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Abstract

This dissertation focuses on the story of the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita found in various Buddhist prajñāpāramitā sūtras. The richness of the story’s contents, the complexity of its multiple extant versions, and its association with prajñāpāramitā make it a piece worthy of investigation. Looking at the origins of the story, previous studies have assumed a linear relationship among the two main versions of the story. Yet a closer analysis conducted in this study reveals two branches of a family tree that appears to stem from an earlier (now lost) parent. The historical analysis of the evolution of the story also provides fresh and reliable evidence concerning the editorial processes of Buddhist texts. Jan Nattier (2003: 49–63) proposed several rules for identifying interpolations in a text. Application of these rules to the Sadāprarudita narrative has led to the formulation of several supplementary rules. Where Nattier’s rules help to identify stratification in the later parallels of the text, these supplementary rules allow for the identification of interpolations in the earlier parallels of the text and between the two main versions as well.

Apart from revealing the historical development of the text this thesis makes important contributions to our understanding of the story’s employment across time and space, revealing the importance given to this narrative by many of the great Buddhist masters from India, Tibet and China, and spanning thousands
of years. In addition, the unique episode which lists many states of samādhi with vivid names is explored to determine whether these samādhis could have had a practical basis or are merely as fanciful as their names suggest. The samādhi on viewing all tathāgatas is further investigated to see what implications this may have for the beginnings of Mahāyāna teachings.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1. BACKGROUND TO THE STORY OF SADĀPRARUDITA AND

LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1.1. BACKGROUND OF THE STORY

In the prajñāpāramitā sūtras of 8,000, 18,000, 25,000, and 100,000 ślokas (verses),¹ and their respective translations in Chinese and Tibetan, there is a particular jātaka or avadāna narrative ² that talks about the Bodhisattva ³

---

¹ Most of the sūtras of this class, though in prose, are named after the number of ślokas, in which 32 syllables are counted as one śloka (Conze 1978: 1). In the manuscripts of these texts, it seems always to be the case that the word “sūtra” does not appear in their titles, which is probably a reflection of the Indian models. However, given the genre of these texts and the long-standing convention in the Buddhist studies field, the word “sūtra” is included in this thesis. For example, the Aṣṭasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā is presented as Aṣṭasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra. I am grateful to Professor Stefano Zacchetti for offering me some insights on this issue.

² From the perspective of early Indian Buddhist classification, this story may belong to several possible genres, such as vyākaraṇa, avadāna, jātaka or pūrva-yoga. The issue on the genres of the narrative will be discussed in § 1.3 of this chapter.

³ It is notable that Bhattacharya (2010: 35–50) shows that the majority of epigraphy and manuscript readings he has investigated have -satva- with a single -t-. He also notes that in a few places the term has been written with a double -tr-, which he proposes may either be a scribal error or reflect actual usage at that period. However, he argues that there is no evidence to support the latter conjecture since in the Buddhist manuscripts of the later period the spelling is satva with a single -t-. Although he does not translate the term bodhisatva, which he regards as a Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit term in the article cited, it is likely that he treats it as equivalent to the Gāndhārī term bodhisatva, or the Pali term bodhisatta, traditionally interpreted as “a being who aspires to Bodhi or Enlightenment.” (Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names, s.v. bodhisatta) It is also possible that Bhattacharya’s preferred reading corresponds to Norman’s (1990: 36) suggested interpretation of the term, “capable of enlightenment” (bodhiśakta), or that proposed by Williams (2005: 996), “directed toward enlightenment” (bodhisakta). Both interpretations are based on sound etymological reasoning. The current work will adopt the form bodhisattva as used
Sadāprudita. This story uses many vivid episodes to recount events in the bodhisattva’s life, depicting his struggles and accomplishments in the course of his search for the teaching of *prajñāpāramitā* (perfection of insight). The story of the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita is a didactic or exemplary account for bodhisattvas who should learn from his diligent spirit. In this story, the doctrine of *prajñāpāramitā*, which is said to be vast and deep, is taught through many interesting and impressive episodes. The story exists in various parallels and forms. There are two main versions of the story found in *prajñāpāramitā* literature. In this thesis, I refer to these as version I and version II.  

Although they differ in their finer details, several major events and episodes run consistently throughout. Drawing from these commonalities, what follows is a short synopsis of the story to provide some essential background, required for the understanding of the following sections. A comprehensive account of the story is given towards the end of this chapter in § 1.4.1.  

---

4 The first to consider that there are two versions of the story in *prajñāpāramitā* literature was Lancaster (1968: 199–309; 1974b: 83–90). I would like to thank Profs. Peter Skilling and John Strong for drawing my attention to Lancaster’s 1974b and 1968 article, respectively. However, I do not entirely agree with Lancaster’s viewpoints. In his article, he describes version I and version II as the “earlier tradition” or the “earlier text,” and the “later tradition” or the “later text”, respectively (Lancaster 1968: 202, 203, 209, 212, 215; 1974b: 83, 87). This appears to suggest that the “earlier tradition” or “earlier text” was formed prior to the “later tradition” or “later text.” However, he does not justify his conclusions, but he was probably influenced by the fact that the “earlier text” was translated into Chinese before the “later text.” In reality, both versions of the story have early and late elements and could have stemmed from a version which was formed even earlier than the two main versions. Therefore, it would be more fitting to describe the two versions as version I and version II. This issue will be discussed in Chapter 4.  

5 Within this thesis all English translations of Chinese, Pali, Tibetan, and Japanese texts are my own, except where otherwise indicated.
The Bodhisattva Sadāprudita’s search for *prajñāpāramitā* proves to be a difficult one and the struggle to find it causes him great distress and he weeps repeatedly. As a result, some gods and buddhas take pity on him and provide him with several revelations. Only then does Sadāprudita come to know that he will be able to find his teacher, the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata, who will instruct him in this teaching in the city of Gandhavatī. He is impelled on his journey by a central question that occurred to him after one of the revelations, “Where have those tathāgatas come from, and where have they gone?” On the way, while resting in a small town, he decides to make a bodily self-sacrifice in order to obtain some valuables to honour his teacher the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata. However, he encounters Māra’s obstruction of his efforts and Śakra’s conclusive test of his resolve. While cutting flesh from his own body, he is fortunately stopped by a merchant’s daughter. She then helps him overcome his difficulties by providing him with riches and servants. Then with a large entourage he proceeds to his

---

6 kutas te tathāgatā āgatāḥ kva vā te tathāgatā gataḥ (Āṣṭasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra, abbreviated as Āṣṭa in citation hereafter, [ed. Wogihara 1932–1935] 944.4–5). According to the story, the answer to the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita’s doubt is na khalu kulaputra tathāgatāḥ kutaścid āgacchanti vā gacchanti vā. acaalītā hi tathātā yā ca tathātā sa tathāgataḥ. na hi kulaputrāṇupāda āgacchati vā gacchati vā yaś cānupādaḥ sa tathāgataḥ (Āṣṭa [ed. Wogihara 1932–1935] 963.5–8). “Indeed, O son of good family, those tathāgatas do not come from or go anywhere because what is true nature does not move, and the tathāgata is true nature, [and] O son of good family, because what is non-origination does not come nor go, and what is non-origination that is the tathāgata.” This is followed by the formula, “Because, O son of good family, the coming or going of x cannot be conceived, and what is x that is the Tathāgata.” An example is na hi kulaputra śūnyatāyā āgamanam vā gamanam vā prajñāyate yā ca śūnyatā, sa tathāgataḥ (Āṣṭa [ed. Wogihara 1932–1935] 963.10–12). “Because, O son of good family, the coming or going of emptiness cannot be conceived, and what is emptiness that is the tathāgata.” (Within this thesis, translations of the Sanskrit in the Āṣṭasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra have been performed mostly consulting Conze’s work (1973), together with all Chinese translations of the sūtra.) For details of the Sanskrit text, see Āṣṭa (ed. Wogihara 1932–1935) 963.9–18. For an alternative translation of the Sanskrit Āṣṭa chapters on Sadāprudita (chs. 30–31), see Conze 1973: 277–298.
destination. Having made extensive and elaborate offerings to the text Prajñāpāramitā and his teacher, he receives the answer to the question that arose at the outset of his journey and learns prajñāpāramitā from the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata.

According to the Dà zhì dù lùn 大智度論 (The Treatise on the [Sutra⁷ of] Great Perfection of Insight, T 25 no. 1509),⁸ a commentary on the prajñāpāramitā sūtra of twenty-two thousand ślokas, this story is used to encourage beginner bodhisattvas to learn the in-depth teaching of emptiness. The treatise recounts, “As long as one can be wholeheartedly diligent and not begrudge one’s body and life, [and] seeking with such a wholehearted mind, one then will be able to attain [the teaching].”⁹ Accordingly, if they hear the story of the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita, they may become confident and think to themselves, “Since that person can attain it, I should [be able to] attain it too.”¹⁰

---

⁷ In this thesis all English translations of texts’ titles are given purely in English, that is, not including any original Indic words. This includes following English spelling conventions, where an Indic term has become a loanword in English. For example, “sūtra” is replaced with “sutra” in this regard.

⁸ Katō (2003: 7) indicates that the title of the commentary on the prajñāpāramitā sūtra of 22,000 ślokas, based on the inference by Demiéville (1950: 375–395) and Lamotte (1970: vii–viii), is probably *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa*. In a publication by Inokuchi (1980: xxv, xxvii, xxviii) regarding discovered manuscripts in Central Asia, several fragments of manuscripts of this commentary, discovered in Kucha, possess the title Mōhē bānruodōduōmī yōubōtīshē 摩訶般若波羅蜜優波提舍, which is probably the transcription of *Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa*. On the other hand, according to a colophon by one of the members of the translation team named Sēngruĩ 僧叡, the title of this commentary is 摩訶般若波羅蜜經釋論 (T 25 no. 1509 p. 57a3). A reconstruction of this title in Sanskrit may be *Mahāprajñāpāramitāsūtripadeśa*, in which the word “sūtra” is included. It seems that the title without the word “sūtra” is more preferable. Note that this title has been reconstructed from the original non-Sanskrit text. All such reconstructed terms in this paper are indicated with an asterisk at the start of the word.

⁹ 但能一心動精進不惜身命, 作如是一心求便可得 (T 25 no. 1509 p. 731c1–3).

¹⁰ 彼人能得我亦應得 (T 25 no. 1509 p. 731c5–6).
The story was clearly a popular one and spread throughout much of the Buddhist world, being used as didactic material for promoting the Buddha’s teachings. For example, both of the remarkable Indian masters Candrakirti and Śāntideva quote several episodes of the story in their works Prasannapadā and Śikṣāsamuccaya, respectively, in which the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita is regarded as a paragon of a Buddhist practitioner. In Central Asia, moreover, there is a Uighur version of the story of Sadāprarudita. This version has been edited by a Uighur specialist, Şinsula Tekin, under the title Die uigurische Bearbeitung der Geschichte von Sadāprarudita und Dharmodgata Bodhisattva (The Uighur version of the story of Sadāprarudita and Dharmodgata Bodhisattva). Several of the lives of eminent Tibetan masters, such as Marpa, Milarepa, and Rechungpa,

---

11 In this thesis references to buddha(s) in general are spelt with lower case b-. Where it is referring to a specific buddha then the term is spelt with a capital B-. For example, Buddha Jiàntuóluóyē. Where the term appears on its own as “Buddha,” it is referring to Śākyamuni Buddha. The same principle also applies to other terms like “bodhisattva” and “tathāgata.” The only exceptions are in the case of direct quotes from other sources where the spelling will follow exactly as how the source text presents it.

12 For these quotations by Candrakirti and Śāntideva, see Prasannapadā (ed. de La Vallée Poussin 1903–1913) 378.12–381.11, and Śikṣāsamuccaya (ed. Bendall 1897–1902) 37.19–41.13, respectively.

13 This work is collected in the Buddhistische Uigurica aus der Yüan-Zeit, published in 1980. In this work, Tekin provides readers with clear images of the Uighur manuscript, a transliteration, a German translation, an overview, a glossary, and so forth. Several editions and reviews of the text have appeared since Tekin’s 1980 edition. There are two full editions, one by Barutçu (1988, PhD dissertation, unpublished) the other by Nüri (2009, PhD dissertation, unpublished). Apart from these editions of the full Uighur text, Zieme (1991) and Shōgaito (1995a: 1–18; 1995b: 1–12) have also published partial editions of the Uighur version of the story of Sadāprarudita. In addition, de Jong (1983) and Laut (1984) reviewed Tekin’s work. To a certain extent, they modified or corrected some of Tekin’s findings concerning this Uighur text. For detailed information on these pieces of work, see Nüri (2009: 6).

14 For the details, see the Heruka, trans. into English by Trungpa & Nālandā Translation Committee 1982: 26, 201.

15 For the details, see Milarepa, trans. into English by Chang 1977: 480, which is an anthology of Milarepa’s work and also contains his life story.
possess accounts of the story that convey an ideal model of the relationship between master and disciple. Among them, Tsongkhapa specifically composed an alternating verse-prose commentary on this story.\(^{17}\) In China, the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita was once regarded as an exemplar of one who practices the recollection of buddhas.\(^{18}\) The employment and the significance of the Sadāprarudita narrative will be discussed in Chapter 6.

In addition to the employment of the story in Dharma\(^ {19}\) teachings, the narrative of Sadāprarudita is also depicted in wall paintings\(^ {20}\) and in manuscript illustrations.\(^ {21}\)

### 1.1.2. Related Literature Review

It has been well known in Buddhist circles that Eugène Burnouf (1801–1852 CE)\(^ {22}\) pioneered the way for studies in prajñāpāramitā literature when he first publish his translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra (abbreviated

\(^{16}\) See Roberts 2007: 128 for the details.

\(^{17}\) This Tibetan commentary by Tsongkhapa has been translated into English by Pema Gyatso and Bailey (2008).

\(^{18}\) The account of the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita as a paragon of one who practises recollecting buddhas is preserved in the Guǎng hóng míng jí 廣弘明集 (A Further Collection [of Essays] to Promote [Buddhism] and Enlighten [Sentient Beings], abbreviated as “A Further Collection of Essays on Buddhism” hereafter), composed by Dàoxuān 道宣. See T 52 no. 2103 pp. 351c18–352a9 for details.

\(^{19}\) In this thesis, the spelling of the term “Dharma” with a capital D- refers to a buddha’s teachings, virtues or the ultimate Truth. Where it appears in lower case d- it is referring to the broader sense of the term as phenomena (see MW s.v. dharma). When used in its Sanskrit sense the term will appear in lower case and italicised as dharma.

\(^{20}\) See Luczanits 2010: 567–578 for the details.

\(^{21}\) See Kim 2009: 255–272 for the details on the illustrations regarding the story of Sadāprarudita in manuscripts.

\(^{22}\) Silk 2004: 96.
as *Aṣṭa* from here on). In the twentieth century CE, Edward Conze (1904–1979) has been regarded as one of the most remarkable and productive scholars working on the *prajñāpāramitā* literature. Another notably preeminent scholar in this field is Étienne Lamotte (1904–1983), whose annotated translation of *Dà zhì dù lùn 大智度論*, *Le Traité de la grande Vertu de Sagesse* (1944–1980), has been regarded as “a text of first-rate importance for Buddhistic studies.”

Several modern scholars have discussed the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita story. However, most are found in the context of research on *prajñāpāramitā* or *jātaka* literature. Generally these discussions are part of a larger investigation, for example, relating to the issue of Mahāyāna ideology or its origin, particularly those works before the 1990s. Nonetheless, among research published before the

---

23 This sūtra consists of 31 chapters; the French translation (Burnouf 1844: 465–483) makes available a substantial portion of Chapter 1, although on p. 465 Burnouf states that he translated “almost the entire” text for his own personal use. Unfortunately the rest of his translation has not been published.


25 See Conze 1978: 127–138 for details on his publications of studies in Buddhism. Although Conze’s research in the *prajñāpāramitā* literature is authoritative, some of his viewpoints have been questioned by modern scholarship, particularly the issue on the lineage of the *prajñāpāramitā* literature. Nattier (2003: 49–50), for example, criticises the approach by which Conze identifies the stratification of the *Aṣṭa*:

From the way his argument is structured, however, it is clear that his principal basis for declaring those passages to be interpolations is the nature of their content, and not their presence or absence in another text. In Conze’s mind, it would seem, such “devotional” passages simply could not have been composed by the same person who was responsible for the more philosophical sections of the text, those that deal (in Conze’s terminology) with the “Absolute,” and with emptiness (Nattier 2003: 50).

26 Although Lamotte’s translation in five sizeable volumes is of first-rate importance, unfortunately, these only cover fascicles 1 to 34. He was unable to complete the remaining 35–100 fascicles within his lifetime.

27 Brough 1950: 790.

28 For example, Conze (1952: 252–253; 1978: 49–50), Yìnshùn (1980: 669–673), and Akanuma (1981: 382–387) discuss this story as part of a bigger investigation into *prajñāpāramitā* literature. Lamotte (1954: 381–386), moreover, uses this story as evidence to argue that the origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism was in north-west India, in particular the
1990s Lewis Lancaster’s (1968: 199–309) unpublished doctoral dissertation devotes a whole chapter to the story of Sadāprudita, in which a presentation and analysis of the major sources is given, as well as a full translation of the story from its earlist Chinese translation (T224) side by side with a rearranged version of the Sanskrit text. In addition, a journal article by Lancaster (1974b: 83–90), which contains a few pages largely excerpted from his doctoral dissertation, looks at this story primarily from the perspective of heroic myth. Lancaster (1968: 220; 1974b: 88) argues that the account of a hero and his journey is unfortunately lost in version II (i.e. those other than the two Chinese translations by Lokakṣema and Zhī Qiān 支謙), and this results in ambiguity in the sequence and the plot. From the perspective of a drama and fortuitous sequence of events, he further comments, “The rearrangement and infusion of meritorious material results in a story that fails to convey the full import of the symbolic journey of the Bodhisattva to find the Prajñāpāramitā” (Lancaster 1968: 202; 1974b: 88). Stephan Beyer (1977: 329–340), following Lancaster’s viewpoint, suggests that the reason why the editors of version II excised some contents that possess visionary theism is that Mahāyāna philosophy seeks to free itself from its visionary roots.²⁹

region of Gandhārā. In addition, Hikata (1961: 26, 29, 44; 1978: 79, 94) mentions this story in his studies of jātaka or avadāna narratives.

²⁹ Karashima (2013a: 181–184) also suggests the same idea. He claims, for example, that the content related to making statues of the Buddha in version I was deleted by the editor(s) of version II. It seems questionable that the story translated by Lokakṣema and Zhī Qiān predates the others. A detailed discussion will be given in Chapter 4.
Since the 1990s quite a few journal articles discussing this story have appeared, most of which are in Japanese. These include Fujita Masahiro 藤田正浩 (1990: 26–31), Tiāncháng 天常 (1992: 98–104; 1998: 96–100),30 Katsuzaki Yūgen 勝崎裕彦 (1995: 30–34; 2001: 47–85), Okada Mamiko 岡田真美子 (1995: 143–155), and Itō Chikako 伊藤千賀子 (2006: 149–154).31 In these studies, one of the preoccupations that many of the scholars pay attention to is the relationship between the jātaka form of the story and version I of the narrative. Three different conclusions are proposed by these studies: (1) that version I emerged first and that the jātaka form of the story is an extract of version I; (2) that the jātaka form of the story was the prototype of version I; or (3) that both version I and the jātaka form of the story stemmed from an earlier version of the story. Each of these conclusions will be discussed in Chapter 4.

1.2. SURVEY OF THE CHARACTERS IN THE STORY

1.2.1. SADĀPRARUDITA

The Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita is the protagonist of the story, particularly in the first half of the narrative. The name Sadāprarudita literally means, “ever

---

30 The 1992 reference represents her Master’s dissertation. Both of the works by Tiāncháng are in Chinese.
31 Recently, there have also been two doctoral dissertations concerning the story. They are Nūri (2009, unpublished doctoral dissertation) and Mak (2009, unpublished doctoral dissertation).
weeping,” which is transcribed as Sābōlūn, Sātuōbōlūn 薩陀波聨, Sātuōbōlūn 薩陀波倫, Sātuōbōlūn 薩陀波倫, or Sātuōbōlūn 薩陀波倫 in Chinese. From the perspective of early Buddhism the name Sadāprudita, “ever (sadā) weeping (prrudita),” possesses a negative connotation. A sutta in the Saṃyutta-nikāya, for example, says, “The uninstructed worldling, O bhikkhu, being contacted by a painful bodily feeling, grieves, laments, weeps, beats his breast and becomes distraught. … But the instructed noble disciple, O bhikkhu, being contacted by a painful bodily feeling, does NOT grieve, lament, weep, beat his breast and become distraught.”

Why was this bodhisattva called Sadāprudita (Ever-weeping)? In the Dào xíng bānruò jīng 道行般若經 (Sutra on [Perfection of] Insight: Proceeding on the Way, T 8 no. 224) and the Dà míng dù jīng 大明度經 (Sutra on Transcendence by Great Insight, T 8 no. 225), this name was given to him by the devas (gods) of the Trāyastrimśa Heaven. According to Lokakṣema’s translation, one day while asleep, the bodhisattva dreams of a god who tells him, “You should search for the great Dharma.” When he wakes up and starts searching for this Dharma, it turns

32 All transcriptions of Chinese ideograms will be given in Pinyin in this thesis.
33 An example of this transcription can be found in T 17 no. 760 p. 608b12.
34 An example of this transcription can be found in T 14 no. 441 p. 275b27.
35 An example of this transcription can be found in T 8 no. 224 p. 470c21.
36 An example of this transcription can be found in T 8 no. 227 p. 580a24.
37 assutavā bhikkhave phutthajano sārīrikāya dukkhāya vedanāya phuttho samāno socati kilamati paridevati urattālim kandati sammoham āpajjati. … sutavā ca kho bhikkhave ariyasāvako sārīrikāya dukkhāya vedanāya phuttho samāno na socati na kilamati no paridevati na urattālikandati na sammoham āpajjati (SN IV 206 [36.4]). See also Bodhi 2000: 1262.
38 汝當求索大法 (T 8 no. 224 p. 470c28).
out to be a very difficult task. Nowhere could he find a buddha teaching the sūtras or practitioners practicing meditation and the religious life. Day after day he is in a state of extreme grief, weeping and crying because of his desire to find the great Dharma and yet not being able to do so. When the gods of the Trāyastriṃśa Heaven come down and see the bodhisattva weeping so sadly, they give him the name Sadāprarudita.\textsuperscript{39} However, such an account of the origin of the bodhisattva’s name is omitted in the other translations by Kumārajīva, Xuánzàng 玄奘, Dānapāla and so forth, which represent version II.

In the \textit{Dà zhì dù lùn} 大智度論, there is a series of questions, “Why was he given this name? Was it given by his parents? Was this because of a certain event that happened?”\textsuperscript{40} The answers to these provide another explanation as to how the name Sadāprarudita came about. The commentary mentions three answers to these questions that all begin with \textit{yǒu rén yán} 有人言 (some say). The first answer is that he was named Sadāprarudita (Ever-weeping) on account of weeping easily when he was small. This implies that the name was likely to have been given by his parents. The second is that he was given this name because he had cultivated great compassion and his mind had become sympathetic towards others, he always wept when he saw those who were poor, old with illness, and grieved at the chaos of the world. In other words, the name was given by those who knew or heard of him possessing the characteristic of compassion. The third answer is that

\textsuperscript{39} T 8 no. 224 pp. 470c24–471a8; T 8 no. 225 pp. 503c23–504a4.
\textsuperscript{40} T 25 no. 1509 p. 732a12–13.
the bodhisattva had cultivated compassion for aeons of lives and that due to his compassion for sentient beings he went into the wilderness in order to diligently aspire after the Dharma for their benefit. There, he heard a voice of revelation in the air that suddenly disappeared before he could enquire further. Because of this, he wept for seven days. After this event, the devas, nāgas, and other divine beings called him Sadāprudita. Thus, in this story the name Sadāprudita (Ever-weeping) represents the characteristic of compassion, and does not have the negative connotation encountered in earlier Buddhist texts.

It is noteworthy that the third answer in the Dà zhì dù lùn 大智度論, in part, is somewhat akin to the account of how the gods of the Trāyastriṃśa Heaven named him Sadāprudita after they saw the bodhisattva weeping so sadly. The obvious similarity is that this name was given by divine beings. In short, the third answer in the Dà zhì dù lùn 大智度論 seems to a certain extent to be correlated with version I. There are, moreover, some other similarities between the two portrayals as shown in the Table 1.1.

---

41 Nāga is a serpent-like spirit.
43 It seems that in Mahāyāna Buddhism compassion may be manifested in the act of weeping. Another case is seen in Tibetan Buddhism. The goddess Tārā, known as the Mother of Mercy, the Goddess of Compassion, the “mother of liberation,” the “one who saves,” is said to have emerged from a lotus that grew in a lake made by the tears of the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara as he wept for the world’s sufferings (see Moir-Bussy 2010: 900).
### Table 1.1 Similar aspects of the 道行般若經 and 大智度論 portrayal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>道行般若經</th>
<th>大智度論</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...The bodhisattva ... has cultivated gunas for aeons of lives.</td>
<td>...The bodhisattva has cultivated compassion for aeons of lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There used to be a buddha named Tánmójiézhòujìéluò  who had passed away a long time ago.</td>
<td>At that time there was no buddha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...即棄捐家深山中無人之處 (T 8 no. 224 p. 471a13–14).</td>
<td>...遠離人眾在空閑處 (T 25 no. 1509 p. 732a17–18).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...then [he] left home for the mountains, away and remote from other humans.</td>
<td>...[he] left the crowd for the wilderness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

44 The numbering of tables and figures in this study agrees with the chapter numbers, i.e. Table 1.1 represents the first table in Chapter 1, and Figure 3.1 refers to the first figure in Chapter 3.

45 The Sanskrit original may have been  Dharmāgacācākaśāgatarāja. See § 1.2.3.2 for the detailed discussion on the reconstruction of this buddha’s name. Karashima (2010: 760; 2011: xii–xiii; 2013a: 180–181) suggests that the source text for Lokakṣema’s translation of the Aṣṭa is likely to have been in Gāndhārī. This inference is on the basis of some expressions in Lokakṣema’s translation which presuppose sound changes only found in Gāndhārī, and not in other Indian vernaculars of the time. Although the source text for Lokakṣema’s translation of the Aṣṭa is likely to have been in Gāndhārī, this thesis will provide reconstructions of terms in Sanskrit, as to date many terms in Gāndhārī are still unknown, and the inconsistencies of Gāndhārī orthography would make reconstructions problematic. For more information about the relationship between Lokakṣema’s translation and the Gāndhārī manuscript of the Aṣṭa, see Falk 2011: 20–23; Falk and Karashima 2012: 19–21.
There is sometimes a surprise when consulting the meaning of a Sanskrit term interpreted by Tibetan or Chinese translators, as is the case with the name Sadāprarudita. The Tibetan translation is *rtag-par rab-tu ngu-ba* or *rtag-tu-ngu,* which also means “ever weeping.” However, when we look at the Chinese translations of the name, there are some interesting twists. It is translated as Chángtí 常啼 (Ever-weeping) or Chángbēi 常悲 (Ever-grieved), which is consistent with the literal sense in Sanskrit. On the other hand, there is a special translation, Pǔcí 普慈, which means “universal loving-kindness.” This translation is found in *Dà míng dù jīng* 大明度經, which is attributed to Zhī Qiān. Surprisingly, it is totally unique and reflects nothing of the sense of its Sanskrit at all. Jan Nattier (2008a: 136–137) points out that this text has two different portions, compiled by different translators. Chapter one of this text is probably not Zhī Qiān’s work, but chapters two to thirty are likely to have been translated by him. The story of Sadāprarudita is included in the section that is likely to be Zhi Qian’s work. It seems hard to conclude with certainty that Zhī Qiān’s translation here is based on an Indic term that is different from “*sadāprarudita.*” As noted by Nattier (2008a: 137), Zhī Qīan is “known to have played an active role in revising

---

46 For instance, the Tibetan translation is seen in the *shes-rab-kyi pha-rol-tu phyin-pa stong-phrag-nyi-shu-Inga-pa,* Peking 731: di: 254b.6.

47 This Tibetan translation is seen, for example, in the *'phags-pa shes-rab-kyi pha-rol-tu phyin-pa brgyad-stong-pa,* Peking 734: mi: 283b.4.


49 T 3 no. 152 p. 43a13.

50 T 8 no. 225 p. 503c17.
existing translations by Lokakṣema.”\(^{51}\) Hence, it appears fair to say that in this instance, Zhī Qiān has transformed Lokakṣema’s transcription of the name Sātuóbōlūn 薩陀波倫 (Sadāprarudita) into the translation Pūcī 普慈 (Universal Loving-kindness). Although this translation is unique with no correspondence to the meaning of sadāprarudita, Zhī Qiān may have thought that “weeping” was so negative that it did not suit a bodhisattva, and thus translated the name Sadāprarudita in accordance with the bodhisattva’s character instead. This seems to be supported by an account in the Dà zhì dù lùn 大智度論. As discussed earlier, this treatise gives three possible interpretations for why the bodhisattva is called Sadāprarudita, one of which is that he had cultivated great compassion and being sympathetic to the suffering of beings, he always wept when he saw those who were poor, old with illness, and grieved at the chaos of the world.\(^{52}\) Therefore, the translation of the name to Pūcī 普慈 may be influenced by the bodhisattva’s quality of compassion or loving-kindness.

There is another strange translation, Chánghuānxī 常歡喜 (Ever-joyful), seen in the Fó mù bǎo dé zàng bānruòbōluómi jīng 佛母寶德藏般若波羅蜜經 (Sutra on Perfection of Insight: The Virtue Treasury of the Mother of Buddhas, T 8 no. 229), a Chinese parallel to the Prajñāpāramitā-ratna-guna-saṃcaya-gāthā, translated by Dharmabhadra in the tenth century CE. Apparently, the meaning of

\(^{51}\) Despite this, there are differences between the two Chinese translations in several places, which suggest that Zhī Qiān’s translations could be also based on Indic originals. I am grateful to Prof. Nattier for bringing to my attention her observations on this issue.

\(^{52}\) See T 25 no. 1509 p. 732a14–17 for the details.
this translated term is opposite to the meaning of *sadāprarudita*, “ever weeping.” According to Conze (1952: 251), the *Prajñāpāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā* is written in so-called Buddhist Sanskrit (or Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit). The chapter title, according to Yuyama Akira’s 湯山明 (1976: 122) edition, is “Sadāprarudita” which means “ever weeping.” Both Jì Xiànlín 季羡林 (1995: 215–216) and Choong Yoke-Meei 宗玉媚 (2009: 42–44) point out that there are at least two extant Sanskrit versions of this text. Choong further states that the version that Dharmabhadra used may be different from the extant two. In the case of the version used by Dharmabhadra, the exact wording is unclear. If the translation of the name as Chánghuānxǐ 常歡喜 is correct, then one possible interpretation might be that the chapter title, if in Sanskrit, is not Sadāprarudita but something like “Sadāpramada,” which means “ever joyful,” or “Sadāpramudita,” which means “ever delighted.” It might also be possible that “Sadāprarudita” was taken as a compound of “sadā” and “aprarudita,” which literally means “always not weeping,” in which “not weeping” may then have been further interpreted as “joyful” by the translator Dharmabhadra. A similar example is found in the translation of the bodhisattva called Sadāparibhūta in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* sūtra,\(^{53}\) and the name was translated as Chángbùqīng 常不
which means “to never slight [others].” In this case it is taken as a compound of sadā and aparibhūta.

### 1.2.2. Dharmodgata

Apart from Sadāprudita, the other key figure of the story is Dharmodgata, the teacher Sadāprudita seeks and who eventually teaches him prajñāpāramitā. The character of Dharmodgata is introduced in one of the revelations that Sadāprudita receives early on in the story when he is in the wilderness. A voice in the sky admonishes him to go east and pay no attention to his bodily needs or personal gain. After this, the voice tells Sadāprudita:

\[
\text{evam tvam kulaputra pratipadyamāno na cireṇa prajñāpāramitāṁ}
\]
\[
\text{śroṣyasi pustakagatāṁ vā dharmaḥbhāṇakasya bhikṣoḥ kāyagatāṁ}
\]


[When] practising thus, O son of good family, you will learn the prajñāpāramitā before long which is either contained in a book or held in the body of a Dharma-preacher monk.

As witnessed in the Chinese translations, the wording prajñāpāramitāṁ śroṣyasi … dharmaḥbhāṇakasya bhikṣoḥ kāyagatāṁ, “you will learn the

---

54 An example of this translation can be found in T 9 no. 262 p. 50b23.
*prajñāpāramitā* which … is held in the body of a Dharma-preacher monk,” seems to have been modified in a variety of ways:

(1) *cóng púsà kǒu wén* 從菩薩口聞 ([you will] hear (or learn) [the *prajñāpāramitā*] from the mouth of a bodhisattva, T 8 no. 221 p. 141c10–11;

(2) *cóng púsà suǒ shuō wén* 從菩薩所說聞 ([you will] hear (or learn) [the *prajñāpāramitā*] by the discourse of a bodhisattva, T 8 no. 223 p. 416b18–19);

(3) *cóng púsà suǒ wén* 從菩薩聞 ([you will] hear (or learn) [the *prajñāpāramitā*] in the abode\(^{55}\) of a bodhisattva, T 6 no. 220 p. 1059c27–28);

or abbreviated as,

(1) *cóng fǎshī wén* 從法師聞 ([you will] hear (or learn) [the *prajñāpāramitā*] from a Dharma-preacher (*dharmabhāṇaka*), T 8 no. 227 p. 580b15–16);

*cóng fǎshī suǒ wén* 從法師所聞 ([you will] hear (or learn) [the *prajñāpāramitā*] in the abode of a Dharma-preacher (*dharmabhāṇaka*), T 8 no. 228 p. 668b22–23).

---

55 The term “abode” is used here to translate the Chinese *suǒ*. Although it might be possible to take *suǒ* as a passive particle, according to the context in this case, it should be taken as “abode,” because the text including this account is 不久得聞甚深般若波羅蜜多。或從經典中聞，或從菩薩所聞 (T 6 no. 220 p. 1059c26–28), “not long [you] are able to learn the in-depth *prajñāpāramitā* either from a scripture or from a bodhisattva in their abode” (likewise for item (1) in the following paragraph).
In the Tibetan translations, Sadāprarudita will learn the *prajñāpāramitā* either from “a scripture” (*glegs-bam*) or from “a monk Dharma-preacher’s body” (*dge-slong chos smra-ba’i lus*).\(^{56}\) This agrees with the Sanskrit text quoted above. Thus, when we take into account the Sanskrit, Chinese, and Tibetan versions of the text, it is unclear whether Dharmodgata is a monastic or a layperson. Nevertheless, it is certain that he is a bodhisattva and the one who is able to teach Sadāprarudita the *prajñāpāramitā*.

The name Dharmodgata was transcribed as Tánmójié 晤無竭 \(^{57}\) by Lokakṣema and Kumārajiva in their translations of *prajñāpāramitā* texts. Kumārajīva also transcribes it as Dámóyùqiétuó 達磨禪陀 \(^{58}\) and translates it as Fāshèng 法盛,\(^{59}\) which means “Dharma-extending,” in his translation of the *Dà zhì dù lùn* 大智度論. The name was translated as Fālái 法來,\(^{60}\) which means “Dharma-appeared,” by Zhī Qiān and Kāng Sēnghuí 康僧會, while Xuánzàng translates it as Fàyǒng 法涌,\(^{61}\) which means “Dharma wellspring,” and Dānapāla renders it as Fāshàng 法上,\(^{62}\) which means “Dharma rising.” In Tibetan, it is translated as *chos ’phags*, of which a literal English translation, as pointed out by Pema Gyatso and Geoff Bailey, may be “Exalted Dharma,” “Sublime Dharma,” “Noble

\(^{56}\) Peking 734: mi: 284b.5. There is a slight variant in the reading with reference to “a monk Dharma-preacher’s body.” Sadāprarudita will learn the *prajñāpāramitā* either from “a scripture” (*glegs-bam*) or from “a Dharma-preacher monk” (*chos smra-ba’i dge-slong*) (Peking 731: di: 255b.4).

\(^{57}\) T 8 no. 224 p. 471c23; T 8 no. 223 p. 417b2.

\(^{58}\) T 25 no. 1509 p. 736a10.

\(^{59}\) T 25 no. 1509 p. 736a12.

\(^{60}\) T 8 no. 225 p. 504b22; T 3 no. 152 p. 43c7.


\(^{62}\) T 8 no. 228 p. 669b14.
Dharma,” or “Supreme Dharma.” It is clear that dharma is translated as fǎ 法 in Chinese, while udgata is interpreted differently. According to MW s.v. udgata, it may mean “gone up, risen, ascended, proceeded forth, appeared, gone, departed, extended, large,” and so forth. Basically, each of these Chinese translations reflects one of the meanings of udgata. In the Dà zhì dù lùn 大智度論, an interpretation of udgata is provided, “The term udgata means extensive and dharma means teachings in Chinese.” The text then goes on to explain, “The bodhisattva, in the city Gandhavatī, gives people [the Buddha’s] teachings to let them extensively plant wholesome roots. Therefore, [he] is called Dharmodgata.” Thus, according to the interpretation of the Dà zhì dù lùn 大智度論, dharmodgata may be understood as “extended by the Dharma.”

63 See Tsongkhapa, trans. into English by Pema Gyaltsö and Bailey 2008: 8. Pema Gyaltsö and Bailey propose a liberal translation “Sublime Wisdom” for the Tibetan chos ’phags. They argue that although the literal translations represent very legitimate choices, the liberal translation “Sublime Wisdom”, in the overall context of Tsongkhapa’s commentary on the story, reflects the content and narrative flow (Tsongkhapa, trans. into English by Pema Gyaltsö and Bailey 2008: 8).

64 習陀托秦言 直摩秦言 (T 25 no. 1509 p. 736a10). Such an expression qīnyān 秦言, which literally means “in Chinese,” is often presented in brackets in smaller size font in this treatise in the Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō 大正新修大藏經 (Taishō Tripiṭaka) to distinguish between the text and interpretations by the translator. For example, when commentating the birth name of the Gautama Buddha, an account in the Dà zhì dù lùn 大智度論 we find the following:

父母名字悉達陀(秦言共利) (T 25 no. 1509 p. 73b10–11). “[The Buddha’s] parents gave him the name Xiǎdáituó (Skt. Siddhārtha, meaning “having accomplished one’s objective” in Chinese).”

However, some are not in brackets as is the case here. This may be taken as an unintentional omission by the Taishō editors because the instances are not many. These additional words can be regarded as notes which probably were made, based on the translator’s interpretation, by Sēngruī who was in charge of polishing Kumārajīva’s translation of this work (Yinshūn 2004: 14–23).

65 此菩薩在眾香城中。為眾生隨意說法。今眾生廣種善根故號法盛 (T 25 no. 1509 p. 736a10–12).
1.2.3. OTHER CHARACTERS

1.2.3.1. THE BUDDHA BHĪŚMAGARJITANIRGHOŚASVARA OR JIÀNTUÓLUÓYÉ

According to the Sanskrit text of the story, which belongs to version II, the Buddha addressed Subhūti thus, “Sadāprudita now engages in the holy life in the presence of the Tathāgata Bhīṣmagarjitanirghośasvara.” The name of this tathāgata literally means “one whose voice is like the sound of horrible roars.”66 Other translations of this buddha’s name found in other sources are:

- Léiyīnwēiwáng 雷音威王67 (the king of thunder-voice which is mighty), by Kumārajīva in the Xiǎo pǐn bānruòbōluòmì jīng 小品般若波羅蜜經 (Smaller Sutra on Perfection of Insight, one of the Chinese parallels to the Aṣṭa);

66 punar aparām Subhūte tatheyam prajñāpāramitā paryesṭavyā, yathā Sadāpruditaṇe bodhisattvamahāsattvamāryesiṃ ya etarhi Bhīṣmagarjitanirghośasvarasya tathāgatasyārthataḥ samyaksambhūdhyāntikā brahmaṇyamārang carati (Aṣṭa [ed. Wogihara 1932–1935] 927.3–6). “Moreover, O Subhūti, this prajñāpāramitā should be sought, as it was sought by the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita, a great being, who now engages in the holy life in the presence of the Tathāgata Bhīṣmagarjitanirghośasvara, the Worthy One, the Completely Awakened One.” On the other hand, in the Chinese version translated by Dānapāla the portrayal concerning the time frame is slightly different from all other parallels. It says:

67 T 8 no. 227 p. 580a24.
• Léihουyǐnwáng 雷吼音王⁶⁸ (the king of roaring thunder-voice), by Dānapāla in the Fó mǔ chūshēng sān fāzàng bānrùòbōluómiduō jīng 佛母出生三法藏般若波羅蜜多經 (Sutra on Perfection of Insight: The Three Dharma Treasures Produced by the Mother of Buddhas, one of the Chinese parallels to the Aṣṭa);

• Léiyīn 雷音⁶⁹ (thunder-voice), by Mokṣala in the Fāng guāng bānrùò jīng 放光般若經 (Sutra on [Perfection of] Insight: Illumination, one of the Chinese parallels to the Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra);

• Dàléiyīn 大雷音⁷⁰ (mighty thunder-voice), by Kumārajīva in the Mōhē bānrùòbōluómitā jīng 摩訶般若波羅蜜經 (Sutra on Great Perfection of Insight), one of the Chinese parallels to the Pañcavimśatisāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra);

• Dàyúnléiyīn 大雲雷音⁷¹ (thunder-voice of great cloud), by Xuánzàng in the Dā bānrùō jīng (chū huī) 大般若經 (初會) (Sutra on Great [Perfection of] Insight (First Assembly), a Chinese parallel to the Śatasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra);

• sgra dbyangs mi zad par sgros pa⁷² (roar in inexhausible voice), in the Tibetan translation of the Aṣṭa;

⁶⁸ T 8 no. 228 p. 668a22–23.
⁶⁹ T 8 no. 221 p. 141b20.
⁷² Peking 734: mi: 283b4.
• *sgra dbyangs mi b扎 bzad par sgrogs pa*73 (roar in horrifying voice), in a Tibetan translation of the *Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā* sūtra;

• *sgra dbyangs mi zad par sgrogs pa*74 (roar in inexhausible voice), in a Tibetan translation of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā* sūtra).

According to the *Dà zhì dù lùn* 大智度論, when this buddha gave his first sermon and set the wheel of Dharma in motion, all sentient beings in the ten directions resolved to seek bodhi (awakening) and those belonging to other sects75 who held wrong views were tamed on account of fear, just like a great nāga king before the rain makes mighty thunder which scares all birds and worms. Because of this, gods and humans call him Dālèiyīn 大雷音 (mighty thunder-voice).76 Although there is no transcribed term concerning the buddha’s name mentioned in these texts, its Sanskrit equivalent is probably Bhīṣma-garjita-nirghoṣa-svara, which literally means “one whose voice is like the sound of horrible roars,” which is

---

75 The phrase “those belonging to other sects” is a translation of the Chinese term wăidào 外道, which literally means “those who are out of the path,” where “path” refers to the buddha’s path. Lamotte (1944: 64, 79, etc.) renders the term wăidào 外道 as hérétique, which corresponds to “heretic” in English, and regards it as a translation of the Sanskrit term tīrthika. Boucher (2008: 246) also translates the term as “heretic.” The term in the *Wéimójié suǒ shūō jīng* 维摩詰所說經 (*Sutra on the Elucidation of Vimalakīrti,* Vimalakīrtinirdeśa sūtra, T 14 no. 475) translated by Kumārajīva corresponds to “heterodox opponents” in a translation of the sūtra by Thurman (1976: 44), which is mostly based on the Tibetan version. The Sanskrit term tīrthika is equivalent to tītthiya in Pali. Bodhi (2000: 2005) interprets the Pali term aṁnatītthiya as “belonging to other sects i.e., wanderers outside of the Buddhist fold.”
76 大雷音佛者，應如大龍王將欲降雨震大雷音。烏雀小虫悉皆怖畏。是佛初轉法輪時，十方眾生皆發心。外道邪見皆恐怖懾伏。是故天人眾生稱佛為大雷音 (T 25 no. 1509 p. 732a2–5).
consistent with this interpretation. In short, it seems evident that “the sound of horrible roars” (bhīṣma-garjita-nirghoṣa) in this context is referring to thunder, according to its Chinese translations and the interpretation found in the commentary.

Unlike in version II, where this buddha’s name relates to a dreadful sound, a horrible roar or roaring thunder, in version I, the name is starkly different. It is said that Sadāprarudita now is in the land of the Buddha Jiàntuóluóyē (the equivalent Eastern Han sound gloss is gjian da la āja) 捷陀羅耶77 according to Lokakṣema’s transcription but which is translated as Xiāngjī 香積78 by Zhī Qiān, which literally means “pile of fragrance.” His land is called Zhòngxiāng 留香,79 which means “plenty of fragrance.” In his work, A Critical Edition of Lokakṣema’s Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā, Karashima Seishi 辛嶋静志 (2011: 464), based on Edwin Pulleyblank’s (1991) and W. South Coblin’s (1983; 1994) phonological data, suggests that Jiàntuóluóyē 捷陀羅耶 could be a transcription of Sanskrit Gandhālaya80 or Gandharāja. However, he is less certain of the latter reconstruction. It is notable, as pointed out by Erich Zürcher (1959: 50), that Zhī Qiān’s translations are primarily retranslated works from the same sources as Lokakṣema’s.81 Thus, it may be possible to reconstruct the original

77 T 8 no. 224 p. 470c22.
78 T 8 no. 225 p. 503c22.
79 T 8 no. 225 p. 503c23.
80 This is also the Sanskrit equivalent suggested by Akanuma (1981: 384), although he does not provide his reasons for this.
81 Nattier (2008a: 137) also states that Zhī Qiān is “known to have played an active role in revising existing translations by Lokakṣema.” This should not necessarily lead to the
Sanskrit name by considering the transcription and translation together. Zhī Qiān’s translation of the buddha’s name is Xiāngjī 香積 (pile of fragrance). First let us look at Karashima’s suggestion of Gandhālaya. Although it fits Lokakṣema’s transcription quite well, the meaning of ālaya does not seem a perfect match to the meaning of the Chinese jī 積 in Zhī Qiān’s translation. Basically ālaya means “house,” “receptacle,” or as suggested by Franklin Edgerton, “fundamental base.”82 As for jī 積, the basic meaning is “pile,” which does not agree well with the meaning of ālaya.83 There is another suggestion that agrees well with the meaning of xiāng jī 香積 (pile of fragrance), namely gandhālu-caya84 (fragrant pile). Yet, this does not fit Lokakṣema’s transcription perfectly, as in Early Middle Chinese luó (the equivalent Eastern Han sound gloss is la) 羅 is not the usual transcription of -lu. Other possible reconstructions of its

---

82 See BHSD, s.v. ālaya for the details.
83 Although the concepts of receptacle and accumulation are related, they are not exact synonyms. There is a notable coincidence which could explain this gap between Lokakṣema’s transcription and Zhī Qiān’s translation. In chapter ten of the Fó shuō wéimójié jīng 佛說維摩詰經 (The Buddha’s Discourse on the Sutra on Vimalakīrti, Vimalakīrti-nirdeśā sūtra, T 14 no. 474) translated by Zhī Qiān, a buddha and his land are introduced by Vimalakīrti, in which the buddha is called Xiāngjī 香積 (T 14 no. 474 p. 532a9, the corresponding Sanskrit term, gandhottamakūṭa, see Vimalakīrti [ed. Taishō 2006] 90.12–13) and his land is called Zhōngxiāng 积香 (T 14 no. 474 p. 532a10, the corresponding term, sarvagandhasugandha, see Vimalakīrti [ed. Taishō 2006] 90.11). It might be that Zhī Qiān did not render the names based on the original text, but just copied the names of the buddha and his land from one text to the other as the names are very similar.
84 Coblin’s (1994: 144) data shows that in Buddhayaśa’s transcriptions ye 靥 corresponds to -ca, -cā and -ya.
Sanskrit counterpart are Gandharāśi or Gandhakuṭa. Between the two, Gandharāśi, which means “pile of fragrance” perfectly fits Zhī Qiān’s translation Xiāngjī 香積, and seems to be closer to Lokākṣema’s transcription. If we considered the Sanskrit form only, the ending of rāśi does not seem to fit luóyé (the equivalent Eastern Han sound gloss is la ʔja or la zja) 耶. However, if we take into account the Gāndhārī language, -ya could correspond to the Sanskrit -śa or -śi (by means of the phonological reduction -ś- > -h- > -y-) (Salomon 2008: 117 [§ II.3.2.1.8]). In addition, in the later Kharoṣṭhī script śa and ya became orthographically indistinguishable (Glass 2007: 99–100), which may have also contributed to the śa > ya change apparent in the Chinese transcription. It is common that final vowels, especially short vowels, are considerably weakened in most Middle Indo-Aryan languages, and that this is reflected in the non-writing of final vowels (Brough 1962: 82 [§ 24]). Therefore the presence of the final vowel -i in this proposed Sanskrit reconstruction is not so improbable, especially in light of the reconstructed pronunciation of yé 耶, which was pronounced as jia in Early Middle Chinese. Given the discussion above, this buddha’s name Jiàntuóluóyē 捷陀羅耶 could be a transcription of something like gadharaśa or gadharaya in the Gāndhārī language, which could correspond to the Sanskrit, Gandharāśi.

---

85 I am grateful to Prof. Jan Nattier (personal communication) for bringing to my attention Gandharāśi as a possible reconstruction of the buddha’s name, which fits very well Zhī Qiān’s translation, Xiāngjī 香積 (pile of fragrance).
Nonetheless, the most likely Sanskrit reconstruction of Jiàntuóluóyē 捷陀羅耶 unfortunately is unable to be confirmed here, as this would require further evidence to be unearthed.

1.2.3.2. The Buddha Tánmójiézhòujiéluó

According to version I, particularly the *Liù dù jì jīng 六度集經* (Compendium of the Six Transcendent Practices, T 3 no. 152), the time frame is at the time when there was no Buddha, Dharma, and Saṅgha. The buddha of that realm had long passed away, his teachings had also vanished, and there were no more monks whom Sadāprarudita could approach. That buddha’s name according to the transcription by Lokakṣema was Tánmójiézhòujiéluó (Eastern Han sounds: *dam mjo gjiat ʔa tʃok gjiat la*) 瞘無竭阿祝 or Jingfāzhīhuīláiwáng 景法自穡來王 as a translation by Zhī Qiān. Again, a possible reconstruction of the Sanskrit name can be derived from an analysis of Lokakṣema’s transcription and Zhī Qiān’s translation of the name. The character 景 may mean “sun” or “bright,”

---

86 This text was translated (and also possibly compiled) by Kāṅg Sēnghūì in the mid-third century CE. See T 55 no. 2145 p. 7a25–b1 for the date. As for the date of this text, see also Chavannes, *Cinq cents contes et apologues extraits du tripitaka chinois*, Vol. 1 (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1910) iii, as cited in Nattier 2003: 186–187 n. 29. The title of this text, if indeed there was an Indian version, may be reconstructed as *Śat-pāramitā-saṃgraha*. This reconstruction is suggested by the *Buddhist Chinese-Sanskrit Dictionary* s.v. 六度集經.

87 A similar situation can be observed in *jātaka* stories in which the events take place in “a buddha-less age,” except for those that feature vows in front of past buddhas (Ohnuma 2007: 50). From a religious perspective, it seems that they may have particular appeal to us in our present buddha-less age.


89 T 8 no. 224 p. 471a8–12.

90 T 8 no. 225 p. 504a5–8.
where it is pronounced as jiing. Considering its transcription as tán mò jié (Eastern Han sounds: *dam mjo gjiat) 阿祝竭 by Lokakṣema, jīn fā 景法, could be the translation of dharmāga (dharma-agā) which means “sun-like Dharma.” The characters zì hùi lái 自穢来 literally means “coming from filth.” If we take into account Lokakṣema’s transcription a zhòu jié (Eastern Han sounds: ‘a tʃjok gjiat) 阿祝竭, then the corresponding Sanskrit may be acaukṣāgata (a-caukṣa-aṅgata) which means “coming from the impure.” Obviously, wáng 王 corresponds to rāja, of which the transcription is luó 羅 by Lokakṣema. Accordingly, the buddha’s name may be reconstructed, if its Sanskrit form existed, as Dharmāgācaukṣāgatarāja.

---

91 This probably refers to the simile of a lotus, which grows in muddy water, but rises above it unsullied by the muddy water.

92 It is not uncommon in Lokakṣema’s translations that he does not transcribe all syllables of the original Sanskrit (or possibly the original Gândhārī) or the vowels in the final syllables are elided. Examples are his transcription of tathāgata (or the Gandhārī form such as tasaghada, tasakada, tasagada, tasagada, or tasaghada) as dā sā ā jié (Eastern Han sounds: tat sat ‘a gjiat) 愍薩阿竭 (T 8 no. 224 p. 429a27 for example) where the vowel in the final syllable -a, is omitted; sā tuó bō lún (Eastern Han sounds: sat da pa ljwɔ) 薩陀波倫 (T 8 no. 224 p. 470c21 for example) as a transcription of sadāprāra[di]ta, with the omission of -dita; and tán mò jié (Eastern Han sounds: tam mjo gjiat) 阿祝竭 (T 8 no. 224 p. 471c23 for example), a transcription of dharmodgat[a], where -a is omitted. This phenomenon could be a sort of simplification of transcription (see Nattier 2006: 183–199 for a detailed discussion of this phenomenon). On the other hand, Ji (1948: 93–105) points out that the origin of these transcriptions may be one of the Central Asian languages such as Tokharian or Kuchean. The Sanskrit term buddha, for example, becomes pud or pùd in Kuchean. In his “Second talk on ‘Fu Tu’ and ‘Fo’” (1992: 19–30), he revised his previous conclusion in the article above, and further suggests that the Parthian term bwt or but, which is from the Sanskrit term buddha, is the base of the Chinese transcription fō (Eastern Han sounds: bjat 佛. In addition, Lévi (1897: 16; 1900: 461–462) has demonstrated that the name Shālu 沙律 in the chapter Xírong zhuàn 西戎傳 (Accounts on the Peoples in the Western [Regions]) contained in Wēiliū 魏略 (Outline of Wèi) is a certain early transcription of the Sanskrit Śāriputra or the Prakrit form *Śāriyut (as cited in Zürcher 1959: 428).

93 Karashima (2010: 477) states that tán mò jié 阿祝竭 is the transcription of the Sanskrit dharmodgata while a zhòu jié 阿祝竭 is unknown.
On the other hand, 景 may also be read as yǐng 影, which is a variant reading of this Chinese character, meaning “an image in a mirror.”\(^94\) For example, 景法自穂來王 is read differently in other parallels where it is taken as 影法無穂如來王\(^95\) in the Liù dù jí jīng 六度集經 (Compendium of the Six Transcendent Practices, T 3 no. 152) or 景法無穂\(^96\) in the Jīng lǜ yì xiàng 經律異相\(^97\) (Extraordinary Phenomena\(^98\) in Sutras and Codes of Monastic Discipline, T 53 no. 2121).\(^99\) Jīng 景 is taken as yǐng 影 in the Liù dù jí jīng 六度集經 and zìhuì 自穂 becomes wú huì 無穂 in both parallels. The character lǎi 來, moreover, reads as rǔláí 如來 (tathāgata) in the Liù dù jí jīng 六度集經.\(^100\) However, the parallel in the Liù dù jí jīng 六度集經 is unlikely to be a translation from an original Sanskrit or Prakrit source. There is evidence that suggests the Sadāprarudita jātaka is an additional part in the Liù dù jí jīng 六度集經.

---

\(^94\) For the details, see Hányǔ dà cídìǎn 漢語大詞典 (Comprehensive Chinese Lexicon), s.v. 影.
\(^95\) T 3 no. 152 p. 43a19.
\(^96\) T 53 no. 2121 p. 41a27.
\(^97\) This text was compiled by Bāochāng 寶唱 et al., who under an imperial order composed it during the Liáng dynasty, in the 15th year of Tiānjìn 天監 era (516 CE). See T 55 no. 2149 p. 266b29 for this account.
\(^98\) In the text title, “Extraordinary Phenomena” is to translate the Chinese yì xiàng 異相. According to the Fóguāng dà cídiǎn 佛光大辭典 (Fōguāng Encyclopeic Lexicon), this text is a sort of Buddhist encyclopedia consisting of xīyǒu yì xiàng 希有異相 (literally meaning “unusual/rare extraordinary appearance”) found in sūtras and codes of monastic discipline. In this context, yì xiàng 異相 can be interpreted as “extraordinary phenomena.” See Fóguāng dà cídiǎn 佛光大辭典 (Fōguāng Encyclopeic Lexicon), s.v. 經律異相 for details.
\(^99\) At the end of this parallel in the Jīng lǜ yì xiàng 經律異相, there is a note in brackets, 出度無極集第七巻 (excerpt from the Compendium on the Transcendent Practices to the Ultimate Perfection in the 7th fascicle, T 53 no. 2121 p. 41b24), which shows that the parallel in the Jīng lǜ yì xiàng 經律異相 is in fact an abridgement from that in the Liù dù jí jīng 六度集經. The work Compendium on the Transcendent Practices to the Ultimate Perfection is a variant title of the Compendium of the Six Transcendent Practices (T 55 no. 2145 p. 7a25).
\(^100\) T 3 no. 152 p. 43a19.
probably adapted from the story of Sadāprudita in the *prajñāpāramitā* sūtras. As shown in Chapter 4 of this thesis, a detailed assessment of the style of the *jātakas* in the *Dhyānāpāramitā* chapter, to which the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita *jātaka* belongs, reveals that the narratives in this chapter are very different from the narratives found in the other chapters of this sūtra. This suggests that the chapter itself may be a later addition. In short, the style of the *jātakas* in the chapter of *Dhyānāpāramitā* suggests that the Sadāprudita *jātaka* is probably an adapted work by Kang Sênghuì rather than a translation from a Sanskrit or Prakrit original.

To sum up, although there is a variant reading of a translation of the buddha’s name Yingfāwúhuirúláiwáng 影法無穢如來王 found in the *Liù dù jí jīng* 六度集經, which might be a reference to reconstructing Tánmójiézhòujíéluó 曇無竭阿祝竭羅, given that the parallel concerning Sadāprudita in the *Liù dù jí jīng* 六度集經 may not be a translation work from a Sanskrit or Prakrit original but was composed in China, it would not be of help to use its translation to reconstruct the buddha’s name Tánmójiézhòujíéluó 曇無竭阿祝竭羅. Based on Lokakṣema’s transcription Tánmójiézhòujíéluó 曇無竭阿祝竭羅 and Zhī Qīān’s translation Jīngfǎzīhuíláiwáng 景法自穢來王, the buddha’s name, if its Sanskrit form had existed, may be *Dharmāgācauksāgatarājā.

---

101 See Tiāncháng 1998: 96–101 for the details of her argument. Also see § 4.2.4 for the detailed discussion of this issue.
1.2.3.3. The Merchant’s Daughter, Śakra, Māra, and Heroic Myth

In all the versions of the story, while on the way to Dharmodgata’s place, Sadāprudita decides to make a bodily self-sacrifice in order to obtain some valuables to honour his teacher. However, he encounters Māra’s obstruction of his efforts and Śakra’s test of his resolve. This incident also introduces a merchant’s daughter who plays the role of an assistant, helping Sadāprudita achieve his aim of learning prajñāpāramitā from his kalyāṇa-mitra (a friend of virtue) Dharmodgata.

As the leading figure in the story, Sadāprudita is cast as a hero when the story is looked at from the perspective of heroic myth and legend. Lancaster (1968: 217–218; 1974b: 87) points out that version I of the story fits the structure of a heroic myth and legend. In this regard, he applies some of the theories of Joseph Campbell (1949: 51, 193, 259, 358) and observes that Sadāprudita is the hero in the story, who receives his “call” in a dream where he is asked to seek the prize, the teaching of prajñāpāramitā. On his journey, he meets with the enemy, Māra, who is in possession of great power. With the assistance of helpers, Śakra (supernatural help) and the merchant’s daughter (feminine aid), he overthrows his enemy, Māra. From his journey in the “land of darkness” he emerges with a large group of five hundred girls and five hundred chariots loaded with jewels and


103 This and the following account are based on Lancaster 1968: 217–218; 1974b: 87–88.
precious stones, which he takes as a kind of talisman to help him reach the prize that awaits him at the end of the journey. When the whole retinue has heard the teachings from Dharmodgata, the five hundred girls are transformed into men and Sadāprarudita receives his prediction that in a future life he will become a buddha. According to Bronislaw Malinowski (1954: 171ff.), the last episode fulfils a pattern of the last scene in the story of a hero in which the hero either dies or passes through some form of anthropomorphic glorification.

Following the theme of a hero, in the Tibetan tradition of Buddhism, the merchant’s daughter has also become a heroine figure. Interestingly, it is claimed that Yeshe Tsogyal (777–873), one of the founders of the Tibetan Buddhist tradition and an important figure of the Nyingma School, is an incarnation of a merchant’s daughter similar to one of the supporting characters in the story of Sadāprarudita. According to the Lady of the Lotus-born, the life story of Yeshe Tsogyal, when the merchant’s daughter died,

… she wandered far and wide through many Sambhogakaya Buddha-fields, and at length, when the Buddha Shakyamuni was present here on earth, she took birth as a woman known as Gangadevi and made a

---

104 Yeshe Tsogyal is a leading female figure and exemplar for Tibetan Buddhists. She is also important for her role in the stories of the establishment of Tibetan Buddhism in the eighth century CE. See Janet Gyatso 2005: 9981–9982 for more general information about Yeshe Tsogyal.
collection of his teachings. Afterward, she lingered again in the
Sambhogakaya Buddha-fields, being known as Sarasvati …

In Tibet Yeshe Tsogyal is recognised as a manifestation of Sarasvati (Klein 1995: 15–17). A historical Tibetan figure was thereby linked with the merchant’s daughter who aids Sadāprarudita on his journey to seek *prajñāpāramitā*, thereby keeping the story alive.

1.3. Genre

From the perspective of early Indian Buddhist classification, the story of Sadāprarudita found in *prajñāpāramitā* and *jātaka* literature may belong to several possible genres, such as *vyākaraṇa, avadāna, jātaka* or *pūrvayoga*. In version I of the story, there is a section detailing Sadāprarudita’s prediction of his own attainment of Buddhahood, as well as that of his companions. This account depicts a prediction being conferred on bodhisattvas. Obviously, this is one of the significant features of a type of text known as *vyākaraṇa*, which commonly

---

105 Namkhai Nyingpo and Gyalwa Changehub, trans. into English by Padmakara Translation Group 1999: 5.
106 Maeda (1964: 281–319) provides a summary of different styles of the *aṅga vyākaraṇa* as follows: the style of question-and-answer, the style of wide elaboration, and the style of prediction regarding disciples’ realisation, future births or achievements, which are based on different sources of ancient Indian traditions, such as Sarvāstivāda and Theravāda schools. Yinshūn (1994: 519–539), having investigated a wider range of sources including Mahāyāna texts, amends Maeda’s conclusion. He argues that the three styles should be categorised into two main classes, the general and the specific. The general class can be regarded as *vyākaraṇa* because of the style of its text, while the specific class is classified according to the contents which relates to the disciples’ realisation or to their future births.
means “distinction,” “explanation” or “prediction” in Buddhist literature. Thus, it seems proper to regard the genre of version I of the story as vyākaraṇa.

Douglas Osto (2008: 35–36) proposes the term “Mahāyāna avadāna” as the genre of the Sadāprarudita story, but provides no rationale for such a classification. One possible reason may be because it is a sort of “quest narrative” (Osto 2008: 35), which recounts the great deeds of one on the Buddhist path for didactic purposes. His proposal is reasonable as avadāna literally means “glorious acts.” Furthermore, according to the examples that are found in the Dà zhì dù lùn 大智度論, some avadāna narratives include a section concerning prediction. For instance, this commentary mentions the avadāna narrative where the Dīpaṃkara Buddha manifests Śākyamuni Bodhisattva’s attainment of the avaivartika state. In other words, he has gone beyond return on the way to Buddhahood. In the commentary, it is said, “The avadāna in the vinaya recounts that since he met the Buddha Dīpaṃkara, to whom he scattered five flowers and [for whom] he spread his hair on the [muddy] ground, [Dīpaṃkara] Buddha revealed that he had gone beyond returning [from Buddhahood] (avaivartika). Śākyamuni Bodhisattva then rises into the air and praises the Buddha [Dīpaṃkara]

According to Yinshūn, the style of question-and-answer and wide elaboration can be found in both the general and specific categories of vyākaraṇa.

For detailed discussions of this category and classification system, see Maeda (1964: 281–319) and Yinshūn (1994: 519–539).

An earlier discussion of the Sadāprarudita story as an avadāna is contained in Egil Fronsdal’s (1998: 177–185) doctoral dissertation. However, the reason he regards the story as an avadāna does not seem to be explicitly given. In his dissertation, he also highlights similarities between the Sadāprarudita narrative and the story concerning Sumadhi receiving his prediction from Dīpaṃkara (Fronsdal 1998: 178–185).

See MW s.v. avadāna.
with hymns (gāthā). …”¹¹⁰ This *avadāna* is given in detail in the Dharmaguptaka’s *vinaya* where it recounted that Śākyamuni Bodhisattva will attain Buddhahood, and will be known as Śākyamuni Buddha.¹¹¹ Accordingly, the genre of version I could also be described as *avadāna*.

In addition, the story of Sadāprarudita is also collected in the *Liù dù jì jīng* 六度集經 which consists of *jātaka* stories of Śākyamuni Buddha categorised in accordance with the six *pāramitās*.¹¹² There is no doubt that in this particular instance the story is taken as a *jātaka*. Moreover, an account in the *Dà zhì dù lùn* 大智度論 also regards the story as a *jātaka*, which recounts,

… here the *jātaka* story of Sadāprarudita is provided as evidence.

The Buddha’s teachings consist of twelve divisions (*dvādasāṅga-buddha-vacana*). One may attain salvation on account of [the teachings of] sūtras, *gāthas* or *jātakas*. Here the Buddha gives a *jātaka* [story] as evidence. If there are some [Buddhists] who hear [the story], then they think to themselves, “Since he can attain [it], I can attain [it] too!” Therefore, the Buddha recounts the story of Sadāprarudita.¹¹³

¹¹⁰ 當泥阿波陀那中說。從見然成佛。以五華花敬佛。以髮布地。佛為授阿耨跋致記。騰身虚空以偈讚佛 … (T 25 no. 1509 p. 579c24–26).
¹¹² See T 3 no. 152 p. 43a13–c20 for the *jātaka* version of the story. This version will be discussed in Chapter 4.
¹¹³ 此中說薩陀波叡本生為證。佛法有十二部經。或因修殊路偈經本生經得度。今佛以本生經為證。若有聞者作是念。彼人能得我亦應得。是故說薩陀波叡菩薩本生因緣 (T 25 no. 1509 p. 731b26–c7).
It is hard to say whether the versions preserved in *prajñāpāramitā* literature stemmed from the *jātaka* version or vice versa. The *jātaka* version is simpler than the other two versions in terms of the content of the story. In a few places, however, the account in the *jātaka* version is more detailed. To sum up, the story of Sadāprudita has three versions preserved in *prajñāpāramitā* and *jātaka* literature, that is version I, version II, and a *jātaka* form of the story. According to which aspects of the content are emphasised, the genre of this story may be described as *vyākaraṇa, avadāna* or *jātaka*.115

Although the story itself may have been described as various genres depending on which perspective one looks at it, we should bear in mind that versions I and II of the story of Sadāprudita are integral parts of different *prajñāpāramitā* sūtras.116 Accordingly, from a macro perspective, the genre of

---

114 For a detailed discussion on this issue, see § 4.2.2.
115 There is another term to describe this story. In his commentary on the *Aṣṭa*, Haribhadra uses the term *pūrvavāya*, literally “former connection,” to refer to the story of Sadāprudita (see *Aṣṭa* [ed. Wogihara 1932–1935] 21.16). Concerning the genre of *pūrvavāya*, see Lenz (2003: 79–110).
116 For example, the story of Sadāprudita is found in the chapters thirty and thirty-one of the Sanskrit *Aṣṭa*, which is a canonical text (see *Aṣṭa* [ed. Wogihara 1932–1935] 927.3–988.26). The account before the story in the chapter thirty shows, at least, that the editor(s) of the Sanskrit *Aṣṭa* may have regarded the story of Sadāprudita as “*buddhavacana*.” It recounts:


   When it was thus said [by the Bhagavat], Venerable Subhūti said this to the Bhagavat: “How, O Bhagavat, did the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita, the great being, seek the perfection of insight?” When it was said [by Venerable Subhūti], the Bhagavat said this to Venerable Subhūti: “First of all, O Subhūti, the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita, the
versions I and II of this story is sūtra, that is, a canonical text in which there is already a relatively fixed content. In Chapter two, the approaches to extract historical data is based on the position of taking the genre of version I and version II as “sūtra.”

1.4. SUMMARY AND STRUCTURE OF THE STORY

The following account of the story and analysis of its structure are based on version I and version II since they are the only complete versions of the narrative.

1.4.1. SUMMARY OF THE STORY

In both versions, it is the Buddha (Śākyamuni) who recounts the story of another bodhisattva called Sadāprarudita to one of his best disciples, Subhūti. He starts the story by advising Subhūti to search for prajñāpāramitā as the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita has done. According to Lokakṣema’s translation, a representative of version I of the story, Sadāprarudita now dwells in a buddha realm called Nízhējiāntuóbōwū 尼遮犍陀波勿́ ("Nityagandhaprabhūta")\(^{117}\) where

---

\(^{117}\) great being, [when] seeking the perfection of insight, is not desirous of [needs of] his body, does not begrudge his life, is not attached to gain, honour and fame.

"In the other translation of version I by Zhī Qiān, Nízhējiāntuóbōwū 尼遮犍陀波勿́ corresponds to Zhòngxiāng 沮香, literally “plenty of fragrance” (T 8 no. 225 p. 503c23), which probably corresponds to *Gandhaprabhūta alone (without nitya-) in Sanskrit.

\(^{118}\) I would like to thank Prof. Jan Nattier (personal communication) for providing this reconstruction of the buddha realm."
there is a buddha named Jiântuōluóyé 捷陀羅耶 (*Gandhâlu-caya).\textsuperscript{119} When the Buddha praises Sadāprarudita as an exemplar for one who seeks \textit{prajñāpāramitā}, Subhûti asks to learn more about his virtue. The Buddha then relates how, in an earlier life when Sadāprarudita was in the wilderness diligently striving to attain \textit{prajñāpāramitā}, he hears a voice in the air that told him to “go east,” admonishing him to pay no attention to bodily needs or personal gain.

Before this wilderness scene in which he hears the voice in the air, version I recounts a series of episodes concerning the background of the story and how the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita comes to be in the wilderness. The Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita was a person who possessed good karma and was destined to fulfil a resolution to care for all sentient beings, but was yet to awaken to his fate. One day a god tells him in a dream, “You must seek the great Dharma.” When he wakes from the dream and starts to seek this great Dharma, it turns out to be a very difficult task. Nowhere can he find the Three Jewels (i.e. Buddha, Dharma, and Saṃgha) or any methods that were practised by a bodhisattva. He suffers extreme anguish, weeping and crying day after day because his desire to find the great Dharma is frustrated. A god of the Trāyastriṃśa Heaven comes down and sees him weeping so sadly and therefore names him “Sadāprarudita,” “Ever-weeping.” In a second dream, a god from the Trāyastriṃśa Heaven tells the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita the name of a previous buddha, and he awakes from

\textsuperscript{119} See T 8 no. 224 p. 470 c22–23. On the other hand, version II does not mention the name of the buddha’s land. For instance, the \textit{Aṣṭa}-Skt, an example of version II, only points out the buddha’s name, Bhīsmagarjitanirghosasvara, which differs from that found in version I (see \textit{Aṣṭa} [ed. Wogihara 1932–1935] 927.5 for the example).
the dream the moment this buddha’s name is mentioned. Thereafter, he leaves his home and family and heads to the wilderness to meditate. However, the meditative life does not fulfil his wishes. Accordingly, he weeps for a second time. At that moment, a god appears in the sky and tells him the name of the Dharma, prajñāpāramitā. Sadāprarudita then asks, “How can I attain prajñāpāramitā? Where can I attain it?” The god replies, “go east,” and admonishes him to pay no attention to his bodily needs or to personal gain. This is where version II of the story begins and the following account of the story is based on version II, in particular the Sanskrit text.

The Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita follows the advice and sets off in search of the great Dharma, prajñāpāramitā. Soon after his departure, he is beset with doubts about how far he must go, and this anxiety brings on another bout of weeping. Suddenly, an unknown buddha figure manifests in the sky. This buddha soothes him and tells him about the city of Gandhavatī and the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata who lives there teaching prajñāpāramitā. After hearing the instruction, Sadāprarudita enters a samādhi and sees all the buddhas of the ten directions. When he emerges from the samādhi, the doubt arises in him, “Where have those buddhas come from and where have they gone?” While wondering about this, tormented by not knowing the answer, he weeps again. As he is weeping, he remembers the instruction to see the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata in the east and stops weeping. With that thought, he sets off on his journey.
Sadāprarudita pauses to rest in a city and thinks to himself, “I am so poor that I cannot obtain a gift to honour the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata.” Subsequently, he decides to sell his own body in order to purchase suitable gifts. Māra, however, is not pleased to see such meritorious behaviour, as it will make his realm diminish. So, by using his great powers, Māra obstructs the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita, preventing any citizen in that city from seeing or hearing his attempts to sell his own body. When Sadāprarudita realises that he is unable to find a buyer for his body, he goes to one side and weeps again.

At this moment, the god Śakra appears and comes to test the bodhisattva’s resolve. Assuming the form of a young man, he asks to buy Sadāprarudita’s heart, blood, and marrow in order to offer them as a sacrifice. The Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita willingly agrees to the deal. In order to give his heart, blood, and marrow to the young man in exchange for money to purchase gifts to honour his future teacher, the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata, he takes out a sharp knife to cut up his own body and break his bones. From a nearby mansion, the daughter of a merchant, who is not under the sway of Māra, witnesses the incident. The sight of the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita cutting up his body distresses and astonishes her to such an extent that she rushes out to stop him. Upon finding out that he is willing to fulfil this supreme resolution in order to make offerings to the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata, the merchant’s daughter promises to provide him with the necessary riches from her parents on the condition that he stops mutilating his body. At this point, Śakra reveals his true form and Sadāprarudita is able to make
his mangled body whole again on account of the purity of his resolution.\textsuperscript{120} The difficult stage of the journey has now been overcome and the bodhisattva leaves the city surrounded by great wealth and accompanied by the merchant’s daughter and her five hundred serving girls. Finally, he reaches the city of Gandhavatī and acquires from the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata the answer to his question, “Where have those buddhas come from and where have they gone?”

Having resolved Sādāprarudita’s doubt, the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata leaves the platform from which he had been preaching and enters his house, where he remains in various states of sāmadhi for seven years. Sādāprarudita remains outside the house, without sitting or lying down for seven years, waiting for the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata to return to the platform to teach him prajñāpāramitā. Eventually, Sādāprarudita is informed that his teacher will emerge from sāmadhi in seven days to teach him prajñāpāramitā. He prepares for his teacher’s arrival by cleaning the surroundings. Māra intervenes again, and prevents him from finding any water to clean the area, but this does not stop Sādāprarudita, who then sprinkles the ground with his own blood to prevent any dust from being stirred up

\textsuperscript{120} The description on how the Bodhisattva Sādāprarudita’s mangled body becomes whole again is based on the Aṣṭa-Skt (Aṣṭa [ed Wogihara 1932–1935] 949.20–950.4). Among the parallels of version II there are some variant readings in terms of this episode. Some are unclear but seem to suggest that it is Śakra who makes his mangled body become whole again, according to the context (T 8 no. 227 p. 582c17–22; T 8 no. 221 pp. 143c29–144a4), and some clearly recount that it is Śakra who makes his mangled body whole again (T 8 no. 223 p. 419b16–21; T 6 no. 220 pp. 1063c25–1064a9). There are four parallels of version II that are the same as the description in the Aṣṭa-Skt, which depicts that it is Sādāprarudita himself who makes his own mangled body become whole again (T 8 no. 228 p. 671c18–29; Peking 734: mi: 295a.7–295b.7; Peking 732: phi: 209b.4–210a.2; Peking 731: di: 265b.5–266a.4). In version I, it seems that it is Śakra who makes the Bodhisattva Sādāprarudita’s mangled body whole again (T 8 no. 224 p. 472c 19–21; T 8 no. 225 p. 505a 17–18).
and soiling the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata’s body. Impressed by Sadāprarudita’s sincerity, Śakra again helps him overcome Māra’s obstruction and offers him divine flowers to revere the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata for his teaching of prajñāpāramitā. Upon hearing the teaching, the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita enters into various samādhis. At this point in the narrative the Buddha admonishes Subhūti to seek prajñāpāramitā as did Sadāprarudita. It is here that version II of the story comes to a close. In version I, on the other hand, the story continues. After the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita enters into various samādhis, he further inquires about the voice and body of a buddha. This is followed by a prediction that Sadāprarudita and his companions will attain Buddhahood and then version I of the story comes to a close.

1.4.2. STRUCTURE OF THE STORY

From the above summary of the story, the main structure of the two versions can be divided into three parts:

(1) The introductory account of the story in which the Buddha instructs Subhūti to regard the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita as a paragon of one who seeks prajñāpāramitā;

(2) The body of the story which details the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita’s quest for prajñāpāramitā;

(3) The conclusion in which the Buddha admonishes Subhūti to seek prajñāpāramitā as the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita did.
In terms of the second of these three parts, that is, the body of the story, the main incidents in version I and II are generally consistent, with the exception of the section which discusses the events before the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita hears a voice in the air while in the wilderness, and the section after the event where he enters into various samādhis. These additional sections are found only in version I. To assist with the discussion of the structure and outline of the two versions, the term “common part” will be used to refer to that part of the body of the story that is more or less the same in both versions, that is, excluding the two additional sections found in version I.

The common part of the story is comprised of two divisions: the journey to the city of Gandhavatī and the meeting with the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata. The sequence of the main structure in the first division, the journey to Gandhavatī, is as follows:

1. Revelations from a voice in the air;
2. Revelations from an unknown buddha figure;
3. Revelations from the immeasurable number of present buddhas of the ten directions;
4. Sadāprarudita sells his own body to gain gifts to make offerings to the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata.

The second division concerning the meeting with the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata has the following structure:
(1) Making offerings to the texts on prajñāpāramitā and to Dharmodgata;
(2) Disclosing his intention to visit the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata;
(3) Requesting resolution of his doubt;
(4) The Bodhisattva Dharmodgata enters into various samādhis for seven years;
(5) The Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita sprinkles the ground with his blood to prevent dust from rising and soiling the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata’s body;
(6) The Bodhisattva Dharmodgata teaches prajñāpāramitā.

Even though the story of the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita has two main versions, the two divisions in the common part, including the incidents they contain, are remarkably similar. This makes it possible to sketch a synoptic chart of parallel passages between the two versions, as given in Appendix 1. In other words, both version I and version II have essentially the same structure.

1.5. **Structure of this Study**

Above I have provided an introduction to the story of the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita, which is the focus of this study. The summary of its literary background, and a brief assessment of the story’s genre, structure, and characters provide a preview of the more detailed analyses that are to follow in the subsequent chapters. An outline of the study is as follows:
Chapter 2 looks at the story from a historical perspective and presents a detailed discussion of the methodologies appropriate to such a perspective. Interestingly, the analysis of the story demonstrates that some previous conclusions, which are based on pre-existing methods, may need revising.

Chapter 3 then examines the story from a literary perspective, looking at its date and provenance and investigating various methods to determine the origin of the story. Remarkably, although the story has undergone change over the centuries, there is a high degree of consistency in many cases between the different versions.

Chapter 4 addresses the issue of the relationships between version I, version II, the jātaka form, and the Uighur version of the story, looking at their ancestral connection, chronological order, and mutual influence. The story, as captured in the different parallels, will be brought to light in full. An assessment of the differences between the various versions indicates that alterations and adaptations occurred not only in India but also in China.

Chapter 5 further probes the story’s content and examines a special episode of the story in which Sadāprarudita enters various samādhis. These samādhis are unique in that they are different in version I and version II of the story, yet are similar in that the names of these samādhis are quite fanciful. This chapter will explore whether these samādhis could have had a practical basis or are merely a product of vivid imagination. In addition, the specific samādhi of viewing all
tathāgatas will be assessed to see what it means for a practising Buddhist on a personal level, and from a broader perspective, what implications this may have for the beginnings of Mahāyāna teachings.

Chapter 6 steps back from the micro analysis of the narrative and moves into another interesting aspect of the story, evaluating its popularity as measured by its employment over time and across the different traditions of Indian, Tibetan, and Chinese Buddhism. The story’s flexibility and depth of content is revealed in the way these three different traditions use it to focus on three different aspects of Buddhist practice.

In contrast, Chapter 7 looks not at the manifestations of the story, but the anomaly of its absence from some prajñāpāramitā sūtras. Although the story is found in many prajñāpāramitā sūtras, not all prajñāpāramitā sūtras contain the story. In this chapter each instance where the story is absent will be explored in an attempt to identify the possible reasons for this.

Chapter 8 provides the conclusion to the study. In it the findings of each chapter will be reviewed and their significance further investigated. During the process of this study, many interesting elements have come to light. These will be canvassed briefly for the interest of those considering future research and investigation in this area.
Chapter 2

Methodology

As the aim of this study includes the extraction of historical data from the story of Sadāprarudita, the theoretical tools employed for this purpose will be presented in this chapter. In her study of the *The Inquiry of Ugra* (*Ugraparipṛcchā*), Jan Nattier (2003) uses the content of the text as a source to reconstruct social history. In this regard, she has drawn together a set of well-established methods that can be used for this purpose. Accordingly, in this thesis, the methodologies applied are largely based on those outlined by Nattier in her work, the *Ugraparipṛcchā*. In general, her methodological notes, comments, and principles are sound and can help in the data mining of a text. However, two reviews of her study of the *Ugraparipṛcchā* have raised issues pertinent to her methodologies. These will be discussed briefly before delving into the main purpose of this chapter. Being aware of any shortcomings in her study before our employment of her methodologies will help in the avoidance of the same errors in this study.

121 This approach could be seen as a shortcoming as it does not especially emphasise the religious or doctrinal significance of some parts of the story. I am grateful to Professor John Strong for bringing to my attention Lancaster’s (1974a: 287–291) journal article on the body of the Buddha and the making of images, which is a good example of seeing this story from a different perspective. Nonetheless, given that the main purpose of this study is to extract historical data from the story of Sadāprarudita, attempts at mythological exploratory exegeses are less of a focus in this dissertation.
2.1. LESSONS TO BEAR IN MIND

Since Nattier’s work was published in 2003, there have been two notable review articles: one by Matthew Kapstein (2005: 528–530) and the other by Ulrich Pagel (2006: 73–82). Both reviewers have raised some comments that are applicable to our discussion on methodology here.

Pagel (2006: 75–77) raises two issues for consideration regarding methodology. First he claims that to contextualise the content of a text for the purpose of gaining information on its chronology can only be successful if the volume of sources and the selection criteria of the sources are sufficient and robust. In terms of volume, he suggests that a larger number of texts should be consulted even if they are not as well known and are less researched. In terms of selection criteria, where possible, all relevant texts containing the topic in question should be consulted. In essence, he argues that the larger the volume of sources used and the better the selection criteria, the greater the success in gaining reliable data. The other issue that Pagel draws attention to is the consistency or faithfulness with which the methods are adhered to. This point is important for any research and, where possible, checks should be put in place to avoid unintentional inconsistencies from developing.

Kapstein (2005: 529) does not raise any points regarding her general methodology. However, on a specific point, he raises one other issue concerning the opening formulas of homage, placed at the beginning of Mahāyāna sūtras. He
considers that these salutations should not be regarded as an integral part of the main text, given their uncertainty regarding their function in India and their prescription by official translation committees in the early ninth century CE.

Generally speaking, in both articles, the reviewers raise no significant objections about the methods for text interpretation that Nattier has outlined but point out some limitations or factors to be kept in mind when applying them. Nonetheless, they regard her chapter “Methodological Considerations” as a good point of reference, as it consolidates and explains some well-established tools of the trade. Kapstein (2005: 529), for example, comments that the chapter on methodology presents an approach that is a “particularly lucid statement of the application of well-known procedures of text criticism to the special concerns of Buddhist studies.” Bearing in mind the critical points from the reviewers, we can start to discuss the methodologies employed in this study.

2.2. Methodologies Employed in this Study

In using the content of the text as a source to reconstruct social history, Nattier presents four points for consideration, three of which are highly relevant in this study. The three points are summarised as follows:\textsuperscript{122}

\textsuperscript{122} See Nattier 2003: 48. The fourth point of consideration is how to mine a text for information about the history of Indian Buddhism. This challenge is compounded when the text in question has no surviving version in any Indic language. Rather, the only access to the text is through other sources, such as citations from other texts, or translations into Chinese and Tibetan. Fortunately, there is a Sanskrit parallel of the Sadāprarudita story, the manuscript of which is dated to around the eleventh century CE. Nevertheless, in the
(1) how can one identify the interpolations and changes to the text that have taken place and what literary processes led to these additions and changes?

(2) can a text provide us with valid historical information? If so, what procedures can we use to separate reflections of what Buddhists actually thought and did at the time, from the author’s wishful thinking?

(3) may a text be silent about certain matters that we might expect it to discuss? How should these absences be interpreted and what procedures should we use to evaluate their significance?

In the following discussion we will consider each of these issues as they bear on our understanding of the story of Sadāparudita.\textsuperscript{123}

\textbf{2.3. TEXTUAL STRATIFICATION}

Identifying the layers of stratification within a text is significant because information contained in the later layers can obviously not be used to interpret the social and religious context of the time when the text was formed. In order to

\textsuperscript{123} Nattier (2003: 48) states that these considerations should apply to the study of other Buddhist scriptures, and may also prove to be applicable to a wide range of non-Buddhist literature as well.
carefully peel away at the layers of a text, Nattier (2003: 50–51) outlines the following methods:

(1) the use of structural and stylistic criteria to identify noticeable breaks within a text. The example she gives is when there is a clear interruption of the narrative and the discussion resumes after the end of the suspected interpolation. In such a case the suspected passage almost certainly is a later addition;

(2) identifying when there is a noticeable difference between the language, grammar, or style of a particular passage and the surrounding material. Where this occurs, it is reasonable to suspect that there is an interpolation;¹²⁴

(3) comparison of a range of versions of a single text to identify passages that are present in some, but not all, of these recensions. In the case of Buddhist texts, according to Nattier (2003: 51), both the extant Indic-language copies, if any, and all available Chinese and Tibetan translations should be included. For this procedure, she concludes, “Where such passages are present only in the later version(s) of the sūtra in question, we can conclude with some measure of confidence that they are indeed interpolations” (Nattier 2003: 51).

¹²⁴ Nattier (2003: 50) proposes that this approach, if used with caution, can help us to identify the presence of later layers even when we have only a single exemplar of a text.
In the case of the story of Sadāprarudita we have eleven parallels seen in variant prajñāpāramitā sūtras: seven preserved in Chinese, three in Tibetan, and one in Sanskrit. The procedure to identify passages in the later version(s) that have no parallels in the earlier one(s) would seem quite straightforward. However, because among the eleven parallels two main versions of the story can be identified, version I and version II, both of which possess some elements that appear in one and not the other, things are not as simple as it seems. Moreover, taking into account the different paths of transmission of each text across a large expanse of time and between geographically distant lands further complicates how we can interpret the information they contain. As a result, the following discussion will first focus on the parallels of version II and then on the differences between version I and version II. As version I only occurs in two Chinese translations, Aṣṭa-L and Aṣṭa-Zh, in which the Aṣṭa-Zh to a certain extent is a retranslation of the Aṣṭa-L, a detailed comparison will not be undertaken in this study. In the following discussion some adjustments to Nattier’s methodology will be proposed, primarily where her approach is not so applicable to the complicated cases found in the parallels of the Sadāprarudita story.

125 See Chapter 4 for more information regarding the relationships among the different forms of the text.
126 Abbreviation used in this thesis to refer to the story of Sadāprarudita found in the Chinese translation of the Aṣṭa translated by Lokakṣema.
127 Abbreviation used in this thesis to refer to the story of Sadāprarudita found in the Chinese translation of the Aṣṭa translated by Zhī Qīan.
2.3.1. Looking for the Layers Among Version II

2.3.1.1. Adjustments to Complement Nattier’s Methodology

Generally, when looking at variant texts of version II of the story of Sadāprarudita from a chronological aspect, the oldest is the Aṣṭādaśa-M\textsuperscript{128} (the late third century CE), which is the shortest and contains the most succinct depiction of the episodes. The youngest text of version II is found in the Sanskrit Aṣṭa (ca. 1000–1150 CE). As stated above, Nattier has pointed out that over the development of a text, where the later version(s) contains pieces of information not found in the earlier version(s), then these can be taken as interpolations. In the case of the story of Sadāprarudita the aspect of time, that is, the chronology of the various parallels of the text, is not so straight forward. At present the dates attached to each parallel relate to the time of their translation or the available manuscript. The Aṣṭādaśa-M was translated into Chinese around the late third century CE by Mokṣa. The two Chinese translations, Aṣṭa-K\textsuperscript{129} and Pañcaviṃśati-K,\textsuperscript{130} were translated by Kumārajīva in 408 and 404 CE, respectively (the dates of which are very close), while the Śata-X,\textsuperscript{131} which is found in a Chinese translation of the Śatasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra was translated by Xuánzàng 玄奘 in 660–663 CE. The three Tibetan parallels were

\textsuperscript{128} Abbreviation used in this thesis to refer to the story of Sadāprarudita found in the Chinese translation of the Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra translated by Mokṣa.
\textsuperscript{129} Abbreviation used in this thesis to refer to the story of Sadāprarudita found in the Chinese translation of the Aṣṭa translated by Kumārajīva.
\textsuperscript{130} Abbreviation used in this thesis to refer to the story of Sadāprarudita found in the Chinese translation of the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra translated by Kumārajīva.
\textsuperscript{131} Abbreviation used in this thesis to refer to the story of Sadāprarudita found in the Chinese translation of the Śatasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra translated by Xuánzàng.
translated around the late eighth century or the early ninth century CE. Given the proximity of the time, their chronology is not so clear. Next we have the \textit{A\textsc{ṣ}ta-D}\textsuperscript{132} translated by Dānapāla in 982 CE, and lastly we have the \textit{A\textsc{ṣ}ta-Skt}\textsuperscript{133} found in the Sanskrit \textit{A\textsc{ṣ}ta} dated to ca. 1000–1150 CE based on the available manuscripts. Due to a lack of better information, this is the best we can do at present in terms of placing a date to the texts. It is almost certain that the content of the text had formed sometime earlier and might in fact be dated many centuries earlier. Bearing in mind this problematic situation, the supplementary rule applied in the study of this story gives less emphasis to the aspect of time. Apart from time, it may be that the amount of interpolations can also be influenced by the corresponding text to which it relates. The following hypothetical situation may shed light on the complexity of identifying interpolations in version II of the story of Sadāprarudita.

Among the parallels of version II, the \textit{Śata-X}, which is found in the lengthy \textit{Śatasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā} sūtra, usually contains more elaboration and details than any of the other parallels. With the current dates available, it pre-dates the \textit{A\textsc{ṣ}ta-Tib},\textsuperscript{134} the \textit{A\textsc{ṣ}ṭādaśa-Tib},\textsuperscript{135} the \textit{Pañcaviṃśati-Tib},\textsuperscript{136} the \textit{A\textsc{ṣ}ta-D}, and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{132} Abbreviation used in this thesis to refer to the story of Sadāprarudita found in the Chinese translation of the \textit{A\textsc{ṣ}ta} translated by Dānapāla.
\item \textsuperscript{133} Abbreviation used in this thesis to refer to the story of Sadāprarudita found in the Sanskrit \textit{A\textsc{ṣ}ta}.
\item \textsuperscript{134} Abbreviation used in this thesis to refer to the story of Sadāprarudita found in a Tibetan translation of the \textit{A\textsc{ṣ}ta}.
\item \textsuperscript{135} Abbreviation used in this thesis to refer to the story of Sadāprarudita found in a Tibetan translation of the \textit{A\textsc{ṣ}ṭādaśasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā} sūtra.
\item \textsuperscript{136} Abbreviation used in this thesis to refer to the story of Sadāprarudita found in a Tibetan translation of the \textit{Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā} sūtra.
\end{itemize}
the Aṣṭa-Skt. If the Aṣṭādaśa-M, Aṣṭa-K, and Pañcavimśati-K were not available and the Śata-X was the earliest extant text, then many of these elaborations in the Śata-X, which to a large extent can be identified as interpolations, would not be identified as such under Nattier’s method. For example, when the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata responds to Sadāprarudita’s query about where the buddhas have come from and where they have gone, he uses similes, such as the illusions conjured up by a magician, dreams, and so forth to clarify the answer. In the Śata-X, further similes are employed, such as images in a mirror, an echo in a valley, and shadows. However, these similes are not found in any of the other parallels, regardless of whether they are earlier or later than the Śata-X.137 Evidently, to a large extent, these similes found only in the Śata-X are interpolations. In other words, Nattier’s method allows interpolations to be identified only when they occur in later parallels and, therefore, these similes in the Śata-X, though evidently “new,” would not be identified as interpolations due to the Śata-X taking the early position in the chronological order of the parallels. However, conclusions about the date of the Śata-X and “interpolations” are problematic. It appears early in the chronology only relative to its date of translation into Chinese, which does not necessarily mean the Indic original was composed prior to the other texts.

In short, if we apply Nattier’s method to identify interpolations in the story of Sadāprarudita, then pieces of extra information found in the earlier texts that

---

137 T 6 no. 220 pp.1068b5–1069a10. Such an interpolation may be regarded as “reiteration with additional examples” (Nattier 2003: 56–57).
are likely to be interpolations would not be identified as such. In the case of the story of Sadāprarudita, which has eleven parallels, it seems fair enough to conclude that if information only appears in one but not any of the other parallels, to a large extent, it can be identified as a later addition. This is a “supplementary rule” that I apply in this study. Of course, this supplementary rule does not always apply as alternative interpretations may arise. Therefore, corroboration from other factors is needed to draw firmer conclusions. Essentially, the difference between Nattier’s method of identifying interpolations and this supplementary rule is that the supplementary rule gives less consideration to the aspect of time. This rule, with careful use, may be a supplement to Nattier’s method.

There is another case where this supplementary rule can be applied to identify an interpolation in the story. The Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita, having received a revelation from a voice in the air, sets out towards the east. Not long after that, he recalls that he had forgotten to ask the voice how far he should go, and so he begins to cry, grieve, and lament for his oversight. As Sadāprarudita thus pines, an unknown tathāgata figure (tathāgata-vigraha) suddenly stands before him.\textsuperscript{138} All the parallels simply have “tathāgata figure”\textsuperscript{139} or “buddha figure,”\textsuperscript{140} while the Aṣṭādaśa-M provides more information to depict the tathāgata

\textsuperscript{138} Aṣṭa (ed. Wogihara 1932–1935) 932.10–12.
\textsuperscript{139} Peking 734: mi: 286a.2–3; Peking 732: phi: 201b.5; Peking 731: di: 257a.2; T 8 no. 228 p. 669a14; Aṣṭa (ed. Wogihara 1932–1935) 932.11.
\textsuperscript{140} T 8 no. 227 p. 580c18; T 6 no. 220 p. 1060b20. The Pañcaviṃśati-K simply has “buddha” but it is understandable that the “buddha” should be read as “buddha figure” (T 8 no. 223 p. 417a4).
“tathāgata figure that possesses the thirty-two marks [of the super human] and eighty accessory marks.” In this case, although the Aṣṭādaśa-M is the earliest parallel among the version II texts, it contains the extra information of “thirty-two marks [of the super human] and eighty secondary marks” which is unseen in all of the other parallels. This can be interpreted in two ways, first is that this extra information is an interpolation, the other is that this additional description was omitted from all other texts at a later time. If we compare the Aṣṭādaśa-M with the two parallels of version I, which pre-dates the Aṣṭādaśa-M, it is found that both the Aṣṭa-L (ca. the late second century CE) and the Aṣṭa-Zh (ca. the mid-third century CE), simply have “conjured buddha,” without the extra information of “thirty-two marks [of the super human] and eighty accessory marks” in the corresponding place. This evidence therefore shows that the extra information in the Aṣṭādaśa-M is more likely an interpolation.

There is another case where extra information appears only in the Aṣṭādaśa-M but not in the other parallels, including those belonging to version I. In the episode where the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita receives a revelation from a voice in the air, the voice admonishes him to be aware of Māra’s misdeeds. In particular, the voice tells Sadāprarudita that when he sees his teacher enjoying the sensual pleasures that can be seen, heard, smelled, tasted or touched, offered by

---

141 T 8 no. 221 p. 142a9–10.
142 The Sanskrit equivalent to “thirty-two marks [of the super human] and eighty accessory marks” is dvātrimesac ca mahāpurusalakṣaṇāni aśitiś cātuṣyaśjañānāni.
143 T 8 no. 224, p. 471b16–17; T 8 no. 225 p. 504a27.
Māra, he should understand that his teacher enjoys these things with skilful means (upāya-kauśalya), without defilement. After this, a simile is given in the Aṣṭādaśa-M, which recounts that his teacher is “just like a thunderbolt that can go through anything without even a speck of dust attaching to it.”¹⁴⁴ This simile is seen only in the Aṣṭādaśa-M and not in any of the other parallels of version I or II. It may be possible that the simile is merely missing from all the later texts of version II. However, given that it is also absent in the two parallels of version I that pre-date the Aṣṭādaśa-M, arguably there is a stronger case for regarding it as an interpolation.

This supplementary rule can be used both ways to identify interpolations and lost information. For example, while the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita laments because of forgetting to ask the voice about how far he should go and from whom he can learn prajñāpāramitā, an unknown buddha figure suddenly appears before him and responds to his query. When answering the question regarding from whom Sadāprarudita can learn prajñāpāramitā, the unknown buddha figure indicates that the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata is the teacher he should seek out. This is followed by an account that in the past the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata had also sought prajñāpāramitā in the same way, just as Sadāprarudita was now seeking it. This account is found in all parallels of the story of version II,¹⁴⁵ except the

---

¹⁴⁴ 譬如金剛無所不人不受塵垢 (T 8 no. 221 p. 141c24–25).
¹⁴⁵ Aṣṭa (ed. Wogihara 1932–1935) 936.5–6; Peking 734: mi: 288b.6; Peking 732: phi: 204a2–3; Peking 731: di: 259b2–3; T 8 no. 227 p. 581b15–17; T 8 no. 221 p. 142c8–9; T 8 no. 223 p. 417c9–10; T 6 no. 220 p. 1061b17–18.
It seems evident that the account was somehow lost in the $\text{Aṣṭa-D}$, given its preservation in all the other parallels of version II.

To sum up, given that the dates when the parallels or examples of version II may have formed or were translated are somewhat problematic, the supplementary rule gives less consideration to the aspect of time. With careful use of this supplementary rule, interpolations in earlier texts can also be isolated.

2.3.1.2. **Types of Interpolations**

Nattier (2003: 53–59) lists five types of interpolations found in the *Ugraparipṛcchā*: multiplication of epithets, completion of a standard list, recall of a passage from elsewhere, filling in the blanks, and reiteration with additional examples. Likewise these types of interpolations are also found in the parallels of version II of the Sadāprarudita story. Nattier (2003: 52, 57–59) comments that the majority of interpolations she has encountered rarely contain genuine new concepts and elements that add to the plot and thus suggests that to a large extent, interpolations added into Indian religious texts were an unconscious act. In the narrative of Sadāprarudita, although minor interpolations can be found, which would support Nattier’s proposal, some lengthy and interesting cases of interpolations also exist, which would challenge that proposal. These different types of interpolations are assessed one by one in the following discussion.
2.3.1.2.1. Multiplication of epithets

Interpolations that fall into the category of “multiplication of epithets” see an expansion in the titles or descriptions following the mention of a buddha or bodhisattva. In the case of version II of the Sadāprarudita narrative a similar interpolation is seen in the incident when an unknown tathāgata figure (tathāgata-vigraha)\textsuperscript{146} appears before the bodhisattva to comfort him as he laments and grieves. All parallels of version II simply have “tathāgata figure”\textsuperscript{147} or “buddha figure.”\textsuperscript{148} But in the Aṣṭādaśa-M we find, “tathāgata figure that possesses thirty-two marks [of the super human] and eighty accessory marks.”\textsuperscript{149}

2.3.1.2.2. Completion of a standard list

Interpolations in this category arise when an item in a commonly known list is mentioned, and it would seem natural to a later author, redactor, or scribe to complete the list. In the episode where the merchant’s daughter stops Sadāprarudita from mutilating himself, Sadāprarudita explains that he is selling his bone, blood, and so forth to gain some riches in order to honour the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata who will teach him prajñāpāramitā. Having learnt the prajñāpāramitā, he further explains, he will soon acquire various kinds of qualities of a buddha. In the Aṣṭādaśa-M, the quality of “inconceivable pure

\textsuperscript{146} Aṣṭa (ed. Wogihara 1932–1935) 932.10–12.
\textsuperscript{147} Peking 734: mi: 286a.2–3; Peking 732: phi: 201b.5; Peking 731: di: 257a.2; T 8 no. 228 p. 669a14; Aṣṭa (ed. Wogihara 1932–1935) 932.11.
\textsuperscript{148} T 8 no. 227 p. 580c18; T 6 no. 220 p. 1060b20.
\textsuperscript{149} 如來之像。三十二相八十種好 (T 8 no. 221 p. 142a9–10).
conduct” is mentioned in this context. One of the parallels of version II, this quality seems to be expanded into two lists, which are different but related. One consists of inconceivable purity of morality, concentration, and insight. The other consists of the aggregates of inconceivable pure morality, concentration, insight, liberation, and liberated insight.

2.3.1.2.3. Recall of a passage from elsewhere

These types of interpolations refer to the incorporation of passages from other texts, or even from an earlier part of the text itself. In the episode where an unknown buddha figure provides Sadāprarudita with directions to the city of Gandhavati, the unknown buddha figure points out that Dharmodgata will teach him prajñāpāramitā. All parallels of version II, except the Aṣṭādaśa-M, have the terms instructed, exhorted, inspired, and gladden (saṃdarśakaḥ samādāpakaḥ

---

150 不思議淨戒 (T 8 no. 221 p. 143c12).
151 There is one exception that seems to be a case of omission. In the Aṣṭa-D there is nothing related to the buddha virtue, morality, in the corresponding place. Instead it has 不可思議無量無數佛功德法, “immeasurable and innumerable Dharmas of buddha virtue that are inconceivable” (T 8 no. 228 p. 671b25–26).
152 acintyām ca sīlavīśuddhim acintyām ca samādhi-vīśuddhim acintyām ca prajñā-vīśuddhim (Aṣṭa [ed Wogihara 1932–1935] 948.14–15). The other parallels where the list consists of the three items are Peking 734: mi: 294b.2–3; Peking 732: phi: 209a.1–2; Peking 731: di: 265a.1; T 8 no. 223 p. 419a25–26. The three are commonly known in Pali as adhisīla (higher morality), adhicicca (higher concentration), and adhipañña (higher insight), which are referred to as sikkha, which literally means “training” (PTSD, s.v. sikkha).
153 T 8 no. 227 p. 582c3–4; T 6 no. 220 p. 1064c8–9. The five items in Pali are usually known as silakkhandha (aggregate of morality), samādhipakhkhandha (aggregate of concentration), paññākkhandha (aggregate of liberation), vimutikkhandha (aggregate of insight), vimuitṭhānasannakkhandha (aggregate of insight and vision of liberation), which are referred to as an arahat’s virtues. For the details about these five items, see Bodhi 2000: 1924 n. 160.
154 T 8 no. 221 p. 142c5–8.
Such an expression can be found in early Buddhist texts and commonly the equivalent in Pali is sandassesi samādapesi samuttejesi sampahansesi. Accordingly this may be regarded as an interpolation arising from the recall of a passage from early Buddhist texts, or possibly included for the sake of imitating such earlier texts.

Another example of this type of interpolation is when Sadāprarudita receives the instruction from a voice that tells him not to be shaken by form and other things, the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita replies that he will act accordingly. In the Śāta-X it has some more information, which depicts that his mind is bristling with joy and he is amazed at the incident, which has never happened before, while replying to the voice in the air. This is not seen in all other parallels of version II. However, such an expression can be found elsewhere in

---

155 Aṣṭa (ed Wogihara 1932–1935) 936.3–4. This is also seen in the following parallels of version II: Peking 734: mi: 288b.5–6; Peking 732: phi: 204a2; Peking 731: di: 259b2; T 8 no. 227 p. 581b15; T 8 no. 228 p. 669c23; T 8 no. 223 p. 417c9; T 6 no. 220 p. 1061b16. In the Aṣṭādaśa-M, the corresponding place has quàn zhù 歧助 (T 8 no. 221 p. 142c7–8), which literally means to exhort and promote. This slightly differs from shì jiào lì xī 示教利喜 (literally meaning to instruct, exhort, inspire, and gladden), which is a Chinese translation of samdarṣaṅkaḥ samādāpakaḥ samuttejakāḥ samprahārṣako. It is by no means clear if quàn zhù 歧助 is an abbreviation of shì jiào lì xī 示教利喜. However, if comparing the account 常歧助於阿耨多羅三藐三菩提 (T 8 no. 221 p. 142c7–8) in the Aṣṭādaśa-M with that in the Pañcaviṃśati-K 能歧汝阿耨多羅三藐菩提示教利喜 (T 8 no. 223 p. 417c8–9), for example, the result shows that quàn zhù 歧助 in the Aṣṭādaśa-M seems more likely to be the equivalent to jiào 敎 (to instruct or exhort) in the Pañcaviṃśati-K.

156 For example, this can be found in MN III 190.

157 Aṣṭa (Wogihara 1932–1935) 929.15–18; Peking 734: mi: 284a.7–8; Peking 732: phi: 200a.2–4; Peking 731: di: 255a.6–b.1; T 8 no. 228 p. 580b8–9; T 8 no. 228 p. 668b12–14; T 8 no. 221 p. 141c1–2; T 8 no. 223 p. 416b8–9; T 6 no. 220 p. 1059c12–13.

158 正欣喜踊躍未曾有 (T 6 no. 220 p. 1059c13).
Xuánzàng’s translation of the Śatasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra, to which the Śata-X belongs.\(^{159}\)

### 2.3.1.2.4. Filling in the blanks

Interpolations of this category arise not so much from memorisation, but rather are additional adjustments to further clarify a point. An example of this type of interpolation is found in the form of a rhetorical question. In the episode where the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita receives a revelation from a voice in the air, he is admonished to love, honour, and tend to a friend of virtue (kalyāṇa-mitra). All parallels of version II, except Pañcaviṃśati-K, directly give the quality of a good friend.\(^ {160}\) The Pañcaviṃśati-K, however, adds a rhetorical question, “What type of person is a friend of virtue?”\(^ {161}\) This is then followed by the qualities of a good friend.

### 2.3.1.2.5. Reiteration with additional examples

Unlike the above types of interpolations, which Nattier regards as adding nothing genuinely new, this category of interpolation sees extra information added, although its content is not new. In regard to this type of interpolation, while dwelling in the wilderness, the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita hears a voice

\(^{159}\) For example, the expression can be found in T 5 no. 220 p. 2c18–19.


\(^{161}\) 何等是善知識 (T 8 no. 223 p. 416b15).
admonishing him to pay no attention to his bodily needs or personal gain. One of the instructions is that he must not be shaken by form or the other aggregates. In the Śata-X a lengthy list of items, by which he must not be shaken, is added, such as the twelve loci (dvādaśāyatana), the eighteen compositional elements of living beings (aṣṭādaśadhātu), the twelve limbs of dependent origination (dvādaśāṅgapratīṣṭhasamutpāda), the six perfections (ṣaṭpāramitā), the thirty-seven limbs of awakening (saptatriṃśadbodhipakṣikadharma), and the four noble truths (caturāryasatya). These items are not found in any of the other parallels of version II.

2.3.1.2.6. Other types of interpolations

There are a few cases of interpolations in the story of Sadāprarudita that do not fit well into the categories of interpolation proposed by Nattier. For example, in the episode where the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita is instructed that he should understand that his teacher enjoys the sensual pleasures offered by Māra with skilful means (upāya-kauśalya), the Aṣṭādaśa-M provides the thunderbolt simile, 譬如金剛無所不人不受塵垢,162 “just like a thunderbolt that can go through anything without even a speck of dust attaching to it.” Such an interpolation may serve the role of making information more easily understood through elaboration.

Another noticeable example is in the episode where the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita encounters Māra’s obstruction and Śakra’s test. At the end Śakra

---

162 T 8 no. 221 p. 141c24–25.
throws off his disguise as a young man, and in his own proper body, stands before Sadāprudita and willingly grants the bodhisattva a request. Sadāprudita asks Śakra to give him the supreme Dharmas of a buddha but Śakra is unable to fulfill Sadāprudita’s request. Finally, according to the Aṣṭa-Skt, Sadāprudita declines the offer of another favour and then makes his mangled body whole again by himself. In the Śata-X, quite a few dramatic elements are added into this dialogue, which are not found in any other parallels of version II. After Śakra’s reply that he is unable to give the bodhisattva the supreme Dharmas of a buddha, Sadāprudita asks Śakra to give him prajñāpāramitā and again Śakra responds frankly that he has no such capacity, but is able to make Sadāprudita’s mangled body become whole again. Sadāprudita replies that he can make his own mangled body become whole again without the need of Śakra’s power. Śakra then begs the bodhisattva to kindly give him the chance to make the mangled body become whole again as this had been caused by him. Finally, Sadāprudita agrees to Śakra’s request and allows Śakra do as he wishes. Such an amusing and dramatic account of events does not seem to fit well into the categories given above.

Nattier’s argument that interpolations were not consciously added into Indian religious texts may be true of interpolations belonging to practical or

\[163\] Aṣṭa (ed Wogihara 1932–1935) 949.20–950.4. Among version II texts, the Aṣṭa-D (T 8 no. 228 p. 671c18–29) and the three parallels in Tibetan (Peking 734: mi: 295a.7–295b.7; Peking 732: phi: 209b.4–210a.2; Peking 731: di: 265b.5–266a.4) are consistent with the Aṣṭa-Skt. In the other parallels (T 8 no. 227 p. 582c17–22; T 8 no. 221 pp. 143c29–144a4; T 8 no. 223 p. 419b16–21; T 6 no. 220 pp. 1063c25–1064a9), it is more or less suggested that Śakra makes his mangled body become whole again.

\[164\] T 6 no. 220 pp. 1063c24–1064a7.
doctrinal parts of a text, but does this also hold true for additional content in narratives? It is notable that the Šata-X is within the first part of the large *prajñāpāramitā* text, *Dà bānruò jīng* 大般若經 (*Sutra on Great [Perfection of] Insight*, T 5–7 no. 220), which is a recast text and consists of sixteen different *prajñāpāramitā* sūtras. Given the size of the sūtra, it is reasonable to believe that the *Dà bānruò jīng* 大般若經 was in written form while it was recast by the editor(s), otherwise the task of recasting it purely in the minds of the reciters would be phenomenal.\(^{165}\) Therefore, during the process, the editors would need to decide what should be preserved and what is to be excised.\(^{166}\) While editing the story of Sadāprudita, for example, it may be possible that in their minds they considered things like: “Is it proper to incorporate these additional elements into this part of the story to benefit the readers or audiences?” In short, in terms of the interpolation regarding the dialogue between Śakra and Sadāprudita, to a certain extent, the interpolation could have been consciously added into the episode in order to enrich the content.

2.3.2. **Identifying Interpolations by Comparing Version I and Version II**

In § 2.3.1, a supplementary rule was introduced to further assist in the identification of interpolations, given that Nattier’s approach to identifying

---

\(^{165}\) There is an account about the total amount of *ślokas* of the *Dà bānruò jīng* 大般若經, which is found in Xuánzàng’s biography, 梵本總有二十萬頌 (T 50 no. 2053 p. 275c24–25), “the Sanskrit original possesses two hundred thousand *ślokas* in total.”

\(^{166}\) As for the issue on excision of a text, see Chapter 7 for more discussion.
interpolations does not fully cover the complicated cases found in the parallels of version II of the Sadāprudita narrative. The supplementary rule is that where a piece of information is found in only one of the extant parallels of the story and not in any of the others, this, to a large extent, can be taken to be an interpolation. Caution needs to be applied when using this rule for it may be possible that the extra piece of information, found in only one of the extant parallels of the story and not in any of the others, might reflect excision of that passage from all other parallels at a later date. Accordingly, it is necessary to bear in mind the two possible situations and where possible investigate further corroborating evidence to better inform the conclusion. Nonetheless, this supplementary rule, with careful use, aids in the identification of further levels of stratification in version II of the story. On the other hand, both Nattier’s approach and this supplementary rule provide limited help when it comes to identifying interpolations by comparing version I and version II of the story. The main reason is that both versions contain elements not found in the other. For example, in version I the initial episode of the story contains a section that depicts Sadāprudita receiving several revelations and as a result he sets out on the journey to seek prajñāpāramitā. This is followed by the episode where the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita, while staying in the wilderness, hears a voice in the air admonishing him to go east. However, this section is not found in any of the parallels of version II. Instead, before the episode where Sadāprudita receives an admonishment to go east, version II has an account that depicts Sadāprudita’s endeavour to seek prajñāpāramitā without
any care for his body, life, and so forth. This account, though short, is not seen in version I. Table 2.1 lists the sequences of this initial episode for comparison.

**Table 2.1 Sequence of the initial episode of the story**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence No.</th>
<th>Version I</th>
<th>Version II</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Subhūti asks the Buddha, “How did the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita seek the <em>prajñāpāramitā</em>?”</td>
<td>Subhūti asks the Buddha, “How did the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita seek the <em>prajñāpāramitā</em>?”</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The episode where Sadāprudita receives several revelations and as a result, he leaves for the wilderness in order to seek the <em>prajñāpāramitā</em>.</td>
<td>The depiction that Sadāprudita in the past endeavoured to seek the <em>prajñāpāramitā</em> without any care for his body, life, and so forth.</td>
<td>Utterly inconsistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Bodhisattva Sadāprudita in the wilderness hears a voice in the air admonishing him to go east to seek <em>prajñāpāramitā</em>.</td>
<td>The Bodhisattva Sadāprudita in the wilderness hears a voice in the air admonishing him to go east to seek <em>prajñāpāramitā</em>.</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table, we can see that the content of sequence 2 in version I is entirely missing in version II and vice versa. Nattier (2003: 60) proposes that it is generally the case that a later text will be longer than its earlier recensions. She further states that although omissions are found occasionally, they are often the result of a copyist’s error, skipping from a phrase found in one line to identical wording below (Nattier 2003: 61). However, in the case of the content found in sequence 2, it is unlikely that the content seen in version I, is a result of such a copyist’s error. This is because the content of sequence 2 in version I is not insignificant. In addition, since all the parallels of version II post-date the two parallels of version I, the content of sequence 2 that appears only in version II, according to Nattier, can be identified as an interpolation. Yet it seems questionable that the editor(s) would replace the content of sequence 2 in version I, resulting in the version II we see today. By assuming that version II evolved from version I (or vice versa), various pieces of information, like sequence 2 above, become hard to explain. This issue is resolved when we look at the evolution of the story in Chapter 4. Based on a detailed analysis of the contents in the various versions of the story, it seem more likely that both version I and version II developed from a hypothetical earlier version. Under this hypothesis, the contents of sequence 2 in both versions may be regarded as interpolations, which were independently added to the hypothetical earlier version by two different traditions.
A careful reading of version I and II reveals a crucial piece of information pointing to the existence of a hypothetical earlier version. This information lies in the names of samādhis that Sadāprudita experiences. Both versions contain the episode of Sadāprudita entering into various samādhis, yet interestingly the names of these samādhis are entirely different between the two versions. The list of samādhis that Sadāprudita enters into on the first occasion in the Aṣṭa-L (i.e. version I)\(^{168}\) begins with “the samādhi called non-existence of a place”\(^{169}\) and ends with “the samādhi called sameness of [the three time frames,] the past, the future, and the present.”\(^{170}\) On the other hand, the first list of the samādhis that he enters into in the Aṣṭa-Skt (i.e. version II), for example, begins with “the samādhi called contemplation on the nature of all dharmas” (sarva-dharma-svabhāva-vyavalokano nāma samādhiḥ)\(^{171}\) and ends with “the samādhi called viewing all tathāgatas” (sarva-tathāgata-darśī nāma samādhiḥ).\(^{172}\) Although the number of the samādhis he enters into on the first occasion in version I is fewer than those in version II, these additional samādhis in version II cannot be regarded as a case of expansion from version I because the names of the samādhis in version I and II

---

\(^{168}\) For the whole list of the samādhis that the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita enters into on the first occasion in version I, see T 8 no. 224 pp. 473c27–474a21; T 8 no. 225 p. 505c3–22.

\(^{169}\) 無處所三昧 (T 8 no. 224 p. 473c27).

\(^{170}\) 過去當來今現在悉等三昧 (T 8 no. 224 p. 474a21).

\(^{171}\) Aṣṭa (ed. Wogihara 1932–1935) 940.22.

\(^{172}\) Aṣṭa (ed. Wogihara 1932–1935) 942.5. For the whole list of the samādhis that the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita enters into on the first occasion in version II, see Aṣṭa (ed. Wogihara 1932–1935) 940.22–942.5; Peking 731: di: 260a.1–261a.1; Peking 732: phi: 204a.8–205a.8; Peking 734: mi: 289a.4–290a.8; T 8 no. 227 p. 581b24–c13; T 8 no. 228 p. 670a6–b4; T 8 no. 221 p. 142c18–22; T 8 no. 223 pp. 417c21–418a12; T 6 no. 220 pp. 1061c3–1062a2.
are entirely different. Stephan Beyer (1977: 329–340) notes that version I possesses some contents that version II lacks. Following Lewis Lancaster’s viewpoint that version II is a later rearranged version, Beyer suggests that some contents in version I were excised to form version II, in particular those possessing visionary theism. The reason for the decision to excise elements, he proposes from a philosophical perspective, is that Mahāyāna philosophy had sought to free itself from its visionary roots. If we follow Beyer’s idea to interpret the situation concerning the *samādhis*, it implies that the editor(s) of version II replaced the list of the *samādhis* seen in version I with the content we see today. If this is the case, then it turns out that Mahāyāna philosophy strengthened itself by emphasising its visionary roots through the multiplication of the number of *samādhis* in version II. This contradicts Beyer’s inference. In fact, the more likely situation is that the *samādhis* were added to a hypothetical earlier version of the story independently by different traditions. As a result, the content of the first list of the *samādhis* in version I is entirely different from that in version II. Therefore, the relationship between version I and II is less likely to be of parent–child, that is one descended from the other, but rather they are in a sibling relationship, having a common parent.

Following this assumption of a hypothetical earlier version, then all differences between version I and II can be attributed to adjustments undertaken

---

173 Among the parallels of version II, *Āṣṭādaśa-M* is an exception in terms of the number of the *samādhis*. In *Āṣṭādaśa-M* the list of *samādhis* that Sadāprudita enters on the first occasion only has ten items.
by different traditions. Thus, these differences should be identified as interpolations. Employing this rule, where both version I and II have the same episodes, the differences within that episode can be identified as interpolations, while the similarities would reflect the earlier stratification of the story and provide a window from which we can get glimpses of the hypothetical earlier version. To further clarify this rule and its application, let us turn to the episode where Sadāprudita sees a beautifully adorned lofty pavilion (kūṭāgāra).

2.3.2.1. Identifying the layers in the episode where Sadāprudita

enquires about a pavilion

In both version I and II, there is an episode where Sadāprudita sees a pavilion and tries to find out more about it. In version II, Sadāprudita sees from afar a lofty pavilion made of seven precious substances and adorned with many valuable things. Dharmodgata is then depicted burning the best incense to honour the text of prajñāparamitā. Next Sadāprudita sees Śakra, together with many

---

174 Aṣṭa (ed. Wogihara 1932–1935) 955.3. To accurately translate the term kūṭāgāra into English does not seem so straightforward. Conze (1973: 288) renders it as “pointed tower.” It is translated as khang pa brtsegs pa (Peking 734: mi: 298b.6), khang bu brtsegs pa (Peking 732: phi: 213a.6) or khang pa rtseg ma (Peking 731: di: 269a.2–3) in Tibetan, which can mean upper storey of a house. The corresponding place in all the Chinese parallels is tài 檐, which basically means “a high square building with a flattop roof (see Hányüdìcídian s.v. 檐).” In PTSD (s.v. kūta), the term is defined as “a building with a peaked roof or pinnacles, possibly gabled, or with an upper story.” Nobuyoshi Yamabe (1999b: 340–341) suggests “vaulted house” as a translation for this Sanskrit term. In the Sanskrit-Japanese-Chinese dictionary edited by Wogihara (s.v. kūṭāgāra), he lists several Chinese translations that may correspond to this term, such as gé 閣, lóugé 樓閣, chōnggé 重閣, which can mean, “pavilion.” It is worth noting Yamabe’s (1999b: 340–344; 1999a: 49–54) more detailed discussion of this term, especially with respect to its context in esoteric texts.
divine beings, scattering heavenly flowers, heavenly sandalwood powder, and so forth over the pavilion, and playing heavenly music to revere it. With curiosity, he then asks Śakra why they do so. Śakra replies that this is because the *prajñāpāramitā*, written on golden tablets by the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata, is placed in the middle of the lofty pavilion.\(^\text{175}\)

On the other hand, in version I Sadāprudita sees from afar a lofty pavilion adorned with many precious things. He then asks a pedestrian, who is coming out from that city, “What kind of pavilion is that, which is adorned with many precious things?”\(^\text{176}\) The person replies that placed in the middle of that lofty pavilion is the *prajñāpāramitā*, which was written on golden tablets by the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata. He further explains that the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata makes offerings to the *prajñāpāramitā* sūtra every day with many kinds of flowers and the best incense, as well as lighting lamps, hanging banners and playing music to honour the text of *prajñāpāramitā*. The bodhisattvas that accompany Dharmodgata also pay reverence in a similar way. The person finally states that the divine beings of the Trāyastriṃśa Heaven use Māndārava flowers and great Māndārava flowers to honour the text of *prajñāpāramitā* three times every day,

---

\(^{175}\) For the details of the episode, see *Aṣṭha* (ed. Wogihara 1932–1935) 954.27–956.10; Peking 734: mi: 298b.6–299b.4; Peking 732: phi: 212b.2–213a7; Peking 731: di: 269a.2–b.8; T 8 no. 227 p. 583b17–c6; T 8 no. 228 pp. 672c28–673a23; T 8 no. 221 p. 144b11–c1; T 8 no. 223 p. 420b28–c24; T 6 no. 220 pp. 1065c9–a29.

\(^{176}\) T 8 no. 224 p. 473a19–20; T 8 no. 225 p. 505a29–b1.
and do the same through the night-time.\textsuperscript{177} The following table (Table 2.2) maps out the sequences of this episode for ease of comparison.

**Table 2.2 Comparison of the episode concerning the query about the lofty pavilion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence No.</th>
<th>Contents of each sequence</th>
<th>Notes on detailed differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Version I</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
<td>Depiction of the pavilion made of seven precious substances and adorned with many valuable things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
<td>Depiction of the text of <em>prajñāpāramitā</em> written on golden tablets and placed in a box.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
<td>Depiction of the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata burning incense to honour the text of <em>prajñāpāramitā</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{177} T 8 no. 224 p. 473a16–b1; T 8 no. 225 p. 505a29–b7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence No.</th>
<th>Contents of each sequence</th>
<th>Notes on detailed differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Version I</strong></td>
<td><strong>Version II</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sadāprudita sees from afar a lofty pavilion adorned with many precious things.</td>
<td>Sadāprudita sees from afar a wonderful pavilion, made of precious substances and adorned with many precious things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
<td>Sadāprudita sees Šakra with many divine beings scattering heavenly flowers, heavenly sandalwood powder, and so forth over the pavilion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
<td>Divine beings play heavenly music to revere the text of <em>prajñāpāramitā</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sadāprudita asks a pedestrian, who is coming out of the city: “What kind of pavilion is that, which is adorned with many precious things?”</td>
<td>Sadāprudita asks Šakra, “Why are you scattering heavenly flowers, heavenly sandalwood powder, and so forth over that pavilion, and why is heavenly music being played to revere it?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence No.</td>
<td>Contents of each sequence</td>
<td>Notes on detailed differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Version I</strong></td>
<td><strong>Version II</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
<td>Śakra replies that there is the <em>prajñāpāramitā</em>, which is the mother of bodhisattvas and will enable bodhisattvas to attain many kinds of virtue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
<td>The Bodhisattva Sadāprudita asks Śakra where the text of <em>prajñāpāramitā</em> is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The person replies that this is because the <em>prajñāpāramitā</em>, written on golden tablets by the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata, is placed in a box in the middle of the lofty pavilion.</td>
<td>Śakra replies that the text, written on golden tablets by the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata, is placed in the middle of the lofty pavilion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
<td>Śakra further explains that he is unable to show the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita the text as the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata has sealed it in a box.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence No.</td>
<td>Contents of each sequence</td>
<td>Notes on detailed differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The Bodhisattva Dharmodgata makes offerings to the <em>prajñāpāramitā</em> sūtra every day with many kinds of flowers and the best incense.</td>
<td>Similar content is seen in sequence 3 of version II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dharmodgata also lights lamps, hangs banners, and plays music to honour the text of <em>prajñāpāramitā</em>.</td>
<td>Similar content about using music to honour the text of <em>prajñāpāramitā</em> is seen in sequence 6 of version II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The bodhisattvas who accompany the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata honour the text in the same way.</td>
<td>Version II lacks this content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 2.2, we can see that versions I and II of this episode are occasionally identical, at other times differ only slightly. It is also not uncommon that elements found in one are completely lacking in the other or are found elsewhere.

2.3.2.1.1. Discerning the interpolations in contents that are identical in both versions

There are four points where the two versions are identical, although their presentation (i.e. in dialogues or in depictions by an unseen narrator) varies slightly. These minor differences may be a result of alterations by the editor(s) of versions I and II at a later time. Nevertheless, to a large extent, these passages can be identified as the earlier stratum of this episode. The four passages are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence No.</th>
<th>Contents of each sequence</th>
<th>Notes on detailed differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The divine beings of the Trāyastrimśa Heaven use Māndārava and great Māndārava flowers to honour the text of prajñāpāramitā three times every day, and do the same through the night-time.</td>
<td>Similar content is seen in sequence 5 of version II.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) Sadāprarudita sees from afar a lofty pavilion;
(2) the pavilion is made of precious substances and adorned with valuable things;
(3) the text of prajñāpāramitā is written on golden tablets, placed in a box in the middle of the pavilion;
(4) the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata uses incense to honour the text of prajñāpāramitā.

2.3.2.1.2. Discerning the interpolations where there are only slight differences

Where there are only slight differences between passages that have essentially the same content, it is harder to determine whether or not the differences can be identified as interpolations. In such cases, more attention is needed to try and identify the layers. One such instance is the actual sequence where Sadāprarudita enquires about the pavilion. In version I, Sadāprarudita asks a pedestrian (human) about the pavilion, while in version II it is Śakra (a divine being) whom Sadāprarudita asks. It is clear that version II possesses more dramatic elements, such as Śakra together with other divine beings scattering flowers, playing music, and so forth, which raises Sadāprarudita’s curiosity about why they behave in such a manner. Moreover a sense of mysticism is added when Śakra informs Sadāprarudita that he is unable to reveal the prajñāpāramitā because the text has been sealed in a box by Dharmodgata. Version I lacks these dramatic elements. In contrast, version I simply recounts that Sadāprarudita asks a
person, who is coming out of the city of Gandhavatī, about the pavilion. One may suppose that version I contains the earlier stratum because the account in version I is simpler and less miraculous. One may therefore further propose that the editor(s) of version II replaced the content in version I with something that was more attractive and dramatic.\(^{178}\) Although such an inference is not unreasonable, an inconsistency arises when looking at the sequence just prior to this episode, that is, version I contains descriptively more interesting content. The episode recounts that Sadāprarudita sees the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata preaching prajñāpāramitā. Version II simply states that he sees Dharmodgata, surrounded by a large audience, demonstrating Dharma. On the other hand, version I gives more information describing the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata, “He is a person who is young and good looking, bright and luminous.”\(^{179}\) It is hard to imagine that the editor(s) of version II would excise the depiction of the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata’s appearance, which would certainly satisfy a reader’s curiosity about this great teacher. Returning to the episode and sequence where Sadāprarudita enquires about the pavilion, it seems more likely then that the contents, in terms of the interlocutor and the related accounts in both version I and

---

\(^{178}\) Note, not everyone would agree that the development of a story necessarily follows the pattern of simple and factual to dramatic and embellished. This may be true if the story under investigation is an independent text, such as a jātaka story, which in the process of transmission might experience both elaborations and simplifications. However, our knowledge of this story at present indicates that it is predominantly an integral part of prajñāpāramitā sūtras. In terms of the development of Mahāyāna texts in general, Nattier (2003: 60) suggests, “by and large growth rather than shrinkage seems to be the norm.” In this case, given that the story of Sadāprarudita is found as a part of prajñāpāramitā texts, it is not unreasonable that this norm regarding the development of a sūtra may also apply here.

\(^{179}\) 為人幼少・顔貌殊好・光耀明照 (T 8 no. 224 p. 473b8–9).
II, are interpolations to a hypothetical earlier version, which most likely lacked these details and merely had Sadāprarudita asking someone about the pavilion. This would mean that the editor(s) of version I and II independently added the details to this sequence to enhance its contents, forming what we see today.

2.3.2.1.3. Discerning the interpolations where information is found in one version but not the other

Finally, where a passage or description is found in one version but not the other, it is not unreasonable to suspect that this passage is an interpolation. Based on the assumption of a hypothetical earlier version, a possible scenario is that the editor(s) of the *prajñāpāramitā* sūtras added elements to the story and modified it when they incorporated it into the *prajñāpāramitā* sūtras. This may have been done in order to make the story more suitable to the *prajñāpāramitā* sūtra context. The differences we encounter between versions I and II resulted from the editors(s) modifying their respective texts independently.

For instance, the content of sequence 14 of version I is not found in version II (see Table 2.2 above), that is, version I mentions that the bodhisattvas who accompany the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata honour the text of *prajñāpāramitā* in the same way he does. Though this content may have been omitted from version II, given a hypothetical earlier version, it is also possible that this content was introduced into version I when the story of Sadāprarudita was incorporated into the large *prajñāpāramitā* text.
An example of the reverse, where information is found in version II but is lacking in version I, is sequence 8 of version II. This is Śakra’s response to Sadāprudita’s query as to why they are scattering heavenly flowers, heavenly sandalwood powder, and so forth over the pavilion, and playing heavenly music to revere it. The answer is that the motive for doing so is due to the text of *prajñāpāramitā*, which is the mother of bodhisattvas and will enable bodhisattvas to attain many kinds of virtue. This is followed by another query from Sadāprudita, “Where is the text of *prajñāpāramitā*?” This query is also unseen in version I. Again, given the assumption of a hypothetical earlier version, this content found only in version II and not in version I may also be regarded as an interpolation.

In short, the contents that are identical in version I and II can be regarded as the earlier stratification, while differences between versions I and II can, to a large extent, be identified as later interpolations.

### 2.3.2.2. The story itself as a lengthy interpolation?

In addition to the cases of interpolation discussed above, in the episode where the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita sees the beautifully adorned pavilion, there is a crucial piece of information that suggests the story itself to be an interpolation of the *prajñāpāramitā* sūtras. Reading the text carefully, we know that there is a *prajñāpāramitā* text written on golden tablets placed in the pavilion. This is found both in version I and version II, indicating it is likely to belong to the older layers.
of stratification. If we treat this account as mere dramatisation to liven up the story, then we need not further investigate this piece of information. However, putting aside the more fanciful aspect of this account, and following the principle of irrelevance (see discussion in §2.4.2. in this chapter), the account about prajñāpāramitā written on golden tablets indicates that the authors were already aware of a written form of the prajñāpāramitā. If this is the case, then there is an important point worth delving into. With regard to that prajñāpāramitā written on golden tablets, it seems clear that it refers to a prajñāpāramitā sūtra. This is supported by the corresponding account found in the Dà zhì dù lùn 大智度論 (The Treatise on the [Sutra of] Great Perfection of Insight, T 25 no. 1509), in which the written form of the prajñāpāramitā is paraphrased as bānruò jīngjuàn 般若經卷 (scroll(s) of the Sutra on [Perfection of] Insight). If we accept this interpretation, then it begs the question, “What prajñāpāramitā sūtra is it referring to?” Obviously one would immediately assume that the written form of the prajñāpāramitā refers to another prajñāpāramitā text, such as the Vajracchedikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra, in which the story of Sadāprudita is not found at all. At first glance this would seem logical because if that prajñāpāramitā written on golden tablets included the story of Sadāprudita, then the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita would be able to read about his life story and learn about his own future, like looking into a crystal ball. However, if we think more deeply about the development of a text over time and step into the shoes of its compiler(s), a more

180 T 25 no. 1509 p. 743c23.
reasonable answer to the question is to assume that the prajñāpāramitā written on golden tablets refers to an earlier form of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā śūtra (Aṣṭa), the Aṣṭadaśasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā śūtra (Aṣṭādaśa), the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā śūtra (Pañcaviṃśati), or the Śatasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā śūtra (Śata), without the story of Sadāprudita. That is, although it is unclear whether the text of prajñāpāramitā written on golden tablets refers to one of the prajñāpāramitā śūtras we have today, it is reasonable to suggest that the written form of the text refers to one of the prajñāpāramitā śūtras that now possess this story. This is because from a compiler’s perspective, it is more sensible to introduce material into a text if it is relevant, and to discard material that is (apparently) irrelevant. Accordingly, the likely situation could be that the compiler(s) may have taken the prajñāpāramitā written on golden tablets (i.e. an earlier form of the Aṣṭa, Aṣṭādaśa, Pañcaviṃśati, or Śata) and introduced the story of Sadāprudita to give us the texts of the Aṣṭa, Aṣṭādaśa, Pañcaviṃśati, or Śata we have today as they regarded the content of the story as relevant to the contents of the prajñāpāramitā written on golden tablets. This proposition would shed light on why the story of Sadāprudita appears in some but not all prajñāpāramitā texts and thus to a large extent suggests that the story itself must be a later addition to these prajñāpāramitā texts.\textsuperscript{181} This would make the story one of the lengthiest (if not the lengthiest) interpolations utilised by the compiler(s).

\textsuperscript{181} For more discussions on whether the story is a later addition, see Chapter 3.
2.4. Extracting Historical Data from a Normative Source

In her thorough study of the Ugraparipṛcchā, Nattier (2003: 63–70) explicates several rules that are applied for extracting historical information from a normative source. These rules, in her words, are applicable to almost the entire range of Buddhist literary texts, even non-Buddhist materials (Nattier 2003: 64–65).\(^2\) She reminds the researchers, who apply these rules to their sources, of the careful use of the sources, that is, to recognise their nature as prescriptive texts while using them, as appropriate, to extract historical data (Nattier 2003: 64). The following is a summary of these rules, as well as examples of their application in this thesis.

2.4.1. The Principle of Embarrassment

Under the principle of embarrassment, we are looking for statements or accounts in a text that reveal situations running contrary to the positions the author represents or are self-mortifying to the community to which they belong. In such instances Nattier proposes that there is a high probability that these statements or accounts have a basis in fact. In assessing the date and provenance of the story in Chapter 3, for example, this principle was applied to garner information about a possible time that the story may relate to. Using the description of Sadāprarudita’s world, a place that is most impure and devoid of

\(^2\) Nattier (2003: 65 n. 26) cautions that the principles have been formulated primarily for use in analysing texts that are in the style of exhortation. Modifications in some of these techniques might be required when the rules are applied to other genres, such as hagiography or ecclesiastical history.
the Three Jewels, as unfitting as such a place may be for a bodhisattva, nevertheless, this may be a reflection of a turbulent time in Indian history where Buddhism fell into decline and society saw little peace. Alternatively, such a dire description of the bodhisattva’s environment may be used to reinforce how lucky the audience is in having the Dharma present and vibrant and therefore how important it is that they should value and support it.

2.4.2. THE PRINCIPLE OF IRRELEVANCE

The principle of irrelevance refers to gathering factual information from incidental mentions of items that are not directly related to the author’s main argument. These may be lists of things that were well known to the audience of the time, reflecting social norms, or common understandings. Gathering such information may require a bit more attention to the details of the text. For example, in the episode where Sadāprarudita reaches the city of Gandhavatī and sees the pavilion with the prajñāpāramitā on gold tablets, the descriptions in that scene offer a rich amount of incidental information. Most notably it indicates that at the time of the author’s compilation, written texts existed and practices of worship included the offering of flowers, incense, light, and music. Another example is the mention of making buddha statues found in the episode where Sadāprarudita asks Dharmogdāta about the voice of a buddha, which would
indicate that at the time of compilation, the practice of making buddha statues already prevailed.\footnote{For the account about making buddha statues, see T 8 no. 224 p. 476b17–27; T 8 no. 225 p. 507a22–29.}

2.4.3. The Principle of Counter Argument

The principle of counter argument relates to prescriptive statements in a text, teaching one to do or not to do certain things. From these we can gather that some faction of society at the time did contravene these prescriptions and thus there was a need to spell them out clearly in the text. As for the narrative in this thesis, the main prescriptive statement that easily comes to mind is the instruction in a revelation to go east and pay no attention to bodily needs and personal gains. Though this may not relate to a social situation of society at the time, at a spiritual level, and from a Buddhist perspective, it reflects the fact that human beings and sentient beings tend to have a strong clinging to the notion of a true self, something which goes to the core of Buddhist and prañāparamitā teachings.

2.4.4. The Principle of Corroborating Evidence

Ideally, to form a picture of the past, the more diverse the sources of information, the more certain we can be in drawing conclusions. Relying purely on a limited source, such as the contents of prañāparamitā sūtras, reduces the reliability of any conclusions we may arrive at. In the case of the story of Sadāprarudita, we have little evidence available from other sources to support or
refute the descriptions found in this story. An example of corroborative evidence is discussed in Chapter 3, which addresses the issue of the date and provenance of the text, namely, Kajiyama Yūichi 梶山雄一 (1983: 5–9) uses Brahmanical sources to provide some corroborating evidence regarding the turbulent time in north India around the first century CE.

2.4.5. The Interpretation of Absence

Nattier provides a clear guide for how to go about interpreting the absence of items in a text. Below is a summary of three questions and answers that Nattier (2003: 69–70) puts forward when considering the reason why a text is silent on certain issues.

(1) Is the missing item required in order to make sense of what is presented in the text? If yes, then it may be that the item was too well known and thus the author merely took it as assumed background knowledge.
(2) Does the text contain something that appears to be a precursor to the missing item? If true, then it is likely that the omitted item was unknown to the author and what little is mentioned is all that was available or known to the author at the time.
(3) Does the absent item conflict with the author’s position? If affirmative, then it may be possible that the author knew of the silent item, but due to its nature, decided to stay silent on the issue.
In Chapter 7, these simple yet essential questions and answers form the basis of assessing the silence with respect to the whole story of Sadāprarudita in some *prajñāpāramitā* sūtras.

### 2.4.6. A Distant Mirror

In Nattier’s study of the *Ugraparipṛcchā*, she highlights that where an Indic source text is no longer available, the use of multiple translations in Chinese and/or Tibetan can help with the understanding of the underlying Indic text and possibly even reconstruct some of its vocabulary. Fortunately, there is a surviving Sanskrit version of the *Aṣṭa* containing version II of the story. However, this does not mean that this mirroring method is not applicable in this study at all. In Chapter 1, in an attempt to reconstruct an Indic form of the names of some characters in version I of the story, I have used translations by Zhī Qīān 支謙 and Lokakṣema’s transcriptions, given that Zhī Qīān’s translations are retranslated works from the same sources as Lokakṣema’s.

As outlined above (see footnote 44), Karashima Seishi 辛嶋静志 (2010: 760; 2011: xii–xiii) suggests that the source text for Lokakṣema’s translation of the *Aṣṭa* may have been in the Gāndhārī language. This inference is on the basis of some expressions in Lokakṣema’s translation, which presuppose sound changes only found in Gāndhārī, and not in other Indian vernaculars of the time.¹⁸⁴

¹⁸⁴ For more information about the relationship between Lokakṣema’s translation and the Gāndhārī manuscript of the *Aṣṭa*, see Falk 2011: 20–23; Falk and Karashima 2012: 19–21.
Although the source text for Lokakṣema’s translation of the Aṣṭa could have been in Gāndhārī, this thesis will provide reconstructions of terms in Sanskrit, as to date many terms in Gāndhārī are still unknown, and the inconsistencies of Gāndhārī orthography would make reconstructions problematic.

Bearing in mind the considerations and the principles outlined in this chapter, we are now able to start an analysis of the Sadāprarudita story in detail, beginning with looking at it as a literary document.
Chapter 3

The Formation of the Story of Sadāprudita

3.1. THE STORY OF SADĀPRUDITA AS A LITERARY DOCUMENT

3.1.1. A POSSIBLE PROCESS OF NEW TEACHINGS INTRODUCED

The true beginning of the story of the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita is probably irretrievable. It is unclear, for example, whether the story had from its inception been attributed to the Buddha himself as we now have it or whether this was a later development. Jan Nattier (2003: 11) points out that there are examples in the Buddhist canon where texts that were originally attributed to a particular and named individual, not the Buddha, were gradually subjected to a process of “sūtrafication” during which the standard features of the sūtra genre were added and attributed to the Buddha. Unlike the Gaṇḍavyūha sūtra (Sutra on the Supreme Array,185 Gaṇḍavyūha hereafter), which is the last part of the immense Huāyān jīng 華嚴經 (Flower Adornment Sutra, T 9 no. 278 and T 10 no. 279)186 and also a complete sūtra (Gaṇḍavyūha) which begins with evaṃ mayā śrūdam, the story of Sadāprudita is not presented in full sūtra style. Yet the Buddha is introduced

185 Osto (2008: 273–290) suggests that a more appropriate translation of the term gaṇḍavyūha would be “supreme array.”
186 According to Huā yán jīng tàn xuán jì 華嚴經探玄記 (Notes on Exploring the Profundity of the Flower Adornment Sutra, T 35 no. 1733), composed by Fāzàng 法藏, the transcription of the title for this sūtra is Jiānmápiāohē 健努骠訶 (Gaṇḍavyūha, see T 35 no. 1733 p. 121a10–11 for the account). Osto (2009: 274) states that the Huā yán jīng 華嚴經 is generally referred to as the Avatamsaka sūtra in Sanskrit. He comments that there seems to have been some confusion in the Chinese tradition regarding the Sanskrit equivalent of huā yán 華嚴. For details of his argument on this issue, see Osto 2009: 273–288.
into the narrative as the storyteller through the depiction of him admonishing Subhūti that one should seek *prajñāpāramitā* as did Sadāprarudita. Nattier (2003: 11–13) argues that consideration of the origin of a text is important as there is a great difference between a text that was originally composed with the pretence to being *buddhavacana* and one that began its literary life more humbly, but then only gradually progressed to sūtra status. She alerts us to the fact that most of the initial literary, philosophical, and ritual experiments that culminated in the production of what are now known as “Mahāyāna sūtras” took place off-camera (Nattier 2003: 13). In other words, according to Nattier, these initial experiments were never documented in written form. Therefore, she concludes, it would be rash to suppose that a given text known to us today as a sūtra began its life in that format. Nattier (2003: 13) also points out that it has long been recognised in Buddhist studies circles that most of what we have today as written canonical documents originated as oral texts, which is, however, less true of Mahāyāna sūtras than of other Buddhist texts. There is an interesting account that, in part, supports Nattier’s statement. In the *Lóngshùpúsà zhuàn* (A Biography of the Bodhisattva Nāgarjuna, T 50 no. 2047B),¹⁸⁷ said to have been translated by Kumārajīva around the fifth century CE, it is recounted that the Bodhisattva Nāgarjuna goes to the Snowy Mountains where there is a *stūpa* in which there is an old monk who gives him a Mahāyāna sūtra.¹⁸⁸ Further, it is said that the Bodhisattva Mahānāga took Nāgarjuna to the palace of the nāgas and gave him

---

¹⁸⁷ A possible Sanskrit reconstruction of this title is *Nāgarjunabodhisattvacarita.*

¹⁸⁸ 雪山中深遠處有佛塔。塔中有一老比丘。以摩訶衍經與之 (T 50 no. 2047B p. 185c21–23).
numerous vaipulya (extensive works)\textsuperscript{189} and profound sūtras as well as countless sublime Dharmas. The Mahāyāna sūtras were so many that he could not read through all of them and as a result, Nāgārjuna obtained a box of [Mahāyāna] sūtras and departed the palace.\textsuperscript{190} From the summary of the episode concerning Nāgārjuna’s encounter with Mahāyāna sūtras, though we do not know the contents of the sūtras, it is clear that these sūtras were in written form rather than oral transmission. Although this is just a tale and should not be considered as a historical fact, at the least it may be interpreted that the editor(s) or the author(s) of the biography of the Bodhisattva Nāgārjuna presumed that Mahāyāna sūtras existed in written form when they were revealed. Nonetheless, it is also possible that the predecessors of those Mahāyāna or vaipulya sūtras were in oral form, derived from variant sources.

Akanuma Chizen 赤沼智善 (1981: 332) points out a notable account which may suggest how Mahāyāna sūtras, or at least the praśīpaśāramitā sūtras, were known in Buddhist communities. He notes that in the very beginning of the Dào xíng bānrùò jīng 道行般若經 (Sutra on [Perfection of] Insight: Proceeding on the

\textsuperscript{189} Cabezón (2003: 756) states, but without providing specific information, that there is evidence, which indicates some Mahāyānists regarded the so-called vaipulya (extensive works) as a kind of Mahāyāna canon, possibly subsumed within the sūtra basket. It is notable that vaipulya texts are interpreted as equivalent to Mahāyāna scriptures in the Dà zhì dà lùn 大智度論, which recounts, 廣經者名摩訶衍。所謂般若波羅蜜經六波羅蜜經… 如是等無量阿僧只諸經。為得阿耨多羅三藐三菩提故說 (T 25 no. 1509 p. 308a4–8). “As for ‘vaipulya text’, it is called Mahāyāna [text], that is, the Praśīpaśāramitā sūtra, the Śatpāramitā sūtra …. Such countless sūtras are taught for the sake of [beings’] attainment of unsurpassed awakening (anuttara-samyak-sambodhi).” This is a piece of evidence that agrees with Cabezón’s statement.

\textsuperscript{190} For the account about seeing Mahāyāna sūtras in the nāga palace, see T 50 no. 2047b p. 186a8–16.
Formation of the Story of Sadāprudita

Way, T 8 no. 224)\textsuperscript{191} and Dà míng dì jīng 大明度經 (Sutra on Transcendence by Great Insight, T 8 no. 225),\textsuperscript{192} the occasion on which the teaching of praṇāpāramitā is given is the fifteenth day of the half-month when monks recited the prātimokṣa and he states that the original form of such a scenario can be seen in some āgama sūtras or nikāya suttas. For example, a parallel to this is seen in a Majjhima-nikāya sutta (Mahāpuṇṇama-sutta, MN III 15), in which the Buddha is depicted seated among the monks on an uposatha (Skt. upoṣadha) full-moon night answering the monks’ questions. Another related example can be found in the Sāmaññaphala-sutta (DN I 47) which sets the scene with King Ajātasattu asking his courtiers what he should do this beautiful full-moon night, to which the answers are that he should visit one or other of the religious leaders of the day. The discourse culminates with the suggestion that he should visit the Buddha, which he does. He then receives a teaching about the fruits of the ascetic life. No doubt Mahāyāna ideas and texts were disseminated and discuss on a variety of occasions. However, the authors or editors of the Aṣṭa must have felt that the nights of the upoṣadha were a particularly auspicious time for this to occur since these texts depict the teaching of praṇāpāramitā taking place on the fifteenth day of the lunar month when monks recited the prātimokṣa. In this way the status of these texts is enhanced by association with the holiness of the upoṣadha. In fact, on the upoṣadha days of the fifteenth of the lunar month, according to the Sarvāstivāda vinaya, for example, the wilderness-dwelling monks should attend

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{191} 月十五日說戒時 (T 8 no. 224 p. 425c8–9).
\item \textsuperscript{192} 十五齋日月滿 (T 8 no. 225 p. 478b25).
\end{itemize}
the ceremony of reciting monastic rules held at a monastery. To sum up, on upoṣadha days of the fifteenth of the lunar month, the ceremony of reciting monastic rules is held at a monastery and Dharma-discourses are given at a certain time before or after the ceremony. If those monks who have acquired Mahāyāna teachings are wilderness-dwellers, upoṣadha days of the fifteenth would have been good opportunities for them to promote these teachings. Although the accounts above may not exactly reflect the factual situation of how all Mahāyāna sūtras became known to an audience, it may be true for some Mahāyāna sūtras and the association with the holiness of the upoṣadha may be a way to enhance the status of these texts. Given these accounts, it is not unreasonable to interpret that the editor(s) of the above two texts presumed that the teachings were introduced to an audience on upoṣadha days of the fifteenth.

3.1.2. THE EARLIEST FORMS OF THE STORY OF SADĀPRARUDITA

For the story of Sadāprarudita, it is true that we have no direct evidence showing that it was an independent oral text before being transmitted in written form. The earliest form of the story which we have available, a Chinese translation dating from the mid-second century CE, already presents the story as a

---

193 See T 23 no.1435 p. 411a19–21 for the details.
194 While new teachings can appear for the first time, it is possible that doubts also occurred to the audience. Nattier (2003: 12–13 n. 3) in her study The Inquiry of the Ugra (Ugraparipṛcchā), draws the reader’s attention to a notable account concerning questions about the presenter’s authoritativeness and the legitimacy to present Dharma-discourses not preached by the Buddha. She interprets this as a possible trajectory that the “sūtrification” process can take. Nonetheless, such an account may also suggest that while the teaching on prajñāpāramitā appeared for the first time under these circumstances, the legitimacy of the teaching was questioned by some in the audience.
part of a sūtra, with the Buddha as the storyteller. However, it would be imprudent to treat this earliest extant translation as the “original.”¹⁹⁵ Nattier (2003: 14) proposes that different versions of a scripture can be seen as the equivalent to different time-lapse photographs of the scripture at successive stages of its growth. She further states that such a visual analogy must be used with caution, for it implies that the evolution of the scripture can be described in linear terms, as changes in the shape of a single entity over time. The argument she raises is:

A single sūtra could be transmitted orally to a number of different people, each of whom might then become the source of his or her own branch of the textual tradition. Subsequently one or more (but not all) of these oral versions of the text might find their way into written form, at which point the possibilities for diffusion—and for new kinds of errors, emendations, and elaborations—would increase still further. Thus, the lineage of any single Buddhist sūtra in India might better be described as an immensely complicated family tree of which photographs of only a few of the ancestors (not all of them

¹⁹⁵ A recent discovery of a first-to-second century Gāndhārī scroll containing a remnant of the अष्टा illuminates further the context slightly before the time of Lokakṣema’s translation. In this scroll, which has been tentatively dated to 47–147 CE, a “separate strip of bark bearing a colophon speaks of the first postaka of the manuscript, as if more scrolls containing more chapters were written or intended to be written. If the language of Lokakṣema’s version was Gāndhārī and if his text is only slightly larger than our manuscript, then it stands to reason that our text in its complete state should also have contained as many chapters as were known to Lokakṣema” (Falk 2011: 20–23; Falk and Karashima 2012: 19). This discovery, even if fragmentary, allows a better understanding of the textual history of the अष्टा as a whole, showing for example, that Lokakṣema’s translation reflects an already more developed text, than is evident in the Gāndhārī text.
belonging to the same branch of the family) have survived (Nattier 2003: 15).

Following Nattier’s analogy, the surviving versions of the story of Sadāprudita might be described as different paintings based on now-lost ancestral photographs, produced by artists of varying levels of expertise using photographs in varying states of preservation. Thus, it is hard to know if the story of the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita began its life as part of prajñāpāramitā literature, a jātaka compendium, or even as an independently transmitted popular story. However, it is reasonable to believe that the story of Sadāprudita could have begun its life in an oral form, which was later written down and incorporated into various written texts such as the prajñāpāramitā sūtras.196

---

196 It is noteworthy that the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita is briefly mentioned in the Wéiyuè zá nàn jīng 惟曰雜難經 (Extensive Sutra on Miscellaneous Expositions, see T 17 no. 760 p. 608b10–15 for the details). This text is said to be translated by Zhī Qiān in around mid-third century CE according to the Lì dài sān bāo jì 歷代三寶記 (Records on the Three Treasures from the Past Dynasties, T 49 no. 2034), composed by Féi Chángfáng 費長房 in around the second half of the sixth century CE. Wéiyuè zá nàn jīng 惟曰雜難經 is read as Wéiyuè zá nàn jīng 惟越雜難經 (Extensive Sutra on Miscellaneous Expositions) in the Lì dài sān bāo jì 歷代三寶記 (T 49 no. 2034 p. 58a23). Sakaino (1935: 105–106) argues that according to the features of the transcribed terms, it was likely to have been translated by Lokakṣema in around the second century CE. Nonetheless, this could still be considered problematic as Nattier (2008a), in her A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations: Texts from the Eastern Han and Three Kingdoms Periods, does not include this text.
3.2. Versions of the Story

3.2.1. Two Main Versions of the Sadāprudita Narrative in the Prajñāpāramitā Sūtras

The story of Sadāprudita has been preserved in the prajñāpāramitā sūtras and their parallels in Chinese and Tibetan. Among them, there are two main versions of the story in those sūtras, which are referred to as version I and version II in this study. Version I is found only in two Chinese translations of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra (Aṣṭa), while version II is found in the Sanskrit Aṣṭa; in two further Chinese translations of the Aṣṭa; and in the Tibetan translation of the Aṣṭa. Version II is also found in the Chinese and Tibetan translations of the Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra (Aṣṭādaśa), the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra (Pañcaviṃśati), and the Śatasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra (Śata) with some exceptions.

The story is not seen in the two Chinese translations parallel to the Aṣṭa, translated by Xuánzàng. In addition, the story is also missing from the extant Sanskrit Pañcaviṃśati, its two Chinese parallels translated by Xuánzàng.

---

197 There are two Tibetan translations of the Pañcaviṃśati, one each in the Kanjur and Tanjur. The one in the Tanjur is divided into eight chapters in which the story of Sadāprudita is not included. See Kimura 1986: iii.

198 These are the Dà bānrúò jīng (dì sì huì) 大般若經 (第四會) (Sutra on Great [Perfection of] Insight (Fourth Assembly), T 7 no. 220 (4)) and the Dà bānrúò jīng (dì wǔ huì) 大般若經 (第五會) (Sutra on Great [Perfection of] Insight (Fifth Assembly), T 7 no. 220 (5)).

199 The Dà bānrúò jīng (dì èr huì) 大般若經 (第二會) (Sutra on Great [Perfection of] Insight (Second Assembly), T 7 no. 220 (2)) and the Dà bānrúò jīng (dì sān huì) 大般若經 (第三會) (Sutra on Great [Perfection of] Insight (Third Assembly), T 7 no. 220 (3)).
the Śata and the Tibetan translation of the Sanskrit Śata (Conze 1978: 33, 45).\textsuperscript{200} It is unknown whether the story was included in the Sanskrit Aṣṭādaśa,\textsuperscript{201} the Móhé bānrùò chāo jīng 摩訶般若鈞經 (Extract of the Sutra on Great [Perfection of] Insight, T 8 no. 226),\textsuperscript{202} and the Guăng zàn jīng 光讃經 (Sutra on Praise of Light, T 8 no. 222) translated by Dharmarakṣa in the late third century CE, since both are fragmentary. The versions of the story of Sadāprudita, as found in the prajñāpāramitā sūtras, are listed here with their detailed information and the abbreviations that are used in this study.

(1) Aṣṭa-Skt: The story of Sadāprudita in the Sanskrit Aṣṭa.


\textsuperscript{200} The details concerning the absence of the story from some prajñāpāramitā sūtras will be discussed in Chapter 7.

\textsuperscript{201} See Conze 1978: 40–41 for more information about the extant fragments of the Sanskrit Aṣṭādaśa.

\textsuperscript{202} In the Taishō collection the name Tánmópí 暄摩禪 (Dharmapiya) is given as the translator of Móhé bānrùò chāo jīng 摩訶般若鈞經. However, Kajiyoshi (1980: 68–76) argues that the extant fragment, which is called Móhé bānrùò chāo jīng 摩訶般若鈞經, should be a fragment of Xīn dào xíng jīng 新道行經 translated by Dharmarakṣa in the late third century CE.
(3) Aṣṭa-L: The story of Sadāprudita in the Chinese Aṣṭa, Dào xíng bānruò jīng (Sutra on [Perfection of] Insight: Proceeding on the Way, T 8 no. 224) translated by Lokakṣema in the late second century CE.

ch. 28 Sātuòbōlūnpā sūn 薩陀波倫菩薩品, pp. 470c20ff.

ch. 29 Tánmójiépā sūn 曾無竭菩薩品, pp. 474b7ff.

(4) Aṣṭa-Zh: The story of Sadāprudita in the Chinese Aṣṭa, Dà míng dù jīng (Sutra on Transcendence by Great Insight, T 8 no. 225) translated by Zhī Qiān in the mid-third century CE.

ch. 28 Pǔcí kāi shí pān 普慈閣士品, pp. 503c20ff.

ch. 29 Fǎlái kāi shí pān 法來閣士品, pp. 505c25ff.

(5) Aṣṭa-K: The story of Sadāprudita in the Chinese Aṣṭa, Xiǎo pān bānruòbōlúomi jīng 小品般若波蜜經 (Smaller Sutra on Perfection of Insight, T 8 no. 227) translated by Kumārajīva in 408 CE.

ch. 27 Sātuòbōlūn sūn 薩陀波崑品, pp. 580a23ff.

ch. 28 Tánmójié pān 曾無竭品, pp. 584, a21ff.

(6) Aṣṭa-D: The story of Sadāprudita in the Chinese Aṣṭa, Fó mù chūshēng sān fāzāng bānruòbōlúomíduō jīng 佛母出生三法藏般若波羅

---

203 This title is derived from the heading of the first chapter Dào xíng 道行 (Proceeding on the Way), which could refer to the Sanskrit sarvākāraññatācārya, proceeding towards insight of all aspects. This is the heading of the first chapter in the Aṣṭa (Aṣṭa [ed. Wogihara 1932–1935] 1.4–5).
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蜜多經 (Sutra on Perfection of Insight: The Three Dharma Treasures Produced by the Mother of Buddhas, T 8 no. 228) translated by Dānapāla in 982 CE.

ch. 30 Chángtí púsà pǐn 常啼菩薩品, pp. 668a21ff.

ch. 31 Fāshàng púsà pǐn 法上菩薩品, pp. 673c23ff.


(8) Aṣṭādaśa-M: The story of Sadāprudita in the Chinese Aṣṭādaśa, Fàng guāng bānruò jīng 放光般若經 (Sutra on [Perfection of] Insight: Illumination, T 8 no. 221) translated by Mokṣala in the late third century CE.

ch. 88 Sātuóbōlún pǐn 薩陀波倫品, pp. 141b19ff.

ch. 89 Fāshàng pǐn 法上品, pp. 145a1ff.

ch. 73 Byang-chub sms-dpa’ rtag-par rab-tu ngu-bas ting-nge’-dsin-gyi sgo-mang-po thob pa (Bodhisattva Sadāpaprudita’s attainment of many entrances to samādhis): pp. 254bff.


(10) Pañcaviṃśati-K: The story of Sadāpaprudita in the Chinese Pañcaviṃśati, Mōhē bānruòbōluómì jīng 摩訶般若波羅蜜經204 (Sutra on Great Perfection of Insight, T 8 no. 223) translated by Kumārajīva in 404 CE.

ch. 88 Chángtí pǐn 常啼品, pp. 416a24ff.

ch. 89 Fāshàng pǐn 法尚品, pp. 421b26ff.

(11) Śata-X: The story of Sadāpaprudita in the Chinese Śata, Dā bānruò jīng 大般若經 (chū hui) 大般若經 (初會) (Sutra on Great [Perfection of] Insight (First Assembly), T 220 (1)) translated by Xuánzàng in 660–663 CE.

ch. 77 Chángtí púsà pǐn 常啼菩薩品, pp. 1059a16ff.

ch. 78 Fāyōng púsà pǐn 法湅菩薩品, pp. 1067b15ff.

---

204 According to the commentary of the sūtra, Dà zhì dà lùn 大智度論, the original of the Mōhē bānruòbōluómì jīng 摩訶般若波羅蜜經 consists of 22,000 ślokas (verses). T 25 no. 1509 p. 756c27–29.
3.2.2. JĀTAKA FORM OF THE STORY AND THE UIGHUR VERSION

In addition to version I and version II mentioned above, the story of Sadāprarudita also exists as a jātaka found in a jātaka collection, which is available in Chinese only. This is the Liù dū jì jīng 六度集經 (Compendium of the Six Transcendent Practices, T 3 no. 152), translated (and possibly compiled) by Kāng Sēnghuì 康僧會 in the mid-third century CE.205 The story of Sadāprarudita is jātaka No. 81, which is placed in the chapter on Dhyānāparamitā (Perfection of Meditation) in which the bodhisattva is called Chángbēi 常悲 (Ever-grieved).

There is also a Uighur version, which was published by Şinasi Tekin in 1980 as Die uigurische Bearbeitung der Geschichte von Sadāprarudita und Dharmodgata Bodhisattva (The Uighur Version of the Story of Sadāprarudita and Dharmodgata Bodhisattva), in Buddhistische uigurica aus der Yüan-Zeit, ed. Şinasi Tekin, 154–383. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

3.3. STORIES BEARING SIMILARITIES TO THE SADĀPRARUDITA STORY FOUND IN OTHER SOURCES

It is not uncommon in narrative literature to find different stories sharing similar or common narrative elements. Unsurprisingly, this holds true of the Sadāprarudita story as well. When reading the story closely, we find that some

205 For the date of this text, see T 55 no. 2145 p. 7a25–b1 and Chavannes, vol. 1, 1910: iii (cited in Nattier 2005: 186–187 n. 29).
elements are similar to those in other narratives. For example, Lewis Lancaster (1974b: 83), in this regard, points out that the Buddha’s name in version II is Bhīṣmagarjitanirghoṣasvāra and this is very similar to Bhīṣmagarjitasvararāja found in the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka sūtra in the story of Sadāparibhūta who is a counterpart to Sadāprarudita. In addition, he also indicates that the episode of Śakra testing Sadāprarudita’s resolve is parallel to the jātaka story of King Śibi in which Viśvakarman, in the form of a pigeon, asks for protection from a hawk that is really Śakra in disguise (Lancaster 1974b: 86). Katsuzaki Yūgen 勝崎裕彦 (1995: 25) notes that the episode of the merchant’s daughter helping Sadāprarudita overcome Māra’s obstruction and Śakra’s test of his resolution is parallel to the incident where a young woman, Sujātā, offers porridge to the Bodhisattva Śākyamuni so that he can recover from weakness and thereafter attain Buddhahood. He further proposes that the episodes concerning Sadāprarudita and the merchant’s daughter are an echo of the story regarding the Dīpankara Buddha’s prediction that a young man will attain Buddhahood, and then he will be called Śākyamuni (Katsuzaki 1995: 25).  

Moreover, from a macro perspective, Douglas Osto (2008: 35) points out that the story of Sudhana in the Gaṇḍavyūha has some similarities to the narrative of Sadāprarudita. He states that both are the type of quest narrative found in the final part of larger scriptures, Sudhana in the immense Huā yán jīng 華嚴經 and Sadāprarudita in the lengthy Aṣṭa. Further he indicates that the two narratives

---

206 Fronsdal (1998: 177–185) also points out the similarities between the Sadāprarudita story and the Dīpankara story.
involve a young man’s journey in search of enlightenment at the instruction of a spiritual authority. Since the Sudhana story in the Huā yán jīng 華嚴經 and the Sadāprārudita narrative in the Aṣṭa, as pointed out by Osto, have quite a few similar features, it may be worthwhile to see if the two narratives have some further common features of a macro aspect. As the Sudhana story also presents as an independent text, the Gaṇḍavyūha, it may be possible that the Sadāprārudita narrative once existed likewise. There is a Uighur version of the Sadāprārudita story, which is an independent text in alternating verse-prose style. However, it is evident that this version is a later composition based on version II of the Sadāprārudita narrative. So far the Sadāprārudita story is only found in larger texts such as prajñāpāramitā sūtras.

Another point that is worthy of investigation is whether these two narratives clearly have predecessors. Yìnshùn 印順 (1981: 1110–1111) indicates that the story of Sudhana in the Gaṇḍavyūha bears some similarity to the jātaka story of Prince Sudhana, which might be its predecessor. The jātaka story of Prince Sudhana is found in the chapter on Bhaiṣajyavastu (Matters regarding Medicine) of the Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya (The Mūlasarvāstivāda’s Code of Monastic Discipline), belonging to the Mūlasarvāstivāda, which was one of the significant ordination lineages in India. The jātaka story recounts Prince Sudhana’s endless endeavour looking for his wife Sumana. Yìnshùn proposes that, although the objects that the two Sudhanas pursue in the jātaka and in the

---

207 See Chapter 4 for a detailed discussion on the Uighur version of Sadāprārudita narrative.
Gaṇḍavyūha differ, the two stories have identical representations of the protagonist’s spirit of endeavour directed towards his object of desire (Yinshun 1981: 1110–1111). As for the Sadāprarudita narrative, there is a jātaka story of the Bodhisattva Chāngbēi 常悲 (Ever-grieved), which is found in the Liù dù jì jīng 六度集經 and placed in the category of Dhyānapāramitā. The content of the Chāngbēi jātaka is close to version I of the Sadāprarudita story but much shorter. However, some evidence shows that this Chāngbēi jātaka is likely to be an adaptation of version I. In other words, the predecessor of the story of Sadāprarudita, to date, is yet to be found. Apart from the points highlighted by Lancaster, Katsuzaki, and Osto etc., there is a notable jātaka story which is seen in the Dà bānnièpán jīng 大般涅槃經 (Sutra on [the Buddha’s] Great Passing Away, T 12 no. 374, Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa sūtra hearafter) that bears various points of similarity to the Sadāprarudita story. An outline of this jātaka story is as follows.

When the Buddha praises the greatness of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa sūtra, a bodhisattva called Kaśyapa makes a vow that he will skilfully promote the sūtra and encourage all beings to learn it. Then the Buddha praises the Bodhisattva Kaśyapa’s devotion to the sūtra and predicts that he will attain unsurpassed awakening prior to countless other bodhisattvas due to the superior

---

208 The issue on the relationship between the Chāngbēi 常悲 jātaka and version I of the Sadāprarudita story is discussed in Chapter 4.
209 The precise dating of when this text was translated by Dharmakṣema is problematic. Generally it was translated by Dharmakṣema in around the early fifth century CE. See Hodge 2012: 9–16 for the discussion on this issue.
causal consequences of a good mind. Then the Buddha gives his previous life story as an example. In a former time, the Buddha used to be a brahman who practised the bodhisattva path and was very knowledgeable of all other religions, except Buddhism. He goes about looking for Mahāyāna sūtras, with no success, not even being able to hear the name of a vaipulya (extensive work) text. At that time he lives in the Snowy Mountains where there is an abundance of running rivers, ponds, forests, and medicinal plants. The fruit trees are productive and the varieties countless. He lives alone surviving on forest fruits and engaging in the meditative life. For an immeasurably long time he is unable to hear of the appearance of a tathāgata or of the name of a Mahāyāna sūtra. A sage tells Śakra that there is a great being (i.e. the brahman mentioned above) who does not conceive things for his own good and that he gave up all his treasures: his wife and children, whom he loves; his physical body; his home; his elephants, horses, and vehicles; and his servants. What he desires, the sage says, is solely to gain unsurpassed awakening (anuttara-samyak-sambodhi), and is bound to attain it. Upon hearing the news of such a great being, Śakra and some other gods are amazed at his pure conduct and stillness of mind. Śakra praises the great being and wants to see if he is equipped with the required qualities, so as to truly be able to shoulder the burden of unsurpassed enlightenment. Thus, Śakra transforms himself into a flesh-eating demon and visits the bodhisattva. He then recites half of a verse (gāthā) from the teachings of the past buddhas, “Impermanent are all formations; Their nature is to arise and vanish.”  

\[210\] This translation follows Bodhi (2000: 94). This and the following half-verse appear in
half-verse is elated like a person who has been ill for a long time and finally seeing a skilful doctor who has the medicine to cure him, or like a traveler who arrives home to a warm welcome, or like a farmer that endures a long drought and finally there is rain. The bodhisattva approaches the demon and asks him to recite the remaining verse. The demon promises him the other half of the verse on the condition that the bodhisattva gives him the soft flesh of a human to eat and their warm blood to drink. Having heard this, the bodhisattva immediately agrees to offer himself as food in order to hear the other half of the verse. Seeing his determination, the demon agrees to reveal the full verse and says, “Having arisen, they cease: Their appeasement is blissful.” Then the demon reminds the bodhisattva of the agreement. The bodhisattva then climbs a tree, intending to throw himself off it. After he jumps from the tree, Śakra reveals his true form and gently carries the bodhisattva to the ground (T 12 no. 374 pp. 449c2–451b5).

There are clearly some points in common between this jātaka found in the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa sūtra and the story of Sadāprurudita. First, the inability of the bodhisattva brahman in this jātaka to find Mahāyāna sūtras, and not being able to even hear the name of a vaipulya text is similar to the account in the Sadāprurudita story when the Bodhisattva Sadāprurudita was unable to

various Buddhist texts, of which the Pali version can be found in the DN II 157, aniccā vata samkhārā, uppādavayadhanno, uppaṭṭitvā nirujjhanti tesam vāpasamo sukho. See also DN II 199; Jā I 392; Ap I 64; Ap II 385. Other sources that contain this verse include T 1 no. 7 p. 204c23–24; T 2 no. 100 p. 435a16–17; T 2 no. 100 p. 489b2–3; T 3 no. 189 p. 623c21–22; T 4 no. 203 p. 470a5–12; T 14 no. 456 p. 430b24–25; T 24 no. 1451 pp. 399c29–400a1.

211 This translation follows Bodhi (2000: 94). See footnote 210 for references to other examples of this verse in Pali and Chinese.
encounter a buddha, the Dharma or a monk, a feature that is found in the Aṣṭa-L,\textsuperscript{212} Aṣṭa-Zh,\textsuperscript{213} and the jātaka form of the story in the \textit{Liù dù jí jīng} 六度集經.\textsuperscript{214} In addition, the description of the brahman living a meditative life and surviving on fruits is parallel to the description of the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita living in the mountain and subsisting on mountain water and wild fruits encountered in the jātaka form of the story in the \textit{Liù dù jí jīng} 六度集經.\textsuperscript{215} Moreover, the scenario found in the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa sūtra jātaka in which Śakra disguises himself as a demon in order to test the bodhisattva’s resolution finds a counterpart in the Sadāprarudita story in the episode of Śakra transforming himself into a young brahman for the sake of testing Sadāprarudita’s resolution. Apart from the similarities above, both narratives also convey the same motif of self-sacrifice undertaken in order to learn the Dharma. It is uncommon in jātaka stories to find bodhisattvas sacrificing themselves for the sake of learning the Dharma. More commonly we read of a bodhisattva performing bodily self-sacrifice for the purpose of benefiting other beings.\textsuperscript{216}

In summary, various episodes of the story of Sadāprarudita have parallels in other unrelated stories. Some of these narratives, such as the jātaka story of King Śibi and Sujātā giving assistance to Śākyamuni, are encountered in early

\textsuperscript{212} T 8 no. 224 p. 470c27–p. 471a2.
\textsuperscript{213} T 8 no. 225 p. 503c24–p. 504a1.
\textsuperscript{214} T 3 no. 152 p. 43a14–20.
\textsuperscript{215} T 3 no. 152 p. 43a25–26.
\textsuperscript{216} Ohnuma (2007: 273–283) provides a list of gift-of-the-body jātakas with details of their references. Although they may not completely cover all of such kinds of stories, the motif of the stories on the list is about bodily self-sacrifice for the sake of benefiting beings rather than learning the Dharma.
Buddhist literature and therefore may have contributed to the story of Sadāprārudita. It seems clear that the jātaka in the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa sūtra post-dates the story of Sadāprārudita. Nevertheless, both have the same motif of self-sacrifice for the sake of learning the Dharma, which is not commonly seen in jātaka or avadāna collections belonging to the early Buddhist traditions, such as the Theravāda or Sarvāstivāda, and could be, to a certain extent, regarded as a unique feature of Mahāyāna narratives.217

3.4. PROVENANCE AND DATE

It is well known that in Mahāyāna Buddhism prajñāpāramitā (perfection of insight) is one of the practices of the six pāramitās, which plays the crucial role of guidance on the Bodhisattva Path. Among Mahāyāna sūtras a specific group of sūtras are centred on the teaching of prajñāpāramitā. Traditionally in Chinese

217 The jātaka story on self-sacrifice for the sake of learning the second half of the verse just discussed is also briefly mentioned in Xuánzàng’s records of his journey when describing the environment of the Hila Mountains in Udyāna (T 51 no. 2087 p. 882c20–883a1). Similar stories that possess quite different episodes can be found in the following sources: T 4 no. 202 p. 349a6–b23; T 4 no. 200 pp. 218c15–219, b17; T 3 no. 152 p. 32a20–b16. In addition, there is another story about self-sacrifice for the sake of the Dharma. In one of the Buddha’s previous lives, he was a sage who sought the right Dharma. One day a brahman who claims to have the Dharma came to him. The sage delightedly asks the brahman to teach him the Dharma. The brahman agrees on the condition that he uses his bone and blood to transcribe what he teaches. The sage willingly agrees to the brahman’s request and uses his bone and blood to transcribe the teaching as it is given. See T 4 no. 202 p. 351b12–c5 for the details of the story. This story is also mentioned by Xuánzàng in his journal when he visited a stūpa in Udyāna (T 51 no. 2087 p. 883a11–13).
Buddhism this category of sūtras has become more significant with the term *prajñāpāramitā* as a part of the title of such texts.\(^{218}\)

Much scholarship has focused on the development of *prajñāpāramitā* sūtras, and many great scholars have contributed their significant research to this area. Among them, on the one hand, some scholars claim that the smaller versions of *prajñāpāramitā* sūtras were really excerpts of larger ones. For example, some argue that the text in 8,000 ślokas (*Aṣṭa*) was excerpted from the text in 25,000 ślokas (*Pañcaviṃśati*). On the other hand, some argue that the text in 8,000 ślokas was formed earlier and subsequently expanded to the text in 25,000 ślokas.\(^{219}\) For example, Edward Conze (1973: xi) asserts that the text in 8,000 ślokas, or rather its precursor, was expanded into 10,000 (*Daśasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā* sūtra), 18,000 (*Aṣṭādaśa*), 25,000 (*Pañcaviṃśati*), and 100,000 (*Śata*) ślokas,\(^{220}\) while Shiomi Tōrudō 鹽見徹堂 (1933: 102–120) claims that the direction of the development of the *prajñāpāramitā* sūtras is from the large to the short.\(^{221}\) In terms of the development among the *prajñāpāramitā* sūtras in 8,000, 18,000, 25,000, and 100,000 ślokas, it seems more likely that the process was from a

\(^{218}\) Zhīshēng 智昇 in his *Kāiyuán shì jiào lù* 開元釋教錄 (*Buddhist Catalogue Composed During the Era of Kāiyuán*, T 55 no. 2154), composed in 730 CE, started to classify all Mahāyāna sūtras into several categories according to their contents, beginning with the category of *Prajñā*, that is, prior to other categories. It is said, he explains, that *Prajñāpāramitā* sūtra is “the mother of all buddhas” (*T* 55 no. 2154 p. 582b11). Huimin 惠敏 (2002: 18) states that this taxonomy has been followed by later traditional Buddhist catalogues.

\(^{219}\) Kajiyoshi 1980: 221–234 has well summarised the Japanese scholarship regarding the arguments on the two different directions of the development of *prajñāpāramitā* sūtras.


\(^{221}\) This idea may be traced back to Hikata Ryūshō 干瀨龍祥 (1914: 51–62). However, much latter he rejected his previous view and come to regard the *Aṣṭa* as being earlier than the larger versions (Hikata 1958: xxix–xxxvi).
concise to an extensive style.\textsuperscript{222} Regardless of the passage of development, these texts can be regarded as a group based on the common contents of \textit{prajñāpāramitā}.\textsuperscript{223}

3.4.1. THE REGION WHERE THE SADĀPRARUDITA STORY WAS ADDED TO

\textbf{PRAJÑĀPĀRAMITĀ SŪTRAS}

The story mentions at various points the location of a city, Gandhavatī. If we take this to be purely mythical in nature or simply referring to a location within the Buddhist cosmology, then in terms of extracting historical elements there is not much more information that can be realistically gathered.\textsuperscript{224} However

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{222} Kajiyoshi (1980: 207–565) examines the direction of this development by reviewing the records in ancient Chinese and Indian literature, modern scholarship, and a thorough comparison of the contents in the Đào xìng bānruò jīng 道行般若經 and the Făng guāng bānruò jīng 放光般若經, including their parallels. Based on a thorough analysis, including the findings of his original research published in 1944, he argues that the most likely direction of the development among the \textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtras in 8,000, 18,000, 25,000, and 100,000 ślokas, is from a concise style to an extensive one, that is, from 8,000 to 100,000 ślokas. Saigusa (1983: 102) discusses this issue and states that this debate had lasted for more than a thousand years until the publication of such thorough research as contained in Kajiyoshi’s (1944) work, and that henceforth the debate should come to a close.

\item \textsuperscript{223} According to Kajiyoshi’s research, \textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtras developed from the \textit{Aṣṭa} and the process is as follows. 1. Original \textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtra → 2. The system of Đào xìng bānruò jīng 道行般若經 (\textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtra in 8,000 ślokas and its parallels) → 3. The system of Făng guāng bānruò jīng 放光般若經 (\textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtra in 18,000 ślokas and its parallels, including 25,000 ślokas) → 4. The system of the \textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtra in 100,000 ślokas (Kajiyoshi 1980: 726). The original \textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtra refers to the first chapter of the \textit{Aṣṭa} (See Kajiyoshi 1980: 568). The system of Đào xìng bānruò jīng 道行般若經 includes the \textit{Aṣṭa} and its translations in Chinese and Tibetan (see Kajiyoshi 1980: 40–96; Saigusa 1983: 109–111). The system of the Făng guāng bānruò jīng 放光般若經 refers to the \textit{Aṣṭa} and the \textit{Pañcavimśati}, including their translations in Chinese and Tibetan (see Kajiyoshi 1980: 97–111; Saigusa 1983: 111–113). The system of the \textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtra in 100,000 ślokas refers to the \textit{Śata} and its translations in Chinese and Tibetan (see Kajiyoshi 1980: 112–114; Saigusa 1983: 113).

\item \textsuperscript{224} Interestingly, Lamotte (1944: 25) takes the accounts of the movement of the \textit{prajñāpāramitā} teachings in a purely mythological way. He points out that the accounts
\end{itemize}
if we apply the principle of irrelevance,\textsuperscript{225} then perhaps from the accounts of this city we may garner some geographical information. Such information could help locate the place where the story of Sadāprarudita was incorporated into the sūtras. For example, in the beginning of the story Sadāprarudita was instructed to go to Gandhavatī where he could hear the teaching of \textit{prajñāpāramitā} taught by the great teacher Dharmodgata.\textsuperscript{226} Étienne Lamotte (1954: 381–386) proposes that Gandhavatī may refer to the ancient Buddhist centre of Gandhāra. Cài Yàomíng 蔡耀明 (1998: 80–83) criticises this view, stating that Gandhavatī may not necessarily have a connection to Gandhāra in the north-west of India. His main argument is that Gandhavatī is described as a city in the east rather than in the north-west. He further argues that this story, as described in the \textit{Aṣṭa-L} for example, is set \textit{nāi wǎng jiǔ yuǎn shì} 乃往久遠世\textsuperscript{227} “a time long long ago.” It is noteworthy that in the \textit{Aṣṭa-L} the city’s name was transcribed as Jiàntuóyuè 捷陀越, and Ji Xiànlín 季羡林 (1985: 234) points out that in some Chinese historical or

\begin{itemize}
  \item should be viewed simply as iterations of a great cosmic circumambulation (akin to that performed by the cakravartin’s wheel of Dharma, or by certain buddha relics). From a religious perspective, such an interpretation emphasises the significance of the \textit{prajñāpāramitā} teachings, representing the right Dharma of the Buddha. See the discussion below in this section for details on the itinerary of the \textit{prajñāpāramitā} teachings.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{225} See § 2.4.2

\textsuperscript{226} \ldots kulaputra \ldots pūrvam eva disam gaccha asti kulapuretha pañcabhir yojanaśatiair Gandhavatī nāma nagari \ldots tasya ivam kulaputra Dharmodgatasya bodhisattvasya mahāsattvasyaśāntikam gaccha tataḥ śroṣyati prajñāpāramitām (\textit{Aṣṭa} [ed. Wogihara 1932–1935] 932.10–36.19). “\ldots O son of good family, go east! Five hundred yojanas away from here, O son of good family, there is a city named Gandhavatī.\ldots You, O son of good family, go to that Bodhisattva Dharmodgata, the great being. There you will hear the \textit{prajñāpāramitā}.” See also T 6 no. 220 pp. 1060b24–1061b15; T 8 no. 221 p. 142a12–c10; T 8 no. 223 p. 417a3–c7; T 8 no. 224 pp. 471b23–472a17; T 8 no. 225 p. 504b7–c5; T 8 no. 227 pp. 580c20–581b18; T 8 no. 228 p. 669a17–c25.

\textsuperscript{227} T 8 no. 224 p. 470c25.
geographical sources, transcribed terms such as Jiàntuówèi or Jiàntuóyuè, were used to refer to the region of Gandhāra. He proposes that these transcribed terms were based on the Sanskrit, Gandhavat.\(^{228}\) Therefore, according to Ji, Gandhāra was also known as Gandhavatī in some Chinese historical or geographical sources. It is by no means certain whether the name Gandhavatī in the story refers to Gandhāra, as proposed by Lamotte, or merely is a city of a similarly sounding name. However, it is possible that these sūtras contain some historical information. For example, Sylvain Lévi (1905: 261–305) indicates that the *Yuèzāng fěn* (Moon Treasury Section)\(^{229}\) of the *Dà fāngděng dà jí jìng* (Great Extensive Scripture of the Great Assembly)\(^{230}\) mentions the names of fifty-five kingdoms of India, Central Asia, and China, such as Qiánťuóluó (Gandhāra), Yútián (Khotan), and Zhèndànhánguó (China).

There is a noteworthy description with reference to the transmission of *prajñāpāramitā* sūtras in the *Aṣṭā*:

\[
\textit{ime khalu punah śāriputra śatpāramitāpratisaṁyuktāḥ sūtrāntās}
\]
\[
tathāgatasātyayena daksināpathe pracarisyanti daksināpathāt punar
\]
\[
eva vartanyāṁ pracarisyanti, vartanyāḥ punar uttarapate
\]

\(^{228}\) See Ji 1985: 234.
\(^{229}\) The corresponding Sanskrit title given by Lévi (1905: 261) is *Candragarbha* sūtra.
Formation of the Story of Sadāprudita

pracarisyanti navamaṇḍaprāpte dharmavinaye

Moreover, Śāriputra, these sūtras associated with the six perfections, after the passing away of the Tathāgata, will spread in the south. From the south they will spread to the east and from there to the north at the time when the Dharma-Vinaya is like freshly made cream right up to the period when the good Dharma disappears.

This description claims that the prajñāpāramitā sūtras initially spread in the south of India, it then disseminates to eastern India and then to the north. Many scholars take this account as evidence to support the argument that the prajñāpāramitā sūtras originated from the south of India as all accounts begin the itinerary from the south, except the Dà ming dù jīng 大明度經 which begin the itinerary from Shìshì guó 酋氏國 (the kingdom of the clan of Śākya).\textsuperscript{231} However, Lamotte (1944: 25) argues that even if there is sufficient evidence to believe that the prajñāpāramitā sūtras originated from the south of India, taking this itinerary as the basis for such an argument is questionable.\textsuperscript{232} Although this itinerary may

\textsuperscript{231} For references of these scholars’ arguments, see Lamotte 1944: 25.
\textsuperscript{232} Lamotte (1944: 25–26) based on various versions of prajñāpāramitā sūtras in Chinese or Sanskrit, points out that the itinerary through which prajñāpāramitā spread is mixed. He mentions five approaches, which can be found in the prajñāpāramitā sūtras:

(1) South→West→North;
(2) South→North;
(3) South→East→North;
not be taken as evidence indicating where these Mahāyāna sūtras originated, it is reasonable to suggest that this is what the editor(s) of the prajñāpāramitā sūtras presumed about their spread. It is noteworthy that although the itineraries are inconsistent, all of them end in the north, except those in Xuánzàng’s translation, in which the north is followed by the north-east as the end point of the itinerary.²³³

Apart from the one exception, the consistent destination of the north might suggest that the place where the editor(s) compiled the texts was in northern India.

Following this point, it is notable that Lamotte highlights an account in the Dà zhì

(4) Shishi guó 釋氏國 (the kingdom of the clan of Śākyā)→ Huídūnī guó 會多尼國 (*Vartani, East)→ Yūdānyuē guó 接單曰國 (*Uttaravati, North);
(5) South-east→South→South-west→North-west→North→North-east.

Lamotte’s analysis does not include some Chinese versions and the Pañcavimśati. In fact, there is another itinerary: South→North→North-east (T 7 no. 220 pp. 889c25–890a11). The various itineraries, together with related references from the prajñāpāramitā sūtras, are presented as follows.

(1) South→West→North:
- Mōhē bānruòbōluòmí jīng 摩訶般若波羅蜜經 (T 8 no. 223 p. 317b6–c15).
- Dào xíng bānruò jīng 道行般若經 (T 8 no. 224 p. 446a25–b9).
- Xiǎo pín bānruòbōluòmí jīng 小品般若波羅蜜經 (T 8 no. 227 p. 555a22–b6).
- Fǒ mǔ chǔshěng sān jāzāng bānruòbōluòmíduō jīng 佛母出生三法藏般若波羅蜜多經 (T 08 no. 228 p. 623b2–9).

(2) South→North:
- Fāng guāng bānruò jīng 放光般若經 (T 8 no. 221 p. 72a2–17).

(3) South→East→North:

(4) Shishi guó 釋氏國 (the kingdom of the clan of Śākyā)→ Huídūnī guó 會多尼國 (*Vartani, East)→ Yūdānyuē guó 接單曰國 (*Uttaravati, North):
- Dà míng dù jīng 大明度經 (T 8 no. 225 p. 490a22–28).

(5) South-east→South→South-west→North-west→North→North-east:
- Dà bānruò jīng (chū huì) 大般若經 (初會) (T 6 no. 220 pp. 538b13–539b10).
- Dà bānruò jīng (dì èr huì) 大般若經 (第二會) (T 7 no. 220 pp. 212c28–213c25).
- Dà bānruò jīng (dì sān huì) 大般若經 (第三會) (T 7 no. 220 pp. 593c21–594b24).
- Dà bānruò jīng (dì sì huì) 大般若經 (第四會) (T 7 no. 220 pp. 808b21–809a13).

(6) South→North→North-east:
- Dà bānruò jīng (dì wǔ huì) 大般若經 (第五會) (T 7 no. 220 pp. 889c25–890a11).

²³³ The account “north-east” comes after the north and may, perhaps, be interpreted as a further spread of the sūtras towards Central Asia or even further, to China, at a later time.
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*dù lùn* 大智度論 (*The Treatise on the [Sutra of] Great Perfection of Insight*), in which the north (*uttarapatha*) may include the north-west area. The commentary recounts:


[As for] “This profound *prajñāpāramitā* [sūtra], after the Buddha’s passing away, will spread in the south” … “[As for the *prajñāpāramitā* sūtra] then will spread to the north” … Moreover, there are the Snowy Mountains in the northern area. On account of the cold in the Snowy Mountains, herbs there are able to cure most diseases and the rice that is consumed can help people tame the three poisons [of mental factors]. Due to the three poisonous [mental factors] being under control, people are so mild and pliable that the “five faculties” (*pañcendriyāṇi*),

234 “Five faculties” (五根) usually refers to 信等五根, which literally means “the five faculties which begin with faith.” They include śraddhā (faith), vīrya (diligence), smṛti (mindfulness), samādhi (concentration), and *prajñā* (insight), which are five spiritual faculties in this context, as stated, for example, in the *Samyutta-nikāya*: *pañcimāni bhikkhave indriyāni. katamāni pañca. saddhindriyaṃ viriyindriyaṃ satindriyaṃ samādhindriyaṃ paññindriyaṃ. imāni kho bhikkhave pañcindriyāṇī ti.* (*SN* V 193 [48.1]) There are, O bhikkhus, five faculties. What five? The faculty of faith, the faculty of energy, the faculty of mindfulness, the faculty of concentration, the faculty of insight. These indeed, O bhikkhus, are the five faculties.

For more texts regarding the five faculties, see the *Indriyasamyutta* (*SN* V 193–243).
developed. Because of these conditions, \textit{prajñāpāramitā} [sūtras] are predominant in the north.

In a previous passage of the commentary, it specifies that there is a lake named Ānāpódāduō 阿那婆達多 (Skt. *Anavatapta, Lamotte 1944: 450) in the Snowy Mountains located in the northern area.\footnote{北邊雪山中，有阿那婆達多池 … (T 25 no. 1509 p. 114a15; Lamotte 1944: 450).} Xuánzàng also mentions this lake,\footnote{The transcribed term by Xuánzàng is Ānāpódāduō 阿那婆達多. Jì (1985: 41) reconstructs the Sanskrit term as Anavatapta.} in his travel journal \textit{Dà táng xīyù jì} 大唐西域記 (The Great Tang Records of the Western Region), which is between the south of Xiāngshān 香山 (Fragrant Mountains)\footnote{Jì (1985: 41) notes that the Fragrant Mountains refer to the Onion Mountains (or Pamir Mountains). In short, according to the commentary, the Snowy Mountains are included in \textit{uttarapatha}, in which there is a lake named *Anavatapta. Therefore, it seems reasonable to conclude that the Great Snowy Mountains here broadly refers to the Himalayas (perhaps only part of the mountains as the Himalayas are mostly outside the north-west) or Hindu Kush Mountains, which are incorporated in the so-called north-west.} and the north of Dàxuěshān 大雪山 (Great Snowy Mountains). Jì (1985: 41) notes that the Fragrant Mountains refer to the Onion Mountains (or Pamir Mountains). In short, according to the commentary, the Snowy Mountains are included in \textit{uttarapatha}, in which there is a lake named *Anavatapta. Therefore, it seems reasonable to conclude that the Great Snowy Mountains here broadly refers to the Himalayas (perhaps only part of the mountains as the Himalayas are mostly outside the north-west) or Hindu Kush Mountains, which are incorporated in the so-called north-west.

Based on the above discussions the account regarding Sadāprarudita’s study of \textit{prajñāpāramitā} and the itinerary of the spread of the \textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtras suggest that the story has strong connections to the north-west of India. Thus, it is possible that the story was added to the \textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtras when
they spread to the north-west of India. Though this proposition is by no means certain, given the information available, the north-west seems to be a plausible option.

3.4.2. The Date of the Inclusion of the Story of Sadāprudita in the Prajñāpāramitā Sūtras

Some scholars have argued that the story of Sadāprudita’s search for prajñāpāramitā was added to the prajñāpāramitā sūtra in 8,000 ślokas and its parallels after the main parts were already formed. This raises the interesting questions of when the story was added to the prajñāpāramitā sūtras. The following discussion aims to answer this question.

---

238 There may be another way to interpret the mention of the city Gandhavatī, which is to take the description as purely mythological—a kind of pure land, heaven or cakravartin’s city. In this way, the account regarding the city Gandhavatī in the east, for example, may be seen as a parallel to Akṣobhya’s land, named Abhirati, which is “far to the east” (Nattier 2004: 13). For further information about the Buddha Akṣobhya and his land, see Nattier (2000: 71–102).

239 It is notable that the venues of some jātaka stories in Xuánzàng’s journal record, Dà tang xīyù jì 大唐西域記 are associated with the places where he heard them, which differ from their parallels found in other sources. For example, when Xuánzàng visited a stūpa established by King Aśoka in Gandhāra, he mentioned the Ekaśṛṅga jātaka, and the region of the stūpa is where the Ekaśṛṅga used to dwell (T 51 no. 2087 p. 881b27). However, the venue in its parallels, found in the chapter on Saṃghabhedaavastu (Matters regarding the Schism of the Monks) of the Mūlasarvāstivādinayava (T 24 no. 1450) and the Dà zhī dì lùn 大智度論 (T 25 no. 1509) for example, is associated with Vārānasī (T 24 no. 1450 p. 161b9; T 25 no. 1509 p. 183b6), rather than Gandhāra. The jātaka no. 526 in the Pali cannon, which is parallel to the Ekaśṛṅga narrative, also relates the venue to Vārānasī (Jā V 193). Thus, this indicates that there was a process by which jātaka stories from distant locations, were reinterpreted and localised to new regions. This is in contrast to the situation where, in the new Buddhist regions of the north-west, new jātaka stories arose through the acclimitisation of local legends (Lamotte 1988: 366–367).

3.4.2.1. Evidence that the Story of Sadāprudita is a New Addition to the Prajñāpāramitā Sūtras

Table 3.1 below presents a comparison of the two extant translations of the prajñāpāramitā sūtras namely:

(1) Dào xíng bānruò jīng 道行般若經 (Sutra on [Perfection of] Insight: Proceeding on the Way; a Chinese translation in 8,000 ślokas, translated by Lokakṣema, ca. the late second century CE), and

(2) Fàng guāng bānruò jīng 放光般若經 (Sutra on [Perfection of] Insight: Illumination; a Chinese translation in 18,000 ślokas, translated by Mokṣala, ca. the late third century CE).

The comparison shows that the core section where both versions show alignment is section 2. Where there are no corresponding chapters, these are presented in bold font. Chapters 19–21 in the system with 18,000 ślokas can be regarded as more recent additions.

---

241 This title is derived from the heading of the first chapter Fàng guāng 放光 (Illumination).
242 According to the colophon of this sūtra, collected in the classical catalogue of Buddhist texts, Chū sānzàng jì jí 出三藏記集 (A Collection of Records on the Translated Tripitaka), the Sanskrit (or Prakrit) text possesses liùshí wàn yǔ yán 六十萬餘言 (more than six hundred thousand syllabic characters or akṣaras). As each line consists of 32 syllables, this is approximately equivalent to eighteen thousand lines. T 55 no. 2145 p. 47c13.
### Table 3.1 Comparison of the 道行般若経 Dào xíng bānruò jīng and the 方光般若經 Fàng guāng bānruò jīng

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>道行般若経 Dào xíng bānruò jīng (system in 8,000 ślokas, T 8 no. 224)</th>
<th>方光般若経 Fàng guāng bānruò jīng (system in 18,000 ślokas, T 8 no. 221)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
<td>Ch. 1 Illumination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch. 8 Light of Tongue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ch. 1 Proceeding on the Way</td>
<td>Ch. 9 Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch. 18 Sannāha-sannaddha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch. 19 Questions regarding Mahāyāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch. 20 Dhāraṇī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch. 21 Development of Stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch. 22 Questions regarding the departure of the Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch. 27 Questions regarding Contemplation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ch. 2 Questions [of Śakra]</td>
<td>Ch. 28 Non-appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ch. 26 Boundlessness</td>
<td>Ch. 68 Boundlessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ch. 27 To Follow Suit</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
<td>Ch. 69 Interactions among the Six- pāramitās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch. 87 All Phenomena as Magical Delusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ch. 28 Sadāprarudita</td>
<td>Ch. 88 Sadāprarudita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ch. 29 Dharmodgata</td>
<td>Ch. 89 Dharmodgata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ch. 30 Entrusting</td>
<td>Ch. 90 Entrusting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though it is claimed that the prajñāpāramitā sūtra of the system of 18,000 ślokas developed from that of the system of 8,000 ślokas, the later system did not absorb the full contents of the previous version. Kajiyoshi Kōun 梶芳光運 (1980: 723–724), for example, indicates that Chapter 27 “To Follow Suit” in the Dào xíng bānruò jīng 道行般若經 has no corresponding part in the Fàng guāng bānruò jīng 放光般若經. He proposes that this may be because it was added to the 8,000 ślokas system after the system of 18,000 ślokas had been completed. The following account in a Chinese translation by Kumārajīva, belonging to the system of 8,000 ślokas, provides evidence to support this inference. In this text, Chapter 25 “Seeing Akṣobhya Buddha” (which is consistent with Ch. 26 “Boundlessness” in the Dào xíng bānruò jīng 道行般若經) says:

説是法時，諸比丘眾，一切大會天、人、阿修羅，皆大歡喜。^{244}

When the Dharma was being taught, all monks and the other assembly, including gods, humankind, and asuras delighted [in the Buddha’s teaching].

This is a formal ending of a sūtra. Moreover, not long before this description, the Buddha entrusted and transmitted the perfection of insight to

---

^{244} T 8 no. 227 p. 579b10–11. See also the translation by Xuánzàng T 7 no. 220 (5) p. 920b13–16. In Xuánzàng’s other translation of the system of 8,000 ślokas, such an account occurs at the end of the chapter “To Follow Suit” (T 7 no. 220 (4) p. 865a22–26). This suggests that the chapter was added to the sūtra before the story. In the two versions translated by Xuánzàng, moreover, the story of Sadāprudita is not included.
Ānanda,\textsuperscript{245} which is also a common concluding element in sūtras. Obviously, these accounts suggest that Ch. 26 may have originally been the ending of the text. Therefore, the development of the prajñāpāramitā sūtra of 8,000 ślokas, based on the Chinese Āṣṭa translated by Lokakṣema as the example, may have followed two approaches. One possibility could be that it was revised after the completion of the system of 18,000 ślokas. The other possibility is that in the development from the 8,000 ślokas to the 18,000 ślokas, not all of the contents were incorporated. However, Nattier (2003: 59–61) considers that shrinkage in the development of a text is less likely.\textsuperscript{246}

The headings of the last three chapters of both translations are consistent. They are: Ch. 28 “Sadāprarudita,” Ch. 29 “Dharmodgata,” and Ch. 30 “Parīndanā.”\textsuperscript{247} Among these three concluding chapters, the main part is Ch. 28 “Sadāprarudita” and Ch. 29 “Dharmodgata” which contain the story concerning the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita who goes to see the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata in order to learn prajñāpāramitā. The last chapter is about entrusting the teaching to disciples, which is part of a formal conclusion in sūtras.

\textsuperscript{245} See T 8 no. 227 pp. 577c18–578a28 for the details.
\textsuperscript{246} This issue of shrinkage and the exceptions will be canvassed in Chapter 7.
\textsuperscript{247} Although the heading of the last chapter of both translations is “Parīndanā” (entrusting) the contents are quite different.
3.4.2.2. SCHOLARSHIP ON THE ADDITION OF THE SADĀPRARUDITA STORY TO

PRAJÑĀPĀRAMITĀ SŪTRAS

Since both the prajñāpāramitā sūtra system in 8,000 ślokas and 18,000 ślokas possess the story of Sadāprarudita, this raises an interesting question: If the contents after Ch. 26 in the Dào xíng bānruò jīng 道行般若經 were newly added after the system of 18,000 ślokas was formed, how is it that both systems possess the same concluding chapters? Kajiyoshi (1980: 723–724) states that it is difficult to ascertain if the story of Sadāprarudita was added into the text in 8,000 ślokas earlier than the text in 18,000 ślokas or vice versa. Yīnshùn (1981: 669–673) argues that there is some evidence that shows the story in the system of prajñāpāramitā sūtra in 8,000 ślokas could have been adopted from the system of prajñāpāramitā sūtra in 18,000 ślokas as the story possesses some features that belong to the system of prajñāpāramitā sūtra in 18,000 ślokas only. In other words, the story was at first systematically added into the system of prajñāpāramitā sūtra in 18,000 ślokas and after that the editor(s) of the system of prajñāpāramitā sūtra in 8,000 ślokas also incorporated the story into their text. Take for example the Dào xíng bānruò jīng 道行般若經, where the introduction of the story yields some inconsistencies between the story and the other parts of the Dào xíng bānruò jīng 道行般若經. Yīnshùn provides the following four points to support this argument:
(1) The term *dhāraṇī* is mentioned in the story of Sadāprudita.²⁴⁸ However, there is no content related to *dhāraṇī* in the chapters before the story in the system of *prajñāpāramitā* sūtra in 8,000 ślokas. On the other hand, *dhāraṇī* is a component of the bodhisattva’s practice, which is taught in the system of *prajñāpāramitā* sūtra in 18,000 ślokas.²⁴⁹

(2) There are two lists of the names of *samādhis* that appear in the story of Sadāprudita. Similar content regarding series of *samādhis* is seen in the system of *prajñāpāramitā* sūtra in 18,000 ślokas, but no corresponding account in the system of 8,000 ślokas.²⁵⁰ This is shown in the Table 3.2.

---

²⁴⁸ For example, having received the admonishment from a tathāgata, the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita thought to himself:

ārjo dharmodgato bodhisattvo mahāsattvo dhāraṇīpratilabdhah pañcābhiṣjaḥ…

(Aṣṭa [ed. Wogihara 1932–1935] 943.29–944.1). “The noble Bodhisattva Dharmodgata, a great being, who has acquired the *dhāraṇīs*, possesses the five transcendental knowledges …”

See also Conze’s (1973: 283) translation; T 8 no. 227 p. 582a10–13; T 8 no. 228 p. 670c11–15. In Lokakṣema’s translation, the corresponding place lacks this description, while the concept of *dhāraṇī* is mentioned in a latter part of the story (See T 8, no 224 p. 477a27–29). Interestingly, both corresponding places of the story in Zhī Qiān’s translation lack the concept of *dhāraṇī* completely.

²⁴⁹ See T 8 no. 221 pp. 26b12–27a12; T 8 no. 222 pp. 195c17–196b6; T 8 no. 223 p. 256a6–b28; T 7 no. 220 pp. 81c8–82b16; T 7 no. 220 pp. 489b16–490a26 for the account concerning *dhāraṇī*.

²⁵⁰ Yinshùn (1981: 670) here gives a concise explanation for this point, which is not easy to understand. Here I have tried to provide further elaboration to clarify this point in Table 3.2.
Table 3.2 Comparison of common parts in the *Đào xíng bānruò jīng* 道行般若經

and the *Fàng guāng bānruò jīng* 放光般若經

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Đào xíng bānruò jīng 道行般若經 (system in 8,000 ślokas, T 8 no. 224 pp. 425c8–426a2)</th>
<th>Fàng guāng bānruò jīng 放光般若經 (system in 18,000 ślokas, T 8 no. 221 pp. 11a23–13c9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ch. 1 Proceeding on the Way&lt;br&gt;The Buddha instructs the Venerable Subhūti to teach bodhisattvas regarding perfection of insight.</td>
<td>Ch. 9 Proceeding&lt;br&gt;The Buddha instructs the Venerable Subhūti to teach bodhisattvas regarding perfection of insight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subhūti says that he does not see that dharma Bodhisattva, nor a dharma called perfection of insight …</td>
<td>Subhūti says that he does not see that dharma Bodhisattva, nor a dharma called perfection of insight …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ch. 10 Study&lt;br&gt;No parallel</td>
<td>Series of names of <em>samādhi</em>&lt;br&gt;Contemplation among eighteen kinds of Emptiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That thought is no thought, since in its essential original nature thought is transparently luminous. ……</td>
<td>That thought is no thought, since in its essential original nature thought is transparently luminous. ……</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) In the story of Sadāprudita (Ch. 27 of the *Xiǎo pīn bānruòbōluómì jīng* 小品般若波羅蜜經, belonging to the system in 8,000 ślokas) the items concerning a buddha’s virtue are great loving-kindness (*mahāmaitri*), great compassion (*mahākaruṇā*), great appreciative joy (*mahāmuditā*), great equanimity (*mahopeksā*), ten powers (*daśa-*)
formation of the story of Sadāprudita) (aṣṭādaśävenika-buddha-dharmāḥ). Everywhere else in the Xiào pín bānrǔòbōluòmì jīng 小品般若波羅蜜經, the items of a buddha’s virtues only consist of the ten powers (daśa-balāni), four confidences (catvāri vaiśāradyāni), and eighteen unique Dharmas. On the other hand, the list of a buddha’s virtues found in Kumārajīva’s Chinese translation of a prajñāpāramitā sūtra belonging to the system of 18,000 ślokas is consistent with the list found in the story.

(4) The most significant evidence is that the general attitude of the teaching in the story of Sadāprudita is that a practitioner can adeptly live with desires as skilful means. This attitude is opposite to that of the other part of the Dào xíng bānrǔò jīng 道行般若經, but consistent with the teaching in a certain part of the Fàng guāng bānrǔò jīng 放光般若經.

In short, as the story possesses some features that are consistent with the contents of the Fàng guāng bānrǔò jīng 放光般若經, such as dhāraṇī and the list of names of samādhis, which do not exist in the Dào xíng bānrǔò jīng 道行般若經 except in the content of the story, Yìnshùn suggests that the story was incorporated into Fàng guāng bānrǔò jīng 放光般若經 first when it was formed and then into the Dào xíng bānrǔò jīng 道行般若經. According to Yìnshùn’s (1981: 701–702) inference, the date that Fàng guāng bānrǔò jīng 放光般若經 was
formed is somewhere between 50 and 150 CE,\(^{251}\) which is also when the story of Sadāprarudita was added into the text.

Based on Yinshùn’s estimation of the compilation dates of the \textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtras in 8,000 ślokas and 18,000 ślokas, the system of \textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtra in 8,000 ślokas may have formed sometime between the early first century and the early second century CE, but was subsequently revised to incorporate the story of Sadāprarudita that was originally found in the system of 18,000 ślokas (Figure 3.1). Although Yinshùn’s deduction is reasonable, there is evidence that suggests another more likely process by which the story of Sadāprarudita was incorporated into the \textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtras, that is, the story was incorporated into the \textit{Dào xíng bănruò jīng} 道行般若經 and into the \textit{Fàng

\(^{251}\) The process by which Yinshùn establishes his inferences is quite complex. The following is a concise summary of his ideas. Yinshùn states that the accurate date for when different \textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtras were formed cannot be established with certainty. However, it is possible to estimate the approximate time frame. Following Kajiyoshi’s (1980: 568–727) idea that the “original \textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtra” was formed prior to the \textit{Aṣṭa}, Yinshùn notes that the core contents of the original \textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtra are similar to the unique doctrine, 生死涅槃皆是假名 (T 45 no. 1852 p. 8c26–27) “birth and death, and \textit{nirvāṇa} are nothing but nominal designations,” advocated by the Ekavyāvahārika school (一說部, T 45 no. 1852 p. 8c25–27), one of the early Buddhist schools. He then assumes that the editor(s) of the original \textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtra could be connected to the Ekavyāvahārika or could have been influenced by Ekavyāvahārika’s unique doctrine. He assumes that the formation of the original \textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtra should thus not have been too far after the time of the eighteen early Buddhist schools (i.e. 100 BCE, see Yinshùn 1981: 343–353 for his conclusion concerning the date of the formation of early Buddhist schools). Thus, he assumes the formation of the original \textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtra was around 50 BCE. He then proposes that the original \textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtra developed into the \textit{Aṣṭa} over approximately a hundred year period, according to the expansion of the contents. Likewise, a reasonable time-span for the development of the \textit{Aṣṭa} into the \textit{Pañcavimśati} was also about a hundred years. Given the dates when these texts were introduced to China, he states that the times when these texts were formed should be no later than the dates suggested above. See Yinshùn (1981: 627–702) for the details of his inference concerning different \textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtras.
guāng bānruò jīng 放光般若经 independently and separately. This issue will be discussed in Chapter 4.

Hirakawa Akira 平川彰 (1974: 315–316) proposes that the story of Sadāprarudita was added into the Dào xíng bānruò jīng 道行般若經 in approximately the second half of the first century CE. This is because the story includes passages concerning the making of buddha images and thus must have been composed sometime during or after the last half of the first century CE, when images of the Buddha first appeared.

**Figure 3.1 Yinshùn’s inference on the development of the system of 8,000 ślokas**

The system of 8,000 ślokas
(prior to the addition of the content after Ch. 26)

The system of 18,000 ślokas
possessing the story of Sadāprarudita formed.
(ca. early second century CE)

Ch. 27 To Follow Suit
added. (after the system of 18,000 ślokas was formed)

The story of Sadāprarudita
from the system of 18,000 ślokas added.
3.4.2.3. FURTHER MATERIAL RELEVANT TO THE DATING OF THE SADĀPRARUDITA STORY

In addition to Yìnshùn and Hirakawa’s inferences mentioned above, there are several further notable accounts that may shed light on the dating for the addition of the Sadāprarudita story to these texts.

3.4.2.3.1. The earliest example of the inclusion of the Sadāprarudita story in a praṇāpāramitā sūtra

In the previous discussion, it is clear that the story of Sadāprarudita is a relatively recent addition to the praṇāpāramitā sūtras. In order to understand when the Sadāprarudita story was added to the Aṣṭa, we must have some idea of the likely date of the initial formation of the Aṣṭa, which may also be regarded as the earliest feasible date for the inclusion of the story of Sadāprarudita in a praṇāpāramitā sūtra. In the Aṣṭa, the copying, worship, and so on of such praṇāpāramitā sūtras is highly encouraged. For example, the sūtra says:

punar aparām kauśika yatreyaḥ praṇāpāramitā antaśo likhitvā
pustakagatāṁ kṛtvā pūjāpūrvaṅgamaṁ sthāpayitvā na satkarisyate
nodgrahīsyate, na dhārayisyate na vācayisyate na paryāvāpsyate na
pravartaiṣyate na deśaiṣyate nopadeksyate noddeksyate na
svādhyāsyate na tatra kauśika sattvānāṁ manuṣyo vā amanuṣyo vā
'vatārārthiko 'vatāragaveṣy avaṭāraṁ lapsyate sthāpayitvā
Further, O Kauśika, where this perfection of insight, is written down, made into a book, and set up for the purpose of honouring zealously (even though) it will not be treated well, will not be respected, will not be remembered, repeated, studied, will not cause [anyone] to hold onto good, will not cause [anyone] to teach, will not be explained, will not be shown, will not be meditated on, there, O Kauśika, of beings neither a human nor non-human, who is seeking and wanting an opportunity for hostile approach, will get any chance, except where there is results due to past deeds. That son or daughter of good family, O Kauśika, will completely obtain this merit in the present life.

The god Śakra is depicted questioning the Buddha:

\[
\text{evam ukte śakro devānām indro bhagavantam etad avocat yo}
\]
\[
\text{bhagavan kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā imāṃ prajñāpāramitāṃ likhitvā}
\]
\[
\text{pustaka-gatāṃ kṛtvā sthāpayed enāṃ ca divyābhiḥ}
\]
\[
\text{puspadhūpagandhamālya-}
\]

When it was thus said, Śakra, the chief of gods, said this to the Blessed One: “O Blessed One, suppose a son or daughter of good family, having written down this perfection of insight, made it into a book, would then set it up, and would treat it well, esteem it, respect it, revere it, worship it or adore it, with divine flowers, incense, fragrance, garlands, perfume, aromatic powder, robes, parasols, flags, bells, banners, with lamps and garlands on all sides, and with honours of many kinds. And suppose another would deposit in stūpas the relics of a tathāgata, and an arhat, a completely awakened one, completely liberated and he would take hold of them and preserve
them, and he in the same way would treat them well, regard them as
the guru, respect them, revere them, worship them, adore them, with
divine flowers, incense, fragrance, garlands, perfume, aromatic
powder, robes, parasols, flags, bells, banners, with lamps and
garlands on all sides, and with honours of many kinds. O Blessed
One, which one of the two, of a son or daughter of good family,
would beget the greater merit?”

After several rounds of questions and answers, the Buddha states in
conclusion that of these two it is the former, the one who copies, etc., the
prajñāpāramitā who begets the greater merit (ayam eva kauśika tayoḥ
kulaputrayoḥ kuladuhitror vā bahutaram puṇyam prasavet (Aṣṭa [ed. Wogihara
1932–1935] 211.12–18)).

These descriptions suggest that when the sūtra was compiled, the recording
of the Buddha’s teachings in writing may have just started as a way to spread or
preserve the teaching of perfection of insight efficiently. Therefore,
encouragement to write down the perfection of insight, to copy, worship it, etc.
was promoted by proclamation of their advantages and comparison of merit. It
was seen as beneficial to spread or preserve the teachings in written form.

254 See also Conze’s (1973: 106) translation; T 8 no. 224 p. 432a20–25; T 8 no. 225 p.
484a18–21; T 8 no. 226 p. 514b26–c3; T 8 no. 227 p. 542c1–6; T 8 no. 228 p. 596a21–25;
It is commonly accepted that the time when Buddhists might have first written down their texts depends on when writing was introduced into India. Tracking this link takes us back to the Indus Valley civilisation ca. 2000 BCE. Kenneth Norman (2006: 104) states that there are only a handful of inscriptions found in India, which have been claimed to be pre-Aśokan, but for which there is still no agreement among scholars regarding their dates. A probable explanation given by Norman (2006: 104), for this paucity of early examples of writing is that writing was initially used exclusively for administration and trading and then only later for religious or literary purposes, and that since it was unnecessary for the documents of administrators and merchants to last forever, they were written on ephemeral materials, and therefore perished.

Although Norman proposes that the date of the introduction of writing into India may have pre-dated Aśoka, the usage of writing in Buddhist communities does not appear to have been wide spread until the early first century BCE. According to Theravāda sources writing was first used on a large scale for the preservation of Buddhist texts in the first century BCE. According to the Pali

---

255 The following account is based on Norman (2006: 102), which is a review of von Hinüber’s (1989) research about the origin of the Brāhmī script. Von Hinüber’s research puts forward three views regarding the Brāhmī script, among which Norman supports the view that writing arose from the Indus Valley civilisation.

256 According to Falk (2011: 19), an avadāna collection in the “Split” Collection which is written on birch-bark scrolls in Gāndhārī using Kharoṣṭhī script has been radiocarbon dated to 184–46 BCE. This may be among the earliest surviving Buddhist manuscripts, which in part provide evidence that writing was relatively widespread among Buddhist communities in the north-west at this period.
tradition, which is based on the *Dīpavamsa* and *Mahāvamsa*. It is stated that during the reign of King Vaṭṭagāmiṇi, the Island of Ceylon was in constant danger of being attacked by foreigners who were not Buddhist. When these invasions were successful, the following period “proved to be a very dark one for Buddhism” (Adikaram 1994: 79). Wars and other forms of political unrest necessitated the abandoning of the chief centres of learning such as the Mahāvihāra. In addition, the Brāhmanatissa famine also made bhikkhus think of writing down the canon. Accordingly, between 29 and 17 BCE, theras assembled bhikkhus to compile the *tipiṭaka* in writing at the Āloka-vihāra, which was located in the Central Province, remote from Anurādhapura, the capital of King Vaṭṭagāmiṇi Abhaya. This is often used as a notable account of the writing down of Buddhist texts on a large scale (Norman 2006: 99). However, it is still possible that prior to this event, some sūtras were written down on pieces of bark or palm leaf for the purpose of transferring merit to others on a small scale.

---

257 *Dīp* XX 20–21 = *Mhv* XXXIII 100–101. Allon (1997: 3) points out that the Theravāda account that occurred first in the *Dīpavamsa* is extremely brief, that is, two verses only, based on which we do not know whether writing was utilised as an aid to composition or transmission before this time.

258 This and the following account are based on Adikaram 1994: 79; Norman 2006: 99–101. Collins (2003: 913) argues that the idea of a council under the patronage of the King Vaṭṭagāmiṇi Abhaya was a later idea. He suspects the factuality of the “time,” “place,” and “royal patronage of a council” as there is no new evidence to testify the authenticity of the account in the *Dīpavamsa*, and suggests that the account may be merely based on the belief of the author of the *Dīpavamsa*.

259 Norman (2006: 100) mentions some other possibilities that played a part in persuading the bhikkhus to make the decision to write down the canon, such as foreign invasion from south India and the political and economic circumstances of the times. He further states, “It has also been suggested that the growing power of the newly founded Abhayagiri vihāra, and the threat which this offered to the Mahāvihāra, could not be ignored” (Norman 2006: 100).

260 Making a record of the donors’ names and the wish to share the merit with someone’s relatives or friends was recorded in some early manuscripts. See Salomon, 1997: 355–357.
since writing, as pointed out by Norman (2006: 101), had already been used by the emperor Aśoka ca. 268–232 BCE in the two scripts of Kharoṣṭhī and Brāhmi.\textsuperscript{261} Despite this possibility, it seems that no manuscript found to date has been dated earlier than the first half of the second century BCE.\textsuperscript{262} It might be that the usage of writing could have begun earlier in Buddhist communities, but became more widespread around the beginning of the first century CE.

Therefore, given the above discussion about the introduction of writing to Buddhist communities, if it is the case that the passage about writing the prajñāpāramitā sūtra is not a later addition to the system of prajñāpāramitā sūtra in 8,000 ślokas, then a probable date for that system’s formation should be some time after the early second century BCE but no later than the first half of the second century CE. This time range is scientifically supported by the findings of Falk (2011: 20). According to Falk, the Kharoṣṭhī manuscript of the Aṣṭa in the “Split” Collection, which is fragmentary, has been radiocarbon dated to a later range of 25–43 CE (probability 14.3\%) or 47–147 CE (probability 81.1\%). On the other hand, if the passage about writing down the sūtra is a later addition to the Aṣṭa, then the Aṣṭa might have been formed prior to the early second century BCE, that is, before writing was believed to have been introduced to Buddhist communities. However, this premise currently lacks evidence.

\textsuperscript{261} Much has been written on transfer of merit, for further details see Kajiyama 1983: 68–69.
\textsuperscript{262} See footnote 240 above.
Moreover, a description concerning the itinerary of the spread of the *prajñāpāramitā* sūtra in the Chinese *Aṣṭa* translated by Kumārajīva could also be used to estimate a date:

舍利弗白佛言。世尊。後五百歲時。般若波羅蜜當廣流布北方耶。[佛言。]舍利弗。後五百歲當廣流布北方 (T 8 no. 227 p. 555b2–4).

Śāriputra asked the Buddha, “O Blessed One, will the perfection of insight extensively spread to the north [during] the five hundred after-years?” [The Buddha replied,] “Yes, Śāriputra, [during] the five hundred after-years it will extensively spread to the north.”

Further, the *Dà zhì dù lùn* 大智度論, commentary on the *prajñāpāramitā* sūtra in 22,000 ślokas presents the following account:

如佛告阿難。我涅槃後。此般若波羅蜜。當至南方。從南方至西方。後五百歲中當至北方 (T 25 no. 1509 p. 59b9–11).

For example, the Buddha addressed Ānanda: “After I pass away, the perfection of insight will spread to the south and then from the south to the west. It will be transmitted to the north [during] the five-hundred after-years.”

The accounts, “after I pass away” and “during the five hundred after-years” are noteworthy. In this context, it is reasonable that the “five hundred after-
years” refers to the period immediately after the Buddha’s passing away. Hirakawa (1974: 321–324) argued that the statement “five hundred after-years” is unlikely to be historically factual because the account is missing in some other early versions of the *prajñāpāramitā* sūtra in 8,000 ślokas. However, Kajiyama Yūichi (1983: 5–9) argued that although some early translations of the sūtra lack the description, they refer to “the period when the good Dharma disappears” in the same context, which is significant and may be supported by historical events. He points out that there was chaos in northern India after the reign of King Aśoka (ca. 268–232 BCE) until the establishment of the Kushan Empire (ca. the first century CE). In addition, he provides evidence from Brahmanical sources, which describe the severe misery in northern India around the first century CE. Based on the above accounts, it is possible that the description “during the five hundred after-years,” together with the account “the period when the good Dharma disappears” both reflect, in part, the historical fact that there was chaos and misery in northern India around the first century CE. Given the above information, the event where the *prajñāpāramitā* sūtra in 8,000

---

263 See Nattier (1991: 33–37) for a detailed discussion on “five hundred after-years.” This phrase has been the subject of some misunderstanding and Nattier (1991: 36) concludes, “In this context another possibility seems evident: that the expression ‘five hundred years’ refers to the period immediately after the death of the Buddha. And in fact the word *paścima* (understood as ‘last’ or ‘final’ …) can mean simply ‘that which follows’ something else.” I am grateful to Professor Nattier for bringing this issue, and her discussion of it, to my attention.
\textit{\textit{śloka}s} was compiled should have taken place around 500 years, or later, after the passing away of the Buddha.

There is no agreement among scholars on the date of the death of the Buddha (Cousins 1996: 57–63; Ruegg 1999: 82–87). In the last decades of the nineteenth century CE and at the beginning of the twentieth century CE the dates most often cited are 483 or 486 BCE, which are based on the Southern Buddhist tradition (Pali sources) and the Chinese source, known as the so-called “Dotted Record” of the fifth century CE, which is still of Sinhalese origin and therefore not fully independent of the Southern Buddhist tradition. In the 1950s, Lamotte proposed a new date based on Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna sources. Until recently two main traditional chronologies were the main materials for the discussion of this topic, that is, the long chronology, based on the Southern Buddhist tradition, which dates the Buddha’s passing away as ca. 486 or 483 BCE and the short chronology, based on Sarvāstivāda and Mahāyāna sources, which places it in ca. 386 BCE (Cousins 1996: 57–63; Ruegg 1999: 82–87).

During the last decade of the twentieth century CE, a publication on the date and historiography of the death of the Buddha explored this topic based on a greater diversity of sources and arguments (Bechert 1991–1997). Most of the

\footnote{\text{It seems that 500 years is a convenient round traditional number, which could stem from the prediction that Buddhism will endure for only five hundred years. Nattier (2004: 210) points out that this prophecy is found in the \textit{vinaya} texts of several different ordination lineages (\textit{nikāya}), dating from perhaps a century or so after the Buddha’s passing away. Although 500 years is an approximate number, this, in part, could explain why the account in the \textit{praṇāpāramitā} sūtra in 8,000 \textit{śloka}s is 500 years rather than another figure such as 550 or 600.}}
articles in this publication tend to place the date of the death of the Buddha between 420 and 350 BCE, with many of them advocating a date around 400 BCE with a margin of about twenty years on either side (Cousins 1996: 60; Ruegg 1999: 85). In other words, these authors propose that the Buddha probably died sometime between 420 and 380 BCE.

Based on the date of the death of the Buddha and the traditional account of the spread of the *prajñāpāramitā* to the north, while problematic, a tentative conclusion can be made. It could be assumed that the sūtra in 8,000 ślokas (*Aṣṭa*) dates from the late first century to the early second century CE. This might be regarded as the earliest time point when the story of Sadāprarudita was incorporated into the system of *prajñāpāramitā* sūtra in 8,000 ślokas as the story was a subsequent addition. This is supported by the fragmentary manuscript of the *Aṣṭa* contained in the “Split” Collection of Kharoṣṭhī Manuscripts, which, as discussed above (§ 3.4.2.3.1), have been radiocarbon dated to a range of 25–43 CE or 47–147 CE (Falk 2011: 20).

### 3.4.2.3.2. The account in the story depicting a time of chaos

In the *Aṣṭa*-L, the *Aṣṭa*-Zh, and the *Liù dù jí jīng 六度集經*, there is an account depicting the background of the story, in which the Three Jewels (i.e. Buddha, Dharma, and Saṃgha) are nowhere to be found in the world. In addition,

---

265 See the discussion above on p.137 regarding Hirakawa’s (1974: 321–324) comments on the non-historicity of the phrase “five hundred after-years.”
Sadāprarudita is not even able to find any method that is practised by a bodhisattva. He suffers extreme anguish, weeping and crying day after day, because his desire to find the great Dharma is frustrated. In the Liù dù jí jīng 六度集經, it is recounted, at that time there was no buddha, nor scriptural texts (i.e. Dharma) nor saṅgha existent in the realm. The world was described as a most impure place where humans rejected the good and were strongly attracted to whatever was evil, analogous to moths being attracted to a flame. Such a description may, to a certain extent, reflect historical facts. Yinshùn (1957: 4–7) points out that the Āyūwāng zhuàn 阿育王傳 (A Biography of the King Aśoka, T 50 no. 2042)\(^{266}\) mentions that there would be three cruel kings who persecute the people and destroy the Buddha’s teachings. The king from the south is named Shijū 釋拘 (Śaka), from the west, Bōláo 鉢牢 (Pahlava, i.e. a Parthian), and from the north, Yánwúnà 閻無那 (Yavana, i.e. a Greek).\(^{267}\) Nakamura Hajime (1987: 145–227) notes that these three kings (Kauśāmbī) are represented in the Śākyamūra parvan of the Mahāvīryākhyāta, where the cost of the destruction of the saṅgha is described.

\(^{266}\) Jan Nattier (1992: 150) points out that Āyūwāng zhuàn 阿育王傳 is one of several quite different versions of the tale of Kauśāmbī, which, in her words, is “another nominee for the status of the most primitive recension of the Kauśāmbī story.” A detailed analysis of this and other versions of the Kauśāmbī story, together with a discussion of the evidence for the time and place of their composition is given in chapters seven and eight of Once Upon a Future Time (Nattier 1992: 145–227).

\(^{267}\) T 50 no. 2042 p. 126c1–9. Yinshùn (1957: 4) states that the names of the three kings in the Āyūwāng zhuàn 阿育王傳 refer to three different people who invaded India after the Mauryan Empire. There is a similar account concerning Buddhist persecution by a monarch, which is found in the Āsokāvadāna. It is stated, “Then King Puṣyamitra equipped a fourfold army, and intending to destroy the Buddhist religion, he went to the Kukkutārāma; ... Puṣyamitra therefore destroyed the saṁghārāmas (Buddhist monasteries), killed the monks there, and departed. After some time, he arrived in Śākala, and proclaimed that he would give a hundred dināra reward to whoever brought him the head of a Buddhist monk.” (trans. Strong 1983: 293) Puṣyamitra, the founder of the Śuṅga dynasty, defeated the Mauryan Empire in approximately 180 BCE (Hirakawa 1974: 278). Thapar (1997: 200) questions the authenticity of this legend and asserts that it may not be a historical fact as archaeological evidence casts doubt on the claims of Buddhist persecution by Puṣyamitra. Mishra (2001) also comments on this issue:
states that the Mauryan Empire was not strong enough in its centralisation, and so was susceptible to disintegration. The two dynasties that followed it and governed the plain along the Ganges, i.e., the Kāṇvas and Śuṅgas, were more brahmanistic and less inclined to support Buddhism. North-western India was invaded by Greek kings from Bactria, and then the Śakas and Parthians. The account in the Āyûwâng zhuàn 阿育王傳 matches the historical facts in north-western India. If the account concerning a dark world in the story of Sadāprudita is a reflection of the historical facts that Buddhists encountered persecution, this suggests that the time the story was formed would be after this dark period of foreign invasions in north-western India. That would place the date in the second half of the first century CE.

3.4.2.3.3. Summary of possible dates for the incorporation of the Sadāprudita narrative into the prajñāpāramitā sūtras

To sum up, based on the discussion above, the possible time when the story of Sadāprudita was incorporated into the prajñāpāramitā sūtras could be:

Although archaeological evidence is meagre in this regard, it seems likely that the Deorkothar stupa was destroyed as a result of Pushyamitra Sunga’s fanaticism. The exposed remains at Deorkothar bear evidence of deliberate destruction datable to his reign. The three-tiered railing is damaged; railing pillars lie, broken to smithereens, on stone flooring. Twenty pieces of pillar have been recovered, each fragment itself fractured. The site offers no indication of natural destruction.

It is by no means certain whether the accounts in the Āyûwâng zhuàn 阿育王傳 and Aśokāvadâna reflect the historical facts or not. However, it is possible that after the decline of the Mauryan Empire, Buddhists suffered from chaos caused by wars, which in part was recorded in some Buddhist literature.
(1) during the second half of the first century CE, which may also be when the story formed (based on the dark period depicted in the story);
(2) during or after the second half of the first century CE (according to Hirakawa);
(3) between 50 and 150 CE (according to Yǐnshùn);
(4) the late first century to the early second century CE (based on accounts of copying the sūtras and the spread of the prajñāpāramitā sūtras to the north).

Based on the summary of the possible dates calculated using different approaches, it is therefore reasonable that the story of Sadāprudita formed some time during the second half of the first century CE and was incorporated into prajñāpāramitā sūtras during or after this period, though no later than the late second century when Lokakṣema translated the Aṣṭa in Luòyáng.
Chapter 4

The Relationship between the Different Versions of the Story of Sadāprarudita

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the prajñāpāramitā sūtras of 8,000, 18,000, 25,000 and 100,000 ślokas and their respective translations in Chinese and Tibetan possess long versions of the narrative concerning the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita’s search for prajñāpāramitā, of which two main versions are identifiable. In this chapter I will first look at the relationship between these two main versions, and in particular, what this suggests about the evolution of the story of Sadāprarudita. Next the jātaka form and Uighur version of the story will also be investigated, looking at how they relate to the two main versions and what this suggests about their origins.

4.1. The Two Main Versions of the Story of Sadāprarudita

4.1.1. The Proper Way to Name the Two Versions

The notion that there are two versions of the story of Sadāprarudita in the prajñāpāramitā literature may be traced back to Lewis Lancaster (1968: 199–309; 1974b: 83–90). In his studies, Lancaster (1968: 202, 203, 209, 212, 215; 1974b: 83, 87) referred to the two versions as the “earlier tradition” or “earlier text” and “later tradition” or “later text,” respectively. However, the chronology he
proposes for these two versions is questionable and consequently naming them as “earlier” and “later” is problematic. It appears that he has taken one version as the earlier version because it was translated into Chinese before the other one.\textsuperscript{268}

Moreover, he seems to suggest that version II stemmed from version I. For example, he states that the background as to why Sadāprudita is searching for prajñāpāramitā, which is preserved in version I, “has been dropped”\textsuperscript{269} by the editor(s) of version II. In addition, he gives the following statement that also suggests the same idea:

While the additional material added to the doctrinal passages served the useful function of explaining or bringing up to date ideas that were part of changing and developing Mahāyāna, this was not the case in the story of Sadāprudita. The changes which are shown by a comparison of the earlier text of T. 224 and T. 225 with the later translations and the Sanskrit display several negative aspects. First the clarity and sequence of the plot have been severely damaged. The narrative as found in Lokakṣema is simple and well told with a quality of suspense and drama. On the other hand, the Sanskrit has been rearranged and infused with so much meritorious material that it fails to convey the full import of the symbolic journey of the Boddhisattva to find the Prajñāpāramitā (Lancaster 1968: 202).

\textsuperscript{268} Lancaster 1968: 11–24.
\textsuperscript{269} Lancaster 1968: 210.
In reality, both versions of the story have early and late elements and could have stemmed from a version which was formed even earlier than the two main versions. Also, the investigations of the list of samādhis in the two versions, highlights the problematic nature of speaking of an “early” and “late” version (see § 2.3.2 for further discussion of this issue). Therefore, it would be more fitting to describe the two versions with a naming convention that does not contain a connotation of time. In this paper, I refer to these as version I and version II.

4.1.2. CHRONOLOGY OF THE TWO MAIN VERSIONS

As briefly noted in § 3.2.1, version I is only found in two Chinese translations of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra (Aṣṭa). The first was translated by Lokakṣema in the late second century CE.270 The second translation of the Aṣṭa that contains version I was done by Zhī Qiān 支謙 in the mid-third century CE.271 These are referred to as Aṣṭa-L and Aṣṭa-Zh, respectively in this study.

Version II is found in the Sanskrit Aṣṭa272 and its Chinese translations, the Xiǎo pín bānrúōbōluòmí jīng 小品般若波羅蜜經 (Smaller Sutra on Perfection of Insight, T 8 no. 227),273 translated by Kumārajīva in 408 CE, and the Fó mǔ

---

270 T 8 no. 224 pp. 470c20–477b21, (for the information about the date, see T 55 no. 2145 p. 6b10; T 55 no. 2147 p. 158c6; T 55 no. 2148 p. 189b7; T 55 no. 2154 p. 478c1–2).
271 T 8 no. 225 pp. 503c20–507c23, (for the information about the date, see T 55 no. 2146 p. 119b6; T 55 no. 2147 p. 158c11–12).
chūshēng sān fāzàng bānruòbōluómiōduō jīng 佛母出生三法藏般若波羅蜜多經 (Sutra on Perfection of Insight: The Three Dharma Treasures Produced by the Mother of Buddhas, T 8 no. 228), translated by Dānapāla in 982 CE. There are three other Chinese translations parallel to the Sanskrit Aṣṭa. One of them is the Mōhē bānruò chāo jīng 摩訶般若鈔經 (Extract of the Sutra on Great [Perfection of] Insight, T 8 no. 226), translated by Dharmarakṣa in the late third century CE. The other two are the Dà bānruò jīng (dì sì huì) 大般若經 (第四會) (Sutra on Great [Perfection of] Insight (Fourth Assembly), T 7 no. 220 (4)), and the Dà bānruò jīng (dì wǔ huì) 大般若經 (第五會) (Sutra on Great [Perfection of] Insight (Fifth Assembly), T 7 no. 220 (5)), both of which are translated by Xuānzàng 玄奘 in ca. 660–663 CE. The Mōhē bānruò chāo jīng 摩訶般若鈔經 is fragmentary and the story does not appear in the extant fragments. In terms of the Dà bānruò jīng (dì sì huì) 大般若經 (第四會) and the Dà bānruò jīng (dì wǔ huì) 大般若經 (第五會), the story is also absent. Version II is also preserved in the Chinese translations parallel to the Aṣṭādaśa or the Pañcaviṃśati. These are the Fàng guāng bānruò jīng 放光般若經 (Sutra on [Perfection of] Insight: Illumination, T 8 no. 221), translated by Mokṣala in the late third century CE, and the Mōhē bānruòbōluómiō jīng 摩訶般若波羅蜜經 (Sutra on Great Perfection of Insight, T 8

---

274 T 8 no. 228 pp. 668a21–676b12.
275 In the Sanskrit Pañcaviṃśati, the story is absent (Conze 1978: 45).
no. 223),\textsuperscript{276} translated by Kumārajīva in 404 CE. In fact, there are three other Chinese parallels to the *Pañcavimśati* or *Aṣṭādaśa*, one of which is called *Guāng zàn jīng* 光讃經 (*Sutra on Praise of Light*, T 7 no. 222), translated by Dharmarakṣa in the late third century CE. Unfortunately, the story is unavailable in this text as it is fragmentary and the extant parts do not contain the story. The other two are the *Dà bānruò jǐng* (dì èr huì) 大般若經 (第二會) (*Sutra on Great [Perfection of] Insight* (Second Assembly), T 7 no. 220 (2)), and the *Dà bānruò jǐng* (dì sān huì) 大般若經 (第三會) (*Sutra on Great [Perfection of] Insight* (Third Assembly), T 7 no. 220 (3)), both of which were translated by Xuánzàng in ca. 660–663 CE. The story is also missing in these two parallels. In addition, version II is also found in the Chinese translation of the *Śata*,\textsuperscript{277} that is, the *Dà bānruò jǐng* (chū huì) 大般若經 (初會) (*Sutra on Great [Perfection of] Insight* (First Assembly), T 6 no. 220 (1)),\textsuperscript{278} translated by Xuánzàng in ca. 660–663 CE. As for the story in the Tibetan translations of *prajñāpāramitā* sūtras, it is found in the *'Phags-pa shes-rab-kyi pha-rol-tu phyin-pa brgyad-stong-pa* (by Śākyasena, Jñānasiddhi, and Dharmatāsīla, the eighth to the ninth century CE),\textsuperscript{279} *'Phags-pa shes-rab-kyi pha-rol-tu phyin-pa khri-brgyad-stong-pa shes-bya-pa theg-pa chen-po'i mdo* (by Ye-shes-sde et al.,\textsuperscript{280} the eighth to the ninth century CE),\textsuperscript{281} and *Shes-

\textsuperscript{276} T 8 no. 223 pp. 416a24–423c20. According to the commentary of this text, the sūtra possesses èr wàn èr qiān jì 二萬二千偈 (twenty-two thousand verses). See T 25 no.1509 p. 756a28–29 for the account.

\textsuperscript{277} The story is not included in the Sanskrit version of the *Śata* (Conze 1978: 33).

\textsuperscript{278} T 6 no. 220 (1) pp. 1059a16–1073a8.

\textsuperscript{279} Peking 734: mi: 283b.3ff. This is a Tibetan translation of the *Aṣṭa*.

\textsuperscript{280} As for works translated by Ye-shes-sde, see Sherab Rhaldi 2002: 21–34.

\textsuperscript{281} Peking 732: phi: 199a.5ff. This is a Tibetan translation of the *Aṣṭādaśa*.
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rab-kyi pha-rol-tu phyin-pa stong-phrag-nyi-shu-nga-pa (by Ye-shes-sde et al., the eighth to the ninth century CE). The three Tibetan parallels of the story also belong to version II. The oldest extant text containing version II of the story is in one of the Chinese translations parallel to the Aṣṭādaśa, translated by Mokṣala in the late third century CE.

4.1.3. Main Issue of the Two Versions

In terms of the main incidents in the body of the story, the two versions exhibit areas of both similarity and divergence. There are two significant segments in version I that are entirely missing from version II. These two segments are: the incident of Sadāprarudita receiving revelations before he hears a voice in the air while in the wilderness, and the incident of Sadāprarudita receiving another teaching from Dharmodgata after the event where he enters into various samādhis for the second time. The episodes that are common to both versions of the story consist of two major divisions: (1) the journey to the city of Gandhavatī and (2) the meeting with Dharmodgata. Remarkably, these two divisions, including the incidents they contain, are very similar. This consistency

---

282 Peking 731: di: 254b.3ff. This is a Tibetan translation of the Pañcavimśati.
283 The Peking edition of the Tibetan translation of the Śata lacks the story. Conze (1978: 33) also notes that Bu-ston had earlier pointed out the absence of the story in the Śata. The issue concerning the story’s absence from some prajñāpāramitā sūtras will be discussed in Chapter 7.
in the overall structure makes it possible to sketch the contours of a synoptic chart of parallel passages in the two versions.\textsuperscript{284}

As for the two segments that are only found in version I, when considering how the story developed through time, there are generally three possibilities:

(1) The two segments could have been omitted or excised from version I, leading to the formation of version II.

(2) The two segments could have been interpolations, or new additions, to version I. In other words, the original matter or substance of version I is later than that of version II, even though version I was translated into Chinese earlier.

(3) The third hypothesis is that there was an earlier version which did not have the two segments initially, and this version developed into two independent recensions. The first line of development saw the two segments added into the story, forming version I. Somehow, this version was not available to those who collated and translated the text at a later period. The second line of development was that the earlier version evolved into version II, but in this case, without undergoing the addition of the extra segments.

\textsuperscript{284} See Appendix 1.
So the question is: which of these hypotheses is supported by the facts? The following section will point out the most likely case by probing the evidence in the texts.

4.1.4. The Structure of the Two Versions

In §1.4.2 a detailed outline of the structure of the two versions of the story was presented to show that essentially the two versions have the same structure. Here I will give a brief recap of the structure. Both versions contain three parts, which are:

1. the introductory account of the story where Buddha is instructing Subhūti;
2. the body of the story containing the details of Sadāprarudita’s journey;
3. the conclusion of the story where Buddha is admonishing Subhūti.

Within the body of the story, the incidents are also similar with the exception of the two segments that are unique to version I only, and these similar incidents are referred to in this paper as the “common part”. The common part of the story contains two divisions and is presented here again for ease of reading.

First division, the journey to Gandhavatī, is as follows:

1. revelations from a voice in the air;
2. revelations from an unknown buddha figure;
(3) revelations from the immeasurable number of present buddhas of the ten directions;

(4) selling his own body to gain gifts to make offerings to Dharmodgata.

The second division, the meeting with Dharmodgata has the following structure:

(1) making offerings to the texts on *prajñāpāramitā* and to Dharmodgata;

(2) disclosing his intention to visit Dharmodgata;

(3) requesting resolution of his doubt;

(4) Dharmodgata enters into various *samādhis* for seven years;

(5) Sadāprarudita sprinkles the ground with his blood to prevent rising dust from soiling Dharmodgata’s body;

(6) Dharmodgata teaches *prajñāpāramitā*.

### 4.1.5. Manifest Differences between the Two Versions

Notwithstanding the above, when delving deeper into the story, there are quite a few differences between the two versions. The following section discusses two distinct differences found between version I and version II. One is the point of division between the two chapters of the story, and the other distinct difference is the unique story content found only in version I.
4.1.5.1. THE DIVISION BETWEEN THE TWO CHAPTERS OF THE STORY

In the Sanskrit version and all the Chinese and Tibetan translations, the entire story of Sadāprarudita is given in two chapters named “Sadāprarudita” and “Dharmodgata.” However, version I and version II of the story differ in the way in which the editor(s) divided the material between the two chapters. In version II, when Sadāprarudita sees Dharmodgata, he seeks the resolution of his doubt by asking, “Where have those buddhas come from and where have they gone?” At the moment the answer is about to be revealed, the chapter called “Sadāprarudita” ends. On the other hand, the question is thoroughly answered in version I and is followed by Sadāprarudita achieving various samādhis for the first time. The chapter “Sadāprarudita” in version I then comes to a close with Dharmodgata rising and retiring to his house.

Interestingly, in version II, the event where Sadāprarudita first enters into the various samādhis occurs after he hears the details of the characteristics of Gandhavatī. In fact, this change in the sequence of events in the two versions is not an isolated case. There are also several other events that, although found in both versions, are located at different points in the narrative. Changes to how original texts were divided into chapters are not uncommon. For example, a

---

285 There is an exception. In the Tibetan translation, Shes-rab-kyi pha-rol-tu phyin-pa stong-phrag nyi-shu lnga-pa, “Prajñāpāramitā in Twenty-five Thousand [ślokas]” (Peking 731: di: 254b.3ff.), the story is divided into three chapters, which are shown below:

ch. 73 Byang-chub sms-dpa’ rtag-par rab-tu ngu-bas ting-nge-’dsin-gyi sgo-mang-po thob pa, “Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita’s attainment of many entrances to samādhis.” (254b.3–262a.5);
ch. 74 rTag-par rab-tu ngu-pa, “Sadāprarudita.” (262a.5–272a.5);
ch. 75 Chos-kyis ’phags-pa, “Dharmodgata.” (272a.5–280b.1).
similar situation also occurs in the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*. Patrick Olivelle (2005: 7–11) points out that this text may have been originally divided into four chapters and the traditional division of the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra* into 12 chapters was probably imposed on the text when it was subjected to a revision that added several sections. He reveals the original structure by analysing the “transitional verses,” of which the function is to mark the conclusion of one subject and the beginning of another. In relation to the story of Sadāprarudita, there is a verse version of the *Aṣṭa* called *Prajñāpāramitā Ratnagunaśamcayagāthā*; the chapter numbers and titles of chapters 30 and 31 correspond to those of the *Aṣṭa*. However, as pointed out by Edward Conze (1978: 10), the contents of the verses in the two chapters do not correspond to the text of the *Aṣṭa* and make no reference whatsoever to the Sadāprarudita/Dharmodgata story.

Since Olivelle’s approach cannot be employed here, analysing the context of the story may help ascertain some possible reasons why the chapter division in the common part differs between the two versions. In version I, the chapter “Sadāprarudita” ends after Sadāprarudita’s question is completely answered, Dharmodgata is seen, and Sadāprarudita achieves the various *samādhis*. This seems to have completeness and coherence in itself and the ending at this point is quite natural. If the chapter “Sadāprarudita” in version I was originally a complete narrative, then the next chapter “Dharmodgata” would seem to be additional or extraneous. On the other hand, version II ends the chapter with the unanswered question (“Where have those buddhas come from and where have they gone?”),
which would not normally be a satisfactory or natural conclusion. Lancaster (1968: 216; 1974b: 87), from the perspective of a drama, proposes that this may be a strategy that contributes to the suspense in the narrative, similar to that used in modern novels, inspiring the reader to read on to get the answer. In addition, the chapter in version II may conclude as soon as the question has been asked because the following chapter is named after the protagonist, “Dharmodgata.” Obviously, as soon as he starts to instruct Sadāprudita, the lead role shifts from Sadāprudita to Dharmodgata and this is a fitting place to begin the chapter on Dharmodgata. It is uncertain whether the chapter division in version I or version II is the original. However, both have their strengths depending on which aspect is considered.

4.1.5.2. THE UNIQUE CONTENT IN VERSION I: EXPANSION OR OMISSION?

As mentioned above, two significant sections in version I are completely missing in version II. One is the section before Sadāprudita hears a voice in the air while in the wilderness, which explains why he is searching for prajñāpāramitā. The other is the section\(^\text{286}\) after the event in which he enters into the various samādhis for a second time, which primarily consists of three parts: (1) the enquiry about the voice and body of a buddha;\(^\text{287}\) (2) the various auspicious

---

\(^{286}\) Although I treat this section on a whole as unique to version I, within this section some of the contents do have parallels in version II. These will be commented on as they arise.

\(^{287}\) The answer to the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita’s enquiry about a buddha’s voice consists of several similes such as the sound of a booghparp, the sound of a vertical bamboo flute, and an echo in a valley. The simile of the sound of a booghparp is also found in all parallels of version II, when the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata responds to Sadāprudita’s question,
events due to Dharmodgata’s teaching regarding a buddha’s voice;\textsuperscript{288} (3) a prediction that Sadāprarudita and his companions will attain Buddhahood.

So what can we make of these unique segments in version I? As mentioned earlier, when interpreting this difference in terms of how the story developed through time, one hypothesis is that the two additional sections could have been omitted or excised from version I, leading to the formation of version II. Another is that the two sections could have been interpolations or new additions to version I, even though it was translated earlier than version II. Jan Nattier (2003: 51) provides a straightforward approach for identifying interpolations in the versions of \textit{The Inquiry of Ugra} (\textit{Ugraparipṛcchā}). She argues that where some passages are present only in the later translation(s) of the sūtra in question, the conclusion that they are indeed interpolations can be drawn with some measure of confidence. However, upon comparison of version I and version II of the Sadāprarudita story, both versions have their own unique episodes that are absent in the other version. It would seem that Nattier’s approach is not applicable in the case of the two versions of the story of Sadāprarudita. Nonetheless, her approach is still of help in identifying interpolations among the various translations of version II.

\textsuperscript{288} In version II, the episode where the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata answers the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita’s question, “Where have those tathāgatas come from and where have they gone?” has a depiction similar to this part. The various auspicious events occurred right after Dharmodgata’s explanation on where those tathāgatas have come from and where they have gone. For the similar depiction in version II, see, for example, \textit{Aṣṭa} (ed. Wogihara 1932–1935) 977.10–978.2.
Given that the two Chinese translations of version I are parallel to the Aṣṭa, another method to identify interpolations in the two versions would be to examine the story in the Aṣṭa and the Chinese translations of version II. The chronological sequence of version II of the story found the Chinese translations is as follows:

- Aṣṭa-K in the Xiǎo pǐn bānrươbōluömì jīng 小品般若波羅蜜經, translated by Kumārajīva in 408 CE;
- Aṣṭa-D in the Fó mǔ chūshēng sān fāzàng bānrươbōluómǐduō jīng 佛陀母出生三法藏般若波羅蜜多經, translated by Dānapāla in 982 CE.

As for the story in the Sanskrit Aṣṭa (Aṣṭa-Skt), Conze (1973: xi) points out that available manuscripts date between 1000 and 1150 CE. On this basis, the Aṣṭa-Skt in the form in which it is attested in these manuscripts is regarded as later than Aṣṭa-D for the time being.

A notable example that shows the expansion through the process of the development of the story from the Aṣṭa-K to the Aṣṭa-Skt over time is the number of samādhis that Sadāprarudita enters into in his first experience. The Aṣṭa-K has 52, while the Aṣṭa-D has 60 and the Aṣṭa-Skt 62. Similarly, in the case of the two segments, the same logic may be applied. As version I was translated earlier than version II, one possible conclusion would be that the two segments were somehow excised from version I. In other words, it is not unreasonable to suppose that

---

version II developed from version I and that the two segments, for some reason, were omitted. If this is the case, then there lies a further question, why is it that the lists of the samādhis that Sadāprurudita enters into for the first time and second time in version I are utterly different from the two lists given in version II? In other words, if version II is derived directly from version I, the content of the list of the samādhis, to a certain or large extent, should be similar.

Another difficulty that arises with this premise concerns why the section in version I, which provides a very readable background to understanding the story, is entirely omitted in version II. For example, version II briefly states that Sadāprurudita searched for prajñāpāramitā with diligence, and begins the story with the scene in which he hears a voice in the air saying “go east.” On the other hand, version I portrays Sadāprurudita’s struggle and search (see Chapter 1 for a detailed account of the story). It is difficult to believe that such a readable and informative account, as given in version I, would be utterly suppressed or rejected by a later compiler of version II, who, in all likelihood, would have seen this section. In short, the hypothesis that version II is derived directly from version I appears to have many problems, and therefore, this premise strikes me as weak.

---

290 For example, the list of samādhis that Sadāprurudita enters into for the first time in the Aṣṭa-L (i.e. version I) begins with the samādhi called “non-existence of a place” and ends with the samādhi called “sameness of the three time frames, the past, the future, and the present” (T 8 no. 224 pp. 473c26–474a21), while in the Aṣṭa-Skt (i.e. version II), the list begins with the samādhi called “contemplation on the nature of all dharmas” (sarva-dharma-svabhāva-vyavalokana) and ends with the samādhi called “viewing all tathāgatas” (sarva-tathāgata-darśin) (Aṣṭa [ed. Wogihara 1932–1935] 940.22–942.5). A detailed discussion on this issue is given in § 2.3.2.
Moreover, if the two additional sections that appear in version I are a result of the process of growth, why is it that the Aṣṭa-D (translated in 982 CE) and the Aṣṭa-Skt available to us (the earliest manuscripts of which date to between 1000 and 1150 CE) do not have these two sections that are found in the early translations by Lokakṣema (ca. the late second century CE) and by Zhī Qiān (ca. the mid-third century CE)? A more likely explanation is that there was an earlier version that did not initially have the two sections and its renditions developed in two independent ways. One path of development saw the two sections added to the earlier version, leading to the formation of version I. Unfortunately, this longer version became unavailable at a later period and so was not collated and translated at a later date. The other development path is that the earlier version continued to spread and evolve without the two sections, yielding version II. As the two version made their passage through time and space, lists of samādhis were incorporated according to different “samādhi traditions” belonging to different monastic or teaching lineages, possibly, but not necessarily, located or transmitted in different regional centres of Buddhist activity.  

This process is shown in the following chart:

---

291 It is, of course, not entirely impossible that one tradition, seeing the list of samādhis in an hypothesised earlier version of the story, decided to replace it in its entirety with their own listing. However, the motivation of the editor(s) to entirely replace the list of samādhis, a slightly unexpected alteration, is unclear and would require further research.
Figure 4.1 Possible paths of development of version I and version II

There is another point that further supports this argument. In the episode concerning Sadāprudita’s departure for the wilderness upon hearing a revelation, version I says that he hears a god telling him the name of the previous buddha in a dream after which he leaves for the wilderness. It seems a bit illogical or unreasonable that he only hears the name of the previous buddha in a dream and then leaves for the wilderness. Something in this turning point concerning his motive to leave for the wilderness appears to be missing. To a certain extent, this gap between the dream and finding himself in the wilderness suggests that the editors carelessly left a “fingerprint” indicating where a section was added into the story. This problem is resolved in the jātaka version of the story of Sadāprudita, which may be regarded as an earlier work based on version I (see § 4.2 below). In the jātaka version, Sadāprudita is instructed in the dream by a previous buddha to abandon his possessions, and the comment is made to him that “the stilling and
extinction of all thoughts—this is the unconditioned.” [292] Therefore, following this, he leaves for the wilderness.

To sum up, based on the arguments given above, the process of the development of the story seems to be that the two versions were derived from an earlier hypothetical version, and then evolved separately. Compared with the previous premise that version II developed from version I, this supposition, in part, would appear to be more likely.

4.2. The Story of Sadāprudita as a Jātaka of Śākyamuni

Buddha in the Liù dù jí jīng 六度集經

In addition to the two versions so far discussed, the story of Sadāprudita also exists in a jātaka form recorded in the Liù dù jí jīng 六度集經 (Compendium of the Six Transcendent Practices) translated (and possibly compiled) by Kāng Sēnghuī 康僧會 in the mid-third century CE. Generally speaking, the Sadāprudita jātaka may be divided into three parts: (1) the introductory account of the jātaka; (2) the body of the jātaka; and (3) the conclusion of the jātaka. The body of the jātaka consists of the stage where Sadāprudita leaves for the wilderness and sets off on the journey to Gandhavaṭī. Notably, the introductory account of the jātaka version corresponds to one of the unique sections in version

---

292 詳念寂滅是為無為 (T 3 no. 152 p. 43a23).
I of the story of Sadāprudita in the prajñāpāramitā sūtras. This shows that the Sadāprudita jātaka has a close relationship with version I of the story.

4.2.1. A Summary of the Sadāprudita Jātaka

The jātaka version begins with the Buddha’s account of his previous life as one named Chángbēi 常悲 (Ever-grieved), who wept all the time (based on the description “who wept all the time,” the name Chángbēi 常悲 is replaced in the following discussion with Sadāprudita, “Ever-weeping”). Before the account of his setting out on the journey to seek prajñāpāramitā, we are given a gloomy picture of the world in which Sadāprudita dwelt.

At that time there is neither a buddha in the realm, nor any scriptural texts (i.e. the Dharma), nor any saṃgha. The world is described as a most impure place where humans rejected the good and were strongly attracted to whatever is evil, analogous to moths being attracted to a flame. One day, when in a dream, Sadāprudita fortunately hears a buddha called Yīngfǎwúhuīrúlái wáng 影法無穢如來王, who had been in nirvāṇa for a long time, instructing him, “Abandon your defilement of affection, and detach yourself from the associated defilements of

---

293 In the two main versions of the story of Sadāprudita found in the prajñāpāramitā sūtras, the story begins with the Buddha admonishing Subhūti to seek prajñāpāramitā, just as Sadāprudita did.

294 The translation of the Chinese “塵勞” is literally “dirt that causes weariness.” This is a technical term, usually a translation of kleśa (defilement). For example, see Charles Muller’s Digital Dictionary of Buddhism, s.v. 塵勞 (http://www.buddhism-dict.net/ddb/).
the six faculties.”²⁹⁵ He is also instructed not to leave any kind of craving on his mind, even though they are as fine as a hair. Thereafter, he leaves his home and family with great joy, retiring to the wilderness to meditate where he subsists on mountain water and wild fruits. The meditative life, however, is insufficient to lead to contact with a buddha or to hear any buddha’s Dharma. Therefore, he weeps over his bad fortune. At this point, a god appears in the sky and tells Sadāprudita that there is a great Dharma named prajñāpāramitā which leads to the achievement of Buddhahood. Sadāprudita then asks, “From whom can I learn this pre-eminent Dharma?”²⁹⁶ The god replies, “From here, directly go east,”²⁹⁷ and admonishes him to pay no attention to his bodily needs or personal gain.

Upon hearing the instruction, Sadāprudita follows this advice and sets off in search of the great Dharma. At the same time he is beset with doubt about how far he must go; this spurs another bout of weeping. Due to his sincerity, another revelation occurs in which an unnamed buddha appears before him. The buddha explains how all dharmas are empty, like illusions and bubbles, and tells him of the city of Gandhavatī and the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata who lives there teaching prajñāpāramitā. After that instruction, Sadāprudita sees all the buddhas of the ten directions in a saṃādhi. When he emerges from the saṃādhi, a question arises in his mind, “Where have those buddhas come from and where have they gone?”

²⁹⁵ 去心恩愛之垢。無著六情之塵勞 (T 3 no. 152 p. 43a21–22).
²⁹⁶ 當由誰聞斯尊法乎 (T 3 no. 152 p. 43b8–9).
²⁹⁷ 爾自斯正東行 (T 3 no. 152 p. 43b10).
It is when he is pondering this that he starts to weep again. This is suddenly
followed by the conclusion that one should practise dhyānapāramitā in this
manner, which is the end of the Sadāprarudita jātaka.

Such a gap between the body of the jātaka and its conclusion suggests that
the Sadāprarudita jātaka could have been adapted from the story of Sadāprarudita
in the prajñāpāramitā sūtras. In other words, it would seem that a compiler
adapted the part before the question and excised the part after the question to
construct a jātaka version of the story, but did so with a lack of editing skills when
concluding the jātaka.

4.2.2. Differences between Version I and the Jātaka Version

A comparison of version I of the story and the Sadāprarudita jātaka shows
that the two are highly consistent in terms of the main episodes, although differing
in some details. In general, version I is more complex than the jātaka version in
terms of episodes, as shown in the comparative table in Appendix 2. However, in
some parts the jātaka version presents more details. For example, in the section
portraying Sadāprarudita’s predicament in terms of the situation of the world in
which he dwelt, version I only mentions, “he wanted to be able to see a buddha,
and to be able to hear the scriptures, but he was unable to do so, and there was no

298 An analysis of the terminology used in the jātaka version and version I of the story
translated by Zhī Qiān shows a degree of similarity. See § 4.2.3 for a discussion on this
issue.
guidance for bodhisattva practice [to be found].” On the other hand, the jātaka version gives an even more vivid picture of the dark condition of the world. The world was described as a most impure place where humans rejected the good and were strongly attracted to evil, similar to moths attracted to a flame. Another example where the jātaka version provides more detail is the description that one day, when in a dream, Sadāprudita heard a buddha called Yingfăwūhiruláiwāng 影法無穢如來王, who had been in nirvāṇa for a long time, instructing him, “Abandon your defilement of affection, and detach yourself from the objects of the six faculties.” He is also instructed not to leave any kind of craving on his mind, even though they are as fine as a hair. Having heard the instruction, Sadāprudita was extremely pleased.

The jātaka describes that he was “as if a hungry man had taken delicious food.” Version I on the other hand simply recounts that in his dream a god instructed that in the past there was a buddha called Jingfāzhuīláiwāng 景法自穢來王 and after that he awoke and was extremely pleased.

4.2.3. ALTERATIONS AND ADAPTATIONS OF THE STORY

In addition to interpolations, there is an alteration in the sequence of the account concerning revelations from a god while Sadāprudita is in the

---

299 欲得見佛欲得聞經索之了不能得。亦無有菩薩所行法則 (T 8 no. 224 pp. 470c29–471a2).
300 T 3 no. 152 p. 43a14–17.
301 去心恩愛之垢。無著六情之塵勞 (T 3 no. 152 p. 43a21–22).
302 T 3 no. 152 p. 43a20–24.
303 猶餓夫得甘食 (T 3 no. 152 p. 43a24).
wilderness. In the jātaka version, the god first tells him about the benefits of learning and practising prajñāpāramitā—that one will definitely be able to achieve Buddhahood. After that, he admonishes Sadāprudita to go east and concentrate on seeking prajñāpāramitā, paying no attention to the five aggregates, the six faculties, and so forth. In version I, the teaching of the benefits of practising prajñāpāramitā and the admonition to go east are reversed.

Another difference between the two versions is the adaptations of similar episodes. For example, in the episode concerning Sadāprudita’s departure to the wilderness upon hearing a revelation, version I says that he hears a god telling him the name of the previous buddha in a dream and then he leaves for the wilderness. Something about his motive to leave for the wilderness appears to be missing. The corresponding account in the jātaka version resolves this problem because in the dream Sadāprudita is instructed by the previous buddha to abandon his defilement of affection, and detach himself from the objects of the six faculties. He is also instructed not to leave any kind of craving on his mind, even though they are as fine as a hair. Therefore, in order to follow the instructions, he leaves for the wilderness.

Nattier (2003: 48–63) points out that there are three types of changes that can occur over time in relation to the process of transmission of a text: (1)
interpolations; (2) omissions and abbreviations; and (3) alterations in the sequence of a text. The first two types of changes work in opposition to each other and she argues that generally the likely direction of development is that the later text will be longer. She further argues, “There are exceptions, of course, and many of these involve interpolations arguably added in China; but by and large growth rather than shrinkage seems to be the norm.”

The Sadāprudita jātaka seems to be one of those exceptions. From the comparisons given above, interpolations or additions are seen in both version I and the jātaka version. Adaptation is also seen in the story, which may be regarded as a fourth type of change which can occur over time. It is hard to say with certainty that the jātaka form of the story is an excised work of version I, or that version I developed from the jātaka version. A synopsis of pre-2000s research concerning this issue is chronologically shown below. This synopsis incorporates the summary of pre-1990s scholarship by Okada Mamiko 岡田真美子 (1995: 143–145):

(1) Akanuma Chizen 赤沼智善 (1981: 387) in his Bukkyō kyōtenshi ron 仏教経典史論 (A Survey on the History of Buddhist Texts), originally published in 1939, suggested that the jātaka form of the Sadāprudita narrative existed prior to the story of Sadāprudita in the

---

309 Nattier 2003: 60.
prajñāpāramitā sūtras. This may be the earliest reference to this issue in contemporary scholarship.\(^{310}\)

(2) Kajiyoshi Kōun 梶芳光運 (1944\(^{311}\): 657), according to his thorough studies of the evolution of the prajñāpāramitā sūtras, claimed that the story of Sadāpradita in the prajñāpāramitā sūtras is a new addition to prajñāpāramitā literature, which developed from the jātaka form of the Sadāpradita narrative.

(3) Hikata Ryūshō 千葉龍祥 (1954: 105)\(^{312}\) has an entirely opposite opinion. He argued that the Liù dù jì jīng 六度集經 commonly has references to prajñāpāramitā literature thought; therefore, the authors of the Liù dù jì jīng 六度集經 must have known the story of the Sadāpradita from its prajñāpāramitā sūtra context. Okada (1995: 144) notes that Hikata revised his opinion in another work.\(^{313}\) His revised path of the story’s development is presented in Figure 4.2.

\(^{310}\) Okada (1995: 143–145) here does not include Akanuma’s viewpoint and attributes the earliest reference on this issue to Kajiyoshi (1944). However, it seems that the earliest reference should be attributed to Akanuma (1939).

\(^{311}\) In footnote 3 of her article, the year 1943 is given as that of Kajiyoshi’s publication. This may be a typo. The correct year should be 1944.

\(^{312}\) See also the revised and enlarged edition, Hikata 1978: 94.

\(^{313}\) Okada here does not provide the reference to Hikata’s work. For the details see Hikata 1961: 44–45.
Figure 4.2 Hikata’s revised opinion on the story’s path of development

An earlier version of the Story

Sadāprudita story in the praṇāpāramitā sūtras Version I: with the two segments and the lists of various samādhis added (but not available elsewhere at a later period).

Jātaka version of Sadāprudita

(4) Hirakawa Akira 平川彰 (1968: 106) argued that the Sadāprudita story in the praṇāpāramitā sūtras developed from the jātaka form of the Sadāprudita narrative as the former is more detailed than the latter. This agrees with Kajiyoshi’s opinion. Again, Okada notes that Hirakawa (1989: 322) revised his opinion and proposes a similar model to Hikata’s revised idea, which, according to Okada’s understanding, can be shown as follows:
Figure 4.3 Hirakawa’s revised opinion on the story’s path of development

(5) Kajiyama Yūichi 梶山雄一 (1976: 13–28), from the perspective of history of Buddhist ideology, proposed that the Sadāprarudita story in the prajñāpāramitā sūtras developed from the jātaka form of the Sadāprarudita narrative, a view that is consistent with Kajiyoshi’s opinion and Hirakawa’s earlier viewpoint.


---

314 Okada appears unsure about the “Prototype of the Sadāprarudita story” as she states, 原型 ＝ 本生話? (prototype = jātaka story?).
(7) Okada (1995: 153), thinking that the jātaka form of Sadāprarudita does not include the episode of blood sacrifice, proposed that this version formed prior to version I of the Sadāprarudita narrative.

(8) Tiāncháng 天常 (1998: 96–101), having analysed all the jātakas in the chapter on Dhyānapāramitā in the Liù dù jí jīng 六度集經, proposed that the story of Sadāprarudita as a jātaka of Śākyamuni Buddha is an adaptation from the story of version I and was added into the Liù dù jí jīng 六度集經 at a later date.

(9) Itō Chikako 伊藤千賀子 (2006: 149–154), from the perspective of the description of a buddha’s thirty-two marks, asserted that the Sadāprarudita story in the prajñāpāramitā sūtras developed from the jātaka form of Sadāprarudita narrative as the former has more detailed descriptions of a buddha’s thirty-two marks than those in the latter.

In summary, regarding the relationship between the jātaka form of the Sadāprarudita narrative and the version of the story in the prajñāpāramitā sūtras there are three possibilities presented in the literature. They are:

(1) the jātaka version and the story of Sadāprarudita in the prajñāpāramitā sūtras were developed from a common earlier source;

(2) the story in the prajñāpāramitā sūtras was adapted from the jātaka version;
(3) the Sadāprudita *jātaka* is an extract from the story of Sadāprudita in the *prajñāpāramitā* sūtras.

From a micro analysis of the features in version I and the *jātaka* form of the story, evidence can be found to support all three possibilities. However, from a macro analysis of the *Liù dì jì jīng 六度集經*, almost all the *jātakas* in the chapter on *Dhyānapāramitā* are problematic as they are obviously not *jātakas*, in the sense that they are not stories of the Buddha’s past lives, but rather are adapted from existing stories of other practitioners or stories from the Buddha’s present life biography (see the following § 4.2.4 which focuses on this issue).<sup>315</sup> This throws doubt onto possibility (2) above. As for the remaining two options, there are several pieces of information that provides support for the possibility that the *jātaka* version was derived from version I. First of all, the terminology used in the

<sup>315</sup> For the stories that are from the Buddha’s present life in the chapter on *Dhyānapāramitā*, there is none that follows the typical formulae of a *jātaka* story, such as beginning with *xízhē púsā...昔日菩薩...* (T 3 no. 152 p. 1a21), “Once upon a time the bodhisattva...” The editor(s) seemed to just take the stories of the Buddha’s present life connected to *dhyāna* from other sources and place them into this chapter. It is noteworthy that there is a phenomenon found in Gandhāran *avadānas*, which is close to this situation, which consists of a change of a narrative’s inner genre category. According to Lenz (2010: 6–14), quite a few *avadānas* found in Gandhāri manuscripts “cannot be placed comfortably into a ‘standard’ *avadāna* package.” He further states that these Gandhāran *avadānas* neither explicitly consist of two stories, one of the past and one of the present, nor do they end with a conclusion connected to actions performed in the distant past with those carried out in the present. Lenz points out that those which are self-styled as *avadānas* contain only a single story concerning present actions. Another significant point relevant to the discussion here is that Vaidya (1958: xi) indicates that there were some monks, known as *avadānikas* (avadāniasts) or *avadānārthakovidas* (avadāna experts), who specialised in the *avadāna* class of literature. Strong (1985: 864), following Vaidya’s point, proposes that they were a self-conscious group who were engaged in reading, reciting, compiling, and composing *avadānas*. Based on these points, it is reasonable to believe that there used to be experts known as *jātakika* who were engaged in reading, reciting, compiling, and composing *jātakas*. This could well explain the situation that appears to have occurred to the chapter on *Dhyānapāramitā*.
jātaka form of the story is close to Zhī Qiān’s translation, belonging to version I. For example, in Lokakṣema’s translation, the transcribed term bānnihuán 般泥洹 (parinirvāṇa, [Buddha’s] passing away, T 8 no. 224 p. 471a9) is mièdù 滅度 (passing away) in Zhī Qiān’s translation (T 8 no. 225 p. 504a5). In the jātaka version the corresponding term is also mièdù 滅度 (T 3 no. 152 p. 43a19–20).

Another example is the name Dharmodgata. Lokakṣema transcribed it as Tánmójié 塔無竭 (T 8 no. 224 p. 471c23) while Zhī Qiān translated it as Fǎlái 法來 (T 8 no. 225 p. 504b22) which is the same in the jātaka version (T 3 no. 152 p. 43c7). Moreover, it is not uncommon that a later compiler would seek to improve upon the weaknesses found in the version they base their work on. We can see this trait when analysing the links between events in the jātaka form of the story of Sadāprarudita, which are better than that in version I of the story in the prajñāpāramitā sūtras in some areas. For example, in version I Sadāprarudita hears a god telling him the name of the previous buddha in a dream and then he leaves for the wilderness.316 The link between the dream and his leaving for the wilderness is unclear. This problem seems to be fixed in the corresponding account in the jātaka version. In the dream Sadāprarudita is instructed by the previous buddha to abandon his defilement of affection, detach himself from the objects of the six faculties, and to leave any kind of craving on his mind, even though they are as fine as a hair. In order to abandon his affections, he leaves for

316 T 8 no. 224 p. 471a10–14.
the wilderness and meditates.\textsuperscript{317} Another example is the link between Sadāprarudita’s weeping due to not knowing where the destination is and the incident that an unknown buddha figure appears before him. Version I simply recounts that when Sadāprarudita is weeping, an unknown buddha figure appears before him.\textsuperscript{318} In the \textit{jātaka} version a further description depicts that due to Sadāprarudita’s sincerity, an unknown buddha comes to him.\textsuperscript{319} Notwithstanding these improvements, the compiler also shows their own weakness when it comes to the conclusion of the \textit{jātaka}, which is somewhat abrupt. Having considered the above factors, it seems likely that the \textit{jātaka} version was adapted from version I of the story, in particular the version translated by Zhī Qiān. Further, there is evidence that points to Kāng Sēnghuī as the compiler who adapted the story for a \textit{jātaka} of Śākyamuni Buddha and added it to the \textit{Liù dù jí jīng} 六度集經.\textsuperscript{320} If this is true, then alterations or adaptations of texts occurred not only in India or Central Asia, but also in China.\textsuperscript{321}

\textsuperscript{317} T 3 no. 152 p. 43a20–23.
\textsuperscript{318} T 8 no. 224 p. 471b14–17.
\textsuperscript{319} T 3 no. 152 p. 43b19–24.
\textsuperscript{320} Tiānchāng 1998: 100.
\textsuperscript{321} A similar situation is seen in the transmission of the \textit{Lotus Sutra} to China. For example, there is a record by an unnamed writer in the version of the \textit{Lotus Sutra}, compiled by Jñanagupta and Dharmagupta (T 9 no. 264 p. 134b27–c22), that provides witness concerning textual criticisms of different versions of the \textit{Lotus Sutra}, which was made by one of the members of the translation team of the \textit{Lotus Sutra} led by Jñanagupta and Dharmagupta (601 CE). This record mentions that the verses in Chapter XXV of Kumārajīva’s version (406 CE) were not made by him but by Jñanagupta and Dharmagupta of the Sui Dynasty. See also Soothill 1987: 7–8.
4.2.4. Problematic Features of the Chapter on *Dhyānapāramitā*

The *jātaka* of Sadāprarudita in the *Liù dù jí jīng* 六度集經 is in the category of the *dhyānapāramitā* (perfection of meditation), even though the story is about the search for *prajñāpāramitā*. There is evidence that points towards the Sadāprarudita *jātaka* being a later addition, probably adapted from the story of Sadāprarudita in the *prajñāpāramitā* sūtras. Evidence for this is revealed, for example, when the style of the *jātakaś* in the chapter on *Dhyānapāramitā* is analysed. Most notably, they are very different from the narratives of all the other chapters in this text.\(^{322}\) The Buddha, for example, was once an animal, such as a monkey, a deer or a parrot. He also used to be a poor man, a common person or a king, and so forth. These roles are seen in most *jātakas* in the *Liù dù jí jīng* 六度集經. However, he is not portrayed as a Mahāyāna bodhisattva in any previous life, except in the *jātakas* in this chapter on *Dhyānapāramitā*. Furthermore, the Sadāprarudita *jātaka* begins with, “The Bhagavat himself talked about when he was a bodhisattva…”,\(^{323}\) which is unique and differs from the conventional account in this text which normally starts with, *xízhē púṣá* 昔者菩薩…, “Once upon a time, the bodhisattva…”\(^{324}\) In fact, many of the narratives in the chapter on *Dhyānapāramitā* are not *jātakas* at all. Narratives Nos. 75 and 76, for example,


\(^{323}\) 眾祐自說。為菩薩時… (T 3 no. 152 p. 43a13).

\(^{324}\) This is a common epithet used to refer to a previous life of Śākyamuni Buddha. The usage of the term Bhagavat refers to him after he had achieved Buddhahood and that of “the Prince” is used to refer to him before his awakening in his last life.
are general descriptions about meditative practices of monks, while narratives Nos. 77 to 79 illustrate how Prince Siddhārtha Gautama attained concentrated meditation before he achieved Buddhahood. In addition, narrative No. 80 is a parallel to a part of Yōuxīng jīng 遊行經 (Sutra on Wanders) collected in Cháng āhán jīng 長阿含經 (Sutra of Long Discourses), which is a narrative relating to the incident when the Buddha asked Ānanda to bring him some water on the way to the town of Kuśinagara after he had taken his last meal offering from Cunda. Further, narrative No. 81 corresponds to the story of Sadāprarudīta, which is not a jātaka of Śākyamuni Buddha, but a story of another bodhisattva in one of his previous lives, according to the story recorded in the prajñāpāramitā sūtras. Given the evidence shown above, these narratives are likely to be subsequent additions to the Liù dù jí jīng 六度集經. In other words, those jātakas, including the Sadāprarudīta jātaka, could have been added to the Liù dù jí jīng 六度集經 at a later period, although in general the text may have been formed earlier. Among

325 T 3 no. 152 pp. 39c3–41a20.
326 T 3 no. 152 pp. 41a21–42b26.
327 The corresponding Sanskrit title is Dīrgha Āgama.
328 T 1 no. 1 p.19a1–c17. Similar accounts can be seen in the Mahāparinibbāna-sutta (DN II 129–135) and the Fó bānnǐhuán jīng 佛般泥洹經 (Sutra on the Buddha’s Passing away, T 1 no. 5 p. 168a16–b25). See Waldschmidt (1944: 147–162) for his discussion of this episode.
330 The textual history of the Liù dù jí jīng 六度集經 is complex. Chén Hóng 陈洪 (2003: 11–17) points out that from a textual viewpoint, the Liù dù jí jīng 六度集經 consists of compilation and translation. This text is not purely a translation by Kāṅg Sēnghūi. He argues that some of the stories in the present version (he calls it the “newly-compiled version”) of the Liù dù jí jīng 六度集經 are rewritten ones and some are actually re-translated works. He concludes that in its long history of transmission, its textual morphology has gradually emerged mainly in three forms. They are the compiled and translated version by Kāṅg Sēnghūi, the revised version evolved in the Southern Dynasty, and the newly-compiled version shaped during the Sui and Tang Dynasties.
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the narratives in the chapter on Dhyānapāramitā, the only narrative that could probably be regarded as a jātaka about Śākyamuni Buddha is No. 82. This narrative highlights Śākyamuni Buddha and the Bodhisattva Maitreya in a previous life using skilful means to instruct a king to uphold the five precepts, ten virtues, and so forth. Based on the content, narrative No. 82 is (to a large extent) connected to prajñāpāramitā rather than dhyānapāramitā, although it is classified in the category of dhyānapāramitā. It seems that within this chapter on Dhyānapāramitā, there is no jātaka devoted to illustrating dhyānapāramitā.

There is a noteworthy account in the Sarvāstivāda Āpídámó dà pípóshā lùn 阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論 (Great Extensive Treatise on the Higher Doctrine, T 27 no. 1545), translated by Xuánzàng in the Tang Dynasty in the years of Xiǎnqìng 順慶, 656–659 CE, which states:

A bodhisattva has to develop the four pāramitās (perfections) through three asamkhya kalpas (innumerable eons) and then achieve perfection. They are dānapāramitā (perfection of giving), śīlapāramitā (perfection of morality), vīryapāramitā (perfection of diligence), and prajñāpāramitā (perfection of insight).
Interestingly, dhyānapāramitā is not included in the items of development on the bodhisattva path in the mainstream Sarvāstivāda tradition. This may, in part, be a clue as to why there is no proper jātaka devoted to dhyānapāramitā.

4.3. THE UIGHUR VERSION OF THE STORY

4.3.1. TEKIN’S EDITION OF THE UIGHUR MANUSCRIPT OF THE STORY

In addition to the two main versions and the jātaka form of the story of Sadāprarudita, there is also a Uighur version. This was edited by a Uighur specialist, Şinasi Tekin, under the title Die uigurische Bearbeitung der Geschichte von Sadāprarudita und Dharmodgata Bodhisattva (The Uighur version of the story of Sadāprarudita and Dharmodgata Bodhisattva).³³⁵ In his introductory essay to the edition, Tekin (1980: 156–161) proposes that the Uighur version of Sadāprarudita cannot be regarded as a translation, but rather as a new version of the story. The main reason he gives is that the Uighur version of Sadāprarudita primarily consists of verses whereas all other versions are in prose. He provides the following information about the Uighur version:

³³⁵ This work is collected in the Buddhistische Uigurica aus der Yüan-Zeit, published in 1980. In his work, Tekin provides readers with clear images of the Uighur manuscript, a transliteration, a German translation, an overview, a glossary, and so forth. I would like to thank my fellow PhD student at the University of Sydney, Blair Silverlock, for his assistance in reading the German translation of the Uighur version.
Ch 4 - Relationship between the Different Versions of the Story

- dating: according to the style of the scripts, the text was probably produced during the Yuan dynasty (ca. the thirteenth to the fourteenth century CE);\footnote{As for the dating, the Uighur manuscript has the information, \textit{hiw yyl”r’m”y}, which literally means “the first month of a dragon year” (see Tekin 1980: 154). On account of the cursive style of the script, which occurred in the Yuan dynasty, Tekin then proposes that this text was formed between the 13th–14th centuries CE. On the other hand, Nüri (2009: 7–10) argues that the Uighur text could have been formed earlier than this time. She analysed the language and found some significant features from the perspectives of phonetics, syntax, loanwords, spelling, and so forth. Based on previous studies in the linguistics of Uighur, Nüri proposes another possible dating for the formation of the Uighur text, which is between the 12th–13th centuries. Moriyasu (1983: 209–231), based on an analysis of a letter which was glued to the back cover of the Uighur text, proposes that the dating of this Uighur text should be between the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries CE, more specifically, between the early and the mid-fourteenth century CE. This agrees with Tekin’s suggestion.}

- script: primarily in cursive Uighur script but includes some Chinese characters, which are used as ideograms and pronounced in Uighur within the text;

- style: principally mixed verse-prose, with prose sections either within verses or between verses;

- status of the text: probably a draft as there are quite a few corrections in some lines;\footnote{Tekin (1980: 155, 162) gives other reasons for why he believes that the manuscript is a draft.}

- division of the story: there is no division between the two main episodes of the story, which differs from the parallel versions in the other languages.

Tekin also draws the reader’s attention to some other interesting points. For example, in his introduction, he notes that in the Śikṣāsamuccaya, Śāntideva
quotes a passage from the story in the Aṣṭa, which describes how Śakra magically transforms himself into a *schülergestalt*\textsuperscript{338} (*māṇavaka*),\textsuperscript{339} while the Uighur version recounts that Śakra magically transforms into a brahman. Moreover, he argues that the story of Sadāparibhūta, which means “to never slight [others],” in the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka* sūtra is a counterpart to Sadāprudita, and suggests that the story of Sadāprudita might stem from the story of Sadāparibhūta.

After Tekin’s edition of the full Uighur text published in 1980, there have been some other editions and reviews.\textsuperscript{340} To a certain extent, they modified or corrected some of Tekin’s findings concerning this Uighur text. Building on these preliminary studies, some important issues will be discussed below, namely, the purpose of composing the Uighur version, its relationship to the other versions, and significant differences between the Uighur version and its closest version (i.e. version II).

\textsuperscript{338} The German translation, *schülergestalt* (a pupil’s figure), does not exactly fit the sense of its Sanskrit original *māṇavaka*, which literally means “young brahman” or “brahman pupil.” Tekin may have based his rendition on Bendall and Rouse’s (1922: 40) translation of “guise of disciple.”


4.3.2. ISSUES ON THE FORMATION OF THE UIGHUR VERSION OF THE STORY

In his primary study on the Uighur version of the story, Tekin (1980: 156) states that this version of the story of Sadāprarudita is not a translation from other languages but a Uighur adaptation. This raises the issues of why the Uighur version of the story was composed and what was its model?

4.3.2.1. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER VERSIONS OF THE STORY OF SADĀPRARUDITA

Given that the Uighur version of the story of Sadāprarudita is not a translation of a new version, compared to version I and II and the jātaka, this raises the question, “Which version did the author(s) rely on?” In the Uighur version, as stated by Tekin, there are some Chinese characters within the text, which may be a significant clue pointing to a close relation between the Uighur version and the Chinese translations of the story. However, Tekin does not propose a probable source because, as he admits in his introductory essay to the translation of the Uighur version of the Sadāprarudita story, he was not able to access the Chinese sources.

It was proposed by Jan Willem de Jong (1983: 226) that Kumārajīva’s translation of the prajñāpāramitā in 8,000 ślokas could have been the source of the Uighur version. The reason advanced by de Jong to support this is that this translation, among the various Chinese translations of Prajñāpāramitā texts, has always been the most popular in China. On the other hand, Rāziya Nūri (2009:}
96–130) argues that the source of the Uighur version of the story is actually the Chinese translation of the Śatasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra by Xuánzàng. She reaches this conclusion by assessing each corresponding character between Xuánzàng’s translation and the Uighur version.\textsuperscript{341} Although her study is thorough and elaborate, there appears to be some minor points that she seems to have missed which are only found in other Chinese translations. Could this indicate that the composer(s) had consulted other Chinese translations of the story? For example, when depicting how happy the residents were in the city of Sugandhapura, the description in the Uighur version recounts, “happiness just exactly like the gods above.”\textsuperscript{342} This is similar to the account in one of the translations of version I, that is, Lokakṣema’s translation:

\[
\ldots 譬如忉利天上 \ldots \text{其城快樂亦復如是 (T 8 no. 224 p. 471c17–20).}\textsuperscript{343}
\]

\[
\ldots \text{just like the [gods in the] Trāyastriṃśa Heaven above… the happiness in the city [of Gandhavatī] is the same.}
\]

This account is only found in version I and the Uighur version. Another similarity between Lokakṣema’s translation and the Uighur version is the account regarding Sadāprarudita’s self-sacrifice. In order to obtain some wealth to honour

\textsuperscript{341} In her PhD dissertation, Nûri (2009: 131) also suggests some other possible sources in ancient Central Asian languages, such as Tocharian or Sogdian languages.
\textsuperscript{342} For the transliteration of this description, see Tekin 1980: 192 (verse XXIX, line number 91). See also Nûri 2009: 26 (verse XXIX, line number 91) for the transcription. For the translation, see Tekin 1980: 242 in German and Nûri 2009: 66 in Chinese.
\textsuperscript{343} This is also seen in Zhi Qiān’s translation. See T 8 no. 225 p. 504b19–20.
Dharmodgata, Sadāprarudita promises to sell his flesh, blood, bone marrow, and heart in the Uighur version. The corresponding account in Lokakṣema’s translation is “blood, flesh, bone marrow, and heart,”\(^{344}\) while the account in other Chinese translations, belonging to version II, only has “blood, bone marrow, and heart,"\(^{345}\) that is, there is no mention of “flesh.” In addition to the two examples above, it is interesting that the term “the god of gods” \((t[ā]j[y]ri t[ā]j[y]risi)\)\(^{346}\) is used to refer to the Buddha in the very beginning of the Uighur version and this is unseen in other extant parallels. However, the term \(tiān zhōng tiān\) 天中天, which literally means “god amongst gods” or “the god of gods,” is used in the same sense in Lokakṣema’s translation (Aṣṭa-L)\(^{347}\) and the fragment of the \(Mōhē bānruò chāo jīng\) 摩訶般若鉈經,\(^{348}\) attributed to Dharmarakṣa. Unfortunately, only the first five scrolls of the \(Mōhē bānruò chāo jīng\) 摩訶般若鉈經 are still in existence.

It is hard to say whether the composer(s) had consulted the translation of the story in the \(Mōhē bānruò chāo jīng\) 摩訶般若鉈經 as the extant fragments do not contain the story. However, the use of “god of gods” might seem to suggest that the Chinese translation of the story found in the Aṣṭa-L or the \(Mōhē bānruò chāo jīng\) 摩訶般若鉈經 may have had an influence on the Uighur version. On the other hand, given that the term “god of gods” \((tāj[y]ri tāj[y]risi)\) is used in other Uighur
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344 T 8 no. 225 p. 472b24–25. See also Zhī Qiān’s translation, T 8 no. 225 p. 504c29.
345 For example, the translation by Xuānzāng gives the three items of “human blood, marrow, and heart” (T 6 no. 220 p. 1063a4). See also T 8 no. 221 p. 143b21–22; T 8 no. 223 p. 419a2–3; T 8 no. 227 p. 582b15; T 8 no. 228 p. 671a29–b1.
346 See Tekin 1980: Tafel 1 [line 1] for the account in the image of the manuscript. Tekin’s transliteration is \(tnkry\) \(tnkry\)sy (1980: 184) and Nūri’s transcription is \(t[ā]j[y]ri t[ā]j[y]risi\) (2009: 19).
347 For example, the translation 天中天 is seen in T 8 no. 224 p. 427a4.
348 T 8 no. 226 p. 509b1.
texts, it does not seem uncommon that it appears in the composition of the Uighur version of the story of Sadāprudita.

From the examples above, it appears that the Uighur version has some elements that correspond to the Chinese translations other than that by Xuánzàng. Although it is possible that, apart from Xuánzàng’s translation, some other Chinese translations of the story may have been consulted by the authors of the Uighur version, it seems less likely that Lokakṣema or Zhī Qiān’s translation was accessible to them. This is because, as pointed out by Niú Rǔjí 牛汝极 (2002: 56–58), Uighur translation of Buddhist texts started in the late tenth century CE, and the majority of the sources were from Chinese Buddhist cannon obtained from the royal house of the Tang dynasty, in which the text translated by Lokakṣema or Zhī Qiān was less likely to have been included as Xuánzàng’s translation was more preferable at the time. Another reason would be that although Lokakṣema or Zhī Qiān’s translation was still available in China in the late tenth century CE, due to the difficulty in comprehending their translations, they would not have been the preferred choice. Dàoān 道安 (312–385 CE), a pivotal figure in the Eastern Jin dynasty, comments that the links between sentences or paragraphs in Lokakṣema’s translation of the Aṣṭa are quite

349 For example, Yáng (2009: 66–68) indicates that in the Uighur manuscripts the term tāgri tāgri is seen in the Kumbhakara jātaka and Maitrisimit.
350 Yáng (2001: 161–165) also indicates that the extant Uighur manuscripts of Mahāyāna Buddhist scriptures, such as the Suvarnaprabhāsottama sūtra, Amitāyurdhyāna sūtra, and the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāna sūtra, are close to Chinese texts that were translated in the fifth century CE or later.
If such an eminent Buddhist as Dàoān had difficulty in understanding the text translated by Lokakṣema, then it would be reasonable to assume that others also faced similar difficulties. As such the author(s) of the Uighur version would have also taken this factor into account when selecting the version on which to base their piece of work.

4.3.2.2. **The purpose of composing the Uighur version**

In terms of trying to understand the purpose for which the Uighur version of the story was composed, various sources and methods can be applied. In some fragments of Uighur Buddhist manuscripts colophons exist and provide some information about patronages, purposes, scribes, and so forth. Unfortunately, such information is not available for the manuscript of this Uighur text of the story of Sadāprarudita. Although this is the case, some information can be obtained through the colophons that appear in other Uighur fragments which are similar in style (i.e. adaptation into alliterating poetry). For example, a great Uighur translator, Antsang, composed an alliterating poetry piece adapted from the section about the aspiration of Samantabhadra in the *Huā yán jīng 華嚴經* (*Flower Adornment Sutra*). In one of his verses, he adds extra content, stating he started composing the poem because he sought the noble virtue. He also mentions that the
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content in the chapter of *Gandavyūha* deeply impressed him.\(^{352}\) Another Uighur translator, Prajñāsṛi, adapted Nāgārjuna’s work into poetry and gave the reason why he did thus. In the colophon he says that in order to show his honour to the *prajñāpāramitā*, which is great and profound, he adapted Nāgārjuna’s treatise *Nirvikalpa* into alliterating poetry.\(^{353}\) The purpose of these authors in composing their poetic works may be regarded as a demonstration of their religious enthusiasm.

On the other hand, as the Uighur version of the story of Sadāprarudita is an alternating verse-prose narrative, another possibility is that it could have been drafted for a performance. For example, the well-known Uighur text, *Maitrisimit* (Skt. *Maitreyasamiti*, lit. “meeting with Maitreya”), which consists of alternating lines of prose and rhymed verse, is a sort of “play.”\(^{354}\) According to some of the information in the colophons, Annemarie von Gabain proposes that the Uighur

---


\(^{353}\) For the details of the colophon by Prajñāșrī, see Yang 2004: 83.

\(^{354}\) Ji (1991: 64–70) proposes that the story of *Maitrisimit* is a play as the title in the manuscript remaining in the Tocharian version of this story is *Maitreyasamitināṭaka*. The term, *nāṭaka*, refers to “play” in this context. With regard to literary style of the Uighur version or the Tocharian version of this story, a definite conclusion has not been reached among scholars. This story is regarded differently by different scholars. Their points of view are that (1) it is an embryonic form of a play (von Gabain 1980: 60; Geng 2004: 126–130), (2) a sort of performance that recounts stories with pictures (Mair 1988: 40–41), (3) talking and singing literature (Shen 1990: 4–12; 1995: 26–28), and (4) a real play (Ji 1991: 64–70; Li 1999: 121–141). Yang (2005: 242–245) argues that these different ideas about the style of this story can be taken as different perspectives to understand ancient performances in Central Asia as elements in the story may refer to various possibilities. Both Ji and Yang argue that although *nāṭaka* may refer to a “play,” it is not proper to assume that *nāṭaka* is the same as the modern usage of the term “play.”
Maitrisimit is an embryonic form of a play which was performed on the fifteenth day of the first month of the lunar calendar. She states that on this day, lay devotees gathered in a monastery and participated in ceremonies for repenting their faults and for the salvation of their dead relatives. In the evening, they listened to didactic stories, watched performances such as Maitrisimit, and so forth. Further, she proposes that these works were composed by those with authority on the śāstras and the purpose of the composition was not for reading but rather for performances by which the public were drawn into the noble teachings (von Gabain 1980: 60). Likewise, the Uighur version of the story of Sadāprarudita could have had the same purpose.

Another approach that may provide some idea about why a story in a prose sūtra form was adapted into an alternating verse-prose narrative is to consider biànwén 變文 (literally, “transformation text”), which is a sort of popular literature in the region of Dunhuang. This genre consists of alternating narrative verse-prose and was prevalent in China during the Tang Dynasty (618–907 CE) and the Five Dynasties (907–960 CE). Since the style of the Uighur version also consists of prose and verse, consideration of the Buddhist biànwén may shed some further light. In the Tang Dynasty and the Five Dynasties, quite a few Buddhist narratives were adapted for popular literature, and thus were written
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355 This English translation is proposed by Mair (1983: 3; 1989: 43). Having reviewed all interpretations by other scholars, he argues that the term biàn 變 is etymologically related to a Buddhist technical term meaning “transformation” and suggests that “transformation text” may suit the Chinese best. For more details, see Mair 1983: 1–7; 1989: 36–72; and Lù 2000: 1–24.
partly in prose and partly in verse, known as *biànwén*. One of the significant features of *biànwén* is its alternating verse-prose narrative style. Mair (1983: 7; 1989: 88–89) points out that in the “prosimetrical” narratives (ie. *biànwén*) there are two basic patterns for the relationship between prose and verse. In the first pattern, the verse is an integral component of the narrative structure, that is, it helps to carry the story forward. In the second pattern most of the essential narrative content is in the prose passages and the verses are utilised chiefly to recapitulate or embellish the narrative. Lù Yongfēng 隆永峰 (2000: 138) indicates that the verses in both structures of *biàn wén* are rhymed verses and each line primarily consists of seven or five characters. Further, he elaborates on the function of the prose sections in the first pattern of *biàn wén*, showing how the prose sections are used to join episodes, especially where there is a change of speaker. Another significant feature of *biàn wén* is the use of pictures within the text. Mair (1989: 41–46) states that *biàn wén* was actually a type of pictorial storytelling transmitted to China through Central Asia from India. As for the function of *biàn wén*, Lù (2000: 300) proposes that the style of *biàn wén* played a crucial role in the promotion and spread of Buddhism into Chinese society as it combines Buddhist doctrine with the expressions used by the ordinary people in their daily life, thereby presenting the teachings in a vivid and impressionable form.

356 Tekin (1980: 41) also proposes that it is possible that Uighurs referred to the pictures used in narrative storytelling as körünč.
The Uighur version of the story of Sadāprarudita has similar features to \textit{biànwén}. First of all, the Uighur version is also an alternating verse-prose narrative in which verse is an integral component of the narrative structure. Furthermore, Tekin (1980: 176) points out that the less frequent prose sections are used to join episodes, especially where there is a change of speaker, as with \textit{biànwén}. Unlike Indian verses, which are based on meters, as stated by Tekin (1980: 176), the verses in the Uighur version of the story are based on alliterating lines.\footnote{Tekin (1980: 176) states that this style of alliteration has a Mongolian origin. Zieme states that alliteration is a significant feature of Uighur poetry. From the extant Uighur manuscripts of Uighur poetry, he points out that these rhymed verses have three styles: head rhyme only, end rhyme only, and both. For details, see Zieme, trans. into Chinese by Guì and Yáng 2007: 57.} According to the transcription in Nūri’s edition, end rhyme appears in a few verses.\footnote{For example, verses 28, 33, 37 have end rhyme (Nūri 2009: 25–27).} This is another similarity to \textit{biànwén}. Since the Uighur version of the story resembles \textit{biànwén} in terms of genre, it is possible that the purpose of its formation is to promote the spread of Buddhism in Uighur society, like the role that \textit{biànwén} played in China. More specifically, the Uighur version may have been drafted as some kind of performance, similar to some Indian plays which are also in verse-prose form. There are some features of the Uighur version of the story, which in part, support this point. Compared with the other versions, the Uighur version tends to describe conventional issues more vividly, while accounts relating to doctrinal issues on the \textit{prajñāpāramitā} teaching or Sadāprarudita’s experiences in various \textit{samādhis} are fewer. For example, when describing the people in the City of Sugandhapura, the Uighur version gives more information
about the residents of the city, depicting them as “well-mannered and beautiful,” and “dancing, swimming, laughing, and drinking wine.” Moreover, when describing the birds of the land of Sugandhapura, the Uighur version has more details about their behaviours such as rubbing themselves on their breasts, stretching out their wings and flapping them, holding their tails up high, stroking their feathers with their claws, quarrelling with one another, screaming, running away, hitting each other, cackling, singing, chirping, screeching.\textsuperscript{359} All of these details on the birds’ behaviours are not seen in any of the other versions. On the other hand, the account about the teaching of \textit{prajñāpāramitā} by Dharmodgata in the Uighur version lists only eight of the characteristics of \textit{prajñāpāramitā}, while its closest version, version II, gives thirty. In short, according to the evidence shown above, the Uighur version of the story of Sadāprudita, which was written in verse-prose style, may also have been composed for the purpose of making the story more readily accessible to a general audience.

\textbf{4.4. The Evolution of the Story Over Time}

In the prior sections of this chapter, the contours of the development of the two main versions, the \textit{jātaka} form, and the Uighur version of the story of Sadāprudita have been sketched. A synoptic exposition of the process of their evolution will be given here.

\textsuperscript{359} For more information on the detailed descriptions of the residents and the birds in the City of Sugandhapura, see Tekin 1980: 242–243; Nüri 2009: 65–67.
Nattier provides a relatively objective idea of the parameters of the textual evolution in her studies on the *Ugraparipṛcchā*:

… it is vital that we bear in mind that these four extant versions do not necessarily stand in a linear historical relationship to one another; there is no reason to think that the Indian text used by Dharmarakṣa, for example, was a direct lineal descendant of the version translated by An Hsüan and Yen Fo-t’iao. On the contrary, it is far more likely that the four extant Chinese and Tibetan translations were based on Sanskrit or Prakrit versions stemming from several different branches of the textual family tree (Nattier 2003: 37).

This is helpful to researchers trying to ascertain a probable path of a text’s development from a historical perspective. In other words, a conclusion or inference would be relatively more reliable if it were based on multiple exemplars collected from the texts themselves. That is, all valid points should be given due consideration in an objective manner. Otherwise, if only a selective set of points are considered, there is the risk of introducing bias, which would then yield results that obscure rather than shed light on the likely process of a text’s development, and may even stray far away from it.

Generally speaking, high consistency between two texts with different chronological ages of their translations would show that there is a close relationship between them. That is, one is either derived from the other or both
developed from a common ancestor. The process of development of the two main versions of the story of Sadāprarudita (versions I and II) tends to support the idea that both stemmed from different branches of the same textual family tree rather than that one developed from the other. The crucial evidence supporting this inference is the fact that the contents of the various samādhis in one version are utterly different from that in the other. As for the consistency between the two main versions in terms of the sequence of the main episodes, this may, at the very least, serve as a window through which the shape of the hypothesised earlier version of the story may be viewed.

I have previously demonstrated the relationships between version I and version II, version I and the jātaka form of the story, and version II and the Uighur version. Based on these discussions, a probable path of development in relation to these four versions of the story of Sadāprarudita would be as follows. In terms of the lineage of version I, after it was formed, it was transmitted to China and was translated into Chinese between the second and third century CE. However, version I seems to have been unavailable at a later period because it is not found in later translations or in the Sanskrit Aṣṭa of which the available manuscripts date between 1000 and 1150 CE.360 Interestingly, a jātaka version, which looks like an abbreviated work of version I, is found in the Liù dù jì jīng 六度集經 translated by Kāng Sēnhuí (ca. the mid-third century CE). There is even

---

360 Another reason why version I is not seen in later translations could be that version I was prevalent in certain regions but somehow was not transmitted. Therefore, geographical factors may also have played a role in the unavailability of version I. I would like to thank Prof. Jan Nattier for calling my attention to this aspect.
some evidence which suggests that Kāng Sēnghuì was the compiler who adapted the story from version I for a jātaka of Śākyamuni Buddha and added it into the Liù dù jí jīng 六度集經. In short, the version of the story represented by version I appears to have fallen out of use. On the other hand, version II continued to develop as witnessed by the eleventh century version in the Sankrit Aṣṭa and influenced the composition of the Uighur version of the story. Accordingly, the development of the four versions can be depicted as in Figure 4.4.

**Figure 4.4 Development Path of Version I, Version II, the Jātaka Form of the Story, and the Uighur Version**
Having investigated the story of Sadaprarudita from literary and historical aspects, the discussion will now move to the interpretation and usage of the contents. This next area of investigation allows the value of the story to be revealed from a different aspect.
Chapter 5

Sadāprarudita’s Experiences in Various Samādhis

In the previous chapter the list of samādhis that Sadāprarudita experiences played a crucial role in the process of establishing the relationship between the two main versions of the story. It is also notable that Sadāprarudita’s experience in various samādhis is one of the significant events in the story that relates to the practice of Buddhism. With a particular focus on these samādhis, this chapter will examine the implications of the names of these samādhis because some of the names of these samādhis seem to be just the result of vivid imaginings. In other words, the focus will be whether the names of these samādhis actually have a basis in practical experience or not, and also what the practice of these samādhis means for a practitioner. Further, the principle of irrelevance will be applied to the samādhi on viewing all tathāgatas in order to evaluate what historical information we can garner from this unique samādhi.

5.1. Vivid Imaginings or Practical Experiences?

According to the accounts in the Aṣṭa-Skt, there are two occasions where Sadāprarudita undergoes the experience of a series of samādhis. One occasion is after he hears the instructions regarding the city of Gandhavatī and the

361 As mentioned in Chapter 1, the Sanskrit Aṣṭa contains version II of the story. In version I, there are three occasions on which Sadāprarudita has experiences in samādhis.
Bodhisattva Dharmodgata from an unnamed tathāgata figure (tathāgata-vigraha).

The sūtra recounts:

Then, without moving from the very spot where he was, the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita, the great being [was deeply absorbed in thinking of] listening to the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata, the great being, teaching the prajñāpāramitā. And listening [thus], he gave rise to the perception of the non-clinging to all dharmas and the various entrances to samādhis manifested in his presence.\(^{363}\)

Having experienced a series of samādhis, Sadāprarudita finally sees that all the buddhas of the ten directions are in his presence. This is the first occasion on which he experiences various samādhis. The second occasion is after he has listened to Dharmodgata teach the prajñāpāramitā.\(^{364}\)

When looking at the names of the samādhis closely, one cannot help but question to what extent these samādhis reflected actual practices since some of the names appear quite fanciful. For example, this would appear to be the case with

\(^{362}\) In this context, the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita is imagining that he is “listening” to the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata teaching the prajñāpāramitā (as he is not yet in his physical presence). One of the Chinese translations corresponds to the addition given here in square brackets, that is, yīxīn di xiāng 一心諦想, literally meaning “to thoroughly think of with a focused mind” (T 8 no. 228 p. 673c3).


\(^{364}\) *atha khalu sadāpraruditasya bodhisattvasya mahāsattvasya tathā nisāṅnasyaiva tasyāṁ velāyāṁ sarvadharmasamataṁ nāma samādhirājo jātaḥ...* (Aṣṭa [ed. Wogihara 1932–1935] 987), “Then there arose the king of concentration named ‘sameness of all dharmas’ in the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita, the great being at that time sitting thus.”
the samādhis referred to as the concentration named “scattering flowers” (kusumābhikīrṇo nāma samādhiḥ),\textsuperscript{365} the concentration named “mirror image-like attainment” (ādarśa-maṇḍala-pratibhāsa-nirhāro nāma samādhiḥ),\textsuperscript{366} and the concentration named “supernatural manifestations of lotuses” (padma-vyūho nāma samādhiḥ).\textsuperscript{367} At first glance these names do not sound like actual concentration practices. However, there is an account found in the commentary on the prajñāpāramitā sūtra of 22,000 ślokas, the Dà zhì dù lún 大智度論 (The Treatise on the [Sutra of] Great Perfection of Insight), which provides elaborations on these samādhis, and this, to a large extent, shows that they were based on practical religious experiences. Of the above-mentioned concentrations, the reason why the concentration of “scattering flowers” (kusumābhikīrṇa) is so named is because those practitioners, while in this concentration, can be present before the buddhas and scatter flowers on them.\textsuperscript{368} Furthermore, the reason why there is a concentration called “the supernatural manifestations of lotuses” (padma-vyūha) is because those who attain this concentration can see precious lotus flowers raining onto the buddhas of the ten directions, and the buddhas themselves are all sitting on lotus flowers.\textsuperscript{369} According to these explanations, we can see that the names of

\textsuperscript{365} Aṣṭa (ed. Wogihara 1932–1935) 941.2–3.
\textsuperscript{366} Aṣṭa (ed. Wogihara 1932–1935) 941.4–5.
\textsuperscript{367} Aṣṭa (ed. Wogihara 1932–1935) 941.20–21.
\textsuperscript{368} 散華三昧者。得是三昧者。於十方佛前能以七寶華散佛 (T 25 no. 1509 p. 736c26–27), “As for the concentration [named] ‘scattering flowers,’ those who attain this concentration can be in front of the buddhas of the ten directions [and] scatter flowers on them.”
\textsuperscript{369} 得是三昧者。見十方佛坐七寶蓮花上。於虛空中雨寶蓮花於諸佛上 (T 25 no. 1509 p. 737b9–11), “Concerning the concentration [named] ‘the supernatural manifestations of [lotus] flowers,’ for those who attain this concentration, they can see the buddhas of the ten directions sitting on lotus flowers, on whom there rains precious lotuses from the sky.”
these concentrations that are related to flowers are based on what the *samādhi* practitioners see or can do while in these concentrative states. There is another type of *samādhi* name which possesses similes, such as the concentration named “mirror image-like attainment” (*ādarśa-maṇḍala-pratībhāsa-nirhāra*) and the concentration named “the peak without obstruction from all dharmas” (*sarva-dharmānavāvaraṇa-koṭi*). Again, these are not mere fanciful constructs. According to the explanation in the *Dà zhì dù lùn* 大智度論, the concentration is named “mirror image-like attainment” (*ādarśa-maṇḍala-pratībhāsa-nirhāra*) because, “Those who attain this concentration [can] see all phenomena as images in a mirror, which are illusory [and] without essence.”370 Moreover, the reason why another concentration is called “the peak without obstruction from all dharmas” (*sarva-dharmānavāvaraṇa-koṭi*) is because, “When bodhisattvas are in that state of concentration they [are able to] see all dharmas entirely without obstruction, just like one who is able to completely view [everything] in the four directions when standing on the peak of a mountain.”371 This type of *samādhi* gets its name from the simile that describes the experiences in that *samādhi*. To sum up, although some of the names of these *samādhis* that Sadāprarudita experiences may sound fanciful, according to the explanations found in the *Dà zhì dù lùn* 大智度論, they appear to have some basis in practical experience.

---

370 得如鏡像三昧者。得是三昧者觀三界所有。如鏡中像虛詭無實 (T 25 no.1509 p. 737a2–4). There seems to be a slight difference between the Sanskrit name and the Chinese translation.

371 諸法無礙頂三昧者。如人在山頂遍觀四方。菩薩住是三昧中。普見一切諸法無礙 (T 25 no. 1509 p. 737a20–22).
A note of interest here is that such a series of *samādhis* does not appear in early Buddhist texts such as *āgama* sūtras, but similar descriptions can be found in other Mahāyāna texts. This may be a reflection of later developments. In other words, while examples of *samādhis* are mostly unseen in early Buddhist texts, there are other Mahāyāna texts of comparable vintage (notably *pratyutpanna-buddha-saṃmukhāvasthita-samādhi*, studied by Paul Harrison)\(^\text{372}\) that do discuss *samādhis*. Why is it that these *samādhis* were absent in the *āgama* texts? It might be possible that at the time such lists of *samādhis* may not have been well known, or widely known. Further, they may not have been taught by the Buddha, but rather by his disciples. This may partly explain the observation made above. For example, in sūtra No. 576 of the Chinese *Saṃyuktāgama* (T 2 no. 99 pp. 149c6–150a16) there is an account where the Venerable Nāqiédāduō 那伽達多 (*Nāgadatta*) asks the householder Zhíduōluó 質多羅 (*Citra*) about four kinds of *samādhi*: wǔliàng xīn sānmèi 無量心三昧 (the concentration of measureless mind),\(^\text{373}\) wúxiàng xīn sānmèi 無相心三昧 (the concentration of signless mind),\(^\text{374}\) wúsǒuyǒu xīn sānmèi 無所有心三昧 (the concentration of mind by means of nothingness),\(^\text{375}\) and kǒng xīn sānmèi 空心三昧 (the concentration of mind by means of emptiness).\(^\text{376}\) Then, before giving his answer to the Venerable

---

\(^\text{372}\) There is a thorough study of this *samādhi* by Paul Harrison, published in 1990. The *samādhis* evident in this text are also not found in *āgama* texts, thus one might suppose that descriptions of *samādhis* are distinctive to Mahāyāna texts.

\(^\text{373}\) A possible reconstruction of the Sanskrit name is *aparimāṇa-citta-samādhi*.

\(^\text{374}\) A possible reconstruction of the Sanskrit name is *animitta-citta-samādhi*.

\(^\text{375}\) A possible reconstruction of the Sanskrit name is *ākiṁcana-citta-samādhi*.

\(^\text{376}\) A possible reconstruction of the Sanskrit name is *śūnyatā-citta-samādhi*. 
Nāqiédáduō’s query, the householder Zhíduōluó responds by asking Venerable Nāqiédáduō a question, “Are these samādhis taught by the Blessed One or originated by you?” The Venerable Nāqiédáduō then replies that they are, “Taught by the Blessed One.” In this dialogue, the householder Zhíduōluó’s question, in which he enquires whether the samādhis are taught by the Buddha or originated from Venerable Nāqiédáduō, may suggest two points. One is that these samādhis, although originally taught by the Buddha, might not have been commonly known by Buddhists at that time, and the other is that some samādhis might have originated from the Buddha’s disciples, based on their own practical experiences. One such example reflecting the latter is found in sūtra No. 558 of the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama (T 2 no. 99 p. 146b1–18).

On one occasion a monk attained the concentration of signless mind but had no idea about the merits and goal of this samādhi. He then thought to himself that the Venerable Ānanda would discuss this samādhi if someone asked him about it. In this way, he would learn about the merits and goal of this samādhi. However, in the six years of his staying in the community led by the Venerable Ānanda, no one asks Ānanda about the samādhi. Finally, the monk himself asks

---

377 此諸三昧為世尊所說。為尊者自意說耶 (T 2 no. 99 p. 149c16–17).
378 尊者那伽達多答言。此世尊所說 (T 2 no. 99 p. 149c17–18).
379 The sūtra also recounts that having received the elaboration on the four samādhis from the householder Zhíduōluó, the Venerable Nāqiédáduō further questioned the householder Zhíduōluó whether he had previously heard of what he had just taught right now, to which the householder Zhíduōluó replied, “Never, Venerable!” See T 2 no. 99 p. 150a12–13 for the account.
380 Although they may have been known at an earlier stage, the textual evidence seems to suggest that these were a later, and specifically Mahāyāna, development.
381 五想心三昧 無相心三昧, Skt. *animitta-citta-samādhi.
Ānanda about the concentration of signless mind and duly obtains some information about it. The account that “there was no other person who had asked about the concentration of signless mind over six years” may suggest that few monks had heard of this samādhi or experienced it. In short, though early Buddhist texts may not abound with lists of samādhis, evidence from sūtras Nos. 576 and 558 of the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama shows that there were practitioners achieving various states of samādhi and then inquiring about them.

Accordingly, it appears more likely that the series of samādhis in the story of Sadāprarudita were in fact a reflection of the actual experiences of practitioners within Mahāyāna communities.

**5.2. THE SPECIFIC SAMĀDHIS OF VIEWING ALL TATHĀGATAS**

According to the Aṣṭa-Skt that belongs to version II, among the series of samādhis that Sadāprarudita experiences, the last is named “viewing all tathāgatas” (sarva-tathāgata-darśin). When in this samādhi, Sadāprarudita sees the buddhas of the countless realms in the ten directions teaching bodhisattvas the prajñāpāramitā. The buddhas also applaud him, comfort him, and answer his

---

382 經六年中。無有餘人問此義者 (T 2 no. 99 146b10–11).

383 However, the terms used in these texts seem to be echoing names of the four formless attainments and/or the three meditations on the empty (śūnya), signless (animitta), and wishless (apraṇāhita) concentrations known also in Pāli texts, so not technically samādhi (even though the texts do use sanmei 三昧 with reference to these). I thank Professor Nattier for bringing this to my attention.

query about who is his *kalyāṇa-mitra* (a friend of virtue). After giving him the instructions, they disappear and Sadāprudita emerges from the *samādhi*. Sadāprudita then asks himself about where those tathāgatas have come from and where they have gone. Later, Sadāprudita meets his appointed spiritual guide, the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata, and presents this question to him. The Bodhisattva Dharmodgata’s response to this query is significant: *na khalu kulaputra tathāgatāḥ kutaścid āgacchanti vā gacchanti vā*, “Indeed, son of good family, tathāgatas do not come from or go anywhere.”

Based on the description above, we find a remarkably similar account concerning the *pratyutpanna-buddha-sammukhāvasthitā-samādhi* (simplified hereafter as *pratyutpanna-samādhi*), which literally means, “the concentration of having stood in the presence of the present buddhas.” The account is found in the *Bāṇḍhū sānnēi jīng* 般舟三昧經 (*Sutra on the Concentration of Being in the Presence of All the Buddhas*, T 13 no. 417).

---

385 Aṣṭa (ed. Wogihara 1932–1935) 942.5–943.23. The structure of the story here in version II differs from version I. At this point in version I, Sadāprudita has a vision of a buddha figure, who teaches him about the nature of all dharmanas and gives a description of Gandhavatī. After this, he then attains the single *samādhi* of viewing all buddhas in the ten directions (T 8 no. 224 p. 471b19–c4; T 8 no. 225 p. 504a29–b7).


388 A possible reconstruction of the Sanskrit name is *Pratyutpanna-samādhi-sūtra*. Harrison notes that the Sanskrit text of the *Bāṇḍhū sānnēi jīng* 般舟三昧經 has not survived, except for one small fragment found at Khadalik in Central Asia, edited by F. W. Thomas. For the details see Harrison 1978: 56; 1990: xv–xvi. He also gives detailed information about the parallels in four Chinese versions and one Tibetan translation (Harrison 1978: 40–41; 1990: xv–xvii). Paul Harrison’s main work on the *Pratyutpanna-samādhi-sūtra* is his study and annotated translation, published in 1990, of the Tibetan version of this text.
… [with a pure mind], if one wishes to see buddhas, one then can see. When one sees buddhas, one can ask questions, and replies will be given. Having heard the teachings, one will be exalted and should think to oneself, “Did these buddhas come from somewhere? Did I go anywhere?” One then can realise, “These buddhas come from nowhere and I do not go anywhere.”

Paul Harrison (1978: 48) notes this similarity and comments that there is no way of knowing whether or not the samādhi on viewing all tathāgatas in the Sadāprarudita narrative can be equated with the pratyutpanna-samādhi. However, he does propose that the experience of the vision of the buddhas in the ten directions may be regarded as a specific experience on the path to the perfection of insight and awakening, an experience which the author of the tale saw as being worthy of elucidation in terms of the doctrine of śūnyatā (emptiness). Jacob Kinnard (1999: 93–97) also points out the importance of seeing buddhas from the perspective of the development of insight (prajñā). He notes that according to Śāntideva’s Śikṣāsamuccaya, seeing buddhas is vital because immeasurable brightness—great insight—arises in those who see a buddha, whether in the form of an image or in person. This statement by Śāntideva sheds light on the

---

389 欲見佛即見。見即聞。聞經大歡喜作是念。佛從何所來。我為到何所。自念佛無所從來。我亦無所至 (T 13 no. 417 p. 899b24–26). See also T 13 no. 419 pp. 922c26–923a1; T 13 no. 418 p. 905c26–29; T13 no. 416 p. 877a29–b3.

significance of the practice of the visualisation of buddhas. The practice not only cultivates *samādhi*, but also insight.

In addition to this account in the *Bānzhōu sānmèi jīng* 般舟三昧經, the story of Sudhana’s search for good friends in the *Gaṇḍavyūha* has a parallel description. In this account, during his visit to the country of Vanavāsi, Sudhana meets his appointed good friend, Muktaka. After Sudhana relates his intentions to Muktaka, he receives instructions regarding a concentrated state that Muktaka had experienced, which is called *asaṅgavyāho nāma tathāgatavimokṣaḥ* (literally, the liberation of tathāgatas named “marvelous manifestations without obstacles”). Muktaka concludes:

> iti hi kulaputra ... daśasu dikṣu
dāśabuddhakṣetraparamāṇurajaḥsamāḥs tathāgatān arhaḥ
samyaksamān buddhān paśyāmi. na ca te tathāgatā iḥāgacchanti, na

Thus, O son of good family, ... I see tathāgatas, the worthy ones, the perfectly awakened ones, [in numbers] equal to the infinitesimal particles of dust in the realms of the ten buddhas in the ten directions. Neither do those tathāgatas come here nor do I go there.

who see the greatest of human beings becomes wide; the might of insight, which is countless and bright, arises.”
Interestingly, in the *Gaṇḍavyūha* there is a second name for this concentrated state, which is mentioned after Sudhana asks about how to initiate and develop the bodhi mind of bodhisattvas:

\[
\text{atha khalu muktakah śreṣṭī tasyāṃ velāyāṃ sarvabuddhakṣetra-}
\text{samavasaraṇaṃ nāma anantāvartadhāraṇīmukhapūrvaṃgamam}
\]

\[
\text{bodhisattvasamādhimukhaṃ samāpadyata (Gaṇḍavyūha [ed. Vaidya}
\text{1960] 64.20–21).
\]

Then at that time the chief Muktaka entered the gate to the *samādhi* of bodhisattvas, preceded by the entrance to the endless whirl *dhāraṇī*, called “assembling the realms of all buddhas.”

Although the description of this concentrated state is similar to those in the previous quotations from the *Aṣṭa* and the *Bāṇzhōu sānmèi jīng* 般舟三昧經, the name differs. This may be due to differences in the geographic origin of each text or differences in the transmission of the texts by different communities. Names of *samādhi* can differ in different textual traditions. For example, a certain *samādhi* in one of the *Saṃyuktāgama* sūtras is named differently in its parallel in the Pali *Samyutta-nikāya*. In the *Saṃyuktāgama* sūtra No. 576, as mentioned earlier, Venerable Nāqiédáduō asks the householder Zhíduōluó about four kinds of *samādhi*: the *wúliàng xīn sānmèi* 無量心三昧 (concentration of measureless mind); the *wúxiàng xīn sānmèi* 無相心三味 (the concentration of signless mind);
the *wúsuōyǒu xīn sānṃēi* 無所有心三昧 (concentration of mind by means of nothingness); and the *kōng xīn sānṃēi* 空心三昧 (the concentration of mind by means of emptiness). 391 The householder Zhíduōluó explains that on the one hand, the four *samādhis* are different in meaning and also different in phrasing, but on the other hand, the four are the same in meaning and only different in phrasing. In this latter definition, where the four *samādhis* are the same in meaning, they are referred to as *wúzhēng* [xīn sānṃēi] 無靜 392 [心三昧] ([the concentration of mind by means of] non-disputation). 393 In the sutta of the *Saṃyutta-nikāya*, 394 which parallels the *Saṃyuktāgama* sūtra No. 576, the corresponding name of the *samādhi* is “unshakable liberation of mind” (*akuppā cetovimuttī*). 395 This example

---

391 T 2 no. 99 pp. 149c6–150a16.
392 复问长者。云何法一义种味。答言。尊者。谓贪[者是]有量。[患·病者是有量]。若无[静]者第一无量 (T 2 no. 99 p. 150a6–7), “Then [the venerable] asks the householder, ‘what is the way by which these things are one in meaning and different in phrasing?’ [The householder] answers, ‘O venerable, craving is measurable, [hatred and ignorance are measurable], but non-disputation is the best among the measureless.’” The extra words in the square brackets are based on the account after this as shown below,

答言。尊者。謂贪者是有量。若无[静]者第一無量。謂貪者是有相。患·病者是有相。無[靜者是無相。貪者是所有。患·病者是所有。無靜者是無所有 (T 2 no. 99 p. 150a6–9).

393 A possible reconstruction of the Sanskrit term is *araṇa* or *araṇā*, see BHSD sv. *araṇa* katamo ca bhante pariyaśo yam pariyāyaṃ āgama ime dhāmme ekathā vyañjanam eva nānām? rāgo bhante pamāṇakarano, doso pamāṇakarano, moho pamāṇakarano, te khiṃsasavassa bhikkhuṇo pahīnā uccīṣṇāmāgala taḷāvatthukatā anabhāvavatā ayatim anuppādadhamma. yāvatā kho bhante appamāṇā cetovimuttī, *akuppā tāsam cetovimutti aggam akkhyāyati* (SN IV 297 [41.7]), “And what, O venerable sir, is the way by which these things are one in meaning and different only in phrasing? Craving, O venerable sir, is a producer of measurement, hatred is a producer of measurement, and delusion is a producer of measurement. For a monk of whom taints are destroyed, these have been abandoned, cut off at the root, made like palm stumps, obliterated so that they are no more subject to future arising. To whatever extent there are measureless liberations of mind, the unshakable liberation of mind is declared the best among them.” This translation, with some alteration, follows Bodhi 2000: 1326.

394 According to the context in the *Saṃyuktāgama* sūtra No. 576 and its parallel in the *Saṃyutta-nikāya*, the term *wúzhēng* 無靜 (non-disputation) is probably an abbreviation of

---

206
shows that different Buddhist communities may name the same concentrated state differently. Such a variation in naming could result from various causes, differences in geographic location and communities appear to have been significant factors. The following analysis presents the evidence.

Douglas Osto (2008: 114–115) argues that there is some evidence within the Gaṇḍavyūha that suggests the text has a connection with southern India; while in the story of Sadāprudita, there is evidence that indicates a link to the northwest of India. With regard to the Bāṇzhōu sānmèi jīng 般舟三昧經, in one of its parallels, the Dà fāngděng dà jí jīng xiánhù fēn 大方等大集經賢護分 (The “Bhadrapāla Section” of the Great Extensive Scripture of the Great Assembly), there is an account that says eight bodhisattvas will come to northern India and impart the teaching [on pratyutpanna-samādhi]. This, to a certain extent, suggests that the Bāṇzhōu sānmèi jīng 般舟三昧經 is connected with northern India. Accordingly, although the experiences in the concentrated state where a practitioner can see the buddhas of the ten directions and have dialogue with them are similar, the names of these concentrated states vary on account of different geographic locations and communities.

---

wužhěng xīn sānmèi 無靜心三昧 (the concentration of mind by means of non-disputation, Skt. śarāṇā-citta-samādhi).

396 See § 3.4.1 for the detailed discussion on the connection between the name Gandhavati and the north-west of India.

397 T 13 no. 416 p. 885a28.
5.3. **A Crucial Role of Dhāraṇī**

It is noteworthy that in the *Gaṇḍavyūha*, this concentrated state is also regarded as a sort of dhāraṇī, with which one is able to retain and not forget the teachings that have been heard. This seems to be a probable mode by which some Mahāyāna sūtras may have originated, that is, from those who achieved such a concentrated state. Harrison (1978: 52–54) argues that one of the reasons why one wishes to see the buddhas is eagerness to hear the Dharma expounded by them. He further suggests that meditation is portrayed as a legitimate means whereby the eternal buddha-principle continues to reveal religious truths to those fit to receive them, and thus, this sheds an interesting light on the composition of Mahāyāna sūtras in general. However, in the case of dhāraṇī, Harrison proposes that the *samādhis* were experiences that led to the creation of such texts, as mnemonic devices. Étienne Lamotte, in one of his lengthy notes, puts forward his own position on dhāraṇī. He states that its first and foremost sense is the memorisation of the teachings of all the buddhas. He further argues that it is incorrect to regard dhāraṇī as a mantra or a magical formula. Moreover, he points out that this is how the Tibetans and Chinese understood the term, in which the former renders dhāraṇī as gzungs, which is from the root ’dzin pa, meaning “to lay hold of, to seize,” and the latter have transcribed it by the characters tuólúóní 陀羅尼 or tuólánní 陀憐尼, or translated it as zōngchí 總持 which means

---

398 復次得陀羅尼菩薩。一切所聞法以念力故。能持不失 (T 25 no. 1509 p. 95c18–19), “Moreover, those bodhisattvas who have obtained dhāraṇī are capable of maintaining all of what they have heard on account of the might of recollection.” See also Lamotte’s translation 1944: 318.
“completely retaining.” In other words, the function of dhāraṇī is to enable those who achieve it to memorise the teachings of all buddhas. Egil Fronsdal (1998: 132) argues that the two main sources of Mahāyāna scriptures were visionary revelations and inspirational utterances. The experience of learning Dharma teachings from buddhas in the state of samādhi can be assigned to the category of visionary revelations.

Based on the discussion above one possible interpretation regarding this samādhi on viewing tathāgatas is that apart from seeing countless buddhas and learning Dharma from them, the practitioner also attains dhāraṇī. That is, dhāraṇī is an integral part of this samādhi. Therefore, the means by which a practitioner could remember a buddha’s teaching they experienced in samādhi and thereby relay it either verbally or in a written form (text) to others was a dhāraṇī. Hence it appears that dhāraṇīs could therefore be seen as another kind of inspirational source for Mahāyāna teachings, and as such were recorded in some Mahāyāna sūtras.

---

400 On function and sense of dhāraṇī, see Davidson 2009: 97–147.
401 Fronsdal (1998:132) further defines visionary experience as “those visions and dreams in which one directly sees and/or hears a buddha or bodhisattva preach” and inspirational utterances as “those spontaneous and unmediated acts of speech that arise out of direct and personal contact with some sacred dimension of reality or understanding.” For more information about these two sources of new teachings see Fronsdal 131–156.
Chapter 6

The Employment and Significance of the Sadāprarudita Story in Different Buddhist Traditions

This chapter examines the employment of the story of Sadāprarudita as it is preserved in different sources, and addresses its significance and the possible reasons for its employment by different traditions. For the purposes of this chapter and this thesis, a full assessment of all instances where this narrative has been applied would require an extended amount of time and effort while yielding reduced economies of scale. Rather, to demonstrate the importance and flexibility of the story, a limited discussion is undertaken here, focusing on some textual sources in the Indian and Tibetan Buddhist traditions, and a specific work representing early Chinese Pure Land Tradition.

6.1. Purpose of Looking at the Adoption and Use of the Story

Understanding how different traditions utilise the story reveals how different traditions value the story and the teachings within. In terms of the text itself, seeing how it is employed will reveal the richness of the text in practice. The story of Sadāprarudita has been used in different ways by various Buddhist traditions that flourished in India, Central Asia, China, and Tibet. The story was clearly a popular one and spread throughout much of the Buddhist world, being
used as didactic material for promoting the Buddha’s teachings. For example, both of the remarkable Indian masters, Candrakīrti and Śāntideva, quote several episodes of the story in their works, Prasannapadā⁴⁰² and Śikṣāsamuccaya, respectively.⁴⁰³ In these works Sadāprarudita is regarded as a paragon of a Buddhist practitioner. In Tibet, quite a few pieces of work about the lives of eminent Tibetan masters, such as Marpa,⁴⁰⁴ Milarepa,⁴⁰⁵ and Rechungpa,⁴⁰⁶ possess accounts of the story that convey an ideal model of the relationship between master and disciple. In addition, Tsongkhapa⁴⁰⁷ specifically composed an alternating verse-prose commentary on this story.⁴⁰⁸ In China, Sadāprarudita was once regarded as an exemplar of one who practises the niàn fó sānmèi 念佛三昧 (concentration of recollecting buddhas).⁴⁰⁹ The following overview of these traditions will highlight how aspects of the Sadāprarudita story are used to emphasise the key concepts of devotion to buddhas, Dharma or gurus.

---

⁴⁰² In this thesis, the discussions of Candrakīrti’s quotations in the Prasannapadā will be based on the edition by de La Vallée Poussin, 1903–1913, under the title Madhyamakavṛttiḥ: Mālamadhyamakakārkās (Mādhyamikasūtras) de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā commentaire de Candrakīrti (abbreviated as Prasannapadā hereafter in citation).

⁴⁰³ For the quotations by Candrakīrti and Śāntideva, see Prasannapadā (ed. de La Vallée Poussin 1903–1913) 378.12–381.11, and Śikṣāsamuccaya (ed. Bendall 1897–1902) 37.19–41.13, respectively.

⁴⁰⁴ For the details, see Heruka, trans. into English by Trungpa & Nālandā Translation Committee 1982: 26, 201.

⁴⁰⁵ For the details, see Milarepa, trans. into English by Chang 1977: 480.


⁴⁰⁷ Tsongkhapa (1357–1419) was the founder of the Gelug School. In his young adulthood he was well known for his studies and his intellect. During the last three decades of his life he dedicated himself to teaching, writing, and other activities that greatly contributed to Buddhism in Tibet. See Dreyfus (2003: 861–862) for more information about Tsongkhapa.

⁴⁰⁸ This Tibetan commentary has been translated into English by Pema Gyatso and Bailey (2008).

⁴⁰⁹ A possible reconstruction of this samādhi’s name in Sanskrit is *buddhasmṛti or *buddhānusmṛti.
6.2. THE VALUE OF DHARMA IN THE INDIAN TRADITION

In the *Prasannapadā*, a commentary on Nāgārjuna’s *Mūlamadhyamaka-kārikā*, Candrakīrti410 refers to Sadāprudita as a paragon of one who abandons life to seek prajñāpāramitā (commentary on verse 12 of Chapter 18).411 In summary, the vṛtti (commentary) explains the kārikā (verses) and elaborates on how liberation is attainable by pratyekabuddhas (self-awakened ones) during periods when there is no perfectly awakened one (buddha) existing. According to the commentary, accomplishment of the essence of the Dharma is still possible despite the lack of association with a buddha.412 It then quotes in detail four episodes from the story as evidence.413 These episodes are where:

(1) the Buddha advises Subhūti to seek prajñāpāramitā as did Sadāprudita;

410 Candrakīrti is a remarkable Indian thinker of the Madhyamaka philosophy, active in the seventh century CE (ca. 600–650 CE), whose interpretation of the Madhyamaka has been regarded as one of the most authoritative. See Hirakawa 1979: 202–203 and Jackson 2004: 111 for more details about Candrakīrti.

411 For the details, see *Prasannapadā* (ed. de La Vallée Poussin 1903–1913) 378.7–381.11.

412 tasmād asamsargād dhetoḥ pratyekabuddhānām asambuddhake 'pi kāle yasmād bhavaty eva dharmatattvādhiham, tasmād avandhyā siddhir asya sambuddhamahāvaidyārajaprapitaṃasya saddharmatattvādhiḥbhasaḥyasyaṃ vijñeyam. yataś ca etad evam, ato 'rhaṭ prājaṅah prānāḥ api parityajya saddharmatattvaṃ paryesitumī. jatho kām bhagavatā āryāṣṭasāhasrikāyāṃ bhagavatvāṃ (Prasannapadā [ed. de La Vallée Poussin 1903–1913] 378.12–379.4), “At a time when there was no Perfectly Awakened One, there was indeed the attainment of the Reality of the Dharma for the pratyekabuddhas, because of non-association, and therefore it should be understood, ‘The efficiency of the ambrosial medicine [conducive] to the Reality of the True Dharma dispensed by the King of Great Physicians, the Perfectly Awakened One, is productive’. Because of that, where that is so, [one should know:] ‘An intellectual, having abandoned [his] lives, is able to seek out the Reality of the True Dharma.’ [This is] as said by the Bhagavat in the Noble [Prajñāpāramitā of] Eight Thousand [Ślokas].”

413 For the Sanskrit text on the following episodes, see *Prasannapadā* (ed. de La Vallée Poussin 1903–1913) 379.4–381.11.
(2) Sadāprarudita is in the wilderness and hears a voice in the air admonishing him to go east without paying attention to his bodily needs and personal gain;

(3) Sadāprarudita sells his own body to obtain riches for honouring the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata but encounters Māra’s obstruction and Śakra’s test;

(4) Dharmodgata teaches Sadāprarudita prajñāpāramitā.

In short, Candrakīrti uses this story to admonish Buddhists to realise the truth, as did Sadāprarudita.

Another great Indian master, Śāntideva, uses the story of Sadāprarudita to show the importance of self-preservation. In his work on moral theory, Śikṣāsamuccaya, Śāntideva dedicates a chapter on the importance of “self-preservation.” The way to achieve this is kalyāṇamitrānustargaṇa sūtrāntadarśanena ca, “by ‘never leaving the good friend’ and ‘study of the scriptures.’” One aspect of never leaving good friends is illustrated by acts of

---

414 Śāntideva (ca. seventh to eighth century CE) was an Indian Buddhist scholar resident at the Buddhist monastic centre of Nalanda in northern India. He has been regarded as an adherent of the Madhyamaka philosophy of Nāgārjuna. In addition, he is famous for his eloquent Sanskrit treatises, the Bodhicaryavatāra, on the Mahāyāna bodhisattva ideal. For more information about Śāntideva, see Mrozik 2005: 8109–8110 and Williams 2003: 749.

415 For the discussion on self-preservation, see Śikṣāsamuccaya (ed. Bendall 1897–1902) 34.10–44.15. See also Bendall and Rouse’s (1922: 37–45) English translation.

416 In Bendall and Rouse’s English translation, they give the title “The Duty of Self-preservation” to Chapter 2 of the Śikṣāsamuccaya according to the motif of this chapter (Bendall and Rouse 1922: 37). The wording used by Śāntideva, for example, is ātmā raksitavyah (Śikṣāsamuccaya [ed. Bendall 1897–1902] 34.14), which literally means “self should be preserved.”

paying homage to one’s “good friend,” that is, a friend of virtue (*kalyāṇa-mitra*). Based on the examples that Śāntideva gives, “self-preservation” means to preserve one’s Dharma practice rather than the physical body. Here Śāntideva presents details of Sadāprarudita’s acts of self-sacrifice in order to revere his appointed good friend, Dharmodgata, as examples. The actual episodes used as illustrations are:

1. Sadāprarudita sells his own body to obtain riches for honouring Dharmodgata but encounters Māra’s obstruction and Śakra’s test;
2. Sadāprarudita sprinkles his blood on the ground to stop rising dust from soiling the body of Dharmodgata.

According to Śāntideva’s explanation, bodhisattvas should value the Dharma and the teachers who teach the Dharma beyond all things. He further states, “Thus by this [phrase], ‘not leaving the Good Friend,’ and ‘study of the Scriptures,’ is implied the whole acceptance of the Dharma.”

---

418 For the details of the quotation concerning the story, see *Śīkṣāsamuccaya* (ed. Bendall 1897–1902) 37.19–41.13.
419 According to the quotation from the *Śīkṣāsamuccaya* concerning this episode, Sadāprarudita hears a divine voice saying that on the seventh day Dharmodgata will emerge from meditation. Having heard this, Sadāprarudita then plans to clean the environment around Dharmodgata’s Dharma seat prior to him coming out of his house. Due to Māra’s obstruction, he cannot find any water to clean away the dust. Accordingly, Sadāprarudita sprinkles his blood on the ground to prevent Dharmodgata from being soiled by rising dust (see footnote 393 for reference details).
are limited and significant conclusions cannot be drawn from them, it is noteworthy that both of these great Indian masters employed the story when trying to stress the priority of the Dharma.

6.3. The Value of the Guru in the Tibetan Tradition

In the Tibetan tradition, teachers from different periods have utilised the story of Sadāprarudita. They have made use of the story by comparing certain practitioners and their experiences with that of Sadāprarudita.

6.3.1. Eleventh Century Tibetan Masters

Looking at some of the great masters in the eleventh century CE, we find that in the text, *The Life of Marpa the Translator*,\(^{421}\) there is a description of how joyful Marpa\(^{422}\) was when he finally met Maitrīpa. It recounts that he felt great joy, “just like that of the bodhisattva Sadāprarudita when he met the bodhisattva Dharmodgata.”\(^{423}\) This refers to the episode after Sadāprarudita acquires from

---

\(^{421}\) The quotations concerning Marpa here are from *The Life of Marpa the Translator*, an English translation of the *Sgra-bsgyur mar-pa lo-tsā’i rnam-thar mthong-ba don-yod* by Chögyam Trungpa and the Nālandā Translation Committee, published in 1982 by Prajñā Press. The Tibetan text of Marpa’s biography was composed by Tsangnyön Heruka (Tib. gTsang smyon Heruka, 1452–1507 CE). For the details about Tsangnyön Heruka, see Larsson’s (2009) research on Tsangnyön Heruka.

\(^{422}\) Marpa (1002/1012–1097 CE) was a remarkable translator and lay Buddhist master who was credited with the transmission of many Buddhist teachings to Tibet from India, including the teachings and lineages of Vajrayāna and Mahāmudrā. For more information about Marpa, see Declerq 2005: 5715–5716 and Quintman 2003: 513–514.

\(^{423}\) Heruka, translated into English by Trungpa & Nālandā Translation Committee 1982: 26. The original Tibetan text is:
Dharmodgata the answer to his query, “Where have those tathāgatas come from, where have they gone?” He experiences a supreme and sublime feeling of zest and joy:

\[
\text{atha khalu sadāprurudito bodhisattva mahāsattvaḥ paramodāreṇa} \\
prītiprāmodyena samanvāgato ‘bhūt.}
\]

Then the Bodhisattva Sadāprurudita, the great being, attained the most wonderful joy and bliss.

When we examine the two more closely, we can find slight differences. In the case of Marpa, his joy arises at the point of meeting Maitrīpa. On the other hand, Sadāprurudita’s joy comes after he hears the teachings from Dharmodgata. Therefore, not only is Sadāprurudita’s joy due to Dharmodgata, but perhaps more so due to the teachings. There is another case in this work, which also briefly mentions the story of Sadāprurudita. It recounts:

In the expanded *Mother of the Victorious Ones* it is said, “Some bodhisattvas need a father and mother, but do not need a wife. Some

---

426 There is information given in a footnote on page 201 of the book by the translator, which states that the expanded *Mother of the Victorious Ones* is the Śatasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra. On the other hand, it is interesting that the story of Sadāprurudita is unseen in the Sanskrit *Sata* and in its Tibetan translation (Peking ed. No. 740). This is pointed out by Conze 1978: 45 and Bu-ston (see trans. Obermiller 1986: 50), respectively.
bodhisattvas need a father, mother and a wife, but do not need any sons or daughters. Some bodhisattvas need a father, mother, wife, sons, daughters, servants, and all desirable things.” It is said that Marpa was like this last example. He worked for the benefit of sentient beings in the same way as the noble bodhisattvas Dharmodgata and Sadāprudita. (Heruka, Trungpa & Nālandā Translation Committee trans. 1982: 201) 

In this context, Dharmodgata and Sadāprudita’s possession of servants and valuables are highlighted.

Another example where the name Sadāprudita is mentioned is in The Hundred Thousand Songs of Milarepa, in which there is a verse that describes Gampopa’s emotions when he searched for his guru. The verse compares this experience to that of the “Ever-crying Bodhisattva,” also known as, Sadāprudita, when he was searching for his teacher. The verse is:

---

427 The Tibetan text is as follows:
rgyal ba’i yum rgyas pa las / byang chub sems dpa’ ’ga’ zhir la ni pha dang ma dgos la / chung ma mi dgos pa yod do // byang chub sems dpa’ gang zhir la ni pha ma dang chung ma dgos la / bu dang bu mo mi dgos pa yod do // byang chub sems dpa’ ’ga’ zhir la ni / pha ma dang / chung ma dang / bu dang bu mo dang / ’khor la sogs pa’i ’dod yon thams cad dgos pa yod do // zhes gsungs pa’i don phyi ma dang mthun pa dang / gzhan yang byang chub sems dpa’ ’phags pa chos ’phags dang / rtag tu ngu dang mzad spyod mthun pa’i sgo nas sems can gyi don mzad pa lags so // (Heruka 1970: 247.12–248.8).

428 The quotation regarding Milarepa here is from The Hundred Thousand Songs of Milarepa, translated from the Tibetan text Mi-la’i mgur ’bum into English by Garma C. C. Chang. This work was compiled by Tsangnyön Heruka (Tib. gTsang smyon Heruka, 1452–1507 CE).

429 Gampopa (1079–1153 CE) was the figure most responsible for systematising the doctrines and founding the Kagyu School, one of the four major schools of Tibetan Buddhism today, as an institution. For more information about Gampopa, see Jackson 2005: 8254–8256.
The first time I heard your name
I was filled with joy and inspiration
With great earnestness, and disregarding
Hardship, I set out to seek you —
As did the Ever-Crying Bodhisattva.\footnote{The “Ever-Crying Bodhisattva” is the translation of rtag du ngu, which is the Tibetan translation of the Sanskrit name Sadāprarudita and the translator also regards this bodhisattva as the Sadāprarudita mentioned in prajñāpāramitā sūtras. (Milarepa, compiled by Heruka, trans. into English by Chang 1977: 497 note 17)}

(Milarepa, compiled by Heruka, trans. into English by Chang 1977: 480)\footnote{/ mtshan de yi snyan pas phyogs rnam khyab /
/ de thos kho bo spro ba skyas /
/ shar skar ma smin drug ’og nas snyogs /
/ las tsha grang yid la bgyis te /
/ rtag tu ngu yi rnam thar bzhin / (Milarepa, compiled by Heruka 1983: 641.20–642.3).}

In the verse, the significance of meeting one’s guru is emphasised using the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita as a comparison.

In his biography,\footnote{The quotations concerning Rechungpa are from The Biographies of Rechungpa: The Evolution of a Tibetan Hagiography, a critical study in Rechungpa’s biography by Roberts, published in 2007 by Rouledge.} Rechungpa\footnote{Rechungpa (1084–1161 CE) was a Tibetan master of the Kagyu lineage, one of the principal traditions of Buddhism in Tibet. For more information on Rechungpa, see Roberts 2007.} describes his journey from Tibet to India in search of his teacher Varacandra. His teacher identifies him as Padmāka, who is considered the most important figure in the introduction of Buddhism into Tibet, and further lauds him as “a jewel of the teachings,” “a lamp of the Dharma,” and compares him to the “Long-suffering Bodhisattva,” that is, Sadāprarudita (Roberts...}
Here the story of Sadāprarudita is mentioned in the sense of demonstrating a paragon of a spiritual guru.

6.3.2. Nineteenth Century Tibetan Masters

Moving forward in time an example is seen in the book *The Words of My Perfect Teacher*, written by Patrul Rinpoche. In this work, there is a section that highlights the importance of a spiritual friend with all the requisite qualities, which states:

Once you have met a noble spiritual friend with all the requisite qualities, follow him without any concern for life or limb—just as the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita followed Bodhisattva Dharmodgata, the great paṇḍit Nāropa followed the supreme Tilopa, and Jetsun Mila followed Marpa of Lhodrak. (Patrul Rinpoche, trans. into English by Padmakara Translation Group 1994: 153)

---


435 The quotations concerning the story of Sadāprarudita are from *The Words of My Perfect Teacher*, an English translation of the Kun-bzaṅ bla-ma’i zhal-lung by the Padmakara Translation Group.

436 Patrul Rinpoche (1808–1887 CE) was a prominent teacher and author of the Nyingma school of Tibetan Buddhism. See Patrul Rinpoche, trans. into English by Padmakara Translation Group 1994: xxxi–xxxix for the details.

437 *des na dge ba’i bshes gnyen dam pa yon tan thams cad dang ldan pa rnyed nas / de nyid bsten pa’i dus su lus dang srog la mi lta bar byang chub sems dpa’ rtag tu ngus byang chub sems dpa’ chos ’phags bsten pa dang / pan chen nā ro pas skyes mchog te lo pa bsten pa dang / rje btsun mi las lho brag mar pa bsten pa ltar dgos te /* (Patrul Rinpoche 1992: 116b.6–17a.2).
This statement is followed by the whole story of Sadāprarudita given as one of the examples to support this aspect. In particular, the episodes of the story mentioned are where:

1. Sadāprarudita is in the wilderness and hears a voice in the air admonishing him to go east without paying any attention to his bodily needs and personal gain;

2. An unknown buddha figure appears before him and gives him instructions on the direction, distance, and name of the place;

3. Sadāprarudita enters various samādhis for the first time;

4. Sadāprarudita sells his own body to obtain riches for honouring Dharmodgata but encounters Māra’s obstruction and Śakra’s test;

5. Dharmodgata answers Sadāprarudita’s query about where those buddhas have come from and where they have gone;

6. Before Dharmodgata emerges from samādhi, Sadāprarudita sprinkles his blood on the ground to clean away dust, preventing rising dust from soiling Dharmodgata’s body;

7. Dharmodgata teaches Sadāprarudita prajñāpāramitā and then Sadāprarudita enters various samādhis for the second time.

---

439 See Patrul Rinpoche 1992, 117a.2–121a.5 for the quotations of the listed episodes of the Sadāprarudita narrative.
6.3.3. **Example from a Modern Tibetan Master**

In his work, *Great Treasury of Merit*, Kelsang Gyatso\(^{440}\) stresses the value of one’s spiritual teacher over the buddhas themselves, and uses the story of Sadāprarudita as evidence. In this context he states:

In the *Perfection of Wisdom Sutra in Eight Thousand Lines* the story is told of a great Bodhisattva called Sadaprarudita who relied sincerely upon his Spiritual Guide, Dharmodgata, regarding him as more precious than his own life, and more important than all the Buddhas. (Kelsang Gyatso 1992: 9)

Finally he concludes:

If a great meditator such as Sadāprarudita, who was able to receive instructions directly from Buddhas, still needed to rely upon a Spiritual Guide, it goes without saying that we must find a qualified Spiritual Guide and rely upon him or her sincerely. (Kelsang Gyatso 1992: 11)

---

\(^{440}\) Kelsang Gyatso (1931–) is a leading Tibetan figure of the current time. He is a Buddhist monk, meditation master, scholar, and author of many books based on the teachings of the Gelug school of Tibetan Buddhism. See Kay 2004: 56–61 for more information about Kelsang Gyatso.
The episodes that Kelsang Gyatso mentions are:\(^{441}\)

(1) Sadāprarudita sees all buddhas in the ten directions;

(2) Sadāprarudita sells his own body to obtain riches for honouring Dharmodgata but encounters Māra’s obstruction and Śakra’s test;

(3) Sadāprarudita together with the merchant’s daughter and her entourage meet the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata and acquire the teaching on the \textit{prajñāpāramitā}.

In summary, these Tibetan masters have used the story to stress the importance of the guru and of following the guru.

With regard to this last example, which stresses that a spiritual guru is “more important than all the Buddhas” (Kelsang Gyatso 1992: 9), there is a different interpretation to that of Kelsang Gyatso. In the \textit{Dà zhi dà lùn} 大智度論 (\textit{The Treatise on the [Sutra of] Great Perfection of Insight}), a question is raised, “Since the buddhas appear before him, why do they not enlighten him directly but assign him to Dharmodgata?”^{442}\footnote{\textit{The Treatise on the [Sutra of] Great Perfection of Insight}, T25 no. 1509 p. 735c11–12.} The answer given is because Sadāprarudita and Dharmodgata have a strong karmic connection, established through aeons of lives.

\(^{441}\) See Kelsang Gyatso 1992: 10–11 for the details of the quotation concerning the listed episodes.

\(^{442}\) 见《大智度論》T25 no. 1509 p. 735c11–12.
On account of this, it is most appropriate that Sadāprudita is enlightened by Dharmodgata.\textsuperscript{443}

There is an account in the \textit{Xián yú jīng} 賢愚經 (\textit{Sutra on the Wise and the Foolish}, T 4 no. 202), which proposes the same idea. It recounts that an old man called Śrīvardhin wanted to go forth but all the monks he met declined his request. Having understood his situation the Buddha directed Maudgalyāyana to provide Śrīvardhin with the opportunity for ordination. He explains to Maudgalyāyana that sentient beings only attain enlightenment with the guidance of someone with whom they have a good karmic connection. If some have good karmic connections with the Buddha and no other teachers, then only the Buddha’s guidance can enlighten them. If some have good karmic connections with other masters and not the Buddha, then only these masters’ guidance can enlighten them rather than the Buddha.\textsuperscript{444} In short, the \textit{Dà zhì dù lùn} 大智度論 tends to emphasise the significance of karmic connection.\textsuperscript{445} From the perspective of the path to enlightenment that is intended for the audience, both the Buddha and other

\textsuperscript{443} 佛所以不即度者。以其與世無竭世因緣應當從彼度故。有人應從舍利弗度。假使諸佛現身不能令悟 (T 25 no. 1509 p. 735c15–17). “The reason why the buddhas do not enlighten him is because of the aeons of karmic connection between Dharmodgata and him. Therefore, [he] should be enlightened by him. [For example,] if there is someone who should be enlightened by Śāriputra, even though all the buddhas appear before that person, they are not able to enlighten that person.”

\textsuperscript{444} 告大目犍連。今與出家。何以故。眾生隨緣得度。或有於佛有緣。餘人則不能度。於餘人有緣佛則不能度。於舍利弗有緣。目連。迦葉。阿那律。金毘羅等。一切弟子。則所不度。如是展轉。隨其有緣。餘人不度 (T 4 no. 202 p. 377b16–20).

\textsuperscript{445} Kelsang Gyatso’s statement may also have a link to the idea of karmic connection. If we further query, “Among the qualified spiritual guides, why is it that only a certain one can enlighten us well, but not another?”, the reason may then lead us to the answer of karmic connection. However, the statement as it reads above gives the impression that buddhas are excluded from the spiritual guides that one should rely upon.
masters should be equally valued. From the short analysis of some of the great Tibetan masters from the last millennium till now, we can see that they have used the story of Sadāprarudita to stress the importance of the guru and following one’s guru.

6.4. The Importance of Accomplishing the Samādhi of Recollecting Buddhas in the Chinese Pure Land Tradition

Lastly the discussion will turn to Chinese Buddhism and its use of the story. The story is quoted by various schools of Chinese Buddhism, but in order to limit the discussion, this section will centre on the early Pure Land tradition. In the Guǎng hóng míng jí (A Further Collection of Essays on Buddhism), there are some hymns under the collective title Niàn jī sān mèi shí jí (Anthology of Poems on the Concentration of Recollecting Buddhas).

---

446 Other Chinese schools of Buddhism have utilised the story differently. The example here of the Pure Land tradition is limited and not necessarily representative of all, but is nevertheless a useful illustration of how the story has been used.

447 This work is composed by a vinaya master Dàoxuăn 道宣 in the Tang dynasty. This is a collection of essays written in defence against criticisms from non-Buddhists. According to the explanation of the title given by the author, 廣弘明集 (Guǎng hóng míng jí), it may be translated as “A Further Collection [of Essays] to Promote [Buddhism] and Enlighten [Sentient Beings]” (T 52 no. 2103 p. 335b9).

448 T 52 no. 2103 p. 351b10.
composed by Huīyuān 慧遠⁴⁴⁹ or Wáng Qízhī 王齊之 in around the fourth century CE.⁴⁵⁰ Three hymns are about Sadāprarudita and one is about Dharmodgata. The first hymn on the narrative of Sadāprarudita is called Sùtuōbōlún zàn 薩陀波倫讚 (A Hymn on Sadāprarudita).⁴⁵¹ Next to the heading, there is an account in brackets providing the reason why these hymns were composed.⁴⁵² The explanation does not seem very clear but appears to convey information about some wall paintings at the Prajñā Monastery, which is located on a tableland and the paintings are about the story of Sadāprarudita. The style of the paintings is the so called bian 變 style, literally meaning “transformation.” Hence it appears that the explanation is referring to the paintings on the wall of the Prajñā Monastery, which is situated on

---

⁴⁴⁹ Huīyuān (334–416/417 CE) was a significant leader of the Buddhist community in the south of China around the fourth century CE. See Robinson 1967: 96–114 for the details about this master.

⁴⁵⁰ Lài (1997: 76) attributes these hymns to Wáng Qízhī but provides no rationale. On the other hand, in the table of contents at the beginning of the 30th fascicle of the Guǎng hóng wén mǐng jí 廣弘明集, there are two pieces of information that shows the author of the hymns may be Huīyuān rather than Wáng Qízhī. They are:

1. 晉沙門釋慧遠念佛三昧詩序 (井佛菩薩讃), “The preface to the poems on the samādhi of recollecting buddhas by the śramaṇa Shì Huīyuān in the Jin dynasty (together with the hymns on buddhas and bodhisattvas);”

2. 晉王齊之念佛三昧詩, “The poems on the samādhi of recollecting buddhas by Wáng Qízhī in the Jin dynasty.”

According to this information, it is Huīyuān who wrote the preface and the hymns concerning Sadāprarudita and Dharmodgata while Wáng Qízhī was merely the composer of the poems concerning the samādhi of recollecting buddhas. See T 52 no. 2103 p. 349a27–29 for the information shown above. Some contradictory information regarding authorship is present in two editions. The message in brackets bǐng fǒu púxà zàn 井佛菩薩讃 in the Song 宋 edition and Ming 明 edition is placed after the account on Wáng Qízhī, which suggests that Wáng Qízhī is the author of the hymns. T 52 no. 2103 p. 351c18.

⁴⁵¹ The Chinese account in the brackets is 因畫波若臺讃. 變立讃等. The punctuation that the Taishō edition gives here is incorrect. It should be read as 因畫波若臺讃 變立讃等, which means, “On account of paintings on [the wall of] the Prajñā [Monastery on a] tableland, the hymns are composed in accordance with the [paintings on the] transformation.”
a tableland, and that the hymn has been composed in accordance with these paintings on magical transformation. The hymn is shown below.

Serene is the great sage.
His wondrous deeds inscribed into history.
[The great Dharma] like a dragon diving and hidden in a deep lake,
[is beyond his reach].
Still yet is he to connect with the glorious virtue [of the Three Jewels].
Fate brings him significant revelations,
A god points out his path [“you should seek the great Dharma”].
The revelations in dreams that flowed from sincerity,
Enlightens this honourable sage.⁴⁵³

The information, though elegant and poetic, is imprecise in relation to the alluded episode(s). However, given that this hymn mentions “a god” and “dream,” it may be referring to the account where Sadāprudita, in a dream, receives a revelation from a god, which is found only in the two earliest Chinese translations of the Aṣṭa by Lokākṣema and Zhī Qīān 支謙, that is version I.⁴⁵⁴

---

⁴⁵³ 密哉達人。功玄囊葉。龍潛九澤。文明未接。運通其會。神疏其轍。感夢魂交。啟茲聖哲 (T 52 no. 2103 p. 351c19–20).
The second hymn is called Sātuōbōlūn rù shān qiú fā zàn 險陀波倫入山求法讚 (A Hymn on Sadāprudita Heading to a [Barren] Mountain in Search of Dharma).\(^{455}\) The content is:

His lamenting spreads throughout the barren mountain.

He exerts himself with endless sincerity [to seek the Dharma].

The voice in the air [that said, “go east!”] still rings in his ears.

Dawn comes, excited with joy, he sets off seeking the Dharma.

Following the admonition [from the unknown buddha figure of transformation], by night he heads off [to Gandhavatī].

All doubts concerning the journey disappear.

Because he made his resolution so sincerely,

The [unknown buddha figure of] transformation accordingly manifests.\(^{456}\)

Again, though the specific episode of the story is not absolutely clear, given the content, this hymn may cover the following episodes:

(1) Sadāprudita is in the wilderness and hears a voice in the air admonishing him to go east without paying attention to his bodily needs and personal gain;

---

\(^{455}\) T 52 no. 2103 p. 352a1.

\(^{456}\) 激響窮山。憤發幽誠。流音在耳。欣躍晨征。奉命宵遊。百慮同冥。叩心在誓。化乃降靈 (T 52 no. 2103 p. 352a2–3).
(2) An unknown buddha figure appears before him and gives him instructions on the direction, distance, and name of the place.

The third hymn is named Sàtuóbólún shǐ wù yù gòngyǎng dàshī zàn 薩陀波倫始悟欲供養大師讚 (A Hymn on Sadāprudita When He Attains Realisation and Attempts to Make Offerings to the Great Master).\(^{457}\) The hymn recounts as follows:

The path to the ultimate is about to start.

The gate to the essence [will] open once again.

Hard to attain are such wonderful deeds.

His self-sacrifice brings forth great benefit.

From confidence in the Dharma, no attachments [to body] has he.

The unexpected encounter [with a merchant’s daughter] yields a pleasant reward.

If it is not him [the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita], the great sage,

Who else can achieve this extraordinary approach?\(^{458}\)

As with the prior two hymns, this hymn does not specifically indicate which episode(s) it covers either. The title of the hymn points to the information about Sadāprudita’s attempts to make offerings to the great master Dharmodgata. It

\(^{457}\) T 52 no. 2103 p. 352a4.

\(^{458}\) 歸塗將敗。靈闊再闢。神功難圖。待損而益。信道忘形。歡不期適。非伊哲人。孰探玄策 (T 52 no. 2103 p. 352a5–6).
seems to describe the episodes where Sadāprudita sells his own body to obtain riches for honouring Dharmodgata but encounters Māra’s obstruction and Śakra’s test, and finally meets a merchant’s daughter who helps him to obtain riches to fulfil his aim.

The fourth hymn turns its attention to the other main character of the story and is called Tānmójié pūsà zàn 曆無竭菩薩讚 (A Hymn on the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata).\textsuperscript{459} It reads as follows:

What an inexhaustibly diligent and knowledgeable sage.
His skills are wonderful; his approaches are the upmost,
Just like a valley,
Channeling hundreds and thousands of rivers [to the sea].
On the bank, no one awaits the boat;
On the road, no cart returns.
The three streams, the origin [of defilement],
All cease entirely here.\textsuperscript{460}

The hymn praises Dharmodgata for his skilful means in enlightening numerous beings. This seems to be a sort of general praise regarding how great Dharmodgata is. On the other hand, if we read the story closely, this hymn could refer to a specific account as follows:

\textsuperscript{459} T 52 no. 2103 p. 352a7.
\textsuperscript{460} 曆無竭 (T 52 no. 2103 p. 352a8–9).
At that moment when Dharmodgata elaborates on the body of buddhas, forty eight thousand bodhisattvas immediately realise [the teaching and] obtain the cultivation of complete confidence, a hundred billion bodhisattvas all attain dhāraṇīs, two hundred billion bodhisattvas attain [the power of] no hindrance, and four hundred billion bodhisattvas attain the irreversible (avaivartika) bodhisattva [stage]…

In short, the content of the hymns is praise of the bodhisattvas’ efforts and the achievements in their practice. As mentioned above, these hymns were composed in accordance with some paintings on the wall of the Prajñā Monastery, which are based on the story of Sadāprudita. It is noteworthy that the Prajñā Monastery is where Huīyuān practised the samādhi of recollecting buddhas. This seems to suggest that the paintings and hymns on the wall of the Prajñā Monastery may have played a key role in encouraging the parishioners of the monastery to regard Sadāprudita as an exemplar of practising the samādhi of recollecting buddhas. Given this point and that these hymns are under the collective title, “Anthology of Poems on the Concentration of Recollecting Buddhas,” it seems that the early Pure Land tradition in China used the story to

---

461 是時正無竭菩薩說佛身時。四萬八千菩薩即解得盡信之行。百億菩薩悉得諸陀鄰尼法。二百億菩薩得無所著礙問皆能報。四百億菩薩皆得阿惟越致菩薩… (T 8 no. 224 p. 477a28–b2).

462 There is an account in the biography of Huīyuān, which recounts that one day when emerging from meditation at the Prajñā Monastery, he saw the figure of the Amitābha Buddha pervading the sky. For the details of the account, see T 47 no. 1969A p. 192c2–3.
emphasise the importance of achieving the practice of seeing buddhas, that is, 念佛三昧 (concentration of recollecting buddhas).

6.5. Summary

It has not been possible to present an exhaustive investigation of all instances of the use of the story of Sadāprudita in this chapter. However, the examples discussed are sufficient to provide a general indication of the diverse ways in which the Sadāprudita narrative has been employed, and of its importance to a variety of Buddhist communities. The current brief survey of texts from India, Tibet, and China highlights how well known, respected and widely used the story of Sadāprudita was over a large geographical region and span of time right up to the present, as witnessed by the contemporary examples. It is evident from the examples discussed here that there are regional differences in the use of the story. It seems clear that the approach of the two Indian masters, Candrakīrti and Śāntideva, focuses on the value of learning and practising the Dharma. By contrast, the Tibetan masters have used the story to highlight the significance of a guru and of following the guru, while in the Chinese hymns that praise Sadāprudita and Dharmodgata, we see the emphasis on recollecting buddhas. Of course, further investigation is needed to verify these conclusions, which are based on a rather limited number of examples.
The diversity of ways in which the story has been employed must in part be a product of the complexity of the story: the various and diverse episodes and elements allowing a teacher or author to tap into the story to illustrate the point at hand. Noteworthy is the reference by all traditions investigated in this chapter to the episode where Sadāprudita sacrifices himself in order to fulfil his own vow. This may well reflect the ultimate sacrifice that a human can make for buddhas, their guru, and the Dharma. As such it parallels the Buddha’s own self-sacrifice during his long career as a bodhisattva.
Chapter 7

The Absence of the Story of Sadāprudita From Some

Prajñāpāramitā Sūtras

In the previous chapter we looked at the employment of the Sadāprudita narrative, how it has been used and by whom, to get an idea of the story’s significance and popularity. Interesting as the story may be, it is quite noteworthy that the story of Sadāprudita is preserved in some prajñāpāramitā sūtras, but absent in others or is absent from a translation of a particular text. This chapter will look at each version of the prajñāpāramitā sūtras where the story does not feature and explore the possible reasons for this phenomenon.

7.1. The Story’s Absence from the Śatasāhasrikā

Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra

First we look at a unique case where the story of Sadāprudita features in the Chinese version of the Śatasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra (Śata), translated by Xuánzàng 玄奘 in the seventh century CE, yet the Sanskrit parallel lacks it. As noted by Edward Conze (1978: 33), Bu-ston (1290–1364 CE) drew attention to

---

463 In this case the term, “prajñāpāramitā sūtras,” is used in a narrower sense, referring to those comprising the Aṣṭa and its extensions, that is, the Aṣṭādaśa, Pañcavimśati, and Śata, and excluding others that fit the category of prajñāpāramitā literature, such as the Diamond Sūtra and Heart Sūtra.

464 Conze 1978: 45.
the absence of the story in the Sanskrit Šata. Bu-ston claims that this is because Nāgārjuna did not bring back those chapters of the scripture from the realm of the nāgas.

A parallel statement, which might be the source of Bu-ston’s claim, or which possibly belonged to a related tradition that informed his ideas, is found in the Lóngshù púsà zhuàn 龍樹菩薩傳 (A Biography of the Bodhisattva Nāgārjuna, T 50 no. 2047A), said to have been translated by Kumārajīva around the fifth century CE. It recounts that the Bodhisattva Mahānāga took Nāgārjuna to the nāga’s palace and gave him numerous vaipulya and profound sūtras as well as countless sublime Dharmas. Bu-ston’s account, mythical aspect aside, suggests that the Šata initially included the story of Sadāprarudita. The claim that Nāgārjuna did not bring back those chapters of the scripture from the realm of the nāgas could be interpreted to mean that some one, perhaps the editor of the text, excised the Sadāprarudita story and several chapters from the text, producing the version that Bu-ston encountered in the thirteenth to the fourteenth century CE, as well as the surviving Sanskrit text. By taking Bu-ston’s claim into account, this well explains why the Chinese translation by Xuánzàng in the seventh century CE has the story but not the version Bu-ston encountered in the thirteenth to the fourteenth century CE. This likewise may explain the absence of the story in the Sanskrit Šata.

---

465 For the information about the absence of the four chapters, see Bu-ston, trans. Obermiller 1986: 50.
467 A possible reconstruction of the Sanskrit title is *Nāgārjunabodhisattvacarita.
468 以諸方等深奧經典無量妙法授之 (T 50 no. 2047A p. 184c10–11).
surviving Sanskrit version. Using Bu-ston’s account, it could be proposed that the
time when the story of Sadāprarudita was excised might have been some time
between the seventh century CE and the thirteenth century CE. Another
possibility is that the Sadāprarudita story was not originally part of the Šata but
was added to form a new version some time before the seventh century CE with
both the new version and the original version of the Šata being available in
subsequent centuries in some places. The new version (with the story of
Sadāprarudita) was clearly available to Xuánzàng when he visited India but was
apparently unknown to Bu-ston, and remains unavailable today. It is by no means
certain which of these hypotheses is closer to the factual situation. Further
evidence is required to draw firmer conclusions about the story’s absence in the
Sanskrit Šata.

7.2. THE STORY’S ABSENCE FROM THE PAÑCAVIṂŚATISĀHASRIKĀ

PRAJÑĀPĀRAMITĀ SŪTRA

Another case where the story is absent is in the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā
prajñāpāramitā sūtra (Pañcaviṃśati). In this case, it is more certain that absence
of the story is the result of excision. According to Conze (1978: 45), the extant
manuscripts of the Pañcaviṃśati do not possess this story. He indicates that these
manuscripts, which may belong to the fifth century, are a recast version of the text
(Conze 1978: 36–37). This version has eight chapters and after each of them the
appropriate heading from the Abhisamayālaṃkāra is added. In other words, the
chapter headings are consistent with that of the eight stages of *abhisamaya* (spiritual realisation) presented in the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra*, which is a commentary on the *Pañcaviṃśati*, traditionally attributed to Maitreyanātha. Kimura Takayasu 木村高尉 (1986: iii) indicates that there are two Tibetan translations, one each in the Kanjur and Tanjur. He notes that the version in the Tanjur is consistent with the recast version of the *Pañcaviṃśati*, where the structural headings of the sūtra proposed by the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra* are incorporated into the text.

---

469 In his edition of the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra*, first published in 1929, Stcherbatsky briefly points out that the Tanjur collection contains translations of twenty-one different commentaries on the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra*, and some of them show the connection of its systematic doctrine with the *Pañcaviṃśati* and others connect the work to the *Aṣṭā* (1992: viii). On the other hand, Conze (1952: 252) argues, “In actual fact, the correlation is quite superficial, and was obviously never intended by the author of the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra*, which is based on the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā*.” He clearly and confidently points out that there is “no counterpart at all in the *Aṣṭā*” to those from the last items of the 5th *abhisamaya* to the 8th *abhisamaya*, which actually constitutes a large part of the *Pañcaviṃśati*. He also provides the relevant citations corresponding to the *Pañcaviṃśati* and the *Ṣata* (see p. 252 n. 2 for the details). Hyōdō (2000: 8–14) provides detailed references to these commentaries in the Tanjur collection and shows that they connect the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra* to the *Pañcaviṃśati*, the *Ṣata*, the *Aṣṭādaśa*, or the *Prajñāpāramitā-ratna-guṇa-samcaya-gātā*. Although the composition of the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra* could have been based on different sources, Hyōdō (2000: ii, 1) proposes that the text on which the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra* is based is 特に「二万五千頌般若経」 (particularly the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā praṇāpāramitā sūtra*).

470 As for the authorship of this treatise, Conze (1978: 101) summarizes the different pre-1970s views as follows: (1) Maitreyanātha who composed it in the Tuṣita Heaven, a view held according to the Indian or Tibetan tradition; (2) Asaṅga’s teacher Maitreyanātha in this world, proposed and supported by Frauwallner, Tucci, and Ud; and (3) Asaṅga. It seems that Conze tends to be an advocate of the first option (Conze 1978: 102). On the other hand, Hyōdō (2000: 2–5), having summarised the opinions prior to his work, argues that there is some evidence indicating that Maitreya or Asaṅga is not likely to be the author of the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra*. He then proposes, according to his investigation of the authorship, that someone else, active at the same time or after Dignāga (sixth to early seventh century CE), composed this work. The most likely person, he further suggests, is Ārya Vimalkṣena.
The title of the *Pañcavimśati* points to the reason why this version is divided into eight chapters, a division which differs from its Chinese parallels. The title contains the wording, *abhisamayālaṁkārāṇusāreṇa saṁśodhita*, which indicates that this version has been refined in accordance with the *Abhisamayālaṁkāra*. Conze (1952: 252) comments on whether or not the *Abhisamayālaṁkāra* elaborates on the story. He argues that the *Abhisamayālaṁkāra* makes no attempt to fit chapters 29 to 31 into its scheme. In other words, according to Conze, the story of Sadāprudita (chapters 30 and 31) is not included in this commentary.

It is also pointed out by Haribhadra that the *Abhisamayālaṁkāra* excludes this story from the eight stages of *abhisamaya*. Haribhadra gives the following comment in his *Abhisamayālaṁkāra layākāra praṇāpāramitāvyākhyā* (Commentary Possessing the Perspective of the Abhisamayālaṁkāra on the [Aṣṭasāhasrikā] *praṇāpāramitā* [sūtra]):

\[
\text{tadanantaraṁ sadāpruditabodhisattvavat pratipattiḥ kāryeti}
\]

\[
vineyajanabodhanāya tatpūrvavogakathāmukhena
\]

\[
kalyāṇamitrārāgana-pūrvakapraṇāpāramitāyogānuśāsāṁ
\]

\[
\text{saṁdarśayitum upasamāhāra-dvāreṇa madhyamapratipattyā}
\]

---

471 In the second part of the *Dā bānruò jīng 大般若經* (T 7 no. 220 (2)), for example, there are eighty-five chapters within this parallel.

472 According to the edition by Kimura (2009: 174), for example, at the end of chapter one it is stated, *āryapaścavimśatisāhasrikāyāṁ bhagavatāyām praṇāpāramitāyām abhisamayālaṁkārāṇusāreṇa saṁśodhitāyāṁ sarvākārajñatādikāraḥ subhūtiparivartarāḥ prthamah*, “The first chapter of Subhūti, with the topic of knowledge of all aspects in the *Illustrious Noble Twenty-five Thousand [Śūkla] Praṇāpāramitā* [sūtra], completely refined in accordance with the *Abhisamayālaṁkāra*.”
yathoktābhisamayakramapratipādana-param eva parivartatrayām
desitaṁ. tat punah sugamatvād abhisamayālaṃkārakārikayā na

Immediately after that [Ch. 29],473 [thinking] the practice such as that of the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita is to be undertaken, [then] by means of his previous life story [and] for the sake of awakening those who are being instructed, the last three chapters [of the sūtra], which illustrate the aforementioned stages of spiritual realization, are taught for the sake of the practice of the Middle [Path]. [This is taught] by means of showing the benefit of the acquisition of prajñāpāramitā due to winning the favour of a good friend in former times. However, because [the story] is easily understood, it is not included in the doctrinal verses of the Abhisamayālaṃkāra.

This may well explain why the recast version of the Pañcaviṃśati does not possess this story. As the story is easily understood, it is excluded from the Abhisamayālaṃkāra. Accordingly the editor(s) recasting a new version that accords with the Abhisamayālaṃkāra naturally would have excised the story from the Pañcaviṃśati.

7.3. The Story's Absence from Some Parts of the Dà Bānruò

In addition to the two instances just discussed, the story is also absent from some parts of the Chinese translation, the Dà bānruò jīng 大般若經 (Sutra on Great [Perfection of] Insight, T 5–7 no. 220), translated by Xuánzàng. The parts in question are the Dà bānruò jīng (dì wǔ huì) 大般若經 (第五會) (Sutra on Great [Perfection of] Insight (Fifth Assembly), T 7 no. 220 (5)), the Dà bānruò jīng (dì sì huì) 大般若經 (第四會) (Sutra on Great [Perfection of] Insight (Fourth Assembly), T 7 no. 220 (4)), the Dà bānruò jīng (dì sān huì) 大般若經 (第三會) (Sutra on Great [Perfection of] Insight (Third Assembly), T 7 no. 220 (3)), and the Dà bānruò jīng (dì èr huì) 大般若經 (第二會) (Sutra on Great [Perfection of] Insight (Second Assembly), T 7 no. 220 (2)), which are parallel to the Aṣṭa, the Aṣṭādaśa, and the Pañcaviṃśati, respectively. This large text, the Dà bānruò jīng 大般若經, is unique and consists of sixteen parts. The first to fifth parts are parallels to the Śata, the Pañcaviṃśati, the Aṣṭādaśa, and the Aṣṭa. It seems obvious that the originals translated by Xuánzàng can be seen as a sort of re-

474 See Conze 1978: 21, 46. For the texts of the fourth and fifth parts, see T 7 no. 220 pp. 763b7–865a26 and T 7 no. 220 pp. 865c7–920b16, respectively.
476 See Conze 1978: 21, 35. For the text of the second part, see T 7 no. 220 pp. 1b6–426a14.
477 Traditionally it is said that this large text was taught by sichù shíliúhuì 四處十六會 (by the sixteen assemblies in the four places). See T 55 no. 2154 p. 560b27–c5 for the account.
arranged version. This version might have been formed, most likely in India,\(^{479}\) by a certain anonymous editor(s), who collected the different \textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtras and reorganised them to become one large piece of work. In other words, each part of this text is actually a complete \textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtra, each concluding with a standard expression, typical for the end of a sūtra.\(^{480}\)

The story of Sadāprarudita is seen only in the first part of the large text but not in the second to fifth parts. However, the other Chinese parallels to the second to fifth parts do possess this narrative. It is by no means certain whether the story was originally absent, or existed but was later excised by the editor(s). However, if we look at all the parallels of the \textit{Aṣṭa} in Chinese and Tibetan, the story is only absent in its two Chinese parallels by Xuánzàng. Could it be possible that Xuánzàng himself omitted the story in his translation? This practice, where very wordy expressions were abbreviated and repetitions were omitted, was employed in Kumārajīva’s translations.\(^{481}\) Although this is a tempting explanation, it is inconsistent with the record, in which it is recounted:

\(^{479}\) There is an account that may support this suggestion. It states, 大般若經。經梵本總有二十萬頌 (T 50 no. 2053, p. 275,c24-5), “The \textit{Dā bānrūò jīng}’s Sanskrit original possesses two hundred thousand \textit{slokas}.” This conveys the idea that the manuscript of the \textit{Dā bānrūò jīng}, accessible to Xuánzàng, contained an already quite large text consisting of several different \textit{prajñāpāramitā} sūtras.

\(^{480}\) Conze (1978: 21–22) gives a comparative table of the sixteen parts and their parallels.

\(^{481}\) This is witnessed by Sēngrūi 僧敘, who was in charge of polishing the drafts of Kumārajīva’s Chinese translations. In the colophon of the \textit{Dā zhī dù lùn} 大智度論, Sēngrūi reports, 法師以秦人好簡故裁而略之 (T 25 no. 1509 p. 57b22–23; T 55 no. 2145 p. 75a28–29), “Venerable [Kumārajīva] excised and abbreviated the text [in his translation] because Chinese people prefer simple and concise [readings].”
As the text was so huge, his disciples requested [Xuánzàng] to omit [some parts of the text]. It is like the translations by Kumārajīva, which abbreviated the very wordy expressions and omitted the repetitions. The venerable intended to follow the assembly’s request. Immediately that night in his dreams there were extremely horrible events as if warning him [against omitting and abbreviating the text]. Having awakened, he was so fearful that he then addressed the participants, “Let us go back to [the initial plan, which is to] translate the text without any omissions.” During that night, he dreamed about the great auspicious matter of seeing buddhas and bodhisattvas. Upon awakening, he was joyful and therefore he dared not to omit [any words].

From this record, it does not seem likely that Xuánzàng performed the omission of the story from the text. Therefore, this suggests that the story was excised by the editor(s), most likely in India, of the Dà bānruò jīng 大般若經, rather than the translator, Xuánzàng.
To sum up, the investigation in this chapter into the absence of the story in some texts provides evidence in support of shrinkage. The lack of the story in the Pañcaviṃśati offers evidence that a sūtra may be recast with some chapters or sections excised due to a lack of relevance or importance to the editors’ purposes, which was noted by certain authoritative commentaries on the text.
Chapter 8

Conclusion

In this thesis I have investigated the story of the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita from a variety of perspectives including its ancestral evolution and the relationships between the surviving versions, its use across time and by different Buddhist traditions, and its relevance to the origins of Mahāyāna teachings. Specifically, the samādhi of viewing all tathāgatas was found to be of some doctrinal significance. The results have shed an interesting light on historical issues concerning the evolution of Buddhism in India and the redactional and editorial processes of Buddhist texts. Here I will review these findings and conclusions to summarise the main contributions the study has made to this field of research, as well as canvassing further areas of study that fellow researchers with an interest in this area may consider pursuing.

In Chapter 1 the literary review of the story has shown that although this is not the first study to look at the story of Sadāprarudita, it is one of the few, if not the first, to have focused on the story in full and in the main allowing it to reveal its secrets through a thorough investigation of all available editions of the story, as well as in-depth analyses of its contents. As with all introductory chapters, a broad overview of the story was also provided and all areas of the study were briefly touched upon to give a preview of the complete study. This also served the
purpose of imparting pre-requisite information so that the following chapters can be read with ease.

In Chapter 2, the various methodologies applied in this study were detailed. In her study of The Inquiry of Ugra (Ugaraparipṛcchā), Jan Nattier (2003) provides a resourceful summary of well-established methodologies to be applied in the extracting of data from textual sources. Using the methods and bearing in mind the critical reviews regarding the application of these methodologies, the contents and episodes of the story were explored to establish that the story itself could in fact be one big supplement. Unlike many minor interpolations that Nattier proposes to be more likely a result introduced unconsciously by those in charge of reciting the sūtras, the sheer volume of information in the story—two full chapters—suggests that this interpolation was likely a conscious decision of the editor(s). Within the story, many other interpolations are also found, some of which did fall neatly into the categories presented by Nattier: multiplication of epithets, completion of a standard list, recall of a passage from elsewhere, filling in the blanks, and reiteration with additional examples, while others did not fit so well into these categories and provide evidence of conscious acts by the editor(s) to enhance the material in the narrative for the benefit of the audience. In the process of applying Nattier’s methodologies to the story of Sadāprarudita, some unique features, in terms of canonical texts, have arisen and from these I proposed several supplementary rules to Nattier’s position regarding interpolations:
(1) Apart from time, the number of interpolations in a text may also be influence by the underlying text to which it relates. In the case of version II of the story, though Śata-X (660–663 CE) pre-dates some of the other parallels, based on the dating information available, it contains more interpolations, this may reflect the fact that it comes from the system of prajñāpāramitā in 100,000 ślokas;

(2) Though information contained in later texts and not found in earlier texts may be regarded as interpolations with some measure of confidence (Nattier 2003: 51), I further proposed that information found in one text only and not in any other parallels, regardless of date, may be regarded as a possible interpolation. Moreover, this supplementary rule can also be applied to identify lost information, that is, where one extant parallel does not contain the information found in all the other existing parallels, one can surmise that this piece of information may have been lost;

(3) In trying to interpret the differences between the parallels of a text, such as in the case of version I and version II of the story, more reasonable conclusions can be drawn by taking into account the relationship between the various versions. In the case of the narrative of Sadāprarudita, many of the perplexing points that previously could not be well explained have all fallen into place by applying the assumption
of sibling relationships, and the existence of a hypothetical earlier version (the parent version).

The above three findings are summarised in general terms, and in every case it would be ideal to be able to attain corroborating evidence to draw firmer conclusions.

In Chapter 3 the formation of the story, its origins in terms of both time and place, were investigated by considering information in the story and the prajñāpāramitā sūtras. Although it is uncertain whether the story of Sadāprarudita began its life as part of prajñāpāramitā literature, a jātaka compendium, or even as an independently transmitted popular story, it is reasonable to believe that the story could have begun its life in an oral form, which was later written down and incorporated into various written texts such as the prajñāpāramitā sūtras. Based on the episode in the story where the Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita was told to go east to learn prajñāpāramitā from the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata, as well as an assessment of the spread of prajñāpāramitā sūtras in India, the evidence suggested that the story has strong connections with the north-west of India, and this may be a plausible location for its incorporation into prajñāpāramitā sūtras. To ascertain a likely time frame for the formation of the story and its introduction into a prajñāpāramitā sūtra, a lengthy investigation into the origins of prajñāpāramitā sūtras and when Buddhist texts were committed to writing was carried out, as this sets the lower limits for a possible time frame. The upper limits of that time frame
are marked by the period when the *prajñāpāramitā* sūtras, which already possess the story, were transmitted to China. Using these markers the story of Sadāprudita is likely to have been formed some time during the second half of the first century CE and was incorporated into *prajñāpāramitā* sūtras during or after this period, though no later than the late second century CE when Lokakṣema translated the *Aṣṭa* in Luòyáng 洛陽.

There is a unique quality found while looking at the formation of the story. It is one of the few instances in *jātaka* or *avadāna* collections where a bodhisattva sacrifices themselves for the sake of the Dharma, which is not commonly seen in *jātaka* or *avadāna* collections belonging to the early Buddhist traditions, such as the Theravāda or Sarvāstivāda, and could be, to a certain extent, regarded as a unique feature of Mahāyāna narratives.

Over the centuries as the story formed and was handed down through the generations, it flourished into at least 4 versions: version I, version II, a *jātaka* form, and a Uighur version. A careful analysis of their structure, episodes, and relationship was conducted in Chapter 4. First a detailed comparison of version I and version II was carried out. This revealed that a notable section in the body of the story is consistent between both versions, which thus allowed for the drawing up of a chart of parallel passages, see Appendix 1. Notwithstanding this similarity there are two major segments that are unique to version I. These are the episodes before Sadāprudita hears a voice in the air while in the wilderness, and the episodes after the event where he enters into various *samādhis* for the second
time. The fact that both versions have some elements unique to themselves and some that are shared presented many interesting issues when looking at the chronology of their ancestry. Previously, Lewis Lancaster referred to these two versions as the “earlier” and “later” versions, implying one version is a direct descendent of the other. However, this hypothesis seems quite insecure when the names of the samādhis found in both versions, which surprisingly are entirely different, were compared. Therefore, a rethink of the story’s likely path of development is needed, given the evidence before our eyes. As versions I and II have a core section that is very similar, this would suggest that they had a common ancestry at some point. Yet the fact that the names of the samādhis are entirely different and version I has two major segments unique to itself would suggest that both versions developed independently at some other point in time. Therefore, it was proposed that a more likely path of evolution is that there was an earlier version, without the section on samādhis and the unique segments in version I. This I have called the hypothesised earlier version, which provides the material for the body of the story (and other elements in the narrative) that is consistent between both versions. Subsequently the story spread and took (at least) two main separate paths of development. One path saw the unique segments added and a list of samādhis based on a certain “samādhī tradition” belonging to a particular monastic or teaching lineage, and/or a particular, local or regional centre of Buddhist activity, this eventually became the version I which is available today. The other development yielding version II only saw the incorporation of a
list of *samādhis*, based on another “*samādhi* tradition” belonging to a particular monastic or teaching lineage, and/or a particular, local or regional centre of Buddhist activity.

Having established the relationship between version I and version II, next I assessed the *jātaka* form of the story recorded in the *Liù dù jì jīng 六度集經 (Compendium of the Six Transcendent Practices, T 3 no. 152). The introductory account of the story in the *jātaka* form of the story bears much similarity with one of the unique segments found in version I. Generally, although the episodes in the *jātaka* form of the story are less complex than version I, in some areas it provides more detailed depictions (see Appendix 2 for a detailed comparison). Over the years various studies have considered the relationship between version I and the *jātaka* version. Many say that version I evolved from the *jātaka* version, a few argue it is the other way around, and some propose that both stemmed from an earlier version. An assessment of the problematic issues relating to the chapter on *Dhyānapāramitā* in the *Liù dù jì jīng 六度集經 suggested that this chapter may be a later addition, and this makes the idea unlikely that version I evolved from the *jātaka* version. Next a closer look at the terminology used in the *jātaka* version and the parallel translated by Zhī Qiān 支謙 revealed a degree of similarity in the use of some terms. Moreover, better links between some episodes found in the *jātaka* version might be taken as later adaptations to improve the source version’s shortcomings. Thus, all these pieces of information combined suggest that it is
more likely that the *jātaka* version was adapted from version I, in particular Zhī Qiān’s translation.

Lastly, I came to consider the Uighur version and its position within the family tree of this narrative. The style of the Uighur version is a verse-prose narrative, unlike version I, version II, and the *jātaka* version, which are all in prose. Şinasi Tekin (1980: 156) states that this version of the story of Sadāprarudita is not a translation but a Uighur adaptation. Based on its contents, it seems to have a closer relation to version II, and may have been adapted from the parallel translated by Xuánzàng 玄奘. On the other hand, the descriptions of the residents in the City of Sugandhapura and the list of bodily sacrifices made in the Uighur version align well with version I of the story, and this gives rise to the small possibility that the composer(s) might have also consulted other Chinese parallels of the story. However, Lokakṣema or Zhī Qiān’s translation of the story may not have been accessible and preferable at the time.

Though prior studies have focused on this Uighur version, this study further considered the question of why it was created in the first place. As yet, there is no concrete evidence to indicate the true purpose of its author(s). Nevertheless, from assessing its style, content, and similar texts, the information garnered suggested that it could have been composed for the purpose of expressing the author’s reverence for the teachings, just as the Uighur translators Antsang and Prajñāśrī composed pieces in verse form to revere the aspirations of Samantabhadra and the *prajñāpāramitā*, respectively. Alternatively, the Uighur
version could have been the script for some form of a performance or biàn wén 变文 to spread the teachings in a form that was more accessible to a larger audience and more easily understood.

Having considered all four versions of the text, a summary of their possible development is as follows: Version I and version II arose from a hypothetical earlier version. Version I was transmitted to China and was translated into Chinese during the second and the third centuries CE, but subsequently fell out of use in India at an unknown period. Interestingly, a jātaka version, which looks like an abbreviation of version I, is found in the Liù dù jí jīng 六度集经 translated by Kāng Sēnghuì 康僧會 (ca. the mid-third century CE). Version II was also transmitted to China, where it influenced the composition of the Uighur version of the story, but continued to develop and remain in circulation in India at least until the eleventh century CE as attested by the Sanskrit version of the Aṣṭa.

While comparing the various parallels of the story, examples of Nattier’s three types of changes that can occur to a text over time, namely, interpolations, omissions and abbreviations, and alterations in the sequence of a text, could all be identified, yet there is an additional fourth type that the study of the story revealed, that is, adaptations. For example, in version I, while Sadāprārudita’s motive for leaving the household life is not so clear, the answer is clarified in the jātaka version. Or in the case of the Uighur version the whole text may have undergone adaptation to suit the purpose of the author(s).
In Chapter 4, the crucial piece of evidence leading to my proposal of a hypothetical earlier version was found in the list of *samādhis*. There are further points of interest that stem from the lists of *samādhis* contained in the story and this was the focus of Chapter 5. In the list of *samādhis*, states of meditative concentration are named, such as “scattering flowers” (*kusumābhikīrṇa*) and “the peak without obstruction from all dharmas” (*sarva-dharmānavāvarāna-koṭi*). Upon a first reading of these names, one cannot help but question whether or not they truly are *samādhi* practices or are just a product of the editor’s vivid imagination. In the *Dà zhì dù lùn* 大智度論 (*The Treatise on the [Sutra of] Great Perfection of Insight*, T 25 no. 1509) we learn that these names are based on practical experience, reflecting the abilities of the practitioner once they are in that state.

Having established the basis for these *samādhis* in the *Aṣṭa*, a subsequent question that arose is, “Why do they not appear widely in other early Buddhist texts?” Upon investigation of some accounts found in the Chinese *Samyuktāgama* it appeared that although these *samādhis* existed, they were little known, possibly because few practitioners attained such states of concentration. In addition, some of the teachings on these *samādhis* were taught by the Buddha’s disciples rather than by the Buddha himself. This may partly explain why such *samādhis* were not widely recorded in early Buddhist texts. However, given that such an extensive list of *samādhis* was incorporated into the narrative of
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Sadāprarudita, this clearly suggests that the editor(s) of the Aṣṭa were aware of these *samādhis* and possibly even had a close understanding of these *samādhi* practices. Another interesting issue that arose when investigating the names of *samādhis* is the situation where the same state of concentration may actually be assigned different names due to different traditions, communities, and geographic locations.

Among the list of *samādhis* there was one particular *samādhi* that warranted further investigation, this was the *samādhi* named “viewing all tathāgatas.” While in this state, Sadāprarudita sees the buddhas of the countless realms in the ten directions teaching bodhisattvas the *prajñāpāramitā*. This raises the possibility that *samādhi* practitioners were yet another source for the revelations of *prajñāpāramitā* and thereby Mahāyāna teachings. This is in keeping with Paul Harrison’s (1995: 65–66) suggestions that some of the impetus for the early development of Mahāyāna came from forest-dwelling monks and that *samādhi* practices were important because they provided a channel for fresh revelations and inspiration, which explains the significant proliferation of Mahāyāna texts. In other words, *samādhi*-practising forest-dwelling monks contributed to the development of Mahāyāna. There are two accounts in the Aṣṭa that also support this idea. In the first chapter of the Aṣṭa, two *samādhis* regarding the bodhisattva’s practice of *prajñāpāramitā* are mentioned. They are the concentration called “not to be caught by all dharmas” (*sarvadharma-parigṛhitọ*
nāma samādhīrī)\textsuperscript{483} and the concentration called “not clinging to all dharmas” (sarvadharmanupādāno nāma samādhīrī).\textsuperscript{484} According to research by Kajiyoshi Kōun 梶芳光運, this part (i.e. the first chapter of the Aṣṭa) preserves the “original prajñāpāramitā” teachings, which predate the creation of the Aṣṭa.\textsuperscript{485} In other words, according to Kajiyoshi, the “original prajñāpāramitā” teachings were incorporated into the Aṣṭa as it formed. Since the so-called original prajñāpāramitā exhibits a connection to the teachings of samādhis, this may suggest that the appearance of prajñāpāramitā teachings is related to samādhi practice. It could be that samādhi practitioners, having acquired the teachings of prajñāpāramitā while in samādhi, could have then brought the teachings to the Buddhist communities. If this is so, then a further question would arise, “How is it that they can recall the volumes of teachings given by the buddhas while in samādhi?” To answer this question I turned to the role of dhāraṇī. Unlike the common understanding of dhāraṇī as a mantra or a magical incantation, dhāraṇī can be understood to be the ability to memorise the Buddha’s teachings. Thus, it may be that the experience of learning teachings from the buddhas of the ten directions can arise when in such states of samādhi and the means by which a practitioner can then relay these teachings to others was on account of the attainment of dhāraṇī.

\textsuperscript{483} Aṣṭa (ed. Wogihara 1932–1935) 49.20–21.
\textsuperscript{484} Aṣṭa (ed. Wogihara 1932–1935) 60.8.
\textsuperscript{485} Kajiyoshi 1980: 568.
Having looked at the story in detail and what this implies about its ancestral relationship, path of evolution, and implications for Mahāyāna teachings, Chapter 6 then analysed the story from a macro perspective. The importance and attractiveness of the story of Sadāprurudita is witnessed by its employment over a large expanse of time and by a diverse range of Buddhist communities. Starting from the birthplace of Buddhism, in India, great masters such Candrakīrti and Śāntideva have used various episodes in the story to highlight the importance of the Dharma, in particular they quoted passages that show how Sadāprurudita valued the Dharma and was thus a model practitioner for others to emulate. In Tibetan Buddhism, we can find examples of prominent figures, from the turn of the last millennium till the present day, utilising this narrative to stress the importance of the guru and following one’s guru. Chinese Buddhism has also used the story in various ways. The early Pure Land Tradition is one such example; it highlighted the achievements of Sadāprurudita’s practice of recollecting the buddhas and seeing buddhas, that is, niàn fó sānmèi 念佛三昧 (concentration of recollecting the buddhas). Though only a handful of examples were surveyed, it is noteworthy that all the traditions investigated in this chapter utilise the episode where Sadāprurudita sacrifices himself in order to fulfil his own vow. This may well reflect the ultimate sacrifice that a human can make for buddhas, their guru, and the Dharma. This also parallels the Buddha’s own self-sacrifice during his long career as a bodhisattva.
As the purpose of this study was to look at the narrative from a variety of perspectives, the time and effort dedicated to each area of the study required some balancing. Hence in Chapter 6 only a brief survey was conducted. Ideally with more time to undertake further surveys of the past adoptions and usage of the story of Sadāprarudita, no doubt a much deeper understanding of its importance would reveal itself. Thus, this is one area of further investigation and study that fellow researchers may want to consider delving into.

Following on from Chapter 6 where the concern was to focus on how the story had been adopted by various masters and Buddhist traditions, Chapter 7 looked at the peculiar phenomenon of the story’s absence in some prajñāpāramitā sūtras. Nattier (2003: 60) proposes two factors that are to be considered when reaching the likely direction of evolution of a text, namely, “to suspect abbreviation in one text or expansion in another.” Although Nattier proposes shrinkage or expansion to be the two possible directions of a text’s development, she considers the former to be less likely in the case of Mahāyāna texts. The investigation in this thesis of the absence of the story in some texts provided evidence in support of shrinkage. The lack of the story in the Pañcaviṃśati is evidence that a sūtra may be recast with some chapters or sections excised due to a lack of relevance or importance to the editors’ purposes, which was noted by a certain authoritative commentary on this text. Regarding the story’s absence in the Śata, due to the limitation of available evidence, I have only touched upon a few possibilities, including the possibility that the underlying original text for the
Chinese translation of the Śata is different from the extant Sanskrit manuscript of the Śata, namely the former contained the story while the latter does not. Perhaps in the future as more evidence and/or new methods come about, further investigation may provide a more definitive answer to this issue.

The above has summarised the main points that have come from the fruits of the present study of the Sadāprarudita narrative. Looking into its historical evolution has revealed insightful methodologies that can be applied, with care, to extract information about the different layers within a text, and to analyse what this may mean about the historical context of the time. Undoubtedly, the most valuable lesson that has come from this study is that in the drawing up of any conclusion, all the facts (at least all that we have at hand) should be allowed to tell their story. Minor pieces of information should not be overlooked, nor should our judgment be clouded with pre-existing bias.
Appendix 1

The following table compares the story of Sadāprudita based on consistency. That is, where sections run consistent between the two texts, they are presented in the same row. Where they are different, then a new row is used to separate the incident. The same applies to the table in Appendix 2.

Comparative Table of Version I and Version II of the Story of Sadāprudita

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version I</th>
<th>Version II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Buddha instructs Subhūti to regard Sadāprudita as a paragon of one who seeks <em>prajñāpāramitā</em></td>
<td>1. The Buddha instructs Subhūti to regard Sadāprudita as a paragon of one who seeks <em>prajñāpāramitā</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sadāprudita’s quest for <em>prajñāpāramitā</em></td>
<td>2. Sadāprudita’s quest for <em>prajñāpāramitā</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Before setting off on the journey to seek <em>prajñāpāramitā</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1. The land where Sadāprudita is now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2. A dream in which a god admonishes him to search for the great Dharma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3. Grieving and lamenting over the inability to fulfil his desire to find the great Dharma, meet a buddha, and so forth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4. The gods of the Trāyāstrimśa Heaven bestow on him the name Sadāprudita (Ever-weeping)</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5. Sadāprudita’s predicament at that time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6. A dream in which Sadāprudita hears a previous buddha’s name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.7. Leaving for the wilderness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. The journey to the City of Gandhavatī</td>
<td>2.1. The journey to the City of Gandhavatī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1. Revelations from a voice in the air</td>
<td>2.1.1. Revelations from a voice in the air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version I</td>
<td>Version II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.1. Sadāprudita hears that the great Dharma is called <em>prajñāpāramitā</em> and is instructed to seek it</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.2. Admonition to go east and concentrate on seeking for <em>prajñāpāramitā</em>, paying no attention to the five aggregates, the six faculties, and so forth</td>
<td>2.1.1.1. Admonition to go east and concentrate on seeking for <em>prajñāpāramitā</em>, paying no attention to food, drink, and so forth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.3. The benefits of following the admonition is that one will be able to achieve Buddhahood soon</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.1. Admonition to go east and concentrate on seeking for <em>prajñāpāramitā</em>, paying no attention to food, drink, and so forth</td>
<td>2.1.1.2. Instruction to have confidence in the three gates of liberation – emptiness (<em>śūnyatā</em>), signless (<em>anirmita</em>), and wishless (<em>apraṇihita</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.3. Admonition to shun signs, existence, and the false view that there are beings</td>
<td>2.1.1.4. Instruction regarding respect for good Dharma teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.4. Instruction regarding respect for good Dharma teachers</td>
<td>2.1.1.5. Advice on following good Dharma teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.5. Advice on following good Dharma teachers</td>
<td>2.1.1.5.1. Characteristics of good Dharma teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.5.2. Benefits of learning from them</td>
<td>2.1.1.5.2. Benefits of learning from them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corresponds to 2.2.2.9 in this version</td>
<td>2.1.1.6. Admonition on abandonment of worldly motives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corresponds to 2.2.2.8 in this version</td>
<td>2.1.1.7. Instruction on how to follow Dharmodgata with sincere respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corresponds to 2.2.2.7 in this version</td>
<td>2.1.1.8. Instruction on right understanding when seeing Dharma teachers apparently indulging in enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No parallel</td>
<td>2.1.1.9. Advice on contemplating the truth of dharmas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.10. Instruction on how to reflect upon treatment from Dharma teachers that initially may be disheartening</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.4. Sadāprudita’s regret for not asking the details concerning the way to the place where he can learn <em>prajñāpāramitā</em></td>
<td>2.1.1.11. Sadāprudita’s regret for not asking the details concerning the way to the place where he can learn <em>prajñāpāramitā</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version I</th>
<th>Version II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2. Revelations from an unknown buddha figure</td>
<td>2.1.2. Revelations from an unknown buddha figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.1. Praise and comfort to relieve Sadāprudita’s regret</td>
<td>2.1.2.1. Praise and comfort to relieve Sadāprudita’s regret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.2. Instructions regarding how all dharmas are like reflections on clear water, objects seen in a dream, and so forth</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.3. Instructions on the direction, distance, and name of the place</td>
<td>2.1.2.2. Instructions on the direction, distance, and name of the place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.4. Details on the characteristics of Gandhavatī</td>
<td>2.1.2.3. Details on the characteristics of Gandhavatī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.5. Exposition on Dharmodgata’s life</td>
<td>2.1.2.4. Exposition on Dharmodgata’s life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corresponds to 2.3.3.3 in this version</td>
<td>2.1.2.5. Sadāprudita enters various samādhis for the first time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.6. Revealing that Dharmodgata is the right Dharma teacher for him</td>
<td>Corresponds to 2.1.3.4 in this version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.7. Instruction on right understanding when seeing Dharmodgata’s worldly conduct</td>
<td>Corresponds to 2.1.1.8 in this version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.8. Instruction on how to follow Dharmodgata with sincere respect</td>
<td>Corresponds to 2.1.1.7 in this version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.9. Admonition on abandonment of worldly motives</td>
<td>Corresponds to 2.1.1.6 in this version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3. Revelations from the immeasurable number of present buddhas of the ten directions</td>
<td>2.1.3. Revelations from the immeasurable number of present buddhas of the ten directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3.1. Sadāprudita sees the present buddhas of the ten directions in a samādhi</td>
<td>2.1.3.1. Sadāprudita sees the present buddhas of the ten directions teaching prajñāpāramitā in a samādhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3.2. Praise for his diligence which is the same as that exhibited by all the buddhas when they were on the Bodhisattva Path</td>
<td>2.1.3.2. Praise for his diligence which is the same as that exhibited by all the buddhas when they were on the Bodhisattva Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No parallel</td>
<td>2.1.3.3. Advice on reverence to Dharma teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version I</td>
<td>Version II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corresponds to 2.2.2.6 in this version</td>
<td>2.1.3.4. Revealing that Dharmodgata is the right Dharma teacher for him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3.3. Question: “Where have those buddhas come from and where have they gone?”</td>
<td>2.1.3.5. Question: “Where have those buddhas come from and where have they gone?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3.4. Making a resolution to visit Dharmodgata</td>
<td>2.1.3.6. Making a resolution to visit Dharmodgata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4. Sadāprarudita sells his own body to gain gifts to make offerings to Dharmodgata</td>
<td>2.1.4. Sadāprarudita sells his own body to gain gifts to make offerings to Dharmodgata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4.1. Obstruction by Māra</td>
<td>2.1.4.1. Obstruction by Māra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4.2. Śakra’s test of Sadāprarudita’s resolution</td>
<td>2.1.4.2. Śakra’s test of Sadāprarudita’s resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4.3. Receiving assistance from a merchant’s daughter and then approaching the City of Gandhavatī</td>
<td>2.1.4.3. Receiving assistance from a merchant’s daughter and then approaching the City of Gandhavatī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. The meeting with the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata</td>
<td>2.2. The meeting with the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1. Making offerings to the text of <em>prajñāpāramitā</em> and to Dharmodgata</td>
<td>2.2.1. Making offerings to the text of <em>prajñāpāramitā</em> and to Dharmodgata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2. Disclosing the intention for visiting Dharmodgata</td>
<td>2.2.2. Disclosing the intention for visiting Dharmodgata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3. Requesting resolution of his doubt</td>
<td>2.2.3. Requesting resolution of his doubt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3.1. Question: “Where have those buddhas come from and where have they gone?”</td>
<td>2.2.3.1. Question: “Where have those buddhas come from and where have they gone?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3.2. Dharmodgata’s responses to Sadāprarudita’s question: “A tathāgata is the same as emptiness, conjured things, mirage, and so forth which neither come nor go.”</td>
<td>2.2.3.2. Response to Sadāprarudita’s question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.3.2.1. Tathāgata is indeed the suchness <em>(tathātā)</em>, non-arising <em>(anutpāda)</em>, limit of reality <em>(bhūtakoṭī)</em>, and so forth which neither come nor go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.3.2.2. Explanation using similes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.3.2.2.1. Mirage of water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.3.2.2.2. Conjured troops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.3.2.2.3. Buddhas seen in dreams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.3.2.2.4. Treasures in the great ocean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.3.2.2.5. Sounds from musical instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(These 5 listed similes appear in all parallels of version II. Some parallels of version II contain even more similes.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3.3. Sadāprarudita enters various <em>samādhis</em> for the first time</td>
<td>2.2.3.3. Corresponds to 2.1.2.5 in this version</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No parallel
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version I</th>
<th>Version II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corresponds to 2.3.6.6 in this version</td>
<td>2.2.3.3. Various auspicious events due to Dharmogata’s teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corresponds to 2.3.6.3 in this version</td>
<td>2.2.3.4. Sadāprudita’s self sacrifice together with a merchant’s daughter and her five hundred maidens to be Dharmogata’s attendants and servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.4. The Bodhisattva Dharmogata enters into various samādhis for seven years</td>
<td>2.2.4. The Bodhisattva Dharmogata enters into various samādhis for seven years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.5. The Bodhisattva Sadāprudita sprinkles the ground with his blood to prevent dust from rising and soiling the Bodhisattva Dharmogata’s body</td>
<td>2.2.5. The Bodhisattva Sadāprudita sprinkles the ground with his blood to prevent dust from rising and soiling the Bodhisattva Dharmogata’s body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6. The Bodhisattva Dharmogata teaches prajñāpāramitā</td>
<td>2.2.6. The Bodhisattva Dharmogata teaches prajñāpāramitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6.1. Dharmogata emerges from meditation and receives offerings of flowers from Sadāprudita and his companions</td>
<td>2.2.6.1. Dharmogata emerges from meditation and receives offerings of flowers from Sadāprudita and his companions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6.2. The teaching of prajñāpāramitā</td>
<td>2.2.6.2. The teaching of prajñāpāramitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6.2.1. The negation of entity</td>
<td>2.2.6.2.1. The truth of prajñāpāramitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6.2.2. Prajñāpāramitā is everywhere</td>
<td>2.2.6.2.2. The merit of prajñāpāramitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.6.2.3. The boundlessness of prajñāpāramitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.6.2.4. The firmness of prajñāpāramitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.6.2.5. The emptiness and stillness of prajñāpāramitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.6.2.6. The inconceivability of prajñāpāramitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6.3. Sadāprudita’s self sacrifice together with a merchant’s daughter and her five hundred maidens to be Dharmogata’s attendants and servants</td>
<td>2.2.6.3. Sadāprudita enters into various samādhis for a second time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6.4. Sadāprudita enters into various samādhis for a second time</td>
<td>2.2.6.3. Sadāprudita enters into various samādhis for a second time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6.5. Inquiry about the voice and body of a buddha</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6.6. Various auspicious events due to Dharmogata’s teaching</td>
<td>Corresponds to 2.2.3.3 in this version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version I</td>
<td>Version II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6.7. Prediction that Sadāprudita and his</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>companions will attain Buddhahood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conclusion that one should seek</td>
<td>3. Conclusion that one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prajñāpāramitā like Sadāprudita</td>
<td>should seek prajñāpāramitā like Sadāprudita</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2

Comparative Table of Version I and the *Jātaka* Version of the Story of Sadāprudita

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version I</th>
<th>Jātaka version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Buddha instructs Subhūti to regard Sadāprudita as a paragon of one who seeks <em>prajñāpāramitā</em></td>
<td>1. Once upon a time the Buddha was the Bodhisattva Sadāprudita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sadāprudita’s quest for <em>prajñāpāramitā</em></td>
<td>2. Sadāprudita’s quest for <em>prajñāpāramitā</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Before setting off on the journey to seek <em>prajñāpāramitā</em></td>
<td>2.1. Before setting off on the journey to seek <em>prajñāpāramitā</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1. The land where Sadāprudita is now</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2. A dream in which a god admonishes him to search for the great Dharma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3. Grieving and lamenting over the inability to fulfil his desire to find the great Dharma, meet a buddha, and so forth</td>
<td>2.1.1. Grieving and lamenting over the inability to fulfil his desire to meet a buddha, Dharma, samgha, and so forth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4. The gods of the Trāyastriṃśa Heaven bestow on him the name Sadāprudita (Ever-weeping)</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5. Sadāprudita’s predicament at that time</td>
<td>2.1.2. Sadāprudita’s predicament at that time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6. A dream in which Sadāprudita hears a previous buddha’s name</td>
<td>2.1.3. A dream in which Sadāprudita hears a previous buddha teaching him Dharma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.7. Leaving for the wilderness</td>
<td>2.1.4. Leaving for the wilderness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. The journey to the City of Gandhavatī</td>
<td>2.2. The journey to the City of Gandhavatī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1. Revelations from a voice in the air</td>
<td>2.2.1. Revelations from a god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.1. Sadāprudita hears that the great Dharma is called <em>prajñāpāramitā</em> and is instructed to seek it</td>
<td>2.2.1.1. Sadāprudita hears that the great Dharma is called <em>prajñāpāramitā</em> and is instructed to seek it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version I</td>
<td>Jātaka version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.2.</td>
<td>2.2.1.2. Admonition to go east and concentrate on seeking for prajñāpāramitā, paying no attention to the five aggregates, the six faculties, and so forth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.3.</td>
<td>2.2.1.3. The benefits of following the admonition is that one will be able to achieve Buddhahood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.4.</td>
<td>2.2.1.4. Sadāpradita’s regret for not asking the details concerning the way to the place where he can learn prajñāpāramitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.</td>
<td>2.2.2. Revelations from an unknown buddha figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.1.</td>
<td>2.2.2.1. Praise and comfort to relieve Sadāpradita’s regret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.2.</td>
<td>2.2.2.2. Instructions regarding how all dharmas are like reflections on clear water, objects seen in a dream, and so forth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.3.</td>
<td>2.2.2.3. Instructions on the direction, distance, and name of the place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.4.</td>
<td>2.2.2.4. Details on the characteristics of Gandhavatī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.5.</td>
<td>2.2.2.5. Exposition on Dharmodgata’s life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.6.</td>
<td>2.2.2.6. Revealing that Dharmodgata is the right Dharma teacher for him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.7.</td>
<td>2.2.2.7. Instruction on right understanding when seeing Dharmodgata’s odd conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.8.</td>
<td>2.2.2.8. Instruction on how to follow Dharmodgata with sincere respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.9.</td>
<td>2.2.2.9. Admonition on abandonment of worldly motives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3.</td>
<td>2.2.3. Revelation from the immeasurable number of present buddhas of the ten directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.1.</td>
<td>2.2.2.1. The benefits of learning and practising the prajñāpāramitā is that one will definitely be able to achieve Buddhahood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.3.</td>
<td>2.2.1.3. Admonition to go east and concentrate on seeking for prajñāpāramitā, paying no attention to the five aggregates, the six faculties, and so forth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.4.</td>
<td>2.2.1.4. Grieving and lamenting over not knowing details concerning the way to the place where he can learn prajñāpāramitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.</td>
<td>2.2.2. Revelations from an unknown buddha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.1.</td>
<td>2.2.2.1. Praise and comfort to relieve Sadāpradita’s regret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.2.</td>
<td>2.2.2.2. Instructions regarding how all dharmas are empty, like illusions, and bubbles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.3.</td>
<td>2.2.2.3. Instructions on the direction, distance, and name of the place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.4.</td>
<td>2.2.2.4. Simple portrayal of the residents of Gandhavatī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.5.</td>
<td>2.2.2.5. Exposition on Dharmodgata’s life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.6.</td>
<td>2.2.2.6. Revealing that Dharmodgata is the right Dharma teacher for him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.7.</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.8.</td>
<td>2.2.2.8. Instruction on how to follow Dharmodgata with sincere respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2.9.</td>
<td>2.2.2.9. Admonition on abandonment of worldly motives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3.</td>
<td>2.2.3. Revelation from present buddhas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version I</td>
<td>Jātaka version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3.1. Sadāprarudita sees the present buddhas of the ten directions in a samādhi</td>
<td>2.2.3.1. Sadāprarudita sees the present buddhas in a samādhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3.2. Praise for his diligence which is the same as that exhibited by all the buddhas when they were on the Bodhisattva Path</td>
<td>2.2.3.2. Praise for his diligence which is the same as that exhibited by all the buddhas when they were on the Bodhisattva Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3.3. Question: “Where have those buddhas come from and where have they gone?”</td>
<td>2.2.3.3. Question: “Where have those buddhas come from and where have they gone?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3.4. Making the resolution to visit Dharmodgata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4. Sadāprarudita sells his own body to gain gifts to make offerings to Dharmodgata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4.1. Obstruction by Māra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4.2. Śakra’s test of Sadāprarudita’s resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4.3. Receiving assistance from a merchant’s daughter and then approaching the city of Gandhavatī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. The meeting with the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1. Making offerings to the text of prajñāpāramitā and to Dharmodgata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2. Disclosing the intention for visiting Dharmodgata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3. Requesting resolution of his doubt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3.1. Question: “Where have those buddhas come from and where have they gone?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3.2. Dharmodgata’s responses to Sadāprarudita’s question: “A tathāgata is the same as emptiness, conjured things, mirage, and so forth which neither come nor go.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3.3. Sadāprarudita enters various samādhis for the first time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.4. The Bodhisattva Dharmodgata enters into various samādhis for seven years</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.5. The Bodhisattva Sadāprarudita sprinkles the ground with his blood to prevent dust from rising and soiling the Bodhisattva Dharmodgata’s body</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version I</th>
<th>Jātaka version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6. The Bodhisattva Dharmodgata teaches <em>prajñāpāramitā</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6.1. Dharmodgata emerges from meditation and receives offerings of flowers from Sadāprarudita and his companions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6.2. The teaching of <em>prajñāpāramitā</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6.2.1. The negation of entity</td>
<td>2.3.6.2.2. <em>Prajñāpāramitā</em> is everywhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6.3. Sadāprarudita’s self sacrifice together with a merchant’s daughter and her five hundred maidens to be Dharmodgata’s attendants and servants</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6.4. Sadāprarudita enters into various <em>samādhis</em> for a second time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6.5. Inquiry about the voice and body of a buddha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6.6. Various auspicious events due to Dharmodgata’s teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6.7. Prediction that Sadāprarudita and his companions will attain Buddhahood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conclusion that one should seek <em>prajñāpāramitā</em> like Sadāprarudita</td>
<td>3. Conclusion that one should practise <em>dhyānapāramitā</em> like this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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