

JOURNAL
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

XI.

A CHINESE TEXT CORRESPONDING TO PART OF
THE BOWER MANUSCRIPT.

By K. WATANABE.

THE great merit of the laborious publication of the Bower Manuscript by Dr. Hoernle need not here be repeated. Since I met this excellent scholar some years ago, I have carefully examined the whole Chinese Tripiṭaka to identify the manuscript, but I have only been able to find one of the various texts of which it is composed. This is, however, one of the most important Sūtras of Buddhist mysticism; and its curious relation with the Pāli scriptures in many places¹ throws some light upon the dark question of the history of Buddhist literature.

The identified portion of the manuscript consists of the six leaves which appear in plates xlix–liv. The greater part of the text has unfortunately been lost, and these leaves that remain are only a small portion of it.

The corresponding Chinese text is contained in six translations,² of which the following three versions³ completely correspond to the text of the manuscript, while the

¹ One of these was already reported by Professors Serge d'Oldenburg and Bühler in the *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vol. v, 116, and vii, 271.

² Nanjio's "Cat. of the Chinese Tripiṭaka," 306–311.

³ Nanjio, 306–8.

others only partially agree with it, showing a more primitive and less developed form than the other three.

1. Mahāmāyūrīvidyā-rājūi, translated by I-tsing, A.D. 705.
2. „ translated by Amoghavajra,
A.D. 746–771.¹
3. „ translated by Sanghapāla,
A.D. 516.²

The contents of the three versions are substantially the same, except that in the first two texts there are often interpolations.

The text is also found in part iii of the Pañcarakṣā,³ of which many codexes are extant in European and Asiatic libraries.⁴

Through the generosity of the libraries of the Royal Asiatic Society and the Asiatic Society of Bengal,⁵ I have been able to make not only a collation of the text with that of the Bower Manuscript, but also a comparative and critical study of the whole text. I hope that the result of this study will be eventually published in full; but I venture here to submit the main results, with a few remarks on the more important and interesting points.

(1) The verses,⁶ after the invocation of the Nāgas, are apparently borrowed from the paritta in the Mora-jātaka.⁷

¹ 貞元錄, vols. xv and xvi, “The Life of Amoghavajra,” and his memorial to the Emperor T'ai-tsung (reigning 763–779).

² This more exact date is derived from Nanjio, No. 1610, vol. v.

³ Bendall's “Cat. of the Buddh. Skt. MSS.,” pp. 33, 48, 99, 105, 152, 157, 162, 175, 190; Cowell & Eggeling, “Cat. of Buddh. Skt. MSS. in the R.A.S.,” p. 42.

⁴ Besides the Calcutta Library, the Japanese Oriental Society now possesses a manuscript brought by Rev. Kawaguchi, who was several years in Tibet and Nepal. (The Society was established by Professors Nanjio, Takakusu, and Dr. Tokiwai, 1901, in memory of the late Max Müller.)

⁵ Nos. 56 and 57 from the library of the R.A.S. and No. B. 4 from Calcutta.

⁶ Bower MS., part vi, lief 3, obverse line 5—reverse line 2; London MS. 56, f. 89 A; Calcutta MS., f. 115 B. The verse 1, metre Vamśastha; 2, Indravajra.

⁷ Jātaka 159; Fausböll, ii, 33–8.

SANSKRIT.	PĀLI. ¹
Namo'stu Buddhāya, namo'stu bodhaye !	Nam'atthu Buddhānaṃ, nam'- atthu bodhiyā !
Namo vimuktāya, namo vi- muktaye !	Namo vimuttānaṃ, namo vi- muttiyā ! (B).
Namo'stu Śāntāya, namo'stu Śāntaye !	
Namo'stu muktāya, namo'stu muktaye ! (1)	
Ye brāhmaṇā vāhita-pāpa- dharmās	Ye brāhmaṇā vedagu sabba- dhamme
teṣāṃ namas te ca ² māṃ pālayantu ³ ! (2)	te me namo te ca maṃ pāla- yantu ! (A).

The above comparison shows us very clearly that two new pādas, imitating the original metre and thought, were invented by Mahāyānist and interpolated in the Pāli verse.

The word Yaśomitrasya,⁴ inserted in the last pāda of the second verse, must be the name of a votary who had perhaps copied the manuscript and offered his prayer, because it is prescribed in the notes of the Chinese version that a votary, in such places of the text, must recite his name. Or it may be also possible that an influential person bearing this name made a scribe copy the manuscript for him, as was a custom in ancient China and Japan.

(2) Though in size very different from the preceding four leaves, leaves 1-2 of part vii give really the continuation of their text. They were copied by the same hand as wrote part vi, for the name Yaśomitra occurs in the leaf 2, obverse, line 3. According to the Chinese and the Sanskrit texts about one or one and a half leaves between parts vi and vii are wanting. This lost portion is precisely of interest, because it again contains a modified story from the Mora-jātaka. The gold-coloured peacock king appears

¹ Fausböll, ii, 34, 35.

² Bower MS. ; Yaśomitrasya (P)[â](r)[aṃ] ; Pālayantu.

³ After the verse follows svāhā.

⁴ Bower MS., pl. lii, last line.

in the story as a votary of the Mahāmāyūrī-mantra whose miraculous power had rescued him from an emergency, threatening to destroy his life.

I will quote here from my collated copy of the two manuscripts,¹ compared with the Chinese versions, the nonsensical parts of the mantra being naturally omitted.

Bhūtapūrvam, Ānanda, Himavanta-parvatasya dakṣiṇa-pārśve Suvarṇāvabhāso² nāma mayūra-rājā prativasati sma. So 'py anayā Mahāmāyūrī-vidyā-rājñyā rakṣām svastyayanam kṛtvā divā svasti nāvaharati. So 'yam svastyayanam kṛtvā rātrau nāvaharati sma.

(*Follows mantra.*)

So 'pareṇa samayen' Ānanda anayā Mahāmāyūrī-vidyā-rājñyā rakṣām svastyayanam na kṛtvā, sambahulair ābhīrvane mayūra-kanyābhīḥ sārddham ārāmeṇ' ārāmam udyānenōdyānam parvata-pārśve kāmeṣu gr̥ddhaḥ, saktō, madamattah, pragūḍhaḥ, pramūrchitaḥ, prarūḍhito (!) 'nūvicarat pramoda-vāsāt anyataram parvata-vivaram anupraviṣṭaḥ.

Sa tatra dīrgha-rātrau pratyarthikāḥ, pratyamitra-hiṃsakair, avatāram prekṣibhir,³ avatāram gavesibhir, mayūrapāśena baddhaḥ.

So 'mitramadhyagataḥ smṛti-pratīlabdhaḥ imām eva Mahāmāyūrī-vidyā-rājñīm manasy akārṣit.

(*Follows mantra.*)

Atha tasmād āsanāt parimuktaḥ svasti-kṣaṇena svastivisayam anuprāptaḥ.

(*Follows mantra.*)

Aham ev' Ānanda sa tena kālena tena samayena Suvarṇāvabhāso nāma Mayūra-rājā babhūva.

(*Follows mantra.*)

(3) The passage in plate liv, reverse, lines 6-7, reads in the London and Calcutta MSS.⁴ as follows:—

¹ London MS., 89 B; Calcutta MS., 116 B.

² See Fausböll, ii, 33, 'suvarṇavabhāso ahoṣi.'

³ "By those who are watching for his appearance, by those who are searching for his appearance." Avatāra does not mean incarnation, as it commonly does.

⁴ London MS., 91 B; Calcutta MS., 120 A.

Tat kasmād dhetoṛ? vadhyārha Ānanda daṇḍena mucyate, daṇḍārhaḥ prahāreṇa, prahārārha ākrośeṇa, ākrośārhaḥ paribhāṣeṇa, paribhāṣārha romahaṛṣeṇa, evam eva mucyate.

It is better, I think, to add here rather a translation of the corresponding Chinese translation by the well-known I-tsing than a new one of my own, because his version not only gives very clearly the meaning of the passage, but at the same time enables us to see the state of the Chinese text.

“On what account? O Ānanda! One who is liable to death¹ will be released (that is to say, will be alleviated) with fine,² one who is liable to a fine with the infliction of blows, one who is liable to the infliction of blows with abuse, one who is liable to abuse with censure, one who is liable to censure with Lomahaṛṣa. So in this way he will be released from all punishment.”

Lomahaṛṣa seems here to be the slightest of all punishments. It may signify some horrifying act by a policeman, which, even without the use of a single word of blame, would give a thrill to the accused. Sanghapāla translates it, “[the punishment even] not relating word.”³

The passage is used in some Mahāyāna sūtras as a favourite formula to explain the great power of some Dhāraṇī therein described. The parallel in the Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna,⁴ is the oldest description of it, as this avadāna was existing in the beginning of the third century.⁵ It runs:

Yaḥ kaścid Ānanda ṣaḍakṣaryā vidyayā paritrāṇaṃ svasty-
ayanaṃ kuryāt, sa yadi bandhārha⁶ bhaved daṇḍena

¹ Sanghapāla translates this word by 應遭囚繫, ‘one who is liable to the imprisonment,’ bandhārha, as the Divyāvadāna (see further on, note 4).

² ‘Daṇḍa’ is a general name for punishment. Itsing and Amoghavajra take it for ‘fine,’ 罰物, while Sanghapāla translates by 鞭罰, ‘punishment by the whip.’

³ 不涉言.

⁴ Cowell’s “Divyāvadāna,” p. 614.

⁵ Cu Iūh-yen, together with C’chien, translated this Sūtra in A.D. 229. See Nanjio, I, 489, vol. I.

⁶ badh° in the edition.

mucyate, daṇḍārhaḥ prahāreṇa, prahārārhaḥ paribhāṣaṇayā,
paribhāṣaṇārho romaharṣaṇena, romaharṣaṇārhaḥ punar eva¹
mucyate.

Our text seems apparently to have borrowed the passages
from this old avadāna.

¹ evam ucyate in the edition.