
Introduction

I.1

At first glance, the *Jayamatipariṣcchāsūtra* (“The Sūtra of the Inquiry of Jayamati”) appears to be a short Mahāyāna sūtra preserved in the Tibetan Kangyurs,¹ as well as in a recently published Sanskrit manuscript.² However, despite appearances, the *Jayamatipariṣcchāsūtra* in fact has an intertextual relationship, previously unrecognized, as part of the *Śūraṃgamasamādhi-sūtra* (“The Concentration of Heroic Progress”) (Apple 2015).

I.2

The Sanskrit version of the *Jayamatipariṣcchāsūtra* is preserved as the eighth among twenty sūtras contained in a unique, but incomplete, manuscript collection recovered from the Potala Palace in Lhasa, Tibet. The Sanskrit edition is divided into three paragraphs with section numbers. We have retained the section numbers in the following translation of the Tibetan version. The Tibetan version of the *Jayamatipariṣcchāsūtra* exists in twelve available Tibetan exemplars that date initially from the late eighth to mid-ninth century, beginning with the Dunhuang IOL Tib J 75 exemplar, up through the vulgate editions of handwritten and printed Kangyur versions which date from the thirteenth to the eighteenth centuries.

I.3

The Inquiry of Jayamati is listed in two early ninth century Tibetan catalogs, the Lhenkarma (*lhan kar ma*),³ and the Phangthangma (*’phang thang ma*),⁴ as the *Jayamatipariṣcchā* (*rgyal ba’i blo gros kyis zhus pa*) in eleven ślokas. The late thirteenth century catalog of the Tibetan Kadampa master Darma Gyaltsen (*dar ma rgyal mtshan*, 1227-1305), commonly known as Chomden Reltri (*bcom ldan ral gri*), lists the sūtra as the *Jayamatipariṣcchā* (*rgyal ba’i blo gros kyis zhus pa*) in eleven ślokas.⁵ A listing of texts appended to the *History of Buddhism in India and its Spread to Tibet* by Butön Rinchen Drup (*bu ston rin chen grub*, 1290-1364) also records the work as the *Jayamatipariṣcchā* (*rgyal ba’i blo gros kyis zhus pa*) in eleven ślokas.⁶ These catalog lists match the Tibetan title of the sūtra that is found in a marginal note above the first line of the Sanskrit manuscript of the *Jayamatipariṣcchā* as *’phags pa rgyal ba’i blo gros kyis zhus pa’i mdo ste brgyad par rdzogs so*.⁷

However, among vulgate Kangyurs, the Tshalpa (*tshal pa*) editions of Cone (C), Degé (D), Jangsatham (J), Peking (Q), the independent Kangyurs of Phug brag (F, F2), and the Gondlha (Go) proto-Kangyur give the title as *The Mahāyāna Sūtra “Jayamati”* (*Jayamatīnāmamahāyānasūtra*, *rgyal ba’i blo gros zhes bya ba theg pa chen po’i mdo*), while only the Kangyurs of the Thempangma (*thems spang ma*) line of London (L) and Stok Palace (S), as well as the mixed Kangyur of Narthang

(N), give the title, in Tibetan at least, as *'phags pa rgyal ba'i blo gros kyis zhus pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*, (*The Mahāyāna Sūtra "The Inquiry of Jayamati"*). Although this should translate the Sanskrit *Jayamatipariṣcchā-nāmamahāyānasūtra*, these Kangyurs, too, use the Sanskrit title *Jayamatināma-mahāyānasūtra*. None of the available Tibetan editions have a colophon that lists the translators of the *sūtra*.

1.4

Analysis of the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions indicate that they preserve different *nidāna* or prologues. The Sanskrit version has the Bhagavān residing at Vulture's Peak in Rājagrha with a great company of 1,250 monks, while the Tibetan version has the Bhagavān residing at the grove of Anāthapiṇḍada in Jeta Wood in Śrāvastī together with a great assembly of monks and a great multitude of bodhisatvas.⁸ Vinītā's study⁹ also notes that the conclusions of the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions differ. These differences between the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of the introductory settings and formulaic conclusions may well indicate that this brief *sūtra* was redacted in a manner similar to the Mūlasarvāstivāda rules on "how to make up a *sūtra*."¹⁰ This is based on the fact that all Tibetan versions of the *sūtra* give Śrāvastī as the setting, this being the favored location for a redacted text among the Mūlasarvāstivāda according to Gregory Schopen's recent analysis.¹¹

1.5

The other immediately apparent difference in content between the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions is that the edited Tibetan contains nineteen prescriptions rather than the fourteen in the Sanskrit. In the following translation, the third and fourth prescriptions in the Tibetan are in inverse order compared with the Sanskrit. Notably, the eighth prescription in the Tibetan version discusses [knowledge](#), while the Sanskrit version has [meditative absorption](#). Classical philological and phylogenetic textual analysis of the available Tibetan exemplars of the *Jayamatipariṣcchā* indicates there are four lines of textual relations grouped within the (I) Tshalpa (C, D, J, N, Q, Y) line, (II) Thempangma (L, S) line, (III) Dunhuang (M) and Phug brag (F, F2) manuscripts, and (IV) Western Kangyur lines (Go). Textual analysis also indicates two recensions of the *sūtra*, with the Dunhuang exemplar and the two Phug brag exemplars, each containing sixteen prescriptions, representing one textual recension, while the Gondlha proto-Kangyur and vulgate Kangyurs represent another textual recension. The Dunhuang and Phug brag exemplars may represent early, but incomplete, Tibetan translations of the *sūtra*.

1.6

Be that as it may, the doctrinal content of the *Jayamatipariṣcchā*, including all nineteen prescriptions found among vulgate Tibetan Kangyurs, is actually contained within the much older version of Kumārajīva's early fifth century Chinese

translation of the *Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra*, the *Shoulengyan sanmei jing*, 首楞嚴三昧經 (Taishō. no.642, 15), as well as the later ninth century Tibetan translation of the *Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra*. This intertextual relation between the *Jayamatiparipṛcchāsūtra* and *Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra* has not been noticed before, either by traditional Buddhist scholars or by modern Buddhist studies scholars. Versions in French and English of the corresponding content are located in section 153 of Étienne Lamotte’s translation of the *Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra*,¹² under the title given by Lamotte, “Why and How to Practice the Heroic Progress.” Kumārajīva’s Chinese version and the Tibetan version of the *Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra*, translated by Śākyaprabha and Ratnarakṣita, closely match the syntax and terminology found in the Tibetan version of the *Jayamatiparipṛcchāsūtra*, despite several minor differences in wording (Apple, 2015).

1.7

Although there is a direct correspondence in content between the *Jayamatiparipṛcchāsūtra* and this section of the *Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra*, a significant difference between the two sūtras is the person speaking the prescribed content. In the *Jayamatiparipṛcchāsūtra* the prescriptions are delivered by the Buddha to the bodhisatva Jayamati. The *Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra*, on the other hand, attributes the prescriptions to Jayamati. After Jayamati proclaims the nineteen prescriptions in the *Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra*, the Buddha responds to Jayamati, corresponding to section 154 of Lamotte’s *Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra* translation,¹³ with a proclamation advocating the practice of the *Śūraṃgamasamādhi*, emphasizing how this *samādhi* encompasses and goes beyond the qualities that the bodhisatva Jayamati had declared.

1.8

The correspondence between the *Jayamatiparipṛcchāsūtra* and this section of the *Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra* brings up a number of interesting questions related to philology, intertextuality, and other cultural practices in the study of Mahāyāna sūtras. Based on the analysis of these sūtras, the *stemma codicum* for the content of the *Jayamatiparipṛcchāsūtra*, due to its being incorporated into the *Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra*, pushes the inferred archetype or oldest inferable ancestor of this sūtra back before the fifth century of Kumārajīva.

1.9

How do we know this? The content of the *Jayamatiparipṛcchāsūtra* was wholly subsumed and inverted from the Buddha’s speech to represent the bodhisatva Jayamati’s proclamation, including all nineteen prescriptions in the *Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra*. This means that the content of the *Jayamatiparipṛcchāsūtra* must precede the composition of this section of the *Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra*. Most modern scholars theorize that the *Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra* is one of the oldest Mahāyāna sūtras¹⁴ due to its listing in Chinese catalogs as being translated several times before Kumārajīva’s fifth century Chinese version, including the non-extant

second century *Shoulengyan jing*, 首楞嚴經, of Lokakṣema (支識, 185 c.e.) and the lost third century translation of Zhi Qian (支謙).¹⁵ Although we are unable to verify that these early, but lost, Chinese versions included the section that corresponds with the *Jayamatipariṣcchāsūtra*, we can still infer that the content of the *Jayamatipariṣcchāsūtra* with its nineteen prescriptions must go back to the fourth century. It is highly probable that the content of the *Jayamatipariṣcchāsūtra* circulated as a type of *subhāṣita* or set of well-spoken sayings for monks who took up the vocation¹⁶ of Mahāyāna practices.

I.10

In sum, the evidence of relationships between the *Jayamatipariṣcchāsūtra* and *Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra* brings a nuanced awareness to the intertextual relationships between Mahāyāna sūtras. This evidence indicates that the authorial communities that composed and compiled “Mahāyāna” texts during the Kuṣāṇa and Gupta eras in South Asia were aware of each other’s work and that there were shared elements between authorial communities of different “Mahāyāna” sūtras. The subsuming of the *Jayamatipariṣcchāsūtra* into the *Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra* also provides a rare glimpse of something more. It points toward the editorial practices utilized by the authors of Mahāyāna sūtras to gain rhetorical advantage over competitors. The shared content demonstrates that the authorial communities of these sūtras were not only borrowing each other’s ideas, stock phrases, and literary tropes, but were actively competing to demonstrate that their vision of the bodhisatva way superseded the practices and motivations outlined by other groups.

THE TRANSLATION

The Noble Great Vehicle Sūtra The Inquiry of Jayamati

1.1

Homage to all buddhas and bodhisatvas!

Thus I have heard at one time. The Bhagavān was residing at the grove of Anāthapiṇḍada in Jeta Wood in Śrāvastī together with a great assembly of monks and a great multitude of bodhisatvas. Then, the Bhagavān addressed the bodhisatva Jayamati as follows.

1.2

“Jayamati, a faithful man or woman of a good family¹⁷ (1) who desires merit should

worship the Tathāgata; (2) who desires discernment should be devoted to learning; (3) who desires heavenly rebirth should uphold moral conduct; (4) who desires wealth should increase charity; (5) who desires beauty should cultivate patience; (6) who desires eloquence should pay respect to the guru; (7) who desires memory should not have excessive pride; (8) who desires knowledge should frequently practice appropriate mindfulness; [F.251.a] (9) who desires liberation should abstain from all evil; (10) who desires to make all beings happy should generate the mind for awakening; (11) who desires a sweet voice should speak truthfully; (12) who desires virtuous qualities should take joy in solitude; (13) who desires the Dharma should attend to the spiritual friend; (14) who desires quiescence should frequently practice no contact with others; (15) who desires insight should frequently examine things as empty; (16) who desires rebirth in the world of Brahmā should cultivate love, compassion, joy, and equanimity; (17) who desires the abundant resources of gods and humans should behave in conformity with the path of ten virtuous actions; (18) who desires complete nirvāṇa should take joy in empty dharmas; (19) who desires to obtain all virtuous qualities¹⁸ should worship the Three Jewels.”

1.3

When the Bhagavān had spoken, the bodhisatva mahāsatva Jayamati, the complete assembly, and the world with its gods, humans, demigods and gandharvas rejoiced and highly praised what had been proclaimed by the Bhagavān.