THE COMPOSITION OF THE GUAN WULIANGSHOUFO-JING:
SOME BUDDHIST AND JAINA PARALLELS TO ITS
NARRATIVE FRAME

The “Sūtra of Contemplation on the Buddha of Immeasurable Life,” the Guan Wuliangshoufo-jing (hereafter Guan-jing), is one of the central canonical texts of so-called Pure Land Buddhism, grouped with the Larger and Smaller Sukhāvatīyāha sūtras into a triad termed the “Pure Land Triple Sūtra,” (Jōdo sambukyō 浄土三部経).¹ In this context the Guan-jing is especially important in the Japanese Pure Land schools, the Jōdo-shū 浄土宗 and the Jōdo Shinshū 浄土真宗. Preaching a means to rebirth in the Pure Land, the Guan-jing is highly regarded for its visual depictions of this Pure Land of the Buddha Amitāyus and for its teaching of the benefit of evocation of his name, the latter practice well known as the repetition in Japanese pronunciation of the words “Namu Amida Butsu” 南無阿弥陀仏. As is also well known, however, there have long been questions about the origins of the Guan-jing, questions which traditionally have been motivated not by a scholastic search for “historical truth” but rather by the religious (or perhaps more accurately religio-political) necessity of determining the text’s orthodoxy, hence its basic “authenticity.”²

From the point of view of a modern, disinterested historical study which aims, in so far as this is possible, at objectivity, however, it is meaningless to use terms like “genuine” or “authentic” with regard to the status of a given text, other than to describe traditional attitudes. While it is important to understand that within traditional systems, and for those modern (in the present case mainly sectarian Japanese) scholars whose contexts are defined by such systems, questions about authenticity and orthodoxy are of crucial import, these are notions which are meaningful only within a context which recognizes orthodoxy, which is to say within a normative system, and thus will be avoided in the following discussions.

Our own questions about the origins of the Guan-jing can thus be recast, framed not as ideological suspicions about the text’s orthodoxy but rather in terms, for example, of its composition – since the term “composition” can refer both to the structure of the sūtra itself, and to the process through which the sūtra passed to reach its present structure or form. Our examination of the composition of the Guan-jing, then, is necessarily a study both of its history and of its structure. As we will see, there is a good reason for setting up the problem in this way: one key to the origins of the Guan-jing is in the interrelation of the two modes of “composition.”

To set the stage for the present investigation, it will be necessary to briefly sketch some of the reasons why the idea that the Guan-jing is a Chinese translation, like so many others, of an Indic original is not generally accepted – the remaining alternatives being that the text was translated from a Central Asian language, or written or compiled from the beginning in Chinese. The Indian origins of the Guan-jing have been doubted for a variety of reasons, ranging from generally well-considered arguments to some that can be dismissed out of hand. One of the most important points often made is that the vocabulary of the Guan-jing seems to owe much to the Wei 維 (220-265) dynasty translation of the Larger Sukhāvatiyāyā (T. 360) and to that of the “Sūtra on the Ocean of Contemplative Trance of Visualizing the Buddha,” Guanfo sanmei hai-jing 觀佛二昧海經 (T. 643). Fujita Kōtatsu (1990: 160) has detailed some of the resemblances between the Guan-jing and the Wei translation of the Larger Sukhāvatiyāyā, showing that the former “drew upon” the latter: “We know this because some of the terms adopted ... are found only in that version.” Likewise, Shikii Shūjō studied the relation between the Guan-jing and Guanfo sanmei hai-jing and concluded (1965: 230) that the two sūtras have a very large number of similarities not only in structure, object and vocabulary, but also in goal, method and character, and in the content they seek to express. Rather than supposing that this automatically implies a Chinese origin for the text, Mark Blum (1985: 133) has attempted to explain these facts by saying that “a look at the one other translation attributed to [the putative translator of the Guan-jing] Kalayaśas (T. 1161) reveals the same type of borrowing, so this may reflect the attitude and abilities
of the translation as much as the language or authorship of his original text.” In general, of course, Chinese translators often referred to the works of their predecessors. As Hirakawa Akira (1984: 14) has pointed out, there are for instance many examples in the translations of the Vinayas in Chinese of translators referring to and employing translations from previous translators’ works. The impact, for example, of the translation equivalents and styles of such translators as Kumārajiva and Xuanzang on their followers is well known. Thus a similarity between the sentences of different sūtras is no grounds for considering a text to be apocryphal, or in other words, a non-translation.5

It is necessary here to clarify a point alluded to by Blum, namely the status of the “translator” of the Guan-jing, Kalayaśas. It is widely agreed that the presently available Chinese Guan-jing came into existence between 420 and 440 C.E., perhaps toward the earlier part of this period, in the environs of present-day Nanjing.6 The Chinese sūtra catalogues, moreover, generally agree in their attribution of the text to the Central Asian monk Kalayaśas.7 In order to understand what such attributions mean, however, we have to understand what the catalogues are, and what they are not. It is very clear that rather than being historical documents as we are wont to consider them, the sūtra catalogues which record the existence and attribution of translations are polemical documents, or perhaps better records of political decisions. As Antonino Forte (1984: 333) states, “the purpose of these catalogues is known to be not so much to register all the translations completed but to record the works after they had been judged canonical.”

Now, what is it that allows a text to be considered canonical? In other words, by what criteria did the Chinese Buddhist authorities judge a text to be a genuine Buddhist scripture? Again, we can refer to Forte (1990: 243):

For centuries, the Chinese cultivated the illusion that the existence or absence of a corresponding Sanskrit text was sufficient to establish whether a specific work written in Chinese was authentic or apocryphal. Although convenient, this practice for rejecting many would-be sūtras produced in China ... such a criterion would have been of little help in determining falsifications made outside China. For this reason, the participation of foreign Tripitaka masters would have been essential, for only they would know whether a text was current outside of China and therefore
“canonical.” Hence it can be said with little exaggeration that these foreign teachers symbolized orthodoxy for the Chinese—to the point that they were considered the guarantors, if not the very source, of translated texts. It is for this reason that translated texts were attributed to such foreign translators, and certainly not because they had actually translated anything, for, as is well known, their often inadequate knowledge of the Chinese language, especially in the early years of their tenures in China, would not have permitted them to engage in any but a medley of translation activities.

Thus, if a given text were accepted as the word of the Buddha in lands considered by the Chinese to be Buddhistically orthodox, namely in India itself and Indian Central Asia, then this constituted proof of the text’s authenticity. The mere existence of an Indo language original—it is incautious to use the term “Sanskrit” in this context—was evidently not sufficient to guarantee the authenticity of a text, since such a text could have been considered spurious even in the land of its origin.4

Once we understand the logic of the process of authorization of a Buddhist scripture in China, and the reasons why the “translator” may sometimes better be termed a guarantor or certifier of orthodoxy, we can follow more clearly the logic of the attribution process for a translation. Forte (1984: 316) remarks on this as follows:

The assignment of the responsibility for a translation was an extremely important matter as its purpose was to reassure the Buddhist establishment and the government of the full authenticity and orthodoxy of a work. This need to make one person responsible often meant that the actual contribution of other members of the team tended to be unacknowledged. The paradox thus often arose of the accredited translator, usually a foreigner, being unable to speak or write Chinese, while the actual translators received so little attention that, but for the colophons at the end of a number of translations, we would often not have even known their names.

I think the implications of Forte’s remarks should be clear. If we are dealing with non-Chinese “translators,” then we must imagine that these individuals probably had little to do with the actual mechanics of the translation of a text. Kalayaśas was a foreigner of the type referred to by Forte. With this in mind, Fujita Kōratsu’s remarks (1990: 163) seeking to support the theory that the Guan-jing was compiled in China may be seen to convey a misplaced emphasis. Fujita speculates: “When translating the sūtra, Kalayaśas probably
did not initially, since it is reported … that the Shih-ma Sung-ch’uan served as his scribe. In this process, the sūtra’s concepts and expressions assumed a Chinese coloring, since numerous Chinese-translated scriptures were consulted and utilized .... Taking into account the observations of Forte quoted above, it is clear that there is nothing in the circumstance of a Chinese serving as Kalayaṇā’s scribe to set this translation method apart from most others, and nothing here to point to any questionable provenance for the sūtra.

The questions we as modern scholars want to ask about the provenance of the Guan-jīng are nevertheless different from those asked by the guardians of orthodoxy in Buddhist China. For those Chinese authorities, if Kalayaṇā as a Central Asian monk certified the Guan-jīng’s authenticity, that is to say its currency in the Buddhist realms with which he was familiar, and if he were accepted by the Chinese authorities as a legitimate representative of the type of orthodoxy they wished to promote (Forte 1990: 243), then the Guan-jīng would have been accepted into the canon and thence recorded in the sūtra catalogues. It is also helpful to recall that we know of cases in which – for their own ideological and political aims – Chinese Buddhist authorities went so far as to arrange for the “forgery” of Buddhist sūtras, or at least parts thereof (Forte 1976: 135), and on the other hand we may add that there were certainly cases in which the Chinese rejected for their own reasons texts, for example Tantras – which were considered orthodox in other Buddhist lands. Such an analysis of the ideological background of information provided by orthodox Chinese sources undermines our confidence in them as historical evidence.

Since however our modern standpoint is outside the range of questions of orthodoxy or authority, we must inquire into the provenance of a sacred text without allowing questions of the text’s spiritual authority to affect our reasoning. For us whether the Guan-jīng is a transcript of the words of the historical Buddha Śākyamuni or whether it was compiled in fifth century China – or whether its origins lie anywhere in between – is a problem of history, not a problem of orthodoxy. And thus when we cite evidence from those whose ideological biases differ from our own, we must take this difference into account. The authors of Chinese sūtra catalogues, and
those who wrote hagiographies of monks, had an agenda radically different from our own. If we do not understand this, and weigh their evidence accordingly, we can be misled, or at the least confuse our reasoning. However, that our new understanding of the evidence of the sūtra catalogues erodes some arguments for the Chinese origins of the Guan-jing is a destructive rather than a constructive step in the process of tracing its origins; it does not lead positively toward a solution of the problem. To take such positive and constructive steps we turn to the internal evidence provided by the work itself.

The Structure of the Guan-jing as a Key to its Composition

According to Kenneth Tanaka (1990: xviii, xix, 58), the earliest commentary on the Guan-jing is that of Jingying Huiyuan 淨影慧遠 (523-592) titled the Guan Wuliangshoujing-yishu 觀無量壽經義疏, while in retrospect the most influential, at least in the Japanese Pure Land traditions, has been that of Shandao 華道 (613-681), titled the Guan Wuliangshoufojing-shu 觀無量壽佛經疏. Both of these commentaries are of the shu 疏 type, the earliest example of which was Daocheng’s 道生 (355-431) Lotus sūtra commentary.11 Concerning the structure of this type of commentary Tanaka (1990: 59) says that “in its developed form, it divides the sūtras into sections with the following standard nomenclature: ‘preface,’ ‘main body,’ and ‘conclusion.’” While in the details Huiyuan and Shandao each divide the Guan-jing slightly differently, they agree with each other in the basic sub-divisions. These sub-divisions are broad, moreover, on a doctrinal analysis of the text, not on a philological or text-critical dissection. It is important to realize this for what follows. Shandao basically divides the text as follows:12

Prologue: 序分
Non-meditative Good: 散善: Contemplations 14-16.
Epilogue. 流通分

In 1976, Yamada Meiji published a paper which revolutionized our understanding of the structure of the Guan-jing. Yamada showed
that the Chinese names used to refer to the Buddha Amitayus are not
mixed randomly in the text, but follow a definite pattern. The name
appears in the text thirty-four times. The name Wuliangshou-fo 無量
壽佛 appears nineteen times, and Amituo-fo 阿彌陀佛 appears
fifteen times. What is of importance, however, is the distribution of
these names. The names appear in the text as follows:

Prologue: Amituo-fo: 3 times.
Meditative Good: Wuliangshou fo: 15 times
Amituo-fo: Once, in the 13th (last)
section.
Non-meditative Good: Amituo-fo: 11 times.
Both names: Once each in the 16th
(last) section.
Epilogue: Wuliangshou-fo: 3 times.

Yamada (1976: 79) concluded from this (and other types of
evidence not directly relevant to us here) the following:

To state my conclusion . . ., I stand with those who believe that the Guan-ting was
created — more precisely compiled — in China. Thus, the variation between the
names Wuliangshou-fo and Amituo-fo in the sutra is not due to the translator
(compiler) willfully or intentionally varying his translations of the name Amitayus
(or a Pali or Sanskrit variant) found in his original, rather, he collected into one book, with a
certain purpose, the legend of Ajsatāsīra, the thirteen contemplations of the Medi-
tative Good and the three contemplations of the Non-meditative Good, which
originally had independent existences, adding a conclusion and polishing the style.
This is my hypothesis. The side-by-side appearance of the two names together in the
Thirteenth Contemplation and the Section of the Lowest Rank of the Lowest Grade
of Birth I understand to be the so-to-speak glue binding together the section on
Meditative Good with the section on Non-meditative Good, and both of the latter
with the conclusion.

I think Yamada’s evidence makes it clear that — with the exception of
his statement that the sutra was actually compiled in China, which
is still debatable — his hypothesis must be correct. It is especially
convincing that the transitional sections of the sutra mix both names.
The fact that the joins revealed by Yamada’s text-critical analysis
 correspond to joins in the text recognized by the commentators
seems to suggest that even to those who lacked any awareness of the
historical background of the formation of the sūtra — and of course for traditional commentators the text was a unified whole, a record of Sākyamuni Buddha’s preaching — its episodic character was clear. On the other hand, this may be largely fortuitous, since the shu type of commentary was employed in commenting on texts which we have no reason to believe were compiled in the same fashion as the Guan-jing. It may be interesting, however, in the future to re-examine traditional dissections of sūtras with an eye toward text-critical problems, looking to see if the commentators’ feeling for joints in the sense can lead us to philologically locate historically discrete units of the texts.

Yamada has gone on in his article (1976: 78) to try and identify the origins of the Prologue section itself, the story of Ajātaśatru and Bimbisāra. He points out that within the very brief span of the introductory story the name Devadatta appears twice in two different guises, once as Dītādā 薄達 and once as Tipodaduo 提婆達多. Yamada comments that “We can only call this strange. I cannot understand the reason why within an extremely brief story the name of one and the same individual should appear in different guises.” Yamada (1976: 86) also agrees with Tsukinowa Ken’ya who suggested that materials from the Mahāyāna-Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra were joined with those from the *Daśabhūmikabhāṣā-sāstra, with some embellishment, yielding the introductory story of the Guan-jing. It has of course long been recognized that both of these texts contain stories similar or related to that of the Guan-jing.13 Yamada sums up his ideas as follows (1976: 86 = Yamada et al. 1984: xxiii):

Additionally, by considering the Ajātaśatru story in this way, the reason for the use of two names for Devadatta becomes clear. That is, we know that the Ajātaśatru story was not a direct translation of an existing story in an Indian text, but rather a story that had been skillfully woven together from strands taken from a number of varying sources. Thus, it is highly conceivable that Devadatta’s name was taken from at least two different sources, each rendering the name in a different way, and that these names subsequently were put into Chinese. In other words, it is another case of different Indian or Central Asian texts being translated and compiled in order to produce a single Chinese text. For while the story and the main characters suggest an Indian origin, there are story elements, such as the idea of eighteen thousand kings killed by princes coveting the throne, or the treatment of how Ajātaśatru threatens to kill his mother Vaidehi, which seem to fit naturally into the Ajāta-
At this point let us present a translation of the Prologue section of the Guan-jing, containing the story of Ajātaśatru and Bimbisāra:

In the great city of Rājagaha there was a prince named Ajātaśatru who, following the counsel of Devadatta, an evil friend, seized his father King Bimbisāra and confined him within a seven-walled chamber. He ordered his attendants that no one was to be allowed to go to him. The Royal Consort, named Vaidēhi, remained loyal to the king. Purifying herself by bathing, she spread flour mixed with ghee and honey over her body and filled her ornaments with grape juice, secretly giving these to the king. Then the king ate the flour and drank the juice, and asking for water he rinsed his mouth.

Having finished rinsing his mouth, he joined his palms together in reverence and faced toward the Vulture Peak. From afar he saluted the Blessed One and spoke these words: “Maha Maudgalyāyana is my Good Friend. I pray he will show compassion for me and impart to me the eight precepts.”

Then Maudgalyāyana, flying like a hawk or falcon, rapidly arrived at the place of the king. Day after day [flying back and forth] like this he imparted to the king the eight precepts. The Blessed One also sent the Reverend Pūrna to preach the Teachings to the king. In this way, three weeks passed, and because the king ate the flour and honey and was able to hear the teachings, his countenance was peaceful and calm.

At that time Ajātaśatru questioned the guards at the gate [to the prison], “Is my father the king still alive?” The gate guards said: “Great King, the Royal Consort, her body spread with flour and honey and her ornaments filled with juice, offers these to the king. And the śramanas Maudgalyāyana and Pūrna come from the sky to teach the Dharma to the king. It is impossible to prevent them.”

Then, having heard these words, Ajātaśatru became angry with his mother and said: “My mother is a rebel and the companion of a rebel. The evil śramanas through their illusions and spells caused this evil king not to die through these many days.”

And then he seized a sharp sword intending to kill his mother.

At that time there was a minister named Candraprabha, wise and intelligent. Along with Śivaka he saluted the king and said: “Great king, we have heard that the Vedic discourses teach that from the beginning of the aon there were evil kings numbering eighteen thousand who, because of their lust for the throne, killed their own fathers. Yet we have never heard of anyone illicitly killing his own mother. . . .”

After this point Bimbisāra does not reappear in the story, and Vaidēhi becomes the central protagonist. Ajātaśatru relents and gives up any idea of harming his mother, but he does cast her into prison. While in prison she, like Bimbisāra before her, entreats the Buddha.
from atar, and he sends Maudgalyāyana and Ānanda to her, then
follows himself. At this point begins the bulk of the sūtra, compris-
ing the instruction to Vaiḍheī on the Pure Land of Amiṭāyus, that is
Sukhāvati, and the way to attain birth there. In the epilogue Vaiḍheī
attains awakening, but there is no return to the story of Ajātaśatru.16

From here on in our investigation, let us accept that we can study
the episode of Ajātaśatru and Bimbisāra – the introductory narrative
– independent from the rest of the Guan-jing. It is but one separable
unit of the whole sūtra, and questions on the origins of the sūtra itself
as a unit can be set to one side as we deal with this one separable
portion. In addition, I believe that Yamada, although he does not
prove it, is correct in his suggestion that the introductory story itself
is a composite narrative, thus divisible into its constituent parts.
While not explicitly stated by Yamada, apparently the joint in the
introductory section itself must fall between the episode of Ajāta-
śatru questioning the guards of the jail, who inform him that Maudga-
lyāyana and Pūma visit the jail to preach to Bimbisāra, and the
immediately following section relating Ajātaśatru’s anger at his
mother. The latter section begins with the sentence “Then, having
heard these words, Ajātaśatru became angry at his mother, and said
...” 時、阿闍世聞此語已、怒其母、曰... As Yamada has stated,
the following passages, in which after grabbing a sword to strike
Vaiḍheī Ajātaśatru is reprimanded with by his ministers, do not
occur in other versions of the tale. In fact, as the numerous examples
to be quoted below will show, the traditional versions of the tale
continue after Ajātaśatru’s interview with the jailers in quite a
different fashion than does the Guan-jing. In this way I think it is
possible to prove that the point at which the traditional Indian
versions of the tale on the one hand and the Guan-jing version on the
other diverge is precisely the point of a joint in the text of the latter,
indicating a fusion of source materials, and an indication of the
boundaries of a stock narrative episode widespread throughout
Buddhist and Jaina Indian literature.17

Definitely we begin our analysis of the stories in detail, some more or
less theoretical observations should be offered. Given the assumption
that Yamada’s hypothesis is correct, and the Guan-jing is in fact
composed of a number of elements connected together into a whole,
it should be possible to carry out two types of investigation at the same time. In fact, more generally speaking, we can say that for any text which can be shown to be wholly or even partially constructed out of originally independent elements, a double-sided investigation is possible. First, we can investigate various aspects of the general problem of the origins of a given text itself by looking severally at the elements used to construct that text. Individually tracing the history and evolution of the component elements of a sūtra should help us to better understand the composition and development of the sūtra as a whole. Second, we can investigate the evolution of each given element of the text independent of its context as an element of that text. Thus, at one and the same time we can contribute, first, to a study of the origins of one Buddhist sūtra, and, second, to a more general study of — depending on which elements of a text we choose to trace at any given time — narrative motifs, philosophical doctrines, and so on.

It might be objected that, while Yamada may be correct that the Guan-ėj is in fact formed out of discreet elements melded together into a whole, his method cannot apply to many, perhaps most, Buddhist sūtras. But it is not necessary that an entire sūtra be constructed out of stock units, or that those units be so obviously of diverse origin, to apply to advantage this research methodology. Probably most Buddhist sūtras, whether Mahāyāna or those of so-called Mainstream Buddhism, no matter the land of their composition, make use of stock phrases, stock episodes (narrative or otherwise), stock doctrinal passages and so forth, mixed to a greater or lesser degree with original material — the innovations of the particular text. These stock materials mixed into a text may become the objects of the double-sided study proposed above.

The idea that texts are formed out of pericopes and stock phrases — although not exclusively so formed, of course — has long been recognized, and especially in the relatively well studied Pāli literature lists could undoubtedly easily be compiled of just such pericopes. The study of narrative elements in Buddhist literature may be one of the easiest areas in which to begin this type of research. Moreover, since narrative materials have often been
ignored in the field of Buddhist Studies, a field which is biased toward doctrinal studies, at least at first progress should be rapid.  
Within the constraints of an article such as the present one it is impossible to trace in detail any story which appears with some frequency in Buddhist literature, such as the story of Ajitaśatru; there is simply too much material. It is necessary then to pref ace the following with the disclaimer that what follows is a selective and provisional study. At almost every turn more material could have been added, more parallels adduced, as a glance at the dictionaries of Malalasekera (1938) and Akanuma (1931) will show. Nevertheless, I would like to present several versions of the story of Ajitaśatru's imprisonment of Bimbisāra, and Yaideh's transport of nourishment into her imprisoned husband, as found in Buddhist and Svetāmbara Jaina literature. (I believe the story is not found at all in either Digambara Jaina or Brahmanical and Hindu literature.) Since one of the foci of the present study is the question of the origins of the Guan-jing, the story presented in that sūtra as quoted above will be taken as the point of departure for the analysis that follows.

The Buddhist Parallels

Since long ago scholars have adduced the Mahāyāna-Mahāpari-nirvāṇa-sūtra's version of the story of Ajitaśatru and Bimbisāra as a parallel to the Guan-jing's version. As we saw above, Yamada (1976: 86) has suggested it as a source for at least part of the Guan-jing's narrative. There are considerable problems with the external history of the Chinese translations of the Mahāyāna-Mahāpari-nirvāṇa-sūtra, but we can more or less safely assume that the so-called Northern Recension texts T. 374 and T. 376 date from the beginning of the fifth century. The later so-called Southern Recension T. 375 was apparently heavily revised and augmented in China, but T. 374 and 375 agree exactly in the passages in question here, which do not appear at all in the oldest stratum of the text, T. 376. Two sets of passages contain material parallel to passages in the Guan-jing. In the first, Ajitaśatru is introduced as a king who killed his own father, and regrets it deeply. His regret causes boils to appear on his body, boils for which there is no cure. His ministers
variously give him different advice about whom to consult, listing a number of heretical teachers and their doctrines. One minister mentions the names of many kings who killed their own fathers, although with the intention of convincing Ajatasatru that his action is not wrong, in contrast to the intention of the Guan-ting passage. The second often cited passage may be translated as follows:

When Sudarśana [- Ajatasatru] heard [the reason why he was named Ajatasatru, the story of his youth and so forth], he straightaway had his minister arrest his father the king and concommit him outside the city, guarded by a four-fold army [consisting of elephant, horse, chariot and foot units]. When the consort Vaidehi heard of these events, she immediately went to the king, but those who were guarding the king intercepted her and would not allow her to enter. At that time the consort was outraged and shouted abuse at them. The guards straightaway notified the prince: “Great King, the consort wishes to see your father the king. We could not judge whether to permit it or not.” When Sudarśana heard this he again became enraged, and immediately went to his mother. Approaching her and pulling his mother by the hair, he drew his sword, wanting to cut her down. At that time Jivaka spoke, saying: “Great King, although crimes have been committed as long as there has been a country, even the most awful has never extended as far as women, much less to the mother by whom one was given birth.” When Prince Sudarśana heard these words, thanks to Jivaka he quickly released [his mother]. [But] he thoroughly cut off his father the king from clothing, bedding, drink, food and medicines, and after seven days the king’s life ended. When Prince Sudarśana saw that his father was dead, then he became repentant.

These passages obviously refer to the same story as that in the Guan-ting, but cannot be the sole source for the whole story. The second episode is, however, unique among the parallel versions known to me in relating the scene of Ajatasatru’s anger, certainly an important detail.

In a series of studies on the Guan-ting, Sueki Fumihiko (1982, 1986a, 1986b) investigated among other topics the question of the origins of the sūtra. Especially in his excellent synthetic survey (1986b), Sueki accepted Yamada’s 1976 analysis of the structure of the text, and in all three papers just referred to he tried to suggest a possible source for the introductory narrative unit, singling out the episode of Vaidehi’s transport of liquid nourishment into her imprisoned husband in her anklets as a characteristic element of the Guan-ting’s tale. Sueki apparently selected this story element at least
partially because the closest parallel version of the story known to him, that of the *Sanghabhedavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, contains an account in which not only is the means of transport the same, but it is not grape wine (or juice) which Vaidehi carries in to the king, but water. Sueki thought that this indicated an innovation on the part of the compiler(s) of the *Guanya*. I am inclined to disagree with this specific aspect of Sueki's interpretation for reasons I will discuss below, but first let us take a look at the Mūla-
sarvāstivāda version of the story.

It has been pointed out several times that the story of Ajātaśatru and Bimbisāra is presented in the *Sanghabhedavastu* of the Mūla-
sarvāstivāda Vinaya.22 The story there begins with the lifelong opposition of Ajātaśatru, spurred on by the evil Devadatta, to his father, Bimbisāra. Bimbisāra offers Ajātaśatru ever larger shares of his kingdom in order to assuage the latter’s greed, first the realm of Campa, then all of Magadha except Rājagṛha, then all but the treasury, then all but the king’s own harem. After each conciliation, Devadatta urges Ajātaśatru to “show courage” and demand more from his father Bimbisāra. And each time Ajātaśatru abuses the citizenry, causing them to flee from his oppression. The following is the narrative from that point on, translated, I believe for the first time in a modern language, from the Sanskrit text discovered at Gilgit.26

The king [Bimbisāra] spoke [to Ajātaśatru] in censure, saying: “You were given the provinces along with the treasury and the stores. Why do you now destroy them?”

When he had spoken thus, [Ajātaśatru] was angry and said to the ministers: “Gentlemen, what is the punishment for one who rebukes an anointed kaśtriya king?” The ministers said: “Lord, the punishment is to be put to death.” He said: “It is my father; how will I put him to [a violent] death? Go, place him in the confinement of jail.” [So Bimbisāra] was thrown into jail.

[Now,] that king [Bimbisāra] was beloved by his townsfolk and by the provincials. When the masses of people who dwelt in his realm heard [what had befallen the king], they grew sad, but knowing that Ajātaśatru was angry, violent and harsh, no one spoke any censure of him. King Bimbisāra remained in jail carrying out his [usual] activity,27 and [his queen] Vaidehi [daily] brought him a dish of rice boiled in milk.28

Ajātaśatru asked the jailers: “Gentlemen, how does the old king sustain himself?”

They answered: “Lord, your mother [daily] takes him a dish of rice boiled in milk.”
Ajātāśatru gave an order that food and water were to be withheld, so that [Vaidehi] would no more bring them in. And in the harem it was ordered that no one must send food and water into the jail, the punishment for one who sent them in being death. Understanding [Ajātāśatru's] violent nature, none ventured food [for Bimbisāra], so why would they have need of sending it in? Then Vaidehi, her mind troubled by affection for her husband, smeared her limbs with barley-meal paste and filling her anklets with water, undertook to take in that [food to Bimbisāra], and he sustained himself by it. This stratagem too was detected by the jailers, but out of affection for the king they did not inform Ajātāśatru.

Once again Ajātāśatru questioned the jailers, asking: "Gentlemen, how does the old king sustain himself?" They reported to him in detail, and he said: "Gentlemen, restrain Vaidehi so that she enters no more." Then [at that time] the Blessed One, in order to plant [in Bimbisāra] the roots of good, began to walk on the Vulture Peak on the side that faced the window [of the jail]. King Bimbisāra seeing the Blessed One through the window produced a joy which preserved his life.

And Ajātāśatru once again asked the jailers: "Gentlemen, food and water were withheld, now how does the old king sustain himself?"

They answered: "The Blessed One, in order to assist him, walks on the Vulture Peak, and [Bimbisāra] stands [at the window] and gazes at him everyday."

[Ajātāśatru] said: "Close the windows, and lacerate his feet with a razor." Then they shut the windows and lacerated his feet with a razor, and he was afflicted by painful suffering. His voice choked with tears and sobbing, with eyes full of tears, he thought: "The Blessed One does not pay any attention to me, beset by troubles, danger and distress!"

But there is nothing the Buddhas, Blessed Ones do not know, do not see, do not understand, do not discern. The reality is that, surveying the world thrice nightly and thrice daily with the Buddha-eye, the vision of truth arises for the Buddhah, Blessed Ones ..." [Namely, they consider:] "Who is forsaken? Who is joyful? Who is beset by troubles? Who is beset by danger? Who is beset by distress? Who is beset by troubles, danger and distress? Who is sunken in evil states? Who is disposed towards evil states? Who is inclined toward evil states? Extracting him from evil states, whom shall I establish in heaven and in liberation? Whose unplanted roots of merit shall I plant? Whose planted roots of merit shall I mature? Whose fully matured [roots of merit] shall I liberate?"

The Blessed One addressed the Reverend Mahā-Maudgalāyana: "Go, Maudgalāyana. Inquire after King Bimbisāra's health on my behalf. And say this: The Blessed One said: "I have done [for you] what needs to be done by a Good Friend. I have pulled your foot out of the hells, the realm of beasts and the realm of demons, and established you among the gods and men. I put an end to samsāra [for you]. I dried up the oceans of blood and tears [for you]. I leapt over the mountains of bones [for you]. I barred shut the doors of the evil states, and spread open [for you] the doors of heaven and of liberation. But actually these deeds are done by you alone, are [now] piled up, their requisites attained, their conditions prepared, they are ready to cascade out like a flood, and they are unstoppable. Who else will experience the
Therefore, Great King, you must act in accord with your deeds."

"Yes, Reverend," the Venerable Mahā-Maudgalyāyana promised to the Blessed One. And then he attained such a contemplative trance that when his mind was composed he vanished from the Vulture Peak and set himself in the jail, in front of King Bimbisāra. And he spoke as follows: "Great King, the Blessed One inquires after your health." [King Bimbisāra said:] "I salute [you], Reverend Mahā-Maudgalyāyana, and the Blessed One."[56]

[Maudgalyāyana said:] "The Blessed One, Great King, spoke thus: 'I have done [for you] what needs to be done by a Good Friend. I have pulled your foot out of the hells, the realm of beasts and the realm of demons, and I established you among the gods and men. I put an end to samsāra [for you]. I dried up the oceans of blood and tears [for you]. I leapt over the mountains of bones [for you]. I barred shut the doors of the evil states, and spread open [for you] the doors of heaven and of liberation. But actually these deeds are done by you alone, are [now] piled up, their requisites attained, their conditions prepared, they are ready to cascade out like a flood, and they are unstoppable. Who else will experience the [results of the] deeds done by you alone? Great King, the deeds [you have] done and piled up are not matured [somewhere] outside [yourself] in the earth realm, or in the water realm, or in the fire realm, or in the wind realm, but the auspicious and inauspicious deeds [you have] done are rather only matured in [your own psychic continuum, that is in your own] aggregates, spheres and components of clinging [to existence].

Deeds do not disappear even in one hundred aeons.

[But] reaching completeness and the proper time, they produce results for beings."

Therefore, Great King, you must act in accord with your deeds."

He, imprisoned in the jail, afflicted by the sufferings of having his feet lacerated by razors and by the deprivation of food and water, said: "Reverend Mahā-Maudgalyāyana, where is excellent food to be eaten?"

He said: "Great King, among the gods belonging to the company of the four Guardian Kings," and so saying the Venerable Mahā-Maudgalyāyana attained such a contemplative trance that when his mind was composed he vanished from the jail and set himself on the Vulture Peak.

Ajātašatru put [his son’s] finger in his own mouth, and the boil burst in his mouth. Ajātašatru disposed of the purulent blood on the ground, and when Prince Udāyāshīradhā saw the purulent blood, he began to cry once more. Seeing Vaidēhi smile, Ajātašatru said: “Mother, what is it?”

She said: “Son, this ailment comes from your father, and you had it too. But when your father placed [your] finger in his mouth and the boil burst, so that you should not cry he swallowed the purulent blood. He did not dispose of it on the ground.”

[Ajātašatru] said: “Mother, was I so dear to [my] father?” She said: “Yes.”

As Ajātašatru’s name disappeared, and respect arose. He said to his ministers: “Gentlemen, I will give half the kingdom to the man who tells me that the old king lives.” [Since] that king was beloved by his townsfolk and provincials, a great mass of people began to run towards the jail.

The king [Bimbisāra] heard the noise and considered: “Now what on earth are they going to do?” Trembling with fright, he drew in a long breath and died. He became a son of the Guardian King Vaiśravana, and daily, sitting on his lap, he partook of the nectar of the gods.

Vaiśravana said: “Who are you?” He said: “I am Jinarābhī, Great King.” And the appellation Jinarābhī was applied to him.

Sueki (1982: 463) has characterized his idea about the relationship between the episodes of Vaidēhi bringing wine or water to Bimbisāra in, respectively, the Guan-jing and the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya as follows: “Probably the author of the Kuan-ching [= Guan-jing] knew the expression of the S[amghṭh[edavastu] and adopted it transforming the latter half. But the Śbb was translated into Chinese more than two hundred years later than the Kuan-ching. Therefore the author of the Kuan-ching would have known the story before it was translated into Chinese.” Several years later Sueki (1986a: 260) restated his conclusions as follows: “Probably the description of the S[amghṭh[da]V[astu] or a similar one is the original form and that of the Guan-jing is a transformed one.... Whether water or grape juice, the passage that Vaidēhi filled her ornaments with drink is found in no other materials than the SV and the Guan-jing. Taking this similarity into consideration, we can surmise that [the] author or the author group of the Guan-jing would have known either the story of the SV or a similar one.” Fujita Kōtsu (1985: 43) has accepted Sueki’s argumentation, and speculated as follows: “Probably, as the Samghṭhṭedavastu text indicates, the Indian versions of the tale had only
water," the compiler of the Guan-jing newly adding grape juice (or grape wine), thus transforming the story. If this is so, we can see this as an indication that the tale was established in the wine producing regions of Central Asia."

Sueki apparently intended to emphasize not only what Vaidehi was carrying (a problem to which I will turn below), but also the similarity of the expressions in the two texts for the means of transport of food — and more specifically drink — into the jailed king. While Sueki is correct that the Guan-jing and the Mulasarvastivada Vinaya share certain specific details, and uniquely share the interesting reference to anklets, the overall story which comprises the narrative introduction to the Guan-jing, far from being unique to the Guan-jing and Samghabheda vatast, is in fact a stock tale or vignette in Indian texts. That is, there exist other parallel versions which make it clear that the history of the episode is more complex than Sueki or Fujita perhaps imagined. In order to demonstrate this, I would like to introduce some materials which contain close parallels to the Guan-jing's story of Ajatasatru and Bimbisara. I will begin with materials that would have been available in China in the Chinese language at the time of the compilation of the Guan-jing. The purpose of this presentation is not to suggest that these versions themselves served as models for the Guan-jing, but rather is to demonstrate the circulation of the story not only in India but as far as China even before the time of the Guan-jing. I will present these texts in chronological order, and since to the best of my knowledge they have not yet been presented in any European language I translate the extracts in full.

What is probably the earliest available datable version of a story close to that found in the Guan-jing appears in a Chinese sutra, the Foshou Weishengyuan-jing 佛說未生冤經 (*Ajatasatru-sūtra), translated — if the traditional attribution is correct — by Zhi Qian 於謙 between 220 and 253 C.E. Although this version lacks any reference to wine or grape juice, and so cannot be considered to be an exact parallel to the version of the Guan-jing, it is of interest in itself, if for no other reason than as an example of one of the oldest surviving Chinese translations of Buddhist literature. The text is translated in full in Appendix II to the present paper, but in summary
the story is as follows:” Spurred on by Devadatta, Ajatasatru attempts to take over the throne from his father Bimbisāra, throwing the latter into jail. Bimbisāra urges Ajatasatru to give up his evil ways, but he refuses.

The prince [Ajatasatru] said [to Bimbisāra]: “Don’t blabber! My long-cherished wish is fulfilled. How can I let you go?” He then gave an order to the jailers, saying: “Cut off [the king’s] food and starve him to death.” And the jailers threw [the king] into jail.

King Bimbisāra entreats the Buddha from his jail cell, and the queen tries to dissuade the prince from his plan.

The prince said: “Ever since I was young I have been determined to kill my father and become king myself. Today I fulfilled my wish. What are you giving me advice for?”

The queen said: “Refusing advice is the cause of the fall of kingdoms. I want to see the king – may I or not?”

The prince said: “You may.”

The queen cleansed her body by bathing, and coating her body with honey and flour entered [the jail].

The king complains of his poor physical condition, and the queen tells him that it is for this reason that she has brought food into the jail on her body. The king eats the food, and then turns in the Buddha’s direction regretting that he cannot meet the Buddha or his disciples.

The prince interrogated the jailers, saying: “You have cut off the king’s food for several days; why is he not yet dead?” And they replied: “The queen entered the jail bringing in honey and flour, and thus sustained the king’s life.” The prince said: “From now on you must not allow the queen to see the king.”

And the king, starving, got up and, facing the place where the Buddha was, made obeisance. And then he was no longer hungry .... When the prince heard of this, he ordered that the windows [of the jail] be blocked up and the soles of the [king’s] feet be lacerated, so that he would not be able to stand up and see the Buddha .... The jailers immediately lacerated the soles of his feet, and his pain was immeasurable.

The Buddha then preaches to Bimbisāra from afar, and through the Buddha’s power Bimbisāra understands his previous karma. He dies and is reborn in heaven. Here there is of course no mention of
any liquid sustenance, wine or otherwise, but there are already a number of details we will find repeatedly in other texts.

The next Chinese text to which we may turn our attention is the Vinaya of the Sarvastivadins, the Shisong-lu 十誦律 (T. 1435 [XXIII] 261b7-262a10), a translation of the late fourth century. Again, spurred on by Devadatta, Ajātaśatru is urged to overthrow his father.

King Ajātaśatru heard this, became iovous, and he ordered his ministers and court attendants to apprehend his father the king, commanding them to imprison him. The great ministers received his instructions and straightaway they arrested [Bimbisāra] and secured him in the jail. The great king [Bimbisāra] was good, wise and tender, and so one billion people took various delicacies and went to speak with the king. The king ate and thus sustained himself. After several days had passed, Ajātaśatru asked: “Is the great king alive or not?” [The jailers] answered: “He is alive.” “How is he able to survive?” They answered: “People come to speak with the king, and they bring food and drink which sustain him.” The king immediately ordered the jailers: “Starting right away you must not allow anyone to enter [the jail].”

Later, a consort of the king stole some food and took it in to the king, who by eating it was able to survive. After several days had passed, the king again asked: “Is the great king alive?” And they answered: “He is alive.” “How is he able to survive?” They answered: “It is because there is a consort of the king, and she comes and gives him food and drink.” Immediately [the king] ordered the jailers not to allow the king’s consort to enter [the jail].

Now, there was a chief consort who had a deep respect and regard for the great king. Taking food, she coated the lining of her garments with it. Then putting on yet another layer of clothes on top, she went into the jail. Taking off the clothes she gave them to the king and made him eat, enabling him to survive. After several days had passed, the king again asked: “Is my father the king alive?” They answered: “He is alive.” “How is he able to survive?” They answered: “He is able to survive thanks to the visits of the chief consort.” The king said: “Do not allow the chief consort to enter [the jail].”

From within his jail cell the king’s father looked toward the Vulture Peak in the distance. The great king saw the Buddha and the monks Śāriputra, Maudgalyāyana, Aniruddha, Nandiya and Kimbila, climbing up and descending the mountain. The great king was able to look upon the Buddha and the monks in the distance, and because of the joy (thus caused) he survived. After several days had passed, Ajātaśatru again asked: “Is my father the king alive?” They answered: “He is alive.” “How is he able to survive?” A minister with a jealous spirit answered, saying: “He survives since he looks upon the Buddha and the monks in the distance.” The king immediately gave an order commanding that an obstructing partition be erected, and [the king] prevented from being able to look out.

......(list of miracles which occur when Buddhhas enter a city omitted)......
At that time, the Buddha entered Rājagaha with his right foot treading upon the threshold of the gate, and everywhere he manifested each and every one of the multiple auspicious portents [listed above, but omitted in this translation]. After seeing these signs, King Bimbisāra knew the Buddha would enter Rājagaha. From his tower the king faced a gap [in the wall] and standing there he gazed upon the Buddha entering the city. The king attained the Noble Path, and since he saw the Buddha and the monks, the joy [produced by that] sustained him. And after several days had passed, Ajātaśatru again asked: “Is the king still alive?” They answered: “He is alive.” “How is he able to survive?” A minister with a jealous spirit answered, saying: “The Buddha entered the city and manifested his supernatural powers. Your father the king survives because he faced through a gap and looked upon the Buddha.”

Ajātaśatru said: “With a sharp blade cut the soles of the great king’s feet, and quickly bind the skin; do not allow him to move to and fro.” Being so ordered they right away cut the soles of the great king’s feet, quickly binding them, and he was unable to move to and fro. For this reason the king lay down, and as the days passed he grew emaciated and ill.

Again, at one time King Ajātaśatru was eating with his mother. The king had a son, whose name was Udayabhāsa, and he was playing in the road with a young dog. The king asked: “Where is Udayabhāsa?” They answered: “In the road playing with the dog.” The king said: “Bid him come; I will eat with him.” And clutching the dog he came following the messenger. But the prince did not eat. The king asked why, and the prince said: “If the king allows me to eat with my dog, then I shall eat.” The king said: “As you wish.” And the prince himself ate, and then with [some food] and gave it to the dog. The king said to his mother: “I have done a difficult thing. Why? I am an anointed kṣatriya king, yet out of love for my son I allowed him to eat with a dog.”

His mother said: “This is not a difficult thing you have done. Why? There are people who eat dog meat, and if you allow them to eat it, what is so strange?” Do you know that your father really did do something difficult?” The king said: “What difficult thing did he do?” His mother said: “When you were young your finger had a carbuncle. It quickly became very painful, and day and night you could not sleep. Your father held you on his knee, and put your abscessed finger into his mouth. The body of the great king was soft, and you were able to be sleep comfortably. Because his mouth was warm, the carbuncle ripened and discharged purulently. The great king thought to himself, ‘If I take his finger out [of my mouth] and spit out the pus, this will increase my son’s suffering.’ So straightaway he swallowed the pus. Your father did this difficult thing; now please release him!”

The king listened to this in science, but after his mother had spoken he said: “Release him!” A cry went up in the palace: “Release the great king!” Everywhere in the streets people heard that the great king would be released. Because the king was wise and good, a hundred thousand people all proclaimed “Good!” And they all moved toward the jail, each saying: “The great king will be released.”

The great king heard this tumultuous roar, and thought to himself: “My son is
evil, and doesn’t feel compassion or pity. I do not know now what sort of punishment he will inflict upon me.” And thinking thus, he cast himself off his bed and thereupon ended his life. At that time King Ajātashatru snatched away the life of his father the king and incurred a great sin of immediate retribution. 49

This text too, while containing a number of vital story elements, does not provide details about the sustenance brought into the king, and in particular there is no mention of drink.

I believe that the texts just presented are the main pre-Guan-jing Chinese versions of our story. But this of course does not exhaust the Buddhist versions of the story, and many other versions of the story have come down to us. Looking at this information will help us to understand what forms the story took, and by trying to identify the tolerances of the story itself we can begin to try to identify what may be the innovations of a particular version or tradition.

As has been known for more than one hundred years, our story occurs in the Pāli commentarial literature, and it has been recounted from there several times. 50 The version of the story closest to that with which we are presently concerned is found in Buddhaghosa’s commentary to the Dīgha-nikāya, the Samantabhadra-vilāsini. The section introductory to that which contains our tale consists of the background of Ajātashatru’s life. 51 Before his birth it was predicted that Ajātashatru would become his father’s enemy. 52 During her pregnancy his mother, due to the influence of the unborn child, felt a pregnancy craving for her husband Bimbisāra’s blood. In order to prevent the child Ajātashatru from killing Bimbisāra in the future, she repeatedly tried to abort the foetus, but was found out and stopped by the king. At birth the child was taken from her, and when presented with her son years later she grew to love him. King Bimbisāra subsequently bestowed upon his son the vice-regency. The story then introduces Devadatta who urges Ajātashatru that, life being short, he should kill his father and seize the throne immediately. Ajātashatru is caught in his assassination attempt, and when Bimbisāra questions him, he replies that the attempt was motivated by his desire for the throne. And so Bimbisāra grants the kingdom to him. 53 Ajātashatru tells Devadatta that he has attained his desire, and the following is a translation of the story from that point: 54
“You, like a man who has put a mouse inside a drum and covered it
over, think you have done [all] that needs doing. [But] in a few
days your father [Bimbisāra], contemptuous of what you have done,
will become king himself [again, just as the mouse will chew his way
out of the drum].”

[Ajātasattu asked:] “Well friend, what shall I do?”

“You should kill him off.”

“But friend, how can I kill my own father with a weapon?”

[Then] you should kill him by cutting off his nourishment.”

[So Ajātasattu] caused his father to be cast into a torture chamber.55 And he said
[to the guards], “Except for my mother, you shall not allow others to see him.”

The queen [Ajārasūtra’s mother] placed food in a golden vessel and she entered
[the jail] carrying it in a pouch in her garment. And the king [Bimbisāra] ate it and
sustained himself. [Ajātasattu] asked: “How does my father sustain himself?” And
hearing the situation, he said: “Do not allow my mother to enter [the jail dressed] in
a pouch garment.”

From that time, the queen placed [the food] in a turban and took it in. Hearing of
that too [Ajātasattu] said: “Do not allow her in if she is wearing a turban.” And so
then, concealing food in a golden slipper, the queen put on the slippers and went in
[to the jail]. And the king sustained himself by that [food]. Again [Ajātasattu] asked:
“How does he sustain himself?” And hearing the facts he said: “Do not allow her
entry wearing slippers.”

At that time, bathing in perfumed water the queen smeared her body with a
syrup of four ingredients, and clothing herself went in [to the jail]. Licking her body,
the king sustained himself. Again [Ajātasattu] asked [how Bimbisāra sustained
himself], and hearing the facts he said: “From now on, refuse my mother entrance
[to the jail altogether].”

The queen stood at the doorway [to the jail] and said: “Lord Bimbisāra, you did
not permit me to kill this [son of ours, Ajātasattu], when he was young, and you
nourished your enemy yourself. This is now our very last visit, for from now on I
will not be able to see you. If some fault attaches to me, forgive it Lord.” And crivine
and weeping she left.

From then on the king was without nourishment, and sustained himself through
the joy of the fruit of the path [obtained] by walking to and fro, and his countenance
was extremely brilliant.

“Tell me, how does my father sustain himself?” [Ajātasattu] asked. Hearing [the
answer] “He sustains himself by walking to and fro, Lord, and his countenance is
extremely brilliant,” he thought: “I shall prevent his pining.” So he ordered the
barbers: “Slicing open my father’s feet with a razor, smear them with salt and oil
and roast them crackle-crackle with acacia wood embers.”

King [Bimbisāra] saw these [barbers coming] and thought: “Surely my son has
been admonished by someone, and these [barbers] have come to shave me.” They
came, greeted him, and stood there. And being asked, “Why have you come?” they
told him [Ajātasattu’s] order. [Bimbisāra] told [them]: “Do what your king
commands.” Saying “Sit down, Lord,” they said to the king: “Lord, we are carrying
out the king's order, do not be angry with us. This is not fit for a Righteous King like you." And with the left hand they grabbed his ankle and with the right hand the razor, and slicing open the soles of his feet they smeared them with salt and oil and roasted them until they could not take the pain.

The king, it is said, long ago entered the area around a shrine wearing shoes and treads with those [hood] feet on a mat appointed for sitting. This present situation is the karmic result of that past act, they say.

The king experienced a strong sensation, and he brought to mind [the expression] "Hail to the Buddha! Hail to the Dhamma!" and in the area around the shrine he withered like a discarded garland. And he was reborn as a yaksha named Janavasabha, an attendant to Vessavavana, in the Heaven of the Four Guardian Kings.

On that very same day a son was born to Ajatassatru. The two messages apprising him of the twin facts of his son's birth and his father's death arrived at precisely the same moment. The ministers placed in the king's hands the letter which said: "I wish I will announce the fact of the birth of [your] son."

At that moment the king felt a great love for his son, his whole body shaking and feeling reaching even down to the marrow of his bones. Then he understood his father's virtuous qualities: "When I too was born my father felt love for me in just the same way," and he said: "Go, release my father, release him!" "Who is there to release, Lord?" they said, and handed him the second message.

Learning of the fact of his father's death, weeping he approached his mother and said: "Mother, did father love me?" She said: "Foolish boy, what are you saying? When you were small there was boil on your finger. Then, being unable to appease [you, the nurses] took you and went into the presence of your father, seated in the law courts. Your father placed your finger in his mouth, and the boil ruptured there in his mouth. Then out of love for you your father did not spit out the pus mixed with blood but instead swallowed it. So much did your father love you."

Crying and wailing, [Ajatassatru] performed his father's funeral.

In this tale again, although there are a number of characteristic story elements, many of them common to the other versions we have examined above, there is still no mention of liquid nourishment, and specifically no mention of wine.

It may be that there are or were other important Buddhist versions of our tale, in Indic languages, Tibetan, Chinese or other Buddhist languages, for certainly, as we have already seen, the story is widespread. But I believe that those versions presented so far give at least a fair sample of the main extant versions. Now, if these versions constituted the complete extent of the tale in Indian literature, the story would still have to be counted as a fairly widely known one. We have quoted it in Indic languages from fifth century Ceylon and perhaps sixth or seventh century Gilgit, and in Chinese from as
early as the third century B.C. This must be counted as a fundamental Buddhist legend. But there is at least one vital element missing in those versions which parallel the episode presented in the Guan-jing, as noted by Skeat, namely the introduction of wine into the story. And if we were to limit our study to Buddhist sources, we might be at an impasse. But this story is not the sole property of the Buddhists.\(^{51}\)

The Jaina Parallels

The question of the dating of early Jaina texts is a vexing one, but already in the \textit{Nirayāvaliyā}, the eighth of the Śvetāmbara Upāṅgas, a text which dates (in the form in which we have it) to not before the fourth century,\(^{62}\) we find a story identical in outline to the versions recounted above, although the element of the queen's efforts to carry nourishment to the imprisoned king is missing. The \textit{Nirayāvaliyā} is a very interesting work, and should certainly be translated in its entirety by a competent Jaina scholar. Since, however, the work does not contain an exact parallel to the episode we are studying here, and is thus not directly relevant to the issue at hand, I will not translate the story, which is rather long, in full. On the other hand, this represents probably the earliest non-Buddhist version of the story, so it is worth summarizing briefly: Queen Cellanā, the mother of Kūnīka (that is, Ajātaśatru), craves in her pregnancy for the fried muscle of the heart of King Śrenīka (that is, Bimbisāra). Prince Abhaya, Śrenīka's son, tricked her into believing that she has been given it to eat. When Kūnīka is born Cellanā expels him, and a cock tears open the child's finger. Śrenīka discovering this succors the child, and puts the injured and infected finger into his own mouth to clean it and ease the child's pain. Later, Kūnīka along with his ten brothers imprisons his father and himself takes the throne. Then, on a certain occasion Kūnīka comes to pay his respects to his mother, who however looks unhappy and does not respond. Asked why, she relates to Kūnīka the story of her pregnancy and wish to be rid of him, and of Śrenīka's care of his son's injured finger, accusing Kūnīka of ingratitude. The story goes on.\(^{53}\)
Then King Kūnika, having listened and attended to this statement in the presence of Queen Cella, spoke thus to Queen Cella: “I have done a wicked thing, mother, binding with chains the dear, divine King Śrenika, venerable, beloved with tender attachment. I will go to him and cover the chains of King Śrenika myself.”

So saying, with an axe in hand he went, determined, to the prison fortress. Then King Śrenika, seeing the prince approaching with axe in hand, spoke thus to himself: “This Prince Kūnika desires what no one desires [namely, death], is marked out for a miserable end, was insauspiciously born on the fourteenth day of the month, has abandoned propriety, fortune, happiness and renown, and comes here quickly with an axe in hand. Who knows, but I shall die through some horrible means of death.” And so saying [to himself] in fear, dread, alarm, anxiety and terror, he put tala-pudaga poison into his mouth. Then King Śrenika, having put tala-pudaga poison into his mouth, in the passing of an instant fell down lifeless, motionless, deprived of vitality.

Then, when that Prince Kūnika arrived at that prison fortress and saw King Śrenika fallen down lifeless, motionless, and deprived of vitality, overcome by grief for his father he fell with his whole body upon the ground like the best Campaka tree cut down by an axe.

Kūnika then regains consciousness, and repents the evil he has done. While the parallel is not exact, it is plain that this is, in general terms, identical to the story we found in several Buddhist texts. This in itself is quite interesting, but there is more.

The oldest Jaina text of which I am aware in which our story, including the episode of the queen of Śrenika / Bimbisāra bringing him nourishment in prison, appears is the Āvaśyakacūrti of Jina-dāsāgani, dated by Leumann (1934: IVb) to between 600 and 650 C.E. The whole Āvaśyaka literature – what Brunn (1981: 17) calls the “Āvaśyaka cluster” – is a vast storehouse of Jaina and more generally Indian tales, and has yet to be explored in much detail. Despite the apparently rather late date of the Cūrni, for instance, it almost certainly preserves earlier narrative material. Watanabe Kenji (1990: 900) has observed that:

Compared with Buddhist works, the dates of these works [= Āvaśyaka texts] are new, but ... the stories of the Jaina tradition use Prakrit even within ṭikā which are written in the Sanskrit language. This indicates that those stories are quoted from an old tradition. Actually, the Jaina stories are often indicative of a form close to the original of the tales. There are many cases in which the age of the text and that of the tale it transmits are not the same.
Although Adellinä Mette (1983, 137-38) has discussed some parallels between the Āvaśyakacūrṇi and the Mūlasarvasvādā Vinaya, and opined that in some cases motifs or stories found in the former “are probably borrowed from Buddhist sources in later times,” this can by no means be the case in a great many instances, and undoubtedly is not so in the present circumstance. The text of our story is given in the Āśī ṛni in Prakrit prose:

At one time, Kūnika conferred together with the princes, Kāla and the rest: “Arresting Śrenika, we will split the kingdom into eleven parts.” They agreed, and Śrenīka was arrested.

Forenoon and afternoon, [Kūnika] caused [Śrenika] to be given one hundred lashes with a whip, and he permitted no one except Cetanā to approach [Śrenika]. “Food and water are prohibited,” [he said].

Thence Cetanā, fixing kūmāraka66 in her hair, and repeatedly [washing] her hair with a hundred layers of wine, entered [the prison]. She pretended to wash, and one hundred times washing her hair with water it became [reconstituted as] wine. Thanks to the power of this [wine], he did not perceive any pain.

Once, at another time, [Kūnika] had a son, Prince Udāvin, by [his consort] Padmāvari. When [Udāvin] was eating he urinated on his hand and on the plate. But [Kūnika] did not move him, saying “He must not be disturbed!” Removing as much of the food as was urinated upon, he ate the remainder. He [then] said to his mother: “Mother! Did anyone else ever hold a son so dear?”

She said: “Vile one! Your finger spilled forth worms and your father put it in his mouth. Nevertheless you waited.”

His mind became tender toward her, and he said: “Then why did he give me [only] molasses sweetmeats to eat [rather than sugar ones]?”

The queen said: “It was I who did that to you, since you were always your father’s enemy. Beginning in the womb,” and thus she told him everything. “Still your father did not become indifferent. Still your father showed such devotion to you.”

[Kūnika] became unhappy, and hearing that, excitedly grabbing an iron staff the size of his arm he ran thinking “I will shatter his fetters.”

The guards, out of concern for the king, informed him: “This evil one comes holding an iron staff.”

Śrenika thought: “Who knows, but I shall die through some horrible manner of death.” And thinking thus he took tālapuḍa poison. By the time [Kūnika] got there, [Śrenika] was dead.

Seeing this, [Kūnika] became even more unhappy. Then exclaiming [Śrenika], he went home. Content to abandon the burden of sovereignty, he sat thinking about that. The crown prince and the ministers thought: “The king will die.” And so inscribing an edict on a copper plate, and giving it an old appearance, they publicized it: “Thus it is to be done for the father: He will be saved through the giving of the
pinda. From that time on, [the general custom of the rite of] offering of pinda to one's father became established. And thus in time [Kūñika] became free of grief.

What we immediately notice here is the mention not only of the transport of food into the imprisoned king, but also of drink, and specifically of wine, an element found in none of our extant Buddhist parallels. On the other hand, the means of transport of the wine is different from that in the Guan-jing, a perhaps significant detail.

It seems more than likely that the great Jaina scholar Hemacandra (1088-1173) was inspired by, or even directly based himself on, this account in the Avāṣṭyakacūrṇī when several centuries later he recorded the same tale in his veritable encyclopedia of Jaina narrative lore, the Trīśatiśalākāpurusacarita or “Lives of the Sixty-three Divine Persons [of Jainism].”69 Our tale occurs in the tenth book of Hemacandra’s vast work, the Mahāvīracarita, this version in Sanskrit as distinct from the earlier Prakrit versions.69 Hemacandra lived in Gujarat under the Caulukya dynasty, and is credited with converting the monarch Kumarapala to the Jaina faith, this conversion leading to the domination of Jainism in Gujarat. As the life and works of Hemacandra, however, are well known and well studied, there is no need to describe them here in detail,67 and we can move directly to a translation of the story.

In the meantime, Prince Kūñika held counsel together with Kāla and the others, ten brothers like himself: “Although our father is old, he still has not had enough of kingship. For when the son of a king reaches the age at which he may wear armor, [the king] is entitled to take a vow. [For the kingship] excellent Abhaya, who gave up his wealth though young, is preferable to our father, blind to worldly concerns, who does not perceive his own old age. So now, arresting our father we will assume the sovereignty suited to us at this time; there will be no objection to this, for he is devoid of discernment. That done, we brothers will enjoy the kingdom in eleven parts. But after that let our imprisoned father live for even a hundred years!”

Accordingly they all evil-minded, imprisoned their own unsuspecting father. For evil offspring are like a poison tree born within one’s own house. Therefore, Kūñika threw Śreniṣka, like a parrot, into a cage. But there was a difference, for he did not give him even food or drink. Prompted by his former tutored, morning and afternoon day after day evil, Kūñika lashed his father a hundred times with a whip. Śreniṣka endured this misfortune wrought by fate; even if he is strong, what can an elephant do, tied by a rope? Kūñika did not permit anyone to go near Śreniṣka, except that out of courtesy to his mother he did not bat Celāṇa. Daily Celāṇa, hair wet from a hundred washings in
wine, like one who had bathed a short while before, went to Srenika. And placing a ball of kulmāsa into her hair like a wreath of flowers, Celaṇā, devoted to her husband, took it to him. Celaṇā gave the hidden ball of kulmāsa to her husband, and obtaining what was for him hard to find in, thought it to be like divine food. Srenika maintained his life with that ball of kulmāsa. In the absence of food, the disease that is hunger leads to death. Together with drops of tears from her eyes Celaṇā, devoted to her husband, made fall from the tangles of her hair drops of wine [placed there] through a hundred washings. And Srenika drank those falling drops of wine, as a thirsty cāṭaka12 drinks drops of water released by the clouds. By virtue of that wine drunk up in mere drops Srenika did not feel the whippings, nor did he suffer from thirst.

And having imprisoned Srenika in this way, to the haughtily reigning Kūṇika a son was born by his wife Padmāvari....

One day, fond of his son, the king, the son of Srenika, sat down to eat, having set Udāyin atop his left thigh. When Kūṇika had half-eaten, [his son] the child urinated and like a stream of liquid ghee the stream of urine fell into the food. "Let there be no interruption of my son's voiding" said the king, whose father is Srenika, and he did not move his knee; such was his affection for his son. And removing with his own hand the urine-soaked food, he ate the remainder just like that; and even this made him happy, because of his love for his son.

Then Kūṇika asked Celaṇā who was sitting there: "Mother, has there ever been a son so dear to anyone else as this one is to me?" Celaṇā said: "Aah! Villain! Wretch! Disgrace to your family! Don't you know how exceedingly beloved you were to your father? Because I had an evil pregnancy craving, I knew then that you were your father's enemy. For pregnant women have pregnancy cravings which correspond to the [nature of the] embryo. Knowing that even while you were in the womb, vile one, you were your father's enemy, out of concern for my husband's welfare I undertook an abortion. Nevertheless, you were not destroyed by the various abortion medicines, but on the contrary you flourished; everything is beneficial for the very strong. And expressing the sentir with 'When shall I see my son's face?' your father satisfied whatever sort of hankerings I felt. Certain that you were the enemy of your father, even when you were born, I abandoned you; but your father fetched you back zealously as if his own life [were being abandoned].

"Then one of your fingers was pricked by the tail feather of a wild hen, and became filled with worms and pus, exceedingly painful. Your father placed your finger, wounded though it was, into his mouth, and only as long as your finger was within his mouth were you succored. That father by whom you, ill-mannered wretch, were thus cossed was thrown into prison as his reward."....

Kūṇika said: "Shame! Shame on me, acting without reflecting! I shall deliver the kingdom back to my father, as if it had been placed on deposit." With these words, though the meal was but half-eaten, rinsing his mouth and handing his son to a nurse, Kūṇika stood up, anxious to go into the presence of his father. Intending "I will shatter the fetters on my father's feet" and grabbing an iron staff, he ran toward Srenika. The guards assigned to Srenika, previous intimates of his, saw Kūṇika
Kūnika repents, and after performing the cremation begins to waste away himself. His ministers convince him to perform the requisite offerings by forging a copper-plate inscription, and eventually Kūnika gets over his grief. There is no question that this version is highly elaborated and embellished, but at the same time its connection with the Avasyakacūrṇi version should be obvious. While perhaps the most detailed and elaborate version I have met with, the Trisastisalākāpurusacarita version is not the latest.

A close parallel to our story appears again in the Ākhyānakamānīkosā, a text by Nemicandra (1015-83) furnished with a Prakrit verse commentary (vytti) by Āmradeva (1134). The narrative material is contained in Āmradeva’s commentary. Here too Prince Aśoka-candra, the Kūnika character, arrests his father, imprisons and whips him, and attempts to starve him to death. And again, Cēllana conceals kulmāsa in her hair, which is also washed with wine. She gives the food to the king, and reconstitutes the wine. By drinking the wine, the king is able to endure the whippings, and so on.

The latest of the versions I will quote here is that found in the Kathākūsā, a Jaina story collection of unknown authorship and date. Discussing the text in his A History of Indian Literature, Winternitz (1927: 542, n. 2) says “It is certainly not old, though it probably made use of old sources.” The editor of the Sanskrit text, Ingeborg Hoffmann, quotes Ludwig Alsdorf’s opinion that “No dating appears to be attempted anywhere. The work, however, may belong at the earliest to the fifteenth century, rather than the sixteenth.” This text was translated into English already in 1895 by C.H. Tawney, the well known translator of the Kathāsaritsagāra or “Ocean of Story,” but the text and this English translation seem to have remained little known, even among Indologists. It was in fact
in reading this translation that I first noticed the parallel to the Guan-jing, a parallel pointed out already by Tawney in his introduction.

The story that interests us is found in chapter 25 of the Kathākośa, in the episode of Kūlavaḷaka. Tawney himself, in the brief introduction to his translation, pointed out that “The statement in the ‘Kathākośa’ with regard to the behavior of the head-queen agrees closely with that found in the ‘Amitāyur Dhyāna Sūtra,’ translated from the Chinese by Mr. J. Takakusu.”27 (“Amitāyur Dhyāna Sūtra” is, of course, the hypothetical, and almost certainly false, Sanskrit “reconstruction” of the Chinese title Guan Wuliangshou-jing.) Hoffmann has taken no note of this identification, but has noted other parallels including that with the Triṇaṣṭikaṇḍīkāpuruṣasaraśāstra.28 Tawney himself (1895: xx-xxi, and 175-78, in the notes), as Hermann Jacobi before him, correctly identified Śrenika with Bimbisāra, Koṇika (Kūnika) with Ajitaśatrud and Cīlanā (Cel[llanā] with Vaiḍenī.

The story of Kūlavaḷaka begins with Śrenika ruling in Rājagṛha. After Prince Aḥhayā abdicates the succession to become a Jain monk, King Śrenika hands the kingdom over to Koṇika.

One day Koṇika, having consulted with the ten princes, Prince Kāla and the others, threw Śrenika into prison. He whipped him a hundred times every forenoon and a hundred times every afternoon, and forbid him food and water. Then Queen Cīlanā, having fixed kuṃīśa in her hair, with great difficulty took them in for him to eat. Through a strategem she took [him] Candusākā wine in her hair, and when her hair was washed a hundred times, all the water became wine. Owing to the strength given him by the wine, the king was able to endure the whippings.

One day there was born to that same Koṇika by his wife Padmivati a son named Udaya. Once Koṇika was eating, having placed [his son] on his lap, and his urine fell right into the food vessel. Koṇika did not put him off his lap for fear of disturbing his rest, but ate his food mixed with urine. He said to his mother, who was nearby: “Mother, is there anyone whose son is so dear to him?” His mother said: “Damn! Listen, you wicked man! When you were in my womb, I had a pregnancy craving to eat your father’s flesh. The king satisfied my pregnancy craving, when I gave nirm to you, saying that you were evil I abandoned you in a grove of Aśoka trees. When the king heard this, he himself went to the grove and brought you back. Thus you were named Aśokacandra. Then a cock tore open your finger, and it became inflamed. Therefore you received the name Koṇika. Your infected finger caused you intense pain, and your father held that finger, oozing fetidly, in his mouth, and then you did not cry. To this extent did he love you.”

When Koṇika heard this, he was full of remorse, and he said: “Shame on me, to show such gratitude to my own father!” Then immediately taking up an iron club,
with the aim of breaking the [jailed king’s] chains, he personally set out [for the jail]. Then the guards informed the king in advance: “Konika is coming in a very impatient mood, with an iron club in his hand. We have no idea what he is up to.” The king thought to himself: “He will put me to death by some ingrading mode of execution.” And so thinking he took tāludāra poison. When Konika arrived there, King Śrenika was dead. [Śrenika] subsequently became an inhabitant of hell, destined to live in the first hell for eighty-four thousand years. Liberated from hell, he shall be the first tīrthāṅkara, named Mahāpadma, in this very land of Bhārata.

The resemblance of all these versions, with the exception of the first, to each other is clear. I do not know if the relationship between these texts has been investigated from a more general standpoint, but it seems very likely if not nearly certain that at least the versions of our story in the Avaśyakacūrṇi, the Trīsaṭṭalakāpurusacarita and the Kathākosa go back to a common origin, so close are they in wording and sequence. It is probable that there are other Jaina versions of our tale, but I am not a specialist in Jaina literature, and I must leave it to those who are to point out additional examples.

Now that we have presented in translation the main versions of the story as found in what we may term primary texts – old Indian texts or direct translations from such, excluding secondary compilations which may quote or paraphrase the story on the basis of such primary texts – it is time to turn to an analysis and comparison of the various versions.

Appraisal

There are a number of impressive parallels between the various Buddhist and Jaina versions of the story of Ajātaśatru and his father Bimbisāra. Among these, the reference to Bimbisāra’s queen bringing liquid nourishment to her jailed husband appears to be a significant element for the study of the history of this story. It would, naturally, be unreasonable to suggest that the authors of the Guanying knew of the Jaina parallels to their story, and I in no way mean to suggest that the presence of wine in both traditions indicates a direct relation between them. On the other hand, the absence of references to wine in known Chinese and Indian Buddhist sources and the presence of such references in non-Buddhist Indian sources makes it more than likely that the materials which inspired the
authors of the *Guan-jing* in their composition of the narrative frame were, or at least could have been, presently unknown, and perhaps no longer extant, Indian materials, even if the *sūtra* as a whole were composed in a non-Indian environment.

To understand a bit better how this composition of the *Guan-jing* may have taken place, it may be instructive to take a look at the way in which the narratives of the texts of our tale, translated above, line up against one another, story element by story element, in what they include and what they omit. An analysis of the arrangement of motifs (see the Table) shows that the division postulated above—the division between on the one hand the episode of Ajātaśatru’s imprisonment of his father and subsequent attempt to starve him to death and on the other hand that of Ajātaśatru’s attempt to kill his mother—is paralleled in the other versions of the story. That is, while apparently the second episode of Ajātaśatru’s anger is found outside the *Guan-jing* only in the *Mahāyāna-Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*, all of the versions of the story quoted above show a shift in the narrative at that same point; there is a disjunction in the narrative sequence. Some versions follow with an episode of Ajātaśatru’s own son, others with a story about Ajātaśatru’s own childhood. Ajātaśatru is led to repent by these stories told to him by his mother, or by his spontaneous love for his own child and the empathy for his father engendered by that love. The uniformity of the narrative pattern across all versions of the story suggests the underlying episodic structure, and the existence of our postulated separable story units. The very fact of the wide spread of our story, and the existence of versions structurally and in terms of content so close to that of the *Guan-jing* in Jain texts from North-western India, again make it clear that the first episode of the Prologue of the *Guan-jing* is thoroughly Indian, showing no necessary evidence of Central Asian influence. This too suggests, I believe, that the first portion of the Prologue narrative frame was borrowed verbatim, or nearly so, from Indian materials. The coincidence between specific elements in the *Guan-jing* account and those in, respectively, the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* and the *Mulasarvāstivāda Vinaya* (Ajātaśatru’s anger and the queen’s use of anklets) does suggest a possible relation with these texts, but again, the episode is still firmly located in the
Indian world. The same cannot be said, however, for the Guan-jing as a whole.

Above I mentioned briefly some of the reasons offered in support of the position that the Guan-jing is of non-Indian origin. I believe that the strongest arguments are those which suggest a Central Asian origin for the text as a whole, but probably some area of Central Asia under strong Chinese cultural influence; it seems likely that the text was originally composed in the Chinese language, if only for the reasons adduced by Yamada and explained above. Fujita Kōtatsu (1990: 157, 163) supposes that the text was compiled in the Turfan area, but aside from the fact that already in Western Jin 西晋 (late third century C.E.) times the Turfan area possessed Buddhist scriptures in Chinese (Ogasawara 1961: 137), I cannot detect Fujita’s reasons for pointing specifically to Turfan. It may be more cautious to suggest in a general way, with Sueki (1986b: 176), that the text was composed in Eastern Turkestan under the influence of Chinese thought and originally in the Chinese language. Another possibility is that the sūtra was composed in China (Nanjing?) by a monk (Kalayasāsā?) from Central Asia, again in Chinese from the beginning. Some of the arguments which could be leveled against this suggestion are implied by our earlier discussion of the rationale behind Chinese verification of the authenticity of sūtras. It seems unlikely that, unless some powerful Chinese person or persons actually requested or at least sanctioned a sūtra — after all, a record of the word of the Buddha — created in China itself, such a work would be admitted as orthodox. There are of course examples of just such occurrences, but it seems to me that the political environments which engendered such “apocryphal” texts have yet to be well understood.

Discussing the overall composition of the Guan-jing, Sueki (1986b: 178) says:

I surmise that while on the one hand the Prologue, the first Thirteen Contemplations and the later Three Contemplations contain elements going back some to Central Asia and some in their turn to India, on the other hand some of those elements date to the time when the sūtra was put together in its present form. That is, the sūtra along with organizing contemplations on Amiṣṭāya which were being practiced in Central Asia transformed the tragedy of Bimbisāra and Ajañacāra — which I imagine was popular in Central Asia — turning it into a story centered on Vādudeśi. Moreover,
It will require considerable further work to critically examine the evidence for this hypothesis, at least parts of which are nevertheless certainly correct. Since the Nine Grades of beings into which the Guan-jing classifies religious practitioners seems virtually certain to be of Chinese origin, and the Indic origins of the introductory story are equally clear, it may be best to use the term suggested by Fujita (1985: 60-61) and speak of a “mixed origin” for the sūtra, this referring to its composition out of units of mixed Indian, Central Asian and Chinese origin. Following the arguments of Yamada (1976), it is hard to imagine that the text was written originally in a language other than Chinese.

Several other aspects of the versions we have examined should not be overlooked. While I cannot offer a detailed discussion of the literary qualities of the texts presented above, it is clear that some are bare presentations of a story, while others are rich, poetic treatments of the same theme. Here even the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya rises above the generally pedestrian literary level of most Buddhist texts when it employs such poetic conceits as the terms bhartṛsnehoparuddhyamānāhradaya (“her mind troubled by affection for her husband”) and bāsoparuddhyamānāaṣṛṣṭvadakālantha (“his voice choked with tears and sobbing”), and the imagery of Hemacandra’s version in which Celaṇā rehydrates the wine she smuggles to Śrenika with her tears is vivid and striking. The ways in which these stories have each been transformed would make an interesting object of study.

We might provisionally note some ironic twists, such as the concern of the king, dying of hunger, to discover which realm, upon his rebirth, will offer him the best kinds of food. It is only speculation to suggest that the motif of the rebirth of Bimbisāra on the lap of Vaśravana is primary, and the connection with the food in the latter’s realm secondary. Likewise the laceration of the king’s feet to prevent his seeing the Buddha and thereby sustaining his life is integrated into the stories with varying degrees of success. In the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya and *Ājītasatru-sūtra, the sight of the Buddha sustains the king, but in the version of the scholastic Buddhaghosa it is the joy produced by his attainment of the magga-
phala (for Buddhaghosa probably technically equivalent to satāpattiphala) which sustains the king, and preventing the king’s pacing does nothing to affect this. It has been suggested that in the concern with feet we should see some connection with a world-wide archetype including the piercing of Oedipus’s heel, but I confess I am not convinced by this suggestion 90

A theme which provides part of the background for the story, but is not expressed explicitly in every version (or is mentioned previous to the place in the text where our extracts began), is the pregnancy craving (dohada) of Ajātaśatru’s mother during the time he is in her womb. This motif, as Maurice Bloomfield (1920) has so interestingly shown, is a common element in Indian tales. Bloomfield discusses several versions of our story, and in addition mentions a similar, though not entirely parallel, account in the Jaina Samarāicca Kahā of Haribhadra (mid-eighth century) and its Sanskrit paraphrase the Samarādyasamikṣepa of Pradyumna (1214). The Prakrit story collection Samarāicca Kahā contains (Jacobi 1908-26: xlv: 175 ff.) the story of a prince who imprisons his father the king. The king’s queens visit him in jail, but in this version the king wishes to starve himself to death. His son threatens to cut off the king’s head unless he takes food, and upon his refusal the son indeed does take his own father’s life. I have not studied this story in detail, but its connection, at least conceptually, with our tale is obvious. The actual violent murder of a father by a son is rather rare in Indian literature, and the reluctance of the son to undertake such a vicious action against his father is referred to in several versions of our story. 91

There are, however, in fact examples in Buddhist and Jaina literature of violent patricide, and I refer the interested reader to my paper (Silk Forthcoming) which deals with this topic in detail.

One aspect of the tale of Ajātaśatru and Bimbisāra which has drawn considerable attention is the similarity to the European story of Oedipus. A Japanese psychoanalyst and sometime disciple of Freud, Kozawa Heisaku 古沢平佐 (1897-1969), apparently decided that the Japanese did not have an Oedipus Complex, but rather an “Ajase Complex,” Ajase 甑世 being the Japanese reading of the Chinese transliteration of the name Ajātaśatru. Here we may merely note that the tale interpreted psychoanalytically in this theory is a
modified version of the one we have recounted above. According to Sueki (1985), Kozawa presented the Ajātaśatru story based on the version in the Kyōgyōshinshō 行教信證 of Shinran 視鸞, which is in turn based on the Guan-jing and the Mahāyāna-Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra. Kozawa’s follower Okonogi Keigo 小此木啓吾 (1930 - ) added additional elements of his own creation removing the story, as Sueki says, even further from the sources. Sueki questions whether an ancient Indian story can reveal anything about the contemporary Japanese psyche, although of course a similar question could be asked about an ancient Greek story and modern Europeans. Be that as it may, it is very revealing for the Buddhist scholar and the psychoanalyst alike to note, as Sueki suggests, that apparently Shinran added our story to his monumental work the Kyōgyōshinshō late in his life, after his break with his own son Zenran 善鸞. Although perhaps for somewhat different reasons than those adduced by the Japanese psychoanalysts, I also believe that it is not entirely accurate to treat the Ajātaśatru story as a true Oedipal tale since, crucially, Ajātaśatru does not in fact desire his mother. I have discussed the issue of Indian Oedipal tales in detail in my paper mentioned above.

Finally, in order to more fully understand the Guan-jing and its Prologue, it is important to ask what a story like that of Ajātaśatru and Bimbisāra does when used as a narrative frame for a text. I think one of the most important roles fulfilled by any such frame story is the provision of legitimation for the text. The audience of a new literary production, the authors of which adopt a well-known story such as that of Ajātaśatru and Bimbisāra, is already familiar with the “facticity” of the story. It is a tribute to the hold that this particular story has on the imagination, perhaps, that even such a modern, critical scholar as Fujita Kōtatsu (1985: 89) repeatedly refers to the “historical reality” (shūitsu 歴実) of the “Tragedy at Rājagṛha.” While suggesting (1985: 91) that “probably the compiler(s) of the Guan-jing, collecting various available versions of the tale of Ajātaśatru, reconstructed them into a shape fitting to the introduction to this sūtra,” a suggestion with which I agree, he goes on to say (1985: 92): “However, this Tragedy of Rājagṛha has as its background the historical reality of Ajātaśatru’s murder of his father, but the overall
structure skillfully integrates some psychological coloring.... It is not merely a report of historical fact..." In his very valuable comparative study of the earliest Buddhist and Jaina canonical texts, Nagarājī (1986: 456ff.) even goes so far as to debate about the religious affiliation – Buddhist or Jaina – of the main actors. As far as I can see, neither of these scholars, or the many others who similarly refer to the historical facticity of the story, offers reasons for accepting the historicity of the tales to which they refer, perhaps assuming that the weight of tradition guarantees their authority. As a matter of general principle, however, the burden of proof must fall on one who wishes to accept legendary material as representing historical fact, and we as historians must begin with an assumption that the legends are not historical, believing so until convinced otherwise. On the other hand, an examination of legends as legends may often help us understand how Indian Buddhists understood their own tradition.

As one illustration of this approach, let me suggest that from the point of view of the insiders of a tradition, if an account is filled with information they know (or think they know, a modern might say) to be correct, these pieces of information new to them share in the factual authority of the already known and (therefore) true. In the case of frame stories in religious works, the facticity of the frame – the historical reality, from the point of view of the tradition – lends authority to the message of the preaching contained in the work. Since we know it to be true, the argument will run, that Prince Ajātaśatru imprisoned his father Bimbisāra, and so forth, it should also be true that the religious lessons conveyed to the imprisoned king as recorded in the text at hand (for us the Guan-jing) are authentic, an accurate report of the teaching of the Buddha Śākyamuni (and therefore, of course, they are also "true" in a more profound sense). Familiarity with a story brings with it an emotional or emotive attraction, in which new elements then share in the "charisma" of the old and familiar. The legendary material may, therefore, serve as a tool for the text's self-authentication. It almost goes without saying that such self-authentication might be especially necessary for a text whose authority or authenticity is potentially doubtful. The authors of the text might well go out of their way to try
to convince their audience of the text’s historicity, since this is an aspect of its broader overall authenticity. One approach is to examine the dynamics of the legends themselves, to explore the ideology which drove their authors to compose these stories. I believe that such investigations will be one fruitful area for future research in Buddhist literature.

As an example of a direction future investigations might take, we might inquire how a traditional reader is affected when a narrative frame familiar to him from a certain context is used to enframe a completely different doctrinal content. The sermon framed in the Guan-jing, which is to say the entire teaching of contemplations on Amitayus’s Pure Land, is totally unconnected with that framed within the very same frame story in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, the latter sermon being a rudimentary exposition of karma. The more general question, then, might be how narrative frames interact with what they frame. I cannot explore these issues here, but I think the problem is one worth keeping in mind.

Conclusion

The present paper has provided evidence for the Indian origins of the first part of the Prologue section of the Guan-jing, the narrative frame of the story of Ajatasatru and his father, Bimbisara, further showing that the story recounted there is the common property of the Buddhist and Śvetāmbara Jain traditions. It is therefore certain that this portion of the text is directly based on Indian materials. However, it is likewise clear that the Guan-jing as a whole cannot be an Indian product, and is most likely a work initially composed in the Chinese language, perhaps in Central Asia. The importance of comparative studies which take into account not only Buddhist materials but also those of other Indian traditions, such as Jainism, has therefore been emphasized. Moreover, mention has been made of the problem of the historical facticity of legendary materials, and it has been suggested that much can be learned from the study of legendary materials as legend, when care is taken not to confuse legend with history.

There remain many interesting questions about the Guan-jing, and
the full story of its origins is far from written. The present paper has, however, offered some clues which, it is hoped, might aid in the writing of that history. It is also hoped that some of the methods utilized here might also be used, mutatis mutandis, in the investigation of other Buddhist texts.

Jonathan A. Silk
Western Michigan University
Appendix I: On the Problem of Wine

In his very detailed study of the Guan-jing published in 1985, which totally supersedes his 1970 (and 1990!) accounts, Fujita Kōtsu has accepted the arguments of Sueki Fumihiko (1982, 1986a, 1986b) offered on the basis of the Guan-jing’s mention of grape juice or wine. In the passage recounting Vaiśeṣi’s transport of nourishment in to the imprisoned King Bimbisāra, the Guan-jing has her carrying in “grape wine (or possibly juice)” (guooshujiang 風桃槇) concealed in her ankle ornaments, while the parallel version in the Mulasarvastivāda Vinaya (in Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese) has her bringing in water, again in her ankles. Recalling that Central Asia, and particularly the Turfan basin, is a central area in the production of grapes, Fujita (1985: 43) speculated as follows: “Probably as the Samghabheda-davastu text indicates, the Indian versions of the tale had only ‘water,’ the compiler(s) [hensha 楊纂者] of the Guan-jing newly adding grape juice (or grape wine), thus transforming [the story]. If this is so we can see this as an indication that the tale was established in the wine producing regions of Central Asia.” Now, Fujita and Sueki did not go beyond the Mulasarvastivāda Vinaya to see if they could locate other Indian versions of the tale (as indeed the present paper shows is possible), but even without access to such direct evidence a portion of the reasoning offered by these two scholars can be shown to be in need of correction.

Certainly the coincidence of the means of transport, ankle ornaments, is important. However, although I believe that it is nowhere made explicit, there seems to be an underlying assumption behind the argument sketched above that the term for grape wine found in the Guan-jing could not have come from either a Chinese source other than the Mulasarvastivāda Vinaya – which itself is rightly rejected as a possible source of the idea by Sueki, since the Mulasarvastivāda Vinaya was translated only after the Guan-jing is known to have come into existence – or from an Indian source. I would like to show briefly that either of these alternatives can be shown to be possible, even based on an assumption that one knows nothing of the other versions of the Guan-jing’s story discussed above.
It is certainly true that Central Asia was one, one might even say the, important center of viticulture in ancient and medieval Asia. According to the detailed account in Laufer (1919: 220ff.), however, already in 128 B.C.E. the Chinese encountered wine produced from grapes in Fergana and among the Parthians, and taking the seeds back to China they cultivated them extensively. The above cited word for grape, putao (later written 葡萄, as it is in modern Japanese and Chinese), is assumed to be of Iranian origin (Laufer 1919: 225, and Bailey 1954: 11). But the Chinese were slow to take up grape wine production and drinking. "The curious point is that the Chinese, while they received the grape in the era of the Han from an Iranian nation, and observed the habit of wine-drinking among Iranians at large, acquired the art of wine-making as late as the T’ang from a Turkish tribe of Turkistan" (Laufer 1919: 233). Of course the Chinese had a large number of other alcoholic beverages available, made out of various agricultural products. It is clear, nevertheless, that knowledge of grape wine is very ancient in China, even if the general practice of producing and consuming it dates to the medieval period.

It may be relevant to note here that the term putaojiang need not necessarily refer to an alcoholic beverage. Xuanzang’s Datang Xiyuji 大唐西域記 (§II.17 = T. 2087 [LI] 875b5-6; Ji 1985: 215; Beal 1906: 189; Mizutan 1971: 48) mentions the alcoholic wine of grapes, consumed by Ksatriyas, but in the same passage refers to the non-alcoholic juice of grapes consumed by Sramaṇas and Brahmans: 沙門婆羅門飲葡萄酒... 酒非酒醚之謂也.

In India the knowledge and use of grape wine is ancient, as has been well-known for some time. Hideo Kimura (1961: 4) made clear that “Grapes and their wines were already popular in Indian life in the fourth century A.D. and ... they were known also by the people who used [the] Sanskrit language in about the fourth century B.C.” At the same time that Kimura’s paper was published, a study of Indian culinary habits was also published (Prakash 1961), containing detailed information on wines. The interested reader can also consult Chattopadhyay (1968), which however concentrates on references to drunkenness, generally in somewhat later literature.
The terms for grape wine in India can be traced to a fairly ancient period. In the Pali Vinaya (i.246,16), Jataka (ii.96,19-20), and elsewhere, the term muddikāpānam seems to mean grape juice with intoxicating properties (Laufer 1919: 240). Chapter two of Kautilya's Arthaśāstra, dated by T. R. Trautmann (1971: 183-84) to about 150 C.E., contains the following at II.25.24: "nrīvikaraso madhu, grape juice (wine) is (called) madhu." The term mārdvika or grape wine is also found in the Suśrutasaṁhitā 45.173, which dates to perhaps the second century, the Vīṣṇudharmacītra 22.83, probably of the fifth century, and Vagbhata's Āśṭāṅgasaṅgraha 6.120, 126, 127, of the seventh (?) century, and can undoubtedly be found in numerous other such texts. The fifth century poet Kālidāsa's Rāghuvamsa IV.65 contains the following which, while not explicit, is certainly suggestive:

vinayate saµ tadyodhā madhubhir vijayaśramam!
āśīrtāmānaṁ saµ drākṣāvalayabhūmisu //

His wasps removed the fatigue of victory with wines,

On grounds encircled with grape vines and covered with precious deer skins.

The normal Classical Sanskrit words for grape wine are mārdvika, madhu and so on on the one hand, and drākṣārasa, drākṣāsava and the like on the other. For etymological discussions of the first group see Bailey (1934). The second group of terms is related directly to a Sanskrit word for grapes, drākṣā. I think several things should be clear from this necessarily brief discussion. First, it is not certain that the term found in the Guan-jing passage necessarily refers to an alcoholic beverage made of grape juice (that is, what we commonly call “wine”), although this does seem likely. Second, since the Chinese had a very ancient knowledge of the grape and of grape wine, although this knowledge may not have been widespread it is conceivable that Chinese Buddhist authors too had this knowledge. Third, it is obvious from numerous references in both technical and non-technical Sanskrit and Pali literature that grape wine was well-known in ancient India, certainly at least as early as the second century C.E.

All of the above could have been known without any awareness of the Indian parallels to the story of Ajatasatru and Bimbisara adduced
in the present paper. Those Indian examples from Jaina literature, however, containing as they do explicit reference to wine brought to the jailed king, suggest that the idea of Sueki and Fujita that the Indian version(s) of the tale had water being taken in to the imprisoned king, this being replaced in Central Asian versions of the tale with wine, must be reconsidered.98

Appendix II: The Weishengyuan-jing or *Ajātaśatru-sūtra
Translated by Yuet-Keung Lo, with Jonathan Silk

The text translated in full here is found in the Taishō edition of the Chinese canon as T. 507 (XIV) 7/4b24-775b24, titled Foshuo Weishengyuan-jing 佛說未生冤經. It is attributed to the Yuezhi 月氏 (Indo-Scythian) layman Zhi Qian 支謙 of the Wu 蜀 dynasty (223-253 C.E.). As far as I know the text has been translated only once before into a modern language, into Japanese by Sadakata (1984: 103-112). The present translation is mostly the work of Dr. Lo, edited by the present writer.

The *Ajātaśatru Sūtra

Thus it was heard. At one time the Buddha was dwelling in Rājagṛha on the Vulture Peak, along with gods, nāgas, demons, spirits, kings, officials and common people. All went to where the Buddha was, and paid obeisance to him. Being edified [by the Buddha’s discourses], they made offerings to him, and the rituals were all in accordance with propriety. Devadatta saw this and his jealousy was measureless. He went back [to the palace] and spoke to Prince Ajātaśatru, saying: “Your father carted away all kinds of treasures of the kingdom in order to offer them to the Buddha and the śramanas, depleting the state treasury. Now is a good time for you to usurp the kingdom and become king yourself. I will raise an army to conquer the Buddha; you can become king and I will become Buddha, and both of us will attain what we want. Isn’t that fine? You will surely
Ajātaśatru and Devadatta colluded and hatched a devious plot, and thus [Ajātaśatru] commanded the powerful officials to prepare the snare. "When the king returns [from visiting the Buddha], snatch his [royal] seal and throw him in jail!" When the king returned, the officials did as they had been ordered, and cast the king into jail. But the king felt at ease, and contemplating the previous [karma which caused his present] disaster, he was without fear. In fact, he felt even more faith in the Buddha’s words. And the king said: "What transgressions have I committed that I am so punished?"

None, the queen and concubines and all beings large and small in the kingdom, were not saddened [by the king’s imprisonment]. Then the king spoke to those who were crying, saying: "The Buddha said: ‘Heaven and Earth, the sun and moon, Mount Sumeru and the ocean — all that is composite will certainly perish, all that flourishes will decay, all that comes together will be separated, all that is born will certainly die. Therefore the wheel of sorrow turns endlessly, causing profound suffering. Seeking for its origin and searching for its beginning, we find that things exist because of the combination of causes and conditions. This is called life. When the causes and conditions separate and disintegrate, this is called emptiness. The body is made up of the four great elements. The soul of sentient beings resides in that [body]. At death it returns to its origin. The soul departs [the body], leaving it empty, and this is why we say non-self. When you are not even able to protect your body, how could you constantly protect your kingdom? When the Buddha first came to my country I did not yet have a son. And then [the Buddha] asked me whether I knew if I would be ruling in the future or not. I answered that I did not know. The Blessed One said again: ‘Everything is impermanent; you should carefully think about this.’ The Buddha’s warning to me at that time was precisely aimed at the current situation. Each of you should diligently pursue your ambition and keep the Buddha’s warning in mind."

Then the king spoke to the prince, saying: "Whenever you were sick, I was concerned for you, and always wanted to save you from danger, even at the expense of my own life. The benevolence and grace of a parent can be superseded only by Heaven; what kind of
heart have you that you can bear to be so evil? One who kills a
parent goes at death to hell without any cessation [in his punish-
ment]. You will be one of these people. I am your father. Even
though you respect your parents and venerate filiality, you should
fear that your name would not live up to the standard [of filial
piety]. How is it possible that you want to kill me, your father? I
am going to cede the kingdom to you. I want to go to the Buddha and
become a śramaṇa. When I contemplate lust it burns my body like
fire. The various attractions of women are all empty, [although even]
blind people are all certainly confused [by them]. Merely looking at
the Buddhist sūtras one can recognize the evil of women's hypocri-
sy, and know the harm that [hustling for] fame and profit can do to
oneself.\textsuperscript{104}

The prince said: “Don’t blabber! My long-cherished wish is
fulfilled. How can I let you go?” He then gave an order to the jailers
saying: “Cut off [the king’s] food and starve him to death.” And the
jailers threw [the king] into jail.\textsuperscript{105} And King Bimbisāra turned
toward where the Buddha was. Bowing he paid obeisance and said:
“My son is as evil as anything under Heaven and Earth, but I don’t
feel even a smidgen of anger. I only hold to the Buddha’s teaching
that joy in the world is impermanent and suffering long-lasting.”
While he was in jail his hair became disheveled, and looking up to
heaven he cried out: “Alas, it is painful! How can this kind of thing
happen?”

The queen and the consorts and everyone in the kingdom was very
sad and upset. And the queen said to the prince: “The great king is
bound in fetters and jailed, so he needs attendants for [even] his
sitting and lying down. His pain is indescribable. Ever since you
were born the childlike heart of the king felt affection for you. He
never forgot you, neither when eating nor when sleeping. When
[your body made up of] the four great elements waxed or waned [in
poor health], the king would lie beside your pillow attending to you.
His tears would flow, his heart burn and his body would become
emaciated, and he wanted to save your life even at the expense of his
own. You should remember this nurturing [which you received from]
your father and from Heaven. Don’t be rebellious. The Buddha said
in a sūtra: ‘The ultimate goodness is not greater than filiality. The
enormity of evil is only to harm one’s parents. 106 Heaven would bless even mutual service of elders and juniors, not to mention respect for one’s parents. 107 Now you are following your evil and cruel nature, and commit this serious crime. Surely you will go to hell. Sixty billion years in this world is one day and night in hell. All of the various kinds of sufferings each last for years, and you will experience all of them. Surely that will be severe! Those who merely want to gratify themselves all certainly end in regret.”

The prince said: “Ever since I was young I have been determined to kill my father and become king myself. Today I fulfilled my wish. What are you giving me advice for?”

The queen said: “Refusing advice is the cause of the fall of kings. I want to see the king – may I or not?”

The prince said: “You may.”

The queen cleansed her body by bathing, and coating her body with honey and flour entered [the jail]. She saw the king, who looked extremely emaciated, and unconsciously she let out a wail. All the people who heard it cried copiously. The queen said: “The Buddha said that prosperity and happiness are impermanent but suffering for one’s sins is eternal.”

The king said: “The jailers cut off my food and I have been hungry and thirsty for days. The body has eighty thousand pores and each of them has a hundred kinds of worms. Thrice peeter my belly, my blood and flesh are consumed, and my life-span is exhausted.”

Saying this he sobbed and fainted several times.

The queen said: “Realizing this difficult situation, I myself coated my body with honey and flour; come now and eat it. You should consider the Buddha’s warning and not neglect it.”

The king ate and then turned to where the Buddha was, and sobbing paid obeisance and said: “The Buddha taught that prosperity and fortune are difficult to preserve. They are like an illusion or a dream. Truly they are just as you have taught.” Then he said to the queen: “When I was king, my kingdom was vast and expansive. I had whatever clothing and food I desired. And now I am in jail and starving to death. My son follows an evil and rebellious teacher, disobeying the benevolent teaching of the Buddha. I am not afraid of death, but my only regret is that I cannot receive the pure teachings face to face.
from the Buddha, neither can I converse about the essence of his holy path with Śāriputra, Maudgalyāyana or Mahākāśyapa.”

The king again said to the queen: “The Buddha said that those who are dear to one are like a flock of birds gathering together in a tree. In the morning they scatter and each goes its own way in accordance with its misfortune and fortune. Maudgalyāyana having removed all his impurities and wiping out all his sins attained the six supernatural knowledges and the four bases of supernatural power. Even so he was beaten by a greedy and jealous Brahmin. How much more so [is severe retribution expected] in my own case. Having done evil deeds, had fortune chases after one just like a shadow seeking after the body [that casts it] and an echo responding to the sound [that causes it]. It is difficult to encounter a Buddha and it is difficult to hear the teaching of a Buddha. There are many sages and their virtues are lofty. The rituals and the precepts are immeasurable, too many for the common people to be able to practice and follow. Embrace the Buddha’s scriptural teachings, convert the people with benevolence, and obtain the virtue of making offerings [to the Buddha]. Indeed it is truly difficult to encounter his purifying transformation. Now I am going to die and my soul will depart far away. For one who wants to pursue his ambition, there is nothing better than the Buddha’s teachings. You should carefully uphold those [teachings] in order to avoid future disaster.” Having heard the king’s warnings, the queen was again saddened and upset.

The prince interrogated the jailers, saying: “You cut off the king’s food for several days; why is he not yet dead?” And they replied: “The queen entered the jail bringing in honey and flour, and thus sustained the king’s life.” The prince said: “From now on you must not allow the queen to see the king.”

And the king, starving, got up and, facing the place where the Buddha was, made obeisance. And then he was no longer hungry, and the night became bright. When the prince heard of this, he ordered that the windows [of the jail] be blocked up and the soles of the [king’s] feet be lacerated, so that he would not be able to stand up and see the Buddha and the light. The jailers immediately lacerated the soles of his feet, and his pain was immeasurable. [Despite the pain] he did not cease to be mindful of the Buddha.
From afar the Buddha preached a sūtra to him, saying, “One’s good and evil deeds will bring one fortune and disaster. You must be careful!”

King Bimbisāra replied: “Even if I were to be carved up and my body cut into minute pieces, I would never think about evil.”

And the Blessed One said again: “Now I am a Tathāgata, Arhat, unexcelled perfect Buddha, teacher of gods and men. The three thousand times many thousands [of worlds with their] suns and moons, gods, demons, and nāgas all pay obeisance to me, and yet my previous karma still causes me problems and is even now not extinguished. How much more so for common people.”

Receiving the grace of the Devatādāva, the king could see his previous karma and he dared not look at it with resentment. He was not fearful of the boiling and burning sufferings of hell. He concentrated on the Buddha and his disciples, and he dared not be negligent [even] in his sitting and lying down. He then joined his hands together in obeisance [and said]: “Today my life is over and the evolution of my soul is finished forever.” Sobbing, his breath was extinguished in an instant. And all the officials and people in the kingdom were terribly sad and called out to Heaven, saving: “Alas! Why should this happen?”

King Bimbisāra immediately gained awakening and was reborn in Heaven. The gates of the three ways were closed to him, and his sufferings were extinguished.

Appendix III: The Āvaśyakacūrṇi

The following is the text from Jinadūsagani’s Āvaśyakacūrṇi (Jinadūsagani 1928-29), I.171,11-172,8. As the text is hard to come by, I print it here for convenience:

aṇṇādā Koṇio Kālādīhiṃ kumārehiṃ samāṁ marṣiṃ ti / Seniyaṃ bandhīttā ekkārasarāhge rajjāti karemu tti / tehim padissuṭām / Senio baddho / purvaṃkhe avaraṃkhe ya kasasatam deveveti / Cellaṇāc kato vi dhokam na deti / bhattam vārṣeṃ pāṇyam ceti / tāhe Celaṇē cūrmaṃ vāla bandhīttā satādhowaṃ[117] surē kese āuṭṭitā pavisati / sā kira dhuvvati sattaṃ vāre pāṇyam surē bhavati /
Appendix IV: The *Trīsaṣṭiśalākāpurusācaritam*

This appendix contains the Sanskrit text of the *Trīsaṣṭiśalākā- purusācaritam* as edited in Sah 1977. I have romanized the text, dividing words accordingly and removing some *avagrahas*, but otherwise what is printed below is a strict transcription of Sah's edition. I provide it here only because the Sanskrit is not easy to come by. It remains to thank Mr. Michilīku Yaji in for loaning me his copy of Sah's edition.


atātātā kumārā 'pi matihaśyaṁasa kāmikah /

kālādibhiḥ svasadrśair daśābhir bhrāṭr bhīḥ saha // 114

jaram api pitāmakaṁ rájyaśya na hi tṛpyati /

putre hi kavacāhāre rájno 'dhikurne vratam // 115
varahāṃ abhayāḥ śūyān aujuvald yuvāpi yah/
na tu tāto viśayāndhah svāṁ jārāṁ yo na paśyati // 116
tad adya pitaraḥ baddhāv rājyaṁ svasaṃayocitam/
grāṇmo napavado 'tra vivekavikalo hi saḥ // 117
kṛtvākādaśāḥ rājyaṁ bhṛārato bhumīmahe vayam/
pitā tu baddhas tadana jīvatv abdaśatāny api // 118
iti te durdiyāḥ sarve viśvastām pitaraḥ nījam/
babandhūr durapatyaṁ hi gṛhajāto viśadrumāḥ // 119
śukavat paśijare 'ksaipāt kūnīkaḥ ārenikāṁ tataḥ/
viśeso 'yaṁ punar bhaktapāne api dadu na hi // 120
pūrvāṁ cāparāṁ ca kūnīkaḥ pūrvavārataḥ/
pitāḥ kaśāḥātaṁ pāpo 'dād anuvāsaraṁ // 121
adhisehe ārenikas tāṁ durdaśāṁ daivadhaṅkitām/
dantyavālaḥ samarthe 'pi vārībaddhaḥ karotu kim // 122
nikāsā ārenikaṁ ganturm kūniko 'dān na kasyacit/
kevalaṁ mātrādākṣaṇyaḥ celenāṁ na hy avārayat // 123
celenāpi pratidinam surayā śatadhautayā/
sadyahsāte vādvārakedēṣabhūyopaśrenikāṁ yayau // 124
kulmāsaṇipindākām caikām keśāntaḥ puspādaṁavat/
praksipva celenānaisit patihkātā tādantike // 125
patye kulmaśapindām tāṁ prachannāṁ celenā dadau/
prāpya tāṁ api duḥprāpaṁ sa mene divyābhoyavat // 126
rakṣāra ārenikāḥ prānayātraṁ pimeṭakāyā tayā/
bubhukṣālaṁṣa rogo vinānmaṁ khalu mṛtyave // 127
śatadhautasurābindīṇaṁ keśaṁśāca ca celenā/
apārayat patihkātā salṣaḥ niṭṭrhāṣubindubhīḥ // 128
āreniko 'pi surābindūṁ patataḥ pibatī svaṁ tāṁ/
cātako meghamuktaṁbubindūṁ iva pippāsitāḥ // 129
bindumatrapāyāṁ ārenikāḥ surayā tayā/
na viveda kaśāghātāṁ trṣayuṁ nāpy apiḍyata // 130
itthaṁ ca ārenikām baddhāv kurvato rāivas utkataṁ/
kūnīkasya padmāvatyāṁ patnyāṁ sūnurajāyata // 131
……
āsāṁ cakre 'nrasā hnikturnī rājā ārenikanandanaḥ/
vāmornamastake nyasyodāyāṁ putravatsalah // 144
ardhabhukte kūnike ca mūtrayāmāsa so 'rhhakah/
papāta sarpiḥdārceva mūtradhārā ca bhijate // 143
sūnor mā vegabharango bhūd iti śrenikasūr nṛpaḥ /
na jānu cālayāmāsa putravātālam iḍrṣām // 146
mūtraśāvantam annamaḥ ca svavam utsārva pānīnā /
tathāiva bhubuje putrapremnaitad api śarmane // 147
papracha cēlaṇām tatropaviṣṭāṃ atha kūnikāḥ /
maṭar evam etath preṇān abhūt kāsyāvad seti vā // 148
cēlaṇāvocad āḥ pāpa nṛkheṭa kulaṃpaṅsana /
na jānasi yathābhus tvamī pitur atyanavallabhaḥ // 149
durduḥadena jñāto 'si pitru vaśī taddā mayā /
strinām āpṇaḥsatvānām yathāgarbham hi dohadāḥ // 150
garbhaḥsitam api jñātvā tvam are pitṛvairinām /
garbhaḥsātanam āraṇibhi maya pātrāvecchayā // 151
tathāpi na vilino 'si tais tait śādausadhair api /
kiṃtu pratyuta puṣto 'si sarvam pathyam baliyasām // 152
tava pitrā ca me tāṅgro api apūrī manorathāḥ /
kadā drakṣyāmy aham putravakram ity āsaya bhrām // 153
pitur vairi niśctya tvam jāto 'pi mayaṣhīnakāḥ /
āṇīto 'si punah pitrā yatnāt svam iva jīvitam // 154
tadā kukkuṭikāpi cichāviddhaikā ca tavāṅguliḥ /
kunḍapūrakūlyantarātma abhūd arṣatīyinoi // 155
tvatpitā 'dhān mukhe kṣiptān tāḍrśim api te 'migulim /
tāvad eva sukham te 'bhūd yāvad vaktramānaṃguli // 156
evam yenaśi pitra tvam re durītāta laṭhaḥ /
krte pratikrtam tasyākāri kārāpraveśanam // 157

......
kūnikāḥ śmāha dhīg dhīn mām avimrśya vidhāyinam /
rājyam nyāśāpitam ivāpāysiāmi punah pituḥ // 160
ity ardhabhukte 'py ācāmya dhātryāḥ putram samarpya ca /
udastẖāt kūnikās tātasamipi gantum utsukaḥ // 161
pitrādṛṣeu nigadān bhāṃksyāmiti vicintayān /
lohadamāṃgam ṣṛṛtvā ca 'bhīśrenikam adhāvata // 162
upāśrenikam ādīstā yāmikāḥ pūrvasamstutāḥ /
dṛṣṭvā kūnikām āyāntam iti vyājahrākulaḥ // 163
sāksāt damastāsva 'iva lohadātvaḥkutvaḥ pūrāṇaḥ /
drutam āyāti te sūnur na vidmaḥ kim kariṣyati // 164
śrenikas cintayāmāsa jighāṇsur nūnam iva māma /
anyadāgāt kaśāhastāt dāṃdahasto 'dhunaiti tu // 165
THE COMPOSITION OF THE GUAN WULIANGSHOUFO-JING

Appendix V: The Kathākośa

The Sanskrit text presented here is from Hoffmann 1974: 429.8-431.18:


NOTES

1. I would like to thank those who have so generously helped me with different aspects of this study over the years. I received good advice and various help from (in alphabetical order) Griff Fouk, Phyllis Granoff, Satoshi Hiraoka, Robert Sharf, Fumihiko Sueki, Michihiko Yajima, and Nobuyoshi Yamabe, and the paper is much better for their assistance.

2. The term Jodo samhkyo is given in Japanese since it seems, according to Fujita 1970: 9, note 8, to have been invented by the Japanese cleric Honen 法然 (1133-1212), and used for the first time in his Senchaku Hongan Nembutsushu 選擇本願念佛集 (T. 2608 [LXXXIII] 2a7).

In giving a conventional translation of the text’s title, I intentionally avoid the vexed question or the precise meaning of guan.

3. At least since the time of Dogen 道元 the authenticity of the Guan-jing has been questioned within the Buddhist tradition. In his Hokkyo 華厳記 Dogen records the following passage from his time in China (1233-27). “These days the Dogu- [Tiantai] temples of the realm are constructed with a hall of sixteen contemplations. Those sixteen contemplations appear in the [Guan] Wuliangshou-jing. [But] it is not clear whether that story is genuine or spurious, and scholars of the past and the present have wondered about the point.” 今天下寺院或謂十六觀之室，彼十六觀者出於觀無量壽經。彼經真僞未詳，古今學者之所疑也. Quoted by Tsukinowa 1971: 159-60, followed by Fujita 1985: 61, note 2. For a critical edition of the text, and a translation of the complete passage, see Kodera 1980: 245 and 131.

Note that Tsukinowa 1971: 160 has argued that Dogen’s doubts about the authenticity of the Guan-jing expressed here have nothing to do with scholarly questions but were rather entirely sectarian prejudices, reflecting Chan contacts with the Tiantai school. On the other hand, it is unlikely that Dogen could have meaningfully raised the question at all unless some suspicions about the text had already been current.

A list of some seventeen of these reasons can be found in Fukuhara 1984. On the other hand, there are some who still hold that it is an Indian text. Chief among these seems to be Hirakawa Akira. In 1964 he reintroduced the idea of Hayashima Kyôsuke (1964) that the mention in the Guan-jing of the term qingjing yechu 清淨業處 refers to a “pure karmasthâna,” an Indian Abhidharmic scholastic category otherwise unknown in the northern Buddhist tradition. The terms and ideas of karmasthâna (Pâli kammattâna) meditation are well known, but apparently restricted to the
Theravada tradition. Hirakawa (1984: 2; 14) thus argues that the restriction of the idea to southern Buddhism implies the Indian origin of the Guan-jing. (For a general discussion of kammathāna, see Mori 1982.) Hirakawa’s reasoning has been rejected by Sueki (1986b: 166-67) and Fujita (1986: 21-52). According to these scholars, there is no good reason to identify the term qingjing yuensu in the Guan-jing with the Abhidharma kammathāna. Among the forty kammathāna listed in the Visuddhi-
mañca, for instance, such a term does not appear. Sueki (1986b: 167) argues that qingjing yechu is rather to be connected with the term jingye 淨業 in the sense of “undefiled actions”; this term appears in the Guan-jing in a place preceding qingjing yuensu. I agree with this analysis.

Takahashi 1993: 284-85 misunderstands the issue of origins as an entirely geographic one (and raises the problem of the definition of “India”), when it is primarily a linguistic problem. In the case of the thesis of Indian origin, the problem is not in precisely what spot the text was created, but whether it was originally written in an Indic language.

4 See also Tsukinowa 1971: 145.

It has been suggested (e.g., by Gómez 1995: 244, n. 61) that the term “apocryphal” is not a good one to describe the materials we are discussing. However, in my opinion, “apocrypha” is at least preferable to one of the proffered alternatives, “pseudepigrapha,” since the latter is defined in the Oxford English Dictionary (compact reprint edition of 1971) as “A collective term for books or writings bearing a false title, or ascribed to another than the true author,” the example being given that certain Jewish writings dating in early in the first millennium were ascribed to Old Testament prophets. Apocrypha, on the other hand, is defined as “A writing or statement of doubtful authorship ... specifically those books included in the Septuagint and Vulgate versions of the Old Testament, which were not originally written in Hebrew.” The latter case seems much closer to the example we are discussing. (D. S. Russell, writing in The Oxford Companion to the Bible [Metzger and Coogan, 1993: 629b, s.v. Pseudepigrapha], has even suggested that, given the ambiguities of the term, rather than pseudepigrapha “it is much less confusing to use the word apocryphal.”)


7 There are, however, some problems with this, as is often the case when considering the evidence of sūtra catalogues. Pas 1977: 195 (and again 1995: 36) is wrong in referring to a “unanimous tradition.” More accurate is Mark Diint’s (1983: 131) characterization: “Despite its initial listing in Seng-yu’s catalogue among the ‘miscellaneous sūtras by anonymous translators’ and references in Ming-ts’un’s Ta chou
mu lu and Chih-shene’s K’ai-yuan lu of a separate translation from the same period by Dharmamitra (356-442), scholars have generally accepted the tradition of a single translation by the monk Kalayāsas from the ‘western regions.’” For more on sūtra catalogues, see below.

8 It is of some interest to note that the reverse argument is sometimes found even
today, namely that without evidence of an Indian original a text cannot be judged Indian (and “authentic”). A recent work by Kenneth Tanaka (1990: 38) comments about the Guan-jing as follows: “Since the sūtra has neither been found in a Sanskrit version nor cited by any Sanskrit text, the original was probably not compiled in India. The absence of a Tibetan translation further undermines the theory of an earlier Sanskrit text.” It is frustrating to see such reasoning repeated in spite of frequent and clear statements of the obvious fact that many definitely Indian texts are extant only in Chinese. See for example the statements of Hirakawa 1984: 13-14 and Fujita 1985: 29, to name only two scholars whom Tanaka has obviously read. The same point is again made with explicit reference to the Guan-jing by Takahashi 1993: 280-81.

9 The implication of this point is that, whether or not there existed an original of the Guan-jing in a non-Chinese language, it is almost certain that those who made the text in (or into) Chinese were native Chinese who no doubt had before them ample examples of previous Chinese Buddhist works. This means that similarity in diction and so on between the Guan-jing and other works proves nothing about its putative apocryphal status.

10 Contrary to what is sometimes thought, it seems that the Tibetans too did similar things. See Karmay 1988: 5-6.

11 The Muṣalānuma-sūtra, published in the Dainippon Zoharōkyō 大日本續藏經 (revised edition), volume 27, # 577. Kim 1990: 82 and 106 n. 3 seems, with some confused phrasing, to support and yet contradict this claim. His book is a translation of this commentary.

12 For a more detailed breakdown of the text according to Shandao, see the chart in Fujita 1985: 80, and his discussion 79ff. See now also Pas 1995.

13 For the story in the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra, see Hirakawa 1971: 2-5; Kawamura 1976; Mochizuki 1988: 137-54. The particulars are discussed in detail below. The *Dadhānāsthamāṣṭāsāstra* refers to the story, T. 1521 (XXVI) 49a21, but without any significant details. While the text obviously knows the episode, it could not have served as a source for a more detailed recounting.

14 The Chinese text of the Guan-jing (T. 365) is printed in Yamada et al. 1984, but see also Fujita 1985 and Sueki 1986b for lists of textual variants. In making my translation from the Chinese I am indebted to that contained in Yamada et al. 1984, despite my occasional disagreements with its renderings.

15 Rinsing with water signifies the end of the meal. There is considerable discussion in the scholarly literature concerning the exact signification of the terms translated here and below provisionally as honey, ghee and flour. Since exact identifications are not necessary for the arguments of the present paper, I happily leave aside these questions.

16 An interesting discontinuity occurs in the coda to the sūtra, the return to the frame story. There it is stated that Vaidēhi and her five hundred attendant women rejoiced and so on. The mention of five hundred attendante is a stock expression, found throughout Buddhist literature, but this is the first mention of such a retinue in
the text, one would not expect an impoverished queen, who is clearly out of royal favor, to be attended by a small army of servants. 

For references to this story in Pāli Buddhist literature see Malalasekera 1938, s.v. Ajātasatru 1.11.35, and s.v. Bimbisāra Il.1085.9. For Chinese materials see Alakna 1931, s.v. Ajātasatru 10-12, and s.v. Bimbisāra 99-102. For references in Jaina literature see Mehta and Chandra 1970-72, s.v. Kūñia 1.196-97, and s.v. Senja Il.1.856-57. For the story of Ajātasatru in Buddhist literature generally see the excellent study of Chinese sources in Ono 1916, and more briefly the remarks of Hirakawa 1971. Recent rather popular works are Sadasaka 1984 and 1989 (a translation of the Ajātasatru-kaukhyo-vinodana). Even more popularized is Igarashi 1989. Some speculative comparative remarks on motifs may be found in Imoto 1982: 25-53, followed by Takenaka 1982. (I thank Elizabeth ten Grotenhuis for informing me of Takenaka’s article, and sending me a copy.) See also Iahigami 1984.

In fact, to a certain extent the Pali Text Society’s editions and translations, and the practices of some native scribes, of marking exact repetitions in a text by reference to the preceding instance of a passage, rather than repeating it in extenso, reflect one albeit obvious aspect of this fact. This is even more pronounced in canonical Jaina literature, in which expressions indicating the instruction “(insert here the stock) description” (utaka or jīva) occur with regularity.

It is to be sure not only Buddhist Studies which labors under this prejudice. One of the leading scholars of Jaina literature (Bruhn 1981: 19), in a preliminary study of the Avāsāvaka literature, a rich storehouse of Jaina narrative materials, has observed that the study of the texts of this literature “is after all largely a study of their dogmatic and scholastic contents.” This approach is, I feel, most unfortunate.

Dr. Luitgard Soni (University of Marburg) has kindly informed me that although there are several tales about Śrenika and his family in the Bhaktivinoda and other allied Digambara narrative compilations, the Ajātasatru episode is absent.

For a detailed study see Shimoda 1991.

Found at T. 371 (XII) 474a = T. 375 (XII) 717a and following.

T. 374 (XII) 475c6-13 = T. 375 (XII) 718b29-e6.

T. 374 (XII) 565e19-29 = T. 375 (XII) 819b6-17

The story and its connection with the Gwan-jing was discussed in Nishimoto 1934: 322, n. 20. See also Yamada et al. 1984: 6, n. 2; Sueki 1982: 463; and Fujita 1985: 42-43.

Gnoli 1978: 155.23-159.10. A few corrections can be suggested to this text: Page 156.24, and 156.25: vālīyamāna. 157.16: ārogaya. 158.5: -tēhhyāt pādah. 158.9: deleite upacāti. (I am well aware that this edition may not report the manuscript precisely, but since photos of the manuscript have never been published and are unavailable, I am unable to re-edit the text.) I was able to consult the corresponding Tibetan text only in the Derge Kanjur, dge bsdus, 215a6-218a2. The Chinese translation due to Yüngh [Wenn] is found in T. 1450 (XXIV) 189c-190c23, given in

27 The passage is not quite clear. The normal Brahmanical sense of karmaparāyana is devotion to ritual activity, but the sense here might be different. The Tibetan phug stul na las khor na la ren cing dag pa seems to mean that the king remained in jail due only to his karma, but it could be taken to mean “engaged only in action.”

28 Śhālépāka. The exact sense of this term is not certain here; it may not have the connotation it has in Brahmanical ritual texts.

29 Saktukalka = Tibetan phyé ‘i de gu.

30 A list of epithets of Buddhas is omitted from the translation at this point.

31 This entire passage is a set phrase, which has been translated by Lamotte 1958: 715-16, including the section abbreviated here.

32 Or: “Send a greeting to King Bimbisāra in my words.”

33 Following the Tibetan, khyod la.

34 See the stock passage given in Lamotte 1958: 717.

35 The verse is common in the Avadāna literature, e.g., Divyāvadāna (Cowell and Neil 1886) 54,9-10, Avadānasasūta (Speyer 1906-09) I.74,7-8. A slightly variant form, preferable as Speyer (note 13) points out in avoiding the awkward repetition of api, is:

   na prajāsuṇi kaśyam kṣaṇam akṣaṇaṁsauvat api /
   saṃāgriṁ prāpya kālam ca phalantu khaṇaṁ dehiṁ ām.

36 Or: “Greets you.”

37 It is perhaps better to follow the Tibetan and omit ca, then translate: “Reverendo Mahā-Maudgalyāyana, I salute the Blessed One.”

38 Gnilé’s text spells the name here thus differently from above, but the manuscripts must be checked before the form is finally accepted as the real.

39 Even if the translation is not by Zhi Qian, the archaic language makes it quite clear that the text dates from a very early period.

40 The entire sutra has been translated into modern Japanese by Sadakata 1984: 103-12. Hirakawa 1971: 7 is partially mistaken when he writes: “There seem to be no scholars who have noticed this sutra in relation to the establishment of the Guan jing, but I believe it certainly is a text which must be taken into consideration.” I of course agree with the latter half of this statement, but compare the study of Ono 1916: 395 and 411-12, who did in fact discuss this sutra long before Hirakawa.

41 The text is paraphrased in modern Japanese by Sadakata 1984: 116-18. It is discussed in some detail by Ono 1916 passim, but especially 413 and 418. In my translation 261b25-c10, the listing of miracles, is omitted.

42 I am not certain if xinxiranshou 心喜念受 is to be understood in its technical
sense as one of the "three patience," which may not be an Indian category at all.
The normal sense in which I would read the Chinese—"he was happy and bore [it]
patiently"—is clearly impossible; there is nothing to endure. We must take xiren 喜
忍 as the core of the phrase, rather than reading two sets of two characters. See Oda
1974: 1363a3, 243b.
43 It is possible that we should understand a plural here, consorts, in contrast to the
chief consort below. But no number is marked in the Chinese.
44 I am not certain of the technical sense here of shengdao 聖道, often but not
45 This seems to be the sense of the phrase 不得東西, but the dictionaries apparently
do not record this usage. In T. 653 (XV) 792c13 東西 seems to mean "in every
direction." The Tibetan equivalent is there (Peking Kanjur #886 mdo, thub 41a2)
phyogs dang phyogs mislams su. [The Tibetan translation of the Chinese version
(Peking #191 mdo, in 188a4), however, has phar nub du phyogs shing. This might
indicate that the translators did not understand the Chinese term to mean anything
other than "east and west." ] Another confirmation of this sense is seen in T. 99 (II)
345c12-13 (Samyuktāgama 1260 ~ SN ii.270-271 [xx.10]). A cat eats a mouse, but
once inside the bowels of the cat the mouse eats at the cat's bowels. Then: "The cat
raced about kith and yon in confusion and panic, through abandoned houses and
graveyards, not knowing where it was, until ultimately it died." 趕居室與近巷非
宅荒間不知何止遂至於死。
46 The sentence could perhaps be understood slightly differently. 即抱狗子, 跟信
是恐—may mean "clutching the dog he came in accord with the message."
47 This sentence may also be interpreted somewhat differently. 自食腸突與狗 may
mean "he took from his own food and gave it to the dog."
48 I do not understand the reference.
49 Note that the term 大逆罪, while undoubtedly here a reference to the worst of
the anantāra sins, is found in Chinese as early as the Shiji 史記 in much the same
50 See Hardy 1880: 328-30 (I have not seen the first edition of Hardy's work, dated
to 1266 C.E. Kern seems to have based himself on Hardy. Kern also seems to refer
to a Northern version of the story, perhaps from Schiefner 1851, but the latter is not
available to me.
51 Ajātasattu is of course the Pāli form of Sanskrit Ajātaśatrū.
52 This presupposes the etymological interpretation of Ajātasattu as an adjectival
compound meaning "unborn enemy," but the more natural (although it is difficult to
say "correct") understanding is to take the term as a possessive compound, meaning
"he whose enemy is unborn," implying that one is so great that none can face him as
a worthy opponent.
53 Up until this point the story, verbally very close to the Sumangala-vilāsī
versum, is found also in the Pali vinaya, Cūḷavagga VII.3-5 (Oldenberg 1886: 190-191, Horner 1952: 266-68), with some additional details.

The text is found in Rhys Davids and Carpenter 1886:1.135,29-138,17.

A gloss in the text here says: "torture chamber is used in the sense of smoke-house."

Presumably in the prison yard— or is there some contamination from the preceding sentence?

The manuscript reading recorded in the edition, page 137 note 14 (from the Royal Library of Mandalay manuscript), Jananavasabha, is probably correct, rather than the edition's Jananavasabha (otherwise unassessed). On the other hand, the form is a lectio facilior and may be a hyper-correction. The parallel versions, however, also suggest the correction. See Edgerton 1953 s.v. Jimnasabha, and the version from the Mahaavataravīsā Vinaya, above.

The Pali form of Sanskrit Vaiśāraṇya.

I mean primary versions. Derivative versions, quoting from other versions with or without attribution, are of course common. See for example the Foyuan zhulin 《法源真林》(T. 2122), a seventh century Chinese work which quotes (LIII) 666b24ff, the Weishengyuan-jing among other versions of the story as an illustration of lack of filial piety, and the eleventh century Japanese tale collection Konjaku Monogatari-shū 今昔物語集 III.27 (Yamada et al. 1959: 248-51), one source of which is clearly the Guan-jing itself. A bad English translation of the Konjaku episode is to be found in Dyckstra 1986: 56-60. As for other Indian Buddhist, and perhaps not derivative, versions, I have not been able to check the Kaipadramāvadāna, which is referred to by Feer 1891: 212 as containing in the Śrimāyavatāna twelve manuscript pages (167-179 in the Paris manuscript) which "relate in great detail the murder of Bimbisāra by Ajāṭhasatru." Compare also the Abhinavagupta Mahavibhaśa 1.154b (XXVII) 266c13-267a9; T. 1545 (XXVII) 360b3-4c16; T. 1547 (XXVIII) 521b3-522a1. Here Vaidēhi is absent, but Bimbisāra's rebirth is discussed in detail.

Kavan Enoki's appendice to Le Vinaya Bouddhique 1962: 256 lists a Chinese manuscript fragment (item C 83) which tells part of a "story of King Ajātāśatru who, having killed his father and mother, was converted to a very faithful believer in Buddhism." According to Enoki "No identical text is found in the existing sūtras relating to Ajātāśatru." Intrigued by this, I obtained a copy of the manuscript in question; when I asked his help in matter, however, Prof. Fujieda Akira identified the manuscript fragment as belonging to the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra T. 334j (XII) 504d21-504d22. This previously unidentified Dunhuang manuscript fragment does not, therefore, contain another version of our story, but is rather a copy of a well-known version.

I give a very conservative date for the Lawkt Miatasaravatvada Vinaya; the text might be considerably older.

Fujita 1985: 94, n. 2, never followed up his one lead to non-Buddhist versions of the tale.

There is a good likelihood, however, that the contents are much older. The
Prakrit text can be found in Deleu 1909, the *etna princeps* of Warren 1879 (which I have not seen), and other editions mentioned by Deleu. Probably the first to point out the parallelism between this Jaina tale and the Buddhist versions was Jacobi 1879: 5, and 1880: 178 (the latter Jacobi’s review of Warren 1879). Jacobi’s identification was noted by Weber 1883: 421, by Deleu 1969: 87-88 and note 30, and by many in between. Jacobi repeated his reference in his translation of Kern 1882b: 244 note **. However, this reference is not found in Kern’s Dutch original 1882a, nor oddly in the later French translation 1901. As far as I know, this text has never been translated into a Western language. I imagine there may be Gujarati translations, but I have never seen or even heard of one.

I translate the following from the Ardha-magadhi text in Deleu 1969: 105.26-106.2. I have filled in the abbreviated stock expressions with reference to the preceding portions of the story, and to Hoernle 1885-90.

For this stock expression, see Hoernle 1885-90: text page 153 (§256): *na najai naṁ, aham kena vi karunamānā nāriṁśāṁ*. The commentary page 71 clarifies: *karunamānā te dhākṣamanyuṇā*. Hoernle translates on page 162 “who knows but I shall die by some evil death,” with the note that literally one should translate “it is not known, (but) I shall be killed by some evil death.” Very close is *Vivāyasūrya* VI.125 (Upadhye 1935: 39): *taṁ naṁ mama na najai keṇa asubhunam karunamānā nāriṁśāṁ*

The term here (Deleu 1969: 105.36) is *taḷapuṇḍa-visa*. See Ratnadraja 1923: 3.42. Below we get in Prakrit *taḷapuṇḍa* and, in a text which is otherwise in Sanskrit, *taḷapuṇḍa*. Now, *kaḷākūṭa* is the well-known poison produced at the primal churning of the oceans and the drinking of which turned Śiva’s throat blue. K. R. Norman 1992: 154 (ad *Sutaripāṇa* 62) has suggested that if Sanskrit *kaḷākūṭa* is the original form of the term in question here, the Middle Indic forms may be derived thus: *kaḷākūṭa* (with dissimilation of k’ > k) > *taḷākūṭa > Prakrit taḷa(v)uṇḍa > [taḷapuṇḍa] > Pāli taḷapuṇḍa. I thank Dominik Wujastyk (email communication) for his efforts to identify for me *kaḷākūṭa* poison in Ayurvedic sources, but unfortunately (as is so often the case) the authorities disagree.

The text is in *Jinadāsagana*: 1928-29: II.171-172. It has been referred to for example by Jain 1984: 169, n. 4, whose interpretation of the wine mentioned in the story however is not quite right.

As the text edition is rather difficult to come by, I give a transcript of the portion translated here in Appendix III.

The exact sense of *kaṃmasa* (*kaṃmasa* or *kaṃnas* in Sanskrit) is not quite clear, but Johnson 1962: 104, n. 126, says that it is half-cooked pulse. Dictionaries define the word as grain or half-cooked rice and pulse (peas, beans, etc.). Chinese Buddhist texts seem to render it in ways that suggest rice or beans was understood. See Wujastyk 1964-74, s.v. *kaṃmasa*. But since the *Kāśyapaparivarta* §152, for example, has the compound *odanaṅkaṃmasa*, it seems less likely that *kaṃmasa* means rice. The *Mahāvyutpatti* 5747 renders the term by *wenmian* 湯麵, “warm noodles (?)”, but Tibetan *zan dron* seems to mean simply “warm food,” or a food made of hot, ground
up &c. &c. See also Wojtita 1975: 41 (footnote 1) who quotes (without, however, mentioning the source) Śaṅkara’s commentary to Chandogyopanisad 1.10.2. offering for kūlmaṇa what is clearly a sort of folk etymology, kutsāda māsāh, “despised or contemptible beam.” One may further note that D. D. Kosambi (1962: 184) has pointed out that, whatever the technical identification of kūlmaṇa may be, all indications point to it as the lowest, most humble type of food. Thus, the suggestion that the high-status kine was sustained by means of such course food is significant.

69 Actually, Johnson, the translator of the work, consistently writes -caritra, but the edition I have referred to (Sah 1977) writes -carita, which I have followed. I think the meaning does not change.


71 See Bühler 1889 = Patel 1936, and Winternitz 1927: 482ff.

72 A mythical bird which lives on raindrops.

73 The text is to be found in Punyavijayi 1962: 36 (116): 61ff.

74 See Hoffmann 1974: 429,8-431.18, and Tawney 1895: 176-78. My translation is indebted to those of Tawney and Hoffmann.

75 Hoffmann 1974: XVII, quoting Alsdorf 1928: 4. I have unfortunately not been able to see Alsdorf’s book myself.

76 The text in Sanskrit with Apabhramśa verses, accompanied by a German translation, was presented as a thesis over twenty years ago, although regrettable it seems never to have been published. However, a bound photocopy of Hoffmann’s work is kept in America in the University of Pennsylvania Library, call number BL/1316/ K37/1974a. I thought this was the editio princeps, but Hoffmann (page XIX) refers to an edition published in Lahore in 1942 by Jagadishchandra Shastri. Even Hoffmann, however, did not see this edition. Because of its inaccessibility, I print the text of the tale in Appendix V.

77 Tawney 1895: xx, referring to Takakusu 1894: 161. It is interesting to remark that in his additional notes to Tawney’s translation (Tawney 1895: 239), Ernst Leumann pointed out that this account in the Kathākośa parallels the story in the Nirayavālīya, referring to Warren 1879.

78 I have not been able to check some of the other parallels referred to on page XXXIII, but most seem not to be directly relevant. Hoffmann refers to, but I have not seen, the Āvaśyakānirūyki IX, 65, 6, and Somatīla’s Sīlāgarūṇini and Puspa-

maṇḍākānī (referring to Alsdorf 1928: 71). The parallel between the Kathākośa and the Trisastīkālākūpaśu carita was noted long ago by Johnson 1925: 308. The story is there summarized and Johnson notes that “The account of Śrenika’s death agrees fairly closely with that in the Kathākośa,” referring to Tawney’s translation. It is odd that Johnson seems not to refer at all to her own 1925 article in her 1962
translation of the Mahaavacarita.

79 Tawney took Candrabhāsi as a proper name, but this does not seem to be correct. Hoffmann notes that Candrabhāsi is not known as a type of alcoholic beverage, but there is certainly seems to be. Candrubhaha means which mock the moon (in clarity), and it may signify a clear drink. The Sahadakalpadruma defines the term as guddīc, a plant technically called Cocculus cordifolius (probably the same or nearly the same as cocculus indicus). The applicability of this here seems dubious, however, since this plant is poisonous.

80 As Hoffmann notes, Tawney’s “dog” is incorrect (but it is not certain how he read his manuscript): is the coincidence with the Shivasanghe “dog nothing more than dumb chance?

81 I am not certain of this rendering. Tawney translated “whitlow,” and Hoffmann “Der finger beiein zu fäulern.” The Sanskrit-Wörterbuch of Röhring and Roth 1855-75: 2.381 translates kānīa as “zusammengezogen, eingeschnürt.” In Prakrit (Sheth 1928 s.v.) the term is defined as saṃkocita, that is, “contracted, shroweled up.” If the word is correctly to be taken as etymologically Sanskrit (from the root यक्त), the sense would seem to be derivationally something like “atrophy,” but the context leads to the conclusion that the meaning should be “inflammation.”

82 Hoffmann’s note reads: “This is only understandable in Prakrit. The Kumāra- pataprathbdnha has: sa kuniyā jāyā. tāo dārgehāh kānīa te nāmrīt kāyām.” See the preceding note.

83 That is, the first of 24 Tirthānikaras of the coming age, equal to Padmanābha. See Mehta and Chandra 1970-73: 113-38.

84 A very interesting example of the independent existence and historical persistence of one of these episodes is found in modern Hindu story-telling, wherein the vignette of winning into love is repeated. See Nayar 1969: 104.

85 It is of course still possible that the version known to the compilers of the Guan-jing resembled the Mulasarvastivada version in having a liquid transmitted by anākha, that liquid being water. Since the Central Asian compilers were no doubt quite familiar with grape wine, they could have adapted such a version, changing, as it were, water into wine. Such an explanation seems to me, however, unnecessarily complicated, although certainly the scenario cannot be ruled out.

86 In this context other similar texts must be taken into account. Although not translated (?) until after the Guan-jing, there exist five other “guan” visualization (or contemplation) sūtras in Chinese. One of these is the previously mentioned Guanfo sannai hai-jing (T. 642). The others are the “Sūtra on the Technique of the Practice of Visualizing the Bodhisattva Samantabhadra” Guan Puixian puja xingfa-jing 觀普賢菩薩行法經 (T. 277), the “Sūtra on Visualizing the Bodhisattva Akasaajātmaka” Guan Xukongzang puja-jing 觀虚空藏菩薩經 (T. 409), the “Sūtra on Visualizing the Bodhisattva Maitreya Gaining Birth in the Tusita Heaven” Guan Mile puja zhangsheng doushuaitian-jing 觀藥師菩薩生兜率天經 (T. 452), and the “Sūtra on Visualizing the Two Bodhisattvas Bhaisajyagarbha and Bhaisajyaguru” Guan Yaowang Yanshang erpuja-jing 觀藥王藥上二菩薩經 (T. 1161). The
The question of the so-called nine grades of beings, the jiupin 九品, has been raised several times in discussions over the origine of the Guan jing. As various scholars have pointed out (Pan 1977: 210; Nogami 1973: 179-81; Sueki 1982: 462), the system of ranking beings from those of the Highest Rank of the Highest Grade of Birth in the Pure Land 下品 down through the Lowest Rank of the Lowest Grade of Birth found in the Guan jing seems to reflect the Chinese bureaucratic system of the "Nine Categories and the Impartial and Just;" jiupin zhiheng 九品中正. This system itself is rather old in China. In a detailed study of the system, Donald Holzman (1957: 388) has characterized its history succinctly: "Although it was formally established at the beginning of the Wei dynasty, in 220 A.D., the system of the Nine Categories is in reality an extension of methods applied since the Later Han for the choosing and promotion of Bureaucrats," despite which he confesses (1957: 395) that the origin of the term itself is obscure. The application of this nine-fold scheme to people may well go back to this bureaucratic system, but the nine-fold division of things ranging from 上上 to 下下 is even older, dating as Holzman (1957: 395) points out to the Book of Documents (Shangshu 上書), in which (Karlsgren 1950: 12ff.) fields, products and so forth are so ranked. Another possible source of the idea, however, and one which I believe has not yet been investigated, lies in a text perhaps more likely to have been associated with Buddhist interests, the Taoist Taipingjing 太平經. As discussed briefly by Kaltenmark (1979: 31), this text contains (at 42: 88ff.) a nine-fold division of human beings, ranking them from "divine men who are without shape and are endowed with qi 氣 down to slaves, but I believe the terms 上上 and so forth do not appear. I must leave it to specialists in Taoism to discuss whether there may be any connection between this categorization and that of the Guan jing.

Note however also the fifth century translation of the *Abhidharmakokāvyabhāṣā* T. 1546 (XXVIII) 213b ff., = T. 1545 (XXVII) 274b ff., where we find 上上 through 下下. See too the Tszheng Tsengsheng Xindi Guan jing 大寺本生心地觀經 T. 159 (III) 303b5 and following which uses the terms 上品, 下品 and so forth.
There seems little doubt, however, that this very interesting text was compiled in China, although its date remains uncertain.

Fujita 1993 is merely a summary of his 1985 book which, he complains, has been almost entirely ignored. In any case, in this recent work Fujita repeats his earlier suggestion of the "mixed origin" of the sûtra.

I do not want to imply my belief in the existence of any unique original version which served as a basis for some transformation, but rather use the term "transformation" more loosely to indicate the apparently original and innovative features unique to a given version.

See Imoto 1962: 48 ff, and passim.

Reluctance to draw the blood of royalty was also known for example among the Mongols, who, it is reported, employed suffocation instead. The Tibetans are known to have "avoided violence" by sewing a victim into a skin and tossing him into a river. Sending off the victim still alive apparently avoided or mitigated the sin associated with violence. This is probably the same idea being referred to in those versions of our tale which speak of the son's reluctance to kill his father "with a weapon."

The Kyögyôshinshô passage is found in Hoshino et al. 1990: 109ff. = 328ff.

This interpretation is apparently not entirely without controversy, however, as the chronological details of Shinran's life, and the history of the composition of the Kyögyôshinshô, are fraught with problems. Therefore Sueki's suggestion, while certainly attractive from the psychological point of view, may in the end not stand up to historical criticism. See Dobbins 1989: 37-38.

Imoto 1982, however, apparently seems to suggest that Ajitaśatru in fact actually does desire his mother. But as far as I can tell there is absolutely no textual basis for such a claim.

Suggestions of other even less obvious connections with European legends have been hazarded. I do not know quite what to make of the article by Uno 1988 which discusses the similarities between the episode studied in the present paper and the "Caritas Romana," the story of the imprisoned Cimon being nourished by the breast of his daughter. On the story see Steensberg 1976. I am inclined to think that any similarities are simply adventitious. Certainly, at any rate, Uno's suggestion (1988: 113) of a connection (even conceptually) with the "earth-breast" which nourishes the prince in the "Foundation Legend of Khotan" is to be rejected. (On the latter story, see Vamoski 1980.)

Moreover, the weight of legendary tradition is not itself evidence in the study of history. Of course, on the other hand, when the object of the historical study is the legend itself the various manifestations of that legend are our evidence, but then the history we are writing is the history of a story, and not the history of a true happening. (For an excellent study of just such a legendary tradition, see Watanabe 1909.) Unfortunately, in much of what is written about Indian Buddhism, at least, this distinction has been blurred or even lost entirely. The result has been disastrous especially for the study of the formative stages of the Buddhist tradition, and the
damage will no doubt take a very long time to repair.

97 Takahashi 1993: 283 has also referred to Laufer’s study, but he did not, I think, take his investigations far enough.

98 It is gratifying to note that, having been made aware of my critique by an early draft version of the present paper, Sueki has adopted my understanding in 1992: 65. Although I sent the same draft to Prof. Fujita, in 1993: 244-45 he again offered his old argument without any reference to my critique.

99 The punctuation of the Taishō edition in the present sūtra is particularly bad, but since the translation itself indicates where we differ this is not marked further.

100 “Soul” rendare bukuro 弥勒.

101 “Non-self” renders feishen 非身.

102 A reference to the Avici hell.

103 Compare the Classic of Filial Piety, Xiaojing 孝經 9.1: Confucius said: “Of all the natures between Heaven and Earth, human nature is [the most] lofty. Of all human behavior, there is nothing greater than filial piety. Of all filial piety, there is nothing greater than respecting one’s father. Of all behavior of respecting one’s father, there is nothing greater than treating one’s father as equal with Heaven.” 天地之性人為貴。人行莫大於孝。孝莫大於尊父。尊父莫於配天。 Despite this kind of parallel, however, this may be an authentic reference to old Buddhist literature, or at least to ideas current in Buddhist India. Compare for example AN II iv §2 (Samcitavagga, Duppatičāra) = Ekottarikāgama T. 125 (II) 161a10-20, and see T. 687 (XVI) 780bc. See also Avadānaśataka (Speyer 1906-09): 204.13-205.7. I owe these references to Demiéville 1925: 107, note 2. In addition, see Schopen 1984.

104 The text following “...become a śramaṇa” is not easy to understand clearly. But certainly Bimbisāra is giving his reasons for quitting the world, becoming a monk, and leaving the sovereignty to Ajātasatru. There is, he is arguing, no need to imprison him, because he will gladly give up his position in exchange for the life of a renunciant. But the translation remains tentative.

105 Perhaps something is wrong with the text, since the king is already in jail. But more likely the author(s) just lost track of the story a bit.

106 Compare Xiaojing 11.1: Confucius said: “The ordinances of the five punishments amount to three thousand, and there is no crime more enormous than being unfilial.” 子曰。五刑之屬三千，而莫大於不孝。 See note 103, above.

107 Sadakata thinks the “quotation” ends here, rather than with the previous sentence as we have taken it; this is certainly also possible.

108 Sūḍa 四遠 seems to be a non-standard translation of ṛddhi-pāda.

109 The Pāli tradition attributes the death of Mahā-Maudgalyāyana to a beating received from Jānas (Niganṭhas); see Malalasekera 1938: II.546-47. But in the Chinese Ekottarikāgama 增壹阿含經 26.9, T. 125 (II) 639a12 and following, which is without Pāli equivalent, the beating to death of Maudgalyāyana is attributed to the
Accepting the variant 佛化 for 神化 in note 9.

Accepting the variant 僧減 for 僧式 in note 10.

Accepting the variant 俗 for 湜 in note 11.

Or: the light of / produced by the Buddha.

That is, the Buddha.

Accepting the variant 太 for 大 in note 14.

This may refer to freedom from future rebirth in the three evil destinies, the realms of hell, hungry ghosts and beasts, or to the fact that his defilements, the karma which comes from those defilements and the fruits of that karma are all cut off.

For the edition's satāvyā, which seems to be a misprint.

Both these words are written ज्ञेके by Hoffmann, without variants, but strictly speaking ज्ञेके is correct.

Hoffmann writes Bharate without variants, which should probably be emended as I have done.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Devadatta</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Restrictions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctance to violence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restriction on food</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whipping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affection of people for king</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen requests to enter prison</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathing of queen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking in food</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking in drink</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facing Buddha / pacing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monks visit prison</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning of jailers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shutting window</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacerating feet</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger at mother</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmention episode</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son and dog</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injured finger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boil on son's finger</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boil on own childhood finger</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fright at noise / sight of advancing son</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Another story about boils in included in this text, but it is not directly parallel.

1 Guan-jung
II Maññayana sacchāparinirvāṇantara
III Mādhavācāyā Vinaya
IV S. Aṭṭhakāla-sūtra
V Shisong-tū
VI Simangala-vilāśini
VII Narendraśāstra
VIII Aṣṭāvakacārī
IX Trisāṭṭhabhākuṇḍa-sūtra
X Kathākūśa