

Offprint from:

『創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所・年報』  
平成24年度（第16号）2013年3月発行

---

---

*Annual Report of  
The International Research Institute  
for Advanced Buddhology  
at Soka University  
for the Academic Year 2012  
[= ARIB], vol. XVI, March 2013*

---

---

Noriyuki KUDO

A Newly Identified Manuscript of the *Pāramitāsamāsa*  
in the *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
Soka University  
Tokyo · 2013 · Hachioji  
JAPAN

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所  
東京・2013・八王子

# A Newly Identified Manuscript of Āryaśūra's *Pāramitāsamāsa* in the *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*<sup>1</sup>

Noriyuki KUDO

Recently, the present writer came to know that a single folio (Serial No. 57) in the *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts* (= *GBM*) is a part of manuscript of the *Pāramitāsamāsa* composed by Āryaśūra. According to the previous classification of *GBM*, this folio was classified as a part of a manuscript of the *Bhaiṣajyagurusūtra*.<sup>2</sup> However, due to the poor condition

---

<sup>1</sup> In autumn 2011, the National Archives of India (New Delhi) and the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University (Tokyo) agreed on publishing a new facsimile edition of the Gilgit manuscripts — except those of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* — now deposited at the former organization. This joint project is conducted under the general editorship of Dr. Oskar von Hinüber (Prof. Emeritus, Freiburg University), Prof. Seishi Karashima and the present author (IRIAB, Soka University). The manuscripts are re-classified (though retaining their original serial number) according to their genre such as *Vinaya* texts, the *Mahāyānasūtras*, *avadānas* and so on. Our joint publication contains the photographs which are newly taken in color, a concordance to editions and to parallels in Chinese and/or Tibetan, and up-to-date surveys of research on individual texts. The superior quality of the new color facsimile edition will allow scholars working on the Gilgit manuscript easily to distinguish parts of letters from the stains on the birch-bark and read the manuscripts more precisely. This paper is a result of our joint project and was made possible by reading the new photographs.

All the manuscripts of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* (serial Nos. 44, 45, 47, 48, 49) from Gilgit are jointly published by the National Archives of India, Soka Gakkai, and the Institute of Oriental Philosophy: *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkam: Gilgit Lotus Sutra manuscripts from the National Archives of India* = インド国立公文書館所蔵ギルギット法華経写本 [*Indo kokuritsu kōbunshokan shozō Girugitto Hokekyō shahon*], (Lotus Sutra manuscript series 12) 2012, Tokyo. ISBN 978-4-88417-031-8.

At this point, I would like to thank Dr. Shayne Clarke, who took trouble in checking and correcting my unidiomatic English. Needless to say, any errors which remain are of my own.

<sup>2</sup> For example, editors of the *GBM*, Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra, classified this manuscript as follows: “57. Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra. It is a single folio, bearing the number 2” [Preface in part 10, 1974, p. 10]; Schopen 1977, 1978, and Matsumura 1982. Gregory Schopen, who edited the Gilgit *Bhaiṣajyagurusūtra* text in his doctoral dissertation (Schopen 1978), does not support *GBM*'s attribution (see Schopen 1977: 206): “The two mss. consisting of a single leaf are nos. 32 and 57 (I have not yet been able to find no. 57 on my microfilm and so have had to take Chandra's word that it is a ms. of *Bhg.* [= *Bhaiṣajyagurusūtra*, abbreviation expanded by N.K.].)” Later again Schopen points out that “Two other Gilgit fragments — serial no. 52, facsimile no. 3306 and serial no. 57, facsimile nos. 3257-3258 — have been identified as possibly being from manuscripts of the *Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra*, but neither, it now seems, are” (2009: 194, 16-18). See also *Buddhist Text Information* No. 14, March 1978, pp. 1-3. (Cf. As to serial no. 52, facsimile no. 3306, see p. 358 of above replica edition of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*. In the margin of the pasteboard of the fragment, a remark concerning its attribution is written as “[Bhaiṣajya .. ..] (probably by the editors). Actually this fragment is a right part of folio 102 of no. 44.) Matsumura 1982 lists all the materials of the *Bhaiṣajyagurusūtra* not only in Sanskrit but also in Tibetan and Chinese translations; among them, although six Gilgit manuscripts including a single folio of No. 57 are mentioned as Sanskrit sources, he himself could not utilize this folio because its condition in the facsimile edition was

of the photos and the illegibility of the published facsimile edition (first ed. in 1974; second/revised in 1995) it was difficult for scholars to utilize this manuscript to the point that no textual description of this folio was made. Consequently, scholars inevitably have had to accept the classification made by the editors of the *GBM*–, even if they have not been able to identify this manuscript as belonging to the *Bhaiṣajyagurusūtra*.

Moreover, a text of the *Pāramitāsamāsa* was edited on the basis of a sole manuscript kept in the National Archives of Nepal, Kathmandu and studied. To date, this manuscript written in Newārī script, probably between the 13th to 14th centuries, has been believed to be the only extant manuscript of this text. Therefore, our newly identified manuscript is a only the second known Sanskrit manuscript of the *Pāramitāsamāsa* and it is considerably older than the Nepalese manuscript.

### 1. About Manuscript

This manuscript (Serial no. 57<sup>3</sup>) is a single folio of birch bark written in Gilgit/Bāmiyan, Type II (Protośāradā),<sup>4</sup> having 9 lines on the recto and 10 lines on the verso, approximately 51 letters per line; its size is 38.4 cm long and 6.8 cm high and a part of the first line of the verso is damaged (for its appearance, see the black/white facsimile nos. 3257/3258, *GBM* volume 10, part 10)<sup>5</sup>. There is a string hole on the left half-side of the folio (both sides) between lines 4 and 6; a space for the string hole is somewhat squarish<sup>6</sup>. It bears the folio number 2 on the recto side.

---

so bad and thus illegible (1982: 77).

<sup>3</sup> On its manuscript cover made of thick paper, the following description is found, probably written after the Gilgit manuscripts were shifted to New Delhi (1947): “S No. 57, 1 leaf / Box No. 5 / Bhaiṣajanya [*sic.*] Guru Sūtram / bhaiṣajyaguru sūtram [in Devānāgarī].” In this description, we find the remark “Box no. 5.” It is not clear to what this refers, but as far as we know from Lokesh Chandra (1959: 135), all the Gilgit manuscripts which had been transferred from Srinagar to New Delhi were “preserved in five big boxes.” It might be a mere coincidence that the manuscripts were in five boxes when they were found at mound C of finding site in Gilgit (see Hackin’s report in Lévi 1932: 15 [“Le centre est occupé par les fragments de cinq poteaux de bois, le cinquième étant entouré par les quatre autres”]). (This is mere speculation but does the ‘Box no.’ indicate their original preservation in the site?) According to the manuscript covers, ‘Box no. 1’ contains the manuscripts of serial no. 1 (all *Vinayavastus*); ‘Box no. 2’ = those of serial nos. 2-23; ‘Box no. 3’ = those of serial nos. 24-28 [all the *Prajñāpāramitā* texts]; ‘Box no. 4’ = those of serial nos. 29-43; ‘Box no. 5’ = those of serial nos. 44-62 [= all *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* manuscripts]. Serial numbers (1-62) were given when the manuscripts were preserved in Srinagar (see Bapat 1961-62. During 1957-60 when Bapat did research on the Gilgit manuscripts at the National Archives of India, he noticed that “There was also a list, prepared by the local pandits, of this collection ...” [p. 127]). This list in which the manuscripts were classified into 62 and given the details such as numbers of folio, titles known so far and so on — is slightly different from the list published by Lokesh Chandra 1959.

<sup>4</sup> It is interesting to note that only two scripts are used in the *GBM*, namely Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I and Type II (or Protośāradā). The former is always used to write the manuscripts of Mahāyāna works and the later is used for writing non-Mahāyāna works such as *Vinaya* literatures, non-Mahāyāna *sūtras*, *avadāna* texts, *gāthās* and so on. There are some exceptions of which Gilgit/Bamiyan Type II or Protośāradā is used for transcribing the Mahāyāna texts, for example, *Bhaiṣajyagurusūtra* (No. 32, one folio = Dutt’s A and Schopen’s V), *Samghāṭasūtra* (No. 39, fifteen folios), *Pratītyasamutpādahṛdayakārikā* of Nāgārjuna (No. 61, three folios) and No. 57: *Pāramitāsamāsa*.

<sup>5</sup> A new facsimile edition including this folio will be published in Volume IV of our publication.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Hu-von Hinüber 1994: 36.

The author is Āryaśūra but he is not the same person as the author of the *Jātakamālā*.<sup>7</sup> The date of this ‘Āryaśūra’ is not fixed; Meadows (see below) places the *Pāramitāsamāsa* “to around 7th or 8th Century A.D.” (1986: 21). However, as is stated by herself, since the “only firm lower limit is the translation of the text into the Tibetan in the late 8th century”<sup>8</sup>, its exact dating is difficult to settle. According to paleographical studies, the script of this manuscript (Protośāradā) was used in 7th and 8th century<sup>9</sup>. If this dating is accepted, this would mean that this Gilgit manuscript is earlier than its Nepalese counterpart (13–14th century)<sup>10</sup> on the one hand and very close to an original text on the other hand. Furthermore, our Gilgit manuscript might be earlier than the Tibetan translation by Vairocanarakṣita (ca. 8th or 9th century). Therefore, the date of composition of this text should be considered to be at least earlier than 7th or 8th century.

Our folio contains text from the 6th verse to pāda c of the 46th verse of the first chapter (Dānapāramitā) of the *Pāramitāsamāsa*.

## 2. Previous Studies

As far as I know, there are three Sanskrit editions, namely Ferrari 1946, Meadows 1986 and Saito 2005. All three editions use the same manuscript material known to them at that time but their readings differ from each other.

Ferrari 1946 is the first edition of this text; she uses a modern copy of the Nepalese manuscript. Her edition is, according to Meadows, “based on a modern copy made in Nepal at the request of Professor Giuseppe Tucci ... Ferrari states that the ms. from which her copy was made was found in the library of the Mahārāja of Nepal ....”<sup>11</sup>

Meadows 1986 is based on the palm-leaf manuscript written in Newārī<sup>12</sup> (abbreviated as “K.” by Meadows) although she works through a microfilm. In the introduction of her book, she writes: “According to Mr. Dangol and Dr. Michael Witzel, ... the ms. was originally in the collection of the Rājguru, Hemrāj Pandit; upon his death in the early 1960s, his son arranged for the transfer of the manuscript collection to the Nepalese government and specifically to the Bir Library on the Trichandra campus; the manuscripts in the national collection were transferred to the National Library at Harihar Bhawan, Pulchowk, and finally to the present National Archives.”<sup>13</sup> It is unclear whether

<sup>7</sup> As to the author, see Meadows 1986: 1-21; Hahn 1982: 321-324; Saito 2005.

<sup>8</sup> Meadows *op. cit.*, p. 21. Tibetan translation was done by Vairocanarakṣita; on his date, see Saito 2005: 9.

<sup>9</sup> As to the dating of the script, see Sander 1986, 1989 (especially p. 111); Hu.-von Hinüber 1994: 37-40.

<sup>10</sup> See Meadows 1986: 22.

<sup>11</sup> Meadows *op. cit.*, p. 21.

<sup>12</sup> According to the Nepalese-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project (NGMCP), its script is classified as ‘Magadhi,’ see [http://catalogue.ngmcp.uni-hamburg.de/wiki/A\\_39-2\\_Pāramitāsamāsa](http://catalogue.ngmcp.uni-hamburg.de/wiki/A_39-2_Pāramitāsamāsa) [accessed: 20 Feb., 2013].

<sup>13</sup> Meadows 1986: 22. On this history of the collection, de Jong 1989: 239, note 2, asks: “Is there any evidence showing that manuscripts from the library of the Mahārāja were later transferred to the collection of the Rājguru?”

K is indeed an original of Ferrari's copy<sup>14</sup> but Meadows concludes that "on the basis of evidence I have in hand I believe K was the ms. from which Ferrari's copy was made."<sup>15</sup> There are a number of discrepancies in the readings between the materials they used; Meadows discusses the relationship of K to Ferrari's copy and enumerates the differences (Meadows 1986: 25-37).

After Meadows book was published, de Jong published a review of her book (de Jong 1989); he criticizes her emendations and translation. Later he obtains a microfilm of manuscript K and again discusses her readings (de Jong 1991).

By 1986, we had had two Sanskrit editions; both editors also use a Tibetan translation by Vairocanarakṣita for correction but Ferrari "does not mention which particular edition of Tanjur was used"<sup>16</sup> and Meadows "does not say anything about the Tibetan translation apart from remarking that 'All substantive emendations (those affecting meaning) were made by me on the basis of the Tibetan'."<sup>17</sup> Saito (2005) published a comprehensive study of the Tibetan translation of the *Pāramitasamāsa*. In editing the Tibetan text, he uses editions from the Chone, Derge, Ganden, Narthang and Peking Tanjur along with a quotation in the *Lam rim chen mo* by Tsoñ kha pa (two versions). Furthermore, he made preliminary observations on the Sanskrit text and compares in detail the readings of the previous two editions and the Sanskrit manuscript.<sup>18</sup> (Unfortunately the present writer could not consult the Nepalese manuscript due to time constraints, but by using Saito's study I have been able to compare the Gilgit manuscript [= G, hereinafter] with the Nepalese manuscript).

### 3. Some remarks on the text

G's reading does not show significant differences with the aforementioned Sanskrit editions. However, at some points, particularly where editorial problems have been pointed out, G gives a better reading. In many cases, G corresponds well with the Tibetan translation. Here, however, one major divergence is worth noting in the sequence of verses.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Saito who also reads this manuscript states that "Damit liefern die 47 besseren Lesarten bei F gegenüber K keinen zwingenden Beweis dafür, daß Fc nicht von K abhängig ist, ..." (Thus, 47 better readings found in F deliver to K no compelling evidence that Fc does not depend on K ...) (2005: 333).

<sup>15</sup> Meadows 1986: 31. de Jong (1989: 234) remarks: "There is no doubt that both manuscripts are closely related to each other but this is not sufficient to suppose that F co is copied directly from K." After gaining a photocopy of K, he states that "F co. is a direct or indirect copy of K and that the differences between the two manuscripts are due to mistakes made by one or more copyists" (de Jong 1991: 181).

<sup>16</sup> Meadows' comment on Ferrari (Meadows 1986: 21).

<sup>17</sup> de Jong's comment on Meadows (de Jong 1989: 235). The sentence in single quotation marks is quoted from Meadows (1986: 36) by de Jong.

<sup>18</sup> As to the Sanskrit text, Saito gives "corrections to Meadows' text" in his introduction (pp. 3-5); then discusses in detail orthographical features and readings in M, F, and K (pp. 319-335); and finally presents a Sanskrit text with his textual footnotes. (pp. 339-395).

In addition to the aforementioned editions, note Sato 1991-, in which Sato translates the first chapter of the *Pāramitāsamāsa* into Japanese with annotations.

<sup>19</sup> There are other cases where verse sequence in Sanskrit differs from that in the Tibetan translation:

Comparing the verse numbers given in the previous Sanskrit editions, viz., verse numbers of M and S, G preserves a different order; verse 26 in M, S corresponds to 28 in G and 27<sup>20</sup> in Tib. Likewise, M, S 27 = G 26 = Tib. 25; M, S 28 = G 27 = Tib. 26. There is another instance of verse disorder: M, S 33 = G 34 = Tib. 33; M, S 34 = G 33 = Tib. 32.<sup>21</sup> As to the sequence of verses, G and the Tibetan translation are the same; only the text based on the Nepalese manuscript differs.

M, S	G	Tibetan
26	28	27
27	26	25
28	27	26
33	34	33
34	33	32

In the following, variant readings found in the previous editions, namely K, M, S and T, are noted under every verse; since M and S — including remarks by de Jong 1991 — used the same Nepalese manuscript, if there are differences in reading, that of K is mentioned separately (otherwise those of M and S are mentioned).

#### SYMBOLS USED:

- F, F co: A copy of the manuscript used by Ferrari, probably of K<sup>22</sup>.  
 G: *GBM* no. 57, a birch-bark manuscript, written in Proto-śāradā, one folio.  
 K: A palm-leaf manuscript in the National Archives of Nepal (No. 5-145, microfilm A 39/2), written in Newārī script, 10 folios.  
 M: Meadows' Sanskrit text.  
 S: Saito's Sanskrit text.  
 T: Tibetan translation of the *Pāramitāsamāsa* by Vairocanarakṣita, see Saito 2005.  
 ( ) restored *akṣara*(s)  
 [ ] damaged *akṣara*(s)  
 .. one illegible *akṣara*  
 . illegible part of an *akṣara*  
 / *daṇḍa*  
 // double *daṇḍa*  
 \* *virāma*  
 • punctuation mark

II.60-65, III.13, IV.7, V.28, 62, see Saito 2005.

<sup>20</sup> The first verse in Sanskrit has no equivalent in Tibetan; thus the corresponding Tibetan translation starts from the second verse in Skt.

<sup>21</sup> Saito 2005: 92.

<sup>22</sup> In Meadows 1986, this material is called 'F co.' while Saito 2005 distinguishes two, namely 'F' and 'Fc'. 'F' indicates 'Sanskrit text edited by Ferrari' and 'Fc' indicates 'copy of manuscript.' Cf. de Jong 1989: 235: "... the abbreviation F co. for the copy used by Ferrari is rather clumsy. Why not use a single letter such as C?"

:	<i>visarga</i> used aspunctuation
'	<i>avagraha</i> (not written in manuscript; it is added in brackets in the transliteration)
○	string hole
ḥ	<i>upadhmānīya</i> [ <i>visarga</i> + <i>p/ph</i> ]
ḥ	<i>jihvāmūlīya</i> [ <i>visarga</i> + <i>k/kh</i> ]

## [Pāramitāsamaṣaḥ Chapter 1: Dānapāramitāsamaṣaḥ]

## TRANSLITERATION:

[2r1]yadā [ni]sṛṣṭo jagato mayāyaṃ kāyo (')pi tattyāgakṛto (')pi dharmmaḥ (/)

bāhye tadā vastuni saṅgacittaṃ na me gajasnānam ivānurūpaṃ\* (// 6<sup>23</sup> //)

a: K *tisṛṣṭo*<sup>24</sup>, S *yadātisṛṣṭo*<sup>25</sup>; M, S *jagate*

māṃsārthino māṃsam idaṃ harantu majjānam apy uddharatāṃ tadarthī •

ahaṃ hi lokārtham idaṃ bibharmmi śarīraṃ kiṃ bata vastu bāhyam\* (// 7 //)

b: M *uddharaṇāt*<sup>26</sup>, KS *uddharatāt*, T *brus te khyer*<sup>27</sup>

yathā hi bhaiṣajyama[2r2]hīruhasya tvakpatrapuṣpādi janā haranti •

madīyam ete (')paharanti caivaṃ [nai]naṃ vikalpās samudācaranti • (// 8 //)

a: M, S *yathaiva* for *yathā hi*, c-d: M, S *ceti naivaṃ*, d: M, S *vikalpāḥ*

tathaiva lokārthasamudyatena svalpo (')pi kāryo na mayā vikalpaḥ (/)

duḥkhe kṛtaghne satatāśucau ca dehe paramāy upayujyamāne • (// 9 //)

ādhyātmike caiva mahījalādye bāhye ma[2r3]hābhūta[ga]ṇe ca tulye •

idaṃ mamedam na mameti ko (')yam ajñānapaṃkāṅkavidhir mmamāpi • (// 10 //)

d: M, S *mayāpi* for *mmamāpi*<sup>28</sup>

gr̥hṇīta gātrāṇy api me yatheṣṭaṃ mā kāṛṣur asmiṃ parakīyabuddhim\* (/)

yuṣmākam eva svam idaṃ hi sarvaṃ na svābhimāno mama kaścīd attra : (// 11 //)

c: M, S *kim arthaṃ* for *hi sarvaṃ*, K *him arthaṃ*<sup>29</sup>, d: M, S *nātmābhimāno* for *na svābhimāno*

<sup>23</sup> Verse number is not given in the manuscript.

<sup>24</sup> de Jong [1991: 181] reads K by himself and says: “The text of 6ab according to K is: *yadābhisṛṣṭo jagate mayāyam / kāyo 'pi tattyāgakṛto 'poi dharmmaḥ //*”; see also Sato 1991: 113, note on v. 6-2.

<sup>25</sup> See S’s textual note, p. 340, fn. 1; also cf. S. p. 79.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. de Jong 1989: 237.

<sup>27</sup> S’s textual note, p. 340, fn. 2.

<sup>28</sup> See S’s textual note (p. 340, fn. 3): “*bdag gi* für das dreimalige *mama* (in c und d) T”; cf. de Jong 1991: 181-2. According to de Jong, K reads *mamāpi*; F reads *mayāpi*. Also cf. Sato 1991: 112, note on v. 10-1.

<sup>29</sup> See M p. 158, 11c; cf. S p. 325, 1.19) 1.11c.

ity adbhutā yasya bhavanty abhīkṣṇam saṃbuddha[2r4]bhāvānugūṇā vitarkāḥ (/)  
taṃ bodhisatvātiśayaṃ vadanti buddhā mahāsatvam aciṅtyasatvāḥ (// 12 //)

a: K *bhavantibhīkṣṇam*<sup>30</sup>

evam sa dānapratipattiśūrah karoti kāye (')pi na jātv apekṣām\* /  
tasyāprayatnād upayānti śuddhiṃ karmmaṇi vākkāyamanomayāni • (// 13 //)

viśuddhakarmma ca hitaṃ pareṣāṃ[2r5]m āyāsaduḥkhena vinā karoti •  
itthaṃ ca ś/mantyāyam abhiprapanno nayānaye kauśaṃ lam abhyupaiti • (// 14 //)

a: K *vahitaṃ* for *ca hitaṃ*<sup>31</sup>, c: M, S *sa sattvārtham* for *ca śantyāyam*; KS *abhiprapanno*<sup>32</sup>, M *abhiprayatno*

bhūyastaraṃ prāpya phalaṃ sa dānāt saddharmmadānena tataḥ karoti •  
bhavāndhakāre bhramatāṃ janānāṃ sūryodayāt spaṣṭataraṃ prakāśam\* (// 15 //)

a: M, S *balam* for *phalam* T 'bras bu T (= *phalam*)<sup>33</sup>

sādhāraṇā lokahitārtha[2r6]siddhis sarvajñabhāvābhyudayapraṭiṣṭhā •  
ato (')sya puṇyākṣayatābhyudeti praṅbheva bhānor udayasthitasya • (// 16 //)

a: M, S *sādhāraṇī* for *sādhāraṇā*

ity adbhutā dānamayā guṇaughā ye bodhisatvābharaṇābhavanti •  
yasmāt tadīyaṃ parikarmma cittam dānasya kāruṇyapurassarasya • (// 17 //)

c: M, S *tasmāt* for *yasmāt*; S *citraṃ*, T *rnam pa maṇi*<sup>34</sup>

āyu[2r7]ḥpratībhānabalādi bauddham niṣpādayeyaṃ jagatām anena /  
satvā mayā cāmiṣasaṃgrhītā saddharmmapātrāṇy api me bhaveyuh (// 18 //)

c: M, S *-saṃgrhītāḥ* for *-saṃgrhītā*<sup>35</sup>

ity annadānaṃ pratidāti vidvān na tas svasaṃpattiparigrahāya :  
pānāny api kleśatṛṣāś śamāya lokasya lokārthacaro dadāti • (// 19 //)

a: M *pradadāti* for *pratidāti*, b: M, S *vidvān na svarga-* for *vidvān na tas sva-*, T *raṇ gi phun sum tshogs pa* (= *svasya saṃpatti*)<sup>36</sup>

bauddhasya caivarddhivi[2r8]ceṣṭitasya nirvāṇasaukhyasya ca sarvalokaḥ (/)  
lābhī katham syād iti lokanātho yānaṃ mahāyānamatir ddadāti (// 20 //)

<sup>30</sup> M notes [158, 12a]: “*yat prabhavanty* F (F co.)”; see also S’s textual note (p. 341, fn. 1).

<sup>31</sup> See S’s textual note (p. 341, fn. 2).

<sup>32</sup> de Jong [1991: 182]. See also S’s textual note (p. 341, fn. 3); also cf. S p. 330, 2.2.2) a) 1.14c (*tn- / nn-*).

<sup>33</sup> See S’s textual note (p. 341, fn. 4); also cf. Sato 1991: 112, note on v. 15-1.

<sup>34</sup> See S’s textual note (p. 341, fn. 5); also cf. S p. 326, 2.1. 1.17c.

<sup>35</sup> M notes [160, 18c]: “*°rthasaṃgrahīnāḥ*, F co.”; cf. S p. 330 2.2. 2)a) 1.18c.

<sup>36</sup> See S’s textual note (p. 342, fn. 1).

a: M, S °*viceṣṭitasya*, K °*viceṣṭitasya*<sup>37</sup>, d: M, S *mahāyānaratir* for *mahāyānamatir*<sup>38</sup>

saṃbuddhavarṇasya ca hemabhāso lajjāmayasyaiva ca bhūṣaṇasya<sup>39</sup> (/)  
niṣpattaye vastravidhīn udārām • satkṛtya kālānugūṇam dadāti (// 21 //)

d: M, S *kālānugūṇam* for *kālānugūṇam*

saṃbodhimaṇḍāsanam āsanā[2r9]ni • śayyāś ca śayyāṭṭrayam īkṣamāṇas (/)  
sarvajñacakṣuḥpratilabdhave ca caityeṣu rathyāsu ca dīpadānaṃ (// 22 //)

d: M, S *dīpamālām* for *dīpadānaṃ* (T. reads: *mar me dbul*)

vādyāni divyaśrutisaṃgrahārtha[m\*] saṃbuddhaśīlāya ca gandhadānaṃ<sup>40</sup> •  
sabhārapārāmavihāragehām ccharaṇyadānābhimukho dadāti • (// 23 //)

d: M, S *śaraṇyabhāvābhi-* for *ccharaṇyadānābhi-*

dānaṃ rasānām ca susaṃskṛtānām [2v1] rasārasajñatvapariḡrahāya :  
bhaiṣajyadānāny ajarāmaratvaṃ lokān imān prāpayi + + + (// 24 //)

a: M, S *tu* for *ca*, b: M, S *rasārasāgratva-* for *rasārasajñatva-*<sup>41</sup>

d: M, S *prāpayitum* dadāti // 24 //

+ .. + .[u] tām ātmasamaṃ n[i]n. ṣur ddās. kṛtān kleśagaṇena lokān\* (/)  
sa dāsādānāni sadā dadāti dāsānudāsān<sup>42</sup> aparān karo .i (// 25 //)

a: M, S *bhujīṣyatām ātmasamaṃ ninīṣur*, b: M, S *dāsīkṛtān*

c: M, S *dāsādāsyādi* for *dāsādānāni*,<sup>43</sup> d: M, S *aparākariṣyan* for *aparān karo(t)*<sup>44</sup>

.. .. ti puttr. + + +<sup>45</sup> [vi]drumādīm dadāti sallakṣaṇasampadartham\* (/)

[2v2] ratnapradīpāni ca bhūṣaṇāni cittrāṇy anuvyañjanasauṣṭhavāya : (// 26 // = M, S 27)

a: M, S v.26: *dadāti putrān duhitṛh*. M, S v.27: *suvarṇamuktāmaṇi-*.

c: M, S *ratnapradīptāni* for *ratnapradīpāni* (T reads: *sgron ma 'lamp'*)<sup>46</sup>

<sup>37</sup>. M notes [162, 20a]: "... the K ms. reading of °*viceṣṭitasya* ..."; but her note is wrong as is pointed out by S [342, fn. 2].

<sup>38</sup>. Cf. M's translation note on v. 20.3 (p. 269) says: The use of *rati* is somewhat unusual, ... ."

<sup>39</sup>. Cf. de Jong 1989: 238 points out M's mistranslation; also Sato 1991: 112, note on v. 21-1.

<sup>40</sup>. Cf. M notes [162, 23b]: "*pānthadānaṃ*, F (F co.)"; S p. 329, 2.2. 1) c) 1.23b [*gāndha°/pānthā°/ e*] 1.23b.

<sup>41</sup>. See S's textual note (p. 343, fn. 1).

<sup>42</sup>. For this word, see S's textual note (p. 343, fn. 2).

<sup>43</sup>. Cf. M notes [162, 25d]: "*dāsānadāsān* K, F co. (*dādānudāsān* F)."

<sup>44</sup>. Cf. S's textual note (p. 343, fn. 2): "wie *aparā°* dann zu emendieren ist: *aparā<n>*, *amarā<n>* oder ähnlich."

<sup>45</sup>. Although verse 26 seems to start here, namely "*(dadā)ti putr(ān)*", verse 27 intervenes; consequently the sequence of verses is different from present Sanskrit text: M, S25 = G25; M, S26 = G28; M, S27 = G26; M, S28 = G27 (sequence of G corresponds to that of the Tibetan translation, see S pp. 92-94; Sato 1991: 3, note 6).

<sup>46</sup>. See S p. 93.

dhyānārtham utpādyā tapovanāni saddharmakoṣāya ca vittakoṣam\* (/)  
 munīndrarājyāya dadāty akhinno rājyāni cājñāpanamaṇḍitāni • (// 27 // = M, S 28)  
 a: M, S *udyāna-* for *utpādyā*, d: M *-maṇḍitāni*, K *-paṇḍitāni*, S *-paṇḍitāni* (S notes [343, fn. 3]: *brgyan T* (= °*maṇḍitāni*))

dadāti puttrān duhittrīḥ pṛyaś ca bodhipriyatvād anavadyadānam\* (/)  
 ekāntasaddharmaratipṛyaś ca krīḍā[2v3]viśeṣān ratihetubhūtān\* (// 28 // = M, S 26)  
 a, c: M, S *priyaś* for *pṛyaś*

cakrāṅkitābhyāṃ caraṇottamābhyāṃ saṃbodhimaṇḍākramaṇotsukatvāt\* (/)  
 sa nirvicāraś caraṇapradānaṃ lokārthaniṣpattikaro dadāti • (// 29 //)  
 a: M, S *nirvikāraś* for *nirvicāraś*<sup>47</sup>

duḥkhāpagāyām atiśīghragāyām magnasya lokasya kathan nu dadyām\* (/)  
 saddharmahastān iti sa pradatte<sup>48</sup> hastān vikoṣāmburuhaparakāśān\* (// 30 //)  
 b: M, S *kathaṃ na* for *kathan nu*, c: M, S *saṃpradatte* for *sa pradatte*

śraddhe[2v4]ndriyādeḥ paripūranārthaṃ sa karṇanāsādi dadāty akhinnaḥ (/)  
 cakṣuś ca cakṣur vimalīkariṣyaOn lokasya sarvāvaraṇaprahāṇāt\* (// 31 //)  
 a: M, S *śraddhendriyādiḥ* for *śraddhendriyādeḥ pari-*

utkrtya māmsāni saṣoṇitāni dadāti kāruṇyavaśena nāthaḥ (/)  
 bhūmyagnivāyvambuvad eva me syāl lokopajīvyahḥ katham eṣa kāyah // (32 //)

<sup>49</sup>majjānam apy adbhutavī[2v5]raceṣṭo dadāti lokasya kathaṃ na kuryām\* (/)  
 tāthāgataṃ vighrahaṃ apradhṛṣyaṃ vṛṣṭyāpi vaOjrojvalayā patantyā • (// 33 // = M, S 34)

lokottamajñānasamāpanārthaṃ sa uttamāṅgair api satkaroti •  
 abhyāgatasyārthijanasya yācñāṃ pṛāg eva gātrāvayavais tadanyaiḥ // (34 // = M, S 33)  
 d: M, S *dehāvayavais* for *gātrāvayavais* [*deha* = *gātra*, 'body'] (T reads: *lus*)

ity evamādyāṃ satatānavadyāṃ tad bo[2v6]dhisatvāmbudharapramuktam\* (/)  
 prahlādyā dānāmbu jagat samagraṃ sarvajñatāsāgaram abhyupaiOti • (// 35 //)  
 c: S *prahlādyā* for *prahlādyā*<sup>50</sup>

<sup>47</sup> See S's textual note (p. 344, fn. 1). Cf. M's translation note on v. 29.3 (p. 272) ; Sato 1991: 112, note on v. 29-1.

<sup>48</sup> For *sampadatte*? However, a drop of *anusvāra* is hardly seen in this manuscript.

<sup>49</sup> The sequence of verses in the extant Sanskrit version of the Nepalese manuscript is 33-34-35 but our G has different one 34-33-35. This sequence of G corresponds to that of the Tibetan translation (see S p. 97; Sato 1991: 3, note 6).

<sup>50</sup> It is not known why he emends so.

anviṣya bhogān viṣameṇa nāsau dadāti notpīdanayā parasya<sup>51</sup> •  
na ttrāsalajjāpratīkārāhetor na dakṣiṇīyān parimārgamāṇaḥ (// 36 //)<sup>52</sup>

na ca praṇīte na ti rūkṣadānam adakṣiṇīyān i[2v7]ti vāvamānya :  
vipākakāṅkṣākṛpaṇīkṛtam vā satkārahīnam vijugupsitam vā • // (37 //)

a: M, S *sati* for *na ti*<sup>53</sup>; b: M, S *adakṣiṇīyā iti* for *adakṣiṇīyān iti*

naivānatiṃ śīlavate prayacchan viparyayaṃ gacchati netarasmai •  
nātmānam utkarṣati naiva nindāṃ karoti so (')nyasya samaprayogaḥ // (38 //)

a: M, S *naivonnatiṃ* for *naivānatiṃ* [T reads: *mtho (mthoṇ)* Skt. *unnati*]<sup>54</sup>

na cāsya mithyāśayadānam asti naivāsty anadhyāśayadānam asya (/)  
na krodhadoṣopa[2v8]hataṃ dadāti naivānutāpaṃ kurute sa datvā • (// 39 //)

na ślāghamāno vipulaṃ dadāti glāyaṃ na caivāvipulaṃ dadāti •  
na yācakānām upaghātadānam yadvā bhaved vipratipattihetuḥ (// 40 //)

a: M, S *ślāghyamāno*<sup>55</sup> for *ślāghamāno*, K *ślāghamāno*; b: M *nāślāghyamāno*  
'nyataraṃ dadāti, K *nāślāghamāno* (')*lpataraṃ dadāti*, S *nāślāghyamāno* *lpataraṃ*, T *ñui*  
*bar* (= *alpataraṃ*)<sup>56</sup>

nākāladānaṃ sa dadāti kiñcid dadāti kāle viṣame (')pi naiva :  
na devabhāvāya na rājyahetor nna hīnayānasprḥayālubhāvā • (// 41 //)

d: M, S *-bhāvāt* for *-bhāvā*

nāsau [2v9] mukhālokanayā dadāti • na kīrttiśabdāya na hāsyahetoḥ (/)  
paryāyam etac ca mamaiva naivaṃ • yadvā vihiṃsāsahitaṃ pareṣāṃ (// 42 //)

a: M, S *mukhollokanayā* for *mukhālokanayā*<sup>57</sup>

c: M, S *paryāptam* for *paryāyam*, M, S *mameti* for *mamaiva*; d: M, K  
*vihiṃsāhasitaṃ*<sup>58</sup> for *vihiṃsāsahitaṃ*, S *vihiṃsāsahitaṃ*<sup>59</sup>

sarvajñabhāvāpariṇāmitaṃ vā • sadgarhitaṃ vā sa dadāti naiva (/)  
tato (')sya tat pāramitābhīdhānam\* parāṃ viśuddhiṃ samupaiti dānaṃ (// 43 //)

<sup>51</sup> Cf. de Jong [1989: 238] points out M's mistranslation of this verse; Sato 1991: 112, note on v. 36-1.

<sup>52</sup> Verses 36-39 in T are differently composed, see S p. 99. G corresponds to M, S.

<sup>53</sup> *na ti*: a scribal error? Cf. Sato 1991: 111, note on v. 37-1.

<sup>54</sup> See S p. 102; see also Sato 1991: 111, note on v. 38-1.

<sup>55</sup> See S's textual note (p. 345, fn. 1): *gcam byas bkur zes* (= *ślāghyamāno*). Cf. S p. 326, 2.1. 1.40ab [*ślāgha-/ślāghya-*].

<sup>56</sup> See S's textual note (p. 345, fn. 2-3).

<sup>57</sup> Cf. de Jong [1989: 238] points out M's mistranslation of this verse; also Sato 1991: 109-110, note on v. 42-1.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. de Jong [1991: 184] proposes to read *vihiṃsāsahitaṃ* instead of *vihiṃsāhasitaṃ*; also Sato 1991: 110, note on v. 42-2.

<sup>59</sup> See S's textual note (p. 346, fn. 1); also cf. S p. 326, 2.1. 1.42d [*°hasitaṃ/°sahitaṃ*].

b: M, S *sagarhitam* for *sadgarhitam*

dānodbhavaṃ tasya ca puṅyarāśiṃ • lokāt samagrā[2v10]n api piṇḍitāni (/)  
puṅyāni naivābhibhavanti yasmāt\* lokottamatvaṃ sa tato (')bhyupaiti • // (44 //)

b: M, S *samagrād api* for *samagrān api*

pañcasv abhijñāsu ca niścītātmā lokāya yad varṣati dānavarṣam\* (/)  
samantatas tasya kutaḥ pramāṇaṃ parikṣayo vā satataḥ pravṛtteḥ // (45 //)

a: M, S *vinīcitātmā* for *ca niścītātmā*, d: M, S *satatapravṛtteḥ* for *satataḥ pravṛtteḥ*

tad akṣayāṇaṃ jagatāṃ hitāya jñānasya hetuś ca tad akṣayasya •  
ttraidhātukena kṣayiṇā [2v10 ends] (na tac ca saṃlipyate vyomavad ambudena // 46 //)

a: M, S *yad* for *tad*, b: M, S *yad* for *tad*

## Abbreviations and Bibliography

F, F co: A copy of the manuscript used by Ferrari (1946).

G: Gilgit manuscript of the *Pāramitāsamāsa* in the National Archives of India, serial no. 57, a birch-bark manuscript, in Proto-śāradā, one folio, 38.4 x 6.8 cm.

GBM: *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, the facsimile edition edited by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra.

K: A palm-leaf manuscript in the National Archives of Nepal, No. 5-145, microfilm A 39/2, in Newārī (Magadhi) script, 10 folios, 7 lines/side, 57 x 5.5 cm. 13-14th century.

M: Meadows' Sanskrit text, see Meadows 1986.

S: Saito's Sanskrit text, see Saito 2005: 337ff.

T: Tibetan translation by Vairocanarakṣita, see Saito 2005.

Bapat, P. V.

1961/62 "Gilgit Manuscripts and Numerical Symbols," in: *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, vol. XI, pp. 127-131.

Chandra, Lokesh

1959 "A Note on the Gilgit Manuscripts," in: *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, vol. IX.2, pp. 135-140.

Dutt, Nalinaksha

1939 *Gilgit Manuscripts*. Vol. I, Srinagar [*Bhaiṣajyagurusūtra*. Introduction pp. 47-57, text pp. 1-32].

Ferrari, Alfonsa

1946 "Il compendio delle Perfezioni di Āryaśūra," in: *Annali Lateranensi*, vol. 10 (1946), pp. 9-102 [not available to present writer].

Hahn, Michael

1982 *Die Subhāṣitaratnakaraṇḍakakathā. Einspätbuddhistischer Text zur Verdienstlehre*, Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philol.-hist. Kl., Nr. 9, pp. 311-374.

Hu-von Hinüber, Haiyan

1994 *Das Poṣadhavastu. Vorschriften für die buddhistische Beichtfeier im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins*, Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalische Fachpublikationen.

de Jong, J. W.

1989 Review on Meadows 1986, in: *Indo-Iranian Journal* 32, pp. 234-239.

1991 "Notes on the Text of the *Pāramitāsamāsa*," in: 『前田惠學博士頌壽記念・佛教文化學論集』東京: 山喜房佛書林 (*Mayeda Egaku hakushi shōjukinen: Bukkyō bunkagaku ronshū* [*Studies in Buddhism and Culture in honour of Professor Dr. Egaku Mayeda on his sixty-fifth birthday*])

(Tokyo: Sankibo Busshorin), pp. 181-187 [(600)-(594)].

Lévi, Sylvain

1932 “Note sur des manuscrits sanscrits provenant de bamiyan (afghanistan) et de gilgit (cachemire),” in: *Journal Asiatique*, Janvier-Mars 1932, pp. 1-45.

Matsumura, Hisashi 松村 恒

1982 「薬師経の諸伝本」 『佛教學』 13, pp. 73-103 (“Recensions of the *Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra*,” in: *Bukkyo-gaku [Journal of Buddhist Studies]* 13, pp. 73-103).

Meadows, Carol

1986 *Ārya-Śūra's Compendium of the Perfections: Text, Translation and Analysis of the Pāramitāsamāsa*. (Indica et Tibetica 8), Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.  
Reviewed by J. W. de Jong 1989.

Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra

1959-74 *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)*. Śata-Piṭaka Series Volume 10, parts 1-10, Delhi: The International Academy of India (reprinted as: *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts, revised and enlarged compact facsimile edition*. Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica Series 150, 151, 152, Delhi 1995 in three parts).

SAITO, Naoki

2005 *Das Kompendium Der Moralischen Vollkommenheiten by Āryaśūra, Vairocana and Vairocanarāṣitas Tibetische Übertragung Von Āryaśūras Pāramitāsamāsa Samt Neuausgabe Des Sanskrittextes*. (Indica et Tibetica 38), Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.

SATO, Seiji 佐藤 誠司

1991 「伝 Ārya Śūra 作 『波羅蜜の要約 (Pāramitāsamāsa)』 第1章和訳」 『論集』 18, pp. 1-16. [“Ārya Śūra's ‘Compendium of the Perfections (Pāramitāsamāsa)’ The 1st chapter. A Japanese translation,” in: *Ronshū [Studies in Religions East and West]*, 18, pp. 1-16].

Sander, Lore

1968 *Paläographisches zu den Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung, Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, Wiesbaden, 1968.*

1983 “Einige neue Aspekte zur Entwicklung der Brāhmī in Gilgit und Bamiyan (ca. 2.–7. Jh. n. Chr.),” in: *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien: Vorträge des Hamburger Symposions vom 2. Juli bis 5. Juli 1981*, ed. K. Röhrborn and Wolfgang Veenker, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, pp. 113-124.

1989 “Remarks on the Formal Brāhmī of Gilgit, Bāmiyān, and Khotan: with an Appendix of Selected Inscriptions from Thor North (Pakistan),” in: *Antiquities of Northern Pakistan — Reports and Studies*, vol. 1: Rock Inscriptions in the Indus Valley, Text, ed. by Karl Jettmar, pp. 107-130.

2007 “Confusion of Terms and Terms of Confusion in Indian Palaeography,” in: *Expanding and Merging Horizons. Contributions to South Asian and Cross-Cultural Studies in Commemoration of Wilhelm Halbfax*. ÖAW Denkschriften, 351 Band. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, pp. 121-139.

Schopen, Gregory

1977 “Sukhāvātī as a generalized religious goal in Sanskrit Mahāyāna Sūtra literature,” in: *Indo-Iranian Journal* 19, pp. 177-210 [Appendix I: Gilgit Mss. of *Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra* (p. 205-207), Appendix II: Gilgit Ms. of *Samādhirāja-sūtra*, Appendix III: Dutt's edition of *Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra* (p. 208-210)].

1978 *The Bhaiṣajyaguru-Sūtra and the Buddhism in Gilgit*. (Unpublished PhD thesis, submitted to Australia National University, Canberra.)

2009 “On the Absence of Urtexts and Otiose Ācāryas: Buildings, Books, and Lay Buddhist Ritual at Gilgit,” in: *Écrire et transmettre en Inde classique / sous la direction de Gérard Colas et Gerdi Gerschheimer*. (Études thématiques 23), Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient, pp. 189-219.

<key words: Pāramitāsamāsa, Āryaśūra, Gilgit manuscripts>