

General Editors: Oskar von HINÜBER / Seishi KARASHIMA / Noriyuki KUDO

Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India

Facsimile Edition

Volume II.1

Mahāyāna Texts:
***Prajñāpāramitā* Texts (1)**

Edited by

**Seishi KARASHIMA, Youngjin LEE,
Jundo NAGASHIMA, Fumio SHOJI, Kenta SUZUKI,
YE Shaoyong and Stefano ZACCHETTI**

**The National Archives of India
New Delhi, INDIA**

**The International Research Institute
for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University, Tokyo, JAPAN**

2016

GILGIT MANUSCRIPTS IN THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES OF INDIA
FACSIMILE EDITION

VOLUME II.1

MAHĀYĀNA TEXTS:
PRAJÑĀPĀRAMITĀ TEXTS (1)

General Editors: Oskar von HINÜBER / Seishi KARASHIMA / Noriyuki KUDO

Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India

Facsimile Edition

Volume II.1

Mahāyāna Texts:
***Prajñāpāramitā* Texts (1)**

Edited by

**Seishi KARASHIMA, Youngjin LEE,
Jundo NAGASHIMA, Fumio SHOJI, Kenta SUZUKI,
YE Shaoyong and Stefano ZACCHETTI**

**The National Archives of India
New Delhi, INDIA**

**The International Research Institute
for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University, Tokyo, JAPAN**

2016

Published by
The National Archives of India and
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University

The National Archives of India
Janpath, New Delhi 110001, INDIA
E-mail: archives@nic.in
<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.in>

The International Research Institute for Advanced
Buddhology, Soka University
1-236 Tangi, Hachiōji, Tokyo 192-8577, JAPAN
E-mail: iriab@soka.ac.jp
<http://www.iriab.soka.ac.jp>
〒192-8577 東京都八王子市丹木町1-236
創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
Phone: (+ 81-42) 691-2695
Fax: (+ 81-42) 691-4814

First published 2016

Printed in Japan by Meiwa Printing Company, Tokyo

© The National Archives of India, New Delhi, INDIA

All rights reserved.

Apart from any fair dealing for the purpose of private study, research, criticism or review, no part of this book may be reproduced, translated or utilised in any form, either by print, photoprint, microform, multimedia or any other means, now known or hereafter invented, without written permission of the copyright holder and publishers. Enquiries should be made to the publishers.

ISBN 978-4-904234-13-6

Table of Contents

Introduction	vii
Bibliography, Abbreviations and Signs	xiii
Abbreviations for Captions	xv
Plates The <i>Larger Prajñāpāramitā</i>	plates 1~251
The <i>Vajracchedikā</i>	plates 253~259

Introduction

I The *Larger Prajñāpāramitā* (A)

(1) The state of the manuscript

There are three large manuscripts of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā* (LP) in the Gilgit manuscripts, preserved in the National Archives of India. (A) The first was originally given serial numbers 24, 25 and 28; (B) the other two were given serial numbers 26, 27 and 50.¹ In addition, there are some fragments of this scripture. Here, we publish the first manuscript. The latter ones together with the fragments will be published separately in the near future.

The *Larger Prajñāpāramitā* (A), which can be dated to the beginning of the 7th century C.E. from the colophon², originally consisted of 307 folios³, out of which only 10 are missing. Therefore, this manuscript is one of the most important ones amongst many of the same scripture.⁴

Though Conze (1974b: xv; 1978: 34~35, 40) and consequently the editors of FE (FE[re] I 10) thought that Chapter 37 of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* ended on folio 187 *verso* 6 and immediately afterwards, Chapter 48(!) of the *Aṣṭādāśasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* began, now, in the light of the other versions in Chinese, Tibetan and Sanskrit, it is clear that there is no gap between 187 *verso* and 188 *recto*, which therefore denies their assumption. At the same time, it disproves Conze's view that this manuscript *consists* of these two different texts.⁵ In fact, it consists of one and sole text, which we should call the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā*, following Kumārajīva's translation (*Mohe Banre Boluomi jing* 摩訶般若波羅蜜經), or the "*Larger Prajñāpāramitā*" in comparison to the "*Smaller Prajñāpāramitā*", i.e. the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*.

As mentioned above, this manuscript originally consisted of 307 folios:

- (1) Folios 1~149⁶: folios 54, 75 and 76 are missing. The last part of 149 *verso* finishes in mid-sentence and folio 150 starts in the middle of another sentence as well. Compared with the Chinese, Sanskrit and Tibetan versions and especially with an incomplete Sanskrit manuscript from the Mogao Caves at Dunhuang, written in a script similar to our manuscript, namely Gilgit/Bamiyan type I, we are able to calculate that around 40~50 folios were omitted by the scribe between the end of folio 149 and the beginning of folio 150.
- (2) Folios 150~210⁷: folio 208 is missing.
- (3) Folios 211~213 are missing.
- (4) A fragment of folio 214(?) is preserved⁸ and reproduced in this volume.
- (5) Folios 215~218 *recto* are missing.
- (6) Folios 218~263 had been in the possession of Agha Mohammad Ali Shah but these were handed over to Giuseppe Tucci. After being photographed in Italy — 218 *recto* was overlooked accidentally(?)⁹ —, they were returned to Pakistan and preserved in the Museum of Karachi. Conze (1962) published an edition of this part together

¹ According to Klaus Wille, the folios in nos. 26, 27 and 50 consist of parts of two different manuscripts of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā*. Cf. von Hinüber 2014: 103. We are now in the process of transliterating these.

² The colophon (308r10ff.) states: "This is a religious gift from the very devout Nāśasiṃha, being a great *gakhravida* (an official title), together with Śrī Deva Paṭola Śāhi Vikramādityanandin ..." (cf. von Hinüber 1980: 53~58 = 2009: 692~697; *ib.* 2004: 16~21). Vikramādityanandin is thought to have ruled Paṭola (Palola; namely Gilgit region) between 605~625 C.E. (cf. *ib.* 2004: 99). These dates match also the assumption on palaeographical grounds very well.

³ Folio 300 is missing, but there is no content gap between folios 299 and 301. Therefore, the scribe must have merely numbered them incorrectly.

⁴ It is also noteworthy that this manuscript was not normal one but written by a scribe at the request of probably the highest officer of the Paṭola dynasty of Gilgit or the royal family (see note 2). Nonetheless, the scribe omitted around 40~50 folios, as we shall see later.

⁵ Cf. Zacchetti 2005: 19~22.

⁶ FE, vols. 3~5 = FE(re) I, nos. 175~466.

⁷ FE, vol. 5 = FE(re) I, nos. 467~586.

⁸ FE, vol. 5, nos. 587~588 = FE(re) I, nos. 587~588.

⁹ It is improbable, though *not* impossible, that only the *verso* side remained while the *recto* side might have fallen off. I assume that the *recto* side was simply overlooked and therefore not photographed. Although the catalogue (Sferra 2008: 53) does state that there are microfilms from 215 *recto* up to 263 *verso* in the Tucci Collection, this is a mistake.

with some unspecified fragments. The left part of folio 245, which was not accessible to him at that time, was edited in Bapat 1949.

- (7) Folios 264~308¹⁰: folio 300 is missing, which resulted from, as mentioned above, the scribe's mistake in numbering. The text ends on 308 *recto* with the words *Prajñāpāramitāyām Akopyadharmatānirdeśa-parivartaḥ dvyāśītimaḥ samāptaḥ* ("The 82nd Chapter of the Teaching of Immovable *Dharmatā* in the *Prajñāpāramitā* is completed")¹¹, which is followed by a colophon.

(2) Transcriptions

Transcriptions of folios 1~27r, 202~205, 218v~263, 265r6~308 have been published by Zacchetti (2005: 366~400), Choong (2006: 109~133), Conze (1962 and 1974), respectively. Folios 124v7~210 were transliterated, though still unpublished, quite a few years ago by Tsai Yao-ming 蔡耀明, who kindly provided me with this transliteration. The rest, namely folios 27v~124v7, 214(?), 264~265r5, has been transliterated by my colleague Tatsushi Tamai 玉井達士 at my request. Thus, we have now the transliteration of the whole manuscript, with which we can compare with the other versions. Dr. Tamai is now preparing a transliteration of other Gilgit manuscripts of the same scripture, which were mentioned above.

(3) Parallel versions

There are five Chinese translations of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā* made by Dharmarakṣa (286 C.E.), Mokṣala (291 C.E.), Kumārajīva (404 C.E.); and two more versions, translated by Xuanzang (660~663 C.E.).

Nalinaksha Dutt edited around two-fifths of the Sanskrit *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, based on four Nepalese manuscripts in 1934. Takayasu Kimura published a new critical edition of the whole text, also based on four manuscripts from Nepal, between 1986~2009.

As mentioned above, there is an incomplete Sanskrit manuscript, which was discovered in the Mogao Caves at Dunhuang and is now preserved in the British Library. This is written in a script (Gilgit/Bamiyan type I) similar to our manuscript in question and its contents are also close to the latter. Its transliteration, together with its parallels in this manuscript in question, has been published by Suzuki and Nagashima (2015).

There is a Tibetan translation of the *Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* in the Kanjur. There are also two different translations of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* included in the Kanjur and Tanjur (Peking, no. 5188; Derge, no. 3750), separately.

(4) The relationship between the Gilgit *Larger Prajñāpāramitā* (LPG) and the other versions

¹²The various versions of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā* can be classified into two groups on the criterion, whether one contains the story of Bodhisatva Sadāprarudita or not — as Dharmarakṣa's Chinese translation is incomplete, ending abruptly, we do not know whether its original Indian manuscript had contained this or not.

(A) Versions, which contain the story:

The Chinese translations by Mokṣala (abbr. Mo) and Kumārajīva (Kj); the Tibetan translations of the *Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (AdsP[Tib]) and the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (PvsP[Tib]) in the Kanjur Canon, and Xuanzang's Chinese translation of the *Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (ŚSP)

(B) Versions, which do not contain the story:

The two Chinese translations by Xuanzang (Xz[I], Xz[II]), the Sanskrit text of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (PvsP[K]) based on the Nepalese manuscripts, the Tibetan translation of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* in the Tanjur Canon, the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of the *Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, which is merely an expansion of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā*¹³, as well as the Gilgit manuscript in question

Thus, from this particular point of view, it is clear that the Gilgit manuscript is closer to the latter group.

In addition, the various versions of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā* can also be classified into two groups on the

¹⁰ FE, vol. 5 = FE(re) I, nos. 589~675.

¹¹ The titles and cardinal numbers of the parallel chapters in the other versions are as follows: AdsP(Tib): the 82nd Chapter *Chos nyid 'gyur ba med pa bstan pa* (= *Akopyadharmatānirdeśa*); PvsP(Tib): the 71st Chapter *Chos nyid mi 'gyur ba bstan pa* (= *do.*); PvsP(Tib): the 74th Chapter *Chos nyid mi 'gyur ba bstan pa* (= *do.*); Xuanzang's Chinese translation of ŚSP: the 76th Chapter, named 無動法性品 (= *do.*; T. 6, no. 220, 1057c1); the Sanskrit version of ŚSP: the 73rd Chapter, named *Akopyadharmatānirdeśa* (see Matsunami 1965: 137f.); the Tibetan translation of ŚSP: the 72nd Chapter, named *Chos nyid 'gyur ba med pa bstan pa* (= *do.*; Tib[PK], no. 730, *ser phyin*, ji 320a6), while PvsP(K) reads instead "Dharmakāya-paragraph of the 8th *Śikṣā-parivarta*". The titles of the Chinese versions also differ: Mo. the 87th 諸法妙化品; Kj. the 87th 如化品; Xz(I). the 85th 空性品; Xz(II). the 31st 宣化品.

¹² The following descriptions are based on the investigations by Kenta Suzuki, Stefano Zacchetti and Fumio Shōji.

¹³ Cf. Zacchetti 2015: 186.

criterion, whether one received revisions in accordance with the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra*, which is said to have been related by the legendary Maitreya and compiled by Asaṅga (ca. 395~470 C.E.), or not.

(A) Versions, revised in accordance with the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra*:

The Sanskrit text of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* based on the Nepalese manuscripts and the Tibetan translation of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* in the Tanjur Canon¹⁴

(B) Versions, not revised:

The other versions including the Gilgit manuscript in question

Thus, we may conclude that, from the point of view of the general structure, the two Chinese translations by Xuanzang (Xz[I], Xz[II]) are the closest to this Gilgit manuscript. If we consider the dates of these three — the Gilgit manuscript dates back to the beginning of the 7th century C.E., and the Chinese translations were made between 660~663 C.E. —, it is not surprising that they are close to one another. Although these three seem to belong to the same lineage of transmission as the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā*, their readings differ quite often. In general, Xz(II) is expanded more than the Gilgit manuscript, while Xz(I) is expanded more than Xz(II).

As mentioned above, the *Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* is an expansion of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā*. The similarity between the former and the Gilgit manuscript has been pointed out already (Zacchetti 2015: 187). I assume that one of the reasons for their similarity may be that both of them were not received revisions in accordance with the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra*. However, we need further research so as to clarify the relationship between the two *Prajñāpāramitā* scriptures.

Thus, the classification of various versions of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā* constitutes a particularly complex issue, which cannot be discussed fully here. We are preparing a text of this manuscript based on the above-mentioned transliterations, comparing other versions as well as the yet unstudied Gilgit manuscripts. In this way, we may clarify the relationship amongst the various versions of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā* in the near future.

(5) System of the Captions

Each plate is provided with information concerning the *recto* or *verso* of a folio, e.g.:

2 FE 3.177; Dhr 147b4~21; Mo 1b1~11; Kj 217b3~14; Xz(I) 1c7~24; Xz(II) 427c16~428a1;
recto PvsP(K) I-1 2.2~21; PvsP(D) 5.8~6.8; AdsP(Tib.U) ka 4b1~5a6; AdsP(Tib.S) ka 4a2~b7;
 AdsP(Tib.Pk) ni 2b2~3a1; AdsP(Tib.D) ka 2b4~3a4; PvsP(Tib.U) ka 5a5~6a1; PvsP(Tib.S) ka
 4b4~5b2; PvsP(Tib.Pk) nyi 3a7~4a1; PvsP(Tib.D) ka 3a6~4a1

2 = folio number

FE 3.177 = the photo of 2 *recto* is found in facsimile number 177 in part 3 of the first edition of *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts* (Facsimile Edition); the same facsimile number is given in the revised edition (FE[re]), though the number of the volume differs.

Dhr 147b4~21 = parallel part in Dharmarakṣa's Chinese translation

Mo 1b1~11 = parallel part in Mokṣala's Chinese translation

Kj 217b3~14 = parallel part in Kumārajīva's Chinese translation

Xz(I) 1c7~24 = parallel part in Xuanzang's Chinese translation (1)

Xz(II) 427c16~428a1 = parallel part in Xuanzang's Chinese translation (2)

PvsP(K) I-1 2.2~21 = parallel part in the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, ed. Takayasu Kimura

PvsP(D) 5.8~6.8 = parallel part in the same Sanskrit text, ed. Nalinaksha Dutt

AdsP(Tib.U) ka 4b1~5a6 = parallel part in the Tibetan translation of the *Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, the Ulaanbaatar manuscript version of the Kanjur

AdsP(Tib.S) ka 4a2~b7 = parallel part in the same Tibetan translation in the Stog Palace manuscript version of the Kanjur

AdsP(Tib.Pk) ni 2b2~3a1 = parallel part in the same Tibetan translation in the Peking block-print edition of the Kanjur

AdsP(Tib.D) ka 2b4~3a4 = parallel part in the same Tibetan translation in the Derge block-print edition of the Kanjur

PvsP(Tib.U) ka 5a5~6a1 = parallel part in the Tibetan translation of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, the

¹⁴ According to Shōji, both the Sanskrit text from Nepal and the Tibetan translation in the Tanjur contain the same wordings, which divide a chapter into smaller sections and subsections. Also, he points out that the commentaries of the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra* by Ārya Vimuktisena (6th c.) and so on agree, not with the Tibetan translation of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* in the Kanjur, but with that in the Tanjur.

Ulaanbaatar manuscript version of the Kanjur

PvsP(Tib.S) ka 4b4~5b2 = parallel part in the same Tibetan translation in the Stog Palace manuscript version of the Kanjur

PvsP(Tib.Pk) nyi 3a7~4a1 = parallel part in the same Tibetan translation in the Peking block-print edition of the Kanjur

PvsP(Tib.D) ka 3a6~4a1 = parallel part in the same Tibetan translation in the Derge block-print edition of the Kanjur

In some cases, other references are added as well:

IOL San 1492 = parallel part in the Dunhuang manuscript of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā*

Cz = page numbers of Conze 1974b, in which his transliteration of a part of this manuscript, namely 265r~308r is found

Choong = page numbers of Choong 2006, in which a part of this manuscript, namely 124v~129v, is found

When there is no parallel part present in a certain version, the sign “-” is added, e.g.: Dhr -

II The *Vajracchedikā*

(1) The state of the manuscript and parallel versions

¹⁵There is an incomplete manuscript of the *Vajracchedikā* in serial number 10 of the Gilgit corpus preserved in the National Archives of India. 7 folios (5, 7~12) out of the original 12 have survived, while folios 1~4 and 6 are lost. This manuscript has been edited three times: by Chakravarti (1956), Dutt (1959: 141~170) and Schopen (1989; with translation). It is written in the Gilgit/Bamiyan type I script and probably dates back to the 6th~7th centuries. There is another manuscript of the same text and written in the same script, which was discovered probably in the Bamiyan area in Afghanistan and is now preserved in the Schøyen Collection (MS 2385; ed. Harrison / Watanabe 2006). Both manuscripts are incomplete but fortunately they complement one another. Thus, we can reconstruct the form of the text “which was circulating in the area of Greater Gandhāra in the 6th and 7th centuries” (Harrison 2006: 133). There is another incomplete Sanskrit manuscript, dating back probably to around the beginning of the 6th century, which was discovered in 1900 by Aurel Stein in Dandān-Uiliq near Khotan and is now preserved in the British Library. Recently, Paul Harrison (2015) has studied it and published its new transliteration.

From manuscripts produced in Japan and China in the 18th century, Max Müller made an edition of this scripture (1881). Based on this, Edward Conze made an “amalgam” edition (1974a), combining the readings of Müller’s edition with the above-mentioned Central Asian and Gilgit manuscripts as well as the Tibetan translation. Albeit this deficiency, this edition has been widely used.

There are six Chinese translations. The first was made by Kumārajīva in 402 C.E., which was followed by the translations by Bodhiruci (509 C.E.), Paramārtha (562 C.E.), Dharmagupta (592 C.E.), Xuanzang (660~663 C.E.) and Yijing (703 C.E.). The Tibetan translation was made by Śīlendrabodhi and Ye shes sde around 800 C.E. There are also the Khotanese¹⁶ and other versions.¹⁷

According to Shōgo Watanabe’s research (2009: 37~57), the above three Sanskrit manuscripts — the one discovered in Dandān-Uiliq is simpler than the other two — agree with Kumārajīva’s translation of this text (402 C.E.) very well and the stages of the development of various versions are as follows: Kumārajīva’s translation (402 C.E.) → Bodhiruci’s translation (509 C.E.) → Paramārtha’s translation (562 C.E.) → Yijing’s translation (703 C.E.) → Dharmagupta’s translation (592 C.E.), Xuanzang’s translation (660~663 C.E.), the Tibetan translation by Śīlendrabodhi and Ye shes sde (around 800 C.E.) and the later Sanskrit manuscripts (18th century).

(2) System of the Captions

Each plate is provided with information concerning the *recto* or *verso* of a folio, e.g.:

5	FE 7.1380; §§ 13c~14a; IOL San 7r6~8r4; Sc 39r1~40v1; Cz 38.6~39.20; Kj 750a16~b3; Br 754b1~19; Pa 763c2~21; Dg 768c1~21; Xz 982a14~b8; Yj 773a24~b12;
<i>recto</i>	Tib.S ka 239b4~240b3; Tib.Pk tsi 167a3~b5; Tib.D ka 125b3~126a3

5 = folio number

¹⁵ For the following part, cf. Zacchetti 2015: 192f.

¹⁶ Cf. Konow 1916; KT III 20~29.

¹⁷ Cf. Watanabe 2009: 9~11.

FE 7.1380 = the photo of 5 *recto* is found in facsimile number 1380 in part 7 of the first edition of *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts* (Facsimile Edition); the same facsimile number is given in the revised edition (FE[re]).

§§ 13c~14a = section and subsection divisions given in the Sanskrit edition by Conze (1974a)

IOL San 7r6~8r4 = parallel part in the manuscript discovered in Dandān-Uiliq, ed. Harrison 2015

Sc 39r1~40v1 = parallel part in the manuscript discovered probably in the Bamiyan area, ed. Harrison / Watanabe 2006

Cz 38.6~39.20 = parallel part in the Sanskrit edition by Conze (1974a)

Kj 750a16~b3 = parallel part in Kumārajīva's Chinese translation

Br 754b1~19 = parallel part in Bodhiruci's Chinese translation

Pa 763c2~21 = parallel part in Paramārtha's Chinese translation

Dg 768c1~21 = parallel part in Dharmagupta's Chinese translation

Xz 982a14~b8 = parallel part in Xuanzang's Chinese translation

Yj 773a24~b12 = parallel part in Yijing's Chinese translation

Tib.S ka 239b4~240b3 = parallel part in the Tibetan translation of the *Vajracchedikā*, the Stog Palace manuscript version of the Kanjur

Tib.Pk tsi 167a3~b5 = parallel part in the same Tibetan translation in the Peking block-print edition of the Kanjur

Tib.D ka 125b3~126a3 = parallel part in the same Tibetan translation in the Derge block-print edition of the Kanjur

III Division of roles

The manuscript of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā* (A) is bulky in amount and the task of identifying each folio with parallels in Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese versions was going to be hard. Therefore, I shared the work with my colleagues. The following is a list of what was allotted to each of us. At first, I divided the folios into two groups: **(I)** folios 1 to 130 and **(II)** the rest, namely folios 131~210, 214(?) and 264~308.

(I)

Seishi Karashima: identification of the Chinese parallels throughout the whole part; identification of the Tibetan parallels in AdsP(Tib.D) and PvsP(Tib.D) of folios 1 to 80; and identification of the Sanskrit version (PvsP) of folios 1 to 49

Kenta Suzuki: identification of Kj of folios 81 to 125

Stefano Zacchetti: identification of the Sanskrit version of folios 50 to 111

Youngjin Lee: identification of the Sanskrit version of folios 112 to 130; identification of the Tibetan parallels in AdsP(Tib.D) and PvsP(Tib.D) of folios 81 to 130

Fumio Shōji: identification of parallels in the other editions of the Kanjur, based on AdsP(Tib.D) and PvsP(Tib.D)

Chinese identifications were checked by Wang Junqi, Shiori Ijūin and Ryūken Nawa.

Tibetan identifications were checked by Genkai Hayashi.

Sanskrit identifications were checked by Yūki Takatsukasa and partly by Ye Shaoyong.

(II)

Kenta Suzuki: identification of the Chinese translations throughout the whole part

Jundō Nagashima: identification of the Sanskrit version (PvsP) of folios 214(?) and 264; identification of AdsP(Tib.D) of folios 131~210; identification of PvsP(Tib.D) throughout the whole part

Youngjin Lee: identification of the Sanskrit version (PvsP) of folios 131~210 and 265~308; identification of AdsP(Tib.D) of folios 265~308

Fumio Shōji: identification of parallels in the other editions of the Kanjur, based on AdsP(Tib.D) and PvsP(Tib.D)

Chinese identifications were checked by Wang Junqi and Ryūken Nawa.

The manuscript of the *Vajracchedikā* was studied by Ye Shaoyong and checked by Ryūken Nawa.

Some readers may regard the page and line numbers in the captions of the plates as merely rows of numbers, but behind them lay thousands of hours of work.

Acknowledgements

I like the Chinese proverb which goes *yinshui siyuan* 飲水思源, lit. “when drinking water, think of its source”. Here, I should like to record how our project of publishing the coloured facsimiles of the Gilgit manuscripts in the National Archives of India began and express my gratitude to those who enabled us to publish this series.

It was on a very hot summer day in 2010, when I was requested by the director, Dr. Yōichi Kawada and the staff of the Institute of Oriental Philosophy, which is located next to our building, to go to the National Archives of India, New Delhi and investigate the Gilgit *Saddharmapundarīka* manuscripts and fragments in order to help them prepare a facsimile edition of these to be published from their institute. In response, I told them that it would be impossible to identify fragments of the Lotus Sutra out of thousands of manuscripts and fragments during a short stay. Instead, I proposed to photograph the whole Gilgit collection and look for them slowly and carefully in Tokyo. They agreed and thus, that is how the whole project of publishing the coloured facsimile editions of the Gilgit manuscripts in the National Archives of India came into being. A few days later, I was asked again to come over to their institute. The staff showed me a mountain of photographs and microfilms of Sanskrit manuscripts, which Prof. Dr. Lokesh Chandra, Director of the International Academy of Indian Culture, had entrusted to Dr. Daisaku Ikeda, President of Soka Gakkai International, several years before. I was greatly astonished to find amongst them very clear photos of the Gilgit manuscripts, which had been used for the *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts* (Facsimile Edition) and a table of the letters of the Gilgit script, written beautifully with a special pen by Dr. Raghu Vira, which we are planning to publish in the near future. Like other researchers of the Gilgit manuscripts, I, myself, had been struggling to decipher the Gilgit manuscripts using poor-quality reproductions in the facsimile editions, while during all that time, the best quality black-and-white photographs of the said manuscripts had been lying "silently" in a cabinet in the building next to ours. As they lie now in our library, I consult them from time to time to admire the enormous achievements of the father and son pair, Drs. Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra and the complete trust between the latter and Dr. Ikeda. In this sense, I should like to express my gratitude and indebtedness to Drs. †Raghu Vira, Lokesh Chandra, Daisaku Ikeda as well as to Yōichi Kawada and the staff of the Institute of Oriental Philosophy, who are all the "source" of our present project.

I should like to express my deepest gratitude to Prof. Tsai Yao-ming, who kindly entrusted his unpublished transliteration to me several years ago and to Dr. Tatsushi Tamai, who transliterated the rest of the manuscript at my request. Without their transliterations, it would have been impossible to compare the whole manuscript, a huge amount indeed, with the other versions. As I wrote above, Dr. Tamai is now transcribing the other Gilgit manuscripts and fragments of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā* for our further research.

I wish to thank my colleague, Prof. Noriyuki Kudō, who not only went to New Delhi to arrange the photographing of the manuscripts, but also prepared a concordance of the newly-taken photographs with the numbers given in the previous facsimile editions; to Messrs. Ryūken Nawa, Genkai Hayashi, Yūki Takatsukasa, Wang Junqi, Ms. Shiori Ijūin for checking parallel parts in Chinese, Sanskrit and Tibetan versions; to Messrs. Makoto Nakanishi, Rin Takemura, Yūki Ushioda and Prof. Ye Shaoyong who arranged the plates and prepared this publication with their profound knowledge of computer technology.

I should also like to express my gratitude to the president of Soka University, Yoshihisa Baba, to the Board of Trustees Chair of Soka University, Yasunori Tashiro and to the Chair of the Steering Committee of IRIAB, Hirotomo Teranishi, for their understanding, encouragement and generous support in our various research projects.

Thanks are also due to my friend, Rev. Peter Lait, Mses Susan Roach and Rieko Ishizaka, for checking my English.

Without the unselfish endeavours and generosity of all these people, this volume could never have been possible.

Seishi Karashima

Hachioji, 7th March 2016

BIBLIOGRAPHY, ABBREVIATIONS AND SIGNS

- β = In AdsP(Tib.S) ga, there are two folios which are numbered 152. The first one is indicated as 152α and the second one as 152β.
- Bapat, P. V.
1949 “Another valuable collection of Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts”, in: *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Institute* (Poona) 30, pp. 241~253.
- BLSF = *Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia: The British Library Sanskrit Fragments*, editors-in-chief, Seishi Karashima and Klaus Wille, Tokyo, vol. I (2006), vol. II (2009), vol. III (2015): International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University.
- BMSC = *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection: Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. I (2000), vol. II (2002), vol. III (2006), ed. Jens Braarvig *et al.*, Oslo: Hermes Publishing.
- Chakravarti, Niranjan Prasad
1956 “The Gilgit Text of the Vajracchedikā”, in: Giuseppe Tucci (ed.), *Minor Buddhist Texts*, Part I, Rome (SOR 9), pp. 173~192.
- Choong, Yoke Meei
2006 *Zum Problem der Leerheit (śūnyatā) in der Prajñāpāramitā*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang (Europäische Hochschulschriften).
- Conze, Edward
1962 *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā: Chapters 55 to 70 Corresponding to the 5th Abhisamaya*, edited and translated, Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente (SOR 26).
1974a *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā*, 2nd ed. Rome 1974: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente (SOR 13).
1974b *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā: Chapters 70 to 82 Corresponding to the 6th, 7th, and 8th Abhisamayas*, edited and translated, Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1974 (SOR 46).
1978 *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature*, 2nd ed., rev. and enl., Tokyo: The Reiyukai (Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica Series Maior, I).
- Dutt, Nalinaksha
1934 *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, London: Luzac (Calcutta Oriental Series, no. 28).
1959 *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. 4, Calcutta, Srinagar; Delhi 1984: Sri Satguru Publications.
- FE = Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts* (Facsimile Edition), 10 pts., New Delhi 1959~1974 (Śata-Piṭaka Series 10).
- FE(re) = Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, revised and enlarged compact facsimile edition, 3 vols, Delhi 1995: Sri Satguru Publications (Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica Series 150~152).
- Harrison, Paul
2006 “Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā: A New English Translation of the Sanskrit Text Based on Two Sanskrit Manuscripts from Greater Gandhāra”, in: BMSC III, pp. 133~159.
2015 “The British Library Vajracchedikā Manuscript IOL San 383–387, 419–427”, in: BLSF III 2, pp. 823~865, plates 1~15.
- Harrison, Paul and Shōgo Watanabe
2006 “Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā”, in: BMSC III, pp. 89~132.
- Hinüber, Oskar von
1980 “Die Kolophone der Gilgit Handschriften”, in: *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 5/6: 49~82 = 2009: 688~721.
2004 *Die Palola Śāhis: Ihre Steininschriften, Inschriften auf Bronzen, Handschriftenkolophone und Schutzzauber: Materialien zur Geschichte von Gilgit und Chilas*, Mainz: Philipp von Zabern (Antiquities of Northern Pakistan, Band 5).
2009 *Kleine Schriften*, hrsg. von Harry Falk und Walter Slaje, 2 Bde, Wiesbaden 2009: Harrassowitz (Glasenapp-Stiftung 47).
2014 “The Gilgit Manuscripts: An Ancient Buddhist Library in Modern Research”, in: *From Birch Bark to Digital Data: Recent Advances in Buddhist Manuscript Research: Papers Presented at the Conference Indic Buddhist Manuscripts: the State of the Field, Stanford, June 15 - 19, 2009*, ed. by Paul Harrison and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Denkschriften / Oesterreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 460) (Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens, 80), pp. 79~135.
- Konow, Sten
1916 “The Vajracchedikā in the old Khotanese version of Eastern Turkestan”, in: A. F. Rudolf Hoernle (ed.), *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan*, Oxford 1916: Clarendon Press, pp. 214~288.
- KT = Harold Walter Bailey, *Khotanese Texts*, 5 vols, Cambridge 1945~1963: Cambridge University Press; repr. Cambridge 1969, 1980.
- Matsunami, Seiren
1965 *A Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Tokyo University Library*, Tokyo: Suzuki Research Foundation.
- Müller, Friedrich Max
1881 “Vagrakkhedikā”, in: *Buddhist Texts from Japan*, Oxford: Clarendon Press (Anecdota Oxoniensia, Aryan Series, vol. 1, part 1), pp. 15~46.
- Schopen, Gregory
1989 “The Manuscript of Vajracchedikā found at Gilgit”, in: L.O. Gómez & J.A. Silk (eds.), *Studies in the Literature of the Great Vehicle: Three Mahāyāna Buddhist Texts*, Ann Arbor: Collegiate Institute for the Study of Buddhist Literature and Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of Michigan (Michigan Studies in Buddhist Literature, no. 1),

pp. 89~139.

Sferra, Francesco

2008 *Sanskrit Texts from Giuseppe Tucci's Collection*, Part I, Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente (SOR 104; *Manuscripta Buddhica*, vol. I).

SOR = *Serie Orientale Roma*, Roma

ŚSP = *Śatasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*

Suzuki, Kenta and Jundo Nagashima

2015 “The Dunhuang Manuscript of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā*”, in: BLSF III.2, pp. 593~821.

T = *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經, ed. Junjirō Takakusu 高楠順次郎, Kaikyoku Watanabe 渡邊海旭, 100 vols., Tokyo 1924~1934.

Tib(Pk) = *The Tibetan Tripitaka: Peking Edition* 影印北京版西藏大藏經, ed. Daisetz T. Suzuki, 168 vols., repr. under the Supervision of Otani University, Kyoto, Tokyo 1955~1961: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute.

Watanabe, Shōgo 渡辺章悟

2009 *Kongō Hannyakyō no Kenkyū* 金剛般若經の研究 [A Study of the *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā*], Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin 山喜房佛書林.

Zacchetti, Stefano

2005 *In Praise of the Light: A Critical Synoptic Edition with an Annotated Translation of Chapters 1-3 of Dharmarakṣa's Guang zan jing* 光讚經: *Being the Earliest Chinese Translation of the Larger Prajñāpāramitā*, Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica, 8).

2015 “*Prajñāpāramitā Sūtras*”, in: *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism: Literature and Languages (Handbook of Oriental Studies)*, ed. Jonathan A. Silk *et al.*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 171~209.

ABBREVIATIONS FOR CAPTIONS

Abbreviations for the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā*

- LPG = Gilgit manuscript of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā* reproduced in this volume
Cz = Conze 1974b
Dhr = Dharmarakṣa's Chinese translation of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā*, namely the *Guangzan jing* 光讚經 (286 C.E.), T. 8, no. 222, 147~216.
Mo = Mokṣala's Chinese translation of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā*, namely the *Fanguang Banre jing* 放光般若經 (291 C.E.), T. 8, no. 221, 1~146.
Kj = Kumārajīva's Chinese translation of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā*, namely the *Mohe Banre Boluomi jing* 摩訶般若波羅蜜經 (404 C.E.), T. 8, no. 223, 217~424.
Xz(I) = Xuanzang's Chinese translation of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā*, namely the *Da Banre Boluomiduo jing, di erhui* 大般若波羅蜜多經, 第二會 (660~663 C.E.), T. 7, no. 220, 1~426.
Xz(II) = Xuanzang's Chinese translation of the *Larger Prajñāpāramitā*, namely the *Da Banre Boluomiduo jing, di sanhui* 大般若波羅蜜多經, 第三會 (660~663 C.E.), T. 7, no. 220, 427~761.
PvsP(K) = *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, ed. Takayasu Kimura, 6 vols, Tokyo 1986~2009: Sankibō Busshorin. I 1~VIII 179
PvsP(D) = *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, ed. Nalinaksha Dutt, London 1934: Luzac (Calcutta Oriental Series, no. 28).
AdsP(Tib.U) = Tibetan translation of the *Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, the Ulaanbaatar manuscript version of the Kanjur, *sher phyin*, no. 11, ka 1b1~352a8, kha 1b1~382a7, ga 1b1~360a8.
AdsP(Tib.S) = Tibetan translation of the *Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, the Stog Palace manuscript version of the Kanjur, no. 13, ka 1b1~382a7, kha 1b1~399a4, ga 1b1~392a7.
AdsP(Tib.Pk) = Tibetan translation of the *Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, the Peking block-print edition of the Kanjur, vol. 19, 205~318, vol. 20, 1~205, *sher phyin*, ni 1b1~282a8, pi 1b1~281a8, phi 1b1~223b8.
AdsP(Tib.D) = Tibetan translation of the *Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, the Derge block-print edition of the Kanjur, *sher phyin*, Tohoku, no. 10, ka 1b1~300a7, kha 1b1~304a7, ga 1b1~206a7.
PvsP(Tib.U) = Tibetan translation of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, the Ulaanbaatar manuscript version of the Kanjur, *sher phyin*, no. 10, ka 1b1~364a8, kha 1b1~353a8, ga 1b1~383a7, nga 1b1~362a7.
PvsP(Tib.S) = Tibetan translation of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, the Stog Palace manuscript version of the Kanjur, no. 12, ka 1b1~403a7, kha 1b1~381a7, ga 1b1~430a7, nga 1b1~394a7.
PvsP(Tib.Pk) = Tibetan translation of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, the Peking block-print edition of the Kanjur, vol. 18, 39~323, vol. 19, 1~202, *sher phyin*, nyi 1b1~300a6, ti 1b1~311a4, thi 1b1~312a8, di 1b1~282a7.
PvsP(Tib.D) = Tibetan translation of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, the Derge block-print edition of the Kanjur, *sher phyin*, Tohoku, no. 9, ka 1b1~382a4, kha 1b1~393a6, ga 1b1~381a5.
IOL San 1492 = Suzuki / Nagashima 2015
Choong = Choong 2006

Abbreviations for the *Vajracchedikā*

- IOL San = Harrison 2015
Sc = Harrison / Watanabe 2006
Cz = 1974a
Kj = Kumārajīva's Chinese translation of the *Vajracchedikā*, namely the *Jingang Banre Boluomi jing* 金剛般若波羅蜜經 (402 C.E.), T. 8, no. 235, 748~752.
Br = Bodhiruci's Chinese translation of the *Vajracchedikā, do.* (509 C.E.), T. 8, no. 236a, 752~757.
Pa = Paramārtha's Chinese translation of the *Vajracchedikā, do.* (562 C.E.), T. 8, no. 237, 762~766.
Dg = Dharmagupta's Chinese translation of the *Vajracchedikā*, namely the *Jingang Nengduan Banre Boluomi jing* 金剛能斷般若波羅蜜經 (592 C.E.), T. 8, no. 238, 766~771.
Xz = Xuanzang's Chinese translation of the *Vajracchedikā*, namely the *Da Banre Boluomiduo jing, di jiuhui, Nengduan Jingang fen* 大般若波羅蜜多經, 第九會, 能斷金剛分 (660~663 C.E.), T. 7, no. 220, 980~985.
Yj = Yijing's Chinese translation of the *Vajracchedikā*, namely the *Nengduan Jingang Banre Boluomiduo jing* 能斷金剛般若波羅蜜多經 (703 C.E.), T. 8, no. 239, 771~775.
Tib.S = Tibetan translation of the *Vajracchedikā*, the Stog Palace manuscript version of the Kanjur, *sras sna tshogs*, ka 232a1~252a1.
Tib.Pk = Tibetan translation of the *Vajracchedikā*, the Peking block-print edition of the Kanjur, vol. 21, 250~256, *sher phyin*, tsi 161b2~175b8.
Tib.D = Tibetan translation of the *Vajracchedikā*, the Derge block-print edition of the Kanjur, *sher phyin*, Tohoku, no. 16, ka 121a1~132b7.