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SUMMARY

s.1 The Dwelling Place of Mañjuśrī first presents a dialogue between Mañjuśrī and Śāriputra regarding the activity of “dwelling” (vihāra) during meditation, the nature of dharmas, and the “true nature” (tathatā). This opens into a conversation between Mañjuśrī and a large gathering of monks whereby Mañjuśrī corrects the monks’ misinterpretations. Mañjuśrī then instructs Śāriputra on the enduring and indestructible nature of the realm of sentient beings and the realm of reality. Finally, the power of Mañjuśrī’s teaching is explained and reiterated by the Buddha.
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INTRODUCTION

i.1 The Dwelling Place of Mañjuśrī opens with the Buddha Śākyamuni residing in Rājagṛha on Grdhṛakūṭa Mountain together with a great monastic assembly of five hundred monks and a multitude of bodhisattvas. After the Buddha has delivered a Dharma teaching, Mañjuśrī walks through the monastic quarters of the area and sees Śāriputra engaged in meditation among the residences of the five hundred monks. There follows a dialogue between Mañjuśrī and Śāriputra regarding the activity of “dwelling” during meditation, the nature of dharmas, and the “true nature.” This opens into a conversation between Mañjuśrī and the five hundred monks in which Mañjuśrī corrects the monks’ misinterpretations. Finally, Mañjuśrī instructs Śāriputra on the non-decrease and non-increase of the realm of sentient beings (sattvadhātu) and the realm of reality (dharmadhātu)—an instruction that indicates the nonconceptual, immutable, and indestructible nature of awakening. Because this nature, symbolized by Mañjuśrī himself, does not dwell anywhere, it is without any dwelling place, in other words without any determinate location or foundation. The power of Mañjuśrī’s teaching is explained and reiterated by the Buddha. The sūtra concludes with the Buddha predicting the future awakening of the five hundred monks and eighty thousand gods who are present in the audience.

i.2 The sūtra is not extant in Sanskrit but is preserved in Chinese, Tibetan, and Mongolian versions. There are two Chinese versions: the 文殊師利巡行經 Wén shū shī lì xún xíng jīng translated by Bodhiruci ca. 508–535 CE (Taishō 470) and the 文殊尸利行經 Wén shū shī lì xíng jīng translated by Jñānagupta in 586 CE (Taishō 471). The Tibetan version is preserved in Dunhuang manuscripts and in Tibetan Kangyur editions. A recently published critical edition of the Tibetan version of this sūtra identifies two extant Dunhuang Tibetan manuscripts and three fragments and utilizes seventeen available Kangyur and proto-Kangyur editions. The Dunhuang manuscripts contain an early Tibetan edition that was translated before the implementation of codified rules and principles for translating Buddhist texts issued by the Tibetan emperor Trisong Detsen (r.
800–815 CE). Still, the Dunhuang manuscripts and the canonical Kangyur versions contain the same recension of the sūtra, with some minor differences in terminology and idiomatic expressions. The Chinese versions generally match the Tibetan version, though they do contain several terms that point to different Sanskrit originals as well as portions that are missing from the Tibetan.4

The Dwelling Place of Mañjuśrī is also recorded in the Denkarma5 and Phangthangma6 inventories of Tibetan imperial translations, so we can establish that it was first translated from Sanskrit into Tibetan no later than the early ninth century, as the Denkarma is dated to 812 CE. The late thirteenth-century catalog of the Tibetan Kadampa master Darma Gyaltsen (1227–1305), commonly known as Chomden Raldri, lists the sūtra as The Noble Sūtra “The Dwelling Place of Mañjuśrī.”7 A listing of texts appended to the history of Buddhism in India and Tibet composed by Butön Rinchen Drup (1290–1364) lists the work under the same title but adds that it was translated by Yeshé Dé and consists of one hundred and forty ślokas.8 Among Kangyurs that have a colophon, the translators listed are the Indian teacher Surendrabodhi and the translator in charge of the revision, venerable Yeshé Dé.

The sūtra enjoyed some popularity in eighth- and ninth-century Tibet, a fact attested to by its inclusion among the one hundred and four titles of Buddhist scriptures found in Mahāvyutpatti §1329 and the number of extant Tibetan Dunhuang fragments. The sūtra was also cited in several early Tibetan treatises from Dunhuang9 and two times by Vimalamitra (eighth century) in his commentary on nonconceptual meditation.10 The sūtra is also sporadically cited in later Tibetan commentaries11 and was briefly analyzed by Pekar Sangpo (sixteenth century) in his overview of the sūtras preserved among Tibetan Kangyurs.12

The Dwelling Place of Mañjuśrī (in Sanskrit Mañjuśrīvihāra) is a discourse that plays on the Sanskrit word vihāra, which can variously mean (1) dwelling place, (2) condition of existence, (3) walking about,13 (4) monastery, (5) pleasure ground, (6) sport, (7) arrangement, or distribution.14 The Chinese translators understood the title of the term in the sense of (3), with Bodhiruci translating the title as Mañjuśrī’s “going around” (巡行) and Jñānagupta translating the nearly synonymous Mañjuśrī’s “wandering” (行).15 This connotation refers to the opening scene, in which Mañjuśrī wanders about the monastic residences. This sense is not captured in the Tibetan translation gnas pa, which corresponds only to connotations (1) or (2) among the possibilities listed above. Without a Sanskrit manuscript of the text, we cannot be sure of the exact connotation of vihāra, but the context throughout the sūtra implies that the “dwelling place” of Mañjuśrī is not a determinate place. The dwelling place that Mañjuśrī explains to Śāriputra and the five hundred monks is the realm of reality, which is beyond
time, unlocalized, immovable, and inaccessible to conceptual thought. Awakening in this sūtra is characterized as the nonconceptual awareness of the infinite realm of reality.

In the first half of the sūtra, Mañjuśrī criticizes various presuppositions underlying Śāriputra’s conceptual understanding of concentration and its role in spiritual practice (i.3), the past, present, and future (i.5, i.11), comprehension (i.16), and the “dwelling place” of an arhat (i.18). Although difficult to verify, the presuppositions of Śāriputra may well represent the mainstream Buddhist understandings of a person following the Abhidharma of the Sarvāstivādin ordination lineage, particularly Śāriputra’s advocacy of the practice of standing firm in the past, present, and future. According to Pekar Sangpo, the concise meaning of this part of the sūtra is that Śāriputra is taught, as a response to Mañjuśrī’s questions, the emptiness that by nature is free from the conceptual fabrication of anything.

The second half (i.21–1.41) of the sūtra consists of a dialogue that develops between Mañjuśrī and the five hundred monks in the audience. The five hundred monks are initially disturbed by and reject Mañjuśrī’s teaching and move away from him, but the monks then return upon Mañjuśrī’s further instruction to Śāriputra. Mañjuśrī’s additional instruction to Śāriputra is the cause for four hundred of the monks’ minds to be liberated from the pollutions. However, one hundred monks fall into a deep hell realm due to being greatly disturbed by Mañjuśrī’s instruction. Śāriputra then questions Mañjuśrī’s motives and mode of teaching. The Buddha comes to the defense of Mañjuśrī and explains the great karmic benefit of hearing the profound Dharma for these monks, even if they doubt it. The Buddha predicts that the monks will swiftly be reborn in Tuṣita heaven after their instructive interlude in hell and that they will then become arhat disciples under the future Buddha Maitreya. Tibetan scholars like Situ Penchen Chökyi Jungné (1700–1774) cite this episode as an example of the power of the profound Dharma to bring great positive effects, even for those who have doubt and do not follow the instruction.

After Śāriputra praises Mañjuśrī on his eloquence in explaining the Dharma, Mañjuśrī proceeds to instruct the audience on the “non-decrease and non-increase” (anūnatvatpūrṇatva) of the realm of sentient beings and the realm of reality (i.27). The topic of “non-decrease and non-increase” is an important theme in a number of Mahāyāna sūtras, such as The Perfection of Wisdom in Seven Hundred Lines (Toh 24), The Questions of Suvikrāntavikrāmin (Toh 14), and The Absorption That Encapsulates All Merit (Toh 134 (https://read.84000.co/translation/toh134.html)), along with various sūtras of the Heap of Jewels (Ratnakūṭa) class and even the Heart Sūtra. The Anūnatvatpūrṇatvanīdesaparivarta, a discourse that bears the name of this topic and is preserved only in Chinese, connects this topic with the teaching of
Buddha nature (tathāgatagarbha). The Dwelling Place of Mañjuśrī, however, equates the non-increasing and non-decreasing true nature with the realm of reality and the realm of sentient beings. The non-increase and non-decrease of the realm of sentient beings and the realm of reality is explained in The Questions of Suvikrāntavikrāmin, where both realms are said to lack any intrinsic essence, are infinite, and are designated through conventional expressions. The Buddha explains to Suvikrāntavikrāmin that “non-decrease and non-increase” is a synonym for the vision of how things are in a nonconceptual manner. The Dwelling Place of Mañjuśrī concurs with this understanding, where the text reads, “that which is uncurtailed in this way is awakening. Awakening is liberation. Liberation is nonconceptual. The nonconceptual is unfabricated and immutable. The unfabricated and immutable is wholly beyond suffering.” Because this nonconceptual nature, which is symbolized by Mañjuśrī himself, does not dwell anywhere, it is without a fixed dwelling place, in other words without any metaphysical foundation.

The Prajñāpāramitā literature seems to have also exerted an influence on The Dwelling Place of Mañjuśrī, as there are several themes found in the sūtra that are redolent of earlier Prajñāpāramitā discourses. For example, the sūtra mentions that arhats are “constituted by the unconditioned,” a phrase found throughout the Prajñāpāramitā literature and particularly well known from The Sūtra on the Perfection of Wisdom “The Diamond Cutter” (Toh 16). At the conclusion of The Dwelling Place of Mañjuśrī, the Buddha predicts that the audience will achieve complete Buddhahood “in the eon called Star-like,” a prediction that is also given in a number of Prajñāpāramitā discourses. We also note that a parallel to the episode of the monks falling into hell is found in the sūtra Teaching the Practice of a Bodhisattva (Toh 184 (https://read.84000.co/translation/toh184.html)).
The Noble Mahāyāna Sūtra

The Dwelling Place of Mañjuśrī

1.1 [F.266.b] Homage to all buddhas and bodhisattvas!

Thus did I hear at one time. The Bhagavān was staying at Rājagṛha, on Grdhraṅkūṭa Mountain, together with a large community of a full five hundred monks and a great congregation of bodhisattvas. At that time, the Bhagavān, after emerging in the late afternoon from secluded meditation,27 surrounded and honored by a great assembly, taught the Dharma.

1.2 Subsequently, the youthful Mañjuśrī was walking about, going from residence to residence among all five hundred monks. When he went to the residence where the elder Śāriputra lived, Mañjuśrī saw him sitting alone in solitude, practicing concentration while in meditative seclusion.

1.3 When he saw him, he said the following words to the elder Śāriputra: “Honorable Śāriputra, are you practicing concentration?” “Yes,” replied Śāriputra, “it is so, Mañjuśrī.”

1.4 “Honorable Śāriputra,” said Mañjuśrī, “are you concentrating in order to abandon afflictions that have already been abandoned? Or are you concentrating in order to abandon those that have not yet been abandoned?

1.5 “Honorable Śāriputra, are you concentrating while dwelling on the past? Are you concentrating while dwelling on the future? Or are you concentrating while dwelling on the present?28 Honorable Śāriputra, are you concentrating while dwelling on bodily form? Are you concentrating while dwelling on feelings, perceptions, volitional formations, or consciousness? Honorable Śāriputra, are you concentrating while dwelling on the eye? Or are you concentrating while dwelling on the nose, ear, tongue, body, or mind?
Honorable Śāriputra, [F.267.a] are you concentrating while dwelling on visible form? Or are you concentrating while dwelling on sound, smell, taste, touch, or other phenomena?

“Honorable Śāriputra, are you concentrating while dwelling on the desire realm? Or are you concentrating while dwelling on the form realm or the formless realm?”

“Honorable Śāriputra, are you concentrating while dwelling on the internal? Or are you concentrating while dwelling on the external? Or are you concentrating while dwelling on the internal and external? Honorable Śāriputra, are you concentrating while dwelling on the body? Or are you concentrating while dwelling on the mind?”

“Mañjuśrī,” replied Śāriputra, “I am practicing concentration in order to dwell in bliss for this life and to dwell in nonforgetfulness.”

Mañjuśrī then asked, “Honorable Śāriputra, do you apprehend any dharmas that dwell in bliss in this life, or that dwell in bliss in what is not this life, or that are without forgetfulness?”

“Mañjuśrī,” Śāriputra replied, “I truly do not observe or apprehend any dharmas that dwell in bliss in this life or that dwell in bliss in what is not this life. However, Mañjuśrī, I rely and dwell on what the Tathāgata taught to śrāvakas as the doctrine of disengagement.”

Mañjuśrī then asked, “Honorable Śāriputra, what is it that the Tathāgata taught to śrāvakas as the doctrine of disengagement and that you, honorable Śāriputra, rely and dwell on?”

Śāriputra replied, “In this regard, Mañjuśrī, a monk relies and dwells on the past, relies and dwells on the future, and relies and dwells on the present. In brief, as mentioned before, one should understand that he relies and dwells as mentioned before all the way up to the mind. Mañjuśrī, the Tathāgata taught these śrāvakas that these dharmas are disengaged, and I rely and dwell on these dharmas.”

Mañjuśrī then asked, “Honorable Śāriputra, why do you say, ‘I rely and dwell on the past, rely and dwell on the future, rely on the present, dwell in disengagement, and, in brief, rely on and dwell in disengagement as mentioned before all the way up to the mind’? It is like this, honorable Śāriputra: a true nature of the past does not exist. A true nature of the future does not exist. A true nature of the present does not exist. In this way, if these dharmas do not exist, then how can the elder Śāriputra say, ‘I rely and dwell on the past, rely and dwell on the future, and rely and dwell on the present’? Dharmas that do not exist have no basis.

“Further, honorable Śāriputra, there is nothing that is a true nature of the past and a true nature of the future and the present. Nor are phenomena caused by anything. Nor do they belong to anything. They are not based anywhere.
There is nothing apprehended as a basis of what is not based anywhere.

"Further, honorable Śāriputra, those who speak of a ‘true nature’ of the past, the future, and the present and who thus propound stability deprecate the Tathāgata. Why is this? It is because a true nature is immovable and without vain imaginings. It is because a true nature is uncorrupted. It is because true nature is empty, without signs, and wishless.

"Further, honorable Śāriputra, a true nature of the past cannot be apprehended. A true nature of the future cannot be apprehended. A true nature of the present cannot be apprehended. And, in brief, the true nature of everything up to mind cannot be apprehended. However, honorable Śāriputra, besides the true nature, one does not apprehend any other dharma capable of being shown or explained."

Śāriputra then asked, "Mañjuśrī, does the Tathāgata teach the Dharma while residing in the true nature?"

"Honorable Śāriputra," Mañjuśrī replied, "if a true nature does not exist, then how can the Tathāgata reside in the true nature and teach the Dharma? If the Dharma also does not exist, then how can the Tathāgata reside in the true nature and teach the Dharma? If the Tathāgata also does not exist, then how can the Tathāgata reside in the true nature and teach the Dharma? All dharmas do not exist and cannot be apprehended. The Tathāgata also does not exist and cannot be apprehended. When his Dharma is taught, it is like this: it is without distinction between either apprehending or not apprehending. The Tathāgata himself is not distinguished by the expressible or the inexpressible. Why is this? Because, honorable Śāriputra, the Tathāgata is completely cut off from expression, involves no designation, and is not something that can be designated."

Śāriputra then asked, "Mañjuśrī, who will become a recipient for a Dharma teaching such as this?"

Mañjuśrī said, "Honorable Śāriputra, one who is not disturbed in the conditioned realm and who does not desire complete nirvāṇa will be a recipient for a Dharma teaching like this. One who does not apprehend dharmas of the past, does not comprehend dharmas of the past, does not apprehend dharmas of the past, present, or future, and does not comprehend dharmas of the past, present, or future will be a recipient for a Dharma teaching such as this. One who neither sees nor appropriates defilements and purifications will be a recipient for a Dharma teaching such as this. One who does not pursue either self or nonself and who does not pursue acquiring and relinquishing is a recipient for a [F.268.b] Dharma teaching such as this. That one will comprehend the meaning of this exposition."

"Mañjuśrī, in this regard, what is comprehended?" asked Śāriputra.
Mañjuśrī then asked, “Honorable Śāriputra, if there were to be something that constitutes the meaning of this exposition, then ask, ‘In this regard, what is comprehended?’ ”

“Mañjuśrī, this profound Dharma teaching is rarely directly perceived,” said Śāriputra. “It is rarely fully apprehended. Mañjuśrī, if even arhats, those in training, and those beyond training grow discouraged regarding this location, how much more so are childish ordinary beings.”

“Honorable Śāriputra,” said Mañjuśrī, “arhats do not have a dwelling place. Why is this? Because if even arhats do not exist, in what place would an arhat dwell? Arhats are thus distinguished by being without dwelling place. Arhats are distinguished by being without apprehension. Arhats are distinguished by having fully cut off the expressible and inexpressible. Why is this? Because as arhats have fully cut off the expressible and inexpressible, they are free from designation. Arhats are free from distinctions concerning places.

“They are distinguished by the unconditioned. They are without engagement. They are distinguished by the unconditioned because if arhats are unconditioned and without dwelling place, what would be the dwelling place of arhats?

“Arhats are not distinguished by name and form. Childish ordinary beings conceptualize name and form. Name and form are understood by arhats to be without conceptions and without conceptualizing. Therefore, arhats are not distinguished by name and form. Even childish beings are not apprehended. The qualities of childish beings, arhats, and arhat qualities are also not apprehended. At the time they are not apprehended, they are not conceived. They are not dealt with. [F.269.a] Without being dealt with, they are unelaborated and peaceful.

“One does not accept their ‘existence,’ nor does one accept their ‘nonexistence.’ One also does not accept that they are both existent while existing and nonexistent while not existing. Nor does one accept that they are neither existent nor nonexistent. When one does not accept any of these, there is no apprehension. Being free from all apprehensions—without thought and free from thought—we speak of one who dwells in the quality of spiritual practice by way of being without dwelling place.”

Once this teaching had been explained by the youthful Mañjuśrī, the five hundred monks of the retinue got up from their seats saying, “We do not see the youthful Mañjuśrī. We do not hear the youthful Mañjuśrī. Any location where the youthful Mañjuśrī could dwell should be abandoned. Why is that? The youthful Mañjuśrī has shown in a blatant manner that the defilements and purifications have a single characteristic.” They thought that he had thereby
said something that was not Dharma, and thinking, “How can we thus train in
the doctrine that is well spoken by the Bhagavān and practice pure moral
conduct?” they departed.

The elder Śāriputra then asked the youthful Mañjuśrī, “Mañjuśrī, do you not
teach the Dharma so that sentient beings may comprehend the Dharma?”

Mañjuśrī replied, “Yes, Honorable Śāriputra.”

Śāriputra said, “Having arisen from their seats, those five hundred monks
have spoken disparagingly and unpleasantly, and they have departed.”

“Honorable Śāriputra, it is good,” said Mañjuśrī, “it is good that those five
hundred monks said, ‘We do not see the youthful Mañjuśrī. We do not hear the
youthful Mañjuśrī. Any location where youthful Mañjuśrī could dwell should
be abandoned. Śāriputra, [F.269.b] the words of these monks are well spoken.
Why is that? Because the youthful Mañjuśrī does not exist and cannot be
apprehended. That which does not exist and cannot be apprehended cannot be
seen and cannot be heard. Any location where the youthful Mañjuśrī could
dwell should be abandoned. Why is that? Because, since the youthful Mañjuśrī
does not exist and cannot be apprehended, any place he could dwell also does
not exist and cannot be apprehended. And one should not try to rely on what
does not exist and cannot be apprehended.”

When those five hundred monks had heard this teaching by the youthful
Mañjuśrī, they again returned to their places and said the following words to
the youthful Mañjuśrī: “Mañjuśrī, why do we not understand what you just
taught?”

Mañjuśrī replied, “This is good, monks, this is good. Such are the activities of
the Teacher’s hearers. In this regard, monks, there is nothing to comprehend
and there is nothing to cognize. Why is this? Because this realm of reality is
the very state of dwelling in the manner of being without dwelling place. That
which is the realm of reality is not a realm. That which does not exist and
cannot be apprehended is also immovable and without death and rebirth. That
which is immovable and without death and rebirth is not something
comprehensible. It is not something cognizable. Those who are without the
vain imaginings of comprehension and cognition are called hearers of the Teacher.
They are called those who have attained the supreme, leaders, and those worthy of
offerings.”

Upon explaining this teaching, among the five hundred monks the minds of
four hundred monks were liberated from the pollutions without any further
clinging. The minds of one hundred monks grew increasingly disturbed, and
their bodily existences and mental states were plunged into the great hell of
Howling.
Venerable Śāriputra then said to the youthful Mañjuśrī, “Mañjuśrī, [F.270.a] I am shocked that one hundred monks have all gone to ruin because you did not teach a Dharma that protects sentient beings.”

Thereupon the Bhagavān replied to the elder Śāriputra, “Śāriputra, do not say such things. Why? Śāriputra, those one hundred monks will come into contact with the great hell of Howling for only a moment, and they will then take rebirth together among the gods of Tuṣita heaven. Śāriputra, if these monks had not heard this Dharma discourse, they would undoubtedly have gone to hell, and having exhausted their karma, some would have taken rebirth as humans. But since they have relied upon this Dharma discourse, even those deeds that would cause other beings to experience hell for an eon will, for them, cause that experience for only a short while. Therefore, Śāriputra, those one hundred monks will be included among the initial hearers of the tathāgata Maitreya and become arhats who have exhausted their pollutions. Since that is so, Śāriputra, for this Dharma discourse to be heard by those who have doubt is excellent indeed, in a way that is not the case for the attainment of the four meditative concentrations, in a way that is not the case for the four immeasurables, and in a way that is not the case for the cultivation of the four formless attainments. Why is that? Because without hearing such a Dharma discourse, one will not be liberated from cyclic existence, nor will one be liberated from birth, ageing, sickness, death, sorrow, lamentation, suffering, sadness, and agitation.”

The venerable Śāriputra then said to the youthful Mañjuśrī, “Mañjuśrī, it is amazing how you have matured sentient beings through your eloquent explanation of this Dharma discourse.”

“Honorable Śāriputra,” replied Mañjuśrī, “the true nature does not diminish, nor does it increase. The realm of reality does not diminish [F.270.b], nor does it increase. The realm of sentient beings does not diminish, nor does it increase. They are not defiled, nor are they purified. Why is this? Because these things do not exist and cannot be apprehended. They are nothing at all, as they amount to nothing but mere conventions. They are not caused by anything at all. They do not dwell anywhere at all and are without dwelling place. Honorable Śāriputra, that which is uncurtailed in this way is awakening. Awakening is liberation. Liberation is nonconceptual. The nonconceptual is unfabricated and immutable. The unfabricated and immutable is wholly beyond suffering.”

Thereupon, the Bhagavān said to the elder Śāriputra, “Śāriputra, it is just as the youthful Mañjuśrī has taught. True nature does not diminish, nor does it increase. The realm of reality also does not diminish, nor does it increase. The realm of sentient beings does not diminish, nor does it increase. It is not defiled, nor is it purified. Why is this? Because these things do not exist and cannot be
apprehended. They are nothing at all, as they amount to nothing more than mere conventions. They are not caused by anything at all. They do not dwell anywhere at all and are without dwelling place.”

1.29 At that time, the Bhagavān uttered these verses:

“We speak of dharmas
Of the past, present, and future.
They are actually not so, for these are mere conventions.
They do not have the characteristics of being one or many. [1]

1.30 “What is conceptualized as being without characteristics
Will itself become a characteristic.
What is without characteristics is nonconceptual;
Conceptuality is not a characteristic either. [2]

1.31 “That which is conceptualized as conditioned
And that which is conceptualized as nirvāṇa
Are both explained by the wise
As the workings of Māra. [3]

1.32 “All of the aggregates, sensory media, and elements
Are formulated by name.
The names and the unproduced
Are both of a single characteristic. [4] [F.271.a]

1.33 “What is properly conceptualized
Is itself not proper.
The wise do not conceptualize even a little bit—
Their sphere of activity is actually empty. [5]

1.34 “Those who conceptualize waver about;
Those who do not conceptualize are unwavering.
Concepts produce wavering;
Being without concepts is nirvāṇa. [6]

1.35 “Those who understand this nature
Are known as wisdom bearers.
On that account they have attained cessation.
That is nonconceptual wisdom. [7]

1.36 “With wisdom is wisdom proclaimed.
Even proclamations of wisdom are vain.
Those who have acceptance via such wisdom
Are known as wisdom bearers. [8]
“The acceptance by which one accepts a holy Dharma of this sort
Is the supreme acceptance
Superior to the generosity
Of filling the trichiliocosms with jewels as offerings. [9]

“Practicing, for incalculable millions of eons,
Giving, morality, forbearance,
Diligent effort, and concentration
Is not equal to this sūtra. [10]

“This Dharma and this vehicle
Were taught by the perfectly complete Buddha.
When relying on this sūtra
All will become tathāgatas.” [11]

When this Dharma discourse had been explained, one hundred thousand living beings purified the Dharma eye with regard to dharmas so that it was dustless and stainless. The minds of five hundred monks were liberated from the pollutions without any further clinging. Eighty thousand gods belonging to the form realm generated the mind set on unexcelled, perfectly complete awakening. The Bhagavān predicted that they would all realize unexcelled, perfectly complete awakening in the eon called Star-like and that all of them would then bear the same name: the tathāgata, arhat, perfectly complete buddha Flower. When the Bhagavān had said this, the youthful Mañjuśrī, the venerable Śāriputra, and the world with its gods, humans, asuras, and gandharvas [F.271.b] rejoiced and praised the proclamation of the Bhagavān.

This concludes The Noble Mahāyāna Sūtra “The Dwelling Place of Mañjuśrī.”
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D  Degé Printed Kangyur
Go  Gondhla Collection Proto-Kangyur
J  Lithang Printed Kangyur
KO  Peking Qianlong Printed Kangyur
L  London Manuscript Kangyur
Ne  Bathang Manuscript Kangyur
S  Stok Palace Manuscript Kangyur
Ta  Tabo Manuscript
V  Ulanbatar Manuscript Kangyur
Y  Yongle Printed Kangyur
Z  Shey Palace Manuscript Kangyur
This version is mentioned by Nakamura 1980 (p. 167) but is there misspelled as Mañjuśrīvikārasūtra.

See Apple 2014.

See Kapstein 2013.

We have indicated a number of these differences in the notes. Along these lines, we have also numbered the verses for reference and editing purposes.

Denkarma, folio 299.a. See also Herrmann-Pfandt 2008, p. 104, no. 195.

Phagthangma, p. 16.


Nishioka 1980, p. 74, §279. One śloka is a unit of 32 syllables in the original Sanskrit.

These sources cite the text as ’jam dpal gnas pa’i mdo. Included among these treatises is a Dunhuang fragment of the rna lbyor chen por bsgom pa’i don attributed to Puk Yeshé Yang (771–850 CE) (IOL Tib J 705 (http://idp.bl.uk:80/database/oo_loader.a4d?pm=IOL Tib J 705;img=1)). Tabo fragments of this treatise preserve three citations of the sūtra (Otokawa 1999, pp. 130, 147, and 151).

cig car ’jug pa rnam par mi rtog pa’i bsgom don (D 3910, folios 8.b, 12.a–b).

See, for example, Gyamtso 2008, pp.139–41.

Pekar Sangpo 2006, p. 266.

This meaning of the Sanskrit verb vihṛ- is related to another meaning that is not commonly found in Buddhist literature, “to roam about for one’s pleasure” or “to walk around at leisure.” One of the Chinese translations (Taishō 470) has in fact rendered the word vihāra in the title of the sūtra as 追行 (“strolling around”), and it also uses these characters for the part in the sūtra where Mañjuśrī “walks about” among the monastic dwellings. It therefore may be that
the underlying Sanskrit of this sūtra would have also attested to this use of the verb. However, the title of the later Chinese translation (Taishō 471) only uses the word 行 (literally “to go” but also “to practice”), which thus covers the more common, practice-oriented meaning of vihāra, “dwelling.”

n.14 Edgerton 1953, p. 505; Monier-Williams 1899, p. 1003.

n.15 Meisig and Meisig 2012, p. 207.

n.16 Pekar Sangpo 2006, p. 265.


n.19 Chang p. 64, p. 101 and 177.

n.20 Lopez 1988, pp. 82–83.

n.21 Shiu 2006.


n.25 Skilling 2012, pp. 119, 121, and 125.


n.27 Tib. phyem red kyi dus kyi tshe nang du yang dag ’jog las bzhengs nas is, as noted by Harrison 1990 (p. 8, n. 8), related to the Pāli sāyaṇhasamayam paṭisallāṇa vuṭṭhito and Sanskrit sāyāhṇa(kāla)samaye pratisamlayanād vyutthāya, “emerging towards evening from solitary meditation.”

n.28 The following questions from “…bodily form?” to “…the formless realm” are missing in Taishō 470.

n.29 Taishō 470 translates “teaching freedom from desire” for “doctrine of disengagement” throughout the sūtra.

n.30 This text takes issue with the thesis of the Sarvāstivādin school that the past, present, and future really and substantially exist (Bareau 2013, p. 177ff.).

n.31 Taishō 470 reads tathāgata rather than tathatā.

n.32 Taishō 470 reads tathāgata rather than tathatā.
Taishō 470 reads *tathāgata* rather than *tathatā*.

Taishō 470 states “true nature is irreversible, true nature has no aspect.”

I have based the translation on the Dunhuang (IOL Tib J 149 (http://idp.bl.uk:80/database/oo_loader.a4d?pm=IOL Tib J 149;img=1), folio 6.a), as all the later Kangyurs, including D, add *mi slob pa rnams kyang* “even those not in training” (*aśaikṣa*). However, arhats are synonymous with *aśaikṣas*, and so this phrase seems to be an addition to the text.

dge sbyong gi chos ≈ śramaṇadharma (*samaṇadhamma*). See Anālayo 2009 for this concept in early Buddhist sources. The Thempangma (L, S, V, and Z) and Tabo (Ta) manuscripts read dge slong for dge sbyong, a frequent wrong reading in Tibetan Kangyurs. Taishō 470 has “dwells in the quality of a śrāvaka” instead of “dwells in the quality of spiritual practice.”

Taishō 470 begins this paragraph with, “At that time, after Mañjuśrī completed this teaching, the five hundred monks stood up from their seats and left, saying, ‘We do not view Mañjuśrī’s body; we do not listen for Mañjuśrī’s name. Wherever Mañjuśrī is and dwells, we should abandon that place. Why? Mañjuśrī is at variance with our pure moral conduct (*brahmacarya*). Thus, we should abandon him.’”

“Hearer” translates *śrāvaka*.

Taishō 470 for the following two sentences has, “Because this realm of reality is itself dharmatā, the way things are, the realm of reality has no thought or regression.”


The Dunhuang manuscript (IOL Tib J 149 (http://idp.bl.uk:80/database/oo_loader.a4d?pm=IOL Tib J 149;img=1)) reads ’khyims = pariveṣin (“to circle about”) rather than *chud zos te ngo mtshar byas*.

Taishō 470 adds “because these monks were able to listen to this Dharma.”

Taishō 470 adds “for one kalpa.”

Taishō 470 is missing “They are not defiled, nor are they purified.”

Taishō 470 is missing the remainder of the quotation.

Taishō 470 reads, “At that time, the World Honored One, in order to reveal this meaning again, uttered these verses.”
Taishō 470 has the same number of verses, but there are differences in style, terminology, and idioms of expression that we have not noted.

I have based the translation on the Dunhuang (IOL Tib J 149), which reads 'dus byas la ni gang rtog against all Kangyur editions, which read 'dus ma byas la gang rtog (“that which is conceptualized as unconditioned”). The Dunhuang reading matches an early Tibetan commentary attributed to Puk Yeshé Yang (771–850 CE), which preserves the reading 'dus byas la ni gang rtog (Otokawa 1999, p. 151). The Kangyur reading does not fit the context, as the unconditioned ('dus ma byas) and nirvāṇa (mya ngan ’das) are quite often synonyms.

I have based the translation on the Dunhuang (IOL Tib J 149) and other Kangyurs (Go, L, Ne, K, and Ta), which read ming dang skye med gang yin pa against Degé, which reads ming dang skye mched gang yin pa (“The names and sense-bases”).

Note that all editions read zad pa except for Degé, which reads zag pa. See Apple 2014, p. 315, n. 400.

Taishō 470 reads “ten thousand.”

Taishō 470 reads “Five hundred monks generated the mind set on unexcelled, true, and complete awakening.”

Taishō 470 reads “Dharma Flower.”
’phags pa ’jam dpal gnas pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po’i mdo (Āryamañjuśrīvīrā-
nāmamahāyānasūtra). Degé Kangyur vol. 61 (mdo sde, tsa), folios 266.b–271.b.


’phags pa ’jam dpal gnas pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po’i mdo. Choné Kangyur vol. 41 (mdo sde, tsa), folios 328.a–333.b.

’phags pa ’jam dpal gnas pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po’i mdo. Gondhla Collection Kangyur vol. 16 (ka), folios 15.a–19.a.

’phags pa ’jam dpal gnas pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po’i mdo. Hemis Kangyur 61.6 (mdo, tsa), folios 310.a–317.a.


’phags pa ’jam dpal gnas pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po’i mdo. Peking Qianlong Printed Kangyur vol. 34 (mdo sna tshogs, mu), folios 275.a–280.a.


‘phags pa ’jam dpal gnas pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po’i mdo. Stok Palace Manuscript Kangyur vol. 60 (mdo sde, ta), folios 394.a–401.a.

‘phags pa ’jam dpal gnas pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po’i mdo. Tabo Manuscript RN21 (ki 46–49); RN311 (ka 37).

‘phags pa ’jam dpal gnas pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po’i mdo. Ulanbatar Kangyur vol. 62 (mdo sde, ta), folios 370.a–377.a.


*Mahāvyutpatti (bye brag tu rtogs par byed pa chen po)*. Toh 4346, Degé Tengyur vol. 204 (sna tshogs, co), folios 1b–131a.


g.

GLOSSARY

g.1 Acceptance
   baod pa
   བཟོད་པ།
   kṣānti

g.2 Affliction
   nyen mongs pa
   རཱུང་མོངས་པ།
   kleśa

g.3 Apprehended
   dmigs pa
   དམིགས་པ།
   upalabdha · ālambana

ɡ.4 Arhat
   dgra bcom pa
   དྱག་བོམ་པ།
   arhat

ɡ.5 Asura
   lha ma yin
   བསྟན་པོ
   asura
   The traditional adversaries of the devas (gods) who are frequently portrayed in the Brahmanical
   mythology as having a disruptive effect on cosmological and social harmony.

ɡ.6 Bhagavān
   bcom ldan 'das
   བོད་ལྡན་འདས
   bhagavān
   An epithet for a buddha.

ɡ.7 Butön Rinchen Drup
   bu ston rin chen grub
   བུ་ཤེས་རིན་ཆེན་གྲུབ་
Characteristic
ntshan nyid
lakṣaṇa

Childish ordinary being
byis pa so so'i skye bo
bālapṛthagjana

Chomden Raldri
bcom ldan ral gri

Cognizable
rnam par shes pa bya ba
vijñātavya

Complete nirvāṇa
yongs su mya ngan las 'da' ba
parinirvāṇa

Comprehensible
kun shes par bya ba
saṃjñātavya

Concentrating
bsam gtan byed pa
dhyāyati
Also translated as “practicing concentration.”

Conditioned realm
'dus byas kyi khams
saṃskṛtadhātu

Darma Gyaltsen
dar ma rgyal mtshan

Defilement
kun nas ryon mong pa
saṃklésa · kleśa
Designated
\[\text{gdags par bya ba}\]
prajñāpya

Designation
\[\text{btags pa}\]
prajñapti

Dharma discourse
\[\text{chos kyi rnam grangs}\]
dharmaparyāya

Disengagement
\[\text{rab tu dben pa}\]
praviveka

Distinguished
\[\text{rab tu phye ba}\]
prabhāvita

Distinguished by the unconditioned
\[\text{’dus ma byas kyis rab tu phye ba}\]
\[\text{asaṃskṛta prabhāvita}\]
This phrase occurs throughout a number of Perfection of Wisdom discourses and several other sūtras (Apple 2014). See, for example, the Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā §7 (Harrison 2006, p. 145).

Doctrine of disengagement
\[\text{rab tu dben pa’i chos}\]
pravivekādharma

Does not diminish, nor does it increase
\[\text{’ber ba ma yin/ ’phel ba ma yin}\]
anūnatvāpūrṇatva
Also translated as “non-decrease and non-increase.” See i.8.

Dwell in bliss in this life
\[\text{tshe ’di la bde bar gnas pa}\]
dṛṣṭa dharma sukha vihāra
Refers to blissful meditative practices achieved in this life as a result of advanced progress on the path in mainstream forms of Buddhism. This phrase occurs throughout the Śrāvakabhūmi (D folios 25a, 70b, 74b, and 152a). It is synonymous with \text{mthong ba'i chos la bde bar gnas pa} (Skt. dṛṣṭa dharma sukha vihāra, “abiding in bliss in the present life”), a term applied to certain types of arhats. Cf. Apple 2013.
Dwelling place
gnas pa
གནས་པ།
vihāra
See i.5.

Empty
stong pa
ོང་པ།
śūnya
Emptiness (stong pa nyid), signlessness (mtshan ma med pa), and wishlessness (smon pa med pa) are known as the “three doors to deliverance” (trīśivimokṣaśamukhāni) or the “three concentrations” (trayaḥ samādhyāḥ) and as a set appear in both mainstream Buddhist sūtras and Mahāyāna sūtras. See Conze 1962, pp. 59–69; Lamotte 1944, pp. 1213–15; and Deleanu 2000, pp. 74–78.

Expressible
brjod pa
བྱོད་པ།
abhilāpya

Flower
me tog
Puṣpa
The name of a buddha in the future.

Four formless attainments
gzugs med pa'i snyoms par 'jug pa bzhi
gzugs med pa'i snyoms par 'jug pa bzhi
caturārūpya samāpatti
These comprise (1) the meditative absorption of the sense field of infinite space, (2) the meditative absorption of the sense field of infinite consciousness, (3) the meditative absorption of the sense field of nothing-at-all, and (4) the meditative absorption of neither perception nor non-perception.

Four immeasurables
tshad med pa bzhi
tshad med pa bzhi
caturapramāṇa
The four positive qualities of loving kindness (byams pa, maitrī), compassion (snying rje, karuṇā), sympathetic joy (dga’ ba, muditā), and equanimity (btang snyoms, upekṣā), which may be radiated towards oneself and then immeasurable sentient beings.

Four meditative concentrations
bsam gtan gzhi
bsam gtan gzhi
caturdhyāna
The four levels of meditative concentration previously attained by beings who inhabit the heavens of the form realm. These are named “first” through “fourth” and each is described at length in Buddhist texts.

Gandharva
dri za
Gandharva
Gṛdhrakūṭa Mountain
bya rdug kyi phung po
Gṛdhrakūṭa
Name of a mountain close to Rājgṛha. It is famous as the place where the Buddha is said to have taught
the Prajñāpāramitā and other teachings.

Howling
ngu 'bod
Raurava
The name of a hell realm. One of the eight hot hells.

Immovable
g.yo ba med pa
anijñana
Also translated as “unwavering.”

Immutable
'gyur ba med pa
avikāra

In brief, as mentioned before
de bzhin du sbyar te
peyālaṃ
Edgerton 1953, p. 354a.

Leader
gtso bo
śreṣṭha

Location
sa phyogs · phyogs
pradeśa

Maitreya
byams pa
Maitreya

Mañjuśrī
'jam dpal
Mañjuśrī

Māra

Meditative seclusion

Māra

Meditative seclusion

nang du yang dag bzrug pa

pratisamāyana

Mere conventions

tha snyad tsam

vyavahāramātra

Name and form

ming dang gzugs

vyavaharanāttra

Nonforgetfulness

bṛjed pa med pa

asaṃpramoṇa

One of the three qualities of mindfulness (dram pa; smṛti) including familiarization (dṛṣṭi i drgos po; samstute vastuni) and nondistraction (mi g.yeng ba; avikṣipta). See, for example, Jaini 1992 (pp. 47–59) on asaṃpramoṇa in Abhidharma literature. The “absorption of nonforgetfulness” (asaṃpramoṇa naṃ saṃādhiḥ) is listed in the Mahāvyutpatti §526.

Observe

yang dag par rjes su mthong ba

samanupaśyati

Peaceful

zhi ba

upaśānta

Pekar Sangpo

pad dkar bzang po

Pollution

zag pa

āsrava
Practicing concentration
bsam gtan byed pa
Also translated as “concentrating.”

Puk Yeshé Yang
spug ye shes dbyangs

Pure moral conduct
tslas gs par spyod pa

Purification
rnam par byang ba

Quality of spiritual practice
dge sbyong gi chos
śramaṇadharma
See Anālayo 2009 for this concept in early Buddhist sources.

Rājagṛha
rgyal po’i khab
Rājagṛha
Now known as Rājgir and located in the modern Indian state of Bihar, Rājagṛha was the capital of the kingdom of Magadha during the Buddha’s lifetime.

Realm of reality
chos kyi dbyings
dharmadhatu

Realm of sentient beings
sems can gyi kham
sattvadhatu

Recipient
snod
bhājana

Śāriputra
sA ri’i ba
Situ Penchen Chökyi Jungné

Śāriputra

Situ Penchen Chökyi Jungné

Stability

kun tu gnas

Sāntaraksitā

Star-like

skar ma lta bu

Tāropama

The name of an Eon in the future.

Surendrabodhi

Surendrabodhi

Those in training

slob pa

śaikṣa

Those who have attained the supreme

mchog thob pa

—

Train in the doctrine

chos 'dul ba

dharmāvinaya

Trichiliocosm

stong gsun gyi stong po'i 'jig rten gyi kham

Triśāhasāmāhāsāhasralokadhātu

A “thrice thousandfold universe,” i.e. a billionfold universe, sometimes called a “third-order great chiliciocosm” (trītyamahāasāhasralokadhātu), consisting of a billion worlds, i.e. a million chiliciocosms (q.v.), or a thousand dichiliocosms (q.v.). In the verse of the Tibetan source the term has been abbreviated to stong gsun.

Trisong Detsen

khris gling le btsan

 légèrement incliné
True nature
de bzhin nyid
tathatā

Tuṣita
dge’ ldan
Tuṣita
One of the heavens of Buddhist cosmology, counted among the six heavens of the desire realm, it is home of future Buddha Maitreya.

Uncorrupted
nyams pa med pa
anupahata

Uncurtailed
mi’ gog pa
anirodha

Unelaborated
spros pa med · spros med
niṣprapañca

Unfabricated
mi byed pa
akriyā

Unproduced
skye ba med pa
anutpāda

Unwavering
g yo ba med pa
anujjhana
Also translated as “immovable.”

Wisdom
ye shes
jñāna

Wisdom bearer
Emptiness (stong pa nyid), signlessness (mtshan ma med pa), and wishlessness (smon pa med pa) are known as the “three doors to deliverance” (triṇi vimokṣa mukhāni) or the “three concentrations” (trayaḥ samādhyaḥ) and as a set appear in both mainstream Buddhist sūtras and Mahāyāna sūtras. See Conze 1962, pp. 59–69; Lamotte 1944, pp. 1213–15; and Deleanu 2000, pp. 74–78.

Without any further clinging

Emptiness (stong pa nyid), signlessness (mtshan ma med pa), and wishlessness (smon pa med pa) are known as the “three doors to deliverance” (triṇi vimokṣa mukhāni) or the “three concentrations” (trayaḥ samādhyaḥ) and as a set appear in both mainstream Buddhist sūtras and Mahāyāna sūtras. See Conze 1962, pp. 59–69; Lamotte 1944, pp. 1213–15; and Deleanu 2000, pp. 74–78.

Without vain imaginings

Worthy of offerings

Yeshé Dé
Youthful Mañjuśrī

An epithet of the bodhisattva Mañjuśrī.