

## 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 bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 33, 1 [1984]pp, 408-404). One manuscript (T 3) is a palmleaf one written in Śaṃvat 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 Śaṃvat 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. -*Mahāvvyutpatti* (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 *bhadravargīya* 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 Sukhāvati 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 Kapphina. In the Larger Sukhāvativyūha MS R has Mahākapphina (Fujita, *op. cit.*, p. 23). See also BHSD, Kapphina and Mahākapphina. The following name is Kauṣṭhila. Hokazono refers to BHSD Kauṣṭhila. Edgerton remarks: "so read with best mss. at LV 1. 14 for Lefm. Kaundinya". How-

ever Lefmann's "best manuscript" (A) has Kausthilena and only H has Kauṣṭhilena. According to Hokazono's apparatus T2 has Kauṇḍilyena. Does this mean that T3-6 read Kauṣṭhilena?

The twenty-fourth name is Kampila. It is not found in C 2 but Tib. has 'ug pa 'owl'. There are many variants: Kasphila, Kaṃpila, Kaṃphila 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 *ulūka* for 'ug-pa. According to Mhv. 8910 'ug mig-po renders *kiṃpilākṣa*. In the Larger Sūkhāvativyūha two manuscripts have Kimpila (cf. Fujita, *op. cit.*, p. 24). Tib. has here Kim-pi-la. In the LV Kimpila or Kiṃpila is without doubt the original reading.

The twenty-fourth name is Mahāpāraṇika. Edgerton BHSD remarks that this name is not noted elsewhere. However, in the Larger Sūkhāvativyūha one finds Pārāyaṇika which is not listed in BHSD. In Tib Mahāpāraṇika is rendered *pha-rol-tu 'gro-ba chen-po* and Pārāyaṇika *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 Vīryanityodyukta. 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 Mahākaruṇācandrin. Edgerton remarks in his dictionary: "So all mss.; but Tib. *sems dpah* = *sattva* instead of *candrin*". However, Tib. has *sems-pa* and C2 *ta-peī szu-wei* 大悲思惟. Probably the original reading is Mahākaruṇācintin.

In the following prose passage there are some differences between the Sanskrit text and Tib. P. 270. 6 *rājamantrinām* is missing in Tib. but it adds after *rājamahāmātrāṇām chags-'og gi rgyal-phran*

which probably corresponds to *kottarāja* (cf. Mhv. 3677 *kottarāja* = *rgyal phran*). I have not found *chabs-'og* in the dictionaries but only *chab-'og* (cf. TTC). In line 7 between *-brāhmaṇa* and *gṛhapati* Tib. adds *tshoñ-dpon* = *śreṣṭhin*. 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 *prabhūtānām pranītānām*. According to his note N 4 inserts *pranītānām*. Tib. has *bsod-ciñ mañ-ba* which corresponds to *pranītānām prabhūtānām*. Probably N4 has inserted *pranītānām* on the wrong place and Tib. translates the original reading. In line 11 the Sanskrit text has *sarvatra cānuliptaḥ padma iva jalena*. Tib. is more detailed: *pad-ma la chus mi-gos-pa ltar thams-cad-du ma chags ma gos-par bžugs-so*, adding after *sarvatra ma chags* (*asakta?*) and *ma gos-par* (*anupalipta?*), and ending the sentence with *bžugs-so* (*viharati?*). The words *udāraś ca* are missing in Tib. In line 16 *samārakam* is missing in Tib. and in line 17 instead of *viharati sma* Tib. has *rab-tu ston-pa* which probably renders *pravedayati* (cf. Pāli *pavedeti*, Vinaya I, p. 35). In the following sentence one must certainly read with T. *sa dharmam deśayati* (cf. p. 271. n. 34). In line 19 Hokazono puts a comma after *svyañjanam* and translates accordingly. In her translation of the Vinaya Miss Horner makes a break before *svartham* in line 18 and translates: "He teaches dhamma, lovely at the beginning, lovely in the middle, lovely at the end. He explains with the spirit and the letter the Brahma-faring completely fulfilled and wholly pure." (*The Book of the Discipline*, Volume IV, London, 1951, p. 47). Tib. makes a break after *paryavadātam*.

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 *sānta* (acc.) as suggested by Tib. : *rnam-grol mthar-phyin ži-ba'i druñ-du den*.

There are a number of problems with the prose passage p. 272. 21-25. In line 22 one must read according to Tib. *tayā pūrvabuddhā..... lokayā*. In line 23 nothing in Tib. corresponds to *samantataḥ*. Also Tib. seems to have read *tasyāḥ praśāntāyāḥ samādhēr* (*rab-tu ži-ba'i tiñ-ne-'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 *-khyeyāga-*. Probably the *ā* in *āprameya* and *āsamkhyeya* 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 parśanmaṇḍalāni* (cf. p. 275, n. 1) and *dharmadeśanā āsan*.

In p. 274. 4 one ought to have *ca* after *maheśvaro: maheśvaraśca*. In line 10 Hokazono separates between *saṃcintya* and *avakramaṇa* in his translation but *saṃcintya* qualifies *avakramaṇa*. His descent is intentional, cf. BHS *saṃcintya*. In line 12 Tib. does not translate *sarva* in *sarvalaukika-*. In line 16 the text has *bodhisattvavikrīḍitaḥ sarvamāraṇḍalavidhvamsanas* but Tib. *byañ-chub sems-dpa'i rnam-par rol-pa dan / bdud-kyi dkyil-'khor thams-cad rnam-par 'jig-pa bstan-pa* renders *bodhisattvavikrīḍitasarvamāraṇḍalavidhvamsanasamdarśanas*. In line 17 Tib. does not translate *aṣṭadaśāvenika*.

Pp. 274-276 the Sanskrit text enumerates 58 tathāgatas. There are 48 mentioned in C1 and 56 in C2. C1 translates Hemavarṇa (line 21) by *hsüeh-hsiang* 雪像 'snow-image' and seems to have read Himavarṇa. In line 23 Tib. *dmag tshogs las rgyal* renders *Jitacakra* and not *Jinacakra*. In line 25 Sthitabuddhidatta is translated as two names by C1: *chu-chüeh* 佳覺 Sthitabuddhi and *chu-shih* 佳施 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 *saṃprakāśayet* (p. 276. 6). The sentence concludes with *iti* in line 12. Before *sukhāya* Tib. (*sman*) add S H add *hitāya*. *Sman* means 'benefit' and not medicine (*iyaku*) as said by Hokazono p. 710, n. 46, cf. p. 278. 1 *bahujanahitāya*, Tib. *skye-bo mañ-po la sman-pa*. In line 8 one must read *cāsyā mahāyānasyodbhāvanārtham* for... *mahāyānodbhāvanārtham*, cf. Tib. *theg-pa chen-po 'di'añ brjod-pa*. Hokazono points out that in line 9 Tib. translates *sarvamārāṇām cābhibhāvanārtham sarvabodhisattvānām codbhāvanārtham* instead of *sarvabodhisattvānām codbhāvanārtham sarvamārāṇām cābhibhavārtham*. This is the logical order found also in C1 and C2 (after the *parapravādins* come the *māras*). According to C1 and C2 one or more words seem to have been dropped. Edgerton points out that one usually finds *guṇodb-*

*hāvanā*. cf. BHSD *udbhāvanā*. C2 has *kung-te* 功德 which corresponds well to *guṇa*. Probably the original reading was *ca guṇodbhāvanārtham* instead of *codbhāvanārtham*. In line 11 *triratnavam-sasyānuparigrahārtham* 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 saṃdhi-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 mdañ 'dir ṅa'i druṅ-du* "last night here near me". cf. p. 278. 8 *rātryām ihāsyām*, Tib. *mdañ-sum 'dir*. Probably one must read *iha bhikṣavo...* It is impossible to know on which Sanskrit text Tib. *ṅa'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 *pratītavārṇā*. Hokazono renders *pratīta* with *myōjō* 明淨 'brilliant-pure', a meaning which is not recorded in Sanskrit dictionaries. Tib. has *bzañ-po* and A *pragīrṇa* which according to Monier-Williams is found in the Bhāgavatapurāṇa. Lefmann wrongly read *pratīrṇa*. Probably one must read *pragīrṇa* which corresponds better to Tib. than *pratīta*. In line 16 Tib. has *dbañ-phyug dbañ-phyug chen-po, īśvaramaheśvara* as in L. 438. 16 where the Sanskrit text has only *maheśvara*. Here *dbañ-phyug* certainly translates *īśa*. 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. *rāganisūdanādyam* 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 yañ* in which *de-rin* translates *adya*. The text is certainly corrupt. In 280. 5-6 Tib. has *lha-yi tshogs-kyis gsol-ba de snañ-phyir / mi-gsuñ-bas gnañ-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: *adhyeṣanām devagaṇasya tūṣṇīm agrhna devān adhivāsanam 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. BHS 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 samdhi-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 Śāntibhikṣu 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 *nityodyukyapra-yuktena* 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 *codbhāvanārtham* (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 Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra which, however, is mainly concerned with linguistic problems (Seishi Karashima, *The Textual Study of the Chinese Versions of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra 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 bukkyō 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.

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: *labdhābhiprāyasya*. L and most mss. have *labdhābhiṣekasya* but T (Tibetan) has *bsam-pa thob-pa.*, *labdhābhiprāyasya*, cf. F (Ph. -Ed. Foucaux, *Le Lalita Vistara*. Seconde partie. Paris, 1892, p. 84). Neither C1 nor C2 have *labdhābhiprāyasya* which was probably later added.

P. 282.5-6: *smṛtimatigatihrīdhṛtyuttaptavipulabuddheḥ*. L and most mss. omit *hrī*. Instead of *-hrīdhṛty-* T has *khrel yod-pa dan / dga'-ba*, *apatrāpyatuṣṭi* (?). C2 seems to have the same reading: *ts'an k'uei chih tsu* 慚愧知足.

P. 282.7-8: *mahāmaitrikaruṇāmuditopekṣābrahmapathakovidasya*. T and C2 read: *mahāmaitrīmahākaruṇāmahāmuditāmahopekṣā-*, cf. T *byams-pa chen-po dan / sñiñ-rje chen-po dan / dga'-ba chen-po dan / btañ-sñoms chen-po*.

P. 282.8: *mahābhijñāvidyāsaṅgānāvaraṇa-*, T has *vidyā* (*rig-pa*) but C2 translates: “having obtained *mahābhijñā*, *asaṅgānāvaraṇa-*”, However, C1 (p. 186a10) has *abhijñā* and *traividyatā*.

P. 282.10: *aparimitapunyasambhara-* in C1 (p. 186a13), but not in C2.

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

P. 282.14-15: *bahubodhisattvakoṭīnayaṭasatasahasrāvalokitāvalokitavadanasya*. 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. BHS D *avalokita* (1).

P. 282.15-16: *śakrabrahmamahēśvaralokapāladevanāgayakṣagandharvāsuraḥsuragarudakinnaramahoragarākṣaganair*. 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....gaṇa*.

P. 282.19: *mahādharmānau-*. H reads *mahādharmānaukā-*.

P. 282.21: *caturōghapāragāminābhiprāyasya*. Read *-gāmitā*, cf. W (Friedrich Weller. *Zum Lalita Vistara I. Über die Prosa des Lal. Vist.*. Leipzig, 1915, p. 16) and Sch. (Walther Schubring, *Zum Lalitavistara. Asiatica. Festschrift Friedrich Weller* Leipzig, 1954, pp. 610-655). A has *pāramitābhiprāyasya*.

P. 282.21-22: *sarvaparapravādisunigrhītasya*. Note the active meaning of *sunigrhīta*, T *śin-tu tshar-bcad-pa*.

P. 282.23: *-mahākaruṇādanda-*. T has *sñiñ-rje chen-po'i chu-bo*. One expects *sdoñ-bu* instead of *chu-bo*.

P. 282.24: *upāyakauśalakarṇikasya*. Read *upāyakauśalya-*? Cf. BHSD s. v. *upāyakauśalya*.

P. 284.1: *-daśadigaṇapratihatagandhino*. T *gsuñ-gi ñad phyogs-bcur thogs-pa med-par ldañ-ba*, i. e. *daśadigaṇapratihatavāggandhino*. Neither C1 nor C2 translate *vāg*.

P. 284.9-10: *caturīryāpathavinayavanopavanasuwardhitataror*. 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 *suwardhita*.

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

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

P. 284.18: *bodhyaṅgasukhaśiśīrakiraṇasya*. T *byañ-chub-kyi yan-lag-gi bde-bas zla-ba'i 'od-zer-du gyur-pa*. Most mss. read *-sukha-raśmiśaśīkiraṇasya*. Read *-sukhaśaśīkiraṇasya*.

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

P. 284.19: *mahāpuruṣacandrasamacatuṣparṣaddvīpānucaritasya*. T *skyes-bu chen-po zla-ba / 'khor-gyi gliñ-bžir soñ-ba*. Read *mahāpuruṣacandrasya catuṣ-*. Cf. Hokazono p. 285, n. 41. P. 284. 13-19 qualify *mahāpuruṣacandra*.

P. 285.22: *-dharmaratnacakra-*. T *chos-kyi 'khor-lo rin-po-che* trans-

lates *dharmacakraratna*.

P. 285.23: *cakravartivaṃśakulakuloditasya*. T *'khor-los sgyur-ba'i rigs-kyi rgyud-du byun-ba*. T omits *kula*.

P. 286.1-2: *sāgaravaradharavīpulabuddheḥ*. T *blo rgya-mtsho dan sa ltar rgya-che-ba'i mchog-tu gyur-pa*. According to Hokazono T translates *sāgaradharavaravīpulabuddheḥ*. F p. 85 reads *sāgaravasun-dharā-*. C1 and 2 mention the sea but not the earth and probably read *sāgaravaravīpulabuddheḥ*.

P. 286.2-3: *merukalpadṛdhabalāprakampamānasasya*. T *ri-rab ltar brtan-ziñ mi-g.yo la mi-bskyod-par mi-nus-pa'i yid dan-ldan-pa*. Read *merukalpadṛdhācalāprakampamānasasya*, cf. Hokazono, p. 721, n. 42? In T one must read *bskyod-par* instead of *mi bskyod-par*.

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

P. 286.6: *niryā (ti) tasarvakuśalamūlasya*. 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: *daśakuśalakarmaphāsevitavataḥ*. The variant readings suggest a possible reading *-pathān āsevitavataḥ*.

P. 286.11: *-samyagadhyāśaya-*. T does not translate *samyag*.

P. 286.13: *ṛjīkṛtavataḥ*. Cf. BHSD. Edgerton quotes A *ṛjvī-* which is probably to be preferred.

P. 286.19: *sarvadevasaṃghaiḥ*. T omits *sarva*.

P. 286.20: *manuṣyalokam utpanno*. Most mss. read *manuṣyalokotpanno* which is to be preferred.

P. 286.21: *tasmin mahāvimāne sukhopaviṣṭasya dvātriṃśadbhūmi-sahasrapratisamsthite*. T *gzal-med-khañ gzan* (D omits *gzan*) *gnas sum-khri ñis stoñ 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: *ucchritachattradhvajapatāka-*. T *gdugs dan / rgyal-mtshan dan / ba-dan sgreñ-ba*. Read *-patāke ratna-*.

P. 288.5: *mahatāpūrṇakumbhopaśobhite*. Missing in T, C1 and C2.

- P. 288.8-9: -*dvijagaṇa*-. T omits *gaṇa*.
- P. 288.9: -*madhuranirghoṣanikūjite*. Probably one must read *madhurasvaranikūjite*, cf. p. 606. 19.
- P. 288.10-11: *vyapagatakhilakrodhapratighamānamadadarṣāpanayane*. T *ña-rgyal dañ / rgyags-ṣa dañ / dregs-ṣa dañ / khro-ba dañ / tha-ba dañ / khoṅ-khro-ba med-par gyur-ṣa*, *vyapagatamānamadadarṣakrodhakhilapratighe*. It is difficult to explain the differences between the Sanskrit text and T. Read *vyapagatakhilakrodhapratighe mānamadadarṣāpanayane?*
- P. 288.13: *caturaśītibhyas tūryasamṅgītisahasranirṇāditebhyo*. Read with A *caturaśītītūrya*-.
- P. 288.15-294.4: In these twenty Āryā 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 Āryā verses in the Lalitavistara.
- P. 290.3: *vīryabaladhyānaprajñā*. Both C1 and C2 omit *bala*. T *brtson-'grus bsam-gtan śes-rab stobs*, *vīryadhyānaprajñābala*. Perhaps *bala* was later added and one must read *vīryadhyānaprajñā?*

### Chapter three.

- P. 296.21: *tad eva poṣadheyam ca pañcadaśyām*. Omit *ca*. Cf. MSV (*Mūlasarvāstivādinayavastu*), I, p. 31: *tad eva poṣadhe pañcadaśyām*.
- P. 296.22: *upavāsoṣitasya*. T *dbu zuṅs-su gnas-śiñ*. In MSV, p. 31 T translates: *smyuñ-ba byas-nas*.
- P. 296.24: *na karmāraḥtam*. Read *akarmāraḥtam*, cf. MSV I, p. 32.
- P. 296.25: *punaḥ*. A *puna*. Read *punā*.
- P. 298.2: before *nūnam* T adds: *bdag-gi druñ-du lha'i 'khor-lo rin-po-che 'oṅs-ṣa las* “since the divine wheel jewel has come to me”.
- P. 298.3: *yan nv ahaṃ divyaṃ cakraratnaṃ mīmāṃseyam* 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 / ṅag rtsub-po ma smra-śig / tshig khyal-ṣa ma smra-śig / brnab-sems can-du ma 'gyur-cig / gnod-sems can-du ma-'gyur-cig / log-par lta-bar ma 'gyur-cig / srog-gcod-la byams-par ma gyur-cig / log-par lta-ba*

*can-gyi bar-la byams-par ma gyur-cig* “do not speak slanderous words (*paiṣunya* M 1693), do not speak harsh words (*pāruṣya* M 1692), do not speak nonsense (*sambhinnapralāpa* M 1698), do not have false views (*mithyādrṣṭi* M 1698), do not rejoice (*rocetha*) in killing until [.....] do not rejoice in false views”.

P. 298.23: *pūrvam diśam vijitah*. Read *vijitya*, cf. p. 298. 27.

P. 298.24: *pūrvam samudram avatarati*. *pūrvam samudram avatīrya*, T *śar-phyogs-kyi rgya-mtsho las rgal-lo // rgal-nas*, i. e. *pūrvāt samudrāt pratyuttarati*, *pratyuttīrya*, cf. p. 298. 28-300. 1.

P. 300.2: *'kṣatam eva*. Read *'kṣata-m-eva*.

P. 300.6: *svaṇṇacūḍakam svaṇṇadhvajam svaṇṇālamkāram*. T *gtsug-gser-gyis brgyan-pa / gser-gyi rgyal-mtshan dan-ldan-pa / gser-gyi rgyan-gyis brgyan-pa*, i. e. *svaṇṇacūḍālamkāram svaṇṇadhvajavantam svaṇṇālamkāralamkāram*.

P. 300.12: *pr[as]ānaratiṃ*. Read *prātarāśanaratiṃ*, cf. p. 301, n. 14 and *Divyāvadāna* p. 631. 14.

P. 300.14: *atha*. T *'di-la* = *iha*, cf. p. 300. 4 and 24.

P. 300.16: *ādṛtavadanam*. T *zon-na gus-par byed* = *ādṛtavahanam* !

P. 300.16-17: *svaṇṇadhvajam svaṇṇālamkāram*. T *gser-gyi rgyal-mtshan dan-bcas-pa / gser-gyi rgyan dan-ldan-pa* = *svaṇṇadhvajavantam svaṇṇālamkāravantam*.

P. 300.25-26: *śuddhanīlavaiḍūryam*. T *thams-cad-du sño-ba / be-dū-rya'i rañ-bzin* = *sarvanīlam vaiḍūryamayam*.

P. 302.2: *udyānabhūmiṃ* not in T.

P. 302.13: after *darśanīyā* T adds *kha-dog bzañ-pa rgyas-pa mchog dan-ldan-pa* = *paramayā śubhavarṇapuṣkalatayā samanvāgatā*, cf. *Divyāvadāna* p. 471. 6, M 5219.

P. 302.15: *uṣṇāni saṃsparśāni*. T *reg-na dro-ba*. Read *uṣṇasamsparśāni*, cf. MSV I, p. 36. 19.

P. 302.21: *divyacakṣuḥ*. T *lha'i mig dan-ldan-pa* = *divyacakṣuṣmān*.

P. 302.28: *udyojayitavyam*. Read *udyojayitavyām*.

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

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

P. 304.6: *aśāstreṇābhinirjitya*. T *mtshon-gyis bda'-ba med la / chos-kyis legs-par phab-ste* = *aśāstreṇa dharmenābhinirjitya*, cf.

Divyāvadāna p. 549.1-2.

P. 304.7: *vāntachandarāgo*. Read with A *vāntacchandarāgo*.

P. 304.7: *ananyadevaḥ*. Read *ananyaneyah*, cf. p. 305, n. 15.

P. 304.8: *ceti*. T adds *rig-byed 'don-du 'dzud-do, vedān vācayati?* Cf. p. 296.13: *brāhmaṇān vedān adhyāpayanti*.

P. 304.10: *buddhakṣetram*. T adds *'di = idam*. Cf. also C2 (p. 541c5.)

P. 304.12-13: *golāṅgula-*. T *mjug-ma=lāṅgula-*. C2 (p. 541c6) has “basis of a tail”, Cf. BHSD *golāṅgula-parivartana* and *gonāṅgula*.

P. 304.14: *kardama iva*. T *'jim-pa la bya-ba de-bžin-du*. Hokazono translates *bya-ba* as “bird” (p. 742, n. 49) but *bya* means “bird” and *bya-ba* “action”. C2 is obscure, cf. Hokazono’s note.

P. 304.15: *atyudgamyā*. Read *abhyudgamyā*. *Abhy-* and *aty-* are often confused.

P. 304.24: *ṛṣipatanasamjñodapādi*. T *draṅ-sroṅ lhuṅ-ba žes bya-ba yaṅ draṅ-sroṅ lhuṅ-ba draṅ-sroṅ lhuṅ-ba žes miṅ-du gyur-te = ṛṣipatanasyāpi ṛṣipatanam ṛṣipatanam iti samjñodapādi*.

P. 306.3: *susthito*. T *kun-nas gnas-par = samsthito*.

P. 306.3-4: *jātiprajñāyate jarāprajñāyate vyādhiprajñāyate maraṇaprajñāyate*. Read *jātiḥ prajñāyate jarā prajñāyate vyādhiḥ prajñāyate maraṇam prajñāyate*.

P. 306.19: *arthavasam*. Read *arthavaśam*, cf. L 244.8.

P. 306.23: *kiyadrūpāyām* T *ji-lta-bu žig-gi lhum-s-su, kiyadgarbhāyām (?)*.

P. 308.1: *tatkulapradeśopacāram*. For T see p. 309. n. 2. C1 “land, state, city” (p. 485b7) is closer to the Sanskrit text than T.

P. 308.9: *vamsarāja-*. Read *vatsarāja-*. 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. 308.17: *-prasādātala-*. T. *khaṅ-bzaṅs = prasāda*, cf. p. 287. n. 52.

P. 308.18: *amarapurabhavanaprakāśyā*. Read *amarapurabhavanaprakāśā*, cf. T *lha'i pho-braṅ daṅ-'dra ba*.

P. 308.24: *idam pradyotakulam*. T *groṅ-'khyer 'phags-rgyal na rab-snaṅ-gi rigs 'di = ujjayininagaryām idam pradyotakulam*.

P. 308.27-28: *caṇḍāś ca capalāś ca raudrāś ca paruṣāś ca sāhasikāś ca*. T *khro-žin gtum-la brlaṅ-žin 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.

P. 310.15: *apara*. A *apare py*.

P. 310.15: *maithilasya*. Hokazono notes that T has *phan-tshun 'byor gyi steñ-du* (p. 744, note 99). However, the Peking edition has *phan-tshun 'gyed-kyi*. Hokazono's reading is found in the Derge edition.

P. 310.18: *sarvasāmantarājābhita-*. T *rgyal-po dañ blon-po thams-cad-kyis zil-gyis mi-non-pa'i* = *sarvasāmantarājābhir anabhibhūta-*, cf. N 4. T has confused *āmātya* and *sāmanta*, cf. p. 744, note 102.

P. 312.1-2: *etan mārṣā*. T *grog-po tshur-śog*. Read *eta mārṣā*. Cf. C1 (485c10) and C2 (542b13-14).

P. 312.3: *kule*. T *rigs rin-po-che* = *kularatne*, cf. p. 744, note 109.

P. 312.9: *abhijñātaṃ*. T *btsun-pa* = *abhijātaṃ*. Read *abhijātaṃ*.

P. 312.23: *adoṣagāminam*. T *že-sdañ mi-'gro-ba* = *adveṣagāminam*. Read *adveṣa-*. Cf. C 1 (485c27).

P. 316.14: *'parikṛṣṭasampat*. T *las-kyi-mthaḥ la ñon-moñs-pa med-pa*. Read *'parikliṣṭasampat?*

P. 316.20-21: *avaropitakuśalānām ca sattvānām kapilavastumahānagar-anilayah*. T *ser-skya'i gnas-kyi groñ-khyer chen-po de ni dge-ba'i rtsa-ba bskyed-pa rnam-kyi gnas-te*, Read *kapilavastumahānagaram nilayah*.

P. 316.24: *salekhyavitreva*. T *bu don la bris-pa ltar*. A *salekhyavitrite eva*. Read *ālekhyavitriteva*, cf. M 5214. Or *sālekhya-* (i. e. *sā ālekhya-*).

P. 316.26: *vyapagatākhila-*. T *mi-des-pa ..... med-pa*. Read *avyapagatakhyila-*. The usual translation of *khila* is *tha-ba*, cf. M 178. Cf. 334. 18.

P. 318.6: *-doṣa-*. T *že-sdañ*. L *dveṣa*. Read *-dveṣa-*.

P. 318.6: *.....buddhi*. Read *buddhī*.

P. 318.8: *sendrāyudham iva yaṣṭiḥ suvinitā*. T *'ja'i dbyiñs ltar śin-tu 'dud-pa* = *indrāyudham iva suvinatā*.

P. 318.9: *cārudarśanā*. A *cārudaśanā*. Read *cārudaśanā*, cf. T 5 and 6.

P. 318.10: *-daśānā*. Read *-darśanā*.

P. 318.11: *-kaṭir*. Read *-kaṭī*.

P. 318.11-12.: *vajrasamghananakalpasadrṣagātrā*. T *rdo-rje ltar mkhregs-śiñ mtshuñs-pa med-pa'i lus dañ-ldan-pa*. Read *-kalpāsadrṣa-* (*-kalpā asadrṣa-*) ?

P. 318.14: *aprativiśiṣṭā*. T *mtshuñs-pa med-pa, asamā?*

P. 318.19-324.20: These twenty verses are found in the two Chinese

translations 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: *guṇānvitād*, Read *guṇānvitāv*.

### Chapter four

P. 326.9: *caturmahādvīpa (ka) loka-*. A reads *-dvīpaka-*, omitting *lo*. Read *-dvīpaloka-*.

P. 326.9-10: *maṇḍalamādādhīṣṭhito*. Read *maṇḍalamāḍo 'dhiṣṭhito*.

P. 326.14: *anekadivya-dūṣyasamstarasamskṛte*. T *lha'i ras bcos-bu'i stan du-ma btiñ-ba*. Read *-samstṛte*. cf. F p. 94.

P. 326.16: *-samskṛte*. T *bkram-ba*. Read *-samstṛte*, cf. 288. 2.

P. 326.18: *-tābhinādite*. T (*mñon-par dga'-ba*) wrongly translates *abhinandite*.

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

P. 326.21: *-nr̥tyagītavāditaparigīte*. A has *-nr̥tyagītpravādite*. T *glu-blañs // gar-byas // rol-mo byas-pa /* inverses *nr̥tya* and *gīta*. Read *-nr̥tyagītpravādite*.

P. 328.4: *-samkhyeyā-*. Read *-samkhyeya-*, cf. p. 272. 24.

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

P. 328.18: *kāyaprasaddhyai*. T *lus śin-tu sbyañs-pa*. Read *kāyaprasrabdhyai*.

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

P. 330.1: *sarvopadhika-*. Read *sarvaupadhika-*? Cf. BHSD s. v. *aupadhika*.

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: *anunnāmāvanāmanatāyai*. Read *anunnāmānavanāmanatāyai?*

P. 332.9: *-pratiprasraddhyai*. T *rgyun chad-par 'gyur-ro*. Read *-pratiprasrabdhyai*.

P. 332.22: *anavamṛdyatāyai*. T *mi thul-bar 'gyur-ro*. Read *mi thub-par 'gyur-ro*.

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

P. 334.7: *-pratiprasraddhyai*. T *rgyun chad-par 'gyur-ro*. Read *-prati-*

*praśrabdhyaī.*

P. 334.27: *-pratyaवेक्षणतāya.* T *nod-ṣa* “to receive”?

P. 336.21: *caturaśīter devaṣṭrasahasrāṇām.* Read with A *caturaśītideva-*.

P. 336.23: *kṣāntih prati-*. Read with A *kṣāntiprati-*. T *bzod-ṣar thob-ṣar gyur-to.*

P. 338.11: *mā ga(c) chata punar apāyān.* T *nan-son dag-tu son-bar gyur ta-re.* T omits *mā.* A also omits *mā.*

P. 340.3-4: *anyonyagamanayuktā yathaiiva sāmāyikā ”sañ ca.* Several mss (including A) have *sāmāyikāmañca.* T has *'dus-ṣa dag ni khri-las-su: sāmājikā mañce?* Hokazono reads *sāmāyikā āsaṃ (āsanam) ca,* cf. p. 761. n. 59. However, *khri* certainly translates *mañca.*

P. 344.10: *pravarṣayed amṛtagāmiṃ.* Read *pravarṣaye-d-amṛtagāmiṃ.*