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

Mahāyāna gift theory is analyzed through a close reading of a range of textual sources, including both Sūtra and Śāstra, two major genres of Indian Mahāyāna Buddhist texts. As part of this project, I categorize the various types of discourses on the gift that appear in Mahāyāna Sūtras. I also translate two Mahāyāna Buddhist texts that have until now not been translated.
into a Western language. The first text I translate is the Dānapāramitā-sūtra, which is preserved only in the Tibetan Kanjur. The second is the Dānapaṭala, a chapter of a Mahāyāna Śāstric text called the Bodhisattvabhūmi that is still extant in Sanskrit. The Dānapāramitā-sūtra exhibits parallels with some Mahāyāna Sūtras in their treatment of gift giving, but sharply diverges from others. And even though the Dānapāramitā-sūtra and Dānapaṭala ostensibly address the same topic and come from the same religious tradition, they are markedly different texts. It is clear that Mahāyāna textual discourse on the gift is extremely diverse. There are competing Mahāyāna gift theories rather than a unified Mahāyāna gift theory.

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

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

The Buddhist case was no different. Buddhist monks and nuns in India appear to have always been economically dependent on the donations of lay members (as well as their monastics) to supply requisites necessary for the pursuit of the religious life. Such requisites included, citing a standard Buddhist list, alms food, robes, bedding and seats, and medicine. Buddhist inscriptions from India, numbering in the thousands, largely record gifts such as these to the Saṃgha. The entire monastic Vinaya, whichever version or “sect’s” one chooses to privilege, might best be summarized as a dizzying array of narrative-embedded rules designed by monks in order to regulate the relations between Buddhist monastics and lay members, relations predicated on the reciprocal exchange of material donations and spiritual merit. Moreover, Buddhist doctrinal lists of the pāramitās or “Perfections,” though they vary in the
number, order, and content of the Perfections, all begin with dāna, “giving” or “generosity.” In perhaps the most famous story known to the Buddhist world, the so-called historical Buddha in his penultimate human life as Prince Vessantara/Viśvaṃtara is said to achieve this first Perfection by giving away all his possessions, the white elephant upon which the prosperity of his kingdom depends, and eventually even his own wife and children. It is no accident that the Buddha awakens in the next life as Siddhārtha Gautama, the Perfection of Giving being one of the final steps in a countless succession of lives whereby he is believed to have acquired the prodigious amount of merit necessary to reach enlightenment.

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

I will endeavor to fill this desideratum by examining how gift giving appears in a range of Mahāyāna sources. Most studies of Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism are limited to texts, and ones that are not limited in this way rarely take textual and nontextual evidence into account at the same time. This dissertation, however, explores Mahāyāna and the gift using textual, epigraphic, and, to a small degree, art-historical data.
Indian gift theory addresses a variety of factors that feature in gift exchange—who should give and receive gifts, what should be given, when and in what situations giving should occur, what results from giving, and so on. Mahāyāna texts formulate gift theories too. They represent one multicolored thread in the Indian theoretical discourse on gift giving. The gift theories propounded in Mahāyāna texts intersect with but also sharply diverge from each other as well as the gift theories of non-Mahāyāna Indian religious texts. Epigraphic and material sources, on the other hand, reflect certain aspects of giving in practice. They allow us to glimpse which facets of gift theory, if any, were actualized in real gift exchanges.

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

Chapter III presents an annotated translation and study of the Dānapāramitā-sūtra. Although it is one of only a few Mahāyāna texts devoted to the important issue of gift giving, I have yet to see it mentioned in scholarship, let alone studied. Part A of chapter III introduces the Dānapāramitā-sūtra, affording important background information on the pāramitās and outlining the structure and major themes within the text. Part A also dates the Dānapāramitā-sūtra based on evidence internal to the text and deals with closely related Mahāyāna Sūtras (or
parts of Mahāyāna Sūtras). The text is translated in part B. The edited Tibetan text, based on six recensions from the Kanjur, is given in part C. The Dānapāramitā-sūtra seems to be extant only in Tibetan translation, being included in the mDo section of the Kanjur.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I cannot follow the evidence Drewes uses for this position. He notes the lack of archaeological evidence for separate Mahāyāna communities, but there is little to no archaeological evidence for Mahāyāna at all in the period Drewes discusses. One could just as easily say that there is no archaeological evidence that Mahāyānists did not live in separate communities. He remarks that “Mahāyānists accept the authenticity of sūtras with a wide spectrum of divergent perspectives today,” but what is going on today has zero bearing on Mahāyānists in India two thousand years ago. That Chinese and Tibetan translators “usually translated multiple sūtras with divergent perspectives” is similarly irrelevant to the Indian situation. Drewes also observes that the anthologists of Mahāyāna Sūtras and authors of Mahāyāna Śāstras quote from multiple Mahāyāna Sūtras. But what the anthologists and Śāstric authors were doing represents a later development of a more homogenous Mahāyāna. And these anthologists
examination of the material shared throughout the entire corpus of Mahāyāna Sūtras, therefore, may help us map out the relationships between them and lead to genealogical models for Mahāyāna texts. This in turn could lead to a better understanding of early Mahāyāna history, when “composing,” redacting, and interacting with texts—reading them, copying them, worshiping them, etc.—may have been a or the dominant form of religious praxis.

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

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

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


5 I use the term Mainstream out of convenience because it has taken root in the field. I use it to refer to the shared forms of Buddhist thought, literature, practice, and institutions that preceded Mahāyāna in India, that served as the matrix out of which Mahāyāna was formed, and that continued to function as the background for Mahāyāna’s entire existence in India (even as Mahāyāna came to shape that religious landscape). Thus by Mainstream I mean both the array of Buddhist traditions and institutions within which Mahāyāna was situated and the forms of non-Mahāyāna Buddhism against which Mahāyāna sometimes defined itself. I understand there are problems with such a catch-all choice, but I am not interested in joining the hair-splitting debate over taxonomic words, much less in muddying the waters by adding new terminology. For a helpful discussion on this topic, see Drewes, “Early Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism II,” 72-73.
If this turns out to be the case, presumably there had to be some form of contact between separate Mahāyāna communities spread among the various Nikāyas. I see no other way to explain the similarities in form and content in different Mahāyāna Sūtras. Such contact may have occurred through real living persons sharing ideas between Mahāyāna groups from the same time period, or through the texts themselves, with a given Mahāyāna community having access to an oral or written text created or redacted by other Mahāyāna communities. Even if we cannot pinpoint the provenance of early Mahāyāna communities and their corresponding texts, outside of extremely vague geographic descriptions like “Greater Gandhāra” or “North India,” we can still potentially map out textual similarities and model how one text influenced others, thereby tracing the degree that the ideas and literary habits of one Mahāyāna community impacted those of other communities, both contemporary and across time. Silk is the only scholar I know of to recognize the potential of studying intertextuality, so it is worthwhile to note his suggestions:

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

---

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

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

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

---

\(^7\) Silk, “What, if Anything, is Mahāyāna Buddhism?” 373-374.
familiarity with other texts to devise new ones,\(^8\) and later material being interpolated from stock Mahāyāna material. Our best hope to sort out the possibly convoluted histories of single texts—or, put more accurately, of the various versions of texts sharing a single title—is through comparing multiple (mostly Chinese) translations made at different points in time, although this is fraught with its own methodological problems.\(^9\) Daniel Boucher, using all the philological tools at the Buddhologist’s disposal, has shed the most light on just how complex Mahāyāna textual history can be. He has demonstrated in some detail the difficult path the Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā-sūtra traveled making its way from India to China, with Dharmarakṣa and his translation team working through—not always successfully—challenging oral and aural barriers to render a text composed in or heavily influenced by Gāndhārī Prakrit in a Chinese vernacular of the 3\(^{rd}\) century CE. Boucher has also delineated significant differences between the Chinese translation made by Dharmarakṣa and those made later by Jñānagupta in the 6th century and by Dānapāla in the 10\(^{th}\) century, as well as differences between the three Chinese translations and the 9\(^{th}\) century Tibetan translation and the very late Nepalese Sanskrit

---

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

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

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


\(^9\) Gregory Schopen, for one, warns that “some—if not a great deal—of what has been said on the basis of Chinese translations about the history of an Indian text has more to do with the history of Chinese translation techniques and Chinese religious or cultural predilections than with the history of the Indian text itself.” See “The Mahāyāna and the Middle Period in Indian Buddhism: Through a Chinese Looking-Glass,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 4.
manuscripts. It will be through painstaking work of the kind done by Boucher that the degree of redaction present in Mahāyāna Sūtras will be able to be sorted out. The redactional histories of single texts, in turn, will help to paint a clearer picture of the relationships between different texts.

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

---


11 Similar studies on the history of “single” Mahāyāna Sūtras have been done, though not usually as detailed as Boucher’s. On the Aṣṭasāhasrikā, for example, see Lewis Lancaster, “The Oldest Mahāyāna Sūtra: Its Significance for the Study of Buddhist Development,” Eastern Buddhist 8.1 (1975): 30-41. On the Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra, see Nattier, A Few Good Men, 51-63.
Due to the constraints of time and space, the task at hand is only to identify patterns in the way a single topic occurs in Mahāyāna Sūtras: giving. Most of the comments above were made merely to flag possible methodological problems and to suggest that similar but more thorough and sophisticated work could lead to an increasingly clearer picture of the web of relationships between Mahāyāna texts and possibly between Mahāyāna communities themselves. But as I stated at the outset, giving has always been central to the survival of religious institutions in India, so understanding an Indian religious movement’s relationship with the gift may reveal a lot about its history as an institution. Among the many possible themes to examine within Mahāyāna texts, then, giving has the potential to offer more clues about its institutional history than, say, literary discourses on emptiness, awakening, or other Mahāyāna points of doctrine.

In this effort, I will reveal tendencies in the many Mahāyāna Sūtras dealing with giving, tendencies that are not entirely dissimilar from what one sees when examining literary genres. Reiko Ohnuma has recently analyzed what she considers to be a genre of Indian Buddhist literature: the Jātakas or stories of former lives in which the Bodhisattva—he who would become Śākyamuni Buddha—gives away his body. For Ohnuma, what makes this group of stories a genre is not that they can be defined by the specific place and time that gave rise to them, as would be possible for something like the British Gothic novel. Nor do gift-of-the-body Jātakas constitute a single genre because we can identify their authors or the social and intellectual characteristics of their readers. Ohnuma’s genre is, by her own admission, largely ahistorical, being historically delimited only by what was culturally Indian during the entire period Buddhism existed in India. Rather, Ohnuma defines the gift-of-the-body genre by the set of narrative conventions the authors of these Jātakas tended to follow and the “horizon of
expectations” present in those stories for the hypothetical competent Indian reader. Based on who the recipient of the Bodhisattva’s body is and whether the Bodhisattva dies because of his sacrifice, gift-of-the-body Jātakas fall into two major types, a small “horizon of expectations” against which a learned reader can judge variations.12

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

---

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

13 From Chinese translations a terminus ante quem for Mahāyāna Sūtras can often be reasonably established. See, for example, Paul Harrison, “The Earliest Chinese Translations of Mahāyāna Buddhist Sūtras: Some notes on the works of Lokakṣema,” Buddhist Studies Review 10.2 (1993): 135-177. But to my knowledge there have only been two noteworthy (published) attempts to pinpoint both the geographic and chronological origins of specific Mahāyāna Sūtras. Based on lexical and thematic parallels with the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya, some Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions, the Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-śūtra, and Aśvaghosa’s Buddhacarita, Gregory Schopen places the Maitreyasimhanāda-śūtra in northwest India during the early Kuśān period (ca. early 2nd century CE). See his “The Bones of a Buddha and the Business of a Monk: Conservative Monastic Values in an early Mahāyāna Polemical Tract,” in Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India, 63-107, esp. 80. For a less cogent effort to place another Mahāyāna text, the Śrīmālavijñānasūtra, based in my view on very weak epigraphic and textual parallels, see A. Wayman and E. Rosen, “The Rise of Mahāyāna Buddhism and Inscriptional Evidence at Nāgarjunakonda,” Indian Journal of Buddhist Studies 2.1 (1990): 49-63. It has also come to my attention recently that Stephen Hodge places the origin of the (Mahāyāna) Mahāparinirvāṇa-śūtra somewhere near Amarāvatī in Southern India during the reign of Gautamiputra Sātakarni, the Sātavāhana king, in the 1st century CE. I have not yet had time to examine the evidence Hodge adduces to locate the Mahāparinirvāṇa-śūtra to such a specific place and time. As far as I know his work on this topic is at present only available on the web: see Stephen Hodge, “The Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-śūtra: The
several centuries later. It is, though, almost entirely made up of Sūtras that can probably be
dated to this 500-year span of time.) These restrictions are certainly more narrow than those
of Ohnuma, but are still frustratingly large and do not even take into consideration the wider
geographic and chronological contexts in which Mahāyāna Sūtras may have actually been read.

But, just like Ohnuma’s analysis of gift-of-the-body Jātakas, we are here dealing with literary
patterns, and because of this her understanding of genre has some overlap with how
Mahāyāna Sūtras describe giving. Technically, references to giving within Mahāyāna Sūtras
would not constitute a genre. There are not many Mahāyāna works devoted solely to giving,
far too few to warrant being characterized as a full-fledged class of literature. The types I will
outline below are categories of phrases and passages about giving within Mahāyāna Sūtras, not
whole works on the subject. Nevertheless, the topic of giving, which one might expect would
be an expansive topic conducive to a great variety of textual expressions and interpretations,
appears in limited and stereotypical ways in Mahāyāna Sūtras. It therefore seems reasonable to
conclude that the authors and redactors of those Sūtras were constrained by certain literary
conventions, and that their putative readers likewise had a finite “horizon of expectations”

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

14 It would be worthwhile to pursue whether Mahāyāna Sūtras constitute their own textual genre.
Certainly one who has the misfortune of being intimately familiar with this literature would know, if
given a Sanskrit text at random, whether he or she had a Mahāyāna Sūtra almost immediately after
beginning to read it.
regarding the phrases and passages dealing with giving. So while the minute phrases and sporadic passages on giving do not qualify as a genre, they obey some of the same rules.\(^{15}\)

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

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

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

\(^{15}\) On the whole, the patterns I identify below are lexical and conceptual, not narrative in form. Buddhist texts, of course, employ a huge range of narrative clichés. Gift giving in Buddhist narratives can follow patterns simply because it is embedded within a fixed storytelling form. The gift-of-the-body stories that Ohnuma analyzes are a good example of this, as are the many *Avadāna* stories that deal with the rewards of gift giving. On one Buddhist gift-giving narrative cliché, see André Bareau, “La nourriture offerte au Buddha lors de son dernier repas,” in *Mélanges d’Indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou* (Publications de l’Institut de Civilisation Indienne 28) (Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard, 1968), 61-71. On the highly schematic form of Jain gift-giving narratives, see Nalini Balbir, “The Micro-genre of Dāna-stories in Jaina Literature: Problems of Interrelation and Diffusion,” *Indologica Taurinensia* 11: 145–61.
that discusses giving to a buddha, then lists the rewards for giving, and then uses giving as a basis for comparison. I have simply organized the topics in a way that I thought would make sense conceptually for the reader. There are representative examples of terms or passages for each category, and I will note when particular passages that I adduce as evidence seem to fit into more than one. For the sake of brevity, the majority of relevant textual samples I have found are not included below. Again, the number of Mahāyāna Sūtras I used was much fewer than what is available in Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese, so it is likely that I have not exhausted all the possibilities for textual categories related to giving. I should also add here that I have found many instances of giving in Mahāyāna Sūtras that resist categorization. These examples may be particular to the Sūtras in which they are found, or they may have intertextual parallels yet to be discovered. All this will have to be sorted out in a more complete survey of the literature.

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

Epithets

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

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

---

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


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

_Giving to a buddha_

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


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

21 In this sense Mahāyāna Sūtras may preserve the Indian “ethics of esteem” that Maria Heim describes so eloquently, which “assumes and renders explicit difference, hierarchy, special classes of persons who are admired apart from others.” See Hibbets (= Heim), “The Ethics of Esteem,” _Journal of Buddhist Ethics_ 7 (2000): 26-42, and Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia*, 45-55 (quote taken from p. 55). (Interestingly, this paradigm can be reversed in modern Jain contexts, where superior status is achieved among lay families—not between monastics and lay persons—by lavish giving. Laidlaw describes how Jain families in India are very reluctant to accept food from other families, in part because of the polluting nature of food, but “aggressively hospitable themselves when they have guests to entertain.” See James Laidlaw, *Riches and Renunciation: Religion, Economy, and Society among the Jains* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 292-293. In this instance it is the status of the donor and not the
vessel through whom one can earn the most merit (see below under Ideal recipients and legitimate practice). In chapter seven of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra, for example, innumerable Mighty Brahma gods make their way to a buddha named Mahābhijñājñānābhibhū, and then give him the flying vehicles from their heaven (divyāni brāhmāṇi vimānāni). The episode is repeated several times in the prose and verse portions of the chapter, and in one instance the gods clarify their motivation for making the gift:

vimānāni sucitrāṇi anubhāvena te vibho /
dadāma te mahāvīra pratighṛṇa mahāmune (56) //
asmākam anukampārthaṃ parībhūṣaṇa vināyaka /
vayaṃ ca sarvasattvāś ca agrāṃ bodhiṃ sāṃśaḥ (57) //

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

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


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


26 Cf. Kern, trans., The Lotus Sutra, 121.
Giving to the most excellent of recipients brings the most excellent of rewards. By accepting and using their divine gift, this buddha would allow for the summum bonum of Mahāyāna soteriological rewards: The Mighty Brahma gods and indeed all beings can reach—literally, “touch” (spṛśemahi)—awakening (see below under Context of awakening).

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

\[
\text{atha khalu trāyastiṃśakāyikānāṃ devaputrāṇāṃ śatasahasrāṇi} \\
\text{divyapuspadhiṃpagandhamālyavilepanacārnarāvarṣair divyai ratnavarṣair divyaiś ca} \\
\text{vastrarāvarṣair bhāgavantam abhyavākiran abhiprākiran / divyaiś cchattrair divyair dhvajair} \\
\text{divyābhīr ghaṇṭābhīr divyābhīhī patākābhīhī samantāc ca divyādipamālābhīr bahuvidhābhīś ca} \\
\text{divyābhīhī pūjābhīr bhāgavantaṃ satkurvanti sma gurukurvanti sma mānayanti sma pūjayanti} \\
\text{smā arcayanti sma apacāyanti sma divyāni ca vādyany abhipravādayāṃ āsuḥ} / 28
\]

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

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


29 Cf. Conze, trans., The perfection of wisdom in eight thousand lines & its verse summary, 132. Note that the purpose of the whole passage is to promote wisdom, explaining how a certain kind of redirection or “transfer” (pariṇāma) brings more merit than the many gifts of bodhisattvas who have reified
I imagine that such a distinction between giving and worship through offerings might not have been made in practice. One would think that giving the Buddha gifts and doing homage to him by making offerings to a stūpa or an image both earn the practitioner merit and, in the end, amount to the same thing. But this is, after all, a Mahāyāna literary world, not a real one. I am making what I hope is not an unwarranted assumption that word choice matters, that the authors and redactors of Mahāyāna Sūtras conceptually differentiated giving and devotion because the literary descriptions of the two behaviors were couched in different language.  At perceptions (aupalambhika). The devotional offerings made by the gods to the Buddha are not part of the comparison involving the gifts of the bodhisattvas. See below under the categories Giving as a basis for comparison, Recontextualization, and Redefinitions. Also note that much or all of the Perfection of Wisdom literature clearly elevates the physical book to the status of a buddha, advocating that the book be elaborately honored in the same manner as this passage here. See, for example, the Aṣṭasāhasrikā in ibid., 105 and 299; and the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra in Edward Conze, trans., The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom, with the divisions of the Abhisamayālaṃkāra (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), 278, 292, and 568. Of course, similar passages can be found outside of Perfection of Wisdom literature. For example, note the passages regarding devotional offerings to the book in Kern and Nanjio, eds., Saddharma-puṇḍarīka, 225.7-8, 226.5-6, 231.11-232.3, 337.3-8, 390.1-391.13, 403.2-6; 418.1-6. On these and other “book cult” passages, again see Schopen, “The Phrase sa prthivipradesas caityabhūto bhavet in the Vajracchedikā.”

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

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

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

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dānena pretagati chindati bodhisattvo} \\
\text{dāridryaṃ ca chinatī tatha sarvakleśān} \\
\text{bhogāṃ c' anantavipulān labhate caranto} \\
\text{dānena sattva paripācayi kricchraprāptan} \\
\end{align*}
\]

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

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

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


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

The rewards for giving can be more closely associated with the type of gift made or how a gift is offered.\textsuperscript{37} This is especially true for the Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra (a chapter of the Divyāvadāna), the Dānapāramitā-sūtra, chapter six of the Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtra, and the fifth “imperishable” of the Akṣayamatinirdeṣa-sūtra. For instance, the Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra describes how a gift of food leads to freedom from desire, one of medicine leads to the freedom from old age and death, and a gift of flowers brings the flowers of the branches of awakening.\textsuperscript{38}

Similarly, in the Bhaiṣajyaguruvaīḍūryaprabha-sūtra, the bodhisattva after whom the text is named makes an oath to sate the bodies of the hungry when he attains awakening. But the reward is not the bodhisattva’s, but rather those he provides with “food endowed with (good) color, smell, and flavor” (\textit{varṇagandharasopetāhāra}): After regaining their health

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

\textsuperscript{38} See James R. Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” \textit{Journal of the American Oriental Society} 49 (1929): 43 (no. 11), 45 (no. 17), and 45-46 (no. 19). The Sanskrit, Chinese, and Tibetan for this text often vary considerably.
Bhaiṣajyaguruṇaḍūryaprabha vows to establish them in the “endless comfort with the flavor of the Dharma” (dharmarasaṇātyaṃtaṣukha).³⁹

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

---

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

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


⁴² Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” 44 (nos. 13 and 14).
sūtra plays with this sort of one-to-one equivalence, matching up physical gift with spiritual reward, the latter either being material too or some kind of otherworldly version of the material object given. In the Dānapāramitā-sūtra the equation often involves gifts of the body, just as when a son or daughter from a good family (kulaputra or kuladuhitr) gives up his or her body in the Śrīmālādeviśiṃhanāda-sūtra it leads to the acquisition of the body of a buddha.\(^{43}\)

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

---

**Giving as a basis for comparison**

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

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

\(^{44}\) Kern and Nanjio, eds., Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, 119.8-11: khādyaṃ daded bhojanavastrapānaṃ śayanāsanaṃ ca vimalottaracchadam / vihāra kārāpayī candanāmayyān sansātīrya ca dāsyayugehi dadyāt (57) //
This example from the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka is an unusual one. Generally comparisons involving giving in Mahāyāna Sūtras take place in the context of weighing the merit resulting from religious activities. In most cases, these kinds of comparisons begin with a consideration of the huge amounts of merit that come from the repeated performance of some “lesser” activity, then state that another religious activity—whatever is being promoted—results in even greater spiritual merit. Although a variety of merit-making activities are employed, it would seem that, more often than not, giving forms the basis for such comparisons in Mahāyāna Sūtras. For example, chapter twenty-two of the Ratnaguṇa-saṃcayagāthā states:

yāvanti sattva nikhilen’ iha jambudvīpe
te sarvi bodhivaracittu upādayitvā /
dānaṃ daditva bahuvarṣasahasakoṭiḥ
sarve ca nāmayi jagārtha nidāna bodhiṃ //
yāś caiva prajñāvarapāramitābhiyukto
divasasmi antamasa ek’ anuvartayeyā /
kalapunyasya na bhavatī iha dānaskandha
tad atandritena sada osaritavya prajñā //


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

46 Yuyama, ed., Prajñāpāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā, 90-91, verses 8-9. Also see ibid., 67-68, verse 4, for a passage very similar to this one; 31, verse 1, where the giving of groups of disciples (śrāvakāganāḥ)
Suppose that as many beings as there are here on the entire Black Plum Continent
Would all, after generating the aspiration for the most excellent awakening,
And after giving gifts for many millions of thousands of years,
Direct everything to awakening on account of the welfare of the world.

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

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

\[
yah kaścin mañjuśrīḥ kulaputraḥ kuladuhitā vā sarvalokadhāturajopamānāṁ
pratyekabuddhānāṁ dīnāḥ dīnāḥ sātarasam āhāraṁ dadyāt divyāni ca vastrāṇi / evam dadad
gaṅgānādhīvālukopamān kalpān dadyāt / yaś cānyo mañjuśrīḥ kulaputraḥ
kuladuhitā vā citra[read: citri or citrī]karmalikhitaṁ vā pustakakarmakṛtam vā buddhaṁ
paśyed / ayaṁ tato 'sankhyeyataraṁ punyaṁ prasavati /\]

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

---

\(^{47}\) Cf. Conze, trans., *The perfection of wisdom in eight thousand lines & its verse summary*, 52.

\(^{48}\) Bendall, ed., *Cikṣāsamuccaya*, 311.7-11.

\(^{49}\) Cf. Bendall and Rouse, trans., *Śiśa-samuccaya*, 277-278. Interestingly, the comparison does not end
here, but instead tersely describes other forms of giving that produce even more merit.
Here, the merit from the activity in question, seeing the Buddha, is again compared to giving.

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

\[
yāṣ ca mañjuśrīr bodhisatvo gaṅgānadīvalikāśamebhyyo buddhebhyyo pratyekam sarvebhyyo gaṅgānadīvalukāsāmānī buddhakṣetraṇī vaśirājamahāmaṇiratnapratipūrṇānī kṛtvā dadyād evaṃ dadad gaṅgānadīvalikāśamān kalpān dānaṃ dadyād / yo vā 'nyo [read: vānyo] mañjuśrīr bodhisatva imāṃ evaṃrūpān dharmān śrutvā ekāntena gatvā cittenābhinhirūpayed imeṣv evaṃrūpeṣu dharmeṣu śikṣyāṃī / so 'śikṣito pi mañjuśrīr bodhisatvo 'syāṃ śikṣyāyāṃ chandiko vatataram puṇyāṃ prasavati / na tv eva tad dānakriyāvastv iti /^{50}
\]

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

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

\footnote{Bendall, ed., Čikṣāsamuccaya, 16.3–8.}

\footnote{Cf. Bendall and Rouse, trans., Śikṣā-samuccaya, 17–18.}
greater reward than a prodigious offering like this made to the superlative fields of merit, only to be quickly assured that even greater merit is possible.\textsuperscript{52}

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

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

\textsuperscript{53} Nattier, trans., \textit{A Few Good Men}, 272.

\textsuperscript{54} See Nattier’s insightful introduction to the text, especially ibid., 73-136 and 193-197.
devoid of possessions. I would point out, then, that employing the gift as a point of reference for earning merit only works if the reader assumes that giving is highly meritorious in the first place. Quite simply, giving is very good, but other religious behaviors are even better. In this interpretation, giving forms the basis of a majority of these comparisons because, in the eyes of Mahāyāna authors, redactors, and readers, it was highly valued as a religious activity and easily relatable to almost any Indian reader.

**Context of awakening**

Mahāyāna Sūtras regularly contextualize the merit from giving (and the other Mahāyāna pāramitās or Perfections) in terms of awakening. That is, the meritorious deed of giving is not an end in itself but is explicitly reframed as part of the path leading to enlightenment. Sometimes, contextualization occurs in a general sense. Giving is shown to be one way—an important way, but one among many possibilities—a practitioner can pursue his or her soteriological quest. This is perhaps most clear in the first chapter of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra, where Maitreya describes the bodhisattvas he sees in innumerable buddha-fields engaged in a variety of activities. Some of the bodhisattvas he describes are giving a host of objects, including food, gardens, many types of precious jewels, animals, slaves, family members, kingdoms, and even their own body parts.\(^5\) These bodhisattvas give, as verse eighteen explains, “seeking this most excellent awakening” (paryēṣamāṇā imam

---

\(^5\) Kern and Nanjio, eds., *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, 10.10-11.10 (Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra*, 13-14); 13.11-14.2 (Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra*, 15-16). Mañjuśrī explains that what Maitreya sees in the buddha-fields of the narrative present parallels similar giving (among other practices) in the buddha-fields from the narrative past at 24.13-14 (Kern, trans., *The Lotus Sutra*, 23). The entire first chapter must be understood in terms of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka’s position of the one vehicle (ekayāna), the view that all practitioners are in fact treading the same path no matter the particular beliefs they hold or religious activities they engage in.
agrabodhim); or, as verse forty states, “they have set out for the most excellent awakening by means of giving” (dānena te prasthita agrabodhim).

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

---

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

57 Ibid., 14.2.

(anuttarā samyakṣambodhi) or an equivalent expression for enlightenment. The giver redirecting the merit can seek his own awakening or that of others, especially that of all beings.  

Verse fifteen from the section of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra just mentioned says that the bodhisattvas seen by Maitreya “give gifts with joyful hearts, redirecting [the merit] in this case toward supreme awakening [and thinking], ‘We will attain the vehicle’” (... dadanti dānāni prahṛṣṭamānasāḥ / pariṇāmayanto iha agrabodhau vayaṃ hi yānasya bhavema lābhinaḥ //).  

Similarly, a verse from chapter thirty-one of the Ratnaṅgaṇasaṃcayagāthā, in a section devoted to giving, reads as follows:

\[
dānaṃ daditva vidupāṇḍitu bodhisattva  
yāvanti sattva tribhave samanāharitvā /  
sarveṣa tesa bhavate ayu dānadalato  
taṃ cāgrabodhi pariṇāmayate jagārtham //\]

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

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

---


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


62 Cf. Conze, trans., The perfection of wisdom in eight thousand lines & its verse summary, 69.
awakening. . .” (sa dānaṃ dadat tān manasikārāṃs tāṃś cittaotpādāṃs tāni kuśalamūlāni anuttarāyāṃ samyakṣambodhau pariñāmayati. . .).\(^6^3\) The examples from the Ratnaguṇasāmcayagāthā and Aṣṭasāhasrikā demonstrate that it is not just merit that can directed to awakening, but also the act of giving itself and any associated states of mind. Nor is this sort of “transfer” limited to giving or the other Perfections in Mahāyāna Sūtra literature. Anything meritorious or virtuous, in fact, is commonly earmarked for awakening.\(^6^4\)

For our purposes, placing giving within the context of awakening is important for a couple of reasons. First, the literary formulas by which Mahāyāna Sūtras express merit “transfer” closely parallel similar sentiments made in what I and others identify as Mahāyāna inscriptions.\(^6^5\) I will take up this topic in detail in chapter V below. Second, contextualizing giving in terms of awakening really gets at the heart of what Mahāyāna is, at least as a literary movement. Awakening, of course, was not a Mahāyāna invention but part and parcel of the Buddhism it inherited. The goal of reaching enlightenment can indeed be found throughout non-Mahāyāna or Mainstream texts.\(^6^6\) Nevertheless, Mahāyāna literature does seem to have focused its efforts on awakening to a degree not seen in Mainstream texts, even though the Mahāyāna descriptions of what awakening is and how to get there vary widely. This focus is so common in Mahāyāna texts that “unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening” or the like


\(^{6^4}\) In addition, merit is directed to other ends besides awakening, though in many cases these other ends appear to be awakened qualities like purity, detachment, or compassion. See, for example, Bendall and Rouse, trans., Śikṣā-samuccaya, 28-36.

\(^{6^5}\) On the literary and epigraphic parallels, for now see Gregory Schopen, “Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions,” in Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India, 223-246, esp. 227-231.

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

**Giving in relation to the other Perfections**

Giving frequently occurs in Mahāyāna Sūtras in conjunction with the other Mahāyāna Perfections, usually understood to be ethical conduct (*śīlapāramitā*), forbearance (*kṣāntipāramitā*), exertion (*vīryapāramitā*), meditation (*dhyānapāramitā*), and wisdom (*prajñāpāramitā*). (Giving and wisdom will be dealt with shortly as a special case—see the category Redefinitions immediately below.) The Perfections most commonly appear in Mahāyāna Sūtras with little elaboration: They can be referred to merely by name (individually or as a set with the plural declension of *pāramitā*), listed in a group that begins with *dāna* (the number of Perfections being standardized to six but eventually expanded to ten*68*), or described very briefly. Sometimes, though, Mahāyāna Sūtras discuss the Perfections at length,

---


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

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

Part of this passage states the following:

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

⁷¹ Ibid., 579-590.
As the bodhisattva—from the first thought of enlightenment [bodhicitta] onwards and up to his being seated on the terrace of enlightenment [bodhimāṇḍa]—gives gifts—if all beings should abuse and revile him, and cut him limb from limb, still, firmly established in the Perfection of Forbearance, he thinks to himself, “I should give to these beings!”; not, “I should not give gifts!” To those who want food he gives food. . . .

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

Redefinitions

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

atha khalv āyuṣmān ānando bhagavantam etad avocat / na bhagavān dānapāramitāyā varṇam bhāṣate na nāmadheyaṃ parikīrtayati / ... / api nu prajñāpāramitāyā evaikasyā bhagavān varṇam bhāṣate nāmadheyaṃ ca parikīrtayati //

bhagavān āha / evam etad ānandaivam etat / prajñāpāramitāyā evāham ānanda varṇam bhāṣe nāmadheyaṃ ca parikīrtayāmi nānyāsāṁ pāramitānāṃ // / tat kasya hetoh / prajñāpāramitā hy ānanda pūrvvaṅgamā pañcānāṃ pāramitānāṃ // anena yogena antargatāḥ

72 Ibid., 580 (with minor emendations).

73 See Étienne Lamotte, trans., Le traité de la grande vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra), Vol. II (Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 26) (Louvain-la-neuve: Institut Orientaliste, 1949), 750-769, which elaborates on giving in relation to the other Perfections. I hesitate to cite the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra*, since its attribution to Nāgārjuna is very likely spurious and especially since there are doubts whether the text is even Indian in origin. It was “translated” by Kumārajīva in 404–405 CE (T. 1509). Nevertheless, Lamotte’s notes to his modern French translation are invaluable.
pañcapāramitāḥ prajñāpāramitāyāṁ evānanda śaṭpāramitāparipūrṇādhivacanaṁ etad yad uta prajñāpāramiteti // tasmāt tarhy ānanda prajñāpāramitāyāṁ parikīrttīyāṁ sarvaṁ śaṭpāramitāḥ parikīrttītā bhavanti // . . . / prajñāpāramitāparighūtāt vā ca pāramitānāmadheyam labhante // tasmāt tarhy ānanda prajñāpāramitaiva pañcānāṁ pāramitānāṁ pūrvvāṅgamā nāyikā pariṇāyikā //

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

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

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

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

74 Mitra, ed., Aṣṭasāhasrikā, 80.9-82.2 (with minor emendations).
75 Cf. Conze, trans., The perfection of wisdom in eight thousand lines & its verse summary, 111-112.
Wisdom the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* states, in Conze’s translation, that a
“[b]odhisattva, when he gives a gift, does not apprehend the gift, the donor, or the recipient.”

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

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

---


---

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

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

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

80 The whole passage can be found in Bendall, ed., Čikṣāsamuccaya, 270.9–271.3; Cf. Bendall and Rouse, trans., Śikṣā-samuccaya, 247.
Giving in Mahāyāna Sūtras can take extreme forms, not because of its being qualified in relation to wisdom, emptiness, or the like, but because of what is to be given: the body. Several Mahāyāna texts propose, sometimes in gruesome detail, that parts of the body or the entire body itself should be willfully sacrificed. The practice of dehadāna or “giving up the body” in Mahāyāna texts is certainly related to other Buddhist literature, especially the Jātakas, that promote the bodhisattva career by imitating the self-sacrificial path of the Bodhisattva, the future Buddha Śākyamuni. The Rāṣtrapālaparipṛcchā-sūtra, in fact, alludes to some fifty Jātakas (though, interestingly, not in the first Chinese translation made by Dharmarakṣa), half of which highlight the Buddha’s generosity in previous lives. It refers to, for instance, the Śibi Jātaka, all of the versions of which tell the story of the Bodhisattva’s sacrificing himself for the sake of others. In one version King Śibi gives away his eyes, in another his head, and in yet another he cuts out part of his thigh to save the life of a dove from a hungry hawk. The Suvarṇaprabhāsottama-sūtra devotes an entire chapter to the Jātaka in which the Bodhisattva


82 For a useful list of the Jātaka allusions in this text, see Louis Finot, Rāṣtrapālaparipṛcchā: Sūtra du Mahāyāna (Bibliotheca Buddhica II) (St. Petersburg: Academy of Sciences, 1901), vii-viii. For discussion and references, see Boucher, Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna, 29-33. Specific Jātaka references occur in other Mahāyāna Sūtras, though not to the same degree as in the Rāṣtrapālaparipṛcchā. The Vajracchedikā, to cite one example, alludes to the Kṣāntivādin Jātaka by referring to the moment when the king of Kaliṅga mutilates the Bodhisattva’s body. See section 14e of the Conze or Harrison translation.
throws himself down a mountain in order to feed a hungry tigress and stop her from eating her own offspring.\textsuperscript{83}

Apart from \textit{Jātaka} allusions or full \textit{Jātaka} tales, Mahāyāna Sūtras frequently refer to gifts of the body. Thus the \textit{Aṣṭasāhasrikā} tells the well-known story of the bodhisattva Sadāprarudita, who cuts up his own body at a marketplace to sell to a man—really Śakra in disguise, there to test his resolve\textsuperscript{84}—to earn enough money to acquire offerings for the bodhisattva Dharmodgata. Later he and a large group of young women, lacking water, pierce themselves with a sword and sprinkle the ground with their blood in order to prevent dust from stirring and falling upon Dharmodgata.\textsuperscript{85} Likewise, the \textit{Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra} contains the influential chapter on the bodhisattva Bhaiṣajyarāja, who in a former life,\textsuperscript{86} as Sarvasattvapriyadarśana, doused his body in oil and burned himself as an offering to a buddha named Candravimalasūryaprabhāsaśrī. Sarvasattvapriyadarśana is reborn after his body burns

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


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

\textsuperscript{86} I am not sure whether former birth stories of bodhisattvas constitute \textit{Jātakas}. Conventionally that title is reserved for accounts of the previous lives of buddhas, especially, of course, of Śākyamuni. \textit{BHSD}, s.v. \textit{jātaka} cites two passages from the \textit{Bodhisattvabhūmi} as examples of the term being used in the former sense, though probably as a “late and secondary extension” of the latter meaning.
for twelve thousand years, and he later publicly incinerates the arm from his new body to
honor the stūpas containing the relics of the same buddha, Candravimalasūryaprabhāsaśrī.87

It is difficult to determine to what extent such extreme acts of giving were practiced by
human Mahāyānists in India,88 but their Sūtras would appear to be literal in their
encouragement to disregard the body. What the Śikṣāsamuccaya calls the Nārāyaṇaparipṛcchā-
sūtra89 declares:

\[
evam eva kulaputra bodhisatvena mahāsatvenāsimś cāturmahābhautike ātmabhāve
bhāṣājyasamjñotpādayitavyā yeṣām yeṣām satvānām yena yeṇārthaḥ tat tad eva me harantu
hastaṃ hastārthinaḥ pādaṃ pādārthina iti pūrvavat //\]

In the same way [that a tree does not resist giving up its parts for medicine], son from a
good family, the bodhisattva-mahāsattva must conceive of his body—made of the four
great elements—as medicine. He thinks the following: “Let various beings take exactly
what they want from me. One who wants a hand [can take my] hand. One who wants a
foot [can take my] foot.”90

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

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

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

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


91 Cf. Bendall and Rouse, trans., Śikṣā-samuccaya, 24. For sources on the concept of the body functioning
as medicine, see Boucher, Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna, 230, n. 192.
Moreover, Śāriputra, a bodhisattva-mahāsattva who finds himself in the middle of a forest with wild animals must not be scared, must not be frightened, and must not be reduced to fear. For what reason? Because a bodhisattva-mahāsattva must surrender everything for the sake of all beings. He must think the following: “If the wild animals were to devour me, then a gift would be given to them. I will fulfill the Perfection of Giving and I will be closer to unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening.”

Indeed, the Sāgaramati-sūtra (again from the Śikṣāsamuccaya) defines the bodhisattva’s Perfection of Giving as “the abandonment of, surrendering of, and indifference to the body” (yaḥ kāyasotsargah kāyaparityāgaḥ kāyānavekṣā / iyaṁ asya dānaparimitā /). No matter how the putative Indian reader of such passages may have interpreted them, on the surface at least these and other Mahāyāna Sūtras do not seem to be figurative or symbolic. They do not say that one should act as if he would surrender his own life, or that one should merely intend to give up his body, or that the willingness to give up the body is symbolic of extreme mental detachment. On the contrary, the bodhisattva must pay no heed to his body and, if the situation arises, simply give it away to whomever asks.
Mahāyāna Sūtras frequently portray the gift of the body as the best of all possible gifts. In the chapter just mentioned from the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra, the Buddha describes gifts like Bhaiṣajyarakṣa’s in no small terms: Surrendering one’s body (ātmabhāvaparityāga) is the best gift (agrapradāna), far better than a series of other possible gifts, such as giving away one’s dear children and wife. Giving up the body, in fact, is the “exceptional, best, most excellent, fine, sublime honoring of the Dharma” (viśiṣṭāgrā varā pravarā pranītā dharmapūjā). And, again according to the Nārāyaṇaparipṛcchā-sūtra (= Sarvapūnyaśamuccayasamādhi-sūtra), a bodhisattva must think as follows:

\[\text{ayaṃ mamātmabhāvaḥ sarvasatvebhyaḥ parityaktah utsṛṣṭaḥ / prāg eva bāhyāni vastūni yasya yasya satvasya yena yena yad yat kāryaṃ bhavisyati tasmai tasmai tad dāsyāmi}\]

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

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

97 Kern and Nanjio, eds., Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, 408.1-5; Cf. Kern, trans., The Lotus Sutra, 265. Later this section of the text explains that burning one’s big toe, a single finger or toe, a single limb, or an arm at a sacred site for Tathāgatas ((EXIT) tathāgatacacya teṣv adipayed ekām hastāngulim pādāṅgulim vaikāṅgaṃ vā bāhum ādīpayed) earns the son or daughter from a good family who has set out on the bodhisattva vehicle and who longs for unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening (bohdhisattvayāna-samprasthiṣṭaḥ kulaputra vā kuladushitā vemām anusattaram samyakṣaṃbodhim ākāṅkṣamāṇo) much more merit than other kinds of gifts. The text then continues into the now familiar comparison of the merit resulting from a huge amount of giving versus keeping just one verse of the text, about which see above under Giving as a basis for comparison. For the entire passage, see Kern and Nanjio, eds., Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, 414.10-415.9 (Cf. Kern, trans., The Lotus Sutra, 269-270).
I have surrendered and relinquished this body of mine to all beings, much more so external objects. I will give any being whatsoever what he needs for any reason at all. When it is deemed right, I will give my hand to those who want a hand. I will give my foot to those who want a foot, and my eye to those who want an eye. I will surrender my flesh to those who want flesh, my blood to those who want blood, my marrow to those who want marrow, my primary and secondary limbs to those who want primary and secondary limbs, and my head to those who want a head; not to mention external objects, such as my wealth, grain, gold, silver, jewels, ornaments, horses, elephants, chariots, vehicles, villages, cities, settlements, rural areas, kingdoms, capitals, towns, female slaves, male slaves, servile workers, servile wage laborers, sons, daughters, and attendants.

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

---

98 Bendall, ed., Čikṣāsamuccaya, 21.6-12.


For a short discussion on and other references to these phrases, see Drewes, “Revisiting the phrase ‘sa prthivipradeṣaḥ caityabhūto bhavet’,” 113-114.
become a buddha and possess the extraordinary body concomitant with awakening. The
distinction between internal and external gifts—implied in the example from the
Saddharmapuṇḍarīka but made explicit in the Nārāyaṇaparipṛcchā-sūtra—is not limited to
Mahāyāna Sūtras. An array of Buddhist texts on giving, in fact, express the superiority of gifts
of the body compared to offering external things. Thus, in the Sīvī-jātaka from the Pāli
collection of birth stories, King Sīvī is not content with external gifts but feels compelled to
surrender parts of his body.101 As we will see, the inner/outer distinction is also an important
theme in the section of the Bodhisattvabhūmi translated below in chapter IV.

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

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

102 This list is squeezed into two compounds, one of them incredibly long: abhūvam aprameyadānapradaṇ
suvarṇamaṇi muktāvaiḍūryaśaṅkaśilāpravāḍajātarūparajatāśmagarbhamusāragalvalohitamuktāgrāmanagaretar
karacaraṇaśirottamāṅgapratyaṅgajīvīdātā. (Note the yāvad near the end of the long
compound also underscores the significance of surrendering one’s own body.) See Kern and Nanjio,
ed., Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, 256.11-257.1 (Kern, trans., The Lotus Sutra, 171). According to Pāṇinian rules,
word order in dvandva compounds should be determined by phonology, not the meaning of the words
or their relative importance. (Many thanks to Stephanie Jamison for pointing this out to me.) Suffice it
to say that Buddhist authors rarely, if ever, operated within the confines of strict Pāṇinian grammar.
Indeed, the order of gifts in the Dānapāramitā-sūtra is remarkably similar to the one here from the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka.

**Giving the Dharma**

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

---


\(^{104}\) Conze, trans., *The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom*, 457.

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

\(^{106}\) Although I have found more references about the exchange of material gifts and the Dharma in Mainstream texts, it is not unheard of in Mahāyāna Sūtras. The *Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra*, in Nattier’s translation, says that “material furnishings provide an occasion for Dharma-furnishing” (Nattier,
Dharma is in turn part of the wider Indian emphasis on knowledge and its great value as a gift—
to be sure, it is because of the gift of knowledge that twice-born men must hold their teachers in such high regard.

On occasion Mahāyāna Sūtras sanction making material donations in concert with gifts of the Dharma. Hence the Longer Sukhāvatīvyūha describes how bodhisattvas in the idyllic setting of Sukhāvatī are generous with both physical and Dharmic gifts, and the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā explains how bodhisattvas situated in the Perfection of Meditation (see above under Giving in relation to the other Perfections) make and praise both types of gifts. Usually, however, Mahāyāna Sūtras describe gifts of the Dharma as utterly superior to material

---

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

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


110 Conze, trans., The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom, 583. See also ibid., 675ff., which describes how a bodhisattva is to go about winning over others to the religious life by means of material gifts and gifts of the Dharma. The list of the four “ways to win over” (samgrahavastu) others appears in a number of Sanskrit and Pāli texts, and, as far as I know, always begins with giving.
gifts, an unequal dichotomy that was borrowed from the larger Mainstream Buddhist world of India. The Ugraparipṛcchā, the content of which—forsooth, the very organization of which—is designed to encourage those on the bodhisattva path to become ascetic monks, tersely explains that householders value giving material things but that “in renunciant life, one highly esteems giving the Dharma.” The Maitreyasimhanāda-sūtra, in one of its many passages heaping criticism on corrupt monastics (see below under Criticism of monastic greed and illegitimate practice), similarly states that “a monk who wants to go to homes [on his alms round] must go with a present of the Dharma, and must not bestow any other present besides that” (Tib. dge slong khyim rnams su ’ang ’gro bar ’dod pas ni chos kyi skyes kyis ’gro bar bya ba ma gtogs par skyes gzhan bskur bar mi bya ste /). The Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra expounds on the point at greater length. In a long section of the text, Vimalakīrti, feigning illness, criticizes the way śrāvakas and bodhisattvas perform many common Buddhist practices. When the Buddha asks Sudatta to visit Vimalakīrti and inquire about his health, Sudatta balks at the idea:

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

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

113 sTog Kanjur, dkon brtsegs, Ca 168b6-7. The Maitreyasimhanāda-sūtra makes the same point elsewhere in the text. sTog Kanjur, dkon brtsegs, Ca 191b4 -193b3 lauds bodhisattvas who “do not delight in gifts” (sbyin pa la dga’ bar yang mi bgyid) and who are “not delighted when they see those who incite someone else to give material things [= āmiṣa] of the world” (gzhan zhig ’jig rten gyi zang zing stsol bar bgyid pa de dag mthong na ’ang de la dga’ ba skyped par mi bgyid pa). But shortly later the text encourages the bodhisattva to enter various places after he has learned a lot and give the Dharma, for “giving the gift of the Dharma (= dharmadāna) was commended and praised by buddhas, blessed ones” (chos kyi sbyin pa sbyin pa ’di ni sangs rgyas bcom ldan ’das rnams kyis bsgags shing bstod pa). Also see the passage from the Maitreyasimhanāda discussed in n. 52 above.
... abhijānāmy ahaṃ bhagavan svake niveśane mahāyajñaṃ yajāmi sarvadaridra-duhkhitebhyāḥ sarvasaṁbrāhmaṇakṛpanātvanīyakācankebhyāḥ dānaḥ dadāmi saptadivisān mahāyajñaṃ yajāmi / tatra saptame divase vimalakīrtitī licchavis tā mahāyajñaśālām praviṣyā mām etad avocat na śreṣṭhiputraivaṃ yajño yaṣṭavya yathā tvam yaṣjase dharmayajñas te yaṣṭavyaḥ kin te āmiṣayajñaḥ. . . .  

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

Sudatta then goes on to relate how Vimalakīrti clarified for him what a Dharma sacrifice consists of, an explanation rife with many advanced Mahāyāna philosophical ideas and doctrinal lists. In the passage translated here, Vimalakīrti promotes the gift of the Dharma while undermining material gifts. More importantly, the object of his critique would not have been lost on a Buddhist audience. Sudatta is none other than Anāthapiṇḍada, the donor who famously purchased the Jetavana, had a monastery built on its grounds, and gave it and the land to the Buddha and his Saṃgha. But here Anāthapiṇḍada does not even know what constitutes a proper gift. The Vimalakīrtinirdeśa paints the donor par excellence of Buddhist literature (and imagery), he who is labeled as the “best among givers” (Pāli aggo dāyakānaṃ).
as a fool who does not understand the first thing about making gifts. In so doing, the text shows disapproval for the whole system of Indian gift exchange.\(^{117}\)

This passage from the \textit{Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra} describes in considerable detail exactly what a gift (or sacrifice) of the Dharma should look like. The \textit{Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā}, too, elucidates what it means when it says a bodhisattva should make a gift of the Dharma. At one point the \textit{Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā} provides a multifaceted and hierarchical explication of what makes up a gift of the Dharma, dividing it into worldly (\textit{laukika}) and otherworldly (\textit{lokottara}) components\(^{118}\); at another, the text concisely calls establishing an individual of the vehicle of disciples or solitary buddhas (\textit{śrāvakayāna} or \textit{pratyekabuddhayāna}, respectively) on the “paths of the ten virtuous actions” (\textit{daśakuśalakarmapatha}) a gift of the Dharma.\(^{119}\) Generally, however, Mahāyāna Sūtras do not appear to spell out the content of the Dharma that should be given. Nevertheless, it seems quite plausible that by a “gift of the Dharma,” Mahāyāna Sūtras mean an offering of their own ideas or words. My suspicion, that is, is that the slippery term \textit{Dharma} in such cases refers to the concepts or literal words from the particular Mahāyāna Sūtras themselves. I am not aware of any Mahāyāna Sūtra that suggests that its contents be kept to oneself (standing in stark contrast to Vinaya passages that declare in no uncertain terms that the monastic discipline is not to be shared with the laity). On the contrary, Mahāyāna Sūtras tend to be relentless in their call for their propagation in oral or written form. In this light, it does not seem unreasonable to conclude that encouraging the reader to make a gift of the

\(^{117}\) The text also takes aim at Brahmanical sacrifices, a frequent target in Mainstream and Mahāyāna Buddhist literature alike.

\(^{118}\) Conze, trans., \textit{The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom}, 676ff.

\(^{119}\) Ibid., 582. Although the \textit{daśakuśalakarmapatha} are prevalent in Mahāyāna Sūtras, they are most definitely not of Mahāyāna origin. I will discuss them below in the introduction to my translation of the \textit{Dānapāramitā-sūtra}, as they occupy a central position in that text.
Dharma is an exhortation for him or her actually to recite the Mahāyāna Sūtra to others or give them away in some physical “book.” Indeed, in another rare passage from a Mahāyāna Sūtra that expands upon about the gift of Dharma, the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa* says, in Pagel’s translation: “[T]he bodhisattva who preaches this Dharma-treatise and explains it in detail to others accomplishes the perfection of liberality [*dānapāramitā*]. Why? Because the gift of the Dharma is the best of [all] gifts.” By “this,” of course, the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa-sūtra* refers to itself. This effort by the authors of the *Akṣayamatinirdeśa* and other Mahāyāna Sūtras represents one of the many strategies employed by Mahāyāna communities to carve out textual niches for themselves, the difficulty of which cannot be understated. For the self-promotion of individual Mahāyāna Sūtras took place in environments with predefined understandings of what the Buddha’s authoritative words (*buddhavacana*) were and

---

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


122 On Mahāyāna textual legitimacy, see Donald S. Lopez, Jr., “Authority and Orality in the Mahāyāna,” *Numen* 42.1 (1995): 21-47, and David McMahan, “Orality, Writing, and Authority in South Asian Buddhism: Visionary Literature and the Struggle for Legitimacy in the Mahāyāna,” *History of Religions* 37.3 (1998): 249-274. On the function of “inspired speech” (*pratibhāna*) in opening up new avenues of *buddhavacana* for Mahāyāna Sūtras, see Graeme MacQueen, “Inspired Speech in Early Mahāyāna Buddhism I,” *Religion* 11 (1981): 303-319; MacQueen, “Inspired Speech in Early Mahāyāna Buddhism II,” *Religion* (12): 49-65. Joseph Walser has recently argued that Nāgārjuna’s real project was to prove that early Mahāyāna texts conformed to Buddhist canonical standards in order to tap the resources for their reproduction. I am uncomfortable with the certainty behind Walser’s conclusions regarding the time and place of Nāgārjuna’s life, but his hypothesis on the practical motives behind Nāgārjuna’s writings is an interesting one, though I do not think it has yet met with substantial discussion. See Walser,
potentially had to proceed in the midst of competition from other new Mahāyāna texts making parallel claims for attention and authenticity. I hope to return to this interesting topic in a future paper, but for now I will just remark that the issue of how and to what end Mahāyāna Sūtras define Dharma is well worth pursuing.123

Promotion of lay giving

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

---


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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

129 On the other hand, the future passive participle pradakṣinīya is used with some frequency to describe personages in Mahāyāna Sūtras. Although pradakṣinīya is generally translated as “worthy of reverence”
Mainstream monasteries and were therefore covered under the umbrella of material support those monasteries afforded. Perhaps Mahāyāna monks did not think it was necessary to address lay generosity in their new literature because it had been so thoroughly tackled in the Mainstream Sūtras they had inherited and the Mainstream Vinayas under which they were ordained. Encouraging lay giving, in this scenario, would have felt superfluous to monks who were already well supported under the auspices of patronage that had been institutionalized by time and tradition.

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

---

130 I have found Reiko Ohnuma’s typology of giving up and giving down particularly useful. According to her schema, buddhas and bodhisattvas give “down” to unworthy recipients out of compassion and without any hope for worldly or otherworldly rewards. (As we will see below, however, Ohnuma’s categorization of giving down is not consistent with the Dānapāramitā-sūtra, where receiving rewards is...
ways. They tend either to identify the recipient as a buddha (see above under *Giving to a buddha*)—whose unlimited compassion is never in any doubt—or to bring genuinely ascetic bodhisattva-monks into relief against the depravity of greedy monks who are definitely not following the compassionate path of a bodhisattva (see the next two sections, *Ideal recipients and legitimate practice* and *Criticism of monastic greed and illegitimate practice*).

The *Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra* represents a notable exception to the general dearth of material in Mahāyāna Sūtras on lay giving. It makes a definitive division between the lay and monastic bodhisattva, and the burden of giving in this text falls squarely on the former: Only in the section devoted to lay bodhisattvas is giving discussed in any detail. The *Ugraparipṛcchā* exhorts the lay bodhisattva to give not only to the community of monks and nuns, but also to anyone who asks. This would even include supplicant beggars, which the text singles out as the recipient of gifts on several occasions.\(^\text{131}\) In the radical world of the *Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra*, the lay bodhisattva is encouraged to give away anything and everything. When the lay bodhisattva gives indiscriminately to all creatures, he cultivates the compassion necessary for the integral to the Mahāyāna bodhisattva’s gift.) See Head, *Eyes, Flesh, and Blood*, 152-166. She argues that the Buddhist notion of giving to unworthy recipients has historical roots in the ethos of the kṣatriya warrior-king, since, according to the epics, it is the duty of the kṣatriya to indiscriminately distribute the land and goods he has acquired through warfare. The kṣatriya, though, must never request or receive gifts, as this would be tantamount to his defeat in battle. In linking the compassionate giving of Buddhist literature to the mode of exchange of the kṣatriya warrior, Ohnuma borrows heavily from Minoru Hara, “A Note on the Rākṣasa Form of Marriage,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 94.3 (1974): 302-304, as well as Thomas R. Trautmann, *Dravidian Kinship* (Cambridge Studies in Social Anthropology 36) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 282-285.

\(^{131}\) Similarly, the lay queen Śrīmālā, in her sixth vow from the *Śrīmālādevīśimhanāda-sūtra*, promises to give her future wealth away to “the poor and friendless”; in her eighth vow she pledges to free the downtrodden from their misery by giving them material goods. See Alex and Hideko Wayman, trans., *The Lion’s Roar of Queen Śrīmālā*, 64-65. Here the notion of a lay person’s giving compassionately to the helpless intersects with pan-Buddhist theories on kingship—or queenship, as the case may be. Contrary to the ethos of Kauṭilya’s *Arthaśāstra*, the proper Buddhist king serves as a moral exemplar by governing with unmitigated compassion, even to the point of giving away the kingdom’s wealth and renouncing his rule.
More importantly, only by relinquishing all of his property is the lay bodhisattva fit for the renunciant life of a monk, a station this Sūtra undoubtedly prefers.  

Ideal recipients and legitimate practice

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

---

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

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

134 Ibid., trans., 275, §20D.
in dependence upon another... I will not rely on any man, woman, boy, or girl...."

The ideal recipient who treads the bodhisattva path, it would seem, is barely on hand during the transaction of the gift. His presence is muted. The *Ugraparipṛccha*-sūtra appears to be uncomfortable with the idea of a bodhisattva as a recipient, a literary uneasiness that I would guess betrays a real-life worry that a bodhisattva could fall prey to the traps of the everyday social world he should be striving desperately to escape.

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

---

135 Ibid., trans., 287-288, §24B.
They live abstemiously in their effort to break the cycle of rebirth, and under no circumstances would they resort to tricking or forcing a donor into giving more. For the model donees of the *Maitreyasīṃhanāda-sūtra*, gifts are only meant to provide the most basic of needs to continue the religious life, which in this section of the text includes being able to fix the mind correctly upon the many sublime characteristics of the Buddha. Meditating upon the qualities of the Buddha and undertaking other religious activities endorsed by the *Maitreyasīṃhanāda-sūtra* only work if practitioners live aloof from the mundane world without hankering after material goods. And it is precisely their commitment to spiritual practice within the context of an ascetic life that makes them proper vessels to receive gifts.

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

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

137 The whole Tibetan passage I am referring to from the *Maitreyasīṃhanāda-sūtra* can be found at sTog, *dkon brtsegs*, Ca 150a1-151a4 (the brief quote is at Ca 150a4-5).
worthy of the donations he receives. In Buddhist terms, the recipient of religious donations must be a fruitful field (kṣetra) that can produce the karmic rewards the patron is counting on. (Again, the most fertile recipient for a donor is a buddha—his unsurpassed dedication to religious practice over many lifetimes has led to an awakened state of perfect morality and omniscience. See above under Giving to a buddha.) Hence, in the Sūryagarbha-sūtra the Buddha is made to explain to King Bimbisāra how donors can expect to benefit from making gifts to “monks who live according to the Dharma” (Tib. dge slong chos kyis gnas pa rnams). If they offer such monks monasteries, household goods, slaves, and other gifts, they “will be reborn as kṣatriyas . . . and will be reborn among the gods of the abode of neither perception nor non-perception” (rayal rigs . . . dag tu skye bar ’gyur ba nas / ’du shes med ’du shes med min skye mched kyi lha rnams kyi nang du skye ba’i bar du ’gyur ro //). Donors to worthy monks “will also be reborn in pure buddha-fields” (sangs rgyas kyi zhing yongs su dag pa dag tu yang skye bar ’gyur ro //) and in future lives “will encounter buddhas, blessed ones” (sangs rgyas bcom ldan ’das rnams dang yang phrad par ’gyur ba). The Ratnarāśi-sūtra is even clearer about who can receive gifts:

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

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

139 I have taken the Tibetan from Silk, “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 177-178. He has translated a long section of the Sūryagarbha-sūtra in ibid., 162-166 (from the Derge, mDo sde, Za 103b5-106b5).
made to him become completely and totally pure. When [that monk] enjoys a gift of faith from donors and benefactors, the maturation of merit from that [gift] for those donors and benefactors has great power, and the benefit [to them] is great. Why? Because, monks, the attainment of a friendly attitude is the best of material objects related to meritorious action.

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

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

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

---


142 The ascetic nature of early Mahāyāna Sūtras has received considerable scholastic attention in recent years. See, as just a sample of this work, ibid., esp. 69-96; Reginald Ray, Buddhist Saints in India: A Study in Buddhist Values and Orientations (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), esp. 251-292; Harrison, “Searching for the Origins of the Mahāyāna: What are we Looking for?”; Nattier, A Few Good Men, 73-170;
this ideal not only advances his own spiritual welfare, but also does a great service to donors in search of worthy recipients for their gifts and the ensuing karmic rewards. Although not necessarily focused on the figure of the yogācārin, all the Mahāyāna Sūtras that are preoccupied with the ideal (human) recipient appear to be up to the same thing: By adhering to a restrictive set of generally ascetic religious activities, the practitioner preserves the integrity of gift exchange. When each side of the gift equation performs its function, the lay person by giving and the monastic through dedication to practice, both the donor and the recipient can benefit.

_Criticism of monastic greed and illegitimate practice_

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


143 The Skt. for “unethical conduct” is _duḥśīla_; when referring to a person, Silk argues that it should be translated more specifically as “precept breaker,” meaning someone who violates the Buddhist rules of
have “given up on the otherworld” (jig rten pha rol btang ba). Rather than legitimately pursuing the religious life, these monks seek their own personal comfort and financial well-being. They are “delighted with acquisitions, honor, and praise” (rnyed pa dang / bkur sti dang / tshigs su bcad pa la mngon par dga’ ba yin /) and driven by attachments, vices that show up “as soon they get a hold of personal possessions” (gang zag gir srel bar byed na) like donated monasteries, slaves, and animals.  

The concern about self-serving monks shows up in the Buddhapiṭakaduḥśīla-nigrahī-sūtra as well. The same figures, the “monks of unethical conduct,” are described there as greedily “feeding their bodies with delectable things that were provided by others” (Tib. gzhan gyis bsags pa’i longs spyod kyis lus gso bar byed do). Instead of what the ideal Mahāyāna donee should care about—his own awakening and the welfare of others—the crooked monks of Buddhapiṭakaduḥśīlanigrahī-sūtra are “preoccupied with their own livelihood, enslaved by material possessions, and preoccupied with [getting] food and clothing” (’tsho ba lhur len pa / ’jig rten gyi zang zing gis bkol ba / zas dang bgo ba lhur len pa yin no /). It is hard to imagine monks who live less “according to the Dharma” than this sorry lot of scoundrels. The “monks of unethical conduct” require gifts to support a lax life, and the only religious acts they might practice are done for show, are vulgar displays of histrionics and sanctimony meant to attract donations.

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

145 I also owe my awareness of this text to Silk, who translated part of it at ibid., 158-162 (using the Derge, mDo sde, Dza 23a5-25b1; Peking, mDo, Tshu 23b3-25b5; sTog, mDo, Kha 351b7-354b7). The Tibetan can be found at ibid., 172-173.
So we have upstanding monks who serve as ideal recipients on the one hand, and profligate monks not concerned with the welfare of their donors on the other. Whose numbers are greater? To borrow an image from the Christian tradition, is this an equal battle of good versus evil? From the acerbic viewpoint of a number of Mahāyāna Sūtras—not only the Sūryagarbha- and Buddhapiṭakaduḥśilanigrahī-sūtras that I just mentioned, but also the Samādhirāja-, Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā-, Kāśyaparivarta-, and Maitreyasīṃhanāda-sūtras, to name a few Mahāyāna texts—the “good guys,” the virtuous bodhisattvas, were in the minority. Degenerate monks were everywhere, and corruption had seeped into the heart of the monastic order, infecting the very institution that the Buddha was believed to have established. Part of this reflects the rhetorical efforts of many Mahāyāna authors and redactors to represent themselves as being part of an embattled minority suffering at the reprobate hands of the non-Mahāyāna majority. When they take up the imagery of the last days of Buddhism—“in a future time, in the final age, in the final period, in the final five hundred years, in the age when the True Dharma is being destroyed” (anāgate 'dhvani paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyāṃ pañcaśatyāṃ saddharmavipralopakāle vartamāne)\textsuperscript{146}—the sense is that they are not talking about the future at all, but a present in which their beliefs and practices and especially their texts—for them, that which represents the “True Dharma”—are being neglected for illegitimate pursuits. It is rhetoric like this that led Gregory Schopen and others radically to reconceive of

\textsuperscript{146} This wording and length of time here have many variations in Mahāyāna texts. The concept is also definitely not of Mahāyāna origin. See Jan Nattier, \textit{Once Upon a Future Time: Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline} (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1991), esp. 33ff. and 106-109.
Mahāyāna as a marginal movement or collection of movements wielding little institutional power in Buddhist India.\textsuperscript{147}

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

\begin{quote}
bcom ldan 'das de bzhin gshegs pas skyes bu dam pa ma lags pa / byang chub sms dpar mchid kyi 'che ba / dge sbyong du mchid kyi 'che ba / glen pa blun po rnyed pa dang bkur sti 'tshal ba / rnyed pa dang bkur sti la gdu ba dang / mdza' bshes kyi sdam pa dang / slosgs mo ster ba'i sdam pa la gdu ba / bsod nyoms la sbyor bar brtson pa / de dag gi nongs pa'i gnas bdag la bka' stsal du gsol /
\end{quote}

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

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

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure.png}
\caption{A figure related to the text content.}
\end{figure}


\textsuperscript{148} sTog Kanjur, \textit{dkon brtsegs}, Ca 164a1-165a6.
it would seem, are just as capable as any monk of duplicity and greed. They can act like dogs. Suffice it to say that the *Maitreyasimhanāda-sūtra* is not the only Mahāyāna text criticizing the immoral and wayward behavior (and sometimes even stupidity) of bodhisattvas, a fact that will have to be reckoned with if we ever want to identify the intended audience(s) of this literature.¹⁴⁹ For our purposes it is important to underscore that the ideal donees I described in the last section are few and far between. According to some Mahāyāna Sūtras, greed had infiltrated the ranks of non-bodhisattvas and bodhisattvas alike.

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{153} With regard to this concern in other texts—Mainstream and Mahāyāna—see Silk, “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 247-254.
relationship between the Saṃgha *en masse* and its patrons was much too intimate. (The Saṃgha’s reliance on lay patrons was, of course, nothing new. It formed the basis of its very survival. The problem for these Mahāyāna authors was not that the Saṃgha was reliant on lay donations, but that the donations were now well beyond meeting its basic needs; the problem was one of degree, not kind.) It is hard not to make this conclusion from one of the more trenchant (and frequently cited) passages from the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā*:

*Waving their hands and feet and shaking the hem of their robes [for attention], The ochre necks* 156 wander among village houses drunk on their intoxicating conceit. Taking up the banner of the Buddha [i.e., monastic robes], they act as servants around people of the household. They always carry letters, having abandoned the teaching with its mass of good qualities. They have cows, horses, asses, and [other] livestock, as well as male and female slaves. Forever ignoble, they are fixated on agricultural work and commercial practices.

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


There is nothing that is ignoble or blameworthy to them, nothing that should not be done.
What belongs to the stūpa or the Samgha and what has been acquired for individuals is the same to them.
After seeing [other] monks who are rich in good qualities, they criticize them.
Undertaking immoral and deceitful behavior, those awful frauds ruin women.
A householder does not yearn with desires to the extent that they yearn after they have gone forth.
They will have wives, sons, and daughters like householders do.
In a household where they are honored with robes, alms food, and [other] goods,
The ignoble ones, always under the power of the defilements, covet his [the householder’s] wife.  

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

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

---

157 Cf. Silk, trans., “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 166–167 (and 379–380 for a similar passage in the Ratnarāśi-sūtra); Boucher, trans., Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna, 138. It is important to note that these few verses are part of a section of the text that is not present in the earliest version of the Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā available to us, Dharmarakṣa’s 3rd century Chinese translation. See ibid., 108–109.
wanton fortunes and reliance on donors allowed for and perpetuated the dissolute behavior of monks. As the collective goes so go its members, and reforming one means reforming the other.

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


159 Compare Manusmrīti 4.190-200 in Olivelle, ed. and trans., Manu’s Code of Law, 134 (Skt. on pp. 541-543).
their debt,¹⁶⁰ explains how and to whom money should be lent on interest,¹⁶¹ and has several passages on the inheritance of dead monks’ former property.¹⁶² Mainstream Vinayas also attempt to regulate the complex web of relationships with lay donors, contact with whom these Mahāyāna Sūtras so desperately want to limit. The Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya again and again elaborates on the obligation monks had to generate merit for their patrons by putting their donations to good use. It seems clear, for example, that the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya considers monks obliged to maintain properly and reside in monasteries that lay people donated and, in some cases, still owned.¹⁶³ Few relationships require more careful management and sustained contact between parties than that between property owner and occupant, and one can easily imagine the disdain some Mahāyāna authors might have felt for such a residential arrangement.

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


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

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

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

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

¹⁶⁴ On the overlap in approximate chronology, content, and even wording between Mainstream Vinayas
-especially the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya and Mahāyāna Sūtras, see Schopen, “The Mahāyāna and the
Middle Period in Indian Buddhism,” in Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India, 15, and
“The Bones of a Buddha and the Business of a Monk” in ibid., 68-77.
maintain. We also have hundreds of extant inscriptions from the same period that show us how all of this was financed. Vihāras and other monastic structures, parcels of land where those structures were to be built, and individual images were commonly donated to monastic groups as one-time gifts. In some cases, the Saṃgha or some of its members was endowed with money, which could generate interest on the principal in perpetuity, or villages, the produce and taxes of which could serve as an indefinite source of revenue. We know from Buddhist inscriptions that donations were often made by the wealthy and powerful. And dozens of inscriptions, not insignificantly, record the gifts of monks and nuns.

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

---


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

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

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

\textsuperscript{169} Among the many works by Schopen just cited in short succession, “Art, Beauty, and the Business of Running a Buddhist Monastery in Early Northwest India,” in \textit{Buddhist Monks and Business Matters}, 19-44 in particular shows the lengths to which monks might have gone to attract and maintain close relationships with donors so that their monasteries would prosper.
the Maitreyasiṃhanāda-sūtra: “[W]hat is called ‘poison’ for this well-spoken Dharma and Vinaya is, namely, acquisition” (Tib. legs par gsungs pa’i chos ’dul ba ’di la dug ces bya ba de ni ’di lta ste / rnyed pa yin). The statement here, which would be well placed anywhere in this group of Mahāyāna Sūtras, is not explicitly about giving; it is a condemnation of greed and incorrect religious practice (in this case the sale of Tathāgata images). But greed and illegitimate forms of practice are precisely what ruin a monk’s ability to generate merit for the donor who offers him a gift. Such a monk becomes a barren vessel for donations, a fallow field in which the fruit of the gift wastes away, because he is hoarding “poison.” And because according to our texts the collective Saṃgha was teeming with monks of the same ilk, it, too, was in grave danger. It, too, was amassing poison. Reformative Mahāyāna Sutras read as a sort of antidote. They were attempts to root out corruption and thereby restore the fabric of gift exchange upon which the Saṃgha depended. As Silk remarks, “Perhaps the key point in all this talk about good and bad

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

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

With regards to the larger monastic community, what was at stake for this group of Mahāyāna Sūtras was not material success—again, Buddhist monasteries on the ground look to have been flourishing at the time—but, to use a word I suspect Buddhist philosophical traditions would not care for, its soul.

***

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

---

172 Silk, “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 171. Also see ibid., 182ff., as well as Boucher, Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna, 77-78 and 80-83.
also does not promote lay giving, at least not overtly. And there is apparently no concern with rampant greed and illegitimate practices of monks.

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

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

173 Nattier, A Few Good Men, 69-70 (and 171-192 for their application to the Ugraparipṛcchā).
the text evidently did not care about the monastic/lay division or thought the duality was counterproductive to the pursuit of awakening. The hypothetical donor throughout the text is called only a bodhisattva, never a monastic or a lay bodhisattva. If the Dānapāramitā can be said to promote lay giving, in almost every case it does so obliquely through a generic bodhisattva. The lone exception may be the text’s exhortation for a king to surrender his sovereignty. But even if we assume that a king must be a layman, the text could be encouraging a monastic bodhisattva to give in his future lives as a king—just as the Jātakas recount Śākyamuni doing in many of his former lives—rather than singling out lay generosity as something that needed promotion. As I already stated, Mahāyāna Sūtras take up the topic of lay giving far less than one might expect, possibly because they were loathe to put bodhisattvas in the position of receiving gifts. As the Dānapāramitā-sūtra focuses almost entirely on the donor and not the recipient of gifts, perhaps it shares a reluctance with other Mahāyāna Sūtras to tackle the consequences of the reception of gifts. In addition to Nattier’s first “interpretation of absence,” this reluctance may also help explain the Dānapāramitā’s not addressing giving to a buddha or lay giving.

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

With regard to the Dānapāramitā-sūtra, the answer is certainly affirmative. For the entire point

---

174 Ibid., 70 (emphasis in the original).
of the Mahāyāna Sūtra passages that use giving as a point of comparison is to elevate other religious practices, if not to discourage giving altogether. Obviously, such passages have no logical place in a text where giving is front and center as a merit-making activity and an important constituent, even the fundamental constituent, of the path to awakening. Likewise, the Mahāyāna Sūtras that try to alter the bodhisattva’s perception within the context of emptiness and other abstractions undercut the very reality of giving and its karmic benefits. In stark contrast, the Dānapāramitā’s entire agenda is to spell out the very real rewards that various gifts bring—rather than have him call the metaphysical nature of the gift into question, the text would have the bodhisattva give because he knows he receives both worldly and spiritual goals in return. And there is little reason to suspect that the author(s) of the Dānapāramitā-sūtra would have been ignorant of the giving comparisons, which are widespread in Mahāyāna Sūtras, or a basic Mahāyāna doctrine like emptiness, the influence of which can be detected well beyond the early Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras. It is much more likely that the comparisons involving the gift and the doctrinal redefinitions of giving that are present in other Mahāyāna Sūtras were deliberately rejected because they were contrary to the agenda of the Dānapāramitā.

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

175 Because emptiness rhetoric appears to be pervasive in Mahāyāna texts, it might be a good lens through which to study the issues related to Mahāyāna intertextuality that I touched on at the beginning of this chapter.
address monastic greed and misbehavior all belong to a much earlier period (and different place?) of Mahāyāna history than that of the composition of the Dānapāramitā-sūtra. Due to differences in time or place or because of the limits of education—basically Nattier’s second option—perhaps whoever composed and/or redacted the latter could not have been aware of this reformatory group of texts that later would be compiled into the Tibetan Canon right along with the Dānapāramitā. It is, after all, only with hindsight that we struggle to weave all of these texts into the tapestry of a variegated but still connected “Mahāyāna” history. Of course, the Mahāyāna Sūtras that deal with greed and illegitimate practice never completely disappeared from Indian Mahāyāna (or Mainstream) view either, if only as representations of dimly felt ideals—several hundred years later Śāntideva neatly brought together the Ugraparipṛcchā-, Candrapradīpa- (= Samādhirāja-), Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā-, Ratnakūṭa, and Ratnarāśi-sūtras in his chapter praising the forest life (araṇyasaṃvarṇana) in the Śikṣāsamuccaya.

Unfortunately, the questions surrounding this topic are too opaque to allow for anything approaching satisfying answers.

Some of the other gift categories I have outlined turn up in the Dānapāramitā-sūtra, but in muted form and/or in the last section that may not have been part of the original text. The Mahāyāna Perfections besides giving are mentioned in passing, either in what is basically a list or by the single word “Perfections.” There is not a lot on giving the Dharma either, which usually appears in the text as a reward for some material gift, not as a gift itself. The clearest instance of the Dharma as gift occurs in a single snippet toward the end of the Sūtra: “Because I will give what is immortal by giving the Dharma, it is certain that I am to give the gift of the Dharma” (chos byin pas ni bdud rtsi byin par ’gyur gyis bdag gischos kyi sbyin pa sbyin par bya gor ma...
This line occurs in the aforementioned section that I suspect was an add-on. And since it comes at the end of a desultory series of terse proclamations about different kinds of gifts and the manner of proper giving, it may imply the superiority of dharmadāna, but the text never makes this explicit. In most cases the text actually makes Dharma the spiritual counterpart of some material thing:

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

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

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

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

\[177\] That is, assistance.
palms—admittedly, not the nicest of images) somehow means giving the aid of the Dharma to the downtrodden. The bodhisattva should quite literally give a helping hand.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A. Introduction

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

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

---

1 On dāna and the related tyāga (Pāli cāga) in Buddhist lists, see Dayal, The Bodhisattva Doctrine, 172.
2 Mvy. 1700-1704.
3 See PED, s.vv. dāna and puñña. For additional references to and explications of the puñnakiriyavatthus and punyakriyāvastus in Mainstream and Mahāyāna texts, see also Pagel, The Bodhisattvapiṭaka, 372-373, n. 145.
4 See BHSD, s.v. saṃgraha-vastu; Dayal, The Bodhisattva Doctrine, 251-259.
5 On this possibility, see Nattier, A Few Good Men, 111, 240 (esp. n. 217), and 247 (esp. n. 257).
6 I have tried to remain consistent by capitalizing extremely common doctrinal terms like “Perfection,” which is obviously an arbitrary choice. On the translation of and relationship between the terms pāramitā and pāramī, see Dayal, The Bodhisattva Doctrine, 165-167. On the etymology of pāramitā, see ibid. and especially Nattier, A Few Good Men, 153, n. 35.
sacca (“truthfulness”), adhisthāna (“determination”), mettā (“friendliness”), and upkehā (“equanimity”). The alternative but clearly related list of pāramitās that is most common in Mahāyāna texts, Sanskrit or otherwise, includes six terms: dāna, śīla, kṣānti, vīrya, dhyāna (“meditation”), and prajñā. The other common Mahāyāna list, which almost certainly came after the list of six, adds four other pāramitās: upāya (“strategy”) or upāyakauśalya (“skillful strategy”), pranidhāna (“oath” or “vow”), bala (“strength”), and jñāna (“knowledge”). It is difficult to know the circumstances under which these last four pāramitās were added. They may have been invented by the author(s) of the Daśabhūmika-sūtra, which makes up part of the unwieldy Avatāṃsaka-sūtra but also exists as an independent work. As is well known, the Daśabhūmika-sūtra describes ten stages (bhūmi) of a bodhisattva’s spiritual career, and in doing so maps a pāramitā onto each one of these stages. It may be that four more Perfections were needed for the Daśabhūmika-sūtra simply to match up with bhūmis seven through ten. If this is true, the origin of the list of ten Mahāyāna Perfections dates to the 3rd century CE or perhaps slightly earlier; the Daśabhūmika-sūtra was first translated into Chinese in the late 3rd century, and, given the complexity of its systematization of the bodhisattva path, it is unlikely that it was composed much earlier than that. Dayal, a strong proponent of this hypothesis, suggests the possibility that the Daśabhūmika-sūtra added four Perfections due to a rivalry with the already-mentioned Mainstream list of ten pāramīs, but proposes that it most likely was the

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

9 The Bodhisattva Doctrine, 167.
buddhahood: “Having thus made his [Sumedha’s] resolution [to become awakened], ‘I will certainly become a Buddha,’ he searched in due course the entire cosmic order in order to investigate the contributory conditions to Enlightenment. . . .” What Sumedha finds—not in the universe surrounding him, but in his mind—are the Perfections, and the Nidānakathā continues at some length with descriptions of each. Then, after Sumedha learns the details of the ten pāramīs, the text has him conclude the following: “These alone in this world are the contributory conditions to Enlightenment and have to be fulfilled by Bodhisattas. And besides these ten Perfections there are no others.” It is practicing the Perfections that propels the Bodhisatta to awakening. For the Dānapāramitā-sūtra, the same logic is at work. Taking up the pāramitās propels the bodhisattva, the Mahāyāna bodhisattva in this case, to buddhahood.

Immediately following the part just quoted, the Dānapāramitā continues with the Buddha’s explanation:

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

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

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

---

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

---

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

14 Derge Kanjur, mDo sde, Ts 31b-76b.

15 Implicit in almost all studies of Buddhist texts is the assumption that they were read by many people. It may strike some as unusual that I am claiming the opposite for the Dānapāramitā-sūtra. However, the prudent starting point for textual studies should be to assume that a text was not read, with the burden
giving, which is of no little consequence because it is one of the few Mahāyāna texts devoted exclusively to the topic. This voice is laden with values that at a minimum embody the ideals of those responsible for the composition and/or redaction of the text. As I stated in chapter II, the values of the Dānapāramitā-sūtra diverge from many interpretations of the gift found in other Mahāyāna Sūtras. One might also think to look at a text like this in a descriptive sense, meaning that it could possibly be a window into a real world of Mahāyāna gift exchange, with the text describing the objects given by actual Mahāyāna Buddhists, the manner in which they were given, and the intentions motivating the gifts. As it turns out, however, certain aspects of the Dānapāramitā-sūtra do not accord very well with what we see in the Mahāyāna epigraphic and material records, a discrepancy I will deal with in chapter V.

I should say a few words about, perhaps, the first thing one wants to know about a text, but which is often the most difficult to pin down with any precision: the date of its composition. As is widely accepted, Mahāyāna Sūtra literature appears in great numbers somewhere around the beginning of the Common Era. But the Dānapāramitā-sūtra seems to have been composed at a much, much later time, probably around the end of what Gregory Schopen has called the Middle Period of Indian Buddhism, lasting from ca. 0–500 CE. Different data suggest a late date for our text. Doctrinally, the text appears to be quite mature; any sort of doctrinal list appearing in the Sūtra does so in its most developed form. Again, the number of pārāmitās does not appear in a list of six, but is fully fleshed out to ten. Also, the main body of the text is very organized and hierarchical, with a highly systematized description of the bodhisattva’s ten kuśalakarmapathas followed by the same for the pāramitās. Most significantly, of proof falling on the scholar to present evidence that it was. That burden of proof would necessarily be heavier for any claim that a text was studied and understood, let alone that it influenced actual behavior.
among the named audience members who listen to the Buddha’s teaching on giving are a series of Hindu goddesses who first appear in India quite late, at least by the standards of Mahāyāna Buddhism. These goddesses include Durgā (Tib. dka’ bzog ma), Mahāśrīdevī (dpal gyi lha mo chen mo), and Bhairavī (jigs byed ma), among others, goddesses who in other Buddhist contexts would be labeled Tantric, though the loaded term “Tantric” can in no way be meaningfully applied to this text. Although such goddesses make brief appearances in earlier texts, they really come to the fore in works like the Devī-māhātmya, which makes up chapters 81–93 of the extant Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa but which also seems to have circulated independently, works that, by all accounts, do not appear in India until the 5th century CE at the earliest. With all due caution, I therefore date the composition of the Dānapāramitā-sūtra to around the 5th or 6th century.

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

---

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


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

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

\(^{20}\) Rotman, Divine Stories, 6.

\(^{21}\) Ibid., 8.

\(^{22}\) The compilation of the Divyāvadāna may be as late as the 17th century, the approximate date of its
earliest known Sanskrit manuscripts, and may even have been produced by Nepalese hands. See ibid.,
8-15.

How the Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra came to be part of the (or a) Divyāvadāna is a bit of a mystery. It and
the Prātiḥārya-sūtra are the only sections of the thirty-eight Divyāvadāna chapters not called an Avadāna.
Moreover, the Dānādhikaraṇa is the only chapter that includes Mahāyāna in its title—its full title is the
Dānādhikaraṇa-mahāyāna-sūtra—and it is also the only chapter whose contents are not narrative in form.
I posed this problem to Andy Rotman and Satoshi Hiraoka, but neither of them, despite great
familiarity with the Divyāvadāna, was able to give a satisfactory explanation. Michael Hahn makes clear
that the Maitrakanyaka-avadāna, now chapter thirty-eight of the Divyāvadāna, was not originally
included in the latter text. See Hahn, Haribhaṭṭa and Gopadatta: Two Authors in the Succession of Āryaśūra,
On the Rediscovery of Parts of their Jātakamālās, 2nd ed. (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Occasional Paper
Series I) (Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1992), 5. The Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra was also
probably slipped into the Divyāvādana at a late date, but the reason for this addition is anyone’s guess.
the Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra (T. 705) was not made until around the end of the 10th century, so this is of little help. Fortunately, Matsuda Kazunobu has recently identified a small leather folio (13.5×5.5 cm) containing about the last third of the Dānādhikaraṇa among the Schøyen manuscripts.23 The manuscript is written in a Gupta Brāhmī script that dates to the 5th or 6th century.24

Some of the Dānapāramitā-sūtra overlaps considerably in wording and content with the Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra. Both texts enumerate various objects that should be given and explain the rewards from doing so. In the Dānādhikaraṇa, nos. 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, and 25 include objects to be given that are also found in the Dānapāramitā; nos. 4, 6, 7, 8, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, and 25 in the Dānādhikaraṇa mention rewards that also occur in the Dānapāramitā (sometimes the rewards are matched up with the same gifts, sometimes not).25

The majority of the correspondences with the Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra come from the last section of the Dānapāramitā, which, like the Dānādhikaraṇa, has a series of short statements about not only gift objects and rewards, but also the manner in which one should give. The Tibetan of Dānādhikaraṇa’s nos. 6, 7, 12, and 16 is nearly identical or exactly the same as the Tibetan of the analogous statements from this last section of the Dānapāramitā-sūtra. In addition, some of the corresponding gift-giving statements come in the same sequence in the Dānādhikaraṇa and last

---

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

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

25 See Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna” for the specific type of gift associated with each number. The Chinese translation of the Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra has a long ending that has no parallel in surviving Sanskrit and Tibetan sources (ibid., 50-51)—in some cases, ideas or wording in the Tibetan Dānapāramitā correspond with things found only in this Chinese coda of the Dānādhikaraṇa.
part of the Dānapāramitā: nos. 6–8, 11–13, 16–17, and 19–20 from the Dānādhikaraṇa have parallels in the final section of the Dānapāramitā-sūtra that are found in the same order (the Dānapāramitā’s parallels to nos. 2–4 from the Dānādhikaraṇa also occur together, but in reverse order). Undoubtedly, these two Sūtras are closely related. Since the Dānādhikaraṇa immediately follows the Dānapāramitā in the Tibetan Kanjur, clearly I am not the first one to notice similarities between the two texts. It is not impossible that some of the content of one of the texts slipped into the other when they were copied in Sanskrit, translated into Tibetan and organized in the Kanjur, or when the Tibetan itself was copied. I suspect that the two texts were composed around the same time. The Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra, being written, perhaps, not much earlier than the recently identified Schøyen fragment from the 5th or 6th century, may be slightly earlier than the Dānapāramitā.

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

26 All of this information is laid out in detail in Jens Braarvig, Akṣayamatinirdeśasūtra, Vol. II: The Tradition of Imperishability in Buddhist Thought (Oslo: Solum Forlag, 1993), xvii–xli.
non-extant translations actually existed, but just on the basis of the surviving translations we can conclude with a great degree of confidence that the Akṣayamatinirdeśa was composed earlier than the Dānapāramitā-sūtra. How much earlier is open to question—using evidence internal to the text that need not detain us, Braarvig surmises that the Akṣayamatinirdeśa-sūtra probably “achieved a fairly final form during the first two centuries A.D. . . .”

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

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


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


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

32 Pagel, The Bodhisattvapiṭaka, 2 and 6.

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

Pagel thinks that the similarities between the Akṣayamatinirdesa- and Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtras are the result of the former text’s borrowing material directly from the latter, as opposed to the other way around or a situation in which both texts took material from the same outside source or sources. All of his evidence for this direction of borrowing hinges on his belief that the Akṣayamatinirdesa “deliberately introduced a number of unambiguous doctrinal and editorial adjustments” to the Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtra. Pagel assumes a linear model whereby texts get more complicated and sophisticated, with “simpler” or earlier ideas not being able to show up again as texts change over time. He does not give due consideration to the very real possibility that the “number of interpolations of non-standardised text elements in the Akṣayamatinirdesa” are not interpolations at all, but a sign that instead the Bodhisattvapiṭaka as we have it was standardized in a process of textual leveling (see ibid., 36–48 and 51–53). For Pagel, the Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtra’s relatively simple content and organization—to be sure, judging any text as “simple” is fraught with subjectivity—“point to a period of composition when the conception of the bodhisattva was still dominated by the spiritual ideal characteristic of early Buddhism” (ibid., 4).
That the Akṣayamatinirdeśa- and Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtras were first composed before the Dānapāramitā is important because all three texts treat gift giving in remarkably similar ways. Chapter two of the Dānapāramitā-sūtra is structured very similarly to chapter six of the Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtra, which also deals with the Perfection of Giving, and the first section of chapter five of the Akṣayamatinirdeśa, which classifies giving as the fifth “imperishable” (akṣaya). Each of these three texts discusses external before internal gifts, bāhya- and ādhyātmika-dāna, respectively. None of the texts marks the division between external and internal giving, but the commentary to the Akṣayamatinirdeśa (its ṭīkā) makes this division explicit. All three texts then transition into another section that addresses the manner in which gifts should and should not be given, often putting much emphasis on the intentionality behind gifts. Moreover, the structural order of the gifts enumerated in each text largely overlaps. For example, the sequence of the first nine external gifts in the Dānapāramitā matches the order of gifts in the Akṣayamatinirdeśa, except the fifth gift in the Dānapāramitā, that of ornaments, is treated later in the Akṣayamatinirdeśa; for the eight internal gifts of the body, the sequence is the same in the Dānapāramitā- and Akṣayamatinirdeśa-sūtras, except the gift of skin and the gift of flesh and blood are transposed between the two texts (also, the Akṣayamatinirdeśa includes bones with the gift of marrow but the Dānapāramitā does not).


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

36 Braarvig glosses parts of his translation of the Akṣayamatinirdeśa with explanations from the ṭīkā and supplies the Tibetan for the commentary in the footnotes. See Braarvig, trans., *Akṣayamatinirdeśasūtra*, Vol. II, 114-130.
In addition to the structure of these three texts, their content on gift giving also bears striking similarities. The rewards for giving particular items in the Akṣayamatinirdeśa- and Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtras are frequently the same in the Dānapāramitā. This is especially true for the Akṣayamatinirdeśa, whose wording is in many cases parallel to, if not exactly the same as, that of the Dānapāramitā. To cite just one example, the Akṣayamatinirdeśa says the following about the gift of medicine:

\[ \text{mi rga mi 'chi ba'i bdud rts'i bde ba yongs su bskang ba'i phyir na ba dang sman 'dod pa thams cad la sman sbyin pa'o.}^{37} \]

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

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

\[ \text{sman byin pa 'dis na bdag sms can thams cad kyi rga ba dang / 'chi ba med pa'i bdud rts'i bde ba yongs su rdzogs par byed par gyur cig.} \]

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

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

---


39 I am not sure whether the Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtra also switches terminology, as its treatment of gift giving only came to my attention recently and I have not had adequate time to study the text. I have had to rely mostly on Pagel’s synopsis of its content.
compatible with the Akṣayamatinirdeśa- and Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtras. None of the texts pays much attention to the gift of Dharma\textsuperscript{40} or the qualities of the recipient of the gift.\textsuperscript{41}

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

Structure and Content of the Dānapāramitā-sūtra

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{42} Depending on how one reads the plural sangs rgyas kyi chos thams cad (Skt. buddhadharma), the last part could instead be “All the Teachings of a [or the] Buddha.”
title here certainly sounds like the name of a Mahāyāna work, though it has little to no relation to the actual content of our text.

I divide the Dānapāramitā into four parts, two in each of the text’s chapters. Although this four-part configuration is never spelled out explicitly by the author(s) or redactor(s) of the text, its section on giving has structural parallels in other Mahāyāna texts, including, as I just discussed, the Akṣayamatinirdeśa- and Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtras. The following organization, that is, is not completely arbitrary. The first part of the Dānapāramitā-sūtra is simply the introduction to the Buddha’s discourse, in which the interlocutor—who, as we will see, has a curiously long name—and a host of other characters are introduced in a dazzling backdrop of trees, birds, sundry other plants and animals, and the bejeweled accoutrements so familiar to many Mahāyāna Sūtras. The introduction establishes a paradisiacal setting where the Buddha can deliver his teaching on gift giving. However, nowhere does the first chapter, which comprises about a third of the whole text, deal with the Perfection of Giving, or giving at all for that matter. For after the introduction, the rest of the first chapter—part two of the whole text, as I have organized it—takes up the daśakuśalakarma-patha, the “paths of the ten virtuous actions,” to follow the Tibetan translation of the term. The Buddha is made to explain, in alternating prose and verse, why a bodhisattva-mahāsattva is to reject doing, causing to be done, or approving of someone else’s doing each of the ten Buddhist sins, three of which are physical (taking life, stealing, and sexual misconduct), four of which are vocal (lying, slander, speaking harsh words, and idle chatter), and four of which are mental (covetousness, harmful intent, and incorrect views). The daśakuśalakarma-patha can be found throughout Mainstream
Nikāyas/Āgamas and Vinayas, and they even appear in the Mahābhārata and Manusmṛti. They were picked up in Mahāyāna Sūtras early on, showing up in some of the first translations of Mahāyāna Buddhist texts into Chinese, such as the Aṣṭasāhasrikā and Ugraparipṛcchā. The ten virtues (without karmapatha), in fact, appear in one of the earliest Indian Buddhist manuscripts that we have. And they continued to hold a not-insignificant place in Mahāyāna Sūtras. But why are the daśakuśalakarmapatha featured so prominently in a text on gift giving?

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

---

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

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

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

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

47 The ending of the Dānādhikarana-sūtra that is present only in the Chinese translation frames the ten virtues as a gift—keeping each of the virtues brings a specific karmic reward. See Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” 50-51.
modify the question slightly, then: For the author(s) of the Dānapāramitā-sūtra, why should the daśakuśalakarma-patha be so important for a bodhisattva donor?

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

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

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

Part of the hierarchy of the Dānapāramitā’s treatment of the gift lies in the switch from external objects to internal parts of the body. Less obvious is its change in gift terminology, which I referenced earlier with regard to its relationship with the Akṣayamatinirdeśa. Midway through the third section of the text, the Dānapāramitā starts using the Tibetan equivalent of
Sanskrit *parityāgadāna* (yongs su gtong ba’i sbyin pa)\(^{49}\) to describe gifts instead of *dāna* (sbyin pa). The gift of the vehicle is actually duplicated in the third section of our text, occurring first with *sbyin pa* and later with *yongs su gtong ba’i sbyin pa*. Rather than this section being redundant, it seems to be delineating two types of gift exchange that had different expectations for karmic rewards and, in some contexts, even legal ramifications. In some examples of Buddhist usage, a type of gift as an accusative of *pari√tyaj* marks it as an object over which the donor completely relinquishes ownership, in contrast to a “gift of use,” whereby the donor expects the gift to generate continual merit through its use by the recipient, often the monastic community. This is clearest from a passage in the *Abhidharmakośa* (IV.120), which de La Vallée Poussin translates as follows: “Le mérite du don est de deux sortes: 1) mérite produit par l’abandon (*tyāgānvaya*), le mérite qui résulte du seul fait d’abandonner; 2) mérite produit par la jouissance (*paribhogānvaya*), le mérite qui résulte de la jouissance, par la personne qui reçoit, de l’objet donné.”\(^{50}\) Some Vinaya passages, in an attempt to coordinate relations between monastics and the laity, address these two types of merit as well. In a story in the *Śayanāsanavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, for example, monks are enjoined to live in empty monasteries that were given to them by devout donors, since “there was not merit resulting from use for the donors” (*dānapatīnāṃ paribhogānvayaṃ punyaṃ na bhavati*).\(^{51}\) The *Dānapāramitā*-sūtra, of course, is not concerned with regulating the monastic use of lay donations. The term *paribhoga* (“of use”), in fact, does not occur in its treatment of gift giving.

---

\(^{49}\) Note that *parityāga* and *dāna* were not necessarily in compound in the Sanskrit text.

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

\(^{51}\) See Schopen, “The Lay Ownership of Monasteries and the Role of the Monk in Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticism,” in *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*, esp. 238-239.
Instead, our text appears to mark a difference in difficulty between a “regular” gift (dāna) and a “gift of total surrender” (parityāgadāna). We can infer from the Abhidharmakośa and Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya that the author(s) of the Dānapāramitā considered the former type of gift to involve some degree of continued ties between the donor and the object given, whereas the parityāgadāna was thought to entail a complete renunciation of ownership on the part of the donor.\footnote{We can detect these two kinds of gifts in the epigraphic record too. Many donative inscriptions have dāna or deyadharmā (“religious gift”), but some instead use the term deyadharmaparītyāga (or Prakrit equivalents), “total surrender of a religious gift.” See D.C. Sircar, Indian Epigraphical Glossary (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1966), s.v. parītyāga; Th. Damsteegt, Epigraphical Hybrid Sanskrit: Its Rise, Spread, Characteristics and Relationship to Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit (Orientalia Rheno-Trajectina 23) (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 163, 184, 245, and related notes (Damsteegt characteristically suggests that the term deyadharmā-parītyāga spread because of “North-Western influence”); Gouriswar Bhattacharya, “Dāna-Deyadharma: Donation in Early Buddhist Records (in Brāhmi),” in Investigating Indian Art: Proceedings of a Symposium on the Development of Early Buddhist and Hindu Iconography held at the Museum of Indian Art Berlin May 1986, ed. M. Yaldiz and W. Lobo (Berlin: SMPK, 1987), 44 and 51-52. And in a 5th–7th century South Indian inscription, we can see the concept of a “gift of use” with the term tyāgaparībhogaṇvayam—see S. Sankaranarayanan, “Two Vishṇukundī Charters from Tummalagudem,” Epigraphia Āndhrica 2 (1974): 11, line 20 (this is Tummalagudem A from Table 2 in chapter V; I owe this reference to Schopen, “The Lay Ownership of Monasteries and the Role of the Monk in Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticism,” in Buddhist Monks and Business Matters, 255, n. 69). See also n. 8 in chapter IV, part B for an apparent case of this dichotomy of gifts in the Bodhisattvabhūmi.} The parityāgadāna is more of a sacrifice for the donor and thus constitutes a more advanced bodhisattva practice in the gift-giving scheme laid out in the Dānapāramitā-sūtra. As a caveat, I should add that there is some fluidity in the Dānapāramitā’s use of sbyin pa (dāna), gtong ba (tyāga), and yongs su gtong ba’i sbyin pa (parityāgadāna), especially in its verse passages. While our text does seem to signify a dichotomy between sbyin pa and yongs su gtong ba’i sbyin pa, I do not believe that it makes the sort of rigid technical distinctions that are present in the aforementioned Abhidharmakośa and Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya passages.

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

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

53 See Mvy. 2146 and 6512.
someone’s eyes so that he or she is no longer deceived. Another wordplay occurs with the bodhisattva’s (second) gift of a vehicle, which is described as follows:

\[
\text{rta dang / glang po che dang / shing rta’i bzhon pa yongs su gtong ba’i sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni byang chub sms dpa’ rnam kyi theg pa chen po dang / theg pa mchog dang / theg pa mi mnyam pa dang mnyam pa dang / sangs rgyas kyi theg pa bla na med pa / gtso bo dam pa rab mchog s\text{dud pa’i tshig bla dags yin}}.
\]

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

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

\[
\text{rta dang / glang po che dang / shing rta’i bzhon pa yongs su gtong ba’i sbyin pa ’dis na bdag gis sms can thams cad theg pa chen po dang / theg pa mchog dang / theg pa mi mnyam pa dang mnyam pa dang / sangs rgyas kyi theg pa bla na med pa / gtso bo dam pa / rab mchog gis s\text{dud par byed par gyur cig}}.
\]

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

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

The spiritual rewards that attend the bodhisattva’s gifts are meant, directly or indirectly, to lead beings to awakening. The purified divine eye that results from the bodhisattva’s gift of lamps enables beings to penetrate into the workings of karma and thereby to appreciate fully the magnitude of suffering in a cyclical existence from which they must escape. More directly, what the bodhisattva really wants by giving physical seats is for each
being to gain his own seat of awakening, a bodhimaṇḍa at the center of the particular universe he will one day inhabit. When the bodhisattva gives seats, he should wish to “cause all beings to attain the adamantine seat of the terrace of awakening on the surface of each of the thousand-cubed great thousand-world spheres” (sems can thams cad kyis stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i 'jig rten gyi khams thams cad kyi sa gzhi la byang chub kyi snying po rdo rje'i gdan thob par byed par gyur cig). Except “wish” is hardly adequate to understand the context of the bodhisattva’s statement. It is really a “vow,” or as I translate it throughout the text, an “oath.”

All of the bodhisattva’s gifts in the third section of the Dānapāramitā must be accompanied by a praṇidhāna (Tib. smon lam) that has been approved of in some way by the Buddha. A common usage of praṇidhāna in Buddhist texts is the oath to gain awakening, though it can be used for less “noble” goals, like the oath to acquire a better rebirth. In our text, the bodhisattva is in effect willing the effect of his gifts into existence, which usually entails leading all beings to some aspect of awakening. In the examples presented here, the bodhisattva resolves to give others the visual and auditory capabilities of awakened beings and the seat upon which they will defeat Māra and become awakened themselves.

As with the examples of giving lamps and music, this section of the Dānapāramitā places much emphasis on attaining the glorious body that is concomitant with awakening, a reward that is at once physical and religious. The reward of the superhuman body is felt most strongly at the end of this section, which describes eight gifts of the body (Skt. dehadāna). By giving them away, the bodhisattva is able to parlay his own impure body parts into their awakened counterparts or some other superhuman feature, and not just as a reward for himself. When the bodhisattva gives his eyes, he vows that all beings will obtain Dharma eyes (dharmacakṣus), an untrammeled vision of the Doctrine or Truth or Law. When he surrenders his skin,
to perfect the skin of all beings so it will become soft, delicate, and golden, physical qualities that make up some of the thirty-two marks (lakṣaṇa) of the body of a mahāpuruṣa, the überman of Buddhist literature.\(^{54}\) And when he sacrifices his bone marrow, the bodhisattva makes a vow in the verse section to “perfect the receptacle of all beings’ putrid bodies [so that] it is indestructible, [like] a diamond” (. . . sems can thams cad kyi // rnag gi lus kyi za ma tog / rdo rje mi shigs rdzogs byed shog /). The focus on the perfected body in the Dānapāramitā is far from unusual: It is a common theme in Buddhist texts in general and Mahāyāna Sūtras in particular.\(^{55}\) In the Longer Sukhāvatīvyūha, for instance, the bodhisattva Dharmākara, who will, of course, become Amitābha, makes the following vow: “Blessed One, may I not awaken to unsurpassable, perfect, full awakening if, after I attain awakening, bodhisattvas born in my buddha-field will not all be endowed with the thirty two marks [lakṣaṇa] of the superior human being [mahāpuruṣa].”\(^{56}\) But the Dānapāramitā-sūtra does not restrict the ideal body to bodhisattvas in a particular buddha-field, for our bodhisattva is exhorted to make oath after oath to perfect everyone’s body, placing our text within a subset of Mahāyāna Sūtras that universalizes the bodhisattva path to all beings.\(^{57}\) The bodhisattva of the Dānapāramitā magnifies his virtue by spreading it to other beings, whose future superhuman bodies will

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

\(^{55}\) See Boucher, Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna, 3-19.

\(^{56}\) Gomez, trans., The Land of Bliss, 71 (§28(20)).

\(^{57}\) See Boucher, Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna, 11.
manifest the accomplishments of their own moral actions that led to their awakening. The generosity of the bodhisattva becomes literally embodied in all beings.\(^{58}\)

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

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

---

\(^{58}\) Several scholars have drawn attention to the relationship in Buddhist texts between the body and moral behavior. See especially Ohnuma, Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood, 224-231; Susanne Mrozik, Virtuous Bodies: The Physical Dimensions of Morality in Buddhist Ethics (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).
organizing principles, except perhaps the gift of the Dharma might be highlighted because it comes last. Moreover, several of the gift objects from the third section—food, drinks, clothing, lamps, and many others—are repeated in the fourth section. But unlike the situation in the third section in which the gift of the vehicle is repeated with yongs su gtong ba'i sbyin pa instead of sbyin pa, the repeats between the third and fourth sections do not seem to serve any purpose.

After the hodgepodge of brief statements, there are a few longer sentences that focus mostly on the mental state of the donor—he should give without pride, with joy, with pure intentions, and so on—as well as on the attitude of the donor toward the recipient. The bodhisattva is urged not to feel contempt for or look down on the recipient; he must instead “give with deference and esteem” (gus pa dang bcas pa dang / zhe sar bcas pas sbyin par byed). This is followed by a couple passages that I discussed at the end of chapter II. The text discourages the bodhisattva from seeking out virtuous recipients because they will bring more karmic rewards than unethical recipients and from giving in order to be reborn in certain positions. The text then explains that the bodhisattva must instead redirect his merit toward the “unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening” of all beings, before ending with the bodhisattva-interlocutor’s profusely offering praise to the Buddha. The attention to the recipient, the disavowal of certain karmic rewards, and the redirection of merit to awakening can all be found in Mahāyāna texts, but they nevertheless stand out here because the third part of the text makes no mention of them. The sudden repudiation of certain karmic rewards is particularly striking considering that each gift enumerated in the third section, along with some at the beginning of the fourth section, is structured around the reward it will bring. And for many of these gifts our text promises this-worldly, material rewards. Both the structure
and the content of the last section, then, radically diverge from the previous parts of the text.\footnote{The structural divergence in the Dānapāramitā-sūtra may have antecedents. The Akṣayamatinirdeśa- and Bodhisattvapiṭaka-sūtras enumerate gifts and their rewards in a hierarchical structure before treating the intentionality behind and proper manner of gift giving. However, the content of the last section of the Dānapāramitā shares more in common with the Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra than the sections on giving in these two other texts.} Indeed, the end of the Dānapāramitā reads as if an author or redactor was unaware of or indifferent to the rest of the text, and thus one might reasonably conclude that Dānapāramitā-sūtra as it now exists in the Tibetan Kanjur is not the product of a single person.

A Note on the Translation

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

I try to remain rigorously consistent in vocabulary choices, with the same English word matching the same Tibetan word (and without overlap—I attempt not to use one English equivalent for more than one Tibetan word). I sometimes break this self-imposed rule when
translating technical terms, which are usually not done justice with literal translations. Like much of Buddhist literature, Mahāyāna Sūtras, which tend to be rendered into Tibetan quite faithfully and literally, are often formulaic, dreadfully repetitive, and, frankly, boring. (Though it seems likely that a need for mnemonic devices within the Indian oral traditions of Buddhist literature contributed to its generally lackluster quality, let us remember that some of the best literature the world has known was also produced orally: Orality is not a dead end to dullness.) It has always struck me as odd that one who has access to Buddhist texts only through translation may get the impression that Mahāyāna Sūtras, to say nothing of Pāli Suttas, possess an aesthetic or linguistic sophistication at least comparable to works like Aśvaghoṣa’s Buddhacarita or Āryaśūra’s Jātakamālā. I hope that my effort at consistency helps to avoid such an impression and captures the stylistic simplicity, repetitive nature, and limited vocabulary of the text. 60

A Note on the Tibetan

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

60 For a much rosier picture of the literary formulas and conventions in Mahāyāna Sūtras, especially their use in the Shorter and Longer Sukhāvatīvyūha, see Gomez, The Land of Bliss, 51-55. Needless to say, I do not consider the Sukhāvatīvyūha, Dānapāramitā, or most any Mahāyāna Sūtra to be “well-wrought, learned works of a well-established literary genre” (p. 51). Paul Harrison describes the Longer Sukhāvatīvyūha, rightly in my view, as “interminably tedious to modern sensibilities, with its endless descriptions of the physical features of Sukhāvatī, its flora, its climatic conditions, and the lifestyle of its inhabitants.” He offers the interesting hypothesis that the tedious descriptions in the Longer Sukhāvatīvyūha should be viewed as prescriptive blueprints through which a practitioner could properly visualize the complex setting of Sukhāvatī. See Harrison, “Mediums and Messages,” 120-122 (quote taken from p. 121).
a critical edition, which would require the collation of several more recensions of the Tibetan Kanjur.\footnote{I will add, somewhat cynically, that I do not fully understand the amount of work spent recording each variation from every extant recension of the Kanjur, of which there are fifteen or so, in producing a Tibetan critical apparatus. It seems to have as much to do with satisfying the textually biased standards of the Buddhist Studies guild as it does with getting at the underlying Indian text. (Editing texts with more than one version, as in a case with one text from the Kanjur and a parallel text from Dunhuang, is another matter entirely.) In my experience with the Dānapāramitā-sūtra and other texts, the vast majority of differences between Kanjur recensions are either mistakes or extremely trivial variations. To use Paul Harrison’s terminology, most variations are of the “transmissional” rather than the “recensional” type. The former variations are “errors resulting from scribal lapses or casual attempts to improve or modernise the text (which are indeed usually deliberate, but generally rather trivial in scope)”; whereas the latter “reveal either extensive and deliberate editorial changes to the text, or the adoption of a different text altogether. . . .” See Harrison, Druma-kinnara-rāja-paripṛcchā-sūtra: A Critical Edition of the Tibetan Text (Recension A) based on Eight Editions of the Kanjur and the Dunhuang Manuscript Fragment (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series VII) (Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1992), xxv.} I have collated six recensions, which are as follows:

- D: Derge xylograph Kanjur (mdo sde, Tsa 77a1-95b1)\footnote{The Sde-dge Mtshal-par Bka’-gyur: a facsimile edition of the 18th century redaction of Si-tu Chos-kyi-’byun-gnas prepared under the direction of H.H. the 16th Rgyal-dbaṅ Karma-pa, Vol. 61 (Delhi: Delhi Karmapaе Chodhey Gyalwae Sungrab Partun Khang, 1979).}
- L: Shel dkar/London manuscript Kanjur (mdo, Za, 245a4-273b7)\footnote{Shel dkar Manuscript Kanjur kept in the British Library (Or. 6724), Vol. 47. Many thanks to Burkhard Quessel of the British Library for sending me an electronic copy of the Shel dkar text.}
- N: Narthang xylograph Kanjur (mdo sde, Ba 121b7-151a5)\footnote{Narthang Kanjur, Vol. 61. Many thanks to Bruce Williams for giving me access to the Narthang Kanjur volumes housed in Berkeley’s East Asian Library.}
- Q: Peking xylograph Kanjur (mdo sna tshogs, Mu 87a7-105b4)\footnote{Daisetz T. Suzuki, ed., The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking edition, reprinted under the supervision of the Otani University, Vol. 34 (Tokyo; Kyoto: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute, 1957).}
- S: Stog Palace manuscript Kanjur (mdo sde, Za 240a6-266b7)\footnote{The Tog Palace manuscript of the Tibetan Kanjur, Vol. 73 (Leh, Ladakh: Smanrtsis Shesrig Dpemzod, 1980).}
- T: Tokyo manuscript Kanjur (mdo sde, Za, 222a5-247b8)\footnote{Manuscript Kanjur in the Kawaguchi Collection of the Tōyō Bunko. Many thanks to Caleb Carter and Nobumi Iyanaga for helping me obtain a copy of the Tokyo Kanjur text from the Tōyō Bunko.}
I chose these six Kanjurs because they were relatively easy to acquire and because they represent both the Tshal pa and Them spans ma recensional lines (or the “eastern” and “western” groups, respectively). I have not produced a stemma or checked for “corruption” between recensional lines. I can only offer the observation that in the Dānapāramitā many textual variants are shared by the Derge, Narthang, and Peking Kanjurs on the one hand, and the Shel dkar, Stog Palace, and Tokyo Kanjurs on the other. This accords well with the general consensus, if oversimplified, that the Derge, Narthang, and Peking Kanjurs belong to the Tshal pa line, whereas the Shel dkar, Stog Palace, and Tokyo Kanjurs belong to the Them spans ma line.68

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

---

B. English Translation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3 I am confused by the placement of bcom ldan 'das nyid kyi rtsa lag dang / yul gyi mi rnams la phan gdaqs pa'i phyir, after which there is a daṇḍa in L and S. As it stands, it seems like the Buddha’s discourse is...
Śuddhodana, which was ornamented with many hundreds of thousands of sāl trees, palm trees, garcinia trees, golden shower trees, jujube trees, walnut trees, wild date trees, banyan trees, kadam trees, mango trees, pear trees, myrobalan trees, bael wood apple trees, pomegranate trees, elephant wood apple trees, plantain trees, Indian fig trees, cluster fig trees, beleric trees, pipal trees, Arabian jasmines, royal jasmines, bamboo, hiptage creepers, champak trees, ashoka trees, white roses, trumpet flower trees, acacias, arjuna trees, and Indian coral trees, made beautiful by having banks of foothill and mountain streams, small lakes, ponds, pools, and fragrant springs that were filled with blue lotus, red lotus, white water

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

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

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

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

7 The Tibetan here is shing ljon, which can translate generic Sanskrit words for tree like vṛkṣa and pādapa. Given the nature of this list, however, we are most likely dealing with one species or at least one type of tree. In this light Skt. druma would make more sense, since it has associations with a particular tree brought to Indra’s paradise. See MW, s.vv. druma and pārijāta.
lily, and white lotus flowers,⁸ made beautiful with hundreds of thousands of singing geese,⁹ peacocks, cranes, shelducks, cuckoos, ospreys, parrots, common mynas, pheasants, partridges, nightingales,¹⁰ and coots,¹¹ and bees, which had water that was endowed with the eight [good] attributes¹² and totally filled with clarity, fragrance, utter coolness, nonturbidity, and absolute purity, which had fields that were green, soft, fresh, and comforting to touch, like silk, wool, cotton, Mon silk, kācilindika,¹³ and linen cloth, a fine area that was delightful, pristine, and without rocks, small stones, gravel, filth, swamps, or refuse, and that supported many kinds of wild animals—groups of deer,¹⁴ spotted deer, monkeys, cats, weasels,¹⁵ rabbits, bears, hyenas, and birds. Hundreds of thousands of gods of the night, daughters of the gods, world guardians, Varuṇa, Śiva, Yama, Virūḍhaka, Kubera, Indra, Virūpākṣa, Dhṛtarāṣṭra, demigods, mythical

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

¹⁵ Here L reads srin mo (Skt. rākṣasi), “female demons,” which does not fit the context.
eagles, celestial musicians, centaurs, and mighty serpent spirits were supported by and dwelled at [that] place.

There was a great Community of monks. [In total] there were 77,000 monks, including the venerable Śāriputra, the venerable Maudgalyāyana, the venerable Subhūti, the venerable Kapphiṇa, the venerable Gavāmpati, the venerable Mahākausṭhila, the venerable Bharadvāja, the venerable Ājñātakaunḍinya, the venerable Bhadrika, the venerable Pūrṇa, the venerable Subhadra, the venerable Cūḍapanthaka, the venerable Vakkula, the venerable Rāhula, the venerable Upananda, the venerable Nanda, and the venerable Ānanda. They, as well as the other 77,000 monks, all of them together, to wit, except for one person, the venerable Ānanda, were all Worthy Ones who had destroyed their contaminations, were without defilements, had become powerful, had utterly liberated minds and utterly liberated wisdom, were of good breeding, were [like] great elephants, had performed their duties.

---

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

17 Skt. arhat.

18 Skt. kṣīṇāsrava.

19 Skt. niṣkleśa.

20 Skt. vaśībhūta.

21 Skt. suvimuktacitta.

22 Skt. suvimuktaprajña.

23 Tib. cang shes pa, translating Skt. ājaneya or something close to it, really means “all knowing,” not “well bred.” At some point the Tibetan translators misunderstood ājāneya to be a derivative of the
performed their tasks, laid down their burdens, attained their own goals, totally destroyed the bonds to existence, utterly liberated their minds with correct knowledge, and attained the ultimate supremacy in control over the whole mind.

There was a large group of Aspirants to Awakening [including] many myriads of millions of Aspirants to Awakening, such as the Aspirant to Awakening—Great Hero Maitreya, Mañjuśrī the true prince, Avalokiteśvara, Mahāsthāmaprāpta, Samantabhadra,

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

24 Skt. mahānāga.
25 Skt. kṛtakṛtya.
26 Skt. kṛtakarāṇīya.
27 Skt. apaḥṛtabhāra. The “burden” is a reference to the five skandhas, the aggregates that, according to Buddhist thought, make up living beings who are trapped in cyclical existence. The Bhāra-sutta of the Saṃyutta Nikāya deals with this idea at some length.
28 Skt. anuprāptasvakārtha.
29 Skt. pariksīnabhavasamyojana.
30 Skt. samyagājñāsuvimuktacitta.
31 Skt. sarvacetovaśiparamapāramiprāpta. This is a standard Buddhist list of śrāvakaguṇas or qualities of the Buddha’s disciples. See Mvy. 1074ff.
32 One should not take these numbers very seriously, here or elsewhere—they are part of the ballooned Mahāyāna cosmos (or cosmoses) and mean little more than “inconceivably large.”
33 This is bodhisattva-mahāsattva. See above in n. 1 for remarks and sources on the translation of bodhisattva. “Great hero” is one meaning of mahāsattva in operation not only in Mahāyāna works, but apparently in Sanskrit epics as well. It is also how the Tibetan translators may have understood the term (sems dpa’ chen po, literally something like “great heroic mind”). Of course, there are problems with my rendering sattva differently in two successive words.
34 The further down the list of Aspirants to Awakening, the more speculative their Sanskrit names become. In some cases, I am not even sure I divide the names correctly, given the way Tibetan breaks apart Sanskrit compounds. Of course, the variable and sometimes arbitrary nature of Tibetan
Ākāśagarbha, Devamukūṭa, Ratnamukūṭa, Ratnapāṇi, Ratnaprabha, Ratnagarbha, Ratnacūḍa, Ratnasimha, Ratnajāla, Jālinīprabha, Sūryaprabha, Candraprabha, Dṛḍhasthāma, Dṛḍhamati, Dṛḍhavīrya, Dṛḍhavikrama, Dṛḍhotsāha, Mahotsāha, Prāmodyarāja, Bhaīṣajyarāja, Bhaīṣajya-samudgata, Šubhavimalaviśuddhacandraprabharāja, Kamaladalavimalanakṣatrarāja-saṁkusumītābhiṣīna,35 Bhramarakālakamayūracāṣastyāyitarājitaṭāmukūṭa,36 Padmacandra-smitaprkāśītottānamukhavarṇa, Nīlaratnātīśobhananetragaṇaratnaketu, Samāviraṇukładanta,37 Rajataśaṅkhacandraprobhuddhaṣukla, Kadalapratālaparnajhaviśālāmrapatīta, Kokilaśūkasārikakunālalaviṅkūjanamanojñaḥgaṅgoṣvavrāṇa, Kāyaśana, Bālārka, and Rājavṛkṣasahakārapuṣpākarakadambhūta, and the Aspirant to Awakening—Great Hero Sūkṣmamṛdutaruṇatanukomalasukumārapuṣpakaracaraṇatāmranakha. They, as well as all the

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

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

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

37 Our author(s) evidently named this Aspirant to Awakening after one of the qualities (Skt. lakṣana)—actually, three qualities in one according to one version of the list of qualities—of a Great Man (Skt. mahāpuruṣa): his teeth were even, without gaps, and white. Not unexpectedly, that this was a mark of superhuman beauty in India does not say much for the health and appearance of the average person’s teeth.
other 99,000 Aspirants to Awakening, were irreversible,\textsuperscript{38} turned the irreversible wheel of the Law, vanquished Māra and [other] foes, fully passed beyond all the deeds of Māra,\textsuperscript{39} were skilled in knowing [how to] enter into the regions of all the Thus Come Ones, had the superknowledges,\textsuperscript{40} attained the formula\textsuperscript{41} that will bring about entry into the full extent of the Śūraṅgama-concentration, mastered comprehending the skillful strategies with regard to all the Perfections, taught various world spheres, wore the great armor,\textsuperscript{42} and did not have doubt in the qualities of an Awakened One. Having fully vanquished excessive pride together with [mental] impressions and connections\textsuperscript{43} by means of thinking about all the [mental] impressions of the major and minor defilements, they were disciplined and certain,\textsuperscript{44} entered


\textsuperscript{39} These generally number ten—see, e.g., Bendall, ed., \textit{Śūraṃgama-sūtra}, 151.13-152.19.

\textsuperscript{40} Skt. \textit{abhijña}.

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

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

\textsuperscript{43} Tib. \textit{bag chags dang mtshams sbyor ba}. Nattier, \textit{A Few Good Men}, 293, n. 561 conjectures that the Sanskrit here is \textit{vāsanasambandha}. However, it is more likely \textit{vāsana(pratiksāṃdhi)—according to Mvy. 2166, mtshams sbyor ba med pa = apratisāṃdhi}.

\textsuperscript{44} It is difficult to tell whether the Tibetan here reads \textit{nges pa} or \textit{des pa}. If the latter (and D looks much more like \textit{des pa}), the translation of this phrase should instead be “disciplined and gentle.”
into the establishments of mental awareness, the correct exertions, the bases of supernatural power, the faculties, the strengths, the branches of awakening, and the path,\(^\text{45}\) had abundant friendliness, compassion, joy, equanimity,\(^\text{46}\) forbearance,\(^\text{47}\) [good] intentions, and [good] propensities, were free from pride, haughtiness, arrogance, conceit,\(^\text{48}\) self-inflation,\(^\text{49}\) avarice, narcissism, self-possession, intense clinging, attachment, clinging, lassitude, craving thirst, and strong clinging, made strenuous efforts to benefit themselves, benefit others, and [provide] ease for incalculable hundreds of thousands of myriads of millions of eons, had a disposition that completely effected the compilation and accumulation of roots of virtue, and were free from the strong-arming,\(^\text{50}\) threats, quarreling, fighting, contention, strife, dispute,\(^\text{51}\)

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

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

\(^{47}\) Skt. *kṣānti*, about which see Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 244, n. 240.

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

\(^{49}\) The Sanskrit for *khengs pa* is probably *stambha*. See Mvy. 7339.

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

\(^{51}\) On Sanskrit and Tibetan equivalences for terms of the “quarrel series” in some Buddhist texts, see Prods Oktor Skjærvø, ed. and trans., *This Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras: The Khotanese Suvarnabhāsottamasūtra*, Vol. II: Manuscripts, Commentary, Glossary, Indexes (Sources of Oriental Languages
and minor defilements on account of deception, guile, lies, slander, harsh words, injury, doing harm, punishment, and pernicious views.

Together with them, there were also the four world guardians, namely the great king Vaiśravaṇa, the great king Dhṛtarāṣṭra, the great king Virūḍhaka, and the great king Virūpākṣa, each surrounded by a retinue of his respective attendants. There was the great leader of the earth spirits, Pāṇcika, accompanied by a retinue of his own sons, as well as the great leader of the earth spirits, Vajrapāṇi, accompanied by a retinue of his own earth spirits. There was Hāritī, the mother of mighty ghosts, accompanied by a retinue of her own female earth spirits, as well as Śaṅkhinī, Śūlinī, Pītā, Durgā, Mahāśrīdevī, Sarasvatī, Bhairavī, and Literatures 61) (Cambridge: The Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University, 2004), 163–164, 6.2.48.

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

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

A female supernatural figure, probably a demon.

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

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

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

This is one designation for the Hindu Goddess (Devī), who takes on various forms and names, including some others from the present list. In the Devī-Mahāmya, itself embedded within the larger Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, the Goddess is represented by Kāli, Lakṣmī, Sarasvatī, and Durgā, among others. It is difficult to know whether our author(s) gave much thought to Mahāśrīdevī’s being a goddess with a distinct identity or whether she is merely a name among a hodgepodge of supernatural characters drawn from the Indian pantheon.
Candra, Śakra, the lord of the gods, Maheśvara, a son of the gods, and Brahmā, ruler of Sahā, accompanied by his own retinue of sons of the gods. There was Anavatapta, an otherworldly snake king, as well as Sāgara, an otherworldly snake king, each accompanied by his own retinue of otherworldly snakes. There was Mahātejas, a lord of mythical eagles, as well as Mahākāya, a lord of mythical eagles, each accompanied by his own retinue of mythical eagles. There was Balin, a lord of demigods, as well as Rāhu, a lord of demigods, each accompanied by his retinue of troops. There was Druma, a centaur king, accompanied by his own retinue of centaurs. There was Pañcaśikha, a son of celestial musicians, accompanied by his own retinue. Other than them, there were immeasurable, incalculable, exceedingly splendid gods, otherworldly snakes, earth spirits, celestial musicians, demigods, mythical eagles, centaurs, humans, and spirits. There were the four social classes: priests, warrior-kings, farmer-traders, and servants. There was the fourfold assembly: monks, nuns, lay brothers, and lay sisters. There were hundreds of thousands of myriads of millions of Śākyans.

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

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

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

61 This is my best effort at translating bltas nas, the Tibetan rendering of the absolutive of the Skt. verbal root √dṛś. Some opt not to translate forms of √dṛś and instead use something like “to have darśan,” but, again, I avoid all foreign words in my translation outside of proper names. As is well known, although √dṛś literally means “to see,” this rendering would fall short of capturing its religious nuances. “Seeing” in India carries almost tactile connotations: To see the Awakened One is to touch his divine presence. The classic work to consult is still Diana L. Eck, Darśan: Seeing the Divine Image in India (New York: Columbia University Press, 1981), though it is slanted toward the modern period. Gregory Schopen, “Burial Ad Sanctos,” in Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks, 116-117 underscores the importance of darśan in the Mahāparinibbāna-sutta. See also Boucher, Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna,
ministers, people of the royal court, and doormen, they [the assembly] honored, revered, venerated, and did him homage. The Blessed One obtained a lot of excellent food, bedding and seats, medicine for curing disease, and [other] necessities, and innumerable, immeasurable, incalculable world spheres of the ten directions also extensively celebrated the fame, acclaim, and renown of the Blessed One.

At a level\(^{63}\) spot at the adamantine center [of this setting or of the world], which was delightful, extensive, broad, well sprinkled with water, well swept, well arranged, scented from censers, strewn with blue lotus flowers, as well as the flowers of the red lotus, white water lily, white lotus, hiptage creeper, Arabian jasmine, white rose, trumpet flower tree, aśoka tree, yellow amaranth, royal jasmine, and velvetleaf, and made beautiful with Indian coral trees\(^{64}\) of many kinds of precious substances,\(^{65}\) he [the Awakened One] was sitting on a lion throne set with jewels,\(^{66}\) covered with hundreds of thousands of bejeweled pieces of calico,\(^{67}\) decorated with a bejeweled canopy, decorated with a net of bejeweled bells, and hung with bejeweled

178, n. 20 and the other sources cited there. The use of √drś and its nominal derivatives in Indian Buddhist texts remains ripe for study.

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

\(^{63}\) Flatness is a common characteristic of paradisiacal settings in Buddhist literature.

\(^{64}\) See n. 7 above on Indian coral trees.

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

\(^{66}\) See MW, s.v. ratnagarbha.

\(^{67}\) “Calico,” a type of Indian cloth, translates ras bcos bu (Skt. dusya or dāṣya). See BHSD, s.v. 2 dusya.
streamers. It was adorned with many kinds of precious things, ornamented with hundreds of thousands of myriads of millions of precious things: precious stones,\(^{68}\) gold, diamonds, lapis lazuli, pearls, shells, crystal, coral, sapphires, beryl,\(^{69}\) emeralds,\(^{70}\) precious rocks,\(^{71}\) and quartz.

He had obtained serene faculties, a serene mind, discipline, and the ultimate calm, had obtained discipline and the best calm, was the guardian, was the chief, had restrained faculties, was clear, pure, and unsullied, like a lake, was elevated, like a bejeweled staff,\(^{72}\) remained brilliant, radiant, and vivid, had a body that was well ornamented with the thirty-two marks of a Great Man, had a body that was made beautiful with the eighty\(^{73}\) secondary characteristics, was totally filled with the water of the True Law, like the great ocean, was imperturbable, like Mt. Meru, was the sustenance for all beings, like the earth, produced roots of virtue, like water,

---

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

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

\(^{70}\) Tib. *ma rgad* translates Skt. *marakata*.

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

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

\(^{73}\) D and P omit the expected number eighty for the secondary characteristics (Skt. *anuvyaṅjana*).
was fair-minded, as in a [just] transaction, was untainted, like the sky, dispelled the darkness of not knowing, like the sun, perfected the virtuous qualities, like the moon, totally and completely effected all intentions, like a wish-fulfilling gem, dawnd like the sun, radiated with splendor, like the sun, was cool and gratifying, like the moon, was the true source of jewels, like the ocean, was deep, like the ocean, shone like a mass of fire, had an imperturbable body, had unwavering thoughts, was serene and tranquil, did not have wandering faculties, was not self-inflated or supercilious, was well established within mental awareness, had beautiful physical postures, was thoroughly concentrating, was always concentrating, fully brought about all the roots of virtue for hundreds of thousands of millions of eons into the extreme future, amassed all the accumulations of merit, had skillful strategies with regard to all the Perfections, was focused on comprehension, amused himself in all the levels of the Awakened Ones and Aspirants to Awakening, and mentally practiced all the practices of an Aspirant to Awakening. So that all beings would benefit and be comforted, with effort he taught the Law, which was religiously pure, good at the beginning, good in the middle, and

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

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

76 Tib. _mi rgod pa_ = Skt. _anauddhatya_? See _Mvy_. 1979 and 5193. According to _BHSD_, s.v., _auddhatya_ can mean “mentally frivolous” in Buddhist texts, but that meaning does not seem to work so well in the whole phrase, _ma khengs shing mi rgod pa_.

77 “Physical postures” translates _spyod lam_, which in Buddhist usage usually has the technical sense of the four positions the body can assume: walking, standing, sitting, and lying down. See _BHSD_, s.v. _īryāpatha_.

78 I loosely translate _brtson pa de_ as an agentive noun plus a demonstrative pronoun, but it is not impossible that the _pa_ should be ignored and this should be translated as a verb with a continuative particle: “He made efforts and taught the Law so that all beings would benefit and be comforted.”
good at the end, fine in meaning, fine in expression, unadulterated, totally perfect, totally pure, totally immaculate,\(^7\) without blemish, luminous, delightful, pleasant, brought gratification, brought utter joy, was rousing, brought contentment and expanded the mind, was absolutely pure, fearless, not harsh, enduring, profound, unwavering, unchanging, inscrutable, not within the scope of reasoning, impenetrable by thought, amazing, and indescribable yet beyond indescribable. He taught, explained, analyzed, elucidated and illuminated it.

At that time an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero named Giriguhaśikharagiri-kandarāntarakuṃja-vijṛmbhaṇādavaṇardottamasiṃhanarendra-cūḍāmaṇi,\(^8\) who had a good figure, was beautiful, dear to see, had a fine complexion, was expansive, had what was best, had performed services for former Conquerors, produced roots of virtue, paid honor to many hundreds of thousands of myriads of millions of Awakened Ones, continued the lineage of the Three Jewels,\(^9\) was compassionate, had unrestricted eloquence,\(^10\) affection for people,

---

\(^7\) At least this much is a standard list of epithets for Dharma. See Mvy. 1279-1289.

\(^8\) This is my attempt at a Sanskrit rendering of the interlocutor of this text, who is called in Tibetan: ri’i phug dang / zom dang / ri sul dang / gseb dang / sman ljon gs na seng ge’i mchog rnam par bskyings shing nga ro rnam par srogs pa lta bu’i mi’i dbang po’i gtsug gi nor bu. In English, his name could be translated something like “the crest jewel of the lord of men who was like the best of lions yawning and sounding a roar at mountain caves, peaks, mountain valleys, passes, and bowers.” However mistaken my reconstructed Sanskrit is, I would bet our character would place well in a contest for the longest name in world literature.

\(^9\) On this idea, Nattier, A Few Good Men, 214, n. 44 makes the important remark:
The expression 'lineage of the three jewels' ... carries a great deal more weight than at first meets the eye. What is at issue here is not merely the preservation of the teachings of Śākyamuni (for which the simple term saddharma would more commonly be used), but the possibility of the rediscovery of the same truths in the future by others who will replicate his career. The underlying idea is, in essence, that if no one in the Buddhist community chooses to become a bodhisattva rather than to strive for Arhatship, there will be no possibility of the appearance of another Buddha in the future, and the lineage to which Śākyamuni himself belonged ... will become extinct.
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excellent faith, virtuous intentions, was enduring, profound, had a loving heart, was compassionate, gentle,\textsuperscript{83} at ease among company, learned, wise, illuminating, perspicacious, dexterous,\textsuperscript{84} not lazy, utterly disciplined, great in his gentle virtue, not deceptive, guileless, not harsh, not rough, upright, was free from pride, haughtiness, arrogance, hardheartedness,\textsuperscript{85} anger, envy, avarice, narcissism, self-possession, intense clinging, suffering, mental unease, and ignorance, and was endowed with merit, gathered and sat with that very retinue. Then the Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero Giriguhaśikharagirikandarāntarakuñjavīrmbhaṇanāda-vinardottamasimhanarendracūḍāmaṇi got up from his mat. After putting his upper robe over one shoulder, he put his right knee down on the center of a red lotus. He bent his cupped hands toward the Blessed One, and then said these words to the Blessed One: “If, for the sake of answering a question after I have asked, the Blessed One grants me the opportunity, I want to ask the Blessed One, the Thus Come One, the Worthy One, the Fully and Completely Awakened One, about a certain matter.” Those words being said, the Blessed One spoke these words to the Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero Giriguhaśikharagirikandarāntarakuñjavīrmbhaṇanāda-vinardottamasimhanarendracūḍāmaṇi: “Son from a good family,\textsuperscript{86} because all Awakened Ones

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

\textsuperscript{83} See BHSD, s.vv. sūrata and sauratya.

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

\textsuperscript{85} See BHSD, s.v. khila.

\textsuperscript{86} “Son from a good family” translates Skt. kulaputra, “daughter from a good family” kuladuhitṛ. Jan Nattier avoids the “well-established Buddhist Hybrid English expressions ‘son of good family’ and ‘daughter of good family’ both because they are needlessly wooden and because they fail to capture the
and Aspirants to Awakening will always grant you an opportunity, son from a good family, please ask the Blessed One, the Thus Come One, the Worthy One, the Fully and Completely Awakened One, whatever you want. I will gladden your mind with an answer for that particular question.”

Those words being spoken, the Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero Giriguhaśikharagirikandarāntarakuṇjavijṛmbhaṇādavinardottamasimhanarendracūḍāmaṇi said these words to the Blessed One: “Blessed One, indeed with regard to what does a son from a good family or a daughter from a good family who has generated the first aspiration [i.e., for awakening\(^{87}\)] make strong efforts?”

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

\(^{87}\) Skt. [bodhi]citta. On translating this pregnant term, see Wangchuk, The Resolve to Become a Buddha, esp. 69-70.
The Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero Giriguhaśikharagirikandarāntarakuñja-vijrmbhanādavinardottamasimhanarendracūḍāmaṇi, after saying “Wonderful!” to the Blessed One, listened accordingly to the Blessed One, and the Blessed One spoke to him:

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

The same word, “rob” (Tib. ’phrog pa and related forms), is applied to wealth and a wife. Clearly, our author(s) conceived of both as property that could be illicitly taken.
“Then, how has he rejected telling lies? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “truth,” even for earth spirits, ghosts, and demons, is dear, valuable, sweet, and delightful. Because the truth for me, too, is dear, valuable, sweet, and delightful, may nobody disparage me, cause me to be disparaged, or approve of my being disparaged with the telling of lies. I, too, am not to disparage anyone, cause anyone to be disparaged, or approve of anyone’s being disparaged with the telling of lies.’ In that way, son from a good family, an Aspirant to Awakening—Great Hero has rejected telling lies.” Then this was said:

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

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

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

91 Is it not certain whether the earth spirit and the ghost are the subject of the verse—those who consider the truth dear—or the object of the disparaging words. I have chosen the former since it more closely follows the preceding prose section, though it seems a little odd that they would be described as wise (shes rab can).
possessing harsh words, are not dear, valuable, sweet, or delightful. Because harsh words for me, too, are not dear, valuable, sweet, or delightful, may nobody hurt me, cause me to be hurt, or approve of my being hurt with the speaking of harsh words, or with cruel speech, rough speech, or untrue speech. I, too, am not to hurt anyone, cause anyone to be hurt, or approve of anyone’s being hurt with the speaking of harsh words, or with cruel speech, rough speech, or untrue speech.’ In that way, son from a good family, an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero has rejected speaking harsh words.” Then this was said:

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

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

---

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

93 Here the Tibetan is missing the expected par mi bya after gzhug. I assume this is a mistake and translate accordingly.
“Then, how has an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero rejected covetousness? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘What is called “covetousness,” even for covetous people, is not dear, valuable, sweet, or delightful. Because covetousness for me, too, is not dear, valuable, sweet, or delightful, may nobody describe me, cause me to be described, or approve of my being described with covetous words. I, too, am not to describe anyone, cause anyone to be described, or approve of anyone’s being described with covetous words.’ In that way, son from a good family, an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero has rejected covetousness.” Then this was said:

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

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

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

94 I am not certain what it means to describe someone with covetous words. It may mean to describe someone as covetous. More likely, it could mean that the speaker is covetous, using words indicating that he envies the qualities or possessions of the person being described.
have entered into what is incorrect, is not dear, valuable, sweet, or delightful. Because an incorrect view for me, too, is not dear, valuable, sweet, or delightful, may nobody teach me, cause me to be taught, or approve of my being taught with words with incorrect views. I, too, am not to teach anyone, cause anyone to be taught, or approve of anyone’s being taught with words with incorrect views.’ In that way, son from a good family, an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero has rejected incorrect views.” Then this was said:

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

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

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

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

“Furthermore, son from a good family, an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero who has generated the first aspiration is to make strong efforts with regard to the ten Perfections. Which ten? Namely: the Perfection of Giving, the Perfection of Ethical Conduct, the Perfection of Forbearance, the Perfection of Exertion, the Perfection of Meditation, the Perfection of Wisdom, and the Perfections of Strategies, Oaths, Strength, and Knowledge. Son from a good family, in that case how does an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero make strong efforts with
regard to those ten Perfections? Son from a good family, in this case an Aspirant to Awakening–Great Hero gives gifts, guards ethical conduct, cultivates forbearance, undertakes exertion, meditates in meditation, galvanizes wisdom, becomes skilled in strategies, proclaims oaths, enters into strength, and enters into knowledge.

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

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

“When one gives gifts of food,  
Which are given by one possessing wisdom,  
There are five [things] as a result:  

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

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

96 Tib. tshig bla dags = Skt. adhivacana (Mvy. 6333).
Become endowed with unrestricted eloquence.

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

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to giving drinks? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving drinks” is a synonym for dispelling all the craving thirst [sred pa] of the defilements.

Therefore, it is certain that I am to give gifts of drinks.’ When he gives that gift of drinks, in accordance with an oath that was commended by the Awakened One, he proclaims the oath:

---

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


99 Skt. tṛṣṇā.

100 The Tibetan of the Aksayamatinirdesa-sūtra is extremely close here: nyan mongs pa dang sred pa thams cad bsal ba'i phyir btung ba 'dod pa rnam las btung ba sbyin pa'o (Braarvig, ed., Aksayamatīnirdeśasūtra, Vol. I, 30.12-13).
‘On account of this gift of drinks, may I cause all the oceans of the craving thirst [sred pa] of the defilements of all beings to dry up and may I satisfy them with drinks that have the flavor of absolute liberation.” Then there were also additional words:

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

“By giving a vehicle, a great seer, intelligent, 
Goes through space\textsuperscript{104} by means of supernatural power, 
From an Awakened One’s field to \textsuperscript{105} other fields, \textsuperscript{105} 
[With force] similar to the force of a bird.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to giving clothing?\textsuperscript{106} Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving clothing,” because it is a synonym for cleaning up one’s modesty, \textsuperscript{107} decency, \textsuperscript{108} and appearance, it is certain that I am to give gifts of clothing.’\textsuperscript{109} When he gives that gift of clothing, in accordance with an oath that was assented to\textsuperscript{110} by the Awakened One, he

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{107} See \textit{MW}, s.v. \textit{hrī} (= Tib. \textit{ngo tsha shes pa}).

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

\textsuperscript{109} The idea is that clothing should be used decorously to cover up the body, and thus the reward for giving clothing is an improvement in one’s appearance and visible decorum. See Silk, trans., “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratanakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 369, esp. n. 4. Compare also a verse from the \textit{Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra}:

\textit{bhūṣanā lakṣanāny eṣām aṣṭiś cānuvyañjanāḥ / hrīrapatrāpyavastrās te kalyāṇādhyāśayāḥ śubhāḥ} // (Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature, The Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism, ed., \textit{Vimalakīrtinirdeśa}, 312, verse 8 (with minor emendations)). Here Vimalakīrti explains that bodhisattvas’ “clothing is modesty and decency” (\textit{hrīrapatrāpyavastrās}). And cf. Braarvig, ed., \textit{Aksṭayamatirinirdeśasūtra}, Vol. I, 30.14-16: \textit{ngo tsha shes pa dang / khrel yod pa dang / gser gyi kha dog lta bu’i mdo gungs su sbyang ba’i phyir gos ’dod pa rnam la gos sbyin pa’o}.

\textsuperscript{110} This is a soft reading of \textit{gnang ba} (from Skt. \textit{anuvyānā}), which can come closer to “order” or “prescribe” when referring to something said by the Awakened One. Given the parallel oaths in the text, however, I think a softer reading is preferred here.
proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of clothing, may I clean up the modesty, decency, and appearance of all beings.’” Then there were also additional words:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Then there were also additional words:

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

“By giving lamps, that man,
In [all] worlds at all times,
Successively gets
The five eyes\(^\text{114}\) of Awakened Ones.\(^\text{115}\)

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

---

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

\(^{113}\) Tib. kun mkhyen ye shes = Skt. sarvajñajñāna or the like.

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

\(^{115}\) The divine eye, according to many doctrinal lists, is the second of the five eyes. See BHSD, s.v. cakṣus.

\(^{116}\) The ending of the Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra present only in the Chinese version also includes the divine ear as a reward for giving music—see Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” 50. Also cf. ibid., 46 (no. 24). The reward for giving music in the Akṣayamatinirdeṣa is “purifying the divine ear” (with lha’i snyan
gifts of music.’ When he gives that gift of music, in accordance with an oath that the Awakened One entertained, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of music, may I perfect the divine ear of all beings.”” Then there were also additional words:

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

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

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

117 Then this was said:

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

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

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

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

Then there were also additional words:

“By giving flowers and flower garlands,
May one quickly and in every way

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

“By giving flowers and flower garlands,
Wherever one has been born,
Let kings, ministers, and petty kings.\(^{119}\)
Always pay him homage and exalt him there.

“They then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to gifts of delicacies [ro bro ba]? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving delicacies,” because it is a synonym for the mark of a Great Man that is [called] the height of taste [ro bro ba], it is certain that I am to give gifts of delicacies, [such as those that have] the flavor of grapes, the flavor of sugarcane,\(^{120}\) the flavor of honey, the flavor of butter, the flavor of oil, or the flavor of salt.’ When he gives that gift of delicacies, in accordance with an oath that was commended by the Awakened One, he proclaims the oath:

‘On account of this gift of flavors [ro], may I totally perfect the mark of a Great Man that is [called] the height of taste for all beings.’\(^{121}\) Then this was said:

“With a gift of flavors,
May one perfect
The practice leading to awakening\(^{122}\) of a Completely Awakened One

---

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

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

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

\(^{122}\) Tib. *byang chub kyi spyod pa* = Skt. *bodhicaryā*.
By means of the essence of the flavor of omniscience.

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

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

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

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

---

Divyāvadāna,” 44 (no. 14).

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

125 Tib. 'dzam bu'i gling is a transliteration for jambudvīpa, the island or continent of the jambu fruit. Skt. jambu has traditionally been equated with the Rose Apple tree (Syzygium jambos), but the tree native to India has now, in fact, been shown to be the Black Plum (Syzygium cumini). See D. Wujastyk, “Jambudvīpa: Apples or Plums?” in Studies in the History of the Exact Sciences in honour of David Pingree, ed. Charles Burnett, Jan P. Hogendijk, Kim Plofker, and Michio Yano (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 287-301. I owe this reference to Karttunen, “Bhramarotpitādharāḥ,” 98, n. 23.
“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to giving beds and pillows? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving beds and pillows,” because it is a synonym for a gift of bedding and throw pillows\textsuperscript{127} of a Noble One who has permanently taken away all the coverings\textsuperscript{129} and a Thus Come One [in?]\textsuperscript{130} a divine, holy state,\textsuperscript{131} it is certain that I am to give gifts of beds and pillows.’ When

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

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

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{131} Tib. \textit{tshangs pa'i} \textit{gnas} (Skt. \textit{brahmavihāra}) is a Buddhist technical term that is extremely difficult to translate. K.R. Norman suggests that the term may have been borrowed from its original Brahmanical context, where it meant either living in the absolute \textit{brahman} or with the deity Brahmā. See “Theravāda Buddhism and Brahmanical Hinduism: Brahmanical Terms in a Buddhist Guise,” in \textit{The Buddhist Forum}, vol. II: \textit{Seminar Papers 1988–90}, ed. Tadeusz Skorupski (London: University of London (SOAS), 1991), 195–196. At any rate, here the term refers to both a heavenly location and to the four “immeasurable” (Skt. \textit{apramāṇa}) mental states commonly mentioned in Buddhist literature, on which see Dayal, \textit{The Bodhisattva Doctrine}, 225–229; Lamotte, \textit{L’Enseignement de Vimalakīrti}, 19, n. 66; Pagel, \textit{The}
he gives that gift of beds and pillows, in accordance with an oath that was taught by the Awakened One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of beds and pillows, may I give bedding and throw pillows of [for?] a Noble One who has permanently taken away all the coverings of all beings and a Thus Come One [in?] a divine, holy state.’”

Then there were also additional words:

“On account of what little merit I have accumulated
By giving beds and pillows,
May I remove the coverings of men [and]
The pernicious intellects of the wicked.

“With the blade of wisdom, may one cut through the net
Of pernicious views of living creatures.
May one give the supportive, holy state,
The best of beds that is worthy of the Well Gone Ones.

“A man who gives beds and pillows
Will be born skilled in the treatises.
One who attains calm and gives extensively
Will, arising from a lotus, be resplendent and youthful.

Bodhisattvapiṭaka, 133–145. There may also be a wordplay going on with vihāra, “enjoyment” or “pleasure grounds,” and the imagery of the comfortable bedding.


133 Up to now each Tibetan foot of verse has had seven syllables, but these next verses have nine syllables per foot. I cannot say whether this reflects a difference in the number of syllables in the Sanskrit verses, or whether it was merely the whimsical choice of the Tibetan translators, though one might expect the former. See Skjærvø, ed. and trans., This Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras, Vol. II, 122, 3.61.

134 Here I follow D’s bsten pa against all the others. The bstan pa of L, N, Q, S, and T—unless they mean stan, “seat”?—instead makes the reading “May one give the teaching of the holy state” or “May one give the revelation of the holy state,” but I opt to continue with the bedding imagery.

135 Tib. bstan bcos = Skt. śāstra (Mvy. 1443).

136 It is tempting to suggest that this is a reference to being reborn in a “Pure Land,” especially Sukhāvatī, but there is no other information on which to draw a credible conclusion. Given the lavish, almost supernatural setting described at the beginning of our text, we need not resort to a “Pure Land” for such a phenomenal event—in this text’s world being born from a lotus might just as well occur on “Earth.”
“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to giving mats? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving mats,” because it is a synonym for attaining the adamantine seat of the terrace of awakening on the surface of each of the thousand-cubed great thousand-world spheres, it is certain that I am to give gifts of mats.’ When he gives that gift of mats, in accordance with an oath in agreement with the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of mats, may I cause all beings to attain the adamantine seat of the terrace of awakening on the surface of each of the thousand-cubed great thousand-world spheres.’” Then this was said:

“On account of this gift of mats,
May adamantine seats of the terrace of awakening
That are good, firm, and durable
Arise for living creatures.

“Made from the seven kinds of precious things, [the seats will be]
Two miles in height and
One mile in circumference,
Striking, like Mt. Meru, and

“Surrounded by a hundred heavenly trees of jewels,

---

137 That is, giving a seat allows all beings one day to reach awakening on their own hallowed “terrace” or “circle” or “seat of awakening” (Skt. bodhimaṇḍa), as did Śākyamuni.

138 Skt. trisāhasramahāsāhasra lokadhātu, often translated as “trichiliochosm.” In Mahāyāna cosmology, every world sphere or universe contains a thousand worlds that contain a thousand worlds of their own, and every one of the latter worlds also has a thousand worlds. The total number of worlds therefore equals one thousand cubed, i.e., one billion. See Sadakata, *Buddhist Cosmology*, 93-95. One of the only features consistent across Mahāyāna Sūtras is the gargantuan setting they operate in and the enormous number of characters populating that setting.


140 Although “league” approximates dpag tshad (Skt. yojana) more closely than “mile,” I cannot bring myself to use such a stuffy and outdated word in translation. Indian sources disagree on the exact measurement of a yojana, as is the case for virtually all weights and measures.

141 Tib. ljon shing. There were two earlier instances of shing ljon, but I am not sure whether it and ljon shing translate identical Sanskrit words. (See nn. 7 and 64 above on Indian coral trees.) At any rate, it
Thoroughly ornamented with palatial mansions,
Covered with a net of bells, and
Adorned and illuminated with precious stones and jewels.\textsuperscript{142}

“By giving chairs, mats, and benches
To fellow practitioners,
When cycling in cyclical existences,\textsuperscript{143}
One will attain mats similar to those.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to gifts of necessities?\textsuperscript{144} Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving necessities,” because it is a synonym for perfecting the necessities of awakening, it is certain that I am to give gifts of necessities.’ When he gives that gift of necessities, in accordance with an oath worthy of the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of necessities, may I make the necessities of awakening perfect for all beings.’”\textsuperscript{145} Then there were also additional words:

“With that total surrender of necessities,
May I, moreover, make
The pursuits for the necessities of awakening
Perfect for living creatures.

“By giving forth necessities,
Wherever one has been born,
There he will perfect all the components
That are endowed with the best of all aspects.

\textsuperscript{142} The last two verses describe the seats from the first verse.

\textsuperscript{143} Skt. saṃsāra.

\textsuperscript{144} “Necessities” translates the similarly vague term yo byad (Skt. pariṣkāra) and often denotes mundane household items like furniture.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to giving medicine? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called a “gift of medicine,” because it is a synonym for perfecting for all beings the ease from the immortal nectar\(^{146}\) that is without old age and death, it is certain that I am to give gifts of medicine.’ When he gives that gift of medicine, in accordance with an oath that was empowered by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of medicine, may I make the ease from the immortal nectar that is without old age and death perfect for all beings.’”\(^{147}\) Then this was said:

“With gifts of [medicinal] herbs and medicine,
May all beings quickly attain
Immeasurable lifespans as well as
The immortal nectar of omniscience.

“With gifts of [medicinal] herbs and medicine,
Men will become long lived, remaining without sickness,
With little harm, well, and at ease,
Like the full moon.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders\(^{148}\) male slaves, female slaves, servile workers, and servile wage laborers?\(^{149}\) Son from

---

\(^{146}\) This is an attempt to capture the multivalence of Skt. \textit{amṛta}, which literally means “undead” and hence “immortal,” but also means the nectar of the gods and by extension any medicine that brings deathlessness. Cf. Yuyama, ed., \textit{Prajñāpāramitā-ratna-guna-saṃcaya-gāthā}, 95, verse 4b, in which an Aspirant to Awakening is described as \textit{amṛtasya dāyaku}.

\(^{147}\) The reward for giving medicine in the \textit{Āksyayatinirdeśa} is exactly the same: \textit{mi rṣa mi 'chi ba'i bdud rts'i'i bde ba yongs su bskan̄g ba'i phyir na ba dang sman 'dod pa thams cad la sman sbyin pa'o} (Braarvig, ed., \textit{Āksyayatinirdeśasūtra}, Vol. I, 30.34-35). In the \textit{Dānādhikaraṇa}, a similar reward for giving medicine is promised in the extant Sanskrit version and the Tibetan translation, but not the Chinese (Ware, “Studies in the \textit{Divyāvadāna},” 45 (no. 17)).

\(^{148}\) I translate forms of \textit{yongs su gtong ba} (Skt. \textit{pariṅtyaj}) as “total surrender.” See \textit{MW}, s.v. \textit{pariṅtyaj} and related forms. As I discuss in the introduction, from this point on the text begins using \textit{yongs su gtong ba'i sbyin pa} for most of the gifts, as opposed to the bare \textit{sbyin pa}. 
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a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders male slaves, female slaves, servile workers, and servile wage laborers,” because it is a synonym for perfecting the knowledge that is independent, self-determined, and self-existent by Aspirants to Awakening, it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders male slaves, female slaves, servile workers, and servile wage laborers.’ When he gives that gift that totally surrenders male slaves, female slaves, servile workers, and servile wage laborers, in accordance with an oath that was spoken and taught by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift that totally surrenders male slaves, female slaves, servile workers, and servile wage laborers, may I make the knowledge that is independent, self-determined, and self-existent perfect for all beings.’ Then this was said:

149 We do not normally conceive of a “worker” (las byed pa = Skt. karmakara or karmakāraka) or a “wage laborer” (zho shas 'tsho ba = Skt. pauruṣeya) as property that can be given. However, the authors of the Dānapāramitā-sūtra and many other Buddhist texts—see, for example, the passage from the Sikṣāsamuccaya on pp. 46-47 of chapter II—clearly did, so I add “servile” to my translation. See Uma Chakravarti, “Of Dasas and Karmakaras: Servile Labour in Ancient India,” in Chains of Servitude: Bondage and Slavery in India, ed. Utsa Patnaik and Manjari Dingwaney (Madras: Sangam Books, 1985), 35-75.

150 Tib. rang dga’. I am not sure what the Sanskrit would have been.

151 Tib. rang dbang = Skt. svatantra.

152 Tib. rang byung = Skt. svayāṃbhū.

153 The idea is that giving up those in bondage—and I believe this means letting them go instead of transferring them to another owner—somehow brings about unbounded knowledge in all beings.

154 D and Q omit “totally surrenders.” While there is nothing grammatically incorrect with the plain sbyin pa, given the refrain of yongs su gtong ba'i sbyin pa in this same passage it is most likely an accidental omission. My translation therefore follows the L, N, S, and T.

155 Tha Akṣayamatinirdeśa-sūtra is very similar, except it leaves out “servile workers” and “servile wage laborers” as part of the gift and describes the reward of knowledge as rang nyam instead of rang dga’ (though the Tibetan difference may not reflect one in the underlying Sanskrit—nyam and dga’ can be combined as nyam(s) dga’, “joyous”): rang dbang dang / rang nyam dang / rang byung gi ye shes yongs su
“By surrendering male slaves and female slaves,  
May one, in short, perfect the essence  
Of self-existent knowledge  
For all living creatures.

“By surrendering male slaves and female slaves,  
A man is not born as a slave.  
He lives with enduring self-determination,  
Without dismay and without fear.\textsuperscript{156}

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders all precious things, [including] gold, silver, precious stones, pearls, lapis lazuli, shells, crystal, and coral? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “total surrender of all the precious things, [including] gold, silver, precious stones, pearls, lapis lazuli, shells, crystal, and coral,” because it is a synonym for limitless hundreds of thousands of myriads of millions of Awakened Ones’ fields being illuminated by Aspirants to Awakening [with] light rays, such as those of the color of blue, yellow, red, white, crimson,\textsuperscript{157} glassy white,\textsuperscript{158} and silver,\textsuperscript{159} it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders all precious things, [including] gold, silver, precious stones, pearls, lapis lazuli,
shells, crystal, and coral.” When he gives that gift that totally surrenders all precious things, [including] gold, silver, precious stones, pearls, lapis lazuli, shells, crystal, and coral, in accordance with an oath that was explained and illuminated, and as it was understood, by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of that gift of all the precious things, [including] gold, silver, precious stones, pearls, lapis lazuli, shells, crystal, and coral, may I cause limitless hundreds of thousands of myriads of millions of Awakened Ones’ fields to be illuminated with light rays, such as those of the color of blue, yellow, red, white, crimson, glassy white, and silver.” Then there were also additional words:

“On account of that gift of precious things, may I
Cause all the Awakened Seers’ fields
To be illuminated with many kinds of
Illuminating light rays.

“By giving many kinds of precious things,
Wherever the gentle one has been born,
Let him cause [places] to be illuminated [with] light rays,
Including the intermediate spaces [between] worlds.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders a vehicle, such as that of horses, elephants, and wagons? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders a vehicle, such as that of horses, elephants, and wagons,” because it is a synonym for assembling

---

160 The idea may be that, after they are given up, one can see these same precious things in the newly illuminated fields of Awakened Ones. Sukhāvatī is certainly full of objects made of such precious substances—see, for example, Gomez, trans., *The Land of Bliss*, 16-17 (§9).


162 The intermediate spaces are gaps between worlds that cannot produce their own light. See BHSD, s.v. *lokāntarikā*. 
the Great Vehicle, best Vehicle, Vehicle equal to the unequalled, and the unsurpassed, chief, ultimate, most excellent Vehicle of an Awakened One, it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders a vehicle, such as that of horses, elephants, and wagons.’ When he gives that gift that totally surrenders a vehicle, such as that of horses, elephants, and wagons, in accordance with an oath that was spoken and cultivated by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift that totally surrenders a vehicle, such as that of horses, elephants, and wagons, may I cause all beings to be won over [sdud pa] by the Great Vehicle, best Vehicle, Vehicle equal to the unequalled, and the unsurpassed, chief, ultimate, most excellent Vehicle of an Awakened One.” Then there were also additional words:

“By giving an elephant, may I cause all living creatures to be quickly won over [sdud pa] by The Vehicle of an Awakened One, the Great Vehicle, the best Vehicle.

“By giving an elephant and giving a horse, that man will become Illuminating, learned, dexterous, Inclined to the Great Vehicle, and fortunate.

---

163 This passage plays on the meaning of sdud pa (Skt. samgraha or a derivative of it), which can mean to “bring together” or “assemble,” but in Buddhist usage often means to “win over” or “attract” people to the religious life. See MW, s.v. samgraha; BHSD, s.vv. samgraha and samgraha-vastu; Dayal, The Bodhisattva Doctrine, 251-259.

164 The Tibetan text uses two synonyms for “vehicle,” bzhon pa and theg pa. I do not care for any of the possible English synonyms for “vehicle,” so I merely capitalize theg pa as “Vehicle,” especially because of the use of the technical term theg pa chen po (Skt. mahāyāna) and its connotation of spiritual transport.


166 I follow the reading shes nyen can, which probably translates Skt. dakṣa or daksīṇa. The intended reading, however, may be that of N, bshes gnyen can, “having a (spiritual) friend (bshes gnyen = Skt. mitra),” with the understanding that the mitra leads one in a spiritual direction much as an elephant or a horse takes one through physical space. The same variation occurs earlier in the text in a similar list of adjectives—see n. 84 above.
“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders a
garden, a grove for ascetic practice,¹⁶⁷ and a monastery?¹⁶⁸ Son from a good family, in this case
that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders a
garden, a grove for ascetic practice, and a monastery,” because it is a synonym for making¹⁶⁹
the branches of meditation perfect by Aspirants to Awakening,¹⁷⁰ it is certain that I am to give
the gift that totally surrenders a garden, a grove for ascetic practice, and a monastery.’ When
he gives the gift that totally surrenders a garden, a grove for ascetic practice, and a monastery,
in accordance with an oath that was praised and commended by the Awakened One, he
proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift that totally surrenders a garden, a grove for ascetic
practice, and a monastery, may I make the branches of meditation perfect for all beings.’”¹⁷¹
Then there were also additional words:

“By giving a monastery¹⁷² and a garden,

¹⁶⁷ Tib. dka’ thub kyi nags tshal = Skt. tapovana.

¹⁶⁸ The term “monastery” (Skt. vihāra) is purely conventional. Not only is it fraught with assumptions of
certain modes of living, but can in texts and inscriptions refer to a wide array of building types. There
was never any archetypical Buddhist “monastery” in India.

¹⁶⁹ L, S, and T omit byed par here, so following their reading this sentence would not be causative. Of
course, this would hardly change the meaning.

¹⁷⁰ Here and later Q reads sms can thams cad kyi yan lag, “limbs of all beings,” which makes no sense—
surely a literal sense of filling out the (damaged) appendages of all beings was not the intended
meaning. The “all beings” (sms can thams cad) in this instance may be a true variation, but the omission
of “of meditation” (bsam gtan gyi) is certainly a simple eye-skip from one genitive particle to the next.

¹⁷¹ The reward for an almost identical gift in the Aksayamatinirdeśa is also the perfection of the branches
or components of meditation (Skt. dhyānāṅga): bsam gtan gyi yan lag dang yan lag gi tshogs yongs su rdzogs
par bya ba’i phyir byang chub sms dpa’ rnam kyi skyed mos tshal dang / gzhal med khang dang / dka’ thub kyi
nags tshal dang / gtsug lag khang yongs su gton ba’i sbyin pa’o (Braarvig, ed., Aksayamatinirdeśa-sūtra, Vol. 1,

¹⁷² The Tibetan in this and the next verse is, without variants, lha gang. I suspect this is a mistake for or a
variant of lha khang. Since the Tibetan letters ga and kha are mirror images of each other, it is not
difficult to see how such a mistake or variation could arise. Although lha khang often translates Skt.
May I successively make
The branches of meditation
Perfect for all beings.

“By giving a monastery and a garden,
That man who engages in religious discipline\textsuperscript{173}
Will perfect the branches of meditation and
Be a great ascetic in practicing religious discipline.\textsuperscript{174}

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders his wife, sons, and daughters?\textsuperscript{175} Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders his wife, sons, and daughters,” because it is a synonym for wholly and completely awakening to unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening\textsuperscript{176} by Aspirants to Awakening, it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders my wife, sons, and daughters.’ When he gives that gift that totally surrenders his wife, sons, and daughters, in accordance with an oath to which the Thus Come One paid honor, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift that totally surrenders my wife,

\textit{devakula} or “temple” (using that term very loosely, considering that sophisticated temple architecture would have been in its earliest stages when this text was probably written—see the helpful sources and comments in Gregory Schopen, “On the Underside of a Sacred Space: Some Less Appreciated Functions of the Temple in Classical India,” in \textit{Buddhist Nuns, Monks, and Other Worldly Matters}, 442-443, n. 1), more than likely it translates \textit{vihāra} here. The prose section has the more usual Tibetan rendering of \textit{vihāra}, \textit{gtsug lag khang}, so it would seem that the translators chose \textit{lha gang/khang} in the two verses to limit the number of syllables in each foot to seven.

\textsuperscript{173} Tib. \textit{rnal 'byor can} = Skt. \textit{yogin}.


\textsuperscript{175} Strictly speaking, the Tibetan text does not mark any of the family members of the Aspirant to Awakening as plural.

\textsuperscript{176} L, S, and T follow \textit{byang chub} with \textit{sdud pa} instead of the terminative particle \textit{tu}. This is surely a mistake, for otherwise it would mean something like “. . . awaken to the collection of unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening.”
sons, and daughters, may I cause all beings to wholly and completely awaken to unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening.”’177 Then there were also additional words:178

“For the sake of each and every being,
May that giver of sons
Quickly cause all beings
To awaken to unsurpassed, ultimate awakening.

“Whenever a man who exerts himself
Effects the surrender of his wife, sons, and daughters,
Then his awakening, without contaminations and without joy,179
Is to be regarded as not being difficult at all.180

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders wealth, grain, and supplies? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders wealth, grain, and supplies,” because it is a synonym for filling the provisions of the True Law by Aspirants to Awakening, it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders wealth, grain, and supplies.’ When he gives that gift that totally surrenders wealth, grain, and supplies, in accordance with an oath that was spoken by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift that

177 Cf. Braarvig, ed., Akṣayatimatirdeśāstūtra, Vol. I, 31.5-8; bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa’i byang chub la dga’ bar mngon par rdzogs par ‘tshang rgya bar bya ba’i phyir byang chubs sems dpa’ rnams kyi bu pho dang / bu mo dang / chung ma dang sdu pa yongs su gtong ba’i sbyin pa’o. If there is a logical connection between awakening and surrendering one’s wife and children, it must be that the family was considered an obstacle to the pursuit of the religious life, a widespread and entrenched idea in Classical India, evident, of course, in the life of Siddhārtha. Cf. Skjærvø, ed. and trans., This Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras, Vol. I, 81, *5.27 and 280-281, 15.22 and *15.28; Kern, trans., The Lotus Sutra, 13, verse 18.

178 The following two verses have nine syllables per foot.

179 I follow D for “without joy” (dga’ ba med). L, Q, and S have “without difficulty” (dka’ ba med), which would seem to be redundant with the following line. T combines dga’ and dka’ into one nonsensical word, so it is not possible to tell which one is the preferred reading. N, being illegible here, is not helpful.

180 I take great liberty with the syntax of this verse and my translation is not at all certain.
totally surrenders wealth, grain,\textsuperscript{181} and supplies, may I make the provisions of the True Law full for all beings.’”\textsuperscript{182} Then this was said:\textsuperscript{183}

“With whatever merit that I have, higher [in amount] than the sky,
From surrendering wealth and treasures,
May the realm of men\textsuperscript{184} quickly prosper
With the provisions of the True Law, like the provisions of a king.

“On account of whatever merit I have from surrendering
Wealth, grain, supplies, and a spouse,
May I quickly attain awakening and
May I attain the provisions of the True Law.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders all sovereignty over the four continents, Black Plum Continent, or the kingdom? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders all sovereignty over the four continents, Black Plum Continent, or the kingdom,” because it is a synonym for attaining sovereignty over the kingdom of the True Law by Aspirants to Awakening, it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders all sovereignty over the four continents, Black Plum Continent, or the kingdom.’ When he gives that gift that totally surrenders all sovereignty over the four continents, Black Plum Continent, or the kingdom, in accordance with an oath that was taught by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift that totally surrenders all sovereignty over the four

\textsuperscript{181} L, S, and T add “provisions” (mdzod) here, which does not agree with the parallel phrases in this passage.

\textsuperscript{182} The Akṣayamatinirdeśa makes the same connection between giving up various provisions and the True Law (Skt. saddhārma): dam pa’i chos kyi mdzod dang bang ba yongs su dgang ba’i phyir byang chub sems dpa’ rnams kyi nor dang / ‘bru dang / mdzod dang / bang ba yongs su gtong ba’i sbyin pa’o (Braarvig, ed., Akṣayamatinirdeśaśūtra, Vol. I, 31.9-11).

\textsuperscript{183} These two verses also have nine syllables per foot.

\textsuperscript{184} Tib. \textit{mi rnams rgyud} probably translates Skt. \textit{manuṣyagati}—see Mvy. 9230.
continents, Black Plum Continent, or the kingdom, may I cause all beings to attain the
attainment of the sovereignty over the kingdom of the True Law.”185 Then this was said:186

“On account of what little merit I have brought about
From the wholesale surrender of the four continents,
May these men attain the full extent of
The attainment of the kingdom of the True Law.

“By giving Black Plum Continent,
The king, who possesses the seven precious things,
Who governs the four continents,
Will win sovereignty.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders
the crest jewel187 and crown? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening
thinks this: ‘That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders the crest jewel and crown,”
because it is a synonym for developing the crest of the head that is not looked down upon188 by

185 The Akṣayamatinirdeśa varies considerably from our text here—see Braarvig, ed., Akṣayamatinirdeśa-
/ catvāri dvīpāni saratnapūrṇā niryātitā pūrvajine ṇu mahyam // (and ibid., 261-262, *13.25-13.26); Kern,
trans., The Lotus Sutra, 13-14, verse 20.

186 The next verse has nine syllables per foot, but the one after has seven.

187 In several parallel stories that recount the deeds of King Maṇicūḍa, he gives away his crest jewel; in
the Maṇicūḍāvadāna he does so to attain bodhiratna, the “jewel of awakening.” See Ratna Handurukande,
ed. and trans., Maṇicūḍāvadāna, Being a Translation and Edition, and Lokānanda, a Transliteration and Synopsis
story, see Ohnuma, Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood, 276 (entry E). In the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra, a king’s
gift of his crest jewel (Skt. cūḍāmaṇi), his most prized possession, is compared to the Awakened One’s
teaching of the Lotus Sūtra itself. See Kern and Nanjio, eds., Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, 289.3-292.12.

188 I follow Hubert Durt’s understanding of spyi gtsug bltar mi mthong ba (Skt. anavalokitamūrdha or
anavalokitamūrdhatā), whereby looking down upon (avalokita) the crest of the head of an Awakened One
(or here, of an Aspirant to Awakening) developed into a sort of “taboo” in early Buddhist literature
because one should not—or could not—go beyond or be above his head (even in flight). See his “Note
“taboo” was likely expressed in Indian Buddhist sculpture, with the figure of the Awakened One

165
Aspirants to Awakening, it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders the crest jewel and crown.' When he gives that gift that totally surrenders the crest jewel and crown, in accordance with an oath that was spoken by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift that totally surrenders the crest jewel and crown, may I cause all beings to attain a crest of the head that is not looked down upon.’”

“On account of whatever merit I have accumulated From giving the crest jewel and crown, May beings here Always attain an unobservable crest of the head.

“With that gift of the crest jewel, may I Have a superb cranial protuberance that has A wide girth like the Indian fig [And that] is made of gold and precious stones.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to giving his feet [rkang pa] Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving one's feet,” because it is a synonym for going to the terrace of awakening that is the towering over all others, and possibly in painting as well. See Schopen, “The Ambiguity of Avalokiteśvara and the Tentative Identification of a Painted Scene from a Mahāyāna Sūtra at Ajaṇṭā,” in Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India, esp. 285-87 and the other sources discussed there. In some Mahāyāna texts, having a “crest of the head that is not looked down upon” becomes one of the secondary characteristics (Skt. anuvyañjana) of a Great Man. Also see Nattier, A Few Good Men, 287-288, n. 526 and the sources cited there.

189 In effect, he is making an oath that everyone will acquire a superhuman body, which I discuss briefly in the introduction to the text. Cf. Braarvig, ed., Akṣayamatinirdeśasūtra, Vol. I, 30.43-44: gtsug tor bltar mi mthong ba thob par bya ba'i phyir byang chub sems dpa' rnams kyi gtsug gi nor bu dang cod pan sbyin pa'o.

190 Once again, the first verse has nine syllables per foot, whereas the second verse has seven.

191 More literally, “head’s jewel” (mgo bo'i nor bu): The text substitutes mgo bo for gtsug in order to give the foot an extra syllable.

192 The bump atop the head (Skt. uṣṇīṣa) is a well-known mark of a Great Man, clearly depicted in many extant images of the Awakened One.

193 Here the text switches to internal gifts (Skt. ādhyātmikadāna).
base [r<sup>kang pa</sup>] of the Law by Aspirants to Awakenings, it is certain that I am to give a gift of my feet.' When he gives that gift of his feet, in accordance with an oath that was obtained by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of my feet, may men and all beings, having always gone forth quickly from the home, constraining their desires in order to pacify the harm from birth, old age, illness, and death, be extremely joyous, pacify their faculties, and pacify their bodies, like the moonlight that is worthy of [providing] refuge. After illuminating the darkness of men, who are tormented because they dwell in the darkness, including that of the intermediate spaces [between worlds], by means of emitting light rays that arise from compassion, like the splendor of many kinds of suns, the makers of light, may they dispel the suffering of the bodies in the Extremely Hot Hell.  

May they have have lotus feet that are adorned with the mark of thousand-spoked wheels, that are level, and that are soft, toes that are long and connected with a web, like the feet of a goose, toenails that are ornamented like a fine, purely polished mirror and that are like star jasmine flowers, prominent ankles, and lower legs that stand relaxed in a wondrous manner, similar to a reed or the calf of an antelope. On the seat of the terrace of awakening, the seat with an adamantine

---

194 This is one of the excruciatingly painful hells in Buddhist cosmology (rab tu tsha ba = Skt. pratāpana), generally placed above the Avīci Hell. See Sadakata, Buddhist Cosmology, 48-50.

195 Having wheels at the bottom of the feet is an additional mark of a Great Man, another well-attested feature found in many images of the Awakened One. Indeed, even when the Awakened One is absent, the wheel represents his footprint in early, so-called aniconic images. The rest of this passage describes other marks and secondary characteristics related to the foot and leg.

196 The second half of this phrase—“that are like star jasmine flowers”—reads much differently in L: “that are just the same as all the flowers [of] the terrace of awakening.” This is almost certainly a copying mistake made under the influence of an upcoming phrase.
base, \(^{197}\) the lion throne of the Law, may they utterly subdue Māra in order to vanquish him."\(^{198}\)

Then there were also additional words:

"On account of this gift of his feet,
May one, steadfast, \(^{199}\)
With the soles of the feet possessing the mark of the wheel,
Utterly subdue [Māra\(^{200}\)] on the good seat of the terrace of awakening.

"On account of this gift of my feet, may I,
After sitting on the best seat of the terrace of awakening,
Tame the Māras, \(^{201}\) together with their
Armies, soldiers, and vehicles.

"Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to giving the palms of his hands
[\textit{lag mthil}]? \(^{202}\) Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That
which is called “giving the palms of one’s hands,” because it is a synonym for giving the hand
[\textit{lag pa}]\(^{203}\) of the Law to all beings by Aspirants to Awakening, it is certain that I am to give a gift

---

\(^{197}\) There are many possibilities for Tib. \textit{stegs bu}, mostly because there are many Sanskrit words it could be translating. I elect for the sense of “base,” “foundation,” or even “pedestal” (Skt. \textit{piṇḍikā}, \textit{kapoṭamālā}, etc.). It is also possible that the intended meaning is the surface of the seat, a railing around the seat (Skt. \textit{vedikā}), or even the raised ground upon which the seat rests (Skt. \textit{vitardi}).

\(^{198}\) My translation of this passage is pretty convoluted. So is the Tibetan. The \textit{Akṣayamatinirdeśa} is much more terse and straightforward in its description of the gift of the feet: \textit{dam pa’i chos kyi rkang pas byang chub kyi snying por ’gro bar bya ba’i phyir byang chub sens dpa’ rnams kyi rkang pa sbyin pa’o} (Braarvig, ed., \textit{Akṣayamatinirdeśasūtra}, Vol. I, 31.17-19.

\(^{199}\) I take \textit{brtan pos} to indicate the subject. It may, however, be adverbial, which is supported by Q’s \textit{brtan par}.

\(^{200}\) My guess is that Māra is understood to be the object of “subdue,” as he his in the preceding prose as well as (in the plural) the next verse. Māra might also be understood as the object of “subdue” in the second verse of the next section.

\(^{201}\) There are usually but not invariably four Māras enumerated in Sanskrit and Pāli Buddhist sources: in Sanskrit, \textit{Kleśamāra}, \textit{Skandhamāra}, \textit{Mṛtyumāra}, and \textit{Devaputramāra}. See BHSD, s.v. \textit{Māra}.

\(^{202}\) This may be an example of synecdoche, where the palm of the hand is a way to refer to the entire hand.

\(^{203}\) That is, assistance.
of the palms of my hands.’ When he gives that gift of the palms of his hands, in accordance with an oath that was understood by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of the palms of my hands, may I cause the hand of the Law to be given to beings who are inferior, blind, poor, without a master [to look after them], suffering, impoverished, homeless, without refuge, and defenseless, and to those born in hell, as animals, in Yama’s world, fallen into the unfavorable destinies and unfavorable states, or born at the inopportune times.’ Then there were also additional words:

“By giving the palms of my hands, may I quickly become A Guide [i.e., an Awakened One] with jewels in my hand, Possessing hands that are long and of a golden hue, and An object of homage for the world.

“Having subdued with compassion, Praising the hand of the Law, May I always remove Living creatures from all the unfavorable destinies.

---

204 Being reborn in hell, as an animal, or in Yama’s world (yamaloka) is a standard triad in Mahāyāna texts for the three worst possible fates. See, for example, Kern and Nanjio, eds., Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, 77.15. The three lower destinies in Buddhist cosmology are those of hell-beings, hungry ghosts, and animals—Yama was regarded as the king of the hungry ghosts (Skt. preta), so Yama’s world is equivalent to the realm of hungry ghosts. This triad of unfortunate rebirth states is not unknown in inscriptions either—see A. Ghosh, “A Buddhist Tract in a Stone Inscription in the Cuttack Museum,” Epigraphia Indica 26 (1941–42): 173, lines 20–21.

205 Pāli and Sanskrit Buddhist texts enumerate different lists of eight inopportune times when one could be reborn. See BHSD, s.v. akṣaṇa.


207 The implied image is one of sparkling or shining jewels being used to help lead beings out of the darkness of suffering. In the Bhaisajyaguruvaidūryaprabha-sūtra, the protagonist Bhaisajyaguru vaiḍūryaprabha, whose name refers to both light (prabha) and a kind of jewel (vaiḍūrya), makes an oath that, after he has become awakened, he will have a bejeweled body emitting light that will illuminate the way for beings who are traveling through the darkness (Sanskrit text read from the unpublished Schopen, ed., A Sūtra for the Failed and Misbegotten, section 5.2).
“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders his ears and nose? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders one’s ears and nose,” because it is a synonym for perfecting the intact faculties by Aspirants to Awakening, it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders my ears and nose.’ When he gives that gift that totally surrenders his ears and nose, in accordance with an oath that was established by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift that totally surrenders my ears and nose, may I cause all beings to be get all their faculties.’” Then this was said:

“By surrendering one’s ears and nose,
May all living things
Get all their faculties, and
May all their limbs be complete.

“By surrendering one’s ears and nose,
Wherever he has been born,
That man will there become lovely to see, and
Will come to have a good figure and a beautiful face.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift of his eyes [mīg]? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving one’s eyes,” because it is a synonym for totally purifying the unobscured vision [mīg] of the nose and the ears are often treated as a pair in Buddhist texts, especially with regard to cutting them off—see, e.g., Cowell and Neil, eds., The Divyāvadāna, 472.4-5. I wonder whether Indians may have understood that the nose and ears are anatomically connected, but I have not looked in the classical medical literature to pursue the matter. I can only say that the compound karṇanāśā is listed in MW, citing the Rāmāyaṇa.

209 Tib. dbang po tshang ba = Skt. sakalendriya?

210 The Aksayamatinirdeśā also relates the gift of one’s ears and nose to attaining sound faculties: dbang po ma nyams pa rdzogs par bya ba’i phyir byang chub sans dpa’ rnas kyi rna ba dang sbyin pa’o (Braarvig, ed., Aksayamatinirdeśasūtra, Vol. I, 31.21-22).
the Law by Aspirants to Awakening, it is certain that I am to give a gift of my eyes.’ When he gives that gift of his eyes, in accordance with an oath that was made pure by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of my eyes, may I totally purify the unobscured vision of the Law for all beings.’ Then there were also additional words:

“On account of this gift of my eyes, may I, After awakening to unsurpassed awakening, Absolutely purify The vision of the Law for all beings.

“By that excellent observance of giving the eyes, One will attain eyes that are Without blemish, faultless, pure, broad, Very beautiful, and serene.

“Similar to a petal of a blue lotus, Similar to the eyes of a painted snipe, [With] eyelashes similar to a cow’s, By that [gift], one will attain eyes similar to those.

---

211 Depending on how one renders the slippery term chos (Skt. dharma), this might be translated as “vision of [all] phenomena.” See BHSD, s.v. dharma-cakṣus.

212 Following N and Q, which insert yang before dag par, this would instead read “made correct.”

213 In addition to the “vision of the Law,” with the gift of the eyes the Akṣayamatinirdeśa speaks of the “unobscured vision of an Awakened One”: sems can thams cad la sgrib pa med pa’i sangs rgyas kyi spyan dang chos kyi spyan thob par bya ba’i phyir byang chub sens dpa’’rnams kyi mig sbyin pa’o (Braarvig, ed., Akṣayamatinirdeśasūtra, Vol. I, 31.22-24).

214 Tib. brtul zhags is the equivalent of Skt. vrata, a term difficult to translate with precision. A modern Hindu or Jain vrata (or vrat) generally involves making a vow to abstain from certain foods or other indulgences for various occasions or lengths of time. Since we are dealing with making yet another type of gift in this verse, obviously this modern understanding will not suffice. In Buddhist usage vrata seems to be much vaguer, and might be translated—vaguely—as a (religious) “deed” or “practice” or, as here, “observance.”

215 This is probably the correct identification of Tib. byi’u ku na la (Skt. kunāla or kunālā). In the Divyāvadāna, Aśoka’s son is named Kuṇāla because of his bright and beautiful eyes. See Dave, Birds in Sanskrit Literature, 308.

216 This is one of the marks of a Great Man (Skt. gopakṣman).
“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders his head? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders one’s head,” because it is a synonym for attaining an Omniscient One’s knowledge, which exceeds the best things in the entire triple [world-]sphere, by Aspirants to Awakening, it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders my head.’ When he gives that gift that totally surrenders his head, in accordance with an oath that was in conformity with the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift that totally surrenders my head, may I cause all beings to attain an Omniscient One’s knowledge, which exceeds the best things in the triple world.’”\(^{218}\) Then there were also additional words:

\[
\text{“On account of whatever merit I have} \\
\text{From the total surrender of my head,} \\
\text{May all beings} \\
\text{Attain the unwavering status of an Omniscient One.} \\
\]

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders his skin? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders one’s skin,” because it is a synonym for perfecting the skin by Aspirants to Awakening, [so it will be] soft, delicate, and like the color of

\[^{217}\]“Omniscient One” could just as well be rendered “omniscient knowledge,” from Tib. \textit{thams cad mkhyen pa’i ye shes}. The difference is negligible, as omniscience is the hallmark of one who has become awakened, that is, a buddha. See Nattier, \textit{A Few Good Men}, 215, n. 45. Throughout the text I switch back and forth between the two ideas—the state of omniscience and the being who is omniscient—in order to fit the context.

\[^{218}\]As the head sits atop and is the best part of the body, sacrificing it brings omniscience, which is distinct from and exceeds everything in the triple world (Skt. \textit{trailokya} or \textit{traidhātuka}) of Buddhist cosmology. The \textit{Aksayamatinirdeśa} uses almost identical language: \textit{khams gsum thams cad las khyad par du ’phags pa’i mchog thams cad mkhyen pa’i ye shes thob par bya ba’i phyir byang chub sems dpa’ rnam s kyi yan lag gi dam pa mgo sbyin pa’o} (Braarvig, ed., \textit{Aksayamatinirdeśasūtra}, Vol. I, 31.24-26).
gold, it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders my skin. When he gives that gift that totally surrenders his skin, in accordance with an oath of the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift that totally surrenders my skin, may I make the skin of all beings perfect, [so it will be] soft, delicate, and like the color of gold.’ Then there were also additional words:

“By the total surrender of my skin, 
May I transform living creatures who 
Are born from a body with skin 
[To those having skin that will be] soft, delicate, [and like] the hue of gold.

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to the gift that totally surrenders his flesh and blood? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called the “gift that totally surrenders one’s flesh and blood,” because it is a synonym for extracting what is substantial from everything that is insubstantial by

---

219 Having golden skin is one of the thirty-two marks of a Great Man.

220 Q instead says, “. . . it is certain that the gift that totally surrenders our skin is to be given.” Nowhere else in the text is there a first person plural pronoun, making this reading extremely unlikely.

221 For this gift, the Akṣayamatinirdeśa uses a different verb, yongs su dag pa (“purify”) instead of yongs su rdzogs pa (“perfect”), and describes the future skin using snum pa (Skt. snigdha, “glossy,” “oily,” “smooth,” etc.) instead of srab (“delicate,” “fine,” etc.): jam pa dang snum pa dang gser gi kha dog lta bu'i mdo yongs su dag par bya ba'i phyir byang chub sens dpa' rnams kyi pags pa yongs su gtong ba'i sbyin pa'o (Braarvig, ed., Akṣayamatinirdeśasūtra, Vol. I, 31.29-31).

222 Cf. Nattier, trans., A Few Good Men, 277, §20F: “O Eminent Householder, if a householder bodhisattva sees a sick monk he should cure him of that sickness, even by means of his own flesh and blood.”

223 This is a variation on a cliché found in Mahāyāna Sūtras. According to Nattier, A Few Good Men, 227-228, n. 120, there are three insubstantial things from which Mahāyāna Sūtras speak of “extracting what is substantial”: the body (Skt. kāya), life (jīva), and possessions/enjoyment (bhoga). Our text may therefore refer to all three when it says “everything that is insubstantial” (Tib. snying po med pa thams cad), which would imply that a gift of one’s flesh and blood is simultaneously a sacrifice of the body, life, and a possession that can be enjoyed. With regard to a passage in the Ratnarāśi-sūtra that encourages the wilderness dweller to willingly give up his body to animals and thereby “take what is substantial from the insubstantial body” (Skt. sārāt kāyāt sāram adattam bhaviṣyati), Silk, “The Origins
Aspirants to Awakening, it is certain that I am to give the gift that totally surrenders my flesh and blood. When he gives that gift that totally surrenders his flesh and blood, in accordance with an oath that was created by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift that totally surrenders my flesh and blood, may I cause all beings to take what is substantial from everything that is insubstantial.’ Then there were also additional words:

“Through that [karmic fruit that] I have that matures
From the gift of my flesh and blood,
May all living beings attain what is substantial
From the entirety of what is insubstantial.”

“Then, how does he make strong efforts with regard to giving his marrow? Son from a good family, in this case that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘That which is called “giving one’s marrow,” because it is a synonym for perfecting the body to be indestructible, like a
diamond, by Aspirants to Awakening, it is certain that I am to give a gift of my marrow.’

When he gives that gift of his marrow, in accordance with an oath that was created by the Thus Come One, he proclaims the oath: ‘On account of this gift of my marrow, may I make perfect the bodies of all beings to be indestructible, like a diamond.’ Then there were also additional words:

“On account of this gift of my marrow,
May I make perfect the receptacle of
All beings’ putrid bodies [So that] it is indestructible, [like] a diamond.

“Furthermore, that Aspirant to Awakening thinks this: ‘Because I will get a [good] complexion [kha dog] by giving things that look [kha dog] superb, it is certain that I am to give things that look [kha dog] superb.’

“He [also] thinks:
‘By giving superb scents, I will get a well-regarded scent.
‘By giving superb delicacies, I will attain excellent necessities.
‘By giving superb objects, my feet and hands will become soft and tender.
‘By giving from my own hand, I will be paid honor.

---

227 Skt. vajra.

228 Cf. Braarvig, ed., Akṣayamatinirdeśasūtra, Vol. I, 31.31-33, which combines the gift of marrow with bones and has a very different reward from our text.

229 L, S, and T instead read “. . . [of] all beings’ own [rang, not rna] bodies. . . .”

230 Cf. Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” 42-43 (no. 6), where the donor of the same type of gift is said to attain a beautiful complexion (kha dog mdzes pa).

231 Cf. ibid., 43 (no. 7).

232 Cf. ibid., 43 (no. 8) and pp. 150-151 above.
‘By giving deferentially,\textsuperscript{234} I become worthy of honor by some among kinsmen and the like.

‘By giving at the right time,\textsuperscript{235} wealth will be procured and will expand at the right time.

‘By giving what is agreeable and delightful, I will think about enjoyable and delightful couches, clothing, and the like.\textsuperscript{236}

‘By giving without harming others,\textsuperscript{237} I will attain enduring enjoyment.\textsuperscript{238}

‘With a gift of putting up with\textsuperscript{239} what is disliked, I will become a beloved companion.\textsuperscript{240}

‘By giving food, I will become strong.\textsuperscript{241}

‘By giving drinks [\textit{skom pa}], I will be without thirst [\textit{skom pa}].\textsuperscript{242}

\textsuperscript{233} Cf. ibid., 42 (no. 4).

\textsuperscript{234} Cf. ibid., 41 (no. 3).

\textsuperscript{235} Cf. ibid., 41 (no. 2).

\textsuperscript{236} I am not at all sure about the purport of this sentence: ‘\textit{thun pa dang yid du \textquoteright ong ba byin pas ni mal dang gos la sogs pa longs spyod yid du \textquoteright ong ba rnams la sens \textquoteright jug par \textquoteright gyur /}. There may need to be a genitive particle added after \textit{la sogs pa}, in which case the sentence might read as follows: “By giving what is agreeable and delightful, I will think about delightful possessions, such as couches and clothing.” This emendation, however, does little to help me understand what the sentence is supposed to mean.

\textsuperscript{237} Cf. Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” 42 (no. 5), but note that only the Tibetan translation of the Dānādhikaraṇa has a phrase parallel to our text.

\textsuperscript{238} The second half of this sentence (\textit{longs spyod brtan pa dag \textquoteright thob par \textquoteright gyur}) could also be read as “I will attain durable possessions.”

\textsuperscript{239} See BHSD, s.v. \textit{adhivāsayati}. See Silk, “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 365, n. 5 on construing forms of \textit{adhi\textsuperscript{v}vās} (Tib. \textit{dang du len pa}) strongly and in a positive sense as “consent to.”

\textsuperscript{240} Tib. \textit{khor} might be better rendered as “attendant” or even “advisor,” rather than “companion.” If there is a logical connection between the gift and karmic reward of this short sentence, its meaning escapes me. Perhaps the mark of a good companion or attendant is to put up with things—many of my friends, I am sure, feel that they have to put up with me—but that is pure speculation.

\textsuperscript{241} Cf. Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” 43 (no. 11), as well as pp. 142-143 and n. 97 above.
‘By giving clothing, I will get [a good] complexion.

‘By giving lamps, I will get vision.

‘By giving music, I will have unimpaired ears.

‘By giving a vehicle, I will come to be at ease.

‘By giving medicine, I will have little sickness.

‘By giving flowers, I with become worthy of being paid homage.

‘By giving flower garlands, I will become worthy of being exalted by others.

‘By giving praise, I will get the voice of Brahmā.

‘By giving mats, I will attain a dignified state.

\[242\] Cf. ibid., 44 (no. 12). The Dānādhikaraṇa’s parallel with our text is much closer here compared to the previous passage dealing with giving drinks. See pp. 143-144 above. Cf. Manusmr̥ti 4.229, which says that the donor of water gains satiety: vāridas tṛptim āpnoti (from Olivelle, ed. and trans., Manu’s Code of Law, 550).

\[243\] Cf. ibid., 44 (no. 13), as well as pp 136-137 above.

\[244\] Cf. ibid., 46 (no. 25). In the previous passage related to giving lamps, the reward is the divine eye (see p. 147 above). T has “strength” here instead of “vision” (stobs instead of mig), but this is almost certainly a copying mistake made under the influence of the sentence three lines prior to this one. The association between giving lamps or candles and acquiring good vision is still present in Thailand, if not the larger Theravāda world. See Justin McDaniel, The Lovelorn Ghost and the Magical Monk: Practicing Buddhism in Modern Thailand (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), 138.

\[245\] Cf. Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” 46 (no. 24), as well as pp. 147-148 above.

\[246\] Cf. ibid., 44-45 (no. 16). See pp. 144-145 above and also a few lines below.

\[247\] Once again in a gift of vehicles we have the association between sukha and vehicular axles.

\[248\] Cf. ibid., 45 (no. 17) and p. 156 above.

\[249\] Cf. ibid., 45-46 (no. 19).

\[250\] Cf. ibid., 46 (no. 20). The previous passage in our text combines flowers and flower garlands into one gift (see pp. 149-150 above).

\[251\] Cf. ibid., 46 (no. 24), where Brahmā’s voice is instead (and perhaps more logically) the reward for giving music or a musical instrument.
'By giving a vehicle, I will get supernatural power.'

'By giving ointment, I will be without wounds.

'With the gift of sweeping, I will be free from impurity.

'By giving a bell, I will become aware of former lives.

'By giving a residence, I will give everything.

'Because I will give what is immortal by giving the Law, it is certain that I am to give the gift of the Law.'

---

252 See pp. 154-155 above.

253 Cf. ibid., 44-45 (no. 16). In the passage on pp. 144-145 above, the Aspirant to Awakening makes an oath to bring together both ease, the reward for giving a vehicle just a few lines up, and (the foundations of) supernatural power, the reward here.


255 More literally, “dust” (Skt. rajas)—the image here is the sweeping up of literal and figurative dirt.

256 Here we have a “generalization of an old yogic attainment”—the acquisition of jātismara (Tib. tshe rabs dran pa), or the memory of former lives—that has nothing to do with meditation. See Gregory Schopen, “The Generalization of an Old Yogic attainment in Medieval Mahāyāna Sūtra Literature: Some Notes on Jātismara,” in Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India, 190-220. The Mahāyāna texts Schopen cites each employ jātismara not as the result of deep states of meditation, with which it is usually associated, but as a reward for whatever sort of activity is being recommended—praising the Awakened One, preserving names, copying a text, etc. Our text, a discourse on giving, has plugged in jātismara as a reward for—what else?—giving. Cf. Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” 46 (no. 23), but note that the Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra makes no mention of jātismara.

257 I am unsure about the meaning of this sentence, though the Tibetan is quite straightforward. Cf. ibid., 44 (no. 14) and p. 151 above.

258 Cf. ibid., 45 (no. 18). This section begins with “Because I will get a [good] complexion by giving things that look superb, it is certain that I am to give things that look superb”; it ends with “Because I will give what is immortal by giving the Law, it is certain that I am to give the gift of the Law.” The formula is: Because Y results by giving X, it is certain that I am to give X. There are twenty-five intervening statements in this section that follow a shorter formula: by giving X, Y. It is entirely possible that these twenty-five statements are meant to be read with the longer formula of the opening and concluding statements of this section. For instance, what I translated as “By giving a bell, I will become aware of former lives” might be better rendered as “[Because] I will become aware of former lives by giving a bell, [it is certain that I am to give a bell].”
“When he gives such a gift, he does not give with attachment, does not give with hostility, does not give with delusion, does not become irritated and give, does not give while feeling contempt, does not strike [another] and give, does not hold back and give, does not look down upon [another] and give, does not put down [another] and give, does not give while being inflated with pride, and does not give while slighting [another]. He does not give leftovers. Whatever gift that does not [involve] giving rotten and decomposed [things] is given deferentially. He gives after having revered, venerated, done homage, and shown respect [to the recipient]. He gives a lot, gives fine [things], gives with extreme joy, gives with joy and contentment,\(^{259}\) gives pristinely and extensively, gives from his own hand,\(^{260}\) and gives with deference\(^{261}\) and with esteem. He gives with pure, excellent, and virtuous intentions. He gives without avarice,\(^{262}\) gives without longing, gives without dismay, and gives without fear. He gives extensively and broadly.

"When he gives such a gift, he does not think this: ‘Because the conduct of so-and-so is ethical, I must give [to him]; [but because] the conduct of such-and-such is unethical, [I must not]. So-and-so has good qualities, [so I must give to him]; [but] such-and-such does not have good qualities, [so I must not]. When one gives to so-and-so, there will be great karmic

\(^{259}\) Cf. ibid., 49 (no. 34).

\(^{260}\) Cf. ibid., 42 (no. 4) and p. 175 above.

\(^{261}\) We just saw these last two phrases in succession. This section not only (tersely) repeats earlier parts of the text, but is internally redundant.

\(^{262}\) Cf. ibid., 41 (no. 1).
rewards, great benefits, and great might; [but] when one gives to such-and-such, there will be no great karmic rewards, no great benefits, and no great might.  

“Furthermore, he possesses correct intelligence, so he does not allow this to be thought when he gives that gift because it is not correct: ‘On account of totally surrendering a gift for the sake of roots of virtue and righteousness [chos], may I become this or that king, a head minister, a god, a son of the gods, or any other god whatsoever.’

“But, how then? Instead, he redirects [the merit from giving] toward unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening. On account of totally surrendering [a gift] for the sake of these roots of virtue and righteousness [chos], he redirects [the merit], thinking, ‘May I bring across beings who have not crossed over, liberate the unliberated, give relief to those without relief, cause those who have not become totally extinct to become totally extinct, and become the guide, escort, deliverance, refuge, home, sanctuary, and defense for those who are without

---

263 I understand the opaque pronoun ‘di in these last few sentences to refer to hypothetical recipients of gifts.

264 While I understand the overall purport of this paragraph, I am not at all clear about how it begins: gzhan yang yang dag pa’i blo dang ldan gyi yang dag pa ma yin pa’i phyir de sbyin pa de sbyin pa na.

265 All the editions I have consulted have sbyin pa ‘di dang here. I have omitted this phrase because it does not make sense to say “surrendering a gift for the sake of this gift . . .” and because it is absent in a parallel construction immediately below.

266 D adds klu ’am here, that is, a nāga or an “otherworldly snake.”

267 See Nattier, trans., A Few Good Men, 213 for the same list of vows in the Ugraparipṛcchā-śūtra, and ibid., 148-151 for a short discussion about their occurrence in the Ugraparipṛcchā and other texts, including their adaptation from Mainstream sources.
protection, without refuge, homeless, without sanctuary, and defenseless [in] a world that is blind and without a guide.”\(^{268}\) Then this was said:

“On account of this gift [given] for the sake of righteousness,
May I bring beings
Across the ocean of cyclical existence\(^{269}\)
By means of no other than the Great Vehicle.

“May I liberate all men
From the fetters of the defilements.
May I give relief to those without relief and
Show the path to extinction.

“May I become the escort
For the world that is blind and without a guide.
May I become the protection, defense,
Sanctuary, and refuge for living creatures.

“Son from a good family, in that way an Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero makes strong efforts with regard to the Perfection of Giving.”

Then the Aspirant to Awakening-Great Hero Giriguhaśikharagirikandarāntarakuñja-viṣṇumbhaṇanādavinardottamasimhanarendracūḍāmaṇi, after hearing the analytical explanation of the Perfection of Giving from the Blessed One, felt satisfaction, contentment, delight, extreme joy, happiness, and pleasure, and then got up from his mat. After putting his upper robe over one shoulder, he put his right knee down on the center of the red lotus.\(^{270}\) He

---

\(^{268}\) I stretch the Tibetan syntax from this passage a little, based on the succeeding verses and parallel passages found elsewhere (e.g., J.S. Speyer, ed., *Avadānaçataka: A Century of Edifying Tales Belonging to the Hīnayāna*, Vol. I (Bibliotheca Buddhica 3) (1902; repr., The Hague: Mouton, 1958), 210-211).

\(^{269}\) Q, S, T instead have “May I liberate beings from the ocean of cyclical existence,” using the verb *grol* instead of *sgrol*. The difference in meaning is negligible.

\(^{270}\) Presumably this is the same flower on which he genuflected earlier in the text.
bent his cupped hands toward the Blessed One, and then gave approbation to the Blessed One with melodious verses:\(^{271}\)

“Making gifts is wonderful! It is wonderful, you who are always like a Father! Making gifts is wonderful! It is wonderful, you who make this speech, Well Gone One! It is wonderful, True Kinsman! It is wonderful, Friend and True Teacher! It is wonderful, you who here alone are the Protection from hell! It is wonderful, Senior! It is Wonderful, Superior among gods and men! It is wonderful, Object of homage! It is wonderful, Hero among men! It is wonderful, Speaker! It is wonderful, Great-Souled, Extremely Disciplined One! It is wonderful, King of physicians who dispels the poison of the defilements of men! It is wonderful, Liberator! It is wonderful, Absolute Liberator from the three [levels of] existence! It is wonderful, Physician! It is wonderful, Ultimate Seeker who benefits [others] and Maker of gifts! It is wonderful, Glorious One, One who has a mind directed toward auspicious things! It is wonderful, Fortunate One, One who has a countenance without blemish, similar to the full moon! It is wonderful, Intelligent One, One with broad, long, and azure eyes! It is wonderful, Magnificent One, One whose nose’s shape is marvelously proportioned! It is wonderful, Well-spoken One, One whose ear lobes are similar to a golden plumb-line!\(^{273}\) It is wonderful, One whose teeth are similar to snow and shells! Obeisance! It is wonderful, Chief, Superior, and Master, that today you have spoken thoroughly about the types of gifts to men, who afterwards will want to learn about ethical conduct, forbearance, strength, knowledge, strategies, meditation, supernatural power, and oaths.”\(^{274}\)

After the Blessed One had spoken those words,\(^{275}\) the world, together with those Aspirants to Awakening—the Aspirant to Awakening Mañjuśrī the true prince, the Aspirant to Awakening Avalokiteśvara, Giriguhaśikharagirikandarāntarakuñjavijṛmbhaṇanāda-

---

\(^{271}\) The following verses have eleven syllables per foot.

\(^{272}\) This line has only nine syllables.

\(^{273}\) That is, they are a golden color and hang down toward the ground.

\(^{274}\) This string appears to be an alternative list of Mahāyāna Perfections appended to giving.

\(^{275}\) This ending is absolutely standard for Mahāyāna Sūtras. The Blessed One was not speaking immediately before this statement, which instead refers to his entire sermon.
vinardottamasīmhanarendracūḍāmaṇi, as well as the others—those sons of the gods, those four great kings, the gods, men, demigods, and celestial musicians, was delighted, and praised what had been spoken by the Blessed One.

The Great Vehicle Discourse named *The Noble Perfection of Giving* is complete.

Colophon:

Translated, edited, and established in its definitive form by Prajñāvarma, the Indian master,²⁷⁶ reverend Ye-shes-sDe, the chief editor and translator, et al.²⁷⁷


C. Tibetan Text

rgya gar\(^1\) skad du / ārya dā na pā ra mi tā\(^2\) nā ma\(^4\) hā\(^5\) yā na sū tra / bod skad du / 'phags pa sbyin pa'i pha rol tu' phyin pa zhes bya ba theg\(^7\) pa chen po'i mdo / sangs rgyas dang\(^9\) byang chub smsa' thams cad la phyag 'tshal lo // 'di skad bdag gis thos pa dus gcig na / bcom idan 'das nyid kyi rtsa lag\(^10\) dang / yul gyi mi rnams la phan gdags\(^11\) pa'i phyir\(^12\) ser skya'i gnas kyi grong khyer chen po na\(^13\) rgyal po\(^14\) zas gtsang gi kun dga' ra ba shing sā\(^15\) la dang / ta la dang / ta ma la dang / dong ka'i shing dang/ rgya shug dang/ star\(^16\) ga\(^17\) shing dang\(^18\) / 'bra\(^19\) go dang / shing\(^20\) ba \(t\)a\(^22\) dang / ka dam\(^22\) ba\(^23\) dang / a\(^24\) mra dang / nyo ti\(^25\) dang / skyu ru ra'i shing dang / bil ba\(^26\) dang / bal po se'u dang / ka pid\(^27\) tha\(^28\) dang / chu shing dang / nya gro dha\(^29\) dang / u dum ba\(^30\) ra dang / ba ru ra'i shing dang / a shvad\(^31\) tha dang / bar shi\(^32\) ka\(^33\) dang / sna ma dang / dha nu\(^34\) ska\(^35\) ri dang / a ti mug ta\(^36\) dang / tsam pa\(^37\) ka dang / mya ngan

---

1: L: accidentally conflates rgya gar
2: L and S: ta
3: N: na
4: T: omits (leaving only one ma)
5: S: appears to read mhā for ma hā
6: N: illegible; Q: du
7: L: ”e” marker is written in the reverse direction (slanting upwards to the right), which L does occasionally to avoid writing over a letter or daṇḍa from the line above or over a vowel marker atop an adjacent letter
8: L, N, Q, and S: double daṇḍa
9: L and T: insert daṇḍa
10: T: blag
11: Q: bdags
12: L and S: insert daṇḍa
13: L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
14: T: pos
15: L: sa
16: L: ltar
17: S: ka’i; T: kha
18: S: omits
19: L: ’gro
20: D: shi
21: L, S, and T: ta
22: L, Q, and S: tam; T: ta ma for dam
23: D and T: pa; N: tamba for dam ba
24: L and T: am
25: N: nyi ta for nyo ti
26: N: bilba
28: N: pidtha
29: L: da; T: omits
30: D and T: bā; N: dumba for dum bā; S: wa (= lba)
31: L: shva
32: N: barshi
33: T: squeezes in ka between adjacent syllables, probably as a correction
34: L: na
35: Q: ka
36: N: mugta
37: L: tsam ba; N: tsampa
’tshang\textsuperscript{38} dang / ta ra ni dang / skyā\textsuperscript{39} snar\textsuperscript{40} dang / shi\textsuperscript{41} ri sha\textsuperscript{42} dang / a rdzu\textsuperscript{43} na dang / shing ljon pa brgya stong du mas brgyan pa /\textsuperscript{44} phu chu dang /\textsuperscript{45} ’bab chu’i dngo\textsuperscript{16} dang / mtshe’u dang / lteng\textsuperscript{47} ka dang / rdzing bu dang / khrong pa dri zhim po dang\textsuperscript{48} ldan pa\textsuperscript{49} dag gis mdzes par byas pa / me tog utpā\textsuperscript{50} la dang / pad ma\textsuperscript{51} dang / ku mu da\textsuperscript{52} dang / pad ma\textsuperscript{53} dkar po dag gis gang ba\textsuperscript{54} 55\ ngang pa dang / rma bya dang / khrung khrung\textsuperscript{56} dang / ngur pa dang / khu\textsuperscript{57} byug dang / chun lag dang / ne tso dang / ri skegs dang / shang shang te\textsuperscript{58} u dang / tsa go\textsuperscript{59} ra dang / ’jon\textsuperscript{60} mo dang / ka ran da\textsuperscript{61} ba\textsuperscript{62} rnams skad ’byin pa / bung ba brgya stong dang gis mdzes par byas pa\textsuperscript{63} / chu yan lag brgyad dang ldan pa\textsuperscript{64} gsal zhing\textsuperscript{65} dri zhim la shin tu\textsuperscript{66} bsil ba dang / rnyog pa med cing rnam par dang bas yongs su gang ba\textsuperscript{67} gsing ma sngo zhing ’jam la gzhon pa / dar dang / bal dang / srin bal dang / mon dar dang / ka tsa lin di\textsuperscript{68} ka dang / zar ma’i gos ltar reg na bde ba / yid du\textsuperscript{69} ’ong zhing gtsang la\textsuperscript{70} rdo dang / gseg ma dang / gyo’\textsuperscript{71} mo dang / bkra mi shis\textsuperscript{72} pa dang / ’dam rdzab dang / snyag snyig med pa’i sa phyogs bzang po\textsuperscript{73} ri dags\textsuperscript{74} sna

\textsuperscript{38} T: tshang

\textsuperscript{39} L: skye

\textsuperscript{40} T: nar

\textsuperscript{41} Q: sha

\textsuperscript{42} N: shirsha for shi ri sha

\textsuperscript{43} S and T: ardzu

\textsuperscript{44} L, S, and T: omit daṇḍa

\textsuperscript{45} L, Q, and S: insert daṇḍa

\textsuperscript{46} N: dngos

\textsuperscript{47} L: ltang

\textsuperscript{48} L: inserts daṇḍa

\textsuperscript{49} T: ba

\textsuperscript{50} L, Q, and T: ud pa

\textsuperscript{51} L, N, and S: padma

\textsuperscript{52} L: omits; Q: ta; T: dā

\textsuperscript{53} L, N, and S: padma

\textsuperscript{54} L: pa

\textsuperscript{55} Q: extra space may have been intended for a daṇḍa; L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa

\textsuperscript{56} T: omits (leaving only one khrung)

\textsuperscript{57} T: kha

\textsuperscript{58} T: ti

\textsuperscript{59} D: ko

\textsuperscript{60} T: ’dzon

\textsuperscript{61} N: randa

\textsuperscript{62} N: pa

\textsuperscript{63} L: ba

\textsuperscript{64} L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa

\textsuperscript{65} Q: inserts daṇḍa

\textsuperscript{66} Q: du

\textsuperscript{67} L, N, Q, S, and T: insert daṇḍa

\textsuperscript{68} N: lindi for lin di; Q: da

\textsuperscript{69} T: combines yid du into one word, resulting in a yid with a “u” marker under the final “d”

\textsuperscript{70} L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa

\textsuperscript{71} L: gye

\textsuperscript{72} L: shes

\textsuperscript{73} L and S: insert double daṇḍa; T: inserts daṇḍa

\textsuperscript{74} T: dvags
tshogs²⁶ ldang sko ska²⁶ dang / sha bkra²⁷ dang / spre’u dang / byi la dang / sre²⁸ mo dang / ri bong dang / dom dang / dred dang / bya’i tshogs kyis bsten pa²⁹ mtshan mo’i lha dang / lha’i bu mo dang³⁰ / ‘jig rten skyong ba³¹ dang³² /³³ chu lha³⁴ dang / zhi ba dang / gshin rje dang / ‘phags skyes po dang / lus ngan po dang / brgya byin dang / mig mi bzang dang / yul ’khor srung dang / lha ma yin dang / nam mkha”³⁵ ldang dang / dri za dang / mi ’am ci dang / lto ’phye chen po ’bum dag gnas pa na rten³⁶ cing bzhugs te³⁷ dge slong gi dge ’dun chen po dge slong bdun khri bdun stong la³⁸³⁹ ’dpa’i ste / lsa dang po dang / lsa dang ldan pa sha³⁸ ra dva ti’i bu dang / tshe dang ldan pa maud gal³⁰ gyi bu chen po dang / tshe dang ldan pa³¹ rab ’byor dang / tshe dang ldan pa ka³² pi³³ na dang / tshe dang ldan pa ba³⁴ lang³⁵ bdag dang / tshe dang ldan pa gsus po che³⁶ dang / lsa dang ldan pa³⁷ bha³⁸ ra³⁹ dva³⁹ dza³⁰ dang / tshe dang ldan pa³⁰¹ kun shes kau rṇḍi³⁰² nya dang / tshe dang ldan pa³³ bzan ldan dang / tshe dang ldan pa gang po dang / tshe dang ldan pa³³³ ra³³⁴ tu bzang po dang / tshe dang ldan pa³³⁵ lam phran bstan³³⁶ dang / tshe dang ldan pa ba³³⁷ kku³³⁸ la dang / tshe dang ldan pa³³³⁷ sgra gcan zin³³⁹ dang / tshe dang ldan pa nye dga’ bo dang³³³⁸ / tshe dang ldan pa dga’ bo dang / tshe dang ldan pa kun dga’ bo dang / de dag

---

²⁶ L, S, and T: insert danḍa
²⁷ T: omits
²⁸ L: skra
²⁹ Q: sra; L: srin
³⁰ L, Q, S, and T: insert danḍa
³¹ N: dag
³² D: omits
³³ N and Q: omit
³⁴ N: omits danḍa
³⁵ L, S, and T: zla
³⁶ L and T: combine the two syllables of this word, leaving what looks like namkha’ (this occurs frequently in L.)
³⁷ N: brten
³⁸ L, S, and T: insert danḍa
³⁹ L and T: insert danḍa
⁴⁰ D and L: sha
⁴¹ L: mo’u dgal; N: maudgal; Q: maud dgal; S: mo’u ’gal; T: mo’u gal
⁴² T: ba
⁴³ L and Q: kab
⁴⁴ L and T: bi
⁴⁵ T: omits
⁴⁶ N: ba lang is illegible
⁴⁷ L: tshe
⁴⁸ T: ba
⁴⁹ L: pa, possibly intended for ba; T: ba
⁵⁰ N and Q: dhva
⁵¹ L, S, and T: tsa
⁵² T: ba
⁵³ L and T: ko’u ’di; S: ko’u di
⁵⁴ T: ba
⁵⁵ N and Q: stan
⁵⁶ Q and T: omits; L: pa
⁵⁷ L and S: ku; T: sku
⁵⁸ T: ba
⁵⁹ S: ’dzin
⁶⁰ T: inserts la
la sogs\textsuperscript{110} pa dge slong bdun khri bdun\textsuperscript{111} stong la\textsuperscript{112} 'di lta ste / tshe dang ldan pa\textsuperscript{113} kun dga’ bo
gang\textsuperscript{114} zag gcig ma gtogs par thams cad kyang dg ra bcom pa / zag pa zad pa /\textsuperscript{115} nyon mongs
pa\textsuperscript{116} med pa / dbang dang\textsuperscript{117} ldan par\textsuperscript{118} gyur pa / sems shin tu\textsuperscript{119} rnam par grol ba /\textsuperscript{120} shes rab
shin tu\textsuperscript{121} rnam par grol ba / cang shes pa / glang po chen po /\textsuperscript{122} bya ba byas pa / byed\textsuperscript{123} pa
byas pa / khur bor ba / bdag gi\textsuperscript{124} don rjes su\textsuperscript{125} thob pa / srid par kun tu\textsuperscript{126} sbyor ba\textsuperscript{127} yongs
su\textsuperscript{128} zad pa / yang dag pa’i shes pas\textsuperscript{129} sems shin tu\textsuperscript{130} rnam par\textsuperscript{131} grol ba / sems\textsuperscript{132} thams cad
kyi\textsuperscript{133} dbang dam pa’i pha rol tu son pa\textsuperscript{134} sha stag dang thabs cig\textsuperscript{135} go /\textsuperscript{136} byang chub sems
dpa’i tshogs chen po\textsuperscript{137} byang chub sems dpa’ bye ba ’bum phrag du ma la’ di lta ste / byang
chub sems dpa’ sems dpa’ chen po byams pa dang / ’jam\textsuperscript{138} dpal\textsuperscript{139} gzhon nur gyur pa dang / spyan ras gzigs\textsuperscript{140} dbang phyug dang / mthu chen thob dang / kun tu\textsuperscript{141} bzang po dang / nam
mhka\textsuperscript{142} i snying po dang / Iha’i cod pan dang / rin chen cod pan dang / lag na rin chen dang /
rin chen ‘od dang / rin chen snying po dang / rin chen gtsug phud\textsuperscript{143} dang / rin chen seng ge

\textsuperscript{110} T: stsogs
\textsuperscript{111} T: pdun
\textsuperscript{112} T: omits
\textsuperscript{113} T: ba
\textsuperscript{114} T: omits
\textsuperscript{115} L: omits dan\d\a
\textsuperscript{116} T: omits
\textsuperscript{117} L: appears to read dang, but the writing here is extremely small and difficult to make out
\textsuperscript{118} T: pa
\textsuperscript{119} Q: du
\textsuperscript{120} Q: omits dan\d\a
\textsuperscript{121} Q: du
\textsuperscript{122} L, Q, and S: double dan\d\a
\textsuperscript{123} T: byes
\textsuperscript{124} \textsuperscript{125} L and N: gis
\textsuperscript{126} L and T: combine rjes su into one word, resulting in a rjes with a “u” marker under the final “s” (this occurs
frequently in L)
\textsuperscript{127} Q: du
\textsuperscript{128} Q: inserts dan\d\a
\textsuperscript{129} L and T: combine yongs su into one word, resulting in a yongs with a “u” marker under the final “s” (this occurs
frequently in L)
\textsuperscript{130} L and T: insert dan\d\a
\textsuperscript{131} Q: du
\textsuperscript{132} L: accidentally splits par into two syllables, leaving pa ra
\textsuperscript{133} Q: inserts can
\textsuperscript{134} S: kyang
\textsuperscript{135} T: ba
\textsuperscript{136} L, Q, and T: gcig
\textsuperscript{137} N, Q, S, and T: single dan\d\a
\textsuperscript{138} L: inserts double dan\d\a; S and T: insert dan\d\a
\textsuperscript{139} T: ’jum
\textsuperscript{140} L: dpal’
\textsuperscript{141} N: appears to read gzags, either because of an error or because the “i” marker has been effaced
\textsuperscript{142} Q: du
\textsuperscript{143} L: namkha’
\textsuperscript{144} L and T: pul

187
dang / rin chen dra ba can dang / dra ba can gyi 'od dang / (an eye-skip plus the duplication of ba)  

144 L: the presence of dra ba in the last two names has led to them being mistakenly combined in one line, leaving rin chen dra ba ba can gyi 'od dang / (an eye-skip plus the duplication of ba)
145 L: gnyi
146 L: prefix “b” is squeezed in at the upper left corner of the syllable; N: prefix “b” is mostly illegible
147 N and Q: bstan
148 L, S, and T: insert pa
149 L, N and S: padma
150 Q: mdab
151 T: bar
152 Q: du
153 Q: omits danđa
154 L and Q: snags for snag sa
155 Q and T: 'dzon
156 T: mug gsal for mugs gsal
157 S: tsugs
158 L, N, and S: padma
159 L: inserts danđa
160 L: rin che po for rin po che, with che being squeezed in before po instead of after it
161 L: thon
162 D: ka
163 Q: du
164 L, S, and T: insert danđa
165 L: thabs; T: thag
166 L, S, and T: insert danđa
167 Q: ta
168 L and Q: mdab; T: 'dam
169 L: re
170 L and S: bing
171 N: appears to read either pingka or bingka for ping ka
172 D, L, S, and T: omit the genitive particle
173 N: faint trace of an “l” beneath appears to be there, but otherwise the syllable is za
174 L: ma'i
175 T: inserts ma
176 N: ta mba for dam pa
chub sems dpa’ sems dpa’ chen po rkang lag phra zhing mnyen la gzhon sha chags shing sra lmar sems dpa’ sems dpa’ chen po rkang lag gi sen mo zangs kyi mdog ’dra ba dang de dag la sos pag byang chub sems dpa’ dgu khri dgu stong thams cad kyang phyir mi ldog pa phyir mi ldog pa i chos kyi khor lo skor ba bdud dang phyir rgol ba nges par bcom pa bdud kyi las thams cad las yang dag par ’das pa de bzhin gshigs pa thams cad kyi yul la ’jug pa shes pa la mkhas pa mngon par shes pa dpa’ bar gro ba’i ting nge dzin gyi mtha’i sgo bsgrub pa’i gzungs thob pa pha rol tu phyin pa thams cad la thabs mkhas pa rtogs par khong du chud pa jig rten gyi khams tha dad pa ston pa go cha chen po bgos pa sangs rgyas kyi yon tan la the tsom med pa nyon mongs pa dang nye ba’i nyon mongs pa’i bag chags thams cad la sems pas bag chags dang mtshams sbyor ba dang bcas par mngon pa’i nga rgyal yang dag par bcom nas dul ba dang nga rgyal yang dag par bcom nasal dang / yang dag par spong
ba dang / rdzu 'phrul gyi rkang pa dang / dbang po dang / stobs dang / byang chub kyi yan lag dang / lam la zhugs pa16 byams pa dang / snying rje dang / dga' ba dang / btang snyoms dang / bzod pa dang / bsam pa217 dang / bag la nyal phun sum tshogs pa /218 nga219 rgyal dang / rgyags pa dang / dregs pa dang / ryes rtsom dang / khengs pa dang / ser sna dang / ngar 'dzin pa dang / nga yir 'dzin pa dang / lhag par zhen220 pa dang / chags pa dang / zhen pa dang / brgyal221 ba dang / sred pa dang / mgon par222 zhen pa dang223 bral224 ba225 bskal pa bye ba khrag khrig 'bum phrag grangs med par226 bdag227 la phan pa228 dang / gzhun la phan pa229 dang / bde bar sbyor ba la brtson la230 / dge ba'i rtsa ba shin tu231 bsags232 shing233 tshogs rdzogs par byas pa'i rgyud can234 sgyu235 dang / g.yo dang236 brdzun dang / phra ma dang237 ngag rtsub po238 dang / gsod239 pa240 dang / gnod par byed pa dang / 'ching ba dang / lta ba ngan pas gzing241 pa dang / sdigs242 pa dang / rtsod pa dang / 'thab pa dang / 'breg243 pa dang / 'khrug long dang / 'gyed pa dang / nye ba'i nyon mongs pa dang bral ba sha stag dang / 'jig rten skyong ba244 bzhil po 'di lta ste / rgyal po chen245 po rnam246 thos kyi bu dang / rgyal po chen po yul 'khor srung dang / rgyal po chen po 'phags skyes po dang / rgyal po247 chen po mig mi

214 N: bzhag
215 N: pa'i
216 L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
217 L: ba
218 N: omits daṇḍa
219 N: de
220 L: accidentally splits zhen into two syllables, leaving zhe na
221 S: rgyal
222 T: bar
223 L and N: insert daṇḍa
224 L: 'bral
225 L, Q, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
226 Q: the woodblock has been re-cut to squeeze in mang por here
227 T: dga'
228 L: ba
229 L: ba
230 L, Q, S, and T: pa
231 Q: du
232 L: bstags
233 L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
234 N: the letter ca of can is mostly effaced, but what is present at the top makes the reading seem certain
235 N: this syllable is impossible to make out, and looks as much like spru or spu as sgyu
236 L, Q, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
237 Q: omits the entire phrase phra ma dang plus the daṇḍa
238 L: pa
239 L: bsod
240 N: ba
241 L: gzigs
242 D and N: bsdigs; S: sdig
243 L: possibly 'phreg; S: 'bregs
244 N and Q: omit
245 L: accidentally splits chen into two syllables, leaving che na
246 T: rnam
247 S: while “p” has accidentally been omitted, the “o” marker is actually present above the right half of the preceding “l”
bzang rang rang gi248 g.yog249 ’khor gyis bskor ba rnams dang / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po lngas rtsen rang gi bu’i ’khor dang bcas pa dang / gnod sbyin gyi sde dpon chen po lag na rdo rje rang gi gnod sbyin gyi ’khor dang bcas pa dang / ’byung po250 chen po’i ma ’phrog ma rang gi gnod sbyin mo’i ’khor dang bcas pa dang /251 dung can ma dang / mdung thogs ma dang / ser mo dang / dka’252 bzlog253 ma dang / dpal254 gyi lha mo chen mo dang / dbyangs can ma dang / ’jigs255 byed ma dang / zla ba256 dang / lha’i dbang po brgya byin dang / lha’i bu dbang phyug chen po dang / mi mjd kyi bdag po tshangs pa rang gi lha’i bu’i ’khor257 dang bcas pa dag dang / klu’i rgyal po ma dros pa dang /258 klu’i rgyal po rgya259 mtsho rang rang gi klu’i ’khor dang bcas pa dag dang / nam mkha’260 lding gi dbang po gzi chen dang / nam mkha’261 lding gi dbang po lus chen rang rang gi nam mkha’262 lding gi ’khor dang bcas pa dag dang / lha ma263 yin gyi dbang po stobs can dang / lha ma yin gyi dbang po sgra gcan rang rang gi tshogs kyi ’khor dang bcas pa dag dang / mi ’am ci’i rgyal po ljon pa rang gi mi ’am ci’i ’khor dang bcas pa dang / dri za’i bu zur phud264 lnga pa266 rang gi ’khor dang bcas pa dang / de las gzhan pa lha dang / klu dang / gnod sbyin dang / dri za dang / lha ma yin dang / nam mkha’267 lding dang / mi ’am ci dang / lto ’phye chen po dang / mi dang268 mi ma yin pa gzi269 brjed che ba270 dpag tu med /271 grangs med pa dag dang yang thabs cig272 ste / rigs bzhi po bram ze dang / rgyal rigs dang / rje’u rigs dang / dmangs rigs rnams dang / ’khor bzhi po dge slong dang / dge slong ma dang / dge bsnyen273 dang / dge bsnyen ma rnams dang / shākya274 bye ba khrag khrig phrag275

---

248 L: gis
249 Q: inserts daṇḍa
250 N: bo
251 Q: omits daṇḍa
252 S: bka’
253 D: zlog
254 L: dpa’
255 L: ’jig
256 S: inserts ma
257 N: ’khar
258 T: repeats the entire phrase klu’i rgyal po ma dros pa dang plus the daṇḍa
259 N: brgya
260 L: namkha’
261 L: namkha’
262 L: omits
263 L: namkha’
264 N: mi
265 T: pud
266 D: ba
267 L: namkha’i
268 S: inserts daṇḍa
269 N: gza
270 D, L, N, and T: repeat gzi brjed che ba. The scribe and/or editor of S has almost certainly made a correction to remove the repetition, since there is a gap in the text here (or more precisely, an inserted series of dots) of just the right size
271 L, S, and T: omit daṇḍa
272 L, Q, and T: gcig
273 L and T: insert ma
274 D: shā kya
275 Q: omits
'bum dag dang / rgyal po rnams dang / blon po²⁷⁶ chen po²⁷⁷ rnams dang / grong rdal gyi mi
rnams dang / yul gyi mi rnams dang / khyim bdag dang / blon po dang / pho²⁷⁸ brang 'khor gyi
mi dang²⁷⁹ / sgo dpon gyi 'khor rnams kyiis bskor cing mdun gyis bltas nas²⁸⁰ bkur st²⁸¹ byas /
bla mar byas / ri mo²⁸² byas / mchod pa byas te / bcom ldan 'das kyiis na bza' dang / zhal las
dang / gzims cha dang / gdan dang /²⁸³ snyun²⁸⁴ gyi²⁸⁵ gsos²⁸⁶ sman dang / yo byad mang po gya
nom pa²⁸⁷ dag brnyes²⁸⁸ shing²⁸⁹ phyogs bcu'i 'jig rten gyi khams rab 'byam²⁹⁰ dpag tu med²⁹¹ /
grangs med pa dag tu yang²⁹² / bcom ldan 'das kyi²⁹³ grags²⁹⁵ pa dang²⁹⁶ /²⁹⁷ sgra²⁹⁸ dang / tshigs
su²⁹⁹ bcad³⁰⁰ pa³⁰¹ rgya cher mngon par grags³⁰² so³⁰³ // rdo rje'i snying po'i³⁰⁴ sa phyogs mnyam
zhing yid du 'ong la³⁰⁵ rgya che zhing yangs pa / chag chag legs par btab pa³⁰⁶ / phyag³⁰⁷ dar³⁰⁸
legs par byas pa / legs par rnam par phye ba / pog snod nas bdugs pa / me tog ut³⁰⁹ pa³¹⁰ la
dang³¹¹ /³¹² pad ma³¹³ dang / ku mu da³¹⁴ dang / pad ma³¹⁵ dkar po dang / a ti mug ta³¹⁶ ka dang /

²⁷⁶ Q: omits
²⁷⁷ Q: repeats chen po
²⁷⁸ N: “o” marker is only partly legible
²⁷⁹ T: rnams
²⁸⁰ L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
²⁸¹ L: bsti
²⁸² L: mor
²⁸³ N: omits daṇḍa
²⁸⁴ T: gsnyun
²⁸⁵ L, N, Q, S, and T: omit
²⁸⁶ L: gsol
²⁸⁷ L: ba
²⁸⁸ L: bsnyes; N: appears to read brnyas, either because of an error or because the “e” marker has been effaced
²⁸⁹ L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
²⁹⁰ L, S, and T: ‘byams
²⁹¹ L, S, and T: insert pa
²⁹² L, S, and T: omit daṇḍa
²⁹³ N: ‘ang
²⁹⁴ L: kyiis
²⁹⁵ L: grangs
²⁹⁶ Q: omits
²⁹⁷ N: omits daṇḍa
²⁹⁸ N: appears to read sga, either because of an error or because the subj joined “r” has been effaced
²⁹⁹ L: combines tshigs su into one word, resulting in a tshigs with a “u” marker under the final “s”
³⁰⁰ L: gcad
³⁰¹ L: repeats pa
³⁰² L: grangs
³⁰³ T: combines grags so into one word, resulting in a grags with an “o” marker over the final “s”
³⁰⁴ L: omits the genitive particle
³⁰⁵ L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
³⁰⁶ L: ba
³⁰⁷ L: phyad
³⁰⁸ S: bdar
³⁰⁹ Q and T: ud; L: u da (probably accidentally splitting ud into two syllables)
³¹⁰ N and S: utpa
³¹¹ Q: omits
³¹² N and Q: omit daṇḍa
³¹³ T, S: padma; N: almost completely illegible, but probably read padma
³¹⁴ Q: ta; T: dā
³¹⁵ L, N, and S: padma
ka dampa dang / par shi ka dang / ta ra ni dang / skya snar dang / mya ngan 'tshang
dang / ko ran 'da ka dang / sna ma dang / i thi' ia me tog dag bkram pa / rin po che
sna tshogs kyi shing ljon pas mdzes par byas pa na seng ge'i khri rin po che'snying po
dang / rin po che'i ras bcos bu 'bum dag bting ba / rin po che'i bla re bres pa / rin po
che'i dril bu g.yer ka'i dra ba bres pa / rin po che'i lda ldi spyangs pa / rin po che sna
tshogs kyis spras pa / nor bu dang / gser dang / rdo rje dang / bai dūrya dang / mu
tig dang / dung dang / man shel dang / byi ru dang / an da nnyil dang / rdo'i snying po
dang / ma rgad dang / spug dang / shel dang / rin po che bye ba khrag khrig phrag 'bum
dag gis brgyan pa la bzhugs te / dbang po zhi ba thugs zhi ba48 349 dul ba dang zhi gnas
dam pa brnyes pa / dul ba dang zhi gnas mchog brnyes pa / bsrungs pa / gtso bor gyur pa /
dbang po thul ba / mtsho ltar dang zhing gsal la rnyog pa med pa / rin po che'i mchod
sdong\textsuperscript{355} ltar mgon par ’phags pa\textsuperscript{356} dpal\textsuperscript{357} ’bar zhing lham\textsuperscript{358} me\textsuperscript{359} lhan\textsuperscript{360} ner\textsuperscript{361} bzhugs pa /
sku skyes bu chen po’i mtshan sum cu\textsuperscript{362} rtsa gnyis kyis legs par brgyan pa /
sku dpe byad bzang po\textsuperscript{363} brgyad cus\textsuperscript{364} mdzes par byas pa /
gya mtsho chen po ltar dam pa’i chos kyi chus yongs su\textsuperscript{365} gang ba /
ri rab ltar mi bskyod\textsuperscript{366} pa /
sa ltar sams can thams cad kyi nye\textsuperscript{367} bar tsho ba /\textsuperscript{369} chu ltar dge ba’i rtsa ba rab tu skyed\textsuperscript{370} pa /
tha snyad ltar thugs mnyam pa\textsuperscript{371} /
nam mkha’\textsuperscript{372} ltar gos pa med pa /
nyi ma ltar mi shes pa’i mun pa sel ba /
zla ba ltar dkar po’i chos yongs su\textsuperscript{373} rdzogs pa /
rid bzhin gyi nor bu ltar bsam pa thams cad yongs su\textsuperscript{374} rdzogs par
mdzad pa\textsuperscript{375} /
nyi ma ltar shar ba /
nyi ma ltar gzi brjid kyis lam me ba /
zla ba ltar bsil\textsuperscript{376} zhing sim par\textsuperscript{377} mdzad pa /
rgya mtsho ltar rin po che’i ’byung gnas su\textsuperscript{378} gyur pa\textsuperscript{379} rgya\textsuperscript{380} mtsho ltar zab pa /
me’i phung po ltar snang ba /
lus mi bskyod pa /
sems mi g.yo ba /
shi zhing rab tu zhi ba /
dbang po ’khrul pa mi mnga’ ba\textsuperscript{381} /
ma khengs\textsuperscript{382} shing mi rgod pa\textsuperscript{383} /
dran pa\textsuperscript{385} legs par\textsuperscript{386} nye bar bzhag\textsuperscript{387} pa /
spyod lam mdzes pa /
legs par mnyam par bzhag\textsuperscript{388} pa /
rtag tu mnyam\textsuperscript{389} par bzhag\textsuperscript{390} pa /
phyi ma’i mtha’i bskal pa bye ba phrag ’bum du\textsuperscript{391} dge ba’i rtsa ba

\textsuperscript{355} L: stong
\textsuperscript{356} L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{357} L: dpa’
\textsuperscript{358} D, N, and Q: lam
\textsuperscript{359} Q: combines lam me into one word, leaving lame
\textsuperscript{360} N and Q: lha
\textsuperscript{361} N: appears to read nar, either because of an error or because the “e” marker has been effaced
\textsuperscript{362} Q: bcu
\textsuperscript{363} D and Q: pos
\textsuperscript{364} D and Q: omit brgyad cus
\textsuperscript{365} L: yongsu
\textsuperscript{366} N: omits danḍa
\textsuperscript{367} T: skyod
\textsuperscript{368} L: nya
\textsuperscript{369} L and T: omit danḍa
\textsuperscript{370} L, Q, and S: bskyed
\textsuperscript{371} L: ba
\textsuperscript{372} L and T: namkha’
\textsuperscript{373} L: yongsu
\textsuperscript{374} L: yongsu
\textsuperscript{375} S: ba
\textsuperscript{376} L and T: btsil
\textsuperscript{377} L and T: bar
\textsuperscript{378} L: combines gnas su into one word, resulting in a gnas with a “u” marker under the final “s”
\textsuperscript{379} L, Q, S, and T: insert danḍa
\textsuperscript{380} T: omits
\textsuperscript{381} T: inserts danḍa
\textsuperscript{382} D: khangs
\textsuperscript{383} D: inserts danḍa
\textsuperscript{384} N: either omits the danḍa (with possibly some extra space being intended for one) or only the faintest trace of its bottom remains
\textsuperscript{385} T: ba
\textsuperscript{386} N and Q: pa
\textsuperscript{387} D, L, and T: gzhag
\textsuperscript{388} D and L: gzhag
\textsuperscript{389} L: a large * in the upper right hand corner either marks an omission or the final “m” of mnyam
\textsuperscript{390} D: gzhag
thams cad yang dag par bsgrubs pa\textsuperscript{392} / bsod nams kyi tshogs thams cad bsags\textsuperscript{393} pa / pha rol tu\textsuperscript{394} phyin pa thams cad la thabs mkhas pa / rtoogs par thugs su chud pa / sangs rgyas dang\textsuperscript{395} byang chub sms dpâ'i sa thams cad la rnam\textsuperscript{396} par rol pa / byang chub sms dpâ'i spyod pa thams cad thugs kysis spyad pa / sms can thams cad kysis phan pa dang\textsuperscript{397} bde ba 'thob\textsuperscript{398} par\textsuperscript{399} bya ba' phyir brtsön pa\textsuperscript{400} de\textsuperscript{401} chos ston te / tshangs par\textsuperscript{402} spyod pa / thog mar dge ba / bar du dge ba / tha mar dge ba / don bzang po / tshig 'bru bzang po / ma 'dres pa / yongs su\textsuperscript{404} byang ba / dri ma med pa / 'od gsal ba / yid du\textsuperscript{408} 'ong ba / yid du 'thad pa / yid sim\textsuperscript{409} par\textsuperscript{410} byed pa / yid shin tu\textsuperscript{111} dga' bar byed pa / yid skul bar byed pa / yid mgu\textsuperscript{413} zhirgyas par byed pa / rnam par dag pa / 'jigs pa med pa / mi rtsub pa / bgtan pa / zab pa / mi g.yo ba / mi 'gyur ba\textsuperscript{415} / btags\textsuperscript{416} tu med\textsuperscript{417} pa / rtoogs\textsuperscript{418} i spyod yul ma yin pa / bsam gyis mi khyab pa / rmad\textsuperscript{419} du byung ba / brjod\textsuperscript{420} du med\textsuperscript{421} pa'i yang\textsuperscript{422} brjod du med pa / ston cing\textsuperscript{425} / chad de rnam pa 'byed la\textsuperscript{426} / grel\textsuperscript{427} / cing gsal bar

\textsuperscript{391} T: another phrag for du
\textsuperscript{392} N: ba
\textsuperscript{393} L: bstsags
\textsuperscript{394} Q: du
\textsuperscript{395} L and T: insert danđa
\textsuperscript{396} L: rnam
\textsuperscript{397} L and T: insert danđa
\textsuperscript{398} L and T: thob
\textsuperscript{399} T: bar
\textsuperscript{400} L: ba
\textsuperscript{401} L and T: insert danđa
\textsuperscript{402} Q: pa
\textsuperscript{403} L and Q: double danđa
\textsuperscript{404} L: double danđa
\textsuperscript{405} L: yongsu
\textsuperscript{406} L: yongsu
\textsuperscript{407} L: yongsu
\textsuperscript{408} L: combines yid du into one word, resulting in a yid with a “u” marker under the final “d”
\textsuperscript{409} N: sims
\textsuperscript{410} L: bar
\textsuperscript{411} Q: du
\textsuperscript{412} Q: omits the entire phrase yid skul byed pa plus the danđa. There is no evidence that the woodblock was altered
\textsuperscript{413} L: ‘gu; S and T: ‘gul
\textsuperscript{414} N and Q: omit danđa
\textsuperscript{415} T: la
\textsuperscript{416} S: rtag
\textsuperscript{417} L: mid
\textsuperscript{418} D and Q: insert ba
\textsuperscript{419} Q: smad
\textsuperscript{420} L: “o” marker is barely legible
\textsuperscript{421} L: “e” marker is almost or entirely absent
\textsuperscript{422} L: “i” marker is barely legible
\textsuperscript{423} L: repeats brjod du med pa‘i yang (possibly because the first attempt was poorly written)
\textsuperscript{424} L, S, and T: omit danđa
\textsuperscript{425} L, S, and T: insert danđa
\textsuperscript{426} L: inserts a deformed danđa; S and T: insert danđa
\textsuperscript{427} L: ‘brel
\textsuperscript{428} L: something has been effaced here, possibly a danđa
mdzad do // de’i tse byang chub sms dpam chen po ri'i phug dang / zom dang / ri sul dang / gseb dang / sman ljonga na seng ge'i mchog rnam par bsgyings shing nga ro rnam par sgros pa lta bu’i mi’i dbang po’i gtsug gi nor bu zhes bya ba // gzugs bzang ba / mdzes pa / blta na / sdu pa / kha dog bzang po / rgyas / mchog dang ldan pa / sngon gi rgyal b'ri' rnam la lhag par bya ba byas pa / dge ba'i rtsa ba bskyed pa / sangs rgyas bye ba khrag khrig 'bum phrag mang po la / bsnyen bkur byas pa / dkon mchog gsum gi gdung 'tshob pa / snying rje can / spos pa thogs pa med pa / skye dgu la mnyes gshin pa / dad pa bzang ba / bsam pa dge ba / brtsan pa / zab pa / snying brtsa / sgsal ba / rgyis rgyal b'ri' le lo med pa / shin tu dul ba / dge des che ba / sgyu can ma yin pa / g.yo med pa / mi rtsub pa / mi brlang ba / drang ba / nga rgyal / rgyags pa dang / dregs pa dang / tha ba / dang / khro ba dang / phrag dog dang / ser sna dang / ngar 'dzin pa dang / nga yir 'dzin pa dang / lhag par zhen pa
dang / sdug bsngal ba dang / yid mi bde ba dang / ma\textsuperscript{466} rig pa dang\textsuperscript{467} bral ba dang\textsuperscript{468} / bsod nams dang ldan pa\textsuperscript{469} zhid 'khor de nyid du 'dus par gyur te 'dug go /\textsuperscript{470} de nas byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po ri'i\textsuperscript{471} phug dang / zom dang / ri sul dang / gseb\textsuperscript{472} dang / sman ljongs\textsuperscript{473} na seng ge'i mchog rnam par bsgyings shing\textsuperscript{474} nga ro rnam par sgros pa lta bu'i\textsuperscript{475} mi'i dbang po'\textsuperscript{476} gtsug gi nor bu stan las langs te /\textsuperscript{477} bla'gos phrag pa gcig tu gzar\textsuperscript{478} nas /\textsuperscript{479} pus\textsuperscript{480} mo gyas pa'i lha nga\textsuperscript{481} i snying po la btsugs te / bcom ldan 'das ga la ba de logs\textsuperscript{483} su thal mo sbyar ba btud\textsuperscript{484} nas / bcom ldan 'das la 'di skad ces gsol to / gal te bdag gis zhus nas zhu ba\textsuperscript{485} lan gdab pa'i slad du\textsuperscript{486} / bcom ldan 'das kyis skabs phye na\textsuperscript{487} /\textsuperscript{488} bcom ldan 'das de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sngas rgyas la bdag phyogs 'ga' zhig zhu bar 'tshal lo // de skad ces gsol pa dang / bcom ldan 'das kyis\textsuperscript{489} byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po ri'i\textsuperscript{490} phug dang / zom dang / ri sul dang / gseb dang / sman ljongs\textsuperscript{491} na seng ge'i mchog rnam par bsgyings shing\textsuperscript{492} nga ro rnam par sgros pa lta bu'i mi'i dbang po'i gtsug gi nor bu la 'di skad ces bka' stsal to // rigs kyi bu khyod la sngas rgyas dang /\textsuperscript{493} byang chub sems dpa' thams cad rtag tu skabs 'byed kyis /\textsuperscript{494} rigs kyi bu khyod kyis\textsuperscript{495} de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa\textsuperscript{496} yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sngas rgyas la ci dang ci 'dod pa\textsuperscript{497} dris shig dang / ngas dris pa de dang de'i lan btal pas\textsuperscript{498} 499 khyod kyi sems rangs par bya'o // de skad ces\textsuperscript{500} bka'

\textsuperscript{466} L: mi
\textsuperscript{467} L and N: insert daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{468} L, S, and T: omit
\textsuperscript{469} T: ba
\textsuperscript{470} N, Q, S, and T: single daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{471} N and Q: omit the genitive particle
\textsuperscript{472} N: “e” marker is almost or entirely absent; T: accidentally splits gseb into two syllables, leaving gse ba
\textsuperscript{473} L, Q, and T: ljong
\textsuperscript{474} L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{475} Q: omits the genitive particle
\textsuperscript{476} L: omits the genitive particle
\textsuperscript{477} Q: omits daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{478} L and T: bzar
\textsuperscript{479} Q: omits daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{480} L: phus
\textsuperscript{481} T: inserts sa
\textsuperscript{482} L, N, and S: padma; T: lad pa for pad ma
\textsuperscript{483} L: a second, misplaced “o” marker sits atop the final “s”
\textsuperscript{484} L: btu; Q: bdu
\textsuperscript{485} L, S, and T: zhus pa'i for zhu ba
\textsuperscript{486} Q: zhu ba lung bstan pa'i slad du for zhu ba lan gdab pa'i slad du
\textsuperscript{487} Q: ba
\textsuperscript{488} Q: omits daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{489} S: inserts daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{490} N: chen po'i ri for chen po ri'i (i.e., the genitive particle has been displaced)
\textsuperscript{491} L, Q, and T: ljong
\textsuperscript{492} L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{493} Q and S: omit daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{494} L, Q, and T: omit daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{495} N and Q: kyi
\textsuperscript{496} T: ba
\textsuperscript{497} N: mostly illegible
\textsuperscript{498} L: bas
\textsuperscript{499} L and T: insert daṇḍa
stsal pa dang / bcom ldan 'das la byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po ri'i phug dang / zom dang / ri sul dang / gseb dang / sman ljongs na seng ge'i mchog rnam par bsgyings shing / nga ro rnam par sgrogs pa lta bu'i mi'i dbang po'i gtsug gi nor bus 'di skad ces gsol to / bcom ldan 'das rigs kyi bu' am rigs kyi bu mo dang po sems bskyed pas gang la mngon par brtson par bgyi lags / de skad ces gsol pa dang / bcom ldan 'das kyis byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po ri'i phug dang / zom dang / ri sul dang / gseb dang / sman ljongs na seng ge'i mchog rnam par bsgyings

N: cas
S: inserts daṇḍa
N and Q: ri'i sul
L, Q, and T: ljong
T: squeezes na beneath and between the surrounding syllables ljong and seng
T: bgyings
Q: omits daṇḍa
L: btsug
L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
Q: appears to read dad pa for dang po
T: and T: insert daṇḍa
L, S, and T: omit mngon par; N: la mngon par is almost completely illegible, though what can be seen and the apparent size of the syllables would certainly support this reading
Q: gyi
L: omits
N and Q: ri'i sul
N: only the prefix “g” and the “e” marker are legible
L, Q, and T: ljong
T: bgyings
Q: inserts daṇḍa
S: gyi
L, Q, S, and T: omit double daṇḍa; N: single daṇḍa
L: combines each legs so into one word, resulting in two legs with an “o” marker over the final “s”; N: second legs so is almost completely illegible; T: combines the second legs so into one word, resulting in a legs with an “o” marker over the final “s”
L: yongsu
L: combines legs so into one word, resulting in a legs with an “o” marker over the final “s” (this occurs frequently in L)
Q: single daṇḍa
T: inserts rigs
L: appears to read du for la, but the writing here is extremely small and difficult to make out
N: gzungs; Q: bzungs
T: omits yid la zung
N and S: zhig
N and Q: omit
L: omits the genitive particle
N: omits phug dang plus the daṇḍa
L: zlom
T: gsep
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shing /\(^{536}\) nga ro rnam par sgros pa lta bu'i \(^{537}\)i dbang po'i gtsug gi nor bus \(^{538}\) / bcom ldan 'das la legs so zhes gsol nas \(^{539}\) bcom ldan 'das kyi \(^{540}\) ltar nyan pa dang / bcom ldan 'das kyis de la bka' stsal pa / rigs kyi bu byang chub sms dp\(a^{541}\) 'ems dp\(a^{'542}\) 'en po dang po sms bs\(k\)yed pas \(^{543}\) dge ba bcu'i las kyi lam dag la mgon par \(^{544}\) brtson par \(^{545}\) bya'o / rigs kyi bu de la byang chub sms dp\(a^{'546}\) 'ems dp\(a^{'547}\) 'en po dge ba bcu' \(^{548}\) las kyi lam dag la ji ltar mgon par \(^{549}\) brtson par byed ce na \(^{550}\) rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sms dp\(a^{'551}\) 'ems dp\(a^{'552}\) 'en po ni s\(r\)og g\(c\)od pa spangs pa yin \(^{553}\) log par lta ba \(^{554}\)i bar dag spangs \(^{555}\) pa yin no / \(^{556}\) rigs kyi bu de la byang chub sms dp\(a^{'557}\) 'ems dp\(a^{'558}\) 'en po s\(r\)og g\(c\)od pa spangs pa ji lta \(^{559}\) bu yin zhe na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sms dp\(a^{'560}\) 'ems dp\(a^{'561}\) 'en de 'di s\(n\)yam du sms te / s\(r\)og ces bya ba ni tha na s\(r\)og chags g\(r\)og \(^{562}\) sbur yan chad la yang \(^{563}\) sdug c\(i\)ng phangs \(^{564}\) la dga' zh\(i\)ng yid du 'ong ba yin te / bdag la yang \(^{565}\) s\(r\)og \(^{566}\) di sdug c\(i\)ng phangs \(^{567}\) la dga' zh\(i\)ng yid du 'ong ba yin gyis \(^{568}\) su y\(a\)ng \(^{569}\) bdag la g\(s\)od pa 'am / g\(s\)od du 'jug pa 'am \(^{570}\) bs\(a\)d pa la rjes su \(^{571}\) yi \(^{572}\) rang bar ma gyur cig \(^{573}\) bdag gis k\(y\)a\(n\) su la yang \(^{574}\) bs\(a\)d \(^{575}\) par mi bya / g\(s\)od \(^{576}\) du gzhug par mi bya / g\(s\)od \(^{577}\) pa la rjes su yi rang bar mi bya'o s\(n\)yam mo / / \(^{578}\) rigs kyi bu de ltar na byang chub sms dp\(a^{'579}\) 'ems dp\(a^{'580}\) 'en po s\(r\)og g\(c\)od pa

\(^{535}\) L, Q, and T: ljong
\(^{536}\) L, N, S, and T: omit daṇḍa
\(^{537}\) L: ma
\(^{538}\) L: bur
\(^{539}\) Q: omits daṇḍa
\(^{540}\) Q: omits daṇḍa
\(^{541}\) N: kyis
\(^{542}\) L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
\(^{543}\) T: bar
\(^{544}\) T: bar
\(^{545}\) L: cu
\(^{546}\) T: inserts s\(a\)ngs r\(g\)yas (with the final “s” of r\(g\)yas being almost completely effaced)
\(^{547}\) T: bar
\(^{548}\) L, Q, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
\(^{549}\) N: omits daṇḍa
\(^{550}\) L: omits
\(^{551}\) Q: s\(p\)ongs
\(^{552}\) T: single daṇḍa
\(^{553}\) L: ltar
\(^{554}\) L: grogs
\(^{555}\) L and T: omit; N: 'ang
\(^{556}\) S: 'phangs
\(^{557}\) N: 'ang
\(^{558}\) N: looks like s\(r\)eg, most likely because the right half of the “o” marker has rubbed off
\(^{559}\) S: 'phangs
\(^{560}\) L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
\(^{561}\) N: 'ang
\(^{562}\) N: omits daṇḍa
\(^{563}\) L: rjesu
\(^{564}\) Q: yid
\(^{565}\) L, Q, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
\(^{566}\) N: 'ang
\(^{567}\) L and S: gs\(a\)d
\(^{568}\) L: gs\(a\)d; S and T: bs\(a\)d
\(^{569}\) L: gs\(a\)d; S and T: bs\(a\)d
spangs pa yin no // de la 'di skad ces bya ste // 570 mngal na gnas pa yan chad kyang // 571 kun la srog ni sdu g'i phyir // 572 bdag gi srog phangs 573 gang yin pa // 574 de ni srog chags gsod mi byed // 575 de la ma byin par len pa 576 spangs pa jI lta bu yin zhe na // rigs kyi bu 'di la 577 byang chub sms dpa de 'di snyang du sms te // nor zhæs bya ba ni tha na 578 rigs ngan dang / g.yung po yan chad la yang 579 580 sdu g'i cing phangs 581 la dga' zhæng yid du 'ong ba yin te // 582 bdag la yang 583 nor 'di sdu cing phangs 584 la dga' zhæng yid du 'ong ba yin gys 585 su yang 586 bdag la 'phrog pa 'am / 'phrog tu 'jug pa 'am / phrogs 587 pa la rjes su 'yï rang bar ma gyur cig // 588 bdag gis kyung su la yang 590 dbrog 591 par mi bya 592 / 'phrog 593 tu gzhug 594 par mi bya / phrogs pa la rjes su 'yï rang bar mi bya'o 596 snyam mo / 597 rigs kyi bu de ltar na byang chub sms dpa' sms dpa' chen po ma byin par len pa spangs pa yin no // 598 de la 'di skad ces bya ste // 599 shing dang bong ba yan chad la // 600 gzhan gyi 601 bor 602 bar 603 gyur pa yang // 604 gang la pha yi 605 nor sdu g pa // 606 de ni nor la 'phrog mi byed // 607 de la 'dod pas 608 log par g.yem pa 609 spangs pa jI lta bu

570 Q: double daṇḍa
571 L and S: single daṇḍa
572 L and S: single daṇḍa
573 S: 'phangs
574 L, S, and T: single daṇḍa
575 L: single daṇḍa; Q: omits double daṇḍa
576 T: par
577 L: omits 'di la
578 L: squeezes in na between adjacent syllables (though it is still of normal size), probably as a correction
579 N: 'ang
580 L: squeezes in la yang between adjacent syllables, probably as a correction
581 Q and S: 'phangs
582 Q: omits daṇḍa
583 N: 'ang
584 S: 'phangs
585 L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
586 N: 'ang
587 N and Q: 'phrog
588 L: rjesu
589 N: either omits the daṇḍa or only a faint trace of its top remains
590 N: 'ang
591 L, Q, S, and T: 'phrog
592 T: bya' (as if bya'o was meant to be written)
593 N: phrog
594 N: gzhugs
595 L, N, Q, S, and T: phrogs pa'i for phrogs pa la
596 Q: inserts daṇḍa
597 N: omits double daṇḍa; Q: single daṇḍa
598 Q: single daṇḍa
599 Q: double daṇḍa
600 L and S: single daṇḍa
601 L and T: gyis
602 S: bong
603 L: ba
604 L: single daṇḍa
605 N: phan pa'i for pha yi; Q: pha'i for pha yi
606 L and S: single daṇḍa
607 L and Q: single daṇḍa
608 L: pa; S and T: pa la for pas
yin zhe na / rigs kyi bu ’di la byang chub sems dpa’ de ’di snyam du sems te / 610 chung ma zhes bya ba ni tha na dud ’gro’i skye gnas su gyur pa rnams la yang / 611 sdug cing phangs / 613 la dga’ zhing yid du ’ong ba yin te / bdag la yang / 614 chung ma / 615 sdug cing phangs / 616 la dga’ zhing yid du ’ong ba yin te / yin zhe na / 617 bdag la ’phrog pa ’am / ’phrog tu ’am / phrogs pa la rjes su / yi / 620 rang ba ’am / nan gyis / 621 mnan te / 622 dga’ dgur yongs su / 623 longs spyod / 624 par ma gyur cig / bdag gis kyang su la yang / 625 dbrog / 626 par mi bya / ’phrog tu gzhug par mi bya / phrogs pa la rjes su / yi rang bar mi / bya / nan gyis mnan te / 630 dga’ dgur longs spyod / 631 par mi bya’o snyam mo / // rigs kyi bu de / 632 ltar na / byang chub sems dpa’ / sems dpa’ chen po ’dod pa la log par g.yem pa spangs pa yin no// de la ’di skad ces bya ste / 634 bran mor gyur pa yan chad kyang // 635 gzhang gyi / 636 bzhag / 637 par gyur pa la // 638 gang la rang gi chung / ma sdug / de ni chung ma ’phrog mi byed // 640 de la brdzun du smra ba spangs pa / ji ltu / bu / 643 yin zhe na / rigs kyi bu ’di la byang chub sems dpa’ de ’di snyam du sems te / bden pa zhes bya ba de ni tha na gnod sbyin dang / 644 ’byung po dang / sha za rnams la / yang / 646 sdug cing phangs / 647 la dga’
zhing yid du 'ong ba yin te / bdag la yang648 bden649 pa 'di sdug650 cing phangs651 la /652 dga' zhing yid du 'ong ba yin gyis653 / su yang654 bdag la brdzun655 du smra bas656 sun 'byin pa 'am / sun 'byin du 'jug pa 'am / sun phyung657 ba la rjes su658 yi rang659 bar ma gyur cig / bdag gis kyang su la yang660 brdzun du smra bas sun dbyung bar mi bya / sun 'byin du661 gzhug par662 mi bya / sun phyung ba663 la rjes su yi rang bar mi bya'o snyam mo // rigs kyi bu de ltar664 na byang chub sms dpa' sms dpa' chen po brdzun du smra ba spangs pa yin no // de la 'di skad ces bya ste / gnod665 sbyin 'byung po yan chad kyang //666 gang la bden par667 smra ba sdug / shes rab can de brdzun668 tshig gis //669 lus can rnam la sun mi 'byin //670 de la phra ma'i tshig spangs pa ji lta bu yin zhe na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sms dpa' de 'di snyam du sms te / phra ma'i tshig ces bya ba ni /671 tha na gang zag phra ma can rnam la yang672 yid673 mi sdug cing mi 'dod la / mi dga' zhing yid du mi 'ong ba yin te674 / bdag la yang675 phra ma'i tshig 'di mi sdug cing mi 'dod la676 mi dga' zhing yid du mi 'ong ba yin gyis / su677 yang678 bdag la phra ma zer bas gleng679 ba 'am / gleng du 'jug pa 'am / glengs pa la rjes su680 yi rang bar681 ma gyur cig
phra ma zer bas gleng bar mi bya / gleng du gzhug par mi bya / glengs pa lta bu yin zhe na / rigs kyi bu de ltar na byang chub sms dpa’ sms dpa’ chen po phra ma’i tshig spangs pa yin no // de la ngag rtsub po ba spangs pa ji lta bu yin zhe na / rigs kyi bu ’di la byang chub sms dpa’ de di snyam du sms te / ngag rtsub po zhies bya ba ni tha na gang zag ngag rtsub po dang ldan pa rnamgs la yang’ mi ’sdug cing mi ’dod la’ mi dga’ zhing yid du mi ’ong ba yin te / bdag la yang’ ngag rtsub po ’di mi sdug cing mi ’dod la’ mi dga’ zhing yid du mi ’ong ba yin gyis / su yang’ bdag la ngag rtsub po smra ba dang / gtum pa tshig dang / brlang ba’i tshig dang / mi bden pa ’i tshig gis tsham pa ’am / tho tsham du jug pa ’am / tho tshams pa la rjes su yi rang bar ma gyur cig / bdag gis kyang su la yang’ ngag rtsub po smra ba dang / gtum pa tshig dang / brlang ba’i tshig dang / mi bden pa’i tshig gis tho btsam par mi bya’ / tho btsams du gzhug par mi bya / tho btsams pa la rjes
su\(^{225}\) yi rang bar\(^{226}\) mi bya’o snyam mo //\(^{227}\) rig kyì bu de ltar na byang chub sems dpa’ sems dpa’ chen po ngag rtsub po spangs pa yin no // de la ’di skad ces bya’\(^{228}\) ste\(^{229}\) /\(^{230}\) gang dag su yang\(^{726}\) rung ba la //\(^{732}\) phra ma ngag rtsub mi sdug pa //\(^{733}\) de ni phra\(^{734}\) ma mi zer te //\(^{735}\) rtsub pa’i tshig kyang srung\(^{736}\) bar byed //\(^{737}\) de la tshig kyal\(^{738}\) pa\(^{739}\) spangs pa ji lta bu yin zhe na //\(^{740}\) rig kyì bu ’di la byang chub sems dpa’ sems dpa’ chen po\(^{741}\) de ’di snyam du sems te / tshig kyal\(^{742}\) pa\(^{743}\) zhes bya ba ni tha na gang zag tshig kyal\(^{744}\) pa\(^{745}\) can dag la yang\(^{746}\) 747\) mi sdug cing mi ’dod la\(^{748}\) mi dga’ zhing yid du mi ’ong ba yin te / bdag la yang\(^{749}\) tshig kyal\(^{750}\) pa\(^{751}\) ’di mi sdug cing mi ’dod la \(^{752}\) mi dga’ zhing yid du mi ’ong ba yin gyis \(^{753}\) su yang\(^{746}\) 747\) bdag la tshig kyal\(^{755}\) pa\(^{756}\) smra\(^{757}\) bas\(^{758}\) dran par\(^{759}\) byed pa\(^{760}\) am / dran par\(^{761}\) byed du ’jug pa ’am / dran par byas pa

\(^{718}\) N and S: mtho
\(^{720}\) N: ’tsham; Q: brtsam
\(^{721}\) T: bzhug
\(^{722}\) L: pa
\(^{723}\) N and S: mtho
\(^{724}\) N and Q: brtsams
\(^{725}\) L: rjesu
\(^{726}\) Q: omits
\(^{727}\) Q: single danḍa
\(^{728}\) D: byas
\(^{729}\) D: omits
\(^{730}\) T: double danḍa
\(^{731}\) N: ’ang
\(^{732}\) L and T: single danḍa
\(^{733}\) L: single danḍa
\(^{734}\) L: phrag
\(^{735}\) L and S: single danḍa
\(^{736}\) N and Q: bsrung
\(^{737}\) L: single danḍa
\(^{738}\) L: kyang; S: bkyal
\(^{739}\) L: ba
\(^{740}\) Q: omits danḍa
\(^{741}\) L, S, and T: omit sems dpa’ chen po
\(^{742}\) S: bkyal
\(^{743}\) L: ba
\(^{744}\) S: bkyal
\(^{745}\) L: ba
\(^{746}\) N: ’ang
\(^{747}\) L and T: insert danḍa
\(^{748}\) S: inserts danḍa
\(^{749}\) N: ’ang
\(^{750}\) S: bkyal
\(^{751}\) L: ba
\(^{752}\) L and T: omit danḍa
\(^{753}\) N and Q: omit danḍa
\(^{754}\) N: ’ang
\(^{755}\) S: bkyal
\(^{756}\) L: ba
\(^{757}\) D: smras
\(^{758}\) D: pas
\(^{759}\) L: bar
\(^{760}\) T: inserts danḍa
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la\textsuperscript{762} rjes su\textsuperscript{763} yi rang bar ma gyur cig / bdag gis kyang su la yang\textsuperscript{764} tshig kyal\textsuperscript{765} pa\textsuperscript{766} smra bas dran par mi bya / dran par byed du mi gzhug / dran par byas\textsuperscript{767} pa la rjes su\textsuperscript{768} yi rang bar mi bya' o snyam mo // rigs kyi bu de ltar na byang chub sms dpa' sms dpa' chen po tshig kyal\textsuperscript{769} pa\textsuperscript{770} spangs pa yin no // de la byang chub sms dpa' sms dpa' chen po brnab sms\textsuperscript{771} spangs pa ji lta\textsuperscript{772} bu yin zhe na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sms dpa' de 'di snyam du sms te / brnab sms shes\textsuperscript{773} bya ba ni tha na gang zag brnab sms can rnam la yang\textsuperscript{774} mi sdu cing mi 'dod la\textsuperscript{775} mi dga' zhing yid du mi 'ong ba yin te / bdag la yang\textsuperscript{776} brnab sms 'di mi sdu cing mi 'dod la\textsuperscript{777} mi dga' zhing yid du mi 'ong ba yin gis / su yang\textsuperscript{778} bdag la brnab\textsuperscript{779} sms kyi tshig gis brjod\textsuperscript{780} pa 'am / brjod\textsuperscript{781} du 'jug pa 'am / brjod\textsuperscript{782} pa la rjes su\textsuperscript{783} yi rang bar ma gyur cig / bdag gis kyang su la yang\textsuperscript{784} brnab sms kyi\textsuperscript{785} tshig\textsuperscript{786} gis brjod par mi bya / brjod\textsuperscript{787} du gzhug\textsuperscript{788} par mi bya / brjod pa la rjes su\textsuperscript{789} yi rang bar mi bya'o snyam mo // rigs kyi bu de ltar na byang chub sms dpa' sms dpa' chen po brnab sms spangs pa yin no // de la 'di skad ces bya ste / kyal\textsuperscript{790} pa\textsuperscript{791} i tshig dang brnab sms gnyis //\textsuperscript{792} gang zhig bdag nyid mi 'dod pa //\textsuperscript{793} de ni kyal\textsuperscript{794} pa\textsuperscript{795} i tshig mi smra //\textsuperscript{796} brnab sms kyang ni srung bar byed //\textsuperscript{797} de la gnod sms spangs pa\textsuperscript{798}

---

\textsuperscript{761} L: bar
\textsuperscript{762} Q: omits
\textsuperscript{763} L: rjesu
\textsuperscript{764} N: 'ang
\textsuperscript{765} S: bkyal
\textsuperscript{766} L: ba
\textsuperscript{767} T: byes
\textsuperscript{768} L: rjesu
\textsuperscript{769} S: bkyal
\textsuperscript{770} L: ba
\textsuperscript{771} L: inserts dpa'
\textsuperscript{772} L: litar
\textsuperscript{773} D, N, and S: zhes
\textsuperscript{774} N: 'ang
\textsuperscript{775} L, S, and T: insert danda
\textsuperscript{776} N: 'ang
\textsuperscript{777} S: inserts danda
\textsuperscript{778} N: 'ang
\textsuperscript{779} L: rnab
\textsuperscript{780} D, L, and T: rjod; S: squeezes in what appears to be a tiny prefix "b" before rjod
\textsuperscript{781} D, L, and T: rjod
\textsuperscript{782} L: prefix "b" is squeezed in at the upper left corner of the syllable
\textsuperscript{783} L: rjesu
\textsuperscript{784} N: 'ang
\textsuperscript{785} T: inserts tshigs kyi
\textsuperscript{786} N: only part of the "tsh" and the final "g" are visible
\textsuperscript{787} D: rjod
\textsuperscript{788} L: accidentally conflates du gzhug
\textsuperscript{789} L: rjesu
\textsuperscript{790} S: bkyal
\textsuperscript{791} L: ba
\textsuperscript{792} L: single danda
\textsuperscript{793} L and S: single danda
\textsuperscript{794} S: bkyal
\textsuperscript{795} L: ba
\textsuperscript{796} L: single danda
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ji lta bu yin zhe na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sms dpa' de 'di sniam du sms te / gnod sms shes 799 bya ba ni tha na gang zag gnod sms su gyur pa'i sms dang ldan pa rnam la yang 800 / 801 mi sdug cing mi 'dod la 802 mi dga' zhing yid du mi 'ong ba yin te / bdag la yang gnod sms 'di mi sdug cing mi 'dod la 804 mi dga' zhing yid du mi 'ong ba 806 yin gyis / su yang bdag la gnod sms kyi tshig gis 'chad pa 808 am / 'chad du 'jug pa 'am / bshad pa 809 la rjes su 810 yi rang bar ma gyur cig / bdag gis kyang su la yang 811 gnod sms kyi tshig gis bshad par mi bya / 'chad du gzhug par mi bya / bshad pa la rjes su 812 yi rang bar mi bya'o sniam mo /' 813 rigs kyi bu de ltar na byang chub sms dpa' sms dpa' chen po gnod sms spangs pa yin no // de la log par lta ba spangs pa ji lta bu yin zhe na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sms dpa' de 'di sniam du sms te / log par lta ba zhes bya ba ni tha na gang zag log par zhugs pa rnam la yang 814 mi sdug cing mi 'dod la 815 mi dga' zhing yid du mi 816 'ong ba yin te / bdag la yang 817 log par lta ba 'di mi sdug cing mi 'dod la 818 819 mi dga' zhing yid du mi 'ong ba 820 yin gyis / 821 su yang 822 bdag 823 la log par lta ba'i tshig gis ston pa 'am / ston 824 du 825 'jug pa 'am / bstan pa la rjes su 826 yi rang bar ma gyur cig / bdag gis kyang su la yang 827 log par lta ba'i tshig gis bstan par mi bya / ston du 828 gzhug par mi bya / bstan pa la rjes su 829 yi rang bar mi bya'o sniam mo // rigs kyi bu de ltar na 830 byang chub sms dpa' sms dpa' chen po log par lta ba spangs pa 831 yin 832 no // de la 'di

797 L: single daṇḍa
798 N: ba
799 D, N, and S: zhes
800 N: 'ang
801 Q and S: omit daṇḍa
802 L and T: omit mi 'dod la
803 N: 'ang
804 L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
805 L: dag
806 T: bar
807 N: 'ang
808 L: ba
809 L: ba
810 L: rjesu
811 N: 'ang
812 L: rjesu
813 Q: single daṇḍa
814 N: 'ang
815 S: inserts daṇḍa
816 T: inserts dga' and combines it with the following 'ong into one word
817 N: 'ang
818 T: pa
819 L and S: insert daṇḍa
820 L: pa
821 Q: omits daṇḍa
822 N: 'ang
823 L: accidentally splits bdag into two syllables, leaving ba dag
824 L: stan
825 L and T: tu
826 L: rjesu
827 N: 'ang
828 L and T: tu
829 L: rjesu
830 Q: omits
skad ces bya ste / gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // skad ces bya ste / gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis //
sems log par lta ba gnyis // sems log par lta ba gnyis //
833 yong 834 gis mi 'dod gang yin pa / 835 de ni gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis //
836 yong 834 gis mi 'dod gang yin pa / 835 de ni gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis //
837 yong 834 gis mi 'dod gang yin pa / 835 de ni gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis //
838 yong 834 gis mi 'dod gang yin pa / 835 de ni gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis //
839 yong 834 gis mi 'dod gang yin pa / 835 de ni gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis //
840 yong 834 gis mi 'dod gang yin pa / 835 de ni gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis //
841 yong 834 gis mi 'dod gang yin pa / 835 de ni gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis //
842 yong 834 gis mi 'dod gang yin pa / 835 de ni gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis //
843 yong 834 gis mi 'dod gang yin pa / 835 de ni gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis //
844 yong 834 gis mi 'dod gang yin pa / 835 de ni gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis // gnod sans log par lta ba gnyis //
'jug par byed do // rigs kyi bu de la byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po sbyin pa'i pha rol tu phyin pa la ji ltar mgon par brtson par byed ce na // rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po sbyin pa la mgon par brtson par byed do // rigs kyi bu de la byang chub sems dpa' sbyin pa dag la mgon par brtson par byed ce na // rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te // sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni tshe dang / kha dog dang / stobs dang / bde ba 'grub par 'gyur ba'i tshig bla dags yin no // de lta bas na bdag gis sbyin pa la mgon par brtson par bya dgos te / bdag gis sbyin pa par bya gor ma chag snyam mo // des sas kyi sbyin pa de byin pas tshe byin pa dang / bde ba byin par 'gyur ro // de nas de'i tshe bcom ldan 'das kyis tshigs su bcad pa 'di dag bka' stsal to // kha las sbyin pa byin na ni // des na tshe dang kha dog dang // stobs dang bde ba lnga pa spobs // shes rab can gyis byin pa yin // kha las sbyin pas dga' ba dang // tshe ring stobs ldan bde skyid

862 L: byad
860 Q: omits ji ltar
861 L and Q: gzhon
863 L: ba
864 L: omits
865 T: bar
866 L: bar
867 Q: byad
868 L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
869 T: bar
870 T: bar
871 T: tshi
872 L: ltar
873 T: ba
874 Q: omits kyi sbyin pa
875 L: inserts de by squeezing it in before the next syllable
876 N: byin
877 L: accidentally conflates ma chag, leaving what looks like mchag
878 L: combines snyam mo into one word, resulting in a snyam with an “o” marker over the final “m” (this occurs frequently in L)
879 Q: single daṇḍa
880 S: de
881 Q: da or nga for pa; S: ba
882 L: omits
883 L and S: sbyin
884 S: sbyin
885 L: combines tshigs su into one word, resulting in a tshigs with a “u” marker under the final “s”
886 T: ba
887 T: no
888 L: single daṇḍa
889 L, S, and T: mnga'
890 L, N, S, and T: ba
891 L, S, and T: stobs
892 S: single daṇḍa
893 L: bas
894 L: splits bde into two syllables, leaving ba de
'gyur // skyid cing brtan\(^{97}\) pa de dag ni // thogs\(^{98}\) med spobs dang ldan par\(^{99}\) 'gyur // phyug cing nor mang dpal\(^{90}\) dang ldan //\(^{901}\) mi ni des shing blo ldan la // bsod nams ldan zhing mkhas la zhi\(^{92}\) //\(^{903}\) kha zas byin pas\(^{94}\) de ltar 'gyur //\(^{905}\) de la skom\(^{96}\) sbyin pa la ji ltar mngon par\(^{97}\) brtson par byed ce na //\(^{908}\) rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpal' de 'di snyam du sems te / skom sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni nyon\(^{909}\) mongs pa'i\(^{910}\) sred pa thams cad sel bar\(^{911}\) 'gyur ba\(^{912}\) i tshig\(^{93}\) bla dags yin te / de lta bas na bdag gis skom gyi sbyin pa sbyin\(^{914}\) par bya gor ma chag snyam mo //\(^{915}\) de\(^{916}\) skom gyi sbyin pa de sbyin\(^{917}\) pa na /\(^{918}\) sangs rgyas kyi bsngags\(^{919}\) pa \(^{920}\) i smon lam bzhin du skom gyi sbyin pa\(^{921}\) dis na /\(^{922}\) bdag sems can thams cad kyi nyon mongs pa'i\(^{923}\) sred pa'i rgya mtsho thams cad skems par\(^{924}\) byed par gyur cig /\(^{925}\) rnam par grol ba'i ro\(^{926}\) i\(^{927}\) skom\(^{928}\) gyis kyang tshim par\(^{929}\) byed par gyur cig ces smon\(^{930}\) lam 'debs so // 'di la tshig phyi\(^{931}\) ma\(^{932}\) yang\(^{933}\) yod de /\(^{934}\) rga shi'i chu s rin gyis dkrugs\(^{935}\) pa'i //\(^{936}\) nyon mongs sred pa'i

\(^{97}\) N: probably reads brtson, though the “e” marker is difficult to see; Q: brten
\(^{98}\) S: thobs
\(^{99}\) T: bar
\(^{90}\) L: dpal
\(^{901}\) L: single dan\(\ddot{a}\)da
\(^{902}\) L: zhing
\(^{903}\) L: single dan\(\ddot{a}\)da
\(^{904}\) L, S, and T: byas; N: appears to read bas
\(^{905}\) L: single dan\(\ddot{a}\)da
\(^{906}\) D and L: sgom
\(^{907}\) T: bar
\(^{908}\) Q: omits dan\(\ddot{a}\)da
\(^{909}\) N: appears to read nyan
\(^{910}\) N and Q: omit the genitive particle
\(^{911}\) T: srel par for sel bar
\(^{912}\) L and T: pa
\(^{913}\) N: appears to read chig, either because of an error or because part of the first letter has been effaced
\(^{914}\) N: byin
\(^{915}\) Q: single dan\(\ddot{a}\)da
\(^{916}\) N: appears to read da, either because of an error or because the “e” marker has been effaced
\(^{917}\) T: byin
\(^{918}\) T: double dan\(\ddot{a}\)da
\(^{919}\) L: bsngag
\(^{920}\) N: ba
\(^{921}\) T: ba
\(^{922}\) Q: omits dan\(\ddot{a}\)da
\(^{923}\) D: omits the genitive particle
\(^{924}\) L: bar
\(^{925}\) Q: omits dan\(\ddot{a}\)da
\(^{926}\) N: appears to read ra, either because of an error or because the “o” marker has been effaced
\(^{927}\) Q: omits the genitive particle
\(^{928}\) L: sgom
\(^{929}\) L: bar
\(^{930}\) L: inserts dan\(\ddot{a}\)da
\(^{931}\) L: phyin
\(^{932}\) L: omits
\(^{933}\) N and S: 'ang
\(^{934}\) T: double dan\(\ddot{a}\)da
\(^{935}\) Q: bkrugs
\(^{936}\) N: omits double dan\(\ddot{a}\)da
mtsho bskams\textsuperscript{937} nas // \textsuperscript{938} rnan\textsuperscript{939} grol ro yi\textsuperscript{940} \textsuperscript{941} skom gyis ni // mi rnam bs gis tshim par\textsuperscript{942} bya // \textsuperscript{943} skom\textsuperscript{944} byin pas\textsuperscript{945} ni mkhas pa de // kun tu 'bar\textsuperscript{946} zhing rab 'bar ba\textsuperscript{947} i // yi dags\textsuperscript{948} nyam ngar mi skye zhing // skom pa'i gnod pa 'byung mi 'gyur // de la bzhon pa\textsuperscript{951} i sbyin pa la ji itar mngon par\textsuperscript{952} brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sms t / bzhon\textsuperscript{953} pa\textsuperscript{947} i sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni bde ba dang / rdzu\textsuperscript{956} x phrul gyi gzhis thams cad sdud\textsuperscript{957} pa'i tshig bla dags yin gyis / bdag gis bzhon\textsuperscript{959} pa'i sbyin pa\textsuperscript{960} sbyin par bya ste / bzhon\textsuperscript{962} pa\textsuperscript{963} shing rta'am / bzhon\textsuperscript{964} pa\textsuperscript{965} khyogs sam / bzhon\textsuperscript{966} pa\textsuperscript{967} rta'am / bzhon\textsuperscript{968} pa\textsuperscript{969} glang po che'am / lham sbyin par bya gom ma chag snyam mo // de bzhon pa'i sbyin pa de dag sbyin\textsuperscript{970} pa na\textsuperscript{971} / sangs rgyas kyis bsngags pa\textsuperscript{972} smon lam bzhin du bzhon pa'i sbyin pa 'dis na bdag sms can thams cad kyi bde ba dang / rdzu 'phrul gyi gzhis thams cad sdud par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so // de la 'di skad ces bya ste / bzhon\textsuperscript{974} pa\textsuperscript{975} shing rta\textsuperscript{976}

\textsuperscript{937} D: skems; T: skams
\textsuperscript{938} N: single d\textsuperscript{a}nda (the second one has possibly been effaced)
\textsuperscript{939} L: rnal
\textsuperscript{940} Q: ni
\textsuperscript{941} L: ro'i for ro yi
\textsuperscript{942} L and T: bar
\textsuperscript{943} L: single d\textsuperscript{a}nda
\textsuperscript{944} L: sgom
\textsuperscript{945} L: bas
\textsuperscript{946} L: omits
\textsuperscript{947} N: either pa or the top of ba has been effaced
\textsuperscript{948} T: drags
\textsuperscript{949} L: single d\textsuperscript{a}nda
\textsuperscript{950} S: single d\textsuperscript{a}nda
\textsuperscript{951} L: ba
\textsuperscript{952} T: bar
\textsuperscript{953} L and Q: gzhon
\textsuperscript{954} L: ba
\textsuperscript{955} N: omits d\textsuperscript{a}nda
\textsuperscript{956} N: appears to read rju, either because of an error, a variant spelling, or because part of the letter has been effaced
\textsuperscript{957} D: spud (there are a few dots here indicating a correction, in this case a mistaken one); L: s\textsuperscript{d}ug
\textsuperscript{958} Q: omits d\textsuperscript{a}nda
\textsuperscript{959} L and Q: gzhon
\textsuperscript{960} T: ba
\textsuperscript{961} N: byin
\textsuperscript{962} L: gzhon
\textsuperscript{963} L: appears to read pra, but the writing here is extremely small and difficult to make out
\textsuperscript{964} L: gzhon
\textsuperscript{965} L: ba
\textsuperscript{966} L: gzhon
\textsuperscript{967} L and T: ba
\textsuperscript{968} L and Q: gzhon
\textsuperscript{969} D and L: ba
\textsuperscript{970} T: byin
\textsuperscript{971} T: ni
\textsuperscript{972} S: ba
\textsuperscript{973} L and T: insert d\textsuperscript{a}nda
\textsuperscript{974} L and Q: gzhon
\textsuperscript{975} T: ba
byin pa yis977 //978 rtag tu sems can thams cad kyis //979 theg pa chen po thob gyur cing980 //981 rdzu 'phrul rkang pa thob par shog / bzhon982 pa //983 sbyin pas drang srong che // sangs rgyas zhing nas zhing984 dag tu //985 blo ldan bya yi //986 987 shugs 'dra bar / //988 rdzu 'phrul gyis989 ni mkha' la //990 ggro / //991 de la gos sbyin pa la jitar mngon par brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa992 de 'di snyam993 du sems te / gos sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni ngo tsha shes pa dang /994 khrel yod pa dang /995 mdog yongs su996 dag par byed pa'i tshig bla dags yin gyis / bdag gis gos kyi sbyin pa sbyin997 par bya998 gor ma chag snyam mo // de gos kyi sbyin pa de sbyin999 pa na / sangs rgyas kyis gnang ba 1000i smon lam bzhin du 100110021003 gos kyi sbyin pa 'dis na10041005 bdag sems can thams cad kyi ngo tsha shes pa dang / khrel yod pa dang / mdog yongs su1006 dag par byed par1007 gyur1008 cig ces smon lam 'debs so // 'di la tshig phyi ma yang1009 yod de /1010 gos kyi sbyin pa 'dis na1011 bdag /1012 sems can kun gyi ngo tsha1013 shes //1014

976 T: most of the bottom of “t” is missing
977 T: the final “s” of yis also has an “n” written into it, so it is not possible to tell if yis or yin was intended here
978 S: single danḍa
979 L and S: single danḍa
980 N, Q, and T: cig
981 N and Q: single danḍa
982 L and Q: gzhon
983 N: ba’i; Q: pa’i
984 L: squeezes zhing nas zhing into an extremely small space, probably as a correction
985 S: single danḍa
986 L: yid
987 Q: bla’i for bla yi
988 L: single danḍa
989 N: gyi
990 L, S, and T: las
991 N: single danḍa (the first one has possibly been effaced)
992 S: omits
993 L: snyams
994 Q: omits danḍa
995 Q: omits danḍa
996 L: yongsu
997 N and T: byin
998 L: omits
999 N and S: byin
1000 L: pa
1001 T: omits
1002 L: inserts danḍa
1003 T: inserts ‘di la
1004 Q: ni
1005 L, S, and T: insert danḍa
1006 L: yongsu
1007 L: squeezes par byed par into an extremely small space, probably as a correction
1008 L: ‘gyur
1009 N and S: ‘ang
1010 L: double danḍa
1011 Q: ni
1012 L: double danḍa
1013 Q: cha
1014 T: single danḍa
khrel yod pa ni¹⁰¹⁵ sbyong¹⁰¹⁶ ba dang //¹⁰¹⁷ mdog kyang dag par byed gyur cig //¹⁰¹⁸ gos sbyin
shin tu¹⁰¹⁹ dpal dang ldan // rtag tu rigs ldan gzugs bzang zhing //¹⁰²⁰ mi de ngo tsha shes par
'gyur // mi ni grags¹⁰²¹ ldan skal dang ldan // de la rgyan sbyin pa la ji ltar mgon par brtson
par¹⁰²² byed¹⁰²³ ce¹⁰²⁴ na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te /
rgyan sbyin¹⁰²⁵ pa zhes bya ba de¹⁰²⁶ ni skyes bu chen po 'i mtshan sum cu¹⁰²⁷ rtsa gnyis dang //¹⁰²⁸ dpe
byad bzang po brgyad cu¹⁰²⁹ yongs su¹⁰³⁰ rdzogs par 'gyur ba¹⁰³¹ i tshig¹⁰³² bla dags yin gyis /
bdag gis rgyan gyi sbyin pa¹⁰³³ gser gyi rgyan nam / nor bu 'am / mu tig gam¹⁰³⁴ / bai dūrya¹⁰³⁵
'am / dung ngam / man shel lam / byi¹⁰³⁶ ru'i rgyan sbyin pa¹⁰³⁷ sbyin¹⁰³⁸ par bya gor ma chag
snyam mo // de rgyan gyi sbyin pa de sbyin¹⁰³⁹ na /¹⁰⁴⁰ sangs rgyas kyis gsungs pa'i smon
lam bzhin du /¹⁰⁴¹ rgyan gyi sbyin pa 'dis na¹⁰⁴²¹⁰⁴³ bdag gis sems can thams cad kyi¹⁰⁴⁴ lus
mtshan dang¹⁰⁴⁵ dpe¹⁰⁴⁶ byad bzang po dag gis brgyan pa mthong bar gyur cig ces smon lam
'debs so // de la tshig phyi ma yang¹⁰⁴⁷ yod de / gser gyi rgyan ni byin pa yis¹⁰⁴⁸ // mtshan¹⁰⁴⁹
rnams kyis¹⁰⁵⁰ ni brgyan pa yi¹⁰⁵¹ // sems can thams cad mthong gyur cing¹⁰⁵² //¹⁰⁵³ bdag kyang

¹⁰¹⁵ N and Q: pas na for pa ni
¹⁰¹⁶ D: sbyor
¹⁰¹⁷ L: single danđa
¹⁰¹⁸ L: double danđa
¹⁰¹⁹ Q: bzhin du for shin tu
¹⁰²⁰ L: single danđa
¹⁰²¹ L: grangs; T: skrags
¹⁰²² T: omits brtson par
¹⁰²³ T: bye
¹⁰²⁴ T: omits
¹⁰²⁵ D, N, Q, and T: byin
¹⁰²⁶ L, S, and T: omit
¹⁰²⁷ Q: bcu
¹⁰²⁸ T: omits dang plus the danđa
¹⁰²⁹ Q and T: bcu
¹⁰³⁰ L: yongsu
¹⁰³¹ L: pa
¹⁰³² L: omits; N: tshiqs
¹⁰³³ L. and T: insert danđa
¹⁰³⁴ T: omits (it appears that an “m” has been erased after tig, which would have combined tig and gam into one
word, but gam was never added as a correction after the erasure)
¹⁰³⁵ D: dūrya; L: dū rya; Q: dū rya
¹⁰³⁶ N and S: byu
¹⁰³⁷ L, N, Q, and T: omit sbyin pa
¹⁰³⁸ S: byin
¹⁰³⁹ N: byin
¹⁰⁴⁰ Q: double danđa
¹⁰⁴¹ S: omits danđa
¹⁰⁴² L: omits the entire beginning of this line, rgyan gyi sbyin pa 'dis na
¹⁰⁴³ S and T: insert danđa
¹⁰⁴⁴ T: kyis
¹⁰⁴⁵ L. and T: insert danđa
¹⁰⁴⁶ N: appears to read dpha, either because of an error or because the “e” marker has been effaced
¹⁰⁴⁷ N and S: 'ang
¹⁰⁴⁸ T: yin
¹⁰⁴⁹ N: appears to read mtshan
¹⁰⁵⁰ N: kyi
byang chub tshol bar shog / nor bu mu tig byin pas\textsuperscript{1054} ni // gang dang gang du de skye ba // skye gnas de dang de dag tu //\textsuperscript{1055} rin chen char ni ’bab par ’gyur // de la mar me\textsuperscript{1056} sbyin\textsuperscript{1057} pa la ji ltar mngon par\textsuperscript{1058} brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu ’di la byang chub sems dpa’ de ’di snyam du sems te / mar me sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni lha’i mig yongs su\textsuperscript{1059} dag par ’gyur ba’i tshig bla dags yin gyis //\textsuperscript{1060} bdag gis mar me\textsuperscript{1061} sbyin pa sbyin\textsuperscript{1062} par bya gor ma chag snyam mo // de mar me\textsuperscript{1063} sbyin pa de\textsuperscript{1064} sbyin\textsuperscript{1065} pa na\textsuperscript{1067} sangs rgyas kyis bstan\textsuperscript{1068} pa’i smon lam bzhin du\textsuperscript{1069} mar me sbyin\textsuperscript{1070} pa\textsuperscript{1071} ‘dis na\textsuperscript{1072} / bdag sems can thams cad kyi lha’i mig yongs su\textsuperscript{1073} dag pa’\textsuperscript{1074} gyur ba’i don byed par gyur cig ces smon lam ’debs so\textsuperscript{1075} // de la tshig\textsuperscript{1076} phyi ma yang\textsuperscript{1077} yod de\textsuperscript{1078} /\textsuperscript{1079} kun mkhyen ye shes ’gyur ba yi // mar me\textsuperscript{1080} sbyin pa des na bdag /\textsuperscript{1081} sems can kun gyi\textsuperscript{1082} lha yi\textsuperscript{1083} mig / rnam par dag par byed gyur cig /\textsuperscript{1084} mi de mar me sbyin pa yis // ’jig rten dag na dus kun tu\textsuperscript{1085} // sangs rgyas rnams kyi spyan lnga\textsuperscript{1086} dang // rim gyis\textsuperscript{1087} su ni ldan par ’gyur // de la rol mo’i sgra’\textsuperscript{1088} sbyin pa la ji ltar mngon par\textsuperscript{1089} brtson
par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu ’di la byang chub sens dpa’ de ’di snyam du sens te / rol mo’i sgra’i sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni\textsuperscript{1090} lha’i rna ba yongs su\textsuperscript{1091} rdzogs par\textsuperscript{1092} gyur ba’i tshig bla dags yin gyis /\textsuperscript{1093} bdag gis rol mo’i sgra’i sbyin pa sbyin\textsuperscript{1094} par bya gor ma chag snyam mo // de rol mo’i sgra’i sbyin pa de\textsuperscript{1095} sbyin\textsuperscript{1096} pa na / sangs rgyas rnam par rol pa’i smon lam bzhin du /\textsuperscript{1097} rol mo’i sgra’i sbyin pa ’dis na\textsuperscript{1098} bdag sens can thams cad kyi lha’i rna ba\textsuperscript{1099} yongs su\textsuperscript{1100} rdzogs par byed par\textsuperscript{1101} gyur cig ces smon lam ’debs so // de la tshig phyi ma yang\textsuperscript{1102} yod de /\textsuperscript{1103} rol mo’i\textsuperscript{1104} sgra byin\textsuperscript{1105} des na bdag /\textsuperscript{1106} sens can kun lha rna\textsuperscript{1107} dang /\textsuperscript{1108} sangs rgyas byang chub ’gro phan pa\textsuperscript{1109} // rab tu rdzogs par byed gyur cig /\textsuperscript{1110} rol\textsuperscript{1111} mo’i\textsuperscript{1112} sgra ni byin pas na //\textsuperscript{1113} rdzogs pa’i sangs rgyas grags ldan pa //\textsuperscript{1114} dpa’ bo\textsuperscript{1115} rnams kyi lha yi snyan\textsuperscript{1116} // gang du skyes pa\textsuperscript{1117} de yis ’thob\textsuperscript{1118} // de la\textsuperscript{1119} spos dang /\textsuperscript{1120} phye ma dang / byug pa sbyin\textsuperscript{1121} pa la ji ltar mngon par\textsuperscript{1122} brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu ’di la byang chub sens dpa’ de ’di snyam du sens te / spos dang / phye ma dang / byug pa\textsuperscript{1124} sbyin pa\textsuperscript{1125} zhes bya ba de ni tshul khrims\textsuperscript{1126} dang / thos pa dang /\textsuperscript{1127} ting nge ’dzin gyi spos\textsuperscript{1128} dang / phye ma dang / byug par

\textsuperscript{1090} L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1091} L and T: yongsu
\textsuperscript{1092} L: pa
\textsuperscript{1093} Q: double daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1094} N and T: byin
\textsuperscript{1095} L: pe
\textsuperscript{1096} N and T: byin
\textsuperscript{1097} S: omits daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1098} L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1099} L: accidentally conflates rna ba, leaving what looks like rnab
\textsuperscript{1100} L: yongsu
\textsuperscript{1101} L, S, and T: omit byed par
\textsuperscript{1102} N and S: ’ang
\textsuperscript{1103} L: double daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1104} N: “i” marker for the genitive particle has either been effaced or accidentally omitted
\textsuperscript{1105} L and S: ’byin
\textsuperscript{1106} L: double daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1107} T: rnams
\textsuperscript{1108} L: single daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1109} L: ba
\textsuperscript{1110} L: double daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1111} L: mol
\textsuperscript{1112} D and N: omit the genitive particle
\textsuperscript{1113} S and T: single daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1114} S: single daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1115} S: ba
\textsuperscript{1116} L: snyam
\textsuperscript{1117} L, S, and T: par
\textsuperscript{1118} N and Q: thob
\textsuperscript{1119} L: omits
\textsuperscript{1120} Q: omits daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1121} T: byin
\textsuperscript{1122} N: inserts byin pa
\textsuperscript{1123} T: bar
\textsuperscript{1124} S: pa’i
\textsuperscript{1125} T: ba
\textsuperscript{1126} L: khams
'gyur ba'i tshig bla dags yin gyis / bdag gis spos\textsuperscript{1129} dang / phye ma dang / byug pa sbyin par\textsuperscript{1130} bya\textsuperscript{1131} / gor ma chag snyam mo // de spos dang / phye ma dang / byug pa'i sbyin pa de\textsuperscript{1133} sbyin\textsuperscript{1134} pa na / sangs rgyas kyis\textsuperscript{1135} / dgongs pa'i smon lam bzhi du spos dang / phye ma dang / byug pa\textsuperscript{1136} / i sbyin pa 'dis na\textsuperscript{1137} / bdag gis sems can thams cad tshul khrims dang /\textsuperscript{1138} thos\textsuperscript{1139} pa\textsuperscript{1140} dang / ting nge 'dzin gyi spos kyis byug'\textsuperscript{1141} par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so\textsuperscript{1142} // de la 'di skad ces bya ste // spos dang phye ma byin pa dang /\textsuperscript{1144} byug pa\textsuperscript{1145} dag ni byin pa yis // tshul\textsuperscript{1147} khrims thos dang ting nge 'dzin // lus can rnam s kyis thob gyur cig //\textsuperscript{1148} spos dang phye ma byin pa dang // byug pa byin pas\textsuperscript{1150} skyob rnam s kyi // lha yi shangs dang lha yi sku // skyon med de yis thob\textsuperscript{1151} par 'gyur // de la me\textsuperscript{1152} tog sbyin pa la ji ltar mgon par,\textsuperscript{1153} brtson par byed ce\textsuperscript{1154} na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / me tog dang / me tog phreng,\textsuperscript{1155} gi sbyin pa zhes bya de n\textsuperscript{1156} gzungs dang / spobs pa\textsuperscript{1157} dang / byang chub kyi yan lag rin po che'i me tog thob par 'gyur ba'i tshig bla dags yin gyis / bdag gis\textsuperscript{1158} me tog dang / me tog phreng\textsuperscript{1159} gi sbyin pa\textsuperscript{1160} sbyin\textsuperscript{1161} par bya gor ma chag snyam mo //
de\textsuperscript{1162} me tog dang /\textsuperscript{1163} me tog phreng\textsuperscript{1164} gi sbyin pa de sbyin\textsuperscript{1165} pa na / sangs rgyas kyis gsungs pa'i smon lam bzhin du\textsuperscript{1166} me tog dang /\textsuperscript{1167} me tog phreng\textsuperscript{1168} gi sbyin pa\textsuperscript{1169} 'dis na / bdag gis sms can thams cad kyi lus gzungs\textsuperscript{1170} dang / spobs\textsuperscript{1171} pa\textsuperscript{1172} dang / byang chub kyi yan lag rin po che'i me tog gi sbyin pa de sbyin\textsuperscript{1175} yod de\textsuperscript{1176} me tog me tog\textsuperscript{1177} phreng\textsuperscript{1178} byin pas\textsuperscript{1179} // myur bar rnam pa\textsuperscript{1180} thams cad du // byang chub yan lag me tog gis //\textsuperscript{1182} lus can kun la bryyan\textsuperscript{1184} par shog //\textsuperscript{1185} me me tog me tog phreng\textsuperscript{1186} byin pas\textsuperscript{1187} //\textsuperscript{1188} gang dang gang du skyes pa der //\textsuperscript{1189} 'gyal po blon po zhang blon\textsuperscript{1190} gyis // 'rgyan tu mchod cing rim gro byed // de la ro bro ba'i\textsuperscript{1191} sbyin pa la\textsuperscript{1192} ji ltar mngon par brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sms dpa' de 'di snyam du sms te / ro bro\textsuperscript{1193} ba\textsuperscript{1194} sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni\textsuperscript{1195} ro ro ba'i mchog\textsuperscript{1196} tu 'gyur ba'i skyes bu chen po'i mtshan\textsuperscript{1197} du 'gyur ba'i tshig bla dags yin gyis / bdag gis\textsuperscript{1198} ro ro\textsuperscript{1199} ba'i sbyin pa

\textsuperscript{1162} S: omits
d\textsuperscript{1163} N: omits daṇḍa; Q: omits me tog dang and the daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1164} S and T: 'phreng
\textsuperscript{1165} N: byin
\textsuperscript{1166} L, Q, and T: insert dan\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{da}}
\textsuperscript{1167} N: omits dan\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{da}}
\textsuperscript{1168} S: 'phreng
\textsuperscript{1169} L: omits
\textsuperscript{1170} L and T: guugs
\textsuperscript{1171} S and T: stobs
\textsuperscript{1172} L: squeezes in pa between adjacent syllables, probably as a correction; S and T: omit
\textsuperscript{1173} L, Q, and S: rgyan
\textsuperscript{1174} L: 'debs
\textsuperscript{1175} L: omits; N and S: 'ang
\textsuperscript{1176} L: double dan\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{da}}
\textsuperscript{1177} L: appears to represent the double me tog by using single syllables with double vowel markers, i.e. two “e” markers for an otherwise single me and two “o” markers for and otherwise single tog; T: omits me tog (most likely not realizing the text had switched to verse and requires the repetition here for the two extra syllables)
\textsuperscript{1178} S and T: 'phreng
\textsuperscript{1179} L and N: bas
\textsuperscript{1180} Q and S: single dan\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{da}}
\textsuperscript{1181} T: par
\textsuperscript{1182} S: single dan\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{da}}
\textsuperscript{1183} L: inserts de
\textsuperscript{1184} Q and S: rgyan
\textsuperscript{1185} L: double dan\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{da}}
\textsuperscript{1186} S and T: 'phreng
\textsuperscript{1187} L: bas
\textsuperscript{1188} L: single dan\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{da}}
\textsuperscript{1189} L and S: single dan\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{da}}
\textsuperscript{1190} L, S, and T: lon
\textsuperscript{1191} L: omits ba'i; S and T: omit the genitive particle
\textsuperscript{1192} T: omits sbyin pa la
\textsuperscript{1193} L: bo
\textsuperscript{1194} L: pa
\textsuperscript{1195} L, S, and T: insert dan\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{da}}
\textsuperscript{1196} L: chog
\textsuperscript{1197} L: prefix “m” is squeezed in at the beginning of the word
\textsuperscript{1198} L and T: gi
\textsuperscript{1199} T: bro'
rgun1200 ro 'am / bu ram shing gi1201 ro 'am / mar gyi ro 'am1202 sbrang rtsi'i ro 'am / lan tshva1203 ro1204 par bya gor ma chag snyam mo // de ro bro ba'i sbyin pa de1205 sbyin1206 pa na / sangs rgyas kyi bsngags pa'i smon lam bzhin du //1207 ro'i sbyin pa1208 dis na / bdag gis sems can thams cad la1209 ro bro ba'i mchog tu 'gyur ba'i skyes1210 bu chen po1211 imtshan yong su1212 rdo par byed par1213 gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs1214 so1215 // de la' di skad ces bya ste1216 ro yi1217 sbyin pas1218 sems can kun // kun1219 mkyhen ro yi snying po yis // rdzogs1220 yong su1221 sbrang rtsi'i ro 'am / mar gyi ro 'am / bu ram shing gi1222 dbags par byed par1223 gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs1224 so1225 // de la' di skad ces bya ste1226 ro yi1227 sbyin pas1228 sems can kun // kun1229 mkyhen ro yi snying po yis // rdzogs1230 yong su1231 sbrang rtsi'i ro 'am / mar gyi ro 'am / bu ram shing gi1232 dbags par byed par1233 gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs1234 so1235 // de la' di skad ces bya ste1236 ro yi1237 sbyin pas1238 sems can kun // kun1239 mkyhen ro yi snying po yis // rdzogs1240 yong su1241 sbrang rtsi'i ro 'am / mar gyi ro 'am / bu ram shing gi

1200 L, S, and T: kun
1201 N and Q: insert 'brum (rgun and rgun 'brum both mean “grapes”)
1202 N and Q: bu ram gyi for bu ram shing gi
1203 Q: inserts another daṇḍa after a large gap in the text
1204 L: omits the entire phrase mar gyi ro 'am plus the daṇḍa
1205 L: tsa; N: appears to read tsha or che; T: tsha
1206 L: omits; N, S, and T: ro'i
1207 N, S, and T: insert sbyin pa
1208 N and T: byin
1209 L: omits sbyin pa de
1210 N and T: byin
1211 L, S, and T: omit daṇḍa; Q: double daṇḍa
1212 T: ba
1213 L, S, and T: omit
1214 N: appears to read skys, either because of an error or because the “e” marker has been effaced
1215 L: pa
1216 L: yongsu
1217 Q: omits byed par
1218 Q: 'dabs
1219 T: combines 'debs so into one word, resulting in a 'debs with an “o” marker over the final “s”
1220 L and T: double daṇḍa
1221 Q: ro'i
1222 T: bas
1223 Q: gun
1224 N and Q: insert pa'i
1225 N and Q: omit pa'i
1226 N: kyis
1227 L: yongsu
1228 L: double daṇḍa
1229 L: bas
1230 Q: bzhungs
1231 L: zhiṅ
1232 L: glos
1233 L: mtshon
1234 Q: de
1235 N and Q: na
1236 Q: rnam
1237 N: thob
1238 N: sbyod
1239 T: ba
1240 T: bar
rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa’ de 'di snyam du sms te / gnas sbyin pa\textsuperscript{1242} zhes bya ba de ni sms can thams cad kyi\textsuperscript{1243} gnas dang / skyob pa dang / gling dang / skyabs dang / dpung gnyen du 'gyur ba’i tshig bla dags yin gyis /\textsuperscript{1244} bdag gis gnas kyi sbyin pa sbyin\textsuperscript{1245} par bya gor ma chag snyam mo // de gnas kyi sbyin pa de\textsuperscript{1246} sbyin\textsuperscript{1247} pa na / sangs rgyas kyi\textsuperscript{1248} dmigs pa’i smon lam bzhiin du\textsuperscript{1249} gnas kyi sbyin pa 'dis\textsuperscript{1250} na\textsuperscript{1251} bdag sms can thams cad kyi gnas dang / skyob pa dang / gling dang / skyabs dang / dpung gnyen du gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so // de la\textsuperscript{1252} 'di skad ces bya ste / gzhal med khang gnas\textsuperscript{1253} sbyin\textsuperscript{1254} pa yis //\textsuperscript{1255} bdag ni ’dzam bu\textsuperscript{1256} gling dag tu // lus can rnams kyi skyob dang gling // skyabs dang dpung gnyen gyur par shog /\textsuperscript{1258} gzhal\textsuperscript{1259} med khang gnas sbyin\textsuperscript{1260} pa yis\textsuperscript{1261} // gshags dang dang / skyob pa dang / gling dang / skyabs dang / dpung gnyen du gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so // de la\textsuperscript{1262} 'di skad ces bya ste / gzhal med khang gnas\textsuperscript{1263} sbyin\textsuperscript{1264} pa yis // gzhal\textsuperscript{1265} med khang gnas sbyin\textsuperscript{1266} pa yis\textsuperscript{1267} // gshags dang dang / skyob pa dang / gling dang / skyabs dang / dpung gnyen du gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so //

\textsuperscript{1241} Q: double daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1242} T: ba
\textsuperscript{1243} L and T: kyi
\textsuperscript{1244} Q: double daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1245} N and T: byin
\textsuperscript{1246} L: squeezes in de between adjacent syllables, probably as a correction
\textsuperscript{1247} N and T: byin
\textsuperscript{1248} L and T: kyi
\textsuperscript{1249} L and T: insert daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1250} S: ‘di
\textsuperscript{1251} L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1252} L: accidentally conflates de la, leaving what looks like del
\textsuperscript{1253} T: nas
\textsuperscript{1254} T: byin
\textsuperscript{1255} S: single daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1256} N: dzambu
\textsuperscript{1257} L: omits the genitive particle
\textsuperscript{1258} L: double daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1259} L: gzhan
\textsuperscript{1260} T: byin
\textsuperscript{1261} S: yin
\textsuperscript{1262} L: single daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1263} S: single daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1264} S and T: single daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1265} L: bo
\textsuperscript{1266} S: inserts kyi
\textsuperscript{1267} T: byin
\textsuperscript{1268} T: bar
\textsuperscript{1269} T: omits brtson par
\textsuperscript{1270} N and Q: insert cha
\textsuperscript{1271} D: inserts kyi
\textsuperscript{1272} T: ba
\textsuperscript{1273} L: sbob
\textsuperscript{1274} L, S, and T: phangs
\textsuperscript{1275} D, L, S, and T: omit pa’i
\textsuperscript{1276} Q: double daṇḍa
ma\textsuperscript{1277} dang sngas kyi sbyin pa\textsuperscript{1278} sbyin\textsuperscript{1279} par bya gor ma chag snyam mo\textsuperscript{1280} // de mal dang sngas kyi sbyin pa\textsuperscript{1281} de sbyin\textsuperscript{1282} pa na / sangs rgyas kyis bstan\textsuperscript{1283} pa\textsuperscript{1284} i smon lam\textsuperscript{1285} bzhin du\textsuperscript{1286} mal dang sngas kyi sbyin pa 'dis na\textsuperscript{1287,1288} bdag sems can thams cad kyi sgrib\textsuperscript{1289} pa thams cad gtan spong ba\textsuperscript{1290,1291} phags pa dang /\textsuperscript{1292} lha'i tshangs pa\textsuperscript{1293} 'i smon lam\textsuperscript{1294} bzhin gshegs pa'i gzims mal dang / 'phangs\textsuperscript{1295} pa\textsuperscript{1296} sbyin\textsuperscript{1297} par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so\textsuperscript{1298} // de la tshig\textsuperscript{1299} phyi ma yang\textsuperscript{1300} yod de /\textsuperscript{1301} mal dang sngas rnams byin pa\textsuperscript{1302} bdag la ni // bsod nams tshogs ni cung\textsuperscript{1303} zad ci yod pa /\textsuperscript{1304} des na bdag gis skye bo'i sgrib pa\textsuperscript{1305} dag /\textsuperscript{1306} sdig pa'i blo gros\textsuperscript{1307} ngan pa 'joms par shog //\textsuperscript{1308} lus can rnams kyi lta ba ngan pa yi //\textsuperscript{1309} dra\textsuperscript{1310} ba shes rab\textsuperscript{1311} mtshon gyis gcod par shog /\textsuperscript{1312} bde bar gshegs pa rnams la 'os pa\textsuperscript{1313} yi // mal mchog tshangs\textsuperscript{1314} gnas bsten\textsuperscript{1315} pa sbyin\textsuperscript{1316} par shog /\textsuperscript{1317} mal dang sngas rnams sbyin par byed pa'i mi

\textsuperscript{1277} L: squeezes "ma" of mal beneath and between the preceding gis and the final "l"
\textsuperscript{1278} Q: omits kyi sbyin pa
\textsuperscript{1279} N and T: byin
\textsuperscript{1280} L: snyamo
\textsuperscript{1281} T: ba
\textsuperscript{1282} N and T: byin
\textsuperscript{1283} L and T: bsten
\textsuperscript{1284} S: ba
\textsuperscript{1285} L: squeezes in final smudged “m” of lam (though it is still of normal size), probably as a correction
\textsuperscript{1286} L and T: insert danḍa
\textsuperscript{1287} T: byin par for 'dis na
\textsuperscript{1288} L, S, and T: insert danḍa
\textsuperscript{1289} L: sgribs
\textsuperscript{1290} T: pa
\textsuperscript{1291} L: inserts double danḍa; T: inserts danḍa
\textsuperscript{1292} L and T: omit danḍa
\textsuperscript{1293} L, S, and T: omit pa'\i
\textsuperscript{1294} L: inserts pa
\textsuperscript{1295} L, Q, S, and T: phangs
\textsuperscript{1296} D, L, S, and T: omit
\textsuperscript{1297} T: byin
\textsuperscript{1298} L: 'debs'o
\textsuperscript{1299} T: tshe
\textsuperscript{1300} N and S: 'ang
\textsuperscript{1301} L: double danḍa
\textsuperscript{1302} L: bas
\textsuperscript{1303} N: chung
\textsuperscript{1304} L: single danḍa
\textsuperscript{1305} L: ba
\textsuperscript{1306} L: omits danḍa
\textsuperscript{1307} L: glos
\textsuperscript{1308} L: double danḍa
\textsuperscript{1309} S: single danḍa
\textsuperscript{1310} L: dran
\textsuperscript{1311} T: inserts nga or da, giving the foot an extra syllable
\textsuperscript{1312} L: double danḍa
\textsuperscript{1313} L: ba
\textsuperscript{1314} T: tshang
\textsuperscript{1315} L, Q, S, and T: bstan; N: stan
\textsuperscript{1316} T: byin
\textsuperscript{1317} L: double danḍa
// bstan bcos dag la mkhas par skye bar 'gyur // \[1318\] zhi gnas 'thob \[1319\] cing \[1320\] rgya cher \[1321\] sbyin \[1322\] pa dang // \[1323\] pad ma \[1324\] las byung gzi can gzhon \[1325\] nur 'gyur // \[1326\] de la \[1327\] stan \[1328\] sbyin \[1329\] pa la ji ltar mgon par \[1330\] brtson par byed ce \[1331\] na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / stan sbyin \[1332\] pa zhes bya ba de ni stong \[1333\] gsum gyi stong chen po' \[1334\] 'jig rten gyi \[1335\] khams \[1336\] thams cad kyi sa \[1337\] gzhi la / byang chub kyi snying po rdo rje'i gdan thob par 'gyur ba'i tshig bla dags yin gyis \[1338\] / bdag gis stan gyi sbyin pa \[1339\] sbyin \[1340\] par bya gor ma chag \[1341\] snyam mo // de stan gyi sbyin pa de sbyin \[1342\] pa na / de bzhin gshegs pa dang mthun \[1343\] pa'i smon lam bzhin du / \[1344\] stan gyi sbyin pa \[1345\] 'dis na \[1346\] bdag gis sems can thams cad kyi's \[1347\] stong gsum gyi stong chen po'i 'jig rten gyi khams thams cad kyi sa gzhi la \[1348\] byang chub kyi snying po' \[1349\] rdo rje'i gdan thob par byed par \[1350\] gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs \[1351\] so / de la 'di skad ces bya ste / \[1352\] stan \[1353\] gyi sbyin pa 'di yis na \[1354\] / \[1355\] byang chub snying po' \[1356\] rdo rje'i \[1357\] gdan // bzang zhing sra la btan pa dag \[1358\] / \[1359\] lus can nnams la 'byung bar \[1360\]
shog /sna tshogs rin chen bdun las byas // 'phang du dpag tshad gnyis yod la // kho ra khor yug dpag tshad gcig / ri rab bzhin du spa ba dang / rin chen ljon shing brgyas bskor cing / gzhal med khang gis legs par brgyan / dril bu g.yer ka'i dra bas bkab / nor bu rin chen spras gsal ba tshangs pa mtshungs par spyod rnams la / khri dang stan dang stegs byin pas / kho ba dag na 'khor ba'i tshe / de 'dra i stan ni thob par 'gyur / de la yo byad kyi sbyin pa la ji ltar mgon par brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sms dpa' de di snyam du sms te / yo byad sbyin pa zhes bya ba / de ni byad bying chub kyi yo byad yongs su / rdzogs par 'gyur ba'i tshig bla dags yin gyis / bdag gis yo byad kyi sbyin pa sbyin par bya gor ma chag snyam mo / de yo byad kyi sbyin pa de sbyin pa na / de bzhin gshegs pa la 'os pa'i smon lam

1357 Q: omits the genitive particle
1358 N: dang
1359 L, N, and S: double danγa
1360 L: par
1361 L: double danγa
1362 L: single danγa
1363 L: cig
1364 L: double danγa
1365 L: squeezes in “ra” of rab
1366 L: accidentally conflates spa ba, leaving what looks like spab
1367 L. and T: single danγa
1368 T: omits
1369 Q: lngon
1370 N: zhing
1371 T: bar
1372 L. and T: single danγa
1373 L: tshungs
1374 L. and T: khre
1375 L: bas
1376 S: single danγa
1377 L: 'dri
1378 Q: bstan
1379 L: na
1380 N: “o” marker is almost or entirely absent
1381 T: ba
1382 T: bar
1383 N: “o” marker is almost or entirely absent
1384 L: accidentally conflates ce na, leaving what looks like cen
1385 L: di
1386 T: de byin pa for zhes bya ba, probably as a result of an eye-skip to an upcoming phrase
1387 Q: inserts danγa
1388 T: ne
1389 L, S, and T: insert danγa
1390 L: yongsu
1391 N: omits danγa
1392 N and T: byin
1393 L, S, and T: omit
1394 T: byin
1395 L: end of gshegs, where the second “g” would be, is smudged and completely effaced, with only “gshe” and a subjoined “s” being visible

221
bzhiṅ du yo byad byin¹³⁹⁶ pa ’dis na¹³⁹⁷ bdag sems can thams cad kyi byang chub kyi yo byad yongs su¹³⁹⁸ rdzogs par byed par¹³⁹⁹ gyur cig ces mon lam ’debs so¹⁴⁰⁰ // de la tshig phyi ma yang¹⁴⁰¹ yod de¹⁴⁰² /¹⁴⁰³ yo byad yongs su¹⁴⁰⁴ btang ba¹⁴⁰⁵ des //¹⁴⁰⁶ bdag gis kyang ni lus can gyi //¹⁴⁰⁷ byang chub yo byad btsal ba dag //¹⁴⁰⁸ yongs su¹⁴⁰⁹ rdzogs par byed gyur¹⁴¹⁰ cig /¹⁴¹¹ yo¹⁴¹² byad rab tu byin pa yis // gang dang gang du skyes pa der // rnam pa kun gyi¹⁴¹³ mchog ldan pa’i // yan lag thams cad rdzogs par ’gyur // de la sman sbyin¹⁴¹⁴ pa la ji ltar mngon par¹⁴¹⁵ brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu ’di la byang chub sems dpa’ de ’di snyam du sens te / sman gyi¹⁴¹⁶ sbyin pa¹⁴¹⁷ zhes bya ba de ni sems can thams cad kyi rga ba dang¹⁴¹⁸ ’chi ba med pa’i bdud rtsi’i bde ba yongs su¹⁴¹⁹ rdzogs par ’gyur ba’i tshig bla dags yin gyis / bdag gis sman gyi sbyin pa sbyin¹⁴²⁰ par bya gor ma chag snyam mo¹⁴²¹ // de sman gyi sbyin pa de sbyin¹⁴²² pa na /¹⁴²³ de bzhin gshegs pas byin gyis brlabs pa’i smon lam bzhin du /¹⁴²⁴ sman byin pa ’dis na¹⁴²⁵ bdag sems can thams cad kyi rga¹⁴²⁶ ba dang /¹⁴²⁷ ’chi ba med pa’i bdud rtsi’i bde ba yongs su¹⁴²⁸ rdzogs par byed par gyur cig ces mon lam ’debs so¹⁴²⁹ // de la ’di skad ces bya ste /¹⁴³⁰ rtsi dang sman gyi sbyin pa yis // sens can thams cad¹⁴³¹ tshe dpag med //¹⁴³² thams cad mkhyen pa’i

¹³⁹⁶ L. and S. : sbyin
¹³⁹⁷ L. : inserts double danḍa; S and T. : insert danḍa
¹³⁹⁸ L. : yongsu
¹³⁹⁹ L. : omits byed par
¹⁴⁰⁰ L. : ’debs
¹⁴⁰¹ N. : probably ’ang; S. ’ang
¹⁴⁰² L. : do
¹⁴⁰³ L. : double danḍa
¹⁴⁰⁴ L. : yongsu
¹⁴⁰⁵ T. : bas
¹⁴⁰⁶ S. : single danḍa
¹⁴⁰⁷ S. : single danḍa
¹⁴⁰⁸ L. : double danḍa
¹⁴⁰⁹ L. : yongsu
¹⁴¹⁰ Q. : par
¹⁴¹¹ L. : double danḍa
¹⁴¹² L. : yod
¹⁴¹³ Q. : gyis
¹⁴¹⁴ Q. : byin
¹⁴¹⁵ L. and T. : bar
¹⁴¹⁶ N. : kyi
¹⁴¹⁷ N and T. : ba
¹⁴¹⁸ L. and T. : insert danḍa
¹⁴¹⁹ L. : yongsu
¹⁴²⁰ N and T. : byin
¹⁴²¹ L. : snyamo
¹⁴²² N and T. : byin
¹⁴²³ Q. : double danḍa
¹⁴²⁴ S. : omits danḍa
¹⁴²⁵ L. , S, and T. : insert danḍa
¹⁴²⁶ N. : dga’
¹⁴²⁷ S. : omits danḍa
¹⁴²⁸ L. : yongsu
¹⁴²⁹ L. : ’debs
¹⁴³⁰ L. and T. : double danḍa
¹⁴³¹ L. : final “d” is written beneath “ca”
bdud rtsi yang // myur rtsi dang sman gyi sbyin pa yis // zla ba nya ltar nad med cing // gnod chung skyid cing bde bar gnas // mi nams tshe ni ring bar 'gyur // de la bran dang bran mo dang/ las byed pa dang/ zho shas 'tsho ba yongs su' g tong ba'i sbyin pa la ji ltar mgon par brtson par byed ce na/ rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te/ bran dang / bran mo dang / las byed pa dang / zho shas 'tsho ba yongs su g tong ba'i sbyin pa' zhes bya ba de ni byang chub sems dpa' rnam s kyi rang dga' dang / rang dbang dang / rang byung gi ye shes yongs su rdzogs par 'gyur ba'i tshig bla dags yin gyis / bdag gis bran dang / bran mo dang / las byed pa dang / zho shas 'tsho ba yongs su g tong ba'i sbyin pa  sbyin  par bya gor ma chag snyam mo / de bran dang / bran mo dang / las byed pa dang / zho shas 'tsho ba yongs su g tong ba'i sbyin pa sbyin  na de bzhin gshegs pas gsungs shing bstan pa'i smon lam bzhin du bran dang / bran mo dang / las byed pa dang / zho shas 'tsho  ba yongs su g tong ba'i sbyin pa dis na / bdag sems can thams cad kyi rang dga' dang /
rang dbang dang / rang byung gi ye shes yongs su rdzogs par byed par gyur cig ces mon lam 'debs so / de la 'di skad ces bya ste / bran dang bran mo btang ba yis // mdom na lus can thams cad kyi // rang byung gi ni ye shes kyi // snying po yongs su rdzogs gyur cig / bran dang bran mo btang ba yis // mi ni bran du // mi skye' zhing // btran po rang dbang yod pas 'tsho // zhum pa med cing 'jigs pa med // de la gser dang / dngul dang / nor bu dang / mu tig dang / bai dülya dang / dung dang / man' shel dang / byi ru dang / rin po che thams cad yongs su gtong ba'i sbyin pa la ji ltar mgon par brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sms te / gser dang / dngul dang / nor bu dang mu tig dang / bai dülya dang / dung dang / man' shel dang / byi ru dang / rin po che thams cad yongs su gtong ba zhes bya ba de ni / byang chub sems dpa' rnam kyi sangs rgyas kyi zhing bye ba khrag khrig 'bum phrag mtha' yas mu med pa dag tu 'od zer sngon po dang / ser po dang / dmar
po\textsuperscript{1508} dang / dkar po dang / btsod\textsuperscript{1509} ka\textsuperscript{1510} dang / shel dang / dngul gyi kha dog lta bu snang bar 'gyur ba\textsuperscript{1511} i tshig bla dags yin gyis / bdag gis gser dang / dngul dang / nor bu dang / mu tig dang / bai ḏūrya\textsuperscript{1513} dang / dung\textsuperscript{1514} dang / man shel dang / byi\textsuperscript{1515} ru dang / rin po\textsuperscript{1516} che thams cad yongs su 'gtong ba'i\textsuperscript{1518} sbyin pa\textsuperscript{1519} 1520 sbyin\textsuperscript{1521} par bya gor ma chag snyam mo // de\textsuperscript{1522} gser dang / dngul dang / nor bu dang / mu tig dang / bai ḏūrya\textsuperscript{1523} dang / dung dang / man shel dang / byi\textsuperscript{1524} ru dang / rin po che thams cad yongs su\textsuperscript{1525} 'gtong ba'i sbyin pa de\textsuperscript{1526} sbyin\textsuperscript{1527} pa na\textsuperscript{1528} // de bzhin gshegs pas ji ltar mkhyen cing bshad\textsuperscript{1529} de\textsuperscript{1530} gsal\textsuperscript{1531} bar mdzad pa'i smon lam bzhin du\textsuperscript{1532} gser dang / dngul dang / nor bu dang / mu tig\textsuperscript{1533} dang / bai ḏūrya\textsuperscript{1535} dang / dung dang / man shel dang / byi\textsuperscript{1536} ru dang / rin po che thams cad byin pa des na\textsuperscript{1537} bdag sangs rgyas kyi zhing bye ba khrag khrig phrag 'bum mtha' yas mu med pa\textsuperscript{1538} dag tu 'od zer\textsuperscript{1539} sngon po dang / ser po dang / dmar po dang / dkar po dang / btsod ka\textsuperscript{1540} dang / shel dang / dngul gyi kha dog lta bus\textsuperscript{1541} snang bar byed par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so\textsuperscript{1542} // de la tshig\textsuperscript{1543} phyi ma yang\textsuperscript{1544} yod\textsuperscript{1545} de /\textsuperscript{1546} rin chen byin pa des na\textsuperscript{1547} bdag /\textsuperscript{1548} 'od zer\textsuperscript{1549} sna

\textsuperscript{1508} L: bo
\textsuperscript{1509} N: appears to read bcod, either because of an error or because part of the letter has been effaced
\textsuperscript{1510} S: kha
\textsuperscript{1511} L: pa
\textsuperscript{1512} N and Q: double danḍa
\textsuperscript{1513} D: dū rya; L: dū rya; Q: ḏūrya
\textsuperscript{1514} L: dngul
\textsuperscript{1515} N and S: byu
\textsuperscript{1516} L: omits
\textsuperscript{1517} L: yongsu
\textsuperscript{1518} Q: omits the genitive particle
\textsuperscript{1519} T: ba
\textsuperscript{1520} L: inserts de
\textsuperscript{1521} N and T: byin
\textsuperscript{1522} D and Q: omit
\textsuperscript{1523} D: ḏūrya; Q: dū rya
\textsuperscript{1524} N and S: byu
\textsuperscript{1525} L: yongsu
\textsuperscript{1526} L: squeezes de into an extremely small space, probably as a correction
\textsuperscript{1527} N: byin
\textsuperscript{1528} Q: ni
\textsuperscript{1529} L: bshed
\textsuperscript{1530} S and T: insert danḍa
\textsuperscript{1531} S: gser
\textsuperscript{1532} L and T: insert danḍa
\textsuperscript{1533} L: accidentally conflates mu tig
\textsuperscript{1534} Q: be
\textsuperscript{1535} D and Q: ḏūrya
\textsuperscript{1536} N and S: byu
\textsuperscript{1537} L, S, and T: insert danḍa
\textsuperscript{1538} T: ba
\textsuperscript{1539} L: azer
\textsuperscript{1540} S: kha
\textsuperscript{1541} L, S, and T: bu
\textsuperscript{1542} L: 'debsö
\textsuperscript{1543} N: "tsh" marker atop the letter is almost or entirely absent; T: tshe
\textsuperscript{1544} N and S: 'ang
tshogs snang ba yis // sngs rgyas drang srong che rnams kyi // zhin gnams thams cad snang byed shog // rin chen sna tshogs byin pa yis // des pa gang dang gar skyes pa // 'jig rten mtshams med yan chad du // des ni 'od zer snang bar byed // de la rta dang // glang po che dang // shing rta'i bzhon pa yongs su gtong ba'i sbyin pa la ji ltar mgon par brtson pa byed ce na // rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa de 'di snyam du sens te // rta dang // glang po che dang // shing rta'i bzhon pa yongs su gtong ba'i sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni byang chub sems dpa rnams kyi theg pa chen po ung dang / theg pa mchog dang / theg pa mi mnyam pa dang mnyam pa dang / sangs rgyas kyi theg pa bla na med pa / gtso bo dam pa rab mchog sdud pa i tshig bla dags yin

1545 N: sod
1546 L: double daṇḍa
1547 N: ni
1548 L and Q: double daṇḍa
1549 L: gzer
1550 L: omits
1551 L and T: chen (with the final “n” placed beneath “che” in L)
1552 T: inserts po, giving the root an extra syllable
1553 S: single daṇḍa
1554 L: double daṇḍa
1555 N and Q: skye ba for skyes pa
1556 N: appears to read mchams, either because of an error or because part of the letter has been effaced
1557 D and Q: cad
1558 Q: tu
1559 L: single daṇḍa
1560 L and Q: gzer
1561 T: omits double daṇḍa
1562 N and Q: omit daṇḍa
1563 Q: glang chen for glang po che
1564 N: omits daṇḍa; Q: double daṇḍa
1565 Q: aʒhon
1566 L: yongsu
1567 L, S, and T: omit the genitive particle
1568 T: byin
1569 N and T: bar
1570 N: bar
1571 N: ba
1572 L: appears to read brtson par byad ce, but the writing here is extremely small and difficult to make out
1573 Q: omits daṇḍa
1574 D: bo
1575 L: yongsu
1576 T, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
1577 T: omits
1578 N: looks like pe, most likely because the right half of the “o” marker has rubbed off
1579 T: ba
1580 L: omits the second mnyam pa dang
1581 Q: omits daṇḍa
1582 N and Q: insert daṇḍa
1583 L, N, Q, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
1584 N and Q: insert daṇḍa
1585 T: ba
gyis¹¹⁵⁶ bdag gis rta dang / glang po che dang / shing rta'i bzhon¹¹⁵⁷ pa yongs su¹¹⁵⁸ gtong ba'i sbyin pa¹¹⁵⁹ par bya gor ma chang snyam mo // de rta dang / glang po che dang / shing rta'i bzhon pa¹¹⁶⁰ yongs su¹¹⁶¹ gtong ba'i sbyin pa¹¹⁶² de¹¹⁶³ sbyin¹¹⁶⁴ pa na¹¹⁶⁵ de bzhin gshegs pas gsungs shing bsgoms pa'i smon lam bzhin du rta dang / glang po che dang / shing rta'i bzhon pa yongs su¹¹⁶⁶ gtong ba¹¹⁶⁷ i sbyin pa¹¹⁶⁸ 'dis na¹¹⁶⁹ bdag gis sems can thams cad¹¹⁷⁰ theg pa chen po dang / theg pa mchog dang / theg pa mi myam pa¹¹⁷¹ dang mnyam pa dang /¹¹⁷² sangs rgyas kyi theg pa bla na med pa /¹¹⁷³ gtso¹¹⁷⁴ bo dam pa / rab mchog gis sdud par byed par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so¹¹⁷⁵ // de la tshig¹¹⁷⁶ phyi ma yang¹¹⁷⁷ yod de /¹¹⁷⁸ bdag gis glang chen byin pa yis //¹¹⁷⁹ sangs rgyas theg pa theg pa che // theg pa mchog gis lus can rnams // myur du sdud par¹¹⁸⁰ byed par shog /¹¹⁸¹ glang chen byin zhih rta byin pas¹¹⁸² // gsal zhih¹¹⁸³ mkhas la shes¹¹⁸⁴ nyen¹¹⁸⁵ can // theg pa che la mos¹¹⁸⁶ pa dang //¹¹⁸⁷ mi de skal ba can du 'gyur // de la skyed¹¹⁸⁸ mos tshal¹¹⁸⁹ dang / dka' thub kyi nags tshal dang / gtsug lag khang yongs su¹¹⁹⁰ gtong

¹¹⁵⁶ Q: omits daṇḍa; S: double daṇḍa
¹¹⁵⁷ L: gzhon
¹¹⁵⁸ L: yongsu
¹¹⁵⁹ D and T: ba
¹¹⁶⁰ N and T: byin
¹¹⁶¹ N: ba
¹¹⁶² L: yongsu
¹¹⁶³ T: ba
¹¹⁶⁴ D, L, N, Q, and T: omit; S: inserts de as a correction—pa and de are squeezed into the space of one syllable
¹¹⁶⁵ N, Q, and T: byin
¹¹⁶⁶ L, Q, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
¹¹⁶⁷ L: yongsu
¹¹⁶⁸ L: pa
¹¹⁶⁹ D: ba
¹¹⁷⁰ T: ni
¹¹⁷¹ L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
¹¹⁷² N: only the final “d” is faintly legible
¹¹⁷³ L and T: ba
¹¹⁷⁴ T: double daṇḍa
¹¹⁷⁵ L and T: omit daṇḍa
¹¹⁷⁶ Q: btso
¹¹⁷⁷ L: 'debs so
¹¹⁷⁸ T: (written beneath the preceding la)
¹¹⁷⁹ T: tshe (written beneath the preceding la)
¹¹⁸⁰ N and S: 'ang
¹¹⁸¹ L: double daṇḍa
¹¹⁸² S: single daṇḍa
¹¹⁸³ Q: pa
¹¹⁸⁴ L and Q: double daṇḍa
¹¹⁸⁵ L: bas; S: byas
¹¹⁸⁶ T: zhis
¹¹⁸⁷ N: bshes
¹¹⁸⁸ N: gnyen; Q: nyan
¹¹⁸⁹ T: mongs
¹¹⁹⁰ Q: single daṇḍa
¹¹⁹¹ Q: bskyed
¹¹⁹² S: tshal
¹¹⁹³ L: yongsu
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ba'i sbyin pa la ji ltar mngon par\textsuperscript{1623} brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu ’di la byang chub sms dpa’ de ’di snyam du sms te / skyed\textsuperscript{1624} mos tshal dang / dka’ thub kyi nags tshal dang / gtsug lag khang yongs su\textsuperscript{1626} gtong ba’i sbyin pa\textsuperscript{1627} zhes bya ba de ni\textsuperscript{1628} byang chub sms dpa’ \textit{rnams} kyi bsam gtan gyi yan lag \textit{yongs su}\textsuperscript{1629} ‘rdzogs par byed par\textsuperscript{1630} ‘gyur ba’i tshig bla dags\textsuperscript{1632} yin gyis / bdag gis skyed\textsuperscript{1634} mos tshal dang / dka’ thub kyi nags tshal dang / gtsug lag khang yongs su\textsuperscript{1636} gtong ba’i sbyin pa sbyin\textsuperscript{1641} pa na /\textit{sangs rgyas kyi bstod}\textsuperscript{1643} cing bsgags pa’i smon lam bzhin du /\textit{skyed}\textsuperscript{1644} mos tshal dang / dka’ thub kyi nags tshal dang / gtsug lag khang yongs su\textsuperscript{1646} gtong ba’i sbyin pa ‘dis na\textsuperscript{1647} bdag sems can thams cad kyi bsam gtan gyi\textsuperscript{1648} yan lag yongs su\textsuperscript{1649} ‘rdzogs par byed par gyur cig ces\textsuperscript{1650} smon lam ’debso\textsuperscript{1651} // de la tshig phyi ma\textsuperscript{1652} yang\textsuperscript{1653} yod de \textit{la tshig phyi ma}\textsuperscript{1651} lha gang skyed\textsuperscript{1655} mos tshal byin pas /\textit{bskyed}\textsuperscript{1656} bdag gis sems can thams cad kyi // bsam gtan yan lag rim\textsuperscript{1657} bzhin du // yongs su\textsuperscript{1658} ‘rdzogs par byed par shog / lha gang skyed\textsuperscript{1660}

\textsuperscript{1623} T: bar
\textsuperscript{1624} Q: bskyed
\textsuperscript{1625} L and T: omit \textit{dan\danda}
\textsuperscript{1626} L: \textit{yongsu}
\textsuperscript{1627} T: ba
\textsuperscript{1628} L, S, and T: insert \textit{dan\danda}
\textsuperscript{1629} Q: \textit{sems can thams cad kyi yan lag for byang chub sms dpa’ \textit{rnams} kyi bsam gtan gyi yan lag}
\textsuperscript{1630} L: \textit{yongsu}
\textsuperscript{1631} L, S, and T: omit byed par
\textsuperscript{1632} L: accidentally conflates \textit{bla dags}
\textsuperscript{1633} Q: \textit{double \textit{dan\danda}}
\textsuperscript{1634} L and Q: bskyed
\textsuperscript{1635} L: bka’
\textsuperscript{1636} L: \textit{yongsu}
\textsuperscript{1637} N and T: byin
\textsuperscript{1638} L and Q: bskyed
\textsuperscript{1639} N: omits \textit{dan\danda}
\textsuperscript{1640} L: \textit{yongsu}
\textsuperscript{1641} N and T: byin
\textsuperscript{1642} L: \textit{double \textit{dan\danda}}
\textsuperscript{1643} L: bsto
\textsuperscript{1644} N and S: omit \textit{dan\danda}
\textsuperscript{1645} L and Q: bskyed
\textsuperscript{1646} L: \textit{yongsu}
\textsuperscript{1647} L, S, and T: insert \textit{dan\danda}
\textsuperscript{1648} Q: omits \textit{bsam gtan gyi}. Cf. note 1629 above
\textsuperscript{1649} L: \textit{yongsu}
\textsuperscript{1650} L: squeezes the final “g” of \textit{cig} and \textit{ces} into an extremely small space, probably as a correction
\textsuperscript{1651} L: ’debso
\textsuperscript{1652} T: inserts \textit{dang}
\textsuperscript{1653} N and S: ‘ang
\textsuperscript{1654} L and Q: \textit{double \textit{dan\danda}}
\textsuperscript{1655} L and Q: bskyed
\textsuperscript{1656} L: omits \textit{double \textit{dan\danda}}; S: single \textit{dan\danda}
\textsuperscript{1657} L, S, and T: \textit{rim}
\textsuperscript{1658} L: \textit{yongsu}
\textsuperscript{1659} L: \textit{double \textit{dan\danda}}
mos tshal byin\textsuperscript{1661} pas // rnal 'byor can gyi\textsuperscript{1662} mi de ni // bsam gtan yan lag yongs\textsuperscript{1663} rdzogs shing // rnal 'byor spyod la\textsuperscript{1664} dka' thub che // de la chung ma dang\textsuperscript{1665} bu dang / bu mo yongs su\textsuperscript{1666} gtong ba'i sbyin pa\textsuperscript{1667} la ji ltar\textsuperscript{1668} mgon par brtson par byed\textsuperscript{1669} ce na\textsuperscript{1670} / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sms dpa' de 'di snyam du sms te /\textsuperscript{1671} chung ma dang\textsuperscript{1672} bu dang / bu mo yongs su\textsuperscript{1673} gtong ba'i sbyin pa zhes bya ba\textsuperscript{1674} de ni\textsuperscript{1675} byang chub sms dpa' rnam kyi bla na\textsuperscript{1676} med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub tu\textsuperscript{1677} mgon par\textsuperscript{1678} rdzogs par 'tshang rgya bar 'gyur ba'i tshig bla dags yin gys\textsuperscript{1679} bdag gis chung ma dang / bu dang / bu mo yongs su\textsuperscript{1680} gtong ba'i sbyin pa sbyin\textsuperscript{1681} par\textsuperscript{1682} bya gor ma chag snyam mo\textsuperscript{1683} / de chung ma dang / bu dang /\textsuperscript{1684} bu mo yongs su\textsuperscript{1685} gtong ba'i sbyin pa de sbyin\textsuperscript{1686} pa na / de bzhin gsheds\textsuperscript{1687} pa bsnyen bkur mdzad\textsuperscript{1688} pa i\textsuperscript{1689}\textsuperscript{1690} smon lam bzhin du\textsuperscript{1691} chung ma dang / bu dang / bu mo yongs su\textsuperscript{1692} gtong ba'i sbyin pa 'dis na\textsuperscript{1693} bdag sms can thams cad bla na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub mgon par rdzogs par 'tshang rgya bar byed par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1660} L and Q: bskyed \textsuperscript{1661} T: repeats byin \textsuperscript{1662} N: appears to read gys \textsuperscript{1663} L: yongsu \textsuperscript{1664} N and Q: pa \textsuperscript{1665} T, Q, S, and T: insert \textit{daṇḍa} \textsuperscript{1666} L: yongsu \textsuperscript{1667} N: ba \textsuperscript{1668} N: only the “t” is clearly legible \textsuperscript{1669} L: squeezes in the final “d” of byed, probably as a correction \textsuperscript{1670} L: accidentally conflates ce na, leaving what looks like cen \textsuperscript{1671} N: omits \textit{daṇḍa} \textsuperscript{1672} L, N, Q, S, and T: insert \textit{daṇḍa} \textsuperscript{1673} L: yongsu \textsuperscript{1674} L: pa \textsuperscript{1675} L: accidentally conflates bya ba, leaving what looks like byab \textsuperscript{1676} T, S, and T: insert \textit{daṇḍa} \textsuperscript{1677} L: accidentally conflates bla na, leaving what looks like blan \textsuperscript{1678} T, S, and T: \textit{sdud pa} for \textit{tu} \textsuperscript{1679} T: \textit{bar} \textsuperscript{1680} L, Q, S, and T: insert \textit{daṇḍa} \textsuperscript{1681} L and T: yongsu \textsuperscript{1682} N and T: byin \textsuperscript{1683} T: \textit{bar} \textsuperscript{1684} L: \textit{snyamo} \textsuperscript{1685} L and T: omit \textit{daṇḍa} \textsuperscript{1686} Q: omits \textit{daṇḍa} and squeezes in \textit{bu mo} at the end of the line; N: omits \textit{daṇḍa} \textsuperscript{1687} L: yongsu \textsuperscript{1688} L: omits the “i” marker for the genitive particle \textsuperscript{1689} N and T: byin \textsuperscript{1690} L: gsheds\textsuperscript{1691} D, L, N, and Q: repeat \textit{mdzad}; S: series of dots shows a correction, in this case an obvious one that other versions failed to make \textsuperscript{1692} L: omits the genitive particle \textsuperscript{1693} T: repeats \textit{mdzad pa'i} \textsuperscript{1694} L and T: insert \textit{daṇḍa} \textsuperscript{1695} L: yongsu \textsuperscript{1696} L, S, and T: insert \textit{daṇḍa}
\end{flushright}
so de la tshig phyi ma yang yod de bu yi sbyin pa des ni myur bar yang // sems can rnams ni re re'i don gyi phyir // sems can thams cad bla na med pa yi // byang chub dam pa 'tshang rgya byed par shog chung ma bu dang bu mo gtong byed pa // de la byang chub zag med dga ba med // brtson 'grus idan pa'i mi ni gang la yang // dka' ba ci yang med par bta bar bya // de la nor dang 'bru dang bang mdzod yongs su gtong ba'i sbyin pa de 'di snyam du sems te nor dang 'bru dang bang mdzod yongs su zhes bya ba de ni byang chub sems dpa' rnams kyi dam pa'i chos kyi mdzod yongs su rdzogs par 'gyur ba'i tshig bla dags yin gyis / bdag gis nor dang / 'bru dang / bang mdzod yongs su gtong ba'i sbyin pa sbyin par bya gor ma chag snyam mo de nor dang / 'bru dang / bang mdzod yongs su
gtong ba'i sbyin pa\textsuperscript{1738} de sbyin\textsuperscript{1739} pa\textsuperscript{1740} na / de bzhin gshegs pas gsungs pa'i smon lam bzhin du\textsuperscript{1741} nor dang / 'bru dang /\textsuperscript{1742} bang mdzod yongs su\textsuperscript{1743} gtong ba'i sbyin pa 'dis na\textsuperscript{1744} / bdag sems can thams cad kyi dam pa'i chos kyi mdzod yongs su\textsuperscript{1745} rdzogs par\textsuperscript{1746} byed par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so\textsuperscript{1747} / de la 'di skad cyes bya ste /\textsuperscript{1748} nor dang dbyig\textsuperscript{1749} rnams gtong ba'i bsod nams ni / mkha'\textsuperscript{1750} las lhag\textsuperscript{1751} pa\textsuperscript{1752} bdag la ci yod pas\textsuperscript{1753} // mi rnams rgyud ni dam pa'i chos mdzod kyis\textsuperscript{1754} // rgyal po'i mdzod ltar myur du rgyas gyur cig /\textsuperscript{1755} nor dang 'bru dang bang\textsuperscript{1756} mdzod bud med rnams // gtong ba'i bsod nams bdag la ci yod pa // des na\textsuperscript{1757} bdag gis byang chub myur 'thob\textsuperscript{1758} cing // dam pa'i chos kyi mdzod ni thob par shog /\textsuperscript{1759} de la gling bzhis dang / 'dzam bu\textsuperscript{1760} i gling dang / rgyal srid kyi\textsuperscript{1761} dbang phyug thams cad yongs su\textsuperscript{1762} gtong ba'i sbyin pa la ji ltar mngon par\textsuperscript{1763} brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sems te / gling bzhis dang / 'dzam bu\textsuperscript{1764} i gling dang / rgyal srid kyi\textsuperscript{1765} dbang phyug thams cad yongs su\textsuperscript{1766} gtong ba'i sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni / byang chub sems\textsuperscript{1768} dpa' rnams kyi dam pa'i chos kyi rgyal srid kyi dbang phyug 'thob par 'gyur ba'i tshig bla dags yin gyis\textsuperscript{1769} / bdag gis gling bzhis dang / 'dzam bu\textsuperscript{1770} i\textsuperscript{1771} gling dang / rgyal srid kyi

\textsuperscript{1737} L: yongsu
\textsuperscript{1738} D: ba
\textsuperscript{1739} N and T: byin
\textsuperscript{1740} N: ba
\textsuperscript{1741} L, Q, and T: insert danda
\textsuperscript{1742} L, S, and T: insert mdzod dang /
\textsuperscript{1743} L: yongsu
\textsuperscript{1744} Q: ni
\textsuperscript{1745} L: yongsu
\textsuperscript{1746} T: pa'i
\textsuperscript{1747} L: 'debs
\textsuperscript{1748} L and T: double danda
\textsuperscript{1749} T: has 'brag with both an “i” and a “u” marker, probably as a result of confusing dbiyig and 'bru
\textsuperscript{1750} L: mkhas
\textsuperscript{1751} T: lhags
\textsuperscript{1752} S: mkha' la sa pa for mkha' las lhag pa
\textsuperscript{1753} L and N: bas
\textsuperscript{1754} L, N, S, and T: kyi
\textsuperscript{1755} L: double dança
\textsuperscript{1756} D: bad
\textsuperscript{1757} T: ni
\textsuperscript{1758} N: thob
\textsuperscript{1759} L: double dança
\textsuperscript{1760} N: dzambu
\textsuperscript{1761} L, N, Q, S, and T: omit
\textsuperscript{1762} L: yongsu
\textsuperscript{1763} T: bar
\textsuperscript{1764} N: dzambu
\textsuperscript{1765} N and Q: omit dang and the dança, merging the two lines with the genitive particle gi (‘dzam bu [N: dzambu]’i gling gi rgyal srid . . .)
\textsuperscript{1766} N and Q: omit
\textsuperscript{1767} L: yongsu
\textsuperscript{1768} T: inserts can
\textsuperscript{1769} Q: gyi
\textsuperscript{1770} N: dzambu
\textsuperscript{1771} Q: omits the genitive particle
dbang phyug thams cad yongs su\textsuperscript{1773} gtong ba’i sbyin pa sbyin\textsuperscript{1774} par\textsuperscript{1775} bya gor ma chag snyam mo // de gling bzhi dang\textsuperscript{1776} ‘dzam bu\textsuperscript{1777}‘ dzam bu\textsuperscript{1778} gling dang\textsuperscript{1779} / rgyal srid kyi dbang phyug thams cad yongs su\textsuperscript{1780} gtong ba’i sbyin pa de sbyin\textsuperscript{1781} pa na / de bzhin gshegs pas bstan pa’i smon lam bzhin du / gling bzhi dang\textsuperscript{1783} /\textsuperscript{1784} ‘dzam bu\textsuperscript{1785} ‘dzam bu\textsuperscript{1786} gling dang / rgyal srid kyi dbang phyug thams cad yongs su\textsuperscript{1788} gtong ba’i sbyin pa ’dis na / bdag sems can thams cad dam pa’i chos kyi rgyal srid kyi dbang phyug ’thob pa thob par\textsuperscript{1790} gyur cig ces smon lam ’debs so\textsuperscript{1791} de la ‘di skad ces bya ste / gling bzhi ril gyis btang ba ‘di dag las / bdag gis bsod nams cung\textsuperscript{1795} zad ci bsgrubs pa\textsuperscript{1796} /\textsuperscript{1797} des /\textsuperscript{1798} na mi rnam ’di dag damchos kyi // rgyal srid ’thob pa’i\textsuperscript{1799} mtha’ ni thob gyur cig /\textsuperscript{1800} ‘dzam bu\textsuperscript{1801} ‘dzam bu\textsuperscript{1802} gling ni byin pa yis /\textsuperscript{1803}\textsuperscript{1804} rin chen sna bdun ldan pa yi\textsuperscript{1805} /\textsuperscript{1806} rgyal po\textsuperscript{1807} gling bzhi dbang byed pa\textsuperscript{1808} /\textsuperscript{1809} dbang phyug rnam par /\textsuperscript{1809} rgyal bar ’gyur // de la gtsug gi nor bu dang /\textsuperscript{1810} cod pan yongs su\textsuperscript{1811} gtong ba’i sbyin pa la ji\textsuperscript{1812} ltar

\textsuperscript{1772} Q: omits \textit{daṇḍa}
\textsuperscript{1773} L: \textit{yongsu}
\textsuperscript{1774} N and T: \textit{byin}
\textsuperscript{1775} D: \textit{bar}
\textsuperscript{1776} Q: omits \textit{daṇḍa}
\textsuperscript{1777} N: \textit{dzambu}
\textsuperscript{1778} Q: omits the genitive particle
\textsuperscript{1779} Q: omits
\textsuperscript{1780} L: \textit{yongsu}
\textsuperscript{1781} L: omits; N and T: \textit{byin}
\textsuperscript{1782} D: \textit{ba}
\textsuperscript{1783} L, S, and T: omit \textit{daṇḍa}
\textsuperscript{1784} Q: omits
\textsuperscript{1785} Q: omits \textit{daṇḍa}
\textsuperscript{1786} N: \textit{dzambu}
\textsuperscript{1787} Q: omits the genitive particle
\textsuperscript{1788} L: \textit{yongsu}
\textsuperscript{1789} Q: \textit{ni}
\textsuperscript{1790} L: squeezes the final “b” of ‘thob and pa thob par into an extremely small space, probably as a correction
\textsuperscript{1791} L: ‘debsō
\textsuperscript{1792} Q: omits double \textit{daṇḍa}
\textsuperscript{1793} T: double \textit{daṇḍa}
\textsuperscript{1794} Q: single \textit{daṇḍa}
\textsuperscript{1795} Q: \textit{chung}
\textsuperscript{1796} D and S: \textit{ba}; Q: \textit{shing}
\textsuperscript{1797} L: single \textit{daṇḍa}; Q: omits double \textit{daṇḍa}, a clear oversight that merges the two feet of verse
\textsuperscript{1798} T: \textit{de}
\textsuperscript{1799} L: omits the “i” marker for the genitive particle
\textsuperscript{1800} L: double \textit{daṇḍa}
\textsuperscript{1801} N: \textit{dzambu}
\textsuperscript{1802} D, N, and Q: omit the genitive particle
\textsuperscript{1803} L, N, Q, S, and T: double \textit{daṇḍa}
\textsuperscript{1804} S: inserts \textit{rigs kyi}, giving the foot too many syllables
\textsuperscript{1805} Q and S: \textit{yis}
\textsuperscript{1806} T: \textit{po’i}
\textsuperscript{1807} L: \textit{ba}
\textsuperscript{1808} N, Q, S, and T: double \textit{daṇḍa}
\textsuperscript{1809} S: \textit{bar}
\textsuperscript{1810} Q: double \textit{daṇḍa}; S: omits \textit{daṇḍa}
\textsuperscript{1811} L: \textit{yongsu}
mgon par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du
gtsug gi nor bu dang / cod pan yongs su g tong ba'i sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni
byang chub sems dpa' rnam s kyi spyi gtsug btar mi mthong bar 'gyur ba'i tshig bla
dags yin gyis / bdag gis gtsug gi nor bu dang / cod pan yongs su g tong ba'i sbyin
pa par bya gor ma chag snyam mo / de gtsug gi nor bu dang / cod pan yongs su
g tong ba'i sbyin pa de sbyin na / de bzhin gshegs pas gsungs pa'i smon lam bzhin
du gtsug gi nor bu dang / cod pan yongs su g tong ba'i sbyin pa dis na bdag
sems can thams cad kyi spyi gtsug btar mi mthong ba thob par byed par gyur cig ces
smon lam 'debs so // de la 'di skad ces bya ste mgo bo i nor bu cod pan byin pa
yi // bsod nams tshogs ni bdag la ci yod pa // des na dir ni 's kyi med rtag tu thob gyur cig
// spyi gtsug btar med rtag tu thob gyur cig / gtsug gi nor bu byin des bdag

1812 L: squeezes in ji between adjacent syllables, probably as a correction
1813 T: bar
1814 S: omits danda
1815 L: yongsu
1816 N: double danda
1817 L: ltar; T: pltar
1818 L: omits
1819 T: gis
1820 S: omits danda
1821 T: par
1822 L. and T: yongsu
1823 T: ba
1824 N and T: byin
1825 T: chags
1826 T: combines snyam mo into one word, resulting in a snyam with an “o” marker over the final “m”
1827 L: yongsu
1828 T: byin
1829 L: omits
1830 S: omits danda
1831 L. and Q: yongsu
1832 T: ba
1833 Q: ni
1834 L, S, and T: insert danda
1835 L: inserts gi
1836 L: final “d” is written beneath “ca”
1837 N and Q: kyi
1838 L: spanyo; T: omits
1839 L: ‘debs; T: omits
1840 L: bye
1841 T: inserts ba
1842 T: double danda
1843 T: ba
1844 D: pu; L, S, and T: bu’i
1845 T: ba
1846 L: accidentally conflation ba yi
1847 S: ni
1848 L: des ‘di rin for des na ‘dir ni
1849 D: kyi
1850 Q: bta
1851 L: double danda
//1854 nyag ro dha\textsuperscript{1855} 1856 ltar chu zheng gab\textsuperscript{1857} // gser dang nor bu byas\textsuperscript{1858} pa yi\textsuperscript{1859} // gtsug tor phun\textsuperscript{1860} sum tshogs par shog //1861 de la rkang pa sbyin\textsuperscript{1862} pa la ji ltar mgon par\textsuperscript{1863} brtson par byed ce na //1864 rigs kyi bu ‘di la byang chub sms dpa’ de\textsuperscript{1865} ‘di snyam du sms te / rkang pa sbyin\textsuperscript{1866} pa zhes bya ba de ni //1867 byang chub sms dpa’ rnams kyi chos kyi rkang pa byang chub kyi snying por ’gro ba’i tshig bla dags yin gyis / bdag gis\textsuperscript{1868} rkang pa sbyin pa sbyin\textsuperscript{1869} par bya gor ma chag snyam mo \textsuperscript{1870} //1871 de\textsuperscript{1872}\textsuperscript{1873} rkang pa sbyin pa de\textsuperscript{1874} sbyin\textsuperscript{1875} pa na / de bzhin gshegs\textsuperscript{1876} pas\textsuperscript{1877} bnyes pa’i smon lam bzhin du /1878 rkang pa’\textsuperscript{1879} sbyin\textsuperscript{1880} pa’ dis na /\textsuperscript{1881} mi rnams dang sms can thams cad rtag tu\textsuperscript{1882} myur bar khyim nas\textsuperscript{1883} mgon par\textsuperscript{1884} byung nas\textsuperscript{1885} skye ba’\textsuperscript{1886} dang /\textsuperscript{1887} rga ba’\textsuperscript{1888} dang /\textsuperscript{1889} na ba’\textsuperscript{1890} dang /\textsuperscript{1891} chi ba’i gnod pa zhi bar bya ba’i don gyi phyir ’dod\textsuperscript{1892} bzhin du bag brkyang nas rab tu dga’ zhing dbang po zhi la\textsuperscript{1893} skyabs su’\textsuperscript{1894} ‘os\textsuperscript{1895}

\textsuperscript{1852} T: inserts gyi, giving the foot an extra syllable
\textsuperscript{1853} L: dag
\textsuperscript{1854} L: double daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1855} D and T: da
\textsuperscript{1856} L: nye grod (intended to be nye gro da?) for nya gro dha
\textsuperscript{1857} T: gbab
\textsuperscript{1858} N: byin
\textsuperscript{1859} D, L, N, and Q: yis
\textsuperscript{1860} L: phu
\textsuperscript{1861} L: double daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1862} T: byin
\textsuperscript{1863} T: bar
\textsuperscript{1864} L: double daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1865} L: inserts what appears to be a small ni
\textsuperscript{1866} T: byin
\textsuperscript{1867} L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1868} Q: gi
\textsuperscript{1869} N and T: byin
\textsuperscript{1870} L: snyamo
\textsuperscript{1871} Q: single daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1872} T: omits
\textsuperscript{1873} D, N, and Q: insert la, confusing the opening of this refrain with the one that begins each type of gift
\textsuperscript{1874} Q: omits
\textsuperscript{1875} N: byin
\textsuperscript{1876} L: gsheg
\textsuperscript{1877} Q: pa’i
\textsuperscript{1878} L and T: insert daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1879} L: ba
\textsuperscript{1880} L, N, Q, S, and T: byin
\textsuperscript{1881} Q: omits daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1882} L: part of the bottom of “t” and the “u” marker have been effaced
\textsuperscript{1883} L and T: insert daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1884} L: bar
\textsuperscript{1885} L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1886} L: repeats ba
\textsuperscript{1887} Q: omits daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1888} L: accidentally conflates rga ba, leaving what looks like rgab
\textsuperscript{1889} Q: omits daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1890} L: accidentally conflates na ba, leaving what looks like nab
\textsuperscript{1891} Q: omits daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{1892} L: inserts pa
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pa’1896 zla ba’i ’od ltar gzugs zhi ba1897 snang byed nyi ma sna tshogs1898 kyi gzi brjid ltar snying rje las byung ba’i ’od zer1899 ’phro1900 bas1901 mtshams med pa yan chad1902 mun par zhugs pas nyam thag pa’i mi rnams kyi mun pa snang bar byas nas1903 lus tu tsha1904 ba’i sdug bsngal rnams sel1905 cing1906 1907 pad ma1908 i rkang pa1909 1910 ’khor lo rtsibs stong dang ldan pa’i mtshan gyis spras1911 la1912 mnyam zhi bjam pa1913 dang / sor mo ring zhing ngang pa’i rkang pa ltar dra bas1914 ’brel ba1915 dang / sen mo me long bzang po dag par phyis pa1916 lta bus bryyan te / me tog kun da1917 ltar1918 dang / long bu mi mngon pa dang / rje ngar smig1919 ma dang1920 ri dags1921 e na1922 ya’i byin pa’i dra ba’i ya1923 mtshan gyi stabs1924 kyis dal bus dal nas1925 byang chub kyi snying po’i gdan1926 rdo rje’i stegs bu’i gdan1927 /chos kyi seng ge’i khri la bdud rnam par gzhom pa’i phyir shin tu1928 gnon1929 par gyur cig ces smon lam ’debs so1930 /1931 de la

1893 L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
1894 L: combines skyabs su into one word, resulting in a skyabs with a “u” marker under the final “s”
1895 S: ‘od or ‘ong
1896 L, N, S, and T: omit the genitive particle
1897 S and T: insert daṇḍa
1898 L: tshog
1899 L: gzer
1900 Q: ’phros
1901 L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
1902 D and Q: cad
1903 L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
1904 N: “tsh” marker atop the letter is almost or entirely absent
1905 L: bsel
1906 N: zhing
1907 S: inserts daṇḍa
1908 L, N, and S: padma
1909 N and Q: pa’i
1910 L, S, and T: insert la
1911 L: inserts pa
1912 L, S, and T: omit daṇḍa
1913 L: ba
1914 Q: rkang pa lta bur for rkang pa ltar dra bas
1915 D and T: pa
1916 S: ba
1917 N: kunda
1918 L: byang chub kyi snying po’i tog kun de ltar for me tog kun da ltar (most likely under the influence of an upcoming phrase)
1919 D: smyi
1920 L and T: insert daṇḍa
1921 N and T: dvags
1922 L: ne; S: nga
1923 T: omits
1924 T: stobs
1925 L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
1926 L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
1927 Q and T: omit daṇḍa
1928 Q: du
1929 L: gnod
1930 L, S, and T: omit ces smon lam ’debs so
1931 L, N, and Q: double daṇḍa
tshig phyi ma yang\textsuperscript{1932} yod de\textsuperscript{1933} /rkang pa\textsuperscript{1934} byin pa\textsuperscript{1935} 'di yis na\textsuperscript{1937} /rkang\textsuperscript{1939} mthil\textsuperscript{1940}
'khor lo'i mtshan can gyis // byang chub snying po'i gdan bzang\textsuperscript{1941} la // brtan\textsuperscript{1942} pos\textsuperscript{1943} shin tu\textsuperscript{1944} gnon\textsuperscript{1945} par\textsuperscript{1946} shog /rkang pa\textsuperscript{1948} sbyin\textsuperscript{1949} pa 'dis na bdag / byang chub snying po'i gdan mchog la //\textsuperscript{1950} dug nas bdud rnam sde dang dpung // bzhon\textsuperscript{1951} dang bcas par 'dul bar\textsuperscript{1953} shog / de\textsuperscript{1954} la lag mthil sbyin pa la ji ltar mgon par\textsuperscript{1955} brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa' de 'di snyam du sens te / lag mthil sbyin\textsuperscript{1956} pa zhes bya ba de ni\textsuperscript{1957} byang chub sens dpa' rnam kyis\textsuperscript{1958 1959} sems can thams cad la chos kyi lag pa sbyin pa 'i tshig\textsuperscript{1960} bla dags yin gyis / bdag gis lag mthil sbyin pa\textsuperscript{1962} sbyin\textsuperscript{1963} par bya gor ma chag snyam mo // de\textsuperscript{1964} lag mthil gyi\textsuperscript{1965} sbyin pa\textsuperscript{1966} de sbyin\textsuperscript{1967} pa na / de bzhin gshogs pas rnam par mkhyen pa'i smon lam bzhin du\textsuperscript{1968} lag mthil sbyin pa 'dis na /\textsuperscript{1969} bdag sems can dman pa dang / long ba dang /\textsuperscript{1970} bkren pa\textsuperscript{1971} dang / mgon med pa dang / sdug bsngal ba\textsuperscript{1972} dang / dbul po

\begin{footnotes}
\item[1932] N and S: 'ang
\item[1933] L: accidentally conflates yod de
\item[1934] L: double daṇḍa
\item[1935] N: ba
\item[1936] T: ba
\item[1937] Q: ni
\item[1938] L and S: single daṇḍa
\item[1939] T: rkal
\item[1940] D: thil
\item[1941] D, L, Q, S, and T: bzangs
\item[1942] S: rtan
\item[1943] Q: par
\item[1944] Q: du
\item[1945] L: gnod
\item[1946] L: pa
\item[1947] L: double daṇḍa
\item[1948] T: ba
\item[1949] N: byin
\item[1950] L: single daṇḍa
\item[1951] N: single daṇḍa
\item[1952] Q: gzhon; T: bzho
\item[1953] L: par
\item[1954] L: double daṇḍa
\item[1955] T: bar
\item[1956] T: byin
\item[1957] L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
\item[1958] D, N, and Q: kyi
\item[1959] L and T: insert daṇḍa
\item[1960] L: omits the genitive particle
\item[1961] Q: chig
\item[1962] T: ba
\item[1963] N and T: byin
\item[1964] D, N, and Q: insert la, once again confusing the opening of this refrain with the one that begins each type of gift
\item[1965] L and T: gyis
\item[1966] S: ba
\item[1967] N and T: byin
\item[1968] L and T: insert daṇḍa
\item[1969] N and Q: omit daṇḍa
\item[1970] Q: omits daṇḍa
\item[1971] L: ba
\end{footnotes}
dang / gnas med pa dang / skyabs med pa dang / dpun gnyen med pa⁹⁷³ rnams dang / sms can dmyal ba dang /⁹⁷⁴ dud 'gro'i skye gnas dang / gshin rje'i 'jig rten dang /⁹⁷⁵ ngan song ngan 'gro log par ltung ba dang / mi khom par skyes pa⁹⁷⁶ rnams la chos kyi lag pa sbyin par byed par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so⁹⁷⁷ // de la tshig⁹⁷⁸ phyi ma yang⁹⁷⁹ yod de /⁹⁸⁰ lag mthil sbyin⁹⁸¹ pas⁹⁸² myur du bdag /⁹⁸³ rnam 'dren⁹⁸⁴ lag na rin chen dang /⁹⁸⁵ lag pa ring zhing gser mdog ¹⁹⁸⁶ ldan // 'jig rten mchod gnas ¹⁹⁸⁷ gyur par shog /⁹⁸⁸ snying rjes non ¹⁹⁸⁹ par gyur nas ni // chos kyi lag pa bstod byas la // ngan song kun las lus can rnams // ¹⁹⁹⁰ bdag gis rtag tu 'byin ¹⁹⁹¹ par shog /⁹⁹² de la rna ba dang ¹⁹⁹³ sna yongs su ¹⁹⁹⁴ gtong ba'i sbyin pa la ji ltar mngon par ¹⁹⁹⁵ brtson par ¹⁹⁹⁶ byed ce na / rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sms dpa' de 'di snyam du sms te / rna ba dang ¹⁹⁹⁷ sna yongs su ¹⁹⁹⁸ gtong ba'i sbyin pa ¹⁹⁹⁹ zhes bya ba de ni ²⁰⁰⁰ byang chub sms dpa' rnam s kyi dbang po tshang ba ²⁰⁰¹ yongsu ²⁰⁰² rdzogs par 'gyur ba'i tshig ²⁰⁰³ bla dags yin gyis /²⁰⁰⁴ bdag gis rna ba dang /²⁰⁰⁵ sna yongsu ²⁰⁰⁶ gtong ba'i sbyin pa ²⁰⁰⁷ sbyin²⁰⁰⁸ par bya

1972 L: omits
1973 D: ba
1974 Q: omits danḍa
1975 Q: omits danḍa
1976 S: skye ba for skyes pa
1977 T: combines 'debs so into one word, resulting in a 'debs with an “o” marker over the final “s”
1978 T: tshe
1979 N and S: 'ang
1980 L: double danḍa
1981 N and T: byin
1982 Q: par
1983 L: double danḍa
1984 L: 'drin
1985 L: single danḍa
1986 Q: ldog
1987 L: gnan
1988 L: double danḍa
1989 Q: rje nan for rjes non
1990 N: single danḍa
1991 S and T: byin
1992 L: double danḍa
1993 L and T: insert danḍa
1994 L: yongsu
1995 T: bar
1996 D: bar
1997 L and T: insert danḍa
1998 L: yongsu
1999 T: ba
2000 L and S: insert danḍa
2001 L: pa
2002 L: yongsu
2003 L: tshigs
2004 L and Q: double danḍa
2005 Q and S: omit danḍa
2006 L: yongsu
2007 T: ba
2008 N and T: byin
gor ma chag\textsuperscript{2009} snyam mo // de rna ba dang\textsuperscript{2010} sna yongs su\textsuperscript{2011} gtong ba’i sbyin pa\textsuperscript{2012} de\textsuperscript{2013} sbyin\textsuperscript{2014} pa na / de bzhin gshegs pas rnam par bzhag\textsuperscript{2015} pa’i smon lam bzhin du /\textsuperscript{2016} rna ba dang\textsuperscript{2017} sna yongs su\textsuperscript{2018} gtong ba’i sbyin pa\textsuperscript{2019} ’dis na /\textsuperscript{2020} dbag sems can thams cad\textsuperscript{2021} dbang po thams cad dang ldan par\textsuperscript{2022} byed par gyur cig ces smon lam ’debs so\textsuperscript{2023} / de la ’di skad ces bya ste\textsuperscript{2024} /\textsuperscript{2025} rna ba dang ni sna btang bas /\textsuperscript{2026} irog chags\textsuperscript{2027} rnam\textsuperscript{2028} ni\textsuperscript{2029} thams cad kyang /\textsuperscript{2030} dbang po kun dang ldan gyur te // yan lag thams cad rdzogs par shog /\textsuperscript{2031} rna ba dang ni sna btang bas /gang dang gang du skyes pa der // blta na\textsuperscript{2032} sdug cing gzugs bzang la /\textsuperscript{2033} //\textsuperscript{2034} mi ni de bzhin mdzes par ’gyur // de\textsuperscript{2035} la mig gi sbyin pa\textsuperscript{2036} ja ji ltar mgon par brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu ’di la byang chub sems dpa’ de ’di snyam du sems te / mig sbyin pa\textsuperscript{2037} zhes bya ba de ni\textsuperscript{2038} byang chub sems dpa’ rnam\textsuperscript{2039} kyi chos kyi mig\textsuperscript{2040} sgrig\textsuperscript{2041} pa med pa yongs su\textsuperscript{2042} dag pa’i tshig\textsuperscript{2043} bla dags yin gyis / bdag gis mig gi\textsuperscript{2044} sbyin pa sbyin\textsuperscript{2045} par bya gor\textsuperscript{2046} ma chag snyam mo // de mig gi sbyin pa de sbyin\textsuperscript{2047} pa na /\textsuperscript{2048} de bzhin gshegs pas\textsuperscript{2049} dag par
mdzad pa’i smon lam bzhin du //2049 mig gi2050 sbyin pa ’dis na / bdag sms can thams cad kyi chos kyi mig sgrib pa med pa yongs su2051 dag par2052 byed2053 par2054 gyur2055 cig ces smon lam ’debs so // de la2056 tshig2057 phyi ma yang2058 yod de //2059 mig gi sbyin pa ’dis na bdag /2060 blad med2061 byang chub sangs rgyas nas // sms can kun gyi2062 chos kyi mig //2063 rnam par dag par byed gyur cig / mig byin brtal zhugs bzang po des // dri ma med cing skyon2064 med la // dag cing yangs la mdzes bzang2065 dang /2066 zhi ba’i mig ni thob par ’gyur // ut2067 pala2068 sngon po’i2069 ’dab ’dra dang //2070 byi2071 ’u ku na2072 la’i mig ’dra zhing //2073 mig gi rdzi ma ba yi ’dra // de ’dra’i mig ni de yis ’thob // de la mgo bo2074 yongs su2075 gtong ba’i sbyin pa la2076 ji ltar mngon par2077 brtson par byed ce na / rigs kyi bu ’di la byang chub sms dpa’ de2078 di snyam du sms te / mgo bo yongs su2079 gtong ba’i sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni /2080 byang chub sms dpa’ rnamms kyi khams gsum thams cad las khyad par du ’phags pa’i mchog2081 thams cad mkhyen pa’i ye shes ’thob pa’i tshig2082 bla dags yin gyis //2083 bdag gis mgo bo2084 yongs su2085 gtong ba’i

2048 N and Q: insert yang
2049 S: omits danđa
2050 L and T: gis
2051 L: yongsu
2052 Q: pa
2053 Q: byad
2054 N: bar
2055 L: omits
2056 L: omits
2057 T: tshe
2058 N and S: ’ang
2059 L and Q: double danđa
2060 L: double danđa
2061 L: accidentally conflates bla med
2062 S and T: gyis
2063 L: double danđa
2064 L: skyen
2065 D: bzangs
2066 T: single danđa
2067 L and Q: ud
2068 N and S: utpala; T: utpa la
2069 L and T: omit the genitive particle
2070 L and Q: single danđa
2071 L, S, and T: bye
2072 L, N, Q, and S: kuna
2073 L: single danđa
2074 N and Q: omit
2075 T: yongsu
2076 L: omits
2077 T: bar
2078 L, S, and T: des
2079 L: yongsu
2080 Q: omits danđa
2081 L: inserts double danđa; T: inserts danđa
2082 Q: chiğ
2083 L: omits danđa
2084 N and Q: omit
2085 L: yongsu
sbyin pa sbyin\textsuperscript{2086} par bya gor ma chag snyam mo // de mgo bo\textsuperscript{2087} yongs su\textsuperscript{2088} gtong ba’i sbyin pa de sbyin\textsuperscript{2089} pa na / de bzhi gshegs pa’i rkyen du\textsuperscript{2090} bab pa’i\textsuperscript{2091} smon lam bzhi du\textsuperscript{2092} mgo\textsuperscript{2093} bo\textsuperscript{2094} yongs su\textsuperscript{2095} gtong ba’i sbyin pa\textsuperscript{2096} dis\textsuperscript{2097} na /\textsuperscript{2098} bdag sems can thams cad ’jig rten gsum las khyad par du ’phags pa\textsuperscript{2099} mchog thams cad mkhyen pa’i ye shes thob par\textsuperscript{2100} byed par,\textsuperscript{2101} gyur cig ces smon lam ’debs so\textsuperscript{2102} // de la tshig\textsuperscript{2103} phyi ma yang\textsuperscript{2104} yod de /\textsuperscript{2105} mgo bo yongs su\textsuperscript{2106} gtong ba yis\textsuperscript{2107} // bsod nams bdag la ci yod pa // des\textsuperscript{2108} na sems can kun mkhyen gyi // go ’phang mi g.yo\textsuperscript{2109} thob gyur cig /\textsuperscript{2110} de la pags\textsuperscript{2111} shun yongs su\textsuperscript{2112} gtong ba’i sbyin pa la ji itar mngon par\textsuperscript{2113} brtson\textsuperscript{2114} par byed ce na / rigz kyi bu ’di la byang chub sems dpa’ de ’di snyam du sems te /\textsuperscript{2115} pags\textsuperscript{2116} shun yongs su\textsuperscript{2117} gtong ba’i sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni /\textsuperscript{2118} byang chub sems dpa’ nnams kyi pags\textsuperscript{2119} pa ’jam zhing srab la gser gyi kha dog\textsuperscript{2120} lta bu yongs\textsuperscript{2121} su\textsuperscript{2122} rdzogs par ’gyur ba’i tshig bla dags yin gyis\textsuperscript{2123} /\textsuperscript{2124} bdag gis\textsuperscript{2125} pags\textsuperscript{2126} shun yongs su\textsuperscript{2127} gtong

\textsuperscript{2086} N and T: byin
\textsuperscript{2087} N and Q: omit
\textsuperscript{2088} L: yongsu
\textsuperscript{2089} N: byin
\textsuperscript{2090} L and T: tu
\textsuperscript{2091} L: squeezes the final “b” of bab and pa’i into an extremely small space, probably as a correction
\textsuperscript{2092} L and T: insert daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{2093} T: mgro
\textsuperscript{2094} N and Q: omit
\textsuperscript{2095} L: yongsu
\textsuperscript{2096} T: ba
\textsuperscript{2097} S: des
\textsuperscript{2098} Q: omits daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{2099} N: ba
\textsuperscript{2100} L: bar
\textsuperscript{2101} L, Q, S, and T: omit byed par
\textsuperscript{2102} L: ’debo
\textsuperscript{2103} T: tshe
\textsuperscript{2104} N and S: ’ang
\textsuperscript{2105} Q: double daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{2106} L: yongsu
\textsuperscript{2107} Q: yi
\textsuperscript{2108} N and Q: de
\textsuperscript{2109} T: accidentally conflates mi g.yo
\textsuperscript{2110} L: double daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{2111} L, Q, and S: lpaqs
\textsuperscript{2112} L and T: yongsu
\textsuperscript{2113} T: bar
\textsuperscript{2114} L: prefix “b” is squeezed in at the upper left corner of the syllable
\textsuperscript{2115} Q: omits daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{2116} T, Q, and S: lpaqs
\textsuperscript{2117} L: yongsu
\textsuperscript{2118} Q: omits daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{2119} Q: lpaqs; T: phags
\textsuperscript{2120} D, L, S, and T: mdog for kha dog
\textsuperscript{2121} D: yongs
\textsuperscript{2122} L and T: yongsu
\textsuperscript{2123} S and T: gyi
\textsuperscript{2124} Q: omits daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{2125} Q: reads bdag cag gi instead bdag gis
ba'i sbyin pa sbyin\textsuperscript{2128} par bya gor ma chag\textsuperscript{2129} snyam mo\textsuperscript{2130} // de pags\textsuperscript{2132} shun yongs su\textsuperscript{2133} gtong ba'i sbyin pa de sbyin\textsuperscript{2134} pa na / de bzhin gshegs pa'i smon lam bzhin du /\textsuperscript{2135} pags\textsuperscript{2136} shun yongs su\textsuperscript{2137} gtong ba'i sbyin pa 'dis\textsuperscript{2138} na / bdag sems can thams cad kyi pags\textsuperscript{2139} pa 'jam zhirg sbrab la /\textsuperscript{2140} gser gyi kha dog lta bu yongs su\textsuperscript{2141} rdzogs par byed par gyur cig ces smon lam 'debs so\textsuperscript{2142} // de la tshig\textsuperscript{2143} phyi ma yang\textsuperscript{2144} yod de /\textsuperscript{2145} pags\textsuperscript{2146} shun yongs su\textsuperscript{2147} btang\textsuperscript{2148} ba yis // bdag gis su ni lus can rnam s /\textsuperscript{2149} pags\textsuperscript{2150} shun lus las skyes pa dag /\textsuperscript{2150} 'jam srab gser gyi mdog sgyur shog /\textsuperscript{2151} de la sha\textsuperscript{2152} dang khrag yongs su\textsuperscript{2153} gtong ba'i sbyin pa la ji ltar mgon par\textsuperscript{2154} brtson par\textsuperscript{2155} byed ce na /\textsuperscript{2156} rigs kyi bu 'di la byang chub sems dpa\textsuperscript{2157} de 'di snyam du sems te /\textsuperscript{2158} sha dang khrag yongs su\textsuperscript{2159} gtong ba'i sbyin pa\textsuperscript{2160} zhes\textsuperscript{2161} bya ba de ni /\textsuperscript{2162} byang chub sems dpa' rnam s kyi snying po med pa thams cad las\textsuperscript{2163} snying po\textsuperscript{2164} blang ba'i tshig bla dags yin gyis /\textsuperscript{2165} bdag gis\textsuperscript{2166} sha dang khrag yongs su\textsuperscript{2167} gtong ba'i sbyin pa sbyin\textsuperscript{2168} par bya
gor ma chag snyam mo // de sha dang khrag yongs su\textsuperscript{2169} gtong\textsuperscript{2170} ba’i sbyin pa de sbyin\textsuperscript{2171} pa\textsuperscript{172} na / de bzhin gshegs pas bskyed\textsuperscript{2173} pa’i smon lam bzhi du /\textsuperscript{2174} sha dang khrag yongs su\textsuperscript{2175} gtong ba’i sbyin pa\textsuperscript{2176} ’dis na\textsuperscript{2177} bdag gis sems can thams cad snying po med pa thams cad\textsuperscript{2178} las\textsuperscript{2179} snying po\textsuperscript{2180} len\textsuperscript{2181} du\textsuperscript{2182} jug par byed par\textsuperscript{2183} gyur cig ces smon lam ’debs so\textsuperscript{2184} // de la tshig\textsuperscript{2185} phyi ma yang\textsuperscript{2186} yod de\textsuperscript{2187} /\textsuperscript{2188} sha dang khrag gi sbyin pa yi\textsuperscript{2189} // rnam smin bdag la ci yod des\textsuperscript{2190} // snying po med pa\textsuperscript{2191} ma lus las // ’gro\textsuperscript{2192} kun snying por\textsuperscript{2193} thob gyur cig\textsuperscript{194} de la rkang sbyin pa la ji ltar mngon par\textsuperscript{2195} brtson par byed ce na /\textsuperscript{2196} rigs kyi bu ’di la byang chub sems dpa\textsuperscript{2197} de ’di snyam du sems te /\textsuperscript{2198} rkang sbyin pa zhes bya ba de ni\textsuperscript{2199} byang chub sems dpa’ rnam s kyi lus rdo rje ltar mi shigs\textsuperscript{2200} pa yongs su\textsuperscript{2201} rdzogs par ’gyur ba’i tshig bla dags yin gyis\textsuperscript{2202} /\textsuperscript{2203} bdag gis rkang gi\textsuperscript{2204} sbyin pa sbyin\textsuperscript{2205} par bya gor ma chag snyam
mo de rkang gi sbyin pa de sbyin pa na de bzhin gshegs pas bskyed pa i smon lam bzhin du rkang gi sbyin pa dis na bdag sems can thams cad kyi lus rdo rje ltar mi shigs yongs su rdzogs par byed par gyur cigs ces smon lam 'debs so // de la tshig phyi ma yang yod de rkang gi sbyin pa 'di yis na bdag gis sems can thams cad kyi rnas gi lus kyi za ma tog rdo rje mi shigs rdzogs byed shog gzhan yang chub sems dpas de 'di snyam du sems te kha dog phun sum tshogs pa byin pas ni kha dog dang ldan par gyur gyis bdag gis kha dog phun sum tshogs pa sbyin pas bya gor ma chag snyam sems shing dri phun sum tshogs pa byin pas ni yo byad gya nom pa rnams 'thob par gyur reg pa phun sum tshogs pa

---

2206 L: snyamo
2207 N and T: byin
2208 Q: omits daṇḍa
2209 Q: pa
2210 Q: inserts tha (possibly a mistaken prefix for the following skyed?)
2211 Q: skyed
2212 Q and S: omit daṇḍa
2213 T: ba
2214 Q: omits daṇḍa
2215 T: squeezes “g” beneath and between “shi” and the final “s”
2216 L: yongsu
2217 L: 'debsu
tshe
2218 L: 'degs
2219 N and S: 'ang
2220 L: double daṇḍa
2221 D: ba
2222 S: single daṇḍa
2223 L, S, and T: rang
2224 L, S, and T: ni
2225 L: double daṇḍa
2226 Q: mig gis for mi shigs
2227 L: double daṇḍa
2228 S: byin pa nas for byin pas ni
2229 N: omits daṇḍa; Q: double daṇḍa
2230 Q: omits
2231 L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
2232 T: byin
2233 N: bar
2234 S: omits bya gor
2235 L: snyamo
2236 Q: inserts du
2237 L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
2238 T: bas
2239 N: bar
2240 Q and T: omit daṇḍa
2241 L: squeezes in the final “n” of phun, probably as a correction
2242 L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
2243 L: non
2244 L and N: ba
2245 L, N, and T: thob
2246 T: pa
byin pas byi ni kang lag 'jam zhing gzhon sha chags par gyur rang gi lag nas byin pas ni bsnyen bkur byed pa 'thob par gyur gus par byas te byin pas ni byi ni nang du gzhon shi bya bar gyur dus su byin pas ni de'i nor rnams dus su 'grub cing rgyas par gyur thun pa dang yid du 'ong ba byin pas ni mal dang gos la sogs pa longs spyod yid du 'ong ba rnams la sems jug par gyur / gzhon la mi gnod par byin pas ni longs spyod brtan pa dag 'thob par gyur / mi 'ga' ba dang du len pa'i sbyin pas ni khor snying nye bar gyur / pas ni stobs dang ldan par gyur / skom byin pas ni skom pa med par gyur / skom byin almost certain

2247 Q: omits danḍa
2248 T: regs
2249 Q: pa; T: bas
2250 Q: na
2251 L, S, and T: insert danḍa
2252 D: rka
2253 D: la
2254 N: bar
2255 Q: omits danḍa
2256 L: gnas
2257 L: byer
2258 N: thob
2259 N: bar
2260 Q: omits danḍa
2261 L. and T: insert danḍa
2262 L: bas
2263 L, S, and T: insert danḍa
2264 L. and T: las
2265 T: stogs
2266 L. and T: bsti
2267 L: accidentally conflates dus su
2268 T: pa
2269 L. and T: insert danḍa
2270 Q: omits danḍa
2271 N and S: mthun
2272 L. and N: ba
2273 L. and T: las
2274 T: stogs
2275 N: sbyod
2276 L, S, and T: pa
2277 L, S, and T: insert danḍa
2278 N: thob
2279 N: bar
2280 Q: omits danḍa
2281 Q: ba'i
2282 S: na
2283 Q: omits danḍa
2284 Q: ba
2285 N: second half of this line (starting with stobs) is barely legible, though the reading appears to be the same
2286 Q: sbyin
2287 N: beginning of this line is barely legible, though what can be seen and the apparent size of the syllables makes the reading skom byin almost certain
2288 L: ba
gos byin₂²⁹¹ pas ni kha dog dang ldan par ²²⁹² 'gyur / mar me byin pas ni mig²²⁹³ dang ldan par 'gyur / rol mo'i sgra byin pas ni rna ba nyams pa med par 'gyur /²²⁹⁴ bzhon²²⁹⁵ pa byin pas ni bde ba dang ldan par 'gyur / sman byin²²⁹⁶ pas ni nad nyung bar 'gyur / me tog byin pas²²⁹⁷ ni gzhan gyis mchod²²⁹⁸ par 'gyur / me²²⁹⁹ tog phreng²³⁰ byin pas ni gzhan gyis rim gro bya bar 'gyur //²³⁰¹ bstod pa²³⁰² byin pas ni tshangs pa'i dbyangs dang ldan par 'gyur / stan byin pas ni bla ma'i gnas thob par 'gyur / bzhon pa byin pas ni rdzu 'phrul dang ldan par²³⁰³ 'gyur /²³⁰⁴ byug pa byin pas ni rna med par 'gyur / phyag dar bya ba byin pas ni rdul dang bral bar 'gyur /²³⁰⁵ dril bu byin pas ni tshe rabs²³⁰⁶ dran pa²³⁰⁷ 'gyur / gnas byin pas ni thams cad byin par 'gyur / chos byin pas ni bdud rtsi byin par 'gyur gyis³⁰⁸ bdag gis chos kyi sbyin pa sbyin²³⁰⁹ par bya gor ma chag snyam mo // de sbyin pa de lta bu sbyin²³¹⁰ pa²³¹¹ na²³¹² ²³¹³ chags pas sbyin par mi byed /²³¹⁴ sdang bas sbyin par²³¹⁵ mi byed / rmongs pas sbyin par mi byed /²³¹⁶ tshig pa za zning sbyin par mi byed /²³¹⁷ bnyas²³¹⁸ bzhin du sbyin par mi byed /²³¹⁹ rdeg cing sbyin par mi byed²³²⁰ / tshar bcad²³²¹ de sbyin par mi byed /²³²² khyad du gsod cing sbyin par mi byed /²³²³ smad de sbyin²³²⁴ par mi byed / nga rgyal gyis khengs bzhin²³²⁵ du sbyin par mi byed / 'ging²³²⁶ bzhin du

²²⁹⁹ T: accidentally splits brnyas into two syllables, leaving brnya sa
²³¹⁵ Q: omits daṇḍa
²³¹⁶ Q: omits daṇḍa
²³¹⁷ Q: omits daṇḍa
²³¹⁹ Q: omits daṇḍa
²³²⁰ Q: omits daṇḍa
²³²¹ L: squeezes the final “n” of sbyin and par around the left string hole
sbyin par mi byed / lhag mar gyur pa sbyin par mi byed / rul cing myags pa sbyin par mi byed ky1 2328 sbyin pa gang dang gang sbyin pa de gus te sbyin par byed / bla mar byas / ri mo 2329 byas / 2330 mchod pa byas shing rjed 2331 nas sbyin par byed / 2332 mang du sbyin par byed / 2333 bchang po sbyin par byed / rab tu dga’ bas sbyin par byed / 2334 dga’ zhing mgu bas sbyin par byed / gtsang ba dang / 2335 rgya cher sbyin par byed / 2336 rang gi lag nas sbyin par byed 2338 gus pa dang bcas pa dang / 2339 zhe 2340 sar bcas 2341 pas 2342 sbyin par byed / bsam pa 2343 dag 2344 cing bchang la dge bas sbyin par byed / ser sna med par sbyin par byed / 2345 brkam pa 2346 med par sbyin par byed / 2347 zhum pa 2348 med par sbyin par byed / 2349 byas / 2350 byed / ’jigs 2351 pa med par sbyin par byed / rgya che zhang yangs par sbyin par byed do // de sbyin 2352 pa de lta bu 2353 sbyin 2354 pa na 2355 2356 ’di snyam du ’di ni tshul khrims dang ldan pa yin gyis / 2357 bdag gis sbyin par bya’o // ’di ni tshul khrims ’chal ba 2358 yin no // ’di ni dge ba’ichos dang ldan pa yin no // ’di ni dge ba’ichos ma yin pa 2359 dang ldan pa yin no // ’di la byin na ni ’bras bu che ba dang / 2360 phan yon che ba dang / 2361 mthu che bar’gyur ro 2362 // ’di la byin na ni ’bras bu mi che ba

2325 N: appears to read bzhan, either because of an error or because the “i” marker has been effaced
2326 N: appears to read ’gyang, either because of an error or because the “i” marker has been effaced
2327 N: appears to read cang, either because of an error or because the “i” marker has been effaced
2328 L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
2329 L, S, and T: mor
2330 Q: omits daṇḍa
2331 D and L: brjod
2332 Q: omits daṇḍa
2333 Q: omits daṇḍa
2334 Q: omits daṇḍa
2335 Q and S: omit daṇḍa
2336 N: “e” marker is almost or entirely absent
2337 Q: omits daṇḍa
2338 L, Q, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
2339 Q: omits daṇḍa
2340 T: zhes
2341 D: zhe sa dang bcas for zhe sar bcas
2342 L and T: pa
2343 L: ba
2344 Q: dad
2345 Q: omits daṇḍa
2346 Q: rkam
2347 L: ba
2348 Q: omits daṇḍa
2349 L: ba
2350 D: bar
2351 L: ’jig
2352 S: byin
2353 D, N, and Q: insert de
2354 T: byin
2355 T: ni
2356 L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
2357 N and Q: omit daṇḍa
2358 L, S, and T: pa
2359 D and T: ba
2360 Q: omits daṇḍa
2361 Q: omits daṇḍa
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dang / organism / phan yon mi che ba dang / mthu mi che bar 'gyur ro snyam du mi sems so // gzhon yang yang dag pa'i blo dang ldan gyi yang dag pa ma yin pa / i phyir de sbyin pa de sbyin na / 'di snyam du dge ba'i rtsa ba dang / 'chos kyi phyir sbyin pa / yongs su / 'gtong ba / dis na / bdag rgyal por gyur cig ce 'am / rgyal po gzhon nam / blon po chen po 'am / lha 'am / lha'i bu 'am / lha gzhon gang yang rung ba zhig tu gyur cig ces sems skyed par mi byed do / 'o na gang du zhe na / gzhon du na / gzhon du na / bna na med pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'i byang chub tu yongs su sngo bar byed de / dge ba'i rtsa ba 'di dang / 'chos kyi phyir yongs su / 'gtong ba 'dis na / bdag sems can ma rgal ba rnams sgrol ba dang / ma grol ba rnams / btags ma phyin pa rnams dbugs 'byin pa dang / yongs su / mya ngan las ma 'das pa rnams yongs su / mya ngan las zlo bar byed pa dang / 'jig rten long ba 'dren pa med pa dang / skyob pa med pa dang / skyabs med pa dang / gnas med pa dang / gling med pa dang / dpung gnyen med pa

2362 L: combines 'gyur ro into one word, resulting in a 'gyur with an “o” marker over the final “r”
2363 Q: omits dan'da
2364 Q: omits dan'da
2365 L, Q, S, and T: insert dan'da
2366 T: par
2367 T: ba
2368 D and Q: repeat ma yin pa
2369 N and T: byin
2370 L and T: omit
2371 Q: omits dan'da
2372 D, L, N, Q, S, and T: insert sbyin pa 'di dang (L, Q, S, and T then insert a dan'da)
2373 Q: omits dan'da
2374 D: omits
2375 D: inserts de
2376 L: yongsu
2377 T: bar
2378 L, S, and T: insert dan'da
2379 Q: omits dan'da
2380 D: bo
2381 D: inserts klu 'am /
2382 L: bskyed
2383 D: bar
2384 T: accidentally conflates 'o na, leaving what looks like 'on
2385 N: inserts dan'da
2386 L: yongsu
2387 Q and S: bsn'o (S squeezes in a tiny prefix “b” before sngo)
2388 N: do
2389 N: double dan'da
2390 L, S, and T: insert dan'da
2391 L: yongsu
2392 Q: omits dan'da
2393 L: omits grol ba rnams
2394 D: dgrol
2395 L: yongsu
2396 L: yongsu
2397 L and T: omit dan'da
2398 N: appears to read 'dran, either because of an error or because the “e” marker has been effaced
2399 D: skyob ba for skyob pa
2400 L: ba
rnams kyi 'dren pa dang / yongs su⁴⁴⁰¹ 'dren pa dang / sgrol ba dang / skyabs dang / gnas dang / gling dang / dpung gnyen du gyur cig ces yongs su⁴⁴⁰² sngo⁴⁴⁰³ bar byed do // de la 'di skad ces⁴⁴⁰⁴ bya ste / chos phyir sbyin pa 'dis na bdag / khor ba yi ni rgya mtsho⁴⁴⁰⁷ las // gzhann min theg pa chen po yis //⁴⁴⁰⁹ sems can rnams ni sgrol⁴⁴¹⁰ gyur cig //⁴⁴¹¹ skye bo thams cad nyon mongs pa'i // 'ching⁴⁴¹² ba dag las 'grol bar,⁴⁴¹³ shog // dbugs ma phyin⁴⁴¹⁴ pa dbugs 'byin cing // mya ngan 'das lam ston⁴⁴¹⁵ gyur cig //⁴⁴¹⁶ jig rten⁴⁴¹⁷ long ba 'dren med pa'i // yongs su⁴⁴¹⁸ 'dren par bdag gyur cig / lus can rnams la skyob⁴⁴²⁰ pa dang //⁴⁴²¹ dpung gnyen gling dang skyabs gyur cig /⁴⁴²² rigs kyi bu de ltar na byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa'⁴⁴²⁳ chen po⁴⁴²⁴ sbyin pa'i pha rol tu⁴⁴²⁵ phyin pa la mngon par⁴⁴²⁶ brtson par byed pa yin no // de nas byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po⁴⁴²⁷ ri'i phug dang / zom dang //⁴⁴²⁸ ri⁴⁴²⁹ sul dang /⁴⁴³⁰ gseb dang / sman ljongs⁴⁴³¹ na seng ge'i mchog⁴⁴³² rnam par⁴⁴³³ bsgyings shing⁴⁴³⁴ nga ro rnam par sgrogs pa lta bu'i mi⁴⁴³⁵ i dbang po'i gtsug gi nor bus /⁴⁴³⁶ bcom ldan 'das las sbyin pa'i pha rol tu phyin pa'i⁴⁴³⁷ rnam par dbye ba⁴⁴³⁸ bshad pa thos⁴⁴³⁹ nas⁴⁴⁴⁰ tshim⁴⁴⁴¹ zhing mgu la yi⁴⁴⁴² rangs te
/2443 rab tu dga’ zhung bde ba dang /2444 yid bde ba skyes nas /2444 stan las langs te /2446 bla gos phrag pa gcig tu gzar nas /2447 pus mo g.yas pa’i lha nga /2448 pad ma /2449 i snying po la btsugs /2450 te / bcom ldan ’das ga la ba de /2451 logs su /2452 thal mo sbyar ba btud /2453 nas / bcom ldan ’das la tshigs su bcad pa’i dbyangs kyis legs so /2454 zhes bya ba gsol to /2455 // sbyin mdzad legs so /2456 rtag tu yab ’dra khyod legs so /2457 // sbyin mdzad legs so /2458 gsung /2459 mdzad bde gshegs khyod /2460 legs so /2461 // gnyen gyur legs /2462 so /2463 2464 mdza’ bo /2465 ston par gyur pa /2466 legs /2467 2468 // gcig pu ’di na /2469 dmyal ba skyob pa’i khyod /2470 legs so /2471 lha mi rnams nang bgres pa legs // mchod gnas legs so /2472 2473 mi rnams nang na dpa’ bo legs // gsungs pa legs so /2474 bdag nyid chen po /2475 rab dul /2476 legs // mi rnams nyon mongs /2477 dug /2480 sel /2481 sman pa’i rgyal po legs // grohl ba
legs so\textsuperscript{2482} srid pa gsum las nram grol legs // sman pa\textsuperscript{2483} legs so\textsuperscript{2484} phan bzhed dam pa sbyin mdzad legs // dpal\textsuperscript{2485} yon can legs bkra shis snyoms pa'i thugs mnga' legs // skal ldan zla ba nya\textsuperscript{2486} 'dra dri\textsuperscript{2487} med zhal mnga\textsuperscript{2488} legs // blo ldan mthon mthing\textsuperscript{2489} spyan yangs ring ba legs // dpal ldan shangs 'tsham\textsuperscript{2480} cha byad\textsuperscript{12491} rmad du byung ba legs // smra mkhas snyan shal gse\textsuperscript{2492} gyi 'phyang thag 'dra ba legs // '2493 mcde\textsuperscript{2494} ba kha ba\textsuperscript{2495} dung 'dra legs la phyag 'tshal lo // gtso bo bgres\textsuperscript{2496} pa mgon po khyod kyis de ring du // mi nrams sbyin pa dbye ba legs par gsungs pa legs // slar zhiung tshul\textsuperscript{12497} khrims bzod pa stobs dang ye shes dang // '2498 thabs dang bsam gtan rdu 'phrul\textsuperscript{2499} 2500 smon lam mnyan\textsuperscript{2501} par\textsuperscript{2502} 'tshal // bcom ldan 'das kyis de skad ces bka' 'tshal nas // byang chub sems dpa' 'jam dpal\textsuperscript{12505} gzhon nur gyur pa dang / byang chub sems dpa' spyan ras gzigs dbang phyug dang // ri'i phug dang // zom dang // ri\textsuperscript{2509} sul dang // gseb dang / sman ljongs\textsuperscript{2510} na seng ge'i mchog nram par\textsuperscript{2512} bsgyings shing\textsuperscript{12513} nga ro rnam par sgrogs pa lta bu'i mi'i dbang po'i gtsug gi nor bu la sog\textsuperscript{2514} pa / byang chub sems

\textsuperscript{2479} L: mongsu (following the pattern of combining yongs su, legs so, etc. into one word, but here done incorrectly)
\textsuperscript{2480} N and Q: nang
\textsuperscript{2481} N: appears to read sal, either because of an error or because the “e” marker has been effaced
\textsuperscript{2482} L: legso
\textsuperscript{2483} L: ba
\textsuperscript{2484} L: legso
\textsuperscript{2485} L: dpa'
\textsuperscript{2486} D: nyi
\textsuperscript{2487} L: “i” marker is displaced, leaving what looks like ‘dri dra
\textsuperscript{2488} L: mang
\textsuperscript{2489} L, Q, and T: ting
\textsuperscript{2490} L: 'tshams
\textsuperscript{2491} L: bya
\textsuperscript{2492} N: “e” marker is barely legible
\textsuperscript{2493} L: single daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{2494} N: appears to read mtshe
\textsuperscript{2495} L: accidentally conflates kha ba, leaving what looks like khab
\textsuperscript{2496} N: bgras
\textsuperscript{2497} L: chul
\textsuperscript{2498} L: single daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{2499} T: ‘prul (though a faint trace of a diagonal bar for the correct “ph” may be present)
\textsuperscript{2500} Q: rdu 'phrul is barely legible
\textsuperscript{2501} L: mnyam
\textsuperscript{2502} L: bar
\textsuperscript{2503} L: omits double daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{2504} L: double daṇḍa; Q: omits daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{2505} L: dpa’ (under the influence of the preceding word)
\textsuperscript{2506} Q: omits daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{2507} Q: omits daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{2508} Q: omits daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{2509} N and Q: ri’i
\textsuperscript{2510} Q: omits daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{2511} L and T: ljongs; Q: ljongs or ljod
\textsuperscript{2512} D: bar
\textsuperscript{2513} L, S, and T: insert daṇḍa
\textsuperscript{2514} T: sstogs
\textsuperscript{2515} L, S, and T: omit daṇḍa
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dpā' de dag dang / lha'i bu de dag dang / rgyal po chen po bzhi po de dag dang / lha dang / mi dang / lha ma yin dang / dri zar bcas pa'i 'jig rten yi rangs te / bcom ldan 'das kyis gsungs pa la mgon par bstod do / phags pa sbyin pa'i pha rol tu phin pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo rdzogs so // //

Colophon:

rgya gar gi mkhan po pra dznya bar ma dang / zhu chen gyi lo tsa ba ban de ye shes sde la sogs pas bsgyur cing zhus te gtan la phab pa // //
IV. Giving in Theory: The Dānapaṭala

A. Introduction

The Dānapaṭala or the Chapter on Giving is the ninth section of part one, the Ādhārayogasthāna, of the Bodhisattvabhūmi. The Bodhisattvabhūmi, in turn, is the fifteenth section of the first part (*Maulī bhūmiḥ or *Maulyo bhūmayah?, Tib. sa’i dngos gzhi) of the enormous Yogācārabhūmi,¹ the great treatise of the Yogācāra-Vijñānavāda philosophical school of Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism. Tibetan tradition attributes the Yogācārabhūmi to the famous Indian Buddhist scholar Asaṅga, who is credited with founding Yogācāra along with his half-brother Vasubandhu around the 4th century CE, while Chinese tradition claims that the future buddha Maitreya transmitted the text orally to Asaṅga in the Tuṣita heaven.² Putting aside the legend of Maitreya, based on its size alone it is extremely doubtful that a single person, even a renowned scholar like Asaṅga, could have composed the entire Yogācārabhūmi. I say this knowing full well that the colophon of a Bodhisattvabhūmi manuscript attributes the work to ācārya Asaṅgapāda.³

Deleanu—which whose work I rely heavily on, being in my opinion the best treatment of the Yogācārabhūmi written in a Western language—notes several inconsistencies in the Yogācārabhūmi’s structure and content. He is the most recent scholar to cast doubt on the likelihood that it could be attributed to a single author. Most convincing in my mind is the fact that nowhere in the Yogācārabhūmi are there summary verses (uddāna) outlining its (five or six,

¹ See Deleanu, The Chapter on the Mundane Path, 43-50.

² On the legends of Asaṅga, especially the accounts given by Buston and Tāranātha, Janice Dean Willis, On Knowing Reality: The Tattvārtha Chapter of Asaṅga’s Bodhisattvabhūmi (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979), 4-12.

³ Dutt, 3 (see below for full bibliographic information).
according to the Chinese and Tibetan translations, respectively) major sections, even though there is a summary for the first major section, the *Maulyo bhūmayah*, and for many of the main books making up the *Maulyo bhūmayah* (including the Bodhisattvabhūmi as well as the Dānapaṭala within the Bodhisattvabhūmi). It is hard to believe that such an oversight would have occurred if the Yogācārabhūmi were the work of one author. In addition, the Bodhisattvabhūmi was translated into Chinese as an independent text twice in the early 5th century, long before the entire Yogācārabhūmi was translated into Chinese. If the Yogācārabhūmi were indeed composed by one hand, it seems a little strange that just a fraction of it, the Bodhisattva bhūmi, would have been selected for translation while the rest was ignored, especially if the Yogācārabhūmi were believed to have been the product of a famous Buddhist intellectual. The most satisfying explanation for this set of facts is that the Yogācārabhūmi, in Deleanu’s words, “was not compiled on the basis of a unitary plan but grew gradually from separate textual units and materials.”

The terminus ante quem for the Bodhisattvabhūmi is 418 CE, when Dharmakṣema completed his translation of the text into Chinese. Dharmakṣema’s text had a slightly different title, the *Bodhisattvabhūmyādhāra* (T. 1581). An additional translation of the Bodhisattvabhūmi into Chinese was done around the same time by Guṇavarman (T. 1582). Guṇavarman’s translation must have been completed by his death in 431 CE, though his text may be earlier, as some have argued, than Dharmakṣema’s. Regardless of which translation came first and the relationship between the two, we know that the Bodhisattvabhūmi existed in the early 5th

---

4 Deleanu, *The Chapter on the Mundane Path*, 154ff. Deleanu provides a bevy of references to scholars arguing for and against this position on p. 154.

5 Ibid., 155.

6 See ibid., 230, n. 191 and the sources cited there.
century in roughly its present form, since both translations (and especially Dharmakṣema’s) point to a text quite similar to that of the extant Sanskrit manuscripts (see below). The Bodhisattvabhuṃi was again translated into Chinese as part of the mammoth Yogācārabhūmi in the mid-7th century by the famous literati and pilgrim Xuanzang (T. 1579). Xuanzang studied the Yogācārabhūmi during his travels and brought it back to China among the hundreds of manuscripts he had acquired in India. Earlier, in the 6th century, Paramārtha translated part of the Yogācārabhūmi into Chinese under a different title, the *Saptadaśabhūmiśāstra, but this was evidently lost by the time of Xuanzang’s translation.

Starting from the premise that the Yogācārabhūmi is a historically layered text, Deleanu works out a rather plausible schema for the phases of its development. Dharmakṣema’s translation of the Bodhisattvabhūmi refers five times to the Śrāvakabhūmi, a text that also came to be incorporated into the Yogācārabhūmi. It seems unlikely that all five references were interpolated after Dharmakṣema’s translation, which means that Deleanu is on fairly solid ground in proposing that the Śrāvakabhūmi predates the Bodhisattvabhūmi. Without going into the remaining details of Deleanu’s study, I will just say that his dating of the Śrāvakabhūmi to the early- to mid-3rd century and the Bodhisattvabhūmi to the mid- to late-3rd century strikes me as eminently reasonable.

---

7 See ibid., 106-110 for a brief account of Xuanzang and his history with the Yogācārabhūmi.

8 Ibid., 196-201.

9 Ibid., 154ff.

10 Ibid., 162-167 and 183-186.

11 See ibid., 195-196 for Deleanu’s chronological outline of the development of the Yogācārabhūmi.
Though it is of course not as large as the Yogācārabhūmi, the Bodhisattvabhūmi is neither small nor uncomplicated. It is composed of three major parts, the Ādhārayogasthāna, Ādhārānudharmayogasthāna, and Ādhāraniṣṭhāyogasthāna, while each part is further divided into paṭalas or chapters. Given the complexity of the text, then, the Bodhisattvabhūmi itself could also be the creation of multiple authors and redactors over a protracted span of time. Deleanu assumes as much, dating the “compilation” of the Bodhisattvabhūmi rather than its composition. Roth argues that the first part of the Bodhisattvabhūmi, the Ādhārayogasthāna, was also the first part to be written. If true, this would mean that the Dānapaṭala belongs to the first strata of the Bodhisattvabhūmi’s development, since it is located within the Ādhārayogasthāna. At any rate, based on Deleanu and others it does not seem out of line to conclude that the Dānapaṭala was composed by the 4th century by the most conservative estimate, which would make it, according to my albeit tentative assessment, considerably earlier than the Dānapāramitā-sūtra.

A Mahāyāna Buddhist Śāstra

The Bodhisattvabhūmi is a Mahāyāna Buddhist Śāstra. By that I mean, with no intended facetiousness, that it is Mahāyāna Buddhist, though most of the Yogācārabhūmi (like the Śrāvakabhūmi) is not ostensibly Mahāyānist; it also is, or rather is part of, a Śāstra, the

---

12 See Dutt, 8ff. for a summary of each paṭala. Also see Cecil Bendall and Louis de La Vallée Poussin, “Bodhisattva-Bhūmi: A Textbook of the Yogācāra School, An English Summary with Notes and Illustrative Extracts from other Buddhistic Works,” Le Muséon 7 (1906): 213-230.


While scholars have paid much attention to, even celebrated, the Mahāyāna Buddhist character of the Bodhisattvabhūmi—the very name of the text, after all, tells us that it deals with the spiritual path of the Mahāyāna practitioner—the fact that it is patterned after a certain genre of Indian text is almost completely ignored. No doubt this reflects the unfortunate tendency to treat Indian Buddhism as an entity somehow separate from the social and intellectual history of India. The place of the Dānapaṭala in the textual conversation on gift giving is both a testament to where Mahāyāna gift theory lay by the 4th century and how genre can shape and restrict textual discourse.

There are many Mahāyāna features of the Dānapaṭala. I will touch on just a few of the more salient ones, especially as they stand in contradistinction to the Dānapāramitā-sūtra. To begin with, the Dānapaṭala is clear that the goal of gift giving is to achieve awakening. For the very first line states the following: “Here a bodhisattva, having fulfilled the six Perfections one by one . . . wholly and completely awakens to unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening (iha bodhisattvaḥ krameṇa ṣaṭpāramitāṃ paripūryānuttarāṃ samyaksambodhim abhiṣambudhyate . . .).

There is nothing surprising in the Dānapaṭala’s emphasis on awakening: Attaining awakening dominates the Mahāyāna textual landscape (see the Context of awakening section in chapter II), and, as we will see, the epigraphic landscape too (chapter V). But the Dānapaṭala is also clear

---

On the śāstra part of the title of the Yogācārabhūmi-śāstra, see Wogihara, 8-9 (see below for full bibliographic information).

Tatz attempts to situate bodhisattva ethics, as represented by the Śilaṭaḷa of the Bodhisattvabhūmi, within and against Buddhist Vinaya rules and Indian systems of renunciation more broadly. He does not broach, however, the importance of the Śāstric genre. See Mark Tatz, Asanga’s Chapter on Ethics With the Commentary of Tsong-Kha-Pa, The Basic Path to Awakening, The Complete Bodhisattva (Studies in Asian Thought and Religion 4) (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1986), 2-25.
that rewards, whether those of this world or the next, are not the proper goal of a bodhisattva.¹⁷ For the Dānapatāla, two aspects of the “pure gift” (viśuddhadāna) are as follows:

pratīkārānapekṣaṃ dānaṃ katamat / kārṇyacitto 'nukampācito bodhisattvo dānam dadan na parataḥ pratyupakāraṃ prayāśaṁsate / sukhatamaṃ ṭṛṣṇādhāhena dāyamānām apratibalāṃ prakṛtivākṣitām janaṃ paśyan / vipākānapekṣaṃ dānaṃ katamat / na bodhisattvo dānaṃ dattvā dānasyāyatyāṃ bhogasampadaṃ vā ātmabhāvasampadaṃ vā phalavipākaṃ prayāśaṁsate / sarvasaṃskāreṣu phalgudarśī paramabodhāv anuśaṁsadarśī /¹⁸

What is giving without hoping for remuneration? When giving a gift, a bodhisattva who has a compassionate and sympathetic heart does not expect anything in return from others. He sees that people desire comfort, burn with the heat of craving thirst, suffer from their nature, [but yet] are helpless [to fulfill their desires or end their suffering].

What is giving without hoping for the maturation [of good karmic fruits]? When giving a gift, a bodhisattva does not expect the maturation of good karmic fruits in the future, whether it be getting superb possessions or a superb body. He sees the lack of substance in all conditioned things [and instead] anticipates the benefits of supreme awakening.

The bodhisattva is not to hold out hopes for payback from the recipients of his gifts. Nor should he sully his generosity by expecting karmic returns. The Dānapatāla’s rejection of expecting “superb possessions or a superb body” stands in sharp relief to much of the Dānapāramitā-sūtra, where the bodhisattva is encouraged to give in order to bring about rewards for himself and other beings, rewards including various possessions in future lifetimes and especially the attainment of an awakened body. For the Dānapatāla the body and awakening are at odds—the body, like all objects, or rather like any kind of karmic fruit one might hope to gain, is composed of conditioned pieces (saṃskāra) that are governed by the law

¹⁷ The Dānapatāla’s distinction between awakening and worldly rewards is reminiscent of Spiro’s delineation between “kammatic” and “nibbanic” Buddhism. See Melford E. Spiro, Buddhism and Society: A Great Tradition and Its Burmese Vicissitudes, 2nd ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982). Of course, there is an acute difference between a Buddhist text valuing awakening over karmic rewards and a Western scholar categorizing, even privileging, certain ideas and practices from a Buddhist culture.

¹⁸ Wogihara 135.18-25.
of impermanence. For the Dānapāramitā, on the other hand, awakening and the awakened body are two sides of the same coin—awakening means becoming endowed with a glorious body replete with the marks of a superhuman, and any impermanent body part can be traded up for a permanent one through giving.

Another major theme of the Dānapaṭala is intentionality. To be sure, the emphasis on the intention behind actions is not unique to Mahāyāna, as it can be found in all manner of Buddhist texts.¹⁹ The intentions behind the gifts in the Dānapāramitā are couched in the bodhisattva’s praṇidhānas. But the Dānapaṭala really pushes intentionality to the extreme. In several instances the text takes us into the bodhisattva’s mind with an iti particle. Thus, in a situation where a bodhisattva is unable to obtain the written Dharma for a gift, he must reflect, “I hope my mind is not entangled in the filth of stinginess with regard to the Law. Alas, I am afraid that I do not earnestly want to give the Law in written form!” (mā me dharmamātsarya-malaparyavasthitam cittam / mā haivāham āśayata eva na dātukāmo ’bhilikhitaṃ dharmaṃ /).²⁰ And the text goes on to explain what the bodhisattva should do when he finds that he is or is not stingy. Interestingly, much of the focus on intentionality in the Dānapaṭala is on the circumstances in which a bodhisattva should not give, and not always in ways one might expect. So in the example just mentioned, if the bodhisattva discovers neither stinginess nor defilement in his mind, he should not give the Dharma. If he were to give the written Dharma away, we are told, he only pleases one recipient, whereas if he were to hold on to it, he can

---

¹⁹ The shift in emphasis from action, especially correctly performed sacrificial action, to intention is well covered in the secondary literature. The theme is taken up in Egge, Religious Giving and the Invention of Karma in Theravāda Buddhism. Egge argues that Pāli texts evince a shift in how gift giving was framed in India, with the karmic discourse in which the intentions of the donor were paramount gradually supplanting, but never fully replacing, the more ancient sacrificial discourse exemplified by the offering of alms to the worthy Buddhist mendicant.

²⁰ Wogihara 127.12-14.
acquire knowledge for others and the Dharma has a better chance to grow in the future. According to the Dānapaṭala, as long as the bodhisattva’s intentions are good, he should keep the written Buddhist teachings to himself.\textsuperscript{21}

Ultimately, the contingency of the bodhisattva’s not giving the Dharma is unselfish. Other cases are less clear, at least by the standards of modern Judeo-Christian ethics.\textsuperscript{22} In one section, the Dānapaṭala elucidates the bodhisattva’s options when he does not have any objects to give. He can earn money so he can then acquire objects to give, teach others about generosity, or even bring solicitors to wealthy households that can afford to give. The section concludes as follows:

\begin{quote}
\textit{evaṃ hi bodhisattvah asatsv asaṃvidyamāneṣu bhogeṣu prājñadānasya dātā bhavati yāvad āśayaviśuddhiṃ nādhigacchati / śuddhādhyśayas tu bodhisattvah [sic] yathaiśvāpāya-

\textit{samatikramaṇaṃ pratilabhate / tathaivākṣayabhogatāṃ janmani janmani pratilabhate }\textsuperscript{23}
\end{quote}

In this way a bodhisattva indeed becomes the giver of a wise gift when he does not have possessions, [and this is the case] until he develops pure intentions. But when the intentions of a bodhisattva are pure, he transcends the unfavorable destinies and likewise attains inexhaustible possessions in birth after birth.\textsuperscript{24}

If I understand this passage correctly, once the bodhisattva’s intentions have become pure, it no longer matters that he does not have anything to give. The act of giving, or the acts that substitute for giving, is a means to an end, not an end in itself. My interpretation of the above

\textsuperscript{21} The entire passage on the gift of the Dharma can be found at Wogihara 127.3-128.8.

\textsuperscript{22} On what we might call the “selfish” motivations of those pursuing the bodhisattva path, see Nattier, \textit{A Few Good Men}, 144-147.

\textsuperscript{23} Wogihara 126.25-127.3

\textsuperscript{24} Even though the Dānapaṭala decries worldly rewards as a motivation to give, in no way does it reject classical karmic theory. On the contrary, the bodhisattva is told to trust in the maturation (vipāka) of karmic fruits (phala), and in many passages similar to this one the text emphasizes how much merit the proper bodhisattva creates.
excerpt would appear to be confirmed by yet another passage exemplifying the Dānapaṭala’s stress on intentionality, which I quote in full:

\[
yadi ca bodhisattvah śuddhāśayo bhavati dānam ārabhya so ‘pi sattvakārye prabhūte karāṇiye pratyupasthite svādehāṃgaṃpratyamgāyācanake ‘pi pratyupasthite na svādehāṃgaṃpratyamgāṇy anuprayacchati / tat kasya hetoh / na hy āsya bodhisattvasya dānam ārabhya śuddhāśayasya punaḥ kenacit paryāyaṃ idaṃ dātavyam idaṃ na dātavyam iti bhavati cetasaḥ saṃkocah / tasmād asau bodhisattvo yadāśayaśuddhyartham pratyupasthitam sattvakāryam adhyupekṣya dadyāt so ’syāśayaḥ śuddha iti na pratyupasthitam sattvakāryam adhyupekṣya dadāti /\]

If a bodhisattva has pure intentions with regard to giving, he does not give away his own body or his primary and secondary limbs, neither when the many needs of beings to be dealt with have arisen, nor when approached by someone requesting his own body or his primary and secondary limbs. For what reason? For this bodhisattva who has pure intentions with regard to giving, there is by no means cowering from the thought: “This must be given, this must not be given.” Therefore, after he has become indifferent to the needs of beings that have arisen, this bodhisattva would give when it is for the sake of the purification of his intentions; [but] after he has become indifferent to the needs of beings that have arisen, he does not give when he knows that his intentions are [already] pure.

When the bodhisattva is not fazed by the demands that generosity can place on him, even the demand of surrendering his body, he knows that his mind has been purified of ill intentions, at which point he does not heed the day-to-day needs of other beings and does not give his body. And the gift of the body is not just unnecessary for a bodhisattva with pure intentions, but actively discouraged—far from suggesting that the bodhisattva’s gift is optional, the text says plainly that “he does not give when he knows that his intentions are [already] pure.” These three examples, taken in total, indicate that the outward gift in the Dānapaṭala is important only insofar as it shapes the mind. To turn the Biblical Epistle of James around and adapt it to our text: Deeds without the mind are dead.

Yet Mahāyāna ideals of compassion run through the entirety of the Dānapaṭala. We have already seen that a “bodhisattva who has a compassionate and sympathetic heart does

not expect anything in return from others” (kārṇyacitto 'nukampācitto bodhisattvo . . . na parataḥ pratyupakāraṃ pratyāśaṃsate) because he perceives the despair of beings’ desire and suffering.26 Our text goes much further than this. A chief criterion determining the bodhisattva’s gift—or whether he gives at all—is how it affects the potential recipient: The text explains that a “bodhisattva in no way gives all his internal and external objects to beings indiscriminately” (na . . . bodhisattvaḥ sarvaṃ ādhyātmikabāhyam vastv aviśeṣenaiva sarvathā ca sattvānāṃ dadāti), as the gift must be for their welfare (hita).27 This principle is applied to several situations in the Dānapāṭala. Our text says, for instance, that the bodhisattva donor would agree to give his own life thousands and thousands of times, but not if he “has been incited with an untoward command to harm, kill, or deceive others” (parotpīḍanāya paravadhāya paravaṃcanāya cāyogavihitena copaniṃtritaḥ).28 He does not give his body to the gods that belong to or are instructed by the retinue of Māra, since this would only cause them to hurt others.29 He can give poison, fire, weapons, or liquor away as long as those objects benefit others.30 He cannot give depressed people the opportunity to commit suicide.31 He cannot give gifts that are

26 Wogihara 135.18-21.
27 Wogihara 115.17-116.1.
28 Wogihara 116.3-10.
30 Wogihara 117.6-11. Unfortunately the text does not elaborate on how these items could be used to help others.
31 Wogihara 118.23-25.
designed to hurt or kill animals, especially gifts that are connected with animal sacrifice. And so on.

Part of the Mahāyāna flavor of the Dānapaṭala is the compassion its bodhisattva must show to the recipient of his gifts. In a telling passage that is totally unlike anything found in the Dānapāramitā-sūtra, the Dānapaṭala describes what the bodhisattva should think before being asked for donations. He must play out in his mind a situation in which he is approached by two recipients but only has enough possessions to give to one of them. If one of the solicitors, the text states, “is at ease, not destitute, not needy, has a master [to look after him], and is supported” (sukhitāś cākṛpaṇo 'varākhaḥ sanāthaḥ sapratisaraṇaḥ), but the other “is suffering, destitute, needy, does not have a master [to look after him], and is not supported” (duḥkhitaś ca kṛpaṇo varākhaḥ anāthaḥ apratisaraṇaḥ), then the bodhisattva should mentally prepare himself to give to the one who is suffering only. The distinction that the Dānapaṭala has the bodhisattva make here must be put in the context of normative Indian ethics. In India, the “suffering, destitute, needy,” etc. largely would have been—and in many ways still are—looked upon with contempt. As Heim remarks, “poverty and wretchedness in South Asian culture are markers of demerit and moral want owing to past wrongdoing.” The poor and wretched would not have been considered fruitful recipients for gifts, which explains why many Indian gift-giving texts ignore them and some Dharmaśāstric, Jain, and Buddhist texts are careful to differentiate between making charitable offerings to the needy and giving to venerable recipients. But our bodhisattva is supposed to extend Mahāyāna ideals of

32 Wogihara 117.27-118.9; 120.23-24; 134.7.
33 Wogihara 123.18-124.13.
34 Heim, Theories of the Gift in South Asia, 74-81 (quote taken from p. 75).
compassion to the downtrodden, a deliberate inversion on the part of the Dānapaṭala of Indian
values and customs regarding karmic status and the worthy recipient.

The Dānapaṭala calls the two hypothetical recipients in the just-mentioned example a
yācanaka. But in a few cases we find a slightly different term for the recipient, yācaka, as in the
following passage:

\[
na ca bodhisattvo vividhavipratipattisthitānām uddhatānām asaṃvyṛtāmanāṃ yācanakānām
ākrośakānāṃ roṣakānāṃ paribhāṣakānāṃ vipratipattyā khinnamāṇaso dānaṃ dādāti
nānyatra teṣām evāṃti ke bodhisattvo bhūyasyā mātrayā kleśāveśaprakṛtitām
avagamyānukampācittam upasthāpya dānaṃ dādāti /\]

Also, there is no offense when a bodhisattva gives a gift to beggars who are engaged in
assorted kinds of offensive behaviors, who are rude, who cannot restrain themselves,
and who are verbally abusive, enraged, and reviling, and he should not feel troubled
about it. On the contrary, a bodhisattva readily gives a gift to them after understanding
that being wrapped up in the defilements is natural and then becoming sympathetic
toward them.

The yācaka here is not exactly cast in a positive light. I translate the term as “beggar,” which I
believe goes a long way toward capturing its negative connotations. In the modern United
States, we might call a homeless panhandler a “beggar,” but almost no one would use that
word for a child who goes door to door peddling cookies and asking for donations for her
school. In India, too, not all solicitors were considered equals—it was an act of honor to
support a religious specialist like a ritual priest or a member of a Buddhist fraternity, but an
act of pity to give to a low-class beggar struggling to survive. On the latter, Schopen asserts
that “there can be little doubt that beggary and those who were forced into it were looked
upon, in many circles, with opprobrium and disdain. . . .”\[36\] The Dānapaṭala seems to

---

35 Wogihara 120.17-22.

acknowledge as much—its yācakas are “engaged in assorted kinds of offensive behaviors,” are “rude,” and so on. But for our text, there is no offense (vipratipatti) in giving to such people. Instead of treating them with “opprobrium and disdain,” the Dānapaṭala exhorts the Mahāyāna donor to regard them with sympathy (anukampā). And lest the bodhisattva look down on the yācaka with feelings of superiority, seemingly a natural response to gifts given out of sympathy or pity, later the Dānapaṭala says that a “bodhisattva gives a gift with a humble attitude toward the beggar” (yācanakāya nīcacitto bodhisattvo dānaṃ dadāti).37 Once again, the Dānapaṭala inverts standard Indian values by demanding humility of the bodhisattva in the presence of the lowly yācaka.38

The examples regarding the suffering recipient and the immoral and surly yācaka bear witness to a kind of Mahāyāna counter-discourse of social protest. I am not the first one to notice this. In her analysis of medieval Dharmaśāstric, Jain, and Theravāda gift-giving treatises, Heim makes the following observation:

On matters of structural human relationships . . . Theravāda Buddhist theorists share more with their Jain and Dharmaśāstra counterparts than they do with their Mahāyāna cousins. That Theravādins might share more on certain aspects of gift giving ideology with non-Buddhists than with fellow Buddhists may be surprising. But perhaps it is not so surprising after all. The bodhisattva ethic is in many ways concerned with rethinking the religious meaning of gift giving, and the Mahāyāna revolution demonstrates a

in Schopen, “On the Underside of a Sacred Space,” 444, n. 15); Nattier, A Few Good Men, 112-113; and again Heim, Theories of the Gift in South Asia, 74-81.

37 Wogihara 134.26-135.1.

38 The term yācaka also appears in at least one inscription in a similar context. In a remarkable record of the Viṣṇuṇḍin king Govindavarman, as part of a compound we find -anāthayācakavyādhitadīnakṛpa-, which Sankaranarayanan translates as “the helpless, the beggars, the sick, the depressed, and the wretched. . . .” See S. Sankaranarayanan, “Two Vishṇukuṇḍi Charters from Tummalagudem,” 10 and 12, lines 9-10 (this is Tummalagudem A from Table 2 in chapter V).
radical departure from Theravāda and other traditional Indic modes of hierarchy and social order.\(^{39}\)

And similarly:

It is intriguing that the Theravāda shares more with its Jain and Dharmaśāstra neighbors on dāna than it does with its Mahāyāna kin. The Mahāyāna texts . . . represent a significant and self-conscious departure from widespread Indic structures of giving to worthy recipients. Not only does this observation shed light on dāna as a critical focal point for discerning areas of disagreement between Mahāyāna and Theravāda religious ideas, but it also reconfigures medieval South Asian religious history. Sometimes the differences within religions can be greater than across them.\(^{40}\)

Heim is partially correct. Certainly the passages I have adduced from the Dānapaṭala betray a Mahāyāna ethos of compassion that runs counter to premodern Indian ideas of social structure. For Heim, it is the concept of śraddhā (Pāli saddhā) that explains how Mahāyāna diverges from the predominant South Asian discourse on the gift. The primary meaning of śraddhā in the medieval texts Heim examines is “esteem”—that is, the esteem felt by the donor toward the recipient. According to the medieval theorists, the ideal relationship between the donor and the recipient is asymmetrical—the donor is humble, the recipient is morally worthy—and the donor’s attitude of esteem holds this asymmetry in place. Gift exchange predicated on esteem reflects and cements proper human relationships in an inherently hierarchical social structure.\(^{41}\)

But in light of further examination of the Dānapaṭala, Heim’s conclusions about Mahāyāna gift theory must be tempered somewhat. Despite the compassion and humility that the bodhisattva must show the recipient, the Dānapaṭala does not abandon the concept of


\(^{40}\) Ibid., 81.

\(^{41}\) Ibid., esp. 45ff. Also see Hibbets (= Heim), “The Ethics of Esteem.”
esteem. One of our text’s nine types of gifts is the satpurusadāna, the gift to the satpuruṣa. The short passage on this gift reads as follows:

tatra katamad bodhisattvasya satpurusasya satpurusadānam / yaḥ bodhisattvah śraddhayā dānaṃ dadāti satkṛtya svahastena kālena parān anupahatyā / idaṃ bodhisattvasya satpurusasya satpurusadānam ity ucyate /\(^{42}\)

Here both the bodhisattva donor and the recipient are qualified as a satpuruṣa, a term, literally meaning “good man,” that occurs frequently in Mahāyāna texts but just as commonly in Sanskrit and Pāli (= sappurisa) Mainstream texts. The bodhisattva is supposed to give to the satpuruṣa recipient with śraddhā. Given the context of this passage, the usual rendering of śraddhā in Buddhist texts as “faith” is not appropriate.\(^{43}\) On the contrary, excluding the terms bodhisattva and satpuruṣa, this passage would fit well in the corpus of texts Heim studies, and a reasonable translation of śraddhayā from the above excerpt might therefore be “with esteem,” as Heim would render it, or “with gratitude,” as I have it:

Then, what is a gift to an Upstanding Man by a bodhisattva who is an Upstanding Man. When a bodhisattva gives a gift with gratitude, respectfully, from his own hand, at the right time, and without causing pain to others, this is called a gift to an Upstanding Man by a bodhisattva who is an Upstanding Man.

It is not the recipient who is supposed to feel gratitude for the bodhisattva’s generosity; rather, the bodhisattva should be grateful for being provided with the opportunity to give by the recipient. The satpurusadāna in the Dānapaṭala is basically an exchange between two mannered men. Giving “respectfully,” “from one’s own hand,” and “at the right time” are customs of South Asian gift etiquette\(^{44}\) that our text evidently wants the Mahāyāna practitioner to follow. And as it turns out, very similar descriptions of the sappurisadāna can be found in Theravāda

\(^{42}\) Wogihara 132.19-22.

\(^{43}\) On śraddhā in Buddhist texts, see Rotman, Thus Have I Seen, esp. 29ff. and the sources cited there.

\(^{44}\) On some of these customs, see Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, Vol. II, Pt. II, 851-856.
compendia (Saṅgha), in which we are told that a sappurisa gives with saddḥā, at the right time, from his own hand, etc. Perhaps the differences between Mahāyāna and their Theravāda “cousins” are not so great after all.

Any analysis of gift theory must take genre into consideration. Without having pursued the matter in great depth, I suspect that the Pāli Suttas and Mahāyāna Sūtras that deal with gift giving share more in common with each other than with the Pāli commentaries and compendia and Mahāyāna Śāstras that deal with the same. There is no doubt that the Dānapaṭala and Dānapāramitā-sūtra—or, for that matter, any Mahāyāna Sūtra that I know of—though overlapping in some areas, address different concerns about the gift. For one, the Dānapāramitā-sūtra focuses on the recipient only briefly in its last section. The recipient is also not a subject frequently encountered in Mahāyāna Sūtras in general, and when it is, the topic is often treated very differently than it is in Śāstras. By contrast, Śāstric and Indian exegetical works take much notice of the recipient. As suggested by the topics I have already discussed—the bodhisattva’s compassion for the recipient, including the yācaka, and the satpuruṣa gift—the Dānapaṭala pays almost as much attention to the recipient of the gift as the bodhisattva donor, even as it sometimes inverts the normal Indian relationship between the donor and recipient. We find specific types of potential recipients throughout the Dānapaṭala, many of whom are rarely, if ever, found in this context in Mahāyāna Sūtras, such as the insane, the sick,

---

45 See Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia*, 45 (and 153, nn. 36-38 for references) and 91. According to Heim, the sappurisa of sappurisadāna refers to a donor, but because satpuruṣa is repeated in this passage and satpuruṣasya clearly agrees with bodhisattvasya, the satpuruṣa of satpuruṣadāna almost certainly refers to a recipient.

46 One other example is worth mentioning. The Dānapaṭala and Pāli Saṅghahas make room for participation in gift giving even when one does not have anything to give. Compare Wogihara 126.8-127.3 to the excerpt of the Sārasaṅgha at Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia*, 92.

47 See Heim, *Theories of the Gift in South Asia*, 57-82.
cheats, adherents of other religions (tīrthika), enemies, certain gods, and in a remarkable case, beings who live off of vomited food (vāṃtāśijīvīna). The bodhisattva is said to be capable of detecting a solicitor and giving him what he wants before he even asks for anything. And close attention must be paid not only to what the recipient wants, but also to what is suitable for him:

\[
yadi yācanakaṃ paśyati yuktarūpaṃ cāsmiṃ yathepsitaṃ deyadharmapratiṣṭadanaṃ paśyati / sa nāsti tat kiṃcid buddhabodhisattvānāṃ yat sattvesv aparityaktam iti vidītvā yācanakasycchāṃ pariṇārayati / no ced yuktarūpaṃ samanupaśyati / sa tam eva kalpam upādāya . . . śakṣena vacasā samjñāpyāināṃ preṣayati / 49
\]

If [a bodhisattva] encounters someone requesting something and discerns an offering of religious gifts that is suitable to him and that is just what he wants, knowing that there is nothing whatsoever that has not been surrendered to beings by buddhas and bodhisattvas, he fulfills the wish of the person requesting something. But if [the bodhisattva] does not deem it to be suitable, he, after giving the idea consideration, informs and dismisses him with gentle words. . . .

Hence the bodhisattva should not, for example, give food mixed with onions, meat, or alcohol to ascetics who are prohibited from consuming those items. 50

The Dānapaṭala demonstrates a thorough understanding of Indian custom and law. This is evident on many fronts, of which I will mention only a few. First, the issue of the promised gift comes up several times in our text. It states, for instance:

\[
na ca bodhisattvo yathōktād yathāpratiṣṭād yācanakāya nyūnāṃ dānaṃ dādi / nānyatra samaṃ vā adhiṣṭaṃ [sic] vā / na ca bodhisattvaḥ pranītaṃ vastu pratiṣṭāya lūhaṃ pratyavaraṃ dādi / nānyatra lūhaṃ pratyavaraṃ pratiṣṭāya pranītaṃ dādi saṃvidyamāne pranīte / 51
\]

But a bodhisattva does not give a gift worse than what was described or promised to someone requesting it, [giving a gift] only if it is the same as or better than [what was

49 Wogihara 128.22-129.2.
50 Dutt 84.7-10 (Sanskrit numeral section). Cf. Wogihara 120.7-11.
described or promised]. After promising an excellent object, a bodhisattva does not give something poor and substandard. After promising something poor and substandard, he gives something excellent only if he has something excellent.

According to Dharmaśāstric law, promised gifts were in most circumstances considered to be legally binding.\(^{52}\) Considering the number of times the matter appears in the text, the author(s) of the Dānapaṭala must have been well aware of this fact. Conversely, gifts involving deception could be legally invalidated by the standards of Dharmaśāstric law,\(^ {53}\) a stricture by which the bodhisattva of the Dānapaṭala appears to be bound. The bodhisattva does not “give a gift deceptively” (na ca śāṭhyād dānaṃ dadāti),\(^ {54}\) the text says, nor can he give “in order to mislead others,” (pareṣaṃ vipralāṃbhāya), attempting to trick people with his gift.\(^ {55}\) Finally, the Dānapaṭala has rules related to religious purity. A donor should not, we are told, “carelessly give away something that has been thrown away” (na . . . apaviddham asatkṛtyānuprayacchati).\(^ {56}\) He also should not give “leftover food and drink to ascetics, or that which has been mixed or contaminated with excrement, urine, phlegm, mucus, vomit, sweat, pus, or blood” (yatīnām ucchiṣṭaṃ vā pānabhojanam uccāraprasrāvakheṭaṃghaṇakavāṃtaviriktapūyarudhirasamsṛṭaṃ vā abhidūṣitaṃ vā).\(^ {57}\) As is well known, discarded or leftover items, especially food, have long been considered highly polluting in India, so it seems that the Dānapaṭala wants the bodhisattva to obey normative Brahmanical customs regarding purity. Based on these examples as well as


\(^{54}\) Wogihara 123.1.

\(^{55}\) Wogihara 122.7-8. On the other hand, the bodhisattva is supposed to allow others to cheat him—see Wogihara 125.23-126.6.

\(^{56}\) Wogihara 120.15-16.

\(^{57}\) Wogihara 121.11-13.
others that will be noted in the translation, it is extremely likely that the author(s) of the Dānapaṭala was well versed in Dharmaśāstric literature. The same cannot be said of the authors of Mahāyāna Sūtras.

What makes the Dānapaṭala a Śāstric text, actually what makes the entire Bodhisattvabhūmi a Śāstric text, is not just its content but also its style. The Dānapaṭala is a gift-giving manual concerned with technicalities. It uses language economically and can be a bit choppy, both features of Indian Śāstras. And it is very carefully organized, so much so that I think it could only have been composed in written form. The Dānapaṭala is the first of six chapters dealing with the Mahāyāna pāramitās, ordered in their traditional sequence. Each of these six chapters is divided into the same nine parts (navākāra), which are laid out in the uddāna. Within the Dānapaṭala, most of the nine types of gifts are further broken down into subtypes. The viśuddhadāna, for instance, is divided into ten subtypes. The bulk of the Dānapaṭala is dedicated to the sarvadāna, the “gift of everything.” The sarvadāna is made up of external and internal gifts (bāhya- and ādhyātmika-dāna, respectively), and the text organizes this section along the lines of a brief (samāsa) and detailed (vistara) analysis or prabheda. The analyses of the sarvadāna examine various gift-giving situations—what objects should and should not be given, who is and is not a proper recipient, what a bodhisattva should do when he has and does not have objects to give, etc. The organization of the analyses in the Dānapaṭala is not something that would ever be found in a Mahāyāna Sūtra, but is instead reminiscent of what can be seen in Dharmaśāstras. For example, the first three chapters of the Dānakāṇḍa, part of Lakṣmīdhara’s Kṛtyakalpataru and the earliest extant Dharmaśāstric digest

58 The text even makes cross-references to material it has already covered, which would be very easy to do with a written text but next to impossible with an oral text. See n. 110 in part B.

59 See the section Giving the body in chapter II.
(nibandha) on gift giving (early 12th century), cover, in order, the nature of giving, appropriate and inappropriate gift objects, and proper and improper recipients.60

In many ways the content and style of the Dānapaṭala does not make Mahāyāna look much like a “revolution,” to use Heim’s words.61 It is only through a consideration of a range of genres that we will be able to nuance the continuities and discontinuities between Mahāyāna and Mainstream texts, just as it is only through an examination of a variety of sources that we can attempt to locate Mahāyāna within Indian religious history. My translation of the Dānapaṭala is but a small step in that direction.

A Note on the Text and Translation

There are two editions of the Bodhisattvabhūmi. With the page numbers for the Dānapaṭala, they are as follows:


Wogihara based his edition of the Bodhisattvabhūmi on two incomplete Nepalese manuscripts, the Cambridge manuscript and the Kyoto manuscript, filling lacunae with the help of the Tibetan translation.62 Dutt collated Wogihara’s edition with an additional, complete


61 Theories of the Gift in South Asia, 28.

62 Wogihara, i-ii and 3-7. See also Cecil Bendall, Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge, with Introductory Notices and Illustrations of the Palaeography and Chronology of Nepal and Bengal (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1883), XXXIX-L1.
manuscript of the Bodhisattvabhūmi, which was discovered in the Zhva-lu Tibetan monastery in 1938 by the Indian scholar Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana.\(^6\) With respect to the Dānapaṭala text, Wogihara and Dutt are very close. For the translation I generally follow Wogihara, but I will note when I follow Dutt and when their editions present significant disparities. I will occasionally refer to the Derge Tanjur’s Tibetan translation of the Dānapaṭala, but in an effort to let the Sanskrit stand on its own, I rely on the Tibetan as little as possible. (Citing “the” Tibetan from the Derge is, of course, an oversimplification, as there are five extant recensions of the Tanjur.) I have not consulted the Indian commentaries on the Bodhisattvabhūmi that are now extant in Tibetan translation, though this could prove fruitful in a fuller study of the Dānapaṭala. The *Bodhisattvabhūmi-vṛtti (Tib. byang chub sems dpa’i sa’i ’grel pa) of Guṇaprabha (7\(^{th}\) century) is a commentary that covers eight of the first nine paṭalas of the Bodhisattvabhūmi, including the Dānapaṭala. The *Yogācārabhūmaud bodhisattvabhūmintyākhyā (Tib. rnal ’byor spyod pa’i sa la byang chub sems dpa’ sa’i rnam par bshad pa), written by one *Sāgaramegha or *Samudramegha (late 8\(^{th}\) century), is a huge commentary on the entire Bodhisattvabhūmi.\(^6\)

Just as for the Dānapāramitā-sūtra, I do not use untranslated Sanskrit terms in the body of my translation of the Dānapaṭala. Important Sanskrit terms will be provided in the footnotes. The Dānapaṭala presents a more learned text than the Dānapāramitā, which I attempt to reflect with, among other things, greater flexibility in vocabulary choices. The Dānapaṭala uses about a dozen different words for “give” and I vary the English equivalents accordingly.

\(^6\) Dutt, 3; Deleanu, The Chapter on the Mundane Path, 51-54.

\(^6\) See Tatz, Asanga’s Chapter on Ethics With the Commentary of Tsong-Kha-Pa, 28-29; Deleanu, The Chapter on the Mundane Path, 248-252 and esp. 265, n. 5.
Stylistically, the Dānapaṭala reads like a technical manual, which I again attempt to reflect in the translation. Being a Śāstric text, its sentences often omit words that must be supplied using “carryover” words from previous sentences, which I place in brackets. The text rarely explains ideas in detail and the meaning must often be determined from context. I flesh out some of the text’s more laconically expressed ideas by adding words in brackets or brief explanations in the footnotes, neither of which should be presumed to be correct in all cases.

I impose paragraphs on the text based on how I perceive its internal organization and sequence of ideas.65 I do not follow the paragraphing of the Wogihara and Dutt editions, which can be extremely misleading. Extra spacing is used to separate the nine types of gifts the text describes.

---

65 Tatz does an admirable job reflecting the organization of the Śīlapaṭala in the paragraphing of his translation. See Tatz, trans., Asanga’s Chapter on Ethics With the Commentary of Tsong-Kha-Pa, 47-89.
The Summary:

In brief, these are the nine sorts of giving of an Aspirant to Awakening:
being inherently disposed, everything, difficult to carry out, and directed anywhere,
related to an Upstanding Man, and also of all sorts,
related to those in need and in want, also for ease in this world and the next, and pure.

Here an Aspirant to Awakening, having fulfilled the six Perfections one by one —the
Perfection of Giving and the Perfections of Ethical Conduct, Forbearance, Exertion, Meditation,
and Wisdom—wholly and completely awakens to unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening.

Then, what is the Perfection of Giving of an Aspirant to Awakening? It is said that the
Perfection of Giving of an Aspirant to Awakening means the nine forms of gifts: being
inherently disposed to give, a gift of everything, a gift that is difficult to carry out, a gift that is
directed anywhere, a gift to an Upstanding Man, a gift of all sorts, a gift to those in need and in
want, a gift for ease in this world and the next, and a pure gift.

What is being inherently disposed to give? It is the intent of an Aspirant to Awakening
who has no regard for any belongings or his own body, which is produced together with

---

1 On “Aspirant to Awakening” for Skt. bodhisattva, see n. 1 in chapter III, part B.

2 Skt. dānasya svabhāva. The usual translation of svabhāva as “self-nature” or “essence” does not seem to
fit the context well. This passage does not describe some abstract essence (or lack thereof, the
niḥsvabhāva) of a gift or process of giving, but rather the natural inclination of an Aspirant to
Awakening to give. However, the Bodhisattvabhūmi does use svabhāva in the Yogācāra technical sense—
e.g., Tatz, trans., Asanga’s Chapter on Ethics With the Commentary of Tsong-Kha-Pa, 47—and I believe its
author took advantage of the term’s range of meaning. There is no hint of the three Yogācāra svabhāvas
well known from the Sandhinirmocana- and Lankāvatāra-sūtras.
 detachment [for material things], the physical and vocal action that is motivated by it [the intent] and done for the sake of surrendering objects that can be given, and the irreproachable surrender of all objects that can be given. When someone wants something, it is also offering those objects to him by one who is established in the ethical restraints, who apprehends the authoritative texts, and who has the [correct] view of karmic fruits [i.e., by an Aspirant to Awakening]. This should be known as an inherent disposition of an Aspirant to Awakening to give.

Then, what is the gift of everything? In brief, it is said that everything means there are two kinds of objects that can be given: internal and external.

In that regard, the surrender of his own body—up to his marrow—is said to mean the surrender of an exclusively internal object of an Aspirant to Awakening. On the other hand, [when] an Aspirant to Awakening, after having eaten a lot, regurgitates food and drink for the sake of beings who live by eating regurgitated food, that is said to mean a gift of an Aspirant to Awakening of a mixture of both internal and external objects. Aside from what has just been

---

3 Skt. alābhasahajā = Tib. ma chags pa dang lhan cig skyes pa. Dutt’s edition of this passage is much different and does not at all agree with Tib. The occurrence of kevalādhyātmikavastuparityāgāya here in Dutt appears out of place in the organization of the text, as ādhyātmika gifts have yet to be introduced.

4 The last phrase translates anavadyaś ca sarvadeyavastuparityāgah. The intended reading may have been for the masculine anavadyaś to agree with the neuter vastu within the compound, so that the whole sentence would describe the intention, the actions motivated by the intention, and the faultless objects given as a result of the actions.

5 Skt. āgama.

6 This sentence, with a double relative-correlative construction, is rather difficult to interpret: saṃvara-sthāyinah āgamadrśteh phaladarśinah yo yenārthī tasya ca tadvastupratipādanā. I take the three genitive compounds as agreeing with bodhisattvasya that immediately follows, rather than tasya, the hypothetical recipient. It would be out of line with the ethos of the text to restrict gifts to recipients who are learned practitioners with a correct view of the world.
described, the surrender of the remaining objects that can be given is said to mean strictly the surrender of external objects that can be given.

Then, in brief, an Aspirant to Awakening gives away his own body to others who ask for his body under two conditions. In one case, he gives himself away to others to be under the control of and subject to others, so as to act according to [other beings’] wishes. As an analogy, suppose someone were to enter into a state of slavery for the purpose of [getting] food and clothes for others. In this very way, a spiritually minded Aspirant to Awakening who desires supreme awakening, desires the good welfare and ease of others, and wants to fulfill the Perfection of Giving gives himself away to be under the control of and subject to others, so as to act according to [other beings’] wishes. To those who ask for as much as his primary and secondary limbs—hands, feet, eyes, head—and to those who ask for as much as his flesh, blood, and ligaments, he [gives away that much]; to those who ask for as much as his marrow, he gives away his marrow.

An Aspirant to Awakening surrenders external objects to beings for two reasons: either he gives away what was requested so that it can be enjoyed as [the recipient] pleases, or with a liberated mind he completely gives it [what was requested] away so that [the recipient] takes ownership of it.

---

7 The line is yathākāmakaraṇīyaṃ vā paravaśyaṃ paravidheyam ātmānaṃ pareśām anuprayacchati. The single vā is problematic, and another possible translation is as follows: “He gives himself away to others to act according to their wishes or to be under the control of and subject to others.” However, I believe the outlier vā hooks up with a passage in the next section, the “detailed classification” of a gift of everything. From the analogy in the next sentence, the point seems to be that the Aspirant to Awakening can give himself up to others as long as it benefits beings in some way. The second reason he might do so, so that other beings would be hurt, is verboten. I translate the first vā as “in one case” and supply “[in the second case]” below.

8 Skt. tadvaśītīvāya = Tib. de dbang bar bya ba’i phyir. “Takes ownership” may be a strong reading of vaśītva. However, because of paribhogāya, “for the enjoyment” or “for the use,” there appears to be a distinction
However, an Aspirant to Awakening in no way gives all his internal and external objects to beings indiscriminately. So what does an Aspirant to Awakening give to beings from these two kinds of objects, internal and external? And what does he not give? How does he give? How does he not give? An Aspirant to Awakening does not give to others a gift from those internal and external objects that would be for the ease of beings alone, but not for their welfare, or neither for their ease nor their welfare. However, an Aspirant to Awakening certainly gives to others a gift that would be for their welfare, but not for their ease, or both for their ease and their welfare.⁹

This, then, is the brief teaching about what is and is not a gift [of everything]. Beyond this, the detailed classification [of a gift of everything] should be known.

[In the second case], an Aspirant to Awakening who has been incited with an untoward command to harm, kill, or deceive others in this world does not give himself to be under the control of and subject to others. An Aspirant to Awakening might perhaps agree in the presence of others even to surrender his own life a hundred times, a thousand times, or a hundred thousand times. But he would not harm, kill, or deceive others because he was ordered to by another person or for the sake of pleasing someone else.

If an Aspirant to Awakening has pure intentions with regard to giving, he does not give away his own body or his primary and secondary limbs, neither when the many needs of beings to be dealt with have arisen, nor when approached by someone requesting his own body or his primary and secondary limbs. For what reason? For this Aspirant to Awakening being drawn between two types of gifts: those to which the donor still has ties versus those over which the donor has completely relinquished ownership. See the introduction in chapter III for a brief discussion of this idea.

⁹ That is, the gift must be given for the welfare of other beings no matter what.
who has pure intentions with regard to giving, there is by no means cowering from the
thought: “This must be given, this must not be given.” Therefore, after he has become
indifferent to the needs of beings that have arisen, this Aspirant to Awakening would give
when it is for the sake of the purification of his intentions; [but] after he has become
indifferent to the needs of beings that have arisen, he does not give when he knows that his
intentions are [already] pure.

Also, he does not give his own body or pieces of his limbs to the gods belonging to the
retinue of Māra who have approached and requested them, their aim being to hurt [others],
lest there be excessive injury and pain for them. Just as for the gods belonging to the retinue of
Māra, it should be known that the same goes for the beings who are instructed [to hurt others]
by them [i.e., the gods belonging to the retinue of Māra].

An Aspirant to Awakening also does not give away his own body or pieces of his limbs
to those who are insane and scatterbrained. They are not stable in their own mind. They want
something but do not seek it. They only complain. Because of their lack of mental
independence, he does not give.\(^\text{10}\)

Besides these instances, an Aspirant to Awakening, in submission to others, does
otherwise surrender his own body or pieces of his primary and secondary limbs to those who
ask. What is and is not a gift of an internal object of an Aspirant to Awakening, then, should be
known in this way.

\(^{10}\) The text says that the insane are in a state of asvatantratva. The term asvatantra had legal implications
in India—being asvatantra meant that an individual did not have the legal right to act independently.
*Manuṣmyṛti* 5.147-149 and 9.2-3 famously describe women as not being able to act with svātantra because
they were to be under the guardianship of their fathers, husbands, and sons in the successive stages of
their lives. I believe the implication in our text is that insane individuals are legally unfit to be the
recipient of gifts. Cf. *Manuṣmyṛti* 8.67, 8.163, and 9.201 on the legal and economic restrictions of the
insane.
From external objects, moreover, an Aspirant to Awakening does not give away to those who ask the poison, fire, weapons, or liquor that damages beings or that is requested by those who want to damage themselves or others. But, an Aspirant to Awakening does give to those who ask the poison, fire, weapons, or liquor that benefits beings or that is requested by those who want to benefit themselves or others.¹¹

Moreover, an Aspirant to Awakening does not give away to people unreliable articles that come from others.¹²

An Aspirant to Awakening does not procure other people’s wives by means of a go-between and give them away to others.

He also does not give away food or drink that has living things in it.

An Aspirant to Awakening also does not give away to those who ask those objects that can be given to beings if they are associated with pleasure and amusement or if they are associated with misfortune. For what reason? Even if those objects would bring about a measure of serene trust¹³ for them in regard to the Aspirant to Awakening, that gift of his would nevertheless be even more unfortunate since he, incurring [the guilt from their] delight, indulgence, and misbehavior, would be reborn in the unfavorable destinies after

¹¹ Vasiṣṭha Dharmasūtra 13.55 says that a brahman should not accept gifts of weapons, poison, or liquor: śastraṃ viṣaṃ surā cāpratigṛhyāṇi brāhmanasya (Patrick Olivelle, ed., Dharmasūtras: The Law Codes of Āpastamba, Gautama, Baudhāyana, and Vasiṣṭha (Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 2000), 404).

¹² Skt. parakīya. Dharmaśāstric law forbids giving items one does not own. See P.V. Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra (Ancient and Mediaeval Religious and Civil Law), Vol. III (Government Oriental Series, class B, no. 6) (Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1946), 462.

¹³ Skt. cīttaprasāda, which is extremely difficult to translate. It might be better translated as “gratitude,” though I use that for the conceptually related term śraddhā in this text. See Rotman, Thus Have I Seen, esp. 65ff. and the sources cited there.
Moreover, if those objects associated with pleasure, amusement, and the like would not lead to the unfavorable destinies or the accrual of the roots of vice, that Aspirant to Awakening would willingly give away such objects associated with pleasure, amusement, and the like to those who ask so they [would develop] serene trust and for the sake of winning them over and [spiritually] maturing them by means of those objects. What sort of objects associated with pleasure and amusement does an Aspirant Awakening not give to those who ask? What sort does he give? Namely, an Aspirant to Awakening does not give training on how to kill wild animals. He does not himself perform or cause others to perform sacrifices such as the minor sacrifices and major slaughters in which a lot of living creatures, having been brought together into a mass, are deprived of life. Nor does he give away the [opportunity for] killing domestic animals in temples. When requested, he also does not give away areas where many living creatures dwell—those inhabited by living creatures that either live in water or on land—so that those living creatures would be injured. When requested, he does not give away nets or restraining devices, or instructions on how [to use] nets or restraining devices, for injuring living creatures. Nor does he give away an enemy to [the latter’s] enemies for him to be verbally abused, killed, bound, beaten, or tortured. In brief, an Aspirant to Awakening does not give to those who ask any of those objects [associated with] the pleasure and amusement of beings in order to harm or cause anguish to other beings. However, an Aspirant to Awakening gives away objects [associated with] pleasure and amusement, things such as various elephants, horses, wagons, vehicles, or conveyances, clothing and ornaments, excellent food and drink, training for dancing, singing, and instrumental music, equipment for

14 The “he” (Skt. asau), as I understand it, refers to the Aspirant to Awakening, who thus is himself punished by the recipients’ sinful experiences that are related to the gift. If the text instead means that the karmic fate of the recipients is damaged by the gift, then there is a switch in grammatical number.
dancing, singing, and instrumental music, perfume, flower garlands, and ointment, various housewares, gardens, houses, women for sexual intercourse, and training in assorted subjects of arts and craftwork,\textsuperscript{15} to those who ask so they [would develop] serene trust.

But an Aspirant to Awakening does not give away too much or unwholesome food and drink, even to someone asking because he is sick. He does not give away excellent food and drink to beings who are satisfied yet still crave more.

Nor does he give beings afflicted with sorrow what they want: [the means] to hang themselves, get beaten up, take poison, or be pushed off a cliff.\textsuperscript{16}

An Aspirant to Awakening also would in no way give his mother and father away to those who ask, that is to say, the mother and father of an Aspirant to Awakening who represent the most respectable people\textsuperscript{17} and who nurtured, nourished, and raised him. Thus, an Aspirant to Awakening is not to grow tired because he has supported them\textsuperscript{18} for a long time. Instead, he himself, under the control of and subject to [his parents], must be given for them by pledge, putting himself up as a surety bond, or sale.\textsuperscript{19} Thus, how could an Aspirant to Awakening bear to give them away to others? How could he give them up?

Nor does an Aspirant to Awakening, if he is a powerful king whose head has been anointed, take away from others the children or wives that belong to someone else, [the

\textsuperscript{15} Skt. śilpakarmasthāneṣu śikṣā. See BHSD, s.v. sthāna.

\textsuperscript{16} I.e., he will not help them end their lives.

\textsuperscript{17} I follow the guru of Dutt instead of the guhya of Wogihara. Tib. has bla ma lta bu mchog yin.

\textsuperscript{18} Literally, “from carrying them on his head” (Skt. śirasodvahanāt).

\textsuperscript{19} Skt. ādhamanabandhakasthāpanavikreya = Tib. spu gta’ dang gtar gzhuṅ pa dang btsong ba’i tshul gyis. I follow Tib. in reading three items, though I am not at all certain about their meaning. The usual Skt. term for “pledge” is ādhi, not ādhamana, while the usual term for “surety” is pratibhū or a related word, not bandhaka or bandhana.
children or wives] of beings who along with their property lie within his own territory, and give them away to other people. On the contrary, he should give away for use an entire village or a spot within a village, or an entire city or a spot within a city, saying, “As it was for me, may it be the same for you.” An Aspirant to Awakening also does not give away his own children or wife or give away as property his own female slaves, male slaves, servile workers, or servile wage laborers, if they are not correctly informed [about the situation], reluctant [to being given away], or averse [to being given away], to others who ask. He also does not offer those who are correctly informed [about the situation], content [with being given away], or willing [to being given away] to adversaries, earth spirits and demons, or evil-doers. Nor does he offer a person who is a child or wife, a favorite son, or a child from a good family into a state of slavery.

An Aspirant to Awakening also does not give a kingdom as a gift to evil-doers who beg for one but who are bent on harming others in excess. Rather, he expels such people from the kingdom if he is capable of expelling them.

---

20 The implication may be that the children and wives taken from outside of the king’s territory, e.g., from war spoils, can be given away freely.

21 Skt. bhogam anuprayacchet.

22 That is, he should give land, not certain kinds of human property.

23 Several Dharmaśāstric texts prohibit giving away one’s family members—see Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, Vol. II, Pt. II, 849-850.

24 “Property” = Skt. parigraha. As in the Dānāpārāmitā-sūtra, it is assumed that the Aspirant to Awakening can own human property—see n. 156 in chapter III, part B.

25 Stephanie Jamison has brought to my attention that Skt. a/sanajaptam in a sacrificial setting meant “not/made to agree,” a euphemism for “sacrificed” because the animal was considered to have agreed to its own slaughter. It is possible that we have a watered-down version of this meaning here, whereby slaves and the like were forced to consent to their being given away.
An Aspirant to Awakening also does not take away possessions from his mother and father and give them away to those requesting them. Just like for his mother and father, the same goes for his children, wife, female slaves, male slaves, and servile wage laborers. While he does not do so to his mother and father, he also does not cause extensive anguish to servile workers or servile wage laborers and then surrender them to others who requested them as objects that could be given.

An Aspirant to Awakening justly and considerately amasses possessions and gives them as gifts, not unjustly and inconsiderately, and not after having harmed or caused pain to another.

An Aspirant to Awakening, established in the teaching of the Awakened Ones, of the Blessed Ones, also in no way gives a gift after violating his training.

When giving a gift, an Aspirant to Awakening is also even minded with respect to all beings—whether friends, adversaries, or strangers, virtuous or faulty, inferior, equal, or superior to him, at ease or suffering—giving after establishing the opinion that [they are all] worthy of presents.

But an Aspirant to Awakening does not give a gift worse than what was described or promised to someone requesting it, [giving a gift] only if it is the same as or better than [what was described or promised]. After promising an excellent object, an Aspirant to Awakening does not give something poor and substandard. After promising something poor and substandard, he gives something excellent only if he has something excellent.\(^{26}\)

\(^{26}\) These last two sentences follow Dutt and Tib. Wogihara is slightly different. The promised gift, an issue that appears several times in our text, is usually legally binding according to Dharmśāstric literature. See the introduction to the translation.
An Aspirant to Awakening also does not give a gift while disagreeable, angry, or mentally agitated.\textsuperscript{27} Nor does he, after giving a gift, disparage someone by boasting over and over: “With a gift I benefited, profited, or lifted you up in such and such a way.”\textsuperscript{28}

When giving a gift, an Aspirant to Awakening also does not carelessly give away something that has been thrown away, even to a vile man, not to mention to someone virtuous.

Also, there is no offense when an Aspirant to Awakening gives a gift to beggars\textsuperscript{29} who are engaged in assorted kinds of offensive behaviors, who are rude,\textsuperscript{30} who cannot restrain themselves, and who are verbally abusive, enraged, and reviling, and he should not feel troubled about it. On the contrary, an Aspirant to Awakening readily gives a gift to them after understanding that being wrapped up in the defilements is natural and then becoming sympathetic toward them.

He also does not give a gift that is grasped with incorrect views. He thus [correctly grasps] the following: One does not encounter the Law through a violent [sacrificial] gift in really savage sacrifices. Nor does one give a gift associated with an auspicious ceremony. Nor does one encounter the purity of dispassion, whether worldly or otherworldly, merely by

\textsuperscript{27} According to some Dharmasūtras and Dharmaśāstras, gifts (and other transactions) made under extraordinary mental states like anger are invalid. See Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, Vol. II, Pt. II, 887.

\textsuperscript{28} Some Dharmaśāstric texts also discourage boasting about one’s gifts. See ibid., 849.

\textsuperscript{29} Skt. yācaka. As I discuss in the introduction, the usage of yācaka points to a pitiful person with questionable behavior and/or low status. I translate the term as “beggar” because of the negative connotations that word carries in English. But in most cases our text uses the very similar term yācanaka for the recipient, which I translate very differently, usually as “one who requests” but occasionally as “solicitor.” Although yācanaka does not appear to be used in the same negative contexts as yācaka, at least not as consistently, I cannot be sure whether the author(s) of the Dānapaṭala saw a significant difference in the two terms. The matter warrants further study.

\textsuperscript{30} Skt. uddhāta = Tib. rgod pa. See BHSD, s.v. uddhānana.
giving all sorts of things, even if the things are very pure.\textsuperscript{31} Otherwise, one could maintain a gift of purity merely by accumulating [material things].\textsuperscript{32}

Also, he does not give anticipating karmic rewards. Instead, he redirects [the merit of] all gifts toward unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening. An Aspirant to Awakening who has given rise to strong conviction in the maturation of every kind of karmic fruit of every kind of gift as it really is, and who is not dependent on and cannot be led astray by someone else,\textsuperscript{33} gives a gift. For example, [he has conviction that] a giver of food becomes strong, a giver of clothing gets a [good] complexion, a giver of a vehicle will be at ease, and a giver of lamps will have vision.\textsuperscript{34} Such examples as well as others should be known in detail.

An Aspirant to Awakening also does not give a gift frightened from the dread of poverty. On the contrary, he [gives] only because of a compassionate aim.

An Aspirant to Awakening also does not give a gift that is not proper for those requesting it. For example, [he does not give] leftover\textsuperscript{35} food and drink to ascetics, or that

\textsuperscript{31} I.e., there are other things besides the quantity and quality of the gifts that matter. Note that Tib. renders Skt. \textit{paraṁśta} as `\text{dzin pa}, “grasped,” and \textit{naprayeti} as \text{mi \text{`dzin pa}, “does not grasp.” I translate \textit{naprayeti} as “does not encounter,” which is consistent with Wogihara 134.5-9, where two of these views occur with \text{bhavati} in the same position as \text{pratyeti} here.

\textsuperscript{32} Skt. \textit{nānyatra sambhāramātrakatayā viśuddher dānaṃ dhārayati = Tib. sbyin pa ni rnam par dag par `gyur ba`i tshogs tsam `ba` zhi`g yin par `dzin to}. Notice that Tib. links viśuddher up as a genitive of sambhāra, not dāna, and means something like: “Otherwise, giving is grasped merely as an accumulation of purity.”

\textsuperscript{33} Skt. \textit{parapratyayo `nanyaneyo}. The terms \textit{aparapratyaya} and \textit{ananyaneya} sometimes come together as a pair—see Mvy. 2396 and 2399, where they are listed under the heading \textit{nānāguṇanāmāni}.

\textsuperscript{34} The same associations between these rewards and objects given, including the word play on \textit{sukha} with the gift of a vehicle, can be found in the \textit{Dānapāramitā-sūtra} (chapter III) and other texts.

\textsuperscript{35} Skt. \textit{ucchiṣṭa}. Cf. \textit{Manusmṛti} 2.56, about which Olivelle makes the following note (\textit{Manu’s Code of Law}, 248):

[T]he word \textit{ucchiṣṭa} is a technical term for the state of impurity resulting from the remnants of food attached to lips and fingers after eating. The same term is used for food that remains after someone has eaten (leftovers), which are also impure because they have come into contact with one’s saliva. The extended
which has been mixed or contaminated with excrement, urine, phlegm, mucus, vomit, sweat, pus, or blood. If [the condition of the food] has not been explained and made known, [he does not give ascetics] rice porridge or gruel\(^{36}\) that characteristically causes diarrhea.\(^{37}\) Likewise, [he does not give food] combined or mixed with onions to [ascetics] who do not eat onions. In the same way, [he does not give food combined or mixed with meat] to [ascetics] who do not eat meat. [He does not give drinks] mixed or combined with alcohol to [ascetics] who do not drink alcohol.\(^{38}\) In that way, an Aspirant to Awakening does not give a gift to others after being involved with an improper action. He does not give such kinds of improper gifts.

An Aspirant to Awakening also does not give a gift to those requesting it after being harassed with repeated requests by people who leave and come back in the manner\(^{39}\) of a servant. On the contrary, [he gives] right after he is requested to.\(^{40}\)

An Aspirant to Awakening also does not give a gift seeking\(^{41}\) fame, acclaim, or renown. [He does not give] seeking remuneration from others. He does not give seeking\(^{42}\) to become

---

36 Skt. *odanakulmāsa*. If it were not abundantly clear from the context, rice porridge and gruel are low types of food—see Silk, “The Origins and Early History of the Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 362, n. 2.

37 Skt. *utsarjanadharmi*.

38 All of the items given as examples would have been impure to Indian ascetics (Skt. *yati*). See Patrick Olivelle, “From Feast to Fast: Food and the Indian Ascetic,” in *Ascetics and Brahmins: Studies in Ideologies and Institutions* (New York, Anthem Press, 2011), 71-89.


40 That is, he only needs to be asked once.

41 This is a strong reading of Skt. *niśrita*. See *BHSD*, s.vv. *niśrita* and *niśritya*.

42 Skt. *samniśrita*. See the previous note.
Śakra, to become Māra, to become a wheel-turning king, or sovereignty. He also does not give in order to be sanctimonious\(^ {43}\) around others, thinking, “I hope kings, the head ministers to kings, townsmen and countrymen, priests, householders, the wealthy, traders, and merchants, thinking that I am a giver, a donor, would honor, revere, venerate, and give me homage in the future.”

An Aspirant to Awakening also does not give a cheap gift. He gives abundantly even from little, not to mention from much.

He also does not give a gift in order to mislead others, thinking, “Having enticed them with this gift, I will trick them afterwards.”\(^ {44}\)

He also does not give a gift to others in order to drive people apart. For example, [he does not] think, “After causing division within a village or a spot within a village or a region or a spot within a region by means of a gift, I will take [the land] away and seize it from the owners.”\(^ {45}\)

An Aspirant to Awakening who is dexterous, not lazy, accomplished in his efforts, and is himself the first who is ready and prepared to surrender objects that can be given\(^ {46}\) both

---

\(^ {43}\) Skt. kuhanā. See BHSD, s.v. kuhana; Wogihara, 21ff.

\(^ {44}\) This is one of several statements in the text discouraging deceitful gifts, about which see the introduction.

\(^ {45}\) My translation of this paragraph is not at all certain. I read the gift being proscribed as a kind of apple of discord.

\(^ {46}\) Skt. svayaṁ ca saṁnaddhare parikāre pūrvamgamo devavastuparityāge is not easy to interpret. Manuscript variants include the compound saṁnaddharpitkare and possibly saṁnaddhaparikarapūrvamgamo.
gives himself and causes others to give. It is not that he orders others to give after displaying indolence himself.\textsuperscript{47}

Knowing that a large gathering of a group of ethical and unethical [monks\textsuperscript{48}] who want something are seated and gathered together, he offers all the objects that can be given in due order, beginning with the elder end and ending with the junior end [of monks], by leaving and coming back again and again [with appropriate objects].

But an Aspirant to Awakening does not give a meager gift when he has many, numerous, copious possessions.

He does not give a gift to others in order to hurt someone else. He does not give a gift in order to verbally abuse, become enraged at, beat up, threaten, put down, kill, bind, mutilate, restrain, or banish someone.

Immediately before giving, an Aspirant to Awakening becomes agreeable. While giving, he feels gracious.\textsuperscript{49} After giving, he does not become regretful.\textsuperscript{50}

He also does not give a gift deceptively, [like giving] counterfeit precious stones, pearls, lapis lazuli, shell, crystal, coral, and the like to beings who trust [they will get] them.\textsuperscript{51}

There are not any objects that can be given, whether few or many, that an Aspirant to Awakening has not mentally bequeathed beforehand to all beings. Later, a beggar requests

\textsuperscript{47}I.e., others give not because a lazy Aspirant to Awakening commands them to, but because they are inspired by his zealous generosity.

\textsuperscript{48}This would appear to presume a group of Buddhist monks, though it is not impossible it refers to a generic religious group arranged by age or even status.

\textsuperscript{49}Skt. \textit{cittam prasādayati}.

\textsuperscript{50}Cf. \textit{Aṅguttara Nikāya} III, 337.

\textsuperscript{51}That is, the beings trust they will receive the genuine articles.
wealth from the Aspirant to Awakening as if it were his own, [since] what is requested has [already] been given out.\textsuperscript{52}

An Aspirant to Awakening also gives a gift at the right time, not at the wrong time.\textsuperscript{53} He [gives] what is appropriate, both to himself and to others, not what is inappropriate. He [gives] with correct conduct, not with incorrect conduct. He also [gives] without being scatterbrained, not when scatterbrained.\textsuperscript{54}

An Aspirant to Awakening also does not laugh at or ridicule someone requesting something. He does not upset him. He does not knit his brows [in a frown]. His demeanor is approachable, a smile precedes him, and he greets one first [out of politeness].\textsuperscript{55}

He also does not give a gift slowly, but does so very quickly.

\textsuperscript{52} That is, in a sense the beggar already possesses the object because the Aspirant to Awakening has previously given up ownership of all objects in his mind. Skt. anupradatta means “given out” but may also connote a Dharmaśāstric technical meaning here. Olivelle makes the following comment regarding Manusmṛti 8.212 (Manu’s Code of Law, 317):

[I]t is apparent that the term datta, literally “given,” has a technical meaning [in the context of litigation]. It does not refer to what has been given, as the term implies, but to a gift that is pledged but not yet delivered. This pledge appears to have been legally binding so that the potential recipient was able to move to a court to enforce payment.

The Skt. of Manusmṛti 8.212 is pretty similar to our text: dharmārthaṃ yena dattaṃ syāt kasmaicid yācate dhanam / paścāc ca na tathā tat syān na deyaṃ tasya tad bhavet // (from ibid., 701). The author(s) of the Dānapāṭala may have been deliberately drawing a contrast with this Brahmanical rule or norm: Whereas the Brahmanical twice-born male could in certain circumstances not deliver a promised gift, the Aspirant to Awakening has promised to give away all possessions in his mind and must do so without exception (or, with a different Mahāyāna set of exceptions).

\textsuperscript{53} The notion of giving gifts at the right time appears again in our text as well as in the last section of the Dānapāramitā-sūtra. It was a concept shared across the religions of Classical India—proven by the fact that Indian inscriptions frequently record the precise time of the transaction of a gift—though how each tradition defined the correct time certainly varied. See Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, Vol. II, Pt. II, 851-854; Heim, Theories of the Gift in South Asia, 102-107. Compare Bhagavadgītā 17.20, which explains that sāttvika gifts are given at the right time, and 17.22, which says that tāmasa gifts are given at the wrong time (Miller, trans., The Bhagavad Gīta, 133-134).

\textsuperscript{54} Skt. avikṣiptena ca cetasā na vikṣiptena. Earlier in the text, those who are kṣiptacitta are described as being in a state of asvatantratva. See n. 10 above.

\textsuperscript{55} Skt. pūrvābhilāpin (Dutt = pūrvābhīhāṣi). See BHSD, s.v. pūrvābhīhapī; MW, s.v. pūrvabhāsin.
When there are those who want something, an Aspirant to Awakening, even without being requested, himself [preemptively] selects [what they want] and then gives it to them. But [if they] take it themselves, he allows them to do it.\textsuperscript{56}

An Aspirant to Awakening also does not give an unwise gift.\textsuperscript{57} When he gives, he only gives a wise gift.

What is a wise gift of an Aspirant to Awakening? In this regard, when he has religious gifts, an Aspirant to Awakening thinks the following immediately before a person requesting something comes to him: “If two people requesting something were to come up to me, one who was at ease, not destitute, not needy, who had a master [to look after him], and who was supported, and another who was suffering, destitute, needy, who did not have a master [to look after him], and who was not supported, and if for that purpose I had possessions that could satisfy and fulfill the desires of both of them, then I must satisfy both of them and fulfill each of their desires. But if I did not have possessions whereby I could satisfy and fulfill the desires of both of them, a gift should be given to the one who was suffering, leaving aside the one who was at ease. [That is], a gift should be given to the one who was destitute, needy, who did not have a master [to look after him], and who was not supported, leaving aside the one who was not destitute, not needy, who had a master [to look after him], and who was supported.” Having thought this, he puts [his idea] into action just as he had thought. If, however, he is not able to fulfill the desires of the one requesting something who is at ease, he, in consideration of that very idea he thought of earlier in his own mind [i.e., to give only to the

\textsuperscript{56} The text switches grammatical number from yo/arthī/tasya to parān/eśām.

\textsuperscript{57} BHSD, s.v. dausprajñā translates dauṣprajñadāna as a “gift to the unwise,” but our text describes the wisdom (or lack thereof) behind making certain gifts, not a recipient.
suffering person], informs and dismisses that beggar [the one who is not suffering] in this way:

“I have already granted and promised this object that can be given to this person who is suffering. I offered it to him alone. It is not that I do not want to give it to you. Good sir, please do not become averse to my friendship on account of this [circumstance].”

Furthermore, when an Aspirant to Awakening has religious gifts, after coming up to, greeting, and exchanging pleasantries with those households that are stingy, very stingy, withholding of their belongings, and miserly, those households in which a religious gift is never produced for renunciants or priests,\(^\text{58}\) the Aspirant to Awakening says this: “Could I have your attention? Gentlemen, may you\(^\text{59}\) continue to have inexhaustible riches that benefit you greatly! I have numerous possessions and numerous religious gifts in my house. I myself am seeking a solicitor in order to fulfill the Perfection of Giving. If you meet a solicitor, refuse him [your possessions but] don’t turn him away!\(^\text{60}\) Either accept my wealth as a religious gift and relinquish it to him exactly as you see fit, or else bring that solicitor to me and rejoice in\(^\text{61}\) the gift I am giving.” Then they, after assenting to him, will do as [he suggested], thinking, “Because of our inexhaustible, valuable riches, this son from a good family is pleased with us.”

---

\(^{58}\) Skt. śramaṇabrāhmaṇa.

\(^{59}\) Skt. te bhavantaḥ, using the nominative plural in a formal address of politeness. Wogihara notes a manuscript variant of me instead of te, and Tib. has nga la. I read the line as a flattering greeting through which the Aspirant to Awakening can begin to work his way into the misers’ stingy hearts.

\(^{60}\) I believe Wogihara’s vívarjaiṣyatha is to be preferred over Dutt’s visarjaiṣyatha, though they both can work in this sentence. Skt. mā nirākṛtya vívarjaiṣyatha = Tib. bzlog ste ma btang bar. Skt. visṛjata in the next sentence corresponds to Tib. byin cig.

\(^{61}\) Skt. anumodatha. Skt./Pāli anumodana and related words in Buddhist texts can carry the special meaning of approving of or rejoicing in another’s meritorious deeds with the intention of acquiring merit for oneself.
In this way, that Aspirant to Awakening will surely plant the seed\(^{62}\) for them to remove the filth of stinginess in the future. Because of that skillful strategy [of the Aspirant to Awakening] that is informed by wisdom,\(^{63}\) eventually they will each get used to giving away a limited amount of their wealth to others. Relying on a slight amount of detachment [from material things], they will attain a medium amount [of detachment]; relying on a medium amount [of detachment], they will attain an excessive amount [of detachment].\(^{64}\)

Furthermore, the teachers, preceptors, co-residential pupils,\(^{65}\) and fellow practitioners\(^{66}\) of an Aspirant to Awakening—those who are greedy by nature and inherently covetous, but also those who are not inherently covetous—become distressed from desire because they fail [to receive any] religious gifts. In that case, the Aspirant to Awakening, wanting to do things that make merit in the form of giving,\(^{67}\) [with the merit from giving] being planted in the Awakened One, the Law, or the Community,\(^{68}\) imparts those religious gifts to them [his religious brethren listed above] especially. [But] he has them give [the objects]; he does not do it himself. In this way, that Aspirant to Awakening himself creates a greater amount of merit.

---

\(^{62}\) Skt. *bijam avaropitaṃ bhavati.*

\(^{63}\) Skt. *tena prajñāpūrvakeṇopāyakauśalya.*

\(^{64}\) The Aspirant to Awakening initially pleases the selfish households by allowing them to hold on to their wealth, but he gradually wears down their greed and inspires them to be generous through his skillful strategy (*upāyakauśalya*).

\(^{65}\) Skt. *sārdhamvihāryantevāsin.*

\(^{66}\) Skt. *sabrahmacārin.*

\(^{67}\) Skt. *dānamayam puṇyakriyāvastu kartukāmas.* The term *dānamaya* is the first item in the Skt./Pāli lists of *puṇyakriyāvastus/puññakiriyavatthus*. See the beginning of chapter III, part A.

\(^{68}\) Skt. *buddhāvaropitaṃ vā dharmāvaropitaṃ vā saṃghāvaropitaṃ vā.* The idea is that objects can be given to and merit generated through the Buddha, Dharma, and Saṃgha. Each of the Three Jewels is a distinct recipient for donations.
For some of his fellow practitioners the defilements are subdued. For others the desire for the Law is fulfilled. Beings are won over and [spiritually] matured.

Furthermore, when he has religious gifts, an Aspirant to Awakening, understanding that someone is going to request something merely by an outward hint of his motivations, offers him religious gifts according to his [the recipient’s] wishes.

Whoever comes toward him, thinking, “In this way I will cheat him with a fraudulent transaction,” perceiving his [foolishly generous] temperament, immediately conceals his [the cheater’s] misbehavior, even from others, not to mention from him [the Aspirant to Awakening]. [The Aspirant to Awakening] fulfills his [the cheater’s] wishes. Because of this, he [the cheater] goes away unabashed, elated, sure of himself,69 and cheerful, and the Aspirant to Awakening is deceived by his fraudulent swindling. He [the Aspirant to Awakening] does not originally see through this deceit, but he sees through it later. On these grounds, however, he does not reprove and call attention to that cheating person. In consideration for him [the cheater], [the Aspirant to Awakening] also approves of everything that was accomplished through his scheming71 and taken without being given.72

These kinds of things should be known as a wise gift of an Aspirant to Awakening when he has religious gifts.

Furthermore, when an Aspirant to Awakening does not have religious gifts, that Aspirant to Awakening who is skilled in this or that subject of arts and craftwork puts such a

69 Skt. viśārada—see Wogihara, 39-40 for lexical analysis.
70 Skt. anumodate (Wogihara) or abhyanumodate (Dutt).
71 Skt. tacchalakṛtam, which follows Dutt.
72 The Aspirant to Awakening turns a Dharmaśāstric norm on its head by allowing himself to be cheated.
subject of arts and craftwork to use. Because of this, he, with little difficulty, gains and lives off a large mass of wealth. Or an Aspirant to Awakening who is an amazing talker, a sweet-talker, and terrifically eloquent sets forth a teaching on the Law to others so that the desire to give is established both for impoverished beings, not to mention the rich, and also for the stingy, not to mention those accustomed to liberality. Or he brings beggars who have come to him repeatedly to those devout households in which there especially continue to be, day after day, religious gifts due to the fact that they have copious possessions. After going there himself, he, dexterous, not lazy, and accomplished in his efforts, opens up his heart when gifts are being given and merit is being made, and physically and verbally engages in those deeds with all his ability and might. He also causes those gifts to be offered well to those requesting them. Thus, that is indeed a [genuine] gift [of the Aspirant to Awakening]. [But] that which is offered poorly or preferentially to someone because of a lack of due care, improper behavior, or absent-mindedness is not [a genuine gift of the Aspirant to Awakening]. In this way an Aspirant to Awakening indeed becomes the giver of a wise gift

73 Despite the absence of vā, I read this as the first three of options in this paragraph of what an Aspirant to Awakening can do when he does not have gifts. I believe the implication is that he makes money so he can then acquire them.

74 I.e., even if he has no gifts himself he can still provide others with Buddhist teachings about generosity.

75 Skt. śrāddha.

76 Skt. dakṣo 'nalasa utthānasampannaḥ. The same three terms occur together at Wogihara 122.12-13.

77 Skt. cittam abhiprasādyā.

78 Skt. upasthāyakavaigunyād (Tib. zhal ta byed pa dang / mi mthun pa'i phyir) looks literally like “because of the flaws of an attendant [who delivers the gift?],” but I cannot see how that fits the context.

79 When he does not have any religious gifts, the third option of the Aspirant to Awakening is to bring beggars to wealthy homes and make sure the rich people give their gifts in the proper way.
when he does not have possessions, [and this is the case] until he develops pure intentions. But when the intentions of an Aspirant to Awakening are pure,\(^{80}\) he transcends the unfavorable destinies and likewise attains inexhaustible possessions in birth after birth.\(^{81}\)

Furthermore,\(^{82}\) an Aspirant to Awakening does not give the Law, either from oral explanation or in the form of a book,\(^{83}\) to an adherent of another religion\(^{84}\) looking for a defect in it. He also does not [give] a book to someone greedy by nature who wants to sell it or hoard it away, nor to someone not seeking its knowledge. With regard to someone seeking its knowledge,\(^{85}\) on the other hand, if [the Aspirant to Awakening] achieves his goal with the book, he himself gives him [the recipient seeking the book’s knowledge] exactly what [the recipient] wants. [But] if for whatever reason he does not achieve his goal, an additional book is accordingly supplied\(^{86}\) — thus this Aspirant to Awakening, after finding or having another copy [of the book] written down, gives another. [But] if he neither finds nor is able to have a copy [of the book] written down, then he must first of all examine his own intention: “I hope my

---

\(^{80}\) Wogihara has āśayaviśuddhi and śuddhādhyāśaya (but Dutt has āśayaśuddhi and śuddhāśaya). I do not believe the āśaya/adyāśaya and viśuddhi/suddha differences are significant.

\(^{81}\) Evidently, the Aspirant to Awakening no longer needs to give if he has pure intentions. The text said earlier that he did not need to give away his body as long as his intentions were pure. The issue of intentionality is discussed in the introduction.

\(^{82}\) Here we have a continuation of the section on the wise gift. The remaining portion of the discussion is divided into five parts, each beginning with punar aparaṃ bodhisattvaḥ and ending with idam api . . . prājña-ānaṃ veditavyaṃ. The text summarizes these five parts at Wogihara 131.20-27.

\(^{83}\) Skt. mukhoddeśato vā pustakagataṃ vā.

\(^{84}\) Skt. tīrthika.

\(^{85}\) The syntax here is confusing: na tu tena jñānenānarthine jñānenārthine vā. I believe the daṇḍa placed after jñānenānarthine in Wogihara is right, even though on the surface it looks as if its placement after vā in Dutt would be correct.

\(^{86}\) Skt. anvāvartita = Tib. bsgrub pa. See MW, s.v. anu√ṛt.
mind is not entangled\textsuperscript{87} in the filth of stinginess with regard to the Law. Alas, I am afraid that I do not earnestly want to give the Law in written form!\textsuperscript{88} If he, after examining [his intention] in this way, were to conclude, “My motive is [entangled in] the filth of stinginess with regard to the Law,” then that Aspirant to Awakening forms the following intention: “It must certainly be given!” That would be a gift of the Law.\textsuperscript{89} [If he thinks], “If I were confused\textsuperscript{90} in this situation on account of this gift of the Law, I still must not put up with\textsuperscript{91} defilement and must certainly give it!” [That also] would be a gift of the Law. This is even more the case if [the Aspirant to Awakening] is deficient in his stock of knowledge.\textsuperscript{92} If he, after examining [his intention], were to conclude, “My motive is not [entangled in] the filth of stinginess with regard to the Law,” then that Aspirant to Awakening must realize this: “I should give this gift of the Law in order to destroy my own defilement, in order to complete my own stock of knowledge, or because of affection for [other] beings. When I do not find [any] defilement [in myself], I will discern that the present and future stock of knowledge is larger from not giving [the Law] away. It is not [larger] from giving [the Law] away. [By giving the Law away, any hope] for an ample gain in the Law in the future is especially dim. But when I do not give [the Law] away, I acquire

\textsuperscript{87} Skt. \textit{paryavasthita} = Tibetan \textit{kun nas dkris pa}. See BHSD, s.v. \textit{paryavasthāna}.

\textsuperscript{88} The Aspirant to Awakening seems to hope that he did not give because he was unable to, not because he did not want to.

\textsuperscript{89} Wogihara’s \ldots \textit{dātvayam eva tad dharmadānam syāt} / is to be preferred over Dutt’s \ldots \textit{dātvayam / evaṃ dharmadānam syāt} /.

\textsuperscript{90} Skt. \textit{mūka}, which means “tongue-tied,” “mute,” etc. In this scenario, it is not that the Aspirant to Awakening was unable to speak, but that he was at a loss as to what to do.

\textsuperscript{91} Skt. \textit{anadhivāsyā}. See n. 239 in chapter III, part B.

\textsuperscript{92} Skt. \textit{jñānasambhāravikala}—the implication is that the Aspirant to Awakening is deficient in one of the two \textit{saṃbhāras} (the other being \textit{puṇya}) required for awakening.
knowledge for the sake and welfare of all beings, pleasing both that being [i.e., the specific recipient] and all other beings besides him. When I give [the Law] away, I please this single being only [the specific recipient].” After understanding this as it really is, if the Aspirant to Awakening does not give [but acquires knowledge for others], then he is irreproachable and unregretful, and he does not transgress the way of Aspirants to Awakening.

Moreover, how does he not give? An Aspirant to Awakening could not at all bear to reject someone requesting something with rough words, saying, “I will not give to you!” Instead, he informs and dismisses him tactfully [upāyakauśalena]. This [is the application of] a skillful strategy [upāyakauśalam] to that [situation].

First of all, with pure intentions an Aspirant to Awakening commits and mentally transfers⁹³ all his belongings and all his religious gifts to the Awakened Ones and Aspirants to Awakening in the ten directions, just as a monk would mentally transfer his own robe to his teachers or preceptors. Since he mentally transfers [these things] in this way, he obtains a hoard of a whole variety of wonderful belongings and religious gifts, and he is called an Aspirant to Awakening who dwells in the lineage of the Noble Ones.⁹⁴ He becomes the creator of immeasurable merit, and the merit for him, who always holds it in high regard, grows accordingly at all times. He keeps those religious gifts as if they were entrusted to Awakened Ones and Aspirants to Awakening.

⁹³ Skt. vikalpitāḥ = Tib. bngos.

⁹⁴ Skt. āryavamsāvihārī. The āryavamsa in Buddhist texts is an ascetic ideal of contentment with four things: 1) any robe, 2) any alms food, 3) any bedding or seats (or lodging, Skt. śayanāsana), and 4) any medicine. (The fourth item, according to some sources, is delighting in cutting off (bad qualities) and cultivating (good qualities), Skt. prahāṇabhāvanārāmatā.) See Nattier, A Few Good Men, 127-130. Given the tone of justification in this section on “not giving,” the mental transfer of belongings and religious gifts on the part of the Aspirant to Awakening may be serving as a substitute for living up to the traditional ascetic ideal of the āryavamsa.
If [an Aspirant to Awakening] encounters someone requesting something and discerns an offering of religious gifts that is suitable to him and that is just what he wants, knowing that there is nothing whatsoever that has not been surrendered to beings by Awakened Ones and Aspirants to Awakening, he fulfills the wish of the person requesting something. But if [the Aspirant to Awakening] does not deem it to be suitable, he, after giving the idea consideration, informs and dismisses him with gentle words, saying, “This belongs to someone else, good sir. This is not permitted to be given to you.”95 Or else he dismisses him after showing two or three times more regard and favor for the gift than it [is worth].96 Because of this, he [the person requesting the gift] concludes, “It is not because of his greedy character that this Aspirant to Awakening does not want to give it to me. Rather, surely he does not give because he does not have legal control97 over this gift of the Law [in the form] of a book.” This, too, should be known as a wise gift of an Aspirant to Awakening, [specifically] with regard to a gift of the Law.

Furthermore, an Aspirant to Awakening, giving away all gifts, [that is], gifts of the Law, material gifts, and gifts of security,98 is aware of them as they really are from analogies,

---

95 The Aspirant to Awakening tells what one might interpret as a “white lie.” He uses a Dharmaśāstric excuse by making the solicitor believe that he does not have the legal right to give the gift because it has already been promised to someone else.

96 Skt. taddvīguṇaṃ trīguṇaṃ dānamānasatkāram kṛtvā. The tad may refer to the solicitor—“than him.” In either case, the Aspirant to Awakening tries to get rid of the solicitor tactfully because the gift is not suitable for him.

97 Skt. asvatānta. See n. 10 above.

98 Skt. dharmacīṣābhayaśādāña. Tib. is slightly different, describing the gifts as chos dang zang zing gi rang bzhin (rang bzhin = Skt. svabhāva? prakṛti?). At any rate, the triad of dharma-, āmiśa-, and abhaya-gifts are standard in Mahāyāna Sāstric works, occurring again in this text at Wogihara 133.11-24. The triad also appears in the Śūtrālaṃkāra and Mahāyānasamgraha—see Pagel, The Bodhisattvapiṭaka, 147, n. 118. On abhayadāna, which also occurs in Dharmaśāstric and Jain texts, see Maria Hibbets, “Saving Them From Yourself: An Inquiry into the South Asian Gift of Fearlessness,” Journal of Religious Ethics 27.3 (1999): 437-462. Also see Sircar, Indian Epigraphical Glossary, s.v. abhaya-sāsana; Sircar, Indian Epigraphy, 109.
distinguishing traits, etymological explanations, and analyses of karmic cause and effect. This, too, should be known as a wise gift of an Aspirant to Awakening.

Furthermore, an Aspirant to Awakening gives a gift with a friendly disposition toward malicious beings, a compassionate disposition toward suffering [beings], a joyful disposition toward virtuous [beings], and a serene disposition toward helpful, friendly, and good-hearted [beings]. This, too, should be known as a wise gift of an Aspirant to Awakening.

Furthermore, an Aspirant to Awakening is aware of both an obstacle to giving and the counter to the obstacle to giving as they really are. In that regard, there are four obstacles to giving: first, not being in the habit [of giving]; [second], a limitation or deficiency of religious gifts; [third], longing for the best, most delightful objects; and [fourth], reveling in anticipation of the karmic reward of [getting] superb possessions in the future. On account of [these obstacles to giving], when an Aspirant to Awakening has religious gifts, he is not inclined to give when someone requesting something has approached him courteously. [But], through wisdom, he [the Aspirant to Awakening] very quickly comprehends [the situation], thinking, “This was caused by not being in the habit [of giving]. It is my fault.” Moreover, he

---

99 Skt. paryāyato ’pi lakṣaṇato ’pi nirvacanato ’pi hetupalaprabheda ’pi. The same list appears in the Vyākhyāyukti as tools to analyze language, except nirvacana is replaced by niruki (Tib. nges pa’i tshig) and prabheda (Tib. rab tu dbye ba) occurs without hetuphala-. See Richard F. Nance, Speaking for Buddhas: Scriptural Commentary in Indian Buddhism (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 115-116. I am not sure whether nirvacana and niruki are synonyms.

100 This is an application of the four brahmavihāras: maitrī, karuṇā, muditā, and upekkṣā. See n. 131 in chapter III, part B.
comprehends the following: “Surely I did not give a gift previously because, [even though] I had possessions at the time when the person requesting it approached me courteously, I was not inclined to give. If I will not give now after I have reflected upon [the situation], then once again I will hate giving in the future.” After comprehending [the situation] in this way, he relies on the counter to the obstacle to giving, reflects upon [the situation], and gives. He is no longer influenced by the fault caused by not being in the habit [of giving], nor is he in its power.\footnote{Following Dutt, pūrvaṃ dānaṃ na dattaṃ (Wogihara = pūrvaṃ dānaṃ na dattapūrvaṃ). The datta here may be another example of its technical Dharmaśāstric meaning, “promise” or “pledge”: “Surely I did not promise a gift previously…” See n. 52 above.}

Furthermore, if an Aspirant to Awakening, due to having a limited amount of possessions, is not inclined to give when someone requesting something has approached him courteously, then he, through wisdom, very quickly comprehends that the cause of the obstacle to giving is that [the refraining from giving] occurred in a state of adversity. Putting up with that suffering caused by adversity, he reflects upon [the situation] and gives a gift out of compassion. Thus it occurs to him: “Because of the fault of a previous deed or out of submission to others, I have experienced a lot of overwhelming suffering in life, such as hunger and thirst, but have received no help from others. If the present suffering, which was caused by this gift that resulted in helping others, would lead to my death, my end of days, giving is indeed still more fortunate for me than refusing the solicitor, not to mention [refusing] anyone who lives off of any leafy vegetables [he can find].” Thinking like this, the Aspirant to Awakening puts up with that suffering caused by adversity and gives the gift.\footnote{I follow Dutt’s manuscript, which has nānabhūṣakṛtaḍaṃśūṣūṣūṃśūrī and three total negatives in this line. Dutt’s emendation to nābhūṃsakṛtaḍaṃśūṣūṃśūrī is incorrect.}

\footnote{I follow Dutt’s etad dāṇakṛtaṃ parānugrahahetukam against Wogihara’s etad dānaṃ.}
Furthermore, if an Aspirant to Awakening, due to [an object’s] being really lovely and exceptional, is not inclined to give the object that can be given when a beggar has approached him courteously, then the Aspirant to Awakening, through wisdom, very quickly comprehends that his fault [i.e., refraining from giving] occurred because of possessiveness. He thinks, “This conceptual error\(^{104}\) of mine—that there is well-being in suffering—creates future suffering.” On account of thoroughly discerning\(^{105}\) his error, he rejects that [refraining from giving resulting from his conceptual error], reflects upon [the situation], and gives that object.

Furthermore, if, after giving a gift, the anticipation that the benefit of the karmic effect of giving is having many possessions arises in an Aspirant to Awakening, not [the anticipation that the benefit of the karmic effect of giving is] unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening, then the Aspirant to Awakening, through wisdom, very quickly comprehends that his fault [i.e., the anticipation of having many possessions] occurred because of false views about karmic effects. He examines the insubstantiality of all conditioned things\(^{106}\) as it really is, thinking, “All conditioned things disintegrate in a moment. The enjoyment of their karmic rewards exhausts itself and disintegrates. They disintegrate into separate components.” After examining [conditioned things] in this way, he quits anticipating karmic rewards. He then gives any gift whatsoever, and gives with all [the merit] being redirected to ultimate awakening alone.

---

\(^{104}\) Skt. \textit{saṃjñāviparyāsa}.


\(^{106}\) Skt. \textit{sarvasaṃskārāṇāṃ asāratāṃ}.
These are the four kinds of obstacles to giving for an Aspirant to Awakening. Thus, the knowledge about the four kinds of counters to the obstacles to giving should be understood: comprehension [of not being in the habit of giving], putting up with suffering [and giving in adversity], thoroughly discerning the error [that there is well-being in suffering], and apprehending the insubstantiality of conditioned things. In that regard, an Aspirant to Awakening consistently and properly gives a gift with knowledge about the first three kinds of counters. He properly grasps\textsuperscript{107} meritorious karmic rewards with the knowledge of the last counter. This, too, should be known as a wise gift of an Aspirant to Awakening.

Furthermore, an Aspirant to Awakening who is withdrawn within himself, having a strong propensity [to give] an immeasurable variety of wonderful religious gifts, with pure determination, wholeheartedly, devotedly, and with conviction\textsuperscript{108} wants to give and make offerings to beings. Because of this, the Aspirant to Awakening creates immeasurable merit with little difficulty. This, too, should be known as a wise gift of an Aspirant to Awakening.

These are, in fact, very wise gifts of a wise Aspirant to Awakening.

Whether [an Aspirant to Awakening] has or does not have religious gifts, including material gifts, [the gift that is] peculiar to the Aspirant to Awakening alone\textsuperscript{109} should, in summary, be known in this way—from\textsuperscript{110} [what was said about] a gift of the Law,\textsuperscript{111} to [what was

---

\textsuperscript{107} There is a possible double entendre with Skt. \textit{parigraha}, which can mean “understand” but also “receive.” Perhaps the Aspirant to Awakening gets to have his cake and eat it too—he sees through the futility of karmic rewards but gets merit nonetheless.

\textsuperscript{108} I follow Dutt’s \textit{prasādena saṃkalpair} against Wogihara’s \textit{prasādaṃ saṃkalpya} (Tib. = \textit{dang bas kun tu rtog pa dag gis}).

\textsuperscript{109} Skt. \textit{bodhisattvayaivāvenika}.

\textsuperscript{110} The text uses \textit{upādāya} in a serial expression to refer to its extended discussion of five facets of the wise gift, about which see n. 82 above. On \textit{upādāya}, see BHSD, s.v. 
said about the fourfold examination [of all gifts as they really are],\textsuperscript{112} to [what was said about] a gift [given with] a good mental disposition,\textsuperscript{113} to [what was said about] the knowledge of the counters to the obstacles to giving,\textsuperscript{114} and to [what was said about] a gift [given because of] the propensity [to give] with a good mental disposition.\textsuperscript{115}

This is, for certain, how the analysis of the giving of all internal and external objects [i.e., the gift of everything] of an Aspirant to Awakening should be known in detail.

Following this [section on] the analysis of a gift of everything, the analyses of all the other [types of gifts], beginning with a gift that is difficult to carry out, should be known.

Then, what is a gift of an Aspirant to Awakening that is difficult to carry out? When an Aspirant to Awakening has a limited amount of objects that can be given, he causes anguish to himself and puts up with the suffering [caused by giving away the object], and gives it away to others. This is the first [type of] gift of an Aspirant to Awakening that is difficult to carry out. [When] there is an object that an Aspirant to Awakening likes because he is fond of its characteristics, because he has been acquainted with it for a long time, or because it is really

\textsuperscript{111} Referring to Wogihara 127.3–129.8.

\textsuperscript{112} Referring to Wogihara 129.8–12. The Skt. for “examination” is \textit{pratisa\~mvid}. In P\~ali and Sanskrit Buddhist works, there are four \textit{pratisa\~mvids}: \textit{artha}, \textit{dharma}, \textit{nirukti}, and \textit{pratibh\~ana}. See PED, s.v. \textit{pat\~isa\~mbhid\~a}; BHSD, s.v.v. \textit{pratisa\~mvid} and \textit{pratisa\~mvid\~a}; Dayal, \textit{The Bodhisattva Doctrine}, 259–267. However, as far as I can tell our text instead refers to the four ways to understand gifts that were mentioned earlier: \textit{pary\~aya}, \textit{lak\~sha\~na}, \textit{nirvacana}, and \textit{hetuphalaprebheda}. See n. 99 above. If I am correct, this must mean that \textit{pratisa\~mvid} is not being used in its technical sense here, especially since the \textit{Bodhisattvabh\~umi} discusses the four \textit{pratisa\~mvids} elsewhere (in the \textit{Bodhisattvapaksyapa\~ntala}—see Dutt, 25).

\textsuperscript{113} Referring to Wogihara 129.12–15.

\textsuperscript{114} Referring to Wogihara 129.16–131.13.

\textsuperscript{115} Referring to Wogihara 131.14–19.
helpful to him, he dispels his longing for the exceptional and outstanding object that can be
given and gives it away to others. This is the second [type of] gift of an Aspirant to Awakening
that is difficult to carry out. An Aspirant to Awakening gives away religious gifts to others that
he acquired with difficulty. This is the third [type of] gift of an Aspirant to Awakening that is
difficult to carry out.

Then, what is a gift of an Aspirant to Awakening that is directed anywhere? After
encouraging himself or someone else, an Aspirant to Awakening gives away an object that can
be given to his own hired servants, mother, father, children, wife, female slaves, male slaves,
servile workers, servile wage laborers, friends, companions, relatives, or kinsmen, or to others
who want [the object]. This is called a gift that is directed anywhere.

In summary, [these] are the [first] four forms [of giving] of an Aspirant to Awakening.¹¹⁶

Then, what is a gift to an Upstanding Man by an Aspirant to Awakening who is an
Upstanding Man.¹¹⁷ When an Aspirant to Awakening gives a gift with gratitude,¹¹⁸ respectfully,

---

¹¹⁶ This line follows Wogihara. Dutt’s samāsato bodhisattvasya caturākāraṃ satpuruṣasya satpuruṣadānaṃ appears to have a copying error, with the satpuruṣasya satpuruṣadānaṃ being duplicated from the ensuing line.

¹¹⁷ Skt. satpuṣa, which appears frequently in Mahāyāna texts. In one traditional list, there is a group of sixteen lay Aspirants to Awakening headed by Bhadrapāla who are called satpurusas. See Lamotte, Le traité de la grande vertu de Sagesse, Vol. I, 428, n. 1; Paul Harrison, The Samādhi of Direct Encounter with the Buddhas of the Present: An Annotated English Translation of the Tibetan Version of the Pratyutpanna-Buddha-Sammukhāvasthita-Samadhi-Sūtra with Several Appendices relating to the History of the Text (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series V) (Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1990), 6, n. 7. Our text makes no suggestion that the satpuruṣa is a lay category, though I am not sure in what contexts the term might appear throughout the rest of the Bodhisattvabhūmi.

¹¹⁸ Skt. śraddhayā. See the comments on this passage in the introduction.
from his own hand, at the right time, and without causing pain to others, this is called a gift to an Upstanding Man by an Aspirant to Awakening who is an Upstanding Man.

Then, what is a gift of all sorts of an Aspirant to Awakening? It is an independent gift, a gift of abundance, a joyful gift, an uninterrupted gift, a gift to a [worthy] recipient, a gift to an un[worthy] recipient,\(^{119}\) a gift of everything, a gift that occurs everywhere, a gift that occurs at all times, an irreproachable gift, a gift of an object that is a being,\(^{120}\) a gift of an object that is a place, and a gift of an object that is wealth and grain. These thirteen sorts of gifts are called a gift of all sorts of an Aspirant to Awakening.

Then, what is a gift of an Aspirant to Awakening to those in need and in want. In this regard, an Aspirant to Awakening gives food and drink to those in need and in want of food and drink. He gives a vehicle to those in want of a vehicle, clothing to those in want of clothing, ornaments to those in want of ornaments, and various housewares to those in want of various housewares. He gives perfume, flower garlands, and ointment to those in want of perfume, flower garlands, and ointment, a residence to those in want of a residence, and lighting to those in need and in want of lighting. These should be known as the eight sorts of gifts of an Aspirant to Awakening to those in need and in want.

\(^{119}\) Skt. pātradānatā apātradānatā. In all varieties of Indian religious texts, the term pātra almost always means a “good” or “worthy” recipient when it occurs by itself without any adjectives or description.

\(^{120}\) I follow Wogihāra’s sattvavastudānatā against Dutt’s sarvavastudānatā because of the parallel with the next two gifts.
Then, what is a gift of an Aspirant to Awakening that is for ease in this world and the next? A material gift, a gift of the Law, and a gift of security should, in brief, be known as a gift that is for the ease of beings in this world and the next. [An Aspirant to Awakening], moreover, gives that excellent, undefiled, and appropriate material gift after removing the filth of stinginess and the filth of hoarding [possessions]. In that regard, removing the filth of stinginess should be acknowledged because someone renounces the intention to withhold [from giving possessions], and removing the filth of hoarding [possessions] should be acknowledged because someone renounces the [actual] withholding of possessions. A gift of security should be acknowledged due to someone’s providing protection from the danger from lions, tigers, crocodiles, kings, robbers, water, and the like. A gift of the Law is a teaching on the incontrovertible Law, instruction on logic,¹²¹ and the encouragement [to follow] the rules of training.¹²² As a group all of these make up the nine sorts of gifts of an Aspirant to Awakening that are for the ease of beings in this world and the next. In that regard, the material gift and the gift of security, along with their analyses, correspond to ease in this world, whereas the gift of the Law, along with its analysis, corresponds to ease in the next.

Then, what is a pure gift of an Aspirant to Awakening? These ten sorts [of pure gifts] should be known: without resistance, without grasping [incorrectly], not involving accumulation, without self-inflation, without seeking, without dismay, not inferior, without turning one’s back [on anyone], without hoping for remuneration, and without hoping for the maturation [of good karmic fruits].

¹²¹ Skt. nyāya.

¹²² Skt. sīkṣāpada.
Then, what is giving without resistance? In this regard, when someone requesting something has approached him courteously, an Aspirant to Awakening gives quickly and without delay. [But] the quickness of how the Aspirant to Awakening gives does not apply to how the person requesting [the gift should] receive it.\textsuperscript{123}

What is giving without grasping [incorrectly]? An Aspirant to Awakening indeed does not grasp a gift [incorrectly] with the following views: “There is no karmic effect for this gift”; “The Law occurs through a violent [sacrificial] gift”; “Purity, whether worldly or otherworldly, occurs merely through a really superb gift.”\textsuperscript{124}

What is giving that does not involve accumulation? An Aspirant to Awakening, after accumulating\textsuperscript{125} [possessions] and forming a stockpile of religious gifts over a long period of time, certainly does not later give them all together as a single gift. For what reason? When an Aspirant to Awakening has religious gifts, he is not capable of refusing someone requesting them who has approached him courteously. Nor does he discern the proper way to refuse him. So how could he form a stockpile [of gifts]? An Aspirant to Awakening also does not consider giving that involves accumulation as a good source for earning merit. He contemplates, “[Suppose] the same objects that can be given are being given to similar people who, either individually or as a group, are requesting them. In what way would one acquire more merit: [giving the objects away] little by little or all together?” The Aspirant to Awakening then

\textsuperscript{123} This sentence follows Dutt, \textit{na yācanakasya tathā lābhām ārabhyā tvarā bhavati yathā bodhisattvasya dānam ārabhyā.}

\textsuperscript{124} I read the text as providing three incorrect views, even though there are only two \textit{iti} particles. A very similar passage occurs at Wogihara 120.22–121.2, which makes explicit that the violent gift (\textit{himsādāna}) is a reference to a sacrifice (\textit{yañṇa}).

\textsuperscript{125} Dutt has one \textit{sambhṛtya}, which is supported by Tib., while Wogihara has two. Wogihara’s duplication could either be a mistake or have an intensive/frequentive sense.
discerns that giving that involves accumulation is especially reproachable, and he discerns that giving his possessions as he gets them is beyond reproach. For what reason? Because he who gives a gift of what has been accumulated, when asked by solicitors [for his accumulated possessions], first refuses hundreds of solicitors, then becomes upset with, impatient with, and mistrustful of them, and finally gives a gift of what he has accumulated to some of them, even when he is not asked to. Therefore, an Aspirant to Awakening does not give a gift that involves accumulation.  

What is giving without self-inflation? An Aspirant to Awakening gives a gift with a humble attitude toward the beggar. He also does not give in order to compete with others. After giving a gift, he also does not think, on account of that gift, “I am a giver, a donor, but others are not.”

What is giving without seeking? An Aspirant to Awakening does not give a gift seeking fame, acclaim, recognition, or renown. [While giving] he realizes that fame is the product of opinions and talk, is tied to mere words, and is like a frail leaf.

What is giving without dismay? In this regard, an Aspirant to Awakening becomes agreeable immediately before giving. While giving, he feels gracious. After giving, he does not

---

126 The wrongdoing is not giving one’s accumulations per se, but holding on to possessions without giving them away at the earliest opportunity. Holding on to possessions leads to untoward mental states on the part of the Aspirant to Awakening.

127 The same idea occurred earlier at Wogihara 121.22-23.

128 I follow Dutt’s *ghoṣamātrapatibaddha* against Wogihara’s *mātrapatibaddha*, which is nonsensical.

129 Both Wogihara and Dutt should be emended to *kṛśapattra* or *kṛśipattra* (Tib. *lo ma skam po*). See BHSD, s.v. *kṛśalaka*. 
become regretful. When hearing about the numerous most excellent and wonderful gifts of [other] Aspirants to Awakening, he is not reduced to cowering in disgrace for himself.

What is giving that is not inferior? After serious consideration, an Aspirant to Awakening makes an effort to give away the food, drinks, vehicles, clothing, and other things that are the best and of the highest quality among his religious gifts.

What is giving without turning one’s back [on anyone]? An Aspirant to Awakening gives a gift while even minded, impartial, and equally compassionate toward friends, adversaries, and strangers.

What is giving without hoping for remuneration? When giving a gift, an Aspirant to Awakening who has a compassionate and sympathetic heart does not expect anything in return from others. He sees that people desire comfort, burn with the heat of craving thirst, suffer from their nature, [but yet] are helpless [to fulfill their desires or end their suffering].

What is giving without hoping for the maturation [of good karmic fruits]? When giving a gift, an Aspirant to Awakening does not expect the maturation of good karmic fruits in the future, whether it be getting superb possessions or a superb body. He sees the lack of substance in all conditioned things [and instead] anticipates the benefits of supreme awakening.

The gifts of Aspirants to Awakening become pure in these ten ways.

In this way, Aspirants to Awakening rely on these nine sorts of giving, fulfill the Perfection of Giving, and wholly and completely awaken to unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening.

130 The exact same wording occurs at Wogihara 122.24-123.1.
Here ends the ninth chapter, which is about giving, in the *Foundation of Discipline* section of the *Stage of the Aspirant to Awakening*. 
V. Giving in Practice: The Mahāyāna Epigraphic Record

Up until this point, I have largely restricted myself to textual evidence for Mahāyāna and the gift, specifically giving 1) across Mahāyāna Sūtra literature, 2) in one particular Mahāyāna Sūtra called the Dānapāramitā, and 3) in the Dānapaṭala of the Bodhisattvabhūmi, a large Śāstric text. I hope I have shown that some of the major differences in what is said about giving in Mahāyāna texts, at a minimum those I have studied in detail, stem from genre: Sūtras and Śāstras, though their respective contents may overlap at points, approach gift giving from radically different angles. But textual evidence is only part of the picture; exactly what part of the picture texts occupy will, I think, continue to be a point of controversy among historians of religion for many years to come.

I should start just by calling out the obvious, something so obvious that it is rarely spoken: In Religious Studies, almost all the physical materials that we treat as evidence—churches, temples, shrines, images, ritual paraphernalia, what have you—were, at one time, gifts. Somebody paid for them, somebody gave them, and somebody or something received them. The art-historical sources relevant to Religious Studies (and before the modern era, most “art,” to use the term loosely, was religious in nature), for example, are remnants of exchange between the bygone patrons who paid for them and the recipients who used them for very specific purposes—to be infused with awe, to worship, and so on. Our archaeological sources often represent religious gifts too; when archaeologists unearth some house of worship, they are digging through layers of a religious gift. Gift giving is a topic that is not only important, but also one that can be studied using different kinds of material sources.
For most periods of Indian history, much of our material evidence is accompanied by inscriptions. They come in many forms, but the majority of Indian inscriptions record donations. With regard to Indian Buddhism specifically, the inscriptions we have number in the thousands (unfortunately, the corpus of what I consider Mahāyāna inscriptions is much smaller), and many of these, of course, are donative. With so many extant inscriptions at our disposal, it strikes me as more than a little silly to delve into a study of gift giving without having recourse to the epigraphic evidence, at least as a check on literary sources. Surely inscriptions deserve more than a passing comment in a discussion about “The Buddhist Discourse on Giving,” the title of a chapter in Ohnuma’s authoritative study on Buddhist gift-of-the-body stories. This chapter consists mostly of evidence from Indian Buddhist texts and discussion on Western gift theory, but it also brings in the work of modern anthropologists of India as well as case studies from the modern Theravādin world. If Ohnuma went outside of Buddhist texts for examples of giving in practice, one would think that inscriptions that record

1 An up-to-date catalog of Indian inscriptions is sorely lacking, but Lüders’s is still useful—see H. Lüders, A List of Brahmi Inscriptions from the Earliest Times to about A.D. 400 with the Exception of Those of Asoka (Appendix to Epigraphia Indica and Record of the Archaeological Survey of India, Vol. X) (Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, India, 1912). We are now, however, fortunate to have top scholars committed to putting Gāndhārī inscriptions (in addition to manuscripts and coins) up on the web in a user-friendly format and with complete references. I am speaking, of course, of Stefan Baums and Andrew Glass, “Catalog of Gāndhārī Texts,” http://gandhari.org/a_inscriptions.php.

2 Richard Salomon puts (non-Aśokan) Indian inscriptions into two broad categories, donative and panegyric, and points out that the panegyric inscriptions that praise kings or other rulers (praśastis) were generally written to record donations made by them or on their behalf. See his Indian Epigraphy: A Guide to the Study of Inscriptions in Sanskrit, Prakrit, and Other Indo-Aryan Languages (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 110–111.


4 Ohnuma, Head, Eyes, Flesh, and Blood, 140-166 (the epigraphic evidence makes its brief appearance on 145-146).
gifts from actual Indian Buddhists (from the same periods as the texts she uses!) would have as much relevance as Hindus in modern Uttar Pradesh or Buddhists in modern Sri Lanka or Burma. Moving away from scholarship on India, a similar critique could be leveled at James Egge’s *Religious Giving and the Invention of Karma in Theravāda Buddhism*. In his book, Egge jumps freely between Pāli texts composed and redacted many centuries ago and secondary research on non-Buddhists in contemporary India and Buddhists in modern Sri Lanka and Southeast Asia. But he all but ignores the mass of inscriptions of Sri Lankans, including those of Sri Lankan Buddhists in India,\(^5\) the inscriptions from the Pagan, Khmer, Sukhothai, and Campā kingdoms, as well as other Buddhist donative inscriptions from Southeast Asia. In one instance, Egge does use inscriptions to compare the ethics of the *Vessantara-jātaka* to the contents of the edicts of Aśoka\(^6\) (who, despite the claims of the Theravāda tradition itself, and a long list of scholars who have taken Pāli chronicles as factual accounts, is very unlikely to have been involved in converting Sri Lanka and therefore to have had a hand in establishing Theravāda Buddhism there\(^7\)). And elsewhere he briefly adduces epigraphic evidence to discuss the history of and relationship between dedicating *dakṣīṇā* and dedicating the fruits of good deeds.\(^8\) But these two cases are very much exceptions. In a study about gift giving and Theravāda Buddhism, on the whole Egge neglects the donative inscriptions from the places

---

\(^5\) For an important inscription attesting to Sri Lankans at Nāgārjunākoṇḍa, see J. Ph. Vogel, “Prakrit Inscriptions from a Buddhist site at Nagarjunikonda,” *Epigraphia Indica* 20 (1929–30): 22-23 and plate (Second Apsidal Temple inscription F). This inscription refers to the *tāṃbapamṇaka* (= Sri Lankan) *theriyas*. And for a brief survey of the non-Indian (especially Sri Lankan) presence at Bodhgayā, which lasted almost as long as the history of the site, see Mitra, *Buddhist Monuments*, 62-65.


where the label “Theravāda” might be meaningfully applied. (Theravāda, of course, took many centuries to develop, and even after it had, it cannot simply be equated with the Buddisms of Sri Lanka and mainland Southeast Asia.) His book should really be called *Giving in Pāli Texts.*

This is not to pick on either Ohnuma or Egge. On the contrary, I highlight their respective works because they are otherwise very good and insightful; both have been helpful to my own thinking about gift giving in Buddhist texts. But their nominal use of the inscriptive data, though entirely typical—even for works like theirs that were published relatively recently—should not be repeated. For the value of the donative inscriptions, in conjunction with art-historical and archaeological evidence, is to see certain aspects of giving in practice. They serve as a test, however imperfect, for the many theoretical statements made about gift giving in texts: What objects do texts say should be given, and how does this compare to what we see in the inscriptions? Are the motives behind giving the same in Buddhist inscriptions and texts? Can we detect donors’ attitudes toward their recipients in the inscriptions, and do they agree with the prescriptive positions stipulated in texts? It is for

---

9 At ibid., 122, n. 29, Egge justifies his title and the bias for literary sources in his project:

... I should explain an ambiguity in my title. The doctrinal developments I discuss in the first half of this book probably occurred prior to the formation of the Theravāda as a distinct form of Buddhism. In fact, the term Theravāda only appears for the first time in inscriptions in the third century CE and in literary sources in the fourth century. Even if we define Theravāda as the school of Buddhism for which the Pāli canon is authoritative, it is doubtful whether we can meaningfully speak of Theravāda prior to the Āluvihāra recension in the first century BCE. Nonetheless, I refer to Theravāda Buddhism in my title because I am primarily interested in doctrinal developments reflected in the scriptures considered authoritative by the Theravādin tradition and in how an understanding of these developments can help us better to understand these texts. But his book is littered with hints or direct claims about how Theravādins outside of the texts think and even behave, for which the inscriptive material would, it seems to me, prove invaluable.

10 If the utility of the epigraphic material is not beyond doubt, the following, I suspect, will lay that doubt to rest: John Faithfull Fleet, *Indian Epigraphy: The Inscriptional Bases of Indian Historical Research* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907), 3-24; Sircar, *Indian Epigraphy*, 17-23; Gregory Schopen, “Archaeology and Protestant Presuppositions in the Study of Indian Buddhism,” in *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks*, 1-22; Salomon, *Indian Epigraphy*, 3-6.
questions like these that this chapter takes up Mahāyāna gift giving as seen through donative inscriptions.

But before I get to the content of the inscriptions, I must first attempt to answer some other fundamental questions: Can one even determine whether the donor or the recipient of a gift recorded in an inscription identified as a Mahāyāna Buddhist? If so, would that make it a Mahāyāna gift? (And would both the donor and the recipient have to have identified as Mahāyāna Buddhists to make it a Mahāyāna inscription? Or just one or the other?) If an inscription indicates any religious beliefs, can we tell whether those beliefs necessarily follow from a Mahāyāna understanding of the world? This boils down to the basic problem: What, exactly, is an Indian Mahāyāna inscription?

To resolve this problem, I turn to a seminal paper on Mahāyāna in the Indian epigraphical record, first published by Gregory Schopen some thirty-odd years ago and entitled, appropriately enough, “Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions.”¹¹ Schopen argues for the association of an inscriptive formula involving the earmarking of merit for “unsurpassed knowledge” (anuttarajñāna) with the presence of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India, a conclusion that had already been reached or at least suggested by others, including Sircar, Burgess, and Shizutani.¹² Schopen goes further by contending that the Sanskrit terms śākyabhikṣu (or, in the feminine, śākyabhikṣuṇī) and paramopāsaka (or paramopāsikā) referred to Mahāyāna monastic and lay members, respectively. And most importantly, because these epigraphic markers for Mahāyāna do not appear until the 4th or 5th century CE, he concludes that Mahāyāna did not

¹¹ Now republished in Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India, 223-244.

materialize as a “separate and independent group” in India until hundreds of years after the appearance of Mahāyāna texts. Apart from a couple of notable objections that will be addressed shortly, Schopen’s positions have more or less gained scholarly traction. Paul Williams, for instance, is in complete accord with Schopen: “It seems that for perhaps five or six centuries—the centuries which saw the production of a great deal of the Mahāyāna sūtra literature, and many of the greatest thinkers of the Mahāyāna—Mahāyāna was not seen ‘on the ground’ as an identifiable ‘institution’ involving inscriptive allegiance.” Schopen and others have made minor additions and emendations to his original paper in subsequent publications, usually by way of footnotes, but for many years the only other significant examination of Mahāyāna inscriptions was mostly a foray into textual traditions of questionable relevance. This is an unfortunate state of affairs for those of us interested in Indian Mahāyāna studies, particularly if we want to go beyond what we can glean from Sūtra and Śāstra texts, which are, admittedly, sometimes impenetrable to questions about how Mahāyāna may have fared institutionally within Indian Buddhist culture and within India at large.

13 Quote taken from Schopen, “Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions,” 239.

14 The related issues of Mahāyāna’s possible marginal status and its relationship with Mainstream monastic orders during the so-called Middle Period in India have proven more controversial. I referred to them briefly in chapter II and will return to them in my conclusion. For now I will say that Schopen, if I understand his argument correctly, errs or at least oversimplifies matters when he puts Mahāyāna on the level of a Buddhist “school” or “sect.” At ibid., 241, n. 22, he states that “there are actually more [epigraphic] references to the Mahāyāna than to any other school” (emphasis mine).

15 Williams (with Anthony Tribe and Alexander Wynne), Buddhist Thought, 77. See also Paul Williams, Mahāyāna Buddhism: The Doctrinal Foundations (New York: Routledge, 1989), 28. (But compare now the revised edition of the latter—see Williams, Mahāyāna Buddhism: The Doctrinal Foundations, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2009), 29-30.) I cite Williams here because his books, as much as this can be said for anything on Indian Buddhism, are quite influential, especially to those outside the field, even sometimes being used as textbooks in undergraduate courses.
It is most fortunate, then, that a recent dissertation by Nick Morrissey provides not only an extended discussion of Mahāyāna inscriptions that takes into account forty or so records not in Schopen’s original publication, but also a detailed and easy-to-use appendix of pertinent inscriptions from around the 5th–6th centuries CE, including several inscriptions from Piṭalkhorā discovered by the author himself.\(^\text{16}\) However, on some crucial points I find Morrissey’s study to be lacking. In one section he opines that none of the positions taken against Schopen “has effectively displaced the cogency of the argument which links Mahāyāna Buddhism with śākyabhikṣus and paramopāsakas, as well as the ‘transference of merit’ formula ... that so often occur in conjunction with each other.” But he does not tell us what was so cogent about that argument in the first place or what was lacking in the others. Morrissey is right to push aside the position that the epigraphic and material data for Mahāyāna is too scarce to warrant making reliable conclusions. The paucity of nontextual evidence (as well as manuscripts actually from India) will almost always be a problem when studying premodern India, but as Morrissey deftly remarks, “you work with what you have and however unscientific, employ the results as best you can.” But I would counter his suggestion that the “lack of sufficient data” critique is “perhaps unnecessarily cautious” with the claim that he has perhaps been unnecessarily incautious by not critically reexamining Schopen’s line of reasoning in sufficient detail.\(^\text{17}\) Indeed, despite Morrissey’s warning that the correlations delineated by Schopen are “at present only a hypothesis,”\(^\text{18}\) he automatically places any


\(^{17}\) See ibid., 81–83, esp. his remarks about the sources cited in n. 173.

\(^{18}\) Ibid., 120–121.
inscription with śākyabhikṣu, paramopāsaka, or related term in his “Indian Mahāyāna Inscriptions” appendix.

This being the case, I would like to review Schopen’s argument and its most noteworthy criticisms. I will bring in new epigraphic and textual evidence, either to corroborate his conclusions or to offer new interpretations of the data. Schopen, at the time of his study, was not aware of this material or did not have it at his disposal. The hope is not just to come up with a list of what is or is not a Mahāyāna inscription, but rather, again, to build a solid foundation on which to investigate Mahāyāna giving in practice.

Schopen sets out to show that an epigraphic formula that is present in several dozen donative inscriptions from the Gupta period onwards, which had been described as the “common Mahāyāna formula” by E.H. Johnston and others, did, in fact, correlate with Mahāyāna donors.19 The formula in question, in its most basic form, is yad atra punyaṃ tad bhavatu sarvvasatvānām anuttarajñānāvāptaye: “May the merit here be for the attainment of unsurpassed knowledge for all beings.”20 There are several variations of the formula, most importantly the addition of personages—parents, teachers, etc.—that the donor specifies (or hopes?) will benefit from the resulting merit and thereby attain “unsurpassed knowledge.” Generally the formula includes the name of the donor with some religious title. Schopen then draws a parallel between the epigraphic formula and how merit is commonly said to be “transferred” in Mahāyāna textual sources. As I said in chapter II, merit—puṇya, kuśala, or the like—is “transferred” or redirected in Mahāyāna texts using the causative forms of the verbs

---


20 This is a slight modification to his first thesis. See Schopen, “Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism,” in Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks, 53, n. 88.
The goal of such “transfers” is usually anuttarā saṃyakṣambodhi, “unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening.” The conclusion, by the time Schopen has finished making his case, is that anuttarajñāna from the epigraphical formula refers to the same or similar goal as the textual anuttarā saṃyakṣambodhi. That is, when one has attained “unsurpassed knowledge,” he has reached awakening.

I agree with Schopen that anuttarajñāna and anuttarā saṃyakṣambodhi both refer to awakening, even if the former does so indirectly. Others are less convinced. For a paper from the opening remarks at a recent conference on Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism, Paul Harrison expressed his doubts about the credibility of Schopen’s evidence, in particular the association between anuttarajñāna and anuttarā saṃyakṣambodhi:

Schopen initially implies that the association of this formula [i.e., yād atra punyam . . .] with the Mahāyāna has no firm basis, but his argument proceeds by throwing weight on the question of “merit-transfer.” This is a red herring, the more salient issue surely being whether anuttarajñāna is justifiably to be taken as another way of referring to anuttarā saṃyakṣambodhi (especially when shared with all living beings). Schopen passes lightly over this question, but after querying the linkage of the formula with the Mahāyāna, goes on to take it as read for the rest of the paper.21

Harrison’s caution, I think, is reasonable. Schopen does point to variations of the epigraphic formula in question in Mahāyāna texts, but his material comes from colophons of Mahāyāna manuscripts—two are from Gilgit and the rest are late Nepalese manuscripts. Although these colophons establish a small non-epigraphic correlation between the term anuttarajñāna and Mahāyāna, they do not really get at the problem Harrison raises. In order to strengthen the association between our epigraphic formula and the textual anuttarā saṃyakṣambodhi, what we

---

21 From Paul Harrison, “Early Mahāyāna Buddhism: Laying Out the Field,” keynote address at United Kingdom Association of Buddhist Studies (UKABS) Symposium on Early Mahāyāna Buddhism in Honour of Sara Boin-Webb, held in Cardiff, July 7–8, 2012. The conference papers are slated to be published by Equinox Publishing in 2015 in a volume edited by Harrison himself. The part I have quoted here comes from a footnote of a print version of Harrison’s talk. Not having attended the conference myself, I am not sure whether this part was read aloud.
need are examples of *anuttarajñāna* from within the body of Mahāyāna texts. To be fair to Schopen, in a footnote he does actually bring up two examples of *anuttarajñāna* from within Mahāyāna Sūtras, and I am not really sure why Harrison passed over this important information. One example is taken from the *Suvikrāntavikrāminipariprcchā*, which states the following: *ye punar bhagavan satvāḥ sarvajñajñānaṁ prārthayanti asaṅgajñānaṁ svayambhūjñānaṁ asamajñānaṁ anuttarajñānaṁ prārthayante*. Here the text equates the quest for *sarvajñajñāna*—“omniscient knowledge” or the “knowledge of an Omniscient One”—with *anuttarajñāna* and other exalted levels of knowledge. All of these terms could easily be interpreted as descriptions of awakening, especially since *sarvajña* and *svayambhū* could very well refer to a buddha. The more interesting example Schopen notes comes from the *Kāśyapaparivarta-sūtra*. In the prose of (von Staël-Holstein’s) section 4, we have the line *yāś ca satvān paripācayati tān sarvān uttarasyaṁ samyaksambodhau samādāpayatxxx*. The *Śikṣāsamuccaya* quotes from this passage of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, rendering this line *yāṃś ca satvān paripācayati tān sarvān anuttarāyāṃ samyaksambodhau samādāpayati* (we have the correct form *yāṃś*, the complete final verb, and *anuttarāyāṃ* instead of *uttarasyaṁ*): “All those beings whom he [the bodhisattva] matures

---


23 Compare Yuyama, ed., *Prajñāpāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā*, verse 7, in which the *pāramitās* are said to take on the name “awakening” (*bodhināma*) as they are redirected (*pariṇāmayamāna*) to *sarvajñāta*.


[spiritually] are incited on to unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening.” But the verse section makes a curious change to this line: \( yāṃś cāpi satvān paripācayati anuttare jñāne samādapeti. \) Obviously, the \textit{anuttare jñāne} has been substituted for the prose’s \textit{uttarasyām samyaksambodhau}, I assume \textit{metri causa}. To my eyes, there can be only one conclusion: The \textit{Kāśyapaparivarta}’s author or possibly its redactor—there is a good chance the verses are significantly younger than the prose—understood \textit{uttarasyām} (or \textit{anuttarāyām}) \textit{samyaksambodhau} and \textit{anuttare jñāne} to be functional equivalents. “Unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening” and “unsurpassed knowledge,” if they do not mean the same thing, are close enough in meaning to be interchangeable.

But there is more. I have located other instances of \textit{anuttarajñāna} in Mahāyāna Sūtras that would seem to point in the same direction. One example comes from a quotation of the \textit{Upāliparipṛcchā} in the \textit{Śikṣāsamuccaya}. In this passage the Buddha is made to explain how a bodhisattva should confess his various sins, if I may borrow two pregnant terms from my Catholic roots, to thirty-five buddhas (all of whom the text lists). In the midst of his confession the bodhisattva must agree to do better, promising the following:

\[ \ldots \text{tat sarvaṃ aikadhyaṃ piṇḍayitvā tulayitvā \textit{bhisamkṣipyānuttarāyāṃ samyaksambodhau uttarottarayā pariṇāmanayā yathā pariṇāmitam atītair buddhār bhagavadbhīr yathā pariṇāmayisyanty anāgatā buddhā bhagavanto yathā pariṇāmayanty etarhi daśasu dikṣu} \]

---


27 Technically, it should be \textit{anuttare jñāni} for the meter—see Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, ed., \textit{The Kāśyapaparivarta}, 6.

pratyutpannā buddhā bhagavantah / tathāham api pariṇāmayāmi / sarvam puṇyam anumodayāmi / sarvān buddhān adhyeṣayāmi / bhavatu me jñānam anuttaram / ²⁹

I will take all that [i.e., the good things he has done] and put it into a single mass, weigh it [mentally], bring it together, and redirect [the merit] through more and more redirection [of merit] toward unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening, just as past buddhas, blessed ones have redirected [merit], as future buddhas, blessed ones will redirect [merit], and as current buddhas, blessed ones in the ten directions are redirecting [merit] now. I am going to rejoice in all the merit. I am going to request all buddhas [for help or instruction]. May I have unsurpassed knowledge! ³⁰

Here anuttara and jñāna are out of compound and their syntax is reversed, but their meaning, of course, is the same. As the bodhisattva makes amends for his past misdeeds, he hopes to gain unsurpassed knowledge in the future. Since in this short passage he also vows to use all the virtuous actions he has performed—or the merit resulting from those actions—as a launching pad to “unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening,” it does not seem illogical to conclude that his aspiration for unsurpassed knowledge amounts to the same thing. Though jñānam anuttaram probably does not refer directly to awakening here, it appears to be a state of knowledge concomitant with awakening.

The Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra also uses anuttarajñāna out of compound and with much the same meaning. One occurrence comes from chapter 2, called the Upāyakauśalyaparivarta or “The Chapter on Skillful Strategies.” Here the buddhas from the ten directions appear to Śākyamuni and express their approval:

sādhu mune lokavināyakāgra anuttaram jñānam ihādhigamya / upāyakauśalya vicintayanto anuśikṣase lokavināyakānām / ³¹

Sage, Supreme Leader of the world, this is wonderful! You have realized unsurpassed knowledge,


³¹ Kern and Nanjio, eds., Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, 55.13-14.
And considering the skillful strategies, you are following the training of the [other] Leaders of the world!  

The context of this verse is particularly interesting. Śākyamuni, as is well known, explains how he and all other buddhas use their skillful strategies by teaching multiple vehicles, even though there is only one true vehicle by which everyone is invariably guided to awakening. In so doing, he recounts to Śāriputra an abbreviated version of his own awakening—his enlightenment under a tree, his hesitation to teach ordinary beings the Dharma, the plea by the gods, and so on. It is immediately after this where we encounter the verse with anuttaraṃ jñānam, so there can be little question that the other buddhas are applauding Śākyamuni’s awakened state of knowledge.

A later verse from the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka is even clearer. In a foregone age, we are told, gods descend from the Mahābrāhma realm, present their vimāna vehicles as gifts, and exclaim:

\[
diṣṭyā kṣemeṇa prāpto 'si buddhajñānam anuttaram / vayaṃ te anumodāmo lokaścaiva sadevakaḥ /\]

Magnificent! You have securely attained the unsurpassed knowledge of a buddha! We, as well as the world with its gods, are delighted with you!

The buddha being addressed here is not Śākyamuni, but Mahābhijñājñānābhibhū. His “unsurpassed knowledge” is quite clearly qualified as that of a buddha. Evidently it is a state of knowledge that Mahābhijñājñānābhibhū acquired when he reached awakening, or perhaps the very cause of that awakening.

---

32 Cf. H. Kern, trans., The Lotus Sutra, 45.

33 I refer to this episode in chapter II. See p. 20.

34 Kern and Nanjio, eds., Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, 177.10-11.

35 Cf. H. Kern, trans., The Lotus Sutra, 121.
A third and final example from the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka is similarly revealing. Not insignificantly, our last example comes from the fourth chapter, entitled Adhimukti—“Disposition” or “Inclination” or “Propensity.” The disciples from the audience of the Buddha’s teaching compare themselves via parable to a poor, lost son. They are the son who was not ready to hear the truth about his wealth and heritage; that is, until he worked various menial jobs over the course of two full decades. In verse forty-four, Mahākāśyapa speaks for the disciples when he tells the Buddha:

\[
\text{suniḥspṛhā sma vaya dīrgharātraṃ baudhasya jñānasya anuttarasya /}
\text{pranidhānam asmāka na jātu tatra iyam parā niṣṭha jinena uktā /}
\]

For a long time we have not longed for the unsurpassed knowledge related to a buddha [or: unsurpassed Buddhist knowledge];
We have never had the resolution for it. This final conclusion was spoken by the Conqueror.

It is these disciples who, according to the verses from the same section, have an “inferior disposition” (hīnādhimuktīva), and whose “knowledge does not extend beyond conceiving an individual extinction” (pratyātmiko nirvṛti kalpayāma etāvatā jñānam idaṃ na bhūyaḥ). By contrast, there are the many bodhisattvas who have already knowingly “set out to the ultimate, most excellent awakening” (prasthitā uttamam agrabodhim) on the “unsurpassed path” (anuttaram mārga) to “become buddhas” (bhaveyu buddhāḥ), and who have already “received the prediction” (vyākriyante) that they “will become buddhas in this world” (bhaviṣyathā buddha imasmi loke). It is the latter individuals, those with a superior spiritual disposition or inclination or propensity, who intentionally long for the “unsurpassed knowledge related to a

36 See Yenshu Kurumiya, “Adhimukti in the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra,” in Indological and Buddhist Studies, 337-351.

37 Kern and Nanjio, eds., Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, 117.5-6.

38 For the entire verse section, see ibid., 110.12-120.8 (and cf. H. Kern, trans., The Lotus Sutra, 81-86).
buddha.” Of course this all needs to be put into the context of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka’s famous doctrine of ekāyāna or the OneVehicle—the disciples of mean disposition are unwitting bodhisattvas too, and thus have an indirect claim to the “unsurpassed knowledge” characteristic of buddhahood. But this scarcely changes the fact that this Sūtra purposefully juxtaposes an “individual extinction” against the “unsurpassed knowledge” to which the superior vehicle leads.

This is an admittedly small sample size of anuttarajñāna or related forms from Mahāyāna Sūtras; I hope I or others will find more. But the sample is also telling. In every example, “unsurpassed knowledge” either refers directly to awakening or is used to describe the awakened state. And the Kāśyapaparivarta, apparently without hesitation, swaps locative forms of uttarā/anuttarā samyaksambodhi and anuttara jñāna. In my eyes we can therefore accept Schopen’s and his predecessors’ hypothesis and attribute the yad atra puṇyaṃ epigraphic formula to Mahāyāna donors, not because of merit “transfer” per se—the “red herring,” as Harrison calls it—and not because of its reference to all beings, but because it consigns the merit resulting from the gift to a Mahāyāna goal. (And thus when we are missing the last element of the epigraphic formula, anuttarajñānāvāptaye, caution is warranted before associating such an inscription with Mahāyāna.39) As I stated in chapter II, the goal of awakening is one of the many things Mahāyāna inherited from the Buddhist thought that preceded it, and the idea of awakening has continued to exert influence on Buddhisms of every stripe and color up to the present day. Thus it is not surprising that anuttarañāṇa can be found in late Pāli texts, like the Papañcasūdanī-purāṇa-tīkā and Paramatthavinicchaya, referring to the

39 Again see Schopen, “Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism,” in Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks, 53, n. 88.
“unsurpassed knowledge” of the Buddha or an arahat. But the degree of emphasis on reaching buddhahood comes to be something of a soteriological obsession in Mahāyāna texts and, as I think is the case here, inscriptions. Although seeking awakening may have been an option for non-Mahāyāna Buddhists, it was very much standard for Mahāyāna. In the pithy words of Boucher, “the bodhisattva path seems to have functioned as a pan-Buddhist option: rare in Mainstream circles, generic in Mahāyāna groups.” What I propose we have with our epigraphical formula is a generic Mahāyāna aspiration to reach awakening.

Schopen runs into problems in his assertion that śākyabhikṣu/-bhikṣunīs and paramopāsakas/-opāsikās are, respectively, monastic and lay Mahāyānists. He points to correlations between these monastic and lay titles, the yad atra punyam formula, and words for Mahāyāna in the inscriptions. Of the forty-eight records to which Schopen had access that contain both the yad atra punyam formula and a religious title for the donor, thirty-four have the monastic title śākyabhikṣu or śākyabhikṣunī, and ten have the lay title paramopāsaka or

---


41 Silk may have overcomplicated the picture in “What, if Anything, is Mahāyāna Buddhism?” with his call for a polythetic definition and classification of Mahāyāna, especially with regard to Mahāyāna Sūtras, where a polythetic class “possesses a large (but unspecified) number of features or characteristics which are considered relevant for membership in that class.” It may prove true that “(t)here is no set of features necessary and sufficient for inclusion in the class” of Mahāyāna Buddhism, but not all features are equal. In Mahāyāna Sūtras, the bodhisattva path to awakening dominates the landscape, even if the Sūtras disagree on what makes up that path and who gets to travel it. I would also argue that the inconceivably large cosmos operating in Mahāyāna Sūtras becomes absolutely standard very early on, whether it is referred to explicitly or becomes part of the assumed setting. (The apparent single world system in which the Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra takes place is one of many factors suggesting its early date—see Nattier, A Few Good Men, 187-188.)

42 Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna, 77.
In addition, Schopen lists thirteen non-fragmentary inscriptions that refer to Mahāyāna by name. Eleven of these thirteen explicitly state that the donor was a Mahāyānist, using the terms mahāyānika, mahāyānānyāyin, etc., and twelve of the thirteen are joined by either the donative title sākyabhiṣṭu/-bhikṣuṇī or paramopāsaka/-opāsikā. Even with a small sample size, these are impressive correlations. And I should mention that out of curiosity I checked to see whether these correlations would hold considering the inscriptions that have come to light in the last few decades, essentially repeating Schopen’s methods with a larger corpus of materials. They do: the percentages are more or less the same as in Schopen’s original paper. (In reality, I produced a range of percentages. I paid close attention to the lacunae of fragmentary inscriptions and took into account when an illegible portion of an inscription might or might not contain the title sākyabhiṣṭu/-bhikṣuṇī or paramopāsaka/-opāsikā. I also examined the physical spacing of the inscriptions to determine when our donative formula may have been partially clipped or omitted entirely simply because the scribe did not have enough room.) So where does the problem lie?

Schopen relegates some critical information to a footnote. There are several non-fragmentary inscriptions that include the donative title sākyabhiṣṭu or paramopāsaka, but not the yad atra puṇyaṃ formula. By his count, twelve of the forty-five non-fragmentary inscriptions donated by a sākyabhiṣṭu/-bhikṣuṇī do not have our formula; eight of the eighteen non-fragmentary inscriptions donated by a paramopāsaka/-opāsikā do not have the formula either. To his count, I can add several other donative inscriptions made by one of these two

43 I will, whenever possible, avoid using percentages. The fear is that percentages may be cited elsewhere without the context of the relatively small sample size, thereby giving false notions of large numbers. Seventy-five percent, for instance, sounds much more impressive than three out of four.

44 This is “Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions,” 242, n. 24. Unless stated otherwise, all citations to Schopen in this section refer to this note.
groups of people that also do not end with the \textit{yad atra punya\textemdash} formula. Here are a few such inscriptions roughly arranged in chronological order, chosen because they appear to be completely or almost completely intact, meaning that even the inscriptions with illegible parts could not have contained our formula in the epigraphic space allotted:

- An inscription on a fragmented sculpture of a Buddha refers to a \textit{s\=akyabhik\=su} (and reverend = \textit{bhadanta}) named Suv\=ira. The inscription hails from Kasi\=a, Madhya Pradesh, and dates to the 5\textsuperscript{th} century CE.\footnote{J. Ph. Vogel, “Excavations at Kasia,” in \textit{Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India} 1906–07 (Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, 1909), 62 (inscription no. 2) (= Tsukamoto, Kasi\=a 2; see below for a brief description of how I list inscriptions from Tsukamoto’s catalog).}

- There are identical inscriptions on the bases of two separate standing Buddha images from S\=arn\=ath that date to 476/477 CE. The two inscriptions record the gift of the images by a \textit{s\=akyabhik\=su} named Abhayamitra. Compared to the other inscriptions under discussion, they end in a rather idiosyncratic way:

  \begin{verbatim}
  yad atra punya\textemdash pratim\=ani k\=arayitv\=a may\=a bh\=\=rtam / m\=\=at\=apit\textit{tor} gur\=\=an\=\=am ca lokasya ca \\ sam\=\=aptaye //
  \end{verbatim}

  [May] the merit I have acquired by having an image made [be] for the attainment of the tranquility of my parents, teachers, and the world.\footnote{H. Hargreaves, “Excavations at S\=arn\=ath,” in \textit{Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India} 1914–15, ed. J. Marshall (Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, 1920), 124-125 (inscriptions 16 and 17) and plates 69 o,p (= Tsukamoto, S\=arn\=ath 200 and 201).}

Schopen is right to observe that the inclusion of these two records in this corpus of inscriptions is open to judgment.\footnote{“Mah\=\=ay\=\=a in Indian Inscriptions,” 229.} He ends up including them in the group of \textit{s\=akyabhik\=su} inscriptions with our formula.\footnote{Ibid., 232.} However, until \textit{\=sa\=ma}\footnote{\textsuperscript{49}} can be tied to Mah\=\=ay\=\=a in the way...
that anuttarajñāna can, this is unwise. As far as I know, there are no other inscriptions that use śama in this way. One should note that this inscription is in verse, so śama may have been used only for metrical reasons.

- An inscription painted on the first left pillar of Ajanṭā’s cave 9 almost certainly records the gift of an image that is now lost. It refers to a śākyabhikṣu (and reverend) whose name in the inscription is no longer legible. This and the other Ajanṭā inscriptions listed here date to around the late 5th century.

- Another inscription painted on the first left pillar of Ajanṭā’s cave 9 records the gift of a painted standing Buddha image. The gift was made by a śākyabhikṣu whose name has been lost.

- An inscription painted on the fourth left pillar of Ajanṭā’s cave 9 records the gift of a painted standing bodhisattva image. The gift was made by a śākyabhikṣu (and reverend) whose name probably ends in –sena.

---

49 At Ibid., 229, Schopen translates śama as “cure,” which seems off the mark when applied to the whole world. John Rosenfield renders śama as “final emancipation” at “On the Dated Carvings of Sārnāth,” Artibus Asiae 26.1 (1963): 11. The implied sense of śama may indeed be “final emancipation,” but I find this translation to be overwrought.


52 Ibid., 89 (inscription 5) and plate Ilb (= Tsukamoto, Ajanṭā 19). According to Cohen, “Ajanṭa’s inscriptions,” 291 (inscription 32), the image may represent Maitreya, as the figure holds a water bottle in his left hand and has an antelope skin draped over his left shoulder.
• An inscription painted on the third right pillar of Ajaṇṭā’s cave 9 records some gift, most likely an image. It refers to a śākyabhikṣu whose name is no longer legible.53

• An inscription painted on the ninth left pillar of Ajaṇṭā’s cave 10 records the gift of a painted standing Buddha image. The gift was made by a śākyabhikṣu (who also has the title reverend and probably teacher = bhadaṃta-[ācāryya]). The donor’s name is mostly lost but probably begins with Śa-.54

• An inscription painted on the fifth right pillar of Ajaṇṭā’s cave 10 records the gift of a painted standing Buddha image. It refers to a śākyabhikṣu (and reverend) named Droṇavarman.55

• In a 6th century copperplate grant from Valabhī, Gujarāt, the Maitraka king Guhasena is called a paramopāsaka. (Interestingly, Guhasena is called a paramamāheśvara in a grant preceding this one, suggesting that he was a Śaivite convert to Buddhism.) The grant bequeaths revenue, probably from a local village, to the community of noble monks (or noble community of monks = āryyabhikṣusaṅgha) from the eighteen Nikāyas that comes from many places (nānādigabhyāgaṭāṭḍaśanikāyaḥbhyaṃtara-).56

• An inscription on the base of a small stone relief records the gift of a śākyabhikṣunī. The inscription ends with the word śraṇamataḥ (From a place called Śraṇama? A mistake for


54 Ibid., 91 (inscription 3) (= Tsukamoto, Ajanță 32).

55 Ibid., 93-94 (inscription 16) and plate Vid (= Tsukamoto, Ajanță 45).

56 G. Bühler, “Grants from Valabhi,” Indian Antiquary 5 (1876): 206-207 and plate (inscription B) (= Tsukamoto, Walâ 6). There is a small disagreement as to the date of this grant because of various readings of the second numeral of the year—the year is read as 248, 258, and 268 (of the Gupta era), corresponding to 568–69, 578–79, and 588–89 CE, respectively.
śramaṇā or śramaṇi?). The image comes from Kurkihar and is identified as a goddess.

Although there is no plate of the image or rubbing of the inscription provided, the inscription is compared to another record from the late 7th century, which may be slightly early based on other finds from Kurkihar.57

- An inscription on the base of an ornate bronze Buddha names two donors. The first is named Saṃkaraseṇa, who is called a great lord of treasures (mahāgaṃjampati) and a paramopāsaka. The second donor, named Devaśrī, is referred to as being very devout (mahāśraddhā) and is called a princess (rājaduhītī) and evidently a paramopāsikī (the instrumental looks to be paramopāsikyā, but Tsukamoto has the reading paramopāsikayā). The image comes from Kashmir and dates to around the 8th century.58

- A ca. 8th century copperplate grant from Neulpur, Orissa records the gift of two villages to a hundred brahmans. The gift was made by a ruler (mahārāja) named Śubhākaradeva, who is referred to as a paramasaugata, a supreme devotee of the Sugata. The donor’s father, Śivakaradeva, is called a paramatāthāgato, a supreme devotee of the Tathāgata, and his grandfather, Kṣemaṅkaradeva, is called a paramopāsaka.59 Admittedly, this inscription may mean very little, since it is not the donor who is called a paramopāsaka.

- An inscription on the pedestal of a Buddha image refers to a merchant (= vanika) named Haridatta as a paramopāsaka. But the reference is to the father of the donor, not the donor

57 M.A. Stein, “Notes on an Archaeological Tour in South Bihār and Hazāribāgh,” Indian Antiquary 30 (1901): 86. I owe this reference to Gregory Schopen, personal communication. On Kurkihar, see n. 90 below.


himself (whose name begins with Pa[la?] but is otherwise illegible), so this inscription also may not have any bearing on the present discussion. The image comes from Gumeriya, Bihar, or rather was found in an early 20th century shrine in Gumeriya, and dates to the 9th century.  

- An inscription on a copper plate, which was possibly fixed at the bottom of a Buddha image that served as the gift, calls a certain queen named Candalladevi a paramopāsika (read: paramopāsikā). The inscription comes from Kara, Uttar Pradesh, and dates to the 9th century or later.

- An inscription on a bronze Buddha image refers to a śākyabhikṣu (and elder = stha, short for sthavira) named Guṇadatta. The image comes from Jhewāri in the Chittagong district of Bengal (now Bangladesh), and the inscription dates to the 9th or 10th century.

- An inscription on the base of a fragmentary sculpture of what Sahni identifies as a triad of deities refers to a [para]mopāsaka. The inscription is not complete; we only have the genitive ending of the donor’s name (-sya), a word indicating that the donor was somebody’s son (-suta-), and a reference to an accountant or record-keeper (akṣapatalika-śrī), possibly the donor’s father. I believe Schopen includes this as one of three

---


62 This abbreviation is attested elsewhere in inscriptions from the same general region and time period as this one, like in Tsukamoto, Hilsā 3 and Kurkihar 6, 32, and 79.


64 See Sircar, Indian Epigraphical Glossary, s.v. Akṣapatalika.
fragmentary paramopāsaka inscriptions for which the presence of the yad atra puṇyaṃ formula could not be determined, but he does not enumerate these three inscriptions so I cannot be sure. However, there does not appear to be enough room in the illegible portions of the inscription to fit the formula, and I think the inscription must end with the donor’s name in the genitive case. The image is kept at Sārnāth but its provenance is unknown, and it dates to around the 11th century.65

This group of inscriptions, whatever its final tally might be, does not make up an insignificant percentage of our totals—inscriptions without the yad atra puṇyaṃ formula make up about a third or slightly more of the extant, non-fragmentary śākyabhikṣu/-bhikṣunī inscriptions, and those without the formula about half of the surviving, non-fragmentary paramopāsaka/-opāsikā inscriptions (these proportions are both higher than Schopen’s estimates). It would thus be ill advised to treat them as statistical outliers. But Schopen explains that we should not be surprised by such records: “It is perfectly legitimate to assume that the intention of some inscriptions was simply to record the donor’s name. The formula ‘transferring the merit,’ while probably encouraged, would undoubtedly have been optional.”66 The real assumption, however, which undoubtedly is not perfectly legitimate, is that if donors had happened to write longer inscriptions and expressed their spiritual intentions, they would have used what

65 D.R. Sahni, Catalogue of the Museum of Archaeology at Sārnāth (1914; repr., Delhi: Indological Book House, 1972), 138 (inscription B(e)10) (= Tsukamoto, Sārnāth 54). There is an earlier paramopāsaka inscription from Sārnāth that also does not contain our formula. I am almost certain that Schopen mistakenly lists it as Sā i D(a) 18 when he meant Sā i D(a) 16 (= Tsukamoto, Sārnāth 81).

66 Immediately after this Schopen states the following: “What is much more significant is that while these titles are occasionally found without our formula, they are never found with any of the other formulas or phrases that formally state the intention of the donors . . . [e.g., sarvavadhikaprahānārtham, mātāpitaram udiśyā, savalokahitasukhāya, etc.].” By “other formulas or phrases” he means, I think, non-Mahāyāna epigraphic formulas. But see, e.g., Tsukamoto, Ajanta 39, 40, 41, and Sārnāth 204; Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 287 (inscription 22 = Tsukamoto, Ajanta 14, but with a fuller reading) and 330 (inscriptions 88 and 89, neither in Tsukamoto).
Schopen understands (as I do) to be a Mahāyāna donative formula. That is, because śākyabhikṣus and paramopāsakas are epigraphically correlated with the term Mahāyāna and a certain type of formula, Schopen assumes that all śākyabhikṣus/-bhikṣunīs and paramopāsakas/-opāsikās appearing in the inscriptive record must be Mahāyānists.

But even if this set of inscriptions without the yad atra puṇyaṃ formula did not exist, Schopen’s argument on this point still suffers from a flaw, in my view a fatal one. What he has essentially done is place categories of epigraphic data—monastic and lay titles, words for Mahāyāna, and/or a donative formula—side by side and take it as self-evident that they are causally linked. This will not do. Correlations are not arguments that stand on their own; they are merely interesting statistical observations. That correlation is not tantamount to causation is a sound principle that could and should be applied here. What we need is an argument that causally ties these sets of data together, that explains why there is something inherently Mahāyānist to the terms śākyabhikṣu or paramopāsaka, but to date neither Schopen nor anyone else has provided one.

We should also consider as a sort of null hypothesis that the association between Mahāyāna and these donative titles is mere happenstance. To prove that statistical correlations are causal, one must at the very least show that those correlations are not coincidental. For this set of inscriptions, it could easily be the case that the connection between Mahāyāna and our Indian śākyabhikṣus and paramopāsakas is a coincidence of place and time. In Morrisey’s aforementioned “Indian Mahāyāna Inscriptions” appendix, he lists 109 inscriptions from the 5th and 6th centuries. Over half of these come from the Deccan, and
well over a third come from a single site: Ajaṇṭā. Aside from the numerous *yat atra punyaṁ* inscriptions at Ajaṇṭā, it is clear, mostly from art-historical evidence, that Mahāyāna had some presence at this site. The sculpted figures flanking the many Buddha images that were made during Ajaṇṭā’s second wave of activity—including the “original” or “programmatic” Buddha images in the main shrines and the “intrusive” ones carved all over the walls of the caves—are commonly identified as Mahāyāna bodhisattvas, as are many paintings, including those beside the doorframes of some of the shrine antechambers as well as the autonomous figures present in several caves. One could plausibly deny that all of these are Mahāyāna bodhisattva images (or that the painted images in caves 9 and 10 that are generally identified as Maitreya were of Mahāyāna inspiration). But what cannot be refuted is that the scene with a central figure

---


68 This is not to say Mahāyāna had a majority presence at Ajaṇṭā. The preponderance of Mainstream paintings, especially Jātakas and life stories of the Buddha, led Dieter Schlingloff to conclude that Ajaṇṭā was a “Hīnayāna” site. See Studies in Ajanta Paintings: Identifications and Interpretations (New Delhi: Ajanta Publications, 1988), 175. For identifications of the many paintings at Ajaṇṭā, see Schlingloff, Guide to the Ajanta Paintings, Vol. 1: Narrative Wall Paintings (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1999), and Monika Zin, Guide to the Ajanta Paintings, Vol. 2: Devotional and Ornamental Paintings (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 2003).

69 The 5th/6th history of Ajaṇṭā—including its excavation, artwork, patronage, and monastic occupation, as well as the social and political climate impacting all of the above—has spurred much debate among scholars. Among many works, see: M.K. Dhavalikar, “The Beginnings of Mahayana Architecture at Ajanta,” in Madhu: Recent Researches in Indian Archaeology and Art History, ed. M. S. Nagaraja Rao (Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan, 1981), 133-138; Karl Khandalavala, “The Chronology of Caves 16, 17, 19, 26, 1 and 2 at Ajanta and the Ghatotkacha Cave,” in The Art of Ajanta: New Perspectives, Vol. 1, ed. Ratan Parimoo et al. (New Delhi: Books & Books, 1991), 105-129; Richard S. Cohen, “Setting the Three Jewels: The Complex Culture of Buddhism at the Ajaṇṭā Caves,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1995; Richard S. Cohen, “Problems in the Writing of Ajanṭā’s History: The Epigraphic Evidence,” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 40 (1997): 125-148; Walter M. Spink, Ajanṭa: History and Development, 6 volumes (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Vol. 18.1-6) (Leiden: Brill, 2005–2014). Spink in particular has had a disproportionate influence on Ajaṇṭā scholarship. (And based on my observations, on the site itself: I suspect he had a hand in writing the information provided on the signs placed outside each of the caves.) Although his knowledge about the material evidence at Ajaṇṭā is unsurpassed, Spink freely intermingles this evidence with his own assumptions and weakly supported hypotheses, especially regarding the dating of the inscriptions germane to the site, the historicity of the events in the Daśakumāra-carita (a literary work far removed in time and place from Ajanṭā), and the role of the Vākāṭaka ruler Hariṣeṇa.
surrounded by eight panels, which can be found, either painted or in relief, at caves 2, 4, 6 (upper), 11, 17, 20, and 26, and also at a little niche adjacent to cave 10, betrays a Mahāyāna presence at Ajaṇṭā. Often called the “litany” scene, it depicts the bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara\textsuperscript{70} rescuing human beings from a series of perils, such as shipwreck, fire, and attacks by various wild animals.\textsuperscript{71} This notion of Avalokiteśvara as a savior from mortal danger likely originated with, or was at least connected to, chapter 24 of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra (the samanta-mukhaparivarto nāma-valokiteśvaravikurvaṇanirdeśa), obviously a Mahāyāna text.\textsuperscript{72} And there appears to be an even more direct connection between Ajaṇṭā and this text. Now not one but two paintings have been identified, both convincingly in my eyes, as scenes from the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka. The first is a small painting on a pillar from cave 10, a caityagṛha from the early period of Ajaṇṭā excavation that pre-dates the painting by several centuries. Schopen identifies this painting as the bodhisattva Akṣayatī’s giving a five-string pearl necklace to Avalokiteśvara, while Śākyamuni, seated upon a cushion atop a rectangular block, and with his

\textsuperscript{70} Tārā, herself associated with Avalokiteśvara, also is credited with being the savior—solely or in conjunction with Avalokiteśvara—from the eight perils. References to and possible images of Tārā in this capacity appear to all post-date Ajaṇṭā; as far as I am aware, none of the central figures in the Ajaṇṭā “litany” scenes is female.

\textsuperscript{71} Note that the cave 11 “litany” is inscribed. Much of the yad atra puṇyam formula is still extant (but not anuttarajñānāvāptaye) in the inscription. See Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 307 (inscription 63) (not in Tsukamoto). What is clearly a Mahāyāna image is accompanied by an inscription that probably had our full formula originally, but it was donated by an upāsaka, not a paramopāsaka.

\textsuperscript{72} The Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra also has a chapter that describes Avalokiteśvara’s protecting the devout from different hazards. It is interesting that the “litany” scenes in the art-historical record usually have eight perils, whereas all the texts that I know of that depict Avalokiteśvara as a savior name or describe far more than eight. I suspect that the fixing of the number of perils at eight actually originated from the imagery, though this certainly would require research to confirm. There is at least one inscription, this dating to the late medieval period, that refers to the eight “great dangers” (mahābhayaṇī), and here the dangers are connected explicitly with Tārīṇī (i.e., Tārā)—see N.G. Majumdar, “Nalanda Inscription of Vipulasrimitra,” Epigraphia Indica 21 (1931–32): 97–101 (= Tsukamoto, Nālandā 9). Cf. J.F. Fleet, “Sanskrit and Old-Canarese Inscriptions,” Indian Antiquary 10 (1881): 185–190 (= Tsukamoto, Ḍambaḷ 1 and 2). See also Debala Mitra, “Ashṭamahābhaya-Tārā,” Journal of the Asiatic Society, Letters and Science 23.1 (1957): 19–22 and plates.
hands positioned in dharmacakrapravartanamudrā and his head encircled with a nimbus, looks upon (or approves of) the gift. The cave 10 painting likely portrays a scene from the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka (also chapter 24) in which Avalokiteśvara, after first refusing to take the gift, accepts the necklace out of compassion for Akṣayamati and other beings, then divides it into two and gives one part to Śākyamuni and the other to the stūpa of the buddha Prabhūtaratna. The other, rather elaborate painting covers most of the back wall along the circumambulatory path of cave 9, which is located immediately next to cave 10 and is also a caityagṛha original to the site. Morrissey identifies this as depictions of several episodes from the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra, including not only another image of Akṣayamati’s offering the pearl necklace, but also Śākyamuni’s delivering his sermon—i.e., the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka itself—to the assembly on Grdhṛakūṭa, the famous parable of the burning house, and Prabhūtaratna’s appearance within his flying stūpa. The final evidence for Mahāyāna at Ajanṭā is epigraphic. The donor of cave 26 was a monk named Buddhabhadra. We know from his donative inscription made on the porch of cave 26 that Buddhabhadra was well connected politically, as he dedicated his act not only to his parents but also to an Aśmaka minister

---

73 Schopen, “The Ambiguity of Avalokiteśvara,” in Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India, 278-298. A reproduction of the painting is on page 279.

74 See Morrissey, “Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy,” 125-137 and 243-251 (figures 26-34). Morrissey also makes a convincing case that the structural stūpa in cave 9 was co-opted by juxtaposing it with the painting of Prabhūtaratna’s stūpa from the visual narratives of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka. If Morrissey’s position is accepted, it is a total game changer. It opens up the possibility that the entire cave was taken over as the object of a full-fledged Mahāyāna Sūtra cult, the sort of cult that until now has been suggested almost entirely by literary evidence. See n. 3 in chapter II.

named Bhavirāja, and judging by the grandeur of cave 26, a caityagrha, we can safely assume that Buddhabhadra was extremely wealthy. He also seems to have been a Mahāyānist. The inscription mentions Tathāgatas, Sugatas, and even Bodhisattvas in the plural, all of which points to a Mahāyāna affiliation; one even suspects that when verse 7 of the inscription speaks of “bodhisattvas who desire comfort for the world and who desire liberation” (bodhisatvair bhavasukhakāmaiś ca mokṣakāmaiś ca), Buddhabhadra was making an oblique reference to himself. And the gift appears to have been made with a Mahāyāna goal in mind, a goal not so different, in fact, from that of the epigraphic formula under discussion in this chapter. Verse 15 states the following: “May the merit here be for the attainment of the fruit of the great awakening and the multitude of all stainless qualities for those worlds” (yat atra puṇyaṃ tat teṣāṃ jagatāṃ ca bhavatv idam / sarvvāmalaguṇavyātamahābodhiphalāptaye //).76

All this proves beyond a reasonable doubt that Mahāyāna had some, if not a substantial, influence on Ajanṭā during its second phase of activity around the late 5th century. Which raises the question of whether the association between śākyabhikṣus and Mahāyāna is not heavily skewed by one relatively well-preserved site. If for whatever reason many śākyabhikṣus happened to have made donations (and probably lived) at Ajanṭā during the 5th or 6th century, might we not expect at least some of them to be Mahāyānists? Might we not expect to find the

76 Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 333-334 (inscription 93) (= Tsukamoto, Ajanṭā 68). Each possible reading of -vyāta- has its problems; I follow Cohen and Chhabra in reading it as -vrāta-. Bühler’s reading of -vyāpta- (through the intermediary -vyatt-) would render the line: “May the merit here be for the attainment of the fruit of the great awakening, which is pervaded by all stainless qualities, for those worlds.”

A case could be made that Upendragupta, a powerful donor at the site, was a Mahāyānist too, though the evidence is not as strong as it is for Buddhabhadra (see Tsukamoto, Ajanṭā 59). In addition, a cave 4 donor named Māthura is referred to as a vihārasvāmin—“owner of the monastery,” meaning he donated the entire cave?—and he used our standard yad atra puṇyaṃ formula (Tsukamoto, Ajanṭā 12), and an individual who at least donated a pavilion or hall (maṇḍapa) at cave 20 probably used our formula and might have been a paramopāsaka (Tsukamoto, Ajanṭā 65), although this last inscription is extremely fragmentary and for that reason is not included in the tables below.
use of our *yad atra punyaṃ* formula here by śākyabhikṣus? Not because śākyabhikṣus and śākyabhikṣuṇīs were by definition Mahāyānists, but simply due to the fact that they lived at a place and time where Mahāyāna had gained a degree of currency.

We must also take into consideration the Pāla dynasty, the rule of which was centered in Bihar and Bengal in northeastern India from the 8th to 12th centuries. Many of the Pāla rulers are known to have patronized Buddhism and to have been Buddhists themselves. It was under their aegis that Nālandā continued to operate and Otantapūri and Vikramaśīla, two other so-called monastic universities where Mahāyāna literature was studied and written, were established.77 The definitive history of Buddhism under the Pālas remains to be written,78 but it seems likely that Mahāyāna Buddhism peaked in India during this time. It was then that so many of the extant Perfection of Wisdom manuscripts, especially of the *Āṣṭasāhasrikā*, were produced.79 It should not be overlooked, then, that almost all of the śākyabhikṣu and *paramopāsaka* inscriptions from the late medieval period—when Buddhism in India was on death’s door—come from areas under Pāla control.80 One is left wondering whether any

---


78 For the time being the following works are useful: R.D. Banerji, *The Pālas of Bengal* (1915; repr., New Delhi: Bhartiya Publishing House, 1973); Susan L. Huntington and John C. Huntington, *Leaves from the Bodhi Tree: The Art of Pāla India (8th–12th centuries) and Its International Legacy* (Seattle: Dayton Art Institute in association with the University of Washington Press, 1990), 75-121; Jhunu Bagchi, *The History and Culture of the Pālas of Bengal and Bihar (Cir. 750 A.D.–Cir. 1200 A.D.)* (New Delhi: Abhinav Publications, 1993); and parts of Ronald M. Davidson, *Indian Esoteric Buddhism: A Social History of the Tantric Movement* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002).

79 See Schopen, “The Mahāyāna and the Middle Period in Indian Buddhism,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 5-6 and the sources cited there. On illustrated manuscripts, now see Kim, *Receptacle of the Sacred*.

80 See Schopen’s timeline at “Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions,” 237-238.
correlation drawn between our donative titles and Mahāyāna in Pāla India is coincidental to the fact that Mahāyāna was popular at that place and time.\textsuperscript{81}

Putting aside the possibility that śākyabhikṣu/-bhikṣuṇīs and paramopāsaka/-opāsikās only appear to be linked to Mahāyāna because of geographical and chronological coincidences, there is a good case militating against an inherent association between these donative titles and Mahāyāna. I agree with Yao-ming Tsai, Lance Cousins, and Richard Cohen that śākyabhikṣus and śākyabhikṣuṇīs were monks and nuns making kinship claims. The claim, of course, is that they belonged to the same clan as Śākyamuni Buddha himself. Either these monks and nuns employed the term śākya as a deliberate attempt to connect themselves to their religious founder, or the epithet śākya literally referred to one’s Indian clan, meaning that śākya-monks and -nuns actually had familial ties to the Buddha’s clan or were making false genetic claims that they did. (We should note in this regard that there are at least five inscriptions that refer to śākyopāsaka/-opāsikās, śākya-lay brother and sister, so some lay persons were evidently making this kinship claim too.\textsuperscript{82}) Tsai points out a passage in the Ekottarāgama that states explicitly that those entering the Buddhist path become members of the Śākya clan, regardless of which clan they were born into biologically.\textsuperscript{83} Cousins draws attention to the Pāli terms

\textsuperscript{81} Cousins brings this up at “Sākiyabhikkhu/Sakyabhikkhu/Śākyabhikṣu,” 17. Regarding Schopen’s response, see n. 90 below.

\textsuperscript{82} Tsukamoto, Kuḍā 8, Mathurā 102, and probably Ajanṭā 11 (which refers to a śākya-uṣaka); two others, which I do not believe are in Tsukamoto’s catalog, are also at Ajanṭā and are described at Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 281 (inscription 13) and 330 (inscription 88); another, also not in Tsukamoto’s catalog, might be from Bihar and is described at Herbert Härtel (with contributions from Ernst Waldschmidt), Indische Skulpturen (Berlin: Museum für Völkerkunde, 1960), 73 and plate 41 (many thanks to Gregory Schopen for informing me about this last inscription).

\textsuperscript{83} Yao-ming Tsai, “Searching for the Origins of Mahāyāna and Moving Toward a Better Understanding of Early Mahāyāna,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, 1997, 110–111. (I owe this reference to Walser, Nāgārjuna in Context, 37.) Tsai also brings up the fact that epithets equivalent to the Skt. śākya
sakyaputta and sakkaputtiya, which occur frequently in the Sutta- and Vinayapiṭaka, where they appear to mean not “son of a Sakyan” or the like, but “member of the Sakya clan.” Cousins argues that phrases like samaṇo sakyaputtiyo evolve into the idea “that Buddhist monks (or some of them) are the dhamma heirs of the Buddha and hence in some sense themselves members of the Sakya clan,” and he further argues that the term śākya is an abridged, Sanskritized equivalent of words like the Pāli sakyaputtiya.

Cohen goes into this idea in the greatest depth. I cannot follow many of his positions. For one, he goes beyond Schopen in presuming that śākyabhikṣus identified as bodhisattvas.

were widely adopted by members of the Saṃgha in East Asia, which I do not consider relevant to the problem at hand unless it can be clearly demonstrated that this practice derived directly from an Indian one.

84 Cousins, “Sākiyabhikkhu/Sakyabhikkhu/Śākyabhikṣu,” 11-14. In a postscript to his original “Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions” paper, Schopen lambasts Cousins for considering Pāli texts and “a mixed bag of ‘Hindu’ texts” pertinent to “how monks in North India chose to identify themselves” in Buddhist inscriptions (Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India, 244-246). Cousins does, in fact, devote the bulk of his rebuttal to Schopen to a dizzying array of texts—Pāli and Sanskrit, secular and religious, Buddhist, Jain, and Hindu—and Schopen is correct to call him out on this.

The relevance of any non-Buddhist text—and this may apply to Pāli Buddhist texts too—to these epigraphic titles is probably impossible to establish. Not only would a hypothetical text have to be located geographically and chronologically to determine that it overlapped with the inscriptions under scrutiny—no small task—but it would also have to be shown that an “outside” author would know enough about Buddhists to tell one Buddhist apart from any other. As far as I know, no non-Buddhist text meets these criteria, which is not entirely surprising considering how seldom Buddhist individuals or even Buddhist ideas appear outside of the tradition’s own literature. For the texts Cousins cites, it is not clear that their authors had any idea what it meant to be called a śākyabhikṣu or a paramopāsaka, in the same way a modern American Christian might not understand the differences between a Reform or Conservative Jew or be able to apply correctly those labels to real people. As Schopen points out, the Āgamaḍambara, a satirical drama written by the Śaivite Jayantabhaṭṭa in the 9th century, refers to Buddhist monks as both śākyabhikṣus and bhikṣus. But it is not possible to ascertain whether Jayantabhaṭṭa uses the terms śākyabhikṣu and bhikṣu synonymously, even if one might consider that unlikely, or, again, whether he would be able to differentiate the two meaningfully. He certainly offers us no evidence that he could. If the Āgamaḍambara is the most germane “outside” text to our discussion, this only underscores the frustratingly opaque nature of the literary evidence.

He also claims that Mahāyānists at Ajaṇṭā patterned themselves after Rāhula, Śakyamuni’s only biological son and heir, and even that they conceptually transformed Rāhula into the bodhisattva *par excellence*, or, as Cohen phrases it, “the paradigmatic Śākysbhikṣu.” With several leaps of logic, Cohen’s argument about Mahāyānists and Rāhula is based primarily on the fact that caves 17, 19, and 26 at Ajaṇṭā have images of Śakyamuni’s return to Kapilavastu and Rāhula’s induction into his father’s Saṃgha that are paired with images of the meeting between the former buddha Dīpaṅkara and the brahman Sumati (or Sumedha/Sumegha, as some traditions call him), the meeting that would famously propel the latter eventually to become Śakyamuni Buddha. Nevertheless, Cohen’s analysis of śākyabhikṣu as a kinship term is

86 Elsewhere, however, Cohen does contest one of Schopen’s conclusions, that the śākyabhikṣu was exclusively a Mahāyāna figure. Cohen reexamines a śākyabhikṣu inscription from cave 22 at Ajaṇṭā. According to his reading, this inscription not only contains the term śākyabhikṣu, but also the word *aparaśaila*, a Mahāsāṃghika subgroup commonly listed as one of the eighteen so-called sects into which Indian Buddhism split. This can only mean, in Cohen’s eyes, that the donor whose gift the inscription records was both a Mahāyānist and had been ordained into a Mainstream Nikāya. See his “Discontented Categories: Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna in Indian Buddhist History,” *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 63.1 (1995): 1-25, esp. 10-13. Although almost everyone is now in agreement that Mahāyāna and Mainstream Nikāyas were not institutionally exclusive entities, there appear to be serious problems with Cohen’s evidence. What is obviously lacking from his paper is an actual rubbing or image of the cave 22’s inscription. In this regard we are again fortunate to have Morrissey’s dissertation, which offers a photo, as well as previously published reproductions, of the inscription. See Morrissey, “Śākyabhikṣus, palmsests and the art of apostasy,” 226 (figures 9A-C). The photo clearly shows that where Cohen purports to have read *aparaśaila* in the inscription, only the first vowel “ə” (of the akṣara “ma”) and the medial “ai”-mātrā are now visible. (In passing, this also rules out one of the inscriptions listed by Schopen as including a reference to Mahāyāna.) It seems unlikely that the inscription degraded heavily in the short time between Cohen’s paper and Morrissey’s photo, casting serious doubt on the source of Cohen’s argument. Morrissey, ibid., 69-71 surely offers the most probable reading of the inscription as the beginning of the śākyabhikṣu donor’s name in the genitive case.

87 Quote from Cohen, “Kinsmen of the Son,” 22. At ibid., 7, n. 13, Cohen makes a big deal about the fact that Vasumitra is called a śākyabhikṣu in the introductory verses of the *Samayabhedoparacakra*, which survives only in translation. The epithet śākyabhikṣu appears in the Tibetan translation and two later Chinese translations, but not in the first Chinese translation from ca. 400 CE. Cohen is probably correct that Vasumitra, who is attributed as one of the authors of the famous *Mahāvibhāṣa*, was “Mahāyānized” at some point after this first Chinese translation, as the same translations of the preface to the *Samayabhedoparacakra* also call him a bodhisattva. But Cohen wants to equate śākyabhikṣu with Mahāyānist and therefore commits the same category mistake as Schopen. Both make śākyabhikṣu coterminous with the category Mahāyāna monk.
extremely helpful. He contextualizes Buddhist notions of kinship within Indian Dharmaśāstric law, which charged adopted sons with carrying out the religious duties of their new families—primarily funeral duties, in this case—meaning that the adopted were legally and socially located as kin through their religious behavior. And with numerous literary examples Cohen is able to demonstrate that there are many Buddhist precedents for spiritual kinship. Cohen also discusses an important scene from the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya, a text that circulated in North India at the same time as our inscriptions and that seems to have inspired several paintings at Ajañṭā. In this pericope the Buddha is made to tell Udāyin, who had been sent to bring the Buddha home but who is instead persuaded to become a monk, to declare to others from Kapilavastu that he is a śākyabhikṣu. What appears to make Udāyin a śākyabhikṣu here has nothing to do with the sort of doctrines he follows or the kind of Buddhism he practices, but the mere fact that he has become a monk and happens to be from the Śākya clan.

Like Udāyin in the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya, śākyabhikṣus/-bhikṣunīs, at Ajañṭā and elsewhere, seem to have included themselves among the ranks of Śākyamuni’s clan. Now it is indeed possible that śākyabhikṣus and śākya bhikṣunīs made up a closed group of Indian monks and nuns, since these terms occur, as Schopen underscores, during the same periods and even in the same places that the titles bhikṣu/bhikṣunī can be found in inscriptions. But until new

---

88 For a summary of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya at Ajañṭā, see Vidya Dehejia, Discourse in Early Buddhist Art: Visual Narratives of India (1997; repr., New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 2005), 210-211.

89 This passage is discussed at Cohen, “Kinsmen of the Son,” 9-10, and can be found at Raniero Gnoli, ed., The Gilgit Manuscript of the Śayanāsanavastu and the Adhikaraṇavastu, Being the 15th and 16th Sections of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin (Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1978), 3.

90 In the postscript to his original paper at Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India, 245-246, Schopen specifically brings up the Kurkihar hoard of images from the Pāla era, most of which are Buddhist. From A. Banerji-Sastri, “Ninety-Three Inscriptions on the Kurkihar Bronzes,” Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society 26.3 (1940): 236-251, we can be sure that at least nine (but probably ten)
of the inscriptions on the images record the gifts of monastic donors. Of these nine inscriptions, three were made by bhikṣus (Banerji-Sastri, nos. 1, 23, 90, with 23 and 90 likely coming from the same donor, Virjavaran), five by sthaviras (nos. 6, 18, 31, 32, and 91, with 6, 31, and 32 probably coming from the same pair of donors, Buddhavarman and Dharmavarman), and the other by a monk who is called both a sākyabhikṣu and sthavira (no. 51). Another inscription was made by a student of a sthavira (no. 52) and has the compound acāryopādhyāyasahitām, so this was almost certainly made by some kind of monk too, though it is possible that he had left the order by the time he donated the image. Schopen misrepresents this epigraphic data slightly, but his overall point is important: of these inscriptions, only the sākyabhikṣu one has a reference to Mahāyāna and uses the yad atra punyam formula.

As opposed to adding a footnote to the next paragraph, I will mention here that the titles upāsaka and paramopāsaka are both present in the Kurkihar data as well. There are six Kurkihar images donated by Buddhist lay persons—three by upāsakas (Banerji-Sastri, nos. 20, 22, and 56, with 20 and 56 probably coming from the same donor, Duva) and three by paramopāsakas (nos. 5, 53, and 83). (Note that nos. 20 and 56 have usaki and no. 22 has upāsaki instead of a masculine upāsaka; no. 53 has paramopāsaki instead of paramopāsaka; and no. 83 has paramopāsaka for a female donor.) Among these inscriptions, Mahāyāna is referred to only in one of the paramopāsaka inscriptions (no. 5).

In no way, however, does this small set of inscriptions eliminate the need for caution when dealing with the Pāla era—during which, as I remarked above, Mahāyāna seems to have flourished—much less warrant the conclusion that by definition sākyabhikṣu = Mahāyāna monk and bhikṣu = Mainstream monk or the conclusion that paramopāsaka = Mahāyāna lay person and upāsaka = Mainstream lay person.

The Kurkihar monastic site is in need of thorough study. Alexander Cunningham may have been correct in identifying Kurkihar with the Kukkutaṇḍa-giri mentioned by Faxian and Xuanzang, where Kāśyapa is said to have attained nirvāṇa and been miraculously encased by three mountain peaks. See Cunningham, Report of a Tour in Bihar and Bengal in 1879–1880 from Patna to Sunargaon (Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. XV) (1882; repr., Varanasi: Indological Book House, 1969), 4-5. This could explain its popularity in the Pāla era; at least 150 fine images and dozens of other metallic objects were donated at Kurkihar, and we know that the donors traveled from far and wide, especially from Kāñci in southern India, to give these gifts. For the places mentioned in the Kurkihar inscriptions, see A. Banerji-Sastri, “Kurkihar Bronze Inscriptions,” Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society 26.4 (1940): 306. (But K.P. Jayaswal, “Metal Images of Kurkihar Monastery,” Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art 2 (1934): 71 is incorrect in identifying a donor as having come from Bali. Jayaswal misreads balika for vanika, “merchant.” See Banerji-Sastri, no. 21.)

I have tried without any luck to match up all the inscriptions mentioned in this note with the images on which they were written. But predictably, Banerji-Sastri, “Ninety-Three Inscriptions on the Kurkihar Bronzes” has no image plates and does not give the catalog or accession numbers from the Patna Museum where the images are housed. And conversely, the works I have consulted on the Kurkihar images provide little to no information about the inscriptions. The one museum catalog to which I had access has information for only a couple of the inscriptions. See Patna Museum, Guide to the Patna Museum (Stone Sculptures, Bronzes, and Terracottas) (Patna : Superintendent, Government Printing, 1955), 38-40. I am curious how many images from the Kurkihar trove can be clearly identified as Mahāyāna figures and, if those images have extant inscriptions, whether their donors used the yad atra punyam formula or held any of the titles under scrutiny. Besides several seated and standing Buddha images and some figures of Hindu deities (and the latter were probably used by Buddhists—see Frederick M. Asher, The Art of Eastern India, 300–800 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1980), 84), art historians have identified forms of Avalokiteśvara, Tārā, Mañjuśrī, Vajrapāṇi, and Prājñāpāramitā in the Kurkihar collection of images. See especially Jayaswal, “Metal Images of Kurkihar Monastery”; Bimal Bandhyopadhyay, Metal Sculptures of Eastern India (Delhi: Sundeep Prakashan, 1981), 26ff., 92-98, 121-134, and 143-145; Susan L. Huntington, The “Pāla-Sena” Schools of Sculpture (Studies in...
evidence emerges, that this potentially closed group can be equated with Mahāyāna must be treated as little more than wishful thinking. Mahāyāna Buddhists’ relating themselves, figuratively or perhaps literally, to their religious founder does not preclude the possibility that non-Mahāyānists were as well, and now that I have brought a footnote from Schopen’s paper out of the shadows, as it were, this looks very much to have been the case.

With regard to the titles paramopāsaka and paramopāsikā, I should start by saying that I am not at all sure what their referents are. Certainly they must be karmadhāraya compounds, meaning something like “supreme lay brother/sister,” but that does not get us very far. There are what look like parallel terms in the epigraphic record—paramabhāgavata, paramatāthāgata, paramavaisṇava, paramadaivata, and so on—about which Cousins concludes “indicate either personal affiliation of the individual or a familial to an iṣṭa-devatā or something similar.”91 But the title paramopāsaka/-opāsikā does not follow the same pattern because upāsaka/upāsikā is a lay status, not a deity or the like with which an individual, family, or lineage of rulers would be affiliated. One epigraphic title that looks similar to paramopāsaka/-opāsikā is paramabrahmaṇya. But Sircar defines the latter as certain rulers who were “highly devoted to the Brāhmaṇas.”92 If he is correct and paramabrahmaṇya does not mean “an important brahman” or some such thing, then we are not any closer to understanding what paramopāsaka/-opāsikā means. Paul Harrison defines paramopāsaka as “supreme lay practitioner” and suggests it refers “to the


92 Indian Epigraphical Glossary, s.v.
king, the local ruler or some other dignitary of high status.” Although it may signify an individual of some important standing, it is doubtful it refers to a king or even a local ruler. Indian rulers had many characteristics, but modesty was not one of them; we can be almost certain that if a donor had a formal political title, he or she would have told us this in an inscription, rather than hide his or her status behind a weaker title like paramopāsaka/-opāsikā. (Indeed, it is much more likely that someone would lie in an inscription and claim a title he or she did not actually have.) This, of course, does not rule out the possibility of an individual’s having a political title in addition to being called a paramopāsaka/-opāsikā, which does occur in rare cases. Harrison’s other proposition is more interesting. Because “the term [paramopāsaka/-opāsikā] magnifies the donors, not the object of their devotion,” he suggests it means something akin to the highfalutin labels we attach to generous donors nowadays: “platinum level,” “diamond circle,” etc. Interesting as his suggestion is, it will have to remain as such until this whole class of parama-titles receives fuller study.

For the time being I am not so much interested in what paramopāsaka/-opāsikā means as its relationship to Mahāyāna. Here I believe the same logic I applied to śākyabhikṣu/-bhikṣunī holds for the title paramopāsaka/-opāsikā. The data make clear, especially in the Pāla era, that many lay persons aligned themselves with Mahāyāna and carried the adjective “supreme” as

---


94 The Maitraka king Guhasena, for example, is called both a paramopāsaka and a mahārāja. See Bühler, “Grants from Valabhi,” 207 (= Tsukamoto, Waḷā 6). But Duḍḍā, another donor from the extended Maitraka family, is called only a pāramopāsikā: she was of royal blood but not a ruler. See Bühler, “A Grant of King Dhruvasena I of Valabhi,” Indian Antiquary 4 (1875): 104-107 (= Tsukamoto, Walā 1).

95 “Early Mahāyāna Buddhism,” 8, n. 21.
part of their religious epithets. But this does not rule out other donors’ self-identifying as “supreme” lay brothers or lay sisters—whatever that might signify—and, again, the epigraphic data hidden in Schopen’s footnote would support this.

The best argument against causally linking śākyabhikṣus/-bhikṣunīs and paramopāsakas/-opāsikās with Mahāyāna, I am afraid, comes from silence. As far as I am aware, nowhere in Mahāyāna texts, nor in Mainstream Buddhist texts for that matter, are these terms used as formal titles, much less to mark exclusive groups within the Saṃgha. It strikes me as more than a little odd that a formal distinction marking a certain kind of monk or lay person would never find its way as such into a Buddhist text. Schopen, in his caustic rebuttal to Cousins, correctly asserts that Buddhist textual and inscriptive sources often contradict each other. However, incongruence between literary and epigraphical data seems to be a direct result of Buddhist texts’ offering an abstracted, idealized presentation of religious life. That Buddhist monks would not be wealthy, would not have sex or children, or would be highly involved in contemplating and formulating abstract doctrines, for instance, are the types of value-laden notions likely to have been crafted by monastic, male authors who were heavily invested in their propagation. But it is extremely unlikely that the stakes for formal titles would be nearly so high, and it stretches the imagination to think that our epigraphic terms would have been susceptible to biased textual editing. Indeed, this is not the case for terms like sthavira, vihārasvāmin, parivrājaka, bhikṣu, upāsaka, and even prahāṇika and arhat, all of which appear in Buddhist inscriptions and seem to carry the same meaning there as they do in Buddhist texts.


97 Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India, 245.
In the end, we are still left with the fact that there is a strong epigraphic correlation between śākyabhikṣus/-bhikṣunīs and paramopāsakas/-opāsikās, words for Mahāyāna, and what Schopen and now I have argued is a Mahāyāna donative formula. Assuming the correlation is not a coincidence, the logic regarding the inscriptive epithets needs to be flipped around. It is not a question of automatically identifying śākyabhikṣus and paramopāsikas as Mahāyānists, but of asking why so many Mahāyānists identified as śākyabhikṣus and paramopāsikas. Now, who śākyabhikṣus and paramopāsikas were on the ground is an interesting problem that is far from settled. I have only scratched the surface of this problem here, but I would suggest that future scholars approach the issue anew after first conceptually uncoupling the terms from Mahāyāna.

***

Before turning to the content of Mahāyāna donative inscriptions, I would like to revisit the questions I posed near the beginning of this chapter. I asked whether it was possible to determine whether a donor or a recipient from an inscription was a Mahāyāna Buddhist. Indeed, it seems possible on four counts. First, some inscriptions just say that the donor or recipient was affiliated with Mahāyāna. Second, the evidence from the last section, building off the work of Schopen and others, led to the conclusion that an individual who used the yad atra puṇyaṃ formula with anuttarajñānāvaptaye was a Mahāyāna Buddhist. For a donor’s use of anuttarajñāna as a soteriological goal appears to follow from a Mahāyāna system of beliefs. Third, by the same reasoning—that the repeated articulation of the intention to become a buddha in inscriptions was the product of a religious movement whose defining characteristic was striving for awakening—I add to this corpus a third kind of inscription: those that actually
use the Sanskrit equivalent for buddhahood, *buddhatva*, or otherwise express the desire that beings become buddhas. A Jaggayapeta inscription, for example, records the donation of a Buddha image “for the purpose of obtaining buddhahood” (*buddhavprayāptinimittaṃ*).⁹⁸ Fourth, I also include donative inscriptions that refer to things—that is, a) figures, such as Avalokiteśvara, Tārā, or Amitābha, b) ideas, like the Perfection of Wisdom, and/or c) texts, such as the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*—that are known only (or almost only) from Mahāyāna traditions, so long as the particular inscription suggests that the donor was affiliated with or inspired by Mahāyāna in some way. I say “inspired by” because there are certain inscriptions—Tsukamoto, Ḍambaḷ 1 and Kasiā 126, for example—with obvious Mahāyāna content but for which the donors would most easily be classified as Brahmanical or Hindu. But such religious “crossover” is really only problematic to the modern scholar bent on placing religious ideas and practices into mutually exclusive categories; in most periods of Indian history, an individual could express religiosity through a variety of traditions.⁹⁹ Finally, a fifth possibility, the presence of the title *sākyabhikṣu/-bhikṣunī* or *paramopāsaka/-opāsikā*, falls short as a criterion. Until new evidence emerges, I would like to bracket off the inscriptions recording the gifts of *sākyabhikṣus/-bhikṣunīs* and *paramopāsakas/-opāsikās* that do not have our full

---

⁹⁸ James Burgess, *The Buddhist stupas of Amaravati and Jaggayapeta in the Krishna District, Madras Presidency, surveyed in 1882* (Archaeological Survey of Southern India, Vol. 1) (1887; repr., Varanasi: Indological Book House, 1970), 112 and plate LXIII (inscription no. 4) (= Tsukamoto, Jaggayapeta 4). These inscriptions are discussed in Shizutani, “Mahayana Inscriptions in the Gupta Period.” As far as I am aware, no extant inscriptions that explicitly state the desire for buddhahood in this way occur in conjunction with *sākyabhikṣu/-bhikṣunī* or *paramopāsaka/-opāsikā*.

⁹⁹ This phenomenon is readily apparent, for instance, when looking at the names and titles of the donors in the Sāñcī inscriptions. And it is, of course, not restricted to India. For very good examples of Thai “Buddhist” rituals that resist religious categorization that is rooted primarily in the West, see McDaniel, *The Lovelorn Ghost and the Magical Monk*, 121-160.
epigraphic formula. These titles by themselves are not sufficient to qualify a donor as a Mahāyāna Buddhist.

I also asked what a Mahāyāna inscription was. With regard to donative inscriptions, by definition this epigraphic class should include the records in which a Mahāyāna individual or group was either the donor or the recipient of a gift, whenever, that is, the Mahāyāna affiliation can be ascertained with a degree of confidence. However, in this chapter I will only address the inscriptions in which a Mahāyānist was the donor. In chapter VI I will briefly discuss the few clear epigraphic cases of Mahāyānists as recipients. (From the sources discussed and translated in chapters II, III, and IV, the reader will remember that there appears to have been some discomfort with the idea of Mahāyānists as recipients on the part of Mahāyāna authors.)

Below are two tables of donative inscriptions. For the inscriptions with the yad atra puṇyaṃ formula, I include only those inscriptions that are legible through sarvvasatvānām; in some of these cases sarvvasatvānām is only partially legible but can be safely reconstructed. (Rather than sarvvasatvānām, several inscriptions have sakalasatvarāśer or something close to it, and a few have sārdham sarvasatvānām or the like. For the purposes of this study, I treat these variations as equivalent.) Out of an abundance of caution, I have placed in a separate table the inscriptions in which the yad atra puṇyaṃ formula does not include the final element, anuttarajñānāvaptaye (except when these inscriptions include a word for Mahāyāna), since I consider this to be the Mahāyāna epigraphic marker; the inscriptions in which anuttarajñānāvaptaye is partially legible are counted as having the full formula. (There are several epigraphic variations on anuttarajñāna, such as anuttarapadajñāna, anuttaraṃ
In many instances it is almost certain that anuttarajñānāvaptaye is missing only because the inscription has degraded and is no longer legible at that spot. Other cases are less clear, as the inscriptions seem intentionally to have been written only through sarvvasatvānām. I am not sure whether anuttarajñānāvaptaye would have been implied in such inscriptions, so I leave that open for the reader’s judgment.  

I have stripped down the inscriptions to their most basic data: geographic site, date, donative name(s), donative title(s), and the object(s) given. I restrict explanatory details and other information to the footnotes. This presentation, I hope, will most readily reveal donative patterns for those who are interested in Indian epigraphy and Mahāyāna Buddhism. Some of these patterns have already been discussed. I have, of course, reviewed the history of the problem with regard to donative titles in some detail, but the reader will also notice from the tables that Mahāyānists in India carried a bevy of titles besides śākyabhikṣu/-bhikṣunī and paramopāsaka/-opāsikā. As far as dates, Schopen’s revelation about the epigraphically late

---

100 I do not include a rather idiosyncratic inscription that dates to the 2nd century CE and probably originated in or near Mathurā. Falk’s reading suggests that the inscription records the gift of a Bodhisattva image. He renders the end of the extant part of the inscription as im(ε)na kuśalamūlena sarvvasa(t)[va a]nuttarasya nirantarasya jñā. Falk restores this final word to jñānāvāptaye, saying that “the restitution is possible, partly because anuttara occurs only in this context, and secondly, because the surviving ja is written very small and high above the base line, so that it looks like the first part of a ligature.” See Harry Falk, “Two New Inscriptions from the Time of Huviska,” Berliner Indologische Studien 13/14 (2000): 32–35 (inscription II). I exclude the inscription because it does not have the yad atra puṇyaṃ formula and because I find Falk’s restoration conjectural, but it should be kept in mind as a candidate for one of the earliest Mahāyāna inscriptions.

101 An inscription from Ajanta’s cave 10, which is not included below, suggests that this caution is warranted. It begins with yad atra puṇyaṃ, includes sarvvasatvānāṃ, but then apparently ends with duḥkhamocāya, “for the liberation from suffering.” See Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 297–298 (inscription 44) (= Tsukamoto, Ajanta 31).
appearance of Mahāyāna in India still holds. I will also draw some conclusions about the kinds of things Mahāyāna Buddhists were giving in India to conclude this chapter. With any luck, other scholars will find these tables useful in unearthing patterns about Indian Mahāyāna that I have failed to see.

For geographic reasons, I do not include Mahāyāna inscriptions from Arakan (in present-day Burma) or Nepal. Both areas were highly Indianized, as is obvious from their

102 Schopen, “Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions,” 238-239. With regard to Mahāyāna and dating, we have to be careful how we apply the now widely held position that Mahāyāna adherents were embedded within Mainstream Vinaya lineages, lest it become dogma. Allon and Salomon, in “New Evidence for Mahayana in Early Gandhāra,” 18, conclude that the “absence of references to the Mahayana in such [Gandhāran] inscriptions does not prove the non-existence of Mahayana beliefs, practices, and adherents in the [Nikāya] institutions concerned, because their Mahayana doctrinal affiliation (if any) was irrelevant to the form and content of the inscriptions.” But the absence of Mahāyāna beliefs in donative inscriptions does prove that either the donors did not have them or that the beliefs were not sufficiently “mainstream” for their free expression in inscriptions. Neither alternative speaks highly of the strength of “Mahayana doctrinal affiliation” in early Gandhāra. With the eventual use of anuttarajñāna in inscriptions, I think we do have traces of an actual Mahāyāna belief, but now it is the Nikāya affiliation that is “irrelevant to the form and content of the inscriptions.” In this light, I find Joseph Walser to be much more on the mark: “Mahāyānists . . . may have been able to write sūtras, but may not have had the clout to get the name of their movement carved into stone” (Nāgārjuna in Context, 38). Mahāyānists were composing texts in India for several centuries before they appear in inscriptions with anything approaching “clout.”

103 There appear to be at least three Mahāyāna inscriptions from Arakan. One, dated to the first half of the 6th century, records the gift of Sāvitāṃ-Candraśriyā, queen of Nīticandra. She is called a paremopāsika (sic) and the inscription is cut off after sarvvasatvānāṃ anukama. The grammar and orthography of this inscription are very poor, and Siricar is probably correct in suggesting that anukama is a mistake for anuttama, “with the letters jñānāya lost at the end of the line.” See D.C. Siricar, “Inscriptions of Chandras of Arakan,” Epigraphia Indica 32 (1957–58): 103-109 (inscription no. 1). Another, dated to the early 7th century, records the gift of a bell by a śākyabhikṣu whose name has been lost and includes our full yad atra punyam formula. Schopen includes this inscription in his original paper. A third inscription, which Johnston dates to the 8th century (but which Arlo Griffiths tells me has been dated to other centuries based on paleographic comparisons different from those Johnston relies on), is a long praśasti of a ruler named Ānandacandra; it is not a record of one gift, but like most praśastis it describes the many gifts of the object of praise, in this case Ānandacandra. This inscription, like that of Buddhabhadra from Ajaṇṭā, refers to Bodhisattvas and probably Sugatas (it is in compound) in the plural. It also states that Ānandacandra, when he gave many copper bowls and robes of fine silk to monks, said the following: “May I not lack the Perfection of Giving toward all creatures” (dānapāramitā hiṁ mā me bhavatu jantuṣu). Ānandacandra looks to have been a Mahāyānist, and for what it is worth, the inscription calls him an upāsaka, not a paramopāsaka. See Johnston, “Some Sanskrit Inscriptions of Arakan,” 373-382 (inscriptions A and B). For a lengthy discussion of the inscriptions and coins from
use of Sanskrit in inscriptions, their adoption of Indian names, and palaeographic comparisons. In cases like this it is somewhat arbitrary where one considers India to end, politically or culturally, and another region to begin. (These inscriptions are not included in Tsukamoto’s catalog of Indian inscriptions.) Indeed, I do include Mahāyāna inscriptions from sites in the Northwest like Thalpan and Shatial. One might reasonably argue that Buddhist sites in modern Pakistan and Afghanistan should be classified as Central Asian and not Indian, though the tendency to consider Northwestern sites Indian has only increased with the discoveries of Buddhist manuscripts in Gilgit, Bamiyan, etc. (Tsukamoto’s third volume on “Indian Buddhist Inscriptions” deals with records from the Northwest.)

I should also note that I consider all the inscriptions from Vaiśravaṇa, Kuberavāhana, and Siṅhoṭa, three prominent donors known from the ancient Karakorum.

Arakan, see Pamela Gutman, “Ancient Arakan: with special reference to its cultural history between the 5th and the 11th centuries,” Ph.D. Dissertation, Australian National University, 1976, 24-130. According to Arlo Griffiths, personal communication, there are other Arakenese inscriptions to be published in the near future through the École Française d’Extrême-Orient.

Though it records a gift to a Mahāyāna group and thus would not be included in this section anyway, one Nepalese inscription from around the 7th century documents a permanent endowment of land by a paramopāsikā named Mṛginī for repairing a perfume chamber (gandhakuṭī) and for the use of a universal community of nuns that is said to have “practiced Mahāyāna” (perhaps “went by the Mahāyāna” is more literal) (cāturvviśa-[read: cāturddiśa-]mahāyānapratipannāryabhikṣunīsāṅgha). It is written on the pedestal of a Buddha triad. See D.R. Regmi, Inscriptions of Ancient Nepal, Vol. 1: Inscriptions (New Delhi: Abhinav Publications, 1983), 88 (inscription XC). Another Nepalese inscription describes the gift of water pipes or channels (jaladravanika?) and a well and refers to a śākyo yati named Priyapāla. Evidently Priyapāla was some sort of ascetic who identified as a Śākya. See ibid., 110 (inscription CXI). Regmi, Inscription of Ancient Nepal, Vol. 2: Translations (New Delhi: Abhinav Publications, 1983) has major misreadings of these two inscriptions. He translates sākyayati as a “sage belonging to the Śākya tribe.” He also says sākyayati just refers to a Buddhist monk in Nepal, being equivalent in meaning to śākyabhikṣu, a statement that I can neither deny nor confirm. See ibid., Inscriptions of Ancient Nepal, Vol. 3: Introduction to the Inscriptions (New Delhi: Abhinav Publications, 1983), 194-195.

Sometimes the word Indic is used to refer to those things that show Indian influence. Although this can be useful, it is also a convenient way to sidestep problems of geographic classification, since at various times in history Indic can apply to Sri Lanka, Central Asia, China, Indonesia, and so on.
Highway in Northern Pakistan, as Mahāyāna records. As long as their inscriptions are donative—that is, if they include a word for “gift” or an image with the donor’s name in the genitive case—I include them in Table 2 below. Their Mahāyāna affiliation is beyond doubt. Some of their inscriptions include names of Mahāyāna bodhisattvas, and Kuberavāhana commissioned images of the Vyāghrī-jātaka from the Mahāyāna Suvarṇaprabhāsottama-sūtra and may have used our full yad atra puṇyaṃ formula.\(^{106}\)

I have tried not to duplicate inscriptions in the tables. I have also made an effort to be as complete as possible, but I will be little surprised if some published Mahāyāna donative inscriptions escaped my attention. Here are the conventions I follow in the two tables:

- Inscriptions are arranged alphabetically by site.
- Because it is the most complete catalog available, I will, whenever possible, cite the three-volume inscriptive catalog of Keishō Tsukamoto, Indo bukkyō himei no kenkyū. Even without knowledge of Japanese, Tsukamoto’s catalog is still fairly easy to use as a reference guide. Tsukamoto arranges his inscriptions by site, with sites being grouped into larger geographical areas. I will list all inscriptions available in his catalog exactly as they are listed there, i.e., by site and number (e.g., Bodh-Gayā 21). Unless otherwise noted, citations refer to Tsukamoto Volume 1. When I refer to Volume 3, I will note this with “V.3” in

---

parentheses (e.g., Thalpan 29 (V.3)), which is necessary because some inscriptions appear in both Volume 1 and Volume 3. For a single site, references to Volume 1 will be placed before those to Volume 3.

- For the inscriptions that are not in Tsukamoto’s catalog, I will list the records by site and a capital letter, beginning with the letter A (e.g., Ajañṭā B), and provide a note for the source. For each site I will list those in Tsukamoto’s catalog first in numerical order, then proceed with these others.

- Dates, when not stated in the inscriptions, are usually approximated based on the palaeography of the inscriptions and/or the style of donated images. Approximated dates almost always come from the original publications, not from me or Tsukamoto.

- Inscriptions in which the donor is called a Mahāyānist are in bold.

- I will note when an inscription is included for a reason other than the yad atra punyam formula or a word for Mahāyāna, except for a few of Kuberavāhana’s inscriptions (see above).

- I will usually, but not always, standardize the spelling for names and titles. A blank space in the “Name” or “Title” column indicates that the information was never inscribed or that the inscription is fragmentary.
Table 1: *yat atra punyaṃ* formula without *anuttarajñānāvaptaye*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Title(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Object(s) given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ajaņṭā 9</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Buddhagupta</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajaņṭā 39</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Buddha-</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajaņṭā 70</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajaņṭā A&lt;sup&gt;107&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Raviprabha</td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajaņṭā B&lt;sup&gt;108&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td>upāsaka</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajaņṭā C&lt;sup&gt;109&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Mitradharma</td>
<td>upāsaka</td>
<td>image?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bihar 1&lt;sup&gt;110&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9th cent.</td>
<td>Pūrṇadāsa</td>
<td>sthavira</td>
<td>images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcutta 1</td>
<td>5th cent.</td>
<td>Dharmadāsa</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathpur 1</td>
<td>6th cent.</td>
<td>Dharmapriya</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>107</sup> Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 289 (inscription 27).

<sup>108</sup> Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 307 (inscription 63). If Cohen is correct in identifying the image as an Avalokiteśvara “litany” scene, then the Mahāyāna character of this inscription is secure.

<sup>109</sup> Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 307 (inscription 64). This inscription is no longer extant.

<sup>110</sup> Technically, Bihar 1 represents two identical inscriptions, as Pūrṇadāsa gave two images, each depicting a different life scene of the Buddha. In all likelihood this record should be placed in Table 2, since it appears to end with a mangled form of our formula: *yat punya mātāpitara upādhyāyam pūrvvaṅgamaṃ kṛtvā anuttaram sakalasatvarāśe iti*. I follow a slightly different reading and use an alternative date than that given in Tsukamoto; there is some consensus that the Śūrapāla mentioned in this inscription refers to the ruler from the 9th century. Cf. Bagchi, *The History and Culture of the Pālas*, 12 and the sources cited there.
Table 1: *yat atra punyaṃ* formula without *anuttarajñānāvaptaye*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Title(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Object(s) given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gilgit A111</td>
<td>7th–8th cent.</td>
<td>Narāyāsārvati, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guneriya A112</td>
<td>11th cent.</td>
<td>Kevarttaka</td>
<td>paramopāsaka?</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashmir 3</td>
<td>6th–7th cent.</td>
<td>Voyatyāsa</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashmir 4113</td>
<td>6th–7th cent.</td>
<td>Sukhavarman</td>
<td>paramopāsaka</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosam A114</td>
<td>4th–6th cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuḍā 9</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurā 81</td>
<td>441/442 CE</td>
<td>Jīvā</td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurā 127</td>
<td>5th cent.</td>
<td>Dharmadāsa</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

111 Oskar von Hinüber, *Die Palola Śāhis: Ihre Steininschriften, Inschriften auf Bronzen, Handschriftenkolophone und Schutzauber, Materialien zur Geschichte von Gilgit und Chilas* (Antiquities of Northern Pakistan: Reports and Studies, Vol. 5) (Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 2004), 64–66 (no. 31A). Narāyāsārvati is the wife of Dholaka, the *spālapati* (“der Heerführer”). The donation of this bronze image was made together with (*sārdhaṃ*) several family members, presumably Narāyāsārvati’s, including the mother Padmasukhā and the sons Āmuḍasiṃgha, Puṇyasiṃgha, and Khukhethāla. A *kalyāṇamitra* named Narendrattrāta is also mentioned.

Although the image on which this epigraph is inscribed is now in Khotan, I consider the piece Indian because it most likely comes from Gilgit. The image bears stylistic similarities with other Gilgit bronzes, and according to von Hinüber, the “Eigennamen” in the inscription “verweisen deutlich nach Gilgit” (ibid., 66)—the names on this bronze are similar to those found in inscriptions and manuscript colophons from the Gilgit area. On connections between Gandhāra, Gilgit, and Khotan, see Jason Neelis, *Early Buddhist Transmission and Trade Networks: Mobility and Exchange within and beyond the Northwestern Borderlands of South Asia* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 296–297. Many thanks to Jason for advice on this inscription and for sending me this excerpt from his book.

112 Gouriswar Bhattacharya, “Donors of a few Tārā images from Magadha or South Bihar,” in *Festschrift Dieter Schlingloff: zur Vollendung des 65. Lebensjahres dargebracht von Schülern, Freunden und Kollegen*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm (Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen, 1996), 8–10 and figure 11. Bhattacharya restores *pravaramahāyānayāyinah* from *pravara ... dīnam*, which I do not understand (and I am unable to make this out in the photograph). Obviously, the late date of the image and its identification as Tārā increase the likelihood that Kevarttaka was indeed a Mahāyānist. Bhattacharya believes that it is not Kevarttaka who was a *paramopāsaka*, but his father. See ibid., 9, n. 29.

113 This inscription has *yat atra punyaṃ tad bhavatu savasatvānā mātāpitrisya*, but then *sakalāsatvāsukhanāya*, “for the comfort of all beings.” I include it here because of its first reference to “all beings.”

114 Morrissey, “Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy,” 201 (inscription 859). The date here is my own crude approximation based on a photograph of the inscription. See Aruna Tripathi, *The Buddhist Art of Kauśāmbī, from 300 BC to AD 550* (New Delhi: D.K. Printworld, 2003), 87, figure 57.
Table 1: *yat atra punyaṃ* formula without *anuttarajñānāvaptaye*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Title(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Object(s) given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathurā 136(^{115})</td>
<td>4(^{th}) cent.</td>
<td>Samgharakṣita</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nālandā 15(^{116})</td>
<td>8(^{th}) cent.</td>
<td>Vajjaka</td>
<td>suvarṇakāra</td>
<td>stūpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phophnar Kalan 2</td>
<td>6(^{th}) cent.</td>
<td>Buddhadāsa</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu, ācārya, bhadanta</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phophnar Kalan 3</td>
<td>6(^{th}) cent.</td>
<td>Vidyādhara-svāminī</td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piṭalkhorā A(^{118})</td>
<td>5(^{th})–6(^{th}) cent.</td>
<td>-radha</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piṭalkhorā B(^{119})</td>
<td>5(^{th})–6(^{th}) cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piṭalkhorā C(^{120})</td>
<td>5(^{th})–6(^{th}) cent.</td>
<td>Kama-</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu, bhadanta</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāñcī 917</td>
<td>6(^{th}) cent.</td>
<td>Kulāditya</td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sārnāth 27(^{121})</td>
<td>4(^{th})–6(^{th}) cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sārnāth 198</td>
<td>4(^{th})–5(^{th}) cent.</td>
<td>Dharmade-</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣunī</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shatial 347 (V.3)</td>
<td>5(^{th})–7(^{th}) cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td>kṣatrapa, ?</td>
<td>images</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{115}\) Given the dates of the other Mathurā inscriptions, the 4\(^{th}\) century may be too early for this record.

\(^{116}\) This inscription has a very abbreviated version of our formula, skipping *yat atra punyaṃ tad bhavatv* entirely. After the donor’s name we have *mAṭāpitr pūrvaṅgamaṃ kṛtvā sakalasatvarāśe nratta*. I believe the formula, at least through *sakasatvarāśe*, can be assumed.

\(^{117}\) This inscription is highly unusual. After *yat atra punya tad bhavatv*, we find *aparimitalokadhātustha-sarvānuśaya[ba}ndhanāvadaddhastavalokasyānāvaraṇajñānāvāptaye*. See Schopen, “Mahāyāna in Indian inscriptions,” 228. I am not sure whether the compound *anāvaraṇajñāna* (note that Tsukamoto misprints this as *anāvarṇajñāna*) should be considered a Mahāyāna term or not. See BHSD, s.vv. *anāvaraṇa* and *āvaraṇa*.

\(^{118}\) Morrissey, “Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy,” 207 (inscription §77).

\(^{119}\) Morrissey, “Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy,” 208 (inscription §80).

\(^{120}\) Morrissey, “Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy,” 208-209 (inscription §82).

\(^{121}\) All that remains of this badly damaged inscription is *sarvvasatvānāṃ cānuttara*.

\(^{122}\) This inscription, which is fairly long, is highly fragmentated. There may be up to a dozen or so names connected to the donation. I should also mention, though it does not appear to be donative—unless it is connected to the donation of the head on the same stone?—Tsukamoto, Shatial 351 (V.3): (bo)dhicattam
Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Title(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Object(s) given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ajaṇṭā 11</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Ram-śākya-uṣaka</td>
<td>image</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajaṇṭā 12</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Māthura vihārasvāmin</td>
<td>image</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajaṇṭā 13</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Taranākīrtt-śākyabhikṣu</td>
<td>image</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajaṇṭā 53</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Dharmadatta śākyabhikṣu, bhadanta</td>
<td>image</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajaṇṭā 54</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Dharmadatta śākyabhikṣu, bhadanta</td>
<td>image</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajaṇṭā 55</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Bāpuka śākyabhikṣu, bhadanta</td>
<td>image</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajaṇṭā 67</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Maṣaraśaila? śākyabhikṣu</td>
<td>image</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajaṇṭā 68</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Buddhabhadra bhikṣu, bodhisattva?</td>
<td>cave 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajaṇṭā 69</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Guṇākara śākyabhikṣu, bhadanta</td>
<td>image</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^bodhicittam] ut(p)ādayāmi namo buddhāya. As far as I know, the Mahāyāna idea bodhicitta does not appear anywhere else in inscriptions.

This inscription records the gift of “1,000 buddhas” on the walls of the shrine antechamber. A fuller reading of the inscription can be found at Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 281-282 (inscription 14).

Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 285 (inscription 18) reads the donor’s name as Guṇākīrttya.

Ajaṇṭā 53 and 54 from cave 16 were made by the same donor, Dharmadatta. He made a third inscription that just says bhadantadharmadattasya. See Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 315-317 (inscriptions 70-72).

For the most probable reading of the donor’s name, see Morrissey, “Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy,” 193 (inscription §39). (See n. 86 above in regard to different readings of this inscription.) Gregory Schopen recently brought to my attention that this inscription quotes a verse from a version of the Prasenajit-gāthā, which does not appear to be a Mahāyāna text. According to Morrissey, the verse in the inscription reads as follows: saurūpyasaubhāgya gunopapannā guṇendriyair bhāskaradīptayas (sic) te bhavanti te nayanābhīrāmā ye kārayatīha jinasya bimbam. See, in the edition of the Prasenajitparipaścchā-sūtra found in Tibet, the more recent Bhikṣuṇī Vinitā (Vinita Tseng), ed. and trans., A unique collection of twenty Sūtras in a Sanskrit manuscript from the Potala, Vol. I.1 (Beijing/Vienna: China Tibetology Publishing House/Austrian Academy of Sciences, 2010), 216 (verse 5), which instead has the following: saurūpyasaubhāgya gunopapannā guptendriyā bhāskaradīptayas te / bhavanti loke nayanābhīrāmā ye kārayatīha jinasya bimbam //. This is a rare Mahāyāna inscription that promises worldly rewards—beauty, fortune, and so on—for a gift.

Buddhabhadra’s inscription records the donation of the whole cave, about which see the brief discussion above.

[^bodhicittam]
Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Title(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Object(s) given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ajanṭā D</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>-gupta</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajanṭā E</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>image?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajanṭā F</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>-bhima</td>
<td></td>
<td>image?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajanṭā G</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td>mahāpradhāna, sāvāsigal-adhiṣṭhāyaka, bhanḍāri, sarvādhyakṣa, daṇḍanāyaka</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baḷigāmi 1</td>
<td>1065 CE</td>
<td>Rūpabhaṭṭayya</td>
<td></td>
<td>monastery, land and revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baḷigāmi A</td>
<td>1067 CE</td>
<td>Nāgiyakka</td>
<td></td>
<td>image, land and revenues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


130 Cohen, “Ajanta’s inscriptions,” 283 (inscription 16). Cohen notes the possibility that a single donor was responsible for this and two other inscriptions from cave 2 (my Ajanṭā 11, E, and F).


132 Rūpabhaṭṭayya gave what is called the prabuddhavihāra and provided the means to worship Tārā Bhagavatī as well as the gods (deva or deva) Keśava, Lokeśvara, and, interestingly, Bauddha. For Rūpabhaṭṭayya’s many titles, see Rice’s translation (see Tsukamoto for the reference) and Sircar, Indian Epigraphical Glossary, s.vv.

133 This inscription is included here because it records the gift of an image of Tārā Bhagavatī and because it provides land to fund its worship and to repair a temple that possibly housed the Tārā image. This record, which is referred to but not given a separate entry in Tsukamoto, is connected with Baḷigāmi 1; both inscriptions begin by praising the ruler Āhavamalla in the exact same way, and both record gifts to provide for the same local Buddhists. See B. Lewis Rice, Epigraphia Carnatica, Vol. 7, Pt. 1 (Bangalore: Mysore Government Central Press, 1902), 111-112 and 197 (Shikārpur Taluq, no. 169); C. Hayavadana Rao, ed., Mysore Gazetteer, Vol. 2, Pt. 1 (Bangalore: Government Press, 1930), 145-149; P.B. Desai, “Buddhist Antiquities in Karnataka,” Journal of Indian History 32.1 (1954): 86.
### Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Title(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Object(s) given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bengal A</td>
<td>9th–10th cent.</td>
<td>Dhammamitra</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu, sthavira, mūlasarvāśśvāda-paṛṣadā, pravara-mahājānajāyin</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodh-Gayā 15</td>
<td>6th–7th cent.</td>
<td>Prakhyātakirti</td>
<td>bhikṣu</td>
<td>coping stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodh-Gayā 21</td>
<td>6th cent.</td>
<td>Mahānāman</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu, sthavira</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodh-Gayā 22</td>
<td>6th cent.</td>
<td>Dharmagupta and Daṃṣtrasena</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣus</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodh-Gayā 25</td>
<td>10th cent.</td>
<td>Śakrasena</td>
<td>vinayavid, sthavira, pravara-mahāyānayāyin</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodh-Gayā 28</td>
<td>10th cent.</td>
<td>Vīryendra</td>
<td>mahārāja, paramopāsaka, pravara-mahājānajāyin</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodh-Gayā 36</td>
<td>1230 CE</td>
<td>Aśokavalladeva</td>
<td>shrines? with image</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

134 Debala Mitra, “Lintels with the Figures of Eight Great Bodhisattvas and a Tathāgata—An Iconographical Study,” in Facets of Indian Culture: Gustav Roth Felicitation Volume, ed. C.P. Sinha et al. (Patna: Bihar Puravid Parishad, 1998), 282-285 and plate 3. The exact provenance of this piece is unknown. It is extremely rare for an inscription to have the Nikāya to which a donor was affiliated, though the Nikāya of the recipients is sometimes stated. This is the only Mahāyāna inscription that I know of that does so (ruling out the inscription put forth by Cohen—see n. 86 above). Schopen, “The Mahāyāna and the Middle Period in Indian Buddhism,” in Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India, 22, n. 35 suggests that this inscription is indicative of the “complex, late interrelationship between the Mahāyāna and the Mūlasarvāśśvāda. . . .” My sense is that this relationship was predicated mostly on the fact that the Mūlasarvāśśvāda was a successful Vinaya tradition at a time in northeastern India when Mahāyāna was the dominant Buddhist vehicle or religious movement.

135 The donor in this inscription is described as buddhatvam abhikāṃkṣatā.

136 The donor evidently also went by the name Dharmabhīma (śrīdhārmabhīma iti ca prathitāḥ prthivyāṃ)—a monastic name?—and came from the Sindh region (sindhūdbhavo). The inscription says that Śākrasena made the image because he “longs for unsurpassed awakening so that the world’s suffering would be appeased” (kāṅkata [read: kāṅkṣatā] ‘nuttarāṃ bodhiṃ jagato duḥkhaśāntaye.

137 If I interpret this inscription correctly, King Aśokavalladeva paid (and was “in charge” of the merit) for the gift but a number of his subordinates were involved in bringing his donation to pass. I am not sure whether vihāriyāṃ vuddhapratimāśahītā indicates a shrine or a monastery with a Buddha image, but Vidyavinoda and Sircar (see Tsukamoto for references) translate vihāriya as “shrine.”
Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Title(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Object(s) given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bodh-Gayā 37</td>
<td>1253 CE</td>
<td>Sahaṇasāva</td>
<td>bhāṇḍāgārika, paramopāsaka, pravaramahāyānayāyin</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodh-Gayā 38</td>
<td>12th cent.</td>
<td>Śrīmitra</td>
<td>sambuddhasiddha</td>
<td>cave with images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodh-Gayā A</td>
<td>11th–12th cent.</td>
<td>Ripaḍika</td>
<td>pravaramahājānajāyin</td>
<td>stūpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaṇḍimau 1</td>
<td>10th–11th cent.</td>
<td>Saharaṇa</td>
<td>vaṇīka, sādhu, paramopāsaka, paramamahājānānuyāyin</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilās 12</td>
<td>6th–7th cent.</td>
<td>Siṅhoṭa</td>
<td>image</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilās 13</td>
<td>6th–7th cent.</td>
<td>Siṅhoṭa</td>
<td>image</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

138 According to Sircar, Indian Epigraphical Glossary, s.v. Bhāṇḍāgārika, the donor Sahaṇasāva would have been some “officer in charge of the treasury or the royal store-house.” The gift is not specified in the inscription. Vidyavinoda and Sircar (see Tsukamoto for references) speculate that the gift was “some votive offerings.”

139 This is not only a Mahāyāna record, but I think also one of a small number of inscriptions that can be safely classified as Tantric. (Based on epigraphic evidence alone, Buddhist Tantra seems to have had a limited impact in India. The topic warrants further attention.) I believe the first verse invokes the Buddha; Sanyal says it refers to the ādi- or primordial-buddha (see Tsukamoto for the reference), which is not impossible given the context. The second verse invokes Lokeśvara and the third Ekajaṭā. Śrīmitra is described as sambuddhasiddhānuvaya[read: anvaya for anuvaya?]dhuryabhūtaḥ and sambuddhakṛtyaparamah.

140 Gouriswar Bhattacharya, “Notes on Three Inscribed Buddhist Sculptures,” Journal of Ancient Indian History 15.1–2 (1985–1986): 195–199 and plate XVI (inscription no. 1). The origin of this piece seems to be an educated guess on the part of Bhattacharya. Note that the inscription describes the donor’s father, Madhumathana, as a paramopāsaka.

141 The main inscription says only devadharmo ‘yam kṛtaṃ mayā siṅhoṭena, but next to it is the inscription namo āryā maṃjuśrībodhisattvāya, with representations of a seated bodhisattva and two stūpas on the stone. Cf. Tsukamoto, Chilās 123 and 124 (V.3). Note that the site is rendered “Chilas” in Tsukamoto’s Volume 1 but “Chilās” in Volume 3; I use the latter to standardize the spelling between the two sources.

142 The main inscription accompanying an image of a stūpa says only devadharmo ‘yam siṅhoṭesyā, but next to it there are representations of two bodhisattvas, one with the inscription [na]mo aryā ‘valoki. . . . Under the other bodhisattva, a small inscription also indicates that the image was donated together with (sārddham) a certain Gamanaśūra or Śamanaśūra. Cf. Tsukamoto, Chilās 125–128 (V.3). Note that Tsukamoto, Chilās 120 (V.3), which is only partially legible but which includes [deva]dharmo ’yam, may be another Mahāyāna donative inscription of Siṅhoṭa. However, I have not been able to determine the


Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Title(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Object(s) given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chilās 101 (V.3)</td>
<td>4th–5th cent.</td>
<td>Vaiśravaṇasena</td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilās 115 (V.3)</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Kuberavāhana</td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilās 117 (V.3)</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>[Kuberavāhana]</td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilās 136 (V.3)</td>
<td>5th–7th cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittagong A</td>
<td>11th–12th cent.</td>
<td>pravaramahāyāyin</td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

content of the image associated with this inscription, nor can I confirm whether von Hinüber is correct in attributing the whole complex of rock drawings to which this image belongs to Siṅhoṭa. See von Hinüber, “Buddhistische Inschriften aus dem Tal des oberen Indus,” in Antiquities of Northern Pakistan, Vol. 1, 83–86.

143 This inscription, which is located next to a drawing of a stūpa, says only śrīvaiśravaṇasenasaya. However, one of Vaiśravaṇasena’s inscriptions (Tsukamoto, Thalpan 16 (V.3)) lies to the right of another inscription that says namo kṣobh (sic), “homage to Akoṣabhya” (Tsukamoto, Thalpan 58 (V.3)), and another that has his name also has the word lośvarakhatasya (lokeśvarakṣatra), a reference to Avalokiteśvara (Tsukamoto, Helor Dās 12–13 (V.3)). Note that there are three other names written next to this image of a stūpa (see Tsukamoto, Chilās 102–104 (V.3)), none of which is written in the genitive case, though they may not all be complete. Also note that Vaiśravaṇasena has another simple inscription with his name in the genitive case (Tsukamoto, Chilās 100 (V.3)), but I cannot tell whether it now accompanies or ever accompanied an image.

144 This inscription is badly damaged. It has (ya)[d atra ta]d bhava, but the rest of that line is lost, so it is uncertain whether it had our full formula. I include it here because it was almost certainly donated by Kuberavāhana, who is named in several nearby inscriptions. In the first line of this short two-line inscription, von Hinüber suggests a reconstruction of [kueravāha]na[ṣya] for the donor’s name. See von Hinüber, “Buddhistische Inschriften aus dem Tal des oberen Indus,” in Antiquities of Northern Pakistan, Vol. 1, 81 (inscription no. 74a). This inscription accompanies an image of a stūpa and a worshipping figure—the latter is quite possibly a depiction of Kuberavāhana himself—and is near drawings of the Vyāghri-jātaka from the Suvarṇaprabhāsottama-sūtra that were commissioned by Kuberavāhana.

145 This inscription is extremely weathered, so the identity of the donor(s) cannot be made out. There appear to have been several names in the inscription, at least two of which were connected with sārdhām (“together with”). It is included here because it is located right next to another inscription (Tsukamoto, Chilās 136 (V.3)) that has parallels in the Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra and a (Mahāyāna) collection of dhāraṇīs from Central Asia.

Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Title(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Object(s) given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chittagong B</td>
<td>10th cent.</td>
<td>Sahadeva</td>
<td>prāptapañca-mahāśabda, mahāpratihāra</td>
<td>land and revenues, monastic cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Đambal 1</td>
<td>1095/1096 CE</td>
<td>many individuals</td>
<td>seṭṭins</td>
<td>land and revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deoriyā 2</td>
<td>5th cent.</td>
<td>Bodhivarman</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deoriyā 3</td>
<td>5th cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

147 This record was inscribed on the outside of a vase, but the gift specified in the inscription was not the vase itself. Interestingly, the gifts in this inscription were made for the benefit of the community of monks of the Sthāvirīya Nikāya belonging to the Bela (?) monastery (velavīhārasamvaddhaśāvīrīya-nikāyapratpannāryabhiṣusamgha). See Gouriswar Bhattacharya, “An Inscribed Metal Vase Most Probably from Chittagong, Bangladesh,” in South Asian Archaeology 1991: Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference of the Association of South Asian Archaeologists in Western Europe, held in Berlin 1–5 July 1991, ed. Adalbert J. Gail and Gerd J.R. Mevissen (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1993), 323-338. Sahadeva was a head doorman or someone otherwise involved in defense and was a feudal subordinate to the king, who, according to the inscription, was a rājādhirāja named Attākaradeva. See Sircar, Indian Epigraphical Glossary, s.vv. mahāpratihāra and pratihāra, as well as pañcamahāśabda and prāptapañcamahāśabda. The inscription is included here because Sahadeva’s gift was made “in order to increase merit and for the singular reason of realizing unsurpassed, full, and complete awakening by my parents, myself, and the entire assemblage of living beings” (mātāpitror ātmanaḥ sakalasya ca satvarāšer anuttarāyāḥ sanyaksamvodher adhīgamaiketoh punyasyābhivṛddhyai [read: abhivṛddhyai]). On anuttarā sanyaksambodhi in Mahāyāna texts, again see Schopen, “Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions,” 230-231.

148 This inscription records the gifts by a number of seṭṭins (Old Kanarese for śreṣṭhin), vaiśyas whom the inscription praises at length, to two vihāras that they themselves had had built. One of the vihāras is called the buddhavihāra, the other the āryaśādeviḥāra. The inscription, written on a stone tablet with an image of Tārā, begins with an invocation to Tārā (tāre namas tūbyan), lists several “dangers that she extinguishes” (-bhayaśaman), and also says, among other things, that she “is called wisdom and provides the Buddha’s power” (prajñeti yā kathyaṭe yā buddhasya vibhūtīda). A separate inscription across the top of the stone gives a slightly different list of perils from which Tārā rescues supplicants (see Tsukamoto, Đambal 2).

149 I apply Fleet’s estimate for the date of Deoriyā 2 to Deoriyā 3, since the inscriptions are similar paleographically. Alexander Cunningham, Report for the Year 1871–72 (Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. III) (Calcutta: Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing, 1873), 48 is off considerably in saying that the Deoriyā inscriptions “cannot . . . be later than A.D. 200 or 250. . . .”
Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Title(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Object(s) given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghosrāwā 1&lt;sup&gt;150&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; cent.</td>
<td>Vīradeva</td>
<td>caityas, temple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gopālpur (J) 1&lt;sup&gt;151&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;–12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; cent.</td>
<td>Denuvā</td>
<td>dauvārika, pravara-mahājānujāyin</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gummiddurru 1</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; cent.</td>
<td>Rāhula</td>
<td>śrāmaṇaka</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilsā 3&lt;sup&gt;152&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; cent.</td>
<td>Gaṅgādhara</td>
<td>paramopāsaka</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodar 3 (V.3)&lt;sup&gt;153&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; cent.</td>
<td>Vuruṇḍi and Bhita</td>
<td>mātuṃkhira?</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>150</sup> Vīradeva had two caityas built on a hill near Ghosrāwā and also was responsible for the construction of a temple (bhavana) for a vajrāsana. (The inscription does not say where the temple was, only that it was built “here” (atra), which is probably a reference to Nālandā based on the context of the inscription. Since the inscription says elsewhere that Vīradeva visited the vajrāsana at Bodh-Gayā, it is unlikely that the temple he built was there.) Vīradeva was evidently a powerful individual. He curried favor with the ruler Devapāla and “was established by an ordinance of the Saṃgha as leader to oversee Nālandā” (nālandāparipālanāya nayataḥ saṅghasthiter yah sthitāḥ). The inscription is included in this corpus because of the dedication of Vīradeva’s deed, which is not all that dissimilar from the yad atra puṇyaṃ formula: “May the merit I have acquired from creating this building [i.e., the temple for the vajrāsana], which is like a stairway to the city of liberation, lead the entire multitude of human beings, beginning with the group of my teachers that includes my parents, to complete awakening (sopānamārgam iva muktip[uras]ya kīrttim etam vidhiya kuśalam yad upāttam asmāt / kṛtvā ’ditaḥ sapitaram guruvargam asya samvodhim etu janarāśīr aśeṣa eva //). I am inclined not to agree with Sircar, Indian Epigraphical Glossary, s.v., at least with regards to this inscription, that kīrti is “often interpreted as ‘a building or temple’; but [it is] really, ‘any fame-producing work’. . . .” See F. Kielhorn, “A Buddhist Stone-Inscription from Ghosrawa,” Indian Antiquary 17 (1888): 312, n. 36.

<sup>151</sup> The Tārā image includes the yad atra puṇyaṃ formula on the pedestal as well as an invocation to Tārā on the top of the backplate: om tāre om tāre om tāre svāhā (= Tsukamoto, Hilsā 1). In a delightful aside, the editor of the inscription says that the invocation “would have remained unnoticed had not my attention been drawn to it by my son, a boy of less than ten years, whose meddlesomeness has, now for the first time, produced something good.” See Surendranath Majumdar Sastri, “The Hilsa Statue Inscription of the Thirty-fifth year of Devapala,” Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society 10.3 (1940): 32–33.

<sup>152</sup> This inscription, which has our yad atra puṇyaṃ formula, begins mātuṃkhirasya bhāryāvuruṇḍi-(pu)trabhisāya. On this alone mātuṃkhira would appear to be the name of Bhita’s (or Bhīta’s) father. However, Vuruṇḍi and Bhita show up in other inscriptions with one Jīvadharma, who can only be Vuruṇḍi’s husband and Bhita’s father, leaving mātuṃkhira to look like a title, though it does not seem to be attested outside of Hodar. It is not impossible that mātuṃkhira was an alternative name of Jīvadharma or a title that could stand in for his name—two inscriptions have only the title/name mātuṃkhira in the instrumental case.
Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Title(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Object(s) given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Icchāwar 1</td>
<td>5th cent.</td>
<td>Bedikāyā</td>
<td>upāsikā</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icchāwar 2</td>
<td>5th cent.</td>
<td>Mahādevī</td>
<td>rājīṇī</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaggayapeta 4</td>
<td>5th-6th cent.</td>
<td>Candraprabha</td>
<td>paramopāsikā pravara-mahāyānayāyin</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaynagar A</td>
<td>12th cent.</td>
<td>Maharokā</td>
<td>pravara-mahāyānayāyin</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhewāri A</td>
<td>9th-10th cent.</td>
<td>Śubhadatta</td>
<td>sthavira</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhewāri B</td>
<td>9th-10th cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhewāri C</td>
<td>9th-10th cent.</td>
<td>Kumārabhadra</td>
<td>sthavira, pravara-mahāyānayāyin</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanauj 1</td>
<td>9th-10th cent.</td>
<td>Kusuma</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu, sthavira, pravara-mahāyānayāyita</td>
<td>image?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāndī A</td>
<td>12th cent.</td>
<td>Samudrāditya</td>
<td>rāṇaka, paramopāsaka, pravara-mahājānajaina</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanheri 9</td>
<td>5th-6th cent.</td>
<td>Buddhharakṣita</td>
<td>ācārya</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because I associate the yad atra punyam formula with Mahāyāna, I am tempted to classify the several other donative inscriptions (accompanying rock drawings) of this family as records of Mahāyāna gifts too. However, doing so on the basis of this single inscription may not be prudent, so I will just leave it as a suggestion. Bhita himself must have been the actual scribe of these inscriptions, as he is elsewhere called a divira and divirapati. Jason Neelis, personal communication, suggests to me that Bhita was demonstrating his “scribal aptitude” by using the yad atra punyam formula; in another inscription he uses a different formula with dharmahetuvaradā, which is well known from inscriptions in this area, and his inscriptions, somewhat amazingly, are written in both Brāhmī and Proto-Śāradā scripts. Cf. Tsukamoto, Hodar 4-27 and 167-169 (V.3).

154 Included here because of the compound buddhattvaprāptinimittaṃ.

155 D.C. Sircar, “Jaynagar Image Inscription of Year 35,” Journal of the Bihar Research Society 41.2 (1955): 146 (this inscription and the one referenced in the title of the paper are not the same).

156 Sircar, “Indological Notes,” 112 (inscription A = accession no. 8141).

157 Sircar, “Indological Notes,” 112 (inscription B = accession no. 8142).

158 Sircar, “Indological Notes,” 112-113 (inscription C = accession no. 8145).

159 D.C. Sircar, “Some Inscriptions from Bihar,” Journal of the Bihar Research Society 37.3-4 (1951): 7-10 (inscription C). Read mahāyānayāyin for mahājānajaina for this and Kurkihar 5. According to Sircar, Indian Epigraphical Glossary, s.v., rāṇaka is “derived from Rājanaka, Rājānaka, or Rājanyaka” and is a “title of feudatory rulers and, later, of the nobility.”
Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Title(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Object(s) given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kasiā 125</td>
<td>5th cent.</td>
<td>Haribala</td>
<td>(aneka)vihāra-svāmin</td>
<td>vessel (with relics?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasiā 126</td>
<td>10th cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>monastery and shrine?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashmir 2</td>
<td>6th–7th cent.</td>
<td>Ratnacittin</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerala A</td>
<td>9th cent.</td>
<td>Varaguṇa</td>
<td>deva</td>
<td>land and revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolivāḍ 1</td>
<td>13th cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosam B</td>
<td>6th cent.?</td>
<td>Dharmapradīpa</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu, bhadanta</td>
<td>lamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuḍā 8</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Vyāghrakā</td>
<td>śākyopāsikā</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuḍā 10</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Buddhhasimha</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuḍā 11</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Saṃghadeva</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kura 1</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Rotasiddhayrddhi</td>
<td>vihārasvāmin</td>
<td>monastery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

160 This inscription ends with anena sarvvasatvā buddhā bhavantu.

161 The end of this copperplate inscription, discovered with a copper vessel in the relic chamber of a stūpa, mentions a śākyabhikṣu named Dharmananda who “completely rejoices in/approves of [the gift]” (sarvatrānumodate).

162 This inscription begins by invoking Śiva, Tārā, and the Buddha. It records the gift of some ruler whose name has probably been lost; the last ruler named in the inscription’s genealogy is Bhīmaṭa, but there are three destroyed lines after this. The gift, which was probably spelled out in the damaged portion of the inscription, may have been a monastery with a shrine because the inscription was discovered along with a large Buddha image within the ruins of a shrine.


164 Included here because the inscription begins om nama bhagavatyai āryatārāyai. The partly mutilated image to which this inscription belongs must be Tārā.

165 Morrissey, “Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy,” 201 (inscription §58).

166 This inscription is important not only because it singles out Toramāṇa Śāha among the many beneficiaries of the wish for “unsurpassed knowledge,” but also because it uses the Mahāyāna donative formula in a gift for the acceptance of the teachers of the Mahīśāsaka Nikāya. But in his edition to the inscription, Bühler remarks that the portion of the inscription conveying the monastery to the
### Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Title(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Object(s) given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kurkihar 5</td>
<td>1058 CE</td>
<td>Tikuka</td>
<td>paramopāsaka, pravara-mahāyānajaina</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurkihar 51</td>
<td>10th cent.</td>
<td>Buddhajñāna</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣuṣṭhavira, pravaramahāyānayāyin</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurkihar 66</td>
<td>9th–11th cent.</td>
<td>Khaṃgāka</td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandhuk 1</td>
<td>10th cent.</td>
<td>Jambhalamitra</td>
<td>vrddhasārttha?</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurā 8</td>
<td>6th cent.</td>
<td>Jayabhāttā</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣuṇī</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurā 54</td>
<td>5th cent.</td>
<td>Yaśadinna</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurā 59</td>
<td>454/455 CE</td>
<td>Devatā</td>
<td>vihārasvāmin</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurā 60</td>
<td>444/445 CE</td>
<td>-māradāsa and Daṇḍa</td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurā 61</td>
<td>5th cent.</td>
<td>Dhavaśrīyā</td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurā 79</td>
<td>153 CE</td>
<td>Nāgarakṣita</td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurā 80</td>
<td>434/435 CE</td>
<td>Saṃghavarman</td>
<td>bhikṣu</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurā 119</td>
<td>467/468 CE</td>
<td>Jīvēśvara, Dhanapati, ?</td>
<td>śreṣṭhin</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mahiśāsaka teachers was written below “intentionally obliterated” lines. See G. Bühler, “The New Inscription of Toramana Shaha,” *Epigraphia Indica* 1 (1892): 238-241, esp. 240, n. 7. This opens up the possibility that the Mahiśāsaka teachers were not the original recipients of the gift, and Schopen opines that “it is likely that the record originally read not Mahiśāsaka, but Mahāyāna.” See Gregory Schopen, “The Mahāyāna and the Middle Period in Indian Buddhism,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 12-13. Schopen’s idea is interesting, but it may be based on the assumption that a Mahāyāna donor would only make a donation to a Mahāyāna recipient. Finally, on what this inscription says about the Buddha, see Schopen, “The Buddha as an Owner of Property and Permanent Resident in Medieval Indian Monasteries,” in *Bones, Stones and Buddhist Monks*, 264-265 and 282, n. 35.

167 I am not sure whether vrddhasārttha is a title—meaning “senior trader”?—or whether it should be read as two grandiose adjectives, vrddha and sārrtha.

168 I list the names from this inscription as Tsukamoto gives them, though they can be read differently. The beginning of the second line of the inscription is lost, and then we have māradāsadanḍaṇvijñāyamāṇasya.

169 This inscription ends with yad atra puṇyaṃ tad bhavatu sarvasatvānāṃ buddhatvāya.

170 This is the famous inscription for the Amitābha image that refers to King Huviṣka, edited by Schopen, “The Inscription on the Kuṣān Image of Amitābha and the Character of the Early Mahāyāna in India,” in *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India*, 249-258. Its stated intention is that all beings attain anut(t)ara(ṃ) bud(dh)ajñānam, “the unsurpassed knowledge of a buddha.”

171 The yad atra puṇyaṃ formula is almost completely missing, but I include this inscription here because it refers to the donation of an image of Avalokiteśvara (deyadharmmo 'yam āryāvalokiteśvarapratimā.
Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Title(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Object(s) given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathurā</td>
<td>4th cent.</td>
<td>Brahmasona</td>
<td>śākyabhiṣika, bhadanta</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nālandā 9</td>
<td>12th cent.</td>
<td>Vipulaśrīmitra</td>
<td></td>
<td>case, images, temple, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nālandā 10</td>
<td>9th cent.</td>
<td>Devapāladeva</td>
<td>paramasaugata, parameśvara, paramabhāṭṭāraka, mahārajājādhirāja</td>
<td>land and revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nālandā 12</td>
<td>10th–11th cent.</td>
<td>Bālāditya</td>
<td>paramopāsaka, pravara-mahāyānayāyin</td>
<td>gateway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nālandā A</td>
<td>8th–9th cent.</td>
<td>Gāṅgākā</td>
<td>paramopāsikā</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

prasīṭhāpitā). There may have been more than two donors for this gift, as the inscription is quite fragmentary. Śreṣṭhi is an occupation, not a name, though it is uncertain whether it applies to multiple donors or just Jīvesvara.

172 Given the dates of the other Mathurān inscriptions, the 4th century may be too early for this record.

173 This inscription is really a praśasti of the donor, Vipulaśrīmitra. It has several Mahāyāna elements. It invokes the goddess Tārā, the “savior of the world” (bhagavatī tārā jagattāriṇī), and states that Vipulaśrīmitra had a temple (bhavana) built for her in order to destroy the “eight great dangers of the world” (aṣṭau yaś ca mahābhayāni jagatāṃ). The case (mañjūṣā) was for the great temple (mahāyatana) of Khasarppaṇa (i.e., Avalokiteśvara) and was to hold the “Mother of the Conquerors” (jananī jinānāṃ), evidently a reference to the Prajñāpāramitā embodied in the Aṣṭasāhasrikā text, since elsewhere in the inscription there is a reference to “the Mother of the Buddhas with eight thousand [lines]” (sahasrair aṣṭābhiḥ . . . sambuddhajanānī). Gregory Schopen argues that the mañjūṣā with the “Mother of the Conquerors” was a bookcase that could be turned to “recite” the text mechanically and make merit. See his “A Note on the ‘Technology of Prayer’ and a Reference to a ‘Revolving Bookcase’ in an Eleventh-Century Inscription,” in Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India, 345-349.

174 The land was given at the request of a ruler of Suvarṇadvīpa, a mahārāja named Bālaputradeva, who according to the inscription had a monastery built at Nālandā. It refers to the Buddha as the abode of the Prajñāpāramitā, to Tārā, and evidently to a group of Tantric bodhisattvas (tāṃtrakovodhisattvagaṇa).

### Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Title(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Object(s) given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patagandigudem A</td>
<td>5th cent.</td>
<td>Vikramendravarman</td>
<td>mahābodhisatva</td>
<td>land and revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piṭalkhorā D</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>-deva</td>
<td>śākyabhiṣkū</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raisen A</td>
<td>11th cent.</td>
<td>Vattāṅka</td>
<td>paramopāsaka, pravara-mahāyānayāyin</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saheṭh–Maheṭh 6</td>
<td>12th–13th cent.</td>
<td>Vidyādhara</td>
<td>bodhisattva?</td>
<td>monastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sānci 919</td>
<td>7th cent.</td>
<td>Tuṅga?</td>
<td>monastery?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sārnāth 10</td>
<td>4th–5th cent.</td>
<td>Buddhapriya</td>
<td>śākyabhiṣkū</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sārnāth 11</td>
<td>5th cent.</td>
<td>Buddhāpriya</td>
<td>śākyabhiṣkū</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sārnāth 21</td>
<td>4th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Dhammasena</td>
<td>image</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sārnāth 24</td>
<td>4th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Rāmadatta</td>
<td>śākyabhiṣkū</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

176 As far as I am aware, this inscription has yet to be critically edited. For now see B.S.L. Hanumantha Rao et al., Buddhist Inscriptions of Andhradesa (Secunderabad: Ananda Buddha Vihara Trust, 1998), 207-210. If I understand the inscription correctly, the donor (or his father, Mādhavavarman?) is referred to as a mahābodhisatva. The inscription also has a variation of our formula.

177 Morrissey, “Śākyabhiṣkus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy,” 207-208 (inscription §78).


179 This is a praśasti inscription recounting the exalted lineage and wonderful deeds of the donor, Vidhyādhara. I assume that the primary given object that is described in the inscription was a monastery, though technically it says that Vidyādhara, “in the manner of a monastery, had built and gave, as if it were the single home of his renown, a dwelling that was the foundation of joy for ascetics” ( . . . yaminām ānandamālālayo nirmanāyotsasre vihāravidhinā kīrtter ivaikāśrayaḥ). I include it here because the donor is compared to a “bodhisattva, as had never been before, who took on a body to protect the multitude of living beings” (satvasārthaparitrāṇakāyaparigrahah / abhūd abhūtapūrvayoṃ vodhisatva ivāparaḥ /). This inscription also gives homage to Tārā, who has “rescuing eyes” (uttāralocanā), that is, she surveys the world seeking to rescue beings.

180 This highly fragmentary inscription is included because its author praises Lokanātha (i.e., Avalokiteśvara), who is described as holding a flower and bearing Amitābha, as well as (the bodhisattva?) Vajrapāṇi (pāṇau padmaṃ . . . yo ’mitābhaṃ ca dhatte taṃ vande lokanātham . . . vande vajrapāṇiṃ). It appears to record the gift of a monastery with cells (v[jhāraḥ sallayan tato ’tra kāri . . .), which may have been donated by a certain Tuṅga ( . . . ścana-Tuṅgasya satka eṣa vi(hāraḥ)).
Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Title(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Object(s) given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sārnāth 24</td>
<td>1026 CE</td>
<td>Sthirapāla and Vasantapāla</td>
<td></td>
<td>perfume chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sārnāth 43</td>
<td>5th cent.</td>
<td>Suyātra</td>
<td>paramopāsaka, visayapati</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sārnāth 46</td>
<td>11th cent.</td>
<td>Śamaṅka</td>
<td>paramopāsaka, pravara-mahāyānānuyāyin</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sārnāth 51</td>
<td>11th–12th cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td>paramopāsaka, mahāyānānuyāyin</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sārnāth 96</td>
<td>4th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Sinhamati</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu</td>
<td>column?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sārnāth 111</td>
<td>1058 CE</td>
<td>Māmakā</td>
<td>paramopāsikā, mahājānānujajina</td>
<td>text, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sārnāth 112</td>
<td>12th cent.</td>
<td>Kumāradevī</td>
<td></td>
<td>monastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sārnāth 184</td>
<td>11th–12th cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td>paramopāsaka, mahāyānānuyāyin</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sārnāth 204</td>
<td>6th cent.</td>
<td>Ṛṇṇuṇaṇa</td>
<td>paramopāsaka</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sārnāth 206</td>
<td>8th cent.</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣu, sthavira</td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terai A</td>
<td>6th–7th cent.</td>
<td>Pariśuddhamati</td>
<td>śākyabhikṣunī</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

181 Though written on the base of a Buddha image, this inscription states that the donors, two brothers who were connected with King Mahīpāla I, “built a new stone perfume chamber [for or related to] the eight great places” (kṛtavantau ca navinām aṣṭamahāsthānśailagandhakūtīm). The “eight great places” refers to the eight miraculous events believed to have occurred during the Buddha’s life, so there must have been imagery of these events in or near the perfume chamber, and indeed a stone slab discovered at Sārnāth has these events carved in relief. See Sahni, Catalogue of the Museum of Archaeology at Sārnāth, 6-7 and plate XIX(b) (misprinted as XIX(h)). The two brothers also had two buildings at Sārnāth restored. This inscription is included here because the brothers are described as “incapable of turning back from awakening” (bodhav avinnavartta). For citations of this concept in Mahāyāna texts, see BHSD, s.vv. avinivarta, avinivartaniya, avinivartin, and avinivartin.

182 Read mahāyānānuyāyin for mahājānānujajina. This important inscription states that Māmakā had a copy of the Aṣṭasāhasrikāpārajñā written for the community of monks. There was another donation of Māmakā recorded but this part of the inscription is unfortunately no longer legible. Māmakā’s husband, Dhamesvara, is also described as a paramopāsaka and mahājānānujajin.  

183 This inscription is technically a praśasti of Kumāradevī, one of the wives of Govindacandra of Kanauj. It is included here because of the patent devotion to Tārā/Tārini, to whom Kumāradevī and her mother, Śaṅkaradevī, are actually compared. In verse 21 Tārā is evidently equated with the goddess Vasudhārā, who is also invoked at the beginning of the inscription.

184 The gift is not specified in the inscription, nor in Marshall-Konow (see Tsukamoto for the reference). Tsukamoto writes mahāyānānuyāyin for the mahāyānānuyāyin of Marshall-Konow.
Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Title(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Object(s) given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tetrawan 1</td>
<td>1073 CE</td>
<td>Īcchara</td>
<td>-āsaka, paravaramahāja-</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalpan 27 (V.3)</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Kuberavāhana</td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalpan 28 (V.3)</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Kuberavāhana</td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalpan 29 (V.3)</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Kuberavāhana</td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalpan 30 (V.3)</td>
<td>5th–6th cent.</td>
<td>Kuberavāhana</td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalpan 56 (V.3)</td>
<td>5th–7th cent.</td>
<td>Guṇaśreṣṭa</td>
<td></td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


186 The missing parts of the donor’s titles can be filled out to paravara[read: pravara]mahājānujāyi-paramopāsaka or something close to that.

187 Kuberavāhana’s name, which is usually spelled kueravāhana, is instead spelled kumeṃravāhana here.

188 The *yad atra puṇyaṃ* formula is not completely legible, but this inscription is found with representations of stūpas and seated figures, the latter being labeled as Śākyamuni Tathāgata, Mañjuśrī bodhisattva, Ārya Avalokiteśvara bodhisattva, and Ārya Maitreya bodhisattva. Cf. Tsukamoto, Thalpan 1 and 2.

189 This inscription begins *namo kṣobhya*, “homage to Akṣobhya.”

I should add that there are other donative inscriptions from the Chilās-Thalpan area that might also need to be considered Mahāyāna records. Tsukamoto, Thalpan 41 (V.3) records the donation of a drawing of a stūpa by a donor whose name begins *madana-*,-, who may be the same as the Thalpan 42 (V.3) donor madanasihena from “Altar Rock.” Next to Thalpan 41 (V.3) lies Thalpan 43 (V.3), which gives homage to three Tathāgatas, including Amitābha. The problem is that Thalpan 41 and 43 (V.3) are written in a completely different ductus, so it is uncertain whether they are related. See von Hinüber, “Buddhistische Inschriften aus dem Tal des oberen Indus,” in *Antiquities of Northern Pakistan*, Vol. 1, 89–90 (inscription nos. 90-91). In addition, near the inscribed drawings of stūpas donated by a Varuṇeśvara on “Altar Rock” (Tsukamoto, Thalpan 11-12 (V.3)), there is a separate inscription offering homage to Avalokiteśvara that is not unlike the so-called Avalokiteśvara dhāraṇī (Tsukamoto, Thalpan 55 (V.3)). However, I cannot tell whether these inscriptions are related in any way, so Varuṇeśvara’s possible Mahāyāna affiliation remains unclear. The name Varuṇeśvara comes up again in a Chilās inscription together with a donor named Vicittradeva (Tsukamoto, Chilās 94 (V.3)). Finally, Tsukamoto, Chilās 135 (V.3) was written by (likhitam) an individual named Priyamitra and gives homage to four Tathāgatas, including Amitābha and Akṣobhya, so the inscription is certainly Mahāyānist. The name Priyamitra shows up in five other inscriptions from the same area (Tsukamoto, Chilās 87–91 (V.3)), at least one of which is donative (Chilās 91 (V.3)). However, there was evidently more than one individual with this name—in three inscriptions a Priyamitra has the title bhikṣu, in one a Priyamitra has the title ācārya, and in two others we just have the bare name—so it is uncertain which of Chilās 87–91 (V.3), if any, can
Table 2: Mahāyāna donative inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Title(s) of donor(s)</th>
<th>Object(s) given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tippera A</td>
<td>10th-11th cent.</td>
<td>Īśvarasimha</td>
<td>paramopāsaka, mahāyānayāyin</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tummalagudem A</td>
<td>5th-7th cent.</td>
<td>Govindavarman</td>
<td>mahārāja</td>
<td>land and revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown A</td>
<td>9th cent.</td>
<td>Buddhapiya</td>
<td>sthavira</td>
<td>image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can see that the Mahāyāna epigraphic record is dominated by a certain kind of gift. Of the one hundred and eight inscriptions in Table 2, at least eighty record the gift of images. This trend is even more pronounced when one considers some key points. To begin with, some of the inscriptions from Table 1, most of which were written on images as well, were likely made by Mahāyāna Buddhists. Second, for many inscriptions it is just not possible to tell whether the donor was a Mainstream or Mahāyāna Buddhist. It therefore does not seem unreasonable to suppose that many inscribed images after the 5th century (and some perhaps before that time), even though they do not fit the criteria I have established for a Mahāyāna be connected to Chilās 135 (V.3). See von Hinüber, “Brāhmī Inscriptions on the History and Culture of the Upper Indus Valley,” in Antiquities of Northern Pakistan, Vol. 1, 50-51.

190 N. K. Bhattasali, Iconography of Buddhist and Brahmanical Sculptures in the Dacca Museum (Dacca: India Museum, 1929), 25-26 and plate VI(a).

191 This charter inscription is dated to the 37th year of Govindavarman. The wide range of dates is due to differences in opinion in the genealogy of Viṣṇukundin kings. See Sankaranarayanan, “Two Vishṇukunḍi Charters from Tummalagudem,” 4-20 (Set I); V.V. Mirashi, “New Light on Two Sets of Tummalagudem Plates of the Vishṇukunḍins,” in Indological Research Papers, Vol. I (Nagpur: Vidarbha Samshodan Mandal, 1982), 121-141 (inscription II). I include it here because of several apparent Mahāyāna technical terms used to describe the donor (utpāditamahābodhicitta), the Āryasaṃgha recipient (triyānayāyin), and the Buddha (aṣṭādaśāvenikabuddhadharmma, punyajñānasambhāra, anāvaraṇasakalajñeya). Based on the “excessive use of the Buddhist technical terms,” Sankaranarayanan, “Two Vishṇukunḍi Charters,” 8 suggests that the charter was actually written by the monks who resided in the monastery that benefited from the revenues of the villages given in the grant.

192 Mitra, “Lintels with the Figures of Eight Great Bodhisattvas and a Tathāgata,” 294-297 and plate 7. Although this piece most likely comes from northeastern India, Buddhapiya was from Kāñci, like several donors of the images in the Kurkihar collection (see n. 90 above).
donative inscription, were still given by Mahāyānists. Most importantly, I have not even touched on the hundreds and hundreds of uninscribed images that have been identified either as Mahāyāna figures or as having Mahāyāna content. I have tried to restrict myself to epigraphic matters in this chapter. With the exception of a few pieces at Ajanṭā, I have avoided what are often lengthy yet tenuous art-historical arguments regarding the identity of this or that image. And for now I certainly have no desire to enter beyond the fringes of the larger controversies about Indian Mahāyāna art, chief among them the content of Gandhāran steles.

193 What exactly constitutes Mahāyāna art—to say nothing of art itself—is a vexed problem that can be approached from various angles. Generally art is classified by its content. If an image has iconographic features of, say, the bodhisattva Mañjuśrī, it is by definition a Mahāyāna image. But the problem can be looked at from the point of view of the donor too. If a donor of an image was affiliated with or, again, inspired by Mahāyāna in some way—as evidenced by epigraphic information—should the image be classified as Mahāyāna art? If so, then the many images of Sākyamuni Buddha that are inscribed with our yad atra puṇyaṃ formula, a word for Mahāyāna, and so on would have to be deemed Mahāyānists. (Obviously, Sākyamuni as a Mahāyāna buddha is not a doctrinal problem.) Another critical but sometimes forgotten angle is the point of view of the audience. If a collective audience—or a single viewer?—gazes upon and ritually engages a piece of art with a Mahāyānist “eye of the beholder,” might we consider it to be Mahāyāna art? And would this have limits? Can an aniconic image of the Buddha made before Mahāyāna existed in India be Mahāyānist? How about a sculpture of a Jain Tīrthaṅkara or a Hindu god?

From whichever angle Mahāyāna as a potential category of Indian Buddhist art is approached, one would be wise to reflect on the questions posed and problems raised by Juhyung Rhi regarding the relationship (or lack thereof) between doctrine and imagery. Rhi’s questions and observations concern Gandhāran art, but they are equally valid for other geographic areas:

When someone who is barely aware of or perhaps cares little about what may be termed exclusively as Mahāyāna at a doctrinal level dedicates an image of a divinity that is monopolized in the Mahāyāna scriptural tradition, is he/she a Mahāyānist? Or is his/her dedication an example of Mahāyāna practice? Does the discussion of his/her activity have anything to do with that of doctrinal agenda that could have obsessed the minds of learned monastics in a limited circle?

...[A]rt serving a religion—although it would inevitably reflect the religion—tends to represent certain segments or aspects of religious ideas and practices better than others. Quite frequently some segment or aspect could be disproportionately magnified, while others could be entirely missing. Therefore, information deduced from artistic materials could have a limited significance, and extreme caution is necessary in linking it to that of the textual tradition. Most of the monuments and objects in Gandhāran art were related to devotional practice, and were quite conventional and stereotyped in form and iconography. There seems to have been little room in them for sophisticated doctrinal or philosophical ideas—such as to be found in the textual tradition—to be projected properly.

that depict a central Buddha surrounded by a host of figures, as well as the identity of what are usually considered to be bodhisattva images, whether the latter are independent statues, flanking a Buddha image in triads, or carved in relief as part of the just-mentioned steles. Wherever one positions himself in these controversies, there can be little doubt that some of these uninscribed pieces are Mahāyāna images, especially those from later periods of Indian Buddhist history.

When the epigraphic and art-historical data are combined, the trend is overwhelming. It is clear that Mahāyāna Buddhists in India, at least by the 5th century or thereabouts, were fully engaged in image cults. They were donating images, particularly Buddha images, in great numbers.

Curiously, this level of involvement in image cults is not what one might expect if he reads the Mahāyāna Sūtras discussed in chapter II that promote ascetic lifestyles. Most of these

---

194 Just one of the Gandhāran steles, from Muhammed Nari in present-day Pakistan, has been interpreted as Śākyamuni’s miracle at Śrāvastī, Śākyamuni surrounded by various bodhisattvas (and possibly about to preach a Mahāyāna Sūtra), Amitābha in Sukhāvatī, Aksobhya in Abhirati, and an iconographically nondescript buddha in a generic buddha-field. For a recent summary of the scholarship on this stele, see Paul Harrison and Christian Luczanits, “New Light on (and from) the Muhammad Nari Stele,” in 2011 nendo dai ikkai kokusai shinpojiumu puroshidōngusu: Jōdokyō ni kansuru tokubetsu kokusai shinpojiumu (BARC International Symposium Series 1: Special International Symposium on Pure Land Buddhism) (Kyoto: Ryukoku University Research Center for Buddhist Cultures in Asia, 2012), esp. 71-73. And for a classification scheme of the Muhammad Nari and other steles, see ibid., 88ff.

195 The most meticulous work on early Mahāyāna bodhisattva images, though restricted to Gandhāra, is Juhyung Rhi, “Bodhisattvas in Gandhāran Art: An Aspect of Mahāyāna in Gandhāran Buddhism,” in Gandhāran Buddhism: Archaeology, Art, Texts, ed. Pia Brancaccio and Kurt Behrendt (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2006), 151-182. While Rhi offers a careful typology of certain (non-Buddha) Gandhāran figures, he still assumes that all of those figures are bodhisattvas. On the all-but-ignored possibility, based largely on parallels from Greco-Roman art history, that they instead represent regal or other well-to-do human patrons of Buddhism, see Benjamin Rowland, “Bodhisattvas or Deified Kings: A Note on Gandhara Sculpture,” Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America 15 (1961): 6-12. And for a refreshingly skeptical take on the early art-historical material of North India, see Morrissey, “Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy,” 15-50.

196 This has already been noticed by Morrissey, “Śākyabhikṣus, palimpsests and the art of apostasy,” 170ff.
texts never mention images at all. One that does, the *Maitreyasimhanāda-sūtra*, is highly critical of monks who are involved in the image cult. Another, the *Pratyutpannabuddha-saṃmukhāvasthitasamādhi-sūtra*, refers to the making of images, but evidently to facilitate entering into the *samādhi* for which the text was written, not to worship them, earn merit, or anything else that we normally associate with image cults. Other, less ascetically inclined Sūtras that also appear to come from early strata of Mahāyāna texts barely mention images either, and the scant references to images that can be found in them might be later additions or, in the case of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*, even Chinese interpolations. All of this, in tandem with similar attitudes toward the stūpa cult in early Mahāyāna Sūtras, led Gregory Schopen to conclude the following:

[Early] Mahāyāna *sūtra* literature had no impact on these external cult forms because its authors were simply not interested in them. They . . . were interested in something else, and this would seem to be an obvious consequence of what everyone seems to agree was their major innovation: they were not interested in worshipping Buddhas; they were interested in becoming Buddhas. They were willing to admit that worshipping Buddhas as relics or images was meritorious, but they consistently asserted that it was far, far more meritorious to, in one of their favorite expressions, “obtain patient acceptance in the face of unfathomable dharma.” They took up the metaphor of the cult because that was apparently the most highly regarded activity of their day, but only, it seems, to subvert it, only, it seems, to turn religious energies away from worship and toward—or back toward (?)—understanding what they thought the Dharma or Teaching was and what it entailed.

There are actually at least a few Mahāyāna Sūtras open to these cult practices beyond their use in mere literary metaphors. With regard to the image cult specifically, Rhi notes that

---


the Sumatidārikāparipṛcchā-, Vimaladattāparipṛcchā-, and Bhadrakalpika-sūtras encourage bodhisattvas to make images of the Buddha seated on a lotus, and that the Sumatidārikāparipṛcchā- and Vimaladattāparipṛcchā-sūtras also promote making offerings to the Buddha in the form of an image or stūpa. Like the Pratyutpannabuddhasaṃmukhāvasthitasamādhi-sūtra, the reward for making images in the Bhadrakalpika-sūtra is the attainment of a samādhi. For the Sumatidārikāparipṛcchā- and Vimaladattāparipṛcchā-sūtras, on the other hand, the reward is a miraculous birth (upapāduka). Harrison and Luczanits translate a relevant passage from the Sumatidārikāparipṛcchā-sūtra in the following way:

> With four things, young lady, a bodhisattva is reborn miraculously from a great jewel lotus in the presence of the Buddhas and Blessed Ones. What are the four? They are filling one’s hands with powder or blue lilies (upala) or lotuses (padma) or night lilies (kumuda) or white lotuses (puṇḍarīka) and offering them to the image of a Realized One (tathāgata) or to the stūpa of a Realized One; having no malice towards others; commissioning an image of a Realized One seated on a lotus throne; being firmly convinced about the awakening of the Buddha. With those four things, young lady, a bodhisattva is reborn miraculously from a great jewel lotus in the presence of the Buddhas and Blessed Ones.

Other Mahāyāna Sūtras that seem to sanction the image cult include the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabha, Buddhabalādhānaprātihāryavikurvāṇanirdeśa, and Dānādhikaraṇa, and two non-Sūtra texts attributed to Nāgārjuna, the Ratnāvalī and


200 Translated from Tib., Derge Kanjur, dkon brtsegs, Ca 217a6–b1) mDo sde, Za 103b5-106b5). See Harrison and Luczanits, “New Light on (and from) the Muhammad Nari Stele,” 116-117.


202 See Ware, “Studies in the Divyāvadāna,” 47 (nos. 27-29).
Bodhisambhāra-śāstra, also promote making images of the Buddha on a lotus seat.\textsuperscript{203} But by the standards of Mahāyāna literature, none of these texts would appear to be early. The Sumatidārikāparipṛcchā-, Vimaladattā-paripṛcchā-, and Bhadrakalpika-sūtras were not first translated into Chinese by Dharmarakṣa until the late 3\textsuperscript{rd} century CE and were probably not composed much earlier than that.\textsuperscript{204} And the other texts mentioned here were in all likelihood written around the same time or later, if not much later.\textsuperscript{205}

If these texts, though certainly a small proportion of the total corpus of Mahāyāna literature, accurately reflect overall Mahāyāna attitudes in India, then the willingness on the part of Mahāyāna Buddhists to participate in the image cult—a cult of making and ritually interacting with images that was started by their Mainstream brethren—increased gradually, probably over several centuries. From the 5\textsuperscript{th} century onwards, when we find almost all of the donative inscriptions listed in Tables 1 and 2, Indian Mahāyānists on the whole almost certainly were not just willing to participate in the image cult, but had come to embrace it.

\textsuperscript{203} On the passage in the Ratnāvalī, see Walser, Nāgārjuna in Context, 79-87. On the Bodhisambhāra-śāstra, whose attribution to Nāgārjuna, by the way, is not without doubt, see Rhi, “Early Mahāyāna and Gandhāran Buddhism,” 170.


\textsuperscript{205} Again see Schopen, “On Sending the Monks Back to Their Books,” 119. On the date of the Dānādhikaraṇa-sūtra, see the introductory material in chapter III above. For a very late and possibly Chinese apocryphal Mahāyāna text on bathing Buddha images, see Boucher, “Sūtra on the Merit of Bathing the Buddha,” in Buddhism in Practice, 59-68. Unfortunately I know very little about another text on images, the *Tathāgatapratibimbapratīṣṭhānusāṃsā-sūtra* (T. 694), other than the fact that it recounts the legend of King Udayana’s first Buddha image and, from the straightforward title, enumerates the benefits of making images of the Tathāgata. According to Sharf, the Mahāyāna version of this text was based on two earlier non-Mahāyāna texts (T. 692 and 693) and was not translated (if there was in fact an Indian original) into Chinese until the late 7\textsuperscript{th} century. See Robert Sharf, “The Scripture on the Production of Buddha Images,” in Religions of China in Practice, ed. Donald S. Lopez, Jr. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 261-267.
completely. And if Schopen is right that early Mahāyānists “were not interested in worshipping Buddhas” but rather “were interested in becoming Buddhas,” then Mahāyāna in India looks to have undergone another sea change. For the many images inscribed with the *yad atra punyam* formula suggest that Mahāyānists were interested in worshipping buddhas and becoming buddhas. By donating images they were making a cult object available for worship, if not for themselves then for other Buddhists, and by inscribing them with the *yad atra punyam* formula they were expressing the wish that the worshippers—nay, all beings—would achieve *anuttarajñāna*, “unsurpassed knowledge.” By donating images they were hoping that all beings would be able to realize the exalted level of knowledge concomitant with awakening, the quintessential Mahāyāna soteriological goal.

The textual, epigraphic, and art-historical data seem to be in basic agreement about the history of Mahāyāna image donation in India. Most early Mahāyāna texts say nothing about images, and some that do are hesitant about, if not downright hostile toward, the image cult. When these texts were composed, there is almost no epigraphic evidence for the donation of images by Mahāyāna Buddhists, and there is also little evidence—and very little reliable evidence—for Mahāyāna imagery. Later on, however, we begin to find texts—I have mentioned eleven but there are perhaps more—that promote having images made and making offerings to them for various rewards, and eventually Mahāyāna was to make an indelible mark on the epigraphic and art-historical records of India.

***

I would like to return to where this chapter began: the value of epigraphic sources, especially in comparison to that of texts. Jan Nattier makes some key remarks defending the
importance of textual sources in her book on the *Ugraparipṛcchā-sūtra*. She astutely points out that the production and reproduction of texts, and the dissemination of the ideals present in those texts, are in themselves forms of practice, ones to which certain Buddhists in India devoted a great deal of time, thought, and resources. In so doing, she also calls into question the usefulness of epigraphic sources because of, in her words, the “monotony” of their contents. In particular, she challenges some of the assertions made by Gregory Schopen:

> Though Schopen has argued that inscriptions and not canonical texts reveal the true sentiments of actual Buddhists, it seems important to point out that the surviving dedicatory inscriptions on which he bases his argument are remarkably limited in both content and form. The fact that such a large body of material is so utterly formulaic suggests that we should perhaps view it not as a reflection of actual Buddhists’ beliefs and practices, but rather as a record of what they thought is acceptable—or perhaps even obligatory—to carve.\(^{206}\)

There is no doubt that inscriptions are formulaic. As such, they seem to involve a narrow band of what may have been an array of religious ideas and practices. Rather than dismissing them for their lack of variety, however, I would argue that inscriptions are an indispensable source for precisely this reason. The fact that they tend to express the same or similar things over and over again suggests that the beliefs, feelings, and aspirations they record were widely shared in religious communities and considered important to those who held them. With the *yad atra punyam* formula, what we appear to have is the repetition of a or the critical religious goal held by a network of Mahāyāna Buddhists in India. Mahāyāna inscriptions, that is, have something to tell us because of their formulaic nature, not in spite of it. One might apply the same principle to texts. (As I hope is clear from chapter II above, Nattier surely exaggerates when

---

she says that Mahāyāna Sūtras are “notable for their variety.” For example, the repetitive and stereotyped language used to describe the machinations of karma in Indian Buddhist texts would seem to indicate what Indian Buddhists actually believed (and, correspondingly, what they thought was “acceptable” to write or recite), a widespread belief that no doubt affected behavior outside of the texts. Repetition in texts, as in inscriptions, would appear to point to something crucial. At the very least, it does not seem like variety in texts or inscriptions is a good litmus test for an authentic belief or practice.

It may be fruitful to reflect on Nattier’s suggestion that epigraphic formulas were considered “obligatory” to inscribe, though not for the reason she intended. Epigraphic formulas may have been the written analogs to ritual speech. Like spoken utterances (or performative “speech acts”) that are believed to be required to bring about the intended results of rituals, perhaps written words were thought necessary to effect the goals of inscriptions. An inscription, in this view, is not unlike the prāṇidhāna or “oath” of Buddhist texts or the saṃkalpa or “declaration of purpose” of Brahmanical rituals. If this is true, there is a very good reason for epigraphic formulas: written words were believed to carry

---

207 A Few Good Men, 104.


209 Michaels describes the saṃkalpa as an utterance that intentionally marks off the sacred space, time, and actor of a Brahmanical ritual. Without it, the ritual is merely a mundane sequence of actions that will not produce the desired effect: “It seems, then, that everyday behaviour has to be intentionally directed towards religious aims in order to be ritually acceptable. Unknowingly, unconsciously and unwillingly performed rituals have no religious result (phala, puṇya).” Besides the declaration of the religious goal, donative inscriptions and saṃkalpas share other features: Both often state genealogical and other information about the religious actor and the time of the religious deed. See Alex Michaels, “Saṃkalpa: The Beginnings of a Ritual,” in Words and Deeds: Hindu and Buddhist Rituals in South Asia, ed. Jörg Gengnagel, Ute Hüskens, and Srilata Raman (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2005), 45-63 (quote taken from p. 49).
supernatural potency, so there were disastrous consequences to getting them wrong. The eminent Indian epigraphist Sten Konow clearly saw this in the material he knew so well, proposing that inscriptions “were more or less considered as a kind of charm.”\textsuperscript{210} For some Mahāyānists in India, perhaps the \textit{yad atra puṇyaṃ} was a “kind of charm”—it was not the mental dedication of one’s gift that was thought to lead all beings to “unsurpassed knowledge,” but the words of the \textit{yad atra puṇyaṃ} formula themselves. Perhaps it was not or not just the idea contained in the formula that mattered, but the very act of inscribing the idea into or onto what was for all intents and purposes a permanent surface.

There are very real and frustrating limits to what the epigraphic material, especially the Mahāyāna epigraphic material, can tell us. However, the limits have little to do with what the words of the inscriptions say and everything to do with what the inscriptions were written on. The reader will recall from chapter III that the \textit{Dānapāramitā-sūtra} enumerates a wide range of objects that should be given by a bodhisattva. Those objects are, more or less in the order that the text introduces them, as follows: food, drinks, vehicles (including wagons, palanquins, horses, elephants, and even shoes), clothing, various precious ornaments, lamps, music, perfume, aromatic powder, ointment, flowers and flower garlands, culinary delicacies, residences, palatial mansions, beds and pillows, chairs, mats, benches, household articles, medicine, slaves and workers, gardens, ascetic groves, monasteries, family members, wealth, treasure, grain, supplies, one’s kingdom, the four continents, the crest jewel and crown, virtually every part of one’s body (beginning with the feet and ending with bone marrow), fine

\textsuperscript{210} Konow, \textit{Kharoshṭhī Inscriptions with the Exception of Those of Aśoka} (Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. II, Pt. I) (Calcutta: Government of India Central Publication Branch, 1929), cxviii. At ibid., 93, he says much the same thing with regard to the inscriptions on the images recovered from the Jauliān monastic site: “[T]he aim of the votive inscriptions was not, perhaps, that they should be read and understood, but to ensure religious merit through the mystic power of the aksharas. Only very few of those who saw the images were able to read the inscriptions.”
scents, bells, the Dharma, and even the actions of praise and sweeping. Similar items that are to be given show up in other Mahāyāna Sūtras, though almost never in such an exhaustive list of objects as is found in the Dānapāramitā. The reader will have noticed, moreover, that the Dānapaṭala of the Bodhisattvabhūmi also discusses the bodhisattva’s giving many things, along with myriads of stipulations defining the conditions under which his gifts may be given. (Interestingly, neither the Dānaparamitā nor the Dānapaṭala says anything about donating images or stūpas. The gift of images in Mahāyāna texts has already been commented on. Mention of stūpas as gifts in Mahāyāna Sūtras does not seem to be infrequent, though I have not surveyed the literature systematically with regard to this issue.) The items in the Dānapaṭala include, also in the approximate order that they appear in the text, the following:

- various body parts, poison, fire, weapons, liquor, elephants, horses, wagons, and other vehicles, clothing, ornaments, food, drinks, training and equipment for dancing, singing, and instrumental music, flower garlands, ointment, housewares, gardens, houses, women (for sexual intercourse), training in assorted subjects of arts and craftwork, villages, cities, smaller pieces of land, family members, slaves and workers, lamps, precious ornaments, the Dharma (in oral and written form), security (from harmful things), wealth, grain, perfume, ointment, and lighting.

Some of these objects are theoretical and we can assume that they were seldom given in India, if at all. The statements about giving away the kingdom, the four continents, and the crest jewel and crown in the Dānapāramitā-sūtra are part of a larger Buddhist discourse on the ideal king,\(^{211}\) not descriptions of real gifts. Similarly, the teachings on surrendering the body in

---

both texts are primarily meant to highlight the extreme generosity of a bodhisattva, thereby casting him in the mold of the Bodhisattva, Śākyamuni, who is said to have sacrificed himself in many of his previous lives.\textsuperscript{212} Most of the objects mentioned in these texts, though, are practical, physical items or other common things that must have been given away with some regularity. We can easily imagine Mahāyāna Buddhists in India giving many of them away with intentions that were colored by a Mahāyāna view of the world. Unfortunately, though, we can do little more than imagine.

Aside from many images in Table 2, there are probably eight grants of land and six monasteries, two temples, two caves, a couple references to texts as gifts, possibly two shrines, and a single stūpa, a perfume chamber, a vessel for relics, a lamp, a gateway, and a few other minor items. That is all. Barely any of the objects in two major Mahāyāna works on giving, one a Sūtra and the other a chapter from a Śāstra, show up in the Mahāyāna epigraphic record as gifts. So while Mahāyāna inscriptions provide a record of giving in practice, that record does not come close to telling us everything we want to know about giving. Maria Heim, in one of her many incisive observations, underscores the limits of epigraphy in understanding gift giving:

\begin{quote}
Inscriptions are public expressions of a particular sort. They record significant gifts to temples and institutions rather than face-to-face generosity of every day gifts between persons. Donors generally did not hire scribes and artisans to record in stone their placing a bit of food in the alms bowl of a traveling monk who dropped by that morning.\textsuperscript{213}
\end{quote}

Heim’s caveat very much applies to the Mahāyāna epigraphic record. In general only “big” gifts were deemed worthy to inscribe. For other kinds of objects, we are forced to turn to

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{212} Physical self-sacrifice may have occurred to a limited degree in India. See n. 88 in chapter II.
\textsuperscript{213} Heim, \textit{Theories of the Gift in South Asia}, 30.
\end{flushright}
normative, theoretical texts like the Dānapāramitā-sūtra or Dānapaṭala and make assumptions or guesses about the other things that might have changed hands. We know almost nothing about “face-to-face generosity,” about the mundane interactions between Mahāyāna donors and recipients. It is not even possible to surmise whether such interactions—“placing a bit of food in the alms bowl of a traveling monk,” for example—were a common occurrence. The only information we can glean from Mahāyāna inscriptions about the acquisition of daily requisites such as food, medicine, or materials needed for worship comes from land grants to monasteries. But here it is the land or village, not the requisities themselves, that comprises the actual gift; the granted land merely provides monks with a source of revenue to pay for their ongoing needs.

The tendency for inscriptions to document “big” gifts points to another problem. Not surprisingly, Heim has struck on this as well: “[W]hile inscriptions record many different types of donors—religious men and women, merchants, traders, local chiefs and village headmen, soldiers, ministers, kings, queens, and different kinds of brahmans—they are still depicting the prestige and aspirations of those who can afford to give and record noteworthy gifts.”

Almost all the gifts in Table 2 would have been quite expensive. For the images, generally a donor would have had to pay for an artisan to make one and for a scribe to write the inscription, and for free-standing images, the donor would have also had to pay for the precious materials out of which Indian images were wrought. Schopen, in a conclusion with which I very much agree but which Nattier clearly does not like, avers that Buddhist texts record only “what a small, atypical part of the Buddhist community wanted that community to

214 Ibid.
believe or practice.”215 But most Buddhist inscriptions in India, too, hardly seem to record the activities of a typical part of the community. While textual sources privilege the views of educated male monks, donative inscriptions usually privilege the activities of well-off patrons. Whether we examine the texts or the inscriptions or both, the “poor man’s” religious gift, if that were indeed a real thing, is forever lost to us.

I began this chapter with what I felt was a necessary apology for the use of epigraphic sources—necessary because inscriptions continue to play too small a role in the study of gift giving, necessary because I believe that Indian Buddhist Studies is still in thrall of textual sources. But I will have to finish it, I am afraid, by rolling back that apology just a little bit. Inscriptions do provide a view into the real behaviors of foregone donors and the real beliefs motivating their gifts. But only certain kinds of donors, and only certain kinds of gifts. The view inscriptions afford is not panoramic, and in the end they leave us with only part of the picture of Mahāyāna Buddhist giving in practice.

215 “Archaeology and Protestant Presuppositions,” in Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks, 1.
VI: A Long View of Indian Mahāyāna History

The Indian Mahāyāna position on gift giving resists a neat summary. In reality, there is no single Mahāyāna position on gift giving—what one will find is very much a function of the sources she chooses to examine. With regard to the Sūtra literature, I was able to identify twelve patterns related to gift giving because Mahāyāna Sūtras share so much material and draw from the same stock formulas and tropes. At the same time, those twelve patterns cannot all be found in a single Mahāyāna Sūtra. Certain ideas about the gift may not have circulated at the time and place when particular Sūtras were composed and redacted. Moreover, each Mahāyāna Sūtra that addresses some aspect of gift exchange has a specific agenda that its gift theory or theories invariably reflect. Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras interpret the widespread practice of gift giving through the lens of emptiness and related ideas. Mahāyāna Sūtras with reformative agendas criticize profligate and greedy monks while promoting the ascetic lifestyle of the proper bodhisattva, in large part to elevate the Mahāyāna practitioner as a superior field of merit for gifts. And the Dānapāramitā-sūtra has its own set of interests—not emptiness or reform, but effecting certain karmic consequences by means of the gift and within the context of the bodhisattva’s vow, most notably the realization of awakening and the simultaneous attainment of the awakened body.

The Dānapaṭala, on the other hand, is a Śāstric text with Śāstric concerns. We can see in it the impulse of Indian intellectual traditions to organize and analyze. It breaks the gift down into type and subtype. It examines gift-giving contingencies—possible objects that could be given, potential recipients that could be encountered, various donative situations that could arise—and explains for each the proper course of action of the bodhisattva-cum-donor. It also provides a guide to how the bodhisattva should mentally approach external contingencies of
gift exchange so that he can purify his intentions. All the while, the Dānapaṭṭala reveals a keen awareness of Indian, especially Dharmaśāstric, custom and law, conforming to certain norms while flouting others.

Then there are the Mahāyāna donative inscriptions. Many of the inscriptions state that the goal of the gift is to bring about anuttarajñāna for all beings, which would appear to be the knowledge possessed by awakened beings, if it is not simply a synonym for awakening. Apart from this emphasis on awakening, we see very little of Mahāyāna textual gift theory in the epigraphic evidence. Since Mahāyāna inscriptions tend to be formulaic—indeed, that is how I have identified many of them—it may be that with the epigraphic data we do not have access to all the ways that Mahāyāna gift theories informed donative practice (or vice versa). But we must also consider the possibility that giving in theory and giving in practice are fundamentally different things, not necessarily because they are at odds, but because Mahāyāna textual theory was unavailable, inaccessible, or otherwise irrelevant to practicing donors. But this is speculative. With the evidence at hand, it is not possible to resolve the thorny issue of the relationship between giving in theory and giving in practice. We can, however, conclude with near certainty that the inscriptions demonstrate Mahāyāna participation in the image cult, as the majority of the inscriptions record the gift of images, especially Buddha images. Presumably, the images placed in open locations were made available for viewing, ritual interaction, and/or worship. But donating images is not a major concern in Mahāyāna texts. Conversely, very few of the objects that are mentioned in Mahāyāna texts as gifts show up in the epigraphic record.
I would like to finish by suggesting that the merit in this dissertation lies as much in the periods of Mahāyāna history under scrutiny as any insights it might offer about the theory and practice of Mahāyāna gift giving. The Mahāyāna Sūtras considered in chapter II were composed and redacted beginning around the turn of the Common Era and for several centuries thereafter. The Dānapāramitā-sūtra, the subject of chapter III, seems to be a relatively late Mahāyāna text. I date it to the 5th or 6th century. The Dānapaṭala of the Bodhisattvabhūmi, the subject of chapter IV, appears to have been completed by the 4th century. And the inscriptions covered in chapter V almost all come from the 5th to 13th centuries. The evidence used in this dissertation, then, more or less spans the entire history of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India. This is not normal in Mahāyāna studies.

In a recent paper on Mahāyāna in early Gandhāra, particularly its textual history, Mark Allon and Richard Salomon are certainly correct in saying that the origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism “has been a preoccupation, if not an obsession, of academic Buddhist studies for several decades now.”¹ Within the last thirty or forty years, in fact, there have been dozens of discussions on the topic: on early Mahāyāna Sūtras, Paul Harrison, Gregory Schopen, Jan Nattier, Daniel Boucher, Jonathan Silk, Ingo Strauch, and others; on inscriptions, Schopen and Salomon; on visual evidence, Juhyung Rhi; on origins specifically, many of the above, but also Tilmann Vetter, Heinz Bechert, Reginald Ray, Richard Gombrich, Shizuka Sasaki, Noritoshi Aramaki, and Johannes Bronkhorst; with review discussions, Joseph Walser, David Ruegg,

---

Masahiro Shimoda, Sasaki, and David Drewes.\(^2\) I have left some names off the list, but the idea, I think, is clear.

As far as I can tell, every recent scholar who has written on Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism has contributed publications on its earliest stages, if not its very origins. For some of these scholars, early Mahāyāna Buddhism is the sole focus of their studies, and if they work on anything else, it is not related to Mahāyāna studies at all. As the field stands today, virtually everything written on Indian Mahāyāna deals with early Mahāyāna and its hazy and diffuse beginnings, its position within or relative to Mainstream Buddhism. Shimoda’s 2009 article entitled “The State of Research on Mahāyāna Buddhism,” in my opinion the best overview of Mahāyāna scholarship, is particularly telling. Despite this paper’s summary of and its contribution to problematizing research about Mahāyāna origins, nowhere really does it go beyond what can be learned from early Mahāyāna literature.\(^3\) The reason for this is simple: It is a review article and there is very little work to review in the field that is not about early Mahāyāna and its early texts. In short, it is fairly safe to assume that any publication on Indian Mahāyāna deals with early Mahāyāna.

I do not want to suggest that the beginnings of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India are unworthy of study. I would not want to be so jaded as to undermine the curiosity about what is admittedly a fascinating topic. Indeed, the scholars I just listed have advanced Mahāyāna studies immensely. But there are at least two major problems that come with such a narrow focus on early Indian Mahāyāna. First, it leaves the bulk of Mahāyāna history unexplored, as if

\(^2\) Most of these works have been cited already. I refer the reader to the bibliography for references. I will add that Joseph Walser has informed me that he has an upcoming book on Mahāyāna origins.

a thorough investigation of its earliest stages would reveal everything one might want to know about the sum total of Mahāyāna developments in India. Depending on where one would demarcate the end of Mahāyāna’s early period, this would mean ignoring 500 to 1,000 years of its history, leaving aside the period after the first few centuries of the Common Era up to the near-complete disappearance of Indian Buddhism around the year 1300 or so. Second, early Mahāyāna did not leave much of a footprint in India outside the creation of a large body of Sūtra literature. This is true regardless of how one feels about the controversial identification of some artistic works as Mahāyāna pieces, such as certain Gandhāran steles and what are usually assumed to be bodhisattva images.\footnote{See nn. 193-195 of chapter V.} Given the muted status of early Mahāyāna, one might think it reasonable to expect the publication numbers to be slanted toward later periods in Mahāyāna history, to periods when we can securely identify Mahāyāna images, take stock of Mahāyāna donations, and contemplate the significant influence of Mahāyāna ideas outside of literary circles. Taking this further, one might even think it reasonable if the publication record were essentially the reverse of what I described earlier, with almost all the attention going to a chronologically late, materially relevant, fully developed, and even institutionalized Mahāyāna.

It is probably overweening to demand that Mahāyāna studies reverse course. But it is certainly an understatement to claim that scholarship on Indian Mahāyāna is in dire need of balance, both in the historical periods studied and the types of evidence used. I will leave off with just one example of how broadening our perspective could lead to changes in how Indian Mahāyāna is characterized. It has become generally accepted that differentiating between the Nikāyas and Mahāyāna is a mistake, since the Nikāyas were ordination lineages that included
both Mahāyānists and Mainstream Buddhists. Thus we can speak of Sarvāstivādin Mahāyānists, Mahāsāṃghika Mahāyānists, and the like.\(^5\) However, this should not obscure the possibility that Mahāyāna groups might eventually have separated themselves almost entirely from their Mainstream cousins, regardless of whether the former were still ordained under particular Vinayas. We have known for a long time from the testimony of Faxian and Xuanzang that at least by ca. 400 there were Buddhist monasteries in India that housed only Mahāyānists.\(^6\) This alone suggests some level of Mahāyāna independence. It seems to me that Mahāyānists’ living in spaces solely with their like-minded brethren could psychologically trump any sense of affiliation with non-Mahāyāna Buddhists with whom they shared the same Vinaya lineage.

The epigraphic record, moreover, points in the same direction. We have two early 6\(^{th}\) century inscriptions recording land grants to a Mahāyāna—and the term is used explicitly—community of monks, one from Bengal and the other from Orissa. The inscription from Bengal records a gift of land “for the acceptance of a Mahāyānist, irreversible community of monks” \((\text{mahāyānik'vaivarttikabhikṣusaghanām parigrahe})\) and also refers to a monastery with the āśrama of Avalokiteśvara \((\text{āryyāvalokiteśvarāśramavihāre})\).\(^7\) The inscription from Orissa appears to record an “offering to a Mahāyānist community of monks” \((\text{mahāy[ānikebhyo] bhikṣusamghāya pratipāditaḥ})\) and refer to a monastery that was “inhabited” by Avalokiteśvara

\(^5\) See the references cited in n. 6 of chapter II.


\(^7\) Bhattacharyya, D.C. “A newly discovered Copperplate from Tippera [The Guṇāighar Grant of Vainyagupta: The Year 188 Current (Gupta Era)].” Indian Historical Quarterly 6 (1930): 45-60 (= Tsukamoto, Guṇāighar 1).
There also might be a land grant made for a Mahāyāna community from Valabhi, Gujarat dating to the mid-7th century. According to Bhandarkar, the inscription grants part of a village to “the assembly of the reverend mendicant priests of the Mahāyāna (school) coming from the four quarters to the monastery constructed by Divira-pati Skandabhaṭa.” However, Bhandarkar does not provide any kind of reproduction of the copperplate on which the inscription was engraved or even a transliteration of the inscription, so his translation cannot be verified. In addition, an inscription dating to the early 8th century, from the Chittagong area of present-day Bangladesh, mentions a “field of a Mahāyāna monastery” (mahāyānavihārakṣetra) as the eastern boundary of a plot of land that was changing hands. Here we have three and possibly four Mahāyāna monasteries described in inscriptions. Each inscription mentions Mahāyāna in the context of a land charter, which is of no small importance. Epigraphic land charters were legal documents granting ownership to the recipients, meaning that Mahāyānists actually owned the monasteries and/or land specified in these inscriptions. Which raises the question: What would be the point of a donor’s singling out a Mahāyāna group as the recipient of his gift (or as owning land bordering his gift) if the category “Mahāyāna” were not meaningful and legally binding? Perhaps this would not constitute a formally separate Mahāyāna “sect,” but it

---


demands that we reconsider exactly what we mean when we talk about religious
independence.

But such reconsideration of Mahāyāna is made possible only by widening our gaze. It is
imperative that we look at Mahāyāna literature in concert with the Mahāyāna epigraphic and
material records. Above all, it is imperative that we step back from our tunnel-vision into
Mahāyāna origins in order to take in the whole scope of Mahāyāna history in India.
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