

# The Possibility of Verifying Sanskritization in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*:

A Study of Kern's Variant Readings

NISHI Yasutomo

**1. Introduction** The Sanskrit Lotus Sutra, *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (SP) is regarded as one of the earliest examples of Mahayana Buddhist texts. There are three classical Chinese translations of the Lotus Sutra in existence, including Kumārajīva's translation, *Myōhō-rengē-kyō* (鳩摩羅什『妙法蓮華經』), which is one of the most important sutras in East Asia, especially Japan. It has had a major influence on the formation and development of other sutras, ideas and cultures. It is vital to study the SP in its original language when literary problems and issues arise between the SP and the Chinese translations of the Lotus Sutra,<sup>1)</sup> particularly with regard to the correct interpretation of *Myōhō-rengē-kyō*. The earliest witness we have of the SP is in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit (BHS) and also contains word forms of Middle Indo-Aryan (MIA) and Classical Sanskrit (Skt.). Edgerton named the unique vocabulary, word forms, and syntax that appear in Mahayana sutras as BHS.<sup>2)</sup>

The extant SP manuscripts can be broadly divided into two:<sup>3)</sup> the Central Asia tradition (CA) and the Gilgit-Nepal tradition (G-N). Kern and Edgerton advocated that the original SP was compiled in MIA and was converted to Sanskrit as it was passed down over the years (Kern-Edgerton's hypothesis).<sup>4)</sup> Tsuji studied the SP in detail, and pointed out the following: (i) The BHS forms frequently appear in the verse texts, and Skt. forms in the prose texts, but some BHS forms are found in the prose texts. (ii) The original SP was compiled in not MIA but Skt. While it's being handed down, various degrees of Sanskritization occurred following the tradition, which caused some differences in hybridity, and it is considered that the still-existing manuscripts were made (Tsuji's points).<sup>5)</sup> However, there are many researchers who argue against this theory, and no unified conclusion has been reached yet.<sup>6)</sup>

In my previous study, I noted the following three examples in relation to this discus-

sion: (A) A set of two variant readings: MIA *krīḍāpanaka-* (BHS), Skt *krīḍanaka-*,<sup>7)</sup> (B) a set of three variant readings: MIA *sāntika-* (BHS), MIA *santika-* (Pāli), Skt *antika-*<sup>8)</sup> and (C) a set of three variant readings: MIA *acintika-* (BHS), MIA *acintiya-* (Pāli), Skt. *acintya-*.<sup>9)</sup> In the additional notes of Kern, there is a list of variant readings (91 corresponding word forms: Kern's list<sup>10)</sup> of the correspondences between Kashgar manuscript (O) of CA and Nepal manuscript (N) of G-N, including the above variant readings of (A) and (B). However, these corresponding word forms were not examined in detail, and not as many SP manuscripts were available to him as there are today.

This paper studies in detail Kern-Edgerton's hypothesis and Tsujii's point (ii), that is Sanskritization, by examining the Kern's list. For the purpose of this paper, 19 recensions of the following SP manuscripts were used, some of which are remarkably old and KN edition:

		Age	Manuscript	Date	Findspot	Collection
1	Central Asian	Old	Lü	Mid 5th–6th century CE.	Turfan, Khotan and etc.	The Lüshun Museum, Peking.
2			M	≅ Lü		Note of Dutt's edition.
3			FB	6th century CE.	Farhād-Bēg.	India Office Library, London.
4			Khā	Unknown.	Khādaliq, Khotan and Turfan.	The Berlin State Library, the Deutsches Museum and the British Library.
5			F1		Kashgar.	The Russian Academy of Science, Leningrad.
6			F2		Khādaliq.	India Office Library, London.
7			F3		Domoko and Khādaliq.	India Office Library, London.
8			F4		Khādaliq.	India Office Library, London.
9			F5		Unknown.	India Office Library, London.
10			F6	Kashgar.	India Office Library, London.	
11	New	O	9th–10th century CE.	Khādaliq.	The Russian Academy of Science, the Berlin State Library, the Deutsches Museum and the British Library.	
12	Gilgit-Nepal	Old	D1	6th–7th century CE.	Gilgit	National Archives of India, New Delhi.
13			D2a			
14			D2b			
15			D3a			
16			D3b			
17	D4	The Sir Pratap Singh Museum, Srinagar.				
18	Middle	C5	1064–1065 CE.	Nepal	The Cambridge University Library, Cambridge.	
19	New	R	1803–1804 CE	Nepal	The Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, London.	
20	KN		9th–19th century CE.	Revised edition by mixed manuscripts.		

**2. Kern's List: Variant Readings between O and N** There are 91 variant readings in Kern's list. They can be classified as follows: (I) variant spellings (dialect); (II) different noun and adjective conjugation; (III) distinctive spelling, orthography and etc.; (IV) tenses and conjugations of the verb. In this paper, I focus on the above classification (I) and examine 21 of its variant readings among Kern's list and enumerated them in the order of O : N

as the followings (numbered serially in order of Kern's list appearance): (1) *akilāsī* : *aklāntaḥ*; (3) *acintika* (in *Gāthā*) : *acintīya*; (6) *adhardik* : *adhodik*; (10) *antardhita* : *antarhita*; (15) *avarupta* : *avaropita*; (21) *ākaḍḍhana* : *ākarṣana*; (24) *āptamaṇaḥ* : *āttamaṇaḥ*; (26) *upaniśrāya* : *upaniśrītya*; (27) *uparimā* (*dik*) : *ūrdhvā* (*dik*); (31) *kāṭa* / *kāḍa* : *kāla* / (*kṛṣṇa*); (33) *kevacirotpanna* : *kiyacirotpanna*; (37) *gilāna* : *glāna*; (38) *gailānya* : *glānya*; (44) *niryādayati* : *niryātayati*; (56) *pāramī* : *paramita*; (69) *bhūyaso* : *bhūyasyā*; (71) *mandagailānya* : *mandaglāna*; (72) *manujña* / *manojña* (less common) : *manojña*; (80) *leḍu* / *leṣtu* (both in *Gāthā*) : *loṣṭa*; (89) *sāntikāt* : *antikāt*; (90) *sāntike* : *antike*. This paper reviews the above variant readings in detail and provides the possibility of verifying Sanskritization in the SP.

2.1. (1) *akilāsī* : *aklāntaḥ*; (37) *gilāna* : *glāna*; (38) *gailānya* : *glānya*; (71) *mandagailānya* : *mandaglāna* These word forms of variant readings show O °*ilā*° / °*ailā*° : N °*lā*°. They are variant spellings.<sup>11)</sup> The findings of four kinds of variant readings (1), (37), (38), (71) are summarized in Table I as following. (1) is found at 9 corresponding parts: 8 verse texts and 1 prose. The BHS *kilā*° is found in the verses of CA and G-N, and BHS *akilāsī* in the prose section of O at the corresponding part of Skt. *aklānto* in G-N prose texts: (a). (37), (38) and (71) are found at 14 corresponding parts: 4 verse texts and 10 prose texts: (b). MIA *gilā*° / BHS *gailānya*° appears in the verse of CA and G-N, and the prose of CA. Skt. *glān*°<sup>12)</sup> appears in the prose of CA and G-N: (c). From Table I, (a), (b), (c), and the distribution of appearances of the word forms in each corresponding part show that the transition from the word forms of BHS to those of Skt. occurred in chronological order of manuscripts and from the verse to the prose portions of the texts.

Table I Appearance distribution of (1) *akilāsī*: *aklāntaḥ*; (37) *gilāna*: *glāna*; (38) *gailānya*: *glānya*; (71) *mandagailānya*: *mandaglāna* in Central Asian (CA) and Gilgit-Nepal (G-N) traditions.

Kind of sentence		Verse						Prose					
Tradition		CA		G-N			KN	CA		G-N			KN
Word forms / Copy age		Old	New	Old	Middle	New	(Mixed)	Old	New	Old	Middle	New	(Mixed)
BHS	<i>kilānta</i> °	5	1	2			1						
	( <i>a</i> ) <i>kilās</i> °	1	7	7	5	5	5	1	1				
	<i>kelāsītām</i>	1											
Skt.	<i>aklānto</i>									1	1	1	1
Number of appearances	MIA	7	8	9	5	5	6	1	1				
	Skt.									1	1	1	1
MIA (Pāli)	<i>gilān</i> °	1	4	4	3	1	4	2	1				
BHS	( <i>manda</i> ) <i>gailānya</i> °							3	3				
	<i>girāna</i> °					2							
Skt.	<i>glān</i> °							3	3	11	9	10	10
Number of appearances	MIA/BHS	1	4	4	3	3	4	5	4				
	Skt.							3	3	11	9	10	10

2.2. (6) *adhardik* : *adhodik*; (10) *antardhita* : *antarhita*; (15) *avarupta* : *avaropita*<sup>13</sup> BHSD shows each of these corresponding terms above as variant spellings.<sup>14</sup> The findings of three kinds of variant readings (6), (10), (15) are summarized in Table II<sup>15</sup> as follows. These mentioned above appear only in the prose portion of SP. (6) is found in 4 corresponding parts: BHS *adhardig*° appears in the CA and old G-N traditions; Skt. *adhodig*° does not appear in the CA tradition but appears in the middle and new G-N traditions: (d). (10) is found in 4 corresponding parts: BHS *antardh*° appears in the CA and the old G-N traditions; Skt. *antarhi*° does not appear in the CA tradition but appears in the G-N tradition: (e). (15) is found in 18 corresponding parts: BHS *avarupta*° appears in the CA and the old G-N traditions, but Skt. *avaropita*° does not appear in the CA tradition and appears in the G-N tradition: (f). (d), (e), (f) and the distribution of appearances of the word forms in each corresponding part show that the transition from the word forms of BHS to those of Skt. occurred in chronological order of manuscripts and from the verse to the prose portions of the texts.

Table II Appearance distribution of (6) *adhardik*: *adhodik*; (10) *antardhita*: *antarhita*; (15) *avarupta*: *avaropita*; (24) *āptamaṇaḥ*: *āttamaṇaḥ* in Central Asian (CA) and Gilgit-Nepal (G-N) traditions.

Kind of sentence		Prose					
Tradition		CA		G-N			KN
Word forms / Copy age		Old	New	Old	Middle	New	(Mixed)
BHS	<i>adhardig</i> °	1	2	2			
Skt.	<i>adhodig</i> °				2	2	2
Number of appearances	BHS	1	2	2			
	Skt.				2	2	2
BHS	<i>antardh</i> °	1	3	1			
Skt.	<i>antarhi</i> °			2	4	4	4
Number of appearances	BHS	1	3	1			
	Skt.			2	4	4	4
BHS	<i>avarupta</i> °	4	5				
	<i>avarupita</i> °	1	1				
	<i>avalopita</i> °				1		
Skt.	<i>avaropita</i> °	3	1	8	11	14	14
Number of appearances	BHS	5	6		1		
	Skt.	3	1	8	11	14	14

2.3. (24) *āptamaṇaḥ* : *āttamaṇaḥ*; (72) *manujña* / *manojña* (less common): *manojña*<sup>16</sup> BHSD shows each corresponding term as variant spellings.<sup>17</sup> The findings of two kinds of variant readings (24), (72) are summarized in Table III as following. (24) appears only in the prose of SP and found in 18 corresponding parts: BHS *āptaman*° and Pāli *attaman*° appear in the CA tradition but does not appear in the G-N tradition: (g).

Table III Appearance distribution of (24) *āptamaṇaḥ*: *āttamaṇaḥ*; (72) *manujña* / *manojña* (less common): *manoñña* in Central Asian (CA) and Gilgit-Nepal (G-N) traditions.

Kind of sentence		Verse						Prose										
		CA		G-N			KN	CA		G-N			KN					
Tradition		Old	New	Old	Middle	New	(Mixed)	Old	New	Old	Middle	New	(Mixed)					
Word forms / Copy age																		
BHS	<i>āptamaṇaḥ</i> <sup>o</sup>	/						9	12									
MIA(Pāli)	<i>attamaṇaḥ</i> <sup>o</sup>												1					
Skt.	<i>āttamaṇaḥ</i> <sup>o</sup>												4	4	10	15	12	17
Number of appearances	BHS / MIA Skt.												10	12				
		4	4	10	15	12	17											
BHS	<i>(a)manujñā</i> <sup>o</sup>	5	3					1	1									
	<i>(a)manaujñā</i> <sup>o</sup>	2	3					2	4									
Skt.	<i>(a)manoññā</i> <sup>o</sup>	4	4	24	12	13	14	6	6	9	9	12	12					
Number of appearances	BHS Skt.	7 4	7 4					3 6	5 6									

Table IV Appearance parts of *āttamaṇaḥ*<sup>o</sup> in Central Asian (CA) tradition.

Kind of manuscripts	Old: Lü, M, FB, Khā and F1–6	New: O		
⟨1⟩	(missing)	<i>āttamaṇāḥ</i>	64b1	
⟨2⟩		<i>āttamaṇasaḥ</i>	74a1	
⟨3⟩		<i>āttamaṇā</i>	207b2	
⟨4⟩	<i>āttamaṇāṇḥ</i> ; <i>āttamaṇā</i>	LüA7R9; M147.5	<i>tuṣṭōdāgrāptamaṇasaḥ</i>	211a2
⟨5⟩	<i>āttamaṇasau</i>	FB22a7	<i>āptamaṇasau</i>	275a6
⟨6⟩	<i>ātta</i> <sup>***</sup> (missing)	FB459a1	<i>ātta</i> <sup>***</sup> (missing)	459a1

Skt. *āttamaṇaḥ*<sup>o</sup> is found in 8 corresponding parts in the CA tradition. It is shown in Table IV. The Table IV shows the following: ⟨1⟩, ⟨2⟩ and ⟨3⟩ of the old CA manuscripts are missing, and O is read in Skt.; ⟨4⟩ and ⟨5⟩ of the old CA manuscripts are in Skt., and O is in BHS. It seems to show that the CA tradition changes over time, from Skt. to BHS, and from BHS to Skt. This clarification requires a close examination of other corresponding parts and the connection between the CA and the GN tradition.

(72) is found in 28 corresponding parts: 14 verse texts and 14 prose. BHS *manujñā*<sup>o</sup> / *manaujñā*<sup>o</sup> and Skt. *manoññā*<sup>o</sup> appear in the CA tradition, but BHS *manujñā*<sup>o</sup> / *manaujñā*<sup>o</sup> do not appear and Skt. *manoññā*<sup>o</sup> appears in the G-N tradition. Skt. *manoññā*<sup>o</sup> is found in 19 corresponding parts. It is shown in Table V.

Table V Appearance parts of *manojñ*<sup>o</sup> in Central Asian (CA) tradition.

[1]	Old CA: Lü, M, FB, Khā and F1-6			New: O		
	Word	Verse	Prose	Word	Verse	Prose
(1)	(missing)			<i>manojñena</i>		11a4
(2)				<i>manojñasvareṇa</i>		11a4
(3)				<i>manojñā(h)</i>		58a7
(4)				<i>manojñāh</i>		59b1
(5)	<i>manojñam</i>	F3-H15Kha. i134fol.544		<i>manaujñam</i>		61b5
(6)	<i>manojñarūpam</i>	F3-H18Kha. i174c3		<i>manojñarūpam</i>		63a7
(7)	[ <i>m</i> ]anujñā[rū]pam; <i>manujñarūpam</i>	Khā29v5; F5-V1-fol.I.75b4		<i>manojñarūpam</i>		142a5
(8)	<i>manujñā</i> ; <i>manujña</i>	Khā29v6; F5-V1-fol.I.75b5		<i>manojñagandham</i>		142a7
(9)	<i>manojña(m)</i>	F6-108a6		<i>manujña(m)</i>		144b2
(10)	(missing)			<i>manorama-m-iṣṭa</i>		145b1
(11)				<i>manojña- śabdābhigajitaś</i>		205a5
(12)	<i>manujño</i>	FB8b1		<i>manojño</i>		243a5
(13)	<i>manojñamadhuram</i> ; <i>manojña</i>		LüB12 V2; M216.6	(missing)		
(14)	( <i>mano</i> )jñāśabdā		FB343a4	<i>(mano)jñāśabdā</i>		343a4
(15)	<i>amanojñaśabdā</i>		FB343a4	<i>amanojñaśabdā</i>		343a4
(16)	<i>manojñām</i>	FB344b1		<i>manojñām</i>		344b1
(17)	<i>amanaujñagandhā</i> ; <i>amanojñagandhā</i>		FB346a7; F4-XIX-fol.84a4	<i>amanaujñagandhā</i>		346a7
(18)	<i>ma[n](e)[ñ](m); valgusvaramanaujñam</i>		Khā83v4; FB353a5	<i>valgusvaramanaujñam</i>		353a5

<sup>†</sup> Each of which indicates [1] Kind of manuscripts, [2] Kind of sentence.

The Table V shows the following: (2.2a) <1> of the old CA manuscripts are missing; <13> and <17> of those appear in Skt. *manojñ*<sup>o</sup>; (2.2b) <13> of O are missing; the old and new CA traditions are in Skt.; (2.2c) <17> and <18> of the old CA manuscripts are in BHS *amanaujña*<sup>o</sup> and Skt. *amanojña*<sup>o</sup>; (2.2d) those of O is in BHS *amanaujña*<sup>o</sup>; (2.2e) <7>, <8> and <12> of the old CA tradition in its verse portions are in BHS; (2.2f) those of O is in Skt.; (2.2 g) and <13>-<16> of the CA and G-N traditions in the prose portions are all in Skt. *amanojña*<sup>o</sup>. Table III and (2.2e) show the transition from BHS to Skt. in the verse of CA. Besides, considering <7>, <8>, <12>, and (2.2 g), it is likely to be Sanskritization in the prose of CA.

**3. Discussion and Conclusion** The distribution of the 9 Kern's list of variant readings in the 20 SP source texts supports the arguments of Kern-Edgerton and Kern-Edgerton and Tsuji's point (ii) in the preceding chapter: it can be said that I have found some examples supporting the Kern-Edgerton's hypothesis and the Tsuji's point (ii) that the older SP manuscripts include many word forms of MIA, and that it was changed to Skt. during the process of compilation and editing. I have already come to a similar conclusion regarding the Kern's list of variant readings (3) *acintika* (in Gāthā) : *acintiya*; (89) *sāntikāt* : *antikāt*; (90)

*sāntike* : *antike* by examining the SP source distribution.<sup>18)</sup> The SP source distributions were also examined for other 5 variant readings at corresponding parts (21), (26), (27), (31), and (69), which are not covered in this paper for reasons of space, and the similar results were obtained in support of the Kern-Edgerton's hypothesis and the Tsuji's point (ii).<sup>19)</sup>

There are following two problems in my previous demonstrative study supporting the Kern-Edgerton's hypothesis and the Tsuji's point (ii): (A) There are inaccuracies in the SP source of synonyms of the Kern's list of variant readings: the possibility of misidentification or overlooking the corresponding parts among the SP source; (B) identifying the vocabulary of undated SP manuscripts; (C) the relevance handed down of the CA and the G-N traditions. To solve the problems, there is an urgent need to create a general index of SP manuscripts.<sup>20)</sup> It is highly likely that the SP was originally composed in some MIA (Prakrit) dialect but was gradually Sanskritized during the course of its transmission as witnessed by the manuscripts, based on my evidence supporting the Kern-Edgerton's hypothesis and the Tsuji's point (ii). More proof for this can be found as follows. Regarding (A) and (B): I compare the results of my previous study with the manuscripts whose dates are known by using the general indexes of the SP manuscript and surveying the many word forms (BHS, Pāli, Skt. etc.) that appear in the SP: verification of the frequency of appearance of MIA, BHS, Skt. and etc. in SP manuscripts. It is expected that the estimated dates of those manuscripts whose dates were yet to be determined can be largely determined. Regarding (C): I carefully examined the corresponding parts of *tathāgataprajñā-* in each SP manuscript and found only one case of *tathāgataprajñāyā* in O(Th) of the CA tradition, while in the G-N tradition,<sup>21)</sup> the change from *tathāgataprajñā* to *tathāgatajñāna* was seen in almost chronological order. It would be expected that each corresponding part in the earliest version of the SP was *tathāgataprajñā*, so it was likely changed to *tathāgatajñāna* during the SP transmission process.<sup>22)</sup>

The findings of this paper are not sufficient in themselves to support the conclusion of whether or not the language used for the early version of the SP was solely MIA, BHS, or Skt., or a mixture of those. Thus far, finding variant spellings have involved a process of manually looking for and extracting the variant spellings from the text. In future, for the linguistic investigation of all extant SP manuscripts, including lexicons, word forms, word usage, transcriptions, and metrical analysis and so on will make it easier to identify variant

spellings and will help advance the discussion of the distribution of variant spellings in the source texts by using the general index of SP manuscripts, etc. This is likely to shed new light on our knowledge of the compilation of the Lotus Sutra and the development of its traditions, as well as the correlation between the CA and the G-N. Deeper research into the SP enables us to better resolve the problems posed by the SP and the Chinese Lotus Sutra.

I am very grateful to Dr Mark Allon of the University of Sydney, and Prof Kaie Mochizuki of Vice-president of Minobusan University and Director of the International Institute for Nichiren Buddhism, who reviewed this paper.

### Notes

1) There are many problems with the source texts of the Chinese translations of the Lotus Sutra, lack of consistency in the terminology, and in scholars' translations. Some of these are pointed out in Ocho 1969, Masuda 1971, Nishi 2016, etc. 2) Edgerton, F "Bibliography and Abbreviations." In BHS: XXV and "Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit." In BHS: § 1.33–§ 1.38. 3) Bechert, H. "Foreword." In Chandra 1976: 7ff., Hinüber 1982, Ousaka and Yamazaki 2002, etc. 4) Kern, H. "Additional note." In KN: Vff., Edgerton, F "Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit." In BHS: § 1.33ff. and etc. 5) Tsuji 1970: 3ff. and Tsuji 1970: 5, n. 5. 6) The articles that refute the Kern-Edgerton's hypothesis are Brough 1954 and Tsuji 1970 and so on. On the other hand, Karashima 1992–2006 discusses the Sanskritization of the SP with different perspectives: a focus on the SP manuscript correspond parts of the exchange of words, spellings. Moreover, using more than 50 SP manuscripts and the corresponding parts of proper nouns in the Chinese translation of the Lotus Sutra (phonetic scriptures) as clues, Karashima 1992–2006 argues that the earlier SP was compiled under MIA, and over time it was transmitted from MIA to BHS and then Sanskritized from BHS. However, his arguments do not cover all the results of lexical scrutiny that appear in the SP manuscripts. 7) Nishi 2015. 8) Nishi 2017. 9) Nishi 2019. 10) Kern, *op.cit.* 11) *akilāsin*: BHSD 2, 1; *gilāna*: BHSD 212, 2; *gailānya* BHSD 215, 1. 12) The *grān*<sup>o</sup> appears in the latest age of the R verse texts, however, it is likely that *-gl-* and *-gr-* were interchanged in the G-N tradition process, but this is not known from BHSD or PW. 13) It seems that the spelling and orthography unique to the manuscript are not used in (6) O *-dhard-* : N *-dhod-*, (10) O *-rdhi-* : N *-rhi-* and (15) O *-rupt-* : N *-ropit*, respectively. 14) *adhardiś*: BHSD 12, 1; *antardhita*: BHSD 39, 2; *avarupta*: BHSD 73, 2; *manujña*: BHSD 418, 2; *āptamanas*: BHSD 98, 1. 15) SP corresponding parts of the table are omitted below. 16) Same as note 14 in variant readings (24), (71). 17) *āptamanas*: BHSD 98, 1; *manujña*: BHSD 418, 2. 18) See this paper "1. Introduction." 19) The distribution of the occurrence of variant spellings (33), (44), (56), and (80) has not been examined, but similar verification results are expected. The results of these detailed examinations will plan to be found in *the Bulletin of the Chuo Academic Research Institute* and *the Philosophica Mahāyāna Buddhica Monograph Series*. 20) We have published the word indexes by making and developing IT language analysis programs with our collaborators. See my website, A Study of the Sanskrit and Chinese Lotus Sutra, URL: <https://www.cari-saddharmapundarika.com/> for the SP manuscripts' transcription in the Roman script. 21) D1 50b[61.19] *tathāgataprajñāyā*; D4 60b7 *tathāgatapr(ajñāyā)*; C5 42a4, B 54a5 *tathāgatasya prajñāyā*; C6, T6 *tathāgatasya prajñāyā*; T8 *tathāgatasya samyakprajñāyā*; K, T2 *tathāgatasya jñānatāyā*; A1, R *tathāgatajñāna prabhāyā*. KN [Chapter V]132.1 *tathāgatasya jñānaprabhāyā*. 22) Karashima Seishi and J. Nattier 2005 discussed that the connection between the two SP traditions was passed on from the G-N tradition to the CA tradition.



### Abbreviations

**BHSG, BHSD:** *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. Franklin Edgerton. 2 vols. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1953. **M:** *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtram with N. D. Mironov's Readings from Central Asian MSS*. Revised by Nalinaksha Dutt. Bibliotheca Indica no. 276. Calcutta: Asiatic Society, 1953. **O:** *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra: Kashgar Manuscript*. Ed. Lokesh Chandra. Śata-piṭaka series 229. Tokyo: Reiyukai, (1976)1977. **KN:** *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. Ed. H. Kern and Bunyiu Nanjio. Bibliotheca Buddhica X. St. Pétersbourg: Commissionnaires de l'Académie impériale des sciences, 1908–1912. **PW:** *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*. Otto Böhtlingk and Rudolph Roth. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, (1855–1875)2000.

### Bibliography

**Brough, John. 1954.** “The Language of the Buddhist Sanskrit Texts.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 16(2): 351–375. **Tsuji, Naoshiro 辻直四郎. 1970.** “Hokekyō no gengo” 法華經の言語. In *Hokekyō- no seiritu to tenkai 法華經の成立と展開*, ed. Kanakura Ensho, 3–21. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten. **Hinüber, Oskar von, ed. 1982.** *A New Fragmentary Gilgit Manuscript of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*. Tokyo: Reiyukai. **Toda, Hirofumi. 1981.** *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra Central Asian Manuscripts: Romanized Text*. Tokushima: Kyoiku Shuppan Center. **Karashima, Seishi 辛嶋静志. 1992–2006.** **1992.** *The Textual Study of the Chinese Versions of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra in the Light of the Sanskrit and Tibetan Versions*. Bibliotheca Indologica et Buddhologica 3. Tokyo: Sankibo Press.; **1997.** “Some New Viewpoints on Philological Studies of Early Mahāyāna Texts.” *Bukkyō kenkyū 仏教研究* 26: 157–176.; **1998.** *A Glossary of Dharmarakṣa's Translation of the Lotus Sutra*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica 1. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.; **2001.** “Some Features of the Language of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra.” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 44(3): 207–230.; **2006.** “Underlying Languages of Early Chinese Translations of Buddhist Scriptures.” In *Studies in Chinese Language and Culture: Festschrift in Honour of Christoph Harbsmeier on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*, ed. Christoph Anderl and Halvor Eifring, 355–366. Oslo: Hermes Academic Publishing. **Ousaka, Yumi and Yamazaki, Moriichi. 2002.** “Genealogical Classification of Saddharmapuṇḍarīka Manuscripts Based on Many-Variable Analysis.” *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 17(2): 193–206. **Karashima, Seishi and Nattier, Jan. 2005.** “Qiuluzi 秋露子, An Early Chinese Name for Śāriputra.” *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 8: 361–374. **Nishi, Yasutomo. 2015–2019.** **2015.** “kridapanaka-’ in Saddharmapuṇḍarīka Central Asian Manuscript.” *Journal, Research Institute of Eastern Culture* (19): 1–18.; **2017.** “Examples of *sāntika-*, *santika-* and *antika-* in Saddharmapuṇḍarīka.” *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 66(1): 390(103)–386(107).; **2019.** “Examining the Sanskritization of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka: A Study of Synonyms in the Text.” *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 67(3): 1106(64)–1111(69).

**Key words** *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, Sanskritization.

(Associate Director, Chuo Academic Research Institute of Rishso Kosei-kai, Doctor of Buddhist Studies)