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I. Bibliographical Survey and Description of the Manuscript

I. Sanskrit Texts of the Vajracchedikā Prajināpāramitā

The Vajracchedikā Prajināpāramitā (Vaj) is one of the most celebrated and historically significant works of the voluminous Prajināpāramitā ("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.


* The first announcement that the Schøyen Collection contained a manuscript of the Vajracchedikā Prajināpāramitā 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 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.

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).

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. 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 Jiu Onkō 慈雲歡光 (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 Jiu 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, 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. 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 Songzhushi 廣德寺. In this print, the Sanskrit text appears both in Laṅghsa script and in Tibetan transliteration, to which has been added a Tibetan translation made at the Chos ḷa rgyas glin temple in Beijing by

---

2 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 we (marking them with §).
3 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.
4 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 Kōkiji. Several are known to exist, but their relationship to each other has yet to be determined. Not 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 Kōkiji library will clarify it.
5 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 Ičaṅ skya II Rol pa'i rdo rje (1717–86), state preceptor during the reign of the Qing emperor Qianlong (this is M's T). 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 Laṅkāsa script and printed in red ink (this is M's Ch). 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 Dāndān Uliq in Eastern Turkestan in December 1900, and identified by A. F. Rudolf Hoernle in 1903 as a copy of the Vaj. 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 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. 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 Nāgārī 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.

---

6 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.

7 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 天清号 (see Yuyama 1967: 66, 105), whose premises were at the Songzhushi (see Heissig 1954: 5).

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


10 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.\footnote{It was reprinted in Chap. XXI of Oguibéine 1996 (pp. 252–265), accompanied by useful notes.} 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.\footnote{Conze also adopted M’s division of the text into sections, dividing some of them still further into subsections.} 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-samgraha 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,\footnote{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 Ms. recently edited by Dr. N. Dutt and published by Dr. G. Tucci, in his Minor Buddhist Texts, part I, Rome, 1957 [sic].”} 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.\footnote{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; Uii 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.\textsuperscript{15}

Frag a. Cat. No. 1195 in Lore Sander and Ernst Waldschmidt, eds., *Sanskrit handschriften 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 Mahāparinirvānasūtra: 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 Mahāparinirvānasūtra 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 Nehangō no mihitei no bonbun danpen ni tsuite,” *Indo tetsugaku bukkyōgaku*, Vol. 8 (1993), pp. 129–144 (see esp. p. 130, n. 8).\textsuperscript{16} According to Matsuda, the ms fragment in question is almost certainly from Khadalik. The script is Early Turkestan Brāhmi 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 praṇāpāramitā* (*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 e. Cat. No. 1939+4194a in Heinz Bechert, ed., *Sanskrit handschriften 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 Brāhmi 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.\textsuperscript{17} Two fragments from the middle portion of a single folio, bearing

\textsuperscript{15} 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).

\textsuperscript{16} Kazunobu Matsuda informs us that this identification had already been made independently by Gregory Schopen, and that he had transmitted this to Habata.

\textsuperscript{17} 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 transcription.


Frag k. No. IV in Ariyoshi Sanada, “Otani Tankentai Shōrai Bonbun Butten Shiryo,” *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 Turkestana Brāhma, 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 ms 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 *geṣer yig* copy of the Tibetan translation, even though the label on the outside of the bundle reads *Vajracchedaprajñāpāramitā*. Of the two ms 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 *Kārṇḍavyuḥa*. 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 ms 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 ms 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.

\(^{18}\) 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 Bhaiṣajyaguruvrāhīśceta (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 Bhaiṣajyaguruvrāhīśceta’ is finished,” and this is followed on 26r1–2 by: “Hail to Śākyamuni, the Realized, Worthy and Perfectly Awakened One!” (Bhaiṣajyaguruvrāhīśceta śrāvaka-tathāgatasya sāvyapratītyaṁ tathāgatasya [sa]rvapratidhāna- 
vī[sa]śavistaram abhāmān nā<ma> dharma<pa>ryāyām mahāyānasūtram samāptah || || 
namo Śākyamunayes tathāgatāyāhate 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 Dhāranisamgraha. 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. That is to say, these two sūtras 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

---

19 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.
21 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 dharmaparyaya, 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 (fols. 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.22

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.

---

22 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>fols. 26–46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§§1–16c</td>
<td>(27.3–46.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fols. 47ff.</td>
<td>LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>fols. 1–4</td>
<td>LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§§13b–14e</td>
<td>(38.6–41.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fol. 5</td>
<td>LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§§15b–32b</td>
<td>(44.6–63.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>fol. 1</td>
<td>LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§§2–4</td>
<td>(27.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fols. 3–5</td>
<td>LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§§10b–16c</td>
<td>(35.24–46.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fol. 6</td>
<td>LOST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§§17b–32b</td>
<td>(48.2–63.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 arūpino vā asamjñino (28r2–3), mayā anāgāmiphalan  (35r2), mayā ārādhitā (46r4).

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

srotāpan/njasya evam (34r1), vā imam (43v1), vā imān (45v2).
[3]  ā, ū, ū and r do not shift to the corresponding semivowels before dissimilar vowels. 

\[ \text{diśi ākāśasya (28v7), bhavati arham (35v4), aranāvihāriti aranāvihāriti (36r1), dhvani asam-khye (46r2).} \]


\[ \text{sarve anupadhiśe (28r4); sarve te apramey (30v6), tenocyate anāgāmiti (35r3–4).} \]

(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.

\[ \text{ye imeś (29v6, 30r2, 30v4), prthivi[pra]deśe ito (38r3), te āścaryena (38r6), ukte āyuṣmān (38v2), pr[thi]vīpradeśe idam (45r4).} \]

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

[1]  Visarga before t does not become s.

\[ \text{subhūṭiḥ tasyām (26v5), lakṣanālakṣanataḥ tathāgato (29v3–4), dha[r]maḥ tathāgatena[na] (36r3–4), yah tathāgatena (43r1–2), [da]ṃmaparyāyah tathāgatena (44r6).} \]

[2]  Before a voiced sound visarga does not become r.

\[ \text{ājānadbhiḥ dharmāḥ (31v5), subhūṭiḥ dharmā (40r1).} \]


(a)  Before any vowel other than a, ah does not become a followed by a hiatus.

\[ \text{sakṛd[ā]gaminah evam (34v1–2), bhagavaṇṭah ārāgītā (46r4–5). (However, in such situations ah sometimes becomes o followed by a hiatus: sakṛdāgāmino evam (34v3–4), arhamto evam (35r4–5)! But note also dharmodgrahītyavo instead of dharma udgrahītyavo (31v4).)} \]

(b)  Before a, ah does not become o with a disappearing.

\[ \text{bodhisatvah apratīṣhito (28v5), punyaskandhah askandha (33r2), bhāṣitaḥ arajaḥ (39r4).} \]

(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.

\[ \text{bhikṣavah yena (26v3), dharmah yah (34v5).} \]

(d)  Before a voiced sound, ah does not become ā.

\[ \text{mahāsattvāḥ anuparīgrhitāḥ (27r2–3), [sa]ṃvāḥ bhavisyānty (29v5), satvāḥ aprameyaṃ (43v3), satvāḥ aprameyena (44v4–5). (However, the scribe twice writes kulaputo vā where he should have written kulapurā vā, at 43r6 & 45v2.)} \]

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), catuspadika 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 tāt kasmād
dhetoḥ instead of what is in M and Cz the invariable tat kasya hetoḥ.\(^{23}\) 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)\(^{24}\) differ from S. The same footnotes will also indicate whether P and G read with S or against it.\(^{25}\)

\[1\] 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 (mahāsattva), 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 sambhulaiś ca bodhisattvair mahāsattvaiḥ, which has no counterpart at all in the nidāna of S (26r4).\(^{26}\) as well as two other places where Cz has bodhisattva mahāsattva, but S has nothing: 30v3 (cf. Cz 31.8);

\(^{23}\) On this use of the ablative see Speijer, 1886, §193, pp. 137–140, n. 1.

\(^{24}\) Hereafter in this section we refer only to Cz, but in all cases it may be assumed that Cz reads with M.

\(^{25}\) If P and G’s readings are not mentioned specifically in the notes, one can infer that they agree with S.

\(^{26}\) 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 mahāsattva is missing, and in a further three instances the entire phrase containing bodhisattva mahāsattva is missing. Thus the word mahāsattva is used only three times in S (at 27r2–3, 30r4, 42r3–4), and is comparatively rare.27

[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.


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. tathāgatambhyo 'radbhyyah 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 buddhacaksuṣā (“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 buddhacaksuṣa, 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).

27 It is also of note that, in the first and third of these passages, where P is also extant, P lacks the word mahāsattva, which in that text is attested only once, in §32a.
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 bhāsito ‘grayānasamprasthitānām sattvānām arthāya śreṣṭhayānasamprasthitānām arthāya). In the corresponding passage in S (40r2–3), the sentence stops at bhāṣītaḥ, 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.

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” (imām dharmaparyāyanudgrahīṣyantidhārayīṣyantivācayīṣyantiparyavāpsyantiparebhyaśca vistāreṇa samprakāśayīṣyantí). Here, the final operation (parebhyaśca vistāreṇa samprakāśayīṣyantí) 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.28 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 vistāreṇa deśayet samprakāśayed;
§11. S 38r1–2: udgrhya parebhyo deśayet > Cz 37.8: udgrhya parebhyo deśayet samprakāśayed;
§12. S 38r4: bhāṣya vā deśyeta vā > Cz 37.16: udgrhya bhāṣya vā samprakāśyeta vā;
S 38r6: dhārayīṣyantí > Cz 37.15–17: dhārayīṣyantivācayīṣyantiparyavāpsyantiparebhyaśca vistāreṇa samprakāśayīṣyantí;
§13e. S 39v6: udgrhya parebhyo deśayet > Cz 39.6: udgrhya parebhyo deśayet samprakāśayed;
§14b. S 40v3: udgrhyiṣyantiparyavāpsyantidhāraiyiṣyantí > Cz 40.6–8: udgrhyiṣyantidhārayīṣyantivācayīṣyantiparyavāpsyantiparebhyaśca vistāreṇa samprakāśayīṣyantí;
§14h. S 43v1: udgrhyaiṣyantidhāraiyiṣyantívācayiṣyantiparyavāpsyantiparebhyaśca vistāreṇa samprakāśayīṣyantí;
§15a. S 44r3–5: likhitvoddhṛn(y)āyāḥ dhārayet vācayet paryavāpnuyahāḥ > Cz 43.17–19: likhitvoddhrniyād dhārayet vācayet parya-vāpnuyāḥ parebhyaśca vistāreṇa samprakāśayet;
§15b. S 44v2–3: udgrhyiṣyantidhārayīṣyantivācayīṣyantiparyavāpsyantiparebhyaśca

28 For the remaining two occurrences see §§24, 32a.
vistareṇa samprakāśayiṣyanti;

45r3: śrotum udgrahitum vā dhārayitum vā vācayitum vā paryavāptu(m) vā > Cz 44.12–13: śrotum vodgrahitum vā dhārayitum vā vācayitum vā paryavāptum vā.

§16a. S 45v3: udgrahīsyanti dhārāisyantī paryāvāpsantī > Cz 44.19–45.1: udgrahīsyanti dhārāisyantī vācāisyantī paryāvāpsantī yoniśaś ca manasikāisyantī parebhyaś ca vistareṇa samprakāśayiṣyantī;

§16b. S 46r6–v1: (u)dgraḥis(ya)ṃtī dhāra(y)i(ṣya)m(t)i v(a)ca(y)i(ṣya)m(t)i (pa)ryāvāpsantī > Cz 45.15–17: udgrahīsyantī dhārāisyantī vācāisyantī paryāvāpsantī parebhyaś ca vistareṇa samprakāśayiṣyantī.

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 (anāgata 'dhvani pāscime kāle pāscime samaye pāscimāyaṃ pāncāsaṭayāṃ sādharmanivipraloṣe 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: anāgata 'dhvani pāscimāyaṃ pāncāsaṭayā<ṃ> vartamanāyāṃ > Cz 30.16–18: anāgata 'dhvani pāscime kāle pāscime samaye pāscimāyaṃ pāncāsaṭayāṃ sādharmanivipraloṣe vartamāṇe;

§6(ii). S 30r2: anāgata 'dhvani > Cz 30.22–24: anāgata 'dhvani pāscime kāle pāscime samaye pāscimāyaṃ pāncāsaṭayāṃ sādharmanivipraloṣe vartamāṇe;

§6(iii). S 30r3–4: anāgata 'dhvani ... pāscimāyaṃ pāncāsaṭayāṃ sādharmanivipraloṣe > Cz 30.26–31.1: anāgata 'dhvani ... pāscime kāle pāscime samaye pāscimāyaṃ pāncāsaṭayāṃ sādharmanivipraloṣe vartamāṇe;

§14b. S 40v2 (entire eschatological phrase missing) > Cz 40.3–5: anāgata 'dhvani pāscime kāle pāscime samaye pāscimāyaṃ pāncāsaṭayāṃ sādharmanivipraloṣe vartamāṇe;

§16b S 40r5–6: carime kāle pāscimīṃ(k)āyaṃ pāncāṣaṭayāṃ vartamānāyāṃ > Cz 45.13–14: pāscime kāle pāscime samaye pāscimāyaṃ pāncāsaṭayāṃ sādharmanivipraloṣe vartamāṇa.

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 sādharmanivipraloṣa), 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) yes tathāgatāyārhare samyaksambuddhāya : || evam mayā śrutam ekasmin [sa]lma
2) ye bhagavā* śrāvastyāṁ viharati sma · jetsvane · anāthapiṇḍadasāyāre maha
3) tā bhikṣusamghena sārdham aOrdhatrayodaśabhir bhikṣuṣataiḥ atha khalu bhagavān*
4) pūrvāṁkālasamayeye nivāsya [pā]tracicvaram ādāya · śrāvastiṁ mahānagariṁ pi
5) ādāya praviśat* atha khalu bhagavān* śrāvastimahānagariṁ piṇḍāyaṁ carī

verso (Cz 27.8–19)

1) tvā paścādbhaktapiṇḍapatratikrāṃtaḥ pādau prakṣālya nyoṣidad bhagavān* prajñapta e
2) vāsaṁ paryamkam ābhujya rjum kāyaṁ prāṇidhāya pratimukham śrnutim upasṭhāpya · atha
3) sambahulā bhikṣavah yena bhagavāṁ tenopasaṁkkramann upasamkkramya bhagavatāḥ
4) pādau śirasābhivandya bhagavāṁTaṁ tr̥̃pradakṣinikṛtvā kānte nyoṣidān* tena khalu pu
5) nah samayenāyusmān subhūtiṁ tasyāṁ eva pariṣadi sannipatito bhūt sannisaṇṇāḥ
6) atha khalv āyuṣmān subhūtir utthiyāyāsanād ekāṁsam ut[t]arāsaṁgaṁ kṛtvā dāksinām jā

2) MS 2385/20, ufI/48; folio 27 recto (Cz 27.19–28.8)

1) nnuṇāṇḍala[m] prāthivyāṁ pratiṣṭhāpya yena bhagavāṁs tenāmjaliṁ praṇāmya bhagavāṃtām
etad a
2) vocat* āścaryaṁ bhagavan yāvad evan tathāgatenārhatā samyaksambuddhena bodhisatvā
3) hāsatiḥ anuparigṛhitāḥ paramenāṇugraheṇa : yāvad eva [ta]thāgatena bo
4) dhisatvāḥ parittāḥ paramaOyā parīndanayā · katham bhagava bodhisatvavāyā
5) nasampraṣṭhitena sthātavyam* katham pratīppatapavyam* kāṃthaṃ cī — — — — — — — — tātprati
6) gṛhitavyam* evam ukte bhagavān āyuṣmaṇṭam subhūtim etad av. c. t* sādhu

verso (Cz 28.8–28.17)

1) sādhu subhūte evam etat subhūte anuparigṛh[ī]lās tathāgatena bodhisat.[ā] .. + +
2) menāṇugraheṇa · parittās tathāgatena bodhisatvāḥ — — — — — — — — — —
3) paramayānuparindanayā · tena hi subhūte śṛṇu sādhu — — — — — — —
3) MS 2385/19, uf1/4x; folio 28 recto (Cz 28.18–29.5)
1 nasamprasthitair evam cittam utpadayitavyam* yavaṃtah satvāḥ satvasaṃ[ṛ]haṇa satvaṃ̐
2 tāh anḍājā vā jārayūṇaḥ vā samsvedājā vā upapādūkā vā rūpino vā arūpino
3 vā asamjñino vā asamjñino vā nāva samjñino nāsaṃjñinoḥ yāvat satvadhātuḥ praṇa
4 pyamāṇaḥ pra-- jñāyaṃte O te mayā sarve anupadhiśeṣe nirvāṇadhātau pari
5 nipayitavyāḥ evam aparimāṇāṃś ca satvān* parinivāpayitavyāḥ na ca kaścit satva
6 parinivāpito bhavati · tat kasmād dhetoh sacet subhūte bodhisatvasya satvasaṃjñā
7 pravartate na sa bodhisatva iti naktavyaḥ tat [ka]ṣ[ya] hetoh na s[u] subhūte bodhi[sa]

verso (Cz 29.5–18)
1 tvo vaktavyo yasaḥ satvasaṃjñā pravartata jivasaṃjñā vā pudgalasaṃjñā vā pravartata api
2 khalu punaḥ subhūte bodhisatvena stupratiṣṭhitena dānaṃ dātavyaṃ[ma] na kvacitpratiṣṭhitena
dā
3 naṃ tavyaṃ* na rūpapratiṣṭhitena dānaṃ dātavyaṃ na śabadagandharasprasṭavye[ṣu] na
dharmapraṇi
4 śṭhitena dānaṃ dātavyaṃ* evam hi O subhūte bodhisatvena dānaṃ dātavyaṃ* yathā na
5 nimi
ttasamjñāyāṃ pratiṣṭhe[ṛ]† tat kasya hetoh yah subhūte bodhisatvaḥ apratiṣṭhitoh dānam
6 dadd[ Futures ..]tsy sarh.te puṇyaskandhasya na sukaram praṃaṇam udghāhitum* tat [k]iṃ manyase
7 bh. te sukaram .. [v]. syāṃ diśi ākāsasya praṃa[ṇa]ṃ udghāhitum* subhūter āhā·

4) MS 2385/18, uf1/4o, uf1/4h; folio 29 recto (Cz 29.18–30.8)
1 no hidam bhagavan* evam daksinaḍapacaśimottara ārdhvam vidikṣu-r-avidikṣ[u] : daśa[ṣu
2 di]ks[u] : su
3 karam ākāsasya praṃaṇam udghāhitum* subhūtir [a]ha · na hidam bhagavan* ++ .. [a]
3 ha · evam etā subhūte · evam etat subhūte yo bodhisat[v]o pratiṣṭhito dānam
4 dadd[ Futures tasya puṇyaskandhasya O na sukaram praṃaṇam u[d]grahīh* api [t]u [ka]lu
5 punaḥ subhūte evam bodhisatvena dānamayaṃ puṇyakṛyāvastum dānam dātavyaṃ* tat
6 k[i]m
7 manyase subhūte tathāgato laksanaṣasaṃpadā draṣṭavyaḥ bhagavān āha na laksāṇa

verso (Cz 30.8–19)
1 sampadā tathāgato draṣṭavyaḥ tat kasya hetoh [ya] sā ta[thā]gateṇa laksanaṇasaṃpad bhāṣi
2 tāh saiva[laksanaṣasaṃpadāt]* evam ukte bhag[a[van] āyuṣmaṃtah subhūtim etad avocat* ya
3 vat sute laksanaṃ tāvan mṛṣa · yāvad alakṣaṇam tāva[d a]ṃ[ṛṣa] iti hi laksana[laksana]ntah
4 tathāgato draṣṭavyaḥ || evaΩm ukte a[ṃ]ṣu[ṃ]m jān subhūti bhagavantam etad avocat* a
5 sti bhagavan kecit [sa]tvāḥ bhavisyamty anāgate dhvani paśc[i]ṃyāṃ ṁancāṣatiyā vartamāṇa


6 yāṁ29 ye imēṣv evarūpeṣu sūtrāṁtapadesu bhāsyamāṇesu bhūtasamjñām utpā
d 5) MS 2385/17; folio 30 recto (Cz 30.19–31.5)
1 day[i]syamti bhagavān āha mā tvaṁ su[bhūtevaṁ vocat* a + kecī satvāh bhaviṣya
ty anāgate dhvani ye imēṣv evaṁrūp[e]ṣu sūtrāṁtapadesu[ṣu] bhāsyamāṇesu bhūtasam
jñāṁ utpādayiṣyamti api tu khalu punah subhūte bha[vi]ṣamty anāgate dhvani bo
dhisatvā mahāsa -- -- tvā ē paśc[i]māyāṃ paṃcāsyāṃ saddharmaviṃpralope --
pe vartamāne śila -- -- vaṁto guṇa[va]ṃtah praṇāyato bhaviṣyaṃti na khalu pu
nah subhūte bo30 dhisatvā ekabuddhāparyopāsītā bhaviṣyaṃti.

verso (Cz 31.5–13)
1 naikabuddhavaro[pi]tā -- -- kuśalamū[llā] bhaviṣyaṃti api tu khalu
punah subhū -- -- -- -- -- te a[neka]buddhāparyopāsītā bhaviṣyaṃ
ti anekabuddhāvaro pītakusalamūḷā bhaviṣyaṃti -- -- --
ye imēṣv evarūpeṣu sūtrāṁtapadesu bhāsyamāṇesu ekacitaprasāda
mātram api pratilapsyaṃte31 jñātas te subhūte tathāgatenā dṛṣṭās te subhū
d -- -- -- -- te tathāg[a]tena sarve te aprameye punyaskandham

6) MS 2385/16; folio 31 recto (Cz 31.13–22)
1 prasaviṣyaṃti pratigṛhiṣyaṃti tat kasya hetoh na hi teṣā. subhūte bodhisa
tvānāṃ ātmāsamjñā pravartysate na satvasam na jivasamjñā na pudgalasamjñā pravartysate .
3 nāpi teṣām -- -- -- subhūte bodhisatvānāṃ dharmasamjñā prava
4 ṛtsyate nādharma -- -- Osamjñā nāpi [t]eṣām samjñā nāsamjñā pravartysate .
5 -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- tat kasya hetoh sace subhūte teṣām bodhi
6 satvānā dharma -- -- -- -- -- samjñā [p]ra[v].tsyate sa eva teṣām ātmagra

verso (Cz 32.22–32.7)
1 ho bhavet* sa -- -- -- tvagrāho ji ā [.r]. [h]. + .. .. ho bhavet* sa
2 cad dharmasamjñā prava -- -- -- -- rteta sa eva teṣā + + + .o bhavet* satvagrā
3 ho jivagrāhah -- -- -- -- -- -- -- pudgalagrāha [t]i + .. t. sva hetoh na khalu puna
subhūte dharmadgrahī -- -- -- Otavyo nādharmo tasmā[d] .dā. samdhāya tathāgatenā
bhāṣītaṃ kolopamaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃm ājñānadbhiḥ dharmāḥ eva prahātavyaḥ prāg e
vādharmāḥ || punar aparāṃ bhagavān āyuṣmantaṃ subhūtim etad avocat* tat ki

7) MS 2385/15, ufl1/2f, ufl1/20; folio 32 recto (Cz 32.7–32.15)
1 manyase subhūte kācit tathāgatenānuttarāṃ samyaksambodhir abhisambuddhā: kaścī
d vā dharmas tathāgatena deṣṭaḥ || subhūtir āha yathāhaṃ bhagavan bhagavato
bhāṣītasārtham ājñānāmī O nāsti sa kaścid dha [.m]. + [s] tathāgatenānuttarām
samyaksambodhir abhisambuddhā: nāsti sa kaścid dharma [y]. + + [g]. [e]na deṣṭaḥ ta
t kasya hetoh yo sau tathāgatena dharma de[ṣīṭa] + + + + .o nabhilapyah

29 A space is left after yāṁ due to an imperfection in the surface of the birch bark.
30 A large space is left open in the line, without the usual spacing markers.
31 Between pra and ti an aksara (probably vi) has been erased.
8) MS 2385/14; folio 33 recto (Cz 33.10–18)
1 suntäh tat kasya hetoh sa eva bhagavann askandha[h]+ .m.t tathäga
2 to bhäsate punyaskandhaḥ askandha iti bhagavan bhagavän āha · yaś ca
3 —— khalu punaḥ subhû́te kulaputro vā kuladuhitā vā imām
4 —— trśāhasrä mahśāhasräm lokadhätum saptarānapratipū
taro
5 —— trśāh kṛtvā dāman dadaṭ* yaś ceto dhamaparyayad añtasaś catu

verso (Cz 33.18–25)
1 śpadikām api gäthäm udgrhyā pare[ḥ]yo desäsyaṃ samprakāśayed a[ya]
2 m eva tatonidānam bahunāṃ punyāṃ [pra]sunuyāt* aprameyam asaṃ
3 khyeyam tat kasya heto[h] O ato nirjātā hi subhute tathāgata
4 nām anuttarā samyakasambdiḥ ato nirjātās ca buddhā bhagavataḥ
5 tat kasmād dhetoh buddhadharmḥ buddhadharmā iti subhute abuddhadharmā

9) MS 2385/13; folio 34 recto (Cz 33.25–34.8)
1 ś caiva te · tat ki[m] manyase subhûte api nu srotāpan[n]asya evam bhavati
2 mayā srotāpattiphalam prāptam iti · subhûtir āha · no hidamaḥ bhagava
3 n bhagavān āha · tat kasya O hetoḥ na hi sa bhagavan kīṃcid āpanne te
4 nocaṃtā srotāpanna iti · na rūpam āpanno na śabdā na gadhā na rasā
5 —— n na sprāṣṭavyāṇ na dharmān āpan[n]aḥ tanocyaṃtā srotāpanna iti ·

verso (Cz 34.8–18)
1 bhagavān āha · tat kiṃ manyase subhûte api nu sakṛd[ā]gāmīnaḥ
2 evam bhaven mayā sakṛdāgāmiṃphalaṃ prāptam iti · subhūtir āha · no hi
3 dham bhagavan bhagavān dhāha · tat kasye sathoḥ na sakṛdāgāmi
4 no evam bhaviti mayā sakṛdāgāmiṃphalaṃ prāptam iti · tat kasmā
5 d dhetoḥ na hi sa kaścid dharmah yaḥ sakṛdāgāmitvam āpannah te

10) MS 2385/12; folio 35 recto (Cz 34.18–35.4)
1 + .y.. + .rdāgāmiti · bhagavān āha · tat kiṃ manyase subhûte · a ·— ·
2 pi nv anāgāmina · evaṃ bhavati mayā anāgāmiṃphalaṃ prāptam iti ——
3 tat kasya hetoḥ na sa kaścid dharman yo nāgāmīti · samanupaśyati · teno
4 cyate anāgāmiti · bhagavān āha · tat kiṃ manyase subhûte · api tv arham
5 to evaṃ bhavati mayārhatvam prāptam iti · subhūtir āha · no hidam bhagavan* tat ka
6 + .e .o .. [h]i [bh]agavan* sa kaścid dharmaṃ yo rhan nāmah ya saced bhagavann arha
VAJRACCHEDIKA

verso (Cz 35.4–13)
1 + + + + [v]. .m. + + [tv]. .r. [p]tam iti · sa eva tasyātmagāho bhavet* satvāgrāho j.
2 + grāhah pugdalagrāho bhavet* ahām asmin bhagavan* || tathāgatenārhatā samya
3 ksambuddhena ranavīhārinām agryo nirdiṣṭah ahām asmin bhagavann arhan vigata
4 rāgah na ca me bhagavann evam bhavati arham asminn arhāṁ iti · sacen mama bhagava
5 nn evam bhaven mayārhatvam prāptam iti · na me tathāgato vyākārisyati · arañā — — — — — —
6 .i .ā .i + + [g]rya iti subhūti · kulaputo na kvacīd viharati : — — — — — —

11) MS 2385/11; folio 36 recto (Cz 35.13–23)
1 tenocyate · arañāvihāriti arañāvihāriti · bhagavān ahā · tat kim manyasya
2 subhūte · kaścid dharmat tathāgatena dipamkaraṁ tathāgataṁ hart sa samyaksambuddhā
d udgrhiṁ subhūtir ahā · no hidam bhagavan bhagavān ahā · na sa kaścid dharmah
4 tathāgataṁ dipamkaraṁ taṁ tathāgataṁ arhataṁ samyaksambuddhā udgrhiṁ bhagava
n ahā : ya kaścit subhūte bodhisatvo evam vaded ahām kṣetrayūhāṁ nispādayiṣyāmi
ti sa vitatha vadet* tat kasya hetoh kṣetrayūhā kṣetra — — — — — — — — —

verso (Cz 35.23–36.6)
1 vyuḥā iti subhūte avyūhā hy ete tathāgatena bhāsītā te – nocyante kṣetrayūhā i
2 ti taṁ maṁ tarhi subhūte bodhisatvena evam cittam utpādayitavyam apratiṣṭhitam na rūpa
3 pratiṣṭhitam cittam utpādayīṭavyam · na sadagandharasasprasāvadyadharmapratiṣṭhī –
tam cittam utpādayitavyam* na [k]vacitpratīs[th]ī[ta]m cittam utpādayitavyam* tad yathā .i
5 nāma subhūte puruṣo bhavet* yasyai[va]mrūpam ātmabhāvah syāt tad yathā[pi] .. .. +
6 meroh parvatarājā · tat [k]i manyase su — — — — — — — — — — — —

12) MS 2385/10; folio 37 recto (Cz 36.6–18)
1 bhūte mahān sa ātmabhāvo bhavet* subhūtir ahā · [ma]hān bhagavam mahā s[u]lgata [:] .. +
tmabhāvo bhavet* bhagavan* tat [k]asya het[ol]h abhāvah sa tathāgataṁ na bhāṣītāh tēnā
cyate ā[ti]ma[bhāva] iti · na [hi] s[a] bhāvah t[e]n[o]cyate ātmabhāva iti · || bhagavān ahā ·
ta
t kim man[ya]se subhūte [yā]Ovaṁtyo gamgānadyāṁ vālukās tāvaṁtya evam gamgānados[y]o
bha
5 veyuḥ api nu tāsu bahv[y]o vālū[kā] bhaveyūḥ subhūtir ahā · tā eva tāvaḥ bhagavan ba
6 hvyo gamgānadyo bhaveyūḥ prāg eva yās tāsu vālukāḥ bhagavān ahā · ārocyami

verso (Cz 36.18–37.5)
1 te subhūte pratie[th]ajāyī te yāvatmyas tāsu gamgānadiṣu vālukā bhaveyūḥ tāvaṁ
2 tyo lokādhātavaḥ kaścid eva stri vā p[u]ruṣo vā sapataratnapratipūrṇam kṛtvā tathā
3 gatebhoyo rhadbhayaḥ samyaksambuOdhebhyo dānam dadyāt* tat kim manyase subhūte
api nu sā
4 stri vā puruṣo vā tatonidānaṁ O bahu punyam prasunuyāt* subhūtir ahā · bahu bhaga
5 van bahu s[lgata] : sā stri vā puruṣo vā tatonidānaṁ bahu punyam prasunuyāda bhagavā[ā]
n ahā · yaś ca khalu punah subhūte tāvaṁtyo lokadhātavah sapataratnapratipūrṇam


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

1 क्र्त्वा दनाम दद्यात् या यस ते दहरा[र] दमपर्यायद अम्[्] ता-सास कतुस्पटिकः अपि गाथामव उ
dgrhya parebhyo dasayet* ayam tato bahutaram pyanam prameyam asamkhaye* sampi
2 tu kha[lu] subhute yasmin prthivipra[de]se ito dharmaparyayad antasaś catuspadi
4 kām api gāthām bhāṣyeta O vā desyeta vā sa p[r]āthivipradesāḥ caityabhūto bha
5 ve[t*] sadeva[mā][nusā]surasya lokasya kaḥ pu[n]ar [v]ādah subhute ya imam dharmapa
6 rāyam [dhā]rāisyamti paramena te āscaryena samanvāgatā bhaviṣyamti ta

verso (Cz 37.18–38.5)

1 sminś ca prthivipradeṣe śāstā viharatī anyatarānyatarā vā gurusthāṇiḥ evam u
2 kte āyuṣmān subhūtir bhagavantam ed avocat* ko nāmāyām bhagavan dhammaparyāyah ka
3 thām cainam dhārayāmi · evam ukte O bhagavān āyuṣmāntam subhūtim etad avocat* 
prajñāpa
4 ramītā nāmāya subhūte dhammaparyāyah evam cainām dhāraya : tat kasya hetoh yaiva subhū
dprajñāpārahitā tathāgatena bhūṣita : saiva prajñāramitā : tat kim manyase subhūte { {anu} }
6 api [n]u sa kaści dharma tathāgatena bhūṣitaḥ subhūtir āha no hidām bhagavan* bhaga

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

1 n āha · na sa kaścid bhagavate dharmo yah tathāgata bhūṣita yāvataḥ subhute
2 trśāhasmahāsahāryam lokadhātu prthivirajah kaścit tad bahu bhavet* su
3 bhūtir āha · bahu bhagavan* s tat prthivirajah bhavet* yat ta bhagavan* prthi
4 virajah tathāgatena bhāśiṣita arajaḥ sa tathāgatena bhūṣitaḥ ta
5 d ucñate prthiviraḥ iti · yā sā lokadhātur adhātuh sā tathāgatena bhūṣitaḥ
6 tad ucñate lokadhātura[ṇ] iti : || bhagavān āha · tat kim manyase subhūte dvāṃśādhbhira ma

verso (Cz 38.17–39.7; G 5a2–5)

1 .āpurusalak[ś]anāhī [ta]ḥāgato rhan samyaksambuddho draṣṭavya · subhūtir āha · no hi
2 da[m] bhag[a]vad bhagavān āha · tat kasya hatoh yāni tāni bhagavan dvāṃśārmaḥāpuru
3 lakṣaṇāni tathāgatena bhāśiḥtāny alakṣaṇāni tagatenā bhāṣītāni tasmād u[c]yānte dvā
4 trṃśāmaḥāpurusalakṣanāṃ[ći] · bhagavān āha · yaś ca khalu punah subhūte stri vā pu
5 ruṣo vā gamgānadvālukopamānāt bhāvabhūvan parityayet* yaś ca eto dhammaparyāyaṃ catuspa
6 dikām api gāthāṃ udgrhya parebhyo dasayet* ayam tatonidānaṃ bahutaram punyaṃ pra

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

1 meyiṃ asamkhaye* athā khalu āyuṣmānubhūtih dhammapraveganaśrūni prāmucat* 
2 pravartayam so śrūni parimārjyā bhagavamtaṃ etad avocat* āscaryam bhagavan* paramā 
3 ścaryam sugtā : yā vad ayam dharmapa[ṛ]jāyah tathāgatena bhūṣitaḥ yato me bha − − 
4 gavan* jñānam utpa − − ○ − − [n]naṃ na mayā jātv eva dhammaparyāyah śrutapūrvaḥ 
5 pramaṇa te bhagavan* − − − − āscaryena samanvāgatā bhaviṣyamti ya iha sū 
saivā
16) MS 2385/6; folio 41 recto (Cz 40.14–41.3; G 5b2–4)

1 sya hetoh sarvasamjñā[p]agatā hi buddhā bhagavatā \| evam ukte bhagavān ā
2 yuṣmamāntaṃ subhūtim etad avocat* evam etat subhūte evam etat subhūte
3 paramāryasamanvagatās te satvā bha[v]iṣyant[i] · ya iha sūtre bhāṣyaṃmā
4 ṇe śrutiḥ notrasiṣyant[i] · O na samtrasiṣyam[tī] · samtrāsam āpatsyamte ta
5 t kasya hetoh paramapāramiteyam subhūte tathāgatena bhāṣītā yā [c]a
6 — — — tathāgataḥ paramapāramitāṃ bhāṣate tām aparimāṃṇā buddhā bha

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

1 — — maye abhijñānāmy ahum subhūte atite dhvani pāmca jātiṣatāni yad a
2 haṃ kṣaṃtivādirisīr[a]ḥ bhū tadāpi me nātmasamjñā babhūva · na satvasamjñā
3 na jivasamjñā na pugdalasamjñā · tasmāt ta[r]hi subhūte bodhisatvena mahāśa
tvena [sa]rvasamjñā vinarjāOyitvānuttarasyāṃ s. · y. [ksa]mbodhau cittam utpāda
5 yātvyam* na rūpapratiṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyam* na śabdaga<ndha>rasaspraṣṭa
6 vyapratīṣṭhitam c[i]ttaṃ utpādayitavyam* na dharmapratiṣṭhitam cittam utpādayi

verso (Cz 39.20–40.14; G 5a7–5b2)

1 samjñā tasmā tathāgato bhāṣate bhūtasaṃjñā bhūtasaṃjñīti · na mama bhagavann āścaryaṃ yad a
2 haṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ bhāṣyaṃṇāṃ avakalpayāmy adhimucyāmi · ye te bhagavann imāṃ dharmapa
3 ṛyāyaṃ udgrhiṣyaṃtī · — — — paryavāpsyaṃti dhā-.yīṣyaṃtī · te paramāścaryasama
4 nvāgatā bhaviṣyaṃtī · || — — — api tu khalu punah bhagavan na meśām ā[a]mam samjñā
5 pravartsyate · na satvasamjñā na {ja}jivasamjñā · na pudga[lasa]m[m] jivasamjñā pravartsyate · tat kasya hato
6 yāsāv ātmasamjñā saivaṃsaṃjñā yā satvasamjñā jivasamjñā pudgalasamj[m]nā saivaṃsaṃjñā ·
   tat ka

verso (Cz 41.3–12; G 5b4–6)

1 gavamto bhāṣamte nocyaite paramapāramiteti · api tu khalu punah subhū
t ev yā tathāgatasya kṣaṃtiṃḍaramitā saivāpāramitā tat kasya hatoḥ yadā
3 me su[bhū]te kalimgarājā a[m]Ogapratyamgāny a[che][s]in nāsin me tasmin sama
4 ye ātmasamjñā vā satvasamjñā vā jivasamjñā vā pudgalasamjñā vā na me kā ·
5 cit samjñā nāsamjñā babhūva tat kasya hetoh [sa]cet subhūte mama tasmin sa
6 maye {{ā}}ātmasamjñābhāviṣyat'd vyāpādasamjñā āpi me bhāviṣyat' tasmin sa

verso (Cz 41.23–42.10)

1 tavyam* nādharmapratiṣṭhitam cattam utpādayitavyam* na kvacitpratiṣṭhitam citta
2 m utpādayitavyam* tat kasmād dhetoh yat pratiṣṭhim tad evāpapratīṣṭhim tasmād evam
3 tathāgato bhāṣate rūpāOpratiṣṭhitena dānam [dā]tavyam* api tu khalu
4 punah subhūte bodhisatvenaiveṃ dānaparityāyagah parīvatyajah sarvasatvānām a
5 rthāya yaiva ca satvasamjñā sa evāsamjñā · ya eva te sarvasatvā tathāga
6 tena bhāṣītāḥ te evāsatvāḥ bhūtavādi subhūte tathāgataḥ satyavādi
18) MS 2385/4; folio 43 recto (Cz 42.10–21)
1 tathāvādi tathāgato nāvītatathāvād[i] tathāgato · api tu khalu punah subhūte yaḥ tathā
2 gatena dharmo bhisambuddho deśito vā na tatra satyaṃ na [m]rṣā tad yathāpi nāma subhūte
3 puruṣo ndhakārāḥ[pr]avistāḥ evam vastupatīto [b]o .isatvo draṣṭavya yo vastupatītam dā
4 nam parityajati · tad yathāpi ṯā nāma subhūte cakṣusmān* puruṣo .i .ā .āyā rātryā [s]ū
5 rye bhyudgate nānāvidhāni rūpaṃ[ṃ] paśyet* evam bodhisatvo draṣṭavyo yo vastvapati
6 tam dānaṃ parityajati · api tu khalu punah subhūte ye kulaputro vā kuladuhi[t]a

verso (Cz 42.21–43.14)
1 ro vā imaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ udgrahisyāṃti : dhāra .. syāṃti · v[ā]c. yisyaṃti paryavāpsyaṃti
   · jñā
2 tās te subhūte tathāgatena drṣ[t]ās te subhūte tathāgatena buddhās te tathāgatena sarve
3 te satvāḥ aprameyam punyāḥ[ṃ]skandham prasāvīsyāṃti · yaś ca khalu punah subhūte strī
dhū vā puruṣo vā pūrvāḥnakālasamaye gamgānadhivā[ṃ]kopolamāṃ atmahāvā[n]* parityaje
5 t* madhyāḥnakālasamaye sā – yāḥnakālasamaye gamgānadhivālukopamāṃ ā
6 tmabhāvā parityajet* anena paryāyeṇa ka[l]pakoti[n]yutāsasahasrāṃ ātmabhā

19) MS 2385/3; folio 44 recto (Cz 43.14–21)
1 -- --- -- --- -- van* parityajet'[d] yaś cemaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ śrutvā ·
2 -- na pratikṣiped ayam eva tatonidināṃm bahutaram punyaskandham[32] pra
3 sunuyāt* apra -- -- O – meyam asamkhheyam* kah punar vādah yo li
4 -- khītvo -- -- O dgrhṛ. yāt* [33] [dh]ārayet* vācayet* paryayāpnu
5 yāt* parebhyaḥ ca vistareṇa samprakāṣayet* api tu subhūte aciṃtyo tu
6 lyo ya dharmapā -- -- ryāyaḥ ayaṃ ca [dha]rmaparyāyaḥ tathāgatena bhāṣitah

verso (Cz 43.21–44.6)
1 agrayānasamparasthi – tānāṃ sat[v]ānā .. r.[ya] · śreṣṭhayānasamparasthitānāṃ satvā
2 nām arthāya : [ya] ye i dharr[m]a[pa]ryāya[m u]dgrahisyāṃti · dhārayi[ś]yaṃti · vā
3 ca – yisyaṭi -- -- O par[yā]vāpsyaṃti[34] · jñātas te subhūte tathāgateta
4 -- -- -- -- -- na drṣṭas te subhūte tathāgatena sarve te satvāḥ
5 aprameyena punyaskandhena samanvāgataḥ [bhav]isyāṃti · aciṃty[e]nā[ṃ]tu[ly]enā
6 .. -- -- -- -- -- māpyenāparimān[e]na punyasy[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 bhavisyaṃti · tat kasya hetero · na hi s. [k]y .. subhūte ayam dharmo hinādh[i][mu] ..i .aiḥ
2 śrotum* nātmad[r]ṣṭikaih na satvadrṣṭikaih na jīvad[r]ṣṭikaih na pudgalaṛṣṭikai sa
3 kyam śrotum udgrah[i]tum vā dhārayiṭum vā vācayiṭum vā paryav[i]ṭuṭu .. vā n[e]dām sthānam vi
4 dyate api tu subhūte yatra pr[thi]vipradaśe idam s[ūtra]m prakāśayiṣyati · pūja

---
32 The anusvāra here is written under the bottom of the subscript of śrutvā above.
33 A triangular chip of bark has come away from above the bhav, but the end of the -i can just be made out when the image is magnified.
34 The akṣara ṭā appears to have an e-mātrā above it.
5 niyaḥ sa prthiviprad[e]ś[o] bha[viṣya]...[d]evamānuṣāsurasya lokasya vanda
verso (Cz 44.16–45.5; G 7a3–5)
1 niyaḥ pradakṣinākhaṇiyaś ca sa prthivipradeśa bhaviṣyat[i] · c[ai] · [y]. sa prthi
2 vīpradeśo bhaviṣyati · ye te subhute kulaputro vā kuladuhitar vā imān imaṃrū
3 pāṃ sūtraṃtāṃ – – udgrahisyaṃcit dhārayiṣyaṃti · paryavāpsyaṃti · te pa[r]i[ḥ]uṭa
bhaviṣyaṃ
4 supariḥūṭaḥ ca bhaviṣyaṃti · || yāni teṣām satvānāṃ pauvājanmikāni karmāṇi kṛtāṃ a
5 pāyasamvartaniyāni dṛṣṭa 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 · buddhodhibhim ca prāṇyaṃti · abhijānāmy ahāṃ subhūte atite
2 dhvani asamkhyaṃye kalpe asamkhyeyatāre di[p]a[mkarasya tathāgatasārhatā samyakṣaṃ
3 buddhasya [p]a[reṇa parataram caturaśiti]budhakoṭinayuta[śa]tasaḥrasrāny abbū
4 van ye mayā ārādhita ārāḥdhatvā na virādhiṣṇa yac ca mayā subhūte buddhā bhaga
5 vaṃtāḥ āraṅgita ārāgaye[tvā] na virāgita yac ca carime kāle paścime.āyaṃ pamcā ..
6 tyāṃ vartamānāyāṃ imaṃ s. trāṃ[tam]. d... hi[s]ṃ[t][i] dhā[ra] .i ...m .i [v]. + [y]i ..m .[i] +

verso (Cz 45.16–46.11; G 7b1–4)
 + + + +
2 m api kalā nopaiti sāhāṣtṛtamāṃ a[p]i · sata[s]āhātamāṃ a[i] . k. ｔ. + + + +
3 šṛtramā[m] api · samkhyaṃ a[p]i ○ [k][a][l]a[m] api ganaṇāṃ apa upa[m]ā[m] api +
4 paniśāmate na kṣamatē · + + t subhūte te[s]āṃ kulaṇaḥ%m ku[l]a[di]uṭi .[r] +
5 tā punyaska[m]dham bhāṣ[e]t* yāva. tāḥ te ku[l].[u]ṭrā vā k]uladuhītā vā tasmin sama[ye] +
6 nyaskandha pratīgrhaṃti[i] : unm. [d][m] te satvāḥ] prāpnuḥ cittaviśeṣaṃ vā gacche..
III. Reconstruction

§136; folio 26r1–v4 (Cz 27.1–1)
namo śākyamunareyeṣaś ṭathāgatyārhatē samyaksambuddhāya ||

evam mayā śrutam ekasmin samarjyē bhagavān ||40 śrāvastyāṁ viharaṇi sma | jetaṇve ||41 anātha-
piṇḍadasyāṁ<ā> me maharātā bhikṣusamghena sārdham ardhahyodayasahbhīr bhikṣuṣataṁ< ||

atha khalaḥ bhagavān rśī pūrāṇakālaṃsmayev nivāsya pātracīvaram ādāya | śrāvastīṃ mahanagariṃ
piṇḍāya praśiṣat ||44 atha khalaḥ bhagavān || śrāvastīṃ mahanagari<ṇ> piṇḍāya{ṃ} caritva||46
paścādbhaktaπiṇḍapātpapratikrāṃtaḥ ||47 pādau prakṣālya||48 nyoṣidad bhagavān||49
prajñāpta evvāsanā paryānkaṁ abhujya rjuṁ kāyaṁ prajñadhiya pratimukhaṁ||50 smṛṭīṃ upasthāpya |

35 Different readings in M, Cz, P, G and the relevant Central Asian fragments (Frgs. 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 abhīvandya stands for Cz’s abhīvandya). 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 Parigter 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 M, 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 Parigter make
it difficult to follow the readings of the ms.

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

37 Śākyamunayesa the addition of the superfluous -s to the dative is a scribal error which is possibly influenced by the
genitive śākyamunyesa, or, according to a suggestion made by Seishi Karashima, may reflect the abnormal genitive form
śākyamunyesa tathāgatyārhatāḥ samyaksambuddhasya often found in ms of Mahāyāna sūtras as such as the
Saddharmapundarika. Alternatively, it may simply reflect sandhi applied in error to a punctuation mark subsequently
misunderstood as a genuine visarga.

38 This opening salutation differs from those found in M, Cz and the Tibetan translation (hereafter Tib.) M: namo
bhagavatāḥ āryaprajañāpāramitāyai | Cz: namo bhagavatāya āryaprajiñāpāramitāyai | Tib.: satiḥ rgyas dan byan chub
sems dpa’ thams cad la phyag ‘tshal lo. (Conze gives no justification for reading bhagavatāyai). According to the notes
in M, J has Namāḥ sarvajñāḥ ("Hail to the Omniscient One!").

Among the seven Chinese translations, only that by Dharmaputra (?–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 pluralis). It is thus close to Tib.

39 Cz and Tib. punctuate after samaye, while M and all Chinese translations break the line after śrutam (Ch: 如是我聞).

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

41 This punctuation not found in Cz and M, which read: jetaṇve ’nātha’.

42 S reads: anāthapiṇḍadasyārāme.

43 M, Cz add: sambhulais ca bodhisattvair mahāsattvaiḥ, Tib. adds: byān chub sms dpa’ sms 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.

44 Wherever virāma occurs 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.

45 S reads bhagavan.

46 M, Cz add: kṛtahhatkṛtyah.

47 M, Cz add: pātracīvaram pratiśāmyai.

48 M, Cz: prakṣālya.

49 M, Cz read nyoṣidad, omitting bhagavān (but M notes that Ch & T read nyoṣidad bhagavān).

50 M, Cz: pratimukhīṁ (but M notes that T reads abhimukhāṁ).
bhikṣavah yena bhagavāṁs tenopasmākraman upasamākramya bhagavataḥ v4 pādau śirasābhivandya52 bhagavāṁtam tr̥pradakṣiṇīkṛtva <e>kāmte53 nyāsidan |

§2; folio 26v4–27v6 (Cz 27.16–28.17; P 179.14–24)
tenā khalu puvśnah samayenāyuśmān subhūtiḥ tasyāṁ eva pariṣadī54 sannipatito 'bhūt sannisāṇṇaḥ
<| v6 atha khalv āyuśmān subhūtir utth{y}āyāsanād ekāmsām uttarāsāmgaṁ kṛtvā daksīṇaṁ
jā27r1n{n}umāndalam pṛthivyām pratiṣṭhāpya yena bhagavāṁs tenāṁjaliṁ praṇāmya55 bhagavāṁ-
tam ê29vocat | āścaryāṁ bhagavān57 yāvad eva{h}58 tathāgatenārhatā samyaksambuddhaṁ59
bodhisatvā marāhāsatsvā60 anuparigṛhitāḥ paramenānugraheṇa | yāvad eva tathāgataṇa62 bodhisat-
svāḥ63 parittāḥ64 paramayā parindanayā65 | katham66 bhagava<ν> bodhisatvayārśnasamprasthitena
sthātavyam | katham pratipatta{pa}vyam68 | ka{m}thaṃ cittaṃ pratitṛṣṇhitavyam69 | evam ukte
bhagavān āyuśmaṃyaḥ subhūtim etad av{o}c(a)70 | sādhū v1 sādhu subhūte evam etat subhūte71
anuparigṛhitās tathāgatena bodhisat(v)ā(h)72 para)v2menānugraheṇa | parittās73 tathāgatena bodhi-
satvāh74 v3 paramayānuparindanayā75 | tena hi subhūte śṛṇu sādhu v4 ca suṣṭha ca manasikuru
bhāṣisyā76 | yathā bodhisatvayānasamprasthitena sthātavyam | v5 yathā pratipattavyam77 | yathā
cittaṃ pratitṛṣṇhitavyam78 | evam bhagavann79 i(y) āyuśmān subhūtv6r bhagava{m} taḥ pratyāśrauṣit |

§3; folio 27v6–28v1 (Cz 28.17–29.7; P 179.24–180.10)
bhagavāṁs tān etad avocat60 | iha subhūte bodhisatvayāna28r1{na}samprasthitair81 evan82 cittam

51 M, Cz add: khalu.
52 M, Cz: śrohiḥ abhivandya.
53 M, Cz: tr̥pradaksiîkṛtvaikāmte.
54 M, Cz: pariṣadī.
55 M, Cz: praṇāmya.
56 P begins here (fol. 2r1).
57 P: bhagavā; M, Cz add: paramāścaryām sugata after bhagavan.
58 The reading eva is confirmed by the parallel wording at 27r3, also P, M, Cz.
59 P omits: arhatā samyaksambuddhena.
60 P omits: mahāsattvāḥ.
61 M, Cz add: āścaryāṁ bhagavaṇ.
62 M, Cz: arhatā samyaksambuddhena.
63 M, Cz: mahāsattvāḥ.
64 M, Cz: parimittāḥ, P: parimitāḥ.
65 M, Cz: parimandaṇāyā; (parimindāna)yā.
66 M, Cz: praṇāmaḥ.
67 M, Cz add: kulaputraṇa vā kuladuhitrā vā.
68 P omits: katham pratipattavyam.
69 M, Cz: pragrahītavyam; P: pragrha(hitavyam).
70 P apparently omits: evam ukte bhagavān āyuśmaṃtaṃ subhūtim etad avocat.
72 M, Cz add: mahāsattvāḥ.
73 M, Cz: parimittāţ, P: parimitātās.
74 M, Cz add: mahāsattvāḥ.
75 M, Cz: parimandaṇāyā; parimandaṇāyā.
76 M, Cz add: 'ham te.
77 P apparently omits: yathā pratipattavyam.
78 M, Cz: pragrahītavyam; P: pragrahetevyam.
79 S reads: bhagavān (so too P).
80 M: bhagavān asyaitad avocat (with note: bhagavān etad avocat 1; no MS. has asmai tad); Cz: bhagavān etad
§4: folio 28v1–29r5 (Cz 29.8–30.5; P 180.10–15)

api tu v2 khalu punah101 subhūte bodhisatvena <na va>stupratiṣṭhitena102 dānām dātavyam | na kvacitpratiṣṭhitena dāvānam <dā>tvayam | na rūpapratīṣṭhitena dānām dātavyam103 na sabdagandharasprasāṭviveṣu na dharmapratīṣṭhitena104 dānām dātavyam | evam hi subhūte bodhisatvena105 dānām dātavyam | yathā na nimivṛtasamajñāyāṁ106 pratitāṣṭhet107 | tat kasya hetoh <| yaḥ subhūte bodhisatvah108 apratīṣṭhito dānām v6 dadāi109 (ta)syā subhūte punyaskandhasya na sukaram

---

101 M, Cz: aparinānān (C: aparinānān, corrected on p. 116) api; P: aparimānān ca.
102 M, Cz: parinirvāpya, P: parinirvāpaytvā.
103 M, Cz: P: pravarteta.
104 M, Cz: P: pravarteta.
105 M, Cz: na bodhisatvena vastupratīṣṭhitena; P: bodhisatvenāvastupratīṣṭhpattito; cf. Tib.: hyan chub sens dpa’i dnos pa la mi gnas pur.
106 M, Cz: P: pravarteta.
107 M, Cz: P: khalu punah.
108 M, Cz: P: bodhisatvah.
prāmāṇaṃ udgharitum | tat kim manyase suvṝbh(ū)te sukaram (pū)rv(a)syām diśi ākāsasya pramāṇam udgharitum | subhūti10 āha | 29r1 no hidaṁ bhagavan11 | evam daksinapācaśimottarāśv adha | īrđhvaṃ12 vidikṣu-r-avidikṣu |13 daśasa ṅiṣu |14 surkaram ākāsasya pramāṇaṃ udgharitum | subhūṭir āha | na15 hidam bhagavan | (bhagavan) ārśha | evam etat<16 subhūte | evam etat subhūte17 yo bodhisatvo 'pratiṣṭhito dānāṃ rādātā tasya18 punyaskandhasya na sukaram pramāṇaṃ udgharitum119 api tu khalu rī punaḥ subhūte evam bodhisatvena dānāmayāṃ punyakṛyāvastum dānāṃ dātavyam120 |

§5; folio 29r5–v4 (Cz 30.6–14)
tat kim rī manyase subhūte tathāgato laksanāsampadā121 draṣṭavyāḥ <||> bhagavān122 āha123 na laksanāsampadā124 tathāgato draṣṭavyaḥ <||> tat kasya hetoh <||> yā sa125 tathāgatena laksanāsampad126 bhāśiśvṛtāḥ {ḥ} saivālaksanāsampadā daṃt evam ukte bhagavān āyaṃmaṃtaṃ subhūte itad avocat | ye<ś>ṣa<ṃ>vaḥ <||> takaḥ ṃṛṣaḥ | yāvad alaksanāṃ127 tāvan aṃṛṣaḥ | iti129 hi laksanālaksanataḥ v4 tathāgato draṣṭavyaḥ ||

§6; folio 29v4–31v6 (Cz 30.15–32.5)
evam ukte āyūṣmāṃ subhūte<||> bhagavaṃtaṃ etad avocat | aevsti bhagavan kecit satvāḥ bhaviṣyanty anāgathe 'dhvani130 paścimāyāṃ paṃcāṣatīyā<ṃ|131 vartamāṇavāyuṃ132 ye imēṣv eva<ṃ>rūpeṣu

109 End of fol. 2 in P. Fols. 3–5 of P are missing.
110 S reads: subhūter.
111 M, Cz insert: bhagavān āha.
112 M: daksinapācaśimottarāśv adha īrđhvaṃ. Cz has: daksīna-paścimā-uttara-asvadha-ārđhvaṃ, either through misconstruing the wording of M or because of a misprint, but corrects on p. 116. We restore ("paścimottarāśv adha, otherwise the long a is difficult to understand.
113 M, Cz: digvīduṣamantād for vidikṣu-r-avidikṣu. We take the -r- here as hiatus-bridger, but it may well reflect sandhi applied to a visaṅga originally used as punctuation (cf. next note).
114 M, Cz: daβasa ṅiṣu. Note the use of visaṅga here as punctuation, represented by a danda in our reconstruction.
115 M, Cz: no.
116 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).
117 M, Cz omit: evam etat subhūte.
118 M, Cz insert: subhūte.
119 This sentence quoted in the Śikṣāsamuccaya (ed. Bendall, p. 275) in exactly the same form: yathoktam vajracchedikāyāṃ / yo bodhisatvo 'pratiṣṭhito dānāṃ dātātā tasya punyaskandhasya na sukaram pramāṇaṃ udgharitum iti /.
120 M, Cz: evam hi subhūte bodhisattvāyāṃ samprasthitena dānanāṃ dātavyāḥ yathā na nimittasamjñāyāṃ api pratiṣṭhitet for api tu khalu punaḥ subhūte evam bodhisatvena dānāmayāṃ punyakṛyāvastum dānāṃ dātavyaṃ. Tib. omits this sentence.
121 M, Cz: laksanāsampadā tathāgata (with misprint in M: tathāgata).
122 M, Cz: subhūtir for bhagavan.
123 M, Cz insert: no hidaṁ bhagavan.
124 Frag a begins here (with -io).
125 M, Cz insert: bhagavan. Frag a reads with S.
126 M, Cz: laksanāsampat tathāgatena for tathāgatena laksanāsampad; Frag a: laksanāsampat tathāgatā/.
127 M, Cz: laksanāsampat for laksanām.
128 M, Cz: laksanāsampat for alaksanām. Frag a appears to read with M, Cz.
129 M, Cz: na mṛṣa, Frag a: na mṛṣa / iti for amṛṣa </> iti. Frag a, however, supports the implicit punctuation of S.
130 M, Cz add: paścime kāle paścime samaye. Cf. Tib., which lacks the equivalent of this phrase. Missing in Frag a.
131 M, Cz: paṃcāṣatīyām (but M notes that Ch, J, T read: paṃcāṣatīyām). Frag a has only śatīyām at beginning of line v5.
132 M, Cz: sadharmavipralopakāle vartamāne, Frag a: sadharmavipralo vartamāne for vartamānyāṃ. Cf. Tib.:
sūtrāṁtapadesu bhāsyamānēsu bhūtasamjñāṇam utpādodādayiṣyantī | bhagavān āha | mā tvam subhūte
<e>vam vocat43 | a(sti) kecit satvāḥ bhaviṣya<m>r>ty anāgāte 'dhvani135 ye īmesv evamṛūpeṣu sūtrāṁtapadesu bhāsyamānēsu bhūtasamjñāṇam utpādodādayiṣyantī | api tu khalu punah subhūte bhaviṣyanty anāgāte 'dhvani borādhisaṭvā mahāsaṭvā
136 paścimāyam pāmcāṣatiṣyām137 saddharma-
vipralopake <p> vartamāṇe śilavamto guṇaṃvamtaḥ138 praṇāva<pp>o</pp>
139 bhaviṣyantī | 140 na khalu purṇāḥ141 subhūte bodhisatvā142 ekabuddhaparyupāsītā bhaviṣyantī143 | v1 naikabuddhāvaropita-
kuśalamūlā144 bhaviṣyantī | api tu khalu v2 punah subhūte anekabuddhaparyupāsītā145 bhaviṣyamv31146 anekabuddhāvaropitakuśalamūlā147 bhaviṣyantī | v4 ye īmesv eva<m>r>peṣu sūtrā<m>tapadesu bhāsyamānēsv evacittaprasādāv5mātram148 api pratilapsyaṃte | jñātās te subhūte tathāgatena149 drṣṭās te subhūte te tathāgatena150 sarve te151 aprameyan152 punyaskamdhām 31 r1 prasavṛṣyantī pratigrhiṣyantī <p> tat kasya hetoh <pp> na hi teṣā<pp>m> subhūte153 bodhisarvātvanām154 atmasamjñā
pravartṣyate155 na satvasam<jña> na jivasamjñā na pudgalasamjñā pravartṣyate156 | r3 nāpi teṣām subhūte bodhisatvānām157 dharmaṃsasamjñā pravarṇiṣyate158 nādhasamjñā nāpi teṣām159 samjñā nāsamjñā pravartṣyate160 | r5 tat kasya hetoh <pp> sace<pp> subhūte teṣāṃ bodhisarvātvanā<pp>(m)161 dharma-
dam pa'i chos rab tu rnam par 'jig par 'gyur ba na.
133 M, Cz, Frag a: subhūte tvam for tvam subhūte.
134 M, Cz: vocah. The anomalous vocat of S may be the result of confusion between visarga and -r*, and should probably be emended to vocah. Frag a line r1 ends with vo-
135 M, Cz add: paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyam paṇćasatyaṁ saddharmaṇvipralopake vartamāne, Frag a (beginning of line r2): scimāyam pamaṃsaṭyāṃ saddharmaṇvipralopake vartamāne. Cf. Tīb.: lha brgya tha ma la dam pa'i chos rab tu rnam par 'jig par 'gyur ba na.
136 M, Cz add: paścime kāle paścime samaye. Frag a reads with S.
137 M, Cz: pamaṃsaṭyām. Frag a reads with S. Cf. Tīb.: lha brgya tha ma la.
139 M, Cz: praṇāvamtaḥ ca (Cz: praṇāvantaḥ ca, corrected p. 116). Missing in Frag a.
140 M, Cz add: ya īmesv evamṛūpeṣu sūtrāntapadesu bhāsyamānēsu bhūtasamjñāṇam (Cz: bhūtasamjñāṃ, corrected p. 116) utpādodādayiṣyantī. Cf. Tīb., which adds: [sams can gan la la dag] 'di lta bu'i mdo sde'i tshig bṣad 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 aksaras.
141 M, Cz, Frag a add: te.
142 M, Cz add: mahāsattvā. Frag a reads with S.
143 Frag a breaks off here.
144 S reads: naikabuddhāvaropita
145 M, Cz: anekabuddhāhasatasahasraparyupāsītā.
146 M, Cz omit: bhaviṣyantī.
147 M, Cz: anekabuddhāhasatasahasrāvaropitakuśalamūlā te bodhisatvā mahāsattvā for anekabuddhāvaropitakuśalamūlā.
148 M, Cz: ekacittaprasādām for ekacittaprasādāmāram, but Tīb. adds tsam (mātra).
149 M, Cz add: buddhajñānena. There is no equivalent for buddhajñānena in Tīb.
150 M, Cz add: buddhacakṣuṣāḥ te subhūte tathāgatena.
151 M, Cz add: subhūte.
152 S reads: aprameye (note that e-mātra and anusvāra are easily confused); M, Cz add: asamkhyaṃ.
153 M, Cz: subhūte teṣām for teṣāṃ subhūte.
154 M, Cz add: mahāsattvānām.
155 M, Cz: pravartate.
156 M, Cz: pravartate.
157 M, Cz add: mahāsattvānām.
158 M, Cz: pravartate evam.
159 M, Cz add: subhūte.
160 M, Cz: pravartate.
161 M, Cz add: mahāsattvānām.
saṁjñā prav(a)<r>syate\textsuperscript{162} sa eva teṣām atma-grāvho bhavet | satvagrāho ji(v)\textsubscript{a}(g)\textsubscript{a}(r)ā(h)<ah\textsuperscript{163} pudgala-grā)ho bhavet | sav2ced\textsuperscript{64} <a>dharma\textsubscript{sa}m\textsubscript{j}ñā\textsubscript{a}\textsuperscript{165} pravarteta sa eva teṣā(m) atma-grāḥ)ho bhavet | satvagrāvho jiva-grāvaha pudgalagraha iti (\textsubscript{a}) (at) ka\textsubscript{a} sya hetoh \textsubscript{<>} na khalu puna\textsubscript{<>} v4 subhūte\textsubscript{166} dharmogradhatavayo nādhahma\textsubscript{<>} \textsubscript{<>} tasmād (\textsubscript{i})\textsubscript{d}a(m) samādhāya tathāgatena v5 bhāṣītām\textsubscript{167} klopamām dharmaparyāyaṁ ajānaddhiḥ dharmahḥ eva prahātavyāḥ prāg evādharmaḥ\textsubscript{168} ||

\textbf{§7; folio 31v6–32v1 (Cz 32.6–33.2)}

punar aparāṁ bhagavān āyuṣmāntam subhūtim etad avocat\textsuperscript{169} | tat ki<\textsubscript{m}> 32r1 manyase subhūte kācit\textsubscript{170} tathāgatenaśuttarā\textsubscript{m} samyakṣambodhir\textsubscript{171} abhisambuddhā\textsubscript{172} kaścir\textsubscript{2d} vā dharmās tathāgataν deśītah || subhūtir āha\textsubscript{173} | yathāham bhagavan bhagavato v3 bhāṣītasyārtham ajānāmī nāsti sa kaścid dha(r)m(o) ya) tathāgatenaśuttarā\textsubscript{m} r4 samyakṣambodhir\textsubscript{174} abhisambuddhā\textsubscript{175} nāsti sa kaścid\textsubscript{76} dharman y(\textsubscript{a}) atah\textsubscript{g}(at)ena deśītah \textsubscript{<>} tarṣt kasya hetoh \textsubscript{<>} yo 'sau tathāgataṁ dhamno\textsubscript{177} deśīt(ā)\textsubscript{178} | agrāhyah\textsubscript{s}o \textsubscript{<>} nabhilapyah\textsubscript{179} \textsubscript{<>} v1 na sa dharma nādharnāḥ \textsubscript{<>} tat kasya hetoh \textsubscript{<>} asaṁkṛtāpabhāvīta\textsubscript{180} hy āryapudgalāh \textsubscript{<>}

\textbf{§8; folio 32v1–34r1 (Cz 33.3–26)}

\textsuperscript{181}tat kiṁ māvnyase subhūte ya\textsubscript{182} imām\textsubscript{183} tṛṣāhasramahāmahāsahasrām(ā)m\textsubscript{184} lokadhātuṁ saptaratnapratipūvān\textsubscript{185} kṛtvā\textsubscript{186} dānaṁ dadyāt | tat kiṁ manyase subhūte\textsubscript{187} api nu sa kulaputro vā kulaṁduhuṁ

\textsuperscript{162} M, Cz: pravartetā.
\textsuperscript{163} S appears to have read: jīvāgrāhah.
\textsuperscript{164} S reads: sacad.
\textsuperscript{165} S reads: dharmasamāṁ, as do Ch & T according to M. Frag d begins here with + \{dh\}(a)m(a)samjñā.
\textsuperscript{166} M, Cz add: bodhisattvemahāsattvem. Frag d, although much text is lost, appears to diverge markedly: // {ho} bhavet\textsuperscript{*} : yataḥ na dharman udgrhiḥ. In view of the number of aksaras missing (approx. 24–29), it may originally have read: s(a eva) teṣām atma-grāvho bhavet\textsuperscript{sat} satvagrāvho jiva-grāvah pudgalagrā)ho bhavet\textsuperscript{yataḥ na dharman udgrahī}(avyā nādhāṁ).
\textsuperscript{167} M, Cz: iyaṁ tathāgatena samādhāya vāg bhāṣītā for idam samādhāya tathāgatena bhāṣītām (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.
\textsuperscript{168} M, Cz add: iti. Frag d missing.
\textsuperscript{169} The number of missing aksaras in Frag d make it likely that it did not contain this sentence.
\textsuperscript{170} M, Cz: asti sa kaścid dharma yas for kācit. Frag d missing.
\textsuperscript{171} M, Cz add: ity (but M notes that Ch, J & T lack this).
\textsuperscript{172} M, Cz: abhisambuddhā (to agree with kaścid dharmo, but M notes that J also reads abhisambuddhā). Frag d missing.
\textsuperscript{173} M, Cz: evam utkā ayuṣmāṃ subhūtir bhagavantam etad avocat for subhūtir āha. Frag d missing.
\textsuperscript{174} M, Cz add: ity (M notes that J lacks this). Frag d reads with S.
\textsuperscript{175} M, Cz: abhisambuddhā. It is not clear whether S should be emended to this as well. Frag d with S: abhisambuddhā.
\textsuperscript{176} M, Cz omit: sa kaścid. Frag d reads with S.
\textsuperscript{177} M, Cz add: bhīsamuddho. Frag d reads with S.
\textsuperscript{178} M, Cz: deśito vā. Frag d (deśita agrāhyah) supports our reconstruction of S, in which what can be seen of the missing aksaras renders deśito impossible.
\textsuperscript{179} Frag d: agrāhyah sav anabhilā.
\textsuperscript{180} S reads: asaṁkṛtāpahāviṁ. This scribal error is accounted for by the close resemblance of the aksaras pra and thā.
\textsuperscript{181} M, Cz add: bhagavān āha. Frag d reads with S.
\textsuperscript{182} Frag d breaks off here.
\textsuperscript{183} Cz: yaḥ kaścit kulaputro vā kuladuḥīvemām for ya imām.
\textsuperscript{184} M, Cz: tṛṣāhasram. Hereafter this orthographical variant not noted. M, Cz: "mahāsahasram. Reconstructed as feminine in S on the basis of 33r4.
\textsuperscript{185} M, Cz: "paripūrṇaṁ.
vā tatonidānaṁ bahuṁ 188 punyam 189 prasunuyāt | subhūtīr āha | bahu bhagavavṣn bahu sugata | 190 sa kulaputro vā kuladuhiṭā vā tatonidānaṁ bahuṁ 191 punyam 192 (pra)33r1sunuyāt 193 <> tat kasya hetoh <> sa eva bhagavann askandhaḥ 194 <> (tas)mun(ā) tathāgarto bhāṣate punyaskandhaḥ askandhaḥ 195 iti {bhagavan} bhagavān āha | yaś ca r3 khalu puṇaḥ subhūte kulaputro vā kuladuhiṭā vā imāṁ r4 tṛṣāhasrāmahāsāhasrām 196 lokadhātuṁ saptaratnapratipiṭukṣanām 197 kṛtvā 198 dānam dad<y>āt 199 | yaś ceto dharmaparyāyad amtaśaś ca tathāgato yad bhagavan 200 api gāthāṁ udgrhyā parebhyo 201 desayet samparkāśayed ayāvāṁ eva tatonidānaṁ bahuṭaram punyam 202 prasunuyāt | aprameyam asamśkhyeyām <> tat kasya hetoh <> ato nirjātā hi subhūte tathāgatavānām 203 anuttarāṁ sāmyaksambodhiḥ <> ato nirjātāḥ ca buddhāḥ bhagavaḥ<ś>taḥ <> v5 tat kasmād dhetoḥ 204 <> buddhādbharmāḥ buddhādbharmāḥ iti subhūte abuddhādbharmāḥ34r1ś caiva te 205|

§9a; folio 34r1–5 (Cz 33.26–34.11)
tat kim manyase subhūte | api nu srotāpannaśya evam bhavati r2 mayā srotāpattiphalam prāptam iti | subhūtīr āha | no hidam bhagavān206 <> bhagavān āha207 | tat kasya hetoh <> na hi sa bhagavan kimcid208 āpanna<ḥ> | tenocystate srotāpanna iti na rūpam āpanno na śabdā<ṃ> na gandha<ṃ> na rasāṛṣṇa na sprāṣṭavyān na209 dharmān āpannah <> tenocystate210 srotāpanna iti211 |

§9b; folio 34v1–35r1 (Cz 34.12–18)
v1 bhagavān āha | tat kim manyase subhūte api nu sakṛdgaṁiner <v2 evam bhaven212 mayā sakṛdā-

---

188 M, Cz add: tathāgatābhyo 'rhadbhyyāḥ sāmyaksambuddhebhyyāḥ.
189 M, Cz omit: tat kim manyase subhūte.
188 Cz: bahuṭaram (citing reading of Ch & T reported by M).
190 M, Cz: punyaskamdhāṃ.
190 Visarga is used as punctuation after sugata in §§8, 10c, 11 and 14a.
191 M, Cz omit: bahu.
192 M, Cz: punyaskamdhāṃ.
193 S reads: prasunuyah.
194 M, Cz: yo 'sau bhagavan punyaskamdhās tathāgatena bhāṣitah askamdhah sa tathāgatena bhāṣitah for sa eva bhagavann askandhaḥ.
195 M, Cz: punyaskamdhā for askandha.
196 M, Cz: imāṁ trisāhasrāmahāsāhasrām.
197 M, Cz: 'paripūrṇam.
198 M, Cz: tathāgatēbhyyāḥ 'rhadbhyyāḥ sāmyaksambuddhebhyyāḥ.
199 M, Cz: dadāyāt.
201 M, Cz add: vistareṇa.
202 M, Cz: punyaskamdhāṃ.
203 M, Cz add: arhatāṁ sāmyaksambuddhānām.
204 M, Cz: tat kasya hetoh.
205 M, Cz: tathāgatena bhāṣitah tenocystate buddhādbharmā iti.
206 M, Cz add: na srotaāpannasyaivam bhavati mayā srotaāpattiphalam prāptam iti.
207 M, Cz omit: bhagavān āha.
208 M, Cz: kimcid dharmar for kimcid.
209 M omits: na.
210 S reads: tenocystate.
211 M, Cz add: saced bhagavan srotaāpennasyaivam bhaven mayā srotaāpattiphalam prāptam iti sa eva tasyātmagrāho bhavet sattvagrāho jīvagrāhah pudgalaagrāhah bhaved iti.
212 M, Cz: bhavati for bhaven.
gāmiphalam prāptam iti | subhūtir āha | no hīvdāṃ bhagavan <> bhagavān āha | tat kasya hetoh<sup>213</sup> <> na sakṛdāgāmīvahno evam bhavati<sup>214</sup> mayā sakṛdāgāmiphalam prāptam iti | tat kasmāv<sup>215</sup>d dheho | na hi sa kaścid dharmah yah sakṛdāgāmitvam āpannah <> te35r1(noc)jy(ate sak)ṛdāgāmiti |

§9c; folio 35r1–4 (Cz 34.19–25)
bhagavān āha | tat kīṃ manyase subhūte ar2pi ny anāgāmina {||} evam bhavati mayā anāgāmiphalam prāptam iti<sup>216</sup> <> r3 tat kasya hetoh <> na sa<sup>217</sup> kaścid dharmah yo ’nāgāmiti | samanupāsyati<sup>218</sup> | tenor4cyate anāgāmiti |

§9d; folio 35r4–v2 (Cz 34.26–35.6)
bhagavān āha | tat kīṃ manyase subhūte | api ny<sup>219</sup> arha{m}r5to evam bhavati mayārhatvam prāptam iti | subhūtir āha | no hidam bhagavan<sup>220</sup> | tat kar6(sya h)er(t(o(h)) <> (na) hi bhagavan sa<sup>221</sup> kaścid dharmo yo ’rhan nāmah<sup>222</sup> <> {ya}<sup>223</sup> saced bhagavann arha1(ta evam bha)v(en) m(ayārha)-tv(am p)r(tā)pam iti | sa eva tasyātmagrahō bhavet | satvagrāho j(iv2va)grāhah pudgalagraho bhavet |

§9e; folio 35v2–36r1 (Cz 35.6–14)
ahaṃ<sup>224</sup> asmi{n} bhagavan || tathāgatenārhatā samayaksambuddhāraṇāvihārinām<sup>225</sup> agryo nir-diṣṭah <> ahaṃ asmi{n} bhagavann arhan vigata-rāgah<sup>226</sup> <> na ca me bhagavann evam bhavati a{r}ham asmi{na} arhan<sup>227</sup> iti | sacen mama bhagavāsviṃ evam bhaven mayārhatvam prāptam iti | na me tathāgato vyākarisayati<sup>228</sup> | aranāv<sup>26</sup>(v)i(ḥ)i(r)i(nām<sup>229</sup>)a)agrya iti<sup>230</sup> subhūtī(ḥ) | kulaputro na kvacid viharati | 36r1tenocye | aranāvihāriti aranāvihāriti<sup>231</sup> |

§10a; folio 36r1–4 (Cz 35.15–20)
bhagavān āha | tat kīṃ manyase<sup>232</sup>r2 subhūte | kaścid<sup>233</sup> dharmas<sup>234</sup> tathāgatena dipamkarāt tathāgatā<sup>235</sup> udghrihatḥ <> subhūtir āha | no hidam bhagavan <> bhagavān

<sup>213</sup>S reads: tat kasye hatoh. M, Cz omit: bhagavān āha tat kasya hetoh.
<sup>214</sup>S reads: bhaviitī.
<sup>215</sup>M, Cz: tat kasya hetoh.
<sup>216</sup>M, Cz add: subhūtir āha no hidam 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 ’nāgāmiti / samanupāsyati.
<sup>219</sup>S reads: tv.
<sup>220</sup>M, Cz add: nārha evam bhavati mayārhatvam prāptam iti aifter bhagovan.
<sup>221</sup>M, Cz: sa bhagavan for bhagavan sa.
<sup>222</sup>M, Cz add: tenocyate ’rhan iti.
<sup>223</sup>It is not clear why the scribe has written ya here.
<sup>224</sup>M, Cz: aranāvihārinām.
<sup>225</sup>M, Cz: vitarāgah.
<sup>226</sup>S reads arhān. M, Cz: arhan asmy ahaṃ vitarāga for aham asmi arhann.
<sup>227</sup>M, Cz: na māṃ tathāgato vyākarisyad for na me tathāgato vyākarisayati.
<sup>228</sup>M, Cz: aranāvihārinām.
<sup>229</sup>M, Cz omit: iti.
<sup>230</sup>M, Cz: ’aranāvihāryarāṇāvihāriti. Note that here S writes arana<sup>29</sup>a where previously it had arana<sup>20</sup>.a
<sup>231</sup>S reads: manyasya.
<sup>232</sup>M, Cz: asti sa kaścid.
<sup>233</sup>S reads: dharmat. M, Cz: dharmo yas.
<sup>234</sup>M, Cz: dipamkarasya tathāgatasāyāhatah samyaksambuddhāsyāmtikād for dipamkarāt tathāgatā<sup>235</sup>d a>rhata<h>
āhā<sup>236</sup> | na<sup>237</sup> sa kaścid dharmah<sup>238</sup> rā tathāgatena dipamkarat tathāgatād arhataḥ samyaksambuddhād<sup>239</sup> udghītah <\>

§10b; folio 36r4–v2 (Cz 35.21–25; P 180.17)
bhagavān<sup>5</sup> āhā | ya-ḥ<sup>6</sup> kaścit subhūte bodhisatvavo evam vaded aham kṣetrvyūhāṃ nispādayisyā- mītār<sup>7</sup> sa vitatha<sup>m</sup> vadet | tat kasya hetoh <\> kṣetrvyūhāḥ<sup>8</sup> kṣetrvyūhāḥ iti subhūte avyūhā hy ete<sup>9</sup> tathāgatena bhāṣītāḥ<sup>10</sup> | tenocyānte kṣetrvyūhāḥ ivt<sup>11</sup> <\>

§10c; folio 36v2–37r3 (Cz 35.25–36.12; P 180.17–181.1)
tasmāt tarhi subhūte bodhisatvena evam cittam utpādayitavyam apratīṣṭhitam <\> na rūpa- vā apratīṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyam | na śabdagandharasprasātryadharapratīṣṭhitām cittam utpādayitavyam | na kvacitiaprātiṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyam<sup>12</sup> | tad yathā(p)<sup>i</sup> vā nāma subhūte puruṣo bhavet<sup>13</sup> | yasyaivaṃrūpa<sup>14</sup> ātimabhāvah syāt tad yathāpi (nāma su)vēmeruḥ<sup>15</sup> parvatarāja<sup>16</sup> | tat ki<sup>n</sup> manyase su37r1bhūte<sup>17</sup> mahān sa ātimabhāvo bhavet | subhūtur āhā | mahaṅ<sup>20</sup> bhagavan mahā<sup>n</sup> sugata | (sa ā)2timabhāvo bhavet<sup>19</sup> bhagavan<sup>20</sup> | tat kasya hetoh<sup>21</sup> <\> abhāvah sa tathāgatena bhāṣītah <\> tenorecye<sup>24</sup> ātimabhāva iti | na hi<sup>25</sup> sa bhāvah<sup>26</sup> <\> tenocyate ātimabhāva iti ||

---

**samyaksambuddhād.**

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

<sup>237</sup> M, Cz: nāsti.

<sup>238</sup> M, Cz: dharmo yas.

<sup>239</sup> M, Cz: dipamkarasya tathāgatyārhatāh samyaksambuddhasyāmitkād for dipamkarat tathāgatād arhataḥ samyaksambuddhād.

<sup>240</sup> S reads: nispādayisyāmiti.

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

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

<sup>243</sup> P: tad ucyate kṣetrvyūhāḥ iti.

<sup>244</sup> For this section the wording in M, Cz runs: tasmāt tarhi subhūte bodhisattvena mahāsattvenaivaṃ apratīṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyam yan na kvacitiaprātiṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyam na rūpaapratīṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyam na śabdagandharasprasātryadharapratīṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyam. Pargiter reconstructs P as: tasmā (subhūte bodhisattvenaivaṃ pratīṣṭhitam cittam utpādayitavyam na śabdajgandharasprasātryapratīṣṭhitam 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: upetakāyu mahākāyo yat. There is a gap of about 10 akṣaras in P, up to the word (ā)ātimbhāva, 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: tasyaivasrūpa.

<sup>247</sup> S reads: (su)meroḥ. Cz: sumeruḥ. P: sumeru-.

<sup>248</sup> M: parvatarājaḥ.

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

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

<sup>251</sup> P apparently omits: subhūtur āhā | mahān bhagavan mahān sugata sa ātimbhāvo 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: ātimbhāva ātimbhāva iti bhagavan. Like S, P and Tib. omit these words.

<sup>254</sup> S reads: tenocyate; 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: nātimbhāvah.
§11; folio 37r3–38r2 (Cz 36.13–37.10; P 181.1–13)
bhagavân āha | tar# kim manyase subhûte\textsuperscript{257} yâvamtyos\textsuperscript{258} gamgânadyâm\textsuperscript{259} vâlukâs tâmântyas\textsuperscript{260} eva(m)\textsuperscript{261} gamgânadyo bhar\textsuperscript{262} veyuh \textlangle>\textrangle\textsuperscript{263} api nu tâsu bahvyo vâlukâ bhaveyuh \textlangle>\textrangle\textsuperscript{264} subhûtir\textsuperscript{265} āha | tâ eva tâvad\textsuperscript{266} bhagavan bar\textsuperscript{267} hgyvo\textsuperscript{268} gamgânadyo bhaveyuh prâg eva yâs tâsu\textsuperscript{269} vâlukâh \textlangle>\textrangle\textsuperscript{270} bhagavân āha \textsuperscript{271} àrocayâmi\textsuperscript{272} v1 te subhûte prativedayâmi\textsuperscript{273} te yâvamtyas\textsuperscript{274} tâsu gamgânadiânu vâlukâ bhaveyuh\textsuperscript{275} tâvam\textsuperscript{276} v2yô lokadhâtavâh\textsuperscript{277} kâscid eva\textsuperscript{278} stri vâ puruśo vâ\textsuperscript{279} saptaratnapratipūrnam\textsuperscript{280} krtvâ tathâ\textsuperscript{281} 3gatebhyo ‘rhadbhyaḥ samyaksambuddhebhyo dânam dadyât | tat kim manyase subhûte \textlangle>\textrangle\textsuperscript{282} api nu sâ v4 stri vâ puruśo vâ tatonidânâm bhau punyam\textsuperscript{283} prasunuyât | subhûtir\textsuperscript{284} āha | bahu bhagavâsvan bahu sugata\textsuperscript{285} sâ v28 stri vâ puruśo vâ v281 tatonidânâm bhau punyam\textsuperscript{286} prasunuyât\textsuperscript{287} bhagavân\textsuperscript{288} āha | yâs ca khalu punah subhûte\textsuperscript{289} tâvamtyo lokadhâtavâh\textsuperscript{290} saptaratnapratipūrnam\textsuperscript{291} krtvâ\textsuperscript{292} dânam dadyât | yâs cet\textsuperscript{293} dharmaparyâyâd antâsas\textsuperscript{294} catu-

\textsuperscript{257} P apparently omits: bhagavân āha \textlangle>\textrangle\textsuperscript{258} t kim manyase subhûte (but see note below).
\textsuperscript{258} M, Cz: yâvatyo; P: (yâvanto hi) subhûte.
\textsuperscript{259} M, Cz: gamgâyam mahânâdyâm; P: gamgâyâ (nadyâ).
\textsuperscript{260} M, Cz: tâvata; P: tâvanto.
\textsuperscript{261} P omits: eva.
\textsuperscript{262} P inserts: tat kim manyase subhûte.
\textsuperscript{263} M, Cz: tâsu yâ vâlukâ api nu tâ bahvyo (Cz: bahvyo) bhaveyuh; P: api nu tâ bahvyo bhaveyuh for api nu tâsu bahvyo vâlukâ bhavvyuh.
\textsuperscript{264} P omits: subhûtir.
\textsuperscript{265} P: taceva tâva for tâ eva tâvad.
\textsuperscript{266} Cz: bahavyo.
\textsuperscript{267} M, Cz insert: gamgânadiṣyu; P: tatra for yâs tâsu.
\textsuperscript{268} P omits: bhagavân āha.
\textsuperscript{269} S reads: àrocayâmi. Frag e begins here.
\textsuperscript{270} S reads: prativedhayâmi. Frag e: prave.
\textsuperscript{271} M, Cz: yâvatyo; lacuna in P here. Frag e has a completely different wording: \textlangle>(t)atra gamgânadivâlukâsamâsu gamgânad. + \rangle\rangle
\textsuperscript{272} P apparently omits: bhaveyuh. There seems to be insufficient space in Frag e for it too.
\textsuperscript{273} S reads: lokadhâtavâh; M, Cz: tâvato lokadhâtan; P: tâvato lokadhâtura (?); Frag e: kadadhâum.
\textsuperscript{274} P apparently omits: eva.
\textsuperscript{275} Frag e: kâscid eva kulaiputro vâ kuladuhitâ vâ.
\textsuperscript{276} M, Cz: “paripūrnam for “pratipūrnam; Frag e also supports pari”, but number of missing aksaras at the end of line (approx. 8) suggests it may have read: saptaratnaparipūrnam dânam dadyât / (ta)tonidânam. Long lacuna in P, ending at āha.
\textsuperscript{277} M, Cz: punyaskandham for punyam. Frag e (punyâ) probably read with M, Cz. Cf. Tib.: bsod nams. Lacuna in P.
\textsuperscript{278} P omits: subhûtir. Frag e reads with S, M, Cz.
\textsuperscript{279} P, Frag e: evam bhagavam bahu for bahu bhagavan bahu sugata.
\textsuperscript{280} M, Cz omit: sâ; P, Frag e: sa.
\textsuperscript{281} P: kulaiputro vâ kuladuhitâ vâ; Frag e: ku(la) // (duhi)\rangle\textlangle>\textrangle\textlangle vâ.
\textsuperscript{282} M, Cz: punyaskandham for bahu punyam. Frag e: puny(a), so probably read with M, Cz. Cf. Tib.: bsod nams.
\textsuperscript{283} S reads: prasunuyâda (perhaps because the scribe was about to continue with (apremeyam asamkhheyam, but caught himself in time). M, Cz: prasunuyâd aprameyam asamkhheyam for prasunuyât. That this amplification is a mistake is suggested both by the 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 punyaskandham prasaveta bhagavân āha yâs ca ho punah.
\textsuperscript{284} M, Cz add: stri vâ puruśo vâ. P, Frag e read with S.
\textsuperscript{285} M, Cz: tâvato lokadhâtan; P: tâtâvat lokadhâtum; Frag e: tâvantam lokadhâ(tum).
\textsuperscript{286} M, Cz: P: “paripūrnam for “pratipūrnam. Frag e missing.
\textsuperscript{287} P, Frag e omit krtvâ; M, Cz add: tathâgatâbhyaḥ ‘rhadbhyaḥ samyaksambuddhebhya.
\textsuperscript{288} M, Cz, P: ca (P adds three aksaras here: subhûte?) kulaiputro vâ kuladuhitâ vâ. Frag e reads with S.
\textsuperscript{289} P has insufficient space for much more than ito here. Missing in Frag e.
§12; folio 38r2–v1 (Cz 37.10–19; P 181.13–182.3)
api r3 tu khalu297 subhûte yasmin prthivipradesê e<ta>d avocât | ko nâmâyam bhagavan dharmparyâyah kavsthâm cainam dhârayâmi | evam ukte bhagavân āyusmântam subhûtim etad avocat | prajñâpâramitâ nâmâyam prthivipradesê subhûte dharmparyâyah evam cainam312 dhâraya313 | tês kasya hetoh <> yaiva314 subhû<te>315 v5 prajñâpâramitâ tathâgatena bhâșitaț | saivâpâramitâ316 |

§13a; folio 38v1–5 (Cz 37.20–38.2; P 182.3–8)
evam uv2kte311 āyusmân subhûtir bhagavaṇṭam e<ta>d avocat | ko nâmâyam bhagavan dharmparyâyah kavsthâm cainam dhârayâmi | evam ukte bhagavân āyusmântam subhûtim etad avocat | prajñâpâramitâ nâmâyam prthivipradesê subhûte dharmparyâyah evam cainam312 dhâraya313 | tês kasya hetoh <> yaiva314 subhû<te>315 v5 prajñâpâramitâ tathâgatena bhâșitaț | saivâpâramitâ316 |

§13b; folio 38v5–39r1 (Cz 38.3–6; P 182.8–10)
tat kiṃ manyate subhûte317 v6 api nu sa318 kaści<ta>d319 dharmo320 tathâgatena bhâșitaț <> subhûtir321

291 P: parasya.
292 M, Cz: add: samprakâśayed; P may have had this too. Missing in Frag e, but probably enough space for des(ayet samprakâśayed ayat), since approximately 8 akṣaras are missing at end of line.
293 M, Cz: add: eva. Frag e: m eva, tena pârvakena.
295 M, Cz: P: punyâkṣamdhâ. Missing in Frag e.
296 P: prasaveta for punyâma pra<sunuyâd apra>meyam asamkhyeyam. Frag e also has prasaveta, apparently reading with P.
297 M, Cz add: punah; P, Frag e omit: khalu.
298 P apparently omits: ito. Missing in Frag e.
299 P apparently omits: antaśas. Frag e has anta ... .
302 P: bhâṣyate; Frag e: bhâṣyate.
304 P: bhâvîṣyatî for bhavet. Frag e reads syati, therefore must have read with P.
305 M, Cz, Frag e: subhûte. Lacuna in P.
306 M, Cz add: sakâlasamâumpya. Lacuna in P, but P probably read with S. Frag e reads with S.
307 M, Cz: add: vâcaśâyantam paryavâsyantam parahyâs ca vistareṇa samprakâśaśyayantâ. Frag e: udgrhniśyan(t)i for dhârârayâyantâ. Lacuna in P, but P probably read with S. Frag e breaks off at this point.
308 M, Cz: add: subhûte; P: add: satvā.
309 M, Cz add: subhûte; P: tasmîm (without ca).
310 M, Cz: vijñâgurâ for guruâ. Lacuna in P would apparently permit vijñâgurâ.
311 M, Cz: aṭha for evam ukte.
312 P: add: kāmâm.
313 P: dhâraya.
314 P: yā ceyam for yaiva.
315 P omits: subhûte.
316 M, Cz: add: tâthâgatena bhâșitaț / tenocayate prajñâpâramitâ. The lacuna in P is probably to be reconstructed (reading with S) as -sita saivâpâramitâ tat ki-, not -sita sā pâramitâ tat ki- as Pargiter has it.
317 S follows subhûte with the akṣaras anu, subsequently deleted by being struck through. The many scribal errors in
āha <> no hidamḥ bhagavan | {bhaga<vā>39r1n āha} | na sa kaścid bhagavan | {d}dharmo yah thātāgaṇe<na> bhāşiḥ ta<h >

§13c; folio 39r1–6 (Cz 38.7–15; G 5a1–2; P 182.10–15)
328 yāvatāḥ subhūte r2 trṣāhasramahāsāhasrayaṁ lokadhātau prthivirajah kaccit tad bahu bhavet | surūbhiṭāḥ āha | bahu bhagavans tat prthivirajo bhavet yat tat bhagavan prthir4 viraṇah tathāgatena bhāṣitah arajah sa tathāgatena bhāṣitah <> | tarṣd ucyate prthiviraja iti | yā sā lokadhātur adhātuh sā tathāgatena bhāṣitah <> <r6 ucyate lokadhātur iti ||

§13d; folio 39r6–v4 (Cz 38.16–24; G 5a2–3; P 182.15–20)
bhagavān āha | t47 tat kim manyase subhūte dvātrīṃśadbhīr māv1(h)āpurusalakṣanaiḥ tathāgato 'rhan samyakṣambuddho draṣṭavya<h> | subhūtir āha | no hi2damḥ bhagavan {bhagavān

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

316 M, Cz: api nāasti sa; P: api nu, for api nu sa.
318 P: kaścit.
320 M, Cz add: yas.
321 P omits: subhūtir.
322 P: no it for no hidam.
323 M, Cz: nāstī sa kaścid; lacuna in P, in which Pargiter reconstructs na kaści for na sa kaścid.
324 M, Cz, P (apparently) omit: bhagavam.
325 P apparently omits: yah.
326 G begins here, on fol. 5r1.
327 M, Cz add: bhagavān āha / tat kim manyase subhūte; G adds: bhagavān āha. P reads with S.
328 M, Cz, P, G: yāvat.
329 M, Cz omits: subhūte. G, P (apparently) have it.
331 S reads: lokadhātu. Emended to lokadhātau in line with M, Cz, P, G.
332 S reads: kaścit. M, Cz, G: kaccit; P: kiṇcit.
333 G: vahu.
334 G omits: bhavet.
335 G, P (apparently) omit: subhūtir.
336 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.
337 M, Cz add: tat kasya hetoh. P and G (originally) read with S.
338 M, Cz: tathāgatena bhāṣitam; P: tathāgatena bhāṣitam; G omits: bhavet / yat tat bhagavan prthivirajah tathāgatena bhāṣitah, suggesting that its recension must originally have read: bahu bhagavan tat prthivirajah bhavet / yat tat prthivirajah arajas tathāgatena bhāṣitah.
340 P apparently omits: tathāgatena.
341 M, Cz, P (apparently): bhāṣitam.
343 M, Cz, G: yo ’py asau ; P: yo so for yā sā.
344 M, Cz add: tathāgatena bhāṣito. G, P omit this phrase with S.
345 M, Cz, G: sa; P: sax.
346 M, Cz, G: tena. P reads with S.
347 P omits: bhagavān āha /.
348 P adds: (api) nu.
349 M, Cz: dvātrīṃśaḥ (as first element of compound); G: dvātrīṃśatā; P: dvātrīṃśar (but elsewhere dvātrīṃśa as first element in compound).
350 G: mahāpurusalakṣanaiḥ.
äha} \(\{\) tat kasya hetoh\(\rangle\) yäni tāni\(\rangle\) bhagavan\(\rangle\) dvātrīṃśanmahāpuruṣa\(\rangle\) alaṃkāřanī\(\rangle\) tathāgatena bhāṣītānī alaṃkāřani\(\rangle\) ta\(\langle\rangle\) gatena bhāṣītānī\(\rangle\) tasmād\(\rangle\) ucyamte dvātrīṃśanmahāpurusālaṃkāřanī|}

\(\text{§13e; folio 39v-40r1 (Cz 39.1-8; G 5a3-5; P 182.20-183.3)}\)

bhagavān aha |\(\) 363 yaś ca khalu\(\rangle\) punaḥ subhūte strī vā pavṛṣuṣo vā\(\rangle\) 365 gamgānadivālukopamānām\(\rangle\) ātmabhāvān paritajjāt\(\rangle\) 367 | yaś ceto dharmaparyāyāc\(\rangle\) 368 catuspādikām\(\rangle\) 369 api gāthām udghṛya parebhyo desayer\(\rangle\) | ayam\(\rangle\) tatonidānam bahutaram\(\rangle\) 372 punyaṃ\(\rangle\) pra\(\langle\rangle\) sunuyā\(\rangle\) apra\(\rangle\) meyam asamākhyaṃ\(\rangle\)

\(\text{§14a; folio 40r1-1v (Cz 39.9-21; G 5a5-5b1; P 183.3-10)}\)

atha khalv\(\rangle\) ayūṣmān subhūtiḥ dharmapraveganiṃśruṇi\(\rangle\) prāmumcat | r2 pravartayāṃ\(\rangle\) so 'śrūṇi parimārjya\(\rangle\) bhagavatam etad avocat | āścaryam bhagavan | paramāścaryam sugata | yāvad ayam dharmaparyāyāḥ tathāgatena\(\rangle\) bhāṣītah\(\rangle\) yato me bharagavan\(\rangle\) jñānam utpannam na maya\(\rangle\) jātv eva\(\rangle\) dharmaparyāyāḥ śrutapūrvvah \(\langle\rangle\) r5 paramena te bhagavan |\(\rangle\) 385 āścaryena\(\rangle\)

\(35\text{G omits:'}\) ṛhan samyaksambuddho.\(\rangle\)
\(35\text{G, P omit: subhūtir.}\)
\(35\text{G: no; P: no it for no hidam.}\)
\(35\text{S reads: bhagavad (because of the following bhagavān aha). M, Cz add: na dvātrīṃśanmahāpurusālaṃkāṛnaṃ tathāgato '}\) ṛhan samyaksambuddho draṣṭavyah. Lucana in P insufficient for this addition.
\(35\text{Cz, G, P omit: bhagavān aha.}\)
\(35\text{S reads: hatoḥ.}\)
\(35\text{G: tāni tāni; M, Cz: yāni hi tāni, for yāni tāni. P: (yāni) tāni.}\)
\(35\text{G, P omit: bhagavān.}\)
\(35\text{S reads: dvātrīṃśarō.}\)
\(35\text{M, Cz add: tāni bhagavams; P adds: tāni.}\)
\(35\text{G omits: tathāgatena bhāṣītānī.}\)
\(35\text{M, Cz, G: tena for tasmād. Lucana in P.}\)
\(35\text{P: bhagavān āha \(\langle\rangle\).}\)
\(35\text{P: ho for khalu.}\)
\(35\text{M, Cz add: dine dīne.}\)
\(35\text{G: 'bālukopamān; M, Cz: 'vālukāsamān; P: 'vālikā(śamān?).'}}\)
\(35\text{M, Cz add: evan parityajjān gamgānadivālukopamān kalpāṇs tān ātmabhāvān parityajjā. Lucana in P, G reads with S.}\)
\(35\text{M, Cz, G add antasaṃ after dharmaparyāyād (P: dharmaparyāyā).}\)
\(35\text{M, Cz: catuspadikām; P: catuspadikām. G: catuspadikām with S.}\)
\(35\text{M, Cz add: samprakāśayad. Lucana in P, G reads with S.}\)
\(35\text{M, Cz, G add: eva. Lucana in P, Pargiter reconstructs: ayam eva tata bahutaram, etc.}\)
\(35\text{G: bahu for bahutaram.}\)
\(35\text{M, Cz, P (reconstructed): punyaskandham.}\)
\(35\text{G: prasaveta; P: (prasave) for prasunuyād.}\)
\(35\text{P omits: aprameyam asamākhyaṃ. In S the restored syllables sunuyād apra have clearly been lost as a result of the jump from the end of one folio (39) to the beginning of the next (40).}\)
\(35\text{P omits: khalv.}\)
\(35\text{M, Cz, P: 'vegeṇā' for 'pravegeṇā; G: 'pravegeṇā nos.}\)
\(35\text{M, Cz, G, P (reconstructed) omit: pravartayam.}\)
\(35\text{S reads: parimārjya; M, Cz, P (reconstructed): pramārjya; G: pramārjya for parimārjya.}\)
\(35\text{P: tathāgatena dharmaparyāyaḥ tathāgatena.}\)
\(35\text{M, Cz add (after bhāṣīto): 'grayānasamprasthitānāṃ sattvānāṃ arthāya śreṣṭhayānāsamprasthitānām arthāya.}\)
\(35\text{P (reconstructed) omits: bhagavan.}\)
\(35\text{M, Cz add: bhagavaṇ; G: me for mayā.}\)
samanvāgataḥ bhaviṣyamītī ya iva sūtre bhāṣyamānē bhūtasa(m)jñām upādayīṣyaṃti <\> yā caisaḥ bhagavan | bhūtasaṃjñā saiva vīsamjñā tasmā<\> tathāgato bhāṣate bhūtasaṃjñā bhūtasaṃjñeti |

§ 14b: folio 40v1–4 (Cz 40.1–8; G 5b1–2; P 183.10–16) 
na mamaḥ bhagavann āścaryamāṇyā yad avāham dharmaparyāyaṃ bhāṣyamāṇam avakalpayāmy adhimucyām | ye<\> te bhagavann imaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ udgrhiṣyaṃti paryāvāpsyantī dhāraṇiṣyaṃti | te paramāścaryasamavānvāgataḥ bhaviṣyaṃti |

§ 14c: folio 40v4–41r1 (Cz 40.9–15; G 5b2–3; P 183.16–184.3) 
api tu khalu puṇaḥ bhagavan na teṣām atmasamjñā vā pravartasyate na satvasamjñā na jivasamjñā | na pudgalasamjñā pravartasyate | tat kasya hetō<\> yāsatvasamjñā jivasamjñā pudgalasamjñā saivāsaṃjñā | tat ka41r1sya hetō <\> sarvasamjñāhāpagātē hi buddhā bhagavaṇaṃ <\> h ||

384 M, Cz: evamrūpo; G: ayaṃ for eva. Lacuna in P, Pargiter reconstructs na ma(ya evamrūpo dharmaparyāyaḥ), but na ma(ya jātv eva dharmaparyāyaḥ) is equally possible.
385 P omits: bhagavan.
386 P: satvāścaryena for āścaryena.
387 M, Cz add: bodhisattvā.
388 M, Cz add: śrutvā.
389 M, Cz add: tat kasya hetoh.
390 P: yaisā for yā caisa.
391 M, Cz: saivābhūtasaṃjñā for saivāsaṃjñā. G, P read with S.
392 P: tasmā.
393 G: me.
394 P: daskaraṃ. This reading adopted by Cz, contra M and G, which read āścaryam with S.
395 M: yadāham imaṃ; Cz, P, G: yad aham imaṃ.
396 P inserts: nu.
397 M, Cz: adhimucyē; G: adhimucyā; P: a[ty a]dhimucyāṃ for adhimucyāmi.
398 M, Cz: ye ī. Lacuna in P.
399 G inserts: satvā; M, Cz insert: sattvā bhaviṣyanty anāgataḥ dhvaṇi paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimāyāṃ paṇcāsaṭayaṃ saddharmavipraloke vartamāne ya; lacuna in P, ending with the word paṇcāsaṭayāṃ, suggesting similarity to M, Cz.
400 M, Cz: adhibhāṣyantī dhārasyantī vācayānti paryavāpsyantī paryubhavaḥ ca vistarena samprakāṣayānti; G: udgrahisyantī yāvat paryāvāpsyantī for udgrhiṣyantī paryāvāpsyantī dhārasyantī. P has several lacunae, but may possibly be reconstructed: avakalpayāntī adhi(mucyē)nyantī vistajena (ca parasya samprakāṣayatī). It.
401 M, Cz: paramāścaryena samanvāgataḥ. G, P read with S.
402 P: ho.
403 P: subhāte for bhagavan.
404 S reads: meṣām.
405 M, Cz: pravartisyate; P: pravartisyati. G: pravartisyate with S.
406 P inserts: pravartisyati.
407 M, Cz: pravartisyate; P: pravartisyati; G omits.
408 M, Cz add: nāpi teṣām kācita samjñā nāsaṃjñā pravartate.
409 S reads: hato.
410 M, Cz: ya sā (Cz: sa) bhagavann; P: ya sā for ya asau.
412 G omits: tat kasya hetoh | yāsvāv (or yā sā) atmasamjñā saivāsamjñā / yā satvasamjñā jivasamjñā pudgalasamjñā saivāsamjñā.
§14d; folio 41r1–v1 (Cz 40.16–41.4; G 5b3–5; P 184.4–9)
evan ukte bhagavān āryuṣmāntam subhūtim etad avocat\textsuperscript{414} | evam etat subhūte evam etat\textsuperscript{415} subhūte\textsuperscript{416} r paramā<sca>ryasananyāgatās te satvā\textsuperscript{417} bhaviṣyamānti | ya iha\textsuperscript{418} sūtre bhāṣyamār<m>nā\textsuperscript{419} śrutvā\textsuperscript{420} not\textsuperscript{<t>} rasiṣyamānti | na samtriṣyamānti | <na> samtrāsam āpatsyamānt\textsuperscript{421} not| tarṣṭ kasya hetoh
{| paramapāramiteyaṃ subhūte tathāgatena bhāṣītā\textsuperscript{422} not| ya<ṃ> ca\textsuperscript{423} rō tathāgataḥ paramapāramitāṃ bhāṣate\textsuperscript{424} tāṃ aparimāṃnā\textsuperscript{425} buddhā bhañgavāmto bhāṣamte | te nocýate paramapāramitēti\textsuperscript{426}

§14e; folio 41v1–42v3 (Cz 41.5–42.5; G 5b5–7; P 184.10–185.4)
api tu Khalu punah\textsuperscript{427} subhūvṛte ya\textsuperscript{428} tathāgatasya kṣaṃtipāramitā saivāpāramitā not| tat kasya hetoh\textsuperscript{429} not| yadā v3 me\textsuperscript{430} subhūte\textsuperscript{431} kalimgarājā\textsuperscript{432} angapratyamgāny\textsuperscript{433} a(ch)etsin\textsuperscript{434} nāsin me\textsuperscript{435} tasmin saṃavāye ātmasamjñā vā satvasamjñā vā jīvasamjñā vā pudgalasamjñā\textsuperscript{426} vā na\textsuperscript{437} me kāt\textsuperscript{438} saṃjñā nāsamjñā\textsuperscript{439} babhuva not| tat kasya hetoh not| sacet subhūte mama\textsuperscript{440} tasmin savēmāte ātmasamjñābhañvīṣyat \textsuperscript{|414} d vyāpādasamjñāpi\textsuperscript{442} me ‘bhaviṣyat {}} tasmin sañ\textsuperscript{421}rImaye\textsuperscript{443}

\textsuperscript{414} G: bhagavān āha for evam ukte bhagavān āryuṣmāntam subhūtim etad avocat.
\textsuperscript{415} P: eta.
\textsuperscript{416} M, Cz omit: subhūte. G omits this second evam etat subhūte.
\textsuperscript{417} G omits: satvā. Lacuna in P.
\textsuperscript{418} M, Cz insert: subhūte.
\textsuperscript{419} G: imam dharmaṇaparyaṇaṃ for iha sūtre bhāṣyamāne.
\textsuperscript{420} M, Cz, P omit: śrutvā. G has it.
\textsuperscript{421} P: āpatsyamānt.
\textsuperscript{422} M, Cz add: yadutāpāramitā (but M notes that J omits this). This extra phrase does not appear in G, P, or Tib. either.
\textsuperscript{423} M, Cz insert: subhūte.
\textsuperscript{424} P: yā tathāgatena parama(pāramitā bhāṣītā) for yām ca tathāgataḥ paramapāramitāṃ bhāṣate.
\textsuperscript{425} M, Cz add: api.
\textsuperscript{426} As Pargiter notes, the lacuna in P is too short to contain all the words tāṃ aparimāṃnā buddhā bhañgavāmto bhāṣamte / tenocýate paramapāramitēti.
\textsuperscript{427} P omits: Khalu punah.
\textsuperscript{428} G: ya.
\textsuperscript{429} S reads: hatoḥ.
\textsuperscript{430} G omits: me.
\textsuperscript{431} P omits: subhūte.
\textsuperscript{432} G: kāli" for kalimgā. P’s (kālimgarājā is mostly reconstruction.
\textsuperscript{433} M, Cz, G, P (reconstructed): angapratyamgāmsāny for angapratyangāny.
\textsuperscript{434} M, Cz, G: acchaitisit; P: (acchaitis) for achcetsin.
\textsuperscript{435} P: nāśī me. M, Cz omit: nāśīn me. G reads with S.
\textsuperscript{436} P: satvajīvapudgalasamjñā for satvasamjñā vā jīvasamjñā vā pudgalasamjñā.
\textsuperscript{437} M, Cz add: api. A significant omission in G begins here (see below).
\textsuperscript{438} P: kāci.
\textsuperscript{439} M, Cz: vāsāmija vā for nāsāmija. P reads with S.
\textsuperscript{440} M, Cz, P: sacen me subhūte for sacet subhūte mama.
\textsuperscript{441} G omits: na me kāci samjñā nāsāmija babhuva tat kasya hetoh sacet subhūte mama tasmin samaye ātmasamjñābhañvīṣyat (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 BHS 31.38–40), there is no reason why S should be read differently from the other witnesses in this regard. Here M, Cz, P: ātmasamjñābhañvīṣyad (C writes: ātma-samjñā-abhaviṣyad).
\textsuperscript{442} P omits: api. G: vyāpādasamjñā vāpi.
\textsuperscript{443} M, Cz, P, G: me tasmin samaye ‘bhaviṣyat for me ‘bhaviṣyat tasmin samaye. M, Cz add: sacet sattvāsambhāsaṃjñā / pudgalasamjñābhaviṣyad vyāpādasamjñāpi me tasmin samaye ‘bhaviṣyat / tat kasya heṭoh; P (partly reconstructed) adds: (sacet sattvājīva)samjñā / pudgalasamjñābhaviṣyad(t* vyā)pādasamjñā me tasmin samaye
abiṃjāmyā yāh subhute atite dhvanī panca jātiṣṭāni yad ar̥ham kṣāmtivādi risir abhū tadāpi me nāmaṣaṁjñā babhūvā na satvasaṁjñā rā na jivaṁsaṁjñā na pugdaḥsaṁjñā tasmāt tarhi subhute bodhisatvena mahāsaṁjñā cittam utpādaṁśiḥitam cittam utpādaṁśitvam na rūpapratisṭhitaṁ cittam utpādaṁśiḥitam na saṅgadgaṁḥarsaṁprāṣṭāravyapratisṭhiṁ cittaṁ cittam utpādaṁśiḥitam cittam utpādaṁśiḥitam cittam utpādaṁśiḥitam cittam utpādaṁśiḥitam na kacitpratisṭhitaṁ cittam utpādaṁśiḥitam na tasmād evaṁ cittaṁ vā tathāgato bhāṣate rūpaṁpratisṭhitena dānam dātayam.

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

api tu khalu vā punah subhute bodhisatvenaṁ dānaparītyagah parītyajah sarvasatvānām avṛtthāya yaiva ca satvasaṁjñā sa evāsaṁjñā ya eva te sarvasatvaḥ bhāṣāvān off bhūtavādi subhute tathāgataḥ satyavādi 43r1 tathāvādi tathāgato na vitāthāvādi tathāgato.

bhāvyayat. 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 Schopenh 2004a: 135, n. 7 for detailed comments on this. The text on which G is based may thus have read something like: nāmaṁ mē sāṁmaṁ sāṁmaṁ aṁtāmaṁ sāṁmaṁ vā jivaṁsaṁjñā vā pugdaḥsaṁjñā vā na mē kicciṁ saṁjñā nāsaṁjñā babhāva | tatt kasya hetoḥ | saucet subhute mama sāṁmaṁ sāṁmaṁ aṁtāmaṁsāṁjñābhāvyayad vyāpaḍaṁsaṁjñāpi me sāṁmaṁ sāṁmaṁ bhāvyayat | saucet satvaṁsaṁjñābhāvyayad jivaṁsaṁjñā vā pugdaḥsaṁjñā vā vyāpaḍaṁsaṁjñāpi me sāṁmaṁ sāṁmaṁ bhāvyayat. After the omission of the portion in bold by homoeoteleuton, V may have been added to smooth over the resulting awkardness. The upshot of all this is that this passage in S may also be defective.

444 P: yadāham; G: yo 'ham.
445 M, Cz, G: kṣāmtivādi risir; P: kṣāmtivādi risir.
446 M, Cz: abhūvā | tatrāpi; G: abhūvāṁ tatrāpi; P: babhūva (va tatra) for abhū tadāpi. Here we read the abhū as the root aorist form abhū, which often appears without the final t, and is used for various persons and numbers. Cf. BHSG 32.107. However, the reading abhū <r> tadāpi is also possible.
447 G: nāmaṁsaṁjñābhān (i.e. abhūt).
448 M, Cz add: babhūva.
449 P: tasām.
450 P omits: mahāsaṁvāna.
451 S reads: vā jivaṁśaṁvāntarasyām. G: varjaiyāv (right at end of 5v7, after which folio 6 of G is missing).
452 M, Cz: 'sraṇaṁśaḥvādharpaṁśiḥtām for 'sraṇaṁśaḥvāpṛatisṭhitām.
453 S reads: caitām.
454 M, Cz: tat kasya hetoḥ for tat kasmād dhetoḥ. P omits. Note that the lacunae in P make reconstruction of this section very difficult, although it is obviously much condensed.
455 G: bhāṣāti.
456 M, Cz: apratisṭhitena bodhisattvānaṁ dānam dātayam | na rūpaṁ sāṁmaṁ sāṁmaṁsāṁprāṣṭār (Cz: sraṇaṁśaḥvādharmapraṁśiḥtām dānam dātayam) P: na rūpaṁ apṛatisṭhitena bodhisattvānaṁ dānam dātayam for rūpaṁ apṛatisṭhitena dānam dātayam.
457 P omits: khalu punah.
458 M, Cz: evamṛapo for evam.
460 M, Cz adds: tat kasya hetoḥ.
461 M, Cz: yā caisu subhute; P: yā caiva sā for yaiva ca.
462 M, Cz: saṁsaṁjñā for sa eva saṁjñā.
463 M, Cz: evam te; P: ete for eva te.
464 M, Cz: tad kasya hetoḥ (but M notes its omission in Ch and T).
465 M, Cz: tathāvādāvā ananyathāvādāvā; P: tathāvādāvā for tathāvādāvā.
466 S reads: na vītatāvādāvā. M, Cz: na vītatāvādāvā; P: avītatāvādāvā for na vītatāvādāvā.
467 P omits: tathāgato.
§14g: folio 43r1–6 (Cz 42.12–20; P 185.8–14)
api tu khalu punah468 subhūte yah469 tathārgatena dharma 'bhisambuddho desito vā470 na tatra satyam na msā <]> tad yathāpi nāma471 subhūte r3 puruṣo472 'ndhakāra{ḥ}pravīṣṭah473 <]> evam vastupatiṃ bo(dh)hīsatvo draṣṭavyo474 yo vastupatitam475 dārṇam pariyajati | tad yathāpi nāma476 subhūte cakṣusmān {||} puruṣo477 (v)ih(ḥ)ā(ḥ)āyām <||> rātryām478 sūrya 'bhuydgate nānāvihāni479 rūpāni paśyey | evam480 bodhisatvo draṣṭavyo yo vastupatiṣṭhitam481 dānām pariyajati |

§14h: folio 43r6–v3 (Cz 42.20–43.7; P 185.14–18)
api tu khalu punah482 subhūte ye483 kulaputra484 vā kuladuhita v1tro vā imaṃ dharmaparyayaṃ udgrahisyanti | dhāra(yi)ṣyanti | vāc(a)yisyanti <||> paryavāpsyaṃti485 | jnāv2tās te subhūte486 tathāgatena487 drṣṭaṃ te subhūte488 tathāgatena489 buddhās te tathāgatena <||> sarve v3 te490 satvāḥ aprameyam491 puṇyaskandham prasaviṣyaṃti492 |

§15a: folio 43v3–44r5 (Cz 43.8–19; P 185.18–186.4)
yāṣ ca khalah493 punah subhūte stri v4 vā puruṣo vā pūrvāḥḥakālasamaye494 gamgānadvālukopamāṃ495 ātmabhāvān {||} paryajayet496 | madhyāḥḥakālasamaye497 sāyāḥḥakālasamaye498 gamgānadvālukopamāṃ499 avātmabhāvān <||> paryajayet500 | anena paryāyaṃ501 kalpaḥṭīnayutaśa＜ta＞saḥasrayā502 ātmabhāvān { || } paryajayet503 |

---
468 P omits: khalu punah.
469 P: yathā for yah.
471 P omits: api nāma.
472 P omits: puruṣo.
473 M, Cz add: na kimcid api paśyey. M, Cz also read: puruṣo 'ndhakāraprāvīṣṭo; P: (a)ndhakāraprāvīṣṭah.
474 S reads: draṣṭavya; P: vaktavyam for draṣṭavyo.
475 M, Cz, P: "patito.
476 P omits: api nāma.
477 P: puruṣo ca(kṣusmān) puruṣo.
478 M, Cz: prabhāh̄āyāṃ rātrau; (partly reconstructed): (pra)bhāh̄āyāṃ for vibhāh̄āyāṃ rātryāṃ.
479 P: nānāvihāni.
480 M, Cz add: avastupatiṣṭhitam.
481 M, Cz: yo 'vastupatiṣṭho; (partly reconstructed): (yo avastu)patito for yo vastupatiṣṭho.
482 P (reconstructed) omits: khalu punah.
483 P adds: te after ye.
484 S reads: kulaputro.
485 M, Cz add: parebhyaṣ ca vistāraṇa samprakāṣayisyanti.
486 P omits: subhūte.
487 M, Cz add: buddhājñānena.
488 P omits: subhūte.
489 M, Cz add: buddhacaksusā.
490 M, Cz add: subhūte.
491 M, Cz add: asamkhyeyam (Cz: asamkhyeyam, corrected p. 116) after aprameyam.
492 M, Cz add: pratigrāhiṣyanti.
493 P: (yo) yam ca ho for yaṣ ca khalu.
494 P: pāvāḥnasamaye for pāvāḥnkālasamaye.
495 M, Cz: "vālukasāmāṃ; P (reconstructed): (vālikāsāmāṃ) for "vālukopamāṃ (but M notes that Ch and T read "vālukopamāṃ).
496 P: (ā)tmabhāvam parityajye for ātmabhāvān parityajey.
497 M, Cz add: evam after parityajey.
498 P: madhyāḥnasamaye for madhyāḥnkālasamaye; M, Cz add: gamgānadvālukopamāṃ ātmabhāvān parityajey.
499 P: "sāyāḥnasamaye for sāyāhankālasamaye.
500 M, Cz: "vālukasāmāṃ; P: "vālikāsāmāṃ for "vālukopamāṃ.
bhādṛśīvatān 503  PARA] parityajet 504  {d}yaś ceman 505  dharmaparīyāyam śrutvā  r2 na pratikṣipad ayaṃ eva tatoniḍānam 506  bhuhutaram punyaskandhaṁ prasunuyāt 507  aprameyam asaṃkhyaeyam 508  kah punar vādaḥ 509  yo lir 504 4khitvadgrhn(ī)yāt 510  dhārayet 511  vācayet 512  paryavāpnrūṣyāt 513  pārebhyās 514  ca vistareṇa samprakāśayet 515  |

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

api tu 516  subhute acītmyo 'turṣīlyo 'ya<m> dharmaparīyāyam <> ayaṃ ca 517  dharmaparīyāyam tathāgatena bhāṣitah vi agrayānasamprasthitānāṃ satvān(m a)r(ḥ)aya | śreṣṭhayānasamprasthitānāṃ satvāraṇāṃ arthāya | {ya} ye i<m>parīyāyam udgrahisyamit 518  | dhārayisyamit 519  vāvacyayen<m>u 520  <> paryavāpnsyamit 521  | 'nātās te subhute 522  tathāgatē {ta} vīna 523  drṣṭās te subhute 524  tathāgatena 525  <> sarve te 526  satvāḥ v5 aprameyena punyaskandhena 527  samanvāgata bhaviṣyamit | acītmyenatulyenāmāpyenāparīmāṇena 528  punyaskandhena samanvāga 45r1tā bhaviṣyamit 529  tat kasya heto<h>-  na hi ś(ā)kya(m) subhute ayaṃ 530  dharmo 531  hinādhiemu(kt)i(k)aīh 532  r2  sṛtotum |
nātmādṛśtiṇaḥ na satvādṛśtiṇaḥ na jīvādṛśtiṇaḥ na pudgalādṛśtiṇaḥ Śārśākyaṃ śrotum udgrahitum vā dhārayitum vā vācayitum vā paryavāptu(m) vā nedāṃ sthānam viṛdyate

§15c; folio 45r4–v2 (Cz 44.13–18; G 7a2–3; P 186.17–20)
api tu subhūte yatra pṛthiviprādeṣe idāṃ sūtraṃ prakāśayiṣyat  pujārīṇiṣaya sa pṛthiviprādeṣo bhavisyat(i) sajdevamāṇusārasya lokasya vandavīṇiṣaya praḍakṣiṇīkaraṇiṣaya ca sa pṛthiviprādeṣo bhavisyati ca(t)ɪy(a) sa pṛthivīvipyadeśo bhavisyati

§16a; folio 45v2–46r1 (Cz 44.18–45.6; G 7a3–5; P 186.20–187.3)
ye te subhūte kulaṇtrapāyaḥ vā kuladuhitaro vā imān evaṃśrūṇīpām sūtrāṃ tān udgrāhyaṃ tī paryavāpyantīḥ te paribhūtaḥ bhavisyam <ti> vā suparibhūtāḥ ca bhavisyāṃ ti yāṁ satvāṁ paurvajāmikānāḥ karmāṇi kr̥tyān avsāyaṃ varatiyānāḥ drṣṭā eva dharmān pūrvajāṃkānāḥ asubhāṇiḥ 46r1 karmāṇi kṣapaiṣya <m> ti

531 M, Cz, G, Frag f: dharmaparāyaḥ. P reads with S (missing in Frag b).
532 M, G, Frag Cz: sattvaiḥ (missing in Frag b). Frag fS reads with S.
533 G: satvaḻipudgalādṛśtiṇaḥ for satvādṛśtiṇaḥ na jīvādṛśtiṇaḥ na pudgalādṛśtiṇaḥ (missing in Frag b). Frag f reads 'dṛśtiṇaḥ in all cases.
534 M, Cz: nābodhisattvapratipājīṇaḥ sattvaiḥ śakyam ayaṃ dharmaparāyaḥ śrotum vodgrahitum for śakyam śrotum udgrahitum (missing in Frag b). Frag f: udgrahitaḥ.
535 G: yāvat for dhārayitum vā vācayitum vā. Frag b: /// rayitum vā / desayitum ///. Frag f also has desayitum vā after dhārayitum vā and before vācayitum.
536 Frag f appears to have read: paryāpyunitum for paryavāpytum.
537 M, Cz, G, Frag Cz: khālu punah (missing in Frag b).
538 P: ayaṃ sūtrānta; Frag f: ayaṃ sūtrānta for idāṃ sūtram (missing in Frag b).
540 P: sadevamāṇusārasya (missing in Frag b). Both P, G and Frag f punctuate before sadeva. Frag f breaks off here, with sadevamāṇusāsya.
542 G omits: ca sa pṛthiviprādeṣo bhavisyati.
543 M, Cz: caityabhbhāḥ; G: caityabhāḥ. P reads caitya with S (note that there is not enough space in S for a visarga).
544 Frag b also reads with S.
545 M, Cz: insert: āptu. Frag b reads with S.
546 S reads: kulaṇtrapāyaḥ (all others: kulaṇtrapā) (missing in Frag b).
547 S reads: ivamṛūpaḥ. M, Cz, G: evamṛūpaḥ; P: evamṛupa (missing in Frag b).
548 M, Cz: insert: vācayiṣyantī (missing in Frag b).
549 M, Cz: yonīśa ca manasilakṣiṇiyantī parebhyaḥ ca vistārena samprakāśiṣyantī; G: udgṛḥiṣyantī yavai paryavāpyantī. P: udgṛḥiṣyatī dhārayiṣyatī vācayiṣyatī paryavāpyatī for udgṛḥiṣyantī dhārayiṣyantī paryavāpyantī. Frag b: /// punyantī (Matsuda reads: unīṣṭiyajñī), indicating the verb form paryāpunyantī (cf. paryāpyunitum found above in Frag f).
551 M, Cz, G insert: ca (missing in Frag b).
552 M, Cz: add: sattvaiḥ (missing in Frag b).
553 S reads: paurvā; G, P: pūrvajāmikānī; M, Cz, G insert: asubhānī.
554 G omits: kr̥tyā (missing in Frag b).
556 Cz add: tāyā (contra M).
557 M, Cz: add: tāṃ.
558 M, Cz: paurvajāmikānī; Frag b: pūrvbaj(a) ///.
559 S reads: karmāṇi; G omits: pūrvajāmikānī asubhānī karmāṇi (missing in Frag b).
§16b; folio 46r1–v4 (Cz 45.6–46.6; G 7a5–7b3; P 187.3–187.13)
561: abhijānāmy ahāṃ subhūte atite r2 ’dhvani asamkhṣye ye kalpe asamkhṣye yataraṃ dipamkarasya tathāgatasya rāhataḥ samyakṣamṛbudhhasya’563 parena parisaraṃ564 caturāṣṭibuddhaḥkoṭinaḥyataṣata-sahasṛanyā565 abhūvāṃ566 ye567 mayā āraḍhitā āraḍhayetvā na virāḍhitā568 yac ca569 mayā subhūte570 buddhā bhagāvīṃvtaḥ āraḍgita571 āraḍgayaṃtva572 na virāḍita573 yac ca574 carime kāle pāsciminiṃkāyāṃ575 pāṃcāśaṃputriyāṃ vartamānāyāṃ576 imam s(u)trāṃtaṃ577 (u)dgraḥis(ya)ṃt578 dhārā(y)iṃσ(ya)m(n)i v(āca)y)i(m)i (pa)trāvāṃpyaṃt579 | asya580 subhūte punyaskanadh(a)syaṃ(ā)m(i)k(i)k(ā)d581 (e)ṣa582 pūrṇ(v)i(a)h583 punyaskandhāḥ śatamāniṃt584 api kalā<ṃ> nopaiti sāhasṛtamāṃ585 api | sātasāha<ṛ>tamāṃ586 a(p)i | k(o)ṭ(i)sātasāhaṃvṛtāṃ apī587 | samkhyāṃ api kalāṃ api ganaṇām

559 M, Cz, G: anupṛsyaṃti (missing in Frag b). Lacuna in P, which may be filled by kṣapayiṣyantī | buddhabodhīṃ caṇūpṛsyaṃti or perhaps even kṣapayiṣyantī anuttarāṃ samyaksambodhīṃ ca prāṣyantī, as suggested by some of the Chinese translations (Kumārajīva, Bodhiruci, Paramārtha). Cf. Pargiter, p. 187, n. 1.
560 Note that §16a is quoted in the Śīkṣāsāmuccaya (ed. Bendall, p. 171): yathā vajrayabikāyaṃ uktām / ye te subhūte kula-prāṭvārādā āraḍhitāvat vā imāṃ evamāraṇāṃ stārāṇāṃ udghṛiṣyantī yāvat paryāvṛṭantī | te parihārābhavāṃ suparihārābhavāṃ tāt kasya hetoh/ yāṃ tesāṃ satavāṃ pavauvajāvanikāṃ karmāṃ kriyāṃ apāyaśaṃvartantīyāṃ | tāni tāya parihārābhavā tāṣtā eva dharmer kṣapayiṣyantī buddhabodhīṃ ca prāṣyantī/.
561 Cz inserts: tat kasya hetoh (contra M, which notes that Ch and T have this as well) (missing in Frag b).
563 Lacuna in P. Pargiter’s reconstruction omits: arhataḥ.
564 M, Cz: parataraṇa; G, P (reconstructed) om mit parataram.
565 M, Cz, P: caturāṣṭibuddhaḥkoṭinyayate; P (partly reconstructed): (caturāṣṭir)buddhaḥkoṭinyayate; G: caturāṣṭir buddhaḥkoṭinyayate.
566 P: babhūva.
567 G: yāti.
568 M, Cz: āraḍgita āraḍgaya (Cz: āraḍgā) na virāḍitaḥ (but M notes that J has āraḍhitā āraḍhyā na virāḍitāḥ); G: āraḍgitaḥ āraḍgaya ca na virāḍitī; P: āraḍhitā for āraḍhitā āraḍhayetvā na virāḍhitā.
569 P: yām ca.
570 M, Cz, G add: te. Lacuna in P, between subhūte and virāḍhitā. Frag b breaks off after ā su.
571 G omits: āraḍgita.
572 M, G: āraḍgaya; Cz (in error): āraḍgā.
573 P: virāḍhitā.
574 P: yām ca.
576 M, Cz: paścime kāle paścime samaye paścimeṃkāyāṃ pamarāṣṭāyāṃ saṁdharmavipralopaḥ kāle vartamāna; G: carime kāle paścimeṃkāyāṃ pamarāṣṭāyāṃ vartamaṃyāṃ; P: carime kāle paścimeṃkāyāṃ pamarāṣṭāyāṃ vartamaṃyāṃ.
577 M, Cz: imāṃ evamāraṇāṃ stārāṇāṃ; G: imāṃ stārāṇāṃ for imāṃ stārāṇāṃ. P reads with S.
578 P: udghṛiṣyantī.
579 M, Cz add: parebhāṣa ca vistāreṇa samaprakāṣayiṣyantī; G: udghṛiṣyantī yāvat paryāvṛṭantī for udghṛiṣyantī dhārāyiyantī vācayiṣyantī paryāvṛṭantī.
580 M, Cz add: khalu punah.
581 G omits: antikkād.
582 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.
583 M, Cz: paurvavakah.
584 P: svātāmaṃ for svātātāṃ.
585 M, Cz, G: sahasratamīṃ (Cz: sahasratamīṃ, corrected p. 117); P: sahasrāmīṃ.
586 M, Cz, G: sātatasahasratamīṃ; P: sātatasahasratamīṃ.
587 Although it is tempting to restore koṭinayataḥ on the basis of the same form at 43v6 and 46r3, there is not enough
api⁵⁸⁸ upamāṃ api⁵⁸⁹ (u)v⁴paniśām api⁵⁹⁰ na kṣamate |

§ 16c; folio 46v⁴–6 (Cz 46.6–11; G 7b³–4; P 187.13–14)
(sace)⁵⁹¹ subhūte teṣām kulaputrānāṁ kuladuhiti(t)(nāṁ) vā⁵⁹⁲ puṇyaskandham bhāṣet⁵⁹³ |
yāva(m)taḥ⁵⁹⁴ te⁵⁹⁵ kula(p)utra⁵⁹⁶ vā⁵⁹⁷ kuladuhitāro⁵⁹⁸ vā⁵⁹⁹ tasmin samaye (pu)v⁶⁰⁰ yasyaskandha<ṃ> pratigr̥hṇānti⁶⁰¹ | unm(a)d(a)m te⁶⁰² satvāḥ prāpunuyuh⁶⁰³ cīttavikśeṇaḥ vā gacche(yuḥ |)

space for nayuta; S thus appears to have read with P here. M, Cz: koṭitiṁīm api koṭiśatamatim api koṭiśataśahasratamim api koṭiniyutātatasahasratamim api. P: koṭiśatasahasritamīm api for koṭiniyutātatasahasratamīm api. G omits: koṭiniyutātatasahasratamīm api.

⁵⁸⁸ S reads: apa.
⁵⁸⁹ p omits: upamām api.
⁵⁹⁰ S reads: upaniśāmate. M, Cz: upaniśadam api yāvad aupanyam api; P: upaniśadam api for upaniśām api. G reads with S.
⁵⁹¹ P: sace; M, Cz: sace punah.
⁵⁹³ M, Cz, G: bhāṣeyam. P reads with S.
⁵⁹⁴ 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.
⁵⁹⁵ G adds: satvā after te.
⁵⁹⁶ p breaks off at kulapu. The next folio (fol. 12) is missing.
⁵⁹⁷ G omits: vā.
⁵⁹⁸ S reads: kuladuhitā. Corrected to kuladuhitāro with M, Cz.
⁵⁹⁹ G: kuladuhitaraś ca for kuladuhitāro vā.
⁶⁰⁰ M, Cz: prasavishyanti pratigrhaśyanti; G: parigrhaśyanti for pratigrhaṇānti.
⁶⁰¹ M, Cz, G omit: te.
⁶⁰² M, Cz, G: anuprāpunuyah for prāpunuyah.