

IMRE HAMAR

THE HISTORY OF THE *BUDDHĀVATAṂSAKA-SŪTRA*:  
SHORTER AND LARGER TEXTS\*

In the Taishō edition of the Chinese Buddhist canon, one can find the *Huayan* section (*huayan bu* 華嚴部) in part two of volume nine as well as in volume ten. It does not merely contain the so-called “original or complete translations” of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* (T 278 and T 279, known in Chinese as *benbu* 本部), but also freestanding translations of works corresponding to certain chapters of these larger works (referred to in Chinese as *zhipin* 支品),<sup>1</sup> as well as works which do not correspond to any of the chapters but were presumably written under the influence of the *Huayan* works and were thus traditionally considered to be *Huayan*-related works (*juanshu jing* 眷屬經). The Chinese terms *ben* 本 (root, origin) and *zhi* 支 (branch, descendent) clearly imply that according to the Chinese tradition the freestanding translations originate from a “complete” *sūtra* which is regarded as the revelation of Buddha’s experience of enlightenment under the *bodhi* tree.<sup>2</sup> However, modern philological investigations, as we shall see below, have shown that the larger *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtras* (T 278 and T 279) were compiled on the basis of shorter *sūtras*.

The so-called “original translations” are also called abridged version (*lüeben* 略本) since, as legend has it, the primordial *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* was much longer than any of the extant versions. According to this legend, Nāgārjuna (c. second century CE), the founder of the Madhyamaka philosophy, brought the *sūtra* into the world from the palace of serpents (*nāga*).<sup>3</sup> The serpents guarded three versions, which the Chinese exegetes call the upper (*shang* 上), middle (*zhong* 中) and lower

\* This study was completed through the sponsorship of the Hungarian National Research Fund (OTKA Nr. T 047023). I thank Jan Nattier, Peter Skilling, Paul Harrison, CHEN Jinhua and ŌTAKE Susumu for reading an earlier version of this article and providing their comments.

<sup>1</sup> As of the Sui period (581–618), the catalogues indicate the correspondences between the so-called partial translations and chapters from the larger works. Fajing’s 法經 *Zhongjing mulu* 眾經目錄 T 2146: 55.119c11–120a1. and Yancong’s 彥琮 *Zhongjing mulu* 眾經目錄 T 2147: 55.159a22–b6.

<sup>2</sup> Wei 1998: 41.

<sup>3</sup> *Nāgas* played an important role even in early Buddhism. A *nāga* can be a serpent, a human or a low-ranking god. See Rawlinson 1986: 135–153. According to the *Mahāyāna* legend, Nāgārjuna visited the *nāgas* and there he discovered the *prajñāpāramitā-sūtras*, which had been unknown after Buddha’s death. See Williams 1989: 55.

(*xia* 下) *sūtras*. The longest is the upper version, which consisted of *ślokas*<sup>4</sup> identical in number to that of the specks of dust in the great universe and chapters identical in number to that of the specks of dust in the four worlds. The middle version contained 498,800 *ślokas* and 1200 chapters while the lower version consisted of 100,000 *ślokas* and 48 chapters.<sup>5</sup> The upper and middle versions were too difficult for people, so Nāgārjuna brought the shortest version with him. This story was thought to be borne out by the fact that, according to the *Dazhi du lun* 大智度論, *The Sūtra of the Inconceivable Enlightenment* (\**Acintyavimokṣa-sūtra*, *Buke siyi jietuo jing* 不可思議解脫經) consisted of 100,000 verses.<sup>6</sup> And this *sūtra* is none other than the last chapter of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*. This legend can be traced back to Jizang 吉藏 (549–623), who had read about it in Nāgārjuna’s biography.<sup>7</sup>

In the first half of this article, I examine the translations of the larger *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* and the freestanding translations of its chapters (T 278–298). In the second half I demonstrate with a table how the chapters of the larger works and the freestanding translations of the chapters correspond to one another. In this article I will not cover works that are included in the *Huayan* section but do not correspond to any of the chapters in the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* (T 299–309).<sup>8</sup>

<sup>4</sup> The Chinese *jie* 偈 and *song* 頌 are translations of the Sanskrit *gāthā* and *śloka*. If it is a measure of length, *śloka* is the appropriate Sanskrit term. See Gómez 1967: XXV. n. 1.

<sup>5</sup> We first encounter this with Zhiyan in the *Huayan* school in his work entitled *Huayan jing nei zhangmen deng za kongmuzhang* 華嚴經內章門等雜孔目章 T 1870: 45.586c23–26. It can also be found in the works of the later patriarchs: Fazang’s *Huayan jing zhigui* 華嚴經旨歸 T 1871: 45.593b10–15. and *Huayan jing guanmai yiji* 華嚴經關脈義記 T 1879: 45.656c1–22, HZ T 2073: 51.153a29–b4, HTJ T 1733: 35.122b16–19. and Chengguan’s *Da fangguang fo huayan jing shu* 大方廣佛華嚴經疏 T 1735: 35.523a10–22.

<sup>6</sup> T 1509: 25.756b7.

<sup>7</sup> Jizang examined why the title of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* does not appear in the text. He explained that only 36,000 of the 100,000 *ślokas* of the lower version reached China and that the title can only be found in the part that follows, which was not translated into Chinese (T 1780: 38.863b19–27.). According to Indian custom, the title is placed at the end of the work; it was Daoan 道安 (312–385) who placed it at the beginning of the work in line with Chinese custom (T 1780: 38.863c8–9.). Jizang read about the three versions in Nāgārjuna’s biography, which Sengtān 僧曇 had brought from Khotan. Sengtān and his eleven companions set off for Inner Asia in 575 with the objective of bringing back Buddhist works that were not available in China. They returned home in 581 with 260 Sanskrit manuscripts. These works were translated into Chinese by Jñānagupta (Shenajueduo 闍那崛多) and other translator-monks. The translation of Nāgārjuna’s biography has not survived, however, and none of the catalogues confirms the existence of such a work from this era. Nāgārjuna’s biography has only survived in a translation by Kumārajīva (344–409/413); however, it lacks the section about the three versions. If we accept Jizang’s report as credible then this detail was added to the text during the 150 years between the death of Kumārajīva and the expedition. Perhaps it was in Khotan that the text was expanded, bearing out the close connection between Khotan and the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*. See Ōnishi 1985: 500–505.

<sup>8</sup> For a detailed description of the *Huayan sūtras*, see Takamine 1976: 457–469; Ishii 1964: 57–134. It is on the basis of these that Frédéric Girard prepared his excellent French-language summary. See Girard 1990: 16–27.

### The *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* in India

The *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* is among the longest of the Mahāyāna *sūtras*; however, only two chapters have survived in Sanskrit: the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra*, which describes the spiritual development of a bodhisattva, and the *Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra*, which relates the search for the path by a young boy named Sudhana.<sup>9</sup> This latter work has inspired a great deal of Buddhist art; indeed, the theme is depicted in pictures and carvings from Borobudur to Japan.<sup>10</sup> In fact, I had an opportunity not long ago to view by torchlight the statues depicting the 53 stations of Sudhana's journey in the Duobao 多寶 Pagoda of Dazu 大足.<sup>11</sup> Relatively few Buddhist *sūtras* have survived in Sanskrit, so the dearth of Sanskrit manuscripts is by no means an indication that the work never existed in Sanskrit. The commentaries are of great use in determining the originality of a work and in examining how it is cited in other Indian works.

No written Indian commentary to any version of the larger *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* collection has survived, nor is it certain whether one ever existed. Two Indian commentaries relevant to the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* have been preserved, although both discuss only one chapter of the *sūtra*, the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra*. The first is the *Shizhu piposha lun* 十住毘婆沙論,<sup>12</sup> which, according to tradition, was written by Nāgārjuna and which comments on the first two of the ten stages. Vasubandhu (400–480) wrote the second, the *Daśabhūmivyākhyāna* (*Shidi jing lun* 十地經論),<sup>13</sup> which expounds on the entire *sūtra*. Several Indian works quote from the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*. The *Da zhidu lun* 大智度論, which is attributed to Nāgārjuna, cites the *Bukesiyi jing* 不可思議經, which corresponds to the *Gaṇḍavyūha*. If we accept the authorship of Nāgārjuna, then the *Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra* must already have existed in the 2nd or 3rd centuries. Lamotte, however, disputes this and considers the author of the work a Northern Indian monk who lived in the 4th century and is likely to have belonged to the Sarvāstivāda school.<sup>14</sup> The *Sūtra-samuccaya*, attributed to Nāgārjuna but composed by an unknown author in the 5th century, cites twice the *Avataṃsaka-sūtra* by name, however it also cites component texts of the *Avataṃsaka-sūtra* under their own titles, i.e. the *Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra*, the *Tathāgatopattisaṃbhava-sūtra*, *Daśabhūmika-sūtra*, and *Lokottara-parivarta*.<sup>15</sup> The *Ratnagoṭravibhāga*, written by Sāramatī in the 5th century, quotes from the *Appearance of Tathāgata in*

<sup>9</sup> For these works and Sanskrit publications, see Nakamura 1980: 194–197. The *Gaṇḍavyūha* title is difficult to define. The word *gaṇḍa* means 'stem of a plant, part of something' and *vyūha* is 'arrangement, heap, manifestation'. On this basis Gómez translated the title as *The Sūtra Containing Manifestations in Sections*. This definition is also supported by the fact that the text was referred to by sections called *vimokṣas*. See Gómez 1967: 61–62.

<sup>10</sup> Fontein 1967.

<sup>11</sup> For a detailed description of the statues, see Li 2002: 171–193.

<sup>12</sup> T 1521.

<sup>13</sup> T 1522.

<sup>14</sup> Lamotte 1970.

<sup>15</sup> I am grateful to Paul Harrison for calling my attention to this text.

the *World* chapter (*Rulai chuxian pin* 如來出現品),<sup>16</sup> while in his work entitled *Śikṣā-samuccaya* Śāntideva (686–763) quotes from the *Leader of the Good* chapter (*Xian-shou pin* 賢首品), the *Ten Dedications* chapter (*Shi huixiang pin* 十迴向品), *Detachment from the World* chapter (*Li shijian pin* 離世間品) and the *Pure Practice* chapter (*Jingxing pin* 淨行品) using the titles *Ratnolkādhārānī*,<sup>17</sup> *Vajradhvaja-sūtra*,<sup>18</sup> *Lo-kottaraparivarta*,<sup>19</sup> and *Gocarapariśuddhi-sūtra*,<sup>20</sup> respectively. It is important to note that even in this late Indian work Śāntideva refers to chapters in the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* as freestanding *sūtras*. This might indicate that the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, which corresponds to the sixty- and eighty-fascicle versions of the *Huayan jing*, was unknown in India as one work, and was known only by individual chapters. However, ŌTAKE Susumu has attempted to show that the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, in fact, was composed in India.<sup>21</sup>

### Partial Translations before the Translation of the Larger *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*

The first Chinese translation of the larger *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* was finished in 420; prior to that, however, certain chapters had appeared as separate *sūtras*.<sup>22</sup> These early translations characteristically do not correspond to individual chapters, but are rather extracts from several chapters of the larger *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*. This raises the question of the connection between the partial translations and the translation of larger version. Were summaries made from the larger works or, conversely, were the larger *sūtras* compilations based on early freestanding works? According to KIMURA Kiyotaka, the simplicity of the early works provides evidence that they appeared earlier than the larger works.<sup>23</sup>

The earliest translation is associated with the name Lokakṣema, who translated a work entitled *Fo shuo dousha jing* 佛說兜沙經<sup>24</sup> between 178 and 189, which corresponds to the *Names of Tathāgata* (*Rulai minghao pin* 如來名號品) and *Enlightenment through the Light of Tathāgata* (*Rulai guangming jue pin* 如來光明覺品) chapters in the sixty-fascicle work.<sup>25</sup> The word *dousha* in Lokakṣema's title is a

<sup>16</sup> Takasaki 1966: 189–192.

<sup>17</sup> Bendall and Rouse 1922: 3, 152, 291.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 24, 29, 204, 255, 291.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 151.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 310. Ōtake Susumu has called my attention to the fact that Vasubandhu's *Mahāyāna-sūtrālaṃkāra-bhāṣya* also refers to this chapter under this title and that Asvabhāva's *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha-upanibandhana* quotes a poem from the *Gocarapariśuddhi-sūtra*. (T 1598: 31.412b)

<sup>21</sup> See his article in this book.

<sup>22</sup> For a list and examination of the early works, see Kimura 1977: 6–12.

<sup>23</sup> Kimura 1992: 11–14.

<sup>24</sup> T 280.

<sup>25</sup> Eric Zürcher accepts 29 works as Han period translations on the basis of Chinese catalogues and style. Included among these is the *Fo shuo dousha jing*. See Zürcher 1991: 298.

transliterated Sanskrit word; however, it cannot be unmistakably identified. One possible solution is *daśa*, which means ten.<sup>26</sup> One reason that this is likely is that the number ten has great significance in the work. It introduces the characteristics of a bodhisattva with a list of ten.<sup>27</sup> Some of these characteristics can also be found in the titles of individual chapters of the larger works; it is therefore likely that the editors of the larger *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtras* used this work as a source in editing individual chapters.<sup>28</sup> The number ten frequently occurs throughout the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* with the suggestion of perfection.

The *sūtra* entitled *The Fundamental Activity of a Bodhisattva as Related by Buddha* (*Fo shuo pusa benye jing* 佛說菩薩本業經),<sup>29</sup> which Zhi Qian translated nearly fifty years later between 222 and 228, is extremely important in terms of the formation of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*. Before any further investigation, it is important to emphasize that the chronological order of the translations does not necessarily correspond to the order in which the original source works appeared. Indeed, it is conceivable that one work came to China much later than another. As a result, it is not certain that the Indian antecedent of *Fo shuo dousha jing* mentioned previously was composed earlier than that of *The Fundamental Activity of a Bodhisattva*. The work is divided into three parts: the first part either has no title or the title has not survived. The title of the second part is *The Practice of Making Good Wishes* (*yuanxing pin* 願行品), and that of the third is *The Ten Stages* (*shidi pin* 十地品). The antecedents of the following chapters in the sixty-fascicle *Huayan jing* can be discerned in the work: *The Names of Tathāgata* (*Rulai minghao pin* 如來名號品), *Enlightenment through the Light* (*Rulai guangmingjue pin* 如來光明覺品), *Pure Practice* (*Jingxing pin* 淨行品), *The Ascent of Buddha to the Peak of Mount Sumeru* (*Fo sheng Xumiding pin* 佛昇須彌頂品), *The Bodhisattvas Gather as Clouds in the Palace of the Glorious Victory and Recite Poems* (*Pusa yunji miaosheng dianshang shuojie pin* 菩薩雲集妙勝殿上說偈品) and *The Ten Abodes of the Bodhisattvas* (*Pusa shizhu pin* 菩薩十住品).<sup>30</sup>

According to SAKAMOTO Yukio, it would be erroneous to assume that these six chapters evolved directly out of this *sūtra* since the following works can be considered to be their middle stations of development: *Fo shuo dousha jing*, the *Bodhisattvas Ask about the Fundamental Activity of Buddha Sūtra* (*Zhupusa qiu fo benye jing*

<sup>26</sup> Alternative solutions are *tathāgata*, *toṣa* (satisfaction). See Girard 1990: 17.

<sup>27</sup> T 280: 10.445a27–b3.

<sup>28</sup> The following chapters are in the sixty-fascicle work: *Ten Abodes* (11), *Ten Deeds* (17), *Ten Inexhaustible Treasuries* (18), *Ten Dedications* (21), *Ten Stages* (22), *Ten Supernatural Knowledges* (23) and *Ten Acceptances* (24). They correspond to the following chapters in the eighty-fascicle version: 15, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28 and 29.

<sup>29</sup> T 281. According to Jan Nattier as well, the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* developed from this *sūtra*. Nattier 2003: 192, n. 38. Kobayashi Jitsugen, however, points out that there are significant differences between this *sūtra* and the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*. Indeed, the protagonist here is Śākyamuni buddha, whereas it is Vairocana Buddha in the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*. Furthermore, the essential aim of the work is to describe the path of the *bodhisattva* and not to introduce the absolute world of Buddha. See Kobayashi 1958: 168–169.

<sup>30</sup> For a comparison of the texts, see Sakamoto 1964: 301–314.

諸菩薩求佛本業經)<sup>31</sup> and the *Practices of the Ten Stages of the Bodhisattvas* chapter (*Pusa shizhu xingdao pin* 菩薩十住行道品).<sup>32</sup> However, Jan Nattier has compared these three works (*Dousha jing*, *Zhupusa qiu fo benye jing*, *Pusa shizhu xingdao pin*) with the *Fundamental Activity of the Bodhisattva* and convincingly showed that fitting the three *sūtras* together produces a text that corresponds to the *Fundamental Activity of the Bodhisattva*. It can be concluded that the three texts were originally a translation of one work, although it was preserved in three parts in the transmission process and therefore later came to be seen as three separate works.<sup>33</sup> Accordingly, from the aspect of the evolution of the text, the three works do not represent a later developmental stage, but another translation/recension of the very same work. This translation was done by Lokakṣema.

The work of Dharmarakṣa, who also translated several *Huayan sūtras* into Chinese, represents a milestone in the spread of these works. Already in the CSJ, the following works are listed as his translations:<sup>34</sup>

1. *Going Beyond the World* (*Du shi pin jing* 度世品經)<sup>35</sup> 27 May 291.
2. *The Appearance of Tathāgata as Related by Buddha* (*Fo shuo rulai xingxian jing* 佛說如來興現經)<sup>36</sup> 31 January 292.
3. *Gradually Obtaining the Virtue of Omniscience* (*Jianbei yiqie zhi de jing* 漸備一切智德經)<sup>37</sup> 21 December 297.
4. *The Ten Abodes of the Bodhisattva* (*Pusa shizhu jing* 菩薩十住經) 9 November 302.<sup>38</sup>
5. *The Ten Stages of the Bodhisattva* (*Pusa shidi jing* 菩薩十地經) 28 December 303.<sup>39</sup>
6. *The Bodhisattva Equal Eyes Asks about the Ten Samādhis* (*Dengmu pusa suowen sanmei jing* 等目菩薩所問三昧經)<sup>40</sup> 284–308?

According to his biography, Dharmarakṣa travelled with his master to Central Asia, where he learned the local languages and collected Buddhist manuscripts. Unfortunately, the biography does not tell us when the journey took place or what areas Dharmarakṣa visited. However, no mention is made of any translations done by him between 273 and 284, and it is therefore possible that he journeyed west then.<sup>41</sup> He

<sup>31</sup> T 282.

<sup>32</sup> T 283.

<sup>33</sup> See Nattier's article in this volume and Nattier 2005.

<sup>34</sup> For the dates of the works on the basis of the CSJ, see Boucher 1996: 33.

<sup>35</sup> T 292.

<sup>36</sup> T 291.

<sup>37</sup> T 285.

<sup>38</sup> The date of this work can only be found in the Song, Yuan and Ming editions of the CSJ. It is therefore uncertain.

<sup>39</sup> The date of this work can only be found in the Song, Yuan and Ming editions of the CSJ. It is therefore uncertain.

<sup>40</sup> T 288.

<sup>41</sup> Boucher 1996: 34–35. For an English translation of his biography in the CSJ, see *Ibid.* 23–30. For more details on Dharmarakṣa, see Zürcher 1959: 65–70.

translated the *Huayan sūtras* afterwards, so he is likely to have collected these materials during his journey. The fourth and fifth works have not survived, while the rest can be found in the Chinese collections. The date of the sixth work is uncertain, although it can presumably be placed after he returned from Central Asia (284?) and before he completed the last translation which can be dated with certainty (308). This item is missing from Daoan's catalogue, which is frequently cited by the CSJ, so this provides some grounds for suspicion.<sup>42</sup> This *sūtra* is extremely interesting in respect of the fact that it is absent from the sixty-fascicle *Huayan jing*, whereas it is included in the eighty-fascicle version under the title *Chapter of the Ten Concentrations* (*Shiding pin* 十定品). KIMURA Kiyotaka is of the opinion that on this basis it cannot be ruled out that the eighty-fascicle *sūtra* appeared earlier than the sixty-fascicle work.<sup>43</sup> It is more likely, however, that the eighty-fascicle version came about later and that its editor or editors also incorporated this *sūtra*, which had previously circulated independently.

Dharmarakṣa's *Appearance of Tathāgata Sūtra* (\**Tathāgatotpattisaṃbhava-nirdeśa-sūtra*)<sup>44</sup> is also noteworthy in several respects. First of all, as has been demonstrated by Takasaki Jikidō, this work is an important precursor to the inception of the *Tathāgatagarbha* theory.<sup>45</sup> The translation by Dharmarakṣa contains an introductory part which is not included in either the sixty- or eighty-fascicle *Huayan jing*; it is included, however, in the Tibetan translation.<sup>46</sup> Either the translators of the larger Chinese version omitted this part or it had been missing from the original Sanskrit manuscript as well. A further remarkable aspect of the work is that, in addition to the *Chapter of the Appearance of Tathāgata*, it also contains the *Chapter of the Ten Acceptances* (*Shiren pin* 十忍品). Like translations from earlier periods, therefore, this translation also includes more than one chapter of the later larger *Huayan jing*. It appears that the *Rulai xingxian jing* 如來興顯經, a work mentioned by the LSJ and translated by Bai 白 or Bo 帛 Fazu 法祖, who lived in the time of Emperor Hui 惠 (r. 290–306) of the Jin 晉 dynasty (265–420), is another translation of this work.<sup>47</sup> However, the CSJ makes no mention of this work and so its existence is in serious doubt. According to the LSJ, another translation of this *sūtra* is the *Dafanguang rulai xingqi weimizang jing* 大方廣如來性起微密藏經, which was completed in the Yuankang 元康 period and whose translator is unknown.<sup>48</sup> According to the KSL, however, this is simply an independently circulated version of the text from the sixty-fascicle *Huayan jing*, and it cannot therefore be considered a new translation.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>42</sup> T 2145: 55.8c11.

<sup>43</sup> Kimura 1992: 13.

<sup>44</sup> TAKASAKI Jikidō reconstructed the Sanskrit title on the basis of the Tibetan title. See Takasaki 1958: 348–343.

<sup>45</sup> Takasaki 1974: 574–602.

<sup>46</sup> For a Japanese translation of the Tibetan text, see Takasaki 1981: 127–280.

<sup>47</sup> T 2034: 49.66b2. His biography in the GZ does not mention the translation. T 2059: 50.327a13–c11.

<sup>48</sup> T 2034: 49.68a22, b1–2.

<sup>49</sup> T 2154: 55.590c12. KAGINUSHI Ryōkei 鍵主良敬 also argued in favour of this prior to the discovery of the text. See Kaginushi 1973: 37–56; 1974: 842–848.

This version was lost in China, but was recently discovered in the Nanatsudera Temple in Nagoya.<sup>50</sup> An investigation of this text has borne out the claim made by the KSL.<sup>51</sup>

The *Gradually Obtaining the Virtue of Omniscience Sūtra*, the translation of the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra*, and the two other lost translations by Dharmarakṣa (4, 5) also demonstrate the ten stages of the spiritual development of a bodhisattva. This indicates that this work enjoyed great popularity during this period. The LSJ is the first source that attributes the translation of five *Huayan sūtras* to Nie Daozhen 聶道真, Dharmarakṣa's scribe. From among these it is only the *Bodhisattvas Ask about the Fundamental Activity of Buddha Sūtra* mentioned previously which has survived. The CSJ makes mention of this and two other works, *The Original Vow and Practice of the Bodhisattvas* (*Pusa benyuan xing pin jing* 菩薩本願行品經)<sup>52</sup> and *The Ten-stage Path of the Bodhisattvas* (*Pusa shi dao di jing* 菩薩十道地經),<sup>53</sup> however, it considers their translator unknown. The other two works attributed to Nie Daozhen (*Shizhu jing* 十住經 and *Pusa chudi jing* 菩薩初地經) also deal with the spiritual development of a bodhisattva.

One of the works lost early on is the *Shidi duanjie jing* 十地斷結經, whose translator, according to certain works, was Zhu Falan 竺法蘭,<sup>54</sup> who, as legend has it, came to Luoyang with the Chinese delegation following a dream of the Emperor Ming 明 (r. 58–75).<sup>55</sup> If this were true, it would mean that the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra* would already have been translated into Chinese in the first century. According to the KSL, Zhu Fonian 竺佛念 also translated a work between 365 and 385, the *Shidi duanjie jing* or *Shizhu duanjie jing* in ten fascicles. The title of Taishō 309 is similar: *Zuisheng wen pusa shizhu chugou duanjie jing* 最勝問菩薩十住除垢斷結經. The translator of this is also Zhu Fonian and it also consists of ten fascicles; it is therefore likely that the catalogue is referring to this work. This *sūtra*, however, is not identical to the *Ten Stages* chapter in the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, so it can only be listed among works related to the *Huayan*. It is a sign of serious interest in the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra* that, prior to the translation of the larger *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, it was rendered into Chinese two more times: by Gītamitra under the title *Fo shuo pusa shizhu jing* 佛說菩薩十住經<sup>56</sup> and by Kumārajīva and Buddhayaśas under the title *Shizhu jing* 十住經.<sup>57</sup>

The last chapter of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, *Gaṇḍavyūha*, was also translated before the larger translation. The Taishō canon also contains the *Foshuo luomojie jing* 佛說羅摩伽經,<sup>58</sup> which Shengjian 聖堅 rendered into Chinese between 389 and

<sup>50</sup> Numerous works thought to have been lost have come to light at this temple, so it is an extremely important discovery for research on Buddhism. See Ochiai 1991.

<sup>51</sup> For an edition of the text, see Kimura 1999.

<sup>52</sup> T 2145: 55.23a13.

<sup>53</sup> T 2145: 55.22c23.

<sup>54</sup> KSL T 2154: 55.478b08, GZ T 2059: 50.323a14.

<sup>55</sup> Tsukamoto 1979: vol. I. 45.

<sup>56</sup> T 284.

<sup>57</sup> T 286.

<sup>58</sup> T 294.



406.<sup>59</sup> The work consists of only three fascicles, so it is quite fragmentary compared to later translations.<sup>60</sup> According to the LSJ, An Faxian 安法賢 had translated it in the 3rd century under the same title,<sup>61</sup> whereas Dharmakṣema translated it at the beginning of the 5th century.<sup>62</sup> However, neither work has survived.

### The Sixty-Fascicle *Huayan jing*<sup>63</sup>

The Sanskrit manuscript that served as the source for the first Chinese translation of the larger *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* was brought from Khotan (Yutian 于闐, modern Hetian xian 和田縣). The sacred scriptures were jealously guarded and foreigners were not allowed to take them out of the country. Zhi Faling 支法領, however, ultimately managed to convince the king present him with the first part of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, 36,000 *ślokas* (*jie* 偈) in length. Afterwards, he brought the work to Chang'an. Another monk who was travelling with him, Zhiyan 智嚴, did not return home, but travelled on to Kashmir. He was surprised at the pure life of the monks in Kashmir and their strict observance of the monastic regulations. When he asked who could teach the Chinese, he was told it was Buddhābhadrā, and so he asked the master to accompany him to China.<sup>64</sup>

The foreign master stayed in Chang'an from 406 to 408 but probably had a difference of opinion with the other famous master translator of the age, Kumārajīva, who maintained his own harem behind the walls of the monastery and thus received criticism from monks who argued in favour of following the strict moral code. From Chang'an Buddhābhadrā went to Lushan 廬山, where he joined the community of Huiyuan 慧遠 (334–417) and commenced translating several texts on meditation. In 413, he went to Jiankang 建康, where he settled at the Daochang 道場 monastery. Here he met Zhi Faling, who had arrived from Chang'an. Zhi Faling asked Buddhābhadrā to translate the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, which he had brought with him from Khotan. On the tenth day of the third month [30 April] of 418, he began the work and completed it on the tenth day of the sixth month [6 July] of 420. Financial support for the work was provided by two officials: Meng Yi 孟顛,<sup>65</sup> who held the office of governor of Wu prefecture (*wujun neishi* 吳郡內史), and Chu Shudu 褚叔度,<sup>66</sup> who

<sup>59</sup> T 2034: 49.83b19.

<sup>60</sup> For a brief summary of the work, see Fontein 1967: 176.

<sup>61</sup> T 2034: 49.56c25.

<sup>62</sup> T 2034: 49.84b12.

<sup>63</sup> For a German translation of the work, see Doi 1978, 1981, 1982; for a Japanese translation, see Etō 1917.

<sup>64</sup> For a biography of Buddhābhadrā, see GZ T 2059: 50.334b26–335c14.

<sup>65</sup> We know that Meng Yi was a devout Buddhist; however, other sources do not confirm an association with the translation of the *Huayan jing*.

<sup>66</sup> Chu Shudu's biography can be found in the *Nanshi* 南史 (*juan* 28), but it does not mention his Buddhist connections.

was the general in charge of the garrison on the right flank (*youwei jiangjun* 右衛將軍). After this, he compared the Sanskrit text with the Chinese translation. He completed this phase of the work on the twenty-eighth day of the twelfth month [5 February, 422] of 421. The scribal (*bishouzhe* 筆受者) work was carried out by Faye 法業.<sup>67</sup> Faye expounded on the teachings of the opus in a work of his own entitled *Huayan zhigui* 華嚴旨歸, written in two fascicles. He placed the Sanskrit manuscript on a table and presumably made offerings to it. A Huayan hall (*huayan tang* 華嚴堂) was built in the monastery, where the monks would probably have made offerings.

According to both the CSJ and the KSL, Buddhahadra's translation at first consisted of fifty fascicles and was later divided into sixty.<sup>68</sup> Other catalogues confirm this. It is not known who re-named it the sixty-fascicle work, but it already had that name in the Sui period (581–618).<sup>69</sup> However, the fifty-fascicle work continued to survive according to the catalogues and this is borne out by a manuscript from the Song period (960–1279) which consists of fifty fascicles. Since the third patriarch of the Huayan tradition, Fazang 法藏 (643–712) calls it the sixty-fascicle work in his commentary, this name is likely to have become common by the start of the Tang period (618–907). In terms of content, however, the text did not change.

Divākara (Rizhao 日照 in Chinese), a translator from India,<sup>70</sup> arrived in Chang'an in the spring of 680, settled at the Taiyuan 太原 monastery, and soon became the most respected master translator of the age. He brought with him the Sanskrit manuscript of the last chapter of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, the *Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra*, and, with the aid of Fazang, compared it as well as the other Sanskrit manuscripts available to him with the translation by Buddhahadra. They compared a total of eight or nine Sanskrit manuscripts,<sup>71</sup> and found that nine sections which were missing in Buddhahadra's translation were present in all the versions; the master, therefore, had omitted them from the work.<sup>72</sup> Similarly, the part between the meeting with Maitreya and that with Samantabhadra, in which Mañjuśrī touches Sudhana's head from a distance, was also missing from Buddhahadra's version. Naturally, in the absence

<sup>67</sup> The colophon of the *Huayan jing* provides this information on the translation of the work. See T 278: 9.788b3–9. CSJ T 2145: 55.60c29–61a8. According to the GZ, it was not Zhi Faling who requested Buddhahadra to translate the work, but two officials, Meng Yi and Chu Shudu. In addition to Faye, it also mentions Huiyan 慧嚴 as a participant in the work and adds that over a hundred others also assisted. It makes mention of the creation of the *Huayan tang*; however, it does not provide the time of the translation. See T 2059: 50.335c4–9. The GZ also says that Faye was knowledgeable in the *Huayan* as Tanbin 曇斌 had learnt *Huayan* from him. See T 2059: 50.373a23.

<sup>68</sup> CSJ T 2145: 55.11c9, KL T 2154: 55.505b21.

<sup>69</sup> ZM T 2146: 55.115a11

<sup>70</sup> For his biography, see *Song gaoseng zhuan* 宋高僧傳 T 2061: 50.719a19, HZ T 2073: 51.154c10. See also Forte 1974: 135–164; Chen forthcoming, Chapter 5.

<sup>71</sup> HTJ T 1733: 35.122c22–27, 484c9–15.

<sup>72</sup> Parts that have been omitted: the ten persons called on between the visits to Māyā and Maitreya.

of the original manuscript, we cannot fault Buddhahadra for this omission with certainty since it is possible that these parts were missing from the manuscript that he used. The missing parts were translated and the work circulated independently during the Tang dynasty under the title *Dafangguang fo huayan jing rufajie pin* 大方廣佛華嚴經入法界品.<sup>73</sup> It was only in the Song period (960–1279) that these parts were incorporated into the sixty-fascicle translation.<sup>74</sup>

### The Eighty-Fascicle *Huayan jing*<sup>75</sup>

Empress Wu Zetian 武則天 (623/625–705) learned that the original manuscript of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* could be found in Khotan and sent envoys to collect it. Śikṣānanda brought the work to China and later settled at the Dabian 大遍 monastery in the eastern capital, where he began translating it. This Sanskrit manuscript was longer than the sixty-fascicle *Huayan jing* by 9,000 *ślokas* and consisted of a total of 45,000 *ślokas*. The Sanskrit text was read aloud by Bodhiruci 菩提流志 and Yijing 義淨 while Fazang and Fuli 復禮 wrote down the translation. The work began on the fourteenth day of the third month [1 May] of 695 and was completed in the Foshouji 佛授記 monastery on the eighth day of the tenth month [6 September] of 699 with a foreword written by the empress herself. Foshouji appears as the site of the translation in Huiyuan's 慧苑 (673–743) *Xu huayan lüeshu kanding ji* 續華嚴略疏刊定記 whereas the Empress Wu mentions the Great Biankong 遍空 monastery in her foreword.<sup>76</sup> As CHEN Jinhua showed Śikṣānanda's translation bureau was based at Foshouji monastery, thus the translation of the *Avataṃsaka-sūtra* was done there, while at the Biankong monastery, a palace chapel only the opening ceremony was held.<sup>77</sup>

The earlier translation contained eight assemblies and 34 chapters while the new text had nine assemblies and 39 chapters. Despite the fact that Śikṣānanda's translation is far longer than Buddhahadra's, the part in which Mañjuśrī touches Sudhana's head from a distance has been omitted here as well. As noted earlier, this part was also missing in the sixty-fascicle version; Divākara filled the gap on the basis of the Sanskrit *Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra* manuscript, which he had brought with him. Fazang completed the eighty-fascicle version with the part that had been omitted.<sup>78</sup>

Śikṣānanda returned to Khotan in 704 to visit his sick mother. He returned to China at the request of Emperor Zhongzong 中宗 (r. 684, 705–710) in 708. He died in 710 at

<sup>73</sup> T 295.

<sup>74</sup> For these added parts in the text of Taishō edition, see T 278: 9.765a3–767b28; 783b28–c15.

<sup>75</sup> For an English translation of the work, see Cleary 1993; for a Japanese translation, see Etō 1929, revised by Itō Zuiei 伊藤瑞叡 1959, reprint 1980.

<sup>76</sup> Li 2000: 66.

<sup>77</sup> Chen 2004.

<sup>78</sup> Huiyuan, a disciple of Fazang's, provides a report on this. See *Xu huayan lüeshu kanding ji* 續華嚴略疏刊定記, XZJ 5.49a1–12.

the age of 59. According to his biography, after he was cremated his tongue remained and was sent back to Khotan. In his honour, a seven-storey pagoda was erected outside the northern gate of Chang'an and was named "the Pagoda of the Huayan Tripitaka Master" (*huayan sanzang ta* 華嚴三藏塔).<sup>79</sup>

### The Forty-Fascicle *Huayan jing*

The king of the southern Indian state of Oḍḍiyāna sent a Sanskrit manuscript of the forty-fascicle *Huayan jing* to Emperor Dezong 德宗 (r. 779–805), which Prajñā (744–810?) translated into Chinese. The master translator was originally from northern India and in his youth studied the Hīnayāna teachings, especially those of the Sarvāstivāda. After his ordination he travelled a great deal and came to know Yogācāra and Tantric Buddhism. He came to China to visit Wutaishan 五台山, which was regarded as the residence of Mañjuśrī.<sup>80</sup> In 781 he came to Guangzhou. He went on to Chang'an, where he was treated with great respect and enjoyed the support of the emperor. He began the translation on the fifth day of the sixth month [13 July] of 796 and completed it on the twenty-fourth day of the second month [16 March] of 798. He was assisted by the fourth patriarch of the Huayan school, Chengguan 澄觀 (738–839).<sup>81</sup> This version, which is called the forty-fascicle *Huayan jing*,<sup>82</sup> contains all the parts which are missing from the last chapter of the sixty- and eighty-fascicle recensions.

Of particular interest in this regard is the last fascicle, which includes *The Vow of Samantabhadra* (*Bhadracarī-praṇidhānarāja-gāthā*, *Puxian xingyuan pin* 普賢行願品). This text was first translated by Buddhahadra as a separate work under the title *Wenshu shili fayuan jing* 文殊師利發願經,<sup>83</sup> it is shorter than the later translations. The second translation was prepared by the famous Tantric master, Amoghavajra (705–774), under the title *Puxian pusa xingyuan zan* 普賢菩薩行願贊.<sup>84</sup> Bart Dessein compared the three versions and came to the conclusion that Amoghavajra had changed the title of the work and that Prajñā had adopted this change from him.<sup>85</sup>

This seems to be contradicted by the fact that the titles of the Sanskrit version and of the two Tibetan translations (one of them as part of the *Gaṇḍavyūha*, the other as a separate work) would all include the name Samantabhadra. It is therefore more likely, that the "Mañjuśrī" of the title of Buddhahadra's text was changed to Samantabhadra in India.

<sup>79</sup> For his biography, see *Song gaoseng zhuan*, T 2061: 50.718c19–719a17.

<sup>80</sup> For the connection between Mañjuśrī and Wutaishan, see Birnbaum 1983.

<sup>81</sup> For a critical biography, see Hamar 2002.

<sup>82</sup> T 293.

<sup>83</sup> T 296.

<sup>84</sup> T 297.

<sup>85</sup> Dessein 2003: 327–329.

### The Sanskrit Version

It is clear from the foregoing that according to our sources both the sixty- and eighty-fascicle versions of the *Huayan jing* were translated into Chinese based on Sanskrit manuscripts (*fanben* 梵本) from Khotan. This indicates that this work enjoyed enormous popularity in this area and may even have been compiled there.<sup>86</sup> Unfortunately, the Sanskrit manuscript has not survived. According to ŌNISHI Ryūhō, however, the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* never in fact existed in Inner Asia.<sup>87</sup> Zhi Faling did not bring one work with him called the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, but a number of *sūtras* which Buddhahadra compiled and named the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*. Śikṣānanda in turn attempted to collect similar works based on the Buddhahadra version, and this gave rise to the Sanskrit manuscript which served as the basis for the eighty-fascicle translation.

This appears to be contradicted by a report by the second patriarch of the Huayan tradition, Zhiyan 智儼 (602–668, not to be confused with Zhiyan 智嚴 mentioned above) on a Sanskrit manuscript that could be found in the Dacien 大慈恩 monastery.<sup>88</sup> He provides a precise description: it consisted of 541 pages with 55 syllables (*zi* 字) in one line and twenty lines on one leaf. One *śloka* (*song* 頌) consisted of 32 syllables.<sup>89</sup> He counted 2280 (?) syllables on the two sides of one leaf and making a total of 1,323,480 syllables according to his count, or 41,980 *ślokas* plus ten syllables. Zhiyan's count is not accurate because if his calculations are based on 2280 syllables per page then the total should be only 1,233,480 syllables, which, when divided by 32, gives us 38,546 *ślokas* and eight syllables. However, if we count 2200 syllables per leaf, this gives us 1,190,200 syllables and therefore makes 37,193 *ślokas* and 24 syllables. If we use this last count, the Sanskrit version is not much longer than the sixty-fascicle version, which consists of 36,000 *ślokas*. Zhiyan lists the chapters of the Sanskrit version as well, to be examined further on.

The next question is how this Sanskrit manuscript came to be in the Dacien monastery. We may consider the option that the manuscript used by Buddhahadra or a copy of it found its way here. However, due to the distance both spatial and temporal as well as the significant differences in the arrangement of the chapters, there is little likelihood of this. According to SANADA Ariyoshi, Xuanzang 玄奘 (600–664) might have brought the Sanskrit *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* with him from his pilgrimage since the Dacien monastery featured prominently in his life.<sup>90</sup> Here he also translated a short *Huayan sūtra*, which I will discuss below.

<sup>86</sup> During this period in Inner Asia, Sanskrit was used as the ecclesiastical language and Sanskrit texts were not translated into local vernaculars. It is likely that works were also composed in Sanskrit. See Nattier 1990: 195–219.

<sup>87</sup> Ōnishi 1985.

<sup>88</sup> *Huayan jing nei zhangmen deng za kongmu zhang* 華嚴經內章門等雜孔目章, T 1871: 45.588a13–589b13.

<sup>89</sup> This corresponds to the traditional Indian number of syllables in a *śloka*. See Monier-Williams 1899: 1104.

<sup>90</sup> Sanada 1949: 48–50.

As I noted previously, a part was missing from the last chapter of the sixty-fascicle *Huayan jing*, the *Gaṇḍavyūha*, which was later translated by Divākara with the assistance of Fazang. Fazang wrote that he and Divākara had jointly examined the various Indian versions (*tianzhu zhuben* 天竺諸本), the Kunlun version (*kunlun ben* 崑崙本) and the independent version from Khotan (*yutian biexing ben* 于闐別行本), and that they had found that the parts that were missing from the sixty-fascicle version could be found in all of them.<sup>91</sup> We can conclude from this mention of the “independent version from Khotan” and the fact that we know that Divākara had brought the *Gaṇḍavyūha* with him that they compared the last chapter of the sixty-fascicle *Huayan jing* with the independent *sūtra*.<sup>92</sup>

Like Zhiyan, Fazang also mentions that Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* could be found in the Dacien monastery: “I recently saw in the pagoda of the Dacien monastery three versions of the Sanskrit *Buddhāvataṃsaka-[sūtra]*. I briefly compared all of them with the Chinese version and they were largely identical; the numbers of *ślokas* were also similar.”

近於大慈恩寺塔上見梵本華嚴有三部。略勘並與此漢本大同。頌數亦相似。<sup>93</sup>

### Partial Translations after the Translation of Larger *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*

The chapters translated after the eighty-fascicle translation was completed raise several questions. The third patriarch of the Huayan school, Fazang, who was himself involved in the translation of the eighty-fascicle version, compared the final translation with the Sanskrit manuscript and found that the *Teaching of Samantabhadra* chapter was missing from the Chinese version even though it was part of the Sanskrit original.<sup>94</sup> At the same time, the translator of the eighty-fascicle work also translated this *sūtra* under the title *Dafangguang puxian suo shuo jing* 大方廣普賢所說經. The question therefore is why Śikṣānanda omitted this chapter from the *Huayan jing*. The chapter can also be found in the Tibetan translation prepared in the ninth century under the title *Kun-tu bzang-pos bstan-pa*. It is thus conceivable that the Sanskrit version to which Fazang had access was close to the version used by the Tibetan translators.

After the translation of the sixty-fascicle *Huayan jing*, one of the greatest translators of Chinese Buddhism, Xuanzang, translated a short *Huayan sūtra* entitled *Xian wubian fotu gongde jing* 顯無邊佛土功德經, corresponding to chapter twenty-six of

<sup>91</sup> HTJ T 1733: 35.484c9–15.

<sup>92</sup> According to Li Huiying, it is not clear whether the text in question is the entire *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* or only the *Gaṇḍavyūha*, although the phrase “freestanding version” suggests that it was only the *Gaṇḍavyūha* that was compared with the last chapter of the sixty-fascicle *Huayan jing*. See Li 2000: 70–71.

<sup>93</sup> HTJ T 1733: 35.122b24–25.

<sup>94</sup> HZ 2073: 51.156a20.

the sixty-fascicle *Huayan jing*, *Life-span* (*Shouming pin* 壽命品). The same chapter was also translated by Dharmabhadra in 1001 under the title *Foshuo jiaoliang yiqie foshu gongde jing* 佛說較量一切佛刹功德經. It is interesting that two independent Tibetan translations of this short work have also survived.<sup>95</sup> In this text, “Consciousness-King Bodhisattva” relates that one *kalpa* in our world corresponds to one day in the world of Amitābha, and that one *kalpa* in the world of Amitābha corresponds to one day in the next world. This last world where beings therefore live the longest is the Lotus-womb world, which is the pure realm extolled by the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*. The popularity of the *sūtra* can be explained in part by the growth of the Amitābha-cult in the Tang period and in part by the cult associated with Huayan Buddhism. The importance of the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra* is demonstrated by the fact that, after the partial translations of the previous era and after the translation of the larger works, Śīladharma translated it once more in 799 under the title *Foshuo shidi jing* 佛說十地經.

### The Tibetan version

In addition to the sixty- and eighty-fascicle Chinese translations, the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* has survived in a Tibetan translation. It is not known how the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* arrived in Tibet, but since the Tibetans enjoyed active ties with Khotan the manuscript could have been brought from there.<sup>96</sup> The complete *Buddhāvataṃsaka* makes up a section of the *Bka’-’gyur* called *Phal-chen*. The Tibetan title of the *sūtra* is *Sangs-rgyas phal-po-che zhes bya-ba shin-tu rgyas-pa chen-po’i mdo*.<sup>97</sup> On the basis of this, the Sanskrit title is reconstructed as *Buddhāvataṃsaka nāma mahāvaiṣṭhīya sūtra*. In the Derge recension of the Tibetan Canon the work fills four volumes. Each volume is divided into *bam-pos*,<sup>98</sup> with the *bam-po* numbering beginning anew with each volume. At the end of each *bam-po*, the work is referred to by the following title: *Sangs-rgyas rmad gcad ces bya-ba shin-tu rgyas-pa’i mdo*.<sup>99</sup> According to the *Ldan-kar* catalogue compiled during the time of King Khri-srong-lde-brtsan (754–797), the work consists of 45 chapters and 39,030 *ślokas*. This makes 130 complete *bam-pos* and 30 *ślokas*. It is not difficult to calculate that one *bam-po*

<sup>95</sup> P 772, 934. For their titles, see below.

<sup>96</sup> Khri-lde-gtsug-brtsan (704–754) had a Chinese wife, who interceded for the monks who had fled in large numbers from Khotan. It is owing to this that they were able to settle here and that seven monasteries were built for them. Three years later, however, after the death of the queen, they were driven out. See Snellgrove 1986: 77.

<sup>97</sup> P 761.

<sup>98</sup> One *bam-po* consists of 300 *ślokas*. See Lalou 1953: 313–314. The works in the catalogue prepared during the reign of Khri-srong-lde-brtsan were arranged by number of *bam-pos*, in descending order. The origin of the term *bam-po* must be sought in Chinese as Indian tradition knows no such division. See Skilling 1997: 92.

<sup>99</sup> This is the old Tibetan title for the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*. See *Bod-rgya tshig-mdzod chen-mo* 1985: II. p. 1711.

consists of 300 *ślokas*. The colophon of the Derge edition states that the Tshal-pa edition of this *sūtra* is divided into 115 *bam-pos*, and current editions have different way of division. It is worth noting that this division is similar to the manner in which Zhiyan measured the length of the Sanskrit manuscript.<sup>100</sup> The Tibetan translation was prepared in the first quarter of the ninth century by two Indian scholars, Jinamitra and Surendrabodhi, in collaboration with the Tibetan master-editor Ye-shes-sde. The work consists of 45 chapters (*le'u*), and the bodhisattvas gather on nine occasions in seven places. According to the catalogue prepared by Qing Jixiang 慶吉祥 between 1285 and 1287, *Zhiyuan fabao kantong zonglu* 至元法寶勘同總錄, the Tibetan translation was based on the Chinese version.<sup>101</sup> However, the Tibetan translation contains two chapters which cannot be found in any of the Chinese translations; it is therefore more likely that the Tibetan translation was made from a Sanskrit text.<sup>102</sup> This is supported by the fact that we know that Jinamitra and Surendrabodhi translated from Sanskrit, not Chinese.<sup>103</sup>

The colophon of the Derge edition sheds a certain degree of light on the issue. First of all, it states that the number of *bam-pos* differs in the various editions. It mentions two lines of tradition: one Chinese, the other Indian. In the Chinese line, the teaching went from Buddha to Mañjuśrī and then to Nāgārjuna. Buddhahadra (*paṇḍita* Byang-chub bzang-po) and Śikṣānanda (*paṇḍita* Dga'-ba) subsequently translated it into Chinese. The text was later passed on by Thu-thu-zhun hwashang, and then Sangs-rgyas-'bum of Dbus obtained the teaching from Gying-ju hwashang. This tradition has survived thanks to outstanding translators. The Indian line of tradition is as follows: the teaching came from Buddha to Nāgārjuna, then to Āryadeva and later to 'Jam-dpal-grags-pa. The teaching was received by a contemporary of Milarepa's (1040–1123), Bari lo-tsaba (1040–1111), from Rdo-rje-gdan-pa and later by the great Sa-skya-pa (1092–1158) from Mchims-brtson-seng.

Partial translations survive in *Bka'-'gyurs*, where they are not classed under *Phal-chen* but, with one exception, under *Mdo sna-tshogs* "Miscellaneous *Sūtra*". As men-

<sup>100</sup> Lalou 1953: 319.

<sup>101</sup> T 99.190b.

<sup>102</sup> This confirms my own research in which I have compared the Chinese and Tibetan translations of the *Appearance of the Tathāgata Sūtra*. The Tibetan version contains an introductory section which cannot be found in any of the Chinese translations, except for that by Dharmarakṣa. The Chinese translators presumably left out this introductory section, if it was not already missing from the version that they used. Professor ARAMAKI Noritoshi, who examined the various versions of the *Daśabhūmika-sūtra* as the work was being translated into Japanese, also concluded that this chapter had been translated from Sanskrit (personal communication).

<sup>103</sup> The list of translators from Sanskrit to Tibetan in the *Sgra-sbyor bam-po gnyis-pa* opens with Jinamitra and Surendrabodhi. For the relevant Tibetan text and its translation, see Scherrer-Schaub 1999. Bu-ston writes that King Ral-pa-can (r. 815–836) ordered Jinamitra, Surendrabodhi, Ye-shes-sde and other masters to translate Buddhist texts into Tibetan directly from Sanskrit because the words, or terminology, had been variously rendered in translations from Chinese and other languages, thus making it difficult to study the teaching. See Obermiller 1931: 196–197. For Jinamitra, see also Skilling 1997, chapter 4.



tioned above, there are two translations of the *Life-span* chapter: *Enumeration of the Virtues of Buddha-lands of Tathāgatas* ('Phags-pa de-bzhin gshegs-pa-rnams-kyi sangs-rgyas-kyi zhing-gi yon-tan brjod-pa'i rnam-grangs)<sup>104</sup> and *The King-sūtra which Cannot Be Grasped by Thoughts* ('Phags-pa bsam-gyis mi khyab-pa'i rgyal-po'i mdo zhes bya-ba theg-pa chen-po'i mdo).<sup>105</sup> According to the Derge edition, the former was translated by Jinamitra, Dānaśīla and Ye-shes-sde.<sup>106</sup> The translators of the latter work are unknown.<sup>107</sup>

The *Inconceivable Teaching of Buddha Sūtra* (*Sangs-rgyas-kyi chos bsam-gyis mi khyab-pa bstan-pa*),<sup>108</sup> which is also a part of the translation of larger *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, where it has the same title. The names of the translators have not survived, but the colophon says the following: "Chapter twenty-nine of the *Large Ear Ornament Sūtra*<sup>109</sup> consisting of one hundred thousand chapters is *The Teaching of Buddha which Cannot Be Grasped by Thought* (*Snyan-gyi gong-rgyan rgyas-pa chen-po'i mdo le'u 'bum-pa-las sangs-rgyas-kyi chos bsam-gyis mi khyab-pa bstan-pa'i le'u nyi-shu dgu-pa*)".<sup>110</sup> In fact, this chapter is not the twenty-ninth in the Tibetan translation of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, but the thirty-ninth. Bu-ston (1290–1364) writes that the entire Buddhist canon has not survived and that many parts have been lost. He cites the example of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, which had originally consisted of 100,000 chapters, of which only forty survived.<sup>111</sup> This report is surprising because the Tibetan translation consists of forty-five chapters. The 100,000 chapters (*le'u*) probably refers to the 100,000 *ślokas*. As mentioned earlier, according to legend, the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* which Nāgārjuna brought out of the palace of serpents contained 100,000 *ślokas*. It is interesting to note that this version is close to the sixty-fascicle Chinese version, while the version in the larger work is close to the eighty-fascicle work.<sup>112</sup> This chapter is the twenty-eighth in the sixty-fascicle *Huayan jing*, so it is possible that this independent Tibetan translation is part of another, presumably earlier Tibetan translation of the larger *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, which might have been based on this recension of the *Huayan jing*.

*The King of the Prayer of Outstanding Acts* ('Phags-pa bzang-po spyod-pa'i smon-lam-gyi rgyal-po),<sup>113</sup> which is a translation of *Bhadracarī-praṇidhānarāja-gāthā*, can be found in the *Rgyud (Tantra)* section of *Bka-'gyur*. Unlike the two larger Chinese translations, the larger Tibetan translation also contains this work.

<sup>104</sup> P 772.

<sup>105</sup> P 934.

<sup>106</sup> *A Comparative Analytical Catalogue* 1930–1932: 276.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, 363. For this paper I refer only to the Peking and Derge Kanjurs or their catalogues. Further details about the translation or translators may be found in other Kanjurs or recensions of the text, but I leave this task for future research.

<sup>108</sup> P 854.

<sup>109</sup> This is the old Tibetan title for the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*. *Bod-rgya tshig-mdzod chen-mo* 1985: II. p. 1711.

<sup>110</sup> P 208: 34.200b5–6.

<sup>111</sup> Obermiller 1931: 169.

<sup>112</sup> *A Comparative Analytical Catalogue* 1930–1932: 330.

<sup>113</sup> P 716.

### Comparing the chapters in the various versions

Although no Sanskrit version of a “complete” *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra* has survived, Zhiyan recorded the Chinese translations of the Sanskrit chapter titles in his commentary.<sup>114</sup> We are thus afforded an opportunity to compare the arrangements of the chapters in one Sanskrit, two Chinese and one Tibetan versions. The number of chapters differs: the sixty-fascicle *sūtra* is divided into thirty-four chapters, the eighty-fascicle work contains thirty-nine, the Tibetan translation has forty-five and the Sanskrit “original” – according to Zhiyan’s report – into forty-four.<sup>115</sup> The discrepancy can be traced back to two causes. Firstly, some chapters were omitted from certain versions. Thus, for example, Chapter 11 of the Tibetan translation, *The Garlands of Tathāgata*, and Chapter 32, *The Speech by Samantabhadra*, are missing from all other versions; while the *Ten Concentrations* chapter is found only in the eighty-fascicle and Tibetan texts. Secondly, the text is divided into chapters in different ways and thus the chapter titles also differ. Chapter 2 of the sixty-fascicle Chinese text, *Vairocana Buddha*, for instance, makes up five separate chapters in the eighty-fascicle version, whereas it makes up nine chapters in the Tibetan and “Sanskrit” versions. The last chapter of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, *Gaṇḍavyūha*, is uniquely divided into three chapters in the Sanskrit version. Another difference is that the same chapter may have a different title in different versions. For example, Chapter 1 bears the title *The Eye that Sees the World Clearly* in the sixty-fascicle and Sanskrit versions, whereas it has the title *The Wondrous Ornaments of the Lord of the World* in the eighty-fascicle and Tibetan versions.

On examining the arrangements of the chapters, therefore, we find that the Tibetan and Sanskrit versions are similar. On the basis of these findings, it can be concluded that the Tibetan recension, which contains two additional chapters not found in the other two recensions, represents the fourth and last stage of development of the *Buddhāvataṃsaka-sūtra*, whereas the eighty-fascicle Chinese recension, which contains one more chapter than the Sanskrit and the sixty-fascicle recensions, is the third stage.

### References

- A Comparative Analytical Catalogue of the Kanjur Division of the Tibetan Tripitaka Edited in Peking during the K’ang-hsi Era, and at Present kept in the Library of the Otani Daigaku Kyoto.* Kyoto: The Otani Daigaku Library, 1930–1932.
- Bendall, Cecil and Rouse, W.H.D., trans.: *Śikshā-samuccaya a Compendium of Buddhist Doctrine Compiled by Śāntideva Chiefly from Earlier Mahāyāna Sūtras.* London: John Murray, 1922. (Indian Texts Series)

<sup>114</sup> *Huayan jing nei zhangmen deng za kongmu zhang* 華嚴經內章門等雜孔目章, T 1871: 45.588a21–c14.

<sup>115</sup> For a detailed comparison of the various versions, see Kimura 1992: 4–10.

- Birnbaum, Raoul: *Studies on the Mysteries of Mañjuśrī*. Society for the Study of Chinese Religion, Monograph no. 2. 1983.
- Bod-rgya tshig-mdzod chen-mo*. Beijing: Minzu chubanshe, 1985.
- Boucher, Daniel: "Buddhist Translation Procedures in Third-Century China: A Study of Dharmarakṣa and His Translation Idiom." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1996.
- Chen Jinhua: "The Location and Chief Members of Śikṣānanda's (652–710) *Avatamsaka* Translation Office: Some Remarks on a Chinese Collection of Stories and Legends Related to the *Avatamsaka Sūtra*." *Journal of Asian History* (2004) 38.2: pp. 121–140.
- Chen Jinhua: *History and His Stories: A Biographical Study of the Avatamsaka Master Fazang (643–712)*. Leiden: Brill Academic Publisher. (Series Sinica Leidensia) (forthcoming)
- Cleary, Thomas, trans.: *The Flower Ornament Scripture: A Translation of Avatamsaka Sutra*. Boston–London: Shambhala, 1993.
- Dessein, Bart: "The Glow of the Vow of the Teacher Samantabhadra 'Puxian Pusa Xing Yuan Zan' (T. 297) \*Samantabhadrācāryaprañidhānarāja." *Acta Orientalia Hung.* (2003) 56, 2–4: pp. 317–338.
- Doi, Torakazu, trans.: *Das Kegon Sutra: Das Buch vom Eintreten in den Kosmos der Wahrheit*. Tokyo: Doitsubun-Kegonkyō-kankōkai, 1978.
- Doi, Torakazu, trans.: *Das Kegon Sutra II*. Tokyo: Doitsubun-Kegonkyō-kankōkai, 1981.
- Doi, Torakazu, trans.: *Das Kegon Sutra III*. trans. Tokyo: Doitsubun-Kegonkyō-kankōkai, 1982.
- Etō Sokuō 衛藤即応, trans.: *Daihōkō butsu kegon kyō* 大方広佛華嚴經 [*Dafangguang fo huayan jing*]. Tokyo: Kokumin bunko kankōkai, 1917. (Kokuyaku daizōkyō kyōbu 国訳大蔵経 経部, vols. 5–7.)
- Etō Sokuō 衛藤即応, trans.: *Daihōkō butsu kegon kyō* 大方広佛華嚴經 [*Dafangguang fo huayan jing*]. Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1929. (Kokuyaku issai kyō Indo senjutsu bu kegonbu 国訳一切経 印度撰述部 華嚴部, vol. 4.) Revised by Itō Zuiei 伊藤瑞叡 1959, Reprint 1980.
- Fontein, Jan: *The Pilgrimage of Sudhana: A Study of Gaṇḍavyūha Illustrations in China, Japan and Java*. The Hague Paris: Mouton & Co, 1967.
- Forte, Antonino: "Divākara (613–688), un monaco indiano nella Cina dei Tang." *Annali della Facoltà di lingue e letterature straniere di Ca' Foscari*, Ser. Or. 5, (1974) 13.3: pp. 135–164.
- Girard, Frédéric: *Un moine de la secte Kegon a l'époque de Kamakura, Myōe (1173–1232) et le "Journal de ses rêves"*. Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient, 1990.
- Gómez, Luis O.: "Selected Verses from *Gaṇḍavyūha*: Text, Critical Apparatus and Translation." Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1967.
- Hamar Imre: *A Religious Leader in the Tang: Chengguan's Biography*. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies of The International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies, 2002. (Studia Philologica Buddhica Occasional Paper Series XII)
- Ishii Kyōdō 石井教道: *Kegon kyōgaku seiritsu shi* 華嚴教学成立史 [The history of the formation of Huayan teaching]. Tokyo: Chūō kōron jigyō shuppan, 1964.
- Kaginushi Ryōkei 鍵主良敬: "Nyorai shōki kyōten no kai – Sono shōtai o meguru Tokiwa, Takamine setsu e no gigi" 如来性起經典の怪 – その正体をめぐる常盤・高峰 説への疑義 [The mystery of the nature-origination of Tathāgata scripture: doubts about Tokiwa's and Takamine's explanations on its original form]. *Bukkyōgaku seminā* 仏教学セミナー (1973) 18: pp. 37–56.
- Kaginushi Ryōkei 鍵主良敬: "Nyorai shōki kyō no Seishin yakushutsu setsu o utagau" 如来性起経の西普訳出説を疑う [Doubts about the report on the Western Jin translation of the *Nature-origination of Tathāgata sūtra*]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 (1974) 22.2: pp. 842–848.
- Kimura Kiyotaka 木村清孝: *Shoki Chūgoku kegon shisō no kenkyū* 初期中國華嚴思想の研究 [Study of the Chinese Huayan thought in the early period]. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1977.

- Kimura Kiyotaka 木村清孝: *Chūgoku kegon shisōshi* 中国華嚴思想史 [The history of Chinese Huayan thought]. Tokyo: Heirakuji, 1992.
- Kimura Kiyotaka 木村清孝: “Daihōkō nyorai shōki bimitsuzō kyō” 大方広如来性起微密藏經 [Dafangguang rulai xingqi weimi zang jing] in Makita Tairyō 牧田諦亮 (ed): *Nanatsudera koitsu kyōten kenkyū sōsho* 七寺古逸經典研究叢書 vol. 4. Tokyo: Daitō, 1999, pp. 554–682.
- Kobayashi Jitsugen 小林実玄: “Bosatsu hongō kyō no ito: Kegon daikyō no hensan ni kan shite” 菩薩本業經の意図華嚴大經の編纂に関して [The intent of the *Pusa benye jing*: the compilation of the *Avatamsaka-sūtra*]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 (1958) 7,1: pp.168–169.
- Lalou, Marcelle: Les textes bouddhiques au temps du roi Khri-srong-lde-bcan. *Journal Asiatique* (1953) 241: pp. 313–353.
- Lamotte, Étienne: *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna avec une nouvelle introduction*. Tome III, Louvain: Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 2, 1970.
- Li Fangyin 黎方銀: “Dazu Beishan Duobaota nei Shancai tongzi wushisan can shike tuxiang” 大足北山多寶塔內善財童子五十三參石刻圖像 [The stone sculptures of Sudhana’s 53 visits in the Duobao Pagoda of Beishan of Dazu in Tong Dengjin 童登金 (ed.): *Dazu shike yanjiu wenji* 足石刻研究文集 4. Beijing: Zhongguo wenlian chubanshe, 2002, pp. 171–193.
- Li Huiying 李惠英: *Eon sen ‘Zoku kegon ryakusho kanjō ki’ no kisoteki kenkyū* 慧苑撰『続華嚴略疏刊定記』の基礎的研究 [A basic study of the *Xu huayan lüeshu kandingji* written by Huiyuan]. Tokyo: Dōhōsha, 2000.
- Monier-Williams, Monier: *Sanskrit–English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1899.
- Nakamura Hajime: *Indian Buddhism: A Survey with Bibliographical Notes*. Hirakata: Kansai University of Foreign Studies, 1980. (Intercultural Research Institute Monograph 9.)
- Nattier, Jan: “Church Language and Vernacular Language in Central Asian Buddhism.” *Numen* (1990) 37: pp. 195–219.
- Nattier, Jan: *A Few Good Men: The Bodhisattva Path according to The Inquiry of Ugra (Ugrapariprcchā)*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2003.
- Nattier, Jan: “The Proto-History of the Buddhāvataṃsaka: The Pusa benye jing 菩薩本業經 and the Dousha jing 兜沙經.” *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 2004* [ARIRIAB] (2005) 8: pp. 323–360.
- Obermiller, E.: *History of Buddhism by Bu-ston*. Heidelberg, 1931.
- Ochiai Toshinori: *The Manuscripts of Nanatsudera*. Kyoto: Istituto Italiano di Cultura Scuola di Studi sull’Asia Orientale, 1991. (Italian School of East Asian Studies Occasional Papers 3.)
- Rawlinson, Andrew: “Nāgas and the Magical Cosmology of Buddhism.” *Religion* (1986) 16: pp. 135–153.
- Ōnishi Ryūhō 大西龍峰: “Kegonkyō no seiritsu ryūden ni kansuru kodensetsu – jō-chū-ge sanbonsetsu ni tsuite” 華嚴經の成立 流伝に関する 古伝説 – 上中下三本説について [The ancient legends about the formation and spread of the *Avatamsaka-sūtra*: the lower, middle and upper versions]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 (1985) 33,2: pp. 500–505.
- Sakamoto Yukiō 坂本幸男: *Kegon kyōgaku no kenkyū* 華嚴教學の研究 [Study of Huayan teaching]. Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten, 1964.
- Sanada Ariyoshi 真田有美: “Kegonkyō no bonhon ni tsuite” 華嚴經の梵本に就て [Concerning the Sanskrit version of the *Avatamsaka-sūtra*]. *Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 仏教學研究 (1949) 16–17: pp. 47–70.
- Scherrer-Schaub, Cristina: “Translation, Transmission, Tradition: Suggestions from Ninth-Century Tibet.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* (1999) 27,1–2: pp. 67–77.

- Skilling, Peter: “From bKa’ bstan ’gyur to bKa’ gyur and bsTan ’gyur” in Helmut Eimer (ed.): *Tibetan Studies, Proceedings of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Graz 1995, Transmission of the Tibetan Canon*. 1997, pp. 87–111.
- Skilling, Peter: “Mahāsūtras: Great Discourses of the Buddha. Vol. I, Texts. Critical editions of the Tibetan Mahāsūtras with Pali and Sanskrit counterparts as available. The Pali Text Society: Oxford 1997. (Sacred Books of the Buddhists XLIV)
- Snellgrove, David and Richardson, Hugh: *A Cultural History of Tibet*. London & Boston: Shambhala, 1986.
- Takamine Ryōshū 高峰了著: *Kegon ronshū* 華嚴論集 [Collection of articles related to Huayan]. Tokyo: Kokusho kankokai, 1976.
- Takasaki Jikidō 高崎直道: “The *Tathāgatōtpattisambhava-nirdeśa* of the *Avatamsaka* and the *Ratnagotravibhāga* – with Special Reference to the Term ‘*tathāgata-gotra-sambhava*’.” *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 (1958) 7,1: pp. 348–343.
- Takasaki Jikidō 高崎直道: *A Study of the Ratnagotravibhāga (Uttaratantra): Being a Treatise on the Tathāgatagarbha Theory of Mahāyāna Buddhism*. Rome: IsMEO, 1966. (Serie Orientale Roma 33.)
- Takasaki Jikidō 高崎直道: *Nyoraizō shisō no keisei* 如来藏思想の形成 [The formation of Tathāgatagarbha thought]. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1974.
- Takasaki Jikidō 高崎直道, trans.: *Nyoraizō kei kyōten* 如来藏系經典 [Tathāgatagarbha scriptures]. Tokyo: Chūō kōronsha, 1981. (Daijō Butten 12.)
- Tsukamoto Zenryū: *A History of Early Chinese Buddhism from Its Introduction to the Death of Huiyuan*. tr. Leon Hurvitz, Tokyo: Kodansha International Ltd., 1979.
- Wei Daoru 魏道儒: *Zhongguo huayan zong tongshi* 中國華嚴宗通史 [A comprehensive history of the Chinese Huayan tradition]. Nanjing: Jiangsu guji chubanshe, 1998.
- Williams, Paul: *Mahāyāna Buddhism: The Doctrinal Foundations*. London and New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Zürcher, Eric: *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1959.
- Zürcher, Eric: “A New Look at the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Texts” in Koichi Shinohara and Gregory Schopen (eds.): *From Benares To Beijing: Essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religion*. Oakville-New York-London: Mosaic Press, 1991.

Appendix

Comparative table of chapters of the *Avataṃsaka-sūtra*

Sanskrit (Zhiyan's report)	Buddhabhadra (T 278)	Śikṣānanda (T 279)	Tibetan (P 761)	Partial extant Chinese and Tibetan
(1) 世間淨眼品	(1) 世間淨眼品	(1) 世主妙嚴品	(1) 'jig-rten-gyi dbang-po thams-cad-kyi rgyan-gyi tshul rab-tu byung-ba	
(2) 如來品	(2) 盧舍那佛品	(2) 如來現相品	(2) de-bzhin gshegs-pa	
(3) 普賢菩薩修行入 三摩提品		(3) 普賢三昧品	(3) kun-tu bzang-po'i ting- nge-'dzin dang rnam-par 'phrul-pa rab-tu 'byung-ba	
(4) 說入世界海品		(4) 世界成就品	(4) 'jig-rten-gyi khams rgya- mtsho shin-tu bstan-pa'i phyogs gsal-bar bya-ba yang-dag par bsgrubs-pa	
(5) 淨世界海功德海 光明品		(5) 華藏世界品	(5) 'jig-rten-gyi khams rgya- mtsho gzhi dang snying- po me-tog-gi rgyan-gyis brgyan-pa'i yon-tan rgya- mtsho yongs-su dag-pas snang-ba	

(6) 世界輪圍莊嚴海品			(6) 'jig-rten-gyi khams rgya-mtsho'i khor yug-gi rgyan rgya-mtsho shin-tu bstan-pa	
(7) 說世界海莊嚴地品			(7) jig-rten-gyi khams rgya-mtsho'i sa'i gzhi'i rgyan shin-tu bstan-pa	
(8) 觀世界性處品			(8) zhing-gi rgyud-kyi gnas shin-tu bstan-pa	
(9) 觀世界處安住音聲品			(9) 'jig-rten-gyi khams-kyi rgyud rnam-par dgod-pa shin-tu bstan-pa	
(10) 毘盧舍那品		(6) 毘盧遮那品	(10) nam-par snang-mdzad	
			(11) de-bzhin gshegs-pa phal-po che	
(11) 如來名稱品	(3) 如來名號品	(7) 如來名號品	(12) sangs-rgyas-kyi mtshan shin-tu bstan-pa	佛說兜沙經 T 280: 10.445a5-446a15. 佛說菩薩本業經 T 281: 10.446b28-447a18.
(12) 四諦品	(4) 四諦品	(8) 四聖諦品	(13) 'phags-pa'i bden-pa	

<b>Sanskrit (Zhiyan's report)</b>	<b>Buddhabhadra (T 278)</b>	<b>Śikṣānanda (T 279)</b>	<b>Tibetan (P 761)</b>	<b>Partial extant Chinese and Tibetan</b>
(13) 如來光明熾然 覺品	(5) 如來光明 覺品	(9) 光明覺品	(14) de-bzhin gshegs-pa'i 'od- zer-las nam-par sangs- rgyas	佛說兜沙經 T 280: 10.446a15–b9. 佛說菩薩本業經 T 281: 10.447a19–b4.
(14) 菩薩明難品	(6) 菩薩明難 品	(10) 菩薩問明品	(15) byang-chub sems-dpas dris-pa snang-ba	
(15) 圓淨行品	(7) 淨行品	(11) 淨行品	(16) spyod-yul yongs-su dag- pa	佛說菩薩本業經 T 281: 10.447b6–449 b23. 諸菩薩求佛本業經 T 282: 10.451a6–454 a7.
(16) 賢勝品	(8) 賢首菩薩 品	(12) 賢首品	(17) bzang-po'i dpal	
(17) 須彌頂入如來 品	(9) 佛昇須彌 頂品	(13) 昇須彌山頂品	(18) de-bzhin gshegs-pa ri- rab-kyi rtse-mor gshegs- pa	佛說菩薩本業經 T 281: 10.449b25–29. 諸菩薩求佛本業經 T 282: 10.454a8–20.



(18) 須彌頂如來作 菩薩集說偈品	(10) 菩薩雲集 妙勝殿上 說偈品	(14) 須彌頂上偈讚 品	(19) ri rab-kyi rtse-mo de- bzhin gshegs-pa'i rnam- par 'phrul-pa dang byang- chub sems-dpa'i tshogs- kyi tshigs-su bcad-pa	佛說菩薩本業經 T 281: 10.449b29–c4. 諸菩薩求佛本業經 T 282: 10.454a20–26.
(19) 十菩薩說住品	(11) 菩薩十住 品	(15) 十住品	(20) byang-chub sems-dpa'i rnam-par dgod-pa bcu bstan-pa	佛說菩薩本業經 T 281: 10.449c4–450c25. 菩薩十住行道品 T 283. 佛說菩薩十住經 T 284.
(20) 梵行品	(12) 梵行品	(16) 梵行品	(21) tshangs-par spyod-pa	
(21) 說初發心菩薩 功德花聚喻偈 品	(13) 初發心菩 薩功德品	(17) 初發心功德品	(22) byang-chub sems-dpa' sems dang-po bskyed-pa'i bsod-nams-kyi phung- po'i dpe yang-dag-par bsags-pa tshigs bcad-pa	
(22) 明法品	(14) 明法品	(18) 明法品	(23) chos snang-ba	
(23) 蘇夜摩富作品	(15) 佛昇夜摩 天宮自在 品	(19) 昇夜摩天宮品	(24) ran mtshe-ma'i gnas-na rnam-par 'phrul-ba	諸菩薩求佛本業經 T 282: 10.454a8–20.

<b>Sanskrit (Zhiyan's report)</b>	<b>Buddhabhadra (T 278)</b>	<b>Śikṣānanda (T 279)</b>	<b>Tibetan (P 761)</b>	<b>Partial extant Chinese and Tibetan</b>
(24) 蘇夜摩富菩薩 集說偈品	(16) 夜摩天宮 菩薩說偈 品	(20) 夜摩宮中偈讚 品	(25) rab mtshe-ma'i gnas-su byang-chub sems-dpa'i 'dus-pas tshigs-su bcad- pa bstan-pa	
(26) 十無盡藏品	(18) 菩薩十無 盡藏品	(22) 十無盡藏品	(27) gter mi zad-pa bcu bstan- pa	
(27) 如來昇入兜率 陀天品	(19) 如來昇兜 率天宮一 切寶殿品	(23) 昇兜率天宮品	(28) de-bzhin gshegs-pa dga' ldan-du bzhud-pa dang gshegs-pa dang bzhugs- pa'i rgyan	
(28) 兜率宮菩薩來 說偈品	(20) 兜率天宮 菩薩雲集 讚佛品	(24) 兜率宮中偈讚 品	(29) dga'-ldan-gyi gnas-su byang-chub sems-dpa' 'dus-pa'i tshigs-su bcad- pa bstan-pa	
(29) 金剛幢迴向品	(21) 金剛幢菩 薩十迴向 品	(25) 十迴向品	(30) rdo-rje rgyal-mtshan-gyis yongs-su bsngo-ba	

(30) 十地品	(22) 十地品	(26) 十地品	(31) sa bcu	漸備一切智德經 T 285. 十住經 T 286. 佛說十地經 T 287.
			(32) kun-tu bzang-pos bstan-pa	大方廣普賢所說經 T 298.
		(27) 十定品	(33) ting-nge-'dzin bcu	等目菩薩所問三昧經 T 288.
(31) 神通品	(23) 十明品	(28) 十通品	(34) mngon-par shes-pa	
(32) 忍辱品	(24) 十忍品	(29) 十忍品	(35) bzod-pa	佛說如來興顯經 T 291: 10.614b15–617b7.
(33) 心王問算教入品	(25) 心王菩薩問阿僧祇品	(30) 阿僧祇品	(36) sems-kyis rgyal-pos dris-nas grags-la 'jug-pa bstan	

Sanskrit (Zhiyan's report)	Buddhabhadra (T 278)	Śikṣānanda (T 279)	Tibetan (P 761)	Partial extant Chinese and Tibetan
(34) 壽量品	(26) 壽命品	(31) 壽量品	(37) tshe'i tshad	顯無邊佛土功德經 T 289. 佛說較量一切佛刹功德經 T 290. De-bzhin gshegs-pa-rnams- kyi sangs-rgyas-gi yon-tan brjod-pa'i rnam-grangs P 772. Bsam-gyis mi khyab-pa'i rgyal-po'i mdo P 934.
(36) 說佛法不思議 品	(28) 佛不思議 法品	(33) 佛不思議法品	(39) sangs-rgyas-kyi chos bsam-gyis mi khyab-pa bstan-pa	Sangs-rgyas-kyi chos bsam- gyis mi khyab-pa bstan-pa P 854.
(37) 說如來十身相 海品	(29) 如來相海 品	(34) 如來十身相海 品	(40) de-bzhin gshegs-pa'i sku'i mtshan rgya-mtsho bstan-pa	
(38) 小種好光明說 功德門品	(30) 佛小相光 明功德品	(35) 如來隨好光明 功德品	(41) dpe-byad bzang-po'i 'od- zer bstan-pa	
(39) 說普賢菩薩行 品	(31) 普賢菩薩 行品	(36) 普賢行品	(42) kun-tu bzang-po'i spyod- pa bstan-pa	

(40) 說如來性起品	(32) 寶王如來性起品	(37) 如來出現品	(43) de-bzhin gshegs-pa skye-ba 'byung-ba bstan-pa	佛說如來興顯經 T 291: 10.592c6–614b14.
(41) 出世間品	(33) 離世間品	(38) 離世間品	(44) 'jig-rten-las 'das-pa	度世品經 T 292.
(42) 善財離貪藏品 (43) 彌勒離貪名善財所問品 (44) 說如來功德不思議境界上境界入品	(34) 入法界品	(39) 入法界品	(45) sdong-pos brgyan-pa	大方廣佛華嚴經 T 293. 佛說羅摩伽經 T 294. 大方廣佛華嚴經入法界品 T 295. 文殊師利發願經 T 296. 普賢菩薩行願贊 T 297. 'Phags-pa bzang-po spyod-pa'i smon-lam-gyi rgyal-po P 716.