

TRANSACTIONS
OF THE
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
OF EASTERN STUDIES

No. XLIII 1998

國際東方學者會議紀要

第四十三冊

THE TŌHŌ GAKKAI
(THE INSTITUTE OF EASTERN CULTURE)

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

5. It was Kunikida Doppo 国木田独步 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 琳派 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 Chū 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.

Research Papers

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 'Ba' 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 sbyor* *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa* (*Madhyavyutpatti*)
- MVy* *Mahāvyutpatti*, ed. R. Sakaki, 2 vol., Kyoto 1916–25 (Reprint, Tokyo 1982)
- Q* Peking xylograph Kanjur-Tanjur (Ōtani reprint), Kangxi edition of 1717–20 with missing parts supplied from the Qianlong edition of 1737; *TGS* in vol. 36, *mDo sna tshogs Zhu* 259b4–274a1, no. 924
- RGVV* *Ratnagotravibhāgavṛtti* (Sāramati?), ed. E.H. Johnston (*The Ratnagotravibhāga Mahāyānottaratantraśāstra*), Patna 1950
- SP* *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, eds. H. Kern & B. Nanjio, St.-Petersbourg 1912 (Bibliotheca Buddhica X)
- Suv* *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra*, ed. Johannes Nobel, Leipzig 1937 (Harrassowitz)
- Suv*, *Suvarṇaprabhāṣottamasūtra*, *Erster Band: Die Tibetischen Übersetzungen*, ed. Johannes Nobel, Leiden/Stuttgart 1944 (E.J. Brill/W. Kohlhammer)
- T* *The Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* (*The Tripiṭaka in Chinese*), eds. J. Takakusu & K. Watanabe, Tokyo 1924ff.

treatment of some length.¹⁾ 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 *Tshal 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 Tshal pa and Them spangs ma collections."²⁾

Contained in the *ta* volume of the sūtra section (*mdo bsde, ta*) of this Kanjur is the *Tathāgatagarbhasūtra* (*TGS*).³⁾ 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

Tabo	Fragments of the <i>TGS</i> among the Kanjur materials from Tabo (now in Vienna)
<i>TGS</i>	<i>Tathāgatagarbhasūtra</i>
<i>Tib</i>	Translation of the <i>TGS</i> as contained in the main Kanjurs
	Marks end of line on the folio of the Tibetan text
< . . >	My additions in the Tibetan text
[. .]	Textual elements which should be deleted in the Tibetan text

1) For a description of the Kanjur cp. Eleanor Olson, *Catalogue of the Newark Museum Tibetan Collection*, Vol. III, Newark 1971, p. 114, dating it to the 16th century; the most detailed analysis of the 23 volumes of the Kanjur can be found in Peter Skilling's unpublished article *Kanjur Manuscripts in the Newark Museum: A Preliminary Report*, Nandapurī 1995; the only study including some texts of this Kanjur in a textcritical edition is Peter Skilling's (ed.) *Mahāsūtras: Great Discourses of the Buddha*, Vol. I: Texts, Oxford 1994 (The Pali Text Society, Sacred Books of the Buddhists Vol. XLIV).

2) Skilling, *Kanjur Manuscripts* . . . , p. 4.

3) Vol. *ta*, folios 245bl-258a8. The title at the beginning of the volume reads *de bzhin gshes pa'i snying po zhes bya ba'i mdo*. The title at the beginning of the sūtra itself runs: *de bzhin gshyes' <pa'i> snying po zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo*. It seems remarkable that the Tibetan equivalent for Skt. *ārya*, '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).

available, historically relevant Kanjurs.⁴⁾ Among these 13 versions alone the *TGS* found in this Kanjur from Bathang represents a different, second translation (*Bth*). As the existence of two independent Tibetan translations of the same Indic text are of rare occurrence, this study intends to throw light on the differences between the two Tibetan texts, to describe the particular features of *Bth* and finally to classify it within the history of Tibetan translation activities.

Though the two translations can be said to be independent from each other, they seem nevertheless to be based on Indic originals with an approximately identical wording. As a matter of fact, when considering the eventual affiliation of two distinctly varying renderings of the same underlying text, one should not exclude a priori any imaginable possibility of textual dependency. It could be that *Bth* served the translator(s) of the *TGS* as contained in the major Kanjurs (*Tib*) as departure point for a new version — without additionally consulting any Indic manuscript — but it could as well be that *Bth* was in front of the translator(s) of *Tib* together with the Indic manuscript or that *Bth* was only consulted when the Indic wording was erroneously or unclear.⁵⁾ Also the opposite rela-

4) The critical edition of the *TGS* is part of a Ph.D. thesis to be submitted at the University of Hamburg. The collation comprises the versions of the *TGS* as contained in the Kanjurs from Berlin, Derge, Lithang, London, Narthang, Peking (Ōtani reprint), Phug brag (three versions), Stog, Tabo (fragmentary) and Tokyo (Toyo Bunko) compared with the two Chinese translations. *Bth* will be appended as a diplomatic edition.

5) Nils Simonsson in his *Indo-tibetische Studien*, Uppsala 1957 (Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri Ab) proved convincingly that the Tibetan translation of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* as contained in the Kanjurs is a revision of an older translation, which was available to him as a manuscript from Khotan. In the process of this revision the revisers made also use of the Sanskrit version of the *SP* but tried to keep the wording and word order of the older Tibetan translation wherever possible.

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 horizontally related to each other we need a sufficient number of common features shared by both texts.⁶⁾ Now, throughout the whole sūtra no such common features exist. Besides a basic vocabulary shared by both translations attesting the standardization of Buddhist 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 vocabulary 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-

6) This should even be possible to a certain degree if we assume several revisions of one or both of the texts in later times or far-reaching mistakes in transmission 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 *Samdhinirmocanasūtra* 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 *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* and *Bka'gyur* Research," in *Central Asiatic Journal*, 37/3-4, 1993: 198-224). The "Differences 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 translations" (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.

sibility that one of the two renditions was in the hands of the other translator team, there are no distinguishable traces of such an interaction.

As it is well-known, many Tibetan translations have been done from a Chinese original. Could this also hold true for one of the two translations under discussion? In the case of the *TGS* two Chinese translations are available today:

- a. the *Da fang deng rulai zang jing* 大方等如來藏經 trans. by Buddhahadra (359-429 C.E.) in 420 C.E.⁷⁾ (T 666) and
- b. the *Da fang dū rulai zang jing* 大方廣如來藏經 trans. by Amoghavajra (不空) (705-774 C.E.)⁸⁾ (T 667).

From a detailed comparative study of the Chinese and the Tibetan translations, it became clear that Buddhahadra's work is based on a different, shorter version of the *TGS*, whereas Amoghavajra's (*Ch*) and the two Tibetan translations can be characterized as derived from manuscripts with a very similar wording. Nevertheless, the fact that *Ch* cannot have functioned as basis for one of the two Tibetan translations is evident: in some instances *Ch* contains passages missing in the Tibetan translations, in other *Ch* lacks parts which appear in the Tibetan. How could we explain this unless we assume that the two Tibetan translations are based on a text different from *Ch*? Some instances of divergence can be traced in different readings of words and phrases of the Indic original.⁹⁾

7) For Buddhahadra's date cp. *Répertoire du Canon Bouddhique Sino-Japonais, Édition de Taishō*, compilé par Paul Demiéville, Hubert Durt, Anna Seidel, Fascicule Annexe du Hōbōgirin, Paris-Tokyo 1978, p. 238; the date of translation is according to the *Lidai sanbao ji* 歷代三寶記 (T 2034, 71a13): 元熙二年.

8) Cp. Shinkō Mochizuki, 佛教大辭典 (*Bukkyō daijiten*) s.v. *Fukū* (不空).

9) E.g., *ananya* (不異; 463b1) for *avidyā* (*mi shes*; Q 266b4); *ācāra* (行; 464c12) for *ācārya* (*slob dpon*; Q 270a8); *krośa* (俱盧舍; 462c16) for *kośa* (*mdzod*; Q 265a7); *prabhā* (光明; 461c4) for *prajñā* (*shes rab*; Q 262b1); *vikrīḍita* (遊戲; 461b18) for *vikurvaṇa* or *vikurvita* (*rnam sprul*; Q 262a2); *vimāna* (宮殿; 461a15) for *vitāna* (*bla re*; Q 261a2); *sarvaratna* (一切寶; 463b5) for *saptaratna* (*rin po che sna bdun*; Q

The Newark translation of the *TGS* covers 13 folios whose original size is given as ca. 7 inches by 22–26 inches (= 17.8cm by 56–66cm).¹⁰ Instead of the usual veneration formula¹¹ after the title in Sanskrit and Tibetan, *Bth* just mentions the beginning of the first chapter: *bam po dang po*.¹² At the end of the sūtra no names of translators or revisers are given. After the note that the *TGS* is finished (. . . *rdzogso* ||) and a common verse on the Tathāgata being the cause of the *dharmas*, a short auspicious wish concludes the text.¹³ The folios are not always readable. Especially

266b6); **svam āvasatham prāpya* (將歸舍宅; 464a7) for **samāvasthām prāpya* (*mnyam par gnas par gyur pa*; Q 268b2).

Examples of phrases in *Bth* which can only be explained by a variant reading of the Indic text comprise: *Ananta* (*mtha' yas*; 245b7) for *Ānanda* (*Kun dga' bo*; Q 260a4); *bodhimaṇḍala* (*byangchub [sems] kyi dkyil 'khor*; 252b7) for *bodhimaṇḍa* (*byang chub snying po*; Q 268a8); *rata* (*dga' ba*; 247a6) for *ratna* (*rin chen*; Q 262a1); *Śāradvatīputra* (*sha ra dva to'i bu*; 245b7) for *Śāriputra* (*shā ri'i bu*; Q 260a2f.); *saptaratna* (*rin po che sna bdun*; 254a2) for *sarvaratna* (*rin po che thams cad*; Q 269b5).

10) Cp. Olson, p. 114. I thank Valrae 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 'tshal lo* ||

12) No second chapter (*bam po*) is mentioned throughout the text, though the *lDan/lHan dkar* catalogue is indicating that the *TGS* comprises 310 *ślokas* (= one *bam po* and 10 *ślokas*) (Marcelle Lalou, "Les textes bouddhiques au temps du roi Khri-sroñ-lde-bcan," in *Journal Asiatique* 241, 1953: 313–353, p. 323).

13) || * || *om̐ ye dha rma hedu pra bha va he tun te : shan ta tha ga to hye ba tod šan tsa ye# niro dha a tsbaming ba ti ma ha shra ma na yasvahā || yon mchod bkra : shis par gyur cig || gsungs rab zhal gol bar gyur cig oom ma ŋi pad me houn̄ hri ||* || [*Stands for a dotted circle with a dot in its center of the size of one letter which according to G. Bühler, *Indische Palaeographie, Von circa 350 A. Chr. — ca. 1300 P. Chr.* (Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, I. Band, 11. Heft; Reprint: Tokyo 1977), p. 85, symbolizes a *maṅgala*; #Not clear: *ye* or *yo*?].

Sanskrit versions of the verse at the beginning can, for instance, be found in *SP* 487. 8–9 (variants on p. 489), *Karuṇāpūṇḍarīka* pp. 420.10f., ed. Yamada Isshi, 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,¹⁴ the folios contain nine lines. The handwriting looks shabby showing some empty spaces resulting from the erasion of letters.

As already mentioned by Skilling (*Mahāsūtras* . . . , p. xxvii), one of the particularities of the Bathang manuscripts is their punctuation. Most frequently *Bth* 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 *mdo bsde ta*. Only on this last folio the page number appears fully written (at the left margin): *ta nyis brgya nga brgyad bzbugso* |. 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 *Bth* is in every second case preceded by *na* or *nas*. For the usage of a colon also in Indic inscriptions cp. Bühler (op. cit. in n. 13), p. 84: "5. . . Doppelpunct."

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 *tsheg* is set after a syllable even when followed by a *nyis shad*. The use of a "double *tsheg* that looks like a colon" instead of a single *tsheg* is reported by Jeffrey D. Schoening in his study of the *Śālistambasūtra* for some Dunhuang materials (*The Śālistamba Sūtra and Its Indian Commentaries*, Volume II, Tibetan Editions, Wien 1995 (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, Heft 35,2), pp. 737f.).

Another particular feature of *Bth* 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-

Bth is rich in contractions:¹⁶⁾

skyabs(s)u, skyes(s)o, khams(s)u, grangs(s)u, 'gyur(r)o, chags(s)u, rjes(s)u, btags(s)o, stag(g)o, bdag(g)is, 'das(s)u, nam(m)kha', gnas(s)o, rnam(s)u, phyogs(s)u, dbus(s)u, tshigs(s)u, rdzogs(s)o, bzhugs(s)o, yongs(s)u, lags(s)o, shun(n)i, bshad(d)o, gsungs(s)o.

The *anusvāra* is used extremely frequently within the following words:¹⁷⁾

khamis, bcom, thamis, rnam, rnamis, semis, gsum.

The only abbreviations I have found are:¹⁸⁾

thad (for *thams cad*), *sbra-rtsi* (for *sbrang rtsi*), *gshyes* (for *gshegs*), *saryas* (sic!; for *sangs rgyas*), *semdpa'* (for *sems dpa'*).

Syllable combinations which together make up well-established terms are often written without separating *tsheg* between:¹⁹⁾

skyes-bu, kha-tog, kha-lo, khrig-khrag, ngo-bo, ngo-mtshar, gti-mug, sti-stang, tha-dad, the-tsom, rdo-rje, rnam-par, pha-rol, phyi-rol, phra-mo, phrag-stong, byang-chub, blo-gros, ma-rig, me-tog, rdzu-'phrul, zhe-sdang, 'od-zer, yang-dag, ye-shes, re-re, sems-dpa'.

tion with an 'a *chung* beneath is used (Schoening, p. 737 observes a similar usage in Dunhuang texts). For (*pad*) *mo'i*, this also occurs once in the middle of the line (with 'double *'greng po'* above *na ro* and 'a *chung* beneath) and at the end of the bottom line of a folio verso with (*pad*) *mo* immediately followed by 'a with 'double *'greng po'* above.

Probably not worth mentioning is a number of subscripts. The subscribed letters could well be corrections by the copyist after having been left out first: *grag, ca, ca,, pa, pa,, me,, mong,, stogs,, rdzogs,, ya,, rig.*

16) I have only given those contractions for which no immediate reason such as lack of space at the end of line etc. can be given. The letter supplied in brackets is omitted in the contraction.

17) The form of the *anusvāra* is similar to a *gi gu* turned 90 degrees to the right so that it is placed vertically with its ring above.

18) The dash between the syllables here and in the following rubric is simply intended to separate the different elements. It does not have any correspondence in the Tibetan handwriting.

19) Not well-established combinations comprise: *bsten-te, byas-te* (with super-scripted *s*), *mi-za* and *mig-gis*.

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 cerebrals by their respective dentals.²⁰⁾ 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*).²¹⁾ 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 *ji*, *stsogs* instead of *sogs*, and in some rare cases the use of the *mtha' rten* (*dpe'* for *dpe*).²²⁾

20) Further: *ag nya* for Skt. *ājñā*; *ko'u* for Skt. *kau*; *'di* for Skt. *ṇḍi* (for the use of 'a as nasal cp. Simonsson, p. 20); *dbyi* for Skt. *vi* (cp. Simonsson, p. 97, n. 1).

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

Main irregularities in *Bth* include:

- the use of the particles *kyi* and *kyis* also after final *-n*, *-m*, *-r* and *-l* (the following statistics show the portion of the particle *kyi(s)* (against the regular *gyi(s)*) after the finals: *-n* 83% (against *gyi(s)* with 17%); *-m* 71%; *-r* 62%; *-l* 77%).
- confusion between final *-l* and *-s* or *-r*: *byol* for *byos*; *dbus* for *dbul*; *rus* for *rul*; *rgyal* for *rgyar*; *gsel* for *gser*.
- omitting/adding of subscribed *-r*: *skod* for *skrod*; *bskad* for *bskrad*; *phrag* for *pags*; *smrad* for *smad*.
- various spellings for the same word: *khung* and *phung*; *grags* and *drags* (for *grangs*); *dkiil mo grung* and *dkiil mo drung* (for *skiyil mo krung*); *ci tse* and *ci rtse*; *the tsom* and *the rtsom*; *sman*, *smod*, *smon* and *smrad* (for *smad*); *ril* and *rul*.
- variant spelling possibly caused by same or similar pronunciation: *rgya rgod* for *bya rgod*; *rgyun po* for *rkun po*; *bsgrub* for *sbubs*; *ngam* for *ngan*; *gtong* for *mithong*; *blten* for *bstan*; *spyod* for *bskyod*; *'phags* for *pags*; *dbus* for *dus*; *shin* for *shing*.

22) As further characteristics of old orthography might be mentioned the reversed *gi gu*, *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 cub* for *byang chub*, *mtsan* for *mtshan* or *sems zhan* for *sems can* (for these examples cp. Paul Harrison, *Druma-kinnara-rāja-paripṛcchā-sūtra, A Critical Edition of the Tibetan Text (Recension A) based on Eight Editions of the Kanjur and the Dunhuang Manu-*

With this we finish our analysis of the formal aspects of *Bth* and turn to the terminology chosen by the translators. It might therefore be instructive to arrange some interesting terms of *Bth* side by side with the terms of the translation as contained in all other Kanjurs.²³⁾

script Fragment, Tokyo 1992 (The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, Studia Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series VII), p. xxii and the other works with comparative vocabulary quoted in my n. 23). With the two exceptions of 'og *du* and *yan cad* (for *yan chad*) none of these particularities can be found in *Bth*. I am not sure if the spellings *kha tog* for *kha dog* and *ga las* for *gang nas* in *Bth* should be considered archaic.

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.

23) Not many comparisons of old and new variant terminology or lists of old terminology exist. Most of it are mentioned in Peter Skilling's "From bKa' bstan bcos to bKa' 'gyur and bsTan 'gyur," in *Proceedings of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies*, Vol. III: Transmission of the Tibetan Canon, ed. by Helmut Eimer, Wien 1997 (Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften): 87-109, n. 1 and 29. Further: Simonsson (op. cit. in n. 5); Hakamaya Noriaki (袴谷憲昭), "The Old and New Tibetan Translations of the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*: Some Notes on the History of Early Tibetan Translation," in *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyō Gakubu kenkyū kiyō* 42, March 1984: 192-176; Ochi Junji (越智淳仁), "チベットにおける初期の仏典翻訳形態 — [1]" ("The Style of the Tibetan Translating before the Establishment of the Rules for Translation 'skad gsar gcad'"), in 仏教と文化、中川善教先生頌徳記念論集 (*Bukkyō to bunka, Nakagawa Zenkyō sensei shōtoku kinen ronshū*), ed. by The Department of Buddhism, Kōyasan University 1983: 331-364; Ueyama Daishun (上山大峻), "チベット訳『頓悟真宗要決』の研究" ("A Study on the Tibetan Version of Tunwu chên tsung yao chüeh"), in 禅文化研究所紀要 (*Zenbunka Kenkyūjo kiyō*) VIII, August 1976: 33-103; Powers (op. cit. in n. 6); Eli Franco, "The Tibetan Translations of the *Pramāṇavārttika* and the Development of the Translation Methods from Sanskrit to Tibetan," in *Proceedings of the 7th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies*, Vol. I: Tibetan Studies, ed. by H. Krasser, M.T. Much, E. Steinkellner, H. Tauscher, Wien 1997 (Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften): 277-288; for the *brDa gsar rnying* literature: Mimaki Katsumi (御牧克己), "Index to Two *brDa gsar rñin* Treatises: The Works of dBus pa blo gsal and lCañ skya Rol pa'i rdo rje," in *Bulletin of the Naritasan Institute for Buddhist Studies* 15-2, 1992: 479-503.

A. Transliterations:

<i>Bth</i>	<i>Tib</i>	Sanskrit (MVy) ²⁴⁾
1. <i>Ag nya da ko'u 'di</i>	<i>Cang shes kau di nya</i>	<i>Ājñātakauṇḍinya</i>
2. <i>U ru dbyil ba 'od srung</i>	<i>lTeng rgyas 'od srung</i>	<i>Uruvilvākāśyapa</i> (Tib 1049)
3. <i>Kosti la chen po</i>	<i>gSus po che</i>	<i>Mahākauṣṭhila</i> (Tib 1063)
4. <i>Gang po me tre'i bu</i>	<i>Byams ma'i bu gang po</i>	<i>Pūrṇamaitrāyaṇīputra</i> (Tib 1036)
5. <i>'Ba' gi ya sha</i>	<i>Ngag dbang</i>	<i>*Vāgīśa</i>

B. Translations different in content:

<i>Bth</i>	<i>Tib</i>	Sanskrit (MVy)
6. <i>klu chen po</i>	<i>glang po chen po</i>	<i>mahānāga</i> (Tib 1081)
7. <i>rKang pa mi g.yo bar dpa' ba</i>	<i>Mi g.yo ba'i gnas rnam par gnon</i>	<i>*Acalapādavikrāmin</i>
8.a <i>kho ra khor yug</i>	<i>rgyar</i>	
b <i>khor khor yug</i>	<i>chu dang rgyar</i>	
9. <i>mkhan po</i>	<i>ston pa</i>	<i>śāstr</i> (Tib 11)
10. <i>mngon par dga'o</i>	<i>mngon par bstod do</i>	<i>abhinandati</i>
11. <i>char</i>	<i>rgyur</i>	<i>upanīṣad</i> (Tib 5087)
12. <i>stor ba</i>	<i>lhung ba</i>	
13. <i>mtshu che ba</i>	<i>che ba nyid</i>	<i>*mahātmā</i>
14. <i>snod</i>	<i>gter</i>	
15. <i>dpal</i>	<i>tog</i>	<i>*ketu</i> (Tib 510 etc.)
16. <i>spungs pa</i>	<i>phung po</i>	<i>kūṭa</i> (Tib 4115)
17. <i>'phel pa</i>	<i>skyed pa</i>	<i>prasavati</i>
18. <i>bags kyi<s></i>	<i>rim gyis</i>	<i>kramaṇa</i>
19. <i>ma thag tu</i>	<i>tsam</i>	<i>-mātra</i>
20. <i>ma thogs pa</i>	<i>chags med pa</i>	<i>asaṅga</i>
21. <i>mi bzang bar gyur</i>	<i>mngon par dga' bar 'gyur</i> <i>ba ma yin pa</i>	
22. <i>mun pa'i nang</i>	<i>mngal</i>	
23. <i>rmad du gyur</i>	<i>dga' bar gyur</i>	
24. <i>yon tan mang po</i>	<i>yon tan bkod pa</i>	<i>guṇavyūha</i> (Tib 1381)
25. <i>g.yog pa</i>	<i>yongs su gnas pa</i>	<i>*parisaṁsthita</i>
26. <i>gzhung</i>	<i>rnam grangs</i>	<i>paryāya</i> (Tib 206 etc.)

Remarks: 9. The rendering *mkhan po* for *śāstr* can be found in the Dunhuang manuscripts Pelliot no. 610 (*Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra*). The parallel in the

24) If existing, the respective entry in the *Mahāvīyutpatti* (MVy) with its number is given in brackets. The translation coinciding with MVy is then also noted.

Kanjurs also reads *ston pa* (cp. J.W. de Jong, "Fonds Pelliot Tibétain N° 610 et 611," in: *Buddhist Studies* by J.W. de Jong, ed. by Gregory Schopen, Berkeley 1979 (Asian Humanities Press): 429–438, p. 436 (= 65) E). 15. That *dpal* is seen as an old equivalent for *tog* is confirmed by two *brDa gsar rnying* treatises of the 14th and 18th century (cp. Mimaki, pp. 487, 499). 17. The renderings '*pel*' (Pelliot) and *bskyed* (Kanjurs) appear in the same context of producing merit (de Jong, p. 436 (= 65) C). 18. *Bth* represents old terminology. Cp. Mimaki, pp. 487, 498. 19. Whereas *Tib* is interpreting *-mātra*, in its minimalist sense "alone by . . .," *Bth* renders it temporally "immediately after . . ." 26. The translation *gzhung* against the later absolute standard *rnam grangs* can be found in other old texts. Cp. de Jong, p. 432 (= 61) C, E, F; Simonsson, p. 76.

3.a Synonymous translations:

Bth	Tib	Sanskrit (MVy)
27. <i>mkhyen pa dang rkang</i> <i>par ldan pa</i>	<i>rig pa dang zhabs su</i> <i>ldan pa</i>	<i>vidyācārāṇasampanna</i> (Tib 6)
28. ' <i>khör lo</i>	' <i>phang lo</i>	in <i>śaṭaṭacakraṣamāṇa</i> (Tib 6242)
29. ' <i>khör lo bskor (ba)</i>	' <i>khör los sgyur (ba)</i>	<i>cakravartin</i> (Tib 3551, 3612)
30. <i>dge'o</i>	<i>legs so</i>	<i>sādhu</i> (Tib 6313ff.)
31. <i>dgyes pa'i yid</i>	<i>yi(d) rangs</i>	<i>āttamanas</i> (Tib 2931)
32. <i>ngan sems</i>	<i>phrag dog</i>	<i>irṣyā</i> (Tib 1965)
33. <i>chu bo gang ga</i>	<i>gang ga'i klung</i>	<i>gaṅgānadī</i>
34. <i>chung ngu na</i>	<i>tha na . . . kyang rung ste</i>	* <i>antaśaḥ</i>
35. ' <i>jungs pa</i>	<i>ser sna</i>	<i>mātsarya</i> (Tib 1966)
36. <i>nyon mongs chung ngus</i>	<i>tshegs chung ngus</i>	* <i>alpākṛcchreṇa</i> (Tib 6370)
37. <i>snying po la 'dus</i>	<i>kha ma bye ba</i>	
38. <i>ltas</i>	<i>mtshan ma</i>	<i>nimitta</i> (Bth/Tib 4388)
39. <i>thog mar</i>	<i>dang po</i>	
40. <i>mThu chen po rnyed pa</i>	<i>mThu chen thob</i>	<i>Mahāsthāmaprāpta</i> (Tib 653)
41. <i>dad</i>	<i>mos</i>	
42. <i>rNam par spyān ras</i> <i>gzigs kyi dbang po</i>	<i>sPyān ras gzigs</i> <i>dbang phyug</i>	<i>Avalokiteśvara</i> (Tib 645)
43. ' <i>byung ba</i>	<i>srid pa</i>	<i>bhava</i> (Tib 596 etc.)
44. <i>mang po</i>	<i>tshogs</i>	<i>gaṇa</i> (Tib 6266)
45. <i>mya ngan las</i> <i>yongsu 'das pa</i>	<i>yongs su mya</i> <i>ngan las 'das pa</i>	<i>parinirvāṇa</i> (Tib 186; 4106)

27. The same translation as in *Bth* (with *da drag*: *mkhyend*) appears in Pelliot 610 (de Jong, p. 436 (= 65) E); cp. also Harrison (no. 30 in his list of compara-

tive vocabulary (pp. xxxvii–xliii) for the less revised recension B). 28. '*Khör lo* also in Harrison (no. 8) in the same compound (recension B). 30. So Simonsson, p. 82 and Ochi, p. 355 (comparing the variant terminology of the same chapter of the **Vairocanābhisambodhivikurvitādhiṣṭhānamahātanta-bhāṣya* with the *-vṛtti* (Q 3487 and Q 3490); the *-vṛtti* is said to be a 15th century revised version of the *-bhāṣya*, rev. by *gShon nu dpal*); further Jens Braarvig (*Akṣayamatinirdeśasūtra*, Volume I, Edition of extant manuscripts with an index, Oslo 1993 (Solum Forlag), p. 15, n. 38) for the Dunhuang fragment of the *Akṣayamatinirdeśasūtra*. 33. So Simonsson, p. 87; cp. also Braarvig, p. 44, n. 15: *chu bo* attested in Dunhuang. 39. Simonsson (p. 56) observes the substitution of *dang po* through *thog mar* for a verse in the *SP*; for the substitution of *thog ma* through *dang po* cp. Braarvig, p. vii: the version with the readings closest to the Dunhuang fragments shows *thog ma*. 41. So Simonsson, p. 82; de Jong, p. 432 (= 61) A: Pelliot: *shind tu dad pa la* against *mos nas*; Ochi, p. 353 (*shin tu dad pa* against *mos pa*); Braarvig (pp. vii f.): *dad pa* as well in version a (close to Dunhuang) against version b (*mos pa*) but also in version b against version a (*mos pa*). 42. . . . *dbang po* instead of . . . *dbang phyug* is continuously used in the old version of the *SP*: Simonsson, pp. 115ff., 174 (prose!); cp. also Pelliot no. 550 (Schoening, p. 753); Braarvig, p. viii; 43. Cp. Simonsson, p. 169; Schoening, pp. 753f. 44. Cp. Hakamaya, p. 184; Ochi, p. 351.

3.a Synonymous translations with *Tib* rendering more literally:

Bth	Tib	Sanskrit (MVy)
46. ' <i>phrul mig</i>	<i>lha'i mig</i>	<i>divyaṃ/divya- cakṣus</i> (Tib 202)
47. <i>mi phod</i>	<i>mi 'gro</i>	<i>upayāti</i>

46. So also Braarvig, p. viii; Ochi (p. 357) cites '*phul gyi mig* in the unrevised text for *divyacakṣus* against *lha'i mig*. '*Phul* should of course be emended to '*phrul*.

3.b Synonymous translations with *Bth* rendering more literally:

Bth	Tib	Sanskrit (MVy)
48. ' <i>khör</i>	<i>g-yog</i>	<i>parivāra</i>
49. a <i>gyur pa</i> b ' <i>gyur ba</i>	<i>byung</i> <i>yod pa</i>	* <i>abhūt</i> * <i>bhavet</i>
50. <i>brgya stong</i>	' <i>bum (phrag)</i>	<i>śatasahasra</i> (Tib/Bth 6189/863)
51. <i>thad na gnas pa</i>	<i>slob ma</i>	<i>antevāsin</i> (Tib 7242)
52. <i>brgyad bres</i>	<i>mig mangs ris su bris pa</i>	<i>aṣṭāpadanibaddha</i> (Tib 6062)
53. ' <i>du mched</i>	<i>gnas</i>	<i>āyatana</i> (399 etc.: <i>skye mched</i>)

Bth	Tib	Sanskrit (MVy)
54. sNang bas don med par mi 'gyur ba	mThong ba don yod	Amoghadarśin (Tib 717)
55. mang du byed pa	gces spras byed pa	bahukara (Tib 7062)
56. sha za ma	'dre mo	piśāci (Bth 4756: sha za for piśāca)

49.a Appears in the introduction to a story of a bodhisattva: "... there was a bodhisattva called ..." parallel to e.g., SP 457.6ff.: ... *nāma rājābhūt*. Tib (*byung*: "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 Tib 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 *Suv* 167.4 (= XIV.77d): *yatra sūtram idam bhavet* // = *Suv*, 131.7: *gang na mdo sde 'di yod pa* |. 50. *brGya stong* instead of 'bum (*phrag*) is also attested for the *Tabo* fragments of the *TGS* (cp. n. 32); further Braarvig, p. vi. 53. Tib translates *āyatana* ("abiding place") simply with *gnas*. *Bth* seems to render one of the meanings of the root *yat*, "to join, associate with" through 'du; Pelliot no. 550: 'dum (*m*)ched (Schoening, p. 753); the *Kośalokaprajñapti-samkṣepa*, bearing the remark that it is written in old language (*brda rnying du snang ngo*) in its colophon, also shows 'du mched (Siglinde 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 III.7). 54. *Bth* renders the alpha privative with *mi 'gyur ba*. 56. As *piśāci* derives from the root *piś* ("prepare (esp. meat)"; *piśita*: "any flesh or meat") *Bth* and *MVy*(!) 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 *MVy* 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 *MVy* or the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa* (*sGra sbyor*). At that time tendencies to render the Indic text less slavishly became prevailing and more or less detailed guidelines like those laid down in the *sGra sbyor* 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,²⁵⁾ the increased employment of the particle *dag* in order to express ideas of collectivity,²⁶⁾ constructions with ... 'os pa²⁷⁾ 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, Tib employs the verb *sgo ba* whereas *Bth* uses the hierarchically neutral *smra ba*. When the bodhisattva Vajramati questions the Buddha, Tib operates with *gsol ba* or *zhes gsol* (indicating thereby implicitly his position below the Buddha), *Bth* reads *bshad pa* or *zhes*. Where in regard to the Buddha Tib shows the honorific forms *bzhugs pa* and *mdzad*, *Bth* simply uses *gnas pa* and *byas*. Cp. the chapter on honorifics in the *sGra sbyor* (Simonsson, p. 257).

26) The frequency of *dag* in Tib 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 Tib. Though the Buddha is speaking to a group of bodhisattvas, the only citation of the *TGS* we have reads *kulaputra* ... (RGVV 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 Tib 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 'tshal* in the old version is rendered as *phyag byar 'os* in the revised text (Skt. *vandanīya*).

28) Cp. no. 50 of the variant terminology and the chapter on numbers in the *sGra sbyor* (Simonsson, pp. 254f.).

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

29) It is worth mentioning that also the *sGra sbyor* prescribes 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 *shads* 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.

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

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*: *rDorje'i blo gros byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po* against *Tib*: *byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rDo rje'i blo gros* for Skt. *Vajramatir bodhisattvo mahāsattvaḥ*. This principle is also found in the old translation of the *SP* (Simonsson, pp. 173f.) and the version of the *Akṣayamatīnirdeśasūtra* 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 Subhāṣita-ratna-karaṇḍaka-kathā (dem Āryaśūra zugeschrieben) und ihre tibetische Übersetzung. Ein Vergleich zur Darlegung der Irrtumsrisiken bei der Auswertung tibetischer 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 is to mention that whereas *Tabo* gives the well-known Jinamitra, Dānaśīla, Ye shes sde and others (*la stsogs 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 Dānaśīla, and do not add *la stsogs pa*. After the usual phrase . . . *bsgyur cing zhus te skad gsar chad kyis kyang bcos nas gtan la phab pa ||* (*skad . . . nas* missing in the *Them spangs ma* versions London, Stog and Tokyo!) *Tabo* adds: . . . *phab te chos kyi phyad rgyas btab 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 *brgya stong* throughout instead of 'bum (*phrag*) (cp. variant terminology no. 50) and (again parallel to *Bth*) *gsungs so* for *bka' tsal to* in introducing the verse sections.

The Career of Tawaraya Sōsetsu: From the Tawaraya Atelier to Maeda Patronage*

Janice KATZ

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 俵屋宗雪 (active c. 1622–1650s), 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 Kyōko, 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.