Asian Literature and Translation

ANNOTATED ENGLISH TRANSLATION

OF KUMĀRAJĪVA'S

XIAǑPǏN PRAJÑĀPĀRAMITĀ SŪTRA

HUIFENG SHI

An Annotated English Translation
of Kumārajīva's
Xiaŏpĭn Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra

Huifeng Shi

ABSTRACT

KUMĀRAJĪVA's early 5th century translation entitled the *Xiaŏpĭn Bānruòbōluómì Jīng* (小品般若波羅蜜經), i.e. the *Small Section Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra*, is the fourth of seven Chinese translations of the early Mahāyāna text commonly known by its Sanskrit name the *Aṣṭa-sāhasrikā*, or in English the *Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines*. While this text has generated great interest among scholars of Budhism, many have relied on the Sanskrit recensions, which are considerably later than the *Xiaŏpĭn*, representing an earlier source. Even within the text as a whole, the first two chapters (of the Sanskrit) have been a focus of numerous philological attempts to ascertain a possible ur-text. As such, the translation here is of the corresponding Chinese content of the *Xiaŏpĭn*, namely chapters one, two, and the start of chapter three. Before the translation proper, the Introduction discusses the source and its editions, provides an overview of the doctrinal content of these two chapters, and discusses the voice and policy of our translation. The English translation is not an attempt to return to its now unknown Sanskrit original, nor by reading it through later Chinese traditions, but as close as we can understand to KUMĀRAJĪVA's own understanding and translation technique. The entire English translation is critically annotated, marking significant points of interest both internally within the text, but also externally when compared to the other Chinese translations and later Sanskrit recensions.

INTRODUCTION

KUMĀRAJĪVA'S *XIAŎPǏN PRAJÑĀPĀRAMITĀ SŪTRA* TRANSLATION

The *Xiaŏpǐn Bānruòbōluómì Jīng* (小品般若波羅蜜經),[1] i.e. the *Small Section Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra*, was translated by the Kuchan (龜茲國) Tripiṭakācaryā (三藏) KUMĀRAJĪVA (鳩摩羅什) and his translation team in 408CE, during the 4th month of the 10th year of Hóngshǐ (弘始), in the Later Qín dynasty (後秦), at the Xiaōyaó Garden (逍遙園) near the capital of Cháng'ān (長安).[2] The *Xiaŏpǐn* is a translation of a text known more commonly in the West by the name of its Sanskrit equivalent, the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, i.e. the *Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines*.

The Chinese title *Xiaŏpǐn*, which we translate as *Small Section*, no doubt reflects the fact that KUMĀRAJĪVA was well aware of at least two versions of the *Prajñāpāramitā*, this being the smaller of the two.   The same basic smaller text has been translated a total of seven times into Chinese, both before and after KUMĀRAJĪVA's efforts:[3] 1. The *Dàoxíng Bānruò Jīng* (道行般若經), attributed to LOKAKṢEMA (ZHĪ Lóujīachèn 支婁迦讖), in 179CE during the Late Hàn. 2. The *Dàmíngdù Jīng* (大明度經), translated at some time between 223-229CE.   The bulk of this text was translated by ZHĪ Qiān (支謙), though chapter one was most probably made by KĀNG Sēnghùi (NATTIER 2010), and we shall thus refer to the two as *Dàmíngdù(A)* and *Dàmíngdù(B)*, respectively.   3. The *Bānruò Chāo Jīng* (般若鈔經), translated in 386CE most probably by ZHÚ Fǎhù (竺法護), this is only a partial translation of 13 chapters.   4. The *Xiaŏpǐn* text itself, by KUMĀRAJĪVA.   Subsequenty, 5. and 6. the *Dàbānruòbōluómìduō Jīng* (大般若波羅蜜多

---

[1] A note on the Hànyǔ Pīnyīn for the name of the text: While the two characters 般 and 若 are now individually pronounced as "*bān*" and "*ruò*", respectively, it is common in modern Chinese Buddhist idiom to pronounce them as "*bō*" and "*rě*", which is usually explained as being a uniquely Buddhist form. However, the Chinese is a phoneticization of Sanskrit "*prajñā*", or more likely actually some form of Gāndhārī in the very early Chinese translation, such as "*praña*" (FALK & KARASHIMA 2013; KARASHIMA 2013). Thus, while "*bānruò*" (般若) itself would most likely not exactly correspond to the ancient pronunciation of these characters, it is preferable as a transliteration to "*bōrě*".

[2] Referenced from LANCASTER & PARK (2004), according to *Kaīyüán Shìjiaò Lǜ*, fasc. 4 《開元釋教錄》卷 4:「《小品般若波羅蜜經》：十卷 (題云：「《摩訶般若波羅蜜》，無「小品」字。」祐云:「新《小品經》與《道行》、《明度》等同本，第七譯或七[9]卷，弘始十年二月六日出，至四月三十日訖，見二秦錄及僧祐錄。」(CBETA, T55, no. 2154, p. 512, b7-9) [9]卷＋（或八卷）【宋】【元】【明】; and *Dàzhoū Kāndìng Zhōngjīng Mùlù*, fasc. 2 《大周刊定眾經目錄》卷 2:「《小品般若波羅蜜經》，一部十卷 (或七卷[3]或八卷，菩提經同本異出，[4]一百五十四紙。) 右後秦弘始十年，沙門[＊]羅什於長安逍遙園譯。出長房錄。」(CBETA, T55, no. 2153, p. 382, a10-13) [3]或八卷＝八卷與七卷【宋】【元】【明】。[4]〔一百五十四紙〕－【宋】【元】【明】。[＊1-1]（鳩摩）＋羅【宋】＊【元】＊【明】＊.   See ROBINSON (1967: 71ff) and LAMOTTE (1998: 94ff; 2001: 900ff) who provide more details about both KUMĀRAJĪVA and his translation activities.

[3] Refer CONZE (1978), and ORSBORN = SHÌ (2012: 60-74) for details on the various versions.

經), Assembly 4 and Assembly 5 respectively, by Xüánzàng in 660CE.   7. The *Fómŭ Chūshēng Sānfàzàng Bānruòbōluómìduō Jīng* (佛母出生三法藏般若波羅蜜多經) by Dānapāla in 1004CE. Apart from these Chinese versions, there exists a Tibetan translation by Ye-śes-sde, the *Śes-rab-kyi pha-rol-tu phyin-pa brgyad stoṅ-pa*, from the 9th century CE (Conze 1978: 24).   Our commonly used Sanskrit source, the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, which is quite a late recension from Nepal (Conze 1978: 46ff), can be found in several modern editions, namely those of Wogihara (1932), Mitra (1888), and Vaidya (1960), as discussed in Conze (1978: 46-55). In addition to these Sanskrit editions but also representing Indic versions, incomplete fragments of a very ancient version in Gāndhārī have recently been discovered and are presently under examination (Falk & Karashima 2013).

Kumārajīva's translation of the *Xiaŏpĭn* took place several years after his translation of the *Móhēbānruòbōluómì Jīng* (摩訶般若波羅蜜經), i.e. an equivalent of the *Pañcaviṃśati Prajñā-pāramitā*, or *Perfection of Wisdom in Twenty Five Thousand Lines*, and a commentary to this text attributed to Nāgārjuna (龍樹), i.e. the *Dàzhìdù Lùn* (大智度論), **Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa.*[4] The fact that the larger *Móhē* text was translated by Kumārajīva and company before the smaller *Xiaŏpĭn* suggests the prevailing attitude toward textual provenance of the time, namely, that while both were indeed the "word of the Buddha" (*buddhavacana*), the larger texts held precedence over the smaller due to their more complete coverage of the teachings the genre expounds.   Other texts of the *Prajñāpāramitā* family were also translated at this time by Kumārajīva and his cohorts, such as the popular *Jīn'gāngbānruò Jīng* (金剛般若經), i.e. the *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā*, the *Perfection of Wisdom that Cuts Like a Thunder Bolt*, and the essential *Bānruò Xīn Jīng* (般若心經), i.e. the *Prajñāpāramitā Hṛdaya*, or *Heart of the Perfection of Wisdom.*[5]   Kumārajīva is of course also famed for his translations of many other Mahāyāna *sūtra*s, such as, but not limited to, the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (*Miaòfă Liánhuā Jīng* 妙法蓮花經) and *Vimalakīṛtinirdeśa* (*Weímójié Suŏshuō Jīng* 維摩詰所說經), important Madhyamaka works by Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva such as the **Madhyamaka Śāstra* (*Zhōng Lùn* 中論), as well as the *Daśabhāṇavāra Vinaya* (*Shísòng Lǜ* 十誦律) of the Sarvāsti-vāda school.

Content of the *Xiaŏpĭn Prajñāpāramitā*, Chp. 1-2

Translation is not a purely linguistic or philological task, however, and the demands of the hermeneutic circle require that the translator has a firm understanding of the doctrinal content being presented in the text in question.   Concerning the doctrinal content of the *Xiaŏpĭn* and the smaller *Prajñāpāramitā* in general, several years ago I gave a detailed analysis

---

[4]   For debate regarding authorial provenance, see Lamotte (1970: Introduction), Yìnshùn (1993), *et al.*

[5]   The attribution of Kumārajīva as translator of the *Xīn* (*Hṛdaya*) is a matter under debate, see Nattier (1992).

and reading of both the entire text and the two chapters in question through what I believe to be its chiasmic, i.e. inverted parallel, structure (ORSBORN = SHÌ 2012: 113-209). While such a structure can indeed help clarify certain key messages and provide parallel material for the understanding of given passages, it is not essential to fathoming the teachings of these chapters. Indeed, for several core ideas the chiastic method further confirmed the findings of earlier studies. Below we identify and discuss seven core doctrinal ideas found in the first two chapters of the *Xiǎopǐn*, referenced by their Taishō page and column numbers, e.g. §537a. Interested readers may also consult CONZE's overview, which while based on the Sanskrit is still largely applicable to the *Xiǎopǐn* (CONZE 1973: xi-xv).

Prajñāpāramitā—transcendent knowledge

The first key idea concerns the title of the text itself. As a genre of Mahāyāna scripture and also the doctrinal content, *Prajñāpāramitā* has already found an established English idiom, namely the "Perfection of Wisdom". While "wisdom" has become the standard translation for Sanskrit "*prajñā*", a more accurate cognate would perhaps be "gnosis" or some form of "knowledge" or "cognition". The use of "perfection" for "*pāramitā*" relies on the etymology of "*pāramī*", i.e. "perfect", with abstract suffix "*-tā*", hence "perfection". It is worth noting that the earlier Chinese translations of this genre of text, including those of KUMĀRAJĪVA, usually derive the term from "*pāram*", i.e. "other (shore)" (*bǐʾàn* 彼岸), and "*itā*", past participle from root "√*i*" (or "√*yā*"), meaning "gone", rendered into Chinese as "arrived" (*dào* 到). While elsewhere KUMĀRAJĪVA did translate the term in this manner, for the use of "*prajñāpāramitā*" in the *Xiǎopǐn* text he consistently transliterated using the phonetic "*bānruòbōluómì*" (般若波羅蜜).[6] It seems safe to say that he considered the term to be both unique and particular enough to Indic Buddhism that any attempt to translate into natural and more idiomatic Chinese would have led to an unacceptable result. This could be translated into English as "transcendent" or "gone beyond". This term was used in ancient India to refer in general to the highest extent of some particular skill or learning, e.g. a Brahmin who has "gone to the further shore of the *Vedas*". In the Buddhist context, however, it most commonly referred to the end of cyclic rebirth (*saṃsāra*), namely the state of cessation (*nirodha*) or extinguishing (*nirvāṇa*). We will see below, in the definition of "*mahāyāna*", that this interpretation of *Prajñāpāramitā* is perhaps more in conformity with our text here, than the standard notion of "perfection".

Subhūti's empowerment and Śākyamuni's prediction

The second noteworthy content of the text is found immediately after the standard opening which sets the scene, speaker and audience (§537a-b). The Buddha directs Subhūti to teach

---

6   We have discussed the use of "*bānruò*" rather than "*bōrě*" for Chinese "般若" in the opening page.

the *bodhisattva*s how to "go forth" (*nir√yā*; *chéngjiù* 成就) in *Prajñāpāramitā*, to which Śāriputra questions whether Subhūti will teach through his own power, or through empowerment by the Buddhas spiritual might.   Subhūti's response is that the Buddha's disciples, having received the Dharma from the Buddha, thereupon train in and realize it, thus making all that they teach in accordance with the nature of Dharma—this is what is meant by being empowered by the Buddhas.   In XÚÁNZÀNG's *Dàbānruò* Assembly 5, the first chapter is called the "Subhūti Chapter" (Shànxiàn pǐn 善現品).

In all versions, near the end of chapter 2 (§541a), Śakra asks Śāriputra where the *bodhisattva*s should seek for *Prajñāpāramitā*, and he is instructed that it "should be sought within Subhūti's teaching" (*subhūteḥ parivartād gaveṣitavyā*; 當於須菩提所轉中求).   The start of chapter 3 (in the *Xiǎopǐn*, end of chapter 2 in the Sanskrit) provides reference to a past life of Śākyamuni that would have been well known in the Buddhist community.   The Buddha asserts that one who practices with *Prajñāpāramitā* is like a Buddha, just as when he himself received the prediction to future Buddhahood from Dīpaṃkara Buddha in the city of Dīpavatī in the distant past.

There are potential parallels between on one hand the relationship between Śākyamuni Buddha and Subhūti at the start of chapter 1, and between Dīpaṃkara and Śākyamuni Bodhisattva at the start of chapter 3 of the *Xiǎopǐn* (§541c).   Such an attitude toward what constitutes authentic and legitimate teachings opens up greater potential vistas than a narrow and overly literal notion of the "word of the Buddha" (*buddhavacana*; *fóshuō* 佛說). From the position of modern Buddhist studies which considers the *Prajñāpāramitā* and other Mahāyāna texts to have been composed at least several centuries after the historical Buddha, one can easily argue that such an attitude was given to legitimize such later compositions. But whatever the case, this opening to the text and the closing scenes of the introductory chapters clearly show the importance given to the continuation of the Buddhas' teachings through empowerment and predictions to future awakening of the Buddhas' disciples.

Purity of non-mind mind

A third point of interest concerns teachings on the "essential purity of the nature of mind" (*prakṛtiś cittasya prabhāsvarā*; *xīnxiāng běnjìng* 心相本淨) (§537b).   It is of particular interest because CONZE and others considered that "[t]he idea of an absolute Thought which is perfectly pure and translucent (*prabhāsvara*)" was something that "the *Mahāyāna* gave it a central place in their scheme of things" (CONZE 1962: 196).   However, if such a position did in fact become "central", it now appears that it was not so in the earliest Mahāyāna, as while the passage is present in the *Xiǎopǐn*, it is absent from our earliest witness, the *Daòxíng*. This idea is included in the text with a discussion on the "mind (*citta*; *xīn* 心) which is non-mind (*acitta*; *feīxīn* 非心)", a rather perplexing phrase, perhaps more coherent as "mind

without thoughts". The English language usage of "mind" as agent and "thought" as its activity causes a subtle but important difficulty in accurate translation of Sanskrit "*citta*" or Chinese "心" (*xīn*), which in Buddhist philosophy refers to a discrete event rather than an agent-activity relation. I have reason to suspect that another shade of meaning is indicated in our passage here, based around the entire text's signature rhetorical formula of "XY is not Y", and the fact that the original *Prajñāpāramitā* text was in a Middle Indic, most likely Gāndhārī, and not in our present Sanskrit (Falk & Karashima 2013). (We shall see some clearer examples of this below, in the definitions of "*bodhisattva*", "*mahāsattva*" and "*mahāyāna*".) While the Sanskrit "*citta*" has been uniformly rendered into some term for "mind", it is worth noting that in Prakrits such as Gāndhārī or Pāli, "*citta*" could also derive from Sanskrit "*citra*", i.e. "variegated" or "manifold", used to refer to taints of the mind, the afflictions (see PED 256f, "Citta & Citra"; SN iii 151). Thus, rather than the Sanskrit "mind which is non-mind", from a Prakrit source it could potentially be "mind (*citta*) which is non-variegated (*acitra*)", a deliberate play on the ambiguity between the two term. This would fit well with the text's own description of this state as being "pure and translucent" (*prabhāsvara*; *běnjìng* 本淨) and "undiscriminated" (*avikalpa*; *bùfēnbié* 不分別). While this is by no means certain and further examination of this potential reading is called for, I feel it worth raising this last point given the attention that several scholars have given to this passage in the context of translation.

Samādhi of not grasping at anything

A fourth point, and one which has been used as a base to argue various historical strata within the text, is that of the "*samādhi* of the non-seizing of all *dharmas*" (*zhūfǎ wúshòu sānmèi* 諸法無受三昧) (§537c-538b). While Kumārajīva has translated both appearances of this term identically, the Sanskrit has two different terms, "*sarvadharmāparigṛhīto nāma samādhiḥ*", i.e. "the concentration named not attached to all things", and "*sarvadharmānu-pādāno nāma samādhiḥ*", i.e. "the concentration named not clinging to all things", respectively.[7] It entails not only not clinging to the five aggregates as representative of all phenomena, but also not clinging to the very notion of the five aggregates, their existence or non-existence, their impermanence or eternality, their being dissatisfactory or satisfactory, their emptiness or self-hood, their generation or cessation, and so forth with other antithetical pairs. To so mistakenly perceive the aggregates is to "course in a sign" (*nimite carati*; *xíng xiāng* 行相), i.e. to engage in the signs and conceptualization of phenomena, and not to course in *Prajñāpāramitā*. Even to perceive of oneself as a *bodhi-*

---

[7]   Using Chinese sources other than *Xiǎopǐn*, Yìnshùn cites the two distinct names of the *samādhi* to argue that: "These two forms of *samādhi*, are from different recited traditions of the same teaching, but have been brought together by the compilers of the *sūtra*, who consider them as being *Prajñāpāramitā*" (Yìnshùn 1980: 635).

sattva who courses, or the *Prajñāpāramitā* in which one courses, are likewise coursing in signs.

Near the start of chapter 2, we have a similar passage, wherein Subhūti explains to the god Śakra how the *bodhisattva* is to stand or abide (√*sthā*; *zhù* 住) in *Prajñāpāramitā* by standing or abiding in emptiness (§540a-b). They do so by not standing or abiding in any phenomena at all, not even the conditioned or the unconditioned—general terms for the mundane state of the deluded and the transmundane position of the awakened—for the Buddhas also neither stand or abide on either of the two.

Illusion and the illusory person

Fifth, the conditioned aggregates and also the various transmundane fruitions of the holy ones mentioned in the meditative cognition above are described metaphorically as "illusions" (*māyā*; *huàn* 幻). Near the center of chapter 1 (§538b-c), we learn that to the *bodhisattva*, form and the other aggregates are illusions, and there is no difference between the *bodhisattva* who so contemplates and an illusory person. In the middle of chapter 2 (§540c), the range of this metaphor is extended to the realizations of the four stages of sanctity that culminate in the state of an arhat, also in that of a pratyekabuddha and a fully awakened Buddha. *Nirvāṇa* itself, we are here told, is also an illusion; and so too anything that may surpass even *nirvāṇa*. Just like the passage on the purity of mind, above, CONZE and others also considered this notion of illusion to be a core Mahāyāna teaching. He saw the idea of *nirvāṇa* as illusory was a "novelty", "so startling" that it needed an apocryphal appeal to the Buddha's authority, a "shocking departure from accepted ideas" (CONZE 1967: 126-7). I have elsewhere demonstrated that the *Prajñāpāramitā* use of the illusion metaphor was not at all a Mahāyāna creation, but had a long history in pre-Buddhist and early Buddhist thought (SHÌ 2016). Despite it not being entirely novale, it is still a powerful idea, and the illusion which is at once both perceived to be real yet remains elusively insubstantial has continued as a crucial metaphor for the otherwise ineffable *Prajñāpāramitā*.

Good and bad friends

Drawing close to the center of chapters 1 and 2, the sixth doctrinal point is where reference is made to both the *bodhisattva*'s good friend (*kalyāṇamitra*; *shàn zhìshì* 善知識) and bad friend (*pāpamitra*; *è zhìshì* 惡知識) (§538c). While the good friend is exemplified by the Buddha himself, the description in the *Xiǎopǐn* is whoever both encourages the *bodhisattva* toward the ultimate goal of full Buddhahood by constant engagement with the *Prajñāpāramitā*, and also schools them in identifying the devious ploys of Māra and how to evade them. Māra being, of course, the epitome of the bad friend. It is worth noting that while the *Xiǎopǐn* and the other Chinese sources make mention of Māra as the bad friend near the

center of chapter 1 (§540c), it is absent from the Sanskrit (and thus CONZE's translation). While these passages in the first two chapters are brief, the entirety of the *Xiǎopǐn Sūtra* features several entire chapters named after and focused on descriptions of the "Deeds of Māra" (*Mārakarma*; *Móshì* 魔事).   These chapters also describe how the Buddhas (as the good friends) will lend aid to the aspirant.   Māra also has his nefarious role to play in the *Avadāna* at the end of the text, where Dharmodgata Bodhisattva features as the good friend of the lead hero Sadāprarudita.   We may thus see how these two forces, for good and evil, are important themes in the smaller *Prajñāpāramitā*.

Definitions of *bodhisattva*, *mahāsattva*, and *mahāyāna*

The seventh and final point of note content and doctrine wise is that of definitions of three key terms—*bodhisattva*, *mahāsattva* and *mahāyāna*—located at the center of chapters 1 and 2 (§538c-539a).   These three terms, along with *sarvajñā*, the "all gnosis" of the Buddhas, were also identified by CONZE as perhaps the core material of what he thought to be the ur-text (1967: 124ff).   CONZE and others have typically translated these terms as "awakening being", "great being", and "great vehicle", respectively.   However, in the particular usage of the *Prajñāpāramitā* here, it will be more prudent to first examine the meaning of these terms in more detail before selecting a definitive English translation idiom, if one can be found at all.

For "*bodhisattva*" (*púsà* 菩薩) (§538c), the text defines them as one who trains in all phenomena "without obstruction" (*wúzhàng'aì* 無障礙), KUMĀRAJĪVA's translation of what is most likely the Sanskrit term "*aśakta*".   But what is the connection between the *bodhisattva* and *aśakta*?   Despite the differences between a strict Sanskrit *sattva* and *śakta*, a reflection on what these would be in Middle Indic Prakrits like Gāndhārī is necessary, i.e. *satta* and again *satta*.   Thus, the *bodhi-satta* is *asatta*, where the former refers to an "awakening being" (*sattva* → *satta*), but the latter to "unattached" (*aśakta* → *asatta*).   It is an etymological type definition, common in such ancient literature, which also has a didactic function.   It can be described generically as being in the rhetorical form "XY is not Y", or "XY is Y-less". Though the element "Y" is not necessarily identical in meaning in the former and latter parts of the formula.

A similar etymological definition is also given for "*mahāsattva*" (*móhēsà* 摩訶薩) (§538c). First, they are foremost among the assembly, a typical usage of "superior" for *mahā*. Second, they cut off (literally—*duàn* 斷) the various wrong views of the belief in a being (*sattva*; *zhòngshēng* 眾生), a soul (*ātman*; *wǒ* 我), an individual (*pudgala*; *rén* 人), and so forth. In other words, they are without "being-view", which again implies the negation of a *sattva*. Third, they are, in KUMĀRAJĪVA's idiom, adorned with the great adornment (*dàzhuāngyán* 大 莊嚴).   The Sanskrit term for this is *mahāsaṃnaha*, which usually refers to some kind of armour to be worn by a warrior in battle, hence ZHĪ Qiàn's and XÚANZÀNG's use of *kaǐ* 鎧,

"armour", and likewise CONZE's translation from the Sanskrit of "armour". The *Dàmíngdù(B)* translates *mahāsattva* as *kaĭshì* 闓士, which perhaps hints at the connection to *kaĭ* 鎧 as "armour". We can never perhaps know for sure why KUMĀRAJĪVA chose his particular terminology which differs so much from the other witnesses. Ancient armour is of course affixed or tied (*saṃnaddha*) to the warrior's body, though the *sūtra* tells us that the armour of the *mahāsattva* is "neither bound nor released" (*abaddhaṃ amuktaṃ*; *wúfú wújiĕ* 無縛無解). This is again a formulation in the rhetorical mode "XY is neither Y nor not Y". Fourth, the *mahāsattva* "mounts upon the *mahāyāna*", the translation of which we shall return to in a moment. Lastly, when describing how the *bodhisattva* vows to liberate immeasurable sentient beings in *nirvāṇa* without remainder, all the while not holding the view of a sentient being, a metaphor is given of a magician who creates the illusion of a crowd of people, only to cut off their heads. The question is then asked: has anyone actually been decapitated? No, for there are in reality no such beings. A *mahāsattva* is yet without the view of a *sattva*, a being.

We lastly turn to the "*mahāyāna*" (*dàshèng* 大乘; *móhēyǎn* 摩訶衍) itself (§539a), which is typically translated rather insipidly as the "great vehicle". How are we to translate the term? Reflecting not only on the term itself, whether in Sanskrit, Chinese or Tibetan, and given the broader context of the definitions above, we can already start to see a central metaphor beginning to take shape. That is, the unattached *bodhisattva* mounts upon the *mahāyāna*, dons his armour for battle, and goes forth to cut of the heads of wrong views of a self. The *mahāyāna* is a "great chariot", and a war chariot at that. KUMĀRAJĪVA's Chinese term "*shèng* 乘" includes this more specific sense. The *Hànyǔ Dàcídiǎn* (漢語大詞典) gives as its first definition for "*shèng* 乘"[8] the reading "Carriage. During the Spring-Autumn Period this mainly refers to a military chariot, including a single chariot with four horses" (車子. 春秋時多指兵車, 包括一車四馬); supported by the second definition. We thus take the meaning of the character alone as "*róngchē* 戎車", i.e. "military chariot" (*bīngchē* 兵車). We may thus also note that the "great being" (*mahāsattva*), has another potential reading. Sanskrit *sattva* and *satva* are interchangeable, and by merely modifying the final sound of *satva*, quite possible with the Middle Indics to Sanskrit, we arrive at *satvan*, i.e. a "warrior hero". The *mahāsattva(n)* is a "great hero", hence the armour, war chariot and all the cutting of *sattvic* heads. Back to the *mahāyāna*, the text has Subhūti ask four questions (a list which increases in the later recensions): What is the great chariot? What is the setting forth on the great chariot by the *bodhisattva*? Where does this chariot abide (or stop)? Where does this chariot go forth from? The Buddha replies that: The chariot is immeasurable, it sets forth from the three fold world of *saṃsāra* and stops at the all gnosis of a Buddha; though ultimately the chariot is a non-chariot, "XY is not Y". All four questions

---

[8]   The character "乘" appears as either a verbal form pronounced "*chéng*", or noun "*shèng*".

and answers form around two complementary root verbs, to go or move (√*yā*; *chū* 出), and to stand or abide, set forth or stop (√*sthā*; *zhù* 住).   The former is the same as the root used at the very start of chapter 1, where the Buddha exhorts Subhūti teach how the *bodhisattva*s should "go forth" into *Prajñāpāramitā* (see above), as well as the very root of the term for "chariot" (*yāna*).   The latter matches the notion of how the *bodhisattva* is to "stand" in *Prajñāpāramitā* by standing in emptiness, i.e. by not standing or abiding in any phenomena whatsoever.   The complementary nature of the two terms—√*yā* and √*sthā*—moving and stopping, and their negations, again gives us the rhetorical form of "XY is not Y" or "XY is neither Y nor not Y".   We can clearly see by this point just how significant this type of apophatic rhetorical expression is for our text, and one which must be well understood if a translation is to faithfully preserve the underlying meta-structure of the doctrines taught.

The definitions of these three terms in the *Xiaŏpĭn* is both linguistically and also philo-sophically dense.   This poses a range of problems for any translator, whether KUMĀRAJĪVA or myself.   I believe that this is one reason why KUMĀRAJĪVA often transliterated these terms, rather than translating them proper.   Although for *mahāyāna* KUMĀRAJĪVA does at several points translate by using "*dàshèng* 大乘", rather than transliterating.   While the various shades of meaning are not too difficult to untangle from the Sanskrit, once in a vastly different language such as Chinese, the (pseudo) etymological definitions and lack of linguistic cognates would easily be altogether lost to even an intelligent reader.   Another reason for his transliteration policy would simply be established usage, the terms already being settled in place as standard Buddhist idiom in Chinese by the time of his translation activities.   As for our English, as above, here we are content to follow KUMĀRAJĪVA's own lead, mainly for specialist and philological purposes.   A more fluid translation targeting a broader audience would have the unenviable task of finding English terms that could contain or at least hint at the etymologies given in the Sanskrit.   I wish such a future translator the best of luck, and hope the above discussion can provide grist for the translation mill.

Several of the above themes found in these two chapters of the *Xiaŏpĭn*, such as *samādhi*, illusion, the good and bad friends, as well as the oft used rhetorical formulation "XY is not Y" found in the definitions of *bodhisattva*, *mahāsattva* and *mahāyāna*, are found throughout the remainder of the *Xiaŏpĭn Sūtra*.   Indeed, a very similar structure can be also clearly seen in the *Avadāna* of Sadāprarudita situated at the end of the text.   However, this is far more than we have room for here, and I directed interested readers to my detailed treatment of this in my study of the chiasmic structure of the entire smaller *Prajñāpāramitā sūtra* (ORSBORN = SHÌ 2012).

ENGLISH ANNOTATED TRANSLATION

The annotated English translation of the *Xiǎopǐn* presented here is based on the Chinese text sourced from the Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association (CBETA), 2014 edition.   This is in turn based on the early 20ᵗʰ century Japanese Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō (大正新脩大藏 經), though corrections have been made and modern punctuation added in the CBETA edition over and above that found in the Taishō.   The large *Prajñāpāramitā* family of texts are located in volumes 5-8 of the Taishō, with the *Xiǎopǐn* found in volume 8.   The text of the *Xiǎopǐn* in the Taishō is in turn based on the Sòng (宋), Yüán (元), Míng (明), Gōng (宮) and Shèng (聖) canons.   In addition to the notes found in the Taishō and CBETA versions, in our translation we have made our own amendments in about a half dozen locations, which are all referenced and discussed in the footnotes.   For ease of reference to the Chinese, we have included interlinear references to the Taishō volume 8 page number and column in bold angle brackets taken from the CBETA edition, e.g. **<537a>**, as the default standard. Where considered important, the original Chinese of the *Xiǎopǐn* may be referenced and discussed in the footnotes, though these have been kept to a minimum, as a comparison between the original and the English translation can easily be followed with the above Taishō references.   For comparison between the *Xiǎopǐn*'s Chinese and the Sanskrit, a large number of references to VAIDYA's (1960) edition of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* have been included and discussed in the footnotes.   In particular where the Chinese and Sanskrit differ, and also when KUMĀRAJĪVA's translation of the Indic terms is of particular interest. When citing the Sanskrit in long passages that do not entirely match the Chinese, the corresponding words and phrases have been <u>underlined</u>.   Also, as CONZE's 1973 translation from the Sanskrit, *The Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines & Its Verse Summary*, is the only full English version available, CONZE's own sub-chapter headings, have been included here in braces, e.g. {= CONZE 1:1 Introduction}, for ease of reference at the equivalent point of the text.

What we have and have not translated

Our translation of the *Xiǎopǐn* here is only of fascicle 1 and a small portion at the start of fascicle 2, out of 10 fascicles for the entire *sūtra*.   This contains the whole of "Chapter 1, Introduction" (*Sarvākārajñatācaryā Prathamaḥ Parivartaḥ*; *Chū Pǐn Dìyī* 初品第一) and "Chapter 2, Śakra, Lord of the Gods" (*Śakraparivarto Dvitīyaḥ*; *Shìtíhuányīn Pǐn Dì'èr* 釋提桓因品第二) in fascicle 1, and also the start of "Chapter 3, The Stūpa" (*Aprameyaguṇadhāraṇapāramitāstupa-satkāra Parivartas Tṛtīyaḥ*; *Tá Pǐn Dìsān* 塔品第三) at the beginning of fascicle 2, out of the *Xiǎopǐn*'s total of 29 chapters (compare 32 chapters of the presently extant Sanskrit text). For all three of the earlier versions of this text before the *Xiǎopǐn*, the first chapter is simply named with the same name as the entire text, e.g. "Daòxíng Chapter" (道行品), or some

variant thereof, potentially supporting the notion of this chapter as the ur-text.   Yìnshùn has offered a back translation of the chapter title, or entire text in the case of the *Daòxíng* itself, into Sanskrit as "*Sarvajña(tā)caryā*" (Yìnshùn 1980: 562ff).   This is based on "*daò*" (道) as an old translation idiom for "*sarvajñā*" (or "*bodhi*") and "*xíng*" (行) as "*caryā*", which would be very close to the later Sanskrit recensions available, which have "*Sarvākārajñatācaryā*". The reason for adding the start of fascicle 2 / chapter 3 of Kumārajīva's *Xiǎopǐn* translation is that it corresponds to the end of chapter 2 according to the Sanskrit, Tibetan and some other Chinese versions.   The various versions of this text often differ considerably in where exactly they delineate their chapter breaks (Lancaster 1968: 30).   Together, our range of textual material to translate is thus the equivalent of the first two chapters of our present Sanskrit text, so chosen because in part or in whole this has been claimed by a number of scholars as being or containing the "ur-*sūtra*" of the complete text, such as Kajiyoshi ([1944] 1980), Conze ([1952] 1967), Hikata (1958), Schmithausen (1977) and Yìnshùn (1980), though not according to Vaidya (1960).[9]

At present, academic or lay readers who have an interest in either the entirety of the smaller *Prajñāpāramitā* or in the first one or two chapters often touted as the ur-*sūtra* must rely on Conze's translation alone if they lack the requisite ability with the canonical languages of Sanskrit, Chinese or Tibetan.   For the matter of comparative work, there is a distinct lack of material critically translated from the early Chinese sources, the later Chinese sources and the Tibetan being very similar to our presently available Sanskrit manuscripts.   A full English language translation of the entirety of the *Xiǎopǐn* would naturally be ideal, but due to space consideration I feel that a separate and detailed version of chapters 1 and 2 (by the Sanskrit divisions) would be of most value, and hence the range of the text selected for translation here.

A *Preface* (*Xù* 序) to the *Xiǎopǐn Sūtra* was composed by Kumārajīva's student Sēngruì (僧叡) after translation, which can be found in the Taishō and CBETA editions before the *sūtra* itself. While this *Preface* provides valuable insights into how the text and translation was perceived and accepted by the Chinese Buddhist scholarly elite of the time, we have not included it within our translation here.   There is quite some difference in the historical and philosophical context of the Indian *Xiǎopǐn Sūtra* and its Chinese *Preface*, despite the latter ostensibly being an introduction to the former.   We hope in the future to give the *Preface* the full and detailed treatment it deserves through critical translation and analysis in a separate published article.

---

9   Refer Orsborn = Shì (2012: 87-102) for discussion and critique of these various ur-*sūtra* theories.

Which translation voice?

Even when translating any single text, there is always a question of which actual "translation voice" one is to translate from.   There are a range of potential voices, which lie along a spectrum—at one end, there is the voice of the original author situated within their historical and cultural mileau; at the end of the range, the possibility of bringing the text into the present. Another spectrum is that between the source language and target language, which may range from the word-for-word translation, to the literal, the faithful, and then the semantic translation on the source language side; then for the target language moving into a communicative translation, an idiomatic and then a free translation, finally reaching an adaptation (NEWMARK 1988: 45).   When it is a text such as the *Xiǎopǐn* which is itself already a translation, one is faced with even further possibilities and complications to these two spectrums.   Let us consider just several of the possibilities.

(1) Should one render the Chinese back to a supposed Sanskrit (or other Indic) original, and translate that text in its Indian *sitz im leben* at the point of composition?   This would be no easy matter, for while we may compare with the later Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Aṣṭa-sāhasrikā* there are places where the *Xiǎopǐn* obviously differs.   We do not possess the Indic text that KUMĀRAJĪVA used, and ascertaining the actual Indic text behind the *Xiǎopǐn* would involve no small amount of conjecture.   Even if we did have such a text, would we ourselves read the Indic text in the same manner as KUMĀRAJĪVA, given our own understanding of the language and concepts involved?

(2) Thus, should one take the voice of KUMĀRAJĪVA himself and his coterie of translators as the basis for a modern translation?   It would at least overcome the question of whether our reading of his Indic text would differ from his.   But even this approach itself could easily diverge into two positions, as KUMĀRAJĪVA's own understanding and reading of the text as a native of Indic language and culture in addition to his depth of erudite Buddhist training would differ considerably at times with that of his disciples such as SĒNGRUÌ or SĒNGZHAÒ. How do we separate the two streams?   While we possess the very short and brief *Preface* mentioned above, to securely and confidently take the voice of SĒNGRUÌ or SĒNGZHAÒ would ideally require a commentary composed by the translation office, something similar to the *Notes on the Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* (*Zhù Weímójié Jīng* 注維摩詰經) by SĒNGZHAÒ (僧肇) written when KUMĀRAJĪVA and the same group of translators were working on that text.   There is no such reference point.

(3) A potential third general voice—actually another set or range of voices—for translation could be any one of a number of later Chinese understandings of the text.   For example, how it could have been read by the likes of a Tiāntaí ZHÌYǏ (天台智顗), a Táng dynasty Chán master like HUÌNÉNG (惠能) or Huāyán scholar such as FǍZÀNG (法藏), and so on.   This would be a kind of standard Chinese Buddhist sectarian reading.   While we often know enough

about such Buddhist luminaries to be confident in our understanding of their thought world in general, we would again often still lack specific material to guide a translation or interpretation of individual passages throughout the *Xiǎopǐn.*

(4) Finally, one could render the text into a modern voice, leaving aside the time and place of either the original unknown author(s) or KUMĀRAJĪVA's translation bureau or later Chinese Buddhist tradition. Of course, any sort of translation into a modern language other than Chinese will have this latter voice to some degree.   This would differ from recent efforts in China and Taiwan to render classical scripture into modern Chinese, often by employing classical Buddhist terminology but with modern grammar and sentence structure. However, a full transition to the present day world would also necessitate greater changes above and beyond the mere words and sentences of the text and into its meta-structure and core teachings.   For example, the common use of metaphor in the text may require a shift to an entirely different metaphor.   Not just the occasional metaphors found in certain chapters of the text to elucidate given ideas, but more challengingly the underlying and pervasive cognitive metaphors of Buddhism itself that act as models for core Dharmic axioms and paradigms.   For example, the notion of *pāramitā* as "crossed to the other (shore)", originally most likely a reference to crossing a swirling river (*saṃsāra*) in flood (*augha*, *ogha*), so appropriate to the Gaṅgetic plains.   Another place that may require such wholesale modernization would be use of gender, from a predominantly masculine to a gender inclusive form; or even the change of gender roles of the characters in such narratives as the Sadāprarudita *Avadāna* at the end of the entire *sūtra*—perhaps a female lead can be accompanied by a wealthy young man and his manservants?   Similar arguments for such meta-structural and deep level changes could also be made for our third potential voice, above.   From NEWMARK's list of translation types given above (1988: 45), we can easily see how that which leans heavily to the target language (and historical period) quickly becomes more an "adaptation" than a "translation" proper.

Between the two ends of the above spectrum if potential translation voices, older studies that now make up the canon of modern Buddhist studies itself, often incline heavily toward a supposed "original text", an attitude largely under the influence of classical philological ideals.   This approach, while very valuable on many levels, I feel best to be undertaken based on very ancient Indic language manuscripts while comparing with later versions and translations, and best left to the philological holy grail of reconstructing the "ur-text", something akin to NEWMARK's "word-for-word" or "literal" translations, rather than an exercise in translation proper.   In our case here, that would focus on analysis of the recent Gāndhārī text discoveries.   We cannot do this securely using the *Xiǎopǐn*, however, which is several centuries removed from its original composition and already translated into a language entirely foreign to its original linguistic community.   At the other end of the spectrum, while a Chinese translation is obviously ripe to translate through the voice of

later Chinese traditions of whatever school, I also have strong reservations about such an approach. While recently examining a number of English language translations of the *Prajñāpāramitā Hṛdaya*, i.e. the "Heart" *Sūtra*, translated from Chinese and Tibetan, I noticed the strong tendency to read the text through the light of whatever Buddhist tradition the author and translator was associated with. Any efforts to read such a Mahāyāna text within its own historical and cultural context were largely set aside,[10] and often even the text itself seemed to be half ignored at times, as Nāgārjuna, some other other Chán or Zen master, or late Tantric teaching like Mahāmudrā, or some other tradition, was overlaid upon and read into the text. While I am sure that readers who are practitioners of those Buddhist traditions may derive much benefit from such interpretations, I think that we should have confidence in the text in question and other materials that hail from the same time and place and ways of thought to be coherent and rich enough to speak for themselves, rather than requiring a later spokesperson to stand in their stead.

Given the range of possible translation voices, and my reserves for several extremes within them, I have chosen here to take the voice of KUMĀRAJĪVA as my basis for translation. Or rather, as close as I can reasonably get to him. Our *Xiǎopǐn* in Chinese was translated by him, therefore we do not need to conjecture about what an earlier text may have said or a later commentator could possibly say. As a translator himself who was fluent in both the Indic original language and also the Chinese (to a sufficient degree), KUMĀRAJĪVA's choice of Chinese terminology provides us with an excellent tool to understand and translate terms and ideas. That is, when comparing with the later Sanskrit manuscripts that we have, a given Sanskrit term still has a range of meanings, which shade of meaning do we use to translate into English? KUMĀRAJĪVA's equivalent Chinese term also has such a spectrum of sense, giving us a a number of possibilities. By triangulating between the Sanskrit and the Chinese, we can narrow in on how KUMĀRAJĪVA understood and interpreted a given term or passage, and from there render a suitable English term, expression or sense of meaning. We can further strengthen our confidence in his usage by referring to his other translation works, such as the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, where we can see which Sanskrit terms lay behind his choice of Chinese in translation.   KUMĀRAJĪVA is thus not only the translator, but also in a sense the author, of the *Xiǎopǐn*.   If we may be permitted an indulgence, we hope that our Engish translation is that which KUMĀRAJĪVA himself would have produced had he been translating into English in the early 21st century.   Such is our ideal here, subject to all the usual caveats.

---

[10]   Some may point to NATTIER's (1992) thesis that this text was composed not in India, but in China.   I am aware of this thesis, and it is well worth bearing in mind.   However, I have also yet to see a study which reads the text from the time period and cultural circumstances and that such a Chinese composition would entail.

Some policies of our translation

Such an explicit decision to chose a particular translation voice has real implications for how we go about our translation policy. For example, like most earlier and subsequent Chinese Buddhist translations, KUMĀRAJĪVA's *Xiaŏpĭn* is liberally peppered with transliterations of Indian Buddhist terminology, terms considered too important or difficult to translate that they were instead phoneticized. This includes not just technical terms such as "*bānruòbōluómì*" 般若波羅蜜 for *Prajñāpāramitā* itself, and "*sānmeì*" 三昧 for *samādhi*, but also terms which are now common as to be seldom thought of as transliterations, e.g. "*fó(tuó)*" 佛(陀) to transliterate *buddha*, and "*pú(tí)sà(duŏ)*" 菩(提)薩(埵) for *bodhisattva*, which have long since entered into the Chinese language as household words.

Taking KUMĀRAJĪVA's voice as our point of departure, our own policy of translation or transliteration also typically applies the distinction that KUMĀRAJĪVA himself made. That is, where KUMĀRAJĪVA transliterated, the present translator has given the appropriate Sanskrit, and where KUMĀRAJĪVA translated, a full English translation proper has been given. The overall effect in English translation is that of drawing the reader toward the Indian original, in much the same way that the Chinese readers were and still are also drawn into the Indian. While in some quarters that wish to preserve at least some small degree of philological purity this may be regarded as only proper, we must also acknowledge the drawbacks of such an approach. For example, making the text overly full of foreign and ancient religious jargon which is often quite problematic for a non-specialist readership. It is intended that our translation of the entire *Xiaŏpĭn* text will be more general reader friendly.

Another example of how choosing KUMĀRAJĪVA's voice as our basis leads to a specific approach for our translation is that of metaphors. There are a number of key metaphors, one could call it a system of metaphors, that lie at the heart of these first two chapters of the *Xiaŏpĭn*, and these metaphors are also connected with etymological definitions of key terms. We have already mentioned these above, in the warrior hero metaphor for *bodhisattva*, *mahāsattva* and *Mahāyāna*. We can, if we look carefully, feel KUMĀRAJĪVA's struggle to simultaneously be faithful to his Indic original, render the entire form of the individual metaphors and the underlying structure, but also present all this in coherent Chinese. Our own attempts parallel this, and we hope to show both KUMĀRAJĪVA's successes and failures in this regard, while providing further details on our own reading of this material.

<537a>

Xiaǒpǐn Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra
Fascicle 1[11]

Translated by Kuchan Tripiṭakācārya Kumārajīva of the Late Qín

Chapter One—Introduction[12]

{= Conze 1 The Practice of the Knowledge of All Modes}

{= Conze 1:1 Introduction}

Thus it was heard by me.   At one time,[13] the Buddha dwelt at the city of Rājagṛha, on Mount Gṛdhakūṭa, together with the great saṃgha of bhikṣus, one thousand two hundred and fifty people in total, all of who were arhats, had exhausted the influxes, were like trained elephant kings, had done what was to be done, had abandoned the heavy burden, had reached their own benefit, had eliminated the bonds of existence, were released by right gnosis, and had attained freedom in mind—with the only exception of Ānanda.[14]

Thereupon,[15] the Buddha said to Subhūti: "You who delight in teaching, teach for the

---

[11] The Taishō adds "摩訶 *Móhē*", i.e. Sanskrit "*Mahā*", and has a note stating: "The Dānběn adds the two characters "小品" (*Xiaǒpǐn*) after "*Móhē*"."   Here, "Dānběn 丹本" refers to the Qìdān Canon (契丹藏); and see below at the title of Chp. 3.

[12] = Vaidya (1960: 1): "*sarvākārajñatācaryā prathamaḥ parivartaḥ∣*"   Conze (1973: 83): "The Practice of the Knowledge of All Modes".   *Xiaǒpǐn* and earlier translations forgo a formal name, using just "First Chapter" (初品 *Chū Pǐn*).

[13] Our reading of "如是我聞一時…" = Vaidya (1960: 1): "*evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmin samaye…*" is taken considering the *Upadeśa*, which Kumārajīva would have taken as definitive.   Rather than "Thus it was heard by me at one time: …" together, the *Upadeśa* explains "Thus it was heard by me: At one time …" separately.   See *Upadeśa*, fasc. 2 《大智度論》卷 2〈1 序品〉：「「如是我聞：[23]一時」今當總說。」 (CBETA, T25, no. 1509, p. 66, a27) [23]〔一時〕－【宋】【元】【明】【宮】.   But note that it is only the Taishō reading which adds "一時", "one time", at this point, no doubt under the influence of the alternate reading.   Our personal understanding would be more inclined to the former.

[14] = Vaidya (1960: 1): "*evam mayā śrutam∣ ekasmin samaye bhagavān rājagrhe viharati sma grdhakūte parvate mahatā bhiksusamghena sārdham ardhatrayo daśabhir bhiksuśataih, sarvair arhadbhih ksīnāsravair niḥkleśair vaśībhūtaiḥ suvimuktacittaiḥ suvimuktaprajñair ājñair ājāneyair mahānāgaih krtakrtyaih krtakaranīyair apahrta-bhārair anuprāptasvārthaih pariksīnabhavasamyojanaih samyagājñāsuvimuktacittaih sarvacetovaśiparama-pāramiprāptair ekam pudgalam sthāpayitvā yaduta āyusmantam ānandam∣*"

[15] *Dàoxíng* adds 《道行般若經》卷 1〈1 道行品〉：「月十五日說戒時」(CBETA, T08, no. 224, p. 425, c8-9): "At the time of the full moon, on the 15th, the time of the recitation of the *pratimokṣa* …"

bodhisattvas **<537b>** how they should accomplish[16] Prajñāpāramitā!"

Śāriputra thereupon conceived the thought: "[Will] Subhūti teach through his own power, or empowered by the Buddha's spiritual power?"[17]

Subhūti knew the thought conceived in Śāriputra's mind, and he spoke to Śāriputra, saying: "Whatever the Buddha's disciples may venture to teach, all is [through] the Buddha's power.[18] For what reason? Those who train in that Dharma taught by the Buddha are able to realize[19] the nature of Dharma. Having realized it, whatever they proclaim and teach none is contradictory with the nature of Dharma, through the power of the nature of Dharma."[20]

{= CONZE 1:2 The Extinction of Self}

Thereupon, Subhūti addressed the Buddha, saying: "O Blessed One! The Buddha empowers me to teach the bodhisattvas how Prajñāpāramitā should be accomplished.[21] O Blessed One! 'Bodhisattva', 'bodhisattva' it is said,[22] what dharma is meant by 'bodhisattva'?[23] I do not see any dharma which is known as a 'bodhisattva'. O Blessed One! I neither see a bodhisattva, nor apprehend a bodhisattva; neither see nor apprehend Prajñāpāramitā. What bodhisattva should I teach Prajñāpāramitā? If a bodhisattva hears of this statement, and is neither startled, nor afraid, nor dismayed, nor turns away,[24] and practices according to what has been taught, this is known as teaching a bodhisattva Prajñāpāramitā. Moreover, O Blessed One, when a bodhisattva practices Prajñāpāramitā, they should train in this way, and not conceive the thought: 'This is the mind of a bodhisattva.'[25] For what

---

[16] = VAIDYA (1960: 2): "*niryāyuḥ*" = "they went out", seems to conform to the later use of 出發 "go forth (on the Mahāyāna...)".

[17] = VAIDYA (1960: 2): "*buddhānubhāvena*".

[18] = VAIDYA (1960: 2): "*puruṣakāro*".

[19] Skt adds, VAIDYA (1960: 2): "*dhārayanti ... dhārayitvā*" = "and bear [in mind] ... having born [in mind]" to "realize".

[20] = VAIDYA (1960: 3): "*dharmatā*" = "nature of *dharma*", simple abstract "*-tā*".

[21] As above, VAIDYA (1960: 3): "*niryāyur*" = "go out", seems to conform to the later use of 出發 "go forth".

[22] Or: "The Blessed One says '*bodhisattva*', '*bodhisattva*', ..."

[23] = VAIDYA (1960: 3): "*katamasya etad ... dharmasyādhivacanaṃ yaduta bodhisattva*", = "synonym of what *dharma* is *bodhisattva*?". Xiǎopǐn often uses this 義 for "*adhivacanaṃ*". Also, compare this statement with *Cintaviśeṣabrahmārājaparipṛcchā Sūtra*, fasc. 3 《思益梵天所問經》卷 3〈7 談論品〉:「爾時等行菩薩白佛言:「世尊!所言菩薩,[9]菩薩者為何謂耶?」」(CBETA, T15, no. 586, p. 48, b13-14) [9]菩薩者＝者菩薩【聖】.

[24] Bùjīng 不驚, bùbù 不怖, bùmò 不沒, bùtuí 不退. The Skt has only three terms here, VAIDYA (1960: 3): "*notrasyati na saṃtrasyati na saṃtrāsamāpadyate*". All are √tras, in increasing intensity, i.e. *ut°*, *saṃ°*, *saṃ°ā√pad*. See MÄLL (2003: 89-93).

[25] = VAIDYA (1960: 3): "*yathā asau śikṣyamāṇas tenāpi bodhicittena na manyeta*" Note: Chinese has 菩薩心 (*púsà xīn*) "*bodhisattvacitta*" not 菩提心 (*pútí xīn*) "*bodhicitta*". CONZE (1973: 84) takes "*manyeta*" as √*mān*,

reason?   Because this mind is mindless, due to the essential purity of the nature of mind."[26]

Thereupon, Śāriputra said to Subhūti: "Does this mind which is mindless exist?"[27]

Subhūti said to Śāriputra: "That mind which is mindless, is it apprehendable as either existing or not existing?"[28]

Śāriputra said: "Indeed not!"

Subhūti said to Śāriputra: "If the mind which is mindless is not apprehendable as existing or not existing, is it appropriate to say: 'Does this mind which is not a mind exist?'?"[29]

Śāriputra said: "Why is it mindless?"[30]

Subhūti said: "[Because it is] immutable and undiscriminated.[31]   [If when] a bodhisattva hears this teaching, they are neither startled, nor afraid, nor dismayed, nor turn away, one should know that this bodhisattva is not apart from the practice of Prajñāpāramitā.[32]   If sons of good family and daughters of good family wish to train in the grounds of the

---

thus "does not <u>pride</u> himself".   Chinese uses 念 (niàn) as √man, here and often for "manasi√kṛ".

[26]   = Vaidya (1960: 3): "tac cittam acittam ... prakṛtiś cittasya prabhāsvarā" = "this mind is non-mind ... from the luminosity of the essential nature of mind".   Reading the Chinese from the Skt, better to say 心 相本 (xīn xiāng běn; prakṛtiś citta) "essential nature of mind" is 淨 (jìng; prabhāsvarā) "pure", rather than 心相 (xīn xiāng) "nature of mind" is 本淨 (běnjìng) "fundamentally pure".   This one really is an issue viz Kumārajīva's intrepretation / translation.   However, Móhē, fasc. 3 《摩訶般若波羅蜜經》卷 3〈8 勸學品〉：「是心非心。心相常淨故。」(CBETA, T08, no. 223, p. 233, c23).   The Dàoxíng, fasc. 1 《道行經》 only mentions 有心無心 but has not equivalent for 心相本淨.   Thus, this passage in the Sanskrit Aṣṭa-sāhasrikā, etc., which is often cited by modern scholars as showing the roots of teachings such as the Tathāgatagarbha in the very earliest strata of the Mahāyāna, appears to have been absent altogether in the earliest versions of the sūtra.

[27]   = Vaidya (1960: 3): "asti tac cittaṃ yac cittam acittam".   Xiǎopǐn uses 非心心 "non-mind mind" ("mind which is non-mind") for "acittatā" = "acittam cittam".

[28]   = Vaidya (1960: 3): "yā acittatā, tatra acittatāyām astitā vā nāstitā vā <u>vidyate vā</u> upalabhyate vā"; viz "acittatā".

[29]   = Vaidya (1960: 3): "tatra acittatāyām astitā vā nāstitā vā na vidyate vā nopalabhyate vā, api nu te yukta eṣa paryanuyogo bhavati yad āyuṣmān śāriputra evam āha - asti tac cittaṃ yac cittam acittam iti|".

[30]   = Vaidya (1960: 3): "kā punar eṣā āyuṣman subhūte acittatā?|" = "Now, what, O Venerable Subhūti, is this non-mind-ness?" / "Now, what, O Venerable Subhūti, is this nature of non-mind?"   But, from the other Chinese versions: Yüán, Míng "何法為非心心？" = "What dharma is the non-mind mind?" or "What dharma is the mind (of) non-mind?"; or Gōng edition "何故為非心？" = "Why is it non-mind?"   Actually, in the context of the following reponse from Subhūti, we have gone with the Shèng canon version which seems more appropriate in the end.

[31]   = Vaidya (1960: 3): "subhūtir āha - avikārā āyuṣman śāriputra avikalpā acittatā" = "not made otherwise (a-vi-√kṛ) ... not conceptually discriminated (a-vi-√klp), non-mind-ness (a-citta-tā)".   Skt then praises Subhūti as "araṇāvihārin", Vaidya (1960: 3): "yathāpi nāma tvaṃ bhagavanā araṇāvihāriṇām agratāyāṃ nirdiṣṭo nirdiśasi".   Dàoxíng is missing this statement.

[32]   Dàoxíng adds 《道行般若經》卷 1〈1 道行品〉：「不說空身慧空身慧而說最第一」(CBETA, T08, no. 224, p. 426, a3-4).   Also, that the bodhisattvas become avinivartanīya, i.e. non-regressible (Vaidya 1960: 3).

śrāvakas, they should hear this Prajñāpāramitā, take it up, bear it [in mind], recite it, study it, cultivate and practice it as it is taught.[33]   [If they] wish to train in the grounds of the pratyekabuddhas, they should hear this Prajñāpāramitā, take it up, bear it [in mind], recite it, study it, cultivate and practice it as it is taught.   [If they] wish to train in the grounds of bodhisattvas, they should hear this Prajñāpāramitā, take up and bear it [in mind], recite it, study it, cultivate and practice it as it is taught.   For what reason?   Within the Prajñā-pāramitā there are extensive teachings on the dharmas that the bodhisattvas should train in."

Subhūti addressed the Buddha, saying: "O Blessed One!   I neither apprehend nor see a bodhisattva, what bodhisattva should I teach Prajñāpāramitā?   O Blessed One!   I do not see a dharma bodhisattva that comes and goes, and yet to construct the word 'bodhisattva', and claim that this is a bodhisattva, I would then have qualms.[34]   O Blessed One!   **<537c>** Moreover, the word 'bodhisattva' is not fixed and is without a stand point.[35]   For what reason?   Due to the non-existence of that word.[36]   [That which is] non-existent is also not fixed and has no locus of establishment.[37]   If a bodhisattva hears this matter, and is neither startled, nor afraid, nor dismayed, nor turns away, one should know that this bodhisattva will ultimately abide on the ground of non-regression, abide in non-abiding.   Moreover, O Blessed One, when bodhisattvas practice Prajñāpāramitā, they should not abide in form; they should not abide in sensation, perception, volitions, or cognition.   For what reason? If they abide in form, that is practicing the construction of form; if they abide in sensation, perception, volitions, or cognition, that is practicing the construction of cognition.[38]   If one

---

[33]   These six: "[listen to,] take up, bear in mind, recite, fully penetrate, practice" = VAIDYA (1960: 4): "*śrotavyā udgrahītavyā dhārayitavyā vācayitavyā paryavāptavyā pravartayitavyā*".   Slightly different in Chinese, perhaps *Xiǎopǐn* takes "*pravartayitavyā*" as the 修行?

[34]   = VAIDYA (1960: 4): "*kaukṛtyaṃ*" = qualm, remorse, regret, etc., for that "badly done" 惡作.   Subsequent uses of "疑悔" are largely √kāṅkṣa, √dhandha, citta-√avalīna, rather than √kaukṛtya.

[35]   = VAIDYA (1960: 4): "*api tu khalu punar bhagavaṃs tad api nāmadheyaṃ na sthitaṃ nāsthitaṃ na viṣṭhitaṃ nāviṣṭhitam|*"   Perhaps the "*viṣṭhitaṃ*" as "fixed" and "*sthitaṃ*" as "established".   However, the Skt has negations, too.   Quite different from CONZE's "continuous and not continuous" (1973: 85)!

[36]   Here *Xiǎopǐn* takes √vid as "existence".   Perhaps >ved as "knows"?

[37]   Skt, VAIDYA (1960: 4): "that which is merely an appellation is not fixed ..." rather than "non-existent".

[38]   = VAIDYA (1960: 4): "*rūpābhisaṃskāra ... vijñānābhisaṃskāra*".   The *Móhē*, fasc. 3, qualifies the "abiding":   《摩訶般若波羅蜜經》卷 3〈9 集散品〉:「以吾我心於色中住。是菩薩作色行。[10]以吾我心於受想行識中住。」(CBETA, T08, no. 223, p. 235, c13-18) [10]以吾我心＝有我心故【宋】【明】【宮】，＝以吾我心故【元】.   *Dàoxíng* seems to take "*abhisaṃskāra*" as 行識 (*xíngshì*), "active mentation (?)", showing the mental or perceptual implications.   See also DN *Poṭṭhapāda Sutta* for "*abhisankhāra*" with respect to the cultivation of "*abhisaññānirodha*" (ref. WALSHE 1987: 162f):   "... from the moment when a monk has gained this controlled perception (*saññā*), he proceeds from stage to stage till he reaches the limit of perception. When he has reached the limit of perception it occurs to him: 'Mental activity is work for me, lack of mental activity is better.   If I were to think and imagine (*abhi-sankhār-*), these perceptions [that I have attained] would cease, and coarser perceptions would arise in me.   Suppose I were not to think or

practices the construction of dharmas, they are then unable to receive Prajñāpāramitā, unable to engage in Prajñāpāramitā, unable to fulfill Prajñāpāramitā, and unable to accomplish sarvajñā.[39]　For what reason?　Form does not have the notion of seizing; sensation, perception, sensation, volitions and cognition do not have the notion of seizing.[40] That which is the non-seizing of form, that is not form; that which is the non-seizing of sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition, that is not cognition; and that is also the non-seizing of Prajñāpāramitā.[41]　The bodhisattva mahāsattva should train in this way, practicing Prajñāpāramitā.　This is named the bodhisattvas' 'samādhi of the non-seizing of all dharmas';[42] vast, immeasurable and indeterminate, and unable to be destroyed[43] by all the śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas.　For what reason?　This samādhi cannot be appre-hended through a sign.[44]　If this samādhi could be apprehended through signs, the brahmacārin Śreṇika would not have generated faith toward sarvajñā.[45]　The brahmacārin Śreṇika penetrated into this dharma through limited gnosis.　Having penetrated, he did not seize form; he did not seize sensation, perception, volitions, or cognition.　This brāhmacārin did not hear or see with insight this gnosis through seizing;[46]　did not see with

---

imagine?'　So he neither thinks nor imagines.　And then, in him, just these perceptions arise, but other, coarser perceptions do not arise.　He attains cessation.　And that, Poṭṭhapāda, is the way in which the cessation of perception is brought about by successive steps."

[39]　Skt has, VAIDYA (1960: 5): "*sarvajñatāyā parigṛhītaṃ*", indicating that *pari-√gṛh* can be a "positive" term, like *dhāraṇī*.　Note: *Xiaǒpǐn* uses 薩婆若 typically translated as "*sarvajñā*", yet here, and at most places, the Skt is actually "*sarvajñatā*".

[40]　= VAIDYA (1960: 5): "*[skandha] hi aparigṛhītaṃ prajñāpāramitāyā*".　All add *prajñāpāramitā* as the acc. object. Comparing witnesses, this unique reading is difficult to ascertain as an Indic term like "**°saṃjñā*" or "**°nimitta*", or implications of "滅受想(定)" **nirodhasamāpatti* types, or KUMĀRAJĪVA's own gloss insertion, or simply a haplographic error based on the terms for the second and third *skandha*s.　However, given that this state is described as being without signs (*animitta*), the *Xiaǒpǐn* reading which still supports this is perhaps not highly significant.

[41]　= VAIDYA (1960: 5): "*yaś ca rūpasyāparigrahaḥ, na tadrūpam| evaṃ yo vedanāyāḥ saṃjñāyāḥ saṃskārāṇām| yo vijñānasyāparigrahaḥ, na tad vijñānam| sāpi prajñāpāramitā aparigṛhītā|*"

[42]　= VAIDYA (1960: 5): "*sarvadharmāparigṛhīto nāma samādhiḥ vipulaḥ puraskṛto apramāṇaniyato asādhāraṇaḥ|*" *Daòxíng* 《道行般若經》卷 1〈1 道行品〉:「一切字法不受」(CBETA, T08, no. 224, p. 426, b1).

[43]　= VAIDYA (1960: 5): "*puraskṛtaḥ apramāṇaniyato'sādhāraṇaḥ*" = "unshared".　Also CONZE (1973: 85).　The Skt, VAIDYA (1960: 5, continues with a "*sāpi sarvajñatā aparigṛhītā*" = "that *sarvajñā* is not taken up ...".

[44]　*Daòxíng* 《道行般若經》卷 1〈1 道行品〉:「薩芸若不受」(CBETA, T08, no. 224, p. 426, b3), rather than 不以相得.

[45]　Though *Xiaǒpǐn* uses 得 here for my "apprehend", the term is not √*labh*, but √*grah*, again showing "positive" sense.　Skt adds that Śreṇika "believed resolutely in this cognition of the all-knowing" (CONZE 1973: 85); = VAIDYA (1960: 5): "*sarvajñajñāne adhimucya śraddhānusārī prādeśidena jñānenāvatīrṇaḥ*".　*Xiaǒpǐn* says nothing about this hear, though does below.　*Daòxíng* does not mention Śreṇika by name, but is "餘道人" = "a person of another path".

[46]　This wording is different from the Skt, which has, VAIDYA (1960: 5): "*nāpi tatra prītisukhena taj jñānaṃ samanupaśyati|*".　It is not at all obvious how "*prītisukhena* / 喜樂" could be conflated or confused with "*prāptvena / [abhi]samayayā / upalabhyate*" 得, 聞 or 門.

insight this gnosis through own (internal) form; did not see with insight this gnosis through other (external) form; did not see with insight this gnosis through both own (internal) and other (external) form; and also did not see with insight this gnosis through other than own (internal) and other (external) form.[47]   [He] did not see with insight this gnosis through own (internal) sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition; did not see with insight this gnosis through other (external) sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition; did not see with insight this gnosis through both own (internal) and other (external) sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition; and also did not see with insight this gnosis through other than own (internal) and other (external) sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition.[48]   The brahmacārin Śreṇika had conviction toward sarvajñā, and from apprehending the reality of dharmas attained release.[49]   Having attained release, he neither seized nor was released from any dharma; even to the point of neither seizing nor being released from nirvāṇa.[50]   O Blessed One!   This is known as the Prajñāpāramitā of the bodhisattvas, the non-seizing of form, the non-seizing of sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition.   Although they do not seize form, and do not seize sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition, as they have not yet fulfilled the ten powers of a Buddha, the four infallabilities, and the eighteen unshared dharmas, they do not [enter] parinirvāṇa while in the middle of the path.[51]   Moreover, O Blessed One, [when] a bodhisattva practices Prajñāpāramitā, they should contemplate in this way:[52]   'What is this Prajñāpāramitā?'   'Who's is this Prajñāpāramitā?'   '[That] dharma which is unapprehendable, is that Prajñāpāramitā?'[53]   **<538a>**   If, when a bodhisattva engages in this contemplation and investigation, they are neither startled, nor afraid, nor terrified, nor dismayed, nor turn away, one should know that this bodhisattva is not separated from the practice of Prajñāpāramitā."

Thereupon, Śāriputra said to Subhūti: "If form is separated from the nature of form; sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition are separated from the nature of cognition;

---

[47]   The terms "*adhyātma*" (內) and "*bahirdhā*" (外) meaning either self or internal, and other or external, respectively.   The text not being explicitly clear on this occasion, I have opted to include both readings.

[48]   Skt adds, VAIDYA (1960: 5): "*atra padaparyāye ...*" = CONZE (1973: 85): "In this scripture passage ...".   This gives somewhat of a newer feel to the Skt not present in *Xiǎopǐn*.

[49]   Skt has, VAIDYA (1960: 5): "*... dharmatāṃ pramāṇīkṛtya evam adhimukta iti*" = CONZE (1973: 85): "*... as one who always resolutely believes in this cognition of the all-knowing, is called a faith-follower.*"   Thus, *Xiǎopǐn* has something like "*... dharmatām abhisaṃ-√aya vimukta iti*".   This is no small difference.   Perhaps it is a scribal error due to similarities between "*adhi°*" and "*vi°*" in certain scripts?

[50]   = VAIDYA (1960: 5): "*sa nirvānam api na manyate*".

[51]   = VAIDYA (1960: 5): "*na ca antarā parinirvāti*".

[52]   = VAIDYA (1960: 5): "*evam upaparīkṣitavyam evam upanidhyātavyam*".   Here, √*ikṣ* and √*dhā* imply greater depth than 思惟.

[53]   = VAIDYA (1960: 5): "*kiṃ yo dharmo na vidyate nopalabhate, sā prajñāpāramiteti|*" = "That dharma which is not existent [>*vid* / known >*ved*] or apprehended, is that *prajñāpāramitā*?"   *Xiǎopǐn* reads √*vid* as "apprehend(able)", i.e. "knowable".

Prajñāpāramitā is separated from the nature of Prajñāpāramitā;[54] how can one state that 'This bodhisattva is not separated from the practice of Prajñāpāramitā'?"[55]

Subhūti said: "It is so, O Śāriputra, form is separated from the nature of form; sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition are separated from the nature of cognition; Prajñā-pāramitā is separated from the nature of Prajñāpāramitā; these dharmas are all separated from [their] own natures; and nature is also separated from characteristic."[56]

Śāriputra said: "If bodhisattvas train within this, are they able to accomplish sarvajñā?"

Subhūti said: "It is so.   O Śāriputra!   Bodhisattvas who train in this way, are able to accomplish[57] sarvajñā.   For what reason?   Because all dharmas are not generated, are not accomplished.[58]   Bodhisattvas who practice in this way, will approach sarvajñā."[59]

Thereupon, Subhūti spoke to Śāriputra, saying: "If a bodhisattva practices in the practice of form, this is practicing in a sign; if one practices in the generation of form, this is practicing in a sign; if one practices in the cessation of form, this is practicing in a sign; if one practices in the destruction of form, this is practicing in a sign; if one practices in 'form is empty', this is practicing in a sign; if one practices in 'I practice this practice', is also practicing in a sign.[60]   If one practices in sensation, perception, volitions, or cognition, this is practicing in a sign; if one practices in the generation of cognition, this is practicing in a sign; if one practices in the cessation of cognition, this is practicing in a sign; if one practices

---

[54]   All in the form, VAIDYA (1960: 5): "*yadā [skandha] eva virahitaṃ [skandha]svabhāvena*"; note use of *svabhāva*, not explicit in *Xiǎopǐn*; and also the instrumental sense, which *Xiǎopǐn* also does not make explicit, rather, the sense is perhaps ablative, "separate...from".   Skt adds, VAIDYA (1960: 5): "*yadā sarvajñataiva virahitā sarvajñatāsvabhāvena*" = "that very *sarvajñā* is separated from the own-nature of *sarvajñatā*".

[55]   Last sentence not found in Skt.

[56]   = VAIDYA (1960: 6): "*lakṣaṇasvabhāvenāpi lakṣaṇaṃ virahitam| lakṣyasvabhāvenāpi lakṣyaṃ virahitam| svabhāva-lakṣaṇenāpi svabhāvo virahitaḥ||*" = "1. sign is separated by way of (or in terms of) the own-nature of sign; 2. the signed is separated by way of (or in terms of) the own-nature of the signed; 3. own-being is separated by way of (or in terms of) the sign of own-nature."   In Chinese *Xiǎopǐn* 「相離相之(自)性，所相離所相之(自)性，自性離自性之相。」   *Xiǎopǐn* is thus a general statement and point 3.   Points 1 and 2 are added in the Sanskrit.

[57]   Again = VAIDYA (1960: 6): "*niryāsyati*".

[58]   Play on: *niryāsyati, ajātā* and *anirjātā*, perhaps?   But *Xiǎopǐn* uses *anirjātā* as per *niryāsyati*, i.e. 成就, "accomplish".

[59]   Skt and CONZE (1973: 86) have further with respect to, VAIDYA (1960: 6): "*yathā yathā sarvajñatā āsanní-bhavati, tathā tathā sattvaparipācanāya kāyacittapariśuddhir lakṣaṇapariśuddhiḥ*".

[60]   = VAIDYA (1960: 6): "*saced rūpe carati, nimitte carati| saced rūpanimitte carati, nimitte carati| saced rūpaṃ nimittam iti carati, nimitte carati| saced rūpasyotpāde carati, nimitte carati| saced rūpasya nirodhe carati, nimitte carati| saced rūpasya vināśe carati, nimitte carati| saced rūpaṃ śūnyam iti carati, nimitte carati| ahaṃ carāmīti carati, nimitte carati| ahaṃ bodhisattva iti carati, nimitte carati| ahaṃ bodhisattva iti hy upalambha eva sa carati|*" Sanskrit adds a couple of points here.

in the destruction of cognition, this is practicing in a sign; if one practices in 'cognition is empty', this is practicing in a sign;   if one practices 'I practice this practice',[61] this is also practicing in a sign.[62]   If one conceives the thought: 'One who is able to practice in this way, this is practicing Prajñāpāramitā', this is also practicing in a sign.   One should know that this bodhisattva is yet to well know skillful means."

Śāriputra said to Subhūti: "Now, how does a bodhisattva practice, so that it would be known as practicing Prajñāpāramitā?"

Subhūti said: "If a bodhisattva does not practice in form, does not practice in the generation of form, does not practice in the cessation of form, does not practice in the destruction of form, does not practice in 'form is empty';[63] does not practice in sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition; does not practice in the generation of cognition, does not practice in the cessation of cognition, does not practice in the destruction of cognition, does not practice in 'cognition is empty';[64] this is known as practicing Prajñāpāramitā.   [If they] do not conceive the thought of practicing Prajñāpāramitā; do not conceive the thought of not practicing; do not conceive the thought of both practicing and not practicing; and do not conceive the thought of neither practicing nor not practicing;[65] then this is known as practicing Prajñāpāramitā.   For what reason?   Because of not seizing any dharma.[66]   This is named 'the bodhisattvas' samādhi of the non-seizing of all dharmas';[67] vast, immeasurable and indeterminate, and unable to be destroyed[68] by all the śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas.   Bodhisattvas practicing[69] this samādhi swiftly realize[70] **<538b>** anuttarā samyak saṃbodhi."

Subhūti, empowered by the Buddha's spiritual power, said:[71] "If a bodhisattva practicing

---

[61]   Skt, just, Vaidya (1960: 7): "*ahaṃ carāmīti*" = "I practice".

[62]   Skt and Conze (1973: 86) add, Vaidya (1960: 6): "*ahaṃ bodhisattva iti hy upalambha eva sa carati*".

[63]   Skt again adds, Vaidya (1960: 7): "I practice" and "I am a *bodhisattva*".

[64]   Skt again adds, Vaidya (1960: 7): "I practice" and "I am a *bodhisattva*".

[65]   Skt adds various future tenses in a similar way (Vaidya 1960: 7).

[66]   *Xiaŏpĭn* uses almost the exact same wording as the name of the samādhi to follow.   But here Skt = Vaidya (1960: 7): "*sarvadharmā hy anupagatā anupāttāḥ*" = Conze (1973: 87): "… because all dharmas are unapproachable and unappropriable".   *Xiaŏpĭn* appears to take *an-upa-√gam* and *an-upa-ā-√dā* as both *an-upa-ā-√dā*.

[67]   = Vaidya (1960: 7): "*sarvadharmānupādāno nāma samādhiḥ*".

[68]   = Vaidya (1960: 7): "*puraskṛtaḥ apramāṇaniyato'sādhāraṇaḥ*" = "unshared".   Also Conze (1973: 87).

[69]   = Vaidya (1960: 7): "*viharan*" = "… abide".

[70]   = Vaidya (1960: 7): "*abhisaṃbudhyate*" = 得.

[71]   Skt follows with prediction = Vaidya (1960: 7): "*vyākṛto 'yaṃ bhagavan bodhisattvo mahāsattvaḥ pūrvakais tathāgatair arhadbhiḥ samyak saṃbuddhair anuttarāyāṃ samyak saṃbodhau, yo 'nena samādhinā viharati|*".   *Xiaŏpĭn* puts this prediction at the end of this paragraph: 當知是菩薩已從諸佛得受阿耨多羅三藐三菩提記.

this samādhi neither gives thoughts to nor conceptually discriminates[72] this samādhi as: 'I will enter this samādhi', 'I now enter [this samādhi]', 'I have entered [this samādhi]'.[73]   [If] there are no such conceptualizations, one should know that this bodhisattva has already received prediction to anuttarā samyak saṃbodhi from the Buddhas."

Śāriputra said to Subhūti: "This samādhi practiced by the bodhisattvas, from which they receive prediction to anuttarā samyak saṃbodhi from the Buddhas, is this samādhi able to be shown?"[74]

Subhūti said: "Not so, O Śāriputra!   For what reason?   Sons of good family do not conceptualize[75] this samādhi.   For what reason?   Because the nature of this samādhi does not exist."[76]

The Buddha praised Subhūti, saying: "Sadhū!   Sadhū!   I declare that you are foremost of those people who [practice] the samādhi of non-contention.   It is just as you have said, bodhisattvas should train in Prajñāpāramitā in this way; if they train in this way, this is known as training in Prajñāpāramitā."

Śāriputra addressed the Buddha, saying: "O Blessed One!   Bodhisattvas who train in this way, train in what dharma?"[77]

The Buddha replied to Śāriputra: "Bodhisattvas who train in this way, do not train in dharmas.   For what reason?   O Śāriputra!   All these dharmas do not [exist] in the way foolish common people grasp at them."[78]

Śāriputra addressed the Buddha, saying: "O Blessed One!   How then do they exist?"

The Buddha said: "In the way in which they do not exist, in that way do they exist; and in this way all dharmas do not have any existence.   This is known as 'ignorance'.[79]   Foolish common people conceptualize what is not known, grasp at what is not known.   They fall

---

[72]   = "*manyate*" and "*samāhita*".

[73]   Skt adds, Vaidya (1960: 7): "*evaṃ tasy sarveṇa sarvaṃ savathā sarvaṃ na saṃvidyate*".

[74]   = Vaidya (1960: 7): "*śakyaḥ sa samādhir darśayitum*".

[75]   Skt first has = Vaidya (1960: 7): "*samādhiṃ na jānāti na saṃjānīte*".   The 分別 is the "*saṃ-√jñā*", though the *jānāti* is not present in *Xiǎopǐn*.   This is counter to Conze's "perceive" (1973: 87), also validly from *saṃ-√jñā*.

[76]   Skt uses = Vaidya (1960: 7): "*avidyamānatvena*".   *Xiǎopǐn* uses 無所有 as "*a-vid°*", and the 性 as "*-tvā*"?   Alternative from *Xiǎopǐn*:   "Because the non-existent nature (non-existence) of this *samādhi*."

[77]   Skt = Vaidya (1960: 8): "*dharma*", i.e. singular, not plural.

[78]   = Vaidya (1960: 8): "*na hi te śāriputra dharmāstathā saṃvidyante yathā bālapṛthagjanā aśrutavanto abhiniviṣṭāḥ|*"

[79]   Here the usual use of √*vid* as "exist" becomes 無明 *avidyā* (Vaidya 1960: 8).

into the two extremes,[80] and neither know nor see [those dharmas]. With respect to to non-existent dharmas, they discriminate and conceptualize, grasping at name and form.[81] With grasping as cause, they neither know nor see with insight these dharmas which are non-existent; they neither go forth to, nor have confidence in, nor abide in [the path]. Therefore they fall into the category of grasping, foolish common people."

Śāriputra addressed the Buddha, saying: "O Blessed One! Bodhisattvas who train in this way do not even train in sarvajñā?"

The Buddha replied to Śāriputra: "Bodhisattvas who train in this way do not even train in sarvajñā.[82] Training in this way is also known as training in sarvajñā, the accomplishment of sarvajñā."

Subhūti addressed the Buddha, saying: "O Blessed One! If I were asked: 'If an illusory person were to train in sarvajñā, would they accomplish sarvajñā, or not?' O Blessed One! How should I answer?"

[The Buddha replied to Subhūti:] "O Subhūti! I will ask you a counter question, answer as you see fit. What do you think: Is illusion other than form? Is form other than illusion?[83] Is illusion other than sensation, perception, volitions, or cognition?"

Subhūti said: "Illusion is not other than form; form is not other than illusion. Illusion is that very form; form is that very illusion. Illusion is not other than sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition; cognition is not other than cognition. Illusion is that very cognition; cognition is that very illusion."

[The Buddha replied to Subhūti:] "O Subhūti! What do you think: Are the five

---

[80]   = VAIDYA (1960: 8): "*yathā śāriputra na saṃvidyante, tathā saṃvidyante evam avidyamānāḥ tenocyante "avidyeti"| tān bālapṛthagjanā aśrutavanto 'bhiniviṣṭāḥ| tair asaṃvidyamānāḥ sarvadharmāḥ kalpitāḥ| te tān kalpayitvā dvayor antayoḥ saktāḥ tān dharmānna jānanti na paśyanti|*". The English is an attempt to indicate that what is conceptualized and grasped at is the (objective) thing which is *avidyā*, rather than (subjective) *avidyā* itself. Refer *Móhē*, fasc. 3 《摩訶般若波羅蜜經》卷 3〈10 相行品〉:「是中凡夫以無明力渴愛故，妄見分別，說是無明。是凡夫為二邊所縛，是人不知不見諸法無所有，而憶想分別，著色乃至十八不共法。」(CBETA, T08, no. 223, p. 238, c29-p. 239, a3); "Within this, foolish common people, by thirst and lust of the power of ignorance, mistakening see and conceptualize—this is said to be ignorance. These foolish common people are bound by the two extremes; they neither known nor see that *dharma*s do not exist, yet still conceptually proliferate, grasping at form, etc., up to to the eighteen unshared *dharma*s."

[81]   = VAIDYA (1960: 8): "*tasmāt te 'saṃvidyamānān sarvadharmān kalpayanti| kalpayitvā dvāvantāvabhiniviśante abhiniviśya tan nidānam upalambhaṃ niśritya atītān dharmān kalpayanti, anāgatān dharmān kalpayanti, pratyutpannān dharmān kalpayanti te kalpayitvā nāmarūpe 'bhiniviṣṭāḥ|*"

[82]   Skt adds = VAIDYA (1960: 8): "*evaṃ śikṣamāṇaḥ śāriputra bodhisattvo mahāsattvaḥ sarvadharmeṣu śikṣate*".

[83]   Skt does not have the reversed format, just "illusion other than *rūpa, vedanā, saṃjñā, saṃskārāḥ, vijñāna*" (VAIDYA 1960: 8-9).

aggregates known as[84] the 'bodhisattva', or not?"

[Subhūti said:]   "So **<538c>** it is, O Blessed One!"

The Buddha replied to Subhūti: "[When the] bodhisattva trains in anuttarā samyak saṃbodhi, they should train just as an illusory person.   For what reason?   One should know that the five aggregates are the very illusory person.   For what reason?   It is said that 'Form is like an illusion'; it is said that 'Sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition are like an illusion'; cognition is the six sense faculties, which is the five aggregates."[85]

[Subhūti said:]   "O Blessed One!   If a bodhisattva of novice aspiration[86] hears this teaching, will they not become startled, afraid, dismayed and turn away?"

The Buddha replied to Subhūti: "If a bodhisattva of novice aspiration follows a bad friend, then they will become startled, afraid, dismayed and turn away.   If they have heard this teaching from following a good friend, then they will not become startled, afraid, dismayed and turn away."[87]

[88]Subhūti said: "O Blessed One!   Who is the bodhisattva's bad friend?"

The Buddha said: "[One who] teaches causing one to be separated from Prajñāpāramitā, causing one to have no delight toward bodhi.   Moreover, [one who] teaches causing one to seize signs and discriminatively conceptualize about embellished text and verses.[89] Moreover, [one who] teaches training in the various sūtras and dharmas of the śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas.   Moreover, they act as a condition for Māra's deeds.   They are known as the bodhisattva's bad friend."

---

84   Skt adds = Vaidya (1960: 9): "*atraiṣāṃ saṃjñā samajñā prajñaptiḥ vyavahāraḥ*".   Five terms / synonyms for the Chinese 名 "name".

85   Initially, it looks as if the 識 could be a form of the (future participle or) verb (當)知, i.e. "[thus] should one know the six senses and five aggregates".   However, *Móhē*, "Chapter of the Illusory Man", in a discussion of the 10 similes, illusion, dream, etc., as appearing in the *Upadeśa*, fasc. 44 《大智度論》卷 44 〈11 幻人無作品〉:「六情亦如是。世尊。識即是六情。六情即是五眾。」(CBETA, T25, no. 1509, p. 376, a28-29), "Likewise for the six senses.   O Blessed One!   Cognition is just these six senses; the six senses are just the five aggregates."

86   = Vaidya (1960: 9): "*navayānasaṃprasthitā bodhisattvā mahāsattvā*"; "*bodhisattva...who has newly gone forth on the chariot*".   Note: In later uses of the term "新發意", it is often "*ādikarmika*", e.g. Ch. 15:1.

87   Skt and Conze have both "*kalyāṇamitra*" and "*pāpamitra*" (Vaidya 1960: 9; Conze 1973: 88).

88   This question and response about the "bad friend" (*pāpamitra*) is not found at all in the Sanskrit (or Conze), despite being present in all the early Chinese sources here, and also the sources for the **Pañcaviṃśati*.

89   Or: "Moreover, [one who] teaches one to train in seizing signs and discrimination, and embellish text and verses."   With no Sanskrit for reference, compare however, with *Xiăopǐn*, fasc. 6 《小品般若波羅蜜 經》卷 6 〈16 阿惟越致相品〉:「汝所聞者，非佛所說，皆是文飾莊校之辭。我所說經，真是佛語。」 (CBETA, T08, no. 227, p. 564, b26-27); though again the Sanskrit is lacking there.

[Subhūti said:]   "O Blessed One!   Who is the bodhisattva's good friend?"

[The Buddha said:]   "[One who] teaches causing one to train in Prajñāpāramitā,[90] teaches of Māra's deeds, teaches of the faults and evils of Māra, causing one to know of Māra's deeds; and having [taught[91]] of the faults and evils of Māra, they teach them causing them to forsake [these deeds].   O Subhūti!   They are known as the good friend of the bodhisattva mahāsattva who has aspired[92] the mahāyāna mind, and is greatly adorned."[93]

{= Conze 1:3 The Meaning of 'Bodhisattva'}

Subhūti addressed the Buddha, saying: "O Blessed One!   'Bodhisattva', 'bodhisattva', it is said, what is the meaning of that?"[94]

The Buddha replied to Subhūti:[95]   "In order to train in all dharmas without obstruction, and also to know all dharmas as they really are.   This is known as the meaning of 'bodhi-sattva'."[96]

{= Conze 1:4 The Meaning of 'Mahāsattva'}

Subhūti addressed the Buddha, saying: "O Blessed One!   If knowing all dharmas is known as the meaning of 'bodhisattva', then what is known as the meaning of 'mahāsattva'?"

The Buddha said: "They will be foremost among the great assembly.[97]   This is known as the meaning of 'mahāsattva'."

Śāriputra addressed the Buddha, saying: "O Blessed One!   I would also like to explain the meaning of 'mahāsattva'."

---

90   Skt (Vaidya 1960: 9) and Conze (1973: 88) have "*pāramitā*", not "*prajñāpāramitā*".

91   Seems to be missing a character—"說魔過惡已", "having <u>taught</u> of the faults and evils of Māra...".

92   Skt adds = Vaidya (1960: 9): "*samārūḍha°*", "mounted on" = 乘 (*chéng*).

93   First appearance of *Xiǎopǐn* using "大莊嚴" for "*mahāsaṃnāhasaṃnaddha*" = "armoured with the great armour".

94   = Vaidya (1960: 9): "*tatra bodhisattva iti bhagavan kaḥ padārtha?*"   The term "*padārtha*" is multivalent, MWD, *padārtha*:   "m. the meaning of a word ...; that which corresponds to the meaning of a word."   There are two main possibilities: as "meaning", an earlier sense, or as "thing", an Abhidharma sense.

95   At the beginninging of the Buddha's reply, Skt adds, Vaidya (1960: 9): "*apadārthaḥ subhūte bodhisattva padārthaḥ*"; Conze (1973: 89): "Nothing real is meant by the word 'Bodhisattva'."

96   = Vaidya (1960: 9): "*sarvadharmāṇāṃ hi ... bodhisattvo mahāsattvo 'saktatāyāṃ śikṣate| sarvadharmāṇāṃ hi ... bodhisattvo mahāsattvo 'nubodhanārthena asaktatāyām anuttarāṃ samyaksaṃbodhim abhisaṃbudhyate| bodhy-arthena tu ... 'bodhisattvo mahāsattva' ity ucyate|*".   Kumārajīva's use of "為" as "in order to..." also carries some of the other connotations of "*artha*", otherwise rendered as "義" as "meaning" / "significance"; the sense of "object", "thing" or "entity" etc., Abhidharma style, is not obvious here in *Xiǎopǐn*.   Moreover, Conze (1973: 89) uses "non-attachment" (*asakta*) rather than *Xiǎopǐn* "unobstructed".   Moreover, Skt and Conze add = "*anuttarāṃ samyaksaṃbodhiṃ abhisaṃbudhyate*".

97   = Vaidya (1960: 9): "*mahataḥ sattvarāśer mahataḥ sattvanikāyasya agratāṃ kārayiṣyati*".

The Buddha said: "Explain as you see fit!"[98]

Śāriputra addressed the Buddha, saying: "O Blessed One!   A bodhisattva who teaches the Dharma in order to sever soul view, living being view, life view, person view, existence view, non-existence view, nihilism view, eternalism view,[99] and so forth, is known as the meaning of 'mahāsattva'.   With respect to this, their minds are without grasping.[100]   This is also known as the meaning of 'mahāsattva'."[101]

Śāriputra asked Subhūti: "How is it that with respect to this their minds without grasping?"

Subhūti said: "From being mindless, with respect to this their minds are without grasping."[102]

Pūrṇa the son of Maitrāyaṇī addressed the Buddha, saying: "O Blessed One!   A bodhisattva brings forth the great adornment and mounts upon the great chariot.   This is known as the meaning of 'mahāsattva'."[103]

---

[98]   Standard phrase, Vaidya (1960: 9): "*pratibhātu te śāriputra yasyedānīṃ kālaṃ manyase*".

[99]   = Vaidya (1960: 9-10): "*... ātmadṛṣṭyāḥ sattvadṛṣṭyāḥ jīvadṛṣṭyāḥ pudgaladṛṣṭyāḥ bhavadṛṣṭyāḥ vibhavadṛṣṭyāḥ ucchedadṛṣṭyāḥ śāśvatadṛṣṭyāḥ svakāyadrṣṭyāḥ ...|*".   Within the list of types of self view in the Sanskrit, the last "*svakāyadṛṣṭyāḥ*" is not mentioned in the Chinese, and seems to be an uncommon spelling for Sanskrit "*satkāya*".   Although the Sanskrit prefix "*sat*", "existent", is also given as the gloss for the prefix in Pāli "*sakkāya*", this may in fact be a different back translation from a Prakrit similar to the Pāli, reading "*sa(k)-*" from "*sva-*".   See for example such an understanding in MĀ 《中阿含經》卷 58〈3 晡利多品〉：「復問曰。賢聖。云何為自身見耶。」(CBETA, T01, no. 26, p. 788, a26), where "自身" suggests "**svakāyadṛṣṭiḥ*", for Pāli "*sakkāyo*" in MN 44, i 299; see Ñāṇamoli & Bodhi (1995: 396).   The *Dàoxíng* had trouble with this, apparently reading "*ātma-*" as a simple reflexive "oneself", and "*dṛṣṭy-*" as apparently a verbal form, "seeing".

[100]   This prima facie appears to be unique reading for the *Xiǎopǐn*; however, it seems that the *Xiǎopǐn* misses the subsequent request from Subhūti, the reply from the Buddha and then the larger part of Subhūti's exposition found in the Sanskrit and other Chinese witnesses, ending with Vaidya (1960: 10): "*tenārthena 'bodhisattvo mahāsattva' iti saṃkhyāṃ gacchati||*".

[101]   This part "With respect to this ... '*mahāsattva*'" seems to belong to a later part of the Skt, and skip a piece in the middle, attributed to Subhūti: "A *Bodhisattva* is called a 'great being', if he remains unattached to, and uninvolved in, the thought of enlightenment ... he remains unattached and uninvolved. ..."   Then comes Śāriputra's following question, as per the Chinese.   Thus, the "With respect to this" refers to "*bodhi[sattva]citta*".   Here, rather than "*padārtha*", it is "*saṃkhyāṃ gacchati*" (Vaidya 1960: 10).

[102]   = Vaidya (1960: 10): "*acittatvād āyuṣman śāriputra tatrāpi citte asakto aparyāpannaḥ*".   Skt and Conze (1973: 90) adds a little discussion viz "*acitta* as existent", etc. which is a simple repeat of the similar starting discussion at Chp. 1:2 earlier, not found in any of the earlier Chinese witnesses.

[103]   = Vaidya (1960: 10): "*mahāsattvo mahāsattva iti yadidaṃ bhagavann ucyate, mahāsaṃnāhasaṃnaddhaḥ sa sattvaḥ| mahāyānasamprasthito mahāyānasamārūḍhaś ca sa sattvaḥ| tasmāt sa mahāsattvo mahāsattva iti saṃkhyāṃ gacchati||*"   Note "*saṃkhyāṃ gacchati*" rather than "*padārthaḥ*".   It is curious that *Xiǎopǐn* uses the term 莊嚴, so often translated as "adornment" (noun) and "adorn" (verb) from **ālaṃ-√kṛ*.   Was this a deliberate attempt on Kumārajīva's part to tone down the warrior hero motif as possibly too

Subhūti addressed the Buddha, saying: "O Blessed One!   It is said: 'A bodhisattva brings forth the great adornment.'   What is known as 'bringing forth the great adornment'?"

The Buddha said: "The bodhisattva conceives the thought: 'I should lead **<539a>** immeasurable asaṃkhya living beings to nirvāṇa.'[104]   Having led living beings to nirvāṇa, not any living beings have been led to nirvāṇa.[105]   For what reason?   Such is the nature of dharmas.[106]   By simile, it is like a master illusionist who at the crossroads creates a large assembly of people, and severs the heads all of those created people.   What do you think: Is there anyone who is injured, or who is killed?"[107]

Subhūti said: "Indeed not!   O Blessed One!"

The Buddha said: "The bodhisattva is likewise.   Having led immeasurable asaṃkhya living beings to nirvāṇa, there is not any living being who is led to nirvāṇic cessation.   If the bodhisattva on hearing this teaching is neither startled nor afraid, one should know that this bodhisattva has brought forth the great adornment."

Subhūti said: "As I understand the meaning of what the Buddha has taught, one should know that this bodhisattva has [not] brought forth the great adornment, yet has adorned himself.[108]   For what reason?   Sarvajñā is a dharma which is neither made nor generated;[109] for the sake of living beings they bring forth the great adornment, even though these living beings are also neither made nor generated.[110]   For what reason?

---

military in nature?   We recall KUMĀRAJĪVA's own experiences in the hands of certain generals.   Though MWD does have "wearing amulets, provided with charms" for "*saṃnaddha*".   "Mahāyāna" or "大乘" is translated here as "great chariot" rather than the more common "great vehicle", give the entire metaphor of the *bodhisattva mahāsattva* here.   Note that the *Upadeśa* is somewhat ambiguous too, *Upadeśa*, fasc. 45 《大智度論》卷 45〈15 大莊嚴品〉 (CBETA, T25, no. 1509, p. 387, a26-29).   Still, even here the sense of "defeating bandits" and "defeating Māra" gives the warrior hero sense quite strongly.

[104]   = VAIDYA (1960: 10): "*aprameyā mayā sattvāḥ parinirvāpayitavyā iti*".

[105]   = VAIDYA (1960: 10): "*na ca sa kaścit sattvo yaḥ parinirvṛto yena ca parinirvāpito bhavati*".

[106]   = VAIDYA (1960: 10): "*dharmataiṣā dharmāṇāṃ ...*"   Also adds "*māyādharmatām upādāya syāt*".

[107]   = VAIDYA (1960: 10): "*api nu tatra kenacit kaścid dhato vā mṛto vā <u>nāśito vā</u> antarhito vā?*"

[108]   = VAIDYA (1960: 11): "*... tathā <u>asaṃnāhasaṃnaddho</u> batāyaṃ bhagavan bodhisattvo mahāsattvo veditavyaḥ ...*" = "... <u>not</u> armed with the great armour...".   Moreover, *Móhē*, fasc. 5 《摩訶般若波羅蜜經》卷 5〈17 莊嚴品〉:「爾時須菩提白佛言。世尊。如我從佛所聞義。<u>菩薩摩訶薩無大莊嚴為大莊嚴</u>。諸法自相空故。...。世尊。以是因緣故。<u>當知菩薩摩訶薩無大莊嚴為大莊嚴</u>。」(CBETA, T08, no. 223, p. 248, c25-p. 249, a9).   The negation, i.e. "has [not] brought forth", that I have added at the start of this statement, which is found in all the other texts apart from the *Xiǎopǐn*, is in accord with the basic recurring rhetorical formulation of the *sūtra*, i.e. "XY is not Y".   The explanation from Subhūti still supports the negation, i.e. even though it is not brought about, they still bring it about, for the sake of beings.

[109]   = VAIDYA (1960: 11): "*akṛtā hi sarvajñatā avikṛtā anabhisaṃskṛtā*" = "*Sarvajñatā* is neither made, nor altered, nor constructed".

[110]   = VAIDYA (1960: 11): "*te api sattvā akṛtā avikṛtā anabhisaṃskṛtā*" = "Beings are neither made, nor altered, nor constructed".

Because form is neither bound nor released; sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition are neither bound nor released.[111]

Pūrṇa said to Subhūti: "Form is neither bound nor released?; sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition are neither bound nor released?"

Subhūti said: "Form is neither bound nor released; sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition are neither bound nor released."[112]

Pūrṇa said: "What form is neither bound nor released? What sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition are neither bound nor released?"[113]

Subhūti said: "The form of an illusory person is neither bound nor released; the sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition of an illusory person is neither bound nor released.[114] Due to being non-existent, it is neither bound nor released; due to being separated, it is neither bound nor released; due to being not generated, it is neither bound nor released.[115] This is known as 'the bodhisattva mahāsattva has [not] brought forth the great adornment, yet has adorned himself'."[116]

{= Conze 1:5 The Meaning of 'Great Vehicle'}

Subhūti addressed the Buddha, saying: "O Blessed One! What is the great chariot? What is the setting forth on the great chariot by the bodhisattva? Where does this chariot abide? Where does this chariot go forth from?"[117]

The Buddha replied to Subhūti: "'[What is] the great chariot?' It is without limit and without measure. 'Where does this chariot go forth from?', and 'Where does this chariot

---

[111]   = VAIDYA (1960: 11): "*rūpaṃ [etc] abaddhaṃ amuktaṃ*".

[112]   The structure is slightly different, but perhaps these two statements by Pūrṇa and Subhūti *should* be with respect to the "suchness (*tathatā*) of form, etc."

[113]   Skt VAIDYA (1960: 11) and CONZE (1973: 90) add: "*tathatā*" of *rūpa*, etc.

[114]   Skt VAIDYA (1960: 11) and CONZE (1973: 90) add: "*tathatā*" of the *māyāpuruṣa*, etc.

[115]   無所有 "non-existence" = "*asadbhūtatvā*"; 離 "detachment" = "*viviktatvā*"; 無生 "non-generation" = "*anutpannatvā*" (VAIDYA 1960: 11).

[116]   = VAIDYA (1960: 11): "*ayaṃ sa bodhisattvasya mahāsattvasya mahāsaṃnāhasaṃnaddhasya mahāyānasaṃprasthitasya mahāyānasamārūḍhasya mahāsaṃnāho 'saṃnāhaḥ|*" Note that again *Xiǎopǐn* is in the affirmative (and here the *Dàmíngdù(A)* agrees with it, though not in the former), while the Sanskrit and other witnesses are still in the negative.

[117]   VAIDYA (1960: 12): "*[1] katamac ca tanmahāyānam?| [2a?] kathaṃ vā tat saṃprasthito veditavyaḥ?| [4] kuto vā tan mahāyānaṃ niryāsyati?| [2b?] kena vā tan mahāyānaṃ saṃprasthitam?| [3] kva vā tan mahāyānaṃ sthāsyati?| [x] ko vā anena mahāyānena niryāsyati?|*" Numbering added. The order and number of the questions differ somewhat. Refer also the *Móhē*, fasc. 5 《摩訶般若波羅蜜經》卷 5〈18 問乘品〉：「何等是菩薩摩訶薩摩訶衍？云何當知菩薩摩訶薩發趣大乘？是乘發何處？是乘至何處？當住何處？誰當乘是乘出者？」」(CBETA, T08, no. 223, p. 250, a2-5).

abide?'   This chariot goes forth from the triple world, and abides at sarvajñā.   No chariot is the 'setting forth' of this chariot.[118]   For what reason?   As going forth and that which goes forth are both non-existent, what dharma will go forth?"[119]

Subhūti addressed the Buddha, saying: "O Blessed One! 'Mahāyāna', 'mahāyāna' it is said, it goes forth defeating[120] the whole world with its gods, human beings, and asuras.   O Blessed One!   The mahāyāna is equal to empty space.   Just as empty space holds[121] immeasurable asaṃkhya living beings, so too the mahāyāna holds immeasurable asaṃkhya living beings. This mahāyāna is just like empty space, neither coming from anywhere, nor going to anywhere, nor abiding anywhere.   The mahāyāna is likewise, its past limit is not apprehended, its present limit is not apprehended, and its future limit is not apprehended; this chariot is equal with respect to these three periods of time.[122]   Therefore it is known as the 'mahāyāna'."[123]

The Buddha praised **<539b>** Subhūti, saying: "Excellent!   Excellent!   The mahāyāna of the bodhisattva mahāsattvas is just as you have taught!"

Thereupon, Pūrṇa the son of Maitrāyaṇī addressed the Buddha, saying: "O Blessed One! The Buddha empowers Subhūti to teach Prajñāpāramitā, and to teach the mahāyāna."[124]

---

[118]   = VAIDYA (1960: 12): "[1st Round] [1] "mahāyānam" iti subhūte aprameyatāyā etad adhivacanam| aprameyam iti subhūte apramāṇatvena| yadapi subhūte evaṃ vadasi - [2a?] kathaṃ vā tat saṃprasthito veditavyaḥ? [4] kuto vā tan mahāyānaṃ niryāsyati? [2b?] kena vā tan mahāyānaṃ saṃprasthitam? [3] kva vā tan mahāyānaṃ sthāsyati? [x] ko vā anena mahāyānena niryāsyatīti? [2a?] pāramitābhiḥ saṃprasthitaḥ| [4] traidhātukān niryāsyati| [2b?] yenārambaṇaṃ tena saṃprasthitam| [3] sarvajñatāyāṃ sthāsyati| [x] bodhisattvo mahāsattvo niryāsyati| [2nd Round] api tu khalu punar [1 & 2a? missing?] [4] na kutaścin niryāsyati| [2b?] na kenāpi saṃprasthitam| [3] na kvacit sthāsyati| api tu sthāsyati sarvajñatāyām asthānayogena| [x] nāpi kaścit tena mahāyānena niryāto nāpi niryāsyati nāpi niryāti|"   Numbering added.

[119]   = VAIDYA (1960: 12): "tatkasya hetoḥ? yaś ca niryāyāt, yena ca niryāyāt, ubhāvetau dharmau na vidyete nopalabhyete| evam avidyamāneṣu sarvadharmeṣu katamo dharmaḥ katamena dharmeṇa niryāsyati? evaṃ hi subhūte bodhisattvo mahāsattvo mahāyānasaṃnaddho mahāyānasaṃprasthito mahāyānasamārūḍho bhavati||"

[120]   勝出 = "abhibhavan niryāsyati", "go forth overpowering / defeating..." (VAIDYA (1960: 12).

[121]   受 = avakāśa (VAIDYA (1960: 12).   MWD: "avakāśa: place, space, room, occasion, opportunity; to make room, give way, admit."

[122]   = VAIDYA (1960: 12): "atha samaṃ tadyānam...|" = "In this, this chariot is equal."   Xiǎopǐn appears to want to clarify what "atha" refers to, i.e. "in the three periods of time", past, present and future "三際".   But what is the connection between "time" and the "great chariot" (°yāna)?   Perhaps it is through the term "yāmam", "1. period of three hours; 2. midnight; the middle watch of the night; 3. night; 4. ...; 5. the period between the fortieth and the fiftieth nālika of a day; 6. time; 7. ..." (according to MWD).   The possible reflection of Tamil or South Indian may be significant, though this probably also has Sanskrit roots.

[123]   Skt (VAIDYA 1960: 12) and CONZE (1973: 91): "It is thus that this is the great vehicle of the Bodhisattvas, the great beings.   Trained therein, Bodhisattvas do reach all-knowledge, have reached it, will reach it."

[124]   Skt (VAIDYA 1960: 12) and CONZE (1973: 91) have "manyate" = "fancies" for the term "使", i.e. a kind of challenge from Purṇa; as opposed to the Xiǎopǐn which is more an echo of the start of Chp. 1:2, the "empowerment".

Subhūti addressed the Buddha, saying: "O Blessed One!   Has that which I have taught deviated from[125] Prajñāpāramitā?"

[The Buddha said:]   "Indeed not, O Subhūti!   That which you have taught is in accordance with[126] Prajñāpāramitā."

{= CONZE 1:6 Attainment}

[Subhūti said:]   "O Blessed One!   I do not apprehend the bodhisattva of the past period of time, and also do not apprehend the bodhisattva of the future or present periods of time.[127]   Through the boundless nature of form, the bodhisattva is also boundless; through the boundless nature of sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition, the bodhisattva is also boundless.[128]   O Blessed One!   As such, not apprehending a bodhisattva in any location, in any period of time, or in any way at all,[129] what bodhisattva should I teach Prajñāpāramitā?   Neither apprehending nor seeing a bodhisattva, what dharma should I teach to penetrate Prajñāpāramitā?   O Blessed One!   'Bodhisattva', 'bodhisattva' it is said, that is merely a name, an appellation.[130]   By simile, it is like the statement 'soul', [yet] the dharma 'soul' is absolutely not generated.   O Blessed One!   The nature of all dharmas is likewise.   Within this, what is this form which is neither grasped nor generated?   What is this sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition which is neither grasped nor generated?[131]   'That form is the bodhisattva' is unapprehendable; 'that sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition is the bodhisattva' is unapprehendable; and this unapprehendibility is also unapprehendable.   O Blessed One!   Not apprehending a bodhisattva in any location, in any period of time, or in any way at all, what dharma should I teach to penetrate Prajñāpāramitā?   O Blessed One!   'Bodhisattva' is merely a name, an appellation.   Just as a 'soul' is absolutely not generated, the [own-]nature of all dharmas is likewise.   Within this, what is this form which is neither grasped nor generated?   What is this sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition which is neither grasped nor generated?   The nature of dharmas is likewise; this nature is also not generated; and non-generation is also not generated.[132]   O Blessed One!

---

[125]   = VAIDYA (1960: 12): "*vyatikramya*" = "over-stepped", CONZE (1973: 91): "transgressed".

[126]   = VAIDYA (1960: 12): "*anulomatvaṃ*" = "in accordance", CONZE (1973: 92): "in agreement".

[127]   = VAIDYA (1960: 12-13): "*°antato nopaiti*" = "not approach the [X] limit", and not "apprehend".   Perhaps some wordplay with "*upa√ī*" and "*nir√ī*", etc.

[128]   Skt adds = VAIDYA (1960: 13): "*rūpaṃ bodhisattva iti nopaiti*" = "does not approach 'the *bodhisattva* is form'", etc.

[129]   = VAIDYA (1960: 13): "*... sarveṇa sarvaṃ sarvathā sarvaṃ...|*"

[130]   Skt adds = *prajñāpāramitā* also mere name, etc.; and "*tac ca nāmadheyam anabhinirvṛttam*" = "And what they denote is something uncreated" (VAIDYA 1960: 13).

[131]   Skt adds = VAIDYA (1960: 13): "*evam eteṣāṃ sarvadharmāṇāṃ yā asvabhāvatā, sā anabhinirvṛtiḥ*".

[132]   This section is somewhat more extensive in *Xiǎopǐn* than Skt.   It seems more likely that 法性 (*fǎxìng*) = *dharmasvabhāva[tā]* (as in the first sentence), rather than *dharmatā*.

Should I now teach a not generated dharma to penetrate Prajñāpāramitā?   For what reason?   Apart from not generated dharmas, a bodhisattva who practices anuttarā samyak saṃbodhi is unapprehendable.   If a bodhisattva hears this teaching, and is neither startled nor afraid, one should know that this bodhisattva practices Prajñāpāramitā.   O Blessed One!   When the bodhisattva practices in accordance with Prajñāpāramitā, they make an investigation[133] of all dharmas and do not obtain form.[134]   For what reason?   The non-generation of form is not form, the non-cessation of form is not form; non-generation and non-cessation are not two, are not divided.[135]   If one speaks of 'this form', that is just a non-dual dharma. When a bodhisattva practices in [accordance with] Prajñāpāramitā, they do not obtain[136] sensation, perception, volitions, or cognition.   For what reason?   The non-generation of cognition is not cognition, the non-cessation of cognition is not cognition; non-generation and non-cessation are not two, are not divided.[137]   If one speaks of '[this] cognition', that is just a non-dual dharma."

<539c> Śāriputra asked Subhūti: "As I understand the meaning of what Subhūti has taught, the bodhisattva is just not generated.   If a bodhisattva is not generated, for what reason do they engage in difficult practices, and undergo pain and distress[138] for the sake of living beings?"

Subhūti said: "I do not wish to cause a bodhisattva to engage in difficult practices.   For what reason?   [One who] perceives[139] difficult practices, perceives painful practices, is unable to benefit immeasurable asaṃkhya living beings.   [Only one who] perceives ease toward living beings, perceives happiness, perceives [them as] father and mother, perceives [them as] sons [and daughters], perceives [them as] their own, is able to benefit immeas-urable asaṃkhya living beings.[140]   Just as the dharma 'soul' is unapprehendable in any location, in any period of time, or in any way at all;[141] [likewise] should a bodhisattva

---

[133]   = VAIDYA (1960: 13): "*vyupaparīkṣate*".

[134]   = VAIDYA (1960: 13): "*na rūpam upaiti (+ na ... upagacchati)*".   Also adds, VAIDYA (1960: 13): "*na rūpasyotpādaṃ samanupaśyati, na rūpasya nirodhaṃ samanupaśyati*".

[135]   = VAIDYA (1960: 13): "*advayam etad advaidhīkāram*".   The Skt holds the non-duality to be between "form and the non-generation of form", "form and the non-cessation of form", rather than between "non-generation and non-cessation" per se.

[136]   = VAIDYA (1960: 13-14): "*na ... upaiti, (+ na upagacchati)*".

[137]   = VAIDYA (1960: 14): "*advayam etad advaidhīkāram*".

[138]   = VAIDYA (1960: 14): "*kṛaśo duḥkhānytsahate pratyanubhavitum*".

[139]   All the 想 (*xiǎng*) "perception" in this passage is "*saṃjñā-√kṛ*", "construct the notion" (VAIDYA 1960: 14).

[140]   Skt VAIDYA (1960: 14) and CONZE (1973: 93): "As I myself want to be quite free from all sufferings, just so all beings want to be quite free from all sufferings, etc."

[141]   The *Xiǎopǐn* reads in a manner similar to the earlier reference to an "*ātman*" as a "soul", adding "is unapprehendable"; the Sanskrit, however, takes this in the sense of "Just as I, in all places, times and ways, ... etc" (VAIDYA 1960: 14).   Still, the *Xiǎopǐn* makes doctrinal sense, in that the removal of the "self"

perceive internal and external dharmas.   If a bodhisattva mentally practices in this way, this is known as 'difficult practices'.   Just as Śāriputra has said, 'the bodhisattva is not generated', so it is, O Śāriputra, the bodhisattva is not generated as a substantial entity."[142]

Śāriputra said: "Is it only the bodhisattva that is not generated, or is sarvajñā also not generated?"

Subhūti said: "Sarvajñā is also not generated."

Śāriputra said: "[Is it only] sarvajñā that is not generated, or are foolish common people also not generated?"

Subhūti said: "Foolish common people are also not generated."

Śāriputra said to Subhūti: "If the bodhisattva is not generated, and the dharmas of a bodhisattva are also not generated; sarvajñā is not generated, and the dharmas of sarvajñā are also not generated; the foolish common people are not generated, and the dharmas of the common people are also not generated;[143] now then, because the not generated attains the not generated, the bodhisattva should attain sarvajñā!"[144]

Subhūti said: "I do not wish for the attainment of a not generated dharma.[145]   For what reason?   Due to not generated dharmas being unapprehendable."[146]

Śāriputra said: "A generating generation, or an non-generating generation;[147] that which you have said, and [that which you] delight in teaching, is that generated or not generated?"[148]

Subhūti said: "All dharmas are not generated, that spoken is not generated, and even delight in teaching is not generated.   In this way, delight in teaching!"[149]

---

removes the perception "I have difficult practices", etc.

[142]   There is no Skt equivalent or 實 (shí), but the *Xiaŏpĭn* wishes to emphasize that like the "*ātman*", the "*bodhisattva*" is not a substantial entity.

[143]   Though *Xiaŏpĭn* lacks the "*[X]dharmāḥ*" above (VAIDYA 1960: 14-15), they are each mentioned above in Skt and CONZE (1973: 94).

[144]   = VAIDYA (1960: 15): "*nanvāyuṣman subhūte anuprāptaiva ayatnena bodhisattvena mahāsattvena sarvajñatā bhavati|*"

[145]   Skt adds = VAIDYA (1960: 15): "*abhisamaya*" to "*prāptim icchāmi*" 得.

[146]   = VAIDYA (1960: 15): "*na api anutpannena dhareṇa anutpannā prāptiḥ prāpyate|*" etc.

[147]   Quite difficult to decipher, but refer *Chāo*, fasc. 1 《摩訶般若鈔經》卷 1〈1 道行品〉:「舍利弗復言。以生生者。為從無所生生。」(CBETA, T08, no. 226, p. 511, b20-24).

[148]   If we take "汝所言樂說" as "*anutpanno dharmo*" (not unreasonable), then this matches Skt (VAIDYA 1960: 15).   However, elsewhere it appears that to *Xiaŏpĭn*, "*pratibhā*", from "√*bhāṣ*", "declare" or "expound" (說 *shuō*); but to CONZE it is "√*bhā*" as "flash" or "image" (1973: 94).

[149]   Somewhat different to Skt (VAIDYA 1960: 15) and CONZE (1973: 94), but I will leave *Xiaŏpĭn* as it is here.

Śāriputra said: "Excellent! Excellent! O Subhūti! Among those people who teach the Dharma,[150] you are foremost and supreme. For what reason? Because you are able to answer in accordance with whatever is asked."[151]

Subhūti said: "That is the nature of Dharma. All the Buddha's disciples, with respect to dharmas without supporting basis, are able to answer whatever is asked.[152] For what reason? Due to the indeterminacy of all dharmas."[153]

Śāriputra said: "Excellent! Excellent! This is from the power of which pāramitā?"

Subhūti: "This is from the power of Prajñāpāramitā.[154] O Śāriputra! If, when a bodhi-sattva hears such a teaching, such an exposition,[155] and neither doubts, nor regrets, nor is perplexed, one should know that this bodhisattva practices in this practice, and is not seprated from these mental attentions."[156]

Śāriputra said:[157] "If a bodhisattva is not separated from this practice and is not separated from these mental attentions, then all living beings also are not separated from this practice, are not separated from these mental attentions. [In this way,] all living beings <540a> should also be bodhisattvas. For what reason? Due to all living beings not being separated from these mental attentions."

Subhūti said: "Excellent! Excellent! O Śāriputra! You wish to refute me, but instead prove my point. In what way? From living beings' absence of nature, the absence of nature of mental attentions should also be known.[158] From living beings' separation, the separation of mental attentions [should also be known].[159] From the non-apprehension of

---

Question: What is "*pratibhāti jalpitum*"?

[150] = Vᴀɪᴅʏᴀ (1960: 15): "*dharmakathika*".

[151] = Vᴀɪᴅʏᴀ (1960: 15): "*yato yata eva paripraśnīkriyate, tatastata eva niḥsarati ...|*" Note the "*niḥ√śri*"; and below.

[152] = Vᴀɪᴅʏᴀ (1960: 15): "*bhagavataḥ śrāvakāṇām aniśritadharmāṇām| te yato yata eva paripraśnīkriyante, tatastata eva niḥsaranti...|*" Note the "*ani√śri*"; and above.

[153] = Vᴀɪᴅʏᴀ (1960: 15): "*yathāpi nāma aniśritattvāt sarvadharmāṇām|*" Again, the "*ani√śri*"; as above. For these few statements, the thread of being without √śri is lost in the Chinese.

[154] Skt (Vᴀɪᴅʏᴀ (1960: 15) and Cᴏɴᴢᴇ (1973: 94): "beneficial to all the [three] vehicles, is also the perfection which [allows them not to] lean on any *dharma*, because [it shows that] all *dharma*s have no support [and can therefore give none]."

[155] = Vᴀɪᴅʏᴀ (1960: 15): "*upadiśya*". Perhaps subtly suggesting that the *sūtra* is already an *upadeśa* of sorts?

[156] = Vᴀɪᴅʏᴀ (1960: 15): "*avirahitaś cānena manasikāreṇeti*".

[157] Skt (Vᴀɪᴅʏᴀ 1960: 16) and Cᴏɴᴢᴇ first add about "lacking in attention" versus "lacking in adjustment" (1973: 94-5).

[158] = Vᴀɪᴅʏᴀ (1960: 16): "*svabhāvatā*". Skt and Cᴏɴᴢᴇ then add "*asadbhāvatā*" = "no real existence" (1973: 95).

[159] = Vᴀɪᴅʏᴀ (1960: 16): "*viviktatā*". Skt and Cᴏɴᴢᴇ then add "*acintyatā*" = "inconceivable" (1973: 95).

living beings, the non-apprehension of mental attentions [should also be known].[160]   O Śāriputra!   I wish that the bodhisattvas, by way of these mental attentions, practice Prajñā-pāramitā.”

CHAPTER TWO—ŚAKRA, LORD OF THE GODS[161]

{= CONZE 2 Śakra}

{= Conze 2:1 Preamble}

Thereupon, Śakra, Lord of the Gods, together with forty thousand gods, were all present at the assembly; the four kings of the gods, together with twenty thousand gods, were all present at the assembly; the lords of the Sāhā world, the kings of the brahmās, together with ten thousand brahmās, were all present at the assembly; and so forth, up to, the assembly of the pure abode heavens, many kinds[162] of countless thousands [of gods], were all present at the assembly.   The radiant auras of all those assembled gods, which was the reward for their past actions, no longer manifested, due to the radiant aura from the spiritual power of the body of the Buddha.[163]

Thereupon, Śakra, Lord of the Gods, spoke to Subhūti, saying: “All these countless assemblies of gods gathered and assembled together wish to hear Subhūti teach[164] the meaning of Prajñāpāramitā: How do the bodhisattvas abide in Prajñāpāramitā?”[165]

Subhūti said to Śakra, Lord of the Gods, and all the assembled gods: “O Kauśika!   I will now, empowered by the Buddha’s spiritual power, teach the Prajñāpāramitā.   All those gods who have yet to generate mental aspiration toward anuttarā samyak saṃbodhi, they should now generate that aspiration.   If a person has already entered into the status of certitude [to perfection],[166] they are unable to generate mental aspiration toward anuttarā

---

[160]   = VAIDYA (1960: 16): “*abhisaṃbodhanatā*”.   Skt and CONZE then add = “*yathābhūtārthābhisaṃbodhanatā*” (1973: 95).

[161]   = VAIDYA (1960: 17): “*2 Śakraparivarto dvitīyaḥ*”; = CONZE (1973: 96): II Śakra.

[162]   Could this “zhòng 種” = “kinds” / “types”, be a phonetic scribal error for “zhòng 眾” = “assembly”?

[163]   = VAIDYA (1960: 17): “*buddhānubhāvena buddhatejasā buddhādhiṣṭhānenābhibhūto*”.

[164]   Skt adds = VAIDYA (1960: 17): “*upadeśam avavādānuśāsanīṃ*”.

[165]   = VAIDYA (1960: 17): “*sthātavyam*”.   But Skt adds = “*kathaṃ śikṣitavyam? kathaṃ yogam āpattavyam?*”   Note that this question partly answers the questions in the definition of the “*mahāyāna*”, Chp. 1:5, on where the chariot “abides” (√*sthā*), i.e. stops, after having set forth.

[166]   = VAIDYA (1960: 17): “*samyaktvaniyāmam*”; CONZE (1973: 96): “certain that they have got safely out of this world”.   See the *Upadeśa*, fasc. 18 《大智度論》卷 18 (CBETA, T25, no. 1509, p. 192, c10-17), “As the Buddha taught: ‘If a *bhikṣu* is unable to correctly direct the mind with respect to conditioned *dharma*s, yet wishes to attain foremost mudane *dharma*s, this is impossible; if one does not attain foremost mundane *dharma*s, yet wishes to penetratively [realize] the unconditioned in the fixed status [of *dharma*s], this is impossible;

samyak saṃbodhi. For what reason? Because they have already constructed an embankment against [the torrent of cyclic] birth and death.[167] If these people were to generate mental aspiration toward anuttarā samyak saṃbodhi, I would also have appreciative joy [toward that], and never prevent their merit.[168] For what reason? Superior people should aspire to superior dharmas."[169]

Thereupon, the Buddha praised Subhūti, saying: "Excellent! Excellent! You are able to enthuse[170] the bodhisattvas in this way."

Subhūti said: "O Blessed One! I should be grateful to the Buddha.[171] Just as the Buddhas of the past and their disciples taught the Tathāgata to abide in the dharma of emptiness and taught them to train in the pāramitās,[172] so that the Tathāgata, by training in these dharmas, realized[173] anuttarā samyak saṃbodhi. O Blessed One! I too, should now also safeguard and tend my mind to the bodhisattvas in this way, so that with this safeguarding and tending of mind as a causal condition, the bodhisattvas will swiftly realize anuttarā samyak saṃbodhi."

---

if one does not penetratively [realize] the fixed status [of *dharma*s], yet wishes to attain *śrotāpanna*, *śakrādāgāmi*, *anāgāmi*, or *arhatva*, this is impossible. ... [and the formula in reverse.]" This is most likely in turn from the *Mahāvibhāṣa Śāstra*, fasc. 2 《阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論》卷 2 (CBETA, T27, no. 1545, p. 5, b9-18), which is itself citing earlier *sūtra*. See SN 25:1-10, iii 225-228; = BODHI (2000: 1004-1007); and SN 13 *Abhi-samayasaṃyutta*, BODHI (2000: 621ff n219 = 787ff): "Both *dhammābhisamaya* and *dhammacakkhupaṭilābha* signify the attainment of stream-entry." *Mahāvibhāṣa Śāstra* 《阿毘達磨大毘婆沙論》卷 109, CBETA, T27, no. 1545, p. 563, c26-p. 564, a2); etc. Similar to: "stableness of the Dhamma (*dhammaṭṭhitatā*), the fixed practice of Dhamma (*dhammaniyāmatā*)" (BODHI 2001: 551, 573): "Conditions", II 12.20 and "Cases of Knowledge", II 12.34), the first two: °*ṭṭhitatā* (住位性) and *niyāmatā* (定性). It is a stage of realization, just not yet *nirvāṇa*. Thus, CONZE (1973:): "[i.e. arhats who have reached their last birth, etc.]" is incorrect. It is a point of non-return, only, not finality. Thus, the "fixed status" is preceding realization of the *ārya-phala*s. This statement is found to be "attainment of stream-entry" (*śrotaāpatti*) in all the other three earlier *sūtra*s (*Dàoxíng*, *Dàmíngdù*(B) and *Chāo*). XÜÁNZÀNG's *Dàbānruò*(4) and (5) even specify it as "*śrāvaka* and *pratyekabuddha* certitude", implying that the *bodhisattva*'s have a certitude, albeit of a different nature.

[167] = VAIDYA (1960: 17): "*baddhasīmāno hi te saṃsārasrotasaḥ*". Our translation here adds "torrent" to connect the metaphor of an embankment against a flooding river, which is already implied in the original metaphor of "*saṃsāra*" as a flowing stream.

[168] Skt has = VAIDYA (1960: 17): "*kuśalamūla*". *Xiǎopǐn* seems to be "*puṇya*" or "*guṇa*".

[169] = VAIDYA (1960: 17): "*viśiṣṭebhyo hi dharmebhyo viśiṣṭatamā dharmā adhyālambitavyāḥ*".

[170] = VAIDYA (1960: 17): "*...utsāhaṃ dadāsi|*"

[171] = VAIDYA (1960: 17): "*kṛtajñā*".

[172] Rather than "abide in emptiness" and "the *pāramitās*", Skt (VAIDYA 1960: 17): "*brahmacaryaṃ bodhāya caran*"; CONZE (1973: 96):.

[173] Rather than "realizes ...", Skt (VAIDYA 1960: 17) and CONZE (1973: 96): "*caratā anuttaraṃ jñānam utpāditam*".

{= Conze 2:2 How to Stand in Emptiness or the Perfection of Wisdom}

Subhūti spoke to Śakra, Lord of the Gods, saying: "O Kauśika!   Listen single mindedly[174] to [how] the bodhisattas [should] abide in Prajñāpāramitā.   O Kauśika!   The bodhisattvas, having brought forth the great adornment and mounted <540b> upon the great chariot, abide in Prajñāpāramitā by way of the dharma of emptiness.[175]   [176]They should not abide in form, they should not abide in sensations, perceptions, volitions or cognition; they should not abide in 'form is permanent [or] impermanent', they should not abide in 'sensations, perceptions, volitions or cognitions are permanent [or] impermanent'; they should not abide in 'form is suffering [or] pleasant', they should not abide in 'sensations, perceptions, volitions or cognitions are suffering [or] pleasant'; they should not abide in 'form is pure [or] impure', they should not abide in 'sensations, perceptions, volitions or cognitions are pure [or] impure'; they should not abide in 'form is soul [or] not soul', they should not abide in 'sensations, perceptions, volitions or cognitions are soul [or] not soul'; they should not abide in 'form is empty or not empty', they should not abide in 'sensations, perceptions, volitions or cognitions are empty [or] not empty'; they should not abide in the fruition of a srotāpanna, they should not abide in the fruition of sakṛdāgāmin, they should not abide in the fruit of an anāgāmin, they should not abide in the fruit of an arhat, they should not abide in the path of a pratyekabuddha, they should not abide in the Buddha dharmas;[177] they should not abide in 'srotāpanna fruition is unconditioned', they should not abide in 'a srotāpanna is a field of merit', they should not abide in 'a srotāpanna has up to seven [more] comings and goings in [the torrent of cyclic] birth and death'; they should not abide in 'sakṛdāgāmin fruition is unconditioned', they should not abide in 'a sakṛdāgāmin is a field of merit', they should not abide in 'a sakṛdāgāmin returns only once more to this world and then attains the ending of suffering'; they should not abide in 'anāgāmin fruition is unconditioned', they should not abide in 'an anāgāmin is a field of merit', they should not abide in 'an anāgāmin enters cessation in the other world [of the pure abodes]'; they should not

---

[174]   Standard = Vaidya (1960: 17): "śṛnu sādhu ca susṭhu ca manasikuru".   Imperatives.

[175]   = Vaidya (1960: 17-18): "śūnyatāyāṃ … tiṣṭhitā … prajñāpāramitāyāṃ sthātavyam| … mahāsaṃnāha saṃnaddhena bhavitavyaṃ|"   Note that the "dharma" as "*śūnyatādharmaᵒ" is not found in the Sanskrit; though the Daòxíng and Dàmíngdù(B) also use "空法" (kōngfǎ), i.e. "dharma of emptiness", which the Xiaŏpĭn may be following.

[176]   The list of the dharmas not to be abided in according to the Xiaŏpĭn: The five skandhas: rūpa, vedanā, saṃjñā, saṃskāra, vijñāna;   The four (śrāvakayāna) phalas: srotaāpanna, sakṛdāgāmin, anāgāmin, arhatva; The phala of the other two yānas: pratyekabuddhatva, buddhatva.   However, it gives all the possibilities for the skandhas, e.g. permanent or impermanent, etc., before proceeding to the various phalas for analysis. Other recensions have slightly different content and order of content.

[177]   The four holy ones who have attained the fruitions of the śrāvaka path: srotāpanna "stream entrant"; sakṛdāgāmin "once returner"; anāgāmin "never returner"; arhat "worthy one"; and the pratyekabuddha "solitary awakened one".   These technical terms are all transliterated, not translated per se, in Kumārajīva's Xiaŏpĭn, hence we have used the Sanskrit here.

abide in 'arhat fruition is unconditioned', they should not abide in 'an arhat is a field of merit', they should not abide in 'an arhat enters nirvāṇa without remainder in this life'; they should not abide in 'the pratyekabuddha path is unconditioned', they should not abide in 'a pratyekabuddha is a field of merit', they should not abide in 'a pratyekabuddha transcends the grounds of the śrāvakas, and without reaching the ground of a Buddha enters pari-nirvāṇa'; they should not abide in 'the Buddha dharmas benefit immeasurable living beings, and lead immeasurable living beings to nirvāṇic cessation'."

Thereupon, Śāriputra conceived this thought: "How should a bodhisattva abide?"[178]

Subhūti knew the thought conceived in Śāriputra's mind, and said to Śāriputra: "What do you think: Where does[179] the Tathāgata abide?"

Śāriputra said: "The Tathāgata does not abide anywhere. The non-abiding mind is known as the Tathāgata. The Tathāgata does not abide in the conditioned nature, nor does he abide in the unconditioned nature."[180]

[Subhūti said:] "O Śāriputra! Bodhisattva mahāsattvas should also abide in this way, as the Tathāgata abides, neither abiding nor not abiding in any dharma."[181]

<div align="center">{= Conze 2:3 The Saints and Their Goals are Illusions}</div>

Thereupon, the gods within the assembly conceived this thought: "Even though we can understand the meaning of the speech and language of the yakṣas, that taught and expounded[182] by Subhūti is difficult to comprehend."[183]

Subhūti knew the thoughts conceived in the minds of the gods, and spoke to the gods saying: "Within this, nothing is spoken, nothing is shown, and nothing is heard."[184]

The gods conceived this thought: <540c> "Although Subhūti wishes to make the meaning easier to comprehend, he instead makes it more profound and subtle."[185]

Subhūti knew the thoughts conceived in the minds of the gods, and spoke to the gods saying: "If a practitioner wishes to realize the fruition of a srotāpanna, wishes to abide in the

---

[178]   Skt adds = Vaidya (1960: 19): "*kathaṃ śikṣitavyam*".

[179]   The Sanskrit rendered this in the past (passive), which is interesting in itself. However, given the Chinese, I have translated in the present tense.

[180]   = Vaidya (1960: 19): "*saṃskṛtadhātu*" and "*asaṃskṛtadhātu*". Note translation of "*dhātu*" as "性" here.

[181]   = Vaidya (1960: 19): "*na kvacit shito nāsthito na viṣṭhito nāviṣṭhitaḥ*". Skt then waxes lyrical, but the meaning is essentially this.

[182]   = Vaidya (1960: 19): "*bhāṣate pravyāharati deśayati upadiśati*". The latter for 論.

[183]   = Vaidya (1960: 19): "*na ... vijñāyate...|*"

[184]   = Vaidya (1960: 19): "*na vijñāyate na vijñāyate idaṃ ...| tathā hi nātra kiṃcitsūcyate, nātra kiṃcit śrūyate||*"

[185]   = Vaidya (1960: 19): "*dūrād dūrataraṃ*", "*sūkṣmāt sūkṣmataraṃ*" and "*gambhīrād gambhīrataraṃ*".

fruition of a srotāpanna, they should not depart from this receptivity.[186]   If they wish to realize [and abide in] the fruition of a sakṛdāgāmin, the fruition of an anāgāmin, the fruition of an arhat; if they wish to realize [and abide in] the path of a pratyekabuddha; if they wish to realize [and abide in] the Buddha dharmas; they should also not depart from this receptivity."[187]

Thereupon, the gods conceived this thought: "What sort of person is able to hear in accordance with what Subhūti has taught?"[188]

Subhūti knew the thoughts conceived in minds of the gods, and spoke to the gods, saying: "An illusory person is able to hear in accordance with what I have taught, yet they will neither hear nor realize [anything]."[189]

The gods conceived this thought: "Is it only the hearer who is like an illusion?   Or are living beings also like an illusion?   Is the fruition of a srotāpanna, up to, the path of a pratyekabuddha, also like an illusion?"[190]

Subhūti knew the thoughts conceived in the minds of the gods, and spoke to the gods saying: "I teach that living beings are like an illusion, like a dream;[191]   the fruition of a srotāpanna is also like an illusion, like a dream; the fruition of a sakṛdāgāmin, the fruition of an anāgāmin, the fruition of an arhat, and the path of a pratyekabuddha, also like an illusion, like a dream."

The gods said: "O Subhūti!   You even state that the Buddha dharmas[192] are like an illusion, like a dream?!"

Subhūti said: "I teach that the Buddha dharmas are also like an illusion, like a dream.   I teach that even nirvāṇa is also like an illusion, like a dream."

The gods said: "O Virtuous[193] Subhūti!   You teach that even nirvāṇa is also like an illusion, like a dream?!"

Subhūti said: "O Gods!   If there were any other dharma that surpassed nirvāṇa,[194]   I would

---

[186]   = VAIDYA (1960: 20): "*sa nemāṃ kṣāntim anāgamya|*"

[187]   忍 (*rěn*) = VAIDYA (1960: 20): "*kṣāntim*" = "receptivity".   CONZE abbreviates this list of *phala* (1973: 98).

[188]   = VAIDYA (1960: 20): "*... kiṃrūpā asya āryasubhūter dhārmaśravaṇikā eṣṭavyāḥ?|*"

[189]   = VAIDYA (1960: 20): "*tathā hi te naiva śroṣyanti na ca sākṣātkariṣyanti|*"

[190]   = VAIDYA (1960: 20): "*kiṃ punar ārya subhūte māyopamās te sattvā na te māyā?|*"

[191]   CONZE (1973: 98): "all objective facts", a fair enough addition.

[192]   Skt, not "*buddhadharmāḥ*", but "*samyaksaṃbuddhatva*" (VAIDYA 1960: 20).

[193]   This honorific address, most like "*āyusman*" or "*bhante*", etc. only appears translated twice in the *Xiaŏpĭn*, here, and at Chp. 2:6.

[194]   = VAIDYA (1960: 20): "*nirvāṇād apy anyaḥ kaściddharmo viśiṣṭataraḥ syāt*".

teach that it, too, is also like an illusion, like a dream.   O Gods!   Illusions and dreams, and nirvāṇa, are not two, are not divided."[195]

Thereupon, Śāriputra, Pūrṇa the son of Maitrāyaṇī, Mahākauṣṭhila and Mahākātyāyana,[196] asked Subhūti: "Teaching the meaning of Prajñāpāramitā in this way, who will be able to take it up?"[197]

Then, Ānanda said: "Teaching the meaning of Prajñāpāramitā in this way, avinivartin[198] bodhisattvas, those who possess right views, and arhats who have fulfilled their aim;[199] [people] such as these will be able to take it up."

Subhūti said: "Teaching the meaning of Prajñāpāramitā in this way, none will be able to take it up.   For what reason?   Within this dharma of Prajñāpāramitā, there is no dharma that is effable, no dharma that is showable,[200] and by this principle, none will be able to take it up."[201]

{= Conze 2:4 Śakra's Flowers}

Thereupon, Śakra, Lord of the Gods, conceived this thought: "The Elder Subhūti rains forth the dharma rain.   It would be good if I were to create flowers to scatter upon Subhūti." Śakra, Lord of the Gods, thereupon created flowers and scattered them upon Subhūti.

Subhūti conceived this thought: "These flowers now scattered by Śakra, Lord of the Gods, I have never seen before in the Tuṣita heaven.   These flowers have been generated from a wishing tree,[202] and have not been generated from a [common] tree."

---

[195]   Skt (Vaidya 1960: 20) breaks in two: illusions and *nirvāṇa*; dreams and *nirvāṇa*.

[196]   Skt Vaidya (1960: 20): "*Āyuṣmān Mahākāśyapaḥ ... bodhisattvasahasra*"; = Conze (1973: 99).   But, *Chaō*, fasc. 1 《摩訶般若鈔經》卷 1〈2 問品〉:「舍利弗。分漫陀尼弗。摩訶拘絺羅。摩訶迦栴延等。共問須菩提。」 (CBETA, T08, no. 226, p. 512, c10-11), featuring the disciples "Śāriputra, Pūrṇa Maitrāyanīputra, Mahā-kauṣṭhila, Mahākatyāyana, etc.".   Thus Mahākāśyapa and the *bodhisattva*s may be a late comers to the scene in the latter recensions.

[197]   = Vaidya (1960: 20): "*evaṃ nirdiśyamānāyāḥ pratyeṣakā bhaviṣyanti?*"

[198]   Kumārajīva's transliteration "阿毘跋致" for "*avinivartin*" means "non-regressible" or "irreversible".

[199]   *Xiaŏpĭn* has three types: 1. *avinivartin* bodhisattvas; 2. those possessing right view; 3. perfected *arhat*s. Note that the *Ratnaguṇasaṃcayagāthā* 2:6 adds a fourth, i.e. those matured by a good friend (Yuyama 1976: 18f):   "*catvāri pudgala ime iha nā trasanti jinaputra satyakuśalo avivartiyaś ca| arhan vidhūtamalakleśa prahīṇa-kāṅkṣo kalyāṇamitraparivārita yaś caturthaḥ||6||*".   Other recensions have slight variants.

[200]   Skt has three = Vaidya (1960: 21): "*sūcyate*", "*paridīpyate*", and "*prajñapyate*".

[201]   = Vaidya (1960: 21): "*... tathaivāsyāḥ prajñāpāramitāyā evaṃ nirdiśyamānāyā na kaścit pratyeṣako bhaviṣyati||*"

[202]   = Vaidya (1960: 21): "*na hi manonirjātāni kānicitpuṣpāṇi, nāpi vṛkṣagulmalatānirjātāni|*", Similar in the *Pañca-viṃśati*.   The *Xiaŏpĭn* here has "心樹" (*xīn shù*), the *Móhē* has "意樹" (*yì shù*) (note how Taishō changes the reading for the next two appearances of the term in the next paragraphs), but the Skt does not seem to have the equivalent which we would usually back-translate as "*cittavṛkṣa*" or "*manovṛkṣa*".   However, to explain our choice of translation terminology, we reference the explanation of the *Upadeśa*, fasc. 55 《大

Śakra, Lord of the Gods, knew the thought conceived in Subhūti's **<541a>** mind, and spoke to Subhūti saying: "These flowers have not been generated at all, these flowers have not even been generated from a wishing tree."

Subhūti spoke to Śakra, Lord of the Gods, saying: "O Kauśika!   You say: 'These flowers have not been generated at all, these flowers have not even been generated from a wishing tree.'   If a dharma has not been generated, then that is not known as a flower."[203]

{= CONZE 2:5 Training in Perfect Wisdom}

Śakra, Lord of the Gods, conceived the thought: "The knowledge of the Elder Subhūti is most profound, without destroying the nominal designation he yet teaches the actual meaning."[204]

After so thinking, he spoke to Subhūti saying: "So it is!   So it is!   O Subhūti!   In the way in which Subhūti has taught, the bodhisattvas should train in that way.   [205]Bodhisattvas who train in that way do not train in the fruition of a srotāpanna, in the fruition of a sakṛdāgāmin, in the fruition of an anāgāmin, in the fruition of an arhat, or in the path of a pratyekabuddha.   If they do not train in these grounds, this is known as training in the Buddha dharmas, training in sarvajñā.   If one trains in the Buddha dharmas, trains in sarvajñā, they will then train in immeasurable and boundless Buddha dharmas.   If they train in immeasurable and boundless Buddha dharmas, they will not train for the sake of the increase or decrease of form, will not train for the sake of the increase or decrease of sensations, perceptions, volitions or cognitions;[206]   they will not train for the sake of seizing

---

智度論》卷 55〈29 散華品〉：「「意樹」者，諸天隨意所念則得。以要言之，天樹隨意所欲，應念則至，故言「意樹」。」(CBETA, T25, no. 1509, p. 451, c20-22); = "'Wishing tree': The gods obtain whatever they wish in accordance with their thoughts.   In brief, the trees of the heavens, in accordance with the wishes in the mind, respond to those thoughts and they arrive.   Therefore it is said, 'wishing tree'."   The Sanskrit for this is either "_kalpataru_", or "_kalpadruma_", according to MWD: "one of the five trees (cf. _pañcavṛkṣa_) of Svarga or Indra's paradise fabled to fulfil all desires (cf. _saṃkalpaviṣaya_)."   Although this passage here in the _Pañcaviṃśati_ is largely the same as the _Aṣṭa_, earlier it makes mention of "_... avasakta-paṭṭadāmakalāpaḥ kalpavṛkṣair nānālaṅkāraphalāvanatāgraviṭapaiḥ puṣpavṛkṣaiḥ phalavṛkṣair gandhavṛkṣair mālyavṛkṣaiś copaśobhito 'bhūt ..._", and so is thus aware of this notion.   It seems that "_kalpavṛkṣa_" is the original idea, somehow morphed to merely "_vṛkṣa_", and then "wishing tree" an appropriate translation.   Needless to say, this makes the passages far more comprehensible than say that of CONZE (1973: 99): "these flowers ... are mind-made".

[203]   = VAIDYA (1960: 21): "_... yatkauśika anirjātaṃ na tatpuṣpam|_"

[204]   = VAIDYA (1960: 21): "_gambhīraprajño batāyam āryaḥ subhūtiḥ| tāṃ ca nāma padaprajñaptiṃ nirdiśati, tāṃ ca na virodhayati, tāṃ cottānīkaroti, tām eva copadiśati|_"

[205]   Skt (VAIDYA 1960: 21) and CONZE attributes the following to Subhūti himself (1973: 100).

[206]   增 = _vivṛddhaya_; 減 = _parihāṇāya_ (VAIDYA 1960: 21).   Perhaps these are originally botanical terms, vis-à-vis the "tree", e.g. "growing" and being "cut down", used metaphorically.

form, will not train for the sake of seizing sensations, perceptions, volitions or cognitions.[207] These people will train by way of neither seizing nor destroying dharmas."[208]

Śāriputra[209] said to Subhūti: "Does the practitioner train by way of neither seizing sarvajñā, nor by destroying sarvajñā?"

Subhūti said: "So it is! So it is! O Śāriputra! Bodhisattvas train by way of neither seizing nor destroying [any dharma], up to sarvajñā. When investigating in this way, they are able to train in sarvajñā, are able to accomplish sarvajñā."[210]

Thereupon, Śakra, Lord of the Gods, spoke to Śāriputra, saying: "Where should the bodhisattva mahāsattvas seek for Prajñāpāramitā?"[211]

Śāriputra said: "The Prajñāpāramitā should be sought within that put into motion[212] by Subhūti."

Śakra, Lord of the Gods, said to Subhūti: "Whose spiritual power is this?"[213]

Subhūti said: "This is the Buddha's spiritual power.[214] O Kauśika! You ask: 'Where should one seek for Prajñāpāramitā?' Prajñāpāramitā should not be sought within form, should not be sought within sensations, perceptions, volitions or cognitions; it should also not be sought apart from form, should not be sought apart from sensations, perceptions, volitions or cognition. For what reason? Prajñāpāramitā is not form, and Prajñāpāramitā is not apart from form; Prajñāpāramitā is not sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition, and Prajñāpāramitā is not apart from sensation, perception, volitions, and cognition."[215]

---

[207] 受 = *parigrahāya śikṣate*.   Skt adds = "*na utsargāya*" (Vaidya 1960: 21).

[208] = Vaidya (1960: 22): "*na parigrahāya ... na utpādāya, na antardhānāya|*"   Skt and Conze (1973: 100) add viz *sarvajñā*, as per Śakra's and Śāriputra's subsequent statements.

[209] Skt attributes this statement to Śakra (Vaidya 1960: 22).

[210] Apart from "So it is!", the rest of *Xiǎopǐn* is absent in Skt.

[211] = Vaidya (1960: 22): "*prajñāpāramitā ... kuto gaveṣitavyāḥ?|*"

[212] = Vaidya (1960: 22): "*... subhūteḥ parivartād gaveṣitavyā|*"   The use of "*pari√vṛt*", used for "turning" the wheel of Dharma, refers to a teaching.   It may implicitly give the impression of Subhūti as a Buddha (or Cakravartin king), i.e. a *bodhisattva*.   Refer later in the text, at Chp. 9:3, for the *Prajñāpāramitā* as the "second turning of the wheel of *Dharma*".

[213] = Vaidya (1960: 22): "*kasyaiṣa ... anubhāvo veditavyaḥ?|*"   Skt adds "*adhiṣṭhāna*" too.

[214] = Vaidya (1960: 22): "*tathāgatasyaiṣa ... anubhāvo veditavyaḥ|*".   Skt has Śāriputra say this first, then repeated by Subhūti.

[215] = Vaidya (1960: 22): "*na rūpād gaveṣitavyā na api anyatra rūpād gaveṣitavyā ...|*"   離 = "*anyatra*".   The Skt indicates that rather than just "*prajñāpāramitā* is not form", etc., it is "*prajñāpāramitā* is not to be sought from form", etc.

{= Conze 2:6 The Infinitude of Perfect Wisdom}

Śakra, Lord of the Gods, said: "A mahā-pāramitā is this Prajñāpāramitā! An immeasurable pāramitā is this Prajñāpāramitā! A boundless pāramitā is this Prajñāpāramitā!"[216]

Subhūti said: "So it is! So it is! O Kauśika! A mahā-pāramitā is this Prajñāpāramitā! An immeasurable pāramitā is this Prajñāpāramitā! A boundless **<541b>** pāramitā is this Prajñāpāramitā! O Kauśika! [217]From the immeasurability of form is Prajñāpāramitā immeasurable; from the immeasurability of sensations, perceptions, volitions and cognitions is Prajñāpāramitā immeasurable. From the boundlessness of the object,[218] is Prajñāpāramitā boundless; from the boundlessness of living beings is Prajñāpāramitā boundless. O Kauśika! How is it that 'From the boundlessness of the object, is Prajñāpāramitā boundless'? All dharmas are without beginning, without middle, and without end.[219] Therefore, '[From] the boundless nature of the object, is Prajñāpāramitā boundless'. Moreover, O Kauśika, all dharmas are boundless, their past limit is non-apprehendable, their present limit is non-apprehendable, and their future limit is non-apprehendable. Therefore, '[From] the boundlessness of the object is Prajñāpāramitā boundless'."

Śakra, Lord of the Gods, said: "O Elder Subhūti! How is it that 'From the boundlessness of living beings, Prajñāpāramitā is boundless'?"

[Subhūti said:] "O Kauśika! Living beings are immeasurable, the count of their number is non-apprehendable. Therefore, '[From] the boundlessness of living beings, Prajñāpāramitā is boundless'."[220]

Śakra, Lord of the Gods, said: "O Virtuous[221] Subhūti! What is the meaning of a 'living being'?"[222]

Subhūti said: "The meaning of a 'living being', is just the meaning of a 'dharma'. What do you think: 'Living being', 'living being', it is said, what is the meaning of that?"[223]

---

[216]   = Vaidya (1960: 22-23): "*mahā°, apramāṇa°, aparimāṇa°, anantapāramitā*".

[217]   Skt first adds vis-à-vis "greatness", i.e. "*mahā-*", as the subsequent pattern (Vaidya 1960: 23).

[218]   所緣 (*suǒyűan*) = "*ārambaṇa*" (Vaidya 1960: 23); not to be confused with a "condition" (*pratyaya*; 緣 *yűan*).

[219]   = Vaidya (1960: 23): "*sarvadharmāṇāṃ hi ... yato nānto na madhyaṃ na paryavasānam upalabhyate|*"

[220]   These affirmative statements that "immeasurable" refers to the quantity of living beings in *Xiǎopǐn*, also *Daòxíng, Dàmíngdù(B)* and *Chāo*, is quite negated in the Skt (Vaidya 1960: 23), Xüánzàng's *Dàbānruò* 4 and 5, which state that this is *not* the reason why living beings are "immeasurable". The simple omission of the "*na*" would be sufficient to cause this change. Strangely, the *Móhē sūtra* does not have this response at all, nor do Xüánzàng's versions of the *Pañcaviṃśati, Dàbānruò* 2 and 3.

[221]   The second and last use of this honorific address, the first appearance being at Chp. 2:3.

[222]   = Vaidya (1960: 24): "*tatkaṃ manyase kauśika katamasyaitad dharmasyādhivacanaṃ yaduta sattvaḥ sattva iti?|*"

[223]   Here *Xiǎopǐn* 何義 = Vaidya (1960: 24): "*katamasyaitad dharmasyādhivacanaṃ yaduta sattvaḥ sattva iti?|*" Thus, neither "meaning" nor "entity" seem appropriate, contra "*artha*" as 義.

Śakra, Lord of the Gods, said: "By 'living being', not any dharma is meant, nor any non-dharma is meant.   There is only a nominal designation, and this name is without foundation, without basis, with the forced establishment of a name, known as a 'living being'."[224]

Subhūti said: "What do you think: Within this, is there any real living being that is effable, is showable?"

[Śakra, Lord of the Gods, said:]   "Indeed not!   O Subhūti!"

Subhūti said: "O Kauśika!   If a living being is ineffable, is unshowable, how can one state that '[From] the boundlessness of living beings, Prajñāpāramitā is boundless'?   O Kauśika! If the Tathāgata were to abide and live for as many kalpas as sands of the Gaṇges, exclaiming 'Living being!', 'Living being!', would any really existent living being[225] be generated or cease?"

Śakra, Lord of the Gods, said: "Indeed not!   For what reason?   Because a living being is right from the very beginning constantly pure."[226]

[Subhūti said:]   "O Kauśika!   Therefore, one should know that '[From] the boundlessness of living beings, Prajñāpāramitā is boundless'."[227]

[End of] Xiaŏpĭn Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra, Fascicle 1

<541c>

---

[224]   = VAIDYA (1960: 24): "āgantukam etan nāmadheyaṃ prakṣiptam| avastukam ...| anātamīyam ...| anārambaṇam ... yaduta sattvaḥ sattva iti|".

[225]   The Skt (VAIDYA 1960: 24) is simply "sattva", without equivalent of "實有".   But before one criticizes the Xiaŏpĭn, note that XŪANZÀNG's Dàbānruò 4 has a similar term, fasc. 539 《大般若波羅蜜多經(第 401 卷-第 600 卷)》卷 539〈2 帝釋品〉:「此中頗有真實有情有生滅不？」(CBETA, T07, no. 220, p. 772, b10).

[226]   = VAIDYA (1960: 24): "ādiśuddhatvāt ādipariśuddhatvāt sattvasya|"   Note XŪANZÀNG's Dàbānruò 2 《大般若波羅蜜多經(第 401 卷-第 600 卷)》卷 427〈27 散花品〉:「以諸有情本性淨故，彼從本來無所有故。」(CBETA, T07, no. 220, p. 145, b29-c1), likewise Dàbānruò 3; and also further expanded in Dàbānruò 4 《大般若波羅蜜多經(第 401 卷-第 600 卷)》卷 539〈2 帝釋品〉:「以諸有情本性淨故。彼從本來無所有故，非無所有可有生滅。」」(CBETA, T07, no. 220, p. 772, b11-12).   XŪANZÀNG's Dàbānruò 5 is as per the Xiaŏpĭn and Sanskrit, up to this point, but see below.

[227]   XŪANZÀNG's Dàbānruò 5 then adds 《大般若波羅蜜多經(第 401 卷-第 600 卷)》卷 556〈2 天帝品〉:「無性甚深，俱無邊故。」(CBETA, T07, no. 220, p. 872, a13).

Xiaǒpǐn Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra

Fascicle 2

Translated by Kuchan Tripiṭakācārya Kumārajīva of the Late Qín

Chapter Three—The Stūpa[228]

(The [Qì]dān Canon states: "Chapter on the Jeweled Stūpa"[229])

{= Conze 2:7 Confirmation}

Thereupon, Śakra, Lord of the Gods, the kings of the brahmās, the sovereign god kings,[230] the lords of living beings, the gods and so forth, were all overjoyed, and exclaimed thrice in unison: "Excellent! Excellent! Due to the Buddha coming forth into the world, Subhūti is therefore able to demonstrate and teach this dharma."[231]

Thereupon, the assembly of gods all addressed the Buddha, saying: "O Blessed One! If bodhisattvas are able to practice without being separated from Prajñāpāramitā, one should see these people as like unto Buddhas."[232]

The Buddha replied to the gods: "So it is! So it is! In the distant past, [when] I was at the city of Dīpavatī, the abode of the Buddha Dīpaṃkara, I practiced without being separated from Prajñāpāramitā. At that time, the Buddha Dīpaṃkara predicted[233] that I, in the future, after asaṃkhya kalpas, would become a Buddha, by name of 'Śākyamuni', a Tathāgata, Worthy of Offerings, Completely Realized One, Endowed with Wisdom and Deeds, Well Gone, Comprehender of the World, Unexcelled Man, Skilful Charioteer, Teacher of Gods and Men, Buddha, Blessed One!"[234]

The gods addressed the Buddha, saying: "It is amazing indeed, O Blessed One, that the Prajñāpāramitā of the bodhisattva mahāsattvas is able to include and take up sarvajñā."[235]

---

[228]   No chapter break here in Skt.

[229]   Taishō "Dānběn 丹本" refer to the Qìdān Canon (契丹藏).

[230]   = Vaidya, (1960: 24): "*prajāpatikāḥ*"; = *Xiaǒpǐn* 自在王.

[231]   Skt (Vaidya, 1960: 24) and Conze (1973: 102) have it that Subhūti declares how the Buddha appears in the world.

[232]   = Conze (1973: 102): "As a potential Tathāgata we will henceforth regard that *bodhisattva ... dwells ...*".

[233]   = Vaidya, (1960: 24): "*vyākṛto*".

[234]   = Vaidya, (1960: 24): "*tathāgata, arhan, samyaksaṃbuddha, vidyācaraṇasaṃpanna, sugata, lokavid, anuttara puruṣa, damyasārathi, śāstādevānāṃ ca manuṣyānāṃ, ca buddha, bhagavān|*".

[235]   = Vaidya, (1960: 24): "*āścaryaṃ ... sarvajñatāyā āhārikā anuparigrāhikā ceti*". Other versions imply that by practicing *Prajñāpāramitā* one may "reach sarvajñā", e.g. at *Daòxíng*, fasc. 2 《道行般若經》卷 2:「行般若

波羅蜜自致到薩芸若。」(CBETA, T08, no. 224, p. 431, a11-13); *Dàmíngdù(B)*, fasc. 2 《大明度經》卷 2:「有持大明者，為受一切智矣。」」(CBETA, T08, no. 225, p. 483, c3-4); *Móhē*, fasc. 2 　《摩訶般若鈔經》卷 2:「行般若波羅蜜自致行到薩芸若。」(CBETA, T08, no. 226, p. 513, c1-2).

ABBREVIATIONS

Chāo   *Bānruò Chāo Jīng* (般若鈔經)*.*

Dàbānruò 1   *Dàbānruòbōluómìduō Jīng* (大般若波羅蜜多經), Assembly 1.

Dàbānruò 2   *Dàbānruòbōluómìduō Jīng* (大般若波羅蜜多經), Assembly 2.

Dàbānruò 3   *Dàbānruòbōluómìduō Jīng* (大般若波羅蜜多經), Assembly 3.

Dàbānruò 4   *Dàbānruòbōluómìduō Jīng* (大般若波羅蜜多經), Assembly 4.

Dàbānruò 5   *Dàbānruòbōluómìduō Jīng* (大般若波羅蜜多經), Assembly 5.

Dàoxíng   *Dàoxíng Bānruòbōluómì Jīng* (道行般若波羅蜜經)*.*

Dàmíngdù(A)   *Dàmíngdù Jīng* (大明度經), Chp. 1.

Dàmíngdù(B)   *Dàmíngdù Jīng* (大明度經), Chp. 2-30.

Xiaŏpĭn   *Xiaŏpĭn Bānruòbōluómì Jīng* (小品般若波羅蜜經)*.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

BODHI, B, trans. 2000. *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Samyutta Nikāya.* Wisdom: Boston.

CONZE, Edward. 1973. *The Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines & Its Verse Summary,* Satguru: Delhi.

DĀNAPĀLA, trans. 1004. *Fómŭ Chūshēng Sānfǎzàng Bānruòbōluómìduō Jīng* (佛母出生三法藏般若波羅蜜多經), (**Buddhamātājāna-tridharmapiṭaka*) *Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra,* T228. CBETA (2014 ed.).

GAUTAMA SAṄGHADEVA, trans. 398. *Zhōng Āhán Jīng* (中阿含經), *Madhyamāgama(sutra),* T26. CBETA (2014 ed.).

KĀNG Sēnghùi, trans. 223-229. *Dàmíngdù Jīng(A)* (大明度經), *Mahāprajñāpāramitā Sūtra,* T225. CBETA (2014 ed.).

KIMURA Takayasu 木村高尉, ed. 1986. *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā,* Vols. I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII & VIII. Sankibo Busshorin: Tokyo.

KUMĀRAJĪVA, trans. 404. *Móhē Bānruòbōluómì Jīng* (摩訶般若波羅蜜經), *Mahāprajñāpāramitā Sūtra,* T223. CBETA (2014 ed.).

KUMĀRAJĪVA, trans. 406. *Dàzhìdù Lùn* (大智度論), *Mahāprajñāpāramitā Upadeśa,* T1509. CBETA

(2014 ed.).

KUMĀRAJĪVA, trans. 408. *Xiǎopǐn Bānruòbōluómì Jīng* (小品般若波羅蜜經), *Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra*, T227. CBETA (2014 ed.).

MITRA, R, ed. 1888. *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā.* Bibliotheca Indica: Calcutta.

ÑĀṆAMOLI, B & BODHI, B, trans. 1995. *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Majjhima Nikāya.* Wisdom: Boston.

TRENCKNER, V, & CHALMERS, R, trans. 1888. *The Majjhima Nikāya (3 vols).* Pali Text Society: London.

VAIDYA, P L, ed. 1960. "*Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā*" in *Buddhist Sanskrit Texts*, No. 4, The Mithila Institute: Darbhanga.

WALSHE, M O C, trans. 1987. *The Long Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Dīgha Nikāya.* Wisdom: Boston.

WOGIHARA, U, ed. 1932. *Abhisamayālaṃkār'ālokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā: (Commentary on Aṣṭasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā).* Toyo Bunko: Tokyo.

XŪÁNZÀNG, trans. 659-663. *Dà Bānruòbōluómì Jīng*, Assembly 2 (大般若波羅蜜多經 二會), *Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra*, T220(4). CBETA (2014 ed.).

XŪÁNZÀNG, trans. 659-663. *Dà Bānruòbōluómì Jīng*, Assembly 3 (大般若波羅蜜多經 三會), *Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra*, T220(4). CBETA (2014 ed.).

XŪÁNZÀNG, trans. 659-663. *Dà Bānruòbōluómì Jīng*, Assembly 4 (大般若波羅蜜多經 四會), *Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra*, T220(4). CBETA (2014 ed.).

XŪÁNZÀNG, trans. 659-663. *Dà Bānruòbōluómì Jīng*, Assembly 5 (大般若波羅蜜多經 五會), *Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra*, T220(5). CBETA (2014 ed.).

YUYAMA, Akira, ed. 1976. *Prajñāpāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā (Sanskrit Recension A).* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

ZHĪ Lóujīachèn, trans. 179. *Daòxíng Bānruòbōluómì Jīng* (道行般若波羅蜜經), *Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra*, T224. CBETA (2014 ed.).

ZHĪ Qiān, trans. 223-229. *Dàmíngdù Jīng* (大明度經), *Mahāprajñāpāramitā Sūtra*, T225. CBETA (2014 ed.).

ZHÚ Fǎhù, trans. 386. *Bānruòbōluómì Chāojīng* (般若鈔經), *Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra*, T226. CBETA (2014 ed.).

SECONDARY SOURCES

CONZE, Edward. 1967. *Thirty Years of Buddhist Studies*, Munshiram Manoharlal: New Delhi.

CONZE, Edward. 2013. *Buddhist thought in India: Three phases of Buddhist philosophy* (Vol. 4). Routledge.   Originally published, 1962.

CONZE, Edward. 1978. *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature*, Munshiram Manoharlal: New Dehli.

DAVIDS, T W R, & STEDE, W. 1997. *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary.* Accessed Feb. 2007   http://dsal.uchicago.edu/dictionaries/pali/index.html. Originally pub-

lished, Pali Text Society: Chipstead, 1921-1925.

FALK, H, & KARASHIMA, S. 2013. "A First-century Prajñāpāramitā Manuscript from Gandhāra—parivarta 5." *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology*, 16: 97-169.

HIKATA Ryūshō 干潟龍祥. 1958. *Suvikrāntavikrāmi-paripṛcchā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra: Edited with An Introductory Essay*, Kyushu University: Fukuoka.

KAJIYOSHI Kōun 梶芳光運. 1980. *Daijō Bukkyō no seiritsu-shi teki kenkyū: Genshi Hannyakyō no kenkyū* 大乗仏教の成立史的研究：原始般若経の研究 (*Studies in the Historical Development of Mahāyāna Buddhism: Studies in the Original Prajñā Sūtras.*) Sankibō Busshorin: Kyoto.   Originally published, 1944.

KARASHIMA, Seishi. 2010. *A Glossary of Lokakṣema's Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā.* Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XI. The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University: Tokyo.

KARASHIMA, Seishi. 2011. *A Critical Edition of Lokakṣema's Translation of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā.* Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XII. The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University: Tokyo.

KARASHIMA, S. 2013. "Was the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Compiled in Gandhāra in Gāndhārī?" *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology*, *16*: 171-18.

LAMOTTE, Étienne. 1970. *Le Traite de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse, de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra). Tome III. Chapitres XXXI-XLII.* Université de Louvain: Institut Orientaliste Louvain-la-Neuve.

LANCASTER, Lewis. 1968. *An Analysis of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, University of Wisconsin, unpublished dissertation, UMI.

LANCASTER, Lewis, ed. 1977. *Prajñāpāramitā and Related Systems*, Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series: Berkeley.

LANCASTER, Lewis & PARK, Sung-bae, 2004. *The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue.* Accessed Feb. 2007 http://www.acmuller.net/descriptive_catalogue/.

MÄLL, Linnart. 2003. *Studies in the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā and Other Essays.* Motilal Banarsidass: New Delhi.

MONIER-WILLIAMS, M, LEUMANN, E, & CAPPELLER, C, ed. 2002. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged With Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages.* Accessed Feb. 2007 http://webapps.uni-koeln.de/tamil/. Originally published, Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1899.

NATTIER, Jan. 1992. "The Heart Sūtra: A Chinese Apocryphal Text?", *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 15(2): 153-223.

NATTIER, Jan. 2010. "Who produced the Da mingdu jing 大明度經 (T225)? A reassessment of the evidence." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 31.1-2: 295-337.

NEWMARK, Peter. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation.* Vol. 1. New York: Prentice Hall.

ORSBORN, M B = SHÌ Huìfēng. 2012. *Chiasmus in the early Prajñāpāramitā: literary parallelism connecting criticism & hermeneutics in an early Mahāyāna sūtra.* Doctoral dissertation, The University of Hong Kong: Pokfulam, Hong Kong.

ROBINSON, R H. 1976. *Early Madhyamika in India and China.* University of Wisconsin Press: Madison.

SCHMITHAUSEN, Lambert. 1977. "Textgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zum 1. Kapitel der *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*", *Prajñāpāramitā and Related Systems*, LANCASTER, L, ed., 35-82. Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series.

SHÌ Huìfēng = ORSBORN, M B. 2012.

SHÌ Huìfēng. 2016. "Is 'Illusion' A *Prajñāpāramitā* Creation? The Birth and Death of a Buddhist Cognitive Metaphor", *Journal of Buddhist Philosophy*, 1.2: 214-262.

YÌNSHÙN 印順. 1980. *Chūqí Dàshèngfójiào zhī Qǐyuán yǔ Kāizhǎn* 初期大乘佛教之起源與開展 (*The Origins and Development of Early Mahāyāna Buddhism*), Zhèngwén: Xīnzhú.

YÌNSHÙN 印順. 1993. ZHAÒHUÌ 昭慧, ed. *Dàzhìdùlùn zhī Zuòzhě jí Qí Fānyì* 大智度論之作者及其翻譯 (*The Author and Translation of the Mahāprajñāpāramitā Upadeśa*), Dōngzōng: Taibei.