are almost omnipresent in other texts in the Nikāya/Āgama literature.⁶⁴ Instead, it prefers to use ‘*muni* (尊; sage),’ ‘*brāhmaṇa* (ideal ascetic),’ and ‘*dhīra* (黠/慧; wise one)’ that are not alien to other religious subgroups of the day.⁶⁵ The text also rarely shows such doctrines as the Four Noble Truths, Noble Eightfold Path, or Dependent Origination that epitomize the Weltanschauung of the later Buddhist institution. With a few exceptions, the text does not even usher the audience toward the somewhat abstract concepts that encapsulate reality in later Buddhist accounts, nor does it promise a transcendent next life.⁶⁶ Instead, it carries simple and straightforward messages: people should live peacefully in this world without desire, views, or disputes. Examining the epithets and messages in the *Arthapada*, I would suggest the Buddhist tradition at its beginning, like the Ājīvika and Jain traditions, was not a standalone religious movement but a part of the larger Indian religious tradition, sharing their epithets with other traditions and voicing its views on the current religious agenda. As we trace back to the incipency of the three traditions, what we may expect to find as their distinctive denominational identities will just become blurry. We will only see those charismatic visionary ascetics,

⁶⁴ The four Nikāyas/Āgamas are the four main canonical collections of Buddhist discourses.

⁶⁵ There is no fixed Chinese rendering of the Pāli ‘*brāhmaṇa*’ in the *Yizujing*, Chinese recension of the *Arthapada*. Its Chinese translator, Zhi Qian, seemed perplexed why this non-Buddhist epithet is prevalent in the Buddhist text for the ideal person. Taking this epithet as the Buddhist rival, he recurrently mistranslated the Indic verses.

⁶⁶ A typical counterexample is the *Kalahavivāda sutta* which discusses the causal relations from *saññā* (perception) to *kalahavivāda* (quarrel and dispute). Its doctrinal sophistication culminates in verse 874, which presents the transcendental perception of the highly trained ideal person. The *Arthapada* reveals different levels of institutionalization of the Buddhist tradition, and the sporadic occurrence of such complicated doctrines may have been a later addition.

surrounded by small congregations, interacting as colleagues, and rivaling and influencing each other. As a result, they share a large intersecting area of doctrinal positions and disciplinary praxis.⁶⁷ As the Buddhist institution developed, they may have systematized their doctrines to train their monastic neophytes. In this developmental process, they may have projected their established denominational identities and distinctive doctrinal features back into the past, producing a vast collection of Buddhist literary resources.

5.3. Epithets Representing the Pre-Institutional phase of Buddhism

McGovern's and Balcerowicz's arguments primarily concur with Ria Kloppenborg's (1974) and Martin Gerald Wiltshire's (1990) suggestions that the longstanding Indian ascetic heritage nurtured Buddhist and Jain traditions over many centuries. They decode this age-old heritage by examining the epithet '*paccekabuddha* (Skt. *pratyekabuddha*; Pkt. *patteyabuddha*),' found in Buddhist and Jain literature. The figures with this epithet are, according to the two traditions, awakened persons (*-buddha*; *-jina*), liberated from the endless rounds of rebirth. They are the object of public worship because of their supernatural power; yet, they are mostly anonymous, living alone outside the Buddhist/Jain institution (*pacceka-*).

Kloppenborg's book *The Paccekabuddha: A Buddhist Ascetic* (1983; 1st ed. 1974) deserves credit for introducing Buddhist studies to this theme: the position of the *paccekabuddha* in the ongoing development of ancient Indian ascetic traditions. In her book, she explores the Pāli canonical and commentarial literature and argues that the *paccekabuddha* represents pre-

⁶⁷ Arthur Basham (1981: 134–41) also agrees on the inclusive communal atmosphere in the early śramaṇic traditions. He uncovers the default mode of an amiable companionship and mutual respect between Ājīvikas and Buddhists from the Pāli Vinaya where contestation and hostility between the groups is much more pronounced. He also points out that Ājīvikas and Jainas are so closely related in their doctrines and praxis that the Buddhist texts are frequently confused with the terms '*nigrantha* (Jain monk)' and '*ājīvika*' even in some texts like the *Divyāvadāna* that he believes to be a post-Mauryan composition.

Buddhist Indian asceticism that may even date back to Vedic era. However, she drew harsh criticism from Richard Gombrich, who contended that the *paccekabuddhas* do not carry a historical significance but are just a *hypothetical concept* to epitomize the later Buddhist institution. He has a reason for his contention. Though considered awakened by the later Buddhist institution, the *paccekabuddhas* allegedly did not form a religious community because they lacked the capacity to tutor their disciples. Hence, the Buddhist literature may have introduced them as the antithesis to the epithet ‘*sammāsambuddha* (Skt. *samyaksambuddha*),’ which is—as its literal meaning suggests—a ‘rightly (*sammā*) and fully (*sam*) awakened one (*buddha*)’ well equipped with the capacity to teach their disciples (*sāvaka*; Skt. *śrāvaka*; lit. hearer). In the Buddhist literature, of course, the title *sammāsambuddha* is predominantly dedicated to Gotama Buddha, and the *sāvaka* refers to the assembly (*saṃgha*) of the Buddha’s followers.⁶⁸ Thus, according to Gombrich, the epithet *paccekabuddha* arose categorically in the Buddhist literature in opposition to the founder of Buddhism and his well-established sangha; it does not represent such an age-old Indian religious tradition that worshipped awakened austere renouncers before the ascendancy of Buddhism and Jainism.

There are several reasons why Gombrich’s criticism is debatable. First, this categorical usage of the epithet does not contradict the historicity of the *paccekabuddhas*: the de facto pre-Buddhist legendary ascetics may have inspired the later Buddhist tradition to classify them as one of the Buddhist worthy people. In this case, a lack of the epithet in early Buddhist literature does not mean the related phenomenon did not exist. Kloppenborg draws considerable evidence

⁶⁸ Here, I do not count in the so-called ‘Seven Buddhas of Antiquity’ presented in the *Mahāpadāna Sutta* (DN 14) and the *Ātanāṭiya Sutta* (DN 32) nor its further expansion up to the twenty-four previous buddhas shown in the Pāli *Buddhavaṃsa*. It is because they all look alike in their biographies as if they are carbon copies of Gotama Buddha, though entitled with *sammāsambuddha* alongside Gotama Buddha. This may indicate that previous *sammāsambuddhas* cannot be evidence of the pre-Buddhist ascetic heritage but may appertain to the effort to universalize the Buddhist awakening by the later full-fledged Buddhist institution.

for the pre-Buddhist asceticism from the *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta* (*Sutta Nipāta* verses 35–75). As Gombrich points out, however, we cannot find the epithet in the sutta; it is its commentaries that take the protagonist of the sutta as the *paccekabuddha*.⁶⁹ This sutta is one of the oldest Buddhist texts and expresses the ethos of the solitary ascetic, using an iconic refrain—*eko care khaggavisāṇa kappo* (one should wander alone like the rhinoceros' horn).⁷⁰ Though devoid of the epithet, what this sutta describes is none other but the *paccekabuddha*. Unable to ignore the ideal presented in such cherished Buddhist verses, the tradition could have encapsulated the mysterious type of awakened ones (*buddhas*) in the epithet *paccekabuddha*. Thus, the sutta should be a perfect example of the pre-institutional phase of Indian asceticism that had a share in the ascent of Buddhism. Next, he criticizes her thesis because it is based on scant material, but he could be criticized for the same reason. We all agree that ancient Indian religious studies struggles with limited literary evidence, and most of our reconstructions must necessarily be provisional. However, it is not worthless to look for a more plausible explanation and work on such a nuanced subject as the pre-institutional Buddhist tradition. Finally, we encounter the epithet in diverse contexts other than the categorical one. For example, the *Jātaka* ([The Buddha's] Birth Story) literature frequently portrays the *paccekabuddhas* as the teachers of the former lives of the Buddha. People venerate them as buddhas in the forest, but sometimes fear them for their supernatural potency gained through rigorous asceticism. We find yet another context in such discourses as the *Isigili Sutta* (MN 116). In this sutta, the Buddha passes by the

⁶⁹ We find 3 occurrences of the epithet *paccekabuddha* in its canonical commentary the *Cūḷaniddesa* and over 180 occurrences in its non-canonical commentary the *Paramatthajotikā*.

⁷⁰ Though it extols the eremitic life, it is not without indicating companionship. For example, verses 46–47 suggest a *conditional* solitary life: one should wander alone if he cannot find a fellow ascetic who is at least as judicious and resolute as he is. This is a comradeship on the same hardcore path; still, the verses do not consider the chance to be high, and they end up with the same refrain encouraging solitary ascetic life. Except for these verses, the sutta does not show any hint of companionship, let alone Buddhist monasticism.

Isigili mountain and enunciates 119 names out of the 500 *paccekabuddhas* who lived there in the past. The Buddha pays his due respect to them and makes his monk-adherents salute them. Instead of comparing them with the *sammāsambuddha* or the *sāvakaśaṅgha*, the discourse demonstrates the public memory of such a respected tradition that is remote but still refuses to sink into oblivion. The sheer number of 500 Isigili *paccekabuddhas* implies the ascetic tradition was well-established in the mountain and was very influential in ancient Indian religiosity; seen from the Buddha's recollection of 119 names, the memory of that bygone tradition was still vivid in the minds of the emerging Buddhist tradition; and the due respect the Buddha paid to them discloses that the Buddhist tradition inherited the great legacy of the bygone tradition. To summarize, I believe Kloppenborg's thesis is still viable and deserves more than Gombrich's one-page uncompromising claim that the Buddhist tradition invented the *paccekabuddha* without historical reference.

Martin Gerald Wiltshire's *Ascetic Figures before and in Early Buddhism* (1990) takes up Kloppenborg's thesis and revives the discussion about the historicity of the *paccekabuddha*. He admits that the epithet *paccekabuddha* rarely occurs in the earliest layer of Buddhist literature—such as canonical archaic verses—not to mention in the Vedic corpora. However, he argues that we find precedents for the epithet in such other titles as *isi* (Skt. *ṛṣi*: seer), *muni* (sage), and *samaṇa* (Skt. *śramaṇa*: ascetic/renouncer). These three trans-sectarian titles are prevalent in the earliest stratum of Indian religious literature, and they reflect major aspects of the figure the *paccekabuddha*. To support his thesis, Wiltshire allocates the main body of his book to exploring the features shared between the *paccekabuddha* and the other three titles. In so doing, he characterizes the pre-Buddhist ascetic heritage in the broader field of ancient Indian religious studies. Yet, his book received acrimonious criticisms from K. R. Norman (1990) and Steven

Collins (1992), who defended Gombrich's position that the identity of the *paccekabuddha* is fictitious. Just as Gombrich criticized Kloppenborg for her inaccurate translations of the Pāli material, Norman depreciates the significance of Wiltshire's book due to his frequent scribal errors and unconventional quotations of Indic texts. Collins cites Norman's article that claims *pratyeka* (on one's own) could be a misconstruction of the earliest form of the term *pratyaya* (cause).⁷¹ According to Norman, the original meaning of the *paccekabuddha* may not be an 'awakened one on their own' but an 'awakened one by a cause (other than the Buddha's instruction).' Thus, according to Collins, it may be groundless to associate the *paccekabuddha* with the hero of the *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta*.⁷² Wiltshire respects Norman's etymological suggestion but rebuts Collins by arguing that the alternative etymological origin does not undermine his thesis of the pre-Buddhist ascetic heritage represented by the epithet. Even if Norman is correct, the *pratyaya* may imply the 'cause of religious inspiration external to any current established religious or social systems.' Accordingly, the term still advocates the ethos of renouncers dissociating themselves from society and turning to the wilderness for their religious inspiration, which goes well with the spirit of the *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta*.

I would not say Wiltshire's theory is technically well supported by textual, epigraphical, or archeological evidence, nor does he deal with the relevant scriptures with linguistic dexterity. However, his theory is telling when we take a step forward and see the emergence of Buddhism and Jainism in ancient India as an 'anthropological and sociological reality' (Wiltshire 1993: 244). The debate on the historicity of the *paccekabuddha* is not, or will never be, closed because we lack definitive evidence either for or against Wiltshire's thesis. As he mentions, it is up to us

⁷¹ K. R. Norman (1983) "The Pratyeka-buddha in Buddhism and Jainism" in *Buddhist Studies: Ancient and Modern*, ed. By Philip Denwood and Alexander Piatigorsky. London: Curzon Press.

⁷² It is the commentaries of the *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta* that associate the hero with the epithet *paccekabuddha*.

whether we adopt the traditionalist perspective—like Gombrich, Norman, and Collins—or we see a religious phenomenon as a social construct—like McGovern, Balcerowicz, Kloppenborg, and Wiltshire. From a sociological perspective, the way Buddhist discourses handle these anonymous wandering ascetics suggests worshipping them had long been a pan-Indian religious phenomenon before the Buddhist institutionalization. Even after monasticism overrode the ideal of hermits in India, the preexistent ascetic heritage may not have gone anywhere but continued to survive, having been absorbed into, or reorganized by, the emerging diverse religious groups of the day. The ascetic ideal and the well-established Buddhist institution may have reinforced each other: the ideal represented by the *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta* provided a justification for the otherworldliness of asceticism, rendering the institution more sacred; the institution breathed new life into the ancient hymns, ensuring they would continue to be chanted and transmitted from generation to generation. Wiltshire also implies that a sizeable chunk of Buddhism might be the reconstruction of the later institution. His interpretation may even discredit the *sui generis* characteristics of the Buddha and his awakening claimed in the Nikāya/Āgama literature: the Buddhist tradition may not have come all at once with the spiritual ingenuity of the one Great Man. Rather, it should have been the outcome of the gradual development under the long-held ascetic tradition. The historical Buddha may have been just one among many paccekabuddhas, and it was his followers who happened to organize and gradually differentiate themselves from the other ascetic traditions. In this way, Wiltshire does not subscribe to the mainstream historiography of Buddhism and explore the dynamic between the preexistent Indian ascetic heritage and the Buddha's organized followers.

**Part II. Annotated Translation of the *Yizujing* (義足經, T198) with
Its Pāli Recension, the *Aṭṭhakavaga***

佛說義足經卷上 八雙十六輩

The *Yizujing* (*Sūtra of Poetic Aphorisms*) Spoken by the Buddha, First Fascicle

[Two Fascicles, in] Eight Pairs, Sixteen *Sūtras*.¹

吳月支優婆塞支謙譯

Translated by Zhi Qian, a layperson from the Yuezhi country during the Wu Dynasty²

¹ In my translation, I primarily use the Chinese edition of the *Yizujing* found in T198 of the Taishō Canon 大正新脩大藏經 (compiled 1924–1934). Occasionally, I also consult Z863 from the Zhonghua Canon 中華大藏經 (c. 1980s–) and K800 from the Koryō Canon II 高麗大藏經 再雕本 (carved 1236–1251). The Koryō Canon II is renowned for its editorial accuracy and sophistication, as evidenced by Sugi's *Collation Notes* (K1402) (Buswell, 2004). Moreover, the entire Canon has been well-preserved at Haeinsa 海印寺 in Korea, since being carved onto wooden block prints in the 13th century. For this reason, both the Taishō Canon (assembled in the early 20th century) and the Zhonghua Canon (an ongoing compilation since the late 20th century) rely heavily on the readings of the Koryō Canon II. T198 and Z863 are no exceptions, with both drawing their base texts from K800. Despite the Koryō Canon II's prominence in the evolution of the Chinese Buddhist canon, I have chosen to use T198 for my dissertation, as the Taishō Canon is a well-digitalized platform for East Asian Buddhist literary studies. Nevertheless, K800 and Z863 contain rare Chinese characters in their scripts that are digitalized differently in T198. In such instances, I provide footnotes to indicate the variant characters from K800 and Z863.

In addition, I include footnotes for the variant readings of the *Yizujing* found in the apparatuses of T198 and Z863. The T198 apparatus provides variant readings from the Song Canon 宋藏 (Sixi Canon 思溪藏, 1123–1175), the Yuan Canon 元藏 (Puning Canon 普寧藏, 1269–1286), and the Ming Canon 明藏 (Jiaxing Canon 嘉興藏, 1277–1290). The Z863 apparatus contains variant readings from the Puning Canon 普寧藏 (1269–1286), the Jingshan Canon 徑山藏 (1277–1290), the Qisha Canon 磧砂藏 (circa 1231–1322), the Nan Canon 南藏 (1372–?), and the Qing Canon 清藏. When the two apparatuses are compared, it becomes apparent that the Yuan Canon and the Puning Canon are the same canon with different titles, as are the Ming Canon and the Jingshan Canon. Thus, the two apparatuses collectively offer variant readings from six distinct canons.

I employ the abbreviations K, T, Z for K800, T198, and Z863, respectively. The abbreviations S, Y, and M represent variant readings from the Song, Yuan, Ming editions in the Taishō Canon apparatus, while the abbreviations P, J, Q1, N, and Q2 indicate variant readings from the Puning, Jingshan, Qisha, Nan, and Qing editions in the Zhonghua Canon apparatus. I use a slash (/) to differentiate between the K, T, and Z editions and the editions referred to in the T apparatus and Z apparatus.

八雙十六輩 (K, T, Z / M): [The *Yizujing* comprises] eight pairs with sixteen discourses. 一部合十章 (S): This is the first part, consisting of ten chapters (discourses). 一部合十六章 (Y / Q1, P, N, Q2): This is the first part, [with Parts I and II] together comprising sixteen chapters (discourses). The text should read 一部 / 合十六章 with a break in between, as the first part comprises ten discourses, not sixteen. There is no parallel text for 八雙十六輩 in the Jingshan edition (J). The *Yizujing* consists of two parts: the first part includes ten discourses, and the latter part contains six.

² 吳月支優婆塞支謙譯 (K, T, Z): This text contains the name of the translator, Zhi Qian 支謙, his status as a layman (優婆塞; transcription, equivalent to Sanskrit 'upāsaka'), his ancestry from the Yuezhi country 月支,

桀貪王經 第一

Discourse 1: King Jietan (*Aṭṭhakavagga.1*)³

聞如是。佛在舍衛國祇樹給孤獨園。時有一梵志。祇樹間有大稻田。已熟。在朝暮當收穫。梵志晨起。往到田上遙見禾穡。心內歡喜。自謂得願。視禾不能捨去。

Thus I heard.⁴ When the Buddha was residing in the kingdom of Śrāvastī 舍衛國, at Jeta's Grove 祇樹 in Anāthapiṇḍada's Park 給孤獨園, there was a brahmin 梵志 who owned an expansive rice paddy in Jeta's Grove.⁵ [The rice] reached maturity and was nearly ready for harvest at any

and his current location in the Wu 吳 Dynasty. 吳黃武年優婆塞支謙譯 (S, Y / Q1, P, N): Instead of Zhi Qian's ancestry, this version provides the year of translation, the Huangwu year (黃武年; AD 222-229). This year may belong to a reigning period of Sun Quan 孫權 of the Wu 吳 Dynasty before he declared himself emperor. 吳優婆塞支謙譯 (M / J, Q2): This version omits both the translator's ancestry and the year of translation.

³ 桀貪王經 第一 (K, T, Z): The three base texts (K, T, Z) treat the first discourse (第一) as an individual 'sūtra (經)' within the *Yizujing* (**Arthapada sūtra*), which is about King (王) Jietan 桀貪 (Too Greedy). 桀貪第一卷 (S, Y / Q1, P): These versions do not consider this discourse as an individual *sūtra*, but as a chapter or section, by attaching *juan* (卷; fascicle) at the end. 桀貪第一 (M / N, J, Q2): These versions omit both *jing* 經 and *juan* 卷. With a few exceptions, the three base texts treat the sixteen discourses as *sūtras*, while the versions referred to in the T198 and Z863 apparatuses consider them as sixteen 'chapters or sections' of the *Yizujing*.

⁴ 聞如是: This phrase consists of two parts: 'to hear (聞)'; 'thus (如是).' It represents the standard opening formula prior to the translations of Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什 (344–413 CE) (Nattier 2008: 85). From Kumārajīva's period onward in the history of Chinese Buddhist translation, the more preferred form was '如是我聞 (with 'I (我)' added).'

This *sūtra* includes both the tale of the brahmin and his previous life story as King Jietan. The complete narratives can be found in the *Kāma Jātaka* (J. 467). The tale of the brahmin alone appears in the *Dhammapada Commentary* (verse 216) and the *Paramatthajotikā II*, the Pāli commentary on the *Sutta Nipāta*. The *Kāmanīta jātika* (J. 228) features only the story of the king. For the narratives in the *Paramatthajotikā II*, see Bhikkhu Bodhi's *The Sutta Nipāta* (2017: 1013–1217). For the Jātaka narratives, consult Edward B. Cowell's *The Jataka or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births Vols. 1–6* (1895–1907). For the *Dhammapada* narratives, refer to Eugene Watson Burlingame's *Buddhist Legends Vols. 1–3* (1921).

⁵ 舍衛國: According to the *DPPN* (*Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*), Sāvasthī (Śrāvastī) was the capital of the Kosala Kingdom. It appears that the translator Zhi Qian may have confused this city's name for that of a kingdom, leading to the term '舍衛國' in the text. The correct term should be '舍衛城' (city of Śrāvastī), not '舍衛國' (kingdom of Śrāvastī). "DPPN. (n.d.). Retrieved December 7, 2023, from[https://www.palikanon.com/english/pali_names/sa/saavasthi.htm]."

祇樹給孤獨園: This phrase is the full name of Jetavana (Jeta's Grove). Literally, it can be parsed into "the forest (樹; tree; translation of *vana*) [donated by Prince] Jeta '祇[陀] (transcription of his name)' and park (園; *ārāma*) [donated by a wealthy merchant named] *Anāthapiṇḍada* [translation of his name; *piṇḍada* (one who gives

time.⁶ The brahmin got up at dawn and went to the field. He looked over the [ripe] rice grains from afar and felt immense joy in his heart. He said to himself: “I have got what I longed for.” He feasted his eyes on the rice [field] and could not tear himself away.

佛是時從諸比丘。入城求食。遙見梵志喜樂如是。便謂諸比丘。汝曹見是梵志不。皆對言見。佛默然入城。食後各還精舍。

Meanwhile, the Buddha, accompanied by many *bhikṣus* 比丘 (Buddhist monks), entered the town to seek alms. From a distance, he noticed the brahmin, who was overjoyed as previously mentioned. [The Buddha] then spoke to all the *bhikṣus*, [asking,] “All of you see that brahmin, don’t you?” They all confirmed they did. Without saying anything further, the Buddha proceeded into the town. After their meal, they all returned to the monastery.

即日夜天雨大雹。皆殺田中禾。梵志有一女。亦以夜死。梵志以是故。愁憤憂煩。啼哭無能止者。

During that night, a severe storm with heavy rain and hail devastated the crops in the field. The brahmin had a daughter, who also [tragically] died that same night. As a result, the brahmin became depressed, disoriented, dejected, and distraught.⁷ He cried and wailed, and no one could console him.

food; 給) to *anātha* (people without refuge; 孤獨)].” Another Chinese rendering for *Jetavana* is ‘祇陀林 (the forest given by Jeta).’

梵志: *Fan* (梵) is a transcription of *brahmaṇa*, and *zhi* (志) is a translation of *manas*, mind. (DDB: Digital Dictionary of Buddhism).

⁶ 在朝暮: It means ‘from morning till evening > at any time.’

⁷ 煩 = 惱 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): In both cases, the meaning remains the same.

明日衆比丘。持應器入城求食。便聞梵志有是災害。啼哭甚悲。非沙門梵志及國人所能解其憂者。

The following day, a group of *bhikṣus* took their begging-bowls and entered the town to collect alms. They then heard about the disaster that had befallen the brahmin. His cries and wails were so heart-wrenching that no one among the *bhikṣus*, brahmins, or people in the state could alleviate his distress.

比丘食竟。還到佛所。作禮白。梵志意狀如是。言適竟。梵志啼哭。來到佛所。勞佛竟。便坐佛邊。

After finishing their meals, the *bhikṣus* made their way back to the Buddha's dwelling. There, they reverently paid homage and relayed the brahmin's emotional turmoil [to the Buddha].⁸ As their report was nearing its completion, the brahmin arrived at the Buddha's abode, crying out loudly and wailing. After offering due respects to the Buddha, he sat down beside him.⁹

佛知其本憂所念。即謂梵志言。世有五事。不可得避。亦無脫者。何等爲五。當耗減法。欲使不耗減。是不可得。當亡棄法。欲使不亡棄。是不可得。當病瘦法。欲使不病瘦。是不可得。當老朽法。欲使不老朽。是不可得。當死去法。欲使不死去。是不可得。

⁸ 意狀: This phrase literally means 'mental (意) condition (狀).' In this context, I will translate it as 'emotional turmoil' for a more accurate representation.

⁹ 勞佛: This phrase means 'to perform some laborious/dutiful (勞) [ritual] for the Buddha (佛),' such as paying homage and exchanging greetings. Bapat translates it as 'to inquire of the health of the Buddha,' interpreting '勞' as 'to ask after.' However, this translation is somewhat of a stretch and does not fully capture the intended meaning in the given context.

The Buddha knowing the root of his gloomy musings, then said to the brahmin. “There are five features in the world that no one can escape or free themselves from. What are the five? [First, everything] is subject to wane and diminish. [People] wish to prevent things from waning or diminishing, but that is not possible. [Second, everything] is bound to perish and become discarded. [People] wish to prevent things from perishing or being discarded, but that is not possible. [Third, everything] is susceptible to disease and emaciation. [People] wish to prevent disease and emaciation, but that is not possible. [Fourth, everything] is destined to become old and decrepit. [People] wish to prevent things from getting old and decrepit, but that is not possible. [Fifth, everything] must eventually die and vanish. [People] wish to prevent things from dying and vanishing, but that is not possible.

凡人無道無慧計。見耗減亡棄老病死法來。即生憂憤悲哀。拍髀熱自。耗身無益。何以故。坐不聞知諦。當如是。

Ordinary people lack the [right] path, wisdom, or discretion. When confronted with [the inevitable nature of things]—waning, diminishing, perishing, becoming discarded, aging, falling ill, or dying—they become depressed, confused, sorrowful, and heartbroken. They beat their

thighs, torment themselves, and exhaust themselves in vain.¹⁰ Why is that? Because they have never heard or understood the truth, they [have no other means to react, except] that way.¹¹

梵志我聞有抱諦者。見耗滅法亡棄老病死法來。不以爲憂。何以故。已聞知諦。當如是。
不是獨我家耗。世悉亦爾。世與耗俱生。我何從獨得離。

O, brahmin, I have heard of a person who has embraced the truth.¹² When confronted with [the inevitable nature of things]—waning, diminishing, perishing, becoming discarded, aging, falling ill, or dying—they did not consider it as misery. Why is that? [Because] they had already heard and understood the truth, they [had the means to react] that way.¹³ [They thought to themselves,]

¹⁰ 拍髀熱自 (K, T, Z): This phrase means ‘to beat (拍) their thighs (髀) and afflict (熱) themselves (自).’ Its alternative reading is ‘拍髀熱息 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2).’ ‘熱息’ may mean ‘to have a burning/choking pain (熱) [in the chest and find it hard to] breathe (息).’ Bapat chooses this alternative reading and translates ‘拍髀熱息’ as ‘to beat (拍) of the chest (髀?) with hot (熱) breath (息).’ However, Bapat likely confused ‘髀 (thigh)’ with ‘胸 (chest).’ Moreover, he reads ‘拍髀熱自’ as part of a longer sentence “即生憂憤悲哀 拍髀熱自 耗身無益,” translating it as “Then follows suffering, tribulation, grief, lamentation, beating of the chest with hot breath, and tormentation, with no avail.” While his reading is not impossible, it may be better to separate the inner emotions ‘憂憤悲哀’ from the outer expressions ‘拍髀熱自 耗身.’

¹¹ 坐不聞知諦 當如是: Bapat translates this phrase as “Because (坐?), he sits (坐) without (不) hearing (聞) and knowing (知) the Truth (諦).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation interprets ‘坐’ twice, once as a conjunction ‘because’ and once as a verb ‘to sit.’ I reckon he renders it literally as ‘to sit’ and ‘because’ is his contextual addition. However, ‘坐’ as ‘to sit’ does not well fit in this given context. In the sequence following ‘何以故’ (why is that?), ‘坐’ should indeed serve as a causal link, providing the reason for the preceding statement, and is thus more accurately interpreted as ‘because’ or ‘in consequence of.’ This is an infrequent but valid usage of ‘坐,’ as documented by Seishi Karashima (2012) in his Lokakṣema Glossary, p. 717, where he cites multiple instances of such usage in ancient Chinese literature. Alternatively, ‘坐’ could also function adverbially meaning ‘in vain’ or ‘to no purpose.’ Or, we can extend its primary meaning ‘to sit’ to ‘to dwell in,’ which might be contextually refined to ‘to stuck in’ or ‘to be trapped in.’ Aside from his rendering of ‘坐,’ Bapat also neglects ‘當如是,’ a critical component that typically means ‘should be thus’ or ‘ought to be so,’ which is essential for the complete understanding of the passage.

¹² 抱諦: This term translates into ‘to embrace (抱) the truth (諦).’ This rendering might seem unusual in the current Buddhist doctrinal context. Buddhist truths are something to be awakened to, rather than merely accepted and believed in. However, I adhere to the original text and abstain from attempting to rephrase it as ‘to realize the truth.’

¹³ 當如是: I have interpreted this phrase as ‘it should be thus’ within the preceding sentence (何以故 已聞知諦 當如是), creating a parallel structure to the one found in the last paragraph (何以故 坐不聞知諦 當如是).

“It is not only my family [wealth] that has waned; such occurrences [happen to] anyone in the world too.¹⁴ The world coexists with [the nature of] waning. How can I alone be exempt from [this nature]?”

慧意諦計。我今已耗。至使憂之。坐羸不食。面目委色。與我怨者快喜。與我厚者代憂。慘感家事不修計耗。不可復得。

[Thus,] think wisely reflecting on the truth: “Now, I am already in decline, which causes me worry. Because I am incapacitated by the affliction, I cannot eat anything.¹⁵ My countenance is pallid

This structural parallelism helps to reinforce the contrast or comparison between the two cases. This translation emphasizes the assertion that their response or condition is justifiably so because of their understanding of the truth. Setting aside this parallelism, another interpretation could be to consider ‘當如是’ as introducing the subsequent sentence (當如是 不是獨我家耗 世悉亦爾), which would then read, “[Since] this is how it is, [they know that] it is not only my family [wealth] that has waned; such occurrences [happen to] anyone in the world too.” This interpretation broadens the scope, presenting the waning nature as a universal truth rather than a unique experience to him.

¹⁴ 不是獨我家耗 (K, T, Z) = 是不獨我家耗 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The two alternative phrases ‘不是’ and ‘是不’ essentially convey the same meaning in this context.

Bapat reads the phrase within the larger context of ‘已聞知諦 當如是 不是獨我家耗 世悉亦爾,’ and translates it as “Because, he has already heard and known the truth that [such bewailing] is harmful not only to his family, but to the whole world.” However, this translation is incorrect. According to him, the extended phrase ‘當如是 不是獨我家耗 世悉亦爾’ entirely modifies the previous noun ‘諦 (the truth).’ Yet, he overlooks the translation of ‘當如是 (they react that way; or it is such a way),’ which necessitates a full stop right after it. Besides, his rendering of ‘耗’ as ‘to be harmful’ is a stretch, as its literal meaning is ‘to decrease.’

The parallelism between this paragraph and the previous one indicates that Bapat's translation is inconsistent, and perhaps even misleading. The phrase ‘已聞知諦 當如是’ contrasts with the sentence ‘坐不聞知諦 當如是 (with a full stop)’ in the previous paragraph. Bapat translates the latter sentence as ‘Because, he sits without hearing and knowing the Truth.’ Thus, a full stop should be placed after ‘已聞知諦 當如是’ to maintain consistency.

¹⁵ 坐羸不食: Similar to the earlier phrase ‘坐不聞知諦,’ ‘坐’ here is used in an uncommon way that likely signifies ‘because’ or ‘as a result of.’ For more on this usage of ‘坐,’ see footnote #11. The term ‘羸’ denotes a state of being weakened or emaciated by affliction or illness, often implying physical frailty due to hardship or disease.

face and eyes have lost their luster.¹⁶ [This will make] someone who resents me feel elated and cheerful; [this will make] someone who cares for me [want to] share my distress. [Regardless of their responses, such an unexpected] family misfortune and grief are irreversible, and predicting the loss was not possible.”¹⁷

已諦如是。見耗減亡棄老病死法來。終不復憂也。佛以是因緣。爲梵志說偈。

After [reflecting on] this truth, [even if] they are confronted with [the inevitable nature of things]—waning, diminishing, perishing, becoming discarded, aging, falling ill, or dying—finally, they do not fall into distress again. Given this situation, the Buddha instructed the brahmin through verse.

¹⁶ 面目委色 = 面目痿色 (S, Y, M): The character ‘委’ conveys a sense of losing, withering, or fading. Its counterpart, ‘痿,’ specifically denotes ‘(facial) paralysis,’ suggesting a more acute condition. When paired with ‘色’ (color), ‘痿色’ can imply ‘a pallor’ or ‘a loss of color from one’s face,’ indicating extreme emotional or physical distress. Thus, both ‘委色’ and ‘痿色’ serve similar descriptive functions, capturing nuances of diminished vitality or health, making them effectively interchangeable in conveying the severity of the condition portrayed. ‘面目’ is interpreted as a binom denoting ‘facial appearance’ or ‘countenance’ instead of its literal meaning ‘face and eyes.’

¹⁷ 與我厚者代憂 / 慘感家事不修計耗 / 不可復得: Bapat combines these three sentences and translates them as a single sentence: “Kind people share my sorrow, share the grief and misfortune of my family, and wish that such a calamity may not occur again.” However, this translation is incorrect, and I will explain why.

Firstly, “與我厚者代憂 (someone who likes me ...)” contrasts with the preceding sentence “與我怨者快喜 (someone who hates me ...).” This contrast requires a sentence-break after ‘代憂.’

Next, the entire paragraph discusses wise reflection (慧意諦計), and “someone who hates me will rejoice; someone who likes me will sympathize with me,” cannot be the whole content of the wise reflection that the Buddha suggests. Therefore, “慘感家事不修計耗 不可復得” is the key message of the Buddha. To make this message part of the thinking of someone who likes me, Bapat distorts the phrase ‘計耗.’ It means ‘to plan for/predict about the loss,’ but he translates it as ‘to wish,’ omitting ‘耗 (decrease).’

The Taishō edition of the *Yizujing* (T198) provides a sentence-break in this way: 慘感家事不修計耗 / 不可復得. However, I suggest a different break: 慘感家事不修 / 計耗不可復得. Here, ‘修’ means ‘to repair,’ as in the usage in the Tan Gong I chapter (section 6) from the *Book of Rites* 禮記: “孔子泫然流涕曰 吾聞之 古不修墓.” This translates to “Confucius wept shedding tears and said: ‘I heard that the ancient [saints] did not repair their graves.’” (武英殿十三經注疏 本, 禮記正義: 檀弓上, p.16). Supported by this usage, I have interpreted the character ‘修’ in 慘感家事不修 as ‘to recover something as before.’ Thus, the Buddha’s message is: “Such a calamity is irreversible (慘感家事不修) and unpredictable (計耗不可復得).”

Y1.1 不以憂愁悲聲 多少得前所亡

痛憂亦無所益 怨家意快生喜¹⁸

Not by sorrow, lamentation, or bitter wailing,

Can people recover even a fraction of what they lost before.

Such bitter sorrow is also futile,

As it only serves to make their enemies elated and cheerful.¹⁹

AN1 *Na socanāya na paridevanāya*

Attho idha labbhā api appako pi

Socantam enaṃ dukkhitaṃ viditvā

*Paccatthikā attamanā bhavanti*²⁰

Not through sorrow and lamentation

¹⁸ The first sūtra of the *Yizujing* consists of 23 verses: the initial 4 verses parallel those from the Aṅguttara Nikāya; 1 verse (Y1.5) is almost identical with Y1.18, which parallels Sn766; the following 8 verses from Yuduo serve to explain Y1.5, and they do not have parallels in the Pāli Canon; after the Yuduo's exposition, 4 verses of communication between him and King Jietan also lack parallels in the Pāli Canon either; finally, the last 6 verses from Y1.18 to Y1.23 parallel Sn766–771.

¹⁹ **Y1.1ab**: Bapat translates “不以憂愁悲聲 多少得前所亡” as “Because of sorrow and grief (以憂愁), there should be no (不) piteous lament (悲聲) over things (得?) small or great (多少), that have been [already] lost (前所亡).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. His translation separates ‘憂愁悲聲’ into two parts; ‘憂愁’ is the cause; ‘悲聲’ is the result. Thus, it seems to suggest that grief is acceptable, but expressing grief is not. However, this translation misses the point. In this passage, ‘憂,’ ‘愁,’ ‘悲聲’ (sorrow, grief, and piteous lament) are all connected with the preposition ‘以 (by means of),’ and the main verb should be ‘得 (to get, recover),’ which Bapat either omits or interpret as a noun, ‘things’ or ‘something gained.’ ‘多少’ refers to an unspecified amount of something. Thus, my reading of Y1.1ab is: “By means of sorrow... (以憂愁悲聲), we cannot (不) recover (得) even a small amount (多少) of what has already been lost (前所亡),” which perfectly aligns with the point made in AN1ab.

²⁰ AN1–4: Bapat identifies the four verses from AN5.5.8 / 5.5.10 and suggests their similarity with Y1.1—Y1.4. Upon comparing my translations of both the Chinese and Pāli verses, it is evident that Y1.1–2 correspond to AN1–2, whereas Y1.3 and AN3 significantly differ, and the difference between Y1.4 and AN4 is also not minor.

These Pāli verses all follow the *Triṣṭubh* meter, which consists of eleven syllables per line. AN1b has twelve syllables; for metrical reasons, ‘*labbhā api*’ should be read “*labbhā ‘pi*.”

Can one [gain] even a tiny fraction of good here.

Recognizing that they are in grief and distress,

Their adversaries become elated.²¹

Y1.2 至誠有慧諦者 不憂老病死亡

欲快者反生惱 見其華色悅好

A perfectly sincere person who has an insight into the truth

[Remains] unconcerned about aging, illness, death, and loss.

Those [enemies] who wanted to rejoice become upset instead,

Upon witnessing [the sincere person's] glorious countenance and felicitous demeanor.²²

AN2 *Yato ca kho paṇḍito āpadāsu*

Na vedhati atthavinicchayaññū

Paccatthikā'ssa dukkhitā bhavanti

Disvā mukhaṃ avikāraṃ purāṇaṃ

When a wise person [remains] unshaken in misfortune,

²¹ AN1b: The word ‘*labbhā*’ may be an indeclinable, denoting a negative possibility. Richard Pischel (1957, §465) takes it as an old optative third person singular form of √*labh*, to take.

²² **Y1.2b**: Bapat translates “不憂老病死亡” as “[He] has no sorrow, old age, disease, nor death or dissolution [*sīc*].” This translation is clearly out of context. The message of the verse is not that “the wise do not age...,” but rather that “the wise do not (不) torment themselves (憂) over [the nature of] aging... (老...)” Bapat mistakenly takes the verb ‘不憂’ as a noun, similar to ‘無憂 (no sorrow).’

Y1.2cd: Bapat’s translation of “欲快者反生惱 見其華色悅好” is fragmented and misleading: “Happiness doth one crave, but tribulations doth one create; A flower doth one see, and its colour doth he admire.” Y1.2cd should contrast with the context provided by Y1.1d “怨家意快生喜.” The two contrasting verses Y1.1 and Y1.2 convey the following message: when one appears upset in misfortune, their enemies rejoice (Y1.1); when one remains peaceful even in misfortune, their enemies become dejected (Y1.2).

Knowing how to discern what is for their own sake,
[Their] adversaries become dejected,
Seeing that [their] former facial expression remains unchanged.

Y1.3 飛響不及無常 珍寶求解不死

知去不復憂追 念行致勝世寶

[Even] a fleeting echo cannot match the ephemerality [of phenomena].

The Treasured One sought and unraveled the deathless.

Reminding [oneself that the turbulent time has already] elapsed, never grieve or dwell
in the past.

Fare along mindfully and reach out to the Most Treasured One in this world!²³

²³ Y1.3 stands out for its unique tone and enigmatic wording among the four verses (Y1.1–4), and it does not correspond with the subsequent AN verse. The structure of this verse is intriguing, presenting two messages in juxtaposition. Y1.3c continues the theme of Y1.3a, advising against dwelling in the past, while Y1.3d picks up from Y1.3b, encouraging one to follow the Buddha. In terms of content, Y1.3abc are doctrinal, addressing the Buddhist concepts of impermanence and *nirvāṇa*, whereas Y1.3bd are institutional, referring to the Buddha as ‘the Treasured One.’ This epithet for the Buddha can be inferred from the use of the term ‘Triple Gem,’ which signifies the Buddha, Dharma, and Sangha.

Y1.3a: The enigmatic term ‘飛響’ is not found elsewhere in early Chinese Buddhist translations or ancient Chinese literary corpora. It only appears a few times from the 7th century onwards, describing the far-reaching sound of a bell. In the Biography of Wen Yuan II 文苑列傳下 (section 31) within the *Houhanshu* 後漢書, the word appears in the following sentence: “於是音氣發於絲竹兮, 飛響軼於雲中.” This can translate to “At that moment, sounds emerged from a string instrument [絲] and a flute [竹]! [Then,] the fleeting sound passed through the clouds.” (武英殿二十四史本 後漢書: 文苑列傳下, sec. 31). Bapat translates Y1.3a as “the *colour* is so momentary, that even a *stroke* or [of] a *bird’s flight* cannot compete.” However, ‘飛響’ does not necessarily mean ‘a stroke of a bird’s flight,’ which is out of context. Instead, it should be interpreted as ‘fleeting sounds.’ I believe that Zhi Qian adopted this Chinese rendering to emphasize the ephemerality of phenomena (無常).

Y1.3b: The term ‘珍寶’ is widely used in Chinese Buddhist translations from its earliest history, and in most cases, it is used literally to mean ‘treasure’ or ‘precious gem.’ However, aside from this instance, the *Yizujing* uses this term three more times, and two out of those instances employ it figuratively. In the narrative of the 13th *sūtra*, for example, we find this term in the following sentence: “亦生神珍寶 如來正覺 (A precious divine treasure has arisen too—the Tathāgata, Rightly Awakened One. T198.04.0183b25).” Therefore, I translate it in Y1.3b as ‘the Treasured One (the Buddha)’ because the context suggests that ‘the treasure’ refers to a person who sought and unraveled the secret of deathlessness. Bapat translates this line as “The precious things should one seek, knowing that they will not die.” However, he does not clarify what ‘the precious immortal things’ are. Regarding the theme of

AN3 *Japena mantena subhāsitenā*

Anuppadānena paveṇiyā vā

Yathā yathā yattha labhetha atthaṃ

Tathā tathā tattha parakkameyya

“Wherever one might gain one’s good,
in whatever way—by chanting, mantras,
maxims, gifts, or tradition—there
one should exert oneself in just that way.”²⁴

Y1.4 諦知是不可追 世人我卿亦然

‘deathlessness,’ Buddhist literature, such as Udāna 8.1 & 8.3 in Pāli, occasionally uses *amata* (deathless) as a synonym for *nibbāna*.

Y1.3c: Bapat translates the line ‘知去不復憂追’ as “Knowing (知) the passing away (去) [of things], the sorrowful things (憂) he doth not (不) pursue (追).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. He omits the adverb, ‘復 (again).’ This adverb is placed alongside the negation, forming ‘不復 (never).’ Adjacent to this negative phrase, ‘憂’ is more likely a verb rather than a noun. I translate ‘不復憂追’ as “never (不復) grieve (憂) nor dwell in the past (追).” An alternative reading for Y1.3c is ‘知去不復憂退 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2),’ with ‘退’ replacing ‘追.’ ‘退’ in the apparatuses could be a typographical error. Even if it is, both readings may share the same context, and ‘不復憂退’ may mean “never grieve nor recoil [in sorrow].” In this context, ‘知’ means ‘to be aware of, remind’ (DDB).

Y1.3d: Bapat translates ‘念行致勝世寶’ as “But mindfulness (念) doth he practise (行), and the transcendent (勝世) Treasure (寶) doth he gain (致).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. While this translation works as an independent line, the additional theme of ‘mindfulness practice’ introduced by Bapat makes the verse more confusing. To maintain focus, it is better to read the verse with two juxtaposed themes: Y1.3ac address ‘impermanence,’ and Y1.3bd refers to ‘the Treasured One.’

The term ‘勝世寶’ should be considered as another epithet for the Buddha, similar to 珍寶. The verb ‘致’ here should mean ‘to approach (就).’ The *Laozi* 老子 provides an example of this usage: “故致數車無車 (Thus, he approached many carts, [but he could find] no cart.)” Its commentary explains that “he saw the carts’ wheels, axles, etc., but he could find nothing that he may call ‘the cart.’”

²⁴ I quote this translation from Bhikkhu Bodhi’s (2012) *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, as I find no better way to put it than his translation. The Pāli structure is not complicated; however, it is challenging to render it into readable English. All the nouns in AN3ab are in the instrumental singular, and the verse is structured with correlative conjunctions “*yathā yathā yattha ... tathā tathā tattha ...* (wherever, in whatever way ... there in just that way ...)”

遠憂愁念正行 是世憂當何益

Examining and understanding this [instruction], people must not dwell in the past.

This applies to people in the world, like me and you, gentlemen.

Keep grief and worry at bay and fare along mindfully and righteously.

What use are these worldly anxieties!²⁵

AN4 *Sac'eva jāneyya 'alabhaneyyo*

Mayā vā aññena vā esa attho'

Asocamāno adhivāsayeyya

'Kammaṃ dalhaṃ kinti karomi dānī' ti

If a person should truly understand,

“This good is unattainable for me or anyone else,”

²⁵ **Y1.4a:** Bapat translates the line ‘諦知是不可追’ as “Truly (諦) doth he know (知) that they (是) do not deserve (不可) to be pursued (追).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. In this context, he views the pronoun ‘是’ as referring to ‘sorrowful things (憂)’ from the previous verse (Y1.3c). However, I read this hexasyllabic Chinese line with the traditional 3 / 3 rhythm, placing a pause after ‘是.’ With this cadence, I translate ‘是’ as referring to the Buddha’s message of impermanence and deathlessness from the preceding verse rather than ‘sorrowful things.’ The phrase ‘諦知’ can be understood in two ways: ‘to understand (知) carefully (諦)’ or ‘to examine (諦) and understand (知).’ Thus, the first three words ‘諦知是’ mean ‘to examine and understand these [truths].’ The last three words ‘不可追’ mean ‘you must not dwell in the past.’ For the meaning of ‘追,’ see fn.20, Y1.3c.

Y1.4b: The phrase ‘世人我卿’ offers multiple translation possibilities depending on the interpretation of its components. If ‘我’ is taken as singular ‘me,’ then ‘卿’ is best understood as ‘noble audience,’ referring to those surrounding the Buddha. In this interpretation, ‘我卿’ would be translated as ‘me and you, gentlemen.’ Alternatively, if ‘我’ is read as the plural ‘us,’ then ‘卿,’ typically meaning ‘high officers,’ would not fit as a form of respectful address, and is instead interpreted literally. The term ‘世人’ also allows for two interpretations: when seen as ‘worldly people,’ I add ‘even’ to differentiate the Buddha and the noble Sangha from this category; when taken to mean ‘people in the world,’ it implies that ‘我卿’ should be considered exemplary, necessitating the insertion of ‘like’ to indicate that the Buddha and the noble Sangha are also part of the world’s populace.

Y1.4c: Bapat translates the line ‘遠憂愁念正行’ as “From sorrow and grief (憂愁), he studiously (念?) doth keep himself off (遠).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. He either omits to translate ‘正行 (to fare along righteously)’ or attempts to incorporate the phrase ‘念正行’ into his rendering as ‘studiously.’ In so doing, he overlooks many meanings that the latter three words convey.

Y1.4d: Bapat puts the line ‘是世憂當何益’ as “[For], of what avail can all this, of the world, be? He omits ‘憂’ in his translation, which is an oversight.

They should bear [the situation] without lamenting,

“The *kamma* is mighty. Now, what am I to do?”²⁶

佛復爲梵志。極說經法。次說布施持戒。現天徑欲善。其惡無堅固。佛知梵志意軟向正便見四諦。梵志意解。便得第一溝海道。如染淨繒受色即好。

The Buddha once again meticulously explained the *sūtra*’s teachings to the brahmin.²⁷ Step by step, he instructed that generosity and moral conduct are the shortcuts to rebirth in heaven, and that both the desire for a good [outcome] and the disastrous [consequence] lack solidity.²⁸ The

²⁶ Y1.4 parallels AN4 with a distinct nuance: while Y1.4 instructs individuals to ‘leave a miserable past behind them,’ AN4 encourages people to ‘endure an irrevocable misery without lamenting.’

²⁷ 經法: This term refers to ‘the *sūtra*’s (經) teachings (法),’ likely indicating either the message conveyed in verses Y1.1–4 or the follow-up teachings ‘次說布施持戒 / 現天徑欲善 / 其惡無堅固.’

²⁸ 次說布施持戒 / 現天徑欲善 / 其惡無堅固: Bapat translates this passage as the content of the term ‘經法’ in the following manner: ‘such as talk on charities, good conduct, heavens, advantages and disadvantages and lack of solidity of worldly pleasures.’ His translation is fragmentary, as it seems hastily done to suit his own interpretation. To demonstrate its structure, it is essential to regroup parts of this passage. The Taishō edition often has awkward sentence breaks, and the passage should be regrouped as follows: ‘次說 / 布施持戒現天徑 / 欲善其惡無堅固’

First, the phrase ‘次說’ may refer to either a ‘subsequent teaching [following the *sūtra*’s teachings (經法)],’ or ‘a series of teachings progressing from lower to higher levels,’ corresponding to the ‘graduated discourse’ (anupubbikathā) that the Buddha often used to teach neophytes.

I believe the latter aligns with similar passages in mainstream Buddhist literature. For example, the *Ugga sutta* (AN8.3.1) contains the following passage: “The Blessed One then gave me a *progressive discourse*, that is, a talk on giving, virtuous behavior, and heaven; he revealed the danger, degradation, and defilement of sensual pleasures and the benefit of renunciation. When the Blessed One knew that my mind was pliant, softened, rid of hindrances, uplifted, and confident, he revealed that Dhamma teaching special to the Buddhas: suffering, its origin, its cessation, and the path.” (Translated by Bodhi, 2012: 1148). In this context, the ‘progressive discourse’ represents the original meaning of the Chinese phrase ‘次說.’

The phrase ‘布施持戒現天徑’ is a common set phrase for beginner Buddhist instruction found in mainstream Buddhist literature, such as the exact passage in the 15th *sūtra* of the *Yizujing* (T198.04.0187b24). It conveys that “generosity (布施) and moral conduct (持戒) serve as shortcuts (徑) to rebirth in heaven (現天).” Similar phrases with substituted characters, ‘布施持戒善見天徑’ appear in the 10th *sūtra* (T198.04.0181b06) and ‘布施持戒善現天徑’ in the 14th *sūtra* (T198.04.0185c28). These passages refer to a specific heaven. Both 善見天和 善現天 are translations of the *Sudṛśa* (*Sudassa* in Pāli) Heaven in Buddhist cosmology.

The phrase ‘欲善其惡無堅固’ represents the Buddha’s advanced instruction: “Both the desire for a good [outcome] and the [unexpected] disastrous [consequence] lack solidity.” This teaching leads the brahmin to realize

Buddha recognized that the brahmin's mind was pliable, heading in the right direction. Suddenly, the brahmin saw the Four Truths and grasped their [profound] meaning.²⁹ In that instant, he attained the first path of stream-entry, just like clean silk absorbs the dye's vibrant color exceptionally well.³⁰

便起頭面著佛足。叉手言。我今見諦。如引鏡自照。從今已後。身歸佛歸比丘僧。受我爲清信士。奉行五戒。盡形壽淨潔不犯戒。便起繞佛三匝而去。衆比丘便白佛言。快哉解洗梵志意。乃如是至便喜笑而去。

Then he got up and [prostrated himself], touching the Buddha's feet with his face. Clasping his hands together, he said, "Now, I see the truth as if holding up a mirror and seeing my reflection."³¹ From this moment on, I personally take refuge in the Buddha and the *Bhikṣusaṃgha* 比丘僧 (assembly of Buddhist monks).³² Accept me as [your] lay follower.³³ I will respectfully

that all his distressing experiences during the past few days are just ephemeral. Ultimately, he is able to let them go and move on.

²⁹ 便見四諦 = 使見四諦 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The phrase '便見四諦' means, "Suddenly (便), he saw (見) the Four Truths (四諦)." Its alternative reading '使見四諦' can be translated as "[The Buddha] led (使) him to see (見) the Four Truths (四諦)."

³⁰ 溝港: This term is an early prevalent translation for the Sanskrit term *srotāpatti* (*sotāpanna* in Pāli, stream-entry), the first of the four progressive stages of Buddhist sainthood. It literally means 'the waterway (溝) at the port (港).' Later, the rendering for stream-entry becomes standardized with the translation '預流 (the initial stream)' and the transcription 'Xutuohuan 須陀洹.' Karashima (2012: 576–7) suggests that it may be a transliteration of a Middle Indic form **sodaāvann(a)*.

³¹ 自照: This phrase means 'to reflect oneself.'

³² 身歸佛歸比丘僧: Bapat adds '歸法 (I take refuge in His Law)' to his translation, but this addition is not present in the original text.

³³ 清信士: This term literally means 'a man with pure faith,' and it is a translation of the term '*upāsaka*,' which refers to a male lay follower in Buddhism.

observe the five precepts and maintain purity without violating them till the end of my life.”³⁴

Then he stood up, circumambulated the Buddha three times, and left. Soon after, the *bhikṣus* in the assembly said to the Buddha. “How wonderful! You have unshackled and cleansed the brahmin’s mind.”³⁵ Indeed, he arrived in this wise [stricken with grief], [but] he has left delighted and smiling.”³⁶

佛語諸比丘。不但是返解是梵志憂。

The Buddha said to [all] the *bhikṣus*. “It is not only this [time] that I have responded to the brahmin and relieved him from distress.”³⁷

[The Buddha’s past life story]

過去久遠。是閻浮利地有五王。其一王名曰桀貪。治國不正。大臣人民。悉患王所爲。便共集議言。我曹家家出兵。皆拔白到王前。共謂王寧自知所爲不正施行貪害萬姓。不急出

³⁴ 形壽: This term consists of the two characters, ‘形(physical form)’ and ‘壽(lifespan),’ together referring to ‘life (Skt. *āyus*)’ (DDB).

³⁵ 快哉解洗梵志意 (T / P, J, Q1, N, Q2) = 快哉解沉梵志意 (Z): The passage ‘快哉解洗梵志意’ can be translated as, “How wonderful (快哉)! You have unshackled (解) and cleansed (洗) the brahmin’s (梵志) mind (意).” Its alternative reading is ‘快哉解沉梵志意.’ In this case, the character ‘沉’ is an old name of a river in the western Hunan region. Unless it is a typographical error, it was likely intended to mean a synonym of 洗 (to wash).

³⁶ 乃如是至便喜笑而去: Bapat translates this passage as “Just for this (乃如是?) he came (至). He has now (便?) become happy (喜) and delighted (笑) and (而) gone away (去).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, the phrase ‘乃如是’ does not refer to ‘his purpose,’ but rather it refers to the ‘dejected manner’ in which the brahmin arrived at the Buddha’s residence. This interpretation stands in contrast to the ‘delighted manner’ in which he left the place.

³⁷ The following section presents a story within the story, in which the Buddha recounts his past life in relation to the brahmin’s past life. I have separated this story from the narrative of the first *sūtra* and formatted it as a new paragraph to avoid the use of double quotation marks, as it is an embedded story.

國去。不者必相害傷。王聞大恐怖戰慄。衣毛悉豎。以車騎而出國去。窮厄織草蓐。賣以自給。

In the distant past, there were five kings in the [land of] Jambudvīpa 閻浮利.³⁸ Among the five, one king's name was Jietan 桀貪. He ruled his kingdom unrighteously, causing a great anxiety over his tyranny among both the chief officials and the populace.³⁹ Consequently, they gathered to discuss the situation and decided, “Each of our families [must] send soldiers.” All the drafted [soldiers] went before the king the next day, and declared in unison,⁴⁰ “O king, are you not aware that your unrighteous rule, executed out of your greed, is causing harm to all the people?⁴¹ You must leave this kingdom immediately! If you refuse, we will have no choice but to injure or kill you.”⁴² Upon hearing this, the king quaked with fear, and the hair all over his body stood on end

³⁸ 閻浮利: Karashima (2012:) suggests that this term is a transcription of a certain Middle Indic form **Jambulī(va)* (Skt. *Jambudvīpa*). This place refers to the continent, inhabited by human beings in ancient Indian cosmology, located south of Mt. *Sumeru*.

³⁹ 王所爲: This phrase literally means ‘what the king did.’ I have taken some liberty in translating it as ‘his tyranny.’

⁴⁰ 皆拔白到王前 (T) = 皆拔自到王前 (M / N, J, Q2): Bapat omits ‘白’ or ‘自’ in the phrase ‘皆拔白到王前’ or in its alternative reading ‘皆拔自到王前.’ In this context, the character ‘白’ functions as an adverb meaning ‘in the daytime,’ not a verb ‘to say,’ because the phrase ‘共謂王 [They said (謂) in unison (共) to the king (王)]’ follows immediately after this phrase. I have translated ‘白’ as ‘the next day.’ This meaning of ‘白’ can be seen in the phrases ‘白天’ or ‘白日’ (daytime), which are prevalent from the earliest period of Chinese literary tradition. Without a noun modified, we see 白 alone in Su Shi 蘇軾’s *Qian Chibifu* 前赤壁賦: “不知東方之既白 (He did not know that the Sun had risen in the East, and it was already daytime).” Although this poem was composed in the late 11th century, it may suggest the earlier usage of this term. In the alternative reading, the character ‘自’ could mean ‘one’s own’ and the phrase ‘皆拔自’ would then mean ‘every [family] (皆) drafted (拔) their *own* [soldiers] (自).’

⁴¹ 共謂王寧自知所爲不正施行貪害萬姓 / 不急出國去: T198’s sentence break in this passage is incorrect. The character ‘不’ should be connected to the previous phrase, functioning as a tag question ‘or not.’ Therefore, the passage should read “寧自知 ... 不 / 急出國去 (Do you know yourself that ... or not? You must ...),” which makes the latter sentence an ultimatum. Following the T198’s sentence break, the resulting sentence “不急出國去” would mean “take your time in departing this kingdom,” which is out of context. Bapat reads 不急出國去 as “won’t you quickly go out of the country?” However, the correct phrasing for this interpretation would be “急出國去不.” Furthermore, ‘would you ...’ or ‘won’t you ...’ does not suit the urgency of the situation.

萬姓: This term literally means ‘the ten-thousand surnames.’ I have translated it as ‘all the people.’

⁴² 不者: This phrase means ‘if you do not, ...’ This usage can be found in the Wangmang 王莽 chapter of

[horripilated].⁴³ He fled the kingdom on a chariot and vanished. [From that time on, he experienced] extreme poverty, sustaining himself by weaving and selling products made from rice plants.

大臣人民。取王弟拜作王。便正治不枉萬姓。故王桀貪聞弟興將爲王。即內歡喜計言。我可從弟有所乞。可以自活。便上書具自陳說。便從王乞一鄴。可以自給。王即與之。愍傷其厄。

The chief vassals and the populace elected [the former] king's younger brother, enthroning him [as the new] king while [paying their respect through] prostration. Upon [his enthronement], he ruled [the kingdom] righteously and did not mistreat his subjects. During that time, [former] King Jietan learned that his brother was prospering and becoming a [successful] monarch.⁴⁴ His heart filled with joy as he devised a plan, murmuring to himself, 'I could ask my brother for assistance, which would enable me to support myself.' He then penned a letter [to the king], describing his [dire circumstances]. Consequently, he asked the king for a village to sustain

the *Hanshu* 漢書: “高皇帝大怒。趣歸我國。不者, 九月必殺汝! (Emperor Gao's fury boiled over [as he exclaimed], “Surrender to my kingdom immediately! If you won't, I will slaughter all of you by September!”)

必相害傷: In this context, ‘相’ is better interpreted as shorthand for ‘相對方’ (‘the opponent’ or ‘the other’) rather than its more common meaning of ‘each other,’ which does not fit well here. Therefore, I have translated it as ‘you,’ referring specifically to King Jietan. This interpretation more accurately reflects the intended subject of the action within the narrative.

⁴³ 衣毛: This phrase literally means ‘covering hair.’ In this context, I have translated it as ‘the hair all over his body.’

⁴⁴ 聞弟興將爲王: This sentence can be translated as “He learned (聞) that his brother (弟) was prospering (興) and becoming (將爲) a [successful] monarch (王).” In this sentence, ‘將’ functions as a modal verb meaning ‘be about to,’ as it appears between the main verbs ‘興 (to flourish)’ and ‘爲 (to be).’ Jietan knew that his brother had already become a king, so I added an adjective ‘successful.’ An alternative reading is the sentence “聞弟與將爲王 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2).” Unless it is a typographical error, the variant character 與 may make more sense. It could be a preposition used in a passive sentence to introduce the doer of the action. In this context, ‘將’ should be interpreted as a noun meaning ‘leaders,’ as it follows the preposition. Thus, the variant sentence may read “(Jietan) heard (聞) that his brother (弟) was enthroned as a king (爲王) by the leaders (與將) [of the kingdom].”

himself.⁴⁵ Out of compassion and concern for his [brother's] plight, the king promptly granted his request.

得一隰便正治。復乞兩隰。四五至十隰。二十三十四五十至百隰。二百至五百隰。便復乞半國。王即與之。便正治。

With the village in his possession, [Jietan] governed it righteously. Subsequently, he requested two more villages [from the king]. [His insatiable appetite for expansion led him to request even more]—four, five, up to ten; twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, up to one hundred; and eventually two hundred, up to five hundred villages. Ultimately, [Jietan] once more pleaded for half of the kingdom. The king acquiesced, and [Jietan] proceeded to rule [his share of the realm] righteously.

如是久遠。桀貪生念。便興半國兵。攻弟國即勝。便自得故國。復生念。我今何不悉興一國兵攻二國三國四國。便往攻悉得勝。復正治四國。

A long time passed in this manner, and [one day] Jietan thought, ‘Now, I should gather the forces of [this] half of the kingdom and attack my brother’s realm.’⁴⁶ Swiftly, he triumphed and

⁴⁵ 隰 (T) = 鄴 (K, Z): In the T198 recension, the characters ‘鄴’ and ‘隰’ both appear within the same context in this paragraph and the subsequent one. Regardless of the position (left or right) of the radical ‘阝’ in these characters, they all represent the same concept: ‘village.’ The character ‘隰’ lacks a corresponding Unicode character, but its image from the Mojikyō fonts is provided here for reference. Conversely, the K800 and Z863 recensions consistently feature only the character ‘鄴.’ For further information about the Mojikyō fonts, refer to Y2. fn.25.

⁴⁶ 桀貪生念 / 便興半國兵 / 攻弟國即勝 / 便自得故國: In these sentences, it is unclear where Jietan’s thought ends. T198 has sentence breaks suggesting his thought is ‘Now, I should gather the forces of [this] half of the kingdom (便興半國兵).’ The narration then resumes with “He attacked his brother’s kingdom and won (攻弟國即勝).” In this interpretation, I believe, the purpose of his waging war is not specified in his thinking. Thus, the sentence ‘I attack my brother’s kingdom (攻弟國)’ should be included in his thought process. Therefore, the most reasonable sentence break would be “桀貪生念 / 便興半國兵攻弟國 / 即勝便自得故國,” I have translated these sentences with this structure in mind.

reclaimed [his entire] previous kingdom. A further idea crossed his mind: ‘Now, why shouldn’t I mobilize the forces of the entire kingdom and invade the second, third, and fourth kingdoms?’ Consequently, he waged war and emerged victorious in all battles. He ruled the four kingdoms justly.

復生念。今我何不興四國兵攻第五國。便往攻即復得勝。是時陸地盡。四海內皆屬王。便改號自立爲大勝王。

Once more, a thought arose: ‘Now, why shouldn’t I marshal the forces of these four kingdoms and assault the fifth kingdom?’ He then engaged in the war and quickly secured another victory. At this point, there was no more land left [to conquer]. The entire territory, encircled by the four seas, belonged to the king. He then changed his title and enthroned himself as the ‘Great Victorious King.’

天帝釋便試之。寧知厭足不。便化作小童梵志姓駒夷。欲得見王。被髮拄金杖。持金瓶住宮門。守門者白王言。外有梵志姓駒夷欲見王。王言大善。便請前坐。

Upon [learning of King Jietan’s conquests], the Lord of Heaven 天帝, Śakra 釋, [decided to] test whether the king had found contentment.⁴⁷ He instantly transformed himself into a brahmin boy,

⁴⁷ 天帝釋: This epithet comprises both a translation and a transcription. The first part ‘天帝’ is a translation of the Sanskrit term ‘Devānām-Indraḥ (Indra among gods)’ and can be parsed into ‘the Emperor (帝) of the Gods(天).’ The remaining ‘釋’ is a transcription of the Sanskrit name ‘Śakra.’ According to Edwin G. Pulleyblank (1991: 285), the Early Middle Chinese pronunciation of ‘釋’ is /eiak/, which closely resembles the Indic word it represents. Additionally, consult the entry for ‘帝釋天’ in the Digital Dictionary of Buddhism (DDB) for further information.

天帝釋便試之 寧知厭足不: The phrase ‘寧 ... 不’ means ‘whether ... or not?’. In the Buddhist context, the term ‘厭足’ literally translates to ‘being fed up with (厭) [insatiable desire] and being satisfied (足) [with current possessions].’ Bapat translates the whole phrase ‘試之 寧知厭足不’ as ‘to test him and *know whether* he had, or not, *obtained* contentment.’ However, his translation is incorrect because the character ‘知 (to know)’ does not precede

whose surname was Juyi. He sought an audience with the king. He stood at the palace gate, with disheveled hair and taking a golden staff and a golden jar.⁴⁸ The gatekeeper informed the king, “A brahmin from the Juyi family is out there wishing to have an audience with Your Majesty.” The king said. “Very well.” Then he invited [the brahmin to the palace, allowing] him to sit at the front.

相勞問畢。却謂王言。我屬從海邊來。見一大國豐樂。人民熾盛。多有珍寶。可往攻之。王審足復欲得是國。王言。我大欲得。

After exchanging mutual greetings, Juyi began to address the king,⁴⁹ “I come from the seashore, where I belong. [There,] I witnessed a great kingdom ever flourishing.⁵⁰ Its people are thriving, and many possess priceless treasures. It is [a realm] worth conquering.”⁵¹ The king was wholly satisfied [with Juyi’s suggestion] and once again desired to obtain that kingdom.⁵² He replied. “I

the phrase ‘寧 ... 不,’ but is located within the phrase. Bapat mistakenly adds ‘to obtain’ while searching for a new verb within the phrase.

⁴⁸ 被髮拄金杖 = 被髮柱金杖 (S, Y, M): In these phrases, both 拄 and 柱 likely share the same meaning, which is ‘to lean on.’

⁴⁹ 却謂: This phrase has an interesting usage of the character ‘却 (to drive away).’ This phrase may be similar to the idiom ‘却說,’ which is used when the narrator stops a previous story and takes up a new and more essential one. In the text, the narrator mentions the mutual greetings before transitioning to Juyi’s speech to the king, which is more essential to the narrative. I translate the character ‘却’ as ‘to begin to ...’ Bapat omits this translation.

⁵⁰ 豐樂: This phrase refers to ‘abundant provisions (豐) [and the people] enjoying them (樂).’

⁵¹ 可往攻之: This sentence can be translated as “You could (可) go (往) and conquer (攻) it (之).”

⁵² 王審足復欲得是: Bapat translates this sentence as “The king (王) reflected (審) and wished (欲) further (復) to get (得) a kingdom (是: this).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. He interprets ‘審’ as a verb meaning ‘to examine’ and overlooks ‘足.’ However, the character ‘足’ functions here as a verb meaning ‘to be satisfied,’ and ‘審’ acts as its modifier, serving as an emphatic adverb meaning ‘really, truly.’ One can find a common adverbial usage of ‘審’ in the biographies of Zhang-er and Chen-yu 張耳陳餘列傳 in the *Shiji* 史記: “吾王審出乎? Has our (吾) king (王) *really* (審) been released (出) [from the jail]? (乎)”

ardently wish to acquire it.”

天王謂言。可益裝船興兵相待。却後七日。當將王往適。言天王便化去。

The heavenly king responded, “You must fully equip and increase your fleet of ships and mobilize your forces. We [shall] wait [until they are ready]. Seven days after my departure, I will [return to] escort Your Majesty [to that land].”⁵³ (After) the conversation, the heavenly king magically disappeared.

到其日便大興兵益裝船。不見梵志來。是時王愁憂不樂。拍髀如言。怨哉我今以亡是大國。如得駒夷不堅獲。如期反不見。是時一國人民。迴坐向王。王啼亦啼。王憂亦憂。王處憂未嘗止聞識經偈。便生意而說言。

On the appointed day, [the king] had marshaled a sizable force and [prepared] an increased number of well-equipped battleships, but he did not see the brahmin arrive. Disheartened and unhappy, the king lamented, striking his thighs, “How bitter I feel! Now with [this war preparation], I have brought ruin upon this great kingdom. I should have seized Juyi [at the

⁵³ 當將王往適: This sentence can be translated as, “I will (當) escort (將) Your Majesty (王) to go (往) and reach (適) [the place].”

palace], but I failed to hold him firmly.⁵⁴ Despite his promise, he is nowhere to be found.”⁵⁵ In that moment, the people of the kingdom turned their attention to the king.⁵⁶ As the king wailed, so did they; as the king grieved, so did they. The sorrowful [atmosphere] in the king’s presence remained unchanged [until] they heard and recognized a verse from the *sūtra*.⁵⁷ It was then that [the king] contemplated and said:

Y1.5 增念隨欲 已有復願

日盛爲喜 從得自在⁵⁸

People entertain more and more thoughts driven by desire.

Having [enough] already, they crave still more.

⁵⁴ 如得駒夷不堅獲: The character ‘如’ has various derivative meanings and can be tricky in this context. It precedes the verb ‘得’ and could function as either a conjunction or a modal verb; it may mean ‘if, when’ as a conjunction or ‘should’ as a modal verb. Thus, I suggest two possible interpretations of this sentence: 1) When I had Juyi (in the palace), I did not catch him firmly; 2) I should have seized Juyi (in the palace), but I did not catch him firmly. In both interpretations, the sentence conveys the king’s remorse. For an example of ‘如’ as a conjunction, see Zizhang 子張 of the *Analects* 論語: “如得其情，則哀矜而勿喜 (When you are aware of their suffering, then you should be sorrowful, never joyful.)—translated by Charles Muller.” For an example of ‘如’ as a modal verb, see Chunqiu Zuozhuan 春秋左傳: “若知不能，則如無出 (If we knew that we could not [cope with it], we had better not have come forth)—translated by Andrew Miller.”

⁵⁵ 如期反不見: In this sentence, I interpret the character ‘如’ as a preposition. The phrase ‘如期’ can be understood as ‘as scheduled.’ The character ‘反’ can mean ‘on the contrary.’ Thus, the phrase ‘如期反’ in this context can mean ‘contrary to what is scheduled,’ or ‘despite the arrangement.’

⁵⁶ 迴坐向王: This sentence literally means “[the people of the kingdom] turned (迴) their seats/sitting positions (坐) and faced (向) the king (王).”

⁵⁷ 王處憂未嘗止聞識經偈: The phrase ‘王處憂’ refers to ‘the grief (憂) [surrounding] the king’s (王) place (處);’ the phrase ‘未嘗止’ means ‘it had never stopped;’ the phrase ‘聞識經偈’ means ‘[until] they heard (聞) and recognized (識) a verse (偈) from the *sūtra* (經).’

⁵⁸ Y1.5 and Y1.18 are identical except for one character in the third foot. Y1.5 substitutes ‘盛’ (to flourish) for ‘增’ (to increase) in the Y1.18. Both characters are synonymous. Y1.18 parallels Sn766, the first verse of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. The *Yizujing* must have drawn the motif from Y1.18 and dramatized it with the verses from Y1.5 to Y1.17. Yuduo’s commentary to Y1.5 is the verses from Y1.6 to Y1.13, which make up the major part of this dramatization. Additionally, Y1.5ab and Y1.6ab are identical.

The daily growth [of their possessions] brings them joy.

They run after gains without restraint.⁵⁹

王便爲衆人。說欲偈意。有能解是偈義者。上金錢一千。時坐中有少年。名曰鬱多。鬱多即白王言。我能解是義。相假七日乃來對。

Then, for the sake of the people, the king expressed his desire [to understand] the purport of the verse.⁶⁰ “I will reward anyone with a thousand gold coins who can explain the meaning of this verse.” At that time, there was a boy named Yuduo who was present in the assembly. Yuduo

⁵⁹ **Y1.5:** Bapat translates this verse as follows: “One’s brooding doth one increase and his cravings doth he pursue, Having already attained things, he further craves after them; Every day doth he increase [his longing], and ever doth he rejoice, When he has attained the possession [lit. mastery] of things [he wanted].” His translation is fragmentary and sometimes inaccurate. My rationale is detailed below.

Y1.5ac: Bapat fails to establish a connection between ‘增念’ and ‘隨欲’ in Y1.5a, as well as between ‘日盛’ and ‘爲喜’ in Y1.5c. While these translations do not necessarily distort the verse’s meaning, they lack the smooth progression and inherent cohesion present in the original text.

Y1.5d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘自在’ as ‘mastery’ and then stretches it to mean ‘possession.’ However, this interpretation is incorrect or potentially misleading. Within the verse’s context, ‘自在’ functions similarly to or as shorthand for ‘恣心自在’ (selfish attitude at one’s will / without restraint), a phrase found in both early Chinese Buddhist translations and classical Chinese literature. Refer to 佛說無量清淨平等覺經 (T361_12.0296a03) translated by Lokakṣema and 阿彌陀三耶三佛薩樓佛檀過度人道經 (T362_12.0314a04) translated by Zhi Qian. Additionally, see the 28th section of the Biographies of Hewu, Wangjia, and Shidan 何武王嘉師丹傳 in the *Hanshu* 漢書. The negative context of Y1.5d clarifies the usage of ‘自在,’ so I translate it as “they run after (從) gains (得) without restraint (自在).”

While ‘自在’ can carry both positive and negative connotations, early Chinese Buddhist translations mostly use it positively. In a positive sense, it can be shorthand for its full phrase ‘自由自在,’ which literally means ‘free at one’s will,’ often denoting the capacity of an enlightened being to operate uninhibitedly, devoid of any physical or mental limitations (DDB). In a negative context, ‘自在’ may indicate the erroneous perception of autonomy associated with the misguided view of self 我見 (DDB; Skt. *ātma-dṛṣṭi*). DDB provides an example of this negative usage from 觀心覺夢鈔 (T2312_71.0069c10): “是無常苦不自在色聲香等 故云無我” (These are impermanence, suffering, and lack of autonomy in the form, the sound, the smell, etc.—therefore, it is called ‘non-self.’). In this case, ‘不自在 (non-autonomy)’ is synonymous with ‘無我 (non-self).’ However, neither context precisely applies to Y1.5d.

⁶⁰ 王便爲衆人 說欲偈意: Bapat translates this sentence as “The King then turned to the people assembled and said in connection with the idea of the gāthā on craving.” Interpreting the character ‘爲’ as ‘to turn to (向)’ is a stretch; the term ‘爲衆人’ should be ‘for the people assembled.’ His translation of ‘欲偈意’ as “the idea (意) of the gāthā (偈) on craving (欲)” might be possible. However, I interpret it as ‘to express (說) his intention (欲) regarding the gist (意) of the verse (偈)’ because the content that follows is his proposal to offer a handsome prize to any talented person who can explain (能解) it.

then addressed the king, saying: “I can explain its meaning. Please, grant me seven days, and I will return with an answer [for you].”⁶¹

到七日白母言。我今欲到王所解王憂母謂子。子且勿行。帝王難事如燃火。其教如利刀。難可親近。子言。母勿愁憂。我力自能淹王偈義。當得重謝。可以極自娛樂。

As the seventh day arrived, [Yuduo] said to his mother: “Now I will go to the king’s place and relieve his concern.” His mother cautioned her son, “My son, do not dare to go.”⁶² Serving the royalty is perilous, like a blazing fire.⁶³ The king’s decree is like a sharp blade, dangerous to approach.” The son reassured [her], “Mother, do not grieve or worry. With my ability, I can fathom the gist of the king’s verse.”⁶⁴ We should receive the lavish reward, which would allow us to live an affluent life.”⁶⁵

⁶¹ 相假七日乃來對: In this context, the character ‘相’ is best interpreted as referring to ‘相對方’ (‘the opposite’ or ‘the other’), here rendered as ‘me,’ from the perspective of the person addressing the king. Consequently, ‘相假七日’ is translated as ‘please grant me seven days.’ Seishi Karashima (2012: 556) discusses the usage of ‘相 /xiāng/’ in his glossary, noting that it often “indicates an action performed by one person towards another,” with extensive examples from classical Chinese literature and early Chinese Buddhist texts. For example, he translates “所欲敕使 願相語 我欲相佐助 (T 224.8.472b20)” as “*Please tell me* what you want to command. I would like to offer my help.” Here, the inclusion of ‘願 (I wish, please)’ lends additional politeness to the request.

⁶² 子且勿行: The character ‘且’ serves as a modal verb, meaning ‘be about to,’ following the subject ‘子’ and preceding the verb ‘勿行.’ The Exalted Lineage 泰族訓 of the *Huainanzi* 淮南子 provides an example of this usage: “故天之且風, 草木未動而鳥已翔矣 (When Heaven *is about to* send forth a strong wind, before the grasses and trees have moved, birds have already begun to soar.)—translated by John S. Major and others (*Huainanzi*, 2010).”

⁶³ 燃火 = 然火 (S, Y, M): In both cases, their meanings remain the same: ‘a blazing fire.’

⁶⁴ 淹王偈義 = 證王偈義 (Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The character ‘淹’ means ‘to dip, fathom,’ while ‘證’ means ‘to prove, examine.’ I translate ‘證王偈義’ as ‘to clarify the meaning of king’s verse.’

⁶⁵ 當得重謝 = 當復得重謝 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): the character ‘復’ in the alternative reading means ‘in return.’ I translate its whole sentence as “We should receive a lavish reward *in return*.”
極自娛樂: This phrase literally means ‘to enjoy ourselves 自娛樂 extremely 極.’

便到王所言。我今來對其義。即說偈言。

Upon arriving at the king's place, he announced, "Now, I have returned to answer [your question about] its meaning." Then, he [proceed to] elucidate it in verse.

Y1.6 增念隨欲 已有復願

已放不制 如渴飲湯

People entertain more and more thoughts driven by desire.

Having [enough] already, they crave still more.

They have left their [desire] run out of control,

Like a thirsty [person trying to] gulp down hot soup.

Y1.7 悉以世地 滿馬金銀

悉得不厭 有點正行

[Even if] a person were to fill the entire world

With horses, gold, and silver,

They would never be disillusioned with all the acquisitions.

This [insatiable] behavior is rectified by the wise.⁶⁶

⁶⁶ **Y1.7cd**: Bapat translates these two lines as "And even if one attains this all(悉得), one devises (有點), Without satiation (不厭), a plan for a better life (正行)." [Parentheses added for analysis]. He swaps phrases '不厭' and '有點' between lines c and d.

Y1.7c, 悉得不厭 = 悉得不厭 (Z) = 悉得無厭 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The characters '厭' and '厭' share the same meaning 'to be fed up.' I translate the sentence '悉得無厭' as "They would never find disenchantment with the full acquisitions."

Y1.7d: Bapat translates the sentence '有點正行' as "one devises a plan for a better life," implying a negative sense of 'always devising a scheme to get more without knowing limits.' However, his translation is incorrect for the following reasons. First, although the character '點' on its own may carry both positive and negative connotations, meaning 'cunning' or 'clever,' Zhi Qian employs '點' in a positive sense 'clever,' 'skillful,' or 'wise' throughout the *Yizujing*. In the verses, '點' occurs 31 times in this context, while its synonym '慧' appears

Y1.8 如角距生 日長取增

人生亦爾 不覺欲增

As the antler and the claw grow—

Increasing in length and size day by day—

So too does [desire in] our lives.

We fail to realize that [our] desire is [ever] burgeoning.⁶⁷

Y1.9 飢渴無盡 日日復有

金山拄天 狀若須彌

Y1.10 悉得不厭 有點正行

欲致痛冥 未嘗聞之

Hunger and thirst never cease—

They persist day after day.

[Imagine] a gold mountain reaching skyward,

Akin to Mt. Sumeru;⁶⁸

Even acquiring it in its entirety would not disillusion people.

44 times. I translate ‘點’ as ‘wise,’ ‘a wise person,’ or ‘wisely,’ depending on the context of the verses. This prevalent usage of ‘點’ clarifies that his translation is out of context. Second, his translation of ‘正行’ as ‘a better life’ is also wide of the mark. It is unlikely that the phrase denotes an ‘insatiable covetousness’ in the Buddhist context. Instead, the phrase should mean ‘right behavior’ or ‘to rectify behavior.’ The preceding phrase ‘有點’ also corroborates that ‘正行’ should be read in a positive context.

⁶⁷ **Y1.8b:** The phrase ‘日長取增’ means ‘day by day (日), they get longer (長) and bigger (取增).’ The last part ‘取增’ literally means ‘to achieve increase,’ which I translate as ‘to get bigger.’

⁶⁸ **Y1.9d:** The character ‘狀’ is a variant of ‘狀,’ which means ‘form, appearance, shape.’ 狀若 means ‘to look like.’

This [insatiable] behavior is rectified by the wise.

[Driven by] desire, people find themselves in the afflictive underworld,

[A realm] they have never even heard of.⁶⁹

Y1.11 願聞遠欲 厭者以黠

厭欲爲尊 欲漏難離

One should aspire to listen to [someone who is] free from desire—

A disenchanted individual brimming with wisdom.

[A person] who is disgusted with [insatiable] desire will be admired,

[For] evading the influx of desire is no easy task.⁷⁰

Y1.12 黠人覺苦 不隨愛欲

如作車輪 能使致堅

Wise people recognize that suffering [originates from desire]

And do not indulge in lust and desire.

⁶⁹ **Y1.10ab**: These lines are identical with Y1.7cd and continue Y1.9cd. The object of ‘the full gain (悉得)’ in Y1.10a should be associated with ‘a gold mountain (金山)’ in Y1.9cd.

Y1.9 & Y1.10: The message conveyed in these two verses is as follows: “Desire is insatiable; it leads people to misery; the wise, however, take steps to rectify this situation.”

⁷⁰ **Y1.11**: Bapat translates this verse as “If one wishes to listen [to the advice], from desires one should be far and with them wisely get satiated; If with desires he gets satiated, honoured doth he become; If desires run [wild], it becomes difficult to escape them.” He interprets this verse as three sentences with the same ‘if ... then ...’ structure without providing a solid reason. In particular, his first sentence is not convincing with the message that ‘getting satiated is a prerequisite for listening to the advice.’ I interpret Y1.11ab as an admonition, “listen to a person free from desire,” and Y1.11cd as a statement, “a contented person will be admired and why.”

Y1.11d: The phrase ‘欲漏’ is likely a translation of *kāmāsrava*, which literally means ‘the influx of desire’ and is commonly rendered ‘canker of desire’ in modern English. Given that the character ‘漏’ literally means ‘to leak, flow’ it is plausible that Zhi Qian was well aware of the origin of the word *āsrava* (*ā* + *√sru*; to flow in).

The phrase ‘難離’ literally means ‘hard to leave.’

Similar to constructing a [sturdy] cartwheel,
They can make [their mind] invulnerable [to desire].⁷¹

Y1.13 稍稍去欲 意稍得安

欲得道定 悉捨所欲

Gradually let go of desire,
[And your] mind will find peace step by step.
Wanting to attain the path to serenity,
Renounce all objects of desire.

王言知意。悉治世地盡。四海內無不至屬。是亦可爲厭。乃復遠欲貪海外國。大勝王即謂鬱多言。

The king said: “[Now,] I grasp the gist [of the verse]. I rule over the entire world with no land remaining; within [the continent] encircled by the four seas, no territory lies beyond my dominion. This should indeed be enough. Yet, I still craved for another country far across the sea.” At this point, the Great Victorious King spoke to Yuduo [in verse]:⁷²

Y1.14 童子若善 以尊依世

⁷¹ **Y1.12a:** I add ‘originates from desire,’ to provide a reason why they do not indulge in lust and desire in Y1.12b.

Y1.12d: The phrase ‘致堅’ literally means ‘extremely firm’ or ‘culminates in firmness.’ I clarify ‘what is firm’ and ‘firm against what’ by adding a few words in my translation.

The cartwheel (車輪) in Y1.12c serves as a metaphor for ‘the fortified mind’ in Y1.12d.

⁷² This entire paragraph is absent in Bapat’s translation.

說欲甚痛 慧計乃爾

Young boy! You [have done] remarkably well,

Applying the noble [teachings] to worldly matters,

Explaining the severity of afflictions [hidden in] desire.

You've wisely grasped [the essence of my verse] to such [great depths].⁷³

Y1.15 汝說八偈 偈上千錢

願上大德 說義甚哀

⁷³ **Y1.14a:** I translate the phrase ‘若善’ as “You (若) did great (善).” Charles Muller, in DDB, explains this usage of the character ‘若’ as “You, your; an address to a person of the same social status, probably a dialectical variant of 汝 [you].” With this expression, the king praises Yuduo’s impressive elaboration (Y1.6–13) of the verse Y1.5.

Y1.14b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘以尊依世’ as “giving [due] weight to the experience of the world.” Bapat may have read ‘尊’ as a noun meaning ‘significance’ and the structure ‘以 A 依 B’ as ‘to give A to B.’ However, his translation seems out of context because Yuduo’s exposition relied on metaphors, and he did not emphasize worldly cases.

The character ‘以’ is a preposition meaning ‘by means of,’ which can refer to either a preceding or following phrase. As such, Y1.14b could be interpreted in two ways: 1) “Through (以) your successful exposition (若善), you have honored (尊) and addressed (依) the worldly cases (世);” or 2) “With (以) noble instruction (尊), you turned to (依) the worldly cases (世).”

Considering the former interpretation with ‘以’ referring to preceding content is common in ancient Chinese literature. For example, in Wangzhi 王制 of the *Classic of Rites* 禮記, we find the sentence: “考禮正刑一德, 以尊于天子 (They examined their ceremonies, rectified their punishments, and made uniform what they considered virtuous; thus giving honour to the son of the Heaven. [Translated by James Legge, in CTP]).” In this context, I interpret ‘以尊于天子’ as “in doing so (以), they give honor (尊) to (于) the son of Heaven (天子).” If Bapat considered this type of example and read ‘尊’ as a verb ‘to honor,’ he omitted the subsequent verb ‘依.’ Moreover, as previously mentioned, his interpretation of ‘honoring the world cases’ misses the point of Yuduo’s exposition. Upon examining the possibility of ‘尊依’ as a phrasal verb, this combination rarely occurs either in early Chinese Buddhist translations or in classical Chinese literature.

Therefore, I prefer the latter reading, taking ‘尊’ as a noun meaning ‘noble teaching’ and connecting it with the preceding preposition ‘以.’ I divide Y1.14b into ‘以尊 / 依世,’ which translates to ‘with noble (instruction), [you turned to] the worldly cases.’ I have rephrased this translation for better readability.

Y1.14c: The phrase ‘說欲甚痛’ can be literally translated as, “You have explained that desire is very distressing.”

Y1.14d: Bapat translation of the phrase ‘慧計乃爾’ as “wise men [do ever] their course of action plan” does not fit the context. Y1.14 should represent the king’s appreciation of Yuduo’s answer in the preceding verses.

In an added part of my translation, ‘my verse’ refers to the king’s verse in Y1.5.

The phrase ‘乃爾’ means ‘to such an extent.’

You have presented [your exposition in] eight verses,
And I will offer you a thousand coins for [each] verse.
[Additionally,] I wish to bestow [upon you the title] ‘Great Virtue,’
For explaining the gist [of my verse] with such deep empathy.⁷⁴

鬱多以偈報言

Yuduo expressed his gratitude in verse.

Y1.16 不用是寶 取可自給

最後說偈 意遠欲樂

Y1.17 家母大王 身羸老年

念欲報母 與金錢千 令得自供

I do not need this treasure,
[For] I seek to, and I am able to, provide for myself.
The final [message] I deliver in verse is:
[Keep your] mind away from desire and pleasure.⁷⁵

⁷⁴ **Y1.15ab:** I translate the phrase ‘偈上千錢’ as “I will offer you a thousand coins for [each] verse.” The character ‘上’ primarily means ‘up, high,’ but it can take on various derivative meanings depending on the context. Among all the possibilities, the most probable function it could have is as a verb meaning ‘to present (to a superior).’ Although the king holds a higher social position, as this narrative unfolds, Yuduo is revealed to be a past life of the Buddha and the king, a past life of the brahmin. Thus, the narrative may have deliberately chosen this word.

In the phrase, no specific word confirms the prize as one thousand coins *per* verse. However, the context supports this interpretation. If the king were offering the amount for the entire set of verses, he wouldn’t need to mention ‘eight’ verses in Y1.15a and include another character ‘偈’ before the verb ‘上’ in Y1.15b.

⁷⁵ **Y1.16b:** I interpret the character ‘取’ as ‘to take, choose, or seek’ and translate the whole phrase ‘取可自給,’ as “I choose to, and am able to, sustain myself.”

[However,] Oh, Great King, as for my mother,
She is old, and her constitution frail.
I sincerely hope you reward her
With a thousand gold coins
And grant her [the opportunity] to live independently.⁷⁶

大勝王。便上金錢一千。使得供養老母。

The Great Victorious King immediately granted a thousand gold coins [to Yuduo], allowing him to support his elderly mother.

佛語諸比丘。是時大勝者。即種稻梵志是也。時童子鬱多者。則我身是也。我是時亦解釋是梵志痛憂。我今亦一切斷是梵志痛憂。已終不復著苦。

The Buddha addressed all the *bhikṣus*. “The Great Victorious [King] at that time is the present brahmin rice-farmer, while the boy Yuduo from that time is now me myself.⁷⁷ Just as I relieved the great distress of the brahmin in that past life, so too have I removed all the great distress of the brahmin in his present life.⁷⁸ [His suffering] is already gone, and nothing will trouble him again.”

⁷⁶ **Y1.17:** Yuduo does not seek a reward for himself. He only wishes for his mother to be rewarded with a thousand gold coins—one-eighth the amount of the king’s initial offer. This detail could serve to illustrate Yuduo’s contentment, which is one of the essential Buddhist values.

⁷⁷ The phrase ‘種稻梵志’ can be literally translated as ‘brahmin who sowed the rice.’

⁷⁸ The brahmin in that past life was the Great Victorious King.

佛以是本因。演是卷義。令我後學聞是說。欲作偈句爲後世作明。令我經法久住。義足經。

These are the circumstances in which the Buddha expounded the teaching of this chapter. [In so doing,] he instructed us, his disciples, to learn this exposition, sought to compose verses that would illuminate for future generations, and ensured that our teachings of the *sūtra* would endure for a long time.⁷⁹ [This is] the *Yizujing*.

Y1.18 增念隨欲 已有復願

日增爲喜 從得自在

People entertain more and more thoughts driven by desire.

Having [enough] already, they crave still more.

The daily increase [of their possessions] brings them joy.

They run after gains without restraint.⁸⁰

Sn766 *Kāmaṃ kāmayamānassa*

Tassa ce taṃ samijjhati

Addhā pītimano hoti

⁷⁹ 令我後學 & 令我經法: In these phrases, the first-person pronoun ‘我’ represents the perspective of the transmitters of this *sūtra*, which can be expressed as ‘we, his disciples’ and ‘our teachings of the *sūtra*.’ This interpretation highlights the collective voice of the disciples who are responsible for disseminating the teachings contained within the *sūtra*.

⁸⁰ Verses Y1.18 and Y1.5 are identical, except for the substitution of ‘增 (to increase)’ in Y1.18 for ‘盛 (to flourish)’ in Y1.5. For more details, refer to footnote 56 of this *sūtra*.

*Laddhā macco yad icchati*⁸¹

For one who indulges in sensual pleasure,

If it thrives for them,

They [will] surely become delighted at heart,

Having obtained what [they], as a mortal being, desire.⁸²

Y1.19 有貪世欲 坐貪癡人

既亡欲願 毒箭著身

Coveting worldly sensual pleasures,

Foolish persons become ensnared by their greed.

[When] they have failed [to obtain their] desires and wishes,

[They experience agony as if] a poisonous arrow has pierced their bodies.⁸³

⁸¹ The six Pāli verses below are taken from the *Kāmasutta*, the first sutta of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. These verses are composed in *Śloka* meter, which features eight syllables per foot, typically ending with the rhythm ‘—Light, Heavy, Heavy, Heavy’ in odd feet and ‘—Light, Heavy, Light, Heavy’ in even feet.

⁸² **Sn766**: This Pāli verse comprises a single sentence that includes a subordinate clause, ‘if it thrives for them,’ and a subordinate phrase, ‘having obtained what they, as a mortal being, desire.’ Additionally, it contains a filler ‘indeed (*addhā*),’ and two words referring to the same person, ‘for a person (*tassa*)’ and ‘the mortal (*macco*).’ Consequently, translating this verse into English presents a significant challenge.

Sn766b: In this line, the pronoun ‘*Taṃ*’ refers to ‘*kāmaṃ*’ from Sn766a, which could mean either ‘desire’ or ‘the object of desire.’ In this verse, both ‘*taṃ*’ and ‘*kāmaṃ*’ represent ‘the object of desire,’ or ‘sensual pleasure.’ The pronoun ‘*tassa*’ references *kāmayamānassa* (for one who desires) from Sn766a.

⁸³ **Y1.19a**: The passage ‘有貪世欲’ literally translates to “Imagine a person (有) who covets worldly sensual pleasures.” For improved readability, I have treated this passage as a gerund phrase.

Y1.19b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘坐貪癡人’ as “and sits tight over them—that stupid fool.” He may not be aware that the character ‘坐’ has multiple derivative meanings throughout the history of Chinese literature. In the context of ‘坐’ in this line, we find a similar example in the *Houhanshu* (後漢書: 398–445 AD): “後北地太守廖信坐貪穢下獄，沒入財產。(Afterwards, Liao Xin, the prefect of the northern territory, was found guilty of accepting [lit. coveting] bribes and imprisoned, having his wealth confiscated.) Here, ‘坐’ means ‘to fall into moral decay,’ or ‘to be tried for a crime.’ This example has a legal connotation, while Y1.19b an ethical one. I initially translated ‘坐貪’ as ‘to fall into their greed.’ To improve readability, I rephrased it as ‘to become ensnared by their greed.’

Sn767 *Tassa ce kāmayānassa*

Chandajātassa jantuno

Te kāmā parihāyanti

Sallaviddho va ruppatti

For a person who desires,

In whom lust has arisen,

If their sensual pleasures dwindle,

They become afflicted as if pierced by an arrow.⁸⁴

Y1.20 是欲當遠 如附蛇頭

違世所樂 當定行禪

One should keep away from such desires,

As they would from a nearby serpent's head.

By avoiding the pleasurable things of the world,

They should find composure and practice meditation.⁸⁵

Alternatively, ‘坐’ can denote ‘in vain’ and this phrase could be rendered as “Foolish (癡) persons (人) covet (貪) in vain (坐).”

⁸⁴ **Sn767**: I have relocated the word ‘ce (if)’ from Sn767a to Sn767c, as Sn767 is a single sentence and the main verb of the if-clause is found in Sn767c.

The terms ‘te’ and ‘kāmā’ in Sn767 are masculine, nominative, and plural. However, I have translated them as ‘their sensual pleasures’ instead of ‘those sensual pleasure’ for the sake of clarity.

⁸⁵ **Y1.20c**: In this context, the character ‘違’ means ‘to avoid.’ Y1.20c serves as a prerequisite for the meditation described in Y1.20d.

Y1.20d: The characters ‘定’ and ‘禪’ may have similar meanings: ‘定’ is often a translation of *samādhi* (concentration, meditative equipoise), while according to Karashima, ‘禪 /chán dǎn > ǎn/’ is ‘a transcription of

Sn768 *Yo kāme parivajjeti*

Sappasseva padā siro

So imaṃ visattikaṃ loke

Sato samativattati

One who avoids sensual pleasures,

As if [warding off] a serpent's head with their foot,

Mindfully transcends

This attachment to the world.⁸⁶

Y1.21 田種珍寶 牛馬養者

坐女繫欲 癡行犯身

Y1.22 倒贏爲強 坐服甚怨

次冥受痛 船破海中

Fields, grains, precious treasures,

Cows, horses, servants,

Middle Indic forms *jhāna* or *jhāṇa*, which correspond to the Sanskrit *dhyāna* (meditative absorption). I have translated '定' as 'to find composure,' and 行禪 'to practice meditation.'

⁸⁶ **Sn768b**: The word '*padā*' has two distinct grammatical possibilities in this context. It appears to be an ablative singular (from their foot). However, Norman (2001: 324) classifies it as the 'truncated instrumental (with their foot), following the *Paramatthajotikā II*'s explanation that it is an alternative declension of '*padena* (neutral, instrumental, singular).' I adopt Norman's reading and the commentarial tradition.

Sn768cd: I have translated Sn768d first, followed by Sn768c, to improve its readability.

In Sn768c, '*So imaṃ visattikaṃ loke*' has nine syllables, which exceeds the eight syllables expected in *śloka* meter. Therefore, Norman suggests reading '*So 'maṃ visattikaṃ loke,*' which is supported by Burmese editions and parallel verses found in other Buddhist literature.

And young girls—ensnared by desire [for these],
 People [engage in] foolish behavior and bring about their own ruin.⁸⁷
 Although [these sensual pleasures may seem] weak, they accumulate strength
 [Until individuals] kneel down and submit to these insidious enemies.
 In the endless darkness, they endure pain,
 [As if they were in] a boat wrecked in the vast ocean.⁸⁸

Sn769 *Khettaṃ vatthuṃ hiraññaṃ vā*

Gavāssaṃ dāsaporisaṃ

⁸⁷ **Y1.21c:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘坐女繫欲’ as “He gets engrossed—that stupid fool.” This is not even close to the Chinese meaning. He just omitted the term ‘坐女,’ which is a Chinese idiomatic expression referring to a ‘virgin’ or ‘young girl.’ It is a contraction of the phrase ‘坐家女’ or a variation of the phrase ‘在家女.’ These two terms literally mean ‘a lady (女) who stays (在 or 坐) in her parents’ house (家) either married or unmarried.’ This etymological analysis becomes clear when we consider its antonym 出家(女)—a lady (女) who (married and) went away (出) from her parents’ house (家).

We find an early usage of ‘坐女’ in the *biography of Guo Chen* (郭陳列傳) in the *Hou Han Shu* (後漢書): “後坐女婿亡吏，太守邵夔怒而殺之 [Afterwards, (his) son-in-law disrespected government officials. The magistrate Shaokui got enraged and killed him.]” Here, the phrase ‘坐女婿’ means ‘son-in-law (婿) of his daughter (女) living in her parents’ house (坐).’ The biography was composed more than a century later than the *Yizujing*’s translation. Thus, we may need an earlier example to prove the usage of ‘坐女’ in Y1.21. However, my analysis and reading fit well with Y1.21 and its parallel Pāli verse, Sn769. In Y1.21, the word ‘坐女’ should refer to a young girl or an unmarried lady living in her parents’ house.

The *Brahmajāla Sutta* and the *Sāmaññaphala Sutta* (*Dīgha Nikāya* 1 and 2) provide testimony to ascetic rules against accepting women and young girls alongside other rules against accepting gold, silver, cattle, slaves, etc. They may offer a glimpse of customary culture in ancient India. For example, we find the following moral disciplinary regulation in the *Sāmaññaphala Sutta*: “He abstains from accepting uncooked grain, raw meat, *women and girls*, male and female slaves, ...” (translated by Bhikkhu Bodhi, 1989: 35).

Y1.21d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘癡行犯身’ as “who thus inflicts injury upon his own self.” It seems that he might have separated the character ‘癡’ from Y1.21d and translated it as ‘that stupid fool’ in the previous line (Y1.21c).

⁸⁸ Verse Y1.22 picks up where Y1.21 left off, like how Sn770 follows Sn769.

Y1.22a: The character ‘倒’ literally means ‘upside down, on the contrary, instead.’

Y1.22b: The phrase ‘坐服’ literally means ‘to kneel down and then crawl on one’s belly.’

Y1.22c: The phrase ‘次冥’ literally means ‘consecutive (次) darkness (冥).’ Bapat translates 次冥 as “To the darkness is he consigned.” 次 is typically used as an adjective, noun, or adverb. When used as a verb, it may mean ‘to come next in order.’ His translation of it as ‘to consign somebody to somewhere’ seems a bit of a stretch.

痛 = 病 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): In the alternative reading, the phrase ‘受病’ means ‘to get sick.’

Thiyo bandhū puthu kāme

Yo naro anugijjhati

Sn770 *Abalā va naṃ balīyanti,*

Maddante naṃ parissayā

Tato naṃ dukkham anveti

Nāvaṃ bhinnam ivodakaṃ

Fields, land, gold,

Cows, horses, slaves, servants,

Women, relatives, or various sensual pleasures—

When a person desires them,⁸⁹

[They may appear] weak [at first but] overpower him indeed.

[Their] dangers crush him.

Thus, distress assails him

Like water [gushing into] a broken boat.⁹⁰

Y1.23 故説攝意 遠欲勿犯

⁸⁹ **Sn769ab**: The nouns listed in these two feet are all in accusative singular; however, I have translated most of them as plurals for improved readability.

⁹⁰ Sn770 continues from Sn769, just as Y1.22 does from Y1.21. The connection between the two Pāli verses is established through the phrase ‘yo naro (a person who)’ in Sn769d and the repetition of ‘naṃ (him)’ three times in Sn770abc.

Sn770d: The phrase ‘nāvaṃ bhinnam ivodakaṃ’ can be translated as ‘as if water follows a broken boat.’ The missing verb in this phrase is likely ‘anveti’ (to follow), which appears at the end of the previous line Sn770c. For improved readability, I have translated ‘anveti’ as ‘to gush into’ in this context. Norman (2001: 298) prefers the suggestion from CPD to use ‘to enter’ and cites a similar usage in Dhṛp124: “‘nābbaṇaṃ viṣaṃ anveti’ (poison does not enter [the body or the hand] which does not have a wound).” In this instance, ‘nābbaṇaṃ’ can be parsed as ‘na’ (not) + ‘a’ (without) + ‘vaṇa’ (wound).

精進求度 載船至岸

Thus, I declare: Guard your thoughts.

Refrain from [indulging in] sensual pleasures and do not violate [this injunction].

Strive diligently in seeking to cross over [to the other shore].

Embark on the ship and navigate to [the farther] shore.⁹¹

Sn771 *Tasmā jantu sadā sato*

Kāmāni parivajjaye

Te pahāya tare oghaṃ

Nāvaṃ siñcitvā pārāgū ti

Therefore, a person, ever being mindful,

Should avoid sensual pleasures.

Having relinquished them, they should traverse the flood.

⁹¹ All editions featured in the apparatuses (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2) present this verse as prose, potentially due to the phrase ‘故說’ (Thus, I declare) appearing as part of the narrative. However, its Pāli counterpart is presented in verse form.

Y1.23a: The phrase ‘攝意’ can be literally translated as ‘to guard one’s mind, thoughts, or intentions.’ This expression corresponds with the word ‘sata’ (being mindful) in Sn771. Notably, the translation ‘攝意’ has been used for the Sanskrit term ‘*smṛta*’ and the Pāli word ‘sata’ in the earliest period of Chinese Buddhist translation.

Y1.23b: Bapat translates 遠欲勿犯 as “And from desires and violations keep aloof.” This translation fails to translate a negative word 勿 (do not, no). Here, we should read 勿犯 as ‘not to violate.’

Y1.23cd: Bapat translates the passage ‘載船至岸’ as “And row the boat on to that which is safe.” However, the literal meaning of ‘載’ is ‘to ride, to carry (on a vehicle)’; it carries a stronger connotation of ‘boarding’ than ‘sailing’ or ‘navigating.’ By rendering it as ‘to row,’ he did not require an additional verb and thus translated ‘至’ as a preposition ‘to’ or ‘as far as.’ This is possible, but it would be better as a verb meaning ‘to reach.’ This translation aptly fits this passage, capturing the connotations of both ‘boarding’ (載) and ‘sailing’ (至).

As for the final character ‘岸,’ his translation of it as ‘that which is safe’ makes the well-established Buddhist imagery overly vague and abstract. The literal meaning ‘岸’ is ‘the shore,’ which serves as a metaphor for *nirvāṇa* in Buddhist literature. Although *nirvāṇa*, the ultimate Buddhist goal, can be understood as ‘the safety zone free from mental unease,’ Bapat’s rendering weakens this soteriological imagery across this verse. For example, the character ‘度’ functions as a noun ‘crossing-over’ in the passage ‘精進求度’ in Y1.23c. Bapat’s mistaken rendering of ‘度’ as ‘the yonder there,’ may have led him to depict ‘岸’ vaguely to avoid redundancy. When combined, the two characters ‘至岸’ would be better translated as ‘to reach (至) the [other] shore (岸).’

[Ultimately, they will] reach the other shore after bailing out their boat.⁹²

佛說是義足經竟。比丘歡喜⁹³

When the Buddha had expounded this [*sūtra* in] the *Yizujing*, the *bhikṣus* rejoiced.

⁹² Fumio Enomoto (1989: 35, as cited in Norman 2001: 323) notes that although the *Yogācārabhūmi* quotes a Sanskrit version of the *Kāmasutta*, it lacks a complete verse equivalent to Sn771. This absence may be related to the reason why the editions in the apparatuses of T198 and Z863 present Y1.23 as prose. For additional information, refer to footnote 89 of this *sūtra*.

Sn771d: There is an alternative reading of the word ‘*siñcivā*,’ which is an absolutive form derived from the root ‘*√sic*’ (to pour out), meaning ‘having bailed out.’ Norman argues that ‘*sivā va*,’ should be the correct reading for metrical reasons because this alternative reading fits ‘heavy-heavy-light’ rhythm in *śloka*. In his analysis, the term ‘*sivā*’ is another absolutive form of ‘*√sic*,’ and the particle ‘*va*’ is a contracted form of ‘*iva*’ (as if, like). His suggestion is supported by the two commentaries on the *Aṭṭhakavagga* that consider ‘*siñcivā*’ a simile. They annotate it with the word ‘*yathā*’ (as if, like) a synonym of ‘*iva*’: “as if one could make a heavy boat light and cross the water fast by pouring out weighty water from the boat.” Bodhi also follows the commentarial reading of this verse.

While I respect the commentarial reading, but in my translation, I have opted to follow the PTS edition keeping ‘*siñcivā*.’ The reason is that the Dh369ab cited by Norman demonstrates that the imagery of ‘bailing out a boat’ was already an established soteriological concept in the Buddhist community: “*Siñca bhikkhu imaṃ nāvaṃ sittā te lahumessati* (O, bhikkhu! Bail out this boat. When the boat is bailed out, it will become light for your sake.).” Here, the word ‘*sittā*’ is a past participle female singular of ‘*√sic*’ and ‘*te*’ is the 2nd person pronoun dative singular. Given that this imagery was already present without using ‘*iva*’ or ‘*yathā*’ in the composition of Dh369, I consider the particle ‘*iva*’ to be unnecessary. In this imagery, the water in the boat represents the desire for sensual pleasures.

⁹³ 佛說是義足經竟 = 佛說義足經竟 (P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The character ‘是’ (this) is absent in five editions. In the versions where it appears, this demonstrative pronoun serves to specify this particular discourse as the first among the sixteen discourses of the *Yizujing*. By contrast, the versions without ‘是’ may collectively refer to the *Yizujing* as a whole, without emphasizing any individual discourse. This distinction suggests that the inclusion of ‘是’ aims to highlight the specific significance of the initial discourse within the broader text.

優填王經 第二¹

Discourse 2: King Udayana (*Aṭṭhakavagga.2*)

聞如是。佛在舍衛國祇樹給孤獨園。時有一比丘。在句參國石間土室中。長髮鬚爪。被壞衣。

Thus I heard. When the Buddha was residing in the kingdom of Śrāvastī, at Jeta's Grove in Anāthapiṇḍada's Park, there lived a *bhikṣu* in the kingdom of Kauśāmbī 句參國.² He dwelled in an earthen abode between rocks. He had long hair, a beard, and long nails, and he wore tattered clothes.³

¹ The character ‘經’ is missing in (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2). For more information, refer to fn.3 of the first discourse, 樂食王經 第一.

² We find its parallel narrative in the *Paramatthajotikā II*, the *Samyutta Nikāya Aṭṭhakathā II* 514-5 & III 27, and the *Jātaka IV* 375ff (Mātaṅga jātika; J. 497). In these Pāli narratives, King Udena became jealous of a holy monk named Pindola (Skt. Piṇḍola) Bhāradvāja, who preached to the king's harem while the king was asleep. When threatened by the king, the monk escaped using his psychic powers. Upon hearing about these events from the monk, the Buddha then delivered his teaching.

The theme of a king attempting to abuse a monk out of jealousy is common in Chinese Buddhist literature as well. In the *Diamond Sūtra* 金剛經 (*Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra*; T235.08.0750b15), the Blessed One demonstrates his power of endurance without harboring any enmity while he was dismembered by King Kāliṅga 歌利王 in a past life. The *Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā Śāstra* 大毘婆沙論 (T 1545.27.892b28) also refers to this story but uses a different transcription of the king's name ‘羯利王.’ In this narrative, the king tortured and killed Kṣānti Rṣi (忍辱仙人, in the *Diamond Sūtra*) because his concubines had visited the hermit's abode.

Bapat identifies the name ‘句參國’ as a transcription of ‘Kauśāmbī (Pāli, Kosambī) country.’ Muller (DDB) lists this place name under the entry of 憍賞彌國, another transcription of this country. Drawing on Pulleyblank (1991), we can reconstruct the pronunciation of ‘句參’ during the Eastern Han dynasty (25–220 CE) as /kuəh tshəm/, which closely resembles ‘Kauśāmbī.’

石間 = 石澗 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): In its alternative reading, ‘石澗’ refers to ‘a stream in the stony valley,’ and ‘石澗土室’ could mean ‘an earthen abode on the bank of a stony stream.’

³ 髮鬚 (T) = 鬚髮 (Y, M) = 鬚髮 (K, Z): The Y and M editions have reversed the order of the two characters found in the T edition, while the K and Z editions have variant characters with the reversed order. However, the characters ‘鬚’ and ‘髮’ are essentially the same as they share the same components within each character. Similarly, the characters ‘髮’ and ‘鬚’ are the same for the same reason. As a result, these different displays do not make affect the meaning.

時優填王。欲出遊觀。到我迹山。侍者即勅治道橋。還白王。已治道王可出。王但從美人妓女。乘騎到我迹山。下車步上。

At that time, King Udayana 優填 wanted to go sightseeing to Woji 我迹 mountain.⁴ His attendant promptly ordered [workers] to repair the roads and bridges. [Once the task was completed,] the attendant returned and reported to the king: “The road is made ready, and Your Majesty may set out [at your leisure].” Accompanied only by the beautiful ladies of his harem, the king [set out] by chariot, and [soon] reached Woji mountain.⁵ He then dismounted from his chariot and [began to] ascend [the mountain] on foot.

有一美人。經行山中。從崎至崎。顧見石間土室中。有一比丘。長鬚髮爪。衣服裂敗。狀類如鬼。便大聲呼天子。是中有鬼。是中有鬼。王便遙問何所在。美人言。近在石間土室中。

While walking about the mountain, one of the beautiful ladies went from one rugged trail to

⁴ 優填王: Bapat and Muller identify this name as ‘King Udayana (Pāli. Udena).’ Referring to Pulleyblank, we can reconstruct the ancient pronunciation of ‘優填’ as /ʔuw dɛn/, which closely resembles its Middle Indic form, ‘Udena.’

我迹山: The DDB does not have an entry for this proper name. The reconstructed Eastern Han pronunciation of ‘我迹’ is /ŋa tsiɛjk/. Bapat’s reconstructed pronunciation is /ngo-ki/, but he conjectures that it might be the Chinese equivalent of ‘Uśīragiri (Uśīra mountain), which is derived from *Divyāvadāna* 22.2 and the *Mahāvīyūtpatti* 4126. Pāli Uśīraddhaja and Sanskrit Uśīrabīja are names of a mountain that could potentially support his hypothesis. However, Bapat himself is not entirely confident in this identification, and he opts to use his reconstructed pronunciation ‘Ngo-ki.’ I have chosen to transliterate this place name as ‘Woji’ mountain, utilizing Chinese pinyin pronunciation.

⁵ 乘騎: When analyzed individually, the characters in this phrase represent ‘to mount a chariot’ (乘) and ‘to ride a horse’ (騎). However, these two actions cannot be performed simultaneously. When combined, the phrase takes on the simplified meaning ‘to ride in a chariot’ (CJKV-English Dictionary). This interpretation is further corroborated by the subsequent expression ‘下車,’ which denotes ‘to dismount from the chariot.’

another.⁶ She looked around and spotted a *bhikṣu* inside an earthen abode nestled between rocks. He had long hair, a beard, and overgrown nails, and wore tattered and shabby clothes. His appearance resembled that of a ghost. [Reacting] instinctively, she screamed and called out to the king, “There’s a ghost! There’s a ghost!”⁷ The king promptly inquired from a distance, “Where are you?” The beautiful lady replied, “I’m near an earthen abode between rocks.”

王即拔劍從之。見比丘如是即問。汝何等人。對言。我是沙門。王問汝何等沙門。曰我是釋迦沙門。王言。是應真耶。曰非也。寧有四禪耶。復言。無有也。寧三禪二禪耶。復言。無有。寧至一禪耶。對曰。言實一禪行。

The King then drew his sword and approached the abode. He saw the *bhikṣu* just as [the lady had] described, and asked, “What kind of person are you?” [The *bhikṣu*] replied, “I’m a *śramaṇa* 沙門 [an ascetic].” The king inquired, “What kind of *śramaṇa* are you?” [The *bhikṣu*] responded, “I’m a Buddhist 釋迦 *śramaṇa*.”⁸ The king asked, “Are you an *arhat* or not?”⁹ [The *bhikṣu*] answered, “I’m not.” [The king continued,] “Have you attained the fourth *dhyāna*?” Once again,

⁶ 崎: Bapat’s translation of this character as ‘a peak’ seems to be a stretch. A more accurate interpretation would be ‘rough, uneven, or rugged (trail).’ Thus, the phrase ‘從崎至崎’ means ‘from one rugged trail to another rugged trail.’

⁷ 天子: This title literally means ‘the Son (子) of Heaven (天).’ It appears three times in the *Yizujing*, but only in this discourse does it signify ‘emperor.’ The term carries the concept of the Mandate of Heaven, wherein Heaven bestows upon the emperor the power to govern the empire. However, title ‘king’ 王 is predominant throughout the *Yizujing*, and the context does not necessitate such a political and ideological notion. Therefore, I translate it as ‘the king.’ In the narratives of the 14th & 16th discourses, the term ‘天子’ refers to ‘a son of god’ or ‘a deity,’ rather than an emperor in the human world.

⁸ 釋迦 = 釋家 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The proper noun ‘釋迦’ is a transcription of ‘*Śākya*,’ whereas in the term ‘釋家,’ ‘釋’ is a transcription of ‘*Śākya*,’ and ‘家’ serves as a translation meaning ‘family.’

⁹ 應真: Directly translated as ‘worthy and truthful,’ this term corresponds to the ‘*arhat*’ in Buddhist soteriology, signifying one who is liberated from suffering and the cycle of rebirths.

[the *bhikṣu*] said, “I have not.” [The king went on,] “Have you attained the third or the second *dhyāna*?” [The *bhikṣu*] said again, “None.” [Finally, the king asked,] “Have you attained the first *dhyāna*?” [The *bhikṣu*] responded, “To tell you the truth, I’m practicing the first *dhyāna*.”

王便恚內不解。顧謂侍者黃門。以姪意念。是沙門凡俗人無真行。奈何見我美人。便勅侍者。急取斷絃截來繫是人。侍者便去。

At that moment, the king became enraged and could not quell [the anger welling up] within him. He looked around and said to his eunuch attendant, “This ascetic, with licentious thoughts [like] an ordinary person, is not adhering to pure conduct.¹⁰ How dare he cast his eyes on my beautiful lady!” He then ordered his attendant to cut off a piece of rope and bring it to bind the man.¹¹ His attendant immediately set off [to do so].

山神念是比丘無過。今當怨死。我可擁護令脫是厄。便化作大猪身。徐走王邊。侍者即白王。大猪近在王邊。王便捨比丘。拔劍逐猪。

¹⁰ 黃門: This term refers to a ‘eunuch’ during the Qin (221–206 BCE) and Han (202 BCE–220 CE) dynasties. The title originates from the fact that eunuchs served the emperor and managed his harem, residing within the imperial palace where all the gates (門) were painted yellow (黃). Bapat omits the translation of the entire sentence ‘顧謂侍者黃門.’ This sentence contradicts the previous narrative, which states that the king was accompanied solely by the beautiful ladies of his harem. Such contradictions are not uncommon in Chinese Buddhist translations.

¹¹ 斷絃: This term literally means ‘a piece (斷) of the string of a musical instrument (絃).’ This context implies a scenario where the ladies had brought string instruments to entertain the king, and some of them were broken.

截來繫 = 腕來齧 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The phrase ‘截來繫’ in T198 may mean ‘to cut off (截), bring it here (來), and then bind (繫).’ In the variant reading in the apparatuses, the character ‘腕’ means ‘ant,’ and ‘齧’ means ‘to bite.’ Bapat adopts this variant reading and translates the sentence ‘便勅侍者 急取斷絃腕來齧是人’ as “He ordered his servants to let the string-eating worms bite at his body.” This reading is close to the *Paramatthajotikā II* narrative: “*tamba-kipillikehi taṃ khādāpessāmī ti* (I will make him eaten by the red ant.)” Nevertheless, I choose to follow the base text (T198) in my translation.

The mountain god [believed] that the *bhikṣu* had done nothing wrong and thought, “Now, he may die harboring resentment.¹² I can protect him and help him escape this disaster.” So, he transformed himself into a large boar and slowly roamed near the king. [Observing this,] the attendant then said to the king, “There’s a big boar nearby, Your Majesty.” Upon [hearing this,] the king abandoned [the plan to punish] the *bhikṣu*, and drawing his sword, chased after the boar.

比丘見王去遠。便走出到舍衛祇樹給孤獨園中。爲諸比丘說本末。比丘即白佛。佛是時因是本。變有義生。命我比丘悉知經卷出語。爲後世學作明。令我經道久住。是時佛說義足經。

The *bhikṣu* saw the king head off into the distance.¹³ Then, he fled to the kingdom of Śrāvastī, to Jeta’s Grove in Anāthapiṇḍada’s Park. He shared the entire story in detail with all the *bhikṣus*, who then reported it to the Buddha.¹⁴ At this time, in response to these events [involving the *bhikṣu*], the Buddha had aphorisms arise in his mind.¹⁵ He articulated [this] chapter of the *sūtra*

¹² 怨死 = 恐死 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The phrase ‘怨死’ means ‘to die (死) harboring resentment (怨).’ Bapat follows its variant reading ‘恐死’ and translates the sentence ‘今當恐死’ as “He will be frightened to death.” I would translate this variant passage as “he may die in fear.” Nonetheless, I believe that the mountain god’s concern is the monk’s tarnished moral purity due to dying with resentment, rather than ‘being frightened to death.’

¹³ 去遠 = 去速 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The alternative phrase ‘去速’ means ‘to go away quickly’ or ‘to leave hastily.’

¹⁴ The phrase ‘本末’ literally means ‘root and branches.’ It signifies ‘from the beginning to the end’ or ‘the entire story in detail.’

¹⁵ 佛是時因是本 / 變有義生: Bapat’s translation of this sentence reads, “The Buddha (佛) thinking that this incident (是本變?) had some causal relation (是時因?) with something significant (有義?) in the past life (生?) [of the medicant], ...” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation seems arbitrary and overly stretched. Firstly, this discourse does not include a past life story so that the phrase ‘有義生’ should be understood together as ‘to have (有) aphorisms (義) arise (生) (in his mind).’ Consequently, I separate this sentence as ‘佛是時因是本變 / 有義生,’ which differs from the sentence break in T198. The phrase ‘因是本變’ should mean ‘to be caused (因) by such (是) a series of incidents (本變).’

We find a similar usage of the phrase ‘本變’ (original incidents) in the Biography of Zhang Yi 張翼傳 in the *Record of the Three Kingdoms* 三國志: “綱又於門外罷遣吏兵, 留所親者十餘人, 以書語其長老素為嬰所信者, 請與相見, 問以本變, 因示以詔恩, 使還請嬰” I translate this story as, “Further, Kang dismissed his

to inform us, *bhikṣus*.¹⁶ He elucidated it for future learners, ensuring the longevity of his teachings and the path. It was at this moment that the Buddha taught the *Yizujing*.

Y2.1 繫舍多所願 住其邪所遮

以遮遠正道 欲念難可慧

Bound to the house [filled with] numerous desired possessions,

People become fixated on unwholesome [thoughts, which are clearly] hindrances.

These hindrances lead them away from the right path.

With lustful thoughts, it will be difficult to attain wisdom.¹⁷

officers and soldiers outside the gate, leaving only about ten close associates (所親者). He sent a message to the village elder, who had always been trusted by Ying, asking to meet with him. During the meeting, Kang inquired about *the cause of the recent unrest* and then showed him the imperial edict of pardon, asking him to bring Ying back.”

¹⁶ 命我比丘 & 令我經道: These phrases also introduce the perspective of the transmitters of this sutra, which can be rendered as ‘we (我), his disciples’ and ‘our teaching and path.’ For a similar discussion, please refer to Y1.fn.79.

¹⁷ This *Yizujing sūtra* has eight verses that correspond to the same number of verses found in the Pāli *Guhāṭṭhakasutta*.

Y2.1b: Bapat translates the sentence ‘住其邪所遮’ as “In delusion (所遮) is he merged (住?), and in wrong course (其邪) stands firm (住?).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. Here, he translated ‘住’ twice, which may be possible in certain contexts. However, his translation of ‘所遮’ as ‘delusion’ may be a stretch: he might have associated ‘所遮 (things hidden)’ with the Pāli word ‘*guhā* (cave)’ found in Sn772a and interpreted this figurative term doctrinally as ‘delusion. Even if he did, this metaphorical translation does not fit the given context of Y2.1. Y2.1b should be about ‘desire’ rather than ‘delusion’: this foot deals with the unwholesome thought arising from ‘the things people adore (所願)’ in Y2.1a.

The particle ‘所’ before a verb usually denotes the object or the passive of the verb, but sometimes it merely conceptualizes the verb too, especially in Buddhist contexts. Refer to the entry ‘所 (2)’ in Karashima’s Lokakṣema Glossary. According to him, the phrase ‘所念’ should mean ‘what one thinks’ in Classical Chinese, but it could also mean ‘the act of thinking’ itself in Buddhist literature. In the same manner, the phrase ‘所遮’ usually denotes ‘what is hindered’ or ‘what is covered,’ but it could also mean ‘what obstructs [the mind]’ in Buddhist texts. Therefore, I translate ‘所遮’ as ‘hindrances,’ which fits the context of Y2.1 perfectly. In Y2.1c, ‘遮’ is used as a synonym for ‘所遮,’ which supports my rendering of ‘所遮.’

Y2.1d, 慧 = 惠 (S, Y, M): Bapat opts for the alternative character ‘惠’ and translates the sentence ‘欲念難可惠’ as “Thoughts of craving are hard to be tenderly treated.” However, his translation of ‘惠’ as ‘to be tenderly treated’ seems out of context. The basic meaning of ‘惠’ is ‘to bless,’ but it is commonly used as a synonym for ‘慧’

Sn772 *Satto guhāyaṃ bahunābhichanno*

tiṭṭhaṃ naro mohanasmim pagāḷho

dūre vivekā hi tathāvidho so

*kāmā hi loke na hi suppahāyā*¹⁸

Mired in the cave [of the body] and shrouded in numerous [defilements],

A person remains captivated by allurements.

Indeed, such a person is far from detachment,

As sensual pleasures in this world are really not easy to relinquish.¹⁹

(wise, wisdom) in Classical Chinese. For example, the All-embracing Unity 宙合 of the *Guanzi* 管子 states: “惠者知其不可兩守 乃取一焉 故安而無憂” (A wise person understands that they cannot guard two things; thus, they choose just one. Consequently, they stay peaceful without worries).

¹⁸ The following eight Pāli verses are from the *Guhāṭṭhakasutta* of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, composed in *Triṣṭubh* meter. This *sutta* is the first of the four *aṭṭhakasuttas* that bear the title ‘*aṭṭhakasutta*’ and consist of ‘eight verses’ (*aṭṭha-ka*). Therefore, some scholars have speculated that these four *suttas* may represent the core of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, with the remaining twelve *suttas* appended at a later period. However, this conjecture lacks substantial evidence and remains a subject of debate.

¹⁹ **Sn772ab**: These two lines have a subject (*naro*) but lack a main verb, containing only participles: three past participles (*satto*, *channo*, *pagāḷho*) and a present participle (*tiṭṭhaṃ*). The abundance of participles makes this verse structurally difficult to translate into English. Since Sn772c has an additional subject pronoun (*so*), I divide this verse into two sentences and treat Sn772ab as an independent sentence for improved readability. Consequently, I translate ‘*tiṭṭhaṃ*’ as the main verb of the first sentence.

Sn772a: It is not clear what the metaphor *guhā* (cave) and the adjective *bahu* (many) represent. The *Niddesa* and the *Paramatthajotikā II* explain that the cave is ‘the body’ and ‘many’ refers to ‘many defilements.’ Following the commentarial tradition, Norman (2001) translates it by adding some appropriate words: ‘the cave [of the body]’ and ‘many [defilements].’ Bodhi, on the other hand, omits these additions and translates the first line as ‘stuck in the cave, densely covered over’. For the sake of clarity in my translation, I follow the commentarial tradition because Sn772a appears enigmatic without these specifications.

Sn772c: The *Niddesa* notes that ‘*vivekā*’ has three types—*viveka* of the body, *viveka* of the mind, and *viveka* of the substratum of the rebirth. Following the context the commentary provides, Norman (*ibid*) argues that ‘*viveka*’ should be translated as ‘detachment,’ not ‘seclusion.’ Bodhi (2017: 1023) also introduces the commentarial annotation but translates it as ‘seclusion.’ He believes that seclusion could encompass the three types too. While I agree with the possibility of his three types of seclusion, I find that the rendering ‘detachment’ better fits the context.

Sn772d: The first ‘*hi*’ means ‘it is because;’ and the second ‘*hi*’ is an emphatic particle, meaning ‘indeed, truly.’

Y2.2 坐可繫胞胎 繫色堅雖解

不觀去來法 慧是亦斷本

Dwelling on captivating things, people become bound to a [new] womb.

The attachment to sensuality is powerful, though [not impossible] to release.

They fail to contemplate the law [connecting] past and future,

And their wisdom is indeed severed at its root.²⁰

Sn773 *Icchānidānā bhavasātabaddhā*

te duppamuñcā na hi aññamokkhā

pacchā pure vā pi apekhamānā

²⁰ Y2.2: This verse is closely related to its Pāli parallel, Sn773 in terms of individual wordings, but it presents a slightly different context.

Y2.2a: Bapat translates the passage ‘坐可繫胞胎’ as “To this life and birth (胞胎) attached (繫), doth he sit (坐).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This is not entirely accurate. First, the phrase ‘胞胎’ does not contain any word denoting ‘this life,’ and Bapat added this meaning without a solid basis. Next, the literal translation of ‘坐’ as ‘to sit’ does not fit the given context, and he should have considered its various derivative meanings that aligns with the context. Finally, he does not translate the character ‘可.’ This character can function as a modal verb in front of a verb, meaning ‘can,’ but it can also work as an adjective or noun, meaning ‘good,’ or ‘good thing.’ In this verse, I choose to interpret it as a noun. I interpret ‘可’ as short for ‘可意’ (appealing to one’s mind) or ‘可愛’ (the desirable). DDB has an entry of ‘可意’ and gives its meaning as ‘pleasing.’ Refer to Y6. fn.14, 23, 25; Y7. fn.27; and Y10. fn.42 for this usage of ‘可.’

Y2.2b: Bapat translates the passage ‘繫色堅雖解’ as “And those that are firmly (堅) bound to (繫) worldly things (色), he hardly (雖?) can release (解).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation is misleading. Y2.2b does not have a negative particle like ‘hardly.’ He may have misread 雖 (though) as 難 (difficult). I add ‘possible’ or ‘not impossible’ to clarify this line.

Y2.2c: Bapat translates ‘不觀去來法’ as “things of the past and future, he never doth glance.” His use of ‘things’ introduces unnecessary ambiguity. The phrase ‘去來法’ more precisely refers to ‘the law of causation connecting past and future,’ which is conceptually linked to ‘the causal law between attachment and rebirth’ as discussed in Y2.2ab. Alternatively, this could be interpreted as ‘laws governing coming and going [between rebirths within samsara].’ However, my preferred translation as ‘the law of causation connecting past and future’ is more consistent with the Pāli counterpart Sn773c, offering a clearer and more specific understanding of the Buddhist doctrinal context.

Y2.2d: Bapat translates the passage ‘慧是亦斷本’ as “But (亦?) to the present (是?) is kindly disposed (斷?) as sure as [ever] before.” [Parentheses added for analysis]. It is unclear how he arrived at this translation. The keywords of the verse—‘慧’ and ‘本’—are missing in his translation. He admits that he is not clear about the meaning of Y2.2d in his footnote. Y2.2d complements Y2.2c by stating that without understanding the law, they are destined to be trapped in complete ignorance.

ime va kāme purime va jappam

Driven by desire, bound to the pleasure of existence,

They are difficult to free [on their own] and cannot to be released even by others.

Preoccupied with [what may happen] in the future or [what happened] before,

They long for sensual pleasures in the present or the past.²¹

Y2.3 貪欲以癡盲 不知邪利增

坐欲被痛悲 從是當何依

Craving sensual pleasures, people become blinded by their ignorance.

They are unaware that their dreadful demerits continue to accumulate.

Trapped in [the mire of] their own greed, they experience bitter sorrow.

“From this [time on], what can I rely upon?”²²

²¹ **Sn773:** A subject ‘*te*’ appear in Sn773b with main verbs hidden within the verse. For the sake of readability, I have translated Sn773cd as an independent sentence.

Norman proposes two possibilities regarding the term ‘*jappam*’ in Sn773d: it could be a present participle or a Vedic *ṇamul* absolutive. In the first case, the nominative singular case ending does not align with the other five nominative plural cases in the verse. As a result, Norman suspect that this verse may be a patchwork. In the second case, the term is indeclinable, which prevents the verse from falling into grammatical disarray.

Sn773b: Norman interprets ‘*hi*’ as an emphatic particle, while Bodhi reads it as a conjunction ‘because.’ Bodhi follows the *Mahānidessa*’s annotation that a person stuck in the mud cannot rescue others in the mud, and he translate this line as “they let go with difficulty, for there is no release through others.” However, I consider Bodhi’s interpretation may limit the context. I choose to follow Norman and connect the two ideas—release for oneself and release by others—using ‘and.’

Sn773c: The term ‘*apekhamānā*’ can be parsed as ‘*apa* + *ikhamānā* (looking for, longing for, being concerned; present participle).’ Bapat suggests that the *Yizujing* may have mistaken the word for ‘*a* + *pa* + *ikhamānā* (not paying attention to), resulting in the Chinese translation ‘不觀.’ Norman cites Bapat’s footnote regarding this potential confusion. This mix-up may have contributed to a completely different context being presented in Y2.2.

²² **Y2.3c:** Bapat translates the passage ‘坐欲被痛悲’ as “Though suffering, with this longing doth he sit.” Once again, he does not consider various derivative meanings of the character ‘坐,’ resulting in his imprecise translation. His translation omits the character ‘被,’ which functions as a verb meaning ‘to experience’ or a passive marker, signifying ‘to get + past participle.’ He also adds an unnecessary conjunction ‘though,’ which distorts the context of this line.

Sn774 *Kāmesu giddhā pasutā pamūlhā*

avadāniyā te visame niviṭṭhā

dukkhūpanītā paridevayanti

“kiṃ su bhavissāma ito cutāse.”

Longing for, preoccupied with, and infatuated by sensual pleasures,

They become stingy and trapped in wrongdoings.

Led to adversity, they lament,

“What shall we become when we pass away from here?”²³

Y2.4 人生當覺是 世邪難可依

捨正不著念 命短死甚近

People should recognize this [truth]:

Worldly matters [often] go awry and are difficult to depend upon.

Refrain from dwelling on [things] that lead one astray from the right [path].

Y2.3d: Bapat translates the passage ‘從是當何依’ as “From here, what [place] shall I go to?” The character ‘是’ could refer to both time and place. I choose time expression for ‘是’ because the character ‘依’ means ‘to rely on,’ rather than ‘to go from one place to another.’ Bapat’s translation of ‘依’ seems like a stretch. He may have considered the Pāli word ‘*cutāse* (when we pass away)’ in Sn.774d, but there is no Chinese equivalent to it in Y2.3d.

²³ **Sn774b:** According to the *Mahāniddesa*, the term ‘*visama*’ (*vi* + *sama*, unequal, uneven) carries an ethical connotation, ‘morally wrong,’ in this verse.

Sn774b contains 12 syllables, one more than the number of syllables in *triṣṭubh* meter. Norman suggests that Sn774b has a resolution—substituting two light syllables for a heavy syllable—in *avadāniyā*. He also proposes that the particle ‘*su*’ should be read ‘*sū*’ for metrical cause in Sn774d.

Sn774c: The verb ‘*paridevayati*’ (to wail) is an elongated form of ‘*parideveti*’ that coexists synonymously with *paridevati* in the Pāli canon.

Life is brief, and death approaches ever closer.²⁴

Sn775 *Tasmā hi sikkhetha idh' eva jantu*

yaṃ kiñci jaññā 'visaman' ti loke

na tassa hetu visamaṃ careyya

appaṃ hi taṃ jīvitaṃ āhu dhīrā

Hence, a person should indeed learn from this very [instruction]:

Whatever they may recognize as wrongdoing in the world,

For that reason, they must not commit the wrongdoing,

Because the wise say that [our] life is fleeting.²⁵

Y2.5 展轉是世苦 生死欲溪流

²⁴ **Y2.4a:** The phrase ‘人生’ can refer to ‘human beings’ or ‘in one’s (entire) life.’ As such, an alternative translation of this phrase could be ‘[We] should recognize this [truth] in our lives.’

Y2.4b: The character ‘邪’ has its basic meaning of ‘deviating from a straight course,’ which I maintain without adding any moral connotations.

Y2.4c: Because of the prohibitive particle ‘不’ in the middle of the line, I rearranged the order of phrases in this line. I have initially translated the phrase ‘捨正’ as a gerund phrase ‘abandoning the right path,’ but I have positioned it at the end of the translation, modifying the phrase ‘著念’ to enhance readability. The phrase ‘著念’ literally means ‘to be preoccupied by certain thoughts.’

²⁵ **Sn775a:** I have decided not to follow the *Paramatthajotikā II*’s interpretation of the phrase “*idh'eva*,” which explains it as follows: “*idh'eva ti imasmim yeva sāsane*” (‘right here’ means ‘in this teaching’). Following this commentary, Norman translates “*idh'eva*” as ‘in this very (dispensation).’ Bodhi introduces the commentarial definition but keeps his translation close to its literal meaning ‘right here’ and uses a colon to signify that it refers to the following instruction in Sn775bcd. I interpret this verse similar to Bodhi. I believe the commentarial note sometimes reflects the Theravāda school’s integrity, both doctrinally and institutionally, which might not have been present at the time of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*’s composition.

Sn775bc: The phrase ‘*tassa hetu*’ (for that reason) in Sn775c refers to ‘*yaṃ kiñci*’ (whatever) in Sn775b.

Norman suggests that Sn775bc has a pun on ‘*visamaṃ*,’ meaning both ‘without equal’ and ‘wickedness.’ With its positive meaning ‘without equal,’ the message of Sn775c could be: “People should not do the wrong for the sake (*hetu*) of whatever (whoever) is known to be unparalleled (*yaṃ kiñci jaññā 'visaman' ti*). In this context, ‘whatever’ could refer to ‘the unparalleled teachings of the Buddha.’ I believe its negative meaning ‘wickedness’ better fits the context, reflecting the time of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*’s composition.

死時乃念怨 從欲詆胎極

Distress in this world persists and recurs,

[As] the stream of desire flows through life and death.

[If] a person harbors enmity at the time of death,

Driven by desire, they slander [others persistently] even into their next life.²⁶

Sn776 *Passāmi loke pariphandamānaṃ*

pajaṃ imaṃ tanhāgataṃ bhavesu

hīnā narā maccumukhe lapanti

avītataṇhāse bhavābhavesu

I observe this human race trembling in the world,

Obsessed with craving for [various] modes of existence.

[These] lowly people lament in the face of death,

Not yet free from craving for diverse modes of existence.²⁷

²⁶ **Y2.5ab:** Bapat translates “展轉是世苦 生死欲溪流” as “Widely unfolded is the suffering in this word—Life and Death and this flood of craving.” Here, he equates the entire phrase ‘生死欲溪流’ with ‘世苦’ (the suffering in this world). However, ‘the flood of craving’ itself is not the suffering itself but the cause of the suffering. For this reason, I believe his translation is imprecise: instead, I connect Y2.5a and Y2.5b using a causal conjunction ‘as.’

Y2.5cd: Bapat translates the phrase ‘從欲詆胎極’ as ‘Because of craving (從欲) for this world, that is widely (極?) spurned (詆).’ [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation is not correct. He omitted the character ‘胎’ which is not negligible in the context. The character ‘詆’ means ‘to slander,’ and his translation of ‘to reject, spurn’ is a stretch and out of context. If he may have interpreted ‘極’ as ‘widely,’ which is arbitrary. It should mean ‘extreme,’ or ‘as far as’ and does not mean the spatial prevalence.

詆 (T) = 詆 (K, Z): We cannot find the entry for the character ‘詆’ even in the *Dictionary of Chinese Variants Provided by the Department of Education* 教育部異體字字典 created by the Taiwanese government. I have discovered this character from Konjaku Mojikyō (今昔文字鏡), a comprehensive collection of East Asian characters developed by the Mojikyō Institute (文字鏡研究会) in Japan. The character ‘詆’ consists of ‘言 (to say)’ and ‘互 (each other),’ and it might be synonymous with ‘詆 (to backbite, slander).’

²⁷ **Sn776b:** The term ‘bhavesu’ is in the masculine locative plural form. The plural form of ‘bhava’ (existence, life) may suggest multiple lives for an individual, carrying the concept of ‘karma and rebirth.’ Therefore, I translate it as ‘[various] modes of existence.’

Y2.6 自可受痛身 流斷少水魚

以見斷身可 三世復何增

Complacently, people experience the mass of suffering,

[Like] fish in a dwindling stream with scant water [left].

With insight, one can destroy the mass [of suffering].

How [then] could their three phases [of rebirth] extend further?²⁸

Sn777 *Mamāyite passatha phandamāne*

²⁸ **Y2.6a:** Karashima's Lokakṣema Glossary provides the entry for the phrase '自可' with its meaning as 'self-complacent,' or 'pride oneself.' It also lists a reference from Tang dynasty literature and translates the phrase as 'to be satisfied with oneself.' In the context of the verse, I interpret this phrase as 'complacently,' which aligns with the following simile of fish 'complacently' acquiescing to the dwindling water of stream drying up.

Bapat translates the passage '自可受痛身' as "Amongst one's belongings, with pain doth one throb." The character '身' can have multiple meanings in Buddhist texts, but his rendering 'one's belonging' is hardly supported. It is likely that he considered it as a Chinese rendering for the Pāli '*mamāyite*' (in what is considered as mine). The character '身' usually means 'body, self, personally, etc.' Karashima suggests the meaning 'aggregate, mass' for the word and offers the usage of '戒身' (the aggregate of morality) and '三昧身' (the aggregate of *samādhi*) from the corpus of Lokakṣema. I have interpreted '痛身' as 'the mass of suffering' or 'all sorts of suffering.'

Y2.6b: The passage '流斷少水魚' literally means 'fish (魚) in the little water (少水) with the [in-]flow cut off (流斷).' For readability, I translate it more freely as 'fish (魚) in a dwindling stream (流斷) with scant water [left] (少水).'

Y2.6c: Bapat translates the phrase '斷身' as 'to cut off one's belongings,' considering it as the translation of the Pāli '*amamo careyya*.' We could translate the phrase by itself as 'to destroy the illusion of self,' but this reading may require the phrase '痛身' in Y2.6a to be translated differently as 'suffering due to one's illusion of self.' This change may require too many words to fill the gap between the script and the translation. Thus, I believe it is the best way to consistently translate '斷身' as 'to destroy the mass (of suffering).'

Y2.6d: Bapat translates the passage '三世復何增' as "How will he then aspire after the three realms?" He reads the phrase '三世' as 'the three realms' and adds a footnote defining it as 'Realms of Desire, Form and the Formless (*kāmaabhava*, *rūpabhava*, *arūpabhava*).' However, this might be a conflation with '三界' (the three realms). In Buddhist texts, '三世' typically refers to 'the three periods: past, present, and future,' a usage established early in the history of Chinese Buddhist translation, though it is infrequently interchangeable with '三界,' as in Y9.12d. Additionally, there is no term in the Chinese text that corresponds directly to 'aspire after,' which suggests a possible mistranslation by Bapat.

macche va appodake khīṇasote

etam pi disvā amamo careyya

bhavesu āsattim akubbamāno

Observe those trembling people concerning [their] cherished things,

Like fish in a dwindling stream with scant water [left].

Seeing this, one should lead an unselfish life,

Without forming attachments to various modes of existence.²⁹

Y2.7 力欲於兩面 彼可覺莫著

莫行所自怨 見聞莫自污

Desire is mighty [indeed] for both sides—[past and future].

Never become attached to those objects of cognition.

Never do anything that you will regret.

Never let yourself be tainted by beliefs or traditions.³⁰

²⁹ **Sn777a:** The word ‘*Mamāyite*’ is the masculine locative plural of the past participle of the verb ‘*mamāyati*’ (to take something as ‘mine’).

Sn777b: The phrase ‘*Appodake khīṇasote*’ literally means ‘in the little water where the [in-]flow has been cut off.’ The phrase ‘流斷少水’ in Y2.6b precisely represents this phrase in Sn777b.

³⁰ **Y2.7a:** This line is challenging to translate. Preserving the original text, I have translated it as “Mighty (力) is desire (欲) for both sides (於兩面).” However, this translation does not align well with the following three lines, which list three injunctions. To incorporate these three messages, the character ‘力’ would need to mean ‘to strive to remove’ or ‘suppress.’ Unfortunately, no classical Chinese dictionary provides a meaning close to this. I cannot fill in a word such as ‘to remove (除 or 去)’ either, because it would significantly alter the original text. Therefore, I retain the original text at the cost of a streamlined context in this verse.

Bapat suggests that 力 (lì) must be an error for 離 (lí) or another similar character that agrees with Pāli ‘*vineyya*’ (one should remove). However, these two Chinese characters have notably different shapes and origins. Bapat presumes their phonetic similarity, but scribal errors usually occur when the original character has characters with similar shapes or when the same components of a character are arranged differently. Additionally, the two characters he mentioned may not have been pronounced in the 3rd century China the same way as in modern Pinyin;

Sn778 *Ubhosu antesu vineyya chandaṃ*

phassaṃ pariññāya anānugiddho

yad attagarahī tad akubbamāno

na lippatī diṭṭhasutesu dhīro

One should relinquish passion for both ends,

Comprehending sensory experiences, without hankering after them.

Without doing anything blamable,

their reconstructed pronunciations during the Eastern Han period are /lik/ and /li or liə/, respectively, and are somewhat different from one another.

The reference of the phrase ‘兩面’ (both sides) in Y2.7 is not clear. Bapat cites the *Mahāniddesa*, which suggests possible examples of both the ends (e.g., contact—the origin of contact). He also suggests that the two ends might represent the heresies of eternity and of annihilation. However, there is no support for that suggestion in the verse. This phrase appears in Y5.7 under a similar context, but in Y13.42 under a completely different context. In Y5.7, the passage ‘悉無願於兩面’ means “He has no aspiration towards *both sides*.” In Y13.42, the passage ‘悉莫行兩面辭’ means “Do not engage in any speech that is *divisive* (among people).” It is likely that they refer to ‘past and future’ or ‘this life and next life’ since these themes reappear throughout this *sūtra*, such as Y2.2 ‘繫胞胎’ and ‘去來法’ in Y2.2; ‘死甚近’ in Y2.4; ‘生死欲溪流’ in Y2.5; and ‘三世’ in Y2.6.

Y2.7b: Bapat translates the passage ‘彼可覺莫著’ as “with no attachment (莫著), full comprehension (覺) doth he (彼) possess (可?).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, his translation is not entirely accurate. First, the character ‘莫’ denotes an injunction (do not ...), which is different from the character ‘無’ (there is no ...). Next, he does not consider various derivative meanings that the character ‘覺’ may have: it could mean ‘to cognize’ as well. In fact, DDB lists the phrase ‘可覺’ and explains it as ‘to be cognized, cognizable.’ In the context, I believe the phrase ‘彼可覺’ should represent ‘the object of attachment.’ and I have parsed it as ‘those things (彼) that can be (可) cognized (覺).’

Y2.7c: I have parsed the phrase ‘所自怨’ as ‘things (所) that [make you] blame (怨) yourself (自).’ For the sake of readability, I have translated it as ‘things regrettable.’

Y2.7d: In the *Yizujing*, the phrase ‘見聞’ (to see and hear) or ‘聞見’ (to hear and see) operates as a synonym for ‘所見聞’ (what is seen or heard). Yet, this text utilizes the phrase beyond its literal sense: it is best interpreted as ‘views/beliefs or traditions,’ the pillars for disputes or conflicts. It may also be understood as ‘what is seen and heard’ in certain cognitive contexts. Likewise, its Pāli equivalent ‘*diṭṭhasuta*’ can predominantly be translated as ‘beliefs or traditions’ and less frequently as ‘what is seen and heard.’ My primary translation as ‘beliefs or traditions’ may stir academic debate as it challenges the conventional interpretation of these terms as ‘what is seen and heard.’ For a comprehensive discussion on ‘*diṭṭhasuta*,’ refer to the subsequent footnote on Sn778, and for further details about its expanded version ‘*diṭṭha suta muta sīlavata*,’ see Y4. fn8. My preference for translating ‘見’ as ‘beliefs’ instead of ‘views’ ties in with my translation of ‘*diṭṭha*.’ This is thoroughly discussed in the following footnote on Sn778. These references substantiate my choice of translation for both the Chinese phrase ‘見聞’ and the Pāli compound ‘*diṭṭhasuta*.’

The wise do not cling to beliefs or traditions.³¹

Y2.8 覺想觀度海 有我尊不計

力行拔未出 致使乃無疑

Comprehending perceptions, the seer can traverse the ocean.

The sage does not assume the existence of a [permanent] self.

Practice strenuously and extract [the dart] that has not yet been removed.

³¹ **Sn778a:** The Pāli commentaries offer several pairs of binary concepts as potential references for the term ‘*ubhayanta*’ (both ends). For instance, they propose ‘*phassa*’ (contact) and ‘*phassasamudaya*’ (the origin of contact); ‘*aīta*’ (the past) and ‘*anāgata*’ (the future); ‘*sukkhā vedanā*’ (pleasant feeling) and ‘*dukkhā vedanā*’ (painful feeling); among others. However, with the exception of ‘the past and the future,’ these interpretations do not appear to fully align with the context of this sutta. Norman cites Bapat who considers ‘eternalism and annihilationism’ as a potential reference for ‘兩面’ (See fn.29), but ultimately supports the notion of ‘addiction to sensual pleasure and self-mortification,’ drawing from the example of the phrase ‘*dveme antā*’ (two ends) in the *Dhammacakkappavattana sutta* (SN 56.11). Fronsdal footnotes that the term might refer to ‘states of becoming and nonbecoming.’ Bodhi neither endorses any of the commentarial interpretations nor offers his own clarification on this term. Given these considerations, I resist imposing the Theravāda doctrinal tenet on this verse, as such a notion is absent in this sutta. Instead, I infer its meaning from a line in the next verse (Sn779d): ‘*lokaṃ imaṃ paraṃ cā*’ (this world and the beyond). My interpretation aligns with ‘*taṇhāgataṃ bhavesu*’ (craving for [various] modes of existence) from Sn776b and ‘*bhavesu āsattim*’ (attachment to [various] modes of existence) from Sn777d. For related details, refer to Y5. fn.19.

Sn778b: The word ‘*phassam*’ (sensory experience) is a singular noun, but I have translated it as plural for improved readability.

Sn778d: In this context, the compound ‘*diṭṭhasuta*’ is better interpreted as ‘beliefs or traditions.’ While the prevailing academic translation designates it as ‘what is seen and heard,’ such a literal rendition aligns primarily with cognitive processes. In most other contexts, this broad and indistinct interpretation falls short, necessitating a more nuanced rendering. Predominantly, the *Aṭṭhakavagga* employs the terms ‘*diṭṭha*’ and ‘*suta*’ as various bases for ascetic claims within the phrase ‘*diṭṭha suta muta sīlavata*’ (beliefs, traditions, rationales, morality, or vows), rather than to encapsulate all human experiences in the encompassing manner seen in Abhidharma and commentarial literature. ‘*Diṭṭha*,’ originating from the verbal root √*drś* (to see) and appearing in its past participle form, functions synonymously with the noun form ‘*diṭṭhī*’ (view) in this context. Similarly, ‘*suta*,’ a past participle form derived from the verbal root √*śru* (to hear), corresponds with the noun form ‘*suti*’ (revealed tradition). To conclude, in the majority of *Aṭṭhakavagga* contexts, ‘*diṭṭha*’ likely refers to a doctrinal view or belief, while ‘*suta*’ may denote oral traditions unique to certain religious lineages. Although ‘*diṭṭha*’ is more literally translated as ‘view,’ I choose to render it as ‘belief’ to differentiate it from the frequently used term ‘*diṭṭhī*’ (view). Notably, within the *Aṭṭhakavagga*’s context, ‘*diṭṭha*’ is utilized as a basis for ‘*diṭṭhī*’ (view) and ‘*vivāda*’ (dispute). For a related discussion, please refer to Y4. fn.7, 8, 12, and 13.

Then, you will reach [the stage] that is then free from doubt.³²

Sn779 *Saññaṃ pariññā vitareyya oghaṃ*

pariggaḥesu muni nopalitto

abbūlhasallo caraṃ appamatto

nāsiṃsati lokam imaṃ parañ cā ti

[By] comprehending perception, the sage could cross over the flood,

Without being stained by anything related to acquisition.

Leading a life with the dart drawn out, being vigilant,

³² **Y2.8a:** Bapat translates ‘覺想觀度海’ as “Understanding perceptions, of crossing the flood doth he think.” However, using ‘觀’ to mean ‘to think of’ does not fully capture its richness, which traditionally denotes ‘to observe carefully,’ applicable to both physical and mental objects. This interpretation may dilute its meaning, potentially due to the lack of a direct parallel in Sn779a. There are two plausible interpretations. In the first, ‘觀’ acts as a noun meaning ‘seer,’ who is the agent of ‘度海’ (crossing the ocean). Thus, the phrase could be translated as “Comprehending (覺) perceptions (想), the seer (觀) traverses (度) the ocean (海).” This rendering treats this line as independent of the following one. Alternatively, ‘觀’ can function as a verb meaning ‘to observe,’ with ‘度海’ (the ocean) as the object, signifying ‘the path across the sea.’ This could be rendered as “Comprehending perceptions, he observes (觀) the path across (度) the sea (海),” providing a contextual bridge to the subsequent line which discusses the sage’s freedom from ego-centric constraints. I prefer the first translation as it aligns more closely with the nuances of its Pāli counterpart, Sn779a, and maintains the philosophical depth of the original text.

Y2.8b: Bapat stretches a phrase and a character to fit them with their Pāli parallels. He translates the passage ‘有我尊不計’ as “In personal belongings, the Honoured One doth never get mixed up.” His interpretation of the phrase ‘有我’ as ‘personal belongings’ is a stretch. Considering it a Chinese word for ‘*pariggaha*’ (acquisition, belonging) in Sn779b, he may have parsed it as ‘what I (我) have (有).’ However, this interpretation is not well supported either by early Chinese Buddhist translations or by classical Chinese literature. The phrase ‘有我’ in the Buddhist context means ‘existence of self’ or ‘taking the five aggregates to be a unitary self,’ which is not even close to his rendering ‘belonging.’ Similarly, he interprets the character ‘計’ as ‘to get mixed up,’ believing it should be a Chinese term for ‘*upalitta* (to be stained with).’ Nevertheless, ‘計’ means ‘to calculate, plan, or consider,’ which is quite different from his rendering ‘to get mixed up.’

Y2.8c: Bapat translates the passage ‘力行拔未出’ as “With vigour, he takes out [the dart] that lies within.” He omits the translation of the character ‘行’ (to practice). He might have considered ‘行拔’ a phrase meaning ‘to take out,’ but ‘行’ does not precede another verb (i.e., 拔) and then get assimilated to it.

Y2.8d: Bapat translates the passage ‘致使乃無疑’ as “Thus, doth he shape himself, until no doubt (無疑) is left in him.” [Parenthesis added for analysis]. His translation of the phrase ‘致使’ as ‘to shape oneself’ is arbitrary and vague. It should mean ‘to reach (the aforementioned state) and let ...’

They do not desire this world or the beyond.³³

佛說是義足經。比丘歡喜

When the Buddha had expounded this [*sūtra* in] the *Yizujing*, the *bhikṣus* rejoiced.³⁴

³³ **Sn779a:** The term ‘*pariññā*’ can be either a gerund of the verb ‘*parijānāti*’ (to comprehend) or a feminine instrumental singular case of the noun ‘*pariññā*’ (comprehension).

Sn779c: The term ‘*abbūḷha*’ is a past participle of the verb ‘*abbūhati*’ (to draw out). It can further break down as ‘[*ā + vi > āv > abb*] + *√ūh* (to push).’ The term ‘*caram*’ is a masculine nominative singular of the present participle of the verb ‘*carati*’ (to do, walk).

Sn779d: The phrase ‘*nāsiṃsati*’ can break down as ‘*na + āsiṃsati*’ (*ā + √śams*: lit. to praise for the sake of gain [PTSD] > hope for, desire). According to Norman, the change from ‘*śams*’ to ‘*siṃs*’ involves the palatalization of ‘-a-’ to ‘-i-’ following the consonant ‘ś.’

³⁴ 比丘歡喜 = 比丘皆歡喜 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The alternative script includes the addition of ‘皆,’ which could transform the latter part of this epilog into “the *bhikṣus* all rejoiced.”

須陀利經 第三

Discourse 3: Sundarī (*Aṭṭhakavagga.3*)¹

聞如是。佛在舍衛國祇樹給孤獨園。爲國王大臣及理家所待敬。事遇不懈。飯食衣被。臥床疾藥。供所當得。

Thus I heard. The Buddha, during his stay in the kingdom of Śrāvastī, at Jeta's Grove in Anāthapiṇḍada's Park, was venerated and served by kings, high officials, and householders.² Their service and treatment were unwaveringly dedicated, and they provided whatever he needed, [such as] meals, clothing, sleeping cots, and medications.³

是時梵志自坐其講堂共議言。我曹本爲國王大臣人民理家所待遇。今棄不復用。悉反事沙門瞿曇及諸弟子。今我曹當共作方便敗之耳。

At that time, [a group of] brahmins had gathered in their assembly hall and were engaged in

¹ 須陀利經 第三 = 須陀利經 第三 (K, Z) = 須陀利 第三 (P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The character '陀' is an alternative form of '陀,' but its presence does not alter the phonetic transcription.

The term '須陀利' seems a transcription of the Pāli proper name 'Sundarī.' Based on the work of Pulleyblank (1991), we can reconstruct its pronunciation during the Eastern Han dynasty as /Xudali^h/, closely mirroring the original Indic name.

² 理家: This phrase, which I translate as 'householder,' can be literally interpreted as 'managing (理) a house (家).' Its usage can be traced back to the An Li 安禮 chapter (section 1) of the Confucian text *Su Shu* 素書 from the Western Han era (206 BC–9 AD), where it states: "... 如此, 理身, 理家, 理國, 可也." This can translate to "In this way, managing oneself, one's family, and a country is possible." (漢魏叢書 本 素書, 新語: 安禮章, p. 54). Jan Nattier supports this translation, indicating that it was commonly used as an equivalent for the Sanskrit term 'grhapati' in early Chinese Buddhist translations, though it fell out of use after the time of translator Zhi Qian (Nattier, 2003: 22-25, and 208 fn.12). It is worth noting that Zhi Qian's translation for 'grhapati' is not consistent even within the *Yizujing*. In Discourse 10, he translates it as '長者,' a rendering that became prevalent after his time.

³ 事遇: This phrase can be literally interpreted as 'service (事) and treatment (遇).' Although the character '遇' fundamentally means 'to encounter' and has various derived meanings, it denotes 'to treat' in this context. This interpretation is supported by its synonymous phrase '待遇' in the same context in the next paragraph.

臥床 = 臥具床 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Both represent 'sleeping cots.' The addition of the character '具' (equipment) within the phrase does not alter its inherent meaning.

discussion.⁴ [One of them] spoke up: “In the past, we were the ones served and treated by kings, high officials, people, and householders.⁵ [But] now, we have been abandoned and are no longer employed. Instead, they all serve the *śramaṇa* Gautama and all his disciples. We must devise a strategy to defeat them once and for all.⁶

便共議。今但當求我曹部伍中最端正好女共殺之。以其死屍。埋於祇樹間。爾乃毀傷沙門瞿曇及諸弟子。令惡名遠聞。待遇者遠離不復敬之。學者悉不復得衣食。皆當來事我曹。我曹便當爲世尊。壞瞿曇世無能勝我曹者。

Without hesitation, they began to strategize: “We should pick a beautiful and attractive lady from our circles and collectively take her life. We [can then] bury her body in Jeta’s Grove and proceed to defame the *śramaṇa* Gautama and all his disciples, ensuring that their tarnished reputation spreads widely. Those who [once] served and treated [the Buddha’s Saṅgha] would [then] keep their distance, no longer offering them respect. [His] students would find themselves without food and clothing. People would then turn their services towards us, elevating our status in the world.⁷ [We should aim to] bring down the Blessed One, Gautama, ensuring he is unable to defeat us.

⁴ The characters ‘自’ and ‘共’ literally translate to ‘of their own accord’ and ‘together,’ respectively. However, in the interest of maintaining a smooth reading flow in English, I have chosen to omit them in my translation. For a similar reason, I have translated the character ‘坐,’ which literally means ‘to sit,’ as ‘to gather.’

⁵ I have translated ‘本’ (originally) as ‘in the past’ for a better readability.

⁶ 方便: This term is a compound, meaning ‘stratagem’ or ‘expedient means.’

⁷ For the sake of readability, I have taken certain liberties with this translation. The literal interpretation would be, “All would come to serve us. Consequently, we would become the venerated ones in the world.”

即共行謂好首言。汝寧知我曹今棄不復見用。反以沙門瞿曇爲師。汝寧能忿爲衆作利不。

好首言。作利云何。曰唯捨壽命死耳。答言。我不能也。曰汝不能爾者從今以後。終不復內汝著數中也。女聞大不樂。

They then collectively approached [a lady] named Sundarī and put forth [their predicament].⁸

“Are you aware that we have been cast aside now, no longer find necessities, and people consider the *śramaṇa* Gautama their teacher instead? Would you express your anger and take some action for the good of our group, or not?” Sundarī responded, “What [could I possibly] do to benefit [us]?” They answered, “Only through the sacrifice of your life.”⁹ She retorted, “That I cannot do.” They declared, “If you are unable to make [that sacrifice, we will] never again count you as one of us.”¹⁰ Hearing this, she was filled with great sadness.

即言諾。是我職當也。衆學言。善哉。便共教女言。從今以後。朝暮到佛所。數往祇樹間。悉令萬姓見知汝如是我曹共殺汝。埋著祇樹間。令瞿曇得毀辱不。

Before long, she succumbed [to their pressure, conceding]: “This is my obligation that I must fulfill.” The group of adepts applauded: “Excellent!” They then instructed her: “From now on, visit the Buddha’s dwelling [regularly] in the morning and the evening. Frequently appear in

⁸ 好首: This term, combining ‘好’ (beautiful) and ‘首’ (head), appears to be a translation of the Sanskrit proper name ‘Sundarī,’ which literally translates to ‘beautiful (*su-*) lady (*narī*).’ The ‘d’ in ‘Sundarī’ could be an inserted phoneme. Her transcribed name ‘須陀利’ is also found in the title of this discourse.

⁹ 唯捨壽命死耳: This phrase can be literally interpreted as “Only (唯) [through] the sacrifice of your life (捨壽命) and death (死). That’s all (耳).”

唯 = 惟 (S, Y, M): Both can be considered synonymous in this context. Despite the primary meaning of ‘惟’ being ‘to think,’ it can serve as a substitute for ‘唯’ in this usage.

¹⁰ 終不復內汝著數中也: This phrase can be literally interpreted as “[From now on] until the end (終) [of your life, we will] never again (不復) count (著數) you (汝) as one of us (內...中也).”

Jeta's Grove, ensuring everyone recognizes your frequent visits.¹¹ [Then,] we will together take your life and bury you in the grove, leading to Gautama becoming defamed and scandalized or something like that.¹²

小女即承教。數數往來沙門所。令衆人知女如是。便取女殺埋著祇樹間。

Subsequently, the young lady carried out their instructions. Repeatedly, she visited the *śramaṇa*'s residence, ensuring her frequent appearances were well-noted by all.¹³ [At an opportune time,] they seized her, took her life, and buried her within the grove.¹⁴

衆梵志便相聚會。到王宮門。稱怨言。我曹學中。有一女獨端正。花色無雙。今生亡不知處。王謂言。女行來常在何所。共對言。常往來沙門瞿曇所。王言。爾者當於彼求。便從王乞吏兵。王即與之。

The group of brahmins subsequently convened and made their way to the palace gates. Filled with resentment, they loudly proclaimed, “Among our novices was a beautiful single lady whose beauty was unrivaled. Now, we do not know where she is or whether she is alive or dead.” The king queried, “Where did she frequent, and where did she typically reside?” They replied in one

¹¹ I interpret the phrase ‘如是’ (as such) as ‘frequent visits’ in my translation for specificity.

¹² 令瞿曇得毀辱不: The positioning of the character ‘不’ at the end of a sentence typically is the tag question ‘... or not?’ leaving room for a slight uncertainty. However, in this context, this direct rendering does not fit well. As an alternative, I interpret it as ‘or something like that.’

¹³ Once again, I have interpreted the phrase ‘如是’ (as such) as ‘frequent appearances’ in my translation for added clarity. I have also used passive voice in the sentence to provide some variety in sentence construction.

¹⁴ 便取女殺埋著祇樹間: The character ‘著’ in this case is, according to its entry in CJKV-E, “an auxiliary character that intensifies or signifies the successful completion of the verb to which it is affixed.” CJKV-E, n.d. In this instance, it refers to the completion of the actions ‘killing and burying.’ “CJKV-E. (n.d.). Retrieved November 4, 2023, from [<http://www.buddhism-dict.net/cgi-bin/xpr-cjkve.pl?q=%E8%91%97>].”

voice, “She frequented the *śramaṇa* Gautama’s place.” The king responded, “You should seek her there.” They then implored the king to provide them with officers and soldiers. The king acquiesced to their request on the spot.¹⁵

尋求行轉到祇樹間。便掘出死屍著床上。共持於舍衛四道。悉遍里巷稱怨言。衆人觀沙門瞿曇釋家子。常稱言德戒弘普無上。如何私與女人通。殺埋藏之。如是當有何法何德何戒行乎。

As they were conducting their search, they gradually made their way to Jeta’s Grove. [Upon arrival,] they unearthed a corpse that was attached to a cot. The brahmins transported her through the four main roads of Śrāvastī. They traversed the villages and crossroads, voicing their resentment loudly: “Everyone reveres the ascetic Gautama, the son of the Śākya family, praising his virtues and conduct as expansive, omnipresent, and unparalleled.¹⁶ So how could he hold clandestine meetings with the lady, then murder her and bury her body? Given these circumstances, what kind of dharma, virtues, and conduct could he possibly possess?

食時衆比丘。悉持應器。入城乞食。衆理家人民。遙見便罵言。是曹沙門。自稱言有法德戒。子曹所犯若此。當有何善。奈何復得衣食。

As mealtime approached, all the *bhikṣus*, carrying their begging-bowls, entered the village to seek alms. A gathering of householders and villagers, observing [the *bhikṣus*] from a distance, hurled insults: “These are the *śramaṇas* who boast of possessing dharma, virtues, and conduct. If

¹⁵ The sentence literally translates as ‘The king immediately gave them [to the brahmins].’

¹⁶ My translation of ‘觀’ as ‘to revere’ is a free translation. The character literally interprets as ‘to observer’ or ‘to contemplate.’

their crime matches [the accusations made by the brahmins], what merit could they possibly have? How can they continue to receive clothes and food?”

衆比丘聞如是。持空應器。出城洗手足。盛藏應器到佛所。作禮悉住不坐。如事具說。是時佛說偈言

A group of *bhikṣus* overheard these accusations. Carrying their unfilled bowls, they exited the town, cleansed their hands and feet, and stored their bowls [safely].¹⁷ They then made their way to the Buddha’s abode. After observing the appropriate formalities, they stood at their designated spots but refrained from sitting. They recounted all the aforementioned incidents to [the Buddha]. In response, the Buddha instructed them in verse.

Y3.1 無想放意妄語 衆鬥被箭忍痛

聞凡放善惡言 比丘忍無亂意

Thoughtlessly voicing their deceptive words,

People clash, pierced by arrows [of discord], enduring the hurt.

Hearing their words, whether they are spat out well or ill,

A *bhikṣu* bears them, his thought undisturbed.¹⁸

¹⁷ 盛藏: I have interpreted this phrase as ‘to store,’ treating it as ‘to arrange orderly (盛) and to store (藏)’ and thus removing redundancy. This usage of ‘盛’ is often seen in classical Chinese literature. For instance, in the Way to Be a Son 子道 chapter (section 5) of the *Xunzi* 荀子, we encounter the passage: “子路盛服而見孔子,” which translates to “Zilu, having dressed himself properly, [went to] see Confucius.” (四部叢刊初編 本 荀子: 子道, p. 76).

¹⁸ **Y3.1a:** In this context, the phrase ‘無想’ does not carry the Buddhist doctrinal denotation of ‘without ideation’ (*asaṃjñā*, or *animitta*) or ‘freedom from mental proliferation’ (*nipprapañca*). Instead, it is used in a more generic sense to mean ‘thoughtlessly.’

Ud4.8 *Tudanti vācāya janā asaññatā*

Sarehi saṅgāmagataṃ 'va kuñjaraṃ

Sutvāna vākyam pharusam udīritam

*Adhivāsaya bhikkhu aduṭṭhacitto*¹⁹

Unrestrained people spear [each other] with [their] words

Like [they do] with arrows a tusker engaged in battle.

Upon hearing harsh words spoken,

A monk should weather them with an undisturbed mind.

佛告比丘。我被是妄謗。不過七日耳。

The Buddha addressed the *bhikkhus*: “I have been wronged by this false accusation. (However,) this will not persist for more than seven days.”

是時有清信女。字惟閭。於城中聞比丘求食悉空還。甚鄙念佛及比丘僧。便疾行到祇樹。

至佛所頭面作禮。繞佛坐一邊。佛爲廣說經法。惟閭聞經竟起。叉手白佛言。願尊及比丘

The phrase ‘放意’ literally interprets as ‘to let one’s mind (意) express itself without control (放).’ I believe the meaning of ‘放’ is already conveyed in the phrase ‘無想’ (thoughtlessly), so I have simplified the translation of ‘放意’ to ‘to voice.’

Y3.1b: Bapat translates ‘衆鬥被箭忍痛’ as “Fighting and piercing with arrows [of words], to be endured with pain.” This interpretation appears to be missing some elements. He has not included the translation for ‘衆’ (people). Also, the character ‘被’ is a passive particle that comes before a verb, indicating the phrase ‘被箭’ should be understood as ‘to get pierced’ rather than ‘to pierce.’ It seems he may have associated ‘被’ with ‘忍’ (to endure), when it should instead be linked with the immediately following verb ‘箭’ (to pierce).

¹⁹ This verse, identified by Bapat as parallel to the Chinese verse Y3.1, is sourced from the *Exalted Utterances*, known as the Pāli *Udāna*.

僧。從我家飯七日。佛默然受之。惟閻便繞佛三匝而去。

Around this time, a devout laywoman named Weiyan (Exclusive Beauty), heard in the town that *bhikṣus* were returning from their alms rounds with empty [bowls].²⁰ Filled with deep respect for the Buddha and the *Bhikṣusaṃgha*, she quickly made her way to Jeta's Grove.²¹ Upon reaching the Buddha's place, she paid her respects by touching her forehead [to the Buddha's feet]. After circumambulating the Buddha, she sat to one side. The Buddha then extensively taught her the *sūtra-dharma*. Having listened to [the teaching], Weiyan rose and, with her hands clasped together, said to the Buddha: “I wish the Blessed One and the *Bhikṣusaṃgha* come to my home to have meals for seven days.” The Buddha consented by remaining silent. Weiyan then circumambulated the Buddha thrice and departed.

至七日。佛告阿難。汝與衆比丘。入城悉於里巷四徼街道說偈言

When the seventh day arrived, the Buddha instructed Ānanda: “You and the assembly of *bhikṣus* should enter the town and recite these verses in the villages, crossroads, four borders, and

²⁰ Bapat interprets ‘惟閻’ as a transcription of Viśākhā, a prominent female disciple of the Buddha. However, the reconstructed pronunciation of these characters during the Eastern Han period is /wi-jiam/, which does not seem to align as closely as he suggests. Therefore, I have chosen to use the Pinyin transcription in my translation.

清信女 = 清淨女 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): These terms both refer to a laywoman: the former means ‘woman of pure faith,’ and the latter signifies ‘woman of purity.’

²¹ 鄙念: This phrase appears only once here within the entire Chinese Buddhist translations and is rare in classical Chinese literature. Though Bapat translates it as “take pity on”—a translation that might fit the context—there is little evidence in literary works to support this interpretation. The character ‘鄙’ does not mean ‘to sympathize,’ but is closer in meaning to ‘to despise.’ However, this character can also signify ‘humble’ and serve as a humble form of ‘I.’ Given this interpretation, the phrase ‘鄙念’ may express ‘deep respect’ by self-abasement of Weiyan, rather than exaltation of the Buddha. This suggests that she holds the Buddha and the Saṅgha in humble reverence. In my translation, I render the phrase ‘甚鄙念’ as ‘filled with deep respect for.’

鄙念 = 卹念 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The character ‘卹’ signifies ‘sympathy’ or ‘pity,’ leading to the interpretation of ‘甚卹念’ as ‘deeply sympathetic.’ It is plausible that Bapat employed this alternate character from other recensions of the text without providing explicit notice.

residential areas.

Y3.2 常欺倒邪冥 說作身不犯

重冥行欺具 自怨到彼苦²²

[Those brahmins] have slandered [us], perverted by sinister darkness.

They allege [we] committed a bodily violation that [we] did not perpetrate.

Deeply deluded, they have spun deceptive plots [against us],

[And in return] they will find themselves resentful and plunged into future distress.²³

²² The following five verses (Y3.2–6) comprise what Ānanda is instructed to recite during his alms round. As such, they carry a tone quite distinct from the other verses we find in the *Yizujing*. These five verses do not seem to have Pāli equivalents, maybe because they were improvised to make the *Yizujing* narratives seamless. Most verses that have Pāli counterparts are independent of the narratives, with the narratives seeking to explain the origins of the verses. Bapat’s translation of these verses tends to misinterpret them in an effort to align them with the general tones of the standalone verses.

²³ The Y3.2 verse informs people of the false accusations set up by the brahmins against the Buddha and the impending consequences of these deceptive schemes for the brahmins themselves. Bapat translates this verse as “By constant deceit [*sic*], evil darkness doth one reach; what he says he doth practice, though rules he may not violate. Even in dense darkness, deceitful [*sic*] tricks he doth play, and thus gets himself hated, and suffering doth he reach as well.” His translation introduces an indefinite person ‘one,’ overlooking the crucial role this verse plays in the narrative context.

Y3.2a: The character ‘常’ typically denotes ‘constant,’ ‘common,’ or ‘established,’ but it can also serve as an adverb implying that the subsequent action has already taken place. Consequently, the phrase ‘常欺’ translates as ‘have already slandered.’

倒 = 到 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): With the alternative character, this line may read as “[Those brahmins] have deceived [us], led astray into (到) the malevolent darkness.”

Y3.2b: I interpret the phrase ‘說作身不犯’ as “They allege (說) we committed (作) a bodily (身) violation that we did not perpetrate (不犯)”

Y3.2c: The character ‘具’ presents a translation challenge. I interpret it figuratively as ‘plots’ drawing on its basic meaning of ‘tool’. An alternative reading may consider it as an adjective ‘complete,’ rendering the phrase ‘欺具’ as ‘a complete deception.’

Y3.2d: The phrase ‘到彼苦’ alludes to the Buddhist doctrine of *saṃsāra* (the cycle of rebirth). In this context, the character ‘彼’ (that, the other) appears to refer to the subsequent life.

Y3.3 修地利分具 不守怨自賊

惡言截頭本 常關守其門

When engaging in alms-round,

If unprotected [from] the enemies [of sensory stimuli],

[you risk] becoming a thief unto yourself.

Nip hostile words in the bud before they are even spoken.

Keep the gates of your [senses securely] locked and vigilantly guarded.²⁴

Y3.4 當尊反興毀 尊空無戒人

從口內衆憂 嫉心衆不安

If respected ones, contrary to [expectations], induce slander,

The respect [they have earned] becomes in vain; they are just undisciplined individuals.

²⁴ **Y3.3a**, 地利分具: This phrase can be translated as ‘distribution (分) of the land’s bounty (地利) into a bowl (具),’ which I interpret as ‘alms-round.’ Bapat’s translation of this line as “while practising [*sic*] things that bring worldly reward” overlooks the characters ‘分’ and ‘具.’

The phrase ‘地利’ or ‘地之利’ meaning ‘the production from the land’ is abundant in both Chinese Buddhist translations and classical Chinese literature. For example, in the Common People 庶人 chapter (section 1) of the *Xiaojing* 孝經 (*The Discourse on Filial Piety*), we find the passage, “用天之道, 分地之利, 謹身節用, 以養父母,” which translates to “Using the Way of the Heaven, we harness the yield of the land. Through prudent consumption [of these resources], we should support our parents.” (武英殿十三經注疏 本, 孝經注: 庶人, p. 83).

Y3.3b: The most suitable interpretation of the character ‘怨’ (enemy) is ‘sensory stimuli.’ If unprotected (不守) from this enemy (怨), monks risk becoming thieves (賊) to themselves (自). It is their own greed that poses the threat. Bapat’s translation of this line as “If unrestrained, he gets himself hated and does himself harm” does not accurately capture this meaning.

Y3.3c: Bapat translates this line as “Evil words (惡言) cut (截) the very root [i.e., nape] (本) of the head (頭).” [Parentheses added for clarification]. However, in his translation, what ‘the head’ refers to in this context is ambiguous. I interpret ‘頭本’ as a pleonastic compound, literally ‘at their head and root,’ which signifies ‘at the inception of its formation.’ To maintain clarity while preserving the original imagery, I have rendered it as ‘in the bud before they are even spoken.’

Y3.3d: Once again, I interpret ‘其門’ (the gate) to refer to ‘sensory doors.’

Their words stir unease amongst the masses,

[And their] jealousy disrupts the peace of the people.²⁵

Y3.5 搏掩利人財 力欺亦可致

是悉皆可忍 是最以亡寶

Gambling can rapidly exhaust one's wealth.

Enforcement [by officials] or fraud can indeed lead to [a similar result].

[While] all these [misfortunes] might be endured [by some],

The gravest [loss comes] from forsaking the [Triple] Gems.²⁶

²⁵ **Y3.4:** This verse makes sense when we consider the character ‘當’ as a conjunction meaning ‘if’ or ‘when,’ ‘尊’ as ‘respected ones’ referring to those brahmins who slandered the Buddha and his Saṅgha, and ‘衆’ as a crowd or the general public.

Y3.4ab: I interpret ‘興’ as ‘to start, build.’

當尊反興毀 = 常尊及與毀(S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): A possible interpretation of ‘常尊及與毀’ could be “Frequently, esteemed individuals may encounter [instances of] being slandered.” Here, ‘尊’ refers to the Buddha and his Saṅgha. This interpretation might adjust the next line, Y3.4b, to read as “These esteemed individuals are falsely [accused of] being undisciplined.” Bapat translation of Y3.4a as “The Honoured One (尊) has often (常) met (及與) the [public] revile (毀)” appears to follow this alternative reading. [Parentheses added for analysis].

Y3.4cd: For enhanced readability, I have taken some liberty with this translation. Y3.4c can be literally translated as ‘From [their] words, anxiety [stirs] among the crowd,’ and Y3.4d as ‘[Their] jealousy [makes] the public unease.’

²⁶ **Y3.5a:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘搏掩利人財’ as “To get the reward of this treasure peculiar to men.” However, in this translation, he overlooks a key phrase ‘搏掩’ (Po Yan), which was a type of gambling that was widely-known in ancient China.

搏掩 = 博掩 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): We find a related passage in the *Sound and Meaning of All Sūtras* 一切經音義 (T2128.54.0789a01), compiled by Hui Lin 慧琳 during the Tang dynasty, “博掩: 博, 博戲也, 用六著六棊, 謂之六博. 掩, 圍棊也.” This translates to “Bo Yan: ‘Bo’ refers to the Bo game, played with six pieces on a six-line board, known as Liu Bo. ‘Yan’ refers to a board game.” The Biography of Wang Fu 王符傳 (section 12) from the *Book of the Later Han* 後漢書 also offers insight into this game with the statement: “或以遊博持掩為事,” which translates to “Some people used the Bo game as a cover for their activities.” Li Xian 李賢, the commentator of the biography, provides an annotation for this, indicating, “博, 六博; 掩, 意錢也.” This translates to ‘Bo’ refers to the ‘Liubo [game]’; ‘Yan’ signifies ‘money [for betting].’ (武英殿二十四史 本 後漢書: 王充王符仲長統列傳, p. 98). Taking these references into account and considering the context of Y3.5, I translate the term as ‘gambling.’

The character ‘利’ is best understood as a verb indicating ‘to exploit,’ ‘to covet,’ or ‘to forcibly seize.’ The *Complete Collection of Ancient and Modern Characters* 古今文字集成 offers an example of verbal usage of ‘利’

Y3.6 有怨於正人 世六餘有五

惡有道致彼 坐意行不正

欺咤有十萬

Even the righteous can become targets of resentment.

People possess the six [sensory doors] and the five [aggregates],

Through which evil can infiltrate.

[If individuals] remain [idle] with their minds straying from the right path,

Deception and slander may [proliferate], reaching millions [of people].²⁷

with a somewhat aggressive undertone as follows: “3. 占; 謀利 [forcibly occupy; seize; hold]. 如: 利人妻女...” This can be translated as “3. To occupy; to exploit [forcibly occupy; seize; hold]. For example: ‘to take advantage of someone’s wife and daughter’...” CCAMC, n.d. Given this reference, I have translated it as ‘rapidly exhaust.’ Refer to Y10 fn.48 for a similar usage of ‘利.’

“CCAMC (n.d.). Retrieved November 4, 2023, from [<http://ccamc.co/cjkv.php?cjkv=%E5%88%A9>]).”

Y3.5b: Bapat’s translation of the phrase ‘力欺亦可致’ as “He vigorously practises deceive [*sic*] and gets the same” is imprecise and ambiguous. I have interpreted this phrase as “Force (力) or fraud (欺) can (可) indeed (亦) lead to (致) [a similar result].” In this context, ‘force’ could either imply ‘state force’ or ‘robbery,’ while ‘a similar result’ refers to ‘the depletion of one’s wealth.’

Y3.5c: Bapat’s translation of the phrase ‘是悉皆可忍’ as “Thus, he becomes an object of hatred all around” is incorrect. The character ‘忍’ denotes ‘to endure’ not ‘to hate.’

Y3.5d: Bapat interprets the character ‘寶’ as a synonym for ‘財’ in the first line. However, in my interpretation, it refers to the ‘Triple Gems—the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Saṅgha.’ In this light, Y3.5 conveys the message that losing faith in the Triple Gems is a more severe concern than losing wealth. This verse underscores the severity of the slander the brahmins incurred.

²⁷ **Y3.6:** This verse emphasizes the concept that adhering to the right path can deter the spread of slander. My interpretation significantly differs from Bapat’s. Bapat translates this verse as, “He has nothing but hatred for men that are good. To the six-fold world and to existences five, to boot, to the path of life that is evil, doth he himself betake, thinking all the while of practising [*sic*] his wicked deceit [*sic*], which he hails as being ten-thousands in kind.” Bapat’s understanding of ‘the six-fold world’ (世六) is ambiguous. If he is referring to the ‘six realms of rebirth,’ he should provide a relevant connection to other components of this verse. His translation of ‘有五’ to ‘existences five’ is also uncertain, as he is also unclear about ‘十萬,’ which literally means ‘hundreds of thousands.’ I will explain why I translate this verse quite differently from his translation.

Y3.6a: This line can be literally interpreted as “Resentment may arise even against the righteous individuals,” reflecting the present slander directing towards the Buddha and the Saṅgha.

Y3.6bc: The numbers ‘six’ and ‘five’ in Y3.6b, ‘世六餘有五,’ likely signify the six sensory doors and the five aggregates, respectively. This interpretation is corroborated by Y3.6c, which states that these paths serve as

阿難即受教。俱入城。於里巷四街道。說如佛所言。即時舍衛人民。及諸里家。皆生意言釋家子實無惡。學在釋家。終不有邪行。

Ānanda immediately took the instructions to heart. All [of the *bhikṣus*] proceeded into the town, where they echoed the Buddha's words in villages, at crossroads, and within residential districts. Promptly, every townsperson in Śrāvastī, including all the householders, reflected [on these words and] expressed, "The Son of Śākya has indeed committed no wrongdoings.²⁸ After all, the adepts in the Śākyan tradition have never engaged in misconduct."

是時衆異梵志。自於講堂有所訟。中有一人。言露子曹事。於外出聲言。汝曹自共殺好

conduits for evil to infiltrate individuals. These numerals are recurrent in ancient Chinese Buddhist translations. For instance, in the *Commentary on the Great Perfection of Wisdom* 大智度論, translated by Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什, the phrase '生今世六情五衆身' can be interpreted as "Born in this life, we possess our existence [身] [comprising] the six sensory doors and the five aggregates." (T1509.25.0377a12–13).

According to the DDB, the term '六情' (six sense-organs) is an early rendering of '*ṣaḍāyatana* (Pāli, *chalāyatana*),' which represents the eye, ear, nose, tongue, skin, and mind. The DDB also presents another usage of '六情,' referring to six emotions: joy, anger, despair, happiness, love, and hatred. However, this interpretation does not align well with our current context. Other terms such as '六依' (six sense-bases), '六入' (six sense-doors), '六根' (six sense-faculties), and '六處' (six sense-bases) carry a similar meaning across Chinese Buddhist translations.

The number 'five' also holds significance in ancient Chinese Buddhist translations, as indicated by the term '五衆.' This term, a unique translation by Kumārajīva, is synonymous with the Buddhist concept of '五蘊' (five aggregates): form, feeling, perception, mental formations, and consciousness. While the DDB presents another interpretation of '五衆,' referring to the five categories of Buddha's disciples—*bhikṣu*, *bhikṣuṇī*, *śkiṣamāṇā*, *śrāmaṇera*, *śrāmaṇerikā*—this interpretation does not align with our current context.

The term '餘有' literally translates to 'additionally (餘), there is (有)...' and is commonly used in conjunction with numeric terms to function similarly to 'and.'

I have interpreted '世' as 'the people in this generation.'

Y3.6de: These two lines continue the preceding ones, stating that the lack of vigilance escalates the spread of slander. In this context, I translate '坐' as 'to remain' and take the liberty of translating '十萬' as 'a million' to improve readability.

²⁸ 里家 = 理家 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Both the terms signify 'householder': the former can directly be interpreted as 'village (里) family (家)' or '[those who] dwell (里) in a family (家),' while the latter, as '[those who] manage (理) a family (家).'

首。而怨佛及弟子乎。

At that time, a different group of brahmins were engaged in a debate within an assembly hall.

One of them declared, “I will expose your deeds!” He then stepped outside and loudly proclaimed, “They themselves conspired to murder Sundarī and subsequently pinned the blame on the Buddha and his disciples.”

大臣聞是聲。便入啓王。王即召衆梵志問。汝曹自共殺好首不。便言實爾。王怒曰。當重罰子曹。奈何於我國界。自稱爲道。而有殺害之心。即勅傍臣。悉收子曹。遍徇舍衛城里巷匝。逐出國界去。

A high vassal overheard this claim and immediately rushed to [the palace] to report it to the king. In response, the king summoned the group of brahmins and asked [them]: “Was it you who conspired to murder Sundarī or not?” They then admitted, “Yes, that’s true.” The king, in a fit of rage, declared, “You deserve severe punishment. How dare you profess adherence to the path in my realm, yet harbor intentions of murder and harm in your hearts?” He immediately ordered his attending vassal to arrest these brahmins and to parade them [as criminals] throughout Śrāvastī—in the town, villages, crossroads, and its outskirts—before expelling them from the state.²⁹

²⁹ Bapat’s translation of this passage reads, “He ordered another minister to search them all, to scatter [his men] all along the city of Śrāvastī, through squares and lanes, to chase them out and drive them beyond the borders of his territory.” However, this translation lacks precision. It is a stretch to translate ‘收’ as ‘to search.’ The character’s primary meaning is ‘to gather’ and is translated as ‘to arrest’ in the given context. Furthermore, there are no words in the original text that correspond to ‘to scatter’ and ‘to chase.’ The original text also does not suggest any directives from the king regarding the followers of the brahmins.

匝 = 遞 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Both the terms denote ‘the outskirts.’

佛以食時。從諸比丘。皆持應器入城。時有清信士。名阿須利。遙見佛。便往作禮。揚聲白佛言。聞者不識四方名心甚悲。所聞經法。不能復誦。聞佛及比丘僧怨被惡名。佛謂阿須利言。不適有是宿命因緣。佛便說偈言

At mealtime, the Buddha and the *bhikṣus* accompanying him picked up their bowls and made their way into the town. During that time, a devout layman by the name of Axuli, spotted the Buddha from a distance. He then approached, paying his respects [before] speaking in a resonant voice to the Buddha, “Everyone heard that the Buddha and the *Bhikṣusaṃgha* had been maligned and detested. Thereupon, they became [so disoriented], unable to recognize even the names of the four directions; their hearts were filled with sorrow, unable to recite the *sūtra* teachings that they had previously learned.”³⁰ The Buddha replied to Axuli, “This is not [an isolated incident]; it is causally linked with past lives.”³¹ The Buddha then recited these verses:

Y3.7 亦毀於少言 多言亦得毀

³⁰ 聞者不識四方名心甚悲。所聞經法。不能復誦。聞佛及比丘僧怨被惡名: In my translation, I have rearranged the phrases for clarity and divided them into two sentences to enhance readability as follows: “Everyone heard about (聞者) the slander (聞佛及比丘僧怨被惡名). [Thereupon], they became [disoriented]... (不識四方名心甚悲。所聞經法。不能復誦).”

聞者 = 聞者 (K, Z): The term ‘聞者’ translates to ‘those who have heard,’ whereas ‘聞者’ is indicative of a ‘spy’ or ‘secret agent.’ Given the context, the use of the latter may be a scribal oversight.

³¹ 不適有是: The phrase ‘不適’ is an adverbial phrase meaning ‘not only,’ which makes the full phrase ‘不適有是’ translates as ‘[I] have had not only this [incident].’ The DDB lists ‘only’ as one of the meanings for the character ‘適.’ Karashima has noted in his *Lokakṣema Glossary* that ‘適’ often forms a phrase with a negative word, resulting in the meaning ‘not at all.’ The CJKV-E provides this interpretation of ‘不適’ (not only) along with its synonyms ‘不啻’ and ‘不僅.’ To illustrate the use of the term ‘不啻,’ one can turn to the Numerous Officers 多士 chapter (section 7) of the *Official Documents* 尚書: “爾不克敬, 爾不啻不有爾土, 予亦致天之罰于爾躬!” This translates to “If you fail to obey with respect, you will not only lose your lands, but I will also bring down upon you the fullest extent of Heaven’s punishments.” (武英殿十三經注疏 本, 尚書正義: 多士, p. 96)

Bapat translates the sentence ‘不適有是宿命因緣’ as “No, it is just because of past life.” However, he overlooks the adverbial phrase ‘不適’ and fails to adequately address the referent of the pronoun ‘是.’

亦毀於忠言 世惡無不毀

One can be disparaged for saying little,

Or for saying a lot,

And even for speaking sincerely.

In [this] wicked world, no one escapes disparagement.³²

Dh227 *Nindanti tuṇhimāsīnaṃ, nindanti bahubhāṇinaṃ;*

*Mitabhāṇimpi nindanti, natthi loke anindito.*³³

They cast blame on one who remains silent,

They cast blame on one who speaks excessively,

They cast blame on one who speaks moderately.

In this world, there is no one free from criticism.

Y3.8 過去亦當來 現在亦無有

誰盡壽見毀 難形尚敬難

³² **Y3.7:** In this verse, the term ‘毀’ (to disparage) appears repetitively. To maintain stylistic variety and readability, I have chosen to use this rendering sparingly—specifically twice—while opting to omit it in lines b and c. This approach helps to avoid redundancy and enhances the poetic flow of the translation.

Y3.7c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘忠言’ as ‘to speak moderate,’ presumably interpreting ‘moderate’ as meaning ‘neither too much nor too little.’ However, this translation is incorrect. The character ‘忠’ does not carry such a connotation. He might have mistaken it for ‘中’ (middle) or attempted to align it with its Pāli parallel from *Dhammapada* 227.

忠言 = 惡言 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The term ‘忠言’ translates to ‘sincere words,’ while ‘惡言’ means ‘abusive words.’ ‘惡言’ itself is worth criticism and may not well serve as an example of people’s tendency to criticize others regardless of reasons.

³³ The credit goes to Bapat for identifying the Pāli parallels from the *Dhammapada* verses 227-228.

In the past, the future,
Or the present, there is no one,
Who is slandered throughout their entire lives.
Such a thing is rare. Even rarer is being honored [for their whole life].³⁴

Dh228 *Na cāhu na ca bhavissati, na cetaahi vijjati;*

Ekantaṃ nindito poso, ekantaṃ vā pasamsito.

No one has ever been, nor will ever be, nor is at present found,
Who is entirely criticized or wholly praised.

佛廣爲阿須利說經。便到須達家。直坐正座。須達便爲佛作禮。叉手言。我屬者悲。身不
識方面。所聞經法不能復誦。聞佛及比丘僧怨被惡名。佛是時說偈言

The Buddha expounded the *sūtra* to Axuli in detail. Afterwards, he proceeded to Xuta's
residence, where he directly took his seat with due dignity. Xuta, [in turn], bowed to the Buddha
and spoke with his hands clasped together, "Recently, I was consumed by sorrow to hear that the
Buddha and the *Bhikṣusamgha* had been maligned and detested.³⁵ Thereupon, I became [so

³⁴ **Y3.8d**: The structure of this line could be read as '...is rare (難); ...is even rarer (尚難).' Bapat's translation, "Or, throughout life, has all been praised—rare indeed!", does not reflect the repetition of the character '難.' Furthermore, he may have erroneously translated '尚' as 'or.' If that is not the case, it seems he has omitted its translation.

³⁵ 屬者: This phrase can be interpreted as 'recently' or 'these days' in this context. The DDB provides its synonyms '近者' and '頃者.'

聞佛 = 坐佛 (K, Z): Korean and Zhonghua editions may have read the character '坐' as a conjunction 'because,' rendering '坐佛及比丘僧怨被惡名' as "because the Buddha and the *Bhikṣusamgha* had been maligned and detested." The usage of '坐' as 'because' can be found in the Biography of Mayuan 馬援列傳 (Section 1) from the *Houhanshu* 後漢書: "坐兄何羅反 被誅." This translates to "He was executed because his brother, Heluo, rebelled." (武英殿二十四史 本 後漢書: 馬援列傳, p. 2).

disoriented], unable to recognize even the four directions and failing to recite the *sūtra* teachings that I had previously learned.” The Buddha, at this moment, instructed him in verse:

Y3.9 我如象行鬥 被瘡不著想

念我忍意爾 世人無喜念

I am akin to an elephant charging through the battlefield,

Struck by a spear, [yet] giving no heed to the wound.

[Similarly], with mindfulness, I simply endure thoughts [of others’ assaults].

Few in the world possess such blissful awareness.³⁶

Dh320 *Ahaṃ nāgoḥ saṅgāme, cāpato patitaṃ saram;*

Ud29.21 *Ativākyam titikkhissam, dussīlo hi bahujjano.*³⁷

Like an elephant in the battlefield struck by arrows shot from bows,

I will endure abuse. There are many, indeed, who lack [such] virtue.

³⁶ **Y3.9d**, 喜念 = 善念 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): This alternative phrase ‘世人無善念’ can be translated as “Few in the world possess such skillful awareness.”

Bapat’s translation of the phrase ‘無喜念’ as ‘wicked thoughts’ seems far-fetched. This phrase literally translates as ‘without (無) blissful (喜) mindfulness (念).’ For improved readability, ‘mindfulness’ has been replaced with ‘awareness.’

³⁷ The credit goes to Bapat for identifying parallels in the Pāli *Dhammapada* (lines from verses 320 and 124) and *Udāna* (lines from verses 29.21 and 28.15). This confluence of lines from both the *Dhammapada* and the *Udāna* underscores the fluidity of such ancient collections, echoing Schopen’s (2009) reference to ‘the absence of an urtext.’

Y3.10 我手無瘡瘍 以手把毒行

無瘡毒從生 善行惡不成

[If] my hands bear no wounds,

I [could] grasp poison without harm.

[Just as] no venom can enter unbroken skin,

Evil cannot subdue one who engages in wholesome deeds.³⁸

Dh124 *Pāṇimhi ce vaṇo nāssa, hareyya pāṇinā viṣaṃ;*

Ud28.15 *Nābbaṇaṃ viṣamanveti, natthi pāpaṃ akubbato.*

If there is no wound on the hand,

One could hold poison with the hand.

[For] Poison does not penetrate where there is no wound.

[Likewise,] there is no evil for those who do not generate karma.

³⁸ **Y3.10b:** In this context, the character ‘行’ implies ‘to continue’ or ‘to proceed.’ I have taken some liberties to translate it as ‘without harm.’

瘡瘍 = 瘡痒 (S, Y, M): Both the terms signify ‘wound,’ ‘injury,’ or ‘cut.’

Y3.10c: This phrase ‘從生’ can mean ‘to come forth’ or ‘to appear,’ which results in a literal translation of this line as “Poisoning through cuts will not occur.” To establish a contrast with Y3.10d, which mentions ‘evil’ and ‘good deeds,’ this line has been rendered with ‘venom’ and ‘unbroken skin.’

Y3.10d: In this context, the character ‘成’ can be interpreted as ‘to subjugate’ or ‘to resolve.’ An example of this usage can be seen in the chapter of Duke Huan, the Second Year 桓公二年 from the *Spring and Autumn Annals* 春秋: “三月, 公會齊侯, 陳侯, 鄭伯, 于稷, 以成宋亂.” This translates to “In the third month, the Duke [Huan of Qi] met with the Marquis of Qi, the Marquis of Chen, and the Earl of Zheng in Ji to settle the chaos in the state of Song.” (武英殿十三經注疏 本, 春秋左傳正義: 桓公二年, p. 10).

佛廣爲須達說經。便到維閻家。直坐正座。維閻作禮竟。叉手言。屬者我悲。身不識方面。所聞經法。不能復誦。聞佛及比丘僧怨被惡名。佛因爲維閻說偈言

The Buddha explained the *sūtra* to Xuta in detail. Afterwards, he proceeded to Weiyan's house, where he directly took his seat with due dignity.³⁹ After paying homage to the Buddha, Weiyan clasped her hands together and said, "Recently, I was consumed by sorrow to hear that the Buddha and the *Bhikṣusaṃgha* had been maligned and detested. Thereupon, I became [so disoriented], unable to recognize even the four directions and failing to recite the *sūtra* teachings that I had previously learned." Caused by this incident, the Buddha instructed Weiyan in verse.

Y3.11 無曉欲使惱 內淨外何汚

愚人怨自誤 向風揚細塵

The ignorant are itching to stir up trouble.

[But] how could external [factors] corrupt one whose heart is pure?

The foolish wrong themselves [by harboring] resentment,

[Much like] casting dust against the wind.⁴⁰

³⁹ 維閻 = 惟閻 (S, Y, M): The two characters '維' and '惟' are homophones, sharing the same pronunciation in both Pinyin, /wéi/, and in the Eastern Han pronunciation, /jwi/.

⁴⁰ **Y3.11a:** The phrase '無曉欲使惱' can be translated as "Ignorant people (無曉) are itching (欲) to stir up (使) trouble (惱)." Here, '無曉' literally means 'without awakening,' which I view as synonym of '愚人' in Y3.11c. Alternatively, the phrase could be translated as "No one (無) really understands (曉) that desire (欲) incites (使) distress (惱)." However, in the given context of the verse, the former interpretation appears to be a better fit.

Y3.11c: This phrase '愚人怨自誤' is rendered as "The ignorant (愚人) wrong themselves (自誤) [by harboring] resentment (怨)."

Dh125 *Yo appaduṭṭhassa narassa dussati, suddhassa posassa anaṅgaṇassa;*

Tameva bālaṃ pacceṭi pāpaṃ, sukhumo rajo paṭivātaṃva khitto.

Whoever harms a harmless person, one pure and innocent,

Upon that very fool the evil recoils, like fine dust thrown against the wind.

維閻是時。快飯食佛比丘僧竟。澡水與下坐。聽佛說經。佛爲說守戒淨行。悉見諸道便而去。

After the Buddha and the *Bhikṣusaṃgha* had finished their refreshing meals and washed [their bowls], Weiyan then took a modest seat and requested a teaching from the Buddha.⁴¹ The Buddha guided her on maintaining the precepts and pure conduct. After revealing to her all the teachings, he then departed.

時國王波私匿。具從事騎。以王威法。出城到祇樹。欲前見佛故。乘騎未到。下車步入。遙見佛。便却蓋解冠。却諸侍從。脫足金屣。便前爲佛作禮就座。叉手白佛言。屬者甚悲。身不識方面。所聞經法不復誦。聞佛及比丘僧怨被惡名。佛即爲王說偈言

At that time, the king Prasenajit—accompanied by the cavaliers who attended him—went out of the town with royal pomp, making his way to Jeta’s Grove.⁴² Upon reaching a point where his

⁴¹ (行)澡水: This phrase is a Buddhist term meaning ‘to wash one’s bowl,’ which has been commonly used from the earliest Chinese Buddhist translations.

坐 = 座 (S, Y, M): The characters ‘坐’ and ‘座’ are often used interchangeably. However, ‘坐’ predominantly serves as a verb meaning ‘to sit,’ while ‘座’ is more commonly used as a noun denoting ‘seat.’

⁴² 波私匿: This proper name is a transcription of Prasenajit, the King of the Kosala kingdom. Various other transcriptions of his name can be found in different Chinese Buddhist translations, such as 波斯匿, 卑先匿, 鉢邏犀那特多, 鉢邏斯那特多, and 鉢邏犀那時多.

chariot could go no further, he dismounted and proceeded on foot, seeking an audience with the Buddha. From a distance, he spotted the Buddha. Subsequently, he lowered his umbrella and removed his crown. He held back his attendants and took off his golden boots. Then, he paid his respects to the Buddha and took his seat.⁴³ With his hands clasped together, he addressed the Buddha, “Recently, I was consumed by sorrow to hear that the Buddha and the *Bhikṣusaṃgha* had been maligned and detested. Thereupon, I became [so disoriented], unable to recognize even the four directions and failing to recite the *sūtra* teachings that I had previously learned.” The Buddha immediately instructed the king in verse:

Y3.12 邪念說彼短 解意諦說善

口直次及尊 善惡捨不憂

[Those with] wicked minds may criticize others’ shortcomings,

[While those who] interpret the truth may claim [their own] excellence.

[Though these] arguments may directly or gradually reach the sage,

[The sage,] having abandoned both good and evil, remains untroubled.⁴⁴

波私匿 = 波斯匿 (M): The two characters ‘私’ and ‘斯’ are homophones, sharing the same pronunciation in both Pinyin, /sī/, and in the Eastern Han pronunciation, /si/.

⁴³ 座 = 坐 (S, Y, M): Please refer to Y3. fn.41.

⁴⁴ **Y3.12ab**: Bapat translates these two lines as, “Short (i.e. cutting) are the words which the evil-minded say, Good are those said by [men] that have grasped the Truth.” However, this translation does not align with the context at hand. Firstly, the phrase ‘說彼短’ does not denote ‘terse replies’; instead, it signifies ‘criticizing (說) others’ (彼) shortcomings (短).’ Similarly, Y3.12b is not about ‘good people on the right path’; rather, it implies ‘those who interpret (解意) the truth (諦) claim (說) their own excellence (善).’ This interpretation is supported by Y3.12d, which suggests that the sage abandons both good (善) and evil (惡). Thus, ‘善’ should be viewed as a type of discrimination that the sage should avoid. This interpretation also parallels well with the context of its Pāli counterpart Sn781.

Sn780 *Vadanti ve duṭṭhamanā pi eke*

Atho pi ve saccamanā vadanti

Vādañ ca jātaṃ muni no upeti

Tasmā munī n' atthi khilo kuhiñci

Indeed, those with wicked minds engage in disputes,

And certainly, those with truthful minds engage in disputes too.

[However], the sage does not partake in such arisen disputes.

Hence, the sage remains unobstructed in any respect.⁴⁵

Y3.13 以行當那捨 棄世欲自在

抱至德不亂 制欲人所詰

How [then] could one forsake [both good and evil] in their conduct?

One [should] renounce worldly desire and live unencumbered,

Embodying supreme virtues, remaining undisturbed,

And curbing desires that could invite public censure.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ **Sn780d:** The term ‘*munī*’ is in the plural form and does not agree with ‘*khilo*’ (barrenness, mental obstruction), which is singular. Thus, Norman suggests ‘*muni-khilo*’ might be a split compound infiltrated by ‘*n'atthi*’ (there is no...) in between, with ‘*muni*’ possibly being replaced with ‘*munī*’ for metrical cause. Based on his philological hypothesis, this line can be literally translated as “Therefore, in no respect is there mental obstruction for the sage.”

⁴⁶ **Y3.13ab:** The phrase ‘那捨’ can be interpreted as ‘how to abandon?’. When placed before a verb, the character ‘那’ functions as an interrogative term, similar to ‘奈,’ ‘奈...何,’ ‘那...何.’

Bapat translates these lines as “In his behaviour, how can he—[the heretic]—give up the worldly [attachments], dominated as he is by desires?” However, this translation lacks precision. For one, Bapat links the two lines, using ‘世欲’(worldly...by desires) as the object of ‘捨’ (to abandon) in a likely attempt to align with the Pāli equivalents. This forced parallelism comes at the expense of excluding another verb ‘棄’ (to abandon) and misinterpreting ‘自在’ as ‘as he is (?)’.

Sn781 *Sakaṃ hi diṭṭhiṃ katham accaṇeyya*

Chandānuniṭo ruciṇā niviṭṭho

Sayaṃ samattāni pakubbamāno

Yathā hi jāṇeyya tathā vadeyya

How can one transcend their own view,

When driven by desire, entrenched in [their own] preferences?

Forming their own [set of] absolute truths,

They would make assertions as they are inclined to understand.⁴⁷

舍衛一國人民。悉生念疑。佛及比丘僧。從何因緣。致是惡名聲厄。共視佛威神。甚大巍巍。如星中月。適無敢難。佛悉知其所念。便說是義足經言

A question stirred among the people of Śrāvastī: “What causes and conditions led the Buddha and the *Bhikṣusaṃgha* to be forced to confront such a dire tarnishing of their reputation?”

[Amidst this], all beheld the Buddha’s spiritual power—truly immense, awe-inspiring, much like the moon amid the stars, so matchless that nothing would dare to rival it. Understanding their thoughts, the Buddha proceeded to teach this *Yizujing*, saying:

Given that each line possesses its own verb, I believe these two lines should be interpreted as separate sentences: Y3.13a as a question referring back to Y3.12d; Y3.13b as a response to the question in Y3.13a. With this structure in mind, I have clarified the connection between Y3.13a and Y3.12d by including ‘both good and evil.’ Moreover, in Y3.13b, the phrase ‘自在’ signifies ‘living without hindrances.’

⁴⁷ **Sn781:** This verse contains three optative third-person singular verbs: ‘*accaṇeyya*,’ ‘*jāṇeyya*,’ and ‘*vadeyya*.’ While the verb ‘*vadeyya*’ could be translated as ‘would understand,’ I have chosen to render it as ‘are inclined to understand.’ This emphasizes the subjective nature of their assertions, which are shaped and influenced by personal desires and preferences.

Y3.14 如有守戒行人 問不及先具演

有疑正非法道 欲來學且自淨

If a person adheres to moral conduct

And begins to boast about it, unprompted,

They may question their path: [what is] right teaching and [what is] wrong?

They [may] feel the need to revisit their learning and purify themselves.⁴⁸

Sn782 *Yo attano sīlavatāni jantu*

Anānupuṭṭho ca paresa pāvā

Anariyadhammaṃ kusalā tam āhu

Yo ātumānaṃ sayam eva pāvā

The experts affirm that it is an ignoble person

Who, unsolicited, praises themselves

And publicizes their own morality

And religious observances to others.⁴⁹

⁴⁸ **Y3.14**: This verse presents a critique of certain ascetics who tend to brag about their moral conduct. The text suggests that they return to the basics and purify themselves.

Y3.14cd: Bapat translates these two lines ‘有疑正非法道 欲來學且自淨’ as “The righteous (正) question (有疑) the same (?) and call it (?) unlawful (非法道)—So are they (?) who to the mendicants (學) go (來) and self-purity (自淨) declare (?)” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this translation is imprecise and somewhat arbitrary. It omits some Chinese characters and adds several phrases that do not exist in the original text. Specifically, ‘欲’ and ‘且’ are not included in his translation, or perhaps ‘且’ (also) is mistaken for ‘宣’ (to declare).

⁴⁹ **Sn782**: To enhance readability, I opted to rearrange the sequence of this verse. I have initially translated lines c and d, before returning to lines a and b. The verse can thus be interpreted as “The experts (*kusalā*) affirm (*āhu*) that it (*tam*) is an ignoble person (*anariyadhammaṃ*) [a person (*jantu*)] who (*yo*), unsolicited (*anānupuṭṭho*), praises (*pāvā*) themselves (*ātumānaṃ sayam eva*) and (*ca*) [who (*yo*)] publicizes (*pāvā*) their own (*attano*) morality and religious observances (*sīlavatāni*) to others (*paresa*).” In this translation, I have read

Y3.15 以止不拘是世 常自說著戒堅

是道法黠所信 不著綺行教世

By virtue of [his] tranquility, [the sage] is not bound to this world—

Such is the unsolicited, ceaseless assertion of their steadfast moral conduct.

Never resorting to any flashy behavior to preach to the world—

This is the path and teaching that the wise uphold.⁵⁰

Sn783 *Santo ca bhikkhu abhinibbutatto*

Iti 'han ti sīlesu akatthamāno

Tam ariyadhammaṃ kusalā vadanti

Yass' ussadā n' atthi kuhiñci loke

[On the other hand], a monk exudes serenity and is completely quenched,

‘*anariyadhammaṃ*’ as a *bahuvrīhi* compound denoting a person: ‘one who possesses an ignoble (*anāriya*) nature (*dhamma*).’ According to Norman, ‘*anariya*’ replaced ‘*anāriya* (*na* + *ariya*)’ for metrical cause.

⁵⁰ **Y3.15:** This verse contains two instances of the pronoun ‘是,’ once in line a and again in line c. My interpretation positions the first ‘是’ in line a as referring to line b, while the second instance in line c refers to line d. For improved readability, I have chosen to translate line d ahead of line c.

Y3.15b: In this context, the character ‘著’ could either imply ‘attachment to’ or serve as an auxiliary suffix that intensifies the preceding verb ‘說’ (explain). The DDB also provides the entry ‘說著’ with its meaning ‘to expound.’ These alternative readings of ‘著’ have potential implications for the interpretation of ‘堅.’ With the first interpretation, ‘堅’ takes on a negative connotation, translating as ‘intractable.’ In contrast, under the second interpretation, ‘堅’ conveys a positive meaning, ‘steadfast.’ This leads us to completely disparate understandings of the line. Using the first interpretation, the line could be translated as “They always say that attachment to moral conduct is intractable.” In contrast, the second interpretation renders the line as “Unsolicited, they ceaselessly assert their steadfast moral conduct.” I am inclined towards the latter interpretation, which appears more congruent with the overall context.

Y3.15d: The phrase ‘綺行’ can be interpreted as ‘flashy behavior.’ A similar phrase ‘奇行’ found in Y5.3, can be rendered as ‘odd behavior.’

Without boasting “thus I am” in regard to [their] morality.

Experts deem such a one a noble person

Who possesses no haughtiness wherever in the world.

Y3.16 法不匿不朽言 毀尊我不喜恐

自見行無邪漏 不著想何瞋喜

The true teaching neither hides nor indulges in futile words.

[Even when] praised or slandered, I neither rejoice nor fear.

I perceive my own conduct as free from any evil contaminants.

Not clinging to thoughts, how could I feel anger or joy?⁵¹

Sn784 *Pakappitā saṃkhatā yassa dhammā*

Purakkhatā santi avīvadātā

Yad attanī passati ānisaṃsaṃ

Taṃ nissito kuppapaṭiccasantiṃ

When one holds conjectured, contrived views,

Cherished, [yet] deeply tainted,

And perceives their personal advantage [in them],

⁵¹ **Y3.16b:** Bapat translates this line as “The Honoured One is censured, and yet thinks: ‘I have neither joy nor fear.’” However, I question the accuracy of his interpretation of the character ‘尊.’ Viewing it as a verb ‘to be praised,’ we achieve a symmetry: “when praised, I do not rejoice; when slandered, I do not fear.” Bapat’s interpretation lacks clarity, as it is difficult to understand how one could rejoice in slander unless it was viewed perversely.

They rely on a peace that is [deceptive and] inherently unstable.⁵²

Y3.17 所我有以轉捨 鮮明法正著持

求正利得必空 以想空法本空

[I] have transcended and eradicated all [the views] I [once] held.

[Through] the clear [vision] of Dharma, I have dispelled attachment and clinging.

Striving with right intention, I have realized that [all is] inevitably insubstantial.

Since perceptions are insubstantial, [all] phenomena too are originally insubstantial.⁵³

⁵² **Sn784**: I have incorporated two phrases, ‘in them’ and ‘deceptive,’ to reinforce the focus on ‘views’ and maintain cohesiveness within the verse. Lines ab discuss the speculative nature of these views; line c highlights their prejudiced nature due to perceived gains, and line d emphasizes their inherent instability. Therefore, the peace they enjoy is deceptive, conditional, and temporary.

⁵³ **Y3.17a**: In this context, the phrase ‘所我有’ is best interpreted as ‘what I [once] had,’ prompting a first-person reading of this verse. Although the term ‘我有’ or ‘有我’ can denote ‘existence of self,’ it appears to pertain more to ‘something I once had’ when combined with ‘所’ (object, that which). I interpret this ‘something’ to refer to ‘views,’ which is the central theme of this sūtra (Y3). The phrase ‘想空’ (insubstantiality of thought) in line d further corroborates this interpretation, indicating that the verse addresses the nature of views.

Y3.17b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘鮮明法正著持’ as “Of the bright (鮮明) Law (法), he has taken (持) with wise discrimination (正).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation may lack precision as it potentially neglects the significance of the character ‘著’ (attachment) and seems to reorder the components of the phrase ‘正著持’ without clear justification. My initial interpretation of ‘正’ was as a verb meaning ‘to rectify.’ Nevertheless, in light of its association with ‘著持’ (attachment and adherence [to views]), I have chosen the interpretative translation ‘to dispel,’ reflecting the process of eliminating attachment and adherence.

鮮 = 𩇑 (S, Y, M / Z / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): ‘𩇑’ is a variant of ‘鮮’ (clear/fresh).

正 = 止 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The alternative phrase ‘鮮明法止著持’ can be translated as “The lucid teaching will put an end to any attachment and adherence [to these views].”

Y3.17cd: the character ‘空’ is another critical term that, in my opinion, significantly influences the theme of this verse. It is frequently translated as ‘emptiness,’ emblematic of a key Buddhist doctrine. However, I prefer ‘insubstantial’ or ‘insubstantiality’ as translations here in order to sidestep the deeply ingrained Mādhyamaka concept of ‘emptiness,’ which was introduced to Chinese audiences later in the history of Chinese Buddhist translations.

The term ‘正利’ likely refers to ‘right intention’ (*samyaksamkalpa*; Pāli, *sammāsaṅkappa*), the second facet of the Noble Eightfold Path. Although this term is not listed in the DDB, it appears in the *Zhongbenqijing* 中本起經, translated prior to Zhi Qian’s time: “何謂入道? 八正為真。一曰正見, 二曰正利, 三曰正言, 四曰正行, 五曰正命, 六曰正治, 七曰正志, 八曰正定。” This translates to “What is meant by entering the path? The Eightfold Right [Path] is the correct [answer]. First is right view, second is right resolve, third is right speech, fourth is right action, fifth is right livelihood, sixth is right effort, seventh is right mindfulness, and eighth is right concentration.”

Sn785 *Diṭṭhīnivesā na hi svātivattā*

Dhammesu niccheyya samuggahītaṃ

Tasmā naro tesu nivesanesu

Nirassati ādiyati-cca dhammaṃ

Indeed, entrenched views are not easily overcome.

In exploring [various] teachings, one firmly grasps [a view].

Therefore, within these entrenched [views],

A person discards or adopts a teaching.⁵⁴

(T0196.04.0148c05–7). In this context, ‘正利’ appears as the second element of the Noble Eightfold Path, but its interpretation by character is challenging. I propose ‘right skillful [thinking for one’s benefit],’ which conveys the Buddhist objective of non-greed, non-hatred, and non-ignorance. Later Chinese translations favor ‘正思惟,’ widely used to this day. This term translates to English as ‘right intentions,’ ‘right resolve,’ or ‘right thinking.’ Here, I employ ‘right reflection’ to convey the connotation of ‘利,’ meaning ‘self-scrutinizing one’s thoughts skillfully.’

想 = 相 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): As Buddhist technical terms, the characters ‘想’ and ‘相’ are often used interchangeably meaning ‘thought’ or ‘perception.’ However, ‘想’ predominantly denotes ‘thought,’ while ‘相’ primarily means ‘perception.’ Thus, the alternative phrase ‘以相空法本空’ could have the same meaning or could be translated as “By [understanding] the insubstantiality of perceptions, [I have further realized that] all phenomena are originally insubstantial.”

⁵⁴ **Sn785:** This verse is coherent when the terms ‘*dhamma*’ (teaching) and ‘*diṭṭhī*’ (view) are considered synonymously. This is because line b postulates that a ‘view’ is chosen from various teachings, whereas lines cd proposes that a ‘teaching’ is selected amidst entrenched views. The central message of this verse, therefore, is that individual views are primarily derived from established views and are selected based on subjective preferences not on objective truths. As a result, these deeply rooted views can be formidable to overcome.

Sn785b: The *Mahāniddeśa* interprets ‘*niccheyya*’ as an absolutive, whereas the PTSD sees it as an optative in the third person singular. I find the commentarial explanation more contextually appropriate. The next consideration is whether this line should be read independently or as an absolutive phrase connected either to line a or lines cd. While Norman and Bodhi perceive it as an independent sentence—with Bodhi using a semicolon to connect it to line a—Fronsdal views it as linked to lines cd and uses a colon to connect this sentence with line a. All three readings are plausible, but I have opted to treat it as an independent sentence, akin to Norman and Bodhi’s approach.

Interpreting this line as an independent sentence, I regard ‘*dhammesu niccheyya*’ (exploring among teachings) as an absolutive phrase and ‘*samuggahītaṃ*’ (It is firmly grasped) as the main clause. To align with English grammatical conventions, I have translated ‘*samuggahītaṃ*’ into an active sentence form as “One firmly grasps it.”

Y3.18 不著餘無所有 行不願三界生

可瞑冥悉已斷 云何行有處所

Nothing remains to which [the sage] is attached; there is nothing that they apprehend.

They conduct themselves without desiring rebirth within the three realms.

This is possible [because] they have already eradicated all blinding darkness.

How could they conduct themselves [as if] there is anywhere to abide? ⁵⁵

⁵⁵ **Y3.18:** This verse permits two different interpretations of the terms ‘無所有’ and ‘有處所.’ Initially, these can be understood literally as ‘without something possessed’ and ‘with any dwelling place,’ which I have contextually translated as ‘there is nothing that they apprehend’ and ‘is there anywhere to abide?’ This interpretation ensures internal cohesiveness within the verse, aligning lines b and d effectively: since they do not desire rebirth within the three realms, it follows logically to ask, ‘how could they conduct themselves as if there is (有) anywhere (所) to abide (處)?’ When multiple interpretations are plausible, I prefer to choose one that stays close to the textual literal meaning for my translation.

Alternatively, ‘無所有’ and ‘有處所’ can be interpreted in a figurative sense, aligning more closely with their Pāli counterparts in Sn786. Given that the theme of ‘views’ permeates this discourse, ‘無所有’ in line a can be metaphorically translated as ‘they hold no [preconceived views],’ and ‘有處所’ in line d as ‘any fixed mentality.’ These terms have a deep-rooted history of symbolic and doctrinal usage in early Chinese Buddhist translations, as demonstrated in the works of early translators such as An Shigao (fl. 140–180 CE) and Lokakṣema (fl. 147–189 CE). They were often employed to describe the characteristics of the Dharma or the mental states of advanced Buddhist practitioners. Zhi Qian also frequently employs these terms in a metaphorical sense. For instance, in his translation, *Foshuo huiyan sanmei jing* 佛說慧印三昧經, we find the passage: “法無處所者為何等貌? 泥洹之貌也.” This translates to “What characteristics can be ascribed to the Dharma having no dwelling place? They are the characteristics of Nirvāṇa.” (T0632.15.0467a04). Another example can be found in ‘*Da mingdu jing*’ 大明度經, where the phrase appears: “即於座上得六萬定門。何等為定門? 無處所定, ...” This translates to “Upon his seat, he immediately attained sixty thousand gates of *samādhi*. What kind of *samādhi* gates? The *samādhi* of no dwelling-place, ...” (T0225.08.0505c02–3). Lastly, in his translation, *The Buddha’s Discourse on Removing Doubt from the Brahmin Ambaṭṭha* 佛說解梵志阿鷄經, we find the passage: “佛坐樹下, 了無所有, ...” This translates to “The Buddha sat under the tree and realized the truth of non-possession, ...” (T0020.01.0263c04).

Y3.18c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘可瞑冥悉已斷’ as “Egoism and darkness all he has cut off.” However, in the original Chinese text, there is no character that directly translates to ‘egoism.’ It is likely that he might have mistaken ‘已’ (already) for ‘己’ (self, I). If he translated ‘瞑’ (to close one’s eyes) as ‘egoism,’ that would be farther off the mark. In my translation, I interpret ‘可瞑冥’ as ‘blinding darkness,’ viewing it as ‘darkness (冥) that can (可) blind (瞑) [people].’

瞑 = 瞋 (S, Y, M): The character ‘瞋’ generally signifies ‘hatred,’ prompting a reconsideration of the phrase ‘可瞋冥’ from an alternative angle. ‘冥’ correlates with ‘ignorance,’ hence the phrase ‘可瞋冥’ might allude to the three cardinal defilements (*kleśa*; P. *kilesa*) in Buddhism: greed, hatred, and delusion. This analysis presumes a broader interpretation of the character ‘可,’ which could be seen as shorthand for ‘可愛’ (agreeable/desirable). While ‘可’ is here translated as ‘greed,’ such a rendering is admittedly conjectural.

Sn786 *Dhonassa hī n' atthi kuhiñci loke*

Pakappitā diṭṭhi bhavābhavesu

Māyañ ca mānañ ca pahāya dhono

Sa kena gaccheyya anūpayo so

Indeed, a purified person does not hold a preconceived view

Regarding various forms of existence anywhere in the world.

Having relinquished deceit and conceit,

How could the purified person, remaining unattached, possibly cling to anything?⁵⁶

Y3.19 所當有悉裂去 所道說無愛著

已不著亦可離 從行拔悉捨去

Everything one might possess will be lost [in time].

[Therefore], the path teaches ‘non-attachment.’

Being already unattached, [they] can indeed [live] in solitude.

Through [their] conduct, [attachment] has been [thoroughly] uprooted and discarded.⁵⁷

⁵⁶ **Sn786d**: I have taken a bit of liberty in translating the term ‘*gaccheyya*.’ While it literally translates to ‘could go to’ or ‘could resort to,’ I have rendered it as ‘could cling to’ for more contextual appropriateness.

⁵⁷ **Y3.19a**: In my interpretation, the central theme of this verse is ‘non-attachment.’ Line a addresses impermanence, thus prompting the discussion of ‘non-attachment’ in the succeeding lines. Bapat translates this verse as, “Whatever he should have had, he has broken and gone forth, Whatever his religion says, he neither loves nor clings to. Detachment he has attained and deliverance he has secured, By up-rooting, all things he has abandoned and gone far ahead.” His interpretation seems to center on the theme of ‘detachment through active renunciation.’

Y3.19a: The phrase ‘裂去’ can be interpreted as ‘to be broken away.’ The character ‘去,’ when used after a verb, such as ‘裂,’ signifies the completion of the action. To enhance readability and maintain the poetic rhythm, I have chosen to translate it as ‘will be all lost [in time].’ This provides a touch of poetic freedom while staying true to the original meaning.

Sn787 *Upayo hi dhammesu upeti vādaṃ*

Anūpayam kena katham vadeyya

Attam nirattam na hi tassa atthi

Adhosi so diṭṭhi-m-idh' eva sabbā ti

Indeed, one who is attached [will] engage in disputes about [true] teachings.

How and over what could one [possibly] argue with a person who is unattached?

Indeed, they neither adopt nor reject anything.

They have discarded all types of views right here [and right now].

佛說是義足經竟。比丘歡喜

When the Buddha had expounded this [*sūtra* in] the *Yizujing*, the *bhikṣus* rejoiced.

.

摩竭梵志經 第四

Discourse 4: Brahmin Mojie (*Aṭṭhakavagga.4*)¹

聞如是。佛在舍衛國祇樹給孤獨園。時有一梵志。字摩竭卒死講堂。同學便著床上。共舁出於舍衛里巷四街道。舉聲言。見摩竭者。悉得解脫。今見死屍亦解脫。後聞名者亦解脫。

Thus I heard. When the Buddha was residing in the kingdom of Śrāvastī, at Jeta's Grove in Anāthapiṇḍada's Park, there lived a brahmin named Mojie 摩竭. Unexpectedly, Mojie passed away in an assembly hall. His fellow religious placed [his body] on a cot and shouldered it through [the town of] Śrāvastī, [passing through] neighborhoods, alleys, and crossroads.² They loudly proclaimed, "All who saw Mojie achieved liberation. Now, anyone who sees [his] dead body [will] also achieve liberation. [Furthermore], anyone who [merely] hears his name later [will] attain liberation as well."

¹ 摩竭: Bapat surmises that this proper name might be an attempt to transcribe Māgadha. However, Māgadha generally refers to the inhabitants of Magadha and does not appear in Buddhist literature as a brahmin with the transformative power to liberate those who encounter him. Drawing on Pulleyblank's work in 1991, we can reconstruct the pronunciation of '摩竭' during the Eastern Han Dynasty (25-220 CE) as /Magiat/. Despite this, as I am unable to definitively identify this name, I have opted to retain this term in its pinyin transcription.

² 舍衛里巷四街道: This phrase lists several geographic elements: '舍衛' is translated as '[the town of] Śrāvastī'; '里' as 'neighborhoods'; '巷' as 'alleys'; and '四街道' as 'four crossroads.' Although '里' typically means 'villages,' in this context it more accurately refers to 'neighborhoods' within the town. '巷' often suggests various types of narrow pathways, such as alleys, lanes, forked roads, or minor streets. Here, it is specifically used to denote 'alleys' to distinguish it from '四街道,' which explicitly represents 'four crossroads,' indicating the intersection where four streets meet. This interpretation captures a clear progression from local neighborhoods (里) to narrower paths (巷) and major intersections (四街道) within the urban layout of the ancient Indian town of Śrāvastī.

諸比丘。食時悉持應器。入城求食。時見梵志說摩竭功德如是。食竟悉澡應器。還到佛所。作禮竟皆就座。即爲佛本末說如是。佛因是本演是卷。令我弟子悉聞解。廣爲後世作明。令我經道久住。說是義足經。

At mealtime, all the *bhikṣus* took their begging bowls and entered the town to gather food. It was then that they witnessed the brahmins proclaiming the merits of Mojie in such a manner. Once [the *bhikṣus*] finished their meals, they washed their bowls and returned to the Buddha's location. After paying their respects, they seated themselves and then narrated to the Buddha in detail what they had witnessed. Under these circumstances, the Buddha elucidated this volume, encouraging his disciples to learn, comprehend, and elucidate it extensively for future generations, thus ensuring the longevity of his teachings and the path.³ This is the teaching of the *Yizujing* as taught [by the Buddha].⁴

³ 令我弟子 & 令我經道: These phrases include the term '我' (I/my), suggesting a potential first-person perspective: "I encourage my disciples to learn, comprehend, and elucidate it extensively for future generations, thus ensuring the longevity of my teachings and the path." However, maintaining the third-person perspective without changing it provides better flow. Therefore, I have translated them using the third person, interpreting '我' as 'his.' In early Chinese Buddhist translations, narrative perspectives are often inconsistent compared to modern literature, and shifts in perspective occur frequently. This particular sentence recurs throughout the *Yizujing*, and I consistently interpret it within the third-person narrative framework.

⁴ The narrative in the fourth *sūtra* shares thematic elements with the story found in the *Paramatthajotikā* II, although numerous details diverge significantly from this Pāli commentary. In the *Paramatthajotikā* II, the plot revolves around a brahmin named Candābha (Shining Moon), who boasts a radiant disc on his chest, a mark of merit acquired during the time of Kassapa Buddha. Candābha, prideful of his luminescence, becomes a spectacle as numerous brahmins profit from showcasing his distinctive feature, promising worldly benefits to those who view it. However, upon encountering Gotama Buddha, Candābha finds his radiance eclipsed and his arrogance tempered by the Buddha's superior glow. The Buddha then elucidates to the monks that such ostentatious displays bear no relation to genuine spiritual purity.

By contrast, the *Yizujing* narrative begins with the demise of a brahmin named Mojie, whose companions assert that he maintained his spiritually transformative powers even posthumously. The Chinese narrative is notably succinct, whereas its Pāli counterpart provides a more detailed account, describing Candābha's past life and his entry into monastic life under the guidance of the Blessed One.

Both the *Yizujing* and the *Paramatthajotikā* II narratives of this *sūtra* interpret the concept of '*diṭṭha*' (view) quite literally as 'what is seen,' rooted in the Pāli term's origin from the past participle of the Sanskrit verbal root *√drś* (to see). They bring this concept to life through the characters of Mojie and Candābha, respectively, who each possess unique physical attributes: Candābha has a body that glows akin to the moon, while Mojie's appearance possesses spiritually transformative power. By doing so, these narratives provide the backdrop for the *Arthapada*' critique of 'dogmatic views.' It is plausible that at the time of their composition, these narratives may

: “I encourage my disciples to learn, comprehend, and elucidate it extensively for future generations, thus ensuring the longevity of my teachings and the path.”

Y4.1 我見淨無有病 信見諦及自淨

有知是悉可度 苦斷習證前服

[The brahmins claim:]

“I behold a purity that is free from any affliction.

[Through my] view, [I] perceive the truth and my own purity.

Anyone who realizes this can transcend all;

Suffering ceases and residual tendencies are verified before their subjugation.”⁵

have been critiques of the Brahmanical *Darśana* tradition, which posits that the revered vision of a deity or a holy individual confers spiritual merits to the beholder.

⁵ **Y4.1-2:** I have chosen to interpret these verses as dogmatic claims, which the Buddha introduces to reflect the views held by Mojie’s companions. For the sake of clarity, I have enclosed these verses in quotation marks. Nonetheless, these verses in themselves are ambiguous: it remains uncertain whether they represent the Buddha’s discourse or articulate the perspective of an individual influenced by a particular dogmatic view. Should they contain elements of both, it is unclear which lines might reflect the Buddha’s own discourse. Y4.1d and Y4.2d, in particular, echo the Buddha’s teachings as found in the Four Nikāyas, further contributing to the ambiguity. Their Pāli counterparts, however, offer more explicit clarification. Sn789 (corresponding to Y4.2) counters the claim in Sn788 (corresponding to Y4.1) beginning with a subjunctive clause, thereby indicating that Sn788 typifies dogmatic views. Contrary to Sn789, its Chinese equivalent, Y4.2, does not refute Y4.1 but rather continues along the same lines. Given that the *Yizujing* narrative includes the backdrop of a heretical claim made by the brahmins preceding these verses, I interpret Y4.1-2 as a holistic reflection of such a brahmin assertion.

Y4.1b: The character ‘信’ allows for dual interpretations: basically denoting ‘faith’ and ‘view.’ I have elected to translate it as ‘[through my] view,’ infusing the contextual term ‘以’ (through) for added clarity. This reading concurs with the Pāli counterpart (*dīṭṭhena*) and aligns with Lokakṣema’s lexicon, as elucidated by Karashima (2010: 545). Karashima posits that Lokakṣema, who predates Zhi Qian, rendered the Sanskrit term ‘*dr̥ṣṭi*’ as ‘信,’ indicating a ‘[wrong] view,’ a semantic decision that likely impacted Zhi Qian’s choice of glossary terms.

Alternatively, ‘信’ may serve as an adverb, denoting ‘certainly’ when preceding a verb or adjective, such as ‘見’ (to see). In this sense, the construction ‘信見’ could be rendered as ‘certainly, I see.’ For instance, this adverbial use is evident in the Biography of Huatuo 華佗傳 (section 18) from the *Records of Three Kingdoms* 三國志, where it is written: “若妻信病, 賜小豆四十斛, 寬假限日.” This can translate to “If his wife was indeed ill, they were to

Sn788 *Passāmi suddham paramaṃ arogaṃ*

Diṭṭhena saṃsuddhi narassa hoti

Etābhijānaṃ paramaṃ ti ñatvā

Suddhānupassī ti pacceṭi ñāṇaṃ

“I perceive purity, the ultimate [spirituality], and freedom from illness.

A person attains purity through [this] view.”

Completely recognizing this, knowing that it is the highest,

[Claiming], ‘I hold a vision of purity,’ they treasure [that] knowledge.⁶

Y4.2 見好人以爲淨 有慧行及離苦

黠除凶見淨徑 斷所見證至淨

[The brahmins claim:]

grant her forty bushels of soybeans and extend the deadline [for Huatuo’s return].” (武英殿二十四史本 三國志: 華佗傳, p. 93). This usage lends credence to the interpretation of ‘信見’ as ‘certainly, I see.’

In contrast, Bapat renders ‘信’ as ‘I, the faithful,’ which places it as the subject of the verb ‘見.’ While this reading is possible, it does not align as naturally with the contextual meaning as the aforementioned interpretations of ‘信’ as an adverb ‘certainly’ or as denoting a ‘view.’

Y4.1d, 服 = 形 (S, Y, M): In this verse, the character ‘服’ and ‘形’ may translate to ‘to subjugate’ and ‘to appear,’ respectively. Thus, the phrase ‘苦斷習證前形’ could be interpreted as, “Sufferings (苦) cease (斷) and residual tendencies (習) are verified (證) before (前) their form emerges (形).”

⁶ **Sn788**: This verse presents a shift in perspectives from the first person (*passāmi*) to the third person (*pacceṭi*). I interpret lines ab as representing a heretical claim, with the subsequent lines cd providing the *Aṭṭhakavagga*’s critique of this heretical assertion. To emphasize this, I have enclosed the first two lines in quotation marks. Fronsdal makes this distinction explicit, identifying lines ab as the claim of a brahmin and lines cd as the Buddha’s evaluation. However, in my analysis, I view the first two lines as the Buddha’s quotation of a heretical claim.

The term ‘*pacceṭi*’ literally translates as ‘to come on/back to,’ but it carries figurative meanings such as ‘to fall back on’ or ‘to believe in.’ In this context, I have chosen to interpret and translate it as ‘to treasure.’

“One achieves purity by beholding a [spiritually] excellent person.”

[However, that is not true; rather, it is by]

Possessing wisdom and [good] conduct that they can attain freedom from suffering;

They prudently eliminate [elements that lead to] misfortune and discern the shortcut
towards purity.

By eradicating views, they realize supreme purity.⁷

Sn789 *Diṭṭhena ce suddhi narassa hoti*

ñāṇena vā so pajahāti dukkhaṃ

aññena so sujijhati sopadhīko

diṭṭhī hi naṃ pāva tathā vadānaṃ

Should a person attain purity through a [particular] view,

Or dispel suffering by means of knowledge,

⁷ **Y4.2:** This verse adopts a different approach compared to its Pāli counterpart. While the Pāli verse directly contests the heretical claim that purity arises from views and knowledge, the Chinese verse, having introduced a heretical assertion put forward by Mojie’s fellow brahmins in line a, focuses on presenting the Buddha’s discourse. Its tone closely mirrors that found in the Four Nikāyas and refrains from directly critiquing line a. Notably, lines cd outline the path of an individual, represented by the character ‘點’ (wise)—a term that, despite its potential negative interpretation as ‘cunning,’ is given a positive connotation throughout the verses of the *Yizujing*.

To delineate the perspective this verse may adopt, I introduce a separation between line a and lines bcd. I do this by prefacing line a with the phrase ‘The brahmins claim that’ and lines bcd with the phrase ‘However, this is not true; rather, it is by.’

Y4.2b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘有慧行及離苦’ as “By possessing (有) wisdom (慧), it is possible to be free from pain (離苦).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, his translation overlooks the components ‘行’ and possibly ‘及’; it also introduces ‘it is possible’ where no Chinese character directly supports this interpretation. This deviation may stem from an attempt to align it with the Pāli equivalent in Sn789b. In contrast, my translation retains all the elements, rendering it as, “Possessing (有) wisdom (慧) and [good] conduct (行), they can attain (及) freedom (離) from suffering (苦).”

Y4.2d, 至淨 = 如前 (S, Y, M): The alternative phrase ‘斷所見證如前’ could be translated as “By relinquishing views, they awaken to [the inherent] ‘Suchness’ before [their eyes].” In this context, the character ‘如’ (Suchness; Pāli *tathatā*) might correspond to the term from the *Yizujing*’s Indic original equivalent to ‘*tatha*’ (thus, so it is), as found in Pāli Sn789d. Notably, although the phrase ‘如前’ can straightforwardly mean ‘as previously’ in other circumstances, it does not carry the same connotation in this particular context.

[Even] someone with substrata of clinging [could] be purified by another.

Indeed, [their] view [allegedly] proclaim them [as] those who assert such.⁸

Y4.3 從異道無得脫 見聞持戒行度

身不汚罪亦福 悉已斷不自譽

Adherence to a heretical path does not lead to liberation,

[Whether it involves] beliefs, traditions, observing precepts, or soteriological training.

[The sage] remain untainted by both merits and demerits.

They have already severed all [attachments] and refrain from arrogance.⁹

⁸ **Sn789**: Despite the straightforward structure of this verse, its interpretation and the connections between individual lines remain somewhat ambiguous. Lines ab propose hypothetical scenarios that are promptly refuted in lines cd. The verse might be conceptually outlined as follows, “Purity or freedom from suffering is not achieved through views or knowledge. If this were the case, individuals harboring attachments could find purification through something external, such as views or knowledge. Even though their views might suggest they embody the view they assert, what they say may be quite different from what they are: they could be still bound to attachments.” Line d could be literally translated as, “Indeed (*hi*), his view (*diṭṭhī*) proclaims (*pāva*) him (*naṃ*) as one who asserts (*vaḍānaṃ*) so (*tathā*).”

The term ‘*pāva*’ is subject to various philological interpretations, giving rise to some scholarly debate. According to Norman (2001: 330), the *Mahāniddeśa* interprets ‘*pāva*’ as a present form of ‘*pavadati/pāvadati*’ (to speak out). However, the conjugation of ‘*pāva*’ as the present tense, third person, singular form can be a challenging task. Some scholars consider it to be the imperfect form, while others interpret it as a root aorist of ‘*pra + √vac*.’ Norman favors the imperfect form but translates it with a present tense connotation as ‘betrays,’ similar to Bodhi who renders it as ‘proclaims.’ Jayawickrama translates it as ‘would betray,’ whereas Fronsdal exercises some creative liberty in his translation ‘is betrayed,’ notably omitting its object ‘*naṃ*’ (him). For my own translation, I have chosen the present tense, interpreting it as ‘proclaim.’

The interpretation of this verse in both the *Mahāniddeśa* and the *Paramatthajotikā* II tends to align with the Theravāda tenets: they interpret ‘*aññena*’ in line c as ‘something other than the noble path’ of the Buddha; and ‘*diṭṭhī*’ in line d as incorrect views, such as ‘The world is eternal, etc...’ Norman incorporates this commentarial interpretation into his translation of line c, adding a parenthetical clarification: ‘by something else (than the noble path).’ Jayawickrama similarly includes this interpretation, translating it as ‘by other (means),’ which suggests his preference for ‘means’ over ‘person.’ Bodhi adheres more to the literal translation of ‘by another.’ Fronsdal, in his notes, acknowledges the ambiguity around the term ‘*aññena* [sic],’ debating whether it refers to an entity such as “concern with merit or evil, involvement with self, and creating things,” which are the topics of the subsequent verse, Sn790.

⁹ **Y4.3b**: Bapat’s rendering of the phrase ‘見聞持戒行度’ as ‘from what is seen, or heard, from rites or rituals and beliefs’ may lack precision. Firstly, the phrase ‘持戒行度’ does not have corresponding Chinese characters for his interpretations of ‘rites, rituals, and beliefs.’ It is possible he superimposed its Pāli equivalent ‘*sīlavata*’ onto the phrase, considering its conventional translation as ‘rites and rituals,’ particularly in the context of

Sn790 *Na brāhmaṇo aññato suddhim āha*

Diṭṭhe sute sīlavate mute vā

Puññe ca pāpe ca anūpalitto

Attañjaho na-y-idha pakubbamāno

The brāhmaṇa does not claim purity based on something external,

[Be it] beliefs, traditions, rationales, morality, or vows.

[Remaining] untainted by both meritorious and evil [deeds],

They have discarded [all] assumptions, refraining from any fabrication.¹⁰

‘*sīlavata-parāmāsa*’ (attachment to rites and rituals). However, the Chinese phrase can be literally understood as ‘observing (持) precepts (戒) and undertaking (行) the crossing-over (度).’ Secondly, his literal translation of ‘見聞’ as ‘what is seen or heard’ appears overly broad and somewhat incompatible with the following more specific phrase ‘observing precepts or soteriological training.’ In this context, ‘見聞’ may be more accurately interpreted as ‘beliefs and traditions.’ For an in-depth and relevant discussion, please refer to Y2. fn.29 and 30. For further information on its Pāli counterpart, see the subsequent footnote on Sn790.

Y4.3c: Both Bapat and I translate the phrase ‘罪亦福’ as ‘merit and demerit,’ despite its literal meaning being close to ‘sin and fortune.’

Y4.3d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘悉已斷不自譽’ as ‘Everything he has relinquished, [even] love of fame.’ His translation of the last three characters is imprecise; it literally translates to ‘do not (不) praise (譽) themselves (自).’ Thus, the full phrase may be more accurately rendered as “They have already severed all [attachments] and refrain from arrogance.”

¹⁰ **Sn790ab:** The term ‘*aññato*’ is in the ablative singular form, literally translating to ‘from another.’ Meanwhile, the phrase ‘*diṭṭhe sute sīlavate mute*’ is in the locative singular form, literally translating to ‘in what is seen, in what is heard, in virtuous conduct and observances, and in what is reasoned out.’ For the sake of clarity and fluidity in the translation, I have taken some liberties by translating these terms using ‘based on,’ and treating ‘*diṭṭhe sute sīlavate mute*’ as an elaboration of ‘*aññato*’ (from something else in what is seen ...).

I propose that the terms ‘*diṭṭha*’ and ‘*suta*’ are more accurately translated as ‘beliefs’ and ‘traditions,’ respectively. The conventional academic translations as ‘what is seen’ and ‘what is heard’ may seem overly general and lack specificity. My interpretations as ‘beliefs’ and ‘traditions’ correspond more closely with the subsequent specific terms ‘*sīlavata*’ (morality and vows) and ‘*muta*’ (rationales). For more details on these terms, please refer to Y2. Fn.29 and 30.

The term ‘*muta*’ has engendered diverse interpretations among scholars. The *Mahāniddesa* annotates that the phrase ‘*diṭṭha suta muta*’ represents a full spectrum of human experience, encompassing the perception through the six senses. Consequently, ‘*muta*’ can be construed as ‘what is experienced through the nose, tongue, body, or mind,’ excluding the previous two categories: ‘what is seen (*diṭṭha*)’ and ‘what is heard (*suta*).’ However, Wilhelm Geiger (2005: 13) interprets ‘*muta*’ as ‘thought,’ considering it a labialized form of ‘*mata*,’ derived from the past participle form of the verbal root √*man* (to think). Consistent with the commentary, Jayawickrama translates ‘*muta*’ as ‘what is experienced,’ and Bodhi as ‘the sensed.’ In contrast, Norman and Fronsdaal choose ‘what is thought,’ and ‘what is thought (out),’ respectively. Between these two different readings of ‘*muta*,’ I lean towards Geiger’s interpretation of ‘thought’ as it uniquely distinguishes itself from other five sensory categories such as ‘what is seen,

Y4.4 悉棄上莫念後 有是行度四海

直行去莫念苦 有所念意便縛

Discard all preexisting assumptions and abstain from forming new ones.

One practicing such conduct [will] cross over the four seas [of suffering].

[If one] forsakes this right conduct and fails to reflect upon [the truth of] suffering,

They will have [various] concerns, which will quickly bind their mind.¹¹

what is heard, ... what is touched.’ This distinction seems more convincing than a division between the seen and the heard on one side and the rest of the experience on the other. It seems more plausible that the initial two sensory activities—‘the seen’ and ‘the heard’—could represent all the five sensory experiences, with ‘the conceived/thought’ demarcated as a new category of human experience.

Building upon this exploration, I suggest that ‘*muta*’ could be more aptly rendered as ‘rationales’ within the context of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. My interpretation is buttressed by other verses in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. In Sn839 and 840, we encounter an alternate sequence of terms: ‘*diṭṭha suta ñāṇa sīlabbata*,’ where ‘*muta*’ (what is thought) is supplanted by ‘*ñāṇa*’ (knowledge/rationales). ‘*Ñāṇa*’ also features alongside ‘*sīlavata*’ in Sn799: ‘*ñāṇena vā sīlavatena vā*.’ This phrase in Sn799 follows the discussion on ‘*diṭṭha suta sīlavata muta*’ in the preceding verses, Sn797 and 798. Thus, it becomes clear that ‘*ñāṇa*’ is utilized interchangeably with ‘*muta*’ in these verses. I argue that rendering ‘*muta*’ as ‘rationales’ yields a more detailed and focused comprehension of the theme—potential foundations for ascetic claims.

The term ‘*sīlavata*’ or ‘*sīlabbata*’ combines ‘*sīla*’ (virtuous conduct) and ‘*vata*’ (religious observances). To maintain a consistent degree of conciseness in the phrase sequence ‘*diṭṭha suta muta sīlavata*,’ I have rendered ‘*sīlavata*’ as ‘morality and vows.’

Sn790d: In this context, the term ‘*attañjaha*’ can be parsed into ‘*atta*’ (meaning ‘taken up,’ which is the past participle of ‘*ā + √dā*’ with the suffix ‘*-ta*’), ‘*-m*’ (which is in the accusative singular suffix), and ‘*jaha*’ (signifying ‘abandoning,’ and is an adjectival form of ‘*jahati*’). To improve readability and coherence, I have chosen to translate this as ‘discarding all assumptions.’

¹¹ **Y4.4:** This verse shares a common theme with its Pāli parallel Sn791, but the way they each present this theme is noticeably distinct. Y4.4 begins with an imperative in line a; line b further elaborates on the outcome for one who follows this path; lines cd delineate the consequences for those who do not. In contrast, Sn791 discusses ordinary people who relentlessly pursue their desires in lines ab, and it employs the metaphor of a monkey to depict their behavior in lines cd. Despite these differences in presentation, both verses converge on a shared theme: ‘desire and assumption persist, while their objects shift from one to the next.’

A precise translation of Y4.4 hinges on comprehending the multifaceted usages of the character ‘念,’ which features three times in the verse. In my translation, I have interpreted it in line a as ‘forming assumptions’; in line c as ‘contemplating on’; and in line d as ‘worrying about.’

Y4.4a: Bapat translates the phrase ‘悉棄上莫念後’ as “All aspirations he gives up, and no more doth he regret.” However, his interpretations of ‘上’ as ‘aspiration’ and ‘念後’ as ‘regret’ seem to overextend their intended meanings. I propose that ‘上’ serves as a temporal marker equivalent to ‘前’ (before), setting up a temporal dichotomy with ‘後’ (after). The subsequent term ‘念,’ implying thought or consideration, suggests that the phrase deals more with cognitive states—beliefs or assumptions—than with emotional states like desire, aspirations, or

Sn791 *Purimaṃ pahāya aparaṃ sitāse*

Ejānugā te na taranti saṅgaṃ

Te uggahāyanti nirassajanti

Kapīva sākhaṃ pamuñcaṃ gahāya

Having abandoned a previous [desire], they latch onto the next.

In the pursuit of lust, they fail to overcome attachment.

They grasp [one thing] and [then] let go of [another],

Much like a monkey that releases a branch [only] after securing [the next].¹²

regrets. Thus, my translation of the phrase is “discard all preexisting assumptions and abstain from forming new ones,” where ‘preexisting’ encapsulates the temporal aspect of ‘上’ and directly contrasts with ‘後,’ which is translated here as ‘new’ for modern readers’ clarity.

The temporal dimension of ‘上’ is similarly used in the *Book of Lord Shang* 商君書, as seen in the chapter on the Calculation of Land 算地 (section 5): “其上世之士, 衣不煖膚, 食不滿腸, ... 而為之者, 名也,” translating to “The scholars of bygone eras (lit. previous times), whose clothing did not warm their skin, and whose food did not fill their bellies, ... they did it all for the sake of honor (lit. fame).” (叢刊初編 本 商子: 算地, p. 41). This quotation illustrates how ‘上’ relates to the past, aligning with the temporal interpretation in the phrase ‘悉棄上莫念後.’ Hence, this precedent supports translating ‘上’ as ‘preexisting’ in the context of our discussion.

Y4.4c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘直行去莫念苦’ as “As soon as he ceases to contemplate on suffering.” This translation appears to be inaccurate, particularly his translation of ‘直行去’ as ‘as soon as.’ The term ‘直行’ is frequently used in early Chinese translations to denote ‘right action 正業,’ which is the fourth item in the Noble Eightfold Path 八正道. This usage can be seen in many translations by Lokakṣema and An Shigao. For instance, in the Four Noble Truths Sūtra 四諦經, translated by An Shigao, we find the passage: “八種道, 一直見二直治三直語四直行五直業六直方便七直念八直定.” (T0032.01.0816a14–16). This passage enumerates the elements of 八種道: right view 直見; right intentions 直治; right speech 直語; right action 直行; right livelihood 直業; right effort 直方便; right mindfulness 直念; and right concentration 直定. Though I am not sure whether ‘直行’ references the fourth element of the Noble Eightfold Path, I have opted to translate it as ‘right conduct,’ correlating to ‘是行’ (such conduct) in line b and the entire phrase in line a ‘悉棄上莫念後’ (Discard all preexisting assumptions and abstain from forming new ones.).

Y4.4d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘有所念意便縛’ as “He enters into (有?) bondage (所 or 縛?) of thoughts (念), that rule (縛?) his mind (意).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this translation seems to lack precision. No Chinese character here directly corresponds to his translation of ‘enter into,’ and he omits the translation for ‘便’ (immediately). His rendering of ‘所念’ as ‘bondage of thoughts’ appears to be a misinterpretation. The accurate meaning in this context is ‘object (所) of concern (念),’ which I have simplified in my translation as ‘concerns.’

¹² **Sn791:** The message of this verse is that ordinary people's attachments persist, with their focus shifting from one object to the next; they can only let go of the previous one after they have secured the next.

Y4.5 常覺意守戒行 在上行想彼苦

念本念稍入行 不矯言審有點

Ever being mindful, adhere to the moral precepts.

Engage in higher practices, reflecting upon others' sufferings.

Contemplate foundational thoughts and progressively tread the path.

Avoid dishonest words and seek [insight from] the wise.¹³

¹³ **Y4.5:** This verse departs from Sn792: whereas the Pāli verse contrasts the behaviors of the attached individuals in lines ab with those of the wise ones in lines cd, the Chinese verse consistently discusses what actions people should undertake.

Y4.5a: I have interpreted the phrase ‘覺意’ as ‘being mindful,’ treating it as ‘being alert (覺) about one’s mental activities (意).’ However, I acknowledge that ‘(七)覺意’ is frequently used as a translation for the technical Buddhist term, the ‘seven enlightenment factors’ (*bodhyaṅga*; Pali. *bojjhaṅga*). These factors include mindfulness, investigation of dharma, energy, rapture, tranquility, concentration, and equanimity. Nonetheless, this context within the verse does not align with this particular interpretation.

Bapat’s translation of the phrase ‘常覺意守戒行’ as “He who constantly (常) thinks of (覺意) his rites and rituals” is not accurate. [Parentheses added for analysis]. The term ‘戒行’ should be translated as ‘moral precepts,’ not ‘rites and rituals.’ Furthermore, Bapat fails to incorporate the translation for ‘守’ (to keep). The Pāli equivalent ‘*vata*’ (vow) in Sn792a also aligns more closely with the concept of ‘moral precepts’ than it does with ‘rites and rituals.’

Y4.5b: Bapat translation of the phrase ‘在上行想彼苦’ as “High (上) horse doth he ride (在?), or sinks into suffering (苦) that he meets” is significantly incorrect. [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation does not align with the original text, as there are no Chinese equivalents for ‘horse,’ ‘to ride,’ ‘to sink,’ and ‘to meet’ in the phrase. Furthermore, he omits the translation of ‘行’ (conduct), ‘想’ (to reflect), and ‘彼’ (others). It appears he might have adapted this line to fit its Pāli parallel, particularly shaping it to mirror ‘*uccāvaca*’ (high and low).

In this context, ‘上行’ can be interpreted as ‘higher/excellent practices.’ This usage is frequently observed in the translations by Lokakṣema, An Shigao, and Zhi Qian. For instance, in the *Great Perfection of Wisdom Sutra* 大明度經, Zhi Qian uses this term to describe the practices of a bodhisattva as follows: “如是, 具有上行闍士學得此深明度無極...” This translates to “In this manner, a bodhisattva, who embodies all excellent practices, acquires and masters this unsurpassed and profound *Prajñāpāramitā*...” (T0225.08.0493a23–24). The term ‘闍士’ is an ancient translation for ‘bodhisattva,’ which can be literally understood as ‘a noble individual (士) who initiates (闍) [their journey on the Buddhist path].’ Similarly, the term ‘明度’ is an old translation for ‘*prajñā* (明) *pāramitā* (度).’

Y4.5c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘念本念稍入行’ as “By thinking (念) these (本?) thoughts (念), his rituals doth he practise (行) a little (稍).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this translation has omitted translating ‘入’ (to enter), while adding ‘rituals,’ which does not have an equivalent in Chinese. It appears that ‘本’ is omitted from the translation. If it was not, interpreting it as a determiner ‘these’ seems quite a stretch.

The term ‘本念’ could mean ‘foundational thoughts’—thoughts leading to the Buddhist goal, *nirvāṇa*. As an example, An Shigao’s translation *Yiqieliu sheshouyin jing* 一切流攝守因經 presents the 12 undeclared questions as instances of ‘非本念’ (insignificant/irrelevant thoughts)—the opposite of ‘本念’—such as “Did I exist before this

Sn792 *Sayaṃ samādāya vatāni jantu*

Uccāvacaṃ gacchati saññasatto

Vidvā ca vedehi samecca dhammaṃ

Na uccāvacaṃ gacchati bhūripañño

Undertaking their own vows, attached to concepts,

A person traverses through peaks and troughs.

[Yet], discerning with wisdom, having realized the true nature,

The one with profound wisdom remains unaffected by such highs and lows.

Y4.6 一切法無有疑 至見聞亦所念

諦見聞行力根 誰作世是六衰

[The wise] harbor no doubts towards all dharmas,

[Whether] they pertain to beliefs, traditions, or rationales.

They discern and hear according to what is true and cultivate the [five] powers and
faculties.

Who in this world could regard this [type of individual]

life or not?” The Chinese passage is as follows: “...令如是非本念: 前世我為有不? 前世我為無有不? ...,” which translates to “... leading to these insignificant/irrelevant thoughts: Did I exist or not before this life? Was I non-existent or not before this life? ...” (T0031.01.0813b11–12).

念本念 = 捨本念 (S, Y, M): The alternative phrase ‘捨本念’ requires a drastically different interpretation of ‘本念.’ It could be translated as: “Discard (捨) the root (本) of [trivial] thoughts (念).” In this instance, I have slightly modified the meaning of ‘本念’ to fit the altered context.

as [merely an aggregate of] the six decaying elements?¹⁴

Sn793 *Sa sabbadhammesu visenibhūto*

yaṃ kiñci diṭṭhaṃ va sutāṃ mutāṃ vā

tam evadassim vivaṭaṃ carantaṃ

kenīdha lokasmiṃ vikappayeyya

They do not come into conflict with any religious teachings,

Concerning any beliefs, traditions, or rationales.

How could one classify them in this world,

¹⁴ **Y4.6b:** In this context, the phrase ‘至見聞亦所念’ is best interpreted as ‘pertaining (至) to beliefs (見), traditions (聞), or (亦) rationales (所念).’ The term ‘所念’ (what is thought) aligns with ‘muta’ in Sn793b, which supports my preference for reading the Pāli term as ‘the thought’ or ‘rationales.’ To continue my discussion on the term ‘muta’ in Y4. fn.8, ‘所念’ indicates that the original Indic text of the *Yizujing* likely understood ‘muta’ as ‘thought,’ as proposed by Geiger, rather than as ‘the experienced,’ as suggested by the *Mahāniddesa*. My rendering of ‘所念’ and ‘muta’ as ‘rationales’ differentiates these terms from other potential sources of doctrinal disputes among religious communities in ancient India, such as beliefs, traditions, morality, and vows. For a comprehensive discussion on the interpretation of ‘見聞,’ please refer to Y2. fn.29 and 30, and Y4. fn.7 and 8.

Y4.6cd: A precise interpretation of this verse hinges on the accurate identification of the ambiguous term ‘力根’ in line b and the numerically specific term ‘六衰’ in line d. The term ‘力根,’ as an object of the verb ‘行’ (to exercise), could serve as an abbreviation for ‘五力五根’ (*pañca balāni pañca indriyāni*)—Buddhist technical terms that refer to ‘the five powers and the five faculties.’ Both sets are comprised of five components—faith, energy, mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom—which are meant to be cultivated on the path to liberation. On the other hand, ‘六衰,’ or the ‘six decaying [elements],’ signifies attractions associated with the six sensory doors: the eye, ear, nose, tongue, body, and mind. Although these numerically specific terms might initially appear surprising in the *Yizujing*, by the time of Zhi Qian, Buddhist circles in China had already become familiar with the Āgama literature and its wealth of numerically defined Buddhist technical terms.

Bapat translates ‘行力根’ as “[he...] with energy (力) starts (根?) its practice (行).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation, however, is inaccurate. It overextends the interpretation of ‘根’ (to take root) and disturbs the structure of this line. Furthermore, his translation of the phrase ‘誰作世是六衰’ as “Who can make for him the world, that is no more than six decaying things?” falls short in clarity. This obscurity likely arises from his overlooking of the various potential meanings of the character ‘作.’ Given that this verse discusses the wise individuals on the correct path described in lines abc, the concluding rhetorical question in line d is expected to serve as an appreciation of the wise. In this context, I interpret ‘作’ as ‘看作’ (regard ... as) and translate this line as “Who (誰) in this world (世) could regard (作) this [individual] (是) as [merely an aggregate of] the six (六) decaying (衰) [elements].” My translation of Y4.6d aligns better with its Pāli parallel, Sn793cd: “By what means in the world could one classify them, those who has such a vision and whose conduct is transparent.”

Those who possess such a vision and maintain transparent conduct?¹⁵

Y4.7 不念身不念尊 亦不願行至淨

恩怨斷無所著 斷世願無所著

They harbor no notion of an eternal self, nor do they yearn for an object of reverence.

They also do not crave an exceedingly pure conduct.

Free from attachment, they have severed both gratitude and resentment.

¹⁵ **Sn793ab**: There are several interpretive possibilities for these lines, hinging on varying interpretations of the terms ‘*visenibhūta*,’ ‘*sabbadhamma*,’ and the phrase ‘*diṭṭha suta muta*.’ Based on the rationale provided below, I have rendered them as: “They do not come into conflict with any religious teachings concerning any views, traditions, or rationales.”

The term ‘*visenibhūta*’ lends itself to two interpretations. According to the *Mahānidessa* and the *Paramatthajotikā* II, it signifies ‘becoming (*bhūta*) without (*vi*) the [Evil’s] enemy (*senā*).’ Thus, Jayawickrama adheres to this Pāli commentarial tradition and renders it as “He forms no opposition to all phenomena,” and Fronsdaal as “They aren’t foes to anything.”

On the other hand, the term’s counterpart in Buddhist Sanskrit texts implies ‘becoming (*bhūta*) without (*vi*) association (*śreṇī*).’ Norman (2001: 337) also endorses the latter interpretation, citing supportive evidence from the Jain tradition, and translates Sn793a as “He is not associated with any mental phenomena.” Similarly, Bodhi adopts the latter reading, translating the line as “One who is remote from all phenomena.”

Considering the context, both readings are potentially valid. However, I am more inclined towards the folk etymology proposed by the Pāli commentaries. Consequently, I translate it as “They do not come into conflict with any religious teachings,” interpreting ‘enemy (*senā*)’ as a metaphor for an individual’s inner conflict.

The interpretation of ‘*sabbadhamma*’ is interconnected with that of the phrase ‘*diṭṭha suta muta*.’ In this context, many Pāli scholars interpret ‘*sabbadhamma*’ as ‘all phenomena,’ and ‘*diṭṭha suta muta*’ as ‘what is seen, heard, or thought/experienced/sensed.’ For instance, Bodhi renders these lines as, “One who is remote from all phenomena, from whatever is seen, heard, or sensed—” This interpretation might underscore the Buddhist ideal of detachment via the Abhidharmic categorization of human experience into six different sensory realms. However, if we consider that the composers of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* may not have employed such analytical classification, an alternative interpretation might see ‘*sabbadhamma*’ as ‘all religious discourses’ and ‘*diṭṭha suta muta*’ as ‘beliefs, traditions, or rationales.’ This alternative reading could potentially offer a more contextually suitable interpretation for this verse. For a detailed discussion on my preferred rendering of ‘*diṭṭha*’ and ‘*suta*,’ please refer to Y2. fn.29 and 30.

In support of my interpretation of ‘*diṭṭha suta muta*,’ the *Kālāma Sutta* (AN3.65) may serve as a valuable contextual reference. This *sutta* enumerates ten erroneous methods of accepting doctrines as truth, which could be categorized into three primary groups: traditional doctrines, reasoned doctrines, and doctrines of charismatic figures. I suggest these categories may roughly and respectively correspond to ‘*suta*’ (tradition), ‘*muta*’ (rationales), and ‘*diṭṭha*’ (beliefs). I intend to explore this topic in greater depth in a forthcoming article, which will provide a more comprehensive discussion.

Sn793cd: To enhance the coherence and maintain the flow of the passage, I have opted to translate line d before line c. This adjustment allows for a smoother transition between ideas while preserving the original meaning.

Unattached, they have renounced all worldly desires.¹⁶

Sn794 *Na kappayanti na purekkharonti*

Accantasuddhī ti na te vadanti

Ādānagantham gathitam visajja

Āsaṃ na kubbanti kuhiñci loke

They neither form nor prefer [any views];

They do not claim complete purity.

Having untied [all] the entangled knots of grasping,

They do not harbor desires for anything in the world.¹⁷

¹⁶ **Y4.7a:** The character ‘念’ appears twice in this verse. It essentially means ‘to conceive,’ but in this specific context, I have nuanced its meaning and have translated it as ‘to harbor a notion,’ and ‘to yearn for.’ I find that ‘one’s own eternal self’ is the most appropriate interpretation for the character ‘身’ in this context, and similarly ‘an object of reverence’ for ‘尊.’ Notably, the term ‘身見’ is frequently used in Chinese Buddhist texts as a synonym for ‘我見’ (the belief in one’s own self). While alternative interpretations of ‘念身’ and ‘念尊’ could be considered, such as ‘mindfulness of the body’ and ‘remembrance of the Buddha,’ respectively, these do not seem plausible given the context of this verse. Y4.7ab outlines actions that an ideal individual, according to the *Yizujing*, would not engage in.

Bapat translates the phrase ‘不念身不念尊’ as “Himself (身) has no (不) speculation (念), nor (不) doth he pay homage (尊 or 念尊?) to any.” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, I question the adequacy of his interpretation of ‘身’ as ‘himself’ and ‘念’ as ‘speculation’ in this particular structure: ‘念’ should be treated as the verb ‘to conceive’ following ‘不,’ and both ‘身’ and ‘尊’ should serve as the objects of ‘念.’ Despite the twice-occurring ‘念’ within the same structure of Y4.7a, Bapat’s decision to translate it once as the noun ‘speculation’ and once, possibly as part of the verbal phrase ‘to pay homage to,’ seems less plausible than my consistent interpretation of it as a verb ‘to conceive.’ Considering the context and structure, I propose that my interpretation of ‘身’ as ‘one’s own self’ provides a more fitting translation than Bapat’s rendering ‘himself’ in this context.

¹⁷ **Sn794a:** The term ‘*purekkharoti*’ can be literally translated as ‘to place [something] before [others].’ It is often figuratively used to denote meanings such as ‘to honor’ or ‘to prefer.’ Scholars such as Jayawickrama, Norman, and Bodhi, in line with the Pāli commentarial tradition, interpret it as ‘to prefer.’ Conversely, Fronsdal, probably referencing the PTSD, reads it as ‘to honor.’ Its Chinese counterpart, ‘念尊’ in Y4.7a suggests that the Indic original for the *Yizujing* might have interpreted it with the latter meaning, ‘to honor.’

Y4.8 無所有爲梵志 聞見法便直取

婬不婬著汚婬 已無是當著淨

[By] not grasping at anything, one becomes a brāhmaṇa.

[Upon] hearing and witnessing the Dharma, they instantly and directly achieve it.

[Faced with] sexuality, they harbor no passion for the sexuality

[that ordinary people typically] get attached to and be stained by.

They [grasp onto] nothing, [not even] purity, to which [the ordinary] might cling.¹⁸

Sn795 *Sīmātigo brāhmaṇo tassa n'atthi*

Ñatvā va disvā va samuggahītaṃ

Na rāgarāgī na virāgaratto

Tassīdha n'atthī param uggahītaṃ ti

The brāhmaṇa who has transcended the boundaries,

Does not firmly grasp anything, having known and seen it.

Neither stimulated by passion nor obsessed by dispassion,

¹⁸ **Y4.8a:** The term ‘梵志’ appears to be a hybrid of transcription (‘梵’ for ‘brahma’) and translation (‘志’ for ‘mind’ or ‘manas’), suggesting it was meant to denote ‘brāhmaṇa’ (a holy person). However, scholars like Jan Nattier and Charles Muller have noted its application for ‘brahmacārin’ (living a holy life, including practices like celibacy). In this context, the phrase might be translated as “not grasping at anything is the holy life.” This interpretation aligns with the term’s broader religious and ethical connotations. For further reference, see the *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism* (n.d.), retrieved April 10, 2024, from [http://www.buddhism-dict.net/cgi-bin/xpr-ddb.pl?q=%E6%A2%B5%E5%BF%97].”

Y4.8c: The character ‘婬’ occurs three times in the phrase ‘婬不婬著汚婬.’ I have translated these occurrences differently: I interpret the first and last instances as the noun ‘sexuality,’ while the middle instance should be read as the verb ‘to desire,’ following the negative ‘不.’ Bapat translates this phrase as “No passion (不婬) of senses (婬) has he, and likewise, no attachment (著) for the passions (婬) that corrupt (汚).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation does not seem to fully consider the structural relationship between the characters, resulting in a somewhat disjointed translation. In contrast, I have translated it as “[Faced with] sexuality (婬), they harbor no passion (不婬) for the sexuality (婬) [that ordinary people would typically] get attached to and be stained by.”

They do not hold onto anything as the ultimate in this realm.¹⁹

佛說是義足經竟。比丘悉歡喜

When the Buddha had expounded this [*sūtra* in] the *Yizujing*, all the *bhikṣus* rejoiced.

¹⁹ **Sn795c:** In this line, we encounter several terms such as ‘*rāga*,’ ‘*rāgin*,’ ‘*viraga*,’ and ‘*ratta*,’ all of which originate from the same verbal root $\sqrt{raj}$ or $\sqrt{rañj}$, denoting ‘to be dyed.’ These terms, I have translated respectively as ‘passion,’ ‘being stimulated by,’ ‘dispassion,’ and ‘being obsessed by.’ Interestingly, this line mirrors its Chinese counterpart, Y4.8c, which repetitively features the character ‘姪,’ implying ‘sexuality’ or ‘lewdness.’

What makes this verse stand out is the negation of even the virtue of ‘dispassion’ when it develops into an obsession. This is particularly intriguing considering the Nikāya/Āgama’s portrayal of ‘*virāga*’ (dispassion) as a stage immediately preceding the attainment of *nirvāṇa* (cessation), the Buddhist goal.

鏡面王經 第五

Discourse 5: King Ādāsamukha (*Aṭṭhakavagga.5*)¹

聞如是。佛在舍衛國祇樹給孤獨園。衆比丘以食時。持應器入城欲求食。自念言。今入城甚早。我曹寧可到異梵志講堂。與相勞徠便就坐。

Thus I heard. The Buddha was residing in the kingdom of Śrāvastī, at Jeta's Grove in Anāthapiṇḍada's Park. At mealtime, all the *bhikkhus* picked up their begging-bowls and entered the town seeking alms. [Some of them] thought to themselves: 'It is too early to enter the town now. We would be better off heading to the assembly hall of the heterodox brahmins.' [Upon arrival], they exchanged greetings and promptly took their seats.

是時諸梵志自共諍。生結不解。轉相謗怨。我知是法。汝知何法。我所知合於道。汝所知合何道。我道法可猗行。汝道法難可親。當前說著後說。當後說反前說。多說法非與重擔不能舉。爲汝說義不能解。汝定知法極無所有。汝迫復何對。以舌戟轉相中害。被一毒報以三。諸比丘聞子曹怨言。如是亦不善。子言亦不證。

At that time, all the brahmins were engaged in a heated debate, resulting in a tangled knot [of disagreement] that was difficult to untie. They criticized and held grudges against each other. "I

¹ Bapat correctly identifies King Jingmian (鏡面王; Mirror-Faced) as King Ādāsamukha (Mirror Face). This king, who represents a former existence of Gotama Buddha, features in the Gāmaṇi Canda Jātaka. He is depicted with a face that shone with the resplendent beauty of a well-polished golden mirror, and the narrative showcases his wisdom as he resolves a complicated legal issue and rules his kingdom righteously. Despite sharing the name of the protagonist King Ādāsamukha, this Jātaka story does not connect with the narrative of the *Yizujing*'s fifth discourse.

As the narrative progresses, the discourse focuses on the fruitless debate among the blind people about the real nature of the elephant. A parallel narrative can be found in the *Paramatthajotikā* II in Pāli, which also features the story of the king, the blind people, and the elephant. However, in the Pāli version, the king's name is not specified, and the story takes place in the present life. Here, upon hearing the account of these contemporary events, the Buddha delivered the fifth discourse of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*.

am knowledgeable about this Dharma. What Dharma are you knowledgeable about?” “What I know aligns with the path. With what path does your knowledge align?” “My path and Dharma are infallible and practicable. But your path and Dharma seem inaccessible.” “[In your argument], what should be mentioned first is misplaced at the end, and what should follow is put at the beginning.” “You have spoken at length about the incorrect Dharma, burdening yourself with a load you cannot carry.”² “You fail to comprehend the essence of what [I] have explained to you.”³ “You must definitely realize that the Dharma [I claim] is ultimately inapprehensible.”⁴ “You are cornered. How will you respond?” They lashed out at each other with [their sharp] tongues. Struck by a single harsh remark, they retorted with three. All the *bhikṣus* witnessed these venerable figures exchanging bitter words. Such behavior was unwholesome, and their assertions were unfounded.⁵

² Bapat translates the phrase ‘多說法非與重擔不能舉’ as “You said much about Law which is all not correct. You leave a heavy burden for others which you yourself cannot lift.” In this translation, he reads the character ‘與’ as ‘to give’ or ‘to leave’ and introduces the phrase ‘for others’ to support his interpretation. However, the original Chinese text does not contain any equivalent to ‘for others.’ Moreover, it is more plausible that the heavy burden referred to in the text is meant for the person who espoused the incorrect Dharma, rather than for others.

³ Bapat translates the phrase ‘爲汝說義不能解’ as “The meaning of what you say cannot be understood.” However, this translation seems to overlook the functional character ‘爲,’ which in the phrase ‘爲汝’ means ‘for you.’ Therefore, a more accurate translation of the passage may be, “The meaning (義) of what [I] have explained (說) to you (爲汝), [you] appear unable (不能) to understand (解).”

⁴ Bapat translates the phrase ‘汝定知法極無所有’ as “You know for certain that there is nothing which really exists with you.” However, in this context, the phrase ‘無所有’ should not be interpreted as the Buddhist doctrine of ‘non-possessiveness,’ given that this claim is being made amongst brahmins. I propose it be read as ‘unobtainable’ or ‘hard to obtain,’ alluding to a brahmin’s assertion that his Dharma is so nuanced and profound that his counterparts fail to comprehend what he has expounded.

⁵ Bapat translates the passage ‘諸比丘聞子曹怨言 如是亦不善 子言亦不證’ as “The Bhikṣus have heard your wicked words. Thus it is not good. Your words have no proof.” However, this interpretation seems to deviate significantly from the context. This passage should be viewed as part of the third-person perspective narration, which initiated two sentences prior to this passage. To assume this passage as one brahmin’s accusation against another does not align well within this context. I suggest it be interpreted as, “All the monks (諸比丘) witnessed (聞) these venerable figures (子曹) exchanging bitter words (怨言). Such (如是) [behavior] was unwholesome (不善), and (亦) their assertions (子言) were unfounded (不證).”

子曹正各起座。到舍衛求食食竟舉藏應器。還到祇樹入園。爲佛作禮。悉坐一面。便如事具說。念是曹梵志學自苦。何時當得解。

The reverend [*bhikṣus*] each rose decorously from their seats and headed to Śrāvastī to seek alms. After their meal, they stored their bowls properly and made their way back to Anāthapiṇḍada's Park. [Upon their arrival], they paid homage to the Buddha and took their seats off to one side. Shortly after, they relayed the [day's] events in detail [to the Buddha], recalling [how] the brahmins [seemed to] be torturing themselves in their quest for knowledge and [questioning] when [those brahmins] could [ever] attain liberation.

佛言。是曹梵志。非一世癡冥。過去久遠。是閻浮利地有王。名曰鏡面。時勅使者。令行我國界無眼人悉將來至殿下。使者受勅即行。將諸無眼人。到殿下。以白王。王勅大臣。悉將是人去示其象。臣即將到象廄。一一示之。令捉象。有捉足者。尾者尾本者腹者脇者背者耳者頭者牙者鼻者。悉示已。

The Buddha said, “The total ignorance of those brahmins is not confined to this life alone.” In a time long past, there was a king named Ādāsamukha in this very land of Jambudīpa.⁶ At one point, he instructed his royal messenger to traverse his kingdom and bring all the blind individuals to his court. [Upon] receiving the [king's] command, the messenger promptly executed [his orders], escorting all the blind people to the royal court and reporting back to the king. The king then directed a high-ranking vassal to guide all these individuals to an elephant

⁶ The term ‘閻浮利’ is a transcription of Jambudvīpa, one of the seven continents surrounding Mount Meru as described in ancient Indian cosmology. Based on Pulleyblank's reconstruction (1991), its pronunciation during the Eastern Han Dynasty could have been /Jiambuwlī^h/. However, the more common Chinese transcription for Jambudvīpa is ‘閻浮提,’ pronounced as /Jiambuwdēj/.

for them to touch it. The official took them to an elephant stable, where, one by one, he allowed them to touch and feel the elephant. Some reached out to touch its leg, others its tail, tail stump, belly, flank, back, ear, head, tusk, or trunk. Each one of them [had an opportunity to] perceive the elephant.

便將詣王所。王悉問。汝曹審見象不。對言。我悉見。王言何類。中有得足者言。明王象如柱。得尾者曰。如掃帚。得尾本者言如杖。得腹者言如埤。得脇者言如壁。得背者言如高岸。得耳者言如大箕。得頭者言如臼。得牙者言如角。得鼻者言如索。便復於王前。共諍訟象。諦如我言。王是時說偈言。

Afterwards, they were ushered [back] to the king's presence. The king inquired, "Did you all examine the elephant or not?" To which they replied, "We all did." The king [further] asked, "What was it like?" The one among them who had touched its leg said, "O wise king, the elephant was akin to a pillar." The one who had felt its tail described it as similar to a broom, while the one who grasped the tail stump likened it to a cane. The individual who felt its belly compared it to a mound of earth, and the one who explored its flank said it was like a wall. The one who touched its back declared it was like a lofty hill, and the one who felt its ear asserted it was akin to a large winnowing basket. The one who experienced the elephant's head likened it to a mortar, while the one who touched its tusk claimed it was similar to a horn. The individual who had grasped its trunk described it as a large rope. Subsequently, a heated argument and debate about [the true nature of] the elephant broke out among them before the king. Each insisted their perception was the truth.⁷ At this juncture, the king recited a verse.

⁷ To improve the flow of the text, I have translated the phrase '諦如我言' into indirect speech, changing the first-person pronoun '我' to the third-person pronoun '彼'.

Y5.1 今爲無眼會 空諦自謂諦

見一言餘非 坐一象相怨

Today, I have convened a gathering of the blind.

[The discussion unfolded] without a trace of truth,

[with each one] proclaiming their [perception] as the [sole] truth.

Focused only on [their own] assertion, [they deem] all others false.

Over this single elephant, they [have grown to] resent one another.⁸

佛告諸比丘。是時鏡面王者。即我身是。時無眼人者。即講堂梵志是。是時子曹無智坐空
諍。今子曹亦冥。空諍無所益。

The Buddha addressed all the *bhikṣus*, [saying,] “At that time, the one who was King
Ādāsamukha is none other than me in this life. The blind people at that time are indeed the
brahmins in the assembly hall now. [Just as] those [blind] people of the past lacked wisdom and

⁸ **Y5.1c:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘見一言餘非’ as “Each one alone (一), they contend (言), sees (見) the truth, and none (非) of the rest (餘). Thus are all these.” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this translation disrupts the structure of the Chinese verse: ‘一’ and ‘言’ (only their own word) should be read together as the object of the verb ‘見’ (focused on). Additionally, the phrases ‘the truth’ and ‘Thus are all these’ are inserted into the translation without using brackets, despite their absence from the original verse.

Y5.1d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘坐一象相怨’ as “That rode (坐) one and the same (一) elephant (象), and yet are given to mutual condemnation (相怨).” This mistranslation likely arises from misinterpreting the character ‘坐’ in the context: the narrative does not involve riding. One simple viable reading of ‘坐’ is ‘to sit/gather around,’ but I lean towards its interpretation as ‘because’ in this context. This usage is found in the Vice Minister of the Ministry of Personnel 吏部侍郎 chapter (section 2) from the *Imperial Overview from the Taiping Reign* 太平御覽: “坐此左遷澧州刺史.” This translates to “Because of this, [he] was relegated to the inspector post 刺史 in Lizhou province 澧州.” (四部叢刊三編 本 太平御覽: 吏部侍郎, p. 61). For improved readability, I have chosen to translate ‘坐’ as ‘over’ instead of ‘because of.’

engaged in futile debates, these present [brahmins] too are ignorant, [indulging in] pointless debates to no avail.”

佛是時生是義。具檢此卷。令弟子悉解。爲後世作明。令我經道久住。說是義足經。

The Buddha, at that moment, crafted this profound [verse] and compiled this volume [of the sutta]. [In doing so], he enlightened all his disciples and [paved the way] for them to elucidate the teachings for future generations, thus ensuring the longevity of his doctrine and the path. [This marked] the teaching of the *Yizujing*.

Y5.2 自冥言是彼不及 著癡日漏何時明

自無道謂學悉爾 但亂無行何時解⁹

Enshrouded in ignorance, they claim none can rival them.

Daily tainted by greed and ignorance, when will they ever understand?

Each of them has missed the [right] path, [yet] all assert they have mastered it.

[Mired in] confusion, devoid of [proper] conduct, when will they find liberation?¹⁰

Sn796 *Paraman ti diṭṭhīsu paribbasāno*

Yad uttarimkurute jantu loke

⁹ This verse uniquely consists of seven characters per line, a rarity in the entirety of the *Yizujing* verses. The text predominantly features verses with six characters, followed by those with five. Verses composed of four characters are relatively uncommon when compared to these two types.

¹⁰ **Y5.2b:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘著癡日漏何時明’ as “Drifting in ignorance, when will it be dawn with him?” While this translation manages to encapsulate the general message, it neglects the implications of the characters ‘著’ (signifying attachment or greed) and ‘日’ (indicating a daily occurrence).

Hīnā ti aññe tato sabba-m-āha

Tasmā vivādāni avītivatto

Dwelling in views, [believing them] to be the ultimate,

When a person conceives [something as] the highest in the world,

They claim anything else to be inferior.

Thus, they have failed to transcend disputes.¹¹

Y5.3 常自覺得尊行 自聞見行無比

已墮繫世五宅 自可奇行勝彼

Always considering oneself as embodying noble conduct,

[Believing] their traditions, beliefs, or moral conduct to be unparalleled,

They have already tumbled into and become ensnared by the world's five abodes.

[Yet, they maintain] their peculiar conduct surpasses that of others.¹²

¹¹ Though Sn796 and Y5.2 share a theme, 'a person who views themselves as incomparable,' they do not align line-by-line. While Y5.2 underscores their ignorance and the imperative of liberation, Sn796 underscores the unending disputes stemming from their hubris.

¹² **Y5.3b:** The phrase '聞見行' seems to be a reflection of the Pāli phrase '*ditṭhe sute sīlavate mute*' found in Sn797, although the contexts of the respective verses do not entirely align. Given this, I have opted to translate '聞見行' as 'traditions, beliefs, or moral conduct.'

Y5.3c: Interpreting the phrase '世五宅' (the five houses in the world) poses a challenge. The term '五宅' appears uniquely in this *sūtra* of the *Yizujing* and in the same *sūtra* included in Kang Senghui's 康僧會 *Liudujiing* 六度集經 (T152). The character '宅' generally means 'house' or 'dwelling,' but can also imply 'grave' or 'pitfall.' I have opted for the direct translation 'five (五) abodes (宅),' suggesting a link to the '*pañca kāmagaṇa*'—the objects of the five physical senses (visible forms, sounds, scents, flavors, and tactile sensations). An alternative interpretation involving the numerically-defined term, '*pañca nīvaraṇa*' (five hindrances)—sensory desire, ill will, sloth-torpor, restlessness-remorse, and doubt—seems less likely, as the context more directly pertains to worldly attachments rather than pitfalls in mental cultivation. Bapat translates '世五宅' as 'the five abodes' and suggests in a footnote: "Probably this refers to the five *ālayas* or *kāmagaṇas*. See Sn.535 '*chetvā āsavāni, ālayāni*,' Sn. 635 '*yassālayā na vijjanti*.'" The phrases from Sn. 535 and Sn. 635 translate as 'cutting off cankers and attachments,' and 'one whose attachment is not found,' respectively. These citations suggest a loose connection between '宅' and

Sn797 *Yad attanī passati ānisaṃsaṃ*

Diṭṭhe sute sīlavate mute vā

Tad eva so tattha samuggahāya

Nihīnato passati sabbam aññaṃ

[When a person] finds any personal gains

In [specific] views, traditions, rationales, morality or vows,

They clutch onto them right there,

Deeming all else to be inferior.¹³

Y5.4 抱癡住姪致善 已邪學蒙得度

所見聞諦受思 雖持戒莫謂可

Shrouded in ignorance, dwelling in lust, [they boast of] meritorious attainments.

Already misled, schooled in deceit, [they claim] transcendental achievements.

One should reflect earnestly on [their] beliefs or traditions.

‘ālaya,’ but they do not clarify the specifically numbered term ‘五宅.’ Therefore, I propose that ‘世五宅’ should be understood as the ‘*pañca kāmagaṇa*’ (the five sense objects).

¹³ **Sn797:** This verse is structured as a single sentence using the correlative pronoun ‘*yad*’ and the pronoun ‘*tad*.’ Typically, these pronouns are interpreted as ‘whatever ... that ...,’ but in some cases, they can serve a temporal or subjunctive function. In this context, my translation, which interprets them as ‘when ... then ...,’ offers a more fluid reading of the verse. By contrast, Norman and Bodhi offer more traditional translations, interpreting them as ‘whatever ... that.’

Sn797a: The final syllable of ‘*attanī*’ is extended for metrical reasons, with ‘*attani*’ being the locative singular form of ‘*attan*’ (oneself). Therefore, the literal translation of ‘*attanī ... ānisaṃsa*’ is ‘benefit in oneself.’ However, for improved readability, I have rendered it as ‘personal gain.’

Sn797b: For a comprehensive exploration of my translation choices for ‘*diṭṭhe sute sīlavate mute*,’ please refer to footnotes 29 and 30 in Y2, as well as footnotes 7, 8, 12, and 13 in Y4.

Though they keep precepts, they should not boast [about that] to earn admiration.¹⁴

Sn798 *Taṃ vāpi ganthaṃ kusalā vadanti*

Yaṃ nissito passati hīnaṃ aññaṃ

Tasmā hi diṭṭhaṃ va sutaṃ mutaṃ vā

Sīlabbaṃ bhikkhu na nissayeyya

Whatever one clings to, seeing others as inferior,

The adepts deem it a snare.

Therefore, a *bhikṣu* should not be attached to

Any beliefs, traditions, rationales, morality, or vows.¹⁵

¹⁴ **Y5.4:** This verse sharply contrasts its Pāli parallel, Sn798: while the Pāli verse criticizes excessive pride in one's views and the ensuing disparagement of others' views, the Chinese verse condemns hypocritical claims and promotes genuine self-reflection. If the *Yizujing* faithfully represents its original Indic text, then this discrepancy exemplifies the extensive modifications the *Arthapada* may have undergone as it spread across the Indian subcontinent. This divergence could serve as a counterexample to the traditional Buddhist narrative, which asserts the careful compilation of Buddhist discourses immediately following the Buddha's passing and their faithful transmission after the First Buddhist Council.

Upon dissecting this verse and separating phrases based on their morphemes, a fascinating rhythmic pattern becomes evident: lines ab adhere to a 2/2/2 breath pattern (抱癡/住姪/致善, 己邪/學蒙/得度, translated as 'Enveloped by ignorance/dwelling in lust/claiming merits,' 'Already misguided/learning to deceive/claiming transcendence'), while lines cd transition to a 3/3 structure (所見聞/諦受思, 雖持戒/莫謂可, translated as 'What one has seen and heard/reflect sincerely,' 'Although upholding precepts/should not mention for admiration'). Hexasyllabic Chinese verses tend to read with 3/3 breath pattern, and the 2/2/2 pattern is less frequent.

Y5.4a: Bapat translates the phrase '抱癡住姪致善' as "In (抱?) ignorance (癡) planted firm (住), pleasures (善?) with passion (姪) he gains (致)". [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this translation fails to account for the verb '抱' (to embrace) and misrepresents the noun '善' (merits) in this context.

Y5.4b: Bapat translates the phrase '己邪學蒙得度' as "With studies (學) misdirected (蒙), himself (己?) beguiles (邪) that adeptness (度) he has reached (得)". [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this translation may have confused '己' (already) with '己' (oneself).

Y5.4d: Bapat translates the phrase '雖持戒莫謂可' as "Even if (雖) he observed (持) good conduct (戒), it doth him no good (可?)." [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this translation does not correctly capture the last three characters. '莫' conveys prohibition 'never do,' '謂' signifies 'to mention,' and '可' functions as a noun 'admiration.'

¹⁵ For better flow, I have arranged the translation with line 'b' before line 'a,' and line 'd' before line 'c.'

Y5.5 見世行莫悉修 雖黠念亦彼行

興行等亦敬待 莫生想不及過

One should not indulge in views or worldly observances.

Even with a keen intellect and [adherence to] such observances,

[Which may] foster [a sense of] equality and [garner] respect,

One should eschew any notion of inferiority or superiority.¹⁶

Sn799 *Diṭṭhim pi lokasmiṃ na kappayeyya*

Ñāṇena vā sīlavatena vā pi

Samo ti attānaṃ anūpaneyya

Hīno na maññetha visesi vā pi

One should not form a view in the world,

Based on knowledge and religious observances.

They should not regard themselves as equal [to others].

Nor should they perceive [themselves] as inferior or superior [to others].¹⁷

¹⁶ **Y5.5:** The structure of this verse is intriguing, with interconnected lines building upon each other. Line a sets the stage with a directive against indulging in views and observances; line b hypothetically considers the presence of a keen intellect and adherence to observances; line c details the potential pitfall of arrogance stemming from the sharp intellect and observances; and finally, line d reiterates the advice, cautioning against entertaining any notions that may fuel this risk of arrogance.

Y5.5cd: In my translation, I have interpreted the phrase ‘興行’ as ‘to foster’; ‘等’ as ‘equality’; ‘敬待’ as ‘respect’; ‘不及’ as ‘inferiority’ (literally, ‘does not reach [another’s level]’); and ‘過’ as ‘superiority’ (literally, ‘to surpass’). These interpretations are carefully chosen to align with their Pāli counterparts—‘*samo*’ (equal, 等), ‘*hīno*’ (inferior, 不及), and ‘*visesi*’ (superior, 過) as found in Sn799. This approach ensures that the translation preserves the contextual meanings and philosophical nuances of the original terms.

¹⁷ Compared to the significant divergence between Y5.4 and Sn798, Y5.5 and Sn799 bear a close resemblance to each other.

Y5.6 是已斷後亦盡 亦棄想獨行得

莫自知以致黠 雖見聞但行觀

They have severed this [conceit], eradicated its future [emergence],

And discarded any notion about their exclusive conduct and attainment.

They do not pursue wisdom [only] through their knowledge,

Even if [it is from] what they have seen, heard, and partly reflected upon.¹⁸

Sn800 *Attam pahāya anupādiyāno*

Ñāṇe pi so nissayaṃ no karoti

Sā ve viyattesu na vaggasārī

Diṭṭhim pi so na pacceṭi kiñci

¹⁸ **Y5.6:** This verse may appear complex until we accurately assign contextual meanings to the ambiguous characters ‘是,’ ‘後,’ ‘獨,’ and ‘但.’ I propose that the pronoun ‘是’ alludes to the tendency of comparing oneself to others in terms of equality, inferiority, or superiority, as discussed in Y5.5. ‘後’ signifies the future emergence of this tendency; ‘獨’ represents the ‘exclusive nature’ of one’s conduct and attainment (行得); and ‘但’ indicates the ‘incomplete nature’ of the reflection (行觀). With this interpretation, Y5.6 and Sn800 are seen to share a common theme—the unreliability of knowledge.

Y5.6a: Bapat translates the phrase ‘是已斷後亦盡’ as “This [world], he has already cut off, and what succeeds is also exhausted.” However, his interpretation of ‘是’ as ‘this world’ seems to deviate from the context of this *sūtra*.

Y5.6b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘亦棄想獨行得’ as “By relinquishing his perceptions, the practices only doth he attain.” However, this translation misses the mark by not accurately interpreting ‘獨行得,’ failing to recognize its connection with ‘想’ (notion), and losing sight of the broader context of this line.

Y5.6c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘莫自知以致黠’ as “With the knowledge he possesses, the wise he doth not approach.” However, the personification of the character ‘黠’ is less plausible in this context. I suggest that ‘致黠’ should be rendered as ‘to pursue wisdom.’

Y5.6d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘雖見聞但行觀’ as “Though he has seen, or heard, mere contemplation he doth practise.” I find his translation less convincing due to the uncomfortable combination of the negative connotation of ‘mere’ and the positive denotation of ‘contemplation.’ In this context, I suggest that ‘但行觀’ should be interpreted as ‘partly reflected upon,’ which naturally follows the previous clause ‘雖見聞’ (even if [it is from] what they have seen, heard).

Abandoning what has been held onto, without clinging [anymore],

One refrains from developing an attachment to knowledge.

Neither do they take sides in any schismatic circumstances,

Nor do they fall back on any view whatsoever.

Y5.7 悉無願於兩面 胎亦胎捨遠離

亦兩處無所住 悉觀法得正止

Being detached from the present life or the next,

They harbor no aspiration towards either side.

Indeed, not dwelling in any place on either side,

They contemplate on all dharmas and attain true cessation.¹⁹

Sn801 *Yassūbhayante paṇidhīdha n'atthi*

bhavābhavāya idha vā huraṃ vā

¹⁹ **Y5.7:** A successful translation of this verse hinges on correctly identifying what the phrases ‘兩面’ (both sides) and ‘兩處’ (both places) refer to. Within this verse, ‘胎亦胎’ ([this] womb or [that] womb) emerges as the most probable reference for these phrases. In the context of the previous verses, I find no other suitable reference. Thus, I have translated this verse with this reference in mind. To clarify this reference of the two phrases, I first translate line b, where ‘胎亦胎’ appears, and then line a that has ‘兩面.’ To enhance readability, I have translated ‘胎亦胎’ as ‘the present life or the next.’

Y5.7b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘胎亦胎捨遠離’ as “[Running] from life to life, he has abandoned (捨), relinquished (遠), and kept off (離).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, I find Bapat’s translation, which splits ‘捨遠離’ into three separate verbs, unnecessarily hampers the flow of line b. Consequently, I have opted to translate it as ‘being detached from.’

Y5.7d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘悉觀法得正止’ as “On all the dharmas, he reflects and the rightful he attains and dwells in.” While the basic meaning of ‘止’ is indeed ‘to stop,’ and it could potentially be interpreted as ‘to rest in,’ it makes more sense in this context to connect ‘止’ with the preceding character ‘正.’ I have therefore chosen to translate ‘正止’ as ‘true cessation,’ which represents the Buddhist ideal of ‘*nirvāṇa*.’

nivesanā tassa na santi keci

dhammesu niccheyya samuggahītā

One who does not hanker after either extreme here—

[Be it] this life or the next—

Holds no entrenched positions whatsoever,

[Positions] explored and firmly grasped among [various] doctrines.²⁰

[Regardless of] any doctrines explored and firmly grasped.

Y5.8 意受行所見聞 所邪念小不想

慧觀法竟見意 從是得捨世空

Mindfully perceiving [moral] conduct, beliefs, or traditions,

They do not harbor even the slightest misconceived thoughts.

Wisely reflecting on the dharma, they put an end to [all] views and speculations.

²⁰ **Sn801:** This verse is structured as a single sentence featuring the correlative phrases ‘*yassa ... n’atthi*’ (for whom there is no ...) in line a and ‘*tassa ... na santi*’ (for them there are no ...) in line c. For readability and flow, I have restructured this into: “One who does not ..., does not ...”

In the interest of enhancing readability, I have exercised a bit of grammatical latitude in my translation. If translated literally, the verse could read: “For whom there is no aspiration here in both extremes—for existence after existence here or there—for them, there is no entrenchment that have been explored and firmly grasped among [various] doctrines.”

Regarding the term ‘*ubhayanta*’ (both extremes) in line a, I interpret its context from the subsequent phrase ‘this life or the next.’ This interpretation aligns with the usage of the term in Sn778. As I have previously discussed in Y2. fn. 30, the Pāli commentaries overlay Theravāda doctrines onto this term by suggesting various pairs of binary concepts. However, neither Norman nor Bodhi provides an explicit explanation of its meaning in this context. Fronsdaal suggests that ‘*bhavābhavāya*’ in line b represents the reference for ‘both extremes,’ and interprets it as ‘to becoming or non-becoming,’ splitting it into ‘*bhava*’ (becoming) and ‘*abhava*’ (non-becoming), followed by the dative singular suffix ‘(-āya)’. Conversely, Norman interprets the lengthened vowel ‘*ā*’ in ‘*bhavābhava*’ not as a combination of the ending ‘-a’ and the negative prefix ‘a-’ but as a rhythmical lengthening. Thus, he divides it into two instances of ‘*bhava*’ (life after life). For additional discussions on this topic, please refer to Y2. fn. 29 and 30.

As a result, they can discard [all] insubstantial worldly things.²¹

Sn802 *Tassīdha diṭṭhe va sute mute vā*

pakappitā n'atthi aṇū pi saññā

taṃ brāhmaṇaṃ diṭṭhim anādiyānaṃ

kenīdha lokasmiṃ vikappayeyya

Amidst beliefs, traditions, or rationales here,

They do not formulate even the slightest concept.

How could one [possibly] categorize this brāhmaṇa

Who holds no views in this world?²²

²¹ **Y5.8:** A successful translation of this verse relies on accurately interpreting the term ‘意’ that appears twice within the verse. In the first instance, found in line a, it carries a positive connotation, while its appearance in line c carries a negative connotation, implying something to be discarded (竟) along with views (見). Based on this contextual usage, I have translated the first ‘意’ as the adverb ‘mindfully,’ and the second as the noun ‘speculation.’

Y5.8ab: Bapat translates these two lines ‘意受行所見聞 所邪念小不想’ as “To his practices (行), thoughtfully (意) accepted (受), or to what he has seen, heard (所見聞), or wrongly conceived (所邪念), he gives not the slightest thought (小不想).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this translation raises a question: why would ‘he’ as the ideal person disregard his ‘thoughtfully accepted practices?’ I propose an alternative interpretation where ‘意’ functions as an adverb (mindfully), ‘受’ is a verb (to perceive) that has ‘行’ (moral conduct) and ‘所見聞’ (beliefs and traditions) as its objects, and ‘所邪念’ (misconceived thoughts) is the sole object of ‘小不想’ (do not harbor even slightly). For a detailed discussion on ‘所見聞,’ please refer to Y2. fn.29 and 30 as well as Y4. fn.7, 8, 12, and 13. While I present ‘所見聞’ unconventionally as ‘beliefs and traditions,’ I acknowledge that its direct and conventional interpretation, ‘what is seen and heard,’ could also apply effectively here, implying mindfulness amid sensory inputs.

Y5.8cd: Bapat translates these two lines ‘慧觀法竟見意 從是得捨世空’ as “The wise man contemplating on Law has all the heresies buried. Because of this attainment of his, he gives up all worldly things he holds ‘vain.’” While this translation is a possibility, I favor interpreting line d as “As a result (從是), they are able (得) to discard (捨) all insubstantial (空) worldly (世) things.” The divergence between Bapat’s interpretation and mine lies in the treatment of ‘得,’ which Bapat sees as a noun denoting ‘attainment,’ while I translate it as a modal verb ‘can.’

In line c, I have rendered ‘見’ as ‘views’ rather than ‘beliefs.’ This is because it appears not in the context of ‘所見聞 ...’ (beliefs, traditions, ...), which are sources of views and disputes, but in a setting where it is something to be discarded—hence, views themselves. If interpreted in Pāli terms, it aligns more with ‘*diṭṭhī*’ (views) than ‘*diṭṭha*’ in this context, and this is supported by its Pāli equivalent ‘*diṭṭhī*’ in Sn802c.

²² **Sn802:** I have maintained consistency with my previous renderings of ‘*diṭṭha suta muta*’ throughout the *Aṭṭhakavagga*, translating the phrase as ‘beliefs, traditions, or rationales.’ Although this is my chosen interpretation, the conventional translation ‘the seen, the heard, or the thought/experienced’ also offers valuable insight, particularly in emphasizing the cognitive processes of the ideal person. As an example, Bodhi’s translation of Sn802ab is ‘Not even a subtle notion is formulated by him about what is seen, heard, or sensed here.’ For a more in-

Y5.9 自無有何法行 本行法求義諦

但守戒求爲諦 度無極衆不還

Grasping nothing as their own, how could they adhere to any doctrines?

Initially, they followed doctrines to seek genuine truth,

Merely observing moral precepts in [their] quest for [this] truth.

[But only by] crossing to the other shore do monks never return to [the worldly].²³

Sn803 *Na kappayanti na purekkharonti*

dhammā pi tesam na paṭicchitāse

depth exploration of my translation choices for ‘*diṭṭha suta muta*,’ refer to footnotes 29 and 30 in Y2, and footnotes 7, 8, 12, and 13 in Y4.

²³ **Y5.9:** A successful translation of this verse depends on the interpretation of the polysemous characters ‘法,’ ‘本,’ ‘義,’ and ‘諦.’ Notably, ‘法’ appears twice, requiring a context-sensitive interpretation. The core message of the verse emphasizes that after rigorous spiritual practice, the ideal person does not cling to doctrines and remains detached from worldly conflicts. I interpret line a as emphasizing non-attachment to doctrines; lines b and c reflect initial missteps on the path to discovering truth; line d highlights that irreversible transcendence is achieved through intensive mental cultivation towards the other shore, rather than mere adherence to doctrines or observance of moral precepts. This interpretation aims to capture the verse’s philosophical depth and the progression toward enlightenment.

Y5.9a: In the context of a rhetorical question involving ‘何,’ the term ‘法行’ carries a negative connotation. Consequently, I have rendered it as ‘adhering to (行) [dogmatic] doctrines (法).’ Bapat’s translation of it as ‘having dharmas’ leaves his interpretation somewhat ambiguous due to the broad range of meanings the term ‘*dharma*’ can possess.

Y5.9b: The term ‘本行’ signifies ‘past deeds’ or ‘previous practices,’ whereas ‘義’ and ‘諦’ collectively denote ‘truth.’ To clarify the intent, I have added ‘genuine’ (義) to the noun ‘truth’ (諦), rendering ‘義諦’ as ‘genuine truth.’

Y5.9d: The term ‘無極’ typically means ‘limitless’ or ‘infinity.’ Here, paired with the verb ‘度’ (to cross over), I have opted to translate it metaphorically as ‘the other shore.’ The word ‘衆’ is rendered as ‘monks,’ and the phrase ‘the worldly’ is added to clarify the context for ‘不還’ (‘never to return’ or ‘non-returner’). This line concludes that the ideal person, having crossed over, disengages from worldly disputes and maintains no attachment to doctrines.

na brāhmaṇo sīlavatena neyyo

pāraṃgato na pacceti tādī ti

They form no [views]; they exhibit no prejudices.

No doctrines are adopted by them.

The brāhmaṇa cannot be swayed by moral conduct or religious observances.

Having reached the other shore, such an individual relies on nothing.

佛說是義足經竟。比丘悉歡喜

When the Buddha had expounded this [*sūtra* in] the *Yizujing*, all the *bhikṣus* rejoiced.

老少俱死經 第六

Discourse 6: The Old and Young All Die (*Aṭṭhakavagga.6*)¹

聞如是。佛在娑掃國城外安延樹下。時有一行車人。出城未到安延樹。車轂道敗。便下道一面。悵愁而坐。

Thus I heard. When the Buddha was residing on the outskirts of the kingdom of Vaiśālī 娑掃國, under an Añjana 安延 tree, there was a man who drove a chariot.² He left the town but had not

¹ The character ‘經’ is missing in (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2). For further information, refer to Y1. fn.3 and Y2. fn.1.

² 娑掃國 = 婆掃國 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Although Bapat identifies this proper name as the kingdom of Vatsas (Pāli, Vamsas), I suspect it could be a transcription of Vesālī (Sanskrit, Vaiśālī) with an incorrect usage of the character ‘國’ (country) for the city. This type of mistake occurs with other names as well. For example, though Śrāvastī was a city and not a kingdom, it appears in Y1 and Y2 with the character ‘國,’ resulting in the term ‘舍衛國.’

The proper name ‘娑掃’ or its alternative ‘婆掃’ does not appear in any other texts within the Chinese Buddhist Canon. Their reconstructed pronunciation during the Eastern Han period may be /Sa-saw/ (娑掃) and /Ba-saw/ (婆掃). Bapat reconstructs the pronunciation of ‘婆掃’ as /P’o-sao/ and identifies it with the ancient kingdom of Vatsa (Vamsa), one of the 16 Great Kingdoms (*Mahājanapadas*) that flourished in India from the sixth to the fourth century BCE. He may have narrowed his search to the 16 kingdoms due to the presence of the character ‘國’ (country). However, his identification finds no support from the Pāli Vinaya and Sutta collections. We cannot find any appearance of ‘Vamsa’ as a place where the Buddha once resided. The Janavasabha Sutta (*Digha Nikāya* 18) does mention Vamsa, but it refers to a clan name not a place name.

Instead of Vamsa, I would suggest that ‘婆掃’ may be a transcription of Vaiśālī (Pāli Vesālī), which frequently appears in Pāli literature. For example, the *Majjhima Nikāya* mentions this place as the Buddha’s location six times. Specifically, the text introduces 31 different locations of the Buddha within the 152 suttas. Sāvattihī occurs 77 times, Rājagaha 21 times, and Kosala seven times. Thus, Vesālī is the fourth most frequent location of the Buddha in the *Majjhima Nikāya*. With ‘娑掃’ /Sa-saw/ in the base text, I could not find a similar pronunciation from the 31 places. Although the kingdom of Śūrasena, one of the 16 Mahājanapadas, might have a pronunciation close to the transcription, this kingdom appears six times not as the location of the Buddha. In the parallel narrative of this discourse from the *Paramatthajotikā II*, the location is the kingdom of Śrāvastī (舍衛國). However, if ‘娑掃國’ or ‘婆掃國’ were Śrāvastī, there would be no reason for Zhi Qian to render a new transcription for this sutta exclusively.

The pronunciation of the compound ‘安延’ may be reconstructed as /ʔan-jian/. Bapat reconstructs its pronunciation as /ngan-yen/ and suggests that it may be the Añjana tree. We find this grove (*añjanavana*) mentioned dozens of times across the Vinaya and Sutta piṭakas (e.g., in the *Sāketa sutta* from the *Samyutta Nikāya* 48.43), and this tree (*añjanarukkha*) appears just a few times in the *Jātaka I*, 331 & *V*, 406. I believe Bapat is right and the name ‘安延樹’ is meant to refer to the ‘añjana tree.’

yet reached the Añjana tree when the chariot's wheel hub broke on the road and slid off the side of the road. The man sat there, despondent and crestfallen.³

佛是時持應器從阿難入城求食。道見車轂敗壞。其主下道坐。悵愁不樂。即說是優檀經
At this time, the Buddha, accompanied by Ānanda, took his begging-bowl and entered the town in search of food. Along the way, they saw the collapsed chariot with its broken hub, and the owner sitting by the roadside, despondent, crestfallen, and unhappy. Thereupon, the Buddha taught this Udāna sūtra 優檀經.⁴

Y6.1 如行車於道 捨平就邪道

至邪致憂患 如是壞轂輪

Y6.2 遠法正亦爾 意著邪行痛

愚服死生苦 亦有壞轂憂⁵

Just as driving a cart on the road,

[When a person] leaves a smooth path and follows a rugged one,

They encounter calamity and distress from the rough [terrain].

³ 悵愁 = 抱愁 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The phrase ‘抱愁’ literally translates to ‘to harbor sorrow’ or ‘to be drowning in sorrow.’

⁴ The reconstructed pronunciation of the name ‘優檀’ is close to / ?uw-dan/, and ‘優檀經’ corresponds to the *Udāna Sūtra*.

⁵ Y6.1 & Y6.2 should be read together. The character ‘如’ (just like, Y6.1a) goes with the phrase ‘亦爾’ (also, the same is, Y6.2a) and the phrase ‘如是’ (in that way, Y6.1d) aligns with the phrase ‘亦有’ (they also have, Y6.2d).

In this way, their hub and wheels are destroyed.⁶

It is also just the same with straying from the Dharma and righteousness,

[A person's] mind clings to the wrong, and they act in agony.

The fool endures the suffering of death and rebirth,

Experiencing distress [akin to] a broken hub.⁷

SN1 *Yathā sākaṭiko panthaṃ*

samaṃ hitvā mahāpathaṃ

visamaṃ maggaṃ āruyha

akkhacchinno va jhāyati

SN2 *Evaṃ dhamma apakkamma*

adhammam anuvattiyya

mando maccumukhaṃ patto

*akkhachinnno va jhāyati*⁸

⁶ Y6.1 and Y6.2 draw an analogy between the smooth path and the Dharma, between the rugged path and the wrong, and between the calamity of a broken hub and the suffering of death and rebirth.

Y6.1a: Bapat's translation of the passage '如行車於道' as 'like the cart that has gone astray down the road' stretches the meaning of the character '行.' The phrase '行車' should be translated more literally as 'to drive a cart.'

Y6.1d: Bapat translates the phrase '如是壞輻輪' as 'as was caused by the wheel that was broken,' but there is no Chinese word meaning 'to be caused by' in this line. Moreover, he omits the character '輻' (hub, or axle).

⁷ **Y6.2a:** Bapat translates the phrase '遠法正亦爾' as 'being away from the Right Law, and further.' Essentially, he does not read Y6.2 as a sequel to Y6.1. As a result, he mistranslates the phrase '亦爾' as 'and further.' This word means 'also the same,' and it serves as a link between Y6.1 and Y6.2. See footnote.3.

Y6.2b: Bapat translates the phrase '意著邪行痛' as 'mental attachment for the wrong means nothing but suffering.' This translation is not accurate. Mental attachment for the wrong is not suffering itself but the *cause* of suffering. Furthermore, he omits the translation of the character '行' (to behave) and adds 'nothing but' to emphasize this line.

Y6.2c, 死生苦 = 生死苦 (S, Y, M): The meanings of the two readings remain the same.

⁸ The parallel Pāli verses are from the *Khemasutta* (*Saṃyutta Nikāya* 2.22). These verses are composed in *śloka* meter with eight syllables in each line. The *sutta* contains 6 verses, among which SN1, SN2 are the fifth and

Just like the charioteer on the road,
Who left a smooth, broad path
And ventured onto the rugged terrain,
Broods over [their cart with] a broken axle.
So too, the fool who deserted the Dhamma,
Followed [a path] against the Dhamma,
Fell into the jaws of Death,
Broods over [their life with] a broken axle.

佛便入城。城中時有一梵志死。壽年百二十死。復有一長者子。年七歲亦死。兩家俱送喪。皆持五綵幡。諸女弱皆被髮。親屬啼哭悲淚。佛見因問阿難。是何等人聚會。悲哀聲甚痛。阿難即如事對。

Soon after, the Buddha entered the town. At that time, a brahmin had died in the town at the age of one hundred and twenty.⁹ Meanwhile, a householder's son had also died, aged seven. Both families led their funeral processions, each adorned with banners in five colors.¹⁰ All the women [from both families] appeared feeble, with their hair in disarray. Their relatives were wailing, crying out, mournful, and tearful. The Buddha observed [these] events and asked Ānanda,¹¹

sixth. These two verses should be read together because they are connected with linking particles, 'yathā' (just like) in SN1a and 'evam' (so too is) in SN2a. They also share the same refrain (*akkhacchinno va jhāyati*).

⁹ 梵志死 = 梵志 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): This variant avoids the duplication of the letter 死 in the following 壽年百二十死.

¹⁰ This is one of the features of the ancient Chinese funerary custom.

¹¹ 佛見因: This phrase is literally translated as 'the Buddha observed the causes.' However, in the given context, a more fitting interpretation would be 'the Buddha witnessed these events.'

“What kind of gatherings are these people holding here? Their sorrowful and piteous cries are truly heartbreaking.” Ānanda immediately informed him of what had happened.

佛因是本。有生是義。令我弟子悉解檢是卷。爲後世作明。令我經法久住。時佛說是義足經

Due to this incident, these meaningful [verses] occurred to the Buddha. He encouraged all his disciples to understand, compile, and elucidate this text for future generations.¹² [In so doing,] he ensured the longevity of his *sūtra* teachings. It was then that the Buddha taught this *Yizujing*.

Y6.3 是身命甚短 減百年亦死

雖有過百年 老從何離死

The lifespan of this body is all too brief!

A hundred years pass, and [most will] inevitably die.

Though some [may live] beyond a century,

Aging still stalks [them]. How can they elude death?¹³

Sn804 *Appaṃ vata jīvitam idaṃ*

¹² 令我弟子 和 令我經法: Despite the word ‘我’ (I) in these phrases, I translate it as ‘he.’ These sentences should be better read in indirect speech because there is no mood change to direct speech after the phrase ‘due to this incident.’ See Y1. fn.75 & Y2. fn.15. Bapat adopts direct speech here and revive ‘I (我), though he used indirect speech for Y1 & Y2.

¹³ **Y6.3d:** Bapat’s translation the passage ‘老從何離死’ as “that life, due to old age, is no escape from death” is incorrect. He has altered the position of the characters ‘老’ and ‘從’: for his translation, the script should be ‘從老無離死.’ Additionally, his translation omits the interrogative pronouns ‘何.’

oraṃ vassasatā pi miyyati

yo ce pi aticca jīvati

*atha kho so jarasā pi miyyati*¹⁴

This life is indeed brief.

[Almost] everybody dies in less than a hundred years.

Even if some lives more than [that],

They too [will surely] succumb to death due to aging.

Y6.4 坐可意生憂 有愛從得常

愛憎悉當別 見是莫樂家

When a person fixates on something appealing, it leads to distress.

They develop an attachment, assuming its permanence.

[Whether] one is fond of or repulsed by something, all must eventually part ways.

Recognizing this, do not indulge in the household life.¹⁵

Sn805 *Socanti janā mamāyite*

na hi santi niccā pariggahā

¹⁴ The subsequent ten Pāli verses come from the *Jarāsutta*, the sixth *sutta* of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. These verses employ the *vaitālīya* metre, characterized by 14 morae in odd lines and 16 in even ones. A mora is a unit of phonetical weight in Indic prosody. Light syllables carry a weight of 1 mora, while heavy syllables count as 2 morae.

¹⁵ **Y6.4a:** The phrase ‘可意’ translates as ‘appealing to one’s mind.’ DDB lists this entry and defines it as ‘pleasing.’ Therefore, I interpret the phrase ‘坐可意’ as ‘to fixate on (坐) pleasurable things (可意).’ Refer to Y2. fn.19; Y6. fn.23, 25; and Y10. fn.42 for this usage of ‘可.’

Y6.4b: The character ‘從’ signifies ‘to follow [a certain thought or principle].’ I translate the phrase ‘從得常’ as ‘assuming its permanent quality.’

vinābhāvasantam ev' idam

iti disvā nāgāram āvase

People mourn for what they hold dear,

As possessions are not eternal.

“Indeed, this is the nature of separation.”

Seeing this, one should not live the domestic life.¹⁶

Y6.5 死海無所不漂 宿所貪愛有我

慧願觀諦計是 是無我我無是¹⁷

There is nothing that is not swept away in the sea of death.

[People] search for objects of craving and create a sense of ‘mine.’

The wise vow to reflect on the Truth, pondering this:

“This (my existence) lacks a self, and I do not possess this [permanently].”¹⁸

¹⁶ **Sn805c**, *vinābhāvasantam*: I interpret this phrase as ‘the state (*santam*) of separation (*vinābhāva*).’ It can be broken down as ‘*vinā*’ (without; indeclinable), ‘*bhāva*’ (being, becoming), and ‘*santam*’ (neutral nominative singular form of present participle of ‘*atthi*’ [to be, to exist]).

Sn805d, *nāgāram āvase*: The term ‘*nāgāram*’ can be parsed as ‘*na*’ and ‘*agāram*’ (house; neutral accusative singular form). The word ‘*āvase*’ is the optative third-person singular form of the verb ‘*āvasati*’ (to live).

¹⁷ While verses Y6.1–4 utilize a pentasyllabic structure, the subsequent eight verses Y6.5–12 employ a hexasyllabic form. Generally, hexasyllabic verses are more common in the *Yizujing*, with the exception of a few *suttas* (Y1, Y2, and Y7). As Jan Nattier notes, the hexasyllabic prosody was uncommon in Zhi Qian’s era, and its presence is often considered as a distinctive marker of Zhi Qian’s work.’ The *Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳 (Biographies of Eminent Monks, compiled in 530 CE) associates hexasyllabic verses with the ‘*liuyin fanbai* 六音梵唄’ (six-syllabic Indian song). (Nattier 2008: 119–120).

¹⁸ **Y6.5b**: Bapat translates the phrase ‘宿所貪愛有我’ as “Because of previous (宿) greed (貪) and craving (愛), comes the sense of my-ness (有我).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. He interprets the character ‘宿’ as its usage in the phrase ‘宿世’ (previous lifetimes), and adds ‘because of’ and ‘to come,’ while omitting the particle ‘所.’ However, in this context, ‘所貪愛’ should be translated as ‘objects of craving.’ The passage requires a verb, for which I propose the character ‘宿’ serves. In fact, ‘宿’ carries several derivative meanings, one of which is ‘to

Sn806 *Marañena pi taṃ pahīyati*

yaṃ puriso mama-y-idan ti maññati

evam pi veditvā paṇḍito

na mamattāya nametha māmako

Whatever a person conceives as ‘this is mine’,

[Will inevitably] be left behind upon [their] death.

Knowing this, the wise, my disciple

Should refrain from claiming things as ‘mine.’¹⁹

Y6.6 是世樂如見夢 有識寤亦何見

有貪世悉亦爾 識轉滅亦何見

The joys of the world are akin to [things] seen in a dream.

seek for.’ A typical example of this usage can be found in Xu Wugui 徐無鬼 excerpt from the *Zhuangzi* 莊子: ‘枯槁之士宿名’ (Men of haggard-hermit looks *reach out* for fame.). (Translation by Burton Watson 2013: 203).

Y6.5c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘慧願觀諦計是’ as “Having an insight (觀) into Truth (諦), the wise (慧) thus begin to count (計).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. He omits the characters ‘願’ (to want, seek) and ‘是’ (this). I interpret ‘是’ as referring to the entire content of the following line Y6.5d.

Y6.5d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘是無我我無是’ as “This is not my-self nor my-self is this.” He inaccurately translates the character ‘無’ (without, do not have) as ‘非’ (is not). With this consideration, I interpret the phrase as “This (是)—my existence, i.e., the five aggregates in the Buddhist doctrine—does not possess (無) the self (我; *ātman*), and I (我) do not own (無) this (是) [permanently].”

¹⁹ **Sn806ab:** Sn806a and Sn806b are connected through the relative pronouns ‘yaṃ’ (whatever) and ‘taṃ’ (that). For improved coherence in English, I translate Sn806b first, followed by Sn806a.

Sn806cd: The subject of this sentence is ‘paṇḍito’ (the wise) and ‘māmako’ (my disciple), which I translate together in the third line of my translation.

The terms ‘mamattāya’ (for claiming something as ‘mine’) and ‘māmako’ (one who belongs to me) in Sn806d could be a word play. The core of both words is ‘mama (mine),’ but they carry completely opposing denotations. (Stephanie Jamison, personal communication, August 2019). The term ‘mamatta’ (egocentrism) in Sn806d may be a compressed form of ‘mama-y-idan ti maññati’ (to claim something, ‘this is mine.’) from Sn806b.

When one is awake and conscious, how can they be seen?

Attachments formed in the world are also all like this.

Once consciousness fades, how can they be perceived?²⁰

Sn807 *Supinena yathā pi saṅgataṃ*

paṭibuddho puriso na passati

evam pi piyāyitaṃ janam

petaṃ kālakataṃ na passati

Just as a person who has awakened cannot see

What they experienced in (their) dream,

So too, they cannot see their beloved

Who has passed away and is deceased.²¹

²⁰ **Y6.6c:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘有貪世悉亦爾’ as “So are the things that the world runs after.” The phrase ‘有貪世’ should be parsed as “有 (to have) 貪 (lust for) 世 (worldly things).” The character ‘世’ should be the object of ‘貪,’ not the subject.

Y6.6d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘識轉滅亦何見’ as “Friends and acquaintances, when dead, how can one see?” His interpretation of ‘識’ as ‘friends and acquaintances’ likely derives from reading ‘識’ as ‘親識.’ However, this translation is a stretch, and ‘識’ simply means ‘consciousness’ in this context. Both Y6.6b and Y6.6d contain the character ‘識’ and they end in the phrase ‘亦何見,’ which creates a satisfying rhyme. Therefore, there is no reason to read ‘識’ as ‘consciousness’ in Y6.6b and ‘acquaintances’ in Y6.6d. He may have sought a word equivalent to ‘piyāyitaṃ’ (beloved ones) in Sn807.

²¹ **Sn807b:** I have translated the term ‘saṅgata’ as ‘what they experienced.’ It is a past participle of the verb ‘saṃgacchati’ (to meet), so I initially translated it as ‘what they encountered’ to maintain its original meaning. However, this rendering could imply a more tangible or direct experience in the dream. Hence, I revised it to ‘what they experienced.’

Sn807d: The terms ‘peta’ and ‘kālakata’ are synonyms, both signifying ‘is dead’: ‘peta’ derives from ‘pa + √i (to go),’ meaning ‘to pass away,’ whereas ‘kālakata’ originates from ‘kāla (time) + kata (pp. of √kr [to do]),’ meaning ‘to have fulfilled one’s time.’

Y6.7 聞是彼悉已去 善亦惡今不見

悉捨世到何所 識神去但名在

Those [we once] heard about, they have already departed.

Whether virtuous or wicked, none can be seen now.

[Once we] all leave this world, where will [we] end up?

[Our] consciousness and spirit will depart, leaving only [our] names behind.²²

Sn808 *Diṭṭhā pi sutā pi te janā*

yesaṃ nāmam idaṃ pavuccati

nāmam evāvasissati

akkheyyaṃ petassa jantuno

Those people are seen and heard,

Whose names are currently being called.

Once a person has died,

Only their name remains to be uttered.²³

²² **Y6.7d:** Bapat translation of the phrase ‘識神去’ as ‘the conscious beings have departed’ is incorrect. The term ‘識神’ is a well-established term that reflects the ancient Chinese belief in the continuity of ‘consciousness and spirit’ after physical death. Thus, ‘識神去’ should be understood as ‘when consciousness and spirit depart the physical body.’ This interpretation is in harmony with the remaining phrase of this line, ‘但名在’ (only the name is left behind). While the consciousness and spirit have already journeyed elsewhere, the physical body, left behind, will soon perish. Therefore, only the name will endure here, to be remembered. According to the DDB entry for ‘識神,’ “The presence of this term in translation texts of the third century has been analyzed as one of the most telling features of Buddhism in the south during that period. The same term also features in debates on the survival of death by the spirit in the fifth and sixth century.” This entry cites several scholarly works, including those by Michael Radich (2014 & 2016).

²³ **Sn808ab:** The terms ‘*nāmam*’ and ‘*pavuccati*’ in Sn808b are in singular form, whereas ‘*diṭṭhā*,’ ‘*sutā*,’ ‘*te*,’ and ‘*janā*’ in Sn808a are all in plural form. For the sake of grammatical accuracy in English, I have opted to translate those singular forms in the plural.

Sn808cd: To enhance readability, I have chosen to first translate the time clause ‘*petassa jantuno*’ from Sn808d, followed by the main clause in Sn808c and the term ‘*akkheyyaṃ*’ in Sn808d.

The phrase ‘*petassa jantuno*’ is a genitive absolute, indicating time ‘while or when.’

Y6.8 既悲憂轉相嫉 復不捨貪著愛

尊故斷愛棄可 遠恐怖見安處

Never [can] sorrow, distress, or hatred be renounced

[By those consumed by] craving, attachment, and lust.

Thus, the sage, having severed lust and discarded pleasurable things,

Stands fearless, having found repose.²⁴

There are two different interpretations of the term ‘*akkheyya*.’ As per Norman (2001: 340), the *Mahāniddesa* and the *Paramatthajotikā II* consider it as being derived from ‘*ākhyeya*,’ functioning as a future passive participle of ‘*ā + √khyā*’ and meaning ‘to be pronounced.’ On the other hand, S. M. Katre considers it derived from ‘*akṣeya/akṣayya*,’ which means ‘indestructible.’

²⁴ **Y6.8a:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘既悲憂轉相嫉’ as “grief, bewailing and jealousy, that already exist.” His translation of ‘既’ as ‘already’ may not align best with the context. It should be read in conjunction with the subsequent character ‘轉,’ which he overlooks. While the characters ‘既’ and ‘轉’ literally mean ‘already’ and ‘to develop,’ respectively, in combination, they might convey a situation where something has already occurred, followed by subsequent developments. However, this phrase may not primarily emphasize the sequence of events; instead, it could encapsulate a notion akin to the English structure ‘not only ... but also ...’.

The character ‘既’ holds the proposed meaning whether used standalone or with companion characters (且, 又, 也, etc.). An example from *the Unofficial History of the Scholars’ Circle* 儒林外史 goes, “但他性情不同: 既不求官爵, 又不交納朋友, 終日閉戶讀書。” (However, he [Wang Mian 王冕] was unique in his nature and emotions. He **neither** sought official titles **nor** did he socialize with friends. He spent the entire day reading books behind closed doors.) Although this book was penned around 1750 CE during the Qing dynasty (1644–1912), it still serves as a valuable reference for understanding the usage of ‘既...轉...’ in context, aligning with its Pāli counterpart in Sn809a.

The phrase ‘相嫉’ directly translates to ‘mutual jealousy.’ However, I have omitted ‘mutual’ from my translation for better flow.

For enhanced readability, I have opted to translate this line as ‘sorrow, distress, or hatred,’ and I have relocated the phrase ‘復不捨’ (never be renounced) from Y6.8b to the first line of my translation.

Y6.8b: Considering that Y6.8cd highlights how the wise have eliminated lust and thus live free from fear, I have constructed the context of Y6.8ab to convey a similar message: “Without removing lust, people cannot escape suffering.” I opted for a passive sentence structure for Y6.8ab as it allows for easier treatment of Y6.8a as the subject. Bapat interprets Y6.8b within the same context.

Y6.8c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘尊故斷愛棄可’ as “Therefore (故), the sages (尊) have abandoned (斷 or 棄?) craving for possessions (愛).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, his translation lacks precision. This phrase contains two verbs, ‘斷’ (to cut) and ‘棄’ (to abandon), and two objects, ‘愛’ (craving) and ‘可’ (pleasurable things). Here, the character ‘可’ is likely an abbreviation for ‘可意’ (appealing to one’s mind) as seen in Y6.4a. See Y2. fn.19; Y6. fn.14, 25; and Y10. fn.42 for similar uses of ‘可.’ The two verbs and two objects can be most effectively arranged as ‘斷愛’ (cutting craving) and ‘棄可’ (abandoning pleasurable things).

Sn809 *Soka-paridevamaccharaṃ*

na jahanti giddhā mamāyite

tasmā munayo pariggahaṃ

hitvā acarimsu khemadassino

Those who are greedy for cherished possessions

Cannot escape grief, lamentation, and selfishness.

Therefore, having renounced their belongings,

The sage set forth, finding security [in their peripatetic life].²⁵

Y6.9 比丘諦莫妄念 欲可遠身且壞

欲行止意觀意 已垂諦無止處

Bhikṣus, remain vigilant and avoid harboring deluded thoughts.

Aspire to distance yourselves from worldly pleasures,

[for] this body is destined to disintegrate.

Strive to cultivate tranquility of the mind and insight into the mind.

By approaching the truth, you will rid your mind of all fixations.²⁶

²⁵ Both terms ‘*jahanti*’ in Sn809b and ‘*hitvā*’ in Sn809d originate from the verbal root ‘*√hā*’ (to remove, renounce, avoid, abstain).

²⁶ **Y6.9a**, 莫妄念 = 莫忘念 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): These two readings are distinct, each conveying a different message. The character ‘妄’ translates as ‘false,’ while ‘忘’ means ‘to forget.’ The character ‘念’ has been used as a rendering for ‘mindfulness’ (*smṛti*, Pāli *sati*) since the earliest Chinese Buddhist translations, such as those by An Shigao 安世高 (fl. 148–180 CE). The phrase ‘妄念’ has also been a recognized translation for ‘deluded thought’ since the earliest periods. Thus, the phrase ‘莫妄念’ signifies ‘do not harbor (莫) deluded thoughts (妄念),’ whereas ‘莫忘念’ translates as ‘do not (莫) forget (忘) mindfulness (念).’

Sn810 *Patilīnacarassa bhikkhuno*

bhajamānassa vivittamānasam

sāmaggiyam āhu tassa tam

yo attānam bhavane na dassaye

For a monk living in detachment,

Seeking refuge in a secluded place,

They say it is fitting for him

Bapat adopts the variant reading and translates the phrase ‘比丘諦莫忘念’ as “On the Truth, the Bhikṣu contemplates, without being forgetful.” He introduces the verb ‘to contemplate,’ and perhaps translates the expression ‘忘念’ as ‘to be forgetful.’ This is not precise. We should interpret the character ‘諦’ not as the noun ‘truth,’ but as the verb ‘to be attentive.’ Then, we would not need to insert an additional word ‘to contemplate.’ Therefore, I translate this variant reading as “Monks, remain vigilant and do not lose your mindfulness.”

Y6.9b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘欲可遠身且壞’ as “He wishes to be away from the body that is sure to be dissolved.” Once again, he overlooks the translation of ‘可,’ neglecting its various derivative meanings. It could be possible to interpret ‘可’ as a modal verb before the verb ‘遠,’ but the presence of another verb ‘欲’ in front makes the sequential three verbs ‘欲可遠’ (to aspire to be able to be free from...) seem awkward. I interpret ‘可’ as ‘可意’ (something appealing to one’s mind), which is the object of ‘遠.’ Bapat reads the character ‘身’ as the object of ‘遠,’ but his translation of ‘to be away from the body’ seems inappropriate. In Buddhist doctrine, it is not the body itself, but the attachment (愛) to the body that matters. For this usage of ‘可,’ refer to Y2. fn.19; Y6. fn.14, 23; and Y10. fn.42.

Y6.9c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘欲行止意觀意’ as “He wishes (欲) to cultivate (行) quiescence (止意) and mental cultivation (觀意).” However, his translation of ‘觀意’ lacks precision and does not adequately differentiate it from the other technical term ‘止意.’ The phrases ‘止意’ and ‘觀意’ are probably meant here to signify two distinct categories—*śamatha* and *vipāśyanā*—in Buddhist mental cultivation. Adhering to this Buddhist doctrinal structure, I translate ‘止意’ as ‘tranquility of the mind (*śamatha*; Pāli. *samatha*)’ and ‘觀意’ as ‘insight into the mind (*vipāśyanā*; Pāli. *vipassanā*).’

This bipartite classification of Buddhist mental cultivation has been recognized since the earliest period of Chinese Buddhist translations. For example, An Shigao’s translation, *The Buddha’s Discourse on the Mindfulness of Breathing* 佛說大安般守意經 (T602) includes the following passage (T0602.15.0168c20–21): “止惡一法觀二法惡已盡。止觀者為觀道。惡未盡不見道。” (Ceasing unwholesome [thought] is the first dharma and contemplating [on it] is the second dharma. [When] the unwholesome thought has already disappeared, tranquility and insight constitute the path of meditation. If the unwholesome thought has not yet disappeared, one cannot see the path.).

Y6.9d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘已垂諦無止處’ as “To Truth being inclined, there is no place [here] where he can stay.” In this context, he interprets ‘無止處’ as a reference to ‘homeless life.’ However, this phrase appears to be used figuratively than literally, given that the subsequent verse Y6.10ab contrasts ‘無止者’ with ‘愛不愛’ (lust and detestation). Consequently, I interpret ‘無止處’ as meaning ‘to have no fixation [on lust or detestation].’

not to establish himself in a [fixed] abode.²⁷

Y6.10 無止者亦尊行 愛不愛亦嫉行

在悲憂亦嫉行 無濡沾如蓮華

Indeed, having no fixation is an honorable conduct,

[While] lust and detestation truly represent disgraceful forms of conduct.

To dwell in grief and distress, too, is a dishonorable conduct.

[The sage is] like a lotus flower that is impervious [to water] and unstained [by dirt].²⁸

²⁷ Y6.9 and Sn810, while related in their wording, convey markedly different ideas. Y6.9 emphasizes ‘non-fixation on deluded thoughts,’ whereas Sn810 underscores ‘the importance of a secluded and itinerant life.’

Sn810b: The differing messages between Y6.9 and Sn810 might have arisen from divergent interpretations of the term ‘*vivittamānasam*’ in Sn810b, which can be parsed as ‘*vivitta* (secluded) + *mānasam* (pertaining to the mind). This interpretation is supported by many Pāli manuscripts, as well as commentaries by Buddhaghosa and Dhammapāla. However, the *Mahāniddeśa* reads it as ‘*vivittam* (secluded) + *āsanaṃ* (seat),’ a reading that involves not only a different parsing, but also a metathesis of the consonants, ‘n’ and ‘s.’ The *Mahāniddeśa*’s reading garners support from a few Pāli manuscripts and the Jain equivalent line in the *Sūyagaḍaṅga* I.2.2.17: “*bhayamāṇassa vivikkam āsanam*.” Norman, Bodhi, and Fronsdaal have followed this commentarial interpretation of the term, an approach also reflected in my translation.

Bapat (1951: 14, 52 fn.4) posits that the phrase ‘莫妄念/莫忘念’ in Y6.9a may be derived from the phrase ‘*vivitta mānasam*,’ which he conjectures to be a corrupted Indic script of ‘*vivittam āsanam*.’ Both ‘莫妄念/莫忘念’ and ‘*vivitta mānasam*’ indeed center on the ‘state of mind’ (*mānasa*) rather than the ‘dwelling place’ (*āsana*). However, the intended meaning ‘do not harbor deluded thoughts/do not forget mindfulness’ in Y6.9a diverges markedly from ‘secluded mind’ in Sn810b, as per the PTS edition. Hence, I find it difficult to concur with his assertion.

Norman opts for the commentarial interpretation of ‘*vivittam āsanam*’ over ‘*vivittamānasam*’ in the PTS edition. He justifies his choice by referring to Bapat’s suggestion that ‘*vivittamānasam*’ could be a corrupted Indic. However, I contend that Bapat’s conclusion may be too hasty. Both phrases represent divergent interpretations, but it is not proper to label one as a corrupted Indic phrase. Even though Sn810d refers to a physical dwelling place (*bhavane*), Sn810b need not necessarily refer to a physical location (*āsanaṃ*). A person with a secluded mind (Sn810b) could also lead an ascetic, homeless life (Sn810d). Additionally, Norman’s decision to adopt the *Mahāniddeśa*’s annotation might be considered circular, as it leans on Bapat note, which in turn depends on the *Mahāniddeśa*’s note. In contrast, I propose that the phrase ‘莫妄念’ in Y6.9 can serve as evidence supporting the PTS edition’s reading (*mānasam*) rather than endorsing the *Mahāniddeśa*’s interpretation.

Sn810cd: These two lines contain several words that render awkwardly in English. I initially translated them verbatim as “They say it is appropriate for him that he should not show himself in a [fixed] dwelling.” To enhance readability, I have revised it to “They say it is fitting for him not to establish himself in a [fixed] abode.”

²⁸ **Y6.10abc:** These three lines all share the same structure ‘OOO亦O行,’ which should be interpreted as “OOO is indeed/also O conduct.” The character ‘嫉’ means ‘jealousy,’ but I interpret the phrase ‘嫉行’ more

Sn811 *Sabbattha muni anissito*

na piyaṃ kubbati no pi appiyaṃ

tasmiṃ paridevamaccharaṃ

paṇṇe vāri yathā na lippati

Independent in every respect,

The sage does not hold anything as pleasing or displeasing.

Neither grief nor selfishness [can stain] him,

Just as water leaves no mark on a [lotus] leaf.

Y6.11 已不著亦不望 見聞邪吾不愛

亦不從求解脫 不污婬亦何貪

Already detached, without longing for anything,

broadly as ‘ignoble conduct,’ to create a contrast with ‘尊行’ (venerable conduct). In doing so, I perceive Y6.10 as presenting two opposing forms of conduct—the venerable (尊行) and the ignoble (嫉行).

Y6.10a: Bapat translates the phrase ‘無止者亦尊行’ as “‘Having no place to stay’ indicates the conduct of the Sage.” However, I interpret the phrase ‘無止者’ as ‘having no fixation,’ given its juxtaposition with ‘愛不愛’ (lust and detestation) in Y6.10b. Refer to Y6.9d fn.25 for more detail.

Y6.10bc: Bapat translates the phrase ‘愛不愛亦嫉行’ as “Where, likes and dislikes, as well as the practices of jealousy,” and the subsequent phrase ‘在悲憂亦嫉行’ as “Grief and bewailing, along with the same practices of jealousy.” He reads these six elements—‘愛,’ ‘不愛,’ ‘嫉行’ / ‘悲,’ ‘憂,’ and ‘嫉行’—as the subject of the phrase ‘無濡沾’ (no getting wet or stained) in Y6.10d, interpreting it as a verbal phrase ‘不濡沾’ (do not soak or stain [the sage]). However, he offers no explanation for his reading of ‘無濡沾’ in this way, nor does he clarify why the phrase ‘嫉行’ is repeated in the list. Furthermore, he neglects to translate the verb ‘在’ in Y6.10c.

Y6.10d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘無濡沾如蓮華’ as “Never do soil him, [and so is he] like a lotus [to which water doth not cling].” As previously mentioned, Bapat interprets the six elements in Y6.10bc as the subjects of Y6.10d. However, in his translation, the notion that ‘the practices of jealousy cannot soil him’ is somewhat incongruous. It is not the negative practices, but rather the negative emotions or circumstances that should be unable to affect the worthy one. Therefore, we should consider Y6.10d independently from Y6.10bc. Bapat’s interpretation might have been influenced by his attempt to align Y6.10 with Sn811.

濡 = 輒 (S, Y, M): I would translate the alternative phrase ‘無輒沾’ as ‘not to be stained [even] in the slightest.’

They cherish no beliefs, traditions, or mistaken [sense of] ‘mine.’

Moreover, they do not chase after anything in seeking liberation.

Unstained even by carnal passions, what [else] could they [possibly] crave?²⁹

Sn813 *Dhono na hi tena maññati*

yad idaṃ diṭṭhasutaṃ mutesu vā

na aññena visuddhim icchati

na hi so rajjati no virajjati ti

A purified one indeed does not conceive of anything

From beliefs, traditions, or rationales.

They do not seek purity through any other means,

For they are neither attached to, nor detached from, anything.³⁰

²⁹ **Y6.11a**, 亦不望 = 亦可望 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The variant reading necessitates an entirely different interpretation for each character. I would translate ‘已不著亦可望’ as “[The sage] has already detached; indeed, they are worthy of veneration.” In this context, the character ‘可’ denotes ‘can be’; the character ‘望’ shifts from its negative connotation ‘to long for’ to a positive one ‘to venerate.’

Y6.11b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘見聞邪吾不愛’ as “For what he has seen (見) or heard (聞), amiss (邪), no craving (不愛) he (吾?) had.” [Parentheses added for analysis]. He interprets ‘邪’ (amiss, wrong) as an adjective, modifying the preceding phrase ‘見聞’ (what he has seen or hear). However, the Pāli counterpart ‘*diṭṭha suta muta*’ (beliefs, traditions, or rationales) found in Sn813b, suggests that ‘見聞邪’ should denote ‘beliefs, traditions, or misconceptions.’ Consequently, I propose interpreting ‘邪’ alongside ‘見聞,’ to mean ‘something wrongly cognized.’ Additionally, Bapat seems to either overlook ‘吾’ (I, my, or mine) in his translation or construe it as the third-person pronoun ‘he,’ which seems forced. I interpret ‘邪吾’ in conjunction with ‘邪’ as ‘mistaken [sense of] “mine”.’

Y6.11c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘亦不從求解脫’ as “As he pursues them not, Deliverance he doth seek.” This translation seems disjointed. This phrase should build on what is discussed in Y6.11b with the connecting particle ‘亦’ (also, even). In sum, Y6.11b outlines that “the sage does not long for anything,” and Y6.11c further emphasizes that “they do not pursue or seek anything *even* in the name of deliverance.”

Y6.11d, 婬 = 淫 (M): Both characters are synonymous and interchangeable in this context.

³⁰ **Sn813ab**: These two lines are interconnected through the corresponding pronouns ‘*tena*’ (by that...) in Sn813a and ‘*yad idaṃ*’ (whatever is...) in Sn813b. Their references are further elaborated by the subsequent terms ‘*diṭṭhasuttam*’ (beliefs or traditions) and ‘*mutesu*’ (in rationales).

Despite the grammatical discrepancy between ‘*diṭṭhasuttam*’ (in nominative singular) and ‘*mutesu*’ (in locative plural), the *Mahāniddesa* reads both phrases in the same locative cases as ‘*diṭṭhesu sutesu mutesu*.’ Moreover, the *Paramatthajotikā* II considers these phrases as the three integral components of ‘*diṭṭha suta muta*.’

Y6.12 不相貪如蓮華 生在水水不汙

尊及世亦爾行 所聞見如未生

[The sage] is untainted by lust, akin to lotus flowers,

That rise from [muddy] water yet unsullied by it.

In engaging with the world, the sage acts in the same manner,

As if what is heard and seen leaves no mark upon their mind.³¹

This approach is reinforced by the recurring presence of the same syntactic suffixes attached to these three elements throughout the *Aṭṭhakavagga*.

For an in-depth understanding of my translation choices for ‘*diṭṭha suta muta*,’ please refer to footnotes 29 and 30 in Y2, as well as footnotes 7, 8, 12, and 13 in Y4.

Sn813cd: Notably, these lines imply that the concept of detachment, much like that of attachment, does not pertain to the purified one.

³¹ **Y6.12a:** There are two plausible interpretations of ‘不相貪’: firstly, taking ‘相’ as the verb ‘to associate’ and ‘貪’ as the noun ‘lust’; secondly, interpreting ‘相’ adverbially as ‘one after another’ and ‘貪’ as the verb ‘to lust.’ Considering the lotus metaphor, the first parsing—where an enlightened mind is not tainted by lust, much like lotus flower by water—seems more fitting. The Digital Dictionary of Buddhism (DDB) lists ‘不相’ as ‘dissimilar, different, unassociated,’ citing Hirakawa’s Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary (1997). Bapat’s translation of ‘不相’ as ‘unaffected’ is accurate, but I propose ‘untainted’ as a translation that better suits the context.

Nominally, the character ‘相’ has a wide range of meanings and can shift roles depending on the context. It usually denotes ‘each other,’ but it can also mean a ‘perceptual form’ in a Buddhist doctrinal context. However, when paired with the lotus flower metaphor and the peculiar syntax in which the presumed noun (相) is positioned between a negative particle (不) and a verb (貪), conventional interpretations are put to the test. Addressing such unique Chinese syntax, Meisterernst (2010: 76) suggests that “in negative sentences with a pronominal object, the object can precede the verb immediately after the negative,” exemplified by ‘不吾敬也’ (They do not respect me). Although classical Chinese dictionaries do not typically acknowledge a pronominal function for ‘相,’ its usage as a pronoun is not entirely out of the question; its adverbial usage as ‘each other’ can be rendered as its pronominal usage as well. With all respects, my initial reading of ‘相’ as a verb fits better in the context.

Y6.12b, 生在水水不汙: The character ‘水’ (water) is repeated in this phrase, creating a redundancy in English. To enhance readability, I use ‘it’ in place of the second ‘水,’ leading to the interpretation ‘growing in water yet not sullied by it.’

不汙 = 不干 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The variant ‘干’ is understood as ‘to affect,’ so the phrase ‘水不干’ is translated as ‘water does not affect it.’ This preserves the essence of the lotus remaining untouched by the muddy waters in which it grows.’

Y6.12d, 所聞見如未生: This phrase could literally translate to “as if what has been heard and seen has never arisen.” To capture the implied meaning more evocatively, I have translated it as “as if what is heard and seen leaves no mark upon their mind.” This emphasizes the sage’s detachment and purity, akin to the lotus flower. Regarding my rendering of ‘所聞見,’ I have previously suggested it should denote ‘oral traditions and beliefs,’ but

Sn812 *Udabindu yathā pi pokkhare*

padume vāri yathā na lippati

evaṃ muni nopalippati

yad idaṃ diṭṭhasutaṃ mutesu vā

Much like a water droplet on a lotus leaf,

Just as water leaves no mark on a lotus flower,

The sage, likewise, does not cling to [anything]

among beliefs, traditions, or rationales.³²

佛說是義足經竟。比丘悉歡喜

When the Buddha had expounded this [*sūtra* in] the *Yizujing*, all the *bhikṣus* rejoiced.

in this verse, I admit ‘what is heard and seen’ fits better in the context where the sage is likened to lotus flower that is unsullied by water.

³² The terms ‘*pokkhara*’ and ‘*paduma*’ may refer to two distinct species of lotus flower. To enhance readability, I differentiate them by highlighting different parts of the lotus flower instead.

彌勒難經 第七

Discourse 7: Maitreya's Disputations (*Aṭṭhakavagga.7*)¹

聞如是。佛在王舍國多鳥竹園中。時衆老年比丘。在講堂坐行內事。轉相問法。采象子字舍利弗。亦在座中。聞說內事律法難問。問不隨律言。亦無禮敬。

Thus I heard. The Buddha was residing in the kingdom of Rājagṛha 王舍國, at the Bamboo Park (Veṇuvana), which teemed with birds. At that time, elderly *bhikṣus* gathered in the assembly hall, [either] engaging in sitting meditation [or] discussing the Dharma among themselves.² Among those in the assembly was [a *bhikṣu*] named Citrahastisāriputra.³ He overheard

¹ 彌勒: According to Karashima (2010: 318), this term is a transcription of a Middle Indic form of the name 'Maitreya.' Following his research, I have adopted this identification in my translation.

彌勒難經 第七 = 彌勒難 第七 (P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The five editions appear to address the issue of containing sixteen sūtras within the *Yizujing* 義足經, treating these sūtras as chapters. This suggests a conscious effort to organize the text into a structured format.

² The term '王舍國' is a translation of 'Rājagṛha,' with '王' representing 'king' (*rāja*) and '舍' signifying 'house' (*grha*). The final character '國' (kingdom, state) may be Zhi Qian's mistranslation, as Rājagṛha was the capital city of Māgadha, not a kingdom or state. The more fitting translation would be '城' (city, castle).

The term '竹園' translates to 'Veṇuvana,' with '竹' symbolizing 'bamboo' (*venu*) and '園' standing for 'park' (*vana*).

Bapat interprets the phrase '坐行內事' as 'sitting and discussing their own achievements.' However, given the literal meanings of '行' as 'to do' and '內事' as 'internal matter,' this interpretation seems a bit stretched. Notably, this phrase is followed by '轉相問法' (alternately questioning each other about the Dharma), which can be concisely translated as 'discussing the Dharma among themselves.' Considering this context, I suggest that '內事' should be understood as 'meditation,' rendering '行內事' as 'to engage (行) in meditation (內事).' I further refine the translation of '坐行內事' to simply mean 'to engage in sitting meditation.' This interpretation aligns with a slightly altered phrase '說內事' in an immediately following sentence, which I translate as 'to describe one's meditative state.'

Bapat translates '問法' as 'difficult questions about [Abhi-]dharma.' He bases his interpretation of 'Abhidharma' on the *Cittahastisāriputta sutta* (AN6.60). However, I choose to adhere to the original Chinese character '法' and interpret it as 'the Dharma.'

³ 采象子字舍利弗: This name seems to be a fusion of translation and transcription of 'Cittahastisāriputta,' a character depicted in the *Cittahastisāriputta sutta* (AN6.60) as a monk who leaves the Saṅgha six times and, upon his seventh return, finally achieves enlightenment. The first part, '采象子,' translates as 'lustrous elephant' (采象), with '子' serving as an honorific title tied to a surname, not implying 'son.' The latter part, '舍利弗,' is a transcription of 'Sāriputta,' signifying 'the son of Sāri.' Yet, it is important to note that this Sāriputta is a distinct figure from the Buddha's chief disciple of the same name. Thus, if '子' is used with its primary meaning 'son,' it becomes redundant with '弗,' which transliterates '*putta*' (son). The character '字' nestled in the middle symbolizes 'an alternative name adopted at the age of twenty,' signifying that the subsequent '舍利弗' is a given name to one

discussions on intricate questions [related to] meditative states, monastic rules, and the Dharma.⁴

[Then, he intrusively] posed questions without following the Vinaya's dictates and without offering the due courtesy [to the senior *bhikṣus*].⁵

是時賢者大句私。亦在座中。便謂舍利弗言。無。弟。勿於老年比丘。有所疑隨所言恭敬先學。廣爲舍利弗說定意經。

who has become an adult. Zhi Qian seems to have interpreted 'Cittahatthi' as a surname and 'Sāriputta' as a given name, reflecting the customs of Chinese personal naming. While I draw on Pāli literary sources for this name, I interpret '采象子字舍利弗' as 'Citrahastisāriputra,' employing its Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit form and choosing not to separate the name into surname and given name components.

Bapat interprets '采象子字舍利弗' as 'Citra, the son of an elephant-driver.' In his interpretation, he sees '采'—which can mean 'to pick,' 'colorful,' 'lustrous,' etc.—as a translation of 'Citta/Citra' (variegated), and considers '象子字舍利弗' as a mistranslation by Zhi Qian. Bapat suggests that Zhi Qian incorrectly divided 'Hatthisāri-putta' (the son of an elephant driver) into 'Hatthi' (elephant; 象) and 'Sāriputta' (the son of Sāri; 舍利弗), adding the extra characters '子' and '字' in between. While it is plausible, as Bapat proposes, that Zhi Qian may have misunderstood this Pāli name, it seems that Bapat's own analysis may fail to account for the nuances of Chinese naming conventions and the varied uses of the terms '子' and '字.' Additionally, his analysis of the name with the two components 'Hatthisāri-putta' does not explain why '舍利弗' (Sāriputta) features as the shorthand of the full name in the following portion of the narrative.

⁴ Bapat translates '律法' as 'correct dharma.' Yet, his interpretation of '律' as the adjective 'correct' appears somewhat forced. In a Buddhist context, it typically means 'monastic rules'.

⁵ 問不隨律言 亦無禮敬: Bapat translates these phrases as "The question [問] is not [不] in conformity with [隨] the right procedure [律]," remarked [言] [Sāriputta] and [亦] showed no [無] regard [禮] or respect [敬] [for the old mendicants]. [Bracketed Chinese characters added for analysis]. In his interpretation, he treats '問不隨律言' as Sāriputta's direct speech and the subsequent phrase '亦無禮敬' as the manner in which Sāriputta spoke. However, considering the unseemly positioning of the main verb '言' at the end of the phrase and the conjunction '亦,' this interpretation might not be the most fitting. Instead, I propose these phrases are indirect speech all along that can be translated as: 'He [intrusively] posed questions (問) without following (不隨) the Vinaya's (律) dictates (言) and (亦) without offering (無) the due courtesy (禮敬) [to the senior monks].'

Present in the gathering was the venerable Mahākoṣṭhila.⁶ Addressing Śāriputra, he counseled, “You should never display such disregard for the elderly *bhikṣus*.⁷ [If] you harbor any doubts, voice them with the respect and decorum befitting of your seniors.” He [then proceeded to] elucidate the *Sūtra of Mental Stabilization* to Śāriputra in extensive detail.⁸

⁶ 大句私: Bapat identifies this name as ‘Mahākoṣṭhila,’ the figure who admonishes Citrahastīśāriputra for his disdainful attitude towards his seniors in the *Cittahastīśāriputta sutta* and the *Avadānaśataka* II. I interpret ‘大’ as a translation of ‘mahā’ (great) and believe ‘句私’ to be a transcription of another Indic variant of the proper name ‘Koṣṭhila.’ Referencing Pulleyblank (1991), I could reconstruct the pronunciation of ‘句私’ during the Eastern Han period as /kəwsi/, which seems to align with an Indic variant of ‘Koṣṭhila.’

⁷ 無弟勿於老年比丘: In the T198 version, this passage is divided into three segments: ‘無. 弟. 勿於老年比丘.’ This division in the Taishō canon appears to be a misunderstanding. It is likely that there was unfamiliarity with ‘無弟’ as it could serve as a synonym for ‘無悌’ (denoting a lack of respect or obedience). A more accurate interpretation of this passage would be: “Do not (勿) show disrespect (無弟) towards (於) the elder (老年) monks (比丘).”

Following the Taishō canon’s segmentation, possibly not understanding ‘弟’ as an alternative to ‘悌’ (to respect [elder brother]), Bapat divides the subsequent phrase ‘有所疑隨所言恭敬先學’ into ‘有所疑’ and ‘隨所言恭敬先學.’ He then interprets the sequence as “無 / 弟 / 勿於老年比丘有所疑 / 隨所言恭敬先學.” Bapat views the first three segments as a direct statement: “No (無), Brother (弟), enter (有) no (勿) doubt (所疑) about (於) old, senior, (老年) mendicants (比丘).” Bapat perceives the final segment as a narrative description: “In accordance (隨) with his (Mahākoṣṭhila’s) words (所言), [Śāriputra] paid his respect and regard (恭敬) to the senior monks (先學).” [Chinese characters in parentheses and (Mahākoṣṭhila’s) are added for clarity and analysis].

Yet, despite Bapat’s efforts, there are issues with his interpretation. His reading of ‘無’ as ‘No!’ seems off the mark. In this context, ‘No!’ indicates prohibition, which would more accurately be represented by ‘勿’ or ‘毋’ (both meaning “never do that!”). Additionally, using ‘弟’ with its primary meaning of ‘younger brother’ might be out of place in a Buddhist monastic setting. Moreover, his decision to detach ‘有所疑’ from its following context and append it to the preceding phrase results in an awkward translation. If his intention with ‘勿...有所疑’ was ‘do not doubt,’ then the preferable Chinese structure would be ‘勿疑於老年比丘,’ as the negative particle and its associated verb should be closely positioned in conventional Chinese syntax. This also overlooks the nuanced meanings of the characters ‘有’ and ‘所’ in Chinese: ‘有’ can mean ‘if there is’ and ‘所疑’ can refer to ‘the objects of doubt.’

Given these insights, I interpret the entire phrase ‘無弟勿於老年比丘 有所疑隨所言恭敬先學’ as direct speech attributed to Mahākoṣṭhila. I suggest translating it as: “Do not (勿) display disrespect (無弟) towards (於) the elderly monks (老年比丘)! If you hold (有) any doubts (所疑), ensure (隨) your speech (所言) mirrors the reverence (恭敬) expected towards elders (先學).” A more refined translation could be: “Do not show disrespect to the elderly monks! If you have any doubts, express them with the respect and courtesy befitting your seniors.

⁸ 定意經: The Taishō Canon contains a *sūtra* titled 佛說成具光明定意經 (T630), translated by Zhiyao (ca. 185 CE). However, I am uncertain whether the venerable Mahākoṣṭhila is referring to this particular text.

如有賢者子。發道久在家生意。復念淨法。便除鬚髮已。信捨世事。被法衣作沙門。精進行。附正離邪。已證爲行。自知已度。

According [to the *sūtra*], there once was a son of a noble individual. Even as a householder, he had long been drawn to the Path,⁹ and furthermore, he consistently contemplated the pure Dharma. Eventually, [moved by deep] conviction, he shaved his hair and beard, renouncing his worldly life.¹⁰ He donned the Dharma robes, became a śrāmaṇa 沙門 and took up asceticism. [With dedication], he pursued his [spiritual] practice, accruing virtuous actions and steering clear of misdeeds. [Through his endeavors], he experienced [certain spiritual] practices and [ultimately] realized his own liberation.¹¹

時賢者彌勒。到舍利弗家。舍利弗便爲彌勒作禮便就座。彌勒即如法律難問。舍利弗冥於是事不能對。彌勒便起去。入城求食竟。盥澡藏應器。還到佛所。作禮畢就座。以偈問佛言。

⁹ 如有賢者子 發道久在家生意: Bapat translates these phrases as “Long, long ago (久), there was (有) born (發), in the family (在家) of a sage (賢者), a son (子) who had a sharp mind (生意)...” [Parentheses added for analysis]. In doing so, he seems to disregard the characters ‘如’ and ‘道,’ and the proper Chinese syntax, reshaping the text to fit his preconceived narrative. Although the character ‘發’ can be interpreted as ‘to be born,’ the phrase ‘發道...生意’ would be better understood as ‘his mind had been inclined towards the Path.’ The character ‘久’ does not allude to a distant past but rather signifies the duration of his commitment to the path. Additionally, in this context, ‘如’ is better translated as ‘according [to the sutra]’ because this passage appears to be the content of the sutra that Mahākoṣṭhila narrates. Bapat's interpretation of ‘生意’ as ‘a sharp mind’ is also a bit of a stretch.

生意 = 至意 (Y, M / P, J, Q1, Q2) = 巨意 (N): The phrase ‘發道久在家至意’ can be translated as “Even as a householder, he had long cherished (至意) the Path.” Another variant, ‘發道久在家巨意,’ may be rendered as “Even as a householder, he had long held a great wish (巨意) towards the Path.”

¹⁰ 復念淨法 便除鬚髮已 = 復說以是 剃除鬚髮已 (N): The variant phrase translates to “Furthermore (復), having expressed (說) this thought (以是), he shaved off (剃除) his hair and beard (鬚髮).”

¹¹ 已證爲行: The phrase translates as ‘having already (已) experienced (證) (certain spiritual) practices (爲行).’ While ‘爲行’ can be taken literally to mean ‘to put into practice,’ when preceded by the verb ‘證,’ it more aptly translates to ‘practices.’ This interpretation aligns with Karashima’s (2010: 497) definition of the term as ‘practices.’

Once [after Mahākoṣṭhila's elucidation of the *sūtra*], the venerable Maitreya approached Śāriputra's residence. Upon [his arrival], Śāriputra greeted him with reverence and [Maitreya] then settled in his seat.¹² Maitreya subsequently posed challenging inquiries pertaining to the Dharma and Vinaya.¹³ [However], Śāriputra found himself at a loss, unable to answer.¹⁴ After [this exchange], Maitreya rose and departed, making his way into the town to gather alms. [Having finished his meal], he cleaned his bowl and stored it [appropriately].¹⁵ [Thereafter], he returned to the Buddha's abode.¹⁶ After paying homage to the Buddha, he took his seat and questioned the Buddha in verse.¹⁷

¹² 到舍利弗家 舍利弗便爲彌勒作禮便就座: Bapat's interpretation of these phrases reads, "He (Maitreya) went to the house of Śāriputra, who paid his respect to him (Maitreya) and (Maitreya) took from him (Śāriputra) the seat [he (Śāriputra) was carrying]." [Parentheses added for clarity]. Given Maitreya's elevated social standing compared to Śāriputra, the term '就座' would imply that it was Maitreya who 'went towards (就) the seat (座).' Thus, I have identified the third person pronouns in his translation within Parentheses. However, Bapat's additions of 'from him' and 'he was carrying' seem superfluous and are not reflected in the original Chinese text. My translation simplifies '就座' as 'to take a seat' for clarity and brevity.

¹³ 如法律: Bapat translates this phrase as 'in conformity with the right procedure of dharma.' Yet in this context, the compound '法律' is more accurately translated as 'Dharma-Vinaya,' a synonym for what we would call 'Buddhism.'

¹⁴ 舍利弗冥於是事不能對 = 舍利弗宜於是事不能對 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The alternative phrase can translate as, "Śāriputra, expected to respond to this matter, was unable to provide answers."

¹⁵ 盥澡藏應器 = 已澡藏應器 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Given that '盥' and '澡' are synonymous, replacing '盥' with '已' simply indicates the completion of the washing process.

¹⁶ 還到佛所 = 還到佛 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): In the variant reading, '所' (abode) is missing.

¹⁷ In the seventh *sūtra*'s narrative, the connections between the four primary tales remain somewhat elusive: 1) the account of elderly monks, Śāriputra, and the venerable Mahākoṣṭhila; 2) the *sūtra*'s tale of a man who embraced asceticism and ultimately achieved enlightened; 3) the interaction between the venerable Maitreya and Śāriputra; 4) the episode detailing Maitreya's audience with the Buddha. Indeed, apart from the venerable Maitreya, who instigates the Buddha's subsequent verse instructions, the linkage between these narratives and the following verses is not particularly strong.

The narrative sequence presented here diverges significantly from its Pāli counterpart found in the *Paramatthajotikā* II. In the Pāli version, two close friends, Tissa and Metteyya, embark on their spiritual journeys under the Buddha's instruction. While Metteyya attains the status of an arahant, Tissa chooses to disrobe. Subsequently, Metteyya seeks guidance from the Buddha on behalf of Tissa.

The chapter's Pāli title is '*Tissametteyya Sutta*,' whereas in Chinese, it is termed as 'Maitreya's Challenging Questions.' Given that 'Metteyya' is the Pāli rendition of the Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit term 'Maitreya,' both the Pāli and Chinese narratives revolve around the central theme of 'Maitreya/Metteyya posing questions to the Buddha.'

Y7.1 姪欲著女形 大道解癡根

願受尊所戒 得教行遠惡

“Sexual desires kindled by the female form

Are the roots of ignorance,” elucidates the Great Path.

I seek admonition from the Blessed One.

With His instruction in hand, I will fend off that evil.

Sn814 *Methunam anuyuttassa [icc-āyasmā Tisso Metteyyo]*

Vighātaṃ brūhi mārīsa

Sutvāna tava sāsanaṃ

Viveke sikkhissāmase.”

Thus [speaks] the venerable Tissametteyya:

“O sir, enlighten me on the afflictions

Of one indulging in sexual intercourse.

Upon hearing your teachings,

We will train in seclusion.”¹⁸

¹⁸ **Sn814:** In the previous footnote (fn.13), I explained that the *Paramatthajotikā* II narrative distinguishes Tissa and Metteyya as separate individuals. However, this distinction becomes ambiguous in this verse. On one hand, the appended phrase ‘[icc-āyasmā Tisso Metteyyo]’ implies that Tissametteyya is a singular individual, as evidenced by the nominative singular form of ‘āyasmant.’ Yet, line d employs the plural form ‘sikkhissāmase’ (a future tense, middle voice, first person, plural of ‘sikkhati’), suggesting that Tissa and Metteyya could be two distinct persons.

Y7.2 意著姪女形 亡尊所教令

亡正致睡臥 是行失次第

A mind fixated on lust for the female form

Neglects what the Blessed One has taught and established.

Neglecting the right [path, they will] become dull and lethargic.

By this [mindless] conduct, one may fail to take the necessary steps [on the path].¹⁹

Sn815 *Methunam anuyuttassa* [*Metteyyā ti Bhagavā*]

Mussat' evāpi sāsanaṃ

Micchā ca paṭipajjati,

Etaṃ tasmim anāriyaṃ

The Blessed One [speaks], “O, Metteyya!”:

“For those indulging in sexual intercourse,

Even [my] teachings pass into oblivion.

They follow a misguided [path],

Which is ignoble in them.”

¹⁹ Y7.2: The character ‘亡’ (to die, lose) in lines bc should be interpreted as ‘忘’ (to forget). By adjusting for this alternate meaning of ‘亡,’ the Chinese verse Y7.2 aligns more closely with its Pāli counterpart, Sn815. Bapat’s interpretation of this character is accurate.

次第: Literally, this phrase translates to ‘a sequence.’ I have translated it as ‘necessary steps’ to improve clarity and readability. Bapat renders it as ‘orderliness,’ with the entire phrase ‘是行失次第’ being translated as ‘which (是) means the violation (行失) of orderliness (次第) [in conduct].’ [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this seems somewhat stretched. In this context, ‘次第’ would more appropriately refer to sequential steps rather than an orderly pattern. Moreover, ‘失’ primarily means ‘to lose,’ and ‘行’ should be understood as a noun, following the preceding demonstrative adjective ‘是.’

Y7.3 本獨行求諦 後反著色亂

犇車亡正道 不存捨正耶

Once, they journeyed alone, seeking the truth,

But later, succumbed to unchecked sexual [desires],

[Like] a cart [driven by] raging bulls goes off the right path.

Once they have lost [the right path], they abandon righteousness; is that correct?²⁰

Sn816 *Eko pubbe caritvāna*

Methunaṃ yo nisevati.

Yānaṃ bhantaṃ va taṃ loke

Hīnaṃ āhu puthujjanaṃ

[If] someone once journeyed alone,

[but now] indulges in sexual intercourse,

They [will] be called ‘an inferior commoner’ in the world,

Much like a cart that has gone off track.

²⁰ **Y7.3:** The character ‘本’ in line a signifies ‘originally’ or ‘in the past,’ which is contrasted with ‘後反’ (but later) in line b. Line c presents a vivid imagery, likening unchecked passions to ‘a cart driven by raging bulls’ (犇車).

Y7.3d: In the phrase ‘不存捨正耶,’ the character ‘耶’ functions as an interrogative particle used to solicit agreement. Accordingly, the sentence might informally end with a tag such as ‘it is right, yes?’ For a more formal rendition, I have translated it as ‘is that correct?’

不存捨正耶 = 不存捨正邪 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The inclusion of ‘邪’ (wrong) in place of ‘耶’ (final particle that soliciting assent; see Kroll’s classical dictionary, p. 537b. s.v.) appears to be a scribal error. In this context, the reference to ascetics indulging in sex implies abandoning righteousness (正), rather than a disregard for both right (正) and wrong (邪).

Y7.4 坐值見尊敬 失行亡善名

見是諦計學 所姪遠捨離

Adhering to worthy [conduct], one receives veneration;

Breaching that conduct, one tarnishes their good reputation.

Recognizing this, one [should] earnestly reflect upon what they have learned,

Distancing themselves from, renouncing, and leaving behind the object of lust.²¹

Sn817 *Yaso kitti ca yā pubbe,*

Hāyat'evāpi tassa sā

Etam pi disvā sikkhetha

Methunaṃ vippahātave.

Whatever fame and glory [one enjoyed] in the past,

These will indeed fade away from them.

Recognizing this, one should discipline oneself

To renounce sexual intercourse.²²

²¹ **Y7.4ab**: The term ‘坐值’ in line a is best interpreted in contrast to ‘失行’ in line b. Accordingly, ‘坐值’ can be translated as “adhering (坐) to worthy (值) [conduct],” while ‘失行’ means “breaching (失) the [worthy] conduct (行).”

Bapat translates the phrases ‘坐值見尊敬 失行亡善名’ as “[Formerly], when seen, a high seat was offered and honour shown to him; Character he did lose, and a good name he forgot all;”. He reads the versatile character ‘坐’ as equivalent to ‘座’ (seat) and interprets ‘值’ (worth, price) as akin to ‘高’ or ‘上’ (high), which seems a stretch. Furthermore, his interpretation of ‘亡善名’ as ‘forgetting (忘) a good name’ doesn't align well with the context. Notably, his translation of ‘行’ as ‘character’ is off the mark.

²² **Sn817**: The term ‘vippahātave’ (to abandon) is a Vedic infinitive form, which may attest to the antiquity of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*.

Y7.5 且思色善惡 已犯當何致

聞慧所自戒 痛慚却自思

Yet, dwelling on sexual desires, [oblivious to] what is wholesome or unwholesome,

[Some] have breached [celibacy]; how [then] can they achieve [their goal]?

Having learned the moral principles from the wise,

They ought to take pains to repent and renounce their attachments.²³

Sn818 *Samkappehi pareto so*

Kapaṇo viya jhāyati

Sutvā paresaṃ nigghosaṃ

Maṃku hoti tathāvidho.

Engulfed by [their sexual] fantasies,

One dwells on [them], like the destitute [hungry and thirsty].

Hearing the criticism of others,

²³ **Y7.5a:** I have rendered ‘善惡’ as ‘morality,’ capturing the dual notions of what is deemed right (善) and wrong (惡). To integrate this interpretation within the context, I have included ‘oblivious to.’

Y7.5b: The character ‘犯’ (to violate) alludes to ‘the violation of sexual intercourse.’ In this context, I have translated it to imply ‘breaching celibacy.’

Y7.5c: In his footnote (1951: 58), Bapat suggests that the Pāli term ‘*nigghosa*’ is better translated as ‘所自戒’ in Chinese, envisioning it as ‘good words’ rather than the ‘condemnation’ interpretation found in the Pāli commentary. However, this choice misrepresents both the term ‘*nigghosa*’ and its Chinese counterpart. In its essence, ‘*nigghosa*’ translates to ‘utterance,’ a term that can bear both positive and negative connotations—ranging from ‘fame’ to ‘word of reproach.’ Bapat’s oversight of this duality is further compounded by his translation of ‘所自戒’ as ‘reports of good conduct.’ This strays significantly from the intended meaning. In the given context, the phrase ‘所自戒’ is better understood as ‘what one warns oneself against’ or, more succinctly, ‘one’s moral principles.’ Consequently, both the Chinese translation and the Pāli commentary align more closely with the notion of ‘reproach.’

Y7.5d: Bapat interprets the phrase ‘痛慚却自思’ as “He becomes sad and morose, thinking of nothing but self.” Yet, he seems to omit ‘却’ (to abandon). Given ‘自思’ is the object of ‘却’ and denotes ‘what one cherishes,’ I have translated ‘却自思’ as ‘renouncing one’s attachments.’

Such a one becomes disturbed.²⁴

Y7.6 常行與慧合 寧獨莫亂俱

著色生邪亂 無勢亡勇猛

Always align [your] behavior with [the conduct of] the wise.

[Seek] tranquility in solitude, avoiding disturbances from companions.

Indulging in sexual intercourse [can] lead to perversity and chaos,

Depleting [your spiritual] drive and diminishing vitality [on the path].²⁵

Sn820 *Paṇḍito ti samaññāto*

Ekacariyaṃ adhiṭṭhito

Athāpi methune yutto

Mando va parikissati.

Renowned as a person of wisdom,

They once stood firm in solitude.

[But] then, indulging in sexual intercourse,

²⁴ **Sn818a:** The term ‘*saṃkappa*’ typically refers to ‘thought, intention, or imagination.’ Given the context of ‘celibacy’ across this sutta, I have chosen to interpret it as ‘sexual fantasy.’

Sn818b: The word ‘*kaṇa*’ either acts as a noun or adjective derived from ‘*√kṛp* (to wail),’ signifying ‘poor’ or ‘miserable.’ Here, the verse draws a parallel between someone consumed by sexual fantasies and an individual who is famished, yearning for food. To ensure clarity, I have augmented the imagery of ‘the poor’ by incorporating the descriptors ‘hungry and thirsty’.

²⁵ **Y7.6b:** In this context, the character ‘寧’ does not serve as a conjunction that would turn the phrase ‘寧獨莫亂俱’ into a rhetorical question. Instead, it functions as an adjective meaning ‘peaceful.’

They get into trouble like the foolish.²⁶

Y7.7 漏戒懷恐怖 受短爲彼負

已著入羅網 便欺出奸聲

Negligent in discipline, one becomes consumed by fear;

Succumbing to moral laxity, they will be defeated by that [adversary].

Already [ensnared by] attachments, they are trapped in the net.

Subsequently, they deceive [others] by uttering sly words.²⁷

Sn819 *Atha satthāni kurute*

Paravādehi codito

Esa khv-assa mahāgedho:

²⁶ The order of verses in this discourse differs slightly between the Chinese and Pāli versions: Y7.6 corresponds to Sn820, whereas Y7.7 matches Sn819.

²⁷ **Y7.7a:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘漏戒懷恐怖’ as “Man with leaky conduct bristles with dangers.”. However, this translation lacks accuracy. Firstly, he seems to have mistakenly equated ‘懷’ (to cherish) with the similarly shaped character ‘壞’ (to collapse, destroy). Additionally, his translation of ‘恐怖’ as ‘dangers’ is also off the mark; it more appropriately means ‘fear.’

Y7.7b: The phrase ‘受短爲彼負’ presents ambiguity, especially regarding what the demonstrative pronoun ‘彼’ (that, other) refers to. While it is conceivable that it may allude to ‘fear’ from line a, I have chosen to interpret it as ‘adversaries,’ drawing inspiration from the usage in the phrase ‘知彼知己,百戰不殆’ (Know the enemy and know yourself; in a hundred battles, you will never be in peril) from 謀攻 (the Attack by Stratagem) chapter of 孫子兵法 (the Art of War). Here, ‘彼’ is translated as ‘enemy, opponents.’ The term ‘受短’ is equally challenging, translating literally to ‘receiving shortcomings.’ I believe, in this setting, it parallels ‘漏戒’ (negligent in morality), leading me to translate it as ‘succumbing to moral laxity.’

Bapat renders it as “When he is addressed (受) with short (短) words of reprimand.” This translation neglects the meaning of ‘爲彼負’ (to be defeated by others). Furthermore, his interpretation of ‘受短’ seems overextended. The character ‘短’ is seldom used to denote ‘unfriendly short words,’ especially in this context.

Y7.7d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘便欺出奸聲’ as “And then (便) his deceit (欺) [sic] displays (出) words (聲) that are far from truth (奸).” This translation is off the mark. The character ‘奸’ directly translates to ‘wicked, to violate’ and does not inherently imply ‘falsity.’

Mosavajjam pagāhati.

One hastily readies [defensive] arms,

Stirred by others' [provocative] words.

This is indeed their deep-seated attachment:

They become ensnared in deceit.²⁸

Y7.8 見犯因緣惡 莫取身自負

堅行獨來去 取明莫習癡

Recognizing that breaching [celibacy] is the cause and condition for unwholesomeness,

One should eschew carnal attachments and defeat their own [urges].

They [should maintain] impeccable conduct in solitude [as they] come and go,

Seeking wisdom and renouncing ingrained ignorance.²⁹

²⁸ **Sn819:** This verse centers on the theme of 'defensive mechanisms and deceit,' which slightly diverges from the primary theme of 'celibacy' in this *sutta*.

²⁹ **Y7.8:** I have framed this verse around the recurring theme of 'celibacy' that permeates this *sutta*. Consequently, Y7.8 aligns closely with its Pāli equivalent, Sn821. With this perspective, I have interpreted '犯' in line a as 'a breach of celibacy'; '取身' and '自負' in line b to signify 'attachment to physical [temptations]' and 'yielding to these temptations' respectively; '堅行獨' in line c to mean 'upholding an unblemished celibate life,' and '習癡' as 'habitual ignorance,' implying 'indulgence in sexual intercourse.'

Y7.8b: Bapat translates '莫取身自負' as "Take no (莫) recourse (取) to physical actions (身) that contempt evoke (自負?)." [Parentheses added for analysis]. His interpretation of '身' as 'physical actions' feels overstretched and out of context. Moreover, the meaning he assigns to '自負' seems a bit forced. The term could more directly translate to 'self-defeat' or 'assuming responsibility oneself.' In my version, I believe the negative connotation of '莫' (do not) permeates both components, leading me to choose negative verbs like 'eschew' and 'shun.'

Y7.8c: Bapat translates '堅行獨來去' as "But carry on with your life (堅行...來去) that may even be single (獨)." [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation does not closely align with the original Chinese expression. In a more accurate translation, '堅行獨' should be understood as 'maintaining rigorous celibacy' and '來去' can be conveyed as 'wherever one goes or comes from.'

Y7.8d: Bapat translates '莫習癡' as "practise no pranks of folly." This interpretation feels detached from the original context. The direct translation from Chinese suggests 'do not become habituated to ignorance.' For a more nuanced understanding, I have rendered it as 'renouncing ingrained ignorance.'

Sn821 *Etam ādīnavaṃ ñatvā*

muni pubbāpare idha

ekacariyaṃ daḷhaṃ kayirā

na nisevetha methunaṃ

Recognizing this dire consequence,

In the past, future, and present,

The sage should steadfastly practice celibacy;

They should not resort to sexual intercourse.³⁰

Y7.9 遠可獨自處 諦見爲上行

有行莫自憍 無倚泥洹次

Stay aloof from [those deemed] adorable and [dwell] alone in your sanctuary.

Earnestly discern [what] constitutes supreme conduct.

[Even when] embodying such conduct, refrain from conceit.

Relying on nothing, Nīrvāṇa will be near.³¹

³⁰ **Sn821a:** The demonstrative pronoun ‘*etam*’ (this) likely points to the severe consequences of sexual intercourse, especially for those wise individuals who had maintained celibacy over extended periods. This is referenced in the preceding verse, Sn820.

Sn821b: The indeclinable adverb ‘*idha*’ typically denotes the location as ‘here,’ but occasionally it aligns synonymously with ‘*idāni*’ (now). Even though ‘*idha*’ is placed following the compound ‘*pubbāpare*’ (past and future) in the locative case, it seems most fitting in a temporal context. To improve clarity and readability, I have rendered ‘*pubbāpare idha*’ as ‘in the present, past, and future.’

³¹ **Y7.9a:** The crux of accurately translating the phrase ‘遠可獨自處’ hinges on the appropriate interpretation of the character ‘可.’ While this character can serve as a modal verb preceding another verb to mean ‘can,’ it can also be an adjective or noun signifying ‘good’ or ‘desirable object.’ Positioned after the verb ‘遠’ (to distance oneself from) in this verse, ‘可’ is used as a noun, indicating something or someone alluring or attractive. This can be inferred as a condensed form of ‘可意’ (pleasing to the mind) or ‘可愛’ (desirable). The DDB entry for

Sn822 *Vivekaṃ yeva sikkhetha,*

Etad ariyānam uttamaṃ

Tena seṭṭho na maññetha,

Sa ve nibbānasantike

One should indeed train in [the life of] seclusion,

This is [recognized as] the loftiest for the noble ones.

[Yet, even] with this, they should not conceive [themselves] superior to all.

[Then], they are indeed near to nibbāna.

‘可意’ defines it as ‘pleasing.’ For additional instances of ‘可’ used similarly, refer to Y2. fn.19, Y6. fn.14, 23, 25, and Y10. fn.42.

Bapat translates this phrase as “Far [from the world], find a lonely place of shelter.” This translation overlooks the character ‘可’ and adds an unfitting word ‘to find.’

Y7.9b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘諦見爲上行’ as “Which is considered (爲) as the best (上) by those who see (見) the Truth (諦).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. In this rendition, the relative pronoun ‘which’ alludes to the ‘secluded life’ mentioned in line a. While Bapat’s translation seeks to align with its Pāli equivalent, Sn822b, it overlooks the significance of ‘行’ (behavior, conduct) and presupposes an unmentioned pronoun ‘者’ (a person) following ‘諦見.’ When interpreting the Chinese phrase in isolation, without referencing its Pāli counterpart, it more fittingly translates to “Earnestly (諦) discern (見) [what] would be (爲) the supreme (上) conduct (行).”

Y7.9c: Bapat’s translation of the phrase ‘有行莫自憍’ reads, “When you have it, to self-pride give no shelter.” This translation appears to miss the mark, neglecting the character ‘行.’ Even assuming he interpreted ‘行莫’ as ‘do not give,’ the correct order would be ‘莫行,’ and translating ‘行’ as ‘to give’ is a bit of a stretch. In this context, ‘行’ should be understood as a noun denoting ‘conduct,’ serving as the object of the preceding verb ‘有.’ Therefore, ‘有行’ can be understood as ‘[Even when you] have such conduct [like, living a secluded life].’ Following the particle ‘莫’ is the verb ‘憍,’ which means ‘to be conceited.’ Additionally, there is no Chinese character equivalent to his rendering ‘shelter.’

Y7.9d: The term ‘泥洹’ serves as a transcription for ‘Nirvāṇa,’ the ultimate goal in Buddhist soteriology, although ‘涅槃’ is a more commonly used transcription.

Bapat translates the phrase ‘無倚泥洹次’ as “Though not (無) in actual contact (倚) with Nirvāṇa (泥洹), you are quite near (次).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, his rendering of the phrase seems imprecise. Since the character ‘倚’ is commonly understood to mean ‘to rely/lean on,’ his interpretation of ‘無倚’ as ‘not in actual contact’ feels extended.

Y7.10 遠計念長行 不欲色不色

善說得度痛 悉世婬自食

Planning far ahead and contemplating a lengthy [spiritual] journey,

One [should] not desire either form or formlessness.

Well-articulated may be [the way] to transcend suffering,

[And yet] all worldlings are consumed by their carnal desires.³²

Sn823 *Rittassa munino carato*

Kāmesu anapekhino

Oghatiṇṇassa pihayanti

Kāmesu gathitā pajā” ti

People, bound by sensual pleasures,

Envy the sage, who journeys unencumbered,

Who does not desire sensual pleasures,

³² **Y7.10:** The interpretation of this verse hinges on the accurate understanding of the phrases ‘色不色’ in line b and ‘婬自食’ in line d. Within the given context, ‘色不色’ likely signifies ‘both form and the formless,’ complementing the preceding verb ‘欲’ (to desire). As for ‘婬自食’, it carries the implication that while ordinary individuals might think they derive pleasure (食) from sexual intercourse (婬), in a spiritual context, it is actually the act of intercourse that consumes them.

Y7.10a: Bapat translates the phrase ‘遠計念長行’ as “Think and plan of going [from the world] far, far away.” However, the term ‘長行’ seems to denote ‘a long spiritual journey’ rather than ‘a dissociation from the world.’

Y7.10b: Bapat translation of the phrase ‘不欲色不色’ reads, “With no desire for sensuous pleasures, which get rid of, all;”. His interpretation of ‘不色’ as ‘to get rid of all’ misses the intended nuance. When seen as the object of the verb ‘欲,’ the term ‘色不色’ more fittingly points to dual extremes: the desire for both form and the formless.

Y7.10d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘悉世婬自食’ as “Because all the wordlings are, in pleasures of sense, merged.” In his footnote, he argues that ‘食’ (to eat) is a mistaken word and should be correct as ‘貪’ (to covet). However, his argument does not hold, as the Chinese phrase is aptly constructed with ‘自食’ signifying ‘self-consumption.’ A pertinent reference to ‘自食’ appears in the Wenzhi 文子, within the Predictions chapter 符言: “老子曰: 山生金, 石生玉, 反相剝, 木生蟲, 還自食, 人生事, 還自賊”. Translated, it reads: “Mountains produce gold, Stones give birth to jade. Yet they strip each other away. Wood produces insects, which *in turn consume it*. Humans create affairs but are betrayed by their own actions.” This illustration elucidates the meaning of ‘自食’ as showcased in Y7.10d.

And who has traversed beyond the deluge.³³

佛說是義足經竟。比丘悉歡喜

When the Buddha had expounded this [*sūtra* in] the *Yizujing*, all the *bhikṣus* rejoiced.³⁴

³³ **Sn823**: For improved flow and readability, I have presented the translation of line d first, followed by lines abc.

³⁴ 佛說是義足經竟 = 佛說義足經竟 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The absence of ‘是’ in the variant phrase suggests that these eight editions do not treat this *sūtra* as a standalone text within the *Yizujing*, but rather as a chapter of the *Yizujing* and represented by the collective title.

勇辭梵志經 第八

Discourse 8: Brahmin Yongci (*Aṭṭhakavagga.8*)¹

佛在舍衛國。當留三月竟。一時於祇樹給孤獨園中。是時墮沙國。諸長者子。共賃一梵志。名勇辭。使之難佛取勝。謝金錢五百。梵志亦一時三月。諷五百餘難。難中有變。自謂無勝己者。

The Buddha was staying in the kingdom of Śrāvastī, as the three-month retreat was nearing its end; at that time, he was in Jeta's Grove in Anāthapiṇḍada's Park. By then, all the householders' sons from Duosha 墮沙 State together recruited a brahmin named Yongci 勇辭, tasking him with rebutting the Buddha and defeating him [in a debate], for which they would reward him with five hundred gold coins.² Over the course of these three months, the brahmin [prepared] by

¹ 勇辭梵志經 第八 = 勇辭梵志 第八 (P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The five editions consistently treat the sixteen sūtras as chapters of the *Yizujing*.

² In this particular instance, Bapat translates the phrase '諸長者子' merely as 'house-holders,' missing the nuances imparted by '諸' and '子.' Outside of this interpretation, he consistently translates '長者子' as 'the sons of the householder.' The term '長者子' can be understood in two ways: either as 'the sons of the householders,' as Bapat suggests, or as 'the householders [and their] sons.' I lean towards the second rendering because it seems unnecessary in the former interpretation to exclude householders and refer solely to their sons. Nonetheless, I have opted for the latter, 'the householders' sons.' This decision does not stem from any narrative necessity but from a preference for a more concise phrasing.

Identifying the Indic counterparts for the proper names '墮沙' and '勇辭' presents a challenge. As a result, I have opted to use the Pinyin versions in my translation. The Pāli counterpart of this sutra is the *Pasūra sutta*, where a wandering debater named Pasūra challenges Sāriputta but subsequently becomes his disciple. However, the entirety of this sutta's narrative in the *Paramatthajotikā* II unfolds in the kingdom of Sāvattī (Śrāvastī), with no reference to the Chinese place name '墮沙' State. Additionally, I could not discern any correlation between the Chinese name '勇辭' and the Pāli name Pasūra, neither in terms of translation nor transcription.

使之難佛取勝: This phrase translates as "[They] commissioned (使) him (之) to rebut (難) the Buddha (佛) and achieve victory (取勝) [over him]." While '難' typically functions as the adjective 'difficult,' in this instance, it acts as a verb, meaning 'to rebut' or 'to refute.'

rehearsing over five hundred rebuttals, each with its own set of variations.³ He boasted that no one would ever best him.

佛三月竟。從衆比丘。欲到墮沙國。轉行郡縣說經。次到墮沙猴猿溪邊高觀殿中。諸長者子。即聞佛衆比丘到國。即相聚會合五百餘人。梵志言。佛已到吾國。宜早窮難。

After the three-month [retreat] was finished, the Buddha and his entourage of *bhikṣus* set out for Duosha State, journeying through towns and villages, delivering sermons [along the way],⁴ until they eventually reached a towering grand palace by the Monkey Stream in Duosha State. The news of the Buddha and his *bhikṣus*' arrival reached the householders' sons,⁵ so they quickly convened a gathering of over five hundred individuals. The brahmin declared, "The Buddha is now in our state.⁶ I must refute [his position] without delay."

梵志即悉從長者子。往到佛所。相勞問便坐一面。長者子中。有爲佛作禮者。向佛叉手者。默然者。悉就座。梵志熟視佛威神。甚大巍巍。不可與言。便內恐怖懾。不能復語。佛悉知梵志及長者子共議作。便說是義足經

³ 諷五百餘難: Although the character '諷' typically means 'to chant' or 'to memorize,' in this context I have translated it as 'to rehearse' to preserve the performative connotation akin to 'chanting' and emphasize the preparation for a debate with the Buddha.

⁴ 欲到墮沙國: While this phrase can be directly rendered as "wanted to arrive at Duosha State," I have chosen a more fluid translation, using 'set out for' in place of 'wanted to arrive at' (欲到).

⁵ 猴猿溪: Bapat renders this as 'the Monkey-Lake.' However, the character '溪' signifies 'a valley stream' or 'rivulet,' contrasting with 'lake' (湖). Notably, the preceding two characters '猴' and '猿' both translate to 'monkey.'

⁶ 佛已到吾國: Though '已到' literally means 'has arrived,' I have opted for a more natural phrasing with 'is now' for enhanced readability.

Immediately, the brahmin, accompanied by all the householders' sons, went to the Buddha's place. After exchanging greetings, they sat to one side.⁷ Among the householders' sons, some paid homage to the Buddha, others clasped their hands together towards the Buddha, and still others remained silent; all took their seats.⁸ The brahmin intently observed the Buddha's majestic aura, which was profoundly immense, towering, and indescribable.⁹ Soon, he was overcome with fear and trepidation, rendering him speechless. The Buddha, fully aware of the plans and discussions between the brahmin and the householders' sons, proceeded to expound upon the *Yizujing*.

Y8.1 自說淨法無上 餘無法明及我

著所知極快樂 因緣諦住邪學

They declare, "[Our] pure dharma is unparalleled.

No other dharmas are as clear as ours."

Holding tightly to their beliefs, their satisfaction is profound.

⁷ 相勞問: Bapat interprets this phrase as "to put him questions of welfare." While his interpretation is on the right track, it could benefit from clearer phrasing. The term '問' here does not signify serious questioning but rather denotes a mutual (相) and customary or ritualistic exchange (勞). Challenging the Buddha immediately upon meeting would be inconsistent with the expected etiquette during their audience. I believe the phrase 'questions of welfare' can more aptly be described as 'greetings.' As such, I have chosen to translate '相勞問' as 'to exchange greetings.'

⁸ 叉手: This term specifically refers to putting the hands together with intertwined fingers, a gesture distinct from '合掌,' which involves placing the palms together.

⁹ 佛威神 甚大巍巍 不可與言: In this phrase, both '甚大巍巍' (profoundly immense, towering) and '不可與言' (unable to be described) serve to elaborate on '佛威神' (the Buddha's majestic aura). The term '巍巍' reinforces the imposing nature of the Buddha's aura through the repetition of the adjective '巍' (towering).

[Their] truths are conditional, and they adhere to deceptive doctrines.¹⁰

Sn824 *Idh'eva suddhi iti vādiyanti,*

Nāññesu dhammesu visuddhim āhu

Yaṃ nissitā tattha subhaṃ vadānā

Paccekasaccesu puthū niviṭṭhā

Proclaiming, “Only here lies purity,”

They assert spiritual purity is in no other teachings.

Declaring whatever they rely on there to be auspicious,

They each remain entrenched in their own truths.

Y8.2 常在衆欲願勝 愚放言轉相燒

意念義忘本語 轉說難慧所言

In the assembly, they constantly seek victory.

[Such] misguided [individuals] speak carelessly, causing harm to each other.

¹⁰ **Y8.1b:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘餘無法明及我’ as “The rest have no Law and, in knowledge, cannot equal them.” In this context, ‘them’ refers to ‘[their] pure dharma’ from the previous line. This is a perfectly legitimate translation. The primary distinction between Bapat's translation and mine is the choice of subject: Bapat uses ‘the rest’ (餘) whereas I employ ‘no other dharma’ (餘無法).

Y8.1c: 極快樂 = 在極快 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The variant phrase can be rendered as “they reside in great delight.”

Y8.1d: : Bapat translates the phrase ‘因緣諦住邪學’ as “Thinking it to be Truth, they in their wrong doctrine, ground themselves firm.” This translation seems to miss the mark. Specifically, the term ‘因緣’ denotes ‘causes and conditions,’ making his translation ‘thinking it to be’ a stretch. I've chosen to translate ‘因緣諦’ as ‘[their claimed] truth is conditional’.

Crafting their own interpretations, they lose sight of the original wording [of the teachings].

They debate with one another, rebutting what the wise have declared.¹¹

Sn825 *Te vādakāmā parisam vigayha*

Bālaṃ dahanti mithu aññamaññaṃ

Vadenti te aññasitā kathojjaṃ

Pasaṃsakāmā kusalā vadānā

Coveting debate and diving into the assembly,

They in turn deem one another fools.

Claiming to be experts and craving acclaim,

They initiate a debate based on varied [assumptions].¹²

¹¹ **Y8.2b:** Bapat's translation of the phrase '愚放言轉相燒' reads, "And words (言) such as 'fools' (愚) they pelt (放) at each other (轉相), all around (燒?)." [Parentheses added for analysis]. Bapat seems to opt for the variant character of '遶' (to encircle), which I will revisit later, instead of the Taishō reading '燒' (to burn). In this context, I understand '燒' metaphorically, suggesting 'to cause harm' or 'to hurt feelings.' Bapat's interpretation of '愚' as an accusatory term like '[you] fool!' is valid, particularly when considering its Pāli equivalent '*bālaṃ dahati*' (to label someone a fool). However, another feasible reading positions '愚' as the subject of '放言,' indicating how Zhi Qian's contemporaneous Chinese scholars might have perceived this phrase without referencing the Indic phrasing. I have translated '愚放言' as "[Such] misguided (愚) [individuals] speak carelessly (放言)."

轉相燒 = 轉相遶 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): While '燒' implies 'to burn/harm,' '遶' means 'to encircle.' I interpret this as 'to threaten' or 'to gang up upon' translating the phrase as '[Such] misguided individuals carelessly speak, threatening each other.'

Y8.2c: I have translated the phrase '意念義忘本語,' interpreting '義' as contrasting with '本語' (original words). Therefore, I have rendered '意念義' as 'conceiving (念) interpretations (義) in their mind (意),' which I have rephrased as 'crafting their own interpretations.'

Y8.2d: I read '轉說難' as 'to argue and challenge one another.' For a deeper understanding of the character '難' used as a verb, please see the earlier footnote (Y8. fn.2). Bapat's translation of the phrase as 'Mutually (轉) asking (說) difficult questions (難)' lacks precision. [Parentheses added for analysis].

¹² **Sn825:** To improve the flow, I have rearranged the translation of line d before line c. Line d contains the present participle '*vadāna*' (claiming), while line c has the main verb for both lines, '*vadeti*' (to speak).

Y8.3 於衆中難合義 欲難義當竟句

在衆窮便瞋恚 所難解衆悉善

[When] consensus eludes the assembly,

They attempt to problematize phrases that should hold clear meaning.

Cornered in the assembly, they quickly erupt in anger.

[However], all within the assembly recognize the truly challenging issues.¹³

Sn826 *Yutto kathāyaṃ parisāya majjhe*

Pasaṃsam icchaṃ vinighāti hoti

Apāhata smiṃ pana maṃku hoti

Nindāya so kuppati randhamesī

In the heart of the assembly, immersed in debate,

¹³ **Y8.3:** I have taken some liberties in rephrasing from my initial literal translation, which I'll detail below.

Y8.3a: The phrase ‘於衆中難合義’ can be more directly translated as “[When] in the assembly (於衆中), it is difficult (難) to reach agreement (合義).” Bapat translates it as “In assemblies, questions he puts, the interpretations to gather,” but this seems off the mark. It appears he might have missed the intended meaning of the phrasal verb ‘合義’ (to agree) and instead parsed ‘難合義’ as ‘to pose questions (難) and to compile (合) interpretations (義).’ Contextually, ‘難’ functions better as an adjective indicating ‘difficulty.’

Y8.3b: The phrase ‘欲難義當竟句’ might be more directly rendered as “They desire (欲) to make raise difficulties (難) regarding the meaning (義) of a phrase [句] that should (當) be ultimately clear (竟).” Bapat interprets it as, “The explanations (義) of those questions (難) he expects (欲), when his words (句) he has said.” [Parentheses added for analysis]. Bapat's version seems to misinterpret the context. He appears to consistently confuse ‘難’ with ‘問’ (questions), skewing the intended message of the phrase. Moreover, he omits the significant characters ‘當’ and ‘竟’ in his rendition.

Y8.3c: Bapat's translation, “In the assembly, when defeated, irritated he doth get,” stretches the meaning of ‘窮.’ Rather than suggesting a ‘[final] defeat,’ the Sinograph more aptly conveys the sense of being ‘hard-pressed’ or ‘cornered.’

Y8.3d: The phrase ‘所難解衆悉善’ can be directly translated as “Everyone (悉) in the assembly (衆) [knows] well (善) what (所) is [truly] challenging (難) to resolve (解).” The emphasis here seems to be on the obstinate demeanor of the individual within the assembly. Bapat's rendition, “For, what was hard for him to understand, all the crowd knew so well.” However, the verse seems to stress the attitudes of those posing questions, rather than the complexity of the questions themselves.

One is anxious to defeat [others], desiring acclaim.

Yet, when refuted, they become dejected.

Distressed by criticism, they search for [other's] weaknesses.¹⁴

Y8.4 自所行便生疑 自計非後意悔

語稍疑忘意想 欲邪難正不助

Doubt immediately arises from what they have just done [in the assembly].

Having considered their own errors, they later feel regret.

Increasingly doubtful of their rhetoric, they forget its [underlying] meaning and ideas.

They instinctively twist and complicate [the debate],

[but attempts at] rectification proves unhelpful.¹⁵

¹⁴ **Sn826b:** The term ‘*vinighāti*’ is a masculine nominative singular form, derived from the adjective ‘*vinighātin*.’ It can be broken down into its components: ‘*vi-*,’ ‘*-ni-*,’ ‘*ghāta*’ (the past participle of √*han*, meaning ‘to kill’), and the adjectival suffix ‘*-in*.’

Sn826c: The term ‘*apāhata smiṃ*’ is a locative singular form, composed of ‘*apa-*,’ ‘*-ā-*,’ and ‘*hata*’ (the past participle of √*han*, meaning ‘to kill’). The locative expression, derived from this past participle, indicates time and can be translated as ‘when refuted.’

Sn826d: The term ‘*randhamesī*’ is a masculine nominative singular form, coming from the adjective ‘*randhamesin*.’ It combines ‘*randham*’ (meaning ‘cleft’ or ‘weakness’) and ‘*esin*’ (indicating a striving or desire, from the root √*iṣ*, meaning ‘to wish’).

¹⁵ **Y8.4:** I have not yet located a corresponding verse in the Pāli canon. This verse underscores how debaters, rather than understanding the core truths, become sidetracked by rhetoric and consequently distort and complicate the message.

Y8.4b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘自計非後意悔’ as “‘My (自) beliefs (計), no more (非)’—thus he doth repent ([意]悔).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation seems to misrepresent the characters. Specifically, he appears to misinterpret ‘計’ as ‘belief,’ which is more accurately translated as ‘to calculate, consider, or plan.’ It is possible he confused it with ‘信’ (belief). Additionally, his use of ‘no more’ seems a stretch for the character ‘非’ (is not), which might more appropriately be represented by characters such as ‘無’ or ‘没有.’ He also omits the translation of ‘後’ (later).

Y8.4c: Bapat’s translation of the phrase ‘語稍疑忘意想’ reads, “Words get few and his mental illusions he doubts.” This interpretation, however, seems to miss the mark. The verse’s central theme is not the debaters’ self-doubt but their determination to win debates, even if it means manipulating the truth. Consequently, their emphasis shifts towards their wording, phrasing, and rhetoric, rather than the genuine meanings behind them.

Y8.5 悲憂痛所言短 坐不樂臥暗咋

本邪學致辭意 語不勝轉下意

In grief, anxiety, and pain, when their words [are found] deficient,

They find no solace sitting; lying down, they weep [until] voiceless.

Initially misguided in their learning, leading to the intent in rhetoric,

Unable to prevail with speech, [their spirits] sink into despondence.¹⁶

Sn827 *Yam assa vādaṃ parihīnam āhu*

忘意想 = 妄意想 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The variant phrase ‘語稍疑妄意想’ may translate as, “Increasingly doubtful, they engage in rhetoric with erroneous meanings and ideas.”

Y8.4d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘欲邪難正不助’ as “And (he) wishes (欲) his questions (難?), wrong (邪), had not (不) helped (助) [him] aright (正).” [Parentheses added for clarity and analysis]. This interpretation seems off-track. It appears he has once more mistakenly equated ‘難’ (difficult, challenge) with ‘問’ (ask, question). The line primarily emphasizes that these debaters are determined to triumph, and efforts to rectify their stance prove futile.

¹⁶ **Y8.5:** This verse highlights the despair experienced by debaters defeated due to misguided motivations.

Y8.5a: Bapat translates the phrase ‘悲憂痛所言短’ as “Distressed and grieved that his words [brought] defeat.” Here, Bapat’s interpretation of ‘短’ as ‘defeat’ seems to be a stretch. While the primary meaning of ‘短’ is ‘short,’ its extended meanings can encompass ‘deficient’ or ‘shortcomings.’ It is possible that Bapat aimed to correlate this character with the Pāli term ‘*apāhataṃ*’ (refuted) found in Sn827b. However, in my assessment, ‘短’ is more appropriately aligned with ‘*parihīnaṃ*’ (deficient) from Sn827a.

Y8.5c: Bapat’s translation of the phrase ‘本邪學致辭意’ reads, “His wrong (邪) doctrines (學) of old (本) make (致) him his words (辭) think over (意).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. Bapat’s translation of ‘本’ as ‘old’—when the term typically denotes ‘root’ or ‘origin’—is a somewhat liberal interpretation. Furthermore, within this context, ‘辭’ is more appropriately understood as ‘rhetoric,’ providing a nuanced contrast to the ‘underlying meanings and ideas’ highlighted in Y8.4c. The word ‘意’ is better translated as ‘intent’ rather than Bapat’s choice of ‘to think over.’ For his rendering, either ‘思’ or ‘慮’ would have been more apt.

Y8.5d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘語不勝轉下意’ as “Words bring no victory”—this thought, in his mind, doth roll.’ Notably, he omits the key character ‘下.’ Paired with ‘意,’ it suggests ‘a lowering mood’ or ‘despondence.’ Thus, I have translated ‘轉下意’ as ‘[their spirits] sink (轉) into despondence (下意).’

Apāhataṃ pañhavīmaṃsakāse

Paridevati socati hīnavādo

Upaccagā man ti anutthuṇāti

[If] the arbiters of the debate proclaim

That one's argument is deficient and refuted,

The loser in the debate then cries, laments, and wails,

Thinking "I have been bested by another."¹⁷

Y8.6 已見是尚守口 急開閉難從生

意在難見對生 出善聲爲衆光

Having recognized this, one should guard their words with special [care].

Hasty speech can lead to immediate troubles.

With the mind entangled in these difficulties, one will find adversaries appearing.

[Yet], by speaking skillfully, one [can] enlighten the assembly.¹⁸

¹⁷ **Sn827:** This verse forms a single sentence, constructed around the correlative pronoun 'yam' (that which) and the noun 'hīnavāda' (the loser in the debate). Norman interprets 'yam' as 'if anyone,' a reading also adopted by Bodhi in his translation. Interestingly, this pronoun is paired not with its typical correlative counterpart 'tam' (that) or 'so' (he), but instead aligns with the nominal compound 'hīnavāda.' Therefore, a direct translation of this verse might read: "If there is anyone whose argument the debate's arbiters declare as deficient and refuted, the loser in the debate cries ... thinking ..." For clarity, I have adapted this structure to: "If the debate's arbiters declare one's argument deficient and refuted, the loser in the debate cries... thinking..."

Sn827d: The phrase 'upaccagā man' is an active sentence, translated as 'Someone has outwitted me.' Given the context, the emphasis is not on 'someone,' so I have rendered it in the passive form: 'I have been outwitted.'

¹⁸ **Y8.6:** The central theme of this verse revolves around mindful speech. Various Chinese expressions in the verse convey the act of speaking: '口' (mouth, speech) in line a; '開閉' in line b, which directly translates as 'to open and close [one's mouth]'; and '出...聲' in line d, rendered directly as 'to utter one's voice.'

Y8.6a: 尚守口 = 向守口 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The variant phrase may translate to "one should strive to guard their words."

Sn828 *Ete vivādā samañesu jātā*

Etesu ugghāti nighāti hoti

Etam pi disvā virame kathojjam

Na h'aññadatth' atthi pasamsalābhā

[Whenever] these disputes have emerged among the ascetics,

One becomes either elated or dejected.

Recognizing this, one should refrain from any debate,

For there is no purpose other than the gain of fame.¹⁹

Y8.6b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘急開閉難從生’ as “But, soon, he lets it loose (lit. opens the mouth), which the questions hard had tied (lit. closed).” This interpretation misrepresents the structure. The paired term ‘開閉’ more aptly denotes ‘to utter.’ His choice to translate ‘開’ as ‘to open mouth’ and ‘閉’ as ‘to tie’ seems arbitrary. Furthermore, consistently translating ‘難’ as ‘hard question’ without considering the context can lead to inaccuracies. A more fitting translation for the phrase can be: “Speaking (開閉) hastily (急), troubles (難) will quickly ensue (從生).”

急開閉 = 急開開 (S, Y, M): The duplication of ‘開’ in the variant phrase likely emphasizes excessive or overly frequent talking.

Y8.6c: Bapat’s translation of the phrase ‘意在難見對生’ as “When he finds (見) that the questions (難) in his mind (意) do a good reception (對?) get (生),” is even more problematic. [Parentheses added for analysis]. Notably absent is a Chinese equivalent for his term ‘a good reception.’ While ‘對’ can mean ‘to reply,’ ‘to face,’ or ‘to oppose,’ it does not inherently carry a positive connotation in this context. Given the theme of the consequences of rash speech, a more fitting interpretation of ‘對’ here would be ‘adversaries’ or ‘opponents.’ A suggested translation can be: “With the mind (意) embroiled in (在) these challenges (難), one encounters (見) rising adversaries (對生).”

Y8.6d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘出善聲爲衆光’ as “In words which, when uttered, do the [whole] gathering enliven.” This translation seems to omit the nuance of the character ‘善’, which means ‘good’ or ‘skillful.’ If Bapat incorporated this character into his translation of line c as ‘good reception’, his translation arbitrarily distorts the structure of the original Chinese verse. Instead of conflating lines b, c, and d, as Bapat appears to do, this line should be viewed independently. It presents a scenario contrasting with lines b and c, highlighting the positive effects of skillful speech. While ‘爲衆光’ can be translated literally as ‘one can be the assembly’s illumination,’ I have chosen a more metaphorical interpretation: ‘one can enlighten the assembly.’

¹⁹ **Sn828:** Despite juxtaposing Sn828 with Y8.6, it is important to note that these two verses do not converge thematically. Y8.6 delves into the contrast between ‘mindful speech’ and ‘careless speech,’ while Sn828 explores the essence of debates—aiming for fame and the inevitable outcomes of either victory or defeat. Given these distinct themes, it is advisable to approach each verse independently.

This verse contains four sentences, with each occupying its own line, marked by four terms that can serve as principal verbs. Nonetheless, lines c and d are linked through the causal particle ‘hi’ (because), making line d the causal basis for the statement in line c. While lines a and b are grammatically independent, they are best interpreted

Y8.7 辭悅好生意喜 著歡喜彼自彼

自大可墮漏行 彼不學從何增

已學是莫空諍 不從是善解脫

Pleasing and well-spoken words [of praise indeed] delight the mind.

Being attached to such joys, one after another,

One may fall into lax conduct [due to their] arrogance.

Without [continuous] learning, how can one further develop?

Having learned this [lesson], do not engage in pointless disputes.

By steering clear of such [debates], one [achieves] skillful liberation.²⁰

in conjunction, as ‘*etesu*’ (in these) in line b references ‘*ete vivādā*’ (these disputes) in line a. I have connected the two lines using ‘whenever.’

Sn828b: The terms ‘*ugghāti nighāti*’ are most directly translated as ‘victory and defeat.’ However, the *Mahāniddesa* offers a broader perspective by glossing these with a range of antithetical pairs, including ‘gain and non-gain,’ ‘fame and dishonor,’ ‘praise and blame,’ ‘pleasure and pain,’ ‘joy and sorrow,’ ‘the desirable and the undesirable,’ ‘attraction and repulsion,’ ‘elation and dejection,’ ‘compliance and hostility’ (Bodhi, 2017: 1100). Guided by this commentary, many translators render the terms synonymously with ‘*ugghāta nighāta*,’ which translates to ‘elation and dejection.’ This seems fitting, especially considering the surrounding verses emphasize the emotional reactions of debaters more than the objective outcomes of victory or defeat.

²⁰ **Y8.7:** This is a six-line verse, paralleled with Sn829 and Sn830. The verse from the Chinese text underscores the idea that an attachment to praise can be a precursor to moral degradation. It further suggests that by abstaining from meaningless debates, one can navigate towards liberation.

Y8.7a: The phrase ‘辭悅好’ can be directly translated as ‘words (辭) that are pleasing (悅) and well-spoken (好).’ I believe it refers to the ‘praise’ that is a recurring theme throughout this sūtra. The assertion in line c, suggesting that such words can lead to arrogance, further supports this interpretation.

Y8.7b: Bapat’s translates the phrase ‘著歡喜彼自彼’ as “Attachment to pleasure and joy, he thinks as ‘all-in-all’.” This interpretation is both ambiguous and puzzling: I am uncertain where his rendering of ‘all-in-all’ comes from, and the intended meaning behind his translation remains unclear. The phrase ‘彼自彼’ can be directly translated as ‘that (彼), from (自) [another] that (彼)’. In my view, it suggests a ‘persistent indulgence in praises,’ best rendered as ‘one [praise] after another.’

Y8.7c: Bapat’s translation of the phrase ‘自大可墮漏行’ as “‘Exalting [*sic*] (大可?) his self (自)’ doth mean leakage (漏行?) and fall (墮),” [Parentheses added for analysis]. His translation does not precisely convey the essence of the characters ‘可’ and ‘行’. The term ‘自大’ can be directly translated as ‘self-importance’ and carries the connotations of ‘conceit’ or ‘pride.’ Meanwhile, ‘可墮’ implies a potential ‘fall into’ certain behavior, and ‘漏行’ signifies ‘moral laxity.’

Sn829 *Pasaṃsito vā pana tattha hoti*

Akkhāya vādaṃ parisāya majjhe

So hassati uṇṇamati-cca tena

Pappuyya tam atthaṃ yathā mano ahū

Or, even [when] praised amidst the assembly,

Having proclaimed their doctrine there,

One laughs and revels in that [praise],

Achieving the purpose as they had intended.²¹

Sn830 *Yā uṇṇati sāssa vighātabhūmi*

Mānātimānaṃ vadate pan' eso

Etam pi disvā na vivādayetha

Na hi tena suddhiṃ kusalā vadanti

Elation of any kind is the ground of one's distress.

[Yet], they speak from their profound conceit.

墮漏行 = 惰漏行 (S, Y, M): The variant phrase may translate to 'indolent (惰) and lax (漏) conduct (行),' indicating a state of negligence and lack of discipline.

Y8.7e: Bapat translates '空諍' as 'vain words,' but it can be more accurately rendered as 'futile disputes.'

Y8.7f: Bapat translates the phrase '不從是善解脫' as "[For], from them (從是), no (不) good (善) release (解脫) can he in any way obtain." [Parentheses added for analysis]. While he seems to correctly associate '是' with '空諍' from Y8.7e, the term '從' should act as a verb subsequent to the negative particle '不.' Consequently, '不從是' is better translated as 'By not engaging in these futile disputes.'

²¹ **Sn829:** The verse is more cohesively understood as a single sentence. Lines bd function as gerund phrases, whereas lines ac consist of clauses that can be coherently linked using 'tena' (by that) in line c, referring to 'pasaṃsito' (to be praised) in line a. To link lines ac, I added a conjunction 'when' in my translation of line a.

Sn829ab: The term 'tattha' (there) from line a refers to the phrase 'parisāya majjhe' (in the middle of the assembly) in line b. In my translation, I have rearranged their placements to improve clarity.

Seeing this, one should not dispute,
For the skilled do not claim purity through such means.

Y8.8 多倚生痛行司 行求輩欲與難

勇從來去莫慚 令當誰與汝議

Relying on many for sustenance, the [mendicant] labors [to find] an arbitrator,

Searching for those eager to engage in debate [as well].

Boldly, they wander without a hint of shame,

Asserting, “Who [else but me] is fit to debate with you [all]?”²²

Sn831 *Sūro yathā rājakhādāya puṭṭho*

Abhigajjam eti paṭisūram iccham

²² **Y8.8a:** The phrase ‘多倚生’ pertains to the livelihood of mendicants and translates as ‘relying (倚) on many (多) for sustenance (生).’ To elucidate this notion, I inserted ‘the mendicant’ as the subject for ‘痛行司’ (to toil [to find] an arbitrator). The term ‘司’ translates to ‘an official’ and, given the context, likely denotes ‘an arbitrator in a debate.’ The phrase ‘痛行’ translates to ‘to laboriously undertake,’ and I suspect that ‘行’ here is abbreviated from ‘行求’ (to search for), as seen in the subsequent line. Bapat’s interpretation of ‘多倚生痛行司’ as “Relying much on them means a painful course to adopt,” seems off-target.

行司 = 行同 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The substitution of ‘司’ (an official) with ‘同’ (the same) implies a meaning of ‘acting similarly.’ This suggests a deliberate effort to find someone with a similar inclination or motivation for debate.

Y8.8b: The phrase ‘欲與難’ can be interpreted as ‘desiring (欲) to participate (與) in the challenge/contest/debate (難).’ This phrase describes the preceding term ‘輩’ (fellows).

Y8.8c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘勇從來去莫慚’ as “With shameless audacity, he doth go and come.” While the general idea of his translation aligns with the original text, the specific rendering of ‘shameless (莫慚) audacity (勇)’ deviates from the original Chinese syntactical order. These two terms should be translated distinctly, reflecting their original positions as the first and the last terms in the sequence.

Y8.8d: The character ‘令’ is directly rendered as ‘to command,’ indicating an assertive claim in this context. The subsequent phrase ‘當誰與汝議’ takes the form of a rhetorical question, suggesting the idea that ‘no one but me would dare to challenge the public.’ Bapat’s translation of ‘令當誰與汝議’ as “To meet someone, with whom he may, forthwith, dispute” overlooks the pressing nature of ‘令’ and the rhetorical essence of ‘誰’, as well as the preceding modal verb ‘當’.

Yen'eva so tena palehi sūra

Pubbe va n'atthi yad idaṃ yudhāya

Just as a hero, fortified by the king's finest fare,

Roars forth [like thunder], in search of a worthy opponent,

O hero! Venture to wherever such [an adversary might] be,

[For], indeed, thus far, there is none [here ready] for battle.²³

Y8.9 抱冥柱欲難曰 汝邪諦自守癡

汝行花不見果 所出語當求義

Embracing obscure premises, one seeks to challenge [others] and declares:

“You have twisted the truth and cling to your own ignorance!”

“[While] you have displayed some flowers, you have yet to witness any fruit!”

[However], they ought to scrutinize the meaning of words they have uttered.²⁴

²³ **Sn831**: This verse humorously depicts the hero of a debate as a kingdom's champion, eagerly seeking confrontation with others.

²⁴ **Y8.9**: This verse contains two direct statements from the debater. Line a uses the character ‘曰’ (to declare) to signal these speeches. Lines bc both commence with ‘汝’ (you), indicating the debater's direct challenges to potential adversaries. Line d appears to revert to a narrative voice evaluating the debate enthusiast, though it is still possible to interpret it as a third direct statement aimed at potential opponents.

In this verse, three metaphorical images are employed. First, ‘冥柱’ (dark pillar) in line a likely represents an ‘enigmatic doctrine’ one clings to tenaciously. ‘Darkness’ indicates something unclear, while ‘pillar’ implies ‘stubborn adherence.’ Next, ‘花’ (flower) and ‘果’ (fruit) symbolize ‘initial achievements’ and ‘final outcomes’ in reasoning, respectively. Initial achievements, akin to flowers, may appear vibrant but remain superficial, whereas final outcomes, like fruits, represent genuine accomplishments. Through these metaphors, the debater aims to put their opponents on the defensive.

Y8.9a, 欲難曰 = 欲難日 (S, Y, M): Bapat seems to opt for the variant reading and translates the phrase ‘抱冥柱欲難日’ as “Embracing a column of darkness, he wishes his difficulties to clear.” However, this interpretation extends the meaning of ‘日’ (day) to the verb ‘to clear,’ which may not align well with ‘難’ (difficulties). A more fitting translation of ‘欲難日’ would be ‘eager to challenge [others] day after day.’

Y8.9b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘汝邪諦自守癡’ as “The fool (癡) holds (守): ‘Wrong (邪) you are (汝),! With us (自) is Truth (諦)!’” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation does not accurately capture

Sn832 *Ye diṭṭhim uggayha vivādiyanti*

Idam eva saccaṃ ti ca vādiyanti

Te tvaṃ vadassu na hi te 'dha atthi

Vādamhi jāte paṭisenikattā

Should they grasp a view and engage in debate

Asserting, “Only this is the truth,”

You should indeed respond to them,

“There is no challenger for you here when debate sparks.”²⁵

Y8.10 越邪度轉求明 法義同從相傷

於善法勇何言 彼善惡受莫憂

Transcending the perverse path, move forward in pursuit of wisdom.

[True] teachings share the same gist, [yet people] attack one another.

the inherent syntactical structure of the Chinese verse. The segments ‘汝邪諦’ and ‘自守癡’ should be understood in a subject-verb-object format, translating to ‘you distort the truth’ and ‘you yourself cling to ignorance,’ respectively.

Y8.9c: For the phrase ‘汝行花不見果,’ Bapat offers, “For flowers you move about, but no fruit you do see.” The character ‘行’ is multifaceted, akin to the English word ‘go’ or ‘do.’ Bapat’s choice of ‘to move about’ may not align as closely with the context as my suggested ‘to display.’

²⁵ **Sn832:** The structure of this verse is intricate, built around the correlating pronouns ‘ye’ (those who) in line a and ‘te’ (they) in line c. This lends itself to a direct translation: “For those who debate while grasping a view, asserting, ‘only this is the truth,’ you ought to inform them that indeed there is no rival for you once debate ensues.” For the sake of clarity, I have linked lines ab and lines cd within an ‘if ... then’ framework.

Sn832ab: Although ‘uggayha’ (grasping) is technically a gerund, I have chosen to represent it in the present tense for smoother reading. Conversely, I have opted to render the present tense ‘vādiyanti’ (they assert) as the gerund ‘asserting’ to achieve a similar flow.

Sn832cd: The term ‘te’ is used twice in line c, but they have different grammatical functions. The first ‘te’ serves as a third person masculine accusative plural pronoun, which I have translated as ‘to them’; the subsequent ‘te’ is a second person dative singular pronoun, interpreted as ‘for you.’ In line d, ‘vādamhi jāte’ functions as a locative absolute, indicating the moment ‘when debate ignites.’

O, Brave one! What is [your] opinion on the teaching of the skilled,

On those who can experience good or evil without distress?²⁶

Sn833 *Visenikatvā pana ye caranti*

Diṭṭhīhi diṭṭhiṃ avirujjhamānā

Tesu tvaṃ kiṃ labhetho Pasūra

Yes' idha n'atthi param uggahītaṃ

Yet, if they wander free from confrontation,

[Unanchored in their own] view, [and thus] unhindered by [other's] views,

²⁶ **Y8.10:** This verse identifies the pursuit of debate for fame as the unrighteous path and contrasts it with the teachings of the adept that promote tranquility and absence of distress.

Y8.10a: Bapat translates the phrase ‘越邪度轉求明’ as “Seeking (求) light (明), they have left (越) the wrong (邪), far behind.” [Parentheses added for analysis]. While his translation captures the essence, it doesn't fully convey the nuance of every character. Specifically, he has omitted two characters ‘度’ and ‘轉’; if he has merged the two and rendered them as ‘far behind,’ it is a stretch. In this context, ‘度’ literally means ‘to cross over’ denoting a religious path from the worldly life to the transcendental spirituality. Thus, the term ‘邪度’ denotes ‘a wrong path.’ On the other hand, ‘轉’ indicates a transition from an unrighteous to a righteous path. I have chosen to represent this transition as ‘move forward.’

Y8.10b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘法義同從相傷’ as “Conforming (同) to the [real] meaning (義) of the Law (法), from mutual (相) hurt (傷), they keep aloof.” [Parentheses added for analysis]. The term ‘從’ typically translates to ‘to follow.’ It is unclear how Bapat derived his interpretation of ‘to keep aloof.’ In the context, I have chosen to interpret it as ‘to engage in,’ reflecting the action of following a specific behavior, in this case, ‘mutual abuse.’

Y8.10c: I have interpreted the character ‘勇’ as ‘O, Brave one,’ but it is possible it serves as an abbreviation for the name in this sūtra's title, Yongci (勇辭). This would parallel the Pāli proper name ‘Pasūra’ found in the Pāli equivalent verse Sn833, which also appears in the title of the corresponding Pāli sūtra.

Bapat translates the phrase ‘於善法勇何言’ as “From (於) such good (善) men of the Law (法), O Bravo! (勇) What (何) words (言) do you expect?” [Parentheses added for analysis]. While his translation adds context by including the verb to expect, the structure ‘於...何言’ could be more aptly translated as ‘what do you say about...’ or ‘what is your viewpoint on...’ I believe my interpretation more closely aligns with the intended context and parallels with its Pāli counterpart Sn833.

Y8.10d: Bapat's translation of the phrase ‘彼善惡受莫憂’ as “They never (莫) suffer (受...憂), like those (彼) that are affected by the good (善) or evil (惡) [they do]” appears to deviate from the intended meaning. [Parentheses added for analysis]. To begin with, it seems logical to pair ‘憂’ as a predicate with the negative particle ‘莫,’ resulting in a translation like ‘do not worry’ or ‘without distress.’ The term ‘受’ (experience) should be associated with the preceding words ‘彼善惡’ (those who ... good and evil). Bapat's version also inserts several phrases not present in the original, such as ‘are affected by’ and ‘they do,’ which seems to overextend the intended message. I believe my version, ‘those who experience both good and evil without distress,’ more accurately reflects the message, especially when considering its Pāli counterpart Sn833d, which portrays the wise as detached.

O Pasūra, what can you gain from them,

Who do not cling to anything here as the ultimate.²⁷

Y8.11 行億到求到門 意所想去諦思

與大將俱議軍 比螢火上遍明

Chasing myriad misconceptions, they craft fallacious theories.

Musing on their conceptions, they neglect truthful contemplation.

[When] confronting mighty generals and an army of debaters,

[They are] like fireflies [in front of] a blazing fire, [trying to] outshine its brightness.²⁸

²⁷ **Sn833**: This verse consists of a single sentence with structural connectors: ‘ye’ (those who...) in line a, ‘tesu’ (among them) in line c, and ‘yesu’ (among those who) in line d. These connecting pronouns allude to the same detached individual. For enhanced clarity and flow, I have introduced the word ‘if’ and structured my translation to read: “if they..., what do you ... from them.”

Sn833a: The term ‘*visenikatvā*’ is an absolutive that translates to ‘having made (-*katvā*) oneself without (vi-) opponents (-*seni-*).’ I have streamlined this term to ‘free from confrontation’ for simplicity.

Sn833b: The phrase ‘*Diṭṭhi diṭṭhim avirujjhamānā*’ presents interpretive challenges. Norman acknowledges his difficulty in accounting for the usage of ‘*diṭṭhim*’ in this context. His translation, “not putting one view against other views”, alongside Bodhi’s “who do not oppose a view with other views” and Fronsda’s “who don’t counter views with views”, while insightful, seem not to capture the nuanced grammatical intricacies of the phrase.

From a grammatical perspective, ‘*avirujjhamānā*’ is an active present participle derived from the passive verb ‘*avirujjhati*’, which translates to ‘to be unobstructed.’ This term harmonizes with the instrumental plural case ‘*diṭṭhihi*’ (by views). The puzzling part is the role of ‘*diṭṭhim*’, the accusative singular of the same noun. My solution is to introduce the contextual phrase ‘unanchored in’ before it. Consequently, the essence of the phrase might be: “they are not anchored to any particular view, and hence, remain unobstructed by others’ views.”

Sn833d: The phrase ‘*Yes’īdha n’atthi param uggahītaṃ*’ can be directly rendered as ‘in whom there is nothing here grasped as the ultimate.’ I have adjusted this in my translation for a smoother flow.

²⁸ **Y8.11a**: The interpretation of this line is anchored in the nuanced understanding of the character ‘到.’ While its primary sense is ‘to reach,’ in certain contexts, it parallels ‘倒,’ denoting the ideas of being upside down, perverted, or mistaken. This synonymy is clarified in the *Hanyu Dacidian* 漢語大詞典 (1989: Vol. II, 659).

A salient example can be found in *Zhuangzi* 莊子: ‘春雨日時, 草木怒生, 銚鑄於是乎始修, 草木之到植者過半, 而不知其然.’ This can be translated as: “In spring, when rain and sunlight are timely, vegetation grows vigorously. It is only then that [tools like] sickles and hoes come into play. More than half of the plants that were previously bent now stand upright, but the reason behind this remains enigmatic.” Here, ‘到’ indicates the bent or inverted growth of vegetation, while ‘植’ represents them standing upright.

Sn834 *Atha tvaṃ pavitakkam āgamā*

Manasā diṭṭhigatāni cintayanto

Dhonena yugaṃ samāgamā

Na hi tvaṃ sagghasi sampayātave ti

Another instance is in the *Baopuzi* 抱朴子, where it is written: ‘刀尺顛到者, 則恐人之議已也’ (Those [employing] deceptive measurements fear the criticism of others). Here, ‘刀尺’ (knife and ruler) signifies standards of measurement, with ‘顛到’ pointing to inversion or deception.

These examples highlight ‘到’ functioning similarly to ‘倒,’ capturing notions of inversion or deception. Thus, I have translated the phrase ‘行億到求到門’ as “Chasing (行) myriad (億) misconceptions (到), they craft (求) fallacious (到) theories (門).” The primary meaning of ‘門’ is ‘gate,’ but this character can figuratively mean ‘teaching’ or ‘theory.’

Bapat translates this phrase as “Thinking in mind of the practices followed and heresies heard.” His selection of certain characters is puzzling. It appears he may have mistaken ‘億’ (one hundred million) for ‘憶’ (to think, remember). While it is plausible he derived his interpretation of ‘門’ as ‘聞’ (to hear) from variant character found in other editions, a footnote clarifying this would have been beneficial. Additionally, the interpretation of ‘到,’ which appears twice in the line, remains unclear in his translation.

行億到求到門 = 行韋到來到聞 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The exact meaning of the variant phrase remains ambiguous. However, given the possible synonymy between ‘到’ and ‘倒’ (perverted), it could be interpreted as “Cultivating (行) eccentric (韋) misconceptions (到) [leads to] the emergence (來) of [such] fallacious (到) oral traditions (聞).”

Y8.11b: Bapat’s rendition of the phrase ‘意所想去諦思’ is “You came to (意?) perceptions (所想) which the true (諦) thought (思) expelled (去).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. Using ‘to come to’ for ‘意’ (mind, intention, wish, idea...) makes the meaning unclear and potentially inaccurate.

Y8.11c: 與大將俱議軍 = 舉大將俱義軍 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Bapat translates the phrase ‘與大將俱議軍’ as “[Now] with (與) the Great (大) Captain (將), you have come to be (俱?), truly (議?), in league (軍).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. Here, his interpretation of ‘俱’ (together) as ‘to come to be’ and ‘議’ (to discuss) as ‘truly’ seems to stretch the meanings of these words. It appears he favors the variant ‘義’ (righteous) over ‘議’ in his translation ‘truly.’ The alternative phrase ‘舉大將俱義軍’ could be translated as “Extolling the mighty generals and the [so-called] righteous army.” The term ‘義軍’ might carry a dual meaning of both ‘righteous army’ and ‘the army of theorists.’

Y8.11d: 比螢火上遍明 = 螢火上遍明照 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Bapat interprets the phrase ‘比螢火上遍明’ as “Who surpassing (比?) fire-flies (螢), over-all (上遍) will [surely] shine (明).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. His rendering of ‘比’ as ‘to surpass’ is a stretch. The character ‘比’ means ‘to compare’ or ‘comparable’ and does not denote ‘superiority.’ Additionally, this rendition neglects to translate ‘火’. The variant phrase may translate to “Fireflies hover around the fire [trying to] outshine its splendor.”

Y8.11: Taken as a whole, Bapat’s translation of the verse appears to miss the intended nuance. It is important to recognize that in Chinese literature, ‘fire-flies’ are often used symbolically to depict those who boast about their brightness, yet they can easily be overshadowed by a more luminous light. As a result, Bapat’s interpretation seems to diverge from the original intent. The verse does not seem to celebrate an exemplary individual; rather, it critiques debaters who rely on cursory perceptions and propagate misleading theories. The Pāli counterpart of this verse, Sn834, also contradicts Bapat’s translation but aligns closely with my interpretation.

Now, you have indulged in speculation,
Conceiving conjectural views within [your] mind.
You have challenged the pure in an [argumentative] duel.
Indeed, you are not able to prevail.²⁹

佛說是義足經竟。比丘悉歡喜

When the Buddha had expounded this [*sūtra* in] the *Yizujing*, all the *bhikṣus* rejoiced.

²⁹ **Sn834c:** The phrase ‘*Dhonenā yugaṃ samāgamā*’ can be directly translated as “You have come under yoke with the pure.” For improved clarity and smoother flow, I have rendered it as “You have challenged the pure in an argumentative duel.”

摩因提女經 第九¹

Discourse 9: Mākandika's Daughter (*Aṭṭhakavagga.9*)

佛在句留國。縣名悉作法。時有一梵志。字摩因提。生女端正光世少雙。前後國王亦太子及大臣長者來求之。父皆不應。得人類我女者。乃與爲婦。

When the Buddha was residing in the Kuru kingdom 句留國, at a county named Kalmāṣadharmā 悉作法, there lived a brahmin named Mākandika 摩因提.² He had a daughter, who [blossomed into] an elegant lady with a fair complexion. Few in the world could match her beauty. One after another, many kings, crown princes, high officials, and wealthy householders sought her hand in marriage, but her father did not consent [to any of them].³ [He thought]: “[Only when I] find someone of my daughter's stature will I give her away in marriage.”

佛時持應器。於縣求食食竟盥澡藏應器。出城到樹間閑靜處坐。

¹ The character ‘經’ is absent in these editions (P, J, Q1, N, Q2). For further details, refer to Y1. fn.3, Y2. fn.1, and Y6. fn.1.

² This *sūtra* deviates from the conventional commencement ‘聞如是’ (I heard this way); only two (8th & 9th) out of the sixteen *sūtras* lack this phrase.

The pronunciation of the name ‘句留’ during the Eastern Han dynasty might be /kuəh luw/, closely resembling ‘Kuru.’ This kingdom was one of the sixteen *Janapadas* in ancient India.

I agree with Bapat's identification of the name ‘悉作法’ with a town known as Kalmāṣadharmā. This name is found in Vedic literature and corresponds to the Pāli proper names, Kammāsadamma or Kammāsadhamma. This place name appears to be a translation, as its reconstructed pronunciation from Eastern Han period /Sit-tsəh-puap/ does not match any known Indic place names. The Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names (DPPN) provides the origins of these two names: Kammāsadamma is derived from the story of the man-eating ogre, Kammāsapāda, being tamed (*damma*) and civilized by the Bodhisatta; Kammāsadhamma is named such because Kammāsapāda accepted Buddhist teachings (*Dhamma*). Bapat interprets ‘悉作法’ as ‘All-practise-Dharma,’ reflecting the moral code of the Kuru country following Kammāsadhamma's conversion. In line with Bapat's interpretation, I refer to the place as ‘Kalmāṣadharmā’ in Sanskrit.

The Eastern Han pronunciation of ‘摩因提’ can be reconstructed as /Ma-ʔjin-dej/, which is akin to the Pāli name ‘Māgandīya’ (Skt. Mākandika).

³ Bapat's translation of the phrase ‘前後’ as ‘later’ is inaccurate. The phrase more correctly translates to ‘one after another,’ depicting the sequence of marriage proposals made by influential men.

At that time, the Buddha took his begging-bowl and sought alms at the town. After finishing the meal, he cleaned his bowl and stored it away. He [then] left the town, reached a peaceful spot within a grove, and settled there.

摩因提。食後出行園田。道經樹間。便見佛金色身。有三十二相。如日月。王自念言。持女比是大尊。如此人比我女。

Mākandika, after his meal, took a [leisurely] stroll through the rural area. As he meandered through the grove, he chanced upon the Buddha, whose radiant golden body, bearing the thirty-two marks of a great man, [shone] like the Sun or the Moon. [Upon this encounter,] Mākandika thought to himself, “This highly honorable figure would [indeed] be a perfect match for my daughter.”⁴

便還家謂婦言。兒母寧知得所願不。今得婿踰於女。母聞亦喜。即莊飾女。衆寶瓔珞。父母俱將女出城。母見佛行迹。文現分明。謂父言。寧知空出終不得婿。何故。婦說偈言
Upon his return home, he said to his wife, “My dear, do you realize that we have attained what we have longed for?⁵ Now, we have a son-in-law who surpasses our daughter.” At these words, the mother was overjoyed too. She adorned her daughter with lavish jewelry [including] a gem-studded necklace. Both parents together escorted her outside the town. [Along the way,] the

⁴ Here, the term ‘王’ (the king) seems to be an error by Zhi Qian. It should be ‘the brahmin (梵志)’ or ‘Mākandika.’ For clarity, I have replaced it with ‘Mākandika.’

Mākandika’s thoughts contain redundant expressions ‘持女比’ (In comparison to my daughter) and ‘比我女’ (comparing with/match for my daughter). I have intentionally omitted ‘持女比’ and translated ‘比我女’ as ‘a perfect match for my daughter.’

⁵ The term ‘兒母,’ literally ‘the mother of [our] child/children,’ is a husband’s term for his wife. In this context, I have translated it as ‘my dear.’

The phrase ‘寧知 ... 不’ translates as ‘don’t you know that ...?,’ implying surprise and expectation that the listener should be aware.

mother spotted the Buddha’s footprints, the traces of which were distinct and vivid. She said to her husband, “Do you realize our efforts have been in vain and we will never have him as a son-in-law?”⁶ [Surprised, the husband asked,] “Why do you say that?” To which the wife explained in verse.

Y9.1 姪人曳踵行 患者斂指步

癡人足蹠地 是迹天人尊

A licentious person saunters, dragging their heels.

An enraged person strides with curled toes.

An ignorant person [plods along heavily], sinking to the ankle.

[But] this footprint belongs to one honored by gods and humans.⁷

Vm1 *Rattassa hi ukkuṭikaṃ padaṃ bhava*

Duṭṭhassa hoti anukaddhitaṃ padaṃ

Mūḷhassa hoti sahasānupīlitaṃ

*Vivaṭṭacchadassa idamīdisaṃ padaṃ*⁸

⁶ The phrase ‘謂父言’ literally means “she said to the father [of their children].” In the context of the narrative, the mother is addressing her husband, therefore it has been translated accordingly.

⁷ Y9.1c, 蹠 = 蹠 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The character ‘蹠’(ankle, heel, barefoot) contributes to ambiguity in the phrase ‘足蹠地.’ I interpret this as ‘treading (足) on the earth (地) ankle[-deep] (蹠). The replacement with ‘蹠’ renders the phrase more intelligible: ‘trampling (蹠) the earth (地) with one’s feet (足).’ Bapat opts for ‘蹠’ and translates ‘足蹠地’ as ‘pressing one’s feet on the ground.’

⁸ Several parallel verses exist in Pāli. Although their structure is similar, the predicates within each line are slightly shuffled. This pattern might suggest that, during the composition of these texts, the tradition of interpreting footprints was not as significant beyond its formulaic role in emphasizing the Buddha’s greatness.

The footprint of a greedy person would appear crouched.

The footprint of a malignant person is dragged along.

[The footprint] of a deluded person is forcefully pressed down.

The footprint of a person with the veil lifted resembles this.

(地恐弛之錯)⁹

(They felt as if the earth trembles with fear.)

父言。癡人莫還爲女作患。女必得婿。即將女到佛所左手持臂。右手持瓶。因白佛。今以女相惠可爲妾。女見佛形狀端正無比。以三十二相。瓔珞其身。如明月珠。便姪意繫著佛。佛知其意如火燃。佛即時說是義足經言

This Pāli verse I have utilized is sourced from Buddhaghōṣa’s 5th-century CE treatise on Theravāda doctrine and praxis, *the Path of Purification (Visuddhimagga)* 3.88. This text introduces the verse as an account of the origin of the *Māgandiya Sutta (Vuttampi cetam māgaṇḍiyasuttupattiyaṃ)*.

A verse bearing striking resemblance can be found in the *Dhammapada commentary* I.201: “*Rattassa hi ukkuṭikaṃ padaṃ bhava / Duṭṭhassa hoti sahasānupīḷitaṃ / Mūḷhassa hoti anukaḍḍhitaṃ padaṃ / Vivaṭṭacchadassa idamīdisaṃ padaṃ.*” This translates as: “The footprint of a greedy person would appear crouched. The footprint of a malignant person is forcefully pressed down. [The footprint] of a deluded person is dragged along. The footprint of a person with the veil lifted is like this.” In comparison to the verse from the *Visuddhimagga*, this verse mirrors the former in almost every aspect, except for altered descriptions in lines c and d.

A similar verse is also present in the *Divyāvadāna* (Divy. 527): “*Raktasya puṃsaḥ padamutpaṭaṃ syāt / Nipīḍitaṃ dveṣavataḥ padañ ca / Padaṃ hi mūḍhasya viśrṣṭadehaṃ / Suvītarāgasya padaṃ tvihedṛśaṃ*” This translates to: “The footprint of an enamored man would be springy. The footprint of an enraged person is pressed down. The footprint of a foolish person trails behind. The footprint of a person free from desire embodies such qualities.”

⁹ This commentarial narrative ‘地恐弛之錯’ is missing in these editions (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2).

The husband retorted, “O, foolish woman! Do not make a fuss on our daughter's account!”¹⁰ [Rest assured,] our daughter is bound to find her husband.”¹¹ Shortly after, they brought their daughter to the Buddha’s location. He held [his daughter] by the arm with his left hand and carried a water-jar in his right. He then addressed the Buddha, “For our mutual benefit, I offer my daughter to you in marriage.”¹² The daughter beheld the Buddha’s noble and unparalleled visage, adorned with the thirty-two marks and [radiating] like a pearl of the effulgent moon.¹³ Then, she was struck with passion and felt a deep attraction to the Buddha. The Buddha, discerning her mind ablaze [with desire], proceeded to teach this *Yizujing*, stating:¹⁴

¹⁰ The narrative consistently uses the phrase ‘父言’ (the father said) from the daughter’s perspective, even though the conversation takes place between the wife and the husband. In my translation, I have replaced it with ‘the husband retorted.’

莫還爲女作患: Bapat translates this phrase as “don’t you bother yourself for your daughter. [*sic*. ?],” which can be misleading. Firstly, the character ‘莫’ is a prohibitive particle, not a negative particle used for confirmation. Moreover, Bapat has omitted the adverb ‘還’ (repeatedly, or to keep doing something) and distorted the meaning of ‘作患’ (to cause trouble). In my translation, I interpret this phrase as ‘for our daughter’s sake (爲女), please do not (莫) keep (還) causing trouble (作患).’

¹¹ 女必得婿: This sentence shows another inconsistent perspective. It translates as ‘our daughter (女) is sure (必) to get (得) [our] son-in-law (婿).’ From the daughter’s point of view, I have replaced ‘son-in-law’ with ‘her husband.’

¹² 妾 = 妻 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The character ‘妾’ literally translates to ‘concubine,’ but I have chosen to replace it with ‘wife (妻),’ following alternative readings in these editions.

今以女相惠可爲妾: I interpret this sentence literally as “Now (今), for our mutual benefits (相惠), I will let (可) my daughter (以女) become your wife (爲妻). Bapat omits the translation of ‘相惠.’

¹³ 以三十二相 瓔珞其身 如明月珠: I have chosen to interpret the phrase ‘瓔珞’ not as a noun meaning ‘a necklace of jewelry’ but rather as a verb ‘to adorn.’ The context supports this interpretation: “with the 32 marks, adorning (瓔珞) his body like the pearl...”.

¹⁴ This narrative in *Yizujing* distinctly establishes that the subsequent verses are teachings of the Buddha, which contrasts its Pāli counterparts that contain three verses of Māgandiya’s responses. Bapat misinterprets these three verses, presuming them to be replies from Māgandiya.

燃 = 然 (S, Y, M): Both characters convey a similar meaning, ‘ablaze’ or ‘afame,’ in this context.

Y9.2 我本見邪三女 尚不欲著邪姪

今奈何抱屎尿 以足觸尚不可

In fact, I [once] encountered the three daughters of Evil.

Yet, I felt not the slightest desire or attachment for immoral licentiousness.

Now, why [would I be interested in the girl] containing feces and urine,

Whom I would not even deign to touch with my feet?¹⁵

Sn835 *Disvāna taṇhaṃ aratiṃ ragañ ca*

nāhosi chando api methunasmim

kimev' idaṃ muttakarīsapunnāṃ

*pādā pi naṃ samphusituṃ na icche*¹⁶

Upon seeing Craving, Aversion, and Lust,

I harbor no desire for sexual engagement.

What on earth is this [vessel] filled with urine and excrement?

I would not even wish to touch it with [my] foot.¹⁷

¹⁵ **Y9.2a:** The character ‘本’ appears as a shorthand for ‘本來’ (*originally, in fact*).

Bapat translates the phrase ‘邪三女’ as ‘three wicked women.’ His translation would be closer to ‘三邪女,’ which is different from the original phrase ‘邪三女’ (Evil’s three daughters).

Y9.2b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘尚不欲著邪姪’ as ‘Discontent, Evil attachment, and Sex-passion.’ His interpretation appears incorrect, likely due to his assumption that Y9.2b should parallel Sn835a ‘*taṇhaṃ aratiṃ ragañ ca*,’ which are the names of Māra’s three daughters. However, Y9.2b does not parallel Sn835a; instead, it should be translated as, “However (尚), I neither desired (不欲) nor got attached (著) to sexual misconduct (邪姪) [with them].”

Y9.2c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘今奈何抱屎尿’ as “Now why is here brought [this store of] feces and urine.” His translation of ‘抱’ as ‘to bring’ is incorrect. It should be translated as ‘to embrace, contain.’

¹⁶ Both the Pāli *Māgandiya sutta* and the Chinese 摩因提女經 第九 comprise 13 verses, with 10 of them being parallel to each other.

¹⁷ According to the *Mahāniddeśa*, Taṇhā (Craving), Aratī (Aversion), and Rāgā (Lust) are identified as the names of Māra’s three daughters.

Sn836 *Etādisañ ce ratanaṃ na icchasi*

nāriṃ narindehi bahūhi patthitaṃ

diṭṭhigataṃ sīlavatānujīvitam

bhavūpapattiñ ca vadesi kīdisaṃ

If you do not wish such a jewel

As this woman coveted by numerous kings,

What forms of belief, moral conduct, observances, livelihood,

And state of rebirth do you proclaim?¹⁸

Sn837 *Idaṃ vadāmī ti na tassa hoti, (Māgandiyā ti Bhagavā:)*

dhammesu niccheyya samuggahītaṃ

passañ ca diṭṭhīsu anuggahāya

ajjhattasantiṃ pacinaṃ adassaṃ

(The Blessed One says, “O, Māgandiyā”:))

I do not entertain [the thought] “This I proclaim,”

[Even] after scrutinizing doctrines [that others] cling to tightly.

¹⁸ The following three Pāli verses (Sn836-8) do not have corresponding verses in the Chinese *Yizujing*. This omission in the *Yizujing* appears to be an intentional decision made either by Zhi Qian or by the *Yizujing*’s Indic original. Sn836 and Sn838 are Māgandiyā’s responses to the Blessed One, but in the Chinese discourse, it is stated that all verses (Y9.2-13) following the narrative are meant to be the Blessed One’s teachings.

Sn836 is unique in the *Aṭṭhakavagga* as it is composed entirely in *jagatī* meter.

The terms ‘*etādisa*’ and ‘*kīdisa*’ can be parsed as ‘*etad + disa*’ (such a kind as this; ‘*disa*’ comes from √*drś*) and ‘*kiṃ + disa*’ (what kind), respectively.

Yet, observing [diverse] views without grasping [any],

I have come to know and see inner peace.¹⁹

Sn838 *Vinicchayā yāni pakappitāni, (iti Māgandiyo)*

te ve muni brūsi anuggahāya

ajjhattasantī ti yam etam atthaṃ

kathan nu dhīrehi paveditaṃ taṃ

O, sage! You speak of whatever preconceived thoughts there are,

Without grasping any of them.

[Then,] how do the wise articulate

The essence of this “inner peace”?²⁰

¹⁹ **Sn837a:** The term ‘*tassa*’ is third-person pronoun, in the dative/genitive, singular. This translates literally to ‘as for him.’ The *Mahāniddeśa* glosses it as ‘*mayhaṃ*’ (a first-person, in the dative/genitive, singular) to align with the first-person narrative in this verse.

For clarity and smooth reading, I have chosen to use ‘to entertain [the thought],’ though this line can literally be interpreted as “for me, there is no [such thought as] ‘I proclaim this.’”

Sn837b: The term ‘*niccheyya*’ may present three grammatical interpretations, but only one of them fits in the context: 1) a future passive participle, but it is unlikely due to its lack of declension in the text; 2) an optative third-person singular (as listed in the PTSD under the entry of ‘*nicchināti*’), but this too is unlikely as the subject of Sn837ab is ‘*idaṃ vadāmi it*’ not a 3rd person singular noun; 3) a gerund, as glossed in the *Mahāniddeśa* (*niccheyya ti nicchetvā*). This commentarial interpretation is followed by Jayawickrama, Norman, and Bodhi.

Sn837c: The term ‘*anuggahāya*’ is best understood as ‘*na + uggahāya* (without grasping).’ An alternative reading, ‘*anu + ggahāya*’ (fostering), seems less fitting in this context.

Sn837d: The term ‘*ajjhatta*’ (Skt. *adhi + ātma*) can literally translate into ‘regarding something within oneself.’

The term ‘*pacinaṃ*’ is the present participle of ‘*pacināti*’ (to pick out, discern), in the declension form of masculine nominative singular. For readability’s sake, I’ve chosen to translate it as a distinct verb in conjunction with ‘*adassaṃ*.’

The term ‘*addasaṃ*’ is the aorist first-person singular form of ‘*dassati*’ (to see).

²⁰ **Sn838a:** The phrase ‘*yāni pakappitāni*’ should not be taken as the neutral, nominative, plural form, but rather as the masculine, nominative, plural form, which aligns with the term ‘*vinicchayā*.’

For improved readability, I have incorporated ‘*te ve muni brūsi*’ from Sn838b into the translation of this line.

Sn838b: The term ‘*te*’ is used here as the third-person, accusative plural, referring to ‘whatever preconceived thoughts’ (*vinicchayā yāni pakappitāni*) mentioned in the first line.

Y9.3 我所說婬不欲 無法行不內觀

雖聞惡不受厭 內不止不計苦²¹

[As] I have proclaimed, I harbor no desire for sexual activity.

I perceive no conduct within myself that strays from the Dharma.

Even when hearing of unrighteousness, I feel no repulsion.

[Unless] our mind is calmed, we cannot discern [the reality of] suffering.²²

Y9.4 見外好筋皮裏 尊云何當受是

內外行覺觀是 於黠邊說癡行

On the surface, [she] looks appealing, with her flesh concealed beneath her skin.

[Yet,] how could the sage accept this [woman]?

Having practiced [contemplation on the body] internally and externally,

they realize and see this [truth].

Nearing the insight, they will proclaim that [accepting a woman] is an act of folly.²³

²¹ I could not find parallel Pāli verses to Y9.3 and Y9.4.

²² **Y9.3a:** Bapat's translation of the phrase '婬不欲' as 'sexual passion (婬) and discontent (不欲)' can be misleading. [Parentheses added for analysis]. He interprets '不欲' as a noun, but it should be treated as a verb meaning 'not to desire,' with '婬' (sexual activity) serving as its object. If it were a noun, it should have been '無欲' (desireless-ness). I interpret this phrase as 'I do not desire sexual activity.'

Y9.3d: Bapat translates the phrase '不計苦' as "countless suffering will there be." However, this is a bit of a stretch, as he interprets '不計' as an adjective meaning 'countless.' For his interpretation, '無數' would be a more appropriate phrase. In this context, I read the character '計' as 'to reckon, perceive,' as provided in DDB.

²³ **Y9.4c:** Bapat translates the phrase '內外行覺觀是' as "They who practise enlightenment and insight, within and without." His rendering 'to practice enlightenment (行覺)' is imprecise. 'Enlightenment' is the outcome,

Y9.5 亦見聞不爲黠 戒行具未爲淨

不見聞亦不癡 不離行可自淨

有是想棄莫受 有莫說守口行²⁴

Merely seeing or hearing does not make one wise.

Simply adhering to moral precepts does not render one pure.

Neither does the lack of seeing or hearing equate to ignorance.

Nor can disregarding practice lead to self-purification.

Cast aside any such conceptual thoughts and refrain from clinging to them.

Moreover, curb your verbosity and maintain vigilant control over your speech.²⁵

not the subject, of practice. Additionally, his interpretation of ‘内外’ as ‘within and without’ is unclear. A more accurate reading would divide these six characters into two groups of three. The first three characters (内外行) could be interpreted as ‘practicing internally and externally,’ as suggested by the phrase ‘flesh concealed beneath her skin’ in Y9.4a. The remaining three characters (覺觀是) could be translated as ‘realize and see this [truth].’

²⁴ Both verses Y9.5 and Y9.6 consist of six lines, a structure that parallels their Pāli counterparts Sn839 and Sn840. The other 11 verses in both discourses in Chinese and Pāli conform to the four-line verse form. This similar structure indicates that the two versions of the *Arthapada*—one being the original Indic text translated into *Yizujing*, and the other the Pāli *Aṭṭhakavagga*—maintained their original form quite well up until the 3rd century CE when the Chinese *Yizujing* was translated.

²⁵ Bapat’s translation of Y9.5 relies heavily on its correspondence to Sn839, resulting in an Indic-centric interpretation of the Chinese verse that may not be the most productive approach. It could even distort the intended meanings of the *Yizujing* verse. Bapat suggests that the phrases ‘不爲黠’ (does not make one wise) in Y9.5a and ‘亦不癡’ (neither equates to ignorance) in Y9.5c should be amended to mirror the Pāli phrases ‘*na ñāṇena*’ (not by knowledge) and ‘*aññāṇā*’ (not by the lack of knowledge). However, these two verses do not share an identical structure: Y9.5 consists of six independent sentences with the main verbs—不爲,’ 未爲,’ 不癡,’ 不...可淨,’ 棄莫受,’ 莫說,’ and ‘守’—while Sn839 is structured into three sentences: Sn839ab, Sn839cd, and Sn839ef. When translating ancient texts, it is crucial to respect the original Chinese language and the interpretation of Chinese-speaking audiences during the period. While both verses reflect a common theme, they need not be exact replicas of each other."

Y9.5ac: Given the reason previously discussed, Bapat’s translations of ‘亦不癡’ as ‘[not] known’ and ‘不爲黠’ as ‘the absence of what is known’ may be misleading. Particularly, his interpretation of ‘黠’ as ‘what is known’ seems to be a stretch.

Sn839 *Na diṭṭhiyā na sutiyā na ñāṇena, (Māgandiyā ti Bhagavā)*

sīlabbatenāpi na suddhim āha

adiṭṭhiyā assutiyā aññāṇā

asīlatā abbatā no pi tena

ete ca nissajja anuggahāya

santo anissāya bhavaṃ na jappe

(The Blessed One says, “O, Māgandiyā”:))

[The sage] does not assert purity

Through views, traditions, knowledge, virtuous conduct, or observances;

Neither do [they establish purity]

In the absence of views, traditions, knowledge, virtuous conduct, or observances.

Relinquishing them, without any attachment,

Tranquil, and free of reliance, one should not yearn for existence.²⁶

Y9.6 彼五惱聞見棄 慧戒行莫婬淨

Y9.5f: Bapat translates the phrase ‘有莫說守口行’ as “Life (有) one may not applaud (莫說), but guard, instead, the actions of tongue.” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, in his translation, ‘to applaud life’ appears out of context. A more fitting translation would be ‘In addition (有), do not be verbose (莫說).’

²⁶ Norman posits that phrases such as ‘*Māgandiyā ti Bhagavā*’ (The Blessed One says, ‘O, Māgandiyā’:) in this verse and ‘*iti Māgandiyō*’ (Māgandiyā [says]:) in the next verse are likely reciter’s remarks that were added at a later stage to the *Aṭṭhakavagga*.

Sn839a: Norman suggests that ‘*ñāṇā*’ can replace ‘*ñāṇena*,’ in order to adhere to the eleven-syllable structure of each foot in the *trṣṭubh* meter. He hypothesizes that ‘*ñāṇena*’ likely made its way into the *Aṭṭhakavagga* from the *Mahāniddeśa* gloss due to the declining usage of the neutral instrumental singular case ending in ‘-ā’ and its subsequent replacement by the more prominent case ending in ‘-ena’ during the time when the *Mahāniddeśa* was composed. Furthermore, he maintains that the case ending ‘-ā’ in ‘*aññāṇā*’ is preserved in Sn839c without being replaced by ‘-ena’ because this term does not appear in the commentary.

世所見莫行癡 無戒行彼想有

可我有墮冥法 以見可誰有淨

Eradicate the five types of vexation [that arise from] what are heard or seen.

Do not seek purity through wisdom or virtuous conduct.

Avoid foolish behavior [influenced by various] views in the world.

[Even] in the absence of virtuous conduct, one may conceive this notion [of purity].

[Belief] in the existence of self could lead you to fall into misguided teachings.

While cherishing any view, who can attain purity?²⁷

²⁷ Unlike Sn840, which is Māgandiya's response to the Buddha's teaching in Sn839, Y6.6 stands independently from Y6.5 and serves as another discourse by the Buddha. In Sn840abcd, Māgandiya echoes the Buddha's instruction from Sn839abcd verbatim, with slight modifications. However, the fifth and sixth lines of the two Pāli verses make it clear that Sn840 is Māgandiya's question and Sn839 is the Buddha's instruction.

In contrast, Y9.6abcd doesn't reflect Y9.5abcd as closely as their Pāli counterparts do. Despite sharing themes—'what is heard or seen' (聞見) in the first line, 'virtuous conduct and purity' (戒行, 淨) in the second, 'views and ignorance' (見, 癡) in the third, and 'virtuous conduct' (行) again in the fourth—their phrasings and structures differ significantly. Hence, Y6.6 simply continues the Buddha's instruction from Y6.5.

Moreover, the structure of the Pāli verses differs markedly from those in Chinese. While Sn840abcd forms a single sentence similar to Sn839abcd, each line of Y6.6abcd constitutes an independent sentence, mirroring the structure of Y6.5abcd. Given these differences, I assert that Y9.6 continues the Buddha's instruction, diverging from the pattern set by Sn840.

Bapat attempts to translate Y9.6 as Mākandika's response to the Buddha's teaching in Y9.5.

Y9.6a: Bapat's translation of the phrase '彼五惱聞見棄' as "If by giving up five corruptions like what is heard or seen" adds the conjunction 'if' arbitrarily and omits the pronoun '彼.' Moreover, his interpretation of '惱' as 'corruption' deviates from its actual meaning of 'vexation' or 'anxiety.' Furthermore, he erroneously presents 'what is heard or seen' as an example of 'five corruptions,' which may be a cause but not an instance of corruption. The phrase '彼五惱' likely refers to 'those five types of vexation,' potentially stemming from 'views, traditions, knowledge, virtuous conduct, and observances' as indicated in Pāli Sn839 and Sn840. Intriguingly, while Y9.5 and Y6.6 introduce only three elements—'what is seen (見),' 'what is heard (聞),' and 'virtuous conduct (戒行)'—they lack equivalents for 'knowledge (*ñāṇa*)' and 'observances (*vata*). If my interpretation of '彼五惱' is correct, it's quite compelling that Y9.5 and Y9.6 refer to these five elements when discussing the sources of vexations, despite not introducing them explicitly. Additionally, I have researched the term '五惱' or '五煩惱' in other Chinese Buddhist translations. The term '五惱' appears solely in An Shigao's translations of 長阿含十報法經 (T13) and 七處三觀經 (T150A), but the contexts are entirely different. The synonymous phrase '五煩惱' is found in translations dating back to the 4th century, but these instances, too, present varied contexts that don't apply to this verse.

Y9.6b: 姪 = 望 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The two variant characters do not significantly alter the overall context: the character '姪' could act as a verb synonymous with '貪' (to crave) and '望' (to hope for, long for). Bapat opts for the character '望' and renders the phrase '慧戒行莫望淨' as "Or by wisdom, rites and rituals, no purity may one expect." However, his interpretation of '戒行' as 'rites and rituals' doesn't hold up. Instead, it should signify moral discipline.

Y9.6c: Bapat renders the phrase '世所見莫行癡' as 'Nor, by non-entertaining heresies in the world, nor by ignorance.' However, there's no corresponding term in the text for his rendering 'non-entertaining.' Moreover, he

Sn840 *No ce kira diṭṭhiyā na sutiyā na ñāṇena, (iti Māgandiyo)*

sīlabbatenāpi visuddhim āha

adiṭṭhiyā assutiyā aññāṇā

asīlatā abbatā no pi tena

maññe-m-ahaṃ momuham eva dhammaṃ

diṭṭhiyā eke paccenti suddhim

(Māgandiya [declares]:)

Indeed, if one cannot assert purity

Either through views, traditions, knowledge, virtuous conduct, or observances,

Or in the absence of views, traditions, knowledge,

Virtuous conduct, or observances—in such a manner,

I regard [this] as an utterly foolish doctrine.

[Indeed,] some people hold the belief that purity is attained through particular views.²⁸

overlooks translating ‘莫行.’ This oversight seems to stem from his determination to interpret this verse to align precisely with Sn840. Given its placement before the verb ‘行’ (to behave), ‘莫’ should suggest prohibition, as in ‘do not’ or ‘never do.’

Y9.6d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘無戒行彼想有’ as “Nor by the absence of rites and rituals, can that designation [of purity] one attain.” Once more, his interpretation of ‘戒行’ as ‘rites and rituals’ is misleading. The repeated application of ‘nor’ throughout Y9.6cd is again indicative of his deliberate reading of this verse to mirror Sn840 line by line.

Y6.9e: Bapat renders the phrase ‘可我有墮冥法’ as “This, I (我) deem (可), is falling into (墮) [the deep pit of] darkness (冥).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, he omits translating the characters ‘有’ and ‘法.’ Instead, I interpret ‘我有’ as ‘the illusion of the self, possessing real existence,’ a definition provided in the DDB. In my translation, ‘可’ is viewed as a verb meaning ‘to allow, approve,’ and ‘冥法’ is translated as ‘a misguided teaching.’ The belief in the existence of a self is indeed one of the most enduring views in Indian religions.

Y6.9f: Bapat translates the phrase ‘以見可誰有淨’ as “That who-so-ever (誰) wants Purity (淨) can (可) have (有?) it through heresies (以見) [alone].” [Parentheses added for analysis]. His reading of the whole phrase appears to elaborate or modify ‘darkness’ from the previous line. Not only is his translation nonsensical, but it also disregards the structure of this line. A more accurate translation would be “With any view accepted, who could attain purity?”

²⁸ This line exceeds the *triṣṭubh* meter by four syllables, totaling fifteen. Consequently, for metrical reasons, Norman suggests omitting ‘ce kira’ (if indeed), in addition to replacing ‘ñāṇena’ with ‘ñāṇā.’

Y9.7 諦見聞爾可謂 諦意取可向道

往到彼少不想 今奈何口欺尊

You may assert the truth [based on] what you have seen or heard.

Holding on to [that] thought as the truth, you might adopt it as [your] path.

[People] set out to the other [shore], but only a few are free from conceptualization.

Now, how could you deceive the sage with your words?²⁹

Sn841 *Diṭṭhiñ ca nissāya anupucchamāno, (Māgandiyā ti Bhagavā:)*

samuggahītesu pamoham āgā

Sn840b: Relative to the previous verse, a negative particle ‘*na*’ is missing and an emphatic prefix ‘*vi-*’ is added to ‘*suddhiṃ*.’ Nonetheless, to align with the context, we must include the negative particle in the translation.

Sn840d: I interpret the negative particle ‘*no*’ to apply to all the six instrumental cases in Sn840cd.

²⁹ **Y9.7:** This verse is quite challenging. Bapat, too, admits that verses Y9.5-7 are unclear to him. Bapat translates this verse within the context of the Buddha’s reply to Mākandika’s antagonistic comment, but I maintain that Mākandika’s role is not as prominent in Y9.

Y9.7a: Bapat translates the phrase ‘諦見聞爾可謂’ as “Ask (可謂?), as you (爾) do, about Truth (諦) in what is heard or seen (見聞).” His translation of ‘謂’ as ‘to ask’ is a bit of a stretch. It literally translates to ‘to say, refer to.’ He may have misinterpreted this character as Chinese equivalent to ‘*anupucchamāno*’ (asking incessantly) in Sn841a. I have interpreted it as “you (爾) may assert (可謂) the truth (諦) [based on] what you have seen or heard (見聞).”

Y9.7c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘往到彼少不想’ as “[The Truth] you may have approached (往到), but hardly have discerned ([少]不想).” His translation is not precise. He neglects to translate ‘彼,’ which is a significant word in this line. When combined with ‘往到’ (to go [trying] to reach), ‘彼’ likely denotes ‘the other shore 彼岸’ in this context. He also downplays the importance of ‘少’ in his translation, which should be the subject of the following verb ‘不想’ (do not conceptualize). Considering that ‘non-conceptualization’ is one of the Buddha’s qualities in Buddhist doctrine, I have slightly modified ‘少不想’ and interpreted it as ‘only a few [can reach] non-conceptualization.’

It is quite intriguing to see a positive application of the term ‘少不想’ (not to form the slightest conceptual thought) in Y5.8b: ‘所邪念小不想’ (what [people might have] wrongly speculated, [he] does not conceive the slightest thought). The Pāli parallel, Sn802b, showcases similar phrasing: “‘*n’ atthi añū pi saññā*” ([He] does not possess even the slightest conceptual thought). Both phrases are used in the context of the sage’s qualities.

Y9.7d: In the context of Y9.7c, the character ‘尊’ (the sage) likely refers to an individual who has reached the other shore and attained non-conceptualization.

ito ca nāddakkhi aṇum pi saññaṃ

tasmā tuvaṃ momuhato dahāsi

(The Blessed One says, “O, Māgandiya”:)

Relying on a view, and questioning incessantly,

You have become enamored with firmly held beliefs.

Hence, you have not recognized the nuanced essence [of my teaching].

As a result, you deem [my teaching] as indeed nonsensical.³⁰

Y9.8 等亦過亦不及 已著想便分別

不等三當何諍 悉已斷不空計

[Whether perceived as] equal, superior, or inferior—

Once attached to such conceptual thoughts, people begin to formulate distinctions.

In the absence of these three forms of comparison, how could one engage in dispute?

Having severed all [forms of comparison], one would not engage in futile speculation.³¹

Sn842 *Samo vīsesī uda vā nihīno*

yo maññaṭī so vivadetha tena

tīsu vidhāsu avikampamāno

³⁰ **Sn841c:** The term ‘*aṇusañña*’ is likely to denote ‘subtle discernment’ in a positive context, which I have interpreted as ‘nuanced essence.’ Contrarily, the same term as used in Sn802, mentioned in footnote 26, appears to refer to ‘a subtle [resilient] conceptual thought,’ in a negative sense.”

³¹ **Y9.8d:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘悉已斷不空計’ as “All such [notions] (悉) he has cut off (已斷), and will it not (不) therefore in vain (空), be?” In his translation, he neglects to account for ‘計’ and it is unclear what ‘it’ in his translation refers to. I interpret ‘計’ as ‘to speculate, with ‘空計’(futile speculation) possibly being another expression of ‘分別’ as seen in Y9.8b.

samo vivesī ti na tassa hoti

‘[I am] equal, superior, or inferior [to someone]’—

Whoever evaluates themselves [in such a manner] incites conflict due to this [belief].

Unperturbed by the three modes [of comparison],

[The sage] is free from [any notion of] equality or superiority.

Y9.9 有諦人當何言 已著空誰有諍

邪亦正悉無有 從何言得其短

If there is a wise person, what would they declare?

Who would dispute [with them, saying:] “You have been clinging to insubstantial things”?

Either right or wrong—they do not entertain all such [notions].

Thus, in what terms can anyone find fault with them?³²

Sn843 *Saccan ti so brāhmaṇo kiṃ vadeyya*

musā ti vā so vivadetha kena

yasmim̐ samaṃ visamañ cāpi n’ atthi

³² **Y9.9a:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘有諦人當何言’ as “‘Here is (有) the Truthful (諦)!’—how (何) can (當) one thus proclaim (言)?” In this translation, he omits translating ‘人,’ possibly to align Y9.9a with Sn843a. The term ‘諦人’ represents ‘a person who knows the truth and acts accordingly.’ I interpret it as ‘a wise person.’

Y9.9b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘著空’ as ‘to cling to the void.’ While ‘the void or voidness’ is one interpretation for the Buddhist technical term, ‘*sūnyatā*’ (insubstantiality, emptiness), but I don’t believe ‘空’ carries this doctrinal denotation in this context. Its Pāli equivalent in Sn843b is ‘*musā*’ (falsehood), leading me to understand ‘空’ as ‘something untrue, insubstantial.’

Y9.9d: The character ‘從’ could act as a verb ‘to rely on,’ or a conjunction, implying ‘accordingly, therefore.’ If we adopt its former usage, Y9.9d would mean “Relying on what words can anyone find fault with them?” I, however, chose the latter usage for my interpretation.

sa kena vādaṃ paṭisaṃyujeyya

Why would that brāhmaṇa assert, “This is the truth”?

Or with whom would they contest, [declaring], “That is false”?

Indeed, [when] one has no [concept of] equality or inequality,

With whom would they engage in dispute?³³

Y9.10 捨欲海度莫念 於隰縣忍行黠

欲已空止念想 世邪毒伏不生

Abandoning the sea of desire, crossing over [into homelessness] without hesitation,

The wise conduct themselves rigorously in the villages or towns.

Having thoroughly purged desire, they refrain from speculation or ideation.

The poison of worldly falsehoods has been vanquished,

and shall never reemerge [within them].³⁴

³³ **Sn843cd:** The term ‘*yasmim*’ functions as a relative pronoun, correlating the pronoun ‘*sa*.’ Consequently, Sn843cd can be read literally as: “With whom (*kena*) would he (*sa*)—in whom (*yasmim*) there is no [concept of] equality and inequality—engage in dispute?”

³⁴ **Y9.10a:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘捨欲海度莫念’ as “The ocean of craving he gives up, and into the unthinkable he doth pass.” His translation of ‘莫念’ as ‘the unthinkable’ is somewhat of a stretch and does not fit the context well. If we interpret the character ‘度’ as ‘to renounce household life,’ ‘莫念’ (without a second thought) would more aptly describe the resolute mindset of one renouncing. This reading is in line with the following line Y9.10b, which depicts the renunciants’ daily routine of alms round, and it also corresponds to their Pāli equivalents Sn844ab.

Y9.10b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘於隰縣忍行黠’ as “Into the country, with dexterity, endurance doth he practise.” His translation of ‘黠’ as ‘with dexterity’ seems ill-suited for the context. I consider ‘黠’ as ‘the sage,’ who is the subject of Y9.10ab. The equivalent term ‘*muni*’ (sage) is found in Sn844b, which supports my reading. This line seems to represent the renunciants’ alms round, their livelihood, during which they practice forbearance.

隰 (T) = 鄴 (K, Z): Both variants have the same meaning, ‘a village.’

Y9.10c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘欲已空止念想’ as “From craving released, no undue regard [for any] doth he cherish.” His interpretation of ‘念想’ as ‘undue regard [for any]’ remains unclear. To provide more clarity, I translate ‘念想’ as ‘speculation and ideation,’ hence ‘止念想’ becomes ‘to cease speculation and ideation.’

Sn844 *Okam pahāya aniketasārī*

gāme akubbaṃ muni santhavāni

kāmehi ritto apurekkharāno

kathaṃ na viggayha janena kayirā

Departing from domestic life to [embrace] homelessness,

Without fostering intimate relationships within the village,

Free from sensuality, without having preferences,

The sage would not engage in contentious debates with people.³⁵

Y9.11 悉遠世求敗苦 尊言離莫與俱

如水華淨無泥 重塵土不爲萎

尊安爾無所貪 於世俗無所著

Remaining entirely detached from the world, in pursuit of overcoming suffering,

The sage values ‘a life of seclusion,’ avoiding [idling] with others.

Pure as a water-lily untouched by a speck of mud,

Y9.10d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘世邪毒伏不生’ as “All the worldly poisons he has vanquished, and will not [again] be born.” His translation of ‘不生’ as ‘the sage will not be born again’ is one possible reading, but it stretches beyond the immediate context. I find my interpretation ‘the poison will never resurface in the sage’s mind,’ to be a better fit in this context.

³⁵ **Sn844d:** The main verb of this verse is ‘*kayirā*’ (optative, 3rd person, singular form of ‘*karoti*’ [to make]) found in Sn844d. In combination with the interrogative conjunction ‘*katha*’ (why? how? what?), ‘*kathaṃ karoti*’ forms a phrasal verb with the meaning ‘to debate,’ derived from its literal interpretation of “persistently asking ‘how?’ or ‘why?’.” This line also includes a gerund ‘*viggayha*’ originating from the verb ‘*viggaṇhāti*’ (to quarrel). The negative particle ‘*na*’ applies to both ‘*kayirā*’ and ‘*viggayha*.’ Consequently, Sn844d can be read as “The sage would not engage in a debate, quarrelling with people.” For the sake of clarity, I have positioned ‘*muni*’ (the sage) from Sn844b closer to the main verb ‘*kayirā*’ in Sn844d.

Unwithered [even when] encased in a thick layer of silt,
The sage stays serene, devoid of any craving.
They harbor no attachment to worldly mundane things.³⁶

Sn845 *Yehi vivitto vicareyya loka*
na tāni uggayha vadeyya nāgo
elambujam kaṇṭakam vārijam yathā
jaleṇa paṇkena c' anūpalittam
evaṃ munī santivādo agiddho
kāme ca loka ca anūpalitto

Wandering aloof from worldly [entanglements],
The Nāga would not dispute by taking up [beliefs].
Just as a lotus with a thorny stalk growing in the water,
Remains untainted by both water and mud,
Likewise, a proponent of peace, free from greed,

³⁶ **Y9.11a:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘悉遠世求敗苦’ as “All the world over, he wandered, seeking suffering to destroy.” However, his interpretation of ‘遠’ as ‘to wander’ is not precise; it would be more appropriate to translate it as ‘to distance oneself from.’

苦 = 善 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): In the alternative phrase ‘悉遠世求敗善,’ ‘求敗善’ (seeking to destroy the good) does not hold much coherence. Moreover, the Zhonghua apparatus seems to mistake ‘苦’ for ‘若’ (if), subsequently noting that five other editions (P, J, Q1, N, Q2) have ‘敗善’ instead of ‘敗若.’ Both characters ‘善’ and ‘若’ are likely typographical errors as the three characters can look remarkably similar considering possible wear over time on the woodblock print. Indeed, Z863 is a facsimile of K800, which might be an additional source of typographical errors.

Y9.11d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘重塵土不爲萎’ as “And unsullied (不爲萎?) by particles (塵), thick (重), of filth and mire (土).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. There seems to be a misinterpretation of ‘萎’ on his part: it signifies ‘to wither,’ not ‘to be stained.’ The term ‘塵土’ could be read as ‘silt’ or ‘mud,’ and his decision to translate the two characters separately leads to confusion in the phrase.

Y9.11f: Bapat translates the phrase ‘於世俗無所著’ as “With no attachment (無所著) for the world (於世俗) or its pleasures that may be.” [Parentheses added for analysis]. The added element ‘or its pleasures that may be’ lacks corresponding Chinese characters. The term ‘世俗’ could be simply translated as ‘mundane world.’

The sage remains unsullied by sensual pleasure of the world.³⁷

Y9.12 亦不轉所念想 行如度不隨識

三不作墮行去 捨不教三世事

Moreover, [the sage] does not proliferate speculations or ideations.

Living up to renunciation, they do not chase after [the stream of] consciousness.

Eschewing negligence, they abstain from engaging in [the affairs of] the three [realms].

Having relinquished matters of the three realms, they never teach about them.³⁸

Sn846 *Na vedagū diṭṭhiyā na mutiyā*

sa mānam eti na hi tammayo so

na kammanā no pi sutena neyyo

³⁷ **Sn845ab**: The correlation between both lines is established through the pronouns ‘*yehi*’ and ‘*tāni*.’ However, to enhance readability, I chose to veer from a literal presentation in my translation and have included two words, ‘entanglements’ and ‘beliefs,’ for improved clarity.

Sn845b: The term ‘*nāga*’ refers to a ‘cobra’ or an ‘elephant’ in its literal sense. In Buddhist literature, it’s frequently used metaphorically to signify a minor divinity, or less commonly, a sage. This is the singular instance within the *Aṭṭhakavagga* where ‘*nāga*’ is employed to denote a Buddhist saint. Another term synonymous with a minor divinity and utilized to represent a Buddhist saint is ‘*yakkha*’ (Skt. *yakṣa*; ghost, spiritual being), which can be found in Sn875 and Sn876.

³⁸ **Y9.12b**, 隨識 = 墮識 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): I would render the alternative phrase ‘不墮識’ as ‘not falling into the stream of consciousness.’

Y9.12c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘三不作墮行去’ as “In none (不) of the three actions (三) merged (作墮?), doth he move about (行去).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation lacks clarity and precision. The first part ‘三不作’ should be interpreted as ‘do not engage (不作) in the three (三),’ and the latter ‘墮行去’ as ‘remove (去) negligence (墮行).’ The verse itself does not specify what ‘the three’ are, but it likely pertains to ‘the affairs of the three realms (三世事)’ mentioned in the subsequent line. While Bapat suggests these could be the three types of actions—bodily, verbal, and mental—this interpretation may not align smoothly with the surrounding context. For clarity, ‘三世’ (the three periods) and ‘三界’ (the three realms) denote different concepts, as previously noted in Y2.fn.28. ‘三世’ refers to temporal divisions—the past, present, and future—while ‘三界’ describes types of existential planes—the realms of desire, form, and formlessness. In this verse, ‘三世’ seems to be erroneously conflated with ‘三界.’

anūpanīto so nivesanesu

A person of supreme knowledge does not succumb to conceit,

Based on [their] views or experiences—they do not rely on such things.

Unswayed by karma or tradition,

They remain unattached to the entrenchment of dogma.³⁹

Y9.13 捨不想無有縛 從點解終不懈

制見想餘不取 便厭聲步三界

Having relinquished [all], unengaged in ideation, they cannot be bound by anything.

Heeding the wise, they have been liberated, remaining vigilant until the end.

Having subdued views, ideation, and the like, they do not cling to anything.

Therefore, disillusioned with fame, they wander through the three realms.⁴⁰

³⁹ **Sn846ab:** For the sake of readability and a smoother flow, I have exercised a degree of liberty in translating these two lines. The main verb from the second line of the Pāli verse has been moved to the beginning of the first line in my translation. While the phrase ‘*na diṭṭhiyā na mutiyā*’ is constructed with instrumental cases (by means of), I have interpreted them as ‘based on,’ for improved clarity in English.

The term ‘*tammaya*’ in Sn846b is complex. My translation approaches it as ‘to rely on that,’ parsing it as ‘*tad + aya* (√i, to go).’ Other translations vary significantly: Norman reads it as ‘to be like that,’ Bodhi as ‘do not identify with them,’ and Fronsdal omits it entirely. Multiple sources were consulted to understand this term: the *Mahāniddeśa* defines it as ‘*tapparāyana*,’ indicating ‘to take them as support’; the Pāli Text Society Dictionary describes it as ‘equal to this, up to this’; the Pāli Japanese Dictionary suggests ‘to reach it, get involved in it’; and the Pāli Myanmar Dictionary annotates it as symbolizing ‘lust.’

⁴⁰ **Y9.13a:** Bapat interprets the phrase ‘不想’ as ‘with no perceptions.’ This translation appears to be flawed as it contradicts both the reality and Buddhist teachings. The reality is that as long as individuals are alive, they inherently have perceptions. This fact remains unchanged even for a Buddhist sage. According to Buddhist principles, the root cause of suffering is not perception itself, but rather attachment to these perceptions. Therefore, the distinguishing characteristic of the awakened ones isn’t the absence of perceptions, but their freedom from attachment to them. Consequently, a more accurate translation of ‘不想’ should be ‘not to ideate.’

Y9.13b: Bapat’s translation of the phrase ‘從點解終不懈’ as “delivered as he is by wisdom, no delusions doth he harbour” is not precise. The character ‘懈’ literally means ‘to be negligent,’ so the translation of ‘不懈’ should be ‘to be vigilant.’

Y9.13c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘制見想餘不取’ as “heresies and perceptions he has curbed, and to the rest he never clings.” In this context, as previously discussed, ‘想’ should be translated not as ‘perceptions’ but as

Sn847 *Saññāvirattassa na santi ganthā*

paññāvimuttassa na santi mohā

saññañ ca diṭṭhiñ ca ye aggahesum

te ghaṭṭayantā vicaranti loka’ ti

For one unattached to perception, there remain no bonds.

For one released through wisdom, there remain no delusions.

Yet, those who have held on to perceptions and views,

Traverse the world embroiled in conflicts.⁴¹

佛說是義足經竟。比丘悉歡喜

When the Buddha had expounded this [*sūtra* in] the *Yizujing*, all the *bhikṣus* rejoiced.

‘ideation.’ Furthermore, I contend that ‘餘’ (the rest) should be interpreted in conjunction with ‘見想’ (views and ideation), rather than independently. If read independently as ‘餘不取,’ this raises some interpretative issues: What exactly does ‘the rest’ refer to? Why is it only attachment to ‘the rest’ that is seen as crucial? Consequently, I propose that ‘見想餘’ should be collectively read as the three elements—views, ideation, and the like—against which they guard (制) and to which they avoid forming attachments.

Y9.13d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘便厭聲步三界’ as “with all clamour being disgusted, over the three realms he walks about.” His interpretation of ‘厭聲’ as ‘to be disgusted with clamors’ could be a possible reading, if its context of this verse is not considered. I believe my reading ‘to be disillusioned (厭) with fame (聲)’ fits better in this context. Here, I consider ‘聲’ a shorthand for ‘名聲’ (fame).

⁴¹ **Sn847:** Norman translates the term ‘*saññāvirattassa*’ as ‘for one who is devoid of perceptions,’ but this is somewhat misleading. The term ‘*viratta*’ comes from *vi* + *√raj* (Class 4; to be colored, enamoured, attached). It appears that his interpretation could have been influenced by a potential misunderstanding of the technical term ‘*saññā*’ (perceptions) in Buddhist doctrines. For a similar interpretational mistake made by Bapat, refer to his interpretation of ‘不想’ discussed in Y9.13a fn.37.

異學角飛經 第十

Discourse 10: Miracle Contest with Heretics (*Aṭṭhakavagga.11*)¹

聞如是。佛在王舍國多鳥竹園中。爲國王大臣長者人民所敬事。以飯食衣被臥床疾藥。共所當得。時梵志六世尊。不蘭迦葉。俱舍摩却梨子。先跪鳩墮羅知子。稽舍今陂梨。羅謂娑加遮延。尼焉若提子。

Thus I heard. The Buddha was residing in the kingdom of Rājagṛha, at Bamboo Park, [a sanctuary] teeming with birds.² He was revered by kings, high officials, householders, and the populace, who provided him with food, clothing, a cot, and medicine, ensuring all his needs were met. At that time, six brahmins were highly venerated in the world: Pūraṇa Kāśyapa 不蘭迦葉, Gośāla Maskarin 俱舍摩却梨子, Sañjaya Vairāṭiputra 先跪鳩墮羅知子, [Ajita] Keśakambali 稽舍今陂梨, Pakudha Kātyāyana 羅謂娑加遮延, and Nirgrantha Jñāṭṛputra 尼焉若提子.³

¹ 異學角飛經 第十 = 異學掬飛經 第十 (S, Y, M) = 異學掬飛 第十 (P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Regarding the omitted character ‘經’ in the five editions in the Zhonghua apparatus, please refer to Y1. fn.3; Y2. fn.1; Y6. fn.1; and Y9. fn.1.

In the Taishō and Zhonghua apparatus editions, the character ‘角’ has been replaced with ‘掬.’ While ‘角’ has a broad range of meanings such as ‘horn,’ ‘angle,’ and ‘to compete,’ in this context it likely refers to ‘competition.’ ‘掬’ has a narrower meaning and is generally translated as ‘to grab,’ ‘penetrate,’ or ‘match strength.’ Both terms are seemingly synonymous here, indicating ‘competition.’

The character ‘飛’ translates directly as ‘to fly,’ but in this case, it seems to serve as a synecdoche for ‘miracle.’ Therefore, the phrase ‘角飛,’ which literally means ‘to compete to perform the miracle of flying through the air,’ is more succinctly interpreted as ‘miracle competition.’

A similar story of a miracle competition can be found in the *Prātihārya-sūtra* (Discourse about Miracle Performance) of the *Divyāvadāna* (Divine Stories). In this sutra, six heretics challenge the Buddha to a miracle competition in the Kingdom of Śrāvastī, with King Prasenajit sponsoring the event.

² The term ‘王舍國’ is a translation of ‘Rājagṛha,’ where ‘王’ translating ‘rāja’ (king) and ‘舍’ ‘grha’ (house). The final character ‘國,’ which typically means ‘kingdom’ or ‘state,’ might reflect a misunderstanding by the translator Zhi Qian, as Rājagṛha was actually the capital city of the Māgadha region, not a separate kingdom or state. A more accurate translation for the context would be ‘城,’ which means ‘city’ or ‘fortress.’

The term ‘竹園’ translates the Sanskrit name ‘Veṇuvana,’ with ‘竹’ translating ‘veṇu’ (bamboo) and ‘園’ ‘vana’ (park).

³ The text provides a list of six brahmins’ names, mostly transcribed and partially translated into Chinese. To facilitate better understanding, I refer to Pulleyblank’s 1991 work to reconstruct the pronunciations of these names as they might have sounded during the Eastern Han dynasty.

是六尊亦餘梵志。共在講堂議言。我曹本爲世尊。國王人所待敬。云何今棄不復見用。悉反承事沙門瞿曇及弟子。念是釋家子。年尚少學日淺。何能勝我曹。但當與共試道。乃知勝不耳。至使瞿曇作一變。我曹作二。瞿曇作十六。我曹作三十二。轉倍之耳。

These six Venerable Ones and other brahmins convened in an assembly hall, engaging in discussion. “We were once revered in this world, with kings and the populace showing us service and respect. Why have we been forsaken now, no longer seen as necessary?⁴ On the other hand, the ascetic Gautama and his disciples continue to receive their services. Regarding this son of Śākya lineage, he is just a young man with superficial knowledge.⁵ How could he possibly

Pūraṇa Kāśyapa 不蘭迦葉 /Putlan Kiajiap/.

Gośāla Maskarin 俱舍摩却梨子 /Kuəciəh Makhiakli-tsi/. Here, the character ‘子’ does not represent any phoneme in this teacher’s name. Zhi Qian might have added this character as an honorific suffix, widely used for other respectable figures in China, e.g., Confucius (孔子) and Laozi (老子). However, my reasoning could be incorrect as the honorific usage of ‘子’ applies only to this name inconsistently. It could have been Zhi Qian’s plain mistranslation. Although Bapat translates ‘子’ as ‘follower of,’ it seems improbable in this context since the name refers to the teacher, not his followers.

Saṅjaya Vairāṭiputra 先跪鳩墮羅知子 /Sen-gwikuw Dwa’lati-tsi/. Unlike the case of ‘Gośāla Maskarin 俱舍摩却梨子,’ ‘子’ is used as a translation of ‘putra’ (son).

[Ajita] Keśakambali 稽舍今陂梨 /Kejeiahkimpīli/. A bracket is used because the bracketed phonemes are not represented in the Chinese transcription.

Pakudha (?) Kātyāyana 羅謂娑加遮延 /Lawujhsa Kaiteiajian/. I used ‘(?)’ because ‘Pakudha’ appears not to be exactly represented in the Chinese transcription.

Nirgrantha Jñāṭṛputra 尼焉若提子 /Nri-ian ŋiakdej-tsi/. As is the case with ‘Saṅjaya Vairāṭiputra 先跪鳩墮羅知子,’ the character ‘子’ is a translation of ‘putra.’

尼焉= 尼烏 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The variant reading presents the last name as ‘Nirgrantha Jñāṭṛputra 尼烏若提子,’ pronounced /Nri-?ə ŋiakdej-tsi/. This variation could be the result of a scribal error, considering that the characters might look similar when worn out on the woodblock print.

Interestingly, it should be noted that the title ‘世尊’ (the Blessed One) is not exclusive to the Buddha. It was a generic title used for individuals venerated for their religious standing in ancient India.

⁴ Bapat translates the phrase ‘不復見用’ as ‘no longer entertained.’ This translation appears to be a misinterpretation. The phrase ‘見用’ should be understood as ‘to be (見) used (用),’ with the character ‘見’ functioning as a passive particle preceding a verb. It seems he interpreted ‘見’ as the main verb meaning ‘to watch [something entertaining],’ but it is unclear why he neglected ‘用’ (to use, employ).

⁵ The character ‘念’ in the phrase ‘念是釋家子’ is used to signify ‘thinking of.’ In this context, it serves to shift the narrative focus to a related theme from the preceding narrative. I have translated it as ‘speaking of.’

surpass us? We should join together to challenge [his] spiritual power, determining whether we can outdo him.⁶ If Gautama performs a single miracle, we [must] perform two; [should] Gautama exhibits sixteen miracles, we [must] display thirty-two.⁷ We [must] respond by doubling his demonstrations [of power]!⁸

便共與頻沙王近親大臣語重謝。令達我曹所議變意大臣即便宜白王如語。王聞大瞋恚。數諫通語臣已。便還歸里舍。

Subsequently, these individuals engaged in conversation with a high official who had close ties with King Bimbisāra, expressing their deep gratitude [for his time].⁹ They entrusted him with their discussion regarding the proposed contest of miracles, which the high official promptly and properly relayed verbatim to the King.¹⁰ Upon hearing this, the King became infuriated. After a

⁶ 乃知勝不耳= 乃知勝弱耳 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): In the alternative reading, I would interpret the character ‘弱’ as denoting a ‘young person,’ typically under 20 years of age. It is often used in a derogatory context. Therefore, the phrase ‘乃知勝弱耳’ could be translated as “and find out whether we could triumph over that young man.” The original character ‘不’ in the text is the tag question, ‘or not,’ which leaves room for the unexpected opposite outcome.

⁷ I agree with Bapat that the term ‘至使’ functions as a conjunction, meaning ‘if.’ Here, the character ‘使’ alone conveys a sense of supposition, akin to ‘let’s suppose’ or ‘if,’ especially as it is often used in the phrase ‘說使.’ The character ‘至,’ meaning ‘to proceed,’ acts as an intensifier for the following ‘使.’ While both DDB and CJKV-E include this term in their entries, they suggest a different interpretation as ‘to bring about,’ which corresponds to the synonym ‘致使.’ However, this interpretation does not fit the given context.

⁸ I have interpreted the character ‘轉’ in the phrase ‘轉倍之耳’ as ‘in return,’ denoting that “however many performances Gautama will give, we must respond by doubling his demonstrations of power.”

⁹ The term ‘頻沙’ /bjinṣai/ is a transcription of ‘Bimbisāra,’ who was the King of Māgadha and a patron of the Buddha. According to Buddhist tradition, he held a reign of fifty-two years in Rājagṛha. In the Jain tradition, he is referred to as ‘Seniya.’

Bapat’s interpretation of the character ‘與’ as ‘to go’ in this context should be more accurately translated as ‘together with.’

¹⁰ The term ‘令達’ literally means ‘to order (令) [someone] to deliver (達) a message.’ In my translation, I have softened the phrase to ‘to entrust [someone] to report [something].’ In this context, it is not necessary to underscore a hierarchy between the secular and religious spheres, which Zhi Qian might have intended. As the narrative progresses, it will reveal that secular individuals had the power to punish religious figures.

series of discussions with his advisors and considering their counsel, he retired to his residential quarters.¹¹

衆梵志忽見佛獨得待敬巍巍。便行到王宮門。上書具說變意。王即現所尊六人向瞋恚大罵。王已見諦。得果自證。終不信異學所爲。便謂傍臣。急將是梵志釋。逐出我國界去。梵志見逐。便相將到舍衛國。

The assembly of brahmins felt neglected, seeing that only the Buddha was being served and held in high esteem [by the King].¹² Soon after, they approached the gates of the King's palace and delivered a [verbal] petition detailing their proposed contest of miracles.¹³ Subsequently, the King made his presence known to the six venerable ones.¹⁴ He confronted them with wrath and reprimanded them harshly. Having already perceived the truth, achieved a spiritual fruit, and

宣 = 宣 (M / J, Q2): The variant character '宣' signifies 'to proclaim.' Thus, I would read this alternative phrase '宣白' by removing the adverb 'properly (宣),' simplifying '宣白' to mean 'to report.' Given their similar forms, this variant character might have arisen from a typographical error.

¹¹ The character '諫' typically implies 'to remonstrate [with the King].' It frequently appears in contexts where ministers, risking their own status, express disagreement with the king and offer him their honest counsel. Given the hierarchical implication embedded within the term, Bapat's translation of this word as 'the King's instruction' might be misleading.

I have interpreted the phrase '里舍'—literally meaning 'dwelling (里) house (舍)'—as 'residential quarters.'

¹² The phrase '忽見' can be interpreted in two ways: either as 'to suddenly realize' or as 'to be overlooked.' Bapat opts for the former, which I deem an alternate interpretation. I lean towards the latter interpretation because the brahmins' awareness of the situation is not a recent development, and the term 'suddenly' seems out of place in this context. Here, the character '忽' might not signify 'suddenly' but rather 'to be overlooked.' We find a synonymous phrase, '忽視,' in similar contexts, meaning 'to neglect.'

The character '巍' signifies 'lofty.' The text employs this character twice (巍巍), which intensifies its meaning. I have translated it as 'highly.'

¹³ 上書: This term literally means 'to submit a written opinion to authority figures,' a practice reflecting uniquely Chinese cultural norms rather than those of ancient Indian culture, which relied primarily on oral traditions. Therefore, I have chosen to translate '上書' as 'to deliver a [verbal] petition,' adapting the term to better align with the ancient Indian context and more accurately reflect the intent of the original text.

¹⁴ Bapat overlooks an entire sentence, '王即現所尊六人,' in his translation.

self-verified [his attainment], the King, finally, could not trust what these heretics [planned] to do. Consequently, he commanded a nearby minister to swiftly expel these brahmins. He drove them out beyond the boundary of his kingdom. The brahmins were exiled, and then all of them arrived at the kingdom of Śrāvastī.¹⁵

佛於王舍國教授竟。悉從衆比丘。轉到郡縣。次還舍衛國祇桓中。梵志等不忍見佛得敬巍巍。便聚會六師。從諸異學。到波私匿王所。具說其變意。王即聽之。

Upon concluding his teachings in the kingdom of Rājagṛha, the Buddha, along with an assembly of *bhikṣus*, visited various villages and counties in succession. Eventually, he returned to Jetavana in Śrāvastī.¹⁶ The brahmins and their fellows could not bear witnessing the Buddha receiving such profound respect. The six teachers immediately held a meeting, [led] their heretic

¹⁵ 梵志見逐 便相將到舍衛國: Following the King's order, this passage describes the expulsion of the brahmins, narrated from their perspective. The term '見' acts as a passive marker, and '梵志見逐' translates to 'the brahmins were exiled.' The phrase '相將' indicates a collective action, likely meaning 'leading/bringing (將) each other (相).' The Digital Dictionary of Buddhism (DDB) defines it as 'to do something all together (*sic*),' 'as a group,' or 'in each other's company.' This usage is corroborated by several instances in early Chinese Buddhist translations, such as in Lokakṣema's work: '是三兒相將來至佛前' (These three children came together to the Buddha's presence). Typically, '相將' is followed by a verb denoting action/movement, such as '來至' (go to). In this instance from the *Yizujing*, '相將' is followed by '到' (to arrive), indicating their arrival at the city of Śrāvastī.

Bapat mistakenly places the sentence '便相將到舍衛國' in the following paragraph. Given that the new paragraph commences with the Buddha receiving immense respect, this sentence should not be associated with the succeeding paragraph.

¹⁶ Bapat's interpretation of the character '還' as 'to come to' is not accurate. In this context, it denotes 'to return [from a tour in the villages].'

The term '祇桓' /gīywan/ is a transcription of Jetavana. In this phrase, '祇' represents 'Jeta' and '桓' signifies 'vana.' Across Chinese Buddhist translations, we see other renderings for this name. For example, some transcriptions use the two characters '祇陀' /gīda/ to phonetically represent 'Jeta.' As we have seen in Y1, the term '祇樹' comprises both transcription and translation elements. Here, '祇' is a transcription of 'Jeta,' and '樹' (tree) translates to 'vana' (grove), together rendering '祇樹' as 'Jeta's Grove.'

followers, and approached the place where King Prasenajit resided.¹⁷ They thoroughly explained their proposal for a contest of miracles, to which the King attentively listened.

便乘騎到佛所。頭面著佛足竟一面坐。叉手求願。諸世尊道德深妙。可現變化。使未聞見者生信意。已聞見者重解。使異學無餘語。佛語王言。却後七日。當作變化。王聞歡喜。繞佛三匝而去。

He then mounted a horse and rode out to the Buddha's location.¹⁸ Respectfully, he touched the Buddha's feet with his face, then seated himself to one side. With hands clasped together, he voiced his wish: "May the Blessed One manifest his profound and subtle spiritual achievements and virtues through miraculous feats.¹⁹ [In so doing,] may those who have yet to hear or see [the Buddha] develop their faith [in him]. May those who have already heard or seen [him] deepen their understanding of [the truth]. And may heretics find themselves with nothing further to say [to challenge you]." The Buddha assured the King, "In seven days from now, I will perform miracles." Upon hearing this, the King was delighted. [To honor him,] he circumambulated the Buddha thrice before taking his leave.

¹⁷ The term '波私匿' /pasinrik/ is a transcription of Prasenajit (Pāli. Pasenadi), the King of the Kosala kingdom.

波私匿 = 波斯匿 (M): They may have been pronounced similarly. The variant from the Ming edition is a more commonly used transcription of the king's name.

¹⁸ Bapat's translation of '騎' as 'a chariot' appears to be inaccurate; it typically means 'to ride/straddle a horse.'

¹⁹ Bapat seems to misunderstand the structure of the passage: "諸世尊道德深妙 可現變化。使未聞見者生信意。已聞見者重解。使異學無餘語。" He translates it as "O Blessed One, let your profound virtues be displayed in the form of miracles, never heard of, nor seen before. They will produce faith in the minds [of people] and create full understanding [in them.] It will silence the babbling heretics." In this translation, Bapat inaccurately suggests that '未聞見' modifies the previous phrase '變化,' which is incorrect given the character '使' (let) serves as a separator between the two phrases. Furthermore, he overlooks the contrasting phrases: '未聞見者' (people who have never heard or seen) and '已聞見者' (people who have already heard or seen). In its entirety, the King's request consists of four sentences beginning with '諸世尊...', '使未聞見者...', '(使)已聞見者...', and '使異學....'

至期日。便爲作十萬坐床。亦復爲不蘭等。作十萬坐床息。時舍衛人民。悉空城出觀。佛出威神。時梵志等。便各就座。王起白佛。諾世尊可就座現威神。

When the day arrived, they arranged a hundred thousand seats for [the side of the Buddha]. Similarly, they set up another hundred thousand seats for [the side of] Pūraṇa and the other [brahmins], [thereby] completing [the preparation for the venue].²⁰ At that moment, the inhabitants of Śrāvastī completely emptied out the town to witness the Buddha showcasing his spiritual prowess. Shortly thereafter, each of the brahmins and their followers took their respective seats. The king rose and addressed the Buddha: “May the Blessed One take a seat and manifest his spiritual power.”

是時般識鬼將軍。適來禮佛。聞梵志欲與佛角道。便作颯風雨吹其座。復雨沙礫。上至梵志。膝者至髀者。佛便出小威神。使其座中悉火燃。炎動八方。不蘭等。見佛座燃如是。悉歡喜自謂道德使燃。佛現神竟。炎燃則滅梵志等乃知非其神所爲。便向內憂有悔意。

At this juncture, Pāṇcika 般識, the General of Ghosts, had just arrived and paid his respects to the Buddha.²¹ He had heard the brahmins desired to challenge the Buddha in the spiritual contest.

²⁰ Bapat translates the passage ‘亦復爲不蘭等 作十萬坐床息’ as “Pūraṇa and the rest also prepared a hundred thousand seats [for rest]. This is inaccurate. The particle ‘爲’ implies that the seats were prepared ‘for’ Pūraṇa and the other [brahmins], not ‘by’ them. Additionally, his translation of ‘息’ as ‘for rest’ is a misfit in this context. I suggest interpreting it as ‘to stop,’ indicating that all preparations for the contest had been duly ‘completed.’

²¹ In the phrase ‘般識鬼將軍,’ ‘般識’ /pe:neik/ appears to serve as a name, and ‘鬼將軍’ as a title, signifying the General (將軍; senāpati) of spirits (鬼). Bapat aligns ‘般識’ with ‘Pañcika.’ This name, Pāṇcika, although absent in the Pāli literature, sporadically appears in several pieces of Buddhist Sanskrit literature. It is found 24 times across 13 different sources in Sanskrit (according to a search within the GRETIL resources). Seven occurrences come from the *Divyāvadāna* 163, with typical phrasings being ‘Pāṇciko Mahāsenāpati’ (Pāṇcika the Great General) and ‘Pāṇcikenā Yakṣasenāpatinā’ (by Pāṇcika the General of Yakṣas). In the *Divyāvadāna*, Pāṇcika emerges as the leader of the Yakṣa army, acting on behalf of the Buddha.

In response, he conjured a severe rainstorm, directing it towards their seats.²² Furthermore, he [orchestrated] a shower of sand and gravel upon the brahmins, reaching up to their knees and thighs. Shortly thereafter, the Buddha performed a restrained miracle, igniting a fire across his seat and sending flames in all eight directions. Pūraṇa and other [brahmins] witnessed the Buddha's seat burning as described. Overwhelmed with joy, they assumed that their own spiritual prowess and virtue were responsible for the fire. Upon the completion of the Buddha's miraculous demonstration, the flames were promptly extinguished. It didn't take long for the brahmins and their followers to recognize that the miracle was not their own work. Subsequently, they turned introspective, apprehensive, and filled with regret.²³

佛即起師子座。中有一清信女。有神足。起叉手白佛言。世尊不宜勞神。我欲與異學俱現神。佛言。不須自就座。吾自現神足。貧賤清信士須達女作沙彌。名專華色。與目犍蘭俱往白佛。世尊不宜勞威神。我今願與之共脩道。佛言不須且自還座。我自現神足。佛意欲使衆人得福安隱。悉愍人天令得解脫。復伏梵志等。亦爲後世學者作慧。使我道於未來得住留。

Thereupon, the Buddha rose from his lion's seat. Within the gathering was a laywoman possessing miraculous power. She rose, hands clasped, addressing the Buddha, "O, Blessed One, there's no need for you to exert yourself performing miracles. I wish to [contest] these heretics in the [realm of] miraculous demonstrations." The Buddha replied, "You don't need to. Please take

²² The rare character '飄' is interpreted as 'big wind, typhoon,' as per the *Longkanshoukam* 龍龕手鑑, a Chinese Buddhist dictionary compiled by a Buddhist monk during the Liao dynasty (916–1125 CE).

²³ The phrase '向內' is literally translated as 'to face (向) inside (內)' or 'to become introverted.' Bapat's translation notably omits this term.

your seat. I will display the feats of miracle myself.” The daughter of the destitute layman Sudatta, who was named Utpalavarṇā 專華色 after becoming a novice nun, arrived in the company of Maudgalyāyana 目犍蘭.²⁴ She said to the Buddha, “O Blessed One, there's no need for you to exert yourself to showcase spiritual power. I wish to engage with them all in this spiritual contest.” The Buddha responded, “You don’t need to either. You too, please return to your seat. I will myself manifest these miraculous feats.” The Buddha thought to himself, “I wish to enable the gathering to attain merit and secure peace. I extend my compassion towards all gods and humans, aiming for their liberation. By defeating the brahmins and their followers once again, I [aspire to] empower future practitioners to attain wisdom and solidify [the foundation of] my teachings to last for generations to come.”²⁵

²⁴ The term ‘須達’ /suḍat/ is a transcription of Sudatta, which is the name of a layman. This text portrays him as a poor layman, distinguishing him from the famous Sudatta, who is better known by his honorific, Anāthapiṇḍada. The latter was a wealthy merchant who famously built the Jetavana monastery for the Buddhist Saṅgha.

The term ‘專華色’ literally translates to ‘exquisite flower-like complexion.’ This name appears to be a translation of the name Utpalavarṇā, which implies a ‘lotus-like complexion.’ The DDB lists nine translations and three transcriptions for this Sanskrit name, the most frequent of which is 蓮華色, denoting a ‘lotus flower-like complexion.’ According to the *Buddhist Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*, Utpalavarṇā was one of the two exemplary nuns (along with Khemā) during the Buddha’s time. She frequently appears in Buddhist narratives centered around the performance of miracles. However, a discrepancy does exist: she was not the daughter of a poor layman, as the text suggests, but of a banker.

The term ‘沙彌’ typically refers to a male novice monk. In this context, the more appropriate term would be ‘沙彌尼,’ which denotes a female novice nun. This suggests that Zhi Qian may have made a mistake in his choice of terms. Alternatively, he might have used ‘沙彌’ in a gender-neutral sense.

Bapat translates the passage ‘貧賤清信士須達女作沙彌’ as ‘A poor lay-disciple, only a srotāpanna, [and] a lady who had become a śrāmaṇerī.’ Here, the character ‘女’ is attached to the personal name ‘須達,’ which should make ‘須達女’ read as ‘Sudatta’s daughter.’ If these were independent individuals, Zhi Qian would have likely translated this phrase as ‘清信女’ (female disciple) instead of ‘清信士’ (male disciple), and omitted ‘女’ after ‘須達.’ Bapat’s rendering ‘only a srotāpanna’ (the stream-entry, one of the four Buddhist sainthoods) does not appear in the original text.

²⁵ Bapat translates the passage ‘亦爲後世學者作慧 使我道於未來得住留’ as “the later generations of my followers under training will get wiser and my doctrine will, in time to come, be firmly established.” In this translation, he neglects to render the particle ‘爲’ (on behalf of) and the verb ‘使’ ([I will] make ...).

未來 = 未來時 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Their meanings are the same.

佛時現大變神足。即從師子座飛起。往東方虛空中步行。亦箕坐猗右脇。便著火定神足。出五色光。悉令作雜色。下身出火。上身出水。上身出火。下身出水。即滅乃從南方來。復滅乃從西方來。復滅乃從北方虛空中住。變化所作。亦如上說。

At this point, the Buddha performed a great miracle through his spiritual power. He immediately ascended from his lion's seat, headed towards the east, and strolled through the sky.²⁶ In addition, he sat down, fully extended his legs, and leaning on his right side, he then engaged in the miracle of fire ignition while in a meditative state.²⁷ He emitted a radiance of five colors, conjuring an array of variegated hues. He then spewed fire from the lower part of his body, and [simultaneously] discharged water from the upper part. [Alternatively,] he released fire from his upper part and let out water from his lower part. Shortly thereafter, he vanished [from there], reappearing in the south. He disappeared again, re-emerging in the west, and yet again, disappeared and reappeared in the north, hovering in the sky. [Each time,] the miracles he performed were exactly as described above.

坐虛空中。兩肩各出一百葉蓮花。頭上出千葉華。華上有佛坐禪。光明悉照十方。天人亦在空中。散花佛上。皆言。善哉佛威神。悉動十方。佛即攝神足。還師子座。

[While hovering] in the air in sitting posture, he created a hundred-petaled lotus flower on each shoulder, and above his head, he generated a thousand-petaled flower.²⁸ Seated atop each

²⁶ 即從 = 從 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): For the alternative reading, 'in a flash' (即) would be omitted from the translation.

²⁷ The character '箕' literally interpreted as 'to sit down with both legs fully extended.'
猗 = 倚 (S, Y, M): In this context, both the characters carry the same meaning, 'to lean on' or 'to rest on.'

²⁸ 千葉華 = 千葉蓮華 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The alternative reading explicitly identifies the flower as a lotus.

blossom was a buddha in a meditative pose. Their brilliant light shone across all ten directions. Deities also hovered in the air, showering flowers upon the buddha. Everyone lauded, “Magnificent are the Buddha’s demonstrations of spiritual power!” All ten directions shook.²⁹ Subsequently, the Buddha concluded his miraculous feats and returned to his lion’s seat.

是時梵志等。默然無言。皆低頭如鳩睡。時持和夷鐵。便飛於虛空。見炎炯然可畏。但使梵志等見耳。適現子曹。便大恐怖戰慄。衣毛皆豎各各走。

At this juncture, the brahmins and their followers fell into a stunned silence, heads drooping low [in embarrassment], much like dozing pigeons.³⁰ Subsequently, the Buddha, clasping his iron thunderbolt, then flew into the sky.³¹ He unveiled a formidable display of fiery flames, visible only to the brahmins and their companions—a spectacle specifically aimed at those masters. This incited immense fear within them, leading to tremble involuntarily. As their hair stood on end in fright, each one of them made a hasty retreat.³² This incited immense fear within them, leading to

²⁹ Bapat’s translation of the phrase ‘悉動十方’ as ‘touching all the ten directions’ is not accurate. The character ‘動’ signifies ‘to move,’ or ‘to shake.’

³⁰ 無言 = 無願 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The phrase ‘無言’ translates to ‘without uttering a word,’ which I have left out to avoid redundancy. The alternative phrase ‘無願’ can be translated as ‘lacking the will [to challenge the Buddha].’

³¹ I interpret the term ‘和夷鐵’ /ywahji-thet/ as ‘iron thunderbolt,’ considering ‘和夷’ as a transcription of *vajra* (a thunderbolt, diamond, a mythical weapon) and ‘鐵’ as a translation, indicating ‘[made of] iron.’ In his Lokakṣema Glossary, Karashima identifies ‘和夷羅洹’ as a transcription of a Middle Indic form of Skt. *Vajrapāṇi* (the name of Indra, literally meaning ‘wielding a thunderbolt’).

³² I interpret the character ‘見’ in the phrase ‘見炎炯然’ as synonymous with ‘現’ (to show, manifest). 炎炯然 = 炎煙然 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The two phrases differ slightly in meaning. The former translates to ‘fiery flames,’ while the latter suggests ‘flames and smoke.’

The character ‘子’ in the phrase ‘子曹’ is likely a respectful title referring to the *brahmin*, and ‘曹’ is a plural suffix.

involuntary trembling. As their hair stood on end in fright, each one of them beat a hasty retreat.³³

佛便爲雨衆人。廣說經法。說布施持戒善見天徑薄說愛欲好痛說其災害著苦無堅固。佛以慧意。知衆人意濡住不轉。便爲說四諦。中有身歸佛者。歸法者。歸比丘僧者。有長跪者。受戒者。有得溝港者。得頻來者。得不還者。

Shortly thereafter, the Buddha expounded his *sūtra* teachings for the two assemblies.³⁴ He instructed that generosity and moral conduct serve as expedient paths to the Heaven of Perfect Vision. He [also] elucidated the suffering that [arises from unchecked] desires for pleasurable things and clarified that disaster, a pronounced form of suffering, lacks permanence.³⁵ Utilizing his mind of wisdom, the Buddha perceived the minds of his listeners to be receptive, stable, and

³³ The term ‘衣毛,’ according to the CJKV-E, was an idiom meaning ‘body hair’ during the Han dynasty (202 BCE–220CE). Literally, it could mean ‘hair (毛) that covers (衣) [one’s body].’

³⁴ 爲雨衆人 = 爲兩衆人 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The variation between the characters ‘雨’ (rain, to rain) and ‘兩’ (two) may stem from scribal similarities, resulting in two different interpretative paths. Considering the structure of ‘爲兩衆人’ (for the two assemblies) with the subsequent verb ‘廣說經法’ (to expound the *sūtra* teachings), this reading aligns better within the context, which is meant to address two distinct groups within the audience, potentially the two opposing factions of a hundred thousand individuals each—one supporting and the other opposing the Buddha. On the other hand, the Taishō edition’s ‘爲雨衆人’ could metaphorically suggest ‘showering’ the crowd with lavish teachings, although the syntactical placement of ‘雨’ (to shower) between ‘爲’ (for) and ‘衆人’ (the crowd) makes this interpretation slightly awkward. The ‘兩’ variant, indicating two distinct groups, offers a more plausible narrative context and is preferred for this translation.

³⁵ 說布施持戒善見天徑薄說愛欲好痛說其災害著苦無堅固: This lengthy passage in the Taishō edition can be divided into three sentences for clarity: ‘說布施持戒善見天徑,’ ‘薄說愛欲好痛,’ and ‘說其災害著苦無堅固.’ My sentence breaks are informed by the presence of three main verbs, which I have highlighted in bold types. I would translate these phrases as follows: “He instructed (說) that generosity (布施) and moral conduct (持戒) are the expedient paths (徑) to [the rebirth in] the Heaven of Perfect Vision (善見天); he provided a succinct discourse (薄說) on the suffering (痛) [arising from] the desire (愛欲) for pleasurable things (好); and he explained (說) that disaster (其災害)—a pronounced (著) form of suffering (苦)—lacks solidity (無堅固). To enhance readability, I have made minor adjustments in my translation. For further information on these sentence breaks, please refer to Y1. fn.26.

The character ‘著’ in this context can be interpreted as ‘conspicuous’ or ‘pronounced.’ A similar usage can be found in the Biography of Zhu Gelang from the *Record of the Three Kingdoms*, where it states: ‘信義著於四海’ ([His] trustfulness and righteousness are conspicuous throughout the Four Seas).

unflinching, so he then expounded to them the Four Noble Truths.³⁶ [As a result,] a significant number of attendees sought refuge in the Buddha, the Dharma, and the *Bhikṣusamṅha*. [Many demonstrated their reverence] by kneeling for a prolonged period, while others received precepts. [Furthermore, a considerable number] attained [the spiritual states of] Stream-Enterer, Once-Returner, or Non-Returner.³⁷

是時人民。皆共生意。疑何因緣棄家爲道。復有鬥訟。佛即知子曹疑。便化作一佛。著前端正。有三十二相。衣法衣。弟子亦能化作人。化人語弟子亦語。佛語化人默然。化人語佛默然。何以故。正覺直度正所意故。化佛即右膝著地。向佛叉手。以偈難問言

At this moment, everyone in the assembly had a thought, wondering whether individuals who renounce worldly life for the Path still engage in conflicts and disputes?³⁸ Sensing this doubt

³⁶ 濡 = 輭 (S, Y, M): The character ‘濡’ is often translated as ‘wet,’ while ‘輭’ carries the meaning of ‘gentle and flexible.’ In this context, both characters seem to convey the sense of ‘amenable’ or ‘receptive.’

The sentence ‘知衆人意濡住不轉’ can be literally interpreted as “the Buddha perceived (知) the minds (意) of the crowd (衆人) to be receptive (濡), stable (住), and unflinching (不轉).”

³⁷ The term ‘溝港者’ is an early Chinese translation for the Sanskrit ‘*śrotāpanna*’ (Stream-Enterer). It is noteworthy that its literal translation aligns with ‘a person who has channeled a waterway on the port,’ a concept that intriguingly resembles the Jain epithet Tirthāṅkara (Ford-maker). However, this term may not be a precise equivalent for ‘Stream-Enterer’ in Buddhist soteriology. Later Chinese Buddhist translations rendered this spiritual stage as ‘預流,’ which incorporates the ideas of ‘participation’ (預) and ‘stream’ (流).

The term ‘頻來者’ translates literally as ‘one who comes frequently,’ which does not align with any of the four stages of Buddhist sainthood as delineated in Nikāya/Āgama literature. This term likely represents a mistranslation of ‘一來者’ (Once-Returner), intended to correspond to the Sanskrit ‘*sakṛdāgāmin*’ (literally, ‘once coming’). Although ‘頻’ typically means ‘frequently,’ given the context and Zhi Qian’s attempt to convey the concept of ‘*sakṛdāgāmin*,’ the term might be stretched to imply ‘once again,’ thus adapting the translation to more accurately reflect the original meaning of coming back to this world just one more time.

Lastly, the term ‘不還者’ is an accurate translation for the ‘*anāgāmin*’ (Non-Returner).

By incorporating the term ‘阿羅漢,’ a transcription for the Sanskrit Arhat (Pāli. Arahant), into the existing list of three, we have a comprehensive representation of the four types of Buddhist saints.

³⁸ Bapat’s translation of the phrase ‘疑何因緣棄家爲道 復有鬥訟’ reads as “...doubt as to why one has to abandon family for [the attainment of] of the Path. Further, there were quarrels and disputes.” This translation splits the passage into two sentences, which unfortunately obscures the original intention of the phrase. A more accurate rendering would consolidate the two parts into a single query: “Why, despite renouncing their families for the Path,

among the people, the Buddha conjured another buddha, noble and upright, before him.³⁹ [This apparition] bore the thirty-two marks [of a great man] and was dressed in a sacred robe.

[Notably, the Buddha's] disciples possessed similar abilities to create other beings, and the beings they conjured echoed their words.⁴⁰ While the Buddha spoke, the conjured buddha

do these individuals still engage in conflict?" This focuses on the actual point of contention—the persistent conflict among those renouncers, specifically the six brahmins.

³⁹ A similar narrative to this scene of conjuring up a figure can be found in the story of the miracle contest from the Prātihārya-sūtra of the *Divyāvadāna* 166. The following excerpt, translated by Andy Rotman (2008) in his *Divine Stories: Divyāvadāna*, provides a comparative perspective:

Meanwhile, the Blessed One magically created an image of the Buddha, endowed with the thirty-two marks of a great man, with a shaven head and clad in monastic robes. It is a law of nature that lord buddhas make decisions in conversation with magical images that they have created. If a disciple creates a magical image, however, when the disciple speaks, the magical image only repeats what he says. When the disciple is silent, the magical image is also silent.

When a disciple is speaking, all magical images of his creation repeat what he says.

When he is silent, all are silent."

If the Blessed One questions a magical image that he has created, the Blessed One['s magical image] gives the answer. This is a natural law for perfectly awakened tathāgata arhats.

The narrative from the *Divyāvadāna* provides an intriguing contrast between the capabilities of the figures created by the Blessed One and his disciple. The figure conjured by the Blessed One is capable of meaningful dialogue with the Buddha, while the figure brought forth by the disciple can merely echo the disciple's own words, demonstrating a more limited range of abilities.

Though the passage from *Yizujing* is perplexingly intricate, leaving it unclear whether Zhi Qian's intention was to mirror the narrative as told in the *Divyāvadāna*, the most feasible interpretation of this *Yizujing* passage is through its contextual relation with the *Divyāvadāna* account. Therefore, I translate the passage '化人語弟子亦語' as "The created beings echoed what the disciples also spoke," and '佛語化人默然 化人語佛默然' as "When the Buddha spoke, the conjured buddha listened (lit. remained silent). When the conjured buddha spoke, the Buddha listened (lit. remained silent)." In this context, I interpret '化人' as 'the conjured buddha (化佛),' taking '化人' as 'anyone [the Buddha] had conjured.' Without this reading, these sentences are rather nonsensical. Bapat's translation of these sentences doesn't offer clarity regarding the complexities I've discussed in this footnote.

Finally, I render the phrase '正覺直度正所意故' as 'It is because the truly awakened one could directly comprehend the real intentions [of people].' In this case, I have translated '正所意' as 'real/true intention,' interpreting it as 'truly (正) what is intended (所意)'; I have translated '直度' as 'directly comprehend,' interpreting it as 'directly (直) measure (度).'

著前端正: This phrase can be literally translated as 'prominent (著) in front (前) of [the Buddha] and appears noble and upright (端正).'

The character '子' is notably versatile in classical Chinese. Coupled with the plural suffix '曹,' the term '子曹' has been previously translated as 'venerables' or 'masters.' However, in this context, '子曹' is used to refer to the general public in attendance. In this context, while '子' traditionally signifies 'man,' I interpret and use it without its gender connotation. Refer to fn.31 for previous usage.

⁴⁰ 化作人 = 作化人 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): In this context, both the phrases carry the same meaning, 'to conjure a person.'

listened; conversely, when the conjured buddha spoke, the Buddha would listen. Why is this so? It is because the truly awakened one could directly comprehend the true intentions [of others]. Subsequently, the conjured buddha knelt with his right knee touching the ground. Holding his hands together before the Buddha, he began to pose challenging questions in verse.⁴¹

Y10.1 鬥訟變何從起 致憂痛轉相疾

Q. 起妄語轉相毀 本從起願說佛

Why conflicts and disputes arise,

That breed distress and suffering, fostering mutual resentment,

That germinate deceptive words, spiraling into slanderous accusations?

I beseech the Buddha to elucidate their origin.⁴²

⁴¹ Both the verses in Y10 and those in the *Kalahavivādasutta* (Discourse on Quarrels and Disputes) adhere to a question-and-answer pattern. In these narratives, the conjured Buddha poses the questions, and the actual Buddha provides answers, as corroborated by the notes in *Paramatthajotikā II* on the *Kalahavivādasutta*. I have labeled the verse numbers with ‘Q.’ and ‘A.’ to denote ‘question’ and ‘answer’ respectively.

⁴² **Y10.1a:** The phrase ‘鬥訟變’ can be construed as ‘unexpected incidents (變) of conflicts (鬥) and disputes (訟).’ For the sake of improved readability, I have elected to exclude the character ‘變’ from my translation.

The phrases ‘何從’ and ‘從何’ operate as interrogative pronouns in this tenth discourse, corresponding to various English words such as ‘why,’ ‘how,’ ‘from what,’ and so forth. ‘何從’ appears in Y10.1a, Y10.3a, and ‘從何’ in Y10.5bc, Y10.6c, Y10.7c, Y10.8ab, Y10.10abc, and Y10.12ab. Their Pāli counterparts include ‘*kuto*’ (from where?) in Sn862a, Sn864a, Sn866b, Sn869a, and Sn871ab; ‘*katham*’ (how?) in Sn866c, Sn868c, Sn869b, and Sn871ab; ‘*kismim*’ (where?) in Sn869b and Sn871c; and no Pāli equivalent in Sn871c. The DDB suggests the base meaning of ‘何從’ as ‘how?’ and ‘從何’ as ‘from where/what/whom?’ or ‘why?’, etc. Regardless of the differing character placement within the phrases, I interpret both as interchangeable. Therefore, I translate ‘何從’ and ‘從何’ into an English interrogative that best fits each specific context.

Y10.1b: Bapat renders the phrase ‘致憂痛轉相疾’ as “along with grief and lamentation and mutual jealousy as well.” He omits the verbs ‘致’ (to lead to) and ‘轉’ (to develop into), which form the connecting framework for the remaining four characters. By sidelining these two crucial elements and the structure they create, Bapat simply presents the remaining four characters as a list of the negative outcomes of disputes.

疾 = 嫉 (S, Y, M): While ‘嫉’ primarily signifies ‘jealousy,’ a specific emotion, ‘疾’ encompasses a broader range of meanings such as ‘pain,’ ‘speed,’ ‘hatred,’ and more. Given the context, ‘hatred’ seems the most appropriate interpretation. Considering that Y10.2b also uses ‘嫉’ in a similar context, it seems plausible to treat both characters as synonymous within this discourse. Therefore, I translate them as ‘resentment.’

Sn862 *Kuto pahūtā kalahā vivādā*

Q. *paridevasokā sahamaccharā ca*

mānātimānā sahapasuṇā ca

*kuto pahūtā te tad iṃgha brūhi*⁴³

From where do [these] originate—quarrels, disputes,

Grief, lamentation, along with avarice,

Conceit, arrogance, and slander included?

Where do they spring from? Please, enlighten [me] on it!⁴⁴

Y10.2 坐憂可起變訟 轉相嫉致憂痛

A. 欲相毀起妄語 以相毀鬥訟本

Preoccupied with and fretting over enticements, [people] stumble into disputes,

Which escalate into mutual resentment, causing distress and suffering.

Eager to slander each other, [they] resort to deceptive words.

Y10.1c: Bapat renders the phrase ‘起妄語轉相毀’ as “false words (妄語) and words of slander (毀) that are mutually exchanged (轉相?).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. His translation omits the verb ‘起’ (to bring about), and his interpretation of ‘轉’ as ‘to exchange’ is somewhat dubious. It appears that he has overlooked these verbs from Y10.1bc, possibly in an effort to adapt this *Yizujing* verse to the syntax of the corresponding *Aṭṭhakavagga* verse, where their Pāli equivalents do not exist.

⁴³ The sixteen subsequent Pāli verses derive from the *Kalahavivādasutta*, the eleventh sutta of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. These verses are composed in *triṣṭubh* meter, with a singular exception in Sn873d, composed in *jagatī* meter. Verses Sn863 and Sn875 deviate from the tetrameter structure, containing five feet each.

⁴⁴ **Sn862a:** The term ‘*pahūta*’ originates from Sanskrit, ‘*pra*’ and ‘*√bhū*’ (to become). The *Mahāniddesa* interprets it as ‘*jāta*’ (arisen), which fits the context provided by the preceding word ‘*kuto*’ (from where). The PTSD, meanwhile, suggests an alternate meaning—‘abundant’—which does not seem to fit this particular context.”

Through these slanderous exchanges, [they create further] sources of conflicts and disputes.⁴⁵

Sn863 *Piyā pahūtā kalahā vivādā*

A. *paridevasokā sahamaccharā ca*

mānātimānā sahaṇṇā ca

macchariyayuttā kalahā vivādā

vivādajātesu ca sahaṇṇāni

From coveted things, [the following] emerge—quarrels, disputes,

Grief, lamentation, along with avarice,

Conceit, and arrogance, in tandem with slander.

Quarrels and disputes are linked to avarice,

And once disputes have arisen, slander [follows].⁴⁶

⁴⁵ **Y10.2a:** The Taishō edition equates the term ‘憂可’ with ‘可愛’ from the subsequent verse Y10.3a, linking both to the Pāli term ‘*piya*’ (a pleasurable thing) as found in Sn863a. This alignment attempts to maintain consistency with the Pāli text but leaves unexplained the transformation of ‘憂’ (typically, to be distressed) into a substitute for ‘愛’ (to covet), and the grammatical structure where ‘憂’ precedes ‘可.’ In this context, I translate ‘坐憂可’ as ‘preoccupied with (坐) and fretting over (憂) pleasurable things (可),’ interpreting ‘坐’ as ‘to dwell on,’ ‘憂’ as ‘to be anxious [to obtain],’ and ‘可’ as ‘something appealing,’ potentially abbreviated from ‘可意’ (appealing to the mind) or ‘可愛’ (desirable). For additional details on the usage of ‘可,’ refer to annotations Y2. Fn.19; Y6. fn.14, 23, 25.

The ensuing phrase ‘起變訟’ can be literally interpreted as ‘give rise to (起) incidents (變) of dispute (訟).’ Nevertheless, I take the liberty of a more fluid translation to maintain coherence with the preceding phrase ‘坐憂可.’ This interpretive approach also extends to Y10.2c, which contains the same character ‘起’ serving the same function within the foot.

Y10.2bc: Bapat’s translation, like in Y10.1bc, continues to omit the verbs ‘轉,’ ‘致,’ and ‘起.’

⁴⁶ Sn863 and Y10.2 parallels but with some differences in their presentations. Both Sn863a and Y10.2a begin concurring that disputes stem from cherished things. Sn863bc enumerates a series of negative emotions and events originating from these cherished things, while Y10.2bc presents supplementary causations using verbs ‘致’ (to lead to), ‘轉’ (to evolve into), and ‘起’ (to instigate). Sn863de suggests the concurrent existence of avarice, slander, and disputes, while Y10.2cd asserts that slanderous exchanges offer additional origins for disputes. Overall, Y10.2 implies a cyclical pattern: disputes prompt slander, and in turn, slander incites disputes. This circular causation in Y10.2 may resonate with the ‘coexistence’ of slander and disputes highlighted in Sn863de.

Y10.3 世可愛何從起 轉世間何所貪

Q. 從置有不復欲 從不復轉行受

What gives rise to desirable objects in the world?

How do covetable objects bring about worldly turmoil?

If one relinquishes possessiveness, could they cease to desire?

And thereby, would they no longer partake in the ensuing havoc?⁴⁷

Sn863e: The phrase ‘*vivādaḥjātesu*’ can be broken down into ‘*vivāda*’ (dispute), ‘*jāta*’ (having arisen), ‘*-esu*’ (locative plural suffix). When combined, they translate as ‘when disputes have arisen.’ This is the approach taken by Norman in his translation, though he also offers an alternative interpretation of ‘*vivāda-jāta*’ (the disputatious), with ‘*-jata*’ referring to ‘anything that falls under the category of *vivāda*.’

⁴⁷ **Y10.3:** This verse features a question proposed by the conjured buddha, while Y10.4 provides Buddha’s response. While these verses may initially appear enigmatic, their meaning is unveiled when each line of Y10.4 is perceived as a response to its corresponding line in Y10.3.

The ambiguity of this verse centers on the terms ‘轉世間’ and ‘轉行.’ Initially, I linked these to ‘cyclic rebirths,’ influenced by the Pāli term ‘*samparāyaya*’ in Sn.864 and Sn.865, which is typically translated as ‘for the future’ or ‘for the next life.’ However, upon reevaluation, I found that these Chinese terms do not correspond with the Pāli term, and my initial interpretation did not align with the context of subsequent verses in the *Yizujing*. I now interpret ‘轉世間’ as ‘to bring about worldly turmoil’ and ‘轉行’ as ‘ensuing havoc,’ which more accurately reflects the intent of the Pāli counterparts. These terms may also relate to ‘disputes and conflicts,’ ‘mutual resentment,’ ‘distress,’ ‘slander,’ and ‘deception’ as mentioned earlier in Y10.1–2. Further details on these terms will be discussed in the accompanying footnotes.

Y10.3ab: Bapat translates the first two lines ‘世可愛何從起 轉世間何所貪’ as “Things beloved—what are they due to? So also greeds that in the world strut about?” He seems to draw from the Pāli word ‘*vicarati*’ (to wander) in Sn864b to interpret ‘轉’ as ‘to strut about,’ implying that greed is rampant in the world. However, ‘轉’ primarily means ‘to turn’ or ‘to change,’ suggesting circular rather than horizontal movement, as the Pāli ‘*vicarati*’ may imply. While ‘轉’ can also translate as ‘to move on,’ it focuses more on transitions between states rather than spatial movement. Therefore, I interpret ‘轉’ in this context as ‘to bring about new phases of events,’ which is reinforced by the phrase ‘轉行苦’ (suffering from unleashed havoc) in Y10.4b. This interpretation more accurately captures the essence of transformations described in the verse.

Aware that the syntax of Sn864ab are one interrogative sentence, Bapat omits to translate 何 (what, how, why, ...) in 何所貪 and takes the entire foot of Y10.3b as another subject of the previous foot. Or he may have read 何 in Y10.3b as short for 何從起 (what are they due to?) in Y10.3a and removed this repetition. However, Y10.3b should be an independent question with its own interrogative adverb 何. It is because Y10.4b—the Buddha’s answer to Y10.3b—is separate from another answer of the Buddha in Y10.4a. Thus, I have translated Y10.3b as “How (何) do covetable (貪) objects (所) bring about (轉) worldly turmoil (世間)?” The phrase ‘所貪’ can be interpreted as either ‘greed’ or ‘the object of greed.’ In light of the Buddha’s response in Y10.4b, I believe the latter interpretation is more fitting. For further discussion on the potential interpretations of ‘所貪,’ please refer to Y2.1b fn.16.

Sn864 *Piyā su lokasmiṃ kutonidānā*

Q. *ye vā pi lobhā vicaranti loke*

āsā ca niṭṭhā ca kutonidānā

ye samparāyāya narassa honti

Beloved things in the world and the greed

That pervades it—from where do [they] arise?

Longings and their fulfilment, which a person

Harbors for the future—from where do [they] arise?⁴⁸

Y10.3cd: Bapat translates the subsequent lines ‘從置有不復欲 從不復轉行受’ as “By the stopping of what [things], will expectations be no more, so that, to the worldly life, there will be no more return?” In consideration of the Buddha’s response in Y10.4cd, I concur with Bapat’s interpretation of these lines as a question. However, these lines do not contain an interrogative character corresponding to ‘what [things]’ in his translation. Therefore, these lines should be perceived as a yes-or-no question, a reading corroborated by the Buddha’s response in Y10.4cd.

The phrase ‘從置有’ presents an interpretive challenge. I read it as ‘by (從) discarding (置) possessiveness (有).’ Commenting on the ambiguity of the character ‘有,’ Bapat suggests it might represent the Pāli term ‘bhava’ (existence). However, in the context of the question posed by the conjured buddha in Y10.3c and the Buddha’s subsequent response in Y10.4c, it seems more appropriate to interpret ‘有’ as referring to ‘possessions’ or ‘possessiveness.’ Here, ‘置’ is understood as ‘to discard or give up,’ which can be supported by an example from the Inner Volume Remonstrance Upper Chapter 內篇諫上 179 (CTEXT numbering) of the *Yanzi Chunqiu* 晏子春秋: ‘置大立少 乱之本也’ (Discarding the major and upholding the minor is the root of disorder). (四部叢刊初編 本 晏子春秋). This interpretation of ‘置’ as ‘to discard’ aligns with the Buddha’s response in the subsequent verse (Y10.4), where ‘置’ is substituted by a synonym ‘捨’ (to relinquish or leave behind).

Lastly, I render the phrase ‘轉行’ as ‘the ensuing havoc.’ It appears twice, in contexts such as ‘轉行受’ ([due to greed, people] undergo ‘轉行’) and ‘轉行苦’ ([seizing covetable objects incur] suffering of ‘轉行’), where ‘轉’ (to transform) and ‘行’ (to proceed) combine to signify a sequence of ‘unleashed events/disturbances.’

⁴⁸ Sn864ab and Sn864cd share a similar syntax, yet the usage of the two relative pronouns ‘ye’ differs. In Sn864b, ‘ye’ introduces an additional subject ‘lobhā’ (the greed) into the sentence of Sn864ab, while in Sn864d, ‘ye’ modifies the subjects ‘āsā ca niṭṭhā ca’ (longings and [their] fulfilment) in Sn864c.

Sn864d: The term ‘samparāyāya’ is a singular dative form derived from the noun ‘samparāya’ (*sam* + *parā* + *√i*), which translates to ‘future state’ or ‘the next world.’ Jayawickrama interprets it in the context of rebirth as ‘the after-life,’ which might suggest that this term supports interpreting the corresponding Chinese term ‘轉行’ as ‘a cycle of rebirth.’ However, Norman and Bodhi treat it more broadly as ‘the future,’ related to ‘longings’ and ‘their fulfilment’ mentioned in the previous line. Given this broader perspective and its application in the context of this and subsequent verses, I interpret ‘samparāyāya’ as simply ‘for the future’ and accordingly render ‘轉行’ as ‘ensuing havoc,’ rather than a direct reference to cyclic rebirth.

Y10.4 本所欲著世愛 以利是轉行苦

A. 不捨有從是起 以故轉後復有

Desirable objects stem from attachment to what the world covets.

By exploiting these [objects], [they perpetuate] the suffering of ensuing havoc.

Without discarding possessiveness, they trigger the onset of this [havoc].

Consequently, they accumulate more possessions in turn after [this havoc].⁴⁹

⁴⁹ **Y10.4:** This verse highlights key Buddhist concepts with specific phrases: ‘著世愛’ is interpreted as ‘attachment (著) to what the world (世) covets (愛),’ and ‘利是’ as the act of ‘exploiting (利) this (是) [object of desire].’ These behaviors are presented as the root causes of objects becoming desirable, which in turn triggers disputes and conflicts, as initially discussed in Y10.1–2. The verse suggests that objects become desirable through attachment and exploitation, which also lead to possessiveness (有) and the suffering associated with ensuing turmoil (轉行).

Y10.4b: The character ‘利’ can have diverse meanings and functions contingent on specific contexts. Here, in the phrase ‘以利是,’ it is best understood as a verb indicating ‘to take advantage of,’ or ‘to forcibly seize.’ This interpretation is supported by the succeeding pronoun ‘是,’ which points back to ‘所貪’ (covetable objects) from Y10.3b, and by the thematic links in the subsequent lines Y10.3c and Y10.4c. The line Y10.3b queries the connection between ‘所貪’ and ‘轉世間’ (worldly turmoil), which further ties into ‘有’ (possessiveness) presented in Y10.3c and Y10.4c. The Complete Collection of Ancient and Modern Characters (古今文字集成; CCAMC) offers an example of verbal usage of ‘利’ with a somewhat aggressive undertone as follows: “3. 占; 谋利 [forcibly occupy; seize; hold]. 如: 利人妻女...” (3. To occupy; to exploit [forcibly occupy; seize; hold]. For example: ‘to take advantage of someone’s wife and daughter’...).

Bapat translates the phrase ‘以利是轉行苦’ as “favouring (利) the spring up (轉行) of suffering (苦) in this world (是?).” This interpretation, however, appears to be both imprecise and vague. His reading of ‘利’ as ‘to favor’ might be plausible in another context, but seems off here. His rendering of ‘轉行’ as ‘spring up (起?)’ is also potentially misleading. Furthermore, he may have interpreted ‘是’ as ‘in this world’ in an attempt to align Y10.4b with Sn865b, which seems like a stretch. Notably, he does not account for the initial preposition ‘以’ in his translation of this line.

Y10.4c: In the Buddhist doctrine of the Twelve Links of Causation (*dvādaśanidānāni*), the character ‘有’ represents the Sanskrit ‘*bhava*,’ which translates as ‘coming into existence.’ This concept suggests that ‘*bhava*’ arises from ‘attachment’ and leads to birth, aging, and death. Given this, the phrase ‘Without discarding (不捨) becoming (有), they end up with (從) this (是) arising (起)’ could be seen as referring to the suffering associated with rebirth. However, interpreting it within this later doctrinal framework might be anachronistic. The early Buddhist texts outline the simpler form of Dependent Origination (*pratītyasamutpāda*): “When this exists, that comes to be; when this arises, that arises; when this does not exist, that does not exist; when this ceases to be, that ceases to be.” This foundational causality framework evolves into various forms of the more specified causal doctrines, and ‘*dvādaśanidānāni*’ is one of its most refined elaborations of the Dependent Origination. ‘*Dvādaśanidānāni*’ became a standard formulation that is reverberated in the Abhidharma or Mahāyāna treatises. Consequently, my interpretation for the context of Yizujing should be cautious about applying later doctrinal

Sn865 *Chandānidānāni piyāni loke*

A. *ye vā pi lobhā vicaranti loke*

āsā ca niṭṭhā ca itonidānā

ye samparāyāya narassa honti

Beloved things in the world and the greed

That pervades it—[they] arise from desire.

Longings and their fulfilment, which a person

Harbors for the future—[they] arise from here.⁵⁰

Y10.5 隨世欲本何起 從何得別善惡

Q. 從何有起本末 所制法沙門說

How does indulging in worldly desire first come about?

How do people come to discriminate between good and evil?

specifics. Furthermore, this verse primarily deals with the origins of conflicts and disputes, a theme separate from the existential cycles of birth and death. Therefore, the traditional interpretation of ‘*dvādaśanidānāni*’ may not be entirely applicable here. The pronoun ‘是’ (this) in Y10.4b and Y10.4c likely refers to different entities; it points to ‘所欲’ (desirable objects) in Y10.4b and ‘轉行’ (ensuing havoc) in Y10.4c.

Bapat’s translation of the phrase ‘不捨有從是起’ as “the perfection of expectations doth arise from them,” appears uncertain. It is unclear how he equates ‘不捨有’ with ‘perfection of expectations.’ It seems he may have leaned on his understanding of the Pāli ‘*āsā ca niṭṭhā ca*’ (longings and [their] gratifications) rather than focusing on the Chinese phrase itself. In its original context, the phrase ‘不捨有’ should be interpreted as ‘without relinquishing possessiveness.’

Y10.4d: The character ‘轉’ here seems to function adverbially, indicating a reversal in the direction of causality: while line c suggests that possessiveness leads to ensuing havoc, line d asserts that during such havoc, they further accumulate possessions. Hence, the complete line translates to: “Therefore (以故), they accumulate even more (復) possessions (有) in turn (轉) after (後) [this havoc].”

⁵⁰ The *Mahānidāna* clarifies that ‘ito’ (from this) in Sn865c is referring back to ‘*chandā*’ (from desire) in Sn865a.

How does becoming give rise to all [negative mental states]?

O, Śramaṇa! Please, expound upon the Dharma that you have established!⁵¹

Sn866 *Chando nu lokasmiṃ kutonidāno*

Q. *vinicchayā vā pi kuto pahūtā*

kodha mosavajjañ ca kathaṃkathā ca

ye vā pi dhammā samaṇena vuttā

From where does desire in the world originate?

Discriminations, anger, deceptive speech, doubt

⁵¹ **Y10.5a:** I regard the phrase ‘隨世欲’ (indulging in worldly desire) as equivalent to ‘著世愛’ (attachment to what the world covets) from Y10.4a. This is because, in Y10.4, the Buddha explains that enticing things emerge due to attachment, and in response, the conjured buddha in Y10.5 inquires about the origin of this attachment. Consequently, ‘indulging in worldly desire’ is meant to reflect ‘attachment to what the world covets’ as presented in Y10.4.

Y10.5b: In this context, the character ‘得’ could be interpreted as a modal verb, signifying ‘can’ or ‘to get to,’ placed before the verb ‘別’ (to discriminate).

Y10.5c: Bapat’s interpretation of the phrase ‘從何有起本末’ as “what is it that exists from which we have appearance and disappearance,” significantly deviates from the original intention, particularly in his treatment of ‘本末.’ This term literally translates to ‘roots (本) and tips (末) of branches,’ signifying ‘everything from beginning to end.’ It seems that Bapat, perhaps influenced by his endeavor to align this phrase with the Pāli terms ‘*vibhavaṃ bhavañ ca*’ (vanishing and arising [of things]) found in Sn867c, has misinterpreted this idiom as being synonymous with ‘生死’ (birth and death) or ‘生滅’ (arising and disappearing). This alignment effort, however, leads him to disregard its inherent Chinese meaning. In fact, if this phrase were to be associated with a Pāli verse, it would not be Sn867, but rather Sn866 that parallels Y10.5. Specifically, Sn866bcd provides a list of mental states that ‘本末’ may encompass: ‘*vinicchayā kodha mosavajjañ kathaṃkathā ye dhammā samaṇena vuttā*’ (discriminations, anger, deceptive speech, doubt, and whatever mental states mentioned by the Samaṇa). Thus, I interpret ‘本末’ as ‘all [negative] mental states’ in this context. Accordingly, the phrase in question can reasonably be understood as asking ‘how does possessiveness give rise to all such [negative] mental states.’

There is an alternative reading of ‘本末,’ focusing on the doctrinal context of Twelve Links of Causation. ‘本’

Y10.5d: Bapat renders the phrase ‘所制法沙門說’ as “how is one restrained by the rules (所制法) that the Ascetic (沙門) has proclaimed (說)?” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this interpretation is off-target. The absence of any interrogative word in the original text precludes its translation into a ‘how’ question, indicating that the sentence is not a wh-question, but rather a request. Furthermore, his translation of ‘所制法’ appears to miss its intended meaning. In this context, ‘制’ likely denotes ‘to establish’ as opposed to ‘to regulate,’ a potential alternate interpretation. Therefore, ‘所制法’ would be more aptly translated as ‘the Dhamma that [you] have established.’ Though there are similar elements between Y10.5d and its Pāli counterpart Sn866d, the conveyed messages diverge significantly.

And whatever mental states mentioned by the Ascetic—

From where do they even arise?⁵²

Y10.6 亦是世所有無 是因緣便欲生

A. 見盛色從何盡 世人悉分別作

Truly, desire arises immediately on account of

The presence or absence of something in the world.

Observing how all that [once] flourished ceases to exist,

Commoners discriminate all [the phenomena].⁵³

⁵² **Sn866bcd**: The three lines in question form an interrogative sentence featuring an extensive list of subjects: ‘*vinicchayā, kodha, mosavajjañ, kathaṃkathā*, and *ye dhammā samaṇena vuttā*’ Their single predicate is ‘*kuto pahūtā*’ (from where do they arise?). To enhance readability, I have inserted an emdash to separate the subject list from the concluding question.

⁵³ We see a wide disparity between the causation of this Chinese verse and that of its Pāli parallel. This disparity starts with the term ‘所有無’ (the presence or absence of something) and its Pāli counterpart ‘*sātaṃ asātaṃ* *ti*’ (so-called ‘agreeable’ or ‘disagreeable’) and it persists in the following verses.

Y10.6a: Bapat’s translation of the phrase ‘亦是世所有無’ as ‘whatever is pleasant or unpleasant in this world’ is a considerable departure from the original text, presumably driven by his aim to correlate the Chinese with the Pāli context. However, ‘所有無’ bears no resemblance to ‘pleasant or unpleasant,’ focusing instead on concepts of existence or non-existence. Bapat suggests that ‘所有’ could be a transcription error for ‘所欲’ (things desired). However, there are several reasons why I do not find this plausible.

Firstly, ‘所欲’ is already featured in Y10.4a as part of the previous sequence of questions and answers. In this context, Y10.4 describes ‘objects of desire’ (所欲) as emerging from ‘attachment’ (著). Following this, Y10.5 asks about the origins of ‘隨世欲,’ which is another expression for ‘attachment.’ Y10.6 then responds by providing an explanation for these origins, infusing a new ‘agreeable’ connotation into the same term ‘所欲.’ Such a suggestion, however, seems unsatisfactory and rather implausible. Consequently, it seems highly unlikely that Y10.6 would repurpose ‘所欲’ to represent ‘agreeable’ in the context of desire emerging from the dichotomy between ‘agreeable’ and ‘disagreeable.’

Secondly, Bapat might have hypothesized that ‘有’ and ‘欲’ had similar pronunciations in the past, potentially leading to confusion. However, their reconstructed Eastern Han pronunciations, /wuw/ and /juawk/ respectively, are quite distinct. Furthermore, the shapes of these characters do not closely resemble each other, making a typographical error highly unlikely. Thus, I maintain that ‘有’ could not be a mistaken letter for ‘欲’ in this case.

According to the DDB, the Zusesetsu Bukkyōgo Daijiten 圖說佛教語大辭典 provides an entry for ‘所有無.’ The author, Nakamura, suggests it could be interpreted as ‘快不快’ (pleasure and displeasure) or ‘喜不喜’ (happiness and unhappiness). He uses Y10.6a as an example to substantiate this interpretation, asserting that ‘所有

Sn867 *Sātaṃ asātan ti yam āhu loke*

A. *tam ūpanissāya pahoti chando*

rūpesu disvā vibhavaṃ bhavañ ca

vinicchayaṃ kurute jantu loke

Desire arises depending on

What people label as ‘agreeable’ [or] ‘disagreeable,’ in the world.

Observing vanishing and arising [of things] in various forms,

People formulate [their] opinions in the world.⁵⁴

無’ should accurately translate ‘*sātaṃ asātan*.’ The apparatus of T198 also repeats that ‘所有無’ might correspond to ‘*sātaṃ asātan*,’ interpreted as ‘喜不喜.’ However, all these interpretations are premised on the assumption that the Chinese phrase should be a precise representation of the Pāli wording. Yet, the leap to equate ‘所有無’ with ‘*sātaṃ asātan ti*’ is arguably a substantial stretch.

There are two possible explanations as to why Zhi Qian might have chosen to translate the term as ‘所有無.’ One suggestion is that other ancient Indic languages may have presented ‘*sātaṃ asātan ti*’ quite differently from its Pāli rendition. The Indic text used for the *Yizujing* translation might have contained such a wording, given that diverse Prakrits have varied phonetic representations. I will explore this possibility further in footnote 53. Alternatively, ‘所有無’ might make logical sense within the verse, as it shares connections with the terms used in subsequent lines: ‘盛...盡’ (flourish ... perish) and ‘分別作’ (discriminate). These, in turn, find their equivalents in the Pāli terms ‘*vibhavaṃ bhavañ ca*’ (vanishing and arising) and ‘*vinicchayaṃ kurute*’ (discriminate, form opinions).

Y10.6b: Y10.6b: Bapat interprets the character ‘欲’ as ‘the pursuit of longings,’ likely considering it an abbreviation of ‘(隨)世欲’ from Y10.5a. This interpretation is plausible since Y10.6ab serves as the Buddha’s response to the question posed by the conjured Buddha in Y10.5ab. Both Chinese translations should align with the Pāli term ‘*chanda*’ (desire). Thus, I translate it as ‘desire,’ adhering to the original *Yizujing* text.

Y10.6c: Bapat’s translation of the character ‘盡’ as ‘to decay’ is not quite accurate. ‘盡’ literally signifies ‘to use up, exhaust,’ and it does not inherently suggest any form of chemical or biological decomposition.

⁵⁴ It is intriguing to note the divergence between ‘*sātaṃ asātan ti*’ (what is considered ‘agreeable’ or ‘disagreeable’) in Sn867a and its parallel ‘所有無’ (items that exist or do not exist; or more abstractly, existence or nonexistence) in Y10.6a. The Pāli term ‘*sāta*’ carries dual implications: it could correlate with the Sanskrit word ‘*sāta*’ (pleasurable) or ‘*sattā*’ (existence). This variation might stem from the morphological differences between various vernacular Prakrits. For instance, while the *Aṭṭhakavagga* interprets the phrase from the *Arthapada* as Sanskrit ‘*sāta asāta*’ (pleasurable and unpleasurable), the *Yizujing* might interpret it as Sanskrit ‘*sattā asattā*’ (existence and non-existence). This possibility becomes even more credible considering that both ‘*sātaṃ asātan ti*’ and ‘*sattam asattan ti*’ follow the same metrical pattern (heavy; heavy; light; heavy; heavy; light), which translates to a similar rhythm when chanted.

As per scholars like Brough (1962), Nattier (1990: 204), and Boucher (1996: 55), the majority of early Chinese Buddhist translations likely derived from Gāndhārī originals, which were sometimes transcribed using Kharoṣṭhī or Brāhmī writing systems. According to Professor Diego Loukota (personal communication, July 15, 2019), Kharoṣṭhī manuscripts often fail to indicate long vowels or double consonants, and Brāhmī manuscripts are

Y10.7 所從欺有疑意 亦是法雨面受

A. 念從何學慧迹 願解法明學說

If a person adheres to deceptive [opinions], they [may] have doubts in mind.

Indeed, they [should] accept this Dharma Rain sincerely.

Considering how the learner [can get on] the track towards wisdom,

I will elucidate the Dharma expounded by the wise Ascetic.⁵⁵

similarly unreliable with long vowels. Given the similar chanting or writing pattern of both phrases, it is plausible to suggest that the Indic original for the *Yizujing* might have been in Gāndhārī, and the phrase could have been read as something akin to the Sanskrit ‘*sattā asattā*.’ I intend to delve further into this discrepancy and its implications in the narrative portion of my dissertation.

Sn867c: Sn867c: Norman interprets ‘*vibhavaṃ bhavañ ca*’ as ‘non-existence and existence,’ whereas the *Mahāniddesa*, Jayawickrama, and Bodhi consider it as ‘vanishing and arising.’ Derived from the Sanskrit root ‘*√bhū*’ (to be, become), both interpretations are plausible. Y10.6c appears to endorse the *Mahāniddesa*’s commentary with its rendering ‘盛... 盡’ (flourish ... perish).

Sn867d: Although both ‘*vinicchayaṃ*’ (discrimination, opinion) and ‘*jantu*’ (a person) are singular, I have opted to translate them in plural to align with English writing conventions.

⁵⁵ Y10.7 is not a question from the conjured buddha, but rather a continuation of the Buddha’s response from Y10.6, similar to how its Pāli parallel, Sn868, continues the Blessed One’s answer from Sn867.

Y10.7a: Bapat interprets the phrase ‘所從欺有疑意’ as “[Falsehood] that is produced (所從?) from fraud (欺), and questioning mind (疑意).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. His translation of ‘所從’ as ‘what is produced’ seems a bit forced. The character ‘從’ literally implies ‘to follow,’ and ‘所從’ does not naturally align with his chosen meaning. Furthermore, he overlooks translating the main verb ‘有’ in this segment.

In this context, the character ‘所’ is likely to bear its less common meaning of ‘if.’ This usage is found in the ‘Instruction for Governors’ (牧誓) from the *Classic of History* (尚書)—a compilation of official documents spanning up to the early Zhou dynasty (1046–771 BCE): “勗哉夫子! 爾所弗勗, 其于爾躬有戮!” (My brave men, be energetic! If you be not energetic [in all these matters], you will bring destruction on yourselves: translated by James Legge). While the phrase ‘所從’ could function as an interrogative phrase meaning ‘from where?’, it doesn’t align with the context here, since this verse is not a question from the conjured buddha, but rather a response from the Buddha.

The character ‘欺’ (deceptive [opinion]) is likely a reference back to ‘分別作’ (anything created by discrimination) in Y10.6d. This line underscores the notion that discrimination engenders doubts.

Y10.7b: Y10.7b: Bapat’s translation of the phrase ‘亦是法雨面受’ as “These their appearance make, when this pair [of the pleasant and unpleasant] exists” is full of inaccuracies, omissions, and assumptions. He neglects ‘亦,’ ‘法,’ and ‘受’; while erroneously interpreting ‘雨面’ (shower on the face) as ‘兩面’ (both sides), a misguided attempt to make this phrase align with its Pāli counterpart ‘*dhammā dvaya*’ (two-fold phenomena). No edition of the *Yizujing* endorses this substitution. My interpretation of this phrase is: “Indeed (亦), they [should] accept (受) this (是) Dharma Rain (法雨) with sincerity (面).” In this context, ‘面’ may mean ‘face, to face, face to face,’ and I interpret it adverbially as ‘directly, sincerely.’

Sn868 *Kodho mosavajjañ ca kathaṃkathā ca*

A. *ete pi dhammā dvaya-m-eva sante*

kathaṃkathī ñāṇapathāya sikkhe

ñatvā pavuttā samaṇena dhammā

Anger, lying, and doubt—

These mental states [arise] in the presence of dichotomies.

A skeptic should train on the path of knowledge,

Recognizing [these] teachings have been proclaimed by the Ascetic.⁵⁶

Y10.7c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘念從何學慧迹’ as “The questioner may learn of Wisdom’s Path.” His interpretation of ‘念從何’ as ‘questioner,’ possibly as “one who is thinking: ‘why?’” seems to be rather contrived and misleading. A more accurate translation would be: “Considering (念) how (從何) the learners (學) [can get on the right] path (迹) of wisdom (慧).”

念從何學慧迹 = 念從何覺慧迹(S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The alternative phrase could be interpreted as “considering how one might awaken (覺) on the path towards wisdom.”

Y10.7d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘願解法明學說’ as “Wishing (願) to understand (解) the Law (法) by the Enlightened One (明學) taught (說).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. His interpretation of ‘明學’ as ‘the Enlightened One’ is plausible. However, he does not explain why he considers ‘學’ (to learn) as a person, which I interpret as a ‘*samaṇa*’ (ascetic). This usage occurs in two more instances in Y11.10–11. For instance, Y11.11d reads: ‘以故學一不說’ (For this reason, the Ascetic does not claim a single [dogma]), paralleling the Pāli version Sn884d: ‘*tasmā na ekaṃ samaṇā vadanti*’ (Thus, the **ascetics** do not claim anything). Thus, ‘明學’ could denote ‘the wise ascetic’ or ‘the ascetic who proclaims the path of wisdom,’ potentially referring to the Buddha. Alternatively, ‘明學’ could be read as ‘a school of thought (學) that teaches wisdom (明),’ implying ‘Buddhist thought.’ Similar usage of ‘學’ can be seen in ‘玄學’ (Daoist thought) and ‘儒學’ (Confucian thought).

⁵⁶ **Sn868b:** The term ‘*dvaya*’ signifies ‘two folds’ or ‘dualities.’ Both the *Mahāniddesa* and the *Paramatthajotikā II* infer that it encapsulates ‘*sāta + asāta*’ (agreeable and disagreeable). The *Mahāniddesa* interprets ‘*dvaya...sante*’ as a locative absolute, indicating a temporal aspect—‘when dualities are present.’ Norman proposes that ‘*dvaye*’ transitioned into ‘*dvaya*’ due to metrical constraints.

Sn868c: In this particular context, the term ‘*ñāṇa*’ within ‘*ñāṇapatha*’ (the path of knowledge) adopts a positive connotation, which sharply contrasts its predominantly negative connotation throughout the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. For instance, Sn788–9 suggests that ‘*ñāṇa*’ does not facilitate the cessation of suffering. This verse further implies that this path was established by ‘*samaṇa*’ (the Ascetic), which also differs from the generally negative depiction of ‘*samaṇa*’ as individuals holding onto their rigid dogmas and engaging in disputes with others. Such inconsistencies in the usage of these terms may indicate diverse origins for the sixteen *suttas* present within the *Aṭṭhakavagga*.

Y10.8 所有無本從何 無所親從何滅

Q. 盛亦滅悉一義 願說是解現本

Where do existence and non-existence find their roots?

How are [they] dissolved, freeing one from attachment?

Flourishing and waning—all [must conform to] a single principle.

Please enlighten us on this [matter]; elucidate and reveal its origin.⁵⁷

Sn869 *Sātaṃ asātañ ca kutonidānā*

Q. *kismiṃ asante na bhavanti h' ete*

vibhavaṃ bhavañ cāpi yam etam atthaṃ

etam me pabrūhi yatonidānaṃ

From where do the agreeable and the disagreeable originate?

When absent, what ensures they certainly do not come to be?

As for this matter of non-becoming and becoming,

Tell me, from where does this originate!⁵⁸

⁵⁷ **Y10.8b:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘無所親從何滅’ as “How will they disappear, of their supporters being bereaved?” His translation, however, seems inaccurate, arising from his misinterpretation of ‘親’ as ‘supporters’ rather than ‘affection’ or ‘attachment.’ In this context, the dichotomy (i.e., existence and non-existence, 所有無) is what disappears, therefore its consequence should be freedom from attachment, not the loss of one’s relatives or supporters.

Y10.8c: The meaning of the phrase ‘一義’ (one principle) here is not evident. It might possibly refer to the source or origin of the dichotomy.

盛亦滅 (T) = 盛亦滅 (K, Z): The alternative reading can be translated as ‘flourishing and disappearance.’

⁵⁸ **Sn869c:** We need to define the meanings of ‘attha’ and ‘vibhavaṃ bhavañ ca.’ Jayawickrama translates Sn869c as “whatever this *phenomenon* namely cessation and arising is;” Norman does it as “that *thing* which is ‘non-existence’ and ‘existence’ too;” and Bodhi does it as “as to this *matter* of vanishing and coming-to-be.” I think Bodhi gives a readable translation while respecting the Pāli syntax and morphology.

CPD gives Sn869–870 as examples of reading *attha* as ‘matter, case.’ We find this usage with verbs of communication such as ‘*pucchati* (to ask), *aroceti* (to tell), *bhāsati* (to speak). Take an example from Sn241: *pucchāmi taṃ Kassapa etam atthaṃ...* (O, Kassapa. I ask you [about] this matter...). Thus, I read *yam etam atthaṃ* as ‘as for this matter of...’

Y10.9 有亦無著細濡 去來滅無所有

A. 盛亦滅義從是 解現賢本盡是

Both existence and non-existence [stem from]

the manifestation of subtle cognitive contacts.

Vanishing and arising cease [when] nothing is [cognitively] grasped.

The principle of flourishing and fading derives from this.

I have clarified and unveiled to you that they entirely originate from this.⁵⁹

Vibhavaṃ bhavañ ca could read either as ‘vanishing and arising’ or as ‘non-existence and existence.’ See fn.51 Sn867c. Under the context of Sn869, ‘*vibhavaṃ bhavañ ca*’ is about the agreeable and the disagreeable: Sn869a asks how they arise and Sn869b asks where they vanish. The *Paramatthajotikā II* (552–3) supports this context. Thus, I stick to translating them as ‘vanishing and arising.’

The related gloss of the commentary is: *ettha ca sātāsātānaṃ vibhava[m]-bhavavattukā vibhavabhavadiṭṭhiyo eva[m] vibhavaṃ bhavan ti atth[at]o veditabbo*. Bodhi (2006: 1142) translates this commentarial gloss as “And here, what should be understood as the denotation of ‘vanishing and coming-to-be’ are the views of nonexistence and existence based on the vanishing and coming-to-be of the pleasant and unpleasant.” He reads ‘*vibhavaṃ bhavan ti*’ under the Theravādin tenet that all phenomena are in the constant process of arising and fading away. When this phrase is connected with *diṭṭhi* (view), he translates it as ‘nonexistence and existence,’ with conceptual renderings. He considers the Theravādin tenet that [when grasped], they could give rise to the view of nonexistence or existence.

⁵⁹ **Y10.9:** The pivotal phrase ‘著細濡’ in this verse should be comprehended within the causal context of this *sutta*, which seeks the origin of ‘disputes.’ This search concludes upon reaching ‘perceptions’: dispute morphs from desirable things, which stem from attachment, which in turn arises from existence and non-existence, which emerge from ‘著細濡,’ which are a product of name and form, which ultimately derive from perceptions.

Y10.9a: The phrase ‘著細濡’ is intriguing. Although its meaning of ‘cognitive contact’ is clear within the context of the *sutta*’s causal chain and its Pāli counterpart ‘*phassa*’ (contact, touch), the process of deciphering how this Chinese phrase was constructed to convey this specific meaning presents a challenge. Bapat translates it simply as ‘contact’ without offering further explanation. In the following, I will delve into some potential interpretations of this phrase and justify why one of my conjectures appears plausible.

Firstly, let’s consider whether ‘著細濡’ could be a transcription of a specific Buddhist term. The reconstructed pronunciation from the Eastern Han period for ‘著細濡’ can be /driak or triak; sej^h; juə^h/, which does not seem phonetically similar to ‘*phaṣa*’ in Gāndhārī (Skt. *sparśa*; Pāli. *phassa*; cognitive contact). Professor Loukota (personal communication, October 2019) proposed that this reconstructed pronunciation may resemble ‘*trṣṇā*’ (craving) in Sanskrit (Gāndhārī *taṣa*; Pāli. *taṇhā*). However, I discard this possibility as Y10.10a and Y10.11ad employ ‘細濡’ alone, omitting ‘著’ to represent the same meaning as ‘著細濡.’ A phonetic representation for /sej^h; juə^h/ cannot depict ‘*trṣṇā*’ in Sanskrit.

Consequently, ‘著細濡’ is most likely a translation of the Buddhist technical term ‘cognitive contact.’ Two possibilities arise: first, ‘著’ represents ‘cognitive contact’ with the remaining two characters functioning as

A. *phasse asante na bhavanti h' ete*

adjectives that modify ‘著.’ With this structure, we could interpret ‘著細濡’ as ‘cognitive contact (著 = 着; lit. to touch) that is subtle (細) and soft (濡).’ Indeed, the term ‘細濡’ appears nineteen times (according to the CBETA online search) in translations made by post-Zhi-Qian translators, embodying its literal meaning of ‘[something physical that is] subtle (細) and soft (濡),’ such as grass, clothing, or a heavenly body. However, this interpretation also requires an explanation as to why Y10.10a and Y10.11ad omit the crucial term ‘著’ and abbreviates it to ‘細濡.’

The second interpretation for ‘cognitive contact’ is to view ‘濡’ as embodying this idea. With this in mind, ‘著細濡’ can be read as ‘manifestation (著) of subtle (細) cognitive contact (濡; lit. to get wet).’ This usage of ‘著’ to mean ‘manifestation’ is supported by the *Book of Rites* (禮記), which states: ‘曲能有誠 誠則形 形則著 著則明明 明則動 動則變 變則化.’ ([When] one can tactfully maintain sincerity, it becomes noticeable; when noticeable, it manifests; when manifested, it becomes apparent; when apparent, it exerts influence; when influencing, it enacts change; and when changing, it induces transformation [within the community]). As for the term ‘濡,’ its literal meaning of ‘to get wet’ can be expanded to convey ‘to come into contact with a liquid,’ and it can metaphorically be used to represent ‘sensory/cognitive contact.’ Admittedly, this reading of ‘濡’ is somewhat unconventional. However, this interpretation aligns most closely with the context and accounts for the additional three instances of ‘細濡’ appearing without ‘著’ in this discourse.

The usage of ‘細濡’ to denote ‘cognitive contact’ is rather uncommon, likely exclusive to this particular discourse. T198 also footnotes that it represents the Pāli term ‘*phassa*’ (contact). The more commonly accepted Chinese representation for ‘cognitive contact’ is ‘觸’ (to touch, to come into contact), though this convention wasn’t established until before the fifth century CE, with the translation of Āgama literature.

Y10.9b: Bapat interprets the phrase ‘去來滅無所有’ as “Away, they pass (去) and vanish (滅), if contact does not exist (無所有).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation lacks accuracy. Notably, he omits the character ‘來,’ which should be paired with ‘去.’ Taken literally, ‘去來’ can be understood as ‘going and coming,’ ‘fading away and arising,’ or ‘past and future.’ Furthermore, there is no character equating to ‘contact’ in ‘無所有.’ As such, Bapat should have enclosed ‘contact’ in brackets in his translation. Contrasting this, I interpret ‘無所有’ as “Nothing (無) is cognitively grasped (所有; literally, something possessed or possession).”

Y10.9c: Bapat’s interpretation of the phrase ‘盛亦滅’ as ‘appearance and disappearance’ is not accurate. The character ‘盛’ actually denotes ‘to flourish,’ not ‘to arise.’

Regarding ‘義從是,’ the character ‘是’ (this) refers to ‘cognitive contact.’

Y10.9d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘解現賢本盡是’ as “Understand (解?) thus (是?) the Sage (賢), who their appearance (本?) and disappearance (盡) did explain (現?).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation strays significantly from the mark. The primary connotation of ‘賢’ refers to ‘a worthy one’ who is considered second only to the sage ‘聖’ in terms of virtue according to pre-Buddhist Chinese thought. The *Hanyudazidian* 漢語大字典, as referenced in the CCAMC, offers a secondary meaning for this term, stating: “舊時對人的敬稱。同‘公’，‘君’。” This can be translated as, “In the past, it was a respectful address towards another person. It is synonymous with ‘公’ and ‘君’。” This interpretation is consistent with its Pāli counterpart ‘*te*’ (to you) in Sn870d. Thus, I propose it be translated as ‘to you.’ In this context, there is no character that implies ‘appearance,’ as Bapat suggests. If he extrapolated ‘origin’ from ‘本’ and further stretched its meaning to ‘to appear,’ this would be a far reach. ‘本’ signifies the source of appearance, not appearance itself. Therefore, I suggest interpreting ‘本盡是’ as “[they] entirely (盡) originate (本) from this (是).” Furthermore, ‘是’ in this context should be understood as ‘cognitive contact.’

vibhavaṃ bhavañ cāpi yaṃ etaṃ atthaṃ

etaṃ te pabrūmi itonidānaṃ

The agreeable and the disagreeable originate from cognitive contact.

In the absence of cognitive contact, indeed, they cease to exist.

As for this matter of vanishing and arising,

I declare to you, this originates from here.

Y10.10 世細濡本從何 著世色從何起

Q. 從何念不計著 何因緣著可色

From what do worldly subtle cognitive contacts originate?

Why does attachment to worldly forms arise?

What [states of] mindfulness [may lead one] to cease speculation or attachment?

What cause [prompts their] attachment to desirable forms?⁶⁰

Sn871 *Phasso nu lokasmiṃ kutonidāno*

⁶⁰ **Y10.10c:** Bapat renders the phrase ‘從何念不計著’ as “from what (從何) we may expect (念?) ‘my-ness’ (著?) to be discounted (不計)?” [Parentheses added for analysis]. His interpretation of ‘著’ as ‘my-ness’ seems to be a stretch, despite the character having several derivative meanings with different pronunciations. His understanding of ‘念’ as ‘to expect’ appears off base, even though it can encompass various mental activities. In this context, ‘從何念’ should be ‘something that curbs speculation and attachment’ (不計著). I propose interpreting ‘念’ as ‘mindful vigilance,’ which is congruent with the response ‘寧度癡’ (serenity and transcending ignorance) found in Y10.11c. The character ‘念’ has been used as a Buddhist technical term for ‘mindfulness’ since the earliest stages of Chinese Buddhist translation. For further information, refer to Y6 fn.25.

Y10.10d: Bapat interprets the phrase ‘何因緣著可色’ as “From what is it that there are graspings of the objects of the world?” However, he omits ‘因緣’ and ‘可,’ and introduces ‘of the world’ which is not present in the original text. As per the CCAMC (古今文字集成), ‘可’ can function as an adjective synonymous with ‘善’ or ‘好’ (good). We see a similar usage of ‘可’ from Y2.2, Y6.8, and Y6.9 in the phrases ‘可意’ (appealing to one’s mind) or ‘可愛’ (the desirable).

Q. *pariggahā vā pi kuto pahūtā*

kismiṃ asante na mamattam atthi

kismiṃ vibhūte na phusanti phassā

Whence in the world does cognitive contact arise,

And whence do acquisitions also emerge?

Without what, does possessiveness no longer exist?

With the disappearance of what, do cognitive contacts cease to function?⁶¹

Y10.11 名色授著細濡 本有有色便起

A. 寧度癡得解脫 因緣色著細濡

Name and form trigger the emergence of subtle cognitive contacts.

With various types of existence as their origin, [such] forms then arise.

By achieving serenity and transcending ignorance, [a person] can attain liberation.

With forms as cause and conditions, subtle cognitive contacts come into being.⁶²

⁶¹ **Sn871c:** I interpret the term ‘*mamattam*’ as ‘possessiveness,’ viewing it as indicating a “propensity to take things as ‘mine.’” For additional related insights, refer to Y6 fn18.

Sn871cd: Both phrases ‘*kismiṃ asante*’ and ‘*kismiṃ vibhūte*’ function as locative absolutes, expressing temporal aspects.

⁶² **Y10.11-13 and Sn872-874:** The Buddhist technical term ‘名色’ in Chinese, or ‘*nāmarūpa*’ in Pāli, holds two distinct connotations, each depending on the context. The first, conventionally translated into English as ‘name and form,’ relates to the causal conditions that give rise to cognitive contacts (觸, *phassa*). This interpretation is evident in Y10.11 and its Pāli parallel, Sn872, as well as in Twelve Links of Causation (*dvādaśanidānāni*). The second connotation, within the framework of the genesis of conceptual proliferations (戲/戲論, *papañcasamkhā*) associated with ‘perceptions’ (想, *saññā*), represents mental and physical imprints as *reflected in the mind*. This interpretation can be discerned in the Pāli verses Sn873-874. However, for their Chinese parallels, Y10.12-13, both interpretations are applicable since they do not mirror the Pāli verses exactly.

Interestingly, there is a significant divergence in the presentations of the Pāli verses Sn873-874 and the Chinese verses Y10.12-13. Sn873-874 discusses the process of eradicating form (*vibhoti rūpaṃ*), while Y10.12-13 emphasizes the importance of eliminating *predilection* for forms (捨好色). This distinction results in relative clarity in the Chinese verses when the conventional translation ‘name and form’ is adopted. On the other hand, this same

Sn872 *Nāmañ ca rūpañ ca paṭicca phassā*

A. *icchānidānāni pariggahāni*

icchā na santyā na mamattam atthi

rūpe vibhūte na phusanti phassā

Cognitive contacts are conditioned by name and form.

Acquisitions originate from desire.

In the absence of desire, there is no possessiveness.

translation brings about interpretive challenges for the Pāli verses. Specifically, if one were to interpret that the physical form of the body or the external world disappears during mental cultivation due to the overcoming of four types of perceptions, this would seem to negate the existence of living Buddhist saints; they would ostensibly vanish upon reaching a certain mental state through Buddhist practice. Therefore, in Sn873-874, what ceases to exist through mental cultivation is not the physical body itself but the ‘physical imprints reflected in the mind.’

For the sake of simplicity and to maintain convention, I continue to use the widely accepted translation ‘name and form’ throughout my work, while ‘mentality and materiality’ may also work. However, considering the interpretative challenges posed by ‘(nāma-)rūpa’ in Sn873-874, I have opted to use ‘physical imprint’ as an alternative to the traditional translation ‘form’ when representing ‘rūpa.’ Notably, scholars such as Norman and Bodhi persist in employing the conventional rendering ‘form’ in their Pāli translations, irrespective of context. Fronsdal, considering the usage of ‘nāmarūpa’ in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (3.9.19–26), introduces his own translation ‘appearance’ for ‘rūpa.’ His rendering ‘name and appearance’ may explain the origin of the term in Indian religious landscape, but I find that it may not capture the essence of ‘名色’ and ‘nāmarūpa’ in Buddhist literature as effectively as the traditional rendering ‘name and form.’

Y10.11b: Bapat interprets the phrase ‘本有有色便起’ as “Because of (本) the pleasant (有有?), do the [worldly] objects (色) take rise (便起).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, his translation of ‘有有’ as ‘the pleasant’ is questionable. Although ‘有’ possesses several secondary meanings, its primary meaning is ‘to exist’ or ‘to have.’ Hence, interpreting ‘有’ as ‘the pleasant’ seems to be a significant deviation from its usual meaning. It appears as though he attempted to align ‘本有有’ with its Pāli counterpart ‘icchānidānāni.’ Instead, I suggest translating it as ‘with various types of existence (有有) as their origin (本).’ The term ‘本有’ could allude to multiple Buddhist technical concepts such as ‘primal existence,’ ‘source of all phenomena,’ ‘the present life,’ or even ‘the eighth consciousness’ (*ālaya vijñāna*) in the context of Yogācāra doctrine, but these are not relevant here. While the alternative translation ‘acquisitions in the present life’ could fit within ‘本有有,’ it does not provide a more coherent interpretation than my translation ‘with various types of existence as their origin’ when considering the context of the entire phrase ‘本有有色便起.’

The character ‘色’ in Y10.11bd could possibly be an abbreviation of ‘名色,’ but I have chosen to translate it simply as ‘forms’ to maintain fidelity to the base text.

The character ‘便’ seems to be a temporal expression indicating ‘immediately’ or ‘as soon as.’ In this translation, I have rendered it simply as ‘when.’

Y10.11c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘寧度癡得解脫’ as “Leaving (度) ignorance (癡) behind, is deliverance (解脫) [from ‘my-ness’] gained (得).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. Here, he fails to include a translation for ‘寧.’ While ‘寧’ can function as an interrogative particle (how, why), this reading is not applicable in this context as the Buddha’s response. I interpret it as an adjective indicating ‘serene, peaceful.’

When form dissipates, cognitive contacts cease to function.⁶³

Y10.12 從何得捨好色 從衆愛從何起

Q. 所著心寧悉盡 諦行知如解脫

How can one relinquish their predilection for forms?

From where does the pursuit of various desires arise?

How can an attached mind be completely stilled?

[Please] enlighten us on the true practice that leads to liberation.⁶⁴

⁶³ **Sn872c:** Drawing upon the gloss provided in the *Mahāniddeśa*, Norman interprets the phrase ‘*icchā na santyā*’ as ‘*icchāya asantyā*,’ treating it as a locative absolute. He proposes that ‘*icchā*’ could be a truncated locative ending. Given that the question in Sn871c includes a locative absolute ‘*kisimim asante*,’ I find Norman’s suggestion quite plausible.

⁶⁴ **Y10.12a:** Bapat interprets the phrase ‘從何得捨好色’ as “By the attainment (得) of what (從何) does the good form (好色) cease (捨)?” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation, however, seems imprecise and invites certain challenges. Firstly, ‘捨’ signifies active relinquishment, not just passive cessation. Connected to this issue is his translation of ‘好.’ He renders it as an adjective ‘good’ modifying ‘色,’ an interpretation likely stemming from a misunderstanding of Buddhist doctrines. In context, the aim is not to eradicate the good form itself, but rather ‘one’s predilection for forms.’ Taking these considerations into account, I translate ‘捨好色’ as ‘to renounce (捨) the predilection (好) for forms (色).’

Next, his interpretation of ‘得’ as a noun ‘attainment’ could be one possible reading of this phrase. However, the phrase flows better when ‘得’ is seen as a modal verb ‘can’ preceding the main verb ‘捨’ (to throw away) and followed by the interrogative word ‘從何.’ This interrogative word would also be better understood as ‘how’ rather than ‘what.’ Indeed, its Pāli equivalent is ‘*katham*’ (how?), not ‘*kim*’ (what?).

Y10.12b: Bapat interprets the phrase ‘從衆愛從何起’ as “What is the source (從何起) of all (衆?) lovable things (愛?)?” In his translation, however, he overlooks translating ‘從’ in ‘從衆愛,’ and incorrectly renders ‘愛’ as ‘lovable things.’ In this context, ‘愛’ signifies ‘desire,’ not ‘the object of desire,’ which should be represented by ‘所愛.’ Hence, I interpret ‘從衆愛’ as ‘the pursuit (從) of various (衆) desires (愛).’

Y10.12c: The phrase ‘所著心’ can be understood either as ‘the object of attached mind’ or as ‘attached mind.’ For more insights into the function of the particle ‘所,’ refer to Y2 fn.16. Considering the context, ‘attached mind’ appears to be the most suitable translation here.

Y10.12d: Bapat interprets the phrase ‘諦行知如解脫’ as “Truly, methinks, to me, you [fain] would tell.” However, this interpretation is significantly misaligned with the original meaning. It seems that he has not actually translated this Chinese phrase but instead has attempted to adapt it to its Pāli equivalent. His translation lacks renderings for ‘行知,’ ‘如,’ and ‘解脫.’ Similarly, there are no corresponding Chinese characters in the phrase for his renderings of ‘methinks,’ ‘to me,’ ‘you,’ and ‘to tell.’

Let me begin with the simpler issue. The character ‘如’ seems to function as a verb meaning ‘to approach’ or ‘to lead to’ in this context. This usage is found in the ‘Annals of Xiang Yu’ 項羽本紀 section of the *Shiji* 史記:

Sn873 *Katham̐sametassa vibhoti rūpaṃ*

Q. *sukhaṃ dukhaṃ vā pi kathaṃ vibhoti*

etam me pabrūhi yathā vibhoti

taṃ jāniyāma iti me mano ahū

How should a person practice to make physical imprints disappear?

How does even felicity or affliction disappear?

Tell me how it disappears.

[I have] my heart [set on] this: “we would like to know that.”⁶⁵

‘坐須臾，沛公起如廁，因招樊噲出。’ (After sitting for a while, Pei Gong 沛公 stood up, **went to** the restroom, and then summoned Fan Kuai 樊噲 to come out.) Here, Pei Gong is a title referring to Liu Bang 劉邦, the founder of the Han Dynasty (202 BCE–220 CE), and Fan Kuai is a military general and close confidant of Liu Bang. With this usage of ‘如,’ I translate ‘如解脫’ as ‘to lead to (如) liberation (解脫).’ Bapat might have misunderstood ‘如’ as ‘汝’ (you).

Moving on, the phrase ‘諦行知如解脫’ can be interpreted as a request rather than an instruction or a question, given that it is spoken by the conjured buddha and lacks any interrogative context or particles. Thus, we need to identify a suitable verb of request. According to resources like the DDB and the CJKV-E, ‘諦’ could function as a verb meaning ‘to clarify,’ while ‘知’ could mean ‘to inform’ (通知). However, these resources do not offer relevant examples to back up these interpretations.

Interpreting ‘諦’ as the primary verb, this line could be translated as “*Clarify* practice and knowledge that leads to liberation.” However, finding supporting examples of this usage from classical Chinese literature or early Chinese Buddhist translations proves challenging. There is a somewhat related usage of ‘諦’ functioning as a verb meaning ‘to examine, scrutinize’ found in the Kangxi Dictionary’s (康熙字典) entry for ‘諦’: ‘心不在學而強誦誦，雖入於耳而不諦於心’ (His heart was not focused on learning but he was forced to recite [texts] aloud. Although [the texts] entered his ears, he did not scrutinize them in his heart.) Despite its similarity, this interpretation does not exactly fit the context.

Considering ‘知’ as the main verb, the phrase ‘諦行知’ could be interpreted as ‘*Enlighten* us (知) on the true practice (諦行).’ From the early phases of Chinese Buddhist translation, ‘諦行’ has been widely used, comparable to its synonym ‘正業’ (right behavior), which refers to the fourth element of the Noble Eightfold Path. It could be translated as either ‘true practice’ or ‘right behavior,’ but I chose ‘true practice’ for my translation because I do not want to limit its interpretation solely to the context of the Noble Eightfold Path. It should also be noted that this interpretation of the line slightly differs from its Pāli counterpart.

⁶⁵ **Sn873a:** *Kathaṃ + sameta* (past participle of ‘*sam + √i*’; to come together, correspond to) + *ssa* (genitive singular suffix): ‘for a person who practices how?’.

As noted in fn.63, the phrase ‘*vibhoti rūpaṃ*’ (the form disappears) poses interpretative challenges. The term ‘*rūpa*’ does not refer to the external world, but rather its reflection in an individual’s mind. This becomes evident when we consider the Buddha’s response in Sn874, where it is suggested that ‘*rūpa*’ disappears when the perception (*saññā*) does not trigger conceptual proliferation (*papañcasamkhā*).

Y10.13 不想想不色想 非無想不行想

A. 一切斷不著者 因想本戲隨苦

Neither entertaining [ordinary] perceptions nor perceptions of the fine-material sphere,

Neither devoid of perceptions, [nor harboring] dormant perceptions,

Eradicating all [such perceptions], they remain unattached,

[As] ideation, caused by the sources of perception, leads to suffering.⁶⁶

Sn873d: The term ‘*ahū*’ is an aorist third-person singular of the root $\sqrt{bhū}$. The phrase “*Taṃ jāṇiyāma iti me mano ahū*” can be interpreted as: “My heart (*me mano*) has been (*ahū*) thus (*iti*) [set]: ‘We wish to understand (*jāṇiyāma*) that (*taṃ*).’”

⁶⁶ **Y10.13a:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘不想想不色想’ as “Neither conscious (不想), nor with consciousness (想) of the formless (不色).” However, he omits one instance of ‘想’ out of the three occurrences in the phrase, likely because he overlooks the dual function of this character as both a verb and a noun. In my interpretation, the first ‘想’ operates as the verb ‘to conceive,’ and the second signifies the noun ‘perception.’ There is another ‘想’ omitted after the fourth character ‘不,’ where it should serve as a verb, and the final ‘想’ reappears as a noun. Therefore, the phrase can be interpreted as: “They do not conceive (不想) [ordinary] perceptions (想) nor [conceive] (不[想]) perceptions of fine-material sphere (色想).” To avoid possible redundancy, I have opted for ‘entertain’ in place of ‘conceive.’ This translation also aligns with the Pāli parallel Sn874a.

Specifically, Bapat’s translation of ‘想’ as ‘conscious’ or ‘consciousness’ is inaccurate. The terms ‘識’ or occasionally ‘知’ are more commonly used for these meanings. Instead, ‘想’ is better understood as a mental image, perception, or conception, aligning more accurately with the Chinese rendering for ‘*saññā*’ (Skt. *saṃjnā*). Similarly, his translation of ‘不色’ as ‘the formless’ is incorrect. The negative particles ‘不’ and ‘非’ are used differently: ‘不’ is used with verbs, while ‘非’ is used with nouns. Hence, a verb, likely ‘想’ (to conceive), should be inferred following ‘不.’ According to Buddhist praxis, ‘色想’ should be understood as ‘perceptions of the fine-material sphere,’ which are manifested in the four *jhānas*.

Y10.13b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘非無想不行想’ as “Neither unconscious, nor with consciousness inactive.” However, the verse focuses on perception (想) rather than consciousness (識). ‘非無’ should be understood as ‘not without,’ and ‘不行’ as ‘inactive’ or ‘dormant.’ I would interpret this phrase as, “[They are] neither without (非無) any perception (想), [nor with (非)] any dormant (不行) perception (想).” To enhance readability, I change ‘neither without’ to ‘neither devoid of’ and ‘nor with’ to ‘nor do they harbor.’ Here, my rendering ‘nor do they harbor’ is an addition for clarity and is not a direct translation of ‘不,’ which operates in conjunction with the following character ‘行’ in the phrase.

Y10.13c: 一切斷不著者 = 一切想斷不著 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The alternative phrase can be read as, “They have eradicated all perceptions and remain unattached [to them].”

Y10.13d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘因想本戲隨苦’ as “For (因), in consciousness (想) lies the root (本) of all that is travail (苦).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, he omits translating ‘戲隨.’ As a shorthand of ‘戲論,’ ‘戲’ is the exact translation of the Pāli technical terms ‘*papañcasamkhā*’ (conceptual proliferation).

Sn874 *Na saññasaññī na visaññasaññī*

A. *no pi asaññī na vibhūtasaññī*

evaṃsametassa vibhoti rūpaṃ

saññānidānā hi papañcasamkhā

Not perceiving [ordinary] perceptions, not perceiving extraordinary perceptions,

Not devoid of perceiving [faculty], nor perceiving what have disappeared—

For one who has practiced thus, physical imprints disappear,

Because conceptual proliferation originates from perception.⁶⁷

Therefore, I interpret this line as “Caused by (因) perceptions (想) as source (本), ideation (戲) follows (隨) [resulting in] suffering (苦).”

戲 = 虧 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The character ‘虧’ means ‘failure, deficiency,’ and the phrase ‘虧隨苦’ can be read as “[cognitive] failure follows [resulting in] suffering.”

⁶⁷ **Sn874:** This verse introduces complexity through its cryptic articulation of four types of perception (*saññā*) in the initial two lines. This intricacy escalates with the subsequent discussion of the ‘physical imprint’ (*rūpa*) and ‘conceptual proliferation’ (*papañcasamkhā*) in the third and final lines respectively. The primary factors contributing to this complexity are: the decoding of the four types of perception, the interpretation of the concept related to the disappearance of physical imprints, and the implied causal relationship between this disappearance and the cessation of conceptual proliferation.

Sn874ab: The *Mahānidessa* seeks to clarify the four types of perception mentioned in the verse. According to it, the two lines describe the transcendence of four categories: “normal (*pakati*) perception; deranged (*ummatta*) perception; attainment of cessation (*nirodhasamāpanna*); the four formless attainments (*arūpasamāpanna*).” However, this categorization seems to lack clarity, and it appears to impose a particular soteriological strategy on this verse without substantial justification. This raises doubts regarding the likelihood of the verse being composed with such a soteriological strategy in mind.

The *Mahānidessa*’s explanation presents one potential interpretation, but the second category of ‘deranged perception’ may warrant alternative readings. The commentary defines ‘*visaññā*’ as ‘deranged/disturbed (*vi*) perception (*saññā*),’ a definition followed by Jayawickrama, Norman, Bodhi, and Fronsdal. However, this interpretation raises a question: why is ‘deranged perception’ considered in this context at all? Could we not interpret this term as ‘extraordinary (*vi*) perception (*saññā*),’ referring to the four *jhānas*, a meditative state absent from the list of four?

My proposed interpretation could be supported by its Chinese counterpart ‘色想’ in Y10.13a, which could be construed as ‘perceptions (想) of the fine-material sphere (色界) [experienced in the four *jhānas*].’ Based on this interpretation, it is plausible to infer that the first term, ‘ordinary perception’ (*saññā*), may correspond to ‘perceptions of the desire sphere’ (欲界). The fourth item ‘*vibhūtasaññī*’ could pertain to ‘perceptions of the formless sphere’ (無色界), and the third ‘*asaññī*’ could represent ‘the attainment of cessation’ (滅盡定, *nirodhasamāpatti*), which is an experience of the final *nirvāṇa* (*parinibbāna*) while still alive. Nonetheless, we must consider the possibility of superimposition, acknowledging that the original composer of the verse may not have intended these specific associations.

Therefore, to avoid superimposition, I have grounded my translation of these two lines in philological analysis. There are four compounds that end with ‘*saññin*,’ which can be construed as an adjectival nominal meaning ‘perceiving.’ The first compound, ‘*saññāsaññī*,’ can be translated as ‘perceiving (*saññī*) [ordinary] perceptions (*saññā*).’ The second, ‘*visaññāsaññī*,’ can be rendered as ‘perceiving (*saññī*) exceptional (*vi*) perceptions (*saññā*).’ The third, ‘*asaññī*,’ suggests ‘not (*a*) perceiving (*saññī*).’ And the fourth, ‘*vibhūtasaññī*,’ can be interpreted as ‘perceiving (*saññī*) what has disappeared (*vibhūta*).’

Sn874c: This line proposes that ‘physical imprints disappear’ (*vibhoti rūpaṃ*) for someone who has transcended the four types of perception specified in Sn874ab. However, the disappearance of physical imprints may be associated with the four formless attainments (*arūpasamāpanna*), which are already accounted for in Sn874b. Hence, the *Mahāniddesa*’s explanation seems self-contradictory, asserting that one achieves a formless state (*vibhoti rūpaṃ*) by moving beyond the four formless attainments (*na vibhūtasaññī*). Bodhi (2016) acknowledges the enigmatic nature of this verse (Notes.1932-3; p.1530), expressing skepticism towards the commentarial interpretation.

Bodhi, referencing Y10.13, disputes Bapat’s translation of ‘不色想’ and ‘不行想.’ He interprets ‘不色想’ as ‘*na rūpasaññī*’ (not the perception of the form realm), a translation that aligns with mine and diverges from the interpretation suggested in the *Mahāniddesa*. Refer to Y10 fn.63 for more details. Furthermore, Bodhi proposes that ‘不行想’ could represent ‘*na sañkhārasaññī*’ (not perceiving [active] mental formations?), a suggestion I do not agree with. For his translation to be accurate, the phrase should be ‘非行想,’ not ‘不行想.’ He critiques Bapat’s translation, ‘nor with consciousness inactive,’ arguing that the phrase contains only one negation. However, Bapat’s translation could be valid if we understand ‘非’ in the phrase ‘非無想不行想’ as applying to the entire line, affecting both components: ‘無想’ (without perceptions) and ‘不行想’ (with dormant perceptions). I propose that ‘不行想’ in Y10.13 accurately corresponds to ‘*vibhūtasaññī*’ in Sn874, with ‘不行’ (not active; dormant) being equivalent to ‘*vibhūta*’ (disappeared).

The *Mahāniddesa*’s commentary on Sn874c, as cited by Norman (2001: 360-1) and Bodhi (2016: 1144-1145), posits that ‘*rūpa*’ would disappear for an individual experiencing the fourth *jhāna* as they advance towards formless absorptions (*arūpasamāpannā*). This interpretation is based on its annotation of Sn874ab, where the four types of perception are delineated as: neither ordinary nor deranged, not *yet* in cessation, and not *yet* in a state of formless attainment. The commentary explains that Sn874ab depicts the fourth *jhāna* and suggests that from this stage, one could cultivate the sphere of boundless space (*ākāśānañcāyatana*), that leads to the disappearance of ‘form’ (*rūpa*).

However, the commentary’s interpretation seems to involve significant extrapolation and appears inconsistent with the context of Sn874. Notably, the Pāli verse lacks a term equivalent to ‘yet’ and ‘would.’ The word ‘*vibhoti*’ (a variation of ‘*vibhavati*’) is a present indicative verb, indicating ‘disappear,’ not an optative or a future tense verb suggesting ‘would disappear.’ It also lacks conditional words that may denote, ‘if this person advances to the formless attainments’ as well. Instead, the term ‘*evaṃsametassa*’ (for one who has come this far) suggests that the individual has already transcended the four types of perception listed in Sn874ab. Overall, it seems overly presumptive to propose that this verse contends that for an individual who has not yet achieved formless attainment, ‘*rūpa*’ would disappear should they reach this state.

Sn874d: The technical Buddhist term ‘*papañca*’ has been translated into English in a variety of ways by different scholars. Bhikkhu Bodhi translates it as ‘[mental] proliferation,’ Bhikkhu Nāṇananda as ‘conceptual proliferation,’ Maurice Walshe as ‘multiplicity,’ Luis O. Gómez as ‘mental and linguistic dispersion,’ and Steven Collins as ‘imagining, false conceptualization.’ This term consists of a prefix ‘*pa*’ and a nominal derived from the root ‘*√pac*’ or ‘*√pañc*,’ indicating ‘to spread out,’ so it denotes an ‘uncontrollable expansion.’ It often appears in combination with ‘*saṃkhā*’ (enumeration, notion) or ‘*saññāsaṃkhā*’ (perception and notion). I translate ‘*papañcasamkhā*’ as ‘burgeoning notions’ or ‘conceptual proliferation.’ Taking all these factors into account, this line can be read as ‘because conceptual proliferation arises from perception.’

Y10.14 我所問悉已解 今更問願復說

Q. 行澁悉成具足 設無不勝尊德

You have already answered all my previous inquiries.

Now, I present you with another question, for which I seek your answer once more.

Has the *yakṣa* 行澁 achieved full perfection,

Establishing such unsurpassed honorable virtues?⁶⁸

Sn875 *Yan tam apucchimha akittayī no*

⁶⁸ Y10.14c, 行澁 (T) = 行澁 (K, Z): Both ‘澁’ and ‘澁’ are rare characters. They are not found even in the *Dictionary of Chinese Variants Provided by the Department of Education* 教育部異體字字典 compiled by the Taiwanese government. While I was able to find ‘澁’ in the *Konjaku Mojikyō* (今昔文字鏡), a comprehensive collection of East Asian characters developed by the Mojikyō Institute (文字鏡研究会) in Japan, ‘澁’ was not listed there.

I consider the phrase ‘行澁’ as a transcription of the Pāli term ‘*yakkha*’ (Skt. *yakṣa*). Bapat appears to read the second character as ‘澁’ (saliva) probably because ‘垂’ is a variant of ‘垂.’ Interestingly, Pulleyblank does not include ‘澁’ in his list but include its synonym 唾 /tʰwaʰ/. Assuming that ‘澁’ had a pronunciation akin to ‘唾,’ the reconstructed ancient pronunciation of ‘行澁’ could be /ɣaŋtʰwaʰ/, which closely mirrors the Pāli term ‘*yakkha*.’

Bapat translates the phrase ‘行澁悉成具足’ as “Treating all [worldly things] (悉) as nothing but saliva (? 行澁), and reaching (成) the acme of success (具足).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. In his view, ‘澁’ corresponds to the Pāli term ‘*khe[ḷ]a*’ (phlegm, saliva; Skt. *kheṭa*). As evidence, he refers to a lengthy Pāli passage from the *Majjhima Nikāya* III 300, yet this passage does not use ‘*kheḷa*’ in a similar context as Y10.14c. The cited passage from the *Indriyabhāvana Sutta* (MN 152) reads:

“... Just as a strong man might easily spit out a ball of spittle [*kheḷa*] collected on the tip of his tongue, so too concerning anything at all, the agreeable that arose, the disagreeable that arose, and the both agreeable and disagreeable that arose cease just as quickly, just as rapidly, just as easily, and equanimity is established...” (translated by Bodhi, 1995).

In this passage, ‘saliva’ is used metaphorically to illustrate the speed with which a disciplined individual regains their equanimity. It does not serve to illustrate worldly things as impure, comparable to saliva that one might wish to spit out.

While Y10.14cd lacks an interrogative character, I have chosen to translate them as a question. This is because Y10.14b clearly indicates that the subsequent lines pose a question, as signaled by ‘今更問’ (Now, I pose a further question).

Y10.14d: Bapat interprets the phrase ‘設無不勝尊德’ as “Is he firmly established (設) or not (無) as a Victorious Saint (勝尊德)?” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, he does not account for the term ‘不.’ The phrase ‘無不’ translates to ‘there is nothing that ... cannot ...,’ and ‘勝,’ when following ‘不,’ functions as a verb signifying ‘to outshine or surpass.’

Q. *aññaṃ taṃ pucchāma tad iṃgha brūhi*

ettāvat' aggaṃ no vadanti h' eke

yakkhassa suddhiṃ idha paṇḍitāse

udāhu aññaṃ pi vadanti etto

You have explained to us whatever we asked [you].

We ask you another [question]. Please tell [us] about it.

Do some wise people here indeed assert that

The purity of Yakkha is such an ultimate state?

Or do they proclaim something other than this?⁶⁹

Y10.15 是極正有何邪 向徑神得果慧

A. 尊行定樹林間 無有餘最善說

Indeed, [that is] unquestionably true. How could it be otherwise?

He attained the fruit of wisdom on the direct path to spirituality.

The Blessed One practiced tranquility [under] a tree in the forest.

⁶⁹ **Sn875a:** The term ‘no’ in this context is a first-person pronoun in the dative plural, meaning ‘to us.’

Sn875b: The term ‘taṃ’ serves as a second-person pronoun in the accusative singular, denoting ‘you’ grammatically functioning as an object in the sentence.

Sn875c: Notably, the *Paramatthajotikā II* interprets the term ‘no’ as ‘nu,’ an interrogative particle, distinguishing it from the identically spelled term in Sn875a.

The term ‘ettāvatā’ is an adverb translating to ‘to this extent.’ It originates from ‘e,’ ‘(t),’ and ‘tāvatā,’ the instrumental/ablative singular form of ‘tāvanta.’ This term likely refers back to the spiritual state delineated in the previous verse, Sn874.

Sn875d: The term ‘yakkha’ (Sanskrit, *yakṣa*) originally appears in Buddhist and Jain texts as an indigenous spirit, at times formidable, at others gentle and luminous. Here, it is employed as a title for the Buddha or a highly spiritual individual. This usage is quite rare in other Pāli literature. The *Paramatthajotikā II* interprets it as ‘a person.’ Jayawickrama, adhering to this commentary, renders it as ‘the being.’ Norman leaves the term as is, untranslated, while Bodhi and Fronsdaal translate it as ‘the spirit.’ Given the term’s rich historical context and its significance in the evolution of Buddhist institutions, I have chosen to leave it untranslated.

[Now,] he imparts the highest wholesome [path] leaving nothing behind.⁷⁰

Sn876 *Ettāvat' aggam pi vadanti h' eke*

A. *yakkhassa suddhiṃ idha paṇḍitāse*

tesaṃ pun' eke samayaṃ vadanti

anupādisese kusalā vadānā

Indeed, some wise people here assert that

The purity of Yakkha is such an ultimate state.

Further, some of them, purporting to be experts,

Discourse on 'the [spiritual] stage devoid of residual grasping.'⁷¹

⁷⁰ **Y10.14-15:** While Sn875-876 introduce a teaching other than *Yakkha's* purity (*yakkhassa suddhiṃ*), Y10.14-15 emphasize only the spiritual accomplishments of the Yakkha (Blessed One). The Pāli verses refer to '*ettāvat' aggaṃ*' (the culmination to that extent) in Sn875c and '*aññaṃ...etto*' (other than this) in Sn875e, and distinguish between '*eke*' (some people) in Sn876a and '*eke*' (others) in Sn876c. On the other hand, the Chinese parallels, Y10.14-15, elaborate on the Blessed One's (尊) spiritual quest and his instruction on the path (徑神)."

Y10.15a: Bapat translates the phrase '是極正有何邪' as "Rightly (正) set (極?) is he (是)! [W]rong (邪) how (有何) can he be?" [Parentheses added for analysis]. His interpretation of '是' as a personal pronoun 'he' seems imprecise, as '是' is typically used as a demonstrative pronoun signifying 'this/that' or an adverb meaning 'yes.' For the pronoun 'he,' Chinese generally uses '他,' '彼,' or similar terms. Furthermore, Bapat's interpretation of '極' as 'to be set' seems far-fetched. The term '極' usually serves as an adjective meaning 'extreme, ultimate,' an adverb conveying 'completely,' or a verb implying 'to reach the end of.' In my translation, I interpret '極' as the adverb 'absolutely' and slightly modify it to 'unquestionably.'

Y10.15b: Bapat translates the phrase '向徑神得果慧' as "Hallowed (神) doth he become (向?), and Wisdom's Fruit (果慧) doth he gain (得)." [Parentheses added for analysis]. His translation omits '徑' from this foot. I interpret '向徑神' as 'following (向) the direct path (徑) to spirituality (神).'

徑 = 經 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): This variation '經' could be a typographical error, or it could function as a synonym for 'path,' echoing '徑' in the given context.

Y10.15cd: This part deviates from Sn876cd except for one parallel: the phrases '無有餘' and '*anupādisese*' (without remainders). There are two ways to interpret this Chinese phrase. Reflecting the Pāli term, one could translate '無有餘' as '[*nirvāṇa*] without residual grasping.' However, I maintain that my translation, 'leaving nothing behind' or 'exhaustively,' aligns more closely with the context.

⁷¹ **Sn876:** The *Mahāniddesa* and the *Paramatthajotikā II* interpret 'some wise people' in Sn876ab as 'eternalists;' others (some of them) in Sn876cd as 'annihilationists.' Using these labels, the Pāli commentaries undermine the spiritual stage in Sn874 and the two groups of wise people in Sn875. However, I don't find sufficient grounds to justify these doctrinal categorizations. The commentary's interpretation aligns Sn877 with the Theravāda doctrinal framework, suggesting that these two spiritual stages are still dependent, and by realizing this, one can attain liberation. This interpretive reading of Sn873-7 is notably different from Y10.12-6. These Chinese parallel

Y10.16 知如是一心向 尊已著不戒行

A. 疾行問度世間 斷世捨是彼身

Knowing [the path] to such a concentrated state of mind.

The Blessed One has already elucidated [the path] and steers clear of any [fanatic]
religious observances.

He has transcended the malady of debate in this secular world,

Severed worldly [attachments] and remains indifferent to this life or the next.⁷²

verses indicate that the Yakkha 行澹 has eradicated all the perceptions and has attained the highest spirituality. Thus, they have transcended the malady of debate and are not subject to rebirth.

Sn876c: The *Paramatthajotikā II* interprets the term ‘*samaya*’ as ‘annihilation,’ without providing its philological explanation. The PTSD primarily assigns ‘gathering’ and ‘time’ as its meanings. However, it also acknowledges a rare use of ‘end, conclusion, annihilation’ in reference to Sn876c. Thus, the association of ‘*samaya*’ with ‘annihilation’ solely comes from the *Paramatthajotikā II*. Jayawickrama concurs with this commentarial gloss. Norman, however, expresses doubts and opts for its primary meaning, ‘time.’ Bodhi, wrestling with this challenging term, interprets it as ‘attainment,’ viewing the term as a shorthand for ‘*abhisamaya*’ (realization). I question whether Sn876 was composed within the boundaries of antipodal concepts of ‘eternalism and annihilationism’, and thus, I opt to use its primary meaning, ‘time,’ rendering it as the [spiritual] stage.’

Sn876d: The term ‘*anupādisesa*’ translates literally to ‘without (*an* = *na*) residual (*sesa*) grasping (*upādi*),’ forming a contrast with another technical term, ‘*saupādisesa*,’ which literally signifies ‘with (*sa*) residual (*sesa*) grasping (*upādi*).’ In Nikāya/Āgama soteriology, ‘*anupādisesa*’ characterizes the mental state of arahants after their death, when no life substratum remains, while ‘*saupādisesa*’ depicts the mental state of living arahants. This categorization emerged as an essential aspect during the evolution of Buddhist soteriology, given that living arahants depend on their mental and physical components (*nāmarūpa*), which inevitably engage residual grasping. However, it is unclear whether this verse was composed within the same framework as expounded in later Buddhist soteriology. The assertion that some wise people in Sn876cd are annihilationists advocating ‘*anupādisesa*’ is even more uncertain.

⁷² **Y10.16a:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘知如是一心向’ as ‘With knowledge like this and in concentration steeped.’ Although this interpretation is plausible, I propose an alternate reading that may fit better within the given context. In my version, I render ‘知’ as the verb ‘to know,’ with the subsequent portion serving as its object, denoting ‘[the path] towards (向) such a (如是) concentrated state of mind (一心).’ I suggest that this concentrated state of mind refers to ‘行定’ mentioned in Y10.15c.

Y10.16b: Bapat translates ‘尊已著不戒行’ as “From rites and rituals, is the saint already detached.” However, his interpretation strays from the intended Chinese syntax. His rendering of ‘detached’ incorrectly exchanges ‘著不’ (to manifest / not...) for ‘不著’ (not get attached), which are not synonymous. The character ‘著’ should be considered independently from the subsequent ‘不,’ and more aptly interpreted here as ‘to manifest’ or ‘to elucidate.’ After ‘不,’ the text requires a verb, which ‘行’ (to practice) fulfills appropriately. Here, ‘戒’ typically refers to ‘moral precepts’ but specifically denotes ‘fanatical religious observances’ in this context. This aligns with

Sn877 *Ete ca ñatvā upanissitā ti*

A. *ñatvā munī nissaye so vimaṃsī*

ñatvā vimutto na vivādam eti

bhavābhavāya na sameti dhīro ti

Recognizing these [states] as dependent,

Understanding their foundations, and knowing “I am released,”

The insightful sage refrains from engaging in disputes.

The wise person steers clear of the cycle of rebirths.⁷³

the Sanskrit ‘*śīla-vrata-parāmāṃśa*,’ reflecting the hindrance of excessive adherence to rites and rituals in Buddhist practice. Therefore, I render ‘戒行’ as ‘to engage in (行) fanatical religious observances (戒),’ which more precisely conveys the original Buddhist nuance.

Y10.16c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘疾行問度世間’ as “With querries (問) that he makes (行), through the world (世間) doth he wade (度?).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, he overlooks the translation of ‘疾.’ While the word has a broad range of derivative meanings, I find its use as a verb to be less probable in this context. Instead, I suggest interpreting ‘疾行問’ as ‘the malady (疾) of debate (行問),’ and treating it as the object of the subsequent verb ‘度’ (to cross over, overcome). I perceive ‘世間’ as a locative term meaning ‘in the secular world.’

Y10.16d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘斷世捨是彼身’ as “All worldly lives (世) he cuts off (斷) and remains with his body (彼身) [immaculate].” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, he overlooks the translation of the verb ‘捨’ and the demonstrative pronoun ‘是.’ The pairing ‘是彼’ (this or that) is uncommon compared to the typical combination ‘彼此’ (that or this). Unlike most hexasyllabic verses that follow a 3 by 3 structure, this foot should be read in a 2 by 4 pattern. Here, ‘捨’ does not mean ‘to abandon,’ but rather implies ‘to be indifferent to, to be equanimous.’ Hence, this foot reads ‘斷世’ (to sever the worldly) and ‘捨是彼身’ (to be indifferent to this life or the next). If Bapat translates ‘捨’ as ‘to remain,’ this would not be accurate as its fundamental meaning is ‘to abandon.’

⁷³ **Sn877a:** The *Mahāniddesa* continues to interpret this foot as “these theorists are dependent on the views of eternalism and annihilationism.” However, I remain uncertain whether this foot was composed within the framework of these two antithetical doctrinal views.

Sn877bc: To facilitate a smoother reading, I rearranged the positions of ‘*munī so vimaṃsī*’ (the insightful sage) in the second foot and ‘*ñatvā vimutto*’ (knowing ‘I am released’) in the third foot.

The terms ‘*Munī so vimaṃsī*’ should be read as singular aligning with its main verb ‘*eti*,’ which is singular. Thus, the ‘-ī’ endings in ‘*munī*’ and ‘*vimaṃsī*’ are likely adjusted for metrical cause (Norman: 362).

佛說是義足經竟。比丘悉歡喜

When the Buddha had expounded this [*sūtra* in] the *Yizujing*, all the *bhikṣus* rejoiced.

佛說義足經卷下

The *Yizujing* Spoken by the Buddha, Second Fascicle

吳月支優婆塞支謙譯

Translated by Zhi Qian, an upāsaka 優婆塞 from the Yuezhi country during the Wu Dynasty¹

猛觀梵志經 第十一

Discourse 11: Brahmin Meng-guan (*Aṭṭhakavagga.12*)²

聞如是。佛在釋國迦維羅衛樹下。從五百比丘。悉應真所作已具。已下重擔。聞義已度。所之生胎滅盡。

Thus I heard. The Buddha [once] resided in the Śākya kingdom, beneath a tree in the town of Kapilavastu.³ [There], he was accompanied by five hundred *bhikṣus*, all of whom were arhats.⁴ They had fulfilled what needed to be done, laid down the heavy burden, crossed over by heeding the profound [teachings], and eradicated future rebirths.⁵

¹ 吳月支優婆塞支謙譯 (K, T, Z) = 吳黃武年優婆塞支謙譯 (S, Y / Q1, P, N) = 吳優婆塞支謙譯 (M / J, Q2): For details on the variant introductions of the translator, please refer to Y1. fn.2.

² 猛觀梵志經 第十一 = 猛觀梵志 第十一 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): For more information about the omission of ‘經’ in various editions, see Y1.fn.3.

³ 釋國迦維羅衛: ‘釋’ and ‘迦維羅衛’ are identified as transcriptions for ‘Śākya’ and ‘Kapilavastu’ respectively. The term ‘迦毘羅衛’ is a more commonly used transcription for ‘Kapilavastu’ in Chinese Buddhist translations.

迦維羅衛 = 迦隨羅衛 (S, Y / P, Q1, N): As per the Digital Dictionary of Buddhism (DDB), this variant is also a transcription of ‘Kapilavastu.’ “DDB. (n.d.). Retrieved December 8, 2023, from [http://www.buddhism-dict.net/cgi-bin/xpr-ddb.pl?q=%E8%BF%A6%E9%9A%A8%E7%BE%85%E8%A1%9E]”

⁴ 應真: Directly translated as ‘worthy and truthful,’ this term corresponds to the ‘arhat’ in Buddhist soteriology, signifying one who is liberated from suffering and the cycle of rebirths.

是時十方天下地神妙天來佛所。欲見尊德及比丘僧。是時梵四天王相謂言。諸學人寧知。

佛在釋國迦維羅衛樹下。從五百真人。復十方天地諸神妙天。悉來禮佛。欲見尊威神及諸比丘。我今何不往見其威神。

At that time, divine beings—both celestial and terrestrial—from [all] ten directions under heaven gathered at the Buddha's location, eager to see the Blessed One and the *Bhikṣusaṃgha*.⁶ In the midst of this, the Four Heavenly Kings of the Brahmā realm conversed amongst themselves: “Are all [spiritual] practitioners aware that the Buddha is in the Śākya kingdom, beneath a tree in Kapilavastu, accompanied by five hundred Perfected Ones?⁷ Moreover, [are they aware] that divine beings from every corner of the universe—both celestial and terrestrial—have come to

⁵ 聞義已度: Bapat translates this phrase as “who had accomplished their object.” This interpretation is rather free. While rendering ‘度’ (to cross over) as ‘to accomplish’ can be understood, equating ‘聞義’ (hearing the profound [teaching]) with ‘their object’ misses the mark.

所之生胎滅盡: Bapat translates this phrase as “who had destroyed the possibility of their rebirth,” but this lacks precision. The term ‘possibility’ is not directly represented in the original Chinese. The phrase ‘所之生胎’ can be literally translated to ‘leading to (所之) rebirth (生) in a womb (胎),’ implying the ‘cycle of rebirth.’

⁶ 十方天下: This phrase is translated as ‘all ten directions under heaven’ in this instance, and later as ‘every corner of the universe’ to provide varied expressions.

地神妙天: This phrase can be directly interpreted as ‘terrestrial (地) deities (神) and exquisite (妙) celestial gods (天).’ I have rendered it as ‘divine beings...both celestial and terrestrial’ for clarity and flow.

⁷ 梵四天王: This term represents a somewhat unconventional juxtaposition in the context of traditional Buddhist cosmology. The term ‘四天王’ refers to the Four Heavenly Kings (Cāturmahārājā), inhabitants of the Desire Realm (Kāmadhātu). On the other hand, ‘梵’ or ‘梵天’ typically denotes the Brahmā gods or heaven from the Form Realm (Rūpadhātu), a plane superior to the Desire Realm. The composite term ‘梵四天王’ may suggest a blending or syncretic adaptation within Buddhist cosmological perspectives, hinting at variations in its nuanced details.

Bapat finds a way around this unconventional merge of ‘梵[天]’ (Brahmā [gods]) and ‘四天王’ (the Four Heavenly Kings) by translating ‘梵四天王’ as ‘the four chiefs of the Brahmā gods’, thereby downplaying the emphasis of ‘王’ as ‘king’.

真人: This term is quintessentially a Daoist term for immortals. It is noteworthy that Zhi Qian adopts this indigenous Chinese religious term here to refer to *arhats*, rather than using a transcription or translation. I have rendered it as ‘Perfected One,’ considering its cultural crossovers between Daoism and Buddhism in historical Chinese texts.

venerate the Buddha, wishing to witness his majestic spiritual presence and the assembly of his *bhikṣus*?⁸ Why shouldn't we [too] go and behold his magnificent spiritual [presence]?"

四天王即從第七天飛下。譬如壯士屈伸臂頃。來到佛邊。去尊不遠。便俱往禮佛及比丘僧。各就座。

The Four Heavenly Kings then descended from the Seventh Heaven as swiftly as a robust man might flex and extend his arm.⁹ Reaching the Buddha's vicinity, they approached and paid their respects to both the Buddha and the *Bhikṣusamṃgha* before taking their respective seats.¹⁰

一梵天就座。便說偈言

The First Brahma God settled into his seat and promptly spoke in verse:¹¹

⁸ 威神: This term denotes 'authoritative power' or 'spiritual dignity.' While Bapat translates it as 'miracle,' this is not quite accurate. However, given the context where the narrative revolves around the Buddha conjuring up his double, Bapat's choice can be understood.

⁹ 第七天: The reference to the 'Seventh Heaven' lends support to the interpretation of '梵四天王' as the 'Four Great Brahmās (Mahābrahmā, 大梵天).' This is considered the first heaven of the Form Realm and sits above the Six Heavens of the Desire Realm. In Theravāda cosmology, these Six Heavens include the 'Heaven of the Four Great Kings' (Cātummahārājika), the 'Heaven of the Thirty-Three Gods' (Tāvātimsa), the 'Yāma Heaven' (Yāma), the 'Tusitā Heaven' (Tusitā), the 'Heaven of Enjoying Emanation' (Nirmāṇarati), and the 'Heaven of Controlling Others' Emanations' (Paranimmitavasavatti).

¹⁰ 來到佛邊 去尊不遠: I have rendered this phrase as "reaching (來到) the Buddha's (佛) vicinity (邊), they approached (去)." For conciseness and to avoid repetition, I have chosen to exclude the direct translations of '尊' (the Blessed One) and '不遠' (not far), as their meanings are already expressed in the translated characters '佛' and '邊,' respectively.

去尊不遠 = 去不遠 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Given this approach, the variant phrase '去不遠' does not alter my translation.

¹¹ 一梵天: While Bapat translates this as 'the chief of them,' a more accurate rendition would be 'the First Brahmā God,' especially when considering the subsequent mentions of the Second, Third, and Fourth Brahmā Gods in the same context.

一梵天 = 一梵 (K, Z): The omission of '天' in the Koryō and Zhonghua editions appears to be a scribal error, especially since they do not omit '天' in the following phrases: '二梵天,' '三梵天,' and '四梵天.'

Y11.1 今大會於樹間 來見尊皆神天

今我來欲聽法 願復見無極衆

Today, in this grand gathering amidst the trees,

All celestial deities converge to witness the Blessed One.

Having arrived myself now, I yearn to listen to the Dharma,

Wishing once more to gaze upon this vast assembly.¹²

二梵天適就座便說偈言

The Second Brahmā God proceeded to his seat and immediately spoke in verse:

Y11.2 在是學當制意 直學行知身正

如御者善兩轡 護眼根行覺意

In this [gathering, all] practitioners harness their minds.

¹² The following four verses (Y11.1–4) seemingly have no direct counterparts in the Pāli Canon. These verses are nearly identical to the opening verses (Y12.1–4) of the subsequent sutra.

Y11.1ab: Bapat interprets these two lines as “There has now gathered in this grove an assemblage large, to have a sight of the Blessed One and of gods all.” While Bapat seems to view both the Buddha and the gods as the focal points of attention in the gathering, I believe it is more fitting to interpret this as the gods convening to seek an audience with the Buddha. My interpretation is supported by the following lines clarifying that the First Brahmā God has come to listen to the Dharma and see the Saṅgha.

Y11.1c: Bapat’s translation of ‘今我來’ as ‘have I repaired,’ using the verb ‘to repair’ in the sense of ‘to go to a place’ or ‘to betake oneself to a place,’ but inadvertently misses ‘今’ (now).

Y11.1d: Bapat’s translation of ‘願復見無極衆’ as “With a further desire to see this Saṅgha unexcelled” appears imprecise. In the phrase, ‘復’ (again) should modify the following verb ‘見’ (to see) rather than the preceding verb ‘願’ (to wish). Additionally, his interpretation of ‘無極’ (limitless) seems off the mark; it typically signifies ‘infinite quantity’ rather than ‘excellent quality.’

They calibrate their discipline towards awakening, adept at rectifying themselves.

Just like a charioteer skilled in reining in both sides,

They guard their visual senses and cultivate their aspiration for enlightenment.¹³

三梵天就座便說偈言

The Third Brahmā God took his seat and then spoke in verse:

Y11.3 力斷七伏邪連 意著止如鐵根

捨世觀淨無垢 慧眼明意而攝

[We] have briskly descended from the Seventh [Heaven] to subdue perverted associations.

The minds [in this gathering] display tranquility, much like an iron foundation.

Renouncing the worldly, they perceive purity that is free from blemishes;

¹³ **Y11.2b:** The term ‘直行’ predates the Chinese rendition ‘正行’ for the Buddhist technical term ‘*samyakkarmanta*’ (right action), a component of the ‘*Āryāṣṭāṅgamārga*’ (Noble Eightfold Path). However, the inclusion of the character ‘學’ in the middle makes this reading less plausible. I have chosen to interpret ‘直學行’ as ‘to calibrate (直) study (學) and discipline (行).’

Bapat translates the phrase ‘直學行知身正’ as “And straighten (直) it (學行?) up, themselves (身) being enlightened (正?) and wise (知?).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. His interpretation is somewhat vague in identifying what is being straightened, and should have provided more clarity through the term ‘學行.’ Moreover, his use of ‘enlightened’ and ‘wise’ for the terms seems overextended.

Y11.2d: The term ‘覺意’ can often be an abbreviation for the Buddhist technical term ‘七覺意’ or ‘七覺支’ which translates to the ‘seven enlightenment factors’ (*sapta bodhyaṅga*). These factors encompass ‘mindfulness’ (*smṛti*), ‘investigation of one’s mental phenomena’ (*dharma-pravicaya*), ‘energy’ (*vīrya*), ‘rapture’ (*prīti*), ‘tranquility’ (*praśrabdhi*), ‘concentration’ (*samādhi*), and ‘equanimity’ (*upekṣā*). Nevertheless, it can also refer to ‘菩提心’ which denotes the ‘aspiration [意/心] for enlightenment [覺/菩提].’ In my translation, I have chosen the latter interpretation.

Bapat translates this phrase as ‘護眼根行覺意’ as “Their eyes (眼根) they guard (護)—these men of wisdom [wide].” [Parentheses added for analysis]. His translation leans towards a liberal interpretation, with ‘行覺意’ translated as ‘one who practices enlightened mind,’ which he apparently then further extrapolates to mean ‘one of wide wisdom.’

Their wisdom eye takes in everything through their lucid minds.¹⁴

四梵天就座便說偈言

The Fourth Brahmā God settled into his seat and then recited this verse:

¹⁴ **Y11.3:** Consistent with Y11.2, I interpret this verse as describing the practitioners in the assembly, rather than as counsel from Brahmā directed at them. Nonetheless, the initial line likely describes their descent, given the subsequent context.

Y11.3a: My translation here is tentative. The line ‘力斷七伏邪連’ presents an intriguing challenge, particularly due to the enigmatic usage of the number ‘seven.’ Based on my analysis, it appears to depict the manner in which the Brahmā Gods descended from the Seventh Heaven. I interpret ‘力斷七’ metaphorically as ‘to briskly descend from the Seventh [Heaven],’ akin to cutting through all seven heavens simultaneously.

Two other interpretations were considered. Initially, I viewed the number ‘七’ within ‘斷七’ as ‘final seven,’ but this did not fit the context. Subsequently, I explored it within ‘七伏’ (seven hidden things), which might appear either technical or cryptic. While there is potential to link this term to the *Anusaya Sutta* (AN7.11) that enumerates the seven latent tendencies (*anusaya*): sensual lust, aversion, views, doubt, conceit, lust for existence, and ignorance, this interpretation becomes shaky given Y12.3a’s variation ‘力斷七拔邪連,’ where ‘七拔’ (seven removal?) is difficult to rationalize.

The latter part, ‘伏邪連,’ which describes the purpose of the descent, can be translated as ‘to subdue perverted associations.’ This may refer to the subjugation of the Evil and its forces, a theme common in early Buddhist literature.

Bapat translates the phrase ‘力斷七伏邪連’ as “The seven (七) [evils (邪?)] are with force (力) cut down (斷).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation appears off target. Notably, the character ‘七’ is not directly linked with ‘邪,’ given that ‘伏’ intervenes. Furthermore, Bapat does not account for the characters ‘伏’ and ‘連.’ While he speculates in a footnote that the ‘seven evils’ could denote the ‘seven *anusaya*,’ he does not delve into his rationale.

Y11.3b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘意著止如鐵根’ as “And the mind (意) is from attachment (著) freed (?) and made firm (止?), like (如) the Iron-post (鐵根).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. Yet, his translation of ‘freed from’ lacks support from the actual Chinese characters, and it does not resonate with the metaphor of the ‘iron-post,’ which symbolizes steadfastness. In this context, it is more appropriate to interpret ‘著’ in its primary meaning of ‘to display’ or ‘to manifest,’ rather than functioning as an alternative character to ‘着’ (to be attached to). Consequently, ‘意著止’ can be translated as ‘The mind (意) manifests (著) tranquility (止).’ An illustrative example of ‘著’ as ‘to display’ can be found in the *Great Learning* 大學, which states: 小人閑居為不善, 無所不至, 見君子而後厭然, 掩其不善, 而著其善. Translated, it reads: “When lesser men are idle, they commit misdeeds without restraint. However, upon encountering a noble individual, they suddenly feel shame, hiding their misdeeds and showcasing their virtues.” Here, ‘著其善’ is aptly translated as ‘showcasing their virtues.’

Y11.3d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘慧眼明意而攝’ as “men of vision (眼), and (而) [well-] controlled (攝).” However, this rendering does not account for several nuanced characters, specifically ‘慧,’ ‘明,’ and ‘意.’ My interpretation reads, “Their wisdom eye (慧眼) takes in (攝) everything through their lucid (明) minds (意).” In this context, ‘而’ is normally followed by a verb, and indicates specifically the manner in which the verb is performed. For example, the phrase ‘在路而行’ translates to “he walked along the road,” not merely “he was on the road AND he walked.” So in this phrase, ‘攝’ must be a verb, probably with ‘慧眼’ as the agent and ‘明意’ indicating the manner in which that verb ‘攝’ is performed.

Y11.4 有以身歸明尊 終不生到邪冥

捨人形後轉生 受天身稍離患

Those who take refuge in the luminous Blessed One for their lifetime,

Shall never be reborn in a baleful postmortem [destiny].

Upon shedding their human form, they will transition to their [next] life;

Taking a divine form, they will reduce or cast aside their affliction.¹⁵

是時坐中有梵志。名爲猛觀。亦在大衆中。意生疑信因緣。佛知猛梵志所生疑。是時便作一佛。端正形類無比。見者悉喜。有三十二大人相。金色復有光。衣法大衣。亦如上說。便向佛叉手。以偈歎言

At that moment, among those seated was a Brahmin named Meng-guan.¹⁶ As he sat amidst the vast assembly, his mind gave rise to doubts regarding the belief in karmic causes and conditions. Aware of Meng-guan's skepticism, the Buddha instantly manifested another buddha, whose dignified appearance was unparalleled. All who beheld this sight were filled with joy. This buddha bore the thirty-two marks of a great man, radiated a golden glow, and donned a robe befitting the Dharma. He is indeed as described thus far. Beholding the Buddha with his hands clasped together, he extolled [the Buddha] in verse.

¹⁵ Y11.4: While Bapat's translation aligns with mine in many aspects, he seems to have omitted the translations for '以身' ('for their lifetime' or literally 'with their bodies') in line a and '離' (leave, cast aside) in line d.

¹⁶ 坐中 = 座中 (S, Y, M): The alternative phrase '座中' may translate to 'in the audience' instead of the phrase '坐中' (among those seated). Overall, its meaning remains the same.

11.5 人各念彼亦知 各欲勝慧可說

有能知盡是法 遍行求莫隅解

Everybody assumes they truly understand.

Yet, desiring victory, these [allegedly] wise individuals each may claim,

“If someone can completely understand this dharma,

They will wander everywhere in search of all-encompassing knowledge!”¹⁷

Sn878 *Sakaṃ sakaṃ diṭṭhi paribbasānā*

Q *Viggayha nānā kusalā vadanti*

Yo evaṃ jānāti sa vedi dhammaṃ

Idaṃ paṭikkosam akevalī so

Each abiding by their own views,

Quarrelling, [so-called] experts claim in various ways:

“One who knows in this way understands the Dhamma;

One who rejects this, is not fully accomplished.”¹⁸

¹⁷ **Y11.5a**, 人各念 = 人欲念 (M / J, N, Q2): The variant phrase can translate to ‘People desire’ in place of ‘Everybody assumes.’

Y11.5c: In translating the phrase ‘有能知盡是法’ as “Able to know this Law full well,” Bapat overlooks the character ‘有.’ Within this context, it should read as ‘if there is someone.’

Y11.5d: Interpreting the term ‘莫隅’ as ‘without being cornered, I have chosen the rendering ‘all-encompassing.’ This aligns closely with its Pāli counterpart ‘*kevalin*’ from Sn878d, signifying ‘one who is fully accomplished.’

¹⁸ The *Cūḷaviyūha Sutta* follows a catechetical format. Verses Sn878-9 pose questions, with their respective answers provided in Sn880-2. Similarly, Sn883 asks a question to which Sn884 responds, and Sn885 sets forth a query that the subsequent verses, Sn886 to Sn894, address.

Sn878b: The term ‘*kusalā*’ (the skilled or experts) carries an ironic or even pejorative nuance. To underscore this, I have inserted the qualifier ‘so-called.’

11.6 取如是便生變 癡計彼我善慧

至誠言云爲等 一切是善言說

Grasping such [views], they readily bring discord.

They deem others as fools and see themselves as paragons of wisdom.

With utmost sincerity, they claim that [only] their words and deeds are aligned.

All these are [alleged to be] teachings propounded by experts.¹⁹

Sn878cd: While the lines convey direct speech, they lack the Pāli quotation marker ‘*ti*.’

The term ‘*akevalin*’ is constructed from ‘*a-*’ (a negative prefix), ‘*kevala*’ (one’s own, absolute, or whole), and ‘*-in*’ (a nominal suffix indicating possession of a particular quality). Hence, it translates to ‘[one who has] not yet mastered all facets of the truth.’

The term ‘*kevalin*’ is traditionally associated with Jainism, used as an epithet for their spiritual ideal, and is sporadically found in Pāli literature. For instance, in the *Brahmāyu Sutta* (MN.91), a brahmin poses the question, “how does one achieve completeness (*kevalī*)?” Moreover, in the *Sattaṭṭhāna Sutta* (SN.22.57), the Buddha employs this term, declaring, “a bhikkhu proficient in these ... is termed, within this Dhamma and Discipline, a consummate one (*kevalī*), one who has wholly embraced the holy life, the pinnacle of beings (*uttamapuriso*).” These examples may show the term had been once a trans-sectarian concept before it was claimed by Jain traditions.

¹⁹ **Y11.6:** This verse builds upon Y11.5, probing how one discerns genuine teachings amidst various contradictory claims of truth.

Y11.6a: The term ‘如是’ alludes to the assertions of the so-called experts mentioned in the previous verse. In this context, ‘生變’ translates to ‘to cause trouble.’ Bapat interprets the phrase ‘取如是便生變’ as “Following this course, [hot words] do the [heretics] exchange.” While his translation of ‘取’ as ‘to follow’ lacks precision, his rendition of ‘生變’ as ‘to exchange [hot words]’ feels somewhat expanded upon. Furthermore, he omits the adverb ‘便,’ which, in this context, I have translated as ‘readily.’

Y11.6c: Bapat’s translation of ‘至誠言云爲等’ is, “Of boasts (云爲?) such as these (等?), which, as truthful (至誠), do you claim (言)?” [Parentheses added for analysis]. His interpretation of ‘云爲’ as ‘boasts’ takes considerable liberty with the original text. A more direct translation would be ‘sayings and actions.’ Therefore, this line translates to “With utmost (至) sincerity (誠), they claim (言) that [only] their words (云) and deeds (爲) are aligned (等).” This construction is supported when ‘至誠言’ and ‘云爲等’ are not compressed into the uncommon phrase ‘言云,’ which is uncommon as a phrase in Chinese Buddhist translation. All occurrences of it are part of the expression, ‘言/云何...’ (said: “How...”). Furthermore, ‘云爲’ typically means ‘words and deeds,’ a phrase reflected in entries from the DDB and CJKV-E. This line characteristically represents claims made by disputants who are deeply attached to their own views.

Y11.6d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘一切是善言說’ as “Great experts (善), themselves, [surely] all (一切) do they claim (言說) to be!” While his interpretation is not entirely off, it omits the nuances of ‘是’ and the distinction between ‘言’ and ‘說.’ My translation reads, “[For] all (一切) these (是) are [alleged as] teachings (說) propounded (言) by the experts (善).”

Sn879 *Evam pi viggayha vivādiyanti*

Q *Bālo paro akusalo' ti cāhu*

Sacco nu vādo katamo imesaṃ

Sabbe va h' ime kusalā vadānā

Quarrelling in this manner, they argue

And proclaim, “other are fools, not experts.”

Then, which assertion among these stands true?

For they all insist they are experts.²⁰

11.7 不知彼有法無 冥無慧隨彼黠

冥一切痛遠黠 所念行悉彼有

[If] one becomes ignorant, lacking wisdom, and reliant on others' intelligence

[Simply by] being unaware of [whether] others possess the Dharma or not,

Everyone could be ignorant, afflicted, and distant from intelligence,

[For] they all hold tightly to [only their own] beliefs and conduct.²¹

²⁰ **Sn879a:** The term ‘*evam*’ alludes to the manner of quarrelling described in the previous verse (Sn878).

²¹ **Y11.7:** To clearly convey this verse in English, I have incorporated additional contextual words such as ‘if,’ ‘simply by,’ ‘whether,’ ‘for,’ and ‘only their own.’ My original translation was, “Not knowing whether others possess the Dharma or not, [Some] are in darkness, lacking wisdom, swayed by another’s astuteness. Hazy about everything, they lament their lack of such astuteness. They all cherish [their own] beliefs and conduct.” While this translation remains faithful to the original wording, it struggles with coherence—especially the last line, which does not integrate smoothly with the rest. Additionally, it fails to resonate with the themes presented in Y11.6, where debaters claim the supremacy of their views and criticize others for not understanding them. A deeper review suggests that a closer alignment with the intended meaning might be achieved by incorporating additional context, possibly indicated by its Pāli counterpart. In the revised version, Y11.7 critiques the debaters’ approach as outlined in Y11.6, positing that if their perspective were true, it would render everyone ignorant, as each person is aware only

Sn880 *Parassa ce dhammam anānujānaṃ*

Bālo mago hoti nihīnapañño

Sabbe va bālā sunihīnapaññā

Sabbe v’ime diṭṭhi paribbasānā

If, [by] not recognizing another’s doctrine,

One is deemed foolish, stupid, or lacking in wisdom,

[Then] surely, all are foolish and devoid of wisdom,

[For] they all [remain] anchored to their own view.²²

11.8 先計念却行說 慧已淨意善念

是悉不望黠減 悉所念著意止

[One should] reflect mindfully in advance and withdraw their argument.

of their own views while ignoring others’. To improve flow, I rearranged the sentences, placing what was originally line b before line a for a more logical progression.

Y11.7b: 隨彼黠 = 墮彼黠 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The variant ‘墮彼黠’ can be translated as ‘[some] fall back on other’s intelligence.’

Y11.7d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘所念行悉彼有’ as “The heresies [diverse] do they harbour [in their heart].” This translation seems misaligned with the original text. The terms he interprets as ‘heresies’ are not directly suggested by the characters. Instead, ‘所念行’ can be more accurately understood as ‘what one thinks and acts upon,’ pointing to one’s ‘beliefs and codes of conduct.’

²² **Sn880:** Employing irony and leveraging the debater’s own reasoning, this verse critiques those who steadfastly assert their views while labeling dissenters as foolish.

Sn880b: I have translated the synonymous terms ‘*balo*,’ ‘*mago*,’ and ‘*nihiṇapañño*’ as ‘foolish,’ ‘stupid,’ and ‘lacking in wisdom,’ respectively. In this context, ‘*maga*’—typically meaning ‘beast’—denotes a person of limited intelligence.

Sn880d: In the *Mahāniddeśa*, ‘*diṭṭhi*’ is glossed as ‘*diṭṭhiyā*,’ which means it is considered part of the compound ‘*diṭṭhiparibbasānā*.’ However, Norman interprets it as ‘*diṭṭhiṃ*,’ suggesting that the accusative singular declension is elided for metrical reasons.

While ‘*paribbasānā*’ (abiding by) is in its present participle form, I have translated it as ‘to remain anchored’ to function more like a main verb, ensuring a smoother read.

[Such] a wise individual is indeed pure and harbors wholesome thoughts.

Given all this, they do not expect their wisdom to wane.

In all their thoughts, their mental serenity will be made manifest.²³

Sn881 *Sandiṭṭhiyā ce pana vīvadātā*

Saṃsuddhapaññā kusalā mutīmā

Na tesam koci parihīnapañño

Diṭṭhi hi tesam pi tathā samattā

²³ **Y11.8:** This verse, Y11.8, is markedly different from its Pāli counterpart, Sn881, which continues to critique the mindset of debaters. In contrast, Y11.8 introduces the concept of ‘計念’ (mindful reflection) and focuses on the characteristics of a wise individual. This represents a thematic shift from Y11.5–7, where such reflection is notably absent. Bapat’s translation tries to closely align Y11.8 with Sn881 by suggesting it also addresses the behavior of ignorant debaters, stretching and potentially distorting the original wording. While I incorporated several contextual words in Y11.7 to bridge literal and contextual gaps, Y11.8 is clear and coherent by itself without any deviating lines. Therefore, I have chosen to adhere closely to the original wording of this verse.

Y11.8a: Bapat interprets the phrase ‘先計念却行說’ as “With heresies (計念?) of old (先?), do they act (行) and say (說).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation stretches the definition of ‘先’ (previously) to mean ‘古’ (ancient) and overlooks the role of ‘却’ in the compound ‘却行,’ which according to the DDB and CJKV-E, means ‘to withdraw’ or ‘to step backwards.’ Additionally, Bapat’s labeling of ‘計念’ as ‘heresies’ deviates significantly from its standard connotation of ‘premeditated, calculated thought,’ which I prefer to interpret as ‘to reflect mindfully.’ As for the usage of ‘却,’ one might read the structure ‘先 ... 却 ...’ (first ... and then ...) in this line, but I prefer to follow the entry of ‘却行’ in the aforementioned online dictionaries.

Y11.8bc: Bapat translates these lines ‘慧已淨意善念 是悉不望黠減’ as “That wise, as well as pure, and mindful are they; Of them, none expects to be of wisdom deprived.” In attempting to align Y11.8 with Sn881, Bapat may have used an ironic tone for ‘慧’ (wise person), implying ‘the so-called wise’ in reference to debaters. However, this interpretation appears forced and does not align well with lines a and d of Y11.8. Line a promotes mindful reflection as a means to avoid pointless disputes, suggesting that lines b and c should describe a genuinely wise individual who reflects mindfully and eschews arguments, rather than portraying them with irony. Therefore, a more straightforward interpretation of ‘慧’ as simply ‘a wise individual’ or more clearly ‘a genuinely wise individual’ better suits the context of these lines, emphasizing the positive attributes of wisdom, purity, and mindfulness.

Y11.8d: Bapat’s translation of ‘悉所念著意止’ reads, “For, such are they all (悉) to heresies (所念?) consigned (著意止?).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. His interpretation stretches the meaning of ‘所念,’ which typically signifies ‘thoughts’ or ‘considerations,’ not ‘heresies’ as he suggests. This likely distorts its original meaning in an attempt to align it with the content of Sn881d. Additionally, his translation of ‘著意止’ as ‘consigned’ is vague; he might have interpreted it as ‘the mind (意) becomes attached (著) and settles (止).’ A clearer interpretation would be ‘the manifestation (著) of mental (意) tranquility (止),’ suggesting a state of serene contemplation. This reading better fits the context of a wise individual reflecting mindfully, as described in the rest of the verse.

Again, if they [claim to be] purified by their own view,
[Deeming themselves] perfectly pure in wisdom, adept, and prudent,
None among them [would be] inferior in wisdom,
For, their views are indeed adopted in similar ways.²⁴

11.9 我不据是悉上 愚可行轉相牽

自見謹謂可諦 自己癡復受彼

I do not assert, “This surpasses all,”

[Which] fools might proclaim and then tussle with each other.

[Believing] their view is refined and can be deemed ‘truth,’

In their own ignorance, they even embrace others’ [follies].²⁵

²⁴ **Sn881:** Continuing the critique of debaters begun in Sn880, this verse utilizes irony and mirrors the debaters’ own logic. To emphasize this context, I have incorporated the phrases ‘claim to be,’ ‘deeming themselves,’ and ‘would be’ into my translation, each set off in brackets for clarity.

Sn881a: Both Pāli commentaries interpret the term ‘*sandiṭṭhi*’ as ‘*saka + diṭṭhi*’ (one’s own view), rather than ‘*sandiṭṭhi*’ (the visible world, this world). This commentarial understanding aligns more appropriately with the context. Supporting this interpretation, Norman suggests a potential evolution from the accusative form: “*sa-diṭṭhi* > *sad-diṭṭhiṃ* > *saṃ-diṭṭhiṃ*.” Here, ‘*sa*’ is a reflexive pronoun meaning ‘his own’ and is synonymous with ‘*saka*.’ Influenced by the accusative form of ‘*diṭṭhiṃ*,’ ‘*sa*’ adopts the similar ‘*saṃ*’ form.

Sn881d: The term ‘*samatta*’ can be understood in two ways. It can be derived from ‘*sama*’ (equal) with the abstract noun suffix ‘*-tta*,’ suggesting the meaning ‘equality.’ Alternatively, it can be a combination of ‘*saṃ-*’ (a prefix meaning ‘the same’) and ‘*atta*’ (past participle of ‘*ā + √dā*’; implying ‘taken’). Fronsdal leans towards the former interpretation, translating the line as “All would be equal with regard to their views.” In contrast, both Norman and Bodhi prefer the latter. Norman renders it as “for their view also is likewise adopted,” while Bodhi translates it as “for their views are similarly taken up.” In the context, ‘likewise’ or ‘similarly’ may denote ‘their views are based on beliefs not on the truth.’

²⁵ **Y11.9a:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘我不据是悉上’ as “All this, above, as truth do I not accept.” This interpretation of ‘是悉上’ as ‘all this, above,’ does not fit the context. The phrase more accurately means: “this (是) is superior to (上) everything (悉).” The character ‘上’ can also mean ‘be superior to.’ For clarity, I have translated it using its verb form ‘to surpass.’ The term ‘据’ is often understood as ‘to lean against’ or ‘to rely on,’ which I’ve translated more interpretively as ‘to assert.’

Y11.9b: Bapat translation of the phrase ‘愚可行轉相牽’ reads, “This, which the fools (愚) say (行?), of mutual (相) concern (牽).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation neglects the significance of ‘可’ and ‘轉,’ which imply possibility and transition, respectively. The character ‘牽’ translates to ‘to drag’ or ‘to pull,’ and

Sn882 *Na vāham etaṃ tathīyan ti brūmi*

Yam āhu bālā mithu aññamaññaṃ

Sakaṃ sakaṃ diṭṭhim akaṃsu saccaṃ

Tasmā hi bālo ti paraṃ dahanti

I do not assert, “This is the truth,”

As fools declare it to one another.

They hold their own views as the truth,

Thus, they label others as foolish.²⁶

11.10 自說法度無及 以自空貪來盜

已八冥轉相冥 學何故一不道

in context, ‘相牽’ might suggest a sort of ‘tug of war.’ I have chosen to translate it as ‘to tussle (牽) with each other (相).’

Y11.9c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘自見謹謂可諦’ as “Their own views, alone, as truthful do they claim.” Here, using ‘謹’ to mean ‘alone’ raises questions. While this character can be directly translated as ‘careful’ or ‘prudent,’ I read it as indicating something ‘carefully [crafted].’ I have thus translated it as ‘refined.’

Y11.9d: Bapat’s translation of the phrase ‘自己癡復受彼’ as “And those of others (彼? or 自己?), as foolish (癡), are they (自己? or 彼?) [sure to] declaim (受?)!” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation appears ambiguous, in addition to the omission of ‘復’ and the overextended translation of ‘受’ as ‘declaim.’ I have understood this to mean, “In their own (自己) ignorance (癡), they additionally (復) embrace (受) others’ (彼) [follies].”

²⁶ **Sn882:** Following its critique of debaters, this sutta outlines the stance of its religious exemplar in this verse.

Sn882b: I have excluded the translation of ‘mithu’ (mutually) since it is synonymous with ‘aññamaññaṃ’ (one another). While it is possible to integrate both terms like Bodhi, who renders ‘mithu’ as ‘in pairs’ and ‘aññamaññaṃ’ as ‘one another,’ omitting one avoids redundancy and enhances clarity.

Sn882d: In the Pāli language, ‘dahati’ has dual origins. One stems from the Sanskrit root ‘√dah’ (to burn), resulting in its third person singular form ‘dahati.’ Alternatively, it can be derived from the Sanskrit root ‘√dhā’ (to put), leading to its reduplicated third person singular form ‘dadhāti.’ In this particular context, the Pāli ‘dahati’ aligns with ‘dadhāti’ from Sanskrit, meaning ‘to claim.’ To provide clarity, I have rendered it as ‘to label.’

Each proclaims their discipline unrivaled.

Declaring their hollow [doctrines], they covet and seek to steal [other's faith].

[Engulfed] in darkness on all sides, they continuously deepen into mutual ignorance.

Why do these ascetics not claim in unison?²⁷

Sn883 *Yam āhu saccaṃ tathīyan ti eke*

Q *Tam āhu aññe tucchaṃ musā ti*

Evam pi viggayha vivādiyanti

Kasmā na ekaṃ samaṇā vadanti

What some people claim as truth or reality,

²⁷ **Y11.10:** This verse serves as the interlocutor's query, just like its Pāli counterpart, Sn883.

Y11.10a: Bapat translates the phrase '自說法度無及' as "Their Law that they declare as surpassing and unequalled". While he reads '度' as an adjective meaning 'surpassing,' I interpret it as part of the term '法度' (teaching and practice), which I have simplified as 'discipline.'

Y11.10b: Bapat's translation of the phrase '以自空貪來盜' reads "Is nothing but empty (空), which greedy (貪) heretics come (來) to steal (盜)." [Parentheses added for analysis]. It is noteworthy that his translation omits the characters '以' and '自', and the word 'heretics' does not have a matching Chinese character in the phrase. Also, Bapat's rendition is ambiguous regarding what heretics are stealing and why. In contrast, my translation interprets '以' as 'declaring', a subtle extension from its primary meaning 'to use'. To enhance clarity, I have inserted the terms 'doctrines' and 'other's faith' in brackets.

Y11.10c: 已八冥 = 已入冥 (M): Bapat suspects that '八' is a scribal error for '入,' and thus translates '已入冥轉相冥' as "Having (已) entered (入) darkness (冥), they go on rolling (轉) into the same (相?)." [Parentheses added for analysis]. The first three characters are correctly translated with the variant character. However, his translation of '相' as 'the same' appears stretched; its primary meaning is 'each other,' and its typical use aligns more closely with '相差' (differences) than with '相同' (equal qualities). He also neglects to translate the final '冥', which signifies 'darkness' or metaphorically 'ignorance.' In the original text, It is likely that '八冥' should be interpreted as 'darkness in all eight (八) directions (方),' referring to the four cardinal directions (N, E, W, S) and the four directions between them (NW, NE, SW, SE). It implies 'darkness in all directions.' The phrase '轉相冥' better conveys the idea that their continued debates only deepen their immersion in ignorance.

Y11.10d: Bapat translates the phrase '學何故一不道' as "Why (何故) do not (不) these ascetics (學) declare one (一) and one Truth (道) alone?" [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, considering the placement of the negative particle '不,' the following character '道' is better interpreted as a verb 'to say' rather than a noun 'Truth.' While he might have been accurate in rendering this character as 'to declare,' it is mistaken when he further specifies his interpretation of 'Truth' stemming from '道.' My translation of this phrase is, "Why (何故) do these ascetics (學) not (不) claim (道) in unison (一)?" This interpretation aligns with the preceding lines that highlight individual claims and mutual disputes and is consistent with its Pāli counterpart. It questions why there is so much discord among them when the Truth should be one and the same.

That others claim as false or fallacy.

Quarrelling this way, they argue.

Why do the ascetics not claim in one [and the same] thing?²⁸

11.11 一諦盡二有無 知是諦不顛倒

謂不盡諦隨意 以故學一不說

There is one and only Truth, no second.

Knowing this Truth, one will avoid any cognitive distortion.

[But] these ascetics profess various truths according to their own preconceptions.

As a result, they do not speak in a single voice.²⁹

Sn884 *Ekaṃ hi saccaṃ na dutīyaṃ atthi*

Yasmiṃ pajāno vivade pajānaṃ

²⁸ **Sn883d:** While I align with Norman and Fronsda's interpretation of 'ekaṃ' as 'one [and the same] thing,' I regard Bodh's rendering of 'in unison' as a contextually inventive approach. The line prompts the question: if they all claim to uphold the single truth, why do they differ and engage in verbal disputes?

²⁹ **Y11.11:** In this verse, the character '諦' appears three times, but its meanings vary across instances. In lines ab, it signifies the 'one and only Truth,' and I have represented this with a capitalized 'Truth.' In contrast, in line c, it refers to various purported truths, hence, I have used the lowercase 'truth.'

Y11.11a: Bapat translates the phrase '一諦盡二有無' as "There is one Truth perfect, having none as second." His translation of '盡' seems overstretched; a more fitting interpretation might be 'completely' or 'exhaustively.'

Y11.11b: The phrase '顛倒' literally translates to 'upside down' or 'to turn upside down.' In this context, it signifies 'distorted facts,' akin to the Sanskrit term 'viparyāsa,' which is often used in Buddhist texts to denote erroneous perceptions or cognitive distortions. Thus, I interpret it as 'cognitive distortion,' a term that effectively conveys the meaning of viewing reality in a warped or incorrect manner, consistent with its doctrinal use in describing delusional thinking or misunderstanding of the nature of phenomena.

Y11.11cd: For clarity in line c, I have incorporated '學' (ascetics) from line d. Subsequently, in line d, I have employed the pronoun 'they.'

Nānā te saccāni sayam thunanti

Tasmā na ekaṃ samaṇā vadanti

Indeed, there is one Truth, no second.

A wise individual would not debate this.

These ascetics proclaim their own varied truths;

Hence, they do not claim the one Truth.³⁰

11.12 何諦是餘不說 當信誰盡餘說

饒餘諦當何從 從何有生意識

What is the Truth that other [ascetics] do not proclaim?

Whom should one trust to refute all other [truth-]claims?

From where do [these] numerous other truths originate?

Whence do these conceptions arise?³¹

³⁰ **Sn884**: This verse closely aligns with its Chinese counterpart, Y11.11.

Sn884ab: While these two lines are connected by the relative pronoun ‘*yasmim*’ in line b, forming one sentence, I have separated them for clarity and readability.

Sn884cd: Similarly to Y11.11cd, I have incorporated ‘*samaṇā*’ (ascetics) from line d into my translation of line c. In line d, I have simply used the pronoun ‘they.’

³¹ **Y11.12**: This verse poses a question that is addressed in the subsequent verse, Y11.13. A successful translation hinges on the proper interpretation of ‘餘,’ ‘餘說,’ and ‘餘諦.’ The character ‘餘’ generally means ‘remaining,’ but in this context, it refers to ‘all other truths apart from the Truth.’ DDB and CJKV-E dictionaries list uses of this character to mean ‘non-Buddhist’ or ‘heretical,’ but in this context, ‘other’ would be the proper rendering.

Y11.12ab: Bapat translates the two lines ‘何諦是餘不說 當信誰盡餘說’ as “What truth is it which others [can] not say, which, with faith, will they all declare?” In the first line, Bapat appears to view ‘諦’ in a positive light, interpreting it as the singular Truth that others cannot articulate. This makes the interpretation of the second line somewhat unclear. If Bapat’s intent is to suggest that all others will advocate this Truth given sufficient faith, then the introduction of ‘faith’ feels unexpectedly placed in this context. Conversely, if he views ‘諦’ negatively, as ‘[other] truths’ that are proclaimed with blind faith, then the use of the relative pronoun ‘which’ in line b cannot consistently refer back to the noun ‘諦’ in line a. The result is a contradiction in the nuances attached to the shared noun ‘諦’ between lines a and b.

Sn885 *Kasmā nu saccāni vadanti nānā*

Q *Pavādiyāse kusalā vadānā*

Saccāni su tāni bahūni nānā

Udāhu te takkam anussaranti

Why do disputants proclaim varied truths,

Professing [themselves] as experts?

Are these truths [really] numerous and diverse,

Or are they [merely] following conjecture?³²

11.13 識無餘何說餘 從異想分別擇

眼所見爲著可 識若欺盡二法

Consciousness [itself] does not produce other [truths]; why [then these] varied

[truth-]claims?

Moreover, Bapat seems to either overlook the translation of ‘誰’ (who/whom) or interpret this interrogative pronoun as a relative pronoun, which is not consistent with how the character is typically used. His rendition of ‘盡餘’ as ‘they all’ also does not seem congruent with the present context.

Given these observations, I have chosen to translate ‘信’ as a verb, either ‘to trust’ or ‘to rely on.’ For ‘盡,’ I interpret it as the verb ‘to purge,’ but for contextual appropriateness, I have rendered it as ‘to refute.’

Y11.12cd: These lines delve into the roots of various truths and the emergence of [fallacious] consciousness. The interrogative terms ‘何從’ and ‘從何’ are employed, both translating to ‘from where?’ or ‘whence?’. In the phrase ‘饒餘諦,’ the character ‘饒’ denotes abundance or multitude.

意識: This term is commonly used in Chinese Buddhist texts to translate the Buddhist technical term ‘*mano-vijñāna*,’ which means ‘mind-consciousness.’ However, in this specific context, the term might be more appropriately translated as ‘conception,’ referring to a conceptual understanding or a notion of truth. This translation aligns better with the Pāli word ‘*takka*,’ used in the parallel verse, which connotes reasoning or conjecture.

³² **Sn885:** To improve readability, I integrated ‘*pavādiyāse*’ (disputants) from line b into my translation of line a.

Relying on diverse perceptions, [they] discriminate and choose [their truths].

People tend to become attached to objects seen by the eyes.

If their conceptions are [thus] deceptive, they end up as dualistic dharmas.³³

Sn886 *Na h'eva saccāni bahūni nānā*

Aññatra saññāya niccāni loke

Takkañ ca diṭṭhīsu pakappayitvā

Saccaṃ musā ti dvayadhammam āhu

There are not indeed multiple diverse permanent truths

³³ **Y11.13:** This verse elucidates that diverse truth-claims originate from ‘dichotomous mental activity’ (二法), influenced by attachment to various perceptions. Line d discusses deceptive conceptions, emphasizing that their emergence is a direct consequence of these attachments. To explicitly link these ideas, I have added the contextual word ‘thus’ in line d. This clarifies that the deceptiveness of the conceptions stems directly from the attachments to perceived objects. The argument in this verse aligns with its Pāli counterpart in Sn886, which similarly posits that varied truths arise from ‘dichotomous mental activity’ (*dvayadhamma*).

Y11.13a, 識無餘 = 諦無餘 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2); 何說餘 = 何說饒 (P, J, Q1, N, Q2): In the first variant, ‘識’ refers to ‘consciousness/knowledge,’ while ‘諦’ to ‘truth.’ In the next variant, ‘餘’ means ‘the rest’ or ‘others,’ while ‘饒’ implies ‘abundance.’ Bapat follows the first variant, but is ambiguous about the second. He then translates his preferred phrase ‘諦無餘何說餘(or 饒)’ as “Truth (諦), with counterpart (餘?) none (無), why (何) do they say (說) as many (餘 or 饒)” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This rendition seems to misinterpret ‘餘’ (remaining) as ‘counterpart,’ which contextually signifies ‘various truths excluding the single Truth.’ The Taishō version ‘識無餘何說餘’ can be directly interpreted as “[In] consciousness (識), there are no (無) other [truth-claims] (餘); [then] how (何) do people claim (說) [such] varied [truths] (餘)?” I have refined this as “Consciousness [itself] does not produce other [truths]; [then] why [these] varied [truth-]claims?” For the alternative reading ‘諦無餘,’ I would interpret it as “[In] the Truth, there is no [room for] other [divergent truths]. The second variant ‘何說饒’ aligns closely with the original meaning of ‘何說餘’ for both phrases denotes ‘multifarious other truths.’

Y11.13c: Bapat’s rendition of ‘眼所見爲著可’ as ‘To what their eyes have seen do they apply their fancy’ captures one possible interpretation, where ‘可’ acts as shorthand for ‘可意’ (appealing to the senses) or ‘可愛’ (desirable). However, ‘可’ can also indicate ‘possibility’ or ‘tendency,’ thus the phrase could be interpreted as ‘it is expected (可) that one will become (爲) attached (著) to objects (所) perceived (見) by the eyes (眼).’ My use of ‘tend to’ reflects this interpretation of ‘可’ within the context. For a related explanation of ‘可’ as ‘appealing,’ see Y2. fn.19.

Y11.13d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘識若欺盡二法’ as “And thus results (盡?) the duality (二法) of ‘truth (識?) and (若?) falsehood (欺).’” This translation is off the mark. Firstly, interpreting ‘識’ (consciousness, to know) as ‘truth’ seems to be a stretch. Moreover, his use of ‘若’ simply as ‘and’ does not capture the character’s actual role in the sentence. In this context, ‘若’ functions more like a conditional conjunction, like ‘if’ or ‘when,’ setting up the consequence that follows in ‘盡二法’ (end up with dichotomy).

Beyond the perceptions [present] in the world.

Prompting speculations amidst [varied] views,

They speak of a dichotomy: ‘truth or falsehood.’

11.14 聞見戒在意行 著欲黠變訟見

止校計觀何羞 是以癡復授彼

Clinging to traditions, views, rites, and rationales,

They seek to cunningly adapt and assert [their own] views.

[They then] cease to review or scrutinize [them]; behold how disgraceful [this is]!

These [folks] persistently impart [these views] on others through [their own]

ignorance.³⁴

³⁴ **Y11.14:** This verse builds upon Y11.13, delving deeper into the origins of certain views and the propagation of these views without introspection. Bapat’s translation of this verse, especially of lines cd, seems notably skewed, likely stemming from his attempt to forcibly align it with its Pāli equivalents.

Y11.14a: This line presents the sources of entrenched views without explicitly incorporating a verb, prompting me to integrate ‘著’ (be attached to) from the subsequent line to enhance clarity. The elements of this phrase align closely with those in its Pāli counterpart, Sn887: ‘聞’ corresponds to ‘*suta*’ (heard); ‘見’ to ‘*diṭṭha*’ (seen); ‘戒’ to ‘*śīlavata*’ (moral observances); and ‘在意行’ to ‘*muta*’ (reasoned). I have previously suggested (Y2.fn.30-31; Y4.fn.14) that when these terms are employed as obstacles to purity or peace, they might be best rendered as ‘traditions, beliefs, religious observances, and rationales,’ reflecting the context of ancient Indian religious practices. In this verse, however, I translate ‘見’ as ‘views’ and ‘戒’ as ‘rites/rituals,’ respecting their established translations in English and noting that both ‘見’ and ‘*diṭṭha*’ derive from verbs meaning ‘to see,’ making ‘views’ an appropriate translation. While ‘戒’ typically refers to behavioral discipline or moral precepts, in this context, it refers to ‘*śīlavrataparāmarśa*’—the attachment to rites and rituals—therefore, I opt to render it as ‘rites.’ The term ‘在意行’ can be literally translated as ‘activity in mind.’ This term is synonymous with ‘所念’ found in Y4.6, Y12.8, and many more, which I have chosen to interpret as ‘rationales.’

Bapat’s rendition of ‘聞見戒在意行’ as “To what they have heard, seen, practiced, and believed in” raises some concerns. Specifically, it appears he may have vaguely interpreted ‘戒’ as ‘what they have practiced.’ Additionally, his translation of ‘在意行’ as ‘what they have believed in’ is not immediately discernible from the original text.

Y11.14b: Bapat’s choice to translate ‘變’ as ‘to parry’ seems overly liberal; the character primarily signifies ‘to change.’

Y11.14c: Bapat translates ‘止校計觀何羞’ as “In their decisions (校計?) firm (止?), they view (觀)—O, what (何) a shame (羞)!—”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. His rendering of ‘校計’ as ‘decision’ seems to miss

Sn887 *Diṭṭhe sute sīlavate mute vā*

Ete ca nissāya vimānadassī

Vinicchaye ṭhatva pahassamāno

Bālo paro akusalo ti cāha

Views, traditions, rites and rituals, and rationales—

Some become haughty, relying on these.

Rooted in [their] judgments and exuding arrogance,

They label others as foolish and inept.³⁵

11.15 癡何從授與彼 彼綺可善黠我

便自署善說已 有訟彼便生怨

How foolish it is to emulate and instruct others,

[As if] their clever rhetoric could render them experts or sages!

the mark. While ‘校’ can mean ‘school,’ it also carries meanings such as ‘teach,’ ‘investigate,’ and ‘revise.’ ‘計’ typically means ‘to calculate’ or ‘to think about.’ I see ‘校計’ as a commendable endeavor for ascetics, which, if absent, would be regrettable. As such, I have chosen to interpret it as ‘self-reflection’ and rendered it as ‘review and scrutinize.’

Y11.14d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘是以癡復授彼’ as “Others (彼), and hold them (是?) as nothing but fools (癡).” This translation appears to be significantly off-course. The original text does not seem to have corresponding words for his translations ‘to hold something as’ and ‘nothing but.’ My interpretation aligns with “These (是) [folks] persistently (復) impart (授) to others (彼) based on (以) [their own] ignorance (癡).”

³⁵ **Sn887:** This verse discusses the origins of haughty attitudes exhibited by disputing ascetics. For the phrase ‘*diṭṭhe sute sīlavate mute*,’ I have previously suggested (Y2.fn.30-31; Y4.fn.14) that when these terms are used to mean obstacles to purity or peace, they might be best rendered as ‘traditions, beliefs, religious observances, and rationales,’ which reflect the context of ancient Indian religious practices. In alignment with Y11.14, where established English translations of these terms are maintained, I translate ‘*diṭṭha*’ as ‘views’ and ‘*sīlavata*’ as ‘rites and rituals.’

They then claim [their doctrines] are well expounded.

[Yet], when faced with challenges from others, they show resentment.³⁶

Sn888 *Yen'eva bālo ti param dahāti*

Tenātumānaṃ kusalo ti cāha

Sayam attanā so kusalo vadāno

Aññaṃ vimāneti tath'eva pāvā

In the way they consider another as foolish,

They claim themselves as experts.

They, themselves, stating that they are experts,

Despise another. In that way, they indeed declare.³⁷

³⁶ **Y11.15a:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘癡何從授與彼’ as “That very count which makes one think of others (彼) as fools (癡).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This seems to deviate considerably from the original. The text lacks Chinese characters that would align with ‘count’ or ‘to make one think of.’ Moreover, Bapat’s translation does not account for the interrogative pronoun ‘何’ (how), the preposition ‘與’ (with), or the verbs ‘從’ (to follow) and ‘授’ (to teach).

Y11.15b: Bapat’s translation of the phrase ‘彼綺可善黠我’ as “That [self-]esteem makes an expert of himself” appears to miss the essence of the original phrase. ‘綺’ literally means ‘silk’ and can be metaphorically understood as ‘something delicate, beautiful, or refined’; I render this character as ‘beautiful rhetoric’ in context. Additionally, his translation neglects the modal verb ‘可’ (can) and seems to conflate ‘善’ (expert) with ‘黠’ (wise), rendering them both simply as ‘expert.’

Y11.15c: Bapat interprets the phrase ‘便自署善說己’ as “Then (便) he considers and speaks (署) of himself (自) as an expert (善).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation seems imprecise. There is no Chinese character corresponding to his rendering of ‘to consider.’ Moreover, he omits the translation of the expression ‘說己’ (has expounded). The character ‘署’ typically means ‘to tell’ or ‘to affix one’s signature.’ Thus, ‘自署’ should be translated as ‘to claim oneself.’ To enhance the flow in English, I have omitted ‘自’ (oneself) from my translation.

Y11.15d: Bapat’s translation of the phrase ‘有訟彼便生怨’ reads as “And in disputes, with contempt, at others he doth look.” This too lacks accuracy. The term ‘怨’ is more aptly translated as ‘resentment’ or ‘grudge,’ rather than his chosen ‘contempt.’ To improve the flow in English, I have omitted ‘便’ (then) from my translation.

³⁷ **Sn888c:** The adverb ‘sayam’ (by oneself) and the ablative/instrumental case masculine singular noun ‘attanā’ (on his own account) appear redundant. I have translated both as ‘themselves’ for simplicity.

11.16 堅邪見望師事 邪黠酷滿綺具

常自恐語不到 我常戒見是辟

Holding fast to their misguided views, they long for the reverence reserved for a guru.

Their deceit deepens, being laden with eloquent rhetoric.

They are always anxious that their words [might] not resonate with [the audience].

They constantly guard their beliefs as their sacred dominion.³⁸

Sn889 *Atīsaramdiṭṭhiyā so samatto*

Mānena matto paripuṇṇamānī

Sayam eva sāmāṇ manasābhisitto

Diṭṭhī hi sā tassa tathā samattā

Perfected in extreme views,

Intoxicated by conceit, and proud of [their] achievements,

They indeed have mentally anointed themselves,

³⁸ **Y11.16a:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘堅邪見望師事’ as “With false views full, he expects honour befitting a Master.” In this rendition, he mistakenly translates ‘堅’ (strong) as ‘full.’

Y11.16b: Bapat interprets the phrase ‘邪黠酷滿綺具’ as “With cunning (邪黠) full (滿?) and with pride (綺?) bubbling (具?) in the extreme (酷).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation strays significantly from the original, especially regarding the word order. His translation of ‘綺’ as ‘pride’ is also questionable. A more accurate breakdown might be: “Their deceit (邪黠) deepens (酷), being laden (滿 + 具) with eloquent rhetoric (綺).”

Y11.16c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘常自恐語不到’ as “Always (常), of words (語) he is afraid (自恐), and he dares not (不) draw near (到)” [Parentheses added for clarity]. This interpretation is somewhat ambiguous. A clearer translation could be: “They are always (常) anxious (自恐) that their words (語) might not resonate (不到) with [the audience].”

Y11.16d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘我常戒見是辟’ as “‘Conduct I ever observe’—such heresy is his crown.” This interpretation raises the question of why observing conduct would be considered heretical. A more apt translation might be: “They (我) constantly (常) guard (戒) their beliefs (見) as (是) their sacred dominion (辟).” Here, I have opted to translate ‘我’ (I) as ‘they’ and transformed the direct speech into indirect for smoother coherence, especially given the figurative essence of ‘是辟’, which lends itself better to indirect speech.

Because for them, [their] view is perfect in this manner.³⁹

11.17 見彼諦邪慚藏 本自有慚藏點

以悉知點分別 癡悉無合點行

They view other's [claimed] truths as skewed, shameful, and unclear,

[While,] in fact, their own are laden with shame and ignorance.

[If one can] discern wisdom and knowledge through all such [claims],

None would be ignorant, [as their claims appear] aligned with wise behavior.⁴⁰

Sn890 *Parassa ce hi vacasā nihīno*

³⁹ **Sn889:** In this verse, the subject is 'so' (he), which I have translated using the gender-neutral term 'they.' I have also rendered some singular nouns as plural ones to convey general connotation of the nouns.

The word '*samatta*' in lines a and d is not an abstract noun derived from '*sama*' (equal); instead, it is the past participle of '*sam* + *√āp*,' meaning 'accomplished' or 'perfected.'

In line c, the terms '*sayam*' and '*sāmaṃ*' are synonymous and redundant, so I have represented them with a single translation 'themselves.'

⁴⁰ **Y11.17:** Interpreting this verse poses a challenge due to its enigmatic nature. Its meaning becomes apparent when viewed alongside its Pāli counterpart, Sn890. Given that the Pāli verse highlights the claims of contesting ascetics, which is also the overarching theme of the Y11 sutta, I incorporated terms such as 'claimed' in line a, 'claims' in line c, and a phrase 'as their claims appear' in line d for clarity. I have also introduced 'while' to bridge lines a and b, ensuring Y11.17 resonates with Sn890.

Y11.17a: Bapat's choice to translate '藏' as 'entertained' seems a significant departure from its primary meanings, which include 'to store,' 'to cover,' or 'to hide.' This character also possesses several Buddhist-associated nuances, such as 'Treasury,' the 'Buddhist Canon,' and 'underlying [consciousness].' However, given the verse's negative undertone in line a, I have translated it as 'unclear.'

Y11.17b: Bapat translates '藏點' as 'skillfully guarded,' which is a plausible interpretation. However, I have chosen to render it as 'ignorance,' interpreting it as 'covering wisdom.' While '點' can be negatively construed as 'cunning,' this seems less likely given its positive connotations elsewhere in this verse (lines c and d).

Y11.17cd: Bapat translates the phrase '以悉知點分別 癡悉無合點行' as "If by all what one knows, a man of skill is to be distinguished, Then, a fool will there be none, and one would meet [only] the practitioners of skill." This rendering muddles the relationship between knowledge, skillfulness, and practitioners of skill. Much of this confusion can be addressed by the contextual insertion of the word 'claim.' In this context, '以悉' harks back to 'claims' from the preceding lines, and the verb '合' should have 'claims' as its subject.

Tumo sahā hoti nihīnapañño

Atha ce sayam vedagū hoti dhīro

Na koci bālo samañesu atthi

If one is [deemed] inferior by an adversary's words,

That adversary, too, might be seen as foolish [by another's words].

Yet if one [claims] to be wise and learned by their own accord,

Among ascetics, none [would] truly be [labeled] a fool.⁴¹

11.18 是爲諦住乃說 悉可淨自所法

如是取便亂變 自因緣痛著污

“This is the truth,” one declares with attachment.

“Everything can be purified [within] my realm of tenets.”

Grasping in such manner, they then become restless and create havoc.

Due to [this] cause and condition, they are pained by [both] attachment and impurity.⁴²

⁴¹ **Sn890:** Although the terms and grammar within the verse are straightforward, pinpointing the specific individuals involved within the context presents a challenge. In line a, there is the subject of the adjective ‘*nihīna*’ (inferior); ‘*para*’ (another) who engages in debate with the subject. To provide clearer context, I have identified ‘*para*’ as ‘adversary.’ For further clarity in line b, I have added the phrase ‘by another’s words,’ suggesting that the same adversary might face criticism from yet another individual. Lines c and d introduce a different situation: if one’s self-praise holds true, then every ascetic, based on their own claims, would be considered wise. I have also added contextual words in brackets such as ‘deemed,’ ‘claims,’ and ‘labeled.’

⁴² **Y11.18:** This verse gains clarity when the direct statements ‘是爲諦’ (This is the truth.) and ‘悉可淨自所法’ (Everything can be purified [within] my realm of tenets.) are accurately identified. This identification aligns with its Pāli counterpart Sn892.

Y11.18b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘悉可淨自所法’ as “Pure are all the doctrines which they themselves do maintain.” This translation misses the mark. It neglects the modal verb ‘可’ (can) and introduces ‘maintain,’ which is not present in the original text. In this context, ‘所’ is better translated as ‘place’ or ‘realm,’ making ‘自所法’ translate to ‘my (自) realm (所) of tenets (法).’

Sn892 *Idh'eva suddhi iti vādiyanti*

Nāññesu dhammesu visuddhim āhu

Evam pi tithyā puthuso niviṭṭhā

Sakāyane tattha dalhaṃ vadānā

“Here alone is purity,” they assert;

“There is no purity in other teachings,” they declare.

Thus, heretical teachers variously take their stand,

Staunchly proclaiming their own paths there.⁴³

11.19 從異行得解淨 彼雖淨不至盡

Y11.18c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘如是取便亂變’ as “Thus they [firmly] grasp, get restless and [hot words] do exchange.” He misconstrues ‘變,’ which represents a transition from one state to another, not an exchange of words.

Y11.18d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘自因緣痛著污’ as “And because (因緣) of themselves (自) and by corruptions (污) clutched (著), do they come to grief (痛)!” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation is comprehensible but lacks precision. The term ‘因緣’ (cause and condition) more accurately refer to theme of the previous lines, which suggests ‘自’ may be better understood as a preposition like ‘from’ or ‘due to.’ Given the previous lines’ emphasis on ‘attachment’ and ‘purity,’ it is more fitting to interpret ‘污’ as ‘mental impurity.’ Therefore, a more apt translation of the phrase may be: “Due to (自) [this] cause (因) and condition (緣), they are impaired (痛) by [both] attachment (著) and impurity (污).”

⁴³ **Sn892:** Y11.18 aligns with Sn892, while Y11.19 matches Sn891. Notably, this is an uncommon variation in the sequence of verses between Y11 and Sn.IV-12.

Sn892c: The Pāli term ‘*tithyā*’ surfaces just five times throughout the entirety of Pāli literature—all within the *Sutta Nipāta*, with two instances in the twelfth *sutta* of the *Aṭṭhakavagga* (Sn892 and Sn891). Likely analogous to the Sanskrit ‘*tīrthya*’, the term alludes to the idea of ‘related to Tīrthaṅkara (ford-maker).’ While modern interpretations ascribe ‘Tīrthaṅkara’ as an epithet for the founders or rejuvenators of Jainism, Pāli literature casts a broader net, including the six notable heretical teachers, contemporary to the Buddha. This wide-ranging application underscores the fluidity of religious and philosophical perspectives in ancient India, resonating with the central theme of my dissertation: that the *Arthapada* represents a ‘pre-institutional phase’ of the Buddhist traditions. Within Sn892’s context, ‘*tithyā*’ carries a negative undertone, prompting my translation to the masculine plural noun ‘heretical teachers.’

是異學聞坐安 自貪俱我堅盛

From heretical practices, they [claim to] have achieved liberation and purity.

While they may find [a modicum of] purity, cessation [of impurities] eludes them.

Hearkening to these heretical teachings, satisfied, they hold to them.

[Yet] their desire and ego only intensify and prevail.⁴⁴

Sn891 *Aññaṃ ito yābhivadanti dhammaṃ*

Aparaddhā suddhim akevalīno

Evaṃ hi tithyā puthuso vadanti

Sandiṭṭhirāgena hi te 'bhirattā

“Those who proclaim a teaching other than this,

⁴⁴ **Y11.19:** This verse offers a critique of prevalent heretical paths: while they may speak of ‘liberation’ and ‘purity,’ their approaches are fundamentally incomplete, often amplifying their greed and ego instead.

Y11.19a: Bapat translates the phrase ‘從異行得解淨’ as “From (從) the various practices (行), the heretics (異) [may] an understanding (解) of purity (淨) attain (得).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. Rather than treating ‘異行’ as separate entities, it could be more accurately read as a combined phrase signifying ‘heretical practices.’ Bapat’s interpretation of ‘解淨’ as ‘an understanding of purity’ seems a bit off-target; the phrase ‘得解淨’ would more aptly translate to ‘achieve liberation and purity.’ This interpretation of ‘解’ as ‘liberation’ not as ‘mere understanding’ is bolstered by the context provided by the usages of ‘行’ (practice; path) in this line and ‘盡’ (cessation of impurities) in the subsequent line. Although ‘得’ typically translates to ‘to attain,’ I have prefixed it with ‘allege to’ to offer a clearer context.

Y11.19b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘彼雖淨不至盡’ as “And though they may be pure, perfection do they not reach.” While this translation is essentially accurate, I have integrated the phrase ‘a modicum of’ to distinguish the heretical achievements from ‘盡’ (denoting complete cessation of impurities). I have opted for a slightly liberal translation of ‘不至盡’ as ‘cessation eludes them,’ whereas a direct translation may be ‘they cannot attain cessation.’

Y11.19c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘是異學聞坐安’ as “The heretics (異學) thus (是) hear (聞) of security (坐?) and peace (安?), wherein being lodged (坐安).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. While Bapat translates ‘是’ as the adverb ‘thus,’ it is seldom used as a contracted form of ‘是故’ (for this reason; thus) and should instead act as an adjective modifying ‘異學.’ Additionally, his use of ‘坐安’ twice is redundant; he should have chosen one interpretation. Although ‘坐安’ can be understood as ‘to meditate upon them in silence,’ I have chosen to convey it as ‘to firmly hold (坐) to them, feeling content (安).’

Y11.19d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘自貪俱我堅盛’ as “Themselves (自), with (俱?) greed (貪), get firmly (堅) attached to (盛?) what they have believed in (我?).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. Bapat’s translation of ‘盛’ as ‘attached to’ lacks precision; a more suitable meaning would be ‘to intensify’ or ‘flourish.’ Similarly, his translation of ‘我’ as ‘what they have believed in’ is a significant deviation; in this context, it should signify ‘ego.’

Compromise the purity and are far from perfection.”

In this way, heretical teachers indeed preach diversely,

For they are aroused by the passion for their own views.⁴⁵

11.20 自己盛堅防貪 有何癡爲彼說

雖教彼法未淨 生計度自高妙

[While] their egos swell and they fiercely guard their desires,

How can they claim that others are fools?

Though they instruct others, [their] teaching remains impure.

[Yet, they boast] their livelihood and path as being, from the onset, the loftiest and most

sublime.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ **Sn891:** This verse underscores the exclusivist tendencies of heretical teachers, stemming from their strong attachment to their own views. While ‘*akevalina*’ (imperfect) in Sn891b resonates with ‘不至盡’ (not attaining complete cessation) in Y11.19b, each verse highlights different facets of the heretical teachings.

⁴⁶ **Y11.20:** This verse delves further into the critique of ascetics dominated by arrogance and desire.

Y11.20a: Bapat translates the phrase ‘自己盛堅防貪’ as “Himself (自己) firmly (堅?) attached, with greed (貪), to his beliefs all guarded (防).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. His interpretation misses the mark, neglecting the significance of ‘盛’ (to flourish) and introducing the phrase ‘his beliefs,’ which is absent in the original text. This translation seems to piece characters together without adhering to the natural Chinese syntax. A more fitting interpretation would be, “their egos (自己) swell (盛) and they fiercely (堅) guard (防) their desires (貪).”

Y11.20c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘雖教彼法未淨’ as “And although the Law doth he preach, of purity he is innocent.” This rendition diverges from the inherent meaning. ‘法未淨’ directly translates to “their teachings are not yet pure.” Bapat’s reading of ‘未’ (not yet) as ‘innocent’ or ‘not guilty’ strays from the contextual understanding.

Y11.20d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘生計度自高妙’ as “Counts (計) himself (自?), with great esteem (妙?), perched (生?) high up (高) [in the air].” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation misrepresents the original content, disregards the proper syntax, and introduces a misinterpretation of the individual characters. A more apt translation would be “[they perceive] their livelihood (生計) and path (度) as being, from the onset (自), the loftiest (高) and most sublime (妙).” To enhance the context, I prefaced it with ‘Yet, they boast.’ The character ‘自’ typically translates to ‘self,’ ‘from,’ or ‘automatically,’ but in some classical Chinese texts, it can also signify ‘beginning’ in a philosophical context. This is supported by the entry for this character in the CCAMC, which lists ‘自: 始; 开头 [beginning]’ for its usage in phrases like “故法者, 王之本也; 刑者, 爱之自也” from *Han Feizi*. (底本: 四部叢刊初編 本 韓非子: 心度 p.117). Here, it is poetically used to indicate ‘the start,’ as in “Therefore, laws

Sn893 *Sakāyane cāpi daḥhaṃ vadāno*

Kam ettha bālo ti paraṃ daheyya

Sayam eva so medhakaṃ āvaheyya

Paraṃ vadaṃ bālam asuddhidhammaṃ

While staunchly proclaiming their own paths,

What opponent here could they label as a fool?

Indeed, they themselves stir up strife,

Accusing opponents of [their] foolish and tainted teaching.⁴⁷

11.21 諦住釋自在作 雖上世亦有亂

棄一切所作念 妙不作有所作

The truths they cling to and interpret are invented at their own whim.

Even [those rooted in] deep antiquity also stir discord.

[One should] discard all the concepts they have constructed.

The sublime [Truth] is what is created without being fabricated.⁴⁸

are the foundation of kingship; punishments are where [king's] love [for his people] begins.” In Y11.20d, the translation of ‘自’ as ‘from the onset’ captures this notion of an initial or foundational state.

⁴⁷ **Sn893:** For clearer understanding, I have rendered ‘para’ (other) in lines b and d as ‘opponent.’

⁴⁸ **Y11.21:** While this verse largely aligns with Sn894, Y11.21d notably departs from Sn894d. Its final line evokes the Taoist concept of ‘無爲’ (non-action). This is expanded upon in the ‘Knowledge Rambling in the North’ (知北遊) section of *Zhuangzi*’s (莊子) second chapter: “天地有大美而不言，四時有明法而不議，萬物有成理而不說。聖人者，原天地之美而達萬物之理。是故至人無為，大聖不作，觀於天地之謂也。” This can be translated to: “Heaven and earth showcase immense beauty without speaking; the four seasons proceed with discernible patterns without discussion; all creatures follow innate principles without vocalizing them. The sage, perceiving the beauty inherent in heaven and earth, understands the principles governing all beings. Thus, the most

Sn894 *Vinicchaye thatvā sayam pamāya*

Uddham so lokasmiṃ vivādam eti

Hitvāna sabbāni vinicchayāni

Na medhakaṃ kurute jantu loke ti

Relying on [their own] judgment, assessing by their own [standards],

They [venture] further, engaging in disputes in the world.

[However, by] abandoning all such judgments,

A person does not cause any trouble in the world.

佛說是義足經竟。比丘悉歡喜

When the Buddha had expounded this [*sūtra* in] the *Yizujing*, all the *bhikṣus* rejoiced.

enlightened person embodies **non-action**, and the great sage acts without intentional doing, mirroring the way of heaven and earth.”

Y11.21a: Bapat translates the phrase ‘諦住釋自在作’ as “Grounded in truths that are created from his own self.” While his translation captures the essence of the original, it omits the specific meanings of ‘釋’ (interpret; explain) and the nuance inherent in ‘自在’ (at one’s whim). Though Bapat uses ‘grounded’ to convey the sense of ‘住,’ I have chosen to use its derivative meaning ‘to cling to.’

Y11.21b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘雖上世亦有亂’ as “In this world, [over arguments] he doth get restless.” He overlooks the meaning of ‘雖’ (although) and misrepresents ‘上世,’ which refers to ‘great antiquity’ or ‘ancient times.’ The phrase better translates as “even if some truths may have been transmitted from time immemorial, they can cause discord.”

Y11.21c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘棄一切所作念’ as “His conclusions all, if he doth abandon and relinquish.” This interpretation does not align closely with the original text. Firstly, Bapat seems to use both ‘abandon’ and ‘relinquish’ to convey the single term ‘棄’. Furthermore, there is no character in the original phrase that directly translates to ‘conclusion.’ A more accurate rendering of ‘所作念’ would be ‘the thoughts that have been formulated.’

Y11.21d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘妙不作有所作’ as “Well and good! (妙) No more creations (不作) of his fancy (所作?) will he have (有) any.” [Parentheses added for analysis]. While the phrase is indeed intricate, a closer look at its structure indicates that ‘妙’ (the profound or sublime one) can function as the subject for the verb ‘不作’ (does not fabricate), and ‘所作’ (that which is manifested or created) can be the object of the verb ‘有’ (to have or exist).

法觀梵志經 第十二

Discourse 12: Brahmin Faguan (*Aṭṭhakavagga.13*)¹

聞如是。佛在釋國迦維羅衛樹下。與五百比丘俱。皆應真所作已具。已下重擔。以義自證。會胎生盡。

Thus I heard. The Buddha was once dwelling in a forest [near] the city of Kapilavastu in the Śākya kingdom, accompanied by five hundred *bhikkhus*, all of whom were arhats: they had fulfilled their spiritual duties, relinquished their heavy burdens, realized themselves through the truth, and had put an end to rebirth in another womb.²

¹ This twelfth discourse of the *Yizujing* corresponds to the *Mahāvīyūhasutta* (Sn IV-13) of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*.

法觀梵志經 第十二 (K, T, Z) = 法觀梵志 第十二卷 (Q1) = 法觀梵志 第十二 (P, J, N, Q2): For an in-depth discussion of the recurring exclusion of ‘經’ (*sūtra*) and the insertion of ‘卷’ (chapter) in the titles of alternative versions documented in the Z863 apparatus, refer to Y1.fn.3.

法觀: While Bapat proposes the Indic name as ‘Dharma-darśi,’ he employs the Pinyin pronunciation ‘Fa-Kuan’ when referencing this name within the *sūtra*’s narrative. In Pāli, the name ‘Dhammadassī’ represents two distinct individuals: the fifteenth of the twenty-four Buddhas and an author of Pāli grammar. As I could not locate this specific name as a brahmin in the Pāli literature, I have chosen to retain the Chinese rendering ‘Faguan’.

² 所作已具: This phrase can be translated as ‘having already (已) accomplished (具) what (所) needed to be done (作).’

已下重擔: In this context, ‘下’ functions as a verb, meaning ‘to set down’ or ‘to lay aside.’

以義自證: Bapat’s translation of the phrase as ‘who had attained (證?) within them (自) their objects (義?)’ does not capture the original nuance. The omission of the instrumental preposition ‘以’ (by means of) significantly alters the meaning. Additionally, ‘證’ denotes ‘to verify’ or ‘to realize,’ rather than merely ‘to attain.’ Moreover, ‘義’ should contextually be interpreted as ‘principle’ or ‘truth,’ rather than as ‘objects.’ I have rendered ‘自證’ as ‘to realize (證) themselves (自).’ Alternatively, this term can be interpreted as ‘to self-validate [their spiritual status],’ which emphasizes the aspect of personal verification or confirmation of one’s spiritual insights or attainments.

會胎生盡: This phrase can be understood as ‘ceasing (盡) to be conceived (會) in a womb (胎) and to undergo rebirth (生).’

爾時十方天地神妙天。亦來禮佛。欲見尊德及比丘僧。是時第七天四天王相謂言。諸學人寧知。佛在釋國迦維羅衛樹下。從五百真人。復十方天地神妙天悉往禮欲見尊威神及比丘。我曹今何不往見其威神。

At that time, exquisite divinities from the ten directions, both terrestrial and celestial, arrived at the Buddha's residence to pay respects to him.³ They sought to behold the Blessed One and the *Bhikṣusamgha*. Meanwhile, the Four Heavenly Kings from the Seventh Heaven conversed amongst themselves, asking,⁴ “Are all practitioners aware that the Buddha dwells in a forest near the city of Kapilavastu in the Śākya kingdom, and is accompanied by five hundred arhats? Do they know that celestial and terrestrial beings of exquisite nature from all the Ten Directions have gathered here, offering their respect and eager to witness the majestic power of the Blessed One and the *bhikṣus*? Why then shouldn't we too make our way there to witness his magnificent presence?

四天王即從第七天飛下。譬如壯士屈伸臂頃。來到佛邊。去尊不遠。便俱往禮佛及比丘僧。各就座。

³ 十方: The ‘ten (十) directions (方)’ refer to the eight points of the compass along with ‘zenith’ and ‘nadir,’ representing three-dimensional space. This phrase is often used to symbolically represent the entire universe or all-encompassing reality.

⁴ 第七天四天王: I interpret ‘第七天’ as referring to the location ‘Seventh Heaven’ and ‘四天王’ as denoting the subjects ‘Four Heavenly Kings.’ This reading is consistent with the first sentence from the next paragraph ‘四天王即從第七天飛下,’ which means ‘The Four Heavenly Kings descended from the Seventh Heaven.’ This alignment between the phrases supports the interpretation of ‘第七天’ as a specific celestial realm and ‘四天王’ as celestial beings.

Bapat omits the narrative segment from ‘諸學人寧知’ (are all practitioners aware that...) to ‘各就座’ (each took their respective seats) in the subsequent paragraph, including verses Y12.1–4. He considers this section nearly identical to the parallel narrative in Y11 and its verses Y11.1–4.

The Four Heavenly Kings then and there descended from the Seventh Heaven, as swiftly as a robust individual can flex and extend their arm. Upon reaching the vicinity of the Buddha's residence, they approached and offered their respects to both the Buddha and the *Bhikṣusamṃgha*. [Afterwards,] they each took their respective seats.

一梵天就座。便說偈言

The First Brahma God settled into his seat and promptly spoke in verse:

12.1 今大會於樹間 來見尊皆神天

今我來亦聽法 願復見無勝衆

Today, in this grand gathering amidst the trees,

All celestial deities converge to witness the Blessed One.

Having arrived myself now, I listen to the Dharma,

Wishing once more to gaze upon this invincible assembly.⁵

二梵天就座便說偈言

The Second Brahmā God took his seat and immediately spoke in verse:

⁵ **Y12.1:** This verse mirrors Y11.1 with two distinct variations: ‘欲’ (yearn for) from Y11.1c is replaced by ‘亦’ (and) in Y12.1c, and ‘極’ (extreme) from Y11.1d is replaced by ‘勝’ (to defeat) in Y12.1d. Nonetheless, these alterations are minor. For further details and annotations, please see the footnote associated with Y11.1.

聽法 = 聽汝 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The alternative phrase to Y12.1c can translate to “Having arrived myself now, I listen to you.”

12.2 在是學當制意 直覺行知身正

如馭者善持轡 護眼根行覺意

In this [gathering, all] practitioners harness their minds.

They calibrate their discipline [towards] awakening, adept at rectifying themselves.

Just like a horse-rider who is skilled in handling the reins,

They guard their visual senses and cultivate their aspiration for enlightenment.⁶

三梵天就座便說偈言

The Third Brahmā God took his seat and then spoke in verse:

12.3 力斷七拔邪連 意著止如鐵根

捨世觀淨無垢 黠根明意服軟

[We] have briskly descended from the Seventh [Heaven] to defeat the evil army.

The minds [in this gathering] display tranquility, much like an iron foundation.

Renouncing the worldly, they perceive unblemished purity;

Their discerning eyes [reveal] a lucid mind well-disciplined and docile.⁷

⁶ **Y12.2:** Similarly to Y12.1, this verse corresponds closely to Y11.2, with three notable changes: ‘御’ (charioteer) and ‘兩’ (both) in Y11.2c are substituted with ‘馭’ (horse-rider) and ‘持’ (to maintain) in Y12.2c. Again, these differences remain minor. For further details and annotations, please see the footnote associated with Y11.2.

Y12.2b: 直覺行 = 眞覺行 (S, Y, M) = 真覺行 (P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The characters ‘眞’ and ‘真’ are orthographic variants with the same meaning, ‘true’ or ‘truth.’ Consequently, the phrase ‘眞覺行/真覺行’ translates to ‘to practice towards true awakening.’

⁷ **Y12.3:** Similarly to Y12.1 and Y12.2, this verse corresponds closely to Y11.3, with three notable changes: ‘伏’ (to subdue) from Y11.3a is replaced by ‘拔’ (to uproot) in Y12.3a; ‘慧’ (wise) and ‘而攝’ (and all-embracing) in Y11.3d are substituted with ‘黠’ (wise) and ‘服軟’ (disciplined and docile) in Y12.3d. Again, these differences remain minor. For further details and annotations, please see the footnote associated with Y11.3.

四梵天就座便說偈言

The Fourth Brahmā God settled into his seat and then recited this verse:

12.4 有是身歸明尊 終不生到邪冥

捨人形轉後尊 受天身稍離患

Those who take refuge with their lives in the luminous Blessed One,

Shall never be reborn in a baleful postmortem [destiny].

Upon shedding their human form, they will be revered in their next [life].

Taking a divine form, they will reduce or cast aside their affliction.⁸

是時座中。有梵志名法觀。亦在大眾中因緣所計。見於泥洹脫者有支體。以故生意疑信因緣。

At that moment, within the assembly, there was a brahmin named Faguan.⁹ Amidst the large gathering, he conjectured that even in the state of [final] Nirvāṇa, a liberated individual retains

⁸ **Y12.4:** Similarly to Y12.1, Y12.2, and Y12.3, this verse corresponds closely to Y11.4, with three notable changes: ‘以’ (by means of) from Y11.4a is replaced by ‘是’ (this) in Y12.4a; ‘後轉生’ (transition to the next life later) in Y11.4c are substituted with ‘轉後尊’ (to be revered in the next life) in Y12.4c. Again, these differences remain minor. For further details and annotations, please see the footnote associated with Y11.4.

Y12.4a, 有是身歸明尊 = 因是身歸明尊 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The phrase ‘有是身’ is translated as ‘[as long as] I possess this body,’ whereas the variant ‘因是身’ might be rendered ‘[as long as] I depend on this body.’ Although the wording differs, both expressions convey the same underlying meaning: a commitment to take refuge in the Buddha for the duration of one’s life.

⁹ 法觀: For this individual’s name, I have preserved the Pinyin transcription ‘Faguan.’ Its Sanskrit back-translation is ‘Dharmadarśī,’ and in Pāli, it is rendered as ‘Dhammadassī.’ This name is infrequently found in Pāli

their body with its limbs.¹⁰ This conviction gave rise to his doubts about the veracity of causality.¹¹

佛知法觀梵志所生疑。是時便作一佛。端正形類無比。見者悉喜。有三十二大人相。金色復有光。衣法大衣。亦如上說。便向佛叉手。以偈歎言

The Buddha perceived the doubt that had arisen in the mind of the brahmin Faguan. In response, he instantly manifested another buddha, who was distinguished and unparalleled in form.¹² All who witnessed this were filled with joy. [This figure] possessed the thirty-two marks of a great man, radiated with a golden hue, donned an outer robe representing the Dharma, and truly

literature, with the *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names* listing only two individuals: the fifteenth of the twenty-four Buddhas and a monk noted for his contributions to Pāli grammar. Given that the brahmin Faguan in this text is unrelated to these two figures, I have opted not to translate his name, instead using its Pinyin form. Contrarily, Bapat utilizes both the Pinyin and the back-translated versions.

¹⁰ 因緣所計 見: This phrase translates directly as ‘caused (因緣) by [his own] reasoning (所計), he believed (見).’ For simplicity, I have rendered this as ‘he conjectured.’

於泥洹脫者: This phrase should be divided as ‘於泥洹’ (in Nirvāṇa) and ‘脫者’ (a liberated individual).

脫者有支體 = 脫有者肢體 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The term ‘支’ typically means ‘branch,’ which can encompass limbs, whereas ‘肢’ explicitly refers to limbs. Therefore, in this context, ‘支體’ and ‘肢體’ are functionally equivalent. The alternative reading ‘脫有者’ implies ‘an individual (者) liberated (脫) from their physical form (有),’ corresponding with my use of ‘final’ in ‘in the [final] Nirvāṇa.’ In Buddhist teachings, the final Nirvāṇa signifies the physical passing of the liberated individual. Consequently, the overall meaning of the narrative is maintained.

Bapat renders ‘於泥洹脫者有支體’ as “what (者) attains deliverance (脫) in (於) Nirvāṇa (泥洹) was [only] the [physical] body (體) with limbs (支).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation overlooks the verb ‘有’ (to possess) and does not align with the intended context. Additionally, the concept of the body alone achieving liberation is not typically represented, even among heretical views in Buddhist literature.

¹¹ 以故生意疑信因緣: Bapat translates this sentence as “he was wavering in his mind with regard to this.” However, this translation does not capture the full extent of the original text. The term ‘以故’ (for [this] reason) refers to Faguan’s earlier conjecture; ‘生意疑’ should be translated as ‘doubt arose in his mind’; and ‘信因緣’ more accurately translates to ‘faith in the doctrine of causality’ or ‘belief in the veracity of causality.’ In this instance, ‘因緣’ is used as a noun meaning ‘causality.’ Although it could be literally translated as ‘causes and conditions,’ I have chosen ‘causality’ for its clarity and brevity. This usage contrasts with its function as a verb phrase ‘caused by’ in the preceding sentence.

¹² 是時: To enhance the fluidity of the translation, I have interpreted this phrase as ‘in response,’ which is a somewhat liberal rendition of its original meaning, ‘at that time.’

mirrored the description given so far.¹³ With hands clasped together [in reverence], [this conjured buddha] immediately praised the Buddha in verse.

12.5 如因緣見有言 如已取悉說善

一切彼我亦輕 亦或致在善緣

Following causal [reasoning, one may] form a view [ready] to be expressed.

Based on preconceived [notions, they claim] everything is eloquently articulated.

[Thus, they may] belittle all others [including] us;

Or perhaps, they impart [teachings when] in favorable circumstances.¹⁴

¹³ 衣法大衣: In this context, the initial ‘衣’ functions as a verb meaning ‘to be clothed,’ while the latter is a noun, ‘robe.’ Here, ‘法大衣’ (the great Dharmic robe) appears to refer to the monks’ outer robe, the Saṃghāti. According to the Vinaya, a monk’s attire typically includes three types of robes (三衣; trīṇi cīvarāṇi, also known as kāṣāya): the 安陀會 (antarvāsa or antaravāsaka), covering the lower body; the 鬱多羅僧 (uttarāsaṅga), draping the upper body; and the 僧伽梨 (Saṃghāti), the outermost garment worn outside the dwelling.

亦如上說: This phrase is aptly translated as ‘indeed (亦), [the figure was] exactly as (如) described (說) so far (上).’ This serves to conclude the description, underscoring the accuracy and fidelity of the portrayal.

¹⁴ Y12.5: This verse appears to critique Brahmin Faguan from the perspective of the manifested buddha. In lines a and b, I have interpreted the character ‘如’ to mean ‘following,’ with an added nuance of ‘based on’ in line b. The ambiguities present in lines c and d pose significant interpretative challenges, necessitating a nuanced approach to translation. These lines highlight problematic behaviors, specifically the dismissal of others, including both the historical and the conjured Buddhas, and the attempt to proselytize their own beliefs.

Y12.5a: Bapat renders ‘如因緣見有言’ as “according to (如) and because of (因緣) their views (見), the declarations (言) the [heretics] make (有?).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. His interpretation of ‘因緣’ as an additional preposition alongside ‘如’ is less convincing. In the context of a critique directed at Faguan, ‘因緣’ likely refers to Faguan’s conjecture. In my translation, I have rendered this term as ‘causal [reasoning].’

Y12.5b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘悉說善’ as “they all (悉) say (說):—‘This is the best (善).’” [Parentheses are added for analysis]. While this offers one perspective, my rendition interprets it as their claim, “everything (悉) is eloquently (善) articulated (說).”

善 = 喜 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The variant phrase ‘悉說喜’ might be translated as “everything is articulated with enthusiasm.

Y12.5c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘一切彼我亦輕’ as “All (一切) such (彼?) evoke from me (我) nothing but (亦) contempt (輕).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation seems to stretch the original’s intent. Considering the context provided in lines a and b, which touch upon the ‘formation of views’ and ‘their assertions,’ it is unlikely that the views themselves are the subject of contempt. Line c likely points to a behavior or attitude, specifically the tendency to ‘belittle others.’ Furthermore, Bapat’s inclusion of ‘evoke from’ is not present in the

Sn895 *Ye kec' ime diṭṭhi paribbasānā*

Q *Idam eva saccan' ti vivādiyanti*

Sabbe va te nindam anvānāyanti

Atho pasamsam pi labhanti tattha

Abiding by a dogma, [when] anyone of these [people]

Dispute, [saying,] “Only this is the truth,”

Do they all incur blame,

Or, on the contrary, gain praise thereby?¹⁵

12.6 少自知有慚羞 諍變本說兩果

見如是捨變本 願觀安無變處

Recognizing the triviality of their [views], they [ought to] feel shame.

source text. My reading suggests, “They may belittle (輕) all others (一切彼) including us (我亦).” Here, ‘我’ can also be understood in a plural sense, referring to both the manifested buddha and the Buddha.

Y12.5d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘亦或致在善緣’ as “Though (亦?) they may (或) have reason (致?) to be well-acclaimed (在善緣?).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation seems off-mark, particularly in his reading of the characters ‘亦’ (also; either) and ‘致’ (to cause; send). While he might have understood ‘致’ as shorthand for ‘理致’ (rationale; underlying principle), such a reading may not be supported by standard Chinese dictionaries. Additionally, his interpretation of ‘在善緣’ seems stretched. The term ‘緣’ typically refers to ‘conditions’ or ‘circumstances,’ suggesting the phrase might better be translated as ‘placed in (在) good (善) conditions (緣).’

¹⁵ **Sn895:** This verse employs correlative phrases: ‘*ye keci ime*’ (whoever these) in line a, and ‘*sabbe te*’ (they all) in line c. For enhanced readability, I have translated this verse using ‘[when] anyone of these [people] ... they all.’

Even though there is not an explicit interrogative term present, the *Paramatthajotikā II* interprets this verse as a question. This commentarial interpretation is adopted by Jayawickrama, Norman, and Bodhi. Fronsdal, in contrast, adheres strictly to the grammar and views it as the Buddha’s statement. I lean towards the commentarial understanding to harmonize this Pāli verse with the narrative context provided by its Chinese counterpart.

Quarrels and disputations, [I] assert, yield two outcomes.

Realizing this, one should let go of the root of contention,

Seeking to find the tranquility untouched by dispute.¹⁶

Sn896 *Appaṃ hi etaṃ na alaṃ samāya*

Duve vivādassa phalāni brūmi

Etaṃ pi disvā na vivādiyetha

Khemābhipassaṃ avivādabhūmiṃ

This is indeed trifling, not conducive to peace.

I declare that dispute yields two outcomes.

Having perceived this, one should avoid contention,

Recognizing that the secure peace lies in ground that is free of dispute.¹⁷

¹⁶ **Y12.6:** On a line-by-line basis, this verse closely mirrors its Pāli counterpart, Sn896.

The character ‘變’ appears three times in this verse, each instance suggesting an ‘unexpected turn of events.’ In line b, ‘諍變本’ is translated as ‘disputations... in nature,’ a simplification of ‘events of disputation... in nature’; in line c, ‘捨變本’ is rendered as ‘to let go of the root of contentions,’ with ‘變’ treated as a shorthand for ‘諍變’; and in line d, ‘無變處’ is interpreted as ‘the place/state of no disputation,’ complementing ‘安’ (tranquility). In these lines, ‘本’ is contextually interpreted: adverbially as ‘in nature’ in line b, and nominally as ‘the root’ in line c.

Y12.6a: Bapat translates the phrase ‘少自知有慚羞’ as “Little (少) is this for one’s (自) knowledge (知), creating (有) nothing but discredit (慚羞?).” [Parentheses are added for analysis]. This interpretation seems misaligned with the original. The term ‘慚羞’ can be directly translated as ‘shame and disgrace,’ making his choice of ‘discredit’ a departure from the source text.

Y12.6b: The term ‘兩果’ (two outcomes) in this verse, as well as in the broader context of the sūtra, remains ambiguous. A similar ambiguity is found with its counterpart ‘*duve phalāni*’ (two results) in Sn896b. The *Paramatthajotikā II* suggests that it may denote ‘blame and praise’ or ‘victory and defeat.’ Bapat interprets it as ‘praise and censure.’

¹⁷ **Sn896:** This verse presents ambiguities, especially concerning the reference of ‘*etaṃ*’ (this) in line a and the meaning of ‘*duve phalāni*’ (two outcomes) in line b. The Chinese counterpart does not provide explicit clarity either. The *Paramatthajotikā II* suggests that ‘*etaṃ*’ alludes to ‘*paṣaṃsā*’ (praise) from the preceding verse, Sn895. Consequently, ‘*duve phalāni*’ could indicate ‘praise and blame.’

12.7 一切平亦如地 是未嘗當見等

本不等從何同 見聞說莫作變

All [truths] are [inherently] level, just as the ground is.

Such [disputants] have yet to realize the innate equality of [all] views.

[If their views] are intrinsically unequal, how can they be aligned [with the Truth]?

Upon hearing [others'] expressed views, one should refrain from contention.¹⁸

Sn897 *Yā kāc' imā sammutiyo puthujjā*

Q *Sabbā va etā na upeti vidvā*

Anūpayo so upayaṃ kim eyya

Diṭṭhe sute khantim akubbamāno

Whatever conventional opinions arise from the masses,

The wise do not engage in any of them.

Why would an unattached person get involved in attachment,

¹⁸ **Y12.7:** This verse features various ambiguous nouns and pronouns, whose references become clearer upon careful identification. It implies that all distinct 'truths' are fundamentally equivalent to the singular, ultimate 'Truth.' Consequently, when faced with a multitude of perspectives, one should refrain from engaging in disputes. The relationship between 'truths' and the 'Truth' can be understood through the parable of the blind men and the elephant, found in the *Tiṭṭha Sutta* (*Udāna* VI.4). While the blind men touching the elephant describe it as a 'pillar,' a 'water jar,' an 'iron rod,' etc., they are, in fact, describing different aspects of the same elephant. Therefore, their 'views,' though seemingly divergent, are essentially about the singular Truth (the elephant). In my translation, I have inserted words in brackets to clarify and contextualize the verse.

Bapat translates this verse as "All (一切) the commonalities that are plane (平) like (如) the earth (地)—These (是) he doth never (未) condescend to (嘗?) view (見) as plane (等); When [things], originally (本), are not (不) equal (等), how (從何) can they be the same (同)? About heresies (見), hearsays (聞) and declarations (說) do ye never (莫) dispute (作變)." [Parentheses are added for analysis]. While he omits a few characters such as '亦' in line a and '當' in line b, his translation overall captures the sequence of most characters. However, the overall message appears obscured without identifying their correct references. His interpretation of '嘗' as 'to condescend to' is not in alignment with its usual meaning. I have rendered it as 'to realize' deriving from its primary meaning 'to taste.'

[While they] do not form any desire amidst beliefs and traditions?¹⁹

12.8 猗著是衆可惡 可見聞亦所念

雨出淨誰爲明 愛未除身復身

People may form resentments due to the attachment to these—

To appealing beliefs, traditions, or rationales.

[When] preaching surpasses purity, who [then can] be awakened?

Without overcoming lust yet, [they are awaiting] repeated rebirths.²⁰

¹⁹ **Sn897:** This verse features correlative phrases with ‘*yā kāci imā*’ (whatever these) in line a and ‘*sabbā etā*’ (they all) in line b. This structure mirrors Sn895, which employs similar correlative phrases: ‘*ye keci ime*’ (whoever these) and ‘*sabbe te*’ (they all).

Given the presence of the interrogative adverb ‘*kim*’ (why) in Sn897 and the parallelism between Sn895 and Sn897, there is strong support for interpreting Sn895 as a question, a viewpoint also posited by the commentaries on the *Aṭṭhakavagga*. For more information, see fn.10.

I interpret ‘*ditthe sute*’ as “amidst beliefs and traditions” instead of prevailing rendering ‘in what is seen and heard.’ For my rationale for this, refer to Y2. fn.30; Y4. fn.8, 12, 13.

²⁰ **Y12.8a:** In this line, the character ‘惡’ is likely the verb ‘to hate’ rather than an adjective or noun referring to ‘evil.’ A similar usage can be observed in the *Li Ren* 理仁 chapter, section 3 of the *Analects* 論語 where it says: 子曰, “唯仁者 能好人 能惡人” (The master said, “Only a person of [true] virtue can love or hate others”).

Bapat’s translation interprets ‘惡’ as ‘evil’ and translates ‘猗著是衆可惡’ as “To attachment (著) clinging (猗?), he doth produce all (衆) evil (惡), and ...” This rendering omits the characters ‘是’ and ‘可,’ and may misconstrue the meaning of ‘猗,’ which can either mean ‘elegant’ or be synonymous with ‘倚’ (to rely on). His interpretation of ‘衆...惡’ as ‘all evil’ seems less probable given the interposition of ‘可’ in the phrase. I have translated this phrase as “People (衆) may (可) resent (惡) [others] due to (倚) the attachment (著) to these (是).”

猗 = 倚 (S, Y, M): In this context, both characters seem to denote the idea of ‘relying on.’

Y12.8b: I interpret this line as an elaboration on the term ‘是’ (these) from the preceding line. The character ‘可’ is likely a shorthand for ‘可意’ (appealing to one’s mind) or ‘可愛’ (the desirable). For similar usages, refer to Y2. fn.19. I have chosen to translate ‘見,’ ‘聞,’ and ‘所念’ as ‘beliefs,’ ‘oral traditions,’ and ‘reasoned thoughts,’ respectively, alluding to the potential objects of attachment in ancient Indian religiosity. Bapat’s rendition of this phrase as “Always thinks of heresies and hearsays [and further says]” seems to lack contextual grounding and misses the mark.”

Y12.8c: The line ‘雨出淨誰爲明’ presents interpretative challenges. Here, ‘雨’ (rain), unusually used, is best interpreted metaphorically as ‘words of [religious] teaching that nurtures all beings.’ The CCAMC supports this interpretation, citing an example from the *Memorial to Emperor Jianwen of Liang on the Great Law* (梁簡文帝上大法頌表): 澤雨無偏, 心田受潤. This translates to “The nourishing rain [from the Emperor] is unbiased, and the field of the [people’s] heart is moistened.” (CCAMC, s.v. 雨, retrieved April 24, 2024; Example source: 藝文類聚: 寺碑, chapter 32). This usage likely draws on the Buddhist concept of ‘法雨’ (the rain of Dharma), where ‘雨’

Sn901 *Tapūpanissāya jigucchitaṃ vā*

Atha vā pi diṭṭhaṃ va suttaṃ mutaṃ vā

Uddhamasārā suddhim anuttuṇanti

Avītataṇhāse bhavābhavesu

Depending on austerity—ritualistic obsessions,

Or on beliefs, traditions, or rationales,

Those who pursue higher [rebirths] proclaim purity,

Without being free from craving for various types of existence.²¹

12.9 以戒攝所犯淨 行諦祥已具住

於是寧經至淨 可恐世在善說

symbolizes the dissemination of Buddhist teachings. The subsequent character ‘出,’ typically meaning ‘to come out,’ is possibly used here to mean ‘to surpass’ (Karashima, 2010: 84). Thus, ‘兩出淨’ can be understood as “[When] preaching surpasses purity,” highlighting a discrepancy between speech and practice.

兩 = 兩 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Bapat favors this variant version and renders ‘兩出淨誰為明’ as “Pure (淨) and away (出) from these two (兩), who (誰) else doth know (為明)?” [Parentheses added for analysis]. Bapat seems to interpret ‘兩’ as referring to the ‘two outcomes’ (兩果) mentioned in Y12.6b. While I agree with his interpretation of ‘兩,’ I propose a different, more contextually appropriate translation of the variant phrase: “Both praise and blame are irrelevant to purity; who, then, can truly be enlightened?”

²¹ **Sn901a:** The term ‘jigucchita’ is a past participle of ‘jugucchati,’ a Pāli form of the Sanskrit ‘jugupsate’ (to seek to defend oneself). This Sanskrit term is a desiderative form conjugated from the root √gup (to defend, preserve). I interpret ‘jigucchita’ as elucidating the term ‘tapa’ (austerity, ascetic penance) and have translated it as ‘religious obsessions’ to align with the context.

Sn901b: For a detailed explanation of my translation of ‘diṭṭha suta muta’ as ‘beliefs, oral traditions, and rationales,’ refer to Y4. fn.13.

Sn901c: The term ‘uddhamasara’ (rushing upwards) presents an interpretative challenge. While Alsdorf, drawing from the *Mahāniddesa*’s gloss, suggests it pertains to ‘those who adhere to the deterministic doctrine where *saṃsāra* ceases automatically, unaffected by karma’ (as cited in Norman 2001: 369), this reading may stretch beyond the immediate context. Considering the surrounding verses, it seems more likely that ‘uddhamasara’ refers to devout practitioners striving for higher rebirths.

Through precepts, they safeguard [their] purity from transgressions.

[They claim,] “Conform to [this] truth, then the bliss achieved will last [forever].”

“In this tranquility, [you could] reach all the way to the supreme purity.”

“In this dreadful world, reside within this well-expounded teaching!”²²

Sn898 *Sīluttamā saññāmenāhu suddhiṃ*

Vataṃ samādāya upaṭṭhitāse

Idh’ eva sikkhema ath’ assa suddhiṃ

Bhavūpanītā kusalā vadānā

[Proponents of] precepts as the pinnacle claim purity is [attained] through self-restraint.

Undertaking [their] vows, they adhere [to them].

[They declare], “It is here alone that we should train to achieve purity.”

Professing to be experts, they find themselves entangled in [further] existence.²³

²² **Y12.9:** This verse delves into the assertions of individuals seeking purity through adherence to precepts. This context aligns with that of its Pāli parallel Sn898.

Y12.9b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘行諦祥已具住’ as “By the practice (行) of Truth (諦), of felicity (祥) he becomes possessed (具).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. Notably, this interpretation omits ‘住’ which signifies ‘to dwell’ or ‘to last long.’ Additionally, considering the context, where the emphasis is on the claims of those adhering to various precepts, Bapat’s capitalization of ‘Truth’ seems inappropriate. Instead, it would be more fitting to suggest that the term references the ‘diverse truths’ proclaimed by various ascetics.

Y12.9c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘於是寧經至淨’ as “By (於是?) rather (寧?) following his course (經?), the purity (淨) he would attain (至).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation appears off-target. In this context, ‘寧’ is more aptly translated as a noun ‘peace’ or ‘tranquility,’ rather than as an interrogative adverb ‘how’ or the adverb ‘rather.’ Additionally, ‘經’ should be seen as a verb meaning ‘to pass through,’ with ‘至’ understood as an adjective denoting ‘supreme.’

Y12.9d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘可恐世在善說’ as “And of this dreadful world, he has a good word to say.” This translation overlooks the word ‘在,’ which would be more appropriately translated as ‘to reside’ or ‘to dwell.’ Hence, this line also seems to encapsulate the proclamations of certain misdirected ascetics.

²³ **Sn898cd:** I have taken some liberties in translating these lines. A more literal translation might read: “‘We should train only here, then there would be purity.’ Saying themselves to be experts, they are led to [further] existence.”

12.10 已離諦更求行 悉從罪因緣受

亦如説力求淨 自義失生死苦

Having departed from the Truth, they still seek [other] practices.

Engaging in blameworthy actions, all [of them] experience [*samsāra* due to] causation.

Indeed, they strive for purity, much like [those previously] mentioned.

[Yet,] having lost the Truth, they experience for themselves the suffering of birth and death.²⁴

Sn899 *Sace cuto sīlavatāto hoti*

Sa vedhati kammaṃ virādhavitvā

Sa jappati patthayatīdha suddhiṃ

Satthā va hīno pavasaṃ gharamhā

If they stray from morality and religious observances,

They tremble [thinking that] they have failed in [their] duty.

They yearn and long for purity here,

²⁴ **Y12.10a:** Bapat translates ‘行’ as ‘rituals,’ possibly trying to mirror the term ‘*sīlavata*’ (precepts and religious observances) found in the corresponding Pāli verse (Sn899a). I have chosen a simpler rendition: ‘practices.’

Y12.10b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘悉從罪因緣受’ as “He accepts (受) all (悉) these proceeding (因緣?) from the mis-steps (罪) he has taken (從).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. His translation seems to reshuffle the Chinese word order to better align with the Pāli parallel. His interpretation of ‘因緣’ as ‘proceeding’ is ambiguous and stretches its intended meaning. The term more directly translates to ‘causes and conditions’ and alludes to the concept of causality.

Y12.10d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘自義失生死苦’ as “He is fallen from his aim and mere suffering doth he meet.” However, this overlooks the specific term ‘生死,’ (birth and death) which pinpoints the nature of the suffering.

Like one who is left behind by a caravan while traveling away from home.²⁵

12.11 行力求亦不說 眼如行亦思惟

死生無盡從是 如是慧亦如說

They pursue their practice with vigor yet find no satisfaction.

Their eyes wander, [lost in] thoughts indeed.

[Contrarily, those] liberated from [the suffering of] birth and death abandon such
pursuits.

In this way, the wise are, indeed, as described.²⁶

²⁵ **Sn899d:** The term ‘*sattha*’ is best understood as ‘caravan’, corresponding to its Sanskrit form ‘*sārtha*’ (a group of traders or pilgrims traveling together). Other interpretations such as ‘weapon’ (from Skt. *śāstra*) or ‘teaching’ (from Skt. *śāstra*) do not align with the context.

The *Mahāniddesa* does not interpret ‘*hīna*’ as the typical adjective meaning ‘low’ or ‘inferior.’ Instead, it is read as ‘*ohīna*,’ a past participle derived from the verb ‘*ohīyati*,’ meaning ‘to be left behind.’

The term ‘*pavasam*’ is a present participle, masculine nominative singular form of the verb ‘*pavasati*,’ which means ‘to dwell away from.’ To offer contextual clarity, I have translated it as ‘while traveling away.’

²⁶ **Y12.11:** The interpretation of this intricate verse largely depends on how one dissects the third line. We can potentially split it in two ways: dividing as ‘死生無/盡從是’ suggests the optimistic interpretation ‘there is no death and [re-]birth,’ while a split as ‘死生無盡/從是’ conveys the pessimistic message that ‘death and [re-]birth never end.’ When compared to its Pāli equivalent, the former reading seems more fitting. This interpretation positions lines a and b to describe ascetic debaters, with lines c and d illustrating the contrasting view of the wise, a structure reminiscent of Sn902.

Moreover, it is crucial to differentiate the usages of ‘說’ in lines a and d: in line a, it may function synonymously with ‘悅’ (to be pleased), while in line d, it simply means ‘to say.’

Y12.11a: Bapat translates ‘行力求亦不說’ as “Strenuous search one carries, but never [a word] doth he say.” The ambiguity in this translation stems from Bapat’s interpretation of ‘說’ as ‘to say.’ However, when considering that ‘說’ is also used for character ‘悅’ (to be pleased), the phrase might better be understood as: “Though they seek with great effort, they remain unsatisfied (不說).”

Y12.11b, 眼 = 明 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Bapat opts for the alternative character ‘明’ and translates the phrase ‘明如行亦思惟’ as “Enlightened (明), he thinks (思惟), he is, by practices (行) like these (如).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. My interpretation of this variant leans more towards: “They indeed (亦) consider (思惟) their [religious] practices (行) as indicative (如) of enlightenment (明).” This is a rare instance where the alternative reading from the Song, Yuan, and Ming editions diverges significantly from the reading of Taishō edition.

Y12.11d: Bapat renders ‘如說’ as ‘as one may [well] say,’ whereas I interpret it as ‘as described [before].’ While our readings may slightly differ, the overarching meaning and context remain consistent.

Sn902 *Patthayamānassa hi jappitāni*

Samvedhitam cāpi pakappitesu

Cutūpapāto idha yassa n' atthi

Sa kena vedheyya kuhiñ ca jappe

One who hankers has an [insatiable] desire

And [experiences frequent] vacillations between [their different] preconceptions.

[Conversely,] for one who does not have death and rebirth here,

Why would they vacillate, and where would they hanker?²⁷

12.12 戒彼行一切捨 罪亦福捨遠去

淨亦垢不念覺 無沾污淨哀受

They abandon all their religious observances.

They abandon merits and demerits, leaving them all far behind.

They refrain from discriminating between purity and impurity.

Unstained by the impure or the pure, they accept [both] compassionately.²⁸

²⁷ **Sn902:** This verse contrasts debaters with the wise in regard to hankering and vacillations.

Sn902a: This line is circular simply stating that one who desires has a desire. To differentiate 'one who desires' from 'has a desire,' I have employed 'to hanker' and added 'insatiable.'

Sn902b: For enhanced clarity, I have added 'experiences frequent' and 'their different.'

²⁸ **Y12.12:** While the verse could be interpreted as direct instruction to readers, the use of '彼' (they, their) in line a suggests that each line characterizes a third party, likely 'the wise' as alluded to in Y12.11cd.

Y12.12c: Bapat's interpretation of '不念覺' as 'never give a thought' may not fully reflect its original nuance. In contrast, I lean towards 'to discriminate.' My interpretation derives from understanding '念' as 'to think' and '覺' as 'to perceive,' leading to the combined meaning of 'to think perceptively.' My translation, therefore, is 'to discriminate.' This aligns with the context that the wise refrain from judgments on both purity and impurity. This is also consistent with Hajime Nakamura's depiction of '念覺' as 'discriminating awareness' in *Bukkyōgo daijiten* 佛

Sn900 *Sīlabbataṃ vāpi pahāya sabbam*

Kammañ ca sāvajjanavajjam etaṃ

Suddhī asuddhī ti apatthayāno

Virato care santim anuggahāya

Moreover, abandoning all religious observances

And actions that are either blamable or blameless,

Without craving either purity or impurity,

One should fare along, restrained, without holding to [even] tranquility.²⁹

12.13 修是法度彼一 說無行為遠欺

教語大辭典 (p. 1079b), though it's worth noting that in many Chinese Buddhist translations, this term carries a positive connotation.

Y12.12d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘無沾汚淨哀受’ as “From corruptions (汚 or 沾汚?) free (無), he harbours (受) purity (淨) and compassion (哀).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. His translation stems from dividing the phrase as ‘無沾汚/淨哀受.’ However, this interpretation seems incongruent with the preceding line which suggests that purity and impurity should not be distinguished. I argue for a division like ‘無沾汚淨/哀受’ and propose the translation: “Unstained (無沾) by the impure (汚) or the pure (淨), they accept (受) [both] with compassion (哀).”

汚 = 玷 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Here, ‘玷’ signifies ‘a blemish in a gem,’ symbolizing ‘impurity.’ The meaning remains consistent despite this variant character.

²⁹ **Sn900b:** In the *Paramatthajotikā II*, the term ‘sāvajjanavajja’ is read as “sa + avajja + an + avajja,” which can be translated as “with blame [and] without blame.” Based on this analysis, the proper compound should be ‘sāvajjānavajja,’ but it appears as ‘sāvajjanavajja’ likely due to metrical considerations (Norman, 2001: 369).

Sn900d: According to the *Pāli Text Society Dictionary*, the term ‘virata’ is a past participle of ‘viramati’ (to abstain), while it is ‘viratta’ that is derived as the past participle of ‘virajjati’ (to detach oneself). Given this, I concur with the PTSD’s interpretation and translate ‘virata’ as ‘restrained’. This stands in contrast to the translations by Jayawickrama, Norman, Bodhi, and Fronsdal, who render it as ‘detached,’ likely taking ‘virata’ as ‘viratta.’

Norman considers this line to depict the life of an arhat and dissects ‘anuggahāya’ as ‘anu + ggahāya,’ interpreting it as ‘fostering.’ Meanwhile, Jayawickrama, Bodhi, and Fronsdal break it down as ‘an + uggahāya,’ suggesting the meaning ‘not grasping.’ I concur with the latter view, believing that line d underscores the concept of ‘non-grasping,’ not holding to even tranquility.

受如是便增變 各因諦世邪利

“Practice this teaching, which surpasses any others.”

“[Other] claims without [this] practice are far from [the truth], even deceptive.”

[Yet, by] conforming in this way, they incite increasing disputes.

Each [has their own] justification for truths, [only to cater to their] devious worldly gains.³⁰

Sn903 *Yam āhu dhammaṃ paraman ti eke*

Q *Tam eva hīnan ti panāhu aññe*

Sacco nu vādo katamo imesaṃ

³⁰ **Y12.13:** While this verse does not align closely with Sn903, I have paired them based on Bapat’s classification. His identification showcases a keen observation of thematic and contextual similarities. However, the *Yizujing*, or its Indic original, seems to have followed a different transmission trajectory and occasionally diverges from the *Aṭṭhakavagga*.

The opening two lines seem to present ascetic assertions, while the concluding two provide the *Yizujing*’s assessment.

Y12.13ab: Bapat translates the lines ‘修是法度彼一 說無行為遠欺’ as “About the (是) Dharma (法) he practices (修) as the highest (度 or 度彼一?), Others say (說): ‘Don’t (無?) practice (行) and keep away (遠 or 爲遠?) from deceit (欺).’” [Parentheses added for analysis]. It is probable that Bapat’s translation aims to align this verse with Sn903. However, he seems to misinterpret ‘無行’ (without practice) as ‘don’t practice.’ The accurate term for ‘don’t practice’ should be ‘毋行.’ Moreover, he inserts the words ‘about’ and ‘others’ without providing bracketed indications. A closer look at the original text suggests that it might not support his reading of these lines as signifying ‘two conflicting claims.’ Instead, the text seems to echo a single ascetic voice championing their teachings while critiquing others. While Bapat may interpret ‘度彼一’ broadly as ‘the highest,’ a meticulous reading indicates it should be translated as ‘to surpass (度) any (一) others (彼).’ My initial understanding of ‘彼一’ was ‘any one of them,’ but I have rephrased it to enhance clarity.

Y12.13cd: Bapat translates the lines ‘受如是便增變 各因諦世邪利’ as “In this way (如是), in disputes (變), people do more (增) indulge (便?). And [thus] there is Truth (諦) for each (各)—this is the benefit (利), worldly (世) and ill-conceived (邪).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. While Bapat’s translation captures the essence, it seems to miss nuances, especially the terms ‘受’ (to conform) and ‘因’ (reason/justification).

The phrase ‘便增變’ can be interpreted in two ways: either as ‘immediately (便) increase (增) disputes (變)’ or ‘prompt (便) increasing (增) disputes (變).’ Typically, ‘便’ acts as an adverb denoting ‘then’ or ‘immediately.’ However, it can also function as a verb meaning ‘to facilitate.’ This secondary usage is exemplified in the ‘Reform of the Law’ 更法 chapter from the *Shang Jun Shu* 商君書, which states: “法者, 所以愛民也; 禮者, 所以便事也.” (The law is an expression of love for the people; rites are a means for making things run smoothly.)—as translated by James Legge.

Sabbe va hīme kusalā vadānā

Whatever teaching some people [may] claim to be the highest,

Yet, others claim it to be the lowest indeed.

Which assertion among them is true,

When all of them are claiming to be the salutary?³¹

12.14 自所法便稱具 見彼法詰爲漏

無等行轉相怨 自見行不隨汚

They declare their own teaching as wholly complete.

[Yet,] upon seeing other's teachings, they criticize them as tainted.

[Claiming their] practices as unparalleled, they develop animosity against one another.

[They assert that] their views and conducts will never be stained.³²

Sn904 *Sakaṃ hi dhammaṃ paripuṇṇam āhu*

Aññassa dhammaṃ pana hīnam āhu

³¹ **Sn903d:** The term '*hīme*' can be dissected into '*hi*' (because/indeed) and '*ime*' (these). While I initially interpret '*hi*' as 'for,' suggesting a reason, its placement after the question in line c might be more fittingly rendered as 'when' or 'while.'

³² **Y12.14b:** Bapat's translation of the phrase '見彼法詰爲漏' reads: "Other's (彼) Law (法)," he doth challenge (詰?), "as (爲) with depravity (漏) full." [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation is not correct. The term '見' (to consider) is neglected, and '詰' (to criticize) and '漏' (tainted/lacking) are misinterpreted. Furthermore, there is not any Chinese character in the original text corresponding to his translation of 'full.'

Y12.14c: Bapat translates the phrase '無等行轉相怨' as "By none (無) equalled (等), mutual (相) hatred (怨) do they cherish (轉?)." [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation is also imprecise. It omits the translation of '行' (practice), and probably misconstrues '轉' (to develop) as 'to cherish.'

Y12.14d, 不隨汚 = 不墮汚: The variant phrase '不墮汚' can be translated as 'do not fall into impurity.' Despite the different wording, its meaning aligns with '不隨汚,' retaining the same essential concept.

Evam pi viggayha vivādiyanti

Sakaṃ sakaṃ sammutim āhu saccaṃ

They proclaim [their] own teaching is indeed complete,

While [deeming] others' teachings inferior.

Thus quarrelling, they dispute,

Each asserting [their] own opinion as the truth.³³

12.15 凡所說黠代恐 無於法有所益

無慧眾異說淨 所繫著住各堅

[Such] commoners' proclamations unsettle [this] wise generation,

[For] there is no merit to [their] teachings.

The ignorant populace deems their divergent teachings as pure,

Each firmly entrenched [in beliefs] to which they are bound and attached.³⁴

Sn905 *Parassa ce vambhayitena hīno*

³³ **Sn904:** This verse comprises four lines, each with its main verb. For enhanced readability, I have structured my translation into two sentences by combining lines b with a, and d with c. In line b, while both '*aññassa*' and '*dhammaṃ*' are singular in the original, I have rendered them in the plural 'others' teachings' to align with English conventions.

³⁴ **Y12.15:** This verse offers a unique presentation, distinct from its Pāli counterpart, Sn905. Bapat's translation, however, appears forced in his endeavor to align the two.

Y12.15ab: Bapat translates these lines '凡所說黠代恐 無於法有所益' as "If (代?) the wise (黠) were to be afraid (恐) of what (所) the common folk (凡) say (說), Then, in matters of (於) Law (法), would there be none (無) with (有) any distinction (所益?)!" [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation does not capture the intended meaning. Bapat's interpretation of '代' (generation/to replace) as analogous to the Pāli '*ce*' (if) is a stretch. Additionally, his rendition of '所益' as 'distinction' rather than its more straightforward meanings like 'merit' or 'benefit' seems influenced by an effort to correspond with the Pāli term '*visesin*' (outstanding).

Na koci dhammesu visesi assa

Puthū hi aññassa vadanti dhammaṃ

Nihīnato samhi daḷhaṃ vadānā

If [one's teaching] becomes inferior due to another's criticism,

Then, no [teaching] would stand out as exceptional among teachings.

For many declare another's teaching as inferior,

[While] fervently asserting their own.³⁵

12.16 各尊法如聞止 演如解自師說

無法行但有言 彼所淨因一心

Each holds their own teaching in [such] high regard that they cease listening [to others].

They propagate what they have gleaned from their teacher's dispensation.

[In fact,] they lack [genuine] teachings and practice; they are just verbiage.

Their [claimed] purity is a product of their subjective mentality.³⁶

³⁵ **Sn905b:** The term '*assa*' is derived from the Sanskrit root *√as* (to be), taking its form as the optative third person singular. The preceding term, '*visesin*,' is an adjective that translates to 'outstanding.' As a result, the phrase '*visesi assa*' can be initially understood as 'would be outstanding,' but I have chosen to translate it as 'would stand out as exceptional' to enhance the clarity.

Sn905d: The suffix '*-to*' in the term '*nihīnato*' is in the ablative case, which suggests 'from the perspective.' Hence, the term translates to 'as inferior.' Even though it is positioned in line d, it closely relates to line c, influencing my choice to translate it within that line.

The term '*samhi*' is the locative singular form of the masculine reflexive pronoun '*sa*' (his own).

³⁶ **Y12.16a:** This line highlights the contrasting attitudes debaters have towards their own teachings versus those of others. In this context, '法' is best interpreted as 'their own teaching,' which stands in opposition to others' teachings, to which they are unreceptive. Thus, I interpret '如聞止' as 'in such a way (如) that their capacity to hear (聞) ceases (止).' Bapat renders this phrase '各尊法如聞止' as "Each one's Law remains respected, as hearsay reports." This translation falls short of accuracy: '各' and '法' are not directly linked and are separated by the verb '尊' (to respect). Thus, '各' is better rendered as the subject 'each' and '法' as the object of the verb. Furthermore, he either omits or misconstrues '止' (to stop).

Sn906 *Sadhammapūjā ca panā tath' eva*

Yathā pasaṃsanti sakāyanāni

Sabbe va vādā tathivā bhaveyyuṃ

Suddhī hi nesam paccattam eva

The reverence for their own teachings is evident,

Just as they extol their own paths.

[Given this,] all their assertions could be [deemed] true,

For their [sense of] purity is inherently subjective.³⁷

Y12.16b: In translating the line ‘演如解自師說,’ I offer a more periphrastic translation. A literal rendition might be: “They expound (演) as (如) they understand (解) from their (自) teacher’s (師) teachings (說).”

Y12.16c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘無法行但有言’ as “Even the rituals, unlawful, have none but words [of praise].” His interpretation of ‘無法’ as ‘unlawful’—acting as a modifier for the noun ‘行’ (rituals)—misses the intended nuance. The core concern here does not seem to be about rituals; rather it seems to be the distinction between ‘genuine teaching and practice’ and mere ‘words (但有言).’

Y12.16d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘彼所淨因一心’ as “Purified (淨) he (彼) remains (所?), as he holds (因?) himself so in mind (心).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation appears imprecise. Bapat seems to have taken ‘所’ as the verb ‘to remain,’ possibly extending from its primary meaning of ‘place.’ However, this interpretation feels forced. A more fitting translation for ‘所淨’ would be ‘what they have purified’ or simply ‘purity.’ Additionally, he seems to misconstrue ‘因’ as ‘holds’ rather than its typical meaning ‘caused by’ and overlooks the significance of ‘一’ (one). My direct interpretation of this line is: “Their claimed purity is caused by an individual’s subjective mindset.”

The term ‘一心’ is intriguing. At first glance, it may appear laden with Mahāyāna doctrinal implications—the notion of the ‘one mind,’ foundational to all sentient beings as mentioned in the *Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna* (大乘起信論). However, it probably does not reference this concept, given that the *Yizujing* predates this text by several centuries. The *Lotus Sūtra* does introduce the concept of the ‘one vehicle (一乘),’ which transcends the traditional tripartite classification of Buddhist teachings into the ways of disciples, pratyekabuddhas, and bodhisattvas. Yet, such interpretations seem misaligned with this verse’s context. Here, ‘一心’ more likely refers to ‘individual’ or ‘subjective’ perspectives. This interpretation aligns with its Pāli parallel ‘paccattam’ (individual/subjective) in Sn906d.

³⁷ **Sn906c:** The term ‘tathiva’ should not be parsed as ‘tatha + iva’ (like the truth?). Instead, it appears to derive from the abstract noun ‘tathiya’ (truth), which itself can be broken down into ‘tatha’ (such) and ‘-ya’ (an abstract suffix). This ‘tathiya’ seems to have undergone palatalization to become ‘tathiva,’ a transformation known as *v/y* alternation (as described by Norman, 2001: 371).

Sn906d: I have translated ‘paccatta’ as ‘inherently subjective,’ drawing on the term’s initial meaning ‘separate,’ ‘individual,’ ‘one’s own,’ or ‘subjective.’ Jayawickrama’s interpretation ‘a thing solely subjective’ resonates with mine. However, scholars like Norman, Bodhi, and Fronsdaal lean towards interpretations like ‘exclusive to them,’ ‘exclusively their own,’ and ‘belong to them.’ These latter interpretations emphasize the

12.17 言如是彼亦說 一所見從淨墮

便自見怨所作 坐勝慧自大說

They claim thus, while others voice [different views].

Each view pursues purity, [yet they often] deviate.

From such views arise their own resentments.

Holding fast to [their own perceived] supreme wisdom, they brag about themselves.³⁸

Sn907 *Na brāhmaṇassa paraneyyam atthi*

Dhammesu niccheyya samuggahītaṃ

Tasmā vivādāni upātivatto

Na hi seṭṭhato passati dhammam aññaṃ

The brahman is not swayed by others,

Nor clings to [views] after scrutinizing [various] teachings.

Thus, they transcend [all] disputes,

debaters' belief in their exclusive possession of purity. On the other hand, the former stresses the inherently subjective nature of their claims. This subjectivity fuels their conviction that only they hold the truth and purity.

³⁸ **Y12.17a:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘言如是彼亦說’ as “Words like these he doth speak.” This translation seems to miss the mark. Both ‘言’ and ‘說’ can serve as verbs, potentially forming their own distinct statements. The adverb ‘亦’ (also/but) supports this interpretation by offering a contrast between two positions. Such an interpretation dovetails with the next line that begins with ‘一所見’ (each view), referring to the variety of views previously mentioned.

Y12.17c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘怨所作’ as ‘...is dominated by hatred.’ However, interpreting ‘作’ as ‘to dominate’ does not align with its primary meaning of ‘to make.’ I have adjusted this to ‘to arise’ to enhance clarity and flow.

For they do not see any teaching as supreme.³⁹

12.18 所攝著求便脫 念所信無所住

本所因在好說 淨行在彼未除

Attached to their cherished [beliefs], they seek immediate liberation.

Obsessed with their creed, they [mimic wanderers] without a [fixed] abode.

Their initial motivation stems from [the allure of others'] compliments.

[Their so-called] pure practices are [still] anchored in their resolved [desires].⁴⁰

³⁹ **Sn907:** Although Bapat identifies this verse as a counterpart to Y12.17, the two seem notably distinct, even suggesting a potential misidentification. The Chinese verse emphasizes the passion of debaters, whereas the Pāli verse focuses on the brahman, the exemplary figure in the *Atthakavagga*.

Sn907ab: A straightforward interpretation of these lines might be: “For a brahman, there is nothing to be led by another, [or] nothing firmly grasped, after [their] examining [any] among doctrines.” I have adjusted the phrasing using active verbs for better readability.

⁴⁰ **Y12.18:** This verse is enigmatic and benefits significantly from additional contextual words for clarity. Lines a and b discuss their ascetic life, marked by attachment to their beliefs. Lines c and d address their impure motivations, driven by praise and desires. I have inserted ‘to mimic wanderers’ in line b and ‘so-called’ in line d. While these additions alter the literal meanings somewhat, they are necessary to mitigate the vagueness of the original lines.

Y12.18a: Bapat translates the phrase ‘所攝著求便脫’ as “What (所) he clings (攝著) to he seeks (求), and then (便) speaks out (脫?).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation falls short. Bapat seems to have confused ‘脫’ (to release/liberate) with ‘說’ (to say). The phrase ‘所攝著’ should be better translated as being ‘attached (著) to what (所) they have embraced (攝).’

Y12.18b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘念所信無所住’ as “His object (所) of conviction (信) there doth not (無?) remain (住).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This rendition does not capture the entire phrase. It omits the verb ‘念’ (to remind) and the function of the character ‘所.’ ‘無所住’ should be more directly translated as ‘without [fixed] dwelling.’

Y12.18c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘本所因在好說’ as “Because of (因?) his legacy of the past (本?), ‘good’ (好) he is declared (說).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation is not accurate. Bapat neglects the functional word ‘所’ and the verb ‘在.’ Moreover, his rendition of ‘本’ as ‘legacy of the past’ is an overly extended interpretation. A more accurate translation would consider ‘所因’ as ‘motivation’ or ‘drive’ and ‘好說’ as ‘complimentary words’ or ‘praises.’

Y12.18d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘淨行在彼未除’ as “And from conduct (行) pure (淨), others (彼) do not (未) him exclude (除).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation diverges significantly from the intended meaning. He omits the verb ‘在’ and misrepresents the negative particle ‘未’ (not yet) as ‘do not.’ The term ‘未除’ more aptly translates to ‘unremoved’ or ‘yet to be removed.’ It seems to denote ‘unresolved desires.’ Given

Sn908 *Jānāmi passāmi tath’ eva etaṃ*

Diṭṭhiyā eke paccenti suddhiṃ

Addakkhi ce kiṃ hi tumassa tena

Atisivā aññena vadanti suddhiṃ

“I know. I see. This is clearly the truth!”

Some assert [their] purity based on such doctrinal [convictions].

[But] even if one has seen [thus], what [good] do they gain by that [vision]?

Overstepping the mark, they preach purity through some other [misguided doctrines].⁴¹

12.19 觀世人見名色 以其智如受知

欲見多少我有 不從是善淨有

People with vision in the world will recognize names and forms.

Through their intellect, they comprehend when [they] perceive.

They seek to discern the presence of a certain degree of ‘self.’

[But] neither merit nor purity is gained by adhering to this [path].⁴²

the negative connotation surrounding ‘淨行’ (pure conduct), adding ‘claimed’ or ‘so-called’ for context, as in ‘their claimed pure practices,’ is fitting.

⁴¹ **Sn908b:** The term ‘*pacceti*’ has a literal meaning of ‘to come on to,’ and its figurative usage can be understood as ‘to fall back on’ or ‘to find one’s hold in.’ I have chosen to simplify it by translating it as ‘to assert.’

Sn908d: The term ‘*aññena*’ (by another) has some ambiguity. I clarify this context by adding ‘misguided doctrines.’

⁴² **Y12.19:** The initial two lines of this verse align closely with their counterparts in Sn909, especially with the introduction of ‘name and form’ (名色; *nāmarūpa*). However, the latter half of the verse shows a marked deviation from Sn909. A literal interpretation of the Chinese lines suggests a focus on the impediment posed by the conception of the ‘self’ (我有) in one’s spiritual journey. In contrast, the Pāli lines emphasize that mere seeing and knowing are not inherently linked to purity.

Sn909 *Passaṃ naro dakkhiti nāmarūpaṃ*

Disvāna vāññassati tāni-m-eva

Kāmaṃ bahuṃ passatu appakaṃ vā

Na hi tena suddhiṃ kusalā vadanti

A person who has vision will see name-and-form.

Or upon seeing them, they will know them indeed.

Granted that one sees much or little,

The experts do not claim purity based on that.⁴³

Y12.19c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘欲見多少我有’ as “Granted (欲) that [knowledge], more or less (多少), he (我?) may have been seen (見?) to possess (有).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. Bapat’s interpretation seems influenced by an attempt to align this line with its Pāli counterpart. In the Pāli text, the phrase corresponding to ‘欲見’ is ‘*kāmaṃ . . . passatu.*’ Interestingly, even though ‘*kāmaṃ*’ typically appears as an accusative singular form, in this context, combined with the imperative verb ‘*passatu,*’ it likely adopts an adverbial meaning, translating as ‘let it be that . . .’ This interpretation finds support in the PTSD. Bapat suggests that ‘欲見’ is a ‘mechanical’ and perhaps inaccurate translation from the original Indic phrase mirroring ‘*kāmaṃ . . . passatu.*’ While Bapat’s assertion of a potential mistranslation by Zhi Qian holds merit, his own translation takes considerable liberties, deviating from both Y12.19cd and Sn909cd. Specifically, in relation to ‘我有’ (existence of self), Bapat interprets ‘見’ as ‘seen,’ incorporating it into the phrase ‘見...我有’ (he may have been seen to possess), a move that comes across as somewhat forced. Given the straightforwardness of the Chinese text, I have chosen to preserve its clear expression in my translation, aligning with the Upaniṣadic quest for the true self (*ātman*). In doing so, I aim to capture what might have been Zhi Qian’s interpretation, even if it diverges from the original Pāli meaning.

Y12.19d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘不從是善淨有’ as “But not (不) from (從) this (是), can, for him, purity (淨) be rightly (善?) claimed (有?).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. His translation appears ambiguous and seems misaligned with the context. It is unclear in Bapat’s interpretation how conclusions are drawn about individuals who see and know. If ‘this’ refers to the scenario in the preceding line c—specifically, possessing a certain degree of knowledge—then this concluding line becomes incongruous. It suggests that if the scenario in line c does not hold, then one can justifiably claim purity. While Bapat may aim to match Y12.19cd with Sn909cd, his translation diverges significantly from the Pāli lines’ intended meaning as well.

⁴³ **Sn909:** This verse asserts that purity does not hinge on one’s vision and knowledge of name-and-form. To enhance clarity, I have adopted an interpretative approach in certain instances.

Sn909a: The term ‘*passaṃ*’ (seeing) appears as a present participle in its masculine nominative singular form. I have translated it as ‘with vision,’ given its synonymous relationship with ‘*dakkhiti,*’ which also signifies ‘to see.’

Although ‘*dakkhiti*’ or ‘*dakkhati*’ is in the present tense, I have chosen a future tense translation, aligning it with ‘*aññassati*’ (will know) in line b, which is also future tense. This interpretation finds support from Norman.

Sn909b: The present form of ‘*aññassati*’ in line b is ‘*aññati.*’ Though not listed in the PTSD or the Critical Pāli Dictionary, it can be associated with the Buddhist technical term ‘*aññā*’ (perfect knowledge). Its origins likely trace back to ‘*ā + √jñā*’ (to know well). The prefix ‘*ā*’ gets shortened because of the subsequent double consonant ‘*ññ.*’ A more commonly used verb form related to ‘*aññati*’ is ‘*ājānāti.*’

12.20 有慧行累無有 知亦見正以取

見無過是法行 度是亂不更受

The conduct of the wise is free from any bondage.

[For most, however,] knowledge and vision are adjusted by attachment.

When perceiving the unblemished, that practice is aligned with the Dharma.

[It will] transcend such confusion and never succumb to it again.⁴⁴

Sn910 *Nivissavādī na hi suddhināyo*

Pakappitaṃ diṭṭhi purekkharāno

Yaṃ nissito tattha subhaṃ vadāno

Sn909c: As highlighted earlier, ‘*kāmaṃ*’ combined with the imperative ‘*passatu*’ appears to have an adverbial function, translating to ‘granted that’ or ‘let it be that.’

⁴⁴ **Y12.20:** This verse suggests that knowledge and vision, when stemming from attachment, can lead to confusion. As such, genuine liberation from such entanglements embodies the true spirit of the Dharma. To fully grasp this verse, it is crucial to discern whether each line pertains to the wise or to ordinary individuals.

Bapat translates this verse as “Wise practices he has and ties he had none; The view, wisely thought out, he holds [and firmly doth grasp]; His religious practices, as blameless, doth he view; The flurry he has got rid of, and to it he never doth return.” This rendering presents inconsistencies. In Bapat’s translation, the same figure ‘he’ is portrayed in a positive light in line a, but shifts to a negative tone in line b, especially since ‘firmly... grasp (取)’ is often interpreted negatively within a Buddhist context. Such contradictions arise from not specifying the subject of each line clearly.

Y12.20b: Bapat’s translation of the phrase ‘知亦見正以取’ as “The view (見), wisely (正?) thought out (知), he holds (取) [and firmly doth grasp]” seems off the mark. [Parentheses added for analysis]. His translation appears to overlook the roles of the functional characters ‘亦’ (and) and ‘以’ (by means of), while extending the nuances of other terms, especially ‘正’. The character ‘亦’ seamlessly combines both ‘知’ (knowledge) and ‘見’ (vision). This aligns with ‘智...知’ from Y12.19b, which means ‘comprehend ... with intellect,’ and ‘觀...見’ from Y12.19a, translating as ‘see ... with vision.’ Within this context, the most fitting translation for ‘正’ is either ‘to correct’ or ‘to adjust,’ and ‘以取’ should be conveyed as ‘through attachment.’

Y12.20c: Bapat’s translation of the phrase ‘見無過是法行’ as “His (是?) religious (法?) practices (行), as blameless (無過), doth he view (見).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation seems to misrepresent the intended meanings of ‘是’ and ‘法’. Instead, ‘是’ (this/such) would best refer to ‘見無過’ ([when] one perceives no fault [within]), while ‘法’ should signify ‘aligned with the Dharma’ or as an adjectival rendering ‘Dharmic.’

Suddhimvado tattha tath' addasā so

The dogmatist is indeed not easy to discipline,

Who lionizes a preconceived view.

Proclaiming that the good is [right] there in what they rely on,

The champion of purity sees [things] there as such.⁴⁵

12.21 慧意到無所至 不見堅識所覺

如關閉制所著 但行觀無取異

The wise mind reaches the unattainable,

Unbound by dogma or things discerned by [mere] consciousness.

Guarding against sources of attachment like a gate tightly shut,

They just practice contemplation without grasping at anything eccentric.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ **Sn910a:** The term ‘*nivissavādin*’ can be understood as ‘one who proclaims their firmly established view.’ I have chosen ‘dogmatist’ to encapsulate this meaning. The word ‘*nivissa*’ here is derived from the gerund of ‘*nivisati*,’ meaning ‘to settle down.’

Sn910d: The term ‘*addasa*’ is the aorist third person singular of ‘*dassati*’ (to see). Even though the original tense is in the past, I have rendered it in the present to better align with the context.

⁴⁶ **Y12.21:** This verse characterizes the ‘慧意’ (the wise mind) much like its Pāli counterpart in Sn911, which depicts the ‘*brāhmaṇa*,’ a term for the spiritual exemplar in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*.

Y12.21b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘不見堅識所覺’ as “No (不) heresy firm (堅) doth he harbour (見), his consciousness (識) being awake (覺).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation seems off the mark, mainly due to the omission of the functional character ‘所.’ The expression ‘識所覺’ is more aptly translated as ‘things (所) that consciousness (識) [can] discern (覺).’ As such, I have interpreted this line to convey, “[they] are not (不) found (見) with dogma (堅) or [beliefs] that (所) consciousness (識) may discern (覺).” This reading is in harmony with its corresponding line in Sn911b.

Y12.21c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘如關閉制所著’ as “The closing (關閉?) [of the doors of senses] he knows and from objects (所) of attachments (著) he is far (制?).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This rendering misses the mark, primarily by not giving due weight to the functional character ‘如’ (just like) and stretching the meaning of ‘制’ (to govern/suppress). While Bapat seems to equate both ‘關’ and ‘閉’ with the notion of ‘closing,’ the more conventional use of ‘關’ is either as a noun meaning ‘gate’ or as a verb, ‘to pass through.’ Thus, a more accurate translation for ‘如關閉’ would be ‘just like a gate shut tightly,’ and ‘制所著’ as ‘guarding against sources of attachment.’

Sn911 *Na brāhmaṇo kappam upeti saṃkham*

Na diṭṭhisārī na pi ñāṇabandhu

Ñatvā ca so sammutiyo puthujjā

Upekhati uggahaṇanta-m-aññe

The Brahman does not consider [matters] after making assumptions.

They are not adherents of dogma nor kinspeople of knowledge.

Knowing the diverse conventional opinions,

They remain equanimous, [thinking], “Let others grasp [their beliefs as they will].”⁴⁷

12.22 尊斷世所受取 取與生不應堅

Y12.21d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘但行觀無取異’ as “Circumspect (行觀?) just (但) he is, without (無) grasping (取) the [heresies] that are diverse [sic] (異).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. Although his translation moves in the correct direction, I feel that the rendition, “They merely (但) practice (行) contemplation (觀) without (無) clinging (取) to anything eccentric (異),” encapsulates the intended meaning more aptly.

⁴⁷ **Sn911a:** The interpretation of ‘*kappam*’ and ‘*saṃkham*’ is nuanced given their similar meanings and potential classification as either present participles of related verbs or accusative nouns. The *Mahāniddesa* sees ‘*kappam*’ as the accusative singular of the neutral noun ‘*kappa*’ and an object of the verb ‘*upeti*’ (to go), while it understands ‘*saṃkham*’ as the *ṇamul* absolutive form. Norman supports this view but also considers the possibility that the present participle form of ‘*saṃkham*’ might be mistaken for ‘*saṃkhā*,’ which is a truncated absolutive form of ‘*saṃkhāya*.’ Scholars provide their interpretive renderings for ‘*kappam upeti*’: Norman renders it as ‘to submit to figments’; Bodhi, ‘to take up mental constructs’; Jayawickrama, ‘to reach reckoning [in craving and dogma]’; and Fronsdal, ‘to make things up.’ While these interpretations differ, they are thematically aligned. I prefer a more direct rendering of it as ‘to consider [matters],’ because the subsequent translation of ‘*saṃkham*’ as ‘after making assumptions’, provide a clearer context for ‘*kappam*.’

Sn911b: Although ‘*diṭṭhisārī*’ and ‘*ñāṇabandhu*’ appear in singular forms, I have rendered them in plural to correspond with the gender-neutral pronoun ‘they.’

Sn911d: The term ‘*uggahaṇanta-m-aññe*’ is open to two distinct interpretations. The *Mahāniddesa* and the *Paramatthajotikā II* both interpret it as ‘*uggahaṇanti-m-aññe*,’ with ‘*m*’ functioning as a sandhi. Considering the verb ‘*uggahaṇanti*’ is seldom encountered in Pāli literature, the latter commentary suggests an alternate reading: ‘*uggaṇhanti*’ (to grasp). This interpretation renders the phrase as ‘others grasp.’ Separately, Norman proposes that ‘*uggahaṇantam*’ might be expressed in the middle voice, imperative third person plural form, translating to ‘let others grasp.’ Although each interpretation holds value, I favor Norman’s perspective as it provides a nuanced interpretation while preserving the integrity of the original phrasing.

靜亦亂在觀捨 在是惡哀凡人

The sage has discarded worldly experiences and attachments.

Amidst arising factions, they remain unswayed and steadfast.

[Whether] in a quiet or clamorous [place], they stay composed and equanimous.

[Even when] surrounded by those wicked, they feel compassion for the common folk.⁴⁸

Sn912 *Visajja ganthāni munīdha loke*

Vivādaajātesu na vaggasārī

Santo asantesu upekkhako so

Anuggaho uggahaṇanta-m-aññe

Having released knots here in this world,

The sage does not follow a faction amidst arisen disputes.

They are equanimous, peaceful among the restless.

Without grasping, [they think] “Let others grasp [their beliefs as they will].”⁴⁹

⁴⁸ **Y12.22a:** Bapat renders the phrase ‘所受取’ as ‘graspings and attachments.’ However, it is worth noting that ‘所受’ signifies passive experiences rather than active graspings.

Y12.22b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘取與生不應堅’ as “When factions arise, support he lends to none.” His translation of ‘取與’ as ‘faction’ is apt, suggesting the idea of ‘forming (取) allied groups (與).’ However, the translation for ‘不應堅’ seems off-mark. A more literal translation would be ‘do not (不) comply with (應) and stand firmly (堅) [in one’s position],’ a nuance not entirely captured in Bapat’s version.

Y12.22c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘靜亦亂在觀捨’ as “Quiet among the flurried, with equanimity he views all things.” This interpretation appears to miss certain nuances. The character ‘亦’ can mean ‘and,’ ‘or,’ ‘but,’ or sometimes ‘indeed.’ Therefore, ‘靜亦亂’ would be more accurately translated as ‘[whether in] a quiet or clamorous [place].’ A phrasing closer to his interpretation would be ‘靜於亂’ or something akin to it.

Y12.22d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘在是惡哀凡人’ as “The common (凡) folk (人) he pities (哀) for (在?) the evil (惡) that they do (在是?).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. The reading of ‘在是’ here appears to diverge significantly from its typical use. ‘在’ usually indicates to be [in a place or situation], while ‘是’ is employed as a demonstrative pronoun.

⁴⁹ **Sn912:** For smoother readability, I have integrated ‘muni’ from line a into line b.

12.23 棄故成新不造 無所欲何所著

脫邪信勇猛度 悉已脫世非世

Having discarded the ripening of past [karma], they refrain from creating any anew.

Free from desire, to what would they cling?

Emancipated from distorted beliefs, they courageously cross over [to the other side].

They are already emancipated from both the mundane and the supramundane.⁵⁰

Sn913 *Pubbāsave hitvā nave akubbaṃ*

Na chandagū no pi nivissavādo

Sa vip̐pamutto diṭṭhigatehi dhīro

Na lippati loke anattagarahī

Having abandoned past mental impurities, not forming new ones,

⁵⁰ **Y12.23a**, 成 = 城 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Bapat opts for the alternative reading and translates the phrase ‘棄故城新不造’ as “Old associations he breaks and makes no new.” In his translation, he adopts a figurative interpretation of ‘城’ (city wall) as ‘association.’ However, considering the emphasis on the internal qualities of the sage in the verse, I believe interpreting this character as ‘karma’ provides a clearer insight than suggesting isolation from people. My interpretation also aligns better with its Pāli counterpart Sn913a, which discusses ‘mental defilements’ (*āsava*).

Y12.23c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘脫邪信勇猛度’ as “From false beliefs, released and free is he, the hero.” This translation omits the nuance of ‘度’ (to transcend), which I render as, ‘to cross over [to the other side, viz., *nirvāṇa*].’

脫邪 = 說邪 (S, Y, M / J): The variant phrase ‘說邪信勇猛度’ can be interpreted as “They transcend the propagation of mistaken beliefs with valor.” In this context, ‘說’ is rendered as ‘propagation’ or ‘preaching,’ highlighting the active dissemination of such beliefs.

Y12.23d, 世非世 = 世非生 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Bapat seems to opt for the variant phrase ‘悉已脫世非世,’ translating it as “From the world (世) entire (悉), he has escaped (已脫), and rebirth (生) he has none (非?).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, his interpretation of ‘escaping from the world’ suggests renunciation rather than liberation, which may not align with ‘no rebirth,’ indicative of arahant-ship. Therefore, a more fitting translation of the variant might be “Having achieved complete liberation, they are no longer subject to rebirth in the world.” The original phrase ‘世非世’ can be more accurately rendered as ‘the worldly and the other-worldly.’

They neither chase after desires, nor hold dogmatic views.

The wise person stands fully released from the propensity for views,

Unstained in the world, without any self-reproach.⁵¹

12.24 一切法無所疑 悉見聞亦何念

捨重擔尊正脫 不願過常來見

They harbor no doubts about any phenomena.

How can they entertain thoughts [regarding] any beliefs and traditions?

Casting off the heavy burden, the sage stands rightly liberated,

Without longing for views associated with past, present, and future.⁵²

Sn914 *Sa sabbadhammesu visenibhūto*

yaṃ kiñci diṭṭhaṃ va sutāṃ mutāṃ vā

sa pannabhāro muni vippayutto

⁵¹ **Sn913b:** While the terms ‘*chandagū*’ and ‘*nivissavādo*’ are both singular nominals, I employ the gender-neutral pronoun ‘they.’

⁵² **Y12.24b:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘悉見聞亦何念’ as “Then, what (何) to say of all (悉) that is seen (見), or heard (聞), and (亦?) thought of (念)?” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation seems less likely, given that ‘念’ associates directly with the question word ‘何,’ rather than forming a sequence with ‘見聞.’

Y12.24d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘不願過常來見’ as “He craves (願) not (不), having gone beyond (過) what he always (常) meets (來?) and sees (見).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. While this translation could work with a minor adjustment to ‘來見’ to mean ‘to come and observe,’ it may not completely resonate with the broader theme of the verse, which critiques views in general. In this context, ‘見’ could be understood as ‘views.’ A context-driven interpretation might view ‘過常來’ as temporal indicators representing the ‘past, present, and future.’ While ‘常’ typically means ‘constant’ or ‘usual,’ it may be interpreted as ‘present’ here. Alternatively, it could be rendered as ‘eternity,’ suggesting a translation of ‘過常來’ as ‘past, future, and eternity.’ This interpretation aligns with the sixty-two erroneous views outlined in the *Brahmajāla Sutta* (*Dīgha Nikāya* 1), which categorizes them into 18 views about the past and 44 concerning the future, with frequent references to ‘eternity’ across these categories.

na kappiyo nūparato na patthiyo ti Bhagavā ti

They do not come into conflict with any religious teachings,

Concerning any beliefs, traditions, or rationales.

The sage has laid down their burden and is emancipated,

Standing without mental constructs, desistance, nor longing.⁵³

(Thus [speaks] the Blessed One.)

佛說是義足經竟。比丘悉歡喜

When the Buddha had expounded this [*sūtra* in] the *Yizujing*, all the *bhikṣus* rejoiced.

⁵³ Sn914ab: These two lines are exactly the same as Sn793ab. There are several interpretive possibilities for these lines, hinging on varying interpretations of the terms ‘*visenibhūta*,’ ‘*sabbadhamma*,’ and the phrase ‘*diṭṭha suta muta*.’ Based on the rationale provided in Y4. fn.13, I have rendered these lines as: “They do not come into conflict with any religious teachings concerning any views, traditions, or rationales.”

兜勒梵志經 第十三

Discourse 13: Brahmin Dou-le (*Aṭṭhakavagga.14*)¹

聞如是。佛在王舍國於梨山中。爾時七頭鬼將軍。與鵑摩越鬼將軍共約言。其有所治處生珍寶。當相告語。

Thus I heard. The Buddha was residing in the kingdom of Rājagṛha, on Pear Mountain.² At that time, the General of the Seven-Headed Spirits and the Jumoyue Spirit General made a pact, swearing that if a precious jewel emerged in either of their domains, they should inform the other.³

¹ This thirteenth discourse of the *Yizujing* corresponds to the *Tuvaṭakasutta* (Sn IV-14) of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*.

兜勒梵志經 第十三 (K, T, Z) = 兜勒梵志 第十三卷 (S, Y / P, Q1) = 兜勒梵志 第十三 (J, N, Q2): For an in-depth discussion of the recurring exclusion of ‘經’ (sūtra) and the insertion of ‘卷’ (chapter) in the titles of alternative versions documented in the T198 or Z863 apparatus, refer to Y1.fn.3.

兜勒: The brahmin name ‘兜勒’ has not been definitively identified in Indic Buddhist literature. Therefore, I have opted to use its Pinyin transcription ‘Dou-le’ for this name.

² 梨山: Bapat interprets ‘梨山’ as ‘the Vulture-peak’ (Sanskrit. Grddhakūṭa; Pāli. Gijjhakūṭa) but does not provide the reasoning behind this interpretation. It appears he may have been influenced by Vulture-peak’s reputation as the Buddha’s preferred retreat in Rājagṛha, as referenced in Buddhist Canonical texts. However, neither the translation nor the transcription supports his interpretation. I have chosen to use the more direct translation, ‘Pear Mountain.’

³ 鵑摩越鬼 = 鵑摩越鬼 (S, Y, M ? / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The characters ‘鵑’ and ‘鵑’ represent different types of birds—the shrike and the osprey, respectively. Despite this, they share a similar Pinyin pronunciation, resulting in no significant impact on the transcription of ‘Jumoyue.’ There may be a scribal error in the Taishō apparatus. It indicates discrepancies between the Koryō, Taishō, and Zhonghua editions versus the Song, Yuan, and Ming editions. However, it erroneously presents the phrase identically in both cases as ‘鵑摩越鬼 = 鵑摩越鬼 <三>.’ The notation ‘三’ (three) refers to the Song, Yuan, and Ming editions.

當相告語: Bapat translates this phrase as “then they should (當) tell (告語) each other (相) of the same.” [Parentheses added for analysis]. The added phrase ‘of the same’ in his translation does not have a direct counterpart in the original Chinese wording, which makes his rendition somewhat unclear.

爾時鵝摩越鬼將軍所治處池中。生一蓮花千葉。但莖大如車輪。皆黃金色。鵝摩越鬼將軍。便將五百鬼。來到七頭鬼將軍所。便謂七頭言。賢者寧知我所治池中生千葉蓮花。但莖大如車輪。皆黃金色。

In the lake within the domain of the Jumoyue Spirit General, a lotus with a thousand petals emerged not long after. Its stem was as thick as a cartwheel, and it gleamed entirely of gold. The Jumoyue Spirit General, accompanied by five hundred spirits, quickly visited the residence of the General of the Seven-Headed Spirits. Then, he addressed the Seven-Headed One, “O, Reverend, do you know that in the lake of my domain, a thousand-petaled lotus has blossomed? [Its] stem alone is as thick as a cartwheel, and it gleamed entirely in gold.”⁴

七頭鬼將軍即報言。然賢者寧知我所治處。亦生神珍寶。如來正覺。行度三活。所說悉使世人民得安雄生無上法樂堅無比。已生寶何如賢者寶。復以月十五日。說戒解罪。鵝摩越鬼將軍。報七頭言

The General of the Seven-Headed Spirits responded immediately. “O, Reverend, do you know that in my domain, a divine and precious jewel has also emerged—the Tathāgata, the Rightly-Awakened One? [Through his rigorous] practice, he has attained the three kinds of livelihood [i.e., freedom from greed, hatred, and delusion].”⁵ All his teachings bring peace to people in the

⁴ 但莖 = 其莖 (N): The term ‘但’ functions as an adverb meaning ‘only,’ while ‘其’ may serve as a possessive pronoun translating to ‘its.’ The variation found in the Nan edition, however, does not significantly alter the interpretation of the related sentence.

⁵ 三活: The term ‘three kinds of livelihood’ is interpreted as representing ‘freedom from greed, hatred, and delusion.’ This interpretation aligns with another translation by Zhi Qian found in the *Sūtra of the Prince’s Auspicious Manifestation* 太子瑞應本起經 (T185, 0476c16-0477a20), which states: “便得三活: 一離貪欲, 二離瞋恚, 三離愚癡, 無復罣礙。” Translated, this means, “Subsequently, he achieved the three kinds of livelihood: freedom from greed, freedom from enmity, and freedom from delusion, without any further obstacles.”

world. [This] Hero presents the supreme joy of the Dharma, which is unwavering and incomparable.⁶ How can the treasure that has manifested in your domain compare to such a Blessed Jewel?⁷ Moreover, on every fifteenth day of the month, he expounds upon the precepts and absolves transgressions.” The Jumoyue Spirit General then replied to the Seven-Headed One.

13.1 今十五大淨 夜明如日光

求尊作何方 不著在何處

Today [marks] the fifteenth day [of the month, a day of] great purity.

The night shines as if [illuminated] by daylight.

In which direction should we search for the Blessed One?

We are uncertain of his whereabouts.⁸

行度三活: Bapat translates this phrase as “practising (行) how to go beyond (度) the three-fold (三) ocean of existence (活), the past, present, and future.” [Parentheses added for analysis]. His understanding of ‘三活’ appears to be off the mark. For his interpretation to align, the term should have been ‘三世’ (three periods).

⁶ 法樂堅 (T) = 法樂賢 (K, Z) = 法藥堅 (S, Y, M) = 法藥賢 (P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The variants contrast ‘樂’ (joy) with ‘藥’ (medicine) and ‘堅’ (unwavering) with ‘賢’ (wise). In the context of ‘雄生無上...無比,’ they translate as: 1) “The Hero manifests the supreme Dharma’s joy, unwavering and incomparable,” 2) “...joy, whose wisdom is incomparable,” 3) “...Dharma’s medicine, unwavering and incomparable,” and 4) “...medicine, whose wisdom is incomparable.”

⁷ 已生寶何如賢者寶: Bapat’s translation of this phrase as “And as He (寶?) is already (已) born (生), how (何) do you think, Sir (賢者?), is the Treasure (寶)?” seems to be incorrect. [Parentheses added for analysis]. This seems to be imprecise overlooking the former ‘寶’ and the character ‘如.’ The phrase can be more aptly captured by the comparative structure with the phrase ‘何如’ (how does it compare?): contrasting ‘已生寶’ (the treasure that has already manifested [in your domain]) with ‘賢者寶’ (the treasure of the Wise One [in my domain]).

⁸ Y13.1d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘不著在何處’ as “In what (何) place (處) He stays (在), without (不) being attached (著).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. While this is a plausible interpretation, another interpretation posits ‘不著’ to signify ‘uncertain.’ This perspective aligns more coherently with the context. This usage can be traced back to the Jin Xin 盡心 I Chapter (Section 5) of *Mengzi* 孟子, which proclaims, “孟子曰: 行之而不著焉, 習

Sn153 *Ajja paṇṇaraso uposatho*

Divyā ratti upaṭṭhitā

Anomanāmaṃ satthāraṃ

*Handa passāma Gotamaṃ*⁹

Today is the fifteenth day, the Uposatha .

A divine night has dawned.

Come on! Let us behold Gotama,

The teacher of the eminent name.¹⁰

13.2 尊今在王舍 教授摩竭人

一切見斷苦 洞視是現法

The Blessed One currently resides in Rājagṛha,

Teaching the inhabitants of Magadha.

All [his right] views bring an end to suffering,

[Possessing] clear insight into the reality of the present [world].¹¹

矣而不察焉，終身由之而不知其道者，眾也。” Translated, it conveys: Mencius remarked, “Many are those who act without certainty, habituate without observation, and live their lives without truly grasping the way.”

⁹ **Sn153–Sn180:** Bapat attributes the majority of verses from the first half of the *Yizujing* 13 (ranging from Y13.1 to Y13.24) to the *Hemavata Sutta* (Sutta Nipāta I-9; Sn153–180). I concur with his identification in this instance.

¹⁰ **Sn153cd:** For improved readability, I have reordered the translation by presenting line d before line c.

¹¹ **Y13.2c:** In the phrase ‘一切見斷苦,’ ‘見’ appears to carry a positive denotation, suggesting ‘the Buddha’s right views’ that terminate suffering. Here, ‘一切見’ acts as the subject, translating to ‘all [his right] views’; ‘斷’ serves as the verb, meaning ‘to bring an end to’; and ‘苦’ is the object, ‘suffering.’ However, within the *Yizujing*, ‘見’ generally has a negative connotation when used as a noun meaning ‘views.’ To maintain consistency with this

13.3 從苦復苦生 斷苦不復生

徑聞八通道 無怨甘露欲

今往具禮敬 即是我所尊

The [current] suffering gives rise to more suffering.

When it is eradicated, no further suffering emerges.

Upon directly hearing the [Noble] Eightfold Path,

Enmity dissipates; we yearn for the nectar of immortality.

Now, we all have come to pay homage [to him],

He is exactly the one whom we [should] honor.¹²

13.4 行意學以作 一切有無止

寧有憎愛不 所念意乃隨

He practiced mind cultivation in order to benefit

usual negative meaning, the phrase could alternatively be interpreted as ‘He brings an end to all views and suffering.’ Given the word order and how the Buddha is portrayed in this context, the positive interpretation aligns more naturally with this line.

In the phrase ‘一切見斷苦,’ ‘見’ seems to have a positive denotation ‘the Buddha’s right views’ that bring an end to suffering. In this interpretation, ‘一切見’ is the subject ‘all [his right] views; ‘斷’ is the verb ‘to bring an end to’; ‘見’ is the object. However, when ‘見’ functions as a noun ‘views,’ it has a negative connotation throughout the Yizujing. Thus, if we want to be consistent with its negative meaning, the phrase can be read as ‘He brings an end to all views and suffering.’ Considering the word order as well as the depiction of the Buddha in this line, the positive connotation better aligns in this line.

¹² 今往具禮敬 (T / P, J, Q1, N, Q2) = 今往見禮敬 (K, Z): In the Koryō and Zhonghua editions, the variant phrase can translate to “Now, we have come to behold and pay homage to [him].”

All living things without pause.

How could he harbor resentment or lust?

His thoughts follow his [noble] intention.¹³

Sn154 *Kacci mano supaṇihito*

Sabbabhūtesu tādino,

Kacci iṭṭhe aniṭṭhe ca

Saṅkapp' assa vasīkatā

Is the mind of such a [noble] one,

Well intended toward all living beings?

Has he gained control over his intentions

Toward the desirable and undesirable?

13.5 意堅於行住 已止無所有

憎愛無所在 念空無所隨

¹³ **Y13.4ab:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘行意學以作 一切有無止’ as “He practices (行) [I hope] the training (學) of His mind (意) and (以?) stives (作) Without (無) cessation (止), for [the benefit of] all (一切) living beings (有).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. Bapat’s interpretation of the term ‘以’ is inaccurate; it can mean ‘by means of,’ ‘because of,’ ‘in order to,’ among others. In this context, I read ‘以作’ as ‘[in order] to benefit,’ and the character ‘有’ as a reference to ‘有情’ (living beings).

Y13.4cd: Bapat translates the phrase ‘寧有憎愛不 所念意乃隨’ as “He has (有) no (不) desirables (愛) or undesirables (憎), I hope, And all thoughts (所念) in His mind (意) follow (隨) Him, [their master].” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation appears to be a deliberate alignment with its Pāli equivalent Sn154cd. However, ‘憎愛’ signifies not the objects of desire or hate, but rather the emotions of resentment or lust. The word ‘寧’ introduces a rhetorical question, and the concluding ‘不’ also turns Y13.3c into an inquiry. Bapat’s insertion of ‘Him’ as the object for ‘隨’ seems misplaced. A more fitting context for Y13.4d would be “his thoughts (所念) align (乃隨) with his [noble] intention (意),” where ‘乃’ is used in the sense of ‘accordingly.’

[His noble] intention is steadfast in every stance.

[His mind] has attained tranquility, free from attachment.

Neither resentment nor lust reside [in his mind].

[His] thoughts are devoid [of selfishness], and he does not hanker after anything.¹⁴

Sn155 *Mano c' assa supāṇihito*

Sabbabhūtesu tādino

Atho iṭṭhe aniṭṭhite ca

Saṅkapp' assa vasīkatā

The mind of such a [noble] one is

Well intended toward all living beings.

He has gained control over his intentions

Toward the desirable and undesirable.

13.6 寧貪不與取 寧依無惱害

寧捨有眞行 寧慧無所著

¹⁴ **Y13.5a:** The term ‘行住’ can be directly translated as ‘to walk and to dwell.’ I have interpreted it as ‘every stance.’

Y13.5b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘已止無所有’ as “Having stayed [there], no other existence it has.” This interpretation seems misaligned. Here, ‘止’ signifies ‘tranquility’ and ‘無所有’ conveys ‘non-possessiveness.’

Y13.5c: As mentioned in Y13.4, Bapat’s translation of ‘憎愛’ as ‘desirables and undesirables’ appears to be a forced alignment with its Pāli counterpart, ‘iṭṭhe aniṭṭhite.’

Y13.5d: The concept embodied in the term ‘空’ might not yet hold the indoctrinated notion of ‘emptiness’ during the time of the *Yizujing* translation. Consequently, I have rendered it as ‘devoid of selfishness,’ drawing parallels with how ‘śūnyatā/suññatā’ (absence of self or the substantial core) is used synonymously with ‘anātman/anattā’ (non-self) in the *Nikāya/Āgama* literature.

Would he desire and take what is not given?

Would he resort to violence without remorse?

Is he equanimous showing true conduct?

Is he wise and free from all attachments?¹⁵

Sn156 *Kacci adinnaṃ n' ādiyati*

¹⁵ **Y13.6:** Each of the four lines commences with the character ‘寧,’ which, in this context, signifies a rhetorical question. This usage is a common currency in Chinese literature. I provide an illustrative example found in the Zi Jin 子衿 Chapter of the *Classic of Poetry* 詩經, verse 2: “青青子佩 悠悠我思 縱我不往 子寧不來.” This can be translated as “So blue was [the jewelry] you wore; I have thought of you for so long. Although I cannot come [to you], Why don’t you come [to me]?” This interpretation of ‘寧’ in Y13.6 is substantiated by Y13.7, which offers line-by-line responses to the queries in Y13.6. Further support for this reading can be found in the Pāli parallel verses: Sn156 poses the questions, while Sn157 provides the answers. Given that these verses are recited by the Jumoyue Spirit General, they can be interpreted as a reflective process of self-questioning followed by self-answering. This footnote applies to Y13.8, Y13.10, and Y13.11.

Y13.6a: Bapat translation of the phrase ‘寧貪不與取’ reads as “He, I hope (寧?), doth not (?) like (取?), through greed (貪), what is not (不) given (與) to Him,”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation notably seems to overlook the significance of ‘寧’ and ‘取’, while introducing extraneous terms such as ‘I hope,’ ‘doth not,’ and ‘like,’ which diverge from the original context. Bapat’s choice to render ‘寧’ as ‘I hope’ might arise from an attempt to align it with the interrogative particle ‘*kacci*’ (I wonder if...) from Sn156, thereby extending its meaning to convey ‘I hope that.’ Both meanings are found in the entry of ‘*kacci*’ in *Critical Pāli Dictionary*.

Y13.6b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘寧依無惱害’ as “Has taken recourse (依) to desisting (無惱?) from harm (害);”,. [Parentheses added for analysis]. His representation of ‘無惱’ as ‘desisting’ may cause contextual ambiguity. A more direct translation of ‘無惱’ would be ‘without vexation,’ which I suggest should be translated as ‘without remorse’ within the given context. The core of this phrase seeks to inquire if the Blessed One practices non-harm towards all sentient beings.

Y13.6c: Bapat interpretation of the phrase ‘寧捨有眞行’ is “He has resigned (捨) Himself, I hope (寧?), to conduct (行) real (眞),”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. This rendition appears problematic. While ‘捨’ generally signifies ‘to abandon,’ it can also suggest ‘indifference,’ ‘impartiality,’ or ‘equanimity,’ especially when correlated with the Buddhist term ‘*upekṣā/upekkhā*.’ Though one could interpret Y13.6c as ‘Has he abandoned true conduct?’, this seems less likely given the presence of the verb ‘有’ in the middle and the context provided by Y13.6d. Importantly, while Y13.6ab questions the Blessed One’s abstention from certain negative practices, Y13.6cd delves into his positive attributes.

眞行 = 直行 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The variant ‘直行’ can be translated as ‘right conduct,’ an alternative to ‘眞行’ (true conduct). Notably, ‘直行’ is an earlier Chinese equivalent for ‘正行,’ the term used for ‘*samyakkarmanta*’ (right action), an element of the ‘*Āryāṣṭāṅgamārga*’ (Noble Eightfold Path). For an in-depth discussion, please see Y4. fn.9 and Y11. fn.13.

Y13.6d, 慧 = 惠 (S, Y, M): Bapat opts for the alternative reading translating the phrase ‘寧惠無所著’ as “And He has, I hope, no (無) bounties (惠) to which (所) He is attached (著).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation seems to force the Chinese grammar. The term ‘無’ is not associated with either ‘慧’ or ‘惠.’ Instead, it is linked with ‘所著,’ and ‘無所著’ should translate to ‘non-attachment.’ A more apt translation of Y13.6d would be, “Is he wise/kind and free from all attachments?”

Kacci pāṇesu saññato,

Kacci ārā pamādamhā

Kacci jhānaṃ na riñcati

Does he abstain from taking what is not given?

Is he well-restrained towards [all] living beings?

Does he avoid negligence?

Does he remain steadfast in meditation?¹⁶

Y13.7 捨貪不與取 愍哀及蠕動

斷念不邪著 覺痛當何親

He has discarded desire and [refrains from] taking what is not given.

His compassion extends to even [the tiny] creatures that crawl.

With mental constructs eradicated, he is not attached to any false [beliefs].

Cognizant of suffering, how could he harbor affection?¹⁷

¹⁶ **Sn156:** Each of the four lines begins with the interrogative particle ‘*kacci*.’ This particle suggests supposition or doubt, typically translating as ‘I wonder if ...’ For clarity, I have rendered the four lines as direct questions.

Sn156d: The term ‘*na riñcati*’ can be directly translated as ‘not to neglect.’ In this context, I have opted for the more positive phrasing, ‘to remain steadfast.’

¹⁷ **Y13.7c:** Bapat translation of the phrase ‘斷念不邪著’ reads as “He has cut off and never entertained an attachment wrong;”. This interpretation seems to omit ‘念’ (thoughts). I have rendered ‘斷念’ as ‘with mental constructs ceased.’

Y13.7d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘覺痛當何親’ as “How can the Enlightened One with pain be joined?” The translation of ‘親’ as ‘to join’ is inaccurate and vague. In this context, a more fitting interpretation is ‘to harbor affection.’ Regarding ‘痛,’ while typically associated with acute or severe pain, either physical or emotional, Zhi Qian seems to have used it interchangeably with ‘苦’ to encompass a broader range of discomfort, from physical pain to psychological or existential suffering. This usage is consistent, as evidenced by his use of ‘痛’ as a synonym for ‘苦’ in subsequent verses (Y13.14, 16, 17). In contrast, ‘苦’ generally refers to prolonged suffering, general hardships, or the philosophical concept of life’s pervasive unsatisfactoriness.

Sn157 *Na so adinnaṃ ādiyati*

atho pāṇesu saññato,

Atho ārā pamādamhā

buddho jhānaṃ na riñcati

He does not take what is not given,

And is well-restrained towards [all] living beings.

Also avoiding negligence,

The Buddha remains steadfast in meditation.

Y13.8 寧守口不欺 斷嫉無龜聲

守正不讒人 無念鬥亂彼

Does he guard his words, refraining from deceit?

Has he ended jealousy and is he free from harsh words?

Does he uphold righteousness, never slandering others?

Is he free of thoughts of conflict [that might lead] others into trouble?¹⁸

Sn158 *Kacci musā na bhaṇati,*

¹⁸ **Y13.8bcd**: Despite the absence of the interrogative ‘寧,’ I read these lines as questions, informed by the question-and-answer pattern present in the verses recited by the Jumoyue Spirit General. My reading is supported by their Pāli parallel verses from the *Hemavata sutta*.

Y13.8d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘無念鬥亂彼’ as “Nor does he even think of a grabbing prate with others.” This appears to reflect his forced attempt to align Yizujing verses with their Pāli counterparts. The term ‘鬥亂’ denotes serious conflict and disruption not ‘idle chatter’ which he derives the idea from the Pāli term ‘*sampha*’ (frivolity/foolishness) in Sn158d.

Kacci na khīṇavyappatho

Kacci vebhūtiyaṃ n' āhā,

Kacci samphaṃ na bhāsati

Does he refrain from speaking falsehoods?

Is his speech [gentle and] not harsh?

Does he abstain from acerbic words?

Does he avoid idle chatter?

Y13.9 守口心不欺 不嫉龐聲斷

守行何讒人 悉空彼何亂

He guards his speech and never harbors deceit.

Free from jealousy, he refrains from harsh words.

He guards his behavior, so how could he slander others?

Entirely selfless, how could he cause discord with others?¹⁹

Sn159 *Musā ca so na bhaṇati,*

Atho na khīṇavyappatho

Atho vebhūtiyaṃ n' āhā,

¹⁹ **Y13.9d:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘悉空彼何亂’ as “And all vain and grabbing prate with others, how can He have?” His interpretation of ‘悉空’ as ‘all vain’ might not be the most fitting in this context. While he could have been alluding to the Buddhist doctrine of ‘*śūnyatā/suññatā*’ (emptiness), this technical term may not be the best fit within the Jumoyue Spirit General’s stanza on virtuous behavior. It is more likely that the stanza emphasizes the selflessness of an individual, rather than the philosophical concept of ‘emptiness,’ as the key to preventing discord within the community. Additionally, Bapat’s rendering of ‘亂’ as ‘prate’ seems misleading. For further clarification on this, please refer to the preceding footnote (Y13. fn.13).

Manta atthaṃ so bhāsatī

He does not speak falsehoods.

His speech is [gentle and] not harsh.

He does not speak what is acerbic.

He is considerate, speaking [only] what is meaningful.

13.10 寧不染愛欲 意寧淨無穢

所著寧悉盡 在法寧慧計

Is he free from the taint of lust and desire?

Is his mind pure and untainted?

Has he put an end to all attachments?

In the face of [all] phenomena, is he wise and shrewd?²⁰

Sn160 *Kacci na rajjati kāmesu,*

Kacci cittaṃ anāvilam

Kacci mohaṃ atikkanto,

Kacci dhammesu cakkhumā

Is he not delighted at sensual pleasures?

²⁰ **Y13.10a:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘寧不染愛欲’ as “Attachment and love for [worldly] desires, I hope, He has none.” His rendering of ‘染’ as ‘attachment’ is inaccurate. It denotes ‘to be contaminated’ and does not align with the idea of attachment or clinging. When preceded by the negative particle ‘不,’ the term ‘染’ is more aptly translated as the verb ‘to be tainted.’ For clarity and fluency, I have translate ‘不染’ as ‘to be free from the taint.’

Y13.10d: Bapat interprets the term ‘慧計’ as “He is favourably disposed.” The term actually combines two synonymous characters, which mean ‘wise’ and ‘shrewd.’

Is his mind undisturbed?

Has he surpassed delusion?

Does he have insights into the reality?

13.11 寧度至三活 所行悉已淨

一切斷不著 寧至無胎世

Has he traversed and achieved the three kinds of livelihood?

Is all his conduct now purified?

Has he brought an end to all attachments?

Has he entered the realm where rebirth no longer occurs?²¹

Sn162 *Kacci vījjāya sampanno,*

Kacci saṃsuddhacāraṇo

Kacci' ssa āsavā khīṇā,

Kacci natthi punabbhavo

Does he possess clear knowledge?

Is his conduct entirely pure?

Have his mental impurities been destroyed?

Is he free from any further existence?

²¹ **Y13.11a:** The term ‘三活’ denotes the three kinds of livelihood: freedom from greed, hatred, and delusion. For an in-depth discussion of this term, see footnote Y13.fn.3 of this sutta.

13.12 三活諦已見 所行淨無垢

行法悉成就 從法自在止

He has seen the truth of the three kinds of livelihood.

His conduct is pure and untainted.

He has achieved all the dharmic conduct.

Having mastery over himself through the Dharma, he has ended [rebirth].²²

Sn163 *Vijjāya-m-eva sampanno,*

atho saṃsuddhacāraṇo

Sabb' ssa āsavā khīṇā,

natthi tassa punabbhavo

He possesses clear knowledge.

His conduct is also entirely pure.

All his mental impurities have been destroyed.

He is free from any further existence.

13.13 尊德住悉善 身口悉已止

²² **Y13.12a:** Bapat translation of the term ‘三活諦’ as ‘the Truth of the three existences’ is not correct. The more accurate translation is ‘the truth of the three kinds of livelihood’ such as freedom from greed, hatred, and delusion. Refer to Y13.fn.3 for further details.

Y13.12d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘從法自在止’ as “And following the Law, self-mastery [too] He has obtained.” This translation overlooks the rendering of ‘止’ (to stop). Considering the question in Y13.11d, it seems to denote ‘to end [rebirth].’

尊行定樹間 俱往觀瞿曇

The Blessed One is virtuous, possessing all wholesome qualities.

He has ceased all [karmic actions] through body and speech.

The Blessed One is in the forest, absorbed in meditation.

Let us go together and behold Gautama.²³

Sn164 *Sampannaṃ munino cittaṃ*

Kammanā vyappathena ca

Vijjācaraṇasampannaṃ

Handa passāma Gotamaṃ.

The mind of the sage is complete,

Both in his action and way of speech.

Come on, let us [go and] behold Gotama,

[Who is] endowed with clear knowledge and [good] conduct.²⁴

13.14 真人鹿躡腸 少食滅邪貪

²³ **Y13.13a:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘尊德住悉善’ as “In all (悉) good things (善), a virtuous (德) footing (住?) the Honoured One (尊) attained (住?).” However, the interpretation of ‘住’ in his translation remains ambiguous. It is unclear if he translates it as ‘footing,’ ‘achieved,’ or possibly both. This interpretation feels somewhat forced.

Y13.13b, 止 = 上 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Bapat opts for the variant reading and translates the phrase ‘身口悉已上’ as “His body (身) and tongue (lit. mouth) (口) have a high (上) (training) already (已) undergone.” [Chinese characters added within parentheses for analysis]. However, Bapat’s translation omits the character ‘悉’ (all/entirely). A more concise and inclusive translation might be “He has already (已) culminated (上) in all aspects (悉) of his bodily (身) and verbal (口) [conduct].”

²⁴ **Sn164cd:** For a smoother flow, I have rearranged the translation, presenting line d before line c.

疾行問度法 斷痛從何脫

觀瞻如師子 恐怖悉無有

One who embodies the Truth has calves [resembling] an antelope.

Eating little, he has rid himself of destructive greed.

Let us hasten to go and inquire about the path of Dharma:

How can we bring an end to suffering and attain liberation?

We revere [him, standing majestically,] like the lion,

Who is devoid of fear about anything.²⁵

Sn165 *Enijaṅghaṃ kisaṃ dhīraṃ*

Appāhāraṃ alolupaṃ

Sn166 *Upasaṅkamma pucchāma*

Maccupāsā pamocanaṃ

²⁵ **Y13.14a:** The term ‘真人’ might have its roots in Daoist tradition, symbolizing an ideal person who completely embodies the Truth.

Bapat translates the phrase ‘真人鹿踳腸’ as “The Truthful (真) man (人), with waist (lit. intestines) (腸?) slight like the hoof (踳?) of a deer (鹿).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this interpretation does not align with the accurate context. Here, ‘腸’ broadly represents ‘a body part,’ and ‘踳’ stands as an ancient vernacular character for ‘腓’ (calf). Therefore, when combined, ‘踳腸’ directly translates to ‘the calf.’ To delve deeper:

First, while ‘腸’ primarily means ‘intestines,’ it can also serve as an alternative to ‘臟’ (body organ), such as, ‘心腸/心臟’ (heart) and ‘肝腸/肝臟’ (liver). This character is further expanded in its usage to denote ‘a body part’ in this verse.

Next, the character ‘踳,’ although rare, is listed in the *Dictionary of Chinese Variants Provided by the Department of Education* 教育部異體字字典 sponsored by the Taiwanese government. This dictionary in turn cites *Zhengzitong* 正字通, a dictionary from the early period of Qing dynasty (1644-1911) and *Yupian* 玉篇, a woodprint version dictionary from the Yuan dynasty (1279-1368). These ancient lexicons affirm ‘踳’ as a vernacular variant of ‘腓’ or ‘腓’ (calf).

By joining ‘踳’ and ‘腸,’ we get ‘踳腸,’ which is a synonym of ‘腓腸’ or ‘腓腸,’ both signifying ‘the calf.’ Thus, Bapat’s renderings of ‘腸’ as ‘intestines’ or ‘waist’ and ‘踳’ as ‘hoof’ do not resonate with the precise and contextually relevant meaning.

Y13.14c: Bapat translates ‘疾行問度法’ as “To Him, we quickly repair, of the Law of Deliverance to ask.” In this translation, his interpretation of ‘行’ as ‘to repair’ is not accurate. The correct rendering of ‘疾行’ should be ‘let us go quickly.’

Sn167 *Buddhaṃ verabhayātītaṃ*

Mayaṃ pucchāma Gotamaṃ

To the wise with calves as slender as an antelope's,

Who eats sparingly and is free from greed—

Having approached him, let us ask

About liberation from death's entrapment.

Let us ask Gotama,

The Buddha who has transcended hatred and fear.²⁶

佛所頭面禮七頭鬼將軍。及鵄摩越等。各從五百鬼。合爲千衆。俱到佛所。皆頭面禮佛。

住一面。鵄摩越鬼將軍。便白佛言

The Seven-Headed Spirit General bowed to the Buddha, [touching] his head [to the Buddha's feet].²⁷ The Jumoyue Spirit General followed suit. Both generals were accompanied by five hundred spirits, forming a congregation of a thousand. Upon reaching the Buddha's presence, they all showed reverence [by touching] their faces [to the Buddha's feet] and stood to one side. The Jumoyue Spirit General then addressed the Buddha.

²⁶ **Sn165-7:** This verse amalgamates segments from Sn165ab, Sn166cd, and Sn167cd.

²⁷ 佛所頭面禮 (T, K, Z) = ... (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The omission of '佛所頭面禮' in some versions resolves a narrative inconsistency. This phrase suggests bowing to the Buddha with a head-to-feet gesture and, if placed before '俱到佛所' (all arrived at the Buddha's abode), creates a sequential contradiction. In my translation of the Taishō passage, I posit that the Seven-Headed Spirit General performs the homage first, followed by the others arriving at the Buddha's dwelling. This interpretation, while addressing the sequence issue, seems somewhat contrived to account for two distinct arrivals.

13.15 真人鹿踳腸 少食行等心

尊行定樹間 吾人問瞿曇

One who embodies the Truth has calves [resembling] an antelope.

Eating little, he cultivates an equanimous mind.

We ask Gautama,

The Blessed One who is in the forest, absorbed in meditation.²⁸

Sn165 *Eṇijaṅghaṃ kisaṃ dhīraṃ*

Appāhāraṃ alolupaṃ

Muniṃ vanasmiṃ jhāyantaṃ

Sn167 *Mayaṃ pucchāma Gotamaṃ*

To the wise one with calves as slender as an antelope's,

Who eats sparingly and is free from greed—

Let us ask Gotama,

The sage who meditates in the forest.²⁹

²⁸ **Y13.15:** For a smoother flow, I have rearranged the translation, presenting line d before line c.

Y13.15a: 真人鹿踳腸 = 真人鹿踳脹 (S, Y / P, Q1, N): The character '腸' typically refers to an internal organ; however, in the phrase '鹿踳腸,' it denotes 'the calves of the antelope,' aligning with the Pāli term '*eṇijaṅghaṃ kisaṃ*' which describes slender antelope calves. This likely illustrates the lean limbs of the 'wise person' (*dhīraṃ*) or 'true person' (真人). On the other hand, '脹,' meaning 'to swell' or 'to inflate,' would render '鹿踳脹' as 'swollen antelope legs,' a description that seems out of place. It is plausible that the variant '脹' might metaphorically suggest the strong, muscular upper legs of the antelope, symbolizing strength rather than literal swelling.

Y13.15d: Bapat translates the phrase '吾人問瞿曇' as "Gautama (瞿曇)—to Him do we (吾人) repair and ask (問)." [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, the original phrase does not contain any term that directly translates to 'repair.'

²⁹ **Sn165abc & 167d:** For a smoother flow, I have rearranged the translation, presenting Sn167d before line Sn165c.

13.16 是痛從何滅 從何行脫痛

斷疑問現義 云何脫無苦

How can we bring an end to this suffering?

Through which practice can one be liberated from suffering?

Resolve our questions and reveal the truth.

How can we achieve liberation to become free from suffering?³⁰

13.17 斷苦痛使滅 行是痛苦盡

捨疑妙說持 如義無有苦

[The Buddha replied:]

Eradicate pain and suffering and ensure their extinction.

With such practice, [all your] pain and suffering will come to an end.

Let go of [your] doubts and remember [this] sublime teaching.

In accordance with the truth, suffering will vanish.³¹

³⁰ **Y13.16c:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘斷疑問現義’ as “In order to remove (斷) doubt (疑), a question do I ask (問) about things (義?) present (現).” Nonetheless, his rendering of ‘義’ as ‘things’ seems to be a stretch. In this context, it would be more aptly translated as ‘the truth’ or ‘the reality.’ As a verb preceding the object ‘義,’ ‘現’ is more likely to be a verb meaning, ‘to manifest.’

³¹ **Y13.17:** Although there is no explicit narrative indicator, this verse appears to be Buddha’s reply to the Jumoyue Spirit General’s address.

This verse features several synonymous terms, complicating its English translation. For instance, both ‘苦’ and ‘痛’ denote ‘suffering’; ‘斷’ and ‘捨’ mean ‘to remove’; and ‘滅,’ ‘盡,’ and ‘無有’ all signify ‘cease to exist.’ I have endeavored to distinguish these terms to present a clear, coherent meaning in English.

Y13.17d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘如義無有苦’ as “And all suffering will truly (如義) vanish.” While this translation is valid, I have opted to interpret ‘如義’ as ‘in alignment with the truth.’

13.18 誰造作是世 誰造作可著

誰造世所有 誰造爲世苦

Who has created this world?

Who has forged the objects [we] cherish?

Who has shaped worldly possessions?

Who has produced the suffering of the world?³²

Sn168 *Kismiṃ loko samuppanno,*

Kismiṃ kubbatī santhavaṃ

Kissa loko upādāya,

Kismiṃ loko vihaññati.

In what has the world originated?

In what does it develop affection?

Within what, clinging to what,

Is the world afflicted?³³

³² **Y13.18:** This verse poses a question from the Jumoyue Spirit General.

Y13.18c: Bapat translates ‘所有’ as ‘all that exists.’ While this is one way of reading it, I have chosen ‘possessions’ for its translation. My rationale is the verse’s progression: starting with ‘the world’ in line a, narrowing to ‘objects we cherish’ in line b, further focusing on ‘possessions’ in line c, and culminating in ‘suffering’ in line d.

³³ **Sn168:** I have rendered lines cd as a single sentence to mirror the structure of Sn169, which answers Sn168 by combining its own lines cd. For clarity and to avoid repetition, I have omitted the term ‘*loko*’ from line c, given its presence once again in line d. Additionally, I shifted the term ‘*kismiṃ*’ from line d to line c to improve readability.

13.19 六造作是世 六造作可著

六造世所有 六造爲世苦

[The Buddha replied:]

The six [sense bases] have created this world.

The six have forged the objects [we] cherish.

The six have shaped worldly possessions.

The six have produced the suffering of the world.³⁴

Sn169 *Chassu loko samuppanno,*

Chassu kubbati santhavaṃ

Channam eva upādāya,

Chassu loko vihaññati.

In the six [sense bases] the world has originated.

In the six it develops affection.

Within the six, clinging to them,

The world is afflicted.

³⁴ **Y13.19:** This verse serves as the Buddha's response to the question posed by the Jumoyue Spirit General in Y13.18. Whereas every line of Y13.18 commences with the personal interrogative pronoun '誰' (who?), each line of Y13.19 initiates with '六' (the six [sense bases]). The general might have anticipated personal or divine entities as the agent of creating the world, adorable objects, worldly possessions, and suffering. However, the Buddha reframes the answer to highlight the individual's sensory bases as the causal basis.

13.20 誰得度是世 晝夜流不止

不著亦不懸 深淵誰不沒

Who can transcend this world,

[As] day and night ceaselessly fly by?

Who has not sunk into the abyss,

[Where] there is nothing to grasp or hang on to?³⁵

Sn173 *Ko sū 'dha tarati oghaṃ*

Ko 'dha tarati aṇṇavaṃ

Appatiṭṭhe anālambe

Ko gambhīre na sīdati.

Who, here, [can] traverse the flood?

Who, here, [can] cross the ocean?

Who [can] remain unsunk in the deep,

Without a place to stand or a thing to grip?³⁶

³⁵ **Y13.20a:** Bapat translation of ‘誰得度是世’ reads “Who is he that crosses this world—,” but it appears to overlook the inclusion of ‘得’ which signifies the capability or act of achieving something.

Y13.20b: While ‘晝夜’ is directly translated as ‘days and nights,’ I have chosen to use ‘time’ for a clearer and more streamlined representation.

Y13.20cd: The expression ‘不著亦不懸’ has dual interpretations. It can mean ‘without forming attachment or entanglement’ or ‘with nothing to grasp or hang on to.’ My preference is the latter, mainly because it resonates with its Pāli counterpart Sn173c. Bapat renders ‘深淵’ word by word as ‘deep lake.’ However, when considered collectively, it alludes to an abyss.

³⁶ **Sn174:** For a smoother flow, I have rearranged the translation, presenting line d before line c.

13.21 一切從持具 從慧思想行

內念著意識 是德無極度

[The Buddha replied:]

Equipped with all virtuous conduct,

Wisely contemplating their perceptions and intentions,

With their consciousness anchored in inner mindfulness,

Such a virtuous one can cross over the unfathomable.³⁷

Sn174 *Sabbadā sīlasampanno*

Paññavā susamāhito

Ajjahattacintī satimā

Oghaṃ tarati duttaraṃ.

Always accomplished in virtuous conduct,

Possessing wisdom, well concentrated,

Inwardly reflective, and mindful,

[Such a one can] cross the uncrossable flood.

³⁷ **Y13.21:** The verse presents another response from the Buddha. The initial three lines depict the ‘是德’ (virtuous one) mentioned in the fourth line. I have translated ‘從持’ from the first line to mean ‘that which one should adopt and adhere to,’ and have chosen ‘virtuous conduct’ as its representation. While ‘無極’ directly translates to ‘limitless,’ I have chosen to convey it as ‘the unfathomable’ for clarity.

Y13.21b: I translate ‘從慧思想行’ as ‘wisely (從慧) contemplating (思) their perceptions (想) and intentions (行).’ The term ‘從慧’ literally means ‘to follow wisdom’ or ‘according to wisdom.’ I have rendered it as the adverb ‘wisely,’ to enhance the verb ‘思’ (to think). ‘想行’ is considered within the context of the five aggregates (五蘊), which include 色 (form, *rūpa*), 受 (sensations, *vedanā*), 想 (perceptions, *saṃjñā*), 行 (mental formations, *saṃskāra*), and 識 (consciousness, *viññāna*). This line characterizes the virtuous one who contemplates the arising perceptions and intentions in their mind. Alternatively, the line could be interpreted as ‘through (從) their wisdom (慧), their practice (行) is well-conceived (思想),’ by reconfiguring the grouping of the words.

13.22 已離欲世想 色會亦不往

不著亦不懸 是乃無沒淵

Having let go of desires and worldly thoughts,

Not drawn to sensory contacts either,

Such a one, therefore, [will] not sink into the abyss,

[Where] there is nothing to grasp or hang on to.³⁸

Sn175 *Virato kāmasaññāya*

Sabbasaṃyojanātigo

Nandībhavaparikkhīṇo

So gambhīre na sīdati.

Refraining from sensual perceptions,

Overcoming all fetters,

Utterly destroying the delight in existence,

[Such a one can] remain unsunk in the deep.

13.23 從何還六向 何可無有可

³⁸ **Y13.22:** Building on Y13.21, this verse continues the Buddha's reply to the general

Y13.22a: Bapat translates the phrase '已離欲世想' as "From thoughts of passion, he is far away." However, the word '世' is overlooked in this interpretation, which serves to specify what kind of thoughts (想).

Y13.22b: Bapat translates the phrase '色會亦不往' as "To the assemblage (會) of [worldly] forms (色), he never (不) doth return (往)." [Parentheses added for analysis]. Notably, '亦' is left out in his translation. Moreover, his interpretation of '色會' appears to deviate from its probable meaning. In context, '色' could denote 'all sensory objects,' suggesting that '色會' more aptly refers to 'sensory contacts.'

Y13.22cd: For a smoother flow, I have rearranged the translation, presenting line d before line c.

誰痛亦想樂 無餘滅盡去

[The Spirit General asked:]

Why does one recurrently turn to the six external [sensory objects]?

How are [the six] deemed adorable [when they inherently] lack anything to be adored?

For whom do suffering and fantasized pleasures

Extinguish and disappear without remainder?³⁹

Sn170 *Katamaṃ taṃ upādānaṃ*

Yattha loko vihaññati

Niyyānaṃ pucchito brūhi:

Kathaṃ dukkha pamuccati.

What is that [very] clinging, [the foundation]

Wherein the world is afflicted?

[Now] asked, tell [us] about the release:

How is one released from suffering?

13.24 是六還六向 是生不復生

³⁹ **Y13.23a:** The term ‘六向’ likely refers to the six external sense bases, encompassing visible forms, sound, odor, flavors, tactile objects, and mental objects. While Bapat describes it as ‘six directions,’ he subsequently elucidates it as ‘external objects of sense.’

Y13.23b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘何可無有可’ as “How is it that what [now] exists will no more exist?” However, his translation of ‘可’ as ‘things that exist’ deviates from its literal and contextual meaning. This term can be inferred as a condensed form of ‘可意’ (pleasing to the mind) or ‘可愛’ (desirable). For a more detailed exploration of this interpretation of ‘可,’ see Y2. fn19; Y7. fn27; Y10. fn44 & 59; Y11. fn29; Y12. fn15.

Y13.23c: The term ‘想樂’ is translated here as ‘fantasized pleasures,’ contrasting it with ‘痛,’ which signifies ‘suffering.’

名滅已無色 已盡有何餘

[The Buddha replied:]

These six [internal sense bases] recurrently turn toward the six external [sense objects].

This is the origination [of contact. However,] there will be no more [such] arising,

[When] mentality ceases, and materiality becomes no more.

Once these have been brought to an end, what else could remain?⁴⁰

Sn171 *Pañca kāmagaṇā loke*

Manochaṭṭhā paveditā,

Ettha chandaṃ virājetvā

Evaṃ dukkha pamuccati.

It is declared in this world that

There are five strands of sensual pleasure with mind as the sixth.

[By] dispelling desire for these,

One [can] be thus liberated from suffering.⁴¹

⁴⁰ **Y13.24:** This verse opens with the concept of the six contacts and then transitions to the cessation of mental and physical components. While it touches upon the six contacts similarly to its Pāli counterpart, Sn171, the emphasis here is distinct. Sn171 focuses on the elimination of desire as the primary path to liberation from suffering.

Y13.24b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘是生不復生’ as “He is now born but will no more be born.” However, this translation appears out of context. Given that line a references the six internal bases and their six external counterparts, ‘生’ likely pertains to ‘the origination [of six contacts].’ The subsequent phrase ‘不復生’ should be linked to line c, emphasizing the non-origination state of the six contacts—signaling the cessation of an individual’s mental and physical components.

Y13.24c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘名滅已無色’ as “Form having disappeared, name [too] vanishes.” This translation seems to miss broader contextual cues. Its deeper significance emerges when linked with ‘不復生’ from the preceding line. It is important to highlight that this cessation is not akin to the conventional understanding of death. In Buddhist doctrine, ordinary individuals, driven by desire, perpetuate their mental and physical components across subsequent lives.

⁴¹ **Sn171ab:** For a more fluid reading, I have adjusted the translation by placing ‘paveditā’ in the first line followed by ‘pañca kāmagaṇā’ in the subsequent line.

13.25 大喜步往道 大將軍七頭

會當報重恩 開道現大尊

法施無有上

Having walked along the Path with immense joy,

The Great General of the Seven-Headed Spirits

Has approached intent on expressing gratitude for the profound favor.

The Great Sage has established and illuminated the Path;

His bequeathing of the Dharma stands unparalleled.⁴²

13.26 今鬼合千衆 悉能叉手住

⁴² **Y13.25:** This verse seems to consist of five lines and line e best fits within this verse.

Bapat translates this verse as one sentence: “With great joy, the steps towards the Path were turned (往?) By the Great Seven-Headed Commander, So that (會?) the great favours he should return, As the highly Honoured One would preach (開道) and explain The gift of the Law that is surpassed by none.” [Parentheses added for analysis]. I concur with Bapat’s interpretation on most fronts; however, his interpretation of ‘往’ and ‘會’ may lack precision, likely an outcome of condensing the verse into one sentence.

Y13.25a: The phrase ‘步往道’ in the initial line can be translated in multiple manners. It may be interpreted as ‘to step (步) towards and proceed (往) on the Path (道),’ or as ‘to progress (往) stepwise (步) on the Path (道).’ I have selected the second interpretation.

Y13.25c: The expression ‘會當報’ in the third line can be understood as ‘to attend a gathering (會), wishing to (當) reciprocate (報).’ Given this interpretation, I have refined the translation to read ‘to approach with the intention of expressing gratitude,’ ensuring it aligns better contextually.

Y13.25d: 道 = 導 (S, Y, M): The character ‘道’ typically represents ‘the Path,’ whereas the variant ‘導’ signifies ‘guidance’ or ‘teaching.’ Consequently, the alternate phrase ‘開導現大尊’ could be translated as “The Great Sage has established and illuminated his teachings.” Despite the different terms, the core meaning is consistent.

無有上 = 無有止 (Q1): The phrase ‘無有上’ is generally translated as ‘unsurpassed,’ contrasting with the variant ‘無有止,’ which implies ‘unending’ or ‘ceaseless.’ Both convey a sense of extraordinary nature of the Buddha’s teachings, although with slightly different nuances.

一切身自歸 爲世尊大師

Now, the assembly of a thousand spirits [has convened].

All are [respectful] enough to remain with their hands clasped.

All, from the depth of their hearts, take refuge

In the World Honored One, the Great Teacher.⁴³

Sn179 *Ime dasasatā yakkhā*

Iddhimanto yasassino

Sabbe taṃ saraṇaṃ yanti,

Tvaṃ no satthā anuttaro

These thousand yakkhas

Endowed with spiritual prowess and renown,

All seek refuge in you:

You are our incomparable teacher.⁴⁴

⁴³ **Y13.26b:** The term ‘能’ signifies capability. I have interpreted this in the context of the spirits’ readiness or eagerness to progress on the Path, leading me to phrase it as ‘[respectful] enough to.’

Y13.26c: For the expression ‘身自歸,’ I have perceived ‘身’ to symbolize ‘life,’ and have thus interpreted ‘身自’ as ‘from the core of their heart.’

Y13.26d: The phrase ‘爲世尊’ conveys ‘for the Blessed One.’ I chose to phrase it as ‘in the World Honored One’ considering the collocations of the ‘歸’ (seeking refuge) from the preceding line.

師=歸 (S, Y, M): The variant ‘歸’ results in a tautology in Y13.26cd: ‘一切身自歸 爲世尊大歸,’ which may be translated as “Each (一切...自), from the depth of their heart (身), seeks refuge (歸); earnestly (大) seeks refuge (歸) in (爲) the Blessed One (世尊).” The repetition and the similarity in the components of the characters suggest that ‘歸’ might be a scribal error for ‘師.’

⁴⁴ **Sn179c:** The term ‘taṃ’ here is the accusative singular form of the second person pronoun ‘tvam.’

13.27 今已辭求過 各還國政治

今悉禮正覺 念法歸尊法

Now, abstaining from all misdeeds,

Each [of us will] return to our realms to govern [justly].

Now, [we] all pay our respects to the Rightly Awakened One.

With the Dharma in mind, we take refuge in the Blessed One's teaching.⁴⁵

Sn180 *Te mayam vicarissāma*

Gāmā gāmaṃ nagā nagaṃ

Namassamānā sambuddhaṃ

Dhammassa ca sudhammatā

We, [who stand as] they [here], will wander,

From village to village, from mountain to mountain,

Venerating the Fully Awakened One,

The Supreme Truth of the Dhamma.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ **Y13.27a:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘今已辭求過’ as “Now we, having already taken leave,”. This translation overlooks the nuance of ‘求過,’ which I understand to mean ‘to commit (lit. seek) transgressions.’ The preceding character, ‘辭,’ can denote ‘to refuse’ among other meanings such as ‘to say,’ ‘to leave,’ or ‘to dismiss.’ Given the context, I interpret ‘辭求過’ to mean ‘to refrain from committing transgressions.’

Y13.27b: Bapat's translation of the phrase ‘各還國政治’ as “Will return, each to our district,” appears to omit the meaning of ‘政治’ which signifies ‘to govern.’

⁴⁶ **Sn180a:** The term ‘*te mayam*’ merges ‘*te*,’ the nominative plural of the third-person pronoun, with ‘*mayam*,’ the nominative plural of the first-person pronoun. This translates to ‘they we.’ While this pairing might appear contradictory at first glance, such combinations are not uncommon in ancient Indic languages. For instance, ‘*eso aham*’ means ‘this I,’ and ‘*tā mayam*’ signifies ‘they we’ in the feminine gender, followed by a verb aligning with ‘*aham*’ and ‘*mayam*.’ In the given context, both ‘*te*’ and ‘*maya*’ likely refer to the same group. From the vantage point of the Jumoyue Spirit General, who voices this verse, the General of Seven-Headed Spirits and the accompanying one thousand spirits are seen as both ‘they’ and ‘we’—with the speaker being part of this collective.

Sn180d: I have rendered the term ‘*sudhammatā*’ as ‘the Supreme Truth.’

爾時座中。有梵志名兜勒。亦在衆中。便生意於泥洹脫者支體因緣。因是便意生疑。

At that time, among those seated, there was a brahmin named Dou-le. As he sat amidst the assembly, his thoughts drifted to the causality of the physical body of a liberated one who has achieved Nirvāṇa.⁴⁷ Consequently, he then harbored a doubt in his mind.

佛即知兜勒意生所疑。便化作一佛。端正形好無比。見莫不喜者。形類過天。身有三十二大人相。紫磨金色。衣大法衣。

The Buddha immediately knew the doubt that had arisen in Dou-le's mind. He then manifested another buddha, one of unmatched elegance and beauty. Everyone was delighted at seeing [this form], which bore the thirty-two marks of a great man, with a polished golden violet hue, draped in the robe of Dharma.⁴⁸

弟子亦作化人。化人適言弟子亦言。弟子適言化人亦言。佛所作化人。化人言佛默然。佛言化人默然。何故一切制念度故。化佛便叉手偏袒。以偈歎言

⁴⁷ 泥洹脫者支體因緣: Bapat translates this phrase as “What was delivered in Nirvāṇa was [only] the [physical] body with limbs.” However, this seems to miss the nuance of ‘因緣.’ The phrase more aptly captures the concept of ‘the causality (因緣) associated with the physical body (支體) of one who is liberated (脫者) and has achieved Nirvāṇa (泥洹).’ The implications of this could vary. Dou-le might be contemplating the connection between a liberated individual and their corporeal form or perhaps the fate of an arhat's body upon their passing. The former interpretation offers insight into the subsequent narrative contrasting the Buddha with his manifestation, and his disciples with their own. If one leans towards the latter interpretation, ‘泥洹’ is equated with the ultimate Nirvāṇa, symbolizing ‘death.’ The term ‘支體’ translates to ‘limbs and body,’ but can be succinctly termed as ‘physical body.’

⁴⁸ 見莫不喜者: A direct translation of this phrase is “Not a single person was not delighted at seeing this form.” For improved readability, I have rendered it as ‘Everyone was delighted at seeing [this form].’

The [Buddha's] disciples also manifested their own duplicates. When these duplicates enunciated words, the disciples also spoke [at the same time]. When the disciples enunciated words, their duplicates also did the same. As for the duplicate that the Buddha made manifest, when the duplicate spoke, the Buddha remained silent. When the Buddha spoke, the duplicate remained silent. Why was this so? [Because the Buddha] had complete mastery over [his] thoughts and had become transcendent.⁴⁹ The duplicate buddha, with hands clasped and [right shoulder] exposed [in respect], immediately extolled [the Buddha] in verse.

13.28 願問賢神俞曰 遠可靖大喜足

從何見學得滅 悉不受世所有

I seek to inquire of the Noble Divine One; in response [to my query, please] tell [us]

[About] detachment from desires, serenity, great joy, and contentment.

What should a learner perceive in order to attain cessation,

Without holding on to any possessions in the world?⁵⁰

⁴⁹ 一切制念度故: Bapat translate this phrase as “Because (故) all (一切) those that control (制) their thoughts (念) can penetrate (度?) through things.” [Parentheses added for analysis]. The interpretation of ‘度’ as ‘to penetrate’ appears to be an extrapolation. In my understanding, I have taken ‘度’ to mean ‘to cross over’ and ‘制念’ to signify ‘mastery over one’s thoughts.’

⁵⁰ **Y13.28a**, 俞 = 逾 (S, Y, M): Bapat selects the alternative character and translates ‘願問賢神逾曰’ as “Of the divine (神) sage (賢) gone beyond (逾) [all things], I should like to (願) ask (問).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation omits ‘曰’ (to speak). My rendition of the variant phrase is, “I wish (願) to question (問) the noble (賢) and divine (神) one who transcends (逾) [all]. [Please], speak [to us].” The initial character ‘俞’ typically signifies ‘to respond’, suggesting original phrase ‘俞曰’ should be understood as ‘in response, tell [us].’

Y13.28b, 靖 = 靜 (S, Y, M): Both characters signify the same meaning ‘tranquility.’ Bapat translates the phrase ‘遠可靖大喜足’ as “About remoteness (遠) and calm (靖/靜), the source (足?) of great (大) joy (喜).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this interpretation neglects ‘可’ and ‘足’, which appear to represent ‘desirable things’ and ‘contentment’ respectively. For a more detailed exploration of this interpretation of ‘可,’ see cross-references in Y2. fn19; Y7. fn27; Y10. fn44 & 59; Y11. fn29; Y12. fn15.

Sn915 *Pucchāmi taṃ Ādiccabandhuṃ*

Vivekaṃ santipadañ ca mahesiṃ

Kathaṃ disvā nibbāti bhikkhu

Anupādiyāno lokasmiṃ kiñci

I ask the Sun's Kinsman, the Great Seer

About solitude and the state of serenity.

Upon seeing what, does a monk find inner peace,

Without grasping anything in the world?

13.29 本是欲多現我 從一綺便悉亂

所可有內愛欲 從化壞常覺識

The root of such [insatiable] desire is the proliferation of the ego.

Enamored by a bolt of silk, all are instantly distracted.

Merely imagining possession [breeds] deep lust and desire.

[Yet], always be aware that with time, [everything] fades and crumbles.⁵¹

⁵¹ **Y13.29:** Verses from Y13.29 are the Blessed One's instructions, unless otherwise noted.

Bapat translates this verse as “The root of desire and the obtrusion [sic] of the self And all distraction therefrom may be completely ended. And whatever craving that may be embosomed—For its destruction, one should be watchful and alert.” This interpretation diverges significantly from the original meaning, mainly due to a misinterpretation of the character ‘綺’ which denotes ‘silk,’ not ‘to end.’ It is possible that Bapat confused it with ‘終’ (to end). As a result, ‘從一綺’ should be translated as ‘enamored (從) by a (一) bolt of silk (綺),’ portraying people's distraction by enticing items. Moreover, this translation neglects the presence of ‘是’ and ‘多’ in line a; ‘便’ in line b; and ‘從’ and ‘常’ in line d.

Y13.29c: The phrase ‘所可有內愛欲’ can be directly translated as “The potential (可) possession (所...有) [breeds] inner (內) lust (愛) and desire (欲).” For better clarity and fluency, I have phrased it as “Merely imagining possession [breeds] deep lust and desire.”

Sn916 *Mūlaṃ papañcasamkhāyā ti Bhagavā*

Mantā asmī ti sabbam uparundhe

Yā kāci tanhā ajjhataṃ

Tāsaṃ vinayā sadā sato sikkhe

The Blessed One says: “The root of conceptual proliferation is

[The conceit] ‘I am,’ all of which the wise should prevent.

Whatever internal cravings [may arise],

They should train to subdue them, being ever mindful.”⁵²

13.30 莫用是便自見 不及減若與等

雖見譽衆所稱 莫貢高蹶彼住

Do not resort to such self-assessments:

“[You] are not my match,” “[I] am inferior to you,” or “[I] am your equal.”

Even when praised and admired by the masses,

Y13.29d: I have translated ‘從化壞常覺識’ as “[Yet], always (常) be aware (覺識) that with time (從), [everything] fades (化) and crumbles (壞).”

⁵² **Sn916:** Concerning the role of ‘*mantā*’ in line b, there are two potential interpretations. It might serve as the subject for the subsequent verb ‘*asmī*’, rendering the phrase ‘*mantā asmī ti*’ as ‘I am the wise.’ Alternatively, it could be the subject of the optative verb ‘*uparundhe*’ (one should prevent). Andersen Smith, who edited the Pāli *Sutta Nipāta* in 1913 for PTS, supports the former interpretation, a reading also adopted by Fronsda. The latter interpretation is preferred by Jayawickrama, Norman, Bodhi, and myself.

Do not be arrogant or assume a condescending stance towards others.⁵³

Sn918 *Seyyo na tena maññeyya*

Nīceyyo atha vā pi sarikkho

Putṭho anekarūpehi

Nātumānaṃ vikappayan tiṭṭhe

On that account, one should not deem themselves superior,

[Nor see themselves] as inferior, or even equal to [another].

[Although] being influenced by various forms,

One should not dwell on imagination about themselves.⁵⁴

⁵³ **Y13.30a:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘莫用是便自見’ as “Because of this (是), he may not (莫?) think (見) [high] of himself (自).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation is far off the mark. Firstly, ‘莫’ is not merely a negative particle ‘not’ or ‘no’; its primary function is to indicate prohibition. Therefore, ‘莫用’ can be translated as ‘do not use...’, which I interpret as ‘do not resort to...’ Bapat’s attempt to link ‘莫’ with farthest character ‘見’ instead of the closest verb ‘用’ seems arbitrary. Moreover, there is no character in the original text that would suggest the context ‘because of.’ He seems to include this phrase to align it with ‘tena’ in Sn918a.

Y13.30b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘不及減若與等’ as “Nor (不) low (減?), nor ranked (及?) as on level (等) with (與) others;”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation is not accurate. The phrase can be segmented into three parts: ‘不及’ (do not match), ‘減若’ (lesser than you), and ‘與等’ (equivalent to). Here, ‘減’ primarily means ‘to decrease’ and ‘及,’ ‘to reach,’ suggesting that Bapat’s interpretation stretches the meanings of these characters. It is possible that he confused ‘及’ with ‘綴’ (a rank/stage). I have used ‘they’ as the subject for ‘不及’ and ‘I’ as the implied agent in ‘減若’ and ‘與等.’ With this framework, the phrase expresses notions of superiority, inferiority, and equality, reflecting the three types of self-assessment mentioned in line a.

Y13.30d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘莫貢高蹶彼住’ as “He may not exalt himself to the skies and then fallen stand.” This interpretation seems questionable. In the context, ‘莫’ primarily signals prohibition, and ‘貢高’ suggests ‘arrogance.’ Therefore, ‘莫貢高’ can be understood as ‘do not be arrogant.’ While the character ‘蹶’ holds various meanings, paired with ‘彼’ (others), it can be read as ‘elevate oneself above others’. Consequently, ‘蹶彼住’ could imply ‘assuming a condescending stance towards others.’

⁵⁴ **Sn918a:** In the sequence of the *Yizujing*, Sn918 precedes Sn917. Consequently, the term ‘tena’ (on that account) in line a might seem to come out of nowhere. In the Pāli verse sequence, it is quite clear that the term is a reference to Sn917a’s phrase ‘yaṃ kiñci dhammam abhijaññā,’ which can be translated as ‘whatever doctrine one might know.’

Sn918c: The Mahāniddesa interprets the term ‘putṭho’ as ‘phuṭṭho’ (affected by), which is the past participle of ‘phusati’ (to touch). While the original ‘putṭho’ could derive from ‘poseṭi’ (to be nourished) or ‘pucchati’ (to ask), neither seems contextually appropriate. I adhere to the commentarial interpretation.

13.31 如所法爲已知 若在内若在外

強力進所在作 無所得取無有

If one follows a certain preferred doctrine,

Be it concerning the inner [mind] or the external [world],

And ardently proceeds to advocate for their [doctrinal] position,

They will not achieve [the serenity of] ‘dispassion.’⁵⁵

⁵⁵ **Y13.31a:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘如所法爲已知’ as “Already (已) he has understood (爲?...知) whatever (所?) is in consonance (如?) with Law (法)—”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation may not accurately capture the nuances of ‘如’ and ‘所’ within the context. The character ‘如’ likely signifies ‘if’ or ‘when,’ whereas ‘所’ might convey ‘fit’ or ‘preferred.’ While this usage of ‘如’ is found frequently in Chinese classics, ‘所’ with this denotation is not common. An instance where ‘所’ means ‘fit’ is seen in the Zi Han 子罕 Chapter (Section 15) of the *Analects* 論語: “子曰: 吾自衛反魯, 然後樂正, 雅頌各得其所,” translated as “Confucius remarked, ‘After my return from Wei to Lu, the music was corrected, with each of the Court and Praise songs finding their *rightful place*.’” (武英殿十三經注疏 本, 論語注疏: 子罕, p. 75). The other denotation ‘preferred’ of ‘所’ is evident in the Great Treatise II 繫辭下 (Section 2) of the *I Ching* 周易: “日中為市, 致天下之民, 聚天下之貨, 交易而退, 各得其所, 蓋取諸噬嗑,” translated as “The market convenes at midday. People from all corners gather, as do goods from every region. After trading, they disperse, each obtaining *what they want*, all stemming from the principles of the hexagram *Shi He* (#21: Biting Through).” (武英殿十三經注疏 本, 周易正義: 繫辭下, p. 12). I translate this phrase as “If (如) one follows (爲已知) a certain preferred (所) doctrine (法).” Here, ‘爲已知’ directly translates to ‘is what one already knows.’ This literal translation does not align well with ‘preferred doctrine,’ since ‘preferred’ implies prior knowledge or acceptance, making the phrase redundant. Therefore, I have opted to render it as ‘to follow,’ although this interpretation is somewhat stretched.

Y13.31c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘強力進所在作’ as “He is strenuous and diligent at whatever he does,”. While this captures the overarching sentiment, I propose an alternate interpretation for ‘所在作,’ which would mean ‘establishing one’s [doctrinal] position.’ In this context, ‘所在’ can be understood as ‘location’ or ‘place,’ and I interpret it figuratively as a ‘doctrinal position.’ Although ‘作’ literally means ‘to make’ or ‘to establish,’ I have translated it as ‘to advocate.’ This rendering is justified by the context where the doctrinal position has already been preferred and followed in the previous lines.

Y13.31d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘無所得取無有’ as “Without (無) aiming at (所得?) [the fruit]. Thus grasping (取) will not (無) exist (有).” This interpretation seems ambiguous. A clearer translation of ‘無所得’ would be ‘nothing to be attained,’ which hints at the mental state of ‘*nirvāṇa*’—a state devoid of attachments. The *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism* (DDB) characterizes ‘無所得’ as representing enlightenment, defined by a lack of attachment and erroneous discriminations in the mind. The Pāli equivalent ‘*nibbuti*’ in Sn917d also corroborates this interpretation, depicting the mindset of the awakened as tranquil and free from cravings. Based on this insight, ‘取無有’ can be more accurately conveyed as ‘they cannot achieve.’

Sn917 *Yaṃ kiñci dhammam abhijaññā*

Ajjhattam atha vā pi bahiddhā

Na tena thamam kubbetha

Na hi sā nibbuti satam vuttā

Whatever doctrine one may know,

Either inwardly or outwardly,

They should not become dogmatic on that account,

For this is not called ‘quenching [of craving]’ of the good.⁵⁶

13.32 且自守行求滅 學莫從彼求滅

以內行意著滅 亦不入從何有

One should seek cessation through self-cultivation;

The practitioner [should] not seek cessation by chasing externalities.

With inner reflection, the mind’s attachment fades.

Indeed, [when] nothing infiltrates [the mind], where can [attachment] reside?⁵⁷

⁵⁶ **Sn917c:** The term ‘*tena*’ (on that account) seems to encompass the entirety of lines a and b

Sn918d: The referent of the feminine pronoun ‘*sā*’ remains ambiguous. While ‘*thama*’ could potentially be its antecedent, it typically functions as a masculine or neutral noun. An alternative interpretation might suggest the pronoun refers to the overall content of previous lines. Meanwhile, ‘*satam*’ represents the present participle masculine genitive singular of ‘*√as*’ (to be) and, in this context, signifies ‘the good [people].’

⁵⁷ **Y13.32a:** I interpret ‘自守行’ as ‘self-cultivation.’ The term ‘且’ seems to function synonymously with ‘宜,’ used as a modal verb ‘should’ or ‘ought to.’ For further details on this usage of ‘且,’ see Karashima (2010: 364).

Y13.32b: I interpret ‘從彼’ as ‘chasing externalities.’ Additionally, I have translated ‘學’ as ‘the practitioner,’ who serves as the subject of this line and refers back to ‘one’ in my translation of the previous line.

Y13.32d: While Bapat translates ‘亦不入’ as “He pries not into things,” in the Buddhist context, it seems more fitting to interpret it as “[External influences] do not penetrate [the mind].” Furthermore, his rendering of ‘從何有’ as “How can he [possibly] do it?” seems vague. The phrase is about existence (有) not action (爲). A more precise translation would be “Where can [attachment] find a place?”.

Sn919 *Ajjhattam eva upasame*

Nāññato bhikkhu santim eseyya

Ajjhattam upasantassa

N' atthi attā kuto nirattam vā

A monk should find tranquility within;

He should not seek peace from external [sources].

For one who finds serenity within,

There is nothing grasped; [hence,] how could anything be rejected?⁵⁸

13.33 在處如海中央 無潮波安平正

一切止住亦爾 覺莫增識與意

Like being in the middle of the sea,

Devoid of tides or waves, quiet, still, and undisturbed,

The Awakened One dwells like this, unruffled in any [situations];

He does not allow conceptions to proliferate through his mind.⁵⁹

⁵⁸ **Sn919a:** I have moved my rendering of ‘*bhikkhu*’ from line b to line a, as it serves as the subject in both lines.

⁵⁹ **Y13.33c:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘一切止住亦爾’ as “Just (亦) so (爾) with one in whom everything (一切) has stopped (止) and stayed (住).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This rendition lacks precision. Firstly, his rendering of ‘stopped and stayed’ is ambiguous due to the misplacement of ‘住’; it should pair with ‘亦爾,’ resulting in ‘住亦爾’ (he dwells in this manner). ‘一切止’ literally means ‘all has stopped,’ indicating tranquility in any situation. As the subject is missing from line c, I have used ‘覺’ (the Awakened One) from line d as the subject for both lines c and d.

Y13.33d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘覺莫增識與意’ as “The Enlightened One (覺) can have no (莫) protuberances (增識) in his mind (意).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation is not accurate. Above all

Sn920 *Majjhe yathā samuddassa*

Ūmi no jāyatī ṭhito hoti

Evaṃ ṭhito anej' assa

Ussadam bhikkhu na kareyya kuhiñci

Just as being in the middle of the ocean,

Which remains still with no wave arising,

So, staying calm, without mental turbulence,

A monk would not show agitation on any occasion.

13.34 願作大慧眼視 已證法復現彼

願作光仁善恕 諸檢式從致定

We beseech you to use your great wisdom eye to let us see

The Dharma that you have already realized and reveal anew for others.

We beseech you to radiant your kindness, virtue, and mercy,

For all who have convened in the obligatory rules and are seeking deep meditation.⁶⁰

else, his configuration of ‘增識’ renders the conjunction ‘與’ superfluous. ‘識與意’ should be interpreted collectively as ‘conceptions in the mind.’ Though ‘識’ literally denotes ‘consciousness,’ it is rendered as ‘conceptions’ because ‘增識’ seems to be the translation of the Buddhist technical term *prapañca* (conceptual proliferation). This term presents a notion that in the ordinary mind, conceptions keep expanding uncontrollably.

⁶⁰ Y13.34: This verse poses a question to the Blessed One, similar to its Pāli counterpart, Sn921.

I initially interpreted ‘大慧眼’ (Eyes of Great Wisdom) and ‘光仁善’ (Light of Kindness and Virtue) as epithets for the Buddha, influenced by their Pali equivalents *Vivaṭacakkhu* (One with Clear-sighted Eyes) and *Bhaddan te* (Venerable One) in Sn921. However, the correct Chinese word order for ‘Light of Kindness and Virtue’ should be ‘仁善光,’ not ‘光仁善,’ and the term ‘光仁善’ appears only once here in the entire Chinese Buddhist Canon. This rarity led me to reparse ‘作光’ as the verb ‘to radiate’ and ‘仁善恕’ (kindness, virtues, and

Sn921 *Akittayi vivaṭacakkhu*

Sakkhi dhammaṃ parissayavinayaṃ

Paṭipadaṃ vadehi bhaddan te

Pātimokkhaṃ atha vā pi samādhim

One with clear-sighted eyes, a true witness,
Has declared the Dhamma that wards off perils.
O, Venerable One, tell [us] about the Path,
Obligatory rules, and concentration as well.⁶¹

13.35 且攝眼左右著 不受言關閉聽

戒所味莫貪著 我無所世所有

Refrain from letting eyes wander [in search of] attachments everywhere,
Avoid harboring [thoughts about others'] chatter, closing the gate of hearing.
Be guarded against tasty foods, forming no craving or attachment,

mercy) as its object. Given the parallel structure in lines a and c, I reinterpreted line a to use ‘作’ as the verb ‘to use’ with ‘大慧眼’ (great wisdom eye) as its object.

Y13.34ab: Bapat translates the phrase ‘願作大慧眼視 已證法復現彼’ as “I hope the Great vision-eyed Seer will reveal To others the Law already experienced by Him.” Notably, this translation does not include the phrases ‘作...視’ (make [us] see) and ‘復’ (once more).

Y13.34cd: Bapat translates the phrase ‘願作光仁善怨 諸檢式從致定’ as “I hope He—may the Honoured One excuse me—will shed light On the rules [of Prātimokṣa] and the concentration that follows.” This overlooks the term ‘善’ (virtuous/meritorious/skilled). Contrary to Bapat, I have read line d as a reference to ‘諸’ (all those assembled here).

⁶¹ **Sn921:** For a smoother rendition, I have repositioned the two terms: I have moved ‘*sakkhi*’ (eyewitness) from line b to line a, and ‘*akittayi*’ (declared) from line a to line b.

Hold no sense of ‘mine’ about worldly possessions.⁶²

Sn922 *Cakkhūhi n’ eva lol’ assa*

Gāmakathāya āvaraye sotam

Rase ca nānugijjheyya

Na ca mamāyetha kiñci lokasmim

One should keep their eyes unwavering.

They should close their ears to village gossip.

They should not crave flavors,

Nor hold a sense of ‘mine’ in anything in the world.

⁶² **Y13.35a:** Literally, the phrase ‘且攝眼左右著’ translates to “One should (且) restrain (攝) their eyes (眼) from fixating (著) on things to both the left (左) and right (右).” In my translation, the term ‘左右’ is interpretively rendered as ‘everywhere,’ suggesting a more comprehensive restraint. In contrast, Bapat’s rendition, ‘Just hold your eyes from moving right or left,’ interpret ‘著’ as ‘moving,’ which appears less precise since ‘著’ typically connotes fixation or attachment rather than simple movement.

著 = 羞 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The term ‘羞’ denotes ‘shame,’ offering a different nuance to the phrase. Therefore, ‘且攝眼左右羞’ could be understood as, “One should restrain their gaze from casting upon shameful (羞) things in all directions (左右),” which introduces a moral dimension to the concept of visual restraint from worldly desires.

Y13.35b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘不受言關閉聽’ as “Give (受?) words (言) no (不?) access (關) to your ears (聽?) which closed (閉) may remain (?.)” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation is puzzling, as it seems to conflate ‘受’ (to accept) with ‘授’ (to give), resulting in an awkward phrase, ‘to give words access.’ It is conceivable that he is translating ‘受言關’ creatively as ‘to give words access,’ but this approach neglects traditional Chinese word order and syntax by merging ‘不...關’ to mean ‘no access’ and ‘關...聽’ as ‘access to hearing.’ Furthermore, ‘聽’ (to listen) is broadened to imply ‘ears,’ an extrapolation not directly indicated by the text. A translation that remains more faithful to the structure and meaning of the original might read: “Do not (不) accept (受) chatters (言), and close (閉) the gate (關) to listening (聽).” This interpretation adheres more closely to the explicit meanings of each character.

關 = 開 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The character ‘開’ means ‘to open,’ and the variant phrase ‘不受言關閉聽’ might be interpreted as “Do not accept chatters, closing (閉) [gate] of hearing (聽) that was [previously] open (開).”

Y13.35c: Bapat’s translation of ‘莫貪著’ as ‘that are tabooed’ seems to diverge from the phrase’s core meaning. A more straightforward translation would be ‘do not (莫) desire (貪) or become attached (著).’

13.36 身所有若龜細 莫還念作悲思

所可念便生願 有來恐慧莫畏

[Encountering] sensory objects, whether coarse or refined,

Refrain from dwelling on them or entertaining melancholic thoughts.

Desirable things can promptly incite longing,

When danger comes, the wise remain unafraid.⁶³

Sn923 *Phassena yadā phuṭṭh' assa*

Paridevaṃ bhikkhu na kareyya kuhiñci

Bhavañ ca nābhijappeyya

Bheravesu ca na sampavedheyya

When affected by an [awful] cognitive contact.

⁶³ **Y13.36a:** I have rendered the phrase ‘身所有’ as ‘sensory objects’ deducing it to mean ‘that which (所) [is considered] existing (有) through the body (身).’

Y13.36b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘莫還念作悲思’ as “Entertain (還 or 作?) no (莫) thought (思) of grief (悲) in your mind (念?).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this translation omits one of the two verbs ‘還’ and ‘作.’ Taking these two verbs into account, a more nuanced interpretation would be: ‘do not reflect [on them] (莫還念)’ and ‘[do not] entertain sorrowful thought (作悲思).’

Y13.36c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘所可念便生願’ as “If you have (生) a craving (願) for things (所) that are covetable (可念?).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation, however, lacks nuance. The Chinese character that would equate to ‘if’ is absent, and ‘便’ is not addressed in his translation. My interpretation of ‘所可念’ is ‘desirable things,’ which I understand to mean ‘things (所) perceived (念) as desirable (可).’ For a more detailed exploration of this interpretation of ‘可,’ see Y2. fn19; Y7. fn27; Y10. fn44 & 59; Y11. fn29; and Y12. fn15.

Y13.36d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘有來恐慧莫畏’ as “And if you have fears, please (惠), do not crouch.” In this interpretation, Bapat seems to replace the original character ‘慧’ (wisdom) with ‘惠’ (graciousness). It is important to note that while ‘惠’ might occasionally represent ‘wisdom’ (慧), the reverse—‘慧’ indicating ‘grace’ (惠)—is not applicable. Additionally, Bapat’s reading of ‘畏’ as ‘to crouch’ seems off. This character generally means ‘to fear.’ If he meant ‘to think,’ he might have confused ‘畏’ with ‘思.’

For the character ‘恐,’ I have opted to translate it as ‘danger’ or ‘intimidation,’ rather than its more common meaning of ‘fear.’ This choice is supported by the context in line d, where the wise remain unafraid, suggesting that ‘恐’ refers to external threats rather than internal fear.

A monk should not lament under any circumstance.

He should not yearn for existence,

Nor should he fear amidst daunting situations.

13.37 所得糧及飲漿 所當用若衣被

取足止莫慮後 從是止餘莫貪

[As for] victuals, drink, or soup that you get,

And requisites, such as robes,

Be content only with what is acquired; do not be anxious about [whether you will have
them] later.

Adhering to this limit, do not covet more.⁶⁴

Sn924 *Annānam atho pānānaṃ*

Khādaniyānaṃ atho pi vatthānaṃ

Laddhā na sannidhiṃ kayirā

Na ca parittase tāni alabhamāno

Food and drink,

⁶⁴ **Y13.37a:** Bapat's translation neglects the term '漿' (soup).

Y13.37c: Bapat translates '取足止莫慮後' as "Take (取) them enough (足) for your need and stop (止), without (莫) providing (慮?) for the future (後)." [Parentheses added for analysis]. His reading of '取足' is linguistically valid, but it does not capture the broader spirit of Buddhist livelihood that emphasizes moderation. Therefore, a more contextually appropriate interpretation would be 'be content (足) with what is acquired (取).' Additionally, Bapat seems to have misconstrued the character '慮,' which signifies 'to consider/to worry about.'

Y13.37d: Bapat translates '從是止餘莫貪' as "With (從) these (是), ye rest (止) [content] and covet (貪) ye not (莫) for the rest (餘)." [Parentheses added for analysis]. While his reading of '從是止' is grammatically valid, a more nuanced interpretation that considers the broader context might be 'adhering (從) to this (是) limit (止).'

Solid nourishment, as well as clothing—

Upon receiving [them], one should not hoard.

Nor should one be agitated [even if] one does not acquire them.

13.38 常行定樂樹間 捨是理無戲犯

若在坐若在臥 閑靜處學力行

Always practice meditation and rejoice in the forest.

Abandon such theories and refrain from indulging in conceptual proliferation.

Whether sitting or lying down,

Strenuously train yourself in quiet and peaceful places.⁶⁵

Sn925 *Jhāyī na pādalol' assa*

Virame kukkuccaṃ na-ppamajjeyya

Atha āsanesu sayanesu

Appasaddesu bhikkhu vihareyya

⁶⁵ **Y13.38b:** Bapat translates the phrase ‘捨是理無戲犯’ as “To rules of conduct (理?) be resigned (捨), with no (無) violence (犯?) or play (戲) with them;”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation is notably divergent from the expected meaning. Particularly, his interpretation of ‘捨是理’ as ‘be resigned to rules of conduct’ seems to deviate significantly. Generally, when followed by the object, such as ‘是理’ here, the verb ‘捨’ is taken to mean ‘to abandon’ rather than ‘to be equanimous.’ Consequently, ‘是理’ suggests something negative that ought to be discarded. The term ‘理’ can encompass various meanings, such as ‘reason,’ ‘theory,’ ‘principle,’ among others. Here, ‘theory’ or ‘reasoning’ might be more fitting translations. Additionally, Bapat’s translation of ‘犯’ as ‘violence’ is questionable. A more suitable translation would be ‘to commit crimes’ or ‘to violate rules.’ I understand ‘無戲犯’ to mean ‘no conceptual proliferation entertained.’

Y13.38b: The phrase ‘若在坐若在臥’ is best translated as “whether one is sitting or lying down.” Bapat’s rendering as “In places of dwelling or of rest,” though seemingly a more interpretive attempt, does not accurately capture the essence of the original wording.

A monk should be a meditator, not an aimless wanderer.

He should abstain from remorse and avoid negligence.

[Whether] on seats or beds,

He should reside in places of minimal noise.⁶⁶

13.39 莫自怨捐睡臥 在學行常嚴事

棄晔忽及戲謔 欲世好悉遠離

Do not reproach yourself. Avoid [excessive] sleep and lying down.

In learning and training, always be strict in your behavior.

Abandon benightedness, inattention, frolics, and lies.

Distance yourself from all desires and worldly predilections.⁶⁷

⁶⁶ Sn925: To enhance the flow, I have restructured the translation, placing ‘*bhikkhu*’ from line d into line a.

⁶⁷ Y13.39a, 怨 = 恐. (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): In his translation, Bapat opts for the variant character ‘恐’ and renders ‘莫自恐’ as ‘No fear (恐) ye entertain.’ However, this interpretation might not fully consider the significance of ‘自,’ which seems less congruent with ‘恐’ than with ‘怨.’ In this context, ‘自怨’ (self-blame or self-resentment) appears more pertinent to the subsequent theme of excessive sleep than ‘自恐’ (self-fear). A lethargic lifestyle is more likely to result in self-resentment rather than self-fear, suggesting that ‘怨’ (resentment/blame) is a more appropriate translation than ‘恐’ (fear). However, if we were to consider the variant phrase in isolation from its context, it could be translated as ‘do not fear yourself.’

Y13.39b: Bapat translates the phrase ‘在學行常嚴事’ as “In (在) watchful (學?) behaviour (行) always (常) practice (事?) exertion (嚴?).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. I find this translation to be imprecise. His translations of ‘學’ as ‘watchful,’ ‘事’ as ‘practice,’ and ‘嚴’ as ‘exertion’ appear to be a bit too liberal interpretations. My version is, ‘In (在) learning (學) and training (行), always (常) be strict (嚴) with [your] behavior (事).’ Here, ‘事’ is primarily taken to mean ‘activity/task’ as a noun or ‘to serve’ as a verb, and I have adapted it to the Buddhist conduct with my rendering ‘conduct’ or ‘behavior.’

Y13.39c: Bapat translates the phrase ‘棄晔忽及戲謔’ as “Drowsiness (晔忽?), sport (戲) and (及) laughter (謔?) ye abandon (棄).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, his character translations seem to miss their mark. While ‘晔’ is more commonly associated with ‘darkness’; ‘忽’ indicates ‘inattention or negligence’; ‘戲’ can mean ‘frolic’ but in a Buddhist context, it suggests ‘conceptual proliferation’ (*prapañca*); and ‘謔’ translates to ‘lie.’

Y13.39d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘欲世好悉遠離’ as “And from sexual (欲?) enjoyment (好?) and self-adornment, keep away (遠離).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. In order to align Y13.39d with its Pāli counterpart Sn926d, his translation seems to take liberties, overlooking ‘世’ (world/generation) and ‘悉’ (all/entirely),

Sn926 *Niddaṃ na bahulīkareyya*

Jāgariyaṃ bhajeyya ātāpī

Tandiṃ māyaṃ hassaṃ khiḍḍaṃ

Methunaṃ vippajahe savibhūsaṃ

One should not overindulge in sleep.

Being ardent, they should engage in wakefulness.

They should abandon laziness, deceit, laughter, play,

Sexual activity, and self-adornment.

13.40 捨兵鑿曉解夢 莫觀宿善惡現

莫現慧於胞胎 悉莫鑿可天親

Abandon sorcery and dream interpretation.

Do not observe the constellations [as a] revelation of good or bad [fortune].

Do not prophesize [about a fetus] conceived in a womb.

Completely eradicate divining heaven's will with a chisel.⁶⁸

introducing 'self-adornment' unexpectedly, and pushing the interpretations of '欲' and '好' with a specific sexual emphasis.

⁶⁸ **Y13.40a:** I have translated the term '兵鑿' as 'sorcery', drawing inspiration from its Pāli equivalent 'āthabbaṇa' (Atharva spell/black magic) found in Sn927a. In this context, '兵' can be interpreted as 'to kill with a weapon', and '鑿' symbolizes the chisel, a tool historically tied to divination in ancient China. This leads me to an interpretation that suggests 'warding off evil spirits using the sacred chisel as a threat.' In classical Chinese literature, the divinatory role of '鑿' or its abbreviated character '凿' is evident. A notable instance from the Adornment of the Heterodox chapter 飾邪 (section 1) of *Hanfeizi* 韓非子 states: "鑿龜數筮, 兆曰大吉, 而以攻燕者趙也." This translates to: "After chiseling the turtle and tallying the divinatory sticks, the omen pronounced 'It is highly auspicious that Zhao 趙 will attack Yan 燕.'" (四部叢刊初編 本 韓非子: 飾邪, p. 107). Bapat's

Sn927 *Āthabbaṇaṃ supinaṃ lakkhaṇaṃ*

No vidahe atho pi nakkhattaṃ

Virutañ ca gabbhakaraṇaṃ

Tikicchaṃ māmako na seveyya

Atharva spells, [interpretation of] dreams and signs,

Along with astrology—none should one practice.

[Deciphering] animal cries, assisting impregnation,

And offering medical healing—a follower of mine should not practice.⁶⁹

13.41 莫造作於賣買 莫於彼行欺利

莫作貪止縣國 莫從彼求欲利

Do not manufacture [goods] for trade.

interpretation of this term as ‘weapons of injury’ seems to overlook the historical nuances of the character ‘鑿’ and appears misplaced in this context, prompting my choice of translation.

I have rendered the phrase ‘曉解夢’ as ‘dream interpretation,’ with ‘曉’ meaning ‘to reveal’, ‘解’ as ‘to explain’, and ‘夢’ translating as ‘dream.’

Y13.40b: Bapat seems to have inadvertently omitted the translation of this line. Within the context, the character ‘宿’ is aptly understood as ‘constellation’.

Y13.40c: My interpretation of ‘現慧’ is ‘to prophesy,’ where ‘現’ stands for ‘to reveal’ and ‘慧’ represents ‘knowledge.’ The subsequent phrase ‘於胞胎’ suggests ‘the fetus’ or ‘unborn baby’. Bapat’s rendition of ‘莫現慧於胞胎’ is “Exhibit not your skill of [sustaining the child in] the womb.” However, his choice to equate ‘慧’ with ‘skill’ necessitates an awkward inclusion of the words ‘sustaining the child’.

Y13.40d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘悉莫鑿可天親’ as “Use not (莫) at all (悉) a probing [knife] (鑿) and thus be a favourite (親) of gods (天).” This is a somewhat nebulous translation, perhaps stemming from Bapat’s oversight of ‘鑿’ being historically used as a divination tool in ancient China. The line serves as a caution against seeking divine omens.

⁶⁹ **Sn927:** This verse outlines the improper livelihoods that Buddhist monks in ancient India might have pursued. The prohibition against these practices, combined with the use of the term ‘māmaka’ (my disciple) in line d, indicates that the composer of this verse, or perhaps the entire sutta, was cultivating a distinct Buddhist identity.

Do not deceive and exploit others.

Do not yearn to linger in a county or state.

Do not follow others to seek desired benefits.⁷⁰

Sn929 *Kayavikkaye na tiṭṭheyya*

Upavādaṃ bhikkhu na kareyya kuhiñci

Gāme ca nābhisajjeyya

Lābhakamyā janaṃ na lāpayeyya

A monk should not partake in trade.

He should not insult [others] under any circumstances.

He should not linger in a village.

He should not chatter with people desirous of gains.

13.42 莫樂行不誠說 悉莫行兩面辭

盡壽求慧所行 具持戒莫輕漏

Do not indulge in untruthful talks.

⁷⁰ **Y13.41:** Bapat's translation, while close, has certain inaccuracies in interpreting specific terms. The Pāli parallels also support my interpretations.

Y13.41a: Bapat's rendering of '造作' as 'to engage oneself in' lacks precision. A more direct translation is 'to create/manufacture.' The term '賣買' can be directly translated as 'selling and buying,' which I have rendered concisely as 'trade.'

Y13.41b: In this context, the character '彼' refers to 'other people.' Bapat's translation of it as 'the same' seems to be a mistranslation, possibly referring to 'buying and selling' from line a.

Y13.41c: Bapat's translation of '止縣國' as 'for any dwelling-places in the country' is not exact. With '縣' meaning 'county' and '國' signifying 'state,' the term '止' is more appropriately translated as a verb, 'to dwell.'

Y13.41d: Bapat appears to misinterpret '從彼' as 'from the same,' potentially referencing 'for any dwelling places in the country' from line c. A more accurate interpretation is simply 'to follow others.'

Avoid all forms of divisive speech.

Until the end of [your] life, pursue the path of the wise.

Uphold all the precepts, and avoid dismissing any transgressions as trivial.⁷¹

Sn931 *Mosavajje na niyyetha*

Sampajāno saṭhāni na kayirā

Atha jīvitena paññāya

Sīlavatena nāññam atimaññe

One should not be led to falsehood.

Nor should one deliberately commit fraudulent deeds.

Furthermore, one should not look down on another

Due to livelihood, wisdom, morality, or religious observances.

13.43 橫來詰莫起恐 見尊敬莫大語

所貪棄不可嫉 捨兩舌患悲法

[When] faced with criticism, remain unafraid.

⁷¹ **Y13.42b:** Bapat's interpretation of '兩面辭' as 'duplicity of speech' might not capture the essence. A more accurate translation would be 'divisive speech,' which implies speech tailored to the listener with the intent of causing disagreement or discord.

Y13.42c: The phrase '慧所行' can directly translate to 'what (所) the wise (慧) would do (行).' I have rendered it simply as 'the path of the wise.'

Y13.42d, 具 = 眞 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Bapat seems to choose the variant character and translates '眞持戒莫輕漏' as "And rules of conduct ye hold truly (眞), without slighting them as leaky." His phrase 'to slight rules as leaky' may lack precision and clarity. A more direct translation could be: "Uphold (持) the precepts (戒) with sincerity (眞), and do not (莫) dismiss any breaches (漏) as insignificant (輕)." In this rendition, I interpret '輕' as 'to treat as trivial,' emphasizing the importance of acknowledging and addressing all transgressions, regardless of their perceived gravity.

[When] being venerated and respected, refrain from boasting.

Let go of desires and avoid envy.

Eschew divisive language [that leads to] resentment and sorrow.⁷²

Sn928 *Nindāya na-ppavedheyya*

Na uṇṇameyya pasaṃsito bhikkhu

Lobhaṃ saha macchariyena

Kodhaṃ pesuṇiyaṇ ca panudeyya

A monk should remain undisturbed by blame.

He should not swell with pride when praised.

He should cast aside greed,

Along with stinginess, anger, and slander.

⁷² **Y13.43a**, 恐 = 怨 (S, Y, M / ? P, J, Q1, N, Q2): According to the Zhonghua apparatus, the five editions (P, J, Q1, N, Q2) display ‘莫起’ instead of ‘起恐,’ which appears to be a clear error. ‘莫起’ is about the fourth and fifth characters and cannot replace ‘起恐,’ which is about the fifth and sixth characters. It seems more accurate to read this as ‘莫起怨’ in place of ‘莫起恐,’ aligning with the parallel apparatus found in the Taishō edition.

Bapat chooses the alternative character ‘怨,’ translating the phrase ‘橫來詰莫起怨’ as “If words of challenge ye meet, let no hatred (怨) overpower you.” While this translation grasps the general essence, it inaccurately interprets ‘詰’ as ‘words of challenge.’ A more precise translation of ‘詰’ would be ‘criticism’ or ‘censure.’ In the context, ‘怨’ (hatred/resentment) seems more pertinent in response to censure rather than ‘恐’ (fear). Nevertheless, in my translation, I adhere to the Taishō version’s use of ‘恐.’ Additionally, ‘橫來’ should be interpreted as ‘to come across’ or ‘encounter,’ more accurately reflecting its meaning in this context.

Y13.43c: The term ‘所貪’ might refer to either ‘objects of desire’ or just ‘desire.’ I have opted for the more straightforward ‘desire.’ For details about this two possible renderings of ‘所’ in Chinese Buddhist translation, please refer to Y2. fn.16.

Y13.43d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘捨兩舌悲法’ as “And the double-tongue (兩舌), too, with what is anger and grief.” This interpretation appears to omit the significance of ‘捨’ (to abandon) and ambiguously represents ‘法’ as ‘what.’ In this setting, ‘法’ can be better understood as ‘mental state.’ In my own translation, however, I have chosen to omit ‘法’ to enhance the flow.

13.44 所欲言學貪著 莫出聲龜邪漏

無羞慚莫從學 所施行莫取怨

A learner may be attached to their cherished words.

[But] they should not voice those [that may be still] rough, misguided, and defiled.

Without a sense of moral conscience, one should not pursue learning.

Avoid harboring resentment against the obligatory [monastic] procedures.⁷³

Sn930 *Na ca katthitā siyā bhikkhu*

Na ca vācam payutaṃ bhāseyya

Pāgabbhiyaṃ na sikkheyya

⁷³ **Y13.44a:** Bapat translates ‘所欲言學貪著’ as “Words (言) that (所) reveal one’s desire (欲) as well as greed (貪) or attachment (著).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. The translation is not accurate. It overlooks the potential subject ‘學’ (a learner) and erroneously connects ‘欲’ and ‘貪著,’ even though they’re separated by ‘言’ and ‘學.’

Y13.44c, 無羞慚 (T) = 無羞慚 (K, Z) = 無著慚 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The character ‘慚’ is a variant of ‘慚,’ both signifying ‘shame’ or ‘moral conscience.’ Thus, the first two versions, ‘無羞慚’ and ‘無羞慚,’ are identical, differing only in graphical representation. In contrast, ‘無著慚’ introduces a different meaning due to the character ‘著,’ whose primary meaning is ‘to make known,’ customarily used in place of ‘着’ (attachment). In the given context, ‘without attachment, one should not pursue learning’ does not make sense; the context requires a different interpretation of ‘著’ as ‘confession’ that Buddhist renunciants do in the *Upasadha* rituals conducted twice a month. This different interpretation of ‘著’ also affects the connotation of the following character ‘慚,’ which was rendered positively as ‘moral conscience’ in my interpretation of the Taishō version, but as negatively as ‘shameful [misdeeds]’ in my translation of the apparatuses. Consequently, I interpret ‘無著慚’ as ‘without (無) the confession (著) of shameful (慚) [misdeeds].’ My interpretations of both versions are in line with Buddhist principles, emphasizing the importance of moral shame and confession of misdeeds as foundational to Buddhist practice, reflecting the interplay between the Vinaya and the Dharma. Therefore, I translate the variant phrase ‘無著慚莫從學’ as ‘Without (無) confessing (著) shameful (慚) [misdeeds], one should not engage in learning.’

Bapat translates ‘無羞慚莫從學’ as “Of words of impudence (無羞慚?), ye never (莫) learn (學) any.” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation is far off the mark. The term ‘無羞慚’ can be directly translated as ‘without (無) shame (羞) or remorse (慚),’ mirroring the Pāli terms ‘*hiri*’ (shame) and ‘*ottappa*’ (remorse). For enhanced clarity, I have chosen to phrase it as ‘a sense of moral conscience.’ Bapat’s rendering may originate from his forced alignment of ‘無羞慚’ with the Pāli ‘*pāgabbhiyaṃ*’ (impudence) from Sn930c.

Y13.44d: Bapat’s translation of ‘所施行’ as ‘in all your doings’ is not spot-on. Contrary to the similar term ‘所行’ (actions one has taken), ‘所施行’ conveys a slightly distinct shade of meaning. With ‘施’ introducing the nuance of ‘official implementation’ or ‘generosity,’ I have leaned towards the former, translating it as ‘the executed procedures.’ Should ‘所施行’ indicate ‘generosity bestowed,’ there’s no justification for one to feel resentment (怨).

Katham viggāhikam na kathayeyya

A monk should not be a braggart.

He should not say a word with ulterior motives.

He should not train himself in impudent [conduct].

He should not speak quarrelsome speech.⁷⁴

13.45 聞麤惡不善聲 從同學若凡人

善關閉莫與同 慧反應不過身

Upon hearing rough, malicious, or unwholesome speech,

From fellow practitioners or commoners,

You should well close off your ears and refrain from responding in kind.

React with wisdom, never commit transgressions against yourself.⁷⁵

Sn932 *Sutvā rusito bahum vācam*

⁷⁴ **Sn930b**: In the *Mahāniddesa*, the term ‘*payutam*’ is interpreted as ‘*payuttam*’ (applied/intent on). While this term can carry both positive and negative connotations, the *Paramatthajotikā II* leans towards a negative interpretation. Therefore, I have translated ‘*payutam*’ as ‘with ulterior purposes.’

⁷⁵ **Y13.45d**, 反 = 及 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The substitution of ‘反’ with ‘及’ significantly alters the line’s meaning. ‘反’ in ‘慧反應’ suggests a compound meaning ‘to react (反應) with wisdom (慧).’ However, ‘及’ in the variant ‘慧及應’ creates a conjunction, pairing ‘慧’ (wisdom) with ‘應’ (worthy). In this context, ‘應’ is interpreted as an abbreviation for ‘應供’ (arhat or worthy one), a common usage in Chinese Buddhist translations. Therefore, the variant line ‘慧及應不過身’ is better translated as “The wise (慧) and worthy (應) do not commit wrong against themselves,” suggesting that responding in kind to others’ unwelcoming words is doing harm onto oneself.

Bapat, opting for this variant, translates it as “For, the wise (慧) and (及) worthy (應?) never (不) make a personal (身) assault (過?).” He appears to draw parallels with the Pāli version, but his interpretation of ‘不過身’ seems to miss the mark. Considering the negation ‘不,’ the term ‘過’ should be understood as a verb meaning ‘to commit transgressions,’ with ‘身’ serving as its object and functioning as a reflexive pronoun.

Samañānaṃ puthuvacanānaṃ

Pharusena ne na paṭivajjā

Na hi santo paṭisenikaronti

Annoyed, [when] hearing many [critical] words

From ascetics or ordinary people,

One should not reply to them with a harsh [word],

For the good do not retaliate.⁷⁶

13.46 知如來諦已正 不戲作著意作

從宴淨見已滅 不戲疑曇瞿教

Knowing the Truth that the Tathāgata has already rectified,

Neither proliferate nor cling to mental constructs.

With views already subsided in pursuit of peace and purity,

Do not proliferate doubts about Gotama's teachings.⁷⁷

⁷⁶ **Sn932b:** The PTSD defines '*puthuvacana*' as either 'speaking in many (bad) ways' or as referring to 'people with various/ordinary speech.' The latter interpretation is derived from the *Mahāniddeśa*'s annotation. In line with the commentarial explanation, Alsdorf proposes that line b should be read as '*samañānaṃ vā puthujjanānaṃ vā*' (ascetics or ordinary people) for metrical reasons. Both Norman's and Fronsdal's translations align with this commentarial note. However, Jayawickrama and Bodhi lean towards the former interpretation, adhering to a more literal translation of '*puthuvacana*.' Given the phrase '*bahuṃ vācam*' (many [critical] words) already present in line a, I find the former interpretation somewhat repetitive and prefer the latter.

Sn932d: The term '*santo*' can be derived from either the past participle form of '*sammati*' (to be calmed) or the present participle form of '*as*' (to be). In line with the latter philological origin, '*santa*' could denote either 'existence' or 'the good.' Jayawickrama and Fronsdal adopt the former interpretation, translating '*santa*' as 'those with serenity' and 'peaceful,' respectively. In contrast, Norman and Bodhi favor the latter, rendering it as 'the good [people].' While both interpretations are valid, I have chosen the latter for my translation.

⁷⁷ **Y13.46 and Y13.47:** These verses appear to serve as the epilogue of this sutta, recited by the Jumoyue Spirit General.

Y13.46a: Bapat translates '知如來諦已正' as "Knowing (知) the Truths (諦) of Tathāgata (如來) as just (已?) and right (正)." [Parentheses added for analysis]. While this translation captures the essence, there is a slight misinterpretation. The character '已' is primarily translated as 'already,' and is often used in the present perfect

Sn933 *Etañ ca dhammam aññāya*

Vicinam bhikkhu sadā sato sikkhe

Santī ti nibbutim ñatvā

Sāsane Gotamassa na-ppamajjeyya

Having grasped this teaching and reflecting upon it,

A monk should practice, always being mindful.

Recognizing the serenity [and acknowledging] ‘it is peaceful,’

He should not be negligent in the teaching of Gotama.

13.47 自致慧不忘法 證法無數已見

tense context. Subsequently, the character ‘正’ can act as a verb meaning ‘to rectify,’ and I have contextually translated ‘諦已正’ as ‘to have elucidated the Truth.’

Y13.46b: Bapat rendering of ‘不戲作著意作’ is “Never (不) dally (戲作?) with them, but with close (著?) thought think over (意作?);”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation seems to deviate significantly from the original meaning, and the reasoning behind such renderings is elusive. In context, ‘戲作’ translates to ‘to create (作) conceptual proliferation (戲),’ and ‘意作’ can be understood as ‘[what] the mind creates,’ which denotes ‘mental constructs.’

Y13.46c: Bapat translates ‘從宴淨見已滅’ as “Consider (見?) that from (從) the calm (宴) and quiet (淨?) doth Quiescence (滅?) result;”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this translation deviates from the more probable meaning. Attempting to align with Pāli Sn934, his interpretations of ‘見,’ ‘淨,’ and ‘滅’ appear misdirected. In this verse, ‘見已滅’ likely conveys the idea of ‘views (見) having already (已) subsided (滅).’

Y13.46d, 曇瞿 (T) = 瞿曇 (K, Z): In the Taishō version, the term ‘曇瞿’ appears to be a metathesis of ‘瞿曇’ (the transcription of Gautama) as found in the Koryō and Zhonghua versions.

Bapat translates ‘不戲疑曇瞿教’ as “And Gautama’s (曇瞿) teaching (教) ye never (不) treat as light (戲) or with doubt (疑).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. His translation may be influenced by his alignment with the Pāli counterparts, particularly his interpretation of ‘戲’ as ‘to treat lightly’ based on the Pāli term ‘*pamajjati*’ (to be negligent). However, this alignment approach seems to loosely connect the subsequent character ‘疑’ (doubt), which lacks a counterpart in the Pāli text. Considering the structure and meaning within the Chinese context, ‘不戲疑’ may be more accurately rendered as ‘do not (不) frivolously entertain (戲) doubts (疑).’ This translation directly aligns with the Chinese text, emphasizing the admonition against casual or frivolous engagement with doubts concerning Gautama’s teachings.

常從慧如來學 好不著從是慧

On his own, [Gautama] has attained the insight into the unforgettable Dharma.

He has realized the Dharma, [after] having witnessed it innumerable times.

[Hence, one should] always pursue wisdom, the Tathāgata's teaching.

Prefer to be unattached by following this wisdom.⁷⁸

Sn934 *Abhibhū hi so anabhibhūto*

Sakkhi dhammaṃ anītiham adassī

Tasmā hi tassa Bhagavato

Sāsane appamatto sadā namassam anusikkhe

ti Bhagavā ti

For he is a conqueror, unconquered [by others].

With his own eyes, he saw the truth, not through hearsay.

Therefore, in the teachings of this Blessed One,

⁷⁸ **Y13.47a:** Since Y13.46d has introduced ‘曇瞿教’ (Gautama’s teachings), I read Y13.47a as describing Gautama and I have added him as the subject. It is Gautama who has reached the insight on his own.

不忘法 = 不亡法(S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): In the phrase ‘不忘法,’ a direct translation would be ‘do not forget the Dharma.’ However, considering the context, this phrase can be interpreted as a noun, ‘the unforgettable Dharma,’ which serves to qualify the preceding character ‘慧’ (wisdom/insight). Similarly, the variant ‘不亡法,’ found in other editions, can be understood in a similar vein, emphasizing the enduring nature of the Dharma. Therefore, I translate it as ‘the imperishable Dharma.’ This translation strategy aims to highlight the extraordinary qualities of the Dharma as described in the text.

Y13.47b: Bapat translates ‘證法無數已見’ as “He has seen (已見) the Law (法) directly-experienced (證) and to tradition not (無?) submitting;”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation appears inaccurate. Bapat’s approach of its forcing alignment with the Pāli counterpart causes him to miss the significance of ‘無數’ (innumerable) while introducing words ‘tradition’ and ‘to submit’ that are not present in the original Chinese text.

Y13.47d: Bapat translation of ‘好不著從是慧’ reads as “And from (從) this (是) wisdom (慧) will follow (從) good (好), with attachment (著) none (不).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. While his translation of ‘好’ as ‘good’ is feasible elsewhere, it seems less likely in a Buddhist context, especially in connection with ‘著’ (to attach). The phrase ‘好不著’ more aptly suggests ‘Prefer (好) to be unattached (不著),’ or alternatively, ‘The desirable (好) cannot (不) stain (著) [him].’

Always train diligently, revering [the Blessed One].

[Thus, said] the Blessed One.⁷⁹

佛說是義足經竟。比丘悉歡喜

When the Buddha had expounded this [*sūtra* in] the *Yizujing*, all the *bhikṣus* rejoiced.

⁷⁹ **Sn934:** Sn934ab should be understood alongside Sn933cd, which recommends practicing under Gotama’s teachings. As such, Sn934ab provides a rationale for doing so. In this context, I interpret ‘*hi*’ as ‘because.’ Subsequently, Sn934cd reemphasizes the importance of diligent practice under Gotama’s guidance.

蓮花色比丘尼經 第十四

Discourse 14: Nun Utpalavarṇā (*Aṭṭhakavagga.16*)¹

聞如是。佛在忉利天上。當竟夏月。波利質多樹花適好盛。坐濡軟石上。欲爲母說經。及忉利天上諸天。爾時天王釋。到佛所爲佛作禮。便白佛言。今當用何時待遇尊。佛告天王。用閻浮利時待我。天王得教。即禮佛歡喜而去。

Thus I heard. The Buddha was in Trāyastriṃśa Heaven toward the end of the summer retreat.² The Pārijātaka trees were in full and magnificent bloom.³ Seated upon a soft and yielding stone, the Buddha intended to expound the sūtras to his mother and all the celestial beings of Trāyastriṃśa Heaven.⁴ At that time, Śakra, King of the Gods, approached the Buddha to pay homage. Śakra then inquired of the Buddha, “When might it be suitable for me to attend to you,

¹ This fourteenth discourse of the *Yizujing* corresponds to the *Sāriputtasutta* (Sn IV-16) of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*.

蓮花色比丘尼經 第十四 (K, T, Z) = 蓮花色比丘尼 第十四 (P, J, Q1, N, Q2): For an in-depth discussion of the recurring exclusion of ‘經’ (sūtra) in the titles of alternative versions documented in the Z863 apparatus, refer to Y1.fn.3.

² 當竟夏月: This phrase can directly translate to ‘on the verge of completing the summer months.’ In my translation, ‘夏月’ is interpretively rendered as ‘summer retreat,’ reflecting the rainy season (*varṣa*; Pāli *vassa*) in Buddhist tradition, a time traditionally for renunciants to retreat to a fixed dwelling. This interpretation contrasts with Bapat’s translation of ‘in order to spend his summer,’ which misses the nuance of ‘當竟’ (about to complete). This term specifically suggests the approaching end of the summer season rather than the act of spending summer.

忉利天: According to Karamshima (2010: 112), ‘忉利’ is “a transcription of a certain Middle Indic form of Sanskrit ‘Trāyastriṃśa’ (Thirty-three).”

³ 波利質多: According to DDB entry of this term, it is a transcription of the Pārijāta (tree), the sovereigns of celestial flora. It is also translated as ‘天樹王’ (King among heavenly trees).

好盛 = 盛好 (S, Y, M): In the variant phrase, the characters have undergone a metathesis. However, this reversal does not alter the intended meaning of the phrase. Both denote ‘in full bloom.’

⁴ 濡軟石 = 柔軟石 (S, Y, M): The term ‘濡軟’ translates to ‘wet and soft,’ whereas ‘柔軟’ means ‘flexible and soft.’ Both descriptions are used to characterize the stone (石) upon which the Blessed One is seated. Bapat takes ‘濡軟’ as a pleonastic compound, equating it simply with ‘soft,’ or alternatively uses the similar pleonastic compound ‘柔軟.’ My interpretation agrees with Bapat’s, highlighting that the stone seat is firm but also comfortable.

O Blessed One?”⁵ The Buddha replied to the Lord of the Devas, “You may attend to me when [I am] in Jambudvīpa.”⁶ With the guidance received, Śakra venerated the Buddha with joy and then departed.

爾時賢者摩訶目犍連。亦在舍衛。亦竟夏月。於祇樹給孤獨園中。爾時四輩悉到目犍連所。比丘輩。比丘尼。清信士。清信女。四輩悉禮目犍連。各一面住。

At that time, the venerable Mahā-Maudgalyāyana was residing at Śrāvastī, also nearing the completion of the summer retreat in Jeta’s Grove at Anāthapiṇḍada’s Park. Thereupon the entire four assemblies [of disciples]—*bhikṣus*, *bhikṣunīs*, laymen, and laywomen—approached Maudgalyāyana. They all paid their respects to Maudgalyāyana and took their positions around [him].⁷

便共問目犍連。今世正眼爲在何所竟是夏三月。目犍連便告四輩。今佛在忉利天上。當竟夏三月。念母懷妊勤苦故留說經。及忉利諸天。在波利質花樹下濡軟石上。樹高四千里。布枝二千里。樹根下入二百八十里。所坐石。按之即陷入四寸。捨便還復。

⁵ 待遇: Bapat translates this phrase as ‘to see,’ which does not capture its correct connotation. The individual components of the phrase, ‘待’ and ‘遇,’ mean ‘to treat’ and ‘to meet/entertain,’ respectively. When combined, the phrase ‘待遇’ denotes ‘to serve’ or ‘to treat with hospitality,’ reflecting both the action of meeting someone and the manner in which they are treated.

⁶ 閻浮利: According to Karashima (2010: 560), ‘閻浮利’ is “a transcription of a certain Middle Indic form of Sanskrit ‘Jambudvīpa’ (the continent, situated to the south of Mt. Sumeru).”

⁷ 四輩悉禮目犍連: I have simplified ‘四輩悉’ (all the four groups) as ‘they all’ because this term has already mentioned in the previous sentence.

各一面住: This phrase can be interpreted as ‘each (各) [group] settles (住) on each (一) side (面).’ Since ‘各’ denotes ‘each [of the four groups 四輩]’ in the given context, ‘一面’ should refer to ‘one [of the four cardinal] sides [around Mahā-Maudgalyāyana].’ I have simplified it as ‘each took their positions around him.’ In contrast, Bapat’s translation ‘Each of them took his seat at the end,’ does not accurately represent the original text, as there is no character in the phrase that directly translates to ‘the end.’

All promptly questioned Maudgalyāyana, “Where does the Right Eyes of this World dwell now, as the three months of summer retreat near the end?”⁸ Maudgalyāyana then addressed the four assemblies, “Currently, the Buddha resides in the Trāyastriṃśa Heaven, to complete the three-month summer [retreat]. In honor of his mother’s toils during her pregnancy, he remains there to impart the sūtras [to her and] to all the deities of the Trāyastriṃśa Heaven. He is seated upon a soft and yielding stone at the base of a Pārijāta tree. This tree [towers] four thousand *li* high, with branches extending two thousand *li*, and roots [plunging] two hundred eighty *li* deep.⁹ The stone he sits on gives in by four inches when pressed and instantly rebounds when released.¹⁰

⁸ 竟是夏三月: This phrase explicitly defines the duration of the summer retreat as three months (三月), a detail notably absent in Bapat’s translation. This temporal specification reinforces my earlier interpretation of ‘夏月’ as ‘summer retreat,’ and it aligns with the traditional Buddhist context of observing a rain retreat for a three-month period.

⁹ 里: This character ‘li’ is a traditional Chinese unit of distance. Its value has historically varied considerably. Generally, in ancient China, it might have represented different distances in various regions and time periods. It is analogous to the Western ‘mile’ in the sense of being a measure of travel distance, though the actual lengths differ.

二百八十里 = 二百八千里(S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The original phrase ‘二百八十里’ (280 *li*) appears too modest for the Pārijāta tree’s described height of 4,000 *li* and width of 2,000 *li*. Conversely, interpreting ‘二百八千里’ as ‘208,000 *li*’ according to Western numerical conventions leads to an implausibly large dimension. Furthermore, from the perspective of East Asian traditions, the representation of large numbers involves separating digits into groups of four from the right. Hence, in East Asian numerical expression, the number ‘208,000’ would conventionally be written as ‘二十萬八千’ (literally, 20,8000) rather than ‘二百八千’ (208,000). This distinction underscores the necessity for a nuanced approach when interpreting large numbers.

Therefore, I propose an alternative interpretation: ‘二百八千里’ might represent dimensions of ‘200 *li* in depth and 8,000 *li* in width,’ or vice versa, or indicate a range of root lengths from about 200 *li* to 8,000 *li*. These interpretations offer more plausible scales for the tree’s roots. The substitution of ‘千’ for ‘十’ in the variant phrase might be due to a scribal error, given their visual similarity. However, I suggest that the scribes of the variant phrase might have been influenced by the consistent use of ‘千’ in describing both the tree’s height and width and thus used ‘千’ for portraying its depth. It is also conceivable that the scribes may have intended to use ‘千’ to emphasize the staggering scale, rather than precise dimensions, of the Pārijāta tree.

By translating the scale as ‘two thousand and eighty *li* (2080 *li*; 二千八十里),’ Bapat introduces his own interpretative scale for the tree’s roots, which significantly deviates from the original phrases, ‘二百八十里’ (280 *li*) and ‘二百八千里’ (interpreted here as a range from 200 to 8,000 *li*).

¹⁰ 寸: This character ‘cun’ is a traditional Chinese unit of length that has also seen varied usage throughout history. It was often based on natural measurements such as the width of a person’s thumb. As with ‘li’, the exact length designated by ‘cun’ could change depending on the time period and locality.

摩訶目犍連。廣復爲四輩說經法。便默然。諸四輩聞經。歡喜著念。便禮目犍連悉去。

Mahā-Maudgalyāyana further elaborated on the teachings of the *sūtras* to the four assemblies. Upon [completing it], he fell silent. All the four assemblies listened to the *sūtras* with joy and reflected on it. Finally, they all bowed respectfully to Maudgalyāyana and dispersed.

至竟夏三月。復衆四輩。皆悉來到目犍連所。頭面禮竟。悉就座。共白目犍連。善哉賢者。學中獨多神足。願煩威神到佛所。爲人故禮佛足。以我人語白佛。閻浮利四輩。飢渴欲見尊。善哉佛。愍念世間人。願下閻浮利。目犍連聞如是默然。可四輩。復以經法戒。四輩衆歡喜。目犍連辭。四輩悉起禮。復起繞目犍連而去。

At the conclusion of the three-month summer [retreat], the members of all four assemblies once again gathered at Maudgalyāyana's dwelling. After paying their respects with prostrations, they all found their seats.¹¹ Together, they addressed Maudgalyāyana, "How excellent, Oh, Venerable One! Among the [Buddha's] disciples, only you possess a multitude of miraculous powers.¹² We beseech you to exercise your wondrous abilities and journey to where the Buddha resides. On behalf of the masses, offer respects at the Buddha's feet and convey our message to the Buddha in our human language:¹³ 'The four assemblies of Jambudvīpa ardently wish to see the Blessed

¹¹ 座 = 坐 (S, Y, M): The characters '座' and '坐' can be used interchangeably, though they often differ in grammatical function. '座' is typically used as a noun meaning 'seat,' while '坐' is more commonly employed as a verb meaning 'to sit.'

¹² 學中獨多神足: Bapat translates this phrase as "Among (中) the disciples (學), Sir, your good self alone (獨) is expert in performing miracles (神足)." [Parentheses added for analysis]. In this translation, 'your good self' appears to be a poetic embellishment to '獨' (alone), which could be more directly translated. While 'expert in' is an interpretative addition, it aligns acceptably with the meaning of '神足.'

¹³ 爲人故禮佛足 以我人語白佛: Bapat translates this sentence as "And on behalf of (爲...故) the people (人), pay respects (禮) at the feet (足) of the Buddha (佛) and, on behalf of (以?) us (我), say to (白) the Buddha (佛):". [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation overlooks the nuance of '以' (by means of) and omits the critical term '人語' (human language). Bapat seems to simplify '我人' to 'us,' whereas a more nuanced translation

One, [their yearning as acute] as hunger and thirst. How excellent, O Buddha!¹⁴ May you have compassion for the beings of this world and please consider descending to Jambudvīpa.”

Hearing this, Maudgalyāyana remained silent, signaling his acceptance to the four assemblies. He then exhorted them with the teachings of the *sūtras*, filling the four assemblies with joy. As Maudgalyāyana prepared to depart, the assembly members rose to bid him farewell with reverence. They then proceeded to circumambulate him before taking their leave.

爾時目犍連。便取定意。如壯士屈伸臂頃。從閻浮利滅。便往天上。去佛不遠。

Thereupon, Maudgalyāyana promptly entered into deep meditation. As swiftly as a mighty person might flex and extend his arm, he vanished from Jambudvīpa and ascended to the heavens.¹⁵ He [quickly] made his way to [where] the Buddha was, not far off.

是時佛在無央數天中央。坐說經法。目犍連便生想。如來在天衆中。譬如閻浮利。佛即知目犍連意想所念。告目犍連言。不與世間等。迅去即便去。欲使來即來。去來隨我意所念。

would be ‘we and others,’ capturing the phrase’s broader inclusivity. Furthermore, his interpretation of ‘語白’ as ‘to say’ does not account for its redundancy—both ‘語’ and ‘白’ signify ‘to say’—nor does it align well with common usage in ancient Chinese texts. Therefore, ‘以我人語’ should be more accurately rendered as ‘in (以) our (我) human (人) language (語).’ This interpretation likely reflects the context of the Buddha residing in Heaven, emphasizing the need for communication in human terms.

¹⁴ 善哉佛 = 善哉我佛 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The inclusion of ‘我’ before ‘佛’ in the variant phrase introduces a nuance of personal affection or belonging, rendering it as ‘our Buddha.’

¹⁵ 便往天上 = 便住天上 (P, Q1, N): While both phrases essentially convey the same meaning, the use of ‘往’ (to go) in the first emphasizes the act of ‘movement’ from one place to another. In contrast, ‘住’ in the second phrase implies an ‘instant appearance’ in another realm, focusing on the destination rather than the journey.

At that time, the Buddha was seated amidst an innumerable host of deities, expounding on the teachings of the *sūtras*.¹⁶ Maudgalyāyana then had this thought, ‘The Tathāgata presides over the celestial gathering just as [he does among the assemblies of] Jambudvīpa.’ The Buddha, then immediately knowing what Maudgalyāyana was thinking, addressed him: “This [realm] is unlike the mundane world. [Here, if I desire the deities] to depart, they do so instantly; when I call them forth, they arrive without delay. Their comings and goings are at the behest of my intent.”

目犍連白佛言。是天衆多好甚樂。天中有先世一心自歸於佛。壽盡來生天上。或有身歸法者。或自歸僧者。壽盡皆來生天上。或有先世淨心樂道。壽盡來生天上。佛言。目犍連如是。是天中先世一心歸佛歸法歸僧心樂道。壽盡皆來生天上。

Maudgalyāyana responded to the Buddha, “These divine beings are resplendent and blissful. Many of these deities, who in their former lives sought refuge in the Buddha with undivided heart, have been reborn in this divine plane. Others took refuge in the Dharma or the Saṅgha, and upon the expiration of their lives, they all ascended to the heavens.¹⁷ And there are those who, having delighted in the Path with pure mind in their prior existence, have now found rebirth in the celestial realms after their earthly sojourn.” The Buddha responded, “Maudgalyāyana, it is as you say. Those who in their past lives dedicated themselves wholeheartedly to the Buddha, to the

¹⁶ 無央數: It means ‘countless/innumerable.’ According to Hirakawa’s *Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary* and Nakamura’s *Bukkyōgo daijiten*, this term is commonly seen expressed in the transliterated form of 阿僧祇 (*asamkhyeya*).

¹⁷ 或有身歸法者 = 或有自歸法者 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Both phrases essentially convey the same meaning, emphasizing personal commitment or dedication to the Dharma (法). The character ‘身’ refers to the ‘body,’ and ‘自’ to the ‘self,’ but in this context, both imply a sense of wholehearted devotion or commitment.

Dharma, and to the Saṅgha, and those who found joy in the Path—they have all been reborn in the heavens when their previous life came to an end.”

爾時天王釋。坐在佛前。意尊佛語及目犍連所言。即言。賢者目犍連所說實如是。先世有身歸佛歸法歸比丘僧。及淨心樂道。皆來生天上。

Thereupon, Śakra, King of the Gods, was seated before the Buddha, holding in esteem the words of the Buddha and the declarations of Maudgalyāyana.¹⁸ He spoke thus: “The Venerable Maudgalyāyana speaks the truth. Those who in their former lives devoted themselves with sincerity to the Buddha, to the Dharma, and to the *Bhikṣusaṃgha*, as well as those who joyfully followed the Path with a pure heart, have all been reborn in the heavens.”

是時有八萬天。坐在天王釋後。諸天悉欲尊佛所言。及目犍連。亦其王所言。便言賢者目犍連可所說者。實如賢者言。其有先世作人時。身歸三正淨心樂道。壽盡皆來生天上。爾時八萬天因緣目犍連各各自陳我得溝港。

At that moment eighty thousand deities were seated behind Śakra, King of the Gods. All the gods wished to acclaim what the Buddha, Maudgalyāyana, and their sovereign had said. They then concurred that the Venerable Maudgalyāyana’s sayings were indeed those of a sage. In their former human lives, they had sought refuge in the Triple [Gem] and had joyously pursued the Path with upright and pure hearts, so that at the end of those lives, they were all reborn in the

¹⁸ 意尊佛語及目犍連所言: Bapat translates this phrase as “paying respectful (尊) attention (意) to what the Buddha (佛) said (語) to Maudgalyāyana (目犍連).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this translation does not fully capture the presence of ‘及’ (and) and ‘所言’ (what someone has said). The phrase actually refers to two distinct objects of attention: ‘佛語’ (the Buddha’s words) and ‘目犍連所言’ (what Maudgalyāyana has said), linked together by ‘及’ (and). The proper translation should reflect this dual focus, indicating respectful attention given to both the Buddha’s words and Maudgalyāyana’s statements.

heavenly realms. Moved by their encounter with Maudgalyāyana, each of the eighty thousand deities proclaimed their attainment of Stream-entry.

目犍連便前作禮。頭面著佛足。便白佛言諾閻浮利四輩。飢渴欲見佛。善哉願尊愍念世間。以時下到閻浮利。佛便告目犍連。汝且下語世間四輩。佛却後七日當從天上來下安詳會於優曇滿樹下。目犍連言。諾受教便起作禮。繞佛三匝。便取定意。譬如壯士屈伸臂頃便滅於忉利天。即住閻浮利地上悉告世間人。佛却後七日。當從天上來下安詳會於優曇滿樹下

Thereupon, Maudgalyāyana paid homage to the Buddha by touching his forehead to the Buddha's feet. He then beseeched the Buddha: "Please grant the request of the four assemblies in Jambudvīpa who yearn to see the Buddha [with a fervor] akin to hunger and thirst.¹⁹ How blissful it would be, I pray, if the Blessed One takes pity on the human world and descend to Jambudvīpa at this time!" Then, the Buddha instructed Maudgalyāyana: "Go down and announce to the four assemblies of the world that, in seven days, I will descend from the heavens for a serene assembly beneath the Udumbara tree in full bloom." Maudgalyāyana assented: "As you instruct, so shall I do." Rising, he paid his respects by circumambulating the Buddha three times. Then, with focused intent, as effortlessly as a strong person might flex and extend his arm, he disappeared from Trāyastriṃśa Heaven and appeared upon the earth of Jambudvīpa. He

¹⁹ 諾閻浮利四輩 飢渴欲見佛: Bapat translates this as, "O Lord, the four (四) classes (輩) [of disciples] in Jambudvīpa (閻浮利) are thirsty (lit. hungry and thirsty) (飢渴) with the desire (欲) to see (見) the Buddha (佛)." [Chinese characters within parentheses added for analysis]. While he incorporates 'O Lord,' Bapat omits the significant character '諾' (to allow). A more accurate translation would include this element, rendering it as 'to grant the request,' emphasizing the plea of Jambudvīpa's four classes of disciples to be allowed to see the Buddha, driven by their deep yearning.

proclaimed it to the people of the world: “In seven days, the Buddha will descend from the heavens to the serene congregation beneath the Udumbara tree in full bloom.

佛於天上便取定意。如力士屈伸臂頃佛於忉利天。上至鹽天。爲諸天說經。滅於鹽天。即至兜術天。復從兜術天滅。即至不憍樂天。化應聲天 梵衆天 梵輔天 大梵天 水行水微天 無量水天。水音天。約淨天。遍淨天。淨明天。守妙天。玄妙天。福德天。德淳天。近際天。快見天。無結愛天。已說經。悉使大歡悅。

The Buddha, while in the Trāyastriṃśa Heaven, entered into profound meditation. As effortlessly as a strong person might flex and extend his arm, he ascended from Trāyastriṃśa to the Yāma Heaven.²⁰ There, he expounded the sūtras for all the deities [present]. Vanishing from Yāma, he next appeared in the Tuṣita Heaven. Departing from Tuṣita, he [sequentially] visited the Nirmāṇarati, Paranimittavaśavartin, Brahmapārisajja, Brahmapurohita, Mahābrahmā, Ābha/Parittābha, Appamāṇābha, Ābhassara, Parittasubha, Appamāṇasubha, Subhakiṇṇa, Shoumiao [Guarding Sublimity], Xuanmiao [Mysterious Sublimity], Vehapphala, Dechun [Virtuous Innocence], Aviha/Atappa, Sudassa, Akaniṭṭha. [At each,] he taught the sūtras, bringing immense joy to all.²¹

²⁰ 鹽天 (T) = 𩇛天 (K, Z) = 燄天 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): We encounter the three distinct forms of the Chinese transcription for Yāma Heaven. The character ‘鹽’ translates to ‘salt.’ The character ‘𩇛,’ which is a rare variant of ‘鹽,’ as noted in the *Dictionary of Chinese Variants Provided by the Department of Education* 教育部異體字字典 created by the Taiwanese government. The closest character to ‘𩇛’ from the Simsun fonts is ‘塼.’ Meanwhile, ‘燄’ means ‘flame.’ Despite its different meaning, its Pinyin pronunciation is /yán/ like the other two. According to Pulleyblank (1991), the reconstructed Eastern Han pronunciation for ‘鹽’ is /jiam/, but the pronunciations for the other variants are not listed.

²¹ The identification of certain heavens presents a challenge due to variations in the corresponding Pāli and Chinese sources. I have consulted the *Bannihuanjing* 般泥洹經 (T0006. 01.0182b12–21) and the Pāli *Sāleyyaka Sutta* (MN41) for cross-referencing. Despite this, the precise Indic equivalents for the heavens named ‘守妙天,’ ‘玄妙天,’ and ‘德淳天’ remain elusive. As such, I have transcribed these as ‘Shoumiao,’ ‘Xuanmiao,’ and ‘Dechun’ respectively, based on their Pinyin pronunciations, with tentative English translations.

便與天上色天。俱下住須大施天。從上下悉從二十四天上。至第三天上住。悉斂上有色天。悉復斂有欲天。來至第二天須彌巔上住。

Thereupon, [the Buddha,] accompanied by the deities of the Form (Rūpa) Realm, descended to the Sudassī Heaven.²² Then, [deities] from the highest to the lowest of all twenty-four heavens converged upon the Third Heaven and stayed there.²³ [Subsequently, the assembly

化應聲天: This term is likely equivalent to ‘Paranimitavaśavartin’ in Sanskrit or ‘Paranimittavasavatti’ in Pāli, which is translated by Ñāṇamoli and Bodhi (2005: 384) as ‘the gods who wield power over others’ creations.’ Another prevailing Chinese term for this heaven is ‘他化自在天.’

梵眾天, 梵輔天, 大梵天: These realms are indicated by the term ‘梵’ (Brahmā) and seem to be equivalent to ‘Brahmapārisajja,’ ‘Brahmapurohita,’ and ‘Mahābrahmā’ respectively. However, the Pāli *Sāleyyaka Sutta* groups these realms under the collective term ‘Brahmakāyika,’ which Ñāṇamoli and Bodhi translate as ‘Brahmā’s retinue.’ In contrast, the Abhidhamma text Kathāvatthu (2.7) treats them as separate planes and does not use the collective term ‘Brahmakāyika.’ The term ‘Brahmapārisajja’ also appears in MN49, SN6.1.5, and SN6.2.4, where it is referred to as ‘the Brahmā’s assembly,’ which Bodhi translates without distinguishing it as an individual Brahmā heaven or class of deities.

While I initially listed the names of the heavens in Sanskrit, I have opted for the Pāli versions for ‘Brahmapārisajja,’ ‘Brahmapurohita,’ ‘Mahābrahmā,’ ‘Ābha/Parittābha,’ ‘Appamāṇābha,’ ‘Ābhassara,’ ‘Parittasubha,’ ‘Appamāṇasubha,’ ‘Subhakiṇṇa,’ ‘Vehapphala,’ ‘Aviha/Atappa,’ ‘Sudassī,’ and ‘Akaniṭṭha.’

水行水微天: the *Bannihuanjing* separates this into two heavens—‘水行天’ and ‘水微天,’ which correspond to ‘Ābha’ and ‘Parittābha’ in the Pāli *Sāleyyaka Sutta*. I have unified these as ‘Ābha/Parittābha Heaven’ in my translation.

近際天: This heavenly realm may correspond to ‘Aviha Heaven’ or ‘Atappa Heaven.’ The etymology of ‘Aviha’ can be debated; the *Pali Text Society’s Dictionary* (PTSD) expresses uncertainty, while the *Critical Pāli Dictionary* (CPD) suggests its Buddhist Sanskrit equivalent is ‘Avṛha,’ denoting permanence (a-√vrh-a). The *Vibhanga* and the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* offer an interpretation of enduring or unceasing (a-vi-√hā). AN5.125 depicts a young deva named Hatthaka from Aviha Heaven, who is described as lacking a gross body, causing him to sink in the Buddha’s presence. The term ‘Atappa’ is absent from the PTSD but is identified in the CPD as Buddhist Sanskrit ‘Atapa,’ with potential meanings related to the absence of suffering (a + √tap) or the absence of enjoyment (a + √trp), as referenced in the *Mahāvastu*. For my translation, I have rendered it as ‘Aviha/Atappa Heaven.’

To maintain brevity, ‘Heaven’ has been omitted from each term within the main text. For a comprehensive comparison, please refer to the appended table of these names.

²² 須大施天: This heaven appears to be a transcription of the ‘Sudassī Heaven,’ corroborated by its reconstructed pronunciation /Suədaei/ from around the time the Yizujing was translated. Notably, this heaven is not included in the previous sentence. The Buddha is described as ascending from the Trāyastriṃśa Heaven in the Desire Realm to the Akaniṭṭha Heaven in the Form Realm, before descending to the Sudassī Heaven, situated just below the Akaniṭṭha Heaven.

²³ 二十四天: The designation ‘twenty-four heavens’ requires clarification. This sūtra enumerates twenty-two heavens, ranging from the Trāyastriṃśa to the Akaniṭṭha, including the Sudassī Heaven. The first five heavens are categorized within the Desire Realm, while the following seventeen are part of the Form Realm. To account for twenty-four heavens, one may consider including the Cātumahārājika (四大天王) Heaven, the lowest (第一天) in the Desire Realm, which this sūtra does not explicitly list. Additionally, the term ‘水行水微天’ could be interpreted

encompassing] all deities from both the Form (Rūpa) Realms and the Desire (Kāma) Realms gathered at the Second Heaven, atop Mount Sumeru, and resided there.²⁴

是時有天子墮彼邏。被王教意。便化作三階。一者金。二者銀。三者琉璃。

At that time, a celestial prince named Duobiluo, acting under the directive of his sovereign, instantaneously manifested three staircases: one of gold, the second of silver, and the third of beryl.²⁵

as two distinct heavens: the ‘Ābha’ (水行天) and ‘Parittābha’ (水微天) Heavens. This interpretation would complete the count of twenty-four heavens. It is notable that the narrative of this sūtra later introduces ‘善現天’ as a new term, which seems to be a variant of the Sudassa (快見天) Heaven and is also synonymous with ‘善見天.’ This analysis excludes the Formless Realm—comprising Ākāśaṇāñcāyatana, Viññāṇaṇcāyatana, Ākiñcaññāyatana, and Nevasaññānāsaññāyatana—often regarded as higher than the heavens of the Desire and Form Realms.

第三天: This term likely refers to ‘the Tuṣita Heaven,’ which ranks as the third heaven in ascending order within the Desire Realm. Accordingly, the Cātumahārājika Heaven is recognized as the first and lowest heaven (第一天) within the Desire Realm.

²⁴ 第二天: This term likely denotes ‘the Trāyastriṃśa Heaven,’ the second ascending heaven in the Desire Realm. It is traditionally located atop Mount Sumeru, which corresponds with the context described in this passage. At this juncture, the assembly is ready to begin its descent.

²⁵ 墮彼邏 = 墮彼邏 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The reconstructed pronunciations of ‘墮彼邏’ and ‘墮彼邏’ from the Eastern Han period are /Dwapila^b/ and /Dawpisiam/, respectively. Given these phonetic clues, identifying their corresponding Indic names accurately presents a significant challenge. Therefore, I have opted to transcribe their names using Pinyin pronunciations, /Duobiluo/ and /Duobixian/, respectively. The considerable difference between the Pinyin pronunciations of ‘邏’ (/luo/) and ‘邏’ (/xiam/) suggests that one of these variants might result from a scribal error, possibly due to similarities in script.

琉璃: The term ‘琉璃’ can refer to a range of translucent materials, such as glass, but its precise meaning in Chinese Buddhist translations and classical Chinese literature is a subject of scholarly debate. According to the Digital Dictionary of Buddhism (DDB), ‘琉璃’ is identified as one of the seven jewels (七寶) and can be translated variously as ‘beryl’ or ‘lapis-lazuli.’

Professor Diego Loukota, in a discussion on H-Buddhism dated June 1, 2020, details the etymological history of ‘琉璃’ and ‘beryl’ as follows:

“Ruri=琉璃, Early Middle Chinese (Pulleyblank) [毘]琉璃 *[bji]luwli (the trisyllabic form does occur sometimes, even if the dysyllabic 琉璃 *luwli is far more common) is a phonetic rendering of a Middle Indic form related to Ardhamāgadhī [ve]ruḷiya, Pāli [ve]luriya, etc. (sanskritized to vaiḍūrya).”

“The generally accepted etymology of English ‘beryl’ is Greek βήρυλλος *bērillo*s, in turn from a form closer to Ardhamāgadhī *veruḷiya* than to Pāli *veluriya* and [written] Gāndhārī *veḍur[i]ya*, which we have now in the *Bhadrakalpikasūtra* scroll in the Schøyen collection.”

(Source: H-Buddhism Discussions, retrieved January 8, 2024, from [https://networks.h-net.org/node/6060/discussions/129375/query-lapis-lazuli-vase#reply-129860]).

佛從須彌巔。下至琉璃階住。梵天王。及諸有色天。悉從佛右面。隨金階下。天王釋。及諸有欲天。從佛左面。隨銀階下。佛及諸無數有色天釋。亦諸無數有欲天。悉下到閻浮利安詳會優曇滿樹下。是使無數人民悉來會。欲見佛。欲聞法。

The Buddha descended from the peak of Mount Sumeru and paused upon the staircase made of beryl. The King of the Brahmā Heavens, along with all the deities of the Form Realm, descended on the Buddha's right side, following the golden staircase. Śakra, the King of the Gods, together with all the deities of the Desire Realm, descended on the Buddha's left side, following the silver staircase. The Buddha, accompanied by innumerable deities from the Form Realm, and Śakra, along with innumerable deities from the Desire Realm, all arrived at the serene assembly beneath the fully blossomed Udumbara tree in Jambudvīpa.²⁶ This [event] drew countless people to the gathering, all eager to behold the Buddha and to hear the Dharma.

是時蓮花色比丘尼。化作金輪王服。七寶導前。從衆力士兵。飛來趣佛。是大衆人民。及長者帝王遙見金輪王悉下。道不敢當。前廣作徑路。蓮花色比丘尼到佛所。

In his translation, Bapat uses 'lapis-lazuli.' However, considering the etymological connection of '琉璃' and 'beryl' to their Indic forms, I have chosen to use 'beryl' in my translation. This decision is informed by the term's historical and linguistic roots, providing a translation that closely aligns with its original Indic context.

²⁶ 佛及諸無數有色天釋 / 亦諸無數有欲天: In the Taishō edition, the segmenting of the text may not accurately reflect the realms of the deities. The initial part, '佛及諸無數有色天釋' suggests Śakra is grouped with the innumerable deities of the Form Realm, which is a discrepancy since Śakra belongs to the Desire Realm. Therefore, the text should be revised to '佛及諸無數有色天 / 釋亦諸無數有欲天,' which translates to "the Buddha and the innumerable deities of the Form Realm / Śakra, along with the innumerable deities of the Desire Realm." This amendment not only places Śakra in the appropriate realm but also preserves the eight-character metrical pattern of the passage. The proposed structure provides a contrast between '佛' (the Buddha) and '釋' (Śakra); parallels '及' (and) with '亦' (and); mirrors the phrase '諸無數' (all innumerable); and juxtaposes '有色天' (deities of the Form [Realm]) with '有欲天' (deities of the Desire [Realm]).

At that time, the *bhikṣuṇī* Utpalavarṇā miraculously transformed herself into the Golden-Wheel-[Turning] Monarch, adorned with robes [inlaid with] the seven jewels.²⁷ Preceded by a vanguard and escorted by a contingent of mighty warriors, she swiftly advanced towards the Buddha, as if in flight. The gathered crowd, including householders and kings, watched the Golden-Wheel-[Turning] Monarch and all [her retinue] coming down from afar.²⁸ Finding the road too narrow [for her grand procession], they widened the pathway to [facilitate her unimpeded progress]. In this [grandeur,] *bhikṣuṇī* Utpalavarṇā made her way into the Buddha's presence.

是時天亦見人。人亦悉見天。以佛威神。天爲下。地爲高。人悉等。天亦無貪意在人。人亦無貪意在天。

²⁷ 化作金輪王服 / 七寶導前: The character ‘服’ (wearing/robes), should be connected to the subsequent phrase, restructured as ‘化作金輪王 / 服七寶 / 導前.’ The first part describes her transformation; the second, her clothings; the last, a vanguard in front. This adjusted parsing makes this phrase easier to understand.

The term ‘金輪王’ refers to the most exalted type of Cakravartin, a Wheel-Turning Monarch. In Buddhist cosmology, this ideal sovereign rules over Jambudvīpa with perfect virtue. Among the ranks of Wheel-Turning Monarchs, the ‘金輪王’ (Golden-Wheel-Turning Monarch) stands supreme, above the Silver-, Copper-, and Iron-Cakravartins.

蓮花色: This name is a translation of ‘Utpalavarṇā’ in Sanskrit, or ‘Uppalavaṇṇā’ in Pāli, who was one of the two principal female disciples of the Buddha, noted for her adeptness in spiritual powers. The component ‘蓮花’ reflects the ‘lotus flower,’ with ‘*utpala*’ particularly indicating the blue lotus. The character ‘色’ in this context denotes ‘countenance’ or ‘complexion,’ aptly translating the element ‘*varṇā*’ from the original Sanskrit name.

The transformation of *bhikṣuṇī* Utpalavarṇā into a Cakravartin is intriguing, given that the Wheel-Turning Monarch is traditionally male. It is likely that she assumed a male form before becoming the legendary monarch. Consequently, I refer to ‘his retinue’ rather than ‘her retinue’ in this context.

²⁸ 飛來趣佛...見金輪王悉下: In this context, the characters ‘飛’ (to fly) and ‘下’ (to descend) could be interpreted in two ways. The first is a literal interpretation where the *bhikṣuṇī* is described as flying (飛) towards the Buddha and descending (下) from the sky, indicative of her miraculous powers. The second interpretation is figurative, suggesting that she approached the Buddha with the swiftness of flight (飛) and came down (下) along the road. Bapat chooses the figurative reading, translating ‘飛’ as ‘to hasten’ and ‘下’ as ‘to come down.’ This reading is also considered more plausible in my view, as it better aligns with the enormous scale of her retinue and the crowd’s reaction to widen the path, suggesting a horizontal rather than a vertical approach.

At that time, both the celestial beings and humans were visible to each other.²⁹ Through the [awe-inspiring] spiritual power of the Buddha, the heavens were brought down while the earth rose up, [placing both deities and] humans on equal footing. Neither the gods harbored any desire to become human, nor did the humans covet the state of the gods.

時有人貪著樂金輪王。是時有一比丘。坐去佛不遠。便箕坐直身。意著檢戒。比丘見天樂會亦人樂會。自生念言。是一切無常。一切苦。一切空。一切非我何貪是。何願是。已是。何有。比丘即在坐得溝港道。已自證。佛知人知天。知彼比丘生意所念。說偈言

At that time, some people were envious of the Golden-Wheel-Turning Monarch's delight.³⁰

Nearby, a *bhikṣu* sat with his legs crossed, his back straight, as he attentively reflected on his precepts.³¹ Witnessing the celestial and human festivities, he pondered, 'All is impermanent, all

²⁹ 天亦見人 人亦悉見天: To improve readability, I have taken a certain liberty in this translation. These phrases directly translate to "the gods see humans and humans also see the gods."

³⁰ 時有人貪著樂金輪王: Bapat translates this phrase as "At that time (時), there was (有) a man (人) who envied (貪著) [the lot of] the golden-wheel-monarch (金輪王)." This translation, however, overlooks the term '樂' (delight) and, in its place, introduces 'the lot of,' a phrase within a bracket not present in the original text. While '貪著' can be directly translated as 'to crave and be attached to,' I agree with Bapat's interpretive choice of 'to envy.' This term aptly captures the essence of desiring and clinging to the happiness or fortune that another person, in this case, the golden-wheel-monarch, experiences.

³¹ 是時有一比丘 坐去佛不遠 便箕坐直身 意著檢戒: I have taken some liberty in translating this sentence to reduce redundancies and to improve readability. A more literal translation may be: "At that time (是時), a monk (有一比丘), seated (坐) not far (不遠) from (去) the Buddha (佛), quickly (便) [assumed] an open sitting [posture] (箕坐), with a straight back (直身), focusing his mind on (意著) a careful examination (檢) of his precepts (戒)."

I propose that '箕' or '箕坐' should be understood as denoting a sitting posture with crossed legs within Buddhist literature. Although '箕' literally refers to a Chinese winnowing basket and is defined by the CJKV-E Dictionary as 'to sit down with both legs fully extended,' the accompanying phrases 'with one's back straight' (直身) and 'to attentively reflect on precepts' (意著檢戒) imply that '箕坐' represents a more disciplined posture. Given that the context suggests an upright seated position suitable for meditation rather than a relaxed posture with legs extended, I suggest that '箕坐' describes a posture where the thighs are outstretched with the lower legs crossed over the thighs.

直身 = 道身 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): In the context of contemplation, the variant '道身' can be interpreted as 'to govern (道) one's body (身).' This likely signifies '*indriya-saṃvara*' (the restraint of the [six] sensory gates), a concept central to contemplative practices. A typical example of this usage of '道' is found in the chapter of On Learning 學而 (section 5) from the *Analec* 論語: "子曰: 道千乘之國: 敬事而信, 節用而愛人, 使民

is suffering, all is insubstantial, and all is selfless. Why covet or desire anything? If such, what [value] do they truly hold?’³² In this state of contemplation, the *bhikṣu* attained the path of Stream-entry, fully verifying it within himself.³³ The Buddha perceived the inner musings arising in the minds of humans, deities, and that particular *bhikṣu*.³⁴ Then, the Buddha spoke a verse.

14.1 有利得人形 持戒得爲天

於世獨爲王 見諦是獨尊

There are [manifold] benefits to being born human,

Observing precepts begets a celestial [rebirth].

In this life, one may reign as a sovereign alone.

以時。” This passage translates to, “Confucius said, ‘To govern a state of a thousand chariots: be respectful in your duties and trustworthy, be frugal and cherish the people, and employ the people at the proper times.’” (武英殿十三經注疏 本, 論語注疏: 學而, p. 32).

³² 比丘見天樂會亦人樂會 自生念言: My translation is for brevity. A more direct translation may be: “The monk (比丘), observing (見) the celestial beings (天) rejoice (樂) in the congregation (會) and humans (人) rejoice (樂) in the congregation (會), voiced (言) the thoughts (念) that arose (生) within him (自).”

已是何有: This directly translates to “If it is already (已) so (是), what (何) [significance] does it have (有)?”

³³ 在坐 = 在座 (S, Y, M): In this context, the characters ‘坐’ and ‘座’ are used interchangeably, with ‘在坐’ and ‘在座’ both indicating a state of being seated, rendered as ‘while sitting’ and ‘while in the seat,’ respectively. Therefore, the meaning conveyed by the variant phrase is consistent. However, to convey the monk’s meditative focus more aptly, I have translated these phrases as ‘in this state of contemplation’ rather than simply ‘seated.’

³⁴ 佛知人知天 / 知彼比丘生意所念: The sentence should be parsed as ‘佛 / 知人 / 知天 / 知彼比丘 / 生意所念,’ which translates to “The Buddha perceived the inner musings arising in the minds of humans, deities, and that particular *bhikṣu*.” The repeated use of ‘知’ (to know/perceive) indicates that ‘生意所念’ (the thoughts arising in the minds) are connected with ‘人’ (people), ‘天’ (deities), and ‘彼比丘’ (that *bhikṣu*). It is incorrect to read this as ‘佛知 / 人知 / 天知 / 彼比丘生意所念,’ implying “The Buddha knew, the people knew, and the deities knew the thoughts arising in that monk.” Such an interpretation would misconstrue the intended meaning, as the sentence is intended to highlight the Buddha’s unique ability to discern the thoughts and intentions of others, not a shared knowledge of the *bhikṣu*’s mind.

[Upon] seeing the Truth, one may be held in unparalleled esteem.³⁵

是時蓮花色比丘尼。適到佛前。便攝神足七寶及兵衆悉滅不現。獨住無髮衣法衣。便頭面著佛足。

At that moment, *bhikṣuṇī* Utpalavarṇā arrived at the Buddha's place. She immediately retracted her display of spiritual powers. The seven jewels and her soldier entourage vanished from sight,³⁶ she remained alone, clad in her Dharma robes, her head shaved. Then, [bowing deeply,] she touched her forehead to the Buddha's feet.

佛因到優曇滿樹下坐。成布席坐適坐。便爲大衆人民。廣說經法。說布施持戒善現天徑說欲五好痛說具惡。佛知人意稍濡離龜。便現苦諦習盡道諦。

Thus, the Buddha approached the seating [area] under the blooming Udumbara tree.³⁷ Taking his place among the prepared seats, he expounded the teachings of the *sūtras* to the assembled

³⁵ **Y14.1:** This verse highlights the advantages of human birth, positioning it as a foundation for three potential fortunes: celestial rebirth, sovereignty in this life, and the status of a sage upon realizing the Truth. The first line introduces the overarching theme of 'the benefits of human form,' while the subsequent lines outline the three favorable destinies available to disciplined humans. Bapat's translation, "Having possessed the privilege of a human form, And by observing the Rules of Conduct, a god One doth become in this world. He alone is the king, And He alone the Honoured One, as He has seen the Truth." lacks this structural clarity, failing to distinctly present the verse's organized progression of ideas.

Y14.1bc: Bapat's parsing of lines '持戒得爲天 於世 / 獨爲王' unnecessarily combines them, which obscures their individual meanings. Each line should be treated separately to convey the specific destinies they describe: 'Observing precepts begets a celestial rebirth' and 'In this life, one may reign sovereign alone.' This distinct rendering more accurately reflects the independent nature of each line's message.

³⁶ 七寶及兵衆悉滅不現: Bapat translates this phrase as "The seven jewels and all disappeared and were [no longer] seen." Here, '兵衆' (soldier entourage) is omitted.

³⁷ 因: This character, meaning 'because of,' indicates a causal relationship, potentially referring to Utpalavarṇā's encounter with the Buddha as described in the preceding text.

crowd.³⁸ He taught that acts of generosity and adherence to moral precepts directly lead to rebirth in the Sudassa Heaven; he elucidated that desiring five types of pleasurable things leads to suffering and detailed all the evil [consequences].³⁹ Seeing the people's minds had become receptive, having moved beyond their initial crudeness, the Buddha revealed the Truth of Suffering, the Truth of the Origin [of Suffering], the Truth of the Cessation [of Suffering], and the Truth of the Path [leading to that cessation].⁴⁰

中有身歸佛歸法歸比丘僧者。中有隨力持戒者中有得溝港自證頻來。至不還道自證。

Within [the assembly,] there were those who had taken refuge in the Buddha, the Dharma, and the *Bhikṣusaṅgha*; individuals who observed the precepts to the best of their ability; those who

³⁸ 成布席坐適坐: The term ‘成布席’ may refer to ‘the seats that have been arranged,’ and ‘坐適坐’ means ‘to sit (坐) at the fitting (適) seat (坐) [intended for the Buddha].’

³⁹ 說布施持戒善現天徑: This phrase translates to ‘expounding on generosity and the observance of precepts as direct paths to the Sudassa Heaven,’ a recurring theme in the *Yizujing*. For additional references, see annotations Y1. fn.26, Y10. fn.34, and Y15. fn.22. I have translated ‘善現天’ as ‘the Sudassa Heaven,’ but it can also be interpreted as ‘favorable rebirth in heaven,’ combining ‘善’ (favorable), ‘現’ (manifestation or rebirth), and ‘天’ (heaven).

說布施持戒善現天徑 說欲五好痛 說具惡: Bapat translation, “He talked about charity, conduct, heaven, the disadvantageous and painful nature of desires and their lowness,” fails to reflect the structured presentation of the original text. The repeated use of ‘說’ (to teach or expound) introduces three distinct teachings: generosity and virtue leading to the Sudassa Heaven, the suffering resulting from craving five sensual pleasures, and the repercussions of unwholesome acts.

⁴⁰ 稍濡離龜 = 稍輒離龜 (S, Y, M): The character ‘濡’ typically means ‘to moisten,’ while ‘輒’ denotes ‘soft.’ However, in this context, they convey metaphorical meanings: ‘濡’ symbolizes ‘calmness’ and ‘輒’ ‘receptiveness.’ These characters are employed to reflect the audience’s preparedness to receive the Buddha’s teachings, indicating a state of mind that has transitioned to tranquility and openness. Therefore, I interpret the phrase ‘稍濡離龜’ or ‘稍輒離龜’ as ‘becoming (稍) receptive (濡/輒) and moving beyond (離) their initial coarseness (龜).’

苦諦習盡道諦 = 苦諦集盡道諦 (Y, M): Though ‘諦’ (truth) appears only twice in this phrase, it effectively presents the Four Noble Truths (*caturāryasatya*): suffering (苦), its origin (習 or 集), its cessation (盡), and the path (道) to that cessation. Here, ‘習’ (habituated tendencies), typically associated with ‘craving’ (*trṣṇā*; Pāli, *taṇhā*; Chinese 渴愛), represents the origin of suffering. Zhi Qian’s use of ‘習’ may underscore the deep-seated pattern of craving, in line with the Second Noble Truth. In the Yuan and Ming editions, ‘習’ is substituted with ‘集,’ which commonly translates as ‘to gather’ and in a Buddhist context, refers to the ‘arising or source of suffering.’

had attained the Stream-entry, those who had personally realized the Once-returner, and those who had realized the Non-returner's Path through self-verification.⁴¹

是時賢者躬自在座。便起偏袒向佛。叉手面於佛前。以偈讚佛言。

At that moment, a sage leaned forward in his seat, and then stood up. Baring his right shoulder [as a sign of respect], he turned to face the Buddha. With hands clasped together and a forward gaze, he began to extol the Buddha in verse.⁴²

14.2 今恭禮雄遍觀 見諦現說被度

常慈哀見福想 然人天得何讚

⁴¹ 中有: This phrase translates to 'Within [the assembly,] (中) there were... (有)' While '中有' acquires a specialized meaning in later Chinese Buddhist texts, such as the *Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra* 瑜伽師地論 (T1579), where it denotes the 'intermediate state' between death and rebirth, its use here is more straightforward. It resembles common expressions like '水中有神' (There was a spirit in the water) and '不知飯中有毒' (He did not know that the food was poisoned), indicating simple presence or existence within something.

中有得溝港自證頻來 至不還道自證: This phrase identifies three types of Buddhist sages—the stream-enterer (溝港), the once-returner (頻來), and the non-returner (不還). '溝港' corresponds to the stream-enterer, a term that literally means 'a person who has channeled a waterway (溝) on the port (港)' and metaphorically refers to someone entering the stream leading towards enlightenment. The term '頻來,' literally meaning 'frequent returner,' is intriguingly used here to denote '*sakṛdāgāmin*' (once-returner), a sage who will be reborn in the human realm only once more. The use of '頻' (frequent) is paradoxical and contrasts with the more literal translation '一來' (once) or its transcription '斯陀含.' The non-returner, '不還,' refers to those who have reached a stage where they will not return to the human realm. For a comprehensive explanation of all four types of Buddhist saints, including the arhat, please refer to Y10. fn.36.

⁴² 是時賢者躬自在座 便起偏袒向佛 叉手面於佛前 以偈讚佛言: Bapat translates this passage as "This respected (賢) person (者) got up (起) from (自) his seat (在座), laid bare his [one shoulder] (偏袒), and facing (向) the Buddha (佛), folded (叉) his hands (手), and said extolatory gāthās;". This translation omits '是時' (at that moment), '躬' ('to bend forward' or 'personally'), '便' (then/swiftly), '面於佛前' (a forward gaze towards the Buddha), and '佛言' (...the Buddha, saying:). Many of these terms, while adding to the narrative detail, might be seen as stylistically redundant or implicit in the overall action described.

躬自在座便起: This phrase appears to describe a sequence of graceful actions. Here, '躬' likely signifies 'to bend forward,' indicating a preparatory movement for balance before standing up. Consequently, I translate it as "[a sage] bent slightly forward (躬) and then (便) stood up (起) from (自) his seated position (在座)."

Now, with reverence, I pay homage to the Hero, whose gaze encompasses all,
Who directly realizes the Truths and reveals the secret [path] to deliverance.
With unwavering compassion, he manifests auspicious thoughts.
So, what praise from mortals and deities could possibly suffice?⁴³

14.3 度無極復道彼 捨恐怖就安樂

廣說法遍照世 聞每樂不死安

He has traversed to the boundless, laying anew the Path for all.
Forsaking fear, he abides in serenity and bliss.
Expansively, he expounds the Dharma, illuminating the entire world.
Hearing it, one is invariably filled with the joy and peace of the Deathless.⁴⁴

⁴³ **Y14.2a**, 禮雄 = 敬雄 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): While ‘禮’ highlights the ritual of paying homage’ and ‘敬’ emphasizes the ‘respectful attitude,’ both characters convey the act of revering the Hero. Hence, I have translated both ‘禮雄’ and ‘敬雄’ as ‘paying homage to the Hero.’

Y14.2b, 現說被度 = 現說彼度 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The term ‘現說’ implies ‘to reveal and elucidate,’ which I have succinctly translated as ‘reveals.’ ‘被度’ refers to the ‘concealed or secret (被) [path] to liberation (度),’ while ‘彼度’ pertains to ‘liberation (度) for others (彼).’ Bapat opts for ‘彼度,’ translating it as ‘for their release,’ which aligns with the context appropriately.

Y14.2c: The character ‘見’ in ‘見福想’ seems synonymous with ‘現’ (to manifest).

Y14.2d, 然人天得何讚: My interpretive translation of this line reflects its rhetorical nature, using ‘any ... can suffice’ for ‘得何...’ to imply insufficiency. As Y14.2 extols the Hero (雄), the concluding line is understood to mean ‘No praise can truly suffice,’ echoed by the rhetorical ‘...得何讚?’ (What praise can be enough?).

⁴⁴ **Y14.3c**: The term ‘遍照’ directly translates to ‘illuminate entirely,’ with ‘遍’ used as an adverb, meaning ‘entirely.’ However, in combination with ‘廣’ (expansively), the translation of ‘expansively...entirely’ could become redundant in English. To maintain the original emphasis without redundancy, I have chosen to translate ‘廣說法遍照世’ as ‘Expansively, he expounds the Dharma, illuminating the entire world,’ with ‘遍’ as an adjective modifying ‘世.’

Y14.3d, 聞 = 聞: The character ‘聞’ usually means ‘to hear.’ In contrast, ‘聞’ refers to ‘space,’ ‘time,’ or ‘to intersperse.’ The variant ‘聞每樂不死安,’ therefore, might complement the idea of ‘the entire world’ (遍...世) from the previous line. Considering this, I render the phrase as ‘...where one consistently encounters the joy and peace of the Deathless,’ implying that the teachings resonate throughout time and space, offering eternal serenity and happiness.

14.4 尊戒海廣無度 義深大善行明

無穢淨垢不著 慧船大度三界

The Blessed One cautions about the sea that is vast and hard to cross.

[His teachings] are profound, grand, full of wholesome conduct and wisdom.

[He remains] immaculate, pure, and untainted by any defilements.

The Ark of his wisdom is great, ferrying [beings] across the three realms.⁴⁵

14.5 無缺傷無減增 尊不著已行捨

從戒尊三界師 從見世去無還

Free from flaws or anguish, untouched by [mental] sway,

The Blessed One remains unattached, his equanimity perfected by [past] practice.

Adhering to the precepts [laid down by] the Blessed One, the Teacher of the three
realms,

⁴⁵ **Y14.4:** This verse exalts the profundity and expansive reach of the Blessed One's teachings.

Y14.4a: Bapat translates the phrase '尊戒海廣無度' as "Broad (廣) and unfordable (無度) is the ocean (海) of the Honoured One's (尊) rules of conduct (戒)." [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this interpretation is debatable, as the metaphor of an 'ocean' typically does not refer to the precepts in Buddhism. The term '無度' can be interpreted in two ways: as 'without (無) limit (度)' or 'boundless,' as noted in the CJKV-E dictionary, and as 'no (無) crossing (度)' or 'unable to cross.' While 'boundless' complements '廣' (vast), the interpretation 'hard to cross' better fits the metaphor of the sea, which symbolizes the three realms (三界) or the endless cycle of rebirth (*saṃsāra*). I prefer this latter interpretation, but I render it as 'hard to cross' instead of 'unable to cross' to avoid contradicting the foundational Buddhist belief in the potential for liberation. The term '戒' here is more aptly interpreted as a verb meaning 'to caution' or 'to warn,' rather than as a noun 'precepts.' This interpretation aligns with the metaphor of 'the Great Ark' (船大) in line d, representing the means of transcendence across the boundless sea of *saṃsāra*.

We follow his vision, depart from the [fleeting] world, and never regress.⁴⁶

14.6 心住賢無過尊 自在定人天雄

明慧力致金色 何人天不禮尊

His mind abides in sagacity, faultless, Oh, Blessed One,

In his meditative mastery, he is the Hero of humans and gods.

[His] wisdom shines with the force of golden [light];

Who among gods and humans would not pay their homage to the Blessed One?⁴⁷

⁴⁶ **Y14.5a:** Bapat translates ‘無缺傷無減增’ as “With no (無) imperfections (缺), and being neither (無) depressed (減) nor elated (增),”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this translation omits ‘傷’ (harm or suffering). I agree with his interpretation of ‘減增’ as indicating emotional or mental fluctuations and have thus translated it as ‘mental sway’ to capture both emotional and cognitive states.

Y14.5b: Bapat’s translation of ‘尊不著已行捨’ as “Equanimity the Honoured One doth practice and so is He detached;” fails to capture the completed aspect conveyed by ‘已’ (already). Therefore, I have translated ‘已行捨’ to imply that ‘[his] equanimity (or renunciation) has been perfected through practice,’ suggesting a state of completion rather than ongoing action.

Y14.5cd: Bapat interprets ‘從戒尊三界師 從見世去無還’ as “Because of (從) conduct (戒?), the Master (師) of the three worlds (三界) does He become; Having seen (見) the world (世), out doth He go (去), but never (無) doth He return (還).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation fails to reflect the parallel construction in these lines, starting with ‘從戒’ (following the precepts) and ‘從見’ (following the vision). Thus, he translates ‘從戒’ as ‘because of conduct’ and omits the significance of ‘從’ in ‘從見.’ To preserve the ‘following’ aspect in these lines, I have shifted the subject from ‘the Blessed One’ to ‘we, the followers,’ emphasizing our adherence to his path.

⁴⁷ **Y14.6a:** Bapat translates ‘心住賢無過尊’ as “Firm (住?) is the Sage’s (賢) mind (心) and unsurpassed (無過?) is the Honoured One (尊).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation may not accurately capture the original intent. In this context, ‘住’ is a verb that means ‘to abide,’ and its use as an adjective ‘firm’ by Bapat is a stretch. Additionally, ‘心’ (mind) and ‘賢’ (virtuous) cannot be conjointly rendered as ‘the Sage’s mind’ (賢心) because they are separated by ‘住.’ Following ‘無’ (without), ‘過’ should be understood as a noun meaning ‘fault.’ To suggest ‘unsurpassed,’ a different construction such as ‘不過’ (do not surpass) would be needed. However, even if ‘不過’ were to replace ‘無過,’ it does not typically carry the positive connotation of ‘unsurpassed’ or ‘unparalleled,’ particularly in descriptions of the Buddha’s qualities.

Y14.6b: The phrase ‘自在定’ conveys the Buddha’s autonomous control over meditative states, entering them freely as he wishes, which underscores his profound meditative prowess.

14.7 師觀世兩衆會 雖觀捨不著過

意觀意無垢心 三界空尊所空

The Teacher observes the world and the assembly of both groups.

Though he observes them, he is equanimous and does not fixate on [their] faults.

His mind discerns [all] minds, [his] heart immaculate.

The three realms are insubstantial; he respects their [all] insubstantial [phenomena].⁴⁸

14.8 是世行拔後根 定至定趣甘露

今神天服於尊 悉叉手觀覺身

In this world, he has uprooted the future [rebirths],

Settled in deep meditation, savoring the nectar [of deathlessness].

Now, the divine beings yield before the Blessed One,

⁴⁸ **Y14.7a:** The term ‘兩衆會’ likely denotes the two assemblies, referring to the gatherings of celestial beings and humans.

Y14.7b: Bapat translates ‘雖觀捨不著過’ as “Although (雖) He [thus] reflects (觀), equanimity (捨) He has, with no fault (不...過?) of attachment (著).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation lacks accuracy. ‘不著過’ should be rendered as ‘do not (不) grasp (著) at faults (過).’ Bapat’s interpretation seems to conflate ‘不’ and ‘過,’ treating them as a phrase synonymous with ‘無過’ (without fault), while the original syntax suggests otherwise. This line underscores the Buddha’s quality of equanimity: He observes the world impartially, without grasping at the faults of others.

Y14.7c: Bapat translates ‘無垢心’ as ‘from impurity (垢) being immune (無...心?).’ [Parentheses added for analysis]. While it is creative, a more direct translation would be ‘a mind without defilements,’ clearly stating the Buddha’s mental purity.

Y14.7d: Bapat translates the phrase ‘三界空尊所空’ as “And the three worlds are void which the Honoured One has [realized].” This translation may not convey the full meaning. ‘尊所空’ should be understood as ‘he respects what is insubstantial,’ with ‘所空’ meaning ‘that which is insubstantial’ or ‘insubstantiality’ and ‘尊’ acting as a verb meaning ‘to respect.’ This line further accentuates the Buddha’s even-mindedness, respecting the phenomena within the three realms rather than dismissing them due to their ephemeral nature.

With fingers clasped together, they all behold the embodiment of Awakening.⁴⁹

14.9 已無疑樂法堅 悉知識人天心

亦如行蟲獸心 宴淨然愍苦衆

Free from doubt, his delight in the Dharma is unwavering.

He fully perceives the innermost thoughts of humans and gods.

Likewise, he understands the minds of insects and beasts.

[Abiding in] serenity and purity, he feels compassion for those suffering [from their
five] aggregates.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ **Y14.8a:** Bapat translates ‘是世行拔後根’ as “The worldly (世) practices (行) He doth take out (拔) from the root (根);”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, Bapat’s translation may not adequately capture the connotations of ‘後根,’ which in a Buddhist context usually refers to ‘the root of future [rebirths].’ The construction ‘行拔’ ought to be read as a compound verb that means ‘to uproot,’ with ‘行’ (to carry out) reinforcing the action denoted by ‘拔’ (to pull out), a linguistic function well analyzed by Karashima (2010: 549-550). I therefore translate ‘行拔後根’ holistically as ‘he has uprooted the future [rebirths],’ which signifies the Buddha’s attainment of liberation from the cycle of rebirth. While Bapat’s interpretation of ‘是世行’ as ‘the worldly practices’ may be linguistically valid, it does not seem to fit the context as well, especially considering his apparent oversight of ‘是’ (this/such).

Y14.8b: Bapat translates ‘定至定趣甘露’ as “From meditation (定) to meditation (定) doth He pass (至?) until the Deathless (甘露) doth He reach (趣).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation may not fully convey the intended meaning. In this phrase, the character ‘至’ is more accurately used as an adjective meaning ‘utmost,’ modifying the following ‘定’ (meditation). This is in contrast to the initial ‘定,’ which acts as a verb, ‘to settle in.’ Therefore, ‘定至定’ should be translated as ‘settled in the utmost meditation.’ Even if ‘至’ were to function as a verb, as Bapat interprets, it would denote arriving at a certain state rather than transitioning between states. The term ‘甘露’ (literally ‘sweet dew’) symbolizes the nectar of immortality, a common metaphor in Buddhist texts for the sublime state achieved through the Buddha’s teachings or the ultimate aim of those teachings.

Y14.8d: Bapat translates ‘觀覺身’ as ‘to see the Personality that is enlightened.’ The term ‘身’ can be translated as ‘body’ or ‘embodiment,’ suggesting a more tangible representation. Hence, a more appropriate rendering would be ‘beholding the embodiment of Awakening,’ referring to the Buddha’s enlightened presence rather than just ‘Personality.’

⁵⁰ **Y14.9a,** 堅 = 賢 (Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Bapat chooses the variant ‘賢’ and translates ‘已無疑樂法賢’ as “With doubts dispelled, the Sage is delighted in the Law;”. While this translation aligns with the overall meaning, I suggest a slightly different rendition: “Free from doubt, he revels in the Dharma, sublime in its virtue.” This emphasizes both the absence of doubt and the exceptional quality of the Dharma.

Y14.9b: To enhance readability, I have translated ‘知識...心’ as ‘perceives the innermost thoughts,’ simplifying the phrase while retaining its essence.

14.10 自恣化在天下 正眞定收取易

意制念伏彼信 天人世覺獨尊

[During] the ‘invitation ceremony,’ he has manifested himself here in this world.

With ease, he attains authentic and indisputable states of meditation.

His thoughts, well-controlled, foster unwavering faith in others.

Among the gods and humans of this world, the Awakened One alone is held in the

highest esteem.⁵¹

Y14.9c: Bapat translates ‘亦如行蟲獸心’ as “The thoughts (心) of insects (蟲) and beasts (獸), [too], (亦如) that move (行).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation, however, may misinterpret ‘行.’ While ‘行’ primarily means ‘to walk,’ it typically refers to bipedal walking, not the crawling of quadrupeds. In this context, ‘行’ should be interpreted as ‘to do’ or ‘to act,’ linking it to ‘悉知識’ (to fully perceive) from the previous line. The phrase ‘亦如’ (likewise) supports this reading. Therefore, I have translated ‘亦如行’ as ‘Likewise, he understands,’ which clarifies the meaning and maintains the continuity from the preceding line. This translation emphasizes the Buddha’s comprehensive understanding of all beings’ innermost thoughts.

Y14.9d: The character ‘然,’ when following descriptors like ‘宴淨’ (peaceful and pure), typically imparts an adverbial (-ly) or abstract nominal (-ness) quality to the terms. Such examples are abundant, like ‘突然’ (suddenly), ‘欣然’ (joyfully), ‘惠然’ (kindly), and others. In this vein, ‘宴淨然’ can be interpreted as ‘peacefully and purely’ or ‘tranquility and purity.’ My translation favors the latter, adding ‘abiding in’ to convey the enduring quality of this state.

The term ‘苦橐’ appears exclusively once in the *Yizujing*; it is absent from other Chinese Buddhist translations or classical works. ‘橐’ is defined in the 說文解字 (*Explanation of Writings and Analysis of Characters*) as an ancient Chinese waist sack or as an onomatopoeic term for the sound made when cooking rice cakes. The *Sound and Meaning of All Sūtras* 一切經音義 concurs with the sack definition. Considering ‘橐’ as ‘sack,’ ‘苦橐’ could metaphorically represent ‘suffering associated with the five aggregates’ (五陰盛苦; *pañcopādāna-skandha*), a cardinal concept in Buddhist doctrines. Given its rarity, my translation and analysis of this term are somewhat tentative.

⁵¹ **Y14.10a:** Bapat opts for the variant phrase and translates ‘自恣化在天上’ as “According to his liking, [into a god] in a heaven doth He Himself transform.” This interpretation misses the Buddhist term ‘自恣’ (*pravāraṇā*), the ‘invitation’ ceremony that marks the conclusion of the summer rain’s retreat. On this day, Buddhist monks confess any offences they may have committed during the retreat. The Chinese rendering denotes they are welcome to confess following their own (自) bent/volition (恣).

天下 = 天上 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): This gathering is currently taking place in Jambudvīpa. Thus, the term ‘天上,’ which translates to ‘in the heavens,’ appears to be a mistake, likely due to the presence of divinities at the gathering.

14.11 道德妙與誰雙 觀尊形何時厭

於三界獨步行 戒義堅若寶山

Who can match Him, whose path and virtues are so sublime?

When could one ever weary of beholding the Blessed One's visage?

He fares alone, [unbound], through the three realms of existence.

The precepts and teachings [he established] stand firm as a bejeweled mountain.

14.12 垂綺願三界恐 捨嫉念無恩愛

慧在定明如日 無瑕穢夜月光

He has pledged a grand vow for the fearful [souls] across the three realms.

Casting aside enmity, he harbors neither partiality nor attachment.

Y14.10b: The term ‘收取’ is literally translated as ‘to receive.’ However, in this context, it is more accurately rendered as ‘to attain,’ which encapsulates the ease with which the Awakened One accesses meditative states.

Y14.10c: Bapat translates ‘意制念伏彼信’ as “With his mind, His thoughts He doth control and the beliefs of others too.” This translation interprets ‘制’ (to control) and ‘伏’ (to subdue) as having synonymous meanings. In this rendering, ‘伏’ is simplistically translated as ‘too.’ However, ‘伏’ seems to carry a subtly different connotation in this context. It suggests the Buddha’s ability to not just control, but to evoke a sense of voluntary respect or faith among others. Therefore, I propose translating it as ‘to foster,’ implying others’ faith is unforced. The phrase ‘意制念’ should be understood as ‘[his] mind controls [his] thoughts,’ indicating the Buddha’s mastery over his own mental processes.

Y14.10d: Bapat translates ‘天人世覺獨尊’ as “The world (世) of gods (天) and men (人) is understood (覺) by the Honoured One (尊) alone (獨).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation, while coherent, seems understated as the concluding line of the verse. The preceding lines describe the Buddha’s guidance (line a), mastery of meditation (line b), and influence (line c). Therefore, I suggest that this line should be interpreted as indicating universal reverence towards the Buddha. Accordingly, I translate ‘覺’ as ‘the Awakened One,’ signifying an active agent, and ‘尊’ as ‘to be revered,’ a passive verb, inverting Bapat’s approach of treating ‘尊’ as the agent ‘the Honoured One’ and ‘覺’ as a passive verb ‘is understood.’

The wise one, established in serenity, shines bright like the sun.

Unsullied, [he gleams like] the moon's nocturnal light.⁵²

14.13 著淨戒現淨行 有淨慧善過淨

住淨法現淨光 高山雪見照然

He established pure precepts [that are] embodied in his immaculate actions.

Endowed with pristine wisdom, he has purified both wholesome and transgressive
[actions].

Abiding in the pure Dharma, he radiates a clear light,

[Just like] snow [that crowns] the lofty peaks shines brilliantly.⁵³

⁵² **Y14.12a**, 恐 = 怨 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Bapat translates ‘垂綺願三界恐’ as “The noble (綺?) aspirations (願) prone (垂), and away from the three (三) worlds (界) turned (恐? or 怨?),”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. This rendering raises questions about the interpretation of ‘恐/怨.’ His translation suggests ‘恐/怨’ as ‘to turn away from,’ diverging from their primary meanings of ‘to fear’ (恐) and ‘to resent’ (怨). I interpret these characters more literally as ‘those who are scared’ and ‘those who harbor grudges,’ respectively. For the variant phrase ‘垂綺願三界怨,’ I propose “He has pledged a grand vow for [those who harbor] grudges across the three realms.” Here, ‘垂綺願’ is directly translated as ‘to hand down (垂) noble (綺) wishes (願).’ In my broader interpretation, this phrase is rendered as ‘to pledge a grand vow,’ aiming to capture the profound commitment and breadth of the vow’s scope.

Y14.12c: Bapat translates ‘慧在定明如日’ as “In (在) meditation (定) adroit (慧?), doth He shine (明) like (如) the Sun (日),”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation seems to stretch the meaning of ‘慧.’ While translating ‘慧’ as ‘adroit’ is not implausible, in this context, the literal meaning ‘wisdom’ or ‘the wise’ is more fitting. It is more coherent to interpret that it is the wisdom or the wise one whose brilliance is being compared to the sun.

Y14.12d: Bapat translates ‘無瑕穢夜月光’ as “Or like the Moon (月) that shines (光) in an unsullied (無瑕穢) night (夜).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation misses a subtle nuance by forcing the phrase ‘無瑕穢’ to modify ‘夜’ and rendering ‘無瑕穢夜’ as ‘an unsullied night.’ Rather, ‘無瑕穢’ should be read as an independent clause, meaning ‘[He] is without any impurities.’ This interpretation aligns ‘無瑕穢’ more directly with the subject of the verse. Consequently, the phrase ‘夜月光’ should then be understood as a metaphor, suggesting that his purity and clarity are akin to the light of the full moon in the night sky.

⁵³ **Y14.13**: This verse features the character ‘淨’ (pure) six times, serving as a thematic thread throughout. Each line focuses on a different aspect of purity: line a on precepts, line b on wisdom, line c on the Dharma, and line d provides a metaphor that complements the message in line c. The varied use of ‘淨’ in each line necessitates careful interpretation to fully grasp the verse’s meaning.

14.14 十五夜星中月 今觀尊人天雄

法悉照明人天 身相現絡真珠

[Like] the [full] moon in the starry [sky] on the fifteenth night [of the lunar month],

We now behold the Blessed One, the Hero to gods and humans.

[His] Dharma is utterly brilliant, a luminous [guide for] mortals and divinities,

[And his noble] physical marks gleam like pearls on a string.⁵⁴

Y14.13a: The phrase ‘著淨戒現淨行’ may initially appear enigmatic due to its usage of the character ‘淨’ (pure) twice, with its collocation with similar characters ‘戒’ (precepts) and ‘行’ (actions). Not only that, the two-thronged meanings of the verb ‘著’ adds its complexity. Bapat translates it as “To pure conduct doth He stick and pure practices doth He teach,”. His translation of ‘著’ as ‘to stick to’ may misrepresent the line’s intended meaning because this verse is part of praising hymns of the Buddha not of his disciples. As a verb, it primarily means ‘to write’ or ‘to make known’ and, in its derivative meaning ‘to get attached,’ it functions synonymously with ‘着’ (to get attached to). In ‘著淨戒,’ ‘著’ is better rendered as ‘to make known’ or ‘to establish’ similar to the contrasting verb ‘現’ (to manifest), which in turn can be rendered as ‘to be embodied’ in this line. Thus, I have interpreted this line as ‘He established pure precepts [that is] embodied in his immaculate actions.’

Y14.13b: The phrase ‘有淨慧善過淨’ effectively introduces ‘淨慧’ (pure wisdom) that makes one transcend both wholesome and transgressive [actions].

contrasts with ‘淨’ (purity), potentially referring to pure actions as discussed in the previous line. This highlights the superiority of wisdom over mere actions. Bapat translates this line as “Wisdom (慧) doth He possess (有), that is great (善) and pure (淨) in the extreme (過?),”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation, however, omits ‘淨’ in ‘有淨慧’ and misses an exact nuance of ‘過’ in ‘善過淨.’ If ‘過’ functions as an adjective modifying ‘淨,’ it should carry a negative connotation ‘excessive’ or ‘faulty’ and rarely carries the positive sense in his rendering ‘great and pure in the extreme.’ Thus, ‘過’ should be rendered as a verb with its primary meaning ‘to go beyond’ denoting ‘淨慧’ (pure wisdom) surpasses ‘淨,’ which may refer to ‘淨行’ (pure conduct) from line a. ‘善’ (in its virtue) seems to set the parameter of the comparison between the two pure virtues.

Y14.13c: This phrase ‘住淨法現淨光’ juxtaposes ‘淨法’ (the pure Dharma) with the metaphor ‘淨光’ (pure light), indicating the radiance that emanates from living according to the Dharma.

Y14.13d: The phrase ‘見照然’ literally translates to ‘seen (見) brightly (照然).’ For simplicity, this has been rendered as ‘shines forth,’ to convey the visibility of the subject’s luminous nature.

⁵⁴ **Y14.14a:** The term ‘十五夜’ (the fifteenth night) denotes the fifteenth night of the lunar month, when the full moon shines forth at night. This is a significant time in many Asian cultures and often holds special meaning, especially in religious and traditional contexts. The imagery of the full moon on this night is frequently used in literature and poetry to symbolize completeness, brightness, and beauty.

Y14.14d: 絡 = 珞 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): While the character ‘絡’ generally signifies ‘a thread’ that pieces jewels together, ‘珞’ typically means ‘necklace jewels.’ Therefore, despite the variant usage of ‘絡’ and ‘珞,’

14.15 諦復諦猛善說 自行致本無師

釋家子獨見妙 慧千眼去瘡疣

Ardently and eloquently, he has proclaimed the Truth in many ways,

[A Truth] he essentially attained through his own practice, without a mentor.

The Śākya scion alone has perceived the profound [Truths],

His thousand-eyed wisdom excising the abscess [in the world].⁵⁵

14.16 言盛濡意無龐 出聲悲人天坐

聞尊語甜美法 渴飲飽如流海

His speech is fluent and enriching, [leaving] minds free from any coarseness.

[When] his voice of compassion resounds, humans and gods alike sit [in attendance],

Listening to the Blessed One expound on the Dharma that is sweet and profound,

The thirsty are quenched, sated as if by a boundless, flowing waters.⁵⁶

the phrases ‘絡真珠’ and ‘珞真珠’ denote the same with the following ‘真珠’ (pearl) just specifying what kind of jewel.

⁵⁵ **Y14.15a:** Bapat translates ‘諦復諦猛善說’ as “Truth (諦) after (復) Truth (諦) has the Hero (猛?) well (善) preached (說)—”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. His translation of ‘猛’ seems to be imprecise, which literally means ‘fierce’ or ‘ardent.’ It rarely occurs as an epithet for the Blessed One not only in the meaning ‘the Hero’ but also ‘the Ardent One?’. The more usual character for ‘the Hero’ in such contexts would be ‘雄.’ Therefore, I suggest interpreting ‘猛’ in its adverbial sense as ‘ardently,’ to reflect the intensity with which the Truth is preached, as in “Truth upon Truth, he has ardently and eloquently preached.” Regarding ‘諦復諦,’ I have rendered it as ‘the Truth in many ways,’ because its literal translation ‘Truth upon Truth’ may not fit with the singular capitalized ‘Truth.’ In this context, Truth is singular, but its representation can be multiple.

⁵⁶ **Y14.16a:** Bapat translates ‘言盛濡意無龐’ as “His words are very soft, with no roughness in His mind,”. His translation ‘very soft’ oversimplifies the richness of ‘盛濡,’ which conveys not only the ‘fluent’ (盛) aspect of

14.17 取法爾有何非 審奉行到彼安

說議斷後不思 聞尊聲眼每滅

Embracing things as they are, where lies the fault?

Carefully practicing, one reaches the other shore.

Cease speculations and debates; let not further thought [disturb].

Hearing the Blessed One's voice, Nirvāṇa is always within view.⁵⁷

14.18 慧現徑直無邪 涉先迹致故成

顧念後告冥者 如梵王悉照空

the Buddha's speech but also its 'enriching' (濡) quality. It implies that his words fully imbue and nurture the listener's mind, beyond the mere gentleness that 'very soft' might suggest.

Y14.16d: While '流海' is literally interpreted as 'flowing sea,' this depiction may not align with the metaphorical intention to represent satiation, since seawater is not drinkable. Therefore, I have chosen to interpret it as 'a boundless flowing waters,' a metaphor that evokes the idea of an abundant and quenching source of fresh water, more fitting in the context of alleviating thirst.

⁵⁷ **Y14.17a:** Bapat translates '取法爾有何非' as "Take to (取) the Law (法) as it is (爾), then what (何) is it that ye miss (有...非?)?" [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation, however, may not fully capture the essence of '有何非.' The phrase combines '有' (to exist/have), with the interrogative '何' (how/what), and '非,' which in this context is best understood as 'fault' or 'wrong,' not as the verb 'is not.' Rather than suggesting something is lacking, it poses a rhetorical question about the existence of any fault. '法爾' seems to be a translation of the Buddhist technical term '*dharmatā*,' which means 'things as they are' or 'the true nature of things.' Thus, a more accurate translation would be, "Embrace things as they are, where is the fault?"

Y14.17d: Bapat translates '聞尊聲眼每滅' as "To the honoured (尊) words (聲) listen (聞), with eyes (眼) often (每) closed (滅?)." [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation appears to overlook the significance of '滅,' which literally means 'to cease/annihilate' and is less likely to denote 'to close.' In this Buddhist context, it symbolizes 'Nirvāṇa,' signifying the ultimate cessation of suffering and desire, rather than merely closing one's eyes. Consequently, '眼每滅' can be interpreted as 'Nirvāṇa is always in view.' This line poetically suggests that attentively listening to the Blessed One's words draws one nearer to the state of Nirvāṇa with every passing moment.

The Sage has revealed the Path, both direct and unerring,
Follow the trail blazed by the Founder to attain his achievements.
Mindful of future generations, imparting [wisdom] to those in the dark,
He illuminates all of space, like Brahmā's sovereign king.⁵⁸

14.19 神天尚念世人 神行義無所比

從法計捨世念 尊繫著無餘處

Even divine beings in heaven show care for humans in the world,
[Whose] spiritual conduct and righteousness stand unparalleled.
Reflecting upon the Dharma, casting off [all] worldly concerns,
There is no place where the Blessed One is ensnared or bound.⁵⁹

⁵⁸ **Y14.18a**, 直 = 宣 (Q1): In this line, '直' functions as an adjective, meaning 'direct/straight,' whereas '宣' serves as a verb, denoting 'to proclaim.' Thus, the variant line '慧現徑宣無邪' can be rendered as "The Sage has made the Path known, proclaiming it in an unerring way."

Y14.18b: The terms '先' (predecessor) and '故' (old, here synonymous with 古) refer back to '慧' (the Sage) mentioned in the preceding line. For enhanced readability, '先' is aptly translated as 'the Founder,' and '故' is interpreted as the pronoun 'he' to denote the Founder.

成 = 城 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): While '成' generally means 'to achieve/succeed,' '城' denotes 'castle.' In this context, '城' is metaphorically used to signify 'achievement.' Hence, the variant line's meaning is consistent with the original. Bapat opts for the variant character and translates it as 'city.'

Y14.18c: The character '後' is taken to mean 'disciples' or 'successors.' It is translated more broadly as 'future generations' to extend the scope of those who benefit from the Sage's teachings.

Y14.18d: The phrase '悉照空' translates directly as 'to illuminate all space.' The phrase is poetically rendered as 'he illuminates the expanse, everywhere,' effectively conveying the far-reaching and all-encompassing nature of the Sage's wisdom.

⁵⁹ **Y14.19**: The character '念' indeed showcases its versatility and requires a nuanced interpretation based on context. In this verse, it adopts different meanings in lines a and c. In line a, '念' embodies positive sentiments such as compassion, benevolence, or favorable regard, reflecting the divine beings' attitude towards humanity. Conversely, in line c, within the compound '世念' (worldly concerns), it represents thoughts or considerations that practitioners are encouraged to relinquish on the Path to enlightenment.

Bapat's translation does not seem to fully capture the interconnectedness between the lines: "Even gods and spirits envy (lit. think of) the men of the world, And incomparable is the doctrine followed by the divine; Following the Law, ye worldly thoughts give up; For, the Honoured One has nowhere left any bonds of attachment." Contrary to his somewhat isolated treatment of each line, I interpret line b as accentuating the distinctive righteousness and

是時賢者舍利弗。在衆中坐。便起座。偏袒叉手。以偈歎曰

At that time, the Venerable Śāriputra was sitting in the congregation. He immediately stood up from his seat. Having [his right] shoulder bare and putting his palms together, he extolled in verse.

14.20 未嘗見有是者 未嘗聞有說者

尊如是威神天 從兜術來至是

Never before has one like him been seen,

Nor has one so eloquent [in teaching] been heard.

Such is the Blessed One's divine spiritual might,

From Tuṣita Heaven, he arrived here.

Sn955 *Na me diṭṭho ito pubbe [icc-āyasmā Sāriputto]*

Na-ssuto uda kassa ci

Evaṃ vagguvado satthā

Tusitā gaṇi-m-āgato

[As Venerable Sāriputta declares,]

spiritual conduct of humans, acknowledged by divine beings in line a. Line c, from my perspective, elaborates on the motivation behind the Blessed One's detachment articulated in line d, showcasing his liberation from any worldly concerns.

“Never before have I seen,
Nor heard from anyone, [such an occurrence:]
A Teacher of such eloquent speech,
Arrived from the Tusita [Heaven] with an attendant host.”

14.21 天人世悉擁護 重愛俗如身眼

一切安不爲轉 樂獨行著中央

All gods and humans in the world dearly uphold [him],
And the masses treasure [him as dearly] as their own sight.
In every way, [his] tranquility never falters,
Relishing solitude, he stands out, [even] amidst [the crowds].⁶⁰

⁶⁰ **Y14.21a:** Bapat translates ‘天人世悉擁護’ as “Surrounded (擁護?) by gods (天) and men (人) in the whole (悉) world (世).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation does not fully convey the nuance of ‘擁護,’ which means more than just ‘to surround’; it implies ‘to cherish and protect.’ In my translation, I have simplified this term as ‘to uphold,’ which captures the sense of active support and guardianship that ‘擁護’ signifies.

Y14.21b: Bapat translates ‘重愛俗如身眼’ as “Honoured (重) and loved (愛) by the same (俗?), the very eye (眼) incarnate (身)—”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation seems to overlook key elements of the phrase. The term ‘俗’ (the worldly folks) isn’t effectively captured by ‘the same,’ although it is possible that Bapat interprets it as synonymous with ‘天人世’ from line a. Additionally, the crucial comparative word ‘如’ (as) is not given due emphasis. A more precise translation would be, “Honored and loved by the common folk, as [precious as] their own sight.” This translation respects the comparative aspect of ‘如’ and more accurately conveys how the worldly folks revere him, akin to the value they place on their own sight.

Y14.21d: Bapat translates ‘樂獨行著中央’ as “Alone (獨) He finds delight (樂) in the midst (中央) of [all].” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this interpretation may not fully capture the nuances of the phrase. ‘獨行’ denotes a solitary life or conduct and serves as the object of the verb ‘樂’ (to enjoy), suggesting enjoyment in a solitary lifestyle or conduct. Thus, the translation of ‘獨’ as ‘He alone’ does not align well with this context. Additionally, the translation overlooks the significance of ‘著,’ which conveys prominence. ‘著中央’ literally means ‘standing out at the center,’ but in this context, it implies a notable presence within the congregation despite a preference for solitude. Therefore, a more accurate translation might be, “He delights in a solitary life, yet stands out prominently amidst the congregation,” emphasizing the juxtaposition of his fondness for solitude with his conspicuous presence within the Saṅgha.

Sn956 *Sadevakassa lokassa,*

Yathā dissati cakkhumā

Sabbaṃ tamaṃ vinodetvā

Eko va ratim ajjhagā

As the Seer stands revealed

To the world along with its gods,

Dispelling every shade of darkness,

He alone is sealed in bliss.

14.22 無憂覺我善行 到上教復還世

饒心解壞欲身 惡行出有善義

We virtuously advance towards the Awakened One, who is free from anxiety,

He [who] returned to this world [after] teaching in the higher realms.

He nurtures minds set free, dissolving desire for the body,

So that evil actions are dispelled and virtue and righteousness upheld.⁶¹

⁶¹ **Y14.22a:** Bapat translates ‘無憂覺我善行’ as “With no (無) trouble (憂), He (我?) is awakened (覺) to the good (善) that He has practised (行);”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this interpretation may misrepresent the subject of the verse. Translating ‘我’ as ‘He,’ presumably referring to the Buddha, seems to be inaccurate. A more literal interpretation of ‘我’ as ‘we’ in the first person, potentially encompassing the sage (Venerable Sāriputta in the *Aṭṭhakavagga*) and others, is more fitting. In this light, ‘善行,’ as an action undertaken by ‘us,’ is better interpreted as ‘to virtuously approach/advance,’ while ‘無憂覺’ signifies the Awakened One, free from anxiety, whom the sage and others are approaching. This interpretation is in harmony with the Pāli parallel Sn957, where Sāriputta approaches the Buddha. Although ‘無憂’ has been used in other contexts, such as translating the proper name Aśoka or symbolizing the tree under which the Buddha was born (無憂樹), these usages are relatively uncommon before the 4th century CE.

Y14.22b: Bapat translates ‘到上教復還世’ as “He has returned (復還) to the world (世) to teach (教) His doctrine”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation, however, does not capture the full meaning of ‘到上,’ which signifies ‘arrival in the higher realm.’ The phrase, therefore, implies two distinct actions by the Buddha: his journey to the heavenly realm to impart teachings (到上教), and his subsequent return to this world (復還世). The

Sn957 *Tam Buddhaṃ asitaṃ tādīṃ*

Akuhaṇ gaṇim āgataṃ

Bahunnam idha baddhānaṃ

Atthi pañhena āgamiṃ

To the Buddha, the sublime and unattached,

Who is sincere and arrives with [a vast] retinue,

I approach with my query,

On behalf of the multitude here who are bound.⁶²

14.23 若比丘有厭心 行有敗有空生

在樹下若曠野 在深山于室中

interpretation of ‘到上教’ as merely ‘to teach His doctrine’ fails to acknowledge the celestial aspect of the Buddha’s teaching mission.

Y14.22c: Bapat translates ‘饒心解壞欲身’ as “For the benefit (饒) of the release (解) of mind (心) of those (身?) with rotten (壞?) desire (欲).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this interpretation is inaccurate. Although ‘身’ is versatile and often carries a reflexive meaning akin to ‘one’s own’ when referring to individuals, it does not typically represent ‘those who’ (者). In this context, ‘身’ likely does not function as a reflexive pronoun either, as reflexive uses of ‘身’ generally precede the verb. Here, its placement suggests that it is the object of ‘欲’ (‘to desire’ or ‘desire for’). Therefore, ‘壞欲身’ should be translated as ‘to dissolve desires for the body.’ This interpretation contrasts with the first part of the line, ‘he nurtures liberation of the mind,’ resulting in a coherent translation: “He nurtures liberation of the mind and dissolves desires for the body.”

Y14.22d: Bapat translates ‘惡行出有善義’ as “So that evil may go and good purpose may be achieved.” However, this translation may not adequately capture the intended contrast between ‘惡行’ (evil actions) and ‘善義’ (virtues and righteousness). Additionally, the verbs ‘出’ (to dispel) and ‘有’ (to cultivate or to uphold) are in opposition, further emphasizing the active process of rejecting vice and embracing virtue.

⁶² **Sn957a:** The term ‘*tādīn*’ is believed to derive from the Vedic expression ‘*tad + √dṛś*,’ which translates to ‘such appearance.’ This term is employed to depict the attributes of the Buddha and arahants. In this context, it is aptly translated as ‘the sublime,’ succinctly yet effectively encapsulating its nuanced meaning.

Sn957d: The term ‘*atthin*’ can be analyzed as ‘*attha + -in*,’ indicative of ‘having the purpose of’ or ‘acting on behalf of.’ This interpretation aligns with its contextual usage, reflecting intentionality or purposefulness.

14.24 若高處下床臥 來恐怖凡幾輩

行何從志不畏 或久後所行處

If a *bhikṣu*, weary of [worldly life],

Seeks refuge in a desolate or vacant [region],

Whether beneath a tree, in the vast wilderness,

Or in a secluded mountain cave,

Whether resting in a lofty spot or on a humble cot,

What kinds of fear might assail [him]?

Which practices [and what] resolve [must he cultivate] to remain fearless,

In [his chosen] place of practice, perhaps over an extended time?⁶³

⁶³ **Y14.23a:** The term ‘厭心’ here may be directly translated as ‘disgusted mind,’ but within a Buddhist context, it more aptly refers to the Buddhist technical terms ‘*nirveda*’ or ‘*saṃvega*.’ ‘*Nirveda*,’ or ‘*nibbidā*’ in Pāli, indicates ‘disillusionment/disenchantment [with the world]’ or ‘disgust [toward the world],’ whereas ‘*saṃvega*’ denotes ‘a spiritual urgency to escape *saṃsāra* and reach liberation.’

Y14.23b: Bapat translates ‘行有敗有空生’ as “When his affairs get spoiled, and retires to a solitary seat.”. However, this translation might misinterpret ‘行有敗,’ suggesting incorrectly that a *bhikṣu*’s retreat is due to personal failure in society. While ‘敗’ can indeed mean ‘to defeat’ or ‘to be defeated,’ in this context, it conveys the notion of a place being in decline or desolate. When combined with ‘有空,’ the phrase ‘有敗’ specifically indicates a desolate location. The use of ‘有’ implies the ‘potential existence’ or ‘presence’ of something, in this line denoting ‘a place.’ Thus, ‘有敗有空’ should be translated as ‘in a deserted or empty place,’ giving the entire phrase ‘行有敗有空生’ the meaning of ‘to go and dwell in a desolate or vacant place.’ The phrase ‘to seek refuge’ is a stylistic choice that effectively captures the essence of ‘行 (to go) ... 生 (to dwell)’ within a Buddhist context. The term ‘retreat’ is added to emphasize that ‘有敗’ and ‘有空’ refer to places that are suitable for spiritual seclusion.

生 = 坐 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): In the variant reading, ‘坐’ (to sit/dwell) is used instead of ‘生’ (to live/dwell). Despite this variation, the underlying meaning is consistent, and my translation as ‘to seek refuge’ aptly encompasses the connotations of both terms.

A comparable use of ‘有’ to suggest the ‘potential existence’ of a person is observed in the Gaozi I 告子上 chapter (section 10) from the *Mencius* 孟子: “由是則生而有不用也, 由是則可以辟患而有為也.” This may be translated as “From this, one may choose to save their life, yet there might be those who would not adopt such a course. Following this, one may avert misfortune, yet there might be those who would not engage in such actions.” (武英殿十三經注疏 本, 孟子注疏: 告子上, p.41). In this passage, ‘有’ denotes a possibility or presence of a particular type of a person.

Y14.23c: Bapat translates ‘曠野’ as ‘a cemetery,’ likely attempting to correlate it with its Pāli counterpart, ‘*susāna*’ (a cemetery). However, this interpretation seems to be a stretch. The term ‘曠野’ more accurately denotes ‘vast wilderness’ or ‘open plain where there are no trees,’ and does not specifically refer to ‘a cemetery.’ It is crucial to maintain the original text’s depiction of ‘曠野’ as an expansive, uninhabited natural area, rather than a specific burial site.

Sn958 *Bhikkhuno vijigucchato*

Bhajato rittam āsanam

Rukkhamūlam susānam vā,

Pabbatānam guhāsu vā

Sn959 *Uccāvacesu sayanesu,*

Kīvanto tattha bheravā

Yehi bhikkhu na vedheyya

Nigghose sayanāsane

To the monk who recoils [from worldly life],

Who retreats to a secluded spot,

[Be it] at a tree's root, within a cemetery,

Or in mountain caves,

Upon resting places, high or low,

What kinds of fear might arise there,

From which the monk ought not to tremble

Within [his] silent abode?⁶⁴

Y14.24b: The term ‘凡幾輩’ has been translated to reflect its constituent elements: ‘凡’ connoting ‘all’ or ‘overall,’ ‘幾’ suggesting ‘how many’ or ‘several,’ and ‘輩’ meaning ‘types’ or ‘kinds.’ The phrase thus originally poses the question, ‘how many kinds overall?’ For clarity and brevity in English, this has been adapted to ‘what kinds of?’ which effectively conveys the intended meaning while maintaining succinctness.

Y14.24c, 志 = 悉 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Bapat seems to opt for the variant character and translates ‘行何從悉不畏’ as “Those from which a Bhikṣu will never have any fear, ”. However, this interpretation may not fully encompass the original text’s intent, as it overlooks the implications of ‘行’ (practice) and the interrogative nature of ‘何’ (how/what/why). A more faithful rendition of this variant reading might be “By adhering to what practice, may one remain fearless?” This translation not only preserves the interrogative essence of ‘何’ but also acknowledges the importance of ‘行’ in the context of spiritual practice.

⁶⁴ **Sn959b:** The term ‘kīvant’ is an interrogative word typically meaning ‘how many/much/great?’ or simply ‘how?’ In the given context, however, I believe its use is not to inquire about number or quantity, but rather

14.25 世幾輩彼來聲 若往來在方面

比丘處不著意 所止處寂無嚮

In this world, what kinds of [frightening] sounds might assail him,

Whether he is in the path of the once-returner,

[Or residing with] a detached mind within the *bhikṣus*' quarters,

In such places, where [all sounds] fade, dead silent, without [even] echoes.⁶⁵

Sn960 *Kaṭi parissayā loke*

to explore the variety or types. Therefore, I have made an interpretive decision to translate 'kīvant' as 'what kinds of?' This choice aims to capture the essence of the term in a way that is more aligned with the contextual meaning, focusing on the nature of the entities in question rather than their quantity.

⁶⁵ **Y14.25:** This verse presents an intriguing ambiguity, only clarified when recognizing the two spiritual states delineated in lines b and c. Line a poses a query about potential fears induced by sounds, while lines b and c specify the individuals to whom this question pertains. Line d describes the monks' quarters as places of such profound silence that it may feel daunting. This interpretation aligns well with its Pāli counterpart Sn960.

Y14.25bc: These lines introduce two distinct stages of Buddhist sainthood. The term '往來' (to go and come), in this context, is understood to denote the Buddhist soteriological term '*sakṛdāgāmin*' (once-returner), which literally means 'once (*sakṛt*) coming back (*āgāmin*).' This Chinese translation corresponds with the more commonly used term '一來' (once-returner). The subsequent term '在方面,' rendered as 'to dwell in that direction,' is interpreted as referring to individuals aspiring to the state of once-returner. This suggests they are on the path (*marga*) toward this attainment but have yet to realize the fruit (*phala*) of their spiritual journey. The second category, depicted in line c, is characterized as '不著意,' meaning '[one who] is not attached in mind.' Within the context of Buddhist soteriology, '不著' is indicative of '*arhat*,' the highest level of spiritual attainment in Buddhism.

Y14.25d: The phrase '所止處' can indeed be interpreted in various ways, such as 'the place of cessation' or 'the state of Nirvāṇa.' However, these interpretations may not be entirely fitting in this specific context. The line seems to describe a physical location—a remote and perhaps formidable setting where monks dwell. This understanding is supported by '寂無嚮' (silent without echoes), highlighting the locale's profound quietness and lack of reverberation, indicative of a tangible, physical space rather than a metaphysical state like Nirvāṇa. This interpretation of line d is consistent with line a, which refers to 'fear caused by sound,' and aligns well with its Pāli counterpart Sn960d, further supporting the notion of a physical, tranquil space for spiritual practice.

無嚮 = 無響 (S, Y, M): Although '嚮' primarily denotes 'to face towards,' when paired with '無,' it adopts a noun form analogous to '響' (echo). Thus, '無嚮' can be understood as 'without echo,' emphasizing the absence of reverberation or sound reflection, akin to '無響' (echolessness).

Gacchato amataṃ disaṃ

Ye bhikkhu abhisambhave

Pantamhi sayanāsane

For one journeying towards the uncharted realm,

How many perils exist in the world,

That a monk must surmount,

[While residing] in a secluded abode?⁶⁶

14.26 口已出善惡響 在行處當何作

持戒住行不捨 比丘學求安祥

[If] words of praise or blame [about] a *bhikṣu* have spread among the people,

How should he conduct himself in his dwelling or on his [alms] round,

Adhering to his precepts, unwavering in his practice,

And [continually] training to seek serenity?⁶⁷

⁶⁶ **Sn960:** To enhance the verse’s flow, I have rearranged line b to precede line a. This adjustment addresses the relative pronoun ‘ye’ (which) in line c, which refers back to ‘*parissayā*’ (perils) mentioned in line a. This restructuring ensures that the reference is clear and the verse reads more fluidly in English.

Sn960b: The phrase ‘*amataṃ disaṃ*’ can be directly translated as ‘deathless quarter,’ typically signifying ‘Nirvāṇa.’ However, in the *Mahāniddeśa* and the *Paramatthajotikā II*, ‘*amataṃ*’ is glossed as ‘*agataṃ*,’ which implies ‘never gone/been before’ or ‘untraveled.’ This interpretation has been adopted by scholars like Jayawickrama, Norman, Bodhi, and Fronsdal. Aligning with this commentarial interpretation, I have also translated ‘*amataṃ disaṃ*’ in a way that reflects this understanding of ‘*amataṃ*’ as ‘*agataṃ*.’

⁶⁷ **Y14.26:** This verse forms part of the sage’s inquiry, centering on the interrogative adverb ‘何’ (how) in line b. Line a is construed as a subjunctive clause, positing a hypothetical situation; lines c and d appear to further articulate the question introduced in lines a and b, detailing the *bhikṣu*’s ethical commitments and spiritual aspirations. To clarify the subject of this multifaceted inquiry, I have strategically relocated the term ‘比丘’ (*bhikṣu*) from line d to the beginning, framing it as the subject of the overarching question that begins in line a.

Y14.26ab: Bapat translates ‘口已出善惡響 在行處當何作’ as “The words, good or evil, that his mouth has uttered, And his spheres of work—how are they shaped?”. This interpretation suggests a focus on the individual’s verbal actions and practices. However, this is somewhat ambiguous and potentially misleading, as ‘口’

Sn961 *Ky-āssa vyappathayo assu,*

Ky-āss' assu idha gocarā

Kāni sīlabbatān' assu

Pahitattassa bhikkhuno

What modes of speech should he adopt?

What fields of conduct should he embrace here?

What [forms of] morality and vows are to be upheld

By a determined monk [in his spiritual stride]?

14.27 云何學戒不漏 獨在行常無伴

欲洗冥求明目 欲鼓鼙吹內垢

How should he train in precepts, [to ensure] no mental defilements arise,

While practicing alone, always without companions,

Striving to clear away the darkness, in pursuit of the seer's wisdom,

in this context is more aptly understood as referring to 'people's mouths' rather than 'his mouth.' If '口' signifies 'the people's mouths,' then line a sets up a scenario where one hears words, either praising or disparaging, being spread by others. Consequently, line b queries how one should comport themselves in their own environment in response to these external opinions. The term '口' carries multiple meanings, including 'mouth,' 'words,' 'gate,' and 'a counting unit for people or animals.' In this context, it is interpreted as 'mouths,' a synecdoche for 'the people' or 'populace.' Coupled with '善惡' (good or bad), '響' (sound/echo), aptly denotes 'words spreading' or 'news.'

Y14.26d, 安祥 = 安詳 (S, Y, M): Although '祥' typically signifies 'happiness' and '詳' connotes 'detail' or 'accuracy,' these terms acquire distinct connotations in Buddhist literature when coupled with '安.' In such contexts, '安祥' and '安詳' both convey notions of a 'composed manner' or 'serenity,' aligning with the ultimate Buddhist goal, Nirvāṇa. Consequently, despite their primary meanings differing slightly, the two variant terms merge in their depiction of this fundamental Buddhist aspiration. Karashima (2010: 18) also translates '安詳' more concisely as 'serenely' or 'composedly.'

Eager to expel inner impurities, [as if] using bellows?⁶⁸

Sn962 *Kaṃ so sikkhaṃ samādāya*

Ekodi nipako sato

Kammāro rajatassēva

Niddhame malam attano

What discipline should he undertake,

With singular focus, wise and mindful,

To purge his own impurities,

As a smith blows away silver's [dross]?⁶⁹

⁶⁸ **Y14.27a:** In this context, the character ‘漏’ (to leak) aligns with ‘煩惱’ (mental afflictions), corresponding to the Buddhist term ‘*āsrava*,’ which denotes ‘mental defilements’ or ‘afflictions.’ Etymologically, ‘*āsrava*’ suggests ‘influx’ or ‘flowing in’ (*ā* + *√sru*), indicating an external intrusion of impurities. This notion closely parallels Jain teachings, which liken karmic impurities to dust that pervades the environment, adhering to individuals through sinful actions.

Y14.27c, 明目 = 目明 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Despite the positional switch between ‘明’ (bright/clear) and ‘目’ (eye) in the variant phrase, the conveyed meaning is consistent, representing the concept of ‘clear-sightedness’ or ‘wisdom of the seer.’ This term encapsulates the idea of spiritual clarity or insightful perception, a key attribute in Buddhist soteriology.

Y14.27d, 鼓鞞 = 鼓鞞 (S, Y, M): The character ‘鞞’ is quite rare and not listed even in the *Dictionary of Chinese Variants Provided by the Department of Education* 教育部異體字字典 created by the Taiwanese government. I have found this character from Konjaku Mojikyō (今昔文字鏡), a comprehensive collection of East Asian characters developed by the Mojikyō Institute (文字鏡研究会) in Japan. The character ‘鞞’ incorporates elements of ‘鼻’ (nose) and ‘皮’ (leather), suggesting a tool resembling a nose made of leather, likely used for bellows. Therefore, ‘鼓’ (to beat) seems to metaphorically refer to the action of operating such a device. This interpretation aligns with the simile in the corresponding Pāli verse (Sn962cd), which uses the metaphor of a smith blowing away impurities from silver. In this context, the character ‘鞞’ also refers to ancient Chinese bellows, though it frequently denotes ‘harness’ or ‘ornaments on chariot’ in other contexts.

⁶⁹ **Sn962:** This verse is structured as a single sentence, with its primary verb in the optative mood ‘*niddhame*’ (one should blow away) appearing in line d, and a gerund ‘*samādāya*’ (taking upon) in line a. In the translation, ‘*samādāya*,’ although a gerund, has been rendered with an optative sense as ‘one should undertake.’ Additionally, ‘*niddhame*,’ which is in the optative mood, has been translated as the infinitive ‘to blow away’ for clarity and readability. For better flow, the lines have been reordered, placing line d before line c.

佛謂舍利弗。意有所厭惡。及有所著。在空床臥行欲學。如法今說。令汝知聽

The Buddha addressed Śāriputra: “For those whose minds are disillusioned [with worldly life], inclined to dwell in seclusion, [relying on] a humble cot, and are eager to learn, I shall now impart the teachings in accordance with the Dharma so that you will understand this and follow [them faithfully].”⁷⁰

Sn963 *Vijigucchamānassa yad idaṃ phāsu, Sāriputtā ti Bhagavā*

Rittāsanam sayanam sevato ce

Sambodhikāmassa, yathānudhammaṃ

Taṃ te pavakkhāmi yathā pajānaṃ

["O, Sāriputta," says the Blessed One:]

I shall proclaim that which I know,

Peaceful for the disillusioned heart,

⁷⁰ This passage marks a narrative transition, shifting the speaker from the sage to the Buddha. Notably, its counterpart in Pāli is Sn963, which reflects this narrative shift in its verse form in the *triṣṭubh* meter.

意有所厭惡 及有所著 在空床臥行欲學: In these phrases, each keyword carries multiple meanings. ‘厭惡’ typically means ‘to detest,’ while ‘著’ suggests ‘to get attached to,’ and ‘欲學’ means ‘eager to learn.’ Piecing these together coherently presents a challenge. However, considering the Buddha’s response to the sage’s inquiries, these terms should be interpreted with positive and encouraging connotations within the Buddhist context. Here, ‘厭惡’ implies a sense of ‘disillusionment with worldly life,’ and ‘著,’ when associated with ‘在空床臥’ (residing in an empty place with a simple cot to lie down), should suggest ‘to be inclined towards seclusion.’ This interpretation corresponds well with the Pāli Sn963, where ‘*vijigucchati*’ (to be disgusted) is understood positively as ‘disillusionment,’ and ‘*sevati*’ (to resort to) echoes the sense of ‘著’ as ‘attached’ or ‘inclined.’ Thus, the Taishō edition’s grouping of phrases may require reconsideration. The arrangement should likely be ‘意有所厭惡 / 及有所著在空床臥 / 行欲學.’ Bapat’s translation, “Of him who has likes and dislikes and of him who desires to learn in solitary dwelling places,” does not seem to fit the context accurately.

知聽: In considering its translation, two interpretations arise: ‘to perceptively listen to’ and ‘to understand and faithfully follow.’ The diversity of meanings for “知” and “聽” supports both translations. However, ‘to understand and faithfully follow’ is preferred, as it extends beyond the act of attentive listening to include the imperative of applying the teachings in practice. ‘To understand and heed’ is another possible translation, but it implies a sequence where ‘understanding’ precedes ‘listening,’ which is less apt once one has grasped the teachings. After comprehension, the emphasis naturally shifts to the active application and adherence to the Dharma.

To you, retreating to a secluded place,

Aspiring for awakening in accord with the Dhamma.⁷¹

14.28 五恐怖慧不畏 至心學遠可欲

勤蚱蜢亦蛻蟲 人惡聲四足獸

The wise are undaunted by the five fears,

Their minds well-honed, eschewing all that lures.

[Unshaken] they strive [amidst] swarming insects, shedding insects, snakes,

Harsh human words, and [the prowling of] quadrupeds.⁷²

⁷¹ **Sn963:** The intricate structure of this verse necessitated rearrangement for a clearer translation, following the order of line d, line a, line b, and line c. The original sequence, fully considering grammatical nuances, translates to: “Whatever is peaceful for the disillusioned, if one resorts to a secluded seat and a cot, for the one aspiring to awaken according to the Dhamma, I will declare it to you as I know.” In rearranging this translation, line d, containing the main verb ‘*pavakkhāmi*’ (I will declare), is positioned first. The correlative pair ‘*taṃ*’ (it) in line d and ‘*yad idaṃ*’ (whatever this) in line a prompts placing line a second, where ‘*taṃ*’ signifies the Buddha’s teaching, and line a characterizes its essence. Lines b and c, related with ‘*te*’ (to you), describe the intended recipient of this teaching.

To streamline the translation, ‘*ce*’ (if) in line b, which typically introduces a conditional scenario, has been omitted. Furthermore, ‘*ritṭāsanam sayanam*’ (a secluded seat and a cot) is simplified to ‘a secluded place.’ As a result, line b is rendered as ‘retreating to a secluded place,’ expanding on ‘*te*.’ Line c, which discusses the aspiration for awakening in accordance with the Dhamma, also modifies ‘*te*.’ Therefore, ‘*te*’ has been moved from line d to before lines b and c, enhancing the logical flow of the verse.

This approach aims to faithfully preserve the original text’s meaning and intent while ensuring accuracy and readability.

⁷² **Y14.28:** The ‘五恐怖’ (the five fears) in line a are not explicitly defined. However, when compared with the Pāli equivalents in Sn964, they likely correspond to the following terms: ‘蚱蜢’ (grasshoppers), ‘蛻’ (shedding insects), ‘蟲’ (snakes), ‘人惡聲’ (harsh human words), and ‘四足獸’ (quadrupeds). ‘蚱’ and ‘蜢’ are nearly synonymous, typically referring to grasshoppers, locusts, or cicadas. I have grouped them together under ‘swarming insects.’ Furthermore, ‘蛻’ suggests ‘shedding insects,’ derived from its original meaning ‘to cast off [molted] skin/shell.’ ‘蟲’ generally means ‘insects’ but can also signify ‘snakes.’ Given its Pāli counterpart ‘*sirīṃsapāna*’ (snake/serpent) in Sn 964, I have translated it as ‘snakes.’ This interpretation simplifies the list while capturing the breadth of challenges referenced in the original text.

Y14.28a, 五 = 無 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): With the inclusion of two negative terms, the variant phrase ‘無恐怖慧不畏’ offers an alternative interpretation: “The wise (慧) is without fear (無恐怖), not (不) afraid (畏) [of anything].” This rendition departs from specifying ‘the five types of fear’ and instead reinforces the notion of complete fearlessness through the repetition of negation, highlighting the profound tranquility and courage attributed to the wise.

Sn964 *Pañcannaṃ dhīro bhayānaṃ na bhāye*

Bhikkhu sato (sa) pariyantacārī

Ḍaṃsādhīpātānaṃ sirīṃsapānaṃ

Manussaphassānaṃ catuppadānaṃ

Mindful, adhering to the [disciplinary] boundaries,

The wise monk should not fear the five terrors—

[Intrusions of] gadflies, moths, or serpents,

Encounters with people, or quadrapedal beasts.

14.29 非身法意莫識 無色聲光無形

悉非我悉忍捨 莫聞善貪^{際縣}

Disregard teachings that are not my own,

Those devoid of [insights into] visual and auditory sense objects [viz., the six cognitive objects], and the illumination of formless [meditative states].

Nothing indeed is truly mine; resolutely renounce all.

Do not heed flattering talk of villages or counties, nor covet them.⁷³

⁷³ **Y14.29a:** Bapat translates ‘非身法意莫識’ as “To the doctrines not his own, he pays no heed—the doctrine”. However, this rendering may not fully capture the speaker’s (the Buddha’s) intent or perspective. The phrase ‘非身法’ should be directly translated as ‘teachings (法) that are not (非) my own (身),’ signifying teachings outside the Buddhist dispensation, aligning with the Pāli term ‘*paradhammika*’ (other teachings) as found in Sn965a. Furthermore, ‘意莫識’ literally means ‘do not (莫) take note (識) in mind (意).’ Hence, it is more accurately rendered as ‘disregard,’ reflecting a deliberate choice to remain uninfluenced by non-Buddhist teachings.

Y14.29b: Bapat translates ‘無色聲光無形’ as “Of what is without colour or sound or light or form—”. However, this rendering might not fully convey the line’s meaning, as it overlooks the second ‘無’ and leaves the phrase quite ambiguous. A more interpretive translation is needed, one that builds upon ‘other teachings’ mentioned

Sn965 *Paradhammikānam pi na santaseyya*

Disvā pi tesaṃ bahubheravāni

Athāparāni abhisambhaveyya

Parissayāni kusalānuesī

One should not be intimidated by adherents of other teachings,

Even when confronted with numerous threats from them.

Moreover, those pursuing virtue

Should also surmount other challenges.⁷⁴

14.30 所被痛不可身 恐若各悉受行

是曹苦痛難忍 以精進作拒扞

in the previous line. This line should be understood as emphasizing the absence (無) of profound insights into the six cognitive objects (implied by ‘色聲’) as well as the lack of illumination (光) of formless (無形) meditative states. In the Buddhist context, ‘colors and sounds’ often represent the entire six cognitive objects, encompassing visual, auditory, olfactory, gustatory, tactile, and mental phenomena, while ‘the formless’ typically refers to advanced meditative states beyond physical form. This line seems to critique non-Buddhist teachings for their omission of these critical elements of Buddhist doctrine and meditative practice.

Y14.29c: Bapat translates ‘悉非我悉忍捨’ as “All such he disowns, having tolerance and equanimity for them all;”. However, this interpretation may inadvertently disconnect ‘悉非我’ from ‘悉忍捨,’ introducing concepts of tolerance and equanimity that are not fully aligned with the intended context. A more cohesive and accurate translation would be, “Nothing indeed (悉非) is truly mine (我); with steadfast resolve (忍), renounce (捨) all (悉).” In this phrase, ‘忍,’ used adverbially before the verb ‘捨’ (to renounce), implies ‘patiently’ or ‘resolutely,’ reflecting the profound challenge in Buddhist practice of renouncing all deep-seated attachments and self-centered perceptions, a fundamental aspect of Buddhist soteriology.

Y14.29d: The rare character ‘𨾏’ is synonymous with ‘鄴’ (village). Regarding this variant character, please refer to Y1. fn.43 for further detail.

⁷⁴ **Sn965b:** In translating ‘disvā,’ I have opted for ‘confronted with’ to capture the implied intensity of the experience, deviating slightly from its literal translations such as ‘seeing’ or ‘observing.’ This choice is intended to convey a more active and direct engagement with the challenges mentioned in the text.

If one is beset with unbearable suffering,
And if each instance brings terror, all must be faced and borne.
These aggregated sufferings [indeed] form afflictions hard to endure,
[Yet,] one must repel [them] with intensified exertion.⁷⁵

Sn966 *Ātaṃkaphassena khudāya phuṭṭho*

Sītaṃ accuṇhaṃ adhivāsayeyya

Sa tehi phuṭṭho bahudhā anoko

Viriyaṃ parakkamma daḷhaṃ kareyya

Struck by [the pangs of] hunger and the touch of fever,

One ought to bear the cold and the scorching heat.

Afflicted by these in various ways and exerting oneself,

A renouncer should steadfastly fortify their efforts.

⁷⁵ **Y14.30:** The interpretation of ‘所’ in line a and ‘若’ in line b, as markers for conditional clauses—represented by ‘if’—brings clarity to the verse’s message. The verse prompts a proactive approach, underscoring the necessity of a concerted effort to confront and surmount suffering or fear.

Y14.30a: Although ‘所’ typically precedes verbs in the passive voice, indicating ‘the object’ of the verb, its use alongside ‘被’—another marker of passivity—suggests an alternative function in this case. Here, ‘所’ appears to serve as a conditional ‘if,’ rather than indicating passive voice. This conditional use of ‘所’ is elaborated in Y10. fn.54. When combined with ‘不可’ (cannot), the character ‘身’ operates as a verb, implying ‘to experience.’ Consequently, ‘不可身’ is interpretable as ‘cannot be experienced’ or more fittingly as ‘unbearable,’ which can be parsed as ‘un- (不) -bear- (身) -able (可).’ In this rendition, ‘不可身’ modifies ‘痛’ (suffering), and the passive marker ‘被’ is translated as ‘to be beset with,’ indicating a state of being overwhelmed by suffering.

Y14.30b: The term ‘各,’ indicating ‘each instance,’ refers back to ‘痛’ (suffering) from line a. I have chosen ‘to face and bear’ as an interpretive translation for ‘受行,’ capturing the essence of confronting and enduring individual instances of suffering. This line amplifies the intensity of suffering by intertwining it with fear.

Y14.30c: The character ‘曹,’ meaning ‘group,’ is interpreted as ‘collectively,’ considering the individual instances of suffering as a whole. This perspective emphasizes the cumulative weight of the sufferings faced.

Y14.30d: 拒扞 = 拒杆 (S, Y, M) = 巨杵 (P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Both ‘拒’ and ‘扞’ carry the meaning of ‘to ward off,’ and I have translated ‘作拒扞’ as ‘to repel.’ The term ‘杆,’ referring to ‘shield’ or ‘pole,’ introduces an imagery of weaponry used for defense; ‘作拒杆’ thus implies the use of a weapon or tool for protection. ‘巨杵,’ meaning ‘great shield,’ further intensifies this imagery. Hence, ‘作巨杵’ (to make a great shield) denotes the act of constructing a robust defense. Despite the variations, all these terms converge in the theme of safeguarding oneself from sufferings and fears.

14.31 願綺想念莫隨 掘惡栽根拔止

著愛可若不可 有已過後莫望

Do not latch on to desirable and charming fantasies.

Dig up the evil, sever its roots, and pull them out completely.

Whether [those fantasies seem] alluring or otherwise,

Once [they] have emerged and faded, refrain from longing [for them] anew.⁷⁶

Sn968 *Kodhātimānassa vasaṃ na gacche*

Mūlam pi tesaṃ palikhañña tiṭṭhe

⁷⁶ **Y14.31a:** Bapat translates ‘願綺想念莫隨’ as “When [evil] thoughts (念 or 想念) of ease (願綺想?) come, do ye never (莫) submit (隨) to them.” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, the translation of ‘ease’ may not accurately reflect the original terms, as ‘願’ and ‘綺’ directly translate to ‘wish’ and ‘silk/beautiful,’ respectively, denoting ‘desirable and charming.’ These words modify ‘想’ (imagination) or ‘想念’ (imagined thoughts), suggesting ‘desirable and charming fantasies.’ While ‘想念’ can be understood as a single term ‘fantasies,’ it is conceivable that ‘念’ could be interpreted independently in its Buddhist context as ‘mindfulness,’ indicating the mental discipline needed to resist (莫) pursuing (隨) such fantasies (想). Therefore, an alternative translation of this line might be “Maintain mindfulness; do not latch on to desirable and charming fantasies.”

Y14.31b: Bapat translates ‘掘惡栽根拔止’ as “The roots (根) of evil (惡) ye dig out (掘) and destroy (栽 or 拔) them.” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this translation may not fully respect the original syntax, which features a sequence of verbs ‘掘’ (to dig up), ‘栽’ (to cut through), and ‘拔’ (to pull out), with ‘惡’ and ‘根’ not forming a compound phrase but being separate entities affected by the actions. The character ‘止’ here likely denotes the finality or completeness of these actions, rather than implying ‘to stop’ or ‘cessation’ in a passive sense. A more contextually accurate translation of this line might be “Dig up the evil, sever its roots, and completely remove them,” bringing the process to its definitive end.

Y14.31c: ‘著愛可若不可’ is interpreted as “whether (若) [they are] appealing (著愛可) or not (不可),” encompassing a broad spectrum of perceptions or fantasies.

Y14.31d: Bapat translates ‘有已過後莫望’ as “Overpower (有已過?) them, and have no (莫) hankering (望) for them again (後).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this rendering may not fully capture the conditional essence embedded in ‘有已過.’ The phrase more accurately translates to “if they (the perceptions or fantasies) have arisen (有) and already (已) passed (過).” This establishes a conditional premise for the directive in ‘後莫望’ (do not long for them afterwards), thus serving as a warning against forming attachments to ephemeral perceptions or desires. The line advises maintaining a detached stance towards transient experiences, emphasizing the practice of non-attachment.

Atha-ppiyaṃ vā pana appiyaṃ vā

Addhā bhavanto abhisambhaveyya

One should not come under the sway of anger or arrogance.

Entirely uprooting their roots, one should remain steadfast.

Then, coping with things whether pleasing or displeasing,

They should fully surmount them.⁷⁷

14.32 存點想熟成善 越是去避龐聲

忍不樂坐在行 四可忍哀悲法

Cultivate wise thoughts that mature into virtue.

Leave such past [events] behind and eschew harsh words.

Endure discomfort, whether stationary or on the move.

These four grievous circumstances must be endured.⁷⁸

⁷⁷ **Sn968d**: Both the *Mahāniddesa* and *Paramatthajotikā II* interpret ‘*addhā bhavanto*’ (surely, the Lord) as ‘*abhibhavanto*’ (conquering), an interpretation I have adopted. It appears less probable that the Blessed One would refer to ‘the Lord’ or ‘Venerable’ in the third person in this context. While there is scholastic disagreement regarding this gloss, Norman (2001: 391-2) investigates the philological evolution from ‘*abhibhavati*’ to ‘*addhā bhavati*.’

⁷⁸ **Y14.32a**: Bapat translates ‘存點想熟成善’ as “Guided (存?) by wise (點) thoughts (想) that are well-matured (熟成善?),” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this rendering may not precisely convey the original text’s meaning. The translation of ‘存’ as ‘to guide’ diverges from its more common meanings of ‘existence’ or ‘maintenance.’ Given its less frequent but contextually fitting meaning of ‘to nurture,’ I have chosen ‘to cultivate’ as a translation, reflecting a sense of fostering or nurturing. This usage resonates well with the depiction in the Instructions on the Seasonal Ordinances 時則訓 chapter (section 10) from the *Huainanzi* 淮南子: “立冬之日, 天子親率三公, 九卿, 大夫以迎歲於北郊. 還, 乃賞死事, 存孤寡.” This can translate to “On the day of the beginning of winter, the Emperor personally leads the Three Dukes, Nine Ministers, and high officials to welcome the new year at the northern suburbs. Upon returning, he then rewards those who have served until death and provides for the orphans and widows.” (四部叢刊初編 本 淮南鴻烈解: 時則訓, p.147). Here, ‘存’ implies providing care and sustenance. Furthermore, ‘熟成善’ is more accurately translated as ‘to ripen into virtue,’ with ‘熟成’ denoting a process of karmic maturation or development, and ‘善’ signifying ‘virtue’ rather than simply ‘well.’ Thus, a more contextually fitting translation of this line might be “Cultivate shrewd thoughts that ripen into virtue,” emphasizing the intentional development of wisdom and moral excellence.

Sn969 *Paññaṃ purakkhatvā kalyāṇapīti*

Vikkhambhaye tāni parissayāni

Aratiṃ sahettha sayanamhi pante

Caturo sahettha paridevadhamme

Placing wisdom foremost, and taking joy in virtue,

One should dispel those perils:

One should overcome discontent in secluded dwelling;

One should conquer the four occasions of lamentation.⁷⁹

14.33 常何止在何食 恐有痛云何止

有是想甚可悲 學造棄行遠可

Y14.32b: Bapat translates ‘越是去避麤聲’ as “All rough (麤) sounds (聲) ye avoid (避), being far from them (越是去).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this interpretation may not fully grasp the nuanced meaning of ‘越.’ In this context, ‘越’ should be interpreted as the verb ‘to transcend’ or ‘to leave behind,’ with ‘是去’ (such past [events]) as its object. Therefore, a more contextually appropriate translation might be “Transcend such past [events] and shun harsh words.”

Y14.32c: Bapat translates ‘忍不樂坐在行’ as “Endure (忍) discontent (不樂) and sit (坐) in (在) your dwelling [selected] (行?).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, his interpretation of ‘行’ as ‘dwelling [selected]’ seems misplaced. ‘行’ more accurately denotes ‘to wander’ or ‘being on the move.’ In my translation, ‘不樂,’ interpreted as ‘is not pleased,’ is aptly translated as ‘discomfort,’ aligning with the broader context of ‘坐在行’ (whether stationary or in motion), to convey the idea of enduring discomfort irrespective of one’s circumstances.

Y14.32d: The exact reference of ‘四’ (four) in this verse is subject to interpretation. When combined with ‘哀悲法’ (grievous situations), ‘四...哀悲法’ may correspond to the four challenging situations outlined in the following verse, Y14.33ab. This interpretation is analogous to how the Pāli ‘*caturo paridevadhamme*’ (four grievous occasions) in Sn969 align with the detailed descriptions of the four situations in the subsequent verse, Sn970ab.

⁷⁹ Sn969b: The term ‘*tāni parissayāni*’ (those perils) appears to pertain to the two subsequent issues addressed in the verse: the discomfort with solitude mentioned in line c, and the four distressing situations outlined in line d.

Sn969d: Following the earlier note, ‘*caturo paridevadhamme*’ (four grievous occasions) in Sn969 likely corresponds to the four types of lamentable inner reflections described in Sn970ab.

‘Where shall I settle each day? What shall I eat?’

[When] overwhelmed by fears and afflictions, how can I put them to rest?’

Entertaining such concerns can lead to profound distress.

[Thus,] a practitioner [should] cultivate [their mind], relinquish [such worries], and
renounce all that is coveted.⁸⁰

Sn970 *‘Kiṃ su asissāmi, kuvaṃ vā asissaṃ*

Dukkhaṃ vata settha, kuv’ ajja sessaṃ’

Ete vitakke paridevaneyye

Vinayetha sekho aniketasāri

⁸⁰ **Y14.33a:** Bapat translates ‘常何止在何食’ as “Where (何) shall I all time (何) dwell (何)? Where (在何) shall I eat (食)?” [Parentheses added for analysis]. While the first ‘何’ in ‘常何止’ is rightly translated as ‘where,’ indicating a concern about the place of dwelling, the second ‘何’ in ‘在何食’ is more fittingly interpreted as ‘what,’ directing the focus to the matter of sustenance. This distinction is crucial, as ‘where to eat’ may not be as significant a concern for ascetics as ‘what to eat.’ Moreover, using ‘何’ twice for the same meaning of ‘where’ would be redundant in this context. Therefore, ‘常何止’ inquires about a regular dwelling place (Where shall I reside regularly?), while ‘在何食’ shifts to the question of sustenance (What shall I eat there?). The phrase ‘在何食,’ with ‘在’ denoting ‘residing [there],’ introduces a separate concern about nourishment. This bifurcated interpretation is in harmony with the use of ‘四’ (four) in the previous verse, which likely refers to the four main concerns of an ascetic: uncertainties about a permanent dwelling, food, fears, and afflictions. This nuanced approach, distinguishing between individual concerns, provides a clearer understanding of why ‘四’ is used in the preceding verse, as opposed to Bapat’s interpretation that conflates these concerns into one.

Y14.33b: Bapat translates ‘恐有痛云何止’ as “I am afraid there will be pain; how shall I stay?”. However, this interpretation may not grasp the nuanced meaning of ‘止.’ In this context, ‘止’ more aptly conveys the idea of ‘to cease’ or ‘to bring to rest,’ rather than merely ‘to stay.’ Additionally, Bapat’s translation does not account for the connection to ‘四可忍’ (four grievous circumstances) mentioned in the preceding verse. Therefore, a more accurate translation may be “When fears and afflictions arise, how can they be ceased?” This not only reflects the concern about confronting and overcoming fears and afflictions but also ensures coherence with the reference to the ‘four grievous circumstances,’ thereby maintaining the continuity and depth of the original text.

Y14.33d: Bapat translates ‘學造棄行遠可’ as “The learner (學) doth abandon (棄) them, moving (行) far (遠) [from the house].” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this interpretation misses the nuances of ‘造’ and ‘可.’ ‘造’ more accurately denotes ‘to make’ or ‘to cultivate,’ emphasizing an active effort or practice. ‘可,’ in this context, represents ‘desirable things’ or ‘what is coveted.’ Therefore, ‘行遠可’ should be understood as ‘to wander (行) far away (遠) from desirable things (可),’ signifying a deliberate distancing from attachments and desires. Accordingly, a more contextually fitting translation would be “A practitioner cultivates [their mind], abandons [such worries], and wanders far from all that is coveted.” For further reference on the nuanced usage of ‘可’ in similar contexts, see annotations Y2. fn19; Y7. fn27; Y10. fn44 & 59; Y11. fn29; Y12. fn15; and Y13. fn57.

‘What shall I eat, or where shall I eat?

I indeed slept in discomfort. Where shall I sleep tonight?’

Such thoughts will lead to lamentation and

Should be subdued by the trainee who wanders without a fixed abode.⁸¹

14.34 有未有苦樂苦 知其度取可止

聞關閉縣國行 龜惡聲應莫願

The presence or absence of anxieties [leads to] either satisfaction or distress.

Recognizing moderation, refrain from grasping at what is coveted.

Close off the gates of your ears [when traversing through] villages and states.

[Upon hearing] harsh or vile speech, wish not to respond in kind.⁸²

⁸¹ **Sn970a:** ‘*Asissāmi*’ and ‘*asissam*’ are both future tense, first-person singular forms of ‘*asati*’ (to eat), with ‘*asissāmi*’ in the active voice and ‘*asissam*’ in the middle voice, reflecting different aspects of the action of eating.

Sn970b: ‘*Settha*’ and ‘*sessam*’ stem from the verb ‘*seti/sayati*’ (to sleep). ‘*Settha*’ is the s-aorist, middle voice, first-person singular form, with the final phoneme ‘-m’ elided for metrical reasons (Norman, 2001: 393). ‘*Sessam*,’ in contrast, is the future tense, middle voice, first-person singular form.

Sn970d: ‘*Vinayetha*’ is the optative, middle voice, third-person singular form of ‘*vinayati*’ (to remove, subdue), indicating an action to be desired or suggested. Although not in the passive voice, I have rendered it in a passive-like construction for smoother English flow by introducing ‘by’ before the agent ‘*sekho aniketasārī*’ (the trainee who wanders without a fixed abode).

⁸² **Y14.34a:** Bapat translates ‘有未有苦樂苦’ as “Whether ye have (有) or not (未有) things ye hate (苦) or covet (樂), ye will suffer (苦).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this translation may not fully capture the nuances of the original text. Specifically, his rendering of the first ‘苦’ as ‘things ye hate’ seems a stretch; his interpretation of ‘樂’ as ‘[things ye] covet’ may not entirely resonate with its contextual meaning. The construction of this line, with its dual instances of ‘有’ and ‘苦,’ might appear enigmatic at first glance. Yet, its meaning unfolds when dissected into ‘有未有苦’ (the presence or absence of suffering) and ‘樂苦’ (pleasure or distress), indicating a cause-and-effect dynamic. This is better understood as one leading to the other. The initial ‘苦’ is likely referring to ‘anguish over essentials,’ as suggested in the preceding verse Y14.33ab, while the latter ‘苦’ seems to encompass a more general concept of ‘suffering.’ Therefore, a translation that might more accurately convey the essence of this line would be, “The presence or absence of anxieties [leads to] either distress or satisfaction.”

Y14.34b: Bapat translates ‘知其度取可止’ as “Your (其?) measure (度) ye know (知). Having taken (取) just enough (可?), ye stop (止).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation provides a general sense of the original text, yet it deviates in certain linguistic aspects. Specifically, ‘其’ typically serves as a third person or

Sn971 *Annañ ca laddhā vasanañ ca kāle*

Mattaṃ so jaññā idha tosanatthaṃ

Sotesu gutto yatacāri gāme

Rusito pi vācaṃ pharusam na vajjā

Upon receiving food and clothing in a timely manner,

One should know moderation for the sake of contentment here.

Guarded regarding those [necessities] and well-restrained in villages,

One ought not to speak harsh words, even when provoked.⁸³

impersonal pronoun; thus, interpreting it as a second person possessive pronoun ‘your’ is a bit far-fetched. Additionally, while ‘可’ can indeed mean ‘appropriate,’ its usage as ‘enough’ may not fully align with the intended meaning within this context. When coupled with ‘取’ (to take), ‘可’ more fittingly functions as an object and refers to ‘what is desirable.’ In this line, ‘度’ more accurately translates to ‘limit’ or ‘moderation,’ reflecting a sense of restraint or measured action. Therefore, a more precise translation might be, “Knowing the limit, refrain from taking what is coveted.” This rendition underscores the importance of self-awareness and restraint in the face of temptation or desire.

Y14.34d: Bapat translates ‘龐惡聲應莫願’ as “No (莫) rough (龐) or evil (惡) words (聲) they may expect (願) from you.” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation somewhat misses the mark, particularly in terms of capturing the essence of ‘應’ (response) and the prohibitive nature of ‘莫’ in this context. Additionally, his interpretation of ‘願’ as ‘to expect’ is somewhat misleading; the term is better understood as ‘to actively wish for’ or ‘to desire,’ rather than merely ‘a third party’s expectation.’ Accordingly, a more accurate translation might be, “Do not (莫) harbor a desire (願) to retaliate (應) [in kind] to harsh (龐) or vile (惡) words (聲).” This rendition emphasizes the proactive choice not to engage or respond to negativity with similar negativity, aligning more closely with the original text’s call for restraint and higher ethical conduct.

⁸³ **Sn971a:** The term ‘*vasana*’ can mean ‘clothing’ or ‘dwelling.’ In this context, ‘clothing’ seems more appropriate, aligning better with the theme of basic necessities.

Sn971b: The term ‘*jaññā*’ is a truncated poetic form of ‘*jāneyya*,’ the optative third-person singular form of ‘*jānāti*’ (to know). It implies a suggested action of understanding or recognizing.

Sn971c: The Pāli Text Society edition lists ‘*sotesu*’ (in the ear), while the Chaṭṭha Saṅgāyana edition has ‘*so tesu*’ (he, in these). The *Mahāniddesa* offers support for both readings. The former could imply a broader interpretation encompassing all six cognitive sense organs, while the latter seems to refer specifically to the necessities mentioned in preceding verses.

Sn971d: Similar to ‘*jaññā*,’ the term ‘*vajjā*’ is a truncated poetic form of ‘*vadeyya*,’ the optative third-person singular form of ‘*vadati*’ (to speak), indicating an advised action of speaking.

14.35 舉眼人莫妄瞻 與禪會多莫臥

觀因緣意安祥 止安念疑想斷

Do not gaze on others improperly by lifting your eyes.

Engage in meditation sessions; avoid excessive lying down.

Contemplate the causes and conditions, [fostering] serenity in your mind.

Stabilize [your thoughts] calmly and mindfully, dispelling any skeptical thoughts.⁸⁴

Sn972 *Okkhittacakkhu na ca pādalolo*

Jhānānuyutto bahuajāgar' assa,

Upekkham ārabba samāhitatto

Takkāsayam kukkucciy' ūpacchinde

With eyes lowered and not wandering aimlessly,

One should remain very vigilant [while] absorbed in meditation.

Fostering equanimity and [maintaining] a composed mind,

⁸⁴ **Y14.35a:** Bapat translates ‘舉眼人莫妄瞻’ as “When your eyes (眼) ye lift up (舉), do not (莫) flightily (妄) look around (瞻);”. While this translation broadly conveys the essence of the phrase but misses certain nuances. Notably, ‘人’ (people/others) is overlooked in his translation, and ‘瞻’ conveys a sense of deliberate observation rather than a mere casual glance. The phrase ‘舉眼人’ (lifting eyes towards people) combined with ‘妄瞻’ (improper gazing) suggests an admonition against the monks’ inappropriate scrutiny of others, particularly during the alms round.

舉眼人 = 舉眼之 (S, Y, M / P, J, N, Q2) = 舉門之 (Q1): ‘之’ primarily means ‘to go,’ and in ‘舉眼之,’ it could imply the routine of an alms round, hinting at a notion of ‘walking with one’s eyes lifted.’ In ‘舉門之,’ ‘門’ might refer to a ‘sensory gate,’ specifically the eyes. This interpretation aligns these variants with a common theme, emphasizing the importance of proper conduct and mindfulness regarding one’s gaze, especially in the context of monastic practices. The nuances in these variations underscore the text’s emphasis on the discipline of sensory perceptions and the mindfulness of one’s interactions with the external environment.

Y14.35d, 止安念 = 止妄念 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): In this variant, the phrase is aptly translated as ‘Cease (止) deluded (妄) thoughts (念).’ The verb ‘止’ shifts in meaning from ‘to stabilize’ to ‘to cease’ or ‘to halt,’ reflecting the transition from the positive attribute ‘安’ (peaceful) to the negative ‘妄’ (deluded). Similarly, the nuance of ‘念’ transitions from a sense of ‘mindfulness’ to simply ‘thoughts’ or ‘mental activity.’ This change emphasizes a more direct and active cessation of delusion, aligning with the text’s broader theme of cultivating clarity and discernment in one’s mental processes.

One should eradicate misconduct and speculative thoughts.⁸⁵

14.36 取莫邪與無欺 慈哀視莫恐氣

如對見等心行 冥無明從求鮮

Refrain from taking things dishonestly; interact [sincerely] without deceit.

Look upon [all] with kindness and empathy; let not [your demeanor] be intimidating.

Even when encountering opponents, practice equanimity of mind.

[Amidst those] in total ignorance, keep seeking clarity of [mind].⁸⁶

Sn967 *Theyyam na kareyya, na musā bhaṇeyya*

⁸⁵ **Sn972d:** The compound ‘*takkāsaya*’ merges ‘*takka*’ (speculation) with ‘*āsaya*’ (abode/inclination), indicating a dwelling or proclivity towards speculative thinking. In this translation, it is succinctly rendered as ‘speculative thoughts,’ capturing both the nature of the thoughts and the mind’s tendency to indulge in them.

⁸⁶ **Y14.36a:** Bapat’s rendering of ‘與’ as ‘to give’ is one of its derivative meanings. However, this interpretation may not fully align with the traditional roles of ascetics in ancient Indian religious contexts, where they are more commonly recipients rather than givers of necessities. A more fitting translation in this context could be ‘to interact with’ or ‘to associate with,’ reflecting the relational and communal aspects of ascetic life.

Y14.36b, 恐氣 = 怨氣 (P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Bapat adopts the variant ‘怨氣’ and renders ‘莫怨氣’ as ‘with no hatred.’ This translation, while conveying the basic idea, tends to oversimplify the phrase and overlook the nuanced implications of ‘inhibition’ (莫) and ‘creating an atmosphere’ (氣). A more nuanced translation might capture the essence of actively avoiding the generation of an atmosphere charged with fear or animosity.

Y14.36c: Alternatively, ‘對’ may simply refer to an ‘external sense object’ rather than ‘an opponent.’ With this interpretation, lines c and d could be translated as: “Even when encountering sensory objects, practice equanimity of mind; amid murky ignorance, keep seeking clarity [of mind].” This reading eliminates the notion of a ‘person’ (an ‘opponent’) in line c and thus obviates the need to nominalize ‘[those in] total ignorance’ in line d. However, in my translation, I opt for ‘opponent’ because lines a and b focus on behavioral guidelines in social interactions, rather than on ideological and doctrinal norms.

Y14.36d: Bapat translates ‘冥無明從求鮮’ as “And seek (求 or 從求) purity (鮮) by getting free from darkness (冥) of ignorance (無明).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation introduces the concept of ‘getting free from,’ which is not explicitly present in the original text. Additionally, his interpretation of ‘鮮’ as ‘purity’ does not entirely resonate with the character’s broader semantic range, which stems from the notion of ‘freshness’ (鮮潔) as seen in live fish, extending metaphorically to vegetables, clarity, and brightness. In this verse, a translation such as ‘clarity’ or ‘luminosity’ (鮮明) would be more apt, symbolizing the enlightenment or the illuminating wisdom that Buddhist ascetics strive to achieve amidst the darkness of ignorance.

Mettāya phasse tasathāvarāni

Yad āvilattaṃ manaso vijaññā

‘Kaṇhassa pakkho’ ti vinodayeyya

One should not commit theft, nor should one speak falsehoods.

With love, one should extend a hand to both the feeble and the stable.

One should recognize any murkiness in the mind

And dispel it, [considering,] ‘[This is] an ally of darkness.’⁸⁷

Y.14.37 被惡語莫增意 故怨語於同學

放聲言濡若水 媿慚法識莫想

[When] assailed by harsh words, do not brood over them,

[Nor dwell on] resentful words previously [heard] from fellow practitioners.

Let your words flow gently, like a stream.

Refrain from harboring thoughts of deeds that bring shame and remorse.⁸⁸

⁸⁷ **Sn967**: This verse features five main verbs in the optative third-person singular form, indicating actions that are advised or wished for. These verbs are ‘*kareyya*’ (one should do), ‘*bhaṇeyya*’ (one should speak), ‘*phasse*’ (one should touch), ‘*vijaññā*’ (one should discern), and ‘*vinodayeyya*’ (one should dispel). The verb ‘*vijaññā*’ here is a contracted poetic variant of ‘*vijāneyya*,’ used for metrical purposes.

⁸⁸ **Y14.37a**: Bapat translates ‘被惡語莫增意’ as “If you are abused, brood it not over;”. This translation, however, does not fully capture the specific nature of the abuse referenced in the original text. The phrase ‘被惡語’ more accurately pertains to ‘receiving harsh words’ and is best understood in the context of verbal rather than general abuse, which may include physical or psychological aspects.

Y14.37b: Bapat translates ‘故怨語於同學’ as “Let words of hate towards companions [in holy life] vanish.” His interpretation appears to interpret ‘故’ as an active verb suggesting the act of making something disappear. However, ‘故’ rarely serves as a transitive verb in classical Chinese literature, and it typically denotes past occurrences or states. It is often found in conjunction with ‘亡’ (to die), to form the phrase ‘亡故’ (to pass away), a euphemistic expression for death. This is exemplified in *Dream of the Red Chamber* (紅樓夢), where the sentence ‘可惜上月其母竟亡故了’ can be translated as “It is just a pity that her mother passed away last month!” (紅樓夢: 賈夫人仙逝揚州城 冷子興演說榮國府, p. 46). While *Dream of the Red Chamber* was written much later than the translation of the *Yizujing*, it provides insight into the use of ‘故’ in a euphemistic context relating to death.

Sn973 *Cudito vacīhi satimābhinande*

Sabrahmacārīsu khilaṃ pabhinde

Vācaṃ pamuñce kusalaṃ nātivelam

Janavādadhammāya na cetayeyya

[When] provoked by words, one should remain mindful and rejoice.

[When] with fellow spiritual seekers, one should remove mental barriers.

One should speak wholesome words, [but] not excessively.

One should not indulge in thoughts that [may] lead to gossip.

14.38 若爲彼見尊敬 有行意離莫受

若色聲若好味 香細滑是欲捐

If you are venerated by others,

Keep a watchful mind, let [such regard] pass, and do not cling to it.

Whether it be forms, sounds, delightful tastes,

Consequently, ‘故怨語’ is more accurately translated as ‘past resentful words,’ consistent with Y14.37a’s overarching message, which advises against dwelling on or exacerbating such negative thoughts (‘莫增意’).

故怨語 = 故怨詰 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Although ‘詰’ carries the connotations of criticize or rebuke, which are more targeted than the general term ‘語’ (words), the overall import of the phrase does not differ materially within the context of the discussion. Both terms convey the idea of negative or resentful speech from the past.

Y14.37d, 媿慚法 = 愧慚法 (S, Y, M): The character ‘媿’ (feeling ashamed or embarrassed) serves as a variant of ‘媿’ with synonymous meaning, ensuring that the phrase retains the same interpretation across the variants. Both characters refer to the emotional response of shame or embarrassment in the context of moral or ethical conduct.

Fragrances, or tender touches, renounce the craving for them.⁸⁹

Sn974 *Athāparam pañca rajāni loke*

Yesam satīmā vinayāya sikkhe

Rūpesu saddesu atho rasesu

Gandhesu phassesu sahetha rāgaṃ

Moreover, in the world, there exist five kinds of defilement,

Which one should mindfully train to eliminate.

In [the realm of] forms, sounds, and tastes,

[As well as] scents, and tactile sensations, one should overcome desire.⁹⁰

14.39 於是法莫嫖著 學制意善可脱

戒遍觀等明法 行有一舊棄冥

Do not crave or cling to these phenomena.

Cultivate self-control to successfully achieve liberation.

Examine the precepts thoroughly to live up to the illuminating Dharma.

⁸⁹ **Y14.38d**, 是欲捐 = 是欲損 (K, Z): The character ‘捐’ denotes ‘to discard/abandon,’ whereas ‘損’ implies ‘to diminish/undermine.’ The visual similarity between these characters suggests the possibility of a scribal variation. Despite the difference in nuance, both terms converge in the overarching theme of this line: the act of renouncing or relinquishing desire (欲).

⁹⁰ **Sn974b**: This line has been adapted for greater clarity and brevity. A more literal translation would be ‘for the elimination of which one should mindfully train [themselves],’ but the revised version aims to convey the same meaning in a more concise manner.

Develop a focused mind to dispel longstanding darkness.⁹¹

Sn975 *Etesu dhammesu vineyya chandaṃ*

bhikkhu satīmā suvimuttacitto

kālena so samma dhammaṃ parivīmaṃsamāno

ekodibhūto vihane tamaṃ so ti Bhagavā ti

A mindful monk, with a well-liberated mind,

Should dispel desire for these phenomena.

In due time, thoroughly examining the true Dharma,

⁹¹ **Y14.39a:** The term ‘是法’ (these phenomena) is likely a reference to ‘色聲好味 香細滑’ (forms, sounds, delightful tastes, fragrances, and tender touches) as mentioned in the previous verse, Y14.38cd. This connection establishes ‘是法’ as encompassing sensory experiences that are typically the objects of desire.

Y14.39b: Bapat translates ‘學制意善可脫’ as “Ye, a mindful (制意) student (學), be well-released (善... 脫);”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this translation may not fully account for the word ‘可,’ which implies potentiality or intention. My translation interprets ‘可’ as ‘in order to,’ suggesting that the release is not just a state but a goal to strive for. The phrase ‘制意’ is literally ‘to control the mind,’ which I have chosen to translate as ‘self-control’ since it is used nominally as the object of the verb ‘學’ (to learn/practice). This conveys the active effort to discipline one’s mind, a key aspect of the practice necessary for liberation.

Y14.39c: Bapat translates ‘戒遍觀等明法’ as “With proper (戒? or 遍?) reflection (遍觀? or 觀?), have a just (等?) knowledge (明) of the Law (法).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this translation may not fully capture the specific meanings of each character. ‘戒’ traditionally refers to ‘precepts’ or ‘discipline’ rather than ‘proper.’ The translation should reflect ‘戒’ as pertaining to the ethical and moral guidelines in a Buddhist context. ‘遍’ indicates the thoroughness or comprehensiveness of the reflection or observation denoted by ‘觀.’ Bapat’s interpretation of ‘等’ as ‘just’ does not align with its use in this context; ‘等’ is better understood as a verb here, meaning ‘to match’ or ‘to live up to.’ The character ‘明’ is an adjective here, describing the ‘Law’ or ‘Dharma’ as ‘illuminating.’ Thus, a more accurate translation might be, “Examine the precepts thoroughly to live up to the illuminating Dharma.” This conveys both the depth of the reflection required and the aspiration to embody the wisdom of the Dharma fully.

Y14.39d: Bapat translates ‘行有一舊棄冥’ as “Being alone (行有一?), do smite off (棄) the darkness (冥) that doth already exist (舊).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this translation introduces an interpretation that diverges from the likely intent of the phrase, particularly in the translation of ‘行有一.’ The phrase ‘有一’ (having one) is more accurately associated with the concept of ‘unified mental focus,’ not necessarily physical solitude. In the context of Buddhist practice, it commonly refers to a state of concentration or one-pointedness of mind, similar to the Pāli counterpart ‘ekodibhūta’ found in Sn975d, which denotes the cultivation of a focused, singular state of mind. ‘棄冥’ (discard darkness) metaphorically speaks to the act of shedding ignorance or delusion. Therefore, a more precise translation might be, “Cultivate a focused mind to dispel the pre-existing darkness,” emphasizing the active practice of mental concentration to overcome ignorance.

He, being one-pointed, should dispel all darkness.

Thus [proclaimed] the Blessed One.⁹²

佛說是義足經竟。比丘悉歡喜

When the Buddha had expounded this [*sūtra* in] the *Yizujing*, all the *bhikṣus* rejoiced.⁹³

⁹² **Sn957:** For improved readability, I have rearranged the translation sequence of line b to precede line a.
Sn957a: The term ‘*etesu dhammesu*’ (in these phenomena) seems to refer back to ‘*rūpesu saddesu rasesu gandhesu phassesu*’ (in the forms, sounds, tastes, scents, and tactile sensations) mentioned in the preceding verse, Sn956cd.

Sn975c: This verse follows the Triṣṭubh meter, typically comprising eleven syllables per line. However, line c contains fifteen syllables, exceeding the standard count. Norman (2001: 394) proposes omitting the phrase ‘*samma dhammam*’ for metrical reasons. Without this phrase, the line could be translated as ‘in due time, thoroughly examining himself.’

⁹³ 是義足經 = 義足經 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The character ‘是’ (this) is omitted in the variant versions. However, this omission does not impact the understanding of the epilogue.

子父共會經 第十五

Discourse 15: Reunion of Son and Father (*Aṭṭhakavagga.10*)¹

聞如是。佛在釋國。從千弟子梵志故道人皆老年悉得應真六達所求皆具。佛從教授縣國。轉到迦維羅衛城外尼拘類園中。

Thus I heard. Once, the Buddha was residing in the Śākya kingdom, accompanied by a thousand disciples, [all] former brahmins. Mature in years and [well advanced] on the [spiritual] path, they had attained arhatship and [mastered] the six spiritual powers, embodying all [the virtues] they had sought.² The Buddha, imparting his teachings from one [locality] to another, journeyed through various counties and states, eventually arriving at Nigrodha Park on the outskirts of Kapilavastu.³

迦維羅衛諸釋。聞佛從老年應真千比丘。轉行教授。已到是國。近在城外園中。便轉相告語。先鷄鳴悉當會。自共議言。諸賢者正使太子不樂道。當作遮加越王。我曹悉當爲其民耳。今棄七寶作道。自致作佛。我人今悉取長者。家出一人。亦從佛求作沙門。諸釋如

¹ This fifteenth discourse of the *Yizujing* corresponds to the *Purābhedasutta* (Sn IV-10) of the *Aṭṭhakavagga*.

子父共會經 第十五 (K, T, Z) = 子父共會 第十五 (P, J, Q1, N, Q2): For an in-depth discussion of the recurring exclusion of ‘經’ (sūtra) in the titles of alternative versions documented in the Z863 apparatus, refer to Y1.fn.3.

² I interpret the passage by parsing it as follows: “從千弟子梵志故 / 道人皆老年 / 悉得應真六達 / 所求皆具。” Here, ‘故’ (former) qualifies ‘梵志’ (brahmin), indicating that the thousand disciples who followed the Buddha were formerly of the brahmin class. I have interpreted ‘道人’ as ‘people on the path,’ rendered as ‘well advanced on the path.’ The term ‘應真’ is a translation of ‘arhat,’ synonymous with its transcription ‘阿羅漢.’ In this context, ‘六達’ directly translates to ‘six masteries,’ likely to refer to the six spiritual powers (*abhiññā*). According to the Pāli literature, these powers include psychic mastery (*iddhividhā*), recollection of one’s own past lives (*pubbenivāsanussati*), vision of others’ rebirths (*dibbacakkhu*), clairaudience (*dibbasota*), reading others’ minds (*cetopariyañāṇa*), and extinction of mental impurities (*āsavakkhaya*).

³ The terms ‘迦維羅衛’ and ‘尼拘類’ are transcriptions of ‘Kapilavastu’ and ‘Nigrodha,’ respectively.

是。衆爲復增。便從迦維羅衛城出。欲見尊德。欲聞明法。諸釋女人。亦復聚會。俱到佛所。欲聞明法。

The Śākyaans of Kapilavastu learned that the Buddha, accompanied by a thousand senior *arhat bhikṣus*, was journeying to teach and had arrived at their kingdom, residing in a park on the outskirts of the city. They quickly spread the word, agreeing to meet before [dawn's] rooster crows. In their communal discussion, [someone] remarked, “Venerables! Had the Prince not reveled in the spiritual path, he might have been a wheel-turning-monarch, and all of us, his subjects.⁴ Yet, he renounced the seven jewels, embarked on the path, and achieved buddhahood himself.⁵ Now, we have all become householders. [Let] each family send one person to follow the Buddha and embrace the ascetic life.” [This proposal] was unanimously embraced by the

⁴ 諸賢者正使太子不樂道 當作遮迦越王 我曹悉當爲其民耳: Bapat translates this passage as “Oh, [would] the worthy good man here just make the Crown-prince dislike the Path and that he became a sovereign monarch! We will all become his subjects.” However, this rendition falls short of capturing the passage’s intended meaning, primarily due to the misinterpretation of ‘正使.’ Bapat reads ‘正使’ as ‘just to make,’ whereas it functions more accurately as a conditional conjunction, akin to ‘if’ or ‘even if.’ Karashima (2010: 630-633) provides numerous examples of this usage from ancient Chinese Classics and various Chinese Buddhist translations. In this context, ‘正使’ is more appropriately translated as ‘if.’ Consequently, the passage does not express a desire for the Buddha’s return to secular life but rather contemplates a hypothetical scenario: if he had not been drawn to the spiritual Path, he might have ascended as their sovereign monarch. Bapat’s interpretation also contradicts the following narrative that they decide each family should send one person to follow the Buddha’s path.

自共議言 諸賢者 = 自共議言 語賢者 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The phrase ‘諸賢者’ typically serves as a respectful address, translating to ‘all the Venerables!’ On the other hand, ‘語賢者’ indicates a more specific action, aptly translating to ‘[someone] spoke to the Venerables.’ This variation prompts a reconsideration of ‘自共議言’ as ‘[someone] from the discussion,’ interpreting ‘議言’ as ‘discussion and statement.’ The proximity of ‘言’ and ‘語,’ both implying ‘to speak,’ might render the phrase repetitive or redundant. Furthermore, although addressing the Śākyaans as ‘諸賢者’ is typical for speakers within the text, it appears less fitting for the narrator to use this term for the Śākyaans when they are portrayed as anonymous figures rather than religiously esteemed individuals. This nuance leads to the hypothesis that ‘語’ in this context may be a scribal error or deviation, taking into account the narrative style and the broader context.

遮迦越 = 遮迦越 (S, Y, M): Both terms appear to be transcriptions of ‘*cakravartin*’ (wheel-turning monarch; Pāli: *cakkavatti*). Based on Pulleyblank (1991), we can reconstruct their Early Middle Chinese pronunciations: 遮迦越 as /tɕia-ke:-wuat/ or /tɕia-kai-wuat/ and ‘遮迦越’ as /tɕia-kia-wuat/. Closely resembling the pronunciation of ‘*cakravartin*,’ both terms reflect attempts to phonetically represent the same Sanskrit term.

⁵ The character ‘今’ typically means ‘now,’ but in this context, I have translated it as ‘yet’ to emphasize its function in contrasting the past, particularly within a subjunctive mood setting.

Śākyans, and their numbers swelled.⁶ They then departed from the city of Kapilavastu, eager to see the Blessed One and to hear his luminous teachings. The Śākyan women also gathered and journeyed to the Buddha's abode, eager to learn from his lucid teachings.

爾時佛取神足定意適定。便在空中步行。爾時諸釋。見佛步行虛空中。悉歡喜生敬愛心。

爾時悅頭檀王。便以頭猗著佛足作禮竟。便一面住。迦維羅衛民悉不平。王爲佛作禮是何法以還禮子。

At that time, the Buddha invoked his spiritual powers, focusing his mind to enter the [appropriate state of] samādhi.⁷ He then proceeded to walk through the air. Upon witnessing the Buddha's aerial promenade, all the Śākyans were filled with joy, their hearts brimming with reverence and affection. King Śuddhodana promptly [knelt down,] laying his forehead at the Buddha's feet as [a gesture of] homage.⁸ After [offering his respects], he stepped aside. [This act] stirred [a sense of] unease among all the citizens of Kapilavastu. [They pondered,] 'What kind of Dharma is this,

⁶ 諸釋如是 衆爲復增: Bapat translates this phrase as "In this way the multitude of the Śākyas [as followers of the Buddha] may be further increased." However, this interpretation may not fully capture the nuances of the original text, particularly regarding the term '如是.' While '如是' can be used adverbially as 'in this way,' it also serves as an affirmative expression akin to 'you are right' or 'so be it.' Given the structure, where '諸釋' (all the Śākyans) and '衆' (the multitude) are separated by '如是,' Bapat's reading of '諸釋...衆' as a contiguous phrase 'the multitude of the Śākyas...' seems less likely. The phrase is more accurately understood as two separate statements, first reflecting the consensus among the Śākyans, and second noting the subsequent increase in the number of Śākyans adhering to this consensus—namely, sending one family member to follow the Buddha.

⁷ 取神足定意適定: This phrase combines several concepts. The term '取神足' is interpreted as 'to invoke spiritual powers.' '定意' is taken to mean 'to focus/settle the mind.' '適定' denotes 'to enter into a state of samādhi.' The dual use of '定' encompasses both an action and a state; the former '定' functions as a verb meaning 'to focus/settle,' and the latter as a noun, referring to 'samādhi'—a meditative state.

⁸ 悅頭檀: This term is presumed to refer to Buddha's father, King Śuddhodana. Drawing on Pulleyblank's (1991) work, the reconstructed pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese might be /jwiat-dəu-dan/. Furthermore, considering the character '說,' often used as an alternative to '悅,' the pronunciation /çwiat-dəu-dan/ provides an even closer approximation to the original Indic name.

猗 = 倚 (S, Y, M): The character '猗' possesses a range of meanings. In this specific context, it serves as a variant of '倚' (to lean toward or to rely on), suggesting the same action or posture.

where the King pays homage to the Buddha, reversing [the customary order of] the son's paying homage [to the father]?'⁹

王即聞民悉不平已如是。王便言。諸賢者。是太子生時。地大動現大光明。悉照一切生便行七步。無所抱猗便左右視出聲言。三界甚苦。何可樂者。諸天於空中持白蓋。復散摩尼花。復鼓五百樂。復雨香水。盥浴太子。諸民爾時我第一爲太子作禮。諸賢者。太子在園閭浮樹下。晨起往坐。便得臥。樹枝葉悉在太子東作蔭。禺中至晡。樹枝葉悉復在西爲太子作蔭。樹尚不違太子身。諸民爾時我第二爲太子作禮。王爾時說偈曰

At that moment, upon sensing such unrest among his citizens, the King responded:¹⁰

“Venerables! When the Prince was born, the earth trembled profoundly, and a brilliant light shone, illuminating all beings. Unassisted, he took seven steps, looked around, and declared,¹¹

⁹ 王爲佛作禮是何法以還禮子: This phrase reflects the citizens' bewilderment at witnessing King Suddhodana's homage to the Buddha. The question '是何法' translates to 'what kind of Dharma is this?', where '法' here is understood not in its usual religious sense, but as referring to 'the rightful or established procedure'. The term '以還' suggests a deviation or contradiction, implying 'contrary to the proper or usual procedure.' This reflects the citizens' confusion about the reversal of conventional roles, where typically a son pays homage to his father, not the other way around.

¹⁰ 王即聞民悉不平已如是: The character '聞' means 'to hear.' However, in this context, it seems to capture the King's perception of the underlying sentiments of his citizens, rather than a literal hearing of their voices. Therefore, I have chosen to interpret and translate '聞' as 'to sense' or 'to perceive,' reflecting the King's attunement to the inner unrest of the people.

不平 = 平 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The absence of '不' in the variant texts likely represents a scribal oversight. This hypothesis is reinforced by the context provided by the preceding sentence, which depicts the Śākya's 'unease' (不平) upon witnessing the king's homage to the Buddha. Sensing this 'unease' from the Śākya's, the king needs to explain why he paid homage to the Buddha or his son. The expected sentiment of 'unease' or 'disturbance' (不平) aligns more coherently with the narrative, suggesting that '不' was inadvertently omitted in some manuscripts.

¹¹ 左右視 = 大右視 (S, Y): The term '左右視' typically means 'to look to the right and the left' or 'to look around,' encompassing a general scanning of one's surroundings. On the other hand, '大右視' suggests a more specific action, likely translating to 'to look greatly or primarily to the right.' The notable difference in meaning between these two phrases raises the possibility that the variation '大右視' could be a scribal error, especially if the broader narrative or textual tradition does not support a specific emphasis on looking to the right.

‘The three realms are steeped in suffering; what joy is there to be found?’ Deities in the sky held aloft white umbrellas, scattered maṇi flowers, and played five hundred musical instruments.¹² They also showered fragrant water to bathe the Prince.¹³ People! That was the first occasion on which I paid my respects to the Prince. Venerables! The Prince once sat beneath a jambu tree in the garden.¹⁴ Rising at dawn, he went and seated himself there. As he lay down, the tree’s branches and leaves provided shade from the east till late morning.¹⁵ [From noon] to dusk, they shifted to offer shade from the west, [continually adjusting their shade,] never once deviating

¹² 復散摩尼花 = 覆散摩尼花 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): While ‘覆’ typically conveys the idea of ‘to cover over’ or ‘to turn over,’ it may also be used interchangeably with ‘復’ to imply the notion of ‘repeatedly’ or ‘again.’ Considering this, both ‘復散’ and ‘覆散’ could be understood synonymously, suggesting the continual act of scattering or spreading. However, ‘覆散’ might specifically imply scattering in such a way as to ‘cover the entire space,’ enhancing the imagery of a thorough or complete dispersion.

The term ‘摩尼’ likely represents a transcription of the Sanskrit ‘*maṇi*’ (jewel), suggesting that ‘摩尼花’ refers to a type of precious or jewel-like flower, potentially of divine significance. While there are species known as *maṇi* flowers, the term here may symbolize flowers of celestial beauty or spiritual importance.

¹³ 盥浴太子 = 灌浴太子 (S, Y, M) = 灌浴太子 (P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The character ‘盥’ commonly means ‘to wash,’ whereas ‘灌’ and its simplified variant ‘灌’ indicate ‘to pour’ or ‘to sprinkle [water].’ When paired with ‘浴’ (to bathe), each of these terms—‘盥浴,’ ‘灌浴,’ and ‘灌浴’—convey the action of bathing, with a subtle emphasis on the method of applying water. Although the characters imply slightly different actions (‘washing’ versus ‘pouring/sprinkling’), in the context of bathing the Prince, they essentially refer to the ceremonial or respectful act of bathing, and thus can be understood synonymously as ‘to ceremonially bathe.’

¹⁴ 閻浮樹: ‘閻浮’ seems to be a transcription of the Sanskrit ‘*jambu*.’ The Jambu tree, a tropical fruit-bearing species, is known for its considerable height, potentially reaching up to 50 feet.

¹⁵ 作蔭 = 作陰 (S, Y, M): The characters ‘蔭’ and ‘陰’ are used interchangeably in this context, both signifying ‘shade.’ Regardless of the slight variation in character usage across different printing versions, the meaning remains consistent, referring to the act of providing shade or shelter.

from his body.¹⁶ People! That was the second occasion I paid my respects to the Prince.” The King then recited the following verse:¹⁷

15.1 今爲三勇猛黠 以頭禮遍觀足

初生時動天地 坐樹蔭身不露

Now, for the third time, [I offer my respects to] the Brave One, the Wise One,

By bowing down, placing my head at the feet of the All-Seer.

The first [homage] was when both heaven and earth trembled at his birth,

[And the second,] as he sat beneath the tree, his body shaded [from the sun].¹⁸

¹⁶ 禺中 = 隅中 (P, Q1, N): ‘禺中’ refers to an ancient Chinese time division, specifically the ‘禺’ period (also known as ‘巳’ time), which corresponds to late morning hours, approximately between 9 a.m. and 11 a.m. In contrast, the variant ‘隅中’ has a spatial connotation, translating to ‘in the corner,’ potentially indicating the extent of the shade’s reach. However, given that this term is paired with the time expression ‘至晡’ (until dusk), ‘禺中’ as a temporal marker aligns more naturally with the narrative flow, indicating the movement of shade during a specific period of the day rather than a spatial reference to a corner. The use of ‘禺中’ is therefore more contextually appropriate in this instance, maintaining the focus on the progression of time from late morning to dusk.

晡: Another ancient Chinese temporal term, ‘晡’ refers to the end of the day or the ‘last watch of the day,’ synonymous with ‘申’ time, which is approximately between 3 p.m. and 5 p.m.

樹尚不違太子身: Bapat translates this phrase as “Even the trees would not be hostile (lit. opposed) to the body of the Crown-prince.” However, this translation may not aptly capture the intended meaning. The term ‘違’ (to run counter) in this context should not be interpreted as ‘hostile,’ which implies animosity or aggression. A more faithful interpretation of this phrase would be, “The tree’s shade never deviated from the Prince’s body,” poetically conveying that the tree’s branches and leaves were in harmonious synchrony with the Prince, continuously adjusting to provide him with constant shade. This interpretation emphasizes the miraculous and harmonious nature of the event, rather than an absence of hostility or opposition.

¹⁷ 說偈曰 = 說偈言 (S, Y, M): In this context, ‘曰’ and ‘言’ serve the same function and are interchangeable. Thus, both phrases convey the same meaning that can be parsed as ‘to express (說) [one’s idea] in verse (偈), saying (曰/言).’

¹⁸ Y15.1: Having narrated the two instances where he paid homage to the Buddha in the past, the King articulates through verse that his present act of bowing should not come as a surprise, given the extraordinary manifestations of the Buddha.

Y15.1ab: Bapat translates ‘今爲三勇猛黠 以頭禮遍觀足’ as “The present (今) is (爲) the third (三) time, O ye men (?) of bravery (勇猛) and skill (黠), When (以?) I paid respects (禮) at the feet (足) of the Circumspect (遍觀).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, his interpretation of ‘勇猛黠’ as ‘men of bravery and skill’ appears to be a plural reference to the Śākya, which may not align with the intended meaning in the given context.

佛爾時攝神足。下座比丘僧前咸坐上。諸釋及釋諸女人。皆頭面禮佛。各就座。王亦就座。即偈歎佛言

Subsequently, the Buddha retracted his supernatural powers and descended to take his place in front of the *Bhikṣusaṅgha* of s who were all already seated.¹⁹ Both Śākya men and women, together, bowed deeply before the Buddha, [touching] their foreheads [to his feet, before] taking their own seats. The king also took his seat and then commenced to extol the Buddha with verses.²⁰

15.2 象馬駕金車 乘行臺閣間

Considering that ‘勇猛’ and ‘黠’ carry implications of spiritual prowess, they seem more fittingly attributed to the Buddha rather than the lay Śākya. Therefore, I have translated ‘勇猛黠’ as ‘the Brave One’ and ‘the Wise One,’ epithets befitting the Buddha’s spiritual stature. Furthermore, Bapat’s translation of ‘遍觀’ as ‘the Circumspect’ lacks the breadth of meaning carried by this term in Buddhist contexts; it signifies the Buddha’s omniscience rather than just prudence. Hence, I have chosen ‘the All-seer’ to encapsulate this broader spiritual concept. The use of ‘以’ in Bapat’s translation as ‘when’ is also reconsidered; it is better understood here as indicating the manner in which homage is paid, not as a temporal connector. To reflect this, I have introduced ‘I offer my respects to’ at the beginning of line a to establish it as an independent clause.

Y15.1d: The phrase ‘身不露’ is directly translated as ‘[his] body was not exposed [to direct sunlight].’ This phrase poetically describes the moment when the Buddha, sitting under the tree, was shielded from direct sunlight, emphasizing the harmonious interaction between nature and the enlightened being.

¹⁹ Bapat translates ‘下座比丘僧前咸坐上’ as “He came down (下) and sat (座) before (前) the *bhikṣusaṅgha* (比丘僧) that was sitting (坐) below (上?).” However, this translation does not fully capture the nuances of the phrase. The term ‘咸’ is overlooked, which signifies the collective nature of the group and implies that everyone in the group was involved in the action. Additionally, the interpretation of ‘上’ as ‘below’ is inaccurate. ‘上’ can typically imply ‘above’ in a spatial sense, ‘previous’ in a temporal sense, or denotes a position of superiority in a social hierarchy. In this context, it should add a temporal dimension. The phrase more accurately suggests that the Buddha took a seat of honor or prominence in front of the entire assembly of monks who were already seated.

²⁰ The ensuing verses present a dialogue between the King and the Buddha. In the text, the initials ‘K’ for ‘King’ and ‘B’ for ‘Buddha’ preceded by each verse number denote the respective speakers.

K 金足蹈遍地 足云何生胝

Elephants and horses draw [your] golden chariot,
Carrying you through castles and grand mansions.
[Your] golden feet traverse the earth extensively,
[Yet,] how could calluses form upon your feet?²¹

15.3 神足爲我車 恣心無限度

B 乘是神妙車 世車安可久

The supernatural powers serve as my chariot,
Unleashed at will, boundless in their scope.
Aboard this divine and mystical chariot,
How could worldly chariots ever endure [as long as mine]?²²

²¹ **Y15.2:** This verse incorporates traditional Buddhist imagery, particularly the metaphor of the Buddha turning the Dharma Wheel. The imagery of 'elephants,' 'horses,' 'golden chariot,' and 'golden feet' is more than ornamental but holds symbolic weight, as indicated by the Buddha's response in Y15.3. These symbols are central to unfolding the deeper spiritual significance embedded within the text.

Y15.2cd, 金 = 今 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Bapat opts for the alternative reading and interprets '今足蹈遍地 足云何生胝' as "Now (今) on foot, do ye tread on all the earth, Say how thick have the soles of your feet [now] grown." However, this interpretation strays from the verse's central theme, which exalts the purity and sanctity of the Buddha's (golden) feet, revered by the King's gesture of touching his forehead to them. Lines cd underscore that, despite the Buddha's vast travels, his feet remain unmarred by earthly impurities or calluses. This concept is delicately underscored by the imagery of the elephant-and-horse-drawn chariot in lines ab, symbolizing the Buddha's pedagogic journey, transcending mere physical traversal. His teachings, much like his golden feet, extend across various lands and cultures, maintaining their pristine and universally applicable nature. The alternate phrasing '今足蹈遍地,' while slightly modifying the original, does not significantly alter its meaning; it simply requires the removal of the descriptor 'golden' and the addition of the adverb 'now' for contextual consistency.

²² **Y15.3b:** The term '恣心' often bears a negative connotation, implying 'selfish attitude.' However, in this context, it aligns more closely with '自在心,' which signifies 'autonomous and unimpeded mastery.' This interpretation underlines the Buddha's free and masterful exercise of his spiritual powers, rather than a notion of selfishness.

Y15.3d: Bapat translates '世車安可久' as "What worldly chariot can there any longer be [for me]?" This translation seems to emphasize that the Buddha has the supernatural chariot, so why need the physical chariot. This rendition seems to imply that the Buddha's supernatural chariot makes the physical chariot obsolete. However, this

15.4 素被細軟衣 既服身形好

K 金露被身行 是服有何好

Once, [you] were adorned in garments of the finest weave.

Clad in [such attire], your form and stature were splendid.

[But now,] robed in a golden glow as you tread,

What [garb could] surpass this [divine] attire?²³

translation does not fully capture the nuances of ‘安’ and ‘久.’ ‘安’ is an interrogative adverb, asking ‘how?’ or ‘why?’ rather than specifying ‘what?’ or ‘which?’ in relation to the ‘worldly chariot.’ Meanwhile, ‘久’ implies endurance or longevity, extending beyond Bapat’s interpretation of ‘any longer.’ Taking these meanings into account, ‘安可久’ translates to ‘how (安) can (可) it last long (久)?’ This rhetorical question contrasts the ephemeral nature of worldly possessions with the enduring substance of the Buddha’s teachings. It suggests that the Buddha’s spiritual ‘chariot,’ emblematic of his teachings and wisdom, far outlasts any material or worldly construct.

²³ **Y15.4:** In this translation, I have aimed to preserve the evocative imagery and emotional depth of the original text by adopting a flexible approach to grammatical consistency. I have structured lines cd as a single sentence, with the implicit subject in line c being ‘the Buddha’ or ‘you,’ and an explicit shift in line d to ‘what attire.’ This method ensures a poetic and fluid translation while capturing the essence of the original verse.

Y15.4a: Bapat translates ‘素被細軟衣’ as “The clothes (衣) that were delicate (細) and fine (軟) ye always (素) did put on (被).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. While ‘素’ often connotes ‘white’ or ‘simple,’ it can also carry a temporal implication, particularly functioning adverbially to denote ‘formerly.’ Positioned before the verb ‘被’ (clothed), it serves to contrast the Buddha’s past physical attire with his present spiritual radiance, making my rendering ‘once’ a more fitting translation than Bapat’s ‘always.’ Furthermore, ‘細軟’ is rendered as ‘finest weave,’ enhancing the description of the attire with a nuanced touch of elegance and refinement.

Y15.4c: While ‘露’ typically translates to ‘dew,’ in this context, it likely refers to ‘甘露’ (nectar), symbolizing the Buddha’s nirvāṇa or his compassionate outreach to sentient beings. To align with the metaphorical essence of ‘金露’ (golden dew), which contrasts with the physical clothing, I have chosen to translate it as ‘golden glow.’ This interpretation captures the spiritual significance of the phrase, distinguishing it from Bapat’s translation of ‘金露’ as ‘yellow robe,’ which does not fully encapsulate its spiritual connotations. Furthermore, in Buddhist texts, ‘金色’ (golden) often denotes a ‘spiritual aura,’ distinguishing it from ‘黃色’ (yellow) which typically refers to the physical color of an object.

Y15.4d: Bapat translates ‘是服有何好’ as “How (何) good (好) is this (是) covering (服) which you have now put on?” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this rendering misses the verse’s comparative aspect, contrasting the Buddha’s past material attire with his present spiritual aura. With this interpretation, ‘好’ should be rendered as ‘better’ or ‘to surpass,’ not merely as ‘good.’ Aligning with the interpretation of ‘露’ in line c as ‘glow,’ I have rendered ‘服’ as ‘[divine] attire,’ to emphasize the contrast with mundane clothing. This adjustment aims to enrich the poetic imagery and highlight the transcendent nature of the Buddha’s spiritual ‘attire.’

15.5 王法爲我衣 念世行教授

B 是服先學造 我已覺如來

The Regal Dharma [adorns me] as my robes;

In caring for the world, I embark on [my] teachinga.

These robes were crafted by those who practiced before me;

Now, awakened [to the Dharma,] I [stand before you as] the Tathāgata.²⁴

15.6 本樂高殿舍 隨時造閣樓

K 今獨宿樹間 恐怖當何依

Once, you took delight in the grandeur of palatial halls,

[Whose] pavilions and balconies were created seasonally [for your pleasure].

Now, you find solitude under the trees for the night,

[In moments of] fear, what do you turn to for refuge?²⁵

²⁴ **Y15.5:** In response to the King’s inquiry in Y15.4, this verse proclaims that his spiritual radiance stems from the Dharma and is the true attire of the Buddha.

Y15.5a: The term ‘王法’ directly translating to ‘the royal law,’ typically signifies secular authority or worldly regulations. However, this direct meaning diverges from the context of the Buddha’s spiritual discourse. Hence, it is rendered as ‘the Regal Dharma,’ to denote the exalted and pervasive nature of the Buddha’s teachings, distinct from mundane legal systems.

Y15.5b: This line portrays the Buddha as not only a teacher of the transcendent Dharma but also as someone attuned to worldly concerns, bridging the spiritual with the temporal.

Y15.5cd: These lines emphasize that the Dharma is not a novel doctrine introduced by the Buddha but a timeless truth he has reawakened to. His enlightenment to this perpetual Dharma is what transforms him into the Tathāgata, the ‘Thus-Come,’ embodying the eternal law.

²⁵ **Y15.6b:** Bapat translates ‘隨時造閣樓’ as “And from time to time were built the harems that were high,”. However, his rendering of ‘隨時’ as ‘from time to time’ does not capture its contextual meaning in this verse. It should be understood as ‘according to the seasons,’ reflecting the construction of seasonal residences to

15.7 瞿曇世無怨 造仇姪已斷

B 脫欲念無憂 無仇當何恐

Gautama harbors no ill-will in this world,

Having eradicated enmity and lust.

Freed from the chains of desire, [he dwells] without anxiety.

Absent of foes, what indeed is there to fear?²⁶

15.8 本食恣意味 金器食香美

accommodate the varying comforts of the year, a testament to the luxuries enjoyed by the Buddha in his princely youth.

Y15.6c: Bapat translates ‘今獨宿樹間’ as “Now, ye, all alone, do stay in the midst of a grove.” His interpretation of ‘宿’ as ‘to stay’ does not capture both the temporal and contextual meanings. ‘宿’ literally means ‘to spend the night,’ This detail underscores the solitary nature of the Buddha’s current dwelling in contrast to his former luxuries and hints at the potential for fear during the forest nights. This interpretation aligns with the line d, which poses a question ‘how to deal with the terrifying environment during the night.

Y15.6d: Bapat translates ‘恐怖當何依’ as “What dreadful terrors may be assailing you there?”. This translation misinterprets the verb ‘依’ (to rely on) and changes the question’s focus. The line inquires about the source of the Buddha’s comfort or reliance in the face of such fears, probing deeper into his spiritual foundation rather than merely questioning the nature of his fears.

²⁶ **Y15.7:** This verse responds to King Suddhodana’s concerns as expressed in Y15.6, highlighting that the absence of desire and enmity eradicates fear. Here, the Buddha refers to himself not with the personal pronoun ‘I,’ but by his family name, ‘Gautama,’ when addressing his father. This unique form of self-reference is significant and may suggest various layers of meaning, meriting further in-depth analysis.

Y15.7b: Bapat translates ‘造仇姪已斷’ as “The sex-desire that was an enemy has been already cut off.” This translation tends to interpret ‘仇’ (enemy) as directly linked to ‘姪’ (sexual desire), somewhat limiting its broader implications. Yet, this verse’s context points towards the necessity of overcoming both enmity and desire to achieve liberation from fear. Hence, ‘仇’ (enmity) and ‘姪’ (lust) must be viewed as distinct challenges, as the verse compellingly calls for the eradication of both ‘姪’ (lust) and ‘欲’ (desire) on one hand, and ‘怨’ (ill-will) and ‘仇’ (enmity) on the other. ‘造’ is translated as ‘to make,’ signifying ‘[the tendency] to foster [enmity and lust]’ in the given context. For smoother English flow, I have omitted ‘fostering’ from the translation.

K 今日乃得食 麤惡有何樂

Once, you dined on cuisine to your heart's content,

Savoring fragrant delicacies in golden vessels.

Now, you obtain your sustenance [from alms],

[Partaking in] the coarse and bland, what joy is found therein?²⁷

15.9 我先飯法味 棄貪從苦空

B 悉斷四飯本 哀世故行丐

I prioritize savoring the taste of the Dharma,

Abandoning greed and embracing [the truths of] suffering and insubstantiality.

Cutting off the roots of all the four kinds of nutriment,

Taking pity on the worldly, I wander for alms.²⁸

²⁷ **Y15.8a:** The term ‘恣意’ typically denotes unrestrained willfulness or indulgence without moderation.

Y15.8c: The term ‘今日’ directly means ‘today,’ yet here, it serves as a contrast to ‘本’ (formerly), suggesting an enduring change in habits. The term intimates the Buddha’s consistent practice of alms rounds, a daily routine rather than an isolated incident. Thus, I have chosen ‘now’ to convey this ongoing aspect. Likewise, ‘得食’ (to get food) is translated in the present continuous tense as ‘get sustenance from alms,’ indicating a customary practice. The contrasting connotation is expressed in the character ‘乃’ meaning ‘then however’ in the given context. This meaning is fully implied in my rendering ‘now’ so that I have omitted ‘in contrast’ for a better English flow.

今日 = 今丐 (S, Y, M): The term ‘丐’ refers to ‘beg,’ consistent with the Buddha’s practice of alms rounds. Thus, the variant ‘今丐乃得食’ translates to: “Now, [you] beg to obtain sustenance.” This rendition further underscores the regularity and humility of the Buddha’s alms-seeking tradition.

²⁸ **Y15.9ab:** Bapat translates ‘我先飯法味 棄貪從苦空’ as “Before I ate things that savoured of the Law, Lust did I give up and suffering and void I did realize.” However, attaching a chronological interpretation to ‘先’ may misconstrue the overall message. ‘先’ should be interpreted here as ‘to prioritize,’ signifying the Buddha’s preference for spiritual nourishment over material sustenance. Thus, ‘abandoning greed and embracing the truth’ in line b should be understood as the underlying reasons why the Buddha could enjoy the Dharma, not as preceding actions to taking alms.

Y15.9c: Bapat renders ‘四飯’ as ‘four kinds of rice,’ noting a possible connection to the names of King Suddhodana’s four brothers, all incorporating ‘*odana*’ (food). Yet, such a reading could be confusing, as it implies the Buddha specifically needed to sever the relations with his four uncles. In response to the King’s question in Y15.8 regarding worldly versus spiritual sustenance, ‘四飯’ is more aptly understood as the four kinds of nutriments

15.10 浴尊以花香 伎女樂從行

K 起止山樹間 誰當浴明者

[Once, they] bathed you, Venerable, in scents of flower petals.

Court women provided music gracing your every passage.

[Now that] you have set forth to dwell amid mountain forests,

Who remains to bathe the one now Awakened?²⁹

(Pāli, *cattāro āhārā*) that perpetuate the cycle of existence. Thus, they should be severed at their roots (悉斷...本) in order to be freed. These nutriments include physical food (*kabalīṅkārahāra*), contact or sensory impressions (*phassāhāra*), mental volition (*manosañcetanāhāra*), and consciousness (*viññāṇāhāra*), all of which are to be transcended in the pursuit of enlightenment. The Buddha, redirecting King Suddhodana's query, emphasizes his spiritual status, fully disentangled from these four worldly bindings.

²⁹ **Y15.10ad:** Bapat translates ‘浴尊以花香’ as “In water scented with flowers and perfumes did the Honoured One bathe,” and ‘誰當浴明者’ as “What kind of bath does the Enlightened One take?”. This interpretation suggests an intransitive use of ‘浴’ (to bathe), depicting the Buddha as bathing himself. However, ‘浴’ should be understood as transitive here, with ‘尊’ (Venerable) and ‘明者’ (Awakened One) as its objects, indicating that others once bathed the Buddha. The use of ‘誰’ (who) in line d is not asking about the type of bath but rather inquiring who would perform this service for the Awakened One in his current ascetic life. Therefore, ‘誰’ should not be translated as ‘what kind of’ but rather ‘who,’ inquiring about the person who would now provide such care. Consequently, I have included ‘once they’ in line a to indicate who previously performed this service. Additionally, I have refined the translation of ‘當’ (should) to ‘remains’ to enhance the contrast between the Buddha's past and present and to ensure the translation flows smoothly in English.

Y15.10b, 伎女 = 妓女 (S, Y, M): The term ‘伎女’ is often equated with ‘妓女,’ which historically denotes women with courtly roles that often included entertainment such as music or dance. The translation ‘courtesans’ commonly used, carries connotations of sexual relations within the courtly setting. To focus on their professional role rather than gendered relationships, the term ‘court women’ is preferred, though it may not fully capture the entire historical context of their positions and functions within the court.

Bapat translates ‘伎女樂從行’ as “In the company (從行?) of dexterous women (伎女) that [with their sports] did you amuse (樂);”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this translation may not accurately reflect the structure of the original text. ‘樂’ is positioned between ‘伎女’ as the subject and ‘從行,’ the verb phrase meaning ‘to accompany.’ Therefore, the subject should consistently remain ‘伎女’ (court women), and they are the ones providing music (樂) as they accompany (從行) the Buddha. The line has been rendered with a poetic touch as ‘court women provided music gracing your every passage’ to convey ‘從行,’ enhancing the English translation's lyrical quality.

Y15.10c: Bapat translates ‘起止山樹間’ as “Now ye do stay (止) in (間) mountains (山) and groves (樹).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation does not fully account for the term ‘起’ (to arise/begin). The character ‘起’ conveys the initiation of an action or a change in state, which in this context indicates the Buddha's act of renouncing worldly life to dwell among the mountains and trees. A more accurate translation would be: “Now

15.11 樂法戒爲河 淨點悉在中

B 鬥極往浴淨 遊度不復還

I rejoice in the Dharma and Vinaya; [they are] the river [where I bathe].

Complete wisdom and purity are found in [these waters].

With intensive endeavor, I sought to bathe for purification,

On the journey to liberate [all beings], I shall never retreat.³⁰

that you have set forth to dwell amid mountain forests,” emphasizing the active choice and transition into a life of renunciation.

³⁰ **Y15.11:** The Buddha, in lines ab, responds to the King’s reminiscences about the Prince’s former luxuries of bathing and music by recontextualizing these acts within a spiritual framework. He equates ‘bathing’ with the pursuit of ‘purity’ and ‘music’ with the attainment of ‘wisdom.’ These concepts are now represented in his rejoice in the Vinaya and the Dharma, symbolizing his commitment to a life of spiritual discipline and enlightenment.

In line c, the Buddha’s rigorous practice and discipline following his departure from worldly pleasures are depicted. Line d, on the other hand, highlights his dedication to disseminating the insights acquired upon reaching enlightenment.

Y15.11a: Bapat translates ‘樂法戒爲河’ as “In the River of Conduct of delight in Law.” However, this translation misses the structural nuance of the original Chinese. The verb ‘爲’ (to be) links the subject ‘樂法戒’ (delighting in the Dharma and Vinaya) directly with the predicate ‘河’ (river), suggesting that the practices of Dharma and Vinaya themselves are the ‘river’ in which the Buddha finds purification. This connection is not clearly captured in Bapat’s rendition. Bapat’s rendering ‘in’ may have come from ‘在中’ (exist in the middle of something) in line b.

Y15.11b: Bapat’s translation of ‘淨點悉在中’ as “The pure and the clever do all take their dip;” introduces general actors, diverging from the specific dialogue between the King and the Buddha, and shifting the focus away from the personal transformation of the Buddha. The line should concentrate on the Buddha’s own spiritual purification, not on a broader group’s actions. His rendering of ‘take one’s dip’ is not found in the original text.

Y15.11cd: Bapat translates ‘鬥極往浴淨 遊度不復還’ as “The wranglers [too] go there for a pure bath in it, And take to the journey to be delivered and never to return.” However, this translation also inaccurately introduces ‘the wranglers’ as the subject, moving away from the focus on the Buddha’s transformation from prince to enlightened being. ‘鬥極’ (striving to the utmost), which he renders as ‘the wranglers,’ illustrates the Buddha’s profound spiritual efforts rather than a physical struggle. Continuing from this context, ‘遊度’ is better translated as referring to the Buddha’s mission to liberate all beings, maintaining focus on his spiritual journey rather than a literal journey of others.

爾時佛爲王及諸釋女人。廣說經法。先現布施持戒現天徑微說善痛道其苦導現達世近親三十七品從可得安如。

At that time, the Buddha extensively expounded the teachings of the *sūtras* to the king and all the Śākya women. He began by indicating that acts of generosity and [strict] adherence to precepts [pave] a direct path to heavenly [rebirth].³¹ He [then] elucidated the subtler [teachings: firstly, that] kind and compassionate guidance for those who suffer leads to renown and mastery in this

³¹ The segmentation in the Taishō edition of the extended phrase ‘先現布施持戒現天徑微說善痛道其苦導現達世近親三十七品從可得安如’ could be refined for clarity. My proposed segmentation would be: ‘先現布施持戒現天徑 / 微說善痛道其苦導現達世 / 近親三十七品從可得安如.’ This division clearly delineates three distinct sections, each commencing with either verbal phrases ‘先現’ (to begin by indicating) and ‘微說’ (to subtly explain), or the noun phrase ‘近親’ (resorting to), followed by descriptions of the Buddha’s teachings. Contrary to Bapat’s division of ‘先現布施持戒現天徑微說善痛道其苦導 / 現達世近親三十七品從可得安如,’ which merges the first two concepts into one longer phrase and separates ‘現達世’ into the second section, my segmentation aims to offer a clearer understanding of each teaching’s specific focus. The argument against Bapat’s segmentation will be elaborated in the subsequent footnote, where I suggest ‘現達世’ should belong to the second of my divisions ‘微說善痛道其苦導現達世.’

布施持戒現天徑: The theme of ‘generosity and adherence to precepts as a direct path to heaven’ is a recurring motif in the *Yizujing*, capturing a fundamental principle of the Buddha’s teachings. For further exploration, refer to annotations in Y1. fn.26, Y10. fn.34, and Y14. fn.39. Bapat interprets this phrase as ‘of gifts of charity, of observance of good conduct, of passing into heaven,’ which segments the components, detracting from the unified message. A more integrated translation might emphasize the interconnectedness of generosity and ethical conduct as a singular pathway leading to celestial realms.

This paragraph outlines the so-called ‘graduated discourse’ (*anupūrvikathā*; Pāli, *anupubbikathā*), which is the basic teaching the Buddha directed to neophytes to the Dharma. It begins with instruction on the benefits of generosity (*dānakathā*) and morality (*śīlakathā*), culminating in the prospect of rebirth in the heavens (*svargakathā*). These teachings ultimately prepare the student to hear about the dangers of sensuality and the advantages of renunciation, leading to the teaching of the four noble truths. See *Princeton Dictionary of Buddhism*, ‘*anupubbikathā*’ s.v.

life³²; [and secondly, that] through unwavering practice of the thirty-seven factors of enlightenment, one may attain the serene state of the Tathāgata.³³

³² 善痛道其苦導現達世: This phrase poses interpretive challenges, offering a rich ground for varied understandings. The interpretation ‘kind (善) and compassionate (痛) guidance (道) for those (其) who suffer (苦) leads to (導) renown (現) and mastery (達) in this life (世)’ resonates strongly with Buddhist principles and seems most apt for this context. Here, ‘痛’ is nuanced to mean ‘empathy towards the suffering of others,’ emphasizing the emotional resonance and active compassion involved.

A direct reading of ‘善痛’ as ‘virtuous suffering’ diverges from core Buddhist tenets, which do not endorse suffering or self-mortification as pathways to enlightenment.

The term ‘善痛’ appears in early Chinese Buddhist texts prior to the 4th century, generally signifying ‘pleasant feelings’ or ‘positive perceptions.’ In these instances, ‘痛’ serves as a substitute for ‘受’ (feelings) or ‘想’ (perceptions), a usage supported by Karashima (2010: 485). An illustrative example is found in the *Abhidharma Treatise on the Fragrant Nectar* (阿毘曇甘露味論, T1553.28.0969b13–15), which queries: “云何善法? 持攝善身口業, 善痛想行陰及智緣盡.” This can be translated as: “What are wholesome dharma[s]? [They are] to maintain virtuous actions of body and speech, while the mind has disengaged (緣盡) from the aggregates of pleasant feelings, perceptions, volitional formations, and consciousness.” In this context, ‘智’ typically translated as ‘wisdom,’ is understood as ‘consciousness,’ aligning with its role within the context of the five aggregates in Buddhist teachings. However, interpreting ‘痛’ primarily as ‘feelings’ or ‘perceptions’ seems less congruent with the broader context of the phrase in question.

Bapat renders ‘善痛道其苦導’ as ‘of the extremely (善) painful (痛) nature (道) of the passions, and of the suffering (其苦) that flows (導) from them.’ This translation, however, appears to dissect the phrase into separate entities, missing an opportunity to present them as interconnected and cohesive message.

³³ The term ‘近親’ typically refers to ‘relatives’ but, in this particular context, given its association with ‘三十七品’ (thirty-seven factors of enlightenment), it more aptly translates to concepts of ‘familiarizing with,’ ‘engaging in constant practice of.’ This interpretation aligns with the broader application of these teachings in Buddhist practice.

三十七品: This term holds specific significance within Buddhist doctrine, referring to the thirty-seven factors of enlightenment (*bodhipakṣa dharma*). These are foundational elements across all Buddhist traditions, comprising the four foundations of mindfulness, four right exertions, four bases of supernatural power, five spiritual faculties, five strengths, seven factors of enlightenment, and the Noble Eightfold Path. When combined, these elements total thirty-seven. This term is also known in Chinese as ‘三十七道品’ (thirty-seven factors of the path), ‘三十七助道品’ (thirty-seven factors for assisting the path), and ‘三十七菩提分法’ (thirty-seven factors of enlightenment).

As mentioned in the previous footnote 31, Bapat’s division and interpretation of the segment appear to misrepresent the original text. By segmenting ‘現達世’ from its preceding context and pairing it with ‘近親三十七品從可得安如,’ Bapat translates this as “Then he showed (現) to his relations (近親) in the present world (世) the Thirty-seven (三十七) things (品), from which peace (安) can (可) be obtained (得).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This interpretation overlooks the connotations of ‘mastery’ in ‘達’ and misapplies ‘現’ as the verb ‘to show,’ which, due to its separation from ‘達’ by ‘世,’ should instead convey ‘renown’ or ‘manifestation.’ Furthermore, Bapat’s rendering of ‘近親’ strictly as ‘relations’ narrows its broader potential meanings in this context.

I argue that ‘近親三十七品’ should be interpreted as engaging deeply with, committing to, or maintaining an unwavering practice of the Thirty-seven factors of enlightenment, rather than simply presenting them to ‘relations.’ This interpretation aligns more closely with the Buddhist principle of direct and personal engagement with the path to enlightenment, moving beyond a literal translation to capture the essence of the Buddha’s teachings.

佛以道意。知悅頭檀王意滿喜已性濡。無亂縛解。可爲說善度法。便說苦諦習盡道諦。佛說是四諦法。王即在座開解。三毒垢除。於法中得諦眼。譬如淨繒投於染中即受色好。王亦入法如是。爾時王見諦疑斷。在法開解。

The Buddha, with his enlightened mind, perceived that King Śuddhodana's mind was filled with joy and his disposition had become serene, free from agitation.³⁴ Released from the bonds [of delusion], the King was ready to receive the profound teachings of the Dharma. The Buddha then expounded the Truth of Suffering and the Truths of the Origin [of Suffering], the Cessation [of Suffering], and the Path [leading to that cessation].³⁵ As the Buddha delivered these teachings, the King, seated in his place, gained immediate and clear understanding. He eradicated the

³⁴ This sentence shows how the graduated discourse made the listeners' minds serene and pliant so they would be receptive to the core teaching of the four noble truths, which follow below.

性濡 = 住濡 (S, Y, M / J, Q1, N, Q2): The term '性濡' implies a transformation of one's inherent nature (性) towards serenity (濡), suggesting a state of receptiveness and tranquility. Conversely, '住濡' denotes a sustained state of dwelling (住) in serenity. While Bapat's translation 'stable and soft' captures the essence of a continuous presence within tranquility, implied in '住濡,' his etymological note '佳而大' (beautiful and great) diverges from the textual and semantic context. It appears he may have conflated '住' with '佳' (beautiful), overlooking the more pertinent components '氵' (water) and '雨' (rain) in '濡' that contribute to its meaning of moistness or saturation, which better reflects the term's connotation of serenity. Additionally, '大' does not directly relate to either '住' or '濡,' making his etymological suggestion seem misplaced.

Bapat's translation of '無亂' as 'free from destruction' does not capture the term's nuanced meaning. The character '亂' more accurately refers to 'disorder,' 'agitation,' or 'confusion,' rather than implying 'destruction.' This distinction is crucial for understanding the text's context, where '無亂' suggests a state of calm and clarity, free from mental turmoil or disturbance.

³⁵ 苦諦習盡道諦: This phrase presents a slight variation of the Four [Noble] Truths. Traditionally rendered as '苦集滅道' ([the truths of] suffering, origin, cessation, and the path), here it is expressed as '苦習盡道.' The *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism* (DDB) notes that '習' is occasionally used to translate 'samudaya' (origin), thus '習諦' can be seen as equivalent to '集諦' (the truth of the origin of suffering). For further discussions on my rendering of '習' in this context, please refer to Y14.fn.40. '盡諦' aligns with the third Noble Truth, synonymous with '滅諦' (the truth of cessation). For enhanced English readability, I have included '四諦法' from the subsequent phrase '佛說是四諦法' in this translation, rendering '四諦法: 苦諦習盡道諦' as a cohesive statement.

defilements of the three poisons.³⁶ Amidst the Dharma teaching, he attained the ‘Eye of Truth.’³⁷ Just as a clean [piece of] silk effectively absorbs color when immersed in dye, the King similarly embraced the Dharma fully. At that moment, the King [clearly] saw the Truth, dispelled [all] doubts, and firmly established himself in the Dharma, achieving profound insight.

便起座向佛。叉手白言。已近已近。已遠已遠。今我身歸佛法及比丘僧受我爲清信士。盡形壽悉不犯已淨。

Rising from his seat, [the King] faced the Buddha and clasped his hands together. He declared, “I have drawn near to what should be approached and have distanced myself from what should be forsaken.”³⁸ Now, I wholeheartedly take refuge in the Buddha, the Dharma, and the *Bhikṣusamṃgha*. Please accept me as a devout lay follower. For the rest of my life, I will not violate the purity that I have attained.”³⁹

³⁶ 三毒: In Buddhist teachings, the ‘three poisons’ refer to greed, hatred, and delusion. These are fundamental defilements that impede enlightenment and are key concepts in Buddhist doctrine.

³⁷ 諦眼: In this context, ‘諦眼’ is synonymous with ‘法眼’ (Dharma eye; *dharmacakṣu*), a term associated with the spiritual attainment of Stream Entry (*śrotāpanna*). A person who has reached this stage is known to possess a deep understanding of the Dharma, free from doubt, marking a significant milestone in the Buddhist path.

³⁸ 已近已近 已遠已遠: This phrase is seemingly repetitive, but implies more than that. It is best translated as “I have drawn near (已近) to what ought to have been approached (已近), and have distanced myself (已遠) from what ought to have been forsaken (已遠).” It emphasizes both the embracing of the spiritual path (drawing near) and the renunciation of worldly attachments (distancing). Bapat’s rendering ‘what is near is near, and what is far is far’ misses the deeper spiritual significance embedded in the action of drawing near to or distancing from in the context of a Buddhist path.

³⁹ 受我爲清信士 盡形壽悉不犯已淨: This phrase encapsulates two distinct messages from the King: one, a request for refuge in the Triple Gem and the other, a pledge of maintaining purity. Bapat’s translation combines them into one sentence, but there are several inaccuracies in his interpretation. Firstly, ‘盡形壽’ (till the end of my life) should be linked with the King’s commitment to uphold purity, which can translate to “I vow not to breach the already attained purity throughout my life.” Bapat’s interpretation of ‘不犯已淨’ as ‘remaining pure on account of non-violence of rules’ misrepresents the original text. The Chinese phrase lacks any wording that implies ‘on account of.’ Also, ‘已淨’ directly refers to a state of purity that has been achieved, suggesting the King’s vow is a commitment to maintain this purity for the remainder of his life, without directly attributing it to the adherence to specific rules or acts of non-violence.

故釋中亦有身歸佛者。歸法者歸僧者。釋諸女人。自歸亦如是。中有持不殺戒者。持不盜戒。持不淫戒。持不欺戒。中有遠酒不飲酒戒。

Thus, among the Śākyaans, [countless] individuals took refuge with their lives in the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Saṅgha.⁴⁰ The Śākya women [likewise] pledged their refuge in the same way. Among them were adherents who upheld the precept of not-killing, not-stealing, not-committing sexual misconduct, and not-lying.⁴¹ There were also [numerous] individuals who committed to the precept of abstaining from alcohol, staying far away from alcohol.

爾時悅頭檀王見法甚明見諦無疑。在法勇猛。便起座向佛叉手。以是義足偈歎言

At that moment, King Suddhodana perceived the Dharma with utmost clarity and recognized the Truth unequivocally. Steeped in the Dharma, he was resolute in his practice. Rising from his seat, he faced the Buddha with his hands clasped together and extolled [the Buddha] through this *Yizujing* verse.

⁴⁰ The term ‘亦有...者’ directly translates to ‘also there are people who’ or ‘indeed there are people who,’ but it should not only denote the presence of such people, but also the widespread nature of this commitment among the Śākyaans within this specific narrative context. Thus, I have interpretively translated it as ‘there are countless individuals who,’ emphasizing the abundance of such instances without altering the original meaning significantly.

The phrase ‘歸佛者 歸法者 歸僧者’ is succinctly translated as ‘those who take refuge in the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Sangha,’ streamlining the repetition of ‘歸...者’ for clarity and conciseness in English. This translation choice preserves the essence of seeking refuge in the Triple Gem while ensuring readability and avoiding redundancy in the English rendition.

歸僧者 = 有歸僧者 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The inclusion of ‘有’ does not modify the essence of the expression. This is because the presence or existence denoted by ‘有’ is inherently suggested in the preceding phrase ‘亦有...者’ and naturally extends to the contexts of ‘歸法者’ and ‘歸僧者.’

⁴¹ For the same reason, the phrase ‘中有持不殺戒者 持不盜戒 持不淫戒 持不欺戒’ is efficiently condensed in my translation to avoid the repetitive structure of ‘those who uphold’ for each precept. This approach retains the original message’s essence while ensuring the translation’s readability and flow.

15.12 有戒具當何見 云說言從陰苦

K 願瞿曇解說此 問正意世雄生

Endowed with the complete precepts, what view should one [hold]

To be deemed serene [amidst] the suffering of the [five] aggregates?

O Gautama, please expound upon this matter—

I [want to] ask about the true heart of the Born Hero of this era.⁴²

Sn848 *Kathaṃdassī kathaṃsīlo*

⁴² **Y15.12:** The inquiry posed by the King in this Chinese verse presents a nuanced challenge, particularly in the first half. This complexity is clarified by interpreting ‘從’ in line b as synonymous with ‘從容’ (relaxed/peaceful), echoing the Pāli term ‘*upasanta*’ (calmed/peaceful) found in Sn848b and aligning with the Buddha’s response in later verses.

Y15.12a: Bapat translates ‘有戒具當何見’ as “With what treasure of good conduct and holding which view,”. However, this translation introduces an additional interrogative ‘what’ that is not present in the original text, which only contains ‘何’ (what/how). This translation appears to stretch to align with the Pāli parallel Sn848a, which indeed uses ‘*kathaṃ*’ (what/how/why) twice. The original Chinese does not suggest a duplication of the interrogative form but rather poses a singular question regarding the type of view one should hold alongside the precepts. A more accurate translation would directly address the singular nature of the inquiry without implying two separate questions, focusing on what specific view is considered appropriate or effective when one is fully endowed with precepts.

Y15.12b: Bapat translates ‘云說言從陰苦’ as “Is [a person] called ‘one who has buried suffering’?”. This translation diverges significantly from the original Chinese text’s subtleties. The term ‘云說言’ stitches together three characters, each typically meaning ‘to say.’ However, ‘云說’ is better understood here as a colloquial expression equivalent to ‘it is said’ (云云), and ‘言’ introduces the direct speech or reported saying. The phrase ‘從陰苦,’ within this context, translates to ‘serenity (從) amidst suffering (苦) from the aggregates (陰).’ The term ‘陰’ denotes the ‘five aggregates’ (五陰; *skandhas*) of form (色), feeling (受), perception (想), intention (行), and consciousness (識), central to Buddhist teachings on the nature of self and suffering.

Y15.12c: In addressing the Buddha, the King uses their family name ‘Gautama’ instead of the Buddha’s personal name known as ‘Siddhārtha’ in some sources. We have also seen the Buddha reference himself to the King with his family name, not with his personal name in Y15.7. The use of ‘Gautama’ by both the King and the Buddha could hint at a later composition period since they were composed from the singular third-person perspective, rather than from the Buddha’s and the King’s own voices and perspectives.

說此 = 此說 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The alternative reading ‘此說’ maintains the intended meaning of ‘說此’ (to expound on this matter).

Y15.12d: I have interpreted the phrase ‘問正意世雄生’ as ‘I [want to] ask about (問) the true (正) heart (意) of the Born (生) Hero (雄) of this era (世).’ This interpretation anticipates the descriptions of the Buddhist ideal in subsequent verses, framing ‘世雄生’ as an embodiment of such ideals.

Upasanto ti vuccati

Tam me Gotama pabrūhi

Pucchito uttamaṃ naraṃ

What vision and what conduct

Lead one to be called ‘peaceful’?

O Gotama, please explain this to me,

As I inquire about [the nature of] the supreme person.⁴³

15.13 先已行棄重恚 亦不著後來願

B 來現在亦不取 亦不受尊敬空

They have renounced deep-seated anger from the past;

Likewise, they do not cling to future aspirations.

Not grasping at the ever-present moment,

They indeed place no value on empty honors.⁴⁴

⁴³ **Sn848:** In this translation, I have aimed for a balance between fidelity to the original Pāli and enhanced readability in English. A more literal translation, closely adhering to the Pāli text, would be: “Having what vision and what morality, is one called ‘being calmed?’ Tell me about it, O Gotama, being asked about the supreme person.”

⁴⁴ **Y15.13:** This verse, and the twelve that follow up to Y15.25, are delivered in the Buddha’s voice, encapsulating his teachings and insights. Y15.13 specifically highlights the concept of ‘non-grasping’ across three temporal dimensions: the past, the future, and the present.

Y15.13a: Bapat translates ‘先已行棄重恚’ as “In the past (先), all (重?) hatred (恚) he had already (已) abandoned (棄; 行棄?);”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. The character ‘重’ can denote both ‘repeated’ and ‘serious,’ thus modifying ‘恚’ (anger) to suggest either repetitive or profound anger. Bapat appears to favor a broad interpretation, equating ‘重’ with ‘all,’ possibly to underscore the recurring nature of hatred. This interpretation extends the term’s literal meaning. In contrast, my translation views ‘重’ as indicative of ‘deep-seated,’ emphasizing the intensity rather than the frequency of anger. Bapat’s coupling of ‘行’ with ‘棄’ invites scrutiny, as ‘行’ is typically used before nouns to mean ‘to perform a certain action,’ and ‘棄’ is most often employed as a verb. Therefore, ‘先已行’ should be seen as distinct from ‘棄,’ more likely referencing actions in the past. I interpret this as ‘what has (已) previously (先) been done (行).’ This interpretation offers a stark contrast to the subsequent lines

Sn849 *Vītataṇho purā bhedaṁ ti Bhagavā*

Pubbam antam anissito

Vemajjhe nūpasamkheyyo

Tassa n' atthi purekkhataṁ

The Blessed One [declares]:

“Free of craving [even] before the destruction [of the body],

Unattached to the past,

Not to be reckoned in the present.

They harbor no preferences.”⁴⁵

15.14 未來想不著愛 久遠想亦不憂

that address the future (line b) and the present (line c), indicating that ‘先已行’ refers to past actions or events. For a more fluid English translation, this notion is broadly interpreted as ‘from the past.’

Y15.13b: 後來願 = 後求願 (M): The alternative phrase ‘亦不著後求願’ can be translated as “Nor do I cling to any future pursuit of aspirations.” Though this version adds the term ‘pursuit,’ the overall tone and meaning remain consistent with the original text.

Y15.13c: The term ‘來現在’ merges the concepts of ‘coming’ or ‘approaching’ (來) with ‘the present’ (現在), suggesting a present that is dynamic and continuously unfolding. This interpretation captures the essence of the present as not merely a static moment but one that is perpetually arriving. Accordingly, I have translated it as ‘the ever-present moment,’ emphasizing the fluid and ongoing nature of the present.

Y15.13d: Bapat translates ‘亦不受尊敬空’ as “Aloof from vain (空) honour (尊) and regard (敬), which he never (不) himself doth receive (受).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. The phrase ‘aloof from’ is an interpretive addition not present in the original text, introduced for clarity but not explicitly marked as an addition. In contrast, I have translated ‘不受’ as ‘to place no value on,’ opting for an interpretive approach that enhances readability and flow in English. This choice aims to convey the original sentiment in a manner that resonates with English-speaking audiences, focusing on the subject’s disregard for superficial accolades rather than their physical reception.

⁴⁵ **Sn849:** Responding to the King’s question about the characteristics of a supreme person, the Buddha enumerates key qualities. These include the absence of craving, detachment from both the past and the present, and the absence of any preferences or biases. This succinctly encapsulates the Buddha’s teaching on the qualities essential for spiritual attainment and liberation. The subsequent verses also list such qualities from diverse perspectives.

行遠可捨細軟 邪見盡少無有

They neither grasp at nor hanker after thoughts of the future;

Nor do they harbor worries over distant memories.

Shunning the desirable, they abandon comfort and luxury.

With the exhaustion of wrong views, they [find peace] in simplicity or absence.⁴⁶

Sn851 *Nirāsatti anāgate*

Atītaṃ nānusocati

Vivekadassī phassesu

Diṭṭhīsu ca na niyyati

Unattached to the future they remain;

They do not grieve over the past.

Discerning detachment in sensory contacts,

⁴⁶ **Y15.14–25:** In the numbering of these verses, I have chosen to omit the ‘B’ tag beneath the verse numbers, operating under the assumption that the Buddha’s voice is the default narrative mode throughout the *Yizujing* text. Thus, it is implied that these verses are spoken by the Buddha unless otherwise specified.

Y15.14c: Bapat translates ‘行遠可捨細軟’ as “From relinquishable (捨) delicate (細軟) contacts, he keeps himself off (行遠).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, Bapat’s interpretation overlooks the nuanced significance of ‘可,’ which, in this context, likely signifies appeal or desirability, echoing the meanings of ‘可意’ (pleasing to the mind) or ‘可愛’ (desirable). This interpretation suggests a discernment for things that are mentally appealing or desirable. For a comprehensive analysis of ‘可’ in this usage, see references in Y2. fn19; Y7. fn27; Y10. fn44 & 59; Y11. fn29; Y12. fn15, where its similar applications are explored. Given the context, ‘行遠’ should be understood as ‘to keep distance from,’ highlighting an intentional effort to distance oneself. Furthermore, Bapat’s rendering of ‘捨’ as ‘relinquishable’ might inadvertently introduce a distinction between relinquishable and irrelinquishable delicate contacts, distorting the verse’s intended message. Therefore, ‘捨’ is best interpreted directly as the verb ‘to relinquish,’ not qualifying ‘細軟’ but rather indicating the act of renouncing appealing or delicate comforts.

Y15.14d: Bapat translates ‘邪見盡少無有’ as “False views he has ended, none remaining in the least.” While this translation captures one aspect of the line, it may not fully convey the nuanced implications within the given context. In contrast, my interpretation of ‘少無有’ as ‘having little or nothing’ reflects the ascetic principle of ‘non-greed’ or ‘contentment.’ I have rendered this as ‘[to find peace in] simplicity or absence,’ which harmonizes with the preceding line’s emphasis on the renunciation of comfort and luxury. Through this lens, lines c and d collectively highlight the Buddhist ethos of achieving contentment with minimal or no material possessions, underlining the virtues of simplicity and renunciation.

They are not led astray amidst dogmas.

15.15 已去恐無畏怖 不可動信無疑

無嫉心樂彼與 行如是愛尊命

With fear gone, they have nothing to be afraid of.

Their faith is unshakable, free from any doubt.

Devoid of jealousy, they rejoice in others' [gains].

In such conduct they abide, cherishing the Blessed One's teachings.⁴⁷

Sn850 *Akkodhano asantāsī*

Avikatthī akukkuco

Mantabhāṇī anuddhato

Sa ve vācāyato muni

Free from anger and fear,

Void of boasting and remorse,

Humble, speaking with consideration,

⁴⁷ **Y15.15a:** This line features several synonyms for 'fear,' namely '恐,' '畏,' and '怖.' In my translation, '畏怖' is interpreted as a compound concept, highlighting external and specific objects or situations that evoke fear. Conversely, '恐' is treated as representing the general emotion of 'fear,' reflecting an underlying tendency in one's mind.

Y15.15d: Bapat translates '行如是愛尊命' as "Whosoever thus behaves likes the life of the 'Honoured.'" However, this translation of '命' as 'life' may not fully capture the essence of the verse within its context. A more appropriate interpretation of '命' would be 'instructions' or 'teachings,' resonating with the themes of freedom from fear outlined in line a, unshakable faith in line b, and freedom from jealousy in line c. This interpretation suggests that the concluding line serves to underscore adherence to these practices as a manifestation of reverence for the Blessed One's teachings. Thus, it is implied that individuals engage in such conduct out of a deep respect and value for the Blessed One's guidance.

Such is the sage, [master of] restrained speech.

15.16 能自守不多望 自多得慧無嫉

不惡醜不嫫冶 不兩舌捨戲疑

Capable of self-restraint, desiring little,

The wise harbor no envy for [others'] abundant gains.

They neither loathe ugliness nor put make-up on it.

They are free from slander and abandon playful speculation.⁴⁸

⁴⁸ **Y15.16a:** Bapat translates ‘能自守不多望’ as “A man of retiring habits (自守 or 能自守?), he holds no (不) expectations (望) high (多).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation diverges from the precise meanings of the terms used in the original text. ‘能’ specifically denotes ‘capability,’ ‘自’ conveys a self-reflective quality, indicating oneself, and ‘守’ directly translates to ‘to guard.’ The original verse does not include equivalents for phrases like ‘a man of,’ ‘to retire,’ or ‘habits.’ The phrase ‘a man of’ might be inferred with a bracket to suggest that Bapat interprets ‘能自守’ as referring to a person possessing the specific quality. However, his interpretation of ‘自守’ as ‘habits’ stretches beyond a likely understanding of the term as ‘maintaining one’s own [principles].’ Furthermore, the addition of ‘to retire’ significantly deviates from the original line’s meaning. A more faithful interpretation would highlight the individual’s capability for self-guardianship and moderation of desires, directly translating it as “Able (能) to guard (守) oneself (自), they harbor few (不多) expectations (望).” This approach adheres closely to the original wording and its connotations, underscoring the themes of self-discipline and the limitation of desires.

Y15.16b: Bapat translates ‘自多得慧無嫉’ as “Plenty (多) of wisdom (慧) he has acquired (得) and no (無) jealousy (嫉) doth he entertain;” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation offers one possible perspective; however, it renders the function of ‘自’ somewhat obscure. Additionally, interpretation of ‘得’ as a verb ‘to acquire’ amidst its object ‘多…慧’ (plenty of wisdom) overlooks the phrase’s syntactic structure. Bapat appears to interpret the line as “He, on his own (自), has abundantly (多) acquired (得) wisdom (慧), and is devoid of (無) envy (嫉).” However, a more nuanced interpretation could be “The wise (慧) harbor no (無) envy (嫉) for (自) [other’s] abundant (多) gains (得).” Here, ‘自’ is understood as indicating reason or condition, akin to ‘from the fact that,’ ‘because of,’ or ‘despite.’ This usage of ‘自’ is exemplified in the Tan Gong II 檀弓下 chapter (section 211) of the *Book of Rites* 禮記: “樂正子春之母死，五日而不食。曰：吾悔之，自吾母而不得吾情，吾惡乎用吾情!” This example translates as, “After Yue-zheng Zi-chun’s mother died, he did not eat for five days, lamenting, ‘I regret it. Even if my mother has passed, I could not express my true feelings. Of what use are my feelings now?’” (武英殿十三經注疏 本，禮記正義：檀弓下，p. 148). While some might opt for ‘自’ as a temporal term ‘ever since’ in this example, the contextual expressions of unarticulated sorrow (‘I could not express …’) and introspective questioning (‘what use are …’) support interpreting ‘自’ as ‘even if’ or ‘because.’ The CCAMC’s entry of ‘自’ also reinforces this interpretation by classifying this passage as an example of ‘自’ meaning ‘even if.’ CCAMC. (n.d.). (Retrieved December 3, 2023, from [http://ccamc.co/cjkv.php?cjkv=%E8%87%AA]).

慧無嫉 = 惠無嫉 (S, Y, M): The term ‘惠’ is primarily understood as ‘blessings,’ yet it can also serve as a homophone or alternative for ‘慧,’ which signifies ‘wisdom.’ Therefore, the phrase ‘惠無嫉,’ while literally

Sn852 *Patilīno akuhako*

Apihālu amaccharī

Appagabbho ajeguccho

Pesuneyye ca no yuto

They are withdrawn, without deceit,

Free from greed, unselfish,

Modest, not contemptible,

And refrain from engaging in slander.

translating to ‘blessings without envy,’ can parallel the meaning of ‘慧無嫉’ (the wise harbor no envy) due to the interchangeable use of ‘惠’ and ‘慧’ in classical texts.

Y15.16c: The phrase ‘不惡醜不娑冶’ is structured around two negative constructions: ‘不惡’ (not hate) and ‘不...冶’ (not adorn). In this context, ‘醜’ and ‘娑’ denote the concept of ugliness. Thus, a more accurate translation might be, “Do not (不) hate (惡) ugliness (醜) nor (不) embellish (冶) plainness (娑).” This interpretation highlights This rendering captures the essence of non-aversion to physical unattractiveness and the avoidance of superficial adornment. Bapat’s translation as “With no evil or ugliness, no improprieties doth he harbour,” diverges from the original text’s intent. The critical distinction lies in the use of ‘不’ (do not) as opposed to ‘無’ (without), indicating active verbs following ‘不.’ Thus, ‘惡’ should be read as the verb ‘to hate,’ rather than as the noun ‘evil,’ and the sequence ‘娑冶’ implies an action, with ‘冶’ as the verb ‘to embellish’ and ‘娑’ referring to ‘plainness’ or ‘ugliness’ as its object.

不娑冶 = 不娑冶 (Q2): ‘娑’ is a rare Chinese character, which I have found its image font from the *Dictionary of Chinese Variants Provided by the Department of Education* 教育部異體字字典 compiled by the Taiwanese government. According to it, the character is associated with the delicate features of a moth, such as its eyebrows or, its antennae. Within this context, the character is likely used in a manner akin to ‘娑,’ symbolizing ‘ugliness.’ Therefore, ‘不娑冶’ parallels the original phrase ‘不娑冶,’ conveying a rejection of the embellishment of ugliness.

Y15.16d: Bapat translates ‘不兩舌捨戲疑’ as “No double-tongue doth he know and gives up all light-heartedness and doubt.” This translation overlooks significance of ‘戲’ in the Buddhist doctrinal context. It denotes uncontrolled ideation that drifts away from reality, rather than mere light-heartedness. The phrase ‘戲疑’ more accurately translates to ‘playful speculation’ or ‘frivolous doubt,’ rendering ‘捨戲疑’ as a deeper level of mindfulness and avoidance of speculative thinking that lacks grounding in reality. Therefore, a more nuanced translation might be, “He does not engage in slander and renounces frivolous doubt.” This interpretation better captures the essence of mindfulness and restraint in speech and thought, aligning more closely with the intended doctrinal message.

15.17 意悉脫無所著 棄自見無綺妄

安庠行能解對 亦不欲斷欲想

His mind, fully liberated, clings to nothing.

Discarding the view of self, he is free from pretense and deceit.

With tranquil demeanor, adept in comprehending others,

Indeed, he harbors no desires, eradicating [all] covetous thoughts.⁴⁹

Sn853 *Sātiyesu anassāvī*

Atimāne ca no yuto

Sanho ca paṭibhānavā

Na saddho na virajjati

Not intoxicated by agreeable [experiences],

Nor entangled in arrogance,

They are gentle, quick in understanding,

Neither [overly] credulous nor indifferent.

⁴⁹ **Y15.17b:** 棄自見 = 棄目見 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The term ‘目見’ directly translates as ‘to see with one’s own eyes,’ which appears out of place in the specified context. This discrepancy suggests the possibility of a scribal error, specifically the omission of the top stroke from ‘自.’ The intended phrase likely should be ‘棄自見,’ implying a concept of ‘abandoning the view of self,’ which aligns more coherently with the philosophical or ethical teachings being discussed.

Y15.17c, 安庠 = 安詳 (S, Y, M): The terms ‘安庠’ and ‘安詳’ are frequently used in Chinese Buddhist translations, typically conveying the sense of being ‘serene’ or ‘composed.’ While ‘安詳’ can be straightforwardly interpreted as ‘peaceful (安) and mindful (詳),’ the analysis of ‘安庠’ poses a challenge. Unlike ‘詳,’ which means ‘detailed,’ ‘careful,’ or ‘attentive,’ the character ‘庠’ primarily signifies ‘school’ or ‘to nourish.’ This discrepancy raises the possibility that ‘庠’ could be a scribal error for ‘詳,’ or that the two characters were used interchangeably, possibly due to their nearly identical pronunciations in both modern Pinyin and their reconstructed forms from the Eastern Han period.

15.18 不學求所樂欲 悉無有亦不憂

無怨恚捨愛欲 不爲味所可使

Neither training to seek what gratifies desire,

Nor harboring anxiety over having nothing,

Free from enmity and anger, relinquishing lust and desire,

They are not driven by [any] tastes.⁵⁰

Sn854 *Lābhakamyā na sikkhati*

Alābhe na ca kuppati

Aviruddho ca taṇhāya

Rase ca nānugijjhati

They do not train with desire for gain,

Nor are they agitated in the absence of gain.

Unobstructed by craving,

They do not yearn for [fine] tastes.

⁵⁰ **Y15.18a:** The phrase ‘不學求’ directly translates to ‘do not train to seek.’ This translation underscores the importance of liberating oneself from any impure motivations underlying one’s training. It emphasizes a Buddhist principle: the cultivation of a mind free from the pursuit of worldly desires and personal gains, aligning with the path of spiritual purity and detachment.

Y15.18d: The line ‘不爲味所可使’ utilizes the ‘爲 A 所 B’ grammatical structure, which implies passivity with ‘A’ acting as the agent. In this case, ‘味’ refers to ‘tastes’ or ‘inclinations.’ The term ‘可使’ translates as ‘to be employed’ or ‘to be used.’ Here, interpreting it as ‘to be driven’ more effectively captures the line’s essence. Therefore, the translation “They are not driven by any tastes” suggests the idea of being free from the influence of both sensory indulgences, like delicacies, and deeper personal preferences or inclinations.

15.19 不自高我無等 得對毀橫取敬

當行觀止意念 見善惡非次望

Not [indulging in] self-praise, [thinking] ‘I have no equal.’

Encountering backbiters or unrighteous people, they remain respectful.

When engaging in meditation, they mindfully still [their] thought.

They face good or bad without subsequent longings.⁵¹

Sn855 *Upekhako sadā sato*

Na loke maññate samaṃ

Na vivesī na nīceyyo

Tassa no santi ussadā

Always equanimous and mindful,

They do not consider themselves as equal,

Superior, nor inferior [to others] in this world.

⁵¹ **Y15.19a:** Bapat translates ‘不自高我無等’ as “High doth he not exhalt himself, nor doth he put himself on level with others;”. This translation shifts the narrative from the first-person ‘我’ (I) in the original text to a third-person ‘he,’ altering the directness of the statement. The phrase ‘我無等,’ using the first-person pronoun ‘我,’ should be accurately rendered as “I have no equal.” This interpretation is consistent with ‘不自高,’ which translates to ‘do not self-elevate,’ emphasizing the virtue of humility and the avoidance of self-aggrandizement.

Y15.19b: The primary meanings of ‘橫’ is ‘horizontal,’ ‘transverse,’ or ‘broad,’ but its derivative meanings could be diverse. Within the context, it may denote ‘violent’ or ‘unrighteous’ shown in the usage from the Wan Zhang II chapter 萬章下 in the *Mengzi* 孟子: 橫政之所出, 橫民之所止, 不忍居也。 This translates to “He could not bear to dwell in places where unrighteous governance prevailed, nor unrighteous people reside.” (武英殿十三經注疏 本 孟子注疏: 萬章下, p. 65-6). Bapat’s translation of ‘得對毀橫取敬’ as “As against (對) scorn (毀) and disrespect (橫) that he may meet (得), he is always respectful (取敬);” seems to follow this interpretation too. [Parentheses added for analysis].

Y15.19c: In the phrase ‘當行觀,’ ‘當’ should function as a verb ‘to undertake’ or as a preposition, akin to ‘在’ (to be in a particular situation), indicating a state or condition, not as a modal verb ‘should.’ It is because this verse describes the ideal person so that the context of ‘one should do...’ does not fit in the given context. The compound ‘行觀’ refers to ‘practicing meditation.’ Thus, taken together, the phrase denotes the idea of ‘when practicing meditation’ or ‘undertaking the practice of meditation.’

Traces of arrogance are absent in them.

15.20 去所在無所止 觀向法當何著

欲色空亦無色 從黠計不欲脫

15.21 愛已滅乃已息 三界空無樂意

悉解離何從得 多從海度無憂

Departing from [fixed] abodes, [wandering] without stable refuge,

Contemplating the Dharma, to what [then] could they possibly cling?

In [the realms of] desire, form, and formlessness, all indeed are insubstantial.

Wisely understanding, they do not [even] desire liberation.⁵²

[With] lust extinguished and stilled,

[In] the three realms—all insubstantial—they harbor no pleasure.

Fully liberated and detached, what gain remains to be sought?

⁵² **Y15.20 & Y15.21:** While capable of independent treatment, these verses are presented together due to the grammatical and thematic connections between the Pāli verses Sn856 and Sn857, that parallel the Chinese verses Y15.20 and Y15.21. This joint presentation enriches the understanding of their corresponding verses in Pāli and the comparative study between the two versions.

Y15.20a: The terms ‘所在’ and ‘所止’ essentially mean ‘place to stay’ and ‘place to rest,’ hinting at the notion of a ‘fixed residence’ or a ‘permanent abode.’ Bapat metaphorically interprets these as ‘reliances’ and ‘thing where his mind dwells,’ respectively. This metaphorical reading is a viable interpretation, aligning with the broader themes of detachment.

Y15.20c: The terms ‘欲’ (desire), ‘色’ (form), and ‘無色’ (formless) refer to the three realms (三界) in Buddhist cosmology: the desire realm, the form realm, and the formless realm.

Y15.20d: Bapat translates ‘從黠計不欲脫’ as “But from his wise aim, he desires not to be released.” However, this translation may seem to suggest an aversion to liberation, contradicting Buddhist principles. Instead, following the discussion on the insubstantial nature of the three realms, this phrase should underscore that even liberation, transcending these realms, is also not an object of desire. This nuanced interpretation ensures alignment with the essence of Buddhist teachings on non-attachment, where even the pursuit of liberation is approached without attachment.

[As] the masses are swept into the ocean [of suffering], they cross over, undisturbed.⁵³

Sn856 *Yassa nissayatā n' atthi*

Ñatvā dhammaṃ anissito

Bhavāya vighvāya vā

Taṇhā yassa na vijjati

Sn857 *Taṃ brūmi upsanto ti*

Kāmesu anapekхинаṃ

Ganthā tassa na vijjanti

Atāri so visattikaṃ

For the one who has no reliance,

Who, understanding the Dhamma, remains independent,

Who does not exhibit craving for

Existence or annihilation,

⁵³ **Y15.21a:** In this context, ‘已滅’ (has been extinguished) and ‘已息’ (has been stilled) are closely related, each with subtle differences: ‘已滅’ suggests the cessation of what previously existed, whereas ‘已息’ hints at the cessation of future occurrences. The interjecting term ‘乃’ effectively bridges these two ideas and adds an emphatic nuance, akin to ‘indeed.’

Y15.21cd: Bapat translates ‘悉解離何從得 多從海度無憂’ as “All this kind of release—from what has he obtained? Mostly, from his crossing the ocean and passing into the griefless state.” However, this translation might read as fragmented and somewhat incomplete in its latter portion. It seems Bapat intended to extend the query posed in the initial part, driven by the repeated use of ‘從.’ Yet, ‘從’ bears different implications in each instance: first, as ‘to seek a goal,’ and then as ‘to emulate or follow.’ While Bapat interprets ‘解離’ as a singular notion of ‘release,’ I have rendered the two components separately as ‘liberation’ (解) and ‘detachment’ (離). Both renderings seem viable in the given context.

‘The ocean,’ represented by ‘海,’ embodies ‘the ocean of suffering,’ a central metaphor in Buddhist discourse that underscores the universal and mighty nature of suffering. This imagery is further accentuated by ‘多從,’ denoting ‘the masses being swept along,’ thereby illustrating the collective human struggle against the currents of suffering.

多從海 = 多彼海(S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): In the variant versions, the verb ‘從’ is substituted with the determiner ‘彼,’ modifying ‘海.’ Therefore, ‘多彼海’ can be rendered as ‘the masses are in that ocean,’ referring to the ocean [of suffering]. This adaptation shifts the focus from an action (following) to a state of being (in) and highlights the metaphorical use of ‘ocean’ to represent suffering rather than the physical environment.

I declare them ‘truly serene,’
Free from longing in sensual desires.
For such a one, no fetters [can be] perceived.
They have transcended all attachments.⁵⁴

15.22 不願生見有子 列地行願寶增

來不生去不到 欲何索從何得
Not desiring to procreate and cherish offspring,
[Nor] yearning for wealth to increase by tilling of orderly plots of land,
Coming into [this world], never to be reborn; departing from it, never to return,
What, then, would they seek in desire; from what could they possibly benefit?⁵⁵

⁵⁴ **Sn856 & Sn857:** These two verses exhibit a grammatical interconnection, marked by the use of pronouns that create a cohesive link between them. ‘*Yassa*’ (for the one who) in Sn856ad sets the context, which is then referenced in Sn857 with ‘*taṃ*’ (such a one) in Sn857a and ‘*tassa*’ (for such a one) in Sn857c. This cohesive use of pronouns bridges the verses, establishing their thematic continuity.

⁵⁵ **Y15.22a:** Bapat translates ‘不願生見有子’ as “He doth not pray for the [re-] birth of his sons whom he sees prosper;”. However, this translation deviates from the original meaning by implying ‘rebirth,’ a concept not supported by the text or its Pāli counterpart, Sn858a. The phrase more accurately reflects a lack of desire for producing offspring, rather than concerns about their rebirth or prosperity. The addition of ‘to prosper’ further diverges from the text’s essence. In this context, ‘生’ directly translates to ‘to procreate,’ ‘見’ to ‘to see,’ and ‘有子’ to ‘to have offspring,’ collectively conveying the message that ‘the ideal person does not desire to procreate and have offspring.’ The combination of ‘生,’ ‘見,’ and ‘有’ (to have) naturally suggests ‘to procreate and cherish offspring,’ a simplification that captures the essence without redundancy.

Y15.22b: Bapat translates ‘列地行願寶增’ as “Nor doth he wish increase in his fields or other treasure;”. This translation interprets ‘列地行’ and ‘寶’ as distinct targets of desire. Yet, the strategic placement of ‘願’ (to wish) suggests that ‘寶’ (treasure/wealth) is the primary object of desire, with ‘列地行’ indicating the means to that end. The term ‘列地行’ poses interpretative challenges. ‘列’ may have multiple meanings: as a verb, it can mean ‘to divide, arrange, or enumerate’; as an adjective, it signifies ‘numerous’; and as a noun, it represents ‘row, or column.’ Here, ‘列地’ is best understood as ‘orderly plots of land,’ and ‘行’ as ‘to cultivate,’ a reading that aligns with its Pāli parallel, Sn858b. While ‘地行’ could allude to the ‘Ten Bhūmi practice (菩薩十地行; *dasabhūmī*)’ of a Bodhisattva in Mahāyāna contexts, such an interpretation does not fit well with this particular instance.

Y15.22c: The phrase ‘來不生去不到’ is somewhat enigmatic and necessitates interpretive judgment. Here, ‘來’ is interpreted as ‘coming into this world’ and ‘去’ as ‘departing from this world.’ The terms ‘不生’ and ‘不到’

Sn858 *Na tassa puttā pasavo vā*
Khettaṃ vatthuṃ na vijjati
Attāṃ vā pi nirattaṃ vā
Na tasmim̐ upalabbhati
They possess neither
Sons, cattle, nor plots of land.
What is grasped or rejected
Do not exist in him.⁵⁶

15.23 悉無能說到處 衆學沙門遊心

悉令求所在處 如觸冒知如去

Utterly indescribable is the destination

Of many ascetics earnestly training [on the Path].

Let them all seek this abode

To grasp [the essence of] the Tathāgata, [as though] blind people were perceiving

are indicative of particular spiritual attainments: ‘never to be reborn’ for the former and ‘never to return to this world’ for the latter.

⁵⁶ **Sn858b:** The terms ‘*khetta*’ and ‘*vatthu*’ in Pāli are closely related, both signifying ‘field’ or ‘land.’ In this translation, they have been collectively rendered as ‘plots of land’ to capture their combined essence of agricultural or owned land.

Sn858c: The term ‘*atta*’ means ‘taken up), derived from the past participle of ‘*ā + √dā*’ (to take). The term ‘*niratta*’ is its negative form meaning ‘rejected.’ This distinction highlights the dichotomy between acceptance and rejection in the context of attachment.

Sn858d: The term ‘*upalabbhati*’ is the passive form of ‘*upalabhati*,’ which translates to ‘to obtain’ or ‘to find.’ For simplicity and clarity, ‘*upalabbhati*’ in this context has been translated as ‘to be found’ or ‘to exist’ considering the passive nature of the term in conveying the presence or absence of certain qualities or objects.

[an elephant].⁵⁷

⁵⁷ **Y15.23:** This verse exhibits significant divergence from its Pāli counterpart, Sn859. While the Pāli text emphasizes the composure of an ideal person in the face of slander, the Chinese verse focuses on the spiritual journey towards an ineffable goal undertaken by practitioners. The structural complexity of the Pāli verse raises the possibility that the Chinese rendition might represent either a mistranslation or reflect distinct interpretive traditions within early Indian Buddhism. Such divergence underscores the richness of variations and interpretive nuances inherent in the transmission and translation of Buddhist scriptures, suggesting a multifaceted understanding of Buddhist teachings across different cultures and historical periods.

Y15.23ab: Bapat translates ‘悉無能說到處 衆學沙門遊心’ as “That place (處) doth he reach (到) where no (悉無) words can describe (能說) him, Where no (?) ascetic (沙門) under training (衆學) can reach (遊) his mind (心)——”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation introduces an unwarranted negative ‘no’ in the second line, diverging from the text’s original meaning. ‘到處’ conveys not a tangible location but the spiritual endpoint of the Buddhist path. ‘遊心,’ more aptly translated as ‘the mind wandering freely,’ suggests a pursuit of spiritual freedom beyond worldly confines. Therefore, a more accurate rendition may read: “Utterly (悉) indescribable (無能說) is the destination (到處) [Toward which] many (衆) ascetics (沙門) earnestly training (學) on the Path (遊心).”

遊心 = 逝心 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The variant ‘逝心,’ interpreted as an earlier translation for ‘*brāhmaṇa*,’ stems from ‘exegetical etymology,’ linking ‘*brah-*’ to ‘*bāheti*’ (to expel; 逝) and ‘*-maṇa*’ to ‘*manas*’ (mind; 心). DDB. (n.d.). Retrieved February 29, 2024, from [http://www.buddhism-dict.net/cgi-bin/xpr-ddb.pl?q=%E9%80%9D%E5%BF%83]. This suggests an interpretation akin to ‘ascetics and *brāhmaṇas* earnestly training.’ This nuanced understanding further enriches the text’s interpretation, highlighting the deliberate mental discipline undertaken by seekers of enlightenment.

Y15.23d: Bapat translates ‘如觸冒知如去’ as “As (如) a thing (冒?) to be in touch (觸) with. Knowing (知) it to be so (如), they rush (去?) on to it.” This translation introduces ambiguity, primarily due to a fragmented interpretation of ‘如去.’ This phrase is likely a Chinese rendition of the Indic epithet ‘Tathāgata,’ where ‘如’ (thus) corresponds to ‘*tathā*’ and ‘去’ (gone) to ‘*gata*.’ Notably, ‘Tathāgata’ is more commonly translated into Chinese as ‘如來’ (Thus-come), with ‘如’ matching ‘*tathā*’ and ‘來’ (come) to ‘*āgata*.’ The interpretation of ‘冒’ as ‘a thing’ by Bapat does not capture any of the character’s broader meanings, which include ‘hat,’ ‘sack,’ ‘to cover,’ or ‘to venture.’ According to the DDB (sources: Hirakawa), ‘冒’ often suggests ‘acting blindly or recklessly,’ a meaning that aligns more closely with the context here. DDB. (n.d.). Retrieved February 29, 2024, from [http://www.buddhism-dict.net/cgi-bin/xpr-ddb.pl?51.xml+id(%27b5192%27)]. Consequently, ‘如觸冒’ is best understood as ‘like perceiving [an elephant] blindly,’ evoking the well-known Buddhist analogy of the blind men and the elephant. This interpretation underlines the uncertainties faced by ascetics in grasping the true nature of awakened existence on their spiritual journey.

Given cryptic nature of this line, an alternative translation is contemplated: “[Even] if (如) encountering (觸) peril (冒) [on the Path], such (如) perceptions (知) merely pass (去).” This interpretation is informed by ‘觸冒’’s usage to denote ‘facing risks or hazardous situations,’ a theme echoed in the early Chinese Buddhist Canon and Classical Chinese literature. For example, the *Discourse on Life* 生經 (T154.03.0077c08–09) describes an exiled subject’s journey: “獨涉遠路, 觸冒寒暑, 疲極憔悴, 無所似類, 而到他國,” meaning “He traveled alone on a long journey, encountering risks, cold and heat, to the point of extreme exhaustion and haggardness, unmatched by any, eventually reaching a foreign land.” This narrative resonates with themes found in Pāli texts, like Sn.52 from the *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta* “*Sitaṇ ca uṇhaṇ ca, khudam pipāsam; Vātātape ḍaṃsasirimsape ca*,” which translates to “Cold and heat, hunger and thirst; Wind and heat [of the sun], gadflies and snakes.” Thus, the term ‘觸冒’ may encapsulate the idea of ‘encountering danger.’

This interpretation, grounded in the broader application of ‘觸冒,’ necessitates revisiting the line’s components: ‘如’ as ‘[even] if’; and ‘知如去’ as ‘such perceptions (知), likewise (如), pass (去).’ (For further detail of this rare usage of ‘如’ as ‘even if’ please refer to Y13.fn.49.) However, in the context of Y15.23d, which highlights the ineffability of the Path’s destination and the Tathāgata’s nature, ‘觸冒’ is aptly likened to ‘blind people perceiving an elephant.’ This analogy more accurately captures the essence of the verse, underscoring the spiritual journey’s inherent uncertainties and the challenges in fully comprehending the profound truths of Buddhism until directly experienced.

Sn859 *Yena naṃ vajju puthujjanā*

Atho samaṇabrāhmaṇā

Taṃ tassa apurekkhataṃ

Tasmā vādesu n' ejati

[Regardless of] how common folk,

Ascetics, and brāhmins may disparage them,

They remain indifferent to such [disparagement].

Thus, they are untroubled by [these] accusations.⁵⁸

15.24 亦不嫉亦無貪 雖在高尊不樂

不樂中下不樂 從法生非法捨

Free from envy and devoid of greed,

Even in positions of high esteem, they find no joy.

Neither in being ordinary nor lowly do they take delight;

[Their thoughts] emerge from the Dharma, discarding what is not Dharma.⁵⁹

⁵⁸ **Sn859:** This verse employs the correlational structure ‘yena ... taṃ ...’ (by whatever ... that ...), which I have translated as ‘regardless of how...’ The pronouns ‘naṃ’ and ‘tassa,’ referring to the ideal person, are rendered as the gender-neutral singular ‘they’ to maintain inclusivity. As for the term ‘vajju,’ Norman (2001: 356) suggests that it likely represents ‘vajjū,’ the optative third-person plural form of the root √vad (to speak), serving as an alternative to ‘vadeyyū.’ He suggests that ‘-ṃ’ might have been omitted for metrical reasons.

⁵⁹ **Y15.24a:** The phrase ‘亦不嫉亦無貪’ utilizes ‘不,’ a verbal negator (do not), and ‘無,’ a nominal negator (without). To enhance the symmetry and rhythm in the English rendering, a consistent use of ‘無’ is adopted, rendering it as ‘free from envy and devoid of greed,’ which smoothly conveys the dual absence of negative emotions.

Sn860 *Vītagedho amaccharī*

Na ussesu vadate muni

Na samesu na omesu

Kappaṃ n' eti akappiyo

Free from greed, devoid of stinginess,

The sage does not speak [of themselves]

As among superiors, equals, or inferiors.

Unbound by mental constructs, they do not fixate on any.⁶⁰

15.25 是悉空亦無有 從不得亦不求

莫欲世邪樂人 意已止便到盡

Y15.24bc: The text sets up a contrast among ‘高尊’ (high esteem), ‘中’ (middle), and ‘下’ (lowly). For brevity, the repeated term ‘不樂’ (take no pleasure) in line c is translated only once, reflecting its occurrence twice in the source.

Y15.24d: This line delineates the dichotomy between ‘從法’ (following the Dharma) and ‘非法’ (that which is not Dharma). For clarity, ‘Their thoughts’ is introduced as subjects for ‘生’ (arise). While Bapat translates ‘法’ as ‘the precepts of the Law,’ this interpretation may narrowly confine its broader implications to merely ‘precepts.’ A more encompassing translation might be ‘[their thoughts] arise from the Dharma, discarding what is not Dharma,’ thus broadening ‘法’s’ scope beyond specific precepts to the whole of Dharma’s teachings and practice.

⁶⁰ **Sn860d:** The term ‘*kappa*’ shares its origin with the Buddhist Sanskrit ‘*kalpa*,’ typically signifying ‘mental creation’ or ‘imagination.’ Diverse interpretations include ‘criterion’ by Jayawickrama, ‘figment’ by Norman, ‘mental construct’ by Bodhi, and ‘comparison’ by Fronsda. Both Norman and Bodhi emphasize the fabricated nature of mental activities, while Jayawickrama and Fronsda underscore its role in categorizing ‘superiority, equality, and inferiority.’ In my translation, I adopt ‘mental constructs’ following Bodhi’s usage, which captures the general essence while also honoring the term’s contextual application in differentiation.

The subsequent term ‘*a-kappiya*’ stems from the negative prefix ‘*a-*’ combined with an adjectival form of ‘*kappa*,’ which could be related to the Sanskrit ‘*a-kalpika*,’ denoting ‘not engaging in the formation of (false) ideas.’ Thus, ‘*a-kappiya*’ translates to ‘without mental constructs.’ To prevent repetition, ‘any’ replaces the term to maintain the meaning of being free from such constructs.

All these [phenomena] are insubstantial, and there is nothing [of one's own].

Therefore, they neither cling to nor yearn for anything.

They do not desire worldly [affairs] that people may erroneously delight in.

With the mind at rest, they swiftly reach cessation.⁶¹

Sn861 *Yassa loke sakaṃ n' atthi*

Asatā ca na socati

Dhammesu ca na gacchati

Sa ve santo ti vuccatī" ti

One who claims nothing as one's own in the world,

Who does not grieve over non-existence,

Who does not adhere to dogmas,

Such [a person] is truly called 'calmed.'

⁶¹ **Y15.25a:** To elucidate the phrase '是悉空亦無有,' 'phenomena' is included to interpret '是悉' as 'all these [phenomena],' offering a clearer context for '空' (insubstantiality) and '無有' (no permanent ownership). '空' and '亦無有' literally translate to 'void' and 'ultimately nonexistent,' respectively. I consider that the terms '空' and '無有' reflect the Buddhist principle that nothing possesses permanent, inherent existence, akin to the Pāli phrase '*sakaṃ n'atthi*' in Sn861a, which means 'there is nothing of one's own.'

Y15.25b: Bapat translates '從不得亦不求' as "When he doth not get anything, he pursues it not [further];". However, this translation narrows the verse's broader implications. Considering the prior line's focus on the insubstantiality and lack of ownership, '從' is better translated as 'therefore,' indicating a logical consequence rather than a conditional statement. The phrase '不得亦不求' becomes 'neither cling to nor seek,' emphasizing detachment from all desires, not just the absence of pursuit upon not obtaining.

Y15.25c: Bapat translates '莫欲世邪樂人' as "He covets (欲) not (莫) the people (人), good (樂?) or bad (邪), in the world (世);". [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this translation misconstrues the object of '欲' (to desire): it is not 'people' (人) but 'worldly affairs (世)' that are not to be desired (莫欲). The following words '邪樂人' qualifies 'worldly affairs,' which can be rendered as '[that which] people (人) may erroneously (邪) delight in (樂).' In this context, '樂' functions as a verb 'to enjoy' and is not an adjective indicating that the people themselves are 'enjoyable' or 'good.' His translation of '樂' as 'good' also extends its connotation beyond its intended usage.

Y15.25d: Bapat's translation of '盡' as 'perfection' lacks precision; 'cessation' or 'Nirvāṇa' is a more suitable translation, referring to the ultimate goal of the Buddhist path.

佛說是義足經竟。比丘與悅頭檀王。及釋人民。悉歡喜

When the Buddha had expounded this [*sūtra* in] the *Yizujing*, the *bhikṣus*, King Śuddhodana, and the Śākya people all rejoiced.⁶²

⁶² 佛說是義足經竟 = 佛說是義足經 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The absence of ‘竟’ in various versions does not alter the overarching narrative, as it typically marks the conclusion of a *sūtra* or a segment thereof.

維樓勒王經 第十六

Discourse 16: King Virūdhaka (*Aṭṭhakavagga.15*)¹

聞如是。佛在舍衛國祇樹給孤獨園。爾時迦維羅衛諸釋。新起大殿。成未能久。諸釋悉共言。從今已後。莫使沙門梵志釋中衣冠。及長者子。得先入是殿中。先使佛。次及比丘僧入。餘人乃當從後入耳。

Thus I heard. The Buddha was residing in the kingdom of Śrāvastī, at Jeta's Grove in Anāthapiṇḍada's Park. At that time, the Śākyaans of Kapilavastu had newly built a great hall. It was completed shortly after, and the Śākyaans unanimously declared: "From now on, we shall not allow any ascetics, brahmins, Śākyaan officials, or sons of [wealthy] householders to enter this hall first.² We must invite the Buddha first, and then the *Bhikkhusaṃgha* to enter. Others may only enter afterwards.

¹ This sixteenth discourse of the *Yizujing* corresponds to the *Attadaṇḍasutta* (Sn IV-15) from the *Aṭṭhakavagga*.

維樓勒王經 第十六 (K, T, Z) = 維樓勒太子經 第十六 (S, Y, M) = 維樓勒太子 第十六 (P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The various versions recorded in the Taishō and Zhonghua apparatuses show a difference in the use of titles for Virūdhaka: they substitute '太子' (crown-prince) for '王' (king). The narrative recounts Prince Virūdhaka's experience of insult by the Śākyaans and his subsequent vow of revenge, which he fulfills upon becoming the King of the Śrāvastī kingdom. Therefore, both '太子' and '王' are appropriate, reflecting different temporal aspects of his life. The versions from the Zhonghua apparatus omit the term '經' (sūtra), a variation that is not uncommon. For detailed analysis on the frequent omission of '經' in the titles of alternative versions noted in the Z863 apparatus, see the discussion in Y1.fn.3.

This narrative, detailing the decimation of the Śākyaans, appears to be strategically positioned as the concluding sūtra of the *Yizujing*.

惟樓勒: This name likely represents the transcription of Virūdhaka (Pāli: Vidūḍabha), as evidenced by its reconstructed pronunciation /jwīləwlək/ during the Eastern Han period in China, following Pulleyblank's research (1991). Virūdhaka, a prince of the Kosala Kingdom and successor to King Prasenajit (Pāli, Pasenadi), harbored deep resentment against the Śākyaans from a young age. After ascending to the throne, his pent-up anger culminated in the notorious massacre of the Śākyaan clan.

² 釋中衣冠: The term '衣冠' refers to the formal attire typical of the royal court. Therefore, the phrase is best understood as 'those in courtly dress among the Śākyaans,' effectively translating to 'Śākyaan officers.' This interpretation is crucial to capture the cultural significance embedded in '衣冠,' a nuance that Bapat's translation as 'any man among the Śākyaans' fails to encompass.

從今已後 = 從今以後 (S, Y, M): The terms '已後' and '以後' are synonymous, both signifying 'hereafter' or 'subsequently.' Therefore, the variant reading retains the same temporal indication and does not change the narrative's meaning or progression.

爾時舍衛國王子惟樓勒。以事到釋國。未及入城。便至新成殿中宿。明日入城。所欲取竟。便還其國諸釋聞太子惟樓勒在新殿中宿。便大不樂。瞋恚不解。便出聲罵。今奈何令婢子先入是殿。便共掘殿中土棄深七尺所。更取淨土復其處。便復取牛湏洗四殿。惟樓勒太子聞諸釋不淨惡我。掘殿中土七尺所更以新土復其處。悉以湏洗四殿復罵我爲婢子污是新殿。聞內結。悲著心。我後把國政者。當云那治諸釋。

At that time, Prince Virūḍhaka of the kingdom of Śrāvastī visited the Śākya kingdom for [personal] reasons. Before entering the city, he reached the newly constructed hall and stayed there overnight. The following day, he entered the city, completed his tasks, and returned to his state.³ [However, when] the Śākyans learned that Prince Virūḍhaka had spent the night in the new hall, they were deeply displeased and harbored enduring resentment.⁴ [Outraged], they accused him out loud, “Now, how was the son of a slave woman allowed to enter this hall first?” In response, they excavated and discarded the soil of the hall to a depth of seven feet, replacing it with pure earth. They also cleansed the four sides of the hall with cow milk.⁵ Prince Virūḍhaka,

³ The Taishō editors’ sentence break is not accurate here. The passage ‘便還其國諸釋聞太子惟樓勒在新殿中宿’ is not one sentence, but should have a period after ‘便還其國.’ It is because this is about the prince’s action, while the following is about the Śākyans’ reaction. To emphasize this sentence break, I have added ‘however, when.’

⁴ 瞋恚不解: The phrase can directly translates to ‘[their] resentment could not be quelled,’ which has been rendered as ‘they harbored enduring resentment.’

⁵ 牛湏: The character ‘湏’ means ‘milk,’ and Bapat’s translation of ‘牛湏’ as ‘cow’s urine’ is culturally situated within the ancient Indian reverence for the substance. In contrast, considering Zhi Qian’s influence or a Chinese perspective, I have chosen to interpret it literally as ‘cow milk.’ The Chinese context does not hold cow’s urine in the same sacred regard as the Indian context, and it is plausible that ‘湏’ was intentionally chosen to refer to ‘milk’ to avoid the impure connotations associated with ‘urine.’ This interpretation aligns with a more culturally appropriate understanding for a Chinese audience and sidesteps the negative associations of urine in the Chinese cultural milieu.

四殿: While ‘四殿’ can be literally translated as ‘four [religious] halls,’ the context, preceded by ‘大殿’ (the Great Hall), suggests a singular location. To harmonize with this, ‘四殿’ has been rendered as ‘four sides of the hall.’ This reading considers the possibility of a purification ceremony within a religious hall, where actions are

heard that the Śākyaans reviled and resented him; they excavated and discarded the soil of the hall to a depth of seven feet, replacing it with fresh earth; cleansed the four sides of the hall with cow milk; and blamed him yelling ‘the son of a slave girl defiled this new hall.’ Upon hearing this, he was overwhelmed with sorrow and spite. [Resolved, he thought,] ‘When I assume control of state affairs later, I will determine how to deal with the Śākyaans.’

從是不久。舍衛國王崩。大臣集議。徵太子拜爲王。惟樓勒王。即問傍大臣者。有不淨惡國王者其罪何至。傍臣白言。如是罪至死。王言然。諸釋不淨惡我。諸釋是佛親家。至使佛有恩愛在諸釋者。終不能得治子曹罪。臣下即白言。佛棄世欲。無恩愛在親屬。欲治諸釋罪無所難。王聞白如是。即勅興四種兵象馬車步兵出城引號。當攻迦維羅衛城。

Not long thereafter, the King of the Śrāvastī state passed away. The senior ministers gathered to deliberate on [the state’s future, ultimately] urging the Crown Prince to ascend the throne. [Upon his coronation], King Virūḍhaka promptly inquired of the senior ministers: “If someone despises and maligns the king, what should be their punishment?”⁶ The ministers responded: “Such offenses warrant the death penalty.” The king remarked: “Indeed. The Śākyaans have shown me nothing but contempt. [Yet], being relatives of the Buddha, they enjoy his affection and

likely to take place around the perimeter or on all sides of the hall, rather than in four distinct halls. This interpretation provides a coherent and logical description of the ceremonial space within the narrative’s context.

便還其國 = 使還其國 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The term ‘便’ typically conveys a sense of immediacy or sequential action, whereas ‘使’ indicates an ‘official command or dispatch.’ In this context, the variant with ‘使’ suggests that the prince’s return to his state was not merely a subsequent event but one that occurred under official orders. Therefore, the phrase ‘使還其國’ is aptly translated as ‘he was officially summoned back to his state,’ emphasizing the formality and authority behind the action rather than its timing within the narrative.

⁶ 不淨惡國王: This phrase can directly translate to ‘to defile (不淨) and hate (惡) the King (國王).’ I have rendered this as ‘despise and malign the king’ to enhance readability.

gratitude, making it difficult to punish them for their offenses.”⁷ The ministers immediately responded,⁸ “The Buddha has eradicated worldly desire and harbors no familial affection and gratitude. If you want, punishing the Śākyaans for their offense presents no difficulty.” Receiving this counsel, the King promptly ordered the mobilization of the four military divisions: elephants, cavalry, chariots, and infantry.⁹ Leading the forces out of the state, he had the [battle] horn sounded, [signaling] the attack on the Kapilavastu state.

佛以食時。持應器入舍衛城求食。食竟出城下道。於釋樹下薄枝葉少蔭涼。在其下望王興兵行大道。遙見佛在薄蔭樹下坐。即下車到佛所。禮竟住一面。白佛言。諾今有餘大樹枝葉茂盛多蔭涼。大樹名爲迦旃迦維羅衛多優曇鉢尼拘類。佛何以不坐是蔭何爲坐是小釋樹

⁷ 至使: This phrase conveys the meaning of ‘to cause,’ ‘to bring about,’ or ‘to result in.’ Within the context, it indicates the causal relationship between the Buddha’s former association with the Śākyaans and the ensuing difficulty in punishing them.

終不能得治子曹罪: Bapat translates this phrase as “they may not (不) finally (終) be able (能) to receive (得) punishment (治) adequate to the guilt (罪) of the young (子?) folk (曹).” However, ‘子’ in this context should not be limited to ‘young’ but is more accurately understood as ‘persons’ in general, with ‘子曹’ referring to ‘those people’ denoting all the Śākyaans. Bapat might have interpreted ‘young’ with a pejorative connotation, which still does not fit well in the given context. The line emphasizes that the king is resolute in his intention to punish all Śākyaans, without differentiation by age. Thus, a more fitting translation would be “ultimately, I would not be able to exact punishment for the crimes of those people,” which removes any age-specific connotation and aligns with the indiscriminate nature of the intended retribution.

⁸ 臣下即白言: Bapat’s translation of ‘The ministers (臣) subordinated (下?) to the King then (即) said (白言):’ misinterprets the role of ‘下’ in the phrase. In this context, ‘下’ does not function as a verb meaning ‘to subordinate.’ Instead, it forms part of the compound ‘臣下,’ which collectively refers to ‘ministers’ or ‘vassals’ within the hierarchical structure of the monarchy, indicating their position below the king. Additionally, the explicit mention of ‘the King’ is an insertion not present in the original phrase. A more accurate translation would be: ‘The ministers immediately responded.’

⁹ 象馬車步兵 = 象兵馬車步兵 (S, Y, M) = 象兵馬兵車兵步兵 (P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The variant versions intersperse ‘兵’ (soldier or troops) within each segment of the military forces, delineating them as elephant troops, cavalry, chariotry, and infantry. This addition, while specifying each unit as a distinct category of troops, does not alter the fundamental enumeration of the four core components of the army.

少枝葉無蔭樹下有何涼。佛報言。愛其名。樂其涼。故坐其下。王自念言。如是者。佛續
爲有恩愛在諸釋續有助意。即從其處而還。兵歸其國。

As mealtime approached, the Buddha took his alms bowl and entered the city of Śrāvastī to beg for food. After his meal, he left the city and walked down the road, stopping under a Śākya tree with sparse branches and leaves providing scant cool shade. Remaining under the tree, he waited as King [Virūdhaka's] army advanced along the main road. Spotting the Buddha from afar, seated in the paltry shade of the tree, the King quickly dismounted his chariot and approached the Buddha. After paying his respects and standing to one side, the King inquired, “Now, if I may say so, there are other grand trees with lush branches and leaves providing abundant shade, like those trees called the Jiazhan [trees]; Kapilavastu has many such trees like the Udumbara and Nyagrodha.¹⁰ Why then, does the Buddha not sit under those [trees with] abundant shade [but instead] sit under this diminutive Śākya tree with little branches and leaves? How can it be cool under this tree that offers little shade?” The Buddha responded, “I cherish the name of this

¹⁰ 諾今有餘大樹: The character ‘諾’ typically conveys ‘agreement’ or ‘consent,’ subtly introducing or softening the speaker’s forthcoming statement. In this context, it functions as a courteous lead-in to the King’s query, effectively setting a polite tone. Thus, translating ‘諾’ as ‘if I may say so’ appropriately reflects the King’s respectful approach. Bapat’s interpretation of ‘諾今有餘大樹’ as “There are, to be certain, other big trees” diverges from the original’s nuanced use of ‘諾’ for seeking permission and ‘今’ indicating ‘now.’ A more precise translation would be: “If I may say so, there are now other great trees,” which not only retains the original’s courteous tone but also accurately incorporates the temporal aspect conveyed by ‘今.’

迦旃 ... 優曇鉢 尼拘類: While ‘優曇鉢’ (Udumbara) and ‘尼拘類’ (Nyagrodha) are direct transcriptions of tree names from Sanskrit, the term ‘迦旃’ presents a unique case. Commonly, it serves as a transcription for the personal name ‘Kātyāyana,’ recognized as one of the Buddha’s ten principal disciples. Given its rare application in the context of trees, and the ambiguity surrounding its specific botanical reference, I have opted to retain its pinyin form ‘jiazhan.’ This approach acknowledges the term’s unusual occurrence in this setting without ascribing to it a potentially inaccurate botanical identification.

迦旃 = 加旃 (S, Y, M): Based on Pulleyblank (1991), the reconstructed pronunciations of these characters during the Eastern Han period are /kiateian/ and /kaiteian/, respectively. Despite the slight phonetic variation, both terms refer to the same type of tree, with the variant character maintaining this botanical reference unchanged.

迦維羅衛 = 加維羅衛 (S, Y): Similarly, due to the minimal phonetic discrepancy, both variants consistently refer to the city of ‘Kapilavastu,’ illustrating how slight variations in character usage do not alter the intended geographic reference.

tree (Śākya) and find comfort in its shade, that's why I sit under it." The King thought to himself, 'If so, the Buddha still holds [deep] affection and gratitude for the Śākyans and continues to wish to protect them.' [With this thought], he retreated from that place and led his troops back to their kingdom.

佛教授舍衛人民。生意欲到迦維羅衛國。便從諸比丘。即到釋國。於尼拘類園中教授。

The Buddha, after imparting teachings to the inhabitants of Śrāvastī, wanted to journey to the kingdom of Kapilavastu. Accompanied by a group of *bhikṣus*, he then proceeded to the Śākya realm. There, in the Nyāgrōdha Park, he continued his teachings.

久頃舍衛國王。便復問傍臣左右言。若有不淨惡國王者。其罪何至。諸臣對言。如是罪至死。王復言諸釋致惡我。子曹皆是佛近親。佛當有顧念在諸釋。我終不得子曹勝。臣下復白言。我曹悉聞諸沙門言。瞿曇姪欲已斷。有何恩愛在近親。王欲治其罪。無以為難。王聞諸臣下白如是。即勅興四種兵。引號出城。

After some time, the King of Śrāvastī once again promptly asked his ministers, to his left and right, "What should be the punishment for someone who despises and maligns the king?"¹¹ The ministers responded, "Such offenses deserve execution." The king [then] remarked, "The Śākyans have shown nothing but contempt towards me. [Yet], they are relatives of the Buddha, and the Buddha should have concern for the Śākyans. After all, I find myself unable to [punish] these people." The ministers replied again, "We have indeed heard from the ascetics that

¹¹ 久頃: The term is an uncommon time expression in classical Chinese literature and appears only six times across the early translations of mainstream Buddhist canonical texts. This phrase is composed of antonyms: '久' meaning 'a long time,' and '頃' signifying 'a short time.' The most fitting English equivalent to '久頃' would likely be 'sooner or later,' which conveys a sense of 'after a while' or 'after some time' in this context.

Gautama has eradicated sexual desire. How then could he harbor special gratitude and affection for his kin? If the King wishes to punish their offenses, it should not be too challenging.”

Hearing such advice from his ministers, the King immediately ordered the mobilization of the four military divisions. At the sound of the battle horn, [the army] marched out of the city.

到諸釋國。行至冥已。近去釋城四十里所因止宿。諸釋悉聞舍衛國王興四種兵。欲來攻是國。近去城數十里。恐明日來到。即遣輕足上騎。到佛所道。是願佛教我曹。作何方便。佛即告諸釋。堅閉城門。王終不能得勝。開門內者。惟樓勒王。即殺諸釋不疑。是騎人聞佛教。便禮佛上馬如去。

As they journeyed towards the Śākya kingdom, night fell when they were about forty *li* from the Śākyan city.¹² Therefore, they halted there and stayed overnight. [Meanwhile], the Śākyans, having learned that the King of Śrāvastī had mobilized his four military divisions with the intent to invade their kingdom and was merely tens of *li* away, grew fearful of an imminent [attack possibly] the next day. In response, they sent a swift messenger on horseback to where the Buddha was, seeking [his counsel]: “We request the Buddha to guide us in formulating an effective strategy.”¹³ The Buddha immediately advised the Śākyans, “Secure the city gates tightly. [Then,] the King will ultimately fail in his conquest. [Be warned, if] you open the gates

¹² 到諸釋國: In this instance, the verb ‘到’ does not imply ‘arrival’ but rather ‘the direction of the journey.’ Therefore, I have translated it as ‘journey towards.’ This specific use of ‘到’ is exemplified in the poem, Ancient Long Ballad 古長歌行 from the Han dynasty’s *Yuefu* 樂府 (Music Bureau [Collection]). This collection is, in turn, included in the *Art and Literature Collection* 藝文類聚, compiled in the seventh century during the Tang dynasty. The poem contains the line “百川東到海, 何時復西歸?”, which translates as “Hundreds of rivers flow east to the sea; when will they ever return westward?” This reference highlights the usage of ‘到’ to indicate direction rather than finality of movement. (藝文類聚: 樂府 古長歌行).

¹³ 輕足: This term literally translates to ‘light-footed’ or ‘quick-footed,’ referring to someone who is exceptionally fast in their actions. In the context of this text, it aptly describes ‘a swift messenger.’

to King Virūḍhaka, he will surely massacre the Śākyaans without hesitation.”¹⁴ Upon receiving the Buddha’s guidance, the horseman respectfully bowed to the Buddha, swiftly mounted his horse, and rode back.

是時賢者摩訶目犍連。在佛後住。便白佛言。明慧莫以諸釋爲憂。我今欲舉一釋國移置異天地間。若以鐵籠籠之。悉一天下共者。當奈之何。佛即告摩訶目犍連言。耐能爾當奈其罪何。目犍連言。但說有形事。無奈無形罪何。佛爾時說偈言

At that time, the Venerable Mahā-Maudgalyāyana was standing behind the Buddha. He promptly addressed the Buddha, saying, “O, [Sage of] Profound Wisdom, do not be concerned for the Śākyaans. I will lift the entire Śākya kingdom and place it in a concealed [realm] between heaven and earth.¹⁵ Were I to encase it in an iron fortress, what could the rest of the world possibly do to [harm] it?”¹⁶ The Buddha responded to Mahā-Maudgalyāyana, “Even if you managed such a feat, how would you address their sins?” Maudgalyāyana replied, “I speak of protecting the tangible. How can one guard against the intangible sins?” In response to this, the Buddha spoke a verse:

¹⁴ 開門內者 惟樓勒王 即殺諸釋不疑: The character ‘者’ can function as a connector, positioned at the end of the first clause establishing various relationships between clauses. Here, it links ‘開門內者’ (If you open the gate and let [him] in) with ‘惟樓勒王 即殺諸釋不疑’ (then King Virūḍhaka will undoubtedly massacre the Śākyaans) with a conditional relationship. A similar use of ‘者’ for indicating a causal relationship is seen in the *Intrigues of the Warring States* 戰國策 (Chapter 2, Section 1): “吾妻之美我者, 私我也; 妾之美我者, 畏我也; 客之美我者, 欲有求於我也,” which means “My wife praises me out of love for me; my concubine, out of fear; and my guest, out of desire for something from me.” (士禮居叢書 本 戰國策: 鄒忌脩八尺有餘, p. 53).

¹⁵ 置異天地間: In this context, ‘異’ signifies ‘something unusual’ or ‘extraordinary.’ Since it describes a location, I have translated it as ‘a concealed realm,’ implying a hidden or extraordinary space between heaven and earth.

¹⁶ 以鐵籠籠之: Here, the phrase uses ‘籠’ twice, first as a noun and then as a verb. I have interpreted the first ‘籠’ to mean ‘fortress’ or ‘enclosure,’ and the second ‘籠’ as ‘to encase.’ Thus, it translates to ‘to encase (籠) it (之) in (以) an iron (鐵) fortress (籠).’

16.1 作善惡終無腐 從福樂在冥苦

善惡栽向日出 久遠來身受止

Good and evil deeds never perish,

Leading to the bliss of good fortune or the realms of postmortem anguish.

Virtues and vices planted in the past shall be made manifest,

[Ensuring] personal accountability [even] in the distant future, [only then] ceasing.¹⁷

舍衛國王。即摩飾鬥具。俱便前當攻釋城。諸釋悉共興四種兵象兵馬兵車兵步兵。亦出城
欲拒扞惟樓勒王。諸釋亦復摩飾兵。當與舍衛國王及兵共鬥。尚未相見。諸釋便引弓。以

¹⁷ **Y16.1:** There is a discrepancy in verse numbering between my translation and Bapat's. Bapat does not count this verse in his numbering, resulting in a consistent difference of one in all subsequent verses. For instance, what I refer to as Y16.10 corresponds to Bapat's verse 9 in the 16th *sūtra*.

Y16.1a: The term '無腐' literally means 'without decay,' symbolizing the enduring nature of karmic actions, which inevitably come to fruition.

Y16.1c: Bapat translates '善惡栽向日出' as "The good (善) or evil (惡) Karma (栽) that one did (出?) in days of old (向日).". This translation considers '栽' (to plant) as a metaphor for 'Karma.' This approach seems to overlook '出' (to emerge or manifest), or possibly misinterpreting it as 'to do.'

善惡栽 = 善惡裁 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The original character '栽,' meaning 'to plant,' is replaced with '裁,' which translates to 'to tailor,' in the variant phrases. This substitution introduces a nuanced analogy for conceptualizing 'karma.' Whereas 'to plant' directly links to the causative nature of karmic actions, suggesting growth and fruition over time, 'to tailor' presents '善惡' (good and evil) in terms of deliberate crafting or shaping by individuals. This metaphor shift implies that actions, whether good or bad, are meticulously fashioned by one's decisions, akin to cutting and sewing fabric. Thus, I would translate the variant line '善惡栽向日出' as "Virtues and vices crafted in the past shall manifest," emphasizing the sense of intentional personal agency in shaping one's karma, much like a tailor with fabric.

Y16.1d: The phrase '久遠來身受止' conveys the inevitability of facing the outcomes of one's actions, emphasizing that the effects of deeds will be endured until they have been wholly encountered and subsequently resolved.

利刃箭射斷車。當應亦射斷車輓。亦射斷車轂。亦截車軸。射斷駝。亦射斷人身。珠寶無所傷害。

The King of Śrāvastī promptly readied his combat gear, and [his troops] then [moved] forward, about to attack the Śākya fortress.¹⁸ The Śākyans, [in response], mobilized their four divisions of the army—elephants, cavalry, chariots, and infantry—and came out of the fortress, ready to confront King Virūdhaka. The Śākyans also prepared for combat and were poised to engage in battle against the King of Śrāvastī and his forces. However, before they could confront each other, the Śākyans drew their bows and with sharp-bladed arrows, they [skillfully] cut through the chariots, [precisely] severing the yokes, hubs, and axles.¹⁹ They even shot through the manes of horses and the jewel-encrusted adornments on the bodies of [the enemy soldiers, causing damage] without inflicting harm on [any living beings].²⁰

¹⁸ 摩飾鬥具: The phrase ‘摩飾’ combines ‘摩’ (to rub or polish) and ‘飾’ (to adorn or equip), which in this context translates to ‘preparing’ or ‘readying.’ Thus, ‘摩飾鬥具’ can be interpreted as ‘readying the combat gear’ or ‘preparing the weaponry.’

俱便前當攻釋城: This phrase can directly translate to ‘altogether, (俱) [his troops] were then (便) moving forward (前), about to (當) attack (攻) the Śākya (釋) fortress (城).’

¹⁹ 以利刃箭射斷車 當應亦射斷車輓 亦射斷車轂 亦截車軸: This series of phrases refers to the specific ways the Śākyans’ arrows damaged the chariots. The verb ‘射斷’ (to shoot and break) is used three times to emphasize the thoroughness of the destruction, targeting different parts of the chariots (yokes, hubs, axles). ‘截’ (to sever or cut off) further highlights the precision of their strikes. To make the English translation fluid, ‘射斷’ is translated only once to summarize the overall destruction, while ‘截’ is used to underscore the targeted damage caused by the arrows.

當應亦: This combines ‘當應’ (naturally or as expected) and ‘亦’ (‘also’, or emphatic particle ‘indeed’). It implies an inevitable or expected action by the Śākyans, focusing only on inanimate targets. An illustrative example of this phrase is found in *the Commentary on the Vimalakīrti [Sūtra]* 維摩義記 (T1776.38.466a04): “此是誰聲? 當應亦是維摩所發,” which translates to “Whose voice was this? It was, as expected, indeed produced by Vimalakīrti.” Here, ‘維摩’ with its reconstructed Eastern Han pronunciation /jwima/ is an abbreviated transcription of the Indic name ‘Vimalakīrti.’ This commentary, attributed to Huiyuan 慧遠 (fl. 523–592) during the Sui Dynasty 隋, demonstrates the idiomatic use of ‘當應亦’ in classical Buddhist texts.

²⁰ 射斷駝 亦射斷人身. 珠寶無所傷害: The current punctuation in the Taishō edition might be misleading, as ‘射斷人身’ seems to contradict the Śākyans’ adherence to precepts against harming living beings. A more coherent interpretation would be to adjust the punctuation as ‘射斷駝 / 亦射斷人身珠寶 / 無所傷害.’ In this revised parsing, the phrase translates to ‘they [skillfully] shot through the horse manes and also the jewel-encrusted

舍衛國王。大恐怖。顧問左右。汝曹寧知諸釋已出城迎鬥死。我曹終不得其勝不如早還。

傍臣即白王言。我曹先曰聞諸釋皆持五戒。盡形壽不犯。生至使當死。不敢有所傷害。有所傷害。爲犯戒。但前自可得其勝。王即引兵。而前突釋兵陣。諸釋見王前甚進。便入城閉門。

Stricken with immense fear, the King of Śrāvastī turned to his attendants nearby and inquired whether the Śākyaans had already emerged from the fortress prepared to fight to the death, doubting their own chances of victory and considering an early withdrawal. [One of his] nearby ministers then reassured the King, “We have previously heard that the Śākyaans faithfully observe the five precepts, never violating them throughout their entire lives, even in the face of death.²¹ They would not dare to harm us, as doing so would violate their precepts. Just press forward, and victory will be ours.” [Encouraged by these words,] the King led his forces in an assault against the Śākyaan formation. Confronted with the King’s aggressive advance, the Śākyaans quickly retreated into the fortress and shut the gates.

adornments on human bodies, ensuring no harm came to living beings.’ This interpretation aligns better with the context, emphasizing the Śākyaans’ precision in avoiding injury to life while engaging in combat.

The character ‘駢,’ composed of ‘馬’ (horse) and ‘毛’ (hair), primarily signifies ‘horse manes.’ While Bapat interprets ‘駢’ as ‘the fan of the chariot that protects one from dust,’ a possible derivative meaning within the context of ancient Chinese charioteering, I suggest ‘horse manes’ as a more precise interpretation. This choice closely aligns with the narrative’s progression from detailing chariot components to demonstrating the Śākyaans’ archery precision—specifically, their careful aim at inanimate aspects of sentient beings, such as horse manes and possibly ornaments or attire, without causing harm. This reading more accurately captures the scene’s essence, highlighting the Śākyaans’ skill and their ethical conduct.

²¹ 先曰聞 = 先日聞 (S, Y, M): The original phrase ‘先曰聞,’ which translates as ‘formerly (先) heard (聞) sayings (曰),’ is contrasted with the variant ‘先日聞,’ which simplifies to ‘formerly (先日) heard (聞).’ The term ‘先日’ is a common expression meaning ‘the other day’ or ‘previously,’ denoting a past reference point. In this context, the variance reflects a subtle shift from a specific recounting of sayings to a general reference to past hearing.

爾時舍衛王。以遣人語諸釋。舅氏與我有何仇怨。而不開門。小欲有所借入即出城不久留。諸釋中信佛所言。本行經法無疑向道。便言不須開門。釋中未淨心歸佛歸法歸比丘僧。無諦有疑。便以爲可開門。復共言。我人不得爾恐是中有外對。我曹悉坐耆老行籌。不受籌者爲當不欲內王。受籌者爲欲內王。多者我又當隨適行。籌悉受不受者少耳。衆人言。當開門內王。諸釋便開門內惟樓勒王。適入迦維羅衛城便生取諸釋當將出城殺之。

At that time, the King of Śrāvastī sent a messenger to the Śākyaans with this message: “[My maternal] uncles, what old grievances do you hold against me that prevent you from opening the gates? My request is minor. If [you allow me] entry, I [promise] not to linger long within the fortress.”²² Among the Śākyaans, some were devout followers of the Buddha's teachings. Firm in their practice of the teachings of the *sūtras*, unwavering in their path, they insisted that the gates should remain shut.²³ [However,] others in the Śākyaan community were not yet fully devoted with pure mind to the Buddha, the Dharma, and the *Bhikṣusaṃgha*.²⁴ With no [insight into] the

²² 借入即出城不久留: This phrase employs a conditional structure ‘借...即...’ (if...then...), which translates to “If [I am] allowed in, then [I will] not stay long in the fortress.” To enhance readability while preserving the original meaning, I have streamlined the translation by omitting the explicit mention of ‘departing’ (出), as it is implied in the context of not staying long.

²³ 本行經法: The term ‘本行’ typically refers to ‘past actions’ or ‘longstanding practices,’ as seen in the title ‘佛說菩薩本行經’ (Discourse on the Bodhisattva’s Past Actions Spoken by the Buddha; T155). In the phrase ‘本行經法,’ ‘本行’ carries this connotation, suggesting a deep and enduring engagement with the Buddhist path, possibly extending across past lives. Therefore, this phrase can be interpreted as indicating that some Śākyaans had been diligently practicing the teachings of Buddhism for a significant period. With this understanding, I have rendered ‘本行經法’ as ‘firm in their practice of the teachings of the *sūtras*,’ to convey the sense of long-term, committed practice in the Buddhist tradition.

²⁴ 釋中未淨心歸佛歸法歸比丘僧 無諦有疑: Bapat translates these phrases as “Among the Śākyaans were others who, with no pure mind, took refuge in the Buddha, took refuge in the Law, took refuge in the Order of the Bhikṣus, who did not recognise the Truths and had doubt.” This translation potentially misinterprets the scope of ‘未’ (not yet). The use of ‘未’ suggests that the entire action of taking refuge has not yet occurred with a pure mind, rather than indicating they took refuge but without a pure mind. The correct interpretation should convey that they have not yet taken refuge in the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Sangha with a pure mind, coupled with their lack of understanding of the Truths and their doubts. This clarifies that their spiritual journey and commitment are still inchoate, marked by uncertainties and a lack of deep conviction.

truth and harboring doubts, they believed it permissible to open the gates. After much debate, they decided: “Given the unavoidable risks posed by the external threats, let us all [request] our elders to conduct a vote.²⁵ Those who refuse the counting-stick are against admitting the King, while those who accept it are in favor.²⁶ We will proceed according to the majority’s decision.” The majority accepted the counting-sticks, with only a few refusing. Consequently, the consensus was to open the gates for the King. [Thus,] the Śākyans opened the gates, admitting King Virūḍhaka. Upon his entry into Kapilavastu, he immediately captured all the Śākyans alive, intending to lead them out of the fortress for execution.

爾時釋摩男白舍衛王。願天子與我小願。王言。將軍欲何願。我願今沒是池中頃。以其時令諸釋得出城走。諸大臣白言。王當與釋摩男願令在水中能幾頃。王即與其所願。釋摩男

²⁵ Bapat translates ‘我人不得爾恐是有外對’ as “We (我人) cannot (不) afford (不得爾?) to [open the door], for fear (恐) that there are among (中) us (是) some (有) who are partisans (對?) of our enemies (外?).” This translation seems to misinterpret key elements. Firstly, ‘不得爾’ suggests ‘inevitability’ rather than ‘affordability,’ indicating a situation with no alternatives rather than a question of choice. Moreover, ‘外對,’ interpreted by Bapat as ‘partisans of our enemies,’ may stretch the meaning of ‘對’ beyond its primary sense of ‘opposing’ or ‘facing.’ Hence, ‘external opponents’ is a more fitting translation, directly referring to King Virūḍhaka’s forces rather than suggesting internal collusion with enemies. Therefore, a translation that more accurately reflects the original sentiment would be, “We (我人) inevitably (不得爾) fear (恐) being amidst this (是中) presence (有) of external (外) threats (對).” This interpretation aligns with the narrative’s focus on collective apprehension concerning King Virūḍhaka’s military threat, rather than an internal breach of loyalty. This approach concisely conveys the overarching theme of imminent danger from external forces. Subsequently, I have refined the context as “Given the unavoidable risks posed by the external threats,” to encapsulate the situation’s gravity succinctly.

坐耆老: Bapat’s interpretation, ‘... sit (坐) and get the elders (耆老)...’ slightly misconstrues the term’s compact structure. The phrase more straightforwardly refers to ‘those occupying the positions of elders.’ Thus, I translate it succinctly as ‘the elders,’ emphasizing their role rather than their physical posture or the action of gathering them.

行籌: Literally translating to ‘counting sticks,’ this term was traditionally used in decision-making processes. Therefore, I have translated it as ‘to conduct a vote,’ which accurately conveys the action of making a collective decision in this scenario.

²⁶ 欲內王: This phrase directly translates to ‘desiring to admit the King.’ Its repetition in the text emphasizes the consideration of whether to allow the King entry. To maintain the narrative flow in English, I have chosen to omit the second occurrence, ensuring the translation remains concise without losing the essence of the repeated deliberation.

即沒池中。以髮繞樹根而死。王怪在水甚久。便令使者按視。釋摩男在水中何等作。如王言。往按視之。見釋摩男在水底死。便還白王。天子。寧知釋摩男持髮繞樹根而死。王即絞城中餘釋。復問。所生得釋悉死未。臣白言。悉已象蹈殺之。王便從處還國。

At that time, the Śākya Mahānāma [approached] the King of Śrāvastī and requested, “Your Majesty, please grant me a small favor.”²⁷ The King inquired, “General, what is it that you wish for?”²⁸ [Mahānāma replied,] “Now, I wish to submerge myself in this pond for a moment so that during that time, the Śākyans may be allowed to flee the city.” His vassals suggested [to the King], “Your Majesty, why not grant Mahānāma’s wish? How long can he possibly remain underwater?” The King [agreed] and granted his wish. The Śākya Mahānāma then dove into the pond, binding his hair to a tree root, and drowned himself. The King, suspicious of the extended submersion, sent an envoy to investigate what the Śākya Mahānāma was doing underwater. As instructed by the King, they commenced their investigation and found Mahānāma dead, [anchored] to the bottom. [The envoy] reported back, “Your Majesty, who could have foreseen that Mahānāma would bind his hair to a tree root and take his own life?”²⁹ Following this, the

²⁷ 釋摩男 This name is translated as ‘the Śākya Mahānāma,’ with ‘釋’ representing the clan name ‘Śākya’ and ‘摩男’ a transcription of ‘Mahānāma.’ The reconstructed Eastern Han pronunciation of ‘摩男’ is /Manam/, akin to ‘Mahānāma.’ According to Pāli sources (Dhammapada Aṭṭhakathā, I.345f; Jātaka I.133 & IV.145f), he was King Virūḍhaka’s father-in-law and fathered a daughter with a slave-girl named Nāgamundā. This daughter was sent to the Kosala Kingdom to marry, an event that sowed the seeds for the tragic end of the Śākyans. See *Pāli Proper Names* under ‘Mahānāma.’

天子: This term, traditionally used in Chinese to denote ‘the Son of Heaven’ (emperor), is contextually adapted to ‘Your Majesty’ to better align with the ancient Indic context of the narrative.

²⁸ 將軍: The term directly translates to ‘military general.’ According to the aforementioned Pāli sources, Mahānāma was a Śākya king, and it is unclear why he was referred to as ‘general.’ I conjecture that ‘將軍’ may not necessarily denote a military rank in this context. Instead, it could be figuratively translated as ‘Brave Man’ to convey respect for his courage. However, in my translation, I have retained the literal meaning of this term.

²⁹ 天子 寧知釋摩男持髮繞樹根而死: Bapat translates this phrase as “My lord (Deva-putra) may know that Śākyas Mahānāma has tied his hair around the root of a tree and dead.” However, this translation overlooks the interrogative nuance introduced by ‘寧,’ which is critical for conveying the rhetorical question inherent in the original text. Consequently, a more accurate rendering of this phrase would be, “Your Majesty, who could have

King ordered the hanging execution of the remaining Śākyans within the city. He further asked whether all the captured Śākyans had been executed, to which a minister replied, “They have all been trampled to death by elephants.”³⁰ Only after these events did the King [depart] and return to his own kingdom.

佛以晡時悉告諸比丘。俱到逝心須加利講堂所。諸比丘悉言諾。佛即與眾比丘俱。到逝心講堂。道經過諸釋死處。釋中尚有能語者。遙見佛舉聲稱冤佛聞諸釋悲哀甚痛。佛即謂比丘。愚癡人惟樓勒所作罪不小。佛便至諸釋地中。化出自然無數床。佛及比丘悉坐。

As evening approached, the Buddha instructed all the *bhikṣus* to proceed to the lecture hall of the brahmin Xujiali.³¹ The *bhikṣus* all agreed. Accompanied by the community of *bhikṣus*, the

foreseen that Mahānāma would bind his hair to a tree root and take his own life?” This translation not only preserves the rhetorical nature of the question but also emphasizes the unexpected and tragic nature of Mahānāma’s act.

³⁰ The narrative describes two forms of execution: ‘絞’ (hanging) and ‘象蹈殺’ (death by elephant trampling). It is interpreted that the King initially orders the hanging of the Śākyans. Upon inquiring about survivors, he is informed that any remaining Śākyans were trampled to death by elephants.

悉死未 = 悉死末 (P, Q1, N): ‘未’ indicates a state of non-completion, meaning ‘not yet,’ whereas ‘末’ suggests a conclusion or finality, equivalent to ‘finally.’ In the context of the king’s inquiry, ‘悉死未’ asks about the current state of affairs, questioning ‘[whether] all have not yet died?’ On the other hand, ‘悉死末’ implies a query into the final outcome, asking ‘[whether] all have finally died?’ The subtle difference between the two terms shifts the emphasis from an ongoing process (未) to its completion (末).

悉已象蹈殺之 (T) = 悉已象蹈煞之 (K, Z) = 悉已象踏殺之 (P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The phrase ‘悉已象蹈殺之’ translates to ‘all have been trampled to death by the elephant.’ The character ‘蹈’ found in the Konjaku Mojikyō (今昔文字鏡) appears to be a variant of ‘蹈,’ with a similar meaning of ‘trample.’ Similarly, ‘踏’ is another homograph of ‘蹈,’ carrying the same connotation. ‘煞’ is a synonym for ‘殺’ and is used here as a verb meaning ‘to kill.’ Each variant phrase, regardless of the specific characters used, conveys the message that the elephant has lethally trampled all involved.

³¹ 晡時: This term denotes a particular time in ancient China, traditionally around 3 to 5 PM, signifying the day’s work drawing to a close. It is often considered the final period or watch of the day. In the context of this translation, ‘以晡時’ is aptly rendered as ‘as evening approached,’ aligning with the narrative’s setting and the natural conclusion of daytime activities. Bapat’s interpretation of ‘at the meal-time’ inaccurately suggests a time earlier in the day, typically around noon, which does not align with the historical understanding of 晡時.

逝心須加利: The term ‘逝心’ is an early Chinese translation of the term ‘*brāhmaṇa*’ (Brahmin). This translation appears to be based on an exegetical etymology rather than phonological developments from Indic languages. In this translation, ‘逝’ (depart from [evil]) represents ‘*brah-*’ and is associated with ‘*bāheti*’ (to keep away from [evil]), while ‘心’ (mind) corresponds to ‘*-maṇa*’ linked to ‘*manas*’ (mind). These associations reflect interpretations found in the Pāli canon, where ‘*brāhmaṇa*’ is related to moral purity and mental discipline. For a

Buddha set out for the brahmin's hall. On their path, they passed by the place where the Śākyaans had perished.³² [A handful of] Śākyaans, still able to speak, caught sight of the Buddha from a distance and called out to him, voicing their grievances.³³ The Buddha listened to the Śākyaans' sorrowful, pitiful, and agonizing [laments]. He said to the *bhikṣus*, "Indeed, Virūḍhaka is foolish! The sin he has committed is not minor." At the site where the Śākyaans lay, the Buddha miraculously caused numerous natural stools to appear. The Buddha and the *bhikṣus* then took their seats upon them.

佛爲諸釋。廣說經法竟謂比丘言。汝曹意何趣。屠者以是作是業。以是生活。從是因緣。寧可得樂乘聖象神馬七寶車不。比丘對曰。終不得。佛言善哉。意亦如是。不見不聞屠以是業自立。可得富樂。何以故。屠者無慈心哀意。觀占諸獸故。

After eloquently expounding on the teachings of the *sūtras* for the Śākyaans, the Buddha addressed the *bhikṣus*: "What do you think?³⁴ [Suppose] a butcher makes their living by means

detailed explanation, please consult the entry '逝心' in the Digital Dictionary of Buddhism (DDB), referenced from the work of Jan Nattier. "DDB. (n.d.). Retrieved December 15, 2023, from [http://www.buddhism-dict.net/cgi-bin/xpr-ddb.pl?q=%E9%80%9D%E5%BF%83]."

³² 道經過 = 道徑過 (S, Y / J, Q2): The term '經' commonly denotes 'threads' or refers to 'canonical texts' but also serves as a verb meaning 'to pass through' or 'to go by,' which is the interpretation applied in this context. '徑,' while typically meaning 'shortcut' or 'diameter,' similarly functions as a verb meaning 'to go directly' or 'to travel,' making '道徑過' convey a sense almost identical to '道經過.' Both phrases effectively describe the action of traversing or passing along a path.

³³ 稱冤 = 稱怨 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The character '冤' typically signifies 'injustice' or 'grievance,' while '怨' usually means 'resentment' or 'complaint.' Despite their slightly different connotations, both characters in this context represent a sense of grievance or bitterness. Therefore, in both phrases, '稱' translates as 'to call upon' or 'to invoke,' and '冤/怨' refers to the grievances or bitterness being directed towards. Hence, the phrases can be understood as 'to invoke [the Buddha] due to their grievances,' reflecting an appeal to higher authority in the face of perceived injustices or resentments.

³⁴ 汝曹意何趣: This phrase is a unique way of asking for an opinion, rare in both Chinese Buddhist translations and classical Chinese literature. It can translate directly as 'what (何) opinion (趣) do you (汝曹) have in mind (意)?' To ensure fluidity and naturalness in English, I have translated it as 'what do you think?' This captures the essence of the question while being easily understandable to an English-speaking audience.

of their specialty.³⁵ Given these conditions, would they ever enjoy [the luxury of] riding a sacred elephant, a divine horse, or a chariot adorned with the seven jewels?”³⁶ The *bhikṣus* replied, “No, they cannot.” The Buddha agreed: “Well answered! I think so too. I have never seen or heard of a butcher, who, from such a vocation, could gain wealth and pleasure. Why is this? It is because the butcher, lacking compassion and mercy, exploits those animals and takes their lives.”³⁷

佛復言。比丘。汝曹意何趣漁獵者及屠牛者。以是故作以是業。以是自生活。寧得乘神象聖馬寶車恣意富樂不。比丘對曰。終不得。佛言善哉。我亦不聞不見漁獵屠牛。是業自活。可致富樂。何以故。子曹遠哀無慈觀占獸以是遠樂奈何道。此愚癡人。乃於向道得果者傷害之。乃知是子亦遠善當生見其從是七日當爲水所漂。比丘以故當慈心莫學傷害心至見燒枉。亦莫生害意。

³⁵ 以是作是業 以是生活: This phrase can be interpreted as ‘by this means (以是), one performs their tasks (作是業); by this means (以是), they earn their livelihood (生活).’ For clarity and flow in English, it can be condensed to ‘to earn one’s livelihood through their specialty.’

生活 = 自生活 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The inclusion of ‘自’ (on one’s own) before ‘生活’ (to make one’s living) emphasizes autonomy or self-sufficiency in earning a living.

³⁶ 從是因緣 寧可...: This phrase translates to “given this causal relationship (從是因緣), is it really feasible (寧可)...?” It poses a question about the plausibility or acceptability of something when considering the given cause-and-effect circumstances.

³⁷ 觀占諸獸故: This phrase combines ‘觀’ (to observe/regard) with ‘占’ (to divine/take), reflecting the butcher’s perspective and behavior toward animals. It suggests that because of their profession, they observe (觀) animals (諸獸) with the intent to take their lives (占), embodying the original text’s indication of a lack of compassion inherent in such trades.

觀占 = 觀瞻 (M / J, Q2): In this variant, ‘瞻,’ which typically means ‘to gaze upon or look at,’ replaces ‘占.’ The change from ‘占’ to ‘瞻’ shifts the focus from the action of taking life to the act of observation. Bapat’s translation reflects this shift, rendering ‘觀瞻諸獸故’ as ‘Because [he]... looks at the beasts,’ which captures the visual attention but not the consequential action implied in ‘占.’ It is worth noting, however, that in the context of butchery, ‘觀瞻’ would still imply a utilitarian observation, a looking upon with the intent to use or exploit, rather than a neutral or benign act of seeing.

The Buddha further asked: “Bhikṣus! What do you think? Suppose there is a fisherman, a hunter, or a cow-butcher, who makes their living by means of their specialty.³⁸ Can they ever revel in the wealth and pleasure of riding a sacred elephant, a divine horse, or a chariot adorned with the seven jewels?” The bhikṣus replied, “No, they cannot.” The Buddha affirmed: “Well answered! I also have never heard or seen a fisherman, a hunter, or a cow-butcher who, living on their vocation, could gain wealth and pleasure. Why is this? They, lacking compassion and mercy, exploit those animals and take their lives.³⁹ In this way, they distance themselves from the pleasure. What then of someone as foolish [as Virūḍhaka], who has inflicted harm upon those following the path or those who achieved its fruits?⁴⁰ Consequently, you will see that this man, indeed, distances himself from the good and wealth [and that this man] will be reborn to find himself being tossed about by flood in seven days from his [birth].⁴¹ Oh, Bhikṣus, on that

³⁸ 漁獵者 = 𩺰獵者 (S, Y, M): Within the variant versions, the character ‘𩺰’ is notably rare and is absent from the *Dictionary of Chinese Variants provided by the Department of Education* (教育部異體字字典) as well as the *Konjaku Mojikyō* (今昔文字鏡). However, by analyzing its component ‘支’—often rendered as ‘攴’—I located the character ‘𩺰’ related to ‘fishing’ in these specialized lexicons of rare Chinese characters. Consequently, in this context, ‘𩺰’ and ‘漁’ are interpreted to have the same meaning, both signifying ‘fishing’ or ‘fishery.’ This unique character is documented in the Taishō edition, from where it has been replication for this annotation.

³⁹ 子曹 = 子遭 (K, Z): The term ‘曹’ in ‘子曹’ serves to pluralize the preceding noun, implying a collective ‘they,’ which, in this context, refers to fishermen or hunters. Conversely, ‘遭’ in ‘子遭’ is commonly used as a verb meaning ‘to encounter,’ often with negative connotations. Therefore, ‘子曹’ is interpreted as ‘they,’ while ‘子遭’ is translated as ‘they encounter [the act of killing animals],’ highlighting the adverse circumstances they face.

⁴⁰ 子曹遠哀無慈觀占獸以是遠樂奈何道。此愚癡人: The sentence structure in the Taishō edition may be wrongly parsed, particularly concerning the phrase ‘奈何道.’ This phrase appears to start a question that should be connected with ‘此愚癡人,’ leading to a more logical segmentation: ‘子曹遠哀無慈觀占獸以是遠樂。奈何道此愚癡人...’ This can be directly translated as, “What (奈何) can we say (道) about such (此) a foolish (愚癡) person (人)...?” This revised parsing and translation create a smoother transition from discussing professions that kill animals to addressing King Virūḍhaka, enhancing the overall coherence of the narrative.

⁴¹ 當生見其從是七日當為水所漂: Bapat translates this phrase as “You will (當) see (見) him (其), on the seventh (七) day (日) from (從) today (是), being (為...所) washed away (漂) alive (生?) by water-[flood] (水).” However, this translation overlooks its own syntax, repositioning the second character ‘生’ to the last part of the phrase ‘to be drowned alive.’ ‘生’ should be interpreted within the phrase ‘當生見其,’ which, in this context, denotes ‘will be reborn and find himself [in a situation].’ The following phrase ‘從是七日’ implies ‘seven days from this (birth),’ and ‘當為水所漂’ signifies ‘he will be swept away by water.’ Thus, it is incorrect to take ‘生’ from ‘當

account, you must have compassionate heart. Do not harbor intentions to harm, even when faced with being burnt or wronged. Never entertain thoughts of harming living creatures.”

佛以是本以是因緣以是義生令弟子悉解爲曹卷語檢爲後世作明使我經道久住世間。佛爾時說是義足經

In light of this origin, these causal conditions, and the truths revealed [through this incident], the Buddha ensured that all his disciples understood [this sutra]. He articulated its wordings for the scribes, and elucidated their meanings for future generations, thus ensuring that both this *sūtra* and the Buddha’s path would long survive in the world.⁴² In that moment, the Buddha expounded this *Yizujing*.

16.2 從無哀致恐怖 人世世從點聽

今欲說義可傷 我所從捨畏怖

Lack of compassion leads to fear.

生見其’ and render it with ‘當爲水所漂.’ By this relocation of ‘生,’ Bapat interprets the timing as an event seven days from the current moment, wherein the King is envisioned being swept away by water. The entire phrase is a prognostication about the King’s next life rather than an event in the near future. An apt translation would be: “Upon rebirth, he will find himself being washed away by water on the seventh day after his birth,” highlighting the prophecy’s emphasis on a karmic repercussion in a subsequent existence. It is crucial to note that the historical account of King Virūḍhaka does not align with this predicted outcome within seven days from the spoken prophecy, suggesting the importance of interpreting ‘生’ as referring to rebirth.

⁴² This passage serves as the conclusion of the narrative, and the lengthy string of characters can be appropriately parsed as ‘佛 / 以是本 / 以是因緣 / 以是義生 / 令弟子悉解 / 爲曹卷語檢 / 爲後世作明 / 使我經道久住世間.’ The phrase ‘爲曹卷語檢’ introduces an editorial element, translating to ‘for (爲) those (曹) who prepare scrolls (卷), I articulate (檢) wordings (語),’ indicating instructions for transcription. The term ‘我經道’ (my *sūtra* and Path) presents a shift in perspective. While the passage predominantly employs the narrator’s voice, the use of ‘我’ (I, my) here suggests the Buddha’s voice momentarily coming to the forefront. This blending of voices subtly indicates the Buddha’s direct involvement in the preservation and transmission of his teachings.

Through the ages, people [should] listen to the wise.

Now, I intend to discourse on [people's] vulnerability to [such] distress

[And of] the path I followed to relinquish fear.⁴³

Sn935 *Attadaṇḍā bhayaṃ jātaṃ*

Janam passatha medhakaṃ

Samvegaṃ kittayissāmi

Yathā samvijitaṃ mayā

Fear arises from using violence.

Behold the people engaged in conflict.

I will speak of [people's] agitation,

As I have personally witnessed it.⁴⁴

⁴³ **Y16.2b**, 人世世 = 人無世 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The term ‘無世,’ as an alternative to ‘世世’ (from generation to generation), possibly connotes a state ‘beyond the worldly.’ This interpretation aligns with the use of ‘無世’ in various contexts within the Chinese Buddhist Canon, such as ‘無世間,’ ‘無世俗,’ and ‘無世事,’ all of which suggest transcendence beyond worldly matters. Consequently, the variant line ‘人無世從點聽’ may be interpreted as: “Those [aspiring to] transcend the worldly realm should heed the wise’s [instructions].”

Y16.2c: Bapat translates ‘今欲說義可傷’ as “I’ll (欲) tell (說) you now (今) how I felt distressed (傷).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. However, this translation does not fully account for ‘義’ (truths/principles) and oversimplifies ‘可傷’ to reflect the potential for distress. The phrase ‘義可傷’ may translate to ‘truths (義) about susceptibility (可) to anxiety (傷),’ where ‘可’ denotes a sense of potentiality or vulnerability, and ‘傷’ refers to emotional distress or pain. This phrase seems to be about the truth about the universal human experience, rather than an individual narrative. Bapat’s approach may stem from his forced alignment of this line with one of several commentarial interpretations of its Pāli counterpart, ‘*saṃvegaṃ kittayissāmi*’ (I will speak of [my] concern), which can be also interpreted as ‘I will speak of [people’s] agitation.’ For further annotation of Sn935c, refer to the following footnote.

⁴⁴ The origin of the *Attadaṇḍasutta*, as elucidated in the *Paramatthajotikā II*, presents a contrast to the narratives in *Yizujing* 16 concerning King Virūḍhaka. The Pāli commentary attributes the *sutta*’s genesis to the conflict over water rights between the Sakyans and Koliyans. This historical context is distinct from the accounts of King Virūḍhaka’s massacre of the Śākyaans in the latter texts, highlighting a different set of circumstances leading to discord.

Sn935b: The term ‘*medhaka*’ is linguistically akin to ‘*medhaga*,’ paralleling the Sanskrit ‘*methana*’ (abusive speech). This etymological lineage suggests that ‘*medhaka*’ in this context signifies ‘strife’ or ‘conflict.’ Norman (2001: 381) discusses phonological transformations in ancient Indic languages, particularly noting the interchangeability of ‘*k/g*’ and ‘*th/dh*’ sounds, which supports this interpretation.

16.3 展轉苦皆世人 如乾水斷流魚

在苦生欲害意 代彼恐癡冥樂

All beings in the world [endure] unceasing cycles of suffering,

They are like fish in a dwindling stream, bereft of its inflow.

Living amidst such torment, they crave thoughts of harm.

On their behalf, I am concerned about such foolish and benighted cravings.⁴⁵

Sn935d: The term ‘*saṃvijita*’ in its past participle form presents etymological complexities, leading to multiple interpretations:

First, it can derive from ‘*saṃ + vijayati*’ (to conquer/subdue). This seems less applicable in the current context, as it diverges from the thematic focus on experiential understanding.

Next, it may stem from ‘*saṃ + √vid + ya*’ (√*vid*: to know; -*ya*:- a passive suffix). Supported by Norman’s translation, this interpretation suggests an alternation between ‘*saṃviditaṃ*’ and ‘*saṃvijitaṃ*,’ as seen in the *Sutta Nipāta* and its post-canonical commentary, *Paramatthajotikā II*. Norman translates ‘*saṃvijita*’ as ‘to be experienced.’ Jayawickrama follows a similar understanding, rendering it as ‘to be undergone.’ I have adopted this interpretation as ‘to be witnessed,’ modifying it to active voice for better readability.

And lastly, it can originate from ‘*saṃ + √vij + ya*’ (√*vij*: to tremble; -*ya*:- a passive suffix). Bhikkhu Bodhi (2017: 315) translates it as ‘to be stirred [by a sense of urgency],’ aligning with Fronsda’s (2016) interpretation ‘to be shaken.’ Though Fronsda’s rendering leans towards this etymology, he suggests both ‘to tremble’ (√*vij*) and ‘to feel’ (√*vid*) as his etymological understanding in his endnote (Chapter 15 endnote 3).

As I see it, ‘agitation’ or ‘mental unease,’ as shown in Bhikkhu Bodhi’s and Fronsda’s renderings, does not pertain to the Buddha’s mentality. The *Paramatthajotika II* seems to be aware of this issue and clarifies that ‘*saṃvijita*’ as ‘agitation’ in the Buddha’s context denotes a sense of urgency stirred by compassion. Moreover, it adds that this agitation was felt long time ago, when the Buddha, as a bodhisatta, was yet to be awakened (Bodhi, 2016: 1189), suggesting a compassionate urgency rather than personal agitation.

⁴⁵ **Y16.3a:** Bapat’s translation of ‘展轉苦’ as ‘throbbing with distress’ captures the sense of ongoing discomfort but misses the broader implication of ‘展轉,’ which suggests a continual unfolding in succession. The phrase more accurately conveys the concept of ‘unceasing cycles,’ aligning with the Buddhist understanding of suffering as a continuous, cyclical process. This interpretation highlights the relentless nature of suffering, suggesting that it unfolds or rolls out in continuous sequences throughout existence.

Y16.3d: The Chinese phrase ‘代彼恐癡冥樂’ presents two potential interpretations. My translation aligns with the one paralleled in the Pāli version Sn937d, emphasizing the Buddha’s compassion and concern for all beings trapped in suffering. It is rendered as “On their (彼) behalf (代), I am concerned (恐) about such foolish (癡) and benighted (冥) cravings (樂),” referring to people’s inclination towards quarrel and violence amidst their own sufferings, as outlined in the preceding lines.

An alternate reading interprets it as ‘replacing (代) those (彼) fears (恐) with foolish (癡) and benighted (冥) pleasures (樂),’ which implies resorting to conflict as an escape from individual suffering. Though this reading is syntactically sound, it introduces an unexpected twist on the theme of perversion.

癡冥樂 = 疲真樂(S, Y, M): Bapat seems to opt for the variant phrase and translates ‘代彼恐疲真樂’ as “Replacing (代) that (彼) fear (恐), with pleasure (樂) that was real (真) but depraved (疲).” [Parentheses added for

Sn936 *Phandamānaṃ pajam disvā*

Macche appodake yathā

Aññamaññehi vyāruddhe

Disvā maṃ bhayaṃ āvisi

Observing people tremble

Like fish in shallow waters,

Seeing [them] entangled in mutual hostility,

Fear gripped me.⁴⁶

16.4 一切世悉然燒 悉十方亂無安

自貢高不捨愛 不見故持癡意

The whole world [burns] as if engulfed in flames;

In every one of the ten directions, turmoil reigns devoid of peace.

analysis]. However, this rendering misinterprets ‘疲’ as denoting moral depravity rather than its typical connotations of physical or mental weariness. Moreover, the depiction of the pleasure as both ‘real’ (眞) but ‘depraved’ (misinterpretation of ‘疲’) contradicts the intended meaning; real or true happiness in Buddhist texts is aligned with spiritual fulfillment rather than depravity. The Buddhist concept of ‘眞樂’ (true happiness) is spiritual fulfillment rather than temporary or morally questionable pleasures. Therefore, a more accurate translation of ‘代彼恐疲眞樂’ could be “On their (彼) behalf (代), I am concerned (恐) that [such behaviors] might weaken (疲) [their enthusiasm for] true (眞) happiness (樂).” This interpretation aligns with Buddhist teachings that caution against mistaking transient, material pleasures for the true joy found on the path to Nirvāṇa, underscoring the risk that such pursuits might sap one's strength and detract from the pursuit of deeper, meaningful happiness.

⁴⁶ **Sn936cd**: In the original text, the entirety of line c serves as the object of the verb ‘disvā’ (seeing), which is found in line d. To improve the flow and coherence in English, I have repositioned ‘disvā’ to appear within line c. This adjustment ensures that the direct connection between the act of seeing and the observed events in line c is more immediately apparent in the English translation, thus enhancing its readability while remaining faithful to the original meaning.

[People] extol themselves, unwilling to relinquish sensuality.

Blind to [the truth], they persist in foolish notions.⁴⁷

Sn937 *Samantaṃ asaro loko*

Disā sabbā sameritā

Icchaṃ bhavanam attano

Nāddasāsiṃ anositaṃ

The world is completely without core.

Every direction is set adrift.

Wishing for my own [secure] haven,

I found no [spot remained] unoccupied.⁴⁸

16.5 莫作縛求冥苦 我悉觀意不樂

⁴⁷ **Y16.4:** In this verse, the metaphor of fire (燒) is employed, symbolizing lust and turmoil. This contrasts with its Pāli counterpart, Sn937, where the term ‘*sameritā*’ is interpreted, though not explicitly, as flood imagery, translated as ‘set adrift’ to evoke a sense of insecurity and aimlessness. Despite these differing metaphors, there is a notable parallel in the use of ‘悉十方’ (all the ten directions) in Y16.4b and ‘*disā sabbā*’ (all directions) in Sn937b, highlighting a shared thematic focus on the universality of the described conditions.

Y16.4c: Bapat translates ‘自貢高’ as “Wishing self-advancement,” may not fully capture the essence of the original terms. The phrase ‘自貢高’ does not explicitly include the concept of ‘wishing.’ Furthermore, ‘貢高’ more accurately translates to ‘arrogance’ or ‘self-exaltation’ rather than ‘advancement.’ This nuance is crucial, as the original phrase critiques the ego-driven arrogance that blinds individuals to the realities of suffering and the path to enlightenment. Therefore, a more precise translation would be “[People] extol themselves [in arrogance],” highlighting the critique of self-centered pride and the spiritual blindness it entails.

⁴⁸ **Sn937:** In the *Mahāniddesa*, the phrase ‘*bhavanam attano*’ (my own abode) is interpreted as a refuge amidst the chaos of ‘all directions set adrift.’ Expounding on line d, the commentary suggests an allegory where positive states of existence are invariably succeeded by negative ones, exemplified by youth being overtaken by old age and life by death. However, this interpretation seems to show a noticeable divergence from the original wording, particularly with the term ‘*anosita*’ (unoccupied; *na + osita*) in line d, which does not appear to be fully clarified within this context.

彼致苦痛見刺 以止見難可忍

Avoid being ensnared in the pursuit of darkness and suffering.

My observation of all [beings] brings no pleasure to my heart.

They end up in suffering, being pierced with pain,

Which is difficult to endure, even through trying to ignore it.⁴⁹

Sn938 *Osāne tv-eva vyāruddhe*

Disvā me aratī ahu—

Ath' ettha sallam addakkhiṃ

Duddasaṃ hadayanissitaṃ

Observing those in opposition until the very end,

⁴⁹ **Y16.5a:** Bapat translates ‘莫作縛求冥苦’ as “With extinction entangled, the darkness of suffering did they seek.” This translation may diverge from the straightforward meaning conveyed by the original phrase. In his analysis, Bapat sees ‘莫作’ as indicative of engaging in destructive actions, an interpretation influenced by viewing ‘作’ in a binary with constructive activities. However, ‘作’ broadly means ‘to make’ or ‘to do,’ without an inherent positive or negative bias. ‘莫,’ as a negation, functions here as a directive against action, making ‘莫作’ translate more accurately to ‘do not do.’ Hence, Bapat’s extension of ‘莫’ to imply destructiveness is misleading. The phrase ‘莫作縛’ is better understood as ‘do not become fettered,’ maintaining the original’s emphasis on avoiding self-imposed constraints that lead to suffering.

Y16.5bc: Bapat translates ‘我悉觀意不樂 彼致苦痛見刺’ as “When I saw all this, discontent my mind did assail, Which led on to suffering. A dart of grief I noticed—”. In an attempt to draw a parallel to the Pāli version, this translation does not capture the nuances of the original Chinese text accurately. Specifically, his interpretation of ‘苦’ and ‘痛’ in line c as the Buddha’s personal suffering and grief is problematic because those characters have negative connotations and are less likely to apply to the Buddha’s empathy or compassion. It also overlooks the pronoun ‘彼’ (that), which more likely refers to people in general, not the Buddha himself. Furthermore, ‘見’ seems to be a passive marker in ‘見刺’ (to be pierced) rather than its typical meaning ‘to see.’ Overall, this translation misplaces the source of suffering and pain, which should be attributed to the general condition of sentient beings rather than the Buddha’s personal emotional state.

Y16.5d: Bapat translates ‘以止見難可忍’ as “A dart, difficult to be seen, and hard to endure.” This translation introduces elements absent in the Chinese text, notably the metaphor of ‘a dart.’ The original phrase, when closely examined, does not include any reference to a dart but instead focuses on the difficulty of enduring the sight of suffering. ‘以止見’ should thus be translated with attention to its component parts: ‘以’ (by means of), ‘止’ (stopping), and ‘見’ (seeing), leading to a translation that acknowledges the Buddha’s empathetic distress upon witnessing the suffering of beings. This would correct Bapat’s interpretation and better align the translation with the intended meaning, suggesting the profound impact of seeing widespread suffering and the challenging nature of confronting such realities, even for someone as enlightened as the Buddha.

[I felt a deep sense of] discontent arise within me.

[It was] then I perceived a dart here,

Invisible [to the ordinary yet firmly] lodged in their heart.⁵⁰

16.6 從刺痛堅不遺 懷刺走悉遍世

尊適見拔痛刺 苦不念不復走

[Despite] the pain of the dart, the stubborn refuse to remove it.

Holding onto their darts, they run [into troubles] everywhere in the world.

[Yet] the sage, witnessing such [plight], removes their painful darts.

Relieved from their anguish, they cease their [restless] wandering.⁵¹

⁵⁰ **Sn938a:** The noun ‘*osāna*’ in Sn938a and the past participle ‘*osita*’ (occupied) in Sn937d both derive from ‘ava + √sā.’ The *Mahāniddeśa* and the *Paramatthajotikā II* seem to interpret ‘*osāna*’ (end/conclusion) as a callback to ‘*osita*’ in the preceding verse, as noted by Norman (2001: 382), but the direct connection between their meanings is not explicitly established in these texts.

Sn938b: Given that the object of ‘*disvā*’ (seeing) encompasses the entirety of the preceding line, I have chosen to integrate it within line a in my translation for coherence.

Sn938d: The phrases ‘*duddasa*’ (difficult to see) and ‘*hadayanissita*’ (lodged in the heart) describe ‘*salla*’ (dart) in line c. To provide additional context in the translation of line d, I have included the phrases ‘to the ordinary’ and ‘yet firmly’ emphasizing the subtle nature of this metaphorical dart.

⁵¹ **Y16.6a:** The character ‘從’ within the phrase ‘從刺痛堅不遺’ primarily means ‘to follow’ or ‘from.’ Yet, within this specific context, interpreting it as ‘despite’ represents a deliberate interpretative choice. This decision underlines the enduring nature of individuals amidst pain (刺痛), accentuating the paradox of suffering while refusing to eliminate its source (堅不遺). This theme of enduring contradiction forms the verse’s core message. Bapat’s interpretation, “With this dart of grief, planted firm and hence not negligible,” seems to misconstrue ‘遺’ as ‘to neglect’ or ‘negligible.’ In reality, ‘遺’ more accurately means ‘to leave something behind’ or ‘to lose.’ Therefore, the line should be understood as highlighting the individuals’ stubbornness to persist with the dart, rather than emphasizing the dart’s significance. This interpretation aligns closely with subsequent lines that depict their resilience in living with the dart.

Y16.6bd: The phrase ‘走悉遍世’ in line b, literally meaning ‘to run all over the world,’ is interpreted here as ‘to encounter difficulties everywhere.’ This translation aims to underscore its metaphorical essence, portraying not merely aimless wandering but a journey laden with obstacles, exacerbated by the lingering pain of the dart (懷刺). Likewise, ‘不復走’ suggests a cessation of such troubled wanderings, interpreted as ‘they cease their restless wandering.’ This translation underscores the end of their relentless quest and the difficulties it entails. The phrase ‘苦不念’ in line d, literally ‘not concerned about the pain,’ is adapted for fluency in English as ‘relieved from their anguish,’ capturing the transition from suffering to peace.

Sn939 *Yena sallena otiṇṇo*

Disā sabbā vidhāvati

Tam eva sallam abbuyha

Na dhāvati nisīdati

Stricken by that dart,

One scurries in every direction.

[Yet] upon removing that very dart,

They cease to run and no longer despair.⁵²

16.7 世亦有悉莫受 邪亂本捨莫依

欲可厭一切度 學避苦越自成

Renounce all worldly possessions,

[As] sources of perversity and turmoil, abandon them and do not depend on them.

Strive for disenchantment, transcending them completely,

Ascetics should eschew suffering and attain self-realization.⁵³

⁵² **Sn939:** This verse forms a single sentence with two phrases and two clauses, interconnected by the correlative pronouns ‘yena’ (by which) in line a and ‘tam’ (that) in line c. For improved readability, I have divided it into two separate sentences in my translation; lines ab is one and lines cd is the other.

Sn939d: The Pāli commentaries interpret ‘nisīdati’ not in its Sanskrit form ‘niṣīdati’ (ni + √ṣad; to sit down) but as ‘na + sīdati’ (not to subside). Norman endorses this interpretation, noting the potential for ‘na/ni’ alternation in Pāli.

⁵³ **Y16.7:** In this verse, I have interpreted three terms with significant Buddhist doctrinal implications. Firstly, ‘世亦有’ in line a is translated as ‘all worldly possessions,’ which are characterized in line b as sources of evil and turmoil. The instructions in lines ab—‘do not cling to them’ (悉莫受), ‘renounce them (捨),’ and ‘do not rely on them (莫依)’—are emphasized repeatedly.

Y16.7c: Bapat’s rendering of ‘欲可厭一切度’ as “Passions, objects of disgust—all of them ye pass over” presents one interpretation. However, this may not fully capture the depth of ‘厭’ (to detest) within the Buddhist

Sn940 *Tattha sikkhānugīyanti:*

Yāni loke gathitāni

Na tesu pasuto siyā

Nibbijha sabbaso kāme

Sikkhe nibbānam attano

There, the training [rules] are recounted:

One should not be ensnared by

Whatever fetters there are in the world.

Thoroughly seeing through sensual pleasures,

One should train [for] their own Nibbāna.⁵⁴

doctrinal framework. ‘厭’ closely aligns with the Pāli ‘*nibbidā*’ (disillusionment/disenchantment), a concept pivotal for progressing towards Nirvāṇa. Additionally, ‘欲’ could be positively framed as ‘to aspire,’ and ‘可’ indicates ‘potentiality.’ This analysis casts doubt on interpreting ‘欲’ (passions) and ‘可厭’ (objects of disgust) as simple binary reactions of liking or disliking. Therefore, I suggest ‘欲可厭’ is more accurately rendered as ‘aspiring to be disillusioned,’ aligning with ‘一切度’ (transcending them all). For the sake of English fluency, I have adapted this as ‘to strive for disenchantment.’

Y16.7d: Bapat translates ‘學避苦越自成’ as “Suffering (苦) ye learn (學) to avoid (避), being away (越?) from the flourish (成) of the self (自).” This translation posits ‘自成’ as indicative of a negative ‘prevailing ego-centrism’ to be avoided. Yet, within Buddhist discourse, this term mostly carries positive implications of ‘natural completion’ or ‘self-realization.’ My interpretation also aligns better with its Pāli parallel ‘*nibbānam attano*’ (one’s own Nirvāṇa). Dissecting ‘越自成,’ ‘成’ (perfection) emerges as the goal beyond; ‘自’ functions as a reflexive pronoun; ‘越’ (to cross over) reflects the Buddhist journey from the realm of suffering (*saṃsāra*) to enlightenment or Nirvāṇa, metaphorically the ‘further shore.’ My interpretation, ‘to cross over (越) to one’s own (自) perfection (成),’ is condensed to ‘to attain self-realization’ for smoother English expression.

⁵⁴ **Sn940a:** This verse is composed of five lines. Norman (2001: 383) points out that the first line may be an editorial interpolation, although its octasyllabic rhythm fits the *śloka* meter characteristic of this verse.

Sn940bc: Lines bc form a sentence. To enhance the flow of the text in English, I have chosen to translate line c prior to line b.

The term ‘*pasuta*,’ equivalent to ‘*pasita*’ (attached/engaged), is the past participle of ‘*pa + √sā / √si*’ or ‘*prasita*’ in Sanskrit. It is often used alongside the locative objects, such as here, the pronoun ‘*tesu*’ (in them). Regarding the change of ‘*i*’ into ‘*u*,’ refer to Geiger (2005: § 19.3), who explains the alternation between ‘*i*’ and ‘*u*,’ just after an accent-syllable. I have translated ‘*pasuta*’ as ‘to be ensnared by,’ which corresponds with ‘*gathitāni*’ (fetters) in line b.

Sn940d: The term ‘*nibbijha*’ is the gerund form of ‘*ni + √vyadh*’ (to pierce through). In this context, it is translated as ‘seeing through’ to convey the idea of penetrating or understanding deeply.

16.8 住至誠莫妄舉 持直行空兩舌

滅恚火壞散貪 捨惱解黠見度

Live with utmost sincerity, shunning [all] deluded behaviors.

Uphold right actions and remove duplicitous speech.

Quench the fire of anger, break asunder [the grip of] greed.

Eliminating vexations, free of them, the sage should envision the further shore.⁵⁵

Sn941 *Sacco siyā appagabbho*

Amāyo rittapesuṇo

Akkodhano lobhapāpaṃ

Sn940e: The word ‘*sikkhe*’ is the optative third-person singular form of ‘*sikkhati*’ (to train), denoting a practice to be undertaken.

⁵⁵ **Y16.8a:** Within the context of ‘妄舉’ (foolish actions), the term ‘舉’ closely aligns with ‘動’ (movement/action), indicating actions undertaken without wisdom or discernment.

妄舉 = 忘舉 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): The character ‘妄’ conveys ‘falsity’ whereas ‘忘’ encapsulates ‘forgetfulness.’ These characters seem to reflect complementary aspects of the notion of delusion—being led astray from truth or reality.

Y16.8b: The term ‘直行’ is interpreted here as synonymous with ‘正業’ (right action), which is often used to translate the Buddhist concept of ‘samyak-karmānta.’ This is the fourth component of the Noble Eightfold Path (*Ārya-aṣṭāṅga-mārga*). For a more detailed discussion on ‘直行,’ see the footnote in Y4. fn.9.

In the same line, ‘空’ is rendered as a verb meaning ‘to empty.’ This translation positions ‘空’ as an action applied to ‘兩舌’ (duplicitous speech), suggesting the removal or avoidance of dishonest speech as part of ethical practice.

Y16.8d: Bapat translates ‘捨惱解黠見度’ as “All evil (惱) ye abandon (捨) and [worldly] cunning (黠) ye get rid of (解 or 度).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation, however, misses several nuances of the original text. Firstly, ‘惱’ is better understood as ‘psychological or emotional afflictions,’ highlighting inward challenges rather than external misdeeds. Furthermore, the expression ‘見度’ implies a journey towards ‘finding release’ or ‘achieving liberation,’ aspects not captured in Bapat’s translation. Additionally, the characterization of ‘黠’ as ‘cunning’ seems incongruent with its context alongside ‘見度.’ Within this framework, ‘黠’ more aptly refers to ‘the wise,’ contrary to being ‘sly’ or ‘cunning.’ This adjustment not only corrects the interpretation but also aligns with the broader thematic essence of the passage, emphasizing internal transformation and enlightenment.

Vevicchaṃ vitare muni

One should be truthful, not insolent,

Without deceit, devoid of slander, and free from anger.

The sage should transcend

Greed, wickedness, and covetousness.⁵⁶

16.9 捨瞢瞢莫睡臥 遠無度莫與俱

綺可惡莫取住 著空念當盡滅

Dispel the clouds from your mind and eschew indulgent slumber.

Keep a distance from the undisciplined; refrain from associating with them.

Never cling to or reside in [deceptive] charms, [for they] may bring adverse
[outcomes].

Anchor your thoughts on the insubstantiality [of all things] that are destined to
dissipate.⁵⁷

⁵⁶ **Sn941:** This verse is structured into two distinct segments. The first segment concludes with ‘*akkodhano*’ (without anger), positioned at the start of line c, while the second segment begins with ‘*lobhapāpaṃ*’ (greed and wickedness), located at the end of line c. In my translation, ‘*akkodhano*’ has been integrated into line b to foster a more balanced and coherent English rendition. Similarly, ‘*lobhapāpaṃ*’ has been rearranged to align with ‘*vevicchaṃ*’ (covetousness) in line d. This adjustment was made because ‘*lobhapāpaṃ*’ and ‘*vevicchaṃ*’ are the direct objects of the phrase ‘*vitare muni*’ (the sage should transcend), which forms the subject and verb of the second sentence. These changes aim to preserve the syntactical and thematic coherence of the original text in its English translation.

⁵⁷ **Y16.9a,** 捨瞢瞢 = 捨瞢瞢 (S, Y, M) = 捨瞢瞢 (P, J, Q1, N, Q2): Both the variant characters ‘瞢’ and ‘瞢’ are very rare characters, making their precise definitions elusive. Each variant phrase starts with the verb ‘to abandon’ and ends with ‘瞢,’ signifying ‘blurry vision’ or ‘mental fog.’ Considering the structural similarities and the shared use of ‘瞢’ across these variants, it is plausible to interpret all these expressions as referring to the concept of mental cloudiness or confusion.

Y16.9b: Bapat’s rendering of ‘遠無度莫與俱’ as “With carelessness never ye do yourself conduct.” may not fully capture the specificity of ‘莫與俱,’ which directly implies ‘do not (莫) associate with (與俱).’ Thus, when

Sn942 *Niddaṃ tandiṃ sahe thīnaṃ*

Pamādena na saṃvase

Atimāne na tiṭṭheyya

Nibbānamanaso naro

One should conquer sleep, lethargy, and sloth;

They must not dwell in heedlessness.

A person whose mind is set on Nibbāna

Should not abide in arrogance.⁵⁸

connected to ‘無度,’ it suggests a warning against association with those lacking restraint or discipline. My interpretation, ‘those without (無) discipline (度),’ aims to clarify that it advises distancing oneself from individuals who exhibit undisciplined behavior.

Y16.9c: Bapat translation of ‘綺可惡莫取住’ as “Egotism (綺), to be detested, never do ye cherish,” interprets ‘綺’ as ‘egotism,’ which diverges from its primary or secondary of ‘exquisite beauty’ or ‘deceptive charms’ in a Buddhist setting. Therefore, ‘綺可惡’ more accurately warns against the dangers of being ensnared by ‘subtle beauties’ (綺) that may (可) lead to detrimental (惡) consequences.

綺 (T? / S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2) = 謔 (K, Z): While ‘綺’ points towards ‘exquisite beauty,’ ‘謔’ is associated with ‘making jokes.’ In this context, ‘謔可惡’ could suggest a caution against ‘frivolous jesting that may result in negative consequences.’

莫取住 = 莫臥住 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): ‘取’ signifies ‘to grasp or hold onto,’ suggesting a form of attachment or tenacity, whereas ‘臥’ means ‘to lie down,’ reflecting a sense of inactivity or passivity. Both expressions converge on the concept of ‘not dwelling in’ or ‘not lingering over,’ advocating for a stance of non-attachment and alertness. Despite their different connotations—‘取’ highlighting attachment and ‘臥’ indicating passivity—they collectively underscore a broader principle of avoidance. This advice, to avoid both clinging and complacency, stands somewhat independently from the warning against the allure of ‘綺可惡’ (the deceptive charm of superficial beauties), yet complements the overarching theme of cautious engagement with the world.

Y16.9d: For ‘著空念當盡滅,’ the use of ‘著’ (to anchor or to establish) takes on a positive light when paired with ‘空念’ (contemplation of insubstantiality), aligning with Buddhist practice of mindfulness towards the absence of everlasting autonomy. Conversely, ‘盡滅’ (to completely extinguish) carries a negative nuance, underscoring the transient and ultimately insubstantial nature of all worldly things, thus rendered as ‘destined to dissipate.’ This translation seeks to encapsulate the dual aspects of embracing spiritual insight while recognizing the impermanence of material conditions.

⁵⁸ **Sn942:** This verse features three verbs in the optative third-person singular form, signifying a sequence of disciplinary admonitions.

Sn942cd: To enhance readability and ensure a smoother flow in the English translation, I have reordered the original sequence, placing line d before line c.

16.10 莫爲欺可牽挽 見色對莫爲服

彼綺身知莫著 戲著陰求解難

Do not be led astray by deceitful [allurements].

Upon encountering an attractive person, resist succumbing to [temptation].

Beware of their embellished bodies; do not become attached.

Seeking liberation is difficult when indulging in and clinging to the [five] aggregates.⁵⁹

Sn943 *Mosavajje na niyyetha*

Rūpe snehaṃ na kubbaye

Mānañ ca parijāneyya,

Sāhasā virato care

One should not succumb to falsehood.

They should not cultivate affection for the [physical] form.

⁵⁹ **Y16.10a:** The translation of ‘欺’ as ‘words of falsehood’ by Bapat does not seem to fit the verse’s focus on the pitfalls of sexuality. I have opted for ‘deceitful [allurements]’ to better match the verse’s overarching theme.

Y16.10b: I have interpreted ‘見色對’ as ‘to encounter (見) a sexually attractive (色) partner (對),’ which is more specific to sexuality compared to its Pāli counterpart ‘*rūpe sneha*’ (affection for the form). The justification for this specificity in the Chinese translation is further supported by the subsequent phrase ‘彼綺身知’ (beware of their adorned bodies) in line c, which implies a sexual context.

Y16.10c: Bapat translates ‘彼綺身知莫著’ as “That egotism ye [yourself] know, without being attached;” However, his translation of ‘綺’ as ‘egotism’ is far off the mark. ‘綺’ translates not as ‘egotism’ but more aptly refers to ‘adornment,’ a reading reinforced by the inclusion of ‘身’ (body).

Y16.10d: Bapat translates ‘戲著陰求解難’ as “For, when you are overcome (陰) by playful attachment, Search for Knowledge will be difficult [for you].” However, this translation takes liberty with the term ‘陰.’ This term is contextually flexible; however, it does not conventionally mean ‘to overcome’ or ‘to be overcome.’ It corresponds more closely with ‘蘊,’ related to the ‘五取蘊’ (the five aggregates: forms, feelings, perceptions, volitional formations, and consciousness; *pañcaskandha*) in Buddhism. This correlation is substantiated by the interchangeable use of ‘五陰’ and ‘五蘊’ within Buddhist texts. Therefore, I have rendered ‘戲著陰’ as ‘indulging in (戲) and attaching to (著) the five aggregates (陰),’ which aligns with the Buddhist discourse on the perils of attachment. Such an interpretation is apt for this verse’s closing focus on the theme of sexuality, illustrating how sensual attachments can impede spiritual insight and progress.

They should thoroughly understand conceit.

They should live abstaining from rashness.⁶⁰

16.11 久故念捨莫思 亦無望當來親

見在亡不著憂 離四海疾事走

Forsake thoughts of the distant past; refrain from pondering them.

Nor should you pine for future kinships.

Realizing [all] existing things are to perish, do not succumb to sorrow.

Retreat from the whole world [lit. the four seas]; all phenomena are fleeting.⁶¹

Sn944 *Purāṇaṃ nābhinandeyya,*

Nave khantiṃ na kubbaye

Hīyamāne na soceyya

⁶⁰ **Sn943:** This verse is composed of four succinct sentences, each occupying one line, all articulated in the optative mood. This grammatical structure shows the verse's instructive and wishful tone.

Sn943c: As noted by Norman (2001: 206, 384), the term '*parijānāti*' might carry an additional meaning. Besides its primary interpretation of 'to fully recognize,' it also has the connotation of 'to give up,' a usage found in Jain texts. This dual meaning brings additional clarity to the line: 'they should recognize and relinquish conceit.' The occurrence of this nuanced and somewhat rare usage, shared with early Jain literature, could suggest potential shared literary sources or philosophical influences within diverse ancient ascetic traditions. This intersection might indicate a broader intertextual dialogue within these early spiritual writings.

⁶¹ **Y16.11c:** The phrase '見在亡' aptly conveys the realization (見) that all existing (在) things are destined to perish (亡), encapsulating the impermanent nature of existence.

Y16.11d, 離四海 = 雖四海 (S, Y, M): Bapat opts for the variant reading and translates '離四海疾事走' as "For though there be four oceans [vast], they may soon vanish." This translation employs the literal meaning of '四海' as the four oceans, which symbolically represent the entire world. However, this reading, with the conditional 'even though,' does not harmoniously follow the directive 'do not succumb to sorrow' found in line c. It is plausible to consider the replacement of '雖' (though) with '離' (to leave) as an inadvertent scribal error, with the original text likely featuring '離'—indicating a withdrawal from worldly attachments. Furthermore, the contexts of lines c and d suggest that they are separate admonitions rather than parts of a single, continuous thought.

Ākāsaṃ na sīto siyā

One should not delight in the ancient,

Nor should they crave the novel.

They should not lament what is fading away,

Nor cling to what seems appealing.⁶²

16.12 我說貪大猛弊 見流入乃制疑

從因緣意念繫 欲染壞難得離

I declare that greed is immensely powerful and destructive.

As [various] views flood in, [speculation and] doubt [must] be restrained.

[When] thoughts are bound by causes and conditions,

And desires taint and overwhelm, it is hard to leave them behind.⁶³

⁶² **Sn944c:** The term ‘*hīyamāna*’ is the present participle of ‘*hīyati*’ (to dwindle), which is, in turn, the passive form of ‘*jahati*’ (to abandon). The specific form used in the text, ‘*hīyamāne*,’ is in the masculine locative singular, denoting ‘in an object that is diminishing.’

Sn944d: While ‘*ākāsa*’ typically translates to ‘sky’ or ‘space,’ in this instance, its meaning diverges. The *Mahāniddeśa* interprets it as analogous to ‘*taṇhā*’ (craving). Additionally, Norman (2001: 384) postulates that it might stem from the Sanskrit ‘*ākārṣa*,’ which conveys the sense of ‘attraction’ or ‘fascination.’

⁶³ **Y16.12a:** Bapat translates ‘我說貪大猛弊’ as “The greed (貪), I (我) say (說), is an evil (弊), powerful (猛) and great (大);”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation interprets ‘弊’ as a noun ‘evil.’ Contrarily, I consider ‘弊’ to be better represented as ‘destructive,’ an adjective that conveys the damaging consequences of greed, in line with its portrayal in Buddhist teachings.

Y16.12b: In the phrase ‘見流入乃制疑,’ I construe ‘見’ as ‘views’ or ‘beliefs’—a noun rather than the verb ‘to see.’ These ‘views’ flood into one’s mind and can breed ‘doubt,’ which practitioners are advised to control.

Y16.12cd: Bapat translates ‘從因緣意念繫 欲染壞難得離’ as “The attachments (繫) ye think (意念) over, with (從) causes (因) and conditions (緣); The mire (染) of craving (欲) ye break through (壞), though (?) hard (難) to be (得) free from (離).” This translation reads as a self-contradictory statement. He describes being ensnared by attachments, yet simultaneously overcoming the craving despite the difficulty. His translation also forces the insertion of the word ‘though’ due to misinterpreting ‘染’ as a noun ‘mire’ rather than a verb ‘to taint.’ A more coherent translation would differentiate line c’s description of an attached state of mind from line d’s broader commentary on the difficulty of liberation when desires dominate the psyche. Given the complex interplay of thoughts, causality, and desires described, ‘離’ should be translated as ‘liberation’ rather than the more limited

Sn945 *Gedhaṃ brūmi ‘mahogho’ ti,*

Ājavaṃ brūmi jappaṇaṃ

Ārammaṇaṃ pakappaṇaṃ,

Kāmapaṃko duraccayo

I call greed ‘the great deluge.’

Desire, I call ‘the [rushing] current,’

[The lure of] sense-objects, ‘a tidal force.’

The morass of desire is hard to traverse.⁶⁴

16.13 捨欲力其輩寡 悉數世其終少

捨不沒亦不走 流已斷無縛結

Few are those who have renounced the [formidable] power of desire.

[Across] countless lifetimes, yet such [individuals] indeed remain scarce.

Having discarded it, be neither overwhelmed nor driven by it.

‘separation’ or ‘detachment,’ directing the focus toward the overarching aspiration for liberation in Buddhist practice.

⁶⁴ **Sn945:** This verse utilizes a series of water-related metaphors: ‘mahogha’ (great flood) in line a, ‘ājava’ (rushing current) in line b, ‘pakappaṇa’ (a tidal force) in line c, and ‘paṃka’ (swamp) in line d, each symbolically representing aspects of desire and greed.

Sn945b: The *Mahāniddesa* interprets ‘ācamā’ (rather than ‘ājava’) metaphorically as ‘taṇhā’ (craving). The PTSD seems to endorse the *Mahāniddesa*’s reading of ‘ācamā’ as ‘absorption.’ Contrarily, the CPD (s.v. *ājava*) posits that ‘ācamā’ may be due to a graphic confusion between ‘j’ and ‘c,’ and defines ‘ājava’ as ‘onrush/stream/current.’ Norman (2001: 384) corroborates the CPD’s view by suggesting the potential for a ‘v/m’ alternation. In light of these interpretations, my translation aligns with the CPD and Norman’s approach to the term’s etymology and metaphorical resonance in this verse.

Sn945c: The *Paramatthajotikā* II appears to interpret ‘pakappaṇa’ as ‘pa-kampana’ (causing to shake, trembling). Norman, however, recommends reading it as part of the series of sea and water metaphors in this verse, translating it as ‘the movement (of the tide).’ My translation ‘a tidal force’ is in line with Norman’s interpretation.

[Once] the current [of desire] is severed, no fetters remain to bind.⁶⁵

Sn948 *Yo 'dha kāme accatari*

Samgaṃ loke duraccayaṃ

Na so socati nājjheti

Chinnasoto abandhano

Whoever here has transcended sensual desires

And attachment that are difficult to overcome in this world,

Does not grieve nor fret,

Having severed the stream, they are unfettered.⁶⁶

16.14 乘諦力點已駕 立到彼慧無憂

是胎危疾事護 勤力守可至安

Riding on the power of truth, the wise have fully harnessed it.

⁶⁵ **Y16.13:** This verse speaks to the emancipation achieved by surmounting desire. It recognizes the potent and often overwhelming nature of desire and highlights the infrequency of individuals who succeed in liberating themselves from its clutches. The verse advocates for a definitive disengagement from the allure of desire in order to realize true emancipation from its constrictive ties.

Y16.13b: Bapat translates ‘悉數世其終少’ as “The various (數) lives (世) [ye may pass through] ye try to attenuate (少);”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation falls short in capturing the essence of the phrase. The term ‘悉’ can indeed be inferred as part of ‘various,’ but ‘其’ (it/such) and ‘終’ (ultimately) are not accounted for, which diminishes the meaning. My interpretation acknowledges the continuation of this scarcity theme from line a, even when considering the expanse of innumerable lifetimes.

⁶⁶ **Sn948a:** The word ‘accatari’ is the aorist third-person singular form of the verb ‘ati + tarati,’ which means ‘to cross over’ or ‘to pass beyond.’

Sn948b: The term ‘duraccaya’ is a nominal form derived from the verb ‘duracceti/duraccayati’ (difficult to go beyond), which comprises ‘dus’ (difficult), ‘ati’ (beyond), and ‘eti/ayati’ (to go; fr. √i).

Sn948c: The term ‘na ajjheti’ stems from ‘na + adhi + eti,’ which translates as ‘not to long for’ or ‘not to regret.’ The *Paramatthajotikā II* interprets it as ‘na abhijjhati,’ meaning ‘do not covet.’ Norman suggests the variant reading ‘na gijjhati’ (do not desire), indicating a possible phonetic alternation between ‘g’ and ‘bh.’

Having reached the further shore, they stand [steadfast], untouched by distress.

In the perilous and pressing matter of rebirth, they are well shielded.

Through vigilant and steadfast guarding, they are able to achieve serenity.⁶⁷

Sn946 *Saccā avokkamma muni*

Thale tiṭṭhati brāhmaṇo

Sabbaṃ so paṭinissajja

Sa ve santo ti vuccati

⁶⁷ **Y16.14a:** The use of equestrian imagery in ‘乘諦力點已駕’ metaphorically expresses mastery over truth. The terms ‘乘’ (to mount/ride) and ‘駕’ (to rein/drive) are indeed related to horsemanship and are critical in unpacking the metaphor when placed alongside ‘諦’ (truth) and ‘點’ (wise). The metaphor suggests not only the wise person’s engagement with truth but also their skilled command of it, akin to a skilled rider with a horse. With this metaphorical usage in mind, I opt for a literal translation of this line.

While Bapat translates the phrase as “On firm truth as their vehicle, do the intelligent take their ride,” equating ‘乘’ with ‘vehicle’ and ‘駕’ with the act of ‘riding,’ my interpretation emphasizes the state of mastery already achieved, rather than the ongoing process of riding. Both translations offer valid readings, albeit from different perspectives on the relationship between the wise and the truth.

Y16.14b: The phrase ‘立到彼慧無憂’ appears to use ‘彼’ in reference to ‘the other shore,’ symbolizing the Buddhist objective of Nirvāṇa. The combination of ‘立’ (to stand) and ‘到’ (to reach) implies a sequence where one stands firm after having arrived. Therefore, ‘立到彼’ translates directly as ‘standing firm upon reaching the further shore.’ For the sake of clarity in English, I have chosen the phrasing ‘having reached the further shore, they stand steadfast.’ Bapat translates this as “And presently (立), do they come to wisdom, from tribulations freed.” Here, he interprets ‘立’ as indicating immediacy and seems to take ‘彼’ as a personal pronoun ‘they,’ which might not adequately capture the specific Buddhist imagery of ‘到彼’ (arriving at the other shore). His rendition suggests the attainment of wisdom as a direct, immediate outcome, potentially missing the metaphor’s deeper spiritual journey connotations.

Y16.14c: The term ‘胎’ (womb) here metaphorically signifies ‘rebirth.’ The phrase ‘是胎危疾事護’ revolves around the theme of safeguarding against the cycles of rebirth. Thus, I render it as “In the (是) perilous (危) and pressing (疾) matter (事) of rebirth (胎), [they are well] shielded (護).” A similar construction of ‘事護’ (to protect in the matters of) appears in the Hereditary House of Minister Xiao 蕭相國世家 chapter (section 2) in the *Shiji* 史記: “高祖為布衣時, 何數以吏事護高祖.” This can translate to “When Gaozu 高祖 was a commoner, He 何 often protected him in his official duties.” (武英殿二十四史本 史記: 蕭相國世家, p. 81).

Y16.14d: The phrase ‘可至安’ indeed translates directly to ‘can reach serenity,’ suggesting the potential to attain peace. However, since the preceding lines portray the wise as having already reached the metaphorical ‘other shore,’ implying the realization of peace, the sense of mere potentiality may be misplaced here. To preserve the subtle possibility expressed by ‘可’ without shifting the focus, one might consider using ‘one can reach serenity.’ This, however, would introduce an indefinite subject that is not yet at the ‘other shore,’ diverging from the established context. Therefore, I favor ‘they reach serenity,’ affirming the actualized state of serenity by the wise, rather than the indefinite and more general ‘one can reach serenity.’

Stepping not away from truth,
The sage [or] brahman stands firmly upon the solid ground.
Having relinquished all,
They are truly called ‘serene.’⁶⁸

16.15 已計遠是痛去 觀空法無所著

從直見廣平道 悉不著世所見

Discerning far [beyond the worldly], they have left such suffering behind.
Contemplating the nature (dharma) of insubstantiality, they hold on to nothing.
By following right view, they [tread] the wide and even path.
They remain unattached to any views in the world.⁶⁹

Sn947 *Sa ve vidvā, sa vedagū,*

⁶⁸ **Sn946ab:** The term ‘*avokkamma*’ in line a is a gerund derived from the verb ‘*avokkamati*,’ which means ‘not to deviate.’ It is formed by combining the negative prefix ‘*a-*,’ the intervocalic consonant ‘*-v-*,’ and the verb ‘*okkamati*’ (to deviate). This construction emphasizes the act of not stepping away from a path or principle.

Given that ‘*muni*’ (sage) in line a and ‘*brāhmaṇo*’ (brahman) in line b both act as subjects within the same sentence and refer to the same individual, I have combined ‘*muni*’ with ‘*brāhmaṇo*’ in the second line of my translation to reflect this singular subject.

Sn946c: Similarly, ‘*paṭinissajja*’ is the gerund of ‘*paṭi + nis + sajjati*,’ translating to ‘to relinquish’ or ‘to renounce.’ It denotes the act of letting go or giving up something entirely.

⁶⁹ **Y16.15a:** Bapat’s translation of ‘已計遠是痛去’ as “Having known things, from suffering far has he gone,” interprets ‘遠’ (far) in relation to ‘去’ (go/disappear), with an added, somewhat ambiguous reference to ‘things’ as the object of ‘已計’ (having known). In my translation, ‘遠’ is understood adverbially as ‘far,’ emphasizing a departure ‘far beyond the worldly,’ rather than associating it directly with physical or psychological distance from suffering.

Y16.15c: The phrase ‘直見’ represents an early Chinese Buddhist translation for ‘*samyak-dṛṣṭi*’ (right view), marking it as the inaugural element of the Noble Eightfold Path, preceding the later more prevalent term ‘正見.’ This choice reflects a nuanced understanding of early Buddhist translations into Chinese. For further exploration and instances of ‘直見’ within Chinese Buddhist texts, refer to Y4, footnote 9, where this term’s usage and implications are more extensively discussed.

Ñatvā dhammaṃ anissito

Sammā so loke iriyāno

Na pihetīdha kassaci

Indeed, they are wise, masters of profound knowledge.

Knowing the truth, they stand independent.

Righteously wandering about the world,

They desire nothing within this realm.

16.16 自不計是少身 彼無有當何計

以不可亦不在 非我有當何憂

They do not reckon their fleeting body to be their own;

It does not exist [on its own], so what is there to reckon?

Concerning [things that] neither can nor do exist [independently],

Why should one worry about what is not their own?⁷⁰

⁷⁰ **Y16.16a:** The expression ‘自不計是少身’ can be translated to “They do not (不) reckon (計) their (是) fleeting (少) body (身) to be their own (自).” Here, ‘少’ (few/little) is more fittingly interpreted as ‘fleeting’ to underscore the transient, rather than insignificant, nature of the body in a Buddhist context. This interpretation of ‘少’ as denoting a temporal aspect rather than a value judgment aligns with its use in classical Chinese literature, including in the *Mencius*, specifically in the Wan Zhang I 萬章上 chapter (section 2): “始舍之圉圉焉, 少則洋洋焉, 攸然而逝.” This translates as “Initially, when it [a live fish] was put in the pond, it was restless, but soon, it moved smoothly and freely, then quickly passed away” (武英殿十三經注疏 本, 孟子注疏: 萬章上, p. 14). Here, ‘少則’ is understood as ‘soon,’ reinforcing a temporal reading. While Bapat translates ‘是少身’ to ‘this little body,’ such a rendition may inadvertently suggest an evaluative diminution of the body, diverging from the intended emphasis on the inherent transience of physical existence.

Y16.16ab: Bapat interprets ‘自不計是少身 彼無有當何計’ as “This little body he never counts as his own. The other possessess [*sic*] nothing’—how will he thus reckon?” This translation introduces ambiguity regarding the referent of ‘the other’ (彼), which could either an entity distinct from the body or a person separate from the subject. This ambiguity potentially misleads the reader. In context, ‘彼’ more accurately refers back to ‘this little body’ from line a, underscoring the lack of autonomous agent in the body. Additionally, ‘當何計’ emphasizes insubstantiality of this body. This interpretation reinforces the theme of transcendence and non-attachment, reflecting a deeper understanding of the individual’s spiritual attainment.

Sn951 *Yassa n' atthi 'idam me' ti*

'Paresaṃ' vā pi kiñcanaṃ

Mamattaṃ so asaṃvindaṃ

'N' atthi me' ti na socati

Whoever harbors no [thoughts of] 'this is mine'

Nor of '[this belongs] to others,'

Finding no [trace of] selfish attachment,

Grieves not [with the thought], 'I possess nothing.'⁷¹

16.17 本癡根拔爲淨 後裁至亦無養

已在中悉莫取 不須伴以棄仇

Y16.16cd: Bapat translates '以不可亦不在 非我有當何憂' as "'Nothing do (不可?) I possess'—[this thought] is also (亦) impossible for (不在?) him. 'I (我) possess (有) nothing (非?)'—how (何) can (當) this [thought] grieve (憂) him?" [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation potentially distorts the original Chinese text, perhaps in an effort to make it correspond with its Pāli counterpart. This interpretation seems to misconstrue several key elements: '以' (by means of) is better understood as 'concerning' or 'regarding,' setting the theme in this context; '不可' accurately means 'cannot,' expressing impossibility or prohibition; '不在' translates as 'do not exist,' rather than suggesting impossibility or absence; '非' translates as 'is not,' indicating negation, rather than 'nothing.' In the highly philosophical context of this verse, '在' is interpreted as denoting an independent existence, one that might be beyond the realms of causality and interconnectedness. The phrase '非我有' is interpreted as 'not (非) my/one's (我) own (有).' This interpretation underscores the Buddhist concept of non-ownership or non-attachment, highlighting the absence of personal possession or identity in the context of the phrase.

⁷¹ **Sn951c:** The term '*mamatta*' originates as a neutral-gender noun from the possessive form 'mama' of the first-person pronoun '*ahaṃ*' (I) in Pāli. This derivation suggests a meaning akin to 'mine-ness,' a concept which encapsulates the idea of possession or ownership at a personal level. To convey its broader implications in a Buddhist context, '*mamatta*' is more aptly translated as 'selfish attachment.' This translation emphasizes the attachment to the sense of self and personal possessions, which is a central theme in Buddhist teachings on non-attachment and the relinquishing of ego.

Pull out the root of ignorance to attain purity;

Future growths, [even as] they arise, [let them] lack nourishment.

From everything that exists, cling to nothing whatsoever;

Discard unnecessary companionship as you would foes.⁷²

⁷² **Y16.17a:** The phrase ‘本癡根拔爲淨’ uses the imagery of uprooting a plant to imply eradicating ignorance. The two words ‘本’ and ‘根’ may seem similar and redundant, each signifying ‘the root of a plant.’ Coupled with ‘拔’ (to uproot), the imagery becomes potent in its directive to remove ignorance at its deepest level. Thus, this line can be rendered as “Uproot (根拔) the core (本) of ignorance (癡) and become pure (爲淨),” which can be further refined as “Eradicate the root of ignorance to attain purity,” capturing the essence without redundancy. Alternatively, understanding ‘本’ to function as indicating the basis or cause for action, the line might be translated as “By (本) pulling out (拔) the root (根) of ignorance (癡), one becomes (爲) pure (淨).” Here, ‘本’ subtly shifts to imply the cause, seamlessly connecting the action to its purifying outcome.

本癡根拔爲淨 = 本癡根枝爲淨 (S, Y, M / P, J, Q1, N, Q2): In the variant, ‘拔’ (to pull out) is replaced with ‘枝’ (branch), leading to a translation of “Examine the root and branches of ignorance to become pure.” This interpretation leverages an unusual usage of ‘本’ as a verb, implying ‘to examine the source.’ However, this usage doesn’t align as seamlessly with the context compared to the Taishō version, suggesting the possibility of a scribal error. The specific version Bapat used for his translation remains unclear. His rendition, “The root (根) of ignorance (癡), from the past persisting (本?), ye sweep away (拔 or 枝?) clean (爲淨);” doesn’t closely align with either variant presented. [Parentheses added for analysis]. The interpretation of ‘枝’ as a verb is particularly unconventional, making its translation as ‘to sweep’ somewhat speculative. Bapat’s translation seems to extend the meanings of ‘拔’ or ‘枝’ beyond their standard usage.

Y16.17b: Following the preceding line, this verse extends the plant metaphor to depict the potential for future manifestations of ignorance. In ‘後栽至亦無養,’ ‘後栽’ is understood as ‘future sprouts,’ and ‘至’ as ‘emerging.’ While ‘栽’ generally means ‘to plant,’ in this context, it fittingly refers to a ‘sprout’ or ‘seedling,’ indicating that any future seeds of ignorance, should they arise, will find no sustenance and thus fail to flourish.

栽 = 裁 (P, J, Q1, N, Q2): In the variant reading, ‘栽’ translates to ‘to cut off,’ commonly related to the action of cutting cloth. This alteration leads to a nuanced interpretation of ‘後栽至亦無養’ as “[once ignorance (癡)] does emerge, they are to be promptly cut off, thus deprived of nourishment.” This rephrasing aligns with the metaphor of severing the potential growth of negative tendencies or ignorance before they can flourish, emphasizing preemptive action to maintain spiritual purity.

Y16.17c: Bapat’s translation of ‘已在中悉莫取’ as “For its run in the middle, lend no helping hand;” ventures into an imaginative interpretation by equating ‘已在中’ with a dynamic, ongoing process. This creative rendering might stray from the more direct meaning of ‘amongst [things] that currently exist.’ ‘已在中’ essentially highlights items or concepts present in the mundane sphere, to which the unenlightened may form attachments. In a Buddhist context, such entities are exactly what sages or ascetics are advised to disengage from, not considering them as possessions to be gathered. This principle could be elaborated upon as promoting an ascetic way of life that cautions against appropriating what has not been freely offered. My interpretation diverges from the Pāli term ‘majjhe’ (in the middle) found in Sn949c, which is traditionally interpreted temporally as ‘in the present’ by Pāli commentaries. Furthermore, Bapat’s rendition of ‘悉莫取’ as ‘lend no helping hand’ detaches from its literal translation of ‘do not cling to anything at all,’ thus potentially missing the essence of non-attachment and ethical conduct advocated in the verse.

Y16.17d: Bapat translates ‘不須伴以棄仇’ as “Keep not (不) its company (伴), having all enemies (仇) banished (棄).” [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation adds interpretation that diverges from the literal and contextual meaning by overlooking ‘須’ (necessary) and ‘以’ (used here to imply ‘consider as’). ‘不須’ directly translates to ‘unnecessary,’ and thus, ‘不須伴’ should be understood as ‘unnecessary companionship,’ indicating that certain associations are deemed nonessential or potentially disruptive in spiritual or ascetic practices. This

Sn949 *Yaṃ pubbe, taṃ visosehi,*

Pracchā te māhu kiñcanaṃ

Majjhe ce no gahessasi

Upasanto carissasi

Let go of all that was in the past,

Allow nothing to stir in you for the future.

If you cling to nothing in between,

You will journey forth in perfect tranquility.⁷³

16.18 一切已棄名色 不著念有所收

已無有亦無處 一切世無與怨

Having discarded all [attachment to] mental and physical phenomena,

They form no attachments to anything received.

Without possession or [fixed] abode,

corrects the translation to focus on the avoidance of non-essential or harmful relationships rather than the act of banishing enemies, which more accurately reflects the intent within the context of ascetic discipline and practice.

⁷³ **Sn949b:** The term ‘*te*’ is the dative/genitive singular of the second-person pronoun ‘*tvam*,’ and is rendered as ‘in you’ for natural flow in English, complementing the imperative ‘*māhu*’ (do not allow it to arise). The term ‘*ahu*,’ the aorist of ‘*√bhū*’ (to be/arise), is poetically translated as ‘to stir,’ capturing the subtle onset of action or thought.

Sn949c: The term ‘*majjhe*’ is interpreted as a temporal term in the *Mahāniddeśa*, defined as ‘*paccuppannā*’ (in the present), which stems from the adverbial past participle of ‘*paṭi + uppajjati*’ (to have just arisen). This temporal reading fits within the verse’s context, with ‘*pubbe*’ (in the past) in line a and ‘*pracchā*’ (afterwards) in line b framing ‘*majjhe*’ (in the middle) as the time between past and future. However, this temporal expression of ‘*majjhe*’ is uncommon in the Pāli literature, leading to cautious scholarly interpretations. Jayawickrama renders it as ‘in the intervening (present)’ by adding the commentarial interpretation within the parenthesis. Norman renders it as ‘anything in between’; Bodhi, as ‘in the middle’; and Fronsdal, as ‘what’s in between.’ I also have rendered it as ‘in between’ letting the context itself reveal its temporal denotation.

They harbor no enmity towards [anyone] in the whole world.⁷⁴

Sn950 *Sabbaso nāmarūpasmim*

Yassa n' atthi mamāyitaṃ

Asatā ca na socati,

Sa ve loke na jīyyati

For one who finds nothing cherished as ‘mine’

Within all mental and physical phenomena,

Who does not grieve for what lacks [independent] existence,

Truly, in this world, they suffer no loss.⁷⁵

16.19 悉已斷無想色 一切善悉與等

已從學說其教 所來問不恐對

⁷⁴ **Y16.18a:** The phrase ‘棄名色’ literally translates to ‘abandon name and form,’ which may be obscure to contemporary readers. To clarify, I have interpreted it as ‘to discard (棄) [the attachment to] mental (名) and physical (色) phenomena,’ adding contextual words to convey the original meaning more accurately.

Y16.18b: The phrase ‘有所收’ translates to ‘something [one has] received,’ often referring to the items gathered during alms rounds by ascetics or monks.

Y16.18c: The terms ‘無有’ and ‘無處’ are succinctly translated as ‘without possession/ownership’ and ‘without a fixed abode,’ emphasizing the absence of material attachments and permanent residence.

⁷⁵ **Sn950ab:** To enhance readability in English, I have rearranged the original sequence, translating line b before line a. The term ‘*sabbaso*’ typically acts as an adverb meaning ‘altogether,’ but I have adapted it to ‘all,’ used adjectivally to modify ‘*nāmarūpa*’ (mental and physical phenomena). The past participle ‘*mamāyita*,’ derives from the verb ‘*mamāyati*’ (to cherish as mine), which in turn is the denominative verb from ‘*mama*’ (my/mine). Thus, I have rendered ‘*mamāyita*’ as “something cherished as ‘mine’” to convey the concept of personal attachment.

Sn950c: The term ‘*asatā*’ is the ablative singular form of ‘*asant*,’ which is composed of the negative prefix ‘*a-*’ and ‘*sant*,’ the present participle of ‘*√as*’ (to be). In the Buddhist context, this term suggests ‘what does not [really] exist’ or ‘what lacks [independent] existence,’ reflecting the teaching on the non-inherent nature of phenomena.

Having severed all [impurities], free from ideation regarding forms,
They [embody] all virtues, supporting all [beings] impartially.
Having completed their [journey of] training, they impart teachings,
Unfazed by questions posed by people coming from [anywhere].⁷⁶

Sn952 *Aniṭṭhuri ananugiddho*

Anejo sabbadhī samo—

Tam ānisaṃsaṃ pabrūmi

Pucchito avikampinaṃ

Neither harsh nor greedy,

Free of desire, impartial in all regards—

This merit I declare,

[When] questioned about the steadfast one.⁷⁷

⁷⁶ **Y16.19a:** The phrase ‘悉已斷無想色’ is interpreted using ‘impurities’ to clarify the meaning of ‘悉’ (all). I translate ‘想’ as ‘involuntary ideation,’ indicating thoughts that arise spontaneously, akin to physical laws. These refinements address the potential ambiguity of ‘having (已) severed (斷) all (悉)’ and ‘without (無) thoughts (想) on forms (色),’ thus providing a clearer insight into the act of relinquishing all unnecessary mental preoccupations.

Y16.19b: The phrase ‘悉與等,’ is translated as ‘to support all [beings] impartially,’ interpreting ‘與’ as ‘to treat’ or ‘to support.’ This interpretation finds support in a passage from *Strategies of the Warring States* 戰國策: “不如與魏以勁之, 魏戰勝...; 不勝...” This translates to “It would be better to support Wei with our strong troops. If Wei wins the battle,...; if they lose, ...” (士禮居叢書 本 戰國策: 楚攻魏張儀謂秦王, p. 69). This example uses ‘與’ in a context of providing support or aid, paralleling the sense of [equitable] treatment.

Y16.19d: The phrase ‘所來問不恐對’ can directly translate to ‘Unafraid (不恐) of encountering (對) what (所) incomers (來) ask (問),’ encapsulating a demeanor of confidence and openness to inquiries. I interpret it as ‘unfazed (不恐對) by questions (所...問) posed by newcomers (來).’ Bapat’s rendering of ‘不恐’ as ‘with no diffidence’ slightly distorts its intended meaning. It is not about ‘shyness’ but about ‘fearlessness.’

⁷⁷ **Sn952:** This verse features four terms with negative prefixes highlighting virtuous qualities: ‘*aniṭṭhuri*’ (not harsh), ‘*ananugiddha*’ (not greedy), ‘*aneja*’ (not desiring), ‘*avikampin*’ (unshakable). With these terms, the verse employs the apophatic description of the religiously ideal person.

16.20 不從一致是慧 所求是無可學

已厭捨無因緣 安隱至見滅盡

One cannot attain such wisdom from the start,

Nor can they [just] emulate it, [even if] they seek to.

Having become disenchanted and discarded [attachments], they transcend causality,

Attaining secure peace and experiencing cessation.⁷⁸

Sn953 *Anejassa vijānato*

N' atthi kācini saṃkhiti

⁷⁸ **Y16.20a:** The term ‘從一,’ as noted in the Digital Dictionary of Buddhism (DDB, s.v. 從一), is interpreted as ‘from the beginning,’ signifying that the profound wisdom described in preceding verses is not readily attainable. This term can actually be interpreted in various ways, such as ‘following one’s unwavering mind,’ ‘pursuing the primary principle,’ ‘taking one step at a time,’ and many others. Bapat’s rendition of ‘from one’ is ambiguous, which he suspects in his footnotes that this wording may stem from the misinterpretation of ‘*aneja*’ (without desire) in Sn953a as ‘*aneka*’ (not one) seems plausible. Norman (2001: 386) also supports Bapat’s suggestion by mentioning a possible ‘j/k’ alternation. Despite this philological possibility, I would render it as ‘from the start.’

Y16.20b: In this context, ‘學,’ which usually means ‘to learn,’ is interpreted as ‘to emulate’ or ‘to imitate.’ This reflects the traditional Chinese concept that learning often involves emulating one’s teachers or predecessors. This interpretation of ‘學’ finds support in the Valuing Righteousness 貴義 chapter (section 13) from the *Mozi* 墨子: “貧家而學富家之衣食多用，則速亡必矣。” This translates to “If a poor family tries to emulate the clothing and food of a rich family, using many resources, it will surely come to a quick ruin.”

Bapat interprets ‘所求是無可學’ as “The sought (求) and searched by him (是?) is a thing (所) not (無) be heard of (lit. learnt) (學);”. [Chinese characters within parentheses added for analysis]. This translation introduces inaccuracies and misinterpretations. The addition of ‘searched’ lacks a direct correlate in the original phrase, and the translation overlooks the implied possibility in ‘可.’ Furthermore, his interpretation stretches the meanings of the characters: ‘是’ typically serves as a demonstrative pronoun ‘this,’ not often as a third-person personal pronoun; ‘無’ directly translates to ‘without,’ rather than ‘is not.’

Y16.20: This verse marks a distinct departure from its Pāli counterpart, Sn953. The initial lines, Y16.20ab, suggest that wisdom is not innately present from birth nor can it be superficially acquired through imitation, underscoring the necessity of a profound mental transformation. This theme extends into lines cd, which propose that only through a process of becoming disenchanted (已厭) and relinquishing (捨) [attachments] can one move beyond the confines of causality (無因緣), achieve a state of secure peace (安隱至), and ultimately realize Nirvāṇa (見滅盡). This interpretation weaves together the verse’s elements, emphasizing the journey from disenchantment to the ultimate spiritual liberation.

Virato so viyārambhā

Khemaṃ passati sabbadhi

The unagitated, discerning one

Finds no accumulation [of merits or demerits] at all.

Refraining from engaging in [karmic accumulation],

They perceive serenity in every respect.⁷⁹

16.21 上不憍下不懼 住在平無所見

止淨處無怨嫉 雖乘見故不憍

Neither arrogant in higher positions, nor intimidated in lower ones,

They dwell in equanimity, without any [preconceived] views.

Abiding in a realm of purity, they are free from enmity or jealousy.

Though they utilize [various] views, they therefore remain free from conceit.⁸⁰

⁷⁹ **Sn953b:** The *Mahāniddesa* and *Paramatthajotikā II* gloss ‘*kāci nisaṃkhiti*,’ not ‘*kācini saṃkhiti*’ as in the Pāli Text Society edition. Norman (2001: 386) questions the word break in the PTS edition, noting the rarity of the indefinite suffix ‘-cini.’ Aligning with the commentarial interpretation, I translate this as ‘whatever (*kāci*) accumulation (*nisaṃkhiti*).’ ‘*Nisaṃkhiti*’ here refers to ‘karmic accumulation,’ prompting my addition of ‘[of merits or demerits]’ for clarity.

Sn953c: The term ‘*vyārambha*’ directly translates to ‘striving’ or ‘undertaking.’ Given its gloss in the *Mahāniddesa*, similar to that of ‘*nisaṃkhiti*,’ it is interpreted as ‘engagement [in karmic accumulation].’

⁸⁰ **Y16.21:** This verse highlights the principle of equanimity, fostering an open-minded engagement with diverse viewpoints without succumbing to bias. Notably, line d’s ‘乘見’ (utilizing views) forms a contrast with line b’s ‘所見’ (preconceived views), delineating between passively held preoccupations and actively employing them without any prejudice. The term ‘乘,’ typically meaning ‘to mount,’ is metaphorically broadened here to signify ‘to handle’ or ‘to govern,’ thus ‘to employ’ or ‘to utilize’ is a fitting translation, suggesting a deliberate and balanced approach to considering various viewpoints.

Y16.21a: Bapat translates ‘上不憍下不懼’ as “As superior (上) no (不) haughtiness (憍), or as inferior (下) no (不) cowering-down (懼)”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. His translation of ‘上’ and ‘下’ as ‘superior’ and ‘inferior’ might inadvertently impose a comparative framework seemingly at odds with the ethos of the *Yizujing*,

Sn954 *Na samesu na omesu*

Na ussesu vadate muni

Santo so vītamaccharo

Nādeti na nirassatī ti Bhagavā ti

The sage does not claim to be one

Among equals, inferiors, or superiors.

Calmed, free from avarice,

They neither grasp nor reject.

Thus [spoke] the Blessed One.⁸¹

which advocates for a detachment from hierarchical comparisons. The ideal persona, as depicted, transcends such distinctions, making ‘in higher positions’ and ‘in lower positions’ more appropriate translations to convey status without implying comparative value.

不橋 = 不驕 (S, Y, M): Both ‘橋’ and ‘驕’ are synonymous in the given context, advocating for humility across all states.

Y16.21b: Bapat translates 住在平無所見’ as “Is to be seen (住在?) [in him]. Nor (無) is he found (所見) among his equals (平);”. [Parentheses added for analysis]. This translation arbitrarily rearranges its syntax and misinterprets several key elements. The term ‘平’ here more appropriately aligns with the concept of ‘equanimity’ rather than ‘equals’ for the same reason why ‘superior’ and ‘inferior’ does not fit in the context of line a. Moreover, ‘住在’ should not be translated as ‘to be seen’ but rather means ‘to dwell in,’ indicating a state of being rather than visibility. Thus, a more fitting translation might be “They dwell in equanimity, without any [prejudiced] views.

Y16.21c: 淨處 = 靜處 (S, Y, M): These variant readings highlight the nuanced difference between ‘purity’ (淨) and ‘silence’ or ‘peace’ (靜). Both terms convey essential aspects of the spiritual environment or mindset being described, with ‘淨處’ emphasizing purity and ‘靜處’ peace or tranquility.

Y16.21d: Bapat translates 雖乘見故不橋’ as “And though in a chariot is he seen, no haughtiness doth [he display].” This translation diverges from the actual context. ‘乘見’ in this verse refers to ‘utilizing views’ rather than being ‘seen in a chariot.’ A closer translation would highlight the notion of engaging with perspectives without succumbing to arrogance, such as “Though they utilize views, they do not become conceited.”

⁸¹ **Sn954d:** This line juxtaposes ‘ādeti’ (to take) with ‘nirassati’ (to discard), highlighting the binary thinking typical of ordinary people. Being liberated from such dualistic views, the sage does not categorize themselves as equal, inferior, or superior in any situation.

佛說是義足經竟。比丘悉歡喜

When the Buddha had expounded this [*sūtra* in] the *Yizujing*, all the *bhikṣus* rejoiced.

佛說義足經卷下

The second fascicle of the *Yizujing* spoken by the Buddha [is complete].

Appendix. Comparison between the *Yizujing* (義足經) and the *Aṭṭhakavagga*

Table 1. Sūtra/Sutta Order Comparison

Yizujing		Aṭṭhakavagga	
1	King Jietan (桀貪王經)	1	Kāmasutta (Sensual Pleasures)
2	King Udayana (優填王經)	2	Guhaṭṭhakasutta (The Cave)
3	Sundarī (須陀利經)	3	Duṭṭhatakasutta (The Hostile)
4	Brahmin Mojie (摩竭梵志經)	4	Suddhaṭṭhakasutta (The Pure)
5	King Ādāsamukha (鏡面王經)	5	Paramaṭṭhakasutta (The Supreme)
6	The Old and Young All Die (老少俱死經)	6	Jarāsutta (Old Age)
7	Maitreya's Disputations (彌勒難經)	7	Tissametteyyasutta (Tissa Metteyya)
8	Brahmin Yongci (勇辭梵志經)	8	Pasūrasutta (Pasūra)
9	Mākandika's Daughter (摩因提女經)	9	Māgandiyasutta (Māgandiya)
10	Miracle Contest with Heretics (異學角飛經)	11	Kalahavivādasutta (Quarrels and Disputes)
11	Brahmin Meng-guan (猛觀梵志經)	12	Cūlavīyūhasutta (Deployment, Smaller)
12	Brahmin Faguan (法觀梵志經)	13	Mahāvīyūhasutta (Deployment, Greater)
13	Brahmin Dou-le (兜勒梵志經)	14	Tuvaṭakasutta (Quickly)
14	Nun Utpalavarṇā (蓮花色比丘尼經)	16	Sāriputtasutta (Sāriputta)
15	Reunion of Son and Father (子父共會經)	10	Purābhedasutta (Before the Breakup)
16	King Virūḍhaka (維樓勒王經)	15	Attadaṇḍasutta (One Who has Taken Up the Rod)

Table 2. Number of verses comparison

YZJ#	Added verses	Parallel verses	Altogether	Comments on added or absent verses	AV#	# of verses
1	17	6	23	Aṅguttara Nikāya (4); Almost identical verses (-2; Y1.5, 1.6, 1.18); Yet to find their Pāli counterparts (11)	1	6
2		8	8		2	8
3	11	8	19	Dhammapada (4), Udāna (2); Yet to find their Pāli counterparts (5)	3	8
4		8	8		4	8
5	1	8	9	Yet to find its Pāli counterpart (1)	5	8
6	2	10	12	Saṃyutta Nikāya (2)	6	10
7		10	10		7	10
8	1-1	11	11	Yet to find its counterpart (1); Y8.7 = Sn829 + Sn830	8	11
9	3	10	13	Paramatthajotikā II, Visuddhimagga, Divyāvadāna (1); No Chinese counterparts to Sn836, 837, 838: No Pāli counterpart to Y9.3 and Y9.4	9	13
10		16	16		11	16
11	4	17	21	Yet to find their Pāli counterparts (4)	12	17
12	4	20	24	Yet to find their Pāli counterparts (4)	13	20
13	27	20	47	Yet to find their Pāli counterparts (4) 24 verses from Hemavatasutta (Sutta Nipāta Sn-180) equivalent to 23 verses from the Yizujing (Y13.14-15 = Sn.165-167)	14	20
14	19	20	39	Yet to find their Pāli counterparts (4) No Chinese counterpart to Sn963	16	21
15	11	14	25	Yet to find their Pāli counterparts (11)	10	14
16	1	20	21	Yet to find their Pāli counterparts (1)	15	20
Total	100 (101–1)	206	306			210

Table 3. Narratives from the *Yizujing* and the *Paramatthajotikā II*

YZJ	Narratives	AV	Narratives in the <i>Paramatthajotikā II</i>
1	The narrative of a brahmin whose crops are devastated by storms and whose daughter passes away; and the account of his past life as King Jietan, a ruler whose desire for territorial expansion was boundless.	1	The story of a brahmin whose crops were destroyed by severe rain.
2	King Udayana, driven by jealousy, attempts to harm an innocent bhikṣu, but the mountain god intervenes to save him.	2	Driven by jealousy, King Udena attempts to harm Venerable Piṇḍola Bhāradvāja. Out of compassion for the king, the Venerable simply uses his psychic powers to fly away.
3	Brahmins orchestrate a plot to kill Sundarī and falsely accuse the Buddha of the crime. Eventually, the truth is revealed, leading to the exile of the brahmins.	3	Sectarians orchestrate the murder of Sundarī, leading to defamation of the Buddha and the <i>Bhikṣusamṅgha</i> . The Buddha predicts that this turmoil will last only seven days.
4	Brahmins claim that their fellow Mojie possesses miraculous powers, ensuring that anyone who sees him, whether alive or dead, will achieve deliverance.	4	A brahmin named Candābha, who has a disc of rays on his chest, claims that anyone who sees this auspicious sight will gain fame, wealth, and ascend to heaven. However, his rays vanish in the presence of the Buddha, leading to his humility. Subsequently, he renounces his former life and becomes a follower of the Buddha's teachings.
5	The heterodox brahmins are constantly engaged in disputes and quarrels. The Buddha reveals their past lives: they were blind people tasked by King Ādāsamukha, the Buddha's previous incarnation, with identifying an elephant by touch alone.	5	Sectarians in Sāvattthī were constantly embroiled in disputes and quarrels; in response, the king ordered blind people to assemble and identify an elephant by touch. Upon learning of this, the Buddha delivered a discourse addressing the situation.
6	The Buddha connects two incidents in his discourse: a man whose chariot broke down on the road, and the deaths of an old brahmin and a young boy.	6	Brahmin Sāketa and his wife, who had been the Buddha's parents in five hundred consecutive past lives, were allowed by the Buddha to treat him as their son.
7	This narrative comprises several loosely connected stories: Mahākoṣṭhila scolds a young monk named Citrahastīśāriputra for his lack of etiquette; Maitreya poses challenging questions that Śāriputra cannot answer; Maitreya then visits the Buddha and poses questions, prompting the Buddha to deliver a discourse.	7	Tissa and Metteyya both became Buddhist monks. Metteyya practiced diligently and attained arahantship, while Tissa disrobed. Metteyya then requested that the Buddha deliver a discourse to Tissa.
8	Some householders employed the brahmin Yongci to challenge the Buddha in a debate. However, in the Buddha's presence, Yongci was overcome with fear and rendered speechless.	8	A wanderer named Pasūra challenges Śāriputta, the Buddha's chief disciple, to a debate and is defeated. Inspired, Pasūra becomes a follower under Śāriputta. Yet, his debating nature compels him to challenge the Buddha himself. However, in the Buddha's presence, Pasūra is rendered speechless.
9	Upon seeing the Buddha, Brahmin Mākandika offers his daughter's hand in marriage. The Buddha, free from carnal desires, declines the offer and instead provides guidance to Mākandika, his wife, and their daughter.	9	Brahmin Māgandiya wants to hand his daughter over to the Buddha.

10	The Buddha defeats the six heretics in a contest of miraculous feats. To dispel the doubts of the onlookers, he creates a double of himself who poses questions that the Buddha answers.	11	Some deities were uncertain about the origins of quarrels and disputes. To clarify this, the Buddha created a mind-generated Buddha to question him, after which he delivered the discourse.
11	Divine beings gathered to be in the audience with the Buddha. A brahmin named Meng-guan harbored doubts about karmic causation. To address his uncertainties, the Buddha manifested another Buddha, who posed questions that the Buddha then answered.	12	This narrative resembles the 11th discourse, with a notable distinction: some deities questioned whether only those settled in their own views, or also those accepting other views, are considered outstanding.
12	Divine beings assembled to be in the audience with the Buddha. During this gathering, a brahmin named Faguan harbored doubts about the nature of final Nirvāṇa and its physical aspects. To resolve these uncertainties, the Buddha manifested another Buddha, who posed questions that the Buddha himself then answered.	13	This narrative is similar to that of the 11th discourse, with one key difference: some deities pondered the question, “Do those settled in views receive blame or praise from the wise?”
13	Two Spirit Generals visit and praise the Buddha. Brahmin Dou-le, harboring doubts about the causality of the physical body of a liberated individual. To address his concerns, the Buddha manifests his double, who then poses a question that the Buddha answers.	14	This narrative is similar to that of the 11th discourse, with one key difference: some deities pondered the question, “What is the practice for the attainment of arahantship?”
14	The Buddha spends a rain retreat in Trāyastriṃśa Heaven, preaching to his mother and the deities. Afterwards, he descends to Jambudvīpa in response to requests from the human world, accompanied by his large retinue. During this time, Bhikṣunī Utpalavarṇā showcases her miraculous powers. Venerable Śāriputra then poses questions, which the Buddha answers.	16	This narrative comprises a series of loosely connected stories, starting with the envy of divine beings towards the mindful human beings. It includes Venerable Piṇḍola’s use of psychic powers and the Buddha’s subsequent prohibition of such displays, followed by the Buddha’s miraculous contest and his stay in the Tāvātimsa Heaven. Upon returning to this world, the Buddha praises his disciple Śāriputta and concludes with a response to Śāriputta’s verses regarding monastic conduct.
15	The Buddha visits the Śākyaans and demonstrates his miraculous powers. King Śuddhodana pays homage to the Buddha and recounts the three auspicious phenomena that occurred during the Buddha’s time as a prince. Following this, the Buddha delivers a series of gradual teachings, leading many Śākyaans to take refuge in him.	10	This narrative resembles the 11th discourse but diverges on one key point: some deities ponder the question, “What should be done before the dissolution of the body?”
16	This narrative centers on King Virūḍhaka’s decimation of the Śākyaans. The Buddha, observing the suffering of his kin, foretells the grim fate that awaits the king.	15	The Buddha intervenes in a quarrel that erupted between the Sakyans and the Koliyans over water rights.

Bibliography

Primary sources

I. Sutta Nipāta Editions (Aṭṭhakavagga)

1-1. Pāli versions

Burmese-script edition: Chaṭṭha Saṅgāyana Tipitaka edition. Vipassana Research Institute electronic version 4.0 Online at <http://www.tipitaka.org/cst4>.

Roman-script editions:

Andersen, Dines and Helmer Smith. *Sutta-nipāta*. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1913. Reprint 1997.

Franke, R. Otto. “Die Suttanipāta-Gāthās mit ihren Parallelen.” in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (1909–1912) [in 6 installments: 63, 1 (1909):1–64; 63, 2 (1909): 255–286; 64, 1 (1910): 1–57; 64, 4 (1910): 760–807; 66, 2 (1912): 204–260; 66, 4 (1912): 699–708].

Sinhala-script edition: Buddha Jayanti Tripitaka Series, volume 25. Online bilingual version (Pāli-Sinhala) at http://aathaapi.net/tipitaka/29.OTSPKN_Sutta_Nipatha.pdf.

1-2. Western Translations from Pāli

Bodhi, Bhikkhu, trans. (2017). *The Suttanipāta: An Ancient Collection of the Buddha's Discourses together with its Commentaries*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.

Fausböll, V., trans. *The Sutta-nipāta: A Collection of Discourses, Sacred Books of the East Vol X Part II*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898.

Fronsdal, Gil. *The Buddha before Buddhism: Wisdom from the Early Teachings*. Boulder: Shambhala Publications, 2016.

Jayawickrama, N. A., trans. *Suttanipāta: Text and Translation*. Kelaniya, Sri Lanka: Post Graduate Institute of Pāli and Buddhist Studies, 2001.

Norman, K. R., trans. *The Group of Discourses (Sutta-Nipāta): Translated with Introduction and Notes*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2001.

Nyanaponika, Bhikkhu, trans. *Sutta-Nipāta: Früh-buddhistische Lehrdichtungen aus dem Pali Kanon, mit Auszügen aus den alten Kommentaren*. 3rd ed. Konstanz: Beyerlein & Steinschulte, 1996.

Paññobhāsa, Bhikkhu, trans. *The Aṭṭhakavagga (Sutta Nipāta 4), Pali, with English translation*. Path Press Publication, 2012.

Saddhātissa, H., trans. *The Sutta-Nipāta*. London: Routledge Curzon, 1994.

Thānissaro, Bhikkhu. *Sutta Nipāta: The Discourse Group; Translation with an Introduction & Notes*. Metta Forest Monastery, 2016.

2-1. Yizujing

Fóshuō Yìzú Jīng 佛說義足經 Taishō canon Vol. 4, No. 198. Tokyo: Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō (1924–1934).

2-2. English translation of the Yizujing

Bapat, P. V., trans. *The Arthapada Sutra: Spoken by the Buddha—translated by the Upāsaka Che-Kien under the Wu dynasty (222-280 A.D.)*, Visva-Bharati Santiniketan, 1951.

3-1. Gāndhārī version

Falk, Harry. “The ‘Split’ Collection of Kharoṣṭhī Texts.” in Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University (*Sōkaidaigakukokusaibukkyōgakukōtōkenkyūjōnenpō* 創価大学国際仏教学高等研究所年報) for the Academic Year 2010, Vol. XIV (2011): 13-23.

4-1. Sanskrit version

Hoernle, A. F. Rudolf. (1916). “The Sutta Nipata in a Sanskrit Version from Eastern Turkestan” *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, Oct.: 709–732.

II. Niddesa editions

A. Mahāniddesa

Burmese-script edition: Chaṭṭha Saṅgāyana Tipiṭaka edition. Vipassana Research Institute electronic version 4.0. Online at <http://www.tipitaka.org/cst4>.

Roman-script edition: (Mahāniddesa), edited by L. de la Vallée Poussin and E. J. Thomas. London: Pali Text Society. Part I first published in 1916. Part II first published in 1917. Combined reprint in 1978.

Sinhala-script edition: Buddha Jayanti Tripitaka Series, volume 33. Online bilingual version (Pāli-Sinhala) at http://www.aathaapi.net/tipitaka/35.OTSPKN_Maha_Niddesa_Pali.pdf.

B. Cūḷaniddesa

Burmese-script edition: Chaṭṭha Saṅgāyana Tipiṭaka edition. Vipassana Research Institute electronic version 4.0. Online at <http://www.tipitaka.org/cst4>.

Roman-script edition: (Cullaniddesa), edited by W. Swede. Oxford: Pali Text Society. First published 1918. Reprint 1988.

Sinhala-script edition, Buddha Jayanti Tripitaka Series, volume 33. Online bilingual version (Pāli-Sinhala) at http://www.aathaapi.net/tipitaka/36.OTSPKN_Chulla_Niddesa_Pali.pdf.

III. Paramathajotikā II editions in Pāli

Burmese-script edition: Chaṭṭha Saṅgāyana Tipiṭaka edition. Vipassana Research Institute electronic version 4.0. Online at <http://www.tipitaka.org/cst4>.

Roman-script edition: edited by Helmer Smith. 2 vols. Sutta Nipāta Commentary being Paramathajotikā II. Oxford: Pali Text Society. Vol. 1. 1916, reprint 1989. Vol. 2. 1918, reprint 1997.

Sinhala-script edition: edited by Siriyagoda Sumaṅgala Thera and Mapalagama Candajoti Thera, finally revised by Mahagoda Siri Nāṇissara Thera. Colombo: Simon Hewavitarne Bequest Series, 1920.

IV. The Other Pāli Texts in English

Dīgha Nikāya: Maurice Walshe (1995). *The Long Discourses of the Buddha: A Transclation of the Dīgha Nikāya*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.

Majjhima Nikāya: Bodhi, Bhikkhu (1995). *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Majjhima Nikāya*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.

Saṃyutta Nikāya: Bodhi, Bhikkhu (2003). *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Saṃyutta Nikāya*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.

Aṅguttara Nikāya: Bodhi, Bhikkhu (2012). *The Numerical Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Aṅguttara Nikāya*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.

Secondary Sources

- Allon, Mark (1997). *Style and Function: A Study of the Dominant Stylistic Features of the Prose Portions of Pāli Canonical Sutta Texts and Their Mnemonic Function*. Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series XII. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Allon, Mark and Richard Salomon (2010). New Evidence for Mahāyāna in early Gandhāra in *Eastern Buddhist*, Vol. 41(1): 1–22.
- Anālayo, Bhikkhu (2009). *From Craving to Liberation—Excursions into the Thought-world of the Pāli Discourses*. Taiwan, The Buddhist Association of the United States.
- (2010). *From Grapsing to Emptiness—Excursions into the Thought-world of the Pāli Discourses*. Taiwan, The Buddhist Association of the United States
- Ānandajoti Bhikkhu (2004). *Pāli Prosody: Texts and Studies, An Outline of the Metres in the Pāli Canon*, 3rd ed. pdf available at <https://www.ancient-buddhist-texts.net/Textual-Studies/Outline/Outline-of-the-Metres.pdf>
- Arnold, E. Vernon (1905). *Vedic Metre: In Its Historical Development*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Bailey, Greg and Ian Mabbett (2003). *The Sociology of Early Buddhism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Balcerowicz, Piotr (2016). *Early Asceticism in India: Ājīvikism and Jainism*, New York: Routledge.
- Bapat, P. V. (1968). “Some Mis-Interpretations of Chinese Translations.” *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, 48/49 (1968): 361–364.
- Bareau, André (1976). “Les reactions des familles don’t un member deviant moine selon le canon bouddhique pali,” in Wijesekara, O. H. de A. (ed.), *Malalasekara Commemoration Volume*: 15–22
- Basham, A. L. (1951). *History and Doctrine of the Ājīvikas, a Vanished Religion*. London.
- (1982). “Asoka and Buddhism—A Reexamination” at Presidential Address Given on the Occasion of the Fourth Conference of the IABS Madison, Wisconsin, August, 1980. in *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 5, 131–43.
- Bechert, Heinz (1992). “The Writing Down of the Tripiṭaka in Pāli.” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens / Vienna Journal of South Asian Studies*, Vol. 36: 45–53.
- Berger, Peter L. (1990). *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion*. New York: Anchor Books.

- Bhattacharya, Kamaleswar (1967). “*Upadhi-, upādi- et upādāna-* dans le canon bouddhique pāli.” in *Mélanges d’indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou*. Paris: Publications de l’institut de civilisation indienne.
- (1980). “*Diṭṭhaṃ suttaṃ mutaṃ viññātaṃ.*” *Buddhist Studies in Honor of Walpola Rahula*, ed. by Somaratna Balasooriya et al. London: 10-15.
- Bingenheimer, Marcus (2014). “Collation Strategies for the Buddhist Canon as Seen in the Frequency and Impact of Character Variance in Canonical Editions of the *Song Gaoseng Zhuan* 宋高僧傳 (T. 2061)” in *Journal of East Asian Publishing and Society*, Vol. 4 (2): 1–16.
- Bollée, Willem. B. (1974). “Buddhists and Buddhism in the Earlier Literature of the Śvetāmbara Jains.” *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I. B. Horner*. Dordrecht–Boston: D. Reidel: 27–39.
- (ed.) (1980). *The Pādas of the Suttanipāta: With Parallels from the Āyāraṅga, Sūyagaḍa, Uttarajjhāyā, Dasaveyāliya and Isibhāsiāyīṃ*. Reinbek: Wezler.
- (1999). “Adda or the Oldest Extant Dispute between Jains and Heretics (Sūyagaḍa 2.6) Part Two.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* Vol. 27, No. 5: 411–437.
- Boucher, Daniel J. (1996). “Buddhist Translation Procedures in Third-Century China: A Study of Dharmakāśa and His Translation Idiom.” PhD diss. University of Pennsylvania.
- (1998). “Gāndhārī and the Early Chinese Buddhist Translations Reconsidered: The Case of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 118, No.4: 471-506.
- (2000). “On *Hu* and *Fan* Again: The Transmission of ‘Barbarian’ Manuscripts to China.” *Journals of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, Vol. 23 (1): 7-8.
- (2006). “Dharmarakṣa and the Transmission of Buddhism to China.” *Asia Major*, 3rd Series. Vol. 19, No. 1/2, China at the Crossroads: A Festschrift in Honor of Victor H. Mair: 13-37.
- (2008). *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna: A Study and Translation of the Rāṣṭrapālāparipṛcchā-sūtra*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- (2009). “What Do We Mean by ‘Early’ in the Study of the Early Mahāyāna—and Should We Care?” in *Bulletin of the Asia Institute*, New Series, Vol. 23: 33–41.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1985). “Dharma and Abhidharma” in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, London, Vol. 48.2: 305–320
- (1993). *The Two Traditions of Meditation in Ancient India*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

- (1998). *The Two Sources of Indian Asceticism* 2nd ed. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- (2003). “Ājīvika doctrine reconsidered” in Piotr Balcerowicz (ed.): *Essays in Jaina Philosophy and Religion*. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi: 153–178
- (2007). *Greater Magadha: Studies in the Culture of Early India*. Leiden: Brill.
- (2011). *Buddhism in the Shadow of Brahmanism*. Leiden: Brill.
- (2016). *How the Brahmins Won: From Alexander to the Guptas*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Brose, Benjamin (2009). “Buddhist Empires: Saṃgha-State Relations in Tenth-Century China.” Ph.D. diss., Stanford University.
- Brough, John (1962). *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*. London–New York–Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- (1964). “The Chinese Pseudo-Translation of Ārya-Śūra’s Jātaka-Mālā.” *Asia Major: A Journal of Far Eastern Studies* 11: 27–53.
- Burford, G. Grace (1983). “The Ideal Goal According to the Aṭṭhakavagga and its major Pāli Commentaries.” Ph.D. diss., Northwestern University.
- (1991). *Desire, Death, and Goodness: The Conflict of Ultimate Values in Theravāda Buddhism*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- (1992). “Theravāda Buddhist Soteriology and the Paradox of Desire.” *Path to Liberation: The Mārga and Its Transformations in Buddhist Thought* edited by Robert E. Buswell, Jr. and Robert M. Gimello. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Burlingame, Eugene Watson (1921). *Buddhist Legends: Dhammapada Commentary* Vol. 1–3 Harvard Oriental Series Vol. 28–30. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Buswell, Robert E., Jr. and Robert M. Gimello, (ed.) (1992). *Paths to Liberation: The Mārga and Its Transformations in Buddhist Thought*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Buswell, Robert E., Jr. (ed.) (1990). *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- (2004). “Sugi’s Collation Notes to the Koryō Buddhist Canon and Their Significance for Buddhist Textual Criticism.” *Journal of Korean Studies* 9.
- Carter, John Ross (1977). “A History of Early Buddhism” in *Religious Studies* Vol. 13, No. 3: 263–287.

- Chalmers, Lord (1997). *Buddha's Teachings: Being the Sutta-Nipāta or Discourse-Collection* in Harvard Oriental Series Vol. 37. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers. (First pub. Cambridge University Press, 1932).
- Collins, Steven (1982). *Selfless Persons: Imagery and thought in Theravāda Buddhism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- (1987). Review of *The Two Traditions of Meditation in Ancient India* by Johannes Bronkhorst. *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, No. 2: 373–375.
- (1990). “On the Very Idea of the Pāli Canon.” *Journal of the Pali Text Socieity XV*: 89–126.
- (1998). *Nirvana and Other Buddhist Felicities. Utopias of the Pali Imaginaire*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cowell, Edward Byles (1895–1907). *The Jataka or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births* Vol. 1–6.
- Drewes, David (2010). “Early Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism. 2 parts. *Religion Compass*, Vol. 4 (2): 55–65; 66–74.
- (2011). “Dharmabhāṇakas in Early Mahāyāna” in *Indo-Iranian Journal*, Vol. 54, No. 4: 331–372.
- (2015). “Oral Texts in Indian Mahāyāna” in *Indo-Iranian Journal*, Vol. 58 (2): 117–141.
- Edelglass, William and Jay L. Garfield (ed.) (2009). *Buddhist Philosophy: Essential Readings*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Edgerton, F. (1936). “The Meter of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka.” *Madras: Kuppuswami Sastri Commemoration Volume*: 39ff.
- Erdosy, George (1995). “City States of North India and Pakistan at the Time of the Buddha,” in F. R. Allchin (ed.), *The Archaeology of Early Historic South Asia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 99–122
- Fausböll, V. (trans.) (1898). *The Sutta-nipāta: A Collection of Discourses, Sacred Books of the East Vol X Part II*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Franke, R. Otto (1914). “Majjhimanikāya und Suttanipāta.” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Vol. 28: 261–276.
- Fogelin, Lars (2015). *An Archeological History of Indian Buddhism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Fuller, Paul (2005). *The Notion of Diṭṭhi in Theravāda Buddhism: The Point of View*. New York: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Geiger, Wilhelm (2005). *A Pāli Grammar*, translated by Batakriśhna Ghosh, revised and edited by K. R. Norman. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.
- Gombrich, Richard (2006). *How Buddhism Began: the Conditioned Genesis of the Early Teachings*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Gómez, Luis O. (1976). "Proto-Mādhyamika in the Pāli Canon." *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 26. No. 2, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Greene, Eric M. (2012). "Meditation, Repentance, and Visionary Experience in Early Medieval Chinese Buddhism." Ph.D. diss., University of California Berkeley.
- Gregory, Peter N. (2002). *Tsung-mi and the Sinification of Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Harrison, Paul 1987. "Who Gets to Ride in the Great Vehicle? Self-Image and Identity among the Followers of the Early Mahāyāna" in *the Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, Vol. 10 (1): 67–90.
- (1993). "The Earliest Chinese Translations of Mahāyāna Buddhist Sūtras: Some Notes on the Works of Lokakṣema." *Buddhist Studies Review* Vol. 10.2: 135–77
- (1995). "Searching for the Origins of the Mahāyāna: What are We Looking For?" in *the Eastern Buddhist*, New Series, Vol. 28 (1): 48–69.
- (2003a). "Mediums and Messages: Reflections on the Production of Mahāyāna Sūtras" in *the Eastern Buddhist*, New Series, Vol. 35 (1/2): 115–151.
- (2003b). Mahāsāṃghika School. *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*. s.v.
- (ed.) (2018). *Setting Out on the Great Way: Essays on Early Mahāyāna Buddhism*. Bristol: Equinox.
- Henderson, John B. (1991). *Scripture, Canon, and Commentary: A Comparison of Confucian And Western Exegesis*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- (1998). *The Construction of Orthodoxy and Heresy: Neo-Confucian, Islamic, Jewish, And Early Christian Patterns*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Herman, A. L. (1979). "A Solution to the Paradox of Desire in Buddhism." *Philosophy of East and West* 29: 91–94.

- Von. Hinüber, Oskar (1996). *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. New York: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Hirakawa, Akira (1963). *The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism and Its Relationship to the Worship of Stūpas*. Tokyo: The Tokyo Bunko.
- (1990). *A History of Indian Buddhism*. (trans. & ed.) by Paul Groner. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press; (2007): pub. in Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- Hoernle, A. F. Rudolf (1916). “The Sutta Nipata in a Sanskrit Version from Eastern Turkestan.” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*: 709-732.
- Horner, I. B. (1947). “Some Aspects of Movement in Early Buddhism.” *Artibus Asiae*, Vol. 10. No. 2: 138–141.
- Jaini, Padmanabh S. (1979). *The Jaina Path of Purification*. Berkeley-Los Angeles-London: University of California Press.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. and Joel P. Brereton (trans.) (2014). *The Rigveda: The Earliest Religious Poetry of India*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jayatilleke, K. N. (1963). *Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge*. Buddhist Tradition Series, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- Jayawickrama, N. A. (1976-1). “Criteria for the Analysis of the Sutta Nipāta—The Sutta Nipāta: Its Title and Form (A Critical Analysis of the Sutta Nipāta 1).” *The Pali Buddhist Review*, Vol. 1.2: 75-90.
- (1976-2). “The Vaggas of the Sutta Nipāta (A Critical Analysis of the Sutta Nipāta 2).” *The Pali Buddhist Review*, Vol. 1.3: 136-63.
- (1977-1). “A Critical Analysis of the Sutta Nipāta 3.” *The Pali Buddhist Review*, Vol. 2.1: 14-41.
- (1977-2). “A Critical Analysis of the Sutta Nipāta 4.” *The Pali Buddhist Review*, Vol. 2.2: 86-105.
- (1977-3). “A Critical Analysis of the Sutta Nipāta 5.” *The Pali Buddhist Review*, Vol. 2.3: 141-58.
- (1978-1). “The Narrative Ballads (A Critical Analysis of the Sutta Nipāta 6).” *The Pali Buddhist Review*, Vol. 3.1: 3-19.
- (1978-2). “Some Suttas from the Aṭṭhaka Vagga and Pucchās from the Pārāyana Vagga (A Critical Analysis of the Sutta Nipāta 7).” *The Pali Buddhist Review*, Vol. 3.2: 45-64.

- _____ (1978-3). “General Observation and Conclusions (A Critical Analysis of the Sutta Nipāta 8).” *The Pali Buddhist Review*, Vol. 3.3: 100-113.
- Johnson, W. J. trans. (1994). *The Bhagavad Gita*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Karashima, Seishi 辛嶋靜志 (1992). *The Textual Study of the Chinese Versions of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkāsūtra in Light of the Sanskrit and Tibetan Versions*. Tokyo: The Sankibo Press.
- _____ (2010). *A Glossary of Lokakṣema’s Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* 道行般若經詞典. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology Soka University.
- _____ (2013). “Was the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Compiled in Gandhāra in Gāndhārī?” *Annual Report of the International Research Insititute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka Univeristy*, Vol. 16: 171–188
- Lamotte, Étienne (1957 Jan.). “Khuddakanikāya and Kṣudrakapiṭaka.” *East and West*, Vol. 7, No. 4: 341–348.
- _____ (1988). *History of Indian Buddhism*, trans. by Sara Webb-Boin. Louvain-Paris: Peeters Press.
- Lancaster, Lewis R. (2012). “The Movement of Buddhist Texts from India to China and the Construction of the Chinese Buddhist Canon.” *Buddhism Across Boundaries: The Interplay of Indian, Chinese, and Central Asian Source Materials*. Sino-Platonic Papers 222, (ed.) by McRae, John R. and Jan Nattier.
- Lévi, Sylvain (1915). “Sur la Recitation primitive des Textes Bouddhiques” in *Journal Asiatique*. Mai-Juin: 402–24.
- Long, Jeffery D. (2009). *Jainism: An Introduction*. New York: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd.
- Lopez, Donald S. Jr. (ed.) (1988). *Buddhist Hermeneutics*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘I Press.
- Major, John S., Sarah A. Queen, Andrew Seth Meyer, and Harold D. Roth, with additional contributions by Michael Puett and Judson Murray, trans. (2010). *The Huainanzi: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Government in Early Han China*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Macdonell, Arthur Anthony (1916). *A Vedic Grammar for Students*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- McBride II, Richard D. (2007). *Domesticating the Dharma: Buddhist Cults and the Hwaŏm Synthesis in Korea*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- McGovern, Nathan (2013). "Buddhists, Brahmans, and Buddhist Brahmans: Negotiating Identities in Indian Antiquity." Ph.D. diss., University of California Santa Barbara
- (2019). *The Snake and the Mongoose: The Emergence of Identity in Early Indian Religion*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McRae, John R. and Jan Nattier (ed.) (2012). "Buddhism Across Boundaries: The Interplay of Indian, Chinese, and Central Asian Sources Materials." *Sino-Platonic Papers* 222.
- Meisterernst (2010). "Object Preposing in Classical and Pre-Medieval Chinese" in *Journal of Eastern Asian Linguistics Vol.19.1*
- Mizuno, Kōgen 水野弘元 (1952-1953). "Gisokukyō ni tsuite 義足經 について [Notes regarding the Yizujing 義足經]." *Indōgaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 1.1: 87- 95.
- Nakamura, Hajime 中村 元 (1980). *Indian Buddhism: A Survey with Bibliographical Notes*. Tokyo: KUFUS Publication ; (pubs. 1987 Delhi : Motilal Banarsidass Publishers).
- (1983). "Common Elements in Early Jain and Buddhist Literature." *Indologica Taurinensia* Vol. 11: 303-330.
- Nakatani, Hideaki 中谷英明. (2003). "*Buddha no konron* ブツダの魂論 [The Buddha's Theory of the Soul]." Nakatani, Hideaki, ed. *Koten no sekaizō* 古典の世界像, Kobe: 32–56.
- (2011). "*Senzaijigaishiki (papañca) to ninshiki (saññā) no tenkan: Aṭṭhakavagga no kijutsuniyoru* 潜在自我意識 (papañca) と認識 (saññā) の転換: Aṭṭhakavagga の記述による [The Transformation of the mental proliferation and the perception: According to the description of the Aṭṭhakavagga]." *Indōgaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 59, 2: 868–859.
- (2011-2012). "Suttanipāta niokeru Saññā Suttanipāta における saññā [Saññā in the Suttanipāta]." *Indōgaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 60 No. 2: 225–232.
- Nance, Richard (2008). "Indian Buddhist Preachers inside and outside the Sūtras" in *Religion Compass*, Vol 2 (2): 134–159.
- Nance, Richard (2012). *Speaking for Buddhas: Scriptural Commentary in Indian Buddhism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ñāṇananda, Bhikkhu (1971). *Concept and Reality in Early Buddhist Thought: An Essay on "Papañca" and "Papañca-Saññā-Saṅkhā"*. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society.

- (1974). *The Magic of the Mind: An Exposition of the Kalākārāma Sutta*. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society.
- Nattier, Jan (1990). “Church Language and Vernacular Language in Central Asian Buddhism” in *Numen* Vol. 37 Fasc. 2: 195–219.
- (1991). *Once upon a Future Time: Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline*. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press.
- (2003). *A Few Good Men: The Bodhisattva Path according to the Inquiry of Ugra (Ugraparipṛcchā)*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- (2004). “The Twelve Divisions of Scriptures () in the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations.” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University*, Vol. 7: 167–96.
- (2008). *A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations: Texts from the Eastern Han and Three Kingdoms Periods*. Tokyo: Soka University Press.
- (2019). “Zhi Qian.” in *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, edited by Jonathan A. Silk, Brill, pp. 818–825.
- Neelis, Jason E. (2011). *Early Buddhist Transmission and Trade Networks: Mobility and Exchange within and beyond the Northwestern Borderlands of South Asia*. Leiden–Boston: Brill
- Norman, K. R. (1976). “Pāli and the Language of the Heretics.” *Acta Orientalia* 37: 117–26.
- (1978). “The role of Pali in early Sinhalese Buddhism.” *Collected Papers II*, pp. 30–51. First Published in Heinz Bechert ed., *Buddhism in Ceylon and Studies on Religious Syncretism*, Göttingen: 28–47.
- (1980). “The Dialects in which the Buddha Preached.” *Die Sprache der Ältesten Buddhistischen Überlieferung*. Ed. By Heinz Bechert. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: 61–77
- (1983). *Pāli Literature: Including the Canonical Literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of All the Hinayana Schools of Buddhism*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- (1987). “The Origins of the Āryā metre,” in *Buddhist Philosophy and Culture (Essays in Honor of N. A. Jayawickrama)*. Colombo: 203–214
- (1997). *A Philological Approach to Buddhism*, London: The School of Oriental and African Studies (University of London).

- (trans.) (2001). *The Group of Discourses (Sutta-Nipāta): Translated with Introduction and Notes*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- (2003). “The Aṭṭhakavagga and Early Buddhism.” Olle Qvarnström, ed., *Jainism and Early Buddhism: Essays in Honor of Padmanabh S. Jaini*. Asian Humanities Press.
- Obeysekere Gananath (2002). *Imagining Karma: Ethical Transformation in Amerindian, Buddhists, and Greek Rebirth*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Oldenberg, H. (1915). “Zur Geschichte der Triṣṭubh” *Nachrichten von der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (Philologisch-historische Klasse): 490 ff.
- Olivelle, Patrick (intro. & trans.) (1992). *Śaṃnyāsa Upaniṣads: Hindu Scriptures on Asceticism and Renunciation*. New York–Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (ed. & trans.) (1995). *Rules and Regulations of Brahmanical Asceticism: Yatidharmasamuccaya of Yādava Prakāśa*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- (1998). *The Early Upaniṣads: Annotated Text and Translation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pande, Govind Chandra (1974). *Studies in the Origins of Buddhism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Pischel, Richard (1957). *Comparative Grammar of the Prākṛit Languages*. Translated from German by Subhadra Jhā. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Poceski, Mario (2007). *Ordinary Mind as the Way: The Hongzhou School and the Growth of Chan Buddhism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- (ed.) (2014). *Blackwell Companion to East and Inner Asian Buddhism*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Premasiri, P. D. (1972). *The Philosophy of the Aṭṭhakavagga*, The Wheel Publication No. 182, Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society, (2008 BPS Online Edition: at <http://www.bps.lk/library-search-select.php?id=wh182>).
- Pulleyblank, Edwin G. (1983). “Stages in the Transcription of Indian Words in Chinese from Han to Tang,” in *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien: Vorträge des Hamburger Symposions vom 2. Juli bis 5. Juli 1981*, ed. Klaus Röhrborn and Wolfgang Veenkerl Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983, p. 77.
- (1991). *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver: The UBC Press.

- Pyysiäinen, Ilkka (2000). "Sounds of Silence: 'Mystical' Paradox in the Atthakavagga", *Electronic Journal of Folklore* 15: 32–38.
- Radich, Michael (2014). "Ideas about 'Consciousness' in Fifth and Sixth Century Chinese Buddhist Debates on the Survival of Death by the Spirit, and the Chinese Background to *Amalavijñāna." In Lin, Chen-kuo, Michael Radich, eds. *A Distant Mirror: Articulating Indic Ideas in Sixth and Seventh Century Chinese Buddhism*. Hamburg: Hamburg University Press.
- (2016). "A "prehistory" to Chinese Debates on the Survival of Death by the Spirit, with a Focus on the Term Shishen 識神 / Shenshi 神識 ." *Journal of Chinese Religions* 44 (2): 105–126.
- Ray, Reginald. (1994). *Buddhist Saints in India: A Study in Buddhist Values and Orientations*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rhys Davids, T. W. (1898). "Asoka's Bhabra Edict." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* Vol. 30.3: 639–640.
- Rotman, Andy trans. (2008). *Divine Stories: Divyāvadāna Part I*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Ruegg, David Seyfort, and Lambert Schmithausen (ed.) (1990). *Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaka*. Leiden: Brill (Panels of the VIIth World Sankrit Conference) Vol. II
- Salomon, Richard (2000). *A Gāndhārī Version of the Rhinoceros Sūtra*, University of Washington Press.
- Sarao, Karam Tej (2008). Review of *Greater Magadha: Studies in the Culture of Early India* by Johannes Bronkhorst. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, Vol. 103.2: 1–5.
- Schmithausen, Lambert (1981). "On Some Aspects of Descriptions or Theories of 'Liberating Insight' and 'Enlightenment' in the Early Buddhism." *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus Gedenkschrift für Ludwig Alsdorf*. Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH Wiesbaden: 199–250.
- Schopen, Gregory (1975). "The Phrase *sa prthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bhavet* in the *Vajracchedikā* Notes on the Cult of the Book in Mahāyāna." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 17: 147–181
- (1979). "Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions" *Indo-Iranian Journal* 21:1: 1–19
- (1991). "Monks and the Relic Cult in the *Mahāparinibbanasutta*: An Old Misunderstanding in Regard to Monastic Buddhism." *From Benares to Beijing: Essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religion in Honour of Prof. Jan Yun-Hua*, eds. Koichi Shinohara and Gregory Schopen Oakville: Mosaic Press: 187–201; Also collected in Schopen, Gregory (1997).

- (1997). *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks: Collected Papers on the Archeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- (2000). “The Mahāyāna and the Middle Period in Indian Buddhism: Through a Chinese Looking-glass.” *The Eastern Buddhist Society*: 1–25.
- (2001). “On Sending the Monks back to Their Books: Cult and Conservatism in Early Mahāyāna Buddhism” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India: More Collected Papers*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press: 108–153.
- (2003). Mahāyāna. *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*. s.v.
- (2004). “If You Can’t Remember, How to Make It Up: Some monastic Rules for Redacting Canonical Texts.” *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i: 395–408; Originally pub. (1997) in *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ: Studies in Honor of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday (Indica et Tibetica 30)*, ed. P. Kieffer-Pülz and J.-U. Hartmann (Swisttal-Odendorf): 571–582
- (2004). *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters: Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- (2005). *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India: More Collected Papers*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- (2009). “On the absence of Urtext and Otiose Ācāryas: Buildings, Books, and Lay Buddhist Ritual at Gilgit”, in *Écrire et transmettre en Inde classique*, Gérard Colas and Gerdi Gerschheimer (ed.), Paris: École française d’Extrême-Orient: 189–219.
- (2014). *Buddhist Nuns, Monks, and Other Worldly Matters: Recent Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Sen, Tansen (2003). *Buddhism, Diplomacy, and Trade: The Realignment of Sino-Indian Relations, 600–1400*. Honolulu: Association for Asian Studies and University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Shastri, Kalanath & Dinesh Chandra Sharma (trans.) (1988). *Isibhasiyaim Suttaim*. Prakrit Bharati Academy, Jaipur Shri Jain Swetamber Nakoda Parshwanath Teerth, Mewanagar
- Shulman, Eviatar (2012–3). “The Aṭṭhakavagga as Buddhist Poetry.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 35. 1-2: 363–412.
- Silk, Jonathan (2001). “The Place of the Lotus Sūtra in Indian Buddhism” in *Journal of Oriental Studies*, II: 87–105.

- Spiro, Melford E. (1972). *Buddhism and Society: A Great Tradition and Its Burmese Vicissitudes*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Storch, Tanya (2014). *The History of Chinese Buddhist Bibliography: Censorship and Transformation of the Tripitaka*. Amherst: Cambria Press.
- Swanson, Paul (1998). "Apocryphal Texts in Chinese Buddhism: T'ien-t'ai Chih-I's Use of Apocryphal Scriptures." *Canonization and Decanonization*, (ed.) by Arie van der Kooji et al., Leiden: Boston: Brill: 245–56.
- Takuno, Kyoto (1990) "The Evaluation of Indigenous Scriptures in Chinese Buddhist Bibliographical Catalogues." *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, (ed.) by Robert E. Buswell Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press: 31–74.
- Taylor, Charles (2004). *Modern Social Imaginaries*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press
- Veradi, Giovanni. (2011). *Hardships and Downfall of Buddhism in India*. New Delhi: Manohar Publishers & Distributors
- Vetter, Tilmann (1998). *The Ideas and Meditative Practices of Early Buddhism*. Leiden: Brill.
- _____ (1990). "Some Remarks on Older Parts of the Suttanipāṭa." *Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaka* ed. by David Seyfort Ruegg and Lambert Schmithausen. Leiden: Brill.
- _____ (1994). "On the Origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism and the Subsequent Introduction of Prajñāpāramitā." *Asiatische Studien/ Études Asiatiques* Vol. 48.4: 1241–1281
- Walser, Joseph (2018). "When Did Buddhism Become Anti-Brahmanical? The Case of the Missing Soul." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*. Vol. 86, No. 1: 94–125.
- Warder, A. K. (1967). *Pāli Meter: A Contribution to the Study of Indian Literature*. London: Pāli Text Society.
- Watson, Burton trans. (2013). *The Complete Works of Zhuangzi*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- _____ (1970). *Indian Buddhism*. Delhi: Motilal Barnarsidass.
- W. B. Bollée (1980). *The Pādas of the Suttanipāṭa with Parallels from the Āyāraṅga, Sūyagaḍa, Uttarajjhāya, Dasaveyāliya and Isibhāsiyāṃ*. Reinbek: Inge Wezler.
- Welter, Albert (2006). *Monks, Rulers, and Literati: The Political Ascendancy of Chan Buddhism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____ (2008). *The Linji lu and the Creation of Chan Orthodoxy: The Development of Chan's Records of Sayings Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Williams, Paul (2009). *Mahāyāna Buddhism: The Doctrinal Foundations*. New York: Routledge.
- Wiltshire, Martin G. (1990). *Ascetic Figures before and in Early Buddhism*. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Witzel, Michael E. J. (2009). “Moving Targets? Texts, Language, Archaeology and History in the Late Vedic and Early Buddhist Periods.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 52, 2/3: 287–310
- Wu, Jiang, and Lucille Chia (ed.) (2015). *Spreading Buddha’s Word in East Asia: The Formation and Transformation of the Chinese Buddhist Canon*. Columbia University Press.
- Wynne, Alexander (2007). *The Origin of Buddhist Meditation*. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Zacchetti, Stefano (2002). “An Early Chinese Translation Corresponding to Chapter 6 of the *Peṭakopadesa*: An Shigao’s *Yin Chi Ru Jing* T 603 and its Indian Original: A Preliminary Survey.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*. Vol. 65 (1): 74-98.
- (2003). “The Rediscovery of Three Early Buddhist Scriptures on Meditation: A Preliminary Analysis of the *Fo shuo shi’er men jing*, the *Fo shuo jie shi’er men jing* Translated by An Shigao and Their Commentary Preserved in the Newly Found Kongō-ji Manuscript.” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University*, Vol. 6: 251–99.
- (2005). *In Praise of the Light: A Critical Synoptic Edition with an Annotated Translation of Chapter 1–3 of Dharmarakṣa’s Guang zang jing 光讚經, Being the Earliest Chinese Translation of the Larger Prajñāpāramitā*. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology.
- Zürcher, Erik (1991). “A New Look at the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Texts.” In *From Benares to Beijing: Essay on Buddhism and Chinese Religion in Honor of Prof. Jan Yün-hua*, pp. 227–300. Edited by Koichi Shinohara and Gregory Schopen. Oakdale, Ontario: Mosaic Press.