



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The Nandimitrāvadāna: a living text from the Buddhist tradition

Chen, R.

Citation

Chen, R. (2018, October 16). *The Nandimitrāvadāna: a living text from the Buddhist tradition*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/66261>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/66261>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/66261> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Chen, R.

Title: The Nandimitrāvadāna: a living text from the Buddhist tradition

Issue Date: 2018-10-16



The present chapter consists of a diplomatic edition of the Chinese translation of the **Nandimitrāvadāna** (= T2030) on the basis of the first Koryŏ edition [Kr]. The translation is attributed to Xuanzang (d. 664 AD), and was, according to some catalogs compiled by his contemporaries, completed in 654 or 662 AD.¹ It seems to me quite likely that the earliest form(s) of this translation circulated already in the 660s. The first Koryŏ edition of the Chinese Buddhist canon is part of the great cultural heritage of the Koryŏ dynasty (918–1392), to which a copy of the Kaibao canon 開寶藏² was donated by the Song imperial court. The blocks of this edition were carved, on the basis of the copy of the Kaibao canon, during the years 1011–1087, and destroyed in 1234 due to the Mongol invasion of Korea.³ But a substantial portion of this edition survives in more than 2000 printed fascicles now preserved in Korea and Japan, and the Chinese **Nandimitrāvadāna** fortunately belongs to the surviving part. For the present edition, I utilized the photograph of a surviving exemplar of this text preserved at Nanzen-ji 南禪寺 in Kyōto.⁴ According to the preliminary report on the Nanzen-ji

1. The translation is registered in a number of catalogs compiled in the late 7th or early 8th century, where it is unanimously attributed to Xuanzang. For the two different dates of its translation, see the **Datang neidian lu** 大唐內典錄 compiled by Daoxuan 道宣 (fl. 596–667) in 664 AD (see Tokuno 1990: 48–50): 大阿羅漢難陀蜜多法住記七紙 唐龍朔二年玄奘於坊州玉華宮寺譯 [T2149, 55.325c26f.] ‘The **Fazhu ji** [taught by] the Great Arhat Nandamit[ra], in seven folios; translated by Xuanzang at the monastery of the Jade-Flower-Palace of Fangzhou in the 2nd year of Long-shuo reign period of the Tang dynasty (i.e. 662)’, accepted by Mingquan 明佺 et al. (ca. 695) in his **Dazhou kanding zhongjing mulu** 大周刊定衆經目錄 (see Tokuno 1990: 50–52), cf. T2153, 55.436c22f.; see also the **Kaiyuan shijiao lu** 開元釋教錄 compiled by Zhisheng 智昇 in 730 (see Tokuno 1990: 52–58): 大阿羅漢難陀蜜多羅所說法住記一卷見內典錄 永徽五年閏五月十八日於大慈恩寺翻經院譯, 沙門大乘光筆受 [T2154, 55.557b7f.] ‘The **Fazhu ji** taught by the Great Arhat Nandimitra, in one fascicle – see the [Datang] **neidian lu**; translated in the Bureau for Translating Sūtras at great Ci’en monastery on the 18th day of the 5th intercalary month in the 5th year of Yong-hui reign period (i.e. 654), written down by the monk Guang styled Mahāyāna’. For the subtle implications of the technical term bishòu 筆受 ‘to write down’, frequently found in the colophons and catalogs of Chin. translations, see Fuchs 1930: 88, and Zacchetti 2006: 166, n. 41.

2. For the Kaibao canon in general, see Chikusa 2000: 313–318, and Zacchetti 2005: 96–99.

3. See Buswell 2004: 129f., Lancaster/Park 1979: x–xiv, Lancaster 1996: 174–177.

4. This exemplar is registered in the *Nanzen-ji kyōzō issaikyō mokuroku* 南禪寺經藏一切經目錄; see *Shōwa hōbō sōmokuroku* 昭和法寶總目錄, edited by Takakusu Junjirō & Watanabe Kaikyoku (1929), vol. 1, 844b15. The colored photos are available online via <http://kb.sutra.re.kr/ritk/sutra/sutraView.do?kcode=1046&vol=001&knameKor=대아라한난제밀다라소설법주기&knameHan=大阿羅漢難提蜜多羅所說法住記&box=畫&possLoc=남선사>.

collection,⁵ the folios used for the exemplars of the first Koryŏ edition are 27.6–28.1 cm in height (with columns 21.1–23.0 cm in height), and 43.7–49.0 cm in width. In terms of format, it turns out that the exemplars had been scrolls, and were remodeled into accordion books, since successive folds separated from one another by 5 or 6 columns are visible in the photograph; every folio contains 23 columns, in each of which 14 characters are written.

The main objective of the present diplomatic edition is to replicate the text preserved in the first Koryŏ edition as far as possible. Emendations are made to the text only when it is necessary, and are marked with superscript cross (⁺□) so as to remind the reader that the original text is altered at those points. To speak in western philological jargon, I adopt a quasi-Bédierian approach;⁶ that is to say, rather than reconstructing a hypothetical archetype, I base my edition on a select edition whose historicity is unquestionable, collating with it other accessible witnesses. The reasons for my choice are twofold. Firstly, scholars have so far identified three lineages among the xylographic editions of the Chinese Buddhist canon that have come down to us: (1) the Kaibao lineage, (2) the Liao lineage, and (3) the southern lineage.⁷ Since the present text is not testified to by the two witnesses of the second lineage (i.e., the stone-carved sūtras of Fangshan and some printings which might have formed part of the Liao canon),⁸ we only have access to editions belonging to two out of the three lineages. Hence, whenever the readings of the two lineages differ from each other, it is impossible to make any stemmatic judgment according to the majority principle. The only realistic way to deal with this case is to historically reproduce the text attested in one lineage with variants in the other noted. Secondly, the first Koryŏ edition, coupled with the Jin edition [J], constitutes the earliest witness of the Kaibao canon, i.e., the first printed canon, whose blocks were carved during and shortly after the Kaibao reign period of the Northern Song dynasty (968–976) and first used for printing in 983 AD.⁹ Judging from the relative chronology, it is reasonable to assume that the Kaibao lineage is more archaic than the southern lineage, the earliest edition of which was not produced until the late 11th century.

Among the two descendants of the Kaibao canon, the first Koryŏ edition is chronologically prior to the Jin edition, the blocks of which were presumably carved in the 12th century (ca. 1139–1173), when North China was under the

5. *Nihon nanzen-ji shozō Kōrai daizōkyō chōsa hōkokusho* 日本南禅寺所藏高麗初雕大藏經調查報告書, edited by Korea: The Research Institute for Tripitaka Koreana & Japan: International Research Institute for Zen Buddhism, Hanazono University (2010).

6. For a brief history of the French Romance philologist Joseph Bédier and his contribution to modern western textual criticism, see Trovato 2014: 77–82.

7. See Chikusa 2000: 281–287, 337–342; Li 2002: 53–57; and Zacchetti 2005: 92–95.

8. The latter mainly refers to those printings discovered inside a Buddha statue of the Yingxian timber pagoda 應縣木塔, which show a certain affinity with the stone-carved sūtra of Fangshan. But whether those belong to the Liao canon is disputed; see Naka 1996: 194–239; Chikusa 2000: 83–97; and Zacchetti 2005: 102–109.

9. The received opinion to regard 983 as the date of the completion of carving is not quite correct; see Chikusa 2000: 315–318.

Jurchen hegemony. For the collation of the present text, I utilized the main exemplar of the Jin edition discovered at Guangsheng monastery 廣勝寺 in Zhaocheng 趙城 (Shanxi).¹⁰ As far as the present text is concerned, it transpires that the two editions are almost identical in both their format and content; only in 6 cases, variations are detected, and 50% of the cases can be safely ascribed to errors pertaining to the first Koryŏ edition.¹¹ Apart from the remaining 3 cases, the whole text by and large may be traced with certainty back to its counterpart in the Kaibao canon in its original format (*viz.*, 23 columns per block, and 14 characters per column). Three cases of omitting the last stroke of two characters (i.e., jìng 敬 and yīn 殷), are found in the first Koryŏ edition, but not in the Jin edition. This method of a missing stroke in tabooed characters is attested for the first time in the Tang period, during the reign of Gaozong (650–683),¹² and was adopted by the redactors of the Kaibao canon to avoid the given names of the grandfather and father of Zhao Kuangyin 趙匡胤 (r. 960–976), the first emperor of the Northern Song dynasty, which are Jing 敬 and Hongyin 弘殷, respectively. In the few surviving exemplars of the Kaibao canon, Sasaki Isamu has only found four characters tabooed in this manner, *viz.*, jìng 敬, hóng 弘, yīn 殷, and jìng 竟 (tabooed as a homophone of the first one).¹³ The fact that two out of the four characters are attested with a missing stroke in this tiny section of the first Koryŏ edition may well be indicative of the latter's continuity with the Kaibao canon, from which a substantial portion of the tabooed characters was faithfully handed down to the descendant in Korea. The Jin edition of the present text, in marked contrast to its Korean next of kin, does not contain any tabooed character at all. This is also in line with Sasaki's observation that the Jin edition rarely, if not hardly ever, testifies to those tabooed characters, whose missing stroke was probably restored in most cases.¹⁴ If the same holds true for the present text, it is not unlikely that the three cases of tabooing stem from the Kaibao canon, the hyparchetype of this lineage.¹⁵

As for the southern lineage, the apparatus below makes reference to the five editions, from which variants are collected by the redactors of the *Taishōzō* 大正藏 and the *Zhonghua dazangjing* 中華大藏經:¹⁶

10. Reprinted in *Zhonghua dazangjing* 中華大藏經 (Beijing: 1984–1988), vol. 52, 452–456. For the history of this specific exemplar, see Li 2002: 104–106 and Zacchetti 2005: 99.

11. Cf. [C2: 20a&b], [D1.1: 23a], [E1: 3], [F1.1: 21b], [F3.1: 12b] (underscored are occurrences in which the readings of the first Koryŏ edition are erroneous and emended).

12. See Adamek 2015: 144f., §6.2.3.

13. See Sasaki 2013: 414ff.

14. See Sasaki 2013: 410.

15. In principle, the two characters with a missing stroke should be printed in the diplomatic edition which lays claim to historicity. The reason that I temporarily relegate them to the codicological notes in the apparatus is rather a technical one, to wit, the tremendous difficulties in word-processing of such incomplete characters.

16. I was able to access the readings of the following editions only from the apparatuses of these two modern editions. As far as the present text is concerned, there is no discrepancy

F: The exemplar of the so-called old Song edition preserved at the library of the Imperial Household (*kunaichō* 宮内庁) in Tōkyō, which is a mixture of two editions produced in Fuzhou in the late 11th and the 12th centuries.¹⁷

M: The Jingshan edition 徑山藏, which is a private edition mainly based on the so-called northern canon 永樂北藏 produced during the Yongle reign period of the Ming dynasty (1403–1424).¹⁸

Q: The Qisha edition 磧砂藏 rediscovered in 1931 at a monastery in Shaanxi, which is an exemplar of the canon carved in Pingjiang Prefecture 平江府 (present-day Suzhou, Jiangsu) from around 1216 onward.¹⁹

S: The Sixi edition 思溪藏, the blocks of which were first carved during the years 1126–1132 and re-carved around the mid-13th century at the same monastery in Huzhou, Zhejiang.²⁰

Y: The Puning edition 普寧藏, the blocks of which were carved during the years 1277–1290 of the Yuan dynasty at great Puning monastery 大普寧寺 in Hangzhou, Zhejiang.²¹

In three cases, I have emended the readings of the Kaibao lineage, *viz.*, those shared between the first Koryŏ and Jin editions, in favor of the readings of the southern lineage.²² The three emended characters are, in all likelihood, to be regarded as errors which first crept into the text in the Kaibao canon. But prior to the Kaibao canon, there is no datable witness of the present text, so there is virtually nothing that we can know about the textual tradition beyond that point (i.e., the late 10th century).

There is, unfortunately, no copy of the present text among the extant Dunhuang manuscripts. But the same text seems to be registered in a fragmentary catalog discovered by M.A. Stein in the Cave Library of Dunhuang (serial no. Or.8210/S.2079) under the following title:

慶友大阿羅漢所說經法住記 一<卷>²³

The sūtra [entitled] **Fazhu ji** taught by the great Arhat [named] Gracious-Friend (= Nandimitra) in one [fascicle].

This catalog, also copied in another manuscript (i.e., Pelliot chinois 3807), is deemed by Fang Guangchang as an inventory of the collection of Buddhist texts at Longxing monastery 龍興寺²⁴ dated to the period of Tibetan occupation of Dunhuang (786–848), which was modeled on the **Datang**

between the readings given by the two collations.

17. See Chikusa 2000: 340 and Zacchetti 2005: 110–112.

18. See Zacchetti 2005: 227, n. 213.

19. See Franke 1997: 124f.; Chikusa 2000: 341f., 353–355; and Zacchetti 2005: 115.

20. See Chikusa 2000: 341 and Zacchetti 2005: 112–115.

21. See Franke 1997: 123f.; Chikusa 2000: 350–353; and Zacchetti 2005: 116.

22. Cf. [A2.1: 17], [E1: 5b], and [F2.1.2+3: 22].

23. For the transcription, see Fang 2006: 191, where it is assigned an *ad hoc* running number 660 (with reference to its serial number in **Datang neidan lu**).

24. For the history of this monastery from the 8th to the 9th century and its significance for the diffusion of Chinese Buddhist canon in Dunhuang, see Fang 2006: 132–141.

neidan lu 大唐內典錄 but adapted to local practical needs.²⁵ If Fang is right, it would follow that a version of the Chinese translation of the **Nandimitrāvadāna** must have existed in Dunhuang before the mid-9th century.²⁶ However, it turns out that the case is not that simple. Quite recently, some fragments of exactly the same catalog, which were probably discovered in the Turfan region, have been identified in the Ōtani collection of the Lüshun Museum (Liaoning), the Krotkov collection at St. Petersburg and elsewhere.²⁷ These new findings demonstrate that the catalog was also circulating in the Turfan region and thus cannot have been a local compilation in Dunhuang, which reflects the state of affairs in the library of the Longxing monastery at that point. It may well have served as a practical blueprint, as it were, for collecting, depositing, or checking Buddhist texts, rather than a *de facto* inventory of books in a certain monastic library.²⁸ In other words, the catalog is normative rather than descriptive in nature; so the record of the Chinese **Nandimitrāvadāna** in the catalog does not necessarily amount to proof of the historical circulation of the text in Dunhuang.

The title of the text occurs also in another Dunhuang manuscript (serial no. Pelliot chinois 4664+4741) which appears to have originated in a sloppy hand. The content of the manuscript is not so much a catalog of a somewhat complete canon as that of sundry Buddhist texts which are grouped into a number of satchels (zhì 秩). In one of the satchels, the present text, according to the catalog, cohabits with four others:

大悲分陀<利>經八卷 仏遺曰摩尼<寶>經一卷 善恭敬<經>一卷 能斷金剛般若波羅蜜多經一卷 大阿羅漢難提蜜多羅所說法住記一卷已上十二卷同一秩

The **Mahā-Karuṇapūṇḍa*[*rīka*]-sūtra (= T158) in eight fascicles, the **Vevulla-Maṇi*[*ratna*]-sūtra (= T350; i.e., the *Kāśyapaparivarta* or *Ratnakūṭa*)²⁹ in one fascicle, the [Sūtra on] the Wholesome Worship (= T1495) in one fascicle, the *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā* (= T239) in one fascicle, and the *Fazhu ji* taught by the great Arhat Nandimitra in one fascicle. The above twelve fascicles are in the same satchel.

The ways in which satchels are shared by the different texts (hézhì 合秩) in this manuscript are idiosyncratic, insofar as no distinct pattern is discernible. In the case of two other satchels, Fang Guangchang has detected an affinity to the section ‘Register of Canonical Texts’ (rùzàng lù 入藏錄) of the **Datang neidian lu**, where most of (but not all) the texts grouped together in this

25. For a detailed comparative study of the catalog of the Longxing monastery and the **Datang neidan lu**, see Fang 2006: 147–151.

26. This seems to be taken for granted by Shih Jen-Lang; see Shih 2002: 12f.

27. For the philological treatment of these fragments in comparison with their counterparts from Dunhuang, see Wang/Meng 2017: 172–188.

28. For detailed arguments with a critical reappraisal of Fang Guangchang’s point of view, see Wang/Meng 2017: 188–190, 195f.

29. For linguistic justifications for the reconstruction of the form **vevulla-*, see Karashima 2015: 118f. For the identification of the title of the earliest Chinese translation of the *Kāśyapaparivarta*, see Pelliot 1936: 69f. It is significant that the character *yuē* 曰 instead of *rì* 日 is clearly attested in this fragment.

manuscript are also assigned to the same satchel.³⁰ This is, however, not the case with the texts mentioned above, which, as far as I am aware, are not registered in any other catalog as sharing a satchel. Given the obscure nature of the catalog, which is copied in a manuscript with scribbles in Tibetan and may well date back to the period of Tibetan occupation, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to judge whether it can be considered a piece of evidence for the text's presence in Dunhuang.

The lacuna created by the absence of Dunhuang manuscript can be filled, at least partially, by old manuscripts from Japan, where the present text forms part of seven monastic canonical collections (*issaikyō* 一切經).³¹ Within the framework of the present study, I was able to collate two out of the seven manuscripts, *viz.*, those at Kōshō-ji 興聖寺 and Kongō-ji 金剛寺.³²

The nucleus of the canon kept at Kōshō-ji (Kyōto) consists of a collection of texts donated to Kaijūsen-ji 海住山寺 (Kizugawa, Kyōto) in the Kamakura period (1185–1333), which at one time belonged to Nishiraku-ji at Tanba 丹波西樂寺 (Kobe), where they had been copied during the years 1163–1169. It was at some point between 1596 and 1615 that the donated texts were transferred from Kaikūsen-ji to Kōshō-ji, where they have been subject to supplementation several times thereafter. The transformation of their format from scrolls to accordion books did not take place until the Edo period (1603–1867).³³ The extant colophons point to the heterogeneity of the various texts incorporated into this collection, the earliest part of which stems from the Nara period (710–794).³⁴ In some cases, the Kōshō-ji manuscript attests an archaic version of the text, which is different from that transmitted in the xylographic editions but finds a parallel in other Japanese monastic canonical collections, such as that of Nanatsudera.³⁵ The Kōshō-ji manuscript [Ksh] of the present text (serial no. 446-chō-15), 25.3 cm in height (with columns 19 cm in height) and having about 17 characters per column, appears to be a copy of the late Heian period (900–1185). On the outside of the front cover, the title is written in cursive script with two characters missing: 大阿羅<漢>難提蜜多<羅>所說法住記. Folds are separated from

30. See Fang 2006: 143–145.

31. *Nihon genson hachishu issaikyō taishō mokuroku* 日本現存八種一切經対照目録, edited by Academic Frontier Project, International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies (Tōkyō: 2006), 327, Jō 1164.

32. Photographs courtesy of Prof. Ochiai Toshinori 落合俊典.

33. For the history and the origins of the Kōshō-ji collection, see Ochiai 1992: 294f., and Utsunomiya 2000: 663–666.

34. For the Nara period colophons and the Kōshō-ji manuscript of *Chu sanzang jī jī* 出三藏記集 in which some colophons of the Kaibao canon (before 983) are copied, see *Kōshōji issaikyō chōsa hōkokusho* 興聖寺一切經調査報告書, edited by Kyoto Prefectural Board of Education (1998).

35. Cf. e.g. the hagiography of Āśvaghōṣa (i.e. the *Maming pusa zhuan* 馬鳴菩薩傳), a unique version of which is preserved at Nanatsudera and Kōshō-ji and was probably based on a precursor in the Nara period, bearing witness to how the text might have looked in Tang China; see Ochiai 1992: 295–298.

one another by 5 columns. In the upper margin of the first 10 columns, the name of the monastery is written in majuscule characters: 圓通山興聖寺. No colophon, but traces of interlinear emendations are found. There are punctuation marks in red color throughout the manuscript: place and dynastic names are underlined on the right side of the Chinese characters, while personal names and book titles are stricken through with one line and two lines, respectively. Reading marks (*kunten* 訓点), a device used to facilitate the reading of Classical Chinese texts in a Japanese manner, are only found in the first two lines of the manuscript.³⁶

Kongō-ji (Nagano, Ōsaka) boasts a rich collection of canonical texts copied over the course of some three hundred years (i.e., from the late Heian to the late Kamakura period) in the monastic complex centering around it, with the addition of supplements from some collections elsewhere, e.g. those from Hatta-ji 八田寺 (Ōsaka) and Amanomiya 天野宮 (Ōsaka).³⁷ This is also a heterogeneous collection, as is evident from the fact that the colophons of the Kaibao canon found their way into some manuscripts, while some others have colophons dated to the Nara period. Furthermore, it contains some otherwise lost texts which are not found in the *Taishōzō*.³⁸ The Kongō-ji manuscript [Kg] of the present text, which shows more traces of wear than that of Kōshō-ji, is a scroll consisting of seven folios. Every folio is 25 cm in height and 54 cm in width, containing 32 columns, each of which is 19.7 cm in height and has 16–19 characters. There are no punctuation marks, nor reading marks. Glosses on three characters with their pronunciations noted in the *fǎnqiè* 反切 system are written in minuscules below the occurrence, if the rest of the column is left blank; or at the end of the text, where a remark on the assignment of the text to ‘scriptures’ (*jīng* 經) is also written.³⁹ The glosses and the remark may serve as an indication that the text was read and studied at some point before this copy was made. No colophon is found apart from a cursive remark ‘[This] has been proofread once’ (*ikkō ryō* 一交[→校]了), which seems to be written by a different hand and bears witness to the additional process of proofreading after the copy was finished. In terms of orthography, the Kongō-ji manuscript contains both simplified writings peculiar to Japan (e.g. *shì* 尺 for 釋, *mó* 广 for 摩) and idiosyncratic ligatures of disyllabic terms (e.g. *nièpán* 𪛗 for 涅槃,⁴⁰ *shēngwén* 聃 for 聲聞), which are to be systematically studied by specialists.

By and large, there seems to be an affinity between the two old Japanese

36. The lines with reading marks are transcribed as follows: 如レ是傳、聞ノ佛薄-伽-梵般-涅-槃ノ後八百年ノ中執師子國勝軍王ノ都=[...]. For the attestation of reading marks in the Kōshō-ji collection in general, see Utsunomiya 2000: 662–690.

37. For the basic information about and the sources of the Kongō-ji collection, see Akao 2005: 339–352 and Ōtsuka 2016: 27–48.

38. See Ochiai 2004 and 2007.

39. Cf. [B2: 21] and [O: 18] below.

40. For 𪛗 and 𪛗, the normal ligatures of this term, see Zhang 2010: 118 and 364–367. For 𪛗 and its occurrences in Dunhuang manuscripts, see Yu 2008: 55f.

manuscripts, which share common variants here and there. However, due to the lack of data, it is, for the time being, impossible to determine whether the affinity is genealogically significant, and a Japanese sub-branch independent of the aforementioned two lineages, therefore, cannot (yet) be postulated.

Below the edition of the text, the apparatus, and the codicological and orthographic remarks, I present the listing of citations from the Chinese *Nandimitrāvadāna* in the works composed by Chinese, Korean and Japanese monks. The citations not only constitute important *testimonia* to the text at different points of its transmission, but also provide firsthand sources for the future investigation into the history of its reception in East Asia. Since I have for the most part searched the *Taishōzō* electronically, the listing should by no means be considered exhaustive, and I could have overlooked other citations, especially those in those Japanese works that have not been incorporated into the *Taishōzō*. Be that as it may, I hope to have laid the cornerstone of a more ambitious project, which will be undertaken at some point in the future. In what follows, I offer as the final remark of this section a preliminary sketch of the *Nachleben* of the present text in East Asia, citations from which have so far been detected in the following Buddhist works written in Chinese (arranged in chronological order):

FYZL: The *Fayuan zhulin* 法苑珠林 (T2122), a Buddhist encyclopedia in 100 fascicles, completed in 668 AD by the monk Daoshi 道世 (d. 683),⁴¹ who was a younger contemporary of Xuanzang and probably witnessed the latter's translating of the present text. Within the framework of the encyclopedia, the citation of the *Nandimitrāvadāna*, which Daoshi referred to as 'newly translated' (xīnfān 新翻), belongs to the 22th chapter on 'the maintenance of the true teachings' (zhùchí 住持), in which it makes up the bulk of the 6th section dealing with the Arhats.

Gyōnghūng: The *Muryangsugyōng yōn-ŭi sulmun ch'an* 無量壽經連義述文贊 (T1748), an exegetic text on the larger *Sukhāvatīvyūha*, which was composed by the Korean monk Gyōnghūng 憬興 (fl. late 7th century) and exerted a considerable influence on the Japanese Pure Land patriarch Shinran 親鸞 (1173–1263) who quoted from this work extensively.⁴² The *Nandimitrāvadāna* was quoted in the *Sulmun ch'an* to take issue with Huiyuan of Jingying monastery 淨影寺慧遠 (523–592), who, commenting on the reference to 'the future extinction of the true teachings' in the larger *Sukhāvatīvyūha*,⁴³ adopted one of the traditional timetables of the decline (i.e., the true teachings – 500 years; the semblance of the true teachings – 1 000 years; the decadent teachings [mòfǎ/mappō 末法] – 10 000 years). By contrast, Gyōnghūng was predisposed to the alternate timetable in the *Nandimitrāvadāna*.⁴⁴

41. On the basis of some records in Buddhist catalogs, Kawaguchi Gishō inferred that Daoshi was born at some point between 599 and 609 and ordained between 611 and 621; see Kawaguchi 1976: 794–797 (= 276–279).

42. For the citations of the *Sulmun chan* in Shinran's *Kyōgyōshinshō* 教行信證, see Sumikura 1995: 553–555 (= 29–31).

43. Cf. *Wuliang shou jing* / **Amitāyusūtra* 當來之世經道滅盡 [T360, 12.279a11f.] ~ Skt. *anāgate 'dhvani yāvat saddharmavipralope vartamana* ... [ed. Fujita 2011: 74, ll. 14f.].

44. Watanabe Kenshō argued that Gyōnghūng's predilection for the timetable in the *Nandimitrāvadāna* was influenced by Huaigan, although the latter was slightly younger than the former; see Watanabe 1980: 334, and 1981: 146–147. However, since the citation of

Huaigan: The *Shi jingtu qunyi lun* 釋淨土群疑論 (T1960) composed by Huaigan 懷感 (d. ca. 700), one of the leading figures of Pure Land Buddhism during the Tang dynasty. This treatise, written in a catechetical format, attempts to address systematically various questions concerning Pure Land doctrines and to reconcile inconsistencies in various scriptures. The citation of the *Nandimitrāvadāna* is situated in a context of Huaigan's criticism of the apocalyptic vision of the Three-Stages Sect (*sānjiē jiào* 三階教),⁴⁵ which rebuts the soteriological efficacy of Mahāyāna scriptures, starting with the larger *Sukhāvatīvyūha* held dear by Huaigan. In order to expound the aforementioned *locus classicus* on the decline in this Pure Land scripture, Huaigan adduced the timetable in the *Nandimitrāvadāna*,⁴⁶ to the final part of which he added that Maitreya, after his advent in this world, preached the Pure Land teachings for sentient beings. This ending, which is not attested in any version of the *Nandimitrāvadāna*,⁴⁷ was apparently a fabrication of Huaigan who was at pains to reconcile this text with the Pure Land soteriology. The first half of the citation, as quoted by Huaigan, has a peculiar wording unknown in most of the other *testimonia*. In all likelihood, the text was paraphrased by Huaigan or by his predecessor whose work might have influenced Huaigan.

T'unnyun: The *Yugaron k'i* 瑜伽論記 (T1828), a doxographical compendium of exegetic sources on Xuanzang's translation of the *Yogācārabhūmi*, compiled by the Korean monk T'unnyun 遁倫 (aka T'oryun 道倫; ca. mid-7th century to early 8th century).⁴⁸ The citation of the *Nandimitrāvadāna* occurs, in that context, as part of an annotation on a passage from the *Śrāvakabhūmi*, which expounds the persistence of the true teachings as one of the propitious conditions regarding others (*parasampad*).⁴⁹ Having quoted the opinions of (Hui)jing [惠]景 and (Kui)ji [窺]基⁵⁰ on this issue, Tunnyun adduced various timetables of the decline in scriptural sources, including that in the *Nandimitrāvadāna*. The first half of the citation has a different wording from the other *testimonia*, but is almost identical with its counterpart in Huaigan's work. It is thus likely that Tunnyun knew this citation either from Huaigan or from a common source of which Huaigan availed himself.

the *Nandimitrāvadāna* in Gyōnghūng's text lacks the paraphrase and interpolation characteristic of that in Huaigan's catechism (see the discussion below), the hypothetical influence, in this specific case, seems to me not quite plausible.

45. For Huaigan's critique of the doctrines of the Three-Stages Sect, see Nishimoto 1990: 718–720 (= 250–252), and Kaneko 2001: 713–717 (= 207–211).

46. Kendall R. Marchman has failed to notice that this passage was quoted by Huaigan from the *Nandimitrāvadāna*, and considers it an interpretation of his own, representing a brighter outlook which Marchman attributes to the more stable and prosperous life under Tang rule (Marchman 2015: 212). This is a big mistake.

47. Paul Harrison reminds me of the possibility that Huaigan might have drawn inspiration from the appearance of the *Sukhāvatīvyūha* in the list of Mahāyāna scriptures.

48. No biography of Tunnyun or Toryun is extant; for the disputable name and nationality of this monk, see Eda 1934: 87–93 and Yang 1984: 292. Judging from the citations of contemporary works and internal evidence in this compendium, its compilation was completed at the beginning of the 8th century, probably at some point between 705 and 714; see Eda 1934: 98 and Katsumata 1938: 141.

49. Cf. *Yuqieshi di lun* / **Yogācārabhūmi*: 法教久住(...) [T1579, 30.396c26ff.] ~ *Śrāvakabhūmi* §(I)-A-II-4-b-(2)-iii: *deśitānāṃ dharmāṇāṃ avasthānāṃ katamat ...* [ed. Taishō Univ. 1998: 14].

50. For the interrelationship between this compendium of Tunnyun and the *Luezuan* 略纂 (T1829) attributed to (Kui)ji, see Hayashi-Mizutani 2015: 186–191.

FHZJ: The **Fahua zhuanji** 法華傳記 (T2068), a collection of various accounts of the origin, the transmission, and the miraculous efficacy of the **Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra**. This collection, traditionally attributed to Sengxiang 僧詳/祥, is unlikely to have been compiled by the monk Huixiang 惠/慧祥 (ca. 639–706), who is credited with the compilation of the **Hongzan fahua zhuan** 弘贊法華傳 (T2067), as was previously taken for granted.⁵¹ Judging from the dates of works quoted therein, the compilation of the collection was completed no earlier than 774 AD.⁵² The compiler quoted from the **Nandimitravadāna** twice, viz., in the 2nd section narrating the concealment and revelation (yǐnxiǎn 隱顯) of this Mahāyāna scripture, and in the 10th section concerning the future merits obtained by the worshippers of such scriptures. Two portions of the **Nandimitravadāna** seem to be especially useful to the compiler: The first one is the timetable of the decline,⁵³ which helps him frame the historical narrative of the transmission of the **Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra** during the period of the decadent teachings. The other is the passage on the second assembly under Maitreya's preaching, which consists of disciples who have engendered wholesome potentialities with respect to the Buddhist teachings; this section is instrumental in the compiler's promotion of the worship of the **Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra**.

Annyōshō: The **Annyōshō** 安養抄 (T2686) in seven fascicles, extant in a 12th-century manuscript kept at Tōdai-ji 東大寺 (Nara), is an epitome of various canonical and scholastic sources concerning some core doctrines of Pure Land Buddhism. The sources are grouped around a number of dogmatic questions and arranged in the form of a catechism. The compiler's name is not recorded in the *codex unicus*, but a work under the same title (in six fascicles) was attributed, in a Japanese catalog, to the Tendai monk Kyōgetsu-bō Ryōkei 教月房良慶 (1127–1202).⁵⁴ The work's indebtedness to the **Ōjōyōshū** 往生要集 of Genshin 源信 (942–1017) is evinced in two sourced citations from the latter.⁵⁵ As far as the citation of the **Nandimitravadāna** is concerned, the compiler seems to have appropriated the relevant passage in the aforesaid **Sulmun ch'an** of Gyōnghūng without acknowledgement of the source.

Myōe: The **Shiza kōshiki** 四座講式 (T2731) composed by the Kegon-Shingon monk Myōe 明恵 (aka Kōben 高弁; 1173–1232) for the assembly on the Buddha's Nirvāṇa (*nehan'e* 涅槃會) at his monastery Kōzan-ji 高山寺. Myōe is best known for his dream diary, but he was also a trailblazer in the history of Japanese Buddhist liturgy. One of his major contributions to the development of Buddhist liturgical literature is the **Shiza kōshiki**, a quadripartite ritual manual which he composed in 1215.⁵⁶ The

51. For instance, Hatani Ryōtai 羽溪了諦 (*pace* Hatani 1913: 1–6). For the life and date of Huixiang, see Ibuki 1987: 33–45.

52. The latest quoted work is the **Fahua wenju ji** 法華文句記 (T1719) by Zhanran 湛然 (711–782), which was completed in 774; for a systematic study of the citations in this text, see Ichioka 2012: 1–15.

53. Ichioka 2012: 10 claims that the citation of this passage in the **FHZJ** contains a significant error which betrays that the compiler probably drew this passage from the citation in the **FYZL**. This is not quite convincing, inasmuch as my collation demonstrates that the so-called error was actually the archaic reading attested in both the first Koryō edition and the old Japanese manuscripts (see [D1.1: 23a]). Therefore, it does not bear out any exclusive genealogical affinity between the two citations.

54. Arai Toshio was tempted to identify the compiler of the **Annyōshō** with this Ryōkei; see Arai 1979: 223–225 (= 9–11).

55. For the two citations, see Arai 1979: 225–230 (= 11–16).

56. For the **Shiza kōshiki** in general and an in-depth analysis of its performance practice

Nandimitrāvadāna is quoted in the second of the four sections, namely, the **Jūroku rakan kōshiki** 十六羅漢講式 ‘liturgy for the sixteen Arhats’, which is relevant to an earlier work by Myōe, i.e., the **Rakan kushiki** 羅漢供式 ‘offering ceremony for the Arhats’.⁵⁷ The ritual for the sixteen Arhats is, according to this liturgy, divided into five subsections, and the citations of the **Nandimitrāvadāna** are found in the first and the third subsections, which are concerned with enumerating the Arhats’ places of residence and proclaiming the benefits derived from this field of merit (*puṇyakṣetra*), respectively. The first citation seems to share a common source with the invitation (*kanjō* 勸請) part of the **Rakan kushiki**, where almost the same names, dwelling places, and retinues of the sixteen Arhats (with the addition of Mañjuśrī, Mahākāśyapa etc.) are embedded in a formula for dedications.⁵⁸ At the end of the second citation, Myōe also quoted the timetable of the decline up to the point of the Arhats’ passage into Nirvāṇa in an abridged form.

FZTJ: The Fo zu tongji 佛祖統記 (T2035), a Buddhist *summa historica* compiled by an orthodox Tiantai monk named Zhipan 志磐⁵⁹ during the years 1258–1269 and first printed in 1271.⁶⁰ This work is, in Schmidt-Glintzer’s words, “the apex of the historiographical efforts of Buddhists in China.”⁶¹ As the organizing principle of such a unprecedented universal account of Buddhism, Zhipan adopted the format of traditional dynastic histories, which are normally divided into five sections, i.e., basic annals (*běnjì* 本紀), hereditary houses (*shìjiā* 世家), biographies (*lièzhuàn* 列傳), tables (*biǎo* 表), and monographs (*zhì* 志). Reorganizing the Buddhist materials accessible to him into such a framework, Zhipan managed to compile a history of Buddhism after the model of official historiography entrenched in China.⁶² The citations of the **Nandimitrāvadāna** are all found in the section of monographs: The timetable of the decline is divided up and incorporated into the 30th fascicle dealing with the Buddhas in the past, present, and future, where these are mixed with Buddhist sources of various origins and rearranged in an annalistic form, taking the start of the

during Myōe’s lifetime and at Shingon temples in the Tokugawa period (with special emphasis on its musical aspect), see Mross 2016: 89–130.

57. The earliest extant manuscript of the **Rakan kushiki**, preserved at Kōzan-ji, bears a colophon dated 1205. For a photographic reprint and a transcription of the text, see Ishizuka/Yamamoto/Ōtsuki 2000: 327–366. For studies of its codicological features and musical elements, see Ishizuka 2000: 367–371; of its content in comparison with the **Jūroku rakan kōshiki**, see Yamamoto 2000: 373–381. For a discussion on Myōe and his cult of the Arhats from the perspective of intellectual history, see Maekawa 2012: 229–238.

58. The formula is as follows: [...]中[...]尊者（並自眷屬[...]大阿羅漢）：哀愍攝受所施供，證知大眾三業礼！‘The Reverend N.N. in SOMEWHERE (together with his own retinue [consisting of] UMPTEEN great Arhats): May you be so compassionate as to accept what is offered, and be mindful of the homage [paid by] the great assembly with three actions (i.e. with respect to body, speech and mind)!’; cf. Ishizuka/Yamamoto/Ōtsuki 2000: 359–361. For the commonality between the two ritual texts, see Yamamoto 2000: 377.

59. We are not quite informed about the life of this monk, whose dates of birth and death are unknown. For a biographical study of Zhipan, see Jan 1963: 61–66.

60. For bibliographical and historical studies of the **Fo zu tongji**, see Jan 1963: 66–81, and Schmidt-Glintzer 1982: 108–122.

61. Schmidt-Glintzer 1982: 108.

62. Such a historiographical framework, to be sure, was not tailor-made for the Buddhist tradition. Therefore, it is quite understandable that Zhipan had to freely handle this organizing principle in some cases, so as to avoid putting the history of Buddhism on a Procrustean bed; see Franke 1961: 130.

period of the decadent teachings as the reference point. And the account of the various ways in which the Arhats partake of the offerings is quoted under the rubric of ‘offering ceremonies for the Arhats’ (gòng luóhàn 供羅漢), which is one of the Buddhist festivals, ceremonies, and cultic activities enumerated in the 33rd fascicle. Apart from sporadic cases of rewording, the citations are close to those in the **Fayuan zhulin**.

Raihō: The **Shakumakaenron kanchu** 釋摩訶衍論勘注 (T2290), a sub-commentary on the **Shi moheyan lun** 釋摩訶衍論 (T1668) attributed to Nāgārjuna, which is itself an apocryphal commentary on the **Dasheng qixin lun** 大乘起信論 (T1667) attributed to Aśvaghoṣa. According to its colophons, the sub-commentary was composed by the Shingon monk Raihō 賴寶⁶³ at Kōyasan 高野山 during the years 1317–1320. Raihō adduced the sentence mentioning 100 crores of Mahāyāna scriptures from the **Nandimitravadāna** to comment on the number of Buddhist scriptures prescribed in the **Shi moheyan lun** as 100 lakhs.⁶⁴

63. The dates of Raihō are disputable. A colophon has it that the sub-commentary was completed when Raihō was 42 years old, so he was probably born in 1279. However, with regard to his date of death, various sources contradict one another; see his biography in *Shingonshū zensho* 真言宗全書, vol. 43, 336–338.

64. Cf. **Shi moheyan lun**: 總百洛叉數 [T1668, 32.593b20] ‘Totally 100 lakhs in number’.

[o] Chinese title, *Qianziwen* character, and translator

大阿羅漢難提蜜多羅所說法住記 畫

2 大唐三藏法師玄奘奉 詔譯

2 大唐]JKr; Ø FKgKshQSY; 唐 M.

[A1]

- 3 如是傳聞：佛薄伽梵般涅槃後八百
年中，執師子國勝軍王都，有阿羅漢
名難提蜜多羅<sup>唐言
慶友</sup>，具八解脫、三明、
6 六通、无諍、願、智、邊際定等，无量功德
皆悉具足，有大威神，名稱高遠，以願
智力，能知此界一切有情種種心行。

4 阿羅漢] JKgKrKsh; 羅漢 FMQSY.

5a 難提蜜多羅] 難提蜜多羅法 Ksh. 5b 具] 住具 Ksh.

8 能知] 能智 Ksh.

FYZL T2122, 53, 511c22-24: 又依新翻《大阿羅漢難提蜜多羅所說法住記》云：薄伽梵般涅槃後八百年中，執師子國勝軍王都，有阿羅漢名難提蜜多羅<sup>唐云
慶友</sup>。

[A2.1]

- 9 復能隨順作諸饒益。化願既畢，將般
涅槃。集諸苾芻、苾芻尼等，說已所證
諸妙功德，及應所行利樂有情。諸勝
12 事業，皆悉成辦。告時衆曰：「自今已後，
无復所為；唯无餘依，是所歸趣。仁等
當知，有疑可問。」時，諸大衆聞是語已，
15 舉聲號哭，不能自持，宛轉於地。或起
唱言：「佛薄伽梵久已涅槃，諸聖弟子
亦隨寂滅。世間久空，无真⁺調御。今唯
18 尊者，為天人眼。如何復欲弃捨我等？
願垂哀愍，少留壽命。」尊者慶友慰喻
衆言：「不須啼泣。仁等當知，世間法尔
21 有生必滅。諸佛如來降服四魔，於壽
自在；隨順世故，猶示涅槃。況我今者，||
豈宜恒住？設隨汝請，亦无利益。當體
2 此意，勿生憂惱。但有疑者，應可速問。」

12 辦] 弁 Kg. 17 真⁺調御] em. after FKgKshMQSY; 真諦御 JKr. 19 垂] Ø
Kg. 20 啼泣] 帶泣 Ksh.

22 猶示涅槃] 猶示𣵵 Kg. This character is also attested in Dunhuang manuscripts (e.g. Pelliot chinois 2173, Or.8210/S.2662) as a ligature of 涅槃; see Yu 2008: 55f. The origin of the ligature and the process of its derivation are unclear.

FYZL T2122, 53.51C24–26: 化緣既畢，將般涅槃。集諸苾芻苾芻尼等：「但有疑者，應可速問。」

[A2.2]

- 3 諸苾芻等，雖承告示，猶增涕噎，良久
乃問：「我等未知世尊釋迦牟尼無上
正法當住幾時。」尊者告曰：「汝等諦聽。
- 6 如來先已說《法住經》，今當為汝粗更
宣說。佛薄伽梵般涅槃時，以無上法
付囑十六大阿羅漢并眷屬等，令其
- 9 護持使不滅沒。及勅其身，與諸施主
作真福田，令彼施者得大果報。」

4 釋迦] 尺迦 Kg. 8 等] 并 Ksh. 9 及] 乃 M. 10 果報][子]報 Kg.

7 般涅槃] 般矣 Kg.

FYZL T2122, 53.51c26–512a3: 承告，涕噎，良久乃問：「我等未知世尊釋迦牟尼與(sic)上正法當住幾時。」時，尊者告曰：「汝等諦聽。如來先已說《法住經》，今當為汝粗更宣說。佛薄伽梵般涅槃時，以無上法付囑十六大阿羅漢并諸眷屬，令其護持使不滅沒。及勅其身，與諸施主作真福田，令彼施者得大果報。」

Gyõnghũng T1748, 37.170b8–11: 今依《法住記》云：佛滅度時，以無上法付囑十六大阿羅漢并諸眷屬，令其護持使不滅沒。及勅其身，與諸施主作真福田，令彼施者得大果報。

FHZJ T2068, 51.50b21–23: 若依《法住記》：佛薄伽梵般涅槃時，以無上法付囑十六大阿羅漢并眷屬，並令其護持使不滅沒。

Annyõshõ T2686, 84.191c10–13: 今依《注記》(sic)云：佛滅度時，以無上法付屬十六大阿羅漢并諸眷屬，令其護持使不滅沒。及勅其身，與諸施主作真福田，令彼施者得大果報。

FZTJ T2035, 49.319b7f.: 供羅漢：佛滅時，付囑十六阿羅漢，與諸施主作真福田。

[B₁]

時，諸

大衆聞是語已，少解憂悲，復重請言：

- 12 「所說十六大阿羅漢，我輩不知其名
何等。」慶友答言：「第一尊者名賓度羅
跋囉惰闍。第二尊者名迦諾迦伐蹉。
15 第三尊者名迦諾迦跋釐隳闍。第四
尊者名蘇頻陀。第五尊者名諾距羅。
第六尊者名跋陀羅。第七尊者名迦
18 理迦。第八尊者名伐闍羅弗多羅。

14 跋囉惰闍] 拔惰闍 Ksh, 跋惰聞 Kg. 15 隳] 惰 F; 惰 KgKsh. 16 距]
矩 KgKshMSY. 18 闍] 閱 F.

12 知] 如 made over to 知 Ksh.

FYZL T2122, 53.512a3-17: 時，諸大衆聞是語已，少解憂悲，復重請言：「所說十六大阿羅漢，我輩不知其名何等。」慶友答言：「第一尊者名賓度羅跋囉惰闍[...]第二尊者名迦諾迦伐蹉[...]第三尊者名迦諾跋釐隳惰闍[...]第四尊者名蘇頻陀[...]第五尊者名諾距羅[...]第六尊者名跋陀羅[...]第七尊者迦理迦[...]第八尊者名伐闍羅弗多羅[...]

[B2]

- 18 第
九尊者名戍博迦。第十尊者名半託
迦。第十一尊者名囉怛羅。第十二尊
21 者名那伽犀那。第十三尊者名因揭
陀。第十四尊者名伐那婆斯。第十五
尊者名阿氏多。第十六尊者名注荼||
半託迦。如是十六大阿羅漢，一切皆具
三明、六通、八解脫等無量功德，離三
3 界染，誦持三藏，博通外典。承佛勅故，
以神通力延自壽量，乃至世尊正法
應住，常隨護持；及與施主作眞福田，
6 令彼施者得大果報。」

19 託] 諾 Kg. 20 囉] 羅 KgKsh. 21 那] 那 FKgKshMQSY. 23a 氏]
伐 Kg. 23b 注荼] 住荼 Ksh, 法荼 Kg.
1 託] 語 Kg. 2 脫] Ø Kg. 5 應住] 遍住 Kg.

21 名那伽犀那] 那伽犀那 Ksh (with 「名」落[軼] noted in red color); 名那伽犀那 Kg, with two glosses on 犀 and 那 in the fǎnqiè 反切 system, which I tentatively read 素慙反 and 尼牙反. **3 故]** 放 Ksh (with 故 noted in red color).

FYZL T2122, 53, 512a18-b6: 第九尊者名戍博迦[...]第十尊者名半託迦[...]第十一尊者名囉怛羅[...]第十二尊者名那伽犀那[...]第十三尊者名且(因 MY)揭陀[...]第十四尊者名伐那婆斯[...]第十五尊者名阿氏多[...]第十六尊者名注荼半託迦[...]如是十六大阿羅漢，一切皆具三明、六通、八解脫等無量功德，離三界染，誦持三藏，博通外典。承佛勅故，以神通力延自壽量，乃至世尊正法應住，常隨護持；及與施主作眞福田，令彼施者得大果報。

FZTJ T2035, 49.319b8f.: 時，阿羅漢咸承佛勅，以神通力延自壽量。

[C1]

尔時，苾芻、苾芻尼等復重請言：「我等

不知十六尊者多住何處，護持正法，

9 饒益有情。」慶友答言：「第一尊者，與自

眷屬千阿羅漢，多分住在西瞿陀尼

洲。第二尊者，與自眷屬五百阿羅漢，

12 多分住北方迦濕彌羅國。

7 苾芻] Ø Kg. 12 住] 住在 FKgKshMQSY.

FYZL T2122, 53.512a5-8: 慶友答言：「第一尊者[...], 與自眷屬千阿羅漢，多分住在西瞿陀尼洲。第二尊者[...], 與自眷屬五百阿羅漢，多分住在北方迦濕彌羅國。

Myōe T2731, 84.901a11-14: 《法住記》云：第一尊者[...], 與自眷屬一千阿羅漢，多分住西瞿陀尼州。第二尊者[...], 與自眷屬五百阿羅漢，多分住北方迦濕彌羅國。

[C2]

- 12 第三尊者，
與自眷屬六百阿羅漢，多分住在東
勝身洲。第四尊者，與自眷屬七百阿
15 羅漢，多分住在北俱盧洲。第五尊者，
與自眷屬八百阿羅漢，多分住在南
瞻部洲。第六尊者，與自眷屬九百阿
18 羅漢，多分住在耽沒羅洲。第七尊者，
與自眷屬千阿羅漢，多分住在僧伽
⁺茶洲。第八尊者，與自眷屬千一百⁺阿
21 羅漢，多分住在鉢刺拏洲。

15 住在] 住 Kg. 20a ⁺茶] em. after FJKgKshMQSY; 茶 Kr. 20b ⁺阿] em.
after FJKgKshMQSY; 何 Kr.

FYZL T2122, 53.512a9–18: 第三尊者[...], 與自眷屬六百阿羅漢, 多分住在東勝身洲。
第四尊者[...], 與自眷屬七百阿羅漢, 多分住在北俱盧洲。第五尊者[...], 與自眷
屬八百阿羅漢, 多分住在南瞻部洲。第六尊者[...], 與自眷屬九百阿羅漢, 多分
住在耽沒羅洲。第七尊者[...], 與自眷屬千阿羅漢, 多分住在僧伽茶(茶 MY)洲。
第八尊者[...], 與自眷屬千一百阿羅漢, 多分住在鉢刺拏洲。

Myōe T2731, 84.901a14–23: 第三尊者[...], 與自眷屬六百阿羅漢, 多分住東勝身州。
第四尊者[...], 與自眷屬七百阿羅漢, 多分住北俱盧州。第五尊者[...], 與自眷屬
八百阿羅漢, 多分住南瞻部州。第六尊者[...], 與自眷屬九百阿羅漢, 多分住耽
沒羅州。第七尊者[...], 與自眷屬一千阿羅漢, 多分住僧伽茶州。第八尊者[...],
與自眷屬一千一百阿羅漢, 多分住鉢刺拏州。

[C3]

- 21 第九尊者，
與自眷屬九百阿羅漢，多分住在香醉
山中。第十尊者，與自眷屬千三百阿||
羅漢，多分住在三十三天。第十一尊
者，與自眷屬千一百阿羅漢，多分住
3 在畢利颺瞿洲。第十二尊者，與自眷
屬千二百阿羅漢，多分住在半度波
山。第十三尊者，與自眷屬千三百阿
6 羅漢，多分住在廣脇山中。第十四尊
者，與自眷屬千四百阿羅漢，多分住
在可住山中。

2 千一百] 千百 Kg. 5a 山] 山中 Kg. 5b 千三百] 千二百 Ksh.

FYZL T2122, 53.512a18-27: 第九尊者[...], 與自眷屬九百阿羅漢, 多分住在香醉山中。第十尊者[...], 與自眷屬千三百阿羅漢, 多分住在三十三天。第十一尊者[...], 與自眷屬千一百阿羅漢, 多分住在畢利颺瞿洲。第十二尊者[...], 與自眷屬千二百阿羅漢, 多分住在半度波山。第十三尊者[...], 與自眷屬千三百阿羅漢, 多分住在廣脇山中。第十四尊者[...], 與自眷屬千四百阿羅漢, 多分住在可住山中。

Myōe T2731, 84.901a23-b3: 第九尊者[...], 與自眷屬一千二百阿羅漢, 多分住香醉山。第十尊者[...], 與自眷屬一千三百阿羅漢, 多分住三十三天。第十一尊者[...], 與自眷屬一千一百阿羅漢, 多分住畢利颺瞿州。第十二尊者[...], 與自眷屬一千二百阿羅漢, 多分住半度波山。第十三尊者[...], 與自眷屬一千三百阿羅漢, 多分住廣脇山。第十四尊者[...], 與自眷屬一千四百阿羅漢, 多分住可住山。

[C4.1]

第十五尊者，與自眷屬

- 9 千五百阿羅漢，多分住鷲峯山中。第十六尊者，與自眷屬千六百阿羅漢，多分住在持軸山中。諸仁者，若此世界一切國王、輔相、大臣、長者、居士，若男若女，發慍淨心，為四方僧，設大施會，或設五年無遮施會，或慶寺、慶像、慶經幡等施設大會；

 9 住]JKr; 住在 FKgKshQMSY. 11 持軸山] 譬持軸山 Ksh. 12 輔相] 轉相 Kg. 15 慶經幡] 慶經慶經幡 Ksh.

=====

FYZL T2122, 53.512a27-b2 & b6-9: 第十五尊者[...], 與自眷屬千五百阿羅漢, 多分住在鷲峯山中。第十六尊者[...], 與自眷屬千六百阿羅漢, 多分住在持軸山中。[...] 若此世界一切國王、輔相、大臣、長者、居士, 若男若女, 發殷重(淨 FMSY)心, 為四方僧, 設大施會, 或設五年無遮施會, 或慶寺、慶像、慶經幡等施設大會; Myōe T2731, 84.901b3-6 & 901c28-902a1: 第十五尊者[...], 與自眷屬一千五百阿羅漢, 多分住鷲峯山。第十六尊者[...], 與自眷屬一千六百阿羅漢, 多分住持軸山。[...] 《法住記》云: 若此世界一切國王、輔相、大臣、長者、居士, 若男若女, 發慍淨心, 為四方僧, 設大施會。

[C4.2]

- 15 或延請僧至所
住處，設大福會；或詣寺中經行處等，
安布上妙諸坐臥具、衣、藥、飲食，奉施
- 18 僧衆。時，此十六大阿羅漢及諸眷屬，
隨其所應，分散往赴；現種種形，蔽隱
聖儀，同常凡衆，密受供具，令諸施主
- 21 得勝果報。如是，十六大阿羅漢護持
正法，饒益有情。

15 或] 咸 FQSY. 16 住處] 住家 Ksh. 19 往赴] 往起 Ksh. 20 密] 蜜
Ksh. 21 護] 獲 Kg.

21 護]  Ksh (with the orthographic form 護 noted in red color).

FYZL T2122, 53.512b9-15: 或延請僧至所住處，設大福會；或詣寺中經行處等，安布上妙諸座臥具、衣、藥、飲食，奉施僧衆。時，此十六大阿羅漢及諸眷屬，隨其所應，分散往赴；現種種形，蔽隱聖儀，同常凡衆，密受供具，令諸施主得勝果報。如是，十六大阿羅漢護持正法，饒益有情。

FHZJ T2068, 51.50b23-24: 十六阿羅漢護持正法，饒益有情。

Myōe T2731, 902a1-4: 此十六羅漢及諸眷屬，隨其所應，分散往赴；現種種形，陰弊聖儀，示同凡衆，密受供具，令諸施主得勝果報；護持正法，饒益有情。

FZTJ T2035, 49.319b9-12: 若請四方僧，設無遮施，或所住處，或詣寺中，此諸尊者及諸眷屬，分散往赴，蔽隱聖儀，密受供具，令諸施主得勝果報。《法住記》始賓度羅終半托(sic)迦，凡十六位。

[D1.1]

- 22 至此，南瞻部洲人壽
極長至於十歲，刀兵劫起，互相誅戮；||
佛法爾時當暫滅沒。刀兵劫後，人壽
漸增，至百歲位。此洲人等，厭前刀兵
3 殘害苦惱，復樂修善。時，此十六大阿
羅漢與諸眷屬，復來人中，稱揚顯說
无上正法；度无量衆，令其出家；爲諸
6 有情作饒益事。

22 至] Ø KgKsh. 23a 長] KgKrKsh; 短 FJMQSY. 23b 起] 赴 Kg.

23 互] 𠂔 Ksh (with the orthographic form 互 noted in red color). 1 刀兵劫後]
刀兵{起}劫後 Ksh.

FYZL T2122, 53.512b15–21: 至此，南瞻部洲人壽極長至於十歲，刀兵劫起，互相誅戮；佛法爾時當暫滅沒。刀兵劫後，人壽漸增，至百歲位。此洲人等，厭前刀兵殘害苦惱，復樂修善。時，此十六大阿羅漢與諸眷屬，復來人中，稱揚顯說無上正法；度無量衆，令其出家；爲諸有情作饒益事。

Gyõnghũng T1748, 37.170b13–18: 至此，南瞻部州人壽極長至於十歲，刀兵劫起，互相誅戮；佛法爾時當暫滅沒。刀兵劫後，人壽漸增，至百歲位。此洲人等，厭前刀兵殘害苦惱，復樂修善。時，此十六大阿羅漢與諸眷屬，復來人中，稱揚顯說無上正法；度無量衆，令其出家；爲諸有情作饒益事。

T'unnyun T1828, 42.431c12–19 = **Huaigan** T1960, 47.48c15–22: 又慶友《法住記》言此佛法：刀兵劫後，人心厭惡，咸起慈心，不相殺害，共相怜愍，如父如子。命漸增長，至滿百年。十六大阿羅漢[...]并餘眷屬[...]還以[...]教法流行於世，化導群生，造寺度僧，修戒、定、慧。

FHZJ T2068, 51.50b24–25: 此州人壽極長至於十歲。佛法暫滅沒。後，人壽漸增，至四萬歲位。阿羅漢俱來人中，顯說正法。

Myōe T2731, 84.902a4–6: 刀兵劫後，人壽漸增，至百歲位。與諸眷屬，來人中，顯說正法，饒益有情。

FZTJ T2035, 49.299c15f. 南洲人壽至十歲時，刀兵劫起，互相誅戮；佛法是時當暫滅沒。
法住記

[D1.2]

- 6 如是，乃至此洲人壽
六萬歲時，無上正法流行世間，熾然
無息。後至人壽七萬歲時，無上正法
9 方永滅沒。時，此十六大阿羅漢與諸
眷屬，於此洲地，俱來集會；以神通力
用諸七寶造窣堵波，嚴麗高廣。釋迦
12 牟尼、如來、應、正等覺所有遺身馱都，
皆集其內。

11 釋] 积 Kg. 13 集] 悉 F.

FYZL T2122, 53.512b21–26: 如是，乃至此洲人壽六萬歲時，無上正法流行世間，熾然無息。後至人壽七萬歲時，無上正法方未(永 **FMSY**)滅沒。時，此十六大阿羅漢與諸眷屬，於此洲地，俱來集會；以神通力用諸七寶造窣堵波，嚴麗高廣。釋迦牟尼、如來、應、正等覺所有遺身馱都，皆集其內。

Gyõnghũng T1748, 37.170b18–23: 如是，乃至此洲人壽六萬歲時，無上正法流行世間，熾然不息。後至人壽七萬歲時，無上正法方永滅沒。時，此十六大阿羅漢與諸眷屬，於此洲地，俱來集會；以神通力用諸七寶造窣堵波，嚴麗高廣。釋迦如來所有遺身，都集其內。

T'unnyun T1828, 42.431c19–21 = **Huaigan** T1960, 47.48c22–24: 佛法熾盛，至增人壽六萬歲末、七萬歲初。諸阿羅漢總集如來所有舍利，共造寶塔。

FHZJ T2068, 51.50b26–28: 乃至六萬歲時，無上正法流行世間，熾盛(v.l. 然)無息。至七萬歲時，無上正法永滅沒。

Annyõshõ T2686, 84.191c13–19: 如是，乃至此州人壽六萬歲時，無上正法流行世間，熾然不息。後至人壽七萬歲時，無上正法方永滅沒。時，此十六大阿羅漢與諸眷屬，於此州地，恒來集會；以神通力用諸七寶造窣堵波，嚴麗高廣。釋迦如來所有遺身，都集其內。

Myõe T2731, 84.902a6f.: 乃至人壽七萬歲時，無上正法永滅沒。至此時可唱入滅云云。

FZTJ T2035, 49.300a8f.: 《法住記》：人壽七萬歲時，十六羅漢用七寶造窣堵波，釋迦遺身馱都，皆集其內。

[D2.1]

- 尔時，十六大阿羅漢與諸眷屬，繞窣堵波，以諸香、花持用供養，
- 15 恭敬讚歎，繞百千匝。瞻仰禮已，俱升虛空，向窣堵波作如是言：「敬禮世尊、釋迦、如來、應、正等覺！我受教勅，護持
- 18 正法，及與天人作諸饒益。法藏已沒，有緣已周，今辭滅度。」

 17 釋] 尺 Kg. 19 有緣] 化緣 M.

16 敬] 敬 Kr (with the last stroke omitted because the name of the grandfather [i.e., Jing] of the first emperor was tabooed in the Northern Song dynasty. This taboo persisted until the end of 1162; see Adamek 2015: 164f.); but not attested in J.

FYZL T2122, 53.512b26–c2: 爾時，十六大阿羅漢與諸眷屬，遶窣堵波，以諸香、華持用供養，恭敬讚歎，遶百千匝。瞻仰禮已，俱昇虛空，向窣堵波作如是言：「敬禮世尊、釋迦、如來、應、正等覺！我先受勅，護持正法，及與天人作諸饒益。法藏已沒，有緣已周，今辭滅度。」

Gyõnghũng T1748, 37.170b24–29: 爾時，十六大阿羅漢與諸眷屬，遶窣堵波，以香、華持用供養，恭敬讚歎，遶百千匝。瞻仰禮已，俱昇虛空，向窣堵波作如是言：「敬禮世尊、釋迦、如來、應、正等覺！我受教勅，護持正法，及與天人作諸饒益。法藏已沒，有緣已周，今辭滅度。」

T'unnyun T1828, 42.431c21–25 = Huaigan T1960, 47.48c24–28: 十六阿羅漢與諸眷屬，遶塔供養，散諸香、華。瞻仰禮已，俱昇虛空，作如是言：「敬禮世尊、釋迦、如來、應、正等覺！我受教勅，護持正法，及與天人作諸饒益。法藏已沒，有緣已周，今辭滅度。」

Annyõshõ T2686, 84.191c19–24: 爾<時>，十六大阿羅漢與諸眷屬，造窣堵婆。以香、花持用供養，恭敬讚嘆，遶百千匝。瞻仰禮已，俱昇虛空，向窣堵波作如是言：「敬禮世尊、釋迦、如來、應、正等覺！我<受>教勅，護持正法，及與天人作諸饒益。法藏已沒，有像已周，今辭滅度。」

FZTJ T2035, 49.300a9f.: 香、花供養，作如是言：「我先受勅，護持正法，及與天人作諸饒益。法藏已沒，有緣已周，今辭滅度。」

[D2.2]

說是語已，一時

俱入无餘涅槃。先定願力，火起焚身；

21 如燈焰滅，骸骨无遺。時，宰堵波便陷

入地，至金輪際方乃停住。尔時，世尊

釋迦牟尼无上正法，於此三千大千||

世界，永滅不現，從此无聞。此佛土中，

2 有七萬俱胝獨覺一時出現。

21a 焰] Ø Ksh. 21b 遺] 貴 Ksh. 21c 宰] 卒 Kg. 23 釋] 尺 Kg. 1 聞] JKrM; 間 FKgKshSY.

20a 无餘涅槃] 无餘矣 Kg. 20b 火] 大 made over to 火 Ksh.

FYZL T2122, 53.512b26–c2: 說是語已，一時俱入無餘涅槃。先定願力，火起焚身；如燈焰滅，骸骨無遺。時，宰堵波便陷入地，至金剛際方乃停住。爾時，世尊釋迦牟尼無上正法，於此三千大千世界，永滅不現，從此無聞。此佛土中，有七百俱胝獨覺一時出現。

Gyõnghũng T1748, 37.170b29–c5: 說是語已，一時俱入無餘涅槃。聖先定願力，火起焚身；如燈炎滅，骸骨無遺。時，宰堵波便陷入地，至金輪際方乃停住。爾時，世尊釋迦牟尼無上正法，於此三千大千世界，永滅不現，從此無聞。此佛土中，有七萬俱胝獨覺一時出現。

T'unnyun T1828, 42.431c25–432a2 = Huaigan T1960, 47.48c28–49a5: 說是語已，一切俱入無餘涅槃。其舍利塔便陷入地，至金輪際方乃停住。[...]爾時，世尊釋迦牟尼無上正法，於此三千大千世界，永滅不現，從此無聞。此佛土中，有七萬俱胝獨覺一時出現。

Annyõshõ T2686, 84.191c24f.: 說是語已，一時俱入無餘涅槃。光定願力，火起焚身；如燈焰滅，髓骨無遺。時///

FZTJ T2035, 49.300a9–11: 先定願力，火起焚身。時，宰堵波便陷入地，住金剛際。爾時釋迦正法永滅。從此世間，有七百俱胝獨覺一時出現。

[E1]

至人壽

- 3 量八萬歲時，獨覺聖復皆滅度；次後，
彌勒如來、應、正等覺出現世間。時，瞻
部洲廣博嚴淨；无諸荆棘、谿谷、堆⁺阜，
6 平正潤澤，金沙覆地。處處皆有清池、
茂林、名花、瑞草，及衆寶聚，更相暉映，
甚可愛樂。人皆慈心，修行十善；以修
9 善故，壽命長遠。豐樂安隱，士女殷稠，
城邑鄰次，雞飛相及。所營農稼，一種
七穫；自然成實，不須耘耨。

3 獨覺聖] Kr; 獨覺聖衆 JKgKshMQSY, 獨覺聖教 F. 5a 諸] Ø Ksh. 5b ⁺阜] em. after FKgMQSY; 埠 JKrKsh. 6 清池] 清淨池 KgKsh. 7a 名花] 名花 Ksh. 7b 聚] 聖 Kg. 11a 耨] 稱 Ksh.

9 殷] 殷 Kr (with the last stroke omitted because the name of the father [i.e., Hongyin 弘殷] of the first emperor was tabooed in the Northern Song dynasty; see Adamek 2015: 274); but not attested in J. 11 實] 寶 made over to 實 Ksh.

FYZL T2122, 53.512c8–10: 至人壽八萬歲時，獨覺聖衆復皆滅度；次後，彌勒如來、應、正等覺出現世間。時，瞻部洲廣博嚴淨。

Gyõnghũng T1748, 37.170c5f.: 至人壽量八萬歲時，獨覺聖衆復皆滅沒；次後，彌勒如來出世。

T'unnyun T1828, 42.432a2–3: 至人壽量八萬歲時，獨覺聖衆復皆滅度；以後，彌勒出現世間。

Huaigan T1960, 47.49a5–8: 其人壽量八萬歲時，獨覺聖衆復皆滅度。次後，彌勒出現世間，還為衆生說淨土教，令無量衆得生淨土。

FZTJ t2035, 49.300A11: 人壽八萬歲時，獨覺聖衆復皆滅度；次後，彌勒如來出現世間。

[E2]

諸仁者，於

- 12 彼時中，國界莊嚴、有情果報，陳之難
盡。具如《彌勒成佛經》說。彌勒如來成
正覺已，為聲聞眾三會說法，令出生
15 死，得證涅槃。第一會，度九十六俱胝
聲聞眾。第二會，度九十四俱胝聲聞
眾。第三會，度九十二俱胝聲聞眾。

11 於] Ø Kg.

15 得證涅槃] 得證矣 Kg. 16 九十四俱胝聲聞] 九十四俱胝耳 Kg (prob. a
ligature for 聲聞, two characters both containing the radical 耳). 17 九十二俱胝
聲聞] 九十二俱胝耳 Kg

FHZJ T2068, 51.95b4f.: 《法住記》云：彌勒如來成正覺已，為聲聞眾三會說法，令
出生死，得證涅槃。

[F1.1]

若

- 18 國王、大臣、長者、居士、男女一切施主，
 於今釋迦牟尼佛正法中，能為佛事；
 自種善根，或教他種。謂：以七寶、金、銀、
 21 真珠、璧玉、香材、鍤石、銅、鐵、木、石、泥，或以
 繒縷，或以綵畫，作佛形像及窣堵波，
 若大若小，乃至最小如指節量；或以||
 1 香、花諸妙供具，若多若少，而為供養。

18 國王] 諸國王 FKgKshMQSY. 19a 釋迦] 尺迦 Kg. 19b 為佛事] 為佛事
 佛 Kg. 21a 材] 林 FKgKsh. 21b 泥] KgKrKsh; 尼漆 J; 泥土 FMQSY. 22
 窣堵波] 卒都波 Kg. 23 小] 少 Ksh. 1 少] 小 Kg.

[F1.2]

彼由如是善根力故，至弥勒如來成

- 3 正覺時，善得人身；於彼佛第一會中，
以淨信心，捨俗出家，剃除鬚髮，披著
法服。既預聖衆，隨宿願力，便得涅槃。
- 6 是名第一爲佛事故種善根者所得
果報。

4a 以淨信心] 淨□信心 Kg. 4b 剃] 淨 FKgKshMQSY. 4c 披] 被 KgKsh
5 法服] 善法服 Ksh.

5 既預聖衆] {既以淨信心捨俗出家}既預聖衆 Ksh (prob. a dittography noticed by the copyist who left the rest of the line blank and resumed the text on a new line).

[F2.1]

若諸國王及以臣、庶、一切施主，

於今釋迦牟尼佛正法中，能為法事；

9 自種善根，或教他種。

8 釋] 尺 Kg.

FHZJ T2068, 51.95b5-7: 乃至若諸國王及以臣、度一切施，於今釋迦牟尼佛正法種，
能為法事；自種善根，或教他(v.l. 化)種。

[F2.1.1]

9

謂於大乘素咀

纘藏，所有甚深、空性相應諸大乘經；

謂：(1)般若波羅蜜多經、(2)妙法芬陀利迦

12 經、(3)金光明經、(4)金剛手藏經、(5)首楞伽摩

三摩地經、(6)幻喻三摩地經、(7)大神變三

摩地經、(8)集諸功德三摩地經、(9)還如來

15 智印三摩地經、(10)具諸威光三摩地經、

(11)寶臺經、(12)集諸菩薩三摩地經、(13)諸佛攝

受經、

9 咀] 怛 KshM; 但 Kg. 12 金剛手藏經] 金剛手藏 KgKsh. 14 還] 逮
FMQSY; Ø KgKsh.

=====

13-16 三摩地] 三广地 Kg. 16 菩薩] 并 Kg.

FHZJ T2068, 51.95b7-9: 謂於大乘素咀覽藏，所有甚深、空性相應諸大乘經；謂：
般若波羅蜜多經、妙芬陀利(v.l. 羅)經、金光明經等。

[F2.1.2+3]

- (14)集請問經、(15)梵王問經、(16)善吉問經、
 18 (17)勇猛問經、(18)能滿問經、(19)海龍王問經、(20)無
 熱惱龍王問經、(21)樹幢龍王問經、(22)寶掌
 問經、(23)寶髻問經、(24)虛空音問經、(25)虛空吼
 21 問經、(26)幻網問經、(27)寶女問經、(28)妙女問經、
 (29)善臂問經、(30)師子問經、(31)猛⁺授問經、(32)金光
 女問經、

19 幢] 幢 KgKsh. 20 吼] 孔 Kg. 22 ⁺授] 校 JKr, 校 S; after FKgKshMQY.
 23 經] Ø Ksh.

19 熱] 勢 made over to 契 Ksh.

[F2.1.4+5]

- 23 (33)說无盡慧經、(34)說無垢稱經、(35)末||
 生怨王經、(36)諦實經、(37)那羅延經、(38)佛花嚴
 經、(39)蓮華手經、(40)十佛名經、(41)无量光衆經、
 3 (42)極樂衆經、(43)集淨華經、(44)大集經、(45)入一切
 道經、(46)寶幢經、(47)寶聚經、(48)寶篋經、(49)彩畫經、
 (50)高頂王經。如是等大乘經，有百俱胝，
 6 部黨差別。復有大乘毗奈耶藏、阿毗
 達磨藏，衆多部類。一切皆是菩薩藏
 攝。

 23 无盡慧] 无應惠 Kg, 无盡惠 Ksh. 2a 蓮華] 蓮花 KgKsh. 2b 十] 千
 MQY. 3 淨華] 淨花 KgKsh. 4 幢] 幢 Kg, 愜 Ksh. 5 高] 尚 Kg.

=====

4 寶篋經] 寶{一入切到經寶幢經}篋經 Kg (prob. a dittography noticed by the
 copyist who left the rest of the line blank and wrote 篋經 on a new line).
 7 菩薩藏] 并藏 Kg.

FHZJ T2068, 51.95b9-11: 如是等大乘經，有百俱胝，部黨差別；大乘毘奈耶[...]
 Raihō T2290, 69.627c6-8: 《法住記》云：諸大乘經，有百俱胝，部黨差別。復有
 大乘毘那耶藏、阿毘達摩藏，衆多部類。一切皆是菩薩藏攝。

[F2.2]

復有聲聞三藏；謂：素怛纜藏、毗奈

- 9 耶藏、阿毗達磨藏。素怛纜藏有五阿
 笈摩；謂：長阿笈摩、中阿笈摩、增一阿
 笈摩、相應阿笈摩、雜類阿笈摩。毗奈
 12 耶藏中，有苾芻戒經、苾芻尼戒經、分
 別戒本、諸蘊差別及增一律。阿毗達
 磨藏中，有攝、六問、相應、發趣等衆多
 15 部類。

 8-11 阿笈摩] 阿笈广 Kg, 阿笈磨 Ksh. 15 磨] 广 Kg.

=====
 8 聲聞三藏] 𑖦三藏 Kg (𑖦 is prob. a ligature for 聲聞).

FHZJ T2068, 51.95b11: 聲聞三藏[...]

Raihō T2290, 69.627c8-9: 復有聲聞三藏[...]有五阿笈摩略抄。

[F2.3.1]

- 15 復有本生鬘讚、獨覺鬘讚。於如
 是等正法藏中——或是佛說，或菩薩說，
 或聲聞說，或諸仙說，或諸天說，或智
 18 者說——能引義利，乃至有能於四句頌，
 若自誦，若教他誦，若自讀，若教他讀，
 若自持，若教他持，若自解說，若教他
 21 解說；或於法師恭敬供養；

 17 聲聞] 了了 Kg.

21 敬] 敬 Kr (with the last stroke omitted because of the aforementioned taboo); but not
 attested in J. 20 自持] 自於 made over to 持 Ksh.

FHZJ T2068, 51.95b11-15: 於如是等正法藏中——或是佛說，或菩薩說，或聲聞說，
 或諸天說，或智者說——能引義利，乃至有能於四句頌，若自讀，若教他讀，若
 自持，若教他持，若自解說，若教他解說；或於法師恭敬供養；

[F2.3.2]

21

或於經卷

恭敬供養——謂：以種種香花、幡蓋、伎樂、
燈明，而爲供養；或於經卷，以諸雜綵、||
囊𦃟、縷帶而嚴飾之。由如是等善根
力故，至彌勒如來成正覺時，善現人身；

3 於彼佛第二會中，以淨信心，捨離家

法，出趣非家，淨除鬚髮，披著法服；既
預聖衆，隨宿願力，便得涅槃。是名第

6 二爲法事故種善根者所得果報。

22 幡] 幡 KgKsh. 1 𦃟] 𦃟 KgKsh. 2 現] 得 MQSY. 4 披] 被 KgKsh.

4 披] 披 made over to 被 Ksh.

FHZJ T2068, 51.95b15-22: 或於經卷恭敬供養——謂：以種種香華、幡蓋、伎樂、
燈明而爲供養；或於經卷，以諸雜綵、囊𦃟、縷帶而嚴飾之。由如是等善根力故，
至彌勒如來成正覺時，善得人身；於彼佛第二會中，以淨信心，捨離家法，出趣
非家，淨除鬚髮，披著法服；既預聖衆，隨宿願力，便得涅槃。是名第二爲法事
故種善根者所得果報^{法雲經彼記}大同此文。

[F3.1]

若諸國王及臣、庶、一切施主，於今釋

迦牟尼佛正法中，能爲僧事；自種善

9 根，或教他種。謂：諸苾芻、苾芻尼衆，或

次第請，或隨緣請，於月一日，或月八

日，或十五日，設齋供養；或往寺中，若

12 供養佛，若供養衆；或作給⁺侍；或有供

養修靜慮者；或有供養諸說法者；或

見有人，欲於正法學習、流布，從師聽

15 受，不作留難，施其所安，无令怯退；或

設五年无遮施會；或施四方僧；

7a 臣庶] 臣庶等 FKgKshMQSY. 7b 釋] 尺 Kg. 9 諸] 於 KgKsh. 11
齋] 香 Kg. 12a 佛] 一 KgKshMQSY. 12b ⁺侍] 付 Kr; after FJKgKshMQSY.
14 學] 覺 Ksh. 15 難] 經 Kg.

9 或(教)] 或 *ditto* Kg. 11 (八)日] 月 made over to 日 Kg.

[F3.2]

或施寺

舍及坐卧具；或施鍾磬；或施園林；如是

- 18 等類，供養僧衆。彼由如是善根力故，
 至弥勒如來成正覺時，善得人身；於彼
 佛第三會中，以淨信心，捨離家法，出
 21 趣非家，淨除鬚髮，披著法服；既預聖
 衆，隨宿願力，便得涅槃。是名第三爲
 僧事故種善根者所得果報。

 16 寺] 与 Kg. 21 披] 被 KgKshMSY. 22 衆] 衆生 Kg.

=====

18 由] 申 made over to 由 Ksh. 22a 宿] 當 made over to 宿 Ksh. 22b 得
 涅槃] 得矣 Kg. 22c 為] 名 made over to 為 Ksh.

[G1]

- 23 尔時，慶||
- 友大阿羅漢爲諸大衆廣說如上事
- 已，以神通力，於大衆前身昇虛空，高
- 3 七多羅樹；示現種種不可思議雙神
- 變事，令所觀衆增進勝道。時，彼尊者
- 現神變已，即於空中結跏趺坐；捨諸
- 6 壽行及諸命行，入无餘依般涅槃界；
- 先定願力，火起焚身，於虛空中雨身
- 遺骨。時，諸大衆悲歎希有，競收遺骨，
- 9 起窣堵波，以諸香花、寶幢、幡蓋、伎樂、
- 燈明，常爲供養。

3 雙] 大 MQSY. 5 結] 洁 Kg. 6 依] Ø Kg. 9a 窣] 變 Kg. 9b 幢]

幢 KgKsh. 9c 幡] 幡 KgKsh. 10 燈] Ø Kg.

6 般涅槃界] 般矣界 Kg.

[G2]

此《法住記》，古昔諸師

展轉相承，誦持不忘；爲令一切國王、

12 大臣、長者、居士、諸施主等，了達因果，

厭生、老、病、死、芭蕉、幻焰、泡沫之身，修

諸勝業，於當來世，逢事弥勒，解脫煩

15 惱，得大涅槃；生受樂故，於佛正法護

持、建立，令久不滅。

 10 諸] 法 Ksh. 11 轉] 輔 Ksh. 13 幻焰] 幻炎 Kg. 14 勝業] 勝樂
 Kg. 15 受] FJKr; 愛 KgKshMQSY. 16a 持] 於 Ksh. 16b 令久] 合反
 Ksh.

=====

14-15 煩惱] □ (a ligature which I cannot read) Kg. 15 得大涅槃] 得大矣 Kg.

[o'] End title

18 大阿羅漢難提蜜多羅所說法住記

18a 大阿羅漢難提蜜多羅] 慶友大阿羅漢 FKgKshS.

18b 法住記] 法住記一卷 KgKsh.

18 大阿羅漢難提蜜多羅所說法住記] 慶友大阿羅漢所說法住記一卷 Kg; with two lines of additional notes written by the same hand:

目錄中經中入，々此義甚吉。《法住經》者，佛說也。个者(→者个)尊者仿之。

‘[It is] assigned to “scriptures” in the catalog, [it] makes good sense to assign it to this (category). The **Fazhu jing** (= T390?) was preached by the Buddha. This Elder (= Nandimitra) emulated him (= the Buddha).’

穫胡郭反。乎腹反。什(→詩)：「十月之(=穫)稻」也。得也。口也。禾荀(→刈禾)也。七枝也。

This is obviously a gloss on the pronunciation and semantics of the character 穫 that occurs in [E1: 11].