

MANUSCRIPTS IN THE SCHØYEN COLLECTION



BUDDHIST MANUSCRIPTS

Volume III

General Editor:  
Jens Braarvig

Editorial Committee:  
Jens Braarvig, Paul Harrison, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Kazunobu Matsuda, Lore Sander

HERMES PUBLISHING · OSLO

2006

# Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā\*

Paul Harrison and Shōgo Watanabe

## *I. Bibliographical Survey and Description of the Manuscript*

### *1. Sanskrit Texts of the Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramita*

The *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā* (Vaj) is one of the most celebrated and historically significant works of the voluminous Prajñāpāramitā (“Perfection of Wisdom” or “Perfection of Insight”) corpus. To date its Sanskrit text has been accessible to the scholarly world in the form of nine published editions, either of the complete work or substantial parts of it. These nine are listed below in chronological order of appearance, with the sigla by which they are referred to in this study, followed by brief notes on each of them.

1. F. Max Müller, ed., “*Vagrakkhedikā* [= *Vajracchedikā*],” in *Buddhist Texts From Japan* (Anecdota Oxoniensia, Aryan Series Vol.1, Part 1), Oxford, 1881, pp. 15–46.  
Referred to as **M** in this study.
2. E. F. Pargiter, ed., “*Vajracchedikā* in the Original Sanskrit, Stein MS., No. D.III.13b,” in *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan*, ed. by A. F. Rudolf Hoernle, Oxford, 1916, pp. 176–195.  
Referred to as **P** in this study.
3. N. P. Chakravarti, ed., “The Gilgit Text of the *Vajracchedikā*,” in *Minor Buddhist Texts* (SOR IX.1), ed. by G. Tucci, Rome, 1956, pp. 173–192.
4. E. Conze, ed., *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā, Edited and Translated with Introduction and Glossary* (SOR XIII), Rome, 1957. 2nd edition, with Corrections and Additions, Rome, 1974.  
Referred to as **Cz** in this study.
5. N. Dutt, ed., *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. VI, Calcutta, 1959. Reprint: Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica 24, Delhi, 1984, pp. 139–170.
6. P. L. Vaidya, ed., “*Vajracchedikā nāma Triśatikā Prajñāpāramitā*,” in *Mahāyāna-sūtra-saṅgraha*, Part 1 (BST 17), Darbhanga, 1961, pp. 75–89.
7. L. M. Joshi, *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitāśūtra with the Commentary of Asamga, Critically edited and translated into Hindi with Introduction, Notes and Glossary* (Bibliotheca Indo-Tibetica 3), Varanasi, 1978.
8. G. Schopen, “The Manuscript of the *Vajracchedikā* Found at Gilgit,” in *Studies in the Literature of the Great Vehicle: Three Mahāyāna Buddhist Texts*, ed. by L. O. Gómez and J. Silk, Ann Arbor, 1989, pp. 89–139.  
Referred to as **G** in this study.

\* The first announcement that the Schøyen Collection contained a manuscript of the *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā* was made by the BMSC Project Group at the 12th Congress of the International Association of Buddhist Studies held in Lausanne in 1999. Through the good offices of Kazunobu Matsuda, and with the consent of editor-in-chief Jens Braarvig and other members of the Project Group, Shōgo Watanabe undertook the initial transliteration, reconstruction and analysis of the manuscript, in which endeavour he was subsequently joined by Paul Harrison, with whom the work was brought to completion. In the course of their researches both authors have benefitted from the advice of Akira Yuyama, Seishi Karashima and Rolf Giebel, and take this opportunity to express their gratitude to these scholars.

9. Rushi foxue yanjiushi 如實佛學研究室, ed. *Jingang boruo boluomi jing* 金剛般若波羅蜜經, 5 vols., Taipei, 1995–1996. The edition of the Sanskrit text occupies Vol. 3, pp. 1–64.

The Sanskrit text of the Vaj has been translated into modern languages many times. Among the English translations, those by F. Max Müller, Edward Conze and Gregory Schopen have been particularly influential, especially that of Conze. For bibliographical details, readers may consult the introduction to Paul Harrison, “Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā: A New English Translation of the Sanskrit Text Based on Two Manuscripts from Greater Gandhāra,” which appears later in this volume (hereafter referred to as ET).<sup>1</sup>

Both for editions and for translations of the Vaj the *editio princeps* published by F. Max Müller in 1881 (referred to in our study as M) has been of decisive importance, not least because of the way in which it divides the text into sections.<sup>2</sup> Müller used four witnesses to establish his text: two handwritten copies of an old manuscript preserved in the Kōkiji 高貴寺 temple in Osaka, Japan, and two blockprints from China. Since the two manuscripts from Japan are copies deriving ultimately from the same original, they can be regarded as a single witness. That original is apparently a Sanskrit text of the Vaj discovered after the death of the eminent priest Jiun Onkō 慈雲飲光 (1718–1804) by his disciple Chidō 智幢 (1776–1854). This text was reproduced in fascicle 320 of the *Bongaku shinryō* 梵學津梁, compiled by Jiun and his disciples. In this compendium it appears that the Sanskrit text was written vertically, with Chinese equivalents for the Sanskrit words in the column to the right and a Chinese phonetic transcription to the left, followed by the Chinese translations of Kumārajīva and Dharmagupta in the next two columns. One of the copies acquired by Müller, made by the priest Kanematsu Kuken 金松空賢 in September 1880, contained all of this material,<sup>3</sup> while the second, made by the priest Kurehito Kaishin 伎人戒心 of Kōkiji (presumably around the same time), contained only the Sanskrit text, written horizontally.<sup>4</sup> Together they constitute what Müller refers to in his apparatus as J. As for the two woodblock prints from China, one is a woodblock edition printed in Beijing in 1760, probably at the Songzhusi 喬祝寺. In this print, the Sanskrit text appears both in Lañtsha script and in Tibetan transliteration, to which has been added a Tibetan translation made at the Chos ’khor rab rgyas gliṅ temple<sup>5</sup> in Beijing by

<sup>1</sup> Fuller bibliographical surveys may be found in Conze 1978: 60–66 and Yuyama 1967: 61–83, 112–114, 122–124.

<sup>2</sup> These divisions are based on those imposed on the text of Kumārajīva’s translation, which are alleged to have been the work of Prince Chaoming 昭明太子 of Liang 梁 some time in the 6th century (see Müller 1881: 18). It is better to call them sections or even paragraphs (as Müller himself does) rather than chapters. Most subsequent editions, translations and studies of the Vaj have followed them, as do we (marking them with §).

<sup>3</sup> Cat. Bodl. Japan. No. 54. One page reproduced in Müller 1881, Plate 1. We assume that this copy is a faithful reflection of the original *Bongaku shinryō*, although this has not been verified. Müller (1881: 16) records receiving it on 15 February 1881. It is not clear how this relates to the copy of the Vaj which he records receiving as part of a consignment of books brought to England from Japan by Alexander Wylie (Müller 1881: 2), unless this is a reference to Ch (see below). We note in this regard that Müller’s introductory notes are sometimes quite confusing.

<sup>4</sup> Cat. Bodl. Japan. No. 55. One page reproduced in Müller 1881, Plate 2. This copy was sent to Müller at Oxford University by Ernest (later Sir Ernest) Satow, Secretary of the English Legation in Edo (Tokyo). At this point we cannot say whether it simply extracts the Sanskrit text from the previous item, or whether it reproduces another copy of the Vaj held at Kōjiki. Several are known to exist, but their relationship to each other has yet to be determined. Nor is it clear whether the original ms discovered by Chidō still exists, or what it was, an Indian palm-leaf or a later Japanese copy of one. The *Bongaku shinryō* as a whole underwent a process of continual revision, and a number of different tables of contents for it also survive. The situation is complicated, and only a thorough investigation of the holdings of the Kōjiki library will clarify it.

<sup>5</sup> The identity of this establishment is not clear. According to Wang Yao, this may be a reference to the temple known in Chinese as the Xinjiaosi, which was located by the Gaoliang River outside Beijing’s Xizhi Gate (Wang Bangwei,

the *lha bris* (painter) Dam pa, working under the auspices of lCañ skyā II Rol pa'i rdo rje (1717–86), state preceptor during the reign of the Qing emperor Qianlong (this is M's T).<sup>6</sup> The other woodblock print of the Vaj was included in a book of Sanskrit texts acquired by the British collector Alexander Wylie in Beijing, in which the Sanskrit text was engraved in the Lañtsha script and printed in red ink (this is M's Ch).<sup>7</sup> Müller's edition, then, was based on four (or three, if the two copies of J are counted as one) witnesses either hand-copied or printed in comparatively recent times, and thus they may be assumed to postdate the oldest Sanskrit manuscripts of the Vaj by about one thousand years.

No such manuscripts were known, however, when Müller produced his edition. The first to come to light was the Central Asian ms discovered by Sir Aurel Stein in the remains of a dwelling at Dandān Uiliq in Eastern Turkestan in December 1900, and identified by A. F. Rudolf Hoernle in 1903 as a copy of the Vaj.<sup>8</sup> It was not until 1916 that F. E. Pargiter published a full edition of this ms (No. 2 in the list above, henceforth referred to as P), originally complete in 19 folios, of which five had been lost, with many others in a poor state of preservation. According to Pargiter, it dates from the end of the fifth century or the beginning of the sixth century, and represents a text which, at least in terms of content, is fairly close to the Chinese translation by Kumārajīva (401 C.E.).

The second ancient ms of the Vaj to appear was found among the 15 or so Mahāyāna sūtras, some of them in multiple copies, which were discovered along with a large number of other Buddhist texts in the remains of a tower-like building near Naupur, three miles north of Gilgit, in Pakistan, in 1931 (see Jettmar 1981 and especially Fussman 2004, which offers a new perspective on the function of this building and its library, and presents a revised list of titles). Most of these manuscripts are now preserved in the National Archives of India in New Delhi. They include seven folios of the Vaj, dating to the 6th or 7th century, which were eventually published in facsimile edition by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra in 1974.<sup>9</sup> Well before then, however, in 1956, these folios had been published in romanized form by N. P. Chakravarti in the Serie Orientale Roma inaugurated by G. Tucci (No. 3 in our list above). Three years later (in 1959) N. Dutt brought out a version in the Nāgarī script based on Chakravarti's edition (No. 5 in our list). Dutt supplied passages missing in the Gilgit manuscript from Müller's edition and published his edition as a complete version. These additions are pointed out in the notes, but they contain many mistakes. Three decades later (1989), Gregory Schopen provided a detailed and searching review of the editions of Chakravarti and Dutt in the light of a meticulous rereading of the Gilgit manuscript (No. 7 in our list). Presenting a new transliteration of the ms, he also added detailed notes and an English translation. Since Schopen's diplomatic edition of the ms is done with a degree of accuracy and fidelity sadly lacking in those of his predecessors, it is the only one utilized in this study, referred to by the siglum G.<sup>10</sup>

---

personal communication). However, consultation of Heissig 1954 and von Franz 1984 has produced no further illumination.

<sup>6</sup> The recto of folio 3 is reproduced in Müller 1881, Plate 3. For further details, including the text of the colophon, see Yuyama 1967: 61–65. The Tibetan translation, being an 18th-century work, differs from the version found in the Kanjur.

<sup>7</sup> The page carrying the start of the text is reproduced in Müller 1881, Plate 4. The date of printing is not known to us, although the printers appear to have been the Beijing firm Tianqinghao 天清號 (see Yuyama 1967: 66, 105), whose premises were at the Songzhusi (see Heissig 1954: 5).

<sup>8</sup> See Stein: 1907: I, 256–258 for an account of the discovery, and p. 295 for a brief note by Hoernle on the ms.

<sup>9</sup> See Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra 1974: Part 7, ff. 1380–1393.

<sup>10</sup> Schopen's edition has been checked against a microfilm of the original ms, and has been found entirely reliable,

Several new editions of the complete Sanskrit text of the Vaj were brought out after the publication of the Central Asian and Gilgit fragments, but none of them represents a significant advance on M. Nevertheless, Edward Conze's 1957 edition (No. 4, Cz) has, as it were, assumed canonical status, despite its shortcomings.<sup>11</sup> Conze used Müller's edition as his base text, checking its readings against another copy of the bilingual Tibetan blockprint (Müller's T) kept in the library of the School of Oriental and African Studies, London. He presented the text in Roman script, with various orthographical modifications, Western punctuation, liberal use of hyphens to break up compounds, and the sandhi between vowels resolved.<sup>12</sup> In the footnotes he added the results of comparisons with P (No. 2), Chakravarti's edition of the Gilgit manuscript (No. 3), the commentaries by Asaṅga and Vasubandhu, and the Tibetan translation, as well as the Chinese translation by Kumārajīva. When there is a phrase that is missing in P and/or G, it is set within parentheses in the text. However, Conze did not use M consistently as his base text, occasionally making changes to the wording in which he conflated his various witnesses arbitrarily. He also failed to list the differences between his witnesses exhaustively. Some of the failings of the resulting text have been pointed out by Schopen (1989: 96–97). Nevertheless, most subsequent translations and studies have relied on Conze's edition, and philosophical questions have also been addressed on the less than solid foundation it provides. Herein lies a major problem.

In 1961 P. L. Vaidya included an edition of the Vaj in Volume 1 of the *Mahāyāna-sūtra-saṃgraha* in the Buddhist Sanskrit Texts Series (No. 6). Using M as a basis, he made a number of changes to the text, but without any annotation (M's original footnotes were also dispensed with). Vaidya's "improvements" are therefore silent, and they are not always improvements. Although he notes variants in the Gilgit Manuscript, his notes are neither exhaustive nor accurate, being based on Chakravarti and/or Dutt,<sup>13</sup> whose readings of the ms are highly unreliable, as Schopen has amply demonstrated. Since Vaidya did not consult any new mss himself, his "edition" can safely be set aside, unlike Conze's, which for all its imperfections cannot be ignored. For similar reasons one can also set aside Joshi's 1978 edition, which appears to draw on the work of its predecessors (Müller, Pargiter, Chakravarti, Conze and Vaidya) without, as far as we know, reviewing any of the manuscript evidence afresh, while adding or reproducing numerous errors in sandhi and typographical mistakes. In the same way the synoptic Taiwanese edition (No. 9) simply reproduces Müller's edition in roman script, with the sections divided into smaller subsections. However, it also provides students of the text with a remarkably comprehensive set of resources, and is therefore a valuable contribution to the study of the Vaj.<sup>14</sup>

even though a few minor improvements can be suggested, for which see ET, Introduction. His text has also been reproduced as Chap. XXI of Oguibénine 1996 (pp. 252–265), accompanied by useful notes.

<sup>11</sup> It was reprinted in a second edition in 1974, unchanged save for the addition of an appendix entitled "Corrections and Added Notes," pp. 115–118.

<sup>12</sup> Conze also adopted M's division of the text into sections, dividing some of them still further into subsections.

<sup>13</sup> It is in fact not entirely clear which scholar's work Vaidya drew upon for his knowledge of the Gilgit ms, since on p. viii of his introduction he states "I have added a few variants found in the fragments of the Gilgit MSS. recently edited by Dr. N. Dutt and published by Dr. G. Tucci, in his *Minor Buddhist Texts*, part I, Rome, 1957 [sic]."

<sup>14</sup> This massive 5-volume compendium contains not only the Sanskrit text, but a modern Chinese translation with extensive annotations, the Sanskrit text with detailed vocabulary and grammatical notes (in Chinese), seven Chinese translations, the Tibetan translation (Derge edition), seven Japanese translations (Nanjio 1909; Ama 1933; Watanabe 1956–1957; Ui 1958; Nagao (a) 1973; Nakamura 1993 [1960]; Nagao (b) 1993 [1978]), the two English translations of Müller and Conze, the French translation of Harlez (1891), and the German translation of Walleser (1914). Since all these different versions are reprinted with identical division into sections and subsections, the comparison of their readings is greatly facilitated.

In addition to the publications reviewed above, which contain editions of the complete text or of substantial portions of it, and are in most cases well known, small sections of the Vaj are also preserved in the following Central Asian fragments, either published or unpublished:<sup>15</sup>

- Frag a. Cat. No. 1195 in Lore Sander and Ernst Waldschmidt, eds., *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Teil V, Wiesbaden, 1985, pp. 188–189 (see also Plate 81). The left side of a single folio bearing text from §§5–6, written in Gilgit/Bamiyan Type II, alphabet m (Sander 1968).
- Frag b. K. Matsuda, ed., *Sanskrit Fragments of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra: A Study of the Central Asian Documents in the Stein/Hoernle Collection of the India Office Library, London (Studia Tibetica No. 14)*, Tokyo, 1988, pp. 76–77. This is a small fragment, measuring 8cm x 12cm, from the middle of a single folio in the Hoernle Collection, now in the possession of the British Library. It was published by Matsuda Kazunobu in his 1988 study of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra as one of a number of unidentified fragments in the Hoernle and Stein collections, under the reference number A-17. The identification of this as part of the Vaj was first published by Hiromi Habata, in her article “Daijō Nehangyō no mihitei no bonbun danpen ni tsuite,” *Indo tetsugaku bukkyōgaku*, Vol. 8 (1993), pp. 129–144 (see esp. p. 130, n. 8).<sup>16</sup> According to Matsuda, the ms fragment in question is almost certainly from Khadalik. The script is Early Turkestan Brāhmī Type b, alphabet s, according to Sander (1968: Tables 29–40; 1986: 167), dating roughly from the 5–6th centuries. The fragment bears text from §§15a–16b.
- Frag c. G. M. Bongard-Levin and M. I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya, eds., *Vajracchedikā prajñāpāramitā (Bibliotheca Buddhica 34)*, Moscow, 1990, pp. 260–263, 425. This ms (SI P/81) is a fragment of only one folio (6cm x 23.5cm) bearing six lines per side, preserved at the Russian Academy of Sciences. The script is Turkestan Gupta Type (alphabet q), thus roughly 5th century. It corresponds to part of §17.
- Frag d. Cat. No. 1910 in Heinz Bechert, ed., *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Teil VIII, Wiesbaden, 2000, pp. 93–94. A fragment from the right end of a single folio bearing text from §§6–8. The script is North Turkestan Brāhmī Type b, alphabet u (Sander 1968).
- Frag e. Cat. No. 1939+4194a in Heinz Bechert, ed., *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Teil VIII, Wiesbaden, 2000, pp. 117–118. Two fragments from the left and middle portions of a single folio (with the number 308), bearing text from §§11–12. The script is North Turkestan Brāhmī Type b, alphabet u (Sander 1968).
- Frag f. Unpublished: Hoernle Collection no. 143 S.A.19, in the possession of the British Library. A single folio, well preserved, bearing text from §§15a–c. Identified by Jens-Uwe Hartmann. For a preliminary transliteration we are indebted to Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Klaus Wille.
- Frag g. Unpublished: Hoernle Collection no. 149/146 + unnumbered fragm., in the possession of the British Library.<sup>17</sup> Two fragments from the middle portion of a single folio, bearing

<sup>15</sup> This list is not necessarily complete, but merely records all those ms fragments of the Vaj which have come to our attention (in most cases thanks to the prompting of Jens-Uwe Hartmann).

<sup>16</sup> Kazunobu Matsuda informs us that this identification had already been made independently by Gregory Schopen, and that he had transmitted this to Habata.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Hartmann & Wille 1992: 26, 35.

- text from §§30b–32b. Identified by Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Klaus Wille, who also kindly supplied us with a preliminary transliteration.
- Frag h. Unpublished: Stein Collection no. Kha. i. 26 (= Or. 8212.18), in the possession of the British Library. Four fragments of a ms recovered from Khadalik, the largest bearing text from §§25–26a. Identification and description published in Aurel Stein, *Serindia*, Vol. III, Oxford, 1921, p. 1433.
- Frag i. Unpublished: Stein Collection no. Kha. i. 39 (= Or. 8212.20), in the possession of the British Library. One fragment of a ms recovered from Khadalik, bearing text from §§25–30. Identification and description published in Aurel Stein, *Serindia*, Vol. III, Oxford, 1921, p. 1434.<sup>18</sup>
- Frag j. No. 77 in Klaus Wille, “Some recently identified Sanskrit fragments from the Stein and Hoernle collections in the British Library, London (1),” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology*, VIII (2005), pp. 47–80 (see pp. 70–71). Hoernle Collection no. 150.vii.32. One fragment from a single folio, bearing text from §§17b–e. The script is Southern Turkestan Brāhmī (main type).
- Frag k. No. IV in Ariyoshi Sanada, “Otani Tankentai Shōrai Bonbun Butten Shiryō,” *Saiiki Bunka Kenkyū* (Monumenta Serindica), Vol. 4, Kyōto, 1961, pp. 73–76. A single folio broken in two, with some loss of material in the middle, corresponding to the first half of §6, written in Southern Turkestan Brāhmī, late 5th or early 6th century. We are grateful to Akira Yuyama for providing us with copies of Sanada’s work, which unfortunately came to hand too late for the readings of this fragment to be incorporated in our edition.

Besides these Central Asian fragments of the text, Sanskrit mss of the Vaj are also known to exist in Nepal. Yuyama (1967: 68) records three, one in the Bir Library in Kathmandu (No. 276 (*te* 722/1)) and two in the Hem Raj Collection (No. 29 (-3) and No. 30 (-9)). While the latter pair have yet to be traced in the Nepalese National Archives, into which these older collections have been absorbed, the former item, now National Archives 3–722, is in fact an incomplete *gser yig* copy of the Tibetan translation, even though the label on the outside of the bundle reads *Vajracchedaprajñāpāramitā*. Of the two mss of the Vaj listed as having been microfilmed by the Nepal German Manuscript Preservation Project, one (a palm leaf ms in 81 folios, NGMPP E963/5) turns out to be a copy of the *Kāraṇḍavyūha*. The other (Ca 267; NGMPP A913/9; Acc. No 4/267), happily, is indeed the Vaj. It is a paper ms dated 1701 containing a complete copy of the text on 52 folios (not 62, as given in the NGMPP database). This leaves us with a possible total of three mss of the Vaj in Nepal, going by current information, for which we are greatly indebted to the generosity of Akira Yuyama, Christoph Cüppers and Dragomir Dimitrov, who kindly supplied us with copies of the relevant material. These Nepalese mss of the text will repay careful study, if they can be found. At the time of writing, only Ca 267 has come to hand. It is highly corrupt, but its testimony is valuable nonetheless.

---

<sup>18</sup> It is possible that Frags h and i belong to the same folio.

## 2. The Manuscript of the Vajracchedikā in the Schøyen Collection

The discovery of a copy of the Vaj in the Schøyen Collection, in the manuscript unit bearing the designation MS 2385, represents a significant addition to our knowledge of the Sanskrit text of the Vaj. However, it is worth noting at the outset that MS 2385 contains not just one sūtra, but two: the *Bhaiṣajyagurusūtra* (Bhg) and the Vaj. The Vaj begins immediately after the Bhg, which ends on fols. 25v4–26r1 with “... the round of teachings, the Mahāyāna sūtra entitled ‘The Unbroken (?) Full Account of the Excellence of All the Vows of the Realized One Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabha’ is finished,”<sup>19</sup> and this is followed on 26r1–2 by: “Hail to Śākyamuni, the Realized, Worthy and Perfectly Awakened One!” (*Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidūryaprabhasya tathāgatasya [sa]rvapranidhānavi{sa}śeśavistaram abhaṅgam nā<ma> dharma<pa>ryāyam mahāyānasūtram samāptah || ● || namo Śākyamunayes tathāgatāyārhate samyaksambuddhāya | ||*), which invocation precedes the *nidāna* of the Vaj. The folio numbers of the two texts are as follows:

Text 1 Bhg, fols. 1r1–26r1

Text 2: Vaj, fols. 26r1–46v6

These circumstances suggest that at the time this manuscript was produced some Mahāyāna Buddhists regarded the Vaj as one of a set of Mahāyāna sūtras, rather than an independent work. One thinks of the practice in Nepal and elsewhere of copying multiple texts together under the title of *Mahāyānasamgraha* or *Dhāraṇīsamgraha*. Whether or not such titles were applied, we already have ample evidence of such a practice in the Bamiyan area, in the form of the large Mahāyāna Sūtra compendium MS 2378/1 published in Vol. 1 of this series. Even more interesting is the fact that the Gilgit manuscript of the Vaj presents a similar situation. There at least four texts are copied in the same bundle, and although the remainder of the folio (fol. 12) on which the Vaj (the first text in the bundle) ends is left blank, the Bhg begins immediately after on fol. 13.<sup>20</sup> That is to say, these two sūtras<sup>21</sup> once again appear together, even though their order is reversed. In this light, one would be justified in concluding that some Buddhists saw a connection between them. In view of the fact that they were being copied in the same language, script, format and support, it is evident that they were circulating together in the area between Gilgit and Bamiyan (or what Richard Salomon has called “Greater Gandhāra”) by the sixth to seventh centuries, if not earlier.

The Bhg will be the subject of a separate treatment by Gregory Schopen. As far as the Vaj is concerned, the technical details of the portion of the manuscript taken up by it (hereafter referred to as S) are as follows:

Date: ca. 6th–7th century.

Script: Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I, written in a coarse but confident and legible hand. The scribe has frequently resorted to the use of “filler marks” in the form of long dashes (sometimes run together into a single long line, as, e.g., on folio 31v) where he has run into difficulty with the roughness of the writing surface or the lack of sufficient space to accommodate

<sup>19</sup> The reading of this passage and its interpretation are preliminary and tentative, since there are several problematic elements in it (including *sarva* where we would expect *pūrva*). For a definitive treatment we refer the reader to the complete study of the Schøyen Bhg by Gregory Schopen which will appear in the fourth volume of this series.

<sup>20</sup> See Chakravarti 1956: 175–176 for the details.

<sup>21</sup> We use this term loosely here. Nowhere in P, G, or S is the Vaj ever designated as the *Vajracchedikā prajñāpāramitā sūtra*, although the terms *dharmaparyāya*, *sūtra*, and *sūtrānta* are used to refer to it.

the bottom line.

**Support:** Birch bark, generally in an excellent state of preservation. Occasional breaks in the fabric of the ms have been repaired in the digital images which appear at the end of this volume. These breaks range from the complete splitting apart of some folios to the lifting off of small fragments of the top layer of bark. Obverse and reverse of the birch bark are clearly distinguished, since the obverse has a silvery sheen which the reverse lacks.

**Dimensions:** Approximately 5–6cm x 18–19cm. Most of the folios have rounded corners, but a few (28, 33, 34, 41, 42) are cut square, and are also much shorter. Since this involves no loss of text, these folios were probably cut to that shape before being inscribed.

**Format:** Basically, 6 lines per folio. There are, however, some folios with 5 lines (folis. 32, 33, 34 and 45) and one with 7 lines (fol. 28). A stringhole appears to the left of centre, above and below which a space is left on all lines on some folios, although on most the writing continues unbroken around the hole. On the recto of each folio a generous margin accommodates the folio number. Since the text on the verso is right-justified, but is written on the recto with the right edge curving around the folio number, it is possible that the folios were numbered before being inscribed with the text.<sup>22</sup>

**Extent:** 21 folios, numbered 26 to 46. When compared with Conze's edition (Cz), S corresponds to pp. 27.3–46.11 (extending from §1 to almost the end of §16). Müller's edition of the complete text (M) covers 28 pages (pp. 19–46), and because S ends on M's p. 35 (its 17th page), it represents approximately 60% of the full text. We assume therefore that it originally consisted of about 35 folios.

The survival rate of S is thus roughly the same as that of the Gilgit ms (G). Moreover, since it is the first half of G which is missing, by combining S with G it is possible to gain an overall picture of the Vaj as it was circulating around the sixth century in Greater Gandhāra. A critical examination of S, therefore, should enable us to understand the evolution of the text edited by Conze (Cz), which is so widely used at present. In other words, it has now become possible to plot the development of the complete text of the Vaj over a thousand years and more as it spread from Gandhāra to Tibet and as far as Japan. The Schøyen manuscript is thus of great significance for the future study of Prajñāpāramitā literature and of Mahāyāna Buddhism in general.

### *3. The Schøyen Manuscript and Its Relationship with Other Extant Manuscripts*

We begin by comparing the extent of coverage of the Schøyen ms (S) with that of the two other mss thought to be of about the same date, that is, the Gilgit ms as edited by Schopen (G) and the Central Asian ms edited by Pargiter (P). The following diagram shows the extant portions of these three mss with reference to the sections, pages and lines of Cz.

---

<sup>22</sup> It appears that the scribe did this folio by folio, rather than numbering all the folios before copying the text.

*Three Ancient MSS of the Vaj*

S	fols. 26–46 §§1–16c (27.3–46.11)				fols. 47ff. LOST	
G	fols. 1–4 LOST			fol. 5 §§13b– 14e (38.6– 41.20)	fol. 6 LOST	fols. 7–12 §§15b–32b (44.6–63.2)
P	fol. 1 LOST	fol. 2 §§2–4 (27.22 29.15)	fol. 3–5 LOST	fol. 6–11 §§10b–16c (35.24–46.8)	fol. 12 LOST	fols. 13–19 §§17b–32b (48.2–63.2)

As is evident from the above diagram, there is a partial overlap between S and G, and so it is possible to compare the readings of the two. In concrete terms, S 39r1–42r4 corresponds to G 5a1–5b7 (Cz 38.6–41.19), and S 44v6–46v6 corresponds to G 7a1–7b4 (Cz 44.6–46.11). Although the two manuscripts generally tally, they are not identical, and there are many minor differences in wording. Furthermore, when S is compared with P, considered to be the oldest manuscript, it is evident that S is the manuscript closest in content to P. There is no space here to undertake a detailed analysis of all the differences and similarities, but the features of S discussed below in the next two sections of our introduction are generally typical of the older manuscripts G and P rather than the more recent witnesses on which Müller's edition is based.

#### 4. Linguistic Characteristics of S

The language of S is a fairly regular Sanskrit, rather close to that of G, without the more obvious Prakritic colouring that can be observed in P. While it is often difficult to isolate genuine linguistic features from simple scribal errors, a number of characteristics can be noted. They do not necessarily occur consistently throughout the manuscript, but they do at least indicate certain tendencies in it.

The most salient feature is that the rules of sandhi are often ignored. For example, final and initial vowels are frequently left unchanged, a hiatus being preferred to vowel combination consistent with sandhi rules. Further, the manuscript is especially indifferent to the rules of sandhi applying to the *visarga*. In assessing such cases one must of course always be alert to the fact that the non-application of sandhi is an alternative form of punctuation, so only instances in which punctuation is clearly not an issue are given below as examples.

##### (1) Sandhi rules for vowels are not always observed.

[1] Similar vowels do not coalesce.

*vā arūpiṇo vā asamjñino* (28r2–3), *mayaḥ anāgāmiphalam* (35r2), *mayaḥ ārādhitā* (46r4).

[2] *a* or *ā* do not merge with simple dissimilar vowels or diphthongs to produce their full or lengthened grade (*guṇa* or *vṛddhi*).

*srotāpan[n]asya evam* (34r1), *vā imam* (43v1), *vā imān* (45v2).

- [3] *i, ī, u, ū* and *r* do not shift to the corresponding semivowels before dissimilar vowels.  
*diśi ākāśasya* (28v7), *bhavati arham* (35v4), *araṇāvihārīti araṇāvihārītī* (36r1), *dhvani asam-khyeye* (46r2).
- [4] *Abhinihitā* sandhi is ignored, and a hiatus occurs instead.  
*sarve anupadhiṣeṣe* (28r4); *sarve te aprameye* (30v6), *tenocyate anāgāmīti* (35r3–4).  
 (It is therefore not surprising that S also prefers to leave the hiatus after the vocative *subhūte*.)
- [5] A final *e* before an initial vowel other than *a* does not become *a*.  
*ye imeśv* (29v6, 30r2, 30v4), *pr̥thivī[pra]deṣe ito* (38r3), *te āścaryeṇa* (38r6), *ukte āyuṣmān* (38v2), *pr̥[thi]vīpradeṣe idam* (45r4).

(2) Sandhi rules for consonants and especially *h* (visarga) are not always observed.

- [1] Visarga before *t* does not become *s*.  
*subhūtiḥ tasyām* (26v5), *lakṣaṇālaksanataḥ tathāgato* (29v3–4), *dha[r]maḥ tathāgate[nā]* (36r3–4), *yah tathāgatena* (43r1–2), *[dhā]rmaparyāyah tathāgatena* (44r6).
- [2] Before a voiced sound visarga does not become *r*.  
*ājānadbhīḥ dharmāḥ* (31v5), *subhūtiḥ dharmā°* (40r1).
- [3] Changes of *ah* and *āh*.
- (a) Before any vowel other than *a*, *ah* does not become *a* followed by a hiatus.  
*sakrd[ā]gāminah evam* (34v1–2), *bhagavantah ārāgitā* (46r4–5). (However, in such situations *ah* sometimes becomes *o* followed by a hiatus: *sakṛdāgāmino evam* (34v3–4), *arhaṇto evam* (35r4–5)! But note also *dharmodgrahītavyo* instead of *dharma udgrahītavyo* (31v4).)
- (b) Before *a*, *ah* does not become *o* with *a* disappearing.  
*bodhisatvah apratiṣṭhito* (28v5), *pūnyaskandhah askandha* (33r2), *bhāṣitah arajah* (39r4).  
 (However, when this rule is applied, the lost *a* is, as usual in these mss, not indicated by *avagraha*.)
- (c) Before a voiced consonant, *ah* does not become *o*.  
*bhikṣavah yena* (26v3), *dharmāḥ yah* (34v5).
- (d) Before a voiced sound, *āh* does not become *ā*.  
*mahāsatvāḥ anuparigrhītāḥ* (27r2–3), *[sa]tvāḥ bhavisyamty* (29v5), *satvāḥ aprameyam* (43v3), *satvāḥ aprameyena* (44v4–5). (However, the scribe twice writes *kulaputro vā* where he should have written *kulaputra vā*, at 43r6 & 45v2.)

For all these examples, just as many if not more cases can be found where the relevant rules are applied correctly, so the ms is simply inconsistent. This inconsistency is especially noticeable with respect to visarga, which is often left off where we would expect it, even in sentence-final position (e.g. 39v1). How much of this is due to scribal carelessness is unclear. But we note that the use of *anusvāra* is also often in error, with the dot above the letter being left out where it is needed and put in where it is not, so that occasionally one has the impression that the scribe went back and wrote it in afterwards. There are similar instances with the use of *e-mātrā*.

In other respects apart from sandhi the language of the text only occasionally departs from the classical norm in any significant way, even though it contains much BHS vocabulary. This is also true of the later witnesses. Hybrid forms which are not found in M and Cz, however, are, for example, *evarūpa* used interchangeably with *evamrūpa* (see 29v6, 30v4, cf. 30r2), *catuspādika* for *catuspādika* (33r5–v1, 38r1, 38r3–4, 39v5–6), *lokadhātu* as fem. (e.g. 39r5), *carima* (46r5), and so on. We also find four times (28r6, 33v5, 34v4–5, 42v2) the use of the ablative phrase *tat kasmād*

*dhetoh* instead of what is in M and Cz the invariable *tat kasya hetoh*.<sup>23</sup> None of these features is particularly unusual or archaic, indicating that S, like G, represents a recension of the text which has moved somewhat further than P in the direction of linguistic standardisation, although it has still not reached the point represented by M and Cz.

### 5. The Content of S in Comparison with Cz

Generally speaking, to state the conclusion first, it is also evident that in terms of content S lies somewhere near G on a continuum stretching from P to Cz. It should not be inferred from this that all our witnesses represent points in a single line of transmission, and are thus vertically related, but a general trend is clear enough. That trend is towards the introduction in Cz of words and phrases not present in S, or the amplification of words and phrases already found in S. In most such cases the readings of S are very similar to those of P, G, and the early Chinese translations such as that of Kumārajīva. We can thus see that the Vaj has tended to expand over time, even though the basic framework of the text has remained much the same.

The following nine points are illustrative of this process. It will be seen that they range from the presence or absence of single words to the inclusion or omission of lengthy phrases. To avoid unnecessary complexity, reference is given only to folios of S and page and line numbers of Cz. The reader need only check our Reconstruction and consult the footnotes to it to see exactly how and where Cz (and M)<sup>24</sup> differ from S. The same footnotes will also indicate whether P and G read with S or against it.<sup>25</sup>

[1] Subhūti is not addressed in the vocative in S, but is in Cz

S: 28r1 (cf. Cz 28.19); 29r4 (cf. Cz 30.2); 30v6 (cf. Cz 31.13); 31r4 (cf. Cz 31.19); 38r6 (cf. Cz 37.17); 38v1 (cf. Cz 37.18); 41r3 (cf. Cz 40.18); 41r6 (cf. Cz 41.2); 42v5 (cf. Cz 42.7); 43v3 (cf. Cz 43.5); 44r6 (cf. Cz 43.20); 44v4 (cf. Cz 44.4); 45v4 (cf. Cz 45.2).

In these 13 instances the vocative *subhūte* which appears in Cz is missing in S. There are only a few cases where the reverse is true. While this does not of course make any great difference to the overall meaning, it indicates the more concise nature of S. The same pattern is found with the vocative *bhagavan*.

[2] The term *bodhisattva* (always written *bodhisatva*) tends to appear alone in S, and is rarely amplified by the companion term *mahāsattva* (*mahāsatva*), as it often is in Cz. This is the case in the following 9 places:

S: 27r4 (cf. Cz 28.2); 27v1 (cf. Cz 28.9); 27v2 (cf. Cz 28.10–11); 28v4 (cf. Cz 29.12–13); 30r6 (cf. Cz 31.4); 31r1–2 (cf. Cz 31.15); 31r3 (cf. Cz 31.17–18); 31r5–6 (cf. Cz 31.20–21); 36v2 (cf. Cz 35.25–26).

To these add the most striking example, the addition in the *nidāna* of Cz (27.6) of *sambahulaiś ca bodhisattvair mahāsattvaiḥ*, which has no counterpart at all in the *nidāna* of S (26r4),<sup>26</sup> as well as two other places where Cz has *bodhisattva mahāsattva*, but S has nothing: 30v3 (cf. Cz 31.8);

<sup>23</sup> On this use of the ablative see Speijer, 1886, §193, pp. 137–140, n. 1.

<sup>24</sup> Hereafter in this section we refer only to Cz, but in all cases it may be assumed that Cz reads with M.

<sup>25</sup> If P and G's readings are not mentioned specifically in the notes, one can infer that they agree with S.

<sup>26</sup> Similarly, bodhisattvas are mentioned as members of the assembly in the conclusion (§32b) of M and Cz, but not in P or G.

31v4 (cf. Cz 32.1–2).

There are in total eighteen instances of the word *mahāsattva* in Cz, and they all appear together with *bodhisattva*. Of these eighteen, fifteen appear in the section corresponding to the extant S (as far as Cz 46.11). An analysis of the corresponding passages in S reveals that in nine instances the word *mahāsat(t)va* is missing, and in a further three instances the entire phrase containing *bodhisat(t)va mahāsat(t)va* is missing. Thus the word *mahāsatva* is used only three times in S (at 27r2–3, 30r4, 42r3–4), and is comparatively rare.<sup>27</sup>

[3] The formula “Realized, Worthy and Fully Awakened One” (*tathāgata, arhat, samyaksambuddha*) is sometimes truncated.

In several cases, S has the word *tathāgata* alone, whereas Cz amplifies this to the full formula comprising three terms:

S: 27r3 (cf. Cz 28.1–2); 33v4 (cf. Cz 33.22).

Once again, there is nothing especially significant about this, and there are plenty of instances where the full set of three terms is found both in S and in Cz. We leave out of account here the places where the term *arhat* occurs on its own, since in these passages the subject is the various grades of noble person (*āryapudgala*) and the like.

See also the next point.

[4] The phrase *dānam dadyāt* appears without further specification.

There are three instances where S has the phrase *dānam dadyāt* (32v3, 33r5, 38r1), while Cz amplifies this by specifying the recipient of the gift in question, viz. *tathāgatebhyo 'rhadbhyaḥ samyaksambuddhebhyo* (33.5–6, 33.16–17, 37.5–7). But there is one case where S also adds this phrase (37v2–3, cf. Cz 36.21–22).

[5] The sentence “the Realized One knows them, the Realized One sees them” appears without instrumental amplification.

Three times in the extant portion of S (30v5–6; 43v1–2; 44v3–4) the text says *jñātās te subhūte tathāgatena drṣṭās te subhūte tathāgatena* (“the Realized One knows them, Subhūti, the Realized One sees them, Subhūti”). In Cz (31.10–12; 43.3–5; 44.1–3) the means by which this knowing and seeing take place is further specified: *jñātās te subhūte tathāgatena buddhajñānena, drṣṭās te subhūte tathāgatena buddhacakṣusā* (“the Realized One knows them, Subhūti, by means of the cognition of a Buddha, the Realized One sees them, Subhūti, by means of the eye of a Buddha”).

It is doubtful whether one could draw any conclusions from this about the development of the concepts of *buddhajñāna* and *buddhacakṣus*, especially as in the case of the latter the term is also attested in §18a of the Vaj, as it appears in both P and G.

[6] The stock phrase enquiring after the reason for something (*tat kasya hetoh*) is absent.

The stock phrase *tat kasya hetoh*, alternatively *tat kasmād dhetoh*, so common in the Prajñāpāramitā sūtras, with their question-and-answer style of discourse, is absent in seven places in S (35v2; 39r3; 40r6; 42r1 (problematic passage); 42v6; 45v4; 46r1) where it occurs in Cz (35.6; 38.11; 39.18–19; 41.14 (?); 42.9; 45.2; 45.6).

<sup>27</sup> It is also of note that, in the first and third of these passages, where P is also extant, P lacks the word *mahāsatva*, which in that text is attested only once, in §32a.

[7] The beings for whose sake the Buddha teaches the Vaj are not specified.

In Cz, in §14a (39.11–14), Subhūti exclaims “It is a marvellous thing, Lord, it is a most marvellous thing, Blessed One, that this round of teachings has been preached by the Realized One for the sake of living beings who have set out on the highest way, for the sake of those who have set out on the best way” (Cz: *āścaryam bhagavan paramāścaryam sugata, yāvad ayam dharmaparyāyas tathāgatena bhāṣito 'grayānasamprasthitānām sattvānām arthāya śreṣṭhayānasamprasthitānām arthāya*). In the corresponding passage in S (40r2–3), the sentence stops at *bhāṣitah*, and the phrase *agrayānasamprasthitānām*, etc., does not appear. Although an equivalent is found in Xuanzang’s translation (最上乘 … 最勝乘 “the highest vehicle … the supreme vehicle”), the phrase is absent from all the other Chinese versions, from the Tibetan translation, and from P and G as well. Thus this claim that the Vaj has been taught for the benefit of followers of the Mahāyāna is revealed as a later addition to this particular passage, but not, it must be stressed, to the text as a whole, since the very same phrase also occurs in both S and P at §15b.

[8] In S the set of actions performed with regard to the sūtra appears in truncated form.

In Mahāyāna sūtras, a list of things which one does with a text is expressed in the following set phrase, or in variations on it: “They will learn this round of teachings, bear it in mind, recite it, master it, and illuminate it for others in full” (*imam dharmaparyāyam udgrahīṣyanti dhārayīṣyanti vācayīṣyanti paryavāpsyanti parebhyāś ca vistareṇa samprakāśayīṣyanti*). Here, the final operation (*parebhyāś ca vistareṇa samprakāśayīṣyanti*) merits special attention in that it refers to active propagation among others.

Of the 14 instances of this formula or variants of it in Cz, 12 occur in the part of the text covered by S.<sup>28</sup> Leaving out the object of the verbs in question (*gāthā, dharmaparyāya*, etc.), they run as follows, with the altered or amplified wording in Cz in bold:

- §8. S 33v1: *udgrhya parebhyo deśayet samprakāśayed* > Cz 33.19: *udgrhya parebhyo vistareṇa deśayet samprakāśayed*;
- §11. S 38r1–2: *udgrhya parebhyo deśayet* > Cz 37.8: *udgrhya parebhyo deśayet samprakāśayed*;
- §12. S 38r4: *bhāṣyeta vā deśyeta vā* > Cz 37.16: *udgrhya bhāṣyeta vā samprakāśyeta vā*;
- S 38r6: *dhārayīṣyamti* > Cz 37.15–17: *dhārayīṣyanti vācayīṣyanti paryavāpsyanti parebhyāś ca vistareṇa samprakāśayīṣyanti*;
- §13e. S 39v6: *udgrhya parebhyo deśayet* > Cz 39.6: *udgrhya parebhyo deśayet samprakāśayed*;
- §14b. S 40v3: *udgrhīṣyamti paryavāpsyamti dhā(ra)yīṣyamti* > Cz 40.6–8: *udgrahīṣyanti dhārayīṣyanti vācayīṣyanti paryavāpsyanti parebhyāś ca vistareṇa samprakāśayīṣyanti*;
- §14h. S 43v1: *udgrahīṣyamti* : *dhāra(yi)ṣyamti / vāc(a)yīṣyamti* </> *paryavāpsyamti* > Cz 43.1–3: *udgrahīṣyanti dhārayīṣyanti vācayīṣyanti paryavāpsyanti parebhyāś ca vistareṇa samprakāśayīṣyanti*;
- §15a. S 44r3–5: *likhitvodgrhñ(i)yāt* </> *dhārayet* </> *vācayet* </> *paryavāpnuyāt* </> *parebhyāś ca vistareṇa samprakāśayet* > Cz 43.17–19: *likhitvodgrhñiyād dhārayed vācayet paryavāpnuyāt parebhyāś ca vistareṇa samprakāśayet*,
- §15b. S 44v2–3: *udgrahīṣyamti / dhārayīṣyamti / vācayīṣya<m>ti* </> *paryavāpsyamti* > Cz 43.23–44.1: *udgrahīṣyanti dhārayīṣyanti vācayīṣyanti paryavāpsyanti parebhyāś ca*

<sup>28</sup> For the remaining two occurrences see §§24, 32a.

- vistareṇa samprakāśayiṣyanti;*
- 45r3: *śrotum udgrahītum vā dhārayitum vā vācayitum vā paryavāptu(m) vā* > Cz 44.12–13: *śrotum vodgrahītum vā dhārayitum vā vācayitum vā paryavāptum vā.*
- §16a. S 45v3: *udgrahīṣyamti dhārayīṣyamti paryavāpsyamti* > Cz 44.19–45.1: *udgrahīṣyanti dhārayīṣyanti vācayīṣyanti paryavāpsyanti yoniśāś ca manasikariṣyanti parebhyaś ca vistareṇa samprakāśayiṣyanti;*
- §16b. S 46r6–v1: *(u)d(gra)hīṣ(ya)m̄ti dhāra(y)i(sya)m̄(t)i v(āca)yī(sya)m̄(t)i (pa)ryavāpsyamti* > Cz 45.15–17: *udgrahīṣyanti dhārayīṣyanti vācayīṣyanti paryavāpsyanti parebhyaś ca vistareṇa samprakāśayiṣyanti.*

It can be seen from the above examples that the trend in Cz is always towards amplification and standardisation of the formula. This formula is certainly known to S, but is given only once (in §15a) in its full form. The later recension of the Vaj, by contrast, was more inclined to give this formula, like others, in full (i.e. *vistareṇa!*).

[9] The eschatological formula is given in shortened form in S or not at all.

That the well-known Buddhist eschatological formula (*anāgate 'dhvani paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyām pañcaśatyām saddharmavipralope* or similar) was added to the Vaj as it evolved from the text as known from G to that represented by Cz has already been maintained in Watanabe 1999. At first sight S suggests a similar situation. Once again, words added or changed in Cz appear in bold.

- §6(i). S 29v5–6: *anāgate 'dhvani paścimāyām pañcāśatyā<m>* *vartamānāyām* > Cz 30.16–18: *anāgate 'dhvani paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyām pañcaśatyām saddharmavipralopakāle vartamāne;*
- §6(ii). S 30r2: *anāgate 'dhvani* > Cz 30.22–24: *anāgate 'dhvani paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyām pañcaśatyām saddharmavipralope vartamāne;*
- §6(iii). S 30r3–4: *anāgate 'dhvani ... paścimāyām pañcāśatyām saddharmavipralope* > Cz 30.26–31.1: *anāgate 'dhvani ... paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyām pañcaśatyām saddharmavipralope vartamāne;*
- §14b. S 40v2 (entire eschatological phrase missing) > Cz 40.3–5: *anāgate 'dhvani paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyām pañcaśatyām saddharmavipralopa vartamāne;*
- §16b S 46r5–6: *carime kāle paścimi(k)āyām pañcā(sa)tyām vartamānāyām* > Cz 45.13–14: *paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyām pañcaśatyām saddharmavipralopakāle vartamāna.*

In these five cases we see the same pattern as before. The basic idea is attested in S, and all the elements of the formula can be found in it (including the important term *saddharmavipralopa*), but generally S does not give the formula in full. In the later recension, by contrast, the formula is fuller and more standardised.

The above list of differences is not exhaustive, there being many other passages in which the text of S is either considerably shorter than that of Cz, or less standardised in its wording. Both these features are especially evident in the “signature formula” of the Vaj, the affirmation-negation-affirmation sequence, when one compares S with Cz. Because of the wide range of variations and the complexity of the passages in question, readers would be best advised to consult our Reconstruction and the following English Translation directly. It should always be borne in mind, however, that in

some cases we may not be dealing with a genuinely shorter recension, but with the results of scribal error in the form of omission of passages due to eye-skip. Some of these possibilities are discussed in the notes to the English translation. Sections §§9a–d, for example, are typical of this kind of situation, and, since they are not extant in either P or G, need to be carefully studied with reference to the Chinese translations. We omit such passages from consideration here, not only because they are rather complex, but also because they do not illustrate any general features of S apart from the ones we already hope to have established: that S tends to be shorter and less standardised than the recension represented by Cz. These features S shares with P and G (and the Central Asian fragments), in the same way as it tends to share their linguistic characteristics.

## *II. Transliteration*

### 1) MS 2385/21; folio 26 recto (Cz 27.1–8)

- 1 || ● || namo śākyamuna  
 2 yes tathāgatāyārhatē samyaksam̄buddhāya : || evam̄ mayā śrutam̄ ekasmin̄ [sa]ma  
 3 ye bhagavān\* śrāvastyām̄ viharati sma · jetavane · anāthapiṇḍadasyārame maha  
 4 tā bhikṣusamghena sārdham a○rdhatrayodaśabhir bhikṣuśataiḥ atha khalu bhagavān\*  
 5 pūrvāhṇakālasamaye nivāsyā [pā]tracīvaram̄ ādāya · śrāvastīm̄ mahānagarīm̄ pi  
 6 ḥādāya prāviśat\* atha khalu bhagavan\* śrāvastīm̄ mahānagarī piṇḍāyam̄ cari

### verso (Cz 27.8–19)

- 1 tvā paścādbhaktapiṇḍapātapratikkramtaḥ pādau prakṣālyā nyaśīdad bhagavān\* prajñapta e  
 2 vāsane paryam̄kam ābhujya ṛjum̄ kāyam̄ praṇidhāya pratimukhaṁ smṛtim̄ upasthāpya · atha  
 3 sam̄bahulā bhikṣavaḥ yena bhagavām̄ tenopasam̄kkramann̄ upasam̄kkramya bhagavataḥ  
 4 pādau śirasābhivandya bhagavam̄ Otam̄ ṛhpradakṣinīkṛtvā kāmte nyaśīdan\* tena khalu pu  
 5 naḥ samayenāyuṣmān subhūtiḥ tasyām̄ eva pariṣadi sannipatito bhūt sanniṣanṇaḥ  
 6 atha khalv āyuṣmān subhūtir utthyāyāsanād ekām̄sam ut[t]jarāsam̄gam̄ kṛtvā dakṣiṇam̄ jā

### 2) MS 2385/20, uf1/4s; folio 27 recto (Cz 27.19–28.8)

- 1 nnumāṇḍala[m] pṛthivyām̄ pratiṣṭhāpya yena bhagavām̄ tenāmjalim̄ pranāmya bhagavam̄tam̄ etad a  
 2 vocat\* āścaryaṁ bhagavan yāvad evan tathāgatenārhatā samyaksam̄buddhena bodhisatvā ma  
 3 hāsatvāḥ anuparigṛhitāḥ paramenānugraheṇa : yāvad eva [ta]thāgatena bo  
 4 dhisatvāḥ parittāḥ parama○yā parindanayā · katham̄ bhagava bodhisatvayā  
 5 nasamprasthitena sthātavyam\* katham̄ pratipattapavyam\* kamn̄tham̄ ci ----- ttam̄ prati  
 6 gṛhitavyam\* evam ukte bhagavān āyuṣmāṇtam̄ subhūtim̄ etad av. c. t\* sādhu

### verso (Cz 28.8–28.17)

- 1 sādhu subhūte evam etat subhūte anuparigṛh[i]tās tathāgatena bodhisat.[ā] .. + +  
 2 meṇānugraheṇa · parittās tathāgatena bodhisatvāḥ -----  
 3 paramayānuparindanayā · tena hi subhūte śr̄ṇu sādhu -----

- 4 ca suṣṭhu ca manasikuru bhāsi○ṣye · yathā bodhisatvayānasamprasthi[tena] sthā[ta]vyam\*  
 5 yathā pratipattavyam\* yathā cittam pratigr̄hitavyam\* evam bhagavān i + .. ṣmān subhūti  
 6 r bhagavam̄tah pratyāśrauṣit\* bhagavām̄s tān etad avocat\* iha subhūte bodhisatvayāna

**3) MS 2385/19, uf1/4x; folio 28 recto (Cz 28.18–29.5)**

- 1 nasamprasthitair evam cittam utpādayitavyam\* yāvam̄tah satvāḥ satvasamg[r]ahēṇa samgr̄hi  
 2 tāḥ aṇḍajā vā jarāyujā vā saṃsvedajā vā ūpapādukā vā rūpiṇo vā arūpiṇo  
 3 vā asamjñino vā asamjñino vā naiva samjñino nāsamjñinah yāvat satvadhātuḥ prajñā  
 4 pyamānah pra – – jñapyam̄te ○ te mayā sarve anupadhiše nirvāṇadhātau pari  
 5 nipayitavyāḥ evam aparimāṇām̄s ca satvān\* parinivāpayitavyāḥ na ca kaścit satva  
 6 parinivāpito bhavati · tat kasmād dhetoḥ sacet subhūte bodhisatvasya satvasamjñā  
 7 pravartate na sa bodhisatva iti naktavyāḥ tat [ka]s[ya] hetoḥ na s[u] subhūte bodhi[sa]

**verso (Cz 29.5–18)**

- 1 two vaktavyo yasya satvasamjñā pravarteta jīvasamjñā vā pudgalasamjñā vā pravarteta api tu  
 2 khalu punah subhūte bodhisatvena stupratiṣṭhitena dānam dātavya[m]\* na kvacitpratiṣṭhitena dā  
 3 nam tavyam\* na rūpapratiṣṭhitena dānam dātavyam na śabdagandharasaspraṣṭavye[ṣu] na dharmapratī<sup>1</sup>  
 4 ṣṭhitena dānam dātavyam\* evam hi ○ subhūte bodhisatvena dānam dātavyam\* yathā na nimi  
 5 ttasamjñāyām pratiṣṭhe[t\*] tat kasya hetoḥ yaḥ subhūte bodhisatvāḥ apratiṣṭhito dānam  
 6 dadā[t]i .. sya subh.te puṇyaskandhasya na sukaram pramāṇam udgrahītum\* tat [k]im manyase su  
 7 bh. te sukaram .. .[v]. syām diśi ākāśasya pramā[ṇa]m udgrahītum\* subhūter āha .

**4) MS 2385/18, uf1/4o, uf1/4h; folio 29 recto (Cz 29.18–30.8)**

- 1 no hīdaṁ bhagavan\* evam dakṣināpaścimottarā ūrdhvam̄ vidikṣu-r-avidikṣ[u] : daśa[su dīkṣ[u] : su  
 2 karam ākāśasya pramāṇam udgrahītum\* subhūtir [ā]ha · na hīdaṁ bhagavan\* + + .. .[ā]  
 3 ha · evam eta subhūte · evam etat subhūte yo bodhisat[v]o pratiṣṭhito dānam  
 4 dadāti tasya puṇyaskandhasya ○ na sukaram pramāṇam u[d]grahītum\* api [t]u [kha]lu  
 5 punah subhūte evam bodhisatvena dānamayam̄ puṇyakṛyāvastum dānam dātavyam\* tat k[i]m  
 6 manyase subhūte tathāgato lakṣaṇasampadā draṣṭavyāḥ bhagavān āha na lakṣaṇa

**verso (Cz 30.8–19)**

- 1 sampadā tathāgato draṣṭavyāḥ tat kasya hetoḥ [yā] sā ta[thā]gatena lakṣaṇasampad bhāsi  
 2 tāḥ saivālakṣaṇasampadāt\* evam ukte bhaga[vān] āyuṣmaṇtam subhūtim etad avocat\* ya  
 3 vat sute lakṣaṇam̄ tāvan mr̄ṣā · yāvad alakṣaṇam̄ tāva[d a]mr̄[ṣā] iti hi lakṣaṇālakṣaṇataḥ  
 4 tathāgato draṣṭavyāḥ || eva○m ukte ā[y]u[ṣm]ān subh[ū]ti bhagavam̄tam etad avocat\* a  
 5 sti bhagavan kecīt [sa]tvāḥ bhaviṣyam̄ty anāgate dhvani paśc[i]māyām paṇcāśat�a vartamānā

6 yām<sup>29</sup> ye imesv evarūpeṣu sūtrāmtapadeṣu bhāṣyamāneṣu bhūtasaṃjñām utpā

**5) MS 2385/17; folio 30 recto (Cz 30.19–31.5)**

1 day[i]ṣyam̄ti · bhagavān āha · mā tvam̄ su[bh]ūtevam̄ vocat\* a + kecit satvāḥ bhaviṣya  
 2 ty anāgate dhvani ye imesv evamrūp[e]ṣu sūtrāmtapade[ṣu] bhāṣyamāneṣu bhūtasaṃ  
 3 jñām utpādayiṣyam̄ti · api tu khalu punah subhūte bha[vi]ṣyam̄ti anāgate dhvani bo  
 4 dhisatvā mahāsa — — tvā ○ paści[m]āyām paṇcāśatyām saddharmavipralope — —  
 5 pe vartamāne śīla — — vaṃto guna[v]a]m̄taḥ prajñāvato bhaviṣyam̄ti · na khalu pu  
 6 nah subhūte bo<sup>30</sup> dhisatvā ekabuddhaparyupāsitā bhaviṣyam̄ti ·

verso (Cz 31.5–13)

1 naikabuddhavarop[i]ta — — kuśalamū[l]ā bhaviṣyam̄ti · api tu khalu  
 2 punah subhū — — te [a]nekabuddhaparyupāsitā bhaviṣyam̄  
 3 ti anekabuddhāvaro ○ pitakuśalamūlā bhaviṣyam̄ti · — —  
 4 ye imesv evarūpeṣu sūtrātapadeṣu bhāṣyamāneṣv ekacittaprasāda  
 5 mātram api pratilapsyam̄te<sup>31</sup> · jñātās te subhūte tathāgatena dr̄ṣṭās te subhū  
 6 — — te tathāg[a]tena sarve te aprameye punyaskandham̄

**6) MS 2385/16; folio 31 recto (Cz 31.13–22)**

1 prasaviṣyam̄ti pratigrīṣyam̄ti tat kasya hetoh na hi teṣā. subhūte bodhisa  
 2 tvānām̄m ātmasaṃjñā pravartsyate na satvasaṃ na jivasamjñā na pudgalasamjñā pravartsyate  
 .  
 3 nāpi teṣām — — subhūte bodhisatvānām dharmasaṃjñā prava  
 4 rtsyate nādharma — — Osamjñā nāpi [t]eṣām samjñā nāsamjñā pravartsyate ·  
 5 — — — — — tat kasya hetoh sace subhūte teṣām bodhi  
 6 satvānā ḥarma — — — samjñā [p]ra[v].tsyate sa eva teṣām ātmagrā

verso (Cz 31.22–32.7)

1 ho bhavet\* sa — — — tvagrāho jī .ā .[r]. [h]. + . . . . ho bhavet\* sa  
 2 cad dharmasaṃjñā prava — — rteta sa eva teṣā + ++ .o bhavet\* satvagrā  
 3 ho jīvagrāhah — — — — pudgalagrāha i[t]j + .. t.. sya hetoh na khalu puna  
 4 subhūte dharmodgrahī — — Otvayo nādharma tasmā[d] .da. saṃndhāya tathāgatena  
 5 bhāṣitam̄ kolopamaṇ dharmaparyāyam̄ ājānadbhīḥ dharmāḥ eva prahātavyāḥ prāg e  
 6 vādharmāḥ || punar aparaṇ bhagavān āyuṣmaṇtam̄ subhūtim etad avocat\* tat ki

**7) MS 2385/15, uf1/2f, uf1/2o; folio 32 recto (Cz 32.7–32.15)**

1 manyase subhūte kācit tathāgatenānuttarām samyaksambodhir abhisambuddhā : kaści  
 2 d vā dharmas tathāgatena deśitah || subhūtir āha · yathāhaṇ bhagavan bhagavato  
 3 bhāṣitasyārtham ājānāmi ○ nāsti sa kaścid dha .[m]. + [s] tathāgatenānuttarām  
 4 samyaksambodhir abhisambuddhā : nāsti sa kaścid dharmo [y]. + + [g]. .[e]na deśitah ta  
 5 t kasya hetoh yo sau tathāgatena dharmo de[śit]a .. + + + .o nabhilapyah

<sup>29</sup> A space is left after *yām* due to an imperfection in the surface of the birch bark.

<sup>30</sup> A large space is left open in the line, without the usual spacing markers.

<sup>31</sup> Between *pra* and *ti* an akṣara (probably *vi*) has been erased.

verso (Cz 33.1–10)

- 1 na sa dharmo nādharmah tat kasya hetoh asamṣkṛtathābhāvitā hy āryapudgalāḥ tat kiṁ ma
- 2 nyase subhūte ya imāṁ ṛṣṭāhasramahāsāha[s]r. lokadhātum saptaratnapratipū
- 3 rṇam kṛtvā dānam dadyāt\* tat kiṁ O manyase subhūte [a]pi nu sa kulaputro vā kula
- 4 duhitā vā tatonidānam bahu puṇyam prasunuyā[t]\* subhūtir āha · bahu bhagava
- 5 n bahu sugata : sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidā[n]am bahu puṇyam +

8) MS 2385/14; folio 33 recto (Cz 33.10–18)

- 1 sunuyāḥ tat kasya hetoh sa eva bhagavann askandha[h] + .m.t tathāga
- 2 to bhāṣate puṇyaskandhaḥ askandha iti bhagavan bhagavān āha · yaś ca
- 3 – – khalu punah subhūOte kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā imāṁ
- 4 – ṛṣṭāhasrāmahāsāhasrāṁ lokadhātum saptaratnapratipū
- 5 – rṇam kṛtvā dānam dadāt\* yaś ceto dharmaparyāyad amtaśāś catu

verso (Cz 33.18–25)

- 1 śpadikām api gāthām udgrhya pare[bh]yo deśayet samprakāśayed a[ya]
- 2 m eva tatonidānam bahutaram puṇyam [pra]sunuyāt\* aprameyam asam
- 3 khyeyam tat kasya hetoh[h] O ato nirjātā hi subhūte tathāgatā
- 4 nām anuttarā samyaksambodhiḥ ato nirjātāś ca buddhā bhagavataḥ
- 5 tat kasmād dhetoh buddhadharmāḥ buddhadharmā iti subhūte abuddhadharmā

9) MS 2385/13; folio 34 recto (Cz 33.25–34.8)

- 1 ś caiva te · tat ki[m] manyase subhūte api nu srotāpan[n]asya evam bhavati
- 2 mayā srotāpattiphalam prāptam iti · subhūtir āha · no hīdam bhagava
- 3 n bhagavān āha · tat kasya O hetoh na hi sa bhagavan kiṁcid āpanna te
- 4 nocaye srotāpanna iti · na rūpam āpanno na śabdā na gandhā na rasā
- 5 – – – n na spraṣṭavyān na dharmān āpan[n]ah tanocaye srotāpanna iti ·

verso (Cz 34.8–18)

- 1 bhagavān āha · tat kiṁ manyase subhūte api nu sakṛd[ā]gāminaḥ
- 2 evam bhaven mayā sakṛdāgāmiphalam prāptam iti · subhūtir āha · no hī
- 3 daṁ bhagavan bhagavān āOha · tat kasye hatoḥ na sakṛdāgāmi
- 4 no evam bhaviti mayā sakṛdāgāmiphalam prāptam iti · tat kasmā
- 5 d dhetoh na hi sa kaścid dharmah yaḥ sakṛdāgāmitvam āpannah te

10) MS 2385/12; folio 35 recto (Cz 34.18–35.4)

- 1 + .y. . . + .rdāgāmīti · bhagavān āha · tat kiṁ manyase subhūte · a – –
- 2 pi nv anāgāmina · evam bhavati mayā anāgāmiphalam prāptam iti – – –
- 3 tat kasya hetoh na sa kaścid dharmah yo nāgāmīti · samanupaśyati · teno
- 4 cyate anāgāmīti · bhaOgavān āha · tat kiṁ manyase subhūte · api tv arham
- 5 to evam bhavati mayārhatvam prāptam iti · subhūtir āha · no hīdam bhagavan\* tat ka
- 6 + .e. o .. [h]i [bha]gavan\* sa kaścid dharmo yo rhan nāmaḥ ya saced bhagavann arha

verso (Cz 35.4–13)

- 1 + + ... [v]. .m. + .. [tv]. .r. [p]tam iti · sa eva tasyātmagrāho bhavet\* satvagrāho j.
- 2 + grāhaḥ pudgalagrāho bhavet\* aham asmin bhagavan\* || tathāgatenārhatā samya
- 3 ksam̄buddhenāraṇavihāriṇāOm agryo nirdiṣṭah aham asmin bhagavann arhan vigata
- 4 rāgah na ca me bhagavann evam̄ bhavati arham asminn arhānn iti · sacen mama bhagava
- 5 nn evam̄ bhaven mayārhatvam̄ prāptam iti · na me tathāgato vyākariṣyati · aranā -----
- 6 .i.ā.i + + [g]rya iti subhūti · kulaputro na kvacid viharati : -----

**11) MS 2385/11; folio 36 recto (Cz 35.13–23)**

- 1 tenocaye · aranāvihāriti aranāvihāriti · bhagavān āha · tat kiṁ manyasya
- 2 subhūte · kaścid dharmat tathāgatena dīpaṁkarāt tathāgatārhata samyaksam̄buddhā
- 3 d udgr̄hitāḥ subhūtir āha · no hīdaṁ bhagavan bhagavān āha · na sa kaścid dha[r]mah
- 4 tathāgate[na] dīpaṁkarāt taOthāgatād arhataḥ samyaksam̄buddhād udgr̄hitāḥ bhagavā
- 5 n āha : ya kaścit subhūte bodhisatvo evam̄ vaded aham̄ kṣetravyūhān niṣpādayisyāmi
- 6 ti sa vitatha vadet\* tat kasya hetoh kṣetravyūhā kṣetra -----

verso (Cz 35.23–36.6)

- 1 vyūhā iti subhūte avyūhā hy ete tathāgatena bhāṣitā te – nocyamte kṣetravyūhā i
- 2 ti tas[m]āt tarhi subhūte bodhisatvena evam̄ cittam utpādayitavyam̄ apratiṣṭhitam̄ na rūpa
- 3 pratiṣṭhitam̄ cittam utpādayiOtavyam̄ · na śabdagandharasasprāṣṭavyadharmapratiṣthi –
- 4 tam̄ cittam utpādayitavyam̄\* na [k]vacitpratiṣ[th]i[tam̄] cittam utpādayitavyam̄\* tad yathā .i
- 5 nāma subhūte puru[ṣ]o bhavet\* yasyai[va]mrūpam̄ ātmabhāvah syāt tad yathā[pi] ... +
- 6 meroḥ parvatarajā · tat [k]i manyase su -----

**12) MS 2385/10; folio 37 recto (Cz 36.6–18)**

- 1 bhūte mahān sa ātmabhāvo bhavet\* subhūtir āha · [ma]hān bhagavaṇ mahā s[u]gata [:] .. +
- 2 tmabhāvo bhavet\* bhagavan\* tat [k]asya het[o]ḥ abhāvah sa tathāgate[na bhāṣ]itāḥ tena
- 3 cyate ā[t]ma[bhāva] iti · na [hi] s[a] bhāvah t[e]n[o]cyate ātmabhāva iti · || bhagavān āha · ta
- 4 t kiṁ man[ya]se subhūte [yā]Ovaṁtyo gaṁgānadyām̄ vālukās tāvamtya evam̄ gaṁgānad[y]o bha
- 5 veyuḥ api nu tāsu bahv[y]o vālu[kā] bhaveyuḥ subhūtir āha · tā eva tāvad bhagavan ba
- 6 hvyo gaṁgānadyo bhaveyuḥ prāg eva yās tāsu vālukāḥ bhagavān āha · ārocayami

verso (Cz 36.18–37.5)

- 1 te subhūte prative[dh]ayāmi te yāvamtyas tāsu gaṁgānadiṣu vālukā bhaveyuḥ tāvam̄
- 2 tyo lokādhātavah kaścid eva strī vā p[u]ruṣo vā saptaratnapratipūrṇam̄ kṛtvā tathā
- 3 gatebhyo rhadbhyah samyaksam̄buOddhebhyo dānam̄ dadyāt\* tat kiṁ manyase subhūte api nu sā
- 4 strī vā puruṣo vā tatonidānam̄ O bahu puṇyam̄ prasunuyāt\* subhūtir āha · bahu bhaga
- 5 van bahu su[gata] : sā strī vā puruṣo vā tatonidānam̄ bahu puṇyam̄ prasunuyāda bhagav[ā]
- 6 n āha · yaś ca khalu punah subhūte tāvamtyo lokadhātavah saptaratnapratipūrṇam̄

## 13) MS 2385/9; folio 38 recto (Cz 37.5–18)

- 1 kṛtvā dānam dadyāt\* yaś ceto dha[r]maparyāyād am[t]aśaś catuṣpadikām api gāthām u
- 2 dgrhya parebhyo deśayet\* ayam tato bahutaram puṇyam prameyam asamkhyeyam\* api
- 3 tu kha[lu] subhūte yasmin pṛthivī[pra]deśe ito dharmaparyāyād amtaśaś catuṣpadi
- 4 kām api gāthām bhāṣyeta ○ vā deśyeta vā sa p[r]thivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bha
- 5 ve[t\*] sadeva[mā]nu[sā]surasya lokasya kah pu[n]ar [v]ādaḥ subhūte ya imam dharmapa
- 6 ryāyam [dhā]rayiṣyamti paramēṇa te āścaryeṇa samanvāgatā bhaviṣyamti · ta

verso (Cz 37.18–38.5)

- 1 smimś ca pṛthivīpradeśe śāstā viharaty anyatarānyatato vā gurusthānīyah evam u
- 2 kte āyuṣmān subhūtir bhagavam̄tam ed avocat\* ko nāmāyam bhagavan dharmaparyāyāh ka
- 3 thaṁ cainam dhārayāmi · evam ukte ○ bhagavān āyuṣmam̄tam subhūtim etad avocat\* prajñāpā
- 4 ramitā nāmāya subhūte dharmaparyāyāh evam cainaṁ dhāraya : tat kasya hetoh yaiva subhū
- 5 prajñāpāramitā tathāgatena bhāṣitā : saivāpāramitā : tat kiṁ manyase subhūte {{anu}}
- 6 api [n]u sa kaści dharmo tathāgatena bhāṣitah subhūtir āha no hīdam bhagavan\* bhaga

## 14) MS 2385/8, uf1/3h; folio 39 recto (Cz 38.5–17; G 5a1–2)

- 1 n āha · na sa kaścid bhagavam ddharmo yaḥ tathāgate bhāṣitaḥ yāvataḥ subhūte
- 2 tṛṣāhasramahāsāhasryām lokadhātu pṛthivīrajaḥ kaścit tad bahu bhavet\* su
- 3 bhūtir āha · bahu bhagavan\*s tat pṛthivīrajo bhavet\* yat ta bhagavan\* pṛthi
- 4 vīrajaḥ tathāgatena bhā○ṣitah arajaḥ sa tathāgatena bhāṣitah ta
- 5 d ucyate pṛthivīraja iti · yā sā lokadhātur adhātuḥ sā tathāgatena bhāṣitah
- 6 tad ucyate lokadhātu[r] iti : || bhagavān āha · tat kiṁ manyase subhūte dvātṛṁśadbhir ma

verso (Cz 38.17–39.7; G 5a2–5)

- 1 .āpuruṣalak[ś]aṇaiḥ [ta]thāgato rhan samyaksambuddho draṣṭavya · subhūtir āha · no hī
- 2 da[m] bhag[a]vad bhagavān āha · tat kasya hatoḥ yāni tāni bhagavan dvātṛṁśarmahāpuru
- 3 lakṣaṇāni tathāgatena bhāṣi○tāny alakṣaṇāni tagatena bhāṣitāni tasmād u[c]yam̄te dvā
- 4 tr̄māṇmahāpuruṣalakṣaṇāni○ti · bhagavān āha · yaś ca khalu punaḥ subhūte strī vā pu
- 5 ruṣo vā gamgānadīvālukopamān ātmabhāvān parityajet\* yaś ceto dharmaparyāyāc catuṣpa
- 6 dikām api gāthām udgṛhya parebhyo deśayet\* ayam tatonidānam bahutaram puṇyam pra

## 15) MS 2385/7; folio 40 recto (Cz 39.8–20; G 5a5–7)

- 1 meyam asamkhyeyam\* atha khalv āyuṣmān subhūtiḥ dharmapravegenāśrūṇi prāmuṣcat\*
- 2 pravartayam so śrūṇi parimārjyā bhagavam̄tam etad avocat\* āścaryam bhagavan\* paramā
- 3 scāryam sugata : yāvad ayaṁ dharmapa[r]yāyah tathāgatena bhāṣitah yato me bha --
- 4 gavan\* jñānam utpa -- ○ -- [n]am na mayā jātv eva dharmaparyāyāḥ śrutapūrvah
- 5 paramēṇa te bhagavan\* -- -- āścaryeṇa samanvāgatā bhaviṣyamti ya iha sū
- 6 t[r]e bh[āś]yamāṇe bhū – ta[sa.]jñām utpādayiṣyamti yā caiṣā bhaga[va]n\* bhūtasamjñā saivā

verso (Cz 39.20–40.14; G 5a7–5b2)

- 1 samjñā tasmā tathāgato bhāṣate bhūtasamjñā bhūtasamjñeti · na mama bhagavann āścaryaṁ yad a
- 2 haṁ dharmaparyāyam bhāṣyamāṇam avakalpayāmy adhimucyāmi · ye te bhagavann imāṁ dharmapa
- 3 ryāyam̄ udgr̄hiṣyam̄ti ——○—— paryavāpsyam̄ti dhā..yisyam̄ti · te paramāścaryasama
- 4 nvāgatā bhavisyam̄ti · || —○—— api tu khalu punah bhagavan na meṣām āt[ma]samjñā
- 5 pravartsyate · na satvasamjñā na {{ja}}jīvasamjñā · na pudga[lasa]mjñā pravartsyate · tat kasya hato
- 6 yāsāv ātmasamjñā saivāsamjñā yā satvasamjñā jīvasamjñā pudgalasam[jñā s]aivāsamjñā · tat ka

**16) MS 2385/6;** folio 41 recto (Cz 40.14–41.3; G 5b2–4)

- 1 sya hetoh sarvasamjñā[p]agatā hi buddhā bhagavaḥ || evam ukte bhagavān ā
- 2 yuṣmaṇtam̄ subhūtim etad avocat\* evam etat subhūte evam etat subhūte
- 3 paramāryasamanvāgatās te satvā bha[v]iṣyam̄t[i] · ya iha sūtre bhāṣyam̄mā
- 4 ḡe śrutvā notrasiṣyam̄ti · ○ na samṛtrasiṣyam̄t[i] · samṛtrāsam āpatsyam̄te ta
- 5 t kasya hetoh paramapāramiteyam̄ subhūte tathāgatena bhāṣitā yā [c]a
- 6 —— tathāgataḥ paramapāramitām̄ bhāṣate tām̄ aparimāṇā buddhā bha

verso (Cz 41.3–12; G 5b4–6)

- 1 gavaṁto bhāṣam̄te nocyate paramapāramiteti · api tu khalu punah subhū
- 2 te yā tathāgatasya kṣāṇtipāramitā saivāpāramitā tat kasya hatoḥ yadā
- 3 me su[bhū]te kalim̄garājā a[m̄]Ogapratyam̄gāny a.[che]t[s]in nāśin me tasmin sama
- 4 ye ātmasamjñā vā satvasamjñā vā jīvasamjñā vā pudgalasamjñā vā na me kā ·
- 5 cit samjñā nāśamjñā babhūva tat kasya hetoh [sa]cet subhūte mama tasmin sa
- 6 maye {{ā}}ātmasamjñābhaviṣyat\*d vyāpādasamjñāpi me bhaviṣyat\* tasmin sa

**17) MS 2385/5;** folio 42 recto (Cz 41.12–23; G 5b6–7)

- 1 — maye abhijānāmy aham̄ subhūte atīte dhvani paṁca jātiśatāni yad a
- 2 haṁ kṣāṇtipādīriṣi[r a]bhū tadāpi me nātmasamjñā babhūva · na satvasamjñā
- 3 na jīvasamjñā na pudgalasamjñā · tasmāt ta[rh]i subhūte bodhisatvena mahāsa
- 4 tvena [sa]rvasamjñā vinarja○yitvānuttarasayam̄ s .y. [ksa]mbodhau cittam utpāda
- 5 yitavyam\* na rūpapratīṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyam\* na śabdaga<<ndha>>rasaspraṣṭa
- 6 vyapratiṣṭhitam c[i]ttam utpādayitavyam\* na dharmapratīṣṭhitam cittam utpādayi

verso (Cz 41.23–42.10)

- 1 tavyam\* nādharmapratīṣṭhitam cattam utpādayitavyam\* na kvacitpratiṣṭhitam citta
- 2 m utpādayitavyam\* tat kasmād dhetoḥ yat pratīṣṭhim̄ tad evāpratiṣṭhim̄ tasmād evam̄
- 3 tathāgato bhāṣate rūpāOpratiṣṭhitena dānam̄ [dā]tavyam\* api tu khalu
- 4 punah subhūte bodhisatvenaivam̄ dānaparityāgaḥ parityajyah sarvasatvānām a
- 5 rthāya yaiva ca satvasamjñā sa evāsamjñā · ya eva te sarvasatvā tathāga
- 6 tena bhāṣitāḥ ta evāsatvāḥ bhūtavādī subhūte tathāgataḥ satyavādī

**18) MS 2385/4; folio 43 recto (Cz 42.10–21)**

- 1 tathāvādī tathāgato nāvitathāvād[i] tathāgato · api tu khalu punah subhūte yaḥ tathā  
 2 gatena dharmo bhisambuddho deśito vā na tatra satyam na [m]ṛṣā tad yathāpi nāma subhūte  
 3 puruṣo ndhakārah[p]raviṣṭah evam̄ vastupatito [b]o .isatvo draṣṭavya yo vastupatitam̄ dā  
 4 nam̄ parityajati · tad yathāpi ○ nāma subhūte cakṣuṣmān\* puruṣo .i .ā .āyā rātryā [s]ū  
 5 rye bhyudgate nānāvidhāni rūpāṇ[i] paśyet\* evam̄ bodhisatvo draṣṭavyo yo vastvapati  
 6 tam̄ dānam̄ parityajati · api tu khalu punah subhūte ye kulaputro vā kuladuhi[t]a

## verso (Cz 42.21–43.14)

- 1 ro vā imam̄ dharmaparyāyam udgrahiṣyam̄ti : dhāra .. syam̄ti · v[ā]c. yiṣyam̄ti paryavāpsyam̄ti · jñā  
 2 tās te subhūte tathāgatena dṛṣṭās te subhūte tathāgatena buddhās te tathāgatena sarve  
 3 te satvāḥ aprameyam punya○skandham̄ prasaviṣyam̄ti · yaś ca khalu punah subhūte strī<sup>32</sup>  
 4 vā puruṣo vā pūrvāhṇakālasamaye gaṁgānadīvā[lukop]amān ātmabhāvā[n]\* parityaje  
 5 t\* madhyāhṇakālasamaye sā – yāhṇakālasamaye gaṁgānadīvālukopamān ā  
 6 tmabhāvā parityajet\* anena paryāyeṇa ka[l]pakot[i]nayutaśasahasrāṇy ātmabhā

**19) MS 2385/3; folio 44 recto (Cz 43.14–21)**

- 1 ----- van\* parityajet\*d yaś cemam̄ dharmaparyāyam̄ śrutvā ·  
 2 ----- na pratikṣiped ayam eva tatonidānam̄ bahutaram̄ puṇyaskandham̄<sup>32</sup> pra  
 3 sunuyāt\* apra --○ meyam asam̄khyeyam̄\* kah̄ punar vādaḥ yo li  
 4 – khitvo ---○ dgr̄hn̄. yāt\*<sup>33</sup> [dh]ārayet\* vācayet\* paryavāpnu  
 5 yāt\* parebhyaś ca vistareṇa sam̄prakāśayet\* api tu subhūte acim̄tyo tu  
 6 lyo ya dharmapa -- ryāyah ayaṁ ca [dha]rmaparyāyah tathāgatena bhāṣitah

## verso (Cz 43.21–44.6)

- 1 agrayānasamprasthi – tānām̄ sat[v]ānā .. r.ā[y]a · śreṣṭhayānasamprasthitānām̄ satvā  
 2 nām̄ arthāya : – [ya] ye i dhar[m]a[pa]ryāya[m u]dgrahiṣyam̄ti · dhārayi[ś]yam̄ti · vā  
 3 ca – yiṣyati – –○ par[ryā]vāpsyam̄ti<sup>34</sup> · jñātās te subhūte tathāgateta  
 4 ----- na dṛṣṭās te subhūte tathāgatena sarve te satvāḥ  
 5 aprameyeṇa puṇyaskandhena samanvāgatā [bhavi]ṣyam̄ti · acim̄ty[e]nā[t]u[ly]enā  
 6 .. ----- māpyenāparimān[e]na puṇyas[k]an[dh]ena saman[v]āga

**20) MS 2385/2, uf1/2n; folio 45 recto (Cz 44.6–16; G 7a1–3)**

- 1 tā bhaviṣyam̄ti · tat kasya heto · na hi ś. [k]y.. subhūte ayaṁ dharmo hīnādhi[mu] ..i .aiḥ  
 2 śrotum\* nātmad[r]ṣṭikaiḥ na satvadrṣṭikaiḥ na jīvad[r]ṣṭikaiḥ na pudgaladrṣṭikaiḥ śa  
 3 kyaṁ śrotum udgrah[i]tum vā dhā○rayitum vā vācayitum vā paryav[ā]ptu. vā n[e]daṁ sthānam̄ vi  
 4 dyate api tu subhūte yatra pr[thi]vīpradeśe idam̄ s[ūtra]ṁ prakāśayiṣyati · pūja

<sup>32</sup> The anusvāra here is written over the bottom of the subscript *v* of *śrutvā* above.

<sup>33</sup> A triangular chip of bark has come away from above the *hṇa*, but the end of the -ī can just be made out when the image is magnified.

<sup>34</sup> The akṣara *ryā* appears to have an *e-mātrā* above it.

- 5 nīyah sa pṛthivīprad[e]ś[o] bha[viṣya]... .[d]evamānuśāsurasya lokasya vanda  
verso (Cz 44.16–45.5; G 7a3–5)
- 1 nīyah pradakṣiṇikadhaṇīyaś ca sa pṛthivīpradeśo bhaviṣyat[i] · c[ai] .[y]. sa pṛthi
  - 2 vipradeśo bhaviṣyati · ye te subhūte kulaputro vā kuladuhitaro vā imān ivamrū
  - 3 pām sūtrāṁtān – – udgrahiṣyam̄Oti dhārayiṣyam̄ti paryavāpsyam̄ti · te pa[r]i[bh]ūtā  
bhaviṣyam̄
  - 4 suparibhūtāś ca bhaviṣyam̄ti · || yāni teṣāṁ satvānāṁ paurvājanmikāni karmāṇi kṛtāny a
  - 5 pāyasam̄vartanīyāni drṣṭa eva dharme paribhūtatayā pūrvajarnmi[k]. . + + .i

**21) MS 2385/1, uf1/2a, uf1/2e;** folio 46 recto (Cz 45.5–16; G 7a5–7b1)

- 1 karmāṇi kṣapayiṣyati · buddhabodhiṁ ca prāpsyam̄ti · abhijānāmy aham subhūte atīte
- 2 dhvani asam̄khyeye kalpe asam̄khyeyatare dī[pa]ṁkarasya tathāgatasyārhataḥ samyaksam̄
- 3 buddhasya [p]areṇa parataram caturaśitibuddhakotīnayuta[śa]tasahasrāṇy abhū
- 4 van ye mayā ārādhītā ārādhītā na virādhītā yac ca mayā subhūte buddhā bhaga
- 5 vam̄taḥ ārāgitā ārāgaye[tvā] na virāgitā yac ca carime kāle paścime.āyam paṁcā ..
- 6 tyām̄ vartamānāyām imam̄ s. trām[tam]. d... hī[ś]..m̄[t]i dhā[ra] .i ..m̄ .i [v]. + [y]i ..m̄ .[i] +

verso (Cz 45.16–46.11; G 7b1–4)

- 1 ryavāpsyam̄ti · asya [s]u[bh]ūt. puṇyaska .dh. [s]y. [t]. [kād]. [ś]. [p]ū .[v]. [k] + + + + + + + +
- 2 m̄ api kalā nopaiti sāhasṛtamām a[pi · śata]sāhatamām a.[i] · k. t. + + + +
- 3 sṛtamā[m ap]i · sam̄khyām a[p]i ○ [ka]lā[m ap]i gaṇanām apa upa[mā]m api +
- 4 paniśāmate na kṣamate · + + t subhūte te[ś]ām̄ kulaputrāṇām̄ ku[lad]uhī .[r̄] +
- 5 tā puṇyaska[n]dham̄ bhāṣ[e]t\* yāva. taḥ te kula.[utrā vā k]uladuhītā vā tasmin sama[ye] +
- 6 ḡyaskandha pratigrhṇam̄t[i] : unm. [d].[m] te satv[āh] prāpnuyuḥ cittavikṣepaṁ vā gacche..

### III. Reconstruction<sup>35</sup>

§1<sup>36</sup>; folio 26r1–v4 (Cz 27.1–1)

namo śākyamunar<sup>2</sup>ye{*s*}<sup>37</sup> tathāgatāyārhate samyaksambuddhāya ||<sup>38</sup>  
 evam̄ mayā śrutam̄ ekasmin̄ samar<sup>3</sup>ye<sup>39</sup> bhagavān̄ |<sup>40</sup> śrāvastyām̄ viharati sma | jetavane |<sup>41</sup> anātha-  
 piṇḍadasyār̄<ā>me<sup>42</sup> mahar<sup>43</sup>tā bhikṣusamghena sārdham ardhatrayodaśabhir bhikṣuśataih̄<sup>43</sup> <|> atha  
 khalu bhagavān̄ r<sup>5</sup> pūrvāhṇakālasamaye nivāsyā pātracīvaraṁ ādāya | śrāvastīm̄ mahānagarīm̄  
 piṇḍāya prāviśat̄<sup>44</sup> atha khalu bhagavān̄<sup>45</sup> | śrāvastīm̄ mahānagarī<m> piṇḍāya{m} carivītvā<sup>46</sup>  
 paścādbhaktapiṇḍapātāpratikkṛāmtah̄<sup>47</sup> pādau prakṣalya<sup>48</sup> nyaśīdad bhagavān̄<sup>49</sup> | prajñapta ev2vāsane  
 paryam̄kam̄ ābhujya ḥjum̄ kāyam̄ prāṇidhāya pratimukhaṁ<sup>50</sup> smṛtim̄ upasthāpya | atha<sup>51</sup> v3 sambahulā

<sup>35</sup> Different readings in M, Cz, P, G and the relevant Central Asian fragments (Frags a, b, d, e, & f) are signalled in the footnotes, except for minor orthographical variants, differences in sandhi or punctuation (unless deemed significant), use of *avagraha*, and so on. We use the terms “add” and “omit” purely formally, to mark words which appear in one edition or ms and not in others, without implying any sequential processes in the development in the text involving actual additions and omissions. Where there are minor orthographical variants between M and Cz, the spelling of M is always the one given (e.g. M’s *abhivam̄dyā* stands for Cz’s *abhivandyā*). Misprints and minor errors in Cz corrected by Conze on pp. 115–118 are only noted where they form part of variant readings. In the case of P, those words or parts of words reconstructed by Pargiter where there are gaps in the ms or it is illegible appear in parentheses, or, in the case of omissions, are marked by the words “reconstructed” or “apparently.” Such variant readings are of limited use for comparative purposes. That is to say, it is always possible that the missing text agreed with S, and not with M or Cz, and sometimes this is more than likely. A re-edition of P on the basis of S, G and the Central Asian fragments is therefore a desideratum, all the more so since the editorial and typographical conventions employed by Pargiter make it difficult to follow the readings of the ms.

<sup>36</sup> Section and subsection divisions throughout are those adopted in the Sanskrit edition by Conze (Cz), which are based on the paragraphing introduced by Max Müller (M).

<sup>37</sup> Śākyamunayes: the addition of the superfluous -s to the dative is a scribal error which is possibly influenced by the genitive śākyamunes, or, according to a suggestion made by Seishi Karashima, may reflect the abnormal genitive form śākyamunayes tathāgatasyārhataḥ samyaksambuddhasya often found in mss of Mahāyāna sūtras such as the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka. Alternatively, it may simply reflect sandhi applied in error to a punctuation mark subsequently misunderstood as a genuine visarga.

<sup>38</sup> This opening salutation differs from those found in M, Cz and the Tibetan translation (hereafter Tib.) M: *namo bhagavatyā ḥryaprajñāpāramitāyai*; Cz: *namo bhagavatyai ḥryaprajñāpāramitāyai*; Tib.: *saṅs rgyas dan byan chub sems dpa' thams cad la phyag 'tshal lo*. (Conze gives no justification for reading *bhagavatyai*). According to the notes in M, J has *Namah sarvajñāya* (“Hail to the Omniscient One!”).

Among the seven Chinese translations, only that by Dharmagupta (?~619) has an opening salutation, as follows: “I take refuge in all the oceans of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas.” 歸命一切佛菩薩海等 (T. 238, 766c15; note that in this translation *deng* 等 renders Sanskrit plurals). It is thus close to Tib.

<sup>39</sup> Cz and Tib. punctuate after *samaye*, while M and all Chinese translations break the line after *śrutam* (Ch: 如是我聞。一時...).

<sup>40</sup> S frequently punctuates after words like *bhagavant* and *sugata* using virāma or the two dots also used to write the visarga. We preserve this “honorific” punctuation.

<sup>41</sup> This punctuation not found in Cz and M, which read: *jetavane 'nātha°*.

<sup>42</sup> S reads: *anāthapiṇḍadasyārame*.

<sup>43</sup> M, Cz add: *sambahulaiś ca bodhisattvair mahāsattvaiḥ*, Tib. adds: *byan chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po rab tu man po dag dan*. All Chinese translations lack this phrase, except for that by Yijing 義淨, which has 及大菩薩眾.

<sup>44</sup> Wherever virāma occurs (which in this ms incorporates the standard punctuation mark, like a horizontal comma), we place a danda in the Reconstruction, without enclosing it in pointed brackets, so as to make it clear that the punctuation is that of the ms, and not our own imposition.

<sup>45</sup> S reads *bhagavan*.

<sup>46</sup> M, Cz add: *kṛtabhaktakṛtyah*.

<sup>47</sup> M, Cz add: *pātracīvaraṁ pratisāmya*.

<sup>48</sup> M, Cz: *prakṣalya*.

<sup>49</sup> M, Cz read *nyaśīdat*, omitting *bhagavān* (but M notes that Ch & T read *nyaśīdad bhagavān*).

<sup>50</sup> M, Cz: *pratimukhīm* (but M notes that J reads *abhimukhām*).

bhikṣavaḥ yena bhagavāṁś tenopasamkkraman upasamkkramya bhagavataḥ v4 pādau śirasābhivandya<sup>52</sup> bhagavam̄tam̄ tr̄ipradakṣinīkṛtvā <e>kāmte<sup>53</sup> nyaśidān |

§2; folio 26v4–27v6 (Cz 27.16–28.17; P 179.14–24)

tena khalu puv̄nah samayenāyuṣmān subhūtiḥ tasyām eva pariṣadi<sup>54</sup> sannipatito 'bhūt sanniṣaṇṇah <e> v6 atha khalv āyuṣmān subhūtir utth{y}āyāsanād ekāṁsam uttarāsaṁgaṁ kṛtvā dakṣinām jā27r1n{n}umaṇḍalam̄ pr̄thivyāṁ pratiṣṭhāpya yena bhagavāṁś tenāmjalim prāṇāmya<sup>55</sup> bhagavam̄tam̄ ē<sup>56</sup>tad ar2vocat | āścaryam̄ bhagavan<sup>57</sup> yāvad eva{n}<sup>58</sup> tathāgatenārhatā samyaksam̄buddhena<sup>59</sup> bodhisatvā mar̄hāsatvā<sup>60</sup> anuparigṛhitāḥ paramēṇānugraheṇa |<sup>61</sup> yāvad eva tathāgatena<sup>62</sup> bor4dhisatvāḥ<sup>63</sup> parittāḥ<sup>64</sup> paramayā parindanayā<sup>65</sup> | katham<sup>66</sup> bhagava<n> bodhisatvayār̄nasam̄prasthitena<sup>67</sup> sthātavyam | katham pratipatta{pa}vyam<sup>68</sup> | ka{m}thām cittam̄ pratir̄gr̄hitavyam<sup>69</sup> | evam ukte bhagavān āyuṣmam̄tam̄ subhūtim etad av(o)c(a)<sup>70</sup> | sādhu v1 sādhu subhūte evam etat subhūte<sup>71</sup> anuparigṛhitāḥ tathāgatena bodhisat(v)ā<sup>72</sup> para)v2menānugraheṇa | parittāḥ<sup>73</sup> tathāgatena bodhisatvāḥ<sup>74</sup> v3 paramayānuparindanayā<sup>75</sup> | tena hi subhūte śr̄nu sādhu v4 ca suṣṭhu ca manasikuru bhāsiṣye<sup>76</sup> | yathā bodhisatvayānasam̄prasthitena sthātavyam | v5 yathā pratipattavyam<sup>77</sup> | yathā cittam̄ pratigr̄hitavyam<sup>78</sup> | evam bhagavann<sup>79</sup> i(ty āyu)ṣmān subhūtiv̄r bhagava{m}tah pratyāśrauṣit |

§3; folio 27v6–28v1 (Cz 28.17–29.7; P 179.24–180.10)

bhagavāṁś tān etad avocat<sup>80</sup> | iha subhūte bodhisatvayāna28r1{na}sam̄prasthitair<sup>81</sup> evam<sup>82</sup> cittam̄

<sup>51</sup> M, Cz add: *khalu*.

<sup>52</sup> M, Cz: *śirobhīr abhivam̄dyā*.

<sup>53</sup> M, Cz: *triśpradakṣinīkṛtyaikāmte*.

<sup>54</sup> M, Cz: *parṣadi*.

<sup>55</sup> M, Cz: *prāṇamya*.

<sup>56</sup> P begins here (fol. 2r1).

<sup>57</sup> P: *bhagavā*; M, Cz add: *paramāścaryam̄ sugata* after *bhagavan*.

<sup>58</sup> The reading *eva* is confirmed by the parallel wording at 27r3, also P, M, Cz.

<sup>59</sup> P omits: *arhatā samyaksam̄buddhena*.

<sup>60</sup> P omits: *mahāsatvāḥ*.

<sup>61</sup> M, Cz add: *āścaryam̄ bhagavan*.

<sup>62</sup> M, Cz add: *arhatā samyaksam̄buddhena*.

<sup>63</sup> M, Cz add: *mahāsattvāḥ*.

<sup>64</sup> M, Cz: *parīṇditāḥ*, P: *parinditāḥ*.

<sup>65</sup> M, Cz: *parīṇdanayā*; P: *(parinda)nayā*.

<sup>66</sup> M, Cz, P: *tat katham*.

<sup>67</sup> M, Cz add: *kulaputrena vā kuladuhitrā vā*.

<sup>68</sup> P omits: *katham pratipattavyam*.

<sup>69</sup> M, Cz: *pragrahitavyam*; P: *pra(grahetavyam)*.

<sup>70</sup> P apparently omits: *evam ukte bhagavān āyuṣmam̄tam̄ subhūtim etad avocat*.

<sup>71</sup> P omits: *evam etat subhūte*. M, Cz omit: *subhūte* and add: *yathā vadasi*.

<sup>72</sup> M, Cz add: *mahāsattvāḥ*.

<sup>73</sup> M, Cz: *parīṇditāḥ*, P: *parinditāḥ*.

<sup>74</sup> M, Cz add: *mahāsattvāḥ*.

<sup>75</sup> M, Cz: *parīṇdanayā*; P: *parindanayā*.

<sup>76</sup> M, Cz add: *'ham te*.

<sup>77</sup> P apparently omits: *yathā pratipattavyam*.

<sup>78</sup> M, Cz: *pragrahitavyam*; P: *(pragrahe)tavyam*.

<sup>79</sup> S reads: *bhagavān* (so too P).

<sup>80</sup> M: *bhagavān asyaitad avocat* (with note: *bhagavān etad avocat J.*; no MS. has *asmai tad°*) ; Cz: *bhagavān etad*

utpādayitavyam | yāvamtaḥ<sup>83</sup> satvāḥ<sup>84</sup> satvasaṃgraheṇa samgrhīr̥tāḥ<sup>85</sup> aṇḍajā vā jarāyujā vā sam-svedajā vā upapādukā<sup>86</sup> vā rūpiṇo vā arūpiṇo r̥3 vā {a}saṃjñino vā asaṃjñino vā naiva saṃjñino nāsaṃjñinah<sup>87</sup> yāvat satvadhātuḥ prajñāpyamānah prajñāpya{m}te<sup>88</sup> te<sup>89</sup> mayā sarve anupadhiṣeṣe nirvāṇadhātau parir̥5ni<rvā>payitavyāḥ <|> evam aparimāṇāmś ca<sup>90</sup> satvān {} parini<r>vāpa-yitavyāḥ<sup>91</sup> na ca<sup>92</sup> kaścīt satva<ḥ> r̥6 parinirvāpito bhavati | tat kasmād dhetoh<sup>93</sup> <|> sacet subhūte bodhisatvasya satvasaṃjñā<sup>94</sup> r̥7 pravartate<sup>95</sup> na sa bodhisatva iti vaktavyāḥ <|> tat kasya hetoh <|> na sa<sup>97</sup> subhūte bodhisatvāt vaktavyo<sup>98</sup> yasya satvasaṃjñā pravarteta<sup>99</sup> jīvasaṃjñā vā pudgalasaṃjñā vā pravarteta<sup>100</sup> <|>

§4; folio 28v1–29r5 (Cz 29.8–30.5; P 180.10–15)

api tu v̥2 khalu punah<sup>101</sup> subhūte bodhisatvena <na va>stupratiṣṭhitena<sup>102</sup> dānam dātavyam | na kvacitpratiṣṭhitena dāv3nam <dā>tavyam | na rūpapratiṣṭhitena dānam dātavyam<sup>103</sup> na śabdagandha-rasaspraṣṭavyeṣu na dharmaprativ4ṣṭhitena<sup>104</sup> dānam dātavyam | evam hi subhūte bodhisatvena<sup>105</sup> dānam dātavyam | yathā na nimiv5tasamaṃjñāyām<sup>106</sup> prati<ti>ṣṭhet<sup>107</sup> | tat kasya hetoh <|> yaḥ subhūte bodhisatvah<sup>108</sup> apratiṣṭhito dānam v̥6 dadāti<sup>109</sup> (ta)sya subh(ū)te puṇyaskandhasya na sukarām

*avocat*; P: *bhagavān avocat*.

<sup>81</sup> M, Cz: °*samprasthitena*; P apparently reads: *bodhi(satvena)*.

<sup>82</sup> P apparently omits: *evam*.

<sup>83</sup> M, Cz add: *subhūte*.

<sup>84</sup> M, Cz add: *sattvadhātau*.

<sup>85</sup> P omits: *satvasaṃgraheṇa samgrhītāḥ*.

<sup>86</sup> S reads: *ūpapādukā*. M, Cz: *vaupapādukā*.

<sup>87</sup> M, Cz: *naiva saṃjñino nāsaṃjñino vā*; P: *naiva saṃjñānopakā vā*.

<sup>88</sup> M, Cz: *yāvān* (Cz: *yāvan*) kaścīt sattvadhātūr (Cz: °*dhātū*, corrected to °*dhātū* on p. 116) *prajñāpyamānah prajñāpyate* (sing.); P: *yāvamtaḥ satvāḥ prajñāpyamānāḥ prajñāpyante* (pl.). Here we regard the pl. *prajñāpyante* of S as an error possibly caused by the following *te*, and emend to sing.

<sup>89</sup> M, Cz add: *ca*.

<sup>90</sup> M, Cz: *aparimāṇān* (C: *aparimāṇan*, corrected on p. 116) *api*; P: *aparimāṇām ca*.

<sup>91</sup> M, Cz: *parinirvāpya*; P: *parinirvāpayitvā*.

<sup>92</sup> M, Cz, P omit: *ca*.

<sup>93</sup> M, Cz, P: *tat kasya hetoh*.

<sup>94</sup> P: *satvasaṃjñā hi subhūte bodhisatvaya* for *sacet subhūte bodhisatvaya satvasaṃjñā*.

<sup>95</sup> M, Cz, P: *pravarteta*.

<sup>96</sup> S reads: *naktavyah*.

<sup>97</sup> S reads: *su*. P omits: *sa*.

<sup>98</sup> P omits: *vaktavyo*.

<sup>99</sup> M: *yasya satvasaṃjñā pravarteta* (with note indicating that Ch & T read: *yasyātmasaṃjñā satvasaṃjñā pravarteta*); Cz, P: *yasyātmasaṃjñā pravarteta satvasaṃjñā vā*. M thus reads with S and Tib.: *gaṇ sems can du 'du šes 'jug gam | srog tu 'du šes sam / gaṇ zag tu 'du šes 'jug na*.

<sup>100</sup> P omits: *pravarteta*.

<sup>101</sup> P omits: *khalu punah*.

<sup>102</sup> M, Cz: *na bodhisattvena vastupratiṣṭhitena*; P: *bodhisattvenāvastupratipatti*; cf. Tib.: *byaṇ chub sems dpas dños po la mi gnas par*.

<sup>103</sup> P apparently omits: *na rūpapratiṣṭhitena dānam dātavyam*, but the reading of the ms is not absolutely clear, and what Pargiter has as *na kva(cit pra)ti°* may well be *na rūpaprati°*. If not, the following *na śabdagandharasa°* is difficult to explain.

<sup>104</sup> M, Cz: °*spraṣṭavyadharmaṣu pratiṣṭhitena* for °*spraṣṭavyeṣu na dharmapratiṣṭhitena*; P: °*spraṣṭavyeṣu pratiṣṭhīhitvā*.

<sup>105</sup> M, Cz insert: *mahāsattvena*.

<sup>106</sup> M, Cz insert: *api*; P: *saṃjñāyā*.

<sup>107</sup> M, Cz: *pratitiṣṭhet*; P: *pratiṣṭhihe*.

<sup>108</sup> Cz omits: *bodhisattvah*.

pramāṇam udgrahītum | tat kiṁ manyase suv7bh(ū)te sukaram (pū)rv(a)syām diśi ākāśasya pramāṇam udgrahītum | subhūtir<sup>110</sup> āha | 29r1 no hīdam bhagavan<sup>111</sup> | evam dakṣināpaścimottarā<sv adha> ūrdhvam<sup>112</sup> vidikṣu-r-avidikṣu |<sup>113</sup> daśasu dikṣu |<sup>114</sup> sur2karam ākāśasya pramāṇam udgrahītum | subhūtir āha | na<sup>115</sup> hīdam bhagavan | (bhagavān) ār3ha | evam eta<t><sup>116</sup> subhūte | evam etat subhūte<sup>117</sup> yo bodhisatvo 'pratiṣṭhito dānam r4 dadāti tasya<sup>118</sup> puṇyaskandhasya na sukaram pramāṇam udgrahītum |<sup>119</sup> api tu khalu r5 punah subhūte evam bodhisatvena dānamayam puṇyakṛyāvastum dānam dātavyam<sup>120</sup> |

### §5; folio 29r5–v4 (Cz 30.6–14)

tat kiṁ r6 manyase subhūte tathāgato lakṣaṇasampadā<sup>121</sup> draṣṭavyah <|> bhagavān<sup>122</sup> āha<sup>123</sup> na lakṣaṇav1sampadā tathāgato<sup>124</sup> draṣṭavyah <|> tat kasya hetoh <|> yā sā<sup>125</sup> tathāgatena lakṣaṇa-sampad<sup>126</sup> bhāsiṇ2tā{ḥ} saivālakṣaṇasampa{dā}t | evam ukte bhagavān āyuṣmāntam subhūtim etad avocat | y<ā>v3vat su<bhū>te lakṣaṇam<sup>127</sup> tāvan mr̄ṣā | yāvad alakṣaṇam<sup>128</sup> tāvad amṛṣā <|> iti<sup>129</sup> hi lakṣaṇālakṣaṇataḥ v4 tathāgato draṣṭavyah ||

### §6; folio 29v4–31v6 (Cz 30.15–32.5)

evam ukte āyuṣmān subhūti<r> bhagavam̄tam etad avocat | av5sti bhagavan kecit satvāḥ bhaviṣyam̄ty anāgate 'dhvani<sup>130</sup> paścimāyām̄ pañcaśatyā<m><sup>131</sup> vartamānāv6yām̄<sup>132</sup> ye imešv eva<m>rūpešu

<sup>109</sup> End of fol. 2 in P. Fols. 3–5 of P are missing.

<sup>110</sup> S reads: subhūter.

<sup>111</sup> M, Cz insert: bhagavān āha.

<sup>112</sup> M: dakṣināpaścimottarāsv adha ūrdhvam. Cz has: dakṣiṇa-paścima-uttara-āsvadha-ūrdhvam, either through misconstruing the wording of M or because of a misprint, but corrects on p. 116. We restore (Paścimottarā)sv adha, otherwise the long a is difficult to understand.

<sup>113</sup> M, Cz: digvidikṣu samantād for vidikṣu-r-avidikṣuh. We take the -r- here as hiatus-bridger, but it may well reflect sandhi applied to a visarga originally used as punctuation (cf. next note).

<sup>114</sup> M, Cz: daśasu dikṣu. Note the use of visarga here as punctuation, represented by a danda in our reconstruction.

<sup>115</sup> M, Cz: no.

<sup>116</sup> M, Cz: evam eva. This seems the more likely reading in the context (in which a comparison is being made), but the repeated evam etat of S is in fact reflected in three of the Chinese translations (Bo, Dh, Xu).

<sup>117</sup> M, Cz omit: evam etat subhūte.

<sup>118</sup> M, Cz insert: subhūte.

<sup>119</sup> This sentence quoted in the Śikṣāsamuccaya (ed. Bendall, p. 275) in exactly the same form: yathoktam vajracchedikāyām / yo bodhisatvo 'pratiṣṭhito dānam dadāti / tasya puṇyaskandhasya na sukaram pramāṇam udgrahītum iti /.

<sup>120</sup> M, Cz: evam hi subhūte bodhisattvayānasamprasthitena dānam dātavyam yathā na nimittasamjñāyām̄ api pratitiṣṭhet for api tu khalu punah subhūte evam bodhisatvena dānamayam̄ puṇyakṛyāvastum dānam dātavyam. Tib. omits this sentence.

<sup>121</sup> M, Cz: lakṣaṇasampadā tathāgato (with misprint in M: tathāgatā).

<sup>122</sup> M, Cz: subhūtir for bhagavān.

<sup>123</sup> M, Cz insert: no hīdam bhagavan.

<sup>124</sup> Frag a begins here (with -to).

<sup>125</sup> M, Cz insert: bhagavan. Frag a reads with S.

<sup>126</sup> M, Cz: lakṣaṇasampat tathāgatena for tathāgatena lakṣaṇasampad; Frag a: lakṣaṇasampat tathāga//.

<sup>127</sup> M, Cz: lakṣaṇasampat for lakṣaṇam.

<sup>128</sup> M, Cz: alaksanasampat for alakṣaṇam. Frag a appears to read with M, Cz.

<sup>129</sup> M, Cz: na mr̄seti, Frag a: na mr̄ṣā / iti for amṛṣā </> iti. Frag a, however, supports the implicit punctuation of S.

<sup>130</sup> M, Cz add: paścime kāle paścime samaye. Cf. Tib., which lacks the equivalent of this phrase. Missing in Frag a.

<sup>131</sup> M, Cz: pañcaśatyām̄ (but M notes that Ch, J, T read: pañcāśatyām̄). Frag a has only śatyām̄ at beginning of line v5.

<sup>132</sup> M, Cz: saddharmavipralopakāle vartamāne, Frag a: saddharmavipralope varttamāne for vartamānāyām̄. Cf. Tib.:

sūtrāntapadeṣu bhāṣyamāṇeṣu bhūtasamjñām utpā30r1dayiṣyam̄ti | bhagavān āha | mā tvam̄ subhūte<sup>133</sup>  
 <e>vam̄ vocat<sup>134</sup> | a(sti) kecit satvāḥ bhaviṣya<m>r2ty anāgate 'dhvani<sup>135</sup> ye imeṣv evaṁrūpeṣu  
 sūtrāntapadeṣu bhāṣyamāṇeṣu bhūtasamjñām utpādayiṣyam̄ti | api tu khalu punaḥ subhūte  
 bhaviṣyam̄ti anāgate 'dhvani bor4dhisatvā mahāsatvā<sup>136</sup> paścimāyām paṁcāśatyām<sup>137</sup> saddharma-  
 vipralope r5 {pe} vartamāne śilavaṁto guṇavaṁtaḥ<sup>138</sup> prajñāva<m>to<sup>139</sup> bhaviṣyam̄ti |<sup>140</sup> na khalu  
 pur6nah<sup>141</sup> subhūte bodhisatvā<sup>142</sup> ekabuddhaparyupāsītā bhaviṣyam̄ti<sup>143</sup> | v1 naikabuddhāvaropita-  
 kuśalamūlā<sup>144</sup> bhaviṣyam̄ti | api tu khalu v2 punaḥ subhūte anekabuddhaparyupāsītā<sup>145</sup> bhaviṣyam̄v3ti<sup>146</sup>  
 anekabuddhāvaropitakuśalamūlā<sup>147</sup> bhaviṣyam̄ti | v4 ye imeṣv eva<m>rūpeṣu sūtrā<m>tapadeṣu  
 bhāṣyamāṇeṣv ekacittaprasāda v5mātram<sup>148</sup> api pratilapsyam̄te | jñātās te subhūte tathāgatena<sup>149</sup> dr̄ṣṭas  
 te subhūv6te tathāgatena<sup>150</sup> sarve te<sup>151</sup> aprameyam̄<sup>152</sup> puṇyaskam̄dham 31r1 prasaviṣyam̄ti  
 pratigṛhiṣyam̄ti <> tat kasya hetoh <> na hi teṣā<m> subhūte<sup>153</sup> bodhisar2tvānām<sup>154</sup> ātmasamjñā  
 pravartsyate<sup>155</sup> na satvasam<jñā> na jīvasamjñā na pudgalasamjñā pravartsyate<sup>156</sup> | r3 nāpi teṣām  
 subhūte bodhisatvānām<sup>157</sup> dharmasamjñā pravar4rtsyate<sup>158</sup> nādharmasamjñā nāpi teṣām<sup>159</sup> samjñā  
 nāsamjñā pravartsyate<sup>160</sup> | r5 tat kasya hetoh <> sace<t> subhūte teṣām bodhir6satvānā(m)<sup>161</sup> dharma-

dam pa'i chos rab tu rnam par 'jig par 'gyur ba na.

<sup>133</sup> M, Cz, Frag a: subhūte tvam for tvam̄ subhūte.

<sup>134</sup> M, Cz: vocaḥ. The anomalous *vocat* of S may be the result of confusion between visarga and -t\*, and should probably be emended to *vocaḥ*. Frag a line r1 ends with vo-.

<sup>135</sup> M, Cz add: paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyām pañcaśatyām saddharmavipralope vartamāne, Frag a (beginning of line r2): ścimāyām paṁcāśatyām saddharmavipralope varttamāne. Cf. Tib.: lna brgya tha ma la dam pa'i chos rab tu rnam par 'jig par 'gyur ba na.

<sup>136</sup> M, Cz add: paścime kāle paścime samaye. Frag a reads with S.

<sup>137</sup> M, Cz: paṁcāśatyām. Frag a reads with S. Cf. Tib.: lna brgya tha ma la.

<sup>138</sup> M, Cz: guṇavaṁtaḥ śilavaṁtaḥ for śilavaṁto guṇavaṁtaḥ. Missing in Frag a.

<sup>139</sup> M, Cz: prajñāvaṁtaś ca (Cz: prajñavantaś ca, corrected p. 116). Missing in Frag a.

<sup>140</sup> M, Cz add: ya imeṣv evaṁrūpeṣu sūtrāntapadeṣu bhāṣyamāṇeṣu bhūtasamjñām (Cz: bhūtasamjñām, corrected p. 116) utpādayiṣyam̄ti. Cf. Tib., which adds: [sems can gaṇ la la dag] 'di lta bu'i mdo sde'i tshig bśad pa 'di la yan dag par 'du šes (b)skyed par 'gyur ba. Frag a cannot have read with M & Cz, and probably read with S, if one goes by the number of missing akṣaras.

<sup>141</sup> M, Cz, Frag a add: te.

<sup>142</sup> M, Cz add: mahāsatvā. Frag a reads with S.

<sup>143</sup> Frag a breaks off here.

<sup>144</sup> S reads: naikabuddhāvaropita°.

<sup>145</sup> M, Cz: anekabuddhaśatasahasraparyupāsītā.

<sup>146</sup> M, Cz omit: bhaviṣyam̄ti.

<sup>147</sup> M, Cz: anekabuddhaśatasahasrāvaropitakuśalamūlās te bodhisattvā mahāsatvā for anekabuddhāvaropitakuśalamūlā.

<sup>148</sup> M, Cz: ekacittaprasādam for ekacittaprasādamātram, but Tib. adds tsam (mātra).

<sup>149</sup> M, Cz add: buddhajñānenā. There is no equivalent for buddhajñānenā in Tib.

<sup>150</sup> M, Cz add: buddhacakṣuṣā buddhās te subhūte tathāgatena.

<sup>151</sup> M, Cz add: subhūte.

<sup>152</sup> S reads: aprameye (note that e-mātrā and anusvāra are easily confused); M, Cz add: asamkhyeyam.

<sup>153</sup> M, Cz: subhūte teṣām for teṣām subhūte.

<sup>154</sup> M, Cz add: mahāsattvānām.

<sup>155</sup> M, Cz: pravartate.

<sup>156</sup> M, Cz: pravartate.

<sup>157</sup> M, Cz add: mahāsattvānām.

<sup>158</sup> M, Cz: pravartate / evam̄.

<sup>159</sup> M, Cz add: subhūte.

<sup>160</sup> M, Cz: pravartate.

<sup>161</sup> M, Cz add: mahāsattvānām.

saṃjñā prav(a)<r>tsyate<sup>162</sup> sa eva teṣām ātmagrāvīho bhavet | satvagrāho jī(v)a(g)r(ā)h(ah)<sup>163</sup> pudgalagrāho bhavet | sav2ced<sup>164</sup> <a>dharmasamjñā<sup>165</sup> pravarteta sa eva teṣā(m ātmagrāh)o bhavet | satvagrāv3ho jīvagrāhah pudgalagrāha iti (| ta)t (ka)sya hetoh <|> na khalu puna<ḥ> v4 subhūte<sup>166</sup> dharmodgrahitavyo nādharma<ḥ> <|> tasmād (i)da(m) saṃndhāya tathāgatena v5 bhāśitam<sup>167</sup> kolopamam dharmaṇyāyam ājānadbhīḥ dharmāḥ eva prahātavyāḥ prāg ev6vādharmaḥ<sup>168</sup> ||

§7; folio 31v6–32v1 (Cz 32.6–33.2)

punar aparam bhagavān āyuṣmaṇtam subhūtim etad avocat<sup>169</sup> | tat ki<m> 32r1 manyase subhūte kācīt<sup>170</sup> tathāgatenānuttarā{m} samyaksambodhir<sup>171</sup> abhisambuddhā |<sup>172</sup> kaścir2d vā dharmas tathāgatena deśitah || subhūtir āha<sup>173</sup> | yathāham bhagavan bhagavato r3 bhāśitasyārtham ājānāmi nāsti sa kaścid dha(r)m(o ya)s tathāgatenānuttarā{m} r4 samyaksambodhir<sup>174</sup> abhisambuddhā<sup>175</sup> | nāsti sa kaścid<sup>176</sup> dharmo y(as tathā)g(at)ena deśitah <|> tar5t kasya hetoh <|> yo 'sau tathāgatena dharmo<sup>177</sup> deśit(ah<sup>178</sup> | agrāhyah s)o 'nabhilapyah<sup>179</sup> <|> v1 na sa dharmo nādharmaḥ <|> tat kasya hetoh <|> asamṣkṛtaprabhāvitā<sup>180</sup> hy āryapudgalāḥ <|>

§8; folio 32v1–34r1 (Cz 33.3–26)

<sup>181</sup>tat kiṁ ma2nyase subhūte ya<sup>182</sup> imām<sup>183</sup> tr̄sāhasramahāsāhasr(ām)<sup>184</sup> lokadhātum saptaratnaprati-pūv3rṇam<sup>185</sup> kṛtvā<sup>186</sup> dānam dadyāt | tat kiṁ manyase subhūte<sup>187</sup> api nu sa kulaputro vā kulav4duhitā

<sup>162</sup> M, Cz: *pravarteta*.

<sup>163</sup> S appears to have read: *jīvagrāhah*.

<sup>164</sup> S reads: *sacad*.

<sup>165</sup> S reads: *dharmaṇyāyam*, as do Ch & T according to M. Frag d begins here with + /dh/(a)rm(a)samjñā.

<sup>166</sup> M, Cz add: *bodhisattvena mahāsattvena*. Frag d, although much text is lost, appears to diverge markedly: /// /ho/bhavet\*: yataḥ na dharmā udgrāhi. In view of the number of akṣaras missing (approx. 24–29), it may originally have read: s(a eva teṣām ātmagrāhō bhavet\* satvagrāv3ho jīvagrāhah pudgalagrā)ho bhavet\* yataḥ na dharmā udgrāhi(tavyā nādharmaḥ).

<sup>167</sup> M, Cz: *iyam tathāgatena samdhāya vāg bhāśitā* for *idam samndhāya tathāgatena bhāśitam* (but see n. 5 in M for the variant readings of his witnesses and the basis on which he has “tried to restore the original text”). Frag d missing.

<sup>168</sup> M, Cz add: *iti*. Frag d missing.

<sup>169</sup> The number of missing akṣaras in Frag d make it likely that it did not contain this sentence.

<sup>170</sup> M, Cz: *asti sa kaścid dharmo yas* for *kācīt*. Frag d missing.

<sup>171</sup> M, Cz add: *ity* (but M notes that Ch, J & T lack this). Frag d missing.

<sup>172</sup> M, Cz: *abhisambuddhah* (to agree with *kaścid dharmo*, but M notes that J also reads *abhisambuddhā*). Frag d missing.

<sup>173</sup> M, Cz: *evam uktā āyuṣmān subhūtir bhagavāntam etad avocat* for *subhūtir āha*. Frag d missing.

<sup>174</sup> M, Cz add: *ity* (M notes that J lacks this). Frag d reads with S.

<sup>175</sup> M, Cz: *abhisambuddhah*. It is not clear whether S should be emended to this as well. Frag d with S: *abhisambuddhā*.

<sup>176</sup> M, Cz omit: *sa kaścid*. Frag d reads with S.

<sup>177</sup> M, Cz add: *'bhisaṃbuddho*. Frag d reads with S.

<sup>178</sup> M, Cz: *deśito vā*. Frag d (*deśita agrāhya*) supports our reconstruction of S, in which what can be seen of the missing akṣaras renders *deśito* impossible.

<sup>179</sup> Frag d: *agrāhya sau anabhilā*.

<sup>180</sup> S reads: *asamṣkṛtābhāvitā*. This scribal error is accounted for by the close resemblance of the akṣaras *pra* and *thā*.

<sup>181</sup> M, Cz add: *bhagavān āha*. Frag d reads with S.

<sup>182</sup> Frag d breaks off here.

<sup>183</sup> Cz: *yah kaścit kulaputro vā kuladuhitāvemam* for *ya imām*.

<sup>184</sup> M, Cz: *trisāhasra*<sup>o</sup>. Hereafter this orthographical variant not noted. M, Cz: *°mahāsāhasram*. Reconstructed as feminine in S on the basis of 33r4.

<sup>185</sup> M, Cz: *paripūrṇam*.

vā tatonidānam bahu<sup>188</sup> punyam<sup>189</sup> prasunuyāt | subhūtir āha | bahu bhagavav5n bahu sugata |<sup>190</sup> sa kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā tatonidān(a)m bahu<sup>191</sup> punyam<sup>192</sup> (pra)33r1sunuyāt<sup>193</sup> <|> tat kasya hetoh  
<|> sa eva bhagavann askandhah<sup>194</sup> <|> (tas)m(ā)t tathāgar2to bhāṣate punyaskandhah askandha<sup>195</sup>  
iti {bhagavan} bhagavān āha | yaś ca r3 khalu punah subhūte kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā imām r4  
tr̄sāhasrāmahāsāhasrām<sup>196</sup> lokadhātum saptaratnapratipūrṣṇam<sup>197</sup> kṛtvā<sup>198</sup> dānam dad<y>āt<sup>199</sup> | yaś  
ceto dharmaparyāyad amtaśāś catuv1ṣpadikām<sup>200</sup> api gāthām udgrhya parebhyo<sup>201</sup> deśayet samprā-  
kāśayed ayav2m eva tatonidānam bahutaram punyam<sup>202</sup> prasunuyāt | aprameyam asamv3khyeyam  
<|> tat kasya hetoh <|> ato nirjātā hi subhūte tathāgatāv4nām<sup>203</sup> anuttarā samyaksambodhiḥ <|> ato  
nirjātāś ca buddhā bhagava<m>tah <|> v5 tat kasmād dhetoh<sup>204</sup> <|> buddhadharmāḥ buddhadharmā  
iti subhūte abuddhadharmā34r1ś caiva te<sup>205</sup> |

### §9a; folio 34r1–5 (Cz 33.26–34.11)

tat kiṁ manyase subhūte | api nu srotāp洋洋aya evam bhavati r2 mayā srotāpattiphalaṁ prāptam iti  
| subhūtir āha | no hīdaṁ bhagavar3n<sup>206</sup> <|> bhagavān āha<sup>207</sup> | tat kasya hetoh <|> na hi sa bhagavan  
kiṁcid<sup>208</sup> āpanna<ḥ> ter4nocyate srotāpanna iti | na rūpam āpanno na śabdā<n> na gandhā<n> na  
rasār5n na spraṣṭavyān na<sup>209</sup> dharmān āpannah <|> tenocyte<sup>210</sup> srotāpanna iti<sup>211</sup> |

### §9b; folio 34v1–35r1 (Cz 34.12–18)

v1 bhagavān āha | tat kiṁ manyase subhūte api nu sakṛdāgāminah v2 evam bhaven<sup>212</sup> mayā sakṛdā-

<sup>186</sup> M, Cz add: *tathāgatebhyo 'rhabhyah samyaksambuddhebhyo.*

<sup>187</sup> M, Cz omit: *tat kiṁ manyase subhūte.*

<sup>188</sup> Cz: *bahutaram* (citing reading of Ch & T reported by M).

<sup>189</sup> M, Cz: *punyaskandham.*

<sup>190</sup> Visarga is used as punctuation after *sugata* in §§8, 10c, 11 and 14a.

<sup>191</sup> M, Cz omit: *bahu.*

<sup>192</sup> M, Cz: *punyaskandham.*

<sup>193</sup> S reads: *prasunuyāh.*

<sup>194</sup> M, Cz: *yo 'sau bhagavan punyaskandhas tathāgatena bhāṣitah askandhah sa tathāgatena bhāṣitah* for *sa eva bhagavan askandhah.*

<sup>195</sup> M, Cz: *punyaskandha* for *askandha.*

<sup>196</sup> M, Cz: *imam̄ trisāhasramahāsāhasram.*

<sup>197</sup> M, Cz: *paripūrṇam.*

<sup>198</sup> M, Cz add: *tathāgatebhyo 'rhabhyah samyaksambuddhebhyo.*

<sup>199</sup> M, Cz: *dadyāt.*

<sup>200</sup> M, Cz: *catuṣpādikām.* Cf. BHSD, p. 223.

<sup>201</sup> M, Cz add: *vistarena.*

<sup>202</sup> M, Cz: *punyaskandham.*

<sup>203</sup> M, Cz add: *arhatām samyaksambuddhānām.*

<sup>204</sup> M, Cz: *tat kasya hetoh.*

<sup>205</sup> M, Cz add: *tathāgatena bhāṣitah tenocyte buddhadharmā iti.*

<sup>206</sup> M, Cz add: *na srotaāpannasayaivam bhavati mayā srotaāpattiphalaṁ prāptam iti.*

<sup>207</sup> M, Cz omit: *bhagavān āha.*

<sup>208</sup> M, Cz: *kaṁcid dharmam* for *kiṁcid.*

<sup>209</sup> M omits: *na.*

<sup>210</sup> S reads: *tanocyte.*

<sup>211</sup> M, Cz add: *saced bhagavan srotaāpannasayaivam bhavet mayā srotaāpattiphalaṁ prāptam iti sa eva tasyātmagrāho bhavet sattvagrāho jīvagrāhah pudgalagrāho bhaved iti.*

<sup>212</sup> M, Cz: *bhavati* for *bhaven.*

gāmiphalam prāptam iti | subhūtir āha | no hīv3dam bhagavan <|> bhagavān āha | tat kasya hetoh<sup>213</sup> <|> na sakrdāgāmīv4no evam bhavati<sup>214</sup> mayā sakrdāgāmiphalam prāptam iti | tat kasmāv5d dhetoh<sup>215</sup> <|> na hi sa kaścid dharmah yaḥ sakrdāgāmitvam āpannah <|> te35r1(noc)y(ate sak)ṛdāgāmīti |

**§9c;** folio 35r1–4 (Cz 34.19–25)

bhagavān āha | tat kiṁ manyase subhūte ar2pi nv anāgāmina {||} evam bhavati mayā anāgāmiphalam prāptam iti<sup>216</sup> <|> r3 tat kasya hetoh <|> na sa<sup>217</sup> kaścid dharmah yo 'nāgāmīti | samanupaśyati<sup>218</sup> | tenor4cyate anāgāmīti |

**§9d;** folio 35r4–v2 (Cz 34.26–35.6)

bhagavān āha | tat kiṁ manyase subhūte | api nv<sup>219</sup> arha{m}r5to evam bhavati mayārhatvam prāptam iti | subhūtir āha | no hīdam bhagavan<sup>220</sup> | tat kar6(sya h)e(t)o(h) <|> (na) hi bhagavan sa<sup>221</sup> kaścid dharmo yo 'rhan nāmāh<sup>222</sup> <|> {ya}<sup>223</sup> saced bhagavann arhav1(ta evam bha)v(en) m(ayārha)-tv(am p)r(ā)ptam iti | sa eva tasyātmagrāho bhavet | satvagrāho j(iv2va)grāhah pudgalagrāho bhavet |

**§9e;** folio 35v2–36r1 (Cz 35.6–14)

aham<sup>224</sup> asmi{n} bhagavan | || tathāgatenārhata samya v3ksambuddhenāraṇavihāriṇām<sup>225</sup> agryo nir-diṣṭah <|> aham asmi{n} bhagavann arhan vigatav4rāgah<sup>226</sup> <|> na ca me bhagavann evam bhavati a{r}ham asmi{nn} arhann<sup>227</sup> iti | sacen mama bhagavav5nn evam bhaven mayārhatvam prāptam iti | na me tathāgato vyākariṣyati<sup>228</sup> | araṇāv6(v)i(h)ā(r)i(nām<sup>229</sup> a)grya iti<sup>230</sup> subhūti(h) | kulaputro na kvacid viharati | 36r1 tenocyate | araṇāvihārīti araṇāvihārīti<sup>231</sup> |

**§10a;** folio 36r1–4 (Cz 35.15–20)

bhagavān āha | tat kiṁ manyase<sup>232</sup> r2 subhūte | kaścid<sup>233</sup> dharmas<sup>234</sup> tathāgatena dīpaṁkarāt tathāgatā<d a>rhatta<h> samyaksambuddhār3d<sup>235</sup> udgr̄hitah <|> subhūtir āha | no hīdam bhagavan <|> bhagavān

<sup>213</sup> S reads: *tat kasye hetoh.* M, Cz omit: *bhagavān āha tat kasya hetoh.*

<sup>214</sup> S reads: *bhaviti.*

<sup>215</sup> M, Cz: *tat kasya hetoh.*

<sup>216</sup> M, Cz add: *subhūtir āha no hīdam bhagavan nānāgāmina evam bhavati mayānāgāmiphalam prāptam iti.*

<sup>217</sup> M, Cz: *hi sa bhagavan* for *sa.*

<sup>218</sup> M, Cz: *yo 'nāgāmitvam āpannah* for *yo 'nāgāmīti / samanupaśyati.*

<sup>219</sup> S reads: *tv.*

<sup>220</sup> M, Cz add: *nārhata evam bhavati mayārhattvam prāptam iti* after *bhagavan.*

<sup>221</sup> M, Cz: *sa bhagavan* for *bhagavan sa.*

<sup>222</sup> M, Cz add: *tenocyte 'rhan iti.*

<sup>223</sup> It is not clear why the scribe has written *ya* here.

<sup>224</sup> M, Cz insert: *tat kasya hetoh* before *aham.*

<sup>225</sup> M, Cz: *araṇāvihāriṇām.*

<sup>226</sup> M, Cz: *vītarāgah.*

<sup>227</sup> S reads *arhān.* M, Cz: *arhān asmy aham vītarāga* for *aham asmi arhān.*

<sup>228</sup> M, Cz: *na mām tathāgato vyākariṣyad* for *na me tathāgato vyākariṣyati.*

<sup>229</sup> M, Cz: *araṇāvihāriṇām.*

<sup>230</sup> M, Cz omit: *iti.*

<sup>231</sup> M, Cz: *'raṇāvihāryaraṇāvihārīti.* Note that here S writes *araṇā°* where previously it had *araṇā°.*

<sup>232</sup> S reads: *manyasya.*

<sup>233</sup> M, Cz: *asti sa kaścid.*

<sup>234</sup> S reads: *dharmaṭ.* M, Cz: *dharmo yas.*

<sup>235</sup> M, Cz: *dīpaṁkarasya tathāgatasyārhataḥ samyaksambuddhasyāṁtikād* for *dīpaṁkarāt tathāgatā<d a>rhatta<h>*

āha<sup>236</sup> | na<sup>237</sup> sa kaścid dharmah<sup>238</sup> r4 tathāgatena dīpamkarāt tathāgatād arhataḥ samyaksambuddhād<sup>239</sup> udgr̥hitah <|>

**§10b;** folio 36r4–v2 (Cz 35.21–25; P 180.17)

bhagavāsn āha | ya<ḥ> kaścit subhūte bodhisatvo evam vaded aham kṣetravyūhā niśpādayisyāmīr6ti<sup>240</sup> sa vitatha<m> vadet | tat kasya hetoh <|> kṣetravyūhā<ḥ> kṣetravīvyūhā iti subhūte avyūhā hy ete<sup>241</sup> tathāgatena bhāṣitā<ḥ><sup>242</sup> tenocyamte kṣetravyūhā iv2ti<sup>243</sup> <|>

**§10c;** folio 36v2–37r3 (Cz 35.25–36.12; P 180.17–181.1)

tasmāt tarhi subhūte bodhisatvena evam cittam utpādayitavyam apratiṣṭhitam <|> na rūpa-v3pratiṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyam | na śabdagandharaspraṣṭavyadharmapratiṣṭhiv4tam cittam utpādayitavyam | na kvacitpratiṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyam<sup>244</sup> | tad yathā(p)i v5 nāma subhūte puruso bhavet<sup>245</sup> | yasyaivaṁrūpa{m}<sup>246</sup> ātmabhāvah syāt tad yathāpi (nāma su)v6meruh<sup>247</sup> parvatarāja<sup>248</sup> | tat ki<m> manyase su37r1bhūte<sup>249</sup> mahān sa ātmabhāvo bhavet | subhūtir āha | mahān<sup>250</sup> bhagavañ mahā<n> sugata | (sa ā)r2tmabhāvo bhavet<sup>251</sup> | bhagavan<sup>252</sup> | tat kasya hetoh<sup>253</sup> <|> abhāvah sa tathāgatena bhāṣitah <|> tenor3cyate<sup>254</sup> ātmabhāva iti | na hi<sup>255</sup> sa bhāvah<sup>256</sup> <|> tenocyte atmabhāva iti ||

---

samyaksambuddhād.

<sup>236</sup> M, Cz omit: *bhagavān āha*.

<sup>237</sup> M, Cz: *nāsti*.

<sup>238</sup> M, Cz: *dharma yas*.

<sup>239</sup> M, Cz: *dīpamkarasya tathāgatasyārhataḥ samyaksambuddhasyāmṛtikād* for *dīpamkarāt tathāgatād arhataḥ samyaksambuddhād*.

<sup>240</sup> S reads: *niśpādayisyāmīti*.

<sup>241</sup> M, Cz: *te for hy ete*.

<sup>242</sup> P resumes here with the word *bhāṣitāḥ* / on fol. 6r1.

<sup>243</sup> P: *tad ucyate kṣetravyūbhā iti*.

<sup>244</sup> For this section the wording in M, Cz runs: *tasmāt tarhi subhūte bodhisattvena mahāsattvenaivam apratiṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyam yan na kvacitpratiṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyam na rūpa-pratiṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyam na śabdagandharaspraṣṭavyadharma-pratiṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyam*. Pargiter reconstructs P as: *tasmā (subhūte bodhisattvenaivam pra)tiṣṭhitam cittam utpāda(yitavyam na śabda)gandharasparṣa-pratiṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyam*. This reconstruction is highly problematical (among other things, the omission of any reference to *rūpa* is unlikely), but without examining the ms itself any attempt to improve on it would be guesswork.

<sup>245</sup> M, Cz add: *upetakāyo mahākāyo yat*. There is a gap of about 10 akṣaras in P, up to the word (*ā)tmabhāva*, which Pargiter has not attempted to reconstruct. Whatever the wording, it cannot have agreed with M, Cz or with S.

<sup>246</sup> M, Cz: *tasyaivaṁrūpa*.

<sup>247</sup> S reads: (*su)meruh*; Cz: *sumeruh*; P: *sumeru-*.

<sup>248</sup> M: *parvatarājāḥ*.

<sup>249</sup> M, Cz add: *api nu*.

<sup>250</sup> M, Cz add: *sa after mahān*.

<sup>251</sup> P apparently omits: *subhūtir āha / mahān bhagavan mahān sugata sa ātmabhāvo bhavet*, presumably through *saut du même au même*.

<sup>252</sup> M, Cz omit: *bhagavan* (and so apparently does P).

<sup>253</sup> M, Cz add: *ātmabhāva ātmabhāva iti bhagavann*. Like S, P and Tib. omit these words.

<sup>254</sup> S reads: *tenacyate*; P: *tad ucyate*.

<sup>255</sup> M, Cz add: *bhagavan*.

<sup>256</sup> M, Cz add *nābhāvah*. This reading reflected in Tib. as well. P adds: *nātmabhāvah*.

§11; folio 37r3–38r2 (Cz 36.13–37.10; P 181.1–13)

bhagavān āha | tarat kiṁ manyase subhūte<sup>257</sup> yāvam̄tyo<sup>258</sup> gaṁgānadyām<sup>259</sup> vālukās tāvam̄tya<sup>260</sup>  
 eva{m}<sup>261</sup> gaṁgānadyo bharṣveyuh <|><sup>262</sup>api nu tāsu bahvyo vālukā bhaveyuh <|><sup>263</sup> subhūtir<sup>264</sup>  
 āha | tā eva tāvad<sup>265</sup> bhagavan barṣhvyo<sup>266</sup> gaṁgānadyo bhaveyuh prāg eva yās tāsu<sup>267</sup> vālukāḥ <|>  
 bhagavān āha<sup>268</sup> ārocayāmi<sup>269</sup> v1 te subhūte prativedayāmi<sup>270</sup> te yāvam̄tyas<sup>271</sup> tāsu gaṁgānadiṣu  
 vālukā bhaveyuh<sup>272</sup> <|> tāvam̄v2tyo lokadhātavah<sup>273</sup> kaścid eva<sup>274</sup> strī vā puruṣo vā<sup>275</sup> saptaratna-  
 pratipūrṇam<sup>276</sup> kṛtvā tathāv3gatebhyo 'rhadbhyaḥ samyaksambuddhebhyo dānam dadyāt | tat kiṁ  
 manyase subhūte <|> api nu sā v4 strī vā puruṣo vā tatonidānam bahu punyam<sup>277</sup> prasunuyāt |  
 subhūtir<sup>278</sup> āha | bahu bhagavān bahu sugata<sup>279</sup> | sā<sup>280</sup> strī vā puruṣo vā<sup>281</sup> tatonidānam bahu  
 punyam<sup>282</sup> prasunuyāt<sup>283</sup> <|> bhagavāv6n āha | yaś ca khalu punah subhūte<sup>284</sup> tāvam̄tyo lokadhātavah<sup>285</sup>  
 saptaratnapratipūrṇam<sup>286</sup> 38r1 kṛtvā<sup>287</sup> dānam dadyāt | yaś ceto<sup>288</sup> dharmaparyāyād amtaśāś<sup>289</sup> catuṣ-

<sup>257</sup> P apparently omits: *bhagavān āha / tat kiṁ manyase subhūte* (but see note below).

<sup>258</sup> M, Cz: *yāvato*; P: (*yāvanto hi*) *subhūte*.

<sup>259</sup> M, Cz: *gaṁgāyām̄ mahānadyām̄*; P: *gaṁgāyā (nadyā)*.

<sup>260</sup> M, Cz: *tāvatya*; P: *tāvanto*.

<sup>261</sup> P omits: *eva*.

<sup>262</sup> P inserts: *tat kin manyase subhūte*.

<sup>263</sup> M, Cz: *tāsu yā vālukā api nu tā bahvyo* (Cz: *bahvyo*) *bhaveyuh*; P: *api nu tā bahvyo bhaveyuh* for *api nu tāsu bahvyo vālukā bhaveyuh*.

<sup>264</sup> P omits: *subhūtir*.

<sup>265</sup> P: *taceva tāva* for *tā eva tāvad*.

<sup>266</sup> Cz: *bahvyo*.

<sup>267</sup> M, Cz insert: *gaṁgānadiṣu*; P: *tatra* for *yās tāsu*.

<sup>268</sup> P omits: *bhagavān āha*.

<sup>269</sup> S reads: *ārocayami*. Frag e begins here.

<sup>270</sup> S reads: *prativedhayāmi*. Frag e: *prave*.

<sup>271</sup> M, Cz: *yāvatya*; lacuna in P here. Frag e has a completely different wording: //t(a)tra gaṁgānadivālukāsamāsu gaṁgānad. + //.

<sup>272</sup> P apparently omits: *bhaveyuh*. There seems to be insufficient space in Frag e for it too.

<sup>273</sup> S reads: *lokādhātavah*; M, Cz: *tāvato lokadhātūn*; P: *tāvato lokadhātura* (?); Frag e: *kadhātum*.

<sup>274</sup> P apparently omits: *eva*.

<sup>275</sup> Frag e: *kaścid eva kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā*.

<sup>276</sup> M, Cz: °*paripūrṇam̄* for °*pratipūrṇam̄*; Frag e also supports *pari*°, but number of missing akṣaras at the end of line (approx. 8) suggests it may have read: *saptaratnapari(pūrṇam̄ dānam dadyāt / ta)tonidānam*. Long lacuna in P, ending at *āha*.

<sup>277</sup> M, Cz: *pūnyaskandham* for *pūnyam̄*. Frag e (*pūnya*) probably read with M, Cz. Cf. Tib.: *bsod nams*. Lacuna in P.

<sup>278</sup> P omits: *subhūtir*. Frag e reads with S, M, Cz.

<sup>279</sup> P, Frag e: *evam̄ bhagavām bahu* for *bahu bhagavan bahu sugata*.

<sup>280</sup> M, Cz omit: *sā*; P, Frag e: *sa*.

<sup>281</sup> P: *kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā*; Frag e: *ku(la) /// (duhi)tā vā*.

<sup>282</sup> M, Cz: *pūnyaskandham* for *bahu pūnyam̄*. Frag e: *puny(a)*, so probably read with M, Cz. Cf. Tib.: *bsod nams*.

<sup>283</sup> S reads: *prasunuyāda* (perhaps because the scribe was about to continue with *(a)prameyam asamkhyeyam*, but caught himself in time). M, Cz: *prasunuyād aprameyam asamkhyeyam* for *prasunuyāt*. That this amplification is a mistake is suggested both by context and by the parallel in §8 above. Tib. also lacks it, and there is not enough space in Frag e for it. Unfortunately, there is another long lacuna in P at this point, for which Pargiter conjectures *tato pūnyaskandham prasaveta bhagavān āha yaś ca ho punah*.

<sup>284</sup> M, Cz add: *strī vā puruṣo vā*. P, Frag e read with S.

<sup>285</sup> M, Cz: *tāvato lokadhātūn*; P: *tāvata lokadhātūm*; Frag e: *tāvantam lokadhā(tum)*.

<sup>286</sup> M, Cz, P: °*paripūrṇam̄* for °*pratipūrṇam̄*. Frag e missing.

<sup>287</sup> P, Frag e omit *kṛtvā*; M, Cz add: *tathāgatebhyo 'rhadbhyaḥ samyaksambuddhebhyo*.

<sup>288</sup> M, Cz, P: *ca* (P adds three akṣaras here: *subhūte?*) *kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā*. Frag e reads with S.

<sup>289</sup> P has insufficient space for much more than *ito* here. Missing in Frag e.

padikām<sup>290</sup> api gāthām ur2dgrhya parebhyo<sup>291</sup> deśayet<sup>292</sup> | ayam<sup>293</sup> tato<sup>294</sup> bahutaram punyam<sup>295</sup> pra<sunuyād apra>meyam asamkhyeyam<sup>296</sup> |

**§12;** folio 38r2–v1 (Cz 37.10–19; P 181.13–182.3)

api r3 tu khalu<sup>297</sup> subhūte yasmin pṛthivīpradeśe ito<sup>298</sup> dharmaparyāyād amtaśaś<sup>299</sup> catuṣpadir4kām<sup>300</sup> api gāthām<sup>301</sup> bhāṣyeta<sup>302</sup> vā deśyeta vā<sup>303</sup> sa pṛthivīpradeśaś caityabhūto bharṣvet<sup>304</sup> | sadeva-mānuṣasurasya lokasya kah punar vādah subhūte<sup>305</sup> ya imam dharmapar6ryāyam<sup>306</sup> dhārayiṣyamti<sup>307</sup> paramēṇa te<sup>308</sup> āscaryeṇa samanvāgatā bhaviṣyamti | tav1smimś ca<sup>309</sup> pṛthivīpradeśe śāstā viharaty anyatarānyataro vā gurusthāniyah<sup>310</sup> <>

**§13a;** folio 38v1–5 (Cz 37.20–38.2; P 182.3–8)

evam uv2kte<sup>311</sup> āyuṣmān subhūtir bhagavamtam e<ta>d avocat | ko nāmāyam bhagavan dharmaparyāyah kav3tham cainam dhārayāmi | evam ukte bhagavān āyuṣmamitam subhūtim etad avocat | prajñāpāv4ramitā nāmāya<m> subhūte dharmaparyāyah <> evam cainam<sup>312</sup> dhāraya<sup>313</sup> | tat kasya hetoh <> yaiva<sup>314</sup> subhū<te><sup>315</sup> v5 prajñāpāramitā tathāgatena bhāṣitah | saivāpāramitā<sup>316</sup> |

**§13b;** folio 38v5–39r1 (Cz 38.3–6; P182.8–10)

tat kim manyase subhūte<sup>317</sup> v6 api nu sa<sup>318</sup> kaści<d><sup>319</sup> dharmo<sup>320</sup> tathāgatena bhāṣitah <> subhūtir<sup>321</sup>

<sup>290</sup> M, Cz: *catuspādikām*. P: *cātuṣpādām*; Frag e: + + .. *kām*.

<sup>291</sup> P: *parasya*.

<sup>292</sup> M, Cz add: *samprakāśayed*; P may have had this too. Missing in Frag e, but probably enough space for *deś(ayet samprakāśayed aya)*, since approximately 8 akṣaras are missing at end of line.

<sup>293</sup> M, Cz add: *eva*. Frag e: *m eva tena pūrvakena*.

<sup>294</sup> M, Cz: *tato nidānam* for *tato*. Frag e: see preceding note. Lacuna in P, then: *kulaputreṇa kuladu(hitṛṇā) vā*.

<sup>295</sup> M, Cz, P: *punyaskamdhām*. Missing in Frag e.

<sup>296</sup> P: *prasaveta* for *punyam* pra<sunuyād apra>meyam asamkhyeyam. Frag e also has *prasaveta*, apparently reading with P.

<sup>297</sup> M, Cz add: *punah*; P, Frag e omit: *khalu*.

<sup>298</sup> P apparently omits: *ito*. Missing in Frag e.

<sup>299</sup> P apparently omits: *amtaśaś*. Frag e has *anta* ..

<sup>300</sup> M, Cz: *catuspādikām*. P: *cātuṣpādām*. Missing in Frag e.

<sup>301</sup> Frag e: *gāthā*. M, Cz add: *udgrhya*.

<sup>302</sup> P: *bhāṣyate*; Frag e: *bhāṣiṣyate*.

<sup>303</sup> M, Cz: *vā samprakāśyeta vā* for *vā deśyeta vā*. P, Frag e: *tena* for *vā deśyeta vā*.

<sup>304</sup> P: *bhaviṣyati* for *bhavet*. Frag e reads *syati*, therefore must have read with P.

<sup>305</sup> M, Cz, Frag e omit: *subhūte*. Lacuna in P.

<sup>306</sup> M, Cz add: *sakalasamāptam*. Lacuna in P, but P probably read with S. Frag e reads with S.

<sup>307</sup> M, Cz add: *vācayisyamti paryavāpsyamti parebhyas ca vistarena samprakāśayisyamti*. Frag e: *udgrhnīṣyan(t)i* for *dhārayiṣyamti*. Lacuna in P, but P probably read with S. Frag e breaks off at this point.

<sup>308</sup> M, Cz add: *subhūte*; P adds: *satvā*.

<sup>309</sup> M, Cz add: *subhūte*; P: *tasmin* (without *ca*).

<sup>310</sup> M, Cz: *vijñaguru°* for *guru°*. Lacuna in P would apparently permit *vijñaguru°*.

<sup>311</sup> P: *atha* for *evam ukte*.

<sup>312</sup> P adds: *kāmam*.

<sup>313</sup> P: *dhārayata*.

<sup>314</sup> P: *yā ceyam* for *yaiva*.

<sup>315</sup> P omits: *subhūte*.

<sup>316</sup> M, Cz add: *tathāgatena bhāṣitā / tenocyte prajñāpāramiteti*. The lacuna in P is probably to be reconstructed (reading with S) as *-sitā saivāpāramitā tat ki-*, not *-sitā sā pāramitā tat ki-* as Pargiter has it.

<sup>317</sup> S follows *subhūte* with the akṣaras *anu*, subsequently deleted by being struck through. The many scribal errors in

āha <|> no hīdam<sup>322</sup> bhagavan | {bhaga<vā>39r1n āha} | na sa kaścid<sup>323</sup> bhagavam<sup>324</sup> {d}dharmo  
yah<sup>325</sup> tathāgate<na> bhāsi<sup>326</sup>ta<ḥ |>

§13c; folio 39r1–6 (Cz 38.7–15; G 5a1–2; P182.10–15)

<sup>327</sup>yāvataḥ<sup>328</sup> subhūte<sup>329</sup> r2 tr̄sāhasramahāsāhasryām<sup>330</sup> lokadhātau<sup>331</sup> pṛthivīrajaḥ kaccit<sup>332</sup> tad bahu<sup>333</sup>  
bhavet<sup>334</sup> | sur3bhūtir<sup>335</sup> āha | bahu bhagavans tat<sup>336</sup> pṛthivīrajo bhavet<sup>337</sup> yat ta<d> bhagavan |  
pṛthivīrajaḥ tathāgatena bhāṣitah<sup>338</sup> arajaḥ sa<sup>339</sup> tathāgatena<sup>340</sup> bhāṣitah<sup>341</sup> <|> tar5d<sup>342</sup> ucyate  
pṛthivīraja iti | yā sā<sup>343</sup> lokadhātūr<sup>344</sup> adhātuh sā<sup>345</sup> tathāgatena bhāṣitah <|> r6 tad<sup>346</sup> ucyate lokadhātūr  
iti ||

§13d; folio 39r6–v4 (Cz 38.16–24; G 5a2–3; P 182.15–20)

bhagavān āha |<sup>347</sup> tat kiṁ manyase subhūte<sup>348</sup> dvātr̄mśadbhir<sup>349</sup> mav1(h)āpuruṣalakṣaṇaiḥ<sup>350</sup> tathāgato  
'rhan samyaksambuddho<sup>351</sup> draṣṭavya<ḥ> | subhūtir<sup>352</sup> āha | no hīv2dam<sup>353</sup> bhagavan<sup>354</sup> {bhagavān

this section indicate a serious lapse of attention on the part of the copyist.

<sup>318</sup> M, Cz: *api nv asti sa*; P: *api nu*, for *api nu sa*.

<sup>319</sup> P: *kaści*.

<sup>320</sup> M, Cz add: *yas*.

<sup>321</sup> P omits: *subhūtir*.

<sup>322</sup> P: *no iti* for *no hīdam*.

<sup>323</sup> M, Cz: *nāsti sa kaścid*; lacuna in P, in which Pargiter reconstructs *na kaści* for *na sa kaścid*.

<sup>324</sup> M, Cz, P (apparently) omit: *bhagavam*.

<sup>325</sup> P apparently omits: *yah*.

<sup>326</sup> G begins here, on fol. 5r1.

<sup>327</sup> M, Cz add: *bhagavān āha / tat kiṁ manyase subhūte*; G adds: *bhagavān āha*. P reads with S.

<sup>328</sup> M, Cz, P, G: *yāvat*.

<sup>329</sup> M, Cz omit: *subhūte*. G, P (apparently) have it.

<sup>330</sup> M, Cz, P, G (*trs-* reconstructed): *trisāhasramahāsāhasre*.

<sup>331</sup> S reads: *lokadhātū*. Emended to *lokadhātau* in line with M, Cz, P, G.

<sup>332</sup> S reads: *kaścit*. M, Cz, G: *kaccit*; P: *kiñcit*.

<sup>333</sup> G: *vahu*.

<sup>334</sup> G omits: *bhavet*.

<sup>335</sup> G, P (apparently) omit: *subhūtir*.

<sup>336</sup> P omits: *tat*; M, Cz: *bahu sugata* for *tat*. Note that the use of *virāma* at this point in S (*bhagavan\* stat*) is unusual, reflecting a collision of the “honorific punctuation” of the ms with the rules of sandhi.

<sup>337</sup> M, Cz add: *tat kasya hetoḥ*. P and G (originally) read with S.

<sup>338</sup> M, Cz: *tathāgatena bhāṣitam*; P: *tathāgatena bh(āṣitam)*; G omits: *bhavet / yat tad bhagavan pṛthivīrajaḥ tathāgatena bhāṣitah*, suggesting that its recension must originally have read: *bahu bhagavan tat pṛthivīrajaḥ bhavet / yat tat pṛthivīrajaḥ arajas tathāgatena bhāṣitas*.

<sup>339</sup> M, Cz: *tad bhagavams*; P: *tad bhagavaṇ* for *sa*. G omits: *sa*.

<sup>340</sup> P apparently omits: *tathāgatena*.

<sup>341</sup> M, Cz, P (apparently): *bhāṣitam*.

<sup>342</sup> M, Cz, G: *tena*. Lacuna in P, Pargiter reconstructs *tad ucyate*.

<sup>343</sup> M, Cz, G: *yo 'py asau* ; P: *yo so* for *yā sā*.

<sup>344</sup> M, Cz add: *tathāgatena bhāṣito*. G, P omit this phrase with S.

<sup>345</sup> M, Cz, G: *sa*; P: *sas*.

<sup>346</sup> M, Cz, G: *tena*. P reads with S.

<sup>347</sup> P omits: *bhagavān āha /*.

<sup>348</sup> P adds: *(api) nu*.

<sup>349</sup> M, Cz: *dvātr̄mśan*<sup>o</sup> (as first element of compound); G: *dvātr̄mśatā*; P: *dvātriñśar* (but elsewhere *dvātr̄mśa*<sup>o</sup> as first element in compound).

<sup>350</sup> G: *mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇāni*.

āha} <sup>355</sup> | tat kasya hetoh<sup>356</sup> <> yāni tāni<sup>357</sup> bhagavan<sup>358</sup> dvātr̄m̄śanmahāpuru<ṣa>v3lakṣaṇāni<sup>359</sup> tathāgatena bhāṣitāny alakṣaṇāni<sup>360</sup> ta<thā>gatena bhāṣitāni<sup>361</sup> tasmād<sup>362</sup> ucyamte dvāv4tr̄m̄śanmahā-  
puruṣalakṣaṇānīti |

**§13e;** folio 39v4–40r1 (Cz 39.1–8; G 5a3–5; P 182.20–183.3)

bhagavān āha |<sup>363</sup> yaś ca khalu<sup>364</sup> punaḥ subhūte strī vā puv̄sruṣo vā<sup>365</sup> gamgānadīvālukopamān<sup>366</sup> ātmabhāvān parityajet<sup>367</sup> | yaś ceto dharmaparyāyāc<sup>368</sup> catuṣpadikām<sup>369</sup> api gāthām udgr̄hya parebhyo deśayet<sup>370</sup> | ayam<sup>371</sup> tatonidānam bahutaram<sup>372</sup> puṇyam<sup>373</sup> pra40r1<sunuyād<sup>374</sup> apra>meyam asam-  
khyeyam<sup>375</sup> |

**§14a;** folio 40r1–v1 (Cz 39.9–21; G 5a5–5b1; P 183.3–10 )

atha khalv<sup>376</sup> āyuṣmān subhūtiḥ dharmapravegenāśrūṇi<sup>377</sup> prāmuṇicat | r2 pravartayam<sup>378</sup> so 'śrūṇi parimārjya<sup>379</sup> bhagavāntam etad avocat | āścaryam bhagavan | paramār3ścaryam sugata | yāvad ayam dharmaparyāyah tathāgatena<sup>380</sup> bhāṣitah<sup>381</sup> <> yato me bhar4gavan |<sup>382</sup> jñānam utpannam na mayā<sup>383</sup> jātv eva<sup>384</sup> dharmaparyāyah śrutapūrvah <> r5 paramēṇa te bhagavan |<sup>385</sup> āścaryenā<sup>386</sup>

<sup>351</sup> G omits: 'rhan samyaksambuddho.

<sup>352</sup> G, P omit: subhūtir.

<sup>353</sup> G: no; P: no iti for no hīdām.

<sup>354</sup> S reads: *bhagavad* (because of the following *bhagavān āha*). M, Cz add: *na dvātr̄m̄śanmahāpuruṣalakṣaṇais tathāgato 'rhan samyaksambuddho draṣṭavyah*. Lacuna in P insufficient for this addition.

<sup>355</sup> Cz, G, P omit: *bhagavān āha*.

<sup>356</sup> S reads: *hatoḥ*.

<sup>357</sup> G: tāni tāni; M, Cz: yāni hi tāni, for yāni tāni. P: (yāni) tāni.

<sup>358</sup> G, P omit *bhagavan*.

<sup>359</sup> S reads: *dvātr̄m̄śar*°.

<sup>360</sup> M, Cz add: tāni bhagavāms; P adds: tāni.

<sup>361</sup> G omits: *tathāgatena bhāṣitāni*.

<sup>362</sup> M, Cz, G: tena for *tasmād*. Lacuna in P.

<sup>363</sup> P omits: *bhagavān āha* |.

<sup>364</sup> P: ho for *khalu*.

<sup>365</sup> M, Cz add: *dine* *dine*.

<sup>366</sup> G: °bālukopamān; M, Cz: °vālukāsamān; P: °vālikā(samān?).

<sup>367</sup> M, Cz add: *evam parityajan gamgānadīvālukāsamān kalpāms tān ātmabhāvān parityajet*. Lacuna in P. G reads with S.

<sup>368</sup> M, Cz, G add *amtasaś* after *dharmaparyāyād* (P: *dharmaparyāyā*).

<sup>369</sup> M, Cz: *catuṣpādikām*; P: *cātuṣpadikām*. G: *catuṣpadikām* with S.

<sup>370</sup> M, Cz add: *samprakāśayed*. Lacuna in P. G reads with S.

<sup>371</sup> M, Cz, G add: *eva*. Lacuna in P, Pargiter reconstructs: *ayam eva tato bahutaram*, etc.

<sup>372</sup> G: *bahu* for *bahutaram*.

<sup>373</sup> M, Cz, P (reconstructed): *puṇyaskamdhām*.

<sup>374</sup> G: *prasaveta*; P: (*prasavejta*) for *prasunuyād*.

<sup>375</sup> P omits: *aprameyam asamkhyeyam*. In S the restored syllables *sunuyād apra* have clearly been lost as a result of the jump from the end of one folio (39) to the beginning of the next (40).

<sup>376</sup> P omits: *khalv*.

<sup>377</sup> M, Cz, P: °vegenā° for °pravegenā°. G: °pravegenā°.

<sup>378</sup> M, Cz, G, P (reconstructed) omit: *pravartayam*.

<sup>379</sup> S reads: *parimārjyā*; M, Cz, P (reconstructed): *pramrjya*; G: *prāmrjya* for *parimārjya*.

<sup>380</sup> P: *tathāgatena dharmaparyāyo* for *dharmaparyāyah tathāgatena*.

<sup>381</sup> M, Cz add (after *bhāṣito*): 'grayānasamprasthitānām sattvānām arthāya śreṣṭhayānasamprasthitānām arthāya.

<sup>382</sup> P (reconstructed) omits: *bhagavan*.

<sup>383</sup> M, Cz add: *bhagavañ*; G: *me* for *maya*.

samanvāgatā<sup>387</sup> bhaviṣyam̄ti ya iha sūr̄tre bhāṣyamāṇe<sup>388</sup> bhūtasa(m)jñām utpādayiṣyam̄ti <|><sup>389</sup> yā caiṣā<sup>390</sup> bhagavan | bhūtasamjñā saivāv1samjñā<sup>391</sup> tasmā<t><sup>392</sup> tathāgato bhāṣate bhūtasamjñā bhūta-samjñeti |

**§14b;** folio 40v1–4 (Cz 40.1–8; G 5b1–2; P 183.10–16)

na mama<sup>393</sup> bhagavann āścaryam̄<sup>394</sup> yad av2ham<sup>395</sup> dharmaparyāyam̄ bhāṣyamāṇam<sup>396</sup> avakalpayāmy adhimucyāmi<sup>397</sup> | ye<sup>398</sup> te bhagavann<sup>399</sup> imam̄<sup>400</sup> dharmapav3ryāyam̄ udgr̄hiṣyam̄ti paryavāpsyam̄ti dhā(ra)yisyam̄ti<sup>401</sup> | te paramāścaryasamav4nvāgatā<sup>402</sup> bhaviṣyam̄ti ||

**§14c;** folio 40v4–41r1 (Cz 40.9–15; G 5b2–3; P 183.16–184.3)

api tu khalu<sup>403</sup> punah bhagavan<sup>404</sup> na teṣām<sup>405</sup> ātmasamjñā v5 pravartsyate<sup>406</sup> | na satvasamjñā na jīvasamjñā<sup>407</sup> | na pudgalasamjñā pravartsyate<sup>408</sup> |<sup>409</sup> tat kasya heto<ḥ><sup>410</sup> v6 yāsāv<sup>411</sup> ātmasamjñā saivāsamjñā <|> yā satvasamjñā jīvasamjñā<sup>412</sup> pudgalasamjñā saivāsamjñā<sup>413</sup> | tat ka41r1sya hetoḥ <|> sarvasamjñāpagatā hi buddhā bhagava<mta>ḥ ||

<sup>384</sup> M, Cz: *evaṁrūpo*; G: *ayaṁ* for *eva*. Lacuna in P, Pargiter reconstructs *na ma(yā evaṁrūpo dharmapa)ryāyah*, but *na ma(yā jātv eva dharmapa)ryāyah* is equally possible.

<sup>385</sup> P omits: *bhagavan*.

<sup>386</sup> P: *satvāścaryeṇa* for *āścaryena*.

<sup>387</sup> M, Cz add: *bodhisattvā*.

<sup>388</sup> M, Cz add: *śrutvā*.

<sup>389</sup> M, Cz add: *tat kasya hetoḥ*.

<sup>390</sup> P: *yaiṣā* for *yā caiṣā*.

<sup>391</sup> M, Cz: *saivābhūtasamjñā* for *saivāsamjñā*. G, P read with S.

<sup>392</sup> P: *tasmā*.

<sup>393</sup> G: *me*.

<sup>394</sup> P: *dus्करामि*. This reading adopted by Cz, contra M and G, which read *āścaryam̄* with S.

<sup>395</sup> M: *yadham imam̄*; Cz, P, G: *yad aham imam̄*.

<sup>396</sup> P inserts: *nu*.

<sup>397</sup> M, Cz: *adhimucye*; G: *adhimucya*; P: *a[ty a]dhimucyām* for *adhimucyāmi*.

<sup>398</sup> M, Cz: *ye 'pi*. Lacuna in P.

<sup>399</sup> G inserts: *satvā*; M, Cz insert: *sattvā bhaviṣyam̄ty anāgate 'dhvani paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyām pañcaśat�ām saddharmavipralope vartamāne ya*, lacuna in P, ending with the word *pāmcāśat�ām*, suggesting similarity to M, Cz.

<sup>400</sup> M, Cz insert: *bhagavan*.

<sup>401</sup> M, Cz: *udgr̄hiṣyam̄ti dhārayisyam̄ti vācayisyam̄ti paryavāpsyam̄ti parebhyāś ca vistareṇa samprakāśayisyam̄ti*; G: *udgr̄hiṣyanti yāvat paryavāpsyanti for udgr̄hiṣyam̄ti paryavāpsyam̄ti dhārayisyam̄ti*. P has several lacunae, but may possibly be reconstructed: *avakalpayiṣyanti adhi(mucy)iṣyanti vista)reṇa (ca parasya samprakāśayiṣyanti)*.

<sup>402</sup> M, Cz: *paramāścaryeṇa samanvāgatā*. P, G read with S.

<sup>403</sup> P: *ho*.

<sup>404</sup> P: *subhūte* for *bhagavan*.

<sup>405</sup> S reads: *meṣām*.

<sup>406</sup> M, Cz: *pravartisyyate*, P: *pravarti(syati)*. G: *pravartsyate* with S.

<sup>407</sup> P inserts: *pravartisyyati*.

<sup>408</sup> M, Cz: *pravartisyyate*; P: *pravartisyyati*; G omits.

<sup>409</sup> M, Cz add: *nāpi teṣām kācit sanjñā nāsanjñā pravartate*.

<sup>410</sup> S reads: *hato*.

<sup>411</sup> M, Cz: *yā sā* (Cz: *sa*) *bhagavann*; P: *yā sā* for *yā asau*.

<sup>412</sup> P inserts: *yā*. Reconstruct P in the lacuna as *yā sā satvasamjñā yā jīva-*? Cf. Pargiter, p. 184, n. 2.

<sup>413</sup> G omits: *tat kasya hetoḥ | yāsāv* (or *yā sā*) *ātmasamjñā saivāsamjñā / yā satvasamjñā jīvasamjñā pudgalasamjñā saivāsamjñā*.

**§14d;** folio 41rl–v1 (Cz 40.16–41.4; G 5b3–5; P 184.4–9)

evam ukte bhagavān ār̥yūṣmaṇtam subhūtim etad avocat<sup>414</sup> | evam etat subhūte evam etat<sup>415</sup> subhūte<sup>416</sup> r3 paramā<śca>ryasamanvāgatās te satvā<sup>417</sup> bhaviṣyamti | ya iha<sup>418</sup> sūtre bhāṣyamāṇe<sup>419</sup> śrūtvā<sup>420</sup> not<t>rasiṣyamti | na samṛ̥trasiṣyamti | <na> samṛ̥trāsam āpatsyamte<sup>421</sup> <|> tar5t kasya hetoh<sup>422</sup> <|> paramapāramiteyam subhūte tathāgatena bhāṣitā<sup>423</sup> <|> yā<m> ca<sup>423</sup> r6 tathāgataḥ paramapāramitām bhāṣate<sup>424</sup> tām aparimāṇā<sup>425</sup> buddhā bhavīgavamto bhāṣamte <| te>nocyate paramapāramiteti<sup>426</sup>

**§14e;** folio 41v1–42v3 (Cz 41.5–42.5; G 5b5–7; P 184.10–185.4)

api tu khalu punah<sup>427</sup> subhūv2te yā<sup>428</sup> tathāgatasya kṣāṇtipāramitā saivāpāramitā <|> tat kasya hetoh<sup>429</sup> <|> yadā v3 me<sup>430</sup> subhūte<sup>431</sup> kalimgarājā<sup>432</sup> amgaṇpratyamgāny<sup>433</sup> a(c)chetsīn<sup>434</sup> nāsīn me<sup>435</sup> tasmin samav4ye ātmasamjñā vā satvasamjñā vā jīvasamjñā vā pudgalasamjñā<sup>436</sup> vā na<sup>437</sup> me kā{||}v5cit<sup>438</sup> samjñā nāsamjñā<sup>439</sup> babhūva <|> tat kasya hetoh<sup>440</sup> <|> sacet subhūte mama<sup>440</sup> tasmin sav6maye ātmasamjñābhaviṣyat<sup>441</sup> {d} vyāpādasamjñāpi<sup>442</sup> me 'bhaviṣyat {||} tasmin sa42r1maye<sup>443</sup>

<sup>414</sup> G: *bhagavān āha* for *evam ukte bhagavān āyūṣmaṇtam subhūtim etad avocat*.

<sup>415</sup> P: *eta*.

<sup>416</sup> M, Cz omit: *subhūte*. G omits this second *evam etat subhūte*.

<sup>417</sup> G omits: *satvā*. Lacuna in P.

<sup>418</sup> M, Cz insert: *subhūte*.

<sup>419</sup> G: *imam dharmaparyāyaṇ* for *iha sūtre bhāṣyamāṇe*.

<sup>420</sup> M, Cz, P omit: *śrūtvā*. G has it.

<sup>421</sup> P: *āpatsyanti*.

<sup>422</sup> M, Cz add: *yadutāpāramitā* (but M notes that J omits this). This extra phrase does not appear in G, P, or Tib. either.

<sup>423</sup> M, Cz insert: *subhūte*.

<sup>424</sup> P: *yā tathāgatena parama(pāramitā bhāṣitā)* for *yām ca tathāgataḥ paramapāramitām bhāṣate*.

<sup>425</sup> M, Cz add: *api*.

<sup>426</sup> As Pargiter notes, the lacuna in P is too short to contain all the words *tām aparimāṇā buddhā bhagavamto bhāṣamte / tenocye paramapāramiteti*.

<sup>427</sup> P omits: *khalu punah*.

<sup>428</sup> G: *ya*.

<sup>429</sup> S reads: *hatoḥ*.

<sup>430</sup> G omits: *me*.

<sup>431</sup> P omits: *subhūte*.

<sup>432</sup> G: *kali°* for *kalimga°*. P's *(ka)lingarājā* is mostly reconstruction.

<sup>433</sup> M, Cz, G, P (reconstructed): *amgaṇpratyamgāmāṇsāny* for *amgaṇpratyamgāny*.

<sup>434</sup> M, Cz, G: *acchaitisit*; P: *(acchai)tsi* for *accetsīn*.

<sup>435</sup> P: *nāsī me*. M, Cz omit: *nāsī me*. G reads with S.

<sup>436</sup> P: *satvajīvapudgalasamjñā* for *satvasamjñā vā jīvasamjñā vā pudgalasamjñā*.

<sup>437</sup> M, Cz add: *api*. A significant omission in G begins here (see below).

<sup>438</sup> P: *kāci*.

<sup>439</sup> M, Cz: *vāsamjñā vā* for *nāsamjñā*. P reads with S.

<sup>440</sup> M, Cz, P: *sacēt subhūte* for *sacēt subhūte mama*.

<sup>441</sup> G omits: *na me kācit samjñā nāsamjñā babhūva tat kasya hetoh sacēt subhūte mama tasmin samaye ātmasamjñābhaviṣyat* (and possibly more in addition, as is suggested by M, Cz and P; see below). Although conditionals occasionally appear in Buddhist texts without the augment (see BHSG 31.38–40), there is no reason why S should be read differently from the other witnesses in this regard. Here M, Cz, P: *ātmāsamjñābhaviṣyat* (C writes: *ātmā-samjñā-abhaviṣyat*).

<sup>442</sup> P omits: *api*. G: *vyāpādasamjñā vāpi*.

<sup>443</sup> M, Cz, P, G: *me tasmin samaye 'bhaviṣyat* for *me 'bhaviṣyat tasmin samaye*. M, Cz add: *sacēt satvatasamjñā vā jīvasamjñā pudgalasamjñābhaviṣyat* *vyāpādasamjñāpi me tasmin samaye 'bhaviṣyat / tat kasya hetoh*; P (partly reconstructed) adds: *(sacēt satvajīva)samjñā / pudgalasamjñābhaviṣya(t\* vyā)pādasamjñā me tasmin samaye*

<|> abhijānāmy aham subhūte atīte 'dhvani pañca jātiśatāni yad ar2ham<sup>444</sup> kṣāmtivādī riśir<sup>445</sup> abhū tadāpi<sup>446</sup> me nātmasamjñā babhūva<sup>447</sup> | na satvasamjñā r3 na jīvasamjñā na pudgalasamjñā<sup>448</sup> | tasmāt<sup>449</sup> tarhi subhūte bodhisatvena mahāsar4tvena<sup>450</sup> sarvasamjñā vivarjayitvānuttarāyām<sup>451</sup> s(a)m(y)(a)ksambodhau cittam utpādar5yitavyam | na rūpapratīṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyam | na śabdagandharasprasṭar6vyapratīṣṭhitim{m}tam<sup>452</sup> cittam utpādayitavyam | na dharmapratīṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyam | nādharmapratīṣṭhitam cittam<sup>453</sup> utpādayitavyam | na kvacitpratīṣṭhitam cittav2m utpādayitavyam | tat kasmād dhetoh<sup>454</sup> <|> yat pratīṣṭhi<ta>m tad evāpratīṣṭhi<ta>m <|> tasmād eva{m} v3 tathāgato bhāṣate<sup>455</sup> rūpāpratīṣṭhitena dānam dātavyam<sup>456</sup> |

§14f; folio 42v3–43r1 (Cz 42.5–12; P 185.4–8)

api tu khalu v4 punah<sup>457</sup> subhūte bodhisatvenaivam<sup>458</sup> dānaparityāgah parityajyah<sup>459</sup> sarvasatvānām av5rthāya <|><sup>460</sup> yaiva ca<sup>461</sup> satvasamjñā sa evāsamjñā<sup>462</sup> | ya eva te<sup>463</sup> sarvasatvā<ḥ> tathāgav6tena bhāṣitāḥ ta evāsatvāḥ<sup>464</sup> <|> bhūtavādī subhūte tathāgataḥ satyavādī 43r1 tathāvādī<sup>465</sup> tathāgato na vitathāvādī<sup>466</sup> tathāgato<sup>467</sup>

'bhavisyat. In lacking such an addition G appears at first sight closest to S, but the long omission noted above can only be explained by the addition's presence in G's exemplar. See Schopen 2004a: 135, n. 7 for detailed comments on this. The text on which G is based may thus have read something like: nāśin me tasmin samaye ātmasamjñā vā satvasamjñā vā jīvasamjñā vā pudgalasamjñā vā / na me kācit samjñā nāsamjñā babhūva | tat kasya hetoh | sacet subhūte mama tasmin samaye ātmasamjñābhaviṣyad vyāpādasamjñāpi me tasmin samaye 'bhavisyat | sacet sattvasamjñābhaviṣyad jīvasamjñā vā pudgalasamjñā vā vyāpādasamjñāpi me tasmin samaye 'bhavisyat. After the omission of the portion in bold by homoeoteleuton, vā may have been added to smooth over the resulting awkwardness. The upshot of all this is that this passage in S may also be defective.

<sup>444</sup> P: *yadāham*; G: *yo 'ham*.

<sup>445</sup> M, Cz, G: *kṣāmtivādī rśir*; P: *kṣāntivādī rśir*.

<sup>446</sup> M, Cz: *abhūvam* / *tatrāpi*; G: *abhūvams* *tatrāpi*; P: *babhū*(va *tatra*) for *abhū* *tadāpi*. Here we read the *abhū* as the root aorist form *abhūt*, which often appears without the final *t*, and is used for various persons and numbers. Cf. BHSG 32.107. However, the reading *abhū*<*t*> *tadāpi* is also possible.

<sup>447</sup> G: *nātmasamjñābhūn* (i.e. *abhūt*).

<sup>448</sup> M, Cz add: *babhūva*.

<sup>449</sup> P: *tasmā*.

<sup>450</sup> P omits: *mahāsatvena*.

<sup>451</sup> S reads: *vinarjayitvānuttarāsyām*. G: *varjayitvā*° (right at end of 5v7, after which folio 6 of G is missing).

<sup>452</sup> M, Cz: °*spraṣṭavyadharma*pratīṣṭhitam for °*spraṣṭavyapratīṣṭhitam*.

<sup>453</sup> S reads: *cattam*.

<sup>454</sup> M, Cz: *tat kasya hetoh* for *tat kasmād dhetoh*. P omits. Note that the lacunae in P make reconstruction of this section very difficult, although it is obviously much condensed.

<sup>455</sup> P: *bhāṣati*.

<sup>456</sup> M, Cz: *apratiṣṭhitena bodhisattvena dānam dātavyam* / *na rūpaśabdagamdhara*sparsa(Cz: *spraṣṭavya*)dharmapratiṣṭhitena dānam dātavyam; P: *na rūpāpratiṣṭhitena bodhisattve(na dānam)* dātavyam for *rūpāpratiṣṭhitena dānam dātavyam*.

<sup>457</sup> P omits: *khalu punah*.

<sup>458</sup> M, Cz: *evamrūpo* for *evaṁ*.

<sup>459</sup> M, Cz: *kartavyah* for *parityajyah*. P: *dānaparityāgam* *parityajya* for *dānaparityāgah* *parityajyah*.

<sup>460</sup> M, Cz adds: *tat kasya hetoh*.

<sup>461</sup> M, Cz: *yā caiṣā subhūte*; P: *yā caiva sā* for *yaiva ca*.

<sup>462</sup> M, Cz, P: *saivāsamjñā* for *sa evāsamjñā*.

<sup>463</sup> M, Cz: *evaṁ te*; P: *ete* for *eva te*.

<sup>464</sup> M, Cz add: *tat kasya hetoh* (but M notes its omission in Ch and T).

<sup>465</sup> M, Cz: *tathāvādy ananyathāvādī*; P: *tathatāvā* for *tathāvādī*.

<sup>466</sup> S reads: *nāvitathāvādī*. M, Cz: *na vitathavādī*; P: *avitathavādī* for *na vitathāvādī*.

<sup>467</sup> P omits: *tathāgato*.

**§14g;** folio 43r1–6 (Cz 42.12–20; P 185.8–14)

api tu khalu punah<sup>468</sup> subhūte yah<sup>469</sup> tathār<sup>2</sup>gatena dharmo 'bhisaṁbuddho deśito vā<sup>470</sup> na tatra satyam na mṛṣā <|> tad yathāpi nāma<sup>471</sup> subhūte r<sup>3</sup> puruṣo<sup>472</sup> 'ndhakāra{h} praviṣṭah<sup>473</sup> <|> evam vastupatito bo(dh)isatvo draṣṭavyo<sup>474</sup> yo vastupatitam<sup>475</sup> dār<sup>4</sup>naṁ parityajati | tad yathāpi nāma<sup>476</sup> subhūte cakṣuṣmān { } puruṣo<sup>477</sup> (v)i(bh)ā(t)āyā<m> rātryā<m><sup>478</sup> sūrṣrye 'bhyudgate nānāvidhāni<sup>479</sup> rūpāṇī paśyet | evam<sup>480</sup> bodhisatvo draṣṭavyo yo vastvapatitam<sup>481</sup> dānaṁ parityajati |

**§14h;** folio 43r6–v3 (Cz 42.20–43.7; P 185.14–18)

api tu khalu punah<sup>482</sup> subhūte ye<sup>483</sup> kulaputrā<sup>484</sup> vā kuladuhitavīro vā imam dharmaparyāyam udgrahiṣyamti | dhāra(yi)ṣyamti | vāc(a)yisyamti <|> paryavāpsyamti<sup>485</sup> | jñāv<sup>2</sup>tās te subhūte<sup>486</sup> tathāgatena<sup>487</sup> dr̄ṣṭas te subhūte<sup>488</sup> tathāgatena<sup>489</sup> buddhās te tathāgatena <|> sarve v<sup>3</sup> te<sup>490</sup> satvāḥ aprameyam<sup>491</sup> punyaskandham prasaviṣyamti<sup>492</sup> |

**§15a;** folio 43v3–44r5 (Cz 43.8–19; P 185.18–186.4)

yaś ca khalu<sup>493</sup> punah subhūte strī v<sup>4</sup> vā puruṣo vā pūrvāhṇakālasamaye<sup>494</sup> gamgānadīvālukopamān<sup>495</sup> ātmabhāvān { } parityajevāt<sup>496</sup> | madhyāhṇakālasamaye<sup>497</sup> sāyāhṇakālasamaye<sup>498</sup> gamgānadīvālukopamān<sup>499</sup> āvātmabhāvā<n> parityajet<sup>500</sup> | anena paryāyeṇā<sup>501</sup> kalpakoṭinayutaśa<ta>sahasrāny<sup>502</sup> ātma-

<sup>468</sup> P omits: *khalu punah*.

<sup>469</sup> P: *yathā* for *yah*.

<sup>470</sup> M, Cz: *deśito nidhyātō* for *deśito vā*. P omits: *deśito vā*.

<sup>471</sup> P omits: *api nāma*.

<sup>472</sup> P omits: *puruṣo*.

<sup>473</sup> M, Cz add: *na kiñcid api paśyet*. M, Cz also read: *puruṣo 'mdhakārapraviṣṭo*; P: *(a)ndhakārapraviṣṭah*.

<sup>474</sup> S reads: *draṣṭavya*; P: *vaktavyaḥ* for *draṣṭavyo*.

<sup>475</sup> M, Cz, P: °*patito*.

<sup>476</sup> P omits: *api nāma*.

<sup>477</sup> P: *puruṣo ca(kṣuṣmān)ām* for *cakṣuṣmān puruṣo*.

<sup>478</sup> M, Cz: *prabhātāyām rātrau*; P (partly reconstructed): *(pra)bhātāyām* for *vibhātāyām rātryām*.

<sup>479</sup> P: *nānāvividhāni*.

<sup>480</sup> M, Cz add: *avastupatito*.

<sup>481</sup> M, Cz: *yo 'vastupatito*; P (partly reconstructed): *(yo avastu)patito* for *yo vastvapatitam*.

<sup>482</sup> P (reconstructed) omits: *khalu punah*.

<sup>483</sup> P adds: *te* after *ye*.

<sup>484</sup> S reads: *kulaputro*.

<sup>485</sup> M, Cz add: *parebhyāś ca vistareṇa samprakāśayiṣyamti*.

<sup>486</sup> P omits: *subhūte*.

<sup>487</sup> M, Cz add: *buddhajñānenā*.

<sup>488</sup> P omits: *subhūte*.

<sup>489</sup> M, Cz add: *buddhacakṣuṣā*.

<sup>490</sup> M, Cz add: *subhūte*.

<sup>491</sup> M, Cz add: *asamkhyeyam* (Cz: *asamkhyeyam*, corrected p. 116) after *aprameyam*.

<sup>492</sup> M, Cz add: *pratigrahiṣyamti*.

<sup>493</sup> P: *(yo) 'yaṁ ca ho* for *yaś ca khalu*.

<sup>494</sup> P: *pūrvāhnasamaye* for *pūrvāhṇakālasamaye*.

<sup>495</sup> M, Cz: °*vālukāsamān*; P (reconstructed): °*vālikāsamān* for °*vālukopamān* (but M notes that Ch and T read °*vālukopamān*).

<sup>496</sup> P: *(ā)tmabhāvām parityāgām pa(ritya)je* for *ātmabhāvān parityajet*. M, Cz add: *evam* after *parityajet*.

<sup>497</sup> P: *madhyāhnasamaye* for *madhyāhṇakālasamaye*; M, Cz add: *gamgānadīvālukāsamān ātmabhāvān parityajet*.

<sup>498</sup> P: *sāyāhnasamaye* for *sāyāhṇakālasamaye*.

<sup>499</sup> M, Cz: °*vālukāsamān*; P: °*vālikāsamān* for °*vālukopamān*.

bhā<sup>44</sup>**r1**vān<sup>503</sup> {} parityajet |<sup>504</sup> {d}yaś cemam̄<sup>505</sup> dharmaparyāyam̄ śrutvā | r2 na pratikṣiped ayam eva tatonidānam̄<sup>506</sup> bahutaram̄ puṇyaskandham̄ prar3sunuyāt<sup>507</sup> | aprameyam̄ asam̄khyeyam̄<sup>508</sup> | kah punar vādah<sup>509</sup> yo lir4khitvodgrhṇ(i)yāt<sup>510</sup> | dhārayet<sup>511</sup> | vācayet<sup>512</sup> | paryavāpnur5yāt<sup>513</sup> | parebhyāś<sup>514</sup> ca vistareṇa samprakāśayet<sup>515</sup> |

**§15b;** folio 44r5–45r4 (Cz 43.19–44.13; G 7a1–2; P 186.5–17)

api tu<sup>516</sup> subhūte acimtyo 'tur6lyo 'ya<m> dharmaparyāyah <|> ayam ca<sup>517</sup> dharmaparyāyah tathāgatena bhāṣitah v1 agrayānasamprasthitānām satvānā(m a)r(th)āya | śreṣṭhayānasamprasthitānām satvāv2nām arthāya | {ya} ye i<mam> dharmaparyāyam udgrahīṣyamti<sup>518</sup> | dhārayīṣyamti<sup>519</sup> vāv3cayiṣya<m>ti<sup>520</sup> <|> paryavāpsyamti<sup>521</sup> | jñātās te subhūte<sup>522</sup> tathāgate{ta} v4na<sup>523</sup> drṣṭās te subhūte<sup>524</sup> tathāgatena<sup>525</sup> <|> sarve te<sup>526</sup> satvāḥ v5 aprameyeṇa puṇyaskandhena<sup>527</sup> samanvāgatā bhaviṣyamti | acimtyenātulyenāv6māpyenāparimāṇena<sup>528</sup> puṇyaskandhena samanvāga<sup>45r1tā</sup> bhaviṣyamti<sup>529</sup> tat kasya heto<ḥ> | na hi ś(a)ky(am) subhūte ayam<sup>530</sup> dharmo<sup>531</sup> hīnādhimu(kt)i(k)aih<sup>532</sup> r2 śrotum |

<sup>503</sup> P: *ātmabhāvam parityāgām parityajet* for *ātmabhāvān parityajet*.

<sup>504</sup> M, Cz add: *bahūni*. There is insufficient space for *bahūni* in P.

<sup>505</sup> M, Cz: *koṭiniyuta*° for *koṭīnayuta*°. P: *ko(t)iśatasāhasram* for *koṭīnayutaśatasahasrāṇy*.

<sup>506</sup> S reads: *%bhāvan*.

<sup>507</sup> P: *ātmabhāvaparityāgam parityajet*.

<sup>508</sup> Frag b begins at this point.

<sup>509</sup> P (reconstructed) omits: *tatonidānam* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>510</sup> P: *prasaveta* for *prasunuyāt* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>511</sup> P omits: *aprameyam asam̄khyeyam* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>512</sup> P inserts: *subhūte* (but reading before it is unclear; missing in Frag b).

<sup>513</sup> Frag f begins at this point, with -yā.

<sup>514</sup> P, Frag f: *dhāraye* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>515</sup> P, Frag f: *vācaye* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>516</sup> P: *paryavāpnuyā*. Pargiter reconstructs: *paryavāpn(yāt)*, but *paryavāpnuyā* is the likely reading of P.

<sup>517</sup> P (reconstructed): *parasya* for *parebhyāś* (but see Pargiter p. 186, n. 3); Frag b: *(par)eṣām*; Frag f: *pareṣāñ*.

<sup>518</sup> P: *(samprakā)śaye*; Frag f: *samprakāśaye* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>519</sup> M, Cz add: *khalu punaḥ* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>520</sup> M, Cz add: *subhūte* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>521</sup> P, Frag f: *udgrahīṣyanti* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>522</sup> P, Frag f add: *deśayīṣyanti*.

<sup>523</sup> Frag f: *vācayīṣyati*.

<sup>524</sup> S reads: *paryāvāpsyamti*. Frag b: *paryāpa//*; Frag f: *paryavāpsyati*; M, Cz add: *parebhyāś ca vistareṇa samprakāśa-yīṣyamti*.

<sup>525</sup> P, Frag f omit: *subhūte* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>526</sup> M, Cz add: *buddhajñānena* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>527</sup> P, Frag f omit: *subhūte* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>528</sup> M, Cz add: *buddhacakṣuṣā buddhās te tathāgatena* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>529</sup> M, Cz add: *subhūte* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>530</sup> P: *satvā prame(yena) puṇyaskandhena* (Pargiter reconstructs *prame(ya)puṇya*°, but there is too much space); Frag f: *satvā prameyena puṇya[sic!]skandhena* (missing in Frag b). In both cases read *satvāprameyena* (double sandhi) or *satvā 'prameyena'*?

<sup>531</sup> P (partly reconstructed): / *aprameyeṇa* / *(amāpyena)*; Frag f: *aprameyenāpramāṇena* for *°amāpyenāparimāṇena*. G resumes at fol. 7r1 with *rimāṇena* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>532</sup> G omits: *puṇyaskandhena samanvāgatā bhaviṣyamti*. After this sentence M, Cz, G, P, Frag f add: *sarve te subhūte* (G, P, Frag f omit: *subhūte*) *sattvāḥ* (G, Frag f: *satvā*; P: *satvāḥ*) *saṁāṇṣena* (G: *mamāṇṣena*; Frag f: *mama a(m)sena*; P: +*yena*) *bodhim* (Frag f: *bodhi*) *dhārayīṣyamti*, to which M further adds: *vācayīṣyamti paryāvapsyamti* (missing in Frag b). Cf. Tib., which adds: *sems can de dag thams cad ḥa'i byaṇ chub phrag pa la thogs par 'gyur ro*.

<sup>533</sup> Frag f: *mayam* (scribal error?).

nātmadr̄ṣṭikaiḥ na satvadr̄ṣṭikaiḥ na jīvadr̄ṣṭikaiḥ na pudgaladr̄ṣṭikaiḥ<sup>533</sup> śarṄkyam śrotum udgrahītum<sup>534</sup> vā dhārayitum vā vācayitum vā<sup>535</sup> paryavāptu(m)<sup>536</sup> vā nedam sthānam vir4dyate <|>

**§15c;** folio 45r4–v2 (Cz 44.13–18; G 7a2–3; P 186.17–20)

api tu<sup>537</sup> subhūte yatra pṛthivīpradeśe idam sūtram<sup>538</sup> prakāśayiṣyati<sup>539</sup> | pūjar̄niyah sa pṛthivīpradeśo bhaviṣya(ti | sa)devamānuṣāsurasya<sup>540</sup> lokasya vandavīniyah pradakṣinikaraṇiyas<sup>541</sup> ca sa pṛthivīpradeśo bhaviṣyati<sup>542</sup> | cai(t)y(a)<sup>543</sup> sa pṛthivīvīpradeśo bhaviṣyati |

**§16a;** folio 45v2–46r1 (Cz 44.18–45.6; G 7a3–5; P 186.20–187.3)

<sup>544</sup>ye te subhūte kulaputrā<sup>545</sup> vā kuladuhitaro vā imān evamṛūv3pām<sup>546</sup> sūtrāmtān udgrahīṣyamti dhārayiṣyamti<sup>547</sup> paryavāpsyamti<sup>548</sup> | te paribhūtā bhaviṣyam<ti><sup>v4</sup> suparibhūtās ca bhaviṣyamti | <sup>549</sup>yāni<sup>550</sup> tesām<sup>551</sup> satvānām paurvajanmikāni<sup>552</sup> karmāni kṛtāny<sup>553</sup> av5pāyasamvartanīyāni<sup>554</sup> drṣṭa eva dharme<sup>555</sup> paribhūtatayā<sup>556</sup> pūrvajanmik(āny<sup>557</sup> aśubhān)i **46r1** karmāni<sup>558</sup> kṣapayiṣya<m>ti |

<sup>531</sup> M, Cz, G, Frag f: *dharma*paryāyo. P reads with S (missing in Frag b).

<sup>532</sup> M, Cz, G add: *sattvaih* (missing in Frag b). Frag f reads with S.

<sup>533</sup> G: *satvajīvapudgaladr̄ṣṭikaiḥ* for *satvadr̄ṣṭikaiḥ na jīvadr̄ṣṭikaiḥ na pudgaladr̄ṣṭikaiḥ* (missing in Frag b). Frag f reads °dr̄ṣṭikai in all cases.

<sup>534</sup> M, Cz: nābodhisattvapratijñaiḥ sattvaiḥ śakyam ayam dharmaparyāyah śrotum vodgrahītum for śakyam śrotum udgrahītum (missing in Frag b). Frag f: *udgrahetum*.

<sup>535</sup> G: yāvat for dhārayitum vā vācayitum vā. Frag b: /// rayitum vā / deśayitum //. Frag f also has deśayitum vā after dhārayitum vā and before vācayitum.

<sup>536</sup> Frag f appears to have read: *paryāpunitum* for *paryavāptum*.

<sup>537</sup> M, Cz, G add: *khalu punah* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>538</sup> P: *ayaṁ sūtrānto*; Frag f *ayaṁ sūtrānta* for *idam sūtram* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>539</sup> M, Cz: *prakāśayiṣyate*; P, Frag f: *prakāśiṣyate* for *prakāśayiṣyati*. G reads with S. Frag b: /// .yate (Matsuda reads *yane*).

<sup>540</sup> P: *sadevamanuṣyāsurasya* (missing in Frag b). Both P, G and Frag f punctuate before *sadeva*°. Frag f breaks off here, with *sadevamanuṣyāsū*.

<sup>541</sup> S reads: *pradakṣinikadhaṇīyaś*. M, Cz: *pradakṣinīyaś* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>542</sup> G omits: *ca sa pṛthivīpradeśo bhaviṣyati*.

<sup>543</sup> M, Cz: *caityabhūtah*; G: *caityabhūta*. P reads *caitya* with S (note that there is not enough space in S for a visarga). Frag b also reads with S.

<sup>544</sup> M, Cz insert: *api tu*. Frag b reads with S.

<sup>545</sup> S reads: *kulaptru* (all others: *kulaputrā*) (missing in Frag b).

<sup>546</sup> S reads: *ivamṛūpām*. M, Cz, G: *evamṛūpān*; P: *evamṛūpa*° (missing in Frag b).

<sup>547</sup> M, Cz insert: *vācayiṣyamti* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>548</sup> M, Cz add: *yoniśā ca manasikariṣyamti parebhyāś ca vistareṇa samprakāśayiṣyamti*; G: *udgrahīṣyanti yāvai paryavāpsyanti*, P: *ugrahesyati dhārayiṣyati deśayiṣyati vācayiṣyati paryavāpsyati* for *udgrahīṣyamti dhārayiṣyamti paryavāpsyamti*. Frag b: /// *puniṣyanti* (Matsuda reads: *uniṣ[yaj]nti*), indicating the verb form *paryāpuniṣyanti* (cf. *paryāpunitum* found above in Frag f).

<sup>549</sup> G omits: *ca bhaviṣyamti*. M, Cz add: *tat kasya hetoh* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>550</sup> M, Cz, G insert: *ca* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>551</sup> M, Cz add: *subhūte* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>552</sup> S reads: *paurvā*°; G, P: *pūrvajanmikāni*; M, Cz, G insert: *aśubhāni*.

<sup>553</sup> G omits: *kṛtāny* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>554</sup> G, P add: *tāni* (missing in Frag b).

<sup>555</sup> Cz adds: *tayā* (contra M).

<sup>556</sup> M, Cz add: *tāni*.

<sup>557</sup> M, Cz: *paurvajanmikāny*; Frag b: *pūrvbaj(a)* ///.

<sup>558</sup> S reads: *karmāni*; G omits: *pūrvajanmikāny aśubhāni karmāni* (missing in Frag b).

buddhabodhim ca prāpsyam̄ti<sup>559</sup> |<sup>560</sup>

**§16b;** folio 46r1–v4 (Cz 45.6–46.6; G 7a5–7b3; P 187.3–187.13)

<sup>561</sup> abhijānāmy aham subhūte atite r2 'dhvani asamkhyeye kalpe asamkhyeyatare<sup>562</sup> dīpaṁkarasya tathāgatasyārhataḥ samyaksamṛ3buddhasya<sup>563</sup> pareṇa parataram<sup>564</sup> caturaśītibuddhakoṭīnayutaśata-sahasrāny<sup>565</sup> abhūr4van<sup>566</sup> ye<sup>567</sup> mayā ārādhitā ārādhayetvā na virādhitā<sup>568</sup> <|> yac ca<sup>569</sup> mayā subhūte<sup>570</sup> buddhā bhagar5vamtaḥ ārāgitā<sup>571</sup> ārāgayetvā<sup>572</sup> na virāgitā<sup>573</sup> yac ca<sup>574</sup> carime kāle paścimi(k)āyaṁ<sup>575</sup> pamcā(śa)r6tyāṁ vartamānāyām<sup>576</sup> imam s(ū)trāmtam<sup>577</sup> (u)d(gra)hīs(ya)m̄ti<sup>578</sup> dhāra(y)i(ṣya)m̄(t)i v(āca)yī(ṣya)m̄(t)i (pa)v1ryavāpsyam̄ti<sup>579</sup> | asya<sup>580</sup> subhūt(e) puṇyaska(n)dh(a)sy(ām)t(i)k(ā)d<sup>581</sup> (e)ṣa<sup>582</sup> pū(r)v(a)k(ah)<sup>583</sup> puṇyaskandhaḥ śatamatī)v2m<sup>584</sup> api kalā<m> nopaiti sāhasṛtamām<sup>585</sup> api | śatasāha<s>tamām<sup>586</sup> a(p)i | k(o)t(iśatasāha)v3sṛtamām api<sup>587</sup> | samkhyām api kalām api gaṇānām

<sup>559</sup> M, Cz, G: *anuprāpsyam̄ti* (missing in Frag b). Lacuna in P, which may be filled by *kṣapayiṣyanti* / *buddhabodhim cānuprāpsyanti* or perhaps even *kṣapayiṣyanty anuttarām samyaksamṛbodhim ca prāpsyanti*, as suggested by some of the Chinese translations (Kumārajīva, Bodhiruci, Paramārtha). Cf. Pargiter, p. 187, n. 1.

<sup>560</sup> Note that §16a is quoted in the *Śiksāsamuccaya* (ed. Bendall, p. 171): *yathā vajracchedikāyām uktam̄ / ye te subhūte kulaputrā vā kulađuhitaro vā imān evamṛūpān sūtrāntān udgrahiṣyanti yāvat paryavāpsyanti / te paribhūtā bhaviṣyanti suparibhūtāḥ / tat kasya hetoh / yāni teṣām satvānām paurvajanmikāni kṛtāny apāyasamvartanīyāni / tāni tayā paribhūtātāyā dṛṣṭa eva dharme kṣapayiṣyanti buddhabodhim ca prāpsyantītī /.*

<sup>561</sup> Cz inserts: *tat kasya hetoh* (contra M, which notes that Ch and T have this as well) (missing in Frag b).

<sup>562</sup> M, Cz, P, G: *asamkhyeyaiḥ kalpair* (P: *kalpaiḥ*) *asamkhyeyatarair* for *asamkhyeye kalpe asamkhyeyatare*. Frag b: .ā + + samkhyeyatarai(r).

<sup>563</sup> Lacuna in P. Pargiter's reconstruction omits: *arhataḥ*.

<sup>564</sup> M, Cz: *paratareṇa*; G, P (reconstructed) omit *parataram*.

<sup>565</sup> M, Cz, P: *caturaśītibuddhakoṭīnyuta°*; P (partly reconstructed): *(caturaśītibuddhakoṭīnyuta°*; G: *caturaśītibuddhakoṭīnyuta°*.

<sup>566</sup> P: *babhuva*.

<sup>567</sup> G: *yāni*.

<sup>568</sup> M, Cz: *ārāgitā ārāgya* (Cz: *ārāgyā*) *na virāgitāḥ* (but M notes that J has *ārādhitā ārādhyā na virāgitāḥ*); G: *ārāgitāni ārāgya ca na virāgitāni*; P: *ārādhitā* for *ārādhitā ārādhayetvā na virādhitā*.

<sup>569</sup> P: *yam̄ ca*.

<sup>570</sup> M, Cz, G add: *te*. Lacuna in P, between *subhū* and *virādhitā*. Frag b breaks off after *ā su*.

<sup>571</sup> G omits: *ārāgitā*.

<sup>572</sup> M, G: *ārāgya*; Cz (in error): *ārāgyā*.

<sup>573</sup> P: *virādhitā*.

<sup>574</sup> P: *yam̄ ca*.

<sup>575</sup> S *paścimekāyam̄*. Cf. *paścimaka*, BHSD, p. 338.

<sup>576</sup> M, Cz: *paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyām pamcāśatyām saddharmaipralopakāle vartamāna*; G: *carime kāle paścimāyām pamcāśatyām varttamānāyām*; P: *carimikāyām paścimikāyā vartamānāyām* for *carime kāle paścimikāyām pamcāśatyām vartamānāyām*.

<sup>577</sup> M, Cz: *imān evamṛūpān sūtrāntān*; G: *imān sūtrāntān* for *imanī sūtrāntam*. P reads with S.

<sup>578</sup> P: *udgrahesyanti*.

<sup>579</sup> M, Cz add: *parebhyāś ca vistarena samprakāśayiṣyam̄ti*; G: *udgrahiṣyanti yāvat paryavāpsyanti* for *udgrahiṣyam̄ti dhārayisyam̄ti vācayiṣyam̄ti paryavāpsyam̄ti*.

<sup>580</sup> M, Cz add: *khalu punah*.

<sup>581</sup> G omits: *am̄tikād*.

<sup>582</sup> What can be seen of the bottoms of the akṣaras supports this restoration, which is the reading of P. M, Cz, G: *asau* for *esa*.

<sup>583</sup> M, Cz: *paurvakāḥ*.

<sup>584</sup> P: *śatimām* for *śatamatīm*.

<sup>585</sup> M, Cz, G: *sahasratamīm* (Cz: *sahasratamīm*, corrected p. 117); P: *sahasrimām*.

<sup>586</sup> M, Cz, G: *śatasahasratamīm*; P: *śatasahasritamām*.

<sup>587</sup> Although it is tempting to restore *koṭīnayuta°* on the basis of the same form at 43v6 and 46r3, there is not enough

api<sup>588</sup> upamām api<sup>589</sup> (u)v4paniśām api<sup>590</sup> na kṣamate |

§16c; folio 46v4–6 (Cz 46.6–11; G 7b3–4; P 187.13–14)

(sace)<sup>591</sup> subhūte teśām̄ kulaputrāñām̄ kuladuhi(t)ī(ñām̄) v5 vā<sup>592</sup> puṇyaskandham̄ bhāṣet<sup>593</sup> | yāva(m)tah<sup>594</sup> te<sup>595</sup> kula(p)utrā<sup>596</sup> vā<sup>597</sup> kuladuhitaro<sup>598</sup> vā<sup>599</sup> tasmin samaye (pu)v6nyaskandha<m> pratigṛhṇam̄ti<sup>600</sup> | unm(ā)d(a)m te<sup>601</sup> satvāḥ prāpnuyuh<sup>602</sup> cittavikṣepam̄ vā gacche(yuh |)

---

space for *nayuta*; S thus appears to have read with P here. M, Cz: *kotitamīm api koṭiśatataṁm̄ api koṭiśatasahasratamīm̄ api koṭiniyutaśatasahasratamīm̄ api*; P: *koṭiśatasahasritamām̄ api* for *koṭinayutaśatasāhasṛtamām̄ api*. G omits: *kotinayutaśatasāhasṛtamām̄ api*.

<sup>588</sup> S reads: *apa*.

<sup>589</sup> P omits: *upamām̄ api*.

<sup>590</sup> S reads: *upaniśamate*. M, Cz: *upaniśadam̄ api yāvad aupamyam̄ api*; P: *upaniśadam̄ api* for *upaniśām̄ api*. G reads with S.

<sup>591</sup> P: *sace*; M, Cz: *sacet punah*.

<sup>592</sup> S reads: *tā*. M, Cz: *vāham̄*. G: *ca* for *vā*. P reads with S.

<sup>593</sup> M, Cz, G: *bhāṣeyam̄*. P reads with S.

<sup>594</sup> M, Cz, P: *yāvat*; G: *yāvantas* with S, which clearly reads *yavataḥ*, directly above which a fragment of the top layer of bark has lifted off, which may have carried the *anusvāra* over the *va*.

<sup>595</sup> G adds: *satvā* after *te*.

<sup>596</sup> P breaks off at *kulapu*. The next folio (fol. 12) is missing.

<sup>597</sup> G omits: *vā*.

<sup>598</sup> S reads: *kuladuhitā*. Corrected to *kuladuhitaro* with M, Cz.

<sup>599</sup> G: *kuladuhitaroś ca* for *kuladuhitaro vā*.

<sup>600</sup> M, Cz: *prasaviṣyam̄ti pratigṛhṇyam̄ti*; G: *parigrahīṣyanti* for *pratigṛhṇam̄ti*.

<sup>601</sup> M, Cz, G omit: *te*.

<sup>602</sup> M, Cz, G: *anuprāpnuyuś* for *prāpnuyuh*.