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INTRODUCTION

In his seminal work *Imagining Religion*, J. Z. Smith more than once turns his attention to history and myth.¹ Using the Māori cosmogony and the Ceramese myth of Hainuwele as illustrations, he argues that scholars of religion, when reading a text, ought to consider its historical context(s)—a directive meant to steer scholars away from the many conceptual problems associated with attempts to remove a text from its context in order to abstract a stable meaning.² This simple yet substantial insight is instructive because, plainly stated, my thesis is a translation and analysis of a particular variant of the second chapter of the *Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra*, entitled “Pūrvayogaparivarta”³ (henceforth: Pūrvayoga), the provenance of which can be traced to a specific king who governed a relatively small swath of territory in what is now northern Pakistan around the turn of the seventh century CE. But according to Smith, scholars are not just to pay attention to the circumstances in which a text was produced, used, and read. Equally important are the contexts in which scholars find themselves. As such, prior to outlining the contours of the argument to be made in the coming pages, I will first address my context—that is, the field to which this work contributes and in which I am situated.

Buddhist Studies is a relatively young Western academic discipline; according to Donald Lopez, it properly came into being when Brian Hodgson, a British anthropologist,

---


³ The colophon of the chapter reads: “ratnaketuparivartād dvitiyāḥ pūrvayogaparivartāḥ samāptah.” The full title of Pūrvayoga, considering its contents (which will be discussed below), can loosely yet properly be translated as “A Previous Existence of Śākyamuni and Others under Jyotisomyagandhāvabhāsārī.” Yenshu Kurumiya, *Ratnaketuparivarta: Sanskrit Text* (Kyoto: Heirakuji-Shoten, 1978), xvi; *BHSD*, 352.
found several Sanskrit Buddhist texts in Nepal and subsequently distributed them to his colleagues in the first half of the nineteenth century. Hodgson sometimes consulted with practitioners regarding the contents of these texts, but most scholars after him seem to have abandoned this practice in favor of exclusive text analysis. In accordance with the intellectual fashion of the time, these early scholars believed themselves to be abstracting from texts the essential core of Buddhism, against which its historical manifestations were “to be judged, and to be found lacking.” Such treatment was certainly not reserved for Buddhism—indeed, Edward Said has made it clear that the Western academy was no stranger to essentialism at this time. But is it really the case that Buddhism is merely a construction of the Western academy? In some sense, it seems incorrect to answer in the affirmative—for the Buddha was a real person, his followers used the word “bauddha” self-referentially, and they called his teachings “buddhadharma.” Yet at the same time, it must be conceded that “the Buddhism of our handbooks” is principally derived (or at least was so derived) from philosophical texts “produced and circulated among a small circle of monastic elites.”

Given this genealogy, what use does “Buddhism” have as a category? How ought I to proceed? At the risk of appearing too straightforward (and perhaps too eager to stand

---

4 Lopez writes: “Buddhist Studies, then, began as a late-comer to Romantic Orientalism, an offshoot of Indology at a time when India was no longer in vogue.” Donald S. Lopez, Jr., Curators of the Buddha: The Study of Buddhism under Colonialism (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995), 2.
5 Lopez, Curators of the Buddha, 6-7.
7 Lopez, Curators of the Buddha, 7.
9 Lopez, Curators of the Buddha, 7.
on the shoulders of J. Z. Smith\textsuperscript{10}), I understand the Buddhism of early scholarship to be nonexistent. In other words, the notion that “Buddhism” denotes an ahistorical essence is intellectually bankrupt.\textsuperscript{11} But while the category unquestionably carries with it unwanted essentialist baggage, it does not need to be rejected wholesale. Rather, it can be retooled to designate “a complicated network of similarities overlapping and criss-crossing,”\textsuperscript{12} or in less cryptic language, a family of related yet historically situated practices, doctrines, qualities, ways of speaking, and so forth.\textsuperscript{13}

Being that much of the early scholarship on Buddhism was problematic in virtue of its being exclusively textual, it is perhaps ironic that the foundation of the present work is an original translation. Aside from the somewhat trivial motivation of wanting to put my own language skills to the test, I wanted to translate a previously untranslated text to increase the amount of Buddhist literature available in English. But it is not my singular intention to put twenty-odd more pages on a shelf in the mostly empty section labeled “Mahāyāna” in Jorge Luis Borges’ fabled Library.\textsuperscript{14} Rather, I aim to contribute to the


\textsuperscript{11} This view is not groundless; on the contrary, there are solid theoretical and methodological reasons for it. Essences are never as ahistorical as people sometimes claim them to be. Any and all talk about the essence of Buddhism (or any other religion, for that matter) is talk about the normative tradition, which is always contested. And it is this contestation that makes all claims about essence eminently historical. Just as this position is not groundless, nor is it unique to me. I stand among scholars like J. Z. Smith, Bruce Lincoln, Russell McCutcheon, etc., who argue that it is not the job of scholars to take part in debates regarding the normative tradition.


\textsuperscript{13} In the polythetic mode of classification, “a class is defined as consisting of a set of properties, each individual member of the class to possess ‘a large (but unspecified) number’ of these properties, with each property to be possess by a ‘large number’ of individuals in the class, but no single property to be possessed by every member of the class.” Smith, \textit{Imagining Religion}, 4.

\textsuperscript{14} This is a dual reference to Lopez, who brought to my attention that the majority of Mahāyāna sūtras have yet to be translated, as well as Borges’ 1962 short story, entitled “The Library of Babel.” Lopez, \textit{Curators of the Buddha}, 19.
field of Religious Studies by bringing theory to the text—more specifically, I examine Pūrvayoga in terms of myth. While some scholars in the past may have been hesitant to draw conclusions about Buddhism based on theoretically driven analysis due to a perceived lack of data, the field seems to have undergone a noteworthy change in recent years—Charles Orzech, Jan Nattier, Daniel Boucher, and Richard Cohen, for example, have overcome such anxieties to produce sophisticated works of translation and analysis. The work represented in this thesis contributes to this new wave of scholarship, which has taken to task the sometimes essentialist and theoriaphobic features of older scholarship in the field of Buddhist Studies.

Following in the footsteps of said scholars whose works I admire, the translation appears at the end of this thesis, while the preceding sections concern my analysis and the information pertinent to such a task. The purpose of this introduction has been to show, broadly speaking, where I see my work fitting into the field of Buddhist Studies. But in the first proper chapter I focus on the scholarly context more immediately surrounding my work. The significance of the discovery of the Gilgit Manuscripts in the middle decades of the twentieth century, of which the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra is one of several,

---

15 I agree with Lopez, who nearly twenty years ago wrote: “It is this fantasy of the library [containing every book ever written] that seems at times to obsess the study of Buddhism, as if the aim were to edit and translate every text. But the bibliophilia of the Buddhologist, no matter how deeply ingrained, cannot serve as a reason for forever deferring questions of theory.” Lopez, Curators of the Buddha, 19.
20 Unfortunately, I cannot take credit for this word. Leonie Sandercock, an Australian academic, though in the context of an editorial about city planning, uses it in a similar sense. Leonie Sandercock, “Editorial,” in Planning Theory & Practice 5, no. 2 (2004): 141-44.
is difficult to exaggerate—for, as Gregory Schopen notes, the texts provide scholars with a large window into the Buddhism of a specific place and time.\textsuperscript{21} As such, in the first half of the chapter I discuss in varying degrees of detail the history of the discovery and contents of the collection, as well as the work scholars have produced on them. In light of the brief historical survey of Buddhist Studies given above, it may come as no surprise that most of the work done on the Gilgit Manuscripts to date has been philological. This is not at all meant to belittle philological work—indeed, my work would be impossible without it—but rather to say that very few of the manuscripts have been the objects of theoretically driven analysis. In the second half of the chapter, my attention turns to the *Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra*. After providing some general information regarding the text, I argue that the variant of the text central to this thesis must have existed by 630 CE, which proves to be a helpful piece of information when seeking historical data.

The second chapter primarily concerns matters methodological and theoretical. I first address my goals for the translation and how I have attempted to accomplish them. Aside from being grammatically correct, an aim perhaps too obvious to state, I have tried to produce an English translation that someone familiar with Buddhism would find relatively easy to read. This has proven to be quite a difficult task for a few reasons, but I hope my rendering is not altogether unintelligible. Regarding theoretical approach, as noted, I intend to examine Pūrvayoga as myth. After surveying some previous theories of myth, I construct a theory informed by sociological, marxist, and poststructuralist thought; in short, I theorize myth as “ideology in narrative form,”\textsuperscript{22} as one of the

\textsuperscript{21} Schopen, “Bhaiṣajyaguru-Sūtra and the Buddhism of Gilgit,” 105.

\textsuperscript{22} Bruce Lincoln, *Theorizing Myth: Narrative, Ideology, and Scholarship* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1999), 147
strategies by which a certain community “attempt[ed] to authorize their contingent, historical world.”

I have decided to bring this particular conception of myth to the text because of its structural features, because a specific king had the text copied, and because ideology is typically associated with political power. In other words, this theory of myth is capable of exposing the way those in power can employ texts to achieve their desired ends, whatever they may be.

In the third chapter, historical context takes center stage. The colophon of the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra indicates that Vikramādityanandi, a king of the Paṭola Śāhi Dynasty, commissioned the text to be copied along with two of his four known queens, Surendramālā and Dilnitapūṇyā. In an effort to contextualize Vikramādityanandi and his decision to have the text copied, I review the history of the Paṭola Śāhīs, a dynasty of kings who ruled the kingdom of Bolōr between the sixth and eighth centuries CE, their patronage of Buddhism, and their interactions with some of the major powers in the areas surrounding. Unfortunately, information regarding the earliest stages of the dynasty is scarce, but it appears that the dynasty emerged sometime between the late sixth century war between the Sassanid Persians and the Turks and 630 CE. But regardless of when exactly the dynasty came into being, it is clear that the territory they ruled was widely coveted due to its advantageous location on the Silk Road.

The penultimate chapter of this work contains my analysis of Pūrvayoga. As will be made clear in the second chapter, Pūrvayoga lends itself particularly well to analysis

---

24 Kurumiya, Ratnaketuparivarta, 178; Rebecca L. Twist, The Patola Shahi Dynasty: A Buddhological Study of their Patronage, Devotion and Politics (Saarbrücken, Germany: VDM Verlad Dr. Müller, 2011), 239.
in terms of myth due in part to its structural features; not only does its parent text (a self-
proclaimed Mahāyāna sūtra) claim to be the words of Śākyamuni, but it also puts into his
mouth a narrative regarding the activities and teachings of another enlightened being in
what is often called the “mythic past.” Considered in this light, the entire Ratnaketu
Dhāraṇī Sūtra could be analyzed in terms of myth (as could perhaps all other Mahāyāna
sūtras), but Pūrvayoga is the focal point here for reasons of scope. While such a structure
is reason enough to read practically any text as myth, the case for so reading Pūrvayoga
becomes more compelling in light of the fact that the available evidence reveals who
cause it to be copied, when it was copied, and in what context it was copied. Thoroughly
distilled, the question central to this chapter is this: Why was it copied? I assume that
Vikramādityanandi copied the sūtra for a reason—and I argue below that Pūrvayoga can
be read as constructing and naturalizing a worldview in which kingship and buddhahood
are intimately connected, which (if accepted by its audience) would undoubtedly be a
benefit to Vikramādityanandi.
PART I: SITUATING SELF AND SŪTRA

As stated in the introduction, this chapter concerns the specific academic context in which my work is situated. Since the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra is one of the Gilgit Manuscripts, I survey here the discovery and contents of the collection, as well as the scholarship that has been produced on the manuscripts. Reflecting the trend in Buddhist Studies previously outlined, with some notable exceptions, most of the work done on the collection thus far has been philological. In other words, though only concerning one of its chapters, this thesis is one of the few theoretically driven analyses of the Gilgit texts. The second half of this chapter focuses more narrowly on the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra. After surveying some general information about the sūtra, I argue that the variant of the text in question must have existed prior to 630 CE. Establishing a stable terminus ad quem date for my variant of Pūrvayoga helps to determine its historical context.

The Gilgit Manuscripts: Discovery, Contents, and Scholarship

The cache of texts now known as the Gilgit Manuscripts was unearthed over a period of nearly three decades in the mid-twentieth century from a plateau near Naupur, a village adjacent to the city of Gilgit in the northernmost province of modern-day Pakistan.25 High in the mountains and difficult to reach, this plateau was the place where locals took their animals to graze.26 In the first half of 1931, one such local cattle grazer initially

---

25 Pakistan’s northernmost province is called Gilgit-Baltistan. In political terms, Gilgit-Baltistan borders the Wakhan district of the Badakhshan Province of Afghanistan, the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of China, and Jammu and Kashmir of India. Geographically speaking, the province is in the westernmost part of the Himalayas. To be more specific, it is situated southeast of the Hindukush, south of the Pamir, and snugly among the Karakoram.

uncovered the ruins of the structure containing the manuscripts while exploring further an area where he had found some stamped clay tablets; thinking the barely exposed wooden beams to be a grave, he stopped digging and returned home. The next day, however, a different villager returned to the site and continued digging, only to be disappointed by a wooden chest containing not treasure (as he may have hoped), but “just books.” Seven years later, the archaeologist Madhusudan Kaul Shastri commenced the first excavation of the site with permission from local authorities. After just one week, he and his team had uncovered and outlined the specifications of the structure. At that time he found a second, smaller group of manuscripts (two of which had painted covers) and some miniature stūpas. The final stage of discovery occurred in 1956 when Giuseppe Tucci, an Italian scholar of Buddhism, found yet another small group of manuscripts.

Until early in the twenty-first century, scholars agreed that the structure at Naupur was a stūpa, and that the manuscripts were ritually buried there. Richard Cohen narrates the commonly accepted story:

In the middle of the eighth century C.E., the people, perhaps the king, or maybe some monks in Gilgit, sponsored the construction of a large stupa, almost twenty feet wide at its based and forty feet tall. This stupa had two stories inside; the casket with the manuscripts was placed in the upper story, along with clay tablets and perhaps even one or two bronze statues. The manuscripts were sealed up inside the stupa when it was first built. Once interred, these books were never again expected to be read.

---

27 Jettmar, Beyond the Gorges of the Indus, 162-63.
28 For the structure’s dimensions, see Jettmar, Beyond the Gorges of the Indus, 164-65.
29 Sudha Gopalakrishnan, UNESCO—Memory of the World Register: The Gilgit Manuscripts, 6.
30 Jettmar, Beyond the Gorges of the Indus, 170.
31 Gopalakrishnan, UNESCO, 6.
32 I will highlight here three major permutations of the narrative, but it is worth noting that the basic story persists in the minds of some scholars. See, for example, Akira Hirakawa’s A History of Indian Buddhism: From Śākyamuni to Early Mahāyāna, translated and edited by Paul Groner (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1990), 295; Rebecca L. Twist, The Patola Shahi Dynasty, 11; Mushirul Hasan’s “Preface” and Lokesh Chandra’s “Foreword” in Journal of Oriental Studies 22 (2012): 39-41 and 46-51.
It is not clear whence exactly this narrative came, but Sir Aurel Stein, the first Western scholar to examine the manuscripts found by the cattle grazers in 1931, is probably partly responsible—for soon after this initial cache was discovered, he identified the structure as a *stūpa*. Nalinaksha Dutt, who edited and published several of the manuscripts, tells a more detailed version of the story based on evidence drawn from the manuscripts themselves, as well as comparative archaeological evidence from nearby areas. Because archaeologists had discovered manuscripts in *stūpas* elsewhere, and because some of the manuscripts’ colophons list donors by name, Dutt infers that the manuscripts found at Naupur “were specially prepared for a certain ritualistic purpose, and after the performance of that ritual, the [manuscripts], sacred as they were, were placed in a *stūpa*.”

More recently, the German anthropologist Karl Jettmar not only concurs that the structure was a *stūpa*, but also postulates that “the texts brought from Great Bolor by the last Patola Shahi…were incomprehensible and, therefore, translated into ‘Concealed Books’ in an official act.”

Considering that the practice of burying manuscripts was, in fact, common in several Buddhist communities (at least after the turn of the common era), the inference

---

34 Twist, *The Patola Shahi Dynasty*, 32.
35 “Sir Aurel Stein, in the newspaper The Statesman (on 24th July 1931) first announced the discovery of the manuscripts. He reported that some ‘boys watching flocks above Naupur village, about two miles west of Gilgit Cantonment, are said to have cleared a piece of timber sticking out on the top of a small stone-covered mound. Further digging laid bare a circular chamber within the ruins of a Buddhist *stupa* filled with hundreds of small votive *stupa*-s and relief plaques common in Central Asia and Tibet.’” Gopalakrishnan, *UNESCO*, 5.
36 *GM* v1, iii-iv.
37 According to Tibetan Buddhist tradition, Padmasambhava buried Buddhist texts throughout the Buddhist landscape in the eight century to be discovered later because the people were not yet ready for the message contained therein; these texts are called *gter-ma*, which literally means “hidden treasure.” *DOB*, 299; Jettmar, *Beyond the Gorges of the Indus*, 171-72.
38 According to Richard Salomon, “the ritual interment of manuscripts was definitely a common practice during the heyday of Gandhāran Buddhism in the early centuries of the Christian era [sic], and the currently
that the manuscripts were buried intentionally in a stūpa is not altogether unreasonable.\(^{39}\)

But the inference seems to have been the result of the available evidence being colored, so to speak, by a preexisting framework of expectations regarding stūpas, sūtras, and the people who made and used them. It seems that Stein initially identified the structure as a stūpa in part because there were sūtras in it. Later, in conjunction with archaeological evidence from other sites, certain aspects of the structure may have been called upon to confirm the already held belief. Similarly, the inference that the texts were buried intentionally appears to have been partially based on the perceived sacrality of Buddhist literature and the assumption that the structure was in fact a stūpa. Perhaps in the imaginations of twentieth century scholars it was out of the question that a Buddhist would abandon a single sūtra, let alone so many of them. But this is more or less what actually happened according to Gérard Fussman, whose recent reassessment of the evidence calls into question the accuracy of the persistent narrative.\(^{40}\)

Summarizing Fussman’s findings, Cohen writes that the structure at Naupur was probably the living quarters of some local Buddhist teachers, and that the manuscripts found therein were “personal books: inherited books, books they used in their daily vocation, gifts of books from grateful clients.”\(^{41}\)

Moreover, rather than ritually burying their books, Fussman attested and reported instances of the practice undoubtedly represent some tiny fraction of the total number of manuscripts that were buried in antiquity...the practice of text burial [is also] widely and clearly attested in Tibet and East Asia.” Richard Salomon, “Why did the Gandhāran Buddhists bury their manuscripts?” in Buddhist Manuscript Cultures: Knowledge, ritual, and art, eds. Stephen C. Berkwitz, Juliane Schober, and Claudia Brown (London: Routledge, 2009), 31.

\(^{39}\) It makes sense to bury sūtras, particularly, in light of the trikāya theory, which made it conceptually possible for people to think of sūtras as relics of one of the Buddha’s bodies (i.e. the dharmakāya). Cohen, The Splendid Vision, 2.

\(^{40}\) Unfortunately, I cannot yet read French, so my knowledge of Fussman’s work comes from Cohen. For the original article, see Gérard Fussman, “Dans quel type de bâtiment furent trouvés les manuscrits de Gilgit?” Journal asiatique 292 (2004): 101-50.

\(^{41}\) Cohen, The Splendid Vision, 3.
thinks that the teachers at one point simply abandoned their home, leaving it to the elements. In Cohen’s words: “We have these ancient tracts and treatises, not because pious Buddhists secreted them with sublime expectations inside a mystic tomb, but due to chance factors involving economics, human migration, and most of all, the weather.”

Regardless of which narrative is more accurate, roughly sixty manuscripts have emerged from the structure at Naupur to tell their stories. The collection has yet to be edited and published in its entirety, but several manuscripts are available in print due to the labor of Nalinaksha Dutt, who over a span of approximately twenty years produced the four-volume, nine-part *Gilgit Manuscripts*. In addition to the *Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra*, Dutt’s series contains the popular *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā* (the Diamond Sūtra),* the *Samādhirāja Sūtra* (the King of Concentration Sūtra)*, the *Bhaiṣajyaguru Sūtra* (the Master of Medicine Sūtra),* several selections from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* (the monastic code of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, which is still followed by ordained Tibetan Buddhists),* and the *Sarvatathāgatādhiṣṭhāna-sattvāvalokana-buddhakṣetra-sandarśana-vyāham* (“The Splendid Vision in Which One Observes Living Beings and Reveals Buddhafields Through the Empowerment of All Tathagatas”).

---

43 The application for the Gilgit Manuscripts to be entered into UNESCO’s Memory of the World Register states that sixty-two manuscripts were found at Naupur; in contrast, Oskar von Hinüber writes that “there were approximately 50 manuscripts containing 57 titles and 17 Avadānas.” Gopalakrishnan, *UNESCO*, 4; Oskar von Hinüber, “The Saddharma-puṇḍarīkasūtra at Gilgit: Manuscripts, Worshippers, and Artists,” in *Journal of Oriental Studies* 22 (2012): 52.
44 GM v4, xv-xxiv (introduction) and 139-70 (Sanskrit text on Sanskrit numbered pages).
45 GM v2 p1-3. Dutt describes the *Samādhirāja Sūtra* “one of the nine principal texts of the Mahāyānists” in the preface second volume’s second part.
46 GM v1, 47-57 (introduction) and 1-32 (Sanskrit text on Sanskrit numbered pages).
47 GM v3 p1-4.
49 GM v1, 63-70 (introduction) and 47-89 (Sanskrit text on Sanskrit numbered pages).
Dutt did not, however, edit and publish the assorted fragments of Perfection of Wisdom literature that were discovered at Naupur; nor did he include the manuscript of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka Sūtra* (the *Lotus Sūtra*), a text that has long held a place of significance among many Mahāyāna Buddhists. Working to fill these lacunae, Edward Conze published a romanized edition of the *Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (the *Perfection of Wisdom in 18,000 Lines*) in 1962. Likewise, Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra published a facsimile edition of some of the manuscripts found at Gilgit in the 1974, including the *Lotus Sūtra*, as did Watanabe Shōkō in 1975.

Just as several manuscripts have not yet been edited and published, so are many waiting to be translated. Of the texts listed above, the list of which does not intend to be exhaustive, only a few have been the primary foundation of a translation into English. In addition to romanizing the Sanskrit, Conze also translated the *Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*. In 1978, Gregory Schopen completed his dissertation on the *Bhaiṣajyaguru Sūtra*, in which he produced a romanized version of the text based on five Sanskrit manuscripts found at Naupur, a separate romanization based on the available Tibetan manuscripts, as well as an English translation of the *sūtra* based on the Sanskrit and Tibetan manuscripts taken together. Schopen again returned to the Gilgit

---

52 I note only English translations because it is to this particular field of scholarship that my work makes a contribution. That being said, however, none of the manuscripts found at Naupur has been translated into any other language of western scholarship to my knowledge.
53 Schopen, “Bhaiṣajyaguru-Sūtra and the Buddhism of Gilgit.”
manuscripts in 1989, when he published an edited, romanized, and translated edition of
the *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā*, which he based exclusively on the manuscript found
at Naupur.54 Almost twenty-five years later, Cohen published *The Splendid Vision:*
*Reading a Buddhist Sutra*, which is a translation of the *Sarvatathāgatādhiṣṭhānasattvāvalokana-buddhakṣetra-sandarśana-vyūham* based primarily on the manuscript
found at Naupur.55

As the above survey demonstrates, more than a few Gilgit Manuscripts have been
the objects of philological analysis. Indeed, as mentioned in the introduction, the majority
of work done on the manuscripts has involved editing, romanizing, and/or translating.
But that is not the only kind of scholarship that has been produced on the collection. In
addition to translating the *Bhaṭṣajyaguru Sūtra*, Schopen attempted to read the text as if
he were a “hypothetical literate member of the community [who] was familiar with the
literature known to have been available.”56 In other words, he consciously read the text in
relation to surrounding texts in an effort to envision how a well-read Buddhist at the time
might have thought. In a somewhat similar vein, Oskar von Hinüber paints an intriguing
picture of Buddhism as practiced in the Gilgit area during the seventh and eighth
centuries using data gleaned from epigraphy and the colophons of two manuscripts of the
*Lotus Sūtra* found at Naupur. The contents of these colophons reveal that people donated
resources to have *sūtras* copied and engaged in the veneration of *sūtras* for the creation

54 Gregory Schopen, “The Manuscript of the *Vajracchedikā* Found at Gilgit,” in *Studies in the Literature of the Great Vehicle: Three Mahāyāna texts* (Michigan Studies in Buddhist Literature 1), edited by Luis O. Gómez and Jonathan A. Silk (Ann Arbor: Collegiate Institute for the Study of Buddhist Literature and Centre for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of Michigan, 1989), 95-139. This volume also contains a romanized and translated edition of the *Samādhiraṭa Sūtra*, but the translation is based on the Nepalese manuscript and is therefore not immediately relevant.
of merit, which could in turn be transferred to the deceased. Moreover, linguistic analysis of the names listed suggests that people of various ethnicities were actively engaged in Buddhist practices.\footnote{Several names appear to be Iranian, around five appear to be Burushaski, some are Iranian-Burushaski hybrids, and some appear to be derived from Sanskrit. \textup{Hinüber, “The Saddharma\-pu\-ṇḍarīkasūtra at Gilgit,” 56-7.}} Lastly, in addition to being the most recent work of translation, Richard Cohen’s \textit{The Splendid Vision} is the only theoretically driven analysis of one of the Gilgit Manuscripts with which I am familiar. In the book, Cohen examines the \textit{sūtra}’s rhetoric in an effort to refine the category “scripture” for application elsewhere.\footnote{The back cover of \textit{The Splendid Vision} summarizes Cohen’s goals nicely: “The ancient author of the \textit{Splendid Vision} sutra promises every imaginable reward to those who heed its words and rites, whether one’s desire is to become king, enjoy heavenly pleasures for thousands of millennia, or attain the spiritual summit of advanced bodhisattvahood. Richard S. Cohen carefully analyzes this religious rhetoric, developing a heuristic model of ‘scripture’ in which a text becomes sacred scripture when a community accepts it as a receptacle of extraordinary value, an authoritative source of cosmic truth, and a guide for meaningful action.”} Like Schopen and von Hinüber, I will take context into account in my analysis; like Cohen, I aim to examine Pūrvayoga through a particular theoretical lens both to make sense of the text and also to illustrate how the category works in the hope that it illuminates the work of a fellow scholar.

\textit{The Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra}

Having surveyed the contents and scholarship produced on the Gilgit Manuscripts, I now turn to the \textit{Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra}. To my knowledge, only a few scholars have studied this \textit{sūtra} in any depth. Aside from Dutt and Kurumiya, whose critical editions of the text form the foundation of my translation, Bill M. Mak appears to be the only scholar who gives the \textit{Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra} more than a passing mention.\footnote{Bill M. Mak, “Ratnaketu-parivarta, Sūryagarbha-parivarta and Candragarbha-parivarta of \textit{Mahāsaṃnipātasūtra} (MSN): Indian Jyotiṣa through the lens of Chinese Buddhist Canon,” a paper given at the World Sanskrit Conference in New Delhi on January 8, 2012.} Unfortunately, his
research regards astrology, which has little bearing on my work. As such, Dutt and Kurumiya will be my only sources of general information about the *Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra*. In short, the goal of this section is to establish a *terminus ad quem* date for the variant of Pūrvayoga to be analyzed. Pinpointing a precise time window during which the variant in question was produced will help to determine what historical information is pertinent to the analysis to follow.

It seems appropriate to begin with the name of the text. In his edition, Dutt calls the text “*Mahāsaṃnipāta-ratnaketu-dhāraṇī-sūtra,*” which roughly means: *The Buddha’s Discourse at the Great Assembly on the Retention of the Clear Jewel.* The first word in the title (i.e. “mahāsaṃnipāta”) means “great assembly” and denotes either the class of *sūtras* to which the text belongs or the *Mahāsaṃnipāta Sūtra*, the compilation of *sūtras* of the *mahāsaṃnipāta* class under one title. Interestingly, while Dutt consistently uses the four-word title to refer to the *sūtra*, it is actually a fusion of the several distinct names given at the end of each chapter. Kurumiya, distilling rather than combining these titles, refers to the text as “*Ratnaketuparivarta,*” which means: *The Chapter on the Clear Jewel.* Though the text is technically a distinct *sūtra*, Kurumiya’s choice of title makes sense in light of its inclusion in the much larger *Mahāsaṃnipāta Sūtra*. I decided to use the name “*Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra*” throughout my work in order to distinguish myself from Dutt and Kurumiya, but also to reflect that their works were essential to my own. In addition

---

60 The word ‘dhāraṇī’ is sometimes similar in meaning to ‘mantra,’ but more typically refers to the attainment of knowledge and insight, often with connotations of memory—following Damien Keown, I use ‘retention’ here. *DOB*, 74.
61 GM v4, i.
62 The *Mahāsaṃnipāta Sūtra* is also called the *Mahāvaipulyamahāsaṃnipāta Sūtra*. GM v4, i.
63 Excluding repeats, the names given are mahāyānasūtra ratnaketu, ratnaketuparivarta, mahāsannipāta ratnaketusūtra, ratnaketusūtra, mahāsannipāta mahāyānasūtra ratnaketuparivarta, and mahāsannipāta mahāyānasūtra ratnaketuniṣṭhāgamanaparivarta. Kurumiya, *Ratnaketuparivarta*, xvi.
to providing the twofold foundation of my translation, both offer introductions and notes on the text that are helpful in sometimes different ways. Dutt, for example, summarizes the extant chapters of the śūtra\textsuperscript{64} and provides an overview of Buddhism in Kashmir,\textsuperscript{65} while Kurumiya does neither. In contrast, Kurumiya describes the various translations of the text, whereas Dutt’s remarks on such matters are brief and sometimes incorrect.\textsuperscript{66}

Though originally a Sanskrit work, the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Śūtra was known only in translation prior to the initial discovery of the Gilgit Manuscripts in 1931. In Japanese, the Mahāsaṃnipāta Śūtra, of which the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Śūtra is but one chapter, is known as the Daihodō Daijikkyō.\textsuperscript{67} There are two recensions of the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Śūtra in Tibetan: Rin po che tog gi gzuṅs (attributed to Yeshe De and Śīlendrabodhi, who produced it sometime in the early ninth century CE) and Dkon mchog dbal zes bya ba’i gzuṅs (attribution unknown).\textsuperscript{68} Lastly, there are two known Chinese recensions, one of which may provide a terminus ad quem date for the work—namely “Bao chuang fen,” the ninth chapter of the Da-fang-deng da-ji-jing (T397), the latter being equivalent to the

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{64}GM v4, i-xiv.
\textsuperscript{65}GM v1, 1-45. Unfortunately, in light of more recent evidence, Dutt’s survey of Buddhism in Kashmir is not particularly helpful.
\textsuperscript{66}For example, Dutt states that Dharmarakṣa translated the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Śūtra from Sanskrit into Chinese between 414 and 421 CE, but scholars agree that Dharmarakṣa lived between 233 and 310 CE. So, Dutt must have made one mistake or another. But he cannot take all of the blame—for he cites Bunyū Nanjō, who attributes the translation to Dharmarakṣa. GM v4, i; Daniel Boucher, “Dharmarakṣa,” in Encyclopedia of Buddhism, edited by Robert E. Buswell, Jr. vol. 1 (New York: Macmillan Reference USA, 2004); Bunyū Nanjō, A Catalogue of the Chinese Translation of the Chinese Tripitaka (Oxford: Calendron Press, 1883), 27.
\textsuperscript{67}Kurumiya, Ratnaketuparivarta, xi.
\textsuperscript{68}Kurumiya, Ratnaketuparivarta, xix.
\textsuperscript{69}I here make a distinction between work and text—the former being an abstraction, the latter being one instantiation. In her fascinating study of sūtras, setsuwa (explanatory tales), and bodies in medieval Japan, Charlotte Eubanks distinguishes between work and text on the grounds that Mahāyāna sūtras often present themselves as having an abstract existence distinct from their particular instantiations. This self-articulated distinction allows Mahāyāna sūtras to merge with human bodies through reciting, chanting, memorization, and so forth. Charlotte Eubanks, Miracles of Book and Body: Buddhist Textual Culture & Medieval Japan (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011), particularly 19-61.
\end{footnotesize}
Daihodō Daijikkyō and the Mahāsaṃnipāta Sūtra. Though not an undisputed claim, Dharmakṣema probably produced “Bao chuang fen” sometime in 420 CE. Assuming that Dharmakṣema is indeed responsible for this translation, the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra as a work can safely be dated to the early fifth century. Some scholars, however, further speculate that one version or another of the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra may have originally been composed as early as the second/third century CE, but such information cannot be known with any degree of certainty until more evidence surfaces. If I were interested in uncovering the earliest version of the work, then I would pursue this line of enquiry. For my purposes, however, discussion of a hypothetical original text is needless.

Much more pertinent here is the second Chinese translation, Bao xing tuo luo ni jing (T 402), which scholars typically attribute to a monk named Prabhāmitra, who was active between 627 and 633 CE. This specific translation is noteworthy because, unlike “Bao chuang fen”, it is “the word-for-word translation” of the variant found at Naupur. The notion that these two texts could be so similar by chance is next to impossible.

---

70 Kurumiya, Ratnaketuparivarta, x; Hirakawa, A History of Indian Buddhism, 294.
71 Kurumiya references the work of A. Zenba, who argues that Dharmakṣema did not produce “Bao chuang fen” based on analysis of astrological and calendrical data. Apparently, the calendrical system mentioned in the translation traditionally attributed to Dharmakṣema is a typical Chinese system, one that (according to A. Zenba) Dharmakṣema would not have known because he was from India. But, as Kurumiya sensibly points out, it is “of course possible that Dharmakṣema’s translation was altered in order to conform to Chinese astrological conceptions.” Kurumiya, Ratnaketuparivarta, xiv.
73 Regarding the speculative dating, Kurumiya writes: “As to the date of the Mms [i.e. the Mahāsaṃnipāta Sūtra], according to B. Matsumoto it was compiled in the 2nd or 3rd century A.D., although the texts were separately translated at different dates. However, B. Shiio put the compilation of the Mms in the period after the 5th century A.D. H. Ui assumes that the Mms was compiled about 400 A.D., but that the texts existed independently before ca. 250 A.D.” Kurumiya, Ratnaketuparivarta, xii.
75 Kurumiya, Ratnaketuparivarta, v.
other words, it seems far more likely than not that Prabhāmitra based his *Bao xing tuo luo ni jing* on the variant of the *Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra* found at Naupur. If indeed this is the case, then the *terminus ad quem* date of the particular variant of Pūrvayoga translated and analyzed here can be safely established at around 630 CE. Indeed, a contemporaneous Chinese source confirms this date; Kurumiya writes: “Fa lin (572-640 A.D.) in his “Pao hsing ching shū” mentions as the date of the translation 629 (or 628)-630 A.D.”

This date of 630 CE is further reinforced by the analysis of scripts. Dutt and Kurumiya agree that the variant of the *sūtra* in question was written in Proto-Śāradā, which fits nicely with the above *terminus ad quem* date. Summarizing the findings of epigraphists, Rebecca Twist writes:

> There are two scripts that have been used for the Paṭola Śāhi [sic] inscriptive record. The earliest script is called *Brāhmī* Round Script which was generally used prior to 600 or 620/630 C.E. It is an ornate, calligraphic script. The later script used by the Paṭolas is most commonly called *Proto-Śāradā*, but early scholars sometimes referred to it as Post-Gupta or Upright Gupta. *Proto-Śāradā* was used after the *Brāhmī* round script, so it provides a *terminus ante quem* date for the introduction of *Proto-Śāradā* to Gilgit. The fully developed Śāradā script was developed in Kashmir and was used in the second half of the 8th century. Therefore, it is generally suggested by epigraphists that *Proto-Śāradā* was used by the Paṭola Śāhis between 600-750 C.E.

Throwing an unexpected wrench into the system, however, Twist elsewhere asserts that the Gilgit variant of the text was composed in Brāhmī round script. That being said,

---

77 Kurumiya, *Ratnaketuparivarta*, x-xi.
78 *GM* v4, i; Kurumiya, *Ratnaketuparivarta*, xv.
79 Twist, *The Patola Shahi Dynasty*, 24-5. Other scholars (e.g., Tansen Sen and Jens-Uwe Hartmann) agree that Proto-Śāradā was introduced into the area around the turn of the seventh century. Tansen Sen, *Buddhism, Diplomacy, and Trade: The Realignment of Sino-Indian Relations, 600-1400* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2003), 130; Jens-Uwe Hartmann, “From words to books: Indian Buddhist manuscripts in the first millennium CE,” in *Buddhist Manuscript Cultures*, 98.
80 Indicative of the disagreement surrounding the chronology of scripts, Schopen dates the variant to the sixth/seventh century. Perhaps due to a lack of evidence, Dutt initially dated the manuscript to the fifth/sixth century. Twist, *The Patola Shahi Dynasty*, 237; Gregory Schopen, *Figments and Fragments of*
however, I agree with Kurumiya (and, by extension, with Dutt) on this issue for two reasons. First, considering that his “critical edition of the Sanskrit text Ratnaketuparivarta [was] based on the Gilgit manuscript,” it seems reasonable to think that Kurumiya spent more time with the manuscript than did Twist, whose project is not only wider in scope but also more focused on statues and sculptures than texts. Secondly, Twist does not clearly articulate why she thinks that the text was written in Brāhmī, not Proto-Śāradā. Even granting the veracity of Twist’s position, however, the dating of the text is not drastically altered. That is, the variant of Pūrvayoga in question was probably produced sometime around the turn of the seventh century CE. My argument for this position will have to wait until the third chapter, but suffice it to say for now that Vikramādityanandi, who had the text copied, seems to have been the second king of the Paṭola Śāhi Dynasty, which itself seems to have originated in the latter half of the sixth century.

**Concluding Remarks**

In the preceding pages, I hope to have adequately demonstrated that my work contributes to the body of scholarship surrounding the Gilgit Manuscripts and to the wider field of Buddhist Studies. That this thesis contributes to the still wider field of Religious Studies, however, has yet to be justified. In other words, while I have a few times mentioned that this thesis contains an analysis of Pūrvayoga in terms of myth, I have not explained in much detail what I mean by that, and why I think that the text is suited to being so analyzed. So, in order to rectify this, I now turn to methodological and theoretical issues.

---


PART II: MYTH AS IDEOLOGY

The primary objective of this chapter is to outline clearly and succinctly the theoretical framework to be employed in the forthcoming analysis of Pūrvayoga. Before addressing matters of theory, however, I briefly outline the method of translation followed, along with some notes regarding how I have read the text in a general sense. After covering these preliminary topics, I introduce the analytical category of myth and sketch briefly the contours of some important theories of myth used in previous scholarship. Lastly, I formulate an approach to myth informed by sociological, marxist, and poststructuralist thought, with particular reference to the work of Bruce Lincoln. To use Lincoln’s turn of phrase, I theorize myth as “ideology in narrative form.”82 Having fashioned this model, I offer a brief summary of Pūrvayoga, making sure to note why this text lends itself to being read as myth, and why such a reading contributes to the field of Religious Studies.

On Translating the Text

Translation is a delicate business. Due to the instability inherent in language, a text can never be translated perfectly—something is inevitably lost in the process. Nevertheless, one approximation can be better than another. That is to say, it is possible to produce a technically correct and understandable translation that is mostly faithful to the sense of the original. In order to reach these goals, I have attempted to produce a technically correct translation tempered by the method of translation that Richard Cohen articulates in The Splendid Vision. Expressing his goals, Cohen writes: “I set out to create a

82 Lincoln, Theorizing Myth, 147.
translation that is accessible to a general readership and makes sense in English, rather
than one that preserves the Sanskrit’s every grammatical particularity and terminological
nuance.”83 Were I translating Pūrvayoga solely to help other Sanskrit readers to follow
the text in its original language, I would produce the most wooden translation possible.
But I also want those without knowledge of Sanskrit (though with some knowledge of
Buddhism) to be able to read and understand my translation. Cohen outlines the method
he employed to attain these goals in the introduction to his book: First, he translated the
text as literally as possible—he tried to let the Sanskrit determine the English rendering.
He then “reworked sentence structures, adjusted numbers…shifted word orders, and
replaced terse technical terminologies with elucidatory paraphrases—without looking at
the Sanskrit—until [he] removed much of the first draft’s hybridity and fustiness.”84
Lastly, he tested this second rendering against the Sanskrit to make sure there were no
glaring problems. I have based my translation process on these guidelines—and while I
have not followed them as rigidly as did Cohen, they have been an invaluable roadmap.

On Reading the Text

In her book A Few Good Men, Jan Nattier offers some guidelines that I have kept in my
mind while translating and reading Pūrvayoga. She first notes that Buddhist texts are
often fraught with normative statements. In the past, it was not uncommon for scholars to
either agree with such normative statements and decry any “deviations,” or mistakenly
read the normative claims as descriptive.85 Both methods of reading are improper and

85 Nattier, A Few Good Men, 63.
uncritical—for it is not our job as scholars to delineate the normative tradition,\textsuperscript{86} nor is it possible to know what people actually did from a superficial reading of normative claims. But if we sift carefully through such claims, it is possible to reasonably reconstruct what life was like on the ground. Nattier outlines four guiding principles that scholars ought to follow when sifting through “ought” statements.\textsuperscript{87} First, she suggests that if an author reveals something unflattering about her/his own community, then it is quite possibly true. Secondly, if an author includes a detail entirely irrelevant to her/his agenda, then it might offer a glimpse into actual life. Third, if there is a proscription in the text, someone was probably engaged in the activity. Lastly, other disciplines in the academy can yield information about context—history, archaeology, and epigraphy have been particularly helpful in my case.

While Nattier’s approach to religious texts is certainly instructive, Bruce Lincoln seems to provide one with more critical potential. For example, he notes that religious texts do not simply make normative statements—they do so based on claims to “more-than-human origin, status, and authority.”\textsuperscript{88} Regardless of whence the transcendent and absolute origin, status, and authority are said to come, I take rhetorical appeals of this nature to distinguish \emph{religious} texts from nonreligious ones.\textsuperscript{89} But if texts are the result of

\begin{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{87} A description of these principles—namely, the principles of “embarrassment,” “irrelevance,” “counterargument,” and “corroborating evidence”—can be found in Nattier, \textit{A Few Good Men}, 65-9. It is also worth noting here is that optative verbs in Sanskrit are most often meant as hypothetical imperatives, not categorical imperatives.

\textsuperscript{88} Lincoln, \textit{Gods and Demons}, 5.

\textsuperscript{89} This formal quality—that is, an appeal to transcendent and absolute origin, status, and authority—is as important as the content of the text, perhaps even more so. If this manner of distinguishing religious and
human labor, then the following questions can—and one could argue should—be asked of any given text in light of such claims to absolute truth and authority: “Who is trying to persuade whom of what in this text? In what context is the attempt situated, and what are the consequences should it succeed?” With these things in mind, Lincoln offers a few guidelines for reading a text closely and critically. One should first ascertain the basic taxonomy presented in the text, as well as how the members are related hierarchically to one another and why they are so arranged. Secondly, one should note any changes that occur in the hierarchy between the beginning and end of the text. Thirdly, one should identify the author(s) and audience(s) of the text in order to discern whose interests are being presented. Lastly, one should make reasonable connections between the categories hierarchically arranged within the text and the organization of the society in which the text was produced. Being that I am working with a short text, it would be very difficult to reconstruct in any detail the society in which the text was produced. However, the last injunction will be still be useful in my work—for the text represents kings in fascinating ways. In any event, Lincoln’s suggestions anticipate the theoretical framework I intend to apply in my reading of Pūrvayoga, to which I now turn.

---

nonreligious texts does not betray my understanding of religion as an analytical category, suffice it to say that I tend to fall in line with scholars who advocate socio-rhetorical theories of religion. Lincoln, for example, theorizes religion as “that discourse whose defining characteristic is its desire to speak of things eternal and transcendent with an authority equally transcendent and eternal.” It may seem odd to think about Buddhism as a discourse desirous of speaking of eternal things with eternal authority, but I believe the definition still works, particularly for the Mahāyāna and its talk of countless buddhas and bodhisattvas who each govern one of countless universes. The concepts anitya (impermanence) and śūnyatā (emptiness) are certainly central to Mahāyāna thought—but I submit that sentences like “All things are impermanent” and “All things lack inherent essence” are, if one takes a step back and reads with a critical eye, eternal and transcendent statements. Lincoln, Gods and Demons, 1.

90 Lincoln, Gods and Demons, 5.
91 Lincoln, Gods and Demons, 9; Lincoln, Theorizing Myth, 150-51.
Many people today commonly use the word “myth” to refer to a false story. But as Lincoln demonstrates in the first chapter of his book *Theorizing Myth*, this meaning has not always been attached to the word. In his illuminating genealogical analysis of “*mythos*” and “*logos*,” Lincoln shows that these words—denoting categories of human speech or writing—have been the sites of struggles for power throughout history. In brief, he destabilizes these categories by revealing that the connotations of the words changed drastically at the hands of ancient Greek thinkers, particularly Plato. In terms more relevant to the present project, Lincoln demonstrates that the word “myth,” because it has a history (like all words), does not universally denote any particular type of speech or writing. This is similar to one of J. Z. Smith’s many insights: just as “there is no data for religion,” so there is no data for myth; just as religion “has no independent existence apart from the academy,” so myth has no existence outside the minds of scholars.\(^{92}\) One does not read a myth—rather, one reads a text as myth. “Myth” is an empty category to be filled by the scholar and employed in her/his analysis—it is a category requiring explicit theorization.

*Theories of Myth: a survey*

Scholars have thought about myth in a variety of ways over the past few centuries. Before explicating the theory to be employed below, some words should be said about other theories, along with where I stand regarding their utility. Because myths became the objects of scholarly attention during the nineteenth century, it seems appropriate to start

---

\(^{92}\) Smith, *Imagining Religion*, xi.
with this era of scholarship, which I will call “early comparative mythology.” Scholars of early comparative mythology were interested in myths for several different reasons. Some, for example, studied myths (understood as “false stories”) in order to establish (perhaps subconsciously) that “Western” culture—driven by reason and science—was superior to other cultures. Others had a somewhat more favorable view of myths and the people who produced them. Though they did not necessarily assume these stories were false, their motivations were not entirely admirable—such scholars wanted to connect “Western” culture (or specific “Western” cultures—e.g., German culture) back to the earliest known cultures in order to legitimize their culture’s status and myths. Also, many early comparativists were interested in discovering or reconstructing original texts (Urtexts) because they were supposedly the purest and most authentic. This kind of comparison is problematic for a few reasons. First, critical theorists have deconstructed the assumptions underlying scholarship intent on evincing the superiority or inferiority of anyone. Romantic attempts to connect one “modern” culture (and not others) to a “pre-modern” one have also received their fair share of critique. Lastly, aside from my overall

---

93 I use the qualifier “early” here because scholars like J. Z. Smith and Bruce Lincoln, among others, have arguably rectified the enterprise of comparison in the academy. Also, I should note that this approach cannot properly be described as theoretically grounded—many of the scholars during this time period did not begin with the assumption that myths have no ontological existence. In other words, it was widely assumed that “myth” referred to a particular, stable type of writing/speech.

94 James Frazer, for example, studied the myths and rituals of “pre-modern” cultures in such a way that provided “a theoretical and scientific basis to the imperialist ideology which turned colonial exploitation into an expression of Christian charity or enlightened humanism, a ‘white man’s burden’ to protect savages and semi-savages from their irrational fears and the self-inflicted sufferings caused by superstition.” Eric Csapo, *Theories of Mythology* (Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 2005), 45.

95 Max Müller connected European culture to Vedic/Aryan culture by way of philology and comparative mythology: he “distinguished the ancestors of all Europeans with a mentality that ennobled them above other savages, despite the similarities one could find between Aryan and other myths.” Csapo, *Theories of Mythology*, 27-8. Laurie L. Patton (paraphrasing Mary Douglas) describes Müller as “the inheritor, not the examiner, of the quasi-fictive Indo-European mythological tradition.” Laurie L. Patton and Wendy Doniger eds., *Myth and Method* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1996), 390.

96 Again, Frazer is an example of this type of scholarship. See Csapo, *Theories of Mythology*, 61-7.
hesitation to use phrases like “most authentic” to describe just about anything, the very notion of an original text is conceptually problematic in light of the poststructuralist insight that texts always exist in relation to other texts and contexts. Given that texts cannot exist in a vacuum, it is practically nonsensical to speak about original texts. Instead of neglecting my text in order to search for its ever-elusive original, I proceed under the assumption that human beings living in a specific context produced the variant of Pūrvayoga in question for distinct reasons.

Emerging from the kind of early comparative mythology that did not necessarily assume myths to be false stories—Mircea Eliade, whose work significantly impacted the discipline of Religious Studies, understood myths to have three major characteristics:

They are stories about origins, beginnings, creations…They function to provide men with an existential, ontological orientation by narrating the sacred, external events of their own origins, beginnings or creations…They originate in the human experience of a yearning for such a fundamental orientation. 97

For Eliade, then, myths tell of the original creation of cosmos from chaos via an irruption of the sacred into the universe. 98 But they also tell of the creation of cultural institutions within a given cosmos. 99 In other words, the myths of a society communicate how and why everything in that society is the way it is—an insider might say: “We live in this way because the divine so-and-so taught us to live in this way.” By reading myths from the

---

97 Ivan Strenski, Four Theories of Myth in Twentieth-Century History: Cassirer, Eliade, Lévi-Strauss and Malinowski (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1987), 72. Italics in the original.
perspective of an insider, I think Eliade took a small step in the right direction. Because he did not presuppose myths to be the false products of inferior minds, he was able to notice that myths typically function to provide justification for social structures and practices, as well as any changes that might be made to such spheres of life (though he may not have used such language to describe his position). But Eliade’s approach to myth is not without its weaknesses. For example, he often ignored historical context entirely, which inhibited him from understanding these stories as well as he could have. In *Imagining Religion*, J. Z. Smith criticizes Eliade for this tendency to ignore history and demonstrates that the stories typically classified as myths—even cosmogonic ones, which purport to be about the creative activity of prehistorical beings—are best understood in light of the situation(s) in which they were produced and used. Additionally, it is not clear to me that Eliade recognized the importance of textual variants—that is, he did not look into *whether* and *why* there might be different versions of a particular myth. If texts are human products, then one can reasonably assume that when changes are made to a text—excluding, of course, unintentional slips of the pen (but how could we tell if they were truly unintentional?)—they are not made arbitrarily. In other words, it is better to assume that texts reflect rather than create the concerns, interests, and motivations of situated human beings.

If Eliade took myths at face value, Claude Lévi-Strauss dug deep beneath their surfaces. Building on structural linguistics, Lévi-Strauss theorized myths as culturally

---

100 After discussing how *homo religiosus* deals with change, Eliade writes: “[R]eligious man…does not refuse progress in principle; he accepts it but at the same time bestows on it a divine origin and dimension.” Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane*, 90.
significant stories, the deep structures of which contain their real meaning.\textsuperscript{101} To unpack this a bit: The structuralist approach to myths typically begins with the distinction between language as a systematic whole (\textit{langue}) and particular instances of speech or writing (\textit{parole}), which is closely related to the distinction between structure (synchrony) and history (diachrony). For Lévi-Strauss, the most important part of a myth is its ahistorical element—its deep structure, its \textit{langue}.\textsuperscript{102} The variants of a particular myth each point to a single deep structure; even the surface forms of what appear to be completely distinct stories can be manifestations of the same underlying structure. According to Ivan Strenski, Lévi-Strauss thought that the structural analysis of a myth or set of myths, when done properly, reveals the “central contradiction upon which a social system may be founded [or the] central systems of classification, which…provide an indispensable means for ordering the universe.”\textsuperscript{103} That which analysis is said to uncover hints at the supposed function of myth according to structuralism. For Lévi-Strauss, myths are attempts to resolve the tensions that exist between culture and nature in any given society—in the words of Eric Csapo, a myth “may be regarded as a mechanism for

\textsuperscript{101} Ivan Strenski summarizes Lévi-Strauss’ definition of myth as a “strongly structured, important story.” Strenski, \textit{Four Theories of Myth}, 130.

\textsuperscript{102} The privileging of deep structure does not, however, render particular versions of myths unnecessary. Illustrating this in poetic language, Lévi-Strauss writes: “Divergence of sequences and themes is a fundamental characteristic of mythological thought, which manifests itself as an irradiation; by measuring the directions and angles of the rays, we are led to postulate their common origin, as an ideal point on which those deflected by the structure of the myth would have converged has they not started, precisely, from some other point and remained parallel throughout their entire course.” Claude Lévi-Strauss, \textit{The Raw and the Cooked: Introduction to a Science of Mythology: I}, trans. John Weightman and Doreen Weightman (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1969 [1964]), 5-6.

\textsuperscript{103} Strenski, \textit{Four Theories of Myth}, 132. Lévi-Strauss explains how the deep structure of a myth might reveal a central system of classification by examining a few stories from different Native American groups. After describing each story briefly, he concludes that—at the level of deep structure—a connection exists between harelips, twins, and children born feet-first. The structural connection between these three types of people helps to explain why they are represented similarly in stories. Claude Lévi-Strauss, \textit{Myth and Meaning} (New York: Schocken Books, 1995 [1978]), 25-33.
relieving anxiety.” Though his approach is more sophisticated than Eliade’s, Lévi-Strauss (like Eliade) overlooked historical context and surface structure in favor of a mostly decontextualized abstraction—and it is for this reason that I will not employ a wholesale Lévi-Straussian theory of myth in my analysis. That being said, I intend to coopt the structuralist insight that distinctions are often revealing. Rather than look for distinctions in the deep structure of my text, however, I will look for them in the surface structure in light of its context. In conjunction with other evidence, this strategy will allow me to envision the basic structure of society as constructed and naturalized by the text itself.

**Myth as Ideology**

Rather than assuming that some texts are myths in an ontological sense, it is better to say that texts can be read as myths. In other words, “myth” is a category in need of explicit theorization. Rather than viewing Pūrvayoga as a narrative recounting the irruption of the sacred into the universe, I see it as a human creation—one imbuing a specific constructed vision of the universe with characteristics like timelessness, universality, stability, truth, and authority. Rather than reading Pūrvayoga in an effort to find its deep structure and lay bare the “real” meaning of the text, I focus on its surface structure in relation to its historical context. When these inverted aspects of Eliade and Lévi-Strauss’ theories are combined, the ideological approach to myth begins to come into view. Building on the work of scholars like Claude Lévi-Strauss, Émile Durkheim,105 Antonio Gramsci,106

---

104 Csapo, *Theories of Mythology*, 226.
105 Durkheim defined religion as “a system of notions by which individuals imagine the society to which they belong and their obscure yet intimate relations with that society.” Émile Durkheim, *The Elementary
Pierre Bourdieu,107 and Roland Barthes,108 Bruce Lincoln offers a succinct formulation of the ideological approach to myth when he writes:

[When] a taxonomy is encoded in mythic form, the narrative packages a specific, contingent system of discrimination in a particularly attractive and memorable form. What is more, it naturalizes and legitimates it. Myth, then, is not just taxonomy, but ideology in narrative form.109

Lincoln’s definition guides my reading of Pūrvayoga. But this definition could use some unpacking.

The term “myth,” generally speaking, refers to a particular type of story, all of which are human products. But there are several kinds of narratives, so myths must be distinguished from non-myths at the theoretical level. In Discourse and the Construction of Society, Lincoln offers a fourfold system for the classification of narratives depending on the nature of their form and content, along with the way they are received by their users.

Footnotes:
106 In an effort to explain how oppressive dominant groups remain in positions of power, Gramsci distinguished at the theoretical level force and hegemony. In basic terms, the former refers to physical violence/coercion while the latter refers to an intellectual state of consent/approval of the dominated to be ruled by the class in power. See Berch Berberoglu, An Introduction to Classical and Contemporary Social Theory: A Critical Perspective (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2005), 56-8; Jonathan Joseph, Social Theory: An Introduction (New York: New York University Press, 2003), 44-8.
107 Bourdieu was primarily interested in uncovering how social structures, practices, values, etc. reproduce themselves through individuals. In an effort to explain this, he theorized the habitus as a sort of cognitive apparatus that at once is structured by society and structures a person’s activity (physical and intellectual) within said society. When a person internalizes the structures, practices, values, etc. of her/his society, the constructed world in which she/he operates is apprehended as natural. For more on Bourdieu’s theory of the habitus, see Pierre Bourdieu, Outline of a Theory of Practice, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977 [1972]), 72-95 (or, more specifically: 78-87).
108 Generally speaking, Barthes was a poststructuralist who theorized myth as a “second-order semiological system.” William Marderness, How to Read a Myth (Amherst, New York: Humanity Books, 2009), 19; Roland Barthes, Mythologies, trans. Annette Lavers (New York: Hill and Wang, 1972 [1957]), 114. In other words, Barthes saw myths as the result of first-order signs (each of which is the result of an entirely arbitrary combination of signifier and signified) being used as second-order signifiers to denote intentionally selected second-order signifieds. This process of mythical signification serves to naturalize constructed, contingent worldviews. For more, see Barthes, Mythologies, 109-26.
109 Lincoln, Theorizing Myth, 147.
audiences. The first narratives that Lincoln distinguishes are those that neither make claims to truth, nor are taken to be true by anyone—he calls these stories *fables*. Next are stories that claim to be true, but are not taken to be so by anyone—these are *legends*. Still others claim to be true and are typically taken to be true—these are *histories*. The last class of narratives Lincoln describes is that of *myth*. Myths are those stories that are taken to be true *and* authoritative. Realizing that this definition only pushes the buck to another word, Lincoln writes:

>[A] narrative possessed of authority is one for which successful claims are made not only to the status of truth, but what is more, to the status of *paradigmatic* truth...myth is not just a coding device in which important information is conveyed, on the basis of which actors *can then* construct society. It is also a discursive act through which actors evoke the sentiments out of which society is actively constructed.

In other words, a myth is a narrative that constructs a specific vision of reality, proclaims the truth and authority of that vision, and is accepted as such by its audience.

Of the characteristics that myths possess according to Lincoln, authority is most related to ideology. In basic terms, ideology can be theorized as a contingent worldview that not only presents itself as necessary and natural, but is also accepted as such by an audience; even more, by virtue of its authority, the worldview conceals its constructed nature. While there are several aspects to any specific worldview, the one with which I am most concerned is social structure. In these terms, Lincoln writes:

---

111 Lincoln, *Discourse*, 24-5.
112 The account(s) of creation in Genesis will serve as an example here. Some people in the United States believe the biblical creation narrative (a particular reading of it, rather) to be true and authoritative. The text is often read as the foundational reason why men are not only distinct from women, but superior to them. Though all hierarchical relationships are contingent, this story simply cannot be questioned—it serves to naturalize and legitimate a specific vision of the world. A particular reading of the creation narrative could also be said to naturalize and legitimate heterosexual relationships—which is also to render *unnatural* and *illegitimate* any other kind of sexuality.
[An ideology] is not just an ideal against which social reality is measured or an end toward the fulfillment of which groups and individuals aspire. It is also, and this is much more important, a screen that strategically veils, mystifies, or distorts important aspects of real social processes.\textsuperscript{113}

Myths are thus discursive tools that particular groups (be they powerful or subjugated) employ not only to construct, but also to naturalize contingent visions of society.\textsuperscript{114}

\textit{Myth and Pūrvayoga}

Given this understanding of myth, I can now properly discuss the reasons why Pūrvayoga is suited to being read in this way. But in order for the reasons to be defensible, they need to be grounded in the text. For this reason, prior to explaining why an ideological theory of myth is a useful device for reading this text, a quick summary of the text should be given. Pūrvayoga opens with the sons and daughters of Māra asking Śākyamuni how they may attain unexcelled, perfect enlightenment. In response, he says that they must practice the perfections of giving and wisdom, not adhere to any doctrine teaching the existence of a permanent self, understand non-origination, and not cling to sense objects. After this lesson, a series of enlightened beings make short remarks regarding emptiness and the path to unexcelled, perfect enlightenment. As a result of these remarks, thousands of beings accept the truth of the non-origination and emptiness of all phenomena. Such discourses are fairly common in Mahāyāna \textit{sūtra} literature.


\footnote{\textsuperscript{114} Both Lincoln and McCutcheon see myths—particularly religious myths (i.e. those involving appeals to nonobvious beings)—as crucial to social formation, which can be described as the construction, maintenance, and manipulation of imagined social groups in terms of their relation to one another, as well as in terms of their internal organization.}
Śākyamuni then tells a story about a previous existence. The events of the story are set in what might be called the “mythic past”—not only are they temporally removed from Śākyamuni (not to mention the reader of the text), but also qualitatively removed. The story begins with the following description:

*Sons of good family, many great and wonderful ages ago, in a past time, in the world containing four continents, among the people of that magnificent time whose bodies last for 68,000 years there was an unexcelled, world-knowing, blessed, enlightened, well-gone, tathāgata named Jyotisomyagandhāvabhāsaśrī who was perfect in wisdom and conduct. He was a tamer of humans who needed to be tamed; he was a teacher of gods and men.*

In addition to Tathāgata Jyotisomyagandhāvabhāsaśrī (henceforth: Jyotisomya), the story involves three main characters: King Utpalavaktra, Queen Surasundarī, and a soldier named Kumārabhṛta. Śākyamuni’s story begins with a dialogue between Jyotisomya and Utpalavaktra, which regards how to attain a subtle-mind and how to be free from Māra’s path. Shortly thereafter, Surasundarī approaches Jyotisomya and asks him what she can do to ensure that she be reborn as a man; Jyotisomya tells her that the Ratnaketu Dhāranī can not only eliminate the possibility of rebirth as a woman in the future, but also do away with her womanhood right then and there. In the same conversation, Jyotisomya declares that kings who recite and protect the Ratnaketu Dhāranī will have kingdoms free from suffering, war, enemy invasion, and the like. After praising the Ratnaketu Dhāranī’s ability to eliminate womanhood and produce peaceful kingdoms, he proceeds to recite it in the company of Surasundarī and her entourage. As Jyotisomya predicted, the recitation of the dhāranī causes the queen to become a man. But—being that he was recounting this story to an audience—Śākyamuni also recites the dhāranī amidst the sons and daughters

---

115 See [28] in the translation below. The italics are, of course, mine.
of Māra. As a result, many women in the audience become men. After these events happened due to the recitation of the dhāraṇī, King Utpalavaktra renounces his kingdom and takes up life as an ascetic.

At this point in Śākyamuni’s story, the soldier Kumārabhṛta, convinced that the effects of the dhāraṇī were the result of “base magic performed by a wicked Śramaṇa,” starts to preach a type of hedonistic materialism to anyone who would listen. Many people accept his message, but Utpalavaktra convinces them otherwise and guides them to right understanding. Eventually, Kumārabhṛta experiences a change of heart and asks to be taught about unexcelled, perfect enlightenment. After telling this story, Śākyamuni reveals that he himself was King Utpalavaktra, that Maitreya was Queen Surasundarī, and that Māra was Kumārabhṛta—which in turn implies that the events told in story actually occurred. The text states in closing that, due to the telling of this story, myriad beings were set on good paths—either the bodhisattva path, the śrāvaka path, or the pratyekabuddha path.

---

117 Maitreya, whose name literally means “loving-kindness,” is the future buddha. According to Buddhist tradition (both Mahāyāna and non-Mahāyāna) when the teachings of Śākyamuni Buddha are forgotten, Maitreya will come to reinstate them. DOB, 170.
118 The text literally says that some were set on the path to unexcelled, perfect enlightenment. Being that this path is distinguished from the others, I take it to refer to the bodhisattva path. Though scholars like Gregory Schopen, Jan Nattier, and Daniel Boucher have problematized any attempt to equate the terms before the fourth century CE, by the time during which my variant of the text was written, the phrase “bodhisattva path” (Skt: bodhisattvayāna) more than likely referred to the Mahāyāna. While the bodhisattva path is typically conceived as being open to everyone, prior to the institutionalization of the Mahāyāna it appears to have been an exclusive ascetic movement open only to male monks. Further supporting the distinction between the bodhisattvayāna and the Mahāyāna is that the authors of the earliest Mahāyāna sūtras did not support the “cult of bodhisattvas.” Schopen, Figments and Fragments, 127-28; Nattier, A Few Good Men, 175; Boucher, Bodhisattvas of the Forest, 52.
119 Skt: śrāvakayāna (vehicle of the hearers). This designation refers to people who sought enlightenment after hearing the teachings of a buddha. If I may borrow Nattier’s terms, the goal of the śrāvakayāna is Arhatship, which differs from the enlightenment of a buddha in that the latter is attained without help. DOB, 277 and 18; Nattier, A Few Good Men, 88 and 215 (n. 45).
In light of this synopsis, I am now able to explain why Pūrvayoga is well suited to being read as a myth. First and foremost, Pūrvayoga is part of an explicitly Mahāyāna sūtra. This may not seem like a reason to read the text as myth, but the Mahāyāna “did not begin to emerge as a separate and independent group until the fourth century [CE].”\footnote{121}{Schopen, Figments and Fragments, 239.}

With this in mind, it is fascinating to note that the text presents itself as though it were the speech of the historical Buddha,\footnote{122}{The Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra begins with the phrase characteristic of all sūtras, which are said to be words actually spoken at one time by the historical Buddha: Thus have I heard (Skt: evam mayā śrutam).} who died almost one thousand years before this variant of the text came into existence (and centuries before the work was recorded). By putting their text in Śākyamuni’s mouth, the authors/redactors of the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra (and thus Pūrvayoga) appear to have been attempting to legitimate their text and the worldview constructed therein.\footnote{123}{It is also possible to see the use of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit as a legitimation strategy. Sanskrit has long held a special place in the Indian subcontinent, at least among the educated and elite. Along with languages like Hebrew and Arabic, Sanskrit “[tend[s] to be looked upon as more than [an] ordinary language.” But, as Johannes Bronkhorst notes, “no Hybrid Sanskrit text claims to be composed in the original language of all living beings.” As such, it is not clear that the sūtra was written in Sanskrit in order to legitimate its status and authority. Johannes Bronkhorst, “Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit: the original language,” in Aspects of Buddhist Sanskrit: Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Language of Sanskrit Buddhist Texts, Oct. 1-5, 1991, Kameshwar Nath Mishra, ed. (Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1993), 401.

It is also possible to see the use of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit as a legitimation strategy. Sanskrit has long held a special place in the Indian subcontinent, at least among the educated and elite. Along with languages like Hebrew and Arabic, Sanskrit “tend[s] to be looked upon as more than [an] ordinary language.” But, as Johannes Bronkhorst notes, “no Hybrid Sanskrit text claims to be composed in the original language of all living beings.” As such, it is not clear that the sūtra was written in Sanskrit in order to legitimate its status and authority. Johannes Bronkhorst, “Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit: the original language,” in Aspects of Buddhist Sanskrit: Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Language of Sanskrit Buddhist Texts, Oct. 1-5, 1991, Kameshwar Nath Mishra, ed. (Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1993), 401.

124 “The reconstructed Sanskrit title of the work is Mahāyāna-śraddhotpāda-sāstra.” Yoshito S. Hakeda, trans., The Awakening of Faith: Attributed to Aśvaghosha (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006 [1967]), 1.} This critical stance is unlike those taken by other scholars of Buddhism. For example, when discussing the unknown authorship of the Dashen qixinlun (The Awakening of Faith), a popular Mahāyāna text traditionally attributed to Aśvaghoṣa, Yoshito Hakeda writes:

[We] must keep in mind the traditional Indian attitudes toward authorship and the attribution thereof. Not only the discourses in the Pāli canon, which are of fairly early origin, but the sūtras of Mahāyāna Buddhism are...
represented as the words of the historical Buddha, though many of them date from several hundred years or more after the Buddha’s death. Far from representing a spirit of irresponsibility or deceit, such attributions were made in a spirit of sincere piety. Unlike the modern author, who clamors for recognition, the sutra writers of ancient Buddhism deliberately effaced their own identity for the greater glory of their religion.  

There appear to be several problematic ideas in this paragraph at first glance, but the main one is this: Hakeda sees Mahāyāna sūtras, many of which certainly do not contain the words of Śākyamuni, as products of an apolitical piety. In contrast to Hakeda and others like him, I insist that all written texts be read in their specific contexts. That is to say, even if the authors/redactors of the Ratnaketu Dhāranī Sūtra were indeed acting out of sincere devotion to the Buddha, they were still putting their historically and politically situated words into the mouth of a venerated and authoritative individual who had long been deceased. Structural features like this in any text indicate, to me at least, that some rhetorical work is being done.

To some extent, therefore, it seems that all Mahāyāna sūtras lend themselves to being read as myth. But Pūrvayoga is even better suited to analysis in these terms—for in the text, as shown above, Śākyamuni tells of Tathāgata Jyotisomya’s words and actions in a temporally and qualitatively distant universe. In other words, Śākyamuni narrates a story that can likewise be read as myth. Indeed, combined with the above discussion of Mahāyāna sūtras, Śākyamuni’s story in Pūrvayoga can be seen as a myth within a myth. The story is two substantial steps removed from the human beings who produced and used the variant in question.

---

A critical reading of Pūrvayoga in terms of myth contributes to the field of Religious Studies because the theoretical category “myth” is a useful way for other scholars in the discipline to think about texts. As J. Z. Smith writes:

For the self-conscious student of religion, no datum possesses intrinsic interest. It is of value insofar as it can serve as exempli gratia of some fundamental issue in the imagination of religion. The student of religion must be able to articular clearly why ‘this’ rather than ‘that’ was chosen as an exemplum. His primary skill is concentrated in this choice.\textsuperscript{126}

It is my hope that the contents of this chapter sufficiently demonstrate why I have chosen to read Pūrvayoga as myth, as well as what I mean by the word “myth.” To close, I would like to note that the present thesis is so thickly theoretical in large part due to the words of J. Z. Smith given directly above. In my work, I have tried to leave no critical term undefined—for these critical terms enable scholars of religion not only to understand one another, but also to illuminate one another’s work.

\textsuperscript{126} Smith, \textit{Imagining Religion}, xi.
PART III: HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Though not in precisely this order, I have so far situated this thesis among the scholarship produced on the Gilgit Manuscripts, as well as in the wider field of Buddhist Studies. In the second chapter, I theorized the category “myth” in terms of ideology and pointed out the features of Pūrvayoga that render it suited to such analysis, on the basis of which my work can be considered a contribution to the discipline of Religious Studies. In the latter half of the second chapter, I demonstrated that the Gilgit variant of Pūrvayoga must have been in existence by 630 CE, which in turn situates Vikramādityanandi, the Paṭola Śāhi who commissioned the text to be copied, to the early seventh century at the latest. In this chapter, building on the abovementioned material and using the theoretical apparatus outlined in the previous chapter to render certain pieces of information more relevant than others, I survey the Paṭola Śāhi Dynasty, its relationship with Buddhism, and its relations with other powers. Most significantly, I want to highlight that the dynasty probably emerged just shy of the turn of the seventh century, which not only provides a terminus a quo for the variant of Pūrvayoga in question, but also serves to strengthen my reading of the text as an ideological tool.

The Paṭola Śāhis of Bolūr

The Paṭola Śāhis127 were a dynasty of kings who ruled Bolūr,128 a kingdom roughly coextensive with the northernmost region of what is now Pakistan, between the sixth and

---

127 According to Jettmar, the word “Paṭola” appears to derive from the name of “a tribe or the territory of a tribe,” evidence for which can be found in inscriptions in the region that epigraphists have dated to between the fourth and seventh centuries. Also, the royal title “Śāhi” seems to have been coopted from the Kuśāṇas, who ruled the region a few centuries prior. Jettmar, Beyond the Gorges of the Indus, 117 and 183.
eighth centuries CE. The kingdom was divided into two parts, Great Bolōr (corresponding to modern-day Baltistan) and Little Bolōr (corresponding to modern-day Gilgit). Karl Jettmar places the Śāhis’ headquarters in Great Bolōr, from where they ruled until 722, when the Tibetan army overtook Great Bolōr for the last time, causing the king to flee to Little Bolōr, which had been under the supervision of Śāhi-appointed governors. After this time, the kingdom of Bolōr gradually dissolved at the hands of Tang China and the Tibetan Empire, both coveting Bolōr’s mountain passes.

But Tang China and Tibet were not the only powers to desire Bolōr throughout history; it and the surrounding areas, known to scholars as Greater Gandhāra, had seen the rise and fall of a number of empires. Shortly after 250 BCE, around which time Aśoka convened the Third Buddhist Council, Buddhism made its way from India into Greater Gandhāra, where it gradually grew in strength and came to flourish under the Kuśāṇas, whose rule of the area lasted from the first to the third centuries CE. In the

---

128 The name of the kingdom can be spelled in several different ways (e.g., Palur, Pa-lur, Po-lou-lei, Po-lü, Balur, and Balūr). Twist provides evidence for the existence of a kingdom by this name. Alberuni’s India: An Accurate Description of all Categories of Hindu Thought (a work written by a Muslim scholar who lived during the tenth and eleventh centuries), Ḥūdud al-ʿĀlam (a tenth century Persian work), the annals of Tang China and Tibet, and the travel journals of Chinese Buddhists all reference the kingdom. Twist, *The Patola Shahi Dynasty*, 26-8.

129 Twist writes: “Surendrāditya was the last king of Baltistan, and hereafter it was a part of the Tibetan empire from 722-756.” The phrase “for the last time” was used intentionally here—for Tang China and Tibet appear to have quarreled over Bolōr since shortly after their respective inceptions.

130 Jettmar writes: “[N]obody was able to maintain an effective administration in Skardu [i.e. Great Bolōr] and Gilgit [i.e. Little Bolōr] simultaneously. That only became feasible much later due to modern road construction and air traffic, telephone and wireless broadcasting. So right from the beginning a governor or viceroy had to be appointed in one of those areas.” Twist, *The Patola Shahi Dynasty*, 251; Jettmar, Beyond the Gorges of the Indus, 116 and 125-26.

131 Some scholars include Bolōr in the larger territory of Greater Gandhāra, which can for my purposes be defined as the regions around the Indus, Swat, and Kabul river valleys. Siglinde Dietz, “Buddhism in Gandhāra,” in *The Spread of Buddhism*, edited by Ann Heirman and Stephan Peter Bumbacher (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 50.

132 Dietz, “Buddhism in Gandhāra,” in *The Spread of Buddhism*, 54-5. On the basis of archeological and textual evidence, some scholars surmise that the Mahāyāna began to concretize as a distinct institution during this time. For example, Akira Hirakawa writes that the Mahāyāna “developed impressively under Kuśāna rule.” But he also notes that no distinctively Mahāyāna inscriptions older than the second/third
late third century, the Sassanid Persians conquered parts of Greater Gandhāra, but allowed loyal Kuṣāṇas to rule some of their old territory; by the middle of the fourth century, however, a group from Mongolia known as the Kidarites had overtaken much of the Sassanid-Kuṣāṇas’ territory in the north, particularly the Hindukush and adjacent areas.133 About a century later, the Kidarites lost their power to the Hephthalites, whose empire had grown to include much of Central Asia and parts of Greater Gandhāra.134 According to Shui Jing Zhu—an extensive work regarding geography compiled in the early sixth century by Li Daoyuan, an official of the Southern Qi and Liang Dynasties of China—there were two branches of Hephthalites. One of these branches “ruled a mighty state north of the Hindukush and for a time imposed tribute even on the Sassanid empire; the other held sway south of the mountains.”135 Much like its predecessors, however, the dominance of the Hephthalites was short-lived; just as they were reaching their peak, so were the Sassanid Persians and the Western Turks looking to expand. Though the relationship between the latter two empires was often tense, they briefly set aside their differences around 560 CE and “destroyed the Hephthalite empire.”136

Further to the east, as the Persians and the Turks conquered the Hephthalites, the Tibetan Empire and the Sui Dynasty were beginning to take shape. Around the year 570, Namri Songtsen led a mostly unified group of “nomadic traders, wealthy peasants, and
craftspeople” in a rebellion against the son of a recently deceased but particularly disliked feudal lord. By the turn of the seventh century, he had extended his rule to include most of the expansive Tibetan plateau. In 581, Emperor Wen established the Sui Dynasty and unified China for the first time in three hundred years. After Emperor Wen’s death in the early seventh century, Emperor Yang took the throne and ruled until 618 CE. Throughout their rules, which ended at roughly the same time, Emperor Yang and Namri Songtsen worked to expand their empires. But it was not until closer to the middle of the seventh century that Tibet and China (more precisely: Tang China) began to quarrel over Bolōr directly.

This historical survey shows that Central, South, and East Asia during the first eight centuries of the Common Era saw quite a bit of violence. According to Christopher Beckwith, it was “the prosperous Silk Road economy [that] ensured nearly constant warfare.” Situated among the Hindukush and the Karakorum, where the three aforesaid regions meet, Bolōr was home to a few “strategic centers on travel routes used from the 1st through the 8th centuries, especially from the 5th to the 8th.” In other words, the Silk Road passed through Bolōr, making the latter an economically advantageous territory to control. The Paṭola Ṣāhi Dynasty thus appears to have emerged, governed, and collapsed

139 Worth noting is that Yang Jian “relied on Buddhism as an ideology to unify and to consolidate his empire.” He apparently donated land to the Buddhist community, built/repaired monasteries, and built several stūpas during his reign. At the same time, however, he closely supervised the monasteries in order to “prevent the development of any anti-Sui sentiment.” Kenneth Ch’en, Buddhism in China: A Historical Survey (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973 [1964]), 195-98.
140 Beckwith, The Tibetan Empire in Central Asia, 19.
141 Christopher I. Beckwith, Empires of the Silk Road, 137.
142 Twist, The Patola Shahi Dynasty, 12.
in Bolōr during a time of particularly heavy trade and travel. But the Paṭola Śāhis were not only rulers; they were also generous patrons of Buddhism. Based on her analysis of this patronage (particularly sculptures) and the work of many other scholars, Rebecca Twist offers a tentative chronology of the dynasty. Because my primary focus is the early period of the dynasty, only those Paṭolas who ruled Bolōr prior to the Tibetan invasion of 722 will be outlined here.

The first Paṭola Śāhi seems to have been Vajrādityanandi. He commissioned two texts to be copied, but both are fragmented to the extent that they are unidentifiable. The script in which they were composed, however, dates the king to before the year 630 CE. Vikramādityanandi, the second king of the dynasty, commissioned both the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra and the Aṣṭādaśāsāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā (Perfection of Wisdom in 18,000 Lines) to be copied. He also commissioned at least one rock inscription. Ruling before either 630 or 644 CE, Surendravikramādityanandi was the third Paṭola Śāhi. Not only did he have the Bhaiṣajyaguru Sūtra copied, but he was also the first known Paṭola Śāhi to commission a brass sculpture, which appears to be Avalokiteśvara. If the above outline seems thin, it is because very little information regarding the Paṭola Śāhis or their kingdom during this period is available. After this series of rulers, however, the dynasty began to make a larger mark on the historical record.

The fourth king, Navasurendrādityanandi, ruled from 644 to 685 and is believed to have commissioned three dhāraṇīs, a copy of the Sarvatathāgata hṛdaya garbha, and a rock inscription recording his patronage to the Buddhist community. The Tibetan Empire

---

143 In her literature review, she mentions some of the scholars referenced in this work (e.g., Stein, Shastri, Dutt, Fussman, von Hinüber, and Jettmar) as well as several others (Niranjan Chakravarti, Pratapaditya Pal, Pran Gopal Paul, Bansi Lal Malla, and Ulrich von Schroeder), most of whom are art historians.

144 Unless otherwise noted, the following data comes from Twist’s The Patola Shahi Dynasty, 239-51.
gained control over Bolōr during Navasurendrādityanandi’s long reign (perhaps for the first time, though this is speculative). Rebecca Twist writes:

The Tibetan king Mang srong mang brtsan (649-676) was at war with the Chinese and the Turks, beating them both. Mang srong mang brtsan also conquered most of Central Asia, thus extending the Tibetan empire beyond the Pamirs. Due to their strategic location, both Baltistan and Gilgit were involved in the turmoil of the region, especially from the Chinese and Tibetan rivalry. More importantly, records indicate that in 663 C.E. the Tibetan empire controlled Baltistan.¹⁴⁵

Significantly, Navasurendrādityanandi was the first Paṭola Śāhi to use the title “great king of kings, the Supreme Lord” to refer to himself; the inscription in which this title is found has been dated to the early 670s, which may indicate that he had successfully taken Bolōr back from the Tibetans sometime after 663. Jayamaṅgalavikramādityanandi, the fifth Paṭola Śāhi who ruled from 686 to 709, commissioned at least one inscription and two brass sculptures of Maitreya to be made. He also sent two envoys to the Tang court (one in the late 680s and another in the late 690s¹⁴⁶), after which the Tang emperor officially recognized him as the King of Bolōr. Toward the end of his reign, however, it appears that Tibet again conquered Bolōr and enlisted Jayamaṅgalavikramādityanandi’s armies to fight against Tang China. About the year 710, Nandivikramādityanandi became the sixth king of the dynasty, ruling until 716; like his predecessors, he commissioned two sculptures—but his were of Vairocana. Very little is known about the seventh Paṭola Śāhi except that he sent an envoy to China in 717, after which the Tang court recognized his kingship officially.¹⁴⁷ Succeeding this relatively unknown king was Surendrāditya, who ruled between 720 and 725. Like his predecessor, he sent an envoy to China in the first

¹⁴⁵ Beckwith, The Tibetan Empire in Central Asia, 30.
¹⁴⁶ Hans Bielenstein, Diplomacy and Trade in the Chinese World 589-1276 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 347.
¹⁴⁷ Bielenstein, Diplomacy and Trade, 347.
year of his reign and was subsequently recognized as the King of Bolōr.148 But two short years later, the Tibetan Empire invaded Great Bolōr, forcing Surendrāditya to flee west to Little Bolōr, where he seems to have commissioned an inscription declaring his generous patronage to the Buddhist community. Twist surmises that the inscription shows that “he was still practicing Buddhism, perhaps hoping his kingdom would be protected and his kingship restored.”149

Returning to the early years of the dynasty, the Paṭola Śāhi Dynasty seems to have emerged in Bolōr sometime after the Sassanid/Turk offensive against the Hephthalites mentioned above.150 The Hephthalites almost certainly had control of the region of Bolōr during the height of their empire, being that they were situated geographically between the Persians and Turks; after their destruction, however, relations between the Sassanids and the Turks returned to its previous antagonistic state, which appears to have left a power vacuum in the region, if only slightly. B. A. Litvinsky writes:

Central Asia was devastated as a result of this struggle, whereupon relations between the allies (Türks and Sasanians) became strained. This worked to the advantage of the Hephthalites: individual semi-independent Hephthalite principalities continued to exist in the Zerafšan valley [in modern-day Tajikistan], paying tribute to the Türks…The situation was similar in the south, except that here the Hephthalites paid tribute to the Sasanians…Small Hephthalite principalities continued to exist in southern Tajikistan and Afghanistan for a long time; some of them…remained independent.151

Even though the Sassanid Persians and the Turks had conquered the Hephthalites and divided up the territory between themselves, the Hephthalites were still able to maintain

---

148 Bielenstein, *Diplomacy and Trade*, 347.
150 The two empires agreed that the Oxus River would be a suitable border, but their relationship did not remain stable for long. Beckwith, *Empires of the Silk Road*, 116.
some power in the region due to the attentions of the empires being pulled elsewhere. As such, though this is of course speculative, it appears that the Paṭola Śāhi Dynasty may have been able to gain power in Bolōr just as the Hephthalites had maintained some power in parts of their former territory.

More conservative in his estimate, Buddha Prakash proposes that a group of Turks established the Paṭola Śāhi Dynasty sometime “between 627 and 649 [when] the founder of the Karkota dynasty Durlabhavardhana…established his rule in the Kashmir valley…driving the Turk rulers in the neighbouring [sic] regions.”\textsuperscript{152} Whether the Paṭola Śāhis were in fact a Turkish dynasty is not terribly important here (they may have been). However, in light of the discussion of scripts given above, it seems Prakash’s estimates are perhaps too conservative. If Proto-Śāradā script emerged in the northwest Indian subcontinent around the turn of the seventh century, as Twist and epigraphists suggest, and if the \textit{Ratnaketu Dhāranī Sūtra} was composed in Proto-Śāradā, then it seems Vikramādityanandi probably ruled Bolōr between 600 and 630 CE. Lastly, granting that Vikramādityanandi was indeed the second Paṭola Śāhi, then the emergence of the dynasty could tentatively yet reasonably be dated to around 575 CE.

Having such a date for the emergence of the dynasty is important, but not as important as having a date for the text to be analyzed and the king who commissioned it to be copied. Based on the evidence provided in this and the first chapter, it appears that Vikramādityanandi commissioned the text to be copied between 600 and 630 CE. This period of time, as was hopefully made evident above, was characterized by frequent warfare. Some dynasties and empires were growing, some were dying, and some were

\textsuperscript{152} Prakash, “Gilgit in Ancient Times,” 20.
being born. In the midst of this activity, Vikramādityanandi ruled Bolōr and commissioned the copying of the *Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra.*
At this point, a few things have been established. First, the variant of the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra in question was produced in the northernmost region of modern-day Pakistan. Secondly, the provenance of this variant can be traced to Vikramādityanandi, the second Paṭola Śāhi of Bolōr. Next, the research of epigraphists indicates that the Gilgit variant (and thus Vikramādityanandi) can be dated to 630 CE at the latest. And lastly, I proposed that the Paṭola Śāhi Dynasty emerged sometime after the destruction of the Hephthalite Empire, which occurred around the year 560 CE. While these dates are tentative—more data is needed to establish a more accurate chronology—it seems likely that Vikramādityanandi ruled Bolōr around the turn of the seventh century. The purpose of the previous chapter was to settle on this dating, but also to show that the context in which the text was made was one characterized by turbulence. Vikramādityanandi was the second kind in a fledgling dynasty trying to grow and maintain control over a coveted piece of land when the lifespan of dynasties and empires was quite short.

It is with this in mind that I want to begin my analysis of Pūrvayoga. But prior to outlining what I will say below, I would like to note that, although I have placed the translation at the end of this work, that I did so certainly does not necessitate its being read last. Throughout the analysis, I hope to provide enough information to make another brief synopsis unnecessary. But some may want to read the whole text and return to the analysis, or perhaps return to the summary provided in the second chapter—and this is, of course, up to the reader.

153 Throughout this chapter, I quote my translation of Pūrvayoga frequently. Citations for these quotes will be a number in brackets—they refer to the paragraph numbers in the translation below. For reflections on what may appear to be critical words in the text, refer to the footnotes in the next chapter.
In the following pages, then, I analyze Pūrvayoga as myth, which I theorized as a device by which people naturalize (or attempt to naturalize) constructed worldviews. One of the ways a text can be used to naturalize a particular worldview is by appealing to figures recognized as authoritative. There are two such appeals present in Pūrvayoga. Not only is Pūrvayoga part of a Mahāyāna sūtra, which itself claims to be buddhavacana, but in it Śākyamuni communicates a story about the activities of Jyotisomya, who is the buddha of a temporally and qualitatively distant world. It is the appeal to Jyotisomya that is most significant at face value, because he is ostensibly responsible (at least partially so) for Śākyamuni’s future attainment of buddhahood, which imbues him with an authority that I think can rightfully be described as transcendent. In light of these features of the text, its content, and its context, the argument to be advanced below is basically this: Vikramādityanandi commissioned the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra (and, by extension, Pūrvayoga) to be copied because it legitimated his rule over the people of Bolōr. In terms more directly relevant, he had the text copied because it constructs and naturalizes a worldview in which the distinction between kingship and buddhahood is severely blurred, perhaps destroyed entirely.

**Narrative-worlds, taxonomy, and taxonomic shifts**

Prior to discussing how this text functions to naturalize a contingent worldview, it is necessary to establish the basic taxonomy present in the text, trace the changes that occur therein, and ponder the potential significance of those changes. For my purposes, it will
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154 Schopen writes: “The important thing to be noted is that what the speaker of the formula [evam mayā śrutam] heard was the speech of the Buddha (and his interlocutors).” Schopen, “Bhaiṣajyaguru-Sūtra and the Buddhism of Gilgit,” 164.
be useful to distinguish between the two textual layers apparent in Pūrvayoga, which I will call, for lack of a better term, “narrative-worlds.” The first narrative-world is the one in which Śākyamuni is the governing buddha. The second narrative-world, a step above the first, is the one in which Jyotisomya is the governing buddha. It is useful to keep these layers distinct for a time in order to clearly establish the taxonomy and trace the taxonomic changes. As will be made clear, though, the distinction is stable only in my conception, not particularly in the text itself. In other words, the boundary between the first and second narrative-world within the text is permeable, perhaps even nonexistent.

In the first narrative-world, there are a few major characters at play. First, there is Śākyamuni, the buddha of this particular world system, a handful of bodhisattvas (whose names are not important for my purposes), the daughters and sons of Māra, and a group of spectators. At the beginning of the text, these characters can be broadly categorized as enlightened or unenlightened, as well as male or female. Combining these elements, all enlightened beings are male at the beginning of the text, while the unenlightened beings are either male or female. The constituents of these groups change, however, as the story develops. More specifically, as a result of Śākyamuni’s discussion of omniscience and enlightenment,

the daughters and sons of Māra with an entourage of 20,000 others accepted the non-origination of dharmas. They then abandoned their material bodies and acquire subtle bodies. Still twenty-eight others accepted the truth of non-origination. Then 92 among the multitude of wonderful humans and gods obtained the forbearance of bodhisattvas and the dhāraṇīs of meditation.\textsuperscript{155}

Put differently, these beings (numbering in the thousands) undergo an intellectual/mental change of sorts. Though this is not the last change to occur in the first narrative-world,

\textsuperscript{155} [26].
the focus here shifts to the second narrative-world for a moment. The impetus for the shift in focus here comes from the text itself—for after these beings obtained this new knowledge, they vocalized their recognition that Śākyamuni was ultimately responsible for the change. They exclaim:

Look, Blessed One, living beings have intense concentration and the roots of merit and skillful means due to influential contact with a good counselor!\footnote{[27]}

Countering their sentiments, Śākyamuni directs their attention to the role of *karma*. That is, rather than taking credit for their newfound intellectual state, he seems to suggest that the change was a result of their past actions, which is inferred from his decision to tell a story about a previous existence.

Śākyamuni creates and develops the second narrative-world throughout most of the remaining text, though the first narrative-world returns a few times. The characters at play in this textual layer are Jyotisomya, King Utpalavaktra, Queen Surasundarī, a soldier named Kumārabhrta, and a nondescript group of spectators. As before, the individuals in the second narrative-world can be broadly classified as enlightened/unenlightened, and as male/female. And again, combining these two—all enlightened beings at the beginning of the story are male, and the unenlightened beings are either male or female. There is yet another classificatory device at work in this narrative-world: royal/renunciant. This quasi-binary can be thought of as being a subset within the ‘unenlightened’ disjunct, but not restricted regarding male or female.

The first event in Śākyamuni’s story is a conversation between Jyotisomya and King Utpalavaktra. As stated in the second chapter, the latter asks about how to obtain a
subtle mind and how to be liberated from Māra’s path, and Jyotisomya obliges.157 Fast-forwarding the text, so to speak, Utpalavaktra’s status changes drastically: he renounces his kingship, consecrates his eldest son with a coronation ceremony, shaves his head, dons ochre garments, and takes to wandering.158 But the king does not abandon his kingdom because of Jyotisomya’s lesson about enlightenment. Rather, he renounces because of the effects of the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī, which will be discussed shortly.

Rewinding a bit, the second major event in the second narrative-world is the exchange between Jyotisomya and Queen Surasundarī. Immediately after Jyotisomya finishes his conversation with Utpalavaktra, the queen asks how she (or any woman, really) can become a man. As stated above, Jyotisomya tells her that the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī is capable of effecting this change; he says:

[W]hich course, sister, is the course by which a woman quickly becomes a man and the womanhood previously imposed is quickly and completely destroyed? Sister, here is the greatly desirable, greatly comforting, and greatly efficacious Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī. It is the destroyer of all womanhood. It causes the wickedness due to the fruit of suffering of body, speech, and mind to pass away without residue. By resorting to the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī, the womanhood of a woman goes without residue. Having destroyed femininity, [the dhāraṇī] makes manifest masculinity, and the embodied man becomes complete with all limbs.159

Jyotisomya further claims that the dhāraṇī has the ability to profoundly affect the quality of a kingdom and to guarantee the birth of sons. I will return to the former below, but the purpose of this section is to indicate shifts in classification. And here the major shift related to Queen Surasundarī and her entourage:

Friends, in that period and time, in the presence of Tathāgata Jyotisomya and King Utpalavaktra, the divine Queen Surasundarī and 84,000 women

157 [28] and [29].
158 [34].
159 [31].
heard the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī. After their expressions of femininity were made to disappear simply by hearing, Queen Surasundarī and those 84,000 women manifest ed expressions of masculinity. Likewise, simply by hearing the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī, the femininity of innumerable and incalculable daughters of gods, humans, and non-humans disappeared and was replaced by masculinity. The existence as a woman these thousands of women would have obtained in the future is to be destroyed, all obstructions due to past actions suppressed.\textsuperscript{160}

In short, Queen Surasundarī and thousands of other women became men. It seems to have been this effect of the $dhāraṇī$ (not Jyotisomya’s lecture) that caused Utpalavaktra to renounce his kingdom.

It is important to recall that Śākyamuni is telling a story. That is, the second narrative-world both emerges from a particular mouth and enters particular ears in the first narrative-world. As such, Śākyamuni recites the $dhāraṇī$ to his audience at the very same moment he recites it as Jyotisomya in his story. Fascinatingly—and the text itself emphasizes this point heavily—the recitation of the $dhāraṇī$ was not only efficacious in the second narrative-world, but also in the first where the $dhāraṇī$ was merely being represented. As a result, myriad women in Śākyamuni’s audience were transformed into men. The text communicates the event in language worth providing at length here:

Immediately after the Tathāgata Śākyamuni uttered the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī, the great earth trembled…By hearing the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī, the expression of femininity of five hundred daughters of Māra was destroyed and the expression of masculinity appeared. By hearing the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī, the expression of femininity of innumerable and incalculable feminine devas, nāgas, yaksas, gandharvas, asuras, garudas, kinnaras, mahoragas, rākṣasas, and kumbhāṇḍas disappeared and the expression of masculinity appeared. All of their minds were steadfast in unexcelled, perfect enlightenment.\textsuperscript{161}

\textsuperscript{160}[34]. \textsuperscript{161}[33].
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At the end of Pūrvayoga, after the story of Jyotisomya and the others is complete, more is said about the resultant taxonomy. Not only did myriad beings come to accept the truth of non-origination, not only did the women of that group become men, but they were also set on various paths. Pūrvayoga concludes with the following sentences:

Immeasurable, innumerable, myriad hundreds of thousands of victorious beings, gods, and men aspired to attain unexcelled, perfect enlightenment. They were firmly on the road to unexcelled, perfect enlightenment. Immeasurable, innumerable, myriad hundreds of thousands of beings were firmly set on the śrāvaka and pratyeka courses. Immeasurable and innumerable daughters of gods and men, having lost their womanhood, obtained the body of a man.¹⁶²

After the effects of the dhāraṇī in the first narrative-world are outlined in the text, the women who had just become men ask Śākyamuni to continue with his story. The last part of his story regards the negative reactions of people to Jyotisomya’s transformation of Surasundarī into a man, in addition to his causing Utpalavaktra to renounce his throne. It is into this context that Śākyamuni introduces the soldier Kumārabhṛta into his tale. Kumārabhṛta is not too happy about his wife and daughters being turned into men, so he convinces them to become ascetic wanderers with him in order to slander Jyotisomya and convince people that he is a teacher of nihilism. Utpalavaktra, however—who renounced his kingship to become an ascetic—changes Kumārabhṛta’s mind at the end of the story, at which point Kumārabhṛta inquires about unexcelled, perfect enlightenment.

Above I have tried to reconstruct (perhaps just construct) the two narrative-worlds in the text, their respective taxonomies, and their taxonomic shifts. In the case that my representation is somewhat convoluted, I here reiterate the information relevant to the analysis below, which regards issues of kingship. In the first and second narrative-world,
the classificatory scheme and the shifts that occur are similar. In the first, the women in the crowd—the daughters of Māra, *et alia*—become men. And in the second, Surasundarī and her entourage become men. But the distinction most significant to my reading of the text is made between royalty and renunciation. As stated, after Surasundarī and the other women transformed into men, King Utpalavaktra renounces his throne and takes up life as a wanderer. Important to note is that Utpalavaktra renounces because of the effects of the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī on the women around him. In fact, the *dhāraṇī* is fundamental to all of the taxonomic shifts mentioned above.

In all cases of shifts in categorization, the *dhāraṇī* has something to do with it. Though it is somewhat unclear whether the figure reciting the *dhāraṇī* is responsible for the efficacy of the *dhāraṇī* or whether the *dhāraṇī* itself is supposed to be efficacious on its own, I see the recitation of the *dhāraṇī* as dissolving the boundaries between the two narrative-worlds apparent in the text. Jyotisomya recites the *dhāraṇī*, which transforms women into men. At the same time, since Śākyamuni is telling a story, he also recites the *dhāraṇī* to his audience—causing the same change. The two narrative-worlds are further merged when Śākyamuni reveals the identities of the characters in the second narrative-world in terms of those in the first narrative-world: Jyotisomya was a distinct *buddha* and Śākyamuni was in turn Utpalavaktra. Jyotisomya can therefore be thought of as at least partially responsible for Śākyamuni’s eventual attainment of *buddhahood*. The last two identifications, though given above and not too pressing here, will be repeated: Maitreya Buddha was Surasundarī, and Māra was Kumārabhṛta.

At this point in the analysis I hope that the textual layers, or narrative-worlds, have been clearly distinguished, along with their basic classificatory systems, and the
changes that occur therein. Most significant here is the dissolution of the boundary between the narrative-worlds by way of the dhāraṇī and the identifications made between the characters of the narrative-worlds. I have argued that the dhāraṇī (perhaps together with the status of the individual who recites it) serves to dissolve the boundary between the narrative-worlds.

Political Legitimation and Naturalization

Granting that the dhāraṇī indeed blurs the distinction between the two narrative-worlds, associations between the characters involved in both can be reasonably formulated. First, because Śākyamuni and Jyotisomya are the buddhas of their particular narrative-worlds, and because they both recite the dhāraṇī, a certain similarity comes to light. Of course, Śākyamuni and Jyotisomya are not the same, but they share structural similarities—that is, they serve the same function in both narrative-worlds, and occupy the same position in the hierarchical structure. In light of the combination of structural similarity, empirical difference, and the blurred boundary between narrative-worlds, the identification of King Utpalavaktra and Śākyamuni at the conclusion of the text becomes significant. Like a Möbius strip, buddhahood folds into kingship, kingship into buddhahood: Śākyamuni tells a story in which Jyotisomya sets King Utpalavaktra on the path to enlightenment; Śākyamuni then reveals that he was King Utpalavaktra; yet Śākyamuni and Jyotisomya are connected via their enlightenment and status as buddhas, but perhaps not even distinct from one another at base. There is not straightforward statement in Pūrvayoga that these three figures are identical—indeed, if there were, the present analysis would not be too
valuable—but the manner in which the text represents them allows for the characters to intertwine and become conflated.

Given this reading of Pūrvayoga—in which the distinctions between the two narrative-worlds and Śākyamuni, Jyotisomya, and King Utpalavaktra blur—the fact that the historically situated Vikramādityanandi commissioned this text to be copied presents itself as significant. My understanding of myth emphasizes the human origins of a text and the motives (be they conscious or not) underlying the text’s production. The first impetus underlying his commissioning of the text is a simple one: in his conversation with Surasundarī, Jyotisomya promises several benefits to any king who writes the dhāraṇī into a book (an activity encompassed by having the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra copied). He begins his outline of the royal benefits of the dhāraṇī with a promise of protection:

Little sister, any consecrated kṣatriya king who has obtained power in the nation and will maintain this Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī, having written it in a book, the kṣatriya king’s noble verse whose sound is famous will extend in the ten directions until it completely covers the realm of form. Myriad thousands of devas, nāgas, yakṣas, and gandharvas will stand together behind that kṣatriya in order to protect and maintain him.163

The basic idea here is this: if a king writes in a book and recites the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī after ascending the throne, then he will have the support of innumerable powerful beings. Exactly why the king (and presumably his kingdom) needs protection is not addressed in the text. But given the historical context in which the text was produced, Jyotisomya no doubt spoke to real concerns of enemy invasion. In addition to promising the protection of devas, nāgas, yakṣas, and gandharvas, Jyotisomya asserts that all problems relating to society, the natural world, or the individual will disappear given that the king writes in a

[163] [31].
book and recites the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī. Picking up from the end of the quote above, Jyotisomya says:

In his kingdom, all strife, quarrels, famines, diseases, enemy armies, wind, rain, cold, heat, and hatred will strive after cessation. All vicious yakṣas, rākṣasas, lions, buffaloes, elephants, and wolves will be harmless. All afflictions known through contact with suffering due to violence, pain, cruelty, bitterness, or pungency will strive after cessation.\(^{164}\)

Writing, maintaining, and reciting the dhāraṇī does not only cause a kingdom to be free from these woes, but also results in positive benefits: “All his treasure, grain, herbs, trees, fruits, and flowers will grow, increase, and become sweet and lovely.”\(^ {165}\) Jyotisomya next declares that the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra, by being physically present with the king and his army, results in either victory or mutual peace (but never defeat):

If this consecrated kṣatriya king places on the top of a banner this book of the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī in an assembly of people, [then] the consecrated kṣatriya king will conquer the army of his enemy. And if this book of the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī will be placed on the top of the banner belonging to both kings and queens with [their] armies, then they will make peace with one another. Thus are the many virtues and benefits of the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī.\(^ {166}\)

Overlooking that writing the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī in a book presumably puts an end to social ills like warfare, the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra as a physical object is an auspicious thing to bring into battle. Indeed, it is guaranteed that the king who fulfills the antecedent of this conditional will not lose.

By having the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī written, Vikramādityanandī may have thought the abovementioned things would actually happen. At the very least, it seems reasonable to surmise that he hoped they would happen. Indeed, what king would refuse protection

\(^{164}\) [31].
\(^{165}\) [31].
\(^{166}\) [31].
from powerful beings? What king would not want to rule such an idyllic kingdom? But this situation can be approached from another angle. Perhaps rather than simply being a reflection of Vikramādityanandi’s hopes, his copying of the Ratnaketu Dhāranī Sūtra can be seen as a tool by which he attempted to legitimate his rule. Śākyamuni, a presumably authoritative figure among at least some people in Bolōr,167 said that Jyotisomya (who, as the readers of Pūrvayoga discover in the text, possessed authority even over Śākyamuni in a previous existence) said that the kingdom of a king who copies the sūtra will be free from suffering and warfare, and replete with wealth and food. Because Śākyamuni says that this statement came from Jyotisomya, it is likely to be taken as not just true, but also authoritative. Vikramādityanandi undoubtedly satisfied the antecedent of Jyotisomya’s conditional when he commissioned the copying of the Ratnaketu Dhāranī Sūtra, which appears to be not just a promise of safety to the polity, but an attempt to legitimate his rule by aligning himself with two authoritative figures.

But Vikramādityanandi did not only commission the Ratnaketu Dhāranī Sūtra in an effort to align himself with two separate authoritative figures. It seems to me that he may have also been trying to subtly dissolve the distinction between himself, Jyotisomya, and Śākyamuni. I previously argued that Pūrvayoga can be read as connecting kingship and buddhahood—but how is the connection made between Vikramādityanandi and the buddhas of two the narrative-worlds in Pūrvayoga? To put it simply: just as the dhāranī is responsible, so to speak, for dissolving the distinction between narrative-worlds, so it is responsible for dissolving (on a conceptual level) the distinct between Pūrvayoga and the world in which it was produced.

As said above, Jyotisomya recites the *dhāraṇī* in the second narrative-world, which in turn caused King Utpalavaktra to renounce his kingdom and become an ascetic. This ascetic eventually became Śākyamuni Buddha, who was then telling this story to his audience in the first narrative-world. In telling his story, he uttered the *dhāraṇī*, which transformed women into men. The efficacy of the *dhāraṇī*, the structural similarities shared by Jyotisomya and Śākyamuni, and the equation of Śākyamuni and Utpalavaktra together allow for a conflation of the three figures. Vikramādityanandi commissioned the *sūtra* to be copied, which involved the writing of the *dhāraṇī*; in this, Vikramādityanandi followed the suggestion Jyotisomya offered in the form of a conditional. But at the same time, Vikramādityanandi does something similar to Jyotisomya: he employs the *dhāraṇī* for the benefit of others, for the protection and prosperity of his kingdom and the people in it. By copying the *sūtra*, then, Vikramādityanandi engaged in behavior associated with the beneficent *buddhas* of both narrative-worlds.

Moreover, any reader of the *sūtra* could easily have associated Utpalavaktra and Vikramādityanandi by virtue of the fact that they are both kings. Taking alone the second narrative-world, particularly the taxonomic shifts that occur therein, Utpalavaktra and renunciation for the sake of enlightenment are linked, which could have been used to create or maintain a relationship between the Buddhist community (monastic and/or lay) and the Paṭola Śahi Dynasty. But in light of the permeability of the boundary between narrative-worlds, Utpalavaktra can further be linked with Śākyamuni Buddha and further, by structural similarity, with Jyotisomya.

So, to quickly summarize the above: I have argued that Pūrvayoga could have been used to construct a vision of society in which kings and *buddhas* are connected. In
light of historical context, this argument further implies that Vikramādityanandi could have used Pūrvayoga at the very least to intertwine himself with, perhaps even identify himself as Śākyamuni Buddha. But how is this constructed worldview naturalized? How is it that it is made to appear unconstructed? This is actually quite simple. The notion that kingship and buddha-hood are linked can be traced to Śākyamuni and Jyotisomya—that is, if the human origin of the text is ignored. Both are no doubt authoritative figures. But I would also argue that their authority is transcendent and eternal in character—particularly in light of the ideas regarding buddha-hood that had developed by that time and the nature of their claims. Myths are those stories that are taken as true and authoritative by their audience. Appeals made to the transcendent authority of enlightened beings are attempts to make the worldview constructed in the text appear unconstructed and natural.

I have so far argued that the dhāraṇī can be seen as responsible for the taxonomic shifts that occur in the two narrative-worlds in the text, but also for the dissolution of the apparent boundary between them. Moreover, I have argued that Vikramādityanandi, by employing the dhāraṇī, may have been attempting to equate himself with Śākyamuni and Jyotisomya. But there is one more strategy of naturalization involving the dhāraṇī, albeit an admittedly speculative one. Dhāraṇī are typically conceived as strings of semantically meaningless syllables to be recited aloud in repetition. But this particular dhāraṇī is not entirely semantically meaningless. There is one particular word present that calls to mind kingship and buddha-hood. The compound “varapuruṣalakṣaṇasamāruḥhya” can be translated as “having attained the characteristic marks of the best man,” which seems to be a reference to the mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇa, or thirty-two marks of a great man. According to Daniel Boucher, the notion that these bodily marks “endow[ed] both a buddha-to-be
and a universal monarch” were common in the earliest known Buddhist texts; they continued to be “viewed as an essential indication of buddhahood, either achieved or immanent, in Mahāyāna sources as well.”

**Conclusion and Some Remarks on Sex/Gender Ideology**

I have not only argued that Pūrvayoga could possibly be used to fashion and naturalize a worldview in which kingship and buddhahood are intricately interwoven, but also suggested that Vikramādityanandi may have commissioned the *Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra* to be copied in order to legitimate his rule over the people of Bolör and to dissolve the distinctions between himself, Śākyamuni, and Jyotisomya. Given the context surrounding Vikramādityanandi’s reign and the text’s production, this argument is reasonable. But let me be the first to say that my analysis would benefit from further evidence regarding Bolör around the turn of the seventh century, as well as from a sustained study of the other chapters contained in the *Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra*.

But before moving on to the translation, I would like to make one brief remark about the representation of women in the text. That the *dhāraṇī* transforms women into men, and that women are portrayed as being unable to attain buddhahood without first becoming men very clearly betrays, in my view at least, the patriarchy underlying the context in which the text was copied. But again, the text does not merely construct such a worldview; it also naturalizes it by putting such ideas into the mouth of Jyotisomya and Śākyamuni. The notion that women cannot attain buddhahood by virtue of the simple fact that they are women is, of course, a notion created and held by human beings. But the

---

168 Boucher, *Bodhisattvas of the Forest*, 3 and 5; *PSED*, 964.
production of a text in which a transcendentally authoritative being from a wholly other world-system says that women are naturally incapable of buddhahood implies that this scenario has always been the case and will presumably always be the case.

But this reading is somewhat problematized by the fact that Vikramādityanandi commissioned the text to be copied together with Surendramālā and Dilnitapuṇyā, two of his four queens. Perhaps their participation indicates that the cursory reading given above is flawed, perhaps neither woman voluntarily had her name written in the colophon, or perhaps both joined Vikramādityanandi against their own better interests. But there is no evidence to my knowledge that can shed light on how the women of this place and time operated within this ideology. The text provides a loophole for the myriad women in the narrative-worlds (i.e. the dhārani), but not much can be said about what a woman of any given social status may have thought about her place in an empirical world shaped by such ideas, or the strategies she may have employed to maneuver within it. Although the sex/gender ideology manifest in Pūrvayoga could have certainly been unmasked in my analysis, I leave this task to someone else for the reason that doing so is beyond the scope of my work, which relates to matters more overtly political in nature.
[“Pūrvayogaparivarta” from the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī Sūtra\(^{169}\)]

[Śākyamuni’s lecture on the path to buddhahood to Māra’s children]

[1] Now the sons and daughters of Māra, amongst a crowd of spectators, addressed the Blessed One:

“Blessed One, we desire such beauty,\(^{170}\) vehicle,\(^{171}\) knowledge, power,\(^{172}\) compassion,\(^{173}\) expedient means,\(^{174}\) and eloquence.\(^{175}\) Blessed One, how wonderful and equipped with knowledge of expedient means\(^ {176}\) is the Tathāgata\(^{177}\) Possessing which dharma,\(^{178}\) Lord, does a person not fall into the hands of wicked friends, but quickly obtain unexcelled perfect enlightenment?”\(^{179}\)

The Blessed One said:

“Possessing four dharma, son of good family,\(^{180}\) a person does not fall into the hands of wicked friends, but quickly obtains unexcelled, perfect enlightenment. Which four? Now friends, a son of good family—as long as he does not speculate or conceptualize—does not cling to all dharmas and by no means seizes, appropriates, takes up, or arrives at the dharma. Practicing the perfection of giving, he does not attend, acquire, consider, attain, conceive, or make

\(^{169}\) The text in brackets throughout is absent in the Sanskrit. The headings indicate thematic shifts, while the numbers, following Dutt’s paragraphs, serve to organize the text.

\(^{170}\) The word ‘rūpa’ can also mean ‘matter’ or ‘material form.’

\(^{171}\) The word ‘yāna’ can denote a vehicle (e.g., a chariot) or a “vehicle to salvation.” It is unclear which sense is meant here, so I have chosen to keep the ambiguity in the translation. BHSD, 446.

\(^{172}\) The word ‘ṛddhi’ can also mean ‘success’ or ‘wealth.’ In the Tibetan, it is translated ‘rdzu ’phrul,’ which literally means magical or supernatural power.

\(^{173}\) Skt: kṛpā.

\(^{174}\) Skt: upāya.

\(^{175}\) Skt: pratībhāna.

\(^{176}\) It is possible to read ‘upāyajñānasamanvāgata’ as “equipped with knowledge and expedient means.”

\(^{177}\) ‘Tathāgata’ is a title given to Śākyamuni and other buddhas meaning “thus gone or come.” BHSD, 248.

\(^{178}\) In order to highlight its semantic richness, I have left the word ‘dharma’ untranslated throughout. Conze lists the following possible meanings: “(1) The one ultimate Reality. (2) As reflected in life: righteousness, virtue. (3) As interpreted in the Buddha’s teaching: doctrine, Scripture, Truth. (4) An ultimately real event. (5) Object of the sixth sense-organ, i.e. of mind. (6) Property. (7) Mental state. (8) Thing. (9) Quality.” Conze, The Short Prajñāpāramitā Texts, 211.

\(^{179}\) Glossing the compound ‘anuttarasamyakṣambodhi,’ Cohen writes: “The fullest possible insight into the nature and substance of reality. There are several possible degrees of awakening. This is the awakening of a complete and perfect buddha; as such it surpasses the awakenings of the disciple and the solitary buddha.” Cohen, The Splendid Vision, 138.

\(^{180}\) There is disagreement regarding what exactly to make of ‘kulaputra.’ Cohen holds that the term “denotes a religious affiliation but also bespeaks social status,” while Gregory Schopen understands it as “simply an honorific title, a title applied as frequently to monks as to laymen.” Cohen, The Splendid Vision, 135; Gregory Schopen, Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks: Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1997), 117.
conceptions about the fruit of giving—the same holds for practicing the perfection of wisdom.

[2] “Again friends, a son of good family—as long as he does not speculate or conceptualize—does not speak of essence, life-force, individuality, self, or personhood. He does not grasp for the root of existence with his mind.

[3] “Once again friends, a son of good family—as long as he does not speculate or conceptualize—does not cling to taste, touch, smell, sight, or sound.

[4] “Again friends, a son of good family—as long as he does not speculate or conceptualize—does not grasp for the arising, basis, agency, effects, ground, causes, and conditions of all of the aggregates, elements, and bases.

[5] “Why is that? By practicing the yoga of the groundless, by relinquishing discriminations and conceptualization about all sense objects, the path to omniscience is established. Friends, all dharmas are non-existent. But omniscience is soundless, causeless, ineffable, without desire, without origin, without cessation, un-defined, without attachment, groundless, invisible, solitary, selfless, indefinable, the cessation of the momentary, without darkness and light, without place, unsensible, without allies and opponents, unthinkable, without remainder, disinterested, without construct, without dust and impurity, without any agency whatsoever, not making known, without support, inconceivable, untaught, without appearance, and transient. Friends, omniscience is like the sky. It is to be done by the practice of non-discrimination and non-conceptualization, by the practice of non-seizing, by the practice of non-abiding, by the practice of the non-perception of emptiness.

---

181 Skt: sattva.
182 Skt: jīva.
183 The word ‘posa’ often means ‘nourishment,’ sometimes ‘wealth.’ But in this context, following Edgerton, a word like “person, individuality, soul, [or] spirit” is more appropriate. BHSD, 355.
184 Skt: puruṣa.
185 Skt: pudgala. DOB, 224.
186 Skt: sattvadhātu.
187 The ‘skandhas’ are “the five agglomerations which in Buddhism are the basis of (or substitute for) the ‘personality’, and which constitute the root of clinging to existence.” They are “form, feeling, thinking, volition, and consciousness. None of these is permanent or eternal.” BHSD, 607; Orzech, Politics and Transcendent Wisdom, 302.
188 The word ‘dhātu’ refers to the constituent elements of reality. BHSD, 282.
189 The word ‘āyatana’ refers to the six sense organs and their corresponding objects, which together result in perception. BHSD, 101; Orzech, Politics and Transcendent Wisdom, 303.
190 Skt: apraṇihita. BHSD, 47.
191 Skt: anutpāda.
192 Skt: anirodha.
193 Skt: nirātman.
194 Skt: śūnyatā.
“Friends, he who possesses these four dharmas does not fall into the hands of wicked friends, but quickly obtains unexcelled, perfect enlightenment. Friends, he who seeks omniscience by means of a practice based on the characteristics arising from all sense objects—he is fixed on duality. The conceptions of a mind fixed on duality contradict omniscience. Where is the duality in this? That which elevates and depends on consideration of the characteristics of the aggregates, elements, and bases—this duality contradicts omniscience. Thinking that fruit is the basis of practice—this is dualistic. Thinking that the basis of existence is clinging to rebirth—this is dualistic. Thinking that the basis of language is sound and the opportunity for speech, that the basis of teaching is elucidation and exegesis—this is dualistic. Thinking that the basis of the knowable and knowledge is the examination of eternality and destruction—this is duality. Thinking that the basis of consciousness is agency, essence, life-force, individuality, self, or personhood—this is dualistic. Whoever believes that this is dualistic arrives at the arguments and conclusions regarding both shores. Friends, he who pursues omniscience, that person strives after, seizes, and overcomes this duality in his omniscience by pondering origin, cessation, the ego, selfishness, past, present, and future. For example, a man desiring fire should consider the earth, a man desiring a drink should consider fire, a man desiring food should consider a stone, a man desiring flowers should consider a robe, a man desiring perfume should consider a rotten corpse, a man desiring a robe should consider a burial ground, a man desiring a place should consider a precious stone, a man desiring lotions should consider space. Thus it is, friends. He who pursues omniscience by overcoming the duality arising from contemplation and attachment to the basis of practice—his effort is fruitless.”

[Those at the assembly speak in turn about omniscience]

Now, seated in that group was a bodhisattva named Dhāranamati who, after greeting the Blessed One respectfully, said:

“Blessed One, is that which can result in perfect enlightenment the inexpressible dharma?”

---

195 The word ‘samjñā’ can have several meanings (e.g. ‘name,’ ‘sign,’ ‘notion’), but ‘consciousness’ seems to fit best the context. BHSD, 551.
196 Edgerton defines ‘kārāpaka’ as “he who causes to act” and notes that it is used “in a formulaic list of terms applied to the (heretically alleged) ātman, and as such rejected.” BHSD, 179.
197 Apte defines ‘kāra’ as “An agent,” but with connotations of exercising that agency. PSED, 350.
198 Skt: ahāmkāra; literally: I-maker.
199 Skt: mamakāra; literally: mine-maker.
200 Skt: parāṃśet. This third-person, singular, optative verb denotes intentional contact or attention, be it physical or mental (e.g. touching, clutching, pointing to, or considering). In the Sanskrit, the verb is only used twice, but I have supplied it (along with its implied subject) for ease of reading; also, I have translated the verb consistently as ‘consider,’ but the range of possible meanings should be kept in mind.
The Blessed One replied:

“Only he who is perfectly enlightened knows that which is inexpressible. Indeed, son of good family, I will repeat this for you.”

[Dhāraṇamati said:]

“If it is fitting for you, then explain. [8] Is he who obtains omniscience in name one whose existence is characterized by duality?”

[Śākyamuni] said:

“If I will say ‘he is,’ there will be eternality. Now, if I will say ‘he is not,’ there will be nihilism. The middle is found by practice. Neither ‘he is,’ nor ‘he is not.’ Perfect enlightenment is the knowledge of that which is invisible, incomparable, immeasurable, incomprehensible, imperishable, unarisen, and unattached.”

[9] Bodhisattva Vidyunmati said:

“Blessed One, where there is skill in attaining knowledge of ‘neither coming, nor going’—this is perfect enlightenment.”

[10] Bodhisattva Vairocana said:

“Lord, where there is neither a mark of attainment, nor comprehension, nor realization, nor peace, nor calm, nor the three times, nor the triple-vehicle,201 nor pride202 in good conduct203 and vow204—this is perfect enlightenment.”

[11] Bodhisattva Dhāraṇamati said:

“Blessed One, he who does not conceptualize or speculate about the triple-universe,205 the three fetters,206 the triple-knowledge,207 the triple-vehicle, nor all

---

201 Skt: triyāna. According to Edgerton, the word ‘vehicle’ is sometimes used in a literal sense, but also often to refer to “the vehicle to salvation;” in the latter sense, then, ‘triyāna’ refers to the bodhisattvayāna, the pratyekabuddhayāna, and the śrāvakayāna. BHSD, 446.

202 Edgerton defines the word ‘manyanā’ as “conceit in the sense of vain, illusory imagining [or] in the sense of pride.” The latter sense seems to best fit the present context. BHSD, 419.

203 The word ‘sāmīcī’ sometimes means “propriety of conduct, conformity to the ideal.” BHSD, 592.

204 Skt: pranidhi. BHSD, 360.

205 The word ‘traidhātuka’ refers to the worlds of kāma (desire), rūpa (matter), and arūpa (formlessness). BHSD, 259.

206 The phrase ‘trīni samvojanāni’ often denotes satkāyadṛśti (“the heretical belief in a real personality”), šīlavratapārāmarśa (“attachment to good works”), and vicikīṣā (doubt), but “may intend to name rāga [greed], dveṣa [hatred], and moha [ignorance].” BHSD, 538-39, 553, 529, and 484.

207 The word ‘traividyatām’ refers to the knowledge of anītya (impermanence), duḥkha (suffering), and anātman (no-self). BHSD, 260.
the aggregates, elements, and bases; and he who does not praise gain and loss—He is perfectly enlightened.”

[12] Bodhisattva Vajramati said:

“He who does not praise, conceptualize, or speculate about the *dhārma* of ordinary people, the *dhārma* of the wealthy, the *dhārma* of students, the *dhārma* of teachers, the *dhārma* of the disciples, and the *dhārma* of those who seek enlightenment for their own sake—He is perfectly enlightened.”

[13] Bodhisattva Drñhamati said:

“He who, by means of discrimination, completely understands suchness, is perfectly enlightened.”

[14] Bodhisattva Ratnapāni said:

“He who does not speculate in order to not grasp and not obtain the mark of non-origination of all *dhārmas*—He is perfectly enlightened.”

[15] Bodhisattva Acintyamati said:

“He whose mind understands the triple-universe enters the mind. But having understood both minds with the mind, he does not attain [the mind]—He is perfectly enlightened.”

[16] Bodhisattva Arivijaya said:

“He who does not cling to, esteem, tolerate, privilege, desire, or grasp for all *dhārmas*, he who is neither disturbed nor released—He is perfectly enlightened.”

---

208 Skt: *prthagjanadharma*. This phrase sometimes carries connotations of vulgarity and lowliness, but in this context probably simply refers to unenlightened people. *BHSD*, 353; *PSED*, 632.
210 Skt: *śaikṣadharma*. *BHSD*, 532; *PSED*, 926.
211 Skt: *aśaikṣadharma*. Taken woodenly, the word ‘*aśaikṣa*’ means ‘non-pupil.’ Apte provides this sense of the word, but only parenthetically. He defines ‘*aśaikṣa*’ as “An Arhat (no longer a pupil).” I have chosen to translate the word as ‘teacher’ not only to avoid replacing one Sanskrit term with another, but also because the author(s) and copyist(s) could have used the word ‘*arhat*’ if they wanted to do so.
212 More literally, the compound ‘*śrāvakadharma*’ would be translated ‘the *dhārma* of the hearers.’
213 Skt: *pratyekabuddhadharma*. Edgerton defines the compound ‘*pratyekabuddha*’ as “a Buddha for himself alone, who has won enlightenment but lives in solitude and does not reveal his knowledge to the world; in Mahāyāna-texts often mentioned with śrāvakas [and] bodhisattvas.” Thus, ‘*pratyekabuddhadharma*’ refers to the path of that sort of Buddhist. Nattier notes, however, that “there is no evidence that actual Buddhists, in any Asian culture, ever considered themselves practitioners of the *pratyekabuddha* path.” Nattier, *A Few Good Men*, 139.
214 The word ‘*tathātā*’ is a technical term in Buddhism referring to the supreme truth about reality that is beyond all distinctions. *BHSD*, 248.
[17] Bodhisattva Padmagarbha said:

“He who does not speculate about the ego, selfishness, or the attainment of the
course to intellectual receptivity of the profound,\textsuperscript{215} he who does not move
because of merit and demerit—He is perfectly enlightened.”

[18] The youthful\textsuperscript{216} Candraprabha said:

“The blessed one who does not claim all \textit{dharma}s because of tranquility and who
does not see the collection of \textit{dharman} as self-existent or to be honored—He is
perfectly enlightened.”

[19] The youthful Khagamati said:

“For whom all dark and light, arising and decay, and gain and loss do not take
place in the mental states of the mind—He is perfectly enlightened.”

[20] Bodhisattva Akṣayamati said:

“He who is triple-purified\textsuperscript{217} practices the \textit{yoga} of non-perception, but is neither
attached nor unattached to the perfections\textsuperscript{218}—He is perfectly enlightened.”

[21] The youthful Mañjuśrī said:

“Blessed One, he who is neither attached nor unattached to all \textit{dharman}—he
knows the method of the profound \textit{dharma}. And that which he knows, he does not
abandon, withdraw from, attract, or repel. Nor does he produce the arising,
change, decline, knowledge, release, gain, or loss of any \textit{dharma} whatsoever. Nor
does he render impure any places from conceptualization. He is perfectly
enlightened. By this method alone all are perfectly enlightened.”

[The dialogue of Kautūhalika and Mañjuśrī]

[22] Then Bodhisattva Kautūhalika said:

“What is the point, Mañjuśrī, of undertaking this practice? It is the ascertainment
of omniscience by the method of contemplation of the profound and the entrance
into suchness by this one method.”

\textsuperscript{215} Skt: \textit{gambhirāksaṁtinayavatāra}. Edgerton defines the word ‘\textit{kṣānti}’ as “\textit{intellectual receptivity}; the
being ready in advance to accept knowledge; a preliminary stage leading to \textit{jñāna} but distinguished from
\textit{jñāna} by the fact that it is still characterized by doubt.” \textit{BHSD}, 199.

\textsuperscript{216} Skt: \textit{kumārabhūta}. \textit{BHSD}, 187.

\textsuperscript{217} Skt: \textit{triparīśuddha}.

\textsuperscript{218} Skt: \textit{pāramitā}.
[23] Mañjuśrī said:

“These, son of good family, are the twenty practices of omniscience. Without wrong views, there is no need to introduce right views. There is no need to introduce uprightness to the honest. Without wickedness, there is no need to introduce teacher or teachings. There is no need to introduce good speech to those who do not need to hear it. There is no need to introduce right livelihood to those who already live rightly. Without all of the fetters, there is no need to introduce a means of release. Without hatred, there is no need to introduce the principle of compassion toward all beings. Without dukkha, there is no need to introduce the three vows. There is no need to introduce the dharma to the undeniably virtuous. Without agitation, there is no need to introduce calm. Without false teachings, there is no need to protect the true dharma. Without attachment, there is no need to introduce the abandonment of all living beings. Without attachment, there is no need to introduce the abandonment of all things. Without weak beings, there is no need to install a ruler. Without fear, there is no need to introduce the fearless refuge. Without those who have set out on a bad path, there is no need to introduce a prescribed course of conduct. Without harshness and intolerance, there is no need to introduce gentleness and forbearance. Without attachment to grasping for everything, there is no need to introduce forbearance. Without attachment to all living beings. Without attachment to all living beings on anger.

---

219 Technically, this sentence shows up after the twenty practices of omniscience are listed, but I have moved it to the beginning for the sake of clarity. I should note here that the whole of Mañjuśrī’s speech is very terse in the Sanskrit, so—being that one of my aims here is readability—I have taken a great deal of liberty in the translation; for this reason, I will provide the Sanskrit and a more literal translation in a footnote when appropriate.

220 The word used here is ‘asamāropah,’ which literally means ‘no superimposition.’ I translate the word as “no need to introduce” throughout because it conveys the same basic sense in a less technical way.

221 Skt: aṣāhyavijuktaśamāropah; there is no superimposition of uprightness on the guileless.

222 Skt: suvakancīśamāropah; there is no superimposition of good speech.

223 Skt: sanyagājīśamāropah; there is no superimposition of right livelihood.

224 Skt: sarvasaṃyojanarāhatīśamāropah; without all the fetters, there is no superimposition.

225 Skt: samākrośāsarvasattvavacīśamāropah; there is no superimposition of compassion toward all living beings.

226 Skt: trisamvarāsāmāropah; there is no superimposition of the three vows. The word ‘trisamvara’ seems to refer to taking refuge in the three jewels (i.e. the Buddha, his teachings, and the community).

227 Skt: avisamvādanakūsaladharmāśamāropah; there is no superimposition of the dharma on undeniable virtue, or there is no superimposition of the undeniably virtuous dharma.

228 Skt: avyupasāntāśamāropah; there is no superimposition on agitation.

229 Skt: saddharmārakṣāśamāropah; there is no superimposition of protection on the true dharma.

230 Skt: sarvasattvāpparītyāgāśamāropah; there is no superimposition of the abandonment of all beings.

231 Skt: sarvavastuparītyāgāśamāropah; there is no superimposition of the abandonment of all things.

232 Skt: durbalasattvabalapratīṣṭhāpanāśamāropah; there is no superimposition of the installation of superimposition on weak beings. PSED, 653.

233 Skt: bhīṣasaranābhāvāśamāropah; there is no superimposition of the fearless refuge on the fearful.

234 Skt: kumārgasamprasthitāṁ pratipattivijayāśamāropah; (reading the former compound as a dative) for those setting out on a bad path, there is no superimposition of a prescribed course of good conduct.

235 Skt: ksāntisauratvāśamāropah; there is no superimposition of gentleness and forbearance.
introduce discrimination. Without attachment and delusion, there is no need to introduce relinquishment of the aggregates, delusion, and passion. Without attachment to the fruit of action and belief in permanence, there is no need to introduce the relinquishment of the fruit of action and the transformation of all. The practice of omniscience by entrance into the knowledge of suchness cuts through all language, speech, words, sounds, hums, and syllables. Having known all the words of the Tathāgata by entrance into the suchness of heretical teachings, by entrance into the suchness of all practice, by entrance into the suchness of the practice of the perfection of wisdom and virtue, by entrance into the suchness of the arising and decay of all clinging, by entrance into the suchness of the dharma, karma, cause, basis, and the triple-release—Awakening is the practice of omniscience.”

[24] Bodhisattva Kautūhalika said:

“So it is, Mañjuśrī. If one awakens to the course to the profound dharma, then one does not consider any dharma whatsoever. Illuminated is that dharma which is taught, to whom it is taught, and the meanings, words, and syllables by which it is taught. He who enters suchness by the practice of the inexpressible dharma—he awakens to an omniscience, which he may abandon, create, or understand.

[Śākyamuni’s response to Kautūhalika and Mañjuśrī]

[25] The Blessed One said:

“Wonderful! Wonderful! You speak well, son of good family, regarding the obtainment of omniscience by this one method. Why is that? As for all dharmas, there is no superimposition. They have as their purview non-origination and non-destruction. The purview of existence is non-origination and the extinguishing

---

236 Skt: sarvagrāhasamagalakṣaṇāsamāropah; there is no superimposition of accurate description on the attachment to grasping for all. PSED, 808.
237 Skt: sarvarajastamaskandhavarjanāsamāropah; there is no superimposition of relinquishment on the aggregates and all passion and delusion.
238 Skt: sarvapariṇāmanāphalavipākavarjanāsamāropah; there is no superimposition of relinquishment of mature fruit and the transformation of all.
239 The word ‘trīvimokṣa’ refers to śūnyatā (emptiness), animitta (causelessness), and apraṇihita (desirelessness). BHSD, 497.
240 The Sanskrit here is quite difficult to render, and here I refer particularly to the dependent clause at the end of the sentence. The notion that omniscience can be abandoned, created, or understood is odd, but the grammar of the sentence does not seem to allow another reading.
241 Skt: bhūtakoti. Edgerton defines ‘bhūtakoti’ as “end, goal…the supreme truth,” but distinguishes it from nirvāṇa. Orzech describes ‘bhūtakoti’ as “oddly reminiscent of Heidegger’s ‘horizon’ and of the paradox of the asymptotic limit in mathematics.” But the word did always have this meaning. Sharf notes that the word at one time denoted the enlightenment of śrāvakas, which (according to Mahāyāna rhetoric) is inferior to the enlightenment of bodhisattvas. The word in question, however, ends in ‘-ka,’ which “is sometimes used as agentive suffix, sometimes as a diminutive, and often with no special meaning.” As such, considering that the text was certainly originally composed prior to the fifth century (perhaps even as early as the second/third century according to some scholars), the suffix (read as a diminutive) may provide
of ignorance, their purview is the extinction and non-origination of space, they have as their purview inexpressibility. Thus are all living beings. The purview of all dharmas is not substance; it is so proclaimed because they are in reality unattached. Their purview is not at all the aggregates, the triple-world, and the three times. The purview of the three predispositions\textsuperscript{242} is emptiness. The aggregate of increase and decrease, the aggregate of fruition, and the aggregate of dharmas—their purview is not substance.\textsuperscript{243} Possessing all the dharmas of the inexpressible goal, which is the limit of existence or emptiness, the bodhisattva-mahāsattva\textsuperscript{244} penetrates omniscience.

[26] Verily, while the Blessed One was speaking about the acquisition of omniscience, the daughters and sons of Māra with an entourage of 20,000 others accepted the non-origination of dharmas.\textsuperscript{245} They then abandoned their material bodies and acquired subtle bodies. Still twenty-eight others accepted the truth of non-origination. Then 92 among the multitude of wonderful humans and gods obtained the forbearance of bodhisattvas and dhāraṇīs of meditation. [27] Then the 20,000 bodhisattva-mahāsattvas who accepted the truth of non-origination scattered heavenly flowers around the Blessed One. Having prostrated before the Blessed One, they said:

“Look, Blessed One, living beings have intense concentration and the roots of merit and skillful means due to influential contact with a good counselor!”

The Blessed One replied:

“The cause of the karma of the beings who have obtained desire is to be shown.”

[A Previous Existence under Jyotisomyagandhāvabhāsaśrī]

[The dialogue of Jyotisomyagandhāvabhāsaśrī and Utpalavaktra]

The Blessed One told of a previous existence in order to remove their doubts:

\textsuperscript{242} Skt: saṃskāra. This is in reference to psychological predispositions that are inborn, imposed, or acquired.

\textsuperscript{243} I follow Kurumiya’s edition here.

\textsuperscript{244} Cohen provides a nice gloss of this compound: “Literally, enlightenment being, great being. This epithet encapsulates the two qualities that bodhisattvas perfect while proceeding toward buddhahood. As an ‘enlightenment being,’ a bodhisattva strives to perfect the cognitive achievement of awakening: the full understanding of reality as-it-is. As a ‘great being,’ a bodhisattva strives to perfect the moral achievement of great compassion, the intention to free all creatures from samsara’s suffering.” Cohen, The Splendid Vision, 126.

\textsuperscript{245} Skt: anutpattikeṣu dharmeṣu kṣānti. Edgerton defines this phrase as “receptivity to the fact that states-of-being have no origination.” BHSD, 199.
“Sons of good family,”246 many great and wonderful ages ago, in a past time, in the world containing four continents,247 among the people of that magnificent time whose bodies last for 68,000 years there was an unexcelled, world-knowing, blessed, enlightened, well-gone, tathāgata named Jyotisomyagandhāvahāsārī [henceforth: Jyotisomya] who was perfect in wisdom and conduct. He was a tamer248 of humans who needed to be tamed; he was a teacher of gods and men. While suffering [due to the] five impurities249 was occurring in the world, he taught the assembly connected to the triple-vehicle of the four.250 At that time there was a king named Utpalavaktra, a wheel-turning king,251 lord of the whole world. Now, one day, the powerful King Utpalavaktra with his entourage and queen approached Tathāgata Jyotisomya. Having approached and prostrated before the Blessed One, having scattered flowers around him, having given him an offering of fragrant incense, and having prostrated before the Blessed One’s assembly of monks, he said these two verses:

‘Praised exceedingly by the virtuous serpents, gods, etc.!
   Remover of abundant defects!’252
By which of the seven treasures253 do people become wholesome?
   By which does one become subtle-minded? Speak!’

‘Destroyer of the world’s darkness, maker of peace and light!
   Conqueror of sorrow, arising, old age, birth, and death!
   Protector of people from the dangerous paths!
   By what means is one liberated from Māra’s path? Speak!’

---

246 Grammatically, Śākyamuni could be addressing both men and women.
247 Skt: cāturdviṃśika. BHSD, 227.
248 Skt: puruṣadamyasārthi. Literally, the last word of the compound means “charioteer.” Chariot and charioteer imagery is common in Indian literature of this time period. Typically, the senses are conceived as wild horses in need of a skilled charioteer; in this case, however, the text indicates that it is actually the human being in need of control. BHSD, 348.
249 The word ‘pañcakaṣāya’ refers to the impurity of longevity (āyuḥkaṣāya), views (dṛṣṭikāṣāya), mental afflictions (kleśakaṣāya), existence (sattvakaṣāya), and the age (kalpakaṣāya). Orzech describes them as “the five sorts of corruption characteristic of the End of the Teaching: first the kalpa decays, and as a result, egoism and excessive passions arise. These cause an increase in suffering and a progressively shortened life span.” BHSD, 102, 174; PSED, 225, 383; DOB, 143; Orzech, Politics and Transcendent Wisdom, 303.
250 The Sanskrit here is ambiguous. The word “four” could refer to the four-fold universe of Indian/Buddhist cosmology, but could also allude to the Four Noble Truths.
251 Skt: cakravartin.
252 Kurumiya: bhujaga; Dutt: bhujamga. Both words mean “serpent,” but only the latter sometimes means “eight.” Neither Kurumiya nor Dutt say whether the manuscript was difficult to read at this point in the text. But if Dutt’s edition is correct, then Utpalavaktra may very well be referring to the Noble Eight-Fold Path. PSED, 721.
253 According to Edgerton, the compound ‘dhanasapta’ refers to seven spiritual treasures: “ṣraddhā [belief], śīla [virtue], hrī [modesty], apatrāpya [shame], śruta [memory], tyāga [relinquishment], and prajñā [wisdom].” Orzech describes them as “the treasures of a golden-wheel cakravartin ruler of all four continents.” BHSD, 275; Orzech, Politics and Transcendent Wisdom, 304.
Śākyamuni said:

[29] “Then, sons of Māra,\(^{254}\) Tathāgata Jyotisomya said to King Utpalavaktra:

‘Possessing the three dharmas of a worthy man, a bodhisattva becomes one of subtle understanding. Which three? By his mental disposition, he is compassionate toward all living beings. He is intent on the pacification of the suffering of all beings like a mother. He reflects on how all dharmas, etc. [that is, all things made of them] are the same, not different, without life-force, individuality, or personality. Possessing these three dharmas, a worthy man becomes a bodhisattva whose understanding is subtle. Possessing three other dharmas, great king, a worthy man does not fall into the snares of Māra. Which three? He is free from anger toward all beings. He is intent on liberation.\(^{255}\) Made of the same consciousness, he is to be venerated equally by all beings. By this one method, he reflects on how all dharmas, due to a lack of differentiation, are the same as space, unconditioned, unborn, non-arising, unproduced, restrained, suppressed, ceased. By the yoga of non-perception, he examines all the unseen characteristics of objects, which are like space.\(^{256}\) Possessing these three dharmas, great king, a man does not cling to the snares of Māra and is liberated from the way of Māra.

[The dialogue of Jyotisomya and Surasundarī]

Śākyamuni said:

[30] “Now King Utpalavaktra’s main queen, Surasundarī, accompanied by 84,000 women, approached Tathāgata Jyotisomya. Having approached the blessed Tathāgata Jyotisomya, having scattered flowers around him, she said these three verses:

‘Possessor of unique qualities, dispeller of darkness!
   Conqueror of death! Speak now! How does a young woman quickly become a man whose inferior rebirth has disappeared?
   Possessor of disciplined mind! Most excellent benefactor!

‘He whose path is supreme! Well-gone One! Causer of pleasure and calm!
   Lord, how does a young woman abandon herself and become a man?\(^{257}\)
   Speak quickly, Well-disciplined One! Benefactor of others!
   Remove the excessive darkness from my sky!

---

\(^{254}\) Grammatically, Śākyamuni could be addressing Māra’s sons \textit{and} daughters.

\(^{255}\) Edgerton defines ‘anavatāra’ as “non-appearance, the not coming into existence.” \textit{BHSD}, 21.

\(^{256}\) Skt: ākāśavat. According to Edgerton, the word ‘ākāśa’ can mean ‘region,’ ‘voidness,’ ‘empty space,’ or ‘shallowness’ (in the sense of vanity). \textit{BHSD}, 87.

\(^{257}\) The grammar of the Sanskrit is difficult to render: \textit{bhagavan tyajati yuvati tāṃ kathamīha puruṣaḥ}. 74
'Supreme ascetic, unequalled throughout the universe!
Famous possessor of many good qualities, discipline, and memory!
If here I indeed become a man, dispeller of darkness,
speak quickly about the immortal path of the well-gone one.'

[31] ‘That being said, son of good family, Tathāgata Jyotisomya said this to Queen Surasundarī:

‘There is a method, sister, by which a woman quickly exchanges womanhood and the womanhood previously imposed is quickly and completely destroyed. She is not again reborn a woman prior to entrance into unexcelled, final nirvāṇa due to her sincere vow. In that case, which course, sister, is the course by which a woman quickly becomes a man and the womanhood previously imposed is quickly and completely destroyed? Sister, here is the greatly desirable, greatly comforting, and greatly efficacious Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī. It is the destroyer of all womanhood. It causes the wickedness due to the fruit of suffering of body, speech, and mind to pass away without residue. By resorting to the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī, the womanhood of a woman goes without residue. Having destroyed femininity, [the dhāraṇī] makes manifest masculinity, and the embodied man becomes complete with all limbs. The upright man becomes competent in the knowledge of the subtle. Doing good actions in body, speech, and mind the man of good conduct becomes a conqueror of enemies. He whose future mundane existence is to be experienced as suffering of body, speech, and mind due to the fruits of wicked actions of body, speech, and mind—he goes to destruction. Having established unpardonable actions, relinquishing the true dharma, and reviling the

---

258 The word ‘mātrgrāma’ can mean “womankind, the female sex [and sometimes] an (individual) woman.” The latter sense seems appropriate in this context. The word is grammatically masculine. BHSD, 428.

259 The verb ‘parivartayati’ carries connotations of hiding and concealing, maturation and ripening. PSED, 599; BHSD, 329.

260 Skt: mātrgrāmabhāva.

261 Skt: mahārthikā.

262 Skt: mahānusamsā.

263 Skt: mahāprabhavā.

264 In addition to being the name of a dhāraṇī, “Ratnaketu” designates several buddhas and bodhisattvas in Buddhist literature; it can be translated as “Jewel Banner.” The meaning of “dhāraṇī” is debated. Edgerton defines it as “magic formula: often consisting of meaningless combinations of syllables…hold, support.” He also notes that it carries connotations of memory. BHSD, 451 and 284.

265 Skt: strīndriya. According to Apte, the word ‘indriya’ refers to either an “organ of sense, sense or faculty of sense.” As such, the compound ‘strīndriya’ seems to encompass sex and gender. In an attempt to capture the multivalence of the word, I use the word “femininity.” PSED, 248.

266 Skt: purusendriya. See previous footnote.

267 Skt: ānantaryakārīṇa. Cohen glosses a similar compound (pañcānantaryya) as the “five deeds so heinous that their karmic result must be experienced immediately upon their perpetrator’s death. These five are killing one’s own mother or father, killing an arhat, causing a schism in the sangha, and intentionally harming a buddha.” Given that my text does not include the word “pañca,” it is unclear that this is precisely
noble ones,²⁶⁸ by doing these one goes to destruction. The femininity is without remainder. Due to the fruit of wickedness of body, speech, and mind as large as Mt. Meru, future rebirth is to be experienced as a woman. The complete and necessary consequence of obstructions due to past actions goes to destruction. Why is that? All the tathāgatas, arhats,²⁶⁹ and perfectly enlightened beings²⁷⁰ of the past say, control, honorably recite, praise, extol, and mutually delight in the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī in order to increase the roots of merit²⁷¹ and destroy the karma and fruit of suffering of living beings. At this time in the ten directions, the tathāgatas, arhats, and perfectly enlightened beings stay and pass the time in their own luxurious buddha-fields.²⁷² Enlightened One, all of those blessed ones recite and praise the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī in order to grow the storehouse of merit and destroy the karma of living beings. In a future time in the ten directions, those tathāgatas, arhats, and perfectly enlightened beings will say and praise the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī in order to destroy the fruit of action due to suffering of all living beings and in order to grow the roots of merit. At this time, I will say the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī to you. Having rejoiced in the speech of the tathāgatas arisen in the ten directions, I will praise and proclaim the qualities of the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī.

[Additional benefits of maintaining the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī]

[Sākyamuni said, speaking as Jyotisomya:]

‘Little sister, any consecrated²⁷³ kṣatriya²⁷⁴ king who has obtained power in the nation and will maintain this Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī, having written it in a book, that kṣatriya king’s name, greatness, fame, and reputation will extend in the ten directions until it completely covers the realm of form.²⁷⁵ Myriad thousands of devas,²⁷⁶ nāgas,²⁷⁷ yakṣas,²⁷⁸ and gandharvas²⁷⁹ will

what is meant. In light of the context, it seems reasonable to suppose that these deeds are negative. Cohen, The Splendid Vision, 128.

²⁶⁸ Skt: ārya.
²⁶⁹ The arhat is the ideal figure in non-Mahāyāna; attaining arhatthood is the goal of the śrāvakayāna. The enlightenment of arhats is apparently distinct from that of tathāgatas and perfectly enlightened beings.
²⁷⁰ Skt: sanyāsambuddha.
²⁷¹ The compound ‘kuśalamūla’ refers to “non-greed (arāga), non-hatred (adveṣa), and non-delusion (amoha). Expressed in a positive form they correspond to unselfishness, benevolence, and understanding. All good or virtuous states of consciousness are seen as ultimately grounded in one or more of these three. They are the opposite of the three roots of evil.” DOB, 151.
²⁷² Edgerton defines ‘buddhakṣetra’ as “Buddha-field, region or (usually) world or world-system in which a particular Buddha lives and operates.” BHSD, 401.
²⁷³ Skt: mūrdhābhīṣikta.
²⁷⁴ The term ‘kṣatriya’ denotes the military/ruling class of India. It is interesting that the word is used here to describe a king, who would by default be a kṣatriya.
²⁷⁵ Skt: rūpadhātu.
²⁷⁶ Devas are “god[s] or supernatural being[s], normally resident in one of the numerous heavens and reborn there as a result of good karma...The gods are thought to reside on or over Mt. Meru, the cosmic mountain, and to be frequent visitors to the human world, especially to hear the Buddha’s teachings.
stand together behind that kṣatriya in order to protect and maintain him. In his kingdom, all strife, quarrels, famines, diseases, enemy armies, wind, rain, cold, heat, and hatred will strive after cessation. All vicious yakṣas, rākṣasas, lions, buffalo, elephants, and wolves will be harmless. All afflictions known through contact with suffering due to violence, pain, cruelty, bitterness, or pungency will strive after pacification. All his treasure, grain, herbs, trees, fruits, and flowers will grow, increase, and become sweet and lovely. If this consecrated kṣatriya king places on the top of a banner this book of the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī in an assembly of people, [then] the consecrated kṣatriya king will conquer the army of his enemy. And if this book of the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī will be placed on the top of the banner belonging to both kings with their armies assembled, then they will make peace with one another. Thus are the benefits and virtues of the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī. In whichever village, city, or town there might be injury, untimely death, or disease of humans, non-humans, or animals, there this book of the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī is to be brought forth with the implements for great pūja. Having entered with a person well-purified, well-anointed, clothed in new robes, and chaste, having ascended the throne full of various scents and perfumes and strewn with various blossoms, there this book of the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī is to be declared. There all diseases and untimely death strive after cessation. And there all fears, horrors, and bad omens will disappear. Any woman who desires a son—after bathing, putting on new robes, practicing chastity, praising this book with lotions and garlands of fragrant flowers, and ascending the throne perfumed with various fragrant scents and strewn with various blossoms, she should recite this Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī. She will then obtain a

Offerings and sacrifices are made to the gods, and they may be appealed to for help or protection. They enjoy lifespans of hundreds of thousands of years, but are eventually reborn when their good karma is exhausted, and are thus (in contrast to the Buddha) still within the realm of saṃsāra.” DOB, 72.

Nāgas are “serpent-like beings in Hindu and Buddhist mythology. They are said to live in the underworld and inhabit a watery environment. Frequently considered to be benevolent, they also [are] believed to act as guardians of hidden Mahāyāna texts.” DOB, 185.

Keown writes: “Generally thought to be malevolent flesh-eating demons in later Buddhism, the yakṣa and their female counterparts, the yakṣinī, were originally more or less benevolent local nature divinities who if correctly propitiated would protect the community. If not treated with due respect they wreaked their vengeance upon the populace in the form of sickness and natural catastrophes. They were also believed to have many magical powers, especially that of shape-shifting. Yakṣinīs were particularly associated with trees, and are frequently depicted in Indian art as sinuous young women with great sexual grace, though with an undertone of menace.” DOB, 338.

Gandharvas are “heavenly beings, famed particularly for their musical skills. Their name, meaning ‘fragrance-eater’, derives from the belief that they feed only on fragrances.” DOB, 99.

Rākṣasas are “evil flesh-eating demons who also cause sickness and misfortune.” DOB, 233.

The word “avaropita” commonly means something like “plants,” as in planting a seed, but also carries connotations of “fastening down” or “attaching.” BHSD, 74.

The compound ‘mahāpūja’ appears to refers to a ritual where the verses to follow are the guidelines to be followed.
son. This existence as a woman is her last until unexcelled, final liberation—except for her own vow to help living beings.

[Śākyamuni as Jyotisomya chants the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī]

[Śākyamuni said:]

[32] “At that time, Tathāgata Jyotisomya uttered the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī:

jaloke jaloke | moke jali | jala 285 | jalimi | jalavrate 286 | jahile |
varapuruṣalakṣaṇasamāruhya 287 | amame 288 | vamame | vamame |
navame 289 | mahāše | jahame | jahame |
varame varame | vavave | vavave | vahave |
vamgave | vajave |
vāra 290 | vāraśe | jamelekhā | parakhā |
| ala 291 | jahili | jana 292 |
tule 293 |
| jana tudhukhe | vahara | vahara |
simha 294 | vrate |
nana tilā |
nana tina dālā | sūryavihaga 295 | candravihaga 296 |
cakṣu rajyati 297 | śavihaga 298 | sarvakṣayastrītravadvihaga 299 |

283 Parinirvāṇa is the “‘final’ or ‘highest’ nirvāṇa, usually denoting the state of nirvāṇa that is entered at death, in contrast to that attained during life.” DOB, 212.

284 The compound ‘sattvaparipācanahe’ more literally translates to ‘for the purpose of the maturation of beings.’ Edgerton defines paripācana as “ripening, bringing to maturity, in a religious sense.” BHSD, 326.

285 The stem ‘jala’ could mean anything from ‘cold’ to ‘idiotic’ from ‘water’ to “embryo or uterus of a cow.” The word remains in stem form and thus could be read as the vocative form of any of the abovementioned translations. PSED, 448-49.

286 The stem ‘vrata,’ from which the locative ‘vrate’ is formed, often refers to an act of religious austerity, a religious vow, or the object of devotion. In light of the above footnote, the compound ‘jalavrate’ could thus be rendered in several, vastly different ways. PSED, 901-02.

287 As stated in the previous chapter, this compound can be translated as “having attained the characteristic marks of the best man,” which may refer to the thirty-two marks of a great man. According to Boucher, the notion that these bodily marks “endow[ed] both a buddha-to-be and a universal monarch” were common in the earliest known Buddhist texts; they continued to be “viewed as an essential indication of buddhahood, either achieved or immanent, in Mahāyāna sources as well.” Boucher, Bodhisattvas of the Forest, 3 and 5; PSED, 964.

288 Perhaps related to ‘amama,’ an adjective meaning “Without egotism, without an selfish or worldly attachment, devoid of personal ties or desires.” PSED, 135.

289 This word could be related to the adjective ‘navama,’ which means ‘ninth.’ PSED, 538.

290 This word seems to be the vocative singular form of a noun meaning anything from ‘cover’ to ‘multitude,’ from ‘day of the week’ to ‘flask.’ PSED, 844.

291 This word could technically be rendered as the vocative form of “The sting in the tail of a scorpion” or “Yellow orpiment.” PSED, 155.

292 This word could be translated as the vocative form of ‘person,’ ‘people,’ ‘nation,’ or other such words. PSED, 445-46.

293 This word could be the vocative form of ‘tulā,’ a feminine noun meaning ‘balance,’ ‘scale,’ or ‘Libra’ (as in the seventh sign of the Zodiac). PSED, 478.

294 This word is the vocative singular form of ‘lion.’

295 This compound is the vocative singular form of ‘sun-bird.’ PSED, 881.

296 This is the vocative singular form of ‘moon-bird.’ PSED, 881.

297 This verb can mean ‘it is dyed,’ ‘it is reddened,’ or ‘it glows.’ PSED, 793.

298 This compound could mean ‘destroyer-bird,’ perhaps even ‘Śiva’s bird.’ PSED, 902.
The phrase ‘sarvakṣaya’ means ‘the perishing of all,’ and ‘suravihāga’ means something like ‘bird of god’ or ‘bird of the sun.’ The middle phrase, ‘strītva,’ does not appear to be meaningful. BHSD, 199; PSED, 993.

This is the vocative singular form of ‘bird of god’ or ‘bird of the sun.’ PSED, 389.

This is the vocative singular form of ‘action.’

This word could be translated as the vocative singular form of ‘cutting off,’ ‘dividing,’ ‘separating,’ dissection,’ or ‘determination.’ PSED, 896.

This compound could be rendered as the vocative singular form of ‘he who is made of knowledge.’

This is the vocative singular form of ‘thumb’ or ‘finger.’ PSED, 19.

This word is the vocative singular form of “beautiful light.” BHSD, 169.

The particle ‘ca’ functions as a conjunction; the word ‘prati’ modifies variously both verbs and nouns. PSED, 645-47.

This could be rendered as the vocative singular form of ‘freedom from delusion.’ BHSD, 441.

This word has several possible meanings; it could be rendered as the vocative singular form of “turn, revolution...method, process...section, part, [or] chapter.” BHSD, 329.

The compound ‘jyotikṣa’ could be translated as ‘bird of brightness’ or something as simple as ‘star,’ but ‘kṛma’ does not appear to be meaningful. PSED, 458.

This is the vocative singular form of ‘golden coin.’ PSED, 564.

This could be rendered as the vocative singular form of ‘course of knowledge,’ ‘performance of understanding,’ or something similar. PSED, 734 and 380.

This is the vocative singular form of ‘meditation on generosity and self-restraint.’ PSED, 491.

Each constituent of this compound has a meaning, but it is unclear how to put the parts together in a way that makes sense. The first word in the compound, ‘phala,’ means fruit—sometimes in the sense of ‘result,’ sometimes in the sense of ‘food.’ The second word, ‘kūṇḍala,’ can mean “coil (of rope)...curling [or] a ring as a kind of fetter.” The last element, ‘lekha,’ refers to a “written document (of any kind),” but perhaps also to a divine being. BHSD, 185-86; BHSD, 463; PSED, 819.

The word ‘nivarta’ appears to be derived from ni + ;nṛt, which means “To come back, return...flee from, retreat...To cease, desist or abstain from.” PSED, 562.

This compound seems to be the vocative singular of ‘the exhaustion of karma.’ BHSD, 199.

This word appears to be a derivative of prādūr + ṣhūhā, which means “To become manifest or visible, show oneself, appear...To arise, come to light...To become audible, be heard.” As such, it may reasonably be translated as ‘a visible state of existence.’ PSED, 680; BHSD, 392; BHSD, 407.

The word ‘purusā’ often means ‘man,’ but can sometimes be used to refer to a substantial self. The suffix ‘-tva’ can be added to the end of just about any noun to make it abstract. So, ‘purusatva’ could mean ‘manhood,’ ‘selfhood,’ or something of that nature.

This compound could be rendered as the vocative singular form of ‘equal to the unequalled,’ which boils down to ‘unequalled.’ PSED, 189.

The word ‘samaya’ can mean “time...assembly, congregation, conourse (of persons) [or] a high number.” The middle part of the compound appears to be an unconjugated form of vi + ṣbhīd, which means
[The effects of Śākyamuni chanting the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī as Jyotisomya]

[33] Immediately after the Tathāgata Śākyamuni uttered the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī, the great earth trembled yet again. By hearing the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī, the expression of femininity of five hundred daughters of Māra was destroyed and the expression of masculinity appeared. By hearing the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī, the expression of femininity of innumerable and incalculable feminine devas, nāgas, yakṣas, gandharvas, asuras, garuḍas, kinnaras, mahoragas, rākṣasas, and kumbhāṇḍas disappeared and the expression of masculinity appeared. All of their minds were steadfast in unexcelled, perfect enlightenment. The karma leading to existence as a woman in the future is completely and utterly destroyed. Having addressed Tathāgata Śākyamuni with a great sound, those women whose hands were joined together in reverent gesture said:

“Homage and reverence to the perfectly enlightened, arhat, tathāgata, wonder-working Śākyamuni! Speak with compassion and great detail! How was our femininity destroyed? How has our content disposition and masculinity arisen? By that swift and wonderful miracle, we may conceive a mind in unexcelled, perfect enlightenment. Speak of this, Blessed One, in order to overcome immeasurable and innumerable gods and men of a previous existence!”

[34] Now verily the Blessed Tathāgata Śākyamuni spoke of the past:

“Friends, in that period and time, in the presence of Tathāgata Jyotisomya and King Utpalavaktra, the divine Queen Surasundarī and 84,000 women heard the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī. After their expressions of femininity were made to disappear simply by hearing, Queen Surasundarī and those 84,000 women manifested expressions of masculinity. Likewise, simply by hearing the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī, the femininity of innumerable and incalculable daughters of gods, humans, and non-humans disappeared and was replaced by masculinity. The existence as a

---

“To break, tear down…pierce [sic], penetrate…divide, separate.” The last part of the compound, ‘adhijña,’ might very liberally be translated as ‘über-knower.’ BHSD, 565; PSED, 865.

320 ‘Śvāhā’ is word commonly used to signal the end of a ritual or chant; its rough English equivalent is ‘hail!’ PSED, 1020.

321 Edgerton translates the word ‘vyañjana’ as “consonant and syllable; possibly sound…commonly in contrast with artha, meaning, and regularly in such a context with implication of the ‘letter’ as against the ‘spirit.’” In light of the root from which this word derives (vyañj), which means to “reveal, manifest, show…indicate, denote,” I could have translated the word here as “mark,” but settled on “expression” in order to cover both sex and gender. BHSD, 514; PSED, 893.

322 Asuras are beings that are typically malevolent.

323 The word ‘garuḍa’ can refer to the “king of birds” or to an eagle. PSED, 400.

324 The word ‘kinnara’ can refer to “a bad or deformed man” or “a mythical being with a human figure and the head of a horse.” Given the context, the latter seems more appropriate. PSED, 356.

325 Mahoragas are large serpent-like beings often portrayed with human faces. PSED, 301.

326 Kumbhāṇḍas are “a kind of evil spirit, commonly mentioned…among Māra’s followers” and other imaginal beings. The name of this class of beings suggests that they (at least the males) have large, oddly shaped testicles. BHSD, 187.

327 Skt: amanusya. BHSD, 62.
woman these thousands of women would have obtained in the future is to be destroyed, all obstructions due to past actions suppressed. When the manhood of King Utpalavaktra’s Queen Suraśundarī and her assembly was produced, then King Utpalavaktra, the wheel-turning ruler of the world, consecrated his eldest son with a coronation ceremony together with 999 sons and Suraśundarī, 84,000 celestial beings and great men, and 92,000 superior beings, having left the presence of Tathāgata Jyotisomya, having shaved his head and put on ochre garments, he properly went forth from his home into homelessness. Having become an ascetic, he was thus intent on fundamental mental comprehension by recitations.

[35] “Now many ten million people wondered about who caused the wheel-turning king to go forth. They said to one another:

‘Intent on the work of Māra, this fraudulent and deceitful tathāgata teaches a dharma devoted to the work of Māra. To some he offers the expression of femininity, to some the expression of masculinity. He removes the hair and beard of some. To some he gives red garments, and to some yellow garments. To some he teaches the dharma for the sake of divine rebirth. To some he teaches the dharma for the sake of rebirth as a human, to some the dharma for the sake of rebirth as an animal, or for the sake of rebirth in a lower state. The ascetic Jyotisomya, intent on Māra’s course of action and possessing the power to create women, is a liar in the form of an ascetic. Suppose we were to go forth. In the end there is no grasping of name and form, and we are caused not to hear any of his words.

[The introduction of Kumārabhṛta, his polemic, and his change of heart]

[Śākyamuni said:]

[36] “Now there was a soldier named Kumārabhṛta, and he said:

‘I had a wife, women in my harem, and daughters. An ascetic of dirty habits replaced their expressions of femininity with expressions of masculinity. He made their heads bald and their garments red. I am alone and grieved. Having joined together, all of us enter the impassible and

---

328 Skt: karmāvaraṇa. BHSD, 107.
329 The Sanskrit reads ‘suraśundareṇa,’ which is a masculine instrumental singular noun; the grammatical gender of Suraśundarī’s name appears to have been changed to emphasize her transformation.
330 Skt: yoniśāṃ manasikāra. BHSD, 448.
331 Skt: māyā.
332 Kurumiya: paścime; Dutt: paśyema.
333 Skt: šramaṇakoraṇḍaka. Kurumiya writes that the word ‘koraṇḍaka’ is tough to define, but suggests (with reference to two other sources) “a man of dirty habits.” Kurumiya, Ratnaketuparivarta, 45 note 34.
rugged mountains where we will rarely see or hear so much as a sound about the dirty habits of the ascetic intent on Māra’s snares.

“Satisfied, they all said:

‘Let it be!’

[37] “Now, the solder Kumārabṛtta, together with tens of millions of doubters, set out. Dressed as a sage, he roamed the rugged, tangled, and mountainous frontier country. To living beings he taught this doctrine:

‘There is no liberation from samsāra. There is no fruit of good or bad actions. This nihilistic ascetic, who has been born to do the work of Māra, is a liar. Those who go to see him, salute him, and listen to his teachings become mentally agitated. He causes their heads to be shaved. He causes them to leave their houses. He gives them red garments. He causes them to practice wandering in burial grounds. He initiates them into the practices of mendicancy. He makes them eat once [a day]. He makes them hold wrong views. He makes them agitated by impermanence. He makes them dwell in solitary dwellings. He makes them deprived of love, pleasure, dances, songs, fragrances, garlands, lotions, jewelry, sex, and intoxicating drinks. He makes them speak very little. This sort of person, who appears to be an ascetic, is a nihilist set on the ways of Māra. He has observed the formerly unseen and unheard work of that ascetic Gautama and has arisen as an enemy of living beings. This figure has caused many myriad thousands of millions of people to accept wicked views.’

[Śākyamuni said:]

[38] “At a later time, the great ascetic Utpalavaktra, while in some impassible mountains, heard that those who were set out on their own bad way, even made to accept wrong views and doubt the indescribable three jewels. Having heard this, he thought to himself:

‘As long as I do not liberate beings from wicked views and establish them in correct views, my mendicancy would be useless. But how should I obtain unexcelled, perfect enlightenment in a dark existence in a future world and time? And how will I be able to liberate beings who are bound by the four snares and ties of Māra and given to vice?”

335 Skt: caturmārapāśabandhanabuddhān. More literally, this would read something like “bound by the ties and snares of the four Māras.” According to Edgerton, the phrase “caturmāra” refers to “Kleśa-māra [the personification of attachment to impure things], Skandha-māra [the personification of attachment to the aggregates (but perhaps to wickedness in a general sense)], Mṛtyu-māra [the personification of death], and
“Now, having seen Tathāgata Jyotisomya accompanied by hundreds of thousands of beings, the great ascetic Utpalavaktra—great in perseverance, courage, and compassion—wandering here and there to bordering villages, cities, towns, and places in the rugged mountains and valleys, taught the dharma to living beings. Having destroyed wicked views, having fixed those beings in correct views, he established them in unexcelled, perfect enlightenment. He established some in dedication to the prayekabuddha course, some on the śrāvaka course, and some on the fruit. He caused some to become ascetics. He established some in choosing to become laypeople, some in fasting, and some in going to the threefold refuge. And he taught the Ratnaketu Dhārāṇī to the women. Having abandoned femininity, they were established in masculinity. At that time all those ascetics who were doubtful turned away from their wicked views and were caused to be oriented toward an established in unexcelled, perfect enlightenment. Having been near Tathāgata Jyotisomya, having been established, he went forth to the soldier Kumārabhṛta. And thus he [Kumārabhṛta] made an earnest vow:

‘That ascetic Utpalavaktra ruined my family and lead them astray. Thus, I will cause destruction in the buddha-field there belonging to him who has obtained unexcelled, perfect enlightenment. From this birth on, I will cause him harm. When he is a newborn, when he is playing as a child, when he is practicing, studying, and crafting, when he is enjoying the company of his wife—I will cause to tremble him who is seated on the seat of enlightenment. I will create obstacles. I will destroy the tranquility of those who have obtained enlightenment.’

Now the great ascetic Utpalavaktra, by means of his great powers from the undertaking of penance, subdued the soldier Kumārabhṛta who had thus made this determined vow; having caused [Kumārabhṛta] to turn away from the path of wicked views, having pointed out his wrongdoings, [Utpalavaktra] produced in [Kumārabhṛta] the mind of unexcelled, perfect enlightenment.”

Then the soldier Kumārabhṛta, humble and tranquil, made this entreaty:

‘Exceedingly compassionate one, if you have obtained unexcelled perfect enlightenment, then perhaps you, who have obtained awakening, could explain unexcelled, perfect enlightenment to me.’

Śākyamuni said:

“Perhaps, friends, you have uncertainty or doubt. In that period and time, the one called Utpalavaktra made variously a place to worship Tathāgata Jyotisomya.
along with his retinue. Having departed, the ascetic and myriad millions and millions of living beings were made to enter in the three vehicles after destroying wicked doctrine. Innumerable beings were fixed in the fruits. And unlimited myriad millions and millions of women obtained manhood. This is not apparent to you. At that time, I was the wheel-turning king, lord of the earth, named Utpalavaktra. I assumed this form by the power of my mind. Moreover, friends, you may have uncertainty or doubt. In that period and time, the woman named Surasundarī, the queen who became an ascetic, was the bodhisattva-mahāsattva Maitreya. Perhaps, friends, you are doubtful or uncertain. In that period and time there was a soldier named Kumārabhṛta with millions of followers. Again, verily, you are not seeing it. In that period and time, the soldier named Kumārabhṛta was the wicked Māra. At that time, I caused his family to go forth. Because of this, having produced disorder for me, he made this vow:

‘If you have attained unexcelled, perfect enlightenment, then perhaps you could explain unexcelled, perfect enlightenment to me.’

“You, sons of good family, having been irreverent in the presence of Tathāgata Jyotisomya, having embraced wicked views spoken blatantly, having been freed from these views by me, you have gone forth. Then, in proper order, all of you worshipped many thousands of buddhas. You made a place of worship for them. Having heard the dharma, you made vows. You practiced the six perfections. Because of previous bad karma of body, speech, and mind, all of you have experienced suffering for many ages in the three wicked states of being. At this time, by these many actions, one is reborn in the dwelling of the wicked Māra.”

Again, verily, when the Blessed Tathāgata Śākyamuni uttered the Ratnaketu Dhāraṇī in the previous existence, 500 of Mara’s daughters lost their femininity and masculinity arose, and they accepted the dharma of non-origination. Immeasurable, innumerable, myriad hundreds of thousands of gods, men, and beings aspired to attain unexcelled, perfect enlightenment. They were firmly on the road to unexcelled, perfect enlightenment. Immeasurable, innumerable, myriad hundreds of thousands of beings were firmly set on the śrāvaka and pratyeka paths. Immeasurable and innumerable daughters of gods and men, having lost their womanhood, obtained the body of a man.

337 Skt: prajñādhāna.
338 The six perfections are dāna (generosity), śīla (virtue), kṣānti (patience), vīrya (diligence), dhyāna (one-pointed concentration), and prajñā (insight).
339 Skt: duḥkha.
340 The phrase ‘three wicked states of being’ refers to the hellish realm, the animal realm, or the ghostly realm (i.e. three of the six realms of rebirth). BHSD, 46.
341 Skt: strībhāva.
342 Skt: puruṣabhāva.


