

## \*Parikarṣati Reconsidered

Jonathan A. SILK

In the previous issue of this journal,<sup>1</sup> I published a note in which I suggested a small change to the text of the *Pūrṇāvadāna* of the *Divyāvadāna*, namely that the *hapax legomenon* printed in the *editio princeps* as *parikared* be read *\*parikarṣed*, in the expression *ekenāmsena putro mātaram dvitīyena pitaram pūrṇavarṣaśatam \*parikarṣed*, “Should a son carry his mother on one shoulder and his father on the other for a full hundred years.”<sup>2</sup> It should be noted at the outset that there is no question about the meaning of the phrase: it is a metaphorical expression signaling supreme respect for parents. The proper verb in the *Pūrṇāvadāna*, however, being unclear, I essayed a note. When preparing that note, although I paid attention to parallel expressions with the verb *pari√hr*, I overlooked the fact that already in 1902 J. S. Speyer, and some 48 years later but without reference to Speyer likewise D. R. Shackleton Bailey, had noticed the problem, both suggesting instead that one read *parihared*. Speyer wrote confidently as follows:<sup>3</sup>

[A]n indispensable correction may be made with the aid of the transmitted text of the *Avadānaśataka*. Tale nr. 36 of that collection ... contains the same *sūtra* on filial piety as found here .... But the *Avadānaś.* mss. have not *parikared* as is edited here, with no meaning suitable to the context, but *parihared*. The whole sentence I think should be read thus: <yad> *ekenāmsena putro mātaram dvitīyena pitaram pūrṇavarṣaśatam parihared yadvā* etc.

Speyer here advocates an emendation on the basis of an intrinsic difficulty with the text, and a (single) parallel formulation elsewhere. For his part, Shackleton Bailey, in contrast to the certitude of Speyer, wrote with some apparent hesitation: “For *parikared* read *parihared* (T. khur du thogs sam)?”<sup>4</sup> Although the point may seem a minor one, I

---

<sup>1</sup> Silk 2007.

<sup>2</sup> Cowell and Neil 1886: 51.22-23. Tibetan in *Derge Kanjur* 1, *'dul ba, kha*, 5b2, Chinese in T. 1448 (XXIV) 16a20-21 (*juan* 4).

<sup>3</sup> Speyer 1902: 109-110.

<sup>4</sup> Shackleton Bailey 1950: 182. Some trouble was evidently also felt by P. L. Vaidya 1959: 31.23, who without note printed instead *paricaret*. In the glossary, however, p. 538b, he listed *parikaroti* with the definition ‘uphold,’ carrying this over from the glossary of Cowell and Neil apparently without any recognition that the form itself has disappeared from his text. See now Hiraoka 2007: I.114, n. 212, who follows Shackleton Bailey.

believe that important issues are in play here. I would therefore like to reconsider the question, using it as an opportunity to briefly advert to wider issues of text critique in the study of Indian Buddhist literature which deserve fuller treatment.

The passage in question appearing in the *Divyāvādāna* was drawn from the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivāda. The Tibetan parallel in the Vinaya source of the *Pūrṇāvādāna* in the *Vinayavastu* reads our sentence as follows: *bus phrag pa gcig la ni ma bzhas cig shos la ni pha bzhas nas lo brgya tshang bar khur du thogs sam*.<sup>5</sup> Although he is laconic, Shackleton Bailey appears to be suggesting that we change *parikared* to *parihared* on the basis of the Tibetan *khur du thogs sam*.

Shackleton Bailey's suggestion is complicated by examples from elsewhere in the same *Vinayavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. In the *Samghabhedavastu*, extant in Sanskrit, we find three cases of the expression *khur du thogs*: 1) *gzhon nu bdag gis ni sa'i rdul ji snyed mchis pa khur du thogs te mch'o*, equivalent to Sanskrit *kumāra yāvati pṛthivyā mṛttikā tām ahaṃ skandhenādāya gacchāmīti*;<sup>6</sup> 2) *de nas bud med de mu ge'i dus kyi 'chi ba'i 'jigs pas skrag nas rkang lag ma tshang ba'i mi de khur du thogs te grong mthar song nas*, equivalent to *tataḥ sā strī durbhikṣākālamṛtyubhayabhītā taṃ hastapādavikalam puruṣaṃ skandhe āropya grāmāntaṃ samavasṛtā*;<sup>7</sup> 3) a verse following passage 2: *rdum po khur du thogs pa khyod || khyim thab las da mi 'phyo 'am ||*, in Sanskrit *skandhena vahase ruṇḍam idānīm tvaṃ pativratā*.<sup>8</sup> In all these cases, *khur du thogs* renders forms with *skandha*, shoulder, in the first case with the verb  $\bar{a}\sqrt{d}\bar{a}$ , in the second with the causative of  $\bar{a}\sqrt{ruh}$ , and in the third with  $\sqrt{vah}$ .<sup>9</sup> This would suggest that

---

In a general defense of his suggestions Shackleton Bailey wrote the following (1950: 167): “As for the emendations on which I have ventured, space does not allow of any discussion; while nearly all of them have the evidence of the Ḥdul ba as a *locus standi*, they are all put forward not this ground alone but as intrinsically superior readings in their several contexts.” Without implying that any particular instance of his suggestions is consequently unacceptable, I dare to say that in each and every case it is much better—if not indeed essential—to make explicit the grounds for one's changes. If one does not, one leaves the reader to guess, or to take the change on faith. Neither is a good course. Now, there is no question that Shackleton Bailey was an excellent critic (as a Latinist he has been called the best of his generation, and his conjectural emendations brilliant), and most of his ideas are probably good ones. But each must be examined on its own merits, the more so when those merits have nowhere been made clear. Moreover, in light of Shackleton Bailey's general statement of confidence, it is worthwhile wondering about the meaning of his question mark in this particular case.

<sup>5</sup> Chinese has: 假使有人一肩擔父一肩擔母, 至滿百年.

<sup>6</sup> Derge Kanjur 1 'dul ba nga 11b2; Gnoli 1977-1978: I.86,12-13.

<sup>7</sup> Derge Kanjur 1 'dul ba nga 191b5-6; Gnoli 1977-1978: II.118,17-19.

<sup>8</sup> Derge Kanjur 1 'dul ba nga 192a3; Gnoli 1977-1978: II.118,31.

<sup>9</sup> In other passages in this Vinaya, it is not possible to compare the text to any extant Sanskrit source. See Derge Kanjur 3 'dul ba, ca 76a7: *bus phrag pa gcig gis ni pha | cig shos kyis ni ma lo brgya tham par yongs su bang ba byas sam* = T. 1442 (XXIII) 642b6 (*juan* 3): 假使其子一肩持母一肩持父, 經於百年, and the same at Derge Kanjur 3 'dul ba, ca 130a3 = T. 1442 (XXIII) 658c16 (*juan* 7): 假使其子左肩擔父右肩擔母, 經於百年. The Tibetan verb *yongs su bang ba* (*byas*) remains unclear to me.

Further examples of the stock phrase in Indic texts extant only in Chinese include T. 203

Shackleton Bailey's suggestion is not necessarily supported by what he apparently provides as evidence, a Tibetan translation equivalent, since other examples in the same text reflect different underlying Indic originals. Elsewhere, however, more supportive parallels do exist.

In the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* we find the sentence *smān gyi rgyal po | gang gis chos kyi rnam grangs 'di yi ger bris nas glegs bam du byas te | phrag pa la thogs pa des | de bzhin gshegs pa phrag pa la thogs par 'gyur te* rendering *tathāgataṃ bhāṣajyārāja sa kulaputra aṃsena pariharati* | *ya imaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ likhitvā pusta<ka>gataṃ kṛtvā 'ṃsena parihareti*.<sup>10</sup> Likewise, later in the same text *de ni de bzhin gshegs pa phrag pa la thogs pa yin no || ma pham pa | gang chos kyi rnam grangs 'di glegs bam du byas shing phrag pa la thogs pa'i* renders *tathāgataṃ so 'ṃsena parihareta ya imaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ pusta<ka>gataṃ kṛtvā aṃsena parihareta*.<sup>11</sup> Here *phrag pa* renders *aṃsa*, 'shoulder', as in the *Pūrṇāvadāna* passage, and *thogs* renders forms of *pari√hr̥*. In the *Pūrṇāvadāna*, however, it does not appear that *thogs*, the dictionary form of which is *'thogs pa*, 'to carry', has any equivalent in the extant Sanskrit sentence. Rather, in the *Pūrṇāvadāna* the Sanskrit verb appears to be rendered with *bzhag*, a form of *'jog pa*, 'to place'. In a passage from the *Avadānaśataka* with precisely our stock phrase, pointed to by Speyer without reference to its Tibetan translation, we find the same equivalent: *ya ekenāṃsena putro mātāraṃ dvitīyena pitaraṃ pūrṇaṃ varṣaśataṃ parihared*, rendered in Tibetan *gal te bus pha ma gnyis phrag pa g.yas g.yon du bzhag ste | lo brgya'i bar du khyer ram*.<sup>12</sup> For a further example of the construction with *pari√hr̥*, we may notice, as I did in my earlier contribution, one passage in the *Āṅguttara-Nikāya* in Pāli: *ekena bhikkhave aṃsena mātaraṃ parihareyya ekena aṃsena pitaraṃ parihareyya*.<sup>13</sup>

These passages might lead us to conclude that after all Speyer and Shackleton Bailey are right, and that we had best read the anomalous *parikared* as *\*parihared*. The assumption would then probably be that some phonological (?) error was responsible for the miswriting of the proper *h* as *k*, although this is not a typical error of Nepalese

---

(IV) 455c22-23; T. 765 (XVII) 682c10-11; T. 970 (XIX) 359a8-9; T. 1412 (XXII) 140c16-17; T. 1545 (XXVII) 535c23-24.

<sup>10</sup> Kern and Nanjio 1908–1912: 227.8-9; Kashgar in Toda 1981 folio 216a5-6; Tibetan here and below in Nakamura 1976. In these *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* passages I disregard other sometimes significant variant readings since these do not affect the expression in question.

<sup>11</sup> Kern and Nanjio 1908–1912: 338.4-5; Kashgar in Toda 1981 folio 324b6-325a1; Gilgit in Watanabe 1975: 124.25-26. An additional case in this text is less clear. Verse 4.56 (Kern and Nanjio 1908–1912: 119.6-7; Gilgit in Watanabe 1975: 53.32-35; Kashgar in Toda 1981 folio 120a7-b1 reads:

*hastehi pādehi śireṇa cāpi pratipriyaṃ duṣkarakaṃ hi kartum |*  
*śireṇa aṃsena ca yo dhareta paripūrṇa kalpān yatha gaṅgavālikāḥ ||*  
*mgo dang lag pa dang ni rkang pas kyang || lan du phan par bgyi ba shin tu dka' ||*  
*gang gā'i bye snyed bskal pa rdzogs par yang || mgo dang phrag la gang gis khyer ba dang ||*

<sup>12</sup> Speyer 1906-1909: 1.205,1-2 (Maitrakanyaka); Derge Kanjur 343 *mdo sde*, *aṃ* 102b3.

<sup>13</sup> Morris and Hardy 1885-1900: i.61,30-62,1 (II.4.2). Here the Chinese parallel (T. 125 [II] 601a12-14 [*juan* 11]) has: 若復比丘有人以父著左肩上,以母著右肩上至千萬.

manuscripts.<sup>14</sup> However one might account for the reading (though account one must—“it’s a mistake” is not an explanation),<sup>15</sup> there is other evidence that may cast doubt on the resolution proposed by Speyer and Shackleton Bailey.

The very same *Divyāvadāna* contains in its chapter on Rūpāvātī the following sentence: *aṅkadhātrīty ucyate yā dārakam aṅkena parikarṣayaty aṅkapratyaṅgāni ca saṁsthāpayati*.<sup>16</sup> This story lacks any Tibetan parallel, but the term *aṅkadhātrī* itself is known.<sup>17</sup> Edgerton wrote of the lemma *parikarṣayati*, with citation of this passage: “(= Skt. *parikarṣati*, *carries around*; in Skt. *karṣayati* is used in the sense of *karṣati*) *carries around* (a child, said of a nurse).”<sup>18</sup> In addition, as I cited in my earlier contribution, the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* also knows a similar expression, namely *cailoṇḍukam iva śīrasā parikarṣeḥ*, rendered in Tibetan *mgo la thod bzhin du thogs shing*.<sup>19</sup> The meaning of the Sanskrit verb is confirmed here by the commentary, which glosses *dhārayeḥ*.<sup>20</sup> This *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* example demonstrates that *parikarṣati* exists alongside *parikarṣayati* in this type of expression.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>14</sup> On the other hand, it is also hard to understand how within either North Indian or Nepalese scripts *re* could be misread for *rṣe*, since in the latter case the *r* would typically be written atop the full form of *ṣe*. (The opposite error, the disappearance of the *r*, would be much more easily accounted for.) A simple phonological confusion is also hard to imagine.

<sup>15</sup> We should also perhaps (re)consider the possibility, even though it might be unlikely and apparently elsewhere unattested, that in fact *parikared* may be a correct reading perhaps, as Edgerton 1953 s.v. *parikarati* suggested, denominative to *parikara* (see Whitney 1889: §1054). But we must remember that being able to justify it grammatically does not mean that it actually existed. In any event, even if one proposes to keep the current reading, or offer another, the choice must somehow be explicitly justified.

<sup>16</sup> Cowell and Neil 1886: 475.13-14. Tokyo University Sanskrit manuscript 955, folio 7b1, has the same reading.

<sup>17</sup> *Mahāvvyutpatti* 9478 (Ishihama and Fukuda 1989) translates it *pang na ṅsho ba'i ma ma*. On the category of nurses, see Hiraoka 2002: 220-221, and 435 n. 29. To his listing of Chinese translations add that in one of the texts corresponding to the *Rūpāvaty-avadāna*, T. 178 (III) 449a26-28, in which four 侍女 are listed: 女主拭其身, 女主沐浴, 女主乳哺, 女主抱之.

<sup>18</sup> Edgerton then goes on to enter under a separate definition a passage from the *Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra* (Suzuki and Idzumi 1949: 484.11-12), the full verse of which runs as follows:

*buddhavaṃśam anudhārayiṣyasi dharmavaṃśa pariśodhayiṣyasi |*  
*saṃghavaṃśa parikarṣayiṣyase ratnasambhavakaro bhaviṣyasi ||*

Concerning this he writes: “perhaps *attracts, draws to oneself*. . . . Or can the word here mean *you will support, nurse, carry around the Order* (as a nurse carries a child. . .)?” The Tibetan translation (Derge Kanjur 44 *phal chen*, a 301b2-3) has: *sang rgyas rigs ni rjes su 'dzin par 'gyur || chos kyi rigs ni yongs su sbyong par 'gyur || dge 'dun rigs ni yongs su bsud par 'gyur || rin chen 'byung ba'i 'byung gnas khyod 'gyur ro ||*. The Chinese renderings have (T 278 [IX] 775a16-17 [juan 58]): 守護佛種 姓淨修法種姓 攝取僧種性 了三世種姓, and (T. 279 [X] 426c13-14 [juan 77] = T. 293 [X] 822a1-2 [juan 35]) 汝當持佛種 汝當淨法種 汝能集僧種 三世悉周遍. Both the Tibetan and Chinese translations suggest that Edgerton’s first meaning is closer to the mark in this case.

<sup>19</sup> Wogihara 1932-1935: 943.15-16; Derge Kanjur 12, *shes phyin brgyad stong pa, ka*, 267b7.

<sup>20</sup> Wogihara 1932-1935: 961.7.

<sup>21</sup> It may not even be meaningful to make such a distinction. See Edgerton 1953 (Grammar) §29.4: “Ellipsis or telescoping of the syllable *-ay-* occurs in optatives from *aya* verbs. . . .” See

So far, I have considered evidence of parallel passages in an attempt to gain an understanding of the possible forms of similar expressions. From a text critical point of view, the purpose of such an exercise is to define the scope of possible idioms or expressions, thereby strengthening the case for a possible change of the printed text. But the way in which we speak of such a procedure and the terminology we use is often imprecise, and this imprecision contributes to a lack of clarity regarding the goals and limitations of the process itself. Classical text critics often speak of ‘emendation’ and ‘conjectural emendation.’ As Emanuel Tov argues in his survey of text critical studies of Biblical materials, however, it is clearer to speak of a difference between ‘preference’ and ‘emendation’<sup>22</sup> The former term he presents as referring to the choice of an attested reading, while the latter points to an unsupported and therefore imaginary option not attested in any source. If we accept a comparison between the way a Tibetan translation is related to an Indic text and the way the Septuagint is related to the (it would be more cautious to write ‘the’) Hebrew text of the Bible, then we must think of its evidence as supplying ‘readings.’ That is, a Tibetan translation may be ‘retroverted’ into Sanskrit, and the status of such a retroverted reading is equivalent to any other reading found in, for example, a manuscript. The choice between such readings is one of ‘preference,’ rather than a choice between (attested) ‘reading’ and (imaginary) ‘emendation’. Here, therefore, ‘retroversion’ refers to the postulation of an underlying original which a given translation represents.<sup>23</sup> The question then becomes, first, whether a given reading in a Tibetan translation justifies a given retroversion, and second, whether such a retroverted reading is preferable to other available readings.

The most basic editorial goal must always be the establishment of the text intended by its author. Consequently, only if we imagine the original and ultimate bases of two texts to have been different are we freed from the obligation of harmonizing their variant readings. If a certain retroverted reading [A] is related to readings we find in our manuscript(s), even through a chain of corruptions and mistakes, then reading [A] presents another choice between which we might choose (a ‘preference’) in our quest to establish the ‘original’ text.<sup>24</sup> Likewise, it might suggest an as-yet unattested reading (an ‘emendation’) which, nevertheless, the critic may postulate to have been responsible for the generation of the corrupt extant readings (including the retroverted reading). In these terms, what Shackleton Bailey speaks of as ‘emendations’ based on the Tibetan translations of Vinaya texts may in almost all cases more clearly be termed *retroverted readings* for which he expresses his *preference*. His claim, implicit though it may be, is that the Tibetan translation reflects a form of the Indic text which can be recovered, and that the recovered or retroverted Indic text belongs to the same lineage (recension, “text”) as the extant, though perhaps corrupt, Sanskrit text under investigation. The key

---

also §38.27.

<sup>22.</sup> See Tov 1992: 351-369.

<sup>23.</sup> For a detailed discussion, see Tov 1997 *passim*.

<sup>24.</sup> This is a process in which we must engage even though we know we will never actually succeed beyond doubt in recovering an original form of the text.

questions, then, have been and remain, first, whether we can assert with confidence that a given Tibetan form represents a given Sanskrit form (that is, whether a specific retroversion is justified), and second, whether such a retroverted form, even if justified, belongs to the same textual unit as does the extant text, or whether it might rather represent a different version of the Indic text.

To apply a retroversion as a relevant reading requires the assumption of a single textual line standing behind both extant sources. If we wish to claim that a form we find in Tibetan and retrovert into Sanskrit is a ‘reading,’ we must attempt—even if we cannot fully succeed—to explain its relation to the extant text. But this immediately raises the question of what the extant text is. And in the present case, this introduces yet another problem.

The *Divyāvadāna* is one of the earliest Buddhist Sanskrit texts edited in modern times, and its editors reported few of the variants in their Nepalese sources. (In fact, this is probably true of most Indian Buddhist texts so far edited: the selection of the sources, the reporting of their readings, and the explicit expression of the criteria for preference of one reading over another are all often ‘sub-optimal.’) How much does this matter, from a practical point of view? The answer is, we don’t really know. Sometimes perhaps not much.<sup>25</sup> But few modern scholars have thought it worthwhile to go back to the manuscripts, a rather surprising stance to take when one’s task is avowedly one of text criticism. But when we do take that journey back to the sources, we are in for a surprise.

What did the editors of the *Divyāvadāna* have before them in their manuscripts of our passage? Leaving aside all issues other than that of the verb under discussion here, we find that the situation is far from clear. The manuscripts called by the editors E, now in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, and D (which they call “very correct”), in the Société Asiatique, both indeed read *parikared*.<sup>26</sup> However, the editors’ manuscript F, as well as two manuscripts in Tokyo University Library, very clearly read here something entirely different, namely *parikehaled*, a form beyond my understanding.<sup>27</sup> How this

---

<sup>25</sup> In my study of a portion of the *Dharmaruci-avadāna*, for which I was able to compare the Nepalese tradition recorded in the 1886 edition of Cowell and Neil with the text found in centuries earlier Gilgit manuscripts, I discovered less variation between the traditions than I expected, although Cowell and Neil’s text can be corrected in numerous instances. See Silk Forthcoming.

Hiraoka 2007 as Appendix A to his complete translation of Cowell and Neil’s *Divyāvadāna* (II.\*1-32) offers an extensive list of suggested readings (he calls them ‘corrections,’ *teisei* 訂正) at what looks at a quick glance to be a rate of perhaps 2 to 3 per page of the Cowell and Neil edition. In many but not all cases he discusses the suggestions in the notes to his translation, usually with reference to Tibetan and Chinese translations.

<sup>26</sup> Paris 53, folio 31b4, Société Asiatique 5, folio 25a6. I am extremely grateful to the kindness of Vincent Tournier, who checked the Bibliothèque Nationale and Société Asiatique manuscripts for me. The editors note (p. vi) that they did not use MS E beyond the first few pages. In referring to another MS in Cambridge dated by Bendall to the 14<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> century, they record its variants but for the passage in question (Cowell and Neil 1886: 661) they list no relevant reading (implying that it agrees with the printed edition?).

<sup>27</sup> Paris 56, folio 21a7; Tokyo 170, folio 33b7, 171 folio 26a6 (= 47a6 in the continuous

might be related to either *parikared*, *\*parikarṣed* or *\*parihared* is not clear. Moreover, the editors state that all of the manuscripts they were able to use are “only modern copies, made with more or less care from one original, which is now in the possession of Pandit Indrānand of Patan, Nepal,” a manuscript, they report, dated by Bendall to the 17<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>28</sup> Is this manuscript the archetype of the copies of the *Divyāvadāna* in European and Japanese libraries? We are fortunate that this very manuscript was filmed by the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project. Dr. Kengo Harimoto writes to me the following:<sup>29</sup>

Among the paper MSS of the *Divyāvadāna*[*mālā*], the only MS available to us in electronic form (A 123/6) reads *parikared* (folio 25a7). It so happens that this manuscript (NGMPP reel A 123/6, National Archives Kathmandu acc. no. 3/295) is most likely the one once seen by Bendall. The size, the number of folios, material, number of lines on each side, and most of all, the beginning and the end of two folios mentioned in the preface to Cowell and Neil 1886 p. vii match that of our digital photograph DSCN0099.JPG. Having said that, I am very skeptical that this manuscript was the source of all the other MSS Cowell and Neil used. In light of the number of MSS of the *Divyāvadānamālā* microfilmed by the NGMPP (about 15), I would be very much surprised if all five MSS that Cowell and Neil used derived from a 17<sup>th</sup> century (rather late) paper MS, which is A 123/6.

Cowell and Neil must have been aware of manuscripts with the reading *parikehaled*, yet they printed (without notice of variant) the reading *parikared*. Since they view all their sources as based on a single archetype, they must have believed that the former reading is a corruption of the latter. Since they do not even record the reading *parikehaled*, they naturally do not explain how it might be a corruption of *parikared*.<sup>30</sup> From this point of view, it is irrelevant whether the manuscript NGMPP A 123/6, which indeed also reads *parikared*, really is the archetype of Cowell and Neil’s manuscripts. If we understand Shackleton Bailey to be suggesting a retroversion from Tibetan of *\*parihared*, his suggestion must be that the form Cowell and Neil printed in their edition, *parikared*, represents a corruption of this *\*parihared*. In light of his statement that “nearly all of [his suggestions] have the evidence of the Ḥdul ba as a *locus standi*,” unless this case is an exception it would appear that it is upon this basis

---

numbering of the manuscript).

<sup>28</sup> Cowell and Neil 1886: vi-vii.

<sup>29</sup> I am very grateful for the kind assistance Dr. Harimoto provided me via email on 29 January, 2008. Regarding the name of the work in question, it appears that an older title *Divyāvadānamālā* was later shortened to *Divyāvadāna*. For a detailed discussion, see Hiraoka 2002: 19-23, with notes on p. 406. Commenting on how the NGMPP records list their manuscripts, Harimoto confirms Hiraoka’s observation: “Seeing the way they are listed (almost all of them as the *Divyāvadānamālā*), it appears that there was a notion among the pandits in Nepal that the text is called the *Divyāvadānamālā*.”

<sup>30</sup> In fact, they almost never justify their editorial choices, save in a few notes on pp. 703-712 with, inter alia, one or two text-critical observations.

that he is expressing his preference for the retroverted reading *\*parihared* over *parikared*. Or is he indeed suggesting an emendation—what he might have termed a conjectural emendation? But if he is not offering a retroverted reading but an emendation, why does he bother to cite a Tibetan equivalent at all? (And this still leaves the question, why his question mark? Of what is he unsure?) For Speyer the issue of retroversion or possible readings does not arise; he is plainly suggesting a conjectural emendation based on a (single) parallel construction known to him.

The evidence introduced above suggests that while the meaning of the stock expression of respect for parents through the metaphor that one “carries mother/father on one’s shoulders for one hundred years” is not in dispute, *pace* the apparent stance of Speyer and Shackleton Bailey, the linguistic expression of this phrase is not invariant. There exists alongside *pari√hṛ* a similar idiom with *pari√kṛṣ*, construed with the accusative of what is carried and the instrumental of that upon which the carrying is done, both verbs conveying a close if not synonymous sense. It is possible that the form with *pari√hṛ* is more common, though with so few examples it is difficult to judge and, in any case, even if more common, it is not necessarily consequently more likely in any given case. To accept Shackleton Bailey’s change in the example in question from the *Pūrṇāvadāna* as a ‘preference’, that is, to accept that his suggestion has the status of a ‘reading’ supported by the Tibetan translation he cites, would require us to ignore the evidence that the same Tibetan construction elsewhere, even in the very same text, reflects quite different Indic underlying constructions. Shackleton Bailey cannot be right for the reason he apparently adduces: the Tibetan translation of the Vinaya source of the *Pūrṇāvadāna* does not seem to allow us to confidently retrovert a reading of *\*parihared* in the passage in question. But Shackleton Bailey might still be right; it is still possible that we should *emend* the reading *parikared* to *\*parihared*, as explicitly suggested by Speyer. But in this case, we cannot do so based on the evidence of the Tibetan translation, and must rely instead on parallel formulations or on some other as yet unstated grounds (and even the so-called intrinsically better reading is better for some reason[s]). When we move from the realm of retroverted readings, which require of an editor the expression of a *preference* for one firmly established reading over another, to the realm of *conjectural emendations*—emendations proper—we enter the realm of imagination. Further evidence might still clarify the matter but, as it stands, it must be admitted that both my suggested emendation and that of Shackleton Bailey (and of course also Speyer) are emendations, not preferences for attested readings, and equally lack clear and unequivocal support in the sources.

A final lesson here is that the textual history and actual shape of the *Divyāvadāna* (if that is even the proper name for this collection of stories!) is rather more complex than it has heretofore appeared. There is surely much more to be learned, as soon as we stop simply believing authorities, even generally reliable ones, and begin to think and to dig for ourselves.

## Literature

- Cowell, Edward Byles, and Robert Alexander Neil. 1886. *The Divyāvādāna: A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends* (Cambridge; Reprint Amsterdam: Oriental Press / Philo Press, 1970).
- Edgerton, Franklin. 1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Gnoli, Raniero. 1977-1978. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Sanghabhedavastu: Being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*. Serie Orientale Roma 49/1-2 (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente).
- Hiraoka Satoshi 平岡聡. 2002. *Setsuwa no kōkogaku: Indo bukkūō setsuwa ni himerareta shisō* 説話の考古学: インド仏教説話に秘められた思想 (Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大蔵出版).
- . 2007. *Budda ga nazo toku sanze no monogatari: Diviya Avadāna zenyaku* ブツダが迷い解く三世の物語 『ディヴィヤ・アヴァダーナ』全訳. 2 Vols. (Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大蔵出版).
- Ishihama Yumiko and Yoichi Fukuda. 1989 *A New Critical Edition of the Mahāvyyutpatti*. Studia Tibetica 16. Materials for Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionaries 1 (Tokyo: Toyo Bunko)
- Kern, Hendrik, and Bunyiu Nanjio. 1908–1912. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 10 (St. Pétersbourg: Imperial Academy. Reprint: Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970).
- Morris, Richard, and Edmund Hardy. 1885-1900. *The Aṅguttara-Nikāya*. Second Edition, revised by A. K. Warder (London: The Pali Text Society. Reprint: 1961).
- Nakamura Zuiryū 中村瑞隆. 1976-. “Chibetto-yaku Hokekyō” チベット訳法華經. *Hokke Bunka Kenkyū* 法華文化研究 2 onward. Page numbers equal those of Kern and Nanjio 1908-1912.
- Shackleton Bailey, D[avid] R[oyle]. 1950. “Notes on the Divyāvādāna: Part I.” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1950/3-4: 166-84.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2007. “Bauddhavacana: Notes on Buddhist Vocabulary.” *Sōka Daigaku Kokusai Bukkyōgaku Kōtō Kenkyūjo Nenpō / Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 10: 171-179.
- . Forthcoming. “The Story of Dharmaruci: In Kṣemendra's *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* and Its Source the *Divyāvādāna*.”
- Speyer, Jacob Samuel. 1902. “Critical Remarks on the Text of Divyāvādāna.” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 16: 103-130.
- . 1906-1909. *Avadānaçataka: A Century of Edifying Tales Belonging to the Hīnayāna*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 3. Indo-Iranian Reprints 3 (St. Petersburg; Reprint The Hague: Mouton, 1958).
- Suzuki, Daisetz Teitaro, and Hokei Idzumi. 1949. *The Gandavyuha Sutra* (Kyoto: The Society for the Publication of Sacred Books of the World. Originally published 1934).
- Toda, Hirofumi. 1981. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra: Central Asian Manuscripts, Romanized Text* (Tokushima: Kyoiku Shuppan Center).
- Tov, Emanuel. 1992. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press/Assen and Maastricht: Van Gorcum).
- . 1997. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3 (Jerusalem: Simor).
- Vaidya, P. L. *Divyāvādānam*. 1959. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 20 (Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute)
- Watanabe, Shoko. 1975. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka Manuscripts Found in Gilgit*. Part Two: Romanized Text (Tokyo: The Reiyukai).
- Whitney, William Dwight. 1889. *A Sanskrit Grammar: including both the Classical Language, and the Older Dialects, of Veda and Brahmana*. Bibliothek indogermanischer Grammatiken 2. Second (revised and extended) edition (Boston: Ginn & Company / Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel).
- Wogihara Unrai. 1932-1935. *Abhisamayālamkāraḷoka Prajñāpāramitāvyaḷkyā*. Tōyō Bunko Publications Series D, 2 (Tokyo: The Tōyō Bunko. Reprint: Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin, 1973).

\* At the very last moment, while this article was in the proof stage, I came across a possible example of *h/k* confusion in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, in the expression printed by Pradhan (*Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 8 [Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1975]: 218.13-14) *nāham evam ahārṣam*. As Funahashi Issai (舟橋一哉, *Kusharon no Genten Kaimei Gobon* 俱舍論の原典解明 業品 [Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館, 1987]: 192 n. 1) points out (cf. Tib. *ma byas so*, Chn. 不作), the verb is to be read *akārṣam*. Without access to the manuscript, I do not know whether this represents a misprint of Pradhan's or a genuine reading. Since the expression *nāham evam akārṣam* has interesting implications for an outstanding problem in *Dhammapada* 306 and its parallels, I will discuss it separately.

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所・年報  
平成19年度（第11号）

創価大学

国際仏教学高等研究所

年報

平成19年度  
（第11号）

Annual Report  
of

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
at Soka University

for the Academic Year 2007

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所

東京・2008・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology

Soka University

Tokyo・2008