

JONATHAN A. SILK

Test Sailing the Ship of the Teachings:  
Hesitant Notes on *Kāśyapaparivarta* §§153-154

The past century and half or so has brought forth significant progress in the quest to understand Indian Buddhist literature, founded on investigations both philological and philosophical, with the lion's share of the effort having been devoted to interpreting thought or doctrine.<sup>1</sup> At the same time, the authors of Indian Buddhist literature, no matter how much they may have lived what moderns sometimes like to call "the life of the mind," also lived in a real world. Progress in understanding the *realia* of this world, its work-a-day circumstances and conditions, has, however, been slower. One of those who has contributed significantly to filling this lacuna is Dieter Schlingloff, through whose investigations of artistic imagery and textual description much about the everyday world within which ancient Indian Buddhists lived has become clearer. One of the areas to have drawn his particular attention is shipping.<sup>2</sup>

In this small contribution in honor of Prof. Schlingloff, I would like to venture a few remarks on an interesting passage which somehow escaped his attention.<sup>3</sup> It occurs in an earlier Mahāyāna sūtra, the *Kāśyapaparivarta*. The relevant portion of this text is transmitted to us in Sanskrit in two Central Asian manuscripts, one fragmentary, a ninth century Tibetan translation and three Chinese versions, of which two are to some extent inter-related and the third essentially unusable for our present purposes. We have, therefore, basically three primary sources – in Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese – between which we may attempt to triangulate in order to approach some picture of what the Indian text might have been trying to say. A few remarks are needed about just how our sources may be related to one another, and the consequent likelihood that any coherent picture may in fact emerge from such triangulation.

---

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful for the suggestions I received from Vincent Tournier, and for the careful proofreading of Reinier Langelaar.

<sup>2</sup> See Schlingloff 1976, 1981, 1987.

<sup>3</sup> But see below note 9.

The challenge facing any reader of such literature is the fundamental text critical question: do our sources all go back to a single source? If they do, we have some hope – even if it remains unrealized – of discerning the original shape of the text. If they do not, we must renounce the idea that we can edit these sources together in search of any older, much less Ur-, reading. The problem is complex. Even within a single language, it is often far from easy to determine whether variant readings reflect a common ancestor, corrupted though its transmission may be, or rather rely on unrelated, or only irremediably distantly related, sources. The tri-lingual triangulation method introduces even more complications and difficulties. At best, translations may be sources of readings to be obtained through retroversion (or “reconstruction”), supplying possible alternative Indian points of reference.<sup>4</sup> Alternatively, they may provide access to ancient interpretations (or commentaries of a sort), valuable because potentially more informed than our own understandings. But these points of reference are directly relevant only if we can determine them to reflect some state of the same Indic text we have before us now. Consequently, to put it simply, if we can determine that the ancient interpreters had before them substantially the same text we are trying to interpret, especially when their understandings are in mutual agreement we would do well to follow their guidance. At the same time, we must not be slavish: there are occasions, one example of which I will introduce below, when even the ancient translators surely themselves got it wrong.

The passage studied below provides both a very good and a rather poor opportunity to explore how text criticism of Indian Buddhist literature may be undertaken. It is a good example because the basic Indian material is clearly in ill-repair, and modification of the received text – and most of our passage is based upon a single manuscript – is so clearly necessary. It is simultaneously a bad example since (at least for me) so little real progress is possible at this point. Much of the following, therefore, draws attention to problems, without being able to resolve them convincingly.<sup>5</sup>

The passage I examine below is that numbered §§153-154 by Staël-Holstein (1926), the editor of the *editio princeps*, and concerns the “ship of the dharma,” *dharmanau/dharmanāvā*. The passage is structured as a metaphor: the ship of the teaching must be made ready by the bodhisattva – what is this ship like? Then follow a number of items, even the mere division of which is sometimes difficult. Our problems are multiplied by the evident fact that the true meaning of at least some of the items was unknown both to later translators (and in this the land-locked Tibetans appear to have had more trouble than the Chinese) and to those who copied and transmitted the Sanskrit text. As a consequence, some basic facts remain unclear. Just what type of craft is to be imagined here? Did it ply a river, or a sea? Was its

---

<sup>4</sup> See my brief remarks in Silk 2008.

<sup>5</sup> I try here, as everywhere, to be conscious of the message of Housman (clearly expressed in his 1922 essay, “The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism”), that emendation of a text is to be undertaken only with the utmost thought. It is plain, however, that the most complete Sanskrit manuscript of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* is a poor witness, in the sense that we can often be quite sure that its text is *not* correct. To suspect it of incorrectness is one thing; to be able to confidently suggest a solution is another. Frequently other evidence, that of translations and parallels, justifies such confidence. In cases such as that of the present passage where such supports are largely absent, particular humility is required, and we must be ready to admit that we are not yet able to suggest a likely solution in many cases.

hull of stitched design, or were the planks otherwise fastened together? (Was its hull even constructed of wooden planks?) Of what design were its sails? Our inability to answer such basic questions creates, in turn, difficulties in guessing – to call it anything more formal would be false – to what each specific reference points. We are likewise crippled by our ignorance of the ancient Indian vocabulary of sailing and ships, something relatively infrequently mentioned in Sanskrit texts.<sup>6</sup> It is disheartening to think that it may never be possible to understand completely the text studied here. While new materials may be able to improve the situation in the future, at present much remains tentative. The following, then, is meant as an essay at such an interpretation, and makes no claim to be more than that.

Mine is not the first modern attempt to understand this passage, which has naturally confronted all who rendered the scripture as a whole. Weller translated the entire text from Sanskrit and Tibetan (1965), and two of the three Chinese versions (Q and S, in 1964 and 1966), and his translations and notes are of great value. The translations of both Pāsādika (1979) and Nagao (1974) render the Sanskrit text (with some, usually implicit, reference to other versions). The *Kokuyaku Issaikyō* rendering of one of the Chinese versions, Q, in Nagai (1932: 217) is of some value, but I have not found the translation of Q in the *Treasury of Mahāyāna Sūtras*, Chang (1983), to be very useful.

Something is known of ancient Indian boats, but unfortunately for us, there is rather little correlation between visual and textual evidence, such that while we know about, for instance, stitched hull designs, we do not know how these were designated, what technical terms were employed when they were referred to. Moreover, while Pāli literature provides us a certain vocabulary, there is no assurance that this was the vocabulary known to the authors of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, and the text itself suggests that there is some significant difference between the traditions.

Although the edition of Staël-Holstein is generally very reliable, our knowledge of the Sanskrit text itself has improved of late. The available Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* have recently been carefully presented in a more or less diplomatic edition, with excellent color photographs of the leaves published in the same volume. I first cite these materials as provided in Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2002. I then present an edition of the Tibetan translation of the passage as found in the Tibetan Kanjur, based upon representative materials. Finally, I cite the Chinese translations. I then examine each item individually, and attempt to offer an English translation. In this process I do suggest some different readings and (I believe) necessary emendations of the Sanskrit text. (Essential suppletions, as in the edition, are given in italics but otherwise unmarked. Obvious corrections are given in bracketed italics. Geminated subscript *r* [as in *prrajñā*], a peculiarity of such Central Asian manuscripts, is ignored.) I have left the Song dynasty Chinese translation out of consideration in the following, since I am almost entirely unable to coordinate it with the other versions and it is, as usual, far from clear that its translators understood their source well.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup> See Hornell 1920 and Chaudhuri 1976, the weaknesses of which for our present purposes, however, are often all too evident.

<sup>7</sup> The reader who nevertheless wishes to consult it may make use of Weller's 1966 translation.

The basic materials are as follows:

Sanskrit:

St. Petersburg manuscript SI P/2, transcribed with photographs in Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2002.<sup>8</sup>

Turfan manuscript leaf 374 (K 751 [T III MQR]), transcribed with photographs in Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2002.<sup>9</sup> This covers only a small portion of the passage.

Tibetan:

The Tibetan translation is found in the Kanjur; I have used the following versions to edit the edition given below:

Derge Kanjur 87 <i>dkon brtsegs, cha</i> 149b1-150a1	[D]
Lithang Kanjur <i>dkon brtsegs, cha</i> 162a2-b3	[J]
London manuscript Kanjur <i>dkon brtsegs</i> 165a5-b6	[L]
Peking Kanjur 760 (43), <i>dkon brtsegs, 'i</i> 135a4-b6	[P]
sTog Palace Kanjur 11 (43) <i>dkon brtsegs, cha</i> 244b4-245b2	[S]
Tokyo manuscript Kanjur 74 at <i>dkon brtsegs, cha</i> 203a5-b8	[T]

Chinese:<sup>10</sup>

*Puming pusa hui* 普明菩薩會, translated in the Qin 秦 dynasty by an unknown translator. T. 310 (XI) 638b4-19 (*juan* 112). Noted below as Q.

*Dacheng baoyun jing* 大乘寶雲經, *juan* 7, the *Baoji pin* 寶積品, translated by \*Maṇḍalasena (Mantuoluoxian 曼陀羅仙) and \*Saṅghabhara (? Sengjiapoluo 僧伽婆羅). T. 659 (XVI) 283a4-19. Noted below as M.

§153

tatra samāntāloka kīḍṛṣe dharmanau bodhisatvasya samudānayatavyā iha samāntāloka bodhisatvena dharmanāvā samudānayatavyā yad uta sarvasamacittasambhārāḥ bhavaṃti anantapuṇyopacitā śīlaphalanirjātā dānaparivārālamkāraṃkṛtā : āśaya-dṛḍhasārabandhanasubaddhā : kṣāntisoratyasmṛtiśalyabaddhā : saptabodhyaṃgasambhāradṛḍhavīry[a]kuśaladharmadārusamudānitā dhyānacittakramaṇīyakarmaṇīkṛtā : dānt[a]śāntājāneyakuśalaśilpasuniṣṭhitā • atyaṃtākopyadharmamahākaraṇāsaṃgrhītā catuḥsaṃgrahavastuśūraturagavāhinī pratyarthikaprajñājnānasupratirakṣitā • upāyakuśalyasukṛtavicitā catubrahmavihārasuśodhitā •

Turfan manuscript leaf:

śī dharmavāvā • bodhisatvena samudānayatvā : yeyaṃ sarvvasatvasama[c]itta[tā] saṃ + + + /// [I] . . . <sup>1</sup> niryātā dhānaparivārālmkṛtā : āśayadr[ḍha]sā[ra](bandha)-[na]nibaddhā : kṣāmntisau .. .[y]. /// + + + + + [bh]āradṛḍhavīryakuśaladharmadhārusa[m](u)dhā[n]ī[tā • ] dhyānacittakarmanī[ya]karmaṇyākṛtā : dāntaśānt[t] . ///

1) It may be that we can read [aka] here.

<sup>8</sup>This is the manuscript first read by Staël-Holstein 1926, the relevant portion now in Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2002: 54-55, with plates 70-71 (folio 77r2-78r3).

<sup>9</sup>First published in Waldschmidt 1965: 165, then identified as a fragment of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* by Schlingloff in Sander and Waldschmidt 1980: 280. The relevant portion is now in Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2002: 64, with plate 78.

<sup>10</sup>Not included here is: *Dajiashe-wen da baoji zhengfa-jing* 大迦葉問大寶積正法經, translated by \*Dānapāla (Shihu 施護) (Song 宋 dynasty). T. 352 (XII) 215c22-216a6 (*juan* 5).

## §154

catusmr̥tyupasthānasucintitakāyopanītā • samyakprahāṇaprasaṭhā riddhipādajava-javitā • indriyasunirīkṣitadānavakravigat[ā] balavegasamudgatā antareṇa śīthila bodhyaṅgavibodhan. ariśatrumārapathajahanī mānokramavāhinī • kuṭīrthyatīrthajahanī • śamathaniddhyaptinirdiṣṭā • vipaśyanāprayogā • ubhayaor antayor asaktavāhinī • hetudharmayuktā vipulavistīrṇākṣayaprahāṇābandhā vighuṣṭaśabdā daśasu dikṣu śabdāṃ ādāyaty āgacchatāgacchatābhiruta mahādharmanāvāṃ nirvāṇapurgāminī • kṣemamārgagāminī • ma .[ā] + matīra satkāyadṛṣṭimjahanī • pārimatīragāminī laghusarvadṛṣṭigatavigatā •

Tibetan:<sup>11</sup>

## §153

| kun tu snang ba de la byang chub sems dpas dam pa'i chos kyi gru chen po sbyar bar bya ba de ci<sup>1</sup> 'dra zhe na | 'di lta ste | sems can thams cad la sems mnyam pa nyid de bsod nams kyi tshogs mtha' yas pa bsags pa | tshul khrims kyi snam gyis<sup>2</sup> sbyar ba | sbyin pa'i 'khor gyi rgyan gyis brgyan pa | bsam pa dang lhag pa'i bsam pa'i bcings<sup>3</sup> ba sra bas dam por sbrel ba | bzod pa dang des pa dang dran pa'i sbyor<sup>4</sup> kas<sup>5</sup> legs par sbyar ba | byang chub kyi yan lag bdun gyi tshogs can | brtson 'grus brtan pa dang | dge ba'i chos kyi shing gis yang dag par sbyar ba | bsam gtan gyi sems kyis<sup>6</sup> las su rung bar byas pa | dul ba dang | zhi ba dang | cang shes kyi dge ba'i bzos legs par zin par byas pa | shin tu mi 'khrugs pa'i chos can | snying rje chen pos yang dag par zin pa | bsdu ba'i dngos po bzhi<sup>7</sup> dang | dpa' bar 'gro bas bsar<sup>8</sup> ba | shes rab dang ye shes kyis<sup>6</sup> phyir rgol ba legs par bsrungs pa | thabs mkhas pas rnam par bsags pa legs par byas pa | tshangs pa'i gnas pa bzhis legs par yongs su sbyangs pa |

- 1) L med cing *for* de ci 2) L gyi 3) DJLS bcings 4) ST + ba 5) LST khas 6) T kyi 7) DJL *omit* bzhi 8) DJ bstar, L gsar, P sbyar

## § 154

dran pa nye bar gzhang pa bzhis<sup>1</sup> legs par rnam par bsams pa'i lus kyis<sup>2</sup> bsten pa | yang dag par<sup>3</sup> spong bas 'gro ba | rdzu 'phrul gyi rkang pa'i<sup>4</sup> mgyogs<sup>5</sup> pa'i shugs dang ldan pa | dbang pos legs par brtags pas lta ba ngan pa'i shing yon po med pa | stobs kyi shugs yang dag par 'byung bas bar shag shig med pa |<sup>6</sup> byang chub kyi yan lag gis 'gro ba rnam par dag pa | bcugs<sup>7</sup> can dgra nyon mongs pa'i bdud kyi lam 'dor bar byed pa | lam du 'jug par byed pa | pha rol gyi ngogs su phyin par byed pa | mu stegs can ngan pa'i mu stegs 'dor bar byed pa | zhi gnas kyi nges par sems pa bstan<sup>8</sup> pa | lhag mthong gis sbyor ba mtha' gnyis la ma chags par 'jug pa | rgyu'i chos dang yang dag par ldan pa | sgra grags pa yangs shing rgya che la mi zad cing tshad med pa tshur shog | dam pa'i chos kyi gru chen po mya ngan las 'das pa'i grong khyer du 'gro ba | bde bar 'gro ba | 'jigs pa med par 'gro ba | lam du 'gro ba | 'jig tshogs la lta ba 'dor bar zhugs la tshu rol gyi 'gram nas pha rol gyi 'gram<sup>9</sup> du lta ba thams cad sel ba | gtse ba med pa'i mya ngan las 'das par myur du song shig ces phyogs bcur sgras go bar byed pa ste |

- 1) PST bzhi 2) DS kyi 3) DJLT pa'i 4) PT pa 5) PT 'gyogs 6) LT par *for* pa | 7) DP gtsugs 8) D brtan 9) P 'dram; S *omits* gyi 'gram

<sup>11</sup> Only meaningful variants are listed.

Q §153<sup>12</sup>

云何菩薩所習法船謂平等心一切衆生爲船因緣習無量福以爲牢厚清淨戒板行施及果以爲莊嚴淨心佛道爲諸材木一切福德以爲具足堅固繫縛忍辱柔軟憶念爲釘諸菩提分堅強精進最上妙善法林中出不可思議無量禪定福德業成善寂調心以爲師匠畢竟不壞大悲所攝以四攝法廣度致遠以智慧力防諸怨賊善方便力種種合集四大梵行以爲端嚴

## § 154

四正念處爲金樓觀四正勤行四如意足以爲疾風五根善察離諸曲惡五力強浮七覺覺悟能破魔賊入八真正道隨意到岸離外道濟止爲調御觀爲利益不著二邊有因緣法以爲安隱大乘廣博無盡辯才廣布名聞能濟十方一切衆生而自唱言來上法船從安隱道至於涅槃度身見岸至佛道岸離一切見

## M §153

云何菩薩習於法船謂平等心於諸衆生爲船因緣習無量善以爲牢厚清淨戒行以爲坂障布施及果以爲裝飾信心佛道爲諸林木一切福德以爲校具慈悲喜捨堅固繫縛忍辱柔軟憶念爲釘諸菩提分堅強精進最上妙善諸法林中出生如是不可思議無量禪定功德業慧善寂調心以爲師匠畢竟不壞大悲所攝以四攝法廣度致遠以智慧刀防諸惡賊善權方便種種諸法合集奉行以爲裝飾

## § 154

四正念處以爲樓櫓四正勤行以爲人力四如意足以爲疾風五根善察以爲船師五力強壯以爲防備七覺覺悟能破魔賊八直正道隨意到彼離外道法止爲調御觀爲利益不著二邊有因緣法甚爲安隱大乘廣博無盡辯才廣布名聞能濟十方一切群品而自唱言汝等當來上我法船從安隱道得至涅槃度於斷常到無爲岸

— \* —

The prefatory matter begins:

**“In that regard, Samantāloka, of what sort is the ship of the teachings which the bodhisattva must make ready? Here, Samantāloka, the bodhisattva must make ready a ship of the teachings which is ...”**

– and then we find our list of items, as follows:

0-1) sarva<satva>samacittasambhārā<sup>1</sup> bhavati<sup>2</sup> anantapuṇyopacitā

1) MS: °bhārāḥ 2) MS: bhavanti, due to misunderstanding the preceding as plural?

sems can thams cad la sems mnyam pa nyid de bsod nams kyi tshogs mtha’ yas pa bsags pa

Q 平等心一切衆生爲船因緣。習無量福以爲牢厚

M 平等心於諸衆生爲船因緣。習無量善以爲牢厚

<sup>12</sup>I do not punctuate these passages in order not to prejudice the evidence. In treating individual items below, I introduce punctuation. For Q readings have been checked against the Fangshan canon; M is the text printed in the Taishō edition.

The main terms are in the fem. sing. nom., in apposition to *dharmanāvā*. Therefore, the entire series should be taken in the form: The ship of the teachings is: 1) -- 2) -- etc. The list begins here with a general item, referring to the provisions of the boat, *sambhāra*, a word which is simultaneously a technical term referring to the ‘supplies’ a bodhisattva takes along in his quest to save all beings. For this reason, and others to be discussed below, and despite the interpretation suggested by the Tibetan translation, we should understand two terms here, a general item 0, followed by the true first item in the list, item 1.

The word *satva*, missing in the St. Petersburg manuscript, is found in the Turfan fragment and supported by the Tibetan *sems can* and Chinese Q 一切衆生 and M 諸衆生. I presume its absence from the St. Petersburg manuscript to be an error, although the possibility exists that this is a recensional difference. But setting this aside, if we assume that we have here a single expression, there are serious syntactic problems: what, indeed, is the relation between *sarvasatvasamacittasambhārā* and *anantapuṇyopacitā*? Weller declined to translate the Sanskrit, but did render the Tibetan, which has apparently a quite different logic than the Sanskrit, since Tibetan *bsod nams kyi tshogs* seems to assume *\*puṇyasambhāra*, a term found elsewhere in KP, in §20.<sup>13</sup> Weller translated: “Es ist ausgerüstet mit einer unendlichen Fülle [religiösen] Verdienstes, wobei die Gesinnung gegen alle Wesen gleich ist.” Nagao renders: “あらゆる(衆生)に対する平等な心という積荷, すなわち無量の徳の集積を積荷とし.” The Tibetan might be understood as: “[The boat] is laden with endless provisions of merit which are equalmindedness toward all beings.”

The Chinese translations suggest a different understanding. Chinese 因縁 has a grammatical function, usually reflecting something like *hetu*, as in item 26 in this listing, below, therefore “reason, cause”. Chinese *láohòu* 牢厚 (literally ‘firm and thick’) seems to appear only two other times in the entire Chinese Buddhist canon (T. 193 [IV] 55a6 and T. 1440 [XXIII] 545a12). Its meaning as a technical term of ships is not known to me, nor is its relation to the Indic text clear, but a speculation such as ‘load’ seems not impossible. The Chinese translations take *anantapuṇyopacitā* as a separate item, which further suggests that *láohòu* 牢厚 corresponds somehow to *upacita*.

KYIK renders Q: 平等心もて、一切衆生に船と爲る因縁は、無量の福を習うて以て牢厚を爲し. Weller offered: “Die gleiche Gesinnung (gegen) alle Lebenden ist der Grund (für) das Boot,” and attached the next sentence to the following item 2, for which see below. Perhaps both Q and M may be understood more or less as: “Equalmindedness toward all beings is the cause/motivation of the ship. Cultivating endless merit is its *láohòu*,” the final term unfortunately remaining unclear.

In light of the Chinese parallelism with the Indic text, it might be possible to translate the latter as follows:

<sup>13</sup> In that paragraph Q has the apparently corresponding 福德莊嚴, while M has 福德行業, neither of which is clear to me as a rendering of this term. *Puṇya* rendered 福德 is common, but 莊嚴 usually renders terms such as *alamkāra* or *śobha*; 行業 is attested as a translation of *karma*, but apparently not as *sambhāra*.

“[The boat] comes to be provisioned with equalmindedness toward all beings; it is loaded with endless merit.”

- 2) śīlaphala<ka>nirjātā  
 tshul khirms kyi snam gyis sbyar pa  
 Q 清淨戒板 \_ \_ \_ \_ (?)  
 M 清淨戒行以爲坂障

The Turfan fragment has here /// [l] . .. niryāta. I propose to read (*śīlapha*)l(*aka*), of which I believe some trace of the *ka* can be detected on the fragment, and of which the vowel seems consistent. I see the *phala* written in the St. Peterburg manuscript as most likely an error.<sup>14</sup> We should note, however, that *phala* is cited as equivalent to *phalaka* in *Amarakośa* II.8.90, and therefore it may be that both forms should be regarded as possible. To this corresponds Chinese Q *bǎn* 板 and M *bǎnzhàng* 坂障, both of which mean ‘plank.’ Another possibility, however, is that *phalaka* is to be taken in its sense of ‘bark,’ such as that used for garments, which may perhaps serve as the skin of a vessel. In this way *phalaka* as bark would be functionally equivalent to the planks (*phalaka*) which form the hull of the vessel.

As for the participle, Edgerton (1953 s.v. *nirjāta*, *niryāta*) discusses the verb form which in SI P/2 is *nirjāta*, and which the Turfan fragment has as *niryāta*. The sense of *nirjāta* suggested by Edgerton, ‘produced,’ seems apt.

In the Tibetan translation, although *snam* usually has a sense like *snam bu*, ‘woolen cloth,’ it can also mean *stegs* or *lan kan*,<sup>15</sup> the former of which has the meaning of a ‘board’, the latter ‘railing’. The verb *sbyar pa* may mean ‘joined together’ – note that this corresponds to Indic *baddha* in item 5 below (though *sbyar bar bya ba* also renders *samudānaitavya* in the beginning of this passage). A boat joined together by planks produces a fine meaning, but how might this correspond to the Sanskrit text?

Weller in translating Q took the clause I understand as item 1, 習無量福以爲牢厚, together with this one as follows: “Sich in unendlichem Verdienstlichen zu üben, damit macht man die festen Planken der reinen Sittengebote.” KYIK, on the other hand, attaches this to what follows, 行施及果以爲莊嚴, to produce: 清淨なる戒板に行施及び果をば莊嚴と爲し. At least from the perspective of the putative Indic original, both of these solutions are most unlikely, if not impossible. It appears to me that these attempts fail because the text of Q is defective here. Nothing corresponding to M’s syntactically very clear 以爲坂障 is found in Q. M reads 清淨戒行以爲坂障, while Q has only 清淨戒板, immediately followed by 行施及果以爲莊嚴, which clearly corresponds to the following item in the Indic text. M should be understood

<sup>14</sup>For *phalaka* as a plank out of which a ship’s hull is made, among many examples see for instance the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (Wogihara 1932-1935: 584.21-23): *tadyathāpi nāma subhūte mahāsamudragatāyām nāvi bhinnāyām ye tatra kāṣṭham vā na grhṇanti phalakam vā mṛtaśarīram vā nādhyāmbante veditavyam etat aprāptā evaite pāram udake kālam kariṣyantīti* = Derge Kanjur 12, *shes phyin, ka*, 159a1-2: *rab ’byor ’di lta ste dper na rgya mtso chen por zhugs pa’i gru chag pa na gang dag der shing dam spang leb la mi ’dzin tam shi ba’i ro la mi ’jun rab ’byor de ni chu’i pha rol gyi ’gram du ma phyin par chu’i nang du ’chi ba’i dus byed par ’gyur ro zhes rig par bya’o* ||. Here *phalaka* = *spang leb*; the same equivalent is found in the *Suvarṇavarṇāvadāna* (Simon 1979: 336). For additional references see Schlingloff 1988: 209 n. 16, 210 n. 40.

<sup>15</sup>Btsan lha Ngag dbang tshul khirms 1997 s.v.

as “The pure precepts are its planks.” For *jièxíng* 戒行 as *śīla* in M, see §137, while in §135 Q also uses the same term to render *śīla*. It is possible that a haplography has occurred here thanks to the *xíng* 行 which begins the next item, 行施及果以爲莊嚴. This, however, would not explain the presence of *bǎn* 板 in Q.

Weller’s translation of Sanskrit runs: “Es ist hervorgegangen aus der Frucht der Moral,” discussing in a note the question of how to take *phala*. Wondering if a double meaning is possible, he suggests: “Es ist zum Vorschein gekommen, oder tibetisch: es ist zusammengefügt, bereitet mit Planken, als welche die Frucht der Moral sind.” Nagao, I believe wrongly, has: “戒という板で(屋根を)組み上げ.”

**“One made of planks which are the precepts.”**

- 3) *dānaparivārālaṅkāraṅkṛtā*  
 sbyin pa’i ’khor gyi rgyan gyis brgyan pa  
 Q 行施及果以爲莊嚴  
 M 布施及果以爲裝飾

I mentioned above the general principle that, if we can determine ancient translators to have had before them the same readings that we have, we would be wise to follow their guidance in understanding those readings, in light of the obvious greater familiarity and access to tradition possessed by those ancient authorities. But they may also be wrong, so our loyalty to them must not be thoughtless. In the present instance, I believe that we encounter an old and remarkable misunderstanding. The compound *dānaparivārālaṅkāraṅkṛtā* is taken by the Chinese and Tibetan translators (as well as modern translators) as containing *alaṅkāra*, ‘ornament’, a very common term, and one that is possible in context – a ship might well be ornamented (*alaṅkṛta*). However, this understanding is certainly incorrect. Rather, the term in question is without doubt a technical term of ships, *la(m)kāra*, ‘sail,’ or according to Schlingloff, “the rigging as a whole,” a term which, while apparently otherwise unknown in Sanskrit, is well attested in (post-canonical) Pāli.<sup>16</sup> It appears for instance in the following passage from the *Visuddhimagga*:<sup>17</sup>

*yathā ca accheko niyyāmakko balavavāte laṅkāraṃ pūrento nāvāṃ videsaṃ pakkhandāpeti. aparo accheko mandavāte laṅkāraṃ oropento nāvāṃ tatth’ eva ṭhapeti. cheko pana mandavāte pūretvā balavavāte adḍhalaṅkāraṃ pūretvā sothinā icchitaṭṭhānaṃ pāpuṇāti.*

Again, a too clever skipper hoists full *sails* in a high wind and sends his ship adrift, and another, not clever enough, skipper lowers his *sails* in a light wind and remains where he is, but a clever skipper hoists full sails in a light wind, takes in half his *sails* in a high wind and so arrives safely at his desired destination.<sup>18</sup>

There is probably a very good reason that this meaning of the term *la(m)kāra* has not been located in Sanskrit: it is all too easy to confuse it with *alaṅkāra*. Given the

<sup>16</sup> Schlingloff 1988: 198, 1982: 53 “Besegelung.” Probably the reason for seeing here a sense such as ‘rigging’ rather than ‘sail’ is that several more specific words for ‘sail’ exist. The term has given rise to some disagreement about its exact referent, with early suggestions including ‘anchor.’ Perhaps the first to point out the correct meaning of the word was De 1907. The issue has been treated in detail by Haebler 1965.

<sup>17</sup> Warren and Kosambi 1950: 111.1-4

<sup>18</sup> Nyānamoli 1976: I. 141.

sense of *lamkāra* here, one might wonder whether the participle *alamkṛta* should be given some special sense, such as ‘hoisted sail’ or ‘rigged,’ but I know of no evidence for this. Rather, it seems more likely that the punning similarity between *lamkāra* and *alamkāra* led the authors to use the participle *alamkṛta* here. (Or should we instead understand an otherwise unattested \**ā-la[m]kṛta*?)

Another issue here is the exact sense of *parivāra*. Nagao has: “布施とそれに伴うもの(結果)という飾りによって飾られ。” This probably follows QM, which have “... which are giving and its [accompanying] fruits.” In Tibetan *sbyin pa'i 'khor*, the genitive suggests “accompaniment[s] of giving.” Weller takes the Tibetan as follows: “es ist geschmückt mit dem Schmucke einer Gefolgschaft von Gaben.” He renders Q: “Gaben zu spenden und dessen Frucht, damit macht man seinen Schmuck.”

**“One adorned/rigged with sails/rigging which are giving and its concomitants.”**

- 4) *āśayadṛḍhasārabandhanasubaddhā* [Turfan °*nibaddhā*]  
*bsam pa dang lhag pa'i bsam pa'i bcing[s] pa sra bas dam por sbrel ba*  
 Q 淨心佛道爲諸材木。一切福德以爲具足堅固繫縛  
 M 信心佛道爲諸林木。一切福德以爲校具<sup>1</sup>堅固繫縛  
 1) M adds 慈悲喜捨 here, which is an intrusion; see below

Tib. may suggest two items: \**āśayādhyāśayabandha[na]* and \**dṛḍhasāranibaddha*. There is no question that *bsam pa dang lhag pa'i bsam pa* represents *āśayādhyāśaya*, and very little that *bcing[s] pa* renders *bandha[na]*, as it does in KP §125. However, *sra ba* in Mhy. §3372 renders *dṛḍha*, but in §5160 *sāra*. While KP §23 has *dṛḍhādhyāśayatayā = lhag pa'i bsam pa brtan pa*,<sup>19</sup> this in no way proves that here *sra ba* should be *sāra*. In KP §112 *'ching ba dam po = gāḍhabandhana* where it is clear that *dam po = gāḍha*, *'ching ba = bandhana*. Tib. *sbrel ba* rather seems to support the Turfan reading of *nibaddha*, to judge by examples in the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* and *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*.<sup>20</sup> Weller’s “Es ist gut zusammengebunden mit den festen Tauen des Wollens und der Geneigtheit” translates his reconstruction of the Tibetan, namely: *āśayādhyāśayadṛḍhabandhanasubaddhā*. He takes the Sanskrit in the sense of “es ist gut zusammengebunden mit den Banden fester Festigkeit (?) des Wollens.” Nagao: (さとりの)不屈の意欲という強固な綱によって固く縛りつけられ。

The Chinese translations also suggest that we have two items here. Regarding 淨心佛道 and 信心佛道, note that in KP §23 M’s 深樂佛道心地堅固 and Q’s mere 深樂佛道 correspond to Sanskrit *dṛḍhāśaya*. However, in §14 Q’s 佛道 renders *bodhi-mārga*. 淨心 and 信心 may represent (*adhy*)*āśaya*, as at least the former does elsewhere. What 材木/林木 (readings so similar graphically as to be easily confused) could be doing here is hard to say, unless *sāra* was read \**dāru*, which is not very

<sup>19</sup> Cp. *Ratnagotravibhāga* Johnston 1950: 2,4-7 = Derge Tanjur, *sems tsaṃ, phi* 74b6-7; *dṛḍhādhyāśaya = lhag pa'i bsam pa bstan pa*. Johnston 1950: 50,16-18 = Derge Tanjur, *sems tsaṃ, phi* 101b5-7; *dṛḍhayādhyāśaya = lhag pa'i bsam pa brten pa*.

<sup>20</sup> *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* II.9(5) in Study Group 2006: 17, Tib. in Ōshika 1970: 21.16 = *vinibaddha*; *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, Tib. index (Hirakawa 1978) 197a = *nibaddha*.

likely. Weller understood Q as follows: “Reines Herz (und) der Weg (oder die Erleuchtung) Buddhas sind die Bauhölzer.” This is possible if we do not understand 佛道 to somehow reflect *āśaya*. KYIK: 淨心の佛道を諸の材木と爲し。

The second item in Q is 一切福德以爲具足堅固繫縛, which Weller translates: “Alles (für das Heil) Verdienstliche, damit macht man vollkommen feste Taue.” He comments in a note: “I punctuate slightly differently than in Baron von Staël-Holstein’s edition, since *āśayadṛḍhasārab[andha]nasubaddhāḥ* is surely to be put together with this expression. The meritorious = 福德 = *puṇya* as is customary. Completed = 具足 = *sampanna*. Perhaps here the term also means completed.” KYIK takes Q as follows: 一切の福德にて以て具足して堅固に繫縛することを爲し.<sup>21</sup> In both Q and M, 一切福德 looks like it might refer to something that came earlier, *ananta-puṇyopacitā*. However, elsewhere (Q §15, 16, 29, 155 – in all these places M has 功德) 福德 appears to render not *puṇya* but rather *guṇa*. It is therefore interesting to notice that the basic meaning of Indic *guṇa* is string, cord, and thus rope, line, hal-yard or some similar word for a rope used on a ship. Is it possible that there was some such double sense of *guṇa* intended here?

M as transmitted reads: 一切福德以爲校具慈悲喜捨堅固繫縛. Here 慈悲喜捨, generally equivalent to the set of *maitrī*, *karuṇā*, *muditā*, and *upekṣā*, is without doubt an intrusion. Q has 一切福德以爲具足堅固繫縛. If we omit the 4 characters in M we get: 一切福德以爲校具堅固繫縛, in which the difference from Q is merely the nearly trivial variant of Q’s 具足 to M’s 校具. See below in item 13 for one possibility of what to do with these four errant characters.

**“One fastened tight with strong and firm ties which are the intention [of the bodhisattva to save beings].”<sup>22</sup>**

- 5) kṣāntisoratyasmṛtiśalyabaddhā  
 bzod pa dang des pa dang dran pa’i sbyor kas<sup>1</sup> legs par sbyar ba  
 QM 忍辱、柔軟、憶念爲釘  
 1) v.l. khas

Edgerton (BHSD s.v. *śalya*) defines *śalya* as “ship’s cable, hawser,” translating our passage here: “(the ‘ship of the Doctrine’) that is moored (made fast) by the ropes of kṣānti, sauratya and smṛti.” He goes on to suggest:

Pali *salla* in a similar sense should be recognized in Therīg. 347 *kāmā* . . . *sallabandhanā*, desires which bind with cables (the usual meaning of *salla*, tho adopted in PTSD and Mrs. Rhys Davids’ transl., clearly makes no sense); comm. 242.7 *rāgādīnaṃ sallānaṃ bandhanato sallabandhanā* (tatp., not dvandva; and if *rāgādi* could be called arrows or spears, kṣānti etc. of KP could not!).

I do not agree. Regarding the Pāli case, I. B. Horner has observed that *salla* is frequently found in its usual sense of “arrow, dart” in conjunction with *bandhana*, e.g., five types of *salla* and five *cetaso vinibandhā* are listed at *Vibhaṅga* 377.<sup>23</sup> *Therīgāthā* 347, to which Edgerton refers, reads (Oldenberg and Pischel 1883):

<sup>21</sup> Chang 1983 has weakly: “its strong riggings are all kinds of virtues.”

<sup>22</sup> The addition in brackets is a guess, not supported by any version of KP.

<sup>23</sup> Norman 1971: 133, s.v. §347.

*na hiraññasuvaṇṇena parikkhīyanti āsavā |  
amittā vadhakā kāmā sapattā sallabandhanā ||*

I would modify Norman’s rendering (1971) as follows: “The outflows do not diminish because of gold, coined or uncoined; sensual pleasures are enemies, murderers, hostile, binding one as if with pins.” I do not think anything in this understanding is contradicted by the commentary’s *rāgādīnaṃ sallānaṃ bandhanato sallabandhanā*, which indeed simply indicates the proper analysis of the compound and offers no hint as to the nature of the *salla* in question. Moreover, I do not agree with Edgerton that *kṣānti* and the rest could not be called “pegs” in the sense of the key pins or lynchpins which hold together the rest of the practice.

I do not see how *śalya* can mean anything other than arrow, dart or the like; these are the meanings recognized in Sanskrit (Böhtlingk and Roth 1855–1875) and Indic generally (Turner 1966). Moreover, what we know of Indian shipbuilding supports this idea. The planks of the hull of a popular type of vessel were attached together with pegs.<sup>24</sup> We do not know what these were called in Sanskrit, but *śalya* seems a good candidate. However, equally, *śalya* cannot be ‘nail’ since Indian boats were not constructed with nails until a period later than that in which the KP was composed.<sup>25</sup>

In the Tibetan translation, *sbyor ka/kha* is defined by Zhang 1985 as a seam or gap fixed together with glue etc. This is interesting since this technique of joining the planks of a boat is also well known in India.

Weller translated the Sanskrit as: “Es ist zusammengehalten durch die Bolzen der Nachsicht, der Milde, und der Besonnenheit,” and Nagao: 忍耐と柔和と注意深いこととの(三つ)の釘をもって結着され. I agree with these understandings.

As for the Chinese, Weller rendered Q: “Nachsicht, Milde, Besonnenheit sind die Bolzen.” As he points out, at least the Chinese word *dīng* 釘 may indicate a kind of pin or peg (Zapfen) or a sort of double (x-shaped) wedge used to attach two boards together. Both Chinese versions might be rendered: “The firm fastening/fasteners of patience, gentleness and mindfulness are the nails.”

**“One fastened by pegs of patience, gentleness and mindfulness.”**

- 6) *saptabodhyaṃgasambhāradṛḍhāvīryakuśaladharmadārusamudānitā*<sup>1</sup>  
byang chub kyi yan lag bdun gyi tshogs can | brtson ’grus brtan pa dang | dge  
ba’i chos kyi shing gis yang dag par sbyar ba  
Q 諸菩提分堅強精進。最上妙善法林中出  
M 諸菩提分堅強精進。最上妙善諸法林中出生  
1) MS w.r. °viryā°

Some things are quite clear here, others equally unclear. The word *saptabodhyaṃga* is rendered in Tibetan *byang chub kyi yan lag bdun* and both Q and M as 諸菩提分. However, while the following Sanskrit *sambhāra* is rendered in Tibetan *tshogs*, it does not appear in QM. Sanskrit *ṛḍhāvīrya* is rendered *brtson ’grus brtan pa* and

<sup>24</sup> Varadarajan 1995: 169, and figs. 1-3.

<sup>25</sup> Varadarajan 1995: 174.

堅強精進, while *kuśaladharmadāru* is *dge ba'i chos kyi shing* and 最上妙善(諸)法林. A difficulty comes with the final *samudānita*, *yang dag par sbyar ba*, 出(生). Edgerton (BHSD s.v. *samudānaya* 5) cites a number of examples of the word in the sense of 'prepares, makes ready' a boat. But the Chinese translation here is impossible to understand in this sense. Is it possible that 出(生) reflects instead the reading *\*samudgata*?

Weller renders the Sanskrit: "Es ist hergestellt aus dem Holze der heilsamen Momente, fester Energie, und besitzt das Zubehör der sieben zur Erleuchtung notwendigen Glieder," while Nagao has: さとりへの七つの因子(七覚支)を資材とする、すなわち堅忍不拔の精進やもろもろの善を木材として組み立てられている。

Weller rendered Q: "Inmitten des Waldes der Bodhteile, fester Energie, der allerhöchsten Momente des Heilsamen ist es entstanden." KYIK has Q as: 諸の菩提分を、堅強なる精進もて最上妙善の法林中より出し。

**"One provisioned with the seven limbs of awakening, made ready with the timbers of firm energy and good qualities."**

- 7) *dhyānacittakarmaṇīyakarmaṇīkṛtā*  
 bsam gtan gyi sems kyi las su rung bar byas pa  
 Q 不可思議無量禪定福德業成  
 M 如是不可思議無量禪定功德業慧

It is tempting either to emend *°karmaṇīkṛtā* to *°kramaṇīkṛtā*, or *°kramaṇīya°* (note the dental *n*!) to *°karmaṇīya°*. However, these are not equal options: not only do both manuscripts support *karma* (with *karmaṇīkṛtā* and *karmaṇyākṛta*, respectively), Tibetan has *las su* and Chinese has 業 (although I do not understand M's 業慧 alongside Q's 業成). Moreover, the term *karmaṇīya* is well known. As Edgerton points out (BHSD s.v. *karmaṇīya*), this word, the Pāli equivalent of which is *kammaniya*, is frequently an epithet of *citta*. The word means "capable of work," or "ready or fit for use," meanings which fit well. This strongly suggests that the correction *°kramaṇīya°* to *°karmaṇīya°* is the better one.

Weller rendered the Sanskrit: "Es ist für seine Fahrt tüchtig gemacht durch den Gedanken der Versunkenheit," and Nagao: それはまた、禪定はいった心によって巧みに運航するように設計されており。Pāsādikā suggests "made navigable."

Both Chinese versions seem to reflect *\*acintya-aprameya-*(see §20 for the latter)-*dhyāna-karma-*. M's 如是 = *\*evam*? Weller renders Q: "(Durch das) Verdienst undenkbar, unermesslichen Dhyānas ist das Werk vollendet." KYIK connects part of this with the following: 不可思議無量なる禪定にて、福德の業成じて善く心を寂調せるをば、以て師匠と爲し, though this is impossible from the point of view of the Indic text. Chang has the same: "Its builders are the infinite, inconceivable dhyānas and the tranquil, well-subdued mind resulting from one's meritorious deeds." How the Chinese versions might be related to the available Indic text remains unclear to me.

I would emend the Indic text to *\*dhyānacittakarmaṇīyakarmaṇīkṛtā*, and speculatively translate:

**“One made ready for use with a mind made flexible (pliable, ready for use) by meditative trance.”**

- 8) *dāntaśāntājāneyakuśalaśilpasuniṣṭhītā*<sup>1</sup>  
 dul ba dang | zhi ba dang | cang shes kyi dge ba'i bzos legs par zin par byas pa  
 QM 善寂調心以爲師匠

1) MS w.r. *dāntā*<sup>o</sup>. See Weller 1964: 804 155 n. 12; 1965: 154 (6).

The Sanskrit is a bit hard to understand, and the translations not entirely clear. Is the *shījiàng* 師匠 of QM the master carpenter who builds the ship, or the architect who designs the ship? Tibetan *bzo* may suggest the former; shall we then read the Indic text as *śilpi*? (Although the top of the akṣara is actually cut off on the leaf, I agree with the editors that the vowel is almost certainly not *i*, and thus to read so would be to offer an emendation.)

Weller translated: “Es ist gut fertiggestellt durch die Kunstfertigkeit im Heilsamen der Bezähmten, Beruhigten, Rassigen.” Nagao: (心の) 自制・静安・高貴さ(の諸徳) というすぐれた技術によって完成され. Weller rendered Q: “Das gut beruhigte, bezähmte Herz, das macht man zum Hauptzimmermann.” I would rather understand the Chinese: “Excellent calm and a controlled mind are its architect,” and I tentatively follow this as a guide to understanding the Sanskrit.

**“One well-fitted by a skilled architect with training, calming and noble-blooded behavior.”**

- 9) *atyantākopyadharmamahākaruṇāsamgrhītā*  
 shin tu mi 'khrugs pa'i chos can | snying rje chen pos yang dag par zin pa  
 QM 畢竟不壞大悲所攝

Both Weller and Nagao understand two items here. Weller: “Es besitzt die Eigenschaft unendlich ruhiger Fahrt. Es ist gut gelenkt durch großes Mitleid.” He suggests that the Tibetan of the first item should be understood: “Es besitzt die Eigenschaft, daß es nicht sehr in Unruhe versetzt werden kann.” Nagao: まったく動揺することのない性質のものである。大きな仏陀の悲愛によって包まれ. This would require reading *\*atyantākopyadharmā*. It is not clear whether Nagao intends the second clause to go with the following item. An argument against this division of the item into two, aside from the (admittedly trivial) emendation it would require, is that most – though not all – of the parallel items end in a past passive participle. (The Kanjur editions of Derge, Litang and Tokyo omit the *shad* between *can* and *snying*, though this is in no way probative.)

My inclination is to take the Chinese, however, as suggesting a single item. Weller so understood Q: “(Durch) unter keinen Umständen zerstörbares großes Mitleid ist es sorgfältig zubereitet.” KYIK has the same: 畢竟じて壊れざる大悲の攝むる所として.

As Hara 2005 has demonstrated in detail, Pāli and Buddhist Sanskrit have preserved a sense of the root  $\sqrt{kup}$  retaining its Vedic sense of ‘quake,’ and unrelated to its Classical sense of ‘anger’. As Hara states, this is particularly clear when the word is negated. Sanskrit *akopya* has its Pāli equivalent in *akuppa*, and both are well known

in compound with *dharmā/dhammā*, having a sense something like ‘of unshakable nature’. In our passage the reference is both to the nature of the ship of the teachings, metaphorically, and also to the sea-worthiness of the craft, which is extremely stable in the water.

**“One held together by a great compassion whose nature is extremely steadfast.”**

- 10) *catuḥsaṃgrahavastuśūratuṛagavāhinī*  
 bsdu ba’i dngos po bzhi dang | dpa’ bar ’gro bas bsar<sup>1</sup> pa  
 QM 以四攝法廣度致遠  
 1) DJ bstar, L gsar, P sbyar

The latter portion of the Tibetan translation is not clear. The expression *dpa’ bar ’gro ba* can render *śūraṅgama*, while the Sanskrit manuscript reads *śūratuṛaga*. The Tibetan verb is not clear, and is variously read by different editions of the Kanjur. It is not at all obvious that *bsar* is the correct reading (if so it would mean ‘arrange,’ ‘prepare’; the variant *gsar*, ‘young,’ is totally out of the question), and both *bstar* and *sbyar* have some sense of ‘attach,’ ‘fasten.’ But since this is so common in the listing, it might well be a *lectio facilior*. How this might be related to *vāhinī* is unclear. Chinese does not help us much here, save that there is clearly no reference to either horses (*tuṛaga*) or heroic progress (*śūraṅgama*).

Weller understood the Sanskrit: “Es fährt wie ein mutiges Roß durch die vier Mittel [, die Wesen bei der Lehre Buddhas] festzuhalten.” Nagao: 人々を包容し導く四つの事柄(四摂事)によって、強健な駿馬のように(速く)進み.

Weller rendered Q: “Durch die vier Mittel, (die Lebenden) bei Buddhas Lehre zu halten, setzt es (sie) in seiner Breite über (den Ozean des Leides) und läßt die Ferne erreichen.” I understand QM as: “It transports beings far away with the four articles of attraction.”

With more than usual hesitation I offer:

**“One proceeding along with the four articles of attraction as heroic horses [convey along a carriage].”**

- 11) *pratyaṅgikaprajñājñānasupratirakṣitā*  
 shes rab dang ye shes kyis phyir rgol ba legs par bsrungs pa  
 Q 以智慧力防諸怨賊  
 M 以智慧力防諸惡賊

This item requires no particular discussion:

**“One well-protected against foes by wisdom and knowledge.”**

- 12) *upāyakaśalyasukṛtavicitā*  
 thabs mkhas pas rnam par bsags pa legs par byas pa  
 Q 善方便力種種合集  
 M 善權方便種種諸法合集奉行

The key problem here is the sense of *sukṛtavicitā*. Weller, while saying “My German translation is totally uncertain,” offers: “Es ist gut gemachte Stapelung habend durch die Geschicklichkeit in der [zur Belehrung und Bekehrung geeigneten] Verfahrensweise.” Nagao, connecting this expression with the one I separate as the next item 13, offers: 巧みな方便によって(種々のものが)よく集められており、(慈・悲・喜・捨)の四つの浄らかなあり方(四梵行、四無量心)によって美しく飾られている。

The Tibetan translation almost gives the impression that it contains all the elements of the Sanskrit text (*upāyakauśalya* = *thabs mkhas pa*; *sukṛta* = *legs par byas pa*; *vicitā* = *rnam par bsags pa*), without much of the syntax. I would understand: “the gathering up is well done by skilful means,” which is not terribly meaningful.

The Chinese translations seem to reflect the Sanskrit text, but again not entirely transparently. Weller rendered Q: “Die gute Kraft der (zur Belehrung und Bekehrung der Lebenden) geeigneten Verfahrensweise hält (es) in jeder Weise zusammen.” Q itself suggests that we attach this to the following, as Chang takes it: “Ingenuity of all kinds and the four immeasurables are its splendid adornments,” although this translation itself omits so much of the text as to be hardly a translation at all. KYIK has the same understanding: 善方便力もて種種に合集せる四大梵行にて以て端嚴を爲し。Note that Nagao also attaches the Sanskrit here to the following, although in this he may have been influenced by Q, and such a connection seems to be wrong from the point of view of the Indic text as we have it.

The text remains obscure to me, but may evoke the careful piling up of cargo on the deck of the ship. If so we might understand:

**“One in which well-made things are piled up by skillful means.”**

13) *catubrahmavihārasuśodhitā*

tshangs pa'i gnas pa bzhis legs par yongs su sbyangs pa

Q 四大梵行以爲端嚴

M \_ \_ \_ \_ 以爲裝飾

In Chinese Q's *duānyán* 端嚴 and M's *zhuāngshì* 裝飾 suggest that the translators understood  $\sqrt{śubh}$  in the sense of ‘adorn’ rather than  $\sqrt{śudh}$  in the sense of ‘purify’ (thus *\*suśobhita* rather than *suśodhita*). Tibetan *yongs su sbyangs pa*, however, suggests *\*pariśodhanā*.<sup>26</sup> Weller translated Q: “Die vier abgeklärten Zustände des Gemütes, damit macht man es sehr schicklich.”

M is defective. Note, however, that 84 characters earlier, in item 4, M erroneously inserted four characters, namely 慈悲喜捨, precisely the four *brahmavihāras*. (Elsewhere, in KP §25, M translates *catubrahmavihāra* as 四種梵心.) I cannot explain how such a displacement of text, from here to section 4, could have taken place, if that is indeed what did happen. (Standard Chinese scripture manuscripts usually contain something like 16~18 characters per line, but this information does not seem to help; it does not seem likely that a graphic mistake could be responsible.) As it stands, I see M as unreadable here.

<sup>26</sup>Note that the standard equivalent is different: Mhy 5599 *suśodhita* = *phyag dar legs par byas pa*; 5600 *suśobhita* = *legs par ram shin tu mdzes par byas pa*.

I understand the Sanskrit as did Weller: “Es ist gut gereinigt durch die vier abgeklärten Zustände des Gemütes.”

**“One well-cleansed by the four holy states.”**

- 14) *catusmṛtyupasthānasucintitakāyopanītā*  
 dran pa nye bar gzhag pa bzhis legs par rnam par bsams pa'i lus kyis bsten pa  
 Q 四正念處爲金樓觀  
 M 四正念處以爲樓櫓

A fundamental question is what *kāya* may mean here. Both Weller with “Rumpf” and Nagao with (船)体 understand the word as referring to the hull of the boat, but neither refer to such a usage elsewhere. Regarding this word, Vincent Tournier brings to my attention a verse from the *Uttarajjhayāna* (XXIII.72): *sārīram āhu nāva tti jīvo vuccai nāvio | saṃsāro aṇṇavo vutto jaṃ taraṃti mahesiṇo* ||, translated by Jacobi (1895: 127): “The body is the boat, life is the sailor, and the Circle of Births is the ocean which is crossed by the great sages.” Although we have *śarīra* rather than *kāya*, the metaphor of boat as body is clear. Whether this is relevant and helpful here is another matter.

The Chinese versions suggest that, if they reflect the same underlying original, something has gone missing from the Indic text (and was missing from the Indic text underlying the Tibetan translation). Q’s 金樓觀, ‘golden lookout tower’, and M’s *lóulǔ* 樓櫓, also ‘lookout tower’, suggest a ‘crow’s nest,’ or the bridge – some elevated point providing good visibility. The Chinese may be rendered: “the four applications of mindfulness are the [boat’s] (Q: golden) watch-tower.”<sup>27</sup> I do not see how this could be related to the Indic text, unless *sucintitakāya* is, or is some corruption of, a word meaning ‘crow’s nest’ or the like. Given the overall shape of the discussion, it seems to me much more likely here that something has dropped out, or become corrupted, than that *kāya* has a sense like ‘hull.’

Weller rendered the Sanskrit: “Es ist aufgeführt mit einem Rumpfe, der wohlbedacht ist durch die vier Vergegenwärtigungen im Gedächtnisse,” while Nagao has: 四種類の正しく心を配ること(四念処)によってよく考察するという(船)体をそなえ.

The technical sense of *kāya*, if this is in fact the correct word here, escapes me. Therefore, I can hardly translate the Sanskrit as we have it, and can do no better than:

**“One led by a well-considered body [of ~?] through the four applications of mindfulness.”**

- 15) *samyakprahāṇaprasaṭhā*  
 yang dag par<sup>1</sup> spong bas 'gro ba  
 Q 四正勤行 \_ \_ \_ \_ (?)  
 M 四正勤行以爲人力  
 1) v.l. pa'i

<sup>27</sup> Weller Q: “Die vier(fache) rechte Gegenwart der Besonnenheit ist der goldene vielgeschossige Aufbau.”

The term written as *prasāṭha* is difficult. Weller (1965: 155 [1]) suggested that it is equivalent to *prasāṭha* = *prasṛṣṭa*. Karashima (2002: 61) suggests *prasāṭha* as “a corrupted form of \**prasāṭa*~ < *prasṛṣṭa*~ [read: *prasṛṣṭa*] (‘come forth, issued from; spread, diffused’).” Edgerton (BHSD s.v. *praśāṭhatā*) associates *prasāṭha* with Mhy. §2101 *praśāṭhatā*, *rnal du bab pa’am ’dug pa*, “which looks as if it meant trickery, deceitfulness,” comparing Ardhamāgadhī *pasāḍha*, rogue, trickster. As Karashima (2002: 61n141) points out, Pāli has *pasāṭa* as the ppp of *pra√sṛ*, with the sense of “let out, produced,” but this also means “gone forward, advanced, progressed.” Weller seems rather to have imagined *pra√sṛj*, “let loose, send off.” Karashima (2002: 61n142) admits “It is conceivable that \**prasāṭa*~ (< *prasṛṣṭa*) was confused with its synonymous word \**prasāṭha*~ (< *prasṛṣṭa*~), which resulted in the form *prasāṭha* in question.” Tib. has corresponding to this word (?) *’gro ba*. I can hardly see how M’s 人力 could be related.

Karashima translates the compound (n143): “(The dharma-ship) issues from right exertion.” Weller had understood the Tibetan translation: “Ihm ist freier Lauf gegeben durch die vier Formen rechten Strebens.” Nagao: (四種の)正しい努力(四正勤)によって自由に航行し.

It is very clear that manuscript SI P/2 of KP contains many impossible readings, some of which can be explained and some of which must remain as simple errors. It is a mistake to attempt to explain all such cases philologically, which is to say, as concealing possible forms. Therefore, I am not convinced that anything sensible can be made of the Indic text as we have it. By the same token, this does not prove that the text is corrupt either.

Q, however, for its part is evidently defective. As written, it can hardly be but connected with the following, as Chang, KYIK and Weller take it. Weller rendered Q: “Die vier (Formen) rechten Strebens(s), die vier Stufen übermenschlichen Vermögens, die dienen ihm zum schnellen Winde.” KYIK has: 四正勤行・四如意足をば以て疾風と爲し. However, as I divide the text, the following item in both Q and M is a complete sentence, agreeing with the Sanskrit text, and therefore we must conclude that Q here in this item is incomplete. Although difficult to understand, M in this item does form a complete sentence, 四正勤行以爲人力: “the four correct exertions are its human strength (?).” This might suggest something like \*(*catuḥ*)*samyak-prahāṇa-puruṣabala*(?), but the relation between this Chinese and the Indic text is not clear.

Assuming a contextually possible, but by no means certain, sense for *prasāṭha*, I would offer with significant hesitation:

**“One which is moved forward by means of the [four] correct exertions.”**

16) *riddhipādajavajavitā*

*rdzu ’phrul gyi rkang pa’i mgyogs pa’i shugs dang ldan pa*

QM 四如意足以爲疾風

In *riddhipādajavajavitā*, the first element is obvious, *riddhipāda* (*ri* for *ṛ* by sandhi) = *rdzu ’phrul gyi rkang pa* = 四如意足. The next portion, however, *javajavitā*, is less clear. This is what Tibetan renders *mgyogs pa’i shugs dang ldan pa*, Chinese *jífēng* 疾風. If Tibetan *mgyogs pa* translates *java*, *shugs dang ldan pa* must render *javita*.

Although the sense of ‘velocity,’ ‘possessing speed’ is known (see BHSD s.v. *javita*), here I prefer to understand *javita* simply as the ppp of  $\sqrt{jū}$ .

Weller translates the Sanskrit: “Es ist beschleunigt durch die Schnelligkeit der [vier] Arten übermenschlichen Vermögens.” Nagao: (四種の)神通の基礎(四神足)によって速やかに走り。I understand QM: “The four bases of magical power are the wind which quickens it along.” See the previous item.

**“One hastened along by the speed of the [four] bases of magical power.”**

17) *indriyasunirīkṣitadā[ru]vakravigat[ā]*<sup>1</sup>

dbang pos legs par brtags pas lta ba ngan pa'i shing yon po med pa

Q 五根善察離諸曲惡

M 五根善察以爲船師

1) MS °dāna°°vigata. See Weller 1965: 155 (3).

The image is far from obvious, even with the emendations suggested. The relation between the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts is also not quite clear. Sanskrit *indriya* = *dbang po* (五根); *sunirīkṣita* = *legs par brtags pa* (善察); *dāru* (emended from the manuscript's *dāna*) = *shing* – but there is no Chinese correspondent; *yon po* = *vakra* (諸曲惡); *vigata* = *med pa* (離).

Sanskrit *vakra* is well rendered by Tibetan *yon po*. But what of *lta ba ngan pa*, which more usually renders something like *\*kudṛṣṭi*? Q's 曲惡 certainly corresponds to *vakra*, ‘crooked, winding, retrograde motion.’ The correction of *\*dāru* for the manuscript's *dāna* is supported by Tibetan *shing*, but of this there is no trace in either Chinese translation. In addition, M is quite different. The appearance of *dāru* earlier in item 6 also argues against its inclusion here.

M's *chuánshī* 船師, ‘skipper’, must reflect a different text than Q, and does not seem to correspond to anything suggested by either the Indic text or Tibetan translation. I do not know what Indic term it might reflect. Correspondingly, the portion of the Indic text, represented in Q, concerning the rejection of twisted views, is absent from M. Q: “Well scrutinized by the five faculties, free of all twisted evils,” M: “Well scrutinized by a skipper as [things in the world] are scrutinized by the five faculties.”

Weller translates from Tibetan: “Es ist ohne das krumme Holz schlimmer Ansichten, weil die Sinne[swerkzeuge] gut beobachtet werden.” Nagao: (心の五種の)機能(五根)によって十分に考察されて、(悪見という)曲がった木材は用いられず。

Weller renders Q: “Die gute Prüfung der fünf Sinneswerkzeuge entfernt alles Krumme und Böse,” while KYIK has: “五根にて善く察して諸の曲惡を離れ。” Chang's translation is highly interpretive: “The five roots are the able navigator who steers the boat away from the dangerous waters.” Though this seems as if it might have been influenced by M, this is not likely, as the translators probably did not know of M as a version of the KP, and it is unclear upon what basis this interpretation is offered.

In light of the difficulties, for the moment I might suggest:

**“One free of the twisted timbers [of wrong views] through close scrutiny by means of the [five] faculties.”**

- 18) balavegasamudgatā antareṇa śithila<ṁ>  
 stobs kyi shugs yang dag par 'byung bas bar shag shig med pa  
 Q 五力強浮 \_ \_ \_ \_ (?)  
 M 五力強壯以爲防備

In the edition of Staël-Holstein *śithila* is printed in compound with the following *bodhyaṅga*<sup>o</sup>. In the new edition of Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2002, it is written *antareṇa* (')*śithila*. I read *antareṇa*, which takes accusative in the sense of “without,” with *śithila* adding an *anusvāra*, thus: *śithila<ṁ>*. Weller (1965: 155n4) suggested understanding *aśithila* evidently because he understood the Tibetan *bar shag shig med pa* as *bar* + *shag shig med pa*, taking *bar* as *antareṇa* in the sense of ‘in between.’ I think rather that *bar ... med pa* represents *antareṇa* in the sense of “without.”

Weller translates: “Es ist ausgefahren mit dem Ungestüm der [fünf] Kräfte und schlingert unterwegs nicht.” He understands the Tibetan: “Da das Ungestüm der [fünf] Kräfte entsteht, schwankt [es] unterwegs nicht.” Nagao: (同じく五種の)能力(五力)という力によって浮かび、そのあいだ、不安定に揺れることがない。A problem with these interpretations is that *samud√gam* does not mean ‘float’ or ‘put out to sea’ but rather ‘arise’. It would appear that *yang dag par 'byung ba* has the same sense.

While I do not understand Q’s 強浮, or its variant 彌浮, both readings do contain *jing* 浮, float. KYIK reads Q as transmitted: 五力にて誦[わた]り浮び, and Chang understands: “The five powers are its strong bouyancy,” but M suggests that Q is defective here. M itself may be rendered: “The healthy strength (*qiángzhuàng* 強壯) of the five powers is [the ship’s] defense (*fángbèi* 防備),” the relation of which to the extant Indic text is not at all clear.

My understanding, which requires an excess of context within brackets, is highly tentative:

**“One in which the impetus of the [five] powers has arisen, thus [enabling the ship to sail] without instability.”**

- 19) bodhyaṅgavibodhan. ariśatrumārapathajahanī  
 byang chub kyi yan lag gis 'gro ba rnam par dag pa | bcugs can dgra nyon  
 mongs pa'i bdud kyi lam 'dor bar byed pa  
 QM 七覺覺悟能破魔賊

The last syllable of *vibodhan.* is unclear, as is whether we have here one item or two. Should we take *bodhyaṅgavibodhan.* in parallel with the following as \*<sup>o</sup>*nā*? The damaged akṣara appears at the end of line, but this restitution would still require that we ignore sandhi. Sanskrit and Chinese agree on (*vi*)*√budh*, ‘aware’, while Tibetan *rnam par dag pa* seems to presuppose *vi√śudh*, purify, as Weller (1965: 155 [5]) points out. What does any of this have to do with a ship?

Weller translates from Tibetan: “Seine Bahn ist bereinigt durch die [sieben] für die Erleuchtung notwendigen Glieder,” and the next “Es gibt den Pfad des Māra der Laster [, als welcher] ein haßerfüllter Feind [ist], auf.” Nagao: さとりへの(七種の) 因子(七覚支)によってその航路は浄められ、敵であり賊である(煩惱の)魔の道を断つて.

KYIK renders Q: 七覺にて覺悟して能く魔賊を破り. Weller Q separates this item into two : “(Durch die) sieben für die Erleuchtung notwendigen Glieder erweckt es zur Erleuchtung,” and “(Es) vermag den Räuber Māra zu zerschmettern.”

**“One becoming aware through the [seven] limbs of awakening, [and therefore] leaving behind the courses of enemies, antagonists and Māras.”**

21) manokramavāhinī

lam du ’jug par byed pa | pha rol gyi ngogs su phyin par byed pa

Q 入八眞正道隨意到岸

M 八直正道隨意到彼

1) MS w.r. māno°.

It may be that we should connect this directly with the preceding item. Weller (1965: 155 [7]) suggests that Tib. *lam du ’jug par byed pa* refers to \**mārgakramavāhinī*. This may be so for the Tibetan text, but Chinese 隨意 makes it clear that *mana* stood in the text from which QM translated. Weller and Nagao are certainly right that there must be some reference to the eight-fold noble path here, since the whole series refers to the thirty-seven *bodhipakṣa*, so a reference to *mārga* would not be out of place. Exactly where the reference should be applied, however, is not sure. At the same time, Q and M insert the words “noble eight-fold path,” but Tibetan does not, or at least, it does not have either ‘noble’ or ‘eight-fold’. KYIK (apparently not having 入 in its text) connects this passage of Q with the following: 八眞正道にて意に随ひ岸に到つて外道の濟[わたり]を離れ. Tib. *’jug pa* supports Q’s 入 (corresponding to *krama*) and suggests that this character may have dropped from M, perhaps due to its similarity to the immediately following 八. Might we once have had something like \**mārgāvatāramanokramavāhinī*?

Weller translates from Tibetan: “Es läßt in den [achtgliedrigen Heils]pfad eintreten. Es läßt das jenseitige Ufer [des Ozeanes der Wiergeburten] erreichen.” Nagao: (正しい)道(八正道)を進み、(輪廻の大海を渡って)彼岸に到達される. Q should be something like “Enter the noble eight-fold path and proceeding at will to the [other] shore.”

**“Proceeding along in its passage at will.”**

22) kutīrthyatīrthajāhānī

mu stegs can ngan pa’i mu stegs ’dor bar byed pa

Q 離外道濟

M 離外道法

There is a word-play here, with the word for ‘ford, shallows or sandbank,’ and also ‘a holy spot on a river bank,’ *tīrtha*, etymologically related to the word for ‘sectarian,’ *tīrthya*, literally ‘forder’ or ‘one for whom *tīrthas* are holy.’ The phrase means: Avoiding the fords, shallow spots (alluvial deposits, sand bars), which are obstacles to navigation, fords which the evil, non-buddhist sectarians, the forders, worship as their holy spots, but which Buddhists do not consider to be so. Neither the Tibetan nor Chinese translations are able to preserve this image.

**“One avoiding the ford of evil non-Buddhist sectarians.”**

- 23) *śamathaniddhyaptinirdiṣṭā*  
*zhi gnas kyi nges par sems pa bstan pa*  
 QM 止爲調御

It is possible, with Chinese, that this *nirdiṣṭa* means “commanded,” one of its Sanskrit senses and probably supported by 調御. Or may we understand *nirdiṣṭr*, as guide/pilot (but then masc. sing. nom., not fem. as in the other terms)? The parallelism with the following phrase is obvious, but the exact way in which that parallelism is to be worked out is less so. It might suggest, however, taking *nirdiṣṭr* as a noun, rather than *nirdiṣṭā* as a past passive participle. Is it possible that we should understand: “One in which calming profound concentration is its commands and in which insight is its active application, or carrying out of the commands”? The relation between *śamatha* and *niddhyapti* is far from clear. Tibetan seems to have understood a genitive relation, *zhi gnas kyi nges par sems pa*, but the *kyi* might also indicate an appositional or adjectival relation.

Weller renders the Sanskrit: “Es ist bestimmt [zum] ernsten Nachdenken der Gemütsruhe.” He also translates the Tibetan as “Es lehrte, wies auf das tiefe Nachdenken der Gemütsruhe.” Nagao: 心の静寂(止)による深い洞察がなされ. The latter seems to skip *nirdiṣṭa* altogether. Weller translates Q: “Durch seine Standfestigkeit bewirkt es Bezähmung.”

**“One in which calming profound concentration is the pilot / One commanded by calming profound concentration.”**

- 24) *vipaśyanāprayogā*  
*lhag mthong gis sbyor ba*  
 QM 觀爲利益

Chinese is very difficult to understand here in relation to Sanskrit and Tibetan. Does 利益, ‘benefit, profit,’ refer to the profit of trade carried out by the merchants on the boat? That would be fine, but how could it relate to the Indic text? In legal literature *prayoga* does have the meaning of ‘a loan made at interest,’ but I am not convinced that this could apply here. Is the sense of the Sanskrit more straightforward – simply something like ‘activity’?

Weller declines to translate the Sanskrit, but offers for Tibetan “Es ist verbunden, zusammengefügt, mit oder durch tiefe Einsicht.” His rendering of Q is “(Tiefe) Einsicht bewirkt Nutzen,” or in 1965 “die [tiefe] Einsicht bewirkt Gewinn.” Nagao: 觀察(觀)が実修されて.

**“One of which insight is active application.”**

- 25) ubhayor antayor asaktavāhinī  
 mtha' gnyis la ma chags par 'jug pa  
 QM 不著二邊

The meaning here evidently plays on the sense that a boat should not be caught on either bank of a river (not a sea!). It is not clear here what, doctrinally, the two extremes might be, although the sūtra elsewhere does address just this issue.

**“One proceeding along without being stuck on either extreme.”**

- 26) hetudharmayuktā  
 rgyu'i chos dang yang dag par ldan pa  
 Q 有因緣法以爲安隱  
 M 有因緣法甚爲安隱

The Indic text and Tibetan translation seem obviously congruent, as they are generally. The Chinese versions are a bit less clear. In item 28 below, 安隱 renders *kṣema* – should it be *yogakṣema*? Tibetan *yang dag par ldan pa* suggests *\*samyuktā* (I am not sure why Weller 1965: 156 n. 2 should say *saṃprayukta*). For 因緣 as *hetu*, see item 0, above. I am not certain of the exact sense of *yukta*. While a sense such as ‘moored’ is plausible here, I do not know that the word is so used. Note that Pāli *yotta*, Sanskrit *yoktra*, is a word for rope, nautical and otherwise. Is it possible that this is somehow relevant?

Weller understands the Sanskrit: “Es ist versehen mit dem Gesetze des Grundes.” Nagao: しかも因によって(生滅するところの)存在とは、結びついている。

Weller translates Q: “Es besitzt das Gesetz des Grundes, dadurch bewirkt es den Frieden.” KYIK reads with a portion that I consider, although with hesitation, to belong to the next item: 因緣の法を有[も]つて以て安隱なる大乘と爲し。

**“One moored with the law of causality.”**

- 27) vipulavistīrṇākṣayaprahāṇābandhā  
 sgra grags pa yangs shing rgya che la mi zad cing tshad med pa tshur shog  
 QM 大乘廣博無盡辯才

What is 大乘 (usually Mahāyāna) doing here? Is it related to *vipula*, although here *vipula* has nothing of this sense at all? The Indic manuscript’s *prahāṇa* is problematic. Tibetan *tshad med pa* supports *\*aparimāṇa*, and QM 辯才 suggests something like *\*pratibhāṇa*. It is hard to guess what might lie behind these three forms, if indeed a single original is to be postulated.

Weller translates the Sanskrit: “Es besitzt den Riemen weiten, ausgedehnten, unzerstörbaren Strebens.” Nagao, reading this with the following (item 28), has: (その船からは) ひびわたる声 – 広く、大きく、尽きることなく、弁才があつてさえぎられるところがない – が聞こえ。

Weller translates Q: “Das große Fahrzeug ist riesig, es ist unerschöpflich redege- wandt.” KYIK, continuing into the next unit, understood: 廣博無盡の辯才もて廣く名聞を布きて。

“One unbounded in expansive, extended, and inexhaustible exertion.”

28) vighuṣṭaśabd[o] daśasu dikṣu śabdā ādāyaty āgacchatāgacchatābhi<d>ruta<m> mahādharmanāvam nirvāṇapuragāminī • kṣemamārgagāminī • ma(pā) + matī- rasatkāyadrṣṭimjahanī • pārimatīragāminī laghusarvadṛṣṭigatavigatā  
dam pa'i chos kyi gru chen po mya ngan las 'das pa'i grong khyer du 'gro ba | bde bar 'gro ba | 'jigs pa med par 'gro ba | lam du 'gro ba | 'jig tshogs la lta ba 'dor bar zhugs la tshu rol gyi 'gram nas pha rol gyi 'gram du lta ba thams cad sel ba | gtse ba med pa'i mya ngan las 'das par myur du song shig ces phyogs bcur sgras go bar byed pa ste

Q: 布名聞能濟十方一切衆生。而自唱言。來上法船。從安隱道至於涅槃。度身見岸至佛道岸，離一切見

M: 廣布名聞能濟十方一切群品。而自唱言。汝等當來上我法船。從安隱道 得至涅槃。度於斷常，到無爲岸

Weller 1965: 156 (5) writes: “In the expression daśa[di]kṣu śabdā ādāyaty I can determine neither the form of ādāyaty – whether it refers to ādāyatī active present participle or to ādāyati, 3rd sing. – nor the meaning. The translation is a guess.” However, note the expression *vacanam ā√dā* = begin to speak. Parallels indicate how we should understand the units of meaning here, revealing that the words *vighuṣṭaśabdō daśasu dikṣu* form a set phrase. (The manuscript is clear in reading °śabdā, but if this is correct, I cannot determine the intended case.) This is demonstrated by several examples: *Lalitavistara* (Lefmann 1902-1908: 24.11) *daśadigvighuṣṭaśabdā ca tatkulam bhavati*, in which the reference is to the fame of the family into which the bodhisattva will be born; *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (Kern and Nanjio 1908-1912: VIII.23 = 207.11-12) *prabhāsvaro buddhabalenupeto vighuṣṭaśabdō daśasu diśāsu | puraskṛtaḥ prāṇisahasrakoṭibhir deśeṣyatī uttamam agrabodhim ||*, and (9.3 = 217.12-13) *tahi bodhisattvā yathā gaṅgavālikās tataś ca bhūyo paripācayīṣyati | maharddhikaś ca sa jino bhaviṣyati daśaddiśe lokavighuṣṭaśabdaḥ ||*; *Samādhirāja* (Dutt 1939-1959: II.3: XXXV.48 = 515.1-4) *yathai[va kaścit] puruṣa mahānubhāvo dikṣu [vidikṣu] satatu vighuṣṭaśabdaḥ | mahāprapātāṃ prapatati vasundharāyāṃ sarvābhibhūya [tri]bhavam imaṃ samantāt ||*; and *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* (Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature 2006: §I.3.6) in which *daśadigvighuṣṭaśabda* is an epithet.

Concerning other issues of the Indic text, I agree with Weller 1965: 156 (6) that the manuscript reading °ruta may be emended to \**drutam*, after Tibetan *myur du*, and is to be taken adverbially. The editor of Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2002 opts instead for *abhiru<ha>ta* here, which seem to me less defensible.

The fragmentary line which is read *ma .[ā]* + in Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2002 is difficult to construe, with the second akṣara not entirely legible, and the third missing entirely with the damaged edge of the leaf. Although perhaps not the least intrusive emendation possible, it seems most likely that the very clear *ma* should be emended to *a*, the upper portion of which is very similar to *ma*. Weller suggests reading *mahāpāri*, but this is not likely, since this would require that both *pā* and *ri*

have been written in the small (now lost) space at the end of the line which, in light of the way the manuscript is evenly written, is extremely unlikely. I believe that the small portion of the consonant visible on the manuscript may be read as consistent with *pā*. I therefore, following the suggestion of Vincent Tournier, see here \**apārimatīra*<sup>o</sup>, this standing in a set with the following *pārimatīra*<sup>o</sup>. This pairing of ‘this shore’ and the ‘other shore’ is common, including explicit mentions of the transit of boats. See, for example, in Pāli *Visuddhimagga* XXII.96 (Warren and Kosambi 1950: 594.7-9): *yathā nāvā apubbaṃ acarimaṃ ekakkhaṇe cattāri kiccāni karoti | orimaṃ tīraṃ pajahati sotaṃ chindati bhaṇḍaṃ vahati pārimaṃ tīraṃ appeti*, and in Sanskrit *Avadānaśataka* (Speyer 1906-1909: i.148,13-14): *tato bhikṣavo nāvam abhirūdhāḥ | bhagavān ṛddhyāgrata eva tasya nāvikasyāpārimāt tīrāt pārimaṃ tīre sthitāḥ*. Finally, I read *satkāyadr̥ṣṭimjahanī* as a compound following Edgerton (BHSD s.v. jahana).

Weller, apparently unaware of the set phrase to which it belongs, translates the initial *vighuṣṭaśabdā* as: “Es besitzt laut ertönenden Ruf,” offering the alternative “laut verkündete Ruf.” He treats this as separate from the following, which he renders:

Es läßt in den zehn Weltgegenden den Ruf ausgehen: Kommt, kommt schnell zu dem großen Schiffe der Lehre, das nach der Stadt des Nirvāṇa geht, das zum Frieden geht, zur Furchtlosigkeit geht, auf dem Pfade [des Heiles] geht, das, [ausgesehen es] dazu führt, die Ansicht von einem seienden Körper aufzugeben, vom diesseitigen Ufer [des Ozeanes der Wiedergeburten] zum jenseitigen Ufer hinübergeht, das alle [falschen] Ansichten entfernt, zum Nirvāṇa, das frei ist von Widerwärtigkeiten.

Although he claims to be translating the Sanskrit (see below for his rendering of Tibetan), in fact a significant portion of this German reflects instead the Tibetan translation.

Nagao, apparently also unaware that *vighuṣṭaśabdā* forms part of a set phrase, like Weller separates it (see the previous item), and (drawing freely on the Tibetan translation) understands the remaining text as follows:

十方に向かって呼びかけている。「きたれ、この大なる法の船へ。涅槃の城に導き、平安に、怖れなく、正しい道を行き、自我の観念(我見)という此岸を去って、彼岸 - すなわちあらゆる浅薄な偏見を離れた (災いの滅さられた涅槃) - に導く(この法の船)に、速やかにきたれ」と。

Although, as I have noted, his translation of the Sanskrit in fact fuses this with the Tibetan, Weller does also translate the passage explicitly from Tibetan, as follows:

In die Länge und die Breite ist sein unzerstörbarer und unermesslicher Ruf: Kommt herbei! Das große Schiff der guten Lehre geht nach der Stadt Nirvāṇa. Es geht zum Glück (*kṣema*). Es geht zur Furchtlosigkeit (*abhaya*). Es geht auf dem Wege (*mārga*) [des Heiles]. Der Ruf gibt in den 10 Weltgegenden zu verstehen: Beginnt damit, die Ansicht von einem seienden Körper (*satkāya*) aufzugeben, und geht, vom diesseitigen Ufer bis zum jenseitigen Ufer (des Ozeanes der Wiedergeburten) alle (philosophischen) Theorien (*dr̥ṣṭi*) aufgebend, schnell zum Nirvāṇa, das ohne Widerwärtigkeiten ist.

Weller divides Q as two items:

Sein sich weithin ausbreitender Ruf vermag über alle Lebenden der zehn Himmelsgegenden hindringen und läßt von selbst die Worte erschallen: Kommt herbei und besteigt das Boot der Lehre! Dem Wege des Friedens folgend erreicht es das Nirvāṇa.

Es setzt über vom Ufer der Ansicht vom (seienden) Körper zum Ufer der Erleuchtung Buddhas und entfernt alle Ansichten.

KYIK, for its part, took Q as follows:

能く十方の一切衆生を濟はんとて、自ら唱へて言はく。來つて法船に上つて、安隱の道より涅槃に至れ。身見の岸を度つて、佛道の岸たる一切の見を離れたるに至れ。と。

We may translate:

**“One concerning which a cry is raised in the ten directions, and the cry is: Come! Come! Quickly! To the great ship of the teaching which is going to the city of Nirvāṇa, going by a safe route, abandoning this shore characterized by the doctrine of the real existence of a self, going to the further shore on which all items of wrong speculation have been easily eliminated.”**

\* \* \* \*

Aside from various particular suggestions for textual improvement, many of which remain highly speculative, the overall conclusion to be drawn from this exercise, while humble, is that seemingly insuperable problems remain in the face of what appear to be a corrupt Indic text, probably corrupt or in places extremely poorly transmitted translations, and a vastly insufficient background knowledge of the technical terminology of the field, in this case Indian shipping vocabulary. The approach of using Tibetan and Chinese translations to make sense of a corrupt Indic text is no doubt valuable, but as the present example shows, some problems firmly refuse to yield to a solution. At the same time, there does not appear to exist any viable alternative. As has become evident, at least as far as this small selection from the KP is concerned, not a single one of our sources can be read through in an entirely coherent and convincing fashion in isolation. This is not to say that one cannot study a translation, for instance, as a cultural artefact on its own terms, without reference to the source from which it was translated, for surely one can. But so long as our goal is to understand something of the ideas of those who produced such literature, it is only the comparative approach – as uncertain as it may be – which holds out any hope of success.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Böhrling/Roth 1855–1875 O. Böhrling and R. Roth *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*. St. Petersburg 1855–1875.
- Btsan lha Ngag dbang tshul khriṃs 1997 *Brda dkrol gser gyi me long*. Beijing 1997.
- Chang 1983 G.C.C. Chang, (gen. ed.), *A Treasury of Mahāyāna Sūtras: Selections from the Mahāratnakūṭa Sūtra*. University Park/London 1983, 387-414.
- Chaudhuri 1973 Mamata Chaudhuri, Ship-building in the Yuktikapataru and Samarāṅga Sūtheadhāra. *Indian Journal of History of Science* 11.2 (1973) 137-147.
- De 1907 H. De, A Note on the Word ‘Lankāro’. *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 1906-1907, 173.
- Dutt 1939-1959 N. Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts*. Srinagar/Calcutta 1939-1959.
- Haebler 1965 C. Haebler, Ein nautischer Ausdruck im Pāli (Pā. lakāra-). *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 79 (1965) 112-122.
- Hara 2005 M. Hara, A Note on Pāli *akuppa*. In: *Indische Kultur im Kontext: Rituale, Texte und Ideen aus Indien und der Welt. Festschrift für Klaus Mylius*, ed. Lars Göhler, *Beiträge zur Indologie* 40. Wiesbaden 2005, 229-246.

- Hirakawa 1973ff. A. Hirakawa 平川彰 (et al.) *Index to the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (P. Pradhan Edition) Tokyo 1973, 1977, 1978, 3 volumes.
- Hornell 1920 J. Hornell, *The Origins and Ethnological Significance of Indian Boat Designs* Reissue: Karamana, Trivandrum 2002. <sup>1</sup>1920.
- Housman 1922 A.E. Housman, The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism. *Proceedings of the Classical Association* 18 (1922) 67-84.
- Jacobi 1895 H. Jacobi, *Gaina Sūtras*. Vol. 2. The Sacred Books of the East 45. Oxford 1895 (repr. New York 1968).
- Johnston 1950 E. H. Johnston, *The Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyānottaratantraśāstra*. Patna 1950.
- Kern 1908–1912 H. Kern and B. Nanjio, *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 10. St. Pétersbourg 1908–1912 (repr.: Osnabrück 1970).
- Lefmann 1902-08 S. Lefmann, *Lalita Vistara: Leben und Lehre des Çākya-Buddha*. Halle 1902-1908 (repr. Tokyo 1977). 2 vols.
- Nagai 1932 M. Nagai 長井眞琴, Fumyō bosatsu-e 普明菩薩會. In: *Kokuyaku Issaikyō Hōshakubu* 國譯一切經・寶積部 6 (Tokyo 1932) 194-218.
- Nagao/Sakurabe 1974 G. Nagao 長尾雅人 and H. Sakurabe 桜部健, *Hōshakubu Kyōten* 宝積部經典. Daijō Butten 大乘仏典 9. Tokyo 1974.
- Norman 1971 K.R. Norman, *The Elders' Verses II: Therīgāthā*. Pali Text Society Translation Series 40. London 1971 (repr. 1991).
- Ñyānamoli 1956, 1964 Bhikkhu Ñyānamoli [sic], *The Path of Purification (Vissudhimagga)*. Sri Lanka 1956, 1964 (repr. Berkeley/London 1976). Two vols.
- Oldenberg/Pischel 1883 H. Oldenberg / R. Pischel, *The Thera- and Therī-gāthā: (Stanzas Ascribed to Elders of the Buddhist Order of Recluses)*. London 1883 (repr. 1990).
- Ōshika 1970 J. Ōshika 大鹿實秋, Chibetto-bun Yuimakyō Tekisuto チベット文維摩經テキスト [The Tibetan Text of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*]. *Acta Indologica/Indo Kōten Kenkyū* インド古典研究 (1970) I: 139-240.
- Pāsādika 1979 Bhikkhu Pāsādika, The Dharma-Discourse of the Great Collection of Jewels: The Kāśyapa Section: Mahāratnakūṭadharmaparyāya-Kāśyapaparivarta: English translation and Restoration of the Missing Sanskrit Portions (IX). *Linh So'n Publication d'Études Bouddhologiques* (1979) 9, 26-41.
- Sander/Waldschmidt 1980 L. Sander / E. Waldschmidt, *Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden IV*. Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland X, 4. Wiesbaden 1980.
- Schlingloff 1976 D. Schlingloff, Kalyāṅkārīn's Adventures. The Identification of an Ajanta Painting. *Artibus Asiae* 38.1 (1976) 5-28.
- Schlingloff 1981 Indische Seefahrt in römischer Zeit. In: *Zur geschichtlichen Bedeutung der frühen Seefahrt*, ed. H. Müller-Knospe. Kolloquien zur Allgemeinen und Vergleichenden Archäologie 2. Munich 1981, 51-85.
- Schlingloff 1987 Ships and Seafaring. In: *Studies in the Ajanta Paintings. Identifications and Interpretations*. Delhi 1987, 195-218, 389-392.
- Simon 1979 W. Simon, Tibetan *stes, stes-te*, etc. and some of their Sanskrit Correspondences. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 42.2 (1979) 334-336.
- Speyer 1906-1909 J.S. Speyer, *Avadānaçataka: A Century of Edifying Tales Belonging to the Hīnayāna*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 3. St. Petersburg 1906-1909 (repr. The Hauge 1958).
- Staël-Holstein 1926 A.W. Baron von Staël-Holstein, *The Kāśyapaparivarta: A Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa Class: Edited in the Original Sanskrit in Tibetan and in Chinese*. Shanghai 1926.
- Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature 2006. *Bonbun Yuimakyō: Potarakyū shozō shahon ni motozuku kōtei* 梵文維摩經 - ポタラ宮所蔵写本に基づく校訂 / *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa: A Sanskrit Edition based upon the Manuscript Newly Found at the Potala Palace*. Tokyo 2006.
- Turner 1966 R.L. Turner, *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*, London 1966.
- Varadarajan 1994 L. Varadarajan, Indian Boat Building Traditions: The Ethnological Evidence. In: *Athens, Aden, Arikamendu: Essays on the interrelations between India, Arabia*

- and the Eastern Mediterranean*, ed. M-F. Boussac and J-F. Salles. Delhi 1994, 167-192.
- Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2002 M.I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya with S. Karashima and N. Kudo, *The Kāśyapaparivarta: Romanized Text and Facsimiles*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica 5. Tokyo 2002.
- Waldschmidt 1965 E. Waldschmidt, *Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden I*. Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland X, 1, Wiesbaden 1965.
- Warren/Kosambi 1950 H.C. Warren and D. Kosambi, *Visuddhimagga of Buddhahosācariya*. Harvard Oriental Series 41. Cambridge, Mass. 1950.
- Weller 1964 F. Weller, Kāśyapaparivarta nach der Tjin-Übersetzung verdeutscht. *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig, Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe* 13.4 (1964), 771-804.
- Weller 1965 *Zum Kāśyapaparivarta*. Heft 2: Verdeutschung des sanskrit-tibetischen Texts. Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig: Phil.-hist. Klasse 57.3. Berlin 1965.
- Weller 1966 Die Sung-Fassung des Kāśyapaparivarta. *Monumenta Serica* 25 (1966), 207-361. Reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*. Glasenapp-Stiftung Band 26. Stuttgart/Wiesbaden 1987, II, 1305-1459.
- Wogihara 1932-1935 U. Wogihara 荻原雲來. *Abhisamayālamkāraḷoka Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā*. Tōyō Bunko Publications Series D, 2. Tokyo 1932-1935 (repr. Tokyo 1973).
- Zhang 1985 Zhang Y. 張怡蓀 *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo / Zanghan Dacidian* 藏漢大辭典, Peking 1985.