

ART. XVI.—*Tales of the Wise Man and the Fool, in Tibetan and Chinese.* By J. TAKAKUSU, M.A., M.R.A.S.

THE book I have chosen for my present paper is a sort of Jātaka or Avadāna entitled the “Hien-yü-Ching,” which Mr. Nanjio has restored into Sanskrit as “Damamūka-sūtra” (賢愚經), or “Tales of the Wise Man and the Fool.” It will at once remind one of the Tibetan work “mDsañs-blun” (generally called Dsan-lun), that is, “Der Weise und der Thor,” published by I. J. Schmidt,¹ and afterwards by Schiefner, for this is a popular work and is read by almost every student of Tibetan. The Chinese version was by Hui-hsio (慧覺), Wei-teh (威德), and others, written during their stay in Karakhodjo,² A.D. 445 (宋元嘉二十二年). There are, however, two texts both assigned to the same translators, one coming down through the Korean Buddhists and the other through the Chinese. It is said in the earliest catalogue in existence (A.D. 520) that the original text was obtained by the translators in Khoten (Kustana, 于闐) and translated by them in the Temple Tien-an-shi, Karakhodjo (高昌天安寺). As to the Tibetan text we were first informed of its existence by Csoma de Cörosi in the “Asiatic Researches,” vol. xx, 1836, and seven years later we were furnished with the text by the Russian savants mentioned above.

We possess at present four texts of the Sūtra as follows:—

	TIBETAN.		MONGOLIAN.		CHINESE.		KOREAN (in Chinese).
Number of fasciuli ...	12	...	12	...	13	...	13
Number of chapters ...	51	...	52	...	69	...	62
Date of translation ...	After 632 A.D.		After 1269 A.D.		445 A.D.		445 A.D.

¹ St. Petersburg, 1843.

² Later the capital of Uigur; the district of Kao-chang in China corresponding to Karakhodjo of Persians.

Though there seems from the above to have been four different *originals*, it may have not been so in reality, and the difference in the existing texts may be due to omission of some stories according to the will of the translators. The Tibetan is the shortest of all, and the 51 chapters which it contains are found in the three other texts, agreeing with one another very closely, and we have reason to consider it to be the latest work. The oldest is, of course, the Chinese, which contains the greatest number of chapters, and was translated nearly two centuries earlier than the introduction of Buddhism into Tibet in A.D. 632. The Korean text seems to have omitted some seven chapters, and the Mongolian left out some seventeen, while the Tibetan curtailed the most, omitting eighteen altogether. We have still another text in Kalmukish, which is mentioned by Mr. Schmidt.¹

Now let us compare the contents of the texts, Tibetan and Chinese, to which our research is specially directed.²

I.

Chap.	CHINESE.	KOREAN.	TIBETAN.
1.	Several parables. ³ (The last, S'ibi-jātaka; Pāli, 499; Cariya-piṭaka, 1, 8; Skt. Jātaka-mālā, ii.)	1.	1. Darstellung mancherlei Beispiele. ³
2.	Mahā-sattva feeding a tigress with his body. (Jātaka-mālā, i; cf. Avadāna-kalpa-latā, ii.)	2.	2. Semcan C'empo macht mit seinem Körper einer Tigerin eine Gabe.
3.	Two Brāhmaṇas receiving precepts.	3.	3. Von dem Kuntuju, welcher sein übernommenes Pflichtgelübde erfüllte.
4.	A poor man of Benares making offerings to Buddha.	4.	4. Von dem Opferdarbringer nach dem Verkauf seines Körpers.
5.	The sea-god questioning a sailor.	5.	5. Von den Fragen der Gottheit des Meeres.
6.	A Deva-putra 'Han-ka-ta' (Gaṅgādhara).	6.	6. Von dem Göttersohne Gaṅgā-dara.
7.	Prince 'Su-ja-ti' (Sujāti).	7.	deest. (7. MONGOLIAN: Vom Prinzen Susati.)

¹ Dsan-lun, p. xvii.

² The Korean is practically the same as the Chinese, except those chapters omitted in it. The Mongolian agrees mostly with the Tibetan, except that it has an extra chapter, i.e. chap. 7. See Dsan-lun, p. xvii.

³ I omit Chinese and Tibetan originals here for brevity's sake.

II.

Chap.	CHINESE.	KOREAN.	TIBETAN.
8.	Princess Diamond, the daughter of King 'Pa-shi-noh' (Prasenajit).	8.	7. Von der Dorje genannten Tochter des König Saljal.
9.	A child called 'Gold-treasure.'	9.	8. Von Serjig (dem Goldreichen).
10.	A child called 'Flower-heaven' (Puṣpa-deva).	10.	9. Von Hlai-metog (der Götterblume).
11.	A child called 'Jewel-heaven' (Ratna-deva).	11.	10. Von Hlai-rinc'en (dem Götterkleinode).
12.	Rṣi Shan-ti-pa-li (Kṣantivādī). (Pāli Khanti-vādi-Jātaka, 313; Jātaka-mālā, xxviii.)	12.	11. Vom Duldenden.
13.	King Maitrī-bala giving his blood away. (Jātaka-mālā, viii; cf. Avadāna-kalpa-latā, 91.)	13.	12. Von der Gabenspendung des Königs Jampai-tob.
14.	The submission of six heretics.	14.	13. Von der Demüthigung der sechs Irrlehrer.

III.

15.	'Ko-da' offering his body.	15.	14. Von dem Tiere Kunta u. dessen darbringung des eigenen Körpers.
16.	The conversion of King 'Great-light.'		<i>deest. deest.</i>
17.	An Upāsikā 'Ma-ha-shi-na' (Mahā-senā).	16.	<i>deest.</i>

IV.

18.	The merit of entering the priesthood and the householder 'Shi-li-pi-ti' (Śrī-vṛddhi).	22.	15. Das Lob des Eintritts in den geistlichen stand u. dessen verdienst.
19.	The suicide of a novice on account of precepts.	23.	16. Vom Getsül, welcher die übernommenen Pflichtgebote hielt.
20.	The householder who had no organ of sense.	24.	17. Von den Haus-eigenthümer ohne Sinnwerkzeuge.
21.	A poor man and his wife who obtained rewards by offering a cotton-cloth.	25.	18. Von dem Armen, welche ihre Bekleidung von Baumwollenzeug als Gabe darbrachte.
22.	An old woman who sold her poverty to 'Ka-shen-yen' (Kātyāyana).	26.	19. Von der Armen, welche Kātyāyana ihre Armuth verkaufte.

V.

Chap.	CHINESE.	KOREAN.	TIBETAN.
23.	A child called 'Gold-heaven' (Suvarṇa-deva).	27.	20. Von Serhla (goldene Gottheit).
24.	The child of two families.	28.	21. Von dem Sohne zweier Familien.
25.	The householder 'San-dan-nin' (Sandhāna).	29.	34. Von dem Hausbesitzer Dumjed.
26.	King 'Moonlight' (Candra-prabha) giving his head away. Cf. Divyāv., xxii.	30.	22. Von dem König Da-od u. dessen hingabe des eigenen Hauptes.

VI.

27.	King 'Pleasing-eyes' giving his eyes away.	<i>deest.</i>	35. Von dem Könige Migjed.
28.	500 blind children following Buddha.	<i>deest. deest.</i>	
29.	The child 'Pun-na-ci' (Pūrṇa-citta).	<i>deest. deest.</i>	
30.	A poor man 'Ni-ti' (Nithī?).	<i>deest. deest.</i>	

VII.

31.	A Mahā-kapṇiṇa.	31.	24. Von Kabyn C'empo.
32.	The nun Utpalā.	16.	25. Von der Nonne Utpalā.
33.	Seven sons of 'Li-ci-mi.'	32.	23. Von der sieben Söhnen des Kronsbeamten Ridag.
34.	King 'She - tu - la - ken - nin' (S'ārdūla-karṇa).	33.	26. Von Shudtolaggarni.
35.	King Aśoka offering earth to Buddha (in his former birth).	17.	27. Vom König Asoka. Cf. Aśoka-avadāna in Chinese.
36.	Offering seven jars of gold to Buddha.	18.	28. Von den goldenen Kannen.
37.	Rewards to 'Sha-ma' (Kṣamā).	19.	29. Von der Brahmanin Deva.

VIII.

38.	King Chattra-kārī.	34.	<i>deest.</i>
39.	King 'Great-gift.'	35.	30. Von der Seereise des Jimpa C'empo.

IX.

Chap.	CHINESE.	KOREAN.	TIBETAN.
40.	On the memory of Ānanda.	38.	<i>deest.</i>
41.	'Yu-pa-shi' (Upāsī?) killed by his brother.	39.	<i>deest.</i>
42.	The son murdering his father by mistake.	40.	<i>deest.</i>
43.	Sudāta building a Vihāra.	41.	<i>deest.</i>
44.	The conversion of King 'Great-light.'	42.	<i>deest.</i>
45.	The householder 'Lat-na-ja-ya' (Ratna-jaya).	43.	<i>deest.</i>
46.	On the 100 heads of the fish 'Ka-pi-li' (Kapila).	44.	<i>deest.</i>
47.	The Suddhāvāsa - devaputra offering a bath to Buddha.	36.	<i>deest.</i>

X.

48.	King Ma-ha-lin-nu (Mahā-reṇu).	<i>deest.</i>	31. Von dem König Melōndōn.
49.	The two brothers 'Good-seeking' and 'Evil-seeking.'	<i>deest.</i>	32. Von den beiden Brüdern Legts'ol u. Nyeits'ol.
50.	Prince Kalyāṇa-kāri and his sea voyage. (Pāli, Suppāraka-jātaka, 463; Jātaka - mālā, xiv; Supāraka.) ¹	57.	33. Von dem Königssohne Gedon.

XI.

51.	The Bhikṣu Aṅguli-mālā.	45.	36. Von Miduāwa Surpreñcan.
52.	The householder Daṇḍin.	46.	39. Von dem Hausbesitzer Jug-pacan.
53.	The poor girl Nandā.	20.	37. Von der Frau Nyenḡamo.

XII.

54.	Madhura-jita, son of Sithi.	47.	40. Vom Brahmanen Shintsir.
55.	The householder 'Da-mi-li.'	48.	41. Vom Hausbesitzer Danjila.
56.	The child protected by an elephant.	49.	42. Vom Laṅpocoñ.
57.	A man named 'Pa-pa-li.'	50.	<i>deest.</i>
58.	Two parrots understanding the four Noble Truths.	51.	<i>deest.</i>
59.	The bird which obtained the birth in heaven by hearing the law.	52.	<i>deest.</i>

¹ Pāli translated by Grünwedel in his "Buddhistische Studien," p. 79, and a Lepcha text and translation, pp. 119-126.

XIII.

Chap.	CHINESE.	KOREAN.	TIBETAN.
60.	500 swans which obtained the birth in heaven by hearing the law. (Pāli Culla-hamśa Jātaka, 533; Jātaka-mālā, xxii.)	53.	48. Von den 500 Ganssen, welche im Gotterreiche wieder geboren wurden.
61.	On a lion 'Ta-ka-la-pi.'	54.	49. Vom Löwen Yidam-tanpa.
62.	A Brāhmaṇa who offered a robe to Buddha.	55.	43. Von des Brahmanen darbringung eines Flicklappens.
63.	The first occasion on which Buddha showed his compassion.	56.	44. Von der ersten Veranlassung, bei welcher Buddha liebende Fürsorge erzeugte.
64.	King Muṇḍaka (or Mūrdha-ja).	57.	45. Vom König Ciwocei.
65.	Ten sons of the woman Sumanā.	58.	46. Von der Sumanā u. ihrer zehn Söhnen.
66.	The child 'Pa - shi - tsi' (Vasiṣṭha?).	59.	38. Vom Bashitsir.
67.	'Yu-pa-ki-ti' (Upagupta).	60.	47. Von Upagupta.
68.	A worm in the water.	61.	50. Von der Grundursache des Schicksals eines Wurmes.
69.	A Śramaṇera 'Kin-ti' (Kuntī?).	62.	51. Von Getsul Kyunte.

So much for the contents of the work. The right course would be to compare next the details of each chapter. I cannot do this here very well in a limited space, and let it suffice at present to refer to only a few points which are, according to my opinion, enough to convince us that the Tibetan has a close relation with the Chinese, and further to prove that the former is a translation of the latter.

1. The Tibetan translation agrees nearly word for word with the Chinese, so that one can easily trace the connection between the two. Of course there are some omissions or additions in both texts. Generally the paraphrased portions and the equivalents of names given in the Chinese texts are left out in the Tibetan. The disagreement must be due to an addition by a later hand on the part of the Chinese text. At any rate, that the Chinese text was not formerly as it is at present can be easily conceived, for it existed in manuscript during about 527

years, since it had been translated from Sanskrit A.D. 445 (printed for the first time A.D. 972). There are some apparent mistakes which are certainly due to the copyists' ignorance: e.g., 'Su-lo-pa' (修樓婆)¹ is a mistake for 'Su-pa-lo,' for the equivalent is given as 妙色, i.e. 'Excellent colour' (Suvarṇa); 'Mi-kiu-la-pa-la' (彌怯羅跋羅)² for 'Mi-tu-la-pa-la' (Mitra-bala or Maitrī-bala); 'Pa-lo-she-sha' (婆樓施舍) for 'Pa-lo-ka-sha' (Bharukaccha);³ 'Shi-la-pa-ta-ti' (尸羅跋陀提) for 'Shi-la-pa-da-la' (Śīla-bhadra).⁴

Except these mistakes by the copyists, the paraphrased portions, and some additional notes which have in course of time crept into the text, we have nothing against the hypothesis that the Tibetan is the translation of a Chinese version of the Sūtra, which was not much different from the existing text.

2. As to the number of chapters, the Chinese text contains the most; in fact, it has 18 chapters more than the Tibetan, 7 more than the Korean, and 17 more than the Mongolian version. Thus it has a right to be considered as the original, at least of one, if not of all.

3. In point of time, again, the Chinese, having been translated in 445 A.D., and leaving no doubt whatever as to the date, comes first and foremost; and as the Tibetan version must be posterior to the introduction of Buddhism into Tibet in 632 A.D., the Chinese must be at least 200 years older than the Tibetan.

4. The Chinese versions retain Sanskrit words more than the Tibetan. These, when translated into Tibetan, are mostly replaced by similar sounds in case of transcriptions, and by equivalents in case of translations.

¹ Chap. 7 (Tib.). To know the corresponding number of chapters in Chinese and Korean, refer to the list given above.

² Chap. 12 (Tib.).

³ Chap. 17 (Tib.).

⁴ Chap. 35 (Tib.).

Examples of the Chinese retaining more Sanskrit than the Tibetan:—

CHINESE.	SANSKRIT.	TIBETAN.	CHAPTER OF THE TIBETAN.
Pu-pa-ti-po ¹ ...	Puṣpa-deva ...	Hlai-metog ¹ ...	9
Lat-na-ti-po ...	Ratna-deva ...	Hlai-rinc'en ...	10
Mi-ka-la-pa-la ...	Maitrī-bala ...	Jampai-tob ...	12
Ta-la-hu-shi... ...	Taru-kubja ...	Sdoñ-dun (holzklotz) ...	13
Ti-po-tat ...	Deva-datta ...	Hlai-jin ...	13
Su-mi ...	Sumeru ...	Rirab hlumpo ...	13
Shi-li-pi-ti ...	S'ri-vṛddhi ...	Palcei ...	15
Tan-ma-pi-ti ...	Dharma-vṛddhi ...	C'oici p'agpa ...	15
Tan-nya-shi-ci ...	Dāna-sthī ...	Jinpa ...	17
Shi-la-shi-ci ...	S'tla-sthī ...	Ts'ult'in ...	17
Shuk-li ...	S'uklī ...	Karmo (der Weise) ...	18
Su-pa-na-pa-su ...	Suvarṇa-bhāsa ...	Serji-od ...	20
Pa-ta-ci-pa ...	Bhadra-jīva ...	Ts'owa-saṅpo ...	22
Shen-ta-pa-la-pi ...	Candra-prabha ...	Da-od ...	22
Tu-la-nan-ta ...	Cūla-nanda ...	Dug-demo ...	25
Ka-lan-na-ka-li ...	Kalyāṇa-kārī ...	Dgedon ...	33
Pa-pa-ka-li ...	Pāpa-kārī ...	Sdigdon ...	33
Wan-ku-ma-la ...	Aṅguli-māla ...	Sorprencun ...	36
A-li-mit-la ...	Ārya-mitra ...	P'agpai-sheinjen ...	37

5. The Chinese original used by the Tibetan translator seems to have been pretty corrupt, and contained some miswritten characters peculiar to Chinese: e.g.:—

Chap.	TIBETAN.	CHINESE.	SANSKRIT.
1.	Dangama.	曇摩鉗 Tan-ma-kan.	Dharma-kāma.
[There seems to have been a wrong reading in the Chinese.]			
2.	Vami-sūtra.	婆修密多羅 Pa-su-mi-ta-la.	Vasu-mitra.
[The order of Chinese characters seems to have been incorrect.]			
15.	Aseka.	陀塞鞞 ta-sa-ki.	Dāsaka (?).
[The Tibetan translator seems to have read 阿 A for 陀 ta.]			
15.	Lita.	獺利吃 La-li-ta.	Lalita (?).
[The Tibetan reads no 獺 la here.]			

¹ I omit Chinese and Tibetan characters. Moreover, I simplify the Tibetan spellings as much as I can.

Chap.	TIBETAN.	CHINESE.	SANSKRIT.
16.	Suvanata.	周利槃特 Cu-li-pan-tek.	S'uddhi-panthaka. ¹

[Perhaps 利 *li* was not in the original.]

6. Transcriptions by the Tibetan translator done without understanding the original Chinese: e.g. :—

Chap.	TIBETAN.	CHINESE.	SANSKRIT.
2.	C'in-rta (Great cart).	摩訶羅檀那 Ma-ha-la-tan-na.	Mahā-ratna.

[This has been taken to be Mahā-ratha (= great cart). As it stands it is due to a misunderstanding. But it is also possible that the Chinese text has since been altered into Ma-ha-la-tan-na. The Mongolian Üligerün Dalai, 42, and Altan Gerel, 426 (the corresponding Chinese text too), have Yeke Terge and Mahā-ratha, Ch. 大車 (= Great carriage).]

15, et passim.	Sar-p'ag (often used for 'householder' or 'lord').	薩薄 Sat-pak.	Sat-pati (?).
-------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------	----------------	---------------

[Sanskrit equivalent is not certain, perhaps Satpati, 'Good Lord.' Anyhow the Tibetan has simply transcribed the Chinese, or, if I am wrong, has the word Sar-p'ag any meaning as above?]

25.	Shudtolggarni.	設頭羅俯寧 She-tu-la-ken-nin.	S'utudru-karṇa (?).
-----	----------------	-----------------------------	---------------------

30.	Meloṅ-gdon (Mirror-face).	摩訶令奴 Ma-ha-lin-nu.	Mahā-reṇu.
-----	------------------------------	-----------------------	------------

[Here a fanciful etymology seems to have influenced the translator.]

36.	Balamadar.	波羅摩達 Pa-la-ma-tat.	Brahma-datta.
-----	------------	-----------------------	---------------

37.	Pinteloshusha.	賓頭盧埵闍 Pin-tu-lu-ta-ja.	Piṇḍola-dvāja.
-----	----------------	---------------------------	----------------

[Shu points to 垂 *sui*, for 埵 is not *sui*, but *ta*. In this case the Tibetan seems to have misread it.]

7. Some other peculiarities in the Tibetan.

¹ Sukhāvati-vyūha (smaller), § 1.

(A) When a Chinese nasal comes the Tibetan often splits the syllable asunder and makes it into two: e.g. :—

CHINESE.	SANSKRIT.	TIBETAN.	Chap.
虔 闍 尼 波 梨 Kan-ja-ni-pa-li.	Kaṇjani-pālī.	Ka-na-jani-pali.	1.
安 陀 An-ta.	Andhra.	A-na-ta.	16.
周 利 槃 多 Cu-li-pan-ta.	Suddhi-panthaka.	Cūwa-na-ta.	16.

And these, perhaps from a false analogy of Shen-dan, (旃 檀) = Can-da-na, Ma-ha-shen (摩 訶 羨) = Mahā-se-na, Na-shen (那 先) = Nāga-se-na, etc., etc.

(B) Chinese *pi* (= Jap. *bi*) is represented with *byi* in Tibetan, as in the case of a Sanskrit word. *Byi* is generally pronounced *ji* in Tibetan, but we must not apply this rule to the transcribed words, as it has been done by Mr. Schmidt. Thus :—

CHINESE.	TIBETAN.	Chap.
Shi-pi (尸 毘)	Shi-byi (Skt. S'ibi).	1.
Pi-laṇ-kat-li. (毗 楞 竭 梨)	Byi-liṇ-gi-ra-li.	1.
Man-ji-pi-li. (曼 慈 毗 梨)	Man-ji-byi-la.	17.
Ki-li-pi. (機 里 毗)	Ti-li-byi.	35.
Pin-tu-lu-ta-ja. (廣 頭 盧 捶 闍)	Pyin-te-lo-shu-sha.	39.

(C) Mistakes from the forms of characters peculiar to Chinese. Chapter 22: Ma-shen-ta (Mahā-candra, 摩 旃 陀), under which is noted Ta-yü, 大 月 'Great Moon,' but here the Tibetan has 'Can-C'empo,' 'Great-eye,' i.e. 大 目 Ta-mu. The text may have had 目 owing to a corruption. In the case of Pin-te-lo-shu-sha, above referred to, 捶 *ta* is

taken as having the similar sound with 垂 *sui*, on account of their resemblance to each other. I have noticed elsewhere the reading of 槃 *pan* for 梨 *li*, and 阿 *A* for 陀 *ta*, etc., etc. However, these mistakes may be due simply to a corruption of the Chinese text, and the translator may be free from blame.¹

The above remarks, though they may not be exhaustive, will be sufficient to explain the relation between the Tibetan and the Chinese. Formerly, when I was reviewing Mr. Grünwedel's work² in the "Hansei Zasshi" (now the "Orient"), vol. xx, No. 11, 1897, I expressed there the idea that the Chinese may be a translation of the Tibetan,³ but the internal evidence which we can adduce from the texts proves quite the opposite, and the Chinese has the right to claim the priority over the Tibetan. Moreover, the conclusion is confirmed by some native writers who were contemporaries of the authors of the Chinese version.

8. In the catalogues of the Chinese Tri-piṭaka, Kai-yuen-lu, and Ching-yuen-lu it is said as follows:—

"Hien-yü-Ching (The Wise Man and the Fool, 賢愚經,) in 13 vols., sometimes said to be 15 vols. or 16 vols., or even 17 vols.⁴ Otherwise called the Hien-yü-yin-yuen-ching (Dama-mūka-nidāna-sūtra). This is mentioned in the Sung-tsi-lu (宋齊錄) by Tao-hui (道慧), and in the Seng-yiu-lu (僧祐錄) by Seng-yiu (僧祐, flourished in 500–520 A.D.).

¹ The Chinese text is not free from such mistakes as mentioned here. It has that mistake which can be said to be almost *hereditary*, i.e. 波旬 *pa-shun* for Skt. *pāpiya* (= *Māra*), which is a mistake for 波旬 *pa-pi*; analogous to this the text has 耶旬 *ya-shun* for *jhāpeti* (Skt. *kṣapayati*), 'to burn,' but this is again 耶旬 *ya-pi*. In some other texts it is 闍毗 *ja-pi*, 荼毘 *ca-pi*, 闍維 *ja-wei*, or even 耶維 *ya-wei*, all originating from Pāli *jhāpe*-, 'cause to burn.'

² "Buddhistische Studien" von Albert Grünwedel, veröffentlicht aus dem Königlichen Museum der Völkerkunde, Bd. v, Berlin, 1897.

³ p. 27, note.

⁴ We see from this note there were several texts of this Sūtra.

The work exists at present in 13 vols. The author is Śramaṇa Hui-Hsio or T'an-Hsio (慧覺 or 曇覺). Seng-yiu says: 'T'an-Hsio was a native of Liang Chou (涼州). He was noble and intelligent, and renowned for the purity of his conduct and the deepness of his knowledge. When he was in Khoten (于闐, Kustana) he obtained the Sanskrit text of this Sūtra. He came to Karakhodjo (Kau-chang, 高昌) from Khoten, and there he, together with a Śramaṇa Wei-teh (威德), translated the text.' It is also mentioned in Tsing-Mai's (靖邁) work *Ku-chin-i-chin-t'u-ki* (古今譯經圖記).¹ Note: "It is said in the Record of Hien-yü-Ching by Śramaṇa Seng-yiu (僧祐) of the Liang dynasty (A.D. 502-557) that the Śramaṇas of Ho-hsi (west of the river), T'an-Hsio, Wei-teh, and others, eight in all, intended to travel afar in search of their sacred texts. While in the Mahā-vihāra of Khoten they met with the festival called the 'Pañca-varṣa-pariṣad,'¹ which is in Chinese a 'great assembly of all in every five years.' Several teachers versed in the Tri-piṭaka were engaged in the propagation of the precious law; they preach Sūtras or Vinaya according to their special skill. The eight Śramaṇas also took the opportunity, attended the lectures and strove to acquaint themselves with the foreign dialect. They succeeded in explaining what they heard there, and translated it all. When they came back to Karakhodjo, they collected what they learnt of each work and made it into one book. Afterwards crossing over the sand-streams they brought it home to Liang Chou. At the time Śramaṇa Hui-lang was famous as the great preceptor of Ho-hsi, and being rich in pious deeds could recite the expanded texts (Vaipulya) all from memory. He thought: 'The text brought home from Khoten is a portion of the Avadānas. What the Avadānas show us are good and bad examples of man's deeds; they are in other words the distinctions of the wise man and the fool. Among the Sūtras handed down from

¹ 般遮于瑟 Pan-ca-yu-shi. This is mentioned also in Fa-hien's Travels.

former ages Avadānas are numerous, and therefore we will give a new title to this text according to the subject-matter of it, and call it the 'Hien-yü-Ching' (The Wise Man and the Fool)."

According to this contemporaneous and therefore very important note, the title "The Wise Man and the Fool" is entirely of Chinese origin, and if this note be taken as authentic (and of course it is) it will also account for the origin of the Tibetan name Dsan-lun. The fact that the book has the name given by the Chinese must be a strong proof of its having been translated from the Chinese.

9. I do not go at present so far as to say that the Mongolian version of our text is also from the Chinese, but the second chapter of the Üligerün Dalai (the Ocean of Parables)¹ betrays its Chinese origin. The author seems to have read 十太子 '10 princes' for 千太子 '1,000 princes,' for the characters 十 and 千 resemble each other, and such a mistake can only arise in Chinese numerals.

10. Lastly, to strengthen our argument I may quote the words of Csoma de Körösi in his Analysis of Kanjur in the "Asiatic Researches," vol. xx, Arts. ii and xi (1836), p. 480. He says: "At the end (of the Tibetan Dsan-lun) it is stated that this work, it seems, has been translated from Chinese." So even to Tibetans the work appeared to have come from the Chinese.

From the above remarks I hope that the points of my argument have become quite clear to the readers. It is, I think, perfectly certain that the Tibetan version is a translation of the Chinese; the correspondence of both texts cannot be explained otherwise. To make it quite safe, however, we had better wait for a corroboration from scholars versed in Tibetan.

If I have succeeded in drawing attention to the fact that between the Tibetan and the Chinese there exists

¹ = Dsan-lun, chap. 7 (Mongolian), *deest* in Tibetan; Chinese text, chap. 7.

a relation similar to that between Indian originals and Chinese or Tibetan, and also in showing that the comparative study of Buddhism and Buddhist literature must rest on the basis of the four languages, I shall be quite satisfied. By "four languages" I mean, of course, Pāli, Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese.

N.B.—The fact that the text was translated in Karakhodjo in 445 A.D., and the existence of a centre of religious learning in Khoten as told by Seng-yiu (500–520 A.D.), may in a way help the study of that unknown Buddhist language found in Central Asia. The MSS. are now being examined by Professor Leumann, of Strassburg.
