VAJRAYACHDIKĀ IN THE ORIGINAL SANSKRIT

Stein MS., No. D. III. 18 b. (Plate XXI, No. 1, Fol. 14, Rev.)

EDITED BY F. E. PARGLER.

This is a fresh manuscript of the Vajrayachdi. The text of that work was published by Max Müller, from manuscripts discovered in Japan, in the Aneudota Oxoniensia (Aryan Series), vol. i, part i, in 1881. The manuscript, now published, was discovered by Sir Aurel Stein in his first expedition to Eastern Turkestan in the years 1900-1. As related by him in his Ancient Khotan, vol. i, p. 258, it was dug out on the 23rd of December, 1900, from the ruins of a small ‘dwelling-place’ (ibid. p. 256) belonging to the ancient settlement of Dandān Uiliq; see also id., p. 295, and the same author’s Sand-buried Ruins of Khotan, p. 300. It was identified by Dr. Hoernle as containing the text of the Vajrayachdi; and a notice of the identification was published by him in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1903, p. 364.

This manuscript is written on nineteen folios, long and narrow, of coarse country paper, and each folio is about 39 cm. (15 3/4 inches) in length and 75 mm. (2 1/4 inches) in width. It is in fairly good preservation, except that parts have perished or decayed. The folios are numbered on the left margin of the obverse side, and are all present except nos. 1, 3-5, and 12, which are wanting. A few of the folios are nearly whole (nos. 11, 17, and 18), some have lost one or both ends (nos. 7, 8, and 16), but most have perished more or less within the page, and present gaps severing the paper in two, partially or completely (nos. 2, 6, 9, 10, 13-15, and 19).

In the transcript these gaps are enclosed within the mark [ ]. Where the paper has not perished, the writing has suffered injury in many places, so as to show every stage of decay from merely slight defacement to total obliteration. The folios which have suffered least are nos. 17 and 18, which are reproduced in Plate CVIII in vol. ii of Sir Aurel Stein’s Ancient Khotan, while for the present volume fol. 14 b (shown in Plate XXI) has been selected, in order to give an idea of the more common condition of the leaves of the manuscript.

Each page contains six lines of writing. The margin on the left side is generally about 10 mm. (3/4 inch) broad, and on the right side about 7 mm. (1/4 inch).

The writing thus occupies a length of about 37 cm. (14 3/4 inches). In every third and fourth line on each page, at about 77 mm. (3 inches) from the left margin of the writing, a blank space has been left about 2 cm. (7/8 inch) long, so as to make altogether an open place of that length and of about the same height, for the hole through which the string would pass which would hold the folios together. This open space is of very great help in determining the position of the writing that remains in folios in which both ends have perished. The letters have been written with a broad reed pen and are large and well made. The largest such as thā and ṭā may be 13 mm. (3/4 inch) broad, and the smallest such as ṛ and ṛ about 6 mm. (1/4 inch) broad. The size of ordinary letters is about 8 mm. (1/3 inch), so that on an average three letters go to every 25 mm. (1 inch) of space.

It is thus possible to calculate the number of letters that have been obliterated in a decayed passage by carefully measuring its length, and to restore the text in most places with the aid of the printed text with some degree of confidence. In all such cases the restored text is printed in italics. These cases are of two kinds, those in which the writing only has suffered damage, and those in which the paper and writing have both perished. Passages of the first kind are dealt with according to the degree of obliteration, thus: first, where the letters are but slightly defaced and can be read, italics are used; secondly, where the traces remaining of the letters enable one to make out what they were with the aid of the printed text, the italics are enclosed within round brackets; and thirdly, where the letters have disappeared completely, if their number tallies with that in the printed text, the italics are enclosed within square brackets; but, if the two do not tally, the number of lost letters is indicated by an equal number of crosses. Passages of the second kind, where both paper and writing have perished, are enclosed within the mark [ ], and, if the gap can be definitely filled up from the printed text, the restored text is printed in small italics; but if the gap and the printed text do not tally, the number of lost letters is indicated by an equal number of small crosses. The printed text has been an invaluable aid throughout, and without it very little could have been done towards reading the many passages where the MS. has suffered injury.

The MS. has been well written and contains very few errors that are merely clerical, but its language is Sanskrit of poor literary quality and abounds with irregularities and peculiarities of all kinds in both grammar and sandhi and even in the forms of words, that indicate a strong Prākrit or vernacular element and influence. These will be obvious on perusal, and it is unnecessary for me to discuss them here. A very few of the most striking instances may be just mentioned: pratiṣṭhitāvā for pratiṣṭhāvā (fol. 2 b' ; cf. Pāli pāṭiṭhāhātā in Childers’ Pāli Dict. p. 70 a), ugraṃkṣaṇātā for ugraṃkṣaṇātī (fol. 11 a, l. iv), niyākha for evaḥ (fol. 13 b’ a”) and pratyupāśaḥkā for pratyupapāśaḥ (fol. 19 a’). Avagraha
occurs often but is never indicated, and is definitely suggested only where final ā appears as o before an initial tenuis or by the appearance of the following word: it is indicated here by an inverted apostrophe ¹. Virama is expressed in the MS. by a circumflex placed over the letter, which is written small and placed a little below the line: it is indicated here by the sign, placed below the letter. The only mark of punctuation in the MS. is a large dot, and it is so rendered here; but a double dot, the usual sign of visarga, is used once as a mark of punctuation, after bhāgye in fol. 6 v; and perhaps in stīk in fol. 15 b iv.

The date of this MS. may be estimated approximately by means of the copper-plate which was found inside the Nirvāṇa stūpa at Kāśī and which I have deciphered at Dr. Hoernle’s request.¹ That plate may be assigned to the third quarter of the fifth century a.d. because of the coins found with it. The writing in this MS. is very much like that on the plate, though the characters here are more squat and wider. The letters here are written with rather more flourish and present a greater variety of form, thus the vowel-marks for ṭ, i and ā are made in three, and those for e and ai in two ways; also the vowel ə in bodhi has two shapes. Two of the three forms for ā may be seen in gāvatā, in fol. 14 b iv (reproduced on Plate XXI, No. 1), and the third in mahāsākṣara, in fol. 18 a (Anc. Khot., Pl. CVIII); the three forms of i, distinguished as i, ə and ì respectively, in citta-dhārā, citta-dhārā, fol. 14 b v, and vātikā, fol. 14 b; and those of ā distinguished as ā, ā, and â respectively, in Subhūte fol. 14 b, Subhūte fol. 14 b, paripārāṇā in fol. 17 b iv (Anc. Khot., Pl. CVIII). The two forms of e may be seen in nayege fol. 14 b, and just below it, in upalabhya, in fol. 14 b, those of ai differing similarly from each other; while those of o will be seen in the word bodhikī in fol. 17 b v and bodhikī in fol. 177 b v (Anc. Khot., Pl. CVIII), being distinguished as o and e respectively. Initial e also has two quite different shapes, one of which occurs only once clearly, in evam in fol. 17 a vi, while the other is of frequent occurrence, as in fol. 17 a vi, 18 a vi b. Also the letters a, ā, ḍh, ḍh, y, and l display each at least two slight varieties in their forms; e.g. compare bh in bhāvyaghat, in fol. 17 a vi and in fol. 17 a vi; and y, in gṛha and “grena” in fol. 18 a. These features suggest that this MS. is somewhat later than the copper-plate. Yet it cannot be much later, because both the shapes of y (which is a test letter as regards the script) are of the tripartite character. It seems therefore that this MS. may be assigned to about the end of the fifth or the beginning of the sixth century a.d.

In its matter the MS. agrees of course in the main with the printed text, but is less full. Sometimes there is close agreement, but at other times it varies considerably, omitting sentences, or abbreviating them by the reduction of several cumulative expressions to one or two only, as will be seen from the first sentence. In only one or two places does it seem to contain additional matter. It would have been a waste of labour and space to point out all the differences or even many of them, and only passages where there are large variations have been noticed in the footnotes.

For convenient use each page is printed as one paragraph, numbered with the number of the folio and the addition of a for the obverse and b for the reverse; and the beginning of each line in the page has been marked by a small roman numeral. No translation is necessary here because there exists a translation of the Vajracchedikā prepared by Max Müller, in the Sacred Books of the East, vol. xiii, Part II, pp. 109 ff.¹

TEXT

(24) itad avocat, Āścaryaṁ Bhagavān yā[va]d [e]va (Tathā)gate-
(na) bodhisatva anupari[dhātaḥ] paramahānu[grahaṇa] ⁴ Ṭavā eva
Tathāgatena bodhisattvā dīd[isatvā] parinditā paramayā parindaḥ
(nayā) Ṭa[lt] kathāṁ Bhagavāṁ bodhisattva-yāna-samprasthitena sthātavyaṁ kathāṁ
[righṛtās] Tathāgatena bodhisattvā paramahānu[grahaṇa] parinditā
Ṭathāgatena bodhisattva-pra[grahektaṁ] sāṁśāraneṇa sthātavyam Ṭa[lt]
hi Subhūte ārup Sādhu ca sasūḥ ca manasi kuru Bhāṣīyaṁ Ṭathā
(bodhisattva-yāna)-samprasthitena sāṁśāraneṇa sthātavyam yathā (a)
c cittam pra[grahektaṁ] sāṁśāraneṇa sthātavyam yathā (a) [cittam pra[grahektaṁ]
(s)ā[nyā] Subhūte ārup Sādhu ca sasūḥ ca manasi kuru Bhāṣīyaṁ Ṭathā
(bodhisattva-yāna)-samprasthitena sāṁśāraneṇa sthātavyam yathā (a)
c cittam pra[grahektaṁ]

¹ There is also, in the present volume, pp. 276 ff., a translation from the Khotanese, prepared by Professor Sten Konow.
² Begins at p. 20, l. 1, of the printed text.
³ Not p.
⁴ Much more condensed than the printed text, cumulative expressions being reduced to a single one, and several words omitted. The form pariyaketaya is used here; compare fol. 18 a vi.
⁴ Bhagavā is marked with 4 dots above and 5 beneath. It does not occur in the printed text. These dots apparently indicate that it is an error here. Compare fol. 7 a vi, footnote 7, p. 182. [See p. 397 for a similar practice in Khotanese writing.—R.H.]
⁵ The circle indicates where, in the original folios, stood the blank space containing the string-hole, and interrupting lines iii and iv.
⁶ Probably omitting yathā prati[pul]abhedānai of the printed text. See note 4 above.
⁷ Read Bhagavāṁ.
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(a) tma-bhāva iti • O Na hi sa bhā [vo nālma-bhāvaḥ] • Yavanto hi śr [Śr(bha)te Gāmghāyā śadā yāukhās tāvanto Gāmghā-nadyo bhaveyuh Tat kin manyase Subhūte • Api [nu tā bahyo bhaveyuh Āha Tā]cēva tāva (Bhaga) śadhān xxx • baheyā Gāmghā-nadyo (bha)śiye yuḥ pr(a) eva tatra yāukhāh Ā[roc]gyami te Subhūte [prak[iveda]yāmi te] xxx (x t e) x xxxxxxx x xc [kūkā]

(b) ikṣmau yāukhāh tā(nato loka-dhā)tu ra Ṛṣ[Śaṅk] stri vā [puruṣo] vo xxxxxxxxxx xxx xx 10 Āha • Gvavamāha bahu sah kula-puṭro vā kula-(duhitā vā) xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxx[Śu(bhā) iśte tāvata loka-dhātun sapta O-ratna-pariprātman (dā)naṃ dā]dyād yaś ca [xxx x kula-putro] vā kula-dhūhitā vā xxx cātuspādāṃ api gāthām udgṛṣṭa paraOṣya desayēt xxxxxxxxxx[ku]la-putrona kula-dhūhitā vā bahuntarām [puṇyā-skandham prasavata • Api tu Subhūte ya(sa)]maḥ prthivi-pradeśa dharmaparāya cātuspādāṃ p[i] gāthām bhāṣyate • tena sah [prthivi-pradeśaḥ]cītya-bhūto bhaviṣyati • [sa] xxx xxx vā x xxx xxx x xxx xxx x xxx x (pa) ya xx (ya) xxx (ya)imāh dharma-

1 After bhā a small letter, apparently ṭa, appears which has a line through it, as if it were a mistake and were struck out.
2 Three sentences of the printed text are wanting here.
3 Read probably yavanto hi, to correspond to tāvam which follows.
4 This sentence occurs a little earlier in the printed text.
5 These two letters are more than the printed text has. Read perhaps yatra.
6 This letter looks like Su, so far as one can see from the traces of it.
7 For all this breakage the printed text reads yāvyatātām Gāmghā-nadyaḥ, but the reading here seems to be different.
8 Begins at p. 27, l. 20, of the printed text. This letter may be su.
9 This letter seems quite clear, though it does not appear to make sense.
10 Some 22 or 23 letters have been obliterated here, but the printed text is much longer.
11 There are some 20 aksaras wanting; they may perhaps be tato puṇya- skandham pratata Bhagavaṃ Āha Tā cē ko puṇaḥ. Compare fol. 7 b⁴ and 10 a⁴.
12 Read perhaps ko puṇaḥ, or Subhūte.
13 Read perhaps saṁprakāśayet. ayaṃ eva.
14 There are two letters broken away here, and they must be composed of the instrumental case of duḥṣṭas. Its instrumental form here would seem to be duḥṣṭrāḥ, compare pṛṇaḥ in fol. 19 b⁴. This form fills the gap exactly.
15 Compare fol. 7 b⁴.
16 The aksara ma had been omitted, and has been inserted interlinearly above dā.
17 In the first part of this gap read perhaps duṣ-ātarsa laukasa.
pravartisyati 1 Tat kasya hetoh (Yā sā ātma)-[sañjñāḥ] (sañjñāḥ) sañjñāḥ
dīya sarvān-ājāyata[sañjñāḥ] satvā[sañjñāḥ]-
Tat kasya hetoh Sarvva-sañjñāḥ-pagatahi Bu[ddhā bhagavantah]
evam ukti Bhagavad anya Ośmantam Subhūtim etad evam. Evam
tat Subhūte evam etα Subhūte Parama-āsava[riyamva]-
āsatag te
bhāyaṃmāne 4 nātsaṃsāyanti na saṃkṣerānyanti na saṃ-
trastam apānyanti. [Tat] kesyā hetoh. Parama-vi
āpprayam-tvay Subhūte Tatāgatāna bhāṣita 5. Yā Tatāgatena
carita-āpamrītā bhāṣita 8 tam bhāṣante 9
(Api 1 tu) Subhūte ya Tatāgatasya kṣaṇi-pāramitā sañjñā-
dvāpama[mi]-[Tat,k]a]ya hetoh. Yadda (me Ko)[līn-ga kagā aṃga-
pratyaṅga-mānānī ca]cchā 2 nāsy i me tasmin samaye [atma]-
(sañjñāḥ vā satva-jiva-pudgala-saṃjñāḥ)-vā na me kac ca sañjñā na sañjñāḥ babhūva
tat kasya hetoh sañjñā[mi]-me Subhūte tasmin sa[Omaye] a(tma-
) sañjñāḥ)[at]havisyat vacā-pāda-sañjñā me tasmin samaye bhavisyat(ī)_te
satva-jīva-pudgala-saṃjñāḥ vā na me kac ca sañjñā na sañjñāḥ babhūva
tat kasya hetoh sañjñā[mi]-me Subhūte tasmin sa[Omaye] a(tma-
) sañjñāḥ)[at]havisyat vacā-pāda-sañjñā me tasmin samaye bhavisyat(ī)_te
satva-jīva-pudgala-saṃjñāḥ vā na me kac ca sañjñā na sañjñāḥ babhūva
Abhijñāṇyā yā Subhūte stite dhvani ca[na ca]jāti-
sattani] vaidya-mahā vairā[ājāyata[sañjñāḥ] satvā[sañjñāḥ]
na jiva-sañjñāḥ na pudgala-saṃjñāḥ Tasmā
tarhi Subhūte bodhīṣṭa[ṃ] vena sarvva-sañjñāḥ vivāra[ī]
svāmrtata[nu-]
samaye[sa]-[bodhāv] cātāṃm upāyu-gyām Na rūpa-pratiṣṭhitam
cātāṃm upadhāyāvayam (Na sa) bha[ga-
].

1 A sentence of the printed text is omitted after this.
2 These aksara do not seem quite to fill up the space, and perhaps ca should be read after the first yā.
3 Read perhaps satva Ye iha, see fol. 8 a supra.
4 Not g.
5 A sentence of the printed text is omitted here.
6 The construction here differs from that of the printed text.
7 The printed text aparimaṃ api Budhā Bhagavanto bhāṣante is too long for this gap.
8 Begins at p. 31, l. 9, of the printed text.
9 The b is a scribal blunder: see similarly fol. 13 b, footnote 9, p. 188.
10 The printed text exactly fits the gap.
11 The printed text suce satva[sañjñāḥ]-[vairājya]- is too long for this space. Perhaps, following the analogy of line ii above, we might read suce satva-vairājya- which would suit the space.
12 These syllables would ordinarily be a little too much for this space, but might suit it, if written closely as many letters in this line are written. The r appears to be euphonic between i and the semi-vowel y; but cf. trīsāra in fol. 7 b inti. 13 More condensed than the printed text.
14 See the next line where this expression occurs again. These two passages supplement each other clearly.
15 Many more condensed than the printed text.
16 The printed text parṣyāya bhāṣa is longer than suite this gap, and here is the expression in the singular and not the plural.


The reading here differs from the printed text.

2 Begins at p. 33, l. 12, of the printed text.

3 The printed text has parehyasa here and elsewhere, but this MS. reads parasya in some cases, compare fol. 69r; and parehyasa later in other cases, compare fol. 16d. Either word might be read here.

4 A sentence of the printed text is omitted after this.

5 The printed text has aprameya.

6 So probably.

7 The printed text has samadhana, but the word here is different.

8 Read perhaps sakya Subhute ayaam.

9 In this and the following gap the printed text has nearly twice as much matter.

10 Begins at p. 34, l. 7, of the printed text.

11 The d is omitted, just as 1 in drasthagati for 1sra, fol. 8v. [See footnote 17, p. 99—R. H.]

12 The verb is in the singular.

13 The verb is in the singular. A line of the printed text is omitted after this

The printed text has kephagiyan iti Buddha-bodhihih ca sauraprapyayati; but this is two or three aksaras too short to fill the gap.

2 Begins at p. 34, l. 20, of the printed text.

3 The bottom portions only of these four aksaras are discernible, but they agree with the reading khyeyatatarai.

4 These words fill the gap exactly.

5 This MS. has ‘raadik’ in this and the following sentences. The printed text has ‘nig’.

6 Read probably te Buddha Bhagavan ta aradhita, except that these words seem to be one aksara too little.

7 A sentence of the printed text is omitted after this.

8 The reading is unumit in the printed text. There is room for a small letter after this character, such as m, if the d is superscript. Perhaps the full reading may be swapaddi, and swapaddi occurs in the next sentence of the printed text.

11 More abbreviated than the printed text.

12 The character does not appear to be pali.

13 Begins at p. 36, l. 21, of the printed text.
Tathāgataṁ ratham samasyaṁ buddhabhātha Tat kasya hetoh Taṁ thāgaṁ to iti Subhūte Bhāṭaṁ tathātose ṛdhi vacanam eva 1 · Yaḥ kaści Subhūte e-anāṁ vade Tathāgataṁ tena-dharmah bhūtā samyaṁ-sambodhī abhisamāṁ buddhāṁ Nāśi Subhūte sa kaści dharmo yas Tathāgatena-dharmena samyaṁ-sambodhī abhisamam ṛduḥ dhāraṁ Taṁ Subhūte Tathāgatena dharmo 'bhisaṁ-buddhāṁ na tatra satyaṁ na mṛṣa Tasmā Tathāgato bhavatā sarvādhaṁ dhammam āryaṁ-upānaṁ kāyo mahā-kāyaḥ x x Aṅgaṁ Subhūte āha · Yo so Bhagavān Tathāgatena bhāsaṁ taṁ [u]peśa-kāyo ma- (13b) ha-kāyaḥ āryaṁ ma- x x x x x x x (Bhagavām) Tathāgatena bhūṣitaṁ upata-kāyo mahā-kāyaṁ a-kāyaṁ sa sa Tathāaguṇena bhūṣitaṁ Taṁ dvaṁ yataṁ upatākāya maḥā-kāyaṁ · Evam ātate Subhūte Yo bodhi-satvaṁ eva vade Ahaṁ satvāṁ parinivāṁ payisyey Na na bodhisatvaṁ o tva ṛṣitaṁ vahya Tat kasya hetoh Asti hi Subhūte kaści dharmo yo bodhisatvaṁ nāma āha · No iti Bhavgaṁ ma- Tasmā Tathāgato bhāsaṁ satiṁ nihaśvaṁ sarvādhaṁ-dhammaṁ nirjīvaṁ nīḥspadgālam · Yaḥ Subhūte bodhisatvaṁ eva vade Anāṁ ṛṣitaṁ-vuiyāṁ nispadgālam evam kartavyaṁ Tat kasya hetoh Kṣetra-vuiyāṁ kṣetra-vuiyāṁ iti Subhūte Aṅgaṁ bhūṣitam sā Tathāgatena bhāsaṁ Taṁ ṛṣitaṁ kṣetra-vuiyāṁ iti · Yaḥ Subhūte bodhisatvaṁ [u]airāṭma-dhammaṁ naairāṭma-dhammaṁ sa [Tva-] (14a) tathāgatenāḥ [hatā sa] myak-samabhodhena bodhisatvaṁ iti vaktavyaṁ Tat kinc manyase śuṣṇaṁ Subhūte Samvidyayate Tathāgatasya

1 This line of the printed text are omitted after this.
2 A line and a quarter of the printed text are omitted after this.
3 The printed text reads here Buddha-dhamma iti Tat kasya hetoh, but this MS. obviously varies here.
4 This letter is not clear; it might be tvā or tu.
5 There are two more letters here than the printed text.
6 Begins at p. 37, l. 17, of the printed text.
7 The scribe seems to repeat himself here, and the words Subhūte āha Yo so would exactly fill all this space.
8 Two lines of the printed text are omitted after this.
9 The b is a scribal blunder; see fol. 9 a, footnote 9, p. 184.
10 Begins at p. 38, l. 10, of the printed text.
loka-dhātuṇa saṁpatra-ratna-paripārṇaṁ... dā... tato niḍānaṁ bhūtaṁ puṇya-saṁkhandhaṁ prasava(ta)ṁ. Āhaḥ - Bahu Bhagavam. Āhaḥ... evam eva Saṁyak-śāstra Na kula-putro Viśva (kula) duḥkhaiva tato niḍānaṁ puṇya-saṁkhandhaṁ prasavetavā... Sace ko punah Subhūte kho bhāvaṁ Viśva Na tā bhagavata 'bhā̄sī-śāstra Puṇya-śāstra (puṇya-saṁkhandha puṇya-saṁkhandha iti)... Tat kīn manyase Subhūte. Rūpa-kāya-parinispattiyā Tathāgato draśtaṁ śāsavahā Ṛg. No iti Bhagavam Na rūpa-kāya-parinispattiyā Tathāgato draśtaṁ śāsavahā Tat kasya keśōḥ Rūpa-kāya-parinispattiyā iti rūpa-kāya-parinispattiyā iti Aparinispattiyā iti Tathāgatena bhāṣātā Te ucyate Rūpa-kāya-parinispattiyā iti.

(15b) "Tāty kīn maṁ manyase Subhūte la(kṣaṇa)-saṁpadāśyaśārthā Tathāgato draśtaṁ śāsavahā Tāty kasya keśōḥ Yā sa la(kṣaṇa)-saṁpadā... Tathāgatena bhāṣātā la(kṣaṇa)-saṁpadāśyaśārthā Tathāgatena bhāṣātā la(kṣaṇa)-saṁpadāśyaśārthā Tathāgatena bhāṣātā la(kṣaṇa)-saṁpadāśyaśārthā Tathāgatena bhāṣātā la(kṣaṇa)-saṁpadāśyaśārthā Tathāgatena bhāṣātā la(kṣaṇa)-saṁpadāśyaśārthā Te ucyate la(kṣaṇa)-saṁpadā iti... Tat kīn manyase Subhūte Aṣṭi pi Na Tathāgatasyā... Ānīmant Bhavāṇa evaśārthā Tathāgatena kāścīṁ dharmaṁ dhēkāṁ Yo O mama Subhūte evaṁ vade... Tathāgatena kāścīṁ dharmaṁ dhēkāṁ abhyāṣākṣeta māṁ saḥ Subhūte asahodrāgāyaśārthā... O Tat kasya keśōḥ Dharma-đeśāṇā dharmāṁ... nowhere else in this MS, and the word itī negatives it. Itī indicates the close of the preceding discussion. Hence the former supposition seems right, and the gaps contain additional matter not in the printed text.

1. This letter looks like a, a, or dā, and judging from the printed text should be dā. The following gap can contain six average-sized or seven small letters. The whole passage should probably run thus, kṛtā arkadvakṣya saṁyak-saṁbuddhakhyā dānam dāyaṁ apī na sa. It is more abbreviated than the printed text.

2. This gap would contain the mark of punctuation (which always follows athā) and double letters. Read perhaps Eevam etat Subhūte, the phrase of ascent being doubled in the printed text. It occurs doubled thus in fol. 8v.

3. Two lines of the printed text are omitted after this.

4. Begins at p. 40, l. 15, of the printed text.

5. Saṁpadā is treated as the singular person, see line ii. There are traces of the y; compare the same sentence in fol. 17a, itā, tr.

6. A line of the printed text is omitted after this.

7. According to the printed text these words should be read bhāṣātāla(kṣaṇa). Or perhaps ānīmaṁ, as it should be with saṁpadā. Compare a-rohaṇāsāyā in fol. 19a.

8. A line and a half of the printed text are omitted after this.

9. The words dhēkāṁ iti are suggested by the printed text here, but seem rather too much for the space unless we read it yāyā. The prefix yā seems here to be superflously repeated.

10. There is room for six aksaras here, of which the last has the vowel ā apparently. Nām-oṣpalabhya of the printed text does not suit.

11. All this is much abbreviated, and it is difficult to offer more suggestions for filling up the gaps.

12. Read probably satāva vyāsātā Tat kasya keśōḥ, yet there still remain three more spaces for aksaras, which are uncertain.

13. Begins at p. 41, l. 8, of the printed text.


15. The printed text in doubling the phrase of ascent suggests that we should read here Eevam etat Subhūte, but this seems to be one letter too short for the space. Compare the doubled phrase in fol. 8v.

16. The printed text suggests the reading here should be varttavā niṣpadātacāte, but this seems to be one letter too much for the space.

17. For sarvakātyā

18. Begins at p. 41, l. 20, of the printed text.

19. More abbreviated than the printed text.
IN THE ORIGINAL SANSKRIT

Na Subhāte laksana-sahā[(pa)ḥ]dāyās Tathāgatena-ānu Ottāra samyak-
sanbodhim abhīsambuddhāḥ syāt khalu evam asyāḥ 1 Bodhisatva-yuṣmāna-
(samprasthi)tena saṃtvena kasyaci dharmasya vināśaḥ prajñaptaḥ

1 This seems to be intended for a negative verb a-syāt; compare a-pacchati in fol. 18 a.
2 More abbreviated than the printed text.
3 The printed text has Ayam eva laho nidānaṁ.
4 Begins at p. 44, l. 1, of the printed text.
5 These words which nearly agree with the printed text exactly fit this long gap.
6 These words fit this gap and agree with the printed text, except that tad negta always stands in this MS. for tenocyate of the printed text, it is omitted as it is often in this MS.

This printed text has na, but the letter here resembles ca or da and not na. It is omitted as it is often in this MS.

7 Begins at p. 44, l. 15, of the printed text.
IN THE ORIGINAL Sanskrit

(yed yo)thā na-kāṣāyé • Tat ucayate samprakāśayet.¹ Tārak[ā] tīrṇa.²
dēhaṇ dīpa māyāvavyā-buddhān upatīō[ā]nai vidyām abhrahiv ca evam
dēha[ta] nāy[aṃ] sanā(kṛtaṃ) Īdām avoca Bhagavān[ā] āttamanā
Śhāvīra-(Subhū) [tis te] ca bhīkṣu-bhīkṣuny-uṇdak-opā[va]-eitā • sa-deva

gandharva-ōmamā-gō-sūrasa ca [ō] kōko Bhagavato bhāsītām
abhayandur iti • Ṛ Ādhyātāmāna Bhagavati Arko Vairakcedikākā prajñā

darśanītā śamāntā[ya] yā saddīx yax² • saha bhartarī Nandībala


(nena) • saha (Ne)salena • saha Śaṅcaxtyo • saha x sarvab-sate(a[īh]

xxx) xxx

1 The printed text puts this after the verse quoted here.
2 These letters must apparently contain some woman’s name, because the word
‘husband’ follows.
3 This letter is not like the ē always used in this MS, but resembles that in evam
in fol. 14 b.

[Note to p. 178. The forms s and š occur only with bā (in the proportion of
103 : 12); and s in a slightly modified form, occurs also with r (see, e.g., rīṣena,
fol. 17 b, in Ancient Khotan, Plate CVIII); while the form ś occurs with p, s, and
y. All three forms are found also in the manuscript of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka,
edited by Professor Lüders, pp. 144 ff. In that manuscript, indeed, all, or most of
the other varieties of vowel signs have been noticed; see pp. 140–2. The forms s, š
(in the rā variety), and ś are the fourth, second, and first, respectively, of Professor
Lüders’ enumeration. Of his third form there is no example in the Vairakcedikā.
—R. H.]