

# The Bodhisattva *Prātimokṣa* of the *Youposai wu jie weiyi jing*: Its Textual Provenance and Historical Significance

SANGYOP LEE

IN THE FIRST half of the text titled *Youposai wu jie weiyi jing* 優婆塞五戒威儀經 (henceforth *Weiyi jing*, or WYJ),<sup>1</sup> we find a variant Chinese version of what has been traditionally referred to in East Asia as the “bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*” (*pusa jieben* 菩薩戒本), the set of four major and forty or so minor bodhisattva precepts that is compiled in the “*Śīlapaṭala*” (Chapter on Morality) of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi* (henceforth BBh) in a format similar to the *prātimokṣas* of *bhikṣus* and *bhikṣuṇīs*.<sup>2</sup>

I WOULD LIKE to express my deep gratitude to Professor Funayama Tōru for his detailed and incisive comments on earlier drafts of this paper and his encouragement to continue the study of this subject. All errors are mine.

<sup>1</sup> T no. 1503; the “bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*” can be found in T no. 1503, 24: 1116c12–1119c10.

<sup>2</sup> Wogihara (1930) 1971 (henceforth W) and Dutt 1966 (henceforth D) are the two critical editions of the Sanskrit BBh. For information about the base manuscripts of these editions, see their respective introductions and also the discussion in Matsumura 1990, pp. 96–99; for modern language translations of the “*Śīlapaṭala*” of the BBh, see Tatz 1986, pp. 47–89, Fujita 1989–91, An 2015, pp. 177–223, and Engle 2016, pp. 237–311; for a discussion of the “*Śīlapaṭala*” in the Indian Buddhist context, see Zimmermann 2013; for discussions about the relation between the surviving Sanskrit tradition of the BBh and the Chinese translations of the BBh, see Matsumura 1990, pp. 79–80 and Deleanu 2006, p. 230, n. 191. D pp. 108<sub>11</sub>–124<sub>23</sub> (equivalent to W pp. 158<sub>2</sub>–181<sub>14</sub>) is the section of the BBh whose corresponding sections in Chinese translations have traditionally been referred to in East Asia as the “bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*.” For example, the corresponding section in the translation of the BBh by Dharmakṣema (Ch. Tan Wuchen 曇無讖; 385–443), the *Pusa dīchi jing* 菩薩地持經 (T no. 1581), circulated independently in China with some additional ceremonial verses and dialogues under the title “*Pusa jieben*” 菩薩戒本 (T no. 1500), that is, “bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*.”

*The Eastern Buddhist* 49/1 & 2: 39–80

©2021 The Eastern Buddhist Society

In his pioneering study of Mahayana precepts, the *Daijōkaikyō no kenkyū* 大乘戒經の研究, Ōno Hōdō pointed out the heterogeneous nature of the WYJ and the unreliability of the traditional attribution of its translation to Guṇavarman (Ch. Qiunabamo 求那跋摩; 367–431), and presented the compelling argument that the WYJ was compiled in China by combining various short texts about bodhisattva and *upāsaka* precepts that had been in independent circulation under different titles.<sup>3</sup> With regard to the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* of the WYJ, he suggested that this part would have circulated

---

The corresponding section in the translation of the BBh (i.e., the *Pusa di* 菩薩地 of his *Yuqie shidi lun* 瑜伽師地論; T no. 1579) by Xuanzang 玄奘 (602–664) also circulated independently under the title “*Pusa jieben*” 菩薩戒本 (T no. 1501). While this usage of the term “bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*” is not unreasonable given that the sentential structure of these BBh precepts closely resembles that of the precepts of the *bhikṣu* and *bhikṣuṇī prātimokṣas* (e.g., see the discussion in Funayama 2011a, pp. 143–45), it must be noted that this is not a usage attested in extant Indian Buddhist sources. Although a text titled *Bodhisattvaprātimokṣa* is cited several times in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, this is a text unrelated to the “bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*” section of the BBh (see Fujita 1988 for a study of the *Bodhisattvaprātimokṣa* cited in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*). However, scholars also have noted the possible textual affinity between the *Pusa shanjie jing* 菩薩善戒經 (T nos. 1582 and 1583)—another Chinese translation of the BBh by Guṇavarman (Ch. Qiunabamo 求那跋摩; 367–431)—and a certain “*bodhisattvaprātimokṣa*” cited in a short Nepalese Sanskrit manuscript. See Hirakawa 1990, pp. 268–70; Ōtomo 1967, p. 143; Okimoto 1972, p. 130; and Okimoto 1973, p. 375. Yamabe 2005, pp. 31–32, also has a relevant discussion. I think this points to the possibility that the practice of referring to the four major and forty or so minor bodhisattva precepts of the BBh as the “bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*” could have had Indian precedents (see Matsumura 1990, pp. 85–86, for an alternative speculation). Meanwhile, ever since Dutt 1931, this Nepalese Sanskrit manuscript itself has also often been referred to as the *Bodhisattvaprātimokṣa Sutra* owing to the appearance of the sentence “*iti bodhisattvaprātimokṣaḥ*” in the middle of the manuscript (Dutt 1931, p. 285, line 8). But this confusing practice is to be avoided. As Hirakawa 1990, pp. 268–70, and Okimoto 1972, p. 130, point out, this sentence should be taken rather as an indication that the preceding content of the manuscript is a citation from a (possibly much larger) text titled *Bodhisattvaprātimokṣa* than as the title of the text of the manuscript itself. See Fujita 1983 for the most detailed identification of the contents of this manuscript.

<sup>3</sup> Ōno 1954, pp. 21–23, 25–26, and 385–86. This kind of conflation was common for texts that served practical purposes. See Funayama 2002, pp. 13–14. The history of the WYJ itself as a compilation work (the changes in its constituent elements, when it assumed its present form, why these different texts were compiled together, its practical uses, etc.) lies beyond the scope of this study, and I only focus on the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* section of the WYJ on whose original independent circulation I agree with Ōno. For more about the relation between the WYJ and its *prātimokṣa* section, see below the third section of the present essay, “The Chronological Relation between the *Ur-Weiyi jing* and the *Fanwang jing* Bodhisattva *Prātimokṣas*.”

independently as the text titled *Pusa jie yaoyi jing* 菩薩戒要義經 before becoming a part of the WYJ.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, he conjectured that this *prātimokṣa* was likely a polished redaction of the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* section of the *Pusa dichì jing* 菩薩地持經 (henceforth *Dichì jing*, or DCJ),<sup>5</sup> the early fifth-century translation of the BBh by Dharmakṣema (Ch. Tan Wuchen 曇無讖; 385–433).<sup>6</sup> Following Ōno’s observation, which amounted to the claim that the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* compiled in the WYJ was merely a secondary derivative of Dharmakṣema’s DCJ, the existence of this alternative Chinese bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* disappeared completely from scholarly attention.<sup>7</sup>

More recently, however, a number of studies have appeared that proposed to reconsider the importance of the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* of the WYJ in the history of bodhisattva precepts in China. These studies call attention to the previously overlooked phraseological similarity between the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* compiled in the WYJ and the extremely successful Sinitic apocryphal bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* of the *Fanwang jing* 梵網經 (henceforth FWJ; composed in the mid to late fifth century).<sup>8</sup> As these recent studies point out, in a number of important precepts, the WYJ *prātimokṣa* shows

<sup>4</sup> The *Pusa jie yaoyi jing* is mentioned in the *Chu sanzang jiji* 出三藏記集, T no. 2145, 55: 23a4 of Sengyou 僧祐 (445–518). The entirety of the information Sengyou provides about the text is that it is one fascicle and that it is an excerpt (or excerpts) from “*pusa jie*” (*chao pusa jie* 抄菩薩戒). *Pusa jie* was one of the alternative titles of both Dharmakṣema’s DCJ and Guṇavarman’s SJJ. See *Chu sanzang jiji*, T no. 2145, 55: 11b19 (菩薩地持經八卷或云菩薩戒經) and T no. 2145, 55: 14c21 (求那跋摩出菩薩戒十卷).

<sup>5</sup> T no. 1581.

<sup>6</sup> Ōno 1954, pp. 25–26, 192, 194, 414, and 417–18. For the circumstances of the translation of the DCJ, see the *Chu sanzang jiji*, T no. 2145, 55: 103a24–103b5, and the *Gaoseng zhuan* 高僧傳, T no. 2059, 50: 336a19–b1. For more about Dharmakṣema and the date of his activities, see Chen 2004.

<sup>7</sup> Other parts of the WYJ remained of interest to scholars. See Tsuchihashi 1982 and Okimoto 1976.

<sup>8</sup> T no. 1484. See Lee 2010, pp. 89–90; Funayama 2011b, p. 239, n. 22; Funayama 2014, pp. 22–23; Funayama 2017, pp. 487–88. For specific examples of the phraseological similarity between the WYJ bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* and the FWJ bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*, see the tables in Lee 2010, pp. 114–16, and Funayama 2017, pp. 329–421. Some of these examples are cited below in this study. Mochizuki 1930, p. 170, and Ōno 1954, pp. 269 and 417, briefly touch upon the possible influence of the WYJ *prātimokṣa* on the terminology of the FWJ, but do not go as far as to point out their phraseological similarity. Now, for the dating of the creation of the FWJ to between ca. 450 and ca. 480, and a detailed review of previous studies of this apocryphal sutra, see Funayama 1996. Note also that the notion of “apocryphon” has different connotations in Buddhism from the Abrahamic traditions. See Buswell 1990.

the closest phraseological resemblance to the FWJ *prātimokṣa* of all extant Chinese versions of the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* of the BBh, including the *prātimokṣa* sections of Dharmakṣema's DCJ and Guṇavarman's *Pusa shanjie jing* 菩薩善戒經 (henceforth *Shanjie jing*, or SJJ),<sup>9</sup> another early fifth-century translation of the BBh.<sup>10</sup> Scholars have long considered these two translations to be the most important sources for the creation of the FWJ bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*.<sup>11</sup>

This recent discovery has two possible, mutually exclusive implications for our understanding of the development of bodhisattva precepts in Chinese Buddhism: it means that the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* compiled in the WYJ is either (1) evidence of the existence of, if indeed not itself, a hitherto neglected yet important source for the composition of the FWJ bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*,<sup>12</sup> or (2) a unique illustration of the apocryphal FWJ's profound influence on the understanding of bodhisattva precepts in China, in which we ascertain that the apocryphon eventually even reshaped one of the Chinese versions of the very Indian bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* that provided the initial inspiration for its composition.<sup>13</sup>

Taking this new discovery and its possible implications into consideration, the present study revisits the problem of the WYJ bodhisattva

<sup>9</sup> T nos. 1582 and 1583; the fascicle of the SJJ that contained the "bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*" circulated in China as a separate text, and was accordingly assigned a separate Taishō number 1583. T no. 1582 is thus missing this fascicle. The separation of the fascicle that contained the "bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*" from the rest of the SJJ is already noted by Sengyou in the *Chu sanzang jiji*, T no. 2145, 55: 62c28–29. (Compare Sengyou's description here with T no. 1582, 30: 960a7 and T no. 1583, 30: 1013c21.) See also the discussion of this *Chu sanzang jiji* passage and the relation between T no. 1583 and T no. 1582 in Tokiwa 1973, pp. 948–51, and Okimoto 1973, pp. 374–75.

<sup>10</sup> The SJJ shows extensive departure from the surviving Sanskrit tradition of the BBh in numerous aspects. Ōno's earlier argument that this was due to the SJJ being a Sinitic revision of the DCJ (1954, pp. 194–204) has been refuted by Naitō 1962 and Okimoto 1973. It is now generally believed that the SJJ was a translation made from an Indic text that belonged to a different tradition of the BBh, but the exact relationship between the underlying Indic text of the SJJ and the surviving Sanskrit tradition of the BBh remains an unresolved issue. See Matsumura 1990, pp. 79–80 and 86, and Deleanu 2006, p. 230, n. 191, for further discussions of this problem. For the date and circumstances of the translation of the SJJ, see the *Chu sanzang jiji*, T no. 2145, 55: 104b14–23, and the *Gaoseng zhuan*, T no. 2059, 50: 340c29–341b1.

<sup>11</sup> For earlier studies of the sources for the creation of the FWJ *prātimokṣa*, see Mochizuki 1930, pp. 155–85; Ōno 1954, pp. 252–84; and Shirato 1970, pp. 142–44.

<sup>12</sup> I have previously proposed a similar thesis in Lee 2010, pp. 89–90.

<sup>13</sup> Funayama 2011b, p. 239, n. 22, and Funayama 2014, pp. 22–23, suggest this possibility.

*prātimokṣa*'s textual nature and investigates its relation to the FWJ bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*. First, by comparing the WYJ *prātimokṣa* with the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* of the Sanskrit BBh and its Chinese counterparts in Dharmakṣema's DCJ, Guṇavarman's SJJ, and the *Yujuē shidi lun* 瑜伽師地論 (henceforth *Yujuē lun*, or YQL; translation completed in 648)<sup>14</sup> of Xuanzang 玄奘 (602–664), I will identify a number of unique terms and phrases that only the WYJ *prātimokṣa* and the Sanskrit BBh *prātimokṣa* share, and will show that the content of the WYJ *prātimokṣa* thus strongly points to the existence of a previously unknown independent translation of the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* of the BBh.<sup>15</sup> Second, from an analysis of the phrases and terms that are uniquely shared by the WYJ, the FWJ, and the Sanskrit BBh *prātimokṣas*, I will argue that this now-lost variant Chinese translation of the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* of the BBh that became the basis of the WYJ *prātimokṣa* must have come into existence before the creation of the FWJ, and that either this variant translation itself or one of its close derivatives must have been one of the most extensively used sources in the composition of the FWJ *prātimokṣa*. Furthermore, I will point out some reasons we have for postulating that the content and phraseology of this variant translation of the BBh bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* might not have differed so extensively

<sup>14</sup> T no. 1579.

<sup>15</sup> It must be noted here that referring to the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* that appears in the BBh as “the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* of the BBh” or “the BBh *prātimokṣa*” entails possible anachronisms. Although not yet substantiated, it has been suggested that some of the major constituent parts of the “Śīlapaṭala,” including the “bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*” section, could have circulated independently before being incorporated into this chapter. See Zimmermann 2013, pp. 878–79. I think this problem relates to the question of how we should read the passage near the end of the so-called “bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*” section that appears to be written by the compilers of the BBh, where we are told that these bodhisattva precepts are spoken by the Blessed One in various sutras (“[i]many . . . bodhisattvānāṃ śikṣāpadāni teṣu teṣu sūtrānteṣu vyagrāṇi bhagavatā ākhyātāni”; D p. 124<sub>5-6</sub>; W p. 180<sub>13-14</sub>), and that they are presented together “in this treatise on the *piṭaka* of bodhisattvas,” that is, in the BBh (“*tāny asyāṃ bodhisattvapīṭakamāṭṛkāyāṃ samagrāṇy ākhyātāni*”; D p. 124<sub>7-8</sub>; W p. 180<sub>16-17</sub>). Although Zimmermann seems to take this passage as the description of the compilation process of the entire “Śīlapaṭala” (2013, p. 873), it is also possible to read it as the description of how the “bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*” section was compiled, as Hirakawa 1990, p. 261, does. If the latter is the case, the “*prātimokṣa*” section is more likely to have been put together by the compilers of the BBh themselves than having been incorporated from an independently circulating text. The Chinese tradition also seems to have taken this as the description of the provenance of the “bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*” rather than the entire “Śīlapaṭala,” as this passage is reproduced in the two *Pusa jiebens* together with the “bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*” section (T nos. 1500 and 1501; see n. 2 above).

from those of the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* that now survives in the WYJ. The study will conclude with some preliminary discussion of the possible further significance of this variant Chinese translation of the BBh bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* for our understanding of the history of bodhisattva precepts in India, Central Asia, and China.

*The Weiyi jing Bodhisattva Prātimokṣa: Evidence of a Forgotten Chinese Translation of the Bodhisattva Prātimokṣa of the Bodhisattvabhūmi*

A comprehensive survey of the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* sections of the BBh, DCJ, SJJ, and the WYJ reveals that there are numerous phrases of the Sanskrit BBh *prātimokṣa* whose equivalents are only found in the WYJ *prātimokṣa* and not in the DCJ and the SJJ *prātimokṣas*. For example, the first minor bodhisattva precept is presented as follows in the respective versions of the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*.

BBh: *evam bodhisattvaśīlasaṃvarasthito bodhisattvaḥ pratidivasam tathāgatasya vā tathāgatam uddiśya caitye dharmasya vā dharmam uddiśya pustakagate 'pi bodhisattvasūtrapiṭake [bodhisattvasūtrapiṭaka]mātrkāyāṃ vā saṃghasya vā yo 'sau daśasu dikṣu mahābhūmipravistānām bodhisattvānām saṃghaḥ kiñcid evālpam vā prabhūtaṃ vā pūjādhikārikam akṛtvā 'ntata ekapraṇāmam api kāyena antato guṇān ārabhya buddhadharmasaṃghānām ekacatuspadāyā api gāthāyāḥ pravyāhāraṃ vācā antata ekaprasādam api buddhadharmasaṃghaḥ gaganānusmaraṇapūrvakaṃ cetasā rātriṃdivam atināmayati sāpattiko bhavati sātisāraḥ | sa ced agauravād ālasyakausīdyād āpadyate kliṣṭām āpattim āpanno bhavati | (D pp. 109<sub>23</sub>–110<sub>7</sub>; W p. 160<sub>13–25</sub>; Engle 2016 [henceforth E], p. 270).<sup>16</sup>*

If a bodhisattva who is thus committed to the moral restraints of bodhisattvas idles night and day (*rātriṃdivam*) without carrying out on a daily basis (*pratidivasam*) either some small or some greater activities related to the veneration (*pūjā*) of the Tathāgata—towards

<sup>16</sup> Square brackets in the Sanskrit are by Dutt. There are minor differences between the Dutt and Wogihara editions, but most of these differences are pointed out in the footnotes of the Dutt edition. I thus do not reproduce these differences in this paper, unless some further clarification is required. The punctuation is mine. Compare Engle 2016 for alternative English translations of the passages cited in this paper. Relevant pages in Engle's translation are given after the Sanskrit citations.

the Tathāgata [as represented] in the shrine—or [some small or some greater activities related to the veneration] of the Dharma—towards the Dharma [as represented] in the canon of bodhisattva sutras that may even be in the form of books, or [as represented] in the summary of the canon of bodhisattva sutras—or [some small or some greater activities related to the veneration] of the sangha—which is the community of the bodhisattvas who have entered the great stages (*mahābhūmipraviṣṭānām bodhisattvānām*) in the ten directions—by performing with his body even as little as a single bow, or by performing with his voice even as little as an utterance of a single four-line verse (*ekacatuṣpadāyā api gāthāvāḥ*) about the merits of the Buddha, the Dharma, and the sangha, or by performing with his mind even as little as a thought of faith that accompanies the recollection of the merits of the Buddha, the Dharma, and the sangha, then he becomes a transgressor and becomes culpable. If he transgresses because of his lack of respect, or his laziness and indolence, he becomes one who has committed a defiled transgression.

DCJ: 若菩薩住律儀戒，於一日一夜中 (*rātriṃdivam*)，若佛在世，若佛塔廟，若法若經卷，若菩薩修多羅藏，若菩薩摩得勒伽藏，若比丘僧，若十方世界大菩薩眾，若不少多供養乃至一禮，乃至不以一偈讚歎三寶功德，乃至不能一念淨心者，是名為犯眾多犯。若懶惰，若懈怠犯，是犯染污起。(T no. 1581, 30: 913c1–6)

SJJ: 菩薩若受菩薩戒已，若於晝夜 (*rātriṃdivam*)，塔像經卷，讀誦之人，千萬菩薩，不以華香供養禮拜，不能讚歎，心不歡喜乃至一念，是名犯重不名八重，是名菩薩污心疑心。有創墮落，起不淨心，若有所作無恭敬，不信故，懈怠故，是名犯重不名八重。(T no. 1583, 30: 1015b7–12)

WYJ: 如是住菩薩戒者，且 (*pratidivasam*) 應供養諸佛若塔若像，次供養法若行法人及菩薩藏大乘經典，供養眾僧及十方土住於大地諸菩薩 (*mahābhūmipraviṣṭānām bodhisattvānām*)等，於日夜中 (*rātriṃdivam*) 供養三寶，隨其力能乃至一念一禮一四句誦 (*ekacatuṣpadāyā api gāthāvāḥ*) 信心供養，勿令有廢。若不恭敬慢墮心者，犯重垢罪。(T no. 1503, 24: 1117a21–26)

As we can see, among the DCJ, the SJJ, and the WYJ versions of this precept, it is only in the WYJ version that we see the expressions that correspond

to the three Sanskrit BBh phrases “on a daily basis” (*pratidivasam*; in addition to “night and day,” i.e., “*rātriṃdivam*”), “bodhisattvas who have entered the great stages” (*mahābhūmipraviṣṭānām bodhisattvānām*), and “a four-line verse” (*ekacatuṣpadāyā api gāthāyāḥ*). There are numerous similar examples scattered throughout the WYJ *prātimokṣa*.<sup>17</sup> We can establish from this that the WYJ *prātimokṣa* cannot have been the result of revising the bodhisattva *prātimokṣas* of the DCJ and the SJJ. Thus, it is safe to reject Ōno’s earlier conjecture that the WYJ *prātimokṣa* is a redaction of the *prātimokṣa* section of the DCJ. The WYJ *prātimokṣa* has to be either itself a translation of the BBh bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* or an adaptation of an alternative translation of the BBh *prātimokṣa*.<sup>18</sup>

Could then the YQL, Xuanzang’s translation of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, be the alternative Chinese translation of the BBh *prātimokṣa* that the WYJ *prātimokṣa* derived from? The following is the YQL version of the above bodhisattva precept:

YQL: 若諸菩薩安住菩薩淨戒律儀，於日日中 (*pratidivasam*)，若於如來或為如來造制多所，若於正法或為正法造經卷所，謂諸菩薩素怛纜藏摩怛理迦，若於僧伽，謂十方界已入大地諸菩薩眾 (*mahābhūmipraviṣṭānām bodhisattvānām*)，若不以其或多或少或多諸供養具而為供養，下至以身一拜禮敬，下至以語一四句頌 (*ekacatuṣpadāyā api gāthāyāḥ*) 讚佛法僧真實功德，下至以心一清淨信隨念三寶真實功德，空度日夜 (*rātriṃdivam*)，是名有犯有

<sup>17</sup> The sheer ubiquity of the Sanskrit BBh phrases that are not represented in the DCJ *prātimokṣa* or the SJJ *prātimokṣa* but are represented in the WYJ *prātimokṣa* makes it impractical to reproduce all of them in this paper. Below, I only discuss a number of additional examples that happen to appear in the passages I use to establish that even the YQL bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* cannot have been the source of the WYJ bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*.

<sup>18</sup> I of course do not mean that this particular surviving version of the BBh *prātimokṣa* cited here was the basis of the WYJ *prātimokṣa* (or of the alternative translation text that the WYJ *prātimokṣa* could have been an adaptation of). In fact, there are tantalizing indications that the Indic language basis of the WYJ *prātimokṣa* could have belonged to a tradition closer to the one transmitted in a Khotanese version of the BBh *prātimokṣa* (see the third section for details). Nevertheless, we can apply the technique of textual triangulation to the WYJ *prātimokṣa* and the surviving Sanskrit BBh *prātimokṣa* and safely postulate that these expressions (“*pratidivasam*,” “*mahābhūmipraviṣṭānām bodhisattvānām*,” and “*ekacatuṣpadāyā api gāthāyāḥ*”) also existed in the version of the Indic BBh bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* that the translators of the WYJ *prātimokṣa* (or the translators of the alternative Chinese bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* from which the WYJ *prātimokṣa* derived) availed themselves of. The same goes for all the discussions below about “translation” and “rendering” from the Sanskrit BBh. See Nattier 2003, pp. 70–72, for a discussion of this technique.

所違越。若不恭敬懶惰懈怠而違犯者，是染違犯。(T no. 1579, 30: 516a9–19)

We see that the YQL indeed translates all three aforementioned BBh phrases that are not translated in the DCJ and the SJJ *prātimokṣas* but are represented in the WYJ *prātimokṣa*. The *terminus ante quem* of the WYJ bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* is when it was cited in the *Fayuan zhulin* 法苑珠林 of Daoshi 道世 (?–683) that was completed in 668,<sup>19</sup> and thus the WYJ *prātimokṣa*'s reliance on the YQL *prātimokṣa*, whose translation was completed in 648, is chronologically not impossible.

However, this possibility is ruled out by the fact that there are also phrases of the BBh *prātimokṣa* that are only represented in the WYJ *prātimokṣa* and are not translated in either of the YQL, the DCJ, and the SJJ *prātimokṣas*. For example, the following is the precept against not accepting luxurious goods in the respective versions of the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*:

BBh: *bodhisattvaḥ paresām antikāḥ jātārūparajataṃnimuktā vaidūryādikāni ca dhanajātāni vicitrāṇi prabhūtāni pravaraṇi labhamāno 'nudadhyamānaḥ āghātacittaḥ pratighacitto na pratigrhṇāti pratikṣipati sāpattiko bhavati sātisāraḥ kliṣṭām āpattim āpadyate sattvopekṣayā* | (D p. 111<sub>17–20</sub>; W pp. 162<sub>26–</sub>163<sub>4</sub>; E p. 274)

If a bodhisattva, having malicious thoughts and hostile thoughts, does not accept but [instead] rejects gold, silver, jewels, pearls, beryl, and the like that are produced by wealth and are various, abundant, and most excellent, when he has obtained them and has been given them from the vicinity of others (*paresām antikāḥ*), he becomes a transgressor, becomes culpable, and commits a defiled transgression for neglecting other sentient beings.

DCJ: 若菩薩有檀越，以金銀真珠摩尼琉璃種種寶物，奉施菩薩，菩薩以瞋慢心，違逆不受，是名為犯眾多犯，是犯染污。起捨眾生故。(T no. 1581, 30: 914a14–17)

<sup>19</sup> T no. 2122, 53: 944a15–26. Although the title *Youposai wujie wei yi jing* first appears in the *Zhongjing mulu* 眾經目錄 (T no. 2147) of Yancong 彥琮 (557–610) that was compiled in 602 (T no. 2147, 55: 155c9), we do not know if the text of this title at this point contained the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* section that we find in the current version of the WYJ (see the discussion about the incohesive nature of the WYJ as a compilation work in the third section of this study). Thus, the compilation of the *Fayuan zhulin* serves as the *terminus ante quem*.

SJJ: 若有檀越，以金銀真珠車渠馬瑙琉璃頗梨奴婢車乘象馬等物雜色敷具，奉施菩薩，菩薩應受。若不受者得罪。是罪因煩惱犯。(T no. 1583, 30: 1015c18–20)

WYJ: 菩薩，從他人邊 (*pareṣām antikāj*)，得金銀琉璃種種雜寶所須之物，及地中伏藏無主財物，“皆應取之，念當轉施。” [See section 3 below for a discussion of this variation.] 若惡心瞋故不取者，犯重垢罪。(T no. 1503, 24: 1117b17–19)

YQL: 若諸菩薩安住菩薩淨戒律儀，他持種種生色可染末尼真珠琉璃等寶，及持種種眾多上妙財利供具，慇懃奉施，由嫌恨心或恚惱心違拒不受，是名有犯有所違越，是染違犯。捨有情故。(T no. 1579, 30: 516b29–c4)

Only the WYJ version of this precept uses the phrase “*cong taren bian*” 從他人邊 (“from the vicinity of other people”), which corresponds literally to the Indic phrase we see in the Sanskrit BBh, “*pareṣām antikāj*” (“from ‘the vicinity of’ others”; a phrase used for indirectly expressing “from others”). Where the BBh has “*pareṣām antikāj*,” the DCJ and the SJJ versions of the precept have “*you tanyue*” 有檀越 (a certain donor) and the YQL version only has “*ta 他*” (others). The phrase “*cong . . . bian*” appears just one more time in the WYJ *prātimokṣa*: “*cong duxin ren bian*” 從篤信人邊,<sup>20</sup> that is, “from ‘the vicinity of’ pious people.” The part of the BBh *prātimokṣa* that corresponds to this WYJ *prātimokṣa* phrase is indeed the expression “*śrāddhānām brāhmaṇagrhapatīnām antikād*,”<sup>21</sup> that is, “from ‘the vicinity of’ pious brahmans and householders.” Thus, it would be more reasonable to think that the instance of the phrase “*cong taren bian*” in the WYJ *prātimokṣa* version of the above precept resulted from literally translating the phrase “*pareṣām antikāj*” from the original Indic bodhisattva precept than to think that it resulted from revising the three Chinese translations of the precept, in none of which this phrase is rendered literally. This then means that the WYJ *prātimokṣa* is not likely to have been an adaptation of the YQL bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* either, let alone an adaptation of the DCJ and the SJJ *prātimokṣas*.

Below are two more examples that further prove that the WYJ *prātimokṣa* was not a product of redacting any or all of the Chinese translations of the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* known to us.

<sup>20</sup> T no. 1503, 24: 1119a26–27.

<sup>21</sup> D p. 122<sub>18</sub>; W p. 178<sub>7</sub>.

Bh: *bodhisattva utpannam ālasyakausīdyaṃ nidrāsukhaṃ śayanasukhaṃ pārśvasukhaṅ cākāle amātrayā svīkaroti sāpattiko bhavati sātisāraḥ kliṣṭām āpattim āpadyate* | (D p. 118<sub>4-5</sub>; W p. 172<sub>1-3</sub>; E p. 287)

If a bodhisattva indulges in indolence (*ālasyakausīdyaṃ*) that has arisen (*utpannam*) [in him], and [indulges in] the pleasure of slumber, the pleasure of lying in bed, and the pleasure of leaning on his side (*śayanasukhaṃ pārśvasukhaṅ*) at improper times and without proper measure, he becomes a transgressor, becomes culpable, and commits a defiled transgression.

DCJ: 若菩薩，癡墮懈怠，耽樂睡眠，若非時，不知量，是名為犯眾多犯，是犯染污起。(T no. 1581, 30: 915b4–5)

SJJ: 若菩薩，懈怠懶惰，不勤精進，樂眠臥者，得罪。(T no. 1583, 30: 1016c8)

WYJ: 菩薩，起 (*utpannam*) 懶惰意 (*ālasyakausīdyaṃ*)，樂於非時食，貪著睡眠若倚若臥 (*śayanasukhaṃ pārśvasukhaṅ*) 者，犯重垢罪。(T no. 1503, 24: 1117b17–19)

YQL: 若諸菩薩安住菩薩淨戒律儀，癡墮懈怠，耽睡眠樂臥樂倚樂 (*śayanasukhaṃ pārśvasukhaṅ*)，非時非量，是名有犯有所違越，是染違犯。(T no. 1579, 30: 518c18–20)

In this example, we first see that the Sanskrit phrase “the pleasure of lying in bed, and the pleasure of leaning on one’s side” (*śayanasukhaṃ pārśvasukhaṅ*) has its equivalents only in the WYJ *prātimokṣa* and the YQL *prātimokṣa* versions of the precept (although the order is inverted in the WYJ), which again shows that the WYJ *prātimokṣa* cannot have been a redaction of the DCJ and the SJJ *prātimokṣas*. Furthermore, the past passive participle “*utpanna*” (that which has arisen) that modifies the word “*ālasyakausīdya*” (indolence and laziness) is represented only in the WYJ *prātimokṣa*, in the phrase “‘*qi*’ *lan-duo yi*” 起懶惰意 (by ‘giving rise’ to indolent intent). This is another indication that even the YQL bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* cannot have been the basis of the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* compiled in the WYJ.

The following is the second additional example that demonstrates the same point:

BBh: *evam api ca bodhisattvo vidhim anatikramya tīrthikaśāstreṣu bahiḥśāstreṣu kauśalaṃ kurvann abhīratarūpas tatra karoti tena ca ramate na tu kaṭubhaiṣajyam iva niṣevamāṇaḥ karoti sāpattiko bhavati sātisāraḥ kliṣṭām āpattim āpadyate* | (D p. 119<sub>15-17</sub>; W pp. 173<sub>25-174</sub>; E p. 290)

Furthermore, if a bodhisattva, even while not violating the rule [for studying heterodox texts] (*vidhim anatikramya*), by being adept in heterodox texts and outsiders' texts, becomes pleased with them (*tatra*) and delights in them, and does not employ them like a bitter medicine (*kaṭubhaiṣajyam*), then he becomes a transgressor, becomes culpable, and commits a defiled transgression.

DCJ: 如是菩薩，善於世典，外道邪論，愛樂不捨，不作毒想，是名為犯眾多犯，是犯染污起。(T no. 1581, 30: 915c4–6)

SJJ: No corresponding precept.

WYJ: 菩薩，欲學外道經典，應如上學 (cf. “*vidhim anatikramya*”). 若於中 (*tatra*) 受樂生著心，不如服苦藥 (*kaṭubhaiṣajyam*) 者，犯重垢罪。(T no. 1503, 24: 1118c3–4)

YQL: 若諸菩薩安住菩薩淨戒律儀，越菩薩法 (*vidhim atikramya?*)，於異道論及諸外論研求善巧，深心寶翫，愛樂味著，非如辛藥 (*kaṭubhaiṣajyam*) 而習近之，是名有犯有所違越，是染違犯。(T no. 1579, 30: 519b3–7)

First, the term “*kaṭubhaiṣajyam*” (lit. “bitter medicine”) is translated as “*du*” 毒 (poison) in the DCJ *prātimokṣa*, but more literal translations of this term, “*ku yao*” 苦藥 (bitter medicine) and “*xin yao*” 辛藥 (bitter medicine), appear in the WYJ and YQL *prātimokṣas*. Furthermore, it is only in the WYJ *prātimokṣa* that we read a literal rendition of the locative pronoun “*tatra*” (therein) that appears in the BBh version of the precept: “*yu zhong*” 於中 (therein). This locative pronoun is not represented even in the YQL version of the precept. These examples again establish that the WYJ *prātimokṣa* is not a revision of any or all of the known Chinese translations of the BBh bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*.

There is another aspect of the above Sanskrit BBh *prātimokṣa* precept that is reflected only in the WYJ *prātimokṣa* version of the precept. The word “*vidhi*” (rule, principle) in the gerund clause “*vidhim anatikramya*”

(by not violating the rule) refers to the rules for studying heterodox texts that is provided in the bodhisattva precept that immediately precedes this precept. In that preceding precept, we are told that abandoning the study of the discourse of the Buddha and focusing on the study of heterodox texts result in the commission of a defiled transgression.<sup>22</sup> The precept then proceeds to provide some complementary rules that exculpate a bodhisattva who studies heterodox texts. For example, it says that “this [that is, the act of studying heterodox texts] is not a transgression . . . for a person who daily carries out exertion with regard to the discourse of the Buddha twice as much as he does with regard to those [that is, heterodox texts]” (*anāpattir . . . taddviguṇena pratyahaṃ buddhavacane योग्यां कुरवताह*).<sup>23</sup> Thus, in the context of the above precept, the gerund clause “*vidhim anatikramya*” expresses a concession. That is, by using this gerund clause, the precept is saying that *even if* a bodhisattva studies the discourse of the Buddha twice as much as he studies heterodox texts, and thus “*even if* he does not violate this rule” (*vidhim anatikramya*), should he find pleasure in heterodox texts by becoming versed in them, he will nonetheless commit a transgression. This gerund clause is not represented in the DCJ, which begins the precept instead with the translation of “*ūrthikaśāstreṣu bahiḥśāstreṣu kauśalam kurvan*” (he who is adept in heterodox texts and outsiders’ texts): “*shan yu shidian waidao xielun*” 善於世典外道邪論. In the case of the YQL, what appears in the place of this gerund clause is strangely the phrase “*yue pusa fa*” 越菩薩法, that is, “by violating the rule of bodhisattvas.” This rendition would make sense if Xuanzang misread the clause in question as “*vidhim atikramya*” instead of “*vidhim ‘an’atikramya*,” or if he was working with a tradition of the BBh that had such a variant reading.<sup>24</sup> Either way, the result is that the YQL version of the precept renders the gerund clause in question as a depiction of one of the causes that lead to the transgression of the precept under discussion, rather than as an expression of concession: “If bodhisattvas (*ruo zhu pusa* 若諸菩薩) . . . ‘by violating the rule of bodhisattvas’ (*yue pusa fa*; Skt. *vidhim atikramya*?), become adept in the heterodox

<sup>22</sup> D p. 119<sub>9-11</sub>; W p. 173<sub>17-20</sub>. See the second section below for a full translation of the main definition of the precept.

<sup>23</sup> D p. 119<sub>13-14</sub>; W p. 173<sub>23-24</sub>.

<sup>24</sup> The Tibetan translation also has “*tshul dang yang ma ‘gal bar*” (Derge Tengyur, Sems tsam, vol. wi, p. 93b5), that is, “by not violating the rule,” for “*vidhim anatikramya*.” That this YQL passage is not a result of a later corruption of Xuanzang’s original translation is supported by the citation of this passage from the *Posal kyebon so* 菩薩戒本疏 (T no. 1814, 40: 673b20) by the contemporary Silla monk Ūijök 義寂 (d.u.).

texts and find pleasure in them and develop attachment to them (*yu yidao lun ji zhu wai lun yanjiu shanqiao shenxin baowan aile weizhe* 於異道論及諸外論研究善巧深心寶翫愛樂味著) . . . then this is called a transgression (*shi ming youfan* 是名有犯).” Therefore, among the extant Chinese versions of the BBh *prātimokṣa*, it is only in the WYJ version that the original intent of this gerund clause in the Sanskrit BBh precept is represented, albeit through a free translation: “Should a bodhisattva wish to study heterodox texts, he must study them as stipulated above (*ying ru shang xue* 應如上學) [that is, he must study them ‘by not violating the rule’ (*vidhim anatikramya*) stipulated in the preceding precept]. If he [nonetheless] experiences joy in them and grows attachment for them and does not use them as if taking a bitter medicine, then he commits a grave transgression.”

Thus, there is ample evidence that the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* compiled in the WYJ is not the outcome of revising or collating the Chinese translations of the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* we have in the DCJ, SJJ, and the YQL. The only way to explain the many unique agreements between the Sanskrit BBh *prātimokṣa* and the WYJ *prātimokṣa* that we saw in this section is to suppose that the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* section of the WYJ is either itself an independent translation of an Indic version of the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* of the BBh or is a textual derivative of a now-lost independent translation of an Indic version of the BBh *prātimokṣa*. Among these two explanations, the safer and more conservative option would be the latter, given the unclear history of the *prātimokṣa* section of the WYJ before it was incorporated into the WYJ. For lack of a better word, I propose to provisionally use the term “ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*” (despite its obvious anachronism)<sup>25</sup> to refer to this now-lost variant translation of the BBh bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* to which we can attribute all the phrases in the current WYJ *prātimokṣa* that correspond to the Sanskrit BBh *prātimokṣa* but are not represented in any other Chinese translation of the BBh *prātimokṣa*.

### *The Chronological Relation between the Ur-Weiyi jing and the Fanwang jing Bodhisattva Prātimokṣas*

Thus far I have established the existence of the “ur-WYJ” bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*, a forgotten alternative Chinese translation of the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* of the BBh from which the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* currently compiled in the WYJ ultimately derived. It is owing to its derivation from this ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* that the current version of the WYJ *prātimokṣa*

<sup>25</sup> See the introductory section of this paper and n. 3 above.

contains elements that correspond to the phrases of the Sanskrit BBh *prātimokṣa* that are not reflected in any known Chinese translation of the BBh *prātimokṣa*. The question to ask next is when this ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* would have been translated.

There is no decisive date we can use as the *terminus post quem* of the translation of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*. Although the current WYJ bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* has some short passages that resemble the phraseology of the corresponding passages in the bodhisattva *prātimokṣas* of the DCJ (translated between 420 and 431) and the SJJ (translated in 431),<sup>26</sup> there is no way to decide if these agreements resulted from the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* translators' reliance on the DCJ and the SJJ *prātimokṣas*, or rather from a later collation of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* and the DCJ and the SJJ *prātimokṣas*. Thus, although the years of the translation of the DCJ and the SJJ might serve as the *terminus post quem* of the compilation of the current version of the WYJ bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*, it cannot be used as the *terminus post quem* of the translation of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*.

We are on firmer ground with regard to the *terminus ante quem* of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*. First, the *terminus ante quem* of the compilation of the current WYJ bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*—the year 668 when it was cited in Daoshi's *Fayuan zhulin* (see above)—serves as the absolute, most conservative *terminus ante quem* of the translation of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*. Moreover, as I argue in this section, there are reasons to believe that the *terminus ante quem* of the translation of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* should in fact be the date of the composition of the FWJ between circa 450 and circa 480.<sup>27</sup> The argument utilizes the fact that there exists an extensive and unique phraseological agreement between the current WYJ *prātimokṣa* and the apocryphal FWJ *prātimokṣa*.

As mentioned in the introduction, there are numerous distinctive phrases that the FWJ *prātimokṣa* only shares with the WYJ *prātimokṣa* and not with any other extant Chinese versions of the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*.<sup>28</sup> The following two hypotheses exhaust the ways in which we can explain this phenomenon together with the fact that the WYJ *prātimokṣa* is a derivative of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*. These two hypotheses have direct implications for the problem under discussion, the chronological relation between the ur-WYJ and the FWJ *prātimokṣas*.

<sup>26</sup> See nn. 5 and 9 for these dates. See also Funayama 2004, pp. 104–7, for a discussion about the circumstances of the translation of the DCJ and the SJJ.

<sup>27</sup> For the date of the creation of the FWJ, see Funayama 1996, p. 74.

<sup>28</sup> In addition to the examples cited below, see the tables in Lee 2010, pp. 114–16, and Funayama 2017, pp. 329–421.

First, we can speculate that the phrases that the current WYJ *prātimokṣa* exclusively shares with the FWJ *prātimokṣa* were first introduced by the authors of the FWJ *prātimokṣa* and were later adopted either (1) by the translators of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*, or (2) by the editors of the possible adaptations or readaptations of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* that may have existed between the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* and the current WYJ *prātimokṣa*, or (3) by the editors responsible for the final form of the WYJ *prātimokṣa* currently compiled in the WYJ. Thus, according to this explanation, the phrases shared by the FWJ and the WYJ *prātimokṣas* result from the FWJ *prātimokṣa*'s phraseological influence at some point on what can be termed "the WYJ *prātimokṣa* tradition" (note again the unavoidable anachronism), the tradition that began with the translation of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*, continued through possible adaptations and readaptations of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*, and concluded with the finalization of the current version of the WYJ *prātimokṣa*. I will name this explanation "hypothesis one." If hypothesis one is true, it necessarily follows that the conclusion of the WYJ *prātimokṣa* tradition, that is, the final compilation of the current version of the WYJ *prātimokṣa*, cannot have predated the composition of the FWJ *prātimokṣa*. This hypothesis coheres with the traditional understanding that the DCJ and the SJJ *prātimokṣas*, rather than the WYJ *prātimokṣa* tradition, were the main sources through which the authors of the FWJ *prātimokṣa* had access to the content of the BBh *prātimokṣa*.

Second, we can also think that the phrases that the current WYJ exclusively shares with the FWJ were first introduced either (1) by the translators of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*, or (2) by the editors of the different recensions of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* that may have existed between the WYJ *prātimokṣa* and the current WYJ *prātimokṣa*, or (3) by the editors responsible for the current WYJ *prātimokṣa*, and then were adopted by the authors of the FWJ *prātimokṣa*. According to this explanation, the agreement in the phraseology of the FWJ and the WYJ *prātimokṣas* results from the influence of the "WYJ *prātimokṣa* tradition" on the FWJ *prātimokṣa* at the time of the composition of the FWJ. I will name this explanation "hypothesis two." If hypothesis two is true, it necessarily follows that the beginning of the WYJ *prātimokṣa* tradition, that is, the original translation of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*, cannot have been later than the composition of the FWJ *prātimokṣa*. This hypothesis challenges the traditional understanding that the DCJ and the SJJ *prātimokṣas* were the only main sources of the information about the content of the BBh *prātimokṣa* for the authors of the FWJ, and it implies that a text closely related to the WYJ *prātimokṣa* was heavily utilized in the composition of the FWJ *prātimokṣa*.

Below, I will identify some pieces of textual evidence for rejecting hypothesis one and accepting hypothesis two. The following is one of the bodhisattva precepts that show the similar phraseology of the WYJ and the FWJ *prātimokṣas*, and the same precept's BBh, DCJ, and SJJ *prātimokṣa* versions. The precept is a prohibition of abandoning the study of the Buddhist scriptures and exclusively studying heterodox texts. The underlined characters represent the phrases that the WYJ and the FWJ *prātimokṣas* exclusively share, and when applicable, the corresponding phrases in the Sanskrit BBh *prātimokṣa*.

BBh: *bodhisattvo buddhavacane sati buddhavacane akṛtayogyas tīrthikaśāstreṣu bahiḥśāstreṣu yogyāṃ karoti sāpattiko bhavati sātisāraḥ kliṣṭām āpattim āpadyate* | (D p. 119<sub>9-11</sub>; W p. 173<sub>17-20</sub>; E p. 290)

If a bodhisattva, when there exists the discourse of the Buddha (*buddhavacane sati*), does not carry out exertion (*akṛtayogyas*) with regard to the discourse of the Buddha and [instead] carries out exertion (*yogyāṃ karoti*) with respect to heterodox treatises and outsiders' treatises (*tīrthikaśāstreṣu bahiḥśāstreṣu*), he becomes a transgressor, becomes culpable, and commits a defiled transgression.

DCJ: 若菩薩於佛所說棄捨不學，反習外道邪論世俗經典，是名為犯眾多犯，是犯染污起。(T no. 1581, 30: 915b29–30)

SJJ: 若菩薩不讀不誦如來正經，讀誦世典文頌書疏者，得罪。(T no. 1583, 30: 1016c25–27)

WYJ: 菩薩，有佛經藏 (*buddhavacane sati*) 不能勤學 (*akṛtayogyas*)，乃更勤學 (*yogyāṃ karoti*) 外道俗典 (*tīrthikaśāstreṣu bahiḥśāstreṣu*)，犯重垢罪。(T no. 1503, 24: 1118b28–29)

FWJ: 若佛子，有佛經律大乘法正見正性正法身，而不能勤學修習，而捨七寶，反學邪見二乘外道俗典，阿毘曇雜論書記，是斷佛性障道因緣，非行菩薩道者。故作，犯輕垢罪。(Funayama 2017 [henceforth F], pp. 164–65; T no. 1484, 24: 1006c19–23)<sup>29</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Funayama 2017, pp. 35–273, contains a critical edition of the earliest traceable version of the FWJ, in addition to a diplomatic-synoptic edition of all surviving recensions of the FWJ. The punctuation is mine.

As we see, the phrases “*you Fo jing*” 有佛經 ([when] there exist the sutras of the Buddha), “*bu neng qin xue*” 不能勤學 (he is incapable of studying industriously), and “*waidao sudian*” 外道俗典 (heterodox and secular texts) appear only in the WYJ and FWJ versions of the precept against studying heterodox texts. That this unique combination of the three phrases appears in the same context in the same order in the two texts of the same genre of the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* is a strong indication of the existence of an earlier phraseological influence, either from the FWJ *prātimokṣa* to the WYJ *prātimokṣa* tradition (hypothesis one), or from the WYJ *prātimokṣa* tradition to the FWJ *prātimokṣa* (hypothesis two). Moreover, each of these three phrases are themselves extremely rare in the Chinese canon (if we leave out the commentaries on the FWJ), which further rules out the possibility that the WYJ and the FWJ arrived at these phrases independently and that the similar phraseology of the above WYJ and FWJ precepts is thus a mere coincidence.

Then, the problem of hypothesis one—the explanation that the direction of phraseological influence was from the FWJ *prātimokṣa* to the WYJ *prātimokṣa* tradition, and thus that the WYJ *prātimokṣa* tradition was not utilized in the creation of the FWJ *prātimokṣa*—lies in the fact that the expressions “*you Fo jing*” and “*bu neng qin xue*” are reflective of certain aspects of the corresponding Sanskrit precept that are not made apparent in the DCJ and the SJJ’s translations of the precept. As I argue below, this interesting phenomenon is much better accounted for by hypothesis two that postulates that the direction of phraseological influence was from the WYJ *prātimokṣa* tradition to the FWJ.

First, in the Sanskrit version of the above precept, we see the phrase “*buddhavacane sati*,” a locative absolute clause that means “when there exists the discourse of the Buddha.” None of the DCJ and the SJJ versions of this precept has an element that corresponds to this locative absolute construction. The two translations both only have what would correspond to the second instance of the word “*buddhavacane*” in the Sanskrit sentence: “*yu Fo suo shuo*” 於佛所說 (with regard to what was spoken by the Buddha) in the DCJ and “*Rulai zheng jing*” 如來正經 (the correct sutras of the Tathāgata) in the SJJ. It is thus in the FWJ and the WYJ that we find phrases that most closely correspond to the locative absolute clause of the Sanskrit precept: the FWJ and the WYJ both have the phrase “*you Fo jing*” 有佛經, which in the present context similarly means “when there exist the sutras of the Buddha.” If using the structure of “*you*” 有 to describe the situation under which the violation of a precept can take place were a practice

frequently employed in the FWJ, this concurrence of “*you*” in the FWJ version of the precept and “*sati*” in the BBh version of the same precept might be explained as a pure coincidence introduced by the authors of the FWJ and inherited by the WYJ. But this is a rare structure that appears only two more times in the FWJ *prātimokṣa*.<sup>30</sup>

In the Sanskrit version of the precept, we also see the phrase “*akṛtayogyas*,” that is, “he who does not carry out exertion (*yogyā*).” The corresponding phrase in the DCJ is “*qishe bu xue*” 棄捨不學 (he abandons and does not study), and in the SJJ, it is “*bu du bu song*” 不讀不誦 (he does not read and does not recite). In the FWJ and the WYJ versions of the precept, the corresponding phrase is “*bu neng qin xue*” 不能勤學 (he is incapable of studying industriously). Thus, only the FWJ and the WYJ versions use the adverb “*qin*” 勤 (industriously) in describing negligence in studying Buddhist scriptures. What is significant about this adverb “*qin*” is that it is a very common word used for translating words that derive from the root “*√yuj*” (to yoke, to concentrate, to exert oneself) such as the word “exertion” (*yogyā*) in the phrase “*akṛtayogyah*” of the BBh version of the precept. For example, Guṇabhadra (394–468) renders “*-yogaḥ karaṇīyah*” as “*dang qin xiuxue*” 當勤修學 in his translation of the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*.<sup>31</sup> Dharmarakṣa (d. ca. 310) also renders “*abhi√yuj*” as “*qin jing*” 勤精, and Kumārajīva (d. 409/413) renders the same word as “*qin xiu jing jin*” 勤修精進, in their respective translations of the *Lotus Sutra*.<sup>32</sup> Again, if “*qin*” were a word that the FWJ employed randomly throughout the text, this correspondence between “*bu neng qin xue*” of the FWJ version of the precept and the “*akṛtayogyah*” of the BBh version of the precept might be an insignificant coincidence. But in the FWJ, the word “*qin*” is extremely rarely used. In fact, the only instance of the word “*qin*” 勤 in the *prātimokṣa* section of the FWJ is in this precept under discussion, whose corresponding Sanskrit

<sup>30</sup> 有求法者, 不為說一句一偈一微塵許法 (FWJ, T no. 1484, 24: 1005a2–3); 一切處有講法毘尼經律 (FWJ, T no. 1484, 24: 1005b29). The corresponding phrases in the WYJ are 有求法者, 乃至不為說於一偈 (T no. 1503, 24: 1117a1) and 有說法家, 若說毘尼處 (WYJ, T no. 1503, 24: 1118c18). Although the second example of “*you*” does not have a corresponding structure in the BBh, the first example corresponds to the genitive absolute clause, “*arhinām samyakpratyuṣasthītānām dharmāṇām asaṃvibhāgakriyā*” (i.e., “not sharing [one’s knowledge of] doctrines even when those who want them have approached him in the proper manner”; D p. 108<sub>15–16</sub> and W p. 158<sub>9–10</sub>).

<sup>31</sup> “*āryajñānalakṣaṇatrayayogaḥ karaṇīyah*”; see Vaidya 1963, p. 22<sub>30</sub>; 於上聖智三相, 當勤修學; see *Lengqie jing* 楞伽經, T no. 670, 16: 485a15. This translation appears a number of times in this passage.

<sup>32</sup> Karashima 2001, pp. 205–6.

precept has—in exactly the same context of describing negligence in studying Buddhist scriptures—a word that is commonly translated by using “*qin*,” but whose DCJ and SJJ versions do not have a corresponding word.

Thus, the combination of the unique expressions “*you Fo jing*” and “*bu neng qin xue*” in the FWJ version of the precept closely corresponds to certain aspects of the phraseology of the Sanskrit BBh version of the precept that are not made apparent in the DCJ’s and the SJJ’s translations of the precept. This evidence alone raises the possibility that the authors of the FWJ might have had access to an alternative translation of the BBh *prātimokṣa* in which these aspects of the original Indic precept’s phraseology were reflected. It is thus significant that we find in the WYJ version of the precept the very phrases “*you Fo jing*” and “*bu neng qin xue*,” exactly in the place where the Sanskrit precept has “*buddhavacane sati*” and “*akṛtayogyah*.” In fact, if we leave out the addition of the word “*zang*” 藏 (*piṭaka*) and the rendering of the phrase “*sāpattiko bhavati sātisāraḥ kliṣṭām āpattim āpadyate*” (he becomes a transgressor, becomes culpable, and commits a defiled transgression) as “*fan zhonggou zu*” 犯重垢罪 (he commits a grave and defiled transgression), the WYJ precept can be seen as a word-for-word translation of the Sanskrit sentence of the BBh, down to the detail that the phrase for depicting negligence in studying Buddhist scriptures (“*akṛtayogyah*”) and the phrase for depicting efforts at studying heterodox scriptures (“*yogyām karoti*”) use the same word (that is, “*yogyā*”), as reflected in its use of the phrases “*bu neng ‘qin xue*” 不能勤學 and “*nai geng ‘qin xue*” 乃更勤學. Moreover, for three of the four additional instances of the word “*qin*” in the WYJ *prātimokṣa*, the corresponding terms in the Sanskrit BBh *prātimokṣa* are also derivatives of the root “*√yuj*.”<sup>33</sup> This is a clear sign of an underlying translation policy of using the word “*qin*” for rendering words that derive from “*√yuj*.”

It is then only reasonable to postulate that the phrases “*you Fo jing*,” “*bu neng qin xue*,” and “*waidao su dian*” of the WYJ *prātimokṣa* derived from

<sup>33</sup> There are three instances of the verb *qinxiu* 勤修 in the WYJ *prātimokṣa* whose corresponding BBh phrase is either “*pra√yuj*” or “*abhi√yuj*”: *ruo qin xiu shangen* 若勤修善根 (WYJ, T no. 1503, 24: 1118c23) corresponds to “*nirantaram ālambanacittasthiteḥ bodhisatt vasamādhyabhinirhārābhīyuktasya*” (D p. 120<sub>14-15</sub>; cf. “*niraṃtaram ālambanacittasthitibodhisattvasamādhyabhinirhārābhīyuktasya*,” W p. 175<sub>10-11</sub>); *qin xiu shangen* 勤修善根 (WYJ, T no. 1503, 24: 1119a1) corresponds to “*kuśalapakṣye nairantaryeṇa samyak prayuktaḥ syāt*” (D p. 121<sub>5-6</sub>; W p. 176<sub>4-5</sub>); *qin xiu zeng shang shangen* 勤修增上善根 (WYJ, T no. 1503, 24: 1119a7) corresponds to “*ūdāranirantarakuśalapakṣābhīyuktasya*” (D p. 121<sub>15</sub>; missing in W).

the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*, which, as we have already established, was an independent translation of the BBh *prātimokṣa* that became the basis of the WYJ *prātimokṣa*, and that the authors of the FWJ *prātimokṣa* also borrowed these phrases from a derivative of this ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*. Therefore, the translation of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* must have predated the creation of the FWJ *prātimokṣa*.

The merit of hypothesis two becomes all the more evident when we consider how hypothesis one would account for the phraseological agreement between the WYJ and the FWJ versions of the above precept. That is, if we accept hypothesis one and assume that the authors of the FWJ did not have access to the WYJ *prātimokṣa* tradition, we have to postulate the succession of the following two unlikely events: first, we must postulate that the authors of the FWJ, while adapting the DCJ and the SJJ versions of the bo-dhisattva precept against studying heterodox texts, accidentally introduced the phrases “*you Fo jing*” and “*bu neng qin xue*” that in fact closely corresponded to the phraseological aspects of the original Indic bodhisattva precept against studying heterodox texts (that is, the locative absolute construction, the participle “*sati*,” and the root “*√yuj*”) that were not represented in the precept’s DCJ and SJJ renditions. Furthermore, we have to postulate that the FWJ version of the precept thereafter either (1) influenced the translators of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* to borrow from the FWJ these two specific phrases as well as the phrase “*waidao su dian*” 外道俗典 that somehow exactly corresponded to the phraseology of the Indic bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* text they were translating and were in conformance with the translation policy they were using, or (2) influenced the editors working on a derivative of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* to fortuitously borrow from the FWJ’s much more extended version of the precept against studying heterodox texts *only* those phrases that in fact most closely corresponded to the wording of the original Indic precept to which they did not have access. This I think is an extremely unnatural and unnecessarily complicated explanation of the phenomenon at hand, especially when compared to hypothesis two’s straightforward account that the translators of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* first chose to use such phrases as “*you Fo jing*,” “*bu neng qin xue*,” and “*waidao su dian*” simply as translations of the Indic phrases “*buddhavacane sati*,” “*akṛtayogyah*,” and “*tīrthikaśāstreṣu bahiḥśāstreṣu*,” and that these phrases then made their way into the FWJ *prātimokṣa* and also survived in the WYJ *prātimokṣa*.

This analysis conclusively shows that the translation of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* must have taken place before the creation of the FWJ

*prātimokṣa*.<sup>34</sup> Below, I nevertheless discuss three more examples that support the same point, although not as strongly as the above example.

The first additional example is the bodhisattva precept against boasting about oneself and speaking ill of others:

BBh: *lābhasatkārādhyavasitasyātmotkarṣanā parapaṃsanā bodhisattvasya pārajayikasthānīyo dharmah* | (D p. 108<sub>12-13</sub>; W p. 158<sub>4-5</sub>; E p. 267)

Boasting about himself and denigrating others (*ātmotkarṣanā parapaṃsanā*) by him who is attached to gains and favorable treatments constitute an action that is comparable to the *pārajika* offenses [of the *bhikṣus*] for a bodhisattva.

DCJ: 菩薩，為貪利故，自歎己德，毀訾他人，是名第一波羅夷處法。(T no. 1581, 30: 913b2–3)

SJJ: 菩薩，若為貪利養故，自讚其身得菩薩戒住菩薩地，是名菩薩第五重法。(T no. 1583, 30: 1015a4–6)

WYJ: 若菩薩，為利養故，自讚毀他 (*ātmotkarṣanā parapaṃsanā*)，是名菩薩波羅夷。(T no. 1503, 24: 1116c27–28)

FWJ: 若佛子，口自讚毀他，亦教人自讚毀他，毀他因毀他業毀他法毀他緣，而菩薩代一切眾生受加毀辱，惡事自向己好事與他人，若自揚己德隱他人好事，他人受毀者，是菩薩波羅夷罪。(F pp. 92–93; T no. 1484, 24: 1004c19–23)

As we can see, it is in the WYJ and the FWJ versions of this precept that we read the phrase that most literally corresponds to the BBh precept's phrase "*ātmotkarṣanā parapaṃsanā*" (boasting about oneself and denigrat-

<sup>34</sup> Could this precept be a later interpolation to or the result of a later adaptation of the FWJ? If so, this analysis only shows that the particular FWJ precept against studying heterodox texts was written after the translation of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* and does not prove that the FWJ *prātimokṣa* itself was composed after the translation of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*. However, the high profile that the FWJ started to enjoy soon after its appearance in fifth-century China, and the fact that we know much about the early form of the text as well as its different recensions through various manuscripts, speak against this possibility. See Funayama 2014 and Funayama 2017, pp. 11–12, 18–19, for discussions of the early history of the FWJ, and Funayama 2010 and Funayama 2017, pp. 35–39, for discussions of different recensions of the FWJ.

ing others): “*zi zan hui ta*” 自讚毀他 (to boast about oneself and denigrate others). The corresponding phrases in the DCJ and the SJJ versions of the precept have additional elements such as “*jide*” 己德 ([to boast about] one’s own virtue) and “*de pusa jie zhu pusa di*” 得菩薩戒住菩薩地 ([to boast about] having attained the bodhisattva precepts and abiding in a bodhisattva stage), and these two versions thus depart from the phraseology of the BBh precept. What is significant about the phrase “*zi zan hui ta*” is that the FWJ is the earliest extant datable text that uses this phrase. The only other extant datable text before or around the time of the creation of the FWJ that also uses this phrase is the apocryphal *Pusa yingluo benye jing* 菩薩瓔珞本業經, but it has been well substantiated that this text was composed under the heavy influence of the FWJ.<sup>35</sup> Thus again, if we accept hypothesis one, we have to assume the unlikely coincidence that the authors of the FWJ, while adapting the DCJ and the SJJ phrases that express the idea of boasting about oneself and denigrating others, somehow left out exactly those words that were likely added in the process of translation and ended up reconstructing the original phraseology of the Indic precept. Therefore, in this case as well, hypothesis two offers a much more natural explanation that the phrase “*zi zan hui ta*” was first introduced by the translators of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* as the literal translation of the Indic phrase “*ātmoṭkarṣaṇā parapamaṣanā*,” and that this phrase was later adopted by the creators of the FWJ.

The second additional example is the precept against not attending lectures (*śravaṇa*) and conclusive discussions (*sāṃkathyaviniścaya*) about the Dharma:

BBh: *bodhisattvo dharmasravanadharmasāṃkathyaviniścayam vā*  
 [sic] *mānābhiniṅrḥītaḥ āghātacittaḥ pratighacitto nopasaṃkrāmati*  
*sāpattiko bhavati sātisāraḥ kliṣṭām āpattim āpadyate* | (D p.  
 120<sub>8-10</sub>; W p. 175<sub>1-4</sub>; E p. 292)<sup>36</sup>

If a bodhisattva does not go to a sermon about the doctrine (*dharmasravaṇa*) or a conclusive discussion about the doctrine

<sup>35</sup> T no. 1485. The phrase appears in the *Pusa yingluo benye jing*’s summary of the precept under discussion. T no. 1485, 24: 1012b4–5. For the relationship between the FWJ and this text, see Funayama 1996, pp. 67–70.

<sup>36</sup> The Wogihara edition reads “*dharmasravanasāṃkathyaviniścayam*” instead of “*dharmasravanadharmasāṃkathyaviniścayam vā*.” A new critical edition should either follow Wogihara or emend Dutt’s reading to “*dharmasravanam dharmasāṃkathyaviniścayam vā*.”

(*dharmasāṃkathyaviniścaya*) because he is held back by pride and because he has malicious and hostile thoughts, he becomes a transgressor, becomes culpable, and commits a defiled transgression.

DCJ: 若菩薩聞說法處，若決定論處，以憍慢心瞋恨心，不往聽者，是名為犯眾多犯，是犯染污起。(T no. 1581, 30: 916a3–5)

SJJ: 若菩薩聞說法處，乃至一由旬不往聽者，得罪。(T no. 1583, 30: 1017a11–12)

WYJ: 菩薩，有說法 (*dharma*) 家，若說毘尼 (*vinīścayaṃ?*) 處，大法 (*dharma*) 會處，瞋嫉慢心，不往聽者，犯重垢罪。(T no. 1503, 24: 1118c18–20)

FWJ: 若佛子，一切處有講法毘尼經律，大宅舍中講法處，是新學菩薩應持經律卷至法師所聽受諮問。若山林樹下僧地房中，一切說法處，悉至聽受。若不至彼聽受者，犯輕垢罪。(F pp. 120–23; T no. 1484, 24: 1005b29–c24)

The particular succession of the words “*you . . . fa . . . pini . . . da . . . fa . . . chu*” 有 . . . 法 . . . 毘尼 . . . 大 . . . 法 . . . 處 appears only in the WYJ *prātimokṣa* and the FWJ *prātimokṣa* versions of the precept, in exactly the same context of describing the situation in which an academic event is being held that a bodhisattva should attend. This I think is another example that calls for the postulation of a phraseological influence, rather than a pure coincidence.<sup>37</sup> Then, the assumption that the direction of phraseological influence was from the FWJ *prātimokṣa* to the WYJ *prātimokṣa* tradition leads to a problem similar to the previous examples—this time because of the term “*pini*” 毘尼, a term that is used normally for transcribing the word “*vinaya*” (moral discipline). In the entire FWJ, this is the only instance of the word “*pini*,” and in the WYJ, there is only one more instance.<sup>38</sup> Thus again, this is a word that appears rarely in the two texts. But as we can see, in exactly the place where the WYJ and the FWJ versions of the precept

<sup>37</sup> Conducting a search of the Taishō canon with the combination of these words also yields the result that the WYJ and the FWJ are the only two texts that use these words to describe this type of situation.

<sup>38</sup> It is used there as a transcription of the word “*vinaya*”: 如佛所制波羅提木叉及結毘尼 (WYJ, T no. 1503, 24: 1117c11); “*bhagavatā prātimokṣe vinaye*” (D p. 112<sub>20</sub>; W p. 164<sub>19</sub>).

have the word “*pini*,” the BBh version of the same precept has a phonetically similar word, “*viniścaya*” (decision, settling; rendered as “*jueding*” 決定 in the DCJ). If we accept hypothesis two and assume that it must have been in the WYJ *prātimokṣa* tradition that this particular sequence of words was first introduced in the precept against not attending academic events, this concurrence of “*pini*” (Skt. *vinaya*) and “*viniścaya*” can be explained by postulating a phonetic or graphic corruption or variance in the Indic text used for the translation of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*, or a phonetic or graphic confusion that occurred in the translation process.<sup>39</sup> But if we accept hypothesis one and assume that it was in the FWJ version of the precept that this sequence of words first appeared, it follows that the authors of the FWJ *prātimokṣa* coincidentally introduced the only instance of the word “*pini*” in their apocryphal text in exactly the same precept and context in which the Indic bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* has a similar word “*viniścaya*,” and more importantly, that this then influenced the translators of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* or the editors of one of the texts of the WYJ *prātimokṣa* tradition to insert the word “*pini*” they saw in the FWJ and possibly omit the word that corresponded to “*viniścaya*” from the text they were translating or revising. Again, hypothesis two, I think, offers a simpler and more natural explanation of the phenomenon at hand.

The last additional example is the FWJ’s use of the phrase “*e xin chen xin*” 惡心瞋心, literally, “the mind of malice and the mind of anger.” This phrase appears three times in the FWJ *prātimokṣa*, all in the same context of describing the motive behind the possible violation of a precept:

而菩薩惡心瞋心，乃至不施一錢一針一草，有求法者，不為說一句一偈一微塵許法，而反更罵辱，是菩薩波羅夷罪。(F pp. 94–95; T no. 1484, 24: 1005a1–4)

而菩薩以惡心瞋心，橫教二乘聲聞經律，外道邪見論等，犯輕垢罪。(F pp. 138–39; T no. 1484, 24: 1006a13–15)

<sup>39</sup> Although many of the documented examples of such a variation, corruption, or confusion conform to certain fixed phonological or orthographical patterns (see the discussion in Boucher 1998), not all of them do. For example, in Dharmarakṣa’s translation of the *Rāṣṭra pālapariṣeṣāsūtra*, “*zongchi biancai*” 總持辯才 (*dhāraṇī* and eloquence) is the phrase that corresponds to the word “*dhāraṇīpratīlabham*” (acquisition of the *dhāraṇī*) in the surviving Sanskrit tradition, which suggests either that Dharmarakṣa was working with a tradition that had the word “*pratībhānam*” (eloquence) in place of “*pratīlabham*” (acquisition) or that the two words were confused in the translation process. See Boucher 2008, pp. 102–3. The variation between “*pratībhānam*” and “*pratīlabham*” is better explained, I think, by their general similarity rather than by specific phonological or orthographical patterns.

而菩薩法師以惡心瞋心，而不即與授一切眾生戒，犯輕垢罪。(F pp. 218–19; T no. 1484, 24: 1008c7–8)

Again, this is a phrase that is rarely found in the Chinese canon, and the *only* other text in the canon in which we see the phrase being used in any comparable context is the WYJ *prātimokṣa*. In the WYJ *prātimokṣa*, the phrase “*e xin chen xin*” is used eight times in the same context and in the same way as it is used in the FWJ *prātimokṣa*: it appears in the main description of the precept and specifies the motive behind the possible violation of a precept. The following are three such examples:

菩薩，見惡眾生犯戒毀禁作眾罪行，菩薩自知能化為善，若惡心瞋心捨不教者，犯重垢罪。(T no. 1503, 24: 1117c5–7)

若菩薩，見病眾生，以惡心瞋心不瞻養者，犯重垢罪。(T no. 1503, 24: 1119a2–3)

菩薩，見前眾生應有利宜，無有方便而能發起。菩薩惡心瞋心不教示者，犯重垢罪。(T no. 1503, 24: 1119a10–11)

Thus, it is reasonable to assume that the phrase “*e xin chen xin*” was introduced by either the FWJ *prātimokṣa* or a text that belonged to the WYJ *prātimokṣa* tradition and was subsequently adopted by the other. What is significant then is that there is a semantically and structurally very similar phrase in the BBh *prātimokṣa*: “*āghātacittāḥ pratighacittāḥ*,” literally, “the mind of malice and the mind of hostility.” In the BBh *prātimokṣa*, this phrase is also always used in the context of depicting the motive behind the possible violation of the precept. Moreover, in the above three precepts of the WYJ *prātimokṣa*,<sup>40</sup> the corresponding phrase for “*e xin chen xin*” is none other than “*āghātacittāḥ pratighacittāḥ*,” as we can see below:

*bodhisattvo raudreṣu duḥśīleṣu ca sattveṣv āghātacittāḥ  
pratighacittāḥ upekṣate viceṣṭate vā raudratām duḥśīlatām eva  
ca pratyayaṃ kṛtvā sāpattiko bhavati sātisāraḥ kliṣṭām āpattim  
āpadyate* | (D p. 112<sub>11–13</sub>; W p. 164<sub>6–9</sub>; E pp. 275–76)

If a bodhisattva who has the mind of malice and the mind of hostility abandons or disregards cruel and immoral beings by finding an excuse in their very cruelty and immorality, he becomes a

<sup>40</sup> In the remaining five examples, the corresponding phrase in the surviving Sanskrit tradition is “*āghātacittāḥ*” (without “*pratighacittāḥ*”).

transgressor, becomes culpable, and commits a defiled transgression.

*bodhisattvo glānaṃ vyādhitam sattvam āsādyā nopasthāna-paricaryāṃ karoti āghātacittah pratighacittah sāpattiko bhavati sātisāraḥ kliṣṭām āpattim āpadyate* | (D p. 121<sub>9-11</sub>; W p. 176<sub>9-11</sub>; E p. 294)

If a bodhisattva who has the mind of malice and the mind of hostility, after having met with a sick and diseased being, does not approach and look after the being, he becomes a transgressor, becomes culpable, and commits a defiled transgression.

*bodhisattvo dr̥ṣṭadhārmike sām̐parāyike cārthe 'nayaḥprayuktān sattvāṃ dr̥ṣṭvā āghātacittah pratighacitto nyāyaṃ nayaṃ na vyapadiśati sāpattiko bhavati sātisāraḥ kliṣṭāmāpattimāpadyate* | (D p. 121<sub>19-21</sub>; W p. 176<sub>24-27</sub>; E p. 295)

If a bodhisattva who has the mind of malice and the mind of hostility, after having seen beings who are engaged in improper conduct for their present and future benefit, does not instruct them in the proper principle, he becomes a transgressor, becomes culpable, and commits a defiled transgression.

Neither the DCJ nor the SJJ translates this phrase by reflecting its “. . . *cittah* . . . *cittah*” (the mind of . . . the mind of . . .) structure. When we use the surviving Sanskrit BBh tradition as the benchmark, we find that the DCJ renders “*āghātacittah pratighacittah*” into “*chen hen*” 瞋恨 (T no. 1581, 30: 913c13, 914a23–24), “*chen*” 瞋 (914a8, a16), “*chen hen xin*” 瞋恨心 (914b2, 916a3–4, a12–13, a22, b15), and “*xian hen xin*” 嫌恨心 (914b22–23, 916a29). The SJJ translates this phrase only twice, as “*e xin*” 惡心 (T no. 1583, 30: 1015b19) and “*chen hen*” 瞋恨 (1015c9). Therefore, in this case as well, hypothesis two offers a more natural explanation: the translators of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* started using the phrase “*e xin chen xin*” as one of the translations of “*āghātacittah pratighacittah*,” and the phrase was subsequently adopted by the authors of the FWJ *prātimokṣa*, who made use of a text that derived from the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*.

Thus, there are enough reasons to prefer hypothesis two over hypothesis one. This means that the *terminus ante quem* of the translation of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* should be the date of the creation of the FWJ during the mid to late fifth century, and that the unique phraseological agreement

between the FWJ and the WYJ *prātimokṣas* should be attributed to the common reliance of the FWJ and the WYJ on texts that derived from the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*.

*The Relation between the Ur-Weiyi jing and the Weiyi jing Bodhisattva Prātimokṣas*

In the first section of this paper, I established the existence of the “ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*,” the now-lost independent Chinese translation of the BBh bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* from which the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* currently compiled in the WYJ ultimately derived. In the second section, I argued that one of the derivatives of this ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* must have been used in the composition of the FWJ, and thus that the original translation of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* must have predated the creation of the FWJ in the mid to late fifth century. In the course of these arguments, I was able to trace back some of the content of the current WYJ *prātimokṣa* to the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*. Namely, in the first section, I ascribed the phrases that only the WYJ and the BBh *prātimokṣas* share (among the BBh, DCJ, SJJ, YQL, and WYJ *prātimokṣas*) to the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*, and in the second section, I ascribed the phrases that only the WYJ, the FWJ, and the BBh *prātimokṣas* share (among the BBh, DCJ, SJJ, FWJ, and WYJ *prātimokṣas*) to the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*. The question then arises as to the extent to which the WYJ *prātimokṣa* can be seen as a faithful reproduction of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* and the extent to which it is a revision or an adaptation of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*. In this section, I discuss some additional intertextual features of the WYJ *prātimokṣa* that allow us to consider the possibility that its phraseology and content might not differ so radically from those of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*.

First, it is unlikely that what became the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* section of the WYJ (that is, the WYJ *prātimokṣa*) underwent substantial revision in the process of being incorporated into the WYJ. This is because of the incohesive and indefinite nature of the WYJ as a compilation. As mentioned in the introduction, the WYJ is a compilation of various short texts about *upāsaka* and bodhisattva precepts that were in independent circulation in medieval China.<sup>41</sup> However, within the WYJ, there is no editorial attempt whatsoever to present these disparate texts as a coherent whole. The WYJ lacks any overarching introduction or conclusion and it abruptly proceeds

<sup>41</sup> For an attempt at identifying the individual constituents of the WYJ in the traditional catalogues, see Ōno 1954, pp. 21–23, 25–26, and 385–86.

from one text to another without any editorial indication of transition. Moreover, judging from the varying categorization of the WYJ (sometimes as a Mahayana precept text and other times as a “Hinayana” precept text) and the varying reports about the length of the WYJ in the traditional catalogues,<sup>42</sup> the constituent elements of the WYJ also seem to have gone through significant changes through time. Thus, as a compilation work, the WYJ is more a loose and temporary collection of miscellaneous texts about precepts than a processed and organized anthology. This, I think, makes it unlikely that the particular people who were responsible for incorporating the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* into the WYJ were interested in revising or polishing this text. Thus, although the *terminus ante quem* of the compilation of the WYJ *prātimokṣa* is in the seventh century (see above), the text that became the WYJ *prātimokṣa* must have assumed its present form before the date of its compilation into the WYJ.

Furthermore, it is possible to deduce that, in terms of phraseology and main content, the current WYJ *prātimokṣa* either (1) would not have differed substantially from the derivative of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* that the authors of the FWJ availed themselves of in the mid to late fifth century, or (2) if the two indeed differed substantially, it would have been so only because the current WYJ *prātimokṣa* more accurately reproduces the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* than the derivative of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* used by the authors of the FWJ did. This deduction rests on the fact that there is no phrase in the FWJ *prātimokṣa* passages that resembles a phrase in the corresponding passages in the Sanskrit BBh *prātimokṣa* but is not represented in the corresponding passages in the extant Chinese renditions of the BBh *prātimokṣa*.

The deduction runs as follows. First, let us use the name “the fifth-century WYJ *prātimokṣa*” to denote the particular derivative of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* the creators of the FWJ relied on for creating the FWJ *prātimokṣa* in the mid to late fifth century. If the fifth-century WYJ *prātimokṣa* was substantially different from the current WYJ *prātimokṣa* in its phraseology and content, this has to be either because the fifth-century

<sup>42</sup> Compare the following: T no. 2147, 55: 155c9 (“Hinayana,” two fascicles, no specification of length); T no. 2148, 55: 188b4 (“Hinayana,” one fascicle, thirty-three sheets [*zhi* 紙]); T no. 2149, 55: 300c7 (“Hinayana,” no specification of the number of fascicles, twenty-three sheets); T no. 2153, 55: 433c15, 470c10 (“Hinayana,” one fascicle, twenty-three sheets); T no. 2154, 55: 606b16–19, 689a26 (Mahayana, one fascicle, fifteen sheets); T no. 2157, 55: 939c17–20, 1036c19 (Mahayana, one fascicle, fifteen sheets). See also Okimoto 1976, p. 228.

WYJ *prātimokṣa* more accurately reproduced the original phraseology and content of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* than the current WYJ *prātimokṣa* does, or because the fifth-century WYJ *prātimokṣa* less accurately reproduced the original phraseology and content of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* than the current WYJ *prātimokṣa* does, since it is improbable that the fifth-century WYJ *prātimokṣa* and the current WYJ *prātimokṣa*, being both derivatives of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*, could equally accurately reproduce the phraseology and content of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* and somehow at the same time differ from each other substantially. Now, if the former was the case and the fifth-century WYJ *prātimokṣa* more accurately reproduced the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* than the current WYJ *prātimokṣa* does, it follows that the fifth-century WYJ *prātimokṣa* would also have more accurately reproduced the content of the Indic-language BBh *prātimokṣa* than the current WYJ *prātimokṣa* does, since the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* is a translation of the Indic-language BBh *prātimokṣa*. If this were the case, we should be able to find at least one case in which only the FWJ *prātimokṣa* version of a passage (and not any other Chinese version of the passage) has phrases or terms that most closely follow the phraseology or terminology of the corresponding Sanskrit BBh *prātimokṣa* passage, owing to the FWJ creators' reliance on, in addition to other Chinese translations of the BBh, the fifth-century WYJ *prātimokṣa* that was significantly different from the current WYJ *prātimokṣa* and more accurately reproduced the Indic-language BBh *prātimokṣa* than the current WYJ *prātimokṣa* does. However, a comprehensive survey of the eighteen FWJ *prātimokṣa* passages and their corresponding Sanskrit BBh passages reveals that all the phrases of the FWJ *prātimokṣa* passages that resemble the wording of the BBh *prātimokṣa* passages also appear either in the current WYJ *prātimokṣa* or in the DCJ *prātimokṣa*.<sup>43</sup> Thus, by *modus tollens*, it follows that the fifth-century WYJ

<sup>43</sup> These passages are identified based either on their identical purport or the agreement in phraseology. Ōno 1954, pp. 267–78, identifies sixteen such passages (four major precepts, eleven minor precepts, and one passage), and Funayama 2017, pp. 329–421, identifies thirteen passages (four major precepts, six minor precepts, and three passages), eleven of which overlap with Ōno 1954. I compared all of these eighteen passages with their corresponding Sanskrit BBh passages. The location of these eighteen BBh passages and their corresponding DCJ, WYJ, and FWJ passages is as follows: (1) The bodhisattva precepts as part of the discipline of the bodhisattvas of the three times: W p. 154<sub>3–10</sub>, D p. 106<sub>2–7</sub>, T no. 1581, 30: 912c5–8, with no corresponding passage in the WYJ and T no. 1484, 24: 1003b11–13; (2) The precept against boasting about oneself and speaking ill of others: D p. 108<sub>12–13</sub>, W p. 158<sub>4–5</sub>, T no. 1581, 30: 913b2–3, T no. 1503, 24: 1116c27–28, and T no. 1484, 24: 1004c19–23; (3) The precept against not sharing one's resources and knowledge: D p. 108<sub>13–16</sub>, W

*prātimokṣa* and the current WYJ *prātimokṣa* would not have been substantially different from each other in such a way that the fifth-century WYJ *prātimokṣa* was a more accurate reproduction of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* than the current WYJ *prātimokṣa* is. If the two were indeed substantially different from each other, it must be because the fifth-century WYJ *prātimokṣa* was a less accurate reproduction of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* than the current WYJ *prātimokṣa* is. Thus, we can conclude that the phraseology and content of the current WYJ *prātimokṣa* are either not substantially different from the phraseology and content of the derivative of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* used for the creation of the FWJ *prātimokṣa* in the mid to late fifth century, or are preserving the phraseology and content of an even earlier form of the derivatives of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*.

---

p. 158<sub>5-11</sub>, T no. 1581, 30: 913b3-6, T no. 1503, 24: 1116c28-1117a2, and T no. 1484, 24: 1004c24-1005a4; (4) The precept against anger: D p. 108<sub>17-21</sub>, W p. 158<sub>11-17</sub>, T no. 1581, 30: 913b7-9, T no. 1503, 24: 1115a10-13, and T no. 1484, 24: 1006c19-23; (5) The precept against denouncing the bodhisattva canon: D p. 108<sub>22-24</sub>, W pp. 158<sub>17-159</sub>, T no. 1581, 30: 913b10-12, T no. 1503, 24: 1117a4-7, and T no. 1484, 24: 1005a11-15; (6) The result of committing the four *pārājika*-equivalents for bodhisattvas: D pp. 108<sub>24-109</sub>, W p. 159<sub>3-8</sub>, T no. 1581, 30: 913b12-16, T no. 1503, 24: 1117a7-10, and T no. 1484, 24: 1005a16-22; (7) The precept against not greeting one's colleagues properly: D p. 110<sub>15-19</sub>, W p. 161<sub>11-17</sub>, T no. 1581, 30: 913c13-15, T no. 1503, 24: 1117b4-7, and T no. 1484, 24: 1005a27-b5; (8) The precept against not sharing one's knowledge of the doctrine: D p. 112<sub>1-2</sub>, W p. 163<sub>15-17</sub>, T no. 1581, 30: 914a23-25, T no. 1503, 24: 1117b26-28, and T no. 1484, 24: 1006c5-18; (9) The precept against not edifying immoral beings: D p. 112<sub>11-13</sub>, W p. 164<sub>6-9</sub>, T no. 1581, 30: 914b1-3, T no. 1503, 24: 1117c5-7, and T no. 1484, 24: 1005b17-21; (10) The precept against immoral conduct: D p. 115<sub>21-23</sub>, W p. 168<sub>21-25</sub>, T no. 1581, 30: 914b25-27, T no. 1503, 30: 1016a28-b1, and T no. 1484, 24: 1007a23-27; (11) The precept against repaying violence with violence: D p. 117<sub>3-5</sub>, W p. 170<sub>19-21</sub>, T no. 1581, 30: 915b29-30, T no. 1503, 24: 1118b28-29, and T no. 1484, 24: 1006c19-23; (12) The precept against only studying *śrāvaka* texts: D p. 119<sub>7-9</sub>, W p. 173<sub>14-17</sub>, T no. 1581, 30: 915b26-27, T no. 1503, 24: 1118b26-27, and T no. 1484, 24: 1005c5-7; (13) The precept against only studying heterodox texts: D p. 119<sub>9-11</sub>, W p. 173<sub>17-20</sub>, T no. 1581, 30: 915b29-30, T no. 1503, 24: 1118b28-29, and T no. 1484, 24: 1006c19-23; (14) The precept against speaking ill of others: D p. 120<sub>3-4</sub>, W p. 174<sub>20-22</sub>, T no. 1581, 30: 915c15-16, T no. 1503, 24: 1118c15-16, and T no. 1484, 24: 1006a2-5; (15) The precept against not attending doctrinal sermons and discussions: D p. 120<sub>8-10</sub>, W p. 175<sub>1-4</sub>, T no. 1581, 30: 916a3-5, T no. 1501, 24: 1118c18-19, and T no. 1484, 24: 1005b29-c4; (16) The precept against not caring for sick people: D p. 121<sub>9-11</sub>, W p. 176<sub>9-11</sub>, T no. 1581, 30: 916a22-23, T no. 1503, 24: 1119a2-3, and T no. 1484, 24: 1005c8-13; (17) The precept against not correctly instructing others: D p. 121<sub>19-21</sub>, W p. 176<sub>24-27</sub>, T no. 1581, 30: 916a29-b1, T no. 1503, 24: 1119a10-11, and T no. 1484, 24: 1006a16-14; and (18) The five benefits of observing the bodhisattva precepts: D p. 121<sub>16-27</sub>, W pp. 128<sub>27-129</sub>, T no. 1581, 30: 918a24-29, T no. 1503, 24: 1119b23-28, and T no. 1484, 24: 1009c20-1010a1.

Lastly, although the WYJ *prātimokṣa* sometimes shows disagreements with the surviving Sanskrit BBh *prātimokṣa*, this does not necessarily mean that the WYJ *prātimokṣa* either is itself, or is based on, a text that resulted from revising the original translation of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*. In addition to the fact that the occasional interpolation of the translators' own interpretation of passages is not an uncommon practice in Chinese Buddhist translation,<sup>44</sup> it is possible that the base Indic text of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* actually belonged to a separate tradition of the BBh *prātimokṣa* from that of the Sanskrit BBh *prātimokṣa* that has come down to us. This possibility is raised by the fact that some of the WYJ *prātimokṣa*'s departures from the surviving Sanskrit BBh *prātimokṣa* are also identified in the Khotanese version of the BBh *prātimokṣa* in the *Book of Zambasta* (comp. fifth century).<sup>45</sup> For example, earlier we compared the BBh, DCJ, SJJ, YQL, and WYJ versions of the bodhisattva precept against not receiving luxurious goods.<sup>46</sup> One of the phrases that only appears in the WYJ version of the precept was “[the bodhisattva] should take them [that is, the luxurious goods and unclaimed materials], thinking that he will donate them” (*jie ying cui zhi nian dang zhuan shi* 皆應取之念當轉施). A very similar phrase appears in the Khotanese version of the same precept: “He should take them: he will help the distressed (and) afflicted with them” (*nāsāñai dukhāta-m̐ jsa ysera haṃdāde*).<sup>47</sup> There are more examples. Among the BBh, DCJ, SJJ, YQL, WYJ, and Khotanese versions of the precept against idle chattering, only the WYJ and the Khotanese versions state that chattering does not constitute an offense when one is discussing the Dharma: the WYJ has “[it is a non-transgression] if one is discussing matters related to the Dharma” (*ruo tanlun fashi* 若談論法事), and the *Book of Zambasta* has “(if) he is inquiring about the Law

<sup>44</sup> See Funayama 2006 for such examples.

<sup>45</sup> The so-called “bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*” of the BBh appears in the twelfth chapter of the *Book of Zambasta*. For the original Khotanese and an English translation, see Emmerick 1968, pp. 170–83. For more about this text and its manuscripts, see Maggi 2009, pp. 337–39 and 347–57. For more about the textual sources of the twelfth chapter of the text, see Martini 2011, pp. 158–59. For a discussion of the text's relation to practices of bodhisattva precepts in Khotan, see Martini 2012. Although this text was previously believed to have been compiled no earlier than the seventh century, scholars now date the text to the fifth century. See Maggi 2004; Martini 2012, p. 14; Martini 2014, p. 132.

<sup>46</sup> D p. 111<sub>17–26</sub>; W pp. 162<sub>26</sub>–163<sub>14</sub>; T no. 1581, 30: 914a14–22; T no. 1583, 30: 1015c18–26; T no. 1503, 24: 1117b17–26; T no. 1579, 30: 516b29–c12.

<sup>47</sup> Transliteration and translation according to Emmerick 1968, pp. 174–75.

[Kh. *dāta*; Skt. *dharma*], he is guiltless” (*dātā pulstā anārrā*).<sup>48</sup> Also, among the BBh, DCJ, SJJ, YQL, WYJ, and Khotanese versions of the precept against not displaying miraculous powers, only the SJJ, WYJ, and Khotanese versions add that the miraculous powers should be used for the purpose of instilling faith. The SJJ has: “[If the bodhisattva] does not make people who should give rise to faith give rise to faith, he is guilty” (*ke sheng xing zhe bu ling sheng xin de zui* 可生信者不令生信得罪); the WYJ has: “[The bodhisattva should] make them give rise to faith” (*ling sheng xinxin* 令生信心); and the *Book of Zambasta* has: “If a Bodhisattva . . . does not display them . . . to those in whom faith should be induced . . . he is very guilty” (*ka bodhisatvā . . . u nai nājsaṣṭe . . . kye ṣṣadda tcera . . . ārragādā hāmāte kāḍe*).<sup>49</sup> Then, these divergences that the WYJ *prātimokṣa* shows from the Sanskrit BBh *prātimokṣa* more likely result from the differences in the Indic basis of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* than from revisions that took place after the original translation of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*.

In this way, when we consider the incohesive nature of the WYJ as a compilation and the fact that some of the WYJ *prātimokṣa*’s divergences from the Sanskrit BBh *prātimokṣa* should be attributed to the differences in the underlying Indic text rather than to a post-translation revision process, the features of the WYJ *prātimokṣa* that would at first seem to point to the existence of earlier redactions fall short of being substantial evidence. On the other hand, it is possible to put forth an argument for the general phraseological agreement between the derivatives of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* that were in circulation at least as early as the mid to late fifth century and the current WYJ *prātimokṣa*. These circumstances, I think, allow us to postulate that the content of the current WYJ *prātimokṣa* might be a fairly reliable approximation of the original content of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*.

<sup>48</sup> D p. 118<sub>8-12</sub>; W p. 172<sub>7-13</sub>; T no. 1581, 30: 915b8–11; T no. 1583, 30: 1016c11–13; T no. 1503, 24: 1118b9–11; T no. 1579, 30: 518c23–28; transliteration and translation of Khotanese according to Emmerick 1968, pp. 178–79. The words in square brackets are mine.

<sup>49</sup> D pp. 123<sub>26-124</sub>; W p. 180<sub>4-12</sub>; T no. 1581, 30: 916c20–917a3; T no. 1583, 30: 1017c17–19; T no. 1503, 24: 1119b19–23; T no. 1579, 30: 521a2–8; transliteration and translation of Khotanese according to Emmerick 1968, pp. 182–83. The ellipses are mine. If we follow the scholarly consensus that the SJJ was based on an older tradition of the BBh than the surviving Sanskrit BBh, the DCJ, and the YQL (Okimoto 1973, p. 377; Matsumura 1990, p. 86; Deleanu 2006, p. 184, n. 191), this particular agreement between the WYJ *prātimokṣa*, the SJJ *prātimokṣa*, and the *Book of Zambasta prātimokṣa* should be seen as an archaism retained in these texts, rather than a new development that took place within the hypothetical separate tradition of the BBh *prātimokṣa* (to which the WYJ *prātimokṣa* and the *Book of Zambasta prātimokṣa* might have together belonged) proposed here.

There still remains the problem of when and by whom the ceremonial elements (the opening verses, the announcement of the recitation of the precepts, and the closing verses) would have been appended to the main *prātimokṣa* of the WYJ (by the original translators of the *prātimokṣa*, or by later editors?),<sup>50</sup> as well as the problem of the provenance and date of short agreements between the DCJ, the SJJ, and the WYJ *prātimokṣas* (Did the translators of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* rely on earlier translations, or is this the result of a later collation of the three translations?).<sup>51</sup> But these are topics for future studies.

<sup>50</sup> The opening verses do not seem to have been translated from an Indic source. The fifth verse (T no. 1503, 24: 1116c20–21) replicates a verse that can be found in the *Faju jing* 法句經 (T no. 210, 4: 572a4–5) and the *Shi zhu piposha lun* 十住毗婆沙論 (T no. 1521, 26: 77b22–23). I am indebted to Funayama Tōru for this detail.

<sup>51</sup> When we compare the bodhisattva *prātimokṣas* of the DCJ, the SJJ, and the WYJ, we discover the following three patterns: (1) The content of the SJJ *prātimokṣa* differs extensively from the DCJ and the WYJ *prātimokṣas*; the SJJ *prātimokṣa* precepts often articulate a completely different purport from the DCJ and the WYJ versions of the same precepts, and there are many precepts of the SJJ *prātimokṣa* that have no equivalents in the WYJ and the DCJ *prātimokṣas* (see n. 9 above); (2) The content of the DCJ and the content of the WYJ *prātimokṣas*, on the other hand, show a much higher degree of agreement; although they sometimes show disagreements (e.g., the cases cited in the discussion of the similarity between the WYJ and the Khotanese bodhisattva *prātimokṣas* above), the total number of the precepts are almost the same (forty-six in the DCJ and forty-five in the WYJ; the thirty-first precept of the DCJ is missing in the WYJ) and there is seldom a precept that articulates a different purport from its counterpart; (3) However, in terms of phraseology, there is a much more extensive and significant agreement between the SJJ precepts and the WYJ precepts than between the DCJ precepts and the WYJ precepts; in fact, most of the phraseological agreement between the DCJ and WYJ precepts can be explained also by postulating that the translators of the DCJ and the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣas* independently arrived at the same phrases in the process of translating the same Indic sentences, not just by postulating mutual borrowing. This is pure conjecture, but the hypothesis that the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* was translated by a team relying on a person who only knew a version of the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* whose content more closely followed the DCJ *prātimokṣa* than the SJJ *prātimokṣa*, under a circumstance in which the SJJ was the only available previous Chinese translation of the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*, for the very purpose of introducing this alternative bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* whose content differed substantially from the SJJ *prātimokṣa*, would ideally explain all three of these patterns. This hypothesis coheres with three additional facts. First, when Guṇavarman arrived in Jianye 建業 (present-day Nanjing 南京) in 431, he was asked by a local monk to translate the BBh (T no. 2059, 50: 341a20), in response to which he translated the SJJ the same year. If we take this event as a reflection of a period in history during which the existence of the BBh was known in south China but Dharmakṣema's contemporary translation of the BBh (i.e., the DCJ that was translated between 420 and 431 in Guzang 姑臧 in present-day Gansu 甘肅 Province; for these dates, see Chen 2004, p. 258) was yet to be transmitted thereto (cf. the fact that it took almost a decade for Dharmakṣema's

*Concluding Remarks: The Significance of the Weiyi jing Bodhisattva Prātimokṣa in Indian, Central Asian, and Chinese Buddhism*

The findings of the present paper have some implications for our understanding of the history of bodhisattva precepts in Indian, Central Asian, and Chinese Buddhism.

First, we now have some evidence for more seriously considering the possibility that the independent circulation of the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* of the BBh might have had Indian Buddhist precedents. In the Sinitic tradition this was an established practice, as the existence of the two texts titled *Pusa*

---

translation of the *Nirvana Sutra* to arrive in Jianye; Tang 1991, vol. 2, p. 606), this might furthermore be an indication that there also was a short window of time during which Guṇavarman's SJJ was the only available previous translation of the BBh bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* in south China. Second, the only passage of the WYJ *prātimokṣa* that reproduces word-for-word the corresponding passage of the SJJ *in toto* does not in fact belong to the proper bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* section of the BBh (compare T no. 1583, 30: 1018b7–16 and T no. 1503, 24: 1119b23–c3; corresponding passage in the DCJ is T no. 1581, 30: 918a23–b9). In the SJJ and the DCJ, this passage appears at the very end of the “Śīlapāṭala” as the conclusion of its discussion of bodhisattva ethics. In the WYJ, this passage is inserted after the forty-five precepts and before the concluding verses. The proposed hypothesis would offer an explanation of this passage that because the person who provided the team with the Indic bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* text did not know any other part of the BBh, the team had to borrow the entire concluding passage word-for-word from the SJJ, while for the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* proper, they only borrowed some phrases from the previous translation choices of the SJJ. Third, this alternative translation of the BBh *prātimokṣa* did not receive much attention from practitioners. The *Chujiaren shou pusa jiefa* 出家人受菩薩戒法 (P no. 2196; see Tsuchihashi 1980 for a study and transcription) that was compiled in Jianye in 519 lists common contemporary sources for the practice of bodhisattva precepts (for a discussion of this passage, see Funayama 1995, pp. 25–32), but does not mention any text that can be seen as the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* (although it is possible that the compilers knew about this translation but considered it as an insignificant variant of the DCJ *prātimokṣa*). This may be due to the fact that the subsequent introduction into south China of a more complete and more professionally done translation of the BBh—that is, Dharmakṣema's DCJ, the content of whose bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* closely corresponded to the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*—rendered obsolete the need for relying on the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* for practical purposes. Once again, these are pure conjectures, and it is still possible that the agreements between the DCJ, SJJ, and WYJ simply resulted from a later collation rather than the hypothetical series of events proposed here. A proper investigation of this issue should be based on a reliable understanding of the relation between the DCJ, the variant tradition of the DCJ (i.e., the tradition preserved in the so-called Song, Yuan, Ming, and Gong editions; this tradition often, but not always, has phrases closer to the Sanskrit BBh), the SJJ, and their underlying Indic texts, which is an important topic on its own.

*jieben*<sup>52</sup> that correspond respectively to the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* sections of the DCJ and the YQL shows, but scholars have generally believed that these *Pusa jiebens* were excerpted in China from the DCJ and the YQL in response to demands particular to Chinese Buddhists.<sup>53</sup> However, the present study established the existence in early medieval China of the “ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*,” an independent translation of the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* of the BBh that the WYJ *prātimokṣa* is a derivative of. This implies that the foreign Buddhist who provided the Chinese translation team with the Indic text was at the very least not against the idea of translating the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* section of the BBh separately, and possibly even only had the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* section in his memory or possession to begin with.<sup>54</sup> The latter possibility allows us to hypothesize not only that the independent transmission of the BBh bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* had Indian precedents, but also that there might have been a separate textual tradition of the independently circulating BBh bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*. This is a possibility further supported by the contemporary Khotanese version of the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* of the BBh in the *Book of Zambasta*. The Khotanese bodhisattva *prātimokṣa*, just as the WYJ *prātimokṣa*, appears independently separated from its original context in the BBh, and as we saw, the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* sections of the *Book of Zambasta* and of the WYJ exhibit similar departures from the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* sections of the DCJ, the YQL, and the surviving Sanskrit BBh. These facts would make sense if an independent textual tradition was formed from the bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* section of the BBh, underwent its own textual changes, and became the Indic basis of the Khotanese bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* and the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*.

Also, the present study established that the phraseological similarity between the FWJ *prātimokṣa* and the WYJ *prātimokṣa* should be attributed to the FWJ *prātimokṣa*'s reliance on a derivative of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa*, and argued that the current WYJ *prātimokṣa* is likely preserving the phraseology and content of the derivatives of the ur-WYJ *prātimokṣa* that were in circulation around the time of the FWJ's composition in the mid to late fifth century. This means that we can compare the precepts of the FWJ and the WYJ *prātimokṣas* to examine the creation process of the apocryphal FWJ *prātimokṣa* in unprecedented detail. Indeed, a number of interesting pat-

<sup>52</sup> T. no 1500 and T. no 1501.

<sup>53</sup> Ōno 1954, pp. 415–19; Okimoto 1972, p. 130; Matsumura 1990, p. 89.

<sup>54</sup> See the discussion in n. 49.

terns emerge from the comparison of the precepts of the WYJ and the FWJ *prātimokṣas*.<sup>55</sup> Some of these patterns are exemplified in the following bodhisattva precept against anger:<sup>56</sup>

WYJ: 若菩薩，瞋於前人，惡言罵辱，加以手打及以杖石，意猶不息，前人求悔善言懺謝，菩薩猶瞋，憤結不解，是名菩薩波羅夷。(T no. 1503, 24: 1115a10–13)

If a bodhisattva harbors anger towards a person in front of him and swears with bad words, assaults with his hands, sticks, or stones, or because he cannot calm his temper, even when the person in front of him seeks to repent and apologizes with gentle words, the bodhisattva instead harbors anger and steadfastly does not resolve [his anger], then this is called a bodhisattva *pārājika*.

FWJ: 若佛子，自瞋，教人瞋，瞋因瞋業瞋法瞋緣，“而菩薩應生一切眾生中善根無諍之事，常生悲心，而反更”於一切眾生中，乃至於非眾生中，以惡口罵辱，加以手打及以刀杖，意猶不息，前人求悔善言懺謝，猶瞋不解，是菩薩波羅夷罪。F pp. 96–97 (T no. 1484, 24: 1006c19–23).

If a son of the Buddha himself harbors anger, makes others harbor anger, or [creates] a cause, an action, an existence, or a condition of anger, “whereas (*er*) a bodhisattva must (*ying*) foster the moral tendencies and harmonious affairs among all sentient beings and always (*chang*) should give rise to a sympathetic state of mind (*bei xin*), but instead (*er fangeng*)” towards a sentient being or even an insentient being, swears with a bad-mouth, assaults with his hands, knives, or sticks, or because he cannot calm his temper, even when the person in front of him seeks to repent and apologizes with

<sup>55</sup> See Lee 2010 for a more detailed discussion of these patterns and their relation to the FWJ’s utilization of the universal buddha-nature (*foxing* 佛性) doctrine and to the contemporary anti-Buddhist polemics.

<sup>56</sup> The DCJ reads, 菩薩，瞋恚，出僞惡言，意猶不息，復以手打或加杖石，殘害恐怖，瞋恨增上，犯者求悔，不受其懺，結恨不捨，是名第三波羅夷處法 (T no. 1581, 30: 913b7–9); the SJJ reads, 菩薩，若瞋不應加惡，若以手打或杖或石，惡聲罵辱，或時無力不能打罵，心懷瞋忿，若為他人之所打罵，前人求悔不受其懺，故懷瞋恨增長不息心不淨者，是名菩薩第七重法 (T no. 1583, 30: 1015a10–13). The unique phraseological agreement between the WYJ and the FWJ *prātimokṣas* is clear also in this precept. See D p. 108<sub>17–21</sub> and W p. 158<sub>11–17</sub> for the Sanskrit version.

gentle words, he instead harbors anger and does not resolve [his anger], then this is a bodhisattva *pārājika* offense.

First, we notice that one of the elements that the creators of the FWJ interpolated into their version of the precept against anger is the positive definition of the precept. In addition to stating what a bodhisattva should not do with respect to anger in negative terms (abusive language, physical violence, unwillingness to resolve anger) as the WYJ version of the precept does, the FWJ version of the precept also stipulates what a bodhisattva must do in positive terms (encouraging moral tendencies and harmony among sentient beings, sympathizing with other beings). We also notice that this interpolation was done at the cost of readability of the sentence: if we leave out the positive definition of the precept and its accompanying conjunctions “*er*” 而 (whereas) and “*er fangeng*” 而反更 (but instead), the sentence reads much more naturally. The same forced interpolation of positive definitions of precepts is found throughout the FWJ *prātimokṣa* precepts. Also, we see that one of the words the FWJ adds in its version of the precept is “sympathetic mind” (*bei xin* 悲心). References to various positive states of mind—such as “*cibei xin*” 慈悲心 (compassionate and sympathetic mind), “*xin xin*” 信心 (pious mind), “*xiao shun xin*” 孝順心 (filial and obedient mind), and “*gongjing xin*” 恭敬心 (reverent mind)—as the motives behind the observance of bodhisattva precepts are characteristic of the FWJ *prātimokṣa* that stand out when compared with the WYJ *prātimokṣa*, whose psychological vocabulary mostly consists of defilements and afflictions (such as “*e xin chen xin*” discussed above) that lead to the violation of the precepts.<sup>57</sup>

Within the text, the FWJ’s interpolation of the positive definitions of bodhisattva precepts and its emphasis on the positive qualities of the mind can be seen as related to its mobilization of the universal buddha-nature (*foxing* 佛性) doctrine, which stands in contrast to the BBh’s negative understanding of the natural state of the human mind. Contextually, the same changes can be seen as a response to the popular polemical trope employed by the detractors of Buddhism in early medieval China that Buddhist doctrine was inferior to Confucian and Daoist teachings because, originally expounded to the uncivilized peoples of the Western Regions, it focuses more on destroying immoral desires of the human being rather than cultivating innate moral tendencies within the human being.<sup>58</sup>

<sup>57</sup> See Lee 2010, pp. 93–104 and 114–15, for a more detailed argument.

<sup>58</sup> Lee 2010, pp. 88–92 and 104–12. The fact that the focus of Buddhist precepts was the eradication of immoral tendencies was often cited to justify this generalization. See espe-

Although its universal applicability has been questioned by many scholars, there is no denying that there are individual phenomena in the history of Chinese Buddhism for which the traditional “Sinification” model offers the most simple and satisfactory explanation. The transformation of the ur-WYJ bodhisattva *prātimokṣa* into the FWJ *prātimokṣa* in early medieval China would be one such case.

## ABBREVIATIONS

BBh	<i>Bodhisattvabhūmi</i> .
D	Dutt 1966.
DCJ	<i>Pusa dichi jing</i> 菩薩地持經. T no. 1581.
E	Engle 2016.
F	Funayama 2017.
FWJ	<i>Fanwang jing</i> 梵網經. T no. 1484.
SJJ	<i>Pusa shanjie jing</i> 菩薩善戒經. T nos. 1582 and 1583.
T	<i>Taishō shinshū daizōkyō</i> 大正新脩大藏經. Edited by Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡辺海旭. 100 vols. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–35.
P	Pelliot Dunhuang manuscripts.
W	Wogihara (1930) 1971.
WYJ	<i>Youposai wu jie weiyi jing</i> 優婆塞五戒威儀經. T no. 1503.
YQL	<i>Yuqie shidi lun</i> 瑜伽師地論. T no. 1579.

## REFERENCES

An Sōng-du 안성두. 2015. *Posalji: Indo Taesūng Pulgyo posal sasang ūi kūmjat'ap* 보살지: 인도 대승불교 보살사상의 금자탑. Seoul: Sech'ang.

---

cially the following argument by the Confucian scholar He Chengtian 何承天 (370–447): “The Chinese people and the barbarians naturally have a difference. What is it? The people of China are born with a pure disposition, so they harbor benevolence and righteousness. Thus the Duke of Zhou and Confucius explicated the teaching of nature-based practices (*xingxi*). [On the other hand,] the people of foreign countries are endowed with a rigid and tough nature (*xing*), so they are greedy and ferocious. Thus Śākyamuni strictly set the rules of the five precepts (*wujie*). . . . Exhausting the root of cruelty and harm is not considered ‘moderation,’ so the Duke of Zhou and Confucius did not attempt to do so. They [instead] conformed to the Heavenly endowed nature (*tianxing*) and [only] removed what is the most extreme” 華戎自有不同。何者?中國之人，稟氣清和，含仁抱義。故周孔，明性習之教。外國之徒，受性剛強，貪欲忿戾。故釋氏，嚴五戒之科。 . . . 將盡殘害之根，非中庸之謂。周孔則不然，順其天性去其甚泰。 T no. 2102, 52: 19c27–20a4.

- Boucher, Daniel. 1998. "Gāndhārī and the Early Chinese Buddhist Translations Reconsidered: The Case of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra*." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 118, no. 4, pp. 471–506.
- . 2008. *Bodhisattvas of the Forest and the Formation of the Mahāyāna: A Study and Translation of the "Rāṣṭrapālapiṛcchā-sūtra"*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Buswell, Robert E., Jr. 1990. "Introduction: Prolegomenon to the Study of Buddhist Apocryphal Scriptures." In *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, edited by Robert E. Buswell, Jr., pp. 1–30. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Chen, Jinhua. 2004. "The Indian Buddhist Missionary Dharmakṣema (385–433): A New Dating of His Arrival in Guzang and of His Translations." *T'oung Pao* 90, pp. 215–63.
- Deleau, Florin. 2006. *The Chapter on the Mundane Path (Laukikamārga) in the "Śrāvakabhūmi": A Trilingual Edition (Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese); Annotated Translation and Introductory Study*. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.
- Derge Tengyur. 1991. *The Tibetan Tripitaka*. Edited by A. W. Barber. Taipei: Nantian Shuju.
- Dutt, Nalinaksha. 1931. "Bodhisattva-Prātimokṣa Sutra." *Indian Historical Quarterly* 7, pp. 259–86.
- , ed. 1966. *Bodhisattvabhūmi: Being the XVth section of Asaṅgapada's Yogacarabhūmi*. Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Emmerick, Ronald E., ed. and trans. 1968. *The Book of Zambasta: A Khotanese Poem on Buddhism*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Engle, Artemus B., trans. 2016. *The Bodhisattva Path to Unsurpassed Enlightenment: A Complete Translation of the "Bodhisattvabhūmi"*. Boulder: Snow Lion.
- Fujita Kōkan 藤田光寛. 1983. "Byañ chub bzañ po cho *Bosatsu ritsugi giki ni tsuite*" Byañ chub bzañ po 著『菩薩律儀儀軌』について. *Mikkyō bunka* 密教文化 141, pp. 100–87 [sic].
- . 1988. "Bodhisattva-prātimokṣa-catuṣka-nirhāra ni tsuite" (Bodhisattva-prātimokṣa-catuṣka-nirhāra) について. *Mikkyō bunka* 163, pp. 132–117 [sic].
- . 1989–91. "Bosatsujikai hon' wayaku" (菩薩地戒品) 和訳. 3 pts. *Kōyasan Daigaku ronsō* 高野山大学論叢 24, pp. 1–20 (L); 25, pp. 55–86 (L); 26, pp. 133–158 (L).
- Funayama Tōru 船山徹. 1995. "Rikuchō jidai ni okeru bosatsukai no juyō katei: Ryūsō, Nanseiki o chūshin ni" 六朝時代における菩薩戒の受容過程: 劉宋・南齊期を中心に. *Tōhō gakuhō* 東方學報 67, pp. 1–135.
- . 1996. "Gikyō Bonmōkyō seiritsu no shomondai" 疑經『梵網經』成立の諸問題. *Bukkyō shigaku kenkyū* 佛教史学研究 39, no. 1, pp. 54–78.
- . 2002. "'Kan'yaku' to 'Chūgoku senjutsu' no aida: Kanbun butten ni tokuyū na keitai o megutte" 「漢訳」と「中国撰述」の間: 漢文仏典に特有な形態をめぐって. *Bukkyō shigaku kenkyū* 45, no. 1, pp. 1–28 (L).
- . 2004. "The Acceptance of Buddhist Precepts by the Chinese in the Fifth Century." *Journal of Asian History* 38, no. 2, pp. 97–120.
- . 2006. "Masquerading as Translation: Examples of Chinese Lectures by Indian Scholar-Monks in the Six Dynasties Period." *Asia Major* 19, no. 1, pp. 39–55.
- . 2010. "Bonmōkyō shohon no ni keitō" 梵網經諸本の二系統. *Tōhō gakuhō* 85, pp. 179–211.

- . 2011a. “Bonmōkyō gekan senkō setsu no saikentō” 梵網經下卷先行説の再検討. In *Sankyō kōshō ronsō zokuhen* 三教交渉論叢統編, edited by Mugitani Kunio 麥谷邦夫, pp. 127–56. Kyoto: Kyoto Daigaku Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyūjo.
- . 2011b. “Daijōkai: Indo kara Chūgoku e” 大乘戒：インドから中国へ. In *Daijō Bukkyō no jissen* 大乘仏教の実践, edited by Katsura Shōryū 桂紹隆, Saitō Akira 斎藤明, Shimoda Masahiro 下田正弘, Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士, and Takasaki Jikidō 高崎直道, pp. 205–40. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- . 2014. “Bonmōkyō no shoki no keitai o megutte” 『梵網經』の初期の形態をめぐって. *Higashi Ajia bukkyō kenkyū* 東アジア仏教研究 12, pp. 3–25.
- . 2017. *Higashi Ajia bukkyō no seikatsu kisoku Bonmōkyō: Saiko no katachi to hatten no rekishi* 東アジア仏教の生活規則梵網經：最古の形と発展の歴史. Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten.
- Hirakawa Akira 平川彰. 1990. “Daijōkai to bosatsukaikyō” 大乘戒と菩薩戒經. In *Jōdo shisō to Daijōkai* 浄土思想と大乘戒, pp. 253–75. Tokyo: Shunjūsha. (Originally published in *Fukui Hakushi shōju kinen Tōyō shisō ronshū* 福井博士頌壽記念東洋思想論集, edited by Fukui Hakushi Shōju Kinen Ronbunshū Kankōkai 福井博士頌壽記念論文集刊行會, pp. 522–44. Tokyo: Fukui Hakushi Shōju Kinen Ronbunshū Kankōkai, 1960.)
- Karashima Seishi 辛嶋静志. 2001. *A Glossary of Kumārajīva’s Translation of the Lotus Sutra*. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University.
- Lee Sangyop (Yi Sang-yōp 李尚曄). 2010. “Pōmmang-kyōng posalgye wa Yusik’akp’a posalgye ūi pigyo yōn’gu: Yinsōng e taehan yipchang ch’ai rŭl chungsim ūro” 『법망경』 보살계와 유식학과 보살계의 비교 연구 : 인성에 대한 입장 차이를 중심으로. *Pulgyohak yōn’gu* 佛教學研究 27, pp. 83–121.
- Maggi, M. 2004. “The Manuscript T III S 16: Its Importance for the History of Khotanese Literature.” In *Turfan Revisited: The First Century of Research into the Arts and Cultures of the Silk Road*, edited by Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst, Simone-Christiane Raschmann, Jens Wilkens, Marianne Yaldiz, and Peter Zieme, pp. 184–90. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- . 2009. “Khotanese Literature.” In *The Literature of Pre-Islamic Iran: Companion Volume 1*, edited by Ronald E. Emmerick and Maria Macuch, pp. 330–417. New York: I. B. Tauris.
- Martini, Giuliana. 2011. “A Large Question in a Small Place: The Transmission of the *Ratnakūṭa* (*Kāśyapaparivarta*) in Khotan.” *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* 14, pp. 135–83.
- . 2012. “Bodhisattva Texts, Ideologies and Rituals in Khotan in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries.” In *Multilingualism and History of Knowledge*, vol. 1, *Buddhism Among the Iranian Peoples of Central Asia*, edited by Matteo de Chiara, Mauro Maggi, and Giuliana Martini, pp. 13–69. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- . 2014. “Transmission of the Dharma and Reception of the Text: Oral and Aural Features in the Fifth Chapter of the *Book of Zambasta*.” In *Buddhism Across Asia: Networks of Material, Intellectual and Cultural Exchange*, vol. 1, edited by Tansen Sen, pp. 131–69. Singapore: ISEAS Publishing.
- Matsumura Hisashi 松村恒. 1990. “Miscellaneous Notes on the *Upāliparipṛcchā* and Related Texts.” *Acta Orientalia* 51, pp. 61–113.

- Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨. 1930. *Jōdokyō no kigen oyobi hattatsu* 淨土教の起原及發達. Tokyo: Kyōritsusha.
- Naitō Ryūō 内藤竜雄. 1962. “*Bosatsu zenkai kyō ni okeru ni san no mondai*” 菩薩善戒經における二三の問題. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 19 (vol. 10, no. 1), pp. 130–31.
- Nattier, Jan. 2003. *A Few Good Men: The Bodhisattva Path according to the Inquiry of Ugra (Ugraparipṛcchā)*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Okimoto Katsumi 沖本克己. 1972. “Bodhisattva Prātimokṣa.” *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 41 (vol. 21, no. 1), pp. 130–31.
- . 1973. “*Bosatsu zenkai kyō ni tsuite*” 菩薩善戒經について. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 43 (vol. 22, no. 1), pp. 373–78.
- . 1976. “*Zenshin bosatsu nijūshi kai kyō ni tsuite*” 「善信菩薩二十四戒經」について. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 49 (vol. 25, no. 1), pp. 226–29.
- Ōno Hōdō 大野法道. 1954. *Daijōkaikyō no kenkyū* 大乘戒經の研究. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.
- Ōtomo Toshiyuki 大友利行. 1967. “*Bodhisattvapraṭimokṣasūtra no mondaiten*” Bodhisattvapraṭimokṣasūtraの問題點. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 30 (vol. 15, no. 2), pp. 142–43.
- Shirato Waka 白土わか. 1970. “*Bonmōkyō kenkyū josetsu*” 梵網經研究序説. *Ōtani Daigaku kenkyū nenpō* 大谷大学研究年報 22, pp. 105–54.
- Tang Yongtong 湯用彤. 1991. *Han Wei liang Jin Nanbeichao Fojiao shi* 漢魏兩晉南北朝佛教史. 2 vols. Second edition. Taipei: Shangwu Yinshuguan. (Originally published in Changsha: Shangwu Yinshuguan, 1938.)
- Tatz, Mark. 1986. *Asanga’s Chapter on Ethics with the Commentary of Tsong-Kha-Pa, the Basic Path to Awakening, the Complete Bodhisattva*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Tokiwa Daijō 常盤大定. 1973. *Gokan yori Sōsei ni itaru yakukyō sōroku* 後漢より宋齊に至る訳経総録. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai.
- Tsuchihashi Shūkō 土橋秀高. 1980. “*Perio bon Shukkenin ju bosatsukai hō ni tsuite*” ペリオ本「出家人受菩薩戒法」について. In *Kairitsu no kenkyū* 戒律の研究, vol. 1, pp. 832–86. Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō. (Originally published in *Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 佛教學研究 25/26 [1968], pp. 93–148.)
- . 1982. “*Tonkō bon bussetsu zenshin bosatsu nijūshi kai kyō*” 敦煌本・仏説善信菩薩二十四戒經. In *Kairitsu no kenkyū*, vol. 2, pp. 213–30. Kyoto: Nagata Bunshōdō. (Originally published in *Ryūkoku Daigaku Bukkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo kiyō* 龍谷大學佛教文化研究所紀要 12 [1973], pp. 54–67.)
- Vaidya, P. L., ed. 1963. *Saddharmalankāvatārasūtram*. Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute.
- Wogihara Unrai 荻原雲来. (1930) 1971. *Bodhisattvabhūmi: A Statement of Whole Course of the Bodhisattva (Being Fifteenth Section of Yogācārabhūmi)*. Tokyo: Sankibo Buddhist Book Store.
- Yamabe, Nobuyoshi. 2005. “Visionary Repentance and Visionary Ordination in the *Brahmā Net Sūtra*.” In *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya*, edited by William M. Bodiford, pp. 17–39. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Zimmermann, Michael. 2013. “The Chapter on Right Conduct in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*.” In *The Foundation for Yoga Practitioners: The Buddhist Yogācārabhūmi Treatise and Its Adaptation in India, East Asia, and Tibet*, edited by Ulrich Timme Kragh, pp. 872–83. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Department of South Asian Studies.