Remarks on J. W. de Jong’s Notes on the Suvikrāntavikrāmiparipṛcchā-Prajñāpāramitā Text

Hiromasa Tosaki

J. W. de Jong wrote “Notes on Prajñāpāramitā texts: 2. The Suvikrāntavikrāmiparipṛcchā,” PRAJÑĀPĀRAMITĀ AND RELATED SYSTEMS: Studies in honor of Edward Conze, ed. by Lewis Lancaster, BERKELEY BUDDHIST STUDIES SERIES 1, 1977, pp. 187–199 (again compiled in Buddhist Studies by J. W. de Jong, ed. by Gregory Schopen, Berkeley). It contains much useful information together with valuable suggestions. There are, however, some oh which I do not agree with him. This paper is to remark on them. The abbreviations are same as used in de Jong’s Notes.


(remark) “2. ayaṃ prajñāpāramitānirdeśaḥ, T. ses-rab-kyi pha-rol-pa (sic) ’di = iyaṃ prajñāpāramita” is not correct, because T. (Peking ed. 65b 7) has bstan pa after ses rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa and thus agrees with the Sanskrit text: ayaṃ prajñāpāramitānirdeśaḥ.

Remarks on J. W. de Jong's Notes (H. Tosaki)

(9)

(Remark) C. (p. 1068a 14-16) has nājñānena jñānam ity ucyate before nāpi jñānena jñānam ity ucyate.

不由非智說名為智  = nājñānena jñānam iy ucyate
亦不由非智說名非智  = nāpi jñānena jñānam ity ucyate
不由非智說名非智  = nājñānenājñānam ity ucyate
亦不由非智說為名智  = nāpi jñānena jñānam ity ucyate

3. (de Jong, p. 191. 15-28) Su. 8.12-14 (sic): Na hi jñānam vacanyam nāpi jñānam kasyacid viṣayah sarvaviṣayavyatikrāntaṁ hi jñānam, na ca jñānam viṣayam, ayaṁ Suvīrāntavikrāmiṁ jñānānirdesaḥ. Adeśo 'pradesaḥ, yena jñānenāsau jñāninām jñāniti saṁkhyāṁ gacchati, yaivaṁ...... Hikata’s punctuation is not correct because a full stop must be placed between viṣayam (read viṣayaḥ) and ayaṁ, and the full stop between jñānānirdesaḥ and adeśo must be omitted. ......

(Remark) No decisive reason to say that Hikata’s punctuation is not correct. Hikata seems to follow C. (p. 1068a 26-28): 善勇猛。是名如實宜說智相。如是智相實不可說不可示現。 According to Ti, a full stop must be placed between viṣayam and ayaṁ as de Jong does. But it is impossible to determine the original reading.

4. (de Jong, p. 192. 36) Su. 15. 1: dhātuḥ saṁketena. Dhātuḥ is not found in Ti and C.

(Remark) Dhātuḥ is found in C. (p. 1070a 23): 但由世俗假説為界。C. agrees with S.: dhātuḥ saṁketena vyavahārapadāṁ gacchati.

5. (de Jong, p. 193. 2-4) Su. 15. 15-16: Tena tad. Tosaki suggests reading Naitad but according to Ti one must read te na (de ni ...... ma yin-no). Instead of te C. has ‘the Buddhadharmas’.

(Remark) It cannot be said that Tibetan de must be te in Sanskrit. Tibetan de stands generally for tad or etad in Sanskrit. So Tosaki’s suggestion naitad buddhadharmānām adhivacanam agrees with Ti (Peking ed., 32b 2): de ni saṅs rgyas kyi chos kyi tshig bla dags ma yin no. C. (佛法即非佛法增語, p. 1070 b 9) probably means that (the word) ‘Buddhadhharma’ is not a designation of the (real) Buddhadhharma.

6. (de Jong, p. 193. 31-33) Su. 20. 3: te nājñātatacittena bodhiṁ ca paśyanti.
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C. corresponds to: *te 'nena jñānena citte bodhiṃ na paśyanti*. C. does not translate *na bodhau cittaṃ paśyanti, na citte bodhiṃ paśyanti* (p. 20. 4–5).

(Remark) C. (p. 1071 c 24–26) translates *na bodhau cittaṃ paśyanti, na citte bodhiṃ paśyanti*, though the order of the sentences hereabout differs from S., as follows:

(i) *te*  
(ii) *nājñātacittena bodhiṃ ca paśyanti*  
(iii) *na cānātra bodheś cittaṃ paśyanti*  
(iv) *na bodhau cittaṃ paśyanti*  
(v) *na citte bodhiṃ paśyanti*

(i) 彼由此智 (*=te 'nena jñānena*)  
(v) 非於心內見有菩薩  
(ii) 亦非離心見有菩薩 (*=nānyatra cittaḥ bodhiṃ paśyanti*)  
(ii) 亦非離內見有菩薩 (*=nānyatra cittaḥ bodhiṃ paśyanti*)  
(ii) 亦非離內見有實心  
(iii) 亦非離菩薩見有實心

7. (de Jong, p. 194. 3–10) *Su. 22. 20: anulomaṇ ca samdhayanti*. Conze translates: “they explain (their secret intent) in agreement with just the fact”. However, neither Ti nor C. support this explanation. Ti *rjes-su mthun-par smra-bar byed-do*; C. “they harmonize this and that so that there is no mutual opposition”. Probably one must read *samdhayanti* as has been proposed by Matsumoto. According to Edgerton *dhāyati* and *dhāyate* (from *dha*-) occur chiefly in comp. with *antara*. C. is correct in translating *samdhayati* by ‘to harmonize, to make agree’.

(Remark) It is not necessary to read *samdhayanti* instead of *samdha-yanti*, because *samdhayanti* (from *samdhaya*, Nominal verb, cf. Monier-Williams’s Dic., to put or join together, unite) with *anulomaṇ* can be rendered by 和會 (p. 1072c 7) (‘to harmonize’).


(Remark) Even according to C. (p. 1084 c 10–11) : 般若波羅蜜多難有所聞種種文句 (“though as regards Prajñāpāramitā, various words are heard”), no emendation is necessary, because the Sanskrit text as it is conveys the same idea as C. S. means : the (various) words explaining Prajñāpāramitā reach the ear. *Nirdeśāsravaṇāya gacchaty* (p. 43. 3) should be read: *nirdeśah śravaṇāya gacchaty*.

( Remark) No word corresponding to tasyā is found in C. C. (p. 1085a 2) abridged the word พระnirmana paramitayā, because the preceding พระnirmana paramitayā (p. 43. 23) comes down in function to this passage.

And C. (而有説用) agrees with S.: nirdeśah karyam ca karoti. It seems that the preceding passage tasyāh pattraih karyam karoti (p. 43. 22) made de Jong read tasyā nirdeśena karyam ca karoti. But is it necessary? While in the sentence tasyāh pattraih karyam karoti, the subject is pu-rusah (p. 43. 21), in the sentence พระnirmana paramitayā nirdeśah karyam ca karoti, the subject is nirdeśah.

10. (de Jong, p. 195. 11–14) Su. 47. 1–2: nāsyāṃ kaścid upalabhya te 'bhisambuddhāḥ. (Ms. 'bhisambuddhā). Read with C. 'bhisambuddhā. ......

( Remark) It cannot be said that C. 能觉者 (p. 1085c 21) stands only for abhisambuddhr. It may stand for abhisambuddha which has the active meaning. So C. does not necessarily make us read abhisambuddhā. In other words, it is impossible to decide whether Ms. 'bhisambuddhā is an error for 'bhisambuddhā or 'bhisambuddhā.


12. (de Jong, p. 196. 4–8) Su. 68. 14–16: Tad yathā ’yuṣmaḥ Śāradvattputra dharmaṃ nidarśanam nopaiti kasyac̄i dharmasya, kathāṃ tasyaivodāhārami-rdeśo (Hikata tasya evo-, but Ms. tasyaivo-) bhaviṣyati. Tosaki omits dharma but this is found both in Ti and in C. ......

( Remark) Hikata does not read tasya evo-, but tasya evo-. Hikata's reading tasya is correct, because from the context as well as according to C. (如何顯説甚深般若波羅蜜多, p. 1091 b 10–11) the pronoun here must
stand for Prajñāpāramitā.

Tosaki does not omit this dharmo, but the dharmo in the 19th line of the 70th page in accordance with Ti. By the way, as regards my omission of dharmo (p. 70. 19) and emendation of pratyupasthitā (p. 70. 20) to pratyupasthitā, I think at present that the passage should be read: dharmo na kasyacid dharmasya samyogāya vā visamyogāya vā pratyupasthitā, kathāṃ tasya nirdeśo bhaviṣyati. (tasya = prajñāpāramitāya). This reading agrees with C. (p. 1091 e 20–21): 如無有法為法合散而現在前。我當云何宣說如是甚深般若波羅蜜多。

13. (de Jong, p. 197. 29–34) Su. 98. 20–22: Yāvat kalpanā tāvad vikalpanā, nāsty atra vikalpanāsamucchedah. Yatra punah Suvikrāntavikrāmin na kalpanā na vikalpanā, tatra kalpasamucchedah. Tosani (sic !) emends vikalpanāsamucchedah to kalpana-. Ti has mi-rtogs-pa which corresponds to vikalpana. For both vikalpanāsamucchedah and kalpasamucchedah C. has kalpanāvikalpanāsamucchedah which is certainly the original reading.

(remark) Ti (Peking ed., 92 b 3) has no mi-rtogs-pa, but rtogs-pa, which made me6) emend vikalpana to kalpana-. De Jong should have mentioned the reason why he thought C. kalpanāvikalpanāsamucchedah is certainly the original reading.

By the way, Peking ed., 93 a 8–b1: de ni rtog pa med do should be emended to de ni mi rtog pa med do (corresponding to na tatra vikalpana, p. 98. 15), and Peking ed., 93 b 3: ji srid du mi rtog pa de srid du to ji srid du rtog pa de srid du (corresponding to yāvat kalpana tāvad, p. 98. 20–21) as Sde-dge edition, 85a 1, 3.

5) Tosaki, op. cit., p. 315. 6) Ibid. (Assoc. Prof., Kyushu University)