Musashino is also portrayed as a wide plain covered with wild grasses.

5. It was Kunikida Doppo 国木田独歩 in the Meiji 明治 era who broke away from this traditional image and discovered the beauty of stands of assorted trees (zōkibayashi 雑木林) in Musashino. However, in making this discovery he was influenced by Turgenev’s “Rendezvous” translated by Futabatei Shimei 二葉亭四迷.

6. The same thing can be said about painting too. Whereas the early modern Rimpa 琐末 school of painting (Ogata Kōrin 尾形光琳 and his successors) depicted Musashino chiefly in terms of its grassy plains and the moon rising above them, it required the techniques and powers of observation of modern Western-style painters such as Asai Chû 浅井忠 to break free from this traditional image (which did nonetheless have a beauty of its own) and look squarely at the true rural scenery of Musashino.

It is in this manner that I would summarize the characteristics of Japan’s traditional literature and art, as well as their historical vicissitudes, as reflected in writings and paintings treating of Musashino.
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A Second Tibetan Translation of the Tathāgatagarbhasūtra in the Newark Manuscript Kanjur from Bathang:
A Translation of the Early Period (snga dar)*

Michael ZIMMERMANN

Among the Tibetan Collection of the Newark Museum in Newark (New Jersey) there is an incomplete manuscript Kanjur from Bathang in Khams (East Tibet). In spite of the fact that this Kanjur was already donated to the museum as early as 1920 it is surprising that it has only recently become the object of a scholarly

*I would like to thank Prof. Deleanu Florin for taking the trouble to check my English.

The following abbreviations and graphic devices are used in this paper:

Bth Ms Kanjur from ‘Bo’ thang in Tibet, now in the Newark Museum
Ch The second of the Chinese translations of the TGS: 大方廣如來藏經 (T 667)
sGra shyor sGra shyor bom po gnyis pa (Madhyayutpatti)
MVy Mahāyutpatti, ed. R. Sakaki, 2 vol., Kyoto 1916–25 (Reprint, Tokyo 1982)
Q Peking xylograph Kanjur-Tanjur (Otani reprint), Kangxi edition of 1717–20 with missing parts supplied from the Qianlong edition of 1737; TGS in vol. 36, mDo sino tshogs Zku 239b4–274a1, no. 924
RGVV Ratnagotravibhāga (Sāramati?), ed. E.H. Johnston (The Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyāmottaratantraśāstra), Patna 1950
SP Saddharmapundarika, eds. H. Kern & B. Nanjo, St.-Petersbourg 1912 (Bibliotheca Buddhica X)
Suv Suvarṇabhūṣottamaśīla, ed. Johannes Nobel, Leipzig 1937 (Harrassowitz)
treatment of some length. In his critical edition of the *Mahāsūtras* (cp. n. 1), Peter Skilling has used internal criteria to prove that the Bathang Kanjur is affiliated to neither the *Tshāl pa* lineage nor to the *Them spangs ma* lineage of textual transmission. Its independent character can also be ascertained by external kanjurological criteria: the collection of the texts, its grouping and its order within the volumes are unique. It becomes, therefore, very plausible that “the Newark Kanjur belongs to an old and independent textual transmission that predates the compilation of the Tshāl pa and *Them spangs ma* collections.”

Contained in the *ta* volume of the sūtra section (*mdo bsde*, *ta*) of this Kanjur is the *Tathāgatagarbhasūtra (TGS).* In the process of editing the Tibetan text of this important Mahāyāna work, of which no Indic copies have come down to us, I used most of the

---


3) *Vol. ta*, folios 245bl–258a8. The title at the beginning of the volume reads *de bzhin gshags pa’s* saying *po shes bya ba’s mdo*’. The title at the beginning of the sūtra itself runs: *de bzhin gshags* <’pa’i> saying *po shes bya ba thag pa chen po’s mdo*. It seems remarkable that the Tibetan equivalent for Skt. *aryā, phags pa*, does not appear in the titles of the Bathang translation whereas it is common to all the other major Kanjurs. The spelling *mdo bsde* can be found “consistently on all tags” (Skilling, *Kanjur Manuscripts . . . . . p. 6, n. 16).
tion (assuming Tib to be earlier than Bth) cannot be excluded. In
this case the possibility that Tib was somehow incorporated by the
translator(s) of Bth should be under consideration. And, it could
well be that more complex relations exist, i.e., for example, Tib and
Bth are both based on another prior version which has not come
down to us.

However, in order to classify two renditions as vertically or hori-
izontally related to each other we need a sufficient number of com-
mon features shared by both texts.60 Now, throughout the whole
 sûtra no such common features exist. Besides a basic vocabulary
shared by both translations attesting the standardization of Bud-
hist technical terms to a certain degree and parallels due to the
Tibetan grammar, e.g., the position of the verb at the end of the
sentence (at least in the prose), Bth and Tib do not show further
common points. The marked differences in their choice of vocabu-
lar y and word order rather point at a typical case of independent
translations. We cannot but assume that Bth and Tib are independent
translations. Though we cannot completely rule out the pos-
60) This should even be possible to a certain degree if we assume several re-
visions of one or both of the texts in later times or far-reaching mistakes in transmis-
sion caused by copyists of following centuries.

In this regard I find it hard to agree with John Powers’ analysis of the two
versions of the Sandhinirmochanasûtra represented by the Peking, Derge, Lhasa,
Narthang and Cone editions, on the one hand, and the Stog and Tokyo editions, on
the other (cp. “The Tibetan Translations of the Sandhinirmochana-sûtra and Bha-
ces in Terminology, Word Order, Spelling, Meaning and Missing Words and/or
Phrases” which he cites are by no means sufficient to speak of two “distinct trans-
lations” (p. 199). In comparing some sections in Q with their counterparts in Stog
it became evident that the two texts are for the most part identical in the choice of
the vocabulary and the word order. Thus it seems much more appropriate to judge
them as two different versions of one and the same translation. It would be worth
spending time on examining the nature of the differences between the two versions
in order to define their relation as ancestral or horizontal.

7) For Buddhahadra’s date cp. Répertoire du Canon Bouddhique Sinon-Japonais,
Édition de Taihô, compilé par Paul Demiéville, Hubert Durt, Anna Seidel,
Fascicule Annexe du Hôôgôrin, Paris-Tokyo 1978, p. 238, the date of translation is
according to the Lidai sanbao ji 歷代三寶記 (T 2034, 71a3): 元熙二年.
8) Cp. Shinkô Mochizuki, 佛数大辞典 (Bukkyô daijiten) s.v. Fukû (不空).
9) E.g., anârya (不空, 463b1) for astidhyâ (mi shes, Q 266b4); âcâra (行, 464c12)
for âcârya (slob dpon; Q 270b8); krâtâ (俱盧舍, 462c16) for kôda (mdsod; Q 265a7);
prabhâ (光明, 461c4) for prabhâ (shes rab, Q 262b1); vrikâdâta (遊戲, 461b18) for
viksmara or vikṣermata (nun sprul, Q 262a2); vijñâna (悟解, 461a15) for vitâna
(bla re; Q 261a2); sarvajñata (一切覺, 463b5) for spharartha (rin po che sna bdun; Q

[36]

[37]
The Newark translation of the TGS covers 13 folios whose original size is given as ca. 7 inches by 22–26 inches (= 17.8 cm by 56–66 cm). Instead of the usual veneration formula after the title in Sanskrit and Tibetan, Bih just mentions the beginning of the first chapter: *bam po dang po.* At the end of the sūtra no names of translators or revisers are given. After the note that the TGS is finished (… rdo rtags …) and a common verse on the Tathāgata being the cause of the dharmas, a short auspicious wish concludes the text. The folios are not always readable. Especially

266b6; *tsam avastham prāpya* (将锡宅宅; 464a7) for *samavasthāṃ prāpya* (myṇam par gno pa gyur pa; Q 268b2).

Examples of phrases in Bih which can only be explained by a variant reading of the Indic text comprise: *Ananta* (mīha' yas; 245b7) for *Aṇanda* (Kun dga' bo; Q 260a4); bodhimodāla (byang chub sems) kyi dkyil gekhor; 252b7) for bodhimodā (byang chub snying po; Q 268a8); rata (dga' bo; 247a6) for ratna (rin chen; Q 262a1); Śāruṇaputra (sha la dga' bo'i bu; 245b7) for Śāruṇaputra (shā n'i bu; Q 260a26); saṅkaratana (rin po che sna bdun; 254a2) for sarvaratana (rin po che thugs cad; Q 269b5).

10) Cp. Olson, p. 114. I thank Valrac Reynolds, the Curator of Asian Collections of the Newark Museum, for providing me quickly with a duplicate microfilm of the TGS.

11) Q 259b4f.: sangs rgyas dang byang chub sems dpa' thams cad la phyag 'thal la 

12) No second chapter (bam po) is mentioned throughout the text, though the lDan|Han dhar catalogue is indicating that the TGS comprises 310 lhalas (= one bam po and 10 lhalas) (Marcella Lalou, "Les textes bouddhiques au temps du roi Khi-rson-Idel-bcan," in *Journal Asiatique* 241, 1953: 313–353, p. 332).

13) [[* || oni ye dha rma hdu pra bha va he tun te : shan ta tha ga to bye ba tod san tsa ye* nira dha a tshab na ta ma la sha ma na yasvāha || yon mchod bkra : shi par gyur cig || gsungs rab shal gol bar gyur cig oṅk ma nā pad me bhumī ēri || || (*Stand for a dotted circle with a dot in the center of one letter which according to G. Bühler, *Indische Paläographie*, Von circa 350 A. Chr. — ca. 1300 P. Chr. (Grundrisse der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, I. Band, 11. Heft; Reprint: Tokyo 1977), p. 85, symbolizes a mangala; *Not clear: ye or oṅ?*)

Sanskrit versions of the verse at the beginning can, for instance, be found in *SP* 487–8–9 (variants on p. 489), *Karunāpuṇḍarīka* pp. 420.10f., ed. Yamada Iishi, vol. 2, London 1968 (School of Oriental and African Studies) and at the end of some of the Mahāsūtras (Skilling, *Mahāsūtras: …*) s.v. ye dharmā … (Index of verses: Sanskrit).

letters at the beginning and end of lines are often broken or missing due to damaged paper. The folios were probably kept together by two strings cording up the middle of the left and right half of the book. At these parts black stripes from the top to the bottom appear on the folios making the affected letters unreadable. With the exception of two eight-lined folio versos and rectos respectively, the folios contain nine lines. The handwriting looks shabby showing some empty spaces resulting from the erosion of letters.

As already mentioned by Skilling (*Mahāsūtras: …*, p. xxvii), one of the particularities of the Bathang manuscripts is their punctuation. Most frequently Bih operates with two vertically aligned dots resembling a colon where in other Kanjurs a shad is used. The common shad appears only twelve times throughout the whole text. Also the nyis shad appears less often than in other Kanjurs.15

14) I.e., 254b, 255b, 257a and 258a; with 258a ends the section nudo bide ta. Only on this last folio the page number appears fully written (at the left margin): ta nyis brgya nga brgyad bagong. On all the previous folio margins only the numbers of ten and the digits are written in words. Nyis brgya is symbolized by two curved strokes after the volume letter ta.

15) The statistics testify the usage of the 'colon' for 84% of all punctuation marks, the simple shad for only 1 per cent and the nyis shad for about 15%. The usage of the nyis shad seems comparatively rare when compared to the London ms.-TGS with 39%. The simple shad in Bih is in every second case preceded by na or nar. For the usage of a colon also in Indic inscriptions cp. Bühler (op. cit. in n. 13), p. 84: "S. … Doppelpunkt."

After the 'colon' usually a space of one letter is left but there is almost no space between or after the nyis shad. A supposed nyis shad at the end of a sentence after words ending with -g or go appears only as a simple shad. Often a tshag is set after a syllable even when followed by a nyis shad. The use of a "double tshag that looks like a colon" instead of a single tshag is reported by Jeffrey D. Schoening in his study of the Śālistambasūtra for some Dunhuang materials (*The Śālistambasūtra and Its Indian Commentaries*, Volume II, Tibetan Editions, Wien 1995 (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 35,2), pp. 73ff.).

Another particular feature of Bih is that in order to render the genitive pa'i at the end of a line sometimes a mark resembling a double 'greng po above pa in combina-
Little can be said about the few Sanskrit transliterations which occur: Long vowels are seldom marked, Sanskrit aspirates are rendered by their unaspirated counterparts, and cerebral s and their respective dentals. The text itself, like the handwriting, is quite inaccurate: There are erroneous repetitions and omissions of passages, partly corrected later by adding the missing words beneath or above the line. A number of misspellings and unreflected annexing of the -s suffix makes it in some cases difficult to unequivocally determine the basic structure of a sentence (e.g., caused by confusing kyi and kyis). Old orthographic features are rare: there is no da drag and ya btags. There are only few characteristics of Dunhuang texts and early inscriptions occurring in Bth, i.e., ci instead of fi, stsgs instead of sogs, and in some rare cases the use of the mtha'i riten (dp'e for dpe)

16) Further: ar yva for Skt. auddy; ho'u for Skt. han; 'di for Skt. vdi (for the use of 'a as nasal cp. Simonsson, p. 20); dbyi for Skt. ci (cp. Simonsson, p. 97, n. 1).

20) Misspellings are not very common though clearly exceeding the number of orthographic mistakes contained in revised Kanjurs such as Q and Stog.

22) As further characteristics of old orthography might be mentioned the reversed gi ba instead of pa after final -n and -m, the preference for du where we expect tu (e.g., kun du) and unconventional spellings as e.g., byang chub for byang chub, mttian for mttsha or sem sphan for sens can (for these examples cp. Paul Harrison, Druma-himara-rajo-pariprachā-sāra, A Critical Edition of the Tibetan Text (Recension A) based on Eight Editions of the Kanjur and the Dunhuang Manuscripts).
With this we finish our analysis of the formal aspects of Bhū and turn to the terminology chosen by the translators. It might therefore be instructive to arrange some interesting terms of Bhū side by side with the terms of the translation as contained in all other Kanjurs.23

As only a few archaic features appear in the ‘Newark Kanjur,’ Skilling classifies its orthography as belonging to the “middle period” (Kanjur Manuscripts . . ., p. 3). Judging from its orthography I would assign the three versions of the TGS contained in the Phug brag Kanjur to the same period. The manuscripts of the Phug brag Kanjur from Ladakh were written down between 1696 and 1706.


3.a Synonymous translations:

Bih
27. ngyen pa dang shangs
par Idon pa
28. 'khor lo
29. 'khor lo bskor (ba)
30. dge'po
31. bkyar po yi'd
32. ngyen sem
33. chu bo dang po
gang go'i klong
34. chung ngu na
tha na ... kyung rung sten
35. 'jung pa
36. snyon mongs chung ngu
37. snying po la 'dus
38. las
39. thog mar
40. mThun chen po strok pa
mThun chen thob
41. dad
42. rNam par snyan ras
gegs kyi dbang po
43. byung ba
44. mong po
45. snyon ngegs las
yongs su snyon
yongs 'das pa
46. snyon nga
47. 'phrul mig
48. a gya pa
49. b gyur ba
50. bgya stong
51. thad na gnas pa
52. bgyad brtas
53. 'du mchad
54. mThun chen po
mThun chen thob
...
49.a Appears in the introduction to a study of a bodhisattva: "... there was a bodhisattva called ..." parallel to e.g., SP 457 ff.: ... mimaṃsākāra. Tīb (byong: "there appeared") is comprehensible whereas Bth sticks to a more formal and less elucidating rendering of abhūt with gyur pa (chiefly "to become, to be changed"). 49.b Similarly the root bhū combined with the genitive (genitive of belonging) is rendered in Tīb with yod pa: gang gi lag na mdo sde "di yod pa \[. \] [The one] who will have this sūtra in his hands, ..." Bth again operates with a literally translated gyur pa. A similar construction appears e.g., in Sūr 167.4 (= XIV.77d): yatra stīram idam bhaveṣ \[=\] Sūva, 131.7: gang na mdo sde "di yod pa \[. \] 50. brGya stong instead of 'bum (shrag) is also attested for the Tābō fragments of the TGS (cp. n. 32); further Braarvig, p. vi. 53. Tīb translates dkyis rta or dkyis rta or dkyis rta” simply with gnas. Bth seems to render one of the meanings of the root yod, "to join, associate with" through 'du; Pelliot no. 550: 'du' (m)chen (Schoeninger, p. 753); the Ksalakabragspa-sdabs, bearing the remark that it is written in old language (brda rnying du snang rgyo) in its colophon, also shows 'du mchen (Siglinder Dietz, "Remarks on an Hitherto Unknown Cosmological Text in the Kanjur," in Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Tomus XLIII (2–3) 1989: 273–283; p. 280.11.7). 54. Bth renders the alpha privative with m'i gyur ba. 56. As pilcha derives from the root pi (“prepare (esp. meat)”, pilita: "any flesh or meat") Bth and MV'y(1) take up this etymology.

The comparisons show that Bth prefers transliterations for names of arhats which are usually translated. A tendency to a more literal and less idiomatic translation style can be ascertained for the examples subsumed under 3.b. In most cases the terminology represented by Bth is not in accordance with the MV'y and parallels in other old translations can be found. It thus seems quite reasonable to assume that Bth was translated when the standard Buddhist translation vocabulary was not yet established, i.e., during the Early Period (snga dar) up to the 8th century before translation activities became more organized and standardized along with the compilations of compendiums like the MV'y or the sgra shyor bam po gnyis pa (sgra shyor). At that time tendencies to render the Indian text less slavishly became prevailing and more or less detailed guidelines like those laid down in the sgra shyor allowed to please a Tibetan audience by adopting a more elaborated and elegant translation style. As such refinements one could point out the usage of verbs taking in account the hierarchic level of the subjects involved, 23 the increased employment of the particle dag in order to express ideas of collectivity, 24 constructions with ...'os pa 27 or the adoption of proper Tibetan numbers. 28

What holds true for the terminology becomes even more evident once we turn to the 68 verses contained in the TGS. Among them, the pāda order of 24 verses differs between the two Tibetan translations. In order to infer the pāda order of the Indic original we

25 In the case of a deity advising a group of travelers what to do, Tīb employs the verb aga ba whereas Bth uses the hierarchically neutral smra ba. When the bodhisattva Vajrasattva questions the Buddha, Tīb operates with goel ba or shes gsal (indicating thereby implicitly his position below the Buddha), Bth reads bshad pa or shes. Where in regard to the Buddha Tīb shows the honorific forms ba'ings pa and mdzad, Bth simply uses gna pa and byas. Cp. the chapter on honorifics in the sgra shyor (Simonsson, p. 257).

26 The frequency of dag in Tīb is more than double than its usage in Bth. Throughout the text Bth uses the vocative rigs kyi bu against rigs kyi bu dag in Tīb. Though the Buddha is speaking to a group of bodhisattvas, the only citation of the TGS we have reads kula-patra ... (RGV 73.11f). Again, Bth might in this matter stick more slavishly to the Indic original. But cp. Simonsson (p. 49) stating with regard to the particle dag that plural forms remain often unexpressed in the old translation of the SP. The translators of the Early Period might not have felt the necessity to express ideas of collectivity explicitly.

27 Combinations with ...'os pa appear 18 times in Tīb and not even once in Bth. I believe that ...'os pa later became adopted as a possibility to express gerundives in Sanskrit. Cp. Simonsson (pp. 156f), where phyag 'tsal in the old version is rendered as phyag byar 'os in the revised text (Stk. vdantavya).

28 Cp. no. 50 of the variant terminology and the chapter on numbers in the sgra shyor (Simonsson, pp. 254ff.)
have to consult Ch. In 21 of the 24 cases the pāda order of Bth is identical with Ch and we can assume that they represent the original order. We thus can conclude that the translator(s) or revisers of Tib did not stick to the order of pādas as found in the Indic original. This is not a very uncommon supposition, as Simonsson has already demonstrated that the “pāda-pāda-Regel,” i.e., the principle to translate line for line and word for word, was nearly absolutely followed by the old translator(s) of the SP and then sacrificed by revisers in order to attain a smoothly readable Tibetan text, devoid of any syntactical monstrosities caused by an uncritical imitation of Sanskrit syntax. 29) In fact, an analysis of the divergent verses in the TGS suggests that there are two main reasons why the translator(s) of Tib diverted from the order of the Indic text: They always placed the pāda containing the governing verb of the verse (or verse half) at the end of the governed section — a position absolutely necessary to render a Tibetan sentence comprehensible. And they always positioned pādas embracing relative clauses or other specifying elements before the element to be specified. Particularly in the verses, this accounts for a far more reduced scope of interpretative ambiguity.

Without having any Indic manuscripts or extensive quotations of the TGS surviving it is impossible to judge how much the prose of Bth reflects Indic syntactic particularities. 30) Yet, reading its little elaborate and long-winded style with partly unintelligible passages compels one to assume that the translator(s) of Bth felt very uneasy about departing from the Indic manuscripts in form and content. One must not go so far to impute that they deliberately translated corrupt passages without alteration. In some instances, however, syntactical units are just set one after the other without the attempt to stress consistency and continuity of the narrative. This is all in opposition to the canonical translation Tib, a well polished and revised text with sentences flowing pleasantly, appealing to the Tibetan reader. That this ‘polishing’ of Tib, as a matter of fact, sometimes led to an understanding different from the Indic text is not surprising. 31)

I think that the above analysis of Bth allows us to conclude that though displaying few characteristics of old orthography, which hints at the 16th century as a plausible date for its copying, its vocabulary and translation style qualify it as an unrevised work of

---

29) It is worth mentioning that also the sGra bsho briscribes to keeping the pāda order and the order of the words according to the Sanskrit original, but yet it is also willing to accept alterations in order to guarantee “good” Tibetan (cp. Simonsson, pp. 248f.).

The number of syllables per pāda varies in Bth. Leaving aside irregularities due to the Tibetan transmission, nine syllables per line is the normal, but in 15% the four pādas of a verse contain only seven syllables each. Verses with varying numbers of syllables seem not to be exceptional for old translations (cp. Simonsson, pp. 158, 164, 191). Also shas between the syllables of one pāda are not uncommon in Bth (so also in Simonsson throughout the verses of the old translation of the SP). Both features seem unrelated to the Indic original.

30) Whereas in the verses in some cases the verb is placed in the middle of a pāda apparently mirroring its position in the Indic original, the prose comes closer to the Tibetan standards of syntax. Verbs are always positioned at the end of sentences. Another feature demonstrating the affinity of Bth with the Indic original is the word order in the case of names. Bth follows the Sanskrit which usually first mentions the name followed by its specifications, e.g., Bth: rDoje’s blo gros byang chub sems dpa’i sems dpa’i chen po against Tib: byang chub sems dpa’i sems dpa’i chen po rDo rje’i blo gros for Skt. Vajramatir bodhisattva mahāsattva. This principle is also found in the old translation of the SP (Simonsson, pp. 173f.) and the version of the Aksayamatiśrīdēlātātra closest to the Dunhuang fragments as well as in the Dunhuang fragments themselves (Braarvig, p. ix).

31) Examples of such divergences confirmed by the Chinese versions as well as the position of Bth vis-à-vis Ch and Tib will be discussed in my Ph.D. thesis. Cp. also Simonsson; Heinz Zimmermann, Die Subhāṣīta-ratna-karanājaka-kathā (dem Āryaśīrīa zugeschrieben) und ihre tibetische Übersetzung. Ein Vergleich zur Darlegung der Irrtümerziichen bei der Auswertung tibeticher Übersetzungen, Wiesbaden 1975 (Harrassowitz).
the Early Period of Buddhist translations in Tibet. On the other hand, Tib, the canonical version of the TGS, must be considered a second, independent translation, bearing clearly the traces of the Later Period (phyi dar).\(^{32}\)

---

\(^{32}\) I cannot discuss here the complexities and possible interpretations of the Tibetan colophons. Suffice it to mention that whereas Tabo gives the well-known Jinamitra, Dänśîla, Ye shes sde and others (la stogs pa) as translators and revisers of the TGS, all the other versions of Tib (besides the three Phug brag versions which lack a colophon) name Śākyaprabha instead of Jinamitra and Dänśîla, and do not add la stogs pa. After the usual phrase . . . bgyur cing shis te skad gir chad kyi kyang bcos nas giani la phab pa // (skad . . . nas missing in the Them spangs ma versions London, Stog and Tokyol) Tabo adds: . . . phab te chos kyi phyad rgyas btub pa.

None of the versions of Tib exhibits pre-revision elements hinting at several diachronic layers in the text which might indicate different levels of revision. A minor exception might be Tabo which uses bgrya stong throughout instead of 'bum (phrag) (cp. variant terminology no. 50) and (again parallel to Bth) gzungs so for bka' stsal to in introducing the verse sections.

Introduction

In this paper, I address issues pertaining to one school of painters, namely the Rimpa school 琳派, sponsored by the Maeda 前田 daimyo of Kaga-han 加賀藩 and adjacent domains. In particular, I will examine the case of Tawaraya Sōsetsu 倭屋宗雪 (active c. 1622–1650), who is regarded as the immediate successor to Tawaraya Sōtatsu, the school's credited founder. The figure of Tawaraya Sōsetsu as reconstructed through signed paintings and documents had been the only one known in an otherwise obscure period just after the founder’s term of activity. Even so, previous studies have attempted to discuss Sōsetsu’s early career as a member of the Tawaraya workshop and his mature period as a painter for the Maeda daimyo, however treating these two as separate entities. In contrast, here I would like to focus on Sōsetsu’s patrons and professional contacts in order to explore the possible continuities between the artist’s early and later career. Sōsetsu’s connections with those members of the court aristocracy or kuge 公家 in Kyoto with a history of commissioning the Tawaraya workshop is precisely what prompted his service to the buke 武家, or military house of the

*This paper is a revised version of a presentation I delivered at the 43rd annual Tōhō Gakkai conference in May 1998. I would like to thank Professors Kōno Motoaki and Kobayashi Tadashi for their comments and support during my period of research in Tokyo. Thanks are also due to Murai Noriko, Satō Kyôko, and Oshima Tetsuya for their advice in rendering this paper into Japanese. I would like to express my gratitude to The Japan Foundation for the grant which made my research in Tokyo possible.