JIABS

Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies

Cover: Cristina Scherrer-Schaub

Font: "Gandhari Unicode" designed by Andrew Glass (http://andrewglass.org/fonts.php)

JIABS

Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies

Obituaries

Articles

Early Chinese Buddhist translations

Contributions to the International Symposium "Early Chinese Buddhist Translations," Vienna 18–21 April, 2007

Guest editor: Max Deeg

2   Contents

Book review

Experimental core samples of Chinese translations of two Buddhist *sūtra*s analysed in the light of recent Sanskrit manuscript discoveries[1]

Paul Harrison

Introduction and survey of the texts

Reports of the death of Buddhist philology have been greatly exaggerated, to borrow Mark Twain's famous words. Evidence that it is neither dead nor even dying can be found in the healthy audience numbers in recent years at conference panels dealing with Buddhist manuscripts. This shows that lively curiosity – one might even say excitement – has been aroused in our field by the emergence of new textual material and the philological enterprise devoted to it. Manuscripts in the British Library, Senior, Schøyen, Berlin (Bajaur) and Hirayama Collections (the list is not exhaustive), most of them coming from Afghanistan and Pakistan, have not only attracted the dedicated attention of small groups of scholars, but have aroused keen interest in a wider scholarly public, and continue to do so. Afghanistan and Pakistan – which together encompass the region now referred to as "Greater Gandhāra" – are of course not the only source of these new finds: the People's Republic of China has also produced many significant discoveries, significant not

least because the manuscripts emerging from that quarter (most of which come from collections in Tibet) are often complete. Here, of course, it is not entirely appropriate to speak of discoveries, since the manuscripts are not being unearthed, but merely retrieved from storage, from the shelves to which they have been consigned for centuries in the Potala and various monastic foundations.

In what ways these new additions contribute to our knowledge of Buddhism is a story still in the process of being written. I do not intend to survey the whole field here, but merely pick out two texts and assess the way in which recent advances in their study might impact on our approach to Chinese translations of Buddhist texts, especially those produced during the early period. The two texts are the *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā* (hereafter abbreviated Vaj) and the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* (VKN). Both works are undoubtedly important Mahāyāna *sūtra*s, and, although they are very different animals in many ways, the history of their transmission is potentially illustrative of many aspects of the passage of Buddhist *sūtra*s from an Indic medium into Chinese. In both cases multiple Chinese translations are preserved, and in both cases the emergence of new Sanskrit copies has recently amplified and enhanced our understanding of the Indic texts. In the case of the Vaj, we can now reconstruct the entire work as it circulated in Greater Gandhāra in the 6th–7th centuries. For the VKN, we have for the first time access to a complete Sanskrit text, whereas previously our knowledge of this work was based almost entirely on the Chinese and Tibetan translations. It is timely, therefore, to ask what difference these new finds might make to our approach to the Chinese translations, and what light they might throw on them. But before we set about answering these questions, let us first describe the new finds and how they relate to the previously known textual tradition.

In the case of the Vaj our knowledge of the Sanskrit manuscript tradition was already quite rich. The *editio princeps* of the Sanskrit text was published in 1881 by F. Max Müller working from four copies of the text, two from Japan (which he designated together as J) and two from China (his Ch & T). Here I quote from the description given in Harrison & Watanabe 2006:

Müller used four witnesses to establish his text: two handwritten copies of an old manuscript preserved in the Kōkiji 高貴寺 temple in Osaka, Japan, and two blockprints from China. Since the two manuscripts from Japan are copies deriving ultimately from the same original, they can be regarded as a single witness. That original is apparently a Sanskrit text of the Vaj discovered after the death of the eminent priest Jiun Onkō 慈雲飲光 (1718–1804) by his disciple Chidō 智幢 (1776–1854). This was reproduced in fascicle 320 of the *Bongaku shinryō* 梵學津梁, compiled by Jiun and his disciples. In this compendium it appears that the Sanskrit text was written vertically, with Chinese equivalents for the Sanskrit words in the column to the right and a Chinese phonetic transcription to the left, followed by the Chinese translations of Kumārajīva and Dharmagupta in the next two columns. One of the copies acquired by Müller, made by the priest Kanematsu Kuken 金松空賢 in September 1880, contained all of this material, 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 Songzhusi 嵩祝寺. In this print, the Sanskrit text appears both in Lañtsha script and in Tibetan transliteration, to which has been added a Tibetan translation made at the Chos 'khor rab rgyas gliṅ temple in Beijing by the *lha bris* (painter) Dam pa, working under the auspices of lCaṅ 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 Lañtsha script and printed in red ink (this is M's Ch).

The first of the two Japanese copies, with all the material in it, Müller (1881: 16) records receiving on 15 February 1881. He refers to it as Cat. Bodl. Japan. No. 54 (it is now MS. Sansk. d. 28 in the Bodleian Library). One page is reproduced in Müller 1881, Plate 1. The second, with Sanskrit text only (one page reproduced in Plate 2), is his Cat. Bodl. Japan. No. 55 (now MS. Sansk. d. 29). Since the above description was written, I have been able to inspect these two

items in the Bodleian,[2] and compare them with print-outs of digital scans of the original *Bongaku shinryō* materials still kept at Kōkiji, among which there appear to be at least 8 copies of the Sanskrit text of the Vaj, complete or incomplete, with or without other materials in Chinese and so on.[3] As a result of these investigations, some of the details given in the above description now need to be corrected or refined.

First, the Bodleian copies. MS. Sansk. d. 28 (Müller's No. 54) consists of three stitched booklets, covered in blue, bearing the title *Kongō hannya gyō shoyaku goshō* 金剛般若經諸譯互證 and, in *devanāgarī*, *Vajracchedikāsūtraṃ* Part I–III. They are enclosed in a brown case, bearing on the outside the title MS. SANSK. d. 28: VA*GRAKKH*EDIK*Ā*PRA*GÑ*ĀPĀRAMITĀ-SŪTRA, WITH 3 CHINESE TRANSLATIONS & CHINESE TRANSLITERATION 1880. The pages of the booklets have vertical lines printed in blue, within which the text is written in a very fine and regular hand. At the end of the text, on p. 81 of Part III, after a lengthy postscript in *kanbun* taking up two pages, appear some shorter notes in *kanbun* in black ink:

> Copied at Kōkiji in the middle ten-day period of September, Meiji 13 [= 1880].[4] Head of Survey, India School (?),[5] Kanematsu Kūken 金松空賢.

---

[2] I thank Dr Gillian Evison, Indian Institute Librarian & Head of Research Support (Special Collections), for helping me gain access to the two manuscripts in question.

[3] For assistance in locating these materials and securing copies of some of them I am indebted to the kindness of Prof. Shōryū Katsura and Prof. Motohiro Yoritomi, President of Shuchiin University. I would also like to acknowledge the help of the staff of the Shuchiin Library, where I had my first sight of these treasures and was able to examine them.

[4] Someone has written 1879 in arabic numerals at the top of the page above this line of text.

[5] This is a guess at Kanematsu's title. The six characters are written in a cursive hand, with the fourth especially hard to make out, but *indogakkō shirabegakari* 印度學校調掛 seems to be the most likely reading. I thank those colleagues who offered suggestions, even if the puzzle is not yet solved.

Acquired this manuscript copy in three volumes on 15 February, Meiji 14 [= 1881][6] and finished inspecting it on the 17th. Student abroad in England, Nanjō Bunyū.

Then, in red ink:

Finished inspecting it for a second time at 3.17 p.m. on 27 February, Meiji 14 [= 1881], Bunyū.

This note is followed by a poem in Chinese, written on the inside of the back cover, also in red ink, in 4 lines with 14 characters to the line (i.e. 8 lines of verse, 7 characters to the line), with a final inscription in Chinese, signed at the end by Sekka Nanjō Bunyū of Japan. MS. Sansk. d. 28, then, is full of historical interest. By contrast, MS. Sansk. d. 29 lacks any such embellishments. It is a single booklet, with pages of thin, translucent buff-coloured paper doubled back and stitched, bearing on the title page the words "Bodleian MS. Sansk. d. 29," and vertically in *siddhaṃ*: *Vajracchedakaprajñā-pāramitasūtraṃ* [sic]. The booklet has a total of 97 pages (with two sides each), but from p. 60 onwards they are blank: the text finishes on p. 59 verso at the end of the *sūtra*, with the words *vajracchedikā prajñāpāramitātraṃ* [sic] *: samāptaṃ*. There is no further text or annotation. Each page carries 6 lines of *siddhaṃ* characters, written horizontally.

On the basis of my inspection of these items, carried out during a visit to Oxford during the week of 19–23 February 2007, I was able to establish with a reasonable degree of certainty that Müller's Cat. Bodl. Japan. No. 55 (now MS. Sansk. d. 29 in the Bodleian Library) is a faithful hand-copy of Kōkiji Text 0162, while Cat. Bodl. Japan. No. 54 (now MS. Sansk. d. 28) is an equally faithful hand-copy of Kōkiji Text 0165–0167.[7] The Bodleian copies are in both cases extremely accurate, and in a trial collation of many pag-

---

[6] Again, 1880 is written at the top of the page. The date is that on which Müller records receiving this copy.

[7] The certainty is greater in the latter case because of the careful reproduction of the handwritten postscript at the end of 0165–0167, including its erasures and corrections. The text nos. used here are those assigned to the relevant copies in the digital scan collection held in the Shuchiin University Library.

es I noted very few errors. Knowing now where they come from, we can therefore focus our attention on their Kōkiji exemplars.

Kōkiji Text 0162 (hereafter K1) consists of a single stitched booklet with an indigo blue cover and unruled pages of the same kind of buff-coloured and shiny translucent paper that MS. Sansk. d. 29 is written on. The cover bears the title (in black *siddhaṃ* in a long vertical strip which has been left unpainted) *Vajracchedakaprajñapāramitasutraṃ* [sic], to the right of which the tiny Chinese characters *Kongōkyo* 金剛經 are written. Nearer the spine, in red ink, is the inscription *Yuinyo bhikṣu haisha Hōju no zō*, i.e. 唯如 *bhikṣu* [in *siddhaṃ*] 拜寫 法樹之藏 (Respectfully copied by the *bhikṣu* Yuinyo; the collection of Hōju). The pages are numbered 1–48 in Part I (Jō 上) and 1–52 in Part II (Ge 下) (both within the one booklet), each part being preceded by a page bearing the title, again in *siddhaṃ*, *Vajracchedikāsutraṃ* [sic].[8] The pages contain the Sanskrit text, written horizontally – in lines running parallel with the spine – in black ink, three lines to the page, accompanied by pronunciation in Chinese characters (also in black) and a word-for-word Chinese translation or, more accurately, gloss on the Sanskrit (in red).[9] In the Sanskrit text word division is marked by red dots, with horizontal red strokes linking the *akṣara*s of each word. Occasionally *akṣara*s have been corrected or cancelled, again in red; in some cases the correction is written above, in oth-

---

[8] The break between Parts I & II falls in the middle of a word in §14b: *avakalpayā – mi*. Since there is almost half a page left blank after *avakalpayā* at the end of Part I, this can best be explained as the result of copying from another copy in two booklets in which the scribe ran out of space at the end of the first booklet. This is indeed the situation with Kōkiji Text 0075–0076, where the text is broken at exactly the same point but the last page of Part I is full to the last character on the last line (only then does it make sense to break in the middle of a word). On this evidence 0162 appears to be a later copy, but it is not yet clear whether 0075–0076 was the original from which it was made. Further detailed text-critical work on all the Kōkiji copies of the text to determine their stemmatic relationships is a desideratum.

[9] The Chinese equivalents given are often similar to those used in Dharmagupta's translation (see below), but not identical with them.

ers the original *akṣara* has been modified (as when -*a* is corrected to -*ā*). The section divisions of Kumārajīva's translation are also inserted in red. The text covers approx. 100 pages, and finishes on 52 recto in Part II. On 52 verso there is a colophon in red ink, and on the verso of the next page (not numbered), there is a considerable amount of additional colophon text in black.[10] This copy was apparently based on one made in 1838 by Senkai 詮海 (1786–1860).

Kōkiji Text 0165–0167 (hereafter K2) comprises three volumes of *Kongō hannya gyō shoyaku goshō* 梵文金剛般若經諸譯互證, i.e. Fascicule 320 of the *Bongaku shinryō*, the 12th item of the second part of the Matsusen 未詮 section. This is a manuscript written in such a regular and even hand, and with so few corrections, that it appears at first sight to be printed; indeed, it almost certainly represents the final redaction, made in preparation for printing, of several other versions in the collection, which are explicitly designated as drafts. The compiler and editor is named on p. 1 as Hōju 法樹, a *śramaṇa* of Kōkiji Temple in Kashū (now the eastern Ōsaka area); this is the same person as the abovementioned Chidō. This edition comprises the following elements, all written vertically, arranged from right to left: (1) Chinese glosses, aligned word-for-word to the right of the Sanskrit text; (2) Sanskrit text, immediately to the right of which has also been written in small letters the pronunciation in the Japanese katakana syllabary; (3) Chinese phonetic transcription; (4) Kumārajīva's translation; and (5) Dharmagupta's translation. These have all been reproduced in the Bodleian copy, with the sole exception of the *katakana* pronunciation guide. The copying is so exact that the position of the text on each line and each page has been scrupulously observed. Above and outside the page frame the section divisions of Kumārajīva's version are given. The Bodleian copy omits §1, but replicates all the rest. The date of this manuscript is not clear at the time of writing, but on the last two pages of Vol. III of K2 appears a long handwritten note by Senkai apparently added in the year 1847

---

[10] For an analysis of these colophons, see Okukaze 2008. I am indebted to Mr Okukaze for kindly clarifying certain aspects of the Kōkiji materials in recent personal communications.

(Kōka 4). This is the postscript reproduced, with some variations in the wording, in the Bodleian copy MS. Sansk. d. 28.

The ultimate source of all the Kōkiji copies of the Vaj appears to be a single copy sent back to Japan by Ennin 圓仁 (792–862) who was in China 838–847, where he learned Sanskrit and collected Buddhist texts to take back to his homeland. In the colophon notes to several of the Kōkiji copies it is described as a folding book in two fascicules containing the Sanskrit and Chinese texts of the Vaj written horizontally.[11] This was stored in the Zentōin 前塔院 on Mt. Hiei 比叡山 with other texts and ritual paraphernalia brought back from China by the master. It was recopied in the Eikyū & Hōan Periods (1113–1118, 1120–1124) by Yakken 藥賢 and proofread by Yakunin 藥忍,[12] and long kept in the Saitō 西塔 area on Mt. Hiei. Later, in the Tempō Period (1830–1844), Yakken and Yakunin's copy was rediscovered by the monk Shūen 宗淵 (1786–1859), also known as Shin'a Shōnin 真阿聖人 or Shin'amidabutsu 真阿彌陀佛. Shūen made it available to Senkai, who recopied it in Tempō 8 (1837), and then sent it to Hōju (aka Chidō) at Kōkiji.[13]

---

[11] Some of the material in these colophons is quoted from T 2166, *Jikaku daishi zaitō sōshinroku* 慈覺大師在唐送進錄 (see esp. 55.1078b8–24).

[12] The colophons in red ink given at the end of the three Kōkiji copies 0073–74, 0075–76 and 0162 all mention Eikyū 4 (1116) and then a copying in midwinter of Hōan 1 (1120) by Yakken and a proofreading on the 6th day of the 12th month in the same year by Yakunin. The precise relationships of these copies to each other remain to be worked out, but it is to be noted that in formal respects they resemble the manuscript brought (or sent) back by Ennin, i.e. they are in two books (in the case of 0162 copied into one volume), the Sanskrit text is written horizontally, and it is accompanied by Chinese glosses. We can infer from this that Yakken's copy (from which the Kōkiji copies are descended) may have mimicked the original rather closely. It also appears that 0073–74 and 0075–76 both attempted to represent this copy exactly, since the first and last *siddhaṃ* characters of each line are the same in both of them.

[13] According to the colophon a further copy was made and despatched in Tempō 9 (1838). Okukaze (2008) is sceptical about the notion that the manuscripts were kept on Hieizan right up to the 19th century, given

With these Kōkiji copies now accessible, therefore, we are in a position to check Müller's edition against two of its witnesses, or rather, against their sources.[14] The same is true of T (see Müller 1881, Plate 3), for which I have secured a digital copy of the print of the same work kept in the library of the School of Oriental & African Studies, London.[15] I have not been able at this time to locate a copy of Ch. However, the results of the comparison of Müller's edition with the three witnesses which have come into my hands turn out to be rather surprising (see below).

Müller's edition was subsequently supplemented by the discovery of two incomplete but nevertheless sizable manuscript copies bearing an older recension of the text, one being the Stein manuscript from Central Asia (late 5th or early 6th century), published by Pargiter in 1916, the other being the Gilgit manuscript (6th or 7th century), first published by Chakravarti in 1956, and later, in a much more reliable edition, by Schopen in 1989. Edward Conze had all these versions available to him (Schopen's work excepted, of course) when he reedited the text in 1957. His edition has become the standard point of reference, even though it largely reproduces the text as established by Müller, while adding to it information about the Stein and Gilgit manuscripts (not always complete or correct) and a fair number of mistakes. Other editions published during the 20th century take a similar approach, and it has to be said that they generally do not make a positive contribution to our knowledge. At the same time a small number of manuscript fragments from Central Asia have been published, mostly in out-of-

---

the wholesale destruction of the mountain's temple complexes by Oda Nobunaga in 1571. He considers the possibility that the manuscripts were preserved at Shōju Raigōji 聖眾來迎寺 at the foot of the mountain.

[14] It will be another matter to determine which, if any, of the surviving Kōkiji copies is the source of all the others. The preliminary collation of the sections of the Vaj dealt with in this paper suggests that K2 cannot be a direct copy of K1.

[15] Dr Ulrich Pagel kindly assisted me in obtaining this, for which I thank him. The copy in question was also consulted by Conze (1957[1974]: 1). Here it is referred to as T2, to distinguish it from the copy which Max Müller used.

the-way places where they have escaped notice.[16] There are also several Nepalese mss of the text, which, as far as I know, nobody has yet taken the trouble to consult. Although it is possible that others survive, two are known to me, both of them microfilmed by the Nepal German Manuscript Preservation Project. The first is Ca 267; NGMPP A913/9; Acc. No. 4/267, a paper ms dated 1701 containing a complete copy of the text on 52 folios (not 62, as given in the NGMPP database). I will refer to it as Ne2. The second is NAK (National Archive, Kathmandu) Acc. No. 5/186 (NGMPP B 90/16), another paper manuscript of uncertain date, hereafter Ne1. Collation of both these manuscripts indicates that Ne2 is a direct descendant of Ne1, with no strong evidence of contamination from any other source. Therefore in this paper only the readings of the latter will be considered.[17] We can see, then, that the number of copies or parts of copies of the Vaj is quite numerous, and since the oldest of them dates from around the 5th century, we can track the Sanskrit tradition for this text back quite a long way. The Schøyen ms (which we presume to come from the Bamiyan area) is an especially significant addition to our knowledge since it covers the first 60% of the text in a continuous run, and, like the Gilgit manuscript, dates from the 6th or 7th century. Since the Gilgit manuscript covers the second half of the text, but not continuously (one folio is missing), putting the two manuscripts together gives us our first look at the whole text as it must have circulated in the "Greater Gandhāra" region.[18] We should note in this regard that the Stein

---

[16] Details of 11 of these can be found in Harrison & Watanabe 2006: 93–94. Recently further fragments of the Vaj have come to light in the British Library's collections, and have been published in the series *Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia: The British Library Sanskrit Fragments*, edited by Seishi Karashima and Klaus Wille (see Harrison 2009).

[17] For help with securing copies of these manuscripts I am indebted to the staff of the National Archives, Kathmandu, and to the generosity of Dr Dragomir Dimitrov of the Nepal-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project and Dr Christoph Cüppers of the Lumbini Research Institute, Nepal.

[18] For an English translation of this composite text, see Harrison 2006.

manuscript, while somewhat older, is full of gaps, since not only are many folios missing, but those that have survived are in very poor shape.

The Chinese translations of the Vaj present an equally rich picture. Six have survived, as follows:

1. T 235: *Jin'gang boruo boluomi jing* 金剛般若波羅蜜經, by Kumā-rajīva, 402 A.D. (hereafter referred to as K).
2. T 236: *Jin'gang boruo boluomi jing* 金剛般若波羅蜜經, by Bodhi-ruci, 509 (= B).[19]
3. T 237: *Jin'gang boruo boluomi jing* 金剛般若波羅蜜經, by Para-mārtha, 562 (= Z, for Zhendi 真諦).
4. T 238: *Jin'gang neng duan boruo boluomi jing* 金剛能斷般若波羅蜜經, by Dharmagupta, 605[20] (= Dh).
5. T 220(9): *Da boruo jing dijiuhui nengduan jin'gang fen* 大般若經第九會能斷金剛分, by Xuanzang, 648 (= X).
6. T 239: *Fo shuo nengduan jin'gang boruoboluomiduo jing* 佛說能斷金剛般若波羅蜜多經, by Yijing, 703 (= Y).

Given the sizable number of Sanskrit manuscript remains and the survival of six Chinese translations made over a period of 300 years, the comparative study of the Indic and Chinese versions of the Vaj has no shortage of material with which to work.[21]

The situation is quite different with the VKN, the Sanskrit text of which was until recently thought to be lost, and known only

---

[19] Under this Taishō number there are actually two translations attributed to Bodhiruci, the second of which (757a20–761c29), however, is a copy of Paramārtha's translation (T 237) with occasional variant readings. It is not taken into account in this study.

[20] On the "unfinished" nature of T 238, which distinguishes it from all the other Chinese versions, see Zacchetti 1996. Yuyama 1967: 73 gives the date as ca. 592, and notes the existence of a second version by Dharmagupta dated ca. 613 embedded in the *Jin'gang boruo lun* 金剛般若論 (T 1510b). However, although this translation of the commentary ascribed to Asaṅga is by Dharmagupta, the complete translation of the Vaj which it contains appears throughout to be that of Bodhiruci.

[21] Here we take no account of the versions in other languages, such as Tibetan, Khotanese, etc.

through a few scattered quotations in other works.[22] Consequently the emergence of a complete Sanskrit manuscript of this text, discovered in the Potala Palace in 1999, caused a considerable stir. In 2004 a team of scholars working at Taishō University published a transliteration of the manuscript (collated with Tibetan and Chinese translations), and in 2006 they followed this with an edition. The transliteration attempted to be absolutely faithful to the manuscript, while the edition, making no claims to be critical, also changed the readings of the manuscript as little as possible (see the comments on pp. xi–xii), since the editors held that it "bore no substantial damage, was copied by a fairly good scribe with good scripts, and its reading was, in general, reliable." While acknowledging that in a number of places the manuscript failed to agree with the Tibetan and/or the Chinese translations, the editors found the relationships between the various witnesses unclear, and expressed the hope that more detailed study of the individual cases would clarify the situation, and enable their own rather minimalist emendations to be improved upon.

The Chinese translations of the VKN are only half the number of those of the Vaj, but stretch over a somewhat longer period. Three complete translations survive, as follows:[23]

1. T 474: *Weimojie jing* 維摩詰經, by Zhi Qian 支謙, in the pe-

---

[22] For a complete list of such citations see Lamotte 1962: 91–95, and for the text of those in Sanskrit, with Tibetan and Chinese versions as appropriate, see VKN Intro., pp. 23–41. The most important are the eight citations in Śāntideva's *Śikṣāsamuccaya*. Lamotte lists nine, but the third (in Bendall's edition at 153.20–22) is a reference to the text, not a citation as such (cf. VKN Intro., pp. 24–25). Lamotte's list of citations in the *Sūtrasamuccaya* attributed to Nāgārjuna (but certainly not by him) is incomplete: there are 7, not 3, as follows: 73–76 (II6–12), 163 (IV.14), 163 (VIII.17), 182–183 (IV.17), 183–185 (IV.20), 187–188 (XII.17–19), 188–190 (V.20). References are to Bhikkhu Pāsādika's edition of the Tibetan text. It is unfortunate that the *Sūtrasamuccaya* is extant only in Tibetan and Chinese, since its citations of the VKN are quite extensive.

[23] For full details, including other attributions of allegedly lost translations, see Lamotte 1962: 2–14, from which the following details are taken.

riod 222–229 (= Q).

2. T 475: *Weimojie suoshuo jing* 維摩詰所說經, by Kumārajīva, 406 (= K).

3. T 476: *Shuo wugoucheng jing* 說無垢稱經, by Xuanzang, 650 (= X).

Here again we are faced with the handiwork of Kumārajīva and Xuanzang (and their respective teams), but this time we also have to deal with a product of a much earlier period, from one of the pioneers of Chinese Buddhist translations, Zhi Qian.[24]

What are the implications of the Sanskrit versions of these two texts, especially the new finds, for the study of their Chinese translations? The appearance of the VKN, in particular, is likely to be welcomed by those who still adhere to older ideas about the inadequacy and undependability of Chinese versions for the study of Indian material. Gregory Schopen (2005:4) provides a recent and carefully worded statement of such scepticism.

> Chinese translations have also been used – less successfully, I think – to try to track what have been seen as developments within a given Indian text. The nature and number of assumptions and methodological problems involved in such a use have not, however, always or ever been fully faced, and it is not impossible that some – if not a great deal – of what has been said on the basis of Chinese translations about the history of an Indian text has more to do with the history of Chinese translation techniques and Chinese religious or cultural predilections than with the history of the Indian text itself.

There are indeed some serious difficulties to be faced, among them the challenge of understanding the language of these translations, especially the older ones, which is often obscure, or downright chaotic, or the challenge of working out in full the *modus operandi* of the individual translators and their collaborators, and then there are the vagaries of an uncertain and still largely unexplored Chinese manuscript tradition to contend with. But sometimes scepticism and caution can be taken too far. Edward Conze, for example, was

---

[24] On the work of Zhi Qian 支謙, see now Nattier 2008. On his version of the VKN, see pp. 139–141.

inclined to dismiss Kumārajīva's version of the Vaj, despite its antiquity, as throwing little light on the problems of textual criticism "partly because it was not made directly from a sanskrit original,[25] and partly because it is less concerned with literal accuracy than the later Tibetan translations were" (1957: 1–2). While forced to concede that some of its testimony was borne out by other early sources, he suggested (p. 2) that "[m]any of the verbal differences, abbreviations and omissions may very well be accounted for by Kumārajīva's methods of translating rather than by a divergent sanskrit original." Conze's assessment in this regard surely resulted from taking Müller's 1881 edition as the standard by which to judge all the Chinese translations, but it should have been clear to him even from the subsequently discovered Stein and Gilgit manuscripts that this would not do, and that Kumārajīva's text may indeed represent more accurately an earlier – and considerably shorter – recension of the Vaj, even allowing for the distortions arising from his "methods." Scepticism, then, is all very well, but it is no better than blind faith when it chooses not to look at the evidence.

Scholars working in this field need no further persuasion in respect of the value of Chinese sources, even though they are for the most part well aware of the problems attached to their use. Nevertheless, I still think it useful to submit the assumption that we can track changes in Indic texts through their Chinese translations to some kind of test. To do this, I shall in this paper take a small number of short passages from our two *sūtra*s and carry out what is in effect a kind of "core sample" experiment, arranging the various Chinese versions in chronological order to see how they change over time, and assessing the results against a similarly stratified arrangement of the Indic manuscripts. This is of course virtually impossible to do with the VKN, but even a comparison of the unique 11th–13th-century manuscript[26] with the Chinese ver-

---

[25] Conze provides no evidence for this blunt claim.

[26] This is the conclusion about the date reached by the Taishō team. See VKN Intro., pp. 74–75. However, if the script suggests such a date, then the King Gopāla mentioned in the colophon is very probably the third and last to bear that name, whose regnal years are variously given

sions furnishes us with some useful results. We start with the Vaj, picking out three sections (§§7, 12 and 26) for closer scrutiny, before turning to the VKN, from which four samples are taken.

For the Vaj the Sanskrit text of each passage is given first, in two forms, according to the Shorter (in the case of the Vaj presumably earlier) and Longer (presumably later) Versions.[27] The Shorter Versions are represented by the Gilgit (G), Schøyen (S) and Stein (P) manuscripts, as well as by various Central Asian fragments.[28] The Longer Versions reflect the text established by F. Max Müller (MM), which Conze (Cz) reproduces with minor changes, as noted. The presumed exemplars of MM's Japanese witnesses (K1, K2) have also been collated, as well as Ne1 (Nepalese ms, NAK Acc. No. 5/186 [NMPP B 90/16]) and T2 (§7: fols. 13a–15a; §12: 25b–26b; §26a–b: 63a–64b). In order not to encumber the apparatus with excessive detail, the use of class nasals instead of *anusvāra* and gemination of consonants after *r* are not noted in K1 and K2, while minor spelling mistakes in Ne1 & T are also ignored. **Bold** in the text of the Longer Versions indicates where the wording differs from the Shorter Versions, **bold with underlining** indicates an amplification of the wording. A double asterisk after a footnote

as 1128–1143 or 1143–1158 (see ibid., p. 18). This would narrow down the date of the manuscript to around the middle of the 12th century.

[27] In an earlier version of this paper I used the terms "Shorter Recension" and "Longer Recension" in the singular, but now realize that this could be misleading, not simply because "recension" may imply deliberate editorial revision, but chiefly because it might give rise to the idea that all these older, shorter versions of the text are somehow copies of a single form of the work (**the** Shorter Recension), and so too with the later and longer copies. In other words, one would dispose of the fantasy of the Vaj as a single text only to replace it with the illusion of the Vaj as two texts. Nor is it always and necessarily true that the shorter versions – or, we might better say, performances – of a work are older than the longer ones. However, in the case of the Vaj the weight of the manuscript evidence is certainly in that direction. These and other related issues will be discussed at greater length in the introduction to my forthcoming edition of the text.

[28] See Harrison & Watanabe 2006 for full bibliographical details.

indicates that the reading of K1 and K2 is in substantial agreement with the Shorter Versions.[29] The Chinese translations of each passage are then given in chronological order.[30] Each translator is assigned his own colour (in the case of the Vaj, Kumārajīva maraschino red, Bodhiruci maroon, Paramārtha clover green, Dharmagupta black, Xuanzang blueberry blue, and Yijing magenta; for the VKN Zhi Qian black, Kumārajīva maraschino red, Xuanzang blueberry blue), but this colour is applied only to the wording which is original to that translator's text. In this way one can easily see, even without reading Chinese, how much of the wording each translator has taken from his predecessors. An exception is made for Dharmagupta, since his version of the Vaj is not a translation like the others, and it would be very difficult to ascertain the extent to which he borrowed anyone else's wording. Instead his Chinese rendition of all three passages is given again at the end of the Vaj section, set against the Sanskrit, which it follows *verbatim* in Sanskrit word order.

In the case of the VKN the Sanskrit text has come down to us in a single version, so it is presented once only, with minimal or no apparatus (the Tibetan version is also supplied, as given in VKN Text). After the presentation of the VKN passages, I present some remarks about the significance of the general patterns which emerge from this exercise. Within the confines of this paper it is unfortunately not possible to discuss all the points of interest and problems of interpretation which can be found in each passage, so notes on specific variants have been kept to a minimum.

---

[29] In this paper the readings of K1 and K2 are given in the apparatus to the Longer Versions since copies derived from them were collated by Max Müller when he established his edition, and since it is important to show the extent to which he suppressed their testimony in his own apparatus (on this point see below). However, it is evident that this is not their proper place, since they tend very often to agree with the Shorter Versions, i.e. G, S, P and the Central Asian fragments, as will be abundantly clear in the apparatus to my new edition of the complete Sanskrit text.

[30] The text is taken from the CBETA version, checked against the printed copy in the Taishō, and repunctuated. Variant readings are generally not noted.

Text Passages

Vaj §7 Sanskrit (Shorter Versions)[a]

punar aparaṃ bhagavān āyuṣmaṃtaṃ subhūtim etad avocat[b] |
tat ki<ṃ> manyase subhūte kācit tathāgatenānuttarā{ṃ}[c] sam-
yaksaṃbodhir abhisaṃbuddhā │ kaścid vā dharmas tathāga-
tena deśitaḥ ‖ subhūtir āha │ yathāhaṃ bhagavan[d] bhagavato
bhāṣitasyārtham ājānāmi nāsti sa kaścid dha(r)m(o ya)s tathāgate-
nānuttarā{ṃ} samyaksaṃbodhir abhisaṃbuddhā │ nāsti sa kaścid
dharmo y(as tathā)g(at)ena deśitaḥ <> tat kasya hetoḥ <> yo 'sau
tathāgatena dharmo deśit(aḥ[e] │ agrāhyaḥ s)o 'nabhilapyaḥ[f] <> na sa
dharmo nādharmaḥ <> tat kasya hetoḥ <> asaṃskṛtaprabhāvitā[g]
hy āryapudgalāḥ <>

[a] This section missing in P and G. Text here that of S and Frag d (see Harrison
   & Watanabe 2006). Underlining indicates where there are gaps in Frag d, so
   that for these sections of the text we have only the testimony of S.
[b] It can be inferred from the number of missing akṣaras in Frag d that it did not
   contain this sentence in this form. There appears to be enough room for *āha*
   alone, or, more likely, nothing at all, in which case Frag d would have read with K.
[c] Frag d reads: [*ān*](*u*)[*t*](*ta*)[*r*]*ā*.
[d] It can be inferred from the number of missing akṣaras in Frag d that it did not
   contain *bhagavan*.
[e] Frag d (*deśīta agrāhya sau anabhilā*) supports our reconstruction of S, in
   which what can be seen of the missing akṣaras renders *deśito* impossible.
[f] Frag d: *agrāhya sau anabhilā*.
[g] S reads: *asaṃskṛtathābhāvitā*. This scribal error is accounted for by the close
   resemblance of the akṣaras *pra* and *thā* in this script.

Vaj §7 Sanskrit (Longer Versions)

punar aparaṃ[a] bhagavān āyuṣmaṃtaṃ subhūtim etad avocat │ tat
kiṃ manyase subhūte **asti sa kaścid dharmo yas**[b] tathāgatenānuttarā
samyaksaṃbodhir[c] **ity**[d] abhisaṃbuddh**aḥ**[e] kaścid vā[f] dharmas[g]
tathāgatena deśitaḥ │

evam ukta āyuṣmān subhūtir **bhagavaṃtam etad avocat**[h] │ yathā-
haṃ bhagavan[i] bhagavato bhāṣitasyārtham ājānāmi[j] nāsti sa kaścid
dharmo yas[k] tathāgatenānuttarā[l] samyaksaṃbodhir **ity**[m] abhisaṃ-

buddha**ḥ**ⁿ nāsti dharmo^o yas tathāgatena deśitaḥ^p ∣ tat kasya hetoḥ^q ∣
yo 'sau^r tathāgatena dharmo **'bhisaṃbuddho**^s deśito **vā** agrāhyaḥ^t
so 'nabhilapyaḥ^u ∣ na sa dharmo nādharmaḥ^v ∣ tat kasya hetoḥ^w ∣
asaṃskṛtaprabhāvitā^x hy āryapudgalāḥ ∥

[a] *aparaṃ* MM, Ne1, T2: *aparan** K1, K2 (not noted by MM)

[b] *asti sa kaścid dharmo yas* MM, Ne1, *asti sa kaccid dharmo yas* T2: *kacit* K1, K2 (not noted by MM).**

[c] *samyaksaṃbodhir* MM, Ne1, K2, T2: *samyasaṃbodhir* K1, corrected to *samyaksaṃbodhir* K1 (not noted by MM).

[d] So MM, but he notes that his Ch, J & T all read *samyaksaṃbodhir abhi-* (thus K1, K2, Ne1, T2). *Ity* is thus his emendation.

[e] MM notes that his J reads *abhisaṃbuddhā* (thus K1, K2). *abhisaṃbuddhaḥ* Ne1, T2.**

[f] *vā* MM, Ne1, T2: om. K1, K2 (not noted by MM).

[g] *dharmas* MM, Ne1, T2: *dharmmaḥ* K1, K2 (not noted by MM).

[h] *evam ukta āyuṣmān subhūtir bhagavaṃtam etad avocat* MM, Ne1, T (T2: *subhūter*): *subhūtir āha* K1, K2 (not noted by MM).**

[i] *bhagavan* MM, Ne1: *bhagavaṃn* T2, *bhagavaṃ* K1, K2 (not noted by MM).

[j] *ājānāmi* MM, T2: *ajanāmi* K1, K2 (not noted by MM).

[k] MM notes that Ch & T read *dharmas* for *dharmo yas* (thus T2, so too Ne1). *dharmmo yas* K1, K2.**

[l] *tathāgatenānuttarā* MM: *tathāgatenānuttara* T2, *tathāgatenānuttarāṃ* K1, K2 (not noted by MM).**

[m] MM notes that his J reads *samyaksaṃbodhir abhi-* (thus K1, K2). *ity* Ne1, T2.**

[n] *abhisaṃbuddhaḥ* MM, K1: *abhisaṃbuddha* K2, *abhisaṃbuddhā* Ne1, T2.

[o] *nāsti dharmo* MM, Ne1, T2: *nasti sa kaścid dharmmo* K1, *nāsti sa kaścid dharmmo* K2 (not noted by MM).**

[p] MM notes that Ch & T read *bhāṣitaḥ and bhaṣitaḥ* respectively (thus T2). *bhāṣitaḥ* Ne1.

[q] *hetoḥ* MM: *heto* K1, K2, *hetor* T2 (not noted by MM). *heto* Ne1.

[r] *'sau* MM, Ne1: *'so* T2, K1, K2.

[s] *'bhisaṃbuddho* MM, Ne1, T2: om K1, K2 (not noted by MM).**

[t] *deśito vā agrāhyaḥ* MM, T2 (*agrāhyas*): *deśito 'grāhyaḥ* K1, K2 (not noted by MM). *yasito* [!] *vā agrāhyas* Ne1.**

[u] *'nabhilapyaḥ* MM, K1, K2: *'nabhilāpyo* T2.

[v] *nādharmaḥ* MM, T2: *nadharmmoḥ* K1, *nadharmmaḥ* K2 (not noted by MM).

[w] *hetoḥ* MM: *hetor* K1, K2, T2 (not noted by MM).

[x] *asaṃskṛtaprabhāvitā* MM, K1, K2: *asaṃskṛtaprabhāvita* T2, *na saṃskata-prabhāvitā* Ne1.

Vaj §7 Chinese

1. Kumārajīva (T 235, 8:749b12–18)

「須菩提！於意云何？如來得阿耨多羅三藐三菩提耶？如來有所說法耶？」

須菩提言：「如我解佛所說義，無有定 ᵃ法名阿耨多羅三藐三菩提，亦無有定法如來可說。何以故？如來所說法皆不可取，不可說，非法，非非法。所以者何？一切賢聖皆以無為法而有差別。」

2. Bodhiruci (T 236, 8:753b17–23)

復次佛告慧命須菩提：「須菩提！於意云何？如來得阿耨多羅三藐三菩提耶？如來有所說法耶？」

須菩提言：「如我解佛所說義，無有定法如來得阿耨多羅三藐三菩提，亦無有定法如來可說。何以故？如來所說法皆不可取，不可說，非法，非非法。何以故？一切聖人皆以無為法得名。」

3. Paramārtha (T 237, 8:762c16–22)

復次佛(variant: 佛復)告淨命須菩提：「須菩提！汝意云何？如來得阿耨多羅三藐三菩提耶？如來有所說法耶？」

須菩提言：「如我解佛說義，無所有 ᵇ法如來所得名阿耨多羅三藐三菩提，亦無有法如來所說。何以故？是法如來所說不可取，不可言，非法，非非法。何以故？一切聖人皆以無為真如所顯現故。」

4. Dharmagupta (T 238, 8:767c3–10)

復次世尊命者善實邊如是言：「彼何意念，善實？有如來應正遍知無上正遍知證覺？有復法如來說？」

善實言：「如我世尊世尊說義解我，無有一法若如來無上正遍知證覺，無有一法若如來說。彼何所因？若彼如來法說不可取彼，不可說，不彼法，非不法。彼何因？無為法ᶜ顯明聖人。」

5. Xuanzang (T 220(9), 7:980c29–981a8)

佛復告具壽善現言：「善現！於汝意云何？頗有少法 ᵈ如來應正等覺證得阿耨多羅三藐三菩提耶。頗有少法如來應正等覺是所說耶？」

善現答言：「世尊！如我解佛所說義者，無有少法如來應正等覺證

得阿耨多羅三藐三菩提，亦無有少法是如來應正等覺所說。何以故？世尊！如來應正等覺所證 [e] 所說所思惟法，皆不可取，不可宣說，非法，非非法。何以故？以諸賢聖補特伽羅皆是無為之所顯故。」

6. Yijing (T 239, 8:772b22–27)

「妙生！於汝意云何？如來於無上菩提有所證不？復有少法是所說不？」

妙生言：「如我解佛所說義，如來於無上菩提實 [f] 無所證，亦無所說。何以故？佛所說法不可取，不可說，彼非法，非非法。何以故？以諸聖者皆是無為所顯現故。」

[a] Here and in the next clause K inserts the word *ding* 定 ("settled," "definite," "fixed"), for which there is no support in any Sanskrit text. B replicates this.

[b] Here and in the next clause Z drops the word *ding* 定 inserted by K (and B).

[c] The appearance of *wuweifa* 無為法 in Dh increases the likelihood of K reflecting an actual Sanskrit reading *asaṃskṛtadharmaprabhāvitā*, rather than being a commentarial amplification made in China.

[d] X is the first and only Chinese translation to reflect the *asti sa kaścid dharmo yas* of the Longer Versions.

[e] X is the only translation to reflect the (*dharmo*) *'bhisaṃbuddho ... vā* of the Longer Versions. It also adds a third term to the series, *suo-siwei* 所思惟, "pondered," "meditated on."

[f] Here Yijing resorts to a device favoured by Kumārajīva, albeit not in this section. See below.

Vaj §12 Sanskrit (Shorter Versions)[a]

api tu khalu[b] subhūte yasmin pṛthivīpradeśe ito[c] dharmaparyāyād aṃtaśaś[d] catuṣpadikām[e] api gāthām[f] bhāṣyeta[g] vā deśyeta vā[h] sa[i] pṛthivīpradeśaś[j] caityabhūto bhavet[k] <|> sadevamānuṣāsurasya[l] lokasya kaḥ punar vādaḥ subhūte[m] ya imaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ[n] dhārayiṣyaṃti[o] parameṇa te[p] āścaryeṇa samanvāgatā bhaviṣyaṃti | tasmiṃś ca[q] pṛthivīpradeśe śāstā viharaty anyatarānyataro vā gurusthānīyaḥ[r] |

[a] Text that of S, with notes on readings of P and Frag e (see Harrison & Watanabe 2006). Underlining indicates where the Stein ms (P) has gaps. G not extant for this section.

[b] P, Frag e omit: *khalu*.

^c Pargiter's reconstruction omits *ito*, but there is enough room for it in the gap. Lacuna in Frag e.

^d P apparently omits: *aṃtaśaś*. Frag e has *anta .. .*

^e P: *cātuṣpādām* (originally *cātuṣpādāpi*, with *ma* inserted above *dā*). Lacuna in Frag e.

^f Frag e: *gāthā*.

^g P: *bhāṣyate*; Frag e: *bhāṣiṣyate*.

^h P, Frag e: *tena* for *vā deśyeta vā*.

ⁱ P: *saḥ*.

^j P: *pṛthivīpradeśaḥ*.

^k P: *bhaviṣyati* for *bhavet*. Frag e reads *ṣyati*, therefore must have read with P.

^l Frag e *sadevamān[u]ṣyā(surasya)*. Lacuna in P. Both S (| indicates the use of *virāma* in the ms) & P punctuate before this term, but punctuation seems unnecessary. Frag e does not have it.

^m Frag e omits: *subhūte*. Lacuna in P.

ⁿ Lacuna in P, but P probably read with S. Frag e reads with S.

^o Frag e: *udgṛhṇīṣyan(t)i* for *dhārayiṣyaṃti*. Lacuna in P, which may have read either *udgṛhṇīṣyanti* or *dhārayiṣyanti*, but has in any case only enough space for one verb. Frag e breaks off at this point.

^p P adds: *satvā*.

^q P: *(tas)[m](iṃ)* (without *ca*, since it is followed by *(p)[ṛ]-*).

^r Lacuna in P would apparently permit *vijñaguru°*.

Vaj §12 Sanskrit (Longer Versions)

api tu khalu **punaḥ** subhūte yasmin^a pṛthivīpradeśe ito dharma-paryāyād^b aṃtaśaś catuṣpādikām^c api gāthām^d **udgṛhya**^e bhāṣye-ta vā **saṃprakāśyeta**^f vā sa pṛthivīpradeśaś^g caityabhūto^h bhavet sadevamānuṣāsurasyaⁱ lokasya kaḥ punar vādo ya imaṃ^j dharma-paryāyaṃ **sakalasamāptaṃ**^k dhārayiṣyaṃti **vācayiṣyaṃti**^l **pary-avāpsyaṃti parebhyaś ca vistareṇa saṃprakāśayiṣyaṃti**^m | para-meṇa te **subhūta** āścaryeṇaⁿ samanvāgatā^o bhaviṣyaṃti | tasmiṃś ca **subhūte**^p pṛthivīpradeśe śāstā^q viharaty anyatarānyataro^r vā **vi-jña**gurusthānīyaḥ^s ||

^a *yasmin* MM, Ne1, T2: *yesmiṃ* K1, K2 (not noted by MM).

^b *dharmaparyāyād* MM, T2: *dharmmaparyāyād* K1, *dharmmaparyāyad* K2

^c *catuṣpādikām* MM, Ne1, T2: *catuṣpadikām* K1, K2 (not noted by MM).**

^d *gāthām* MM, Ne1: *gāthā* K1, K2 (not noted by MM).

^e *udgṛhya* MM, Ne1, T2 (in Ne1 & T2 followed by *vā*): om K1, K2 (not noted by MM).**

^f *saṃprakāśyeta* MM, Ne1, T2: *deśeta* K1, K2 (not noted by MM).**

g °*pradeśaś* MM, T2 (T2 regularly *pṛthivi*°): °*pradeśaḥ* K1, K2 (not noted by MM).

h *caityabhūto* MM, Ne1, K1: *cetyabhūto* K2 (not noted by MM).

i *sadevamānuṣāsurasya* MM, Ne1, T2: *sadevamānuṣyāsurasya* K1, K2 (not noted by MM).

j *imaṃ* MM, K1, T2: *imāṃ* K2 (not noted by MM).

k *sakalasamāptaṃ* MM, Ne1, T2: om K1, K2 (not noted by MM).**

l *dhārayiṣyaṃti vācayiṣyaṃti* MM, Ne1, T2: *udgṛhīṣyanti dhārayiṣyanti vāca-yiṣyanti* K1, K2 (not noted by MM).

m *paryavāpsyaṃti parebhyaś ca vistareṇa saṃprakāśayiṣyaṃti* MM, T2: om. K1, K2 (not noted by MM); *parebhyaś ca vistareṇa saṃprakāśayiṣyanti* Ne1 (omits *paryavāpsyanti*).**

n *parameṇa te subhūta āścaryeṇa* MM, Ne1, T2 (*subhūte*): *parameṇaścaryeṇa* K1, *parameṇāścaryeṇa* K2 (not noted by MM).**

o *samanvāgatā* MM, Ne1, K1, T2: *samanvāgata* K2 (not noted by MM).

p *subhūte* MM, Ne1, T2: om. K1, K2 (not noted by MM).**

q *śāstā* MM, Ne1: *sāstā* K1, *śāsta* K2, *ccāstā* T2 (not noted by MM).

r *anyatarānyataro* MM, T2: *anyataro* K1, K2 (not noted by MM). *anyataro nānyataro* Ne1.

s *vijñagurusthānīyaḥ* MM, T2: *gurusthānīyaḥ* K1, K2 (not noted by MM). *vijñāsubhasthānīya* Ne1.**

Vaj §12 Chinese

1. Kumārajīva (T 235, 8:750a6–10)

「復次，須菩提！隨說 ᵃ 是經，乃至四句偈等，當知 ᵇ 此處，一切世間天、人、阿修羅皆應供養，如佛塔廟。何況有人盡 ᶜ 能受持、讀誦 ᵈ，須菩提！當知是人成就最上第一希有之法，若是經典所在之處，則為有佛，若尊重弟子。ᵉ 」

2. Bodhiruci (T 236, 8:754a19–24)

「復次，須菩提！隨所有處，說是法門，乃至四句偈等，當知此處，一切世間天、人、阿修羅皆應供養，如佛塔廟。何況有人盡能受持、讀誦此經。須菩提！當知是人成就最上第一希有之法，若是經典所在之處，則為有佛，若尊重似佛。」

3. Paramārtha (T 237, 8:763b19–25)

「復次，須菩提！隨所在處，若有人能從是經典，乃至四句偈等，讀誦講說。當知此處，於世間中即成支提，一切人、天、阿修羅等皆應

恭敬。何況有人盡能受持、讀誦如此經典,當知是人則與無上希有之法而共相應,是土地處,大師在中,或隨有一可尊重人。」

4. Dharmagupta (T 238, 8:768b17–22)

「雖然復次時,善實!此中地分,此法本乃至四句等偈,為他等說若,分別若,廣說若,彼地分支帝有天、人、阿脩羅世。何復言,善實!若此法本持當、讀當、誦當、他等及分別廣說當,最勝彼希有具足當有。此中,善實!地分教師遊行,別異尊重處相似,共梵行。」

5. Xuanzang (T 220(9), 7:981c27–982a5)

「復次善現!若地方所於此法門,乃至為他宣說開示四句伽他,此地方所尚為世間諸天及人阿素洛等之所供養如佛靈廟。何況有能於此法門具足究竟書寫、受持、讀誦、究竟通利及廣為他宣說、開示、如理作意,如是有情成就最勝希有功德,此地方所大師所住,或隨一一尊重處所,若諸有智同梵行者。」

6. Yijing (T 239, 8:773a17–22)

「妙生!若國土中有此法門,為他解說,乃至四句 ᶠ 伽他,當知此地,即是制底,一切天、人、阿蘇羅等,皆應右繞而為敬禮。何況盡能受持、讀誦,當知是人,則為最上第一希有,又此方所,即為有佛,及尊重弟子。」

ᵃ With only one verb here, K reads with the Shorter Versions as represented by P and Frag e.

ᵇ Here and at the start of the last sentence, K inserts the words *dang zhi* 當知, "one should know that ..." presumably to improve the balance and clarity of the translation. Unsupported by any Sanskrit version of the text, this stylistic amplification is repeated by B and Z, and survives even in Y.

ᶜ K is either translating a shorter version with *sakalasamāptaṃ*, or, more likely, adding the word *jin* 盡 to bring out the undoubted implication of the text. Only X provides a clear equivalent for *sakalasamāptaṃ*, which itself looks like a commentarial amplification. All Sanskrit mss of the Shorter Version group lack it, including K1 & K2.

ᵈ K suggests *dhārayiṣyanti* (or *udgṛhīṣyanti*) *vācayiṣyanti*, and lacks the further amplifications of the Longer Versions, first evident in Dh.

ᵉ Reflects the Shorter Versions (no equivalent for *vijña-*, which is not attested in the Chinese until X).

ᶠ Emend text from 向.

Vaj §26a–b Sanskrit (Shorter Versions)[a]

[26a] tat kiṃ[b] manyase subhūte lakṣaṇasaṃpadā[c] tathāgato draṣṭa-
vyaḥ |

   āha | evam[d] etad[e] bhagaval[f] lakṣaṇasaṃpadā[g] tathāgato draṣṭa-
vyaḥ |

   bhagavān āha[h] | sacet punaḥ subhūte lakṣaṇasaṃpadā[i] tathāgato
draṣṭavyo 'bhaviṣyad rājāpi cakravartī tathāgato 'bhaviṣyat |[j]

   āha[k] | yathāham[l] bhagavato bhāṣitasyārtham ājānāmi | na lakṣa-
ṇasaṃpadā[m] tathāgato draṣṭavyaḥ ‖

   atha khalu[n] bhagavāṃs[o] tasyāṃ velāyām imā gāthā abhāṣata[p] : ‖

       ye māṃ rūpeṇa adrākṣur[q] ye māṃ ghoṣeṇa anvayuḥ |
       mithyāprahāṇaprasṛtā na māṃ[r] drakṣyaṃti te janāḥ[s] ‖ 1 ‖

[§26b] draṣṭavyo dharmato buddho dharmakāyās tathāgatāḥ |
        dharmatā cāpy avijñeyā na sā śakyaṃ vijānituṃ[t] ‖ 2 ‖

----

a   Base text is G. Underlining indicates where the Stein ms (P) has gaps. Frags
    h & i (see Harrison & Watanabe 2006: 94) contain material from this section,
    but it was not possible to collate them when this paper was prepared. See now
    Harrison 2009 for their testimony (No. 1; cf. also No. 6).
b   *kiṃ* G: *kin* P.
c   *lakṣaṇasaṃpadā* G: *lakṣaṇasaṃpadāyās* P.
d   *āha | evam* P: *āhaivam* G.
e   *etad* G: *eva* P.
f   *bhagaval* G: *bhagavaṃ* P.
g   *lakṣaṇasaṃpadā* G: *lakṣaṇasaṃpadāy(ās)* P.
h   *bhagavān āha* G: *āha* P.
i   *lakṣaṇasaṃpadā* G: *lakṣaṇasaṃpadāyās* P.
j   P adds here: *tasmād alakṣaṇasaṃpadāyās tathāgato draṣṭavyaḥ*.
k   *āha* G: *āyuṣmāṃ subhūtir āha* P.
l   P has space here for *bhagavan* (cf. Dharmagupta).
m   *lakṣaṇasaṃpadā* G: *lakṣaṇasaṃpadāyās* P.
n   *atha khalu* G: *atha* P.
o   *bhagavāṃs* G: *bhagavāṃ* P.
p   *abhāṣata* G: *...ṣīt* P. Pargiter conjectures *abhāṣiṣīt*, but the form *adhyabhāṣīt*
    (often written *adhvabhāṣīt*) occurs frequently enough to be more likely.
q   *adrākṣur* G: *adrākṣ(ī)* P.
r   *māṃ* G: *me* P.
s   *janāḥ* G: *na(rāḥ)* P.
t   P omits the second verse in its entirety (cf. K).

Vaj §26a–b Sanskrit (Longer Versions)

[26a] tat kiṃ manyase subhūte lakṣaṇasaṃpadā[a] tathāgato draṣṭa-
vyaḥ |

    subhūtir āha | **no hīdaṃ** bhagavan | **yathāhaṃ bhagavato
bhāṣitasyārtham**[b] **ājānāmi**[c] **na** lakṣaṇasaṃpadā tathāgato draṣṭa-
vyaḥ[d] |

    bhagavān āha | **sādhu sādhu subhūte evam etat subhūte evam
etad yathā vadasi** | **na lakṣaṇasaṃpadā tathāgato draṣṭavyaḥ** |
tat kasya hetoḥ[e] | sacet punaḥ subhūte lakṣaṇasaṃpadā tathāgato
draṣṭavyo 'bhaviṣyad[f] rājāpi[g] cakravartī tathāgato 'bhaviṣyat[h] |
tasmān[i] **na lakṣaṇasaṃpadā tathāgato draṣṭavyaḥ** |

    āyuṣmān[j] **subhutir bhagavaṃtam etad avocat** | yathāhaṃ
bhagavato bhāṣitasyārtham ājānāmi[k] na lakṣaṇasaṃpadā tathāgato
draṣṭavyaḥ ‖

    atha khalu bhagavāṃs[l] tasyāṃ[m] velāyām ime gāthe[n] abhāṣata |

        ye māṃ rūpeṇa **cā**drākṣur[o] ye māṃ ghoṣeṇa **cā**nvaguḥ[p] |
        mithyāprahāṇaprasṛtā[q] na māṃ drakṣyaṃti te janāḥ[r] | 1 ‖

[§26b] **dharmato buddho**[s] **draṣṭavyo**[t] dharmakāyā[u] **hi nāyakāḥ**[v] |
        dharmatā ca **na**[w] vijñeyā na sā[x] śaky**ā**[y] vijānituṃ[z] ‖ 2 ‖

---

a   *°saṃpadā* MM, K2, Ne1, T2: *°saṃpada* K1 (not noted by MM).

b   *bhāṣitasyārtham* MM, Ne1: *bhāṣitāsyārtham* T2.

c   *ājānāmi* MM, Ne1: *ajānāmi* T2.

d   *no hīdaṃ bhagavan | yathāhaṃ bhagavato bhāṣitasyārtham ājānāmi na
lakṣaṇasaṃpadā tathāgato draṣṭavyaḥ* MM, Ne1, T2: *evam etad bhagavaṃ
na lakṣaṇasanpadā* (K2: *°saṃnpadā*) *tathāgato draṣṭavyaḥ* K1, K2 (not not-
ed by MM). [K1, K2 read with Shorter Versions except for insertion of the
negative!]**

e   *sādhu sādhu subhūte evam etat subhūte evam etad yathā vadasi | na lakṣa-
ṇasaṃpadā tathāgato draṣṭavyaḥ | tat kasya hetoḥ* (*hetos* T2)| MM, Ne1, T2:
om K1, K2 (not noted by MM).**

f   *'bhaviṣyad* MM: *'bhaviṣyen* K1, *'bhaviṣyet* K2 (not noted by MM). *'bhaviṣyat*
Ne1, *draṣṭavyaḥ bhaviṣyat* T2.

g   *rājāpi* MM, K2: *rājapi* K1 (not noted by MM). *tad rājāpi* Ne1, T2 (not noted
by MM).

h   *'bhaviṣyat* MM, T2, Ne1: *'bhaviṣyet* K1, K2 (not noted by MM).

i   *tasmān* MM, Ne1, T2: *tasman* K1, K2 (not noted by MM).

j   *āyuṣmān* MM, Ne1, T2: *athāyuṣmāt* K1, K2 (not noted by MM).

k   *ājānāmi* MM, T2: *ājanāma* K1, *ājānāmi* K2 (not noted by MM).

l   *bhagavāṃs* MM, T2: *bhagavan* K1, K2 (not noted by MM).

^m *tasyāṃ* MM, K1: *tasyā* K2 (not noted by MM).

ⁿ *ime gāthe* MM, Ne1, T2: *ima gāthā* K1, K2 (not noted by MM).**

^o *cādrakṣur* MM, T2: *adrakṣuḥ* K1, *adrākṣuḥ* K2 (not noted by MM). *mādrākṣu* Ne1 (Ne1 is very corrupt in this verse).**

^p *cānvaguḥ* MM: MM notes that J reads *anvayuḥ* (thus K1, K2), Ch reads *cānvayo*, T reads *cānvayot* (in fact T2 reads *cāndhayo*, with the pāda end marker being misread by MM as a *t*). Conze changes to *cānvayuḥ. yāndhayo*: Ne1.**

^q °*prasṛtā* MM, Ne1, K1, K2: °*prasṛta* T2.

^r *janāḥ* MM, Ne1, K1, K2: *janā* T2.

^s *buddho* MM: *buddha* K1, K2, T2 (not noted by MM). *buddha* Ne1. Conze changes to *buddhā*.

^t *draṣṭavyo* MM: *draṣṭavya* T2, K1, *draṣṭavyā* K2 (not noted by MM). *draṣṭavya* Ne1. Conze changes to *draṣṭavyā*.

^u *dharmakāyā* MM, K1, Ne1, T2: *dharmakāya* K2 (not noted by MM).

^v *nāyakāḥ* MM, Ne1: *nāyaka* K1, K2, *nāyakā* T2 (not noted by MM).

^w *ca na*: MM notes Ch & T read *cāsya* (thus T2), J reads *ca na* (thus K1, K2). *mārrya* Ne1 (corruption of *cāsya*?)

^x *sā*: MM notes that Ch & T read *sa* (thus T2), J reads *sā* (thus K1, K2). *sā* Ne1.

^y *śakyā*: MM notes that J reads *śakyaṃ* (thus K2; K1 *sakyaṃ*, corrected in red to *śakyaṃ*), Ch & T read *śakyā* (in fact T2 reads *śākyā*). *sakyā* Ne1.**

^z *vijānituṃ* MM, Ne1, T2. MM notes that J & T read *janituṃ* (i.e. *vijanituṃ*?). Thus K1, K2: *vijanituṃ*.

Vaj §26a–b Chinese

1. Kumārajīva (T 235, 8:752a11–18)

「須菩提！於意云何？可以三十二相觀如來不？」須菩提言：「如是如是。以三十二相觀如來。」佛言：「須菩提！若以三十二相觀如來者，轉輪聖王則是如來。」須菩提白佛言：「世尊！如我解佛所說義，不應以三十二相觀如來。^a」爾時世尊而說偈言：

　　若以色見我　　以音聲求我　　是人行邪道　　不能見如來^b

2 Bodhiruci (T 236, 8:756b14–23)

「須菩提！於意云何？可以相成就得見如來不？」須菩提言：「如我解如來所說義，不以相成就得見如來。^c」佛言：「如是如是，須菩提！不以相成就得見如來。」佛言：「須菩提！若以相成就觀如來者，轉輪聖王應是如來。是故非以相成就得見如來。」爾時世尊而說偈言：

　　若以色見我　　以音聲求我　　是人行邪道　　不能見如來

彼如來妙體　即法身諸佛　法體不可見　彼識不能知

3. Paramārtha (T 237, 8:765c26–766a7)

「須菩提！汝意云何？可以具足相觀如來不？」須菩提言：「如我解佛所說義，不以具足相應觀如來。」佛言：「如是，須菩提！如是。不以具足相應觀如來。何以故？若以具足相觀如來者，轉輪聖王應是如來。是故不以具足相應觀如來。」是時世尊而說偈言：

若以色見我　以音聲求我　是人行邪道　不應得見我
由法應見佛　調御法為身　此法非識境　法如深難見

4. Dharmagupta (T 238, 8:771a15–28)

「彼何意念善實？相具足如來見應？」善實言：「不如此世尊！如我世尊說義解我，不相具足如來見應。」世尊言：「善善善實！如是，如是，善實！如，如語汝。不相具足如來見應。彼何所因？彼復，善實！相具足如來見應有，彼王轉輪如來有。彼故不相具足如來見應。此相非相故，如來見應。」爾時命者善實世尊邊如是言：「如我世尊！世尊說義解我，不相具足如來見應。」爾時世尊彼時此伽陀說：

若我色見　若我聲求　邪解脫行　不我見彼人
法體佛見應　法身彼如來　法體及不識　彼不(variants: 不彼 & 故彼不)能知

5. Xuanzang (T 220(9), 7:985a15–26)

佛告善現：「於汝意云何？可以諸相具足觀如來不？」善現答言：「如我解佛所說義者，不應以諸相具足觀於如來。」佛言：「善現！善哉！善哉！如是，如是！如汝所說。不應以諸相具足觀於如來。善現！若以諸相具足觀如來者，轉輪聖王應是如來。是故不應以諸相具足觀於如來。如是應以諸相非相觀於如來。」爾時世尊而說頌曰：

諸以色觀我　以音聲尋我　彼生履邪斷　不能當見我
應觀佛法性　即導師法身　法性非所識　故彼不能了

6. Yijing (T 239, 8:775a9–17)

「妙生！於汝意云何。應以具相觀如來不。」「不爾，世尊！不應以具相觀於如來。」「妙生！若以具相觀如來者，轉輪聖王應是如來。是故不應以具相觀於如來。應以諸相非相觀於如來。」爾時世尊而說頌曰：

若以色見我　以音聲求我　是人起邪覲　不能當見我
應觀佛法性　即導師法身　法性非所識　故彼不能了

^a K is the only Chinese translation to accord with the Shorter Versions in the structure of this passage, and to have Subhūti come up with the wrong answer for the first time in the text. See Harrison 2006: 156, n. 112 for a brief note on this important recensional variant.

^b K alone lacks the second verse, in line with the Shorter Versions as represented by P.

^c Although coded maroon, this sentence shares much of the wording with its counterpart in K, but it occupies a different position.

Selected sections of the Vaj according to Dharmagupta

Sanskrit underlined and in bold indicates amplifications not found in the Shorter Versions. Word order has not been changed in either language. Punctuation has been removed.^a

Vaj §7 (T 238, 8:767c3–10)

復次 punar [+ aparaṃ?] 世尊 bhagavān 命者 āyuṣmaṃtaṃ 善實 邊 subhūtim 如是 etad 言 avocat 彼 tat 何 kiṃ 意念 manyase 善 實 subhūte 有 kācit 如來 tathāgatena 應 **arhatā** 正 **samyak** 遍 知 **saṃbuddhena** 無上 anuttarā 正遍知 samyaksaṃbodhir 證覺 abhisaṃbuddhā 有 kaścid 復 vā 法 dharmas 如來 tathāgatena 說 deśitaḥ

善實 subhūtir 言 āha 如 yathā 我 ahaṃ 世尊 bhagavan 世尊 bhaga-vato 說 bhāṣitasya 義 artham 解我 ājānāmi 無 na 有 asti – sa kaścid 法 dharmo 若 yas 如來 tathāgatena 無上 anuttarā 正 samyak 遍 知 saṃbodhir 證覺 abhisaṃbuddhā 無 na 有 asti – sa kaścid 法 dharmo 若 yas 如來 tathāgatena 說 deśitaḥ 彼 tat 何所 kasya 因 hetoḥ 若 yo 彼 'sau 如來 tathāgatena 法 dharmo 說 deśitaḥ 不可取 agrāhyaḥ 彼 so 不可說 'nabhilapyaḥ 不 na 彼 sa 法 dharmo 非 na 不法 adharmaḥ 彼 tat 何 kasya 因 hetoḥ 無為法 asaṃskṛtadharma 顯明 prabhāvitā [hi *unrepresented*] 聖人 āryapudgalāḥ

Vaj §12 (T 238, 8:768b17–22)

雖然 api tu 復次時 khalu **punaḥ** 善實 subhūte 此中 yasmin [?] 地
pṛthivī 分 pradeśe 此 ito 法本 dharmaparyāyād 乃至 aṃtaśaś 四句等
catuṣpadikām [api *unrepresented*?] 偈 gāthāṃ 為他等 **parebhyaḥ**
[?] 說 bhāṣyeta 若 vā 分別 deśyeta [?] 若 vā 廣說 **saṃprakāśyeta**
[?] 若 **vā** 彼 sa 地 pṛthivī 分 pradeśaś 支帝 caitya[bhūto *unrep-*
resented?] 有 bhavet 天 [sa?]deva 人 mānuṣa 阿脩羅 asurasya 世
lokasya 何 kaḥ 復 punar 言 vādaḥ 善實 subhūte 若 ya 此 imaṃ 法
dharmaparyāyaṃ 持當 **udgṛhṇīṣyanti** 讀當 dhārayiṣyaṃti [?] 誦
當 **vācayiṣyaṃti** 他等 **parebhyaś** 及 ca 分別 **vistareṇa** [?] 廣說
當 **saṃprakāśayiṣyaṃti** 最勝 parameṇa 彼 te 希有 āścaryeṇa 具足
samanvāgatā 當有 bhaviṣyaṃti 此中 tasmin [ca *not represented*, cf.
P] 善實 **subhūte** 地 pṛthivī 分 pradeśe 教師 śāstā 遊行 viharaty 別
異 anyataro [vā *not represented*] 尊重 guru 處相似 sthānīyaḥ 共梵
行 **sabrahmacārī** [?]

Vaj §26a–b (T 238, 8:771a15–28)

彼 tat 何 kiṃ 意念 manyase 善實 subhūte 相 lakṣaṇa 具足
saṃpadā 如來 tathāgato 見應 draṣṭavyaḥ 善實 **subhūtir** 言 āha
不 **no** 如此 **hīdaṃ** 世尊 bhagavan 如 **yathā** 我 **ahaṃ** 世尊 **bhaga-**
vato 說 **bhāṣitasya** 義 **artham** 解我 **ājānāmi** 不 **na** 相 lakṣaṇa 具
足 saṃpadā 如來 tathāgato 見應 draṣṭavyaḥ 世尊 bhagavān 言
āha 善 **sādhu** 善 **sādhu** 善實 subhūte 如是 **evam** 如是 **etat** 善實
subhūte 如 **evam** [etad *unrepresented*?] 如 **yathā** 語汝 **vadasi** 不
na 相 **lakṣaṇa** 具足 **saṃpadā** 如來 **tathāgato** 見應 **draṣṭavyaḥ** 彼
tat 何所 **kasya** 因 **hetoḥ** 彼 sa[cet *unrepresented*?] 復 punaḥ 善實
subhūte 相 lakṣaṇa 具足 saṃpadā 如來 tathāgato 見應 draṣṭavyo
有 'bhaviṣyat 彼[= **tad**] 王 rājā 轉輪 cakravartī [api *unrepresented*]
如來 tathāgato 有 'bhaviṣyat 彼故 **tasmān** 不 **na** 相 **lakṣaṇa** 具
足 **saṃpadā** 如來 **tathāgato** 見應 **draṣṭavyaḥ** 此 **tal**[*or* evaṃ?] 相
非相故 **lakṣaṇālakṣaṇatas** 如來 **tathāgato** 見應 **draṣṭavyaḥ** 爾
時 **atha** 命者 **āyuṣmān** 善實 **subhutir** 世尊邊 **bhagavaṃtam** 如
是 **etad** 言 **avocat** 如 yathā 我 ahaṃ 世尊 **bhagavan** 世尊 bhaga-
vato 說 bhāṣitasya 義 artham 解我 ājānāmi 不 na 相 lakṣaṇa 具足
saṃpadā 如來 tathāgato 見應 draṣṭavyaḥ 爾時 atha [+ khalu?] 世尊
bhagavāṃs 彼 tasyāṃ 時 velāyām 此 imā 伽陀 gāthā 說 abhāṣata：

若 ye 我 māṃ 色 rūpeṇa 見 adrākṣur	若 ye 我 māṃ 聲 ghoṣeṇa 求 anvayuḥ
邪 mithyā 解脫 prahāṇa 行 prasṛtā	不 na 我 māṃ 見 drakṣyaṃti 彼 te 人 janāḥ
法體 **dharmato** 佛 **buddho** 見應 **draṣṭavyo**	法身 dharmakāyās 彼 [=?] 如 來 tathāgatāḥ
法體 dharmatā 及 ca [cāpi?] 不 **na** [*or* a-?] 識 vijñeyā	不 na 彼 sā[b] 能 śakyaṃ 知 vijānituṃ

[a] The punctuation of T 238 is more than usually unreliable, since it tends to construe the text as Chinese, rather than Chinese characters arranged in Sanskrit word order. It should be ignored entirely.

[b] Here we accept the variant (see p. 771, n. 2) which accords best with the Sanskrit. The other readings are easily explained as attempts to turn the text into something which makes better sense in Chinese.

VKN §III.36

atha tau bhikṣū etad avocatāṃ │ prajñādharo **vinayadharo**[a] 'yam upāsakaḥ │ na tv ayaṃ bhadantopālir yo bhagavatā vinayadharāṇām agro nirdiṣṭaḥ │

tāv aham evaṃ vadāmi │ **mā bhikṣū atra gṛhapatisaṃjñām utpādayatām │ tat kasmād dhetoḥ**[b] │ tathāgataṃ sthāpayitvā nāsti kaścic chrāvako vā bodhisattvo vā ya etasya pratibhānam ācchindyāt tādṛśa etasya prajñālokaḥ │[c]

[a] There is no equivalent for this word in any Chinese translation or in the Tibetan.

[b] Neither Q nor K has anything corresponding to the wording in bold, although it is represented in X and Tib.

[c] Cf. Tib.: *de nas dge slong de gnyis 'di skad ces mchi'o │ khyim bdag 'di ni shin tu shes rab dang ldan te │ bcom ldan 'das kyis 'dul ba 'dzin pa rnams kyi mchog tu gsungs pa btsun pa nye bar 'khor 'di ni de tsam ma yin no ║*

de gnyis la bdag gis 'di skad ces bgyis so ║ dge slong khyed kyis 'di la khyim bdag snyam pa'i 'du shes ma skyed cig │ de ci'i phyir zhe na │ de bzhin gshegs pa ma gtogs par gang dag 'di'i spobs pa'i rgyun gcod nus pa'i nyan thos sam │ byang chub sems dpa' de │ gang yang med de │ 'di'i shes rab kyi snang ba ni de dang 'dra'o ║.

1. Zhi Qian (T 474, 14:523a26–29)

於是兩比丘言：「上智哉！是優波離[Three Editions insert: 所]不及也。持佛上律而不能說。」

我答言：「自捨如來，未有弟子及菩薩辯才析疑，如此[Three Editions: 是]聰明者也。」

2. Kumārajīva (T 475, 14:541b29–c3)

於是二比丘言：「上智哉！是優波離所不能及。持律之上而不能說。」

我即[即 omitted in Three Editions]答言：「自捨如來，未有聲聞及菩薩能制其樂說之辯，其智慧明達為若此也。」

3. Xuanzang (T 476, 14:563c14–18) (*Underlining: amplification beyond known Sanskrit text.*)

時二苾芻聞說是已得未曾有，咸作是言：「奇哉！居士乃有如是殊勝慧辯，是優波離所不能及。佛說持律最為其上而不能說 [a]。」

我即告言：「汝勿於彼起居士想。所以者何？唯除如來，未有聲聞及餘菩薩而能制此大士慧辯，其慧辯明殊勝如是。」

[a] "... and yet he is unable to speak!" Here X, like K, picks up Q's way of unpacking the implication of the text with words for which there are no direct equivalents in the Sanskrit (or the Tibetan).

VKN §VI.6[a]

āha │ [b]abhūtaparikalpasya kiṃ mūlaṃ │
āha │ abhūtaparikalpasya[c] viparyastā saṃjñā mūlaṃ │
āha │ viparyastāyāḥ saṃjñāyāḥ kiṃ mūlaṃ │
āha │ viparyastāyāḥ saṃjñāyā[d] apratiṣṭhā[e] mūlaṃ │
āha │ apratiṣṭhāyāḥ kiṃ mūlaṃ │
āha │ yan mañjuśrīḥ[f] apratiṣṭhānam tasya[g] kiṃ[h] mūlaṃ bhaviṣyati[i] │
iti hy apratiṣṭhānamūlapratiṣṭhitāḥ sarvadharmāḥ │[j]

[a] Sanskrit is that of the Ed., with variants in the Śikṣ citation according to Bendall's edition (Bendall 1897–1902), pp. 264.6–9.
[b] Śikṣ citation begins here.
[c] *abhūtaparikalpasya* Ed.: Śikṣ omits [not noted in Ed.].
[d] *viparyastāyāḥ saṃjñāyā* Ed.: Śikṣ omits [not noted in Ed.].

^e *apratiṣṭhā* Ed.: *apratiṣṭhānaṃ* Śikṣ (in error?) [not noted in Ed.]

^f *mañjuśrīḥ* Ed.: *mañjuśrīr* Śikṣ [not noted in Ed.].

^g *apratiṣṭhānaṃ tasya* Ed. (noting that MS reads *apratiṣṭhānat* (*tasya*)): *aprati-ṣṭhānaṃ na tasya* Śikṣ [not noted in Ed.]. Read MS as *apratiṣṭhā na {t}tasya* and correct edition accordingly? But cf. Tib.: *’jam dpal gang rten med pa de’i rtsa bar ’gyur ba ci zhig yod de | de ltar chos thams cad ni rten med pa’i rtsa ba la gnas pa’o ‖*. Although the switch between feminine and neuter forms (*apratiṣṭhā, apratiṣṭhānam*) is a little awkward, the Sanskrit text as given in the Śikṣ seems more in line with the Chinese versions, while Tib. is much closer to the MS.

^h *kiṃ* Ed.: *kiñcin* Śikṣ [not noted in Ed.].

ⁱ *bhaviṣyati* Ed.; Śikṣ omits [not noted in Ed.].

^j Cf. Tib.: *smras pa | yang dag pa ma yin pa kun rtog pa’i rtsa ba gang | smras pa | yang dag pa ma yin pa kun rtog pa’i rtsa ba ni phyin ci log gi ’du shes so ‖ smras pa | phyin ci log gi ’du shes kyi rtsa ba gang | smras pa | phyin ci log gi ’du shes kyi rtsa ba ni rten med pa’o ‖ smras pa | rten med pa’i rtsa ba gang | smras pa | ’jam dpal gang rten med pa’i rtsa bar ’gyur ba ci zhig yod de | de ltar chos thams cad ni rten med pa’i rtsa ba la gnas pa’o ‖.*

1. Zhi Qian (T 474, 14:528b20–22)

又問：「不誠之雜孰為本？」

曰：「不住為本。如是，仁者！不住之本無所為本，從不住本立一切法。」

2. Kumārajīva (T 475, 14:547c19–22)

又問：「虛妄分別孰為本？」

答曰：「顛倒想為本。」

又問：「顛倒想孰為本？」

答曰：「無住為本。」

又問：「無住孰為本？」

答曰：「無住則無本。文殊師利！從無住本立一切法。」

3. Xuanzang (T 476, 14:573b17–22) (*Underlining: amplification beyond known Sanskrit text.*)

又問：「虛妄分別孰為本？」

曰：「倒想[variant: 相]為本。」

又問：「倒想孰為本？」

曰：「無住為本。」

妙吉祥言：「如是無住孰為其本？」

無垢稱言：「斯問非理。所以者何？夫無住者即無其本，亦無所住。由無其本，無所住故，即能建立一切諸法。」

VKN §VI.16[a]

āha | itas tvaṃ devate cyutā kutropapatsaye |
āha | yatraiva tathāgatanirmita upapatsyate tatraivāham upapatsye |
āha | tathāgatanirmitasya na cyutir nopapattiḥ |
āha | evam eva sarvadharmāṇāṃ na cyutir nopapattiḥ |[a]

[a] Cf. Tib: *smras pa | lha mo khyod 'di nas shi 'phos nas gang du skye*
smras pa | de bzhin gshegs pas sprul pa de gar skye bar bdag kyang der
skye'o ||
smras pa | de bzhin gshegs pas sprul pa la ni 'chi 'pho ba yang med | skye ba
yang med do ||
smras pa | chos thams cad kyang de bzhin te | 'chi 'pho med cing skye ba yang
med do ||.

1. Zhi Qian (T 474, 14:529a29–b2)

舍利弗問天：「汝沒此當於何生？」

天曰：「佛化所生吾如彼生。」

曰：「如佛化生非沒生也。」

天曰：「眾生 [a] 猶然亦不見其沒生者也。」

2. Kumārajīva (T 475, 14:548c9–12)

舍利弗問天：「汝於此沒當生何所？」

天曰：「佛化所生吾如彼生。」

曰：「佛化所生非沒生也。」

天曰：「眾生猶然無沒生也。」

3. Xuanzang (T 476, 14:574c9–13) (*Underlining: amplification beyond known Sanskrit text.*)

時舍利子問天女言：「汝於此沒[variant 歿]當生何所？」

天女答言：「如來所化當所生處我當生彼。」

舍利子言：「如來所化無沒[variant 歿]無生。云何而言當所生處？」

天曰：「尊者！諸法有情應知亦爾無沒無生。云何問我當生何所？」

   ᵃ Here Q implies the reading *evam eva sarvasatvāṇāṃ*, etc., as opposed to the *evam eva sarvadharmāṇāṃ* of the Sanskrit text (and Tib.). This is followed by K, but oddly enough, X reflects both readings, suggesting that Xuanzang was consulting one or both of the earlier translations.

VKN §IX.13ᵃ

atha tato bhojanāt sarvāᵇ sā parṣat tṛptā kṛtāᶜ | na ca tāvadᵈ bhojanaṃ kṣīyate | yaiś ca bodhisatvaiḥ śrāvakaiḥᵉ śakrabrahmalokapālais tadanyaiś ca satvais tad bhojanaṃ bhuktaṃ teṣāṃ tādṛśaṃ sukhaṃ kāye 'vakrāntaṃ yādṛśaṃ sarvasukhapratimaṇḍiteᶠ lokadhātau bodhisatvānāṃ sukhaṃ | sarvaromakūpebhyaś ca teṣāṃ tādṛśo gandhaḥ pravāti | tadyathāpi nāma tasminnᵍ eva sarvagandhasugandheʰ lokadhātau vṛkṣāṇāṃ gandhaḥ ‖ⁱ

   ᵃ Sanskrit is that of the Ed., with variants in the Śikṣ citation according to Bendall's edition, pp. 269.13–270.3.
   ᵇ *sarvā* Ed.: *sarvāvatī* Śikṣ.
   ᶜ *kṛtā* Ed.: *bhūtā* Śikṣ.
   ᵈ *tāvad* Ed.: *tat* Śikṣ [sic Bendall's edition; Cambridge MS actually reads *ta*].
   ᵉ *śrāvakaiḥ* Ed.: *śrāvakaiś ca* Śikṣ [not noted in Ed.].
   ᶠ *sarvasukhapratimaṇḍite* Ed.: *sarvasukhamaṇḍitāyām* Śikṣ [not noted in Ed.].
   ᵍ *tasminn* Ed.: *tasyām* Śikṣ [not noted in Ed.].
   ʰ *sarvagandhasugandhe* Ed.: *sarvagandhasugandhāyām* Śikṣ [not noted in Ed.].
   ⁱ Cf. Tib.: *de nas zhal zas des 'khor thams cad la tshim par byas kyang zhal zas de zad par ma gyur to ‖ byang chub sems dpa' dang | nyan thos dang | brgya byin dang | tshangs pa dang | 'jig rten skyong ba rnams dang | sems can gzhan dag gis zhal zas zos pa pa de dag kyang ji ltar 'jig rten gyi khams bde ba thams cad kyis rab tu brgyan pa byang chub sems dpa' rnams kyi bde ba ci 'dra ba de lta bu'i bde ba las lus las skyes so ‖ de dag gi spu'i khung bu nas kyang 'di lta bu'i dri 'byung ba ni 'di lta ste dper na 'jig rten gyi khams spos*

thams cad kyi dri mchog de na shing rnams las dri 'byung ba bzhin no ‖.

1. Zhi Qian (T 474, 14:532c4–8)

於是缽飯悉飽眾會，飯故不盡。諸菩薩大弟子天與人食此飯已，氣走安身，譬如一切安養國中諸菩薩也。其香所薰毛孔皆安，亦如眾香之國香徹八難。[a]

2. Kumārajīva (T 475, 14:552c17–20)

於是缽飯悉飽眾會，猶故不㴏[variant 賜, read 澌?]。其諸菩薩聲聞天人食此飯者，身安快樂，譬如一切樂莊嚴國諸菩薩也。又諸毛孔皆出妙香，亦如眾香國土諸樹之香。

3. Xuanzang (T 476, 14:580a29–b6) (*Underlining: amplification beyond known Sanskrit text.*)

於是大眾皆食此食悉得充滿，而尚有餘。時諸聲聞及諸菩薩并人天等一切眾會食此食已，其身安樂，譬如一切安樂莊嚴世界菩薩，一切安樂之所住[variant 任]持。身諸毛孔皆出妙香，譬如一切妙香世界眾妙香樹常出無量種種妙香。

[a] Q here suggests a confusion of *vṛkṣāṇāṃ* and some form of *akṣaṇa*, possibly as a result of using a text in Gāndhārī written in Kharoṣṭhī.

Analysis of the results

The samples taken from our two Mahāyāna *sūtra*s are small, but
sufficient to demonstrate a number of important points. In the Vaj,
for which we have abundant manuscript evidence, we see a con-
tinuing development of the Sanskrit text. The trend is generally in
the direction of enlargement and addition. Some aspects of this are
documented in Harrison & Watanabe 2006, although the inventory
given there (pp. 99–103) is far from exhaustive.[31] Two comments
need to be made about this kind of textual development. First, we
should never assume simple linear progression, as if all available
witnesses can be placed on a single line, stretching from shortest
(and oldest) to longest (and latest). Rather, we ought to expect mul-
tiple branching of the manuscript tradition, with enlargement and
other textual changes not fully present in some of the branches,
despite the late date of their witnesses. This presents the editor of
texts like this with considerable problems which cannot be gone
into here, but to put it in a nutshell, the idea that the wording of any
Mahāyāna *sūtra* can be restored to some original and perfect state
by text-critical processes must be abandoned: all lines do not con-
verge back on a single point. Second, it is useful to think of *sūtra*
texts not as fixed quantities, but as prompt books or scores, which
could be performed *vistareṇa* or *saṃkṣiptena* (i.e. in amplified or
condensed form), and therefore we might also expect this aspect
of their character to be reflected in the manuscript tradition.[32] A

---

[31] In broad terms we are dealing with the amplification of stock formu-
las, the insertion of the names of speakers and persons addressed, a much
more liberal use of vocatives, and so on, all of which tend to increase the
volume of the text without significantly altering its message. Mixed in
with these changes, of course, are others which do make a substantive
difference to the meaning.

[32] A good example is the sequence of actions to be performed with a
sūtra (learning, retaining in memory, reciting, mastering, etc.). While
the Shorter Versions typically have only one or two verbs, are they to be
taken as a genuinely shorter text or as cue words intended to evoke or
trigger the longer sequence that we often find given in full in the Longer
Versions?

further consideration relates to the distinction between what we might call "hard" and "soft" parts of the text, i.e. those portions (the "hard" or "firm" parts) whose memorisation is not difficult, or which are so distinctive that little or no change can be expected, and those which are "soft" insofar as they can easily have other, equally plausible elements substituted, without any loss of overall coherence. All that said, the general trend is toward amplification of the text over time, or towards more extended performances, and we see this reflected in the later Sanskrit manuscript tradition of the Vaj, while the older mss, by contrast, normally carry a shorter, more compressed form of the text. By the later tradition we mean that reflected in Müller's edition, which seems almost always to follow his Ch and T (whose readings are confirmed by our examination of T2), and to be generally, but not always, consistent with the Nepalese manuscripts (as, e.g., our Ne1). Müller, as we have seen, tended to set little store by the readings of his Japanese copies, not knowing that they would turn out to be surprisingly congruent with the older manuscript witnesses which were in his day still undiscovered (P, S, G and the Central Asian fragments).[33] He outlines his approach in his introduction (1881: 17):

> The text of the Va*gra*kkh*edikâ, as handed down to us in China and Japan, is on the whole the same. Even what seem to be mere useless repetitions occur in all. When there is a difference, the Japanese text generally gives an independent and shorter form, as compared with the text of the Chinese and Tibetan books. But we must not ascribe too much importance to this, for it is known that some of the Chinese translators, Kumâra*gî*va, for instance, shortened the Sanskrit texts of the Buddhist Sûtras in their translations, and this may have reacted on the originals.
>
> I have restored the text as well as it could be done, following chiefly the Chinese and Tibetan authorities, though occasionally giving preference to the Japanese text. I have not attempted to give all the various readings, many of which are misprints only, easily corrected by any one who is accustomed to the style of the Mahâyâna-sûtras.

---

[33] This is abundantly evident even in the few short passages dealt with in this paper, as can be seen by the number of footnotes to the Longer Versions followed by asterisks.

So it was that, in virtually the same breath, Müller excused his edition from the need to meet the standard required for truly scientific work in this area and accused Kumārajīva of lack of fidelity to his Sanskrit text, while in effect suppressing the evidence that could have been used to exonerate the great Kuchean translator of the charge. And that evidence, the testimony of the Kōkiji copies, since Müller's day backed up by many other manuscript finds, confirms the existence of the Shorter Versions of the Vaj, copies of which had clearly reached China by the beginning of the 5th century, and continued to circulate there, at least until the Tang period, since it is then that the ancestor of the Kōkiji copies was sent to Japan by Ennin.[34] However, there are also several Chinese translations which reflect the Longer Versions, and are thus more consistent with the later Sanskrit copies of the Vaj, but this is not uniformly so. In some cases the Chinese translations contain material which we may assume was present in Indic versions still inaccessible to us, which may remain so indefinitely. This is especially true of X. However, there is another possibility, which is that Xuanzang in particular amplified the texts himself, i.e. "performed" them *vistareṇa* as he translated them. There need not be anything inauthentic about the versions of the text so produced, especially if he did this in Sanskrit first (or even perhaps if he did it in Chinese). He would thus have been part of a long tradition of Indic text recitation, according to which it was regarded as appropriate and meritorious to give the *sūtra* one was reciting its most elaborate possible form, the "full monty."

So much for the Indic text, an ever-flowing stream of variations which are never fully regular or predictable. In the Chinese translations, we see this variability reflected, but we also see a demonstrable tendency for some translators to go about their work with more than a backward glance over their shoulders at the work of their

---

[34] Müller's editorial policy, which viewed in the light of our current knowledge seems astonishingly cavalier, condemned the Kōkiji manuscripts and their valuable testimony to over a hundred years of oblivion. Had people known what was sitting on the shelves of the Bodleian, to say nothing of the holdings of Kōkiji itself, the work on all the Vaj manuscripts discovered since 1881 would have been greatly facilitated.

predecessors, and we have given some particularly clear examples of this, where translators have borrowed their predecessor's wording wholesale, or modified it only slightly, to produce their own version of the text. We observe, for example, that Bodhiruci was heavily indebted to Kumārajīva, and that Paramārtha also recycled much of his wording. It is clear at the same time that they both had access to copies of the Sanskrit text which were not quite the same as Kumārajīva's exemplar, so that they sometimes modified his wording in the light of that text, or their different understanding of it. Dharmagupta's version, falling in the middle of the sequence of Chinese translations, is entirely different and cannot easily be compared with the others, although its word-for-word adherence to the Sanskrit text allows us to arrive at a reasonable approximation of what that may have been. That Sanskrit text cannot, however, be reconstructed on this basis, at least not with certainty, for various reasons.[35] Xuanzang's version is for the most part a genuine new translation of the Indic text. Although some of Kumārajīva's wording survives in it (and thus in our samples quite a lot of red appears among the blue), this is almost always because his terminology had become the standard coinage by Xuanzang's day, and not because Xuanzang's text is derivative. Yijing's "translation," on the other hand, turns out to be the most unusual and derivative of the lot, and seems to have been put together with material taken from K and X in particular, often in an abbreviated or reworded fashion which we can assume has little to do with any Sanskrit sources, and much to do with Chinese notions of style and elegance. Yijing also seems to be ready to go to any length to maintain a four-character prosodic pattern. All in all, his translation of the Vaj is little more than a pastiche of previous versions, heavily reworked; its value for text-critical purposes is practically nil.[36]

---

[35] The two most important considerations in this regard are our inability to determine the degree to which the Sanskrit of Dharmagupta's copy of the Vaj had been regularized from the earlier Prakritic forms of the type we see in P and the Central Asian fragments, and the fact – clear enough in our sample passages – that Dharmagupta did not supply a Chinese equivalent for every single word or inflection in his Sanskrit text.

[36] This suggests that other translations by Yijing should be approached

Out of the six translations, then, we have to admit that only three can be trusted to any significant degree, K, Dh and X. As for the others, we simply cannot be sure of the extent to which the translators were paying attention to the Indic text in front of them in manuscript form (or being recited for them from memory), and the value of their testimony is therefore compromised.

Now it would be rash to conclude that this is always the case. Each set of translations has to be assessed on its merits. However, we cannot simply assume that a given series of Chinese translations reflects a corresponding series of Indic exemplars. This means that, unless proven otherwise, the evidential value of later Chinese translations is potentially undermined, so that, paradoxically, the most reliable translation, i.e. the one most likely to reflect its Sanskrit exemplar with minimal interference from other sources, is likely to be the first and the oldest. Even then there may be other kinds of interference. We can see in Kumārajīva's case how he was prone to inserting commentarial glosses into his translations, much as we might nowadays (but he could not call on parentheses), to clarify the meaning of the text or make it read more smoothly. Thus his insertion of words like "definite," "fixed" (*ding* 定) in §7 or "really" (*shi* 實) in other sections of the text can trap the unwary reader, who might take them as reflecting the wording of the Indic original.[37] Another example is his addition of the words *dang zhi* 當知, "one should know that ..." in §12 (twice!). What this means is that the work of individual translators needs to be made the object

---

with caution, especially when earlier Chinese versions of the same texts are known to have existed.

[37] So, for example, Alan Cole, in his *Text as Father*, makes a number of claims about the intentions of the Indian author of the Vaj on the basis of these interpolations by Kumārajīva (see, e.g., Cole 2005: 167–168, 183–184, 186). More egregious still is his misconstrual of the last sentence of Vaj §7 in Kumārajīva's version (Cole translates: "All worthy sages are distinguished by taking lack (*wu*) as their teaching (*dharma*)."), which could only be excused if one were entirely unaware of the existence of the Sanskrit text. Unfortunately, this blunder is then put to work carrying a heavy analytical load which it has no hope of supporting (see pp. 183–185).

of systematic study, so that their particular *modus operandi* can be clarified. In this regard research like that of Jan Nattier on Zhi Qian or Daniel Boucher on Dharmakṣa is welcome. With all that, the attempt to reconstitute – or at least recognise the basic shape of – the Sanskrit exemplars lying behind the Chinese versions will never be an exact science, but I think we can gradually improve matters somewhat, even if this only means making the guesswork less wild. Taming our guesses may well be the most we can expect.

Looking at the problem from the Sanskrit side, we see that the availability even of many manuscript witnesses of the Sanskrit text (as in the case of the Vaj) does not eliminate the usefulness of the Chinese. For example, we have seen some wording that must have been attested in some recensions, for which no Indian testimony survives.[38] Also in matters of interpretation, Chinese versions are extremely useful, since they indicate how a Buddhist reader of the 3rd or 4th or 5th century construed the text.

The case of the VKN is quite different, in that, as far as the Sanskrit text is concerned, we have a *codex unicus*. It is, to be sure, a very exciting and important "find," but we cannot take its appearance as a reason to throw the Chinese and the Tibetan versions away. Indeed, we can see that far from reducing their usefulness, it increases it, since they become indispensable for the editing of the Sanskrit text and for working out what interpolations and scribal glosses have crept into it. It would in fact be most unwise to base all future discussion on this Sanskrit text, and to claim that this represents the VKN as an early Mahāyāna *sūtra*, when it is quite clear from Zhi Qian's translation that the text has grown considerably over the centuries. However, once the edition we have now is translated into English, the danger is that this will then be taken as **the** VKN, and used as a basis for all sorts of claims about early Mahāyāna, the VKN as Nāgārjuna read it, and so on. Again, Alan Cole's *Text as Father* shows that this is not a hypothetical situation, since he bases his discussion of what the Indian author of the VKN was about entirely on Kumārajīva's Chinese translation of the *sūtra*.

---

[38] A good example is the appearance of equivalents for Sanskrit *sabrahmacārin* in Dharmagupta's and Xuanzang's versions of Vaj §12.

However, in this case too we see that the first translation of the text by Zhi Qian has thrown a long shadow, insofar as Kumārajīva often picks up its wording, and this should make us circumspect about relying too heavily on his version. Once again, Xuanzang's VKN seems to be a genuine retranslation, although even he appears to be repeating some of the wording of his two predecessors, over and above his use of established translation terminology, like *shengwen* 聲聞 for *śrāvaka* and *pusa* 菩薩 for *bodhisattva*, which is insignificant for our present purposes.

As far as the establishment of a truly critical edition of the Sanskrit text of the VKN is concerned, the Chinese and Tibetan versions remain absolutely essential. The existing preliminary edition leaves something to be desired in terms of its editorial choices and in the application of its editorial conventions, although the manuscript's actual readings are – as far as I have been able to determine – recorded in the diplomatic edition with exemplary care. My impression is that this single late manuscript is a rather unreliable witness, with a considerable number of scribal errors, and that it also incorporates a fair amount of extra material, chiefly what appear to be marginal glosses which have crept into the body of the work.[39] At the same time it also omits portions of the text,[40] and it would therefore be quite a challenge to edit it properly, with some serious methodological problems to sort out on the way.

The conclusion to this paper will therefore come as no surprise, and is hardly likely to provoke disagreement. It is to reaffirm the utility of the Chinese translations as sources in their own right, but at the same time to emphasize the care required in their use,

---

[39] Possible cases can be found at III.33 (Text reads *tat sāhārthāyuṣmann*, Ed. emends to *utsāhāya āyuṣmann*; construe as gloss and read *tatsāhārtha āyuṣmann > tatsāhārthāyuṣmann*?), VI.15 (*gatam* a gloss on *kṛtaṃ*?), etc. One example of an enlargement unattested in any other version can be seen at III.36 (*vinayadharo*).

[40] Clear cases of lacunae in the Sanskrit ms where the Chinese and/or Tibetan versions attest the missing text can be seen at, e.g., §§III.21 (emend to **mahā**vanasyānyatasmin), III.24 (possibly one folio line dropped out?), and III.45 (read *sarvasaṃkhyāvigataḥ | īdṛśasya kāyasya*?).

and to draw attention to the importance of the earlier versions over the later, along with the need for their systematic study. It is also to remind Sanskritists that it would be a mistake to ignore these sources, no matter how many more so-called "Sanskrit originals" come into our hands in the next decades.

Abbreviations

B	Bodhiruci's translation of the Vaj.
Dh	Dharmagupta's translation of the Vaj.
Ch	Sino-Tibetan blockprint used by F. Max Müller (Sanskrit text only in Lañtsha script).
Cz	Sanskrit text of the Vaj after Conze 1957 [1974].
Frag d	Cat. No. 1910 in Heinz Bechert, ed., *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Teil VIII (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2000), pp. 93–94.
Frag e	Cat. No. 1939+4194a in Heinz Bechert, ed., *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Teil VIII (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2000), pp. 117–118.
G	Gilgit manuscript of the Vaj, as edited in Schopen 1989.
K	Kumārajīva's translation of the Vaj or the VKN.
K1	Kōkiji Text 0162.
K2	Kōkiji Text 0165–0167.
MM	Sanskrit text of the Vaj after Müller 1881.
Ne1	Nepalese manuscript of the Vaj, NAK (National Archive, Kathmandu) Acc. No. 5/186 (NGMPP B 90/16).
P	Stein Ms of the Vaj, as edited in Pargiter 1916.
Q	Zhi Qian's translation of the VKN.
S	Schøyen manuscript of the Vaj, as edited in Harrison & Watanabe 2006.
T	Sino-Tibetan blockprint used by F. Max Müller (Sanskrit in Lañtsha script & Tibetan)
T2	Bilingual woodblock edition of the Vaj kept in the library of the School of Oriental & African Studies, London. See Conze 1957 [1974]: 1, 17.
Vaj	*Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā*.
VKN	*Vimalakīrtinirdeśa*.

Intro.	Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature (ed.), *Introduction to Vimalakīrtinirdeśa and Jñānālokālaṃkāra* (Tokyo: Taisho University Press, 2004).
Text	Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature (ed.), *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa and Jñānālokālaṃkāra: Transliterated Sanskrit Text Collated with Tibetan and Chinese Translations, Part II: Vimalakīrtinirdeśa: Transliterated Sanskrit Text Collated with Tibetan and Chinese Translations* (Tokyo: Taisho University Press, 2004).
Ed.	Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature (ed.), *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa: Transliterated Sanskrit Text Collated with Tibetan and Chinese Translations* (Tokyo: Taisho University Press, 2006).
X	Xuanzang's translation of the Vaj or the VKN.
Y	Yijing's translation of the Vaj.
Z	Paramārtha's translation of the Vaj.

Bibliography

Bendall, Cecil (ed.). 1897–1902. *Çikshāsamuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhistic Teaching (Bibliotheca Buddhica I).* St. Petersburg: Imperial Academy [reprinted Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1971].

Chakravarti, N. P. (ed.). 1956. "The Gilgit Text of the Vajracchedikā." In: G. Tucci (ed.), *Minor Buddhist Texts (Serie Orientale Roma IX.1).* Rome: IsMEO: 173–192.

Cole, Alan. 2005. *Text as Father: paternal seductions in early Mahāyāna Buddhist literature.* Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Conze, E. 1957. *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā, Edited and Translated with Introduction and Glossary (Serie Orientale Roma XIII).* Rome: IsMEO. 2nd edition, with Corrections and Additions (Rome: IsMEO, 1974).

Harrison, Paul. 2006. "Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā: A New English Translation of the Sanskrit Text Based on Two Manuscripts from Greater Gandhāra." In: Jens Braarvig (gen. ed.), *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection: Buddhist Manuscripts*, Volume III. Oslo: Hermes Publishing: 133–159.

Harrison, Paul. 2009. "Sanskrit Fragments of the Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā in the British Library." In: Seishi Karashima & Klaus Wille (eds.), *Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia: The British Library Sanskrit Fragments*, Vol. II.1. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University: 637–657 (+ Plates in Vol. II.2).

Harrison, Paul & Shōgo Watanabe. 2006. "Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā." In: Jens Braarvig (gen. ed.), *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection: Buddhist Manuscripts*, Volume III. Oslo: Hermes Publishing: 89–132.

Lamotte, Étienne. 1962. *L'Enseignement de Vimalakīrti (Vimalakīrtinirdeśa).* Louvain: Institut orientaliste.

Müller, F. Max (ed.). 1881. "Vagra*kkh*edikâ [= Vajracchedikā]." In: *Buddhist Texts From Japan (Anecdota Oxoniensia, Aryan Series Vol.1, Part 1).* Oxford: Clarendon Press [reprint Amsterdam: Oriental Press, 1972]: 15–46.

Nattier, Jan. 2008. *A Guide to the Earliest Chinese Translations: Texts from the Eastern Han* 東漢 *and Three Kingdoms* 三國 *Periods.* Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.

Okukaze Eikō. 2008. "Kōkiji-zō shinshutsu no bonbun *Kongōhannyagyō* shahon ni tsuite." *Kōyasan daigaku daigakuin kiyō*, Vol. 10 (2008): 33–42.

Pargiter, E. F. (ed.). 1916. "Vajracchedikā in the Original Sanskrit, Stein MS., No. D.III.13b." In: A. F. Rudolf Hoernle (ed.), *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan*. Oxford: Clarendon Press: 176–195.

Schopen, Gregory. 1989. "The Manuscript of the Vajracchedikā Found at Gilgit." In: L. O. Gómez and J. Silk (eds.), *Studies in the Literature of the Great Vehicle: Three Mahāyāna Buddhist Texts*. Ann Arbor: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, The University of Michigan: 89–139.

– 2005. "The Mahāyāna and the Middle Period in Indian Buddhism: Through a Chinese Looking-Glass," *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India: More Collected Papers.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press: 3–24. [Reprinted from *The Eastern Buddhist*, New Series, Vol. 32, No. 2: 1–25].

Yuyama Akira. 1967. *Indic Manuscripts and Chinese Blockprints (Non-Chinese texts) of the Oriental Collection of the Australian National University Library, Canberra (Occasional Paper, 6).* Canberra: Centre of Oriental Studies, Australian National University.

Zacchetti, Stefano. 1996. "Dharmagupta's Unfinished Translation of the *Diamond-Cleaver* (*Vajracchedikā-Prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*)." *T'oung Pao*, LXXXII: 137–152.