

Remarks on an Instance of Intertextuality in the Eleventh Chapter of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and the Phrase *Tṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* in Buddhist *Sūtra* Literature

Charles William DiSimone
(Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München)

국문요약

산티데바의 『학집론』은 불교문헌 사이의 텍스트 상호관련성에 흥미가 있는 학자들에게는 아주 훌륭한 소재다. 7세기에 성립한 이 문헌의 상당 부분이 종종 상당히 이른 시기의 다른 문헌으로부터 인용한 것으로 이루어져 있고, 그러한 텍스트 상호관련성의 예들이 종종 그 문헌 안에서 일어나기 때문이다.

이 논문은 『학집론』 11장에 인용한 두 문헌 「郁伽長者會」와 『寶聚經』의 한 쌍의 구절 간의 텍스트 상호관련성을 예시함을 시작으로 하여, 이 양 문헌으로부터 언급된 구문들에 공유되고 있는 ‘*tṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati*(풀,

불교학리뷰 (Critical Review for Buddhist Studies)

17권 (2015. 6) 9p~37p

www.kci.go.kr

나무, 약초, 수림)’라는 특정 문구의 용례를 탐구한다. 왜냐하면 이 구문은 모든 이용 가능한 자료들에서 보이기 때문이다. 최근의 현대 학자들만이 이용하게 된 불교문헌의 디지털 작업을 통해 접근 가능한 자료들을 활용함으로써, 현존하는 산스크리트 문헌에서 이 특정한 구문이 일어나는 용례들을 상당히 정확히 밝힐 수 있다. 즉 이 구문이 <방광경>으로 여겨지거나 혹은 『대보적경』 컬렉션의 일부로 발견되는 유명한 대승불교 문헌에서만 사용 된다는 사실을 밝힐 수 있다.

이 논문은 ‘*ṛṇagulmaṣadhivanaspati*’라는 특정 문구가 일어나는 예들과 더불어 산스크리트와 팔리 문헌에서 사용되는 유사한 어구들을 수집하였다. 이러한 작업은 산스크리트와 팔리 자료들에서 이 구문과 그 변형(異文)들을 사용한 용법에 대한 예비 조사를 목적으로 하고 있다. 이러한 조사는 어떻게 이 ‘*ṛṇagulmaṣadhivanaspati*’ 구문을 채용한 문헌들이 관련되어 있으며, 이것이 어떻게 불교 특히 대승 경전 문헌에서 특정한 타입의 텍스트 간의 관계에 대해 우리의 이해를 발전시키는 가에 관한 통찰을 제공해줄 것이다.

주제어 : 텍스트 상호관련성, 불교경전 문헌, 풀·나무·약초·수림, 『학집론』, 『육가장자회』, 『보취경』

The *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, or *Compendium of Training*, is a seventh century manual for aspiring Mahāyāna *bodhisattvas* written by the famed *mahāyānika* monk Śāntideva. To say that Śāntideva is the author is somewhat problematic as the several hundred page text is actually a compilation of selections from ninety-seven separate Mahāyāna works that Śāntideva edited around twenty-seven root *kārikās*, a form of verse where the author concisely states his ideological stance, into one coherent text with its own meaning and purpose quite distinct from the content and historical time of its component works. Due to its eclectic mix of sources collected into one text there are many instances of intertextuality to be found within the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*.¹⁾ In this paper I will discuss a particular instance of intertextuality between two texts quoted in the eleventh chapter of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā-sūtra* and *Ratnarāśi-sūtra* focusing particular attention to the phrase *trṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* (grass, shrubs, medicinal herbs, and forest trees) that appears in both passages and establish a preliminary study on the use of this phrase in Buddhist *sūtra* literature.

The eleventh chapter of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* is titled “Aranyasaṃvarṇana” or, “A Description of the Forest”, and as the title implies, it deals with wilderness dwelling, a topic traditionally associated with a

1) The complicated nature of his authorship is made even more problematic in that it has recently been pointed out that several verses from the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, which had traditionally been thought to be citations from canonical texts, were actually composed by Śāntideva himself as is discussed in Harrison 2007.

high degree of importance for Buddhist monks. I have no intention of getting into issues surrounding its origins in this paper but much recent scholarship has suggested that the early adherents of the Mahāyāna movement in Buddhism supposedly placed an even higher premium upon the act of wilderness dwelling than their mainstream counterparts. This form of asceticism, one of the *dhūtaguṇas*—although known to many if not most monks, both Mahāyāna and Mainstream—continued to play a key role in the Mahāyāna rhetoric of the *bodhisattva* ideal well into Śāntideva’s time. In the eleventh chapter of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, Śāntideva quotes from six texts: the *Ugradattapariṣcchā-sūtra*, the *Sāmadhirāja-sūtra*, the *Rāṣṭrapālāpariṣcchā-sūtra*, the *Ratnakūṭa-sūtra*,²⁾ the *Ratnamegha-sūtra*, and the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra*, all early Mahāyāna texts composed around the second century CE, to illustrate the first *pāda*³⁾ of his twentieth *kārikā*:

ṣameta śrutam eṣeta saṃśrayeta vanaṃ tataḥ |
samādhānāya yujyeta bhāvayed aśubhādīkam ||⁴⁾

Be patient, seek to hear and then resort to the forest.

Direct your mind upon *samādhi*, focusing on impurities.⁵⁾

2) What Śāntideva refers to as the *Ratnakūṭa* was likely the *Kāśyapaparivarta*. (Pedersen 1980, 62).

3) The second *pāda* corresponds to the twelfth chapter.

4) Harrison 2007, 239 and Bendall 1897-1902, XLV.

5) All translations from the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* are my own.

Reading the text one notes that there are two major themes Śāntideva is trying to convey, why one should go to the forest and what a *bodhisattva* should do in the forest once he arrives and the chapter is separated into two parts, each covering one theme. Śāntideva adds very little original writing to this chapter, mostly relying on quotations from the six texts enumerated above to achieve his two aims for the chapter.

In this section of the text, Śāntideva used quotations from several *sūtras* that share not only themes but also textual parallels in the form of the particular use of certain phrases. The most striking example of intertextuality I have found involves the following passages from the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā* and *Ratnarāśi sūtras*, both relatively early Mahāyāna texts. Here we see the passage from the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā-sūtra*:

tadyathā gṛhapate ’raṇye tṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspatayaḥ prativasanto
na bibhyati notrasyanti, na saṃtrasyanti, na saṃtrāsam āpadyante |
evam eva gṛhapate pravrajitena bodhisattvenārāṇye viharatā tṛṇagu-
lmauṣadhivanaspatikāṣṭhakuḍayavad ātmapratibhāsavat saṃjñā kāye
utpādayitavyā | māyāsamatā cittasyotpādayitavyā | ko ’tra bibheti | ko
’sminn utrasyati | tena bhayabhītena vā trastena vā evaṃ yoniśaḥ kāya
upaparikṣitavyaḥ | nāsty atra kāye ātmā va sattvo vā jīvo vā poṣo vā
puḍgalo vā manujo vā mānavo vā | abhūtaparikalpa eṣa yaduta bhayaṃ
nāma | sa mayābhūtaparikalpo na parikalpayitavyaḥ | tena yathārāṇye
tṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspatayaḥ prativasanti amamāparigrahāḥ, evam

evāmamenāparigraheṇāranyam eva sarvadharmā iti jñātvā upasampadya
vihartavyam | tat kasya hetoḥ | raṇachedo 'raṇyavāso 'mamo 'parigrahaḥ ||⁶⁾

Householder, just as grass, shrubs, medicinal herbs, and forest trees that live in the forest do not fear, nor are they alarmed, nor terrified, nor do they fall into terror; so householder, should the mendicant *bodhisattva* dwelling in the forest bring forth the perception that his body is like grass, shrubs, medicinal herbs, forest trees, a piece of a wood, or a wall, like an illusion. He should bring forth the thought that all is equal to *māyā*: ‘Who is afraid here? Who is frightened in this forest?’ He who is deathly afraid or terrified should thoroughly consider his body thus: ‘In this body there is no self, no existence, no life, no man, no person, no human, no one. Of course this thing known as ‘fear’ is unreal, a figment of my imagination. I should not vainly assume this unreal figment of my imagination.’ Therefore, just as grass, shrubs, medicinal herbs, and forest trees live in the forest without possessions and without property; so should he, realizing ‘All things are the forest’ and having become ordained as a monk, dwell in the forest without possessions and without property. Why is this? To dwell in the forest is to sever one’s defilements, to be without possessions and without property.

And second passage from the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra*:

tena tatrāraṇyāyatane prativasatā tṛṇgulmauṣadhivaspaṭinām nimittam

6) Bendall 1897-1902, 199.3-12

grahītavyaṃ | katham ete bhavanti | yathaiśāṃ bhāvānām asvāmikānām
 amamānām aparigrahānām evaṃ niśceṣṭānām nirvyāpārāṇām bhavaty
 utpādo bhaṅgaś ca | na caiśāṃ kaścīd utpādayitā | na nirodhayitā | evam
 evāyaṃ kāyas tṛṇakāṣṭhakūḍayapratibhāso pamo 'svāmiko 'mamo 'parigraho
 niśceṣṭo nirvyāparo hetupratyayayuktayā utpadyate | hetupratyayavaikalayān
 nirudhyate | na punar atra kaścīd dharmāḥ paramārthata utpadyate vā
 nirudhyate veti ||⁷⁾

Dwelling there in that forest sanctuary, he should imagine grass, shrubs, medicinal herbs, and forest trees. How do they come to be? Just as they are unowned, without possessions, and without property, thus they are motionless, at leisure, arising and decaying without anyone causing them to arise and no one causing them to decay; in this very way, this body is like grass, shrubs, a piece of wood, a wall, an illusion, unowned, without possessions, without property, motionless, at leisure, arising due to causes and conditions and finding its destruction due to causes and conditions. Ultimately, there is no *dharma* here that arises or decays.

The similarities between these two passages are striking. It almost appears that the passage from the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra* completes the thought set forth in the *Ugradattapariṣcchā-sūtra*. That these two, separate texts work so well together is naturally a credit to the excellent work as an editor Śāntideva performed in compiling and

7) Bendall 1897-1902, 201.6-11.

organizing the quotations that make the bulk of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. Beyond Śāntideva's genius however, it appears possible that these two *sūtras* are textually related. The phrase *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* (grass, shrubs, medicinal herbs, and forest trees) appears word for word in both texts as something an aspiring forest ascetic should compare himself to because they are inactive, without possessions, and without property; another, albeit shorter, phrase (*amamo 'parigrahaḥ*) also occurs word for word *sandhi* notwithstanding. It is possible that one of these texts was influenced by the other or they were composed by the same person or people. Another possibility is that both texts borrowed from some third text. Yet another option is that these phrases are stock phrases that were part of the Mahāyāna lexicon when *sūtras* were being produced.

The turn to the digital age we now live in has awarded many boons to the contemporary scholar of Buddhist Studies; one of the chief among them being the digitization of a great deal of the texts we study. Utilizing these digital tools I have searched for the phrases shared between the two similar passages in the *Ratnarāśi* and *Ugradattaparipṛcchā sūtras*: *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* and *amamo 'parigrahaḥ* in all Sanskrit texts available to me. The results of this search raise interesting issues especially surrounding the use of the phrase *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati*. The phrase *amamo 'parigrahaḥ* only appears in one other text beyond the *Ratnarāśi* and *Ugradattaparipṛcchā sūtras*, the *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā*,⁸⁾

8) Poussin 1901-1914, 505 and Vaidya 1960b, 236.

Prajñākaramati's commentary to Śāntideva's more famous treatise, the *Bodhicaryāvatāra* and appears to be unique to the passages in the *Ugradattapariṣcchā-sūtra* and *Ratnarāśi-sūtra*, which in and of itself would suggest another connection between the texts. The phrase *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* seems to have a peculiar history of usage. As far as I have been able to discern, the phrase *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* does not occur in Sanskrit literature outside of Buddhist texts. One finds *oṣadhivanaspati* in some instances⁹⁾ or, perhaps more commonly, the phrase *ṛṇagulma* but the two phrases appear to be used distinctly in non-Buddhist Sanskrit literature.¹⁰⁾ Even within Buddhist literature the phrase does not appear commonly. I have only been able to find the full phrase in twenty-one instances spread throughout fifteen texts in addition to the instances found in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* described above:

Table 1. The Phrase *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* in Sanskrit Buddhist Texts

<i>Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra</i> (Vaidya 1960c, 127)	ye ca puṣpavṛkṣāḥ phalavṛkṣāḥ patravṛkṣā bijagrāmabhūtagrāmaśasya ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspatayo vā, te 'pi sarve yena mahāprabho rājā tenābhinatāḥ
<i>Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra</i> (Vaidya 1960c, 366)	evam kalyāṇamitrādhyaśayapariśuddhā hi kulaputra bodhisattvāḥ kalyāṇamitrājñāsu pratipadyamānā vivardhante sarvakuśalamūlaih himavat samniśritā iva ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspatayah

9) The phrase occurs far from regularly but enough to warrant an entry in Monier-Williams' dictionary, s.v. *oṣadhivanaspati* in MW.

10) Most often one sees some variation of *ṛṇagulmalata* or *ṛṇagulmapīlaka*.

<i>Kāraṇḍavyūha-sūtra</i> (Vaidya 1961a, 306)	tadyathāpi nāma sarvanīvaraṇaviṣkambhin varṣākālasamaye sarvāni ṛṇagulmauṣadhivaspatayaḥ sarve nīlābhi(rūpā) bhavanti atha śatamukho nāma nāgarājāḥ bhavanād avatīrya sarvās tā ṛṇagu- lmauṣadhivaspatīr dabati
<i>Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra</i> (Vaidya 1963, 25)	tadyathā mahāmate pṛthivyām ṛṇagulmauṣadhivaspatayaḥ kramavṛttyā virohanti na yugapat, evam eva mahāmate sattvānām tathāgataḥ kramaśaḥ svacittadṛṣyadhārām viśodhayati na yugapat
Āryadeva's <i>Caryāmelāpakapradīpa</i> (quoting <i>Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra</i>) (Pāṇḍeya 2000, 3 and Wedemeyer 2007, 342)	tadyathā mahāmate pṛthivyām sarvat ṛṇagulmauṣadhivaspatayaḥ kramavṛttyā virohanti na yugapat, evam eva mahāmate tathāgataḥ sarvasattvānām kramaśaḥ svacittadṛṣyadhārām viśodhayati na yugapat
<i>Mahāmegha-sūtra</i> (Bendall 1880, 295)	katham, bhagavan, sarvanāgānām sarvanāgaduḥkhāni pratiprasāmbheyuḥ pahaṣitāḥ sukhasamanvitāś ceḥa jambudvīpakālānukālām varṣadhārā utsrjeyuḥ sarvat ṛṇagulmauṣadhivaspatīm virohayeyuḥ
<i>Mahāmegha-sūtra</i> (Bendall 1880, 297)	yeneha jambudvīpe kālena kālam varṣadhārā utsrjati sarvvat ṛ- ṇagulmauṣadhivaspatiśasyāni ca virohayati
<i>Mahāmegha-sūtra</i> (Bendall 1880, 299)	ebhir bhujagādhipate tathāgatanāmabhiḥ pravarttitaḥ sarvanāgānām sarvaduḥkhāni pratiprasārbdhāni sarvaduḥkhasamarppitāś ca kālena kālam iha jambudvīpe varṣadhārā utsrjanti sarvat ṛṇagulmauṣa- dhivaspatiśasyāni ca virohanti
<i>Mahāsannipātaratna-</i> <i>ketudhāraṇī-sūtra</i> (<i>Ratnaketu-parivarta</i>) (Dutt 1984, 22)	ye kecid iha cāturdīpīke ṛṇagulmauṣadhivaspatikṣitiśailaparvatāstān sarvān sapta mahāratnān adhyatiṣṭhat
<i>Suvikrāntavikrāmipari-</i> <i>prcchā</i> (Vaidya 1961a, 70)	evam iyaṃ mahāpṛthivī abhyantarā ca abhiṣyanditā snigdḥā ca bhavati, upariṣṭac ca udakam uhyate, yathā nimnāni ca sthālāni saṃtarpayati, evam iyaṃ mahāpṛthivī upariṣṭān meghair abhiṣyanditā satī ṛṇagulmauṣadhivaspatīm abhiṣyandayati
(<i>Larger</i>) <i>Sukhāvativyūha-sūtra</i> (Vaidya 1961a, 248)	tadyatheyaṃ mahāpṛthivī ekodakajāta bhavet, tatra na vṛkṣā na parvatā na dvīpā na ṛṇagulmauṣadhivaspatayo na nadīśvabhra- prapātāḥ prajñāpayeran, anyatraikārṇavibhūtā mahāpṛthivye kā syāt, evam eva tasmin buddhakṣetre nāsty anyat kiṃcil liṅgam vā nimittaṃ vā anyatraiva vyāmaprabhāḥ śrāvakāś te ca yojana- kotīśatasahasraprabhā bodhisattvāḥ

<i>Samādhirāja-sūtra</i> (Vaidya 1961b, 41)	tasya ca bhagavato bodhiprāptasya sarvavṛkṣapatrebhyaḥ sarvatṛ- ṇagulmauṣadhivaspatibhyaḥ sarvasaīlaśikharebhyaś cābhāvasa- mudgataśabdo niścarati
<i>Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra</i> (Bagchi 1967, 64)	yenāsmiñ jambudvīpe nānā ṛṇagulmauṣadhivaspataya ojasvitarāḥ prarohayiṣyanti
<i>Saddharmapuṇḍarīka- sūtra</i> (Vaidya 1960e, 84)	tadyathāpi nāma kāśyapa asyāṃ trisāhasramahāsāhasrāyāṃ lokadhātu yāvantas ṛṇagulmauṣadhivaspatayo nānāvārṇā nānāprakārā ośadhigrāmā nānānamadheyāḥ pṛthivyāṃ jātāḥ parvatagirikandareṣu vā meghaś ca mahāvāriparipūrṇa unnamet, unnamitvā sarvāvatiṃ trisāhasramahāsāhasrāṃ lokadhātuṃ saṃchādayet saṃchādyā ca sarvatra samakālaṃ vāri pramuñcet tatra kāśyapa ye ṛṇagu- lmauṣadhivaspatayo 'syāṃ trisāhasramahāsāhasralokadhātu, tatra ye taruṇāḥ komalanālaśākhāpatrapalāśās ṛṇagulmauṣadhiva- naspatayo drumā mahādrumāḥ, sarve te tato mahāmeghapramuktā- dvāriṇo yathābalaṃ yathāviṣayaṃ abdhātuṃ pratyāpibanti
<i>Saddharmapuṇḍarīka- sūtra</i> (Vaidya 1960e, 85)	tadyathāpi nāma kāśyapa mahāmeghaḥ sarvāvatiṃ trisāhasra- mahāsāhasrāṃ lokadhātuṃ saṃchādyā samaṃ vāri pramuñcati, sarvāṃś ca ṛṇagulmauṣadhivaspatīn vāriṇā saṃtarpayati yathābalaṃ yathāviṣayaṃ yathāsthāmaṃ ca te ṛṇagulmauṣadhiva- spatayo vāryāpibanti, svakasvakāṃ ca jātipramāṇatāṃ gacchanti evam eva kāśyapa tathāgato 'rhan samyaksambuddho yaṃ dharmāṃ bhāṣate, sarvaḥ sa dharmo ekaraso yaduta vimuktiraso virāgaraso nirodharasaḥ sarvajñajñānaparyavasānaḥ tatra kāśyapa ye te sattvās tathāgatasya dharmāṃ bhāṣamāṇasya śṛṇvanti dhārayanti abhisamyujyante, na te ātmanātmānaṃ jānanti vā vedayanti vā budhyanti vā tat kasya hetoḥ? tathāgata eva kāśyapa tān sattvāṃś tathā jānāti, ye ca te, yathā ca te, yādṛśāś ca te yaṃ ca te cintayanti, yathā ca te cintayanti, yena ca te cintayanti yaṃ ca te bhāvayanti, yathā ca te bhāvayanti, yena ca te bhāvayanti yaṃ ca te prāpnuvanti, yathā ca te prāpnuvanti, yena ca te prāpnuvanti tathāgata eva kāśyapa tatra pratyakṣaḥ pratyakṣadarśī yathā ca darśī teṣāṃ sattvānāṃ tāsu tāsu bhūmiṣu sthitānāṃ ṛṇagulmauṣadhi- vanaspatīnāṃ hīnotkrīṣtamadhyamānāṃ
<i>Saddharmapuṇḍarīka- sūtra</i> (Vaidya 1960e, 214)	dūrasthānāṃ api ṛṇagulmauṣadhivaspatīnāṃ gandhān ghrāyati

<i>Aṣṭasāhasrikā</i> <i>Prajñāpāramitā</i> (Vaidya 1960a, 255)	ye kecana trisāhasramahāsāhasre lokadhātau trṇagulmauṣadhivanaspatayaḥ , te sarve yena dharmodgato bodhisattvo mahāsattvas tena pranatā abhūvan
<i>Jñānālokālamkāranāma-sūtra</i> (Kimura and Onozuka 2004, 32)	tadyathā mañjuśrīr nidāghakālāvasāne varṣānām prathame māsy āgate sattvānām pūrvakarmavipākena pṛthivīgatānām bījagrāmabhūtagrāmasya sarvat trṇagulmauṣadhivanaspatinām samjananārtham upari vaihāyasy āntarīkṣa ākāśe tādrṣā vāyavo vānti
<i>Jñānālokālamkāranāma-sūtra</i> (Kimura and Onozuka 2004, 44)	tadyathāpi mañjuśrīḥ pṛthivīm niśritya pṛthivīm pratiṣṭhāya sarvat trṇagulmauṣadhivanaspatayo vṛddhim virūḍhim vaipulyatām āpadyante
<i>Śrāvakabhūmi</i> (Śrāvakabhūmi Study Group 1998, 86)	tadyathā pṛthivī pratiṣṭhā bhavaty ādhāras trṇagulmauṣadhivanaspatinām utpattaye, evam eva śīlam vistareṇa pūrvavad vācyam
<i>Kāśyapaparivarta-sūtra</i> (Karashima 2002, fol. 21v and Staël-Holstein 1926, 58)	tadyathā kāśyapa abdhātu sarvat trṇagulmoṣadhivanaspatayo rohāpayati evam eva kāśyapa āśayaśuddho bodhisattvaḥ sarvasattvāni maitratayā spharitivā viharan sarvasattvānām sarvasukladharmān virohayati tatredam ucyate yathāpi ābdhātu trṇagulmamauṣadhī vanaspatīm auṣadhidhānyajātam

While these phrases are generally distinct and seem to serve specific functions in their relative texts, looking at these passages containing *trṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* one sees two general themes. First, *trṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* is often used with other words for plants and vegetation of the earth and second, that the passages often have to do with the concept of growth or movement whether figurative or literal, often utilizing a verbs such a *vi-√vṛdh*, *niś-√car*, *√ruh*, *ut-√paṭ*, *ā-√pad*, or to a lesser extent the concept of drinking or drenching. Considering that growing and watering are perhaps the two most common attributes to come to someone's mind when thinking about plants, these usages seem quite natural. Our passages from the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā-sūtra* and *Ratnarāśi-*

sūtra do not seem to have much in common with the other passages sharing the phrase *tr̥ṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* regarding content. We see neither the concept of growth nor movement. Indeed, in the passages from the *Ugradattapariṣcchā-sūtra* and *Ratnarāśī-sūtra* we see what is perhaps the third attribute of plants that commonly comes to mind, that plants do not do anything in particular and certainly do not entertain any fears or hold possessions and partake in activities.

The content of the phrases containing *tr̥ṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* in the *Ugradattapariṣcchā-sūtra* and *Ratnarāśī-sūtra* appears to be unique and the two texts only seem to hold any commonality with each other. However, if we look at the texts that use the phrase *tr̥ṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* altogether we see that many are related to *Ugradattapariṣcchā* and *Ratnarāśī sūtras*. The *Samādhirāja-sūtra* and *Kāśyapaparivarta-sūtra* are both quoted by Śāntideva in the eleventh chapter of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* and of those the *Kāśyapaparivarta-sūtra* and *Ratnarāśī-sūtra* appear to share a close connection, both appearing next to one another in both the Chinese and Tibetan versions of the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection.¹¹⁾ Beyond these connections to the passages among those passages quoted in the eleventh chapter of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, most of the texts containing the phrase *tr̥ṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* share their own connections being either texts found in the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection or texts considered to be so-called

11) Silk 1994, 660.

vaipulya sūtras. We must remain silent on the issue of the authorship of these texts but the fact that many of these texts are found in the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection or are considered to be *vaipulya sūtras* suggests their connection and I believe the use of *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* in these texts further indicates that some, if not all, of these texts are related to some degree.

In addition to finding the phrase *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* as it appears in Buddhist literature, I have attempted to find similar phrases used in various Buddhist text, ultimately coming across thirteen instances in eleven texts:

Table 2. Phrases Similar to *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* in Sanskrit Buddhist Texts

<i>Lalitavistara-sūtra</i> (Vaidya 1958b, 124)	śīṣire hi yathā himadhātu mahān ṛṇagulmavanauṣadhi ojaharo tatha ojaharo ahu vyādhijaro parihīyati indriyarūpabalam
<i>Śikṣāsamuccaya</i> quoting <i>Lalitavistara</i> (Bendall 1897-1902, 206.1-2)	śīṣire hi yathā himadhātu maham ṛṇagulmavanauṣadhi ojaharo tathaujaharo 'yu vyādhi jage parihīyatindriyarūpabalam
<i>Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra</i> <i>a</i> (Vaidya 1960e, 86)	iha yā kāci medinyām jātā oṣadhayo bhavet ṛṇagulmavanaspato drumā vātha mahādrumāḥ sasyāni vividhānyeva yadvāpi haritam bhavet parvate kandare caiva nikuñjeṣu ca yad bhavet sarvān saṃtarpayen meghas ṛṇagulmavanaspātīn ṛṣītām dharaṇīm tarpet pariṣīcatī cauṣadhīḥ tac ca ekarasam vāri meghamuktam iha sthitam yathābalaṃ yathāviṣayam ṛṇagulmā pibanti tat
<i>Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra</i> (Vaidya 1963, 39)	tadyathā mahāmate nistrṇagulmalatāvanāyām
<i>Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra</i> (Vaidya 1963, 42)	ṛṇagulmavṛkṣaparvatā api mahāmate vividhāni ca vādyabhāṇḍāni nagarabhavanagrhavimānāsanasthānāni tathāgatapraveśadhīṣṭhānena pravādyante

<i>Hevajra-tantra</i> (Snellgrove 1959, 33)	sthiraalās ca ye bhāvās ṭṛṇagulmalatādayah bhāvante vai param tattvam ātmabhāvasvarūpakaṃ
<i>Samvarodaya-tantra</i> (Tsuda 1974, 80)	ṭṛṇagulmalatāvṛkṣā jaḍavijjñānamātrakāḥ śaḍgatikās ca ye sattvā vijjñānasaha vartate
<i>Mahāvastu-avādāna</i> (Senart 1882-1897, 1.91)	vanagahanaṃ balagahanaṃ girigahanaṃ tyāgagrahanaṃ viśamāpratisanniṣaṇṇavanaṃ tu manasyagahanaṃ ṭṛṇagulmakaṇṭhakaalatākulāni vṛkṣagrahaṇā gahanaṃ śathanikṛtipaiśunyāni tu manasyagahanaṃ
<i>Avadānaśataka</i> (Vaidya 1958, 95 and Speyer 1906-1909, 37.2)	yāvaca chakreṇa devendreṇa mähendravaraṣaṃ vṛṣṭaṃ yena tadāśrama- padaṃ punar api ṭṛṇagulmauśadhipuṣpaphalasaṃrddhaṃ samvṛttam
<i>Samādhirāja-sūtra</i> (Vaidya 1961b, 43) and <i>Prasannapadā</i> (quoting <i>Samādhirāja-sūtra</i>) (Vaidya 1960d, 121)	buddho yadā bheṣyati dharmarājah sarvāṇa dharmāṇa prakāśako muniḥ ṭṛṇagulmavṛkṣauśadhiśailaparvate abhāva dharmāṇa ravo bhaviṣyati
<i>Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra</i> (Vaidya 1960c, 137)	tasya śikhare vividhat ṭṛṇagulmauśadhipanārāmaracite mahāvabhā- saprāptaṃ bhāskaram ivoditam
<i>Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra</i> (Vaidya 1960c, 250)	tena khalu punaḥ sattvāḥ śuśkeṣu ṭṛṇagulmauśadhipanodyānadrumesū nānāvādhisprṣṭā digvidiśo vidhāvanti sma aparāyanāḥ
<i>Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna</i> (Mukhopadhyaya 1954, 26.6)	tadyathā puṣkarasārinn amiśaṃ api phalabaiśajyavṛkṣāṇāṃ āmalakīharitakīvibhītakī pharasakādīnāṃ anyāsāṃ api vividhānāṃ ośadhīnāṃ grāmajānāṃ pārvatīyānāṃ ṭṛṇavanaspātīnāṃ nānākaraṇāṃ prajñāyate

The most noteworthy thing about these instances of similar phrases to *ṭṛṇagulmauśadhipanaspati* is that the majority of them are metrical verses possibly suggesting that the only reason *ṭṛṇagulmauśadhipanaspati* is not used in those instances is because metrical limitations made it impossible. This is all the more plausible for the texts using similar phrases to *ṭṛṇagulmauśadhipanaspati* in a verse that also use the complete phrase in other, non-metrical, passages such as the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra*, *Laṅkāvatāra-*

sūtra, and *Samādhirāja-sūtra*. In addition to these texts that use both an abbreviated version in verse and the entire phrase of *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* in other places, as shown in the first table above, we see somewhat curiously, that the *Gaṇḍavyūha-sūtra*, one of the few texts that uses the complete phrase, uses the incomplete, *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivana* in two prose sections leaving out *oṣadhi* entirely. These two instances appear to differ from the other passages noted above because they are referring to something different than the grass, shrubs, medicinal herbs, and forest trees of *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* with the first phrase, *vidhatṛṇagulmauṣadhivanārāmaracita*, referring to an arrangement of forested gardens of various grasses, shrubs, and medicinal herbs and the second phrase, *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanodyānadruma*, referring to trees in a forest garden containing grass, shrubs, and medicinal herbs. It seems that when referring to manmade gardens and parks (*ārāma* and *udyāna*) the word *vanaspati*, which distinctly refers to wild trees growing in the natural wilderness, is not used.

Among the texts that use variations of *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* but not the actual phrase we see that aside from the *Lalitavistara* all of the texts are either *avādana* or *tantra* texts. I cannot venture to guess what this may mean but from this we might conclude that the phrase *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* only appears in *sūtra* literature; to be precise it only seems to appear in Mahāyāna *sūtra* literature. Although counted as a *vaipulya sūtra*, the *Lalitavistara* was originally a *Sarvāstivāda* text and perhaps tellingly, we do not see

the complete phrase but rather *ṭṛṇagulmavanaṣadhi*. In the many extant Pali *suttas* the phrase we might expect to find, *tiṇagumbaosadhivanaspati*, is entirely absent and even similar phrases are rare. I have been able to find only four phrases similar to *ṭṛṇagulmaṣadhivanaspati* in Pali *suttas*:

Table 3. Phrases Similar to *ṭṛṇagulmaṣadhivanaspati* in Pali Buddhist Texts

<i>Milindapañha</i> (Mil 410)	Puna ca paraṃ mahārāja megho ututo samutṭhahitvā dharāṇitalaruhe ṭiṇa-rukkha-latā-gumbaosadhi-vanaspatayo parirakkhati, evam-eva kho mahārāja yoginā yogāvacaraṇa yoniso manasikāraṃ nibbattetvā tena yoniso manasikāreṇa samaṇadhammo parirakkhitabbo, yoniso manasikāramūlakā sabbe kusalā dhammā. Idaṃ mahārāja meghassa catutthaṃ angaṃ gahetabbaṃ.
<i>Sattasūriya-sutta</i> (AN IV 100)	hoti kho so bhikkhave samayo, yaṃ bahūni vassāni bahūni vassasatāni bahūni vassasahassāni bahūni vassasatasahassāni devo na vassati, deve kho pana bhikkhave avassante ye keci 'me bījagāmbhūtagāmaosadhitiṇavanappatayo, te ussussanti vissussanti na bhavanti.
<i>Cūḷadhammasamādāna-sutta</i> (MN I 307)	Seyyathā pi bhikkhave gīmhānaṃ pacchime māse māluvāsipātīkā phaleyya, atha kho taṃ bhikkhave māluvābījaṃ aññatarasmiṃ sālāmūle nipateyya. Atha kho bhikkhave yā tasmīṃ sāle adhivatthā devatā sā bhītā saṃviggā santāsaṃ āpajjeyya. Atha kho bhikkhave tasmīṃ sāle adhivatthāya devatāya mittāmaccā nāṭisālohitā, āramadevatā vanadevatā rukkhadevatā, osadhitiṇavanaspatisu adhivatthā devatā, saṅgamma samāgamma evaṃ samassāseyyuṃ: mā bhavaṃ bhāyi, mā bhavaṃ bhāyi, app-eva nāṃ' etaṃ māluvābījaṃ moro vā gileyya mago vā khādeyya davaḍāho vā ḍaheyya vanakammikā vā uddhareyyuṃ upacikā vā udrabheyyuṃ, abījaṃ vā pan' assāti. Atha kho bhikkhave tasmīṃ sāle adhivatthāya devatāya evam-assa: Kiṃ su nāma te bhonto mittāmaccā nāṭisālohitā, āramadevatā vanadevatā rukkhadevatā, osadhitiṇavanaspatisu adhivatthā devatā, māluvābīje anāgatabhayaṃ sampassamānā saṅgamma samāgamma

	<p>evam samassāsesum: mā bhavaṃ bhāyi, mā bhavaṃ bhāyi, app-eva nām' etaṃ māluvābijaṃ moro vā gileyya mago vā khādeyya davaḍāho vā ḍaheyya vanakammikā vā uddhareyyuṃ upacikā vā udrabheyyuṃ, abijaṃ vā pan' assāti; sukho imissā māluvālatāya taruṇāya mudukāya lomasāya vilambiniyā samphasso ti. Sā taṃ sālaṃ anuparihareyya, sā taṃ sālaṃ anupariharitvā upari viṭabhiṃ kareyya, upari viṭabhiṃ karitvā oghanam janeyya, oghanam janetvā ye tassa sālassa mahantā mahantā khandhā te padāleyya Atha kho bhikkhave tasmim sāle adhivatthāya devatāya evam-assa: Idaṃ kho te bhonto mittāmaccā nātisālohitā, āramadevatā vanadevatā rukkhaddevatā, osadhīṭṭiṇavanaspatisu adhivatthā devatā, māluvābīje anāgatabhayaṃ sampassamānā saṅgamma samāgamma evaṃ samassāsesum...</p>
<p><i>Gilānadassana-sutta</i> (SN IV 302-303)</p>	<p>Atha kho sambahulā āramadevatā vanadevatā rukkhaddevatā osadhīṭṭiṇavanaspatisu adhivatthā devatā saṅgamma samāgamma Cittaṃ gahapatim etad avocum Paṇidhehi gahapati Anāgamam addhānam rājā assaṃ cakkavattīti Evaṃ vutte Citto gahapati tā āramadevatā vanadevatā rukkhaddevatā osadhīṭṭiṇavanaspatisu adhivatthā devatā etad avoca. Tam pi aniccaṃ tam pi addhuvam tam pi pahāya gamanīyanti ... Tathā hi pana mam āramadevatā vanadevatā rukkhaddevatā osadhīṭṭiṇavanaspatisu adhivatthā devatā evam ahaṃsu Paṇidhehi gahapati Anāgamam addhānam rājā assaṃ cakkavattīti tāham evaṃ vadāmi Tam pi aniccaṃ la tam pi pahāya gamanīyan ti Kin te ayyaputta āramadevatā vanadevatā rukkhaddevatā osadhīṭṭiṇavanaspatisu adhivatthādevatā atthavasam sampassamānā evam ahaṃsu Paṇidhehi gahapati Anāgamam addhānam rājā assaṃ cakkavattīti Tāsam kho āramadevatānam vanadevatānam rukkhaddevatānam osadhīṭṭiṇavanaspatisu adhivatthānam devatānam evaṃ hoti Ayaṃ kho Citto gahapati sīlavā kalyāṇadhammo sace paṇidahissati Anāgamam addhānam rājā assaṃ cakkavattīti ijjhissati sīlavato cetopaṇidhi visuddhattā dhammiko dhammikam phalam anusarissatīti Imaṃ kho tā āramadevatā vanadevatā rukkhaddevatā osadhīṭṭiṇavanaspatisu adhivatthā devatā atthavasam sampassamānā evam ahaṃsu</p>

The *Milindapañha* contains the only phrase that consists all of the elements of *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati*, *tiṇarukkkhalatāgumbaosadhivanaspatayo*, but it also adds a more general word for tree (*rukkha*) and vines (*latā*). The phrases in both the *Milindapañha* and the *Sattasūriyasutta* both have to do with the relationship between plants and rain, which is one of the common themes the phrase *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* is used in conjunction with in some of the Sanskrit texts. The phrase that occurs both in the *Cūḷadhammasamādāna-sutta* and *Gilānadassana-sutta*, *osadhitiṇavanaspatisu*, is used in both texts to describe *devatā* (deities) who live in various plants in the forest. This usage is not found in the Sanskrit texts in conjunction with the phrase *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati*.

On first glance one might not assume that these passages from Pali texts hold much in common with the use of *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* in Sanskrit Mahāyāna texts, however, this passage from the *Cūḷadhammasamādāna-sutta* is perhaps of note:

Seyyathā pi bhikkhave gimhānaṃ pacchime māse māluvāsipāṭikā phaleyya, atha kho taṃ bhikkhave māluvābījaṃ aññatarasmiṃ sālāmūle nipateyya. Atha kho bhikkhave yā tasmिṃ sāle adhivatthā devatā sā bhītā samviggā santāsaṃ āpajjeyya. Atha kho bhikkhave tasmिṃ sāle adhivatthāya devatāya mittāmaccā ñātisālohitā, āramadevatā vanadevatā rukkhadevatā, osadhitiṇavanaspatisu adhivatthā devatā, saṅgamma samāgamma evaṃ samassāseyyuṃ: mā bhavaṃ bhāyi, mā bhavaṃ bhāyi, app-eva nāma' etaṃ māluvābījaṃ moro vā gileyya mago vā

khādeyya davadāho vā ḍaheyya vanakammikā vā uddhareyyuṃ upacikā
vā udrabheyyuṃ, abījaṃ vā pan' assāti¹²⁾

Bhikkhus, suppose that in the last month of the hot season a *māluva*-creeper pod burst open and a *māluva*-creeper seed fell at the foot of a *sāla* tree. Then a deity living in that tree became fearful, perturbed, and frightened; but the deity's friends and companions, kinsmen and relatives—garden deities, park deities, tree deities, and deities inhabiting medicinal herbs, grass, and forest-monarch trees—gathered together and reassured that deity thus: 'Have no fear, sir, have no fear. Perhaps a peacock will swallow the *māluva*-creeper seed or a wild animal will eat it or a forest fire will burn it or a woodsmen will carry it off or white ants will devour it or it may not even be fertile.'¹³⁾

This passage seems to hold a resemblance to the passage from the *Ugradattapariṣcchā-sūtra* as quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* above. In the *Ugradattapariṣcchā-sūtra* it is a mendicant *bodhisattva* who is exhorted not to fall into a state of fear by comparing himself to grass, shrubs, medicinal herbs, and forest trees and in the *Cūḷadhammasamādāna-sutta* it is a deity living in a *sāla* tree who is exhorted not to fear by his relations, some of whom live in grass, shrubs, medicinal herbs, and forest trees and are presumably not gripped by fear. Is it possible that the author or authors of the

12) MN I 307.

13) Ñāṇamoli and Bodhi 1995, 406.

Ugradattaparipṛcchā-sūtra were in some way influenced by this incident relayed in the *Cūḷadhammasamādāna-sutta*? It must remain speculation but it is tantalizing to imagine that there is an implied connection between the phrase *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* and deities that live in the wilderness and that this connection was well understood by those who used the phrase in the texts they composed. Read in this light, the passages from the *Ugradattaparipṛcchā-sūtra* and *Ratnarāśi-sūtra*, and indeed the passages from other texts using this phrase, take on a new depth.

Based on what I have uncovered, there are several tentative conclusions about the use of *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* that we may draw. I do not believe that *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* is a random stock phrase. While it is true that various combinations of the words that make up *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* appear often in many texts, the phrase with all four words in the proper order is rare. I have only been able to find it in seventeen texts and it hardly appears to be a regularly occurring stock phrase in the sense of phrases such as *evaṃ mayā śrutam* or *yasmin samaye*. However if we take into account the variations and similar phrasings of *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* it becomes clear that *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* was used in a series of somewhat unique instances but not in any codified way. It appears to be a phrase associated with Mahāyāna *sūtras*, mainly with *vaipulya sūtras* and *sūtras* from the *Mahāratnakūṭa* collection. Further, although there appears to be limited influence from Pali sources on the use of *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* it is possible that

the phrase as it is used in Sanskrit sources retains the concept of supernatural beings embodying the plants outlined in the phrase as is seen in the *Cūladhammasamādāna* and *Gilānadassana suttas* and one might cautiously theorize that this usage is how we might interpret the passages from the *Ugradattapariṇchā* and *Ratnarāśi sūtras* as quoted in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* that seem to stand apart from the passages from the other texts that use *tr̥ṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati*. It is my hope that further research will expand upon the conclusions we tentatively draw here but for the time being, we must conclude with the reiteration that this is a preliminary study and as such there are distinct limits to the conclusions we can draw. Further work must be done on this issue involving searching for the phrase in other, varied sources. I suspect a thorough search for this phrase in Chinese and Tibetan sources, where many Mahāyāna texts that are no longer extant in Sanskrit are still available, would yield valuable results that would serve to refine, contextualize, or perhaps even contradict what we have been able to infer above from looking at Sanskrit and Pali sources. Another limit to the work done here is that I have relied entirely upon texts that have already been edited. As new manuscripts composed throughout a wide range of times from disparate locations and in multiple languages continue to come to light and are researched and edited by scholars it is possible that we will find more instances of the use of this phrase and that we will be able to more fully understand the textual connections stemming from the phrase *tr̥ṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati*.

약호 및 참고문헌

Abbreviations

AN : *Āṅguttara-nikāya*, ed. Richard Morris & E. Hardy, *The Āṅguttara-Nikāya*. London 1885-1900 (PTS).

Fol. : Folio

MN : *Majjhima-nikāya*, ed. V. Trenckner, R. Chalmers, *The Majjhima-Nikāya*. (repr.) Oxford 1993 (1888-1899) (PTS).

Mil : *Milindapañha*, ed. V. Trenckner, *The Milindapañho being Dialogues between king Milinda and the Buddhist sage Nāgasena*. London 1962 (PTS).

MW : Monier Williams' Sanskrit-English dictionary, Monier Monier-Williams, Ernst Leumann, and Carl Cappeller, *A Sanskrit-English dictionary etymologically and philologically arranged with special reference to cognate Indo-European languages*. Oxford: The Calarendon Press 1899.

PTS : Pali Text Society

SN : *Samyuttanikāya*, ed. L. Feer, London 1884-1898 (PTS).

Bibliography

Bagchi, S. ed. 1967. *Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra*. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts No. 8. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.

Bendall, Cecil. 1880. "The Megha-Sūtra [a Buddhist-tantric rain-charm edited in an abridged form with a translation]". *Journal of the*

- Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain & Ireland*. 1880: 286.
- _____, ed. 1897-1902. *Çikshāsamuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhistic Teaching, Compiled by Çāntideva Chiefly From Earlier Mahāyāna-Sūtras*. Bibliotheca Buddhica I. St. Petersburg: Imperial Academy.
- Dutt, Nalinaksha. 1984 (1959). *Gilgit manuscripts Vol. IV*. (repr.) Dehli: Sri Satguru Publ.
- Harrison, Paul, 2007. “The Case of the Vanishing Poet: New Light on Śāntideva and the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*”. in Konrad Klaus and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, eds. 2007. *Indica Et Tibetica: Festschrift für Michael Hahn*. Wein: Arbeitskreis Für Tibetische Und Buddhistische Studien, 215-248.
- Kimura, Takayasu, and Kichō Onozuka. 2004. *Bonbun kōtei chikō myōshō gonkyō: Kūkai no shisō to bunka = Sarvabuddhaviṣayā vatārajñānalokālamkāranāma mahāyānasūtra Sanskrit text*. [S.l.]: Nonburusha.
- Mukhopadhyaya, Sujitkumar. 1954. *The Sārdūlakarmāvadāna*. Santiniketan: Viśvabharati.
- Ñāṇamoli, and Bodhi. 1995. *The middle length discourses of the Buddha: a new translation of the Majjhima Nikāya*. Boston: Wisdom Publications in association with the Barre Center for Buddhist Studies.
- Pāṇḍeya, Janārdana Shastri, ed. 2000. *Caryāmelāpakapradīpam = Spyod pa bsdus pa'i sgron ma of Āryadeva*. Rare Buddhist Text Series (Durlabha Bauddha Grantha) 22. Sāranātha, Vārāṇasī: Śodha Yojanā, Kendrīya Ucca Tibbatī Śikṣā Saṁsthāna.

- Pedersen, K. Prescott. 1980. "Notes on the *Ratnakūṭa* Collection".
The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies.
1980: Vol. 2 No. 2.
- Poussin, Louis de De la Vallée, ed. 1901-1914. *Bodhicaryāvatāra-
pañjikā: Prajñākaramati's commentary to the Bodhicaryāvatāra of
Çāntideva*. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal.
- Senart, E. 1882-1897. *Le Mahāvastu; texte sanscrit publié pour la
première fois et accompagné d'introductions et d'un commentaire
par E. Senart*. Paris: Imprimé par autorisation du garde des sceaux
à l'Imprimerie nationale.
- Silk, Jonathan. 1994. "The Origins and Early History of the
Mahāratnakūṭa Tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism with a Study of
the *Ratnarāśīsūtra* and Related Materials." Ph.D dissertation,
University of Michigan.
- Snellgrove, David L. 1959. *The Hevajra Tantra: a critical study, Part
II Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts*. London: Oxford Univ. Pr.
- Speyer, Jacob Samuel. 1906-1909. *Avadānaçataka: A century of
edifying tales, belonging to the Hīnayāna*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 3.
St.-Petersbourg: Académie Impériale des Sciences.
- Śrāvakabhūmi Study Group (The Institute for Comprehensive Studies
of Buddhism, Taisho University)/大正大学総合佛教研究所声聞地研
究会, trans., ed. 1998. *Śrāvakabhūmi, The First Chapter, Revised
Sanskrit Text and Japanese Translation*/瑜伽論声聞地. 第一瑜伽処:
サンスクリット語 テキスト と 和訳. Tokyo: Sankibo Press.
- Staël-Holstein, Alexander Baron von. 1926. *The Kāçyapaparivarta : A
Mahāyānasūtra of the Ratnakūṭa class. Ed. in the original Sanskrit,*

in Tibetan and in Chinese by Baron A[lexander] von Staël-Holstein.
Shanghai: Commercial Press.

Tsuda, Shin'ichi. 1974. *The sanivarodaya-tantra: selected chapters.*
Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press.

Vaidya, P. L., ed. 1958. *Avadāna-Śataka.* Buddhist Sanskrit Texts No.
19. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and
Research in Sanskrit Learning.

_____, ed. 1958. *Lalita-Vistara.* Buddhist Sanskrit Texts No. 1.
Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research
in Sanskrit Learning.

_____, ed. 1960a. *Aṣṭasāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā.* Buddhist
Sanskrit Texts No. 4. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate
Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.

_____, ed. 1960b. *Bodhicaryāvatāra of Śāntideva with the
commentary Pañjikā of Prajñākaramati.* Buddhist Sanskrit Texts
No. 12. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and
Research in Sanskrit Learning.

_____, ed. 1960c. *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtram.* Buddhist Sanskrit Texts
No. 5. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and
Research in Sanskrit Learning.

_____, ed. 1960d. *Madhyamakaśāstra of Nāgārjuna: with the
commentary: Prasannapadā by Candrakīrti.* Buddhist Sanskrit Texts
No. 10. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and
Research in Sanskrit Learning.

_____, ed. 1960e. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra.* Buddhist Sanskrit
Texts No. 6. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies

and Research in Sanskrit Learning.

_____, ed. 1961a. *Mahāyāna-sūtra-saṅgrahaḥ 1*. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts No. 17. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.

_____, ed. 1961b. *Samādhirājasūtra*. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts No. 2. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.

_____, ed. 1963. *Saddharmalankāvatārasūtra*. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts No.3. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning.

Vorobeva-Desiatovskaia, M. I., Seishi Karashima, and Noriyuki Kudo. 2002. *The Kāśyapaparivarta: romanized text and facsimiles*. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica, V. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.

Wedemeyer, Christian K. 2007. *Āryadeva's Lamp that integrates the practices (Caryāmelāpakapradīpa): the gradual path of Vajrayāna Buddhism according to the esoteric community noble tradition*. New York: American Institute of Buddhist Studies at Columbia University.

Abstract

**Remarks on an Instance of Intertextuality in
the Eleventh Chapter of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*
and the Phrase *Trṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* in
Buddhist *Sūtra* Literature**

Charles William DiSimone

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

The *Śikṣāsamuccaya* of Śāntideva is an excellent resource for scholars interested in the relationship between Buddhist texts as a significant portion of this seventh century text is made up of quotations from other, often significantly earlier, texts and as such examples of intertextuality occur often within its pages. Taking an instance of intertextuality between a pair of passages from two texts quoted in the eleventh chapter of the *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, the *Ugradattapariṣṭhā-sūtra* and the *Ratnarāśi-sūtra*, as a starting point, this paper will explore the usage of a particular phrase shared in the passages quoted from both

texts, *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* (grass, shrubs, medicinal herbs, and forest trees), as it occurs in all available sources. By using resources available through the digitization of Buddhist literature that have only become available to modern scholars in recent years, the instances in which this particular phrase occurs in extant Sanskrit texts can be uncovered with a reasonable degree of accuracy, uncovering that it appears to be used almost exclusively within well-known Mahāyāna Buddhist texts considered to be either *vaipulya sūtras* or found as part of the *Mahāratnakūṭa sūtra* collection. This paper collects the instances where *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* occurs as well as similar phrases used in Sanskrit and Pali texts with the goal of creating a preliminary study of the use of this phrase and its variations in Sanskrit and Pali sources that provides some insight into how the texts that employ the phrase *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati* may be related and how this may further our understanding of the connection of certain types of texts in Buddhist—and especially Mahāyāna—*sūtra* literature.

Key Words: Intertextuality, Buddhist *sūtra* literature, *ṛṇagulmauṣadhivanaspati*, *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, *Ugradattaparipṛcchā-sūtra*, *Ratnarāsi-sūtra*

2015년 6월 5일 투고

2015년 6월 14일 심사완료

2015년 6월 18일 게재확정

