

Research on the *Samyukta-āgama*

edited by Dhammadinnā

in memory of Karashima Seishi 辛嶋 静志

Contents

Dharma Drum Institute of Liberal Arts (DILA) Series <i>Bhikṣu Huimin</i>	xi
Preface <i>Bhikkhunī Dhammadinnā</i>	xiii
I. THE COLLECTIONS OF CONNECTED DISCOURSES: STRUCTURAL AND REDACTIONAL PRINCIPLES	
The <i>Sagātha-vagga</i> in the <i>Samyutta-nikāya</i> : Formation and Vedic Background <i>Oskar von Hinüber</i>	3
<i>Peyāla</i> in the <i>Skandha-samyukta</i> : Contraction and Expansion in Textual Transmission <i>Bhikkhu Anālayo</i>	53
Reading Repetitions in the <i>Samyutta-nikāya</i> and Early <i>Abhidhamma</i> : From the <i>Mahā-vagga</i> to the <i>Dhammasaṅgaṇi</i> <i>Rupert Gethin</i>	109
II. THE EARLY DISCOURSES: GANDHARAN CIRCULATION	
Where are the Gandharan <i>Sūtras</i> ? Some Reflections on the Contents of the Gandhari Manuscript Collections <i>Richard Salomon</i>	173
A Gandhari <i>Samyukta-āgama</i> Version of the ‘Discourse on Not- self’ (Pali <i>Anattalakkhaṇa-sutta</i> , Sanskrit * <i>Anātmalakṣaṇa-sūtra</i>) <i>Mark Allon</i>	201

The Gandhari ‘Discourse on Pleasure and Pain’: Some Thoughts on Similes and Textual Variation in the Connected Discourses <i>Joseph Marino</i>	259
--	-----

III. THE EARLY DISCOURSES: TRANSMISSION IN SANSKRIT

Towards a New Edition of the First Twenty-five <i>Sūtras</i> of the <i>Nidāna-saṃyukta</i> : Current State and Remaining Difficulties <i>Jin-il Chung (鄭鎮一)</i>	303
‘Discourse on the Relative Value of the Varieties of Knowledge’ (<i>Vidyāsthānopama-sūtra</i>): A Translation <i>Peter Skilling (Bhadra Rujirathat)</i>	327

IV. SCHOOL AFFILIATION: MULTIPLE RECITATIONS AND INSTITUTIONAL IDENTITIES

Sanskrit Versions of the <i>Āgamas</i> : Schools, Regions and Editors <i>Jens-Uwe Hartmann</i>	359
‘Mūlasarvāstivādin and Sarvāstivādin’: Oral Transmission Lineages of <i>Āgama</i> Texts <i>Bhikkhu Anālayo</i>	387

V. *SŪTRA* QUOTATIONS AND REFERENCES: INTRA-, INTER-, CO- AND CROSS-TEXTUALITY

Traces of Incorporation: Some Examples of <i>Saṃyukta-āgama</i> <i>Sūtras</i> in the Mūlasarvāstivāda <i>Vinaya</i> <i>Yao Fumi (八尾 史)</i>	429
Highlights from a Comparative Study of the <i>Saṃyukta-āgama</i> Quotations in the <i>Abhidharmakośopāyikā-ṭīkā</i> <i>Bhikkhunī Dhammadinnā</i>	481

- Samyukta-āgama* Quotations in Yaśomitra's *Abhidharmakośa-vyākhyā* 591
Bhikkhu Pāsādika
- Cross-references to the *Śrāvakahūmi* in the *Samyukta-āgama*'s *Mātrkā* Transmitted in the *Vastusamgrahaṇī* of the *Yogācārabhūmi* 653
Bhikṣu Huimin (釋惠敏)

VI. ĀGAMAS IN CHINESE: TRANSLATION PROCESSES

- The Underlying Languages of the Three Chinese Translations of the *Samyukta-āgamas* (Taishō nos. 99, 100 and 101) and their School Affiliations 707
Karashima Seishi (辛嶋 静志)
- A Study and Translation of the *Yakṣa-samyukta* in the Shorter Chinese *Samyukta-āgama* 763
Marcus Bingenheimer
- Notes on the Translation and the Translator of the Shorter Chinese *Samyukta-āgama* 843
Ken Su [*Su Jinkun* (蘇錦坤)]

VII. CANON FORMATION AND TEXTUAL SCHOLARSHIP: PHILOLOGIES BETWEEN TRADITION AND MODERNITY

- Ācāriya Buddhaghosa and Master Yinshun 印順 on the Three-*aṅga* Structure of Early Buddhist Texts 883
Choong Mun-keat (鍾秉潔) [*Wei-keat* (煒傑)]
- Assessing the Field of *Āgama* Studies in Twentieth-century China: With a Focus on Master Yinshun's 印順 Three-*aṅga* Theory 933
Stefania Travagnin and Bhikkhu Anālayo

**A Study and Translation of
the *Yakṣa-saṃyukta*
in the Shorter Chinese *Saṃyukta-āgama***

Marcus Bingenheimer
Temple University

Abstract

The chapter presents an annotated translation of the *Yakṣa-samyukta* as contained in an incomplete Chinese version of the *Samyukta-āgama* (*Bieyi za ahan jing* 別譯雜阿含經, T 100), ranging from discourses SĀ² 318 to SĀ² 329. A number of philological and textual issues in the twelve discourses are resolved, by comparing the texts to their parallels in Chinese, Pali and Sanskrit. Corroborating previous studies of discourses belonging to T 100, there is new evidence for a common Indian ancestor of this collection and the complete *Samyukta-āgama* also extant in Chinese translation (*Za ahan jing* 雜阿含經, T 99). Notable evidence includes the displacement of the two consecutive discourses SĀ² 298 and SĀ² 299 (on Sakka and Indaka), the structure of the verse in SĀ² 318; the notes on *juemo* 崛默 (SĀ² 318), *bakkula* (SĀ² 319), *khara* and *kara* (SĀ² 323); the discussion of *dhātrī* vs. *dhañka* (SĀ² 323). Again, differences between the two *Samyukta-āgama* collections point to a period of independent transmission at least for T 100 (e.g., the beginning of SĀ² 318, the end of SĀ² 323, the mention of the *ṣaṇṇavatiyo pāsaṇḍāḥ* in SĀ² 325). In the final section it is argued that the *yakṣas* appearing in the *Yakṣa-samyukta* seem less ‘supernatural’ than the *yakṣas* in *Jātakas* and later literature, and that the discourses might have been occasioned by encounters of members of the early Buddhist *Sanḅha* with tribal communities outside of their ‘mainstream’ agricultural, *śramaṇa/brāhmaṇa*-society audience. An appendix revisits the discussion around the school attribution of T 100.

Contents

I. Introduction

II. Translations

SĀ² 318 [‘Māñibhadra Hosts the Buddha’]

SĀ² 319 [‘Nāgapāla as Bakkula Demon’]

SĀ² 320 [‘The Mother of Piṅgala’]

SĀ² 321 [‘The Mother of Punabbasu’]

SĀ² 322 [‘At the Abode of Māñicara’]

SĀ² 323 [‘Sūciloma Challenges the Buddha’]

SĀ² 324 [‘Possession by a *Yakṣa*’]

SĀ² 325 [‘Ālavaka Challenges the Buddha’]

SĀ² 326 [‘A *Yakṣa* Praises the Nun Vīrā’]

SĀ² 327 [‘A *Yakṣa* Praises the Nun Sukkā’]

SĀ² 328 [‘Sātāgira and Hemavata Question the Buddha’]

SĀ² 329 [‘A *Yakṣa* Hits Sāriputta’]

Conclusion: The *Yakṣas* in the Chinese *Saṃyukta-āgamas*

Appendix: Again on the School Affiliation of T 100

Abbreviations

References

I. Introduction

The *Yakṣa-saṃyukta* that is part of the *Sagātha-varga* in the shorter, incomplete Chinese translation of a *Saṃyukta-āgama* (T 100, *Bieyi za ahan jing* 別譯雜阿含經) contains twelve discourses (SĀ² 318 to 329).¹ However, the summary verse (*uddāna-gāthā*) to this *saṃyukta* lists fourteen discourses, the first two of which are missing.² A remark at the end of the preceding *saṃyukta*, the *Devaputra-saṃyukta*, explains the discrepancy:³

¹ Below I list and discuss variant readings only where they have an impact on the translation, i.e., where the variant suggests a better reading. Otherwise, Chinese and Pali texts are taken from the main text respectively of the Taishō 大正 or the PTS editions respectively, i.e., without including the apparatus. The Chinese text is taken from the *Bieyi za ahan jing* 別譯雜阿含經 project, online edition. For the PTS edition of the *Saṃyutta-nikāya*, I quote and reference Feer's edition (1884–1898). (The newer edition by Somaratne 1998 was not continued beyond the first volume. I compare Somaratne's text for difficult passages and reference it only where it provides new information.) For the *Sutta-nipāta*, I reference Anderson and Smith 1913, which has superseded Fausbøll 1885. For the sake of consistency, I generally use Pali terms and names, even where speaking about Chinese texts. Exceptions are *yakṣa* for *yakkha*, and work and chapter titles, where Sanskrit is used for the *saṃyukta* chapters of the two Chinese *saṃyukta* collections (e.g., *Yakṣa-saṃyukta*) in order to disambiguate them from *saṃyutta* chapters in Pali. The texts have been made available in a Chinese-Pali aligned version at <http://buddhisticinformatics.dila.edu.tw/BZA/>.

² The *uddāna* in T 100 at T II 485b23–25 reads: 因陀羅、釋迦、崛默白山、賓迦羅、富那婆修、曼遮尼羅、箭毛、受齋、曠野及雄、淨、七岳并雪山。害及於無害。是名第十四。

³ T 100 at T II 480a27–29: 此中章次因陀羅夜叉與上因陀羅天子所說不異，以其繁重故闕而不傳，次章釋迦夜叉與上釋迦天子不別，亦闕不書。 Accord-

In this [i.e., the following] chapter, the next [‘Discourse on the] *Yakṣa* Yintuoluo 因陀羅’ [*Indra; cf. *Saṃyutta-nikāya* Indaka], is not different from [the ‘Discourse with] the *Devaputra* Yintuoluo’ [in the *Devaputra-saṃyukta* (= SĀ² 298)]. Because of this overlap, it is not transmitted here. [Similarly,] the following text about the *yakṣa* Sakka 釋迦 [*Saṃyutta-nikāya* = Sakkanāma] is not different from what above has been said about the *devaputra* Sakka [earlier (= SĀ² 299)] and is also omitted.

It thus appears that in the northern tradition the two discourses were at one point included in both the *Yakṣa*- and the *Devaputra-saṃyuktas*, and one might then ask whether Indra/Indaka and Śakra had first been *yakṣas* or *devaputras*? The two discourses that now remain only in the *Devaputra-saṃyuktas* of both T 100 and the complete Chinese *Saṃyukta-āgama* (*Za ahan jing* 雜阿含經, T 99), correspond in the Pali to the first two discourses of the *Saṃyutta-nikāya*’s *Yakkha-saṃyutta*, as is obvious from the names of the protagonists as well as regarding the content of the verse.⁴ While they are called *devaputras*, Chinese 天子, in T 100 and T 99, they are identified as *yakṣas* in the *Saṃyutta-nikāya*. The Pali tradition often, but not always, tends to preserve the earlier version. There is indeed evidence that Indra/Indaka and Sakka started out as *yakṣas* and only

ing to the Taishō apparatus the characters 而不傳次章釋迦夜叉與上釋迦天子不別亦闕 are not part of the Chinese stemma. In his edition of T 99 Yinshun 1983: 346 and 348 erroneously emends 十四 in the *uddāna* of T 100 to 十二. He does not seem to have noticed this editorial note in T 100 nor counted the names.

⁴ SĀ² 298: 因陀羅, pointing to an equivalent of Indaka/Indra, and SN 10.1: Indaka; SĀ² 299: 釋迦, pointing to an equivalent of Sakka, and SN 10.2: Sakkanāma.

subsequently became *devaputras* (and not vice versa). The verse section of *SĀ*² 299 still addresses the *devaputra* Sakka with “Know, *yakṣa* ...”. This suggests that he was first a *yakṣa* before becoming a *devaputra*.⁵

Thus in the northern tradition the two discourses, in effect, moved from the *Yakṣa-samyukta* to the *Devaputra-samyukta* in two steps:

1. The two discourses on Indra/Indaka and Sakka were first reduplicated into the *devaputra samyukta*, perhaps because their names did sound rather like names of *devas*, not *yakṣas*, or perhaps in an attempt to produce two clean decades of discourses in the *Devaputra-samyukta*.

2. As the remark in T 100 translated above attests, they were then omitted from the *Yakṣa-samyukta*.⁶ In view of their absence in both T 100 and T 99 this did not occur as part of the translation process, but must have happened before the T 100/T 99 split occurred. It is possible that the note following the *uddāna* to the *Yakṣa-samyukta*

⁵ In the verse Sakka is directly addressed thus: “Know, *yakṣa*, ...”, 夜叉應當知 (*SĀ*² 299 at T II 476c3); cf. *SĀ*² 162, which belongs to the same cluster as *SĀ*² 299, and which too preserves the address in its verse.

⁶ What happened to the discourses on Indra/Indaka and Śakra in T 99 is a difficult question as the structure of this collection was jumbled at one point in the early stage of transmission in China and the original order of fascicles was only restored by modern scholarship. The discourse on Indra/Indaka (*SĀ*² 1300) is in the *Devatā-samyukta* of T 99 at the position it would be expected (relative to the position of the discourse in T 100). The discourse on Sakka on the other hand seems to have been lost (*SĀ* 577, that is given in the catalogues as a parallel to *SĀ*² 1300, is rather a parallel to *SĀ*² 162). In the received text of the T 99, fascicles 22 (*SĀ* 576–603) and 48 (*SĀ*² 1267–1293) contain discourses featuring *devaputras*, whereas fascicle 49 contains twenty discourses to *devaputras* (*SĀ* 1294–1318) and five with *yakṣas* (*SĀ* 1319–1323), i.e., the beginning of the *Yakṣa-samyukta*.

of T 100 was indeed part of the Indian original, from which T 100 was translated. Alternatively, the note was added as explanation during the translation process, or soon after.⁷ Besides the drift of the first two discourses from the *Yakṣa-saṃyukta* into the *Devaputra-saṃyukta*, there are other overlaps between these two *saṃyuktas*.

A similar apotheosis from *yakṣa* to *devaputra*, can be found in the cluster containing the discourse titled *Sudatta-sutta* (SN 10.8 at SN I 210,28), in which a *yakkha* assists Anāthapiṇḍika in his first encounter with the Buddha. In the northern tradition the protagonist in this role is described as a *devatā* (天神), a generic term for different types of divinities, but there are reasons to believe that earlier version of the story the protagonist was more narrowly understood as a *yakṣa*.⁸

Another *Saṃyutta-nikāya* discourse in the *Yakkha-saṃyutta* (Sūci-loma), has remained in the Chinese *Yakṣa-saṃyuktas* (SĀ² 323, SĀ 1324) but its verse was also used in *Devaputra-saṃyukta* discourses (SĀ² 313 and SĀ 1314).

Thus, the dividing line between *yakṣas*, and *devas*, *devaputras*,

⁷ The wording of the remark, 不傳, 不書, also implies that the two discourses were not elided by the translators or else one would expect 不譯 or such. T 100 was probably translated under the Western Qin 西秦 (AD 385–431), if one accepts the dating of the translation by Mizuno 1970.

⁸ The *devatā* stays unnamed in T 99 (天神 in SĀ 592 at T II 157c22) but is said to “have lived near the city gate.” *Yakṣas* are known to have served as local deities associated with cities. In T 100 he is named in a *hapax legomenon*, surprisingly, as 尸婆天神 (SĀ² 186 at T II 440c2), pointing to ‘*Deva Śiva’, and identifies himself as son of Vaiśravaṇa. Vaiśravaṇa is of course Kubera, the king of *yakṣas*, and thus, by stating his pedigree the *deva* shows his *yakṣa* roots. Again, as with the discourses on Indaka and Sakka, it seems that figures that were first identified as *yakṣa* later were remembered as more generic *devas* or *devaputtas*.

or other types of supernatural beings is thin.⁹ They were all considered *devatās*, and indeed when Alexander Cunningham discovered the ancient Parkham *yakṣa* statue in 1882/1883 it was called ‘Devatā’ by the villagers.¹⁰

This accords with the fluid identity of the *yakṣas* in early India, where, in and between the texts, they often morph into other classes of beings such as *piśācas*, *devaputras*, or humans. Étienne Lamotte (1961: 113) already remarked on the *yakṣa* as a ‘terme élastique’ that denotes all kinds of non-human beings. Gail H. Sutherland (1991: 49) pointed out “precise discrepancies between *yakṣas*, *rākṣasas*, *piśācas*, and others seem permanently obscured and fluid ...”.¹¹ J.F. Marc DesJardins (2002: 92) even claims that the word *yakṣa* was used for different types of divine beings, because the *yakṣa* was the “proto-type ancestral de tous les dieux.”

In general, secondary scholarship emphasizes the divine, supernatural aspects when trying to trace the semantic range of what *yakṣa* came to mean in early India. Ram Nath Misra (1981: 2), for instance, says:

Yakshas have been variously designated either in terms of broad groups or specifically, for instance, *puṇyajana*, *vaiśravanakāyika deva*, *amanussā*, *vāṇamantara*, *deva*, *bhummadeva* or *rukhhadeva*. This group of words indicates that they formed a kindred group—a *devajāti* (*Amarakośa*, 1.1.6) —along with several other demi-gods such as *Deva*, *Gandharva*, *Apsaras*, *Kinnara*, *Guhyaka* etc.

⁹ Examples outside T 100 of the *yakṣa*–*deva*(*putra*) ambiguity are, e.g., Māgadhā as a *yakṣa* in the *Mahāmāyūri vidyā-rājñī*, Lévi 1915: 47 and as a *devaputta* in SN 2.4 at SN I 47,14.

¹⁰ Cunningham 1885 [2000]: 40. For the history of research and authoritative reading of the inscription see Lüders 1961: 175–179.

¹¹ On terminology regarding supernatural beings in early India with special regard to *yakṣas* see DeCaroli 2004: 10–15 and DesJardins 2002: 70–114.

As I will argue in my conclusion, the divine, supernatural aspects of the *yakṣa* are not dominant in the Chinese *Saṃyukta-āgamas*; quite the contrary, the *yakṣas* in our text appear but all too human.

In the following section I attempt a first translation of the twelve discourses that currently constitute the *Yakṣa-saṃyukta* of T 100, SĀ² 318 to SĀ² 329 at T II 480b1 to 485b22. The references to the translated discourses and their Chinese and Pali parallels are given in Table 1 below.

Table 1. The *Yakṣa-saṃyukta* Discourses and their Parallels

Other Chinese Parallels	<i>Yakṣa-saṃyuktas</i> (T 100 / T 99)	<i>Yakkha-saṃyutta</i> (<i>Saṃyutta-nikāya</i>)	Other Pali Parallels
SĀ ² 298 at T II 476b5 / SĀ 1300 at T II 357c15		SN 10.1 at SN I 206,2 (<i>Indaka-sutta</i>)	
SĀ ² 299 at T II 476b25 / SĀ 577 at T II 153c20 SĀ ² 162 at T II 435a22		SN 10.2 at SN I 206,16 (<i>Sakkanāma-sutta</i>)	
	SĀ ² 318 at T II 480b1 / SĀ 1319 at T II 362a5	SN 10.3 at SN I 208,5 (<i>Maṇibhadda-sutta</i>)	
T 1428 at T XXII 673b19 T 1435 at T XXIII	SĀ ² 319 at T II 480b18 / SĀ 1320 at T II 362a29		Ud 1.7 at Ud 4,29 (<i>Ajakalāpaka-sutta</i>)

113b22 T 1464 at T XXIV 890b2			
	SĀ ² 320 at T II 480c20 / SĀ 1321 at T II 362c7	SN 10.6 at SN I 209,16 (<i>Piyaṅkara-sutta</i>)	
	SĀ ² 321 at T II 481a4 / SĀ 1322 at T II 362c22	SN 10.7 at SN I 209,31 (<i>Punabbasu-sutta</i>)	
	SĀ ² 322 at T II 481b1 / SĀ 1323 at T II 363a22		
SĀ ² 313 at T II 479b18 / SĀ 1314 at T II 361a23	SĀ ² 323 at T II 481c15 / SĀ 1324 at T II 363b29	SN 10.3 at SN I 207,1 (<i>Sūciloma-sutta</i>)	Sn 2.5 at Sn 47,23 (vv. 273– 276) (<i>Sūciloma-sutta</i>)
	SĀ ² 324 at T II 482a16 / SĀ 1325 at T II 364a8	SN 10.5 at SN I 208,17 (<i>Sānu-sutta</i>)	
SĀ 603 at T II 161a22	SĀ ² 325 at T II 482c8 / SĀ 1326 at T II 364b21	SN 10.12 at SN I 213,22 (<i>Āḷavaka-sutta</i>)	Sn 10 at Sn 31– 33 (vv. 181–206) (<i>Āḷavaka-sutta</i>)
	SĀ ² 326 at T II 483b4 / SĀ 1328 at T II 365b15	SN 10.11 at SN I 213,10 (<i>Cīrā-sutta</i>)	
	SĀ ² 327 at T II 483b26 / SĀ 1327 at T II 365a24	SN 10.9 at SN I 212,19 (<i>Paṭhamasukkā-</i>	

A Study and Translation of the *Yakṣa-saṃyukta* · 773
in the Shorter Chinese *Saṃyukta-āgama*

		<i>sutta</i>); SN 10.10 at SN I 212,32 (<i>Dutiyasukkā-</i> <i>sutta</i>)	
SĀ ² 315 at T II 479c17	SĀ ² 328 at T II 483c17 / SĀ 1329 at T II 365c6		Sn 9 at Sn 27–31 (vv.153–189) (<i>Hemavata-</i> <i>sutta</i>) Sn 10 at Sn 31–33 (vv.183–190) (<i>Ālavaka-sutta</i>)
	SĀ ² 329 at T II 85a24 / SĀ 1330 at T II 367b5		Ud 4.4 at Ud 39,17 (<i>Yakkhapahāra-</i> <i>sutta</i>)
SĀ ² 186 at T II 440b2 / SĀ 592 at T II 157b18 ¹²		SN 10.8 at SN I 210,28 (<i>Sudatta-sutta</i>)	

¹² Here the protagonist, who helps Anāthapiṇḍika, is a *deva* (天神), not a *yakkha*, as in SN 10.8.

II. Translations

SĀ² 318 [‘Māñibhadra Hosts the Buddha’]

The cluster that constitutes this discourse is complex, although there are only four witnesses: the partial *Samyukta-āgama* translation (SĀ² 318), the complete *Samyukta-āgama* translation (SĀ 1319), the Pali *Samyutta-nikāya* (SN 10.4), and a Sanskrit fragment published by Sergey Oldenburg in “Kashgar manuscripts of N.F. Petrovsky” (1892).¹³ Both Chinese versions seem in bad shape and do not preserve the dialogic nature of the verse. Only some 30–40% of the Sanskrit text remains, and it seems to have included later elements, such as a *dhāraṇī*.

Translation

Thus have I heard. Once, the Buddha was traveling in Magadha, when he intended to go to the abode¹⁴ of the *yakṣa* Juemo.¹⁵ At that

¹³ The article is reprinted in Minayeff and Oldenburg 1983: 173; unfortunately it is in Russian and, due to my ignorance of this language, I am only able to make use of the transliteration of the manuscript, not of the main text of the article. I was not able to discover the current location of the manuscript, which might be lost by now

¹⁴ SĀ² 318: 宮. Both the Sanskrit and Pali have *bhavana*, which also accords with 住處 in SĀ 1319. By itself the character 宮 also allows for ‘palace’ or ‘shrine.’

¹⁵ The origin of the unique Chinese renditions *juémò* 崛默 (SĀ² 318), *juémó* 崛摩 (*uddāna* for SĀ² 318) or *qūmó* 屈摩 (SĀ 1319) is not clear to me. The word transcribed could be **Kumār(a)*, which was (in later times) an epithet (‘everlasting youth’) of Skanda(*graha*) (cf. Kālidāsa’s *Kumārasambhavam*). Skanda – in later Indian myth the son of Śiva (or Rudra, or Agni) and associated with war and conflict – started out as the chief of demons that cause illnesses in children. “Kinder-befallenden

time the *yakṣa* Juemo approached him, paid obeisance to the Buddha's feet, sat to one side and said to the Buddha: "World-honored One, I wish the Tathāgata and the monks would stay at my dwelling tonight."

At that time the World-honored One accepted the invitation by remaining silent. Thereupon, in order to accommodate the Buddha and his retinue, *yakṣa* Juemo quickly conjured up five hundred palatial halls with seats and bedding in each, all fully furnished. He also added five hundred fireplaces, where fires burned without smoke. He then invited the Buddha to his palace and offered him the best hall. The five hundred monks in his retinue received rooms according to their seniority.

At that time, when the Buddha had entered his room and taken his seat, the *yakṣa* Juemo stood to one side and spoke a verse:

"Who has correct mindfulness has good fortune (**bhadra*), //

krankheitsdämonen" (Böhtlingk and Roth 1855–1875, s.v. *Skanda*). Another connection is a *Maṇi* appearing as an associate of Skanda (Böhtlingk and Roth 1855–1875, s.v. *Maṇi*). However, in SĀ² 318, for a transliteration of **Kumār(a)* we would expect 摩 (Coblin 1994, s.v. *ma/mā*) rather than 默 (Coblin 1994, s.v. **māk/'bug*). In the discussion of SĀ² 319 below we find that 摩 was the preferred transcription for Indic *-ma-* in SĀ² 318. There is also an off-chance that 崛默/屈摩 represents *Kube(ra)*. Note that regarding this name both Chinese versions agree against the Pali and the Sanskrit fragment. This implies that SĀ 1319 and SĀ² 318 have a common Indian ancestor, which is not identical with the Kashgar Sanskrit fragment edited by Oldenburg. However, the two *Saṃyukta-āgama* versions also must have undergone a period of independent development. In the discourse opening formula already SĀ 1319 speaks of five hundred monks, which are not mentioned in SĀ² 318. There are more indicators that point to a common origin for a northern line, as well as a period of independent development after a split between the two lines of transmission (Bingenheimer 2011: 45–50).

when mindfulness is correct one indeed is fortunate.¹⁶

With constant attention // and right mindfulness, one sleeps peacefully.¹⁷

[The Buddha replied:]

“With right mindfulness one has good fortune // [but one also does] not harm or strike others,

neither defeating nor being defeated¹⁸ // by any being.¹⁹

Giving rise to loving kindness towards all, // giving up all hatred: only that (斯乃)²⁰ is great good fortune (**mahābhadra*), // [and]

¹⁶ I read 憶念/正念 (SĀ² 318) = 正念 (SĀ 1319) = *satīmā* (*satimant*) (SN 10.4) = ‘mindful’, ‘thoughtful’, and (賢)樂 (SĀ² 318) = 賢德 (SĀ 1319) = *bhaddam* (SN 10.4) = ‘good fortune’, ‘prosperity’, but in a double entendre also referring to Mañibhadra’s name.

¹⁷ It is clear that SĀ² 318 and SĀ 1319 ascribe the whole verse to Mañibhadra. It seems to me, however, that the Chinese versions reflect an early mistake in the common Indic ancestor of T 100 and T 99, which turned the simple exchange between Mañibhadra and the Buddha to a monologue by Mañibhadra, perhaps by the loss of an *iti* marker. The following lines should be attributed to the Buddha.

¹⁸ Anālayo 2018: 1168 chooses to read the variant 貪 found in the Taishō apparatus over the 負 in the Taishō main text. I am not sure why, as the *pāda* here obviously contrasts 勝 and 負. The 貪 should be considered a scribal error. The passage corresponds roughly to the SĀ 1319 parallel 不殺不教殺, 不伏不教伏 “neither kill nor cause to be killed // neither subjugate nor cause to be subjugated” (教 here probably rendering a causative).

¹⁹ SĀ² 318: 眾生, here representing *bhūta*, which includes all kinds of supernatural beings, including *yakṣas*.

²⁰ Anālayo 2018: 1968 suggests ‘therefore’ for 乃, but there seems to be no argument to conclude with ‘therefore’ here. If, however, one assumes a dialogic structure in line with the Pali, 斯乃 should be read as ‘only that’: the Buddha suggests that Māñibhadra needs *also* to follow a non-violent lifestyle in addition to being a considerate host, if he desires to be fortunate. This reading is strengthened by the comparative 更 ‘all the

is all the more free of fault.’²¹

When the *yakṣa* Juemo had spoken this verse, he felt happy, paid obeisance and returned [to his home].²²

Discussion

Considering the wordplay on *bhaddha/bhadra* in the verse, and the fact that a Māñibhadra is attested both for the Pali and the Sanskrit fragment of the discourse, Māñibhadda/Māñibhadra must be assumed as the name in the earliest versions, although neither SĀ² 318’s 崛默 nor SĀ 1319’s 屈摩 can be a transcription of both Mañibhadra and Māñibhadra.

Māñibhadra is a well-known *yakṣa*-lord, and his name appears on several large *yakṣa* statues, dating at least to the first century BC.²³ Gritli von Mitterwallner (1989: 370) interprets the colossal images of Māñibhadra found at Parkham and in Gwalior as belonging to a long-lived cult among traders and merchants that is attested at several locations in north India. In spite of the subsequent decline of his cult in later centuries, the *yakṣa* Māñibhadra was still remembered in later Indian Buddhism, and *dhāraṇī* texts in which he promises to bestow wealth on the reciters can be found in the Tibetan and Chinese canon.²⁴ Māñibhadra is also prominent in Jainism, where he

more’ in the following half-line.

²¹ For an alternative rendition of this line see note 29 below.

²² For the apparent incongruity of the closing (Māñibhadra being delighted by his own words) see the discussion below.

²³ Māñibhadra is even mentioned a few times in the *Mahābharatā* (II 397, III 2529 and XIV 1918), and later works such as the *Kathāsaritsāgara* (e.g., Bhatta, Tawney and Penzer 1924–1928: I 169). Misra 1981: 80–85 provides a comprehensive description of sources. For the statues and inscriptions see among others Lüders 1961: 175–179, Mitterwallner 1989 and Nagata 2003 for more recent discoveries.

²⁴ There are two *dhāraṇī* texts in the Tanyur (*‘phags pa nor bu bzang po’i*

still has temples dedicated to him today.²⁵ In other sources Māñibhadra appears as brother or as general of Kubera, the king of *yakṣas* and lord of wealth and riches.²⁶

The name ‘Māñibhadra’ alludes to his function as the bestower of wealth and guardian of hidden treasure, jewels (*mañi*) etc. In the *Samyutta-nikāya*, Māñibhadra dwells at a *caitya* called *Mañimālaka*, ‘jewel-garland’, again hinting at a pre-existent cult. The transcription from the Sanskrit manuscript has his name consistently as Māñibhadra, which might have implied connotations of pride (*māna*). This too would fit the story, as Māñibhadra proudly praises himself for being diligent in hosting the Buddha.

By the time the early Buddhist canon was formed, at least some *yakṣas* were already established as dwelling at specific sites. The *locus classicus* for this is the *Mahāmāyūri vidyā-rājñī*, which contains a long list pairing *yakṣas* with their dwelling places. The *Mahāmāyūri* has a *yakṣa* Māñibhadra living in Brahmavatī (Lévi 1915: 38), which according to Sylvain Lévi (1915: 74) is “unknown, but should be placed somewhere close to Varṇu and Gāndhāra”, because Brahmavatī appears between these two location in the list, and the list in general constitutes an ordered geographic progression.²⁷ In our case, however, a location in the Northwest is unlikely and all versions agree that the story takes place in Magadha. The *Divyāvadāna* mentions a lotus-pond called Brahmāvātī near Varanasi,²⁸

gzungs, D 764, and *gnod sbyin nor bu bzang po'i rtog pa*, D 765), the former with a Chinese parallel (*Baoxian tuoluoni jing* 寶賢陀羅尼經, T 1285). Here too Māñibhadra's function as a god of wealth is clearly attested.

²⁵ For *yakṣas* in Jainism see Sutherland 1991: 127–136 and Misra 1981: 45–50. For an example for the inclusion of the *yakṣa* cult in Shaivite worship see Agrawala and Chandra 1959.

²⁶ Böhtlingk and Roth 1855–1875, s.v. *Mañibhadra* and *Māñibhadra*.

²⁷ On the different versions of the list see DesJardins 2002.

²⁸ Cowell 1886: 514,11.

and it may well be that this was an early site for the Māñibhadra cult.

The core line of the verse seems to be a wordplay on Māñibhadra's name. It has fortunately been preserved in the Sanskrit fragment as well.

The verse records an exchange, which Māñibhadra begins with a pun on his name, complimenting himself on the careful hosting of the Buddha and his retinue. The Chinese versions highlight his function as a host, and show him preparing fire and rooms not only for the Buddha, but all monks in his retinue. The Pali starts with *satī-mato sadā bhaddam*, “the mindful are always fortunate.” The Sanskrit fragment in Oldenburg's (1983: 173) transcription seems to double this: *smṛtīmatā bhadram astu bhadram astu smṛtīmatā*. Although grammatically problematic, perhaps due to a mistake in the transcription or a faulty manuscript, this is close to what we find translated in SĀ² 318 and SĀ 1319 (with the chiasm replaced by parallelism according to Chinese preferences).

As a whole the verse hinges on a *double entendre*. The first line should be understood as playful self-praise: “[Māñi]bhadra is always mindful, mindful is [Māñi]bhadra.” The Buddha then subverts that by pointing out to Mañibhadra that, although mindfulness is indeed good, those with kindness (*mettā*) and nonviolence (*ahiṃsa*) are “all the more free of fault (SĀ² 318: 更無有過者).”²⁹ In the Sanskrit fragment this admonishment becomes all the more pertinent as Mañibhadra is addressed throughout the surviving passages as ‘Great *Yakṣa* General’ (*mahāyakṣasenapati*).

In the Pali the verse is clearly an exchange between the Buddha and the *yakṣa*. The Sanskrit text is too fragmented to allow a final verdict on the matter. To me, the most likely course of events seems

²⁹ An alternative interpretation of the line 斯乃爲大樂更無有過者 would be, as suggested by Paul Harrison: “This is, to be sure (or: indeed), great (or: the greater?) happiness, // Which nothing else can surpass.”]

to be that the dialogic structure was lost in the stemma on which the Chinese translations are based. Perhaps at some point one or more *iti* markers were dropped, which resulted in the whole verse being spoken by Mañibadhra, as it appears now in both SĀ² 318 and SĀ 1319. Or perhaps the crucial *na* was replaced by a second *-ca* in the verse, which would have caused it to lose the sense that the second part of the verse qualifies the first. Crucially, in the Indian original of the Chinese the *yakṣa* had taken on a different name (rendered as 崛默 in SĀ² 318 and 屈摩 in SĀ 1319), thus the wordplay on *bhadra* was lost, and with it the whole point of the exchange, that is the subtle admonishment that the Buddha gives the self-satisfied *yakṣa*.

The change of speakers is also evident from the closing formulas, which became incongruent as the dialogic markers were lost in the verse. If one assumes the dialogic structure is original in the less well edited SĀ² 318, the *yakṣa* ends up being delighted by his own words, which would be highly unusual for early discourse literature. In the more streamlined SĀ 1319 this was solved by inserting a remark by the Buddha confirming Mañibhadra, which would give Mañibhadra a reason to be delighted.

Content-wise, the change of speakers makes good sense in the overall context of the *samyukta*. As in other discourses below (e.g., SĀ² 320 and SĀ² 325) exhorting *yakṣas* to nonviolence is a recurring motif.

SĀ² 319 [‘Nāgapāla as ‘Bakkula’ Demon’]

This cluster consists of SĀ² 319, SĀ² 1320, text in the Pali *Udāna* (Ud 1.10 at Ud 4,29), text in the *Udānavarga* (verses 33.68–70, Bernhard 1965: 498–500), and passages in the Chinese translations of *Vinaya* texts,³⁰ where the story is used to establish the rule against

³⁰ T 1428 at T XXII 673b19–c16, T 1435 at T XXIII 113b22–c22 and T 1464

scaring one's fellow monks. In a penetrating article Lamotte (1968) has remarked on the unusually large disparities between the texts in this cluster. There are significant differences both between the Pali tradition and the Sanskrit/Chinese versions, as well as between the *Sūtra* and *Vinaya* versions.

Note that in the Chinese versions no *yakṣa* actually appears, but the (older) verse part in both SĀ² 319 and SĀ² 1320, refers to a *pisāca* demon Bakkula. Lamotte (1968: 465–467) has shown that the name Bakkula was mistaken for *pākula* ‘chaos, confusion’ in the Pali, a misreading that has indeed caused considerable confusion among commentators and translators.

Translation³¹

Thus have I heard. Once, the Buddha stayed at Mount Pāṭalī.³² At

at T XXIV 890b2–7.

³¹ For a French translation of this discourse see Lamotte 1968: 456–459.

³² SĀ² 319: *bai shan* 白山, SĀ 1320: *mojiuluo shan* 摩鳩羅山, Ud: *pāṭali*(-putra?) (*v.l. pāvaya* < *pāvā*?). For Pāvā see Akanuma 1931, *s.v.* and Lamotte 1968: 450. Regarding 白山, Lamotte 1968: 456 note 3 suggests that it might render the toponym Pāṭalī which appears in the *Udāna* and the Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya* version (T 1428), and is derived from Sanskrit *pāṭala* ‘pale’, ‘reddish white’. A *śvetagiri* (= 白山), however, appears in the *Mahābhārata* as the abode of the *yakṣa* Māñibhadra (Misra 1981: 80). In SĀ 1320 the toponym 摩鳩羅 is also used as the name for the *pisāca* demon, which is evoked to scare children. It is not unusual for *yakṣa* names to be toponymical. As Bodhi 2000: 474 note 558 has observed “Sometimes a peak is named after a *yakkha*, sometimes a *yakkha* after a peak.” I suggest that 摩鳩羅 transcribes something like **makkula*, which in the Pali version is *bakkula* (also *pakkula*, *vakkula*). This is the cry uttered by the *yakkha* Ajakalāpaka in the *Saṃyutta-nikāya*. Phonetically, the nasalization of *ba-/va-* to *ma-* 摩 is uncommon, but 摩俱羅 is used at least once for the name of the Thera Bak(k)ula (in the *Ratnakūṭa*

that time the venerable Nāgapāla³³ was attending the Buddha. One night the World-honored One was [outside] walking [meditatively] when a light rain fell and lighting flashed. At that time Indra magically conjured a precious hall made of beryl, covering the Buddha. Having done so, he went up to the Buddha and paid obeisance to the Buddha's feet. The Tathāgatha continued walking as he was not yet ready to retire for the night.³⁴

collection, T 310 at T XI 91c13) (on Bakkula as ideal arhat see Anālayo 2007 and 2010). Also, the Bakula tree seems to have been called *makula* or *bakula* (Apte 1957–1959, s.v. *makulaḥ*; Böhtlingk and Roth 1855–1875, s.v. *makula*), so the nasalization *ba-* to *ma-* is well attested in this case. The Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya* parallel of the story has 婆俱羅 for the name of the *yakṣa*, but 摩俱羅山 for his mountain, implying that a distinction between *bakkula* for the *yakṣa* and **makkula* for the place was maintained at one point. Interestingly, the sixth-century glossary *Fanfangyu* 翻梵語 (T 2130 at T LIV 1043b3) glosses this occurrence of 摩俱羅山 with 天冠 (*maḥka* or *mukṣa*), which sounds like a good name for a mountain. The *Fanfangyu* is probably mistaken, however, and 摩俱羅山 does in fact regularly transcribe *mak(k)ula*. According to Lamotte 1968: 453 the northern version, witnessed by both SĀ² 319 and SĀ 1320, the name *Bakkula* was preserved, while the Pali tradition misread *Bakkula* for *pākula* and had to improvise a name for the *yakṣa* protagonist, settling on *Ajakālāpaka* who seems to have had his own cult and might be the *Ajakālako yakho* that is depicted on a balustrade in Bhārhut (Lüders 1963: 74 and Lamotte 1968: 451). Possible origins of Pali *bakkula* are also discussed in Morris 1886: 94 and Woodward 1926: 66–68.

³³ SĀ² 319 translates: 像護; SĀ 1320 transliterates: *naḥieboluo* 那伽波羅; the Sarvāstivāda *Vinaya* (T 1435) also translates: 像守. According to Akanuma 1931, s.v. *Nāgasamala*, Nāgapāla is Nāgasamala, who is known to have served as the Buddha's attendant. Interestingly, the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* mentions a *yakṣa* called Nāgapālaka, Bagchi 1967: 9, 13. It is almost as if the tradition had turned Nāgapāla into a *yakṣa* king after his charade in this discourse.

³⁴ SĀ² 319: 猶未休止. Lamotte 1968: 456 has “seul et sans arrêt”, perhaps

At that time the people in this region, whenever their children did not stop crying, they scared them with [stories of] a *bakkula* demon.³⁵

Now, it has always been the rule with Buddhas, that as long as the teacher has not entered his room, the disciples must not enter their rooms and go to sleep before him. On that occasion Nāgapāla thought: “It is already late at night, but the World-honored One does not sleep. I will pretend to be the Bakkula Demon and scare him to [go inside] and sleep!”

Having thought so, he quickly wrapped himself in a blanket³⁶ [wearing it inside out], went to the path where the Buddha was walking and said to him: “Renunciant! Renunciant! The Bakkula Demon has come!” Thereupon the Buddha said to Nāgapāla: “You really are idiotic! Trying to scare me with *bakkula*! Don’t you know that the Tathāgata has long ago ended [being subject to] fear, the bristling of hair and all terror?”³⁷

Indra having seen and heard [this exchange] said to the Buddha: “World-honored One, among those who live by the teachings of the Buddha, are there more [idiots] like this, who have gone forth?” The Buddha said to Indra: “Kosiyā, Gotama’s tribe is vast and great, it includes all kinds of people. Even those such as him [Nāgapāla] can

reading 獨未休止.

³⁵ *baojuluo* 薄俱羅 (SĀ² 319) = *mojiuluo* 摩鳩羅 (SĀ 1320), here the name of the demon (鬼), derived from the cry he utters (see note 33 above). Not to be confused with the Thera Bakkula.

³⁶ SĀ² 319: 返 (or 反) 被 (or 披) 俱執. SĀ 1320 adds 長毛在外 (“[in such a way] that the long hair was on the outside”), which seems to imply that furs were used as blankets. 俱執 seems to be from *kuśa* (Lamotte 1968: 457) a grass that was woven into mats, but it was also used to denote bedding in general (Nakamura 1975: 269b, s.v.). 被 might be a *lectio facillior* for 披, ‘to wear.’

³⁷ Lamotte 1968: 456 identified this as the stock phrase *bhayaṃ chambhittattam lomahaṃso*.

attain pure qualities before long.” Then the World-honored One spoke a verse:

“When with respect to his own duties³⁸ // a Brahmin is fully cultivated,

and has crossed over to the other shore, // he has put an end to all fetters of existence.

When with respect to his own duties // a Brahmin is fully cultivated,

and considered someone who has crossed over to the other shore, // he has seen all [his] feelings³⁹ destroyed.

When with respect to his own duties // a Brahmin is fully cultivated.

and has crossed over to the other shore, // he has seen all his karmic causes⁴⁰ ended.

When with respect to his own duties // a Brahmin is fully cultivated,

and was able to cross over to the other shore, // he has seen his fetters quietly destroyed.

When with respect to his own duties // a Brahmin is fully cultivated,

and has crossed over to the other shore, // he has seen birth, old age, sickness and death.⁴¹

³⁸ SĀ² 319: 於自己法, corresponding to *sakesu dhammesu* (Pali) / *sveṣu dharmeṣu* (Sanskrit), an allusion to the Brahmanical concept of *svadharma* = [doing] one’s duty. Lamotte 1968: 458 prefers ‘qualités’. In Brahmanism *svadharmas* are relative to caste, age, and gender. In Buddhism this is recast as transcending those categories. Both the Pali and the Sanskrit have the plural, thus the translation “with respect to his own duties”, although neither SĀ² 319 nor SĀ 1320 have plural markers.

³⁹ 受 (SĀ² 319) = *vedanāḥ* (*Udānavarga*).

⁴⁰ 因 (SĀ² 319) = *pratīyā(h)* (*Udānavarga*).

⁴¹ 觀生老病死 (SĀ² 319) = *atha jātījarāṃ c(ai)va // maraṇaṃ cātīvartate*

When with respect to his own duties // a Brahmin is fully cultivated,
and has crossed over to the other shore, // he can even help the
pisāca demon Bakkula to cross over.”

At that time Indra heard what the Buddha said, rejoiced, prostrated himself, and returned to his heavenly palace.

SĀ² 320 [‘The Mother of Piṅgala’]

This discourse might be the earliest mention of the ‘mother of Piṅgala’, the famous Hārītī.⁴² The mother *yakṣiṇī*, who stays unnamed, was to become a widely depicted legendary figure and goddess. She even entered the pantheons of Chinese and Japanese Buddhism, where she is called Guizimushen / Kishimojin 鬼子母神.

Translation

At that time the venerable Anuruddha, following the Buddha in his travels, came to the abode of a demon mother in Magadha.⁴³ Then Anuruddha rose early in the middle of the night, sat straight in meditation, and recited verses from the *Dhammapada* and the verses of the great seers from the *Pārāyana*.⁴⁴ He also with a strong voice re-

“Has fully escaped birth, old age, sickness and death” (*Udānavarga*).

⁴² Waddell 1912: 144–145 would disagree with this as he sees the origin of Hārītī in the figure of the *kinnara* Chandā found in the *Jātakas*. On translations of the Hārītī-related discourses in the Chinese canon see Peri 1917. For her iconography see Foucher 1909 and Lesbre 2000.

⁴³ The unusual beginning might point to a corruption of the text here. SĀ 1321 has the conventional opening 如是我聞：一時佛住王舍城迦蘭陀竹園 (T II 362c7–8). Such a reference to Rājagaha would also make sense for SĀ² 320, which is set in Magadha.

⁴⁴ 波羅延 (SĀ² 320) = 波羅延那 (SĀ 1321) = *Pārāyana* (Sn verses 976–

cited the *Aṭṭhaka-vagga*⁴⁵ and [other] discourses. At that time, *Piṅgala,⁴⁶ the dear little child of a mother demoness was crying and sniffing. At that time the mother demoness comforted the child saying: “Hush, don’t cry. The man of the Way⁴⁷ is reciting discourses.” Then she spoke in verse:

“Hush, Piṅgala, // listen to the man of the Way recite the *Dhammapada*.

Hearing these verses all transgressions are ended, // one can keep the precepts perfectly.

Hush, Piṅgala, // listen to the man of the Way recite the *Dhammapada*.

Hearing these verses one can end the [habit of] killing. // Hush, Piṅgala,

listen to the man of the Way recite the *Dhammapada*. // Hearing these verses one’s speech becomes truthful.

1149). 其義 (SĀ² 320) = 義品 (SĀ 1321) = *Aṭṭhaka-vagga* (Sn verses 766–975). Lévi 1915 remarked on evidence that the *Aṭṭhaka-vagga* and the *Pārāyana* were part of the earliest known recitation by Buddhist lay-people and monastics. In T 100 a recitation of the *Dhammapada* and the *Pārāyana* is also mentioned in SĀ² 184 at T II 439c14–15, translated in Bingenheimer 2013: 207. 大德 here is more likely to translate *mahā-ṛddhika* (or *ārya*) than the more frequent *bhadanta*, ‘reverend’ (Hirakawa 1997: 331). It is referring to the Brahmanical students that question the Buddha in the *Pārāyana*. In the Pali version only the last of them, Piṅgiya, is called a *mahā isi* (Sn 194).

⁴⁵ SĀ² 320: 其義; SĀ 1321: 義品.

⁴⁶ 賓伽羅 (SĀ² 320); against this 畢陵伽 (SĀ 1321) = *Pilinda. In SN 10.6 the child of the *yakkhinī* is called Piyaṅkara. According to the *Samyutta-nikāya* commentary at Spk I 309,4 the pair was out foraging, *gocaram pariyesantī*.

⁴⁷ SĀ² 320: 道人, an early term for a religious practitioner. SN 10.6 has *bhikkhu*.

Hush, Piṅgala, // listen to the man of the Way recite the *Dhammapada*.

Hearing these verses we will not be reborn as demons again, // hush, Piṅgala.”

SĀ² 321 [The Mother of Punabbasu]

Translation

Thus have I heard. Once, the Buddha was in Magadha at the abode of the mother of the *yakṣa* Punabbasu.⁴⁸ As he stayed the night in their abode, the son, the *yakṣa* [Puna]bbasu, and his sister Uttarā⁴⁹ cried at night. Their mother consoled her son and daughter, and to stop them from crying she spoke a verse:

“Punabbasu // and Uttarā,

You better now // stop crying.

The Buddha, the Hero of the World, // teaches the principles of Dharma.

Let me listen, // as neither father nor mother

can make us escape from suffering. // Only the World-honored One, and his well-spoken Dharma // can forever release its listeners from suffering. // All sentient beings

following the flow of desire, // drown in the sea of birth and death.

I wish to hear the Dharma, // to end the flow of desire.

Punabbasu and Uttarā,

you therefore should be quiet.”

Then Punabbasu spoke this verse:

⁴⁸ SĀ² 321: Funapoxiu 富那婆修; SĀ 1322: Funaposhu 富那婆藪; SN 10.7: Punabbasu.

⁴⁹ SN 10.7 has Uttarikā, but both Youdaluo 優怛羅 (SĀ² 321) and Youduo-luo 鬱多羅 (SĀ 1322) point to Uttarā for the northern tradition.

“I follow my mother’s instruction // and will not utter one more sound,
my little sister Uttarā // too will be silent now.

I wish to hear the renunciant // proclaim this marvelous Dharma.
In Magadha the Buddha // is the best among men,
widely, for the sake of all beings, // he proclaims the Dharma that
ends suffering.

He speaks of suffering and its origin // its end and the way to end it.
He speaks of the eight-fold path of the nobles // and the peace of
Nirvāṇa.

Excellent it is to listen to the renunciant // proclaiming the
principles of his Dharma.”

[His] mother answered in verse:

“You are wise // and your words accord with my wishes.

You have well praised // the teacher of this world.

By staying silent // you let me understand the four truths.

Uttarā will later // too understand the four truths.”

SĀ² 322 [‘At the Abode of Māṇicara’]

This is the only discourse in the *Yakṣa-samyuktas* of T 100 and T 99 for which we have no Pali parallel. Incongruencies between the prose frame and the verse part, as well as the absence of a Pali version, indicate that this discourse might be a later addition to the northern transmission line.

Translation

Thus have I heard. Once, the Buddha was traveling in Magadha when he came to the abode of the *yakṣa* Māṇicara.⁵⁰ At that time the

⁵⁰ SĀ² 322: 宮; SĀ 1323: 住處. I keep the translation ‘abode’, which is supported by T 99, for consistency here, although ‘shrine’ might perhaps be

yakṣa Māṇicara and the other *yakṣas* were not at home, but had gathered in some other place.

A woman came to the abode of the *yakṣa*, bringing good incense, flower garlands, and good wine as offering. The World-honored One was sitting in that abode, all faculties stilled. The woman saw the Tathāgata sitting in the abode, on his face a happy expression, his thoughts calmed, his faculties stilled, having achieved the supreme training of the mind, he was like a golden spire.⁵¹

preferable in this case. Monixing 摩尼行 (SĀ² 322) or Monozheluo 摩尼遮羅 (SĀ 1323) can only be the *yakṣa* Māṇicara, who is attested variously in Buddhist and non-Buddhist Sanskrit literature, sometimes identified with Māṇibhadra (Böhtlingk and Roth 1855–1875, *s.v.* *Māṇicāra*). Transliteration–translation compounds such as 摩尼 + 行 are characteristic for T 100.

⁵¹ The term *jinlou* 金樓, which in this cluster (SĀ² 322 / SĀ 1323) has no counterpart in the SĀ 1323 version. It has not been well defined in Buddhist lexicography so far, in spite of being part of a pericope, perhaps because the more usual meaning ‘golden roof’ is unproblematic. Only Hirakawa 1997: 1187 gives *suvarṇa-kūṭāgāra*. *Kūṭāgāra* (variously spelled) is widely attested at least in the Pali corpus (cf. “a building with a peaked roof or pinnacles, possibly gabled” (Rhys Davids and Stede 1921, *s.v.* *Kūṭa*)). The dictionary definitions for Sanskrit *kūṭāgāra* as ‘Dachzimmer, Belvedere’ (Böhtlingk and Roth 1855–1875, *s.v.*), ‘upper room, pleasure-house’ (Cappeller 1891, *s.v.*), do not quite work here, and these definitions have been found deficient (de Vreese 1947, Bollée 1986), although they might underlie the use of the Chinese 金樓 in other occurrences; e.g., 王入寶殿，登金樓 in T 1509 at T XXV 152b19 and 金樓設銀御座 in MĀ 68 at T I 516b4–5, or 入金樓觀 in DĀ 2 at T I 23c18. Coomaraswamy 1928: 262–263 concludes his entry on the term surmising “that *kūṭāgāra* generally means simply ‘a house with a finial (or finials).’” In T 100 the term 金樓 appears five times (SĀ² 93, SĀ² 97, SĀ² 119, SĀ² 267 and SĀ² 322), always, like here in SĀ² 322, in descriptions of the Buddha in meditation; e.g., SĀ² 93 at T II 406b2–4: 來

Seeing this she thought: “The *yakṣa* Māṇicara is appearing right before me!” She then paid obeisance to the Buddha’s feet [thinking he was Māṇicara] and said in verse:

“You who verily repays offerings // please grant me my request.
 Considering you wise and benign// the people of Magadha
 all ask of you to fulfill their wishes. // And always, according to
 their desire,
 you give them wealth and blessings. // Now accord to my request
 let me enjoy happiness in this life // and a heavenly rebirth in the
 next.”

Thereupon the World-honored One replied with a verse:

“Carefully avoid indolence // and the arising of pride.
 Always delight in faith and precepts⁵² // [thus] you should change
 and save yourself.

在樹下坐，容貌殊特，諸根寂定，心意恬靜，獲於最上調伏之意，如似金樓，威光赫然。 T 99 does not use this term. On the four occasions where the passage in SĀ² 322 has a parallel in T 99, three liken the seated Buddha to a golden mountain, 金山, instead of a spire (SĀ 1144 for verse of SĀ² 119, SĀ 1183 for verse of SĀ² 97 and SĀ 101 for verse of SĀ² 267); one speaks merely of the golden radiance of the Buddha’s body, without employing a metaphor (SĀ 1179 for verse of SĀ² 93: 其身金色，光明焰照). Both 金樓 and 金山 might have been *suvarṇa-kūṭa* here, as *kūṭa* alone can mean ‘top of a house, roof, pinnacle’ (Rhys Davids and Stede 1921, *s.v.*), or the ‘peak of a roof’ (Cone 2001, *s.v.*), as well as ‘peak’ or ‘summit’. However, as Bollée 1983: 192 has shown, the compound *kūṭā-gāra* can mean simply the top ornament of a house. As the SĀ² 322 passage shows, these vase-shaped finials were used at one point as a metaphor for the Buddha seated in meditation. I am grateful to Oskar von Hinüber for alerting me to Bollée’s article.

⁵² SĀ² 322: 常當樂信戒. Alternatively, reading *āyati-sukha* for 當樂 (Hirakawa 1997: 852), would result in “Always, for your future happiness, put your faith in the precepts.”

Beseeching Māṅicara – // what more could he do
that would be better than you, by your own practice, // [creating]
the karma to be reborn in heaven?”

Having heard this verse the woman thought: “This certainly is not
the *yakṣa* Māṅicara, but the renunciant Gotama.”

The women then quickly cleared away the incense, flowers, and
the wine bottles, paid obeisance to the Buddha’s feet and with palms
together said this verse:

“How does one obtain // happiness in this life and heavenly rebirth
in the next?

Moving toward what thing // can one obtain happiness?

How should one act? // I ask, oh Gotama,

how to obtain present happiness // and heavenly rebirth at the end
of life?”

[The Buddha said in verse:]

“By generosity and taming one’s faculties // can one give rise to
happiness.

The wise and good, with correct views // befriend renunciants.

Those who live independently by right livelihood // what use do
they have to be reborn in that

Heaven of the Thirty-Three // that is still in the web of suffering?

End your desires // and listen carefully to my explanation.

I will explain to you // the Dharma without impurities.

You, of the *yakṣa* race, // listen well to the deathless [Dharma].”⁵³

At that time the World-honored One explained the Dharma, ex-
horting, instructing, benefiting, and delighting her with the teachings
of the Buddhas, such as regarding generosity, regarding the precepts,
regarding rebirth in heaven, regarding the impurity of desire, and the

⁵³ For this half-line we have a Sanskrit fragment /// ++ (deśayi)ṣy(ā)my
amṛtaṃ vai śṛṇu .. /// (SHT V, no. 1138).

importance of going beyond. The Buddha then understood that her mind and thoughts had been made pliant, and explained to her the four truths: of suffering, its arising, its ending, and the way [towards that end].

The woman was intelligent, on hearing the Dharma she believed and understood, like a new and clean cloth, which is easily dyed. Right on her seat she realized the teaching (*dharma*) regarding the four truths of the nobles, understood the teaching, took hold of the teaching, fathomed the teaching fully, broke through the net of doubt, traversing [through] her doubts to the other shore, not following any other [teachings].

She rose, paid obeisance to the Buddha, and with palms together said: “World-honored One! I have already attained release, I have already attained release. I take refuge in the triple gem for the rest of my life, and will refrain from killing.”⁵⁴

And the woman, having heard the Dharma, was delighted, paid homage and left.

⁵⁴ SĀ² 322: 成就不殺, a somewhat surprising ending, which is not found in the more streamlined SĀ 1323. I translate according to an earlier similar passage in SĀ² 92 at T II 405b20–22: 盡我形壽歸依三寶爲優婆夷, 盡壽不殺, 清淨信向, 不盜、不邪淫、不妄語、不飲酒, 亦復如是. The text is problematic in that in SĀ² 322 the final verse line clearly addresses a *yakṣiṇī*, 汝諸夜叉眾 (諸 here not marking the plural, but accentuating the vocative). This seems to contradict the framing story where the interlocutor seems to be a human woman. I suggest that in the verse we are seeing an older, partially overwritten, version of the framing story in which the Buddha addresses a *yakṣiṇī*, for whom emphasizing to abstain from killing makes sense (like in the verse spoken to the *yakṣiṇī* Piṅgala’s mother in SĀ² 320 translated above).

SĀ² 323 [‘Sūciloma Challenges the Buddha’]

The texts forming a cluster with SĀ² 323 are found in T 99 (SĀ 1324), the *Saṃyutta-nikāya* (SN 10.3) and the *Sutta-nipāta* (Sn 5 at Sn 47–49 (vv. 270–273)). Moreover, Enomoto Fumio 榎本文雄 (1994, no. 1324) has identified two Sanskrit fragments corresponding with the *Śarīrārtha-gāthā* of the *Yogācārabhūmi* (SHT V, no. 1138; Enomoto 1989: 27–28, no. 11).

During the translation process I noticed that the verse part of SĀ² 323 / SĀ 1324 also appears in SĀ² 313 / SĀ 1314, i.e., in the *Devaputra-saṃyukta*, which, as mentioned in the introduction, had other instances of overlap with the *Yakṣa-saṃyukta*. Moreover, the framing story of SĀ² 323, is a parallel to SĀ² 325 (Āḷavaka).

Translation

Thus have I heard. Once, when the Buddha was wandering in Magadha, he came to the abode of the *yakṣa* Sūciloma to spend the night. At that time the *yakṣa* Sūciloma was elsewhere in a gathering with other *yakṣas* and not at home.⁵⁵ Then a friend of Sūciloma, named *Kara⁵⁶

⁵⁵ Both SĀ² 323 and SĀ 1324 here and below are closely related to the fragmentary Sanskrit parallel. Here: (*sūci*)*lomo yakṣo yakṣāṇām samitiṃ gato* (SHT V, no. 1138; Enomoto 1989: 61, no. 1324).

⁵⁶ SN 10.3 has Khara ‘hard, sharp, shaggy’, which, like Sūciloma, describes the hair of the *yakṣa*, and includes connotations of animal fur (*khara* also “donkey, mule”). In SĀ² 323 the *yakṣa*’s name is Zhi 炙 (‘burning, roasting, exposing to sunshine’), in SĀ 1324 Yan 炎 (‘blazing, burning’). Perhaps in the northern tradition *khara* weakened into **kara* (‘ray of light’). A weakening of the distinction between aspirated and non-aspirated stops has been attested for Gandhari (Brough 1962: 100, Salomon 1999: 127–128), but mainly for voiced aspirates. *khara* > *kara* is perhaps a simple mistake in the phase of oral tradition rather than indicative of language change. Again, this mistake proves that the

saw that the Buddha was staying at Sūciloma's abode, went to Sūciloma and told him: "You are very fortunate!⁵⁷ A Tathāgata, an Arhat, a Fully Awakened One is now in your abode to spend the night there."

The *yakṣa* Sūciloma said: "What is that man doing in my abode?"

The *yakṣa* [Kara] responded: "Although he is a human, he is in fact a Tathāgata, an Arhat, a Fully Awakened One."

Sūciloma said: "I will return to my abode right away to figure out for myself whether or not he is a Tathāgata, an Arhat, a Fully Awakened One!"

When his meeting was over, the *yakṣa* Sūciloma quickly returned to his abode. He wanted to touch the Buddha, but the Buddha drew back. He asked the Buddha: "Renunciant, are you afraid?"

The Buddha said: "I have no fear, but your touch is evil."

Sūciloma said again: "Renunciant, I will ask you a riddle. If you can explain it, your blessings will be great; if you cannot answer me I will break your mind, cause your blood to boil and spout forth from your face. I will grasp you by your arms and toss you to the shore of the Ganges."⁵⁸

The Buddha said: "I do not see in this world a *deva*, *māra*, *brahma*,

Indian original of T 100 and T 99 must have at one stage been the same text after the separation from the southern stemma and before the separation of the immediate predecessors of the two collections.

⁵⁷ In other versions Sūciloma is addressed as 聚落主 (SĀ 1324), or *grāmaṇi* (SHT V, no. 1138), i.e., 'chieftain.'

⁵⁸ SĀ² 323's *póqí* [hé] 婆耆 [河] must be an attempt to transliterate *bhāgī[ratha]*, a name for the Ganges, which is attested in the Sanskrit fragment (*bhāgīrathyās tīre* SHT V, no. 1138). SĀ 1324 (恒水) and SN 10.3 (*gaṅgāya*) have 'Ganges'. This transliteration of the name of the river seems unique in the canon and it is not clear whether the translator of T 100 understood that *bhāgī[ratha]* stands for Ganges.

renunciant, or brahmin, who could confuse my mind, break my mind, and cause boiling blood to spout forth from my face, who could grasp me by my arms and toss me to the other side of the Ganges River.” Then Sūciloma said in verse:

“Desire and Hatred // what is their cause?
Joy, unhappiness // and hair-raising terror:
why do they exist? // Those thoughts,
where do they dwell? // How does the babe
just born // know to reach for [his mother’s] milk?”

At that time the World-honored One spoke in a verse:

“Desire is born from oneself // like the [stems of the] Nigrodha Tree.⁵⁹

Desire follows that which it clings to // like many Māluvā creepers entangling the Nigrodha. // This, *yakṣa*, you should know.

If you know its root cause // one can surely get rid of it

Thus those who have broken with the root cause (?)⁶⁰ // can cross the ocean of *samsāra*,

and having crossed over the stream of becoming // there will not be further becoming.”

Having heard what the Buddha said, the *yakṣa* Sūciloma was glad at heart and understood, he leaped up with happiness, and right away took the three refuges.

Discussion

The verse “How does the babe just born // know to reach for [his mother’s] milk?” is one of the more intriguing differences between

⁵⁹ The Nigrodha, the Indian Fig tree, grows new stems by filaments that descent to earth from the branches and take root there.

⁶⁰ The reading 如彼 makes no sense. It is probably a scribal mistake for either *rupo* 如破 (~“Those who have destroyed the root cause //...”) or *zhibi* 知彼 (~“Those who know this root cause // ...”).

the southern and northern tradition in this *samyukta*. Its text as per the six available versions is reproduced in Table 2 below.

The Pali (in both the *Samyutta-nikāya* and the *Sutta-nipāta* versions) here has an unusual simile: *kuto samuṭṭhāya manovittakkā, kumārakā dhaṅkamivossajanti*.⁶¹ According to the commentaries, *dhaṅkamivossajanti* is to be resolved as *dhaṅkam iv' ossajanti* with *ossajanti* further glossed as *kipanti*, 'to throw', 'to cast forth'. The commentary to the *Sutta-nipāta* explains the idea thus: "village children in play catch a crow and, having tied a string around its feet, toss it about, just so having originated from what do unwholesome thoughts toss about a wholesome mind."⁶² Thus Bhikkhu Bodhi's (2000: 307) translation of the verse: "Having arisen from what, do the mind's thoughts // [Toss one around] as boys toss up a crow."⁶³

For the northern tradition Enomoto (1994, no. 1314) has identified a parallel verse passage in the *Yogācārabhūmi* (Enomoto 1989: 27, no.

⁶¹ As Norman 1992: 200–201 and Bodhi 2017: 1351 note 100 and 1446 note 1107 mention, some manuscripts have *vāṅkam* instead of *dhaṅkam*, which, however, does not make much sense here, and seems to be a mistake.

⁶² Pj II 303,22–25: *kumārakā dhaṅkamivossajanti ti yathā gāmadārakā kīḷanti kākaṃ suttena pāde bandhitvā ossajanti kipanti, evaṃ kusalamanaṃ akusalavittakkā kuto samuṭṭhāya ossajanti ti pucchati* (for the *Samyutta-nikāya* commentary see note 65 below).

⁶³ This was solved and translated by C.A. Rhys Davids (Rhys Davids and Woodward 1917: I 265) as "And whence spring thoughts in our minds down sinking // Like tethered crow pulled by boy-captors earthward." In German, Geiger et al. 1997 [1930]: 325, have: "Woher sind die Herzensgedanken aufgetaucht, (Die da sind), wie (wenn) Knaben eine Krähe freilassen", and note, following Rhys Davids: "Das Original ist dunkel, die Ausdrucksweise äußerst knapp. Nach dem Komm. (I. 355–6 [sic]) wäre das Bild von einem Kinderspiel hergenommen. Knaben haben eine Krähe gefangen, binden ihr eine lange Schnur an das Bein, lassen sie fliegen und ziehen sie an der Schnur wieder zu sich zurück."

11). Here the last verse reads *kumāarakā dhātrīm ivāśrayante*, and something similar must have been the source for the Chinese versions. In fact, SĀ 1314 appears to be a literal rendering of this Sanskrit version: *kumāarakā* 鳩摩羅 *dhātrīm* 乳母 *eva* 猶如 *āśrayante* 依倚於。

Table 2. Versions of the Riddle Verse in SĀ² 323 and its Parallels

SN 10.3 = Sn 2.5	<i>Yogācārabhūmi</i> Frag.	SĀ ² 313	SĀ ² 323
<i>kuto samuṭṭhāya manovitakkā / kumāarakā dhāṅka- mivossajanti</i>	<i>kutaḥsamutthās ca mano vitarkāḥ / kumāarakā dhātrīm ivāśrayante</i>	樂不樂恐怖 為是而誰耶 櫻孩捉母乳 意覺從何生	彼意覺者 住在何處 櫻孩小兒 云何生便 知捉於乳
		SĀ ² 1314	SĀ 1324
		恐怖從何起 覺想由何生 猶如鳩摩羅 依倚於乳母	意念諸覺想 為從何所起 猶如新生兒 依倚於乳母

Soon after the separation of the northern and southern line in the transmission of the *Saṃyukta* collections, and probably still in the oral phase of transmission, the unusual *dhāṅkamivossajanti* was misremembered as *dhātrīmivāśrayante*, at a time before the T 100 and T 99 versions separated. After the change from *dhāṅkamivossajanti* to *dhātrīmivāśrayante*, but still before the T 100/T 99 split, the verse part was reused in the *Devaputra-saṃyukta*, when the short discourse SĀ² 313 / SĀ 1314 was created. SĀ² 313 / SĀ 1314 has no direct Pali parallel and we can assume it to be a later variation on the discourse version represented by SĀ² 323 / SĀ 1324. As we saw above there were other *yakṣa* discourses that migrated into the *Devaputra-saṃyukta* in the northern tradition.

This divergence between *dhanka* and *dhātrī* was first discussed by Alex Wayman (1982), who, however, arrived at doubtful conclusions. Wayman noticed the passage by reading the Chinese and the Tibetan versions of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, but did not seem to have had access to the Sanskrit. Without availing himself of the Pali commentaries directly, Wayman sets out on a wild goose chase to get rid of the crow. First he cites C.A. Rhys Davids' paraphrase of Buddhaghosa's explanation and asserts that this "explanation certainly does not accord with the current dictionary entries for the verb form *ussajjati*."⁶⁴ Then he surmises that "Buddhaghosa took *ussajjati* tantamount to a theoretical S[anskrit] *utsañjati*." Theoretical indeed, as both commentaries speak of *ossajati* 'let us go, throws', which is in itself quite understandable, even without referring to the gloss *khipati*. Wayman then lets it go further and flies from *utsañjati* to *utsaṅga* ("a common word for 'lap'") deciding to "render the verb *ussajanti* [*sic*] 'are hoist to the lap'," and thus with him the cruel children eventually end up hoisted onto the lap of their wet nurse. The Sanskrit parallel, however, does not have *utsañjati*, but *āśrayante*, and neither 'lap' nor 'hip' appear in any of the versions. Wayman manages to convince himself that his brainchild makes good sense and even that it is the earlier version. He concludes that the case "supports a conclusion of modern Buddhologists that the Pali canon by itself does not present a complete picture of early Buddhism, but that one should add a component from the northern Bud-

⁶⁴ Wayman was looking at Smith's 2001 [1954]: 1281 tables to the *Saddanīti* (Sadd V 1281, s.v.) at the definition of *ussajjati* (which he insists on reading in spite of the commentaries' *ossajati*). There he finds Sanskrit *utsajjati*, which he (correctly) rejects. Had he followed the commentaries and checked for *ossajati* → *osajjati* (Sadd V 1295, s.v.) he would have been led to the 'approximate' (so marked by Smith) Sanskrit *avasajjati*, which would have been altogether more wholesome.

dhist canon (Tibetan and Chinese) to get early Buddhism in better focus.” In this at least, we can concur.

Comparing the Pali, Chinese, and Sanskrit passages, Buddhaghosa’s explanation of *dhāṅkamivossajanti* makes good sense. His explanation of the metaphor in the *Saṃyutta-nikāya* commentary is lucid: “This asks from where the evil thoughts arise that toss the mind about like boys toss and fling about a crow they caught.”⁶⁵ The Sanskrit/Chinese version that has the thoughts arising “like children depending on their nurse” seems less intuitive and the odds are that we are dealing in the northern tradition with an early corruption of an original *dhāṅkamivossajanti*. It was probably occasioned by the Sanskritization of Pali *osajj-* to Sanskrit *avasṛj-*, which is suggested in Helmer Smith’s (2001 [1954]: V 1295) tables to the *Saddanīti*.⁶⁶

SĀ² 324 [‘Possession by a *Yakṣa*’]

In this discourse the dialogue between the *yakṣa* and the mother of a possessed young man, as well as the allusions to the proper behavior for a renunciant, become fully intelligible only in light of the *Saṃyutta-nikāya* commentary, which gives the following background story: the son was a novice who had decided to disrobe and went home to tell his mother. A female *yakṣa*, who had been his mother in a former life, took possession of him, in order to prevent him from leaving the monastic life.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ Spk I 304,6-9: *kumārakā dhāṅkam iv’ossanjantī ti, yathā kumārakā kākaṃ gahetvā ossajanti khipanti, evaṃ pāpa-vitakkā kuto samuṭṭhāya cittaṃ ossajanti? ti pucchati.*

⁶⁶ See note 64 above.

⁶⁷ As Bodhi 2000: 479 note 572 noted, Buddhaghosa gave the same background story not only in the *Saṃyutta-nikāya* commentary but also in

It is possible that the second half of SĀ² 324 was originally part of a commentary. The lack of a closing passage and the unusual break in narrative time seems to suggest that the text was significantly altered in transmission. In its current form the SĀ² version of the text is hardly intelligible on its own.

Translation

Thus have I heard. Once, the Buddha was staying at Sāvattihī at the Jeta Grove in the Anāthapiṇḍika Park. At that time there was a laywoman who had a son, who having taken the eight precepts was failing to keep them. Because he broke the precepts a spirit possessed him and he went mad.⁶⁸ Then the laywoman spoke this verse:

“On the fourteenth and fifteenth // as well as on the eighth of each half-month,⁶⁹

as well as during the special half-month of the Tathāgata’s supernatural powers⁷⁰ // one is to keep the eight precepts strictly.

the *Dhammapada* commentary at DhP-a IV 18–25.

⁶⁸ For possession by *yakṣa* see DeCaroli 2004: 25–26 and Chandra 1954: 47–48 and 51. DeCaroli asserts, based on a remark by Agrawala, that the motif already appears in the *Vedas*. This is not born out by the referenced passage, however. A Jain tale of possession by a *yakṣa* can be found in the *Antagaḍa-dasāo* (Barnett 1907: 86–96).

⁶⁹ SĀ² 324: 月, as elsewhere in T 100 (e.g., SĀ² 46 at T II 389a10), here ‘half-month’ (*pakṣa/pakkha*).

⁷⁰ Rhys Davids 1880: 141 remarked that the Pali *pāṭihāriyapakkha* was used to denote three periods: the three months of the summer retreat, or the following ‘robe month’ (*cīvara māsa*), or, mainly, the first fortnight/half-month of the robe month. This was forgotten by at least some later translators, who seem to imply the term denotes an extra day; e.g., Norman 1992: 43 and 222: “a special day of the fortnight.” Chinese readers might have understood terms such as 神足月 as pointing to a period in January-February, rather than August-September (Bingen-

If one practices without fail [during those periods] // spirits will not disturb one.

This is what I have heard // from the Arhat.”

The *yakṣa* then spoke this verse:

“At the fourteenth and fifteenth // as well as on the eighth of each half-month,

as well as during the fasting days of the special half-month // one is to keep the precepts without fail.

Keeping all eight precepts fastidiously // spirits will not disturb one.

What you have heard from the Arhat // is all true. I must now release [him].”

The *yakṣa* [also] said:

“Break the precepts and the spirits will disturb you // Breaking them in this life you will be bothered by spirits. // In the next you will receive the fruit of your bad action [i.e., a rebirth in a bad place]. Taking the precepts is like handling a knife. // Handled hastily one always gets hurt.

Wise people need to grasp it well⁷¹ // in just the right way and thus avoid harm.

A renunciant who does not keep the precepts // will later suffer the pains of hell,

like someone who clumsily uses a knife // will surely cut his hand.

Those who grasp it well, remain unharmed // [like those] who can keep the rules of the renunciants are bound to attain *Nirvāṇa* in the end.”

The *yakṣa* finally relinquished the son and released him suddenly.

heimer 2009: 227). The difficulty of pinning down the term was also noticed by Forte and May 1979: 397.

⁷¹ Reading with the Chinese stemma of the Song 宋, Yuan 元 and Ming 明 editions 善捉, instead of 菩提 in the Taishō edition.

The laywoman quickly told her son⁷²:

“You must listen to what I // and the *yakṣa* tell you:

‘All entangling karma // is due to imperfect *brahmacariya*.

Leading a skewed, crooked life // one cannot attain the great fruit
[of arhatship].

Like wielding a knife clumsily // one will surely cut one’s own hand.’

Keeping the rules of the renunciants well // one will in the end
surely make progress towards *Nirvāṇa*,

like someone who, wielding his knife skillfully, // will not hurt
his hand’.”

Earlier, one time, the laywoman had explained the Dharma in various ways to her son, and the son had quickly engendered dispassion [with the world].

Having [engendered] dispassion, he strove to leave home, shaved off his hair, and donned the Dharma robe. Because of his young age he did not find deep happiness in the rules of the homeless. Because he was not happy, he returned home.

When the laywoman saw her son coming from afar, she raised her hands and loudly declaimed in verse:

“The house is aflame // in a blazing fire bright,

those having well escaped, // why would they return?

Why would they enter the fire, // the house aflame

in a blazing fire bright, // why would they return?

Do they wish to be burned?”

At that time her son replied with a verse:

⁷² It is possible that this and the preceding sentence were also part of the verse, but it is just as likely that the translators of T 100 carried on the rhythm of the preceding verse. This phenomenon appears elsewhere in this collection, where verse lines vary between 4, 5 or 7 characters to the *pāda*, sometimes even in the same discourse.

“All humans must die, // a sure cause of grief and lament,
but if I were not to see you now // this too would make me weep.
Mother, why are you // crying like a *preta*?”

His mother responded with a verse:

“Already you went forth // leaving the house to become a re-
nunciant.

Now you return home, // ensnared by Māra, I fear.

That is why I // cry for you.”

The laywoman scolded her son thus in various ways, and he en-
gendered dispassion. Her son then went into the forest, practiced the
way diligently, without pause day and night, and attained arhatship.

SĀ² 325 [‘Ālavaka Challenges the Buddha’]

Translation

Thus have I heard. Once, the Buddha was traveling in Magadha. He
came to the abode of the *yakṣa* Ālavaka⁷³ and spent the night there.⁷⁴
At that time the *yakṣa* was elsewhere in a gathering with other
yakṣas and not at home. A *yakṣa* with the name of Gardabha⁷⁵ saw

⁷³ SĀ 1326: *ālāguī* 阿騰鬼, SN 10.12 and Sn 10: *ālāvaka*, from the topo-
nym Ālavī, a town between Sāvatti and Rājagaha. *Kuāngyě yèchà* 曠
野夜叉 in SĀ² 325 seems to translate Sanskrit **āṭavika* ‘forest-dweller’
(from *aṭavi*, ‘forest’), perhaps in ignorance of the place name Sanskrit
(Āṭavī = Pali Ālavī (Trenckner et al. 1968, s.v. Ālavī)); cf. also Kara-
shima 2020: 749.

⁷⁴ The framing story has obvious parallels to SĀ² 323 (Sūciloma).

⁷⁵ Like with Ālavaka, SĀ² 325 translates (*lījū* 驢駒, ‘young donkey’),
whereas SĀ 1326 transliterates (*jiétán* 竭曇). This *yakṣa* does not
appear in the *Saṃyutta-nikāya* and *Sutta-nipāta* versions of the story.
The Indian might have been *khara*, ‘donkey’, the name that appears in
the discourse on Sūciloma (cf. SĀ² 323 translated above), which has an

that the Buddha made his stay in the abode of Ālavaka. He went to Ālavaka and told him: “You are very fortunate! A Tathāgata, an Arhat, a Fully Awakened One is in your abode to spend the night there.”

The *yakṣa* Ālavaka said: “What is that man doing in my abode?”

The *yakṣa* Gardabha responded: “Although he is a human, he is in fact a Tathāgata, an Arhat, a Fully Awakened One.”

Ālavaka said: “Have you investigated whether or not he is truly a Tathāgata, an Arhat, a Fully Awakened One.”

Ālavaka having finished his meeting, returned to his palace. On seeing the Buddha he said: “Get out, renunciant!” The Tathāgata then left his [Ālavaka’s] dwelling as bidden. Again he said to the Buddha: “Renunciant! Come back in!” The Buddha, having cut off all pride, again entered as bidden. A second, and a third time, he told the Buddha to get out and enter again and the Buddha always did as bidden. The fourth time Ālavaka said: “Renunciant! Get out!”. The Buddha said: “You have already asked me three times. I will not get out for you anymore now.”

Ālavaka then said: “I will ask you a riddle, if you can answer it, I will grant you your seat. If you cannot answer me I will confuse your mind, break it, and cause blood to spout forth from your face. I will grasp you by your arms and toss you to the shore of the Ganges.⁷⁶

The Buddha said: “I do not see in this world a *deva*, *māra*, *brahma*,

identical frame stories, however, that does not fit well with the transcription *jiētán*. More likely seems **garda[bha]*, ‘donkey’. At one passage in T 99 the transcription *jiētán* 竭曇 is used to transliterate the name Gandha[gata] (SĀ 913 at T II 229c4–5). A *yakṣa* named Gardabha is converted in a story in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* (DeCaroli 2004: 38–39) and mentioned in the *Mahāmāyūrī* (DesJardins 2002: 401), where he is associated with Mathurā. (The *Mahāmāyūrī*, however, also knows of a *yakṣa* Kharaposta (DesJardins 2002: 400).)

⁷⁶ See note 58 above on *póqí* [hé] 婆耆 [河].

renunciant, or brahmin, who is able to do such things to me. Ask if you like, I will answer accordingly.” Then the *yakṣa* Ālavaka spoke in verse:

“Among all the treasures // what is the best?

By what practice, practiced well // does one gain happiness and merit?

Among the tastes // what is the best?

Among lives // what is the best lived?”

At that time the World-honored One answered:

“Among the possessions of man // faith is the best.

Practicing Dharma // one can attain happiness.

The truth tastes best, // and one does live best wisely.”

There the *yakṣa* Ālavaka again spoke a verse:

“Who can cross the current, // who the great ocean?

Who can rid oneself of suffering // who can attain purity?”

At that time the World-honored One answered:

“By faith one crosses the current, // by perseverance the ocean.

By effort one can rid oneself of suffering, // by wisdom one can attain purity.”

There the *yakṣa* Ālavaka again spoke a verse:

“How does one attain faith? // How does one obtain wealth?

How does one attain fame? // How does one obtain good friends?”

At that time the World-honored One answered:⁷⁷

“[By trusting the] Arhats one attains faith,⁷⁸ // by practicing the Dharma one attains *Nirvāṇa*.

Carefully⁷⁹ doing what should be done // with diligence one gathers wealth.

⁷⁷ Reading, with the Song, Yuan and Ming editions of the canon, 答 instead of 言.

⁷⁸ For this interpretation I am relying on *saddahāno arahataṃ* in SN 10.12.

⁷⁹ Reading, with the Chinese stemma, 慎 instead of 順.

By truthful speech one gains fame, // by generosity one obtains close friends.

You can ask widely, // [other] renunciants and brahmins:
‘Who else speaks truthfully // apart from me? Who [else] has [realized this] Dharma?’

Among the ninety-six [non-Buddhist] schools,⁸⁰ // you can investigate and listen carefully to them;
but he, whose teaching is nonviolent, // overcomes them all.”

There the *yakṣa* Ālavaka again spoke a verse:

“Why would I need to ask another, // whether renunciant or brahmin,
[now that you have] with great dedication revealed, // and with well-made distinctions expounded the Dharma?

I will remember the grace // by which you taught me thus,
allowing me to behold // the unsurpassed caravan leader.

From today on I will, // wherever I go,
in town or village, // forever find refuge in the Buddha
and reveal the correct Dharma.”

Then the *yakṣa* Ālavaka, having heard what the Buddha said, was delighted and leaped up. He took refuge in the triple gem, accepted the precepts, and became a disciple of the Buddha.

SĀ² 326 [‘A *Yakṣa* Praises the Nun *Vīrā*’]

Above we have seen how some *yakṣa* discourses of the northern tradition were moved into the *Devaputra-samyukta*.⁸¹ In the following

⁸⁰ On the designation 九十六種道 (corresponding to Sanskrit *ṣaṅ-ṇavatiyo pāṣaṅḍāḥ*) in T 100 see Bingenheimer 2011: 48.

⁸¹ See the above discussion on SĀ² 323 concerning SĀ² 323 and SĀ² 313, and the remarks in the introduction (section I above) on the missing discourses in the northern *Yakṣa-samyukta*.

we find an early pair of discourses that was probably formed by reduplication, but stably survived as an almost identical pair the separation of the northern and southern lines of transmission as well as the split between T 100 and T 99. SĀ² 326 and SĀ² 327 are two very similar discourses in which a *yakṣa* praises the nuns Vīrā⁸² and Sukkā, respectively, and exhorts laypeople to make offerings to them. The two discourses correspond closely in structure and content to each other and the names equal those found in their Pali parallels (similar to SĀ² 320 and 321 on mothering *yakṣiṇīs*). We can assume they formed early on through reduplication, before the northern tradition separated from the southern line.

Translation

Thus have I heard. Once, the Buddha was staying in Rājagaha in the Kalanda bamboo grove.⁸³ At that time there was a nun in the Royal

⁸² In the Pali tradition one often reads Cīrā for Vīrā, both of which appear in the manuscript record. SN 10.11 (Feer’s 1884–1898 edition, p. 213) titles the discourse “Cīrā (or Virā).” Somaratne 1998: 460 has “Cīrā”, as do Geiger et al. 1998 [1930]: 335 and Bodhi 2000: 314 in their translations; this against Rhys Davids’ 1917: 275 expressed preference for “Vīrā”. The defenders of Cīrā can point to the alliteration in which the name is used in the Pali verse (SN I 213). The proponents of Vīrā are supported by the semantics of Vīr(y)ā in the Chinese verse and the rare gloss in the Chinese text. On the various Chinese transliterations of her name see Bingenheimer 2011: 156–159. Everything considered, an original of Vīr(y)ā seems more likely.

⁸³ The Indian name for this place, in Pali *kalandakanivāsa veḷuvana*, is sometimes rendered ‘Squirrels’ (*kalandaka*) feeding ground’, but this is just one of several interpretations of the name. In any case, the meaning would not have been clear to a Chinese reader, who would have understood *jialantuo* 迦蘭陀 simply as a transcribed name. The *kalandakanivāsa* was located in the Veḷuvana (bamboo grove) park that was gifted

Monastery, with the name of Vīrā (which means “mighty” in the language of the Qin).⁸⁴ When the people of that country were all celebrating the *komudī* festival [at the end of the rainy season],⁸⁵ they held revelries for seven days and seven nights, but no one invited the nun.

At that time there was a *yakṣa* who had great faith in and respect for the nun Vīrā. Learning that none of the people in that country had invited her, he spoke this verse in the streets [of Rājagaha]:

“The people of Rājagaha // are all drunk and asleep,
while the nun Vīrā // has quietly entered skillful concentration.

to the community by King Bimbiṣāra.

⁸⁴ This exceptional gloss explaining Vīrā’s name has been used by Mizuno 1970 as the main evidence for dating T 100 between 385 and 431.

⁸⁵ The name of this festival appears three times in T 100: SĀ² 326 and SĀ² 327 have the transliteration *jumitou* 俱蜜頭(星會), whereas SĀ² 360 at T II 491b11 has the transliteration *jumiti* 拘蜜提(大會), none of which appear elsewhere in the Chinese canon. T 99 speaks of a “(festival) on the day of the auspicious star”, for the first two instances (吉星日集聚(大會) / 吉星日歡集(大會) in SĀ 1328 and SĀ 1327, parallels to SĀ² 326 and SĀ² 327 respectively), but it uses the transliteration *qiamoni* 橋牟尼(大會) in the parallel to SĀ² 360, SĀ 1340 at T II 369c4-5, and it moreover indicates that the festival took place in the fourth month of the summer (i.e., the last month of the rainy season). Thus, though different in detail, all transliterations converge on a similar Indian original, namely Sanskrit *kaumudī*. Monier Williams 1899, s.v. *kaumuda*: “the day of full moon in the month Kārttika (sacred to Kārttikeya), festival in honour of Kārttikeya held on that day” and “a festival in general.” The Prakritic forms *kaumodī* and *kaumudī* are attested according to Edgerton 1953, s.v. *kaumodī*. The Pali *komudī* is also known as *kattikā-chaṇa* the festival on the full moon of the month of Kattikā, the last month of the rainy season. This coincides with the *pavāraṇā*, the ritual at the end of the rain retreats, but the text here describes a festival before the *pavāraṇā* was established.

As a practitioner she is indeed mighty [i.e., *vīra*], // is accomplished in the mighty Dharma.

This nun, // accomplished in training the faculties,
has forever escaped from the world of dust, // entered extinction and attained *Nirvāṇa*.

Reverend Ones (Pali *bhadanta*) such as her // should be diligently supported with offerings.

How come that none of you // have invited her?”

When the laypeople of the town heard this verse, they all took⁸⁶ clothes and delicacies and donated them to the nun. The *yakṣa*, seeing how they all made their offerings, again said in verse:

“The nun *Vīrā* // has broken all fetters.

The lay followers are wise // to offer⁸⁷ this food,
by offering this food, // they will attain great merit and increase.⁸⁸

The nun *Vīrā* // has broken all fetters.

The lay followers are wise // to offer these clothes,
by offering these clothes, // they will attain great merit and increase.”

⁸⁶ I am unsure whether to take 各持 A&B as ‘all brought A & B’ or ‘some brought A and some B’. The Pali *aññataro upāsako* does not help.

⁸⁷ *neng* 能 here as a filling word, akin to 而 or 乃 (Yu 1986, *s.v.*). It appears to function in this way quite often in the verses in T 100 (see, e.g., above in SĀ² 321: 說苦能生苦 or below at SĀ² 328: 若能真實語).

⁸⁸ This version, though the passages are in different order and have been padded, is quite close to the Pali of the *Cirā-sutta* at SN I 213,18–21: *puññaṃ vata pasavi bahum, sappañño vatāyaṃ upāsako; yo cīrāya adāsi cīvaraṃ, sabbayogehi vippamuttiya*. (Lost, however, is the alliterative play between *puñña* and *pañña*, and *Cirā* and *civara*.)

SĀ² 327 [‘A *Yakṣa* Praises the Nun *Sukkā*’]

Translation

Thus have I heard. Once, the Buddha was staying in Rājagaha in the Kalanda bamboo grove. At that time there was a nun in the royal monastery, with the name of *Sukkā*.⁸⁹ When the people of that country were all celebrating the *komudī* festival [at the end of the rainy season], they held revelries for seven days and seven nights, but no one invited the nun.

At that time there was a *yakṣa* who had great faith in and respect for the nun *Sukkā*. Learning that none of the people in that country had invited her, he spoke this verse in the streets [of Rājagaha]:

“The people of Rājagaha // are all drunk and asleep,
 have not invited the nun // who has trained her faculties.
 “Pure” [=Sukkā] by pure Dharma,⁹⁰ // the nun is skilled in
 concentration,
 has forever escaped from the world of dust // and in silent ex-
 tinction attained *Nirvāṇa*.
 Reverend Ones such as her // should be diligently supported with
 offerings.
 How come that none of you // have invited her?”

⁸⁹ In contrast to the previous discourse, where the translators transcribed the name *Vīrā*, in SĀ² 327 the nun’s name, *Sukkā* [Sanskrit **Śuklā*], is translated 白淨, not transcribed. SĀ 1329 transcribes *shujialuo* 叔迦羅, from something like *śukla*. The *Fanfan yu* 翻梵語 glossary wants to correct 叔迦羅 to 叔歌羅 (probably deriving from *su-kāla*) and glosses it as meaning ‘good time’ (譯曰好時) (T 2130 at T LIV 1002b2). As so often, the *Fanfan yu* is wrong.

⁹⁰ This pun is constructed in the same way and same location (third line) as the one in the previous discourse (where *Vīrā* is ‘powerful’ as the Dharma is powerful), here *Sukkā* (‘Pure One’) is ‘pure’ as the Dharma.

When the laypeople in the town heard this verse, they all took clothes and food and donated them to the nun. The *yakṣa* seeing how they all made their offerings, again said in verse:

“The nun Sukkā // has broken all fetters of desire.
The lay followers are wise // to offer this food,
by offering this food, // they will attain immeasurable merit.
The nun Sukkā // has done away with all covetousness.
The lay followers are wise // to offer these clothes,
by offering these clothes, // they will attain immeasurable merit.”

SĀ² 328 [‘Sātāgira and Hemavata Question the Buddha’]

Translation

Thus have I heard. Once, the Buddha was staying in Rājagaha in the Kalanda bamboo grove. At that time there were two *yakṣas* one was called Sāptagiri, the other Hemavata.⁹¹ The two were friends and had made a vow to each other saying: “Whenever there is a wonderful treasure in your abode, you tell me, and whenever there is a wonderful treasure in my abode I will tell you.”

One time Hemavata had in his abode a lotus blossom with a thousand petals, large like a cart wheel, with a light purple stalk, and ada-

⁹¹ SĀ² 328: 七岳, probably *Sāptagira; Sn 9: Sātāgira and Hemavata. But cf. SĀ 1329: 娑多耆利 and 醯魔波低, which point to Sātāgiri and Hemavati for the northern tradition. Sāptagiri, was probably a mistake for Sātāgiri, that occurred during the process of oral translation, when the reciter misremembered this rare name. As with some other *yakṣas* mentioned in the *Āgama/Nikāya* layer, legends grew around Sātāgiri and he was incorporated into the Hārītī story (e.g., appearing as Hārītī’s brother 娑多山 in the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* (T 1451 at T XXIV 361b9; for a free translation of the passage see Peri 1917).

mantine tendrils. The *yakṣa* Hemavata on seeing this immediately sent a messenger to tell Sāptagiri: “I have something extraordinary in my abode, please come and take a look!”

On hearing this, the *yakṣa* Sāptagiri thought: “The Tathāgata, the World-honored One is staying not far from here. I could send a messenger to Hemavata telling him: ‘Why on earth⁹² should I go there to see a precious flower?’” Having thought that he sent a messenger saying: “A Tathāgata, an Arhat, a Fully Awakened One has appeared at my place. What good is there in a precious flower at your place?”

When the *yakṣa* Hemavata heard this, he, with a retinue of five hundred *yakṣas*, went to the abode where the *yakṣa* Sāptagiri was staying, and said to him in verse⁹³:

“[Today] on the night of the fifteenth // with the full [moon] pure and bright,

I have received your message, gathered my retinue, // and thus have come to meet,

But whom is it I should get to know? // Who is that Arhat of yours?”

The *yakṣa* Sāptagiri replied in verse:

“The Tathāgata, the World-honored One // is the best of Rājagaha
He explains the four truths // to end all suffering.

[That is] he explains how suffering arises from causes, // what brings forth suffering is called the ‘arising’,⁹⁴

⁹² Reading 當 as marking an emphatic question (Karashima 1998, s.v.; Kroll 2015, s.v.).

⁹³ The relationship of the verses in SĀ² 328 with their parallels in SĀ 1329, SĀ² 315, and the *Sutta-nipāta* is quite complex. In his contribution to this volume Ken Su 2020: 862–870 has suggested that the verse part of SĀ² 328 is in disarray.

⁹⁴ SĀ² 328: 習, here as in 苦習, corresponding to Pali *dukkha-samudaya* / Sanskrit *duḥkha-samudaya*. This looks like a gloss, and the text might indeed be faulty here, as a reference to the third truth of the noble ones

the eight-fold right path of the nobles // that leads toward silent extinction.⁹⁵

That is my Arhat, // whom you should get to know.”

The *yakṣa* Hemavata again said in verse:

“Is he towards all types of beings // disposed with *mettā* and the other [divine abodes]?”

Is he with regard to feelings of like and dislike // entirely master of his mind?”

The *yakṣa* Sāptagiri replied in verse:

“His mind is gently disposed // towards all kinds of beings.⁹⁶

Having fully understood all phenomena // he became the guiding teacher for this world.

With regard to feelings of like and dislike // his mind has entirely attained mastery.”

The *yakṣa* Hemavata again said in verse:

“Does he always say the truth // and never lie?”

Is he always compassionate to all beings // and never kills living beings?”

Has he abandoned indolence // and is not vacuous in his meditation?”

(苦盡 or 苦滅) is missing.

⁹⁵ This and the next line is an elaboration of the Pali *dukkha-samudaya-nirodha-magga* / Sanskrit *duḥkha-samudaya-nirodha-mārga* formula. It is much clearer in SĀ 1329. This first part of the exchange concerning the four truths of the noble ones, is contained only in the northern tradition, not in the Pali.

⁹⁶ SĀ² 328: 群萌類. This interesting variant at first seems like a mistake, but does appear in fact once more in the canon (T 200 at T IV 205a29) where the apparatus records the *lectio facillior* 生 for the Chinese stemma. 萌 is probably correct, simply as variant of 萌 in the frequent phrase 群萌類. 群萌類, also appearing as 群萌 or 萌類, probably from *bahu-jana*. 萌/萌 here meaning 氓/民 (HDC, s.v. 萌) ‘people, living beings’ rather than the usual ‘sprout, bud’.

The *yakṣa* Sāptagiri replied in verse:

“He never lies // has abandoned all violence,
and has forever done away with indolence. // The Buddha is always
concentrated.”

The *yakṣa* Hemavata again said in verse:

“Is he without attachments to sensual desires, // his mind undis-
turbed?⁹⁷

Does he have the eye to see phenomena [clearly]⁹⁸ // and has he
ended delusion?

Has he cast off all troubles // and attained liberation?”

The *yakṣa* Sāptagiri replied in verse:

“He has gone beyond the mire of sensual desire // his mind calm
and undisturbed.

He sees phenomena clearly and penetratingly // he has ended delusion.

Forever having abandoned the various fetters // he has attained
liberation.”

The *yakṣa* Hemavata again said in verse:

“Who is not troubled on being separated [from things one likes]? //

Who does not chat idly [now and then]?

Who on seeing [desirable] things does not crave for them? // Who
does not give rise to views and ideas?”

The *yakṣa* Sāptagiri replied in verse:

“[The Buddha] has long since abandoned suffering from separation
from the liked. // He never engages in meaningless talk.

[He] has cast off greed and desire in the mind. // He is forever
without wrong views and ideas.”

⁹⁷ Here and below I resolve ambivalent passages in the Chinese according to Norman’s translation of the Pali *Sutta-nipāta* (Norman 1984: 26–27).

⁹⁸ *SĀ*² 328 and *SĀ* 1329: 法眼; Sn 9: *dharmesu cakkhumā* (Bodhi 2017: 181: translates “vision of phenomena”; Norman 1984: 26 “vision in respect [of mental phenomena]”).

The *yakṣa* Hemavata again said in verse:

“Is he fully endowed with the various fields of knowledge,⁹⁹ // is his conduct pure?

Has he stopped the outflows // [so as] not to be reborn again?”

The *yakṣa* Sāptagiri replied in verse:

“[He] is fully endowed with knowledge and conduct // his conduct is pure.

[He] has since destroyed the outflows, // will never be reborn again.”

The *yakṣa* Hemavata again said in verse:

“The Tathāgata in the three forms of action [i.e., mental, verbal, physical] // is fully accomplished in good conduct.

Do you venerate him // and praise his true Dharma?”

The *yakṣa* Sāptagiri replied in verse:

“The Tathāgata is in body, speech, and mind // fully accomplished in good conduct.

His understanding is perfect. // I do praise his true Dharma.”

The *yakṣa* Hemavata again said in verse:

“A sage, a hero among gods, // with legs like an antelope,
eating little food, not covetous of taste, // a sage meditating in the forest.

Let us go together // to pay our respects to Gotama.”

At that time the *yakṣa* Sāptagiri and the *yakṣa* Hemavata, together leading a host of one thousand *yakṣas*, went to where the Buddha was.

They arranged their clothes properly, and with palms together paid their respects and said in verse:

“The World-honored One’s, the world’s hero’s // the Buddha’s feet we venerate!

What the gods do not know, // you have seen and understood!”

⁹⁹ SĀ² 328: 明, corresponding to Pali *vijjā* / Sanskrit *vidyā*, a broad term that encompasses different forms of secular and spiritual knowledge.

Having spoken this verse Hemavata and Sāptagiri sat to one side.
The *yakṣa* Hemavata then asked the Buddha in verse:

“How does one exit suffering? // How can suffering end?
May the World-honored One explain to me! // Where does suffering
end?”

Then the World-honored One replied in verse saying:

“[There are] five [types of] sensual pleasure, the mind is the sixth //
in regard to these desire is to be discarded.
That is liberation from suffering // that is the exit from suffering.
Liberation from suffering // is to extinguish the sphere of suf-
fering.

What you have asked, // I explain to you as it is.”

The *yakṣa* Hemavata then again asked in verse:

“Where does the flood churn? // Where is there no safe haven?
Where are suffering and delight // extinguished without re-
mainder?”

Then the World-honored One replied in verse saying:

“Eyes, ears, nose, tongue, body, // and the mind as the sixth of
sense faculties:

In them churns the flood, // this is where there is no safe haven.

Where name and form turn no more, // there they attain extinction.”

The *yakṣa* Hemavata then again asked in verse:

“By what has the world arisen? // By which does it gather?
How many [types of] grasping are there in the world? // How
many objects are sought in suffering?”

Then the World-honored One replied in verse saying:

“The world is arisen from six, // because of six it gathers.

From six [types of feelings] grasping arises, // six [types of] sense
objects are always sought in suffering.”

The *yakṣa* Hemavata then again asked in verse:

“How to practice the good Dharma, // day and night without slackening?

How to cross this flood, // where there is no firm ground to stand,
and no support to hold onto. // How not to sink into this depth?”

Then the World-honored One replied in verse saying:

“By never breaking the precepts, // with wisdom and well concentrated,

paying attention to one’s faults, // endowed with mindfulness,
one crosses the flood which is hard to cross. // Abstaining from
fulfilling one’s desires,

discarding all fetters, // ending the delight in becoming,
thus a person can be said // to not sink into this depth.”

The *yakṣa* Hemavata then again asked in verse:

“Who crosses the flood, // who the ocean?

Who can cast off suffering? // How to attain purity?”

Then the World-honored One replied in verse saying:

“Faith crosses the flood, // perseverance crosses the ocean.

Diligent effort can cast off suffering // wisdom can bring purity.

Go visit other renunciants // and brahmins;

ask them one by one. // Who knows this teaching?

Who can explain the true casting off [of suffering] // apart from
me, who can?”

The *yakṣa* Hemavata then again asked [*sic*] in verse:

“On hearing the Buddha’s teaching // the net of doubt has been
dispelled.

What need is there to ask another // renunciant or brahmin¹⁰⁰

[about that which] the world hero¹⁰¹ has [already] well revealed //

¹⁰⁰ Same line appears in SĀ² 325 (Ālavaka), which is in other ways related to the ‘Discourse to Hemavata’.

¹⁰¹ SĀ² 328: 世雄. Hirakawa 1997: 12 suggests *mahā-vīra* or *śāstrī*, both common epithets of the Buddha.

and with true distinctions taught?
 Sāptagiri has been truly gracious // and allowed me to meet
 the unsurpassed guiding teacher. // From now on, wherever I go
 in town or village, // in every place,
 day and night, I will always find refuge // in the Tathāgata, the
 truly Awakened One,
 and in the correct teaching among the teachings.”

There each of the one thousand *yakṣas* were greatly moved and delighted in their minds. They put their palms together saluting the Buddha and all became disciples, taking refuge in the Buddha, the World-honored One.

SĀ² 329 [‘A *Yakṣa* Hits Sāriputta’]

This cluster consists of SĀ² 329, SĀ 1330, Ud 4.4 at Ud 39 (*Yakkha-pahāra-sutta*) and a Sanskrit passage from the *Udānavarga*, identified by Enomoto (1994, no. 1330).¹⁰²

Translation

Thus have I heard. Once, the Buddha was staying in Rājagaha in the Kalanda bamboo grove. At that time the venerable Sāriputta and the venerable Mahā-Moggallāna dwelt at Vulture Peak. One morning Sāriputta, having freshly shaved his head, got up early and sat in meditation, his head covered with his robe.¹⁰³

¹⁰² Migot 1953: 511, in his exhaustive study of the figure of Sāriputra, considers the elements of this story as one of the oldest in the textual layers concerning this disciple: “... cette histoire de *yakkha* nous ramène au vieux fonds légendaire de l’Inde, non seulement prébouddhique mais pré-aryen, et il s’agit vraisemblablement d’une légende très ancienne recueillie et adaptée par les compilateurs de l’*Udāna*.”

¹⁰³ SĀ² 329: 以衣覆頭 “covering the head with one’s robe (or a cloth)” (after

It so happened at that time that there were two *yakṣas* one called Ghāta, the other Upaghāta.¹⁰⁴ When Upaghāta saw Sāriputta he said to Ghāta: “I want to hit that bald recluse with my fist.” Ghāta replied: “This monk is possessed of great spiritual power; don’t do it! You will come to suffer for a long time!” A second, and a third time he warned him thus. But Upaghāta desired to hit Sāriputta with his fist, and did not heed [Ghāta’s] warnings.

It came so far that [Ghāta tried to] physically restrain and grasp him. But then Upaghāta’s evil mind flared up, and in spite of the other’s warnings and his attempts to restrain him, did not desist, and hit Sāriputta’s head with his fist. Having hit him, the *yakṣa* Upaghāta said to Ghāta: “Now that I have hit the monk, I feel as if I am on fire – save me!” As he said this, the earth split open, and his body plunged into the Avīcī Hell.

At that time the venerable Mahā-Mogallāna was sitting under a tree, not far from where Sāriputta was sitting. When he suddenly heard the sound of Sāriputta being hit he went over and said: “[Surely] one cannot tolerate such pain, are you not afraid you might die?” Sāriputta said: “My body can tolerate it, there is no pain, and I won’t die.” The venerable [Mahā-Mogallāna] then said in praise:

having freshly shaved one’s head, perhaps to protect it from the morning cool), appears several times as a pericope in the Chinese *Saṃyukta-āgamas*. This is the only instance, however, where it describes Sāriputta, and the detail is missing in the SĀ 1330 and Ud 4.4 parallels.

¹⁰⁴ The word *ghāta-* in the proper names Ghāta and Upaghāta means ‘blow’ (Böhtlingk and Roth 1855–1875, s.v. ‘Schlag’, ‘Tödtung’). SĀ² 329 translates the names as 爲害 and 復害, which does not allow an exact reconstruction. Only SĀ 1330 preserves the names they were given in the northern tradition as 伽吒 and 優波伽吒. The effect might have been slightly comical (or perhaps scary), as if in English the rouges had been called Slap and Punch. In the *Udānavarga* the two *yakṣas* are not named.

“This is true spiritual power! If Upaghāta had struck Vulture Peak with his hand it would have broken up, but Sāriputta is unchanged.”¹⁰⁵

As the two venerable ones spoke, the Buddha was sitting in his room, meditating in the morning, and with his divine ear heard their words. He spoke this verse:¹⁰⁶

“With an upright mind, like a mountain, // in peace one dwells unperturbed

by things to which one might become attached. // Thus by the teaching of non-attachment¹⁰⁷

one leaves far behind all worldly delights. // What are called worldly delights

are essentially just base desires. // When something brings agitation he who does not respond with agitation // is called not agitated.

Having trained one’s mind thus // one will not feel suffering again.”
At that time the monks heard what the Buddha said, were delighted and remembered it well.

¹⁰⁵ The SĀ 1330 version is closer to the *Udāna* here in that Sāriputta admits some pain.

¹⁰⁶ SĀ 1330 closely follows what we find in the *Udāna* verse. While the wording of SĀ² 329 differs somewhat from SĀ 1330 / Ud 4.4, it is still a variation on the same text; see Ud 4.4 at Ud 41,1–3: *yassa selūpamaṃ cittaṃ, thitaṃ n’ānupakampati; virattaṃ rajanīyesu, kopaneyye na kuppati; yass’evaṃ bhāvitaṃ cittaṃ, kuto taṃ dukkham essa ti*; SĀ 1330 at T II 367b26–28: 其心如剛石，堅住不傾動；染著心已離，瞋者不反報；若如此修心，何有苦痛憂？

¹⁰⁷ SĀ² 329: 不染著法。I am reading the first 染 as 然. Otherwise, the sentence might mean ‘colored/suffused by the teaching of non-attachment’ but this seems less likely. 不染著法 as ‘teaching of non-attachment’ is attested in the *Ekottarika-āgama* (EĀ 25.3 at T II 631b22).

Conclusion: The *Yakṣas* in the Chinese *Saṃyukta-āgamas*

Although the *yakṣas* in modern scholarship are usually grouped with other types of supernatural beings, their earliest appearance in the Buddhist canon, both in the *Saṃyukta-āgama* and the *Sutta-nipāta*, is surprisingly human-like.

Only in SĀ² 318 and 324 *yakṣas* act in a supernatural way, while in two other discourses *yakṣas* are mentioned as supernatural beings to be feared (SĀ² 319) or worshiped (SĀ² 322). These are in line with the presence of a cult of local *yakṣa* deities, which is attested in text and art for the centuries that follow.

The other eight discourses, however, might as well depict encounters of the early Buddhist *Saṅgha* with tribal, non-urban communities, which were not part of the usual *śramaṇa/brāhmaṇa*-society audience of the early discourses. These foraging, wandering figures, both threatening and pathetic, have abodes (*bhavana*), but no settlements. They behave in an uncivilized way, because they were not part of the burgeoning Gangetic civilization, where agriculture was becoming predominant, where *nāstikas* debated with *vaidikas*, and larger towns had started to grow into cities and kingdoms. The teachings that are given to these *yakṣas* often exhort them to nonviolence, which seems to have been a concern for the *Saṅgha* in its dealings with them. Table 3 below summarizes the presence and presentation of such supernatural aspects in each discourse of the *Yakṣa-saṃyukta*.

Thus, in contrast to the *yakṣa* episodes featured in the *Jātakas* and later Indian literature, the *yakṣa* discourses of the *Saṃyukta-āgama* might well have been occasioned by encounters not with a supernatural, but a social ‘other’.

Table 3. The Supernatural in the *Yakṣa-saṃyukta* Discourses

T 100 Discourse	Topic	Supernatural Element
SĀ ² 318	Māñibhadra hosts the Buddha	Māñibhadra magically creates accommodation for the <i>Saṅgha</i> .
SĀ ² 319	Nāgapāla as Bakkula demon	<i>Yakṣa</i> mentioned as frightening demon, but does not appear in the discourse.
SĀ ² 320	The mother of Piṅgala	‘Doubled’ discourse – <i>Yakṣa</i> acts as human, no supernatural element.
SĀ ² 321	The mother of Puna-bbasu	
SĀ ² 322	At the abode of Māñicara	<i>Yakṣa</i> is worshiped, but does not appear in the discourse. Text retains traces of the verse spoken to a <i>yakṣiṇī</i> . The frame story is perhaps a later addition. There is no Pali version.
SĀ ² 323	Sūciloma challenges the Buddha	<i>Brahmodya</i> challenge and threat of violence.
SĀ ² 324	Possession by <i>yakṣa</i>	<i>Yakṣa</i> as spirit that can possess humans.
SĀ ² 325	Ālavaka challenges the Buddha	<i>Brahmodya</i> challenge and threat of violence.
SĀ ² 326	A <i>yakṣa</i> praises the nun Vīrā	‘Doubled’ discourse – <i>Yakṣa</i> acts as human, no supernatural element.

A Study and Translation of the *Yakṣa-saṃyukta* · 823
in the Shorter Chinese *Saṃyukta-āgama*

SĀ ² 327	A <i>yakṣa</i> praises the nun Sukkā	
SĀ ² 328	Sāptagiri and Hemavata question the Buddha	<i>Brahmodya</i> challenge.
SĀ ² 329	A <i>yakṣa</i> hits Sāri-putta	<i>Yakṣa</i> as violent and threatening, but not in a supernatural way.

Appendix: Again on the School Affiliation of T 100

In his contribution to this volume, the late Karashima Seishi 辛嶋 静志 (1957–2019) touches on the question of the school affiliation of T 100 (Karashima 2020).

Personally, I am skeptical that *Āgama* collections were generally understood as belonging to a certain *Nikāya*, and find that most attempts to decide on affiliation disregard the null hypothesis, that is, the possibility that a text was never considered – by audience, transmitters, or translators – as belonging to a particular school. Nevertheless, questions surrounding the school affiliation of *Āgama* texts have been eagerly discussed in the past and we do indeed have collections of *Āgama* texts which seem to have been used in certain communities. Overall, in *Āgama* literature the textual differences between versions in general do not amount to indicators of doctrinal divisions and often allow for different conclusions as to how they came about. In any case, the editor has asked me to comment again on this issue in the light of the points raised by my esteemed late colleague.

Karashima's strongest argument is that T 100 cannot belong to the Sarvāstivāda corpus because of a difference in nomenclature: while the text references a *Dharmapada* (Chinese 法句偈), the Sarvāstivāda version of this verse collection has been named *Udāna* (transliterated in Chinese as 優陀那). This is a good point, which, however, can be explained, as with many eccentric transliteration/translation choices in T 100, by the fact that it was translated from an oral text. The translators settled on the title 法句偈, because that was the name known to them for the collection. T 100 often prefers

translated terms over transliteration (when compared with T 99), but here did not choose, for instance, the terms 無問自說 or 讚嘆經, which are attested for *udāna*, but rather the term 法句偈, which of course is a literal rendition of *dharmapada*. In oral transmission we may assume that what the oral presenter says, what gets translated, and what gets written on the page are often different things, and one cannot put too much weight on one single, if recurrent, term.

Indeed T 99 too uses the title 法句偈 in a verse passage instead of the form 優陀那.¹⁰⁸ Does that mean it cannot be a Sarvāstivāda collection?

When Enomoto Fumio 榎本 文雄 (1980 and again 1984a) compared both T 99 and T 100 with *Udānavarga* verses, he found both in agreement with a later (in his terminology) ‘(Mūla)-Sarvāstivāda’ *Udāna* stemma that is also found in Tibetan and the extant Sanskrit parts of the *Yogācārabhūmi*. He did not remark that the *Udāna* verse parallels in T 100 are somehow different from the ones in T 99 or from the Indian parallels in the Sarvāstivāda stemma.

Finally, the use of the term 法句(經) for *udāna* is attested in *Āgama* literature in a *dvadāśa-aṅga* list contained in the *Dīrgha-āgama*.¹⁰⁹ Although not denoting the verse collection, it is clearly a case where the term *udāna* has been translated with its better known cognate *dharmapāda* as 法句(經); translated, not transliterated, in line with the eleven other *aṅgas* in this passage.¹¹⁰

Although it is of course generally true that the Sarvāstivāda were strongly partial to the title *Udāna(varga)* for their version of the famous verse collection, the Chinese amanuensis who wrote down the

¹⁰⁸ SĀ 1321 at T II 362c16.

¹⁰⁹ DĀ 2 at T I 16c15–17.

¹¹⁰ On the significance of the *aṅga* lists in the *Āgamas* see Bhikkhu Anālayo’s part in Travagnin and Anālayo 2020 in this volume.

oral translation of T 100 might not have been that firmly committed to terminological consistency.

I also find it difficult to agree with Karashima's thesis that T 100 was translated from a particular manuscript that Faxian 法顯 brought to China from Sri Lanka, and that what is now received as T 99 was translated from an orally recited text. I think the opposite is more likely.

Karashima (2020) follows Enomoto (1980 and 1984a) in asserting that T 99 was orally recited by Guṇabhadra. Against this, Andrew Glass (2008 [2010]) has, to my mind convincingly, argued that Guṇabhadra and Baoyun translated T 99 from the manuscript that Faxian acquired in Sri Lanka. (Bhikkhu Anālayo (2015: 55) seems to accept Glass' (2008 [2010]) conclusions.)

I am not interested here in whether the Faxian manuscript was really used to translate T 99, although apart from the historical arguments forwarded by Glass, I find the language of T 99 much more consistent and streamlined, and I am therefore inclined to believe that the longer text was translated from a manuscript. The incomplete, perhaps unfinished, T 100, on the other hand, consists largely of the *Sagāthā-varga* portion of the *Samyukta-āgama* and seems a more plausible candidate for oral translation. This also seems likely in light of several inconsistencies in transliteration/translation, and the traces of Prakrit in the transliteration of names, which Karashima has so helpfully resolved in his contribution to this volume, and some which were noted already by Mizuno Kōgen 水野 弘元 (1970). The case for an oral transmission of T 100 has been argued, to my mind convincingly, by Ken Su [= Su Jinkun 蘇錦坤] (2008) and again in his contribution in this volume (Su 2020). The argument mainly revolves around the relationship between the *uddānas* and the actual text of T 100. The differences between the mnemonic matrix and the actual translation is best explained by assuming an oral translation process.

Karashima (2020: 744) states:

A key consideration here is that if the *Saṃyukta-āgama*, which Faxian had obtained in Sri Lanka, actually belonged to the Sarvāstivādins, it is somewhat surprising that he did not refer to this school's name in the above-quoted description of how he acquired the manuscripts in Sri Lanka.

I do not think this strange at all. Faxian simply noted a school affiliation only where he thought it made sense: with *Vinaya* and with Abhidharma texts, not with *Āgamas*.

Again, Karashima (2020: 745) reasons:

The Sarvāstivādins were at the time flourishing throughout the Northern and North-western regions of India as well as Central Asia, but their presence is not epigraphically attested in Sri Lanka ... and South India.

This is of course correct, although basically no other early mainland Indian schools are mentioned in the extant epigraphic corpus of Sri Lanka either. Sri Lankan Buddhism in the first millennium evolved its own three (perhaps four) communities, which seemed to have inhibited the import of Indian *Nikāya* schools.¹¹¹ Even the Mahīśāsakas are mentioned only in commentaries and we have no evidence that members of the sect had an institutional presence there. Heinz Bechert (2005: 89), who has returned to the question of early Bud-

¹¹¹ In part this seems to have been a consequence of the persistence of Pali (and Sinhalese) which during the Anuradhapura period remained the main literary languages (Bechert 2005: 35). Sanskritization did not occur in Sri Lankan Buddhism as it did in the early Buddhist schools. New doctrinal movements were often known under local names.

dhist sects in Sri Lanka again and again in his research, discovered little trace of any institutional presence of Indian *Nikāyas*.¹¹² Sri Lankan communities, such as the Abhayagirivāsins and the Mahāvihāravāsins, defined the landscape of Buddhist school affiliation on the island, without, however, producing different canonical collections.¹¹³ Bechert (2005: 45–50) also mentions the possible presence of the Dharmaguptakas (a school closely related to the Sarvāstivāda) in the fifth century, and a distinct (in his terminology) (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda literary influence in early Sri Lanka. Thus, although there is no trace of any institutional Sarvāstivāda/Mūlasarvāstivāda presence in Sri Lanka, that does not mean there were no Sarvāstivāda texts in the libraries and it was not at all impossible for Faxian to have come across Sarvāstivāda/Mūlasarvāstivāda literature there.

When it comes to the circulation of manuscripts in South Asia, it seems better not to exclude anything *ex silentio*, considering how fragmentary our evidence is.

Karashima (2020: 744–745) reads the relevant passage thus:¹¹⁴

Faxian ... further (i.e., except for the *Vinaya* of the Mahā-sāṅghikas which he had already acquired in Pāṭaliputra)

¹¹² With the possible exception of a passage in the ninth century Jetavanārāma Sanskrit Inscription (*Epigraphia Zeylanica*, vol. 1 (1912), p. 9), which perhaps alludes to four main *Nikāyas* of contemporary Indian Buddhism.

¹¹³ Bechert 1992: 96: “We have ample evidence for the fact that the Abhayagirivāsins used the same collection of sacred scriptures in Pali which has been handed down to us by the orthodox Theravāda tradition of the Mahāvihāravāsins.”

¹¹⁴ T 2085 at T LI 865c24–27: 法顯住此國二年更求得彌沙塞律藏本得長阿含雜阿含復得一部雜藏此悉漢土所無者得此梵本已即載商人上可有二百餘人。

sought to obtain a text of the *Vinaya* of the Mahīśāsakas (and obtained it). He obtained the *Dīrgha-āgama* and the *Saṃyukta-āgama*, and also obtained one set of the **Kṣudraka-piṭaka* (of the same school).

I see no compelling need for adding “(of the same school).” There is nothing that connects the *Saṃyukta-āgama* (雜阿舍) in this passage to the Mahīśāsakas, nor has anybody else ever read the passage in that sense.¹¹⁵ The obvious reading is that only the *Vinaya* merits mentioning school affiliation, while discourse texts are considered common to all *Nikāyas*.

Faxian might have brought a *Saṃyukta-āgama* from Sri Lanka, but its fate is largely conjecture. There is some circumstantial evidence for the manuscript being used to translate T 99 (Glass 2008 [2010]), but there is really no evidence at all linking it to T 100. Closer to Faxian’s time, in his *Chu sanzang jiji* 出三藏記集 Sengyou 僧祐 (445–518) explicitly says that neither the *Dīrgha-* nor the *Saṃyukta-āgama* that Faxian brought back were ever translated from Sanskrit.¹¹⁶

Somewhat surprisingly, Karashima criticizes Hiraoka Satoshi’s 平岡 聡史 (2000) research on T 99 and T 100, which is quite in line with what others have suggested as the best way to distinguish school affiliation (von Hinüber and von Simson in Bechert 1985, Enomoto 1980 and 1984b). Differences, both in stock phrases as well as in exceptional passages – such as the Buddha’s name causing ‘goose bumps’ in the hearer, which was traced by Hiraoka (2000: 503) – should be considered valid pieces of evidence, if indeed not entirely

¹¹⁵ See, e.g., the translation by Deeg 2005: 171–172 and, from Faxian’s biography, Shih 1968: 112–113.

¹¹⁶ T 2145 at T LV 11c25–12a14.

conclusive. Karashima moreover argues that the evidence given by Enomoto (1984) for a Mūlasarvāstivāda affiliation (‘(Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda’ in Enomoto’s (1984) terminology) is thin. I would agree that more evidence is required, nevertheless a single passage where T 100 agrees with the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* and differs from the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya* (still our only ‘true’ Mahīśāsaka text, T 1421) is still better than no evidence at all. Obviously, a closer comparison between content lines and similar phrases between the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya* and T 100 would be useful. Karashima’s survey of transliterations in the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya* goes in that direction, but it contains no ‘smoking gun’, that is, a passage or even only a transcription that shows clearly that T 100 parallels the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya*, but not the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*. The fact that the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya* is also partly Prakritized is not surprising given its date.

As to the use of Prakrit forms in T 100, these can be found in Mūlasarvāstivāda texts as well.¹¹⁷ Moreover, traces of Prakrit (especially in names) would have been a natural result of the kind of oral transmission that we assume for T 100.

The only internal clue to the provenance of T 100 is in SĀ² 326 (translated above) where the characters 秦言 (‘in the language of the Qin’) gloss the transliteration of the name Virā. Karashima does not discuss this, but the gloss has been used by Mizuno (1970) not only to date the text, but also to place it. Mizuno (1970) identifies the name 秦 here with the Western Qin 西秦 that ruled in Northwest China in the Gansu 甘肅 corridor around Lanzhou 蘭州.

¹¹⁷ von Simson 1985: 83 believes that the Sarvāstivādins were even more resolved than the Mūla-Sarvāstivādins to distance themselves from the medieval [Prakritic] originals. (“Auf der anderen Seite scheint bei den Sarvāstivādin der Wille zur Abkehr und Entfernung von der mittelalterlichen Vorlage stärker ausgeprägt zu sein als bei den Mūla-Sarvāstivādin.”)

Faxian, after his return, is not known to have left East China again and there is absolutely no evidence to place him or the manuscripts he brought back in Northwest China. The Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya* was translated in Yangzhou after Faxian's death. We have no reason to think that the *Saṃyukta-āgama* (雜阿含) manuscript that he brought made it to Northwest China and resulted in T 100. More likely, the manuscript that Faxian brought back remained in Yangzhou as well, with the *Saṃyukta-āgama* (雜阿含) perhaps translated as T 99 (as Glass 2008 [2010] argues), or perhaps not (as Enomoto 2001 argues and Sengyou says in the passage in the *Chu sanzang jiji* referenced above). Nobody seems to think that Faxian's manuscript of the *Dīrgha-āgama* (長阿含) was ever translated and, if Sengyou and Enomoto (2001) are correct, the *Saṃyukta-āgama* (雜阿含) might have shared this fate.

Karashima (2020) thus seems to agree with Mizuno's (1970) attribution of T 100 to the Mahīśāsaka (which I have tried to refute at one point (Bingenheimer 2011)). However, he does not seem to agree with Mizuno's (1970) placement of the translation to the small kingdom of the Western Qin (which I find convincing).

Although I much appreciate rethinking the issue I have not been swayed by any new evidence. What could convince me are two lines of evidence:

1. Historical: Placing some of the Faxian manuscripts in Northwest China *or* disproving Mizuno's (1970) point about the Western Qin and showing conclusively that T 100 was translated in Eastern China.

2. Textual: Finding more evidence in the line of Enomoto (1984a) and Hiraoka (2000) which compares T 100 with the Sarvāstivāda and Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayas* on the one hand and the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya* on the other. This, however, would have to show the opposite

of Enomoto's (1984) and Hiraoka's (2000) examples, that is, passages where T 100 agrees with the Mahīśāsaka *Vinaya* against the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*.

Until such evidence is brought forward I believe it is best to regard T 100 as part of the Mūlasarvāstivāda or Greater Sarvāstivāda corpus, orally transmitted to China, and translated (somewhat roughly without much post-translation editing) in the Lanzhou region under the rule of the Qifu 乞伏 family some time around AD 400.

I deeply regret that Karashima *sensei* is not here anymore to respond to the above remarks. His exacting standards and vast erudition have always been a source of inspiration; his rejoinder is unfortunately not going to appear.

I am very grateful for the comments made by the other participants to the seminar on the Samyukta-āgama, organized by Bhikkhunī Dhammadinnā in Buenos Aires in October 2018. Especially Paul Harrison's close reading of the draft translation resulted in numerous improvements.

Abbreviations

D	Derge edition
DĀ	<i>Dīrgha-āgama</i> (T 1)
Dhp-a	<i>Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā</i>
EĀ	<i>Ekottarika-āgama</i> (T 125)
HDC	<i>Hanyu da cidian</i> 漢語大詞典
SĀ	<i>Saṃyukta-āgama</i> (T 99)
SĀ ²	‘shorter’ <i>Saṃyukta-āgama</i> (T 100)
CBETA	Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association 中華電子佛典協會
CBETA/T	CBETA edition of the Taishō 大正 canon (CD version, 2011)
MĀ	<i>Madhyama-āgama</i> (T 26)
Pj	<i>Paramatthajotikā</i>
PTS	Pali Text Society
Sadd	<i>Saddanīti</i>
SHT	<i>Sanskrit Handschriften aus den Turfan-funden</i>
SN	<i>Saṃyutta-nikāya</i>
Sn	<i>Sutta-nipāta</i>
Spk	<i>Sāratthappakāsinī</i>
T	Taishō 大正 edition
Ud	<i>Udāna</i>

References

- Agrawala, V.S. and Moti Chandra 1959: “Yakṣa Worship in Varanasi: Matsyapurana (Ch. 180)”, *Purāṇa*, 1.1: 198–201.
- Anālayo, Bhikkhu 2007: “The Arahant Ideal in Early Buddhism –

- The Case of Bakkula”, *Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies*, 8: 1–21.
- 2010: “Once again on Bakkula”, *Indian International Journal of Buddhist Studies*, 11: 1–28.
- 2015: “Āgama/Nikāya”, in Jonathan A. Silk (ed.), *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, vol. 1: *Literature and Languages*, Leiden: Brill, 50–59.
- 2018: “The Potential of Facing Anger with Mindfulness”, *Mindfulness*, 9.6: 1966–1972.
- Apte, Vaman Shivram, P.K. Gode and C.G. Karve 1957–1959: *Revised and Enlarged Edition of Prin. V.S. Apte’s The Practical Sanskrit/English Dictionary*, Poona: Prasad Prakashan, 3 vols. (first edition: V.S. Apte, *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, 1890).
- Bagchi, S. 1967: *Mūlasarvāstivādinayavastu*, vol. 1 (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, 16), Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute of Post-graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.
- Barnett, L.D. 1907: *The Antagaḍa-dasāo and Aṇuttarovavāiyadasāo*, London: Royal Asiatic Society.
- Bechert, Heinz 1955–1957: “Zur Geschichte der buddhistischen Sekten in Indien und Ceylon”, *La Nouvelle Clio*, 79: 311–360.
- 1992: “Buddha-Field and Transfer of Merit in a Theravāda Source”, *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 35: 95–108.
- 2005: *Eine regionale hochsprachliche Tradition in Südasien, Sanskrit-Literatur bei den buddhistischen Singhalesen* (Veröffentlichungen zu den Sprachen und Kulturen Südasien, 37), Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Bhatta, Somadeva (comp.), Charles H. Tawney (transl.) and Norman M. Penzer (ed.). 1924–1928: *The Ocean of Story, Being G.H. Tawney’s Translation of Somadeva’s Kathā Sarit Sāgara*, 10 vols., London: C.J. Sawyer.

- Bingenheimer, Marcus 2011: *Studies in Āgama Literature, With Special Reference to the Shorter Chinese Saṃyuktāgama*, Taipei: Shin Wen Feng 新文豐.
- 2013: “Two Sūtras in the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama without Direct Pāli Parallels — Some Remarks on How to Identify ‘Later Additions’ to the Corpus”, *Buddhist Studies Review*, 30.2: 201–214.
- Bodhi, Bhikkhu 2000: *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha* (Teachings of the Buddha), Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- 2017: *The Suttanipāta, An Ancient Collection of the Buddha’s Discourses together with its Commentaries* (Teachings of the Buddha), Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Böhtlingk, Otto von and Rudolph von Roth 1855–1875: *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*, 7 vols., Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften (Großes Petersburger Wörterbuch).
- Boyen, A.-M. 1906: “Yakṣá”, *Journal Asiatique*, 7: 393–477.
- Brough, John 1962: *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*, London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Cappeller, Carl 1891: *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Based upon the St. Petersburg Lexicons*, Strassburg: K. Trübner.
- Coblin, W. South 1994: *A Compendium of Phonetics in Northwest Chinese* (Journal of Chinese Linguistics Monograph Series, 7), Berkeley: Project on Linguistic Analysis, University of California.
- Cone, Margaret 2001: *A Dictionary of Pāli*, vol. 1: (a–kh), Oxford: Pāli Text Society.
- Coomaraswamy, Ananda K. 1928: “Indian Architectural Terms”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 48: 250–275.
- Cunningham, Alexander 1885 [2000]: *Report of a Tour in Eastern Rajputana in 1882–83* (Archaeological Survey of India, 20), New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India.

- DeCaroli, Robert 2004: *Haunting the Buddha, Indian Popular Religions and the Formation of Buddhism*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- DesJardins, J.F. Marc 2002: *Mahāmāyūri, Explorations sur la création d'une écriture prototantrique*, PhD dissertation, McGill University.
- Edgerton, Franklin 1953: *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, vol. 2: *Dictionary*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Enomoto Fumio 榎本 文雄 1980: “Udanavarga shohon to zōagon-gyō, betsuyaku- zōagon-gyō, chūagon-gyō no buhakizoku, Udānavarga 諸本と雜阿含經、別訳雜阿含經、中阿含經の部派帰属”, *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies / Indogaku bukkuyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究, 28.2: 55–57.
- 1984a: “Setsuissaiibu-kei āgama no tenkai – Chūagon to zōagon o megutte 說一切有部系アーガマの展開—「中阿含」と「雜阿含」をめくって—”, *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies / Indogaku bukkuyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究, 32.2: 51–53.
- 1984b: “Agon kyōten no seiritsu 阿含經典の成立 [The formation of the Original Text of the Chinese Āgamas]”, *The Journal of Oriental Studies / Toyo gakujutsu kenkyū* 東洋学術研究, 23.1: 93–108.
- 1989: “Śarīrāthagāthā, A Collection of Canonical Verses in the Yogācāra-bhūmi, Part 1: Text”, in *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon, Neuentdeckungen und Neueditionen* (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 2), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 17–35.
- 1994: *A Comprehensive Study of the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama, Indic Texts Corresponding to the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama as*

- found in the Sarvāstivāda-Mūlasarvāstivāda Literature*, Kyoto: Kacho Junior College.
- Feer, Léon 1884–1898: *The Saṃyutta-nikāya of the Sutta-piṭaka*, London: Pali Text Society.
- Forte, Antonino and Jacques May 1979: “Chōsai”, in Jacques May (ed.), *Hōbōgirin, Dictionnaire encyclopédique du bouddhisme d’après les sources chinoises et japonaises*, vol. 5, Paris and Tokyo: Eastern Buddhist Society, 392–407.
- Foucher, Albert 1909: “La Madone bouddhique”, *Monuments et Mémoires (publiés par l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres)*, 17: 255–275.
- Geiger, Wilhelm, Nyānaponika Mahāthera and Hellmuth Hecker 1997: *Die Reden des Buddha, Gruppierte Sammlung*, Stamm-bach: Beyerlein and Steinschulte, 1997 [first complete German translation; previous editions: Wilhelm Geiger: *Saṃyutta-nikāya, Die in Gruppen geordnete Sammlung*, I (1930), II (1925) [up to SN II 225], München, Neubiberg: Benares Verlag/Ferdinand Schwab; Wilhelm Geiger, continued by Nyānaponika: *Die in Gruppen geordnete Sammlung*, revised, new edition in 3 vols. [up to SN III 279], Wolfenbüttel: Institut für Buddhistische Existenz, 1990 (private edition)].
- Geldner, Karl 1901: “Yakṣa”, in Richard Pischel and Karl Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, 3: 126–143.
- Glass, Andrew 2008 [2010]: “Guṇabhadra, Bāoyún, and the Saṃyuktāgama”, *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 31.1–2: 185–203.
- Hiraoka Satoshi 平岡 聡 2000: “The Sectarian Affiliation of Two Chinese Saṃyuktāgamas”, *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies / Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究, 49.1: 506–500.

- Karashima Seishi 幸嶋 静志 1998: *A Glossary of Dharmarakṣa's Translation of the Lotus Sutra*, Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University.
- 2020: “The Underlying Languages of the Three Chinese Translations of the Saṃyukta-āgamas (Taishō nos. 99, 100 and 101) and their School-Affiliations”, in Dhammadinnā (ed.), *Research on the Saṃyukta-āgama* (Dharma Drum Institute of Liberal Arts Research Series, 8), Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, 707–761.
- Kroll, Paul W. 2015: *A Student's Dictionary of Classical and Medieval Chinese*, Leiden: Brill.
- Lamotte, Étienne 1966: “Vajrapāṇi en Inde”, in *Mélanges de Sino-logie*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 113–160.
- 1968: “Les yakṣa Ajakalāpaka et Bakkula dans les écritures canoniques du bouddhisme”, in *Mélanges d'Indianisme, à la mémoire Louis Renou* (Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne, série in-8°, 28), Paris: Éditions E. De Boccard.
- Lesbre, Emmanuelle 2000: “La conversion de Hārītī au Buddha: origine du thème iconographique et interprétations picturales chinoises”, *Arts asiatiques*, 55: 98–119.
- Lévi, Sylvain 1915: “Sur la récitation primitive des textes bouddhiques”, *Journal asiatique*, sér. 11.5: 401–447.
- Lüders, Heinrich 1961: Klaus Janert (ed.), *Mathurā Inscriptions, Unpublished Papers* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse, Dritte Folge, 47), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Lüders, Heinrich (ed.) 1963: *Bhārhut Inscriptions*, Ernst Waldschmidt and M.A. Mehendale (rev.) (Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, vol. 2, part 2), Ootacamund: Government Epigraphist for India.

- Migot, André 1954: “Un grand disciple du Buddha: Śāriputra”, *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, 46.2: 405–554.
- Minayeff, Ivan P. and Sergey Oldenburg 1983: *Buddhist Texts from Kashgar and Nepal* (Śata-piṭaka Series, 322), Delhi: Jayyed Press.
- Misra, Ram Nath 1981: *Yaksha Cult and Iconography*, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Mitterwallner, Gritli von 1989: “Yakṣas of Ancient Mathurā”, in Doris M. Srinivasan (ed.), *Mathurā, The Cultural Heritage*, New Delhi: Manohar and American Institute of Indian Studies, 368–382.
- Mizuno Kōgen 水野 弘元 1970: “Betsuyaku agon kyō ni tsuite 別譯雜阿含經について”, *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies / Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究, 18.2 (= 36): 41–51.
- Mochizuki Shinko 望月 信亨 1954–1958: Tsukamoto Zenryū 塚本善隆 (ed.), *Mochizuki bukkyō daijiten* 望月佛教大辭典, 10 vols., Tokyo: Sekkai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai 世界聖典刊行協会.
- Monier-Williams, Monier 1899: *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Morris, R. 1886: “Notes and Queries”, *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, 94–96.
- Nagata Kaoru 永田 郁 2003: “Indo kodai shoki ni okeru yakusha no shinzō chōkoku ni tsuite インド古代初期におけるヤクシャの神像彫刻について / A Study on Yakṣas Statues of Early Indian Art”, *Bulletin of Nagoya University Museum / Nagoyadaigaku hakubutsukan hōkoku* 名古屋大学博物館報告, 19: 55–73.
- Norman, Kenneth R. 1984: *The Group of Discourses (Sutta-Nipāta)*, London: Pali Text Society.
- 1992: *The Group of Discourses (Sutta-Nipāta)*, Oxford: Pali Text Society.

- Peri, Noël 1917: “Hārīti, la Mère-de-démons”, *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient*, 17: 1–102.
- Rhys Davids, Caroline Augusta and Frank Lee Woodward (transl.) 1917–1930: *Kindred Sayings (Samyutta Nikāya)*, 5 vols. London: Pali Text Society, 1917, 1922, 1925, 1927 and 1930 [vols. I and II translated by Rhys Davids; vols. III, IV, and V translated by Woodward].
- Rhys Davids, Thomas Williams and William Stede 1921: *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary*, London: The Pali Text Society.
- Salomon, Richard 1999: *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls from Gandhāra, The British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments*, Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Smith, Helmer 2001 [1954]: *Saddanīti, la grammaire Palie d'Agga-vaṃsa*, vol. 5.1: *Tables, 2me partie*, Oxford: The Pali Text Society (originally published: Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. humanistiska vetenskapssamfundet i Lund 22.5.1, Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1954).
- Somaratne, G.A. 1998: *The Samyuttanikāya of the Suttapiṭaka*, vol. 1: *The Sagāthavagga*, Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Su Jinkun 蘇錦坤 [= Ken Su] 2008: “Bieyi za ahan jing shesong de tedian 別譯雜阿含經攝頌的特點”, *Satyābhisamaya / Zhengguan zazhi* 正觀雜誌, 45: 5–80.
- 2020: “Notes on the Translation and the Translator of the Shorter Chinese Samyukta-āgama”, in Dhammadinnā (ed.), *Research on the Samyukta-āgama* (Dharma Drum Institute of Liberal Arts Research Series, 8), Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, 843–880.
- Sutherland, Gail H. 1991: *The Disguises of the Demon, The Development of the Yakṣa in Hinduism and Buddhism*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

- Takahashi Takahide 高橋 堯英 2002: “Saka-Kushan jidai no Maturā ni okeru yakusha shinkō ni kan suru ichi kōsatsu サカ=クシャ ン時代のマトゥラーにおけるヤクシャ信仰に関する一考察 (The Yakṣa Cult in Mathurā during the Saka-Kuṣāṇa Period)”, *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies / Indogaku bukkyō-gaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究, 51.1: 448–443.
- Travagnin, Stefania and Bhikkhu Anālayo 2020: “Assessing the Field of Āgama Studies in Twentieth-century China: With a Focus on Master Yinshun’s 印順 Three-aṅga Theory”, in Dhamma-dinnā (ed.), *Research on the Saṃyukta-āgama* (Dharma Drum Institute of Liberal Arts Research Series, 8), Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, 933–1007.
- Trenckner, Wilhelm et al. 1968: *A Critical Pāli Dictionary* (begun by Wilhelm Trenckner, continuing the work of Dines Andersen and Helmer Smith), Ludwig Alsdorf (ed.), vol. 2, fasc. 5: *āroha – āha*, Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters / Munksgaard.
- Vreese, K. de 1947: “Skt. Kūṭagāra”, in F.D.K. Bosch et al. (ed.), *India Antiqua, A Volume of Oriental Studies Presented to Jean Philippe Vogel C.I.E., On the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of his Doctorate*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Waddell, Laurence A. 1912: “Evolution of the Buddhist Cult, its Gods Images and Art: A Study in Buddhist Iconography with reference to the Guardian Gods of the World and Hārītī, ‘The Buddhist Madonna’”, *The Imperial and Asiatic Quarterly Review*, third series, 33.65–66: 105–160.
- Wayman, Alex 1982: “Is It a Crow (P. dhamka) or a Nurse (S. dhātrī)?”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 102.3: 515–516.
- Yinshun 印順 1983: *Za ahan jing lun huibian* 雜阿含經論會編, 3 vols., Taipei: Zhengwen 正聞.
- Yu Min 俞敏 1986: *Xuci gulin* 虛詞詁林, Beijing: Shangwu Yinshu Guan 商務印書館.

