Notes on Lalitavistara, chapters 1-4

J. W. de Jong

Chapter one.

The publication in 1992 by Hokazono Kōichi of a new edition of chapters 1-14 of the Lalitavistara is a major contribution to the study of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature. Lefmann’s edition of the Lalitavistara, published in 1902 but already printed in 1882, belongs to a period in which very few Pāli and Sanskrit Buddhist texts had been published and little was known about the peculiarities of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit. Moreover, Lefmann was not a scholar of the stature of Senart whose edition of the Mahāvastu was a major achievement. It is only now that new manuscript material has become available that a new edition of the Mahāvastu ought to be undertaken.

Lefmann did not use the Chinese and Tibetan translations of the Lalitavistara. Already in 1848 Foucaux had published a French translation of the Tibetan version with many omissions. Foucaux’s translation of the Sanskrit text, published in 1884, appeared too late for Lefmann to use. In 1892 Foucaux published a second volume which contains notes on the text based on the Tibetan translation and readings of the three Paris manuscripts of the Lalitavistara. Hokazono does not refer to it in his critical apparatus.

Hokazono has been able to use six manuscripts belonging to the Tokyo University Library (T 1-6). However, T 1 and T 2 are parts of one manuscript, T 1 comprising chapters 16-27 and T 6 chapters 1-14 (see Hokazono’s article in Indogaku bukkōgaku kenkyū 33, 1 [1984]pp, 408-404). One manuscript (T 3) is a palmleaf one written in Sāṃvat 652 (1531-1532). Moreover, he has been able to use five manuscripts filmed by the Nepal–German Manuscript Preservation Project (N 1-5) of which one (N 3), a palmleaf manuscript, was written in Sāṃvat 747 (1626-1627). Of the manuscripts used by Lefmann Hokazono has been able to use copies of three. For three other manuscripts he depends on the not always reliable information.
about readings given by Lefmann in the second volume of his edition. The number of manuscripts of the Lalitavistara is considerable. Hokazono mentions that there are 11 manuscripts in the National Archives of Nepal and 37 in private collections (p. 230). It would be impossible for one scholar to collate all existing manuscripts. Moreover, the results would probably be disappointing because all known manuscripts come from Nepal, and most of them appear to have been written in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. However, it would be useful if of all available manuscripts a transcription of the same two or three pages of the beginning of a chapter would be published so that it would be possible to determine their characteristics.

Hokazono has made full use of Divākara’s Chinese translation and the Tibetan translation. He has been able to profit from the work done by previous scholars in the study of Buddhist Sanskrit and Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, and above all, from Edgerton’s grammar and dictionary. Hokazono rightly remarks that one cannot follow blindly Edgerton’s work although I would not entirely agree with his remark that there are many faults in his work (p. 217). If one takes into account that Edgerton had to work with very imperfect editions of Buddhist texts, one cannot but admire the results achieved. It is only when many more reliable editions have been published, that it will be possible to replace Edgerton’s work.

Hokazono’s edition of the first fourteen chapters of the Lalitavistara occupies the second part of his book. For the benefit of Western readers the critical apparatus is written in English. However, the many important remarks concerning the text in the notes following the Japanese translation are only accessible to scholars who read Japanese.

In the left-hand margin Hokazono has given the page numbers of Lefmann’s text. It is a pity that he has not followed Lefmann’s example in numbering the lines of the text which would have facilitated references to his text edition.

In October and November 1996 I had the pleasure to study the first chapter of Hokazono’s edition in a series of seminars in the stimulating environment of The International Institute for Buddhist Studies in Tokyo. The following notes are the result of these seminars. I am very grateful for having had the opportunity to be able to
discuss a number of textual problems with colleagues and students.

The following abbreviations will be used: LV—Lalitavistara, C1—Dharmarakṣa’s translation (A. D. 308), C2—Divākara’s translation (A. D. 683), Tib.—the Tibetan translation (beginning ninth century), L—Lefmann’s edition, BHSG—Edgerton’s Grammar, BHSD—Edgerton’s Dictionary, TTC—Tibetan—Tibetan—Chinese Dictionary Bod-rgya  tshig-mdzod chen-mo (Beijing, 1984), Mhv.—Mahāvyutpatti (the numbers refer to Sakaki’s edition, but I have also consulted the critical edition published by Yumiko Ishihama and Yōichi Fukuda, The Toyo Bunko, 1989). A and H refer to the readings of these two manuscripts in the second volume of Lefmann’s edition. I have consulted also a photocopy of A. As to the Tibetan translation I have been able to consult the Peking and Derge editions. Hokazono does not explain which edition(s) he has used. Needless to say, it will be necessary in the future to publish a critical edition of the Tibetan translation.

The first chapter begins with an enumeration of 34 monks out of the 12,000 present. In C2 only 15 are mentioned but not one in C1. We find similar enumerations in other Mahāyāna sūtras and it would be useful to make a systematic study of them. The first five names are those of the five bhadravargiya monks, cf. BHSD s. v. They are followed by Yaśodeva and his four friends. Instead of Yaśodeva Tib. has Grags-sbyin, i.e. Yaśoda which must have been the original reading. Yaśodeva is also found in the Larger Sukhāvatī where all manuscripts have Yaśodeva (cf. Fujita’s Romanized Text of the Sanskrit Manuscripts from Nepal, Part I, Tokyo, 1992, p. 19). However, in this case Tib. has Grags-lha and Fa-hsien’s translation (991 A. D.) Ch’eng t’ien 稱天 (cf. Kagawa Takao’s synoptic edition, Kyoto, 1984, p. 61). This shows that already before 800 A. D. in this text Yaśoda had been replaced by Yaśodeva.

The eighteenth monk is Kapphila (variants Kaphila, Kaphira). However Tib. has Ka-pi-na and C2 Chieh-pin-na 劫賓那. Without doubt, the original name was Kapphina or Kapphīṇa. In the Larger Sukhāvatīvyūha MS R has Mahākapphina (Fujita, op. cit., p. 23). See also BHSD, Kapphina and Mahākapphīṇa. The following name is Kauṣṭhila. Hokazono refers to BHSD Kauṣṭhila. Edgerton remarks: “so read with best mss. at LV 1. 14 for Lefm. Kauḍḍinya”.
ever Lefmann’s “best manuscript” (A) has Kausthiílena and only H has Kauśhilena. According to Hokazono’s apparatus T2 has Kaundilyena. Does this mean that T3-6 read Kauśhilena?

The twenty-fourth name is Kampila. It is not found in C2 but Tib. has ‘ug pa ‘owl’. There are many variants: Kasphila, Kampila, Kamphila and Kamphila. Under Kasphila Edgerton remarks: “Tib, here reads hug-pa, =Kauśika, which I believe is the true reading”. The equivalent ‘ug pa=Kauśika is found in Das’s Tibetan dictionary but its source is not indicated. Mhv. 4896 has uläka for ‘ug-pa. According to Mhv. 8910 ‘ug mig-po renders kimpiläkṣa. In the Larger Sukhāvatīvyuha two manuscripts have Kimpila (cf. Fujita, op. cit, p. 24). Tib. has here Kim-pi-la. In the LV Kimpila or Kimpila is without doubt the original reading.

The twenty-fourth name is Mahāpārānîka. Edgerton BHSD remarks that this name is not noted elsewhere. However, in the Larger Sukhāvatīvyuha one finds Pārāyanika which is not listed in BHSD. In Tib Mahāpārānîka is rendered pha-rol-tu ‘gro-ba chen-po and Pārāyanika pha-rol-son, cf. Mhv. 5107 pārāyaṇa=pha-rol-tu ‘gro-ba.

The text mentions eight bodhisattvas who are also mentioned in C2. Of the nine bodhisattvas mentioned in C1 1-6 and 9 agree with the Sanskrit text. In the Sanskrit text the seventh bodhisattva is Nityodyuktaprayukta, a rather strange name which seems to occur only in T3. [However, on p. 708, n. 11 Hokazono remarks that one must read with Tib, nityodyuktaprayukta. Here he does not mention T 3]. Tib. has brtson-’grus rtag-par sbyor. According to Hokazono it translates Nityodyuktaprayukta, which is doubtful. Perhaps Tib. renders Viryanityodyukta. C2 translates Nityodyukta and agrees with most of the manuscripts. Moreover, Nityodyukta is well-known (cf. BHSD) and is most probably the original reading.

The eighth bodhisattva is Mahākarunācandrin. Edgerton remarks in his dictionary: “So all mss.; but Tib. sens dpah= sattva instead of candrin”. However, Tib. has sens-pa and C2 ta-pei szu-wei 大悲脨惟. Probably the original reading is Mahākarunācantin.

In the following prose passage there are some differences between the Sanskrit text and Tib. P. 270. 6 rājamantrināṃ is missing in Tib. but it adds after rājamahāmātrānāṃ chags-’og gi rgyal-phant
which probably corresponds to kotţarāja (cf. Mhv. 3677 kotţarāja = rgyal phran). I have not found chabs-'og in the dictionaries but only chab-'og (cf. TTC). In line 7 between -brāhmaṇa and grhapatī Tib. adds tshon-dpon=šreṣṭhin. In line 8 Hokazono reads -brāhmaṇānām caraka- whereas most mss. read -brāhmaṇacaraka-, cf. p. 708, n. 14 where he states wrongly that according to Tib. one must separate brāhmaṇa and caraka. It seems that as in the case with Nityodyukta only T3 has the reading adopted by Hokazono. In lines 8-9 Hokazono reads prabhūtānāṃ praṇītānāṃ. According to his note N 4 inserts praṇītānāṃ. Tib. has bsod-cin maṅ-va which corresponds to praṇītānāṃ prabhūtānāṃ. Probably N4 has inserted praṇītānāṃ on the wrong place and Tib. translates the original reading. In line 11 the Sanskrit text has sarvatra cāṇuliptaḥ padma iva jālena. Tib. is more detailed: pad-ma la chus mi-gos-pa lhar thams-cad-du ma chags ma gos-par bzung-so, adding after sarvatra ma chags (asakta?) and ma gos-par (anupalipta?), and ending the sentence with bzung-so (viharati?). The words udāraḥ ca are missing in Tib. In line 16 samārakaṃ is missing in Tib. and in line 17 instead of viharati sma Tib. has rab-tu ston-pa which probably renders pravedayati (cf. Pali pavedeti, Vinaya I, p. 35). In the following sentence one must certainly read with T. sa dharmam desayati (cf. p. 271. n. 34). In line 19 Hokazono puts a comma after suvyāṇjanam and translates accordingly. In her translation of the Vinaya Miss Horner makes a break before svartam. The five verses on p. 272 are also found in C2. They are written in pure Sanskrit. It is therefore not possible to read in line 12 sāntam or śānta (acc.) as suggested by Tib.: rnam-grol mthar-phyin zi-ba'i dруn-du deṅ.

The five verses on p. 272 are also found in C2. They are written in pure Sanskrit. It is therefore not possible to read in line 12 sāntam or śānta (acc.) as suggested by Tib.: rnam-grol mthar-phyin zi-ba'i dруn-du deṅ.

There are a number of problems with the prose passage p. 272. 21-25. In line 22 one must read according to Tib. taya pūrvabuddhā..... lokayā. In line 23 nothing in Tib. corresponds to samantatāh. Also Tib. seems to have read tasyāḥ prāśāntāyāḥ samādher (rab-tu zi-ba'i tīn-ṇe-'dzin las). It is impossible to know the original reading because
Tib. seems to be based on an already corrupt text. In the following line one must probably read -khyeyaga- (cf. n. 44) although all manuscripts read -khyeyaga-. Probably the ā in āprameya and āsam-khyeya has caused the a to be changed into ā. In 273. 25-274. 2 Tib., seems to be based upon a more correct Sanskrit text: yān......vyūhān yāni ca parśanmandaṇāni (cf. p. 275, n. 1) and dharmaṇeśanā āsan.

In p. 274. 4 one ought to have ca after mahēśvaro: mahēśvaraṇa. In line 10 Hokazono separates between sāmcintya and avakramaṇa in his translation but sāmcintya qualifies avakramaṇa. His descent is intentional, cf. BHSD sāmcintya. In line 12 Tib. does not translate sārva in sarvalaukika-. In line 16 the text has bodhisattvavikriḍitah sarvāralaṃḍalavidhvaṃsanas but Tib. byān-chub sems-dpa'i rnam-par rol-pa daṅ / bdud-kyi dkyil-'khor thams-cad rnam-par 'jig-pa bstan-pa renders bodhisattvāvikriḍitasarvāralaṃḍalavidhvaṃsanasamdarṣanas. In line 17 Tib. does not translate aśṭadaśāṇi

Pp. 274-276 the Sanskrit text enumerates 58 tathāgatas. There are 48 mentioned in C1 and 56 in C2. C1 translates Hemāvarṇa (line 21) by hsüeh-hsiang 雪像 'snow-image' and seems to have read Himāvarṇa. In line 23 Tib. dmag tshogs las rgyal renders jītacakra and not jīnacakra. In line 25 Sthitabuddhidatta is translated as two names by C1: chu-chüeh 稔覺 Sthitabuddhi and chu-shih 稔施 Sthitadatta. C2 chien-lao hui-shih 堅牢惠施 and Tib, blo-gros brtan-pas byin-pa probably translate Sthirabuddhidatta.

Lefmann and Hokazono wrongly put a stop after samprakāśayet (p. 276. 6). The sentence concludes with iti in line 12. Before sukhaṇya Tib. (sman) add S H add hita. Sman means 'benefit' and not medicine (iyaku) as said by Hokazono p. 710, n. 46, cf. p. 278. 1 bahujanahita, Tib. skye-bo man-po la sman-pa. In line 8 one must read cāṣya mahāyāṇasyodbhavānārtham for.... mahāyāṇodbhavānārtham, cf. Tib. theg-pa chen-po 'di'an brjod-pa. Hokazono points out that in line 9 Tib. translates sarvamāraṇānām cābhībhavānārtham sarvabodhīsattvānām codbhāvānārtham instead of sarvabodhīsattvānām codbhāvānārtham sarvamāraṇānām cābhībhavārtham. This is the logical order found also in C1 and C2 (after the paraprabhāsins come the māras). According to C1 and C2 one or more words seem to have been dropped. Edgerton points out that one usually finds gunodb-
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hāvanā. cf. BHSD udbhāvanā. C2 has kung-te 功德 which corresponds well to guṇa. Probably the original reading was ca guṇ odbhāvanārtham instead of codbhāvanārtham In line 11 triratnavam-sasyāmparigrahārtham is not only missing in Tib. (cf. Hokazono, p. 710, n. 48) but also in C1 and C2. In the following line C1 translates buddhakāya! Possibly this is due to a Prakrit form in the text.

In line 17 Tib. does not translate divyaiś. It is found in both C1 and C2 which omit candanacūrṇair and agaracūrṇair. In line 19 read tasyā-m eva rātryā-m to indicate that m is a saṃdhī-consonant. One must omit ca which is not required here.

The beginning of line 23 is suspect: iti (hi) bhikṣavo rātrau praśāntāyām. Tib. has dge-sloṅ mdaṅ 'dir na'i druṅ-du “last night here near me”. cf. p. 278. 8 rātryām ihāsyām, Tib. mdaṅ-sum ‘dir. Probably one must read iha bhikṣavo... It is impossible to know on which Sanskrit text Tib. na'i druṅ-du is based.

P. 278. 10 Hokazono refers to BHSG 34. 1 for praviṣṭamāna. However, this form is highly irregular and one must certainly read with Tib. rab-tu gnas-gyur pratiṣṭhamānasya, cf. also A. Line 13 has pratītavarnā. Hokazono renders pratīta with myōjō 明淨 ‘brilliant-pure’, a meaning which is not recorded in Sanskrit dictionaries. Tib. has bzan-po and A pragirṇa which according to Monier-Williams is found in the Bhāgavatapurāṇa. Lefmann wrongly read pratīrṇa. Probably one must read pragirṇa which corresponds better to Tib. than pratīta. In line 16 Tib. has dbaṅ-phyug dbaṅ-phyug chen-po, tṣvaramahēśvara as in L. 438. 16 where the Sanskrit text has only mahēśvara. Here dbaṅ-phyug certainly translates tīra. In line 21 all mss. have mān. Hokazono reads mām but does not translate it. In Tib. there is no word corresponding to it and it is impossible to know the original reading. In line 24 Hokazono reads with most mss. rāganisūdanādyaṁ but in a note (p. 710, n. 61) he suggests that one must perhaps read nisūdanārtham because Tib. has bsal-bas. However, Tib. has thub-pa ‘dod-chags bsal-bas de-rin yaṅ in which de-rin translates adya. The text is certainly corrupt. In 280. 5-6 Tib. has lha-yi tshogs-kyis gsol-ba de snaṅ-phiyir / mi-gsun-bas gnaṅ-mdzad-pas-na / “In order to show the request of the troop of gods he gave his consent by silence”. The Sanskrit text is different: adhyeṣ anāṁ devaganasya tūṣṇīm agrhna devān adhīvāsanaṁ ca which
Edgerton translates as follows: "I silently accepted the request of the throng of gods for instruction, and the gods (accepted) my assent." (cf. BHSG 8. 85 and Hokazono's note p. 710, n. 66). According to Edgerton all mss. have devān and only a nom. pl. is possible. He adds: "-n- possibly saṃdhi-consonant". A hopeless crux!

On p. 267 Hokazono remarks that "in order to establish our Text, we depend in principle on five mss. of Tokyo and four published works [i.e. the editions of Mitra, Lefmann, Vaidya and Śāntibhiṣṇu Śāstrī] and we check all variants of these mss. and works strictly. On the other hand we refer to the variants of other mss. partially only when we admit the necessity for comparing them." In his critical apparatus Hokazono gives full information on the Tokyo mss., but it is not always clear if the reading adopted by him is the one not mentioned in it. For instance, p. 270. 1 Hokazono puts in the text nityodyuktaprayuktena and indicates in a note that mss. T2, T4, T5 and T6 have different readings. One therefore assumes that T3 has the reading nityodyuktaprayuktena. However, in a note to the translation (p. 708, n. 11) Hokazono refers for the reading nityodyukyaprayuktena only to Tib. and one wonders which is the reading of T3. The same question arises with regard to p. 270. 8: -brāhmaṇānām caraka- where T2 and T4-6 read -brāhmaṇacaraka-. In this case too Hokazono refers only to Tib. (cf. p. 710, n. 140).

In the critical apparatus Hokazono refers many times to the five Nepalese manuscripts photographed by the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project but there are only very few references to the readings of manuscripts in European collections (listed on p. 265).

Both in the critical apparatus and in the notes to his translation Hokazono often refers to Tib. However, he has not noted all the differences between Tib. and LV. I believe that this would be desirable because Tib. is of great importance for the study of the text of the LV. As Hokazono remarks in the first part of his work (p. 150) there are occasionally mistakes in Tib. However, it is difficult to assume that Tib. added words or sentences which were not in the Sanskrit manuscript(s) used by the Tibetan translators. One can consider Tib. to represent a manuscript more reliable than all the Nepalese manuscripts. However, that does not mean that one must not critically examine the readings represented by T. The Tibetan
translation is based upon a text which has a long history and has undergone many changes in the course of centuries. It is sometimes possible to discover that a more genuine reading did not occur in the Sanskrit manuscript(s) used by the Tibetan translators. For instance, C1 and C2 have a much better reading for **codbhāvanārthaḥ** (p. 276. 8) as pointed out above. It is therefore necessary to examine carefully the two Chinese translations.

The first Chinese translation by Dharmarakṣa is often difficult and sometimes impossible to understand. However, it is the oldest testimony to the history of the LV and cannot be neglected. Dharmarakṣa translated many texts and it is therefore possible to make a study of his translation technique and his vocabulary. A useful contribution has already been made by Karashima's study of Dharmarakṣa's translation of the Saddharma- **mapuṇḍarikasūtra** which, however, is mainly concerned with linguistic problems (Seishi Karashima, *The Textual Study of the Chinese Versions of the Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra in the light of the Sanskrit and Tibetan Versions*, Tokyo, 1992).

The first chapter of the LC contains many names of monks, bodhisattvas and devaputras. It is a pity that for Mahāyāna texts there is no equivalent for Akanuma’s Dictionary of Indian Buddhist Proper Names (*Indo bukkyo koyūmeishi jiten*, Nagoya 1930-1931; Kyoto, 1967). Many names are to be found in Edgerton’s Dictionary but not all are mentioned and only names occurring in Sanskrit texts are recorded.

An important text such as the LV requires a detailed commentary. This should pay attention to parallel places in Pāli and Sanskrit Buddhist texts. The publication of a CD-ROM of the Pāli Canon will make it easy to trace parallel passages. It is to be hoped that the Sanskrit Buddhist texts which are not so numerous as the Pāli texts will soon also be registered on a CD-ROM.

Chapter one contains two series of verses. The first, written in good Sanskrit, is found in C2 but the second, written in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, is absent from it. It is interesting to note that C2 and Tib. correspond very well to the Sanskrit text of the first series of verses but that Tib. is of little help in solving the difficulties found in the second series of verses.
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It is obvious that from the study of one brief chapter of the LV it is impossible to draw definite conclusions. My notes on this chapter are meant in the first place as a tribute to Hokazono who has furnished a solid basis for the study of the LV. In the second place I hoped to have indicated, however imperfectly, possible directions for further studies of the text and its history.

Chapter two.

P. 282.4: labdhābhīprāyasya. L and most mss. have labdhābhīṣekhasya but T (Tibetan) has bsam-'pa thob-'pa, labdhābhīprāyasya, cf. F (Ph. –Ed. Foucaux, Le Lalita Vistara. Seconde partie. Paris, 1892, p. 84). Neither C1 nor C2 have labdhābhīprāyasya which was probably later added.

P. 282.5-6: smṛtimatigathihṛidhyuttaptavipulabuddheḥ. L and most mss. omit hṛi. Instead of -ḥṛidhy- T has khrel yod-'pa daṅ / dga’-ba, apatṛpyatuṣṭi (?). C2 seems to have the same reading: ts’an k’uei chih tsu 慚愧足.


P. 282.8: mahābhijñāvidyāsaṅgānāvaraṇa–, T has vidyā (rig-'pa) but C2 translates: “having obtained mahābhijñā, asaṅgānāvaraṇa–”, However, C1 (p. 186a10) has abhijñā and traṇividyaīā.

P. 282.10: aparimitapuṇyasambhara– in C1 (p. 186a13), but not in C2.

P. 282.11: dirghānuparivartin. C1 (p. 186a14) translates: “during a long time he has always obtained mastery”, C2 “without interruption he has benefited the human beings”. BHSD translates: “who has long followed (the proper course)”. The expression dirghānuvartin seems to occur only here and the exact meaning is difficult to determine.

P. 282.14-15: bahubodhinskattvakotinayatasahasrāvalokitāvalokitavadanasya. Hokazono remarks that the meaning of avalokita-avalokita-vadana is not clear (p. 719, n. 11). Probably it means “his face, looked at by the look of..”, cf. BHSD avalokita (1).

P. 282.15-16: sakrabrahmamaheśvaralokakālaḍevaṇagāyakṣagandharva-sūragarudakinnaramahoragarākṣaṇair. Hokazono notes that kin-
naramahoraga is missing in T. However, it is found in C2 which does not translate rākṣasagaṇa. C1 does not translate asura....gana.

P. 282.19: mahādharmanāu-. H reads mahādharmanaukā-.


P. 282.23: -mahakarunādaṇḍa-. T has sniṅ-rje chen-po'i chu-bo. One expects sdoṅ-bu instead of chu-bo.

P. 282.24: upāyakaṇḍalakarnīkasya. Read upāyakaṇḍalya-? Cf. BHSD s. v. upāyakaṇḍalya.

P. 284.1: -daṣadigapratihatagandhino. T gsun-gi nad phyogs-bcur thogs-pa med-par ldan-ba, i. e. daṣadigapratihatavāggandhino. Neither C1 nor C2 translate vāg.

P. 284.9–10: caturīryāpathhavinayavanopavanasuvardhitataror. Instead of taror T has lus, i. e. tanor which is the correct reading, cf. F p. 85, C2 also has “body”. It is the body of the puruṣasimha (1. 12) which is suvardhīta.

P. 284.12: -(pra) mardanasya. The mss. suggest rather the reading -pramathanasya.

P. 284.14: avidyātamo'ndhakāratamahāpaṭala-. In T tamaḥ is missing.


P. 284.18: buddhavibudhamanuja-. T mi daṅ lha mkhas-pa'i. A reads buddhavibudhamanuja-. Hokazono (p. 720, n. 35) translates buddha-vibudha by “a wise heavenly god” (kemmei-naru tenjin), but vibudha qualifies manuja “wise man”. In T one expects rather lha daṅ mi mkhas-pa'i.


P. 285.22: -dharmaratnacakra-. Tchos-kyi 'khor-lo rin-po-che trans-
lates dharmacakraratna.


P. 286.5: dattasatyamkārasaya. T bden-pa'i rgyan-gyis legs-par brgyan-pa, satyalamkārasvalamkṛta, cf. F. p. 85? A has dattasatyamkalasya. The text is hopelessly corrupt.

P. 286.6: niryā (ti) tasarvakuśalamulasaya. T dge-ba'i rtsa-ba nes-par byas-pa. Hokazono notes nes-par byas-pa (=niyamita?). Missing in C1 and 2.

P. 286.8: kāyikena. T lus-kyi. A has kāyena. Read kāyena.

P. 286.9: daśakūśalakarmapathāsevitavataḥ. The variant readings suggest a possible reading -pathān āsevitavataḥ.

P. 286.11: -samyagadhyāsaya-. T does not translate samyag.

P. 286.13: rjikrtavataḥ. Cf. BHSD. Edgerton quotes A rjīr- which is probably to be preferred.


P. 286.20: manusyalokam utpanno. Most mss. read manusyalokotpanno which is to be preferred.

P. 286.21: tasmin mahāvimāne sukhopaviṣṭasya dvātrīṃśadbhūmi-sahasrapratisamsthite. T g zal-med-khaṅ gzan (D omits gzan) gnas sum-khri ſnis stoṅ rab-tu gnas-pa. T does not translate tasmin, mahā - and sukhopaviṣṭasya which occurs again P. 288.12. T gnas is not the usual translation of bhūmi. C1 (p. 484b28) has “beds and seats (or thrones) (ch’uang tso 床座)”, C2 (p. 540c22-23) “subtle, pleasant dwelling places”.

P. 288.1: ucchritatadhvajapatāka-. T gdugs daṅ / rgyal-mtshan daṅ / ba-daṅ sgreṅ-ba. Read -patāke ratna-.
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P. 288.8-9: -dvijagaṇa-. T omits gaṇa.
P. 288.9: -madhuranirghoṣanikūjīte. Probably one must read madhur‐
P. 288.10-11: vyapagatakhillakrodhapratihamānadamadarpāpanayane. T
na‐rgyal daṇ / rgyags‐pa daṇ / dregs‐pa daṇ / thab‐
daṇ / khor‐ba ma‐par gyur‐pa, vyapagatamānadamadarpakrodhakhillapratighe. It is difficult to explain the differences
between the Sanskrit text and T. Read vyapagatakhillakrodhapratihamānadamadarpāpanayane?
P. 288.13: caturaṣṭībhyas tūrjasamāgitahasanirnāditebhya. Read with
A caturaṣṭītūrja‐.
P. 288.15-294.4: In these twenty Ārya verses there are many irregularities. They are found in both C1 and C2. It would be useful to
translate the Chinese versions and to study systematically all Ārya verses in the Lalitavistara.
P. 290.3: vīryabalaḥyānaprajaṇa. Both C1 and C2 omit bala. T brtson‐
grus bsam‐gtan ses‐rab stobs, vīryadhyānaprajanābala.
Perhaps bala was later added and one must read vīryadhyānaprajanā?

Chapter three.

P. 296.21: tad eva poṣadheyam ca pañcadasyaṃ. Omit ca. Cf. MSV (Mulasarvāstivādavinayavastu), I, p. 31: tad eva poṣadhe paṃ-
cadasyaṃ.
P. 298.2: before nūnam T adds: bdag‐gi drun‐du lhaʾi ʾkhor‐lo rin‐
po‐che ʾnūn‐pa las “since the divine wheel jewel has come to me”.
P. 298.3: yan nv aham divyaṃ cakraratnam mimāṃseyam omitted in T.
P. 298.6: prārthayad. Read pravartayann, cf. p. 299, n. 8 for T.
P. 298.20: after vakṣyatha T adds: phra‐ma ma zer‐cig / nag rtsub‐po
ma smra‐sig / tshig khyal‐pa ma smra‐sig / brnab‐sems can‐du ma
ˈgyur‐cig / gnod‐sems can‐du ma ˈgyur‐cig / log‐par lta‐bar ma
ˈgyur‐cig / srog‐gcod‐la byams‐par ma ˈgyur‐cig / log‐par lta‐ba
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can-gyi bar-la byams-par ma gyur-cig “do not speak slanderous words (paiṣunya M 1693), do not speak harsh words (pārusya M 1692), do not speak nonsense (sambhinnapralāpa M 1698), do not have false views (mithyārśti M 1698), do not rejoice (rocetha) in killing until [...] do not rejoice in false views”.

P. 298.23: pūrvaṃ disaṃ vijītaḥ. Read vijīta, cf. p. 298. 27.


P. 300.2: 'ksatam eva. Read 'ksata-m-eva.


P. 300.16: ādhīvavananā. T žon-na gus-par byed = ādīvavahanām !


P. 302.2: udvayābhūmiṃ not in T.


P. 304.3: cakravartī. T 'khor-los sgyur-ba'i rgyal-po = rājā cakravar- tī.

P. 304.3-4: (pūrṇam) cāṣya. For pūrṇam cāṣya cf. Divyāvadāna p. 548. 27. T has de-la = tasya.
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Divyāvadāna p. 549.1-2.

P. 304.7: vāntachandarāgo. Read with A vāntacchandarāgo.
P. 304.10: buddhakṣetram. T adds 'di = idam. Cf. also C2 (p. 541.c5.)
P. 304.12-13: golāṅgula-. T mjug-ma=lāṅgula-. C2 (p. 541.c6) has “basis of a tail”, Cf. BHSD golāṅgula-parivartana and gonaṅgula.
P. 304.15: atyudgamyā. Read abhyudgamyā. Abhy- and aty- are often confused.
P. 306.3-4: jātiprajñāyate jārajprajñāyate vyādhiprajñāyate maraṇaprajñāyate. Read jāti-prajñāyate jāra-prajñāyate vyādhi-prajñāyate maraṇaḥ prajñāyate.
P. 306.23: kiyadrīpāyām T ji-lta-bu žig-gi lhums-su, kiyadgarbhāyāṁ (?)
P. 308.1: tatkulaśradeśopacāraṃ. For T see p. 309. n 2. C1 “land, state, city” (p. 485b7) is closer to the Sanskrit text than T.
P. 308.9: vanśarāja-. Read vaisarāja-. Cf. C1 (485b15) and C2 (543a11). C1 has ho-sha 和沙 vassa (?)
P. 308.13: tatra rāja, T de'i rgyal-po=tasya rājā.
P. 308.27-28: candās ca capalās ca raurdās ca poruṣās ca sāhasikās ca. T khro-'zin gtum-la brlaṅ-'zin gzu-lums-can rgod-pa ste. T does not correspond well with the Sanskrit text. C2 (542a20) has “violent” but C1 (485c2-4) is much more detailed.
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P. 310.15: aparā. A apare ṣy.
P. 310.15: maithilasya. Hokazono notes that T has phan-tshun 'byor gyi steṅ-du (p. 744, note 99). However, the Peking edition has phan-tshun 'gyed-kiye. Hokazono's reading is found in the Derge edition.
P. 312.23: adoṣagāminam. T ze-sdañ mi-'gro-ba=adveṣagāminam Read adeva-. Cf C 1 (485c27).
P. 316.14: parikṛṣṭasampat. T las-kyi-mthāḥ la ūnon-moṃs-pa med-pa. Read parikṛṣṭasampat?
P. 318.6: -doṣa-. T ze-sdañ. L dveṣa. Read -dveṣa-.
P. 318.6: ....... buddhi. Read buddhi.
P. 318.8: sendrayudham iva yaśṭih suvītā. T 'ja'i dbyin śtar śīn-tu 'dud-pa = indrayudham iva suvinātā.
P. 318.10: -daśanā. Read -darśanā.
P. 318.11: -kaṭi. Read -kaṭi.
P. 318.11-12: vajrasaṇil. T rdo-rje śtar mkhreng-shin mtshunś-pa med-pa'i lus dañ-ldan-pa. Read -kalpaśadṛśa- (-kalpā asadṛśa-) ?
P. 318.14: apratīvīśṭā. T mtshunś-pa med-pa, asamā?
P. 318.19-324.20: These twenty verses are found in the two Chinese
translational errors but it is interesting to note that C1 follows the Sanskrit more closely than C2.

P. 322.17: pañca-anūnakāni, Read pañca-m-anūnakāni.

P. 324.11: guñānvitād, Read guñānvilāv.

Chapter four

P. 326.9: caturmahādvīpa (ka) loka-. A reads -dvipa-, omitting lo. Read -dvipaloka-.

P. 326.9-10: mandalamādhiṣṭhitō. Read mandalamādhiṣṭhitō.


P. 326.18: -tābhinādite. T (mṇon-par dga’-ba) wrongly translates abhinandite.

P. 326.20: -dāmamālya-. T omits mālya.


P. 328.15: aṣṭottaraśatam. Both the Sanskrit text and C2 have 109 items.


P. 328.19: tri(kāvadosa) kāra-. Derge has lus-kyi ņes-pa rnam-pa gsum, but P omits lus-kyi ņes-pa. C2 has “three doṣas” (544b5).

P. 330.1: sarvopadhika-. Read sarvaupadhika-? Cf. BHSD s. v. auṣpadhi-ka.

P. 330.15: parā<na>timanyanatāyai. C1 (478a26) has “not despising others” but C2 (544b20) “not depending on the insight of others”.

P. 332.3: anunnāmāananāmanātāyai. Read anunnāmāananāmanātāyai?


P. 332.27: praśraddhi-. T śin-tu sbyaṅs-pa. Read praśrabdhi-.

P. 334.7: -pratipraśraddhyai. T rgyun chad-par 'gyur-ro. Read -prati-
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praśrābdhyai.
P. 334.27: -pratyavekṣaṇatāya. T nod-ña “to receive”?
P. 336.21: caturaśīter devaputrasahasrāṇām. Read with A caturaśitideva-.
P. 336.23: kṣaṇīḥ prati-. Read with A kṣaṇiṃ prati-. T bzod-par thob-par gyur-to.
P. 338.11: mā ga(c) chata punar apāyān. T inan-soñ dag-tu soñ-bar gyur ta-re. T omits mā. A also omits mā.
P. 340.3-4: anyonyagamanayuktā yathaiva sāmāyikā "sañ ca. Several mss (including A) have sāmāyikāmañca. T has ’dus-ña dag ni khri-las-su: sāmājīkā mañce? Hokazono reads sāmāyikā āsañ (āsañ) ca, cf. p. 761. n. 59. However, khri certainly translates mañca.
P. 344.10: pravarṣayēd amṛtagāniṃ. Read pravarṣaye-d-amṛtagāniṃ.