The *amṛta*-section in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra* and the Senavarma Inscription:
Phraseology with the Word *dhātu*

Hiromi Habata

Introduction

Three terms for "Buddha-nature" are used in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra* (hereafter MPM): *tathāgatagarbha*, *tathāgatadhātu*, and *buddhadhātu*. In this sūtra, the word *dhātu* is used in the meaning 'element of the body', and the compound *buddhadhātu* means 'element of the body of the Buddha'. This term is therefore concerned with its original and general meaning 'relic of the Buddha'. In the section in which the idea *amṛta* is thematized, the compound *buddhadhātu* is used obviously with the meaning 'relic of the Buddha'. This section seems to contain early expressions of the *buddhadhātu* in the MPM and allows for a possible interpretation of an earlier stage of the idea of "Buddha-nature". Furthermore, the *amṛta*-section could shed light on a difficult passage in the Senavarma inscription, the interpretation of which is controversial.

1. The existence of the Buddha

Before I deal with the interpretation of the term *amṛta* with *dhātu*, which appears in the MPM and the Senavarma inscription, I would like to give an overview of the theme of the MPM.[1]

The first and main theme of the MPM is, without doubt, the *parinirvāṇa* of the Buddha. Among the *mahāparinirvāṇa* texts, such as the *Mahāparinibbāna-suttanta* of the Theravādins or the so-called *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* (from the Vinaya)[2] of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins, the crucial difference in the MPM is that the *parinirvāṇa* of the Buddha does not actually occur. The Buddha does not die. This theme is expressed with the word *nitya*.

I have already demonstrated the meaning of the Sanskrit word *nitya* in the MPM elsewhere.[3] To summarize my previous findings, the word *nitya* is not used in

---

[1] Habata 2015a, pp. 183–184; Habata 2019, pp. 13–26.

[2] The text on the *parinirvāṇa* of the Buddha belongs to the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādins. The edition of Waldschmidt from Central Asian fragments could belong to the Ṣaṭsūtraka-nipāta of the Dīrghāgama of the Sarvāstivādins. The title of the text is not found in the extant fragments.

[3] Habata 2019, pp. 13–26.

the MPM in the meaning of 'eternal', 'never-ending' in time, but rather in the meaning of 'present here' in space, which agrees with the etymological meaning of *ni-tya*.[4] The Sanskrit word *nitya* consists of two members *ni* and *tya*. The first element *ni* is an adverb which means "in, inside".[5] The second element *tya* has the function of forming an adjective from an adverb with the meaning "being found in the place which the adverb designates" (Pāṇini 4.2.104).[6] The original meaning of *ni-tya* is, therefore, "being found in" which refers to space, not to time. When the condition of being here and now continues, it could be regarded — being seen from the durative aspect — as 'regularly present'. However, as Brough (1952) indicates, this temporal meaning is a connotation.

The expression "The Tathāgata is *nitya*" is not merely an abstract idea but it seems to reflect some sort of religious practice (*bhāvanā*). This practice focusing on the word or some ideal representation of the meaning of the word *ni-tya*[7] indicates that practitioners are concentrating on the existence of the Buddha here and now. Through this practice, it is said that the Tathāgata stays in the home of the practitioners.[8]

2. The *amṛta*-section in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra*

The section in which the term *amṛta* or *amṛta-dhātu* appears contains a possibly earlier expression of "Buddha-nature" in the MPM. In this section, the compound *buddhadhātu* is used, but the well-known formula "every living being has a Buddha-nature" does not appear. This section is found in the (5th) chapter *lha dang / mi dang / lha ma yin dang / mi 'am ci dang / rig sngags 'chang dang / srin po la sogs pa 'dus pas zhus pa* of the Tibetan translation,[9] in the 4th chapter 如来性品 *rú lái xìng pǐn* of the Chinese translation 大般涅槃經 *Dà bān niè pán jīng* by Dharmakṣema 曇無讖 (hereafter ChinD),[10] and in the 13th chapter 如来性品 *rú lái xìng pǐn* of the Chinese translation 大般泥洹經 *Dà bān ní huán jīng* by 法顯 Fǎ xiǎn (hereafter ChinF).[11] No Sanskrit fragment is available for this section. This section has a short introduction,[12] in which Kāśyapa, who is a Brahman with the same family name as Mahākāśyapa (*mahākāśyapa-sagotra*), asks the Buddha about *amṛta*. Therefore, I would like to call

---

[4] See Brough 1952; Hara 1959.

[5] There are two adverbs *ni*: *ni* of *ni-tya* differs from *ni* of *upa-ni-ṣad* which has the meaning "down": see EWA s.v. *nítya-*.

[6] See AiGr II,2 § 513 (p. 697): "in der durch das Adverb bezeichneten Ortslage befindlich".

[7] This meditation practice is called *dvyakṣarabhāvanā* (SF 9.10): see Habata 2007, p. 64.

[8] *teṣāṃ tathāgato gṛhe tiṣṭhati* (SF 13.7): see Habata 2019, p. 121; Yuyama 1981, p. 18, verso 4.

[9] The Tibetan text of the MPM (translated by Jinamitra, Jñānagarbha, and Devacandra) is quoted from the critical edition (Habata 2013) with paragraph number. The *amṛta*-section is found in MPM § 387–391.

[10] Taishō vol. 12, no. 374. The *amṛta*-section is found in ChinD 409a25–410a15.

[11] Taishō vol. 12, no. 376. The *amṛta*-section is found in ChinF 884a29–885a19.

[12] MPM § 386, ChinD 409a19–24, ChinF 884a26–28.

this section "the *amṛta*-section" for convenience. In my paper on the terminological problems of "Buddha-nature" in the Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese versions of the MPM (Habata 2015), I gave an overview of this section, but I did not explain much about the term *amṛta*, because the meaning is relatively clear in the context. However, reading other texts in which the term is used, there seems to be considerable need for interpretation.

The conversation between the Buddha and Kāśyapa in the *amṛta*-section is partly in verse, partly in prose, and can be divided into the following five parts:

1. the first nine verses, spoken by the Buddha: MPM § 387, ChinD 409a25–b17, ChinF 884a29–b14 (ChinF partly in prose and verses 8–9 are spoken by Kāśyapa);

2. the next eight verses, spoken by Kāśyapa: MPM § 388, ChinD 409b18–c9, ChinF 884b15–c1;

3. the next four verses, spoken by the Buddha: MPM § 389, ChinD 409c10–18, ChinF 884c2–9 (ChinF verses are spoken by Kāśyapa);

4. the last four verses, spoken by Kāśyapa: MPM § 390, ChinD 409c19–26, ChinF 884c10–19; and

5. the concluding prose passage, spoken by the Buddha: MPM § 391, ChinD 409c27–410a15, ChinF 884c20–885a19 (ChinF in verse).

The theme in the *amṛta*-section is the threefold refuge, *skyabs gsum* (**triśaraṇa*) or *gzhi gsum* (*traivastuka*),[13] namely the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Saṃgha. Concerning this essential theme, there is a noticeable difference between the verse part and the prose part: The threefold refuge in the verse part seems to be relatively general and simple, however it changes dramatically in the prose part into a unique phase, in which the refuge is concentrated on the Buddha, and the compound *buddha-dhātu* is used obviously in the meaning "element of the body of the Buddha", namely "relic of the Buddha". The verse part indicates possibly an older origin of this passage, and the term *amṛta* or *amṛta-dhātu* is used there. Let us read the text from the first part, which contains nine verses, for convenience in the Tibetan translation which is a word-for-word rendering of the Sanskrit text:

verse 1

kha cig bdud rtsi 'thungs pas 'chi mi 'gyur //
kha cig gis ni 'thungs na 'chi bar 'gyur //
kha cig dug 'thungs pas kyang 'chi mi 'gyur //
kha cig gis ni 'thungs na 'chi bar 'gyur //
Someone would not die through drinking *amṛta*.
Someone would die, if he drinks *amṛta*.
Someone would not die through drinking poison.
Someone would die, if he drinks poison.

---

[13] The Sanskrit word which corresponds to the Tibetan *gzhi gsum* is attested in an unpublished Sanskrit fragment (SF 19a4).

verse 2

theg pa chen po 'di la ni //
chags med ye shes bdud rtsi yin //
mtshungs pa med pa'i ye shes mchog //
de nyid dug yin zhes kyang bstan //

In this Mahāyāna,
the wisdom without attachment is the *amṛta*.
the highest wisdom without equal,
it is also the poison — so I explain.

verse 3

zhu ba'i 'og tu za ba la //
mar gyi snying khu sbrang rtsi dang //
ka ra rnams ni bdud rtsi bzhin //
ma zhu za la dug tu 'gyur //

If one eats after digestion,
ghṛtamaṇḍa/*sarpirmaṇḍa*[14] and honey,
and sugar, they are like the *amṛta*.
If one eats not having digested, it would become the poison.

verse 4

de bzhin rab rgyas bdud rtsi'i mchog //
dgongs pa'i tshig la mi mkhas shing //
byis pa'i blo dang ldan rnams la //
mi bzad pa yi dug tu 'gyur //

Just like this, the excellently extensive [teaching] (*vaitulya*)[15] is the highest *amṛta*.[16]

For those who are not learned in the [well] intended words [of the Buddha],[17]
and have a foolish mind,
it would be the intolerable poison.

---

[14] After Blum 2013, p. 235 the word (醍醐 *tí hū* in ChinD 409b1) could be translated into English as "the cream on the surface of clarified butter".

[15] In the Sanskrit fragments of the MPM, the term *vaitulya* is used, which corresponds to the Tibetan *rab tu rgyas pa* or *shin tu rgyas pa*. For the usage of this term in the MPM see Habata 2007, pp. xlix–li.

[16] A parallel expression appears in a compound *sarvba[ma]hāyānasūtravaitulyaparamāmṛta-saddharmāntardhānān[i]* (SF 22.7): see Habata 2019, pp. 168–170 (The letters in square bracket are damaged).

[17] The Tibetan translation *dgongs pa'i tshig* is used for the Sanskrit *sandhāvacana*, which is attested in SF 1.1; 12.7; 13.5; 21.2. The word *sandhā* is explained as *kalyāṇa* in SF 20.5: *sandheti kalyāṇam ity arthaḥ* "(The word) *sandhā* means remedial/curative" (see Habata 2019, pp. 154–155). Though the word *sandhā* is generally interpreted as "allusive/intentional" or "hidden", this meaning does not seem to suit the usage in the MPM. Ruegg 1989 deals with an interpretation of the word in a wide range of Buddhist texts, in which the Sanskrit fragments of the MPM could not be included.

verse 5

    rang rgyal nyan thos rnams kyang ni //
    rtag tu de dang 'dra ba yin //
    theg chen sman mchog de dag la //
    ba yi 'o ma 'thungs pa bzhin //
    For *pratyekabuddha*s and *śrāvaka*s,
    [it is] always similar to this.
    Mahāyāna, which is the highest medicine, is for them
    like drinking cow's milk.

verse 6

    byang chub sems dpa' 'jigs med pa //
    mi mchog brtan po de dag ni //
    theg pa chen pos nges par 'byung //
    'od srung de ltar shes nas ni //
    Bodhisattvas without fear,
    the highest men who are steadfast,
    they set out (*nir-yā) by Mahāyāna.
    Kāśyapa, [you] knowing in this way,

verse 7

    bdud rtsi rtag pa khams kyi dbyings //
    de la deng 'dir skyabs mchog song //
    bdud rtsi'i mchog gi khams de ni //
    nga yi khams yin sems can khams //
    *amṛta-nitya-dhātu,[18]
    in that, now [you/one] should take the highest refuge.
    This highest *amṛta-dhātu* is,
    my (= the Buddha's) *dhātu*, and the *dhātu* of [my] existence (*sattva).[19]

verse 8

    rtag tu nga la skyabs song na //
    skyabs gsum bdag nyid khams su 'gyur //
    nga yi sku la khams yod kyis //
    bdag nyid 'di la khyod zhugs shig //
    If one always takes refuge in me,
    the threefold refuge would become the *dhātu* of my own self (*ātmabhāva?).[20]

---

[18] The supposed compound *amṛtanityadhātu* could be interpreted as "*dhātu* which dwells in *amṛta*" or "*dhātu* which is *amṛta* and *nitya*". For the interpretation of the compound with *nitya*, for example *araṇya-nitya* "dwelling in the forest", see Brough 1952, pp. 76–77.

[19] The word *sattva* is used in the MPM in the meaning 'being, existence', which designates not only 'sentient beings' (human beings and animals) but includes every existence in the world (also non-sentient beings): see Habata (forthcoming). The supposed compound *sattvadhātu* means here "the element of the existence", i.e. of the existence of the Buddha in the world.

Because there is the *dhātu* in my body,
you should enter into that my own self (*ātmabhāva?).
  verse 9
sangs rgyas chos dang dge 'dun rnams //
nga yi khams kyi rang bzhin te //
gsum po rin chen mchog yin zhes //
bcom ldan 'das kyis tshigs bcad gsungs //
The Buddha, the Dharma, and the Saṃgha,
they are the nature of my *dhātu*.
The three are the highest treasures.
  — So said the Exalted One (= the Buddha) these verses.

Regarding the context of the MPM, the idea that the Buddha never dies and is present here corresponds with the expressions **amṛta-nitya-dhātu* and **parama/uttama-amṛta-dhātu*. And what exactly is present here? It is *dhātu*, clearly defined as "my (= the Buddha's) *dhātu*," for which one should show reverence.

In this *amṛta*-section, the word *amṛta* is used evidently in the meaning 'ambrosia' (lat. noun) or 'ambrosius' (lat. adjective): ambrosia is nectar which deities drink for immortality. The term *dhātu* is used in the meaning 'constructive element of the body of the Buddha', as it is used widely in the MPM. The context of the *amṛta*-section is the *stūpa*-worship, in which 'the element of the Buddha' (*buddha-dhātu*) can be translated into English as 'relic'. It is noticeable that the English word 'relic' is used after the death of a saint, but the Sanskrit word *dhātu* can be used before the death of a saint. Without Sanskrit text of the passage, it is hard to say if both words, *amṛta* and *dhātu*, stand together in the compound *amṛta-dhātu-* or separately with case ending.

3. The Senavarma inscription

The Senavarma inscription documents the re-establishment of a *stūpa*. Its context concerns the worship of the *stūpa* which contains a relic; this context corresponds well with that of the *amṛta*-section in the MPM. Also, the vocabulary in both texts shows similarities.

The Senavarma inscription is written in the Gāndhārī language in the Kharoṣṭhī script. The inscription is incised on a gold sheet; its whereabout is unknown, and only an unclear photo is available.[21] It is also unknown where the inscription was

---

[20] The Tibetan *bdag nyid* here could be a translation for *ātmabhāva, which is used as a synonym of *śarīra*: see BHSD s.v. *ātmabhāva*, also attested in the context of *stūpa*: *mahāratnastūpe tathāgatasyātmabhāvas tiṣṭhaty ekaghanas tasyaiṣa stūpaḥ* (SP 240.11). The word appears also in the Senavarma inscription 5d: *atmabhavate*.

[21] The reliquary, in which the Senavarma inscription was contained, was exhibited in 1985, and the inscription was lost in the preparation for the exhibition: see Jongeward 2012, pp. 73–75, fig. 3.26a and 3.26b:1–5. For the photo of the inscription see Baums 2012, p. 228.

found. The text of the inscription is of great value, but very difficult to interpret. Bailey published in 1980 the Gāndhārī transcription, an English translation and a facsimile of the inscription. After Baily's publication, Fussmann published his transcription and interpretation in 1982, Salomon in 1986, and von Hinüber in 2003.[22] Through every endeavour made by the great specialists in Gāndhārī or Middle Indic and in Indian epigraphy, the interpretation of the Senavarma inscription has been considerably advanced. However, because of the difficulties in the language and in the script, and despite the great contribution by von Hinüber, 22 terms remain difficult to understand. After a series of findings of Gāndhārī materials, Baums published a new edition in 2012.[23] Recently, Wen Zhao gave a new interpretation on the most difficult passage in the inscription, comparing it with the *Prajñāpāramitā* literature.[24]

After the newly found materials in Gāndhārī, our understanding of the language is improving, but Salomon's remark in 1986 on the difficulty of the Senavarma inscription seems to be still valid.[25] As the newly found texts in Gāndhārī often show the character which we place under the category "mahāyāna",[26] it would be necessary for further understanding to compare the unclear expressions in the inscription also with the texts categorized as "mahāyāna", not only with the Pāli texts.

The content of the Senavarma inscription can be divided into the following four parts:[27]

1. (1a–7d)[28] Introduction and the history of the *stūpa*: the main sentence reads *dhātu pra[ti]ṭhavemi* (*pratiṣṭhāpayāmi) "I (Senavarma, King of Oḍi) establish this relic" (5c). Senavarma explains that the *stūpa* was damaged by lightning, and the relic was displaced for the restoration. After the restoration, Senavarma

---

[22] Baily 1980; Fussmann 1982; Salomon 1986; von Hinüber 2003. Reviews on von Hinüber 2003: Falk 2003; Fussmann 2003/04; Salomon 2005.

[23] Baums 2012, pp. 227–233.

[24] Zhao 2017.

[25] Salomon 1986, pp. 262–263: "The Senavarma inscription is a complex and difficult document; there are several problems in the reading of the text, and a great many more in its interpretation. The language and style of the inscription present numerous difficulties, including an often bewildering mixture of dialects and a highly inconsistent orthography. The syntax and word and sentence divisions are also problematic, … Given these obstacles it is inevitable that no one editor will be able to present a definitive version; indeed, it is doubtful that we will ever solve all the problems in this inscription."

[26] For example, see Strauch 2010; Schlosser & Strauch 2016; Schlosser 2019.

[27] The first transcription was published in Bailey 1980, pp. 21–22 with line numbers 1–14. Fussman gave subdivision a–d/g to each line of the text (Fussman 1982, pp. 4–5). Fussman's subdivision was followed in Salomon 1986, pp. 264–269 and von Hinüber 2003, pp. 11–42. The text in Baums 2012, pp. 227–229 is given without this subdivision. For the more detailed overview of the text see von Hinüber 2003, pp. 43–48.

[28] Bailey 1980, pp. 22–23, pp. 24–26; Fussman 1982, pp. 7–8, pp. 9–25; Salomon 1986, pp. 269–270, pp. 272–278; von Hinüber 2003, pp. 11–27; Baums 2012, pp. 227–228, pp. 229–231.

establishes again the relic in the *stūpa*. The sentences in which Senavarma praises the Buddha are the most difficult passage to understand, and have drawn much attention among scholars.

2. (7e–10c)[29] Honor to the Buddha, *pratyekabuddha*s, *śrāvaka*s … parents, family members, and deities: the sentences end with *puyita* (**pūjitaḥ, *pūjitau,* or **pūjitāḥ*) "honored". The differences between singular, dual, and plural are not marked.

3. (10d–13e)[30] Wishes are expressed in imperative or optative forms. There are four verb forms in imperative or optative: twice *hoto* for Skt. **bhavatu, ṇivatato,* which is probably an imperative form of the root *vṛt* with *ni-* or *nir-* (?), and *siati* for Skt. **syāt.*

4. (13e–14e)[31] colophon: the inscription calls itself *śarirapraïṭhavaṇia* (**śarīra-pratiṣṭhāpanikā*). According to the historical studies, the Senavarma inscription should be dated to the first century.[32]

In the third part of the inscription, the expression under consideration *amudae dhatue* (**amṛta- dhātu-*) appears. The text of the third part reads as follows:[33]

(10d) sakṣiteṇa aviyamahaṇirea payato karita [,] (10e) utvareṇa (a)bhavagro [,] atraturo (10f) yavada satva uvavaṇa apada va dupada va catupada va vahupada va (11a) ruvi aruvi saṃñe asaṃñe [–] (11b) sarvasatvaṇa hidasuhadae hoto [.]

(11c) ayam-edaṇe devasame aya ca ṣadha (11d) ye ca prasade se kimatraye hoto [?]

(11e) ye teṇa śakamuṇiṇarahato samasavudheṇa (11f) dhamo abhisavudho madaṇimadaṇo pivasaviṇayo (11g) alayasamughaso vatovacheto taṣokṣayo aśeṣo-(12a)virago-ṇiraso śato praṇito advarasa aṇijo aroga (12b) acata[ṇ]ïṭhu acadavramaio[34] acatapayosaṇo [–] tatra amudae dhatue ṇivatato [,] (12c) yatra imasa aṇavatagrasa sasarasa kṣaye payosaṇe hakṣati [,] (12d) yatra imaṇa vedaïdaṇa sarve śidalibhaviśati [.]

(12e) ye (va)ṇa imo ekaüḍo thuvo ṇiṭhidao viṇiṭhi(13a)tao daheati [,] ite udhu [,] (13b) deve va maṇuśe va yakṣe va ṇage va suvaṇi va gadharve va kuvhaḍe va [,]

[29] Bailey 1980, pp. 23–24, pp. 26–28; Fussman 1982, p. 8, pp. 25–29; Salomon 1986, pp. 270–271, pp. 278–279; von Hinüber 2003, pp. 27–35; Baums 2012, pp. 228–229, pp. 231–232.

[30] Bailey 1980, p. 24, pp. 28–29; Fussman 1982, p. 8, pp. 29–35; Salomon 1986, pp. 271–272, pp. 279–281; von Hinüber 2003, pp. 35–40; Baums 2012, p. 229, p. 232.

[31] Bailey 1980, p. 24, p. 29; Fussman 1982, pp. 8–9, pp. 35–36; Salomon 1986, p. 272, pp. 281–282; von Hinüber 2003, pp. 40–42; Baums 2012, p. 229, p. 232–233.

[32] Salomon 1986, p. 261; von Hinüber 2003, p. 7.

[33] The text is quoted from von Hinüber 2003, pp. 35–39 (minor typographic errors are corrected after Baums 2012, p. 229). Various marks of punctuation remain in square brackets after the method of Salomon 1986, p. 263.

[34] Baums 2012, p. 229 transliterates *acadavramaïo*, i.e., *-i-* is written separately from the preceding *-ma-* and *-ai-* is not diphthong.

(13c) se aviyamahaṇiraa padeati saśarire [.] ye vaṇa aṇumotiśati [,] (13d) teṣu idei
puñakriae aṇubhvae (13e) sia(t)i [.]

Senavarma expresses his wishes after he established the relic in the restored *stūpa*. His first wish (10d–11b) ending with *hoto* (*bhavatu*), the sentence which follows directly the second part of the list of those being honored, expresses "for the benefit and happiness of all beings" (*sarvasatvaṇa hidasuhadae hoto* for Skt. *sarvasatvānāṃ hitasukhatāyai bhavatu*). The subject is not clearly mentioned, but it is certainly his activity of the restoration of the *stūpa* and the re-establishment of the relic.

The second sentence also ending with *hoto* (*bhavatu*) is interpreted as a rhetorical question (11c–d): "This pious gift (*devasame* for *deyadharma*) now, and this faith (*ṣadha* for *śraddhā*), and this devotion (*prasade* for *prasādaḥ*), for what measure/aim shall it be?" The following passage, therefore, should be the answer to this question. This passage, beginning with *ye* (11e), seems to end before the next *ye* (12e), the latter *ye* corresponds with *se* (13c) and the sentence (12e–13c) expresses a curse on a person who would destroy the *stūpa* in the future. The relevant sentence (11e–12d) has the following problems and difficulties.

First, how to understand the syntactical structure of the sentence? The sentence begins with *ye*, which finds no corresponding pronoun. Once *acadavramaio* (12b) was interpreted as *acadavrama* and *io*,[35] so that *io* could stand for the pronoun corresponding to *ye*.[36] However, *acadavramaio* between *acata[ṇ]ïthu* and *acatapayosaṇo* forms a group of three terms[37] beginning with *acata-/acada-* for *atyanta-/atyānta-*, and the three terms stand in the order of the syllable-number; furthermore, the term *vramaio* is now interpreted as *brahmacarya*,[38] which seems to be very probable. The interpretation of *io* as a pronoun is therefore ruled out. As a result, there is no pronoun which would correspond to *ye* at the beginning. Maybe, the *ye* at the beginning is to be understood not as a relative pronoun, but as a conjunction, which connects the previous rhetorical question and its answer after the *ye*.

Second, where is the main verb in this long passage? All interpretations seem to be in agreement on the answer to this question: *ṇivatato* in the phrase *tatra amudae dhatue ṇivatato* (12b). The form of *ṇivatato* is so far interpreted as imperative in comparison with *hoto* for *bhavatu* in the previous sentence. Then, a further problem is the question of what is the subject for this main verb *ṇivatato*? Concerning this problem, the interpretations seem to differ from each other. The difficulty lies in that *ṇivatato* written in the Kharoṣṭhī script never tells us if the verb stands for a singular form or a

---

[35] Fussman 1982, p. 5; Salomon 1986, p. 266.

[36] Fussman 1982, p. 30.

[37] The parallel passage with four terms in Pāli is already mentioned in Fussman 1982, pp. 31–32: *accantaniṭṭho accantayogakkhemī accanta-brahmacārī accanta-pariyosāno* (MN I 251.20–21; AN IV 88.9–10).

[38] Salomon 2005, p. 319.

plural form. So, it would be possible to interpret the subject as singular 'he' or 'it', or as plural 'they'. Furthermore, if the subject were singular 'he' or 'it', whom or what does 'he' or 'it' designate? And if the subject were plural 'they', to whom or what does 'they' refer? As a possible subject in singular, 'he'[39] or 'it' (= 'the dharma')[40] has been suggested, and as a possible subject in plural, 'they' (= 'all living beings')[41] has been suggested.

Third, what is the meaning of the main verb *ṇivatato*? On this question, too, there are different interpretations. However, all interpretations accord in that the ending -*to* stands for an imperative form, for example, *nivartatu or *nivartantu in active or *nivartatām or *nivartantām in middle.[42] The root of this main verb seems to be *vṛt*, however, the interpretations differ from each other.[43] Also the prefix *ni*- written in the Kharoṣṭhī script could be *ni*- but also *nir*-, which makes a considerable difference in the meaning.

Fourth, in which case do both words *amudae dhatue* stand? It seems that both words are understood so far in all interpretations as locative forms. However, the ending -*ae* is oblique feminine singular, so that it could be locative but also instrumental, genitive, or ablative.

Fifth, what do both words *amudae dhatue* mean? All interpretations agree that the word *amudae* stands for Sanskrit *amṛta-. However, there are essential differences in how to interpret the meaning of *amṛta*- with the following word *dhātu*-. The interpretations so far are divided into two very different directions: namely, 'immortal relic',[44] and 'immortal region'.[45]

Sixth, where is designated by *tatra* and *yatra*? It may be clear that *tatra* corresponds with *yatra*, which appears twice at the end of the passage. It seems to designate a place, but which place? Most of the interpretations so far understand *amudae dhatue* as locative, and the interpretations that regard *amudae dhatue* as space suggest that *tatra* and *yatra* are also correlated with *amudae dhatue*. However, if this is so, one would expect rather a relative pronoun feminine singular locative.

---

[39] Bailey 1980, p. 24.

[40] Fussman 1982, p. 8; Salomon 1986, p. 272.

[41] von Hinüber 2003, p. 38.

[42] Fussman (1982, p. 32) and Salomon (1986, p. 280) conceive *nirvartatām* for *ṇivatato*.

[43] Fussman (1982, p. 8) interprets "se trouve"; Salomon (1986, p. 272) "may it rest"; von Hinüber (2003, pp. 37–38) "mögen (sie) zur Ruhe kommen"; Baums (2012, p. 232) "may they come to rest".

[44] Fussman (1982, p. 32) "immortelle relique" namely "relique de ce qui est au-delà de la mort"; Salomon (1986, p. 272) "in that immortal relic". Schopen (1988, p. 532, footnote 30) also accepts this phrase in Senavarma inscription 12b *amudae dhatue* as the "relic" characterized as "immortal" or "deathless".

[45] Bailey (1980, p. 24) "in the immortal region"; von Hinüber (2003, p. 37) "in dem Ort des Nichttodes". Baums (2012, p. 232) translates "in that immortal element", Baums, Griffiths, Strauch & Tournier (2016, p. 388) interprets "in that deathless realm".

4. The Copper Scroll Inscription

Before we consider the very difficult interpretation of this phrase in the Senavarma case, let us see another example of an Indian inscription, which tells us more clearly what one would expect in the corresponding place in a *stūpa*-inscription before or after the colophon.

The "Copper Scroll Inscription", a very important inscription published by Melzer (2006), could give us a clue for the interpretation. This inscription, incised on a thin copper sheet, came from the region of "Greater Gandhāra", and is written in Sanskrit in the Brāhmī script. According to the study by Melzer, it can be dated to between the end of the 5th and the beginning of the 6th centuries.[46] It quotes a sūtra *Śrīmatībrāhmaṇī-paripṛcchā* and a verse from Nāgārjuna's *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā*. After the formula of donation with the date and the names of the donors, there follow 7 verses of praise and good wishes. Let us see some relevant passages in the verses.[47]

verse 3

yasyādyāpi tuṣārahārakumuda{s}spaṣṭīkṛśaṃkhaprabhaiś
chatrodārani(rū)ḍhavedikadharaiś cañcatpatākajvalai<ḥ>
stūpair bhāti mahī dharādharanibhais trailokyapūjyārcitai<s>
taṃ mūrdhnā namate nṛmaulimukuṭavyālīḍhapādaṃ jinam* ||

[To him] whose stūpas even today light up the earth — mountain-like [stūpas] resembling the colour of white frost, pearl necklaces, white water lilies, crystals and conch-shells, raised high by parasols and possessing railings, with flames made up of waving flags, and worshipped by those who are worthy of being honoured by the three worlds — one bows down with the head before this Victorious One, He, whose feet are touched by the crowns [i.e., by the rays of jewels on the crowns] of men.

verse 5

śāntiṃ gatasya sugatasya śarīrabhṛdbhi<ḥ>
stūpair iyaṃ vasumatī pratip(ū)ritā yaiḥ
tiṣṭhaṃtu dāmanakṛtapramukhāni tāni ·
kalpaṃ yathācalapa(ti)ḥ surarājajuṣṭaḥ ||

May the stūpas by which this earth is filled up, [stūpas] containing relics of the Sugata, who has attained tranquillity, headed by one/those made by Dāmana(?), stand for a Kalpa, as long as the Lord of the Mountains [i.e. Meru], inhabited by the kings of gods.[48]

---

[46] Melzer 2006, pp. 263–264.

[47] Melzer 2006, pp. 275–278: verse 3–9. The English translation is quoted from Melzer 2006.

[48] Melzer (2006, p. 276) comments: "This verse contains the wish for the durability of the donated object, as frequently found in inscriptions, but with different wording. *stūpa* is here neuter, as indicated by the demonstrative pronoun *tāni*".

verse 6

buddhyāśrayam[49] etad yasmi<ṃ> śucivṛddhaṃ
gātraṃ mama deśe deśaḥ sa śivasthaḥ
durbhikṣabhṛ(śādh)ivyādhipravimukto
muktaś ca vivādaiḥ śāntiṃ samupaitu ṛ ||

May that country of mine, in which this pure and exalted body [i.e., the stūpa or the relics], the basis for understanding, is located, remain happy, and be freed from famine, severe illness and diseases, as well as freed from dissension, and attain peace.

verse 7

stūpaiḥ śāradameghavṛndasadṛśair ākṣiptasā/u − ◡ ×
−.vārkkāṃśusahasr(a)śodhitamukhaiḥ padmākarair bhūṣitaḥ
asmajjanmanidhānahetur iha yaḥ − − sa tulyo mahān
āryagrāma udārasatvacaritaḥ syāt svargatulyaḥ sadā ||

[The place] here, which is the reason for our birth, which is adorned with stūpas resembling a multitude of [white] autumn clouds, …, [and or like] lotus ponds, the surface of which has been purified by thousands of sunrays, …, may this great village of the noble ones (*āryagrāma*) be constantly frequented by exalted beings [just] like heaven.

It is clear that the donors wish for the happiness and peace of the earth or the country in which the *stūpa*s containing relics of the Buddha stand. The *stūpa*s illuminate the region. The style written in verse and the date of the inscription differ from that of the Senavarma inscription. However, what the donors wish for after they established the *stūpa*s could be similar.

The relevant passage in the Senavarma inscription could therefore express the wishes of Senavarma. He wishes for the happiness and peace of his country or the region where he established the *stūpa*. The phrases with *tatra* and *yatra* could indicate the place or region where the *stūpa* was established.

5. Interpretation of the phrase with *amṛta-* and *dhātu-*

The difference in the interpretation of the passage *tatra amudae dhatue ṇivatato* in the Senavarma inscription lies in the meaning of two words *amudae dhatue*, and that is exactly the starting point for comparing the *amṛta*-section in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra* and the Senavarma inscription. As already mentioned, we encounter two different interpretations: one is to interpret both words as "immortal relic", the other is "immortal region". The reason why both words can be interpreted as "immortal region" is that the term *amṛta-* is often used for *nirvāṇa-*, and *amṛta-dhātu-* has the same meaning as *nirvāṇa-dhātu-*, which express "immortal region".

---

[49] Melzer (2006, p. 276) comments: "The meaning becomes even clearer if *buddhyāśraya* is emended to *buddhāśraya*, the 'resting-place or body of the Buddha'."

Concerning the problem of the interpretation of *dhātu*- as 'region' or 'space', there is a historical change, especially through a process of Sanskritization.[50] The term *dhātu*- is feminine in Pāli and used in the oblique case, as we see also the same in Gāndhārī. When Buddhist texts were sanskritized from Middle Indic, the oblique case of *dhātu*- was changed into the locative case, and as a result it tended to be interpreted as a 'region' or 'space' like *loka-dhātu*-. This change from oblique to locative interpretation happened probably not so early as the first century, when the Senavarma inscription was written. For the interpretation of the phrase in the Senavarma inscription, let us see examples of *amṛta*- with *dhātu*- in other texts.

> dhammayogā samānā jhāyīnaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ vaṇṇaṃ bhāsissāmā ti. evaṃ hi vo āvuso sikkhitabbaṃ. taṃ kissa hetu? acchariyā h'ete āvuso puggalā dullabhā lokasmiṃ, ye amataṃ dhātuṃ kāyena phusitvā viharanti. tasmā ti hāvuso evaṃ sikkhitabbaṃ: – (AN III 356.11–16)
>
> 'We will say the appearance of the monks who are meditating because of being connected with the dharma' — so, friends, you should learn. Why? Because, friends, it is difficult to find the persons in this world who live after having attained with body *amataṃ dhātuṃ* — so, friends, you should learn.

The context is the meditation, in which monks are connected with the dharma. The phrase *amataṃ dhātuṃ* in accusative seems to mean a kind of mental element in a profound meditation on the dharma.

> so yad – eva tattha hoti rūpagataṃ vedanāgataṃ saññāgataṃ saṅkhāragataṃ viññāṇagataṃ te dhamme aniccato dukkhato rogato gaṇḍato sallato aghato ābādhato parato palokato suññato anattato samanupassati. so tehi dhammehi cittaṃ paṭivāpeti, so tehi dhammehi cittaṃ paṭivāpetvā amatāya dhātuyā cittaṃ upasaṃharati: etaṃ santaṃ etaṃ paṇītaṃ yadidaṃ sabbasaṅkhārasamatho sabbūpadhipaṭinissaggo taṇhakkhayo virāgo nirodho nibbānan – ti. (MN I 435.31–436.3)[51]
>
> He (the monk who lives after having entered the first meditation) perceives the phenomena, which are connected with body/matter (*rūpa*), feeling (*vedanā*), ideation (*saṃjñā*), impulse (*saṃskāra*) and sensation (*vijñāna*), from the point of view of *anitya*, unpleasantness (*duḥkha*), illness (*roga*), swelling (*gaṇḍa*), piercing (*śalya*), grief (*agha*), affliction (*ābādha*), otherness/alien (*para*), decay (*paloka*), emptiness (*śūnya*) and no-self/non-self (*anātman*). He turns his mind away from these phenomena (= *rūpagataṃ vedanāgataṃ saññāgataṃ saṅkhāragataṃ viññāṇagataṃ*), and after he has turned his mind away from these phenomena, he collects his mind by/through/in the *amṛta-dhātu* (*amatāya dhātuyā*): 'it is calmed,

---

[50] Habata 2015b.

[51] Cf. *upasaṃharatī ti vipassanācittaṃ tāva savanavasena thutivasena pariyattivasena paññatti-vasena santaṃ nibbānan ti evaṃ asaṅkhatāya amatāya dhātuyā upasaṃharati* (Ps p. 146 to MN I 436.1).

it is exalted, that is, cessation of all *saṃskāra*s, rejection of all *upadhi*s (bases), destruction of thirst/craving, absence of desire, cessation and expiring (*nirvāṇa*)'.

The context here is also the meditation, in which a monk is meditating on every kind of cessation of all mental elements. The phrase *amatāya dhātuyā* in feminine oblique singular seems to mean here also a kind of mental element in the meditation.

In both examples, the phrase *amataṃ dhātuṃ* in accusative or *amatāya dhātuyā* in oblique is used in the context of meditation (*dhyāna*), and the term *dhātu-* does not seem to designate 'space', but 'element' of a mental state, a kind of 'mental elements' which construct the mind (*citta*) of meditating persons (*pudgala*). If the meditating person attains this element called *amata-/amṛta-* or collects the mind in (locative) or by (instrumental) this element, he becomes free from phenomena (*rūpa, vedanā, sañjñā, saṃskāra, vijñāna*) and free from craving and desire. The basic meaning of the word *dhātu-* is 'element' which constructs something, here in the examples, 'element' which constructs the mental state. It is clear that a person is constructed not only with physical/material elements, but also with non-material elements. It is noteworthy that the phrase with *amṛta-* and *dhātu* is used for a living person who is meditating.

6. The Buddha's body after his death

For another difficult passage in the Senavarma inscription, in which the body of the Buddha (*śarīra-*) is expressed with the different terms **antima-* and **paścima-* (*aṃdimaśarirate* in 5d; *pacimaeṇa śarireṇa* in 5e), von Hinüber (2003, p. 25) referred to the idea of three *parinirvāṇa*s which is explained in the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, Buddhaghosa's commentary on the *Dīghanikāya*. The three *parinirvāṇa*s are:

(1) *kilesa-parinibbānaṃ*: the *parinirvāṇa* of *kleśa*s under the bodhi-tree,
(2) *khandha-parinibbānaṃ*: the *parinirvāṇa* of *skandha*s in Kuśinagarī, and
(3) *dhātu-parinibbānan*: the *parinirvāṇa* of *dhātu*s.

The first *parinirvāṇa* under the bodhi-tree and the second *parinirvāṇa* in Kuśinagarī are well known. What is the third *parinirvāṇa*?

tīṇi parinibbānāni nāma, kilesa-parinibbānaṃ, khandha-parinibbānaṃ, dhātu-parinibbānan ti. tattha kilesa-parinibbānaṃ bodhi-pallaṅke ahosi, khandha-parinibbānaṃ kusinārāyaṃ, dhātu-parinibbānaṃ anāgate bhavissati. sāsanassa kira osakkana-kāle imasmiṃ tambapaṇṇi-dīpe dhātuyo sannipatitvā mahācetiyaṃ gamissanti. mahācetiyato nāgadīpe rājāyatanacetiyaṃ. tato mahābodhi-pallaṅkaṃ gamissanti. nāgabhavanato pi devalokato pi brahmalokato pi dhātuyo mahābodhi-pallaṅkaṃ eva gamissanti. sāsapamattā pi dhātuyo na antarāyaṃ nassissati. sabba-dhātuyo mahābodhi-pallaṅke rāsibhūtā suvaṇṇa-kkhandho viya eka-ghaṇā hutvā chabbaṇṇa-raṃsiyo vissajjessanti. tā dasa-sahassī-lokadhātuṃ pharissanti. tato dasa-sahassa-cakkavāḷa-devatā sannipatitvā: ajja satthā parinibbāti, ajja sāsanaṃ osakkati, pacchima-dassanaṃ dāni idaṃ amhākan ti, dasa-balassa parinibbāna-divasato mahantataraṃ kāruññaṃ

karissanti. ṭhapetvā anāgāmino khīṇāsave avasesā sabhāvena saṇṭhātuṃ na sakkhissanti. dhātūsu tejo-dhātu uṭṭhahitvā yāva brahmalokā uggacchissanti. sāsapamattiyā pi dhātuyā sati eka-jālo bhavissati. dhātūsu pariyādānaṃ gatāsu upacchijjissati. evam mahantaṃ anubhāvam dassetvā dhātūsu antarahitāsu sāsanaṃ antarahitaṃ nāma hoti. (Sv 899.27–900.10)

Three *parinibbāna*s are *kilesa-*, *khandha-* and *dhātu-parinibbāna*. There, the *kilesa-parinibbāna* was in sitting cross-legged under the bodhi-tree, the *khandha-parinibbāna* at Kusinārā, and the *dhātu-parinirvāṇa* will occur in the future. At the time when the teaching will draw back, as is expected (*kira*), the *dhātu*s, after they come together on this island Tambapaṇṇī, will go to the Mahācetiya; from the Mahācetiya on the island of Nāga, to the Rājāyatanacetiya; then they will go to the great bodhi-tree. Even the *dhātu*s which are [as tiny as] mustard seeds will not be lost. All *dhātu*s, which will have become a heap like a golden mass, after they become one solid mass,[52] they will emit rays of six colours. They will reach tens of thousands of the worlds. Then tens of thousands of deities of the spheres, after they come together: "Today, the teacher expires completely (*parinibbāti*); today the teaching draws back; it is the last seeing for us now." From the day of the *parinirvāṇa* of the ten powers (the Buddha), they (the *dhātu*s) will generate the greatest compassion. … After the fire/power-element (*tejo-dhātu*) will have arisen in/from the *dhātu*s, it will go upward until the Brahma-realm. Even if the *dhātu* is as tiny as a mustard seed, it will become one multitude [of splendour]. It will be broken when the *dhātu*s are exhausted. In this way, after showing the great power/miracle (*anubhāva*), the teaching will disappear when the *dhātu*s disappear.

In this miraculous story of the *dhātu-parinirvāṇa*, the word *dhātu-* means 'relic' evidently. The third *parinirvāṇa* will occur in the future, and before that the teaching of the Buddha remains. It means that we are now between the second *parinirvāṇa* of the Buddha in Kuśinagarī and the third *parinirvāṇa* in the future. This idea of the *dhātu-parinirvāṇa* shows how powerful the *dhātu*s or 'relics' are considered to be. Also, the existence of the teaching of the Buddha is closely connected with the *dhātu*s or 'relics' of the Buddha.

This idea of three *parinirvāṇa*s is found in the explanation for the phrase *apubbaṃ acariman* "not earlier, not after"[53] in the *Sampasādanīyasuttanta* in the *Dīghanikāya*.

---

[52] For the term *ekaghaṇa-* see Skilling 2005, p. 294–302: the term *ekaghaṇa-* is used in the context of relics also in the *Bhadrakalpika*, of which Gāndhārī fragments are attested. The Gāndhārī text was published in Baums, Glass & Matsuda 2016, the term *ekaghaṇo/°ghaṇa* appears in p. 198 (HG 45) recto 4 (reconstruction, parallels and notes p. 237–238); p. 199 (HG 46, HI 3) verso 3 (reconstruction, parallels and notes p. 256); p. 199 (MS 2179/32a, 32b) A2 (reconstruction, parallels and notes p. 258).

[53] *apubbaṃ acarimaṃ uppajjeyyuṃ. n'etaṃ ṭhānaṃ vijjati* (DN III 114.26–27).

apubbaṃ acariman ti apure apacchā ekato na uppajjanti, pure vā pacchā vā uppajjantī ti vuttaṃ hoti. tattha bodhi-pallaṅke: bodhiṃ appatvā na uṭṭhahissāmī ti, nisinna-kālato paṭṭhāya yāva mātu-kucchismiṃ paṭisandhi-gahaṇaṃ tāva pubbe ti na veditabbaṃ. bodhisattassa hi paṭisandhi-gahaṇe dasa-sahassa-cakkavāḷa kampanen' eva khetta-pariggaho kato. aññassa buddhassa uppatti nivārito hoti. parinibbānato paṭṭhāya yāva sāsapa-mattā pi dhātuyo tiṭṭhanti, tava pacchā ti na veditabbaṃ. dhātūsu hi ṭhitāsu buddhā pi ṭhitā va honti, tasmā etth' antare aññassa buddhassa uppatti nīvāritā [sic. nivāritā?] va hoti. dhātu-parinibbāne pana jāte aññassa buddhassa uppatti na nivāritā. (Sv 898.6–17)

… There, under the bodhi-tree, [thinking] "I will not stand up until I attain the bodhi," between the time of sitting [under the bodhi-tree] and [the time of] taking [his] reunion (new existence) in his mother's womb — one should not understand that it is *pubbe* 'being before' 'earlier'. … The coming forth of another Buddha is kept back, from [the time of] the *parinirvāṇa* [of the Buddha] as long as the *dhātu*s or 'relics' which are as tiny as mustard seeds remain — one should not understand that it is *pacchā* 'after'. Because, when the *dhātu*s remain, also the *buddha*s remain; because of that, the coming forth of another Buddha is kept back here. When the *dhātu-parinirvāṇa* is arisen, then the coming forth of another Buddha is not kept back.

This explanation gives the definition of the phrase *apubbaṃ acariman* "not earlier, not after": between the descending of the Bodhisattva into the mother's womb and the *dhātu-parinirvāṇa* in the future, that is "not earlier, not after" — that means the Buddha exists/remains as the Bodhisattva, as the Buddha, and after his *parinirvāṇa* in Kuśinagarī, he remains here as the *dhātu*s, which we translate into English as 'relics'.

Considering this understanding of the *dhātu* that represents/supports the existence of the Buddha and his teaching, it would not be strange if we translate *amṛta-dhātu-* into English as "immortal relic".[54]

7. Phraseology with *amṛta-* and *dhātu-*

As explained already, the passage containing the phrase *amudae dhatue* in the Senavarma inscription is considerably difficult to interpret; I can only appreciate every effort of all the interpretations. There is much to do before we could come to a convincing conclusion, if it were indeed possible. Nevertheless, in order to close the consideration of this paper, I would suggest a provisional understanding.

---

[54] The problem lies in the fact that we translate the word *dhātu* into English, French, or German as 'relic(s)', 'relique(s)', or 'Reliquie(n)', which has a special meaning in Christianity. The Sanskrit word *dhātu* — of which the basic meaning is '(constructive) element', and which means in the context of the body of the Buddha '(constructive) element of the Buddha's body' — is generally used as 'element', which constructs a person, whether it be material, medical, or psychological, and whether the person be alive or dead.

The passage expresses the wishes of the king Senavarma who repaired the *stūpa* and established the relic in the *stūpa* again. Comparing the similar passage in the Copper Scroll Inscription from Greater Gandhāra, the words *tatra* and *yatra* could be understood as the region where the *stūpa* stands. The subject seems to be the *dharma*, which is accompanied with many attributes beginning with *ye* before *tatra*. Both words *amudae dhatue* in oblique feminine could be interpreted as locative or instrumental, but they are not congruent with *tatra* and *yatra*. The verb with the subject *dharma* in singular could stand also in a singular form, and could be understood as a form of *ni-vṛt* (not *nir-vṛt*). A tentative translation of the passage 11c–12d would be the following:[55]

> (11c–d) This pious gift (**deyadharma-*) now, and this faith (**śraddhā-*), and this devotion (**prasāda-*), for what purpose (**artham*) shall it be?
>
> (11e–12b) The dharma which was completely realized by the worthy Śākyamuni, the truly enlightened one (**samyaksaṃbuddha-*), [the dharma which is] the destroyer of pride, the remover of thirsting, the uprooter (?) of clinging, the cutting off of material things (?), the destruction of thirst, completely free of passion and cessation (?), calm, excellent, free of fever, immovable, free of disease, totally perfected, totally chaste, and totally completed,
>
> (12b–d) [the dharma] may turn/stay there (*tatra* = in the region where the *stūpa* stands) by/with/in the relic that is immortal/ambrosius; where (*yatra* = *tatra*) shall be the end and completion of this beginningless and endless *saṃsāra*, where all of these feelings will become cooled.

I do not mean that this passage in the Senavarma inscription influenced the *amṛta*-section in the MPM, or *vice versa*. Both texts have the common phraseology in the common context. After his study on the term *ekaghaṇa-* in the context of the relic(s) from the Pāli texts, the *Bhadrakalpika*, the *Vimalakīrinirdeśa*, and the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka* — texts from different times, regions, and categories — Skilling (2005, p. 302) concludes: "Phraseologies encode ideologies, and the texts share not only terminology but also ideas." In the shared ideas, the relic (*dhātu*) was regarded as having the same power as the Buddha even after his death, performing a miracle in the place where the *stūpa* stands as if the Buddha remains there, and it was called "immortal/ambrosius (*amṛta*)".

Abbreviations

AiGr: Wackernagel, Jakob/Jacob & Albert Debrunner: *Altindische Grammantik*. Band I–III, Göttingen 1896–1957.

BHSD: Edgerton, Franklin: *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. Vol. II: Dictionary. New Haven 1953.

---

[55] Most of the English expressions are taken from Salomon 1986, if there is no difference in interpretation.

ChinD: 大般涅槃經 *Dà bān niè pán jīng* (Taishō vol. 12, no. 374), translated by 曇無讖 Dharmakṣema

ChinF: 大般泥洹經 *Dà bān ní huán jīng* (Taishō vol. 12, no. 376), translated by 法顯 Fǎ xiǎn

EWA: Mayrhofer, Manfred: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen.* Heidelberg 1992–99.

MPM: *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra.* The Tibetan text is quoted from Habata 2013.

SF: Sanskrit fragments of the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra.* The Sanskrit text is quoted from Habata 2007 and 2019.

SP: *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, ed. Kern & Nanjio. St. Petersburg 1908–12.

The abbreviations of the titles of Pāli texts are those used in the *Critical Pāli Dictionary* (by V. Trenckner et al., Copenhagen 1924–2011).

Bibliography

Bailey, H. W. 1980: "A Kharoṣṭrī Inscription of Seṇavarma, King of Oḍi", *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1980, pp. 21–29.

Baums, Stefan 2012: "Catalog and Revised Texts and Translations of Gandharan Reliquary Inscriptions", *Gandharan Buddhist Reliquaries* (Gandharan Studies 1), ed. D. Jongeward, E. Errington, R. Salomon, S. Baums. Seattle: University of Washington Press, pp. 200–251.

Baums, Stefan, Andrew Glass & Kazunobu Matsuda 2016: "Fragments of a Gāndhārī Version of the *Bhadrakalpikasūtra*", *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection. Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. IV, ed. Jens Braarvig. Oslo: Hermes Publishing, pp. 183–266.

Baums, Stefan, Arlo Griffiths, Ingo Strauch & Vincent Tournier 2016: "Early Inscriptions of Āndhradeśa. Results of fieldwork in January and February 2016", *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 102, pp. 355–398.

Blum, Mark L. 2013: *The Nirvana Sutra (Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra).* vol I (BDK English Tripiṭaka Series). Berkeley: Bukkyo Dendo Kyokai America.

Brough, John 1952: "Audumbarāyaṇa's Theory of Language", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 14, pp. 73–77.

Falk, Harry 2003: [Review on von Hinüber 2003] in: *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 98 (4/5), pp. 573–577.

Fussman, Gérard 1982: "Documents épigraphiques kouchans (III). L'inscription Kharoṣṭhī de Senavarma, roi d'Oḍi: Une nouvelle lecture", *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 71, pp. 1–46.

Fussmann, G. 2003/04: [Review on von Hinüber 2003] in: *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 90/91, pp. 517–520.

Habata, Hiromi 2007: *Die zentralasiatischen Sanskrit-Fragmente des Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra.* Kritische Ausgabe des Sanskrittextes und seiner tibetischen Übertragung im Vergleich mit den chinesischen Übersetzungen (Indica

et Tibetica 51). Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.

Habata, Hiromi 2013: *A Critical Edition of the Tibetan Translation of the* Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra (Contributions to Tibetan Studies 10). Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

Habata, Hiromi 2015a: "*Buddhadhātu*, *tathāgatadhātu* and *tathāgatagarbha* in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra*", *Hōrin: Vergleichende Studien zur japanischen Kultur* 18, pp. 176–196.

Habata, Hiromi 2015b: "The City of *Nirvāṇa*: Conceptions of *Nirvāṇa* with Special Reference to the Central Asian Tradition", *The Eastern Buddhist* 46 (2), pp. 61–83.

Habata, Hiromi 2019: *Aufbau und Umstrukturierung des Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra. Untersuchungen zum Mahāparinirvāṇa-mahāsūtra unter Berücksichtigung der Sanskrit-Fragmente* (Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 25). Bremen: Hempen Verlag.

Habata, Hiromi 幅田裕美 (forthcoming): "Issaishujō to issendai 一切衆生と一闡提 (*sarvasattva* and *icchantika*)", *Nihonbukkyōgakkai nenpō* 日本佛教学会年報 (*The Journal of the Nippon Buddhist Research Association*) 86.

Hara, Minoru 1959: "A Note on the Sanskrit Word *ní-tya-*", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 79 (2), pp. 90–96.

von Hinüber, Oskar 2003: *Beiträge zur Erklärung der Senavarma-Inschrift* (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 2003. Nr. 1). Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

Jongeward, David 2012: "Survey of Gandharan Reliquaries", *Gandharan Buddhist Reliquaries* (Gandharan Studies 1), ed. D. Jongeward, E. Errington, R. Salomon & S. Baums. Seattle: University of Washington Press, pp. 39–110.

Melzer, Gudrun 2006: "A Copper Scroll Inscription from the Time of the Alchon Huns. In collaboration with Lore Sander", *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection. Buddhist Manuscripts*, ed. Jens Braarvig. vol. III, Oslo: Hermes Publishing, pp. 251–278.

Norman, K. R. 2005: [Review on von Hinüber 2003] in: *Indo-Iranian Journal* 48. 2005, pp. 124–127.

Ruegg, David Seyfort 1989: "Allusiveness and Obliqueness in Buddhist Texts: Saṃdhā, Saṃdhi, Saṃdhyā and Abhisaṃdhi", *Dialectes dans les Littératures Indo-Aryennes* (Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne Fascicule 55), édité par Colette Caillat. Paris, pp. 295–328.

Salomon, Richard 1986: "The Inscription of Senavarma, King of Oḍi", *Indo-Iranian Journal* 29, pp. 261–293.

Salomon, Richard 2005: [Review on von Hinüber 2003] in: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 125 (2), pp. 316–320.

Schlosser, Andrea 2019: "Mahāyāna features in early Kharoṣṭhī manuscripts from Gandhāra", *Hōrin. Vergleichende Studien zur japanischen Kultur* 20, pp. 23–41

Schlosser, Andrea & Ingo Strauch 2016: "The Bajaur Mahāyāna Sūtra. A Preliminary

Analysis of its Contents", *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 39, pp. 309–335.

Schopen, Gregory 1988: "On the Buddha and His Bones: The Conception of a Relic in the Inscriptions of Nāgarjunikoṇḍa", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 108 (4), pp. 527–537.

Skilling, Peter 2005: "Cutting across categories: The ideology of relics in Buddhism", *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 8, pp. 269–322.

Strauch, Ingo 2010: "More Missing Pieces of Early Pure Land Buddhism: New Evidence for Akṣobhya and Abhirati in an Early Mahayana Sutra from Gandhāra", *The Eastern Buddhist* 41 (1), pp. 23–66.

Yuyama, Akira 1981: *Sanskrit Fragments of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra: 1. Koyasan Manuscript* (Studia Philologica Buddhica: Occasional Paper Series IV). Tokyo: The Reiyukai Library.

Zhao, Wen 2017: *The Conceptions of Seeing the Buddha and Buddha Embodiments in Early Prajñāpāramitā Literature* (Dissertation München).