

Ulrike Roesler

The Final Time of the Dharma

A 13th-Century Tibetan Version of the Kauśāmbī Story

In her book *Once Upon a Future Time*, Jan Nattier has provided an in-depth study of Buddhist theories of the decline and disappearance of the *dharma*.¹ Based on a careful analysis of her sources, she shows how the timeframe for this decline was expanded further and further as the years since the life of the Buddha increased. A long section of Nattier's study is devoted to the story about events in the city of Kauśāmbī that are believed to cause the eventual extinction of the Buddhist *dharma* (Nattier 1991, chapters 7–10). A conflict within the Buddhist community leads to the death of the last remaining *arhat* on earth and this signals the final disappearance of the *dharma*, accompanied by conflict among humans and natural disasters. Nattier discusses a wide range of versions of this story transmitted in Chinese, Khotanese, and Tibetan and uses the principles of textual criticism to establish a 'stemma' of the different narratives preserved in these sources. In short, the core of the story describes the following events:

“Eliminating those elements that we can be reasonably sure were added at a later date, we are left with the story of an unnamed king ruling at Kauśāmbī who successfully repels a foreign invasion. At the suggestion of his Buddhist advisor, the preceptor Śiṣyaka, the king then invites the monks from surrounding regions to Kauśāmbī for a religious feast. When these monks come together, however, certain differences in their traditions – more specifically, in the degree of their adherence to the monastic rules – begin to surface. Ultimately this leads to an open and violent conflict, in the course of which a monk named Sūrata – widely acknowledged as an *arhat* – is killed by Śiṣyaka's student Aṅgada, who believes that the honor of his teacher has been impugned. Since the crime of killing an *arhat* cannot go

¹ For a convenient earlier survey see Lamotte 1988: 191–202 (French original edition: pp. 210–222).

unpunished, a *yakṣa* appears to avenge the arhat's death, killing Aṅgada on the spot. This would appear to be the end of the story in its original version. No other monks, in this primitive version, are killed, and the response of the king to this debacle is not revealed. The focus of the story is on Aṅgada's heinous crime of killing an arhat, and on the immediate retribution he receives." (Nattier 1991: 219–20)

This simple account was combined with ideas about the decline and disappearance of the *dharma*, which meant that the story – most likely originally recounting past events – was framed as a prophecy predicting the events leading to the extinction of Buddhism in the future. Out of the various renderings discussed by Nattier, two *sūtra* versions are of particular importance for the present context: the *Karmaśataka* (Tib. *Las brgya tham pa*) and the *Candrakarabhāriprcchāsūtra* (Tib. *'Phags pa Zla ba 'i snying pos zhus pa 'i mdo*) which are both included in the Tibetan Buddhist canon. An overview of other materials discussed by Nattier is given in Appendix B, and the reader is referred to Nattier's study for a comprehensive presentation and analysis of these sources. It is noteworthy that the story appears in different narrative formats and under different generic titles in these versions: It is presented as a "(historical) story" (*Li yul chos kyi lo rgyus* "History of Buddhism in Khotan") and a "prophecy" (*Li 'i yul gyi lung bstan pa* "Prophecy of Khotan") and it is embedded in an *avadāna* (in the *Karmaśataka*), contained in a "*sūtra*" (in the *Candrakarabhāriprcchāsūtra*), and included in commentarial works (which we could broadly classify as *śāstra*). Or, to put it another way, we could say that we are probably dealing with a (possibly semi-historical) story about past events that was reinterpreted as a prophecy, and which has been transmitted and preserved in text types that can be classified as *sūtras* and as commentarial literature. Thus, the Kauśāmbī story is yet another example of the complexities of Indian and Tibetan text types and genre designations that have been discussed by various scholars over the past two decades, including the recipient of this Festschrift.²

While perusing early narrative literature from the Tibetan Bka' gdams pa tradition, I came across yet another version of the Kauśāmbī story. It is contained in a commentarial work called *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma* according to its title page.³ It

² See Klaus 2011 in Conermann and El Hawary 2011, Almogi 2005, and Rheingans 2015, amongst others.

³ The manuscript, written in an uneven handwriting that gives the impression of the work of a beginner, comprises 202 folios and is not dated. The title *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma* is taken from the front page. The colophon reads (DMS fol. 202b): *yid nges pa 'byin byed byed [!] rtaṃ [=*gtam] / me tog gsil ma btus zhes bya ba rnam par nges par [']byed pa / me tog gi mdzes pa 'i rgyan ces bya ba theg pa mchog la blo gzhol ba 'i / dpal mdzes rgyal mtshan zhes bya bas rnal 'byor chos kyi ye shes kyi don du bkra shis rdzong sgor sbyar ba 'di yons su rdzogs so // maṅgalaṃ //* "Here ends the text that produces certainty in the mind, the commentary (*vibhaṅga*) called *Me tog gsil ma btus* [from? or: on?] the *Me tog gi mdzes pa 'i rgyan*, composed by Dpal mdzes rgyal mtshan, who is devoted to

was composed by a certain Dpal mdzes rgyal mtshan and quotes lines from a root text which are explained by recounting Indian narrative material, including Buddhist legends as well as some stories from the *Pañcatantra* cycle. The *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma* was most likely composed in the first half of the 13th century, but not much is known about the author apart from the teacher-disciple lineage he refers to within the work.⁴ The work is not dated, but mentions the number of years that have elapsed since the *nirvāṇa* of Buddha Śākyamuni, based on calculations undertaken by Śākyāśrībhadra in 1204, 1207, and 1210. The figures given in this context suggest that the *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma* was written around the same time, i.e. in the early 13th century.⁵ The calculation moreover assumes that the *dharma* will remain for a period of 5000 years after the *nirvāṇa*, namely 3226 years, eight months, and seven days from the point in time when the calculation was made.⁶

the best of vehicles [i.e. the Mahāyāna], for the benefit of the Yogi Chos kyi ye shes in Bkra shis rdzong sgo.”

- ⁴ The Tibetan transmission lineage (DMS fols 3b–4a) begins with Atiśa Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna, followed by teachers of the Bka’ gdams and Bka’ brgyud tradition: *dge slong she ston pa* (**dge bshes ston pa*, i.e. ‘Brom ston pa, 1004–1064), *spyang mnga’ ba* (= *spyang snga ba* Tshul khriṃs ’bar, 1038–1103), *sha bo pa* (= Sha bo sgang pa Padma byang chub, 1067–1131?), *dge shes zhu ston mo ri pa* (= *dge bshes Zhu Don mo ri pa*), *don mo ri pa shar bzhi brje* (unidentified), *bla ma lhog skyab pa* (unidentified), *bla ma rjod pa* (unidentified), *bla ma ti pa ra* (unidentified), *bdag* (Dpal mdzes rgyal mtshan). For a short discussion see Roesler 2011: 99 and Roesler 2015: 389–390.
- ⁵ On Śākyāśrī’s calculation of the time since the Buddha’s *nirvāṇa* see Vostrikov 1994 [1970]: 110ff. Śākyāśrī assumed 544 BCE to be the year of the *nirvāṇa*, which corresponds to the traditional date in the Theravāda tradition. The relevant passage in the *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma* mentions a *byi ba’i lo* (rat year, i.e. 1207?) and indicates the time that has elapsed since the Buddha’s *nirvāṇa* according to a calculation carried out at Bkra shis rdzong, following the tradition of Śākyāśrībhadra. According to this calculation the time that has elapsed is *sngar ’das pa ni lo stong bdun rgya dang / ngag [!] bcu rtsa gsum dang / zla ba bcu gnyis dang / chu tshod bco brgyad ’das so* (DMS fol. 199a3–4). It seems likely that *ngag bcu* is a misspelling for *lga bcu*. The year of writing would then be 1753 after *nirvāṇa* = 1210/11 (this coincides with the year in which Śākyāśrī did his third calculation). However, 1210 is a horse rather than a rat year, and the dating therefore remains inconclusive.
- ⁶ *lus pa ni lo gsum stong dang / nyis *brgya (rgya) dang nyi shu rtsa drug dang / zla ba brgyad dang / *zhag (bzhang) bdun dang dbyug gu bzhi bcu rtsa gnyis lus pa yin no / /* (DMS fol. 199a4–5). The assumption of a 5000 year period is in contradistinction to the version of the *Candragarbhaparipṛcchā*, according to which the dharma will last for 2000 years after the *parinirvāṇa*. Buddhaghosa assumed that the *dharma* would last for 5000 years and this became the standard in the Theravāda school, see Nattier 1991: 56–59. Śākyāśrī’s calculation is thus in accordance with the Theravāda tradition in this respect, as is his dating of the Buddha (544 BCE, see the previous footnote). The 5000 year period also became the standard in Tibet, possibly based on the **Maitreyasūtra* (Tib. *Byams pa’i mdo*), a sūtra about the coming of the future Buddha Maitreya (see Nattier 1991: 59).

The Kauśāmbī story in the *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma* is embedded in a discussion of the time the *dharma* will exist in the world. The story is preceded by a description of four time periods in which the *dharma* will gradually decline (fols 191bff.); this culminates in the events at Kauśāmbī (fols 194aff.) that will lead to the final extinction of the *dharma*. What strikes me as remarkable is the way the *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma* weaves together narrative strands of different provenance. The plot combines elements from the Kauśāmbī narratives of the *Candragarbhapariṣcchā* and the *Karmaśataka*. The introductory section on the four time periods of the decline of the *dharma* is similar to the *Candragarbhapariṣcchā*, but missing in the *Karmaśataka*. There are also other elements in the story that are shared with the *Candragarbhapariṣcchā*, but are absent in the *Karmaśataka*, for example a verse spoken by the *tripīṭaka* master Śiṣyaka,⁷ and a scene at the end in which people are dressed up as “fake monks” and presented to the king.⁸ More-over, both the *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma* and the *Candragarbhapariṣcchā* emphasise that the existence of the *saṅgha* is important because it allows the king to cleanse his sins; this concern with confession and atonement is not expressed in the *Karmaśataka* narrative. However, the *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma* also shares elements with the *Karmaśataka* against the *Candragarbhapariṣcchā*. The most striking instance is an abridged rendering of verses from the *Karmaśataka* which are not contained in the *Candragarbhapariṣcchā* at all (the parallels are presented in Appendix A; one further example can be found in fn. 61).

The *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma* also contains details that are neither in the *Candragarbhapariṣcchā*, nor in the *Karmaśataka*, nor any other version known to me. For example, it provides an additional epithet for Duṣprasaha, the son of king Mahasena (fol. 195a), that is not found elsewhere. Even more interestingly, it seems to reflect some knowledge of the Khotanese version(s) of the narrative as it refers to the disappearance of the *dharma* in Li yul (Khotan) (fol. 194b). Khotan does not feature in the plot, and there would be no need to mention it at all unless

⁷ DMS fol. 196b: “The *tripīṭaka* master says: “For those without a nose, what good is a mirror? Equally, for a recluse who has committed a moral transgression, what good is it to pronounce the *prātimokṣa*?” Cf. *Candragarbhapariṣcchā*, episode [20] (Nattier 1991: 271): *Shi sya ka na re / mi la mig zhar / snga dang rna ba med na me long ci dgos / bltar ci yod / 'dul ba bshad kyang khyed 'dul ba ltar mi spyod / tshul khrims mi bsrungs pa la 'dul ba bshad kyang ci phan zhes smras pa...* “Śiṣyaka said: ‘For someone who is blind, if he is without nose and ears, what use is a mirror! What would he see! Even if I were to teach the Vinaya, you will not act according to the Vinaya. For someone who does not observe moral discipline, what use would it be even if I taught the Vinaya!’ ” The simile of the mirror is also contained in the *Book of Zambasta* (Emmerick 1967: 414–15), which is part of the “*Candragarbha* group” (see Appendix B), and in another text from Khotan, the *Prophecy of Saṅghavardhana*, see Thomas 1935–65, vol. I: 67.

⁸ *Candragarbhapariṣcchā* episodes [25-27] (Nattier 1991: 274–276); DMS fols 198a–b.

the author knew of some texts or stories that make a connection between the decline of the *dharma* and the land of Khotan, such as “Prophecy of Khotan” (*Li yul lung bstan*) and related texts that originated in Khotan and were translated into Tibetan (see Appendix B).

The *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma* is not alone in making this connection: The account of the disappearance of the *dharma* in the famous religious history by Bu ston Rin chen grub (1290–1364) also shows an awareness of the Khotanese versions. While Bu ston mainly provides a slightly abridged rendering of the *Candragarbhaparipṛcchā*, he also refers to the “Prophecy of Saṅghavardhana” (*Dge ’dun ’phel gyi lung bstan pa*).⁹ This title corresponds to a version of the prophecy that seems to have originated in Khotan, but was preserved in Tibetan and incorporated into the Tibetan Buddhist canon (*Dgra bcom pa dge ’dun ’phel gyi(s) lung bstan pa*, Q 5698/D 4201).¹⁰ According to this version, the *dharma* will decline in Khotan and the Buddhist monks from the region will flee to Tibet, and from there to Gandhāra, and finally to Kauśāmbī, where the events take place that lead to the disappearance of the *dharma* on earth. In addition to the “Prophecy of Saṅghavardhana”, Bu ston also quotes from several other *sūtras* that describe the disappearance of the *dharma*; however, he does not mention the *Karmaśataka* in this context. The combination of the *Candragarbhā* plot with elements from the *Karmaśataka* is thus specific to the *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma*, but the knowledge of a Khotanese story related to the end of the *dharma* is shared by Bu ston and our author, a hint at its circulation in Tibet, however small scale or widespread this may have been.

The manuscript of the *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma* contains numerous spelling mistakes which sometimes make it difficult to determine the intended form of a specific word. In spite of this, there is sufficient evidence to show that the verb forms fluctuate between the past, present, and (very occasionally) future tense, in spite of the fact that the framework of the story is set in the future. The past tense forms are not restricted to the perfective use, i.e. completed actions within the narrative sequence of a sentence (“Vorzeitigkeit”), but also occur in the final verb where the logic of the narrative would require a present or future tense. In the translation below I have opted for the present as the basic tense of the narration, without indicating which verbs are in the present and which are in the past; an accurate rendering of the Tibetan forms would have resulted in a confusing mixture of tenses in English.¹¹ One may speculate why the past tense forms have crept into the text: Are they mere slips, perhaps triggered by the perfective verbs within

⁹ *Bu ston chos ’byung*, ed. 1988: 177; trans. Obermiller ²1986: 177. For the full story see *Bu ston chos ’byung*, ed. 1988: 173–177 and trans. Obermiller ²1986: 171–177.

¹⁰ See Thomas 1935–65, vol. I: 39–69 for an edition and translation of this text.

¹¹ Nattier 1991: 237 notes the same inconsistent use of tenses with regard to the *Candragarbhaparipṛcchā*. She has opted for a rendering in the future tense, for the same reason given here.

the sentence that made the author occasionally lapse into the past tense? Or do they confirm Nattier's suggestion that the Kauśāmbī story may originate in a narrative of the past that was turned into a prophecy about the disappearance of the *dharma* at a later stage?

The narrative in the *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma* is fairly brief and shows no attempt at literary embellishment. Such short versions were useful summaries or memory aids that could serve as the basis for more elaborate oral renditions when these legends were recounted by Buddhist teachers in their sermons and explanations, as they are still given today. In spite of the simple and unpretentious style, the author repeatedly draws attention to the Indian provenance of the story, and perhaps to his own scholarship and learning, by using Sanskrit terms such as *loka* "the world" and *treta* "the third [time period]". Neither the Tibetan *Candragarbhapariṣcchā*, nor the Tibetan *Karmaśataka* have included such Sanskritisms in their narrative and this feature must therefore be a deliberate choice on the part of our author.

Proper names, on the other hand, are translated into Tibetan rather than rendered in their transliterated Sanskrit forms. In this respect, the *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma* follows the *Karmaśataka*, which uses the same technique. It differs in this respect from the earliest version of the *Candragarbhapariṣcchā* (i.e. the Dunhuang version), which provides the names in transliteration alone. The later blockprint editions of the *Candragarbhapariṣcchā* within the Tibetan canon have standardised the transliterations to some degree and added Tibetan translations of the names, and Nattier has convincingly argued that these translations were likely taken over from the *Karmaśataka*¹² (see Appendix C for an overview of personal names).

The following pages offer an edition and translation of the story of the disappearance of the *dharma* according to the *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma*, thus adding another element to the known versions of the Kauśāmbī story. I present this version here as a witness to the way legends and stories travelled, developed, and were interwoven, like a narrative thread composed of different strands.¹³ The text leaves us with a number of questions: Was this story based on written manuscript materials or on oral versions that were in circulation at the time? As we have seen, the parallels with the *Karmaśataka* and *Candragarbhapariṣcchā* suggest a good

¹² Nattier 1991: 233–236 discusses the names in some detail. The Tibetan translations of Indian names were not part of the original translation of the *Candragarbhapariṣcchā*, as they are missing in the Dunhuang version. They must therefore have been editorial additions, and their congruence with the names used in the *Karmaśataka* (including one erroneous name form) shows beyond doubt that this is the source for the names.

¹³ The allusion to the idea of a text as a thread (Sanskrit *sūtra*) in which several strands are interwoven (see Klaus 2010) is obviously intended.

knowledge of these textual sources, but the rendering is to a large extent independent of these in its phrasing, and the story contains a few details that are not contained in any of the other known sources. It is an intriguing question how the author of the *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma* composed his version, but this may ultimately be impossible to establish. In addition to the *Karmaśataka* and *Candragarbhaparipṛcchā*, he may have had access to literary sources we do not know; he may have worked either from manuscript copies or from his own memory of the *sūtra* texts or both; he may also have combined elements from the well-known written sources with oral versions he had heard; and he may have improvised now and then. When Nattier discusses her methodology for constructing the stemma of the narrative versions of the Kauśāmbī story, she outlines the limitations of such an attempt in the following way:

“There are, however, a few cases in which the application of these principles will not enable us to fit a given version of the Kauśāmbī story within the stemma constructed below. First, an author may deliberately condense a text in order to fit it within the parameters of a specific literary form, in the process omitting material that would have allowed us to determine the ancestry of his version of the text. Second, an author (or editor) may make use of more than one version of the story in preparing his own recension. And finally—since we are dealing not merely with the copying of manuscripts, but with much more extensive developments in a literary tradition—we must also take into consideration the possibility that oral versions of the story may have influenced written ones, and vice versa. In such cases the trajectory of a given version of the story will be extremely difficult to trace, and much of its ancestry may be impossible to reconstruct.” (Nattier 1991: 214)

These features seem to apply to the case of the *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma*, as the author is evidently summarising the plot rather than copying the story in full (in spite of some passages that show a verbatim knowledge of the literary sources), and we must also assume the possibility that the narrative includes elements of oral versions. What we can say with relative certainty, however, is that the story is based on the narratives of the *Candragarbhaparipṛcchā* and the *Karmaśataka* and reflects some awareness that the story also relates to Khotan. It is thus an interesting witness for the circulation of these sources in the 13th century and for the techniques Tibetan authors used in rendering these materials.

Tibetan text

Editorial conventions

The manuscript is riddled with spelling mistakes. Editorial additions are inserted between square brackets [] and letters to be deleted are inserted between curved

brackets { }. Other emendations are marked with an asterisk, with the original reading provided in the footnotes. Subscript letters are used for letters inserted below the line in the manuscript, and the semi-colon imitates a special punctuation mark representing a *shad* after the first word in a new line of the manuscript.

(fol. 194a6) ...*de nas dus *'gribs te song nas*¹⁴ *rtags tsam 'dzin pa'i dus lnga [b]rgya phrag cig byung [s]te / chos pa'i gzugs *brnyan*¹⁵ *tsam*¹⁶ **bslab*¹⁷ *pa gsum dang mi ldan pa / chos yod kyang [b]stan pa'i bya ba mi byed pa / khyim pa rnams* (fol. 194b) *kyang chos pa la mi gus dge ba dang dge 'dun gyi [b]snyen bkur rgyun [']chad / de'i dus su chos pa rnams kyang chos bzhin mi spyod / de'i dus su dri dang ro [m]chog rnams kyang bag tsam chung ngu 'gro [/] gser la sogs pa'i rin po che rnams kyang dkon [/] rta ya_{ng} nyung 'gro [/] dkar po'i phyogs kyi mi ni nyung / bdud rigs nag po'i phyogs kyi stobs rgyas nas mi nad dang phyugs kyi sems can *'chi*¹⁸ */ lo nyes 'ong / [']thab {b}rtsod byed / skye bo thams cad mi dge ba la dga' zhing dge ba mi byed do [/]*

*de [b]stan pa nub tu byung ba rnams bod du byon te / li yul nas chos kyi [b]stan pa bag tsam yang med par 'gyur ro // de nas bod kyi rab tu byung ba rnams rgya gar gyi yul ghan dho rar 'gro ste / bod na [b]stan pa bag tsam med par 'gyur *ro*¹⁹ *// de nas ghan dho ra'i* (fol. 195a) *[b]stan pa 'jig ste /*

*de'i dus su yul dbus ko'u sha bhi zhes bya bar rgyal po dbang chen sde zhes bya ba sras cig [b]tsas pas lus la khrag rang [']khrugs su yod pa khrag gis [b]skus pa cig *btsas*²⁰ *pa'i tshe khrag gi char {'}babs so // de'i dus su blon po'i bu lnga [b]rgya yang rgyal bu dang 'dra bar sha stag [b]tsas so // de rnams bram ze mtshan mkhan la bstan pas / 'dis 'dzam bu'i gling du khrag gi chag chag 'debs so zhes zer ro // rgyal po zhe{s} sdang che bas rgyal po bzod par dka' ba zhes kyang bya / lag pa dmar po 'jug pas rgyal po *dpung*²¹ *dmar po zhes kyang bya'o //*

¹⁴ *'gri ba'i te song nas*. My emendation is based on parallel phrases on the previous pages of the manuscript (cf. fol. 192b1 and 3).

¹⁵ *snyan*

¹⁶ It appears that our author has misunderstood a technical term here. In other 'decline of the *dharma*' narratives, the expression *dam pa'i chos kyi gzugs brnyan* designates an equivalent ("mirror image", *gzugs brnyan*) of the true *dharma* and does not carry any negative connotations (see Nattier 1991, chapter 4), i.e. it is not "a mere image" of the *dharma*, but it is an equivalent or "semblance of the True Dharma". Our author, on the other hand, applies the term to people rather than the *dharma* itself and speaks of those "who merely resemble religious practitioners" (*chos pa'i gzugs brnyan tsam*).

¹⁷ *la slab*. A possible explanation for this mistake is that the copyist misread the prescript *b* in *bslab pa* and turned it into a separate syllable *la* (*gzugs brnyan tsam la*).

¹⁸ *mchi*

¹⁹ *to* (if this were correct, the verb form would have to be *gyur*)

²⁰ *tse*s

²¹ *dbung*

*de'i dus su *mtha' khob²² kyi rgyal po gsum gyi[s] dbus su dmag *drangs²³ te / de yang lho phyogs kyi rgyal po ka sha zhes bya ba 'khor 'bum dang / (fol. 195b) nub phyogs kyi rgyal po bha li ka zhes bya ba dang 'khor 'bum dang / byang phyogs kyi rgyal po ka sha zhes bya ba 'khor 'bum dang bcas pa gsum gyi dmag 'ongs nas dge 'dun gyi [g]tsug lag khang thams cad [b]shig dge slong thams cad kyang dkrongs so // dmag de 'ongs pa'i gtam thos pas rgyal po dbang chen [sde] {d}mya ngan gyis gdungs ma dga' nas / bar snang nas lha rnam na re gzhon nu bzod par bka' ba rgyal sar thon cig zer nas rgyal por skos pas / {de nas rgyal por skos pas /}²⁴ de nas *mtha' khob²⁵ kyi rgyal po gsum dang yul sprad pas *mtha' khob²⁶ kyi rgyal po gsum 'khor 'bum dang bcas pa thams cad bsad de khrag gis chag chag 'debs so //*

*de nas rgyal po dpung dmar 'gyod de yid khong du chud de / (fol. 196a) bdag gi{s} 'gro sa ni dmyal ba min pa med do snyam nas mya ngan gyis khang par [b]zhugs pa na / blon po rnam kyis smras pa / rgyal po de tsam mi 'tshal te sdig pa *bshags²⁷ pa'i thabs kyis sdig pa [s]byang ba yin pas sdig pa bshags par *mdzod²⁸ cig byas te bshags pa'i rten 'dzam bu'i gling gi rab tu byung ba rnam spyang drangs pa na / rab tu byung ba phal chen lam du dkrongs te rab tu byung ba 'bum tsam ko'u sha bhir sleb bo [/] de rnam kyis rgyal po'i mchod gnas byas nas sdig pa sbyong bar byed do //*

*de'i tshes rab tu byung ba rnam kyi slob dpon ni bram ze mes *byin²⁹ zhes bya ba'i [bu] rab tu byung nas [b]slab[s] pas sde snod [g]sum pa slob ma can gyis dpon byed do // de'i tshes yul dmar bu can gyi tshong dpon nor bzangs kyi bu (fol. 196b) des pa zhes bya ba ri bo gang[s] can na yod *pa³⁰ byon nas tshes {/} bc{w}o lnga'i tshes [g]so sbyong la bab pa na / des pas sde snod gsum pa la so sor thar pa'i mdo mngon par zhus pa dang / sde snod gsum pa na re sna med pa la me long gi[s] ci zhig bya / de bzhin du nyes ltung dang bcas *pa'i³¹ dge sbyong la so sor thar pa *don³² ci bya zer / des pa na re bdag la ni nyes ltung gis gos ma myong bas so sor thar pa *thon³³ cig zhus pas ; sde snod gsum pa'i bsam pa la 'di ni dgra*

²² *thang khog*

²³ *grangs*

²⁴ The repetition is due to a dittography.

²⁵ *thang khyob*

²⁶ *thang khab*

²⁷ *bshegs*

²⁸ *'dzed*

²⁹ *bzhin*

³⁰ *ma*

³¹ *pas*

³² *ton*

³³ *don*

*bcom pa yin par 'dug snyam nas zhus te *gnong ba na³⁴ sde snod gsum pa'i slob mar dge slong dpung rgyan can bya bas nga'i mkhan po la sun 'byin {b}zer te / des pa la *stun³⁵ shing rgyab nas bkrongs so // de na gnod sbyin gzhon rdor bya (fol. 197a) *ba³⁶ yod *pas³⁷ 'jig rten na dgra bcom pa 'di las med pa la de dkrongs pa zer te dpung rgyan can la stun shing rgyab pas bsad do // der rab tu byung ba sde gnyis [']khrugs te mtshon gyis phar [g]sod tshur gsod byas nas rab tu byung ba [g]cig kyang med [/] da sangs rgyas kyi [b]stan pa *dmas?³⁸ nas med par 'gro'o // de'i tshe sa g.yos pa dang / skar mda' ltung ba dang / phyogs bzhi nas gza' *mjug³⁹ rings shar bar gyur te de'i dus su nam mkha' la lha thams cad ngu zhing shākya thub pa'i [b]stan pa 'di nyid du gyur [/] zhi ba'i dus ni 'das par 'gyur [/] mi zad dus ni 'byung gis med [/] gang dag 'di 'dra'i dus la bab pa'i tshe [/] snying stong pa du ma gang snying ni lcags kyi snying por zer⁴⁰ ces pa la sogs pa brjod cing ngu'o // skar ma{i} *dhu ma ke tu⁴¹ bya ba'i lus la du ba nag po *byung⁴² nas nyi ma dang zla ba'i 'od (fol. 197b) kyang mi *gsal⁴³ lo // de nas yum sgyu 'phrul mas nga'i bus [b]skal pa grangs med par bsod nams dang ye shes kyi tshogs pa las byung ba'i chos nub bo zhes 'di skad du smras sngags brjod do //*

*kye ma *des pa⁴⁴ yon tan [can] ;
sangs rgyas sras kyi mthu bo de /
dpung rgyan phra[g] dog *zhe⁴⁵ sdang gis /
dbang du gyur par gsod pa na /
kyi hud mi'i lha [m]chog gi /
[b]stan pa {bs}nyam[s] par gyur gyis med /
sde snod gsum pa slob ma can /
dge slong des pa gnyis gsad pas /
[b]stan pa'i nyi ma nub kyis med /
de dus 'jigs pa chen po yis /*

³⁴ *snang pa na*. The emendation is based on the parallel in the *Candrāgarbhaparīṣcchā*, see Nattier 1991: 272.

³⁵ *brtun*

³⁶ *bo*

³⁷ *pa'i*

³⁸ *rmad*

³⁹ *'jug*

⁴⁰ This appears to be a distorted rendering of verses from the *Karmaśataka*, see fn. 61.

⁴¹ *bu ka ta*. The emendation **dhu ma ke tu* is based on the *Candrāgarbhaparīṣcchā* (Nattier 1991: 273).

⁴² *byang*

⁴³ *glas*

⁴⁴ *'das pa'i*

⁴⁵ *zhi*

*mun pa'i *lo ka⁴⁶ 'byung gis bar /
mya ngan 'das pa'i gnas 'gro ba'i /
chos kyi gru chen zhig gis med /
tshangs pa'i lo ka 'di nyid du /
mgon med yi yang chad par 'gyur /*

*ces pa la sogs smras zhing ngu'o // de nas (fol. 198a) rab tu byung ba rnam kyi
ro rgyal pos mthong ba dang / rgyal *po'i⁴⁷ *bsam pa⁴⁸ la nga'i sgrib par sbyong
ba re ba la khong (?)⁴⁹ rang yang 'di ltar gyur pas de ni bdag gis sdig pa sus
sbyong snyam nas yang mya ngan du byas pa la / blon po rnam kyis yang rab tu
byung ba rnam gzhan kun spyang drangs pa{'i} {m}chog byas pas / rab tu byung
ba ma rnyed nas rab tu byung ba tshul byas te skra dang kha{s} spu 'breg tu mi
thub pas pho[r] bas [']thum pa dang / mes sreg pa dang bcas gos gser po *bco⁵⁰
ru mi 'dod pa la blangs / dmar *po'i⁵¹ ko ba gon dge slong lnga [b]rgya yin no
zhes smras pas / (fol. 198b) rgyal po dga' nas phyag dang mchod pa byas nas chos
dri pas chos med pas yang ngu'o // der sangs rgyas kyi [b]stan pa nub pa dang
nas dang gro dang 'bras dang 'bru la sogs pa nub te *tre ta⁵² pa'o / dar dang ras
la sogs pa nub te *lpags⁵³ pa gon no // ro zhim pa rnam nub nas kha ba dang
rtsub pa lus so // rin po che la sogs pa'i rgyan nub ste rang las byas pa la sogs
pa'i rgyan byed do /*

Translation

(fol. 194a6) ... After that the times deteriorate [further], and the five hundred years of a merely symbolic [Buddhist practice]⁵⁴ will come. [The monks], who are just

⁴⁶ *lo ga*

⁴⁷ *pos*

⁴⁸ *bus ma ba*

⁴⁹ The word *khong* is followed by a gap, which may indicate that the sentence is meant to end here. Could it stand for *gang*, indicating a rhetorical question? My translation of this phrase remains tentative.

⁵⁰ *brtso*

⁵¹ *pa'o*

⁵² *tre te*

⁵³ *sbags*

⁵⁴ *rtags tsam 'dzin pa'i dus lnga phrag cig*. This marks the beginning of the last and final 500 years of the *dharma* according to the *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma*. On fol. 192a1, this time period is called *rtags mtshan 'dzin pa'i dus*, which has a similar meaning and corresponds to a time period in which monks only wear the outward signs (Skt. *nimitta*, Tib. *mtshan*) of monkhood while they are not acting like proper monks any more (see e.g. Nattier 1991: 57).

an imitation of religious Buddhists,⁵⁵ are without the three trainings and even though the *dharmā* does exist, they do not act according to the teachings. The lay people (fol. 194b) too are without respect towards the clerics, and virtuous behaviour and service towards the *saṅgha* come to an end. At that time, the clerics too will not act according to the *dharmā*. At that time, the excellent smells and tastes are slightly diminished; precious materials such as gold become rare; horses too become few; and the good people will become few. As the power of the party of the dark demons has increased, people become ill and the cattle die. The harvests become bad. There is strife. All beings take delight in unwholesome [actions] and do not perform the wholesome [actions].

Those for whom the *dharmā* has disappeared will go to Tibet; from Khotan, the *dharmā* will all but disappear. Then the monks of Tibet go to Gandhāra⁵⁶ in India. In Tibet the teaching becomes all but extinct. After that, the teachings of Gandhāra (fol. 195a) are destroyed.

At that time, there is in Kauśāmbī in the land of Magadha a King called Mahendrasena; when his son is born, the blood in his body is seething and he is covered with blood. When he is born, a rain of blood falls. At that time, five hundred sons of the [five hundred] ministers will also be born in exactly the same way as the prince. They show him to a Brahmin diviner, and he says: “By this [it is indicated that] the world will be sprinkled with blood.” Because as a king⁵⁷ he is full of anger, he shall be called King Duṣprasaha. Because he employs thugs (lit. “people with red hands”, i.e. hangmen or assassins), he will also be called “The One with the Red Troops”.

At that time, the three kings of the border regions pull their troops together. The troops of the three: the 100,000 soldiers of King Kasha of the south, (fol. 195b) the 100,000 soldiers of King Bhalika of the west, and the 100,000 soldiers of King Kasha of the north⁵⁸ arrive, and all temples of the *saṅgha* are destroyed, and all monks get killed. When he hears the news about the arrival of the troops, King Mahendra[sena] is afflicted with sadness and is unhappy. From the

⁵⁵ *chos pa'i gzugs brnyan tsam*. The author or the scribe of the manuscript (mis)understands the term *chos kyi gzugs brnyan*, Sanskrit [*sad*]dharmā-pratirūpaka, “semblance of the *dharmā*” and applies it to the religious practitioners (*chos pa*) rather than the *dharmā* itself, see note 16 above.

⁵⁶ *ghan dho ra*. The parallels in other versions of the story suggest that this stands for Gandhāra.

⁵⁷ The designation ‘king’ is an anachronism; the person in question is the son of the king (i.e. the prince) who will later become king himself.

⁵⁸ The names of the geographical regions and their people are conflated with the personal names of the kings. Furthermore, the text accidentally mentions “King Kasha” twice. Other versions of the story mention the Greeks (*ya va na*) in the north, the Parthians (*pa la ba*) or Bactrians (*ba lhi ka*) in the west, and the Śakas (*sa ka*) in the south, see appendix C.

sky, the gods say: “Make Prince Duṣprasaha king,” and he is appointed king. Then, the three kings of the borderlands unite their countries, and the three borderland kings together with their troops of 100,000 [soldiers] are all killed, and [their] blood is spilled. Then, King “Red Troops” feels regret and gets anxious. (fol. 196a) Thinking “My destination can be nothing but hell,” he stays inside the house in distress. The ministers say: “O king, you do not need [to behave] like this; because a sin is cleansed through confession, you should confess the sin.” When, as the recipients of confession, the monks of Jambūdvīpa are invited, the majority of the monks die on the way, and only around 100,000 monks arrive in Kauśāmbī. They act as priests for the king and undertake to cleanse [his] sins [through a ritual confession].

At that time, the teacher of the monks is the *tripiṭaka* master Śiṣyaka, the son of a Brahmin called Agnidatta, who had become a monk and studied [the *dharma*]. At that time Sūrata arrives, the son of the merchant Sudhana of the region of Pāṭali-putra,⁵⁹ (fol. 196b) who had been in the Himālayas. On the 15th day when the time for the monastic confession ritual (*poṣadha*) has come, Sūrata requests from the *tripiṭaka* master the *prātimokṣa*, and the *tripiṭaka* master says: “For those without a nose, what good is a mirror? Equally, for a recluse who has committed a moral transgression, what good is it to pronounce the *prātimokṣa*?” Sūrata says: “Since I have never been tainted by sin, please pronounce the *prātimokṣa*!” The *tripiṭaka* master asks himself: “Might this be an *arhat*?” and feels remorse; the monk Aṅgada says to the students of the *tripiṭaka* master: “My abbot has been abused!” And he beats Sūrata with a staff, and he dies. Thereupon, the Yakṣa Vajrakumāra⁶⁰ (fol. 197a) says: “There was no *arhat* in the world but this one, and [now] he has been killed!” And he hits Aṅgada with a staff and kills him. Thereupon, the two groups of monks are upset; they kill each other with weapons until not a single monk is left. Now the teaching of the Buddha is degraded and eradicated. At that time, the earth shakes, shooting stars fall, and comets appear in the four directions; at that time all the gods assemble in the sky and say: “The teaching of Śākyamuni has come to this! The time of peace has passed; the time of the inexhaustible [*dharma*] will not arise; at such a time, the many empty hearts [of the people?] must be called hearts of iron!”⁶¹ and they weep. From the body of the comet

⁵⁹ *Dmar bu can* (as in the *Candragarbhaparipṛcchā*). The *Karmaśataka* (D fol. 268b4, K fol. 280a8) has the variant *yul dmar can gyi bu*.

⁶⁰ Rdo rje gzhon nu. In the *Karmaśataka* and *Candragarbhaparipṛcchā*, the Yakṣa is called Dadhimukha “milk face” (Tib. *zho gdong*) and hits Agnidatta with a *vajra*.

⁶¹ This appears to be a distorted rendering of verses from the *Karmaśataka*, spoken by the lay Buddhists of Kauśāmbī: ...*gang dag 'di 'dra'i dus bab tshe // snying ni stong dum (?) gas pa // bdag nyid chen po de dag gi // snying gi lcags kyi snying po zad // zhi ba'i dus ni 'das par gyur // mi zad dus ni byung gis med // ...* (D ha, 270a7–270b1; K su,

Dhūmaketu black smoke comes forth and the sun- and moonlight (fol. 197b) are obscured. Then Māyā, the mother [of Buddha Śākyamuni] says: “Today the *dharmā*, which originated from the merit and wisdom accumulated by my son in many eons, has disappeared.” And she makes the following pronouncement:

“Alas, the virtuous Sūrata,
the eldest [i.e. foremost] son of the Buddha,
has been killed because Aṅgada
was overcome with jealousy and hatred.
Alas, now the teaching of the lord of humans
is nothing but corrupted.
The *tripiṭaka* master Śiṣyaka and
the monk Sūrata have both been killed,
and therefore the sun of the teaching has set and is gone.
At this time, through this great danger,
the large boat of the *dharmā*,
which averted the darkness
and led to the place of *nirvāṇa*
has perished and is gone.
In this very world of Brahma
[beings] are despondent because they are without a protector,”

and she weeps. Then, (fol. 198a) when the king sees the corpses of the monks, the king thinks: “What about my hope to cleanse my sin? Now that this has happened, by whom could my sin be cleansed?” and he is sad. The ministers say: “Please allow us to invite all the other monks!” and as they cannot find any monks, they assume the appearance of monks. As they cannot shave off hair and beard, they cover them with wooden bowls and singe them with fire. As they do not wish to produce yellow [monastic] robes, they don red skins; and they say: “We are 500 monks.” (fol. 198b) The king is happy, and after making prostrations and offerings, he asks for the *dharmā*, and as there is no *dharmā*, he weeps again. Thereupon, together with the disappearance of the *dharmā*, barley and wheat and rice and grains disappear too: that is the third [time period] (*treta*). Silk and cotton etc. disappear, and people are wearing [animal] skins. Pleasant tastes disappear, and

284a8) “Now that such a time has come, the hearts are broken [into] a thousand [pieces]; the hearts of those great beings have lost their iron core. The time of peace has passed. The time of the inexhaustible [*dharmā*] won’t come [again].” It is difficult to see whether the second line reads as rendered above, which makes good sense but is metrically deficient, or whether there is a *tsheg* after *du* and it reads: *snying ni stong du ma gas pa* (“the hearts are not broken into a thousand [pieces]”) which is metrically correct, but seems to make less sense here. The corresponding phrase in DMS is evidently corrupt, but has simply been rendered as it stands in the above translation.

bitter and coarse food remains. Ornaments of jewels etc. disappear, and people have ornaments of natural objects, etc.

Abbreviations

- DMS *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma*
D Derge blockprint of the Tibetan canon
K Peking blockprint of the Tibetan canon (Kangxi edition), 1684–92. (Accessed via tbrc.org, W1PD96684)
Q Peking blockprint of the Tibetan canon, 1717–20. Reproduced in *The Tibetan Tripitaka. Peking edition kept in the library of the Otani University, Kyoto*. Ed. by Dr. Daisetz T. Suzuki. 168 vols. Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation. 1955–61.
Toh. *A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons (Bkaḥ-ḥgyur and Bstan-ḥgyur)*. Ed. by Prof. Hajuku Ui, Prof. Munetada Suzuki, Prof. Yenshō Kanakura, [and] Lect. Tôkan Tada. Sendai: Tôhoku Imperial University 1934.

References

Tibetan primary sources

Bu ston chos 'byung gsung rab rin po che'i mdzod. Ed. Rdo rje rgyal po. Xining: Krung go'i bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang 1988. [Engl. trans. see Obermiller ²1986.]

Candragarbhapariṣcchāsūtra see Nattier 1991, 256–277.

Karmaśataka, Tibetan: *Las brgya tham pa. Bka' 'gyur*, D (Toh. 340), *Mdo sde*, vols. *ha*, 1b–309a and *a*, 1b–128b; K (cf. Q 1007), *Mdo sde sna tshogs*, vols. *su* 1–330a and *hu* 1–131a.

Mdo sde me tog gsil ma: A book of stories of the early Bka'-gdams-pa tradition by Dpal-mdzes-rgyal-mtshan. Reproduced from an ancient manuscript from the Gemur Monastery in Lahul by Topden Tshering. Delhi 1978.

Secondary sources

- Almogi, Orna 2005. "Analysing Tibetan Titles : Towards a Genre-based Classification of Tibetan Literature." *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 15, pp. 27–58.
- Conermann, Stephan and Amr El Hawary (eds) 2011. *Was sind Genres? Nicht-abendländische Kategorisierungen von Gattungen.* (Narratio Aliena? Studien des Bonner Zentrums für Transkulturelle Narratologie I.) Berlin: EB Verlag.
- Emmerick, R. E. (ed. and trans.) 1967. *Tibetan Texts Concerning Khotan.* (London Oriental Series 19.) London: Oxford University Press.
- (ed. and trans.) 1968. *The Book of Zambasta : A Khotanese Poem on Buddhism.* London: Oxford University Press.
- Klaus, Konrad 2010. "Zu den buddhistischen literarischen Fachbegriffen *sutta* und *suttanta*." In: *From Turfan to Ajanta : Festschrift for Dieter Schlingloff on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday.* Ed. by Eli Franco and Monika Zin. 2 vols. Lumbini: LIRI, pp. 519–532.
- 2011. "Textgattungen im alten Indien : Theorie und Geschichte." In: *Was sind Genres? Nicht-abendländische Kategorisierungen von Gattungen.* Edited by Stephan Conermann und Amr El Hawary. (Narratio Aliena? Studien des Bonner Zentrums für Transkulturelle Narratologie I.) Berlin: EB Verlag, pp. 22–46.
- Lamotte, Étienne 1988. *History of Indian Buddhism : From the Origins to the Śāka Era.* Translated from the French by Sara Webb-Boin. Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut Orientaliste de la Université Catholique de Louvain / Louvain: Peeters Press.
- Lokesh Chandra 1998 [1959–61]. *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary.* [Japanese reprint of the ed. New Delhi 1959–61.] Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co.
- Nattier, Jan 1991. *Once Upon a Future Time : Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline.* (Nazan Studies in Asian Religions 1.) Berkeley, California: Asian Humanities Press.
- Obermiller, E. ²1986 [1st ed. Heidelberg 1932]. *The History of Buddhism in India and Tibet by Bu-ston.* Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.

- Rheingans, Jim (ed.) 2015. *Tibetan Literary Genres, Texts, and Text Types : from Genre Classification to Transformation*. (PIATS 12). Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Roesler, Ulrike 2011. *Frühe Quellen zum buddhistischen Stufenweg in Tibet : Indische und tibetische Traditionen im dPe chos des Po-to-ba Rin-chen-gsal*. (Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 20.) Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- 2015. “16 Human Norms (*mi chos bcu drug*) – Indian, Chinese, and Tibetan.” In *The Illuminating Mirror : Tibetan Studies in honour of Per K. Sørensen on the occasion of his 65th birthday*. Ed. by Olaf Czaja and Guntram Hazod. (Contributions to Tibetan Studies 12.) Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, pp. 389–409.
- Thomas, Frederick Williams 1935–65. *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents Concerning Chinese Turkestan*. 4 vols. London: The Royal Asiatic Society.
- Vostrikov, Andrei Ivanovich 1994 [reprint of the ed. Calcutta 1970]. *Tibetan Historical Literature*. Translated from the Russian by Harish Chandra Gupta. [Russian edition 1962.] London, New York: RoutledgeCurzon Press.

Appendix A

Queen Māyā’s verses, *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma* and *Karmaśataka*

Mdo sde me tog gsil ma (fol. 197b1-7) without emendations	Parallel in the Karmaśataka D ha, 272a4-272b3; K su, 286a6-286b4
de nas yum sgyu ’phrul mas nga’i bus skal pa grangs med par bsod nams dang ye shes kyi tshogs pa las byung ba’i chos nub po zhes ’di skad du smras sngags brjod do //	de nas lha mo sgyu ’phrul chen mo sum bcu rtsa gsum pa’i gnas nas babs nas / snying rje rje skad du smre sngags ’don te / kyi hud da ni nga’i bus bskal pa grangs ⁶² med gsum gyi bar du bsgrubs pa’i dam pa’i chos da ni ⁶³ ’thab ⁶⁴ mos nub par byas kyis med do zhes zer ro / ’di skad ces kyang zer te /

⁶² *grangs*] D; *bgrangs* K

⁶³ *da ni*] om. K

⁶⁴ *’thab*] K; *thab* D

<p>kye ma 'das pa'i yon tan ; sangs rgyas sras kyi mthu bo de / dpung rgyan phra (!) dog zhi sngad gis / dbang du gyur par gsod pa na /</p> <p>kyi hud mi'i lha tshog (!) gi / stan pa bsnyam par gyur gyis med / sde snod gsum pa slob ma can / dge slong des pa gnyis gsad pas / stan pa'i nyi ma nub kyis med /</p> <p>de dus 'jigs pa chen po yis / mun pa'i log 'byung gis bar / mya ngan 'das pa'i gnas 'gro ba'i / chos kyi gru chen zhig gis med /</p> <p>tshangs pa'i lo ka'di nyid du / mgon med yi yang chad par 'gyur /</p>	<p>kye ma des pa yon tan can // sangs rgyas sras kyi tha chungts te // dpung rgyan phrag dog zhe sdang gi // dbang du gyur pas bsad pa na // sangs rgyas yum ni brtul zhugs bzang // lha mo chen mo sgyu 'phrul ma // dam pa'i chos ni nub pa'i phyir // mi dga' snying rje bla bar 'gyur // kyi hud mi yi lha⁶⁵ mchog gi // bstan pa nyams par gyur⁶⁶ gyis med // sde snod gsum pa slob ma can // dge slong des pa gnyis bsad pas // deng du zla ba gnam las lhung // nyi ma yang ni 'phos kyis med // bstan pa'i nyi ma med gyur pas // da ni 'jig rten snang ba med // zla ba'i dkyil 'khor dag pa ni // sgra gcan gyis ni zin pa ltar // deng du 'jigs pa chen po yi // mun pa 'jig rten byung gis med // mya ngan 'das pa'i gnas 'gro ba'i // chos kyi gru ni de ring du // dpung rgyan la sogs byis pa rnams // snying med pas ni⁶⁷ bsad kyis med // rtags tsam lhag ma lus par zad // chos ma yin pa snang bar 'gyur // bdud rnams rgyal ba'i sgra skad ni // bdud kyi 'khor rnams sgrags par byed // seng ge'i sgra ni bsgrags pa yi // lus 'phags ri bo de nyid du // da ni brgya byin 'khor dang bcas // mya ngan zug rngus phog par gyur // tshangs bcas 'jig rten de ring du // mgon med yi yang chad par gyur // ... [the lament continues]</p>
--	---

⁶⁵ lha] D; lhag K

⁶⁶ gyur] D; 'gyur K

⁶⁷ snying med pas ni] D; snying rje med pas K

Appendix B

Versions of the Kauśāmbī story discussed in Nattier 1991, chapter 7

Non-Mahāyāna versions:

- *Prophecy of Kātyāyana*, in verse: Chinese translation late 3rd or early 4th century
- *Prophecy of Kātyāyana*, prose version: Chinese translation 5th century (perhaps Dharmaguptaka tradition)

***Aśokāvadāna* group** (Sarvāstivāda tradition):

- *Aśokāvadāna*, Chinese translation late 5th cent.
- *Samyuktāgama* Chinese translation 5th cent.
- *Karmaśataka*, Tibetan translation no later than second half of the 8th cent.
- *Mahāvibhāṣā* (Sarvāstivāda tradition): Chinese translation 7th cent.

Versions with Mahāyāna elements:

- Short summary in the *Mahāmāyāsūtra*, Chinese translation 479-502CE

Candragarbhasūtra group:

- *Candragarbhaparipṛcchā*, Tibetan translation (attested among the Dunhuang manuscripts and later included in the *Bka' 'gyur*)
- Chinese translation incorporated in the *Mahāsammipātasūtra*, mid-6th century
- Khotanese version, around early 8th century: *Book of Zambasta*

Versions from Khotan, preserved in Tibetan but likely translated from Khotanese, with focus on Khotan and references to events of the 8th century:

- *Dgra bcom pa dge 'dun 'phel gyis lung bstan pa* (Q 5698/D 4201)
- *Li'i yul gyi (dgra bcom pas) lung bstan pa* (Q 5699/D 4202); also preserved in three Dunhuang manuscripts
- *Li yul chos kyī lo rgyus*, preserved in one single manuscript from Dunhuang.

Appendix C

Comparison of proper names⁶⁸

As the table below shows, the *Karmaśataka* only contains translations of the Sanskrit names, whereas the Dunhuang manuscript of the *Candragarbhaparipṛcchā* only contains transliterations of the Sanskrit names. Its later blockprint editions in the *Bka' 'gyur* have added the translations to the transliterations. The *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma* follows the *Karmaśataka*.

The kings of the surrounding countries are listed as King Ka sha, Bha li ka, and again Ka sha, which is obviously an error. The Dunhuang version of the *Candragarbhaparipṛcchā* names them as kings [of the] Ya va na (Greeks), Pa la ba (Parthians), and Shag kyu na (Śakas), whereas the later blockprint editions as well as the *Karmaśataka* have turned the Pa la ba into Ba lhi ka (Bactrians).⁶⁹

Both the *Mdo sde me tog gsil ma* and the *Candragarbhaparipṛcchā* understand these to be names of kings rather than peoples, whereas the *Karmaśataka* first correctly identifies these as names of people and in the second instance treats them as names of the respective kings, thus creating some ambiguity.

Mdo sde me tog gsil ma	Karmaśataka (D)	Candragarbhaparipṛcchā T = Dunhuang X = xylograph editions ⁷⁰
Rgyal po Dbang chen sde	Dbang chen sde	T: Men dra se na, X: Ma hen dra se na (Skt. Mahasena)
Rgyal po Bzod par dka' ba	Bzod par dka' ba	T: Du spra ba sam, X: Du spra sa ha stas (Skt. Duṣprasaha)
= Rgyal po Dpung dmar po, Rgyal po Dpung dmar	-	-
Rgyal po Ka sha (south)	Sha ka (south)	T: Rgyal po Ya va na, X: Rgyal po Ya ba na
Rgyal po Bha li ka (west)	Ba lhi ka (west) Ya va na (north)	T: Pa la ba (Parthian), X: Ba lhi ka (Bactrian)

⁶⁸ For a comprehensive list of all proper names of individuals and places see Nattier 1991: 287–295; see *ibid.* 233–236 for a discussion of the names in the *Candragarbhaparipṛcchā*.

⁶⁹ See Nattier 1991: 253 (note 12) and 265.

⁷⁰ I.e. the blockprint editions of the *Bka' 'gyur* used by Nattier: Narthang (N), the Peking editions of 1692 (K) and 1720 (Q), Derge (D), Cone (C), and Lhasa (H). I have not listed all variant readings occurring in these editions, as the table above only aims to show the general patterns of congruences and divergences.

The Final Time of the Dharma

Rgyal po Ka sha (north)		T: Shag ku na, X: Sha ku na
Mes byin	Mes sbyin	T: Ag na tra ta, X: Ag ni da ti, mes byin
Slob ma can	Slob ma can	T: Shir sha ga, X: Shi şya ka, Slob ma can
Tshong dpon Nor bzangs	Tshong dpon Nor bzangs	T: S.hu dha ra sh.ha na, X: Su dhana, Tshong dpon Nor bzang(s)
Des pa	Des pa	T: Su rad, X: Su ra ta, Des pa
Dge slong Dpung rgyan can	Dpung rgyan (zhes bya ba 'jigs su rung ba)	T: Dge slong A gan dhe, X: Dge slong Aṃ ga da, Dpung gi tshogs 'jigs su rung ba (zhes bya ba) (!)
Gnod sbyin Gzhon rdor	Gnod sbyin Zho gdong	T: Gnod sbyin 'Dhid dha mu kha, X: Gnod sbyin Da dhi mu kha, Zho gdong Dir rga mu kha
Yum Sgyu 'prul ma	Lha mo Sgyu 'phrul chen mo	-



