Some Names in Pan Chou San Mei Ching

Asao Iwamatsu

One of the most important sutras of early Mahayana Buddhism is *Pan Chou San Mei Ching* 般舟三昧經 (hereafter PSC), the Sanskrit name of which, derived from Tibetan translation, is *Pratyutpannabuddhasaṃmukhāvasthitasamādhisūtra* (hereafter PraS). Regarding this Ching, *Ch'u San Tsang Chi Chi* 出三藏記集 tells us that two texts were translated under the same or quite similar title: one by Chih Lou Chia Ch'an 支婁迦讖 (or Chih Ch'an 支讖 for short) in 179 A. D.; and the other by Chu Fa Hu 竺法護, probably in the late half of third century A. D. The former is said to be of one Chüan 卷 (but in Sung, Yüan and Ming editions, it is said to be of two Chüan) and is titled *Pan Chou Pan San Mei Ching* 般舟般三昧經 (but in Sung, Yüan and Ming editions, it is simply called *Pan Chou San Mei Ching*); and the latter is said to consist of two Chüan and is titled *Pan Chou San Mei Ching*. Now we have two texts of this same title "*Pan Chou San Mei Ching*." One of them is of three Chüan (Taisho no. 418, hereafter PSC³), and the other is of only one Chüan (Taisho no. 417, hereafter PSC¹). Both of them are said to be translated by the same Chih Lou Chia Ch'an. But there remain some doubts about the translators' ship of these texts, and, as regards the latter, even whether it is really a translation. One reason is that the latter (PSC¹) is contained only in the Kao Li edition whereas the former is contained in every edition of Sung, Yüan and Ming as well as Kao Li; and, at one glance, seems to be not a translation but an extract of the former or such. For these and some other reasons there are various opinions about the translation and translators' ship of these texts. There is no space here for introducing all of these views. Here I would like to follow the widely held opinion which considers the former (PSC³) to have been translated by Chih Lou Chia Ch'an himself and the latter (PSC¹) to have been translated, or rather, abridged by an unknown person.

There are two other Chinese translations of PraS. One of them is *Pa P'o*

P'u Sa Ching 拔波菩薩經 (Taisho no. 419, hereafter PP'C), the translator of which, according to the catalogue of Buddhist works, is unknown (Shih I 失訳). The other is *Ta Fang Têng Ta Chi Ching Hsien Hu Fên* 大方等大集經賢護分, the Sanskrit title of which is reconstructed as *Mahāvaiṣṭhīya-mahāsaṃnipāta-sūtra-Bhadrāpāla-parivarta* (Taisho no. 416, hereafter HHF), and which was translated by Jñānagupta in 594-5 A.D.

The Sanskrit text of PraS is entirely unknown except for one fragment, which was published by S. Konow in R. Hoernle's *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature*. But it has no particular bearing on our present study. PraS is also translated into Tibetan probably from the Skt. original and is contained in the Tibetan Tripiṭaka (Bkaḥ ḥgyur). Recently this Tibetan text of PraS was published in typescript by Mr. P. M. Harrison ("The Tibetan Text of the Pratyutpanna-Buddha-Saṃmukhāvasthita-Samādhi-Sūtra", *Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series I*, Tokyo, the Reiyukai Library, 1978; hereafter TPraS).

In PSC also, as it is usual in Chih Lou Chia Ch'an's translation, we find many Indian words, not only proper names but also some technical terms, remaining untranslated; that is, transliterated. Most of the Skt. equivalents of these transliterated words can be known by comparing these words with Tibetan, though the texts (PSC and TPraS) themselves are not quite the same. It is apparent that the original text of PSC was written not in classical Sanskrit but in Prakrit; and considering the old pronunciation of the characters of these transliterated words we can conjecture, to a certain extent, their original Prakritic form. In this article I would like to treat of Skt. originals of some proper names in PSC, and, if possible, their Prakritic form.

The PraS begins with the story that eight bodhisattvas come from their home cities to visit the Buddha who is staying on the Mt. Gṛdhrakūṭa. Most of these bodhisattvas are found in some other Mahayana sutras among the sixteen satpuruṣas or among the Buddha's attendants; e. g., in *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā* (hereafter Pv), *Śatasāhasrikā* (hereafter Ś) and *Saddharmaṣaṣṭikā* (hereafter SP; only in Sanskrit text) and their various translations.

The eight bodhisattvas in PSC and their correspondents are given in the next page.

Names of eight bodhisattvas in PSC³ and their equivalents

PSC ³	TPraS	Skt. equiv.	PSC ¹
1) 毘 陀 和	bzañ skyoñ	bhadrāpāla	毘 陀 和
2) 羅 隣 那 竭 ¹⁾	dkoñ mchog ḥbyuñ gnas	ratnākara	羅 隣 那 竭
3) 橋 日 兜 ²⁾	phug sbas	guhagupta	橋 日 兜
4) 那 羅 達	ḥdam bus byin	naḍadatta	那 羅 達
5) 須 深	mtshams bzañ	susīma	須 深
6) 摩訶須薩和	ded dpon chen po	mahāsārthavāha	摩 訶 須 薩 和
7) 因 坻 達	dbañ pos byin	indradatta	因 坻 達
8) 和 輪 調 ³⁾	chu lha	varuṇa	和 輪 調

PPC	HHF	Pv	Ś	SP
拔 毘 賢 護	羅 檀 寶 生 ⁵⁾	bhadrāpāla(1) ⁹⁾	bhadrāpāla(1) ⁹⁾	bhadrāpāla(1)
迦 頭 星 藏 ⁶⁾	迦 休 頭 星 藏 ⁶⁾	ratnākara(2)	ratnākara(2)	ratnākara(2)
那 達 頭 那 羅 達 多	那 達 頭 那 羅 達 多	śubhagupta(6)	guhagupta(7)	guhagupta(5)
須 深 無	須 深 無	naradatta(4)	naradatta(6)	naradatta(4)
大大導衆 ⁹⁾	大大導衆 ⁹⁾	sārthavāha(3)	susārthavāha(5)	susārthavāha(3)
尊 達 偉 德	尊 達 偉 德	indradatta(7)	indradeva(9)	indradatta(7)
謾 論 調 水 天	謾 論 調 水 天	varuṇadatta(5)	varuṇadeva(8)	varuṇadatta(6)

FKC	KTC	MPC	CTL	TPC(3)
護 諸 繫(1) ¹⁰⁾	毘 陀 和(1) ¹¹⁾	毘 陀 婆 羅(1) ¹⁴⁾	毘 陀 婆 羅(1) ¹⁰⁾	賢 守(1)
宝 来(2)	羅 隣 那 竭(2)	羅 那 伽 羅(2) ¹⁵⁾	宝 積(2) ¹⁷⁾	宝 性(2)
所受則能說(5)?	嬌 日 兜(5) ¹²⁾	星 得(5)	星 得(3)	星 授(5)
竜 施(4)	那 羅 達(4)	那 羅 達(4)	那 羅 達(5)	仁 授(4)
導 師(3)	摩訶須菩和(3) ¹³⁾	導 師(3)	導 師(4)	導 師(3)
天 王(7)	因 坻(7)	主 天(7)	帝 天(6)	帝 授(7)
雨 天(6)	和 輪 調(6)	水 天(6)	水 天(6)	水 天(6)

TPC(2)	TPC(1)	CHC	SIC	SWC
賢 護(1)	賢 守(1)	賢 護(1)	跋 陀 婆 羅(1)	跋 陀 婆 羅(1)
宝 性(2)	宝 性(2)	宝 事(2)	宝 積(2)	宝 積(2)
星 授(5)	星 授(7)	恩 施(3)	星 德(3)	人 德(4)
仁 授(4)	仁 授(6)	賢 力(6)?	善 力(6)?	善 護 德(5)?
導 師(3)	導 師(5)	善 導(4)	善 師(4)	善 將 導(3)
常 授(6) ¹⁸⁾	導 帝 授(9)	帝 天(4)	帝 天(4)	帝 王 德(7)
	神 授(8)?	水 天(5)	水 天(5)	大 海 德(6)

denotation:

FKC=放光般若經 (T 221)	KTC=光讚經 (T 222)
MPC=摩訶般若波羅蜜經 (T 223)	CTL=大智度論 (T 1509)
TPC=大般若波羅蜜多經 (T 220); the number indicating the <i>Hui</i> 會	
CHC=持心梵天所問經 (T 585)	SIC=思益梵天所問經 (T 586)
SWC=勝思惟梵天所問經 (T 587)	

v. l. and notes:

- 1) 憐=鄰 2) 橋日=橋目, 橋日, 橋曰 3) 輪=倫, 論 4) 大大=大 5) in other place 宝德, 宝得 6) in other place 伽訶炭多, 星德 7) in other place 商主, 善商主 8) the number indicating the order 9) also appearing in 10th position 10) in 8th position 賢護 11) in 8th position 賢守 12) 嬌日=嬌曰, 嬌日, 嬌曰 13) probably miswriting of 摩訶須薩和 14) 颺=跋 15) 颺=刺 16) in other place 善守 17) in other place 剌那(那)伽羅 18) probably miswriting of 帝授

[Original names of the eight bodhisattvas]

(1) 颺陀和 There is no doubt about its Skt. equivalent *bhadrāpālā*. It is interesting that this *bhadrāpālā* is translated into Chinese as 護諸繫 in *Fang Kuang Pan Jo Ching* 放光般若經. This 護諸繫 leads us to suppose that its original in Skt. was something like *baddhapālā*. The old phonetic of 颺陀和 is reconstructed by B. Karlgren ("Grammata Serica Recensa") as *b'wāt(pīwāt)-d'ā-g'wā| b'uāt(pīwāt)-o d'ā-γuā°*, based on which we can conjecture its Prakritic original to have been something close to *bhaddavā(la)*.

(2) 羅憐那竭 Here too there is no doubt about the Skt. equivalent, *ratnākara*. From its old phonetic *lā-lien-nār-g'iat(g'iat)|o lā-lien-nā°-g'iat(g'iat)*, we can conjecture the original as something like *rat[i or a]nāgar(a)*. It seems that the intermediate *t* has been cerebralized to *ṭ* or *ḍ* and that the consonant cluster *tn* has been divided by an intervening vowel such as *i* or *a*.

(3) 橋日兜 (v. l. 橋目兜, 橋日兜, 橋曰兜) There are many doubts about its Skt. equivalent *guhagupta*. Among the texts only Ś supports *guhagupta*, but no other texts seem to support it directly; for the reason being that on one hand neither 迦休頭 *ka-χiōg-d'u|o ka-χiāu-o d'au* in PP'C nor 伽訶炭多 *g'a-χā-ngiāp-tā|o g'a-χā-ngiāp-o tā* in HHF directly corresponds to the Skt. *guhagupta* or its expected Indian form, and that on the other hand it is doubtful whether *guhā* has the meaning 星 "star" which is found in such translation as 星藏,

星德, 星得 or 星授. Moreover, 橋日兜 $g'iog(k'iog)-hiēt-$ / $g'iau(k'iau°)-hiēt- \circ tzu$ (or 橋 $k'iog(k'iog) / \circ k'iau(\circ k'iau)$, 曰 $giwāt/jiwt$) by no means seems to represent the Indian form of *guhagupta* or Skt. itself. Yet it is not quite impossible to suppose that its Skt. equivalent was *guhagupta*, were the character 日 or 曰 a miswriting of 扌 $g'uət/\gamma uət$, 白 $g'ig/\circ g'izu$ or some similar character; in which case its original would have been something like *guh(a)-gut(t)o*. In any case there remain many doubts about this name.

(4) 那羅達 Though the TPraS indicates that its Skt. form is *naḍadatta*, this is dubious. That its Skt. equivalent should be *naradatta* is supported by Pv, Ś and SP. The Chinese translation 竜施 “dragon-given” makes us suppose a Skt. equivalent like *nāgadatta*. In any case, based on its old phonetic $nâr-lâ-d'ât(t'ât) / \circ nâ°-lâ-d'ât(t'ât)$, we can conjecture its original to have been such as *naradat(ta)*.

(5) 須深 Though the equivalent of this 須深 is lacking in HHF as well as in Pv, Ś, SP and their Chinese translations, based on TPraS it seems that its Skt. equivalent was *susīma*. But the old phonetic rendering of 須深, $sīu-sīəm / \circ sīu- \circ sīəm°$, suggests that the second *s* was not kept unchanged, but rather was palatalized into *ś*, probably under the influence of the succeeding palatal vowel *i*. Thus we can conjecture its original to have been such as *susīm(a)*.

(6) 摩訶須薩和 Though the Skt. equivalent known from TPraS is *mahāsārthavāha*, the character 須 no doubt indicates the existence of medial *-su-*. 大善商主 in HHF also supports this medial *-su-*. Thus the Skt. equivalent of this 摩訶須薩和 ought to be not *mahāsārthavāha* but *mahāsusārthavāha*. From its old phonetic $mwâ-ḡâ-sīu-sât-g'wâ / \circ muâ°- \circ ḡâ- \circ sīu-sât- \circ ḡuâ°$, we may conjecture that the original had a form like *mahāsusat(tha)vā(ha)*.

(7) 因坻達 It is interesting that in Ś its equivalent appears as *indradeva*, which would support the justice of the Chinese translation 天王, 天 or 主帝天. But in this case the Skt. equivalent is undoubtedly *indrādatta*. From its old phonetic $•iĕn-d'iĕr(tīr)-d'ât(t'ât) / \circ •iĕn- \circ d'i(°tīei)-d'ât(t'ât)$, we can conjecture its original to have been something like *ind[i or a]r(a)dat(ta)*.

(8) 和輪調 In the Skt. text of Pv and SP *varuṇadatta* appears as the correspondent of 和輪調. But in Ś its correspondent is not *varuṇadatta* but *va-*

ruṇadeva, which would be the Skt. equivalent of 和輪調. The Tibetan equivalent in TPraS is *chu lha*. I do not know whether it is a translation of the Skt. *varuṇadeva* or merely *varuṇa*. From its old phonetic *g'wā-l̥i-wən-d'ioḡ(t̥iōḡ)/* *ɔ̃uá°-l̥i-uən-ɔ̃d'ieu°(ɔ̃t̥iəu)*, we may conjecture its original to have been something like *varuṇ(a)dev(a)*. I have been interested in 謾論調 in PP'C, the first character of which, that is 謾 *mwán(man, mian)/* *muán°(ɔ̃man°, ɔ̃miän)*, seemed to me to indicate the phonetic change *v/m* even in the initial position (under the influence of remote nasal *n*?). But here it is not the main subject.

In PSC³ still remain far more words which require further investigation. Through careful consideration we might be able to reach a lot of interesting conclusions. There is not sufficient space here for discussing all of these matters. Then, I would like to close this short article after giving below some of these words as a material of our further investigation.

PSC ³	PSC ¹	PP'C	HHF	Skt. fr. TPraS
舍衛墮梨 ¹⁾	墮舍利	惟舍	毘耶離	vaiśālī
占波		占波	瞻婆	campā
彼羅斯 ²⁾		波羅奈		vārāṇasī
加羅衛 ³⁾		迦惟羅衛		kapilavastu
鳩睺弥		拘遲		kauśāmbī
沙祇		沙号		sāketa
須門	須門	須聞	須摩那	sumanā
阿凡和梨 ⁴⁾	阿凡和利	阿凡和利	菴羅波離	āmrāpālī
優陂洹	優婆洹	蓮華色	蓮華色	utpalavaṇṇā
須波日			須波日	
驛羅耶			無畏王	kṣemarāja
衛闍波提			電德	vidyuddeva
賴毘羅耶			光王	raśmirāja
提和竭羅			然燈	dīpaṃkara
私訶摩提	私訶摩提		師子意	siṃhamati
跋登加 ⁵⁾	跋陀和		賢作	bhadraṃkara?
惟斯芩	惟斯芩		勝遊	viśeṣagāmin
坻羅惟是逮	坻羅惟逮		堅固精進	dhīravīrya
坻羅首羅鬱沈	坻羅鬱沈		賢勇	dhīraśūra
薩遮那摩	薩遮那摩		薩遮那摩	satyo nāma

v. l. 1)=墮舍利, 隨舍利 2) 彼=波 3) 加=迦 4) 梨=利 5) 登加=菴迦