

The *Bhikṣuṇī Saṃyukta* in the Shorter Chinese *Saṃyukta Āgama*

Marcus Bingenheimer

Dharma Drum Buddhist College, Taiwan
m.bingenheimer@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: This is the third article in a series concerning the Shorter Chinese *Saṃyukta Āgama*, the *Bieyi za ahan jing* 別譯雜阿含經 (T.100) (BZA). The articles are part of a larger project that constructs a digital parallel edition of the 364 *suttas* of the BZA and their various versions.¹ Starting from the fact that we are dealing with text-clusters, i.e. groups of texts, which share relevant narrative elements, the idea behind this edition is to present the texts of each cluster in a convenient and reliable fashion and to improve on previous editions in various ways. The online interface to the database is currently hosted at: <http://buddhistinformatics.chibs.edu.tw/BZA/>.

This article first discusses some comparative issues regarding the different versions of the *Bhikkhunī Saṃyutta*/*Bhikṣuṇī Saṃyukta*, especially concerning the names of the nuns. The evidence from the Chinese suggests that the name *Vajirā* in the Pāli *Saṃyutta Nikāya* is a mistake for *Vīrā*. The article concludes with the first translation of the BZA *Bhikṣuṇī Saṃyukta* into a western language.

THE NEGLECTED SAṂYUTTA

At first glance the modern reader is tempted to take the *Bhikkhunī Saṃyutta*/*Bhikṣuṇī Saṃyukta* (below, referred to simply as the *Bhikkhunī Saṃyutta*), the group of *suttas* on nuns, as corresponding to those on monks. However, neither the position of the *suttas* on nuns within the *Saṃyutta Nikāya* (as *saṃyutta* no. 5) or the *Saṃyukta Āgamas*, nor their content, show that the redactors of the canon(s) thought of the *Bhikkhunī Saṃyutta* as a pendant to the *Bhikkhu Saṃyutta*.² The

-
1. The project is realized at the Dharma Drum Buddhist College 法鼓佛教教研修學院, Taiwan, and is funded by the Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange 蔣經國國際學術交流基金會. The support of the foundation is gratefully acknowledged. Many thanks to Shi Zhanghui, Jung Hsi-chin and Shu Hui-yu for their contributions to the project, and to Peter Harvey for suggesting valuable corrections for this article.
 2. This is true for both the current and the inferred earlier arrangements of the SN or SĀs.

former is rather related to the *Māra Saṃyutta/Saṃyukta* (below, *Māra Saṃyutta*). All its *suttas* consist in a dialogue following a short introduction. The dialogue is generally in verse following a prose introduction. The basic narrative structure is the same in all the *suttas*: Māra tries unsuccessfully to confuse a nun. It seems that all the early redactors of the canon wanted to say about nuns, was that they successfully resisted temptation. However, the reduction to a pattern, while certainly a gesture of restriction, is not done bluntly. Since the *suttas* of the *Bhikkhuni Saṃyutta* are structurally parallel to those in the *Māra Saṃyutta*, the nuns play the part the Buddha acts in the *Māra Saṃyutta*. They are the interlocutors of Māra, who appears to them in the form of a 'young man'. A difference in nuance is that while in the *Māra Saṃyutta* the emphasis is on distraction (Māra tries to prevent the Buddha from meditation), in the *Bhikkhuni Saṃyutta* the language is that of temptation. There is a sexual undercurrent in several *suttas* of the *Bhikkhuni Saṃyutta* where the phrasing insinuates that Māra not only tries to disturb the nuns, but to seduce them.

Another point of reference for the *Bhikkhuni Saṃyutta* is the *Therīgāthā*, which contains many verses that are also found in the *Bhikkhuni Saṃyutta*. As far as the southern, Pāli tradition is concerned (we have no collections of elders' verses for the northern tradition), we find that, although the text has been studied thoroughly by eminent scholars, there are a number of unresolved questions regarding the exact form of the SN-*Therīgāthā* parallels.³ Commentarial information on the nuns too is considerably less detailed than for the monks of the *Bhikkhu Saṃyutta* and the *Theragāthā*. Why, for instance, is there no information on Vijayā and Vajirā⁴ in the SN-commentary?⁵ Why is Vijayā's verse in the SN completely different from her verses (vv. 169–74) in the *Therīgāthā*, while most others have a significant overlap? These and many other questions about nuns in early Buddhism will never be answered; though, as we will see below, comparison with the Chinese suggests in some places at least probable solutions. It should be remembered that if we know little about these first generation of nuns, we know even less about their successors. While the nuns in *Bhikkhuni Saṃyutta* live on in stereotyped narratives, the *bhikkhuni* of later periods were – with few exceptions – completely ignored by the record keepers of Buddhism.

-
3. For instance, Rhys Davids (1909–13, 186), Norman (1971, 96), and Bodhi (1997, 2; 2000, 428) mention the fact that the attribution of the verses of the three sisters Cālā, Upacālā, and Sīsūpacālā differ considerably between the SN and the *Therīgāthā*.
 4. Rhys Davids (1917, 170) points out how strange it is that Vajirā, though her verse was cited widely in other works, (a) was not included in the *Therīgāthā*, (b) is hardly mentioned in the commentary, and (c) has no legend about her.
 5. The *Therīgāthā* commentary too gives only minimal information about Vijayā. The *bhikkhuni* she approached in her verse 'is said to have been the elder Khema' (*bhikkhuninti khemātheriṃ sandhāya vadati*).

THE NUNS' NAMES

In the following we will take a detailed look at the names of the *bhikkhunīs* to see what can be learned from a comparison of the Indian and Chinese forms.⁶ As usual, we find that the BZA sometimes translates the names, while the ZA almost always transliterates.⁷ In the case of Vajirā we suggest that this name is a mistake for Vīra and that the nun in the SN is identical to the Vīra mentioned in the *Yakkha Saṃyutta* (X, 11). Comparison with the Chinese allows us to decide that the name of the nun in SN X,11 is indeed Vīra not Cīra as some editions have it. A simplified list of textual correspondences for the *Bhikkhunī Saṃyutta* is as follows.⁸

BZA	ZA	SN
214. 曠野	1198. 阿騰毘	1. Āḷavikā
215. 蘇摩	1199. 蘇摩	2. Somā
216. 翅舍憍曇彌	1200. 吉離舍瞿曇彌	3. Kisāgotamī
217. 蓮華色	1201. 優鉢羅色	5. Uppalavaṇṇā
218. 石室	1202. 尸羅 (= Selā)	10. Vajirā
219. 鼻嚙	1203. 毘羅 (= Vīra)	9. Selā
220. 毘闍耶	1204. 毘闍耶	4. Vijayā
221. 折羅	1205. 遮羅	6. Cālā
222. 優波折羅	1206. 優波遮羅	7. Upacālā
223. 動頭	1207. 尸利沙遮羅	8. Sīsupacālā

BZA 214: 曠野 / 阿騰毘 / Āḷavikā

Kuang ye 曠野, a common term meaning ‘outside, wilderness, forest’, was used to translate a term close to Skt. Aṭavī, ‘a place to roam about’ (MW, sub voc.), which corresponds to the Pāli place name Āḷavī. The ZA transliteration *ā là pí* 阿騰毘 omits the final *-kā*.

BZA 215: 蘇摩 / 蘇摩 / Somā

The BZA and the ZA use the same characters for this unproblematic transliteration.

6. With a few exceptions this discussion is limited to the forms found in the *Sutta-piṭaka*. The term Indic is deliberately vague. We do not know enough about the original to offer a more precise description of its language. For sure we know that it was neither Pāli nor Sanskrit, but closer to the latter. Heeding the advice of Boucher (1998), I hesitate for now to use labels like ‘Gandhari Prakrit’, the obvious candidate, or other constructs. Boucher notes that the evidence for the underlying Indic text ‘is in fact evidence for the Chinese reception of the Indic text’.
7. This has been observed elsewhere (Bingenheimer 2006, nn. 44, 76; 2007, n. 64). In the *Bhikkhunī Saṃyutta* the BZA translates the complete name four out of ten times, while the ZA has only one mixed translation (優鉢羅色 for Uppalavaṇṇā).
8. For a detailed list see: <http://buddhisticinformatics.chibs.edu.tw/BZA/bzaComCatWeb.html>

BZA 216: 翅舍憍曇彌 / 吉離舍瞿曇彌 / Kisāgotamī

The name of Kisāgotamī – Gotamī the Lean – is transliterated twice, both transliterations are unique, i.e. appear only in these *suttas*. The *chi she* 翅舍 part of the BZA 翅舍憍曇彌 is used elsewhere to render *kesa/keśa*. As Coblin notes, 翅 was widely used by ONWC translators to render *k*-initials and might transliterate *kr*, *ke*, *kye*, or *ki*.⁹

The *li* 離 in ZA 吉離舍瞿曇彌 shows that the name the translators saw or heard must have been close to or identical with Skt. Kṛśāgautamī. *Ji* 吉 (ONWC: *kiit, STCA: *kir, Coblin (1994)) alone was here not sufficient to render *kr*. Whoever read or recited the original pronounced *kr* distinctly enough to distinguish two phonemes *ji li* 吉離 (ONWC: *kiit le, STCA: *kir li, Coblin, 1994). The same principle is used in the transliteration of Kṛśāgautamī in the *Ekottarikāgama* (CBETA/T02.125.558c25) where her name is rendered 機梨舍瞿曇彌.

BZA 217: 蓮華色 / 優鉢羅色 / Uppalavaṇṇā

The name of Uppalavaṇṇā – ‘Lotus-coloured One’ (i.e. fair of skin) – indicates beauty. It is translated in the BZA, while the ZA has a combination of transliteration and translation.

BZA 218: 石室 / 尸羅 / Selā

Though the text corresponds with the Pāli *sutta* on Vajirā, both BZA and ZA clearly transliterate a name close to Pāli Selā, Skt. Śailā.

Again the ZA transliterates, while the BZA opts for translation or perhaps a combination of translation and transliteration as it sometimes does. 石室 is a relatively common term meaning ‘cave’. 石 was able to transliterate *si* or *sil*,¹⁰ however, 室 *śit*, *śjet* (Coblin no. 826) for *la* or *lā* is impossible. The translators seemed to have derived from Pāli *sela* ‘rock, stone, cliff’ (Mizuno 1975, sub voc.) / Skt. *śaila* ‘rigid, stone-like; a rock, crag, hill, mountain’ (MW, sub voc.).

BZA 219: 鼻嚙 / 毘羅 / Vīrā, Vīryā, Vīrī

The second character used to transliterate Vīr(y)ā’s name in the BZA differs slightly among the editions, the Taishō edition has [口+(利/余)], a non-unicode variant characters not in the dictionaries, almost certainly pronounced *li*. However, most other witnesses for this passage print 嚙. The name occurs again in BZA 326 as *bi li* 鼻嚙, where it is glossed as *xiong* 雄 ‘heroic, powerful, mighty’. The original was therefore certainly a Prakrit form of Skt. *vīryā* / *vīrā* / *vīrayā*, which is confirmed by the ZA *piluo* 毘羅 (*vīrā*). Next to Vīrā, Akanuma (1930: 726) suggests Vīrī for 鼻嚙.¹¹

9. Coblin (1994, 39–42) and sub no. 277.

10. Coblin (1994) reconstructs *śit* (no. 1085a) for ONWC.

11. Though Vīrī sounds most likely this is not necessarily so, since (as finals) 嚙, 梨, etc. were in rare cases used for *-ryā*. Coblin (1994, no. 323, cf. sub no. 258) gives mainly *-li* and *-rī* for 梨, but notes Dharmakṣema’s use of *-rya*. An example for this might be e.g. 訶梨 for Haryamkakuḷa

What now is the corresponding name in the Pāli canon for 鼻嚟 and 毘羅?

Although there is no Vīrā in the SN *Bhikkhunī Samyutta*, a nun called Vīrā is mentioned in the *Yakkha Samyutta* (X, 11). This *sutta* is the parallel of BZA 326 and indeed her name is rendered 鼻嚟 (BZA) and 毘羅 (ZA) respectively. Again, little or nothing is known about this *bhikkhunī* and even the spelling of her name was (until now) uncertain. The Pāli manuscript tradition has Vīrā or Cīrā. Geiger et al. (1997) and Bodhi (2000) opt for Cīrā, Rhys Davids (1917, 275) thought Vīrā to be more likely. The evidence from the Chinese shows the reading preferred by Rhys Davids to be correct.

The connection of text and protagonist in this *sutta* is fragile. Comparing cluster BZA 218 and BZA 219, we find that the northern and the southern tradition differ in the attribution of speaker and verse:

- Cluster BZA218: BZA/ZA have Selā as protagonist, but the textual parallel in the SN is the *sutta* on Vajirā.
- Cluster BZA219: BZA/ZA have Vīr(y)ā as protagonist, but the textual parallel in the SN is the *sutta* on Selā.

I suggest the following solution:

1. Originally the verses now ascribed to Vajirā in the SN were spoken by Selā,¹² as suggested by the witnesses of the northern tradition. This would resolve the difference between the Chinese and the Pāli.
2. There never was a nun called Vajirā, the name is a mistake for Vīr(y)ā. This name is attested for the Pāli (SN X, 11) and would fit with the transliterations of both BZA and ZA in the clusters BZA 219 and 326. It also explains why the commentary ‘provides no personal identification [for Vajirā], and no verses in her name have come down in the *Therīgāthā*’.¹³

Could these two changes – exchanging the protagonists of the *suttas* and misspelling/mishearing a name – have happened in the northern tradition instead? That is, did the Sarvāstivādins transmit Vīr(y)ā instead of an original Vajirā? In theory yes, but in this case the odds are that the changes happened on the way south. First, we have three witnesses¹⁴ for the northern tradition and even if

(CBETA/T04.192.20b6). See also *chan ti bo li* 羈提波梨 for Skt. *ṣānti-pāla* in the *Xianyu jing* 賢愚經 (CBETA/T.04.202.359c24), a *sutta* translated around the same time and perhaps in the same region as the BZA. More research is needed on this, however, and the possibility of vowel weakening from *-ryā* to *-rī* in the Prakrit cannot be excluded (Brough attests this weakening of the final vowel for the Gāndhārī Prakrit (1962, §24). See also the footnote on *a li ye* 阿梨耶 below.

12. There is reason to believe that Selā and Ālavikā ‘the one from Ālavī’ (BZA 214) were the same person, mainly because two verses ascribed to Selā in the *Therīgāthā* are ascribed to Ālavikā in the SN. The commentary too, asserts Selā and Ālavikā were identical (see Bodhi 2000, 424, 429). This does however, not concern the argument above.
13. Bodhi (2000, 430). Admittedly, we do not know much about Vīrā either.
14. Next to the BZA and the ZA, the *Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya* ascribes the verse starting ‘Why do you think of a “being”, Marā do you hold this view?’ to Sela/Śailā (*manyase kiṃ nu sattveti māra dṛṣṭigataṃ hi te* – Skt. cited in Enomoto (1994, no. 1202); SN (here ascribed to Vajirā): *Kiṃ nu*

these belong to the same branch of the stemma, it must at least be admitted that the northern version of the *sutta* is better attested. Second, there are numerous disagreements in the attribution of verses between the *Bhikkhunī Saṃyutta* and the *Therīgāthā*, which point to a certain insecurity in the transmission of the elder nuns' verses in general. Thirdly, the argument from silence: since neither Vajirā nor Vīrā is mentioned by the generally very thorough commentaries, we have to assume that some information was lost at an early stage. It therefore seems reasonable to accept the northern version that there was only one nun called Vīr(y)ā.

There exists a Sanskrit fragment of the *Uddāna* to the original Sanskrit *saṃyukta* of either the ZA or the BZA,¹⁵ in which six *Bhikkhunī* names are mentioned. Unfortunately, the names of Uppalavaṇṇā, Selā and Vīrā are represented in this verse by keywords from the sutras: (*supu*)-*ṣpitāgra* (fully blossomed), *satva* (being), *biṃba* (puppet). The *Uddāna* therefore cannot help to decide the spelling question of Vīrā/Vajira's name.

BZA 220: 毘闍耶 / 毘闍耶 / Vijayā

As in 215, both BZA and ZA use the same characters to transliterate this name.

BZA 221: 折羅 / 遮羅 / Cālā

BZA 222: 優波折羅 / 優波遮羅 / Upacālā

BZA 223: 動頭 / 尸利沙遮羅 / Sīsupacālā

The names of Sāriputta's sisters are transliterated unremarkably, with the exception of the BZA rendering for Sīsupacālā. Though the BZA transliterates Cālā and Upacālā, the translator chose to translate Sīsupacālā with the unusual term *dong-tou* 動頭, 'moving/nodding/shaking head'. Stylistically a doubtful choice, but, as we have seen before, the translator of the BZA was no great stylist. He derives this from 'head' (Skt. *śirasa*, Pāli *sīsa*) and 'to shake' (*calati*). Both this translation

sattoti paccesi, māra diṭṭhigataṃ nu te). Evidently the *Kośa* is citing the Sanskrit *Sā* here and is therefore not an independent witness, but the fact that there was no disagreement in the northern tradition (BZA, ZA, and *Kośa*) about who spoke this verse, strengthens its position versus the southern tradition. In the Pāli, none of the verses that the SN attributes to Selā or Vajirā appear in the *Therīgāthā*, and although the chariot simile contained in the *Vajirā sutta* was cited later, there is no reference to Vajirā other than in the *Milindapañha* (vv. 27–8), and this should be regarded as an interpolation. There are two reasons for this. First, Miln. 27–8 has '*Bhāsitampetaṃ, mahārāja, vajirāya bhikkhuniyā bhagavato sammukhā*' (Thus it was said by the *Bhikkhunī Vajirā*, in the presence of the Buddha). *Vajirā* is indeed mentioned here, but the problem is that the verse is spoken to *Māra* not the Buddha. Obviously the person who made the reference did not remember the context clearly. Second, the reference does not exist in both the (partial) Chinese versions (T.1670A and T.1670B) of the text, where *Nāgasena* only mentions 'a Buddhist sūtra': 那先言佛經說 (CBETA, T32, no. 1670A, p. 696, b1) and 那先言佛經說之如 (CBETA, T32, no. 1670B, p. 706, b11–12).

15. See the discussion by Waldschmidt (1980, 144ff.).

and the ZA transliteration suggest that the name of the youngest sister in the northern tradition might not have been Skt. for Sīsupacālā, but a form close to *Sīrṣa-cālā.¹⁶

My conclusion is that at some point early in the redaction of the *Sutta-piṭaka* it was felt that all that was worth recording about the nuns contemporary to the Buddha was that they successfully resisted Māra. Once the *suttas* concerning nuns were bound to a narrow pattern, the connection between verses and speakers became fragile. Since all *suttas* in the *Bhikkhunī Saṁyutta* were restricted to one schema, it must have been more difficult to memorize who said what. Mistakes became more likely, except where the verses themselves allude to the protagonist, as in the *suttas* on Kisāgotamī or Uppalavaṇṇā. Compared to the *Māra Saṁyutta*, the prose text in all three versions of the *Bhikkhunī Saṁyutta* is significantly more formulaic, and the BZA and ZA add a closing formula to the *gāthās*, leveling even the verse parts. The presence of this formula as well as the mentioning of ‘ninety-six non-Buddhist teachings’ in BZA 223 suggests that the northern version underwent at least one major redaction that did not happen in the southern tradition.

In a scholastic tradition that takes pride in its highly developed commentarial corpus, it is somewhat surprising that even the very names of the nuns – what identifies them as individuals – were liable to be forgotten, or remembered in different versions. Was it Cīrā or Vīrā, Sīsupacālā or Sīsaccālā? Was there a Vajirā and a Vīrā, or only one Vīrā? Above I have offered tentative answers to some of these questions, but even if accepted, the amount of information gained is but a tiny fraction of what was lost. The *suttas* on nuns stand reduced in a way that foreshadows the neglect of the Buddhist tradition’s female side by its own historiography.

TRANSLATION¹⁷

214. Āḷavikā

Thus have I heard, once, the Buddha was staying at Sāvaththī at the Jeta Grove in the Anāthapiṇḍika Park.

At that time there was a nun called Āḷavikā. One early morning she took her robes and her begging bowl and entered the town to beg for food. Having fin-

16. Waldschmidt (1980, 146) too has noticed this. Unfortunately the fragment with the *Uddāna* breaks off at *sīrṣa*.

17. To the best of my knowledge this is the first translation of the *Bhikṣuṇī Saṁyutta* from Chinese. The Pāli version has been translated by Ernst Windisch (1895), Caroline Rhys Davids & F. L. Woodward (1917–30) and Bhikkhu Bodhi (2000). As in Bingenheimer (2006; 2007), all names are given in Pāli though generally the Indic original was phonologically closer to Sanskrit. Since it is not always possible to ascertain the original Prakrit, the names have to be normalized to either Pāli or Sanskrit. We choose Pāli because in that way it will be easier for the readers to refer back to the Pāli texts. Obviously the reconstruction of names is an interesting topic, this is why the introduction deals with the nuns’ names *in extenso*.

ished her meal, she cleaned her bowl, and decided to enter the Andhavana forest [to meditate].

At that time King Māra the Bad¹⁸ thought: ‘Gotama the renunciant is now staying at Sāvattihī in the Andhavana forest.¹⁹ His disciple the nun Āḷavikā entered the town [Sāvattihī] to beg for food. Having finished her meal and cleaned her bowl, she has gathered her seat and wants to enter this forest. I shall disturb her!’. Thereupon the Bad One turned into a young man; standing at the wayside he asked Āḷavikā: ‘Where are you going?’. The nun answered: ‘I am going to a secluded place’. On hearing this the young man spoke a verse:

In all the worlds // there is no liberation;
 You are going to a secluded, quiet place // for what?
 You are still young and pretty; // if you won’t enjoy the five sensual pleasures [now],
 One day you will be old and weak; // don’t have regrets later.

There the nun thought: ‘Who is this, who wants to disturb me? What a cheat!²⁰ Is he a human or a non-human being?’. Having thought this, she entered concentration and, using her insight, she recognized that it was the Bad One who tried to disturb her. She spoke a verse:

There is liberation in the world; // I know this through experience.²¹
 You, Bad One, ignorant and shallow // do not know its traces.
 Sensual pleasure is like a sharp halberd, slashing; // the aggregates are bandits, running after you, knife in hand.
 You talk of enjoying the five sensual pleasures // but the suffering [caused by] pleasure is to be feared.
 Sensual pleasure causes sadness and troubles, // sensual pleasure causes longing.²²
 Sensual pleasure causes a hundredfold suffering, // sensual pleasure²³ is the root of all suffering.

18. For the translation of *pāpima* with ‘Bad’ instead of ‘Evil’ or ‘Wicked’ see Bingenheimer, 2007: p.58, n.39. More arguments are found in Windisch (1895, 19), who shows the connection between *Māro pāpimā* and the Vedic *Pāpmā Mrtyuḥ*. Windisch clearly states that according to vedic usage ‘bedeutet *Māro pāpimā* ursprünglich nicht ‘Māra der Böse’, sondern ‘Māra das Uebel’.

19. *Andhavana* should read *Jeta Grove*. This is almost certainly a mistake in the text. In the ZA version the place mentioned in the opening formula is repeated here. Ditto for BZA 216–23.

20. *qi zha* 欺詐. Skt. *krītrima* (Hirakawa, no.1852), Pāli *kerāṭika*, *kerāṭiya*. This exclamation is not found in the Pāli parallels.

21. 我今自證知. Assuming 自 marks the instrumental here. Cf. the Pāli *paññāya me suphussitaṃ* (‘I have closely touched with wisdom’) and the ZA parallel 我自知所得.

22. *zhui nian* 追念. Usually used as VP, here as NP. In the *Āgamas* the term appears prominently only in the BZA. Remarkable also its relative frequency in the *Chuyaojing* 出曜經 (T.212) and the *Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya* (T.1442).

23. This is the last of five occurrences of *yu* 欲 in the verse. I usually render a single character 欲 as ‘desire’, the topic of this *sutta* is however *kāmarati*. Both the BZA and the ZA have 五欲 (*pañcakāma-guṇa*) in places, here therefore 欲 as ‘sensual pleasure’.

[I have] cut off all craving, // the darkness of ignorance²⁴ destroyed.
Having reached and witnessed complete cessation,²⁵ // [I] dwell in a
state of purity.

At that time the Bad One thought: ‘The nun Āḷavikā knows my mind well!’. Vexed, dispirited, and ashamed he returned to his palace.

215. Somā

Thus have I heard, once, the Buddha was staying at Sāvattḥī at the Jeta Grove in the Anāthapiṇḍika Park.

At that time the nun Somā took her robes and her begging bowl and entered Sāvattḥī to beg for food. Having finished her meal, she cleaned her bowl, gathered her seat [for meditation] and went to the Andhavana forest [to meditate].

King Māra the Bad thought: ‘The nun Somā took her robes and her begging bowl and entered Sāvattḥī to beg for food. Having finished her meal, she has cleaned her bowl, and gathered her seat [for meditation] and is now on her way to the Andhavana forest [to meditate]’. Upon this the Bad One changed into a Brahmin, stood at the wayside and said: ‘My lady,²⁶ where are you going?’. The nun answered: ‘I am going to a secluded place’. Thereupon the Bad One spoke a verse:

The stage which seers²⁷ attain, // that state is difficult to reach.
With your inferior intelligence²⁸ // you cannot attain that state.

24. *wu ming an* 無明闇. The Pāli here has *tamokhandho padalito* ‘the mass of darkness is dispelled’, which is fairly close to the ZA (離一切闇冥). The original for the BZA Chinese might have been a Prakrit of **avidyāndhakāra* (Hirakawa, no. 2153) or **avidyātama*.

25. *jin mie* 盡滅 (in BZA 214, 215, 217, 218, 219, 220). Used synonymously with *mie jin* 滅盡 (BZA 216, 221, 222, 223) in this common closing formula. In Buddhist Chinese 滅盡 later became the more common term, but at this relatively early stage the character order was not yet fixed.

26. *a li ye* 阿梨耶, Skt. *āryā*. This particular transliteration is used only once in the BZA. BZA 221 and 222 have 阿利耶, indicating again a lack of ‘editorial oversight’ for the BZA. 阿梨耶/阿利耶 is one of the terms that shows again how distinct the original Prakrit of the BZA was from Pāli. The phoneme [rī] that is absent in Pāli *ayyā* was obviously audible for the translator(s) and transcribed as 梨. In the ZA (CBETA/T02.99.279c24) 阿梨 is used to transliterate the male form (*ārya*).

27. *xian sheng* 仙聖. ZA: *xian ren* 仙人. SN: *isīhi*.

28. *fei ru bihui zhi* 非汝鄙穢智. The text should perhaps be emended here, from *ru* 汝 ‘you’ to *nü* 女 ‘woman’, resulting in ‘The inferior intelligence of a woman’. The case for an emendation rests on two reasons: intra-textually, the first line of Somā’s reply would make better sense this way. Inter-textually, this would follow the Pāli parallel (*na taṃ dvāṅgulaṇṇāya, sakkā pappotumitthiyā*). Against an emendation is the fact that 汝 is used in all consulted editions (CBETA/Taishō, Tripitaka Koreana, Qisha Edition, Zhonghua Edition), and the fact that the ZA has 非彼二指智能得到彼處, which contains the metaphor of the *dvāṅgulaṇṇāya* ‘two-fingered wisdom’ (s. Bodhi 2000, 425, n. 336), without, however, connecting it to women.

Thereupon the nun thought: ‘Is this a human or a non-human being, who wants to disturb me?’. She entered [a state of meditative] concentration and, using her insight,²⁹ she recognized that it was the Bad One. She spoke a verse:

The mark of womanhood has nothing to do with it // if only the mind³⁰
practises meditative concentration
And perceives the highest *Dhamma*; // as long as there are the marks of
man- and womanhood,
One can say that women // are not apt for the *Dhamma*.
Once the marks of man- and womanhood are no more // from where
should distinctions arise?
[I have] cut off all craving, // the darkness of ignorance destroyed.
Having reached complete cessation, // [I] dwell in a state of purity.
Therefore understand: // Bad One you are defeated.³¹
At that time the Bad One thought: ‘The nun Somā knows my mind well!’
Depressed, dispirited, and ashamed he returned to his palace.

216. *Kisāgotamī*

Thus have I heard, once, the Buddha was staying at Sāvattihī at the Jeta Grove in the Anāthapiṇḍika Park.

At that time the nun *Kisāgotamī* took her robes and her begging bowl and entered the town [Sāvattihī] to beg for food. Having finished her meal, she cleaned her bowl, gathered her seat [for meditation], went to go to the Andhavana forest, sat under a tree, abiding in [*jhāna*] meditation.³²

29. *guan* 觀察. The Taishō has *guan*zhong 觀眾, the mistake is corrected in the CBETA/T. edition.

30. The BZA has *yi* 意, which usually translates *manas*. Both ZA and the Pāli have *xin* 心 / *citta*.

31. *boxun duofuchu* 波旬墮負處. Except in BZA 214, this is the final *pāda* of the verse part in all *suttas* of the BZA *Bhikṣuṇī Saṃyukta*. Its Pāli equivalent seems to be the phrase *nihatō tvam asi antaka*, which, however, does not appear in the *Bhikṣuṇī Saṃyukta*, but only in the *Māra Saṃyukta*. Instead of *antaka* ‘bringer of death, Deadly One’, the northern line of transmission obviously had *pāpima* (BZA: 波旬, ZA: 惡魔).

32. *tian zhu* 天住. The Pāli here has *divāvihāra*, which Bodhi (2000) renders ‘for the day’s abiding’ and which appears in this position several times in the *Bhikkhūnī Saṃyutta*. Bodhi’s translation is to be preferred to the definition given in the PED ‘the day-rest, i.e. rest during the heat of the day’. However, in this case *divāvihāra* is probably not the true equivalent of 天住 (*divyo vihārahāḥ* (Hirakawa 1997, no. 7370). The translators seem to have heard or read the Prakrit for *dibba-* or *divyavihāra*. This ‘heavenly abiding’ denotes the fourth *jhāna* (Nakamura 1981, 981d), or more broadly all *jhāna* meditation. Considering that the nuns gather their meditation seat (坐具/*āsana*) and sit under a tree (樹下/*rukḥamūle*), *divāvihāra* here is less likely than *divyavihāra*. In short, the Chinese 天住 should be taken as ‘for [*jhāna*] meditation’ instead ‘for the days’ abiding’. This reading is supported by BZA 217, where the text explicitly states that the nun is meditating (端坐思惟), and BZA 221 and 222 where the nuns are said to ‘enter’ *divyavihāra* (入於天住).

At that time King Māra the Bad thought: ‘The renunciant Gotama is staying at Sāvattḥī at the Jeta Grove in the Anāthapiṇḍika Park and here is this nun called Kisāgotamī. She took her robes and her begging bowl and entered Sāvattḥī to beg for food. Having finished her meal, she cleaned her bowl, gathered her seat [for meditation], and went to go to the Andhavana forest, [now] she has sat down under a tree and is abiding in [jḥāna] meditation’.

Having thought this he changed into a young man, and with the intention to disturb her, spoke this verse:

What are you doing there now // sitting sadly under a tree,
Sighing and sobbing; // haven’t you lost a child?
Dwelling alone in the forest // aren’t you looking for a man?³³

There the nun thought: ‘Who is this? What a cheat! Is he, who wants to cause confusion in me, a human or a non-human being?’. She entered concentration and recognized that it was King Māra. She spoke a verse:

I have cut off craving, // I am without desire, [and] do not think about
children.
Sitting upright among the trees, // no worries, no agitations trouble me.
[I have] cut off all craving, // the darkness of ignorance destroyed.
Having reached complete cessation, // [I] peacefully dwell in a state of
purity.
Therefore understand: // Bad One you are defeated.

At that time the Bad One thought: ‘The nun Kisāgotamī knows my mind well!’. Depressed, dispirited, and ashamed he returned to his palace.

217. Uppalavaṇṇā

Thus have I heard, once, the Buddha was staying at Sāvattḥī at the Jeta Grove in the Anāthapiṇḍika Park.

At that time one morning the nun Uppalavaṇṇā took her robes and her begging bowl and entered the town [Sāvattḥī] to beg for food. Having finished her meal, she cleaned her bowl, gathered her seat [for meditation]. Having washed her feet, she went to the Andhavana forest, and sat uprightly under a tree, abiding in [jḥāna] meditation.

At that time King Māra thought: ‘The renunciant Gotama is staying at Sāvattḥī at the Jeta Grove in the Anāthapiṇḍika Park. The nun Uppalavaṇṇā took her robes and her begging bowl and entered the town [Sāvattḥī] to beg for food. Having finished her meal, she cleaned her bowl, gathered her seat, and went to the Andhavana forest. She is sitting uprightly under a tree, abiding in [jḥāna] meditation. I shall disturb her!’

33. This rather cruel jape alludes to the well-known story of Kisāgotamī’s loss of her son and husband.

Having thought thus he changed into a young man, went to her place and spoke this verse:

Sitting under a Sāla tree,³⁴ // beautiful like its blossoms;
All alone *bhikkhunī*, // is it that you are meditating?
Without a companion, // aren't you afraid of the ignorant?³⁵

At that time Uppalavaṇṇā thought: 'Who is this who wants to disturb me? What a cheat! Is he a human or a non-human being?'. She entered concentration and recognized that it was the Bad One. She spoke a verse:

A hundred thousand sly and deceitful³⁶ rogues // could all do just as
much as you.
They could not move me even an inch, // therefore I stay alone and
unafraid.

At that time King Māra again spoke a verse:

I might hide myself // within your belly,³⁷
Between your brows, // unseen by you.

And the nun again replied with a verse:

My mind has attained self-mastery; // I have well practised the concen-
tration that gives super-natural powers.
Having cut off the great bondages, // I will never be frightened by you.³⁸
I have cast aside³⁹ all fetters, // have pulled out the root of the three
taints [of attachment, hate and ignorance].

34. *poluooshu* 婆羅樹. As in the Pāli and the ZA (堅固樹) this is the Sāla (Skt. Sāra) tree. See Waku (1979, no. 225).

35. *neng bu wei yu chi* 能不畏愚癡. Or perhaps: 'Aren't you afraid, silly?'. This second reading is syntactically unlikely, but the syntax in the BZA *gāthās* is not always regular. The Pāli calls Uppalavaṇṇā 'foolish' (*bāle na tvaṃ bhāyāsi dhuttakānan*). The ZA (不畏惡人耶) like the Pāli says she should be afraid of evil people (*dhuttaka/惡人*), but does doesn't mention foolishness.

The compliment on Uppalavaṇṇā's beauty is slightly more emphatic in the Pāli (*na catthi te dutiyā vaṇṇadhātu*), while the ZA and the BZA stress her having no companion.

In the Pāli tradition Māra's warning was understood in the context of the assault on Uppalavaṇṇā in the Andhavana, referred to in the *Dhammapada* Commentary (Dhp-a, ii.52).

36. *jian wei* 姦偽. ZA: 姦狡. Taken as a compound 姦偽 means 'sly, cunning, deceitful'; 姦 has sexual connotations.

37. No empty threat for the listeners of those days. The *Māratājaniya Sutta* (MN 50) tells the story how Māra hid in the belly of Moggallāna.

38. This passage (我心得自在 善修如意定 斷絕大繫縛 終不怖畏汝) is close to both the *Anuṣṭubh* of the Pāli (*cittasmim vaṣībhūtāmhi, iddhipādā subhāvītā; sabbabandhanamuttāmhi, na taṃ bhāyāmi āvuso*) and the ZA (我心有大力 善修習神通 大縛已解脫 不畏汝惡魔). Note, however, how the somewhat surprising *āvuso* of the southern tradition has been transmitted as *gui* 惡魔 'evil spirit' (ZA) or simply *ru* 汝 'you' (BZA) in the north.

39. A relative rare usage of *tu* 吐 as 'to renounce; to abandon, to part with' (HDC, sub voc.), which has not entered Buddhist lexicography yet. In the BZA for most occurrences (10 of 14) 吐 has the modern meaning of 'to spit, to vomit'. It appears as 'abandon' only three more times in the

The roots of fear thus gone, // I am not afraid.
 I abide here, // [I] have no fear of you.
 Bring on your armies all, // I shall not be afraid.
 [I have] cut off all craving, // the darkness of ignorance destroyed.
 Having reached complete cessation, // [I] peacefully dwell in a state of
 purity.
 Therefore understand: // Bad One you are defeated.

At that time the Bad One thought: ‘The nun Uppalavaṇṇā understands my mind well!’. Depressed, dispirited, and ashamed he returned to his palace.

218. **Selā*⁴⁰

Thus have I heard, once, the Buddha was staying at Sāvattḥī at the Jeta Grove in the Anāthapiṇḍika Park.

At that time one morning the nun Selā took her robes and her begging bowl and entered Sāvattḥī to beg for food. Having finished her meal, she cleaned her bowl, gathered her seat [for meditation] and went to the Andhavana forest [to meditate]. At that time King Māra thought: ‘The renunciant Gotama is staying at Sāvattḥī at the Jeta Grove in the Anāthapiṇḍika Park. And there is the nun Selā who took her robes and her begging bowl and entered Sāvattḥī to beg for food. Having finished her meal, she cleaned her bowl, gathered her seat and has gone to the Andhavana forest. I shall disturb her!’ Having thought this he changed into a young man, approached her and spoke a verse:

Who is it that created beings, // by whom were they made?⁴¹
 Why are they called beings, // from where do they arise?

That time the nun Selā, having heard the verse thought: ‘Who is this? What a cheat! Is he a human or a non-human being?’. She entered concentration and recognized he was King Māra. She answered with a verse:

Māra, you have a wrong view of ‘beings’, // saying and believing they
 actually exist [as substantial entities].

BZA (at CBETA/T 02.100.408b4 and 02.100.449a12). For the ZA however the meaning ‘to abandon’ is more common: in 37 occurrences in the ZA 吐 is used only once in the meaning ‘to vomit’ (CBETA/T02.99.105b5).

40. *shíshì* 石室. See introduction.

41. *zhong sheng zao zuo shei* 眾生造作誰. Literally this reads: ‘Who is it that the sentient beings create?’. But in the light of the parallels a reading like 眾生造作[者是]誰 clearly seems more likely (ZA: 誰為其作者 / SN: *kuvaṃ sattassa kāraṇo*). See also the first *gāthā* in BZA 219. This is an example of how easily the Chinese *gāthās* can be misunderstood. As a non-inflected language, Chinese relies heavily on syntactical position to establish meaning; this often becomes problematic in the *gāthās*, where the syntax is restricted by four, five or seven syllables per halfline. Note also how the singular in Pāli (*sattassa*) is paralleled by a ‘plural’ term 眾生 in Chinese.

Conventional, empty they are but assemblies // there are in fact no 'beings'.

Like when causes and various conditions // converge and yield the use of a 'chariot',⁴²

The same with *khandhas*, *dhātus* and *āyatanas*:// [because of] the convergence of [such] causes and conditions there are beings.

Because of karmic conditions they assemble // because of karmic conditions they disperse.⁴³

[I have] cut off all craving, // the darkness of ignorance destroyed.

Having reached complete cessation. // [I] peacefully dwell in a state of purity.

Therefore understand: // Bad One you are defeated.

At that time King Māra thought: 'This nun knows my mind well!'. Depressed, dispirited, and ashamed he returned to his palace.

219. *Vīrā*⁴⁴

Thus have I heard, once, the Buddha was staying at Sāvattthī at the Jeta Grove in the Anāthapiṇḍika Park.

At that time there was a nun called *Vīrā* staying in the Rājākārāma Vihāra near Sāvattthī. In the morning she took her robes and her begging bowl and entered the town to beg for food. Having finished her meal, she cleaned her bowl, gathered her seat [for meditation] and went to the Andhavana forest [to meditate]. At that time King Māra thought: 'The renunciant Gotama is staying at Sāvattthī at the Jeta Grove in the Anāthapiṇḍika Park. And there is the nun *Vīrā* who took her robes and her begging bowl and entered the town to beg for food. Having finished her meal, she cleaned her bowl, gathered her seat and has gone to the Andhavana forest. I shall disturb her!' Having thought this, he changed into a young man, and, standing by the wayside, addressed her with a verse:

Who creates this shape,⁴⁵ // who is its creator?

From where did this shape appear, // whither will it go?

42. 譬如因眾緣 和合有車用。Note the difference between different versions here. The Pāli has *yathā hi aṅgasambhārā, hoti saddo ratho iti*, the Sanskrit *yathaiva hy aṅgasambhārāt, samjñā ratha iti smṛtā*; the ZA 如和合眾材 世名之為車 does not follow the Skt very closely here. All versions convey the idea of conventional meaning but use slightly different terms. The Pāli version of the simile is also found in the *Milindapañha* (p. 29) and is cited in the *Visuddhimagga* (XVIII, 25).

43. Although the content here is similar, the wording in this first part of the verse differs from the ZA, which closely follows the SN here. The verse style of the BZA here is almost unintelligible without the other version; this might indicate poor Chinese skills on side of the translator(s).

44. See introduction.

45. *se xiang* 色像. Lit. 'form-image'. The ZA uses the more common *xing* 形. Both terms should

At that time Vīrā thought: ‘Who is this, who wants to disturb me? What a cheat! Is he a human or a non-human being?’. She entered concentration and using her insight, recognized that it was King Māra. She answered with a verse:

Shapes are neither self-created // nor created by others.
 When various conditions⁴⁶ meet, they come into being; // parted from
 these conditions they dissolve and vanish,
 Like planted seeds // grow in dependence on earth.⁴⁷
 The *khandhas*, *dhātus* and *āyatanas* // together they form shapes.
 Dependent on suffering [these] grow // and dependent on suffering they
 dissolve and vanish.⁴⁸
 [I have] cut off all craving, // the darkness of ignorance destroyed.
 Having reached complete cessation, // [I] peacefully dwell in a state of
 purity.
 Therefore understand: // Bad One you are defeated.

At that time King Māra thought: ‘This nun knows my mind well!’. Depressed, dispirited, and ashamed he returned to his palace.

220. Vijayā

Thus have I heard, once, the Buddha was staying at Sāvattthī at the Jeta Grove in the Anāthapiṇḍika Park.

At that time the nun Vijayā left the Rājakārāma Vihāra, took her robes and her begging bowl, and entered the town to beg for food. Having finished her meal, she cleaned her bowl, and gathered her seat [for meditation]. She went to the Andhavana forest and sat under a tree, abiding in [*jhāna*] meditation. At that time King Māra thought: ‘The renunciant Gotama is staying at Sāvattthī at the Jeta

render a Prakrit of Skt. *bimba* ‘[reflected] image, picture, type’ (Rhys Davids (1917, 168), translates Pāli *bimba* (at SN I 134) as ‘human doll’).

46. One of the few cases where a difference in *numerus* between the BZA and the Pāli can be shown clearly. The SN has singular here (*hetuṃ paṭicca / hetubhaṅgā*) while the BZA plural (*zhong yuan* 眾緣). Something else is worth noting: assuming that the original was indeed *hetu* ‘cause’ the ZA translates *yin* 因 the BZA *yuan* 緣. Though 緣 might be used to render *hetu*, it was more commonly the translation for *pratyaya/paccaya* ‘condition’. The difference is subtle, and in absence of a Prakrit original cannot be ascertained, but it should not go unnoticed in the search for possible doctrinal differences between the BZA and the ZA. The BZA and the ZA clearly represent distinct textual transmissions from a common source, however, so far no clear case for a doctrinal difference between the texts has been found.
47. At least one *pāda* seems to have been lost here at some stage. Both the ZA and the Pāli make clear that next to earth other elements are needed as conditions for growth. Text-internally as well, the enumeration of *khandhas* etc. seems to demand a parallel in the simile.
48. 因苦故生長 因苦故散壞 Here is a significant difference to the ZA and the SN, which both simply repeat that shapes arise and dissolve dependent on causes and conditions. Cf. the verse of Cālā and its Skt. parallel below.

Grove in the Anāthapiṇḍika Park. The nun Vijayā took her robes and her begging bowl and entered the town to beg for food. Having finished her meal, she cleaned her bowl, gathered her seat and has gone to the Andhavana forest. [Now] she is sitting under a tree, abiding in [*jhāna*] meditation. I shall disturb her!

Having thought thus, he changed into a young man and approached her speaking a verse:

You are full of vigour, // I too am young of years.
 Let us enjoy the five sensual pleasures⁴⁹ together, // enjoying ourselves
 as we may!
 Why sit here alone, // why not be with me?

At that time Vijayā thought: ‘Who is this who wants to disturb me? What a cheat! Is he a human or a non-human being?’. She entered concentration and using her insight, recognized that it was King Māra. She answered with a verse:

Enjoyment, to hop around, to sing and dance // the enjoyment of the
 five sensual pleasures:
 All this I leave to you; // I don’t care for it.
 All the pleasures of the human world, // the five sensual pleasures of
 the heavens:
 All this I leave to you; // I am not for any of these.
 I have cut off all craving, // the darkness of ignorance destroyed.
 Having reached complete cessation. // [I] peacefully dwell in a state of
 purity.
 Therefore understand: // Bad One you are defeated.

At that time King Māra thought: ‘This nun knows my mind well!’. Depressed, dispirited, and ashamed he returned to his palace.

221. Cālā

Thus have I heard, once, the Buddha was staying at Sāvattthī at the Jeta Grove in the Anāthapiṇḍika Park.

At that time there was a nun named Cālā. One morning she took her robes and her begging bowl, and entered the town to beg for food. Having finished her meal, she cleaned her bowl, and gathered her seat [for meditation]. She went to the Andhavana forest, sat upright under a tree to meditate, and entered [*jhāna*] meditation. At that time King Māra thought: ‘The renunciant Gotama is staying at Sāvattthī at the Jeta Grove in the Anāthapiṇḍika Park. There is the nun Cālā who in the morning took her robes and her begging bowl and entered the town

49. 五欲共歡娛. In the ZA (作五種音樂) and the SN (*pañcaṅgikena turiyena, ehayyebhiramāmasa*) the wording alludes to music, as Māra suggests enjoying the ‘pleasures of the five-fold music.’ This metaphor is absent in the BZA.

to beg for food. Having finished her meal, she cleaned her bowl, gathered her seat and has gone to the Andhavana forest. [Now] she is sitting under a tree and has entered [*jhāna*] meditation. I shall go there and disturb her!’ Having thought thus he changed into a young man, approached her and said: ‘My lady, where do you desire to be reborn?’. The nun replied: ‘As things stand, I will not⁵⁰ be reborn anywhere’.⁵¹ That time the young man said a verse:

Once born we are bound to experience joy // and the five sensual pleasures.
Who has taught you // to say you have no need of further birth?

The nun Cālā replied with a verse:

All that is born must die // and is held in bondage by all kinds of suffering.
To cut off all suffering // is not to ask for further life.
The venerable sage, the seer // has explained this truth.
Suffering causes suffering to arise // all this is to be left behind.⁵²
Through practising the eight-fold noble path, // peacefully we find ourselves on the path to *Nirvāṇa*.⁵³
The World-honored One has taught me, // and I rejoice in his teaching.
I have witnessed and realized this teaching // and therefore have no joy in birth.
I have cut off all craving, // the darkness of ignorance destroyed.
Having reached complete cessation, // [I] peacefully dwell in a state of purity.
Therefore understand: // Bad One you are defeated.

50. *du wu* 都無. For the usage of 都無 by Kumārajīva see Karashima (2001, sub voc.). At least in the BZA, however, there seems to be more to the term 都無 than the literal emphatic ‘not at all’. Perhaps reflecting vernacular usage at the time, the term in several places strongly suggests: ‘not to be interested in (or concerned) about something’ (e.g. CBETA/T02.100.394a2-3, CBETA/T02.100.384b6-8, CBETA/T02.100.465c11-12). Both in BZA 221 and 222, 都無 is used to deny a ‘do you like ...’ question. The SN uses *na rocati* and *na ...-kāmā* in this passage. Therefore, next to the literal meaning ‘As it is, I will not be reborn anywhere’, where Cālā is confirming that she has attained arhantship, another possible solution is ‘As it is, I do not care to be reborn anywhere’.
51. Here the versions differ slightly. In the SN Māra asks: ‘What is it, nun, that you dislike?’ (*kiṃ nu tvam, bhikkhuni, na rocesi*) and Cālā replies: ‘It is birth, friend, that I dislike’ (*jātim khvāham, āvuso, na rocemī*). The ZA, strangely, omits this initial exchange. The question that Māra poses here in BZA 221 is synonymous with the one he asks in the following *sutta*. In the SN, on the other hand, he asks all three sisters different questions. The *āvuso* implies that she has not recognized Māra yet.
52. 苦因生於苦 皆應捨離之. This differs greatly from the ZA (苦苦及苦集 滅盡離諸苦) and the Skt. (*duḥkham duḥkhasamutpannam || nirodham samatikramam*) ‘the suffering and the arising of suffering, its destruction and the going beyond it’ Cf. the verse in BZA 219.
53. For this *pādayuga*, which is nearly identical in the ZA, there is a Sanskrit parallel: *āryam caṣṭāṅgikam mārgam || kṣemaṃ nirvāṇagāminam* (Enomoto 1994: no.1205).

At that time King Māra thought: ‘This nun knows my mind well!’ Depressed, dispirited, and ashamed he returned to his palace.

222. *Upacālā*

Thus have I heard, once, the Buddha was staying at Sāvaththī at the Jeta Grove in the Anāthapiṇḍika Park.

At that time there was a nun called Upacālā staying in the Rājakārāma Vihāra. One morning she took her robes and her begging bowl and entered Sāvaththī to beg for food. Having finished the alms,⁵⁴ she cleaned her bowl, washed her feet, gathered her seat [for meditation]. She went to the Andhavana forest, sat uprightly under a tree, and entered [*jhāna*] meditation.

At that time King Māra thought: ‘These days Gotama the renunciant is staying at Sāvaththī at the Jeta Grove in the Anāthapiṇḍika Park. Here now is this nun called Upacālā, who in the morning took her robes and her begging bowl and entered Sāvaththī to beg for food. Having finished her meal, she washed her feet, gathered her seat and went to the Andhavana forest. [Now] she is sitting uprightly under a tree, having entered [*jhāna*] meditation. I shall go and disturb her!’ Having thought thus he changed into a young man, approached her and said: ‘My lady! In which place do you want to be reincarnated?’. The nun answered: ‘I will not be reincarnated anywhere’. That time the young man said a verse:

The Tāvatiṃsa and the Yama heaven, // the Tusita, the Nimmānarati
And the heaven Paranimitavasavattin // are realms of great happiness and pleasure.⁵⁵

You should vow to enjoy them // and you will be reborn there as desired.⁵⁶

54. The pericope changes here and in BZA 223 from the usual wording *shi qi* 食訖 ‘having finished her meal’ to *qi shi yi* 乞食已 ‘having finished the alms’. 乞食 should be taken as NP ‘alms-food’ here, though in the preceding sentence it is used as VP ‘to beg for food’. In the repetition of the pericope by Māra below the text has again 食訖. In BZA 223 the Taishō edition has 乞食已 in both instances. For the second occurrence of the pericope (as thought by Māra), however, four editions consulted by the editors have 乞食訖 instead of 乞食已. The phrase 乞食訖 ‘to finish the alms’ is possible and attested elsewhere (e.g. in the *Chuyaojing* 出曜經 at CBETA/T.04.212.647a21-2). Assuming 乞食已 is correct, it follows the expressions 乞食已, 乞食訖 and 食訖 were considered equivalent (we are starting to develop a Buddhist thesaurus).

55. In the Pāli this verse is clearly about the gods (*devā, devatā*), i.e. the inhabitants of the realms, not the heavens themselves. The BZA translators took the **devā* as a place name (the Chinese *tian* 天 is ambivalent). This might have happened because the plural ending *-ā* was lost in the Prakrit, as some Central Asian scripts did not mark vowel-length. As is well known, it was the notion of *tian* 天 as a place for rebirth that became extremely popular in Eastern Buddhism, while the concept of *tian* 天 as ‘heavenly being’ in the Indian sense proved less influential in China, Korea and Japan.

56. *shou yu sheng miao shi* 受於勝妙事. Lit. ‘obtain the desired effect’ 勝妙 here for Skt. *praṇīta* (Hirakawa, no. 337) or *praṇidhi* (Edgerton, p. 360).

The nun Upacālā said a verse:

The Tāvatiṃsa and the Yama heaven, // the Tusita, the Nimmānarati
 And the heaven Paranimitvasavattin // [those] in these places expe-
 rience pleasures [but]
 As long as there is no emancipation from the view of self // they are
 [still] bound by Māra.⁵⁷
 All [such] worlds are moving, are in flux: // these too will change and
 vanish.
 The common person can not // escape from Māra's realm.
 All worlds are on fire, // smoke streaming out from all of them.
 Away from the tremors, // that place I enjoy.
 I have cut off all craving, // the darkness of ignorance destroyed.
 Having reached complete cessation, // [I] peacefully dwell in a state of
 purity.
 Therefore understand: // Bad One you are defeated.

At that time King Māra thought: 'This nun knows my mind well!'. Depressed, dis-
 spirited, and ashamed he returned to his palace.

223. Sīsupacālā

Thus have I heard, once, the Buddha was staying at Sāvattihī at the Jeta Grove in
 the Anāthapiṇḍika Park.

At that time there was a nun called Sīsupacālā staying in the Rājakārāma
 Vihāra. One morning she took her robes and her begging bowl and entered the
 town to beg for food. Having finished the alms, she cleaned her bowl, washed her
 feet, and gathered her seat [for meditation]. She went to the Andhavana forest,
 sat uprightly under a tree, and entered [*jhāna*] meditation.

At that time King Māra thought: 'Gotama the renunciant is staying at Sāvattihī at
 the Jeta Grove in the Anāthapiṇḍika Park. Here there is this nun called Sīsupacālā,
 who this morning took her robes and her begging bowl and entered Sāvattihī to
 beg for food. Having finished her alms, she washed her feet, gathered her seat and
 entered the Andhavana forest. [Now] she is sitting uprightly under a tree, having
 entered [*jhāna*] meditation. I want to go and disturb her!'. Having thought thus he
 changed into a young man, approached her and said to the nun: 'Of the ninety-six
 [non-Buddhist] teachings,⁵⁸ which one do you like?'. The nun answered: 'I do not
 like any of these teachings'. There the Bad One spoke a verse:

57. *wei mo suo fu* 為魔所縛. The ZA (隨魔自在) again much closer to the Pāli (*māravasaṃ*).

58. *jiushiliu zhong dao* 九十六種道. Skt. *ṣaṇ-ṇavatiyo pāṣaṇḍāḥ* (Hirakawa, no. 31), Pāli *channa-
vuti pāsaṇḍa*. Neither the ZA nor the SN mention these 'ninety-six non-buddhist teachings',
 although the SN commentary does speak of the *channavuti pāsaṇḍa*. The expression belongs to
 the abhidharmic layer of Buddhist literature and at least in Eastern Buddhism there seemed

Who taught you to cut off your hair // and call yourself *bhikkhuni*?
To refuse to enjoy any other teaching, // how silly of you!

Sisupacālā said a verse:

These other, these different teachings, // they all bind us with heretical views.

Bound by various views, // in the end we are caught in Māra's net.

The great World-honored One of the Śākya, // without equal,

The conqueror of all // subdued Māra, sitting on the site of enlightenment.⁵⁹

He has surpassed everything, // is liberated of everything,

Entirely subdued and ended all finite thing. // This Enlightened One
has taught me;

For me he is the World-honored One // and I delight in his teaching.

Having understood his [teachings] // I have ended all defilement.⁶⁰

I have cut off all craving. // the darkness of ignorance destroyed.

to have been two definitions of these ninety-six: the first includes Buddhist views among the ninety-six different teachings; according to the second all ninety-six are non-Buddhist (cf. Mochizuki, vol. 1, p. 671). An example for the second type of explanation, which is the one relevant for the BZA, is found in a Sarvāstivādin *Vinaya* commentary, the *Sapoduo pini piposha* 薩婆多毘尼毘婆沙 (T.1440). 'Concerning the six teachers [that were active during the time of the Buddha], each had fifteen teachings, which he bestowed on [one] student. Because the teachings differed, different views arose in these students. Thus, one teacher gave rise to fifteen different views, and the teachers themselves each still held another teaching, different from that of their students, so that together, teachers and students, there were 16 different kinds [of teachings]. Therefore we speak of ninety-six.' 六師者。一師十五種教。以授弟子。為教各異。弟子受行各成異見。如是一師出十五種異見。師別有法。與弟子不同。師與弟子通為十六種。如是六師有九十六。(CBETA/T.23.1440.536.a22-6).

The 'ninety-six non-Buddhist teachings' 九十六種外道 are mentioned three times in the BZA (BZA 52, BZA 223 and in a *gāthā* at BZA 325), but do not appear at all in the ZA. In the other Chinese *Āgamas* they are rarely mentioned (as far as I see, only once in T.68, a single *Madhyamāgama sūtra* and once in the *Ekottarikāgama* (CBETA/T.02.125.651c29)). Since the term is used several times in the BZA, including a *gāthā*, it is not likely that it was inserted as a gloss during the translation process. The whole text of the BZA must therefore have been redacted after the formation of the abhidharmic concept of the ninety-six teachings. Here is a clear example of *Abhidharma* influence on *Āgama* literature and perhaps an indication that material has been added to the BZA at a point when the ZA text had already found closure.

59. *zuo dao chang* 坐道場. Skt. *bodhi-maṇḍa-niṣadana* (Hirakawa, no. 653). Pāli *bodhi-pallaṅka*. This phrase is not at all typical for the Chinese *Āgamas* and is only mentioned in the BZA. It is relatively common however, in the *Karuṇāpūṇḍarika-sūtra Beihua jing* 悲華經 (T.157), translated by Dharmarakṣa (c. 385–433), and the Chinese *Lalitavistara*-versions T.186 (translated 308) and T.187 (translated between 676 and 687).
60. 我今知彼已 盡除諸結漏 Or: 'I know that **he** already // has ended all defilements'. The subject of this clause is unclear. The version I give in the text seems slightly more likely on syntactic grounds and squares with the ZA, however, in the Pāli it is the Buddha, who has freed himself (*sabbakammakkhayaṃ patto, vimutto adhisāṅkhaye; so mayhaṃ bhagavā satthā, tassa rocemi sāsanān*).

Having reached complete cessation, // [I] peacefully dwell in a state of purity.

Therefore understand: // Bad One you are defeated.

At that time King Māra thought: ‘This nun knows my mind well!’. Depressed, dispirited, and ashamed he returned to his palace.

ABBREVIATIONS

BZA	<i>Bieyi za ahan jing</i> 別譯雜阿含經 (T.100)
CBETA	<i>Chinese Buddhist Electronic Text Association</i> 中華電子佛典協會
CBETA/T.	CBETA edition of the Taishō canon CD-Version 2007
Dhp-a	<i>Dhammapada</i> commentary
HDC	<i>Hanyu da cidian</i> 漢語大詞典 [Comprehensive dictionary of the Chinese language], 12 vols, ed. Luo Zhufeng 羅竹風 (Shanghai, 1994).
Hirakawa	<i>Bukkyō kanbon daijiten</i> 佛教漢梵大辭典 [Buddhist Chinese–Sanskrit dictionary], Hirakawa Akira 平川彰 (Tokyo: Reiyūkai, 1997).
Mochizuki	<i>Mochizuki bukkyō daijiten</i> 望月佛教大辭典, 10 vols, eds Mochizuki Shinko 望月信亨 and Tsukamoto Zenryū 塚本善隆 (Tokyo, 1954–8).
MW	Monier-Williams, <i>A Sanskrit-English Dictionary</i> .
NP	Noun Phrase
ONWC	Old Northwest Chinese (term used by Coblin (1994) for the Chinese spoken in NW China around 400 CE).
PTS	Pali Text Society
SĀ	<i>Saṃyukta-āgama</i>
Skt.	Sanskrit
STCA	Sui-Tang Chang’an (term used by Coblin (1994) for the Chinese spoken in Chang’an during the Sui and Tang dynasties).
SN	<i>Saṃyutta-nikāya</i>
T	Taishō
v.	verse
VRI	Vipassanā Research Institute
VP	Verb Phrase
ZA	<i>Za ahan jing</i> 雜阿含經 (T.99)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akanuma, Chizen 赤沼智. 1930. *Dictionary of Buddhist Proper Names*, 1st Japanese edn, Indo bukkyō koyū meishi jiten 印度佛教固有名詞辭典. Nagoya: 破塵閣書房. (Reprinted Sri Satguru Publications, 1994. [Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica no. 130].)
- Bareau, André. 1955. *Les Sectes Bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule*. Paris: École Française d’Extrême-Orient. (Publications de École Française d’Extrême-Orient vol. 38).
- Bingenheimer, Marcus. 2006. ‘The Shorter Chinese Saṃyukta Āgama – Preliminary Findings and Translation of Fascicle 1 of the Bieyi za ahan jing 別譯雜阿含經 (T.100)’. *Buddhist Studies Review* 23(1): 21–60.
- Bingenheimer, Marcus. 2007. ‘Māra in the Chinese Saṃyuktāgamas, with a translation of the Māra Saṃyukta of the Bieyi za ahan jing (T.100)’. *Buddhist Studies Review* 24(1): 46–74.
- Bodhi, Bhikkhu. 1997. *Discourses of the Ancient Nuns*. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society. (Bodhi Leaves No. 143).

- Bodhi, Bhikkhu. 2000. *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha – A Translation of the Saṃyutta Nikāya*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Boucher, Daniel. 1998. 'Gāndhārī and the Early Chinese Buddhist Translations Reconsidered: The Case of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*.' *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 118(4) (Oct.): 471–506. doi:10.2307/604783
- Brough, John. 1962. *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. (Reprinted 2001.)
- Coblin, South. 1994. *A Compendium of Phonetics in Northwest Chinese*. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics – Monograph Series No 7*. Berkeley.
- Geiger, Wilhelm, Nyānaponika Mahāthera & Hellmuth Hecker. 1997. *Die Reden des Buddha - Gruppierte Sammlung. Erste Gesamtausgabe. Ca. 1450 Seiten*. Stambach: Beyerlein & Steinschulte.
- Karashima, Seishi 辛嶋靜志. 2001. *A Glossary of Kumārajīva's Translation of the Lotus Sutra*. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University.
- Mizunō Kōgen 水野弘元. 1975. *Pārigo jiten パーリ語辞典 [Pāli Dictionary]*. Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.
- Nakamura, Hajime 中村元. 1981. *Bukkyōgo daijiten 佛教語大辭典*, 1 vol. Tokyo: 東京書籍. (First edition 1975 in 3 vols.)
- Norman, Kenneth Roy. 1971. *The Elders' Verses II: Therīgāthā*. London: Pali Text Society.
- Rhys Davids, Caroline A. F. 1909–13. *Psalms of the Early Buddhists*. London: Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press, for the Pali Text Society.
- Rhys Davids, Caroline A. F. & F. L. Woodward. 1917–30. *Kindred Sayings*, 5 vols. London: Pali Text Society.
- Waku Hirotsaku 和久博隆. 1979. *Bukkyō shokubutsu jiten 仏教植物辞典 [Dictionary of Plants in Buddhism]*. Tokyo: Kokusho 国書.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst. 1980. 'Central Asian Sūtra Fragments and their Relation to the Chinese Āgamas'. In *Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung*, ed. H. Bechert, 136–74. Göttingen.
- Warder, A.K. 1970. *Indian Buddhism*. Delhi: Motilal. (Reprinted 1980, 2000.)
- Windisch, Ernst. 1895. *Māra und Buddha*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel. (Abhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften. Phil.hist.Classe No. 15(4).)