

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

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

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

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

To set the stage for the present investigation, it will be necessary to briefly sketch some of the reasons why the idea that the *Guan-jing* is a Chinese translation, like so many others, of an Indic original is not generally accepted – the remaining alternatives being that the text was translated from a Central Asian language, or written or compiled from the beginning in Chinese. The Indian origins of the *Guan-jing* have been doubted for a variety of reasons, ranging from generally well-considered arguments to some that can be dismissed out of hand.<sup>3</sup> One of the most important points often made is that the vocabulary of the *Guan-jing* seems to owe much to the Wei 魏 (220–265) dynasty translation of the Larger *Sukhāvativyūha* (T. 360) and to that of the “Sūtra on the Ocean of Contemplative Trance of Visualizing the Buddha,” *Guanfo sanmei hai-jing* 觀佛三昧海經 (T. 643). Fujita Kōtatsu (1990: 160) has detailed some of the resemblances between the *Guan-jing* and the Wei translation of the Larger *Sukhāvativyūha*, showing that the former “drew upon” the latter: “We know this because some of the terms adopted ... are found only in that version.”<sup>4</sup> Likewise, Shikii Shūjō studied the relation between the *Guan-jing* and *Guanfo sanmei hai-jing* and concluded (1965: 230) that the two sūtras have a very large number of similarities not only in structure, object and vocabulary, but also in goal, method and character, and in the content they seek to express. Rather than supposing that this automatically implies a Chinese origin for the text, Mark Blum (1985: 133) has attempted to explain these facts by saying that “a look at the one other translation attributed to [the putative translator of the *Guan-jing*] Kalayaśas (T. 1161) reveals the same type of borrowing, so this may reflect the attitude and abilities

of the translator as much as the language or authorship of his original text." In general, of course, Chinese translators often referred to the works of their predecessors. As Hirakawa Akira (1984: 14) has pointed out, there are for instance many examples in the translations of the Vinayas in Chinese of translators referring to and employing translations from previous translators' works. The impact, for example, of the translation equivalents and styles of such translators as Kumārajīva and Xuanzang on their followers is well known. Thus a similarity between the sentences of different sūtras is no grounds for considering a text to be apocryphal, or in other words, a non-translation.<sup>5</sup>

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

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

For centuries, the Chinese cultivated the illusion that the existence or absence of a corresponding Sanskrit text was sufficient to establish whether a specific work written in Chinese was authentic or apocryphal. Although convenient heuristically for rejecting many would-be sūtras produced in China ... such a criterion would have been of little help in determining falsifications made outside China. For this reason, the participation of foreign *Tripitaka* masters would have been essential, for only they would know whether a text was current outside of China and therefore

“canonical.” Hence it can be said with little exaggeration that these foreign teachers symbolized orthodoxy for the Chinese – to the point that they were considered the guarantors, if not the very source, of translated texts. It is for this reason that translated texts were attributed to such foreign *Trepiṭakas*, and certainly not because they had actually translated anything, for, as is well known, their often inadequate knowledge of the Chinese language, especially in the early years of their tenures in China, would not have permitted them to engage in any but a modicum of translation activities.

Thus, if a given text were accepted as the word of the Buddha in lands considered by the Chinese to be Buddhistically orthodox, namely in India itself and Indian Central Asia, then this constituted proof of the text’s authenticity. The mere existence of an Indic language original – it is incautious to use the term “Sanskrit” in this context – was evidently not sufficient to guarantee the authenticity of a text, since such a text could have been considered spurious even in the land of its origin.<sup>8</sup>

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

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

I think the implications of Forte’s remarks should be clear. If we are dealing with non Chinese “translators,” then we must imagine that these individuals probably had little to do with the actual mechanics of the translation of a text. Kalayaśas was a foreigner of the type referred to by Forte. With this in mind, Fujita Kōtatsu’s remarks (1990: 163) seeking to support the theory that the *Guan-jing* was compiled in China may be seen to convey a misplaced emphasis. Fujita speculates: “When translating the *sūtra*, Kalayaśas probably

did so orally, since it is reported ... that the Śramaṇa Seng-han served as his scribe. In this process, the sūtra's concepts and expressions assumed a Chinese coloring, since numerous Chinese-translated scriptures were consulted and utilized ...." Taking into account the observations of Forte quoted above, it is clear that there is nothing in the circumstance of a Chinese serving as Kalayaśas's scribe to set this translation method apart from most others, and nothing here to point to any questionable provenance for the sūtra.<sup>9</sup>

The questions we as modern scholars want to ask about the provenance of the *Guan-jing* are nevertheless different from those asked by the guardians of orthodoxy in Buddhist China. For those Chinese authorities, if Kalayaśas as a Central Asian monk certified the *Guan-jing*'s authenticity, that is to say its currency in the Buddhist realms with which he was familiar, and if he were accepted by the Chinese authorities as a legitimate representative of the type of orthodoxy they wished to promote (Forte 1990: 243), then the *Guan-jing* would have been accepted into the canon and thence recorded in the sūtra catalogues. It is also helpful to recall that we know of cases in which – for their own ideological and political aims – Chinese Buddhist authorities went so far as to arrange for the “forgery” of Buddhist sūtras, or at least parts thereof (Forte 1976: 135), and on the other hand we may add that there were certainly cases in which the Chinese rejected for their own reasons texts – for example Tantras – which *were* considered orthodox in other Buddhist lands.<sup>10</sup> Such an analysis of the ideological background of information provided by orthodox Chinese sources undermines our confidence in them as historical evidence.

Since however our modern standpoint is outside the range of questions of orthodoxy or authority, we must inquire into the provenance of a sacred text without allowing questions of the text's spiritual authority to affect our reasoning. For us whether the *Guan-jing* is a transcript of the words of the historical Buddha Śākyamuni or whether it was compiled in fifth century China – or whether its origins lie anywhere in between – is a problem of history, not a problem of orthodoxy. And thus when we cite evidence from those whose ideological biases differ from our own, we must take this difference into account. The authors of Chinese sūtra catalogues, and

those who wrote hagiographies of monks, had an agenda radically different from our own. If we do not understand this, and weigh their evidence accordingly, we can be misled, or at the least confuse our reasoning. However, that our new understanding of the evidence of the *sūtra* catalogues erodes some arguments for the Chinese origins of the *Guan-jing* is a destructive rather than a constructive step in the process of tracing its origins; it does not lead positively toward a solution of the problem. To take such positive and constructive steps we turn to the internal evidence provided by the work itself.

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

According to Kenneth Tanaka (1990: xviii, xix, 58), the earliest commentary on the *Guan-jing* is that of Jingying Huiyuan 淨影慧遠 (523-592) titled the *Guan Wuliangshoujing-yishu* 觀無量壽經義疏, while in retrospect the most influential, at least in the Japanese Pure Land traditions, has been that of Shandao 善導 (613-681), titled the *Guan Wuliangshoufojing-shu* 觀無量壽佛經疏. Both of these commentaries are of the *shu* 疏 type, the earliest example of which was Daosheng's 道生 (355-434) Lotus *sūtra* commentary.<sup>11</sup> Concerning the structure of this type of commentary Tanaka (1990: 59) says that "in its developed form, it divides the *sūtras* into sections with the following standard nomenclature: 'preface,' 'main body,' and 'conclusion.'" While in the details Huiyuan and Shandao each divide the *Guan-jing* slightly differently, they agree with each other in the basic sub-divisions. These sub-divisions are based, moreover, on a doctrinal analysis of the text, not on a philological or text-critical dissection. It is important to realize this for what follows. Shandao basically divides the text as follows:<sup>12</sup>

Prologue:	序分
Meditative Good:	定善: Contemplations 1-13.
Non-meditative Good:	散善: Contemplations 14-16.
Epilogue:	流通分

In 1976, Yamada Meiji published a paper which revolutionized our understanding of the structure of the *Guan-jing*. Yamada showed

that the Chinese names used to refer to the Buddha Amitāyus are not mixed randomly in the text, but follow a definite pattern. The name appears in the text thirty-four times. The name *Wuliangshou-fo* 無量壽佛 appears nineteen times, and *Amituo-fo* 阿彌陀佛 appears fifteen times. What is of importance, however, is the distribution of these names. The names appear in the text as follows:

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

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

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

I think Yamada's evidence makes it clear that – with the exception of his statement that the sūtra was actually compiled in China, which is still debatable – his hypothesis must be correct. It is especially convincing that the transitional sections of the sūtra mix both names. The fact that the joints revealed by Yamada's text-critical analysis correspond to joints in the text recognized by the commentators seems to suggest that even to those who lacked any awareness of the

historical background of the formation of the sūtra – and of course for traditional commentators the text was a unified whole, a record of Śākyamuni Buddha’s preaching – its episodic character was clear. On the other hand, this may be largely fortuitous, since the *shu* type of commentary was employed in commenting on texts which we have no reason to believe were compiled in the same fashion as the *Guan-jing*. It may be interesting, however, in the future to re-examine traditional dissections of sūtras with an eye toward text-critical problems, looking to see if the commentators’ feeling for joints in the sense can lead us to philologically locate historically discrete units of the texts.

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

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

śatru story but are elements that cannot be found in any of the story's traditional sources.

At this point let us present a translation of the Prologue section of the *Guan-jing*, containing the story of Ajātaśatru and Bimbisāra.<sup>14</sup>

In the great city of Rājagṛha there was a prince named Ajātaśatru who, following the counsel of Devadatta, an evil friend, seized his father King Bimbisāra and confined him within a seven-walled chamber. He ordered his attendants that no one was to be allowed to go to him. The Royal Consort, named Vaidehī, remained loyal to the king. Purifying herself by bathing, she spread flour mixed with ghee and honey over her body and filled her ornaments with grape juice, secretly giving these to the king. Then the king ate the flour and drank the juice, and asking for water he rinsed his mouth.<sup>15</sup>

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

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

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

Then, having heard these words, Ajātaśatru became angry with his mother and said: "My mother is a rebel and the companion of a rebel. The evil śramaṇas through their illusions and spells caused this evil king not to die through these many days." And then he seized a sharp sword intending to kill his mother.

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

After this point Bimbisāra does not reappear in the story, and Vaidehī becomes the central protagonist. Ajātaśatru relents and gives up any idea of harming his mother, but he does cast her into prison. While in prison she, like Bimbisāra before her, entreats the Buddha

from afar, and he sends Maudgalyāyana and Ānanda to her, then follows himself. At this point begins the bulk of the sūtra, comprising the instruction to Vaidehī on the Pure Land of Amitāyus, that is Sukhāvātī, and the way to attain birth there. In the epilogue Vaidehī attains awakening, but there is no return to the story of Ajātaśatru.<sup>16</sup>

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

Before we begin our analysis of the stories in detail, some more or less theoretical observations should be offered. Given the assumption that Yamada's hypothesis is correct, and the *Guan-jing* is in fact composed of a number of elements connected together into a whole,

it should be possible to carry out two types of investigation at the same time. In fact, more generally speaking, we can say that for any text which can be shown to be wholly or even partially constructed out of *originally independent elements*, a *double-sided investigation* is possible. First, we can investigate various aspects of the general problem of the origins of a given text itself by looking severally at the elements used to construct that text. Individually tracing the history and evolution of the component elements of a sūtra should help us to better understand the composition and development of the sūtra as a whole. Second, we can investigate the evolution of each given element of the text independent of its context as an element of that text. Thus, at one and the same time we can contribute, first, to a study of the origins of one Buddhist sūtra, and, second, to a more general study of – depending on which elements of a text we choose to trace at any given time – narrative motifs, philosophical doctrines, and so on.

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

The idea that texts are formed out of pericopes and stock phrases – although not exclusively so formed, of course – has long been recognized, and especially in the relatively well studied Pāli literature lists could undoubtedly easily be compiled of just such pericopes.<sup>18</sup> The study of narrative elements in Buddhist literature may be one of the easiest areas in which to begin this type of research. Moreover, since narrative materials have often been

ignored in the field of Buddhist Studies, a field which is biased toward doctrinal studies, at least at first progress should be rapid.<sup>19</sup>

Within the constraints of an article such as the present one it is impossible to trace in detail any story which appears with some frequency in Buddhist literature, such as the story of Ajātaśatru; there is simply too much material. It is necessary then to preface the following with the disclaimer that what follows is a selective and provisional study. At almost every turn more material could have been added, more parallels adduced, as a glance at the dictionaries of Malalasekera (1938) and Akanuma (1931) will show. Nevertheless, I would like to present several versions of the story of Ajātaśatru's imprisonment of Dimbisāra, and Vaidhī's transport of nourishment into her imprisoned husband, as found in Buddhist and Śvetāmbara Jaina literature. (I believe the story is not found at all in either Digambara Jaina or Brahmanical and Hindu literature.)<sup>20</sup> Since one of the foci of the present study is the question of the origins of the *Guan-jing*, the story presented in that sūtra as quoted above will be taken as the point of departure for the analysis that follows.

### The Buddhist Parallels

Since long ago scholars have adduced the *Mahāyāna-Mahāparinirvāna-sūtra*'s version of the story of Ajātaśatru and Bimbisāra as a parallel to the *Guan-jing*'s version. As we saw above, Yamada (1976: 86) has suggested it as a source for at least part of the *Guan-jing*'s narrative. There are considerable problems with the textual history of the Chinese translations of the *Mahāyāna-Mahāparinirvāna-sūtra*,<sup>21</sup> but we can more or less safely assume that the so-called Northern Recension texts T. 374 and T. 376 date from the beginning of the fifth century. The later so-called Southern Recension T. 375 was apparently heavily revised and augmented in China, but T. 374 and 375 agree exactly in the passages in question here, which do not appear at all in the oldest stratum of the text, T. 376. Two sets of passages contain material parallel to passages in the *Guan-jing*. In the first,<sup>22</sup> Ajātaśatru is introduced as a king who killed his own father, and regrets it deeply. His regret causes boils to appear on his body, boils for which there is no cure. His ministers

variously give him different advice about whom to consult, listing a number of heretical teachers and their doctrines. One minister mentions the names of many kings who killed their own fathers,<sup>23</sup> although with the intention of convincing Ajātaśatru that his action is not wrong, in contrast to the intention of the *Guan-jing* passage. The second often cited passage may be translated as follows:<sup>24</sup>

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

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

In a series of studies on the *Guan-jing*, Sueki Fumihiko (1982, 1986a, 1986b) investigated among other topics the question of the origins of the sūtra. Especially in his excellent synthetic survey (1986b), Sueki accepted Yamada's 1976 analysis of the structure of the text, and in all three papers just referred to he tried to suggest a possible source for the introductory narrative unit, singling out the episode of Vaidehī's transport of liquid nourishment into her imprisoned husband in her anklets as a characteristic element of the *Guan-jing*'s tale. Sueki apparently selected this story element at least

partially because the closest parallel version of the story known to him, that of the *Samghabhedavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, contains an account in which not only is the means of transport the same, but it is not grape wine (or juice) which Vaidehī carries in to the king, but water. Sueki thought that this indicated an innovation on the part of the compiler(s) of the *Guan-jing*. I am inclined to disagree with this specific aspect of Sueki's interpretation for reasons I will discuss below, but first let us take a look at the Mūlasarvāstivāda version of the story.

It has been pointed out several times that the story of Ajātaśatru and Bimbisāra is presented in the *Samghabhedavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya.<sup>25</sup> The story there begins with the lifelong opposition of Ajātaśatru, spurred on by the evil Devadatta, to his father, Bimbisāra. Bimbisāra offers Ajātaśatru ever larger shares of his kingdom in order to assuage the latter's greed, first the realm of Campa, then all of Magadha except Rājagṛha, then all but the treasury, then all but the king's own harem. After each conciliation, Devadatta urges Ajātaśatru to "show courage" and demand more from his father Bimbisāra. And each time Ajātaśatru abuses the citizenry, causing them to flee from his oppression. The following is the narrative from that point on, translated, I believe for the first time in a modern language, from the Sanskrit text discovered at Gilgit:<sup>26</sup>

The king [Bimbisāra] spoke [to Ajātaśatru] in censure, saying: "You were given the provinces along with the treasury and the stores. Why do you now destroy them?" When he had spoken thus, [Ajātaśatru] was angry and said to the ministers: "Gentlemen, what is the punishment for one who rebukes an anointed kṣatriya king?" The ministers said: "Lord, the punishment is to be put to death." He said: "It is my father; how will I put him to [a violent] death? Go, place him in the confinement of jail." [So Bimbisāra] was thrown into jail.

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

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

They answered: "Lord, your mother [daily] takes him a dish of rice boiled in milk."

Ajātaśatru gave an order that food and water were to be withheld, so that [Vaidehī] would no more bring them in. And in the harem it was ordered that no one must send food and water into the jail, the punishment for one who sent them in being death. Understanding [Ajātaśatru's] violent nature, none prepared food [for Bimbisāra], so why would they have need of sending it in? Then Vaidehī, her mind troubled by affection for her husband, smearing her limbs with barley-meal paste<sup>29</sup> and filling her anklets with water, undertook to take in that [food to Bimbisāra], and he sustained himself by it. This stratagem too was detected by the jailers, but out of affection for the king they did not inform Ajātaśatru.

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

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

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

[Ajātaśatru] said: "Close the windows, and lacerate his feet with a razor."

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

But there is nothing the Buddhas, Blessed Ones do not know, do not see, do not understand, do not discern. The reality is that, surveying the world thrice nightly and thrice daily with the Buddha-eye, the vision of truth arises for the Buddhas. Blessed Ones ....<sup>30</sup> [Namely, they consider:] "Who is forsaken? Who is joyful? Who is beset by troubles? Who is beset by danger? Who is beset by distress? Who is beset by troubles, danger and distress? Who is sunken in evil states? Who is disposed towards evil states? Who is inclined toward evil states? Extracting him from evil states, whom shall I establish in heaven and in liberation? Whose unplanted roots of merit shall I plant? Whose planted roots of merit shall I mature? Whose fully matured [roots of merit] shall I liberate?"<sup>31</sup>

The Blessed One addressed the Reverend Mahā-Maudgalyāyana: "Go, Maudgalyāyana. Inquire after King Bimbisāra's health on my behalf.<sup>32</sup> And say this: 'The Blessed One said: "I have done [for you]<sup>33</sup> what needs to be done by a Good Friend. I have pulled your foot out of the hells, the realm of beasts and the realm of demons, and I established you among the gods and men. I put an end to saṃsāra [for you]. I dried up the oceans of blood and tears [for you]. I leapt over the mountains of bones [for you]. I barred shut the doors of the evil states, and spread open [for you] the doors of heaven and of liberation."<sup>34</sup> But actually these deeds are done by you alone, are [now] piled up, their requisites attained, their conditions prepared, they are ready to cascade out like a flood, and they are unstoppable. Who else will experience the

[results of the] deeds done by you alone? Great king, the deeds [you have] done and piled up are not matured [somewhere] outside [yourself] in the earth realm, or in the water realm, or in the fire realm, or in the wind realm, but the auspicious and inauspicious deeds [you have] done are rather only matured in [your own psychic continuum, that is in your own] aggregates, spheres and components of clinging [to existence].

Deeds do not disappear even in one hundred aeons.

[But] reaching completeness and the proper time, they produce results for beings.<sup>35</sup>

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

“Yes, Reverend,” the Venerable Mahā-Maudgalyāna promised to the Blessed One. And then he attained such a contemplative trance that when his mind was composed he vanished from the Vulture Peak and set himself in the jail, in front of King Bimbisāra. And he spoke as follows: “Great King, the Blessed One inquires after your health.”<sup>36</sup> [King Bimbisāra said:] “I salute [you], Reverend Mahā-Maudgalyāna, and the Blessed One.”<sup>37</sup>

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

Deeds do not disappear even in one hundred aeons.

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

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

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

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

[Once] a boil appeared on the finger of Ajātaśatru’s son Udayabhadra. Crying he moved towards Ajātaśatru. Putting [the child] on his lap, [Ajātaśatru] hugged him, kissed him, and embraced him. Still he continued to cry, and would not stay still.

[So] Ajātaśatru put [his son's] finger in his own mouth, and the boil burst in his mouth. Ajātaśatru disposed of the purulent blood on the ground, and when Prince Udāyibhadra<sup>38</sup> saw the purulent blood, he began to cry once more. Seeing Vaidehi smile. Ajātaśatru said: "Mother. what is it?"

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

[Ajātaśatru] said: "Mother, was I so dear to [my] father?"

She said: "Yes."

Then Ajātaśatru's hatred toward his father disappeared, and respect arose. He said to his ministers: "Gentlemen, I will give half the kingdom to the man who tells me that the old king lives." [Since] that king was beloved by his townsfolk and provincials, a great mass of people began to run towards the jail.

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

Vaiśravaṇa said: "Who are you?"

He said: "I am Jinaṛṣabha, Great King." And the appellation Jinaṛṣabha was applied to him.

Sueki (1982: 463) has characterized his idea about the relationship between the episodes of Vaidehī bringing wine or water to Bimbisāra in, respectively, the *Guan-jing* and the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya as follows: "Probably the author of the *Kuan-ching* [= *Guan-jing*] knew the expression of the *S[amgha]bh[edavastu]* and adopted it transforming the latter half. But the *Sbh* was translated into Chinese more than two hundred years later than the *Kuan-ching*. Therefore the author of the *Kuan-ching* would have known the story before it was translated into Chinese." Several years later Sueki (1986a: 260) restated his conclusions as follows: "Probably the description of the *S[amghabhedavastu]* or a similar one is the original form and that of the *Guan-jing* is a transformed one.... Whether water or grape juice, the passage that Vaidehī filled her ornaments with drink is found in no other materials than the SV and the *Guan-jing*. Taking this similarity into consideration, we can surmise that [the] author or the author group of the *Guan-jing* would have known either the story of the SV or a similar one." Fujita Kōtatsu (1985: 43) has accepted Sueki's argumentation, and speculated as follows: "Probably, as the *Samghabhedavastu* text indicates, the Indian versions of the tale had only

‘water,’ the compiler of the *Guan-jing* newly adding grape juice (or grape wine), thus transforming the story. If this is so, we can see this as an indication that the tale was established in the wine producing regions of Central Asia.”

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

What is probably the earliest available datable version of a story close to that found in the *Guan-jing* appears in a Chinese sūtra, the *Foshou Weishengyuan-jing* 佛說未生冤經 (\**Ajātaśatru-sūtra*), translated – if the traditional attribution is correct – by Zhi Qian 支謙 between 220 and 253 C.E.<sup>39</sup> Although this version lacks any reference to wine or grape juice, and so cannot be considered to be an exact parallel to the version of the *Guan-jing*, it is of interest in itself, *if for no other reason than as an example of one of the oldest surviving Chinese translations of Buddhist literature*. The text is translated in full in Appendix II to the present paper, but in summary

the story is as follows:<sup>40</sup> Spurred on by Devadatta, Ajātaśatru attempts to take over the throne from his father Bimbisāra, throwing the latter into jail. Bimbisāra urges Ajātaśatru to give up his evil ways, but he refuses.

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

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

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

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

The prince said: “You may.”

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

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

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

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

The Buddha then preaches to Bimbisāra from afar, and through the Buddha’s power Bimbisāra understands his previous karma. He dies and is reborn in heaven. Here there is of course no mention of

any liquid sustenance, wine or otherwise, but there are already a number of details we will find repeatedly in other texts.

The next Chinese text to which we may turn our attention is the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādins, the *Shisong-lü* 十誦律 (T. 1435 [XXIII] 261b7-262a10), a translation of the late fourth century.<sup>41</sup> Again, spurred on by Devadatta, Ajātaśatru is urged to overthrow his father.

King Ajātaśatru heard this, became joyous,<sup>42</sup> and he ordered his ministers and court attendants to apprehend his father the king, commanding them to imprison him. The great ministers received his instructions and straightaway they arrested [Bimbisāra] and secured him in the jail. The great king [Bimbisāra] was good, wise and tender, and so one billion people took various delicacies and went to speak with the king. The king ate and thus sustained himself. After several days had passed, Ajātaśatru asked: "Is the great king alive or not?" [The jailers] answered: "He is alive." "How is he able to survive?" They answered: "People come to speak with the king, and they bring food and drink which sustain him." The king immediately ordered the jailers: "Starting right away you must not allow anyone to enter [the jail]."

Later, a consort<sup>43</sup> of the king stole some food and took it in to the king, who by eating it was able to survive. After several days had passed, the king again asked: "Is the great king alive?" And they answered: "He is alive." "How is he able to survive?" They answered: "It is because there is a consort of the king, and she comes and gives him food and drink." Immediately [the king] ordered the jailers not to allow the king's consort to enter [the jail].

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

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

.....(list of miracles which occur when Buddhas enter a city omitted).....

At that time, the Buddha entered Rājagṛha with his right foot treading upon the threshold of the gate, and everywhere he manifested each and every one of the multiple auspicious portents [listed above, but omitted in this translation]. After seeing these signs, King Bimbisāra knew the Buddha would enter Rājagṛha. From his tower the king faced a gap [in the wall] and standing there he gazed upon the Buddha entering the city. The king attained the Noble Path,<sup>44</sup> and since he saw the Buddha and the monks, the joy [produced by that] sustained him. And after several days had passed, Ajātaśatru again asked: "Is the king still alive?" They answered: "He is alive." "How is he able to survive?" A minister with a jealous spirit answered, saying: "The Buddha entered the city and manifested his supernatural powers. Your father the king survives because he faced through a gap and looked upon the Buddha."

Ajātaśatru said: "With a sharp blade cut the soles of the great king's feet, and quickly bind the skin; do not allow him to move to and fro."<sup>45</sup> Being so ordered they right away cut the soles of the great king's feet, quickly binding them, and he was unable to move to and fro. For this reason the king lay down, and as the days passed he grew emaciated and ill.

Again, at one time King Ajātaśatru was eating with his mother. The king had a son, whose name was Udayabhadra, and he was playing in the road with a young dog. The king asked: "Where is Udayabhadra?" They answered: "In the road playing with the dog." The king said: "Bid him come; I will eat with him." And clutching the dog he came following the messenger.<sup>46</sup> But the prince did not eat. The king asked why, and the prince said: "If the king allows me to eat with my dog, then I shall eat." The king said: "As you wish." And the prince himself ate, and then took [some food] and gave it to the dog.<sup>47</sup> The king said to his mother: "I have done a difficult thing. Why? I am an anointed kṣatriya king, yet out of love for my son I allowed him to eat with a dog."

His mother said: "This is not a difficult thing you have done. Why? There are people who eat dog meat, and if you allow them to eat it, what is so strange?"<sup>48</sup> Do you know that your father really did do something difficult?" The king said: "What difficult thing did he do?" His mother said: "When you were young your finger had a carbuncle. It quickly became very painful, and day and night you could not sleep. Your father held you on his knee, and put your abscessed finger into his mouth. The body of the great king was soft, and you were able to be sleep comfortably. Because his mouth was warm, the carbuncle ripened and discharged purulently. The great king thought to himself, 'If I take his finger out [of my mouth] and spit out the pus, this will increase my son's suffering.' So straightaway he swallowed the pus. Your father did this difficult thing; now please release him!"

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

The great king heard this [tumultuous roar], and thought to himself: "My son is

evil, and doesn't feel compassion or pity. I do not know now what sort of punishment he will inflict upon me." And thinking thus, he cast himself off his bed and thereupon ended his life. At that time King Ajātasattu snatched away the life of his father the king and incurred a great sin of immediate retribution.<sup>49</sup>

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

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

As has been known for more than one hundred years, our story occurs in the Pāli commentarial literature, and it has been recounted from there several times.<sup>50</sup> The version of the story closest to that with which we are presently concerned is found in Buddhaghosa's commentary to the *Dīgha-nikāya*, the *Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī*. The section introductory to that which contains our tale consists of the background of Ajātasattu's life.<sup>51</sup> Before his birth it was predicted that Ajātasattu would become his father's enemy.<sup>52</sup> During her pregnancy his mother, due to the influence of the unborn child, felt a pregnancy craving for her husband Bimbisāra's blood. In order to prevent the child Ajātasattu from killing Bimbisāra in the future, she repeatedly tried to abort the foetus, but was found out and stopped by the king. At birth the child was taken from her, and when presented with her son years later she grew to love him. King Bimbisāra subsequently bestowed upon his son the vice-regency. The story then introduces Devadatta who urges Ajātasattu that, life being short, he should kill his father and seize the throne immediately. Ajātasattu is caught in his assassination attempt, and when Bimbisāra questions him, he replies that the attempt was motivated by his desire for the throne. And so Bimbisāra grants the kingdom to him.<sup>53</sup> Ajātasattu tells Devadatta that he has attained his desire, and the following is a translation of the story from that point:<sup>54</sup>

[Devadatta said:] "You, like a man who has put a mouse inside a drum and covered it over, think you have done [all] that needs doing. [But] in a few days your father [Bimbisāra], contemptuous of what you have done, will become king himself [again, just as the mouse will chew his way out of the drum]"

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

"You should kill him off."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

King [Bimbisāra] saw those [barbers coming] and thought: "Surely my son has been admonished by someone, and these [barbers] have come to shave me." They came, greeted him, and stood there. And being asked, "Why have you come?" they told him [Ajātasattu's] order. [Bimbisāra] told [them]: "Do what your king commands." Saying "Sit down, Lord," they said to the king: "Lord, we are carrying

our the king's order; do not be angry with us. This is not fit for a Righteous King like you." And with the left hand they grabbed his ankle and with the right hand the razor, and slicing open the soles of his feet they smeared them with salt and oil and roasted them crackle crackle with acacia wood embers.

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

The king experienced a strong sensation, and he brought to mind [the expression] "Hail to the Buddha! Hail to the Dhamma!" and in the area around the shrine<sup>56</sup> he withered like a discarded garland. And he was reborn as a yakkha named Janavasa<sup>57</sup> an attendant to Vessavana,<sup>58</sup> in the Heaven of the Four Guardian Kings.

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

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

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

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

It may be that there are or were other important Buddhist versions of our tale, in Indic languages, Tibetan, Chinese or other Buddhist languages, for certainly, as we have already seen, the story is widespread. But I believe that those versions presented so far give at least a fair sample of the main extant versions.<sup>59</sup> Now, if these versions constituted the complete extent of the tale in Indian literature, the story would still have to be counted as a fairly widely known one. We have quoted it in Indic languages from fifth century Ceylon and perhaps sixth or seventh century Gilgit,<sup>60</sup> and in Chinese from as

early as the third century on. This must be counted as a fundamental Buddhist legend. But there is at least one vital element missing in those versions which parallel the episode presented in the Guan-jing, as noted by Sueki, namely the introduction of wine into the story. And if we were to limit our study to Buddhist sources, we might be at an impasse. But this story is not the sole property of the Buddhists.<sup>61</sup>

### The Jaina Parallels

The question of the dating of early Jaina texts is a vexing one, but already in the *Nirayāvaliyā*, the eighth of the Śvetāmbara Upāṅgas, a text which dates (in the form in which we have it) to not before the fourth century,<sup>62</sup> we find a story identical in outline to the versions recounted above, although the element of the queen's efforts to carry nourishment to the imprisoned king is missing. The *Nirayāvaliyā* is a very interesting work, and should certainly be translated in its entirety by a competent Jaina scholar. Since, however, the work does not contain an exact parallel to the episode we are studying here, and is thus not directly relevant to the issue at hand, I will not translate the story, which is rather long, in full. On the other hand, this represents probably the earliest non-Buddhist version of the story, so it is worth summarizing briefly: Queen Cellaṇā, the mother of Kūṇika (that is, Ajātaśatru), craves in her pregnancy for the fried muscle of the heart of King Śreṇika (that is, Bimbisāra). Prince Abhaya, Śreṇika's son, tricks her into believing that she has been given it to eat. When Kūṇika is born Cellaṇā expels him, and a cock tears open the child's finger. Śreṇika discovering this succors the child, and puts the injured and infected finger into his own mouth to clean it and ease the child's pain. Later, Kūṇika along with his ten brothers imprisons his father and himself takes the throne. Then, on a certain occasion Kūṇika comes to pay his respects to his mother, who however looks unhappy and does not respond. Asked why, she relates to Kūṇika the story of her pregnancy and wish to be rid of him, and of Śreṇika's care of his son's injured finger, accusing Kūṇika of ingratitude. The story goes on:<sup>63</sup>

Then King Kūṇika, having listened and attended to this statement in the presence of Queen Cellaṇā, spoke thus to Queen Cellaṇā: “I have done a wicked thing, mother, binding with chains the dear, divine King Śreṇika, venerable, beloved with tender attachment. I will go to him and sever the chains of King Śreṇika myself”

So saying, with an axe in hand he went, determined, to the prison fortress. Then King Śreṇika, seeing the prince approaching with axe in hand, spoke thus [to himself]: “This Prince Kūṇika desires what no one desires [namely, death], is marked out for a miserable end, was inauspiciously born on the fourteenth day of the month, has abandoned propriety, fortune, happiness and renown, and comes here quickly with an axe in hand. Who knows, but I shall die through some horrible means of death.”<sup>64</sup> And so saying [to himself] in fear, dread, alarm, anxiety and terror, he put *tala-puḍaga* poison<sup>65</sup> into his mouth. Then King Śreṇika, having put *tala-puḍaga* poison into his mouth, in the passing of an instant fell down lifeless, motionless, deprived of vitality.

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

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

The oldest Jaina text of which I am aware in which our story, including the episode of the queen of Śreṇika / Bimbisāra bringing him nourishment in prison, appears is the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* of Jina-dāsagaṇi, dated by Leumann (1934: IVb) to between 600 and 650 C.E.<sup>66</sup> The whole *Āvaśyaka* literature – what Bruhn (1981: 17) calls the “*Āvaśyaka* cluster” – is a vast storehouse of Jaina and more generally Indian tales, and has yet to be explored in much detail. Despite the apparently rather late date of the *Cūrṇi*, for instance, it almost certainly preserves earlier narrative material. Watanabe Kenji (1990: 900) has observed that:

Compared with Buddhist works, the dates of these works [= *Āvaśyaka* texts] are new, but ... the stories of the Jaina tradition use Prakrit even within *īkā* which are written in the Sanskrit language. This indicates that those stories are quoted from an old tradition. Actually, the Jaina stories are often indicative of a form close to the original of the tales. There are many cases in which the age of the text and that of the tale it transmits are not the same.

Although Adelheid Mette (1983: 137-38) has discussed some parallels between the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* and the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, and opined that in some cases motifs or stories found in the former "are probably borrowed from Buddhist sources in later times," this can by no means be the case in a great many instances, and undoubtedly is not so in the present circumstance. The text of our story is given in the *Cūrṇi* in Prakrit prose:<sup>67</sup>

At one time, Kūṇika conferred together with the princes, Kāla and the rest: "Arresting Śreṇika, we will split the kingdom into eleven parts." They agreed, and Śreṇika was arrested.

Forenoon and afternoon, [Kūṇika] caused [Śreṇika] to be given one hundred lashes with a whip, and he permitted no one except Cellaṇa to approach [Śreṇika]. "Food and water are prohibited," [he said].

Thence Cellaṇā, fixing *kummāsa*<sup>68</sup> in her hair, and repeatedly [washing] her hair with a hundred layers of wine, entered [the prison]. She pretended to wash, and one hundred times washing her hair with water it became [reconstituted as] wine. Thanks to the power of this [wine], he did not perceive any pain.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Seeing this, [Kūṇika] became even more unhappy. Then cremating [Śreṇika], he went home. Content to abandon the burden of sovereignty, he sat thinking about that. The crown prince and the ministers thought: "The king will die." And so inscribing an edict on a copper plate, and giving it an old appearance, they publicized it: "Thus it is to be done for the father: He will be saved through the giving of the

*pinḍa*." From that time on, [the general custom of the rite of] offering of *pinḍa* to one's father became established. And thus in time [Kūṇika] became free of grief.

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

It seems more than likely that the great Jaina scholar Hemacandra (1088-1173) was inspired by, or even directly based himself on, this account in the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* when several centuries later he recorded the same tale in his veritable encyclopedia of Jaina narrative lore, the *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita* or "Lives of the Sixty-three Divine Persons [of Jainism]." <sup>69</sup> Our tale occurs in the tenth book of Hemacandra's vast work, the *Mahāvīracarita*, this version in Sanskrit as distinct from the earlier Prakrit versions. <sup>70</sup> Hemacandra lived in Gujarat under the Caulukya dynasty, and is credited with converting the monarch Kumarapala to the Jaina faith, this conversion leading to the domination of Jainism in Gujarat. As the life and works of Hemacandra, however, are well known and well studied, there is no need to describe them here in detail, <sup>71</sup> and we can move directly to a translation of the story.

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

Accordingly they all, evil-minded, imprisoned their own unsuspecting father. For evil offspring are like a poison tree born within one's own house. Therefore, Kūṇika threw Śreṇika, like a parrot, into a cage. But there was a difference, for he did not give him even food or drink. Prompted by his former hatred, morning and afternoon day after day evil Kūṇika lashed his father a hundred times with a whip. Śreṇika endured this misfortune wrought by fate; even if he is strong, what can an elephant do, tied by a rope?

Kūṇika did not permit anyone to go near Śreṇika, except that out of courtesy to his mother he did not bar Celaṇā. Daily Celaṇā, hair wet from a hundred washings in

wine, like one who had bathed a short while before, went to Śreṇika. And placing a bail of *kulmāsa* into her hair like a wreath of flowers, Celaṇā, devoted to her husband, took it to him. Celaṇā gave the hidden ball of *kulmāsa* to her husband, and obtaining what was for him hard to find he thought it to be like divine food. Śreṇika maintained his life with that ball of *kulmāsa*. In the absence of food, the disease that is hunger leads to death. Together with drops of tears from her eyes Celaṇā, devoted to her husband, made fall from the tangles of her hair drops of wine [placed there] through a hundred washings. And Śreṇika drank those falling drops of wine, as a thirsty *cātaka*<sup>72</sup> drinks drops of water released by the clouds. By virtue of that wine drunk up in mere drops Śreṇika did not feel the whippings, nor did he suffer from thirst.

And having imprisoned Śreṇika in this way, to the haughtily reigning Kūṇika a son was borne by his wife Padmāvati...

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

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

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

Kūṇika said: "Shame! Shame on me, acting without reflecting! I shall deliver the kingdom back to my father, as if it had been placed on deposit." With these words, though the meal was but half-eaten, rinsing his mouth and handing his son to a nurse, Kūṇika stood up, anxious to go into the presence of his father. Intending "I will shatter the fetters on my father's feet" and grabbing an iron staff, he ran toward Śreṇika. The guards assigned to Śreṇika, previous intimates of his, saw Kūṇika

coming and full of confusion said: "Like the staff-bearer Yama embodied, your son is quickly coming toward us, bearing an iron staff. We do not know what he will do." Śreṇika thought: "Certainly he intends to kill me. Other times he came carrying a whip, but now he comes carrying a staff. I do not know – probably I will be killed through some horrible manner of death. Therefore even before he has come, death will be my refuge." And thinking thus Śreṇika put *tāluṣṭa* poison on the tip of his tongue, and his life left quickly, as if it had been right at the foremost point standing ready to depart.

Kūṇika repents, and after performing the cremation begins to waste away himself. His ministers convince him to perform the requisite offerings by forging a copper-plate inscription, and eventually Kūṇika gets over his grief. There is no question that this version is highly elaborated and embellished, but at the same time its connection with the *Āvaśyakacūrṇi* version should be obvious. While perhaps the most detailed and elaborate version I have met with, the *Triṣaṣṭīśalākāpuruṣacarita* version is not the latest.

A close parallel to our story appears again in the *Ākhyānakamaṇi-kośa*, a text by Nemicandra (1073-83) furnished with a Prakrit verse commentary (*vṛtti*) by Āmradeva (1134). The narrative material is contained in Āmradeva's commentary.<sup>73</sup> Here too Prince Aśoka-candra, the Kūṇika character, arrests his father, imprisons and whips him, and attempts to starve him to death. And again, Cellaṇā conceals *kulmāsa* in her hair, which is also washed with wine. She gives the food to the king, and reconstitutes the wine. By drinking the wine, the king is able to endure the whippings, and so on.

The latest of the versions I will quote here is that found in the *Kathākośa*, a Jaina story collection of unknown authorship and date.<sup>74</sup> Discussing the text in his *A History of Indian Literature*, Winternitz (1927: 542, n. 2) says "It is certainly not old, though it probably made use of old sources." The editor of the Sanskrit text, Ingeborg Hoffmann, quotes Ludwig Alsdorf's opinion that "No dating appears to be attempted anywhere. The work, however, may belong at the earliest to the fifteenth century, rather than the sixteenth."<sup>75</sup> This text was translated into English already in 1895 by C.H. Tawney, the well known translator of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* or "Ocean of Story," but the text and this English translation seem to have remained little known, even among Indologists.<sup>76</sup> It was in fact

in reading this translation that I first noticed the parallel to the *Guan-jing*, a parallel pointed out already by Tawney in his introduction.

The story that interests us is found in chapter 25 of the *Kathākośa*, in the episode of Kūlavālaka. Tawney himself, in the brief introduction to his translation, pointed out that “The statement in the ‘Kathākośa’ with regard to the behavior of the head-queen agrees closely with that found in the ‘Amitāyur Dhyāna Sūtra,’ translated from the Chinese by Mr. J. Takakusu.”<sup>77</sup> (“Amitāyur Dhyāna Sūtra” is, of course, the hypothetical, and almost certainly false, Sanskrit “reconstruction” of the Chinese title *Guan Wuliangshou-jing*.) Hoffmann has taken no note of this identification, but has noted other parallels including that with the *Triṣaṣṭīśalākāpuruṣacarita*.<sup>78</sup> Tawney himself (1895: xx-xxi, and 175-78, in the notes), as Hermann Jacobi before him, correctly identified Śreṇika with Bimbisāra, Koṇika (Kūṇika) with Ajātaśatru and Cillaṇā (Cel[ī]ṇā) with Vaidehī.

The story of Kūlavālaka begins with Śreṇika ruling in Rājagrha. After Prince Abhaya abdicates the succession to become a Jain monk, King Śreṇika hands the kingdom over to Koṇika.

One day Koṇika, having consulted with the ten princes, Prince Kāla and the others, threw King Śreṇika into prison. He whipped him a hundred times every forenoon and a hundred times every afternoon, and forbid him food and water. Then Queen Cillaṇā, having fixed *kulmāṣa* in her hair, with great difficulty took them in for him to eat. Through a stratagem she took [him] Candrahāsā wine<sup>79</sup> in her hair, and when her hair was washed a hundred times, all the water became wine. Owing to the strength given him by the wine, the king was able to endure the whippings.

One day there was born to that same Koṇika, by his wife Padmāvati, a son named Udaya. Once Koṇika was eating, having placed [his son] on his lap, and his urine fell right into the food vessel. Koṇika did not put him off his lap for fear of disturbing his rest, but ate his food mixed with urine. He said to his mother, who was nearby: “Mother, is there anyone whose son is so dear to him?” His mother said: “Damn! Listen, you wicked man! When you were in my womb, I had a pregnancy craving to eat your father’s flesh. The king satisfied my pregnancy craving. When I gave birth to you, saying that you were evil I abandoned you in a grove of Aśoka trees. When the king heard this, he himself went to the grove and brought you back. Thus you were named Aśokacandra. Then a cock<sup>80</sup> tore open your finger, and it became inflamed.<sup>81</sup> Therefore you received the name Koṇika.<sup>82</sup> Your infected finger caused you intense pain, and your father held that finger, oozing fetidly, in his mouth, and then you did not cry. To this extent did he love you.”

When Konika heard this, he was full of remorse, and he said: “Shame on me, to show such gratitude to my own father!” Then immediately taking up an iron club,

with the aim of breaking the [jailed king's] chains, he personally set out [for the jail]. Then the guards informed the king in advance: "Koṇika is coming in a very impatient mood, with an iron club in his hand. We have no idea what he is up to." The king thought to himself. "He will put me to death by some degrading mode of execution." And so thinking he took *tālaputa* poison. When Koṇika arrived there, King Śreṇika was dead. [Śreṇika] subsequently became an inhabitant of hell, destined to live in the first hell for eighty-four thousand years. Liberated from hell, he shall be the first *tīrthankara*, named Mahāpadma,<sup>83</sup> in this very land of Bhārata.

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

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

## Appraisal

There are a number of impressive parallels between the various Buddhist and Jaina versions of the story of Ajātaśatru and his father Bimbisāra. Among these, the reference to Bimbisāra's queen bringing liquid nourishment to her jailed husband appears to be a significant element for the study of the history of this story. It would, naturally, be unreasonable to suggest that the authors of the *Guan-jing* knew of the Jaina parallels to their story, and I in no way mean to suggest that the presence of wine in both traditions indicates a direct relation between them. On the other hand, the absence of references to wine in known Chinese and Indian Buddhist sources and the presence of such references in non-Buddhist Indian sources makes it more than likely that the materials which inspired the

authors of the *Guan-jing* in their composition of the narrative frame were, or at least could have been, presently unknown, and perhaps no longer extant, Indian materials, even if the sūtra as a whole were composed in a non-Indian environment.

To understand a bit better how this composition of the *Guan-jing* may have taken place, it may be instructive to take a look at the way in which the narratives of the texts of our tale, translated above, line up against one another, story element by story element, in what they include and what they omit. An analysis of the arrangement of motifs (see the Table) shows that the division postulated above – the division between on the one hand the episode of Ajātaśatru’s imprisonment of his father and subsequent attempt to starve him to death and on the other hand that of Ajātaśatru’s attempt to kill his mother – is paralleled in the other versions of the story. That is, while apparently the second episode of Ajātaśatru’s anger is found outside the *Guan-jing* only in the *Mahāyāna-Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*, all of the versions of the story quoted above show a shift in the narrative at that same point; there is a disjunction in the narrative sequence. Some versions follow with an episode of Ajātaśatru’s own son, others with a story about Ajātaśatru’s own childhood.<sup>84</sup> Ajātaśatru is led to repent by these stories told to him by his mother, or by his spontaneous love for his own child and the empathy for his father engendered by that love. The uniformity of the narrative pattern across all versions of the story suggests the underlying episodic structure, and the existence of our postulated separable story units. The very fact of the wide spread of our story, and the existence of versions structurally and in terms of content so close to that of the *Guan-jing* in Jaina texts from North-western India, again make it clear that the first episode of the Prologue of the *Guan-jing* is thoroughly Indian, showing no necessary evidence of Central Asian influence. This too suggests, I believe, that the first portion of the Prologue narrative frame was borrowed verbatim, or nearly so, from Indian materials.<sup>85</sup> The coincidence between specific elements in the *Guan-jing* account and those in, respectively, the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* and the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* (Ajātaśatru’s anger and the queen’s use of anklets) does suggest a possible relation with these texts, but again, the episode is still firmly located in the

Indian world. The same cannot be said, however, for the *Guan-jing* as a whole.

Above I mentioned briefly some of the reasons offered in support of the position that the *Guan-jing* is of non-Indian origin. I believe that the strongest arguments are those which suggest a Central Asian origin for the text as a whole, but probably some area of Central Asia under strong Chinese cultural influence; it seems likely that the text was originally composed in the Chinese language, if only for the reasons adduced by Yamada and explained above. Fujita Kōtatsu (1990: 157, 163) supposes that the text was compiled in the Turfan area, but aside from the fact that already in Western Jin 西晉 (late third century C.E.) times the Turfan area possessed Buddhist scriptures in Chinese (Ogasawara 1961: 137), I cannot detect Fujita's reasons for pointing specifically to Turfan. It may be more cautious to suggest in a general way, with Sueki (1986b: 176), that the text was composed in Eastern Turkestan under the influence of Chinese thought and originally in the Chinese language. Another possibility is that the sūtra was composed in China (Nanjing?) by a monk (Kalayaśas?) from Central Asia, again in Chinese from the beginning.<sup>86</sup> Some of the arguments which could be leveled against this suggestion are implied by our earlier discussion of the rationale behind Chinese verification of the authenticity of sūtras. It seems unlikely that, unless some powerful Chinese person or persons actually requested or at least sanctioned a sūtra – after all, a record of the word of the Buddha – created in China itself, such a work would be admitted as orthodox. There are of course examples of just such occurrences, but it seems to me that the political environments which engendered such “apocryphal” texts have yet to be well understood.

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

I surmise that while on the one hand the Prologue, the first Thirteen Contemplations and the later Three Contemplations contain elements going back some to Central Asia and some in their turn to India, on the other hand some of those elements date to the time when the sūtra was put together in its present form. That is, the sūtra along with organizing contemplations on Amitāyus which were being practiced in Central Asia transformed the tragedy of Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru – which I imagine was popular in Central Asia – turning it into a story centered on Vaiḍeḥī. Moreover,

it expanded the various practices of Good and practices of the Recitation of the Name into the Nine Grades, molding the whole into a single sūtra.

It will require considerable further work to critically examine the evidence for this hypothesis, at least parts of which are nevertheless certainly correct. Since the Nine Grades of beings into which the *Guan-jing* classifies religious practitioners seems virtually certain to be of Chinese origin,<sup>87</sup> and the Indic origins of the introductory story are equally clear, it may be best to use the term suggested by Fujita (1985: 60-61) and speak of a “mixed origin” for the sūtra, this referring to its composition out of units of mixed Indian, Central Asian and Chinese origin.<sup>88</sup> Following the arguments of Yamada (1976), it is hard to imagine that the text was written originally in a language other than Chinese.

Several other aspects of the versions we have examined should not be overlooked. While I cannot offer a detailed discussion of the literary qualities of the texts presented above, it is clear that some are bare presentations of a story, while others are rich, poetic treatments of the same theme. Here even the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya rises above the generally pedestrian literary level of most Buddhist texts when it employs such poetic conceits as the terms *bharṭṛsnehoparuddhyamānahrdaya* (“her mind troubled by affection for her husband”) and *bāśpoparuddhyamānagadgadhantha* (“his voice choked with tears and sobbing”), and the imagery of Hemacandra’s version in which Cetaṇā rehydrates the wine she smuggles to Śreṇika with her tears is vivid and striking. The ways in which these stories have each been transformed would make an interesting object of study.<sup>89</sup> We might provisionally note some ironic twists, such as the concern of the king, dying of hunger, to discover which realm, upon his rebirth, will offer him the best kinds of food. It is only speculation to suggest that the motif of the rebirth of Bimbisāra on the lap of Vaiśravaṇa is primary, and the connection with the food in the latter’s realm secondary. Likewise the laceration of the king’s feet to prevent his seeing the Buddha and thereby sustaining his life is integrated into the stories with varying degrees of success. In the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya and \**Ajātaśatru-sūtra*, the sight of the Buddha sustains the king, but in the version of the scholastic Buddhaghosa it is the joy produced by his attainment of the *magga-*

*phala* (for Buddhaghosa probably technically equivalent to *sotāpatti-phala*) which sustains the king, and preventing the king's pacing does nothing to affect this. It has been suggested that in the concern with feet we should see some connection with a world-wide archetype including the piercing of Oedipus's heel, but I confess I am not convinced by this suggestion.<sup>90</sup>

A theme which provides part of the background for the story, but is not expressed explicitly in every version (or is mentioned previous to the place in the text where our extracts began), is the pregnancy craving (*dohada*) of Ajātaśatru's mother during the time he is in her womb. This motif, as Maurice Bloomfield (1920) has so interestingly shown, is a common element in Indian tales. Bloomfield discusses several versions of our story, and in addition mentions a similar, though not entirely parallel, account in the Jaina *Samarāicca Kahā* of Haribhadra (mid-eighth century) and its Sanskrit paraphrase the *Samarādityasamkṣepa* of Pradyumna (1214). The Prakrit story collection *Samarāicca Kahā* contains (Jacobi 1908-26: xlvi; 125. 6ff.) the story of a prince who imprisons his father the king. The king's queens visit him in jail, but in this version the king wishes to starve himself to death. His son threatens to cut off the king's head unless he takes food, and upon his refusal the son indeed does take his own father's life. I have not studied this story in detail, but its connection, at least conceptually, with our tale is obvious. The actual violent murder of a father by a son is rather rare in Indian literature, and the reluctance of the son to undertake such a vicious action against his father is referred to in several versions of our story.<sup>91</sup> There are, however, in fact examples in Buddhist and Jaina literature of violent patricide, and I refer the interested reader to my paper (Silk Forthcoming) which deals with this topic in detail.

One aspect of the tale of Ajātaśatru and Bimbisāra which has drawn considerable attention is the similarity to the European story of Oedipus. A Japanese psychoanalyst and sometime disciple of Freud, Kozawa Heisaku 古沢平作 (1897-1969), apparently decided that the Japanese did not have an Oedipus Complex, but rather an "Ajase Complex," Ajase 阿闍世 being the Japanese reading of the Chinese transliteration of the name Ajātaśatru. Here we may merely note that the tale interpreted psychoanalytically in this theory is a

modified version of the one we have recounted above. According to Sueki (1985), Kozawa presented the Ajātaśatru story based on the version in the *Kyōgyōshinshō* 教行信證 of Shinran 親鸞, which is in turn based on the *Guan-jing* and the *Mahāyāna-Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*.<sup>92</sup> Kozawa's follower Okonogi Keigo 小此木啓吾 (1930 - ) added additional elements of his own creation removing the story, as Sueki says, even further from the sources. Sueki questions whether an ancient Indian story can reveal anything about the contemporary Japanese psyche, although of course a similar question could be asked about an ancient Greek story and modern Europeans. Be that as it may, it is very revealing for the Buddhist scholar and the psychoanalyst alike to note, as Sueki suggests, that apparently Shinran added our story to his monumental work the *Kyōgyōshinshō* late in his life, after his break with his own son Zenran 善鸞.<sup>93</sup> Although perhaps for somewhat different reasons than those adduced by the Japanese psychoanalysts, I also believe that it is not entirely accurate to treat the Ajātaśatru story as a true Oedipal tale since, crucially, Ajātaśatru does not in fact desire his mother.<sup>94</sup> I have discussed the issue of Indian Oedipal tales in detail in my paper mentioned above.<sup>95</sup>

Finally, in order to more fully understand the *Guan-jing* and its Prologue, it is important to ask what a story like that of Ajātaśatru and Bimbisāra does when used as a narrative frame for a text. I think one of the most important roles fulfilled by any such frame story is the provision of legitimation for the text. The audience of a new literary production, the authors of which adopt a well-known story such as that of Ajātaśatru and Bimbisāra, is already familiar with the "facticity" of the story. It is a tribute to the hold that this particular story has on the imagination, perhaps, that even such a modern, critical scholar as Fujita Kōtatsu (1985: 89) repeatedly refers to the "historical reality" (*shijitsu* 史実) of the "Tragedy at Rājagṛha." While suggesting (1985: 91) that "Probably the compiler(s) of the *Guan-jing*, collecting various available versions of the tale of Ajātaśatru, reconstructed them into a shape fitting to the introduction to this sūtra," a suggestion with which I agree, he goes on to say (1985: 92): "However, this Tragedy of Rājagṛha has as its background the historical reality of Ajātaśatru's murder of his father, but the overall

structure skillfully integrates some psychological coloring.... It is not merely a report of historical fact....” In his very valuable comparative study of the earliest Buddhist and Jaina canonical texts, Nagarāṅgi (1986: 456ff.) even goes so far as to debate about the religious affiliation – Buddhist or Jaina – of the main actors. As far as I can see, neither of these scholars, or the many others who similarly refer to the historical facticity of the story, offers reasons for accepting the historicity of the tales to which they refer, perhaps assuming that the weight of tradition guarantees their authority. As a matter of general principle, however, the burden of proof must fall on one who wishes to accept legendary material as representing historical fact, and we as historians must begin with an assumption that the legends are *not* historical, believing so until convinced otherwise.<sup>96</sup> On the other hand, an examination of legends *as legends* may often help us understand how Indian Buddhists understood their own tradition.

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

to convince their audience of the text's *historicity*, since this is an aspect of its broader overall *authenticity*. One approach is to examine the dynamics of the legends themselves, to explore the ideology which drove their authors to compose these stories. I believe that such investigations will be one fruitful area for future research in Buddhist literature.

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

## Conclusion

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

There remain many interesting questions about the *Guan-jing*, and

the full story of its origins is far from written. The present paper has, however, offered some clues which, it is hoped, might aid in the writing of that history. It is also hoped that some of the methods utilized here might also be used, *mutatis mutandis*, in the investigation of other Buddhist texts.

*Jonathan A. Silk*  
*Western Michigan University*

## Appendix I: On the Problem of Wine

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

Certainly the coincidence of the means of transport, ankle ornaments, is important. However, although I believe that it is nowhere made explicit, there seems to be an underlying assumption behind the argument sketched above that the term for grape wine found in the *Guan-jing* could not have come from either a Chinese source other than the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* – which itself is rightly rejected as a possible source of the idea by Sueki, since the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* was translated only after the *Guan-jing* is known to have come into existence – or from an Indian source. I would like to show briefly that either of these alternatives can be shown to be possible, even based on an assumption that one knows nothing of the other versions of the *Guan-jing*'s story discussed above.

It is certainly true that Central Asia was one, one might even say the, important center of viticulture in ancient and medieval Asia. According to the detailed account in Laufer (1919: 220ff.), however, already in 128 B.C.E. the Chinese encountered wine produced from grapes in Fergana and among the Parthians, and taking the seeds back to China they cultivated them extensively.<sup>97</sup> The above cited word for grape, *putao* (later written 葡萄, as it is in modern Japanese and Chinese), is assumed to be of Iranian origin (Laufer 1919: 225, and Bailey 1954: 11). But the Chinese were slow to take up grape wine production and drinking. “The curious point is that the Chinese, while they received the grape in the era of the Han from an Iranian nation, and observed the habit of wine-drinking among Iranians at large, acquired the art of wine-making as late as the T’ang from a Turkish tribe of Turkistan” (Laufer 1919: 233). Of course the Chinese had a large number of other alcoholic beverages available, made out of various agricultural products. It is clear, nevertheless, that knowledge of grape wine is very ancient in China, even if the general practice of producing and consuming it dates to the medieval period.

It may be relevant to note here that the term *putaojiang* need not necessarily refer to an alcoholic beverage. Xuanzang’s *Datang Xiyuji* 大唐西域記 (§II.17 = T. 2087 [LI] 875b5-6; Ji 1985: 215; Beal 1906: I.89; Mizutani 1971: 48) mentions the alcoholic wine of grapes, consumed by Kṣatriyas, but in the same passage refers to the non-alcoholic juice of grapes consumed by Śramaṇas and Brahmans: 沙門婆羅門飲葡萄 ... 漿非酒醴之謂也.

In India the knowledge and use of grape wine is ancient, as has been well-known for some time. Hideo Kimura (1961: 4) made clear that “Grapes and their wines were already popular in Indian life in the fourth century A.D. and ... they were known also by the people who used [the] Sanskrit language in about the fourth century B.C.” At the same time that Kimura’s paper was published, a study of Indian culinary habits was also published (Prakash 1961), containing detailed information on wines. The interested reader can also consult Chattopadhyay (1968), which however concentrates on references to drunkenness, generally in somewhat later literature.

The terms for grape wine in India can be traced to a fairly ancient period. In the Pāli *Vinaya* (i.246,16), *Jātaka* (ii.96,19-20), and elsewhere, the term *muddikāpānam* seems to mean grape juice with intoxicating properties (Laufer 1919: 240). Chapter two of Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*, dated by T. R. Trautmann (1971: 183-84) to about 150 C.E., contains the following at II.25.24: "*mṛdvikaraso madhu*, grape juice (wine) is (called) *madhu*." The term *mārdvika* or grape wine is also found in the *Suśrutasamhitā* 45.173, which dates to perhaps the second century, the *Viṣṇudharmasūtra* 22.83, probably of the fifth century, and Vagbhaṭa's *Aṣṭāṅgasaṅgraha* 6.120, 126, 127, of the seventh (?) century, and can undoubtedly be found in numerous other such texts. The fifth century poet Kālidāsa's *Raghuvamśa* IV.65 contains the following which, while not explicit, is certainly suggestive:

*vinayate sma tadodydhā madhubhir vijayaśramam /  
āstīrṇājīnaratnāsu drākṣāvalayabhūmiṣu //*

His warriors removed the fatigue of victory with wines,  
On grounds encircled with grape vines and covered with precious deer skins.

The normal Classical Sanskrit words for grape wine are *mārdvikā*, *madhu* and so on on the one hand, and *drākṣārasa*, *drākṣāsava* and the like on the other. For etymological discussions of the first group see Bailey (1954). The second group of terms is related directly to a Sanskrit word for grapes, *drākṣā*. I think several things should be clear from this necessarily brief discussion. First, it is not certain that the term found in the *Guan-jing* passage necessarily refers to an alcoholic beverage made of grape juice (that is, what we commonly call "wine"), although this does seem likely. Second, since the Chinese had a very ancient knowledge of the grape and of grape wine, although this knowledge may not have been widespread it is conceivable that Chinese Buddhist authors too had this knowledge. Third, it is obvious from numerous references in both technical and non-technical Sanskrit and Pāli literature that grape wine was well-known in ancient India, certainly at least as early as the second century C.E.

All of the above could have been known without any awareness of the Indian parallels to the story of Ajataśatru and Bimbisara adduced

in the present paper. Those Indian examples from Jaina literature, however, containing as they do explicit reference to wine brought to the jailed king, suggest that the idea of Sueki and Fujita that the Indian version(s) of the tale had water being taken in to the imprisoned king, this being replaced in Central Asian versions of the tale with wine, must be reconsidered.<sup>98</sup>

## Appendix II: The *Weishengyuan-jing* or \**Ajātaśatru-sūtra*

Translated by Yuet-Keung Lo, with Jonathan Silk

The text translated in full here is found in the Taishō edition of the Chinese canon as T. 501 (XIV) 714b24-775b24,<sup>99</sup> titled *Foshuo Weishengyuan-jing* 佛說未生冤經. It is attributed to the Yuezhi 月氏 (Indo-Scythian) layman Zhi Qian 支謙 of the Wu 吳 dynasty (223-253 C.E.). As far as I know the text has been translated only once before into a modern language, into Japanese by Sadakata (1984: 103-112). The present translation is mostly the work of Dr. Lo, edited by the present writer.

### The \**Ajātaśatru Sūtra*

Thus it was heard. At one time the Buddha was dwelling in Rājagṛha on the Vulture Peak, along with gods, nāgas, demons, spirits, kings, officials and common people. All went to where the Buddha was, and paid obeisance to him. Being edified [by the Buddha's discourses], they made offerings to him, and the rituals were all in accordance with propriety. Devadatta saw this and his jealousy was measureless. He went back [to the palace] and spoke to Prince Ajātaśatru, saying: "Your father carted away all kinds of treasures of the kingdom in order to offer them to the Buddha and the śramaṇas, depleting the state treasury. Now is a good time for you to usurp the kingdom and become king yourself. I will raise an army to conquer the Buddha; you can become king and I will become Buddha, and both of us will attain what we want. Isn't that fine? You will surely

succeed.”

Ajātaśatru and Devadatta colluded and hatched a devious plot, and thus [Ajātaśatru] commanded the powerful officials to prepare the army. “When the king returns [from visiting the Buddha], snatch his [royal] seal and throw him in jail!” When the king returned, the officials did as they had been ordered, and cast the king into jail. But the king felt at ease, and contemplating the previous [karma which caused his present] disaster, he was without fear. In fact, he felt even more faith in the Buddha’s words. And the king said: “What transgressions have I committed that I am so punished?”

None, the queen and concubines and all beings large and small in the kingdom, were not saddened [by the king’s imprisonment]. Then the king spoke to those who were crying, saying: “The Buddha said: ‘Heaven and Earth, the sun and moon, Mount Sumeru and the ocean – all that is composite will certainly perish, all that flourishes will decay, all that comes together will be separated, all that is born will certainly die. Therefore the wheel of sorrow turns endlessly, causing profound suffering. Seeking for its origin and searching for its beginning, we find that things exist because of the combination of causes and conditions. This is called life. When the causes and conditions separate and disintegrate, this is called emptiness. The body is made up of the four great elements. The soul<sup>100</sup> of sentient beings resides in that [body]. At death it returns to its origin. The soul departs [the body], leaving it empty, and this is why we say non-self.<sup>101</sup> When you are not even able to protect your body, how could you constantly protect your kingdom?’ When the Buddha first came to my country I did not yet have a son. And then [the Buddha] asked me whether I knew if I would be ruling in the future or not. I answered that I did not know. The Blessed One said again: ‘Everything is impermanent; you should carefully think about this.’ The Buddha’s warning to me at that time was precisely aimed at the current situation. Each of you should diligently pursue your ambition and keep the Buddha’s warning in mind.”

Then the king spoke to the prince, saying: “Whenever you were sick, I was concerned for you, and always wanted to save you from danger, even at the expense of my own life. The benevolence and grace of a parent can be superseded only by Heaven; what kind of

heart have you that you can bear to be so evil? One who kills a parent goes at death to hell without any cessation [in his punishment].<sup>102</sup> You will be one of these people. I am your father. Even though you respect your parents and venerate filiality, you should *fear that your name would not live up to the standard [of filial piety]*.<sup>103</sup> How is it possible that you want to kill me, your father? I am going to cede the kingdom to you. I want to go to the Buddha and become a śramaṇa. When I contemplate lust it burns my body like fire. The various attractions of women are all empty, [although even] blind people are all certainly confused [by them]. Merely looking at the Buddhist sūtras one can recognize the evil of women's hypocrisy, and know the harm that [lusting for] fame and profit can do to oneself."<sup>104</sup>

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

The queen and the consorts and everyone in the kingdom was very sad and upset. And the queen said to the prince: "The great king is bound in fetters and jailed, so he needs attendants for [even] his sitting and lying down. His pain is indescribable. Ever since you were born the childlike heart of the king felt affection for you. He never forgot you, neither when eating nor when sleeping. When [your body made up of] the four great elements waxed or waned [in poor health], the king would lie beside your pillow attending to you. His tears would flow, his heart burn and his body would become emaciated, and he wanted to save your life even at the expense of his own. You should remember this nurturing [which you received from] your father and from Heaven. Don't be rebellious. The Buddha said in a sūtra: 'The ultimate goodness is not greater than filiality. The

enormity of evil is only to harm one's parents.<sup>106</sup> Heaven would bless even mutual service of elders and juniors, not to mention respect for one's parents.<sup>107</sup> Now you are following your evil and cruel nature, and commit this serious crime. Surely you will go to hell. Sixty billion years in this world is one day and night in hell. All of the various kinds of sufferings each last for years, and you will experience all of them. Surely that will be severe! Those who merely want to gratify themselves all certainly end in regret."

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

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

The prince said: "You may."

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

The king said: "The jailers cut off my food and I have been hungry and thirsty for days. The body has eighty thousand pores and each of them has a hundred kinds of worms. These pester my belly, my blood and flesh are consumed, and my life-span is exhausted." Saying this he sobbed and fainted several times.

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

The king ate and then turned to where the Buddha was, and sobbing paid obeisance and said: "The Buddha taught that prosperity and fortune are difficult to preserve. They are like an illusion or a dream. Truly they are just as you have taught." Then he said to the queen: "When I was king, my kingdom was vast and expansive. I had whatever clothing and food I desired. And now I am in jail and starving to death. My son follows an evil and rebellious teacher, disobeying the benevolent teaching of the Buddha. I am not afraid of death, but my only regret is that I cannot receive the pure teachings face to face

from the Buddha, neither can I converse about the essence of his holy path with Śāriputra, Maudgalyāyana or Mahākāśyapa.”

The king again said to the queen: “The Buddha said that those who are dear to one are like a flock of birds gathering together in a tree. In the morning they scatter and each goes its own way in accordance with its misfortune and fortune. Maudgalyāyana having removed all his impurities and wiping out all his sins attained the six supernatural knowledges and the four bases of supernatural power.<sup>108</sup> Even so he was beaten by a greedy and jealous Brahmin.<sup>109</sup> How much more so [is severe retribution expected] in my own case. Having done evil deeds, bad fortune chases after one just like a shadow seeking after the body [that casts it] and an echo responding to the sound [that causes it]. It is difficult to encounter a Buddha and it is difficult to hear the teaching of a Buddha.<sup>110</sup> There are many sages and their virtues are lofty. The rituals and the precepts are immeasurable,<sup>111</sup> [too many] for the common people<sup>112</sup> to be able to practice and follow. Embrace the Buddha’s scriptural teachings, convert the people with benevolence, and obtain the virtue of making offerings [to the Buddha]. Indeed it is truly difficult to encounter his purifying transformation. Now I am going to die and my soul will depart far away. For one who wants to pursue his ambition, there is nothing better than the Buddha’s teachings. You should carefully uphold those [teachings] in order to avoid future disaster.” Having heard the king’s warnings, the queen was again saddened and upset.

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

And the king, starving, got up and, facing the place where the Buddha was, made obeisance. And then he was no longer hungry, and the night became bright. When the prince heard of this, he ordered that the windows [of the jail] be blocked up and the soles of the [king’s] feet be lacerated, so that he would not be able to stand up and see the Buddha and the light.<sup>113</sup> The jailers immediately lacerated the soles of his feet, and his pain was immeasurable. [Despite the pain] he did not cease to be mindful of the Buddha.

From afar the Buddha preached a sūtra to him, saying: “One’s good and evil deeds will bring one fortune and disaster. You must be careful!”

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

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

Receiving the grace of the Devātideva,<sup>114</sup> the king could see his previous karma and he dared not look at it with resentment. He was *not fearful of the boiling and burning sufferings of hell.*<sup>115</sup> He concentrated on the Buddha and his disciples, and he dared not be negligent [even] in his sitting and lying down. He then joined his hands together in obeisance [and said]: “Today my life is over and the evolution of my soul is finished forever.” Sobbing, his breath was extinguished in an instant. And all the officials and people in the kingdom were terribly sad and called out to Heaven, saying: “Alas! Why should this happen?”

King Bimbisāra immediately gained awakening and was reborn in Heaven. The gates of the three ways<sup>116</sup> were closed to him, and his sufferings were extinguished.

### Appendix III: The *Āvaśyakacūrṇi*

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

aṇṇadā Koṇṇo Kālādīhiṃ kumārehiṃ samam̐ maṃteti: Seṇiyam̐  
 baṃdhittā ekkārasabhāge rajjam̐ karemu tti / tehiṃ paḍissutaṃ /  
 Seṇio baddho / purvvaṇhe avaraṇhe ya kasataṃ davāveti /  
 Cellaṇāe katovi ḍhokkaṃ na deti / bhattaṃ vāritaṃ pāṇiyam̐ ceti /  
 tāhe Celanāe kuṃmāse vāle baṃdhittā satādhoyāe<sup>117</sup> surāe kese  
 āuttitā pavisati / sā kira dhuvvati sataṃ vāre pāṇiyam̐ surā bhavati /

tie pabhavenam veyanam na ceteti /

aṅṅadā kadāi Paumāvatie putto Udātī kumāro / so jemamṭassa  
 hatthe thāle ya muttati / ṇa ya cāleti mā rumijjihiti tti / jattitam  
 muttitarā tattilakarā kūrāṃ avaṅṅetā sesam jimito / mātarā bhaṅṅati:  
 ammo aṅṅassavi kassavi eyappio putto hojjā? sā bhaṅṅati: durātmā  
 tava aṅṅuli kimie vamarāti pitā muhe kāum acchiyāito / iharahā  
 tumarā rovasi / tāhe se cittarā maukarā jātarā / bhaṅṅati: kim khāi me  
 gulamodae peseti? devī bhaṅṅati: mae te katā / jeṅṅa tumarā sadā  
 pitiverio udarā āradḍha tti savvam kaheti / tathāvi tujjha pitā na  
 virajjati / tahavi tumae pitā erisarā vasaṅṅam pāvito / tassa addhiti jātā  
 / suṅṅemṅtao ceva utṅṅhāya bāhā mitarā lohadaṅṅdarā gahāya nigalāṅṅi  
 bhamjissamā ti padhāvito / rakkhavālehim raṅṅṅo hitṅṅa niveditāti:  
 esa pāvo lohidaṅṅdarā gahāya eti tti / Seṅṅio cimṅteti: ko jāṅṅati keṅṅavi  
 kumāreṅṅa mārihiti tti tālapuḍarā visarā khaitarā jāva eti tāva mato /  
 daṅṅṅhūṅṅa mutṅṅhutaram addhiti jātā / tāhe dahitūṅṅa ghararā āgato /  
 rajjadhuramukkatatī tarā ceva cimṅtemto acchati / kumāramacchehim  
 cimṅtitarā: nattho rāyā hoti tti tambie sāsane lihittā juṅṅṅarā kātūṅṅa  
 uvaṅṅitarā / evarā pituṅṅo kirati piṅṅṅadāṅṅarā nitṅṅhārijjati tti / tappabhi-  
 tirā pitipiṅṅṅanivedaṅṅā pavattā / evarā kāleṅṅarā visogo jāto /

#### Appendix IV: The *Triṣaṣṭīśalākāpuruṣacaritam*

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

*Triṣaṣṭīśalākāpuruṣacaritam*: Book 10, chapter 12, verses 114-131,  
 144-157, 160-167.

atī āntare kumāro 'pi manṅṅrayāmāsa kūṅṅṅikah /  
 kālādibhiḅ svasadṅṅśair daśabhir bhrātrbhiḅ saha // 114  
 jarann api pitāsmākāṅṅ rājyasya na hi tṅṅṅpyati /  
 putre hi kavacahare rājṅṅo 'dhikurute vratam // 115

varam varīyān abhayaḥ śriyam aujjliad yuvāpi yaḥ /  
 na tu tāto viṣayāndhaḥ svām jarām yo na paśyati // 116  
 tad adya pitaram baddhvā rājyam svasamayocitam /  
 gr̥ṇṇīmo nāpavādo 'tra vivekavikalo hi saḥ // 117  
 kṛtvaikādaśadhā rājyam bhrātaro bhūm̐jmahe vayam /  
 pitā tu baddhas tadanu jīvatv abdaśatāny api // 118  
 iti te durdhiyaḥ sarve viśvastam pitaram nijam /  
 babandhur durapatyam hi gr̥hajāto viśadrumaḥ // 119  
 śukavat pañjare 'kṣaipsit kūṇikaḥ śreṇikam tataḥ /  
 viśeṣo 'yam punar bhaktapāne api dadau na hi // 120  
 pūrvāhṇe cāparāhṇe ca kūṇikaḥ pūrvavairataḥ /  
 pituḥ kaśāghātaśatam pāpo 'dād anuvāsaram // 121  
 adhisehe śreṇikas tām durdaśām daivaḍhaukitām /  
 dantāvalaḥ samartha 'pi vārībaddhaḥ karotu kim // 122  
 nikaṣā śreṇikau gantum kūṇiko 'dān na kasyacit /  
 kevalam mātṛdāksīnyāc celaṇām na hy avārayat // 123  
 celaṇāpi pratidinam surayā śatadhautayā /  
 sadyaḥsnātevādrakeśībhūyopaśreṇikam yayau // 124  
 kulmāṣapiṇḍakām caikām keśāntaḥ puṣpadāmavat /  
 prakṣipyā celaṇānaisit patibhaktā tadantike // 125  
 patye kulmāṣapiṇḍīm tām pracchannām celaṇā dadau /  
 prāpyā tām api duḥprāpām sa mene divyabhojyavat // 126  
 cakāra śreṇikaḥ prāṇayātrām piṇḍikayā tayā /  
 bubhukṣālakṣaṇo rogo vinānam khalu mṛtyave // 127  
 śatadhautasurābindūn keśapāśāc ca celaṇā /  
 apātayat patibhaktā salā netrāśrubindubhiḥ // 128  
 śreṇiko 'pi surābindūn patataḥ pibati sma tām /  
 cātako meghamuktāmbubindūn iva pipāsitaḥ // 129  
 bindumatrapitayāpi śreṇikaḥ surayā tayā /  
 na viveda kaśāghātāms tṛṣayā nāpy apidyata // 130  
 ittham ca śreṇikam baddhvā kurvato rājyam utkatam /  
 kūṇikasya padmāvatyām patnyām sūnurajāyata // 131

.....

āsāñ cakre 'nyadā bhoktum rājā śreṇikanandanah /  
 vāmorumastake nyasyodāyinaṁ putravatsalah // 144  
 ardhabhukte kūṇike ca mūtrayāmāsa so 'rbhakaḥ /  
 papāta sarpirdhārcva mūtradhārā ca bhojauc // 145

sūnor mā vegabhaṅgo bhūd iti śreṇikasūr nṛpaḥ /  
 na jānu cālayāmāsa putravātsalyam idr̥śam // 146  
 mūtraplāvitam annam ca svayam utsārya pāninā /  
 tathaiva bubhuje putrapremñaitad api śarmaṇe // 147  
 papraccha celaṅām tatropaviṣṭām atha kūṅikah /  
 mātār evam sutah preyān abhūt kasyacid asti vā // 148  
 celaṅāvocad āḥ pāpa nṛkheṭa kulapāmsana /  
 na jānāsi yathābhus tvam pitur atyantavallabhaḥ // 149  
 durdohadena jñāto 'si pitur vairī tadā mayā /  
 strīṅām āpannasattvānām yathāgarbham hi dohadāḥ // 150  
 garbhasthitam api jñātvā tvām are piṭṭvairiṅam /  
 garbhaśātanam ārambhi maya patīśivecchayā // 151  
 tathāpi na vilīno 'si tais taiḥ śādaśadhair api /  
 kimtu pratyuta puṣṭo 'si sarvaṁ pathyam balīyasām // 152  
 tava piṭrā ca me tādr̥g apy apūri manorathaḥ /  
 kadā drakṣyāmy aham putravaktram ity āśayā bhṛśam // 153  
 piṭur vairīti niścītya tvam jāto 'pi mayojjihataḥ /  
 ānīto 'si punaḥ piṭrā yatnāt svam iva jīvitam // 154  
 tadā kukkuṭikāpicchavidhaikā ca tavāmguḷiḥ /  
 kṛmipūyākulātyamtam abhūd aratidāyini // 155  
 tvatpitā 'dhān mukhe kṣiptām tādr̥śim api te 'mguḷim /  
 tāvad eva sukham te 'bhūd yāvad vaktrāmtaramguḷi // 156  
 evam yenasi piṭra tvam re durlalita lālitaḥ /  
 kṛte pratikṛtam tasyākāri kārāpraveśanam // 157

.....

kūṅikah smāha dhig dhiṅ mām avimṛśya vidhāyinaṁ /  
 rājyam nyāsarpitam ivārpaiṣyāmi punaḥ piṭuḥ // 160  
 ity ardhabhukte 'py ācamya dhātryāḥ putram samarpya ca /  
 udasthāt kūṅikas tātasamīpe gantum utsukaḥ // 161  
 piṭṭpādeṣu nigadān bhāmṣyamīti vicintayan /  
 lohadaṁḍam grhītvā so 'bhiśreṇikam adhāvata // 162  
 upaśreṇikam ādiṣṭā yāmikāḥ pūrvasamstutāḥ /  
 dr̥ṣṭvā kūṅikam āyāntam iti vyājahurākulāḥ // 163  
 sāksād daṁḍadhara iva lohadaṁḍadharaḥ puraḥ /  
 drutam āyāti te sūnur na vidmaḥ kim kariṣyati // 164  
 śreṇikaś cintayāmāsa jighāmsur nūnam eṣa mām /  
 anyadāgāt kaśāhasto daṁḍahasto 'dhunaiti tu // 165

na vedni māu kumāreṇa mārayiṣyati kenacit /  
 tasmād anāgate 'py asmin maraṇam śaraṇam mama // 166  
 iti tālupuṭaviṣam jihvāgre śreṇiko dadau /  
 prasthānasthā ivāgre 'pi tatprāṇāś ca drutaṁ yayuḥ // 167

### Appendix V: The *Kathākośa*

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

Anyadā Koṇikena Kālaka-kumāra-prabhṛti-daśabhiḥ kumāraiḥ saha mantrayitvā Śreṇiko rājā guptau kṣiptaḥ. Pūrvāhṇe 'parāhṇe'<sup>118</sup> ca kaśānām śatena hanti. Bhaktaṁ pānaṁ ca vāritam. Tatas Cillaṇā dcvī keśeṣu kulmāśān bandhayitvā mahatā kaṣṭhena bhojanārthaṁ praveśayati. Upāyena keśeṣu Candrahāsa-madirām nayati. Śata-vāraṁ prakṣāliteṣu keśeṣu sarvaṁ pāniyaṁ surā bhavati. Rājā surā-prabhāvāt kaśāghātān sahate.

Anyadā tasya Koṇikasya Padmāvati-kuksi-sambhava Udāya-nāmā putra utpannaḥ. Anyadotsaṅge samsthāpya Koṇiko bhojanaṁ kurute. Tasya mūtraṁ sthāla-madhye patati. Koṇikas taṁ parāg utsaṅgān na karoti. Samādhi-sambhaṅga-bhayān mūtra-misṛitaṁ bhaktaṁ bhakṣati. Pārśva-sthitāṁ mātaraṁ vadati: Mātar anyasyāpi kasya putra evaṁ priyo 'sti? Mātroktam: Re durācāra śṛṇu: Tvayi garbhagate mama tava pitur mārṣa-bhakṣaṇe dohado jātaḥ. Rājñā pūrīto dohadaḥ. Mayā tvayi jāte duṣṭa iti bhanitvā tvam parityājito 'śoka-vāṭikāyām. Rājñaitac chrutvā svayaṁ vāṭikāyām gatvā tvam ānītaḥ. Aśokaçandra iti tava nāma kṛtam. Tatra kuikuṭeṇa tavāṅgulī vidāritā. Sā kūṇitā jātā. Tena iti Koṇikas tava nāma kṛtam. Tayāṅgulyā pacyamānayā tavativāratir jātā. Tava pitā pūti-galantīm tām āṅgulīm svamukhe dharayati. Tatas tvam na rodiṣi. Itthaṁ tvam vallabhaḥ. Koṇika iti śrutvā paścāt-tāpo babhūva: Dhiṁ me sva-pitaraṁ prati pratyupakāraḥ. Tatas tat-kālam eva loha-daṇḍam ḡhītvā nigada-bhañjanārthaṁ svayam eva calitaḥ. Tāvād rakṣā-puruṣai rājño 'gre vijñaptam: Loha-daṇḍam ḡhītvāty-utsukaḥ Koṇikaḥ samāyāti no jñāyate kenāpi kāryeṇa. Rājā cintayati: Kenāpi viḍambanā-maraṇeṇa mām mārayiṣyati. Iti vicārya tālapuṭa-viṣam bhakṣitam. Yāvāt

Koṇikas tatra yāti tāvan mṛto rājā Śrīcñikaḥ. Prathama-narake caturaśīti-varṣa-sahasrāyur nārako babbhūva. Narakād udvṛtto 'traiva Bhārate<sup>19</sup> Mahāpadma-nāmā prathama-tīrthānkaro bhaviṣyati.

## NOTES

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

<sup>1</sup> The term *Jōdo sambukyō* is given in Japanese since it seems, according to Fujita 1970: 9, note 8, to have been invented by the Japanese cleric Hōnen 法然 (1133-1212), and used for the first time in his *Senchaku Hongan Nenbutsushū* 選擇本願念佛集 (T. 2608 [LXXXIII] 2a7).

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

<sup>2</sup> At least since the time of Dōgen 道元 the authenticity of the *Guan-jing* has been questioned within the Buddhist tradition. In his *Hōkyōki* 寶慶記 Dōgen records the following polemic from his time in China (1223-27): "These days the Daoxue [Tiantai] temples of the realm are constructed with a hall of sixteen contemplations. Those sixteen contemplations appear in the [*Guan*] *Wuliangshou-jing*. [But] it is not clear whether that sūtra is genuine or spurious, and scholars of the past and the present have wondered about the point." 今天下教院或構十六觀之室。彼十六觀者出於[觀]無量壽經。彼經真偽未詳、古今學者之所疑也。Quoted by Tsukinowa 1971: 159-60, followed by Fujita 1985: 61, note 2. For a critical edition of the text, and a translation of the complete passage, see Kodera 1980: 245 and 131.

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

<sup>3</sup> A list of some seventeen of these reasons can be found in Fukuhara 1984. On the other hand, there are some who still hold that it is an Indian text. Chief among these seems to be Hirakawa Akira. In 1984 he reintroduced the idea of Hayashima Kyōshō (1964) that the mention in the *Guan-jing* of the term *qingjing yechu* 清淨業處 refers to a "pure *karmasthāna*," an Indian Abhidharmic scholastic category otherwise unknown in the northern Buddhist tradition. The terms and ideas of *karmasthāna* (Pāli *kammaṭṭhāna*) meditation are well known, but apparently restricted to the

Theravāda tradition. Hirakawa (1984: 2; 12) thus argues that the restriction of the idea to southern Buddhism implies the Indian origin of the *Guan-jing*. (For a general discussion of *kammaṭṭhāna*, see Mori 1982.) Hirakawa's reasoning has been rejected by Sueki (1986b: 166-67) and Fujita (1985: 31-32). According to these scholars there is no good reason to identify the term *qingjing yesuo* in the *Guan-jing* with the Abhidharmic *kammaṭṭhāna*. Among the forty *kammaṭṭhāna* listed in the *Visuddhi-magga*, for instance, such a term does not appear. Sueki (1986b: 167) argues that *qingjing yechu* is rather to be connected with the term *jingye* 淨業 in the sense of "undefiled actions"; this term appears in the *Guan-jing* in a place preceding *qingjing yesuo*. I agree with this analysis.

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

<sup>4</sup> See also Tsukinowa 1971: 145.

<sup>5</sup> It has been suggested (e.g., by Gómez 1995: 244, n. 61) that the term "apocryphal" is not a good one to describe the materials we are discussing. However, in my opinion, "apocrypha" is at least preferable to one of the proffered alternatives, "pseudepigrapha," since the latter is defined in the *Oxford English Dictionary* (compact reprint edition of 1971) as "A collective term for books or writings bearing a false title, or ascribed to another than the true author," the example being given that certain Jewish writings dating to early in the first millennium were ascribed to Old Testament prophets. Apocrypha, on the other hand, is defined as "A writing or statement of doubtful authorship ... spec[ifically] those books included in the Septuagint and Vulgate versions of the Old Testament, which were not originally written in Hebrew ...." The latter case seems much closer to the example we are discussing. (D. S. Russell, writing in *The Oxford Companion to the Bible* [Metzger and Coogan, 1993: 629b, s.v. Pseudepigrapha], has even suggested that, given the ambiguities of the term, rather than pseudepigrapha "it is much less confusing to use the word apocryphal.")

<sup>6</sup> For some discussions see Fujita 1990: 151ff; Sueki 1986b: 165; Nogami 1981: 167ff. The hagiography of Kalayaśas is translated by Shiit 1968: 147-48.

<sup>7</sup> There are, however, some problems with this, as is often the case when considering the evidence of sūtra catalogues. Pas 1977: 195 (and again 1995: 36) is wrong in referring to a "unanimous tradition." More accurate is Mark Blum's (1985: 131) characterization: "Despite its initial listing in Seng-yu's catalogue among the 'miscellaneous sutras by anonymous translators' and references in Ming-t's'uan's *Ta chou mu lu* and Chih-sheng's *K'ai-yuan lu* of a separate translation from the same period by Dharmamitra (356-442), scholars have generally accepted the tradition of a single translation by the monk Kalayaśas from the 'western regions.'" For more on sūtra catalogues, see below.

<sup>8</sup> It is of some interest to note that the reverse argument is sometimes found even

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

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

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

<sup>11</sup> The *Miaofuhujing-yishu* 妙法華經義疏, published in the *Dainippon Zokuzōkyō* 大日本續藏經 (revised edition), volume 27, # 577. Kim 1990: 82 and 106 n. 3 seems, with some confused phrasing, to support and yet contradict this claim. His book is a translation of this commentary.

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

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

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

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

<sup>16</sup> An interesting discontinuity occurs in the coda to the sūtra, the return to the frame story. There it is stated that Vaidehī and her five hundred attendant women rejoiced and so on. The mention of five hundred attendants is a stock expression, found throughout Buddhist literature, but this is the first mention of such a retinue in

the text; one would not expect an imprisoned queen, who is clearly out of royal favor, to be attended by a small army of servants.

<sup>17</sup> For references to this story in Pāli Buddhist literature see Malalasekera 1938, s.v. Ajātasattu I.31-35, and s.v. Bimbisāra II.285-89. For Chinese materials see Aka-numa 1931 s.v. Ajātasattu 10-12, and s.v. Bimbisāra 99-102. For references in Jaina literature see Mehta and Chandra 1970-72, s.v. Kūṇḍiā I.196-97, and s.v. Senia II.856-57. For the story of Ajātaśatru in Buddhist literature generally see the excellent study of Chinese sources in Ono 1916, and more briefly the remarks of Hirakawa 1971. Recent rather popular works are Sadakata 1984 and 1989 (a translation of the *Ajātaśatru-kaukrtya-vinodana*). Even more popularized is Igarashi 1989. Some speculative comparative remarks on motifs may be found in Imoto 1982: 25-53, followed by Takenaka 1982. (I thank Elizabeth ten Grotenhuis for informing me of Takenaka's article, and sending me a copy.) See also Ishigami 1984.

<sup>18</sup> In fact, to a certain extent the Pāli Text Society's editions and translations, and the practices of some native scribes, of marking exact repetitions in a text by reference to the preceding instance of a passage, rather than repeating it *in extenso*, reflect one albeit obvious aspect of this fact. This is even more pronounced in canonical Jaina literature, in which expressions indicating the instruction "(insert here the stock) description" (*vaṇ[n]ḥo and jīva*) occur with regularity.

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

<sup>20</sup> Dr. Luitgard Soni (University of Marburg) has kindly informed me that although there are several tales about Śreṇika and his family in the *Bṛhatkathākośa* and other allied Digambara narrative compilations, the Ajātaśatru episode is absent.

<sup>21</sup> For a detailed study see Shimoda 1991.

<sup>22</sup> Found at T. 374 (XII) 474a = T. 375 (XII) 717a and following.

<sup>23</sup> T. 374 (XII) 475c8-13 = T. 375 (XII) 718b29-c6.

<sup>24</sup> T. 374 (XII) 565c19-29 = T. 375 (XII) 812b6-17

<sup>25</sup> The story and its connection with the *Guan-jing* was discussed in Nishimoto 1934: 322, n. 20. See also Yamada et al. 1984: 6, n. 2; Sueki 1982: 463; and Fujita 1985: 42-43.

<sup>26</sup> Gnoli 1978: 155.23-159.10. A few corrections can be suggested to this text: Page 156.24, and 156.25: *vātāyanāni*. 157.16: *ārogyaya*. 158.5: *-tebhyaḥ pādāḥ*. 158.9: delete *upacitāni*. (I am well aware that this edition may not report the manuscript precisely, but since photos of the manuscript have never been published and are unavailable, I am unable to re-edit the text.) I was able to consult the corresponding Tibetan text only in the Derge Kanjur, 'dul ba, nga, 215a6-218a2. The Chinese translation due to Yijing 義淨 is found in T. 1450 (XXIV) 189c1-190b23, given in

*kundoku* Japanese “translation” by Nishimoto 1934: 322-25. For a modern Japanese rendering from this Chinese version see Bukkyō Setsuwa Bungaku Zenshū Kankō-kai 1973: 10.215-21. The episode is summarized from the Tibetan by Rockhill 1907: 90-91, and Panglung 1981: 112.

<sup>27</sup> The passage is not quite clear. The normal Brahmanical sense of *karmaparāyana* is devotion to ritual activity, but the sense here might be different. The Tibetan *phyag sbal na las kho na la rten cing 'dug pa* seems to mean that the king remained in jail due only to his karma, but it could be taken to mean “engaged only in action.”

<sup>28</sup> *Sthālipāka*. The exact sense of this term is not certain here; it may not have the connotation it has in Brahmanical ritual texts.

<sup>29</sup> *Saktukalka* = Tibetan *phye 'i 'de gu*.

<sup>30</sup> A list of epithets of Buddhas is omitted from the translation at this point.

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

<sup>32</sup> Or: “Send a greeting to King Bimbisāra in my words.”

<sup>33</sup> Following the Tibetan, *khyod la*.

<sup>34</sup> See the stock passage given in Lamotte 1958: 717.

<sup>35</sup> The verse is common in the Avadāna literature, e.g., *Divyāvadāna* (Cowell and Neil 1886) 54.9-10, *Avadānaśataka* (Speyer 1906-09) I.74.7-8. A slightly variant form, preferable as Speyer (note 13) points out in avoiding the awkward repetition of *api*, is:

*na praṇaśyanti karmāni kalpakotiśuair upi /  
samāgrīm prāpya kālam ca phalanti khalu dehinām //*

<sup>36</sup> Or: “Greets you.”

<sup>37</sup> It is perhaps better to follow the Tibetan and omit *ca*. Then translate: “Reverend Mahā-Maudgalyāyana, I salute the Blessed One.”

<sup>38</sup> Gnoli’s text spells the name here thus differently from above, but the manuscripts must be checked before the form is finally accepted into the text.

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

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

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

<sup>42</sup> I am not certain if *xinxirenshou* 心喜忍受 is to be understood in its technical

sense as one of the “three patiences,” which may not be an Indian category at all. The normal sense in which I would read the Chinese – “he was happy and bore [it] patiently” – is clearly impossible; there is nothing to endure. We must take *xiren* 喜忍 as the core of the phrase, rather than reading two sets of two characters. See Oda 1974: 1363a3, 245b.

<sup>43</sup> It is possible that we should understand a plural here, consorts, in contrast to the chief consort below. But no number is marked in the Chinese.

<sup>44</sup> I am not certain of the technical sense here of *shengdao* 聖道, often but not necessarily a rendering of *ārya-mārga*. See Oda 1974: 417a.

<sup>45</sup> This seems to be the sense of the phrase 不得東西, but the dictionaries apparently do not record this usage. In T. 653 (XV) 792c13 東西 seems to mean “in every direction.” The Tibetan equivalent is there (Peking Kanjur #886 *mdo*, *tshu* 41a2) *phyogs dang phyogs mtshams su*. [The Tibetan translation of the Chinese version (Peking #191 *mdo*, *tu* 188a4), however, has *shar nub du phyogs shing*. This might indicate that the translators did not understand the Chinese term to mean anything other than “east and west.”] Another confirmation of this sense is found in T. 99 (II) 345c12-13 (*Samyuktāgama* 1260 ~ SN ii.270-271 [xx.10]). A cat eats a mouse, but once inside the bowels of the cat the mouse eats at the cat’s bowels. Then: “The cat raced about *hither and yon* in confusion and panic, through abandoned houses and graveyards, not knowing where it was, until ultimately it died.” 貓狸迷悶東西狂走, 空宅塚間不知何止遂至於死。

<sup>46</sup> The sentence could perhaps be understood slightly differently. 即抱狗子、隨信俱至 may mean “clutching the dog he came in accord with the message.”

<sup>47</sup> This sentence may also be interpreted somewhat differently. 自食隨持與狗 may mean “he took from his own food and gave it to the dog.”

<sup>48</sup> I do not understand the reference.

<sup>49</sup> Note that the term 大逆罪, while undoubtedly here a reference to the worst of the *anantārya* sins, is found in Chinese as early as the *Shiji* 史記 in much the same sense. See Morohashi 1955-60: vol. 3: 386 (581.446).

<sup>50</sup> See Hardy 1880: 328-30 (I have not seen the first edition of Hardy’s work, dated 1853); Kern 1882a: 191-99; 1882b: 243-53; 1901: 199-206; Law 1931: 192ff; 1933: 428-30. Hardy’s account is apparently directly based on the *Pūjāvālīya*, which dates to 1266 C.E. Kern seems to have based himself on Hardy. Kern also seems to refer to a Northern version of the story, perhaps from Schiefner 1851, but the latter is not available to me.

<sup>51</sup> *Ajātasattu* is of course the Pāli form of Sanskrit *Ajātaśatru*.

<sup>52</sup> This presupposes the etymological interpretation of *Ajātasattu* as an adjectival compound meaning “unborn enemy,” but the more natural (although it is difficult to say “correct”) understanding is to take the term as a possessive compound, meaning “he whose enemy is unborn,” implying that one is so great that none can face him as a worthy opponent.

<sup>53</sup> Up until this point the story, verbally very close to the *Sumāngala-vilāsini*

version, is found also in the Pāli Vinaya, *Cullavagga* VII.3-5 (Oldenberg 1880: 190-191, Horner 1952: 266-68), with some additional details.

<sup>54</sup> The text is found in Rhys Davids and Carpenter 1886: I.135,29-138,17.

<sup>55</sup> A gloss in the text here says: "Torture chamber is used in the sense of smoke-house."

<sup>56</sup> Presumably in the prison yard – or is there some contamination from the preceding sentence?

<sup>57</sup> The manuscript reading recorded in the edition, page 137 note 14 (from the Royal Library of Mandalay manuscript), Janavasabha, is probably correct, rather than the edition's *Javanavasabha* (otherwise unattested?). On the other hand, the form is a *lectio facilior* and may be a hyper-correction. The parallel versions, however, also suggest the correction. See Edgerton 1953 s.v. *Jinaṣabha*, and the version from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*, above.

<sup>58</sup> The Pāli form of Sanskrit *Vaiśravaṇa*.

<sup>59</sup> I mean primary versions. Derivative versions, quoting from other versions with or without attribution, are of course common. See for example the *Fayuan zhulin* 法苑珠林 (T. 2122), a seventh century Chinese work which quotes ([LIII] 660b24ff.) the *Weishengyuan-jing* among other versions of the story as an illustration of lack of filial piety, and the eleventh century Japanese tale collection *Konjaku Monogatari-shū* 今昔物語集 III.27 (Yamada et al. 1959: 248-51), one source of which is clearly the *Guan-jing* itself. A bad English translation of the *Konjaku* episode is to be found in Dykstra 1986: 56-60. As for other Indian Buddhist, and perhaps not derivative, versions, I have not been able to check the *Kalpadrūmāvadāna*, which is referred to by Feer 1891: 212 as containing in the *Śrīmaty-avadāna* twelve manuscript pages (167-179 in the Paris manuscript) which "relate in great detail the murder of Bimbisāra by Ajātaśatru." Compare also the *Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā* T. 1546 (XXVIII) 266c13-267a9; T. 1545 (XXVII) 360b4-c16; T. 1547 (XXVIII) 521b3-c1. Here *Vaidehi* is absent, but *Bimbisāra*'s rebirth is discussed in detail.

Kazuo Enoki's appendix to La Vallée Poussin 1962: 256 lists a Chinese manuscript fragment (item C 83) which tells part of a "story of King Ajātaśatru who, having killed his father and mother, was converted to a very faithful believer in Buddhism." According to Enoki "No identical text is found in the existing sūtras relating to Ajātaśatru." Intrigued by this, I obtained a copy of the manuscript in question; when I asked his help in matter, however, Prof. Fujieda Akira identified the manuscript fragment as belonging to the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* T. 3/4 (XII) 564b21-566b8. This previously unidentified Dunhuang manuscript fragment does not, therefore, contain another version of our story, but is rather a copy of a well-known version.

<sup>60</sup> I give a very conservative date for the Gilgit *Mulasarvastivada Vinaya*; the text might be considerably older.

<sup>61</sup> Fujita 1985: 94, n. 2, never followed up his one lead to non-Buddhist versions of the tale.

<sup>62</sup> There is a good likelihood, however, that the contents are much older. The

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

<sup>63</sup> I translate the following from the Ardha-māgadhī text in Deleu 1969: 105.26-106.2. I have filled in the abbreviated stock expressions with reference to the preceding portions of the story, and to Hoernle 1885-90.

<sup>64</sup> For this stock expression, see Hoernle 1885-90: text page 153 (§256): *na najjai ṇaṇi, ahaṇ keṇa vi kumāreṇaṃ mārijjissāmi*. The commentary page 71 clarifies: *kumāreṇaṃ ti duḥkhamṛtyunā*. Hoernle translates on page 162 "who knows but I shall die by some evil death," with the note that literally one should translate "it is not known, (but) I shall be killed by some evil death." Very close is *Vivāyasuyam* VI.125 (Upadhye 1935: 39): *tae ṇaṃ mama na najjai keṇai asubheṇaṃ kumaraṇeṇaṃ māriṣṣai*.

<sup>65</sup> The term here (Deleu 1969: 105.36) is *tāla-puḍaga-ṇiṣa*. See Ratnachadrajī 1923: 3.42. Below we get in Prakrit *tālapuḍa* and, in a text which is otherwise in Sanskrit, *tālapuṭa*. Now, *kālakūṭa* is the well-known poison produced at the primal churning of the oceans and the drinking of which turned Śiva's throat blue. K. R. Norman 1992: 154 (ad *Suttanipāta* 62) has suggested that if Sanskrit *kālakūṭa* is the original form of the term in question here, the Middle Indic forms may be derived thus: *kālakūṭa* (with dissimilation of *k > ṭ*) > \**tālakūṭa* > Prakrit *tāla(v)uḍa* > [*tālapuḍa*] > Pāli *tālapuṭa*. I thank Dominik Wujastyk (email communication) for his efforts to identify for me *kālakūṭa* poison in Ayurvedic sources, but unfortunately (as is so often the case) the authorities disagree.

<sup>66</sup> The text is in Jinadāsagaṇi 1928-29: II.171-172. It has been referred to for example by Jain 1984: 169, n. 4, whose interpretation of the wine mentioned in the story however is not quite right.

<sup>67</sup> As the text edition is rather difficult to come by, I give a transcript of the portion translated here in Appendix III.

<sup>68</sup> The exact sense of *kummaṣa* (*kulmaṣa* or *kulmasa* in Sanskrit) is not quite clear, but Johnson 1962: 104, n. 126, says that it is half-cooked pulse. Dictionaries define the word as gruel or half-cooked rice and pulse (peas, beans, etc.). Chinese Buddhist texts seem to render it in ways that suggest rice or beans was understood. See Wogihara 1964-74, s.v. *kulmāṣa*. But since the *Kāśyapaparivarta* §152, for example, has the compound *odanakulmāṣa*, it seems less likely that *kulmāṣa* means rice. The *Mahāvvyūtpatti* 5747 renders the term by *wenmian* 温麵, "warm noodles (?)," but Tibetan *zan dron* seems to mean simply "warm food," or a food made of hot, ground

up tsampa. See also Wojtilla 1978: 41 (item 4) who quotes (without, however, mentioning the source) Śaṅkara's commentary to *Chandogyopaniṣad* 1.10.2, offering for *kulmāṣa* what is clearly a sort of folk etymology, *kutsitā māṣāḥ*, "despised or contemptible beans." We may further note that D. D. Kosambi (1963: 184) has pointed out that, whatever the technical identification of *kulmāṣa* may be, all indications point to it as the lowest, most humble type of food. Thus, the suggestion that the high-status king was sustained by means of such course food is significant.

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

<sup>70</sup> A translation of this section is found in Johnson 1962: 313-16, and the Sanskrit text in Sah 1977: 357-61. Previous volumes of Johnson's translation appeared in the Gaekwad's Oriental Series volumes 51, 77, 108, 125 and 139. My translation is deeply indebted to that of Johnson, but often differs. I translate Book 10, chapter 12, verses 114-31, 144-57, 160-67. The text is given in Appendix IV.

<sup>71</sup> See Bühler 1889 = Patel 1936, and Winternitz 1927: 482ff.

<sup>72</sup> A mythical bird which lives on raindrops.

<sup>73</sup> The text is to be found in Punyavijayji 1962: 36 (116): 61ff.

<sup>74</sup> See Hoffmann 1974: 429.8-431.18, and Tawney 1895: 176-78. My translation is indebted to those of Tawney and Hoffmann.

<sup>75</sup> Hoffmann 1974: XVII, quoting Alsdorf 1928: 4. I have unfortunately not been able to see Alsdorf's book myself.

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

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

<sup>78</sup> I have not been able to check some of the other parallels referred to on page XXXIII, but most seem not to be directly relevant. Hoffmann refers to, but I have not seen, the *Āvaśyakaniryukti* IX, 65, 6, and Somatilaka's *Śīlataṅgini* and *Puspamālākothā* 49 (referring to Alsdorf 1928: 7). The parallel between the *Kathākośa* and the *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita* was noted long ago by Johnson 1925: 308. The story is there summarized and Johnson notes that "The account of Śreṇika's death agrees fairly closely with that in the *Kathākośa*," referring to Tawney's translation. It is odd that Johnson seems not to refer at all to her own 1925 article in her 1962

translation of the *Mahaviracarita*.

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

<sup>80</sup> As Hoffmann notes, Tawney's "dog" is incorrect (but it is not certain how he read his manuscript); is the coincidence with the *Shisong-hi's* dog nothing more than dumb chance?

<sup>81</sup> I am not certain of this rendering. Tawney translated "whitlow," and Hoffmann "Der finger begann zu faulen." The *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch* of Böhtlingk and Roth 1855-75: 2.381 translates *kūnita* as "zusammengezogen, eingeschnürt." In Prakrit (Sheth 1928 s.v.) the term is defined as *samkocita*, that is, "contracted, shriveled up." If the word is correctly to be taken as etymologically Sanskrit (from the root  $\sqrt{kūn}$ ), the sense would seem to be derivationally something like "atrophy," but the context leads to the conclusion that the meaning should be "inflammation."

<sup>82</sup> Hoffmann's note reads: "This is only understandable in Prakrit. The Kumārapalatrātibodha has: sā kuṇṇiyā jāyā. tao dāragehiṃ Kūnio tti te nāmaṃ kayam." See the preceding note.

<sup>83</sup> That is, the first of 24 Tirthankaras of the coming age, equal to Padmanābha. See Mehta and Chandra 1970-72: II.568.

<sup>84</sup> A very interesting example of the independent existence and historical persistence of one of these episodes is found in modern Hindu story-telling, wherein the vignette of urinating into food is repeated. See Narayan 1989: 164.

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

<sup>86</sup> In this context other similar texts must be taken into account. Although not translated (?) until after the *Guan-jing*, there exist five other "guan" 觀 or visualization (or contemplation) sūtras in Chinese. One of these is the previously mentioned *Guanfo sanmei hai-jing* (T. 643). The others are the "Sūtra on the Technique of the Practice of Visualizing the Bodhisattva Samantabhadra" *Guan Puxian pusa xingfa-jing* 觀普賢菩薩行法經 (T. 277), the "Sūtra on Visualizing the Bodhisattva Ākasagarbha" *Guan Xukongzang pusa-jing* 觀虛空藏菩薩經 (T. 409), the "Sūtra on Visualizing the Bodhisattva Maitreya Gaining Birth in the Tuṣita Heaven" *Guan Mile pusa shangsheng doushuaitian-jing* 觀彌勒菩薩上生兜率天經 (T. 452), and the "Sūtra on Visualizing the Two Bodhisattvas Bhaiṣajyarāja and Bhaiṣajyasamud-gata" *Guan Yaowang Yaoshang erpusa-jing* 觀藥王藥上二菩薩經 (T. 1161). The

last mentioned is attributed, like the *Guan-jing*, to Kalayaśas. The other translators, as Kasugai (1953: 98) has pointed out, are predominantly Central Asians. This fact speaks – although with how loud a voice is not clear – for the Central Asian connection of these texts. So far the most detailed study of these texts is that of Tsukinowa (1971), and see now Ōminami 1995, but much more work is still required. It is my impression, and perhaps nothing more than that, that these texts in a general way reflect fourth and fifth century meditational teachings popular in Nanjing and southern China, having their origins in Central Asia, and perhaps ultimately in Kashmir. The extremely important role of Kashmir in the development of Indian Buddhism on the one hand, and Central Asian Buddhism and through that Chinese Buddhism on the other, has yet to be given the attention it deserves. Be that as it may, further studies of the *Guan-jing* will need to take into account these other extant “*guan*” texts. We are now eagerly awaiting the completion of Nobuyoshi Yamabe’s Yale doctoral dissertation which will study these and related questions, centering on a close investigation of the *Guanfo sanmei hai-jing*.

<sup>87</sup> The question of the so-called nine grades of beings, the *jiupin* 九品, has been raised several times in discussions over the origins of the *Guan-jing*. As various scholars have pointed out (Pas 1977: 210; Nogami 1973: 179-81; Sueki 1982: 462), the system of ranking beings from those of the Highest Rank of the Highest Grade of Birth in the Pure Land 上上品 down through the Lowest Rank of the Lowest Grade 下下品 found in the *Guan-jing* seems to reflect the Chinese bureaucratic system of the “Nine Categories and the Impartial and Just,” *jiupin zhongzheng* 九品中正. This system itself is rather old in China. In a detailed study of the system, Donald Holzman (1957: 388) has characterized its history succinctly: “Although it was formally established at the beginning of the Wei dynasty, in 220 A.D., the system of the Nine Categories is in reality an extension of methods applied since the Later Han for the choosing and the promotion of Bureaucrats,” despite which he confesses (1957: 395) that the origin of the term itself is obscure. The application of this nine-fold scheme to people may well go back to this bureaucratic system, but the nine-fold division of things ranging from 上上 to 下下 is even older, dating as Holzman (1957: 395) points out to the *Book of Documents* (*Shangshu* 尚書), in which (Karlgren 1950: 12ff.) fields, products and so forth are so ranked. Another possible source of the idea, however, and one which I believe has not yet been investigated, lies in a text perhaps more likely to have been associated with Buddhist interests, the Taoist *Taipingjing* 太平經. As discussed briefly by Kaltenmark (1979: 31), this text contains (at 42: 88ff.) a nine-fold division of human beings, ranking them from “divine men who are without shape and are endowed with *qi* [氣]” down to slaves, but I believe the terms 上上 and so forth do not appear. I must leave it to specialists in Taoism to discuss whether there may be any connection between this categorization and that of the *Guan-jing*.

Note however also the fifth century translation of the \**Abhidharma Mahāvibhāṣā* T. 1546 (XXVIII) 213b ff. = T. 1545 (XXVII) 274b ff., where we find 上上 through 下下. See too the *Dasheng Bensheng Xindi Guanjing* 大乘本生心地觀經 T. 159 (III) 303b5 and following which uses the terms 上品, 下上品 and so forth.

There seems little doubt, however, that this very interesting text was compiled in China, although its date remains uncertain.

<sup>88</sup> Fujita 1993 is merely a summary of his 1985 book which, he complains, has been almost entirely ignored. In any case, in this recent work Fujita repeats his earlier suggestion of the "mixed origin" of the sūtra.

<sup>89</sup> I do not want to imply my belief in the existence of any unique original version which served as a basis for some transformation, but rather use the term "transformation" more loosely to indicate the apparently original and innovative features unique to a given version.

<sup>90</sup> See Imoto 1982: 48-51, and *passim*.

<sup>91</sup> Reluctance to draw the blood of royalty was also known for example among the Mongols, who, it is reported, employed suffocation instead. The Tibetans are known to have "avoided violence" by sewing a victim into a skin and tossing him into a river. Sending off the victim still alive apparently avoided or mitigated the sin associated with violence. This is probably the same idea being referred to in those versions of our tale which speak of the son's reluctance to kill his father "with a weapon."

<sup>92</sup> The *Kyōgyōshinshō* passage is found in Hoshino et al. 1990: 109ff. = 328ff.

<sup>93</sup> This interpretation is apparently not entirely without controversy, however, as the chronological details of Shinran's life, and the history of the composition of the *Kyōgyōshinshō*, are fraught with problems. Therefore Sueki's suggestion, while certainly attractive from the psychological point of view, may in the end not stand up to historical criticism. See Dobbins 1989: 37-38.

<sup>94</sup> Imoto 1982, however, apparently seems to suggest that Ajātaśatru in fact actually *does* desire his mother. But as far as I can tell there is absolutely no textual basis for such a claim.

<sup>95</sup> Suggestions of other even less obvious connections with European legends have been hazarded. I do not know quite what to make of the article by Uno 1988 which discusses the similarities between the episode studied in the present paper and the "Caritas Romana," the story of the imprisoned Cimon being nourished by the breast of his daughter. On the story see Steensberg 1976. I am inclined to think that any similarities are simply adventitious. Certainly, at any rate, Uno's suggestion (1988: 113) of a connection (even conceptually) with the "earth-breast" which nourishes the prince in the "Foundation Legend of Khotan" is to be rejected. (On the latter story, see Yamazaki 1990.)

<sup>96</sup> Moreover, the weight of legendary tradition is not itself evidence in the study of history. Of course, on the other hand, when the object of the historical study is the legend itself, the various manifestations of that legend *are* our evidence, but then the history we are writing is the history of a *story*, and not the history of a true happening. (For an excellent study of just such a legendary tradition, see Watanabe 1909.) Unfortunately, in much of what is written about Indian Buddhism, at least, this distinction has been blurred or even lost entirely. The result has been disastrous especially for the study of the formative stages of the Buddhist tradition, and the

damage will no doubt take a very long time to repair.

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

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

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

<sup>100</sup> "Soul" renders *hunling* 魂靈.

<sup>101</sup> "Non-self" renders *feishen* 非身.

<sup>102</sup> A reference to the Avīci hell.

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

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

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

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

<sup>107</sup> Sadakata thinks the "quotation" ends here, rather than with the previous sentence as we have taken it; this is certainly also possible.

<sup>108</sup> *Sida* 四達 seems to be a non-standard translation of *ṛddhi-pāda*.

<sup>109</sup> The Pāli tradition attributes the death of Mahā-Maudgalyāyana to a beating received from Jainas (Nigaṇṭhas); see Malalasekera 1938: II.546-47. But in the Chinese *Ekottarikāgama* 增壹阿含經 26.9, T. 125 (II) 639a12 and following, which is without Pali equivalent, the beating to death of Maudgalyāyana is attributed to the

Brahmin "Daṇḍapani 執杖梵志. The same is found in the *Binatyē* 鼻奈耶 T. 1464 (XXIV) 857c26 and following. I owe these references to Akanuma 1931: 379.

<sup>110</sup> Accepting the variant 佛法 for 神化 in note 9.

<sup>111</sup> Accepting the variant 儀識 for 儀式 in note 10.

<sup>112</sup> Accepting the variant 俗 for 濡 in note 11.

<sup>113</sup> Or: the light of / produced by the Buddha.

<sup>114</sup> That is, the Buddha.

<sup>115</sup> Accepting the variant 太 for 大 in note 14.

<sup>116</sup> This may refer to freedom from future rebirth in the three evil destinies, the realms of hell, hungry ghosts and beasts, or to the fact that his defilements, the karma which comes from those defilements and the fruits of that karma are all cut off.

<sup>117</sup> For the edition's *satāoyāe*, which seems to be a misprint.

<sup>118</sup> Both these words are written *-āhne* by Hoffmann, without variants, but strictly speaking *-āhne* is correct.

<sup>119</sup> Hoffmann writes Bharate without variants, which should probably be emended as I have done.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akanuma Chizen 赤沼智善. 1931. *Indo Bukkyō Koyū Meishi Jiten* 印度仏教固有  
名詞辭典 [A dictionary of proper names in Indian Buddhism] (Kyoto: Hōzōkan  
法藏館, reprint 1967.).
- Alsdorf, Ludwig. 1928. *Der Kumārapālapratibodha: Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der  
Apabhramśa und der Erzählliteratur des Jainas*. Alt- und Neu-Indische  
Studien 2 (Hamburg: Freiderichsen, De Gruyter & Co.).
- Bailey, Harold W. 1954. "Madu: A Contribution to the History of Wine." *Silver  
Jubilee Volume of the Zinbun-Kagaku-Kenkyusyo*, Kyoto University (Kyoto:  
Zinbun Kagaku Kenkyusyo): 1-11.
- Beal, Samuel. 1906. *Si-Yu-Ki: Buddhist Records of the Western World* (London:  
Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.).
- Bloomfield, Maurice. 1920. "The Dohada or Craving of Pregnant Women: A Motif  
of Hindu Fiction." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 40: 1-74.
- Blum, Mark L. 1985. Review of Yamada et al. 1984. *The Eastern Buddhist* 18 / 2:  
131-37.
- Böhringk, Otto and Rudolph Roth. 1855-75. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*. 7 volumes (St.  
Petersburg: Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften).
- Bruhn, Klaus. 1981. "Āvaśyaka Studies I." In Klaus Bruhn and Albrecht Wetzler,  
eds., *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus: Gedenkschrift für Ludwig  
Alsdorf*. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 23 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag).

- Bühler, Georg. 1889. "Ueber das Leben des Jaina Monches Hemachandra, des Schulers des Devachandra aus der Vajrasakha." *Denkschrift der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Classe 73* (Vienna: F. Tempsky): 171-258.
- Bukkyō Setsuwa Bungaku Zenshū Kankōkai 仏教説話文学全集刊行会, ed. 1973. *Bukkyō Setsuwa Bungaku Zenshū 仏教説話文学全集* [Complete collection of Buddhist tale literature]. 12 volumes (Tokyo: Ryubunkan 隆文館).
- Chattopadhyay, Aparna. 1968. "The Ancient Indian Practice of Drinking Wine with Reference to Kathāsaritsāgara." *Journal of the Oriental Institute of Baroda* 18 / 1-2: 145-52.
- Cowell, Edward Byles and Robert Alexander Neil. 1886. *The Divyāvadāna: A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends* (Cambridge; Reprint: Amsterdam: Oriental Press / Philo Press, 1970).
- Deleu, Josef. 1969. "Nirayāvaliyāsuyakkhandha: Uvanga's 8-12 van de jaina Canon." *Orientalia Gandensia* 4: 77-150.
- Demiéville, Paul. 1925. "Les Versions Chinoises du Milindapañha." *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 24: 1-258.
- Dobbins, James C. 1989. *Jōdo Shinshū: Shin Buddhism in Medieval Japan* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press).
- Dykstra, Yoshiko Kurata. 1986. *The Konjaku Tales: Indian Section (II)*. IRI Monograph Series 18 (Osaka: Intercultural Research Institute, Kansai University of Foreign Studies).
- Edgerton, Franklin. 1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. 2 volumes (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Feer, Léon. 1891. *Avadāna-Çataka: Cents Legendes Bouddhiques*. Annales du Musée Guimet 18 (Paris; Reprint Amsterdam: APA Oriental Press, 1979).
- Forte, Antonino. 1976. *Political Propoganda and Ideology in China at the End of the Seventh Century* (Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, Seminario di Studi Asiatici).
- . 1984. "The Activities in China of the Tantric Master Manicintana (Pao-ssu-wei 宝思惟: ? - 721 A.D.) from Kashmir and his Northern Indian Collaborators." *East and West* 31 / 1 3: 301-45.
- . 1990. "The Relativity of the Concept of Orthodoxy in Chinese Buddhism: Chih-sheng's Indictment of Shih-li and the Proscription of the Dharma Mirror Sūtra." In Robert F. Buswell, Jr., (ed.), *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press): 239-49.
- Fujita Kōtatsu 藤出宏達. 1970. *Genshi Jōdo Shisō no Kenkyū 原始浄土思想の研究* [Early Pure Land thought] (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店).
- . 1985. *Kanmuryōjūkyō Kōkyū 観無量寿経講究* [Lectures on the *Guan-jing*] (Kyoto: Shinshō Ōtaniha Shūmusho 真宗大谷派宗務所).
- . 1990. "The Textual Origins of the Kuan Wu-liang-shou ching: A Canonical Scripture of Pure Land Buddhism." Translated by Kenneth K. Tanaka. In Robert E. Buswell, Jr., (ed.), *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha* (Honolulu: University of

- Hawaii Press): 149-73. A translation of Fujita 1970, 116-36.
- . 1993. "Kanmuryōjūkyō no senjutsu mondai saissetsu" 『観無量寿経』の撰述問題再説 [A reconsideration of the compilation of the *Guan-jing*]. In Tsukamoto Keishō Kyōju Kanreki Kinen Ronbunshū Kankōkai 塚本啓祥教授還暦記念論文集刊行会, eds., *Tsukamoto Keishō Kyōju Kanreki Kinen Ronbunshū: Chi no Kaikō – Bukkyō to Kagaku* 塚本啓祥教授還暦記念論文集・知の邂逅 – 仏教と科学 (Tokyo: Kōsei shuppansha 佼成出版社): 239-53.
- Fukuhara Ryōgon 福原亮厳. 1984. "Kangyō no Seisakuchi no mondai: Chūgoku Seiritsusetsu Hihan," 観經の製作地の問題 – 中国成立説批判 [The problem of the place of composition of the *Guan-jing*: A critique of the theory of a Chinese origin]. *Eizan Gakuin Kenkyū Kiyō* 叡山学院研究紀要 7: 71-86.
- Gnoli, Raniero. 1978. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Sanghabhedavastu, part 2*. Serie Orientale Roma 49 / 2 (Rome: IsMEO).
- Gómez, Luis Oscar. 1995. "Oriental Wisdom and the Cure of Souls: Jung and the Indian East." In Donald S. Lopez, Jr., *Curators of the Buddha: The Study of Buddhism under Colonialism* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press): 197-250.
- Hardy, R. Spence. 1880. *A Manual of Buddhism in its Modern Development* (London: Williams and Northgate).
- Hayashima Kyōshō 早島鏡正. 1964. "Jōdokyō no Shōjōgōsho-kan ni tsuite" 浄土教の清浄業處観について [The pure *karmasthāna* in Pure Land doctrine]. In *Hikata Hakushi Koki Kinen Ronbunshū* 干潟博士古稀記念論文集 (Fukuoka: Hikata Hakushi Koki Kinenkai 干潟博士古稀記念会): 231-48.
- Hirakawa Akira 平川彰. 1971. "Daijō Kyōten no Hattatsu to Ajaseō Setsuwa" 大乘經典の発達と阿闍世王説話 [The origins of Mahāyāna sūtras and the tale of Ajātaśatru]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 20 / 1: 1-12. Reprinted in *Hirakawa Akira Chosakushū 6: Shoki Daijō to Hokke Shisō* 平川彰著作集六・初期大乘と法華思想 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社, 1989): 71-88. Page references are to the original article.
- . 1984. "Kangyō no Seiritsu to Shōjōgōsho" 観經の成立と清浄業處 [The origins of the *Guan-jing* and the pure *karmasthāna*]. In Waseda Daigaku Tōyō Tetsugakkai 早稲田大学東洋哲学会 ed., *Tōyō no Shisō to Shūkyō* 東洋の思想と宗教 (Tokyo: Waseda Daigaku Tōyō Tetsugakkai 早稲田大学東洋哲学会): 1-18. Reprinted in *Hirakawa Akira Chosakushū 7: Jōdo Shisō to Daijōkai* 平川彰著作集七・浄土思想と大乘戒 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社, 1990): 137-60. Page references are to the original article.
- Hoernle, August Friedrich Rudolf. 1885-90. *The Uvāsagadasāo*. Bibliotheca Indica New Series 557, 578, 614, 644, 697, 752 (Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press / Asiatic Society of Bengal).
- Hoffmann, Ingeborg. 1974. "Der Kathākośa: Text und Übersetzung mit bibliographischen Anmerkungen." Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophischen Fakultät der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität zur München (Munich: Photocopied typescript).

- Holzman, Donald. 1957. "Les Débuts de Système Médiéval de Choix et de Classement des Fonctionnaires: Les Neuf Catégories de l'Impartial et Juste 九品中正." In *Mélanges publiés par l'Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises I*. Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises 11 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France): 387-414.
- Horner, Isaline Blew. 1952. *The Book of the Discipline (Vinaya Piṭaka)*. Volume V: Cullavagga (London: Luzac & Company).
- Hoshino Genpō 星野元豊 et al., ed. 1990. *Shinran: Kyōgyōshinshō 親鸞・教行信証*. Genten Nihon Bukkyō no Shisō 原典日本仏教の思想 6 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店)
- Igarashi Myōhō 五十嵐明宝. 1989. *Ōshajō no Higeiki to Sukui 王舎城の悲劇と救い* [The tragedy at Rājagrha and salvation] (Tokyo: Yayoi Shobō 弥生書房).
- Imoto Eiichi 井本英一. 1982. *Shi to Saisei: Yūrashia no shinkō to shūzoku 死と再生・ユーラシアの信仰と習俗* [Death and Rebirth: Eurasian beliefs and customs] (Kyoto: Jinbun shoin 人文書院).
- Ishigami Zennō 石上善応. 1984. "Kanmuryōju-kyō no Ichishiza" 観無量寿經の一視座 [One point of view on the *Guan-jing*]. In *Takenaka Shinjō Hakase shōju kinen Ronbunshū* 竹中信常博士頌寿記念論文集 (Tokyo: Sankibō 山喜房): 715-24.
- Jacobi, Hermann. 1879. *The Kalpasutra of Bhadrabāhu*. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 7.1 (Leipzig: Reprint Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1966).
- . 1880. Review of Warren 1879. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 34: 178-83.
- . 1908-26. *Haribhadra: Samāraicca Kahā: A Jaina Prakṛta Work*. Bibliotheca Indica 169. New Series 1143, 1210, 1243, 1279, 1332, 1359, 1387, 1451, 1485 (Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press / Asiatic Society of Bengal).
- . See Kern 1882b.
- Jaina, Jagadishchandra. 1984. *Life in Ancient India as Depicted in the Jaina Canon and Commentaries* (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal).
- Ji Xianlin 季羨林, et al. 1985. *Datang Xiyuji Jiaozhu 大唐西域記校注* (Peking: Zhonghua shuju 中華書局).
- Jinadāsagaṇi. 1928-29. *Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi*. Edited by Ānandasāgarasūri (Ratlam: Rishabhadeo Kesharimal).
- Johnson, Helen M. 1925. "Historical References in Hemacandra's Mahāvīracaritra." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 45: 301-10.
- . 1962. *Triśāṣṭisalākāpuruṣacaritra or The Lives of Sixty-three Illustrious Persons*. Vol. 6, Book 10: Mahāvīracaritra. Gaekwad's Oriental Series 140 (Baroda: Oriental Institute).
- Kaltenmark, Max. 1979. "The Ideology of the T'ai-p'ing ching." In Holmes Welch and Anna Seidel, eds., *Facets of Taoism* (New York: Yale University Press): 19-52.

- Karlgren, Bernhard. 1950. *The Book of Documents* (Stockholm: The Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities). Reprint from the *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities* 22.
- Karmay, Samten Gyaltzen. 1988. *The Great Perfection (rdzogs chen): A Philosophical and Meditative Teaching of Tibetan Buddhism* (Leiden / New York: E. J. Brill).
- Kasugai Shinya 春日井真也. 1953. "Kanmuryōjubutsukyō ni okeru Shōmondai" 観無量寿仏経に於ける諸問題 [Problems of the *Guan-jing*]. Originally in *Bukkyō Bunka Kenkyū* 仏教文化研究 3; reprint in *Jōdokyō no Bunkashiteki Kenkyū* 浄土教の文化史的研究 (Kyoto: Hyakkaen 百華苑, 1981): 90-114.
- Kawamura Kōshō 河村孝照. 1976. "Daijō Nehangyō to Shamonkakyō" 大乘涅槃経と沙門果経 [The *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* and the *Śramaṇaphala-sūtra*]. *Tōyōgaku Kenkyū* 東洋学研究 11: 51-62.
- Kern, Hendrik. 1882a. *Geschiedenis van het Buddhisme in Indie* (Haarlem: H.D. Theenk Willink).
- . 1882b. *Der Buddhismus und seine Geschichte in Indien*. Translated by Hermann Jacobi (Leipzig: Otto Schulze).
- . 1901. *Histoire du Bouddhisme dans l'Inde*. Translated by Gédéon Huet. *Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Études* 10 (Paris: Ernest Leroux).
- Kim, Young-ho. 1990. *Tao-sheng's Commentary on the Lotus Sūtra: A Study and Translation* (Albany, New York: State University of New York Press).
- Kimura, Hideo. 1961. "The Grapes Found in Indian Classical Literature." *Bukkyō-gaku Kenkyū* 仏教学研究 18-19: 1-11.
- Kodera, Takashi James. 1980. *Dogen's Formative Years in China: An Historical Study and Annotated Translation of the Hōkyō-kī* (London and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul).
- Kosambi, Damodar Dharmanand. 1963. "Combined Methods in Indology." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 6 / 3-4: 177-202.
- La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. 1962. *Catalogue of the Tibetan Manuscripts from Tun-Huang in the India Office Library* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Law, Bimala Churn. 1931. "Some Ancient Indian Kings." *Buddhistic Studies* (Calcutta: Thacker, Spink): 186-219.
- . 1933. *A History of Pāli Literature* (London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.).
- Laufer, Berthold. 1919. *Sino-Iranica: Chinese Contributions to the History of Civilization in Ancient Iran*. Field Museum of Natural History Publications 201, Anthropological Series vol. 15, no. 3 (Chicago: Field Museum).
- Leumann, Ernst. 1934. *Übersicht über die Āvaśyaka Literatur*. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 4 (Hamburg: Friederichsen, De Gruyter & Co).
- Malalasekera, George Peiris [Gunapala Piyasena]. 1938. *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names* (London: Pali Text Society).
- Mehta, Mohanlal and K. Rishabh Chandra. 1970-72. *Prakrit Proper Names*. Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Series 28, 37, 2 volumes (Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology).

- Mette, Adelheid. 1983. "The Tales Belonging to the *Namāskara-vyākhyā* of the *Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi*. A Survey." *Indologica Taurinensia* 11: 129-44.
- Metzger, Bruce M. and Michael D. Coogan. 1993. *The Oxford Companion to the Bible* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Mizutani Shinjō 水谷真成. 1971. *Daitō Saitiki* 大唐西域記. Chūgoku Koten Bungaku Taikai 中国古典文学大系 22. Second edition (Tokyo: Heibonsha 平凡社, 1988).
- Mochizuki Ryōkō 望月良晃. 1988. *Daijō Nehangyō no Kenkyū* 大乘涅槃經の研究 [A study of the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāna-sūtra*] (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社).
- Mori Sodō 森祖道. 1982. "Gōshōsetsu no shūjūsō" 業處説の種々相 [Aspects of the *kammatṭhāna* theory]. In *Tamura Yoshirō Hakase Kanreki Kinen Ronshū: Bukkyō Kyōri no Kenkyū* 田村芳朗博士還暦記念論集・仏教教理の研究 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社): 127-40.
- Morohashi Tetsuji 諸橋轍次. 1955-60. *Dai Kanwa Jiten* 大漢和辭典. 13 volumes (Tokyo: Daishūkan shoten 大修館書店).
- Nagarāji, Muni Śrī. 1986. *Āgama and Tripiṭaka: A Comparative Study*. Volume 1 (New Delhi: Today and Tomorrow's Printers and Publishers).
- Narayan, Kirin. 1989. *Storytellers, Saints and Scoundrels: Folk Narrative in Hindu Religious Teaching* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press).
- Nishimoto Ryūzan 西本龍山. 1934. "Konponsetsu Issaiubu Binaya Hasōji" 根本説一切有部毘奈耶破僧事. In *Kokuyaku Issaikyō, Ritsubu* 国訳一切経 律部 24 (Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha 大東出版社).
- Nogami Shunjō 野上俊静. 1973. "Kanmuryōjukyō Shikō" 觀無量壽經私考 [A personal view of the *Guan-jing*]. Reprinted in *Chūgoku Jōdokyō Shiron* 中国浄土教史論 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法藏館, 1981): 157-233.
- Norman, Kenneth Roy. 1992. *The Group of Discourses (Sutta-Nipāta)*. Volume II: *Revised Translation with Introduction and Notes*. Pali Text Society Translation Series 45 (Oxford: The Pali Text Society).
- Ogasawara Senshū 小笠原宣宗. 1961. "Kōshōkoku no Bukkyō Kyōgaku" 高昌國の仏教教学 [Qočo and Buddhist doctrine]. In *Tsukamoto Hakushi Shōju Kinen: Bukkyō Shigaku Ronshū* 塚本博士頌壽記念・仏教史学論集 (Kyoto: Tsukamoto Hakushi Shōju Kinenkai 塚本博士頌壽記念会): 136-47.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1880. *The Vinaya Piṭakam: One of the Principal Buddhist Holy Scriptures in the Pāli Language*. Volume II: The Cullavagga (Reprint: London: The Pali Text Society, 1977).
- Ōminami Ryūshō 大南龍昇. 1995. "Kanmuryōjukyō no seiritsu to zenkan kyōten" 『觀無量壽經』の成立と禪觀經典 [The origin of the *Guan-jing* and meditation sūtras]. *Taishō Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 大正大学研究紀要 80: 61-97.
- Ono Genmyō 小野玄妙. 1916. "Ajase Daiō no Jiseki oyobi sono Zuzō" 阿闍世大王の事跡及び其の圖像 [The story of King Ajātaśatru and illustrations of the same]. In the same author's *Bukkyō no Bijutsu oyobi Rekishū* 佛教之美術及歴史 (Tokyo: Bussho Kenkyūkai 佛書研究会): 386-434.

- Panglung, Jampa Losang. 1981. *Die Erzählstoffe des Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya analysiert auf Grund der tibetischen Übersetzung*. Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series 3 (Tokyo: The Reiyukai Library).
- Pas, Julian F. 1977. "The Kuan-wu-liang-shou-fo-ching: Its Origin and Literary Criticism." In L.S. Kawamura and K. Scott (eds.), *Buddhist Thought and Asian Civilization: Essays in Honor of Herbert V. Guenther on His Sixtieth Birthday* (Emeryville, California: Dharma Publishing): 194-218.
- . 1995. *Visions of Sukhāvati: Shan-Tao's Commentary on the Kuan Wu-Liang-Shou-Fo Ching* (Albany, New York: State University of New York Press).
- Patel, Manilal. 1936. *Professor G. Buhler's The Life of Hemacandracarya, Translated from the Original German*. Singhi Jaina Series 11 (Santiniketan: Adhishthata-Singhi Jaina Jnanapitha).
- Prakash, Om. 1961. *Food and Drinks in Ancient India (from earliest times to c. 1200 A.D.)* (Delhi: Munshiram Monoharlal).
- Punyavijayji, Muni Shri. 1962. *Ācārya Nemicandra's Ākyaṇakamanikośa with Ācārya Amradeva's Commentary*. Prakrit Text Society Series 5 (Varanasi: Prakrit Text Society).
- Ratnachandrajī. 1923-32. *An Illustrated Ardha-Magadhi Dictionary*. 5 volumes (Indore; Reprint Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1988).
- Rhys Davids, Thomas William and Joseph Estlin Carpenter. 1886. *The Sumaṅgala-Vilāsini, Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Dīgha Nikāya* (London; Reprint The Pali Text Society, 1968).
- Rockhill, William Woodville. 1907. *The Life of the Buddha and the Early History of His Order* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench Trubner & Co.).
- Sadakata Akira 定方展. 1984. *Ajase no Sukui* 阿闍世のすくい [The salvation of Ajātaśatru] (Kyoto: Jinbun Shoin 人文書院).
- . 1989. *Ajase no Satori* 阿闍世のさとり [The awakening of Ajātaśatru] (Kyoto: Jinbun Shoin 人文書院).
- Sah, Subodhacandra Nanlal. 1977. *Triṣaṣṭīśalākāpuruṣacaritam Mahākāvyaṃ, Daśamam Parva* (Bombay: Srimati Gamgabei Jaina Ceritebal Drast).
- Schiefner, Anton von. 1851. "Eine tibetische Lebensbeschreibung Čakjamuni's, des Begründers des Buddhathums (In Auszug mitgeteilt)." *Mémoires des savants étrangers présentés à l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St. Pétersbourg* 6: 231-332.
- Schopen, Gregory. 1984. "Filial piety and the monk in the practice of Indian Buddhism: A question of 'Sinicization' viewed from the other side." *T'oung pao* 70: 110-26.
- Sheth, Harigovind Das Trīkam Chand. 1928. *Pāiia-Sadda-Mahaṅṅavo* (Calcutta; Reprint Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1986).
- Shih, Robert. 1968. *Biographies des Moines Eminents (Kao Seng Tchouan) de Houei-ktao*. Bibliothèque du Muséeon 54 (Louvain: Institut Orientaliste).

- Shikii Shūjō 色井秀謙. 1963. "Kanbutsu Sanmaikaikyō to Kanmuryōjukyō" 観仏三昧海経と観無量寿経 [The *Guanfo sanmei hai-jing* and the *Guan-jing*]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 13 / 1: 227-30.
- Shimoda Masahiro 下田正弘. 1991. "'Genshi Nehangyō' no Sonzai: 'Daijō Nehangyō' no seiritsushiteki kenkyū – sono ichi" 『原始涅槃経』の存在 – 『大乘涅槃経』の成立史的研究 その1 [The Urtext of the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*]. *Tōyō Bunka Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 東洋文化研究所紀要103 (1991): 1-126.
- Silk, Jonathan. Forthcoming. "Oedipal Calumny and Schismatic Rhetoric in Indian Buddhism: A Study in the Narrative Structure and Doctrinal History of Heresy." Unpublished paper.
- Speyer, Jacob Samuel. 1906-09. *Avadānaçataka: A Century of Edifying Tales Belonging to the Hīnayāna*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 3. Indo-Iranian Reprints 3 (St. Petersburg; Reprint: The Hauge: Mouton, 1958). 2 volumes.
- Steensberg, Axel. 1976. *Caritas Romana / The Concept of Culture* (Copenhagen: National Museum of Denmark). [A volume published on the author's 70th birthday containing a complete bibliography and English translations of two seminal papers.]
- Sueki Fumihiko 末本文美士. 1982. "Some Problems of the Kuan-wu-liang-shou-ching." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 31 / 1: 465-62 (sic).
- . 1985. "Ajase complex-kusu-ron wo megutte" 阿闍世コンプレックス論をめぐって [On the Ajase complex]. *Hikaku Shisō Kenkyū* 比較思想研究 12: 121-25.
- . 1986a. "'The Tragedy in Rājagrha' in the Guan wu liang-shou-jing." *Tōhō* 東方 2: 255-64.
- . 1986b. "'Kanmuryōjukyō' Kenkyū" 「観無量寿経」研究 [A study of the *Guan-jing*]. *Tōyō Bunka Kenkyūjo Kiyō* 東洋文化研究所紀要 101: 163-225.
- . 1992. "Kanmuryōjukyō – Kanbutsu to Ōjō" 観無量寿経 – 観仏と往生 [The *Guan-jing*: Buddha contemplation and rebirth in the Pure Land]. In Kaji-yama Yūichi 梶山雄一 et al., eds., *Jōdo Bukkyō no Shisō* 浄土仏教の思想 2 (Tokyo: Kōdansha 講談社).
- Takahashi Shin'ya 高橋審也. 1993. "Kanmuryōjukyō no seiritsuchi ni tsuite (ge)" 観無量寿経の成立地について (下) [On the place of origin of the *Guan-jing* (2)]. In Ono Gisen 大野義山 ed., *Undō Gidō sensei kiju kinen ronbunshū: Shūkyōteki shinri to gendai* 雲藤義道先生喜寿記念論文集・宗教的真理と現代 (Tokyo: Kyōikushinchōsha 教育新潮社): 279-92.
- Takakusu, Junjiro. 1894. "The Amitayur-dhyāna-sūtra." In F. Max Müller, *Buddhist Mahayana Texts*. Sacred Books of the East 49 (London: Humphrey Milford for Oxford University Press).
- Takenaka Shinjō 竹中信常. 1982. "Kanmuryōju-kyō no sekai" 観無量寿経の世界 [The world of the *Guan-jing*]. In Ishida Mitsuyuki Hakase Koki Kinen Ronbunshū Kankōkai 石田充之博士古希記念論文集刊行会, ed., *Jōdokyō no Kenkyū* 浄土教の研究 (Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō): 75-92.

- Tanaka, Kenneth K. 1990. *The Dawn of Chinese Pure Land Buddhist Doctrine: Ching-ying Hui-yuan's Commentary on the Visualization Sutra* (Albany: State University of New York Press).
- Tawney, Charles Henry. 1895. *The Kathākośa; or Treasury of Stories*. Oriental Translation Fund, new series 2 (London: Royal Asiatic Society).
- Trautmann, Thomas R. 1971. *Kauṭīlya and the Arthaśāstra* (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- Tsukinowa Kenryū 月輪賢隆. 1971. "Butten no shūshi" 仏典の終始 [Buddhist texts from beginning to end]. Reprinted in *Butten no Hihanteki Kenkyū* 仏典の批判的研究 (Kyoto: Hyakkaen 百華苑, 1981): 5-173.
- Uno Motoharu 宇野順治. 1988. "Axel Steensberg, 'Caritas Romana' wo megutte" Axel Steensberg, "Caritas Romana" をめぐって [Axel Steensberg, on the 'Caritas Romana']. *Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 仏教学研究 44: 101-16.
- Upadhye, A. T. 1935. *The Vivāyasuyam*. Sanskrit and Prakrit Jain Literature Series 1 (Belgaum: A. T. Upadhye).
- Warren, Sybrandus Johannes. 1879. *Nirayāvaliyāsuttam, een Upānga der Jaina's* (Amsterdam: Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen).
- Watanbe, Kaigyoku. 1909. "The Story of Kalmāṣapāda and its Evolution in Indian Literature." *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 6: 236-310.
- Watanabe Kenji 渡辺研二. 1990. "Jaina-kyō shoden 'Nanda to Sundarī monogatari'" ジャイナ教所伝「ナンドとスダリー物語」 [The tale of Nanda and Sundarī in Jaina literature]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 38 / 2: 901-897 (sic).
- Weber, Albrecht. 1883. "Ueber die heiligen Schriften der Jaina." *Indische Studien. Beiträge für die Kunde des indischen Alterthums* 16: 211-479.
- Winternitz, Maurice. 1927. *A History of Indian Literature*, volume 2 (Calcutta: University of Calcutta).
- Wogihara Unrai 荻原雲来. 1964-74. *Kanyaku Taishō Bonwa Daijiten* 漢訳対照梵和大辞典 [A Sanskrit-Japanese dictionary with Chinese equivalents] (Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation).
- Wojtilla, Gyula. 1978. "On the Sanskrit and MIA names of pulses in ancient and early medieval India." *Bharata Manisha Quarterly* 4 / 2: 39-44.
- Yamada Meiji 山田明爾. 1976. "Kangyōkō: Muryōjubutsu to Amidabutsu" 観経攷—無量寿仏と阿弥陀仏— [The *Guan-jing: Wuliangshou-fo* and *Amitou-fo*]. *Ryūkoku Daigaku Ronshū* 龍谷大学論集 408: 76-95.
- Yamada, Meiji, et al. 1984. *The Sutra of Contemplation on the Buddha of Immeasurable Life as Expounded by Sakyamuni Buddha* (Kyoto: Ryūkoku University).
- Yamada Yoshio 山田孝雄 et al. 1959. *Konjaku Monogatari-shū 1* 今昔物語集一. *Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei* 日本古典文学大系 22 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店).
- Yamazaki, Gen'ichi. 1990. "The Legend of the Foundation of Khotan." *Memoirs of the Tōyō Bunko* 48: 55-80.

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
Devadatta	1	1	1	1	1	1				
Ministers		2	2	2	2					
Reluctance to violence			3			2				
Restriction on food		5	8	4		3	2	2	1	2
Whipping								1	2	1
Affection of people for king			4	3	3					
Queen requests to enter prison		3		6						
Bathing of queen	2			7		6				
Taking in food	3		5	8	4	4		3	4	3
— repeated —			X		X	X				X
Taking in drink	4		6					4	3	
Facing Buddha / pacing	5		9	5	6	7				
— repeated —				X						
Monks visit prison	6		12							
Questioning of jailers	7		7	9	5	5				
— repeated —			X		X	X				
Shutting window			10	10	7					
Lacerating feet			11	11	8	8				
Anger at mother	8	4								
Urination episode								5	5	4
Son and dog					9					
Injured finger							1		6	5
Boil on son's finger			13							
Boil on own childhood finger		*	14		10	10		6		
Fright at noise / sight of advancing son			15		11		3	7	7	6
Suicide					12		4	8	8	7
Rebirth			16	12		9				8

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

I *Guan-jung*

II *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāna-sūtra*

III *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*

IV *\*Ajātasatru-sūtra*

V *Shisong-lü*

VI *Sumāngala-vilāstini*

VII *Nirayāvāṭiṃ*

VIII *Āvaśvakacūṛṇi*

IX *Triśaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita*

X *Kathākośa*