C.138 NOTES AND QUESTIONS - Bianchini

3.10.2018

**QUESTIONS EDITION (from bottom up) -**

Typo in .txt file, Face B Line 6 : *sṭha*] correct to *ṣṭha*

Face B Line 2 : *tulyaśīladhīḥ* ] I cannot see the long ī in *dhī*, although it would be expected.

Face A Line 12 : *amitābhavaco*] Do we have to mark the full vowel ‘a’ of *amitābha*- or is it redundant?

Face A line 12 : -*hetur* *jinālayaḥ*] We actually have -*hetur* *jjinālayaḥ*. Do we mark doubling of consonant outside word? (I noticed we do when it occurs inside, i.e. *purvvam*)

Face A Line 8 : *lokapra* - - *ntraya*] isn’t there another subscript ‘r’ between *pra* and *ntra*? Any point in writing this down?

Face A Line 6 : *praśamitanirayaṁ*] Does it not look like a ta or ka, rather than a ya? I am not familiar with this function of Vajrapāṇi in relation to hells (probably I am just ignorant of it).

Face A Line 6: - - - [C]*vajra*] Is it a vocalic ṛ before the consonsonant? Any need to write it down?

Face A Line 3 to 4: *lokeśvaran tvāṁ pra(ma)****(4)****(thita)*] I do not understand *tvāṃ* syntactically (although I think I see it on the estampage). The ma or *pramathita* looks more like a śa to me (similar to the śa in the following line: *parītā****ś*** *ca*). I cannot read the beginning of line 4 at all.

Also, isn’t there one more *anusvāra* right above the śva of *lokeśvara*? Could it be *lokeśvaraṃ* ?

Face A Line 2: *vālabhi*] The line seems to end with two syllables which both include a short i. Is the scansion correct?

Face A Line 1: *bhaugrais* ] Do you also see a long ī roughly above gr-? In general, should we mark those vowels and subscript consonants in these two first lines even if we do not get the actual wording?

**BUDDHOLOGY**

As far as I could find out, tripartite subdivisions in *dhātus* or, more often, *kulas* of the kind we see in stanzas 8-9-10 are quite common in esoteric literature. Some of these Tantras are quite early. Besides the possible sources described by Green in his article on Lokeśvara, I would also add the *Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa*. The problem is that I have not been able to find any perfectly matching treatment of the *trikulas*. As Green suggests, it could also be a local evolution based on materials circulating in South East Asia.

As for Lokeśvara and the opening section, those concepts seem to have been quite well established by this time. Maybe the *Kāraṇḍavyūha* could have been a source of inspiration locally speaking (Woodward 2004). Again, I am unfamiliar with the role played by Vajrapāṇī in the context of deliverance from hell. I will try and find out more. Besides, does the inscription really read -*nirayaṃ* on line 6?

**METADATA**

Maybe one could add to the metadata publications which discuss C.138 and offer translations of some passages? I am thinking about Green’s and Mabbett’s articles in particular.

**TRANSLATION**

I believe I generally understand the inscription. Some issues:

How to explain the *tvāṃ* in face A line 3 syntactically?

For *prāptakāpālahaste* would it be fine “once they attained the state of beggars (i.e. they became *bhikṣus*)”?

Stanza 5 looks a bit tricky to me (Huber and Majumdar translate it differently). I want to think a bit more about the translation:

*lokeśvarañ jagadvyāptaṁ śraddhābhāvair atiṣṭhi****(8)****pat· •*

*pṛthivīkīrttaye so smai dharmmadeśanayā hitaḥ ||*

As for the *trikula* portion, I would go with ‘realm’ for *dhātu* and ‘empti(ness)’ for *śūnya*.