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A Sanskrit Fragment of the 
Ajātaśatru-kaukṛtya-vinodanā-sūtra

Jens-Uwe HARTMANN, Berlin    Paul HARRISON, Christchurch

Although it is certainly not a well-known text, there are good reasons for regarding the Ajātaśatru-kaukṛtya-vinodanā-sūtra (AjKV) as a Mahāyāna sūtra of some importance in India. In the first place, the AjKV is cited or mentioned in a number of significant commentarial works. For example, it is quoted on five occasions, in one passage at great length, in the Sūtra-samuccaya (SS), whose attribution to Nāgārjuna (2nd century C.E.? ) is upheld by many scholars, though it is not without problems. In the SS the AjKV is referred to as the Ma skyes dgra'i le'u (Ajātaśatru-parivarta) or the Ma skyes dgra'i mdo (Ajātaśatru-sūtra), with or without the prefix 'Phags pa (Ārya). There is also a brief citation in the Dazhidu lun 大智度論 or *Mahā-prajñā-pāramitā-upadesa (T.1509, 340c), but the attribution to Nāgārjuna of this work is generally not accepted. The citation itself is also somewhat problematic, since the title given—Fang bo jing 放罷經—suggests that the reference is not to the AjKV as we know it, but to a smaller sūtra which appears to have been one of the “building blocks” from which the larger text was constructed, and which survives independently in Chinese translation (T.629).

Although the AjKV appears not to have been used by Śaṅtideva, when we come down to the 8th century we find it referred to in Haribhadra’s Abhisamayālamkārālokā (WOGIHARA 1973: 22) as the Ajātaśatru-śoka-vinodana-sūtra, but unfortunately no citations from it are given. It is similarly referred to in the second Bhāvanā-krama of Kamalaśīla (c. 740–795) (see GOSHIMA 1983: 23) and the Rim gvis 'jug pa'i sgom don of Vimalamitra (fl. late 8th century). The number of known references is thus not large, but the distribution is interesting, suggesting as it does that the AjKV enjoyed a slight resurgence in popularity with Indian

---

1 The attribution of the SS to Nāgārjuna is maintained, for example, by PASÁDIKA (1997: 493–494) and LINDTNER (1982: 11, 172–178). For the Tibetan text of the SS see PASÁDIKA (1989). An English translation by the same author was serialized in “Linh-Son” publication d’études bouddhologiques in Issues Nos. 2–20 (1978–1982). The relevant citations from the AjKV in text and translation are to be found on pp. 21 (= No. 4 [1978], pp. 26–27), 94 (= No. 11 [1980], pp. 37–38), 97 (= ibid, p. 39), 146–154 (= No. 15 [1981], pp. 27–32), and 182 (= No. 19 [1982], p. 54).


3 See Tibetan Tripitaka Peking Edition, Dbu ma A 402b2 (Vol. 102, p. 173). One notes that the passage in which the reference to the AjKV occurs—and thus the reference itself—is an almost verbatim repetition of Kamalaśīla’s text. The overall relationship between these two compilations may well merit closer attention.
Buddhist scholars in the 8th century. This is, one suspects, because its treatment of certain themes struck a chord with other developments taking place in Buddhism at that time, but to be sure of this one would have to study more carefully the works in which the text is mentioned.\(^4\)

The second reason for regarding the \textit{AjK\textsc{v}} as an important document is that it was among the first Mahāyāna sūtras translated into Chinese by Lokakṣema in the late 2nd century: his version survives as T.626, the \textit{Azheshi wang jing 阿闍世王經}. There are in fact three complete Chinese translations of the text, the second having been made by Dharmaśrāka in the late 3rd century—T.627, the \textit{Wenshuzhili puchao sanmei jing 文殊支利普超三昧經}—and the third by Fātian 法天 in the 10th—T.628, the \textit{Weicengyou zhengfa jing 未曾有正法經}. In scope and basic structure all three renditions are similar, although Fātian’s is an outstanding example of Chinese bowdlerization (see \textsc{Harrison} 1993: 152–156), and is peculiar in other respects as well. In matters of detail it is so wildly divergent from all other versions that it can hardly be considered a translation of the \textit{AjK\textsc{v}} at all, and is best seen as a free adaptation of the text, of little utility for comparative purposes, unlike the two older versions. Not only does the antiquity of Lokakṣema’s translation make the \textit{AjK\textsc{v}} historically important, then, but it may also be said that from the point of view of content it is one of the jewels of his collected works. Rich in narrative incident, packed with interesting doctrinal elements, and also complex and demanding in its more philosophical or theoretical passages, the \textit{AjK\textsc{v}} is perhaps the most sophisticated and evolved of the Mahāyāna sūtras translated into Chinese by the Indo-Scythian master. It is, in short, an eloquent witness to the level of development which Mahāyāna Buddhism had attained by the middle of the 2nd century.

Why then has this text been so neglected? Partly because until now, in order to study it, we have had to rely on the three Chinese versions and the Tibetan translation, the ‘\textit{Phags pa ma skyes dgra’i ’gyod pa bsal ba zhes bya ba theg pa chen po’i mdo}, which was revised by Maṅjuśrīgarbha and Ratnarākṣita at the beginning of the 9th century.\(^5\) None of the commentarial citations and references reviewed above yields a single piece of the original Sanskrit—or perhaps we should say Indic—text. Recently, however, this situation has changed. In 1994,

\(^4\) That the \textit{AjK\textsc{v}} had a following in Tibet during the early period is also suggested by its citation in an unidentified \textit{siddhānta} in the Stein collection, for which see \textsc{La Vallée Poussin} (1962: 226, Cat. No. 704). Note, however, that the whole paragraph referring to fol. 13 of Cat. No. 704 has been misplaced: it actually belongs to Cat. No. 705 (cf. the listing for the \textit{AjK\textsc{v}} in the index, where the correct number is given). The short passage quoted is the same as the last of the five citations in the \textsc{SS} listed above, and could, therefore, have been taken from it. The \textit{AjK\textsc{v}} is also the probable source of the much-used image of the lion-cub, on which see \textsc{Jackson} (1992).

\(^5\) The translation is listed in the \textit{IDan} (or \textit{IHan}) \textit{kar ma} (No. 257) as \textit{Ma skyes dgra’i ’gyod pa bsal ba}, 1,500 \textit{slokas} or 5 \textit{bam po}, so we know it was circulating in Tibet by the beginning of the 9th century. None of the available editions of the Kanjur gives any hint as to the identity of the original translators. The colophons of the Tabo and Newark versions give the revisers’ names as Śākyaprabhā (instead of Maṅjuśrīgarbha) and Ratnarākṣita.
our friend and colleague Dr Lore Sander (Berlin) was asked by a manuscript dealer in London to write a brief introductory description for a collection of 108 folios and fragments of Buddhist Sanskrit manuscripts which had originally come from Afghanistan. This was published in 1996, together with two photographs reproducing one side of six folios from the consignment, which was sold in its entirety to a Norwegian collector in the same year. In the following months, similar fragments from various sources continued to reach the European art market, and luckily they were also acquired by the same collector. Through the good offices of Professor Jens Braarvig (Oslo), relations with the collector were established, and a team of scholars was formed with the intention of evaluating the manuscripts and discussing how to make them known and accessible to the academic world. In November 1997 this team, consisting of Lore Sander, Jens Braarvig, Kazunobu Matsuda, Georg von Simson and J.-U. Hartmann, visited the collection and started to arrange the fragments, at least provisionally, according to palaeographical criteria. It became evident that by this stage the collection had grown to approximately 3000 pieces, most of which, however, are single fragments of varying sizes. There are comparatively few undamaged leaves. Palaeographically, the collection offers a very good profile of all the scripts which were in use in the northwestern corner of the Indian subcontinent during the period of Buddhist cultures in this area, beginning with fragments written in Kuśāṇa Brāhmī and ending with those in the script termed “Gilgit/Bamiyan type II” by Sander (1968: 137ff). It also includes a number of fragments in Kharoṣṭhī. In terms of materials, the texts are written either on palm leaves or on birch bark, with a few examples of leather manuscripts. According to the information received so far, all pieces were found in Afghanistan.

When Lore Sander was asked to describe the first consignment of fragments for Sam Fogg’s catalogue, she received xerox copies of them and then started to prepare provisional transliterations. It was on the basis of her transliteration, kindly put at our disposal, that the first fragment of the AjKV (the right one of the two pieces published here) could be identified. During the visit to the collection in 1997, a second piece belonging to the same folio was discovered, and it became evident that the folio itself belonged to a once voluminous palm leaf manuscript containing an unknown number of Mahāyāna sūtras. Until now, most of the approximately 25 surviving folios and fragments of this manuscript could be attributed to the Śrīmālā-devī-simhanāda-sūtra, the Sarva-dharma-apравṛtti-sūtra (Peking No. 847)—both identified by Kazunobu Matsuda—and to the AjKV. Since folio 392 contains both the end of the Śrīmālā-devī-simhanāda-sūtra and the beginning of another, yet unknown sūtra, at least four texts are now documented by the leaves found so far. However, the manuscript is likely to have comprised many more sūtras; this is indicated by the fact that the lowest folio number preserved is 389 (Śrīmālā-devī-simhanāda-sūtra) and the highest—of the

---

fragment published here—can be read as 534. It is planned to publish all the remains of this remarkable Mahāyāna sūtra manuscript in one volume, which will be the first of a series—with the title Buddhist Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection (BMSC)—devoted to the collection as a whole, and therefore we have limited ourselves in this paper to presenting the fragments of a single folio as a sample of the text. As luck would have it, the folio preserves part of the core of the AjKV, the exchange between King Ajātaśatru and Mañjuśrī in which the latter succeeds in dispelling the remorse or guilt (thus the kaukṛtya-vinodana of the title) which the former feels after committing the heinous crimes for which he is so notorious, not only in the Buddhist tradition, but in Jaina literature as well (see Silk 1997). Here we find a sustained application of the notion of “emptiness” (śūnyatā) to the problems of moral responsibility and personal continuity, in short, to the central Buddhist doctrine of karma, illustrated, as it were, with the “worst case scenario” represented by Ajātaśatru and his unspeakable crime of patricide. It is no wonder, then, that the message of the AjKV proved so unpalatable to Chinese tastes that Fatian removed all references to parricide from his translation of it, nor is it surprising that the authors of Buddhist śāstras found the radical philosophical standpoint of the text so compelling. Indeed, the section of text which our folio carries falls immediately after the exceedingly long quotation in the SS. Nāgārjuna, if he was indeed the compiler of this anthology, was obviously convinced of the importance of the AjKV’s principal concern, if he chose to reproduce the text of its core passage at such great length. Our fragment picks up the story, as it were, just at the point at which Nāgārjuna’s citation ends.

The discovery at long last of remnants of a Sanskrit version of the AjKV is an exciting development in the history of Buddhist Studies, and it is to be hoped that further study of the Schøyen Collection will turn up more fragments of this text and of others hitherto thought to be lost in their Indic versions. When combined with continuing research into the Chinese and Tibetan versions to which we already have access, the study of such precious manuscript finds promises to put our investigations into Mahāyāna Buddhism and its literature on a sounder footing. In this particular case there are several indications that the recension of the text in the Sanskrit fragment is closer to that preserved in the two early Chinese translations of Lokakṣema and Dharmarakṣa—and more so to the former than to the latter—than it is to that represented by the much later Tibetan version, but more work is undoubtedly necessary to clarify the evolution of this interesting but neglected text. Although the winds of academic fashion may now be blowing in a different direction, solid philological research of this nature is still indispensable to deepening our understanding of Buddhism and its history. In pursuing that research, we could not do better than to emulate the rigour and dedication personified by Professor Akira Yuyama, to whom this small contribution is dedicated.

---

7 We wish to thank Jens Braarvig for his help in getting access to the fragment, and Mr Martin Schøyen for his permission to publish it.
Description: palm leaf of a light colour with four lines; one punch hole after the first quarter of the leaf, empty space for which is left in all four lines; incomplete leaf consisting of two fragments, the first one from the left edge to the punch hole (8.7 x 3.1 cm) and the second beginning from the punch hole (15.4 x 3.1 cm). Judging from the complete folios of the ms. which survive, the leaf originally measured 38 cm and contained only one punch hole. This means that a little more than one third of the folio is missing. The folio number 534 is preserved on the recto side. Lore SANDER describes the script as ornamental Northwestern Gupta Type of the 4th-5th centuries and compares it to alphabet h in her palaeography (SANDER 1968: 105ff & plate 9ff).

Transliteration Conventions
Parentheses or round brackets ( ) signify restoration in a gap, square brackets [ ] damaged aksaras, pointed brackets <> an addition by us, and curved brackets {} a deletion by us. A cross + denotes a destroyed aksara, two dots .. denote an illegible aksara, one dot an illegible part of an aksara. O stands for the punch hole, /// marks the point where the fragment breaks off, * denotes the virāma and | denotes the punctuation mark in the ms. (resembling a horizontal comma).

recto

1 tathaiveyam parsat paśyāmi āha [k]. + + O nas tvam mahārāja tam kaukṛtyaṃ paśyasi āha yathaiva mamjuśrīr iyaṃ parsat* pūrve ca[kšu .. + + ///
2 mahārāja tathāgatena ānantaryakārinaḥ O anaṃtaraṃ narakagatiḥ tat kiṃ tvam mamjuśrīr narakam gamisyasi āha tat kiṃ ca mamjuśrī ta[tha] ///
3 ayam nirvāṇagāmi āha no hīdam mahā O rāja āha tathābhisaṃbuddhe mamjuśrī sarvadharmaḥ tad apy aham dharmaṃ na samanupaśyāmi + + ///
4 dharmanadhātugatiya [na] ca dharmanadhātur apāyāgā O mī l na svargaṃgāmi l na nirvāṇagāmi l abhitā mamjuśrīḥ sar[va]dharmaṃ dharmanadhātugati ///

verso

1 ānantaryagati mamjuśrī dharmadhātuh ānantaryaṃ O tāyāṃ etad adhivaca-naṃ tvam dharmanadhātuprakṛtikāṇy ānantaryāṇi yā ānantaryaprakṛṭiḥ tat pra. r ///
2 yaṃ na yaṃti [na] svargam l na nirvāṇam h5 O mamjuśrīr āha tam śāstārasya tvam mahārāja vacanaṃ vīlomayisyasi l rājāhā nāhaṃ maṃ .. ///
3 tmyakoṭi l [bhūtakoṭi l da[š]līṭa yā [nairā] O tmyatā na tatra kā cit satvāt9 l asamtaḥ mamjuśrī satvasya na tatra kaś cit yo bhisaṃ[skaret]. .. ///
4 tyaṃtavi[no]di[tā] .. tvā[m] mamjuśrī |10 prahi[p]. O mahārāja kāṃkṣā l āha tadatyaṃtāpaprahiṇatvān mamjuśrī l āha tat katham te mahārā[j]. + ///

8 This visarga is probably used as a punctuation mark.
9 The v in the ligature tvā is open at the bottom and therefore looks almost like tta. Since the v is similarly open in nirvāṇagāmi in line 3, the word is transliterated as satvātā.
10 An elision mark appears here, with āh.. being added below the line.
In order to facilitate the study of the fragment transliterated above, we will now set it alongside the edited text of the relevant sections of the Tibetan translation and the two earlier Chinese versions of the *AjKV*. A provisional English rendering of the Tibetan will also be given, with notes drawing attention to differences between the Sanskrit, the Tibetan and the Chinese versions. First, however, a few brief comments about the Tibetan text are in order. The critical edition of the relevant passage is based on the following eight versions of the text (folio references are given for the passage under consideration):

- **A**: Tabo (Ta po) manuscript (Ke 70b7–71b1)
- **E**: Newark Manuscript Kanjur (mDo bsde Pa 188a4–189a3)
- **F**: Phug brag Manuscript Kanjur (mDo Ke 67b1–69a1)
- **L**: London Manuscript Kanjur (mDo Za 335b4–337a3)
- **N**: sNar thang Blockprint Edition (mDo Ma 408a3–409b4)
- **Q**: Peking Blockprint Edition (mDo Tsu 267a6–268b1)
- **S**: Stög Palace Manuscript Kanjur (mDo Za 330b4–332a7)
- **T**: Tokyo or Kawaguchi Manuscript Kanjur (mDo Za 305a3–306b1)

Full bibliographical details of these eight witnesses will be given in the forthcoming critical edition by HARRISON. Furthermore, in order not to burden this part of the paper with a massive critical apparatus, the following types of variants are disregarded here:

1. Purely orthographical variations and contracted spellings, e.g. *ci* for *ji*, *'tshams* for *mtshams*, *gzho nu* for *gzhon nu*, *yongsu* for *yongs su*, *'di'ang* for *'di yang*, etc. (the latter is standard in N and S);
2. *Da drag*, palatalized *m* and other such archaisms, e.g. *'dzind* for *'dzin*, *myed* for *med*, *stond pa* for *ston pa*, *btsald* for *bsal*, etc. (found almost exclusively in A);
3. Single variants, i.e., readings attested in only one witness, unless they make a substantive difference to the sense of the passage.
4. Punctuation variants. The use of the single and double *shad* will, unless otherwise noted, follow that of A.

Although this gives an oversimplified picture of the textual transmission of this passage in the Tibetan translation, one should note that there are no major recensional

---

11 For ease of reading the square brackets have been removed from our transliteration of the Sanskrit. Except for obvious errors the Sanskrit has not been corrected, but its salient linguistic peculiarities are addressed in the footnotes to the text or to the translation of the Tibetan version. A full study of the language of this manuscript is best postponed until all its surviving leaves have been edited.

12 For the time being we would like to acknowledge the assistance of Dr Valrae REYNOLDS in supplying a microfilm of the relevant volume of the Newark Kanjur (E) and Dr Ulrich PAGEL for making available a xerox of the London Manuscript Kanjur (L). The collation of the Tabo version (A) is on the basis of photographs taken by Dr Cristina SCHERRER-SCHAUB and Paul HARRISON during the 1993 expedition to Tabo Monastery.
differences between the available witnesses at this point. The resulting edition, therefore, although lacking a complete apparatus, is adequate for the comparative study of our manuscript fragment. It will be apparent that there are significant differences between the Tibetan and the Sanskrit. For this reason, a full restoration of those parts missing in the Sanskrit is not attempted. Some conjectures are, however, presented in the notes to the English translation of the Tibetan version, with reference also to the Chinese translations, in which the passage can be found in the following places:

T.626 (Lokakṣema), 402b14–c14  
T.627 (Dharmaraksā), 423b27–424a5  
T.628 (Fatian), 444b4–c8

The relevant sections of the first two of these translations (T.626 & T.627) are also presented in the following pages. The text reproduced is based on the Taishō, but does not follow it exactly, being edited on the basis of the variant readings provided in the Taishō’s critical apparatus, and also freely repunctuated. The sigla used in the footnotes are as follows:

K: 高麗本, Korean Edition of 1151 (base text of Taishō)  
S: 宋本, Song Edition of 1239  
Y: 元本, Yuan Edition of 1290  
M: 明本, Ming Edition of 1601  
G: 宮內省圖書寮本 (舊宋本) “Old Song Edition” (1104–1148) belonging to the Library of the Japanese Imperial Household  
N: 正倉院聖語藏本: The Tempyō mss. (729–) and the Chinese mss. of the Sui (581–617) and Tang (618–907) Dynasties belonging to the Imperial Treasure House Shōsō-in in Nara, collectively called the Shōgo-zō (N for Nara is used instead of S for Sheng to avoid confusion with the Song Edition).

The first characters in each case (高, 宋, etc.) are those which appear in the Taishō’s own apparatus, with the exception of the last edition, for which the siglum is 聖. Finally, the order in which all the different versions are given does not necessarily reflect the chronological sequence of recensions of the AjKV.

---

Note, however, that our passage falls right at the beginning of what is marked as bam po 5 in E, L, N and Q, but as bam po 4 in S and T. A and F mark no bam po division at this point, although A has two double shads with a space between, suggesting some kind of division.
Lokakṣema (T.626)

[阿闍世…]則從三昧
還、見眾菩薩比丘僧、
諸官屬所有、一切如故。
阿闍世復白文殊師利。
聖諸眾會所在¹而我
不見。
文殊師利言。
如仁之狐疑處、屬眾
會在彼間²。
文殊師利復言。
乃見眾會不。
阿闍世則言。
見³。
云何見。
如我所見狐疑、見眾
會如是⁴。
文殊師利復問。
云何見狐疑。
如我屬不見眾會者、
是狐疑於內外亦無所見。

(1) 在 GMSY: om. KN.
(2) 闍 GMSY: 闍 KN.
(3) 見 KN: om. GMSY.
(4) Note that the Taishō (and thus presumably all witnesses collated) repeats the foregoing sentences at this point, with only minor changes in wording, as follows: 文殊師利復問。乃見眾會不。阿闍世則言。見。云何。如我所見狐疑、見眾會如是。This ditography is to be deleted from the text.

Dharmarākṣa (T.627)

於時王阿闍世、皆離
一切想念所著、從三昧
起尋則還復見眾會者、
諸後妓女、城郭¹殿宅、
亦復如故。
王阿闍世白濁首²曰。
向者眾會為何所湊。
又³吾在⁴前而不見之。
濁首報曰。
猶如大王狐疑所湊、
其眾會者向在於⁵彼。
又問。
大王見眾會乎。
答曰。
已見。
濁首問曰。
云何見。
如⁶見狐疑、睹眾會
者、亦復如是。
又問。
以何等見於狐疑乎。
答曰。
如諸會者目前⁷所見
諸形色者、狐疑亦然、
不見内外。

(1) 郭 GKN: 廊 M.
(2) Variant forms of this name are given in the text at this point: 軟首 GS, 濁首 MY, 潮首 KN. These editions are not consistent throughout. The form 濁首 will be used here.
(3) 又 KN: 又曰 GMSY.
(4) 我在 KN: 在吾 GMSY.
(5) 於 GMSY: 于 KN.
(6) 如 GMSY: 而 KN.
(7) 吳 N.}

Sanskrit

// tathaiveyaṃ parṣat¹
paśyāmi 1
āha <l>

k.+-+ nas² tvaṃ mahārāja
tam kaukṛtyam paśyasi 1
āha <l>
yathaiva mamjuśrīr iyam
parṣat pūrvē caṇṣu(sā) //

(1) Note that the fragment has iyam parṣat, while correct Sanskrit would require imām parṣadam (cf. BHSG 15.15 & 21.9).
(2) It is difficult to fill the gap; katham would be expected according to the Tibetan ji ītar, but does not help in explaining the -nas after the gap.
A Sanskrit Fragment of the Ajātaśatru-kaukrtya-vinodanā-sūtra

Thereupon King Ajātaśatru, freed of all conceptualisation and discursive thinking, emerged from that state of meditative concentration (samādhi), and as soon as he did so, he saw the assembly, his own body, his house and his servants, just as they had been before. Then he said to Prince Mañjuśrī, “Mañjuśrī, when I couldn’t see this assembly before, where had it gone?”

Mañjuśrī said, “Great king, where that remorse of yours was, that is where this assembly also went. Now then, great king, do you see this assembly?”

He replied, “Mañjuśrī, I see it.”

He said, “How do you see it?”

He replied, “I see this assembly in the same way that I see that remorse.”

He said, “Great king, how do you see that remorse?”

He replied, “In the same way that beforehand I did not see this assembly with my eyes, I do not see that remorse internally, externally, or anywhere else.”

Tibetan

Thereupon King Ajātaśatru, freed of all conceptualisation and discursive thinking, emerged from that state of meditative concentration (samādhi), and as soon as he did so, he saw the assembly, his own body, his house and his servants, just as they had been before. Then he said to Prince Mañjuśrī, “Mañjuśrī, when I couldn’t see this assembly before, where had it gone?”

Mañjuśrī said, “Great king, where that remorse of yours was, that is where this assembly also went. Now then, great king, do you see this assembly?”

He replied, “Mañjuśrī, I see it.”

He said, “How do you see it?”

He replied, “I see this assembly in the same way that I see that remorse.”

He said, “Great king, how do you see that remorse?”

He replied, “In the same way that beforehand I did not see this assembly with my eyes, I do not see that remorse internally, externally, or anywhere else.”
文殊師利言。即聞佛所言其作逆惡
當入大泥犁不。
王言。
聞。
文殊師利復謂。王、汝自知當入泥犁
不。
阿闍世復問。
其佛得佛時、乃有法上天入泥犁者不。乃有
安隱當至泥洹者不。
文殊師利則言。
無。

又問。大王、世尊説曰、其
犯逆者、不得中止、處
無有間。王自知當至地
獄乎。
王尋答曰。
雲何難首、如來至真
成正覺時、豈見有法、
歸囹圄乎。斯趣三塗、
斯趣天上、斯趣泥洹乎。
答曰。
不也、大王。

// (desitā)1 mahārāja ta-
thāgatena ānantaryakā-
rinaḥ anaṃtaram naraka-
gatiḥ <l>
tat kim tvam maṇjuśrīr2
narakam gamiṣyasi l
āha <l>
tat kim ca maṇjuśrī ta-
thā(gatena) ///

// ayaṃ nirvāṇagāmi l
āha <l>
no hidam mahārāja <l>

(1) Desitā is a possible re-
construction from gsungs na.
(2) Note that the treatment
of the vocative maṇjuśrī is
er erratic throughout.
Manjuśrī said, “Great king, since the Realized One (tathāgata) has said that a person who commits the “immediates” will go immediately to hell, will you, great king, go to hell?”

When he had said that, King Ajātaśatru replied as follows to Prince Mañjuśrī, “Mañjuśrī, did the Realized One awaken fully to any dharma saying, ‘This one goes to a bad rebirth, this one goes to heaven, and this one goes to nirvāṇa.’?”

He said, “No, great king.”

(1) The five ānantarya, or “(offenses involving) immediate (retribution)” are matricide, patricide, killing an arhat, provoking dissension in the Sangha, or causing the Tathāgata’s blood to flow. See BHSD, s.v.

(2) In this sentence the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions deviate: in the Tibetan text Manjusri is asking the question (“Will you, Great King, go to hell?”) which fits the following reply of Ajātaśatru, while in the Sanskrit Ajātaśatru appears to be asking Mañjuśrī the same question. However, this makes no sense: it is likely that manjuśrī was written in error for mahārāja, and that we should emend the text accordingly. Note that in T.626 this is split into two questions: “Have you heard that the Buddha has said...?” and “Do you know, king, that you will go to hell?” T.627 is closer to the Tibetan and to the Sanskrit.

(3) In the Sanskrit there is nothing which corresponds to the stock phrase in Tibetan de skad smras pa dang I ja dpal gzhon nur gyur pa la rgyal po ma skyes dgras di skad ces gsol to.
(1) The Sanskrit text here (tathābhīṣambuddhe maṃ-
juśrī sarvadharmaiḥ) is problematic in
terms of case usage. There are
several possibilities, but inter-
pretation as a poorly Sanskrit-
tized "instrumental absolute"
(perhaps from abhisambud-
dhehi sarvadharmehi) seems
most plausible, since instru-
mental for locative is well at-
tested in Buddhist Hybrid San-
skrit (cf. BHSG, 7.30–7.34; cf.
also BHSD, s.v. abhisambu-
dhyate). The correct Classical
Sanskrit equivalent would thus
be tathābhīṣambuddhesu ..sa-
vadharmesu. Tibetan chos
thams cad la also suggests the
locative, as does T.627.
(2) Tād apy ... dharmam
should read tam apy ...dha-
rmam, unless this is a case of
a neuter modifier with a mas-
The expression is found fre-
quently enough, e.g. in Chap.
1 of the Asyāhasrikā-praṇā-
pāramitā-sūtra (tam apy aham
bhagavan dharmam na sam-
anupaśyāmi yaduta praṇā-
pāramitā nāma, etc., VAIHYA'S
ed., p. 3).
(3) Read śūnyatāgatiya na
cā śūnyatā? See note to trans-
lation.
gsol pa l

'jam dpal chos thams cad la' de bzhin du" mgon par rdzogs par sangs rgyas nas" chos gang sems can dmyal bar mchi ba 'am l lhar mchi ba 'am l mya ngan las 'da' bar 'gyur ba'i chos de" bdag gis ma mthong ste l 'jam dpal chos thams cad ni' stong pa nyid du mchi ba las kyang ma 'das la l stong pa nyid ni ngan song du mchi ba yang ma lags l mtho ris su mchi ba yang ma lags l mya ngan las 'da' bar mchi ba yang ma lags so l

“Mañjuśrī, after becoming fully awakened in the same way with regard to all dharmas, I do not see any dharma which goes to hell, goes to the gods, or goes to nirvāṇa.

Mañjuśrī, no dharma ever goes beyond having emptiness as its re-course, and emptiness is not something which goes to a bad destiny, or goes to heaven, or goes to nirvāṇa.

-------------------------------

(1) Note that for Sanskrit sam-anu-paś the Tibetan has the simple verb mthong.

(2) This is a loose translation of chos thams cad ni stong pa nyid du mchi ba las kyang ma 'das, the sense of which is not entirely clear, although the point seems to be that emptiness applies to all dharmas inevitably and without exception. Tib. ma 'das probably represents Skt. anatlta (cf. BHSD, s.v.). Here the recension represented by the Tibetan text and by T.626 and T.627 appears to add an extra step to the argument, in that it equates all dharmas with emptiness (which does not go to hell, etc.) before equating them with the dharma-dhātu (which does not go to hell, etc.). The Sanskrit text seems to carry only the second equation, and may thus be defective, perhaps due to haplography. Whatever the reason, the various texts diverge markedly at this point, and cannot easily be aligned with each other. The term -gatiya here, as in dharmanā-gatiya, presumably has the same sense as -gatika, cf. BHSD, s.v. gatika. Note that the expression sarva-dharmā śūnya-tat-gatikāh also occurs in the Āṣṭa (Vaidya’s ed., p. 148), in a context reminiscent of our present passage. CONZE (1975: 190) translates “all dharmas are situated in emptiness.”
諸法無所可壞敗。是故入法身。法身者亦無天上、亦無人間、亦無泥犁、禽獸、薜荔。其逆者亦不離法身。其所作逆者身悉法身之所入。諸逆之本悉諸法之本。已去當來無去來者。諸法亦無去來。已知是者、亦不入泥犁、亦不上天、亦不泥洹。

(1) 入 GMSY: 又 KN.

一切諸法、無所破壞。一切諸法、悉歸法界。其法界者、不歸惡趣、不上於天、不歸泥洹。其逆無間、則謂法界。諸逆之源、則謂法界。其本淨者、則謂諸逆。其諸逆者、則謂本淨。是故言日、諸法本淨。是故漢首、一切諸法、至無所生。由斯自知、不歸惡趣、亦不上天、不升泥洹。

（1）源 GMNSY: 原 K.

abhītā mamjuśrīḥ sarvadharmā dharmadhātugati ///

/// ānāmtaryagati mamjuśrī dharmadhātuḥ ānāmtaryatāyām etad adhivacanaṁ ādharmaḥ prakṛtikāny ānāmtaryāni yā ānāmtaryaprakṛtiḥ tat-pra(k)r(ti) ///

/// (apā)yam na yaṃti na svargāḥ na nirvāṇaṁ //

(1) Here // represents the vi-sarga used as a punctuation mark.
‘jam dpal chos kyi dbyings ni ma ‘dres pa’o lchos thams cad kyang chos kyi dbyings kyirang bzhin can te lchos kyi dbyings ni ngan song du yang mi mchi l mtho ris su yang mi mchi l mya ngan las ‘da’ bar yang’ mi mchi’o l

Manjusri, the totality of dharmas is inviolable. All dharmas too have the character of the totality of dharmas, and the totality of dharmas does not go to a bad destiny, does not go to heaven, nor does it go to nirvana. Manjusri, the word “immediate” is a synonym for immediacy in the totality of dharmas. Manjusri, the “immediates” possess the same character as the totality of dharmas, and so whatever the character of the “immediates,” all dharmas too are of that character. Therefore, Manjusri, all dharmas are not subject to going, and for that reason I will neither go to a bad destiny, nor go to heaven, or go to nirvana.”

(1) Tib. ma ‘dres pa, literally unmixed, untainted, unaffected, pure. How and whether this corresponds to Skt. abhitā is unclear, since the sense of the latter is obscure, but it may just be a corruption of abhinna (unbroken, undifferentiated, whole, etc.). One notes in this regard that ma ‘dres pa is indeed a standard equivalent for Skt. asambhinna, while the Chinese versions point in a similar direction. At this point in the text T.626 observes that all dharmas are imperishable, therefore they enter the dharma-kāya—dharma-kāya here has the sense of dharma-dhātu, or total collection of dharmas—while T.627 states that all dharmas are imperishable, all dharmas return to the dharma-dhātu. T.627 thus suggests something like abhinna maṇḍrugā sarvadhārmā dharma-dhātugatiyāḥ sarvadharmāḥ, but the missing portion of the ms. probably lacks the room for the second sarvadharmāḥ as well as na ca dharmadhātur apāyagaṁi / na svargagaṁi / na nirvānagaṁi /, and would thus be closer to T.626.

(2) The Tibetan seems to presuppose a reading ānāmtaryam iti maṇḍrugā svaradharmāḥ, but the Chinese versions point in a similar direction. At this point in the text T.626 observes that all dharmas are imperishable, therefore they enter the dharma-kāya—dharma-kāya here has the sense of dharma-dhātu, or total collection of dharmas—while T.627 states that all dharmas are imperishable, all dharmas return to the dharma-dhātu. T.627 thus suggests something like abhinna maṇḍrugā sarvadhārmā dharma-dhātugatiyāḥ sarvadharmāḥ, but the missing portion of the ms. probably lacks the room for the second sarvadharmāḥ as well as na ca dharmadhātur apāyagaṁi / na svargagaṁi / na nirvānagaṁi /, and would thus be closer to T.626.

(3) The Tibetan suggests a reconstruction to tatprakritāḥ sarvadharmāḥ.

(4) Sanskrit yamū should perhaps be corrected to yāmi in line with the reading of the Tibetan and the Chinese of T.626 and T.627.
文殊師利復問。「佛說有逆，如何今說無有。」
王則答言。「我不違佛所語。云何。」
王言。「無我是佛之說諦。其以無我、是則無人、亦不作罪者。亦無受罪者。」

(1) 源 GMNSY: 原 K.
(2) K 無，而無有實 N，無，而無有實 GMSY.

(1) Note the genitive sästärasya instead of Classical Skt. sästuh.
(2) Ms has dasitä.
(3) Asamta stands here evidently for asato, Tib. mamchis na.
(4) This should perhaps be corrected to abhisamskaroti or, more likely, abhisamskuryät.

maṃjuśrī āha <l>
tam śāstārasya1 tvam ma-
hārāja vacanaṁ viloma-
yiṣyasi l
rājāha <l>
nāhaṁ ma(nJuśrī) ///

/// (bhagavatā nairā)tmya-
kośī {l} bhūtakośī {l} de-
śītā2 <l> yā nairātmyatā
na tatra kā cīt satvata l
asaṃtā3 maṃjuśrī satva-
sya na tatra kaś cid yo
'bhisaṃskaret.4 ///

---
Mañjuśrī said, “Great king, when you say that, are you contradicting the word of the Teacher?”

He replied, “Mañjuśrī, I am not contradicting the word of the Teacher, because the Lord has said that the truth of non-self is the real truth, and so according to that truth of non-self, there is no such thing as a sentient being. If there is no sentient being, there cannot be any performer (of action) with regard to it, nor can there be any experimenter (of the result of any action).”

(1) There is no Skt. equivalent for Tibetan *de skad smra na*, “when you say that.”

(1) LNQST: II A, om. E; (2) ni EFLNQST: ni I A; (3) de na AFNQ: de E, de ni LST; (4) pa FNQ: pa yang ALST.
文殊師利復問。
王已脱於狐疑不。
則答言。
從本已脫、以來亦脫。
文殊師利言。
其疑以盡未。
王言。
已從久遠盡。
文殊師利復問。
云何眾會而知王有逆無逆脫是中。
王言。
以尊法持我故知無逆。
譬如菩薩已得忍辱悉持諸惡。菩薩若慧\(^2\)好願。

又問。
大王、狐疑斷乎。
答曰。
已究除矣。
濡首問曰。
云何大王、猶豫絕乎。
答曰。
永絕。
濡首又問。
今王云何於眾會中知王有逆而言無逆。
答曰。
不也。
又問。
云何。
答曰。
其已逆者、脫於無結、而造證者。彼諸逆者、斯會逆者、其諸逆者、則是菩薩柔順法忍而令眾人得入斯忍。不當於彼、攬持諸逆。濡首、所謂逆者、從彼至斯、無有諸逆。以是之故、不當於彼\(^2\)、總攝諸逆。

---

(1) 慧 GMSY: 恵 KN.
(2) It is possible that the text is corrupt at this point.

// (a)tyaṁtavinoditavāṁ
\(<l>
maṁjuśrī \{l\} āh(a) \(<l>
pṛhaṁ(ā te) mahārajā kāṁsā l
āha \(<l>
tadatyaṁtaprahaṁvatvān
\(<l>
maṁjuśrī \{l\} āha \(<l>
tat katham te mahāraj(a)

---

(1) 問 KN: om. GMSY.
(2) 於彼 KN: 彼於 GMSY.
He said, "Great king, has your remorse been dispelled?"

He replied, "Inasmuch as all dhammas are thoroughly dispelled."

Mañjuśrī said, "Great king, have you eliminated your doubt?"

He replied, "Inasmuch as all dhammas are utterly eliminated."

Mañjuśrī said, "Great king, as far as you are concerned, will this assembly hold you to be a committer of the "immediates," or not, or what?"

He replied, "Mañjuśrī, they will hold me to be established in that "immediate" through which unshakable liberation is comprehended. They will hold me to be established in that "immediate" through which the patient acceptance of the bodhisattva is won. Mañjuśrī, "immediate" is that in which there is no end and no middle, and in that (state) in which there is no end and no middle they will hold me to be established."

---

(1) Chos thams cad has no counterpart in Sanskrit, although the _tad_ in _tadatyamaprahaṇatvān_ could conceivably pick up a previous _sarva-dharmānām_. However, there does not seem to be sufficient space for it in the missing part of the folio. Further, neither T.626 nor T.627 mentions all dhammas at this point, and thus appear to belong to a recension of the text closer to the Sanskrit fragment.

(2) Once again, Tib. actually has "these assemblies." See above, p. 75.

(3) Our rendering of this difficult passage is tentative. The Chinese is not much help, but here a play on words appears to be in progress, in which _ānantarya_, used so often with a negative meaning (leading immediately to punishment), is used positively (leading immediately to spiritual success) (cf. _BHSD_, s.v.). The last sentence employs it to suggest the non-differentiation of the enlightened state, the immediacy of non-dual realization, in which ends and middle, like self and other, drop away. For similar formulations see, e.g., the _Asta_, Vaidya's edition, p. 23.16–25, Conze (1975: 101).
Abbreviations

AjKV Ajātaśatru-kaukṛtya-vinodanā
BHSD Franklin Edgerton, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary, New Haven, 1953.
BHSG Franklin Edgerton, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar, New Haven, 1953.

T. or Taishō Takakusu Junjirō & Watanabe Kaigyoku, eds., Taishō shinshū daizōkyō, 100 vols., Tokyo, 1924–1935.
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